

Single-artificial-atom lasing and its suppression by strong pumping

S. Ashhab,^{1,2} J. R. Johansson,¹ A. M. Zagoskin,^{1,3} and Franco Nori^{1,2}

¹*Frontier Research System, The Institute of Physical and Chemical Research (RIKEN), Wako-shi, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*

²*Center for Theoretical Physics, Physics Department,*

The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1040, USA

³*Department of Physics, Loughborough University, Loughborough LE11 3TU, United Kingdom*

(Dated: March 11, 2019)

We consider a system composed of a single artificial atom coupled to a cavity mode. The artificial atom is biased such that the most dominant relaxation process in the system takes the atom from its ground state to its excited state, thus ensuring population inversion. Even under this condition, lasing action can be suppressed if the ‘relaxation’ rate, i.e. the pumping rate, is larger than a certain threshold value. Using simple transition-rate arguments, we derive analytic expressions for the lasing suppression condition and the photon-number state of the cavity in both the lasing and suppressed-lasing regimes. The behaviour of the system in these different regimes should be testable in experiment using the recently realized superconducting artificial-atom laser.

I. INTRODUCTION

Superconducting circuits have gained increased interest in recent years, particularly for their possible use in quantum information processing and as artificial atoms [1]. In relation to the artificial-atom concept, the idea of placing such an atom in contact with a harmonic-oscillator circuit element, which serves as a cavity, has attracted a great deal of attention [2, 3, 4, 5, 6]. Such circuit-QED systems hold promise for studying various quantum-optics phenomena in a highly controllable and easily tunable setting, as well as exploring parameter regimes that are inaccessible using natural atoms.

One of the most intriguing and counterintuitive phenomena in the fields of atomic physics and quantum optics is lasing [7]. Given the above-mentioned advantages of superconducting circuits for studying atomic-physics and quantum-optics phenomena, it is natural to investigate superconducting implementations of lasing. Indeed, there have been a number of recent theoretical proposals [8, 9, 10, 11] and experimental demonstrations [12, 13] of lasing in superconducting circuit-QED systems.

In Ref. [8] a cyclically manipulated artificial atom is constantly driven into its excited state, from which it can relax by emitting a photon into the cavity, thus establishing a lasing state. In Ref. [10] an atom that is illuminated by an oscillating field with a properly chosen frequency emits photons into a low-frequency cavity. Here we analyze a situation that is different from both Refs. [8, 10], but is closer to the usual picture of lasing with natural atoms. Furthermore, the model that we study is closely related to the experiment of Ref. [12]. It should be mentioned here that essentially the same model has been studied in the past (see e.g. Refs. [14, 15]), mostly as a hypothetical model in the context of natural atoms. A similar model was also analyzed in Ref. [9], but that paper explored different parameter regimes and analyzed different aspects of the problem from this paper.

Using simple transition-rate relations, we analyze the

different possible states of the cavity. In particular, we discuss the interesting result that if the pumping of the atom from the lower to the upper level becomes stronger than a certain critical value, lasing action is lost. Our results concerning the lasing state agree with those of the quantum-optical master-equation approach of Ref. [14]. Our transition-rate-based approach allows us to further analyze the state of the cavity in the suppressed-lasing regime, where it turns out that the state of the cavity takes the form of a thermal state. We comment on a possible experimental implementation of the crossover between the two states with a superconducting artificial-atom laser.

II. MODEL

We consider the situation reported in Ref. [12], i.e. a Cooper-pair box coupled to a harmonic-oscillator circuit element. In the analogy with conventional lasers using natural atoms, the Cooper-pair box plays the role of the atom, whereas the linear circuit element plays the role of the cavity. The Hamiltonian of the system can be expressed as:

$$\hat{H} = \frac{\hbar\omega_a}{2} (\sin\theta\hat{\sigma}_x + \cos\theta\hat{\sigma}_z) + \hbar\omega_0\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} + g_0\sigma_x (\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger), \quad (1)$$

where ω_a is the atom’s characteristic frequency, the angle θ represents the deviation of the atom’s bias point from the so-called degeneracy point, ω_0 is the cavity’s natural frequency, g_0 is the atom-cavity coupling strength, $\hat{\sigma}_x$ and $\hat{\sigma}_z$ are the usual Pauli matrices operating on the atomic state, and \hat{a} and \hat{a}^\dagger are, respectively, the annihilation and creation operators acting on the state of the cavity. We shall describe quantum states using the notation $|n_a, n_c\rangle$, where $n_a = 0$ for the atomic ground state and $n_a = 1$ for the excited state, and n_c represents the number of photons in the cavity.

In order to have efficient emission of photons from the atom to the cavity, the atom and cavity frequencies must be almost equal. For the remainder of this paper, we shall take $\omega_a = \omega_0$. We also take this frequency to be the largest frequency (or energy) scale in the problem.

The setup is designed such that the atom's bias conditions cause it to 'relax' from the ground state to the excited state, with rate Γ [17]. It is this counter-intuitive, inverted relaxation that will provide the mechanism for population inversion, which plays a crucial role in the realization of the lasing state. As such, one can say that the (usual) threshold condition for lasing action is automatically satisfied in this model. One can alternatively say that we have replaced any mechanism that results in population inversion by an inverted-relaxation process. Note that we are ignoring any weak relaxation process pushing the atom from the excited to the ground state, since such a process would not affect the main points we wish to study. Furthermore, since the atom's relaxation rate will be taken to be very large, we shall ignore any additional atomic dephasing mechanisms. The cavity is taken to possess a decay rate κ . As is the case in Ref. [12], we shall generally take the atom's relaxation rate Γ to be much larger than both the cavity decay rate κ and the atom-cavity coupling strength g . This condition will also be required for the suppression of lasing analyzed below.

The above situation concerning the dissipative processes can be described in terms of the cavity being in contact with a heat bath that has a very small and positive temperature, while the atom is in contact with a heat bath that has a very small and negative temperature. It is worth mentioning here that a similar approach (with negative effective bath temperature) was used in Ref. [16] to describe an amplification process.

A comment is also in order concerning the two-step relaxation process of Ref. [12]. The atom first goes from the state $|0\rangle$ to a third state that, for our purposes, can be considered completely inert. This transition occurs with rate Γ_1 . Once in the inert state, the atom relaxes to the state $|1\rangle$ (with rate Γ_2), thus completing the relaxation process. One might intuitively expect that the above two rates can be replaced by a single effective rate given by $\Gamma = \Gamma_1\Gamma_2/(\Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2)$. Indeed, it might seem that we have made such an assumption in using the picture of a direct relaxation process from $|0\rangle$ to $|1\rangle$. As we shall explain in Sec. III, however, a single effective relaxation rate cannot fully describe the two-step relaxation process. In fact, the above expression is not relevant to any of the lasing-related results discussed below. What the simplified model provides is a good qualitative understanding of the mechanisms at play and resulting phenomena in the experimental setup under consideration. With such qualitative understanding at hand, the correct expressions that take into account the details of the relaxation process can be obtained relatively straightforwardly. We shall come back to this point in Sec. III below.

III. PHOTON EMISSION AND LOSS RATES

In order to determine the state of the cavity for a given set of parameters, we first note that the above model contains a mechanism for photon emission into the cavity and a mechanism for photon loss from the cavity. We consider these two mechanisms separately.

The loss rate of photons from the cavity (i.e. the transition rate from the state $|n_q, n\rangle$ to the state $|n_a, n-1\rangle$, where n_a represents the state of the atom) is given simply by the decay rate κ multiplied by the number of photons in the cavity n :

$$\Gamma_{\text{loss}} = n\kappa. \quad (2)$$

Obtaining the photon emission rate requires a somewhat more careful analysis. We first consider the situation where there are no or few photons in the cavity. The atom's bias conditions constantly push it to its excited state. We can therefore assume the atom to be initially in the excited state. If the atom is in its excited state and the cavity has $n-1$ photons, the atom-cavity coupling (with matrix element $g\sqrt{n}$, where $g = g_0 \cos\theta$) induces dynamics between the states $|1, n-1\rangle$ and $|0, n\rangle$. Since $\Gamma \gg g$, the dynamics will take the form of an incoherent process described by the transition rate $W_{|1, n-1\rangle \rightarrow |0, n\rangle} = 4ng^2/\Gamma$. Any population that starts to accumulate in the state $|0, n\rangle$ will quickly relax to the state $|1, n\rangle$. Thus we obtain the photon emission rate (i.e. the transition rate from the state $|1, n-1\rangle$ to the state $|1, n\rangle$)

$$\Gamma_{\text{emission}} = \frac{4ng^2}{\Gamma}. \quad (3)$$

The photon emission rate therefore increases linearly with n for small values of n . Clearly this situation cannot persist for large n , since this mechanism is ultimately limited by the atom's relaxation rate Γ . Indeed, when $g\sqrt{n}$ becomes comparable to or larger than Γ , the $|1, n-1\rangle \leftrightarrow |0, n\rangle$ transitions must be treated as coherent oscillations. One can now argue that in the limit of very large n , where the system spends half of the time in each one of the two states ($|1, n-1\rangle$ and $|0, n\rangle$), the atom has a chance to incoherently relax from its ground state into its excited state only half of the time. In this case the photon emission rate asymptotically reaches the value $\Gamma/2$, which it cannot exceed.

We now comment on the interpretation of the expressions given above for the emission rate in the two-step relaxation picture mentioned in Sec. II. We start by noting that the reason for the appearance of the relaxation rate on the right-hand side of Eq. (3) is that it represents the decoherence rate between the two atomic states. Therefore, in the two-step relaxation picture, only the relaxation rate Γ_1 from the state $|0\rangle$ to the third, inert state would be used in Eq. (3) [any relevant pure dephasing rate would also be added to the decoherence rate]. The transition rate from the atom's inert state to the excited state, on the other hand, does not enter into this formula. In order to find the maximum emission rate, we

start by following the same argument as in the previous paragraph and note that the maximum relaxation rate from the operational states to the inert state is given by $\Gamma_1/2$. Relaxation back from the inert state to the excited state occurs with rate Γ_2 . The effective rate for a sequence of such recurrent relaxation events is given by $(\Gamma_1/2) \times \Gamma_2/(\Gamma_1/2 + \Gamma_2)$. The fact that different relaxation rates are relevant for the determination of the emission rate in different regimes shows that the direct-relaxation model (with a single relaxation rate Γ) cannot consistently describe different features of the lasing phenomenon in a system with a two-step relaxation process (except in the limit $\Gamma_1/\Gamma_2 \rightarrow 0$). However, as mentioned in Sec. II, the nature of the physical effects at play is not affected by this simplification.

A more detailed analysis of the photon emission rate would lead us into having to introduce several definitions and perform rather cumbersome algebra that would not provide any further insight into the ensuing discussion. A relevant study in a closely related system can be found in Ref. [18]. We therefore do not attempt to go any further in this direction, and we turn to analyzing the competition between the loss and emission mechanisms introduced above.

IV. LASING CONDITION AND POSSIBLE STEADY STATES

Combing the photon emission and loss rates as functions of photon number n , one can obtain the probability distribution of photon number states in the cavity. In particular, if this probability distribution has a peak for some value of n , the peak value can be obtained by locating the intersection point between the emission and loss rates. Some relevant examples of such a peak-finding calculation are depicted schematically in Fig. 1.

We treat the atom's relaxation rate Γ as the tunable parameter, keeping g and κ fixed. From Eq. (3) one can see that small values of Γ correspond to a large initial slope of the emission rate (at $n = 0$), even though the emission rate reaches the saturation level for a relatively small value of n . Figure 1(a) represents this situation. If we increase Γ , the initial slope of the emission rate decreases, but it eventually reaches a larger value. By comparing Figs. 1(a) and 1(b), one can see that the peak value of the photon number in the cavity increases with increasing pumping rate. This result agrees with intuitive expectations.

A change of behaviour occurs when Γ reaches a certain regime, an expression for which will be given shortly. As can be seen from Fig. 1(c), the peak value of n starts decreasing with increasing Γ and vanishes at a certain value of Γ . Beyond this point the value of n with maximum occupation probability remains at zero.

This suppression of lasing action by strong pumping is quite counterintuitive. It can be understood in terms of the quantum Zeno effect; at a certain point, the decoher-




FIG. 1: (Color online) Schematic plot of the photon emission rate Γ_{emission} (green solid line) and the photon loss rate Γ_{loss} (blue dashed line) as functions of the photon number in the cavity n . The intersection point (red circle) determines the value of n in the photon-number probability distribution with the highest probability. Going from (a) to (d), Γ is increased, while κ is kept fixed.

ence associated with pumping becomes the most dominant effect and inhibits the emission of photons from the atom into the cavity [19, 20]. In the following we shall analyze the lasing condition and the state of the cavity in the different regimes more quantitatively.

By combining Eqs. (2) and (3), we find that if

$$\frac{4g^2}{\Gamma} > \kappa, \quad (4)$$

the photon emission rate is larger than the photon loss rate, assuming a small photon number in the cavity. Starting with a small photon number, the number increases exponentially in time [This exponential growth continues until the peak value of n is reached, as represented by the circles in Figs. 1(a,b)]. If, on the other hand, Eq. (4) is not satisfied, the loss rate will be higher than the emission rate, and lasing would not occur. Equation (4) can therefore be considered a second threshold condition for lasing in this setup. Note that population inversion is guaranteed in this model and that we are assuming all emission from the atom to go into the cavity.

We now consider the situation where the lasing condition (Eq. 4) is satisfied, and we analyze the probability distribution of the photon number in the cavity. Deep in the lasing regime, we can assume that the emission rate is well approximated by $\Gamma/2$. The loss rate is still given by Eq. (2), i.e. $n\kappa$. The peak in the photon-number

probability distribution therefore occurs at

$$n_{\text{peak}} = \frac{\Gamma}{2\kappa}. \quad (5)$$

Note that this steady-state photon number is independent of the atom-cavity coupling strength. It is also worth mentioning that this relation remains valid even if Γ is smaller than g .

The width of the probability distribution can be calculated as follows. The ‘probability current’ from the n -photon state to the $(n+1)$ -photon state is given by

$$W_{n \rightarrow n+1} = \frac{\Gamma}{2} P_n, \quad (6)$$

whereas the probability current in the opposite direction is given by

$$\begin{aligned} W_{n+1 \rightarrow n} &\approx n\kappa P_{n+1} \\ &= \frac{\Gamma}{2} P_{n+1} + (n - n_{\text{peak}}) \kappa P_{n+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Using the detailed balance equation, i.e. $W_{n \rightarrow n+1} = W_{n+1 \rightarrow n}$, the above two equations can be combined to give

$$\frac{P_n - P_{n+1}}{P_n} \approx -\frac{n - n_{\text{peak}}}{n_{\text{peak}}}, \quad (8)$$

which can be integrated to give the probability distribution

$$P_n = P_0 \exp \left\{ -\frac{(n - n_{\text{peak}})^2}{2n_{\text{peak}}} \right\}. \quad (9)$$

The width of the probability distribution is therefore of the order of $\sqrt{n_{\text{peak}}}$, as would be expected for the lasing state.

We now turn to the situation where lasing is suppressed, i.e. when $4g^2 < \Gamma\kappa$. In the linear regime (i.e. when n is small), we can write simple detailed balance equations for the probabilities P_n of having $n = 0, 1, 2, \dots$ photons in the cavity;

$$\frac{P_{n+1}}{P_n} = \frac{\Gamma_{\text{emission}}(n)}{\Gamma_{\text{loss}}(n+1)} = \frac{4g^2}{\Gamma\kappa}. \quad (10)$$

This equation can be identified as the detailed-balance equation for a cavity in thermal equilibrium at effective temperature

$$T_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\hbar\omega_0}{k_B} \left[\log \left\{ \frac{\Gamma\kappa}{4g^2} \right\} \right]^{-1}. \quad (11)$$

Note that here we are neglecting the small ambient temperature of the cavity. Using the Bose-distribution formula, we find that the average number of photons at the above effective temperature is given by

$$\bar{n} = \left(\frac{\Gamma\kappa}{4g^2} - 1 \right)^{-1}. \quad (12)$$

Therefore, if we start from large values of Γ and we gradually decrease it, the average number of photons in the cavity starts increasing. This number follows a $1/x$ -type function that diverges at the threshold condition. The nonlinearity in the emission rate [see Fig. 1(c)] prevents the photon number from diverging at the critical value of Γ ; instead the system changes behaviour and enters the lasing regime.

For the parameters quoted in Ref. [12], i.e. $g = (2\pi) \times 44$ MHz, $\Gamma = (2\pi) \times 300$ GHz, $\kappa = (2\pi) \times 1.3$ MHz, the ratio $4g^2/(\Gamma\kappa) \approx 20$. This set of parameters is therefore well inside the lasing regime. By reducing g and increasing κ (e.g. during fabrication), however, the boundary between the two regimes can be reached. Since the pumping rate Γ is controllable in experiment, it should be possible to study the transition between the two regimes on a single sample.

V. NUMERICAL CALCULATIONS

We now take the model described above and use it to write the Lindblad master equation (see e.g. Ref. [16])

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d\rho}{dt} &= -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}, \rho] + \Gamma \left(\hat{\sigma}_+ \rho \hat{\sigma}_- - \frac{1}{2} \hat{\sigma}_- \hat{\sigma}_+ \rho - \frac{1}{2} \rho \hat{\sigma}_- \hat{\sigma}_+ \right) \\ &\quad + \kappa \left(\hat{a} \rho \hat{a}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \rho - \frac{1}{2} \rho \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_\pm$ are the atom’s raising and lowering operators. We now solve Eq. (13) numerically for different values of Γ , keeping g and κ fixed. As representative quantities that manifest the differences between the lasing and suppressed-lasing regimes, we plot in Fig. 2 the average photon number in the cavity \bar{n} and the photon number with maximum probability n_{max} as functions of the parameter $\Gamma\kappa/(4g^2)$.

The average photon number \bar{n} agrees with our analytic calculations [Eqs. (5) and (12)] away from the threshold on both the lasing and thermal sides. The maximum-probability number n_{max} coincides with \bar{n} deep in the lasing regime, but it decreases faster as the threshold is approached and clearly exhibits an abrupt change of behaviour when the threshold condition is crossed. The functional dependence of n_{max} agrees with the quadratic function derived in Ref. [14].

VI. CONCLUSION

We have analyzed the lasing behaviour of a single artificial atom in a cavity. Although increased pumping strength initially results in a larger photon population in the cavity, increasing the pumping rate beyond a certain point starts to suppress the number of photons in the lasing state. When the pumping rate reaches a critical threshold value, lasing action is completely lost and a thermal state of the cavity is formed. We have analyzed




FIG. 2: (Color online) Average photon number \bar{n} (blue/black solid line) and maximum-probability photon number n_{\max} (green/gray solid line) in the cavity as functions of the parameter $\Gamma\kappa/(4g^2)$. Note that n_{\max} corresponds to red circles in Fig. 1. The values $g/\omega_0 = 8 \times 10^{-3}$ and $\kappa/\omega_0 = 5 \times 10^{-3}/(2\pi)$ were used in the numerical calculations. The red dashed line shows the predictions of Eq. (5) in the lasing regime, and the red dotted line shows the predictions of Eq. (12) in the thermal regime.

the properties of both the lasing and suppressed-lasing (thermal) states. Our analysis and results are very relevant to the experimentally achieved situation of Ref. [12], suggesting that experimental tests of this phenomenon should be possible in the near future.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank A. Abdumalikov, O. Astafiev, P. Berman, A. Fedorov, Y. Nakamura, A. Satanin and A. Smirnov for useful discussions. This work was supported in part by the National Security Agency (NSA), the Laboratory for Physical Sciences (LPS), the Army Research Office (ARO), the National Science Foundation (NSF) grant No. EIA-0130383, the JSPS-RFBR 06-02-91200 and Core-to-Core (CTC) program supported by the Japan Society for Promotion of Science (JSPS).

-
- [1] For recent reviews on the subject, see e.g. J. Q. You and F. Nori, *Phys. Today* **58** (11), 42 (2005); G. Wendin and V. Shumeiko, in *Handbook of Theoretical and Computational Nanotechnology*, ed. M. Rieth and W. Schommers (ASP, Los Angeles, 2006).
- [2] I. Chiorescu, P. Bertet, K. Semba, Y. Nakamura, C. J. P. M. Harmans, and J. E. Mooij, *Nature* **431**, 159 (2004).
- [3] A. Wallraff, D. I. Schuster, A. Blais, L. Frunzio, R. S. Huang, J. Majer, S. Kumar, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Nature* **431**, 162 (2004);
- [4] See also J. Johansson, S. Saito, T. Meno, H. Nakano, M. Ueda, K. Semba, and H. Takayanagi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 127006 (2006).
- [5] An earlier experiment involved a superconducting qubit coupled to a low-frequency tank circuit; E. Il'ichev, N. Oukhanski, A. Izmalkov, Th. Wagner, M. Grajcar, H.-G. Meyer, A. Yu. Smirnov, A. Maassen van den Brink, M. H. S. Amin, and A. M. Zagorskin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 097906 (2003).
- [6] For one of the earliest theoretical proposals on the subject, see e.g. J. Q. You, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 064509 (2003).
- [7] See e.g. P. W. Milonni and J. H. Eberly, *Lasers* (Wiley, New York, 1988); M. O. Scully and M. S. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, 1997); L. Davidovich, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68**, 127 (1996); W. E. Lamb, W. P. Schleich, M. O. Scully, and C. H. Townes, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **71**, S242 (1999).
- [8] J. Q. You, Y.-X. Liu, C. P. Sun, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 104516 (2007).
- [9] D. A. Rodrigues, J. Imbers, and A. D. Armour, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 067204 (2007).
- [10] J. Hauss, A. Fedorov, C. Hutter, A. Shnirman, and G. Schön, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 037003 (2008).
- [11] An early proposal for a Josephson-junction-based maser was given in N. Hatakenaka and S. Kurihara, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1729 (1996); *Czech. J. Phys.* **46**, 2311 (1996).
- [12] O. Astafiev, K. Inomata, A. O. Niskanen, T. Yamamoto, Yu. A. Pashkin, Y. Nakamura, and J. S. Tsai, *Nature* **449**, 588 (2007).
- [13] Even though no clear evidence of lasing was observed, the mechanism of Ref. [10] that should result in lasing was achieved in M. Grajcar, S. H. W. van der Ploeg, A. Izmalkov, E. Il'ichev, H.-G. Meyer, A. Fedorov, A. Shnirman, G. Schoen, arXiv:0708.0665.
- [14] Y. Mu and C. M. Savage, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, 5944 (1992).
- [15] H.-J. Briegel and B.-G. Englert, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 3311 (1993); C. Ginzler, H.-J. Briegel, U. Martini, B.-G. Englert, and A. Schenzle, *Phys. Rev. A* **48**, 732 (1993).
- [16] C. W. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise* (Springer, Berlin, 2000).
- [17] Note that we do not use any factors of 2π with decay rates. In other words, the occupation probability of the atom's ground state decreases in time as $\exp\{-\Gamma t\}$.
- [18] T. H. Stoof and Yu. V. Nazarov, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 1050 (1996).
- [19] A number of other situation where the quantum Zeno effect plays an interesting role in superconducting circuits have been analyzed recently; See e.g. X.-B. Wang, J. Q. You, and F. Nori, arXiv:quant-ph/0701007; F. Helmer, M. Mariani, E. Solano, and F. Marquard, arXiv:0712.1908.
- [20] A similar effect was also predicted in the study of electronic transport through double quantum dots; S. A. Gurvitz, *Phys. Rev. B* **57**, 6602 (1998); see also S. A. Gurvitz and Ya. S. Prager, *Phys. Rev. B* **53**, 15932

(1996); G. Cohen, S. A. Gurvitz, I. Bar-Joseph, B. Deva-
veaud, P. Bergman, and A. Regreny, Phys. Rev. B **47**,

16012 (1993).