

# Local field induced phase modulation of a weak pulse using electromagnetically induced transparency in a dense medium

Robert Fleischhaker,<sup>1</sup> Tarak N. Dey,<sup>1,2</sup> and Jörg Evers<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Max-Planck-Institut für Kernphysik, Saupfercheckweg 1, D-69117 Heidelberg, Germany

<sup>2</sup>Indian Institute of Technology Guwahati, Guwahati- 781 039, Assam, India

(Dated: February 21, 2019)

We analyze the influence of dipole-dipole interactions in an electromagnetically induced transparency setup at high density. We show both analytically and numerically that the polarization contribution to the local field strongly modulates the phase of a weak pulse. We give an intuitive explanation for this *local field induced phase modulation* and show that it distinctively differs from the nonlinear self-phase modulation a strong pulse experiences in a Kerr medium.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Gy,42.65.Sf,42.65.An

## INTRODUCTION

Electromagnetically induced transparency (EIT) stands out as one of the most useful coherence and interference phenomena (see [1, 2] and references therein). Current research focuses on dilute samples, in which the number of atoms per wave length cubed is much smaller than one. Then, the atoms act independently, as dipole fields originating from neighboring polarized atoms are small compared to externally applied fields. On the other hand, recent theoretical proposals suggest that at sufficiently high density, atomic gases could exhibit a negative index of refraction [3, 4, 5, 6, 7]. This alone makes high densities attractive, but also several aspects of EIT itself suggest advancing to higher densities with more than one atom per wave length cubed. For example, the group velocity reduction in EIT and the related spatial compression of the pulse are directly proportional to the density [2]. Also, the time delay bandwidth product, a figure of merit for the overall performance of a slow light system, depends on density [8].

At higher density, the microscopic field  $E_{mic}$  driving the individual atom is not only given by the externally applied field  $E_{ext}$ , but has to be corrected by contributions originating from neighboring polarized atoms. This local field correction (LFC) is expressed via the mean polarization  $P$  of the medium in the well known Lorentz-Lorenz relation,

$$E_{mic} = E_{ext} + P/(3\epsilon_0), \quad (1)$$

where  $\epsilon_0$  is the permeability of free space. Eq. (1) was originally derived for the static case in a cubic lattice, but is also valid for time-varying fields in isotropic homogeneous media like atomic gases [9].

Using Eq. (1), LFC effects have been studied in a number of systems. For example, generalized Maxwell-Bloch equations for two-level atoms were derived [10] where the LFC gives rise to excitation dependent frequency shifts. In the same framework, LFC was included in stud-

ies of self-induced transparency [11], coherent population trapping [12], lasing without inversion [13], and similar works [14, 15, 16, 17]. But surprisingly, dense gas effects in EIT have received only little attention. In [18], the propagation of two non-adiabatic propagating pulses is considered instead of the usual configuration with a strong continuous wave control field. Some effects such as a modification of the group velocity and a phase modulation are reported, but only numerical results are given without any interpretation of the results [19]. In more recent works, LFC was studied in the context of media with a negative refractive index, but restricted to single atom analysis without considering the actual propagation. LFC effects have also been exploited to spectroscopically resolve the hyperfine structure of the Rb  $D_2$  line in a dense gas [20].

An important reason for the restriction to low densities is detrimental decoherence. Decoherence is mainly induced by atom collisions, which increase with density. At higher density, it is further enhanced due to radiation trapping of spontaneously emitted photons. This density restriction applies in particular to hot atomic vapors [21, 22] where it leads to strong absorption and also limits pulse storage times. Much more promising in this respect are setups relying on ultra-cold gases [23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. Here, recent experiments are advancing into a regime of densities up to  $10^{15}$  atoms/cm<sup>3</sup> with a linear extend of the gas in the  $\mu\text{m}$  range [30, 31, 32]. In such ultra cold gases, atomic collisions are much less frequent, which leads to greatly improved coherence properties. Thus, dense gas light propagation experiments seem within reach, and in view of the promising applications, more insight in light propagation at high density is desirable.

Therefore, in this Letter, we study light propagation in an EIT medium at high density, and reveal and interpret the underlying physical mechanisms. We show that the LFC effects lead to a phase modulation of a probe pulse already at densities of few particles per wave length cubed. This phase modulation is distinctively dif-

ferent from nonlinear self phase modulation, as it leads to a linear frequency chirp across the whole probe pulse, and does not require high probe intensity. We derive analytic solutions for the propagation dynamics of a slow light pulse and the medium polarization in a dense gas, which enable us to provide an intuitive explanation of the phase modulation in terms of the energy exchange with neighboring atoms. All analytical results are verified with full numerical solutions of the nonlinear pulse propagation.

We start from the well-known equations of motion (EOM) for EIT [2]. In these equations, we replace the microscopic probe and control fields by their macroscopic counterparts using Eq. (1). Since the mean medium polarization  $P$  can be expressed in terms of a density matrix element, this leads to nonlinear EOM. Expanding the nonlinear EOM up to linear order in the external probe field leaves us with just two EOM, one for the probe field coherence  $\rho_p$  and one for the Raman coherence  $\rho_r$ ,

$$\partial_t \rho_p = -\Gamma_p \rho_p + \frac{i}{2} \Omega_p + \frac{i}{2} L \gamma_p \rho_p + \frac{i}{2} \Omega_c \rho_r, \quad (2a)$$

$$\partial_t \rho_r = -\Gamma_r \rho_r + \frac{i}{2} \Omega_c^* \rho_p. \quad (2b)$$

Here,  $\Gamma_p = \gamma/2 - i\Delta_p$ ,  $\Gamma_r = \gamma_{dec} - i\Delta$ ,  $\Delta = \Delta_p - \Delta_c$ , and  $\gamma = \gamma_p + \gamma_c$  is the overall decay rate of the excited state.  $\gamma_{dec}$  is the ground state decoherence, and  $\Omega_p$ ,  $\Delta_p$ ,  $\gamma_p$ ,  $\Omega_c$ ,  $\Delta_c$ ,  $\gamma_c$  are the Rabi frequency, the detuning, and the decay rate of the probe and control field transition. Due to the LFC, a new term arises in Eq. (2a) as compared to the low-density case which is proportional to the dimensionless parameter  $L = N\lambda^3/(4\pi^2)$ .  $L$  is a measure for the strength of LFC and is given by the number of atoms per transition wave length  $\lambda$  cubed, with  $N$  as the atom number density. The prefactor ensures that  $L = 1$  corresponds to a density where the LFC induced frequency shift in a two-level atom is equal to half the natural linewidth. Formally, the new term can be interpreted as a frequency shift in the EIT system which can be included into the probe field detuning  $\hat{\Delta}_p = \Delta_p + L\gamma_p/2$ . However, this frequency shift does not influence the two-photon detuning  $\Delta$ . Solving for the steady state of Eqs. (2) leads to the susceptibility  $\chi$ ,

$$\chi = \frac{3L\frac{\gamma_p}{2}(\Delta + i\gamma_{dec})}{\frac{\gamma}{2}\gamma_{dec} - \hat{\Delta}_p\Delta + \frac{|\Omega_c|^2}{4} - i(\hat{\Delta}_p\gamma_{dec} + \Delta\frac{\gamma}{2})}. \quad (3)$$

From Eq. (3) we can easily understand the effect of LFC in the susceptibility. It results in a reshaping of the EIT transparency window. While the two-photon resonance frequency remains unchanged, the transparency window becomes more and more asymmetric with increasing medium density [12].

To verify these results obtained from a single atom steady state linear susceptibility analysis, we also numerically integrated the full set of nonlinear EOM together

with the wave equation. The susceptibility is obtained from the attenuation and phase shift of a weak continuous wave probe field at the medium exit, and fully confirms our analytical results.

We now turn to our main interest, the propagation dynamics of a light pulse in the presence of LFC. For this, we expand the susceptibility Eq. (3) around the center of the transparency window. From  $k(\omega) = \omega[1 + \chi(\omega)]^{1/2}/c$ , we find the frequency dependent wave number  $k(\omega)$  up to second order in the probe field detuning. The solution for the positively rotating component of the probe field in Fourier space then follows as

$$E^{(+)}(z, \omega) = E^{(+)}(0, \omega)e^{ik(\omega)z}, \quad (4)$$

where  $E^{(+)}(0, \omega)$  is given by the initial condition and

$$k(\omega) = k_0 + i\frac{n_g\gamma_{dec}}{c} + \frac{\Delta_p}{v_g} + k_0(i\beta_1 + \beta_2)\Delta_p^2 + \mathcal{O}[\Delta_p^3]. \quad (5)$$

We neglected terms suppressed by a factor of  $\gamma\gamma_{dec}/\Omega_c^2$ , since  $\gamma\gamma_{dec} \ll \Omega_c^2$  is required for low absorption. Each term in Eq. (5) can be clearly interpreted.  $k_0$  is the wave number of the undisturbed carrier wave. The second term describes the decay due to the ground state decoherence  $\gamma_{dec}$  where  $n_g = 3L\gamma_p\omega_0/\Omega_c^2$  is the group index and  $\omega_0$  is the probe field transition frequency. The third term leads to the reduced group velocity  $v_g = c/(1 + n_g)$ . The fourth term is quadratic in  $\Delta_p$  and thus associated with a change of width in the Fourier transformation of a Gaussian. The imaginary part proportional to  $\beta_1 = 6L\gamma\gamma_p/\Omega_c^4$  leads to a broadening of the temporal width due to the finite spectral width of the transparency window. Finally, the real part proportional to

$$\beta_2 = 6L^2\gamma_p^2/\Omega_c^4 \quad (6)$$

results from LFC. Formally, it leads to an imaginary part in the temporal width which corresponds to a phase modulation of the pulse.

To better understand this result, we assume a Gaussian pulse shape as the initial condition. Then, the solution in the time domain can be obtained from Eq. (4) by Fourier transformation. Considering only the envelope defined by  $E(z, t) = \frac{1}{2}\mathcal{E}(z, t)\exp[i(k_0z - \omega_0t)] + c.c.$ , we find

$$\mathcal{E}(z, t) = \mathcal{E}_0\frac{\sigma}{\tilde{\sigma}}\exp\left[-\gamma_{dec}\frac{z}{v_g} - \left(t - \frac{z}{v_g}\right)^2/(2\tilde{\sigma}^2)\right]. \quad (7)$$

$\mathcal{E}_0$  and  $\sigma$  are the initial amplitude and temporal width. The LFC modified width with phase modulation after propagating a distance  $z$  is

$$\tilde{\sigma} = \sqrt{\sigma^2 + 2k_0z(\beta_1 - i\beta_2)}. \quad (8)$$

To give a concrete example, we assume a medium with density  $N \approx 3 \times 10^{14}\text{cm}^{-3}$  and length of  $z = 6.3\mu\text{m}$ .

Then,  $L = 4$  ( $\lambda = 795\text{nm}$ ), and with a control field  $\Omega_c = 2\gamma$ , a probe pulse with initial width of  $\sigma = 20/\gamma$  propagates a distance of  $z = 50v_g/\gamma$ . These medium parameters are consistent with recent ultra cold gas setups [30, 31, 32]. The probe pulse is attenuated mainly by the ground state decoherence  $\gamma_{dec}$ . In addition to collisional dephasing and experimental issues like inhomogeneous magnetic field,  $\gamma_{dec}$  is enhanced by radiation trapping. Due to the high density, incoherently scattered photons can be reabsorbed and lead to further ground state decoherence [21, 22]. Experimentally, an anisotropic (e.g., pencil shaped) sample geometry as well as a small photon scattering rate help to reduce the decoherence rate. We estimate  $\gamma_{dec}$  from results of a recent experiment with Rubidium atoms of density  $N \approx 2 \times 10^{14}\text{cm}^{-3}$  in an anisotropic trap to about  $10^5$  Hz [30]. This would attenuate the initial amplitude to about 85% over the chosen propagation distance. A larger  $\gamma_{dec}$  would lead to more attenuation, but not to a reduction of the phase modulation discussed below.

In Fig. 1(a) we show the propagated pulse together with the LFC induced phase modulation  $\phi(t)$  and the corresponding instantaneous frequency defined by

$$\omega(t) = \omega_0 - \partial_t \phi(t). \quad (9)$$

As before, we compared our analytical results with the full numerical solution for the pulse propagation dynamics. The two results are virtually indistinguishable which suggests that our approximations are well justified.

We now analyze the physical origin of the LFC induced phase modulation. For this, we explicitly calculate the polarization using the relation  $P^{(+)}(z, \omega) = \epsilon_0 \chi(\omega) E^{(+)}(z, \omega)$ . Considering only the real part of  $\chi$  up to quadratic order in  $\Delta_p$  and Fourier transforming it into the time domain, we can distinguish two contributions,

$$P_0^{(+)}(z, t) = \frac{\epsilon_0 n_g}{\omega_0} [i \partial_t \mathcal{E}(z, t)] \exp[i(k_0 z - \omega_0 t)], \quad (10a)$$

$$P_{\text{LFC}}^{(+)}(z, t) = \epsilon_0 \beta_2 [i^2 \partial_t^2 \mathcal{E}(z, t)] \exp[i(k_0 z - \omega_0 t)]. \quad (10b)$$

The first contribution stems from the part linear in  $\Delta_p$  and leads to the change of group velocity. The second contribution is due to the part quadratic in  $\Delta_p$  which is related to the LFC induced phase modulation. In Fig. 1(b) we show the pulse together with these two contributions. In the first half of the pulse,  $E(t)$  is ahead in phase by  $\pi/2$  compared to  $P_0(t)$ , which indicates that energy is transferred from the pulse to the polarization  $P_0(t)$ . In the second half, the pulse is delayed by  $\pi/2$ , and energy is transferred back from the polarization  $P_0(t)$  to the pulse. This energy exchange effectively reduces the group velocity of the pulse. Similarly, we can understand how the interaction of atoms with the collective dipole field of their neighbors proportional to  $P_0(t)$  induces an additional polarization  $P_{\text{LFC}}(t)$ . Before  $t = -\sigma$ , the polarization component  $P_0(t)$  is  $\pi/2$  ahead in phase compared to  $P_{\text{LFC}}(t)$ , whereas at  $-\sigma < t < 0$ , it is delayed




FIG. 1: (Color online) (a) Real part (blue dashed line) and imaginary part (red solid line) of a Gaussian pulse with LFC induced phase modulation. Both parts are scaled to arbitrary but equal units. The parabola (black dash-dotted line) shows the time dependent phase shift in radian measure and the dashed straight line is the corresponding instantaneous frequency. It exhibits a linear frequency chirp with slope  $\alpha_{\text{LFC}}$  over the total extend of the pulse. (b) Envelope and carrier wave of the pulse (black upper line), the polarization induced directly by the pulse (blue middle line), and the additional polarization induced by dipole-dipole interactions (red lower line). The amplitudes are not drawn to scale and the carrier wave length has been strongly exaggerated to make phase relations clearly visible. (c) The nonlinear self-phase modulation (black dash-dotted line) of a Gaussian pulse. The approximately linear (black dashed straight line) frequency chirp in the pulse center has slope  $\alpha_{\text{NSM}}$ .

by  $\pi/2$ , again leading to an energy exchange. The same exchange takes place again for  $0 < t < \sigma$  and  $t > \sigma$ . It is interesting to note that the phase of  $P_{\text{LFC}}(t)$  is continuous at  $t = 0$  despite the apparent phase jump of  $P_0(t)$

by  $\pi$  at that time. It arises from the (not depicted) energy exchange of the system with the control field and the Raman coherence. The polarization  $P_0(t)$  vanishes at  $t = 0$  because the energy is transferred into the Raman coherence. Then, after  $t = 0$ , the polarization is build up again from the coherence.

It remains to analyze the back action of the LFC polarization  $P_{\text{LFC}}(t)$  on the probe pulse. At  $t < -\sigma$  and  $t > \sigma$ ,  $P_{\text{LFC}}(t)$  and  $E(t)$  have opposite phase. This opposite phase has a dragging effect on  $E(t)$ , and reduces its phase. In the central part of the pulse ( $-\sigma < t < \sigma$ ),  $P_{\text{LFC}}(t)$  is in phase with  $E(t)$ . This has a pushing effect on  $E(t)$ , and increases the phase of the pulse. This interpretation agrees with the phase modulation obtained from the calculation as shown in Fig. 1(a). The phase modulation can be well approximated by the parabola

$$\phi_{\text{LFC}}(t) = \frac{\beta_2 k_0 z}{\sigma^2} \left[ 1 - \frac{(t - z/v_g)^2}{\sigma^2} \right]. \quad (11)$$

We thus conclude that energy is exchanged between the atomic dipoles and the field of neighboring dipoles in exactly the same way as between the atomic dipoles and the external field  $E(t)$ . But the two polarization components act differently on the probe pulse, leading to the group velocity change and the phase modulation, respectively.

Finally, we compare the LFC induced phase modulation with nonlinear self-phase modulation (NSM) in a medium with an intensity dependent refraction. The NSM modulation is

$$\phi_{\text{NSM}}(t) = n_2 I(t) k_0 z, \quad (12)$$

where  $n_2$  is the intensity dependent index of refraction,  $I(t)$  the time dependent intensity profile, and  $k_0$  the wave number corresponding to the carrier frequency  $\omega_0$  of the pulse. In Fig. 1(c) we show  $\phi_{\text{NSM}}(t)$  together with the corresponding instantaneous frequency for the case of a Gaussian pulse. We see that the front of the pulse experiences a red shift whereas the back experiences a blue shift with an approximately linear frequency chirp in the center. Comparing the two chirps,

$$\alpha_{\text{NSM}} = 2n_2 I_0 k_0 z / \sigma^2, \quad \alpha_{\text{LFC}} = 2\beta_2 k_0 z / \sigma^4, \quad (13)$$

we find that in the LFC case,  $n_2 I_0$  is replaced by  $\beta_2 / \sigma^2$ , where  $\beta_2$  is defined in Eq. (6). Thus, the LFC modulation does not require a large intensity, and is approximately linear over the total extend of the pulse since it depends on the strength of the dipole-dipole interaction. This strength is given by  $\beta_2$  in an EIT system and can be influenced by the density and the control field strength  $\Omega_c$ .

In summary, we studied light propagation in an EIT system at high densities such that dipole-dipole interactions within the medium become relevant. We found a

local field induced phase modulation that is distinctively different from non-linear self phase modulation, as it is linear across the whole pulse, and does not depend on the pulse intensity. The combination of analytical and numerical results enabled us to interpret the underlying physical mechanisms of the propagation dynamics in dense gases.

- 
- [1] S. E. Harris, Phys. Today **50**, 36 (1997).
  - [2] M. Fleischhauer, A. Imamoglu and J. P. Marangos, Rev. Mod. Phys. **77**, 633 (2005).
  - [3] M. Ö. Oktel and Ö. E. Müstecaplıoğlu, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 053806 (2004).
  - [4] Q. Thommen and P. Mandel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 053601 (2006).
  - [5] J. Q. Shen and S. He, Ann. Phys. **16**, 364 (2007).
  - [6] J. Kästel, M. Fleischhauer, S. F. Yelin, and R. L. Walsworth, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 073602 (2007).
  - [7] P. P. Orth, J. Evers and C. H. Keitel, arXiv:0711.0303.
  - [8] J. Tidström, P. Jänes, and L. M. Andersson, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 053803 (2007).
  - [9] M. Born and E. Wolf, *Principles of Optics* (Mac Millan, New York, 1964).
  - [10] C. M. Bowden, and J. P. Dowling, Phys. Rev. A **47**, 1247 (1993).
  - [11] C. R. Stroud, Jr., C. M. Bowden, and L. Allen, Opt. Commun. **67**, 387 (1988).
  - [12] I. V. Jyotsna and G. S. Agarwal, Phys. Rev. A **53**, 1690 (1996).
  - [13] J. P. Dowling and C. M. Bowden, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1421 (1993).
  - [14] Y. Ben-Aryeh, C. M. Bowden, and J. C. Englund, Phys. Rev. A **34**, 3917 (1986).
  - [15] R. Inguva and C. M. Bowden, Phys. Rev. A **41**, 1670 (1990).
  - [16] M. E. Crenshaw, M. Scalora, and C. M. Bowden, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 911 (1992).
  - [17] J. Rai and C. M. Bowden, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 1522 (1992).
  - [18] N. Wang and H. Rabitz Phys. Rev. A **51**, 5029 (1995).
  - [19] Our results, however, do not show the dependence of the group velocity.
  - [20] H. Li *et al.* Appl. Phys. B **91**, 229 (2008).
  - [21] M. Fleischhauer, Opt. Exp. Vol. **4**, 107 (1999).
  - [22] A. B. Matsko, I. Novikova, M. O. Scully, and G. R. Welch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 133601 (2001).
  - [23] C. Liu, Z. Dutton, C. H. Behroozi, L. V. Hau, Nature (London) **409**, 490 (2001).
  - [24] M. Yan, E. G. Rickey, and Y. Zhu, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 041801(R) (2001).
  - [25] S. Barreiro and J. W. R. Tabosa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 133001 (2003).
  - [26] D. A. Braje, V. Balic, G. Y. Yin, and S. E. Harris, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 041801(R) (2003).
  - [27] H. Kang and Y. Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 093601 (2003).
  - [28] D. A. Braje, V. Balic, S. Goda, G. Y. Yin, and S. E. Harris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 183601 (2004).
  - [29] N. S. Ginsberg, S. R. Garner and L. V. Hau, Nature (London) **445**, 623 (2007).
  - [30] R. Newell, J. Sebby, and T. G. Walker, Opt. Lett. **28**,

- 1266 (2003).
- [31] J. Sebby-Strabley, R. T. R. Newell, J. O. Day, E. Brekke, and T. G. Walker, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 021401(R) (2005).
- [32] M. Fattori, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 080405 (2008).
- [33] M. M. Kash *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **82**, 5229 (1999).