

Nanomechanical squeezing with detection via a microwave cavity

M. J. Woolley,¹ A. C. Doherty,¹ G. J. Milburn,¹ and K. C. Schwab²

¹*Department of Physics, School of Physical Sciences,
University of Queensland, St Lucia, QLD 4072, Australia*

²*Department of Physics, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY 14853, USA*

The normally-ordered squeezing spectrum of the field output from a microwave cavity capacitively coupled to a parametrically driven nanomechanical resonator has been calculated. Maximal squeezing on cavity resonance was found to be possible at experimentally accessible driving strengths and nanoresonator-cavity couplings. The experimental observation of nanomechanical squeezing will require quantum-limited phase-sensitive amplification of the output microwave field.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Lc, 85.85.+j

Squeezing of mechanical motion was first discussed in the context of thermomechanical noise squeezing [1]. A micromechanical cantilever was driven parametrically via a coupled capacitor plate, and the motion of the cantilever was detected via a fiber-optic sensor. The thermal noise of the cantilever in one quadrature was observed to be reduced below the equilibrium value.

It has been shown that *quantum* squeezing [2] of the motion of nanoresonators, analogous to the squeezing of light by optical parametric amplification [3], is feasible, though the detection of such states is problematic. Many other schemes have been proposed for generating squeezed states of nanoresonators based on control sequences applied to coupled qubits [4, 5, 6, 7, 8], or QND measurement and feedback via a single electron transistor [9] or coplanar waveguide [10].

Quantum squeezing is but one of a number of possible inherently quantum phenomena that may be observed in macroscopic mechanical systems [11]. Aside from the possibility of allowing the direct study of quantum mechanics in a new regime, quantum squeezing could ultimately allow for sensitivity in force and mass detection beyond the standard quantum limit [12].

Here we propose a scheme for quantum squeezing of a nanoresonator with detection via a microwave cavity, in the form of a superconducting coplanar waveguide with homodyne detection of the output. The nanoresonator is driven parametrically. Using the input-output formalism of quantum optics [13], the squeezing spectrum of the field output from the microwave cavity was calculated. Near-maximal squeezing was calculated for a range of nanoresonator-cavity couplings and parametric driving strengths that are believed to be experimentally accessible. Indeed, the mechanical motion of a nanoresonator coupled to a coplanar waveguide has been detected recently [14].

The nanoresonator-cavity system is represented in Figure 1. Suppose the cavity has resonant frequency ω_c , and the nanoresonator has resonant frequency ν and mass m . The uncoupled cavity may be described by an equivalent inductance L and equivalent capacitance C . The capacitive coupling between the cavity and input trans-




FIG. 1: Schematic representation of nanoresonator capacitively coupled to a microwave cavity.

mission line, as a function of nanoresonator position $x(t)$, is added in parallel to the equivalent capacitor and may be approximated by $C_0(x) = C_0(1 - x(t)/d)$ where C_0 represents an equilibrium capacitance and d is the equilibrium nanoresonator-cavity separation. Thus the coupled cavity has an equivalent capacitance $C_\Sigma = C + C_0$, such that $\omega_c = 1/\sqrt{LC_\Sigma}$. The capacitive energy of the system can then be given by $Q^2/2C_\Sigma + (\beta/2dC_\Sigma)x(t)Q^2$ where $\beta = C_0/C_\Sigma$.

The cavity is driven by the electric potential $e(t) = \sqrt{2\hbar\omega_c L}\epsilon(e^{i\omega_d t} + e^{-i\omega_d t})$. Parametric driving of the nanoresonator at frequency Ω with strength χ is a modulation of the nanoresonator's "spring constant" $k(t) = 4m\nu(\chi^* e^{i\Omega t} + \chi e^{-i\Omega t})$. Thus

$$H = \frac{p^2}{2m} + \frac{1}{2}m\nu^2 x^2 + \frac{\Phi^2}{2L} + \frac{Q^2}{2C_\Sigma} + \frac{\beta}{2dC_\Sigma}x(t)Q^2 + e(t)Q + \frac{1}{2}k(t)x^2 \quad (1)$$

where (x, p) are the canonical position and momentum of the nanoresonator, and (Q, Φ) are the canonical coordinates for the cavity (representing the charge on the capacitor C_Σ and flux through the inductor L).

Now we may quantize the Hamiltonian via $[\hat{x}, \hat{p}] = i\hbar$

and $[\hat{Q}, \hat{\Phi}] = i\hbar$. In the Schrödinger picture,

$$H_S = \hbar\omega_c a^\dagger a + \hbar\nu b^\dagger b + \hbar\kappa(b + b^\dagger)(a + a^\dagger)^2 + \hbar\epsilon(e^{i\omega_d t} + e^{-i\omega_d t})(a + a^\dagger) + \hbar(\chi^* e^{i\Omega t} + \chi e^{-i\Omega t})(b + b^\dagger)^2 \quad (2)$$

where

$$a = \sqrt{\frac{\omega_c L}{2\hbar}} \hat{Q} + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2\hbar\omega_c L}} \hat{\Phi} \quad (3)$$

$$b = \sqrt{\frac{m\nu}{2\hbar}} \hat{x} + \frac{i}{\sqrt{2\hbar m\nu}} \hat{p} \quad (4)$$

$$\kappa = \beta\omega_c \left(\frac{\Delta x_{rms}}{d} \right) \quad (5)$$

Note that $\Delta x_{rms} = (\hbar/2m\nu)^{1/2}$ is the ground state nanoresonator position uncertainty.

Setting $\Omega = 2\nu$ and transforming to an interaction picture with respect to $H_0 = \hbar\omega_d a^\dagger a + \hbar\nu b^\dagger b$, ignoring off-resonant terms, leads to

$$H_I = \hbar\delta a^\dagger a + \hbar\kappa X(t) a^\dagger a + \hbar\epsilon(a + a^\dagger) + \hbar(\chi^* b^2 + \chi b^{\dagger 2}) \quad (6)$$

where $\delta = \omega_c - \omega_d$ is the detuning between the cavity resonance and the drive, and $X(t) = be^{-i\nu t} + b^\dagger e^{i\nu t}$.

The term proportional to κ represents a low frequency modulation of the cavity resonance frequency, writing sidebands onto the cavity spectrum (and so onto the drive field) at multiples of the nanoresonator resonance. The strength of the modulation depends on the displacement of the nanoresonator, such that monitoring the sidebands of the drive field provides information on the nanoresonator displacement. Squeezing of the mechanical motion shall be coupled into squeezing of the field at the sidebands.

Assuming both the the cavity and the nanoresonator are weakly damped (at rates μ and γ , respectively), we may use a quantum optics master equation [16]. This leads to the quantum Langevin equations

$$\dot{a} = -i\delta a - i\epsilon - \frac{\mu}{2} a + \sqrt{\mu} a_{in} - i\kappa (be^{-i\nu t} + b^\dagger e^{i\nu t}) a \quad (7)$$

$$\dot{b} = -2i\chi b^\dagger - i\kappa a^\dagger a e^{i\nu t} - \frac{\gamma}{2} b + \sqrt{\gamma} b_{in} \quad (8)$$

where the thermal noise inputs are defined via correlation functions of the form

$$\langle a_{in}^\dagger(t), a_{in}(t') \rangle = n\delta(t-t') \\ \langle a_{in}(t), a_{in}(t') \rangle = 0 \quad \langle a_{in}^\dagger(t), a_{in}^\dagger(t') \rangle = 0 \quad (9)$$

with n being the thermal occupancy of the relevant bath mode at the relevant system frequency.

Assuming that we are in the resolved sideband regime ($\nu \gg \mu$), solutions to these equations are well-approximated by the forms

$$a(t) = a_0(t) + a_+(t)e^{-i\nu t} + a_-(t)e^{i\nu t} \quad (10)$$

$$b(t) = b_0(t) \quad (11)$$

where the subscripts $+$ and $-$ denote sidebands above and below the (Schrödinger picture) drive frequency at which a_0 oscillates. Then we have

$$\dot{a}_0 = -i\delta a_0 - i\epsilon - \frac{\mu}{2} a_0 + \sqrt{\mu} a_{o,in} - i\kappa(a_+ b_0^\dagger + a_- b_0) \quad (12)$$

$$\dot{a}_+ = -i(\delta - \nu) a_+ - \frac{\mu}{2} a_+ - i\kappa a_0 b_0 + \sqrt{\mu} a_{+,in} \quad (13)$$

$$\dot{a}_- = -i(\delta + \nu) a_- - \frac{\mu}{2} a_- - i\kappa a_0 b_0^\dagger + \sqrt{\mu} a_{-,in} \quad (14)$$

$$\dot{b}_0 = -2i\chi b_0^\dagger - \frac{\gamma}{2} b_0 + \sqrt{\gamma} b_{o,in} - i\kappa(a_0^\dagger a_+ + a_0 a_-^\dagger) \quad (15)$$

If the *cavity* is driven on the first blue sideband of its response, $\delta = -\nu$, the oscillation of the blue sideband of the *driving field* is off-resonance, and we may neglect $a_+(t)$. Assuming κ is relatively small in (12), we may drop the last deterministic term and solve directly for the steady-state expectation of a_0 , $\bar{a}_0 = \epsilon/\nu$. Then (14) and (15), with the corresponding conjugated equations and dropping the sideband subscripts, yield the quantum Langevin equations

$$\dot{a} = -\frac{\mu}{2} a - igb^\dagger + \sqrt{\mu} a_{in} \quad (16)$$

$$\dot{a}^\dagger = -\frac{\mu}{2} a^\dagger + igb + \sqrt{\mu} a_{in}^\dagger \quad (17)$$

$$\dot{b} = -\frac{\gamma}{2} b - 2i\chi b^\dagger - iga^\dagger + \sqrt{\gamma} b_{in} \quad (18)$$

$$\dot{b}^\dagger = -\frac{\gamma}{2} b^\dagger + 2i\chi^* b + iga + \sqrt{\gamma} b_{in}^\dagger \quad (19)$$

where $g = |\kappa\bar{a}_0|$. Taking the Fourier transform of this system of equations, we obtain

$$-\mathbf{D} \begin{bmatrix} a_{in}(\omega) \\ a_{in}^\dagger(-\omega) \\ b_{in}(\omega) \\ b_{in}^\dagger(-\omega) \end{bmatrix} = \mathbf{A} \begin{bmatrix} a(\omega) \\ a^\dagger(-\omega) \\ b(\omega) \\ b^\dagger(-\omega) \end{bmatrix} \quad (20)$$

where \mathbf{D} denotes the damping matrix

$$\mathbf{D} = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{\mu} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\mu} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\gamma} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \sqrt{\gamma} \end{bmatrix} \quad (21)$$

and

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} i\omega - \frac{\mu}{2} & 0 & 0 & -ig \\ 0 & i\omega - \frac{\mu}{2} & ig & 0 \\ 0 & -ig & i\omega - \frac{\gamma}{2} & -2i\chi \\ ig & 0 & 2i\chi^* & i\omega - \frac{\gamma}{2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (22)$$

Henceforth, the column vectors in (20) shall be denoted by $\mathbf{a}_{in}(\omega)$ and $\mathbf{a}(\omega)$, respectively. Note that these frequencies ω are defined relative to the Schrödinger picture oscillation frequency of the operator in question. Further, the output field operators may be calculated in terms on the input operators using the boundary condition

$$\mathbf{a}_{out}(\omega) = \mathbf{D}\mathbf{a}(\omega) - \mathbf{a}_{in}(\omega) = -(\mathbf{D}\mathbf{A}^{-1}\mathbf{D} + \mathbf{1})\mathbf{a}_{in}(\omega) \quad (23)$$

Now suppose the cavity is driven on the first red sideband of its response. Again using the assumed solutions (10) and (11), the oscillation of the driving field red sideband is now off-resonance and we neglect $a_-(t)$. Under the same assumptions as before, we solve for $\bar{\alpha}_0 = -\epsilon/\nu$, and obtain (again dropping sideband subscripts)

$$\dot{a} = -\frac{\mu}{2}a + igb + \sqrt{\mu}a_{in} \quad (24)$$

$$\dot{a}^\dagger = -\frac{\mu}{2}a^\dagger - igb^\dagger + \sqrt{\mu}a_{in}^\dagger \quad (25)$$

$$\dot{b} = -\frac{\gamma}{2}b - 2i\chi b^\dagger + iga + \sqrt{\gamma}b_{in} \quad (26)$$

$$\dot{b}^\dagger = -\frac{\gamma}{2}b^\dagger + 2i\chi^*b - iga^\dagger + \sqrt{\gamma}b_{in}^\dagger \quad (27)$$

We can use the same boundary condition to obtain the output field operators in terms of the input field operators, as per (23), but now with

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{bmatrix} i\omega - \frac{\mu}{2} & 0 & ig & 0 \\ 0 & i\omega - \frac{\mu}{2} & 0 & -ig \\ ig & 0 & i\omega - \frac{\gamma}{2} & -2i\chi \\ 0 & -ig & 2i\chi^* & i\omega - \frac{\gamma}{2} \end{bmatrix} \quad (28)$$

It should be noted that driving on the red sideband is advantageous from the perspective of cooling the nanoresonator towards its quantum ground state, as has been demonstrated in optomechanical systems [17].

The output field must be amplified for detection. For a linear, phase-preserving amplifier with gain G , the output signal will be

$$c(\omega) = \sqrt{G}a_{out}(\omega) + \sqrt{G-1}d^\dagger(\omega) \quad (29)$$

where $d(\omega)$ specifies the noise at the auxiliary amplifier input. Now $G \geq 2$ will destroy quantum squeezing, such that we would require quantum-limited phase-sensitive amplification to observe the squeezed microwave field output from the coplanar waveguide. A tunable quantum-limited microwave phase-sensitive amplifier, in the form of a Josephson parametric amplifier composed of a transmission line resonator with the central conductor made from a series SQUID array, has recently been demonstrated [18].

To observe squeezing, we are interested in the quadrature amplitudes, defined through

$$c(\omega) = e^{i\theta/2}(X_1(\omega) + iX_2(\omega)) \quad (30)$$




FIG. 2: The *negative* of the squeezing of the output field for (a) driving on the blue sideband and (b) driving on the red sideband, as a function of the parametric driving χ and effective nanoresonator-cavity coupling g , both scaled to μ .

where θ is the local oscillator phase in our homodyne detection scheme. The squeezing spectrum in the X_1 quadrature is given by the normally-ordered variance

$$\begin{aligned} S_1(\omega) &= \langle : X_1(\omega), X_1(\omega) : \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{4} \{ e^{-i\theta} \langle c(\omega), c(\omega) \rangle + e^{i\theta} \langle c^\dagger(\omega), c^\dagger(\omega) \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle c^\dagger(\omega), c(\omega) \rangle + \langle c^\dagger(\omega), c(\omega) \rangle \} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

With the definition (30), maximal squeezing in the X_1 quadrature corresponds to $S_1(\omega) = -0.25$. Each of the variances on the right hand side of (31) may be expressed in terms of variances of input operators.

We now estimate experimentally accessible parameters. The cavity resonant frequency will be $\omega_c/2\pi = 6GHz$ and the nanoresonator frequency will be $\nu/2\pi = 20MHz$. Assuming a nanoresonator mass of $10^{-15}kg$, the ground state uncertainty in nanoresonator position is $\Delta x_{rms} \approx 20.5fm$. Approximating $d = 80nm$ and $\beta = 0.002$, according to (5), $\kappa \approx 19.3s^{-1}$. Microwave cavities can be fabricated with $Q \approx 10^5$ and nanoresonators with $Q \approx 10^5$, with corresponding damping rates are $\mu = 3.77 \times 10^5 s^{-1}$ and $\gamma = 1.26 \times 10^3 s^{-1}$. Note that this puts us in the resolved sideband regime. Henceforth, all rates will be scaled by setting $\mu = 1$.

We consider the ranges $g = 0 \rightarrow 5$ and $\chi = 0 \rightarrow 5$.




FIG. 3: Negated squeezing spectra as a function of χ for $g = 2$ for (a) driving on the blue sideband and (c) driving on the red sideband. Negated squeezing spectra as a function of g for $\chi = 1$ for (b) driving on the blue sideband and (d) driving on the red sideband. All parameters scaled to μ .

The couplings correspond to peak voltages of the order of μV induced on the central conductor, while $\chi = 5$ corresponds to a 12% change in the unperturbed nanoresonator spring constant. Supposing the nanoresonator is driven by a voltage $V(t) = V_0 + V_p \cos \Omega t$ across a capacitance $C_c(x)$, the spring constant modulation is given by $k(t) = (1/2)C_c''(x)(V(t))^2 \approx (C_{c0}/x_{c0}^2)(V_0 V_p \cos \Omega t)$ using a Taylor expansion of $C_c(x)$ about C_{c0} at x_{c0} and considering only the voltage signal at Ω . Assuming $C_{c0} = 200 \text{ aF}$, $x_{c0} = 80 \text{ nm}$, then $V_0 V_p = 60.6 \text{ V}^2$; supposing $V_0 = 15 \text{ V}$ we require $V_p = 4 \text{ V}$. Thus the chosen parameter range is considered experimentally accessible. Optimal squeezing is obtained for local oscillator phase $\theta = \pm \pi/2$, the sign determining in which quadrature the squeezing appears. We shall adopt the choice $\theta = -\pi/2$ such that squeezing appears in the X_1 quadrature. Optimal squeezing is obtained for χ real.

First, consider the case of the cavity being driven on the blue sideband. For the case of vacuum noise and $G = 1$, $S_1(\omega)$ is

$$\frac{8g^2\mu(\gamma - 2\chi)}{(4g^2 - \gamma\mu + 4\mu\chi)^2 + 4(8g^2 + \mu^2 + (\gamma - 4\chi)^2)\omega^2 + 16\omega^4} \quad (32)$$

Clearly, this is optimised at $\omega = 0$. The dependence of the magnitude of squeezing (at this resonance condition) on g and χ is shown in Figure 2(a), and the squeezing spectra as functions of χ and g are shown in Figures 3(a) and 3(b), respectively.

For driving on the red sideband, vacuum noise and

$G = 1$, $S_1(\omega)$ is

$$\frac{-16g^2\mu\chi}{(4g^2 + \gamma\mu + 4\mu\chi)^2 + 4(-8g^2 + \mu^2 + (\gamma + 4\chi)^2)\omega^2 + 16\omega^4} \quad (33)$$

The dependence of the magnitude of squeezing (at resonance) on g and χ is shown in Figure 2(b), and the squeezing spectra as functions of χ and g are shown in Figures 3(c) and 3(d), respectively.

Considering Figure 2, we see that for driving of the cavity on the blue sideband there is a threshold on χ , while for driving the cavity on the red sideband there is no such threshold. From (16)-(19), the coupling term in the effective Hamiltonian for driving on the blue sideband is $\hbar g(ab + a^\dagger b^\dagger)$, while from (24)-(27), for driving on the red sideband it is $\hbar g(a^\dagger b + ab^\dagger)$. The former term generates excitations in both cavity and nanoresonator modes, and thus introduces excess noise into the system. A non-zero parametric driving is required to introduce correlated excitations and restore the vacuum noise level. The latter term simply transfers excitations between cavity and nanoresonator modes, without introducing additional noise.

Considering the spectra of Figure 3, we observe a squeezing bandwidth of the order of 10 's of kHz ; this is sufficient for detection. For driving on the blue sideband, we observe squeezing maxima only on resonance. However, for driving on the red sideband we observe local squeezing maxima off-resonance in the limit $g \gg \chi$. The coupling for red sideband driving may be expressed in

terms of normal mode operators via a two-mode Bogoliubov transformation as $\hbar g \alpha^\dagger \alpha - \hbar g \beta^\dagger \beta$; that is, we now have modes at $\omega_c \pm g$. Under this transformation, parametric driving of the nanoresonator transforms to a term (in the rotating wave approximation) $\hbar \chi (\alpha \beta + \alpha^\dagger \beta^\dagger)$, giving squeezing in the normal modes.

Squeezing of the output field is degraded by thermal noise on the nanoresonator, cavity and amplifiers. Thermal noise on the cavity may be neglected due to the high frequency and low temperatures attainable. A nanoresonator thermal occupancy $n_c > 25$ destroys the squeezing, while maintaining squeezing even with $G = 1.1$ requires $n_a < 4.5$ for the amplifier. Thus, the experimental feasibility of this scheme rests on the development of *coupled* quantum-limited phase-sensitive amplifiers.

-
- [1] D. Rugar and P. Grutter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 699 (1991).
 [2] M. P. Blencowe and M. N. Wybourne, Physica B **280**, 555 (2000).
 [3] L. A. Wu, X. A. Min and H. J. Kimble, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **4**, 1465 (1987).
 [4] P. Rabl, A. Shnirman and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 205304 (2004).
 [5] X. Zhou and A. Mizel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 267201 (2006).
 [6] L. Tian and R. W. Simmonds, arXiv:cond-mat/0606787v1
 [7] K. Jacobs, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 117203 (2007).
 [8] W. Y. Huo, G. L. Long, arXiv:0704.0960v2
 [9] R. Ruskov, K. Schwab and A. N. Korotkov, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 23 (2005).
 [10] A. A. Clerk, F. Marquardt and K. Jacobs, arXiv:0802.1842v1
 [11] M. P. Blencowe, Phys. Rep. **395**, 159 (2004).
 [12] K. C. Schwab and M. L. Roukes, "Putting Mechanics into Quantum Mechanics", Physics Today, July 2005.
 [13] M. J. Collett and C. W. Gardiner, Phys. Rev. A **30**, 1386 (1984).
 [14] C. A. Regal, J. D. Teufel and K. W. Lehnert, arXiv:0801.1827v1
 [15] L. Frunzio, A. Wallraff, D. Schuster, J. Majer and R. Schoelkopf, IEEE Trans. on Appl. Super. **15**, 860 (2005).
 [16] D. F. Walls and G. J. Milburn, *Quantum Optics*, (Springer, Berlin, 1994).
 [17] A. Schliesser, R. Rivière, G. Anetsberger, O. Arcizet and T. J. Kippenberg, arXiv:0709.4036
 [18] M. A. Castellanos-Beltran and K. W. Lehnert, arXiv:0706.2373v1.