

Fractional Quantum Hall State in Coupled Cavities

Jaeyoon Cho,^{1,2} Dimitris G. Angelakis,^{2,3} and Sougato Bose^{1,2}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, Gower St., London WC1E 6BT, UK*

²*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 2 Science Drive 3, Singapore 117542*

³*Science Department, Technical University of Crete, Chania, Crete, Greece, 73100*

(Dated: March 15, 2019)

We propose a scheme to realize the fractional quantum Hall system with atoms confined in a two-dimensional array of coupled cavities. Our scheme is based on simple optical manipulation of atomic internal states and inter-cavity hopping of virtually excited photons. It is shown that as well as the fractional quantum Hall system, any system of hard-core bosons on a lattice in the presence of an arbitrary Abelian vector potential can be simulated solely by controlling the phases of constantly applied lasers. By virtue of the individual addressability of coupled cavity systems, the proposed scheme would open up unprecedented possibilities of examining various kinds of state in a gauge potential at the microscopic level.

The Hall resistance of a two-dimensional (2D) electron gas in the presence of a strong perpendicular magnetic field at a low temperature exhibits plateaus when the Landau filling factor ν takes simple rational values. This phenomenon is called the quantum Hall effect [1]. The integer quantum Hall effect ($\nu = \text{integer}$) is accounted for by considering a non-interacting electron case, in which the existence of the mobility gap between Landau levels, even in the presence of impurities, is responsible for the quantization of the Hall resistance [2]. When the magnetic field is stronger and the temperature is lower, hence the electron-electron interaction comes into play, the fractional quantum Hall effect (FQHE) is observed at fractional fillings. FQHE at fundamental filling factors $\nu = 1/m$ for odd integers m (even integers for bosons) is accounted for by Laughlin's trial wave function (in the symmetric gauge) [3]

$$\Psi_m(\{z_j\}) = e^{-\frac{1}{4}\sum_j |z_j|^2} \prod_{j < k} (z_j - z_k)^m, \quad (1)$$

where $z_j = x_j + iy_j$ is the 2D position of the j th electron in unit of the magnetic length $l_B \equiv \sqrt{\hbar/eB}$ with B being the magnetic field. The elementary excitation of this state is a quasihole (quasiparticle), which has a fractional charge $+e/m$ ($-e/m$) and obeys the anyonic statistics [4].

Since its first discovery in a semiconductor heterostructure in the early 1980s [1], FQHE has now become routinely available in laboratories. In a different context, the achievement of trapping ultracold atomic gases in a strongly correlated regime has prompted an interest in mimicking various condensed matter systems with trapped atoms, thereby allowing one to tackle such complex systems in unprecedented ways [5]. The great advantage of this approach is that such a tailored system of an atomic gas is highly controllable at the microscopic level and is close to pure quantum models of condensed matter systems. In the context of FQHE, a 2D atomic gas is trapped in a harmonic potential [6, 7] or in an optical lattice [8, 9]. Since the atoms in consideration have no real charge, the magnetic field is simulated artificially.

For instance, it is done by rapidly rotating the harmonic trap [6], by exploiting electromagnetically induced transparency [7], or by modulating the optical lattice potential [8, 9]. Additionally, FQHE systems are also simulable in Josephson junction arrays [10].

Recently, coupled cavity arrays (CCAs) [11, 12] have emerged as a fascinating alternative for simulating quantum many-body phenomena, supported by a variety of technologies for implementing them [13, 14, 15]. Motivated by this, we introduce in this paper a new way of simulating FQHE systems in CCAs. To be more specific, we consider a FQHE system of bosonic particles confined in a 2D square lattice of spacing a in the presence of a perpendicular and uniform artificial magnetic field B . Non-interacting free bosons in a single Bloch band are described by the Hamiltonian

$$H_0 = -t \sum_{\langle j,k \rangle} c_j^\dagger c_k \exp\left(-i \frac{2\pi}{\Phi_0} \int_j^k \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot d\mathbf{l}\right), \quad (2)$$

where c_j denotes a boson annihilation operator at site j and $\Phi_0 \equiv h/e$ is the magnetic flux quantum. The summation runs over nearest neighbor pairs. If we take a Landau gauge $\mathbf{A}(x, y) = -By\hat{x}$, this Hamiltonian is written as

$$H_0 = -t \sum_{p,q} \left(c_{p+1,q}^\dagger c_{p,q} e^{-i2\pi\alpha q} + c_{p,q+1}^\dagger c_{p,q} + h.c. \right), \quad (3)$$

where the positions of lattice sites are represented by $a(p\hat{x} + q\hat{y})$ with p and q being integers and α is the spacing of the lattice. Here, $\alpha \equiv Ba^2/\Phi_0$, the number of magnetic flux quanta through a lattice cell, plays a crucial role in characterizing the energy spectrum, whose self-similar structure is known as the Hofstadter butterfly [16]. In addition to this non-interacting Hamiltonian, we consider a hard-core interaction between bosons, which limits the number of particles that can occupy one site to a maximum of one. In this limit, if we also take a continuum limit $\alpha \ll 1$, the Laughlin state (1) is a very




FIG. 1: Schematic representation of a two-dimensional array of coupled cavities. Each atom is confined in the intersection of two orthogonal cavity modes, which are adjusted to have different resonant frequencies.

accurate variational ground state, where the filling factor ν corresponds to the ratio of the number of bosons to the number of magnetic flux quanta.

In order to realize the above situation, we consider a two-dimensional array of coupled cavities each confining a single atom with two ground levels, which will be representing an $s = \frac{1}{2}$ spin. First, we notify that, aside from the additional phases, the Hamiltonian (3) in the hard-core limit corresponds to that of an $s = \frac{1}{2}$ spin lattice system with XX interaction, where the creation-annihilation operation of the zero and one boson states is analogous to the spin flip operation of the spin-down and up states [17]. This natural realization of the hard-core limit is contrary to the case of optical lattices, wherein it is achieved in the limit of strong on-site repulsion [8, 9]. Moreover, as will be seen later, the phase $2\pi\alpha q$ in the Hamiltonian is adjusted simply by controlling the phases of applied lasers, where we are assuming each cavity site can be addressed individually. This optical control of the system would greatly simplify the experiments, compared to the previous schemes involving mechanical modulations of the system. Although in this work we only consider FQHE systems, another great advantage of our scheme is that any Abelian vector potential on a lattice can be also simulated by adjusting the laser phases in accordance with the formula (2). The creation of a quasihole (quasiparticle), which is achieved by adiabatically subtracting (adding) a flux quantum through an infinitely thin magnetic solenoid piercing the 2D plane [3], again reduces to the matter of adiabatically changing the laser phases accordingly, where the quasihole (quasiparticle) is supposed to exist inside a lattice cell. It can be moved along the lattice cells by modulating the laser phases, which would be useful for testing the fractional statistics of quasiexcitations. Moreover, the individual addressability of the system allows for site-by-site examination of the states.

Schemes for realizing the spin exchange Hamiltonian in an array of coupled cavities have been established in recent papers [18]. In these schemes, the spin exchange is mediated by inter-cavity hopping of virtually excited cavity photons. An important difference in the present




FIG. 2: Involved atomic levels and transitions. There are two independent Raman transitions mediated by an excited level $|e\rangle$ between two ground levels $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, represented by superscripts X and Y , respectively. g^X and g^Y are the atom-cavity coupling rates, $\Omega^X e^{-i\theta^X}$ and $\Omega^Y e^{-i\theta^Y}$ are the (complex) Rabi frequencies of the classical fields, and Δ^X and Δ^Y are the detunings.

case is that the phase changes in Hamiltonian (3) associated with spin exchange depend on their locations and directions. These phases can not be canceled out by local phase transformations (if otherwise, the system is simply a spin lattice with XX interaction). For this reason, we introduce an asymmetry in the 2D geometry of coupled cavities, as shown schematically in FIG. 1, where two orthogonal cavity modes along the \hat{x} and \hat{y} directions have different resonant frequencies. Realizing this geometry would be viable in several promising models for coupled cavities, such as photonic bandgap microcavities [14] and superconducting microwave cavities [15]. We assume the frequency difference between the two modes is much larger than the atom-cavity coupling rates. In this way, either direction of the spin exchange can be accessed individually by choosing the laser frequency. We note, however, that the above asymmetry is, in fact, not essential for our purpose. For example, an array of microtoroidal cavities [13], in which case realizing the geometry as in FIG. 1 is nontrivial, can be also used by involving more lasers in the scheme. We discuss this point later.

We introduce a simple atomic level and transition scheme for XX interaction, as shown in FIG. 2. The atom has two ground levels $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, and an excited level $|e\rangle$. There are two cavity modes along the \hat{x} and \hat{y} directions, whose annihilation operators are denoted by a^X and a^Y , respectively. The atom interacts with these cavity modes with coupling rates g^X and g^Y , and with detunings Δ^X and Δ^Y , respectively. Two classical fields with (complex) Rabi frequencies $\Omega^X e^{-i\theta^X}$ and $\Omega^Y e^{-i\theta^Y}$ are applied, respectively, as in the figure. In the rotating frame, the Hamiltonian reads

$$\begin{aligned}
 H = & \sum_{\mu=X,Y} \sum_{j=(p,q)} \left[g^\mu e^{-i\Delta^\mu t} a_j^\mu (|e\rangle \langle 0|)_j \right. \\
 & \left. + \Omega^\mu e^{-i\theta_j^\mu} e^{-i\Delta^\mu t} (|e\rangle \langle 1|)_j + h.c. \right] \quad (4) \\
 & + \sum_{p,q} \left(J^X a_{p+1,q}^{X\dagger} a_{p,q}^X + J^Y a_{p,q+1}^{Y\dagger} a_{p,q}^Y + h.c. \right),
 \end{aligned}$$

where J^X (J^Y) denotes the inter-cavity hopping rate of the photon along the \hat{x} (\hat{y}) direction, and the sub-

script (p, q) represents the cavity site. As mentioned above, we assume $\Delta^X - \Delta^Y \gg g^X, g^Y$, and also assume $\Delta^\mu \gg g^\mu \gg \Omega^\mu, J^\mu$. This requires the strong atom-cavity coupling in that $g^\mu \gg J^\mu$. In this regime, the atomic excitation is suppressed, and adiabatic elimination leads to an effective Hamiltonian

$$H = \sum_{\mu=X,Y} \sum_{j=(p,q)} \left[\delta^\mu a_j^{\mu\dagger} a_j^\mu (|0\rangle\langle 0|)_j + \omega^\mu \left(e^{i\theta_j^\mu} a_j^\mu \sigma_j^+ + h.c. \right) \right] + \sum_{p,q} \left(J^X a_{p+1,q}^X a_{p,q}^X + J^Y a_{p,q+1}^Y a_{p,q}^Y + h.c. \right), \quad (5)$$

where $\delta^\mu = (g^\mu)^2/\Delta^\mu$, $\omega^\mu = g^\mu\Omega^\mu/\Delta^\mu$, and $\sigma^+ = |1\rangle\langle 0|$. Here, we have ignored the ac Stark shift induced by classical fields, which is negligible in our regime (or it may be compensated by other lasers). Again, we assume $\delta^\mu \gg J^\mu \gg \omega^\mu$, which can be satisfied, along with the above condition, when

$$g^\mu/\Delta^\mu \gg J^\mu/g^\mu \gg \Omega^\mu/\Delta^\mu. \quad (6)$$

In this regime, the cavity photon is suppressed, and adiabatic elimination can be applied once more. We extend the method in Ref. [19] to keep up to the third order terms and take only the subspace with no cavity photon. The effective Hamiltonian, in the rotating frame, can then be derived as

$$H = t \sum_{p,q} \left[\sigma_{p+1,q}^+ \sigma_{p,q}^- e^{i(\theta_{p+1,q}^X - \theta_{p,q}^X)} + \sigma_{p,q+1}^+ \sigma_{p,q}^- e^{i(\theta_{p,q+1}^Y - \theta_{p,q}^Y)} + h.c. \right], \quad (7)$$

where the parameters are chosen such that $t = J^X(\omega^X/\delta^X)^2 = J^Y(\omega^Y/\delta^Y)^2$. It is easy to see that this Hamiltonian reduces to the Hamiltonian (2) if we adjust the phases of the classical fields as

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_{p,q}^X &= p\pi + \frac{2\pi}{\Phi_0} \int_{0,q}^{p,q} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot d\mathbf{l}, \\ \theta_{p,q}^Y &= q\pi + \frac{2\pi}{\Phi_0} \int_{p,0}^{p,q} \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{r}) \cdot d\mathbf{l}. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The FQHE Hamiltonian (3) is obtained if we adjust these phases as $\theta_{p,q}^X = p\pi - pq \cdot 2\pi\alpha$ and $\theta_{p,q}^Y = q\pi$. Note that by absorbing unimportant local phases $q\pi$ into the definition of atomic states, the classical fields for $\theta_{p,q}^Y$ can be replaced by one global field.

In order to check the validity of the adiabatic approximation from Hamiltonian (5) to (7), we have performed a direct numerical diagonalization of Hamiltonian (5). We take a set of parameters $\delta^\mu/10 = 10\omega^\mu = J^\mu$, which corresponds to a case where $\Delta^\mu/1000 = g^\mu/100 = \Omega^\mu = J^\mu$. To eliminate the edge effects within a limited computational capability, we consider a periodic boundary condition (i.e., a torus). We consider a 4×4 lattice with




FIG. 3: Energy gap from the ground state to the nine lowest excited states for a 4×4 lattice in the periodic boundary condition in the presence of energy shift $-\epsilon|1\rangle\langle 1|$ applied at two sites chosen evenly. The filling factor is $\nu = 1/2$.

$\alpha = 1/4$ and two bosons, hence four flux quanta in total and the filling factor $\nu = 1/2$. In view of the fact that the cavity photon is suppressed, we restrict our calculation to the subspace wherein the maximum number of excitations in a cavity is limited to one, i.e., $\langle a_{p,q}^{X\dagger} a_{p,q}^X + a_{p,q}^{Y\dagger} a_{p,q}^Y + (|1\rangle\langle 1|)_{p,q} \rangle \leq 1$. Up to the modification due to the torus geometry and a different gauge [20], the ground state should be close to the Laughlin state (1) with $m = 2$. From our numerical diagonalization, the fidelity between the Laughlin state $|\Psi_2\rangle$ and the numerical ground state $|\Psi_G\rangle$ is found to be $F_G = |\langle \Psi_2 | \Psi_G \rangle|^2 = 0.976$. We note that when the ideal Hamiltonian (3) is diagonalized for the same 4×4 lattice, the fidelity of the ground state is found to be 0.989. The fidelity F_G converges to this value as δ^μ/J^μ and J^μ/ω^μ increase, which, however, demands more strong atom-cavity coupling. Note also that the non-unit fidelity is partly due to the finite α , which makes the effect of the lattice geometry non-negligible. The ground state fidelity of the Hamiltonian (3) increases close to one as α decreases [9].

In experiments, the ground state could be prepared by means of an adiabatic transformation, in a similar manner as in Ref. [9]. To show this, we consider the above 4×4 lattice system and deliberately add an energy shift $-\epsilon(|1\rangle\langle 1|)_{0,0} + (|1\rangle\langle 1|)_{2,2}$, which can be done in experiments by applying lasers at those sites to induce ac Stark shifts. When the energy shift ϵ is sufficiently large, the ground state is simply $|1\rangle_{0,0} |1\rangle_{2,2}$ with all other atoms in state $|0\rangle$. In FIG. (3), we plot the energy gap from the ground state to the nine lowest excited states with respect to the amount of the energy shift ϵ . The degeneracy of the ground state in the absence of the energy shift is due to the ambiguity of the center of mass in the torus geometry, which disappears in the plane geometry [20]. Aside from this degeneracy, the excited states have finite energy gaps which allow an adiabatic transformation. From this figure, it is apparent that the Laughlin ground state can be prepared by the following procedure: (1) Prepare the atoms in state $|1\rangle$ at sites chosen evenly in agreement with the filling factor ν , with all other atoms prepared in state $|0\rangle$. Initially all lasers are turned off; (2) Apply lasers at the chosen sites to induce an ac Stark

shift $-\epsilon|1\rangle\langle 1|$, with ϵ chosen moderately, e.g., as the desired value of t . This energy shift does not change the atomic state; (3) Gradually increase the Rabi frequencies Ω^X and Ω^Y to reach the desired value of t ; (4) Gradually decrease the energy shift ϵ to zero.

The quasiexcitation of the Laughlin state is generated when one magnetic flux quantum is adiabatically inserted through an infinitely thin solenoid piercing the 2D plane [3]. In the present system, we can choose the position of the quasiexcitation inside a lattice cell. Reminding that the vector potential outside a solenoid is given by $\vec{A}_s = \Phi_0/2\pi r\hat{\varphi}$, where r is the distance from the solenoid and $\hat{\varphi}$ is the azimuthal vector, the effect of the solenoid can be reflected in the phases of Eq. (8). Generation of the Laughlin state and the existence of the fractionally charged quasiexcitation (in the present case, fractionally excited bosons) could be examined by directly measuring the individual atoms: for example, by measuring the pair correlation functions [21]. Before the measurement, one may turn off all lasers so as to isolate the state from further evolution and decoherence.

Although the atomic excitation is highly suppressed, the atomic spontaneous decay is yet a prominent source of decoherence. If we denote by γ the spontaneous decay rate of an atom, the effective decay rate of the whole system due to the atomic decay is estimated as $N_b\gamma(\Omega/\Delta)^2$, where N_b denotes the total number of bosons in the system (we omit superscript X or Y for simplicity). On the other hand, the energy scale t in the Hamiltonian is given by $J(\Omega/g)^2$. In view of the condition $\Delta \gg g$, the former is still much smaller than the latter for moderate N_b if we assume $\gamma \lesssim J$. However, since the excitation gap is smaller than t , the attainable system size would be restricted in the experimental realization. Although the effective decay rate is decreased by increasing Δ , this in turn requires more stronger atom-cavity coupling rate g so as to satisfy the condition (6).

Finally, we stress the point that the asymmetric geometry introduced in FIG. 1 is in fact not essential. That is, when the two orthogonal cavity modes have the same resonant frequency, one can also obtain the Hamiltonian (7) in the following way: we apply lasers with the same frequency, say ω_1 , in every second row so that they produce the spin exchange to the \hat{x} direction. In the other rows, we apply lasers with a different frequency ω_2 , which also produce the spin exchange to the \hat{x} direction. If we choose the frequencies so that $|\omega_1 - \omega_2| \sim \delta^\mu$, they do not produce the spin exchange to the \hat{y} direction. In the same manner, we apply lasers with frequencies ω_3 and ω_4 in every second column to produce the spin exchange to the \hat{y} direction. By choosing these four frequencies to be sufficiently detuned, we can adjust the associated phases independently for each pair of the spin exchange.

We thank R. Fazio and B. Hessmo for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the Korea Research Foundation Grant (KRF-2007-357-C00016) funded by

the Korean Government (MOEHRD), and by the National Research Foundation & Ministry of Education, Singapore. SB thanks the Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council (EPSRC) UK for an Advanced Research Fellowship and for support through the Quantum Information Processing IRC (GR/S82176/01) and the Royal Society and the Wolfson Foundation.

-
- [1] K. v. Klitzing, G. Dorda, and M. Pepper, Phys. Rev. Lett. **45**, 494 (1980); D. C. Tsui, H. L. Stormer, and A. C. Gossard, Phys. Rev. Lett. **48**, 1559 (1982).
 - [2] R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. B **23**, 5632 (1981).
 - [3] R. B. Laughlin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1395 (1983).
 - [4] D. Arovas, J. R. Schrieffer, and F. Wilczek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **53**, 722 (1984).
 - [5] M. Lewenstein, A. Sanpera, V. Ahufinger, B. Damski, A. Sen, and U. Sen, Adv. Phys. **56**, 243 (2007).
 - [6] N. K. Wilkin and J. M. F. Gunn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 6 (2000); B. Paredes, P. Fedichev, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 010402 (2001).
 - [7] G. Juzeliūnas and P. Öhberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 033602 (2004).
 - [8] D. Jaksch and P. Zoller, New J. Phys. **5**, 56 (2003).
 - [9] A. S. Sørensen, E. Demler, and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 086803 (2005).
 - [10] A. Stern, Phys. Rev. B **50**, 10092 (1994).
 - [11] M. J. Hartmann, F. G. S. L. Brandão, and M. B. Plenio, Nature Phys. **2**, 849 (2006); D. G. Angelakis, M. F. Santos, and S. Bose, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 031805(R) (2007); A. D. Greentree, C. Tahan, J. H. Cole, and L. C. L. Hollenberg, Nature Phys. **2**, 856 (2006); D. G. Angelakis, M. F. Santos, V. Yannopoulos, and A. Ekert, Phys. Lett. A **362**, 377 (2007).
 - [12] D. Rossini and R. Fazio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 186401 (2007); M. X. Huo, Y. Li, Z. Song, and C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 022103 (2008); N. Na, S. Utsunomiya, L. Tian, and Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 031803(R) (2008); M. Paternostro, G. S. Agarwal, and M. S. Kim, arXiv:0707.0846; D.G. Angelakis and A. Kay, New J. Phys. **10**, 023012 (2008).
 - [13] T. Aoki *et al.*, Nature **443**, 671 (2006).
 - [14] Y. Akahane, T. Asano, B.-S. Song, and S. Noda, Nature **425**, 944 (2003); T. Yoshie *et al.*, Nature **432**, 200 (2004).
 - [15] J. Majer *et al.*, Nature **449**, 443 (2007); M. A. Sillanpää, J. I. Park, and R. W. Simmonds, Nature **449**, 438 (2007); M. Mariantoni *et al.*, arXiv:0712.2522.
 - [16] D. R. Hofstadter, Phys. Rev. B **14**, 2239 (1976).
 - [17] H. Matsuda and T. Tsuneto, Suppl. Prog. Theor. Phys. **46**, 411 (1970).
 - [18] M. J. Hartmann, F. G. S. L. Brandão, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 160501 (2007); J. Cho, D. G. Angelakis, and S. Bose, arXiv:0802.3365.
 - [19] D. F. V. James and J. Jerke, Can. J. Phys. **85**, 625 (2007).
 - [20] F. D. M. Haldane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **55**, 2095 (1985); F. D. M. Haldane and E. H. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 2529 (1985).
 - [21] F. D. M. Haldane and E. H. Rezayi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **54**, 237 (1985).