

Single-photon cooling to the limit of trap dynamics: Maxwell's Demon near maximum efficiency

S. Travis Bannerman, Gabriel N. Price, Kirsten Viering, and Mark G. Raizen*

*Center for Nonlinear Dynamics and Department of Physics,
The University of Texas at Austin, Austin, Texas 78712, USA*

(Dated: October 8, 2008)

We demonstrate a general and efficient informational cooling technique for atoms which is an experimental realization of Maxwell's Demon. The technique transfers atoms from a magnetic trap into an optical trap via a single spontaneous Raman transition which is discriminatively driven near each atom's classical turning point. We report compression of phase-space by a factor of 350 and transfer efficiencies up to 2.2%. We compare our transfer efficiency with an analytical model and show that the performance is limited only by particle dynamics in the magnetic trap.

PACS numbers: 37.10.De, 37.10.Gh

The intrinsic connection between information and thermodynamic entropy was first recognized by Leo Szilard in a landmark paper in 1929 [1] and has since become a cornerstone of modern information science [2, 3, 4, 5]. Szilard introduced this concept to resolve the apparent violation of the second law of thermodynamics in a thought experiment known as Maxwell's Demon [6]. A key prediction was that information can be used to reduce the entropy of a gas of particles. Indeed, measurement and feedback is the basis for stochastic cooling in accelerator rings [7, 8]. However, the available information radiated by the charged particles in the ring is enormous compared with the tiny fraction of information that is actually collected and used for cooling.

Recently we proposed the concept of a one-way wall for atoms and molecules and showed how it can be used for cooling [9, 10, 11]. In parallel, an atom diode operating in a similar fashion was independently proposed without application to cooling [12]. Such a one-way wall was directly demonstrated in a proof-of-principle experiment [13]. Our group used these principles to accumulate atoms from a magnetic trap into an optical trap and we reported cooling and phase-space compression [14]. We call this method "single-photon cooling" because each atom scatters only one photon on average in order to be trapped near the recoil temperature.

One of the key questions regarding the cooling process pertains to efficiency. One aspect is the efficiency of information entropy used to cool. We showed, in a conceptual paper, that single-photon cooling is *maximally efficient* in the sense that the entropy increase of the radiation field as each photon is scattered is equal to the entropy reduction of the atoms as they are captured [15]. The other aspect is the efficiency of the transfer from the magnetic trap into the optical tweezer. In this Letter we provide experimental proof that single-photon cooling can approach *maximum efficiency* limited only by particle dynamics in the trap.

Whereas traditional methods of laser cooling rely on photon-atom momentum transfer, single-photon cooling

compresses phase space by direct reduction of entropy in the form of information. Consider a non-interacting ensemble trapped in a one-dimensional magnetic potential, depicted in Figure 1(a). The atoms are initially in a low-field-seeking magnetic state $|i\rangle$. Each atom's trajectory has well-defined classical turning points where its kinetic energy vanishes. Our "Demon" consists of a gravito-optical trap and resonant pump beam which approaches these turning points slowly from the left. In doing so, the Demon discriminates the coldest atoms (those with the least kinetic energy) from the rest of the ensemble and releases this informational entropy in the form of a single scattered photon from the pump beam. Should the atom decay to a final state $|f\rangle \neq |i\rangle$ with a weaker or opposite magnetic coupling, the potential landscape felt by the atom leads to a trapped state in the optical trap (Fig. 1(b)). The net result after the pump beam has encountered the entire ensemble is both a reduction in temperature and an increase in density at the "cost" of a single photon recoil per atom.

We have implemented this general method of informational cooling for ^{87}Rb in a three-dimensional quadrupole magnetic trap. The trap is initially populated with atoms in the $5^2S_{1/2}(F=2)$ hyperfine manifold, with approximately 70% in the $|F=2, m_F=2\rangle$ state and the remaining in the $|F=2, m_F=1\rangle$ state. We experimentally vary the number (N_B) and the temperature (T_B) of atoms in the magnetic trap, but typical values are $N_B \approx 5 \times 10^7$ atoms and $T_B \approx 40 \mu\text{K}$.

Figure 1(c) illustrates the composition of our Demon. A pump beam, detuned 35 MHz below the $5^2S_{1/2}(F=2) \rightarrow 5^2P_{3/2}(F'=1)$ transition, is tightly focused inside a gravito-optical trap which resembles an "optical trough." The trough is formed by two Gaussian laser sheets crossed in a "V"-shape propagating along the x axis. These sheets are orthogonally intersected by two parallel vertical sheets propagating along the y axis which complete the three-dimensional trapping potential. All sheets are derived from a single-mode 10 W laser at 532 nm and create a repulsive potential for atoms in both




FIG. 1: (color online) (a) Effective potential along the vertical axis (\hat{z}) for low-field-seeking atoms due to the combined effect of a quadrupole magnetic field, gravity and a repulsive optical-dipole potential. (b) Potential for atoms with zero magnetic coupling. (c) Geometrical composition of our "Demon." It consists of four Gaussian laser sheets (shown in green) in the shape of an "optical trough." Additionally, a pump beam (shown in red) propagates along the x axis at a height h_p above the vertex of the trough. The trough and pump beam are positioned below a cloud of magnetically trapped atoms.

the $F = 1$ and $F = 2$ ground state manifolds. The length of our trough along \hat{x} is $110\mu\text{m}$ and the three-dimensional trapping depth is approximately $10\mu\text{K}$. We note that single-photon cooling can be carried out with a variety of dipole trap geometries including an attractive crossed dipole trap [11] and a fully-enclosed repulsive optical box [14].

The cooling process is initiated by adiabatically lowering the magnetic trapping potential. The field is linearly ramped off in time t_{ramp} , which is on the order of one second. During this ramp, the atomic cloud expands and the classical turning point of each atom (in the z dimension) approaches the Demon, which is positioned at a fixed distance below the magnetic trap center. The pump beam drives a spontaneous Raman transition by exciting the magnetically trapped atoms to the $5^2P_{3/2}(F' = 1)$ manifold. From here, the majority of the atoms spontaneously decay to the $F = 1$ ground state manifold where they are no longer resonant with the beam. Roughly 16% decay back to the $F = 2$ manifold and are subsequently repumped. Because all projections in the $F = 1$ manifold ($m_F = -1, 0, 1$) couple more weakly to the magnetic field than the initial $|F = 2, m_F = 2\rangle$ state, they could in principle all be trapped. However, the branching ratios give rise to a final population that is predominantly in the $m_F = 0, 1$ sublevels.

The height of the pump beam above the trough vertex (h_p) must be strategically set to optimize cooling. Figure 2 shows the effect of h_p on both the vertical temperature ($T_O^{(z)}$) and the number (N_O) of atoms captured in the optical trough for identical initial conditions. The positive slope of the temperature curve reflects kinetic energy gained by the atoms in free fall. To obtain the




FIG. 2: (color online) Number (\blacksquare) and temperature (\bullet) of optically trapped atoms as a function of h_p (height of the pump beam above the trough vertex). The positive slope of T_O reflects energy gained by atoms in free fall. For $h_p > 80\mu\text{m}$, the additional energy increases the loss rate from the optical trough. For $h_p < 80\mu\text{m}$ spatial overlap of the pump beam and optical trap beams reduces the scattering probability and hence the capture rate. The dashed vertical line indicates the value of h_p yielding the highest phase space density in the optical trough.

coldest sample possible, one should thus minimize h_p so that the atoms are pumped near the vertex. However, the repulsive trough beams overlap the pump beam for small values of h_p , lowering the probability of excitation and thereby decreasing the capture number. Maximizing phase-space density ($\rho \propto nT^{-3/2}$, where n is the atomic density) is accomplished by balancing these two effects. The point of maximum phase-space density is indicated on the graph by the dashed vertical line.

To address the question of transfer efficiency from the magnetic trap to the optical trough we must consider the phase-space distributions of both. If we describe the ensembles in both traps by Boltzmann thermal distributions and Gaussian spatial distributions, the maximum transfer efficiency η by adiabatically loading an optical trap from a magnetic trap may be written:

$$\eta \equiv \frac{N_O}{N_B} = \prod_{i=\{x,y,z\}} \frac{\sigma_O^{(i)}}{\sigma_B^{(i)}} \sqrt{\frac{T_O^{(i)}}{T_B^{(i)}}} \quad (1)$$

where N_O (N_B), σ_O (σ_B), and T_O (T_B) are the number, $1/e$ radius, and temperature of the atoms in the optical (magnetic) trap, respectively. The product over index i corresponds to orthogonal axes and allows for trap anisotropy, and we assume ($(\sigma_O^{(i)}, T_O^{(i)}) \leq (\sigma_B^{(i)}, T_B^{(i)})$).

In a non-interacting ensemble, single-photon cooling compresses one dimension of the magnetic trap completely in both position and momentum space. The effi-

ciency is thus given by Eq.(1) with the product excluding the vertical dimension:

$$\eta_{spc} = \prod_{i=\{x,y\}} \frac{\sigma_O^{(i)}}{\sigma_B^{(i)}} \sqrt{\frac{T_O^{(i)}}{T_B^{(i)}}} = 2\alpha \left(\sigma_B \sqrt{T_B}\right)^{-2} \quad (2)$$

where $\alpha \equiv \sigma_O^{(x)} \sigma_O^{(y)} \sqrt{T_O^{(x)} T_O^{(y)}}$ is a parameter fixed by the geometry of the optical trough, $T_B \equiv T_B^{(x)} = T_B^{(y)}$ indicates a thermalized magnetic trap, and $\sigma_B \equiv \sigma_B^{(x)} = 2\sigma_B^{(y)}$ reflects the anisotropy of our quadrupole magnetic trap. It is important to note that the trapping potential of the optical trough produces a uniform spatial distribution along the x axis, and thus a rigorous derivation of the spatial part of Eq.(2) should contain an integral over this dimension with a finite trough length of $110 \mu\text{m}$. To preserve the generality of the expression for η , this integral is well approximated by the simple ratio $\sigma_O^{(x)}/\sigma_B^{(x)}$ with $\sigma_O^{(x)} \cong 63 \mu\text{m}$.

In Figure 3 we compare measured efficiency with the analytical model (Eq.(2)) for several magnetic trap temperatures. We remove the dependence of η_{spc} on σ_B by noting that $\sigma_B = \sigma_B(T_B)$. The optical trough depths and radii are $(T_O^{(x)}, T_O^{(y)}) = (9.5 \mu\text{K}, 5.2 \mu\text{K})$ and $(\sigma_O^{(x)}, \sigma_O^{(y)}) \cong (63 \mu\text{m}, 56 \mu\text{m})$, respectively. The data show good agreement with the model, but there is a trend of increasing efficiency (as compared to the model) for higher temperatures. We note that our model is applicable to a non-interacting ensemble. The initial trajectories of the ensemble fully determine the dynamics of the cooling process in this case. Only a small fraction of these trajectories, which are represented by Eq.(2), will become trapped in the trough. In reality, the atoms in the magnetic trap weakly interact through collisions. The collision rate in the magnetic trap is given by $\Gamma = \bar{n} \sigma_s \langle v \rangle$, where \bar{n} is the average atomic density, σ_s is the s -wave scattering cross section, and $\langle v \rangle = \sqrt{8k_B T / \pi m}$ is the mean speed in a three-dimensional Boltzmann distribution. The inset in Figure 3 plots the collision rate against the magnetic trap temperature. Collisions induce rethermalization of the ensemble, which replenishes the trapable trajectories as they are removed from the magnetic trap by the Demon. The end result for a weakly-interacting ensemble is a higher efficiency than predicted by Eq.(2), which is consistent with the trend in measured efficiencies.

Monte-Carlo simulations for an ensemble of non-interacting particles agree with our model and give additional insight into the time scale of single-photon cooling. For initial conditions which are typical in our system, the simulations indicate that cooling is maximized for $t_{ramp} \cong 5$ s. Shorter ramp times do not allow complete exploration of phase-space by atoms in the magnetic trap, resulting in inefficient cooling. One might also wish to take advantage of collisions by increasing the ramp time.




FIG. 3: (color online) Atom capture efficiency as a function of the initial magnetic trap temperature. The solid line (-) represents the predicted capture efficiency given by Eq. (2). Circles are experimental data. For higher magnetic trap temperatures we measure efficiencies higher than predicted. We attribute this trend to an increasing collision rate (inset).

In practice, we must contend with the finite trap life time of the optical trough ($\tau \cong 3$ s) which imposes a limit on t_{ramp} . For $t_{ramp} \gtrsim 1$ s, our trap losses overshadow gains and result in a lower net efficiency.

Under optimal conditions, we are able to produce phase-space densities as high as $(4.9 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-4}$, which is a 350-fold increase over the initial phase-space density of the magnetic trap. These values correspond to atoms in the non-magnetic $|F = 1, m_F = 0\rangle$ state, which accounts for approximately 50% of our final population. This proportion is determined by ejecting the low- and high-field-seeking states with a large field gradient after the cooling process. Our transfer efficiency from the magnetic trap into the optical trough is typically around 1%, although this may be arbitrarily set by modifying the initial conditions of the magnetic trap. We have measured up to 2.2% transfer efficiency by starting with a smaller and colder magnetic trap. Given longer trap lifetimes, higher phase-space densities and transfer efficiencies could be achieved by exploiting collisions. Additionally, we will explore the possibility of enforcing ergodicity by modifying the form of the magnetic trapping potential (e.g. with supplemental optical potentials).

In summary, we have demonstrated an informational cooling technique which is maximally efficient with respect to information entropy. We presented an analytical model for the capture efficiency of a non-interacting ensemble and showed that we surpass the predictions of the model by means of collisions. Our technique is particularly promising in light of recent demonstrations with supersonic beams, which have proven the feasibility of pro-

ducing trapped samples of paramagnetic atoms [16, 17] and molecules [18] at millikelvin temperatures in a simple room-temperature apparatus. The general nature of single-photon cooling makes it an attractive candidate for cooling and optically trapping these samples, the vast majority of which cannot be laser cooled with any other existing technique. Indeed, its implementation has even been proposed for molecules [19], which have been excluded from laser cooling in the past due to complicated energy level structures.

We thank E. Narevicius for insightful discussions. We acknowledge support from the R.A. Welch Foundation, the Sid W. Richardson Foundation, and the National Science Foundation. S.T.B. acknowledges support from a National Science Foundation Graduate Research Fellowship.

* Electronic address: raizen@physics.utexas.edu

- [1] L. Szilard, *Z. Physik* **53**, 840 (1929).
- [2] C. E. Shannon, *Bell System Tech. J.* **27**, 379 (1948).
- [3] E. T. Jaynes, *Phys. Rev.* **106**, 620 (1957).
- [4] C. H. Bennett, *IBM J. Res. Dev.* **32**, 16 (1988).
- [5] M. O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 220601 (2001)
- [6] J. C. Maxwell, *Theory of Heat* (Longmans, Green, and Co., London 1875), 4th edition pp. 328 and 329.
- [7] D. Möhl, G. Petrucci, L. Thorndahl, and S. van der Meer, *Phys. Rep.* **58**, 74 (1980).
- [8] S. van der Meer, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **57**, 689 (1985).
- [9] M. G. Raizen, A. M. Dudarev, Q. Niu, and N. J. Fisch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 053003 (2005).
- [10] A. M. Dudarev, M. Marder, Q. Niu, N. Fisch, and M. G. Raizen, *Europhys. Lett.* **70**, 761 (2005).
- [11] G. N. Price, S. T. Bannerman, E. Narevicius, and M. G. Raizen, *Laser Physics* **17**, 965 (2007).
- [12] A. Ruschhaupt and J. G. Muga, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 061604(R) (2004).
- [13] J. J. Thorn, E. A. Schoene, T. Li, and D. A. Steck, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 240407 (2008).
- [14] G. N. Price, S. T. Bannerman, K. Viering, E. Narevicius, and M. G. Raizen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 093004 (2008).
- [15] A. Ruschhaupt, J. G. Muga, and M. G. Raizen, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **39**, 3833 (2006).
- [16] E. Narevicius, A. Libson, C. G. Parthey, I. Chavez, J. Narevicius, U. Even, and M. G. Raizen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 093003 (2008).
- [17] S. D. Hogan, A. W. Wiederkehr, M. Andrist, H. Schmutz and F. Merkt, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **41**, 081005 (2008)
- [18] E. Narevicius, A. Libson, C.G. Parthey, I. Chavez, J. Narevicius, U. Even, and M.G. Raizen. *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 051401(R) (2008)
- [19] E. Narevicius and M. G. Raizen, arXiv:0808.1383 (submitted for publication)