Remark on laser linewidth hazard in opto-mechanical cooling

Lajos Diósi*

Research Institute for Particle and Nuclear Physics H-1525 Budapest 114, POB 49, Hungary (Dated: February 6, 2020)

I discuss the robustness of the pumped cavity dynamics against phase-diffusion of the laser and conclude that opto-mechanical cooling has extreme sensitivity compared to laser cooling of atoms. Current proposals of ground state opto-mechanical cooling appear to require an unrealistic sharp laser linewidth.

Very recently, numerous works [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7] have predicted or suggested that laser cooling can bring a nano-mechanical oscillator (nano-mirror) close to its quantum ground state. It is hard to miss the conceptual similarities between opto-mechanical cooling and the standard (e.g. Doppler) laser cooling of atoms. This time the cooled object is the spatial motion of the mirror instead of the atom, and the refrigerator is an optical cavity oscillator instead of the atom's internal two-level system. The same way in both cases, the refrigerator has high (optical) excitation frequencies, the object has low (thermal) excitation frequencies; therefore the object-refrigerator coupling is practically missing. What really turns the atomic two-level system or the cavity into a refrigerator is the external laser field. Typical limitations of atom cooling are determined by the spontaneous decay rate κ of the atom, hence laser imperfectness (linewidth Γ_l , basically) does not influence the mechanism as far as:

$$\Gamma_l \ll \kappa$$
 . (1)

I will conjecture that for opto-mechanical cooling the condition becomes:

$$n\Gamma_l \ll \kappa$$
 , (2)

where κ is the decay rate of the cavity field. This condition puts a fatally stronger limit on Γ_l because of the large factor n: the steady state excitation number of the pumped cavity. Violating this condition will not invalidate opto-mechnical cooling in general. Ground-state cooling, however, becomes questionable.

Let us follow the standard theory and Langevin equation formalism, shared by most of the cited works, to introduce the time-dependent phase ϕ of the laser field into the equation of the cavity mode absorption operator:

$$\dot{a} = -(\kappa + i\Delta)a + Ee^{-i\phi} + \sqrt{2\kappa}a^{in} + \dots$$
 (3)

where $\Delta > 0$ is the detuning of the cavity mode, E is the amplitude of the laser field inside the cavity. The third term on the r.h.s. denotes the quantum noise coming from the vacuum environment at T = 0 [8]:

$$\langle a_{in}(t)a_{in}^{\dagger}(s)\rangle = \delta(t-s) ,$$
 (4)

and the ellipses stand for the coupling to the position of the mirror. The diffusion of the phase ϕ of the laser light

is determined by the white-noise correlation:

$$\langle \dot{\phi}(t)\dot{\phi}(s)\rangle = 2\Gamma_l\delta(t-s)$$
 (5)

We perform two subsequent canonical transformations $a \to a e^{-i\phi}$ and $a \to a + \alpha$ where $\alpha = E/(\kappa + i\Delta)$ is the large mean amplitude and a becomes a small perturbation around it. We obtain:

$$\dot{a} = -(\kappa + i\Delta)a - i\alpha\dot{\phi} + \sqrt{2\kappa}a^{in} + \dots \tag{6}$$

Note that we have approximated the term $-i(\alpha + a)\dot{\phi}$ by $-i\alpha\dot{\phi}$.

With the choice of small detuning $\Delta > 0$, our refrigerator becomes equivalent with a central oscillator of low frequency Δ , that can have strong, even resonance, coupling to the mirror's mechanical oscillation. One would think that we got the low-frequency refrigerator operating at T = 0 almost for free. In realty, however, the main resource of cooling is the perfect periodic driving field. The relevant imperfectness is the finite linewidth Γ_l of the laser. Indeed, we must assure in eq. (6) that the contribution of the phase-noise (5) remain much less than the contribution of the quantum noise (4), which means $|\alpha|^2\Gamma_l\ll\kappa$. This is just our condition (2), since $|\alpha|^2=n$ for large α . If the condition is not satisfied, the phasenoise will impose an effective non-zero temperature on the cavity oscillator and it can not act as a refrigerator to T=0 anymore. Let us ignore the structural difference between the noises a^{in} and $\dot{\phi}$, and imagine that the contribution of the large phase-noise (5) is equivalent with the contribution of the quantum-noise at a certain high (effective) temperature T:

$$\langle a_{in}(t)a_{in}^{\dagger}(s)\rangle = \frac{k_B T}{\hbar \Delta} \delta(t-s) \ .$$
 (7)

Then the following estimation can be made for the temperature of the effective cavity mode, caused by the phase-noise:

$$k_B T \sim \hbar \Delta \frac{n\Gamma_l}{\kappa} \ .$$
 (8)

Finally, let us consider the concrete magnitudes of the parameters considered, e.g., in ref. [5]. Accordingly, we take $\kappa \sim \Delta \sim 10 \mathrm{MHz}$, the 50mW laser power at

1064nm wavelength yields $E \sim 10^{13} \rm Hz$, and we are led to $n = |\alpha|^2 \sim 10^{10} - 10^{11}$. This huge number would, via condition (2), impose a request of Γ_l less than $10^{-4} - 10^{-3} \rm Hz$! This range is far from being available now.

I have restricted my calculations and arguments for the behaviour of the cavity oscillator (refrigerator). In mind, I had the back-action (self-cooling) method, while the active feed-back control (cold damping) method may turn out less vulnerable by the laser instabilities. Clearly, the coupled linearized quantum Langevin equations must be extended, using eqs. (5,6), and solved for the presence of the phase-noise term. Whatever conclusion the exact calculations have, it is likely that the full 'cost' of the ground-state opto-mechanical refrigerator will contain the cost of extreme laser stability.

This work was supported in part at the Technion by a fellowship from the Lady Davis Foundation, and by the Hungarian OTKA Grant No. 49384.

- * Electronic address: diosi@rmki.kfki.hu; URL: www.rmki.kfki.hu/~diosi
- I. Wilson-Rae, N. Nooshi, W. Zwerger, and T. J. Kippenberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 093901 (2007).
- [2] F. Marquardt, J. P. Chen, A. A. Clerk, and S. M. Girvin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 99, 093902 (2007).
- [3] A. Dantan, C. Genes, D. Vitali, and M. Pinard, Phys. Rev. A 77, 011804(R) (2008).
- [4] S. Gröblacher et al., Europh. Lett. 81, 54003 (2008).
- [5] C. Genes et al., Phys. Rev. A 77, 033804 (2008).
- [6] M. Bhattacharya, H. Uys, and P. Meystre, Phys. Rev. A 77, 033819 (2008).
- [7] C. Genes, D. Vitali, and P. Tombesi, arXiv:0803.2788
- [8] The temperature of the environment can always be ingnored at optical frequencies.