

Quantum Theory of Transmission Line Resonator-Assisted Cooling of a Micromechanical Resonator

Yong Li,¹ Ying-Dan Wang,² Fei Xue,^{3,4,5} and C. Bruder¹

¹*Department of Physics, University of Basel, Klingelbergstrasse 82, 4056 Basel, Switzerland*

²*NTT Basic Research Laboratories, NTT Corporation, Atsugi-shi, Kanagawa 243-0198, Japan*

³*CREST, Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST), Kawaguchi, Saitama 332-0012, Japan*

⁴*Frontier Research System, The Institute of Physical and Chemical Research (RIKEN), Wako-shi, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*

⁵*Department of Electrical Engineering, Technion, Haifa 32000, Israel*

(Dated: March 26, 2019)

We propose a quantum description of the cooling of a micromechanical flexural oscillator by a one-dimensional transmission line resonator via a force that resembles cavity radiation pressure. The mechanical oscillator is capacitively coupled to the central conductor of the transmission line resonator. At the optimal point, the micromechanical oscillator can be cooled near to the ground state and the cooling can be measured by homodyne detection of the output microwave signal.

PACS numbers: 85.85.+j, 45.80.+r, 03.67.Mn, 42.50.Lc

I. INTRODUCTION

Micro- and nano-mechanical resonators have been an interesting research topic due to their broad application in technology and fundamental physics [1]. This includes studies of ultrahigh precision displacement detection [2], mass detection [3], gravitational-wave detectors [4, 5], and attempts to observe quantum behavior of mechanical motion [6, 7, 8, 9, 10]. Many of the applications are fundamentally limited by thermal fluctuations, and in order to reduce their effects, it is desirable to cool the mechanical oscillators. Recently, various schemes like the laser sideband cooling schemes developed for trapped ions and atoms [11], have been proposed for significantly cooling a mechanical resonator (MR) coupled to a Cooper-pair box [12, 13, 14, 15], a flux qubit [16, 17], a superconducting single-electron transistor [18], quantum dots [19], trapped ions [20], and optical cavities [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38]. On the experimental side, optomechanical cooling schemes have been shown to be very promising [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27]: the MR can be cooled to ultra-low temperatures via either photothermal forces or radiation pressure by coupling it to a driven cavity. There are two main optomechanical cooling schemes. The first one involves an active feedback loop [24, 28, 29], and the second one works via passive back-action cooling (also called self-cooling) [22, 23, 25, 26]. A fully quantum-mechanical description of cavity-assisted cooling schemes has been given in Refs. [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36] (for a review, see [37, 38]) and provides the basic description for ground-state cooling experiments via passive cooling schemes based on radiation pressure: A force on the mirror is proportional to the light intensity inside the cavity. A displacement of the mirror leads to a force that is either parallel or antiparallel to the motion of the MR, depending on whether the effective detuning frequency between the cavity field and input driving light field is negative or positive.

More recently, other optomechanical-like cooling schemes have been proposed to replace the optical cavity by a radio-frequency (RF) circuit [39, 40] or one-dimensional transmission line resonator (TLR) [41]. Compared with the optical cavity model, the RF circuit- and transmission line resonator-assisted schemes have some potential practical advantages: (1) they can be incorporated on-chip without involving the optical component, (2) a strong coupling between the TLR (or RF circuit) and the MR can be achieved.

However, the theoretical understanding of the cooling schemes via a RF circuit [39, 40] or a transmission line resonator [41] is based on a classical description of the motion of the MR. A quantum-mechanical description of the motion of the MR, in a similar system consisting of a mechanical resonator capacitively coupled to a superconducting coplanar waveguide, was discussed recently in Ref. [42], which focused on studying the entanglement between the MR and TLR without considering the cooling of MR. Most recently, Teufel *et al.* [43] considered the cooling of a MR by applying directly the theoretical analysis of the cavity-assisted back-action cooling scheme [33] to a superconducting microwave resonator in the weak-coupling limit. They also presented experimental data about the cooling effect on the MR due to the microwave radiation field.

In this paper, we present a quantum-mechanical description and use it to investigate the passive cooling of the MR when it is coupled capacitively to a driven TLR. The Hamiltonian of the TLR-assisted model is also studied in Refs. [42, 43], and is very similar to that of a MR coupled to a driven optical cavity via radiation pressure coupling [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38]. We study the TLR-assisted cooling of a MR in detail by using a quantum Langevin description, which is different from that in [43] (which considered the weak-coupling limit) and works well both in the weak-coupling limit and beyond the weak-coupling limit. We also show the MR can be cooled close to its ground state.

II. MODEL AND HAMILTONIAN

The system that we consider is shown schematically in Fig. 1: a mechanical resonator that is fixed on both ends (or a cantilever fixed on one end) couples capacitively to the central conductor of the TLR [44]. We restrict the description to the fundamental flexural mode of oscillation of the MR which is modeled as a harmonic oscillator of frequency ω_b and effective mass m . The TLR is driven by a microwave at a frequency ω_d and can be modeled as a single mode LC resonator with frequency $\omega'_a = 2\pi/\sqrt{L_a C_a}$ (second harmonic), where L_a is the inductance and C_a the capacitance.




FIG. 1: (Color online) Schematic diagram of a mechanical resonator (MR) located at the center of a one-dimensional transmission-line resonator (TLR). The external microwave field enters from the left and drives the TLR. The signal at the output on the right end can be used to measure the motion of the MR via homodyne detection.

The Hamiltonian of the system reads

$$H = \hbar\omega'_a a^\dagger a + \left(\frac{p^2}{2m} + \frac{m\omega_b^2}{2} x^2 \right) + \frac{C_g(x)}{2} V^2 + \hbar(\varepsilon a^\dagger e^{-i\omega_d t} + \varepsilon^* a e^{i\omega_d t}). \quad (1)$$

The first line describes the free Hamiltonian of the TLR and the MR, respectively, with lowering (rising) operator of the TLR mode a (a^\dagger), and the position (momentum) operator of the MR x (p) which satisfy $[a, a^\dagger] = 1$ and $[x, p] = i\hbar$. The first term in the second line is the capacitive coupling between the TLR and MR with the voltage $V = V_{rms}(a^\dagger + a)$ (where $V_{rms} = \sqrt{\hbar\omega'_a/C_a}$ is the rms voltage [44]) and the capacitor $C_g(x) \approx C_g^0(1 - x/d)$ (for small displacement) depending on the position of the MR along the x -direction (d is the initial equilibrium distance without the coupling and C_g^0 the corresponding capacitance). The last term describes the input driving by a microwave field with the strength ε .

Usually, the fundamental oscillation frequency is of the order of $2\pi \times (10^3 - 10^6)$ Hz for micromechanical resonators and $2\pi \times (10^7 - 10^9)$ Hz for nanomechanical resonators; the TLR frequency can be made to be of the order of $2\pi \times 10$ GHz. Here we will focus on the case of a micro-MR for which the condition $\omega_b \ll \omega'_a$ is satisfied. In the interaction picture with respect to $\hbar\omega_d a^\dagger a$ and neglecting the rapidly-oscillating terms, the Hamiltonian

reads

$$H_I = \hbar\Delta_0 a^\dagger a + \left(\frac{p^2}{2m} + \frac{m\omega_b^2}{2} x^2 \right) - \frac{\hbar g_0}{2} (2a^\dagger a + 1)x + \hbar(\varepsilon a^\dagger + \varepsilon^* a) \quad (2)$$

where $g_0 := C_0 V_{rms}^2 / (\hbar d)$ is a real coupling constant; $\Delta_0 = \omega_a - \omega_d$ is the detuning, and $\omega_a = \omega'_a + C_g^0 V_{rms}^2 / \hbar$ is the modified frequency of the TLR shifted by the coupling between TLR and MR.

This Hamiltonian resembles that used in cavity-assisted cooling schemes [31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36]. Thus, the capacitive-coupling scheme can be used to cool the MR like in the case of radiation pressure cooling in an optical cavity.

III. QUANTUM LANGEVIN EQUATIONS AND FLUCTUATION SPECTRUM

The dynamics is also determined by fluctuation-dissipation processes that affect both the TLR and the mechanical mode. They are taken into account in a fully consistent way by the quantum Langevin equations [45]:

$$\dot{x} = p/m, \quad (3a)$$

$$\dot{p} = -m\omega_b^2 x - \gamma_b p + \frac{\hbar g_0}{2} (2a^\dagger a + 1) + \xi \quad (3b)$$

$$\dot{a} = -(\kappa + i\Delta_0)a + ig_0 a x + \varepsilon + \sqrt{2\kappa} a_{in}. \quad (3c)$$

Here a_{in} (a_{in}^\dagger) is the noise operator due to the input microwave, and $\xi(t)$ denotes the quantum Brownian force that the resonator is subject to. They satisfy [45]

$$\langle a_{in}(t) a_{in}^\dagger(t') \rangle = (N + 1) \delta(t - t'), \quad (4)$$

$$\langle \xi(t) \xi(t') \rangle = \frac{\hbar \gamma_b m}{2\pi} \int d\omega e^{-i\omega(t-t')} \omega (1 + \coth \frac{\hbar\omega}{2k_B T}), \quad (5)$$

where $N = 1/[\exp(\hbar\omega_a/k_B T) - 1]$, k_B is the Boltzmann constant, and T the temperature of the environment. For simplicity, we have assumed that both the bath correlated to the input microwave field and the one connected to the MR have the same temperature [42]. We now perform a similar calculation as that given in Refs. [31, 35, 36, 46]. The steady-state solution of the quantum Langevin equations (3) can be obtained by first replacing the operators by their average and then setting $d\langle \dots \rangle / dt = 0$. Hence we can get the steady-state values as

$$\langle p \rangle = 0, \quad \langle x \rangle = \frac{\hbar g_0 \left(|\langle a \rangle|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \right)}{m\omega_b^2}, \quad \langle a \rangle = \frac{\varepsilon}{\kappa + i\Delta}, \quad (6)$$

where $\Delta = \Delta_0 - g_0 \langle x \rangle$ is the effective detuning. In Eq. (6), we can also take $|\langle a \rangle|^2 + \frac{1}{2} \simeq |\langle a \rangle|^2$, since we

will focus on the case $|\langle a \rangle| \gg 1$ which can be achieved by controlling the input power of the microwave.

Rewriting each operator as a c -number steady-state value plus an additional fluctuation operator, and neglecting the nonlinear terms (since we have chosen $|\langle a \rangle| \gg 1$), we obtain a set of linear quantum Langevin equations:

$$\delta \dot{x} = \delta p/m, \quad (7a)$$

$$\delta \dot{p} = -m\omega_b^2 \delta x - \gamma_b \delta p + \hbar g_0 (\delta a^\dagger \langle a \rangle + h.c.) + \xi, \quad (7b)$$

$$\delta \dot{a} = -(\kappa + i\Delta) \delta a + i g_0 \langle a \rangle \delta x + \sqrt{2\kappa} a_{in}. \quad (7c)$$

To solve these equations, we define the Fourier transform for any operator

$$r(t) := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{i\omega t} \tilde{r}(\omega) d\omega, \quad (8)$$

which leads to

$$\langle \tilde{a}_{in}(\Omega) \tilde{a}_{in}^\dagger(\omega) \rangle = (N+1) \delta(\Omega + \omega), \quad (9)$$

$$\langle \tilde{\xi}(\Omega) \tilde{\xi}(\omega) \rangle = \hbar \gamma_b m \omega (1 + \coth \frac{\hbar \omega}{2k_B T}) \delta(\Omega + \omega). \quad (10)$$

After solving the linear quantum Langevin equations in the frequency domain, we obtain

$$\delta \tilde{p}(\omega) = \frac{1}{B(\omega)} [C^*(-\omega) \tilde{a}_{in} + C(\omega) \tilde{a}_{in}^\dagger + D(\omega) \tilde{\xi}], \quad (11a)$$

$$\delta \tilde{x}(\omega) = \frac{\delta \tilde{p}(\omega)}{i\omega m}, \quad (11b)$$

where $B(\omega) = (i\omega + \gamma_b - i\omega_b^2/\omega)D(\omega) + 2i\hbar|g_0\langle a \rangle|^2 \times \Delta/(m\omega)$, $D(\omega) = (\kappa + i\omega)^2 + \Delta^2$, and $C(\omega) = \hbar\sqrt{2\kappa}g_0\langle a \rangle[\kappa + i(\omega + \Delta)]$.

To calculate the effective temperature of the MR, we define the fluctuation spectra of position and momentum [31, 35, 45] of the MR, which are given by the following correlation function:

$$S_r(\omega) = \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} e^{-i\omega\tau} \langle \delta r(\tau) \delta r(0) \rangle_s d\tau, \quad (r = x, p). \quad (12)$$

Here, $\langle \dots \rangle_s$ denotes the steady-state average. Equivalently, $S_{x,p}(\omega)$ can also be defined as

$$\langle \delta \tilde{r}(\Omega) \delta \tilde{r}(\omega) \rangle_s := S_r(\omega) \delta(\Omega + \omega), \quad (r = x, p). \quad (13)$$

According to Eq. (11a), the spectra of the MR can be written as

$$S_x(\omega) \equiv |\chi_{\text{eff}}(\omega)|^2 [S_{th}(\omega) + S_{ca}(\omega)], \quad (14)$$

$$S_p(\omega) = (\omega m)^2 S_x(\omega), \quad (15)$$

where $S_{th}(\omega) = \hbar \gamma_b m \omega [1 + \coth(\hbar \omega / 2k_B T)]$ is the thermal noise spectrum due to the Brownian motion of the MR; $S_{ca}(\omega) = [(N+1)|C(\omega)|^2 + N|C(-\omega)|^2]/|D(\omega)|^2$ is the induced noise spectrum due to the capacitive

coupling to the driven TLR which has an input noise source. The effective susceptibility is defined as $\chi_{\text{eff}}(\omega) = -iD(\omega)/[\omega m B(\omega)]$ and can be simplified to

$$\chi_{\text{eff}}(\omega) \equiv \frac{1}{m [(\omega_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega))^2 - \omega^2 + i\omega \gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega)]}, \quad (16)$$

where the effective vibrating frequency of the MR is

$$\omega_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega) = \sqrt{\omega_b^2 - \frac{2\hbar|g_0\langle a \rangle|^2 \Delta (\kappa^2 - \omega^2 + \Delta^2)}{m|D(\omega)|^2}}, \quad (17)$$

and the effective damping rate $\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega) = \gamma_b + \gamma_{ca}(\omega)$ with the additional term

$$\gamma_{ca}(\omega) = \frac{4\hbar|g_0\langle a \rangle|^2 \kappa \Delta}{m|D(\omega)|^2} \quad (18)$$

resulting from the capacitive coupling.

The effective temperature of the MR can now be calculated from the mean phonon number in the steady state

$$n_b^{\text{eff}} = \langle \delta b^\dagger \delta b \rangle = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\langle \delta p^2 \rangle}{m\hbar\omega_b} + \frac{m\omega_b}{\hbar} \langle \delta x^2 \rangle - 1 \right), \quad (19)$$

where the variances of position and momentum are

$$\langle \delta r^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} S_r(\omega) d\omega, \quad (r = x, p). \quad (20)$$

Here, δb is the variance of the mechanical phonon lowering operator b : $\delta b = b - \langle b \rangle$ with $b = \sqrt{m\omega_b/(2\hbar)}x + i\sqrt{1/(2m\hbar\omega_b)}p$. This allows us to define the effective temperature T_{eff} by

$$n_b^{\text{eff}} \equiv \frac{1}{\exp(\hbar\omega_b/k_B T_{\text{eff}}) - 1}. \quad (21)$$

IV. COOLING OF THE MR

In this section, we will consider the cooling of the MR by discussing its effective temperature. The effective temperature can be calculated directly by evaluating the integral in Eq. (20) numerically and using Eqs. (19) and (21). Equation (20) can also be evaluated analytically using the approximation scheme described in the following.

The effective mechanical damping $\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega) = \gamma_b + \gamma_{ca}(\omega)$ can be significantly increased, $|\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega)| \gg \gamma_b$, if g_0 is very large, see Eq. (18). Let us consider the most interesting regime when the significantly increased effective mechanical damping is less than the mechanical frequency: $|\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega)| < \omega_b$, (that is, the effective quality factor $Q_b^{\text{eff}} = \omega_b/|\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega)| > 1$), and less than the TLR bandwidth: $|\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega)| < \kappa$ [32, 33, 36, 47]. In this regime, the effective frequency is unchanged $\omega_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega) \simeq \omega_b$ [48] according to Eq. (17), and the effective susceptibility is peaked

around the points $\omega = \pm\omega_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega) \simeq \pm\omega_b$. Then one can get an approximate expression for the variance

$$\langle \delta x^2 \rangle \approx \frac{S'_{th}(\omega_b) + S'_{ca}(\omega_b)}{2m^2\omega_b^2|\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega_b)|}, \quad (22)$$

where the effective thermal noise spectrum $S'_{th}(\omega)$ and induced noise spectrum $S'_{ca}(\omega)$ are the symmetrized parts of $S_{th}(\omega)$ and $S_{ca}(\omega)$, respectively:

$$\begin{aligned} S'_{th}(\omega) &= \hbar\gamma_b m\omega \coth \frac{\hbar\omega}{2k_B T}, \\ S'_{ca}(\omega) &= (2N+1) \frac{|C(\omega)|^2 + |C(-\omega)|^2}{2|D(\omega)|^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Similarly, one can obtain

$$\langle \delta p^2 \rangle = (m\omega_b)^2 \langle \delta x^2 \rangle. \quad (24)$$




FIG. 2: (Color online) Variance of position $\langle \delta x^2 \rangle$ in units of $\hbar/m\omega_b$ as a function of effective detuning Δ . The dashed lines are obtained by numerically evaluating the integral in Eq. (20), the solid lines by using the approximate expressions Eqs. (22,24). Here, $m = 1.5 \times 10^{-13}$ kg, $T = 0.2$ K, $g_0 = 3 \times 10^{-5}\omega_b\sqrt{m\omega_b/\hbar}$, $\omega_a = 2 \times 10^4\omega_b$, $\varepsilon = 2.5 \times 10^3\omega_b$, $\gamma_b = 0.25 \times 10^{-4}\omega_b$, and $\kappa = 0.5\omega_b$.

Figure 2 shows the variance of position $\langle \delta x^2 \rangle$ as a function of the effective detuning Δ . The dashed line corresponds to a numerical evaluation of the integral in Eq. (20). The solid line describes the approximate results obtained through Eq. (22) which can be seen to agree perfectly with the exact numerical evaluation. We checked that this is also the case for the variance of the momentum $\langle \delta p^2 \rangle$.

According to Eq. (22), the position variance (and correspondingly also the momentum variance) of the MR decreases drastically when the effective damping rate is significantly increased $\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega_b) \gg \gamma_b$ (since usually $S'_{ca}(\omega_b) \lesssim S'_{th}(\omega_b)$ for typical values of the parameters as discussed below). That means a significant cooling of the MR can be obtained. However, this is not the case when $\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega_b)$ is negative and $|\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega_b)| \gg \gamma_b$ (for negative detuning $\Delta < 0$). That is because the stability conditions given in Ref. [49] are satisfied only for positive detuning [31, 46]. In fact, a negative effective damping

means the amplitude motion of MR will be amplified and exhibit an instability [50, 51, 52]. In what follows, we will focus on the case of positive detuning.

We now analyze the cooling of the MR quantitatively by calculating its effective phonon number or effective temperature in the case of positive detuning. According to Eqs. (19,22,24), one has

$$n_b^{\text{eff}} = \frac{\gamma_b n_b + \gamma_{ca}(\omega_b) n_{ca}}{\gamma_b + \gamma_{ca}(\omega_b)}, \quad (25)$$

where

$$n_b \equiv \frac{S'_{th}(\omega_b)}{2\hbar m\omega_b} - \frac{1}{2}, \quad (26)$$

$$n_{ca} \equiv \frac{2N+1}{4\omega_b\Delta} (\kappa^2 + \Delta^2 + \omega_b^2) - \frac{1}{2}. \quad (27)$$

Here n_b is the initial mean phonon number of the MR, which can also be given as

$$n_b = \frac{1}{\exp(\hbar\omega_b/k_B T) - 1}. \quad (28)$$

Actually, Eq. (26) is equivalent to Eq. (28) for an uncooled MR whose mean phonon number $n_b \gg 1$.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Average fluctuation phonon number n_b^{eff} vs. effective detuning Δ and decay rate κ of the TLR ($T = 1$ K, for the other parameters see Fig. 2).

From Eq. (25), one can get an effective phonon number n_b^{eff} lower than the initial phonon number n_b when $n_b > n_{ca}$. That means the cooling of the MR happens. The average fluctuation phonon number n_b^{eff} is plotted as a function of the effective detuning Δ and the decay rate κ of the TLR in Fig. 3. Lower values of n_b^{eff} correspond to lower effective temperatures. From Fig. 3, one can obtain a significant suppression of the mechanical motion of the MR in the positive detuning range $\Delta \simeq \omega_b$. In this positive detuning range, the optimal cooling is obtained for $\kappa < \omega_b$, which agrees with other radiation-pressure (or radiation-pressure-like) papers [22, 23, 25, 26, 41]. In fact, one can also get cooling in the case $\kappa > \omega_b$, but its cooling efficiency is less than that when $\kappa < \omega_b$ [25].

In Fig. 4, the ratio of final effective temperature T_{eff} to bath temperature T is plotted as a function of the effective detuning Δ for different initial bath temperatures for a MR with the frequency $\omega_b = 4$ MHz. The




FIG. 4: (Color online) Ratio of effective temperature T_{eff} to bath temperature vs. effective detuning Δ for three initial temperatures: $T = 0.01$ K (dotted lines), $T = 0.1$ K (solid lines), $T = 300$ K (dashed lines). The circle in the inset corresponds to the ground-state cooling of the MR with $n_b^{\text{eff}} \approx 0.16$. Here, $\kappa = 0.1\omega_b$. For the other parameters see Fig. 2.

ratio of effective temperature T_{eff} to bath temperature is about $1/2000$ for initial temperatures in the range from room temperature (300 K) to 0.1 K. Even if the initial temperature is as low as 0.01 K, which can be realized experimentally by using a dilution refrigerator, the ratio is still of the order of $1/600$. That means we have obtained a significant cooling of the MR.

When the initial temperature of the MR (whose frequency is $\omega_b = 4$ MHz) is $T = 0.01$ K, the corresponding initial mean phonon number n_b is much larger than 1: $n_b = 1/[\exp(\hbar\omega_b/k_B T) - 1] \simeq k_B T/\hbar\omega_b \gg 1$. Using the cooling method presented here, one can obtain a very low effective mean phonon number $n_b^{\text{eff}} \approx 0.16$ ($T_{\text{eff}} \approx 0.15$ mK) (as seen from the circle in the inset of Fig. 4 or in Fig. 5(a)). Thus, we can cool such a MR close to the ground state, e.g., a MR with frequency of 4 MHz at an initial dilution refrigeration temperature of 0.01 K.

According to Eq. (25), one can always obtain cooling of the MR when $n_b > n_{ca}$, but there is a limit: $n_b^{\text{eff}} \rightarrow n_{ca}$, which happens when $\gamma_{ca}(\omega_b) \gg \gamma_b$. In the classical limit when the initial temperature is so high that $N \approx k_B T/(\hbar\omega_a) \gg 1$, the minimal value of n_{ca} in Eq. (27) becomes $n_{ca} = N$ at the optical detuning $\Delta = \omega_b$ and $\kappa^2 \ll \omega_b^2$. Correspondingly, the limit of effective temperature T_{eff} can be obtained as

$$\frac{T_{\text{eff}}}{T} \rightarrow \frac{n_{ca}}{n_b} = \frac{\omega_a}{\omega_b}, \quad (29)$$

which is also given in Ref. [30].

In this paper, we will focus on the quantum limit when T is very low (e.g., $T < 1$ K for the TLR frequency $\omega_a = 8 \times 10^{10}$ Hz) in order that $N \ll 1$, and n_{ca} in Eq. (27) becomes

$$n_{ca} = \frac{\kappa^2 + (\Delta - \omega_b)^2}{4\omega_b\Delta}. \quad (30)$$

Choosing the optimal detuning as $\Delta = \sqrt{\omega_b^2 + \kappa^2}$ leads

to the minimal value

$$n_{ca} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\sqrt{1 + \frac{\kappa^2}{\omega_b^2}} - 1 \right), \quad (31)$$

which reduces to

$$n_{ca} \approx \frac{\kappa}{2\omega_b} > 1 \quad (32)$$

when $\omega_b^2 \ll \kappa^2$; or reduces to

$$n_{ca} \approx \frac{\kappa^2}{4\omega_b^2} < 1 \quad (33)$$

when $\kappa^2 \ll \omega_b^2$.

According to the analysis presented above, it is clear that one can get a better cooling efficiency in the second case $\kappa^2 \ll \omega_b^2$, which corresponds to the case of sideband cooling [22, 23, 25, 26, 41]. In this case, the MR can be cooled to the ground state since the effective mean phonon number can be much less than 1: $n_b^{\text{eff}} \rightarrow \kappa^2/(4\omega_b^2) \ll 1$ with the corresponding effective temperature limit

$$T_{\text{eff}} \equiv \frac{\hbar\omega_b}{k_B \ln[1 + (n_b^{\text{eff}})^{-1}]} \approx \frac{\hbar\omega_b}{k_B \ln(4\omega_b^2/\kappa^2)}. \quad (34)$$

On the other hand, if the initial temperature T is less than the limit temperature in Eq. (34), the MR cannot be cooled in both cases.

Our calculation of the cooling limit is related to that given in the cavity-assisted optomechanical back-action cooling scheme in Refs. [32, 33] or in the similar system consisting of a mechanical resonator capacitively coupled to a superconducting microwave resonator in Ref. [43].

We would like to emphasize that the results presented in Figs. 3 and 4 are based on the approximate expressions Eqs. (22,24), where the weak-coupling limit ($|\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega)| < \kappa$) [33, 43] is used (e.g., for the circle in the inset of Fig. 4, $\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega_b) \approx 0.06\omega_b < \kappa = 0.1\omega_b$). When going beyond weak-coupling limit, the results of the approximate expressions Eqs. (22,24) are not valid any more and the integral in Eq. (20) has to be calculated numerically.

Figure 5(a) shows the optimal effective mean phonon number for an initial temperature $T = 0.01$ K obtained by numerically evaluating the integral in Eq. (20), or using the approximate expression in Eqs. (22,24) as a function of κ (for a MR with the frequency $\omega_b = 4$ MHz). The approximate treatment is valid in the weak-coupling limit $\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega_b)/\kappa < 1$, but ceases to be valid outside of the weak-coupling limit. Beyond the weak-coupling limit (e.g., when $\kappa/\omega_b < 0.1$, see Fig. 5(b)), the numerical evaluation of the integral in Eq. (20) also predicts the possibility of ground-state cooling with a maximal cooling efficiency of the same order as in the weak-coupling limit.

The cooling discussed above can be measured by a homodyne detection method like that given in the scheme




FIG. 5: (Color online) (a) Optimal effective temperatures obtained by numerically evaluating the integral in Eq. (20) (dashed line) or using the approximate expression in Eqs. (22,24) (solid line) as a function of κ at the optimal detuning $\Delta = \omega_b$. (b) Logarithm of the ratio of the corresponding effective damping rate $\gamma_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega_b)$ to κ as a function of κ . Here, $T = 0.01$ K, for the other parameters see Fig. 2. The meaning of the circle is the same as in Fig. 4.

of cavity-assisted pressure-radiation cooling of a MR [31, 53]. The motion of the MR can be detected by monitoring the output microwave signal (e.g., the phase or amplitude field quadrature) of the TLR (as seen in Fig. 1) since the measurement of the output spectrum

corresponds to a faithful measurement of the MR motion [54].

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we have studied the self-cooling of a mechanical resonator that is capacitively coupled to a transmission-line resonator. The discussion was based on a linearized quantum Langevin equation. The cooling method presented here is similar to the self-cooling of a MR coupled to an optical cavity by radiation pressure. We discussed the cooling limits of the MR in both the classical and quantum cases. In the quantum limit, we found that ground-state cooling is possible in the side-band case $\kappa^2 \ll \omega_b^2$ for optimal positive detuning $\Delta \simeq \omega_b$ in the weak-coupling limit.

Acknowledgments

We would like thank C.B. Doiron and I. Wilson-Rae for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the Swiss NSF and the NCCR Nanoscience. Y.D.W. was partially supported by the JSPS KAKENHI No. 18201018 and MEXT-KAKENHI No. 18001002. Y.L. and F.X. also acknowledge support by the NSFC through Grant No. 10574133. F.X. was supported in part at the Technion by an Aly Kaufman Fellowship.

-
- [1] V. B. Braginsky and A. B. Manukin, *Measurement of Weak Forces in Physics Experiments* (The University of Chicago Press, Chicago, 1977).
- [2] C. M. Caves, K. S. Thorne, R. W. P. Drever, V. D. Sandberg, and M. Zimmermann, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **52**, 341 (1980); M. F. Bocko and R. Onofrio, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **68**, 755 (1996); M. D. LaHaye, O. Buu, B. Camarota, and K. C. Schwab, *Science* **304**, 74 (2004).
- [3] K. L. Ekinci, Y. T. Yang, and M. L. Roukes, *J. Appl. Phys.* **95**, 2682 (2004).
- [4] C. M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 75 (1980).
- [5] B. Abbott *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 221101 (2005).
- [6] S. Mancini, V. Giovannetti, D. Vitali, and P. Tombesi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 120401 (2002).
- [7] W. Marshall, C. Simon, R. Penrose, and D. Bouwmeester, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 130401 (2003).
- [8] J. Eisert, M. B. Plenio, S. Bose, and J. Hartley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 190402 (2004).
- [9] L. F. Wei, Y.-X. Liu, C. P. Sun, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 237201 (2006); X. Hu and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 2294 (1996); *ibid* **79**, 4605 (1997).
- [10] F. Xue, L. Zhong, Y. Li, and C. P. Sun, *Phys. Rev. B* **75**, 033407 (2007); F. Xue, Y.-X. Liu, C.P. Sun, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 064305 (2007); F. Xue, Y. D. Wang, C. P. Sun, H. Okamoto, H. Yamaguchi, and K. Semba, *New J. of Phys.* **9**, 35 (2007).
- [11] D. J. Wineland and W. M. Itano, *Phys. Rev. A* **20**, 1521 (1979).
- [12] I. Martin, A. Shnirman, L. Tian, and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. B* **69**, 125339 (2004).
- [13] P. Zhang, Y. D. Wang, and C. P. Sun, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 097204 (2005).
- [14] J. Hauss, A. Fedorov, C. Hutter, A. Shnirman, and G. Schön, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 037003 (2008).
- [15] K. Jaehne, K. Hammerer, and M. Wallquist, arXiv:0804.0603.
- [16] Y. D. Wang, K. Semba, and H. Yamaguchi, *New J. Phys.* **10**, 043015 (2008).
- [17] J.Q. You, Y.-X. Liu, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 047001 (2008).
- [18] A. Naik *et al.*, *Nature* **443**, 193 (2006); M. P. Blencowe, J. Imbers, and A. D. Armour, *New J. Phys.* **7**, 236 (2005); A. A. Clerk and S. Bennett, *ibid* **7**, 238 (2005).
- [19] I. Wilson-Rae, P. Zoller, and A. Imamoglu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 075507 (2004).
- [20] L. Tian and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 266403 (2004).
- [21] C. H. Metzger and K. Karrai, *Nature* **432**, 1002 (2004).
- [22] S. Gigan *et al.*, *Nature* **444**, 67 (2006).
- [23] O. Arcizet, P.-F. Cohadon, T. Briant, M. Pinard, and A. Heidmann, *Nature* **444**, 71 (2006).
- [24] D. Kleckner and D. Bouwmeester, *Nature* **444**, 75 (2006).
- [25] A. Schliesser, P. Del'Haye, N. Nooshi, K. J. Vahala, and T. J. Kippenberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 243905 (2006).
- [26] T. Corbitt *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 150802 (2007).

- [27] J. D. Thompson, B. M. Zwickl, A. M. Jayich, F. Marquardt, S. M. Girvin, and J. G. E. Harris, *Nature* **452**, **72** (2008).
- [28] S. Mancini, D. Vitali, and P. Tombesi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 688 (1998).
- [29] D. Vitali, S. Mancini, L. Ribichini, and P. Tombesi, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 063803 (2002).
- [30] M. Grajcar, S. Ashhab, J. R. Johansson, and F. Nori, arXiv:0709.3775.
- [31] M. Paternostro, S. Gigan, M. S. Kim, F. Blaser, H. R. Böhm, and M. Aspelmeyer, *New J. Phys.* **8**, 107 (2006).
- [32] I. Wilson-Rae, N. Nooshi, W. Zwerger, and T. J. Kippenberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 093901 (2007).
- [33] F. Marquardt, J. P. Chen, A. A. Clerk, and S. M. Girvin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 093902 (2007).
- [34] M. Bhattacharya and P. Meystre, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 073601 (2007).
- [35] C. Genes, D. Vitali, P. Tombesi, S. Gigan, and M. Aspelmeyer, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 033804 (2008).
- [36] A. Dantan, C. Genes, D. Vitali, and M. Pinard, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 011804(R) (2008).
- [37] T. J. Kippenberg and K. J. Vahala, *Optics Express* **15**, 17172 (2007).
- [38] F. Marquardt, A. A. Clerk, and S. M. Girvin, arXiv:0803.1164.
- [39] D. J. Wineland *et al.*, arXiv:quant-ph/0606180.
- [40] K. R. Brown, J. Britton, R. J. Epstein, J. Chiaverini, D. Leibfried, and D. J. Wineland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 137205 (2007).
- [41] F. Xue, Y. D. Wang, Y.-X. Liu, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 205302 (2007).
- [42] D. Vitali, P. Tombesi, M. J. Woolley, A. C. Doherty, and G. J. Milburn, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 042336 (2007).
- [43] J. D. Teufel, C. A. Regal, and K. W. Lehnert, arXiv:0803.4007.
- [44] A. Blais, R.-S. Huang, A. Wallraff, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 062320 (2004).
- [45] C. W. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2000).
- [46] D. Vitali *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 030405 (2007).
- [47] M. Pinard, A. Dantan, D. Vitali, O. Arcizet, T. Briant and A. Heidmann, *Europhys. Lett.* **72**, 747 (2005).
- [48] Strictly speaking, $\omega_b^{\text{eff}}(\omega) \simeq \omega_b$ is not always satisfied for arbitrary parameters, but this the case for the parameters considered in the following discussion.
- [49] A. Hurwitz, *1964 Selected Papers on Mathematical Trends in Control Theory*, Ed. R. Bellman and R. Kalaba (New York: Dover); E. X. DeJesus and C. Kaufman, *Phys. Rev. A* **35**, 5288 (1987).
- [50] S. D. Bennett and A. A. Clerk, *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 201301(R) (2006).
- [51] D.A. Rodrigues, J. Imbers, and A.D. Armour, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 067204 (2007).
- [52] M. Ludwig, B. Kubala, and F. Marquardt, arXiv:0803.3714.
- [53] V. Giovannetti and D. Vitali, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 023812 (2001).
- [54] C. A. Regal, J. D. Teufel, and K. W. Lehnert, arXiv:0801.1827.