

Shot noise correlations of sequential weak optical measurement of a single spin

R.-B. Liu,^{1,*} Shu-Hong Fung,¹ Hok-Kin Fung,¹ A. N. Korotkov,² and L. J. Sham³

¹Department of Physics, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Shatin, N.T., Hong Kong, China

²Department of Electrical Engineering, University of California, Riverside, California 92521-0204

³Department of Physics, University of California San Diego, La Jolla, California 92093-0319

(Dated: May 15, 2022)

Interaction between a single spin and a probe is usually very weak and thus the spin states cannot at present be distinguished in a single shot measurement. Here we develop a theory to analyze the data of sequential weak measurement of a single spin which appear as shot noise. Faithful reconstruction of the single spin dynamics from noise correlations is possible since during the weak measurement the state collapse induced disturbance to the spin dynamics is nominal unless the spin state is identified by a successful shot of measurement which occurs with small probability. In particular, spin decoherence concealed by inhomogeneous broadening can be revealed in the third order noise correlation. Such noise correlation method utilizes successful measurements to project the spin to a known basis state, and thus needs no pump or coherent control of the spin as otherwise required in conventional spin echo.

PACS numbers: 76.70.Hb, 03.65.Ta, 42.50.Lc, 76.30.-v

The capability of monitoring single-spin dynamics is a prerequisite for exploiting the spin coherence, e.g., in quantum computing [1, 2]. The standard methods [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14] consist of the following procedure: *initialization-delay-[optional control]-delay-measurement*. The measurement result is averaged over many repeated cycles or a large ensemble of spins as a function of the delay times to reveal the spin dynamics. The interaction between a single spin and external devices is usually very weak, so a high degree of initial polarization, a precise control of the spin (usually a π -rotation or spin flip), and an unambiguous distinction of the spin states in a given basis, are all non-trivial. Great efforts have been put to enhance the signal-to-noise ratio, such as cavity-enhancement of spin-photon coupling [11, 15] and adaptive repetitive readout [16]. An alternative strategy is the noise spectroscopy [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22], which consists of a correlation analysis of the data of a sequential or continuous detection which appear as noise. To derive the dynamics of a quantum object from the noise correlation, the initialization or control pulse is not needed since a state collapse at a successful probe serves as the starter of an evolution. The weakness of the system-probe coupling is exploited since a weak quantum measurement [23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28] causes projection to a basis state with very low probability and introduces little disturbance to the system evolution between two projection events.

Among different types of spin dynamics, the decoherence, being the main obstacle in utilizing the spin coherence in quantum computing, is of special interest and under intensive study [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 13, 14]. The “true” decoherence due to entanglement with environments is often concealed by the rapid “phenomenological” dephasing caused by inhomogeneous broadening in ensemble measurements (e.g., in a typical GaAs quantum dot, the spin decoherence time is $\sim 10^{-6}$ sec, but the inhomogeneous broadening dephasing time is $\sim 10^{-9}$ sec [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]). To resolve the spin decoherence excluding the inhomogeneous broadening effect, spin

echo [5, 6, 10, 13, 14] and mode-locking of spin frequency [8] have been invoked. In this Letter, we will show that the spin dynamics can be revealed in correlations of the noise output of sequential weak probes. In particular, the third order noise correlation singles out the “true” spin decoherence, without pump or control of the spin as required in spin echo.

A simple proof-of-principle setup is shown in Fig. 1. The measurement is based on the Faraday rotation, which has been used in experiments for spin measurements [8, 9, 10, 11, 12]. The probe consists of a sequence of linearly polarized laser pulses evenly spaced in delay time τ . After interaction with a single spin (in a quantum dot, e.g.), the light polarization is rotated by θ or $-\theta$ for the spin state parallel or anti-parallel to the light propagation direction (z -axis). The Faraday rotation angle θ by a single electron spin is usually very small ($\sim 10^{-6}$ rad in a quantum dot [11, 12]), so the two polarization states of the light corresponding to the two different spin states are almost identical. Thus a detection of the light polarization is a weak measurement of the spin. The light polarization is detected by filtering through a polarized beam splitter (PBS) which is aligned to let the light with polarization rotated by θ fully pass through and the light with orthogonal polarization fully reflected. The light with Faraday rotation angle $-\theta$ is




FIG. 1: (Color online) A proof-of-principle setup for weak measurement of a single spin in a quantum dot by Faraday rotation.

reflected with probability $\sin^2(2\theta)$. For a small θ , the average number of reflected photons is much less than one, so in most cases, a single-photon detector set at the reflection arm would be idle with no clicks and one cannot tell which state the spin could be in. The clicks of the detector form a sequence of shot noise, and the noise correlation can be analyzed to study the spin dynamics, such as the precession under a transverse magnetic field and the decoherence. This proof-of-principle setup, being conceptually simple and adapted from existing experiments, is of course not the only possible implementation. For example, one can use continuous-wave probe instead of pulse sequences, interferometer measurement of the polarization instead of the PBS filtering, polarization-selective absorption instead of the Faraday rotation, and so on.

To formulate a weak measurement theory, we consider a laser pulse in a coherent state $|\alpha, H\rangle \equiv e^{a_H^\dagger} \text{-h.c.}|0\rangle$ (where $a_{H/V}^\dagger$ creates a photon with linear polarization H or V) and a spin in an arbitrary superposition $C_+|+\rangle + C_-|-\rangle$ in the basis quantized along the z -axis. Thus the initial spin-photon state is

$$|\psi\rangle = (C_+|+\rangle + C_-|-\rangle) \otimes |\alpha, H\rangle. \quad (1)$$

After interaction, the state becomes an entangled one as

$$|\psi'\rangle = C_+|+\rangle \otimes |\alpha, +\theta\rangle + C_-|-\rangle \otimes |\alpha, -\theta\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $|\alpha, \pm\theta\rangle \equiv e^{a_{\pm\theta}^\dagger} \text{-h.c.}|0\rangle$ (with $a_{\pm\theta} \equiv a_H \cos\theta \pm a_V \sin\theta$) is a photon coherent state with polarization rotated by $\pm\theta$. How much the spin is measured is determined by the distinguishability between the two polarization states

$$\mathcal{D} \equiv 1 - |\langle\alpha, +\theta|\alpha, -\theta\rangle|^2 = 1 - \exp(-4|\alpha|^2 \sin^2\theta). \quad (3)$$

When the average number of photons $\bar{N} = |\alpha|^2 \gg 1$ and the Faraday rotation angle θ is not too small, the two coherent states are almost orthogonal and $\mathcal{D} \rightarrow 1$, thus a detection of the light polarization provides a von Neumann projective measurement of the spin. For a single spin in a quantum dot, the Faraday rotation angle θ is usually very small. For example, in a GaAs fluctuation quantum dot [11], $|\theta| \sim 10^{-5}$ rad for light tuned 1 meV below the optical resonance with a focus spot area $\sim 10 \mu\text{m}^2$. The number of photons in a 10 picosecond pulse with power 10 mW is $\bar{N} \sim 0.5 \times 10^6$. In this case, $\mathcal{D} \cong 4\bar{N}\theta^2 \sim 2 \times 10^{-4} \ll 1$, the spin states are almost indistinguishable by the photon polarization states. After interaction with the spin, the laser pulse is subject to the PBS filtering which transforms the spin-photon state to be

$$|\psi''\rangle = C_+|+\rangle \otimes |\alpha\rangle_t \otimes |0\rangle_r + C_-|-\rangle \otimes |\alpha \cos(2\theta)\rangle_t \otimes |\alpha \sin(2\theta)\rangle_r, \quad (4)$$

where $|\beta\rangle_{t/r}$ denotes a coherent state of the transmitted/reflected mode with amplitude β . Separating the vacuum state $|0\rangle_r$ from the reflected mode and keeping terms up to a relative error $O(\theta^2)$, we write the state as

$$|\psi''\rangle = (C_+|+\rangle + \sqrt{1-\mathcal{D}}C_-|-\rangle) \otimes |\alpha\rangle_t \otimes |0\rangle_r + \sqrt{\mathcal{D}}C_-|-\rangle \otimes |\alpha\rangle_t \otimes |\alpha \sin(2\theta)\rangle_r, \quad (5)$$

where $|\alpha \sin(2\theta)\rangle_r$ denotes the (normalized) state of the reflected mode but with the vacuum component dropped. With a probability $P_1 = \mathcal{D}|C_-|^2 \ll 1$, an ideal detector at the reflection arm will detect a photon-click and the spin state is known at $|-\rangle$, while in most cases (with probability $P_0 = 1 - P_1$), the detector will be idle and the spin state is unknown but keeps almost free evolution. In the POVM (positive-operator-valued measure) formalism [1], the Kraus operators for the click and no-click are respectively

$$\hat{M}_1 = \sqrt{\mathcal{D}}|-\rangle\langle-|, \text{ and } \hat{M}_0 = \sqrt{1-\mathcal{D}}|-\rangle\langle-| + |+\rangle\langle+|, \quad (6)$$

which determine the (non-normalized) post-measurement state $\hat{M}_{0/1}|\psi\rangle$ and the probability $P_{0/1} = \langle\psi|\hat{M}_{0/1}^\dagger\hat{M}_{0/1}|\psi\rangle$.

Between two subsequent shots of measurement, the spin precession under a transverse magnetic field (along x -direction) is described by

$$\hat{U} = \exp(-i\hat{\sigma}_x\omega\tau/2) \quad (7)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_x$ is the Pauli matrix along the x -direction, and ω is the Lamor frequency. Coupled to the environment and subject to dynamically fluctuating local fields, the spin precession is always accompanied by decoherence. For simplicity, we consider an exponential coherence decay characterized by a decoherence time T_2 . In the quantum trajectory picture [24, 29], the decoherence can be understood as a result of continuous measurement by the environment, for which the Kraus operators for the quantum jumps with and without phase flip are respectively [1]

$$\hat{E}_1 = \sqrt{\gamma/2}\hat{\sigma}_x, \text{ and } \hat{E}_0 = \sqrt{1-\gamma/2}\hat{I}, \quad (8)$$

where $\gamma \equiv 1 - \exp(-\tau/T_2) \cong \tau/T_2$ is the coherence lost between two subsequent measurements. For a spin state described by a density operator $\hat{\rho}$, the decoherence within τ leads the state to $\hat{\mathcal{E}}[\hat{\rho}] \equiv \hat{E}_0\hat{\rho}\hat{E}_0^\dagger + \hat{E}_1\hat{\rho}\hat{E}_1^\dagger$.

To study the spin dynamics under sequential measurement, we generalize the POVM formalism for a sequence of n measurement. To incorporate the spin decoherence in the density operator evolution, we define the superoperators for the weak measurement and the free evolution as $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_{0/1}[\hat{\rho}] = \hat{M}_{0/1}\hat{\rho}\hat{M}_{0/1}^\dagger$, $\hat{\mathcal{U}}[\hat{\rho}] = \hat{U}\hat{\rho}\hat{U}^\dagger$, in addition to the decoherence superoperator $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ defined above. For a sequence output $X \equiv [x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n]$ as a string of binary numbers, the superoperator,

$$\hat{\mathcal{M}}_X = \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{x_n} \hat{\mathcal{E}} \hat{\mathcal{U}} \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{x_{n-1}} \cdots \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{x_3} \hat{\mathcal{E}} \hat{\mathcal{U}} \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{x_2} \hat{\mathcal{E}} \hat{\mathcal{U}} \hat{\mathcal{M}}_{x_1}, \quad (9)$$

transforms an initial density operator $\hat{\rho}$ to $\hat{\mathcal{M}}_X[\hat{\rho}]$ (not normalized) and determines the probability of the output $P_X = \text{Tr}(\hat{\mathcal{M}}_X[\hat{\rho}])$. With the POVM formalism, the spin state evolution under sequential measurement and hence the noise correlations discussed below can be readily evaluated.

To illustrate how a real experiment would perform, we have also carried out Monte Carlo simulations of the measurement with the following algorithm: (1) We start from a randomly chosen state of the spin $|\psi\rangle$; (2) The state after a free evolution




FIG. 2: (Color online) The Monte Carlo simulation (solid oscillating curves) and the analytical result (envelopes in dashed lines) of the 2nd order correlation function, calculated with distinguishability $\mathcal{D} = 3 \times 10^{-4}$, Larmor precession period $2\pi/\omega_0 = 3$ ns and the interval between two subsequent measurements $\tau = 0.3$ ns. In (a), no decoherence or inhomogeneous broadening is present ($T_2^{-1} = \sigma = 0$); In (b), $T_2 = 200$ ns but $\sigma = 0$; In (c), $T_2 = 200$ ns and $\sigma^{-1} = 10$ ns. (d) shows the shot noise output obtained in the Monte Carlo simulation. The Monte Carlo simulation is done with 10^{10} shots of measurement.

is $\hat{U}|\psi\rangle$; (3) Then the decoherence effect is taken into account by applying randomly the Kraus operator \hat{E}_0 or \hat{E}_1 to the state (with normalization) with probability $1 - \gamma/2$ or $\gamma/2$, respectively; (4) The measurement is done by randomly applying the Kraus operator \hat{M}_0 or \hat{M}_1 to the state (with normalization) corresponding to the output 0 or 1 (no-click or click), with probability P_0 or P_1 given by the POVM formalism. Step (2)-(4) are repeated for many times. The output is a random sequence of clicks, as shown in Fig. 2 (d).

To study the noise correlation, we first consider the interval distribution $K(n)$, defined as the probability of having two clicks separated by $n - 1$ no-clicks [29],

$$K(n) \equiv \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_{[10_{n-1}]}[\hat{\rho}]) / \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_1[\hat{\rho}]), \quad (10)$$

where 0_{n-1} means a string of $n - 1$ zeros. By a straightforward calculation,

$$K(n) \approx \frac{\mathcal{D} + \mathcal{D}^2}{2} e^{-\frac{n\mathcal{D}}{2}} \left[1 + e^{-\frac{n\pi}{T_2}} \cos\left(n\omega\tau + \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2} \cot \frac{\omega\tau}{2}\right) \right], \quad (11)$$

up to $O(\gamma\mathcal{D}^2)$ and $O(n\mathcal{D}^3)$, for $\gamma, \mathcal{D} \ll \omega\tau < \pi$. A successful measurement at the beginning of an interval projects the spin to the basis state $|-\rangle$ along the optical (z) axis. Then, the spin precesses under the external magnetic field about the x -axis. The interval is terminated by a second successful measurement among the periodic attempts after a time lapse of $n\tau$. The decay of the oscillation is due to the spin decoherence. The overall decay $e^{-n\mathcal{D}/2}$ is due to decreasing of the probability of unsuccessful measurement with increasing time. The measurement also induces a little phaseshift to the oscillation. Obviously, the smaller the distinguishability \mathcal{D} , the less the spin dynamics is disturbed by the measurement.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Contour plot of the envelope of the 3rd order correlation $G^{(3)}(t_1, t_2)$, with parameters the same as for Fig. 2 (c). The insets (a) and (b) show the oscillation details of $G(t_1, t_2)$ in the range $0 \text{ ns} \leq t_{1,2} \leq 30 \text{ ns}$ and $90 \text{ ns} \leq t_{1,2} \leq 120 \text{ ns}$, respectively.

In experiments, often the photon coincidence correlation instead of the interval distribution is measured. The second order correlation $g^{(2)}(n\tau)$ is the probability of having two clicks separated by $n - 1$ measurements [29], regardless of the results in between,

$$\begin{aligned} g^{(2)}(n\tau) &= \sum_{x_1, x_2, \dots, x_{n-1} \in \{0, 1\}} \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_{1x_1x_2\dots x_{n-1}}[\hat{\rho}]) / \text{Tr}(\mathcal{M}_1[\hat{\rho}]) \\ &= K(n) + \sum_{m=1}^{n-1} K(n-m)K(m) \\ &\quad + \sum_{m=2}^{n-1} \sum_{l=1}^{m-1} K(n-m)K(m-l)K(l) + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

By Fourier transformation and summation in the frequency domain,

$$g^{(2)}(n\tau) = \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2} \left[1 + e^{-n(\tau/T_2 + \mathcal{D}/4)} \cos(n\omega\tau) + O(\mathcal{D}) \right]. \quad (13)$$

The spin precession, the decoherence, and the measurement-induced decay are all seen in the second order correlation function [see Fig. 2]. Note that the overall decay of the interval distribution manifests itself as a measurement-induced dephasing of the oscillating signal in the correlation function. The Monte Carlo simulation shows that 10^{10} shots of measurement would yield a rather smooth profile of the spin dynamics, which requires a time span of about 3 seconds for the parameters used in Fig. 2.

In addition to the decoherence due to the dynamical fluctuation of the local field, there is also phenomenological dephasing due to static or slow fluctuations, i.e., inhomogeneous broadening which exists even for a single spin since the sequential measurement contains many shots which form an ensemble. The inhomogeneous broadening is modeled by a Gaussian distribution of ω with mean value ω_0 and width σ . With the inhomogeneous broadening included, the ensemble-

averaged correlation function becomes

$$\langle g^{(2)}(n\tau) \rangle = \frac{\mathcal{D}}{2} \left[1 + e^{-n(\tau/T_2 + \mathcal{D}/4) - n^2 \tau^2 \sigma^2 / 2} \cos(n\omega_0 \tau) + O(\mathcal{D}) \right]. \quad (14)$$

Since usually $\sigma \gg T_2^{-1}$, the decay of the 2nd order correlation is dominated by the inhomogeneous broadening effect [see Fig. 2 (c)].

To separate the spin decoherence from the inhomogeneous broadening, we resort to the 3rd order correlation $g^{(3)}(n_1 \tau, n_2 \tau)$, the probability of having three clicks separated by $n_1 - 1$ and $n_2 - 1$ measurements. The idea can be understood in a post-measurement selection picture: After the first click, the second click has the peak probability appearing at an integer multiple of the spin precession period, so the coincidence of the two earlier clicks serves as filtering of the spin frequency and the third click would have a peak probability appearing at $n_2 \tau = n_1 \tau$, similar to the spin echo. The 3rd order correlation in the absence of inhomogeneous broadening is $g^{(3)}(t_1, t_2) \propto g^{(2)}(t_1)g^{(2)}(t_2)$. The ensemble-average leads to (neglecting the measurement-induced decay)

$$\begin{aligned} \langle g^{(3)}(t_1, t_2) \rangle &\propto 1 + \sum_{j=1,2} e^{-t_j/T_2 - \sigma^2 t_j^2 / 2} \cos(\omega_0 t_j) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} e^{-(t_1+t_2)/T_2} e^{-\sigma^2 (t_1+t_2)^2 / 2} \cos(\omega_0 (t_1 + t_2)) \\ &+ \frac{1}{2} e^{-(t_1+t_2)/T_2} e^{-\sigma^2 (t_1-t_2)^2 / 2} \cos(\omega_0 (t_1 - t_2)). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

Fig. 3 plots $G^{(3)}(t_1, t_2) \equiv \langle g^{(3)}(t_1, t_2) \rangle - \langle g^{(2)}(t_1) \rangle \langle g^{(2)}(t_2) \rangle$ to exclude the trivial background. Along the direction $t_1 = -t_2$, the 3rd order correlation oscillates and decays rapidly (with timescale σ^{-1}). But the oscillation amplitude decays slowly (with timescale T_2) along the direction $t_1 = t_2$, as expected from the last term of Eq. (15).

In conclusion, we have given a treatment of the data from a periodic sequence of weak measurements of a single spin which appear as shot noise. The characteristics of the weak measurement consist in the negligible perturbation of the spin state except for the projective state collapse when the measurement is successful in identifying the spin state. We show that the third order correlation reveals the spin decoherence from the inhomogeneous broadening. The theory presented here for sequential pulse measurement can be straightforwardly generalized to continuous weak measurement by letting the pulse separation $\tau \rightarrow 0$ while keeping the average power of the light unchanged (i.e., $\mathcal{D}/\tau = \text{constant}$). In the proof-of-principle setup based on Faraday rotation, all optical elements have been assumed ideal for conceptual simplicity. An investigation of the defects, e.g., in the PBS and in the photon detector, shows that they do not change the essential results presented here but only reduce the visibility of the features. Details will be published elsewhere.

This work was supported by the Hong Kong RGC Project 2160322, NSA/IARPA/ARO grant W911NF-04-1-0204, and ARO/LPS.

- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge University, Cambridge, 2000).
- [2] D. Loss and D. P. DiVincenzo, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 120 (1998).
- [3] D. Gammon, S. W. Brown, E. S. Snow, T. A. Kennedy, D. S. Katzer, and D. Park, Science **277**, 85 (1997).
- [4] F. H. L. Koppens, C. Buizert, K. J. Tielrooij, I. T. Vink, K. C. Nowack, T. Meunier, L. P. Kouwenhoven, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, Nature **442**, 766 (2006).
- [5] F. H. L. Koppens, K. C. Nowack, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 236802 (2008).
- [6] J. R. Petta, A. C. Johnson, J. M. Taylor, E. A. Laird, A. Yacoby, M. D. Lukin, C. M. Marcus, M. P. Hanson, and A. C. Gossard, Science **309**, 2180 (2005).
- [7] M. V. Gurudev Dutt, J. Cheng, B. Li, X. Xu, X. Li, P. R. Berman, D. G. Steel, A. S. Bracker, D. Gammon, S. E. Economou, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 227403 (2005).
- [8] A. Greilich, D. R. Yakovlev, A. Shabaev, A. L. Efros, I. A. Yugova, R. Oulton, V. Stavarache, D. Reuter, A. Wieck, and M. Bayer, Science **313**, 341 (2006).
- [9] M. H. Mikkelsen, J. Berezovsky, N. G. Stoltz, L. A. Coldren, and D. D. Awschalom, Nature Phys. **3**, 770 (2007).
- [10] J. Berezovsky, M. H. Mikkelsen, N. G. Stoltz, L. A. Coldren, and D. D. Awschalom, Science **320**, 349 (2008).
- [11] J. Berezovsky, M. H. Mikkelsen, O. Gywat, N. G. Stoltz, L. A. Coldren, and D. D. Awschalom, Science **314**, 1916 (2006).
- [12] M. Atatüre, J. Dreiser, A. Badolato, and A. Imamoglu, Nature Physics **3**, 101 (2007).
- [13] A. M. Tyryshkin, S. A. Lyon, A. V. Astashkin, and A. M. Rait-simring, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 193207 (2003).
- [14] E. Abe, K. M. Itoh, J. Isoya, and S. Yamasaki, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 033204 (2004).
- [15] R. B. Liu, W. Yao, and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 081306(R) (2005).
- [16] D. B. Hume, T. Rosenband, and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 120502 (2007).
- [17] S. A. Crooker, D. G. Rickel, A. V. Balatsky, and D. L. Smith, Nature **431**, 49 (2004).
- [18] M. Xiao, I. Martin, E. Yablonovitch, and H. W. Jiang, Nature **430**, 435 (2004).
- [19] M. Oestreich, M. Romer, R. J. Haug, and D. Hagele, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 216603 (2005).
- [20] M. Buttiker, Science **313**, 1587 (2006).
- [21] L. DiCarlo, Y. Zhang, D. T. McClure, D. J. Reilly, C. M. Marcus, L. N. Pfeiffer, and K. W. West, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 036810 (2006).
- [22] M. Braun and J. König, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 085310 (2007).
- [23] H. J. Carmichael, *An open system approach to quantum optics*, Lecture Notes in Physics (Springer, Berlin, 1993).
- [24] H. M. Wiseman and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 548 (1993).
- [25] M. B. Mensky, Phys. Usp. **41**, 923 (1998).
- [26] A. N. Korotkov, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 5737 (1999).
- [27] A. N. Korotkov and D. V. Averin, Phys. Rev. B **64**, 165310 (2001).
- [28] N. Katz, M. Ansmann, R. C. Bialczak, E. Lucero, R. McDermott, M. Neeley, M. Steffen, E. M. Weig, A. N. Cleland, J. M. Martinis, et al., Science **312**, 1498 (2006).
- [29] M. O. Scully and M. S. Zubairy, *Quantum optics* (Cambridge, 1997).

* Corresponding author; rblu@phy.cuhk.edu.hk