

Non-Linearities In Atomic Quantum Receivers: Harmonic And Intermodulation Distortion

Luis Felipe Gonçalves,^{*} Teng Zhang,[†] Georg Raithel,[‡] and David A. Anderson[§]

Rydberg Technologies Inc.
Ann Arbor, Michigan 48103 USA[¶]

(Dated: December 24, 2024)

Rydberg sensors offer a unique approach to radio frequency (RF) detection, leveraging the high sensitivity and quantum properties of highly-excited atomic states to achieve performance levels beyond classical technologies. Non-linear responses and distortion behavior in Rydberg atom receivers are critical to evaluating and establishing performance metrics and capabilities such as spur-free dynamic range and tolerance to unwanted interfering signals. We report here on the measurement and characterization of non-linear behavior and spurious response of a Rydberg atomic heterodyne receiver. Single-tone and two-tone testing procedures are developed and implemented for measurement of harmonic and inter-modulation distortion in Rydberg atomic receivers based on multi-photon Rydberg spectroscopy and radio-frequency heterodyne signal detection and demodulation in an atomic vapor. For a predetermined set of atomic receiver parameters and RF carrier wave in the SHF band near-resonant to a cesium Rydberg transition, we measure and characterize atomic receiver selectivity, bandwidth, roll-off, compression point (P1dB), second-order (IP2) and third-order (IP3) intercepts, and spur-free dynamic range. Receiver intermodulation distortion is characterized for the case of an interfering signal wave applied at two frequency offsets relative to the near-resonant reference local oscillator, $\Delta F/F = 10^{-4}$ at 6 dB and 10^{-6} at 22 dB single-tone bandwidths, respectively. We observe that under suitable operating conditions the atomic receiver can exhibit a suppression of harmonic and inter-modulation distortion relative to that of classical receiver mixer amplifiers. Finally, we describe how the non-linear behaviors of atomic receivers can provide unique, controllable RF signatures inaccessible by classical counterparts and propose their use to realize secure communication modalities and applications.

I. INTRODUCTION

Rydberg atom-based radio-frequency (RF) sensors are a rapidly advancing quantum technology, offering transformative capabilities in RF applications [1–7]. These sensors feature ultra-wide frequency coverage spanning from DC to THz [8–10] with sub-wavelength sensing elements [11, 12] and capabilities ranging from high-intensity RF field measurement [13, 14] and detection of incoherent RF electromagnetic radiation [15], to absolute high-precision field measurements of over-the-air RF electric fields at the 0.1 % level [9] and in situ field measurements of charged plasmas [16]. A notable advancement in Rydberg atom-based RF technologies was the development of phase-sensitive Rydberg detectors and receivers that incorporate a fiduciary reference wave into the atomic detection medium, enabling direct Rydberg atom demodulation of amplitude, frequency, and phase of over-the-air (OTA) electromagnetic waves [3]. Implementations include all-optical RF phase-sensitive detection, where optical RF reference local oscillators interfere with OTA signals in the Rydberg atom state-space, enabling ultra-high RF phase resolution at optical diffraction limits [17], and RF heterodyne reception, utilizing free-space RF reference waves to interfere with OTA signal fields, demonstrating significant enhancement in sensitivity and selectivity in Rydberg heterodyne receivers [18–20]. Other recent demonstrations of continuous RF tuning using off-resonant and on-resonant couplings [21, 22] and simultaneous wide multi-band demodulation [23] exemplify the potential of Rydberg sensors in applications requiring broadband frequency-agility that offer new possibilities in resilient communications and wireless networks.

Leveraging early advances, atomic RF demodulation and reception of modulated RF signals has led to the advent of phase-sensitive atomic receivers for analog and digital radio communications [3, 23–29]. The first Rydberg sensor device, the Rydberg field probe (RFP) and measurement system (RFMS) [5] demonstrated atomic RF field measurement, signal waveform reception and non-invasive high-resolution near-field antenna characterizations [30]. More recently, the authors have developed a compact, sub-100-liter volume fieldable atomic receiver (ARx) (highlighted

^{*} Luis@RydbergTech.com

[†] TZhang@RydbergTech.com

[‡] Raithel@RydbergTech.com

[§] Dave@RydbergTech.com

[¶] This work was supported by Rydberg Technologies Inc. and, in part, by the Defense Advanced Research Projects Agency (DARPA) SAVaNT Program under agreement No. HR00112190065. Distribution Statement "A" (Approved for Public Release, Distribution Unlimited). The views and conclusions contained in this document are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as representing the official policies, either expressed or implied, of the U.S. Government.

in [31]) demonstrating groundbreaking advances in deployable Rydberg device hardware, and heralding the first demonstration of long-range quantum radio communication using a Rydberg atomic receiver [32]. These milestones highlight the potential of Rydberg technology to revolutionize RF communications by leveraging quantum sensing principles for long-distance highly sensitive RF detection.

Despite the remarkable progress made in Rydberg atom-based RF sensors, a critical aspect remains unexplored: the non-linear behavior of Rydberg atom receivers and their harmonic and intermodulation distortion performance in RF signal reception. Non-linear responses and distortion behavior are essential factors in evaluating the capabilities of radio frequency receivers, particularly for determining key metrics such as spur-free dynamic range and resilience to unwanted interfering signals. To date, methods to systematically establish and improve these performance metrics in Rydberg receivers have not been developed. In this work, we address this gap by reporting on measurements and characterizations of non-linear behavior and spurious response in Rydberg atomic RF receivers, shedding light on the fundamental performance advantages and potential optimizations of these quantum sensors.

Two-tone and spurious response testing is commonly performed on classical receiver systems to evaluate their spur-free dynamic range and tolerance to unwanted interfering signals. Receiver performance considerations include protection against radio-frequency (RF)-induced damage to the receiver electronics, the degree of degradation allowed in receiver performance in the presence of strong interfering signals[33], and overall system performance in congested electromagnetic environments. Here we translate these traditional concepts and testing methods from RF engineering to quantum Rydberg atomic sensors and receivers, and develop analogous testing procedures suitable for atomic receivers. We investigate non-linear effects in the quantum optical Rydberg atom response to RF fields in the receiver front end. Since the physics principles underlying Rydberg atomic RF receivers are fundamentally different from those underlying traditional RF receivers, the presented study of nonlinear behavior in Rydberg atomic RF receivers enables direct performance comparisons of atomic quantum receivers to analogous classical technologies.

This paper is organized as follows: In Section II, we describe the RF test setup and Rydberg atomic heterodyne receiver used to conduct the atomic RF measurements and characterization at 10 GHz. In Section III, we present single-tone testing of the atomic receiver and measurements of receiver selectivity including intermediate-frequency (IF) bandwidth and signal rejection ratio. Section IV presents single-tone measurement and characterization of harmonic distortion. In Section V, we present two-tone tests and measurements of intermodulation distortion in the atomic receiver response for in-band and out-of-band interference signals. A figure of merit for intermodulation distortion (IMD) performance comparison between quantum and classical receivers is established to quantify the receiver's non-linear response to incident electric fields of the RF signal waves in the saturation regime, and used to benchmark performance against a classical low-noise amplifier. In Section VI, we provide a discussion of the results, and in Section VI a concluding summary and outlook.

II. ATOMIC RECEIVER TESTING

The test and measurement setup for single-tone and two-tone testing of a Rydberg atomic RF heterodyne receiver is illustrated in Figure 1. Two signal tones at frequencies F_1 and F_2 are generated and combined with the atomic receiver reference local oscillator (LO) at frequency F_{LO} used in phase-sensitive atomic RF heterodyne reception[34]. The three frequencies are generated by three different signal generators synchronized to a rubidium clock, allowing independent frequency and power control of each signal tone and the LO. The combined $F_1 + F_2 + F_{LO}$ waveform is coupled into a WR-75 horn antenna with gain $G = 10$ dBi, which transmits the waveform over-the-air to the atomic vapor of the atomic receiver located approximately 10 cm away in the antenna far-field. The atomic vapor is a cesium gas held at room temperature in a glass cell. Multi-photon Rydberg spectroscopy and electromagnetically-induced transparency (EIT) are used to access RF-field sensitive Rydberg states of the cesium gas with two counter-propagating laser beams at 852 nm (probe beam) and 510 nm (coupler beam).

During RF signal reception, both probe and coupler lasers in the atomic receiver are frequency stabilized to linewidths below 1 kHz at target operating points near the Rydberg resonance [24] using a combination of atomic and ultra-stable optical references [20]. The probe laser frequency is stabilized in the vicinity of a cesium D2 hyperfine transition [35], and the coupler laser frequency is set to couple the $6P_{3/2} \rightarrow 42D_{5/2}$ transition to access the $42D_{5/2} \rightarrow 43P_{3/2}$ Rydberg RF resonance at 9.9376 GHz. The probe beam transmission through the atomic vapor is measured on an amplified photo-detector for absorption measurements of RF-induced changes to the Rydberg atom vapor. The electronic readout is measured using a spectrum analyzer (SA) for measurement of the atomic receiver response to applied RF signal tones. We perform atomic receiver testing in the SHF-band, and configure the atomic heterodyne receiver LO field frequency to $F_{LO} = 9.9376$ GHz, resonant with the $42D_{5/2} \rightarrow 43P_{3/2}$ Rydberg transition. In the presented measurements, either the F_1 or both F_1 and F_2 signal tones are applied to the atomic receiver for single-tone and two-tone measurements, respectively. The atomic heterodyne receiver response to the applied tones is measured on the SA at intermediate frequencies $f_1 = F_{LO} - F_1$ and $f_2 = F_{LO} - F_2$, as well as at overtones and mixing products




FIG. 1. Testing setup for a Rydberg atomic receiver. The F_1 or/and F_2 tones are combined with the Ref LO and injected into a 10 dBi antenna which transmits the combined RF signals over-the-air to an atomic vapor. The response of the RF-sensitive Rydberg atoms in the Cs vapor is measured all optically using a photodetector. The amplified photodetector output is processed using a signal analyzer. For single-tone testing we only apply F_1 , while for two-tone testing we apply both F_1 and F_2 .

of f_1 and f_2 . All RF fields applied to the atomic receiver are calibrated to absolute electric field levels by performing atom-based RF electric field measurements using RF-induced Autler-Townes splittings or AC Stark shifts of Rydberg levels of the receiver atoms. The calibration measurements are performed at test fields that are sufficiently high to generate high-fidelity Autler-Townes splittings.

III. SINGLE-TONE TESTING: SELECTIVITY, IF BANDWIDTH, AND FILTER ROLL-OFF

We first perform a single-tone measurement to characterize the atomic receiver selectivity, IF bandwidth, and filter roll-off for an SHF-band signal tone following the procedure described in our earlier work [20]. The response of the atomic receiver to a tone at frequency F and field amplitude $E_F = 0.017$ V/m is measured as a function of its frequency detuning in the IF $f = F - F_{LO}$ relative to the receiver LO frequency $F_{LO} = 9.9376$ GHz resonant with the Rydberg transition with amplitude $E_{LO} = 0.21$ V/m. Throughout this paper, we use dBV/m as well as V/m as the electric field units. The log scale unit dBV/m is better to visualize the scaling in the plots.

Figure 2a shows the IF signal response of the receiver to the applied tone F as a function of f for F scanned over approximately ± 1 MHz centered near F_{LO} . To quantify the selectivity, the measured response curve is fit empirically to a Voigt function, from which we obtain the peak signal response at $f = 0$ and IF bandwidths at 3, 6, 9, and 12 dB. Measured IF bandwidths are given in Table I.

In Figure 2c, we show the measured signal rejection ratio (SRR) in dBc relative to the peak signal response for $f=10$ kHz out to $f = \pm 15$ MHz. The dashed black lines are separate linear fits to the data in two regions, in which the SRR exhibits qualitatively different roll-off behavior. In the domain $f = 10$ kHz to 1 MHz, the signal roll-off approximately follows 10 dB/decade while from 1 MHz to 15 MHz it approximately follows 30 dB/decade.

TABLE I. IF bandwidth of the atomic receiver at a carrier frequency of 10 GHz

Carrier Frequency (GHz)	3 dB (kHz)	6 dB (kHz)	9 dB (kHz)	12 dB (kHz)
10	61	98	145	212

IV. SINGLE-TONE TESTING: HARMONIC DISTORTION

To investigate the non-linear behavior of the receiver to an incident RF wave, we perform a single-tone measurement of non-linear distortions within the pass-band of the receiver characterized in Figure 2. This is performed using the testing setup shown in Figure 1, with an applied tone $F_1 = 9.9377$ GHz that is offset from the $F_{LO} = 9.9376$ GHz by $f_1 = +100$ kHz approximately at the 6 dB IF bandwidth. No second tone F_2 is applied for this measurement. The measurement is performed at a fixed receiver LO field strength $E_{LO} = 0.21$ V/m, and by varying the electric field strength E_1 of F_1 and recording the f_1 signal response on the SA. The top plot in Figure 3 shows power spectra of




FIG. 2. Atomic receiver response as function of signal frequency detuning $f = F - F_{LO}$ relative to $F_{LO} = 9.9376$ GHz resonant with the Cs $42D_{5/2} \rightarrow 43P_{3/2}$ Rydberg transition: a) Atomic receiver IF response signal to noise (SNR) in dB versus f over a range ± 1 MHz. Empirical fit of the response curve to a Voigt (solid line) gives Gaussian and Lorentzian width of $\Gamma_G/2\pi = 22.8 \pm 0.9$ kHz (FWHM = 56.6 kHz) and $\Gamma_L/(2\pi) = 12.6 \pm 1.6$ kHz, respectively. The IF bandwidths at 3 dB, 6 dB, 9 dB, and 12 dB, listed in Table I, are given by the separations between the intersects between the Voigt fit and respective horizontal dashed lines. Error bars are the standard deviation from an average of 3 independent measurements of the beat note signal at each f . b) Receiver IF response signal to noise (SNR) in dB versus f over a range ± 15 MHz. c) Atomic receiver filter roll-off plot of the signal rejection ratio in dBc versus f . Linear fits in two distinct roll-off regimes (dashed lines) yield 10 dB/decade for $f < 1.1$ MHz and 30 dB/decade for $f > 1.1$ MHz.

the response measured on the SA over a span of 50 kHz to 350 kHz for two F_1 field strengths. At a field strength $E_1 = 0.02$ V/m, approximately one order of magnitude lower than the receiver's LO field strength, the fundamental f_1 beat note is measured at a signal level of 25 dB. Increasing the field strength by 20 dB to $E_1 = 0.2$ V/m, a level comparable to the receiver's E_{LO} field level, second and third harmonics emerge at frequencies (and signal levels) $f_2 = 200$ kHz (29.5 dB) and $f_3 = 300$ kHz (12.8 dB), respectively, as a result of harmonic mixing of the tone and local oscillator fields by the non-linear atomic medium. The bottom plot of Figure 3 shows the received signal power at f_1 and the harmonic overtones f_2 and f_3 generated by the atomic receiver as a function of electric field E_1 of the applied tone F_1 in units of dBV/m. The field is calibrated using the receiver Rydberg atoms. A linear fit to the measured f_1 response over the applied field range $E_1 < -20$ dBV/m gives a slope of $P_{out}(\text{dBm})/E_1(\text{dBV/m})=0.924\pm 0.016$, as expected for the first-order fundamental response, and allowing the designation of the P1dB compression point at an F_1 field strength equal to $E_1=-13.6$ dBV/m. Similarly, we measure linear slopes for the f_2 second harmonic and f_3 third harmonic overtones to be 1.75 ± 0.05 and 2.8 ± 0.15 , respectively, in good agreement with expected values of 2 and 3. The second order intercept (IP2) and third order intercept (IP3) of the harmonic distortion products are also obtained, and nearly coincide at the F_1 field strength of $E_1=12.5$ dBV/m.




FIG. 3. Top: Power spectra of the receiver response measured on the SA for a single tone F_1 applied at the vapor cell with electric-field amplitudes $E_1 = 0.021$ V/m (-33.5 dBV/m)(orange) and 0.209 V/m (-13.5 dBV/m)(blue). Bottom: Measured receiver power for f_i fundamental and higher harmonics $i = 1, 2$, and 3 as a function of applied tone E_1 field in units of dBV/m. Linear slopes (dashed lines), the measured f_1 P1dB compression point at $E_1 = -13.6$ dBV/m (vertical solid line), and f_2 and f_3 IP2=12.5 and IP3=14.0 dBV/m intercept points are indicated.

V. TWO-TONE TESTING: INTERMODULATION DISTORTION

Next we investigate the non-linear response of the atomic receiver for inter-modulation distortion in the presence of an additional interfering signal tone. We perform two-tone atomic receiver testing following the setup shown in Figure 1 by simultaneously applying F_1 , as before, and a second F_2 to the atomic receiver configured to operate at a fixed $F_{LO} = 9.9376$ GHz. The response of the atomic receiver to the tones and resulting intermodulation products are observed directly at the IF on the SA, where the applied F_1 and F_2 tones each get simultaneously demodulated by the Rydberg atoms and reference F_{LO} field to their respective IF at f_1 and f_2 . We investigate two different conditions for the applied tones: (1) $\Delta F/F = 10^{-6}$, where $\Delta F = F_2 - F_1 = 10$ kHz for $F_1 = +100$ kHz, with both tones at approximately the 6 dB IF bandwidth of the receiver (see Figure 2 and Table I) and (2) $\Delta F/F = 10^{-4}$, where $\Delta F = F_2 - F_1 = 1$ MHz for $F_1 = +100$ kHz, with the second tone at a comparably higher frequency at the 22 dB

IF bandwidth, well outside of the resonant line shape shown in Figure 2(a). In all cases the field amplitudes of both tones are equal.

A. Intermodulation distortion at $\Delta F/F = 10^{-6}$

To test IMD at $\Delta F/F = 10^{-6}$ we set $F_1 = 9.93770$ GHz, where $f_1 = F_1 - F_{LO} = 100$ kHz and $F_2 = 9.93771$ GHz where $f_2 = F_2 - F_{LO} = 110$ kHz producing two simultaneous IF responses at $f_1 = 100$ kHz and $f_2 = 110$ kHz, with a two-tone frequency separation of $\Delta F = F_2 - F_1 = 10$ kHz and a relative frequency separation of $\Delta F/F = 10^{-6}$. Figure 4 shows the results of this two-tone measurement. In (a) we show an IMD-map that is constructed by monitoring each of the detected IMD peaks in the IF range spanning from 10 kHz to 300 kHz (x-axis) for a selection of applied RF electric field strengths at the atoms' location for the two tones F_1 and F_2 (y-axis). Each dot on the IMD-map represents a detected peak on the SA, and the size of the dot indicates the relative signal strength for that peak. The color code of the peaks in the IMD-map is chosen such that the fundamental peaks (F_1 and F_2) are black, second-order IMD peaks are red, third-order ones are yellow, fourth-order ones are light-green, fifth-order ones are dark-green, sixth order ones are cyan, eighth order ones are purple, and peaks that represent IMD of orders higher than 8 are gray. This color notation will be used throughout this paper. Here, we observe that intermodulation starts to develop as the electric field strength increases. The plot in (b) is a cut out of two traces from the map in a), showing the spectral response of the atomic signal for two different electric field strengths of F_1 and F_2 . The intermodulation peaks are indexed as $(n_1$ and $n_2)$ such the IMD peak order can be identified by the peak frequency in the IF spectra by $f_{n_1, n_2} = n_1 \times f_1 + n_2 \times f_2$ where the order of the IMD is given by $N = |n_1| + |n_2|$. For example, the first peak labeled $(-1, 1)$ represents a second-order IMD ($N = 2$) and shows up at $f_{-1, 1} = 10$ kHz, and the second peak labeled $(-2, 2)$ represents a fourth-order IMD ($N = 4$) and shows up at $f_{-2, 2} = 20$ kHz. The index scheme will also be used throughout this paper and the IMD peaks will be colored using the previously described color scheme. In this plot we can clearly identify the IMD peaks up to the 8th order ($f_{4, -4}$).

The bottom plot in (c) shows the detected signal strength of the fundamental peaks and the two strongest 3rd order IMD ($f_{2, -1} = 90$ kHz and $f_{-1, 2} = 120$ kHz) as function of electric field strength. The vertical line in the plot serves as a reference marking the LO field signal strength. The dashed lines represent a linear fit of the data within the range before saturation ($E_1 = E_2 < -20$ dBV/m). For the fundamental response at f_1 and f_2 , we observe a near-linear behavior with slopes of 0.97 ± 0.03 and 0.92 ± 0.03 , respectively, and a P1dB compression point at -20(-22) dBm for $f_1(f_2)$. The corresponding RF electric fields of the two tones at the P1dB compression points are approximately -15.5 dBV/m. The observed slopes are close to a slope of 1, as expected for fundamental tones in classical receivers. Regarding the selected intermodulation peaks in the plot ($f_{2, -1} = 90$ kHz and $f_{-1, 2} = 120$ kHz), the linear fit indicates a slope of 2.1 ± 0.08 , which is suppressed relative to the expected slope of 3 for classical RF systems. We attribute these differences in the atomic heterodyne receiver to the non-linear responses and multi-wave mixing effects present in the quantum Rydberg EIT system, which are anticipated to exhibit deviations from classical RF electronics. From the fit we measured an IP3 = 2.7 dBV/m. It is imperative to emphasize that these additional peaks are not attributable to any electronics artifact in the detection or on the back-end of the receiver. Rather, they solely arise as the high-order effects of the atoms themselves. In RF heterodyne measurements, the atoms experience the RF electric fields from the LO and the signal (F_1 and F_2) fields. According to the superposition principle of electromagnetism in free space, the electric-field amplitudes due to multiple field components are a linear sum over all components. As is commonly the case, harmonic generation and IMD arise as a result of nonlinear response of an element (which may be a diode, an amplifier, or a receiver system) at high electric fields. In the present case, it is the nonlinear response of the atomic EIT medium to the electric field that gives rise to harmonic generation and IMD.

B. Inter-modulation distortion at $\Delta F/F = 10^{-4}$

We also tested IMD at $\Delta F/F = 10^{-4}$ by keeping $F_{LO} = 9.93760$ GHz and $F_1 = 9.93770$ GHz, but setting the frequency of the second tone near the end of the receiver's linear response (refer to Figure 2), $F_2 = 9.93871$ GHz. This increases f_2 to 1.110 MHz and leads to an absolute frequency separation of $\Delta F = F_2 - F_1 = 1.01$ MHz. Figure 5 shows the results for the two-tone measurement with $\Delta F/F = 10^{-4}$. Figure 5 (a) shows an IMD-map that illustrates all the IMD peaks in the IF band as a function of the F_1 and F_2 electric field strengths at the atoms' location (as defined previously). In this plot we show that the atomic vapor continues to mix down the applied tones to two intermediate frequencies f_1 and f_2 . In comparison with the results in Figure 4 (a), we observe fewer peaks. This difference is a result of the large ΔF , which allows only a few IMD frequencies (f_{n_1, n_2}) within the atomic IF response bandwidth. For instance, for the $\Delta F/F = 10^{-6}$ case in Sec. V A the 6th-order IMD peak $f_{-3, 3}$ occurs at 30 kHz,




FIG. 4. Atomic receiver two-tone testing at $\Delta F/F = 10^{-6}$: (a) IMD-map showing the intermodulation peaks in the IF range spanning from 10 kHz to 300 kHz (x-axis) for a selection of applied RF electric field for the two tones F_1 and F_2 (y-axis). The dot size and color scheme are explained in the text. (b) Power spectra of the receiver response in the IF measured on the SA (1 kHz RBW) for two tone strengths $F_1=9.93770$ GHz and $F_2=9.93771$ GHz applied at the vapor cell with electric-field amplitudes $E_1 = -5.5$ dBV/m (orange) and $E_2 = -15.5$ dBV/m (blue). The peak indexing scheme is explained in the text. (c) Receiver IF output power in dBm versus two-tone applied electric field $E_1 = E_2$ in dBV/m for the fundamental products (1,0) and (0,1) and third-order IMD (2,-1) at $f_{2,-1} = 90$ kHz and (-1,2) at $f_{(-1,2)} = 120$ kHz. Linear fits are indicated in dashed lines, yielding the measured P1dB = $-17.5(-15.5)$ dBV/m for $f_1(f_2)$, IP3 = 2.7 dBV/m for $f_{-1,2}$ to f_1 , and Figure of Merit FoM = IP3-P1dB = 20.2 dB.

which is well within the atomic IF bandwidth, whereas in the present $\Delta F/F = 10^{-4}$ case the same IMD peak is at 3.030 MHz, which is outside of the atomic IF bandwidth (table I).

In the measurement presented in Figure 5, the two tones were set to have the same electric field strength, but the fundamental tones f_1 and f_2 differ in signal strength, with the signal at f_2 being 10 dB lower than f_1 . This finding is in good qualitative agreement with Figure 2(c), which shows approximately 10 dB drop in IF response between 100 kHz and 1 MHz. Figure 5(b) shows a selection of two SA traces, displaying the spectral response of the atomic signal for two different electric field strengths of the signals at F_1 and F_2 , with the IMD peaks labeled as defined previously. In this plot, we observe IMD products up to the 5th order ($f_{-3,2} = 1920$ kHz).

Figure 5(c) shows the detected signal strength of the fundamental peaks and the two strongest 3rd-order IMDs




FIG. 5. Atomic receiver two-tone testing at $\Delta F/F = 10^{-4}$: (a) IMD-map showing the intermodulation peaks in the IF range spanning from 10 kHz to 2.300 kHz (x-axis) for a selection of applied RF electric fields for the two tones $F_1 = 9.93770$ GHz and $F_2 = 9.93871$ GHz (y-axis). (b) Power spectra of the receiver response in the IF measured on the SA (1 kHz RBW) for two values of the electric-field amplitude $E_{low} = -15.5$ dBV/m (red) and $E_{high} = -5.5$ dBV/m (orange). The peaks indexing scheme is explained in the text. (c) Receiver IF output power in dBm versus two-tone applied electric field $E_1 = E_2$ in dBV/m for the fundamental products (1,0) and (0,1) and the third-order IMD (-2,1) at $f_{-2,1} = 910$ kHz and (-1,2) $f_{-1,2} = 2120$ kHz. Here, the RBW is 1 Hz. Linear fits are indicated in dashed lines, yielding the measured P1dB = $-16.5(-15.5)$ dBV/m for $f_1(f_2)$, IP3 = 19.3(11.9) dBV/m for $f_{-2,1}$ to $f_1(f_2)$, and Figure of Merit FoM = IP3-P1dB ≈ 35 dB.

($f_{-2,1} = 910$ kHz and $f_{-1,2} = 2120$ kHz) as a function of electric field strength. The vertical line in the plot marks the field of the LO. The dashed lines show linear fits of the data in the sub-saturation regime $E_1 = E_2 < -20$ dBV/m; the fits are extrapolated to the right margin of the plot. In the regime $E_1 = E_2 \lesssim -20$ dBV/m, we observe a near-linear behavior for the fundamental response at f_1 and f_2 , with slopes of 0.87 ± 0.01 and 0.91 ± 0.02 , respectively, which is near the expected value of 1. The P1dB compression points correspond to RF electric fields of the two tones equal to -16.5 and -15.5 dBV/m for f_1 and f_2 , respectively. For both 3rd-order IMD peaks selected in Figure 5 (c), the linear fits have slopes of 1.6 ± 0.2 , which is significantly less than our finding in the analogous measurements at

$\Delta F/F = 10^{-6}$ in Figure 4 (c). We also recall, for comparison, that for 3^{rd} -order IMD in classical RF systems a slope of 3 would be expected. Again, we attribute this difference to the quantum nature of the Rydberg receiver.

The IP3 points for the $\Delta F/F = 10^{-4}$ measurements in Figure 5 (c) are determined to be 19.3 dBV/m and 11.9 dBV/m for f_1 and f_2 , respectively. It is noteworthy that these values are fairly large: they contrast with analogous measurements at $\Delta F/F = 10^{-6}$ in Figure 4 (c), where we found an IP3 as low as 2.7 dBV/m. In view of our finding regarding the slopes of the 3^{rd} -order IMDs (see previous paragraph), this difference is largely attributed to the comparatively small slope of the 3^{rd} -order IMD found for $\Delta F/F = 10^{-4}$. A smaller slope of the 3^{rd} -order IMD pushes the IP3 points farther out. Moreover, for $\Delta F/F = 10^{-4}$ [Figure 5 (c)] the IP3 for f_2 is about 7 dB lower than for f_1 . We attribute this behavior to the fact that f_2 is near the atomic IF bandwidth, where the atomic response is reduced by about 10 dB relative to the response at f_1 , pushing the corresponding IP3 to a lower value.

In classical RF systems, IMD is quantified by the power ratio between the fundamental and the 3^{rd} -order IMD responses. The spur-free dynamic range (SFDR) of a receiver is given by $\frac{2}{3}(\text{IP3}_{out}-N_0)$, where N_0 is the noise floor of the non-linear or harmonic component [36] at 1 Hz resolution bandwidth (RBW) on the SA, and IP3_{out} is the output power at the IP3 point. In Figure 5 (c), for f_1 and the 3^{rd} -order IMD we read, on the y-axis, an IP3_{out} of -34 dBm. Also, the SA noise floor was $N_0=-121$ dBm (not shown in the figure). We therefore determine a SFDR of the atomic receiver of $\frac{2}{3}(\text{IP3}-N_0)=58$ dB.

To benchmark the IMD performance of the atomic quantum receiver to that of a typical classical receiver, we introduce a figure of merit for distortion, defined as the difference between the IP3 and P1dB compression point as $\text{FoM}=\text{IP3}-\text{P1dB}$, where IP3 and P1dB are read on the input (x-axis) in Figure 5 (c). This metric quantifies the additional signal strength that would have to be applied to the input of the receiver (whether classical or quantum) before a third-order non-linear response would become significant relative to the receiver's compression point. From Figure 5 (c), we measure a FOM for the atomic receiver of approximately 35 dB, which compares favorably to many classical low-noise amplifiers (LNAs) at 10 GHz. These LNAs typically exhibit a distortion FoM of 12 dB or less (see, for example, commercial devices from Mini-Circuits part No. ZX60-06183LN+ or Pasternack part No. PE15A1032). An illustrative third order IMD response ($f_{-2,1}$) for the a classical LNA with a $\text{FoM}=12$ dB is overlaid in Figure 5 (c) in the red line.

There are two important distinctions to keep in mind in the above comparisons. First, the atomic receiver measures over-the-air free-space RF signal waves, while LNAs process electronic RF signals. Second, not unrelated to the first, the FoM comparison uses a relative metric and does not provide an absolute RF signal metric measurable as a FoM for distortion by both receiver types. Obtaining an absolute signal RF field metric that can be compared for both receiver types would require specific assumptions about the antenna aperture or similar transducer used to convert a free-space RF signal field to an analogous the RF electric signal input into an LNA. Since the antenna transducer details vary substantially for different antenna types and applications of interest, it is not incorporated in the comparison presented in our paper. Generally, and without regard to the front-end antenna used, the atomic quantum receivers can exhibit a greater tolerance to nearby interference signals compared to classical LNAs within their respective dynamic ranges [37].

VI. DISCUSSION

The non-linear behavior of atomic receivers described in this work are notably unlike those of classical LNAs and electronic systems in that they incorporate an atom-field interaction that is ultimately tied to the invariable atomic structure and fundamental physical constants. Moreover, the types of EIT schemes[38–40], the intensities of the optical EIT-readout beams[41–45], and the atomic vapor-cell conditions play a role[46–48]. As such, unlike their classical counterparts, the non-linear behaviors of atomic receivers are reproducible under user-determined conditions and can provide unique, controllable RF signatures on the receive-side for predetermined signal sources. This can be exploited to realize transmit-receive communications modalities for secure communications, RF fingerprinting, and other applications. As a basic example implementation, a physical encryption scheme may be employed using an atomic receiver in which the non-linear response of a two-tone local oscillator (e.g. output shown in Figure 4 can be switched between discrete spectra of higher-order products (e.g. by switching LO amplitudes and frequencies). The switching between spectra can serve as a coding algorithm to, for example, provide a physical frequency hop table selector in the receiver for an incident RF waveform with FHSS modulation.

CONCLUSION

In our study, we have presented a first comprehensive characterization of harmonic and inter-modulation distortion behavior in atomic receivers. Through two-tone testing conducted in the SHF band, utilizing tones resonant to an

Autler-Townes transition between Rydberg atoms in the atomic-receiver medium, we have observed IMD of orders higher than 6, measured the dependence of the harmonics and IMD peaks with incident RF power, obtained crucial metrics such as P1dB and IP3 points, and characterized the dynamic range and spur-free dynamic range of the system. Our results have unveiled a remarkable suppression of harmonic and IMD in atomic receivers under specific operating conditions, diverging from the behavior one would expect for classical receivers. Our observations highlight the unique and advantageous properties of atomic receivers in mitigating nonlinear effects. In addition, we have described the nature of non-linear behaviors exhibited by atomic receivers and have proposed their exploitation in various applications, including secure signal reception and innovative communication schemes. The findings in our work pave the way for the development of robust and versatile atomic receiver technologies with wide-ranging applications.

-
- [1] C. S. Adams, J. D. Pritchard, and J. P. Shaffer, Rydberg atom quantum technologies, *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics* **53**, 012002 (2019).
- [2] D. A. Anderson, G. Raithel, T. Nithiwadee, S. A. Miller, and A. Schwarzkopf, Atom-based electromagnetic radiation electric-field and power sensor, Patent US 9,970,973 B2 (2017).
- [3] D. A. Anderson, G. Raithel, E. G. Paradis, and R. E. Sapiro, Atom-based electromagnetic field sensing element and measurement system, Patent US20190187198A1 (2018).
- [4] B. Liu, L. Zhang, Z. Liu, Z. Deng, D. Ding, B. Shi, and G. Guo, Electric field measurement and application based on rydberg atoms, *Electromagnetic Science* **1**, 1 (2023).
- [5] D. A. Anderson, R. E. Sapiro, and G. Raithel, A self-calibrated si-traceable rydberg atom-based radio frequency electric field probe and measurement instrument, *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation* **69**, 5931 (2021).
- [6] S. Kumar, H. Fan, H. Kübler, J. Sheng, and J. P. Shaffer, Atom-based sensing of weak radio frequency electric fields using homodyne readout, *Scientific reports* **7**, 42981 (2017).
- [7] D.-S. Ding, Z.-K. Liu, B.-S. Shi, G.-C. Guo, K. Mølmer, and C. S. Adams, Enhanced metrology at the critical point of a many-body rydberg atomic system, *Nature Physics* **18**, 1447 (2022).
- [8] C. L. Holloway, J. A. Gordon, A. Schwarzkopf, D. A. Anderson, S. A. Miller, N. Thaicharoen, and G. Raithel, Sub-wavelength imaging and field mapping via electromagnetically induced transparency and autler-townes splitting in rydberg atoms, *Applied Physics Letters* **104**, 244102 (2014).
- [9] S. A. Miller, D. A. Anderson, and G. Raithel, Radio-frequency-modulated rydberg states in a vapor cell, *New Journal of Physics* **18**, 053017 (2016).
- [10] G. Allinson, M. J. Jamieson, A. R. Mackellar, L. Downes, C. S. Adams, and K. J. Weatherill, Simultaneous multiband radio-frequency detection using high-orbital-angular-momentum states in a rydberg-atom receiver, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **6**, 023317 (2024).
- [11] D. A. Anderson, E. Paradis, G. Raithel, R. E. Sapiro, and C. L. Holloway, High-resolution antenna near-field imaging and sub-thz measurements with a small atomic vapor-cell sensing element, in *2018 11th Global Symposium on Millimeter Waves (GSMM)* (2018) pp. 1–3.
- [12] C. Holloway, J. Gordon, S. Jefferts, A. Schwarzkopf, D. Anderson, S. Miller, N. Thaicharoen, and G. Raithel, Broadband rydberg atom-based electric-field probe for si-traceable, self-calibrated measurements, *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation* **62**, 6169 (2014).
- [13] D. A. Anderson, A. Schwarzkopf, S. A. Miller, N. Thaicharoen, G. Raithel, J. A. Gordon, and C. L. Holloway, Two-photon microwave transitions and strong-field effects in a room-temperature rydberg-atom gas, *Phys. Rev. A* **90**, 043419 (2014).
- [14] E. Paradis, G. Raithel, and D. A. Anderson, Atomic measurements of high-intensity vhf-band radio-frequency fields with a rydberg vapor-cell detector, *Phys. Rev. A* **100**, 013420 (2019).
- [15] M. T. Simons, M. D. Kautz, C. L. Holloway, D. A. Anderson, G. Raithel, D. Stack, M. C. St. John, and W. Su, Electromagnetically Induced Transparency (EIT) and Autler-Townes (AT) splitting in the presence of band-limited white Gaussian noise, *Journal of Applied Physics* **123**, 203105 (2018), <https://pubs.aip.org/aip/jap/article-pdf/doi/10.1063/1.5020173/15210478/203105.1.online.pdf>.
- [16] D. A. Anderson, G. Raithel, M. Simons, and C. L. Holloway, Quantum-optical spectroscopy for plasma electric field measurements and diagnostics, arXiv:1712.08717 (2017).
- [17] D. Anderson, R. Sapiro, L. Gonçalves, R. Cardman, and G. Raithel, Optical radio-frequency phase measurement with an internal-state rydberg atom interferometer, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **17**, 044020 (2022).
- [18] M. T. Simons, A. H. Haddab, J. A. Gordon, and C. L. Holloway, A rydberg atom-based mixer: Measuring the phase of a radio frequency wave, *Applied Physics Letters* **114**, 114101 (2019), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5088821>.
- [19] M. Jing, Y. Hu, J. Ma, H. Zhang, L. Zhang, L. Xiao, and S. Jia, Atomic superheterodyne receiver based on microwave-dressed rydberg spectroscopy, *Nat. Phys.* **16**, 911–915 (2020).
- [20] R. Legaie, G. Raithel, and D. A. Anderson, A millimeter-wave atomic receiver, *AVS Quantum Science* **6**, 024402 (2024), https://pubs.aip.org/avs/aqs/article-pdf/doi/10.1116/5.0173654/19870078/024402_1.5.0173654.pdf.
- [21] D. A. Anderson and G. Raithel, Continuous-frequency measurements of high-intensity microwave electric fields with atomic vapor cells, *Applied Physics Letters* **111**, 053504 (2017), <http://dx.doi.org/10.1063/1.4996234>.
- [22] S. Berweger, N. Prajapati, A. B. Artusio-Glimpse, A. P. Rotunno, R. Brown, C. L. Holloway, M. T. Simons, E. Imhof, S. R. Jefferts, B. N. Kayim, M. A. Viray, R. Wyllie, B. C. Sawyer, and T. G. Walker, Rydberg-state engineering: Investigations

- of tuning schemes for continuous frequency sensing, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **19**, 044049 (2023).
- [23] D. H. Meyer, J. C. Hill, P. D. Kunz, and K. C. Cox, Simultaneous multiband demodulation using a rydberg atomic sensor, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **19**, 014025 (2023).
- [24] D. A. Anderson, R. E. Sapiro, and G. Raithel, An atomic receiver for am and fm radio communication, *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation* **69**, 2455 (2021).
- [25] D. A. Anderson, R. E. Sapiro, and G. Raithel, Rydberg atoms for radio-frequency communications and sensing: Atomic receivers for pulsed rf field and phase detection, *IEEE Aerospace and Electronic Systems Magazine* **35**, 48 (2020).
- [26] D. H. Meyer, K. C. Cox, F. K. Fatemi, and P. D. Kunz, Digital communication with rydberg atoms and amplitude-modulated microwave fields, *Applied Physics Letters* **112**, 211108 (2018).
- [27] A. B. Deb and N. Kjærgaard, Radio-over-fiber using an optical antenna based on rydberg states of atoms, *Applied Physics Letters* **112**, 211106 (2018), <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.5031033>.
- [28] C. L. Holloway, M. T. Simons, A. H. Haddab, J. A. Gordon, and S. D. Voran, A multiple-band rydberg-atom based receiver/antenna: Am/fm stereo reception, arXiv:1903.00786 [physics.atom-ph] (2019).
- [29] Z.-K. Liu, L.-H. Zhang, B. Liu, Z.-Y. Zhang, G.-C. Guo, D.-S. Ding, and B.-S. Shi, Deep learning enhanced rydberg multifrequency microwave recognition, *Nature Communications* **13** (2022).
- [30] R. Cardman, L. F. Gonçalves, R. E. Sapiro, G. Raithel, and D. A. Anderson, Atomic 2d electric field imaging of a yagi antenna near-field using a portable rydberg-atom probe and measurement instrument, *Advanced Optical Technologies* **9**, 305 (2020).
- [31] N. Schlossberger, N. Prajapati, S. Berweger, A. P. Rotunno, A. B. Artusio-Glimpse, M. T. Simons, A. A. Sheikh, E. B. Norrgard, S. P. Eckel, and C. L. Holloway, Rydberg states of alkali atoms in atomic vapour as si-traceable field probes and communications receivers, *Nature Reviews Physics* **6**, 606 (2024), see last figure.
- [32] D. A. Anderson, L. F. Gonçalves, G. Raithel, and J. Detlefs, Long-range wireless communication with a quantum radio based on rydberg atoms, in *2024 IEEE INC-USNC-URSI Radio Science Meeting (Joint with AP-S Symposium)* (2024) pp. 249–249.
- [33] Y. Ma, Y. Yamao, K. Ishibashi, and Y. Akaiwa, Adaptive compensation of inter-band modulation distortion for tunable concurrent dual-band receivers, *IEEE Transactions on Microwave Theory and Techniques* **61**, 4209 (2013).
- [34] M. Jing, Y. Hu, J. Ma, H. Zhang, L. Zhang, L. Xiao, and S. Jia, Atomic superheterodyne receiver based on microwave-dressed rydberg spectroscopy, *Nature Physics* **16**, 911 (2020).
- [35] D. A. Steck, Cesium d line data (2023).
- [36] D. M. Pozar, *Microwave and RF design of wireless systems* (John Wiley & Sons, 2000).
- [37] A. V. Padaki and J. H. Reed, Impact of intermodulation distortion on spectrum preclusion for dsa: A new figure of merit, in *2014 IEEE International Symposium on Dynamic Spectrum Access Networks (DYSpan)* (2014) pp. 358–361.
- [38] S. M. Bohachuk, F. Ripka, V. Venu, F. Christaller, C. Liu, M. Schmidt, H. Kübler, and J. P. Shaffer, Three-photon rydberg-atom-based radio-frequency sensing scheme with narrow linewidth, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **20**, L061004 (2023).
- [39] F. Giraldo, A. Kumar, T.-Y. Wu, P. Du, and D. S. Weiss, State-selective electromagnetically induced transparency for quantum error correction in neutral atom quantum computers, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 032425 (2022).
- [40] J. A. Sedlacek, A. Schwettmann, H. Kübler, R. Löw, T. Pfau, and J. P. Shaffer, Microwave electrometry with rydberg atoms in a vapour cell using bright atomic resonances, *Nature physics* **8**, 819 (2012).
- [41] R. Sapiro, G. Raithel, and D. Anderson, Time dependence of rydberg eit in pulsed optical and rf fields, *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics* **53**, 094003 (2020).
- [42] H.-J. Su, J.-Y. Liou, I.-C. Lin, and Y.-H. Chen, Optimizing the rydberg eit spectrum in a thermal vapor, *Optics Express* **30**, 1499 (2022).
- [43] J. Ningyuan, A. Georgakopoulos, A. Ryou, N. Schine, A. Sommer, and J. Simon, Observation and characterization of cavity rydberg polaritons, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 041802 (2016).
- [44] J. Sheng, Y. Chao, S. Kumar, H. Fan, J. Sedlacek, and J. P. Shaffer, Intracavity rydberg-atom electromagnetically induced transparency using a high-finesse optical cavity, *Phys. Rev. A* **96**, 033813 (2017).
- [45] R. Mao, Y. Lin, A. Zhou, K. Yang, and Y. Fu, Shortwave ultra-high sensitivity rydberg atomic electric field sensing based on a subminiature resonator, *IEEE Transactions on Antennas and Propagation* (2024).
- [46] H. Fan, S. Kumar, J. Sheng, J. P. Shaffer, C. L. Holloway, and J. A. Gordon, Effect of vapor-cell geometry on rydberg-atom-based measurements of radio-frequency electric fields, *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **4**, 044015 (2015).
- [47] B. Wu, J. Yao, F. Wu, Q. An, and Y. Fu, Dependence of rydberg-atom-based sensor performance on different rydberg atom populations in one atomic-vapor cell, *Chinese Physics B* **33**, 024205 (2024).
- [48] Z. Song, W. Zhang, Q. Wu, H. Mu, X. Liu, L. Zhang, and J. Qu, Field distortion and optimization of a vapor cell in rydberg atom-based radio-frequency electric field measurement, *Sensors* **18**, 3205 (2018).