

Berry Phase in a Two-atom Jaynes-Cummings Model with Kerr Medium

Shen-Ping Bu, Guo-Feng Zhang, Jia Liu, Zi-Yu Chen*[†]

Department of Physics, School of Science, BeiHang University, Xueyuan Road, Beijing 100083, P.R. China

The Jaynes-Cummings model (JCM) is an very important model for describing interaction between quantized electromagnetic fields and atoms in cavity quantum electrodynamics (QED). This model is generalized in many different direction since it predicts many novel quantum effects that can be verified by modern physics experimental technologies. In this paper, the Berry phase and entropy of the ground state for arbitrary photon number n of a two-atom Jaynes-Cummings model with Kerr like medium are investigated. It is found that there are some correspondence between their images, especially the existence of a curve in the $\Delta - \varepsilon$ plane along which the energy, Berry phase and entropy all reach their special values. So it is available for detecting entanglement by applying Berry phase.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Vf; 03.65.Ta

I. INTRODUCTION

Berry phase [1] or geometric phase, which does not have classical correspondence, becomes a focus point in modern physics. It describes a phase factor gained by the wavefunction after the system undergoes an adiabatic and cyclic evolution, which reflects the topological properties [2, 3] of the state space of the system and has untrivial connections with the character of the system [4], especially with the entanglement [5, 6]. Recently, the Berry phase was introduced into quantum computation to construct a universal quantum logic gates that may be robust to certain kinds of errors [7, 8, 9, 10, 11].

Cavity QED is an important solid-state system for implementing quantum computation, and is studied extensively. In the theory of cavity QED, the Jaynes-Cummings [12] model (JCM) is recognized as the simplest and most effective model on the interaction between radiation and matter, which can be solved exactly. As an important theoretical model, JCM has led to many nontrivial predictions such as collapse-revival phenomenon [13], squeezing [14], antibunching [15, 16], chaos [17], and trapping states [18, 19, 20], etc. Furthermore, despite the simplicity of JCM, it is of great significance because recent technologies enabled scientists to experimentally realize this rather idealized model [21, 22] and to verify some of the theoretical predictions.

Stimulated by the success of the JCM, many people extends this model to explore new quantum effects. One simple way of extending is considering multiple atoms and multiple modes field instead of single atom and single mode field [23, 24]. Another way is considering the interactions between field and medium and fields itself, such as a cavity filled with Kerr medium. Introducing of Kerr nonlinearity in the system Hamiltonian will cause

various nonlinear effects, so it attracts much attentions of scientists [25, 26, 27, 28, 29]. One of the many applications of these nonlinear effects is to produce entangled states [30], which is of extensively applications in quantum information, especially in quantum communication.

In this paper, we try to investigate a two-atom Jaynes-Cummings model in Kerr medium. At first, we calculate the eigenvalues and eigenstates of the system. Then we evaluate the Berry phase of ground state for arbitrary photon number n in terms of the introduction of the phase shift operator, and for comparing the phase with the entanglement we compute the von Neumann entropy as a measurement of entanglement. After these tedious computation, we compare the ground state energy, Berry phase and entropy, and find that there are tight connections between them.

II. HAMILTONIAN AND GROUND STATE ENERGY

The Hamiltonian of the system in the rotating wave approximation can be written as (assuming $\hbar = 1$)

$$H = \omega_f a^\dagger a + \frac{\omega_0}{2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \sigma_z^j + \varepsilon \sum_{j=1}^2 (a \sigma_+^j + a^\dagger \sigma_-^j) + \chi (a^\dagger a a^\dagger a) \quad (1)$$

where a^\dagger and a denote the creation and annihilation operators of the single mode field, ω_f is the transition frequency of the field, ω_0 is the atomic transition frequency, ε is the coupling constant between these two atoms and field, χ represents the coupling of the fields induced by the Kerr medium. $\sigma_z = |e\rangle_j \langle g| - |g\rangle_j \langle e|$, $\sigma_+^j = |e\rangle_j \langle g|$, $\sigma_-^j = |g\rangle_j \langle e|$, with $|e\rangle_j$ and $|g\rangle_j$ being the excited and ground states of j th atom, $j = 1, 2$. By the way, there exists a conserved quantity K for above Hamiltonian, which is

$$K = a^\dagger a + 1 + \frac{\sigma_z^1 + \sigma_z^2}{2}. \quad (2)$$

*Corresponding author.

[†]Email: chenzy@buaa.edu.cn




FIG. 1: (Color online) Ground state energy versus detuning Δ and coupling constant ε , where Δ and ε are measured with unit χ . Part (a) and (b) are respectively correspond to the case $n = 0$ and $n = 40$.

The basis of the subspace ($K = n + 2$) is

$$\begin{aligned} &|n, e_1, e_2\rangle, |n + 1, e_1, g_2\rangle, \\ &|n + 1, g_1, e_2\rangle, |n + 2, g_1, g_2\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

And in that basis, the Hamiltonian is written as (in an appropriate interaction picture)

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} \Delta - \chi(2n + 2) & \varepsilon\sqrt{n+1} & \varepsilon\sqrt{n+1} & 0 \\ \varepsilon\sqrt{n+1} & -\chi & 0 & \varepsilon\sqrt{n+2} \\ \varepsilon\sqrt{n+1} & 0 & -\chi & \varepsilon\sqrt{n+2} \\ 0 & \varepsilon\sqrt{n+2} & \varepsilon\sqrt{n+2} & \Delta - \chi(2n + 2) \end{pmatrix} \quad (3)$$

where $\Delta = \omega_0 - \omega_f$ is the detuning of the cavity field. The four eigenvalues $\lambda_j (j = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ and corresponding eigenstates $|\psi_j\rangle$ have been calculated analytically. However, it is useless to present their complicated formulas here, but $|\psi_j\rangle$ can be written simply as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_j\rangle = & c_j^1 |n, e_1, e_2\rangle + c_j^2 |n + 1, e_1, g_2\rangle \\ & + c_j^3 |n + 1, g_1, e_2\rangle + c_j^4 |n + 2, g_1, g_2\rangle \quad (4) \end{aligned}$$

When $n = 0$, the ground state energy, ie. the lowest eigenvalue of the Hamiltonian for $n = 0$, as a function of detuning Δ and coupling constant ε , is shown in Fig. 1. We find in the figure that when ε approaches 0 there exist two discontinuity points in the derivative of the energy, and the image of the function are symmetry against the line $\Delta = 2$ to some extent. As we will see, these two points will be singularities of Berry phase, and the symmetry of the energy function will also be inherited by the Berry phase.

III. BERRY PHASE AND ENTROPY

Obviously, the whole system are quantized, to study the geometric properties of this system we resort to the method of [31] to evaluate the Berry phase of the system




FIG. 2: (Color online) Ground state Berry phase versus detuning Δ and coupling constant ε where Δ and ε are measured with unit χ , and the unit of the vertical axis is π . Part (a) and (b) are respectively correspond to the case $n = 0$ and $n = 40$.

by introducing a phase shift operator:

$$R(t) = e^{-i\varphi(t)a^\dagger a} \quad (5)$$

where $\varphi(t)$ is changed from 0 to 2π adiabatically. Then the time independent eigen equation of the system: $H|\psi_j\rangle = \lambda_j|\psi_j\rangle$ is changed into $H'|\psi'_j\rangle = \lambda'_j|\psi'_j\rangle$, with $H' = R(t)HR^\dagger(t) - iR(t)dR^\dagger(t)/dt$ and $|\psi'_j\rangle = R(t)|\psi_j\rangle$. Hence the Berry phase can be evaluated according to the standard method as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_j &= i \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \langle \psi'_j | \frac{d}{d\varphi} | \psi'_j \rangle \\ &= i \int_0^{2\pi} d\varphi \langle \psi_j | R^\dagger(t) \frac{d}{d\varphi} R(t) | \psi_j \rangle \quad (6) \end{aligned}$$

For our model, the Berry phase is given as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_j &= 2\pi \left[n |c_j^1|^2 + (n + 1) \left(|c_j^2|^2 + |c_j^3|^2 \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (n + 2) |c_j^4|^2 \right] \quad (7) \end{aligned}$$

Apparently, $c_j^i (i, j = 1, 2, 3, 4)$ are functions of detuning Δ and coupling constant ε . So the Berry phase of the ground state can be controlled by Δ and ε . Fig. 2 shows its image of the case $n = 0$.

Just as we have mentioned before, there are two singularities when ε approaches 0 for the Berry phase, and the image is centrosymmetric to some extent against the intersection curve of the Berry phase image and 2π plane where Berry phase identical equals to 2π , which is adjacent to the plane $\Delta = 2$. This result is similar to that of [32]. In the article [32], the authors calculate the Berry phase of ground state of Tavis-Cummings Model, and it is also found that there are correspondence between the singularities of Berry phase and ground state energy as well as symmetry.




FIG. 3: (Color online) Ground state entropy versus detuning Δ and coupling constant ε , where Δ and ε are measured with unit χ . Part (a) and (b) are respectively correspond to the case $n = 0$ and $n = 40$.

To compare the Berry phase with the entanglement of the system, we calculate the entropy, which can be used to measure the entanglement, using following definition:

$$S(\rho_a) = -\text{tr}[\rho_a \log_2(\rho_a)] \quad (8)$$

where $\rho_a = \text{tr}^f(\rho_{af})$ is the reduced density operator of ρ_{af} , and ρ_{af} represents the density operator of the system. Generally, when the system is in a pure state $|\psi\rangle$, its density operator $\rho_{af} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$.

According to our computations, we present the figure of entropy as a function of detuning Δ and coupling constant ε when $n = 0$ in Fig. 3. Apparently as the figures show, there are the same two points and symmetry correspond to that of the Berry phase and energy.

According to the image and our calculations, we find that for each different value of ε , there exists a maximum value for the energy of the ground state when Δ satisfies following equation:

$$\Delta = \frac{1}{2} + \sqrt{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{17 - 12\sqrt{2} + (12 - 8\sqrt{2})\varepsilon^2} \quad (\varepsilon \neq 0). \quad (9)$$

And to our surprise, at these points where Δ and ε satisfy above equation, the Berry phase is right 2π and the entropy of the system reached its relative minimum value when ε is near 0. The equation determines a curve in the $\Delta - \varepsilon$ plane and because this curve reflects the main character of ground state, we call it the characteristic curve of the ground state. The existence of the characteristic curves proved the tight connections between energy, Berry phase and entanglement.

We also considered the case $n \neq 0$, and find that the images of ground state energy, Berry phase and entropy versus Δ and ε are similar to the case $n = 0$, such as the symmetry against a line ($\Delta = 2n + 2$) to some extent, and the correspondence of singularities. To illustrate this, we represent the images of ground state energy, Berry phase and entropy when $n = 40$ in part (b)'s of Fig. 1, Fig. 2 and Fig. 3 respectively. Obviously, the




FIG. 4: (Color online) The characteristic curves of the case $n = 0$, $n = 2$, $n = 10$, and $n = 40$. It is clearly showed that the move of the curve with the value of n increasing.

main difference between them is that the move of the characteristic curve in the $\Delta - \varepsilon$ plane and its equation reads ($\varepsilon \neq 0$):

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta &= \frac{1}{2}(2n + 1) + A \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{1 - 4(2n + 3)A + 8A^2 + (12 + 8n - 8A)\varepsilon^2} \\ A &= \sqrt{n^2 + 3n + 2}. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

Fig. 4 shows the characteristic curves for different values of n . We think this result maybe owe to the fact that the Berry phase and entropy are all functions of the ground state energy.

IV. CONCLUSION

In conclusion, we calculated the Berry phase and entropy of a two-atom Jaynes-Cummings model with Kerr medium, and found that there are correspondences between their singularities and symmetry. Especially, there exist a class of curves in the $\Delta - \varepsilon$ plane, along which the Berry phase and entropy all reach their special values like 2π for Berry phase. These results reflect the tight relations between the Berry phase and entanglement of the system, and maybe it is caused by the fact that they are all functions of energy. Some physicists are trying to measure entanglement using Berry phase, and our results may be useful to them.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 10604053) and the

Beihang Lantian Project; G. F. Zhang also acknowledges the support of the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 10874013)

-
- [1] M.V. Berry, Proc. R. Soc. A **392**(45) (1984)
- [2] B. Simon, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**(24), 2167 (1983)
- [3] J. Samuel, R. Bhardari, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 2339 (1988)
- [4] Z.S. Wang, C.F. Wu, X.L. Feng, L.C. Kwek, C.H. Lai, C.H. Oh, V. Vedral, Phys. Lett. A **372**, 775 (2008)
- [5] B. Basu, Europhys. Lett. **73**(6), 833 (2006)
- [6] H.T. Cui, L.C. Wang, and X.X. Yi, Eur. Phys. J. D **41**, 385 (2007)
- [7] A. Ekert, M. Ericsson, P. Hayden, H. Inamori, J.A. Jones, D.L. Oi, V. Vedral, J. Mod. Opt. **47**, 2501 (2000)
- [8] X.B. Wang, M. Keiji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 097901 (2001)
- [9] S.L. Zhu, Z. D.Wang, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 187902 (2003)
- [10] X.D. Zhang, S.L. Zhu, L. Hu, Z.D. Wang, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 014302 (2005)
- [11] Z.S. Wang, C.F. Wu, X.L. Feng, L.C. Kwek, C.H. Lai, C.H. Oh, V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 044303 (2007)
- [12] E.T. Jaynes, F.W. Cummings, Proc. IEEE **51**, 89 (1963)
- [13] J.H. Eberly, N.B. Narozhny, J.J. Sanchez-Mondragan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **44**, 1328 (1980)
- [14] J.R. Kuklinski, J.L. Madajczyk, Phys. Rev. A **37**, 3175 (1988)
- [15] R.G. Short, L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **51**, 384 (1983)
- [16] F. Diedrich, H. Walther, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 203 (1987)
- [17] P.W. Milonni, J.R. Ackerhalt, H.W. Galbraith, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 966 (1983)
- [18] J.J. Slosser, P. Meystre, S.L. Braunstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **63**, 934 (1989)
- [19] J. Gea-Banacloche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **65**, 3385 (1990)
- [20] S.J.D. Phoenix, P.L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 2833 (1991)
- [21] O. Benson, G. Raitel, H. Walther, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3506 (1994)
- [22] M. Brune, F. Schmidt-Kaler, A. Maali, J. Dreyer, E. Hagley, J.M. Raimond, S. Haroche, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1800 (1996)
- [23] M. Tavis, F.W. Cummings, Phys. Rev. **170**(2), 387 (1968)
- [24] A.M. Abdel-Hafez, A.S.F. Obada, M. Ahmad, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **20**, L359 (1987)
- [25] A. Joshi, S.V. Lawande, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 5906 (1991)
- [26] H.T. Dung, A.S. Shumovsky, Phys. Lett. A **160**, 437 (1991)
- [27] J.L. Gruver, J. Aliaga, A. Cerdeira Hilda, A.N. Proto, Phys. Lett. A **190**, 363 (1994)
- [28] G. Berlin, J. Aliaga, J. Mod. Opt. **48**, 1819 (2001)
- [29] R.A. Zait, Opt. Commun. **247**, 367 (2005)
- [30] D. Vitali, M. Fortunato, P. Tombesi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 445 (2000)
- [31] A. Carollo, I. Fuentes-Guridi, M.F. Santos, V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 020402 (2004)
- [32] M.M. He, G. Chen, J.Q. Liang, Eur. Phys. J. D **44**, 581 (2007)