

Lasing in Strong Coupling

F. P. Laussy,¹ E. del Valle,² and J. J. Finley^{2,1}

¹Walter Schottky Institut, Technische Universität München, Am Coulombwall 3, 85748 Garching, Germany

²Physikdepartment, TU München, James-Frank-Str. 1, 85748 Garching, Germany

(Dated: November 2, 2018)

An almost ideal thresholdless laser can be realized in the strong-coupling regime of light-matter interaction, with Poissonian fluctuations of the field at all pumping powers and all intensities of the field. This ideal scenario is thwarted by quantum nonlinearities when crossing from the linear to the stimulated emission regime, resulting in a universal jump in the second order coherence, which measurement could however be used to establish a standard of lasing in strong coupling.

“Lasing” as a general concept is any process that generates a coherent field (we will assume light). A single emitter can be used for that purpose, provided that it is in the *strong coupling* with the field [1], in which case the interaction is reversible and can pile-up coherently a very large number of photons through Rabi oscillations [2]. In contrast, conventional lasers operate in the *weak-coupling regime*, where the interaction is perturbative. This demands a large number $N \gg 1$ of emitters to generate a sizable output. The inversion of population of this ensemble leads to a pumping threshold. With a single emitter, if the spontaneous emission rate into other modes than the cavity is small, the growth in the population of photons appears to exhibit no threshold [3]. Even though a proper coherent state is not formed due to the uncertainty in the phase (blurred by the interaction with the environment [4]), the distribution converges to the same Poissonian statistics. Most lasers find their applications in their high intensity and/or narrow (so-called “pencil”) beam, but from a fundamental point of view, *coherence* as defined by Glauber [5], i.e., as autocorrelation functions $N_a[n] = \langle a^{\dagger n} a^n \rangle$ of the field that factor out, is what endows lasing with its cleanest definition.

The strong-coupling regime is not interesting only for its lasing properties. It presents particular quantum nonlinearities that arise in the fully quantized theory [6, 7]. Experimentally, entering the strong coupling regime at the single excitation level is technically demanding, both in the case of atoms and of *artificial atoms* (superconducting qubits and quantum dots). This requires a well isolated system with a high oscillator strength for the emitter and quality factor for the cavity, matching the emitter and the chosen cavity mode both spatially and spectrally. It was only in 2004 that all these requirements were met and strong coupling was achieved for a variety of systems: a single and the same trapped atom in an optical cavity [8], a superconducting qubit in a superconducting transmission line resonator [9] and a quantum dot in a semiconductor microcavity [10–12]. Signatures of strong coupling at the two excitation level have also been reported subsequently in all these systems [8, 13, 14], as well as one-emitter lasing [15–17], showing that they can be considered as two-level systems.

Theoretically, much work has addressed the steady state properties of the one-emitter laser (field intensity, statistics, population inversion...) through the different regions of pumping (quantum, lasing and quenching) [2, 4, 18–32]. In this text, we focus on the transition from strong coupling at low excitations to lasing sustained by the single-emitter. We show how, when conditions are optimum for strong-coupling, all observables (intensity and coherence) tend toward a cancellation of all transients and thresholds. We find, however, a universal “jump” when bridging between these two limits, that forbids the realization of an ideal thresholdless laser. We discuss how this can be taken advantage of.

Lasing in strong coupling is described at its most fundamental level by the coupling between a two-level system σ and a cavity mode a in a dissipative environment that leads to a master equation $\partial_t \rho = i[H_{JC}, \rho] + \{\frac{\gamma_a}{2} \mathcal{L}_a + \frac{\gamma_\sigma}{2} \mathcal{L}_\sigma + \frac{P_\sigma}{2} \mathcal{L}_{\sigma^\dagger}\} \rho$, where $\mathcal{L}_c \rho = (2c\rho c^\dagger - c^\dagger c \rho - \rho c^\dagger c)$ is the Lindblad term associated with decay (γ_a, γ_σ), and pumping (P_σ), and H_{JC} is the celebrated Jaynes–Cummings Hamiltonian, at the heart of the quantum dynamics: $H_{JC} = g(\sigma^\dagger a + a^\dagger \sigma)$. The steady state can be expressed completely in terms of the photon correlators, which obey the equations [25]:

$$\begin{aligned} & \left[1 + \frac{\Gamma_\sigma + (2n-1)\gamma_a}{\kappa_\sigma} + \frac{n\gamma_a}{\Gamma_\sigma + (n-1)\gamma_a} - \frac{2P_\sigma}{\Gamma_\sigma + n\gamma_a} \right] N_a[n] \\ &= \frac{nP_\sigma}{\Gamma_\sigma + (n-1)\gamma_a} N_a[n-1] - \frac{2\gamma_a}{\Gamma_\sigma + n\gamma_a} N_a[n+1]. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where we have introduced $\Gamma_\sigma = \gamma_\sigma + P_\sigma$ and the Purcell rate of transfer of population from emitter to the cavity mode:

$$\kappa_\sigma = 4g^2/\gamma_a. \quad (2)$$

The main observables of interest are the cavity population, $n_a = N_a[1]$, directly linked to the intensity emitted by the device through $I = \gamma_a n_a$, and the n th-order coherence function $g^{(n)}(0) = N_a[n]/n_a^n$, especially the second order one, $g^{(2)}$, measured by photon-counting coincidences at zero time delay. The probability of the emitter to be in the excited state $n_\sigma = \langle \sigma^\dagger \sigma \rangle$ is a dependent variable ($n_\sigma = (P_\sigma - \gamma_a n_a)/\Gamma_\sigma$), which we thus do not need




FIG. 1: (Colour online) (a) Cavity population n_a and (b) second order correlation $g^{(2)}$ for various γ_σ (with $\gamma_a/g = 10^{-2}$). The linear variation $n_a = C_1 P_\sigma$ is superimposed in dashed orange lines. In the stimulated emission regime, all lines converge to the same one (red). The second uppermost curve where $C_1 = C_2$, that covers both regimes, is the closest approximation to an ideal thresholdless laser in strong-coupling. It however deviates slightly in the intermediate region. This deviation becomes compelling in $g^{(2)}$, where it arises as a bunching of photons when turning a perfect Poissonian distribution at small pump into another one at high pump. This curve, which is universal, is magnified in Fig. 2.

to consider any further. These equations can be solved to very good approximation [32]. Two cases, $i = 1, 2$, when the field intensity scales linearly with pumping at a rate of growth C_i , are of interest:

$$n_a = C_i P_\sigma. \quad (3)$$

In the “linear” regime—where only the first rung of the Jaynes–Cummings ladder is occupied—we find:

$$C_1 \approx \frac{\kappa_\sigma}{\kappa_\sigma + \gamma_\sigma} \frac{1}{\gamma_a + \gamma_\sigma} P_\sigma. \quad (4)$$

This is shown in Fig. 1(a) at low pump, where n_a follows the dashed straight lines, given by Eq. (4). In the lasing region, the field intensity also scales linearly with pumping, but this time with a rate independent of γ_σ , since spontaneous processes are completely dominated by stimulated ones:

$$C_2 \approx 1/(2\gamma_a). \quad (5)$$

This is the region in Fig. 1(a) where all lines converge (since γ_a is constant). There is therefore a “jump” \mathcal{J}

between the two rates of efficiency in the transition from the linear to the lasing regime:

$$\mathcal{J} = \ln(C_2/C_1) \approx \ln(\gamma_a + \gamma_\sigma) - \ln(2\gamma_a), \quad (6)$$

which becomes exact when $\kappa_\sigma \gg \gamma_\sigma$. This jump changes sign when $\gamma_\sigma = \gamma_a$, which is the condition that maximises the strong-coupling criterion:

$$4g > |\gamma_a - \gamma_\sigma|. \quad (7)$$

Cases that satisfy Eq. (7) with $\gamma_\sigma < \gamma_a$ result in a *drop down* of the efficiency of pumping when crossing from the linear to the quantum regime, while cases $\gamma_\sigma > \gamma_a$ undergo a *bounce up*, as stimulated emission overcomes spontaneous emission according to the conventional lasing scenario. The drop down is maybe more surprising. It is maximum when $\gamma_\sigma = 0$ (no spontaneous emission) in which case $\mathcal{J} = \ln(1/2)$, the factor $1/2$ being linked to the inversion of population (in the lasing region, $n_\sigma = 1/2$). When the inequality (7) is maximum, the situation of an ideal thresholdless laser would seem to be realized, namely, the light field intensity increases linearly with pumping throughout the entire excitation scheme (until quenching). This is not entirely true, however, since in between the linear regime and the lasing regime lies what we will call the “*quantum regime*”, where the dynamics involving the first few rungs of the Jaynes–Cummings ladder disrupt anyway the zero-jump between the two linear relationships when $C_1 = C_2$. This is shown in Fig. 1(a) where one sees that the case $\gamma_\sigma = \gamma_a$ accounts for both the linear and the lasing regions with the same line, with a small deviation in the intermediate region.

This is even more apparent when considering the statistics $g^{(2)}$, in Fig. 1(b). As photon correlators follow $N_a[n] \propto P_\sigma^n$ at vanishing pump, a finite value for all $g^{(n)}$ is assured independently of the truncation used to solve Eq. (1). We thus obtain the exact expression for the general coherence function in the limit of vanishing pump:

$$g_0^{(n)} = \lim_{P_\sigma \rightarrow 0} \frac{N_a[n]}{n_a^n} = n g_0^{(n-1)} \frac{\kappa_\sigma + \gamma_\sigma}{\kappa_\sigma + \gamma_\sigma + (n-1)\gamma_a} \frac{\gamma_a + \gamma_\sigma}{(2n-1)\gamma_a + \gamma_\sigma}, \quad (8)$$

Starting from $g_0^{(1)} = 1$. The minimum value $g_0^{(n)}$ can take is 0, the case of perfect antibunching. In the very strong coupling regime (where κ_σ is the largest parameter), $g_0^{(2)}$ can be approximated as:

$$g_0^{(2)} \approx 2(\gamma_a + \gamma_\sigma)/(3\gamma_a + \gamma_\sigma), \quad (9)$$

which is always between $2/3$ and 2 , as shown in Fig. 1(b). This result has also been recently obtained by a continuous fraction expansion [31]. The condition for $g_0^{(2)} = 1$,

which separates the bunching (> 1) from the antibunching (< 1) behaviour, is again $\gamma_\sigma = \gamma_a$, the same criterion as the one that aligns the two linear growths. All higher order correlators, Eq. (8), satisfy $g_0^{(n)} = 1$ in this case, showing that the state is exactly Poissonian or, in the sense of Glauber, perfectly coherent.

In the second order statistics, the passage through the quantum region is however markedly located as a “bump” in an otherwise constant $g^{(2)} = 1$. There is some interest in having a stable light source with a pinned fluctuation of its statistics as Poissonian for all intensities, even those much below unity. The ideal thresholdless laser would be such that for all pumping powers (below quenching), its coherence would be that of a laser. Two different mechanisms account for this Poissonian statistics, though: at low pumping, by maximising strong coupling; at large pumping, by stimulated emission overtaking spontaneous emission.

The threshold of a conventional laser is quantified by its β factor, which is the closer to one the lower the threshold, a concept that has been extended to the one-atom laser [29]: $\beta = [\kappa_\sigma / (\kappa_\sigma + \gamma_\sigma)] [\gamma_a / (\gamma_a + \gamma_\sigma)]$. In our approximation of $\kappa_\sigma \gg \gamma_\sigma$, β is related to our jump between the linear increases of the single-photon and stimulated emission lasing regimes as $\mathcal{J} = \ln(1/(2\beta))$. The β factor is the fraction of emission in the lasing mode (the cavity), which is stimulated, over other channels of emission, most importantly spontaneous emission which is always present, at least in weak coupling. Strong coupling being this regime where spontaneous emission becomes a reversible process, we argue that the definition $\beta = 1$, or $\mathcal{J} = -\ln(2)$, suits best weak-coupling lasers and that in strong-coupling, $\beta = 1/2$ or $\mathcal{J} = 0$ is the closest, albeit non-ideal, approximation to thresholdless lasing operation. It is also conceptually appealing that lasing in strong coupling is best realized when strong coupling itself is optimum, Eq. (7). The wider picture covering both the quantum and classical regimes also reveals different types of thresholds, namely, from quantum ($g^{(2)} < 1$) to classical ($g^{(2)} = 1$) statistics when $\gamma_\sigma < \gamma_a$, and from thermal noise ($g^{(2)} > 1$) to classical statistics, which is the conventional case, when $\gamma_\sigma > \gamma_a$. The intermediate situation where $\gamma_a = \gamma_\sigma$ bridges between Poissonian statistics on both sides. If one would assume the efficiency of growth of the intensity as the criterion for lasing, the negative-jump would yield an “anti-threshold” where stimulated emission spoils the efficiency of cavity population, strong-coupling being more efficient. This jump neatly and fundamentally separates two regions that differ only by the fact that $n_a < 1$ in the former case and $n_a > 1$ in the latter, but are otherwise sharing the same growth of the photon intensity with pumping and Poissonian statistics, that is, both displaying the two main features of a laser. It is therefore adequate to denominate them both as lasing. We propose the denominations of “single-photon lasing” and




FIG. 2: (a) universal curve for $g^{(2)}$ when going from one-photon lasing to stimulated emission lasing and, (b), deviation of the statistics realized from a Poissonian distribution, Eq. (10), for the points marked by arrows in (a). The maximum value ≈ 1.10282 is the same for any system realizing lasing in strong-coupling. δ_n is magnified by the value shown on the right hand side.

“stimulated-emission lasing” to term the two sides of the quantum regime. The terminology of a “single-photon laser”, seemingly contradictory in terms, nevertheless restores the concept of coherence as the chief characteristic of lasing, since this is precisely *not* the large intensity (thus, the large number of photons) that characterize lasing, but the fact that the very scarce photons emitted are uncorrelated the one from the others, in stark contrast with a natural source where independent events leads to bunched photons [33]. The same applies to the terminology of “stimulated-emission lasing” which is not a pleonasm in a modern understanding of lasing, where the mechanism is disconnected from its product.

The most remarkable feature of the transition between these two types of lasing is that it is universal. This follows from the strong coupling limit, where the term featuring κ_σ^{-1} in Eq. (1) becomes negligible, in which case the shape is invariant for the dimensionless parameters $P = P_\sigma/\gamma_a$ and $\gamma = \gamma_\sigma/\gamma_a$, for all values of g . It is shown in Fig. 2, along with the physical origin of this fluctuation in statistics, displayed as the difference between the distribution $p(n) = \langle n|\rho|n \rangle$ realized in the system and the ideal Poissonian statistics, with $\bar{n} = \sum_n np(n)$:

$$\delta_n = p(n) - e^{-\bar{n}} \bar{n}^n / n!. \quad (10)$$

In the one-photon lasing region (1–3) in Fig. 2, the system is forced in the lowest rung $n = 1$, resulting in lower probabilities to have two photons than in an ideal laser of the corresponding intensity \bar{n} . This imbalance grows

linearly and, in the transition region (4–7), it spreads over many rungs, with excess of photons nearby the maximum of the distribution while neighbouring rungs are depleted to compensate. In the stimulated emission lasing region (8), this perturbation in statistics propagates along the ladder at the same time as it vanishes, recovering exact Poissonian fluctuations at high intensities.

The curve becomes not-universal anymore but specifics to the system parameters when strong coupling is not good enough. The shape then deviates from that plotted and reaches different (lower) values of its maximum. Interestingly, this occurs when the lasing regime established by stimulated emission (after the bump) is no longer reached, that is, no plateau is fully formed where Poissonian statistics is maintained over a range of pumping. We place it at roughly $\gamma_a \approx 0.1g$. This shows that the transition is really a fundamental bridge between the two types of lasing, that disappears if and only if this crossover is not fully realized.

For good enough strong-coupling, universality implies in particular that all systems exhibit the same maximum in $g^{(2)}$. Numerically, we estimate these lowest possible values by which the system surpass Poissonian statistics to be:

$$g^{(2)} \approx 1.01816, \quad \text{at } P_\sigma \approx 4.5989\gamma_a \text{ when } \gamma_\sigma = 0, \\ g^{(2)} \approx 1.10282, \quad \text{at } P_\sigma \approx 2.115\gamma_a \text{ when } \gamma_\sigma = \gamma_a.$$

It is difficult to know where to place the threshold in the one-emitter laser, other than the rather vague statement that it is zero, which does not account well for the variety of situations that can be observed. An unambiguous definition could be that point where $g^{(2)}$ achieves its maximum, now that we have shown this is a universal feature of lasing in strong coupling. In this case, there is no ideal thresholdless laser and the lowest possible threshold is that given by the condition that maximises strong-coupling, $\gamma_\sigma = \gamma_a$, yielding a threshold at a pumping rate slightly over twice this common decay rate.

Beyond the two particular cases that we have just outlined, there lie all the possible values of γ . From the maximum $g^{(2)}$ obtained, given that it is universal, one can also estimate the the pumping rate and the imbalance of the decay rates, quantities otherwise difficult to access directly. Interestingly, such a local maximum of statistics when crossing the thresholds to stimulated emission lasing have been observed in experimental realizations of a few-emitters laser with a shape that resembles our Fig. 2 [34–37], but it was in all cases linked to an experimental limitation, whereas it is in our case a manifestation of an intrinsic and universal transition in the system. In the light of our findings, this transition region acquires a new interest since it will allow fundamental tests of the theory at the interface between quantum and classical regimes, provide an unambiguous characterization of lasing in strong coupling, quantify the extent of ex-

perimental limitations, give a direct access to underlying parameters of the system and set the lowest thresholds achievable in any device relying on strong coupling.

We thank A. Laucht for discussions. We acknowledge support from DFG via SFB-631, Nanosystems Initiative Munich, the Emmy Noether project HA 5593/1-1 funded by the German Research Foundation (DFG) and the Marie Curie IEF ‘SQOD’.

-
- [1] A. Kavokin, J. J. Baumberg, G. Malpuech, and F. P. Laussy, *Microcavities* (Oxford University Press, 2011).
 - [2] Y. Mu and C. M. Savage, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, 5944 (1992).
 - [3] P. R. Rice and H. J. Carmichael, *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, 4318 (1994).
 - [4] T. B. Karlovich and S. Y. Kilin, *Opt. Spectrosc.* **91**, 343 (2001).
 - [5] R. J. Glauber, *Phys. Rev.* **131**, 2766 (1963).
 - [6] E. Jaynes and F. Cummings, *Proc. IEEE* **51**, 89 (1963).
 - [7] J. I. Cirac, H. Ritsch, and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. A* **44**, 4541 (1991).
 - [8] A. Boca, R. Miller, K. M. Birnbaum, A. D. Boozer, J. McKeever, and H. J. Kimble, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 233603 (2004).
 - [9] A. Wallraff, D. I. Schuster, A. Blais, L. Frunzio, R.-S. Huang, J. Majer, S. Kumar, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Nature* **431**, 162 (2004).
 - [10] J. P. Reithmaier, G. Sek, A. Löffler, C. Hofmann, S. Kuhn, S. Reitzenstein, L. V. Keldysh, V. D. Kulakovskii, T. L. Reinecker, and A. Forchel, *Nature* **432**, 197 (2004).
 - [11] T. Yoshie, A. Scherer, J. Heindrickson, G. Khitrova, H. M. Gibbs, G. Rupper, C. Ell, O. B. Shchekin, and D. G. Deppe, *Nature* **432**, 200 (2004).
 - [12] E. Peter, P. Senellart, D. Martrou, A. Lemaître, J. Hours, J. M. Gérard, and J. Bloch, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 067401 (2005).
 - [13] J. M. Fink, M. Göppl, M. Baur, R. Bianchetti, P. J. Leek, A. Blais, and A. Wallraff, *Nature* **454**, 315 (2008).
 - [14] J. Kasprzak, S. Reitzenstein, E. A. Muljarov, C. Kistner, C. Schneider, M. Strauss, S. Höfling, A. Forchel, and W. Langbein, *Nat. Mater.* **9**, 304 (2010).
 - [15] J. McKeever, A. Boca, A. D. Boozer, J. R. Buck, and H. J. Kimble, *Nature* **425**, 268 (2003).
 - [16] O. Astafiev, K. Inomata, A. O. Niskanen, T. Yamamoto, Y. A. Pashkin, Y. Nakamura, and J. S. Tsai, *Nature* **449**, 588 (2007).
 - [17] M. Nomura, N. Kumagai, S. Iwamoto, Y. Ota, and Y. Arakawa, *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 279 (2010).
 - [18] C. Ginzler, H.-J. Briegel, U. Martini, B.-G. Englert, and A. Schenzle, *Phys. Rev. A* **48**, 732 (1993).
 - [19] M. Löffler, G. M. Meyer, and H. Walther, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 3923 (1997).
 - [20] B. Jones, S. Ghose, J. P. Clemens, P. R. Rice, and L. M. Pedrotti, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 3267 (1999).
 - [21] O. Benson and Y. Yamamoto, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 4756 (1999).
 - [22] S. Y. Kilin and T. B. Karlovich, *Sov. Phys. JETP* **95**, 805 (2002).
 - [23] J. P. Clemens, P. R. Rice, and L. M. Pedrotti, *J. Opt.*

- Soc. Am. B **21**, 2025 (2004).
- [24] T. B. Karlovich and S. Y. Kilin, *Laser Phys.* **18**, 783 (2008).
- [25] E. del Valle, F. P. Laussy, and C. Tejedor, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 235326 (2009).
- [26] A. N. Poddubny, M. M. Glazov, and N. S. Averkiev, *Phys. Rev. B* **82**, 205330 (2010).
- [27] S. André, P.-Q. Jin, V. Brosco, J. H. Cole, A. Romito, A. Shnirman, and G. Schön, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 053802 (2010).
- [28] S. Ritter, P. Gartner, C. Gies, and F. Jahnke, *Opt. Express* **18**, 9909 (2010).
- [29] A. Auffèves, D. Gerace, J.-M. Gérard, M. F. Santos, L. C. Andreani, and J.-P. Poizat, *Phys. Rev. B* **81**, 245419 (2010).
- [30] E. del Valle and F. P. Laussy, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 233601 (2010).
- [31] P. Gartner, arXiv:1105.2189 (2011).
- [32] E. del Valle and F. P. Laussy, arXiv:1105.5836 (2011).
- [33] R. Hanbury Brown and R. Q. Twiss, *Nature* **178**, 1046 (1956).
- [34] S. Strauf, K. Hennessy, M. T. Rakher, Y. S. Choi, A. Badolato, L. C. Andreani, E. L. Hu, P. M. Petroff, and D. Bouwmeester, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 127404 (2006).
- [35] Z. G. Xie, S. Götzinger, W. Fang, H. Cao, and G. S. Solomon, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 117401 (2007).
- [36] S. M. Ulrich, C. Gies, S. Ates, J. Wiersig, S. Reitzenstein, C. Hofmann, A. Löffler, A. Forchel, F. Jahnke, and P. Michler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 043906 (2007).
- [37] M. Witzany, R. Roßbach, W.-M. Schulz, M. Jetter, and P. Michler, *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 205305 (2011).