

Exact solution of quantum dynamics of a cantilever coupling to a single trapped ultracold ion.

T. Liu¹, M. Feng^{1,2} and K.L. Wang^{1,3}

1. *The School of Science, Southwest University of Science and Technology, Mianyang 621002, China*

2. *State Key Laboratory of Magnetic Resonance and Atomic and Molecular Physics,*

Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan 430070, China

3. *The Department of Modern Physics, University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei 230026, China*

Abstract The quantum behavior of a precooled cantilever can be probed highly efficiently by coupling to a trapped ultracold ion, in which a fast cooling of the cantilever down to the ground vibrational state is possible. We solve the dynamics of the coupling system by a squeezed-state expansion technique, and can in principle obtain the exact solution of the time-evolution of the coupling system. Compared to the treatment under rotating-wave approximation, we can present a more accurate description of the quantum behavior of the cantilever.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Vk, 61.46.+w, 62.25.+g

I Introduction

With recent rapid progress in microfabrication technology, quantum electromechanical systems (QEMS), with nano- to micro-meter scale mechanical resonator electrostatically coupled to comparably sized electrical devices, have been drawn much attention [1]. Typical QEMS include the cantilever with the suspended beam clamped at one end, the bridge with suspended beam clamped at both ends, the single electron transistor, and so on [2,3]. Recent research has shown that under the proper temperature and vacuum conditions, the quantum behavior of the QEMS can be evidenced by the coupled electrical devices.

Besides its own interest, QEMS is playing more and more important role in the context of quantum information processing (QIP). We have noticed an idea [4] for QIP with coupled trapped ion to a high Q nanomechanical resonator. Under certain conditions, the two component subsystems interact and yield energy exchange, entanglement and quantum gating. This is a promising way towards large scale QIP. Moreover, readout of individual qubits is very challenging in solid-state QIP, which is resulted from the difficulty of the single spin detection. A recent breakthrough in this respect is the detection of a single unpaired electron spin on the surface of silicon dioxide by magnetic resonance force microscopy [5], which is actually a QEMS. Another QEMS – single electron transistor based on a fullerene [6] also provides a promising way towards readout of qubits in fullerene-based QIP [7]. Furthermore, the superconducting quantum interference device, also a typical QEMS, has already reached single-spin sensitivity [8], based on which a readout of qubit can be carried out [9].

In this paper, we focus on the dynamics of a coupling system involving a very small doubly clamped cantilever (- a nonomechanical resonator as mentioned in [4]) and a single trapped ultracold ion, which has originally been studied in [10]. Our work can also be applied to [4] since

there are many things overlapping between [4] and [10]. One of the purpose in [10] is to highly efficiently probe the vibration of a cantilever precooled to 4 Kelvin, through a coupled trapped ultracold ion based on the fact that (1) the two component subsystems can be coupled and decoupled at will by adjusting the bias gate voltage and (2) the detection of the quantum vibration of the trapped ion can be made by sophisticated optical methods – radiation with blue or red detuned laser [11] and the electric shelving amplification [12]. To reach the goal, the proposal in [10] is made by three steps. The first step is to switch on the coupling of the cantilever to the ion. At a suitable time point when the vibration of the cantilever is fully transferred to that of the ion, the coupling is switched off and the red or blue detuned laser will be on to couple the vibrational and the internal degrees of freedom of the ion. The last step is to read out the vibrational quanta by detecting the internal levels of the ion.

The other purpose in [10] is to fast cool the cantilever down to the ground vibrational state. The numerical calculation in [10] has shown the highly efficient transfer of the energy from the cantilever to the ion. So the cantilever reaches its ground vibrational state only after a half coupling period.

The focus of the present paper is to exactly solve the dynamics of the coupling system consisting of a cantilever and an ion by a squeezed-state expansion technique. We consider the decay effect of the quantum vibrations of the cantilever and the ion due to the thermal environment, and will present a more accurate time evolution of the coupling system compared to the solution in [10] under the rotating-wave approximation (RWA).

II The solution by squeezed-state expansion technique

Starting from [10], we consider the first step by switching on the coupling between the cantilever and the trapped ion, which yields the following Hamiltonian in units of $\hbar = 1$,

$$H = (\omega - i\Gamma_a)a^\dagger a + (\nu - i\Gamma_b)b^\dagger b - \kappa(a + a^\dagger)(b + b^\dagger), \quad (1)$$

where ω and ν are vibrational frequencies of the cantilever and the trapped ion, respectively, and κ is the coupling constant between the two vibrational degrees of freedom. Γ_a and Γ_b are the decay coefficients regarding the vibrations of the cantilever and the trapped ion, respectively. We assume a trial solution of the wavefunction

$$|t\rangle = \rho(t)e^{\alpha_1(t)a^\dagger a^\dagger + \alpha_2(t)a^\dagger b^\dagger + \alpha_3(t)b^\dagger b^\dagger} |0\rangle = \rho(t) |A(t)\rangle, \quad (2)$$

which yields the Schrödinger equation of Eq. (1) as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} & i[\dot{\rho}(t) + \rho(t)\dot{\alpha}_1(t)a^\dagger a^\dagger + \rho(t)\dot{\alpha}_2(t)a^\dagger b^\dagger + \rho(t)\dot{\alpha}_3(t)b^\dagger b^\dagger] |A(t)\rangle \\ & = \rho(t)\{2(\omega - i\Gamma_a)\alpha_1(t)a^\dagger a^\dagger + (\omega - i\Gamma_a)\alpha_2(t)a^\dagger b^\dagger \\ & + (\nu - i\Gamma_b)\alpha_2(t)a^\dagger b^\dagger + 2(\nu - i\Gamma_b)\alpha_3(t)b^\dagger b^\dagger \\ & - \kappa[\alpha_2(t) + [2\alpha_1(t)\alpha_2(t) + \alpha_2(t)]a^\dagger a^\dagger + [2\alpha_2(t)\alpha_3(t) + \alpha_2(t)]b^\dagger b^\dagger \\ & + [1 + \alpha_2^2(t) + 4\alpha_1(t)\alpha_3(t) + 2\alpha_1(t) + 2\alpha_3(t)]a^\dagger b^\dagger\} |A(t)\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

Comparing the terms of $|A(t)\rangle, a^+ a^+ |A(t)\rangle, a^+ b^+ |A(t)\rangle, b^+ b^+ |A(t)\rangle$ in both sides of the equation, we obtain a set of equations,

$$i\dot{\rho}(t) = -\kappa\alpha_2(t)\rho(t), \quad (4)$$

$$i\dot{\alpha}_1(t) = 2(\omega - i\Gamma_a)\alpha_1(t) - \kappa\alpha_2(t) - 2\kappa\alpha_2(t)\alpha_1(t), \quad (5)$$

$$i\dot{\alpha}_2(t) = (\omega + \nu - i\Gamma_a - i\Gamma_b)\alpha_2(t) - \kappa - \kappa\alpha_2^2(t) - 4\kappa\alpha_1(t)\alpha_3(t) - 2\kappa\alpha_1(t) - 2\kappa\alpha_3(t) \quad (6)$$

$$i\dot{\alpha}_3(t) = 2(\nu - i\Gamma_b)\alpha_3(t) - \kappa\alpha_2(t) - 2\kappa\alpha_2(t)\alpha_3(t). \quad (7)$$

From the initial condition $\alpha_2(0) = 0, \alpha_3(0) = 0$, and $\langle t=0 | t=0 \rangle = 1$, we have

$$\frac{\rho(0)^2}{\sqrt{(1-4|\alpha_1(0)|^2)}} = 1, \quad (8)$$

where the proof of Eq. (8) is put in Appendix I. Another initial condition is for the initial vibrational population of the cantilever, i.e., $\langle t=0 | a^+ a | t=0 \rangle = N_a$. With similar algebra to Eq. (8), we obtain

$$\frac{\rho(0)^2}{(1-4|\alpha_1(0)|^2)^{3/2}} - 1 = N_a. \quad (9)$$

Eqs. (8) and (9) result in $\rho(0) = \pm(N_a + 1)^{-1/4}$ and $\alpha_1(0) = \pm \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N_a}{(N_a + 1)}}$, from which we

can straightforwardly obtain the exact dynamics of the coupling system by solving Eqs. (4)- (7). Before doing the numerics, however, for a comparison, we would like to solve the Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) under RWA by the same technique we used above. For a Hamiltonian

$$H = (\omega - i\Gamma_a)a^+ a + (\nu - i\Gamma_b)b^+ b - \kappa(ab^+ + a^+ b), \quad (10)$$

where the counter-rotating-wave terms are removed due to the approximation that rapid oscillating terms resulted by large detuning between the two vibrational degrees of freedom can be effectively averaged out in the calculation in the case of weak coupling. If we still assume Eq. (2) to be the trial solution of the wavefunction, we have the Schrödinger equation

$$\begin{aligned} & i\dot{\rho}(t) + \rho(t)\dot{\alpha}_1(t)a^+ a^+ + \rho(t)\dot{\alpha}_2(t)a^+ b^+ + \rho(t)\dot{\alpha}_3(t)b^+ b^+ |A(t)\rangle \\ & = \rho(t)[2(\omega - i\Gamma_a)\alpha_1(t)a^+ a^+ + (\omega - i\Gamma_a)\alpha_2(t)a^+ b^+ \\ & + (\nu - i\Gamma_b)\alpha_2(t)a^+ b^+ + 2(\nu - i\Gamma_b)\alpha_3(t)b^+ b^+ \\ & - 2\kappa\alpha_1(t)a^+ b^+ - \kappa\alpha_2(t)b^+ b^+ \\ & - 2\kappa\alpha_3(t)a^+ b^+ - \kappa\alpha_2(t)a^+ a^+] |A(t)\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which yields

$$i\dot{\rho}(t) = 0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \rho(t) = \rho(0) \quad , \quad (12)$$

$$i\dot{\alpha}_1(t) = 2(\omega - i\Gamma_a)\alpha_1(t) - \kappa\alpha_2(t) \quad , \quad (13)$$

$$i\dot{\alpha}_2(t) = (\omega + \nu - i\Gamma_a - i\Gamma_b)\alpha_2(t) - 2\kappa\alpha_1(t) - 2\kappa\alpha_3(t) \quad , \quad (14)$$

$$i\dot{\alpha}_3(t) = 2(\nu - i\Gamma_b)\alpha_3(t) - \kappa\alpha_2(t) \quad . \quad (15)$$

Different from the case in the absence of RWA, we can find analytical solutions from Eqs. (13) to (15). After the direct algebra shown in Appendix II, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1(t) &= \alpha_{10}^{(1)} e^{\Omega^{(1)}t} + \alpha_{10}^{(2)} e^{\Omega^{(2)}t} + \alpha_{10}^{(3)} e^{\Omega^{(3)}t} \quad , \\ \alpha_2(t) &= \alpha_{20}^{(1)} e^{\Omega^{(1)}t} + \alpha_{20}^{(2)} e^{\Omega^{(2)}t} + \alpha_{20}^{(3)} e^{\Omega^{(3)}t} \quad , \\ \alpha_3(t) &= \alpha_{30}^{(1)} e^{\Omega^{(1)}t} + \alpha_{30}^{(2)} e^{\Omega^{(2)}t} + \alpha_{30}^{(3)} e^{\Omega^{(3)}t} \quad , \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{10}^{(1)} &= -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N_a}{N_a+1}} \frac{(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(2)})(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(3)})}{(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(1)})(\Omega^{(2)} - \Omega^{(1)})} \quad , \\ \alpha_{10}^{(2)} &= -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N_a}{N_a+1}} \frac{(2\nu - 2i\Gamma_b - i\Omega^{(2)})(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(3)})}{(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(2)})(\Omega^{(2)} - \Omega^{(1)})} \quad , \\ \alpha_{10}^{(3)} &= -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N_a}{N_a+1}} \frac{(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(2)})(2\nu - 2i\Gamma_b - i\Omega^{(3)})}{(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(1)})(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(2)})} \quad , \\ \alpha_{20}^{(1)} &= -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N_a}{N_a+1}} \frac{(2\nu - 2i\Gamma_b - i\Omega^{(1)})(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(2)})(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(3)})}{(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(1)})(\Omega^{(2)} - \Omega^{(1)})\kappa} \quad , \\ \alpha_{20}^{(2)} &= -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N_a}{N_a+1}} \frac{(2\nu - 2i\Gamma_b - i\Omega^{(2)})(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(3)})(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(2)})}{(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(2)})(\Omega^{(2)} - \Omega^{(1)})\kappa} \quad , \\ \alpha_{20}^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N_a}{N_a+1}} \frac{(2\nu - 2i\Gamma_b - i\Omega^{(3)})(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(3)})(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(2)})}{(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(2)})(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(1)})\kappa} \quad , \\ \alpha_{30}^{(1)} &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N_a}{N_a+1}} \frac{(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(2)})(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(3)})}{(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(1)})(\Omega^{(2)} - \Omega^{(1)})} \quad , \\ \alpha_{30}^{(2)} &= -\frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N_a}{N_a+1}} \frac{(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(2)})(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(3)})}{(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(2)})(\Omega^{(2)} - \Omega^{(1)})} \quad , \\ \alpha_{30}^{(3)} &= \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{N_a}{N_a+1}} \frac{(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(2)})(2\omega - 2i\Gamma_a - i\Omega^{(3)})}{(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(1)})(\Omega^{(3)} - \Omega^{(2)})} \quad . \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

III Discussion and conclusion

We consider an achieved cantilever with vibrational frequency 19.7 MHz [3] and assume the frequency of the ion's vibration to be 16 ~ 19.7 MHz. For simplicity, we fix the decay coefficients Γ_a , Γ_b to be $\nu/1000$. But the coupling strength κ will be changed in our calculation to check the difference between the treatments under RWA and non-RWA. Other initial conditions are $\bar{n}_a(0) = N_a = 6$ and $\bar{n}_b(0) = 0$. In terms of our method presented in last section, no matter under which conditions, i.e., under RWA or non-RWA, in order to obtain $\bar{n}_a(t)$ and $\bar{n}_b(t)$ by solving $|t\rangle$, we have to calculate $\alpha_1(t)$, $\alpha_2(t)$, $\alpha_3(t)$ and the initial conditions Eqs. (8) and (9). The numerical results in Figs. 1-5 present us following points:

1. When the two vibrational degrees of freedom are nearly resonant, i.e., $\omega \approx \nu$, the difference between the treatments under RWA and non-RWA is almost invisible in the case of very small coupling constants (i.e., $\kappa/\nu \leq 0.1$ in our calculation), as shown in Fig. 1. It can be well understood from the viewpoint of Jaynes and Cummings' seminal paper [13]: In this case, the counter-rotating terms are negligible and the RWA can be safely used. Our result also confirms the validity of the RWA employed in [4] and [10] because $\kappa/\nu \leq 0.1$ is satisfied there.
2. In the resonant case, i.e., $\omega \approx \nu$, a weak coupling between the two vibrational degrees of freedom could achieve a quick cooling of the cantilever down to the ground state by a half coupling period, even in the case of relatively large decay coefficients Γ_a and Γ_b .
3. To transfer the energy [4,10] or to make entanglement [4] with high fidelity, we prefer a large coupling κ . While with the increase of the coupling strength (i.e., $\kappa/\nu > 0.1$ in our calculation), the counter-rotating terms in the (near) resonant case is not negligible any more, and the RWA could not work well. This can be found in Fig. 2. To have a good transducer or to make high-quality quantum gates, we require the trapped ion to be decoupled from the cantilever at an exact time point. Therefore a non-RWA solution is essential to this situation. Particularly when the two component subsystems are strongly coupled in the (near) resonant case (See Fig. 3), our non-RWA treatment presents some typical quantum characteristics of the system, something like collapse and revival, which are neglected in the RWA treatment. In this case, the trapped ion is not suitable to be a prober or a cooler, but demonstrates some unpredictable behavior along with the cantilever in the evolution. These purely quantum mechanical behavior could be fully observed by detecting the trapped ion by the sophisticated electronic shelving amplification.
4. If the two vibrational degrees of freedom are detuned, as shown in Figs. 4 and 5, the trapped ion cannot be a prober and a fast cooler, and the cooling of the cantilever is done due to the decay. Our calculation without RWA clearly demonstrates this point, while the RWA treatment is somewhat misleading in the case of $\kappa = 10$, in which the trapped ion seems to be an approximately good cooler.

One point we should mention is that, we have only studied the first step in the proposal [10], because the second and the third steps have been well investigated by standard approaches. According to [10], after the vibrational quanta has been fully transferred to the ion, we switch off the coupling κ , and meanwhile turn on the red- or blue-detuned laser radiation. The current ion trap techniques have successfully coupled the internal and the vibrational degrees of freedom of the trapped ultracold ion [14]. But we have not yet found any experimental report for this job for an ion with vibrational quanta $\bar{n}_a(0) \geq 10$ which is beyond the sideband cooling regime. So we choose $\bar{n}_a(0)$ to be 6. Nevertheless, from [10], it seems to be not difficult experimentally to cool a cantilever even for the ion with the vibrational quanta $\bar{n}_a(0) \geq 4000$. As it works for any \bar{n}_a and \bar{n}_b , our method, providing an exact solution for the evolution of system, could be very helpful for the future experiment.

In summary, we have studied the time evolution of an electrostatically coupling system involving a trapped ion and a cantilever, which is the first step of a previous proposal to employ the trapped ion as a transducer and to fast cool the cantilever down to its ground vibrational state. With the squeezed-state expansion technique, we can exactly demonstrate the quantum behavior of the two coupled subsystems, which is very different from the solution with the RWA under certain conditions. Since the field of QEMS is developing very quickly and is playing more and more important role in QIP in the scalability [4] and the qubit readout [5-9], we believe that our method as well as the results presented here could be useful in the fields of QEMS and QIP.

IV Acknowledgements

This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 10474118 and 10274093, and by the National Fundamental Research Program of China under Grant Nos. 2001CB309309 and 2005CB724502.

References

- [1] M. Blencowe, Phys. Rep. **395**, 159 (2004).
- [2] R.G. Knobel and A.W. Cleland, Nature (London) **424**, 291 (2003).
- [3] M.D. LaHaye, *O. Buu, B. Camarota, and K.C. Schwab*, Science **304**, 74 (2004).
- [4] L. Tian and P. Zoller, eprint, quant-ph/0407020.
- [5] D. Rugar, R. Budakian, H.J. Mamin, and B.W. Chul, Nature (London) **430**, 329 (2004)
- [6] H. Park, J. Park, A.K.L. Lim, E.H. Anderson, A.P. Allvisatos and P.L. McEuen, Nature

(London) 407, 57 (2000).

[7] M. Feng and J. Twamley, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 030303 (R) (2004).

[8] C.I. Pakes, P.W. Josephs-Franks, R.P. Reed, S.G. Corner and M.S. Colclough, IEEE Trans. Instrum. Meas. **50**, 310 (2001).

[9] M. Feng and J. Twamley, Eurphys. Lett, **69**, 699 (2005).

[10] W.K. Hensinger, D.W. Utami, H.S. Goan, K. Schwab, C. Monroe, and G.J. Milburn, eprint,quant-ph/0501037.

[11] D.J. Heinzen and D.J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 2977 (1990).

[12] R. Blatt and P. Zoller, Eur.J.Phys. **9**, 250 (1988).

[13] E.T. Jaynes and F.W. Cummings, Proc. IEEE **51** (1963) 89.

[14] D. Leibfried, R. Blatt, C. Monroe, and D. Wineland, Rev. Mod. Phys. **75**, 281 (2003)

Appendix I

From the initial conditions $\alpha_2(0) = 0$, $\alpha_3(0) = 0$, and $\langle t=0 | t=0 \rangle = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned}
& |\rho(0)|^2 \langle 0 | e^{\alpha_1^*(0)aa} e^{\alpha_1(t)a^+a^+} | 0 \rangle \\
&= |\rho(0)|^2 \langle 0 | \sum_n \frac{1}{n!} [\alpha_1^*(0)a^2]^n \cdot \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} [\alpha_1(0)(a^+)^2]^m | 0 \rangle \\
&= |\rho(0)|^2 \langle 0 | \sum_n \frac{1}{n!} [(\alpha_1^*(0))^n a^{2n}] \cdot \sum_m \frac{1}{m!} [(\alpha_1(0))^m (a^+)^{2m}] | 0 \rangle \\
&= |\rho(0)|^2 \langle 0 | \sum_n \frac{1}{n!} [(\alpha_1^*(0))^n a^{2n}] \cdot \sum_n \frac{1}{n!} [(\alpha_1(0))^n (a^+)^{2n}] | 0 \rangle \\
&= |\rho(0)|^2 \langle 0 | \sum_n \frac{1}{(n!)^2} [|\alpha_1(0)|^{2n} (2n)!] | 0 \rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

It is easy to prove

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n!)^2} [|\alpha_1(0)|^{2n} (2n)!] = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1-4|\alpha_1(0)|^2}}.$$

So we get $\frac{\rho(0)^2}{\sqrt{(1-4|\alpha_1(0)|^2)}} = 1$. Similarly, from $\langle t=0 | a^+ a | t=0 \rangle = N_a$, we can obtain

$$\frac{\rho(0)^2}{(1-4|\alpha_1(0)|^2)^{3/2}} - 1 = N_a,$$

where we have used

$$\sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{(n!)^2} [|\alpha_1(0)|^{2n} (2n+1)!] = \frac{\rho(0)^2}{(1-4|\alpha_1(0)|^2)^{3/2}}.$$

Appendix II

For solving Eqs. (13) - (15), we set $\alpha_1(t) = \alpha_{10} e^{\Omega t}$, $\alpha_2(t) = \alpha_{20} e^{\Omega t}$ and $\alpha_3(t) = \alpha_{30} e^{\Omega t}$,

and obtain

$$i\Omega\alpha_{10} = 2(\omega - i\Gamma_a)\alpha_{10} - \kappa\alpha_{20}$$

$$i\Omega\alpha_{20} = (\omega + \nu - i\Gamma_a - i\Gamma_b)\alpha_{20} - 2\kappa\alpha_{10} - 2\kappa\alpha_{30}$$

$$i\Omega\alpha_{30} = 2(\nu - i\Gamma_b)\alpha_{30} - \kappa\alpha_{20}.$$

By diagonalizing the related determinant, we get to

$$\alpha_{20}^{(1,2,3)} = \frac{2(\omega - i\Gamma_a) - i\Omega^{(1,2,3)}}{\kappa} \alpha_{10}^{(1,2,3)},$$

$$\alpha_{30}^{(1,2,3)} = -\frac{2(\omega - i\Gamma_a) - i\Omega^{(1,2,3)}}{2(\omega - i\Gamma_b) - i\Omega^{(1,2,3)}} \alpha_{10}^{(1,2,3)},$$

where

$$\Omega^{(1)} = -[\Gamma_a + \Gamma_b + i(\omega + \nu),]$$

$$\Omega^{(2)} = -[\Gamma_a + \Gamma_b + i(\omega + \nu)] + \sqrt{-[i(\Gamma_a - \Gamma_b) - \omega + \nu]^2 - \kappa^2},$$

$$\Omega^{(3)} = -[\Gamma_a + \Gamma_b + i(\omega + \nu)] - \sqrt{-[i(\Gamma_a - \Gamma_b) - \omega + \nu]^2 - \kappa^2}.$$

By means of the initial conditions $\alpha_1(0) = \frac{1}{2}\sqrt{N_a/(N_a + 1)}$, $\alpha_2(0) = 0$, $\alpha_3(0) = 0$, we obtain

Eqs. (16) and (17).

Captions of the Figures

Fig.1 Time evolution of \bar{n}_a and \bar{n}_b calculated under RWA and without RWA, where $\omega=19.7$ MHz, $\nu=19.7$ MHz, $\kappa=1.8$ MHz, $\Gamma_a=\Gamma_b=0.0197$ MHz, and $\bar{n}_a(0) = 6, \bar{n}_b(0) = 0$.

Fig.2 Time evolution of \bar{n}_a and \bar{n}_b calculated under RWA and without RWA, where $\omega=19.7$ MHz, $\nu=19.7$ MHz, $\kappa=5.0$ MHz, $\Gamma_a=\Gamma_b=0.0197$ MHz, and $\bar{n}_a(0) = 6, \bar{n}_b(0) = 0$.

Fig.3 Time evolution of \bar{n}_a and \bar{n}_b calculated under RWA and without RWA, where $\omega=19.7$ MHz, $\nu=19.7$ MHz, $\kappa=20$ MHz, $\Gamma_a=\Gamma_b=0.0197$ MHz, and $\bar{n}_a(0) = 6, \bar{n}_b(0) = 0$.

Fig.4 Time evolution of \bar{n}_a and \bar{n}_b calculated under RWA, where $\omega=19.7$ MHz, $\nu=16.0$ MHz, $\kappa=1.0$ MHz and 10 MHz, $\Gamma_a=\Gamma_b=0.0197$ MHz, and $\bar{n}_a(0) = 6, \bar{n}_b(0) = 0$.

Fig.5 Time evolution of \bar{n}_a and \bar{n}_b calculated without RWA, where $\omega=19.7$ MHz, $\nu=16.0$ MHz, $\kappa=1.0$ MHz and 10 MHz, $\Gamma_a=\Gamma_b=0.0197$ MHz, and $\bar{n}_a(0) = 6, \bar{n}_b(0) = 0$.





