

Entanglement generation in double- Λ system

Ling Zhou, Yong Hong Ma, Xin Yu Zhao

School of physics and optoelectronic technology, Dalian University of Technology, Dalian 116024, P.R.China

In this paper, we study the generation of entanglement in a double- Λ system. Employing standard method of laser theory, we deduce the dynamic evolution equation of the two-mode field. We analyze the available entanglement criterion for double- Λ system and the condition of entanglement existence. Our results show that under proper parameters, the two-mode field can entangled and amplified.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Dv, 03.67.Mn

I. INTRODUCTION

Continuous variables entanglement (CVE), as entanglement resource, has attracted lots of attention because CVE not only has advantages in quantum-information science [1] but also can be prepared unconditionally, whereas the preparation of discrete entanglement usually relies on an event selection via coincidence measurements. Conventionally, continuous variables entanglement has been produced by nondegenerate parametric down-conversion (NPD) [2]. In order to improve the strength of the NPD, engineering the NPD Hamiltonian within cavity QED has also attracted much attention [3, 4, 5]. Besides parametric down-conversion [2, 6, 7], Xiong et. al. [8] had shown that two-photon correlated spontaneous emission laser can work as a continuous variables entanglement producer and amplifier, which open a new attracting research domain. And then, a number of different schemes have been proposed [9-14]. Different from the gain medium atoms in [8-14], Ref. [15] has studied a single-molecular-magnets system to produce CVE where physics process is similar to [11]. All of these works deal with the similar physics process where both of the two mode will be created (annihilated) a photon in one loop respectively (similar to down-conversion system).

In this paper, we proposed a scheme to generate CVE where the one mode is created a photon and the other is annihilated, which is different from [8-16]. The system consists of atoms in double- Λ configuration interacting with two modes cavity fields. The atoms are driven into a coherent state of the upper two levels by two classical field. We obtain the master equation of the two mode fields. Through analysis of entanglement, we find that the criterion proposed in [18] can be used to judge entanglement. We show that in double- Λ system, entanglement exist on the condition that the two-mode quantum field is tuned away from the atomic transition, and the initial field is in a quantum state. Our study is helpful to understand the entanglement characteristic within a system where quantum field is in "V" configuration.

II. THE MODEL AND THEORY CALCULATION

We consider a system of atoms in double- Λ configuration shown in Fig.1. Two cavity fields interact with atomic transition $|a\rangle \leftrightarrow |c\rangle$ and $|b\rangle \leftrightarrow |c\rangle$ with detuning Δ_a and Δ_b , respectively. The two classical pumping fields with Rabi frequency Ω_2 and Ω_1 drive the atomic level between $|a\rangle \leftrightarrow |d\rangle$ and $|b\rangle \leftrightarrow |d\rangle$ with detuning Δ_1 and Δ_2 respectively. Our double- Λ system can be sodium atoms in a vapor cell [28] where the lower states are the two hyperfine levels $|F=1\rangle$ and $F=2\rangle$ of $3^2S_{1/2}$, and the upper state are $|F=1\rangle$ and $F=2\rangle$ of $3^2P_{1/2}$. The double- Λ system also can be atomic Pb vapor [19]. The phase-dependent electromagnetically induced transparency [28] and efficient nonlinear frequency conversion [19] have been investigated experimentally in double- Λ system. Ref. [20] studied dark-state polaritons in double- Λ system. Here, we are interested in producing two-mode entangled laser via the double- Λ system. In interaction picture, the Hamiltonian of the system can be written as

$$H_0 = \nu_1 a_1^\dagger a_1 + \nu_2 a_2^\dagger a_2 + \omega_a |a\rangle\langle a| + \omega_b |b\rangle\langle b| + \omega_c |c\rangle\langle c| + \omega_d |d\rangle\langle d| \quad (1)$$

$$H_1 = g_1 a_1 |b\rangle\langle c| + g_2 a_2 |a\rangle\langle c| + \Omega_1 |b\rangle\langle d| e^{-i\omega_1 t} + \Omega_2 |a\rangle\langle d| e^{-i\omega_2 t} + H.c. \quad (2)$$

We hope that the Hamiltonian do not contain time t so as to simplify the density matrix deduction of the field. In order to do that, we assume that the classical fields detuning $\Delta_1 = \Delta_a - \Delta$ and $\Delta_2 = \Delta_b - \Delta$. Now we goes into a frame by performing a unitary transformation $U = \exp\{i[H_0 + \Delta_a |a\rangle\langle a| + \Delta_b |b\rangle\langle b| + \Delta |d\rangle\langle d|]t\}$. In the new frame, the Hamiltonian is as

$$H_1 = -\Delta a |a\rangle\langle a| - \Delta b |b\rangle\langle b| - \Delta |d\rangle\langle d| + [g_1 a_1 |b\rangle\langle c| + g_2 a_2 |a\rangle\langle c| + \Omega_1 |b\rangle\langle d| e^{-i\omega_1 t} + \Omega_2 |a\rangle\langle d| e^{-i\omega_2 t} + H.c.]. \quad (3)$$

In order to see the entanglement of the two-mode field, we need to obtain the equation of motion of the two-mode field. Using the standard procedure in laser theory




FIG. 1: The level configuration of atoms. Two cavity modes interact with atomic transition $|b\rangle \leftrightarrow |c\rangle$ and $|a\rangle \leftrightarrow |c\rangle$ with detuning Δ_b and Δ_a respectively while the two classical fields drive the atomic level between $|b\rangle \leftrightarrow |d\rangle$ and $|a\rangle \leftrightarrow |d\rangle$ with detuning Δ_2 and Δ_1 . For simplicity, we assume the spontaneous-emission rate of four level are the same.

developed by Scully and Zubairy[16, 21, 22], we obtain the following master equation governing the dynamics of the two-mode cavity fields as

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho} = & -\kappa_1(a_1^\dagger a_1 \rho - a_1 \rho a_1^\dagger) - \kappa_2(a_2^\dagger a_2 \rho - a_2 \rho a_2^\dagger) \\ & -\alpha_1(\rho a_1 a_1^\dagger - a_1^\dagger \rho a_1) - \alpha_2(\rho a_2 a_2^\dagger - a_2^\dagger \rho a_2) \\ & -\alpha_{12}(\rho a_2 a_1^\dagger - a_1^\dagger \rho a_2) - \alpha_{21}(\rho a_1 a_2^\dagger - a_2^\dagger \rho a_1) + h.c.. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

We can see that the master equation has the term $\rho a_2 a_1^\dagger - a_1^\dagger \rho a_2$ which means that the one mode is created a photon and the other mode is annihilated a photon. The detail deduction of the equation is given in appendix A. In Eq.(4), we have include the loss of the two-mode cavity with loss rate κ_1 and κ_2 . The coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1 &= \frac{g_1^2}{D} [A_{11} L_{bb} + A_{21} L_{ab} + A_{31} L_{db}], \\ \alpha_2 &= \frac{g_2^2}{D} [A_{12} L_{ba} + A_{22} L_{aa} + A_{32} L_{da}], \\ \alpha_{12} &= \frac{g_1 g_2}{D} [A_{11} L_{ba} + A_{21} L_{aa} + A_{31} L_{da}], \\ \alpha_{21} &= \frac{g_1 g_2}{D} [A_{12} L_{bb} + A_{22} L_{ab} + A_{32} L_{db}], \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $D = (\gamma - i\Delta_a)(\gamma - i\Delta_b)[\gamma - i(\Delta + \frac{\Delta_a}{2} + \frac{\Delta_b}{2})] + \Omega_1^2(\gamma - i\Delta_a) + \Omega_2^2(\gamma - i\Delta_b)$, and

$$\begin{aligned} L_{aa} &= \frac{-i\Omega_2}{\gamma} y_3, L_{bb} = \frac{-i\Omega_1}{\gamma} y_2, \\ L_{ab} &= \frac{\gamma + i(\Delta_2 - \Delta_1)}{2\gamma} y_1 - \frac{i\Omega_2}{2\gamma} y_2 - \frac{-i\Omega_1}{2\gamma} y_3, \\ L_{db} &= \frac{\gamma - i\Delta_2}{2\gamma} y_2 - \frac{i\Omega_2}{2\gamma} y_1, \\ L_{da} &= \frac{\gamma - i\Delta_1}{2\gamma} y_3 + \frac{i\Omega_1}{2\gamma} y_1, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} A_{11} &= (\gamma - i\Delta_a)[\gamma - i(\Delta + \frac{\Delta_a}{2} + \frac{\Delta_b}{2})], \\ A_{12} &= A_{21} = -\Omega_1 \Omega_2, A_{31} = -i\Omega_1(\gamma - i\Delta_a), \\ A_{22} &= (\gamma - i\Delta_b)[\gamma - i(\Delta + \frac{\Delta_a}{2} + \frac{\Delta_b}{2})], \\ A_{32} &= -i\Omega_2(\gamma - i\Delta_b) \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} y_2 &= \frac{2i r_{ins}(a_1 \Omega_2 - b \Omega_1)}{a_1 a_2 - b^2}, y_3 = \frac{2i r_{ins}(a_2 \Omega_1 - b \Omega_2)}{a_1 a_2 - b^2} \\ y_1 &= \frac{\Omega_2(\Delta_1 - 2\Delta_2)}{s} y_2 + \frac{\Omega_1(2\Delta_1 - \Delta_2)}{s} y_3, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

in which

$$\begin{aligned} s &= \gamma^2 + \Omega_1^2 + \Omega_2^2 + (\Delta_2 - \Delta_1)^2, \\ a_1 &= M_1 s - \Omega_2^2(2\Delta_2 - \Delta_1)^2, \\ a_2 &= M_2 s - \Omega_1^2(2\Delta_1 - \Delta_2)^2, \\ b &= \Omega_1 \Omega_2 [3s - (\Delta_1 - 2\Delta_2)(2\Delta_1 - \Delta_2)] \\ M_1 &= \gamma^2 + 4\Omega_1^2 + \Omega_2^2 + \Delta_2^2, \\ M_2 &= \gamma^2 + 4\Omega_2^2 + \Omega_1^2 + \Delta_1^2. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Although our four-level atom is similar to [11, 15], the physical process of the two-mode quantum fields is different because the two quantum fields work in different atomic level. In [8-15], both of the two mode will be created or annihilated a photon in one loop. So the master equation is of the form $\rho a_2^\dagger a_1^\dagger - a_1^\dagger \rho a_2^\dagger$ ($\rho a_2 a_1 - a_1 \rho a_2$). In our system, the two quantum fields are in a "V" form levels if we do not see the two classical pumping fields. The simplified "V" form levels is similar to "Hanle effect" laser [?] where the master equation is with the term $\rho a_2 a_1^\dagger - a_1^\dagger \rho a_2$. In our system, the two classical fields make the atoms with the coherence of the two up-level $|a\rangle$ and $|b\rangle$ [see (A10)]. When the spontaneous emissions from $|a\rangle$ and $|b\rangle$ to $|c\rangle$ take place, entangled photons will be produced.

III. ENTANGLEMENT CRITERION CHOICE AND THE DISCUSSION OF THE ENTANGLEMENT CONDITION

How to determine the entanglement is a key problem. In Ref.[8-15], employing the criterion $(\Delta u)^2 + (\Delta v)^2 < 2$ [23], a inequality of the sum of the quantum fluctuations of two operators u and v for some entangled state, they find the entanglement between the two mode fields. However, the criterion inequality of the sum of the quantum fluctuations can not be applied to measure coherent state[24]. Although the entanglement criterion on measure continuous variable have been developed[22-25], we still can not find a criterion to judge all kind of continuous variable entanglement. In order to make clear the

kind of entanglement existing in our model, we now discuss the analytic solution in our system so as to choose a appropriate entanglement criterion as well as to know the condition of entanglement.

Now we analyze the entanglement condition . If $g_1 = g_2$, $\Omega_1 = \Omega_2$, and $\Delta = \Delta_a = \Delta_b \gg \Omega_1, \Omega_2, \gamma$, through Eq.(6) to (10), one can obtain the relation $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_{12} = \alpha_{21} = i\alpha$ (α is a real number). Usually, the loss of the cavity do not change the entanglement structure of the state. It just destroy or sometimes enhance the entanglement a little. So, in our choice entanglement criterion, we omit the loss of the cavity. Therefore, the master equation of our system Eq.(4) can be simplified as

$$\dot{\rho} = i\alpha[a_1a_1^\dagger + a_2a_2^\dagger + a_2a_1^\dagger + a_1a_2^\dagger, \rho]. \quad (10)$$

The effective Hamiltonian $H_{eq} = -\alpha(a_1a_1^\dagger + a_2a_2^\dagger + a_2a_1^\dagger + a_1a_2^\dagger)$. Due to $[a_1a_1^\dagger + a_2a_2^\dagger, a_2a_1^\dagger + a_1a_2^\dagger] = 0$, in interaction picture $H_{eqI} = -\alpha(a_2a_1^\dagger + a_1a_2^\dagger)$. One can easy check that the system state, evolved by $H_{eqI} = -\alpha(a_2a_1^\dagger + a_1a_2^\dagger)$, never meet with the criterion $(\Delta u)^2 + (\Delta v)^2 < r^2 + \frac{1}{r^2}$ for the initial field number $|n_1, n_2\rangle$. We recognize the field Hamiltonian is the generator of the $SU(2)$ coherent state [27]. The evolution of the state $|\Psi(0)\rangle$ is

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = e^{-iH_{eqI}t}|\Psi(0)\rangle = e^{x_+K_+}e^{K_0 \ln x_0}e^{x_-K_-}|\Psi(0)\rangle,$$

where $K_+ = a_1^\dagger a_2$, $K_- = a_1 a_2^\dagger$. These operators satisfy the $SU(2)$ commutation relations, i.e., $[K_-, K_+] = -2K_0$, $[K_0, K_+] = K_+$, $[K_0, K_-] = -K_-$, with $K_0 = \frac{1}{2}(a_1^\dagger a_1 - a_2^\dagger a_2)$; and in which

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &= \{\cosh i\alpha t\}^{-\frac{1}{2}}, \\ x_+ &= x_- = \tanh i\alpha t. \end{aligned}$$

If the initial field state is two-mode Fock state $|0, N\rangle$, the evolution of the state is

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = (\cos \alpha t)^{N/2} \sum_{n=0}^N \binom{N}{n}^{1/2} (i \tan \alpha t)^n |n, N-n\rangle. \quad (11)$$

From the entanglement definition of pure state, we know that the state $|\Psi(t)\rangle$ is a entangled one.

Unfortunately, the Hamiltonian H_{eqI} can not entangle initial coherent state, because the evolution of the system as

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = e^{x_+K_+}e^{K_0 \ln x_0}e^{x_-K_-}|\beta_1, \beta_2\rangle = |\tilde{\beta}_1, \tilde{\beta}_2\rangle, \quad (12)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\beta}_1 &= \beta_1 \cos \alpha t + i\beta_2 \sin \alpha t, \\ \tilde{\beta}_2 &= \beta_2 \cos \alpha t + i\beta_1 \sin \alpha t. \end{aligned}$$

So, it is not entangled.

The two-mode $SU(2)$ cat state is sub-Poissonian distribution. We recall the criterion, proposed by Hillery

and Zubairy[18] can be used for non- Gaussianian state. The criterion say that if

$$\langle N_1 N_2 \rangle < |\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle|^2 \quad (13)$$

the two-mode field is entangled. If the field initially is in number state $|n_1, n_2\rangle$, using the differential equation Eq.(B1-B13)(let $\kappa = 0$ and $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_{12} = \alpha_{21} = i\alpha$), we finally obtain

$$\langle N_1 N_2 \rangle - |\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle|^2 = n_1 n_2 - \frac{1}{4}(n_1 + n_2 + 2n_1 n_2) \sin^2 2\alpha t. \quad (14)$$

The maximum value of $\sin^2 2\alpha t$ is 1; therefore if

$$2n_1 n_2 < n_1 + n_2, \quad (15)$$

the two mode field will be entangled. Because n_1 and n_2 are integer, in order to meet with $2n_1 n_2 < n_1 + n_2$, the number n_1 and n_2 should be not equal. If either n_1 or n_2 is zero (the state is standard $SU(2)$ coherent state), we can see that $\langle N_a N_b \rangle - |\langle ab^\dagger \rangle|^2$ is always less than zero; thus we say the state is entangled. Therefore, the criterion Eq.(12) can be used for judge entanglement within our system.

However, for resonant case ($\Delta_b = \Delta_a = \Delta = 0$), if $\gamma_b = \gamma_a$, $g_1 = g_2$ and $\Omega_1 = \Omega_2$, the coefficients $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_{12} = \alpha_{21} = \beta$ (real number). For the initial state $|n_1, n_2\rangle$, after complicated calculation employing Eqs. B1-B13 for $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = \alpha_{12} = \alpha_{21} = \beta$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle N_1 N_2 \rangle - |\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle|^2 &= \frac{n_1 + n_2}{16} (3e^{8\beta t} + 2e^{4\beta t} - 5) \\ &+ \frac{n_1 n_2}{8} (1 + 6e^{4\beta t} + e^{8\beta t}) \\ &+ \frac{1}{4} (1 + e^{8\beta t} - 2e^{4\beta t}) \geq 0 \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

If n_1 or n_2 is zero, $\langle N_1 N_2 \rangle - |\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle|^2$ equal to zero at initial time. Except that the $\langle N_1 N_2 \rangle - |\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle|^2$ is larger than zero. It is obvious that we can not obtain entanglement in resonant case. This conclusion is consistent with the work in Ref.[12], where author show that for two-level quantum beat laser, entanglement can be created only when the strong driving field should be tuned away from the atomic transition.

IV. THE ENTANGLEMENT OF THE CAVITY FIELD

In above section, we discuss a special case so as to choose entanglement criterion and make clear the condition of entanglement. Although above analysis is for pure state (approximation of master equation Eq.(4)), But the criterion $\langle N_1 N_2 \rangle < |\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle|^2$ should be available in judging entanglement for general case. Now, considering the loss of the cavity and the decay of the atomic levels, we




FIG. 2: (a): The time evolution of the entanglement.(b): The time evolution of the two-mode fields where red line is for N_1 and blue line is for N_2 . Initially, the atom is in number state $|10,0\rangle$ The parameters are $g_1 = g_2 = 1$; $\Delta_a = \Delta_b = 50$, $\Delta = 4$, $r_{in} = 20$, $\gamma = 1$, $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 0.010$. $\Omega_2 = \Omega_1 = 5$.

numerical solve the differential Eqs. (B1) to (B13) and plot the entanglement criterion $\langle N_1 N_2 \rangle - |\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle|^2$ and the $N_1(\langle a_1^\dagger a_1 \rangle), N_2(\langle a_2^\dagger a_2 \rangle)$.

In Fig.2, we plot the case that the initial field state is a number state $|10,0\rangle$ where $\Delta_b = \Delta_a \gg \gamma_b = \gamma_a$ which means that the classical field resonantly drive the atom ($\Delta_1 = \Delta_2 = 0$) and the quantum field interact with the atoms with equal detunings. We see that due to the loss of the cavity, the entanglement gradually disappear and photon number of the two-mode field also decrease under large detuning case. Of course, if the cavity is ideal, one will observe the entanglement oscillation.




FIG. 3: The time evolution of entanglement. Initially, the atom is in number state $|1,0\rangle$ The parameters are $g_1 = g_2 = 1$; $\Delta_a = 50, \Delta_b = 20, \Delta = 10, r_{in} = 20, \gamma = 1, \kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 0.01$. $\Omega_2 = \Omega_1 = 4, 5, 6$ for dotted, dashed and solid line, respectively.

However, with the same detuning $\Delta_b = \Delta_a$ (when $g_1 = g_2$), we can not have amplified entangled laser shown in Fig.2. The quantum fields are in "V" form. If $\Delta_b = \Delta_a$, the photon number in two mode only oscillate because of the symmetry. In our numerical simulation, we find that in order to have amplified entangled

laser, Δ_a and Δ_b should be different. For initial field state in number state $|1,0\rangle$, we plot entanglement and average photon numbers in Fig.3 and 4 for several values of $\Omega_1(\Omega_2)$. One can see clearly that entanglement can be obtained without preparation atomic coherence before (here, atoms are injected in state $|d\rangle$). But the photon number in two mode has large difference. By adjusting the values of $\Omega_1(\Omega_2)$, we can adjust the time region of entanglement. Because we inject the atom in atomic state $|d\rangle$, it will need time to evolve into a coherence among the atomic level $|a\rangle, |b\rangle$ and $|d\rangle$. So, we have no entanglement during a initial short time. With large value of $\Omega_1(\Omega_2)$, the atoms will acquire their coherence quickly so that the entanglement appear quickly. However, with large value of $\Omega_1(\Omega_2)$, the photon number also will be amplified quickly shown in Fig. 4. As in our analytic calculation, we have known that the photon number in two mode differ (Eq.(15)). Here, in order to amplify the photon number, the photon number not only should have difference but also can not put up with very large photon number. With the increasing of photon number, the entanglement disappear. But the disentanglement is not resulted from loss of the cavity because we find even for $\kappa = 0$, entanglement also disappear. We conclude that the disentanglement result from the increase of photon number rather than from the loss of the cavity. As it is pointed out in Ref.[21],in the high-gain limit the condition in Eq.(9) is no longer able to detect whether there is entanglement in the state.




FIG. 4: The time evolution of average photon number.

Now, we show another function of the classical fields,i.e., the ability to overcome the loss of the cavity which is shown in Fig.4. Let us compare dotted line and solid line. The two lines correspond to the loss rate of the cavity $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 0.01$ and 0.1 , respectively; and all the other parameters are the same. Due to the increasing of $\kappa_1(\kappa_2)$, the values of $\langle N_1 N_2 \rangle - |\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle|^2$ move up. If $\kappa_1(\kappa_2)$ keep increasing, we will loss entanglement. However, with the help of classical fields, we still can obtain entanglement even through $\kappa_1(\kappa_2)$ is large, which can be observed by comparing dashed line and solid one. Although the loss rate $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 0.1$, through increasing $\Omega_1(\Omega_2)$ to 6, we still can have entanglement. Of course,

because of the increasing of $\Omega_1(\Omega_2)$, the time region move left, which we have analyze it in Fig.3.




FIG. 5: The time evolution of entanglement. Initially, the atom is in number state $|10, 0\rangle$. The parameters are $g_1 = g_2 = 1$; $\Delta_a = 50, \Delta_b = 20, \Delta = 10, r_{in} = 30, \gamma = 1$. Dotted line: $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 0.010, \Omega_2 = \Omega_1 = 4$; solid line: $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 0.1, \Omega_2 = \Omega_1 = 4$; dashed line: $\kappa_1 = \kappa_2 = 0.1, \Omega_2 = \Omega_1 = 6$.

V. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we have studied the generation of entanglement in a double- Λ system. We derive the theory of this system and analyze the available entanglement criterion for double- Λ system. When the atoms are injected in the ground state $|d\rangle$, the entangled laser can be achieved under the condition of suitable parameters. Due to the classical pumping field introduction, we do not need to prepare atomic coherence, and the intensity of the quantum fields will be amplified. The classical pumping can overcome the loss of the cavity. Our results show that the time for which the two modes remain entangled depends upon the strength of the Rabi frequency of the classical driving field.

Our results is helpful in understanding the entanglement characteristic when the master equation contain the term $\rho a_2 a_1^\dagger - a_1^\dagger \rho a_2$ such as quantum beats laser and Hanle effect laser system. Our studies is limited to the initial state $|1, 0\rangle$. One can research other initial field state. Our initial field should be easy to obtain. Let excited two-level atom with transition frequency $\nu 1$ (or $\nu 2$) passing through the vacuum two-mode cavity, when we detect the output atom in ground state, we will have the field state $|1, 0\rangle$.

Acknowledgments: Authors thank Professor M. S. Zubairy and M. Ikram for their critical reading. The project was supported by NSFC under Grant No.10774020, and also supported by SRF for ROCS, SEM.

APPENDIX A: CALCULATION DETAILS OF DENSITY MATRIX OF TWO-MODE FIELDS

The classical fields will be treated to all orders in the Rabi frequency. The transitions $|a\rangle - |c\rangle$ and $|b\rangle - |c\rangle$ are treated fully quantum mechanically but only up to second order in the corresponding coupling constants. By partially tracing the global state of Schrödinger equation over the atomic variables, we have the formal reduced fields

$$\dot{\rho}_f = -i([H_{cb}, \rho_{bc}] + [H_{ca}, \rho_{ac}] + [H_{ac}, \rho_{ca}] + [H_{bc}, \rho_{cb}]). \quad (\text{A1})$$

Eq.(A1) reveals that we need to get the density matrix elements ρ_{ca}, ρ_{bc} , etc.. Inserting the Hamiltonian Eq.(1) into A.1, from the schrödinger equation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_{bc} &= -(\gamma - i\Delta_b)\rho_{bc} - i\Omega_1\rho_{dc} \\ &\quad + (-ig_1a_1\rho_{cc} + ig_1\rho_{bb}a_1 + ig_2\rho_{ba}a_2), \\ \dot{\rho}_{ac} &= -(\gamma - i\Delta_a)\rho_{ac} - i\Omega_2\rho_{dc} \\ &\quad + (ig_1\rho_{ab}a_1 + ig_2\rho_{aa}a_2 - ig_2a_2\rho_{cc}), \\ \dot{\rho}_{dc} &= -[\gamma - i\Delta]\rho_{dc} - i\Omega_1\rho_{bc} - i\Omega_2\rho_{ac} \\ &\quad + (ig_1\rho_{db}a_1 + ig_2\rho_{da}a_2). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A2})$$

In the last equations Eq.(A2), we have consider the spontaneous-emission of the atomic level. We rewrite it in a matrix form as

$$\dot{\rho} = -M\rho + A \quad (\text{A3})$$

where

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{bc} \\ \rho_{ac} \\ \rho_{dc} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma - i\Delta_b & 0 & i\Omega_1 \\ 0 & \gamma - i\Delta_a & i\Omega_2 \\ i\Omega_1 & i\Omega_2 & \gamma - i\Delta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} ig_1\rho_{bb}a_1 + ig_2\rho_{ba}a_2 \\ ig_1\rho_{ab}a_1 + ig_2\rho_{aa}a_2 \\ ig_1\rho_{db}a_1 + ig_2\rho_{da}a_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A6})$$

When we write matrix A , we let $\rho_{cc} = 0$ and will explain the reason later. A solution of Eq.(A3) which is a linear in the coupling constant $g_{1(2)}$ can be obtained [16, 21, 22]. Here we only care for the matrix elements ρ_{bc} and ρ_{ac} , so we just write the solution of the two terms as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{bc} &= \frac{i}{D}[(A_{11}\rho_{bb}^0 + A_{21}\rho_{ab}^0 + A_{31}\rho_{db}^0)g_1a_1 \\ &\quad + (A_{11}\rho_{ba}^0 + A_{21}\rho_{aa}^0 + A_{31}\rho_{da}^0)g_2a_2], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{ac} &= \frac{i}{D}[(A_{12}\rho_{bb}^0 + A_{22}\rho_{ab}^0 + A_{32}\rho_{db}^0)g_1a_1 \\ &\quad + (A_{12}\rho_{ba}^0 + A_{22}\rho_{aa}^0 + A_{32}\rho_{da}^0)g_2a_2] \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{11} &= (\gamma - i\Delta_a)(\gamma - i\Delta) + \Omega_2^2, \\
A_{12} &= A_{21} = -\Omega_1\Omega_2, A_{31} = -i\Omega_1(\gamma - i\Delta_a), \\
A_{22} &= (\gamma - i\Delta_b)(\gamma - i\Delta) + \Omega_1^2, \\
A_{32} &= -i\Omega_2(\gamma - i\Delta_b),
\end{aligned} \tag{A9}$$

where $D = (\gamma - i\Delta_a)(\gamma - i\Delta_b)(\gamma - i\Delta) + \Omega_1^2(\gamma - i\Delta_a) + \Omega_2^2(\gamma - i\Delta_b)$ in Eqs.(A7)(A8). As a approximation, the density matrix elements in right side of Eqs.(A7)(A8) such as ρ_{bb}^0, ρ_{ba}^0 , etc. will be determined by steady state of classical fields. In other words, the density matrix elements ρ_{bb}^0, ρ_{ba}^0 , etc. of classical fields, as a zero order approximation, are substituted into right side of Eqs.(A7) and (A8). And then, we can obtain a first order approximation of density matrix elements ρ_{ca}, ρ_{ab} in terms of couplings $g_1(g_2)$.

Now, we just consider classical fields to determine the zero order approximation of the density matrix elements ρ_{bb}^0, ρ_{ba}^0 , etc.. The differential equations of density matrix elements only with classical fields and atomic decay are

$$\begin{aligned}
\dot{\rho}_{bb}^0 &= -\gamma\rho_{bb}^0 - i\Omega_1(\rho_{ab}^0 - \rho_{bd}^0), \\
\dot{\rho}_{aa}^0 &= -\gamma\rho_{aa}^0 - i\Omega_2(\rho_{da}^0 - \rho_{ad}^0), \\
\dot{\rho}_{ba}^0 &= -[\gamma - i(\Delta_2 - \Delta_1)]\rho_{ba}^0 + i\Omega_2\rho_{bd}^0 - i\Omega_1\rho_{da}^0, \\
\dot{\rho}_{da}^0 &= -[\gamma + i\Delta_1]\rho_{da}^0 - i\Omega_2(\rho_{aa}^0 - \rho_{dd}^0) - i\Omega_1\rho_{ba}^0, \\
\dot{\rho}_{db}^0 &= -[\gamma + i\Delta_2]\rho_{db}^0 - i\Omega_2\rho_{ab}^0 - i\Omega_1(\rho_{bb}^0 - \rho_{dd}^0), \\
\dot{\rho}_{dd}^0 &= -\gamma\rho_{dd}^0 - i\Omega_1(\rho_{bd}^0 - \rho_{db}^0) - i\Omega_2(\rho_{ad}^0 - \rho_{da}^0) + r_{in}\rho
\end{aligned} \tag{A10}$$

with $\Delta_1 = \Delta_a - \Delta, \Delta_2 = \Delta_b - \Delta$. For $\dot{\rho}_{cc}$, we have $\dot{\rho}_{cc}^0 = -\gamma\rho_{cc}^0$. The steady state solution $\rho_{cc}^0 = 0$ (It is the reason why we let $\rho_{cc} = 0$ in Eq.(A6)). Substituting the steady state solution of (A10) into (A7) and (A8), we obtain ρ_{bc}, ρ_{ac} . And then, inserting ρ_{bc} and ρ_{ac} back into (A1), one can have the master equation Eq.(4) with coefficients Eq.(5) to (9).

APPENDIX B: CALCULATION DETAILS OF DENSITY MATRIX OF TWO-MODE FIELDS

In order to numerical calculate the entanglement criterion $\langle N_1 N_2 \rangle - |\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle|^2$ and the $N_1(N_2)$, we need to deduce a series differential equations from master equations (4) which are listed below.

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\langle a_1^\dagger a_1 \rangle}{dt} &= (\alpha_1 + \alpha_1^* - 2\kappa_1)\langle a_1^\dagger a_1 \rangle \\
&\quad + \alpha_{12}^* \langle a_2^\dagger a_1 \rangle + \alpha_{12} \langle a_2 a_1^\dagger \rangle + \alpha_1 + \alpha_1^*,
\end{aligned} \tag{B1}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle}{dt} &= (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2^* - \kappa_1 - \kappa_2)\langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle \\
&\quad + \alpha_{21}^* \langle a_1^\dagger a_1 \rangle + \alpha_{12} \langle a_2^\dagger a_2 \rangle + \alpha_{12} + \alpha_{21}^*,
\end{aligned} \tag{B2}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\langle a_2^\dagger a_2 a_2^+ a_1 \rangle}{dt} &= (\alpha_1 + \alpha_2 + 2\alpha_2^* - \kappa_1 - 3\kappa_2)\langle a_2^\dagger a_2 a_2^+ a_1 \rangle \\
&\quad + (\alpha_2 + \alpha_2^* + 2\kappa_2)\langle a_2^+ a_1 \rangle + 2\alpha_{21}^* \langle a_2^\dagger a_2 a_1^+ a_1 \rangle \\
&\quad + 2\alpha_{21}^* \langle a_2^\dagger a_2 \rangle + \alpha_{21} \langle a_2^{\dagger 2} a_1^2 \rangle + \alpha_{12} \langle a_2 a_2^\dagger a_2 a_2^+ \rangle \\
&\quad + \alpha_{21}^* \langle a_1^+ a_1 \rangle + \alpha_{21}^*,
\end{aligned} \tag{B3}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\langle a_2^2 a_1^{+2} \rangle}{dt} &= 2(\alpha_1^* + \alpha_2 - \kappa_2 - \kappa_1)\langle a_2^2 a_1^{+2} \rangle \\
&\quad + 2\alpha_{21} \langle a_1^\dagger a_1 a_1^+ a_2 \rangle + 2(\alpha_{21} + \alpha_{12}^*)\langle a_1^+ a_2 \rangle \\
&\quad + 2\alpha_{12}^* \langle a_2 a_2^\dagger a_2 a_1^+ \rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{B4}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\langle a_1 a_1^+ a_1 a_1^+ \rangle}{dt} &= 2(\alpha_1 + \alpha_1^* - 2\kappa_1)\langle a_1 a_1^+ a_1 a_1^+ \rangle \\
&\quad + (\alpha_1 + \alpha_1^* + 6\kappa_1)\langle a_1^+ a_1 \rangle \\
&\quad + 2\alpha_{12} \langle a_1^\dagger a_1 a_1^+ a_2 \rangle + 2\alpha_{12}^* \langle a_1 a_1^+ a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle \\
&\quad + \alpha_{12} \langle a_2 a_1^+ \rangle + \alpha_{12}^* \langle a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle \\
&\quad + 4\kappa_1 + \alpha_1 + \alpha_1^*,
\end{aligned} \tag{B5}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{d\langle a_1^+ a_1 a_2^\dagger a_2 \rangle}{dt} &= (\alpha_1 + \alpha_1^* + \alpha_2 + \alpha_2^* - 2\kappa_1 - 2\kappa_2)\langle a_1^+ a_1 a_2^\dagger a_2 \rangle \\
&\quad + (\alpha_1 + \alpha_1^*)\langle a_2^+ a_2 \rangle + (\alpha_2 + \alpha_2^*)\langle a_1^\dagger a_1 \rangle \\
&\quad + \alpha_{21}^* \langle a_1^+ a_1 a_1^\dagger a_2 \rangle + \alpha_{21} \langle a_1 a_1^+ a_1 a_2^\dagger \rangle \\
&\quad + \alpha_{12} \langle a_2 a_2^\dagger a_2 a_1^+ \rangle + \alpha_{12}^* \langle a_2^\dagger a_2 a_2^+ a_1 \rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{B6}$$

Substituting the subscript 1 (2) with 2 (1) and then making their Hermitian conjugate through (B1) to (B5), we can obtain the other seven differential equations. The total thirteen differential equations will be a closed set. We can numerical solve it.

[1] S. L. Braunstein and P. van Loock, Rev. Mod. Phys. 77, 513(2005).
[2] D. Bouwmeester, J. W. Pan, K. Mattle, et al, Nature 390, 575(1997).
[3] R. M. Serra, C. J. Villas-Boas, N. G. de Almeida, and M. H. Y. Moussa, Phys. Rev. A 71, 045802 R (2005); R. M. Serra, C.J. Villas-Boas, N. G. de Almeida, and M. H. Y. Moussa, ibid 71, 045802(2005).

[4] L. Zhou, H. Xiong, and M. S. Zubairy, Phys. Rev. A 74, 022321 2006 .
[5] R. Guzmán, J.C. Retamal, E. Solano, and N. Zagury, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 010502(2006).
[6] Y. Zhang, H. Wang, X. Y. Li, J. T. Jing, C. D. Xie, and K. C. Peng, Phys. Rev. A 62, 023813(2000); W. P. Bowen, N. Treps, R. Schnabel, and P. K. Lam, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 253601(2002).

- [7] C. Simon and D. Bouwmeester, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91,053601(2003).
- [8] H.Xiong, M.O. Scully, and M. S. Zubairy, Phys.Rev.Lett. 94, 023601(2005).
- [9] H.T.Tan, S.Y.Zhu,M. S. Zubairy, Phys. Rev. A 72,022305(2005).
- [10] E. Alebachew, Phys. Rev.A 76,023808(2007)
- [11] M. Kiffner, M. S. Zubairy, J. Evers, and C.H. Keitel, Phys.Rev.A 75,033816(2007).
- [12] M. Ikram, G. X. Li and M. S. Zubairy, Phys. Rev. A 76, 042317 (2007).
- [13] C. H. Raymond Ooi, Phys. Rev.A 76,013809(2007).
- [14] G. X. Li, H. T. Tan, and M. Macovei, Phys. Rev. A 76,053827(2007).
- [15] X. Y. Lü, J. B. Liu, Y. Tian, P. J. Song and Z. M. Zhan, Euro. Phys. Lett. 82, 6403 (2008).
- [16] M. O. Scully and M. S. Zubairy, Quantum Optics, Cambridge University Press(1997).
- [17] M. O. Scully,Phys. Rev. Lett. 55, 2802(1985).
- [18] M. Hillery and M. S. Zubairy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 050503(2006).
- [19] A. J. Merriam, S. J. Sharpe, M. Shverdin, D. Manuszak, G.Y. Yin, and S. E. Harris,Phys. Rev. Lett. 84,5308(2000).
- [20] Y. D. Chong and M. Soljačić, Phys. Rev. A 77, 013823(2008).
- [21] M. O. Scully and M. S. Zubairy, Phys. Rev. A, 35, 752(1987).
- [22] C. A. Blockley and D. F. Walls, Phys. Rev. A 43, 5049(1991).
- [23] L. M. Duan, G.Giedke, J.I.Cirac, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett.84, 2722(2000).
- [24] E. Shchukin and W. Vogel, Phys. Rev. Lett 95, 230502(2005).
- [25] R. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2726(2000).
- [26] A. Miranowicz, M. Piani, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, quant-ph/06050001.
- [27] C. C. Gerry and R. Grobe, J. Mod. Optics 44, 41(1997).
- [28] E. A. Korsunsky, N. Leinfellner, A. Huss, S. Balushev,* and L. Windholz, Phys. Rev. A 59, 2302(1999)