

Effective spin-1 Heisenberg chain in coupled cavities

Ling Zhou, Wei-Bin Yan, Xin-Yu Zhao

A coupled array of N identical cavities, each of which contains a five-level atom is investigated. The results show that the atoms via the exchange of virtual photons can be effectively equal to spin 1 Heisenberg model under certain conditions. By tuning the laser fields, the parameters of the effective Hamiltonian can be controlled individually.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 42.50.Dv, 75.10.Jm

I. INTRODUCTION

Spin chain has been played an important role in quantum information field as well as in condensed matter physics. The interaction between on site spin can offer us entanglement in solid and realistic way [1-7]. It has been found that spin chain with an open boundary condition can be applied in quantum communication [8], which can translate information with high fidelity from one end to another. Perfect state transfer can be realized by changing the interaction between the qubits in spin networks [9, 10].

However, because of the microscopic properties of solid-state materials, it is very hard to address individual spins while it is the prerequisite for quantum information processing. Single spin addressability can also be very helpful to obtain deeper and more detail insight into condensed matter physics. In order to do this, it has been show that the arrays of Josephson junctions [11], quantum dots [12], optical lattices [13], can provide effective spin-chain Hamiltonian where spin-coupling constants can be controlled. Recently under active investigation is to use the array of coupled cavities, which are ideally suited to addressing individual spins [14-23]. Intense interest has arisen from the demonstration that a polaritonic Mott transition and a Bose-Hubbard interaction can be generated in these structures [15, 16, 17]. Hartmann [18] have shown that single atoms in interacting cavities that are operated in a strong coupling regime can form a Heisenberg spin $\frac{1}{2}$ Hamiltonian in which all parameters of the effective Hamiltonian can be tuned individually.

However, people are increasingly interested in the multilevel systems. A lots of papers treat with multilevel systems in different areas of physics such as in condensed matter physics[19, 20], statistical mechanics [21, 22], as well as in quantum information [23, 24, 25]. Now multilevel systems can be considered as a important field. In this paper, we consider a coupled array of N identical cavities, each of which contain a five-level atom. We show that under large detuning case the atoms via the exchange of virtual photons can be effectively equal to spin 1 model. We use atomic bare basis as spin-level. It should be easy to manipulate the individual atom when we need to project measure etc. on the individual qutrit.

II. MODEL AND THE EFFECTIVE

HAMILTONIAN

We consider an array of cavities which are coupled via exchange of photons. Each of the cavities contains one five-level atom. The atomic configuration is shown in Fig.1. The three long-lived levels $|a\rangle$, $|b\rangle$, $|c\rangle$ represent the three spin states. The cavity mode couples to the transitions $|d\rangle \leftrightarrow |a\rangle$, $|d\rangle \leftrightarrow |b\rangle$, $|e\rangle \leftrightarrow |b\rangle$, and $|e\rangle \leftrightarrow |c\rangle$ while four lasers drive the atom with Rabi frequencies Ω_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$), respectively. The same atomic configurations has been used in [30] for addressing individual atoms in optical lattices with standing-wave driving fields. In the interaction picture, the Hamiltonian reads

$$\begin{aligned}
 H = \sum_{j=1}^N & [(g_1 a_j |d_j\rangle \langle a_j| + \Omega_1 |d_j\rangle \langle b_j|) e^{i\Delta_1 t} \\
 & + (g_2 a_j |d_j\rangle \langle b_j| + \Omega_2 |d_j\rangle \langle a|) e^{i\Delta_2 t} \\
 & + (g_3 a_j |e_j\rangle \langle b_j| + \Omega_3 |e_j\rangle \langle c_j|) e^{i\Delta_3 t} \\
 & + (g_4 a_j |e_j\rangle \langle c_j| + \Omega_4 |e_j\rangle \langle b_j|) e^{i\Delta_4 t} + h.c.] \\
 & + \sum_{j=1}^N J(a_j^\dagger a_{j+1} + a_j a_{j+1}^\dagger),
 \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where g_i is the coupling strength between the cavity and the atom, and Δ_i express the detuning shown in Fig.1, and a_j means the annihilation operator of the cavity field. Here, for simplicity, we assume that the coupling strength g_i and laser Rabi frequency Ω_i do not change with cavity sequence j , which means that the identical atoms are in the identical cavities and driven by identical laser fields. The first sum denote the interaction within the cavities, and the second sum is the inter-cavity hopping between nearest neighbor with hopping rate J . Now we consider the large detuning case with $|\Delta_i| \gg |g_i|, |\Omega_i|$. In addition, in order to avoid undesired atomic transitions, we need the following inequalities $\Delta_2 - \Delta_1 \gg \{ \frac{\Omega_1 \Omega_2}{\Delta_1}, \frac{\Omega_1 g_2}{\Delta_1}, \frac{g_1 \Omega_2}{\Delta_1}, \frac{g_1 g_2}{\Delta_1} \}$, $\Delta_4 - \Delta_3 \gg \{ \frac{\Omega_3 \Omega_4}{\Delta_3}, \frac{\Omega_3 g_4}{\Delta_3}, \frac{g_3 \Omega_4}{\Delta_3}, \frac{g_3 g_4}{\Delta_3} \}$. We adiabatic eliminate atomic excited state $|d\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ and have




FIG. 1: (Color online) The configuration of the five-level atom. The three long-lived levels $|a\rangle$, $|b\rangle$, $|c\rangle$ represent the three spin states. The cavity mode couples to the transitions $|d\rangle \leftrightarrow |a\rangle$, $|d\rangle \leftrightarrow |b\rangle$, $|e\rangle \leftrightarrow |b\rangle$, and $|e\rangle \leftrightarrow |c\rangle$ while four lasers drive the atom with Rabi frequencies Ω_i ($i = 1, 2, 3, 4$), respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
H = & - \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{g_1^2}{\Delta_1} |a_j\rangle\langle a_j| + \left(\frac{g_2^2}{\Delta_2} + \frac{g_3^2}{\Delta_3} \right) |b_j\rangle\langle b_j| + \frac{g_4^2}{\Delta_4} |c_j\rangle\langle c_j| \right] a_j^\dagger a_j \\
& - \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{\Omega_2^2}{\Delta_2} |a_j\rangle\langle a_j| + \left(\frac{\Omega_1^2}{\Delta_1} + \frac{\Omega_4^2}{\Delta_4} \right) |b_j\rangle\langle b_j| + \frac{\Omega_3^2}{\Delta_3} |c_j\rangle\langle c_j| \right] \\
& - \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{\Omega_1 g_1}{\Delta_1} a_j |b_j\rangle\langle a_j| + \frac{\Omega_2 g_2}{\Delta_2} a_j |a_j\rangle\langle b_j| \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{\Omega_3 g_3}{\Delta_3} a_j |c_j\rangle\langle b_j| + \frac{\Omega_4 g_4}{\Delta_4} a_j |b_j\rangle\langle c_j| + h.c. \right] \\
& + \sum_{j=1}^N J (a_j^\dagger a_{j+1} + a_j a_{j+1}^\dagger).
\end{aligned}$$

We assume

$$\frac{g_1^2}{\Delta_1} = \frac{g_2^2}{\Delta_2} + \frac{g_3^2}{\Delta_3} = \frac{g_4^2}{\Delta_4}. \quad (3)$$

The effective Hamiltonian can be classified as

$$H = H_0 + H_1 \quad (4)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}
H_0 = & - \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{g_1^2}{\Delta_1} a_j^\dagger a_j - J (a_j^\dagger a_{j+1} + a_j a_{j+1}^\dagger) \right] \\
& - \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{\Omega_2^2}{\Delta_2} |a_j\rangle\langle a_j| + \left(\frac{\Omega_1^2}{\Delta_1} + \frac{\Omega_4^2}{\Delta_4} \right) |b_j\rangle\langle b_j| + \frac{\Omega_3^2}{\Delta_3} |c_j\rangle\langle c_j| \right], \\
H_1 = & - \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{\Omega_1 g_1}{\Delta_1} a_j |b_j\rangle\langle a_j| + \frac{\Omega_2 g_2}{\Delta_2} a_j |a_j\rangle\langle b_j| \right. \\
& \left. + \frac{\Omega_3 g_3}{\Delta_3} a_j |c_j\rangle\langle b_j| + \frac{\Omega_4 g_4}{\Delta_4} a_j |b_j\rangle\langle c_j| + h.c. \right]. \quad (5)
\end{aligned}$$

Noting that the every term in H_0 commutes each other, when we perform unitary transformation we can do it separately. Diagonalize the cavity-hopping terms by employing a Fourier transformed basis as $a_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=1}^N F_{jk} b_k$, where $F_{jk} = \exp(-i\frac{2\pi}{N}jk)$ and $\sum_{j=1}^N F_{jk} F_{jl}^* = N\delta_{kl}$. The diagonalized form reads $J \sum_j (a_j^\dagger a_{j+1} + a_j a_{j+1}^\dagger) = \sum_j \nu_j b_j^\dagger b_j$ with $\nu_j = 2J \cos(\frac{2\pi}{N}j)$. Now, we goes into the new frame rotating with H_0 , under the conditions

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{\Omega_1^2}{\Delta_1} + \frac{\Omega_4^2}{\Delta_4} &= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\Omega_2^2}{\Delta_2} + \frac{\Omega_3^2}{\Delta_3} \right), \quad (6) \\
\frac{\Omega_1 g_1}{\Delta_1} &= \frac{\Omega_3 g_3}{\Delta_3}, \quad \frac{\Omega_2 g_2}{\Delta_2} = \frac{\Omega_4 g_4}{\Delta_4},
\end{aligned}$$

we have the Hamiltonian

$$\begin{aligned}
H = & - \sum_{j=1}^N \left\{ \left[\frac{\Omega_1 g_1}{\Delta_1} (|b_j\rangle\langle a_j| + |c_j\rangle\langle b_j|) e^{i\mu_+ t} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + \frac{\Omega_2 g_2}{\Delta_2} (|a_j\rangle\langle b_j| + |b_j\rangle\langle c_j|) e^{i\mu_- t} \right] \right. \\
& \left. e^{-i\nu_j t} F_{jk} b_k + h.c. \right\} \quad (7)
\end{aligned}$$

with $\mu_\pm = \frac{g_1^2}{\Delta_1} \pm \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\Omega_2^2}{\Delta_2} - \frac{\Omega_3^2}{\Delta_3} \right)$. We define that the eigenstates of S_z for $S = 1$ are atomic bare level $|a\rangle$, $|b\rangle$, $|c\rangle$; therefore $S_{i+} = S_{ix} + iS_{iy} = \sqrt{2}(|a\rangle\langle b| + |b\rangle\langle c|)$, $S_{i-} = S_{ix} - iS_{iy} = \sqrt{2}(|b\rangle\langle a| + |c\rangle\langle b|)$. Using the spin operator, we rewrite the Hamiltonian Eq.(7) as

$$\begin{aligned}
H = & - \sum_{j,k=1}^N \left[\left(\frac{\Omega_1 g_1}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_1} S_j^- e^{i\mu_+ t} \right. \right. \\
& \left. \left. + \frac{\Omega_2 g_2}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_2} S_j^+ e^{i\mu_- t} \right) e^{-i\nu_k t} F_{jk} b_k + h.c. \right]. \quad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

If the Rabi frequency $\left\{ \frac{\Omega_1 g_1}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_1}, \frac{\Omega_2 g_2}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_2} \right\} \ll \{|\mu_+ - \nu_k|, |\mu_- - \nu_k|\}$, this allows us to make use of the adiabatic elimination once more. Considering the subspace without real photons, we deduce the effective Hamiltonian as

$$H = \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{\Omega_1^2 g_1^2}{2\Delta_1^2} \frac{1}{\mu_+ - \nu_k} S_j^- S_l^+ + \frac{\Omega_2^2 g_2^2}{2\Delta_2^2} \frac{1}{\mu_- - \nu_k} S_j^+ S_l^- \right] F_{jk} F_{lk}^*. \quad (9)$$

In view of $\nu_k = J(F_{1k} + F_{1k}^*)$, we expand $\frac{F_{jk} F_{lk}^*}{\mu_\pm - \nu_k}$ as

$$\frac{F_{jk} F_{lk}^*}{\mu_\pm - \nu_k} = \frac{1}{\mu_\pm} (F_{jk} F_{lk}^* + \frac{J}{\mu_\pm} F_{j+1k} F_{lk}^* + \frac{J}{\mu_\pm} F_{jk} F_{l+1k}^*). \quad (10)$$

This expand demand the condition $J \prec \mu_\pm$. Substitute the relation Eq.(10) into Eq.(9), we finally obtain the effective Hamiltonian

$$H_{xy} = \sum_{j=1}^N A [S_{xj}^2 + S_{yj}^2] + B S_{jz} + C (S_{xj} S_{xj+1} + S_{yj} S_{yj+1}) \quad (11)$$




FIG. 2: (Color online) The comparison of the probability $p(c_2)$ [$p(|\downarrow_2\rangle)$] between the Hamiltonian Eq.(2)(blue-dashed line) with the effective spin chain Eq.(11)(red-solid line). (a): the initial atomic state is $|b_1, c_2\rangle$. (b): the initial atomic state is $\frac{1}{2}(|a_1\rangle\langle a_1| + |b_1\rangle\langle b_1|) \otimes |c_2\rangle\langle c_2|$ ($\frac{1}{2}(|\uparrow_1\rangle\langle\uparrow_1| + |\downarrow_1\rangle\langle\downarrow_1|) \otimes |\downarrow_2\rangle\langle\downarrow_2|$ for spin chain Eq.(11). For all plots, the parameters are $g_1 = g_2 = g_4 = 1$, $g_3 = 1/2$, $\Delta_1 = \Delta_4 = 40$, $\Delta_3 = 20$, $\Delta_2 = 80$, $\Omega_1 = \Omega_2 = \Omega_3 = 10$, $\Omega_4 = 5$, $J = 0.5$.

with

$$A = \frac{\Omega_1^2 g_1^2}{2\Delta_1^2 \mu_+} + \frac{\Omega_2^2 g_2^2}{2\Delta_2^2 \mu_-}, B = \frac{\Omega_2^2 g_2^2}{2\Delta_2^2 \mu_-} - \frac{\Omega_1^2 g_1^2}{2\Delta_1^2 \mu_+},$$

$$C = \frac{\Omega_1^2 g_1^2 J}{\Delta_1^2 \mu_+^2} + \frac{\Omega_2^2 g_2^2 J}{\Delta_2^2 \mu_-^2}. \quad (12)$$

We see clearly that it is spin 1 XY antiferromagnetic Hamiltonian ($C > 0$). Because it is spin 1, the term $S_{xj}^2 + S_{yj}^2$ can not be omitted, which is of essential importance in high-spin cases. Although individual control of the coefficients A , B , C is limited owing to their mutual dependency, we still can change them; because $\{g_i, \Delta_i, \Omega_i\}$ ($i = 1 \dots 4$) meeting with the condition Eqs.(3),(6), we still have seven variable so as to adjust the coefficients A , B , C .

To confirm the validity of our approximations, we numerically simulate the dynamics generated by Hamiltonian Eq.(2) and compare it to the dynamics generated by effective spin model Eq.(11). In Fig. 2a, we consider two atoms in two cavities initially in the state $|b_1, c_2\rangle$ (atom one in $|b\rangle$ and atom two in $|c\rangle$) and calculate the occupation probability $p(c_2)$ (atom 2 in state $|c\rangle$) which corresponding to the probability of spin 2 to point down. Fig.2a shows the time evolution of $p(c_2)$ for Hamiltonian Eq.(2) and $p(|\downarrow_2\rangle)$ for effective spin mode Eq.(11). For our choice of the parameters, one can easily check that they satisfy all kinds of approximation condition such as Eqs.(3), (6) and the two times adiabatic elimination condition $|\Delta_i| \gg \{|g_i|, |\Omega_i|\}$, $\Delta_2 - \Delta_1 \gg \{\frac{\Omega_1 \Omega_2}{\Delta_1}, \frac{\Omega_1 g_2}{\Delta_1}, \frac{g_1 \Omega_2}{\Delta_1}, \frac{g_1 g_2}{\Delta_1}\}$, $\Delta_4 - \Delta_3 \gg \{\frac{\Omega_3 \Omega_4}{\Delta_3}, \frac{\Omega_3 g_4}{\Delta_3}, \frac{g_3 \Omega_4}{\Delta_3}, \frac{g_3 g_4}{\Delta_3}\}$, and $\{\frac{\Omega_1 g_1}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_1}, \frac{\Omega_2 g_2}{\sqrt{2}\Delta_2}\} \ll \{|\mu_+ - \nu_k|, |\mu_- - \nu_k|\}$. From the Fig. 2a, we know that the interaction can be effectively equal to spin 1 Heisenberg chain because the two




FIG. 3: (Color online) The illustration to get $S_Z S_Z$ interaction. Two classical fields are deleted

curves almost merge into one. For the initial atomic state $|b_1, c_2\rangle$, the population of two atoms just oscillate between the two level, and level $|a\rangle$ do not participate the interaction so that we have the reduced two-level system (level $|a\rangle$ has no population).

Fig.2b plots the population $p(c_2)$ for initial state $\frac{1}{2}(|a_1\rangle\langle a_1| + |b_1\rangle\langle b_1|) \otimes |c_2\rangle$. Under this case, all the three levels participate the interaction so that we can see the two steps oscillation (see red line). But now, we have much discrepancy between Hamiltonian Eq. (2) and effective Hamiltonian Eq. (11). The discrepancies come out of the higher order term in the adiabatic elimination. Due to the two participators the excited level and the middle level, the discrepancy between Hamiltonian Eq. (2) and effective Hamiltonian Eq. (11) become larger.

Now, we will obtain effective $S_Z S_Z$ interaction. We still employ the atomic level configuration but now we only need the two laser beams working between $|e\rangle \leftrightarrow |c\rangle$ and $|d\rangle \leftrightarrow |a\rangle$ shown in Fig.3. The Hamiltonian is as

$$H = \sum_{j=1}^N [(g_1 a_j + \Omega_2) |d_j\rangle\langle a_j| e^{i\Delta_1 t} + (g_4 a_j + \Omega_3) |e_j\rangle\langle c_j| e^{i\Delta_3 t} + h.c.] + \sum_{j=1}^N J (a_j^\dagger a_{j+1} + a_j a_{j+1}^\dagger) \quad (13)$$

The other two cavity fields denoting with g_2 and g_3 in

Eq. (1) will only induce a Stark shift on the level $|b\rangle$ and do not affect the effective interaction, so we do not write it in Eq. (13). Under larger detuning $\{|\Delta_1|, |\Delta_3|\} \gg \{g_1, g_4, \Omega_2, \Omega_3, J\}$, we adiabatic eliminate atomic excited

state and have

$$\begin{aligned}
H = & - \sum_{j=1}^N \left\{ \frac{g_1^2}{\Delta_1'} [|a_j\rangle\langle a_j| + |c_j\rangle\langle c_j|] a_j^\dagger a_j - \nu_j b_j^\dagger b_j \right\} \\
& - \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{\Omega_3^2}{\Delta_3'} |c_j\rangle\langle c_j| + \frac{\Omega_2^2}{\Delta_1'} |a_j\rangle\langle a_j| \right] \\
& - \sum_{j=1}^N \left[\frac{\Omega_2 g_1}{\Delta_1'} (a_j S_{z_j} + h.c.) \right], \quad (14)
\end{aligned}$$

where we need the condition $\frac{g_1^2}{\Delta_1'} = \frac{g_3^2}{\Delta_3'}$, $\frac{\Omega_3 g_4}{\Delta_3'} = -\frac{\Omega_2 g_1}{\Delta_1'}$. Switch into interaction picture and then adiabatic eliminate once more under the condition $|\frac{\Omega_2 g_1}{\Delta_1'}| \ll |\frac{g_1^2}{\Delta_1'} - \nu_k|$. Finally, we have the effective Hamiltonian

$$H_{zz} = \sum_{j=1}^N \frac{\Omega_2^2 g_1^2}{\Delta_1'^2 u} S_{z_j}^2 + \frac{2J\Omega_2^2 g_1^2}{\Delta_1'^2 u^2} S_{z_j} S_{z_{j+1}}. \quad (15)$$

where $u = \frac{g_1^2}{\Delta_1'}$. Now, the effective Hamiltonian is $S_z S_z$ interaction.

During the process of deduction of effective Hamiltonian Eqs.(11) and (15), we have changed working picture for two times. But the atomic population probability do not change with the changing of the picture. So, we can compare the atomic population probability in different picture, for example we have done in Fig. 2. However, the Hamiltonian Eqs. (13) and (15) do not affect atomic population probability. Therefore, we do not plot it again.

The two Hamiltonians Eqs. (11) and (15) can be combined into one effective Hamiltonian if we employ the method proposed by [18]. The lasers that generate the

Hamiltonian (11) are turned on for a short time interval dt ($\|H_{xy}\|dt \ll 1$) followed by another time interval dt ($\|H_{zz}\|dt \ll 1$) with the lasers that generate the Hamiltonian (15) turned on. By repeating this sequence until the total time range to be simulated is covered. The effective Hamiltonian $H = H_{xy} + H_{zz}$ finally can be obtained.

The decoherence of the system mainly results from the decay mechanisms via the photons or the excited state $|e\rangle$ ($|d\rangle$). To overcome the decoherence, the coefficients of effective Hamiltonian A , B , and C should be much larger than the decays rates of photons and the excited state $|e\rangle$ ($|d\rangle$). Using the group of the parameters of Fig. 2 (all the parameters are scaled in g_1), we have $A = -0.0128$, $B = 0.0210$, $C = 0.0113$. For a strongly coupled single quantum dot-cavity system, $\frac{\underline{\mu}}{\kappa} \sim 1800$ ($\kappa \sim 1/1800$), $\frac{\underline{\mu}}{\gamma} \sim 300$ ($\gamma \sim 1/300$) in which κ (γ) means the decay of the cavity (the excited state) have been achieved for off resonance [32]. Therefore $\{A, B, C\} \ll \{\kappa, \gamma\}$ can be realized in experiment.

III. CONCLUSION

We consider a coupled array of N identical cavities, each of which contains a five-level atom. We show that under large detuning case the atoms via the exchange of virtual photons can be effectively equal to spin 1 Heisenberg model. Although the coefficients are related one another, we still can tune them by controlling the laser fields so that our system is a good simulator for spin 1 Heisenberg model. When operated in a two-dimensional array of cavities the device is thus able to simulate spin lattices.

Acknowledgments: The project was supported by NSFC under Grant No.10774020, and also supported by SRF for ROCS, SEM.

-
- [1] Arnesen M C, Bose S and Vedral V 2001 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87 017901
- [2] Wang X 2001 *Phys. Rev. A* 64 012313
- [3] Kamta G L and Starace A F 2002 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 88 107901
- [4] Zhou L, Song H S, Guo Y Q, and Li C 2003 *Phys. Rev. A* 68 024301
- [5] Zhang G F, Li S S 2005 *Phys. Rev. A* 72 034302
- [6] Abliz A, Gao H J, Xie X C, Wu Y S, and Liu W M 2006 *Phys. Rev. A* 74 052105
- [7] Kheirandish F, Akhtarshenas S J, Mohammadi H 2008 *Phys. Rev. A* 77 042309
- [8] Bose S 2003 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91 207901
- [9] Christandl M, Datta N, Ekert A, and Landahl A J 2004 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 92 187902
- [10] Wojcik A, Luczak T, Kurzynski P, Grudka A, Gdala T, and Bednarska M 2005 *Phys. Rev. A* 72 034303
- [11] Bruder C, Fazio R, and Schön G 1993 *Phys. Rev. B* 47 342
- [12] Loss D and DiVincenzo D P 1998 *Phys. Rev. A* 57 120;
- Burkard G, Loss D and DiVincenzo D P 1999 *Phys. Rev. B* 59 2070
- [13] Duan L-M, Demler E, and Lukin M D 2003 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91 090402; Garcia-Ripoll J J, Martin-Delgado M A, and Cirac J I 2004 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 93 250405
- [14] Kane B E 1998 *Nature* 393 133
- [15] Angelakis D G, Santos M F, and Bose S 2007 *Phys. Rev. A* 76 031805(R)
- [16] Hartmann M J, Brandão F G S L, and Plenio M B 2006 *Nature Phys.* 2 849
- [17] Greentree A D, Tahan C, Cole J H, and Hollenberg L C L 2006 *Nature Phys.* 2 856
- [18] Hartmann M J, Brandão F G S L, and Plenio M B 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 99 160501
- [19] Nemoto K, Holmes C A, Milburn G J, and Munro W J 2001 *Phys. Rev. A* 63 013604
- [20] Foerster A, Ragoucy E 2007 *Nuclear Phys. B* 777 373
- [21] Yip S K 2003 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 90 250402
- [22] Pires A S T, Costa B V, and Dias R A 2008 *Phys. Rev. B* 78 212408

- [23] Romero-Isart O, Eckert K, and Sanpera A 2007 *Phys. Rev. A* 75 050303
- [24] Alipour S, Karimipour V, and Memarzadeh L 2007 *Phys. Rev. A* 75 052322; Zhou L, Yi Y X, Song H S 2005 *Chin. Phys.* 14 1168
- [25] Bruss D and Macchiavello C 2002 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88** 127901; Kaszlikowski D, Gnaniński P, Żukowski M, Miklaszewski W, and Zeilinger A 2000 *ibid.* **85** 4418
- [26] Rossini D and Fazio R 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 99 186401
- [27] Paternostro M, Agarwal G S, and Kim M S, arXiv:0707.0846
- [28] Cho J., Angelakis D. G., and Bose S., arXiv:0712.2413
- [29] Li Y., Huo M X, Song Z, and Sun C P, arXiv:0802.0079; Hu F M, Zhou Lan, Shi Tao, and Sun C P 2007 *Phys. Rev. A* 76 013819
- [30] Cho J 2007 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 99 020502
- [31] Kay A and Angelakis D G 2008 *EPL* 84 20001
- [32] Hennessy K *et al.* 2007 *Nature* (London) 445 896