

A quantum interface between light and nuclear spins in quantum dots

Heike Schwager, J. Ignacio Cirac, and Géza Giedke

Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann-Str. 1, D-85748 Garching, Germany

(Dated: October 24, 2008)

The coherent coupling of flying photonic qubits to stationary matter-based qubits is an essential building block for quantum communication networks. We show how such a quantum interface can be realized between the polarized nuclear spins in a singly charged quantum dot strongly coupled to a high-finesse optical cavity and a traveling-wave optical field. By adiabatically eliminating the electronic degree of freedom different effective couplings can be achieved that enable write-in, read-out, and the generation of entanglement between the nuclei and the output field of the cavity.

PACS numbers:

Quantum information processing holds great promise for enhanced ways of computation and communication. An important milestone on the way to quantum communication networks is the coupling of “stationary” qubits for storage and data processing (likely to be realized by material systems such as atoms or electrons) and mobile “flying” qubits for communication (typically photons) [1, 2]. Hence the development of “light-matter interfaces” that allow the coherent write-in and read-out of quantum information has been the subject of intense theoretical research [3, 4, 5, 6]. Two paths have been identified to make light efficiently couple to a single atomic quantum system: the use of a high-finesse (optical or microwave) cavity coupled to a single atom or the use of an (optically thick) ensemble of atoms, in whose *collective* state the quantum information is to be stored. Both have resulted in the experimental demonstration of such interfaces in quantum optical systems see, e.g., [7, 8] and [2] for a review.

For qubits realized by electron spins in quantum dots (QD) [9, 10] such interfaces have yet to be realized, though in particular for self-assembled QDs [11], with their close similarity to atoms, there are proposals to map photonic states to the electron spin of a QD [10] in analogy to the atomic schemes. Strong coherent coupling between a single QD and a single mode of a high-Q nano-cavity has been demonstrated experimentally [12], raising the prospect of mapping the state of the optical field to the QD’s electronic state by adapting protocols such as [3].

Despite their good isolation from many environmental degrees of freedom, the electron-spin coherence time in QDs is still limited to nanoseconds, mainly due to strong hyperfine coupling. Moreover, the capacity of such an interface is one qubit only, making the interfacing difficult for many-photon states. In contrast, the ensemble of lattice nuclear spins could provide a high-dimensional and long-lived quantum memory [13]. We will show in the following how to couple the optical field directly to the nuclear spin ensemble, thus interfacing light to an exceptionally long-lived mesoscopic system that allows the storage and retrieval of higher-dimensional states and is

amenable to coherent manipulation via the electron spin [13, 14]. The read-out directly maps the nuclear state to the output mode of the cavity, while the write-in proceeds by deterministic creation of entanglement between the nuclear spins and the cavity output-mode and subsequent teleportation. We also show that the operations necessary for teleportation and verification of entanglement can be implemented all-optically.

The Players— We consider a singly charged self-assembled III-V QD (e.g., InGaAs in GaAs) strongly coupled to a high-Q nano-cavity.




FIG. 1: (a) Singly charged QD coupled to high-Q optical cavity. (b) Level scheme of the QD. Optical and hyperfine transitions.

The QD has four relevant electronic levels: the two electron spin states $|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle$ (spin along the magnetic field B_z in z -direction), each coupled by optical dipole transition to a heavy-hole trion state $|X_{\uparrow,\downarrow}^- \rangle$ (hole spin along growth direction z'). A finite angle between z and z' and proper tuning of the involved frequencies allows the realization of a Λ -system coupling the two spin states by a two-photon process via one of the excitonic levels [15]:

$$H_{\text{opt}} = \omega_c a^\dagger a + \omega_X |X\rangle\langle X| + \omega_Z |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| + \frac{\Omega_c}{2} a^\dagger |\downarrow\rangle\langle X| + \frac{\Omega_l}{2} e^{+i\omega_l t} |\uparrow\rangle\langle X| + \text{h.c.}, \quad (1)$$

where $\hbar = 1$ and ω_c and ω_l denote the cavity and laser frequencies, respectively, ω_X the exciton energy, and $\omega_Z = g^* \mu_b B_z$ is the Zeeman splitting of the electron. Ω_l is the Rabi frequency of the driving laser and Ω_c the vacuum Rabi frequency of the cavity. We assume both cavity decay γ and spontaneous emission of the QD to be much slower than Ω_c and omit both processes in Eq. (1).

This is the setting for adiabatic transfer in cavity-QED [16]. Choosing ω_c, ω_l far detuned from the exciton tran-

sition (by $\Delta_e = \omega_X - \omega_l$) but close to the two-photon resonance $\delta = \omega_c - (\omega_l + \omega_Z) \ll \Delta_e$ (see Fig. 1b) we can adiabatically eliminate the excitonic level, arriving at an effective Jaynes-Cummings-like coupling of the two-level electron spin (described by spin operators $S^{\pm,z}$) to the cavity mode governed by

$$H_1 = \frac{g_a}{2}(S^+a + \text{h.c.}) + H_0, \quad (2)$$

i.e., the absorption of a cavity photon goes along with an upward flip of the electron spin (and the emission of a photon into the laser mode) and vice versa. Reversing the role of laser and cavity modes, we instead realize

$$H_2 = \frac{g_a}{2}(S^+a^\dagger + \text{h.c.}) + H_0. \quad (3)$$

The coupling strength of these interactions is $g_a = -\frac{\Omega_c\Omega_l}{2\Delta_e}$ ($\sim 1-10\mu\text{eV}$ for typical systems [17]). The diagonal part is the same in both cases and given by

$$H_0 = (\Delta_1 + \frac{\Omega_c^2}{4\Delta_e}a^\dagger a) |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| + (\omega_c - \omega_l)a^\dagger a$$

with $\Delta_1 = \omega_Z + \Omega_l^2/[4\Delta_e]$. Both Hamiltonians will be instrumental in the design of the interface.

As already mentioned, the electron spin in a QD has a strong hyperfine interaction with $N = 10^4 - 10^6$ lattice nuclear spins, which is for s-type electrons dominated by the Fermi contact term

$$H_{\text{hf}} = \frac{A}{2N}(A^+S^- + S^+A^-) + \frac{A}{N}A^zS^z, \quad (4)$$

where $A^{\pm,z} = \sum_{j=1}^N \alpha_j I_j^{\pm,z}$ is the collective nuclear spin operator. The individual coupling constants α_j are proportional to the electron wave function at site j (and the magnetic dipole moment of the j th nucleus) [18] and are normalized to $\sum_j \alpha_j = 1$. The hyperfine coupling constant $A \sim 90\mu\text{eV}$ and this interaction is responsible for electron dephasing in nanoseconds. Since the internal dynamics of the nuclear spins is orders of magnitude slower [18] than the hyperfine coupling they are an attractive candidate for storing quantum states [13].

A prerequisite for using nuclear spins as a quantum memory is to initialize them in a well-defined state, ideally fully polarized. Due to their small magnetic moments, nuclear spins are almost completely mixed even at dilution-fridge temperatures and fields of a few Tesla. Recent dynamical polarization experiments [19, 20, 21, 22] have achieved up to 60% polarization and it is predicted that $> 90\%$ are reachable with current technology [23]. A convenient description of the highly polarized nuclei is provided by the Holstein-Primakoff approximation [24], which allows to represent the spin operators A^\pm by bosonic creation and annihilation operators b^\dagger, b . In this description (we assume spin-1/2 nuclei and the fully polarized case for simplicity, cf. [25]), the electron spin couples to a bosonic ‘‘spin wave’’ described by $A^- = \sqrt{N}b$

and $A^z = b^\dagger b - N/2$ by a Jaynes-Cummings-like interaction

$$H_3 = \frac{g_n}{2}(S^+b + Sb^\dagger) + \frac{g_n}{\sqrt{N}}S^z(b^\dagger b - N/2), \quad (5)$$

where $g_n = A/\sqrt{N}$ and the initial state of the nuclear spin system is represented by a collection of bosonic modes, with b in the vacuum state. As shown in [25] this provides a good approximation for hyperfine coupling to a highly polarized nuclear spin ensemble even in the generic case $\alpha_j \neq \text{const}$. In the following, we use H_1, H_2 , and H_3 to couple cavity field and nuclear spin ensemble.

Effective coupling between nuclei and cavity– Both the optical coupling and the hyperfine coupling describe the exchange of excitation between the two-level electronic system and a (quasi-)bosonic mode and both are *detuned* by $H_0 + g_n/\sqrt{N}S^z(b^\dagger b - N/2)$. Now we take the electron to be initialized in $|\downarrow\rangle$ and chose the adjustable parameters in H_0 such that the second order process in which absorption (or emission) of a cavity photon is accompanied by nuclear spin flip (while the electron spin which mediates the coupling remains unchanged) is resonant. We obtain a chain of Λ -systems $\{|\downarrow, n+1, m\rangle, |\uparrow, n, m\rangle, |\downarrow, n, m+1\rangle\}$, where n and m refer to cavity and nuclear spin excitations, respectively. The detuning between the \uparrow and \downarrow levels is $\Delta_2 \approx \omega_Z + A/2 + \Omega_l^2/(4\Delta_e) \gg g_a, g_n$, where small corrections depending on n and m were neglected. Eliminating the electron spin yields an effective quadratic coupling between the cavity mode a and the nuclear spin mode b in which a cavity photon can be converted into a nuclear spin excitation and vice versa:

$$H_{\text{bs}} = g(ab^\dagger + a^\dagger b) + \omega_1 a^\dagger a + \omega_2 b^\dagger b \quad (6)$$

where $g = g_n g_a/(4\Delta_2)$, $\omega_1 = \omega_c - \omega_l - g_a^2/(4\Delta_2)$, $\omega_2 = -g_n^2/(4\Delta_2)$. The renormalized energies ω_1, ω_2 can be chosen equal $\omega_1 = \omega_2$ and set to zero in a rotating frame. Then H_{bs} describes a beamsplitter-like coupling of the modes a and b . If the role of laser and cavity field are reversed, H_1 is replaced by H_2 and the driving laser facilitates the joint creation (or annihilation) of a spin excitation and a cavity photon, realizing a two-mode squeezing effective Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{sq}} = g(a^\dagger b^\dagger + ab) + \omega_1 a^\dagger a + \omega_2 b^\dagger b. \quad (7)$$

For full flexibility, both the ‘‘driven’’ and the empty mode should be cavity modes: this allows to freely switch between H_{bs} and H_{sq} simply by turning on and off the appropriate lasers. Depending on the experimental setting, $g \sim 0.1 - 0.01\mu\text{eV}$ can be achieved.

Quantum Interface– Now the obvious route to a quantum interface is via the Hamiltonian H_{bs} : acting for a time $t = \pi/g$ it maps $a \rightarrow b$ and $b \rightarrow a$ thus realizing a swap gate between cavity and nuclear spins. This

and related ideas are explored in [17] in detail. There are, however, two problems with this approach: first, $g \ll 1/\tau_{\text{cavity}}$, i.e., compared to the effective coupling, we are in the “bad cavity limit” and the cavity field will decay before its state can be mapped to the nuclei. In addition, it is notoriously difficult to couple quantum information into high-Q cavities, although theoretical proposals exist [3] to avoid reflection completely. Both problems can be circumvented for our system by two key ideas: (i) to include the field modes into which the cavity decays in the description and (ii) to realize write-in via quantum teleportation.

Let us first consider the (more complicated) part, namely write-in. In a first step, entanglement between the nuclei and the traveling-wave *output field* of the cavity is created using the two-mode squeezing Hamiltonian H_{sq} (and taking advantage of cavity decay), then quantum teleportation [26] is used to deterministically write the state of another traveling-wave light field onto the nuclei [36]. As we demonstrate below, this dynamics generates strongly entangled pure two-mode squeezed states (TMSS) of nuclear spins and output field, which then enable high-fidelity teleportation onto the nuclear mode. Similarly, H_{bs} can be used for read-out, by writing the state of the nuclei to the output field of the cavity. Note that in both cases we “enlist” cavity decay (at first sight a decoherence process) to play a crucial constructive role in the interface.

Entangling nuclei with the output field– Let us now quantitatively derive the entangled state and discuss the quality of the ensuing interface. The Langevin equation of cavity and nuclear operators is (for $t \geq 0$ when $g \neq 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{a}(t) &= -igb(t)^\dagger - \frac{\gamma}{2}a - \sqrt{\gamma}c_{\text{in}}(t), \\ \dot{b}(t) &= -iga(t)^\dagger, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

where we have specialized to the case $\omega_1 = \omega_2$, transformed to a frame rotating at ω_1 , and performed the rotating-wave and Markov approximations in the description of the cavity decay [27]. Here, c_{in} describes the vacuum noise coupled into the cavity and satisfies $[c_{\text{in}}(t), c_{\text{in}}(t')] = \delta(t - t')$. Integrating Eq. (8), we get (for $t \geq 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} a(t) &= \alpha_{1-}(t)a(0) + \alpha_2(t)b^\dagger(0) + \sqrt{\gamma} \int_0^t \alpha_{1-}(t - \tau)c_{\text{in}}(\tau)d\tau, \\ b(t) &= \alpha_2(t)a^\dagger(0) + \alpha_{1+}(t)b(0) + \sqrt{\gamma} \int_0^t \alpha_2(t - \tau)c_{\text{in}}^\dagger(\tau)d\tau, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\alpha_{1\pm}(t) = e^{-\gamma t/4} [\cosh(\nu t) \pm \gamma/(4\nu) \sinh(\nu t)]$, $\alpha_2(t) = -ig/\nu e^{-\gamma t/4} \sinh(\nu t)$, and $\nu = \sqrt{g^2 + (\gamma/4)^2}$. Let us note here, that H_{bs} leads to almost identical solutions: of course, now $a(t)$ is coupled to $b(t)$ instead of $b^\dagger(t)$ but the only other change to Eq. (9) is to replace ν by $\tilde{\nu} = \sqrt{(\gamma/4)^2 - g^2}$.

While Eq. (9) describes a non-unitary time-evolution of the open cavity-nuclei system, the overall dynamics of system plus surrounding free field is unitary. It is also Gaussian, since all involved Hamiltonians are quadratic. Since all initial states are Gaussian as well the joint state of cavity, nuclei, and output fields is a pure Gaussian state at any time. This simplifies the analysis of the dynamics and, in particular, the entanglement properties significantly: For pure states, the entanglement of one subsystem (e.g., the nuclei) with the rest is directly given by the entropy of the reduced state of the subsystem. Gaussian states are fully characterized by the first and second moments of the field operators $R_1 = (a + a^\dagger)/\sqrt{2}$ and $R_2 = -i(a - a^\dagger)/\sqrt{2}$ via the covariance matrix (CM) $\Gamma_{kl} = \langle \{R_k - r_k, R_l - r_l\} \rangle$ (for $r_k = \langle R_k \rangle$ and the anticommutator $\{, \}$). The CM of the reduced state of a subsystem [e.g., $\Gamma_{\text{nuc}}(t)$ for the CM of the nuclei at time t] is given by the sub-matrix of Γ that refers to covariances of system operators only. For a single mode, the entropy of the reduced system can be computed directly from the determinant of the reduced CM [28] and we obtain with $x(t) \equiv \det \Gamma_{\text{nuc}}(t)$ a simple expression for the entropy (i.e. entanglement)

$$E(t) = x(t) \log_2 x(t) - [x(t) - 1] \log_2 [x(t) - 1]. \quad (10)$$

Since the state at hand (including the output field) is pure and Gaussian it is already fully determined by $x(t)$ up to local Gaussian unitaries [29]: it is locally equivalent to a TMSS $|\psi(r)\rangle = (\cosh r)^{-1} \sum_n (\tanh r)^n |nn\rangle$, which has the CM (in 2×2 block matrix form) $\Gamma_{\text{TMSS}} = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh(2r)\mathbb{1}_2 & \sinh(2r)\sigma_z \\ \sinh(2r)\sigma_z & \cosh(2r)\mathbb{1}_2 \end{pmatrix}$. From Eq. (9) we find that $\Gamma_{\text{nuc}}(t) = \cosh[2r(t)]\mathbb{1}_2$ for all $t \geq 0$ and

$$\cosh[2r(t)] = e^{-\frac{\gamma t}{2}} \left(\frac{\gamma}{\nu} \sinh(2\nu t) + \frac{g^2 + \frac{\gamma^2}{8}}{\nu^2} \cosh(2\nu t) + \frac{g^2}{\nu^2} \right) - 1, \quad (11)$$

quantifies how strongly the nuclei are entangled with the cavity and output fields. After turning off the coupling g at time t_{off} the nuclei are stationary while the cavity decays to the vacuum state. Therefore, the final entanglement of nuclei and output field at time $t - t_{\text{off}} \gg 1/\gamma$ is given by Eq. (10) with $x(t) = \cosh[2r(t_{\text{off}})]^2$. Note that for $\gamma \gg g, 1/t$ and keeping only the leading terms, Eq. (11) simplifies to $3[1 - 8(g/\gamma)^2]e^{\frac{4g^2}{\gamma}t}$, i.e., two-mode squeezing (and therefore entanglement) $r(t)$ grows linearly with time at a rate $\sim \frac{4g^2}{\gamma}$.

Teleportation channel– In order to perform the teleportation, a Bell measurement has to be performed on the output mode of the cavity and the signal state to be teleported. This is achieved by sending the two states through a 50:50 beam splitter and measuring the output quadratures [26]. To be able to do this, we need to know B_0 , the output mode of the cavity. It can be expressed

as a superposition of the bath operators $c(x, t)$

$$B_0(t) = \int z^0(x, t)c(x, t), \quad (12)$$

$$z^0(x, t) = \alpha_2(t-x)/\sqrt{\int_{\mathbb{R}} |\alpha_2(t-x)|^2 dx}, \quad (13)$$

where it should be noted that $\alpha_2(t-x)$ vanishes for $x \notin [0, t]$. This form of $z^0(x, t)$ can be derived by introducing a complete set of orthonormal mode functions $z^k(x, t), k \in \mathbb{N}$ such that at each time t the mode described by $z^0(x, t)$ contains all the output photons [37]. Therefore $\langle B_k(t)B_l(t) \rangle \propto \delta_{k0}\delta_{l0}$ which implies $\langle c^\dagger(x, t)c(x', t) \rangle = z^0(x, t)\bar{z}^0(x', t)$. On the other hand, the boundary condition $c(x, t) = \sqrt{\gamma}a(t-x)\chi_{[0,t]}(x)$ [27] gives $\langle c^\dagger(x, t)c(x', t) \rangle = \frac{\gamma}{4}\alpha_2(t-x')\bar{\alpha}_2(t-x)$ from which Eq. (13) is obtained by normalization.

The procedure for write-in then is: let H_{sq} act for a time t_1 to create the TMSS $\psi(r(t_1))$ of the nuclei entangled with cavity and output field (cf. Fig. 1). To obtain a state in which the nuclei are only entangled to the output field, we switch the driving laser off ($g = 0$) and let the cavity decay for a time $t_2 \gg \tau_{\text{cav}}$, obtaining an (almost) pure TMSS of the nuclei and the output mode.

The read-out step follows identical lines, except that H_{sq} is replaced by H_{bs} and no teleportation is necessary since the state of the nuclei is directly mapped to the output mode of the cavity; for more details see [17].

Performance– The fidelity with which a quantum state can be teleported onto the nuclei using the protocol [26] is a monotonic function of the two-mode squeezing parameter $r(t_{\text{off}})$. A typical benchmark [30] is the average fidelity with which an arbitrary coherent state can be mapped. This fidelity has a simple dependence on the two-mode squeezing parameter r of the state used for teleportation and is given by $F(r) = 1/(1 + e^{-2r})$ [31]. Thus, if our system parameters g, γ and the interaction time $t = t_{\text{off}}$ lead to $\cosh[2r(t_{\text{off}})]$ we have an interface that provides a write-in fidelity $F(r(t_{\text{off}}))$ (see Fig. 2).




FIG. 2: Teleportation-based write-in to the nuclear spins. The average fidelity with which coherent states can be mapped to the nuclei via teleportation (after complete decay of the cavity, see text) is plotted as a function of interaction time t_{off} and for different values of $g/\gamma = 1, 10, 100$ (solid, dash-dotted, dashed). All fidelities converge to 1 as $gt \rightarrow \infty$.

Already for $r(t_{\text{off}}) \sim 1$ fidelities above 0.8 are obtained. As seen from Fig. 2 this could be achieved for $gt_{\text{off}} \lesssim 5$, i.e., within less than a microsecond even for small g/γ .

After switching off the coupling we have to wait for the cavity to decay which typically happens on a nanosecond timescale and does not noticeably prolong the protocol.

Let us briefly consider the main approximations in our derivations. We assume the strong coupling limit of cavity-QED $g_a^2/(\gamma\gamma_{\text{spont}}) \gg 1$, where γ_{spont} comprises spontaneous emission of the quantum dot into non-cavity modes and cavity losses not included in γ . The two main approximations in treating the nuclei are to neglect the nuclear dynamics and the corrections to the bosonic description. Nuclear dynamics is caused by direct dipole-dipole interaction and electron-mediated interaction [18, 32, 33]. These are estimated to become important only on timescales well above a few μs [34] and thus have no appreciable effects during write-in. In order to store the state, it is favorable to remove the electron from the QD after write-in to avoid electron-mediated nuclear dynamics.

The bosonic description is well known for homogeneous ($\alpha_j = \text{const}$) system [24]. In the inhomogeneous case, the main effect we neglect is the coupling to other, possibly not fully polarized modes due to corrections to Eq. (5). In [25] it was shown that Eq. (5) can be used if the system is sufficiently highly polarized (the ‘‘excitation number’’ $\langle 2 \sum_j I_j^z \rangle$ should be much smaller than $\max\{\alpha_j\}/\sum \alpha_j^2$, the effective number of nuclei). Depending on the inhomogeneity, this can be assured by polarizations $\gtrsim 99\%$. In the homogeneous case the conditions are less demanding since effectively decoupled nuclei (in a dark state [13]) do not affect the accuracy of the approximation ($\sim \langle b^\dagger b \rangle / \langle 2 \sum_j I_j^z \rangle$) and polarizations $< 50\%$ are enough provided the dark state is reached.

Conclusions– We have shown how to realize a quantum interface between the polarized nuclear spin ensemble in a singly charged quantum dot and a traveling optical field. The coupling is mediated by the electron spin and the mode of a high-Q optical cavity to which the quantum dot is strongly coupled. Read-out is achieved via cavity decay while write-in is based on the generation of two-mode squeezed states of nuclei and output field and teleportation. For typical values of hyperfine interaction and cavity lifetimes, several ebit of entanglement can be generated long before internal nuclear dynamics becomes non-negligible. By connecting the outputs of two cavities by a Bell measurement, the scheme could also be used to entangle two nuclear spin ensembles in distant cavities. Our results give further evidence that nuclear spins in quantum dots can be a useful system for quantum information processing. In view of the recent impressive experimental progress in both dynamical nuclear polarization of quantum dots and quantum dot cavity-QED, their use for QIP protocols may not be too far off.

We acknowledge support by the DFG within SFB 631 and the Cluster of Excellence NIM.

-
- [1] D. P. DiVincenzo, Fort. Phys. **48**, 771 (2000).
- [2] H. J. Kimble, Nature **453**, 1023 (2008).
- [3] J. I. Cirac, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3221 (1997).
- [4] A. E. Kozekhin, et al., Phys. Rev. A **62**, 033809 (2000).
- [5] M. Fleischhauer & M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 022314 (2002).
- [6] B. Kraus, et al., Phys. Rev. A **73**, 020302 (2006).
- [7] B. Julsgaard, et al., Nature **432**, 482 (2004).
- [8] T. Wilk, et al., Science **317**, 488 (2007).
- [9] D. Loss & D. P. DiVincenzo, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 120 (1998).
- [10] A. Imamoglu, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4204 (1999).
- [11] R. Hanson & D. D. Awschalom, Nature **453**, 1043 (2008).
- [12] K. Hennessy, et al., Nature **445**, 896 (2007).
- [13] J. M. Taylor, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 246802 (2003).
- [14] J. M. Taylor, et al. (2004), cond-mat/0407640.
- [15] D. Stepanenko, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 136401 (2006).
- [16] K. Bergmann, et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. **70**, 1003 (1998).
- [17] H. Schwager, et al., in preparation (2008).
- [18] J. Schliemann, et al., J. Phys: Cond. Mat. **15**, R1809 (2003).
- [19] A. S. Bracker, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 047402 (2005).
- [20] P. Maletinsky, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 056804 (2007).
- [21] B. Urbaszek, et al., Phys. Rev. B **76**, 201301(R) (2007).
- [22] J. Skiba-Szymanska, et al., Phys. Rev. B **77**, 165338 (2008).
- [23] H. Christ, et al., Phys. Rev. B **75**, 155324 (2007).
- [24] T. Holstein & H. Primakoff, Phys. Rev. **58**, 1098 (1940).
- [25] H. Christ, Ph.D. thesis, TU München (2008).
- [26] S. L. Braunstein & H. J. Kimble, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 869 (1998).
- [27] C. W. Gardiner & P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise* (Springer Verlag, Berlin, 2000), 2nd ed.
- [28] S. J. van Enk, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 5095 (1999).
- [29] G. Giedke, et al., J. Quant. Inf. Comp. **3(3)**, 211 (2003).
- [30] K. Hammerer, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 150503 (2005).
- [31] J. Fiurášek, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 012304 (2002).
- [32] W. Yao, et al., Phys. Rev. B **74**, 195301 (2006).
- [33] W. M. Witzel & S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 045218 (2007).
- [34] J. M. Taylor, et al., Phys. Rev. B **76**, 035315 (2007).
- [35] M. G. Paris, Phys. Lett. A **217**, 78 (1996).
- [36] Besides causing a loss in fidelity to be discussed below, teleportation maps the state up to a random unitary, namely a displacement d , which depends on the measurement result. This can be undone by applying the Hamiltonian H_{bs} for a short time t while driving the cavity mode with a correspondingly strong laser such that the cavity is in a coherent state with amplitude $d/(gt)$ [35].
- [37] This is always possible since as shown in [17] at all times the cavity-nuclear system is only entangled with a single output mode.