Light-shift induced behaviors observed in momentum-space quantum walks
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Over the last decade there have been many advances in studies of quantum walks (QWs) including a momentum-space QW recently realized in our spinor Bose-Einstein condensate system. This QW possessed behaviors that generally agreed with theoretical predictions, however, it also showed interesting momentum distributions that were not adequately explained by the theory. We present a new theoretical model, which proves that the coherent dynamics of the spinor condensate is sufficient to explain the experimental data without invoking the presence of a thermal cloud of atoms as in the original theory. Our numerical findings are supported by an analytical prediction for the momentum distributions in the limit of zero-temperature condensates. This new model provides more complete explanations to the momentum-space QWs that can be applied to study quantum search algorithms and topological phases in Floquet-driven systems.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum walks have been under intensive investigation over the last two decades since they can outperform classical algorithms for many practical problems [1–3]. For example, the Grover search algorithm may be viewed as a quantum walk algorithm [2]. Due to quantum interference of various passes during the walk, quantum walks exhibit quite different features when compared to their classical counterpart for which, in contrast, randomness and stochasticity play a crucial role [1]. Similar to classical random walks there are essentially two types of quantum analogues, discrete-time and continuous-time quantum walks. In contrast to the latter, an additional coin-degree-of-freedom characterizes the former, where the state of the coin determines the walker’s direction in the next step.

We apply a new theoretical model to the discrete-time quantum walk implemented in our previous works [4–6] with spinor Bose-Einstein condensates (BECs), consisting of $^{87}$Rb atoms with an additional internal spin-1/2 degree of freedom. In contrast to most other experimental realizations [7–23], this QW occurs in quantized momentum space due to time-periodic kicks applied to the condensate. The experiments in Refs. [4–6] used the two ground-state Zeeman sublevels $|F = 1, m_F = 0\rangle$ and $|F = 2, m_F = 0\rangle$ of a Rubidium BEC to form an effective spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ system. The BEC is periodically subjected to pulses of standing-wave light generated by a laser tuned between the two states. The underlying description is that of the atom-optics kicked rotor (AOKR) as described in Refs. [24, 25], whose Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H} = \frac{1}{2}\hat{p}^2 + k\cos(\hat{\theta}) \sum_{j=-\infty}^{\infty} \delta(t - j\tau).$$

Here, $\hat{p}$ and $\hat{\theta}$ represent the momentum and (angular) position operators, respectively, while $k$ is the strength of the laser kick and $\tau$ the time delay between consecutive pulses. Since the experiment is performed in a periodic lattice potential, we resort to Bloch’s theorem to arrive at the angle description above. This necessitates the introduction of a dimensionless quasi-momentum $\beta \in [0, 1)$. The width of the Gaussian-like quasi-momentum distribution is experimentally given by the initial temperature of the BEC, where a BEC at zero temperature would correspond to a fully resonant system with $\beta = 0$ for all atoms. The typical value of the width of the $\beta$-distribution in our experimental system is of the order of a few percent in the Brillouin zone, i.e., $\beta_{\text{FWHM}} \approx 0.025$.

The evolution during one period $\tau$ is then described by the following Floquet operator

$$\hat{U} = \hat{U}_f \hat{U}_k = e^{-i\tau \hat{K}} e^{-i\sigma, k \cos(\hat{\theta})},$$

which factorizes into a free evolution $\hat{U}_f$ and kick operator $\hat{U}_k$. Since $p = n + \beta$, with integer (quantized angular) momenta $n$, the free evolution equals the identity in quantum resonance conditions, i.e., for an evolution...
corresponding to a full Talbot time $\tau = 4\pi$ and $\beta = 0$. Under these resonance conditions, the atoms move ballistically in momentum space, i.e., their momenta increase linearly with the number of applied kicks [25, 26].

Because the kicking laser is detuned between the two internal states, the potential felt by the two states is identical in size but opposite in sign, which reflects the $\sigma_z$ Pauli matrix. The latter fact models a quantum walk whose direction in each step depends on the internal coin state. There is an important difference between our AOKR quantum walk and an ideal quantum walk as defined, e.g., in Ref. [1]. In the latter at any step of the walk a certain position of the walker couples exactly to the nearest-neighbor positions, whilst in the AOKR quantum walks the coupling to other momentum classes is given by matrix elements which are Bessel functions of first kind [6]. A priori, both internal states would see the same evolution due to the kicks, i.e., they would move symmetrically under the AOKR evolution. To break this symmetry in the coupling, we use a ratchet effect imposed by an appropriate choice of the initial condition in the walker’s space. Those ratchet states are a superposition of at least two neighboring momenta with a relative phase of $e^{i\pi/2}$, i.e.,

$$|\psi_R\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{S}} \sum_s e^{i s \pi/2} |n = s\rangle,$$

where $S$ is the total number of involved momentum classes denoted by $s$. Such initial states can be generated experimentally via Bragg pulses [27, 28]. The mean momentum transfer to individual states depends on the sign of the kicking potential that is different for the two internal states, as shown by [25, 29, 30]. It turns out to be of crucial importance that the larger the internal states, the potential felt by the two states is identical in size but opposite in sign, which reflects the $\sigma_z$ Pauli matrix. The latter fact models a quantum walk whose direction in each step depends on the internal coin state. There is an important difference between our AOKR quantum walk and an ideal quantum walk as defined, e.g., in Ref. [1]. In the latter at any step of the walk a certain position of the walker couples exactly to the nearest-neighbor positions, whilst in the AOKR quantum walks the coupling to other momentum classes is given by matrix elements which are Bessel functions of first kind [6]. A priori, both internal states would see the same evolution due to the kicks, i.e., they would move symmetrically under the AOKR evolution. To break this symmetry in the coupling, we use a ratchet effect imposed by an appropriate choice of the initial condition in the walker’s space. Those ratchet states are a superposition of at least two neighboring momenta with a relative phase of $e^{i\pi/2}$, i.e.,

$$|\psi_R\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{S}} \sum_s e^{i s \pi/2} |n = s\rangle,$$

where $S$ is the total number of involved momentum classes denoted by $s$. Such initial states can be generated experimentally via Bragg pulses [27, 28]. The mean momentum transfer to individual states depends on the sign of the kicking potential that is different for the two internal states, as shown by [25, 29, 30]. It turns out to be of crucial importance that the larger the internal states, the potential felt by the two states is identical in size but opposite in sign, which reflects the $\sigma_z$ Pauli matrix. The latter fact models a quantum walk whose direction in each step depends on the internal coin state. There is an important difference between our AOKR quantum walk and an ideal quantum walk as defined, e.g., in Ref. [1]. In the latter at any step of the walk a certain position of the walker couples exactly to the nearest-neighbor positions, whilst in the AOKR quantum walks the coupling to other momentum classes is given by matrix elements which are Bessel functions of first kind [6]. A priori, both internal states would see the same evolution due to the kicks, i.e., they would move symmetrically under the AOKR evolution. To break this symmetry in the coupling, we use a ratchet effect imposed by an appropriate choice of the initial condition in the walker’s space. Those ratchet states are a superposition of at least two neighboring momenta with a relative phase of $e^{i\pi/2}$, i.e.,

$$|\psi_R\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{S}} \sum_s e^{i s \pi/2} |n = s\rangle,$$

where $S$ is the total number of involved momentum classes denoted by $s$. Such initial states can be generated experimentally via Bragg pulses [27, 28]. The mean momentum transfer to individual states depends on the sign of the kicking potential that is different for the two internal states, as shown by [25, 29, 30]. It turns out to be of crucial importance that the larger the number $S$ in Eq. (3), the less dispersion in the directed kicking occurs [27, 28]. Hence, the best correspondence to an ideal quantum walk is found for large $S \geq 3$, whilst for $S = 2$ differences from ideal walks are visible in the central part of the walker’s probability distribution [31].

The coin operator is realized by a Rabi coupling between the two internal states of the atoms. This coupling is mediated by resonant microwave (MW) pulses, inducing a unitary rotation on the Bloch sphere given by

$$\hat{M}(\alpha, \chi) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\frac{\alpha}{2}) & e^{-i \chi} \sin(\frac{\alpha}{2}) \\ -e^{i \chi} \sin(\frac{\alpha}{2}) & \cos(\frac{\alpha}{2}) \end{pmatrix},$$

where $\alpha$ and $\chi$ are real angles. An additional $\sigma_z$ rotation is implementable by an accessible third angle that was not considered in Refs. [4, 6] and will also not be considered in this paper. The experimental QWs in Ref. [4, 6] were described by the following sequence of unitary operations

$$\hat{U}_\text{step}^j = [\hat{M}]^j \hat{W},$$

realizing $j \in \mathbb{N}$ steps of the walk applied to an initial state expressed by Eq. (3). Here

$$\hat{W} = \hat{M} \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, 0 \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ -i & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\hat{Y} = \hat{M} \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2} \right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ i & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

are two different coins that initialize and execute the walk, respectively. It is important that the two coins must be different in order to guarantee a symmetric evolution of the walker (see Ref. [1]). The kick strength on the order of $k \approx 1.5$ proves to resemble well an ideal walk with only nearest neighbor couplings [4, 6, 31]. For example, the experiments reported in Refs. [4, 6] used $k = 1.2$, $k = 1.45$, and $k = 1.8$. After $j$ steps, the momentum distribution of both internal states is measured using the standard absorption imaging procedure to yield the final observable $P(n,j) = P_{11}(n,j) + P_{22}(n,j)$. Note that all the experimental realizations so far implemented walks with only $S = 2$, e.g., an initial ratchet state of the form

$$|\psi_R\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|n = 0\rangle + i |n = 1\rangle).$$

Numerical simulations of the walk given by Eq. (5) showed a good resemblance to the ideal quantum walk [31], with ballistically moving sidepeaks and little probability at the center around $n = 0$. However, the experiments observed a large non-vanishing part of the momentum distribution that stayed close to $n = 0$ throughout the entire evolution of up to $j = 15$ steps [4, 6]. This observation was initially explained in Ref. [4] by a rather large residual thermal atomic cloud that would make up about 10% to 15% of all the measured atoms. A thermal cloud would correspond to much hotter atoms uniformly distributed across the entire Brillouin zone $\beta \in [0, 1)$. All non-resonant quasi-momenta ($\beta \neq 0$) essentially do not respond to the kicks and hence will move little and not at all contribute to the expected ballistic flanks in the distribution. In this paper we suggest a more complete theoretical interpretation of the experimental data, not involving a thermal cloud but based on several coincidences that resulted in a deviation of the experimentally measured walks from the theoretical expectation. These coincidences include a different choice of the phase angle $\chi$ in Eq. (1) and the specific form of the ratchet initial state in Eq. (8), both reflecting the fact that we are dealing with an AOKR quantum walk and not with an ideal quantum walk for which the observed effect would not occur.

II. NEW THEORETICAL MODEL

A. Light-shift compensation in the experiment

As shown in Refs. [32, 33], the Hamiltonian for an AOKR with two different internal states contains an additional constant AC Stark shift [34] between the two energy levels. This light shift induces a phase whenever
a kick is applied giving an effective kick of the form

$$\hat{U}_{k,\text{eff}} = e^{-i\sigma_z k \left(1 + \cos(\theta)\right)}.$$  

(9)

This means that there is a relative phase of $2k$ for each application of the kick operator, i.e., for each step of the walk. This light-shift phase needs to be compensated in the experiment since it would lead to a different evolution with respect to the theoretical prediction (note that the new terms in Eq. (9) would adversely affect the phase evolution in the internal degree of freedom changing the overall interference pattern). A compensation with a $\sigma_z$ phase gate with a third Bloch angle $\gamma = k$ by an additional MW pulse would be possible. The experiments reported in Refs. [4][6], however, used the phase $\chi$ of Eq. (4) as a free parameter in order to best compensate the light shift phase. Several runs were made for various choices of $\chi$ and finally the value, with which the walk was most symmetric around $n = 0$, was used in all other experiments in Refs. [4][6]. The absolute value of $\chi$ as well as a possibly present third Bloch angle $\gamma$ were under limited experimental control, and the aforementioned compensation procedure seemed to make this fact irrelevant.

The experiments may have, for instance, easily exchanged the coin $\hat{Y}$ by the coin $\hat{G}_H$ in the walk, effectively resulting in a new sequence, e.g.,

$$\hat{U}_{\text{step}}^j = [\hat{U}\hat{G}_H]^j \hat{U}\hat{Y},$$

(10)

The $\hat{Y}$ and $\hat{G}_H$ curves in Fig. 1(a) show that such an exchange of the two coins indeed has dramatic effects on the quality of the walk. The operator $\hat{G}_H$ is the Hadamard gate defined as [6]:

$$\hat{G}_H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$  

(11)

While momentum distributions of the QWs represented by Eq. (10) and Eq. (5) are mirror symmetric around $n = 0$ since both coins are perfectly balanced (all giving unbiased walks), the actual final distributions look very different. Assuming that only a MW pulse expressed by Eq. (4) was applied as stated in Refs. [4][6] with $\alpha = \pi/2$ fixed, the combined effect of a MW pulse and the light shift could have been of the form

$$\hat{M} \left( \frac{\pi}{2}, \chi \right) e^{-ik\sigma_z} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-ik} & e^{-i(\chi + k)} \\ -e^{i(\chi - k)} & e^{ik} \end{pmatrix}$$

(12)

$$= \frac{e^{-ik}}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & e^{-i(\chi - 2k)} \\ -e^{i\chi} & e^{-2ik} \end{pmatrix}.$$  

(13)

In the last step we extracted a global phase $e^{-ik}$ that is not important for the following discussion. Generally, the phase $\chi$ cannot fully remove the effect of the light shift phase here. The quantum walk can, however, still be made symmetric around $n = 0$ by the choice $\chi = 2k = \pi \mod (2\pi)$, which would yield an effective MW operation. Hence, the aforementioned swapping of the two different coin operators could have occurred in the experiments. For example, with a kick strength of $k \approx 1.5$ the light shift phase gives a value close to $2k \approx \pi$ (see Eq. (7)). Small deviations from the condition for $1.2 < k < 1.8$ appear not to change the global picture, as will be later shown in more detail in Sect. [IIE].

Figure 1. The walker’s distributions are shown after $j = 20$ steps for an AOKR discrete-time quantum walk. The kick strength is set at the experimental value $k = 1.45$. In (a) different walk protocols are shown. The distributions are computed by evolving the initial state in momentum space given by Eq. (8). The label $\hat{Y}$ resembles the walk that is initialized by $\hat{W}$ and the evolution is executed with the $\hat{Y}$-coin. $\hat{W}$ and $\hat{G}_H$ are initialized by the $\hat{Y}$-coin and then their respective walk is executed by $\hat{W}$ or $\hat{G}_H$. $\hat{Y}$ and $\hat{W}$ produce the same momentum distributions for all times. The AOKR walks in (b) are implemented by the $\hat{Y}$-coin and executed by the $\hat{G}_H$-coin. The different labels denote the momentum classes included in the initial state, as denoted by $\hat{s}$ in Eq. (53). The broader the initial state is in momentum space the more the peak in the central region vanishes. One should remember that only the state expressed by Eq. (8) (solid orange line) was experimentally implemented in Refs. [4][6].
B. Alternative MW pulse – Hadamard Gate

We have just seen that the actually implemented MW pulses in the experiment may be close to Hadamard gates $\hat{G}_H$. In contrast to the original $\hat{W}$ pulses, $\hat{G}_H$ pulses have the minus sign on the diagonal. Both pulses, however, are completely unbiased leading to walks with sidepeaks moving symmetrically outwards in a ballistic manner. We find that the difference in the signs of $\hat{W}$ and $\hat{G}_H$ matrix elements has no consequence for an ideal quantum walk with just nearest-neighbor couplings. For our AOKR walks, however, the different sign induces significantly different behavior. Figure 1(a) shows a numerical example derived for a perfectly resonant walk ($\beta = 0$). Our simulation results for the new proposed QW (see Eq. (10)) clearly indicate that the bulk of its momentum distributions has a larger probability to remain in the center ($n = 0$), as shown by the orange curve in Fig. 1(a).

C. Initial-state dependence

As described previously, an important difference between an ideal quantum walk and the AOKR walks discussed in this paper are the initial states in the walker’s space [4]. The initial state experimentally implemented was expressed by Eq. (8) with two involved momenta. As described in Refs. [27–30], the state is constructed to be concentrated in position space at the rising (falling) flanks of the potential where the force impulse towards the left (right) is maximal. It is exactly this effect that leads to directed ratchet-like motion. The more momentum states that are included in the initial state, the more densely peaked is the wavefunction in position (angle) space. For a highly dense wavefunction in position space, the directed motion works with minimal dispersion. The latter is a nuisance in our AOKR walk with respect to an ideal quantum walk. Hence, it is indeed not too surprising that the AOKR QWs become more similar to ideal QWs when using "better" ratchet initial states. This is seen in Fig. 1(b) for the walk with the new Hadamard coin $\hat{G}_H$ during the evolution steps. The artificial clumping at the center of the momentum distributions disappears when more momentum classes are included in the initial states (see Fig. 1(b)).

It is known that an ideal quantum walk does not display a central peak from the start, independent of the initial state (see Ref. [1]). The consequence is that an ideal walk does not display any difference between the various implementations using the different balanced coins described above. In the end, the dominant central peak, displayed when using the $\hat{G}_H$ coin, can be seen as an artefact from AOKR realization when using the simplest initial state. This central peak disappears when adding more momentum classes to the initial state (see Fig. 1(b)). This provides a clear prediction that could easily be checked in future experiments.

D. Analytic solution

A comparison between the numerical implementation of the new walk given by Eq. (10) and the corresponding analytical solution derived from Eq. (C63) is shown in Fig. 2. The full calculation for the analytical expression is somewhat lengthy and reveals little insight as it closely follows Refs. [32, 33]. Therefore, we only present here the final result for the momentum distributions, while the calculation in full detail can be found in the App. ??.

The final momentum distribution is
\[ P(n,j) = P_{1}(n,j) + P_{2}(n,j) = \frac{1}{2^{j+1}S} \left[ \left( \sum_{l=0}^{N} \sum_{s} a_{l,1}(-1)^{s} J_{(n-s)}((N-2l-1)k) \right)^{2} + \left( \sum_{l=0}^{N} \sum_{s} a_{l,2}(-1)^{s} J_{(n-s)}((N-2l+1)k) \right)^{2} + \left( \sum_{l=0}^{N} \sum_{s} a_{l,1}(-1)^{s} J_{(n-s)}(-(N-2l-1)k) \right)^{2} + \left( \sum_{l=0}^{N} \sum_{s} a_{l,2}(-1)^{s} J_{(n-s)}(-(N-2l+1)k) \right)^{2} \right] \]

Here \( J_{\alpha}(x) \) are Bessel functions of the first kind and the coefficients \( a_{l,1/2} \) are given by

\[
a_{l,1} = \frac{1}{2^{N}} \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \sum_{m=0}^{l} \left( \begin{array}{c} N \\ 2u \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} N \\ 2u+1 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} u \\ m \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} N-2m \\ l-m \end{array} \right) (-1)^{-l+m} 8^{m} 
+ \frac{1}{2^{N}} \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \sum_{m=0}^{l} \left( \begin{array}{c} N \\ 2u \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} N-2m+1 \\ l-m \end{array} \right) (-1)^{-l+m} 8^{m} 
- \frac{1}{2^{N}} \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \sum_{m=0}^{l} \left( \begin{array}{c} N+1 \\ 2u+1 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} u \\ m \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} N-2m \\ l-m \end{array} \right) (-1)^{-l+m} 8^{m}, \]

\[
a_{l,2} = \frac{1}{2^{N}} \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \sum_{m=0}^{l} \left( \begin{array}{c} N+1 \\ 2u+1 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} u \\ m \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} N-2m \\ l-m \end{array} \right) (-1)^{-l+m} 8^{m}, \]

with \( N = j - 1 \). The sum over \( s \) in Eq. (C63) denotes the sum over the involved momentum classes in the initial state given by Eq. (C53). Note that the momentum distribution is found to be of the same analytical form as those discussed in Ref. [33]. The coefficients only differ from previous results by a factor \((-1)^{-l}\) within the sums. These additional factors change the interference patterns in such a way that the different walk protocols, as discussed in Sect. IIA, result in different momentum distributions. Hence, we arrived at a full understanding of the two different QWs with the two coins \( \hat{Y} \) and \( \hat{W} \) (or rather \( \hat{G}_{H} \)) interchanged.

### E. Comparison between theoretical explanations

We have put forward an alternative way of understanding the central peaks around zero momentum in the experimental implementations of the AOKR quantum walks. To simulate experimental systems, we must include the finite width in the initial quasi-momentum distribution of the spinor BECs mentioned in Sect. IIA. This is best done numerically by averaging over a reasonable ensemble of quasi-momenta \( \beta \). Nonresonant \( \beta \) induces a phase scrambling making the walks less ballistic with the effect of reducing the population in the ballistically moving sidepeaks. The value of \( \beta \), drawn from a Gaussian distribution of a certain width \( \beta_{FWHM} \), was estimated in the experiments as \( \beta_{FWHM} \approx 0.025 \) (see Refs. [4, 6]). The numerical walks are obtained as an average over 1000 realizations, with each realization involving a value of \( \beta \) being randomly drawn from the corresponding Gaussian.

In the left panels of Fig. 3, the walks are implemented by the \( \hat{G}_{H} \) coin, while the right panels feature the implementation of Eq. (13). In other words, while the left panels show the new walk that we argue to be responsible for the experimentally observed momentum distributions, the right panels show theoretical predictions using experimental parameters based on the originally proposed \( \hat{W} \) coin and a "wrong" compensation phase (see Eq. (13)) with \( \chi = \pi \) and \( k = 1.45 \). As anticipated in Sect. IIA, the latter two protocols given by Eq. (10) and Eq. (13) essentially lead to the same momentum distributions for all choices of \( \beta_{FWHM} = 0 \) in Fig. 3(a,b), \( \beta_{FWHM} = 0.01 \) in Fig. 3(c,d), and \( \beta_{FWHM} = 0.025 \) in Fig. 3(e,f). With increasing \( \beta_{FWHM} \), the sidearms and the central regions become less and less distinct and the ballistic sidepeaks tend to fade out.

Similar behaviors were seen in our experimental data [16]. Figure 3(a) shows a typical experimental result adapted from Ref. [4]. We find good theory-experiment agreements by comparing Fig. 3(a) with Fig. 3(b) that shows the predictions of our new model (See Eq. (10)). First, we observe in both Fig. 3(a) and Fig. 3(b) a central part that does not evolve far away from the origin and the two sidearms that evolve ballistically away from their initial position in momentum space. Second, the observed
Figure 3. Numerical simulations of AOKR quantum walks with $k = 1.45$ and different quasi-momentum distributions with $\beta_{\text{FWHM}} = 0$ (a,b), $\beta_{\text{FWHM}} = 0.01$ (c,d), and $\beta_{\text{FWHM}} = 0.025$ (e,f), all averaged over 1000 values of $\beta$. Left panels: implemented with the $\hat{G}_H$ coin. Right panels: executed with Eq. (13) at $\chi = \pi$. It can be seen that despite the small deviations, as discussed in Sect. II A, both protocols essentially follow the same behavior, making both likely to correspond to the actual experimental data.

and predicted rates of the spread of these sidearms in momentum space with increasing number of steps appear comparable. Our new interpretation shown in Fig. 4(b) would also be in reasonable agreement with the originally guessed temperature of the BEC with $\beta_{\text{FWHM}} \approx 0.025$, when the fainting of the sidearms is considered. Fig. 4(c) shows momentum distributions of the QW given by the old theoretical model (see Eq. (5)) after a residual thermal cloud of atoms is added into the BECs. The QWs shown in Fig. 4(c) appear to be different from our experimental observations, i.e., the predicted QWs lack the significantly contributing central region and the structure of the sidearms are of a quite different shape. More theory-experiment agreements between our new theoretical model (see Eq. (10)) and the experimental data reported in our previous works [4–6] are elaborated in App. D for other values of the kick strengths.
III. CONCLUSION

We have introduced a more complete theoretical explanation for the peculiar behavior observed in the discrete-time quantum walks implemented with the AOKR platform in Refs. [4–6]. We argue that the coin operations acting on the internal states of the atoms may have been different from the original proposal discussed in Ref. [31]. This difference, induced by the experimental calibration of the coin parameters together with an additional AC Stark shift present in the setup, may have led to less efficient quantum walks with a large population remaining close to the starting site of the walker.

The understanding of these experimental results is of importance for further applications of walks realized with the AOKR platform. Our analysis implies that the realized walks may have had a higher quality than expected in the subsequent manner: the central population seemingly not participating in the walker’s evolution is actually an artificial interference effect induced by a non-optimal coin and therefore an ingredient of the system itself. This effect makes the AOKR platform look even better for the quantum simulation of non-trivial walks and the investigation of applications such as quantum search algorithms [36] or of topological phases in Floquet-driven systems [37].
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Appendix A: Details of the analytic calculation of the momentum distribution

We consider one step of the new quantum walk of interest and this is expressed by the operator $U$. The walk will be initialized by the $Y$-matrix.

$$U \equiv G_H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & e^{-i k \cos(\theta)} & 0 \\ 1 & -1 & 0 & e^{i k \cos(\theta)} \end{pmatrix}$$

$$Y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ i & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

To derive a closed form solution to the evolution we rewrite $U^T$ with $N \equiv T - 1$ and $N \geq 0$. We define $U^T$ in the following fashion:

$$U^T = \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^T \begin{pmatrix} A_1^{(T-1)}(k) & A_2^{(T-1)}(k) \\ A_3^{(T-1)}(k) & A_4^{(T-1)}(k) \end{pmatrix}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A3)

Repeating the steps of the calculation in Ref. [33], the goal is to express the matrix elements as polynomials in the kick operator $e^\pm ik \cos(\theta)$ and then translate the resulting evolution back to momentum space. Looking at the first few orders of the evolution, we notice that the matrix elements are related to each other according to

$$A_1^{(N)}(k) = (-1)^{N+1} A_4^{(N)}(-k),$$

$$A_2^{(N)}(k) = (-1)^{N+1} A_3^{(N)}(-k).$$  \hspace{1cm} (A4) \hspace{1cm} (A5)

The matrix entries will be found to be recursive polynomials. The initial conditions are

$$p_1^{(0)}(\tilde{z}) = p_2^{(0)}(\tilde{z}) = 1,$$  \hspace{1cm} (A6)

$$p_1^{(1)}(\tilde{z}) = z \equiv e^{-i k \cos(\theta)} + e^{i k \cos(\theta)},$$

$$p_2^{(1)}(\tilde{z}) = \tilde{z} \equiv e^{-i k \cos(\theta)} - e^{i k \cos(\theta)}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A7) \hspace{1cm} (A8)

We will show by induction that the following equations hold for calculating the matrix elements included: for arbitrary $N$:

$$A_1^{(N)}(\tilde{z}) = e^{-i k \cos(\theta)} p_1^{(N)}(\tilde{z})$$

$$A_2^{(N)}(\tilde{z}) = e^{i k \cos(\theta)} p_2^{(N)}(\tilde{z}).$$  \hspace{1cm} (A9) \hspace{1cm} (A10)
where the polynomials $p_1^{(N)}$ and $p_2^{(N)}$ are defined by a recursion formula.

$$p^{(N)} = \tilde{z}p^{(N-1)} + 2p^{(N-2)} \quad \text{(A11)}$$

It will be demonstrated that the solution to the recursion can be written as polynomials in the kick operator, i.e.,

$$p_1^{(N)} = \sum_{l=0}^{N} a_{1,l/2} e^{ik\cos(\theta)(N-2l)} \quad \text{(A12)}$$

Comparing to Ref. [33], one should notice slight differences. The computations will be somewhat analogous, but will also show differences in the details. In this section, the matrix elements in Eq. (A4) and Eq. (A5) have different relations amongst each other, compared to Ref. [33]. Also the polynomials in Eq. (A6)-(A8) are now functions in $\tilde{z}$ instead of having $z$ as their argument. Slight deviations are also found in Eq. (A9)-(A10) and the recursion formula shows the same structure but varies from the one reported in Ref. [33] for the walk with $Y$ instead of $\tilde{G}_H$.

**Appendix B: Solution to the recursion formula**

Let us assume for now that Eq. (A11) is true. To solve the equation one may choose the ansatz $p^{(N)}(z) \equiv x^N(z)$ and plug it in which yields

$$x^N = \tilde{z}x^{(N-1)} + 2x^{(N-2)} \quad \text{(B1)}$$

This leads to a quadratic formula

$$x^2 = \tilde{z}x + 2 \quad \text{(B2)}$$

with the solution

$$x_{1/2} = \frac{\tilde{z} \pm \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2} \quad \text{(B3)}$$

The recursion formula from above satisfies linearity. Therefore the general solution is given by a linear combination of both solutions.

$$p_1^{(N)}(z) = c_1 x_1^{(N)} + c_2 x_2^{(N)} \quad \text{(B4)}$$

The coefficients $c_1$ and $c_2$ can be found by putting in the initial conditions which leads to

$$p_1^{(N)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2z - \tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\tilde{z} + \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2z - \tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\tilde{z} - \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N \quad \text{(B5)}$$

and

$$p_2^{(N)} = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + \frac{\tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\tilde{z} + \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{\tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\tilde{z} - \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N \quad \text{(B6)}$$

Since the initial conditions and the recursion showed some differences from Ref. [33], we find a solution for the polynomials that differs in several signs and as stated above, the polynomials have their argument in $\tilde{z}$. 
Appendix C: Prerequisites

Before continuing some simple relations will be shown that will later prove themselves to be useful:

\[ z^2 - \tilde{z}^2 = (e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} + e^{ik\cos(\theta)})^2 - (e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} - e^{ik\cos(\theta)})^2 \]
\[ = e^{-2ik\cos(\theta)} + e^{2ik\cos(\theta)} + 2 - (e^{-2ik\cos(\theta)} + e^{2ik\cos(\theta)} - 2) \]
\[ = 4 \]  \hspace{1cm} (C1)

\[ (z - \tilde{z})(z\tilde{z} + \tilde{z}^2 + 8) = \left( e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} + e^{ik\cos(\theta)} - (e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} - e^{ik\cos(\theta)}) \right) \]
\[ \cdot \left( e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} + e^{ik\cos(\theta)}(e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} - e^{ik\cos(\theta)}) + (e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} - e^{ik\cos(\theta)})^2 + 8 \right) \]
\[ = 2e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \left( e^{-2ik\cos(\theta)} - e^{2ik\cos(\theta)} + (e^{-2ik\cos(\theta)} + e^{2ik\cos(\theta)} - 2) + 8 \right) \]
\[ = 2e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \left( 2e^{-2ik\cos(\theta)} + 6 \right) = 4 \left( e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} + 3e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \right) \]
\[ = 4 \left( 2e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} + e^{ik\cos(\theta)} - 2(e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} - e^{ik\cos(\theta)}) \right) \]
\[ = 4(2z - \tilde{z}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (C2)

\[ z^\alpha = (e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} - e^{ik\cos(\theta)})^\alpha \]
\[ = \sum_{u=0}^{\alpha} \binom{\alpha}{u} (e^{-ik\cos(\theta)})^u (-e^{ik\cos(\theta)})^{\alpha-u} \]  \hspace{1cm} (C3)
\[ = \sum_{u=0}^{\alpha} \binom{\alpha}{u} (-1)^{\alpha-u} e^{ik\cos(\theta)(\alpha-2u)} \]

\[ \int_0^{2\pi} e^{in\theta} e^{ik\cos(\theta)} d\theta = 2\pi i^n J_n(k) \]  \hspace{1cm} (C4)

\[ J_{-a}(k) = (-1)^a J_a(k) \]  \hspace{1cm} (C5)

Eq. (C4) is taken from Ref. [38].

1. Proof for recursion

We have already solved the recursion above by the ansatz. We still have to show that the solution of the recursion also solves for the matrix elements as stated in Eqs. (A9) and (A10). The proof will follow by induction. The statement is trivially true for \( N = 0 \), by the choice of the initial conditions. Now let the statement be true for \( N \). Then we will show that the statement will also be true for \( N + 1 \). It is

\[ U^{(T+1)} \propto \begin{pmatrix} A_1^{(T-1)}(k) & A_2^{(T-1)}(k) \\ A_3^{(T-1)}(k) & A_4^{(T-1)}(k) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} & e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \\ e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} & -e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \end{pmatrix}. \]  \hspace{1cm} (C6)

From that we can conclude:

\[ A_1^{(N+1)} = e^{-ik\cos(\theta)}(A_1^{(N)} + A_2^{(N)}) \]  \hspace{1cm} (C7)
\[ A_2^{(N+1)} = e^{ik\cos(\theta)}(A_1^{(N)} - A_2^{(N)}). \]  \hspace{1cm} (C8)

First we proof the induction for \( A_1 \).
Therefore the induction for $A_1$ is complete. It remains to finish the induction for $A_2$. 

(C9) \[A_1^{(N+1)} = e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} (A_1^{(N)} + A_2^{(N)})\]

(C10) \[= e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} \left(e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} p_1^{(N)} + e^{ik\cos(\theta)} p_2^{(N)}\right)\]

(C11) \[= e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} \left(\frac{z + \bar{z}}{2} p_1^{(N)} + \frac{z - \bar{z}}{2} p_2^{(N)}\right)\]

(C12) \[= e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} \left(\bar{z} p_1^{(N)} + \frac{z - \bar{z}}{2} (p_1^{(N)} + p_2^{(N)})\right)\]

(C13) \[= e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} \left(\frac{z - \bar{z}}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2z - \bar{z}}{\sqrt{z^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{z} + \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N + \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \frac{2z - \bar{z}}{\sqrt{z^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{z} - \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N\right)\]

(C14) \[= e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} \left(\frac{z - \bar{z}}{2} \left(1 + \frac{2z - \bar{z}}{\sqrt{z^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{z} + \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N + \frac{1}{2} \left(2 - \frac{2z - \bar{z}}{\sqrt{z^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{z} - \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N\right)\]

(C15) \[= e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} \left(\bar{z} p_1^{(N)} + \left(\frac{z - \bar{z}}{2} + \frac{z(z - \bar{z})}{2\sqrt{z^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{z} + \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N\right)\]

(C16) \[= e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} \left(\bar{z} p_1^{(N)} + \left(\frac{z - \bar{z}}{2} + \frac{z(z - \bar{z})}{2\sqrt{z^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{z} + \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N - \left(\frac{z - \bar{z}}{2} - \frac{z(z - \bar{z})}{2\sqrt{z^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{z} - \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N\right)\]

(C17) \[= e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} \left(\bar{z} p_1^{(N)} + \left(\frac{z - \bar{z}}{2} + \frac{z(z - \bar{z})}{2\sqrt{z^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{z} + \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N - \left(\frac{z - \bar{z}}{2} - \frac{z(z - \bar{z})}{2\sqrt{z^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{z} - \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N\right)\]

(C18) \[= e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} \left(\bar{z} p_1^{(N)} + \left(\frac{z - \bar{z}}{2} + \frac{z(z - \bar{z})}{2\sqrt{z^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{z} + \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N + \left(1 - \frac{2z - \bar{z}}{\sqrt{z^2 + 8}}\right) \left(\frac{\bar{z} - \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2}\right)^N\right)\]

(C19) \[= e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} \left(\bar{z} p_1^{(N)} + 2p_1^{(N-1)}\right)\]
\[ A_2^{(N+1)} = e^{ik\cos(\theta)} (A_1^{(N)} - A_2^{(N)}) \]
\[ = e^{ik\cos(\theta)} (e^{-ik\cos(\theta)} p_1^{(N)} - e^{ik\cos(\theta)} p_2^{(N)}) \]
\[ = e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \left( \frac{z + \tilde{z}}{2} p_1^{(N)} - \frac{z - \tilde{z}}{2} p_2^{(N)} \right) \]
\[ = e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \left( \tilde{z} p_2^{(N)} + \frac{z + \tilde{z}}{2} (p_1^{(N)} - p_2^{(N)}) \right) \]
\[ = e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \left[ \tilde{z} p_2^{(N)} + \frac{z + \tilde{z}}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{2z - \tilde{z}}{\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} + \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N + \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{2z - \tilde{z}}{\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} - \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N \right) \right] \]
\[ = e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \left[ \tilde{z} p_2^{(N)} + \frac{z + \tilde{z}}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{z - \tilde{z}}{\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} + \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{-z + \tilde{z}}{\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} - \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N \right) \right] \]
\[ = e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \left[ \tilde{z} p_2^{(N)} + \frac{z + \tilde{z}}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{z^2 - \tilde{z}^2}{2\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} + \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{-z^2 + \tilde{z}^2}{2\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} - \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N \right) \right] \]
\[ = e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \left[ \tilde{z} p_2^{(N)} + \frac{z + \tilde{z}}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{z^2 - \tilde{z}^2}{4\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} + \frac{z^2 - \tilde{z}^2}{4} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} + \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{-z^2 + \tilde{z}^2}{4\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} - \frac{z^2 - \tilde{z}^2}{4} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} - \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N \right) \right] \]
\[ = e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \left[ \tilde{z} p_2^{(N)} + \frac{z + \tilde{z}}{2} \left( \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{z^2 - \tilde{z}^2}{4\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} + \frac{z^2 - \tilde{z}^2}{4} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} + \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N + \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{-z^2 + \tilde{z}^2}{4\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} - \frac{z^2 - \tilde{z}^2}{4} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} - \sqrt{z^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N \right) \right] \]
\[ = e^{ik\cos(\theta)} \left[ \tilde{z} p_2^{(N)} + \frac{z + \tilde{z}}{2} p_2^{(N-1)} \right] \]

Therefore it is proven that \( A_1 \) and \( A_2 \) follow the relations given above. \( A_3 \) and \( A_4 \) can from here on be calculated by (A4) and (A5).

2. Rewriting the polynomials

To obtain the final momentum distribution, it is convenient to rewrite the polynomials into a more accessible form. Therefore, the polynomials will be rewritten into polynomials in the kick operator
\[ p_1^N = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{2z - \bar{z}}{\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\bar{z} + \sqrt{\bar{z}^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N + \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{2z - \bar{z}}{\sqrt{z^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\bar{z} - \sqrt{\bar{z}^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N \]  

where in the last step we have changed indices from \( l \) to \( l + m \). Note that for the upper part in Eq. (C33) all odd powers cancelled each other, same account for the uneven powers of the lower part. Furthermore, we defined \( a_{l,1} \) to
be

\[ a_{l,1} = \frac{1}{2N} \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \sum_{m=0}^{l} \left( \binom{N}{2u} - \binom{N}{2u+1} \right) \left( \binom{N-2m}{l-m} \right) (-1)^{N-l+m} \cdot 8^m \]
\[ + \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \sum_{l=1}^{N-2m} \binom{N}{2u+1} \binom{N-2m-1}{l-m-1} (-1)^{N-l+m} \cdot 8^m \]
\[ - \frac{1}{2N^2} \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \sum_{l=0}^{N-2m-1} \binom{N}{2u+1} \binom{N-2m-1}{l-m} (-1)^{N-l+m} \cdot 8^m. \quad (C40) \]

Note the factor \((-1)^m\) dragged out in the third line of the coefficient \(a_{l,1}\). This factor \((-1)^m\) has a different reason in Ref. 33 since it is not resolved from the shift of the index. Analogous steps have to be taken for \(p_2^{(N)}\).

\[
p_2^{(N)} = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{\tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} + \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N + \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 - \frac{\tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} - \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N \quad (C41)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2^{N+1}} \left[ \left( 1 + \frac{\tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} + \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N + \left( 1 - \frac{\tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}} \right) \left( \frac{\tilde{z} - \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N \right] \quad (C42)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2^{N+1}} \left[ \left( \frac{\tilde{z} + \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N + \left( \frac{\tilde{z} - \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N \right] + \frac{\tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}} \left( \frac{\tilde{z} + \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N - \frac{\tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}} \left( \frac{\tilde{z} - \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}}{2} \right)^N \right] \quad (C43)
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{2^{N+1}} \left[ \sum_{u=0}^{N} \binom{N}{u} \tilde{z}^{N-u} \left( \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8} \right)^u + \sum_{u=0}^{N} \binom{N}{u} \tilde{z}^{N-u} \left( -\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8} \right)^u \right.
\]
\[
+ \frac{\tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}} \left( \sum_{u=0}^{N} \binom{N}{u} \tilde{z}^{N-u} \left( \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8} \right)^u - \sum_{u=0}^{N} \binom{N}{u} \tilde{z}^{N-u} \left( -\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8} \right)^u \right) \right] \quad (C44)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2^{N}} \left[ \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \binom{N}{2u} \tilde{z}^{N-2u} \left( \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8} \right)^u + \frac{\tilde{z}}{\sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8}} \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \binom{N}{2u+1} \tilde{z}^{N-2u-1} \left( \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8} \right)^{2u+1} \right] \quad (C45)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2^{N}} \left[ \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \binom{N}{2u} \tilde{z}^{N-2u} \left( \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8} \right)^u + \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \binom{N}{2u+1} \tilde{z}^{N-2u} \left( \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8} \right)^u \right] \quad (C46)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2^{N}} \left[ \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \binom{N+1}{2u+1} \tilde{z}^{N-2u} \left( \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8} \right)^u \right] \quad (C47)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2^{N}} \left[ \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \binom{N+1}{2u+1} \tilde{z}^{N-2u} \left( \sqrt{\tilde{z}^2 + 8} \right)^u \right] \quad (C48)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2^{N}} \left[ \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \sum_{m=0}^{u} \binom{N+1}{2u+1} \binom{u}{m} \tilde{z}^{N-2m} 8^m \right] \quad (C49)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2^{N}} \left[ \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \sum_{m=0}^{N-2m} \sum_{l=0}^{u} \binom{N+1}{2u+1} \binom{u}{m} \left( \binom{N-2m}{l} \right) (-1)^{N-2m-l} 8^m e^{i k \cos(\theta)(N-2m-2l)} \right] \quad (C50)
\]
\[
= \frac{1}{2^{N}} \left[ \sum_{l=0}^{N} a_{l,1} e^{i k \cos(\theta)(N-2l)} \right] \quad (C51)
\]
Again in the last step we shifted the index $l$ shifted to $l + m$ and $a_{l,2}$ has been defined to be:

$$a_{l,2} = \frac{1}{2^N} \sum_{u=0}^{N/2} \sum_{m=0}^{l} \binom{N + 1}{2u + 1} \binom{N - 2m}{l - m} (-1)^{N+l+m} \cdot 8^m$$

(C52)

Please note that in Eqs. (C40) and (C52) the factor $(-1)^N$ acts like a global phase on the system and is therefore irrelevant.

### 3. Calculating the momentum-distribution

The intention is to implement a ratchet state of the form:

$$|\psi_R\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{S}} \sum_s e^{i s \pi/2} |n = s\rangle.$$  

(C53)

As already stated above, the ratchet state is initialized by application of the beamsplitter matrix $\hat{Y}$. We organise our internal basis $|1\rangle \equiv \binom{0}{i}$ and $|2\rangle \equiv \binom{i}{0}$. Therefore, the total initial state is given by

$$\psi_{in} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (i|1\rangle + |2\rangle) \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{S}} \sum_s e^{-is\pi/2} |n = s\rangle.$$  

(C54)
The total momentum distribution is given as the sum of the momentum distributions of both the respective internal states.

\[ P(n, T) = P_{(1)}(n, T) + P_{(2)}(n, T) \]

\[ = \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} e^{-in\theta} \langle \theta, 1 \vert U_T^\dagger \vert \psi_{in} \rangle d\theta \right]^2 + \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} e^{-in\theta} \langle \theta, 2 \vert U_T^\dagger \vert \psi_{in} \rangle d\theta \right]^2 \]  

\[ = \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} e^{-in\theta} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^T \langle \theta, 1 \vert \left( A_{1}^{(T-1)}(k) A_{2}^{(T-1)}(k) \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (i|1) + |2\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{S}} \sum_s e^{-is\frac{\pi}{2}} |n = s \rangle \right]^2 \]

\[ + \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} e^{-in\theta} \left( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^T \langle \theta, 2 \vert \left( A_{3}^{(T-1)}(k) A_{4}^{(T-1)}(k) \right) \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (i|1) + |2\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{S}} \sum_s e^{-is\frac{\pi}{2}} |n = s \rangle \right]^2 \]

\[ = \frac{1}{2T+1S} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} e^{-in\theta} \left( iA_{1}^{(T-1)} + A_{2}^{(T-1)} \right) \sum_s (-i)^s \langle \theta \vert n = s \rangle d\theta \right]^2 \]

\[ + \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{0}^{2\pi} e^{-in\theta} \left( iA_{3}^{(T-1)} + A_{4}^{(T-1)} \right) \sum_s (-i)^s \langle \theta \vert n = s \rangle d\theta \right]^2 \]

\[ = \frac{1}{2T+1S} \left[ \sum_{s=0}^{2\pi} (-i)^s e^{-i(n-s)\theta} \left( \sum_{l=0}^{N} a_{l,1} e^{ik\cos\theta(N-2l-1)} + \sum_{l=0}^{N} a_{l,2} e^{-ik\cos\theta(N-2l+1)} \right) d\theta \right]^2 \]

\[ = \frac{1}{2T+1S} \left[ \sum_{l=0}^{N} \sum_{s=0}^{2\pi} (-i)^s e^{-i(n-s)\theta} \left( \sum_{l=0}^{N} a_{l,1} e^{ik\cos\theta(N-2l-1)} + \sum_{l=0}^{N} a_{l,2} e^{-ik\cos\theta(N-2l+1)} \right) \right]^2 \]

\[ = \frac{1}{2T+1S} \left[ \sum_{l=0}^{N} \sum_{s=0}^{2\pi} (-i)^s e^{-i(n-s)\theta} \left( \sum_{l=0}^{N} a_{l,1} e^{ik\cos\theta(N-2l-1)} + \sum_{l=0}^{N} a_{l,2} e^{-ik\cos\theta(N-2l+1)} \right) \right]^2 \]
Even though the computation shows variations in its details, the momentum distributions found in Eq. (C63) and in Ref. [33] are of the same analytical form. Nevertheless, the coefficients differ from each other.

Appendix D: Comparison between the theoretical models and experimental data for different kick strengths

In Refs. [4–6] the experiments are performed for several kick strengths, namely \( k = 1.2, k = 1.45, \) and \( k = 1.8. \) In the previous section we worked out the analytical solution for resonant quasi-momentum \( \beta = 0, \) valid for all parameters and initial states. Now, we include a finite distribution of quasi-momenta centered around zero with a finite width \( \beta_{\text{FWHM}} \) as described in the main text. This is done numerically as a closed-form for \( \beta \neq 0 \) is possible [33] but can only be evaluated approximately.

We find a few interesting theory-experiment agreements as shown in Fig. 5, Fig. 6, and Fig. 7. First, the theoretical results at several kick strengths \( k \) feature the same characteristics as the experimental implementation, such as a dominant central peak and ballistically evolving sidearms. Second, for larger \( k, \) the sidearms appear to spread more with increasing steps of the walk. The sidearms in the experimental images tend to fade out for larger step numbers in the walks. This effect can be understood as a result from dephasing not only due to the nonresonant quasi-momenta but also due to other noise sources. Only for \( k = 1.8 \) in Fig. 7, however, the central peak is more dominant than expected by the experimental image.
Figure 7. Same as in Fig. 5 for $k = 1.8$.
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