

Gouy Phase for Fullerene Molecules

I. G. da Paz[†], M. C. Nemes[†], C. H. Monken[†], S. Pdua[†] and J. G. Peixoto de Faria[‡]
[†]*Departamento de Física, Instituto de Ciências Exatas, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais, CP 702, CEP 30161-970, Belo Horizonte, Minas Gerais, Brazil and*
[‡]*Departamento de Física e Matemática, Centro Federal de Educação Tecnológica de Minas Gerais, Av. Amazonas 7675, CEP 30510-000, Belo Horizonte, MG, Brazil*

Matter waves and classical light waves in vacuum obey very different dispersion relations. This is one key ingredient for phenomena which are typical of one or the other. However, in the paraxial approximation, the electromagnetic wave equation is reduced to the Helmholtz equation, that is formally equivalent to the two-dimensional Schrödinger equation for a free particle. We explore the analogy between paraxial light and matter waves and we investigate how this analogy can be used to obtain information about position-momentum correlations. In particular, we show that the well known Gouy phase for light waves can be defined for matter and this definition is completely consistent with recent experiments involving diffraction of fullerene molecules and can be extracted therefrom.

PACS numbers: 03.75.-b, 03.65.Vf, 03.75.Be

The origin of quantum interferometry can be traced back to the first, low intensity interferometric experiments by Taylor in the first decade of last century [1]. The subject has become a fundamental one when the foundations of Quantum Mechanics were established, and started debates employing gedanken quantum interferometry experiments. These debates are still alive in present days. Atom optics is now a rapidly developing area in atom physics [2]. Here one works with coherent beams of atoms to produce and control matter waves in analogy with electromagnetic waves. At the same time the experimental technology has opened us new possibilities and a highly sophisticated level of precision. The result of these rapid technological advances offers new perspectives in different areas involving waves.

One of the main differences in the dynamical behavior of electromagnetic and matter waves relies in their completely different dispersion relations. Free electromagnetic wave packets in vacuum propagate without distortions while, *e.g.*, an initially narrow gaussian wave function of a free particle tends to increase its width indefinitely. However, the paraxial approximation to the propagation of a light wave in vacuum is formally identical to Schrödinger equation. How far into reality can we take this formal analogy?

The purpose of the present contribution is to quantify a few analogies between classical electromagnetic waves in the paraxial approximation and the Schrödinger equation for free particles. We show that some phenomena well known to one of these subjects can be both qualitatively and quantitatively mapped on the other. Two examples we will explore are: a) Schrödinger's generalized uncertainty principle and its consequences for electromagnetic waves and free quantum particles; b) The 100 years old Gouy phase [3, 4, 5] so well known and tested for electromagnetic waves and its corpuscular counterpart.

Consider a stationary electric field in vacuum

$$E(\vec{r}) = A(\vec{r}) \exp(ikz). \quad (1)$$

The paraxial approximation consists in assuming that the complex envelope function $A(\vec{r})$ varies slowly within one wavelength $\lambda_L = 2\pi/k$. Under this condition the equation for $A(\vec{r})$ can be immediately obtained and reads [6]

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + i4\pi \frac{1}{\lambda_L} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right) A(x, y, z) = 0. \quad (2)$$

Consider now the two-dimensional Schrödinger equation for a free particle of mass m

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + 2i \frac{m}{\hbar} \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \right) \psi(x, y, t) = 0. \quad (3)$$

Here, $\psi(x, y, t)$ stands for the wave function of the particle in time t . Let us now assume that the particle's movement in the z direction is classical and its velocity in this direction remains constant. In this case one can interpret the time variation as the variation in this direction according to the relation $t = z/v_z$. Now using the fact that $\lambda_P = h/p$ and substituting in Eq. (3) we get

$$\left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial x^2} + \frac{\partial^2}{\partial y^2} + i4\pi \frac{1}{\lambda_P} \frac{\partial}{\partial z} \right) \psi(x, y, t = z/v_z) = 0. \quad (4)$$

The condition of constant velocity in the propagation direction has been used in the analysis of recent diffraction experiments with fullerene molecules [7, 8]. A theoretical model using this assumption was also shown to qualitatively reproduce the data well [9].

In the present contribution we exploit the analogy between Eqs. (4) and (2) in order to show that a matter wave Gouy phase can be indirectly extracted from the experiments of Nairz *et al.* [8].

The analogy between the above equations in what concerns the uncertainty principle can be immediately constructed given the formal analogy between the equations.

Consider the plane wave expansion of the normalized wave $u(x, t)$ [10]

$$u(x, t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int \mathbf{k} \Lambda(k) e^{i[kx - \omega(k)t]}. \quad (5)$$

The amplitudes $\Lambda(k)$ are determined by the Fourier transform of the $u(x, 0)$ ($t = 0$ for simplicity):

$$\Lambda(k) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u(x, 0) e^{-ikx} dx. \quad (6)$$

The averages of functions $f(x, k)$ of x and k are evaluated as [11]

$$\langle f(x, k) \rangle = \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^*(x, 0) f_s \left(x, -i \frac{\partial}{\partial x} \right) u(x, 0) dx, \quad (7)$$

in complete analogy with quantum mechanics. The function $f_s(x, -i \frac{\partial}{\partial x})$ is obtained from $f(x, k)$ by substituting the c-number variable k by the operator $-i \frac{\partial}{\partial x}$ followed by symmetric ordering. For example, if $f(x, k) = xk$, then $f_s(x, -i \frac{\partial}{\partial x}) = -\frac{i}{2} (x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} x)$. Thus, we can write the variances

$$\sigma_{xx} = \langle x^2 \rangle - \langle x \rangle^2, \quad (8)$$

$$\sigma_{kk} = \langle k^2 \rangle - \langle k \rangle^2, \quad (9)$$

and the covariance

$$\sigma_{xk} = -\frac{i}{2} \int_{\mathbb{R}} u^*(x) \left(x \frac{\partial}{\partial x} + \frac{\partial}{\partial x} x \right) u(x) dx - \langle x \rangle \langle k \rangle, \quad (10)$$

and get

$$\sigma_{xx} \sigma_{kk} - \sigma_{xk}^2 \geq \frac{1}{4}. \quad (11)$$

Equation (11) is the equivalent of Schrödinger's generalized uncertainty principle for waves. It is also true in this context that the evolution given by Eq. (2) preserves this quantity. This fact allows us to experimentally access the nonlocal correlation σ_{xk} by the measurements of σ_{xx} and σ_{kk} , which are quite simple to perform. Moreover, as we show next, σ_{xk} is directly related to the Rayleigh length and Gouy phase.

A possible solution of Eq. (2) is a gaussian wave packet given by

$$E(x, y, z) = E_0 \frac{w_0}{w(z)} \exp \left[-\frac{x^2 + y^2}{w(z)^2} \right] \exp(ikz) \times \exp \left\{ \left[\frac{ik(x^2 + y^2)}{2R(z)} \right] - i\zeta(z) \right\}. \quad (12)$$

In Eq. (12) we have used the well known quantities

$$w(z) = w_0 \left[1 + \left(\frac{z}{z_0} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (13)$$

$$R(z) = z \left[1 + \left(\frac{z_0}{z} \right)^2 \right], \quad (14)$$

$$\zeta(z) = \arctan \left(\frac{z}{z_0} \right), \quad (15)$$

and

$$z_0 = \frac{\pi w_0^2}{\lambda_L}, \quad (16)$$

where w_0 is the beam waist at $z = 0$, $w(z)$ is the beam width at z position, z_0 is the Rayleigh length, $\zeta(z)$ is the Gouy phase, λ_L is the wavelength of light, and E_0 is a positive constant [12].

The generalized uncertainty relations for the gaussian beam can be immediately obtained. Indeed the variances

$$\sigma_{xx} = \frac{w^2(z)}{4} = \frac{z_0}{2k} \left[1 + \left(\frac{z}{z_0} \right)^2 \right], \quad (17)$$

$$\sigma_{k_x k_x} = \frac{k}{2z_0}, \quad (18)$$

$$\sigma_{xk_x} = \frac{z}{2z_0}, \quad (19)$$

satisfy the equality

$$\sigma_{xx} \sigma_{k_x k_x} - \sigma_{xk_x}^2 = \frac{1}{4}. \quad (20)$$

Analogue expressions can be found for the second moments of the y transverse component. The saturation at the value 1/4 allows the determination of the nonlocal correlation σ_{xk_x} . From (20) and using the results (17) and (18) we get

$$\sigma_{xk_x}(z) = \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\left[\frac{w(z)}{w_0} \right]^2 - 1}, \quad (21)$$

which is a function of z/z_0 just like expression (15) for Gouy phase.

The connection between the Gouy phase and the covariance σ_{xk_x} has a purely kinematical nature. As pointed by Simon and Mukunda [13], the parameter space of the gaussian states has an hyperbolic geometry, and the Gouy phase shift is just the geometric phase associated with the evolution of a light beam when it crosses the focus. According to Eq. (17), in the focus region, the beam suffers a spatial confinement, while away from the focus, on the other hand, we observe a spread in the beam width. However, as shown by Eq. (18), the spread in momentum is always constant. These results contradict the argument used by Feng and Winful in Ref. [14] in order to give a physically motivated explanation of the Gouy phase. The authors assert that the Gouy phase shift originates from the contribution of the transverse momentum spread, a quantity proportional to $w(z)^{-2}$.

Note that σ_{xk_x} can be positive or negative according to (21). However it has been derived assuming the focus at $z = 0$. If one uses a different focus, we should take

this into account. The plus and minus signs in (21) can be best visualized if one looks at (19)

$$\sigma_{xk_x} = \frac{z}{2z_0} \rightarrow \sigma_{xk_x} = \frac{z - z_c}{2z_0}. \quad (22)$$

We thus observe that for light waves propagating toward (away from) the focus, the correlation is negative (positive).

Next, we show the particle's counterpart of that situation. The free time evolution of an initially gaussian wave packet

$$\psi(x, y, 0) = \left[\frac{1}{\sigma_0 \sqrt{\pi}} \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} e^{-\frac{x^2 + y^2}{\sigma_0^2}}, \quad (23)$$

according to Schrödinger equation is given by [15]

$$\begin{aligned} \psi(x, y, t) = & \left[\frac{1}{B(t) \sqrt{\pi}} \right] \exp\left(-\frac{x^2 + y^2}{B^2(t)}\right) \\ & \times \exp\left\{ i \left[\frac{m(x^2 + y^2)}{2\hbar R(t)} - \mu(t) \right] \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

The comparison with the solution of the wave equation in the paraxial approximation with the same condition at $z = 0$ yields

$$w(z) \rightarrow B(t) = \sigma_0 \left[1 + \left(\frac{t}{\tau_0} \right)^2 \right]^{\frac{1}{2}}, \quad (25)$$

$$R(z) \rightarrow R(t) = t \left[1 + \left(\frac{\tau_0}{t} \right)^2 \right], \quad (26)$$

$$\zeta(z) \rightarrow \mu(t) = \arctan\left(\frac{t}{\tau_0}\right), \quad (27)$$

and

$$z_0 \rightarrow \tau_0 = \frac{m\sigma_0^2}{\hbar}. \quad (28)$$

The above equations show that the matter wave propagating in time with fixed velocity in the propagation direction and the stationary electric field in the paraxial approximation (see Eq. (12)) are formally identical [if one replaces $t = z/v_z$ and $t/\tau_0 \rightarrow z/z_0$ in the Eqs. (25–27)]. The generalized uncertainty principle for particles produces

$$\sigma_{xx} \sigma_{pp} - \sigma_{xp}^2 = \frac{\hbar^2}{4}, \quad (29)$$

showing that the gaussian wave packet saturates the uncertainty principle at all times. From the above expression one can immediately connect the dynamical time dependence of the wave packet to the nonlocal correlations σ_{xp} . Note that Eq. (29) is identical to Eq. (20) with $\hbar \rightarrow 1$.

In Ref. [8], an experiment with fullerene molecules C_{70} has been performed in order to verify the uncertainty principle. In that experiment, a collimated molecular beam crosses a variable aperture slit and its width is measured as a function of the slit width (see Fig. 3 in Ref. [8]). Using this result one can extract σ_{xp} in complete analogy with the previous section for light waves. The theoretical model we propose here is described in Ref. [16]. In the present case, we consider the single slit modeled as a gaussian function with the experimental width and, for simplicity, the wave function depending on a unique spatial coordinate – the x direction. At the screen the wave function is [15, 16]

$$\psi(x, t + \tau) = \left(\frac{\eta}{\pi} \right)^{\frac{1}{4}} \exp\left[-\frac{(\eta + iv)x^2}{2} - i\frac{\mu(t)}{2}\right], \quad (30)$$

where

$$\eta(t, \tau) = \beta(t) \left(\frac{m}{\hbar\tau} \right)^2 \xi(t, \tau), \quad (31)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} v(t, \tau) = & -\frac{m\beta(t)^2}{\hbar\tau} \xi(t, \tau) + \frac{t}{\tau\sigma_0^2 B(t)^2} \\ & \times \left[\frac{m}{\hbar\tau} + \frac{\hbar t}{m\sigma_0^2 B^2(t)} \right] \xi(t, \tau). \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

Here, t is the time from the collimator to the slit, τ is the time from the slit to the screen and

$$\xi(t, \tau) = \left\{ \beta^2(t) + \left[\frac{m}{\hbar\tau} + \frac{\hbar t}{m\sigma_0^2 B^2(t)} \right]^2 \right\}^{-1}. \quad (33)$$

Also,

$$\beta(t) = \frac{1}{B(t)^2} + \frac{1}{b^2}, \quad (34)$$

where b is the slit width.

The beam width at the screen is given by [15]

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^2(t, \tau) = & \frac{1}{\beta(t)} + \left(\frac{\hbar\tau}{m} \right)^2 \beta(t) \\ & + \frac{t\tau}{\beta(t)} \left[\frac{\hbar}{mB(t)} \right]^2 \left[\frac{2}{\sigma_0^2} + \frac{t\tau}{\tau_0^2 B^2(t)} \right], \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

where the time is fixed (by experiment) and the slit width is varied. The experimental result for the molecular beam width α as a function of slit width b is depicted in Fig. 1.

In Fig. 1, we observe that the theoretical prediction of the beam width is in excellent agreement with the experimental results for slit widths smaller than $10 \mu\text{m}$. However, for greater values of the slit width, the model does not fit the experimental points. As discussed in Ref. [8], the reason for this disagreement can be ascribed to




FIG. 1: Width of a beam of fullerene C_{70} molecules as a function of the slit width. The full curve corresponds to our calculation and the points are the results obtained in the experiment reported in Ref. [8]. We used $t = 5.6$ ms, $\tau = 6.7$ ms and $\sigma_0 = 10$ μm . The disagreement of the theoretical prediction and the experimental points for slit widths greater than 10 μm can be ascribed to the purely classical shadow width contribution.




FIG. 2: $x - p$ correlation as a function of the slit width. The full curve corresponds to our calculation and the points were obtained from the experimental results reported in Ref. [8]. The parameters are the same as in Fig. 1

the contribution of the purely classical shadow. This contribution must be properly deduced from the measured values of the molecular beam width in order to give the correct quantum part.

From this result, σ_{xp} can be calculated, in analogy to Eq. (21). Results are shown in Fig. 2. Here, as usual, we must shift the origin of the slit widths $b \rightarrow b - b_c$ where b_c is the slit width for which the beam width is minimal.

The phase can then be shown to be compatible with both the model and the data (see Fig. 3). Unfortunately the lower branch could not be extracted from the present data. But this should be a rather simple experimental task.

Acknowledgments

We would like to thank K. M. Fonseca Romero for a careful reading of the manuscript. This work was partially supported by CNPq.




FIG. 3: Gouy phase as a function of the slit width. The full curve corresponds to our calculation and the points were obtained from the experimental results reported in Ref. [8]. The parameters are the same as in Fig. 1

-
- [1] G. I. Taylor, Proc. Cam. Phil. Soc. **15**, 114 (1909).
[2] J. Appl. Phys. B **54** (1992) special issue in optics and interferometry with atoms.
[3] C. R. Gouy, Acad. Sci. Paris **110**, 1251 (1890).
[4] C. R. Gouy, Ann. Chim. Phip. Ser. **6** 24 (1891).
[5] A. E. Siegman, *Lasers* p. 682 (University Science Books, Mill Valley, 1986).
[6] B. E. A. Saleh, and M. C. Teich, *Fundamentals of Photonics* p. 86 (John Wiley Sons, New York, 1991)
[7] O. Nairz, M. Arndt, and A. Zeilinger, Am. J. Phys. **71**, 319 (2003).
[8] O. Nairz, M. Arndt, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032109 (2002).
[9] A. Viale, M. Vicari, and N. Zangh, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 063610 (2003).
[10] J. D. Jackson. *Classical Electrodynamics* p. 323 (Jonh Wiley, New York, 1999).
[11] D. Stoler, J. Opt. Soc. Am. **71**, 334 (1981).
[12] L. Mandel, and E. Wolf. *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* p. 269 (Cambridge, New York, 1995).
[13] R. Simon, and N. Mukunda, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 880 (1993).
[14] S. Feng, and H. G. Winful, Opt. Lett. **26**, 485 (2001).
[15] I. G. da Paz, Master thesis. Departamento de Fsica, Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais (2006).
[16] G. Glionna, *et al.*, Physica A **387**, 1485 (2008).