

# Quantum Reservoir Engineering

J.F. Poyatos\*, J.I. Cirac,\* and P. Zoller

*Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Innsbruck, Technikerstrasse 25, A-6020 Innsbruck,  
Austria.*

(October 23, 2018)

## Abstract

We show how to design different couplings between a single ion trapped in a harmonic potential and an environment. This will provide the basis for the experimental study of the process of decoherence in a quantum system. The coupling is due to the absorption of a laser photon and subsequent spontaneous emission. The variation of the laser frequencies and intensities allows one to “engineer” the coupling and select the master equation describing the motion of the ion.

One of the fundamental questions of Physics is understanding the borderline between microscopic phenomena ruled by quantum mechanics and the macroscopic world of classical physics. In particular, according to quantum mechanics [1], a system can exist in a superposition of distinct states, whereas these superpositions seem not to appear in the macroscopic world. One possible explanation of this paradox [2] is based on the fact that systems are never completely isolated but interact with the surrounding environment, that contains a large number of degrees of freedom. The environment influences the system evolution which continuously decoheres and transforms system superpositions into statistical mixtures which behave classically [2,3]. This problem is directly related to the problem of measurement in quantum theory [4,5] where the system to be measured is described by quantum mechanics and the measurement apparatus is assumed to behave classically. Apart from this fundamental point of view a more practical aspect is the question to what extent one can preserve quantum superpositions, which is the basis of potential applications of quantum mechanics, such as quantum cryptography and computation [6,7].

From the theoretical point of view, quantum decoherence has been studied extensively [2,3,8–11]. Most of the effort has been focused on the decoherence of a harmonic oscillator (the system) due to the coupling to a reservoir consisting of oscillators (the environment). According to these studies, the decoherence process depends critically on the form of the coupling between the system and the environment. On the experimental side, however, there have not been any systematic investigations. This is due to the lack of experimentally accessible systems where both the time scale and the form of the system–environment coupling can be changed in a controlled way.

In this paper we will show how to “engineer” the system–environment coupling in a situation that is experimentally accessible with existing technology. The system of interest will be an ion confined in a electromagnetic trap, and the environment will be the vacuum modes of the electromagnetic field. This corresponds to an experimental realization of a harmonic oscillator coupled to a reservoir of oscillators. The coupling between our system and the environment takes place through the recoil experienced by the ion when it inter-

changes photons with the electromagnetic field. As we will show below, this coupling can be manipulated by laser radiation. Variations of the laser frequency and intensity allows one to engineer such a coupling.

Laser cooled trapped ions [12] are a unique experimental system: unwanted dissipation can be made negligible for very long times, much longer than typical times in which an experiment takes place. Furthermore, arbitrary quantum states of the ion's motion can be synthesized and coherently manipulated using laser radiation [13]. In addition, the state of motion can be completely determined in the sense of tomographic measurements [14]. In a series of remarkable experiments, Wineland and collaborators have generated a variety of non-classical states of ion motion [15,16]. In particular, they have been able to produce [16] a so-called ‘‘Schrödinger cat state’’ [17] corresponding to

$$|\Psi\rangle \propto |\alpha\rangle + |-\alpha\rangle, \tag{1}$$

with  $|\alpha\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \alpha^n / \sqrt{n!} |n\rangle$  a coherent (quasiclassical) state. In Fig. 1(a) we have plotted the density operator for such a state in the position representation, i.e. (the real part of)  $\rho(x, x') = \langle x | \rho | x' \rangle$ . The peaks near the diagonal correspond to two possible localizations of the particle, whereas the other two peaks are related to the coherences that are responsible from the quantum behavior [2].

The interaction of a Schrödinger cat state with the environment has been the paradigm of decoherence of superposition states. As first argued by Zurek [2] (see also Refs. [3,2,8,9]), for a coupling which is linear in the system coordinates, a macroscopic superposition of the form (1) decays to a statistical mixture  $\rho \propto |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| + |-\alpha\rangle\langle-\alpha|$ , on a short time scale (decoherence time) which is related to the size of the cat ( $|\alpha|^2$ ) and is much faster than the energy dissipation time: this provides an explanation for the absence of superpositions in the macroscopic world [2]. We emphasize that the decoherence process of (1) is sensitive to the form of the reservoir coupling. For some quadratic couplings, for example, the decoherence and energy dissipation time can become identical [9]; moreover, there exist interactions which allow Schrödinger cat states to be stable, and, what is more surprising, dissipation

can drive a system into a steady state of the form (1) [9]. For example, in Fig. 1(b,c) the decay of a Schrödinger cat under linear and quadratic coupling is illustrated: for a linear coupling (Fig. 1 b) the nondiagonal peaks (coherences) of the density matrix decay much faster than for the quadratic couplings (Fig. 1 c). We will show that all these theoretical predictions can be tested experimentally for the case of a trapped ion.

The process of decoherence can be analyzed in detail under very general assumptions invoking to the so-called Markov approximation, which considers the correlation time for the environment to be much shorter than the evolution time of the system due to the coupling [11]. In this case the interaction of a system with an environment is described in terms of a master equation. For a single decoherence channel this equation has form ( $\hbar = 1$ )

$$\dot{\rho} = \gamma(2f\rho f^\dagger - f^\dagger f\rho - \rho f^\dagger f), \quad (2)$$

Here  $\rho$  is the reduced density operator for the system in the interaction picture after tracing over the reservoir. The operator  $f$  and the parameter  $\gamma$  reflects the system–environment coupling. For a harmonic oscillator  $f$  will be a function of the creation and annihilation operators  $a$  and  $a^\dagger$ , which are defined as usual  $X = 1/(2M\nu)^{1/2}(a^\dagger + a)$ ,  $P = i(M\nu/2)^{1/2}(a^\dagger - a)$  where  $X$  and  $P$  are the position and momentum operators and  $M$  the particle’s mass. According to Zurek [2], the coupling with the environment singles out in a quantum system a preferred set of states, sometimes called “the pointer basis”. This basis depends on the form of the coupling  $f$ . For example, for  $f = X$  the pointer basis is the position eigenstates. The density operator describing the system evolves in such a way that it rapidly becomes diagonal in this preferred basis, which is usually connected to the disappearance of quantum interferences. Our goal is now to find an experimental realization of the master equation (2) for different system–reservoir couplings  $f \equiv f(a, a^\dagger)$ .

Let us consider a single ion moving in a one–dimensional harmonic potential. The ion interacts with a laser in a standing wave configuration of frequency  $\omega_L$ , close to the transition frequency  $\omega_0$  of two internal levels  $|g\rangle$  and  $|e\rangle$ . Using standard methods in quantum optics based on the the dipole, Born–Markov, and rotating wave approximations, the master

equation that describes this situation can be written in the general form

$$\dot{\rho} = -iH_{\text{eff}}\rho + i\rho H_{\text{eff}}^\dagger + \mathcal{J}\rho, \quad (3)$$

with

$$H_{\text{eff}} = H_{\text{tp}} + H_{\text{int}} + H_{\text{cou}} - i\frac{\Gamma}{2}|e\rangle\langle e|, \quad (4a)$$

$$\mathcal{J}\rho = \Gamma \int_{-1}^1 du N(u) e^{-i\eta u(a+a^\dagger)} \sigma_- \rho \sigma_+ e^{i\eta u(a+a^\dagger)} \quad (4b)$$

where  $H_{\text{tp}} = \nu a^\dagger a$ ,  $H_{\text{int}} = \frac{1}{2}\omega_0 \sigma_z$ , and  $H_{\text{cou}} = \frac{\Omega}{2} \sin[\eta(a + a^\dagger) + \phi](\sigma_+ e^{-i\omega_L t} + \sigma_- e^{i\omega_L t})$ , give the free Hamiltonian for the motion in the trap, the internal two-level system Hamiltonian, and the one describing the coupling with the lasers, respectively. Here,  $\sigma_+ = |e\rangle\langle g| = (\sigma_-)^\dagger$  and  $\sigma_z = |e\rangle\langle e| - |g\rangle\langle g|$  are usual spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  operators describing the internal transition,  $\nu$  is the trap frequency,  $\Gamma$  the spontaneous emission rate, and  $\eta = (k_L^2/2M\nu)^{(1/2)}$  the Lamb-Dicke parameter which is the ratio of the recoil frequency  $k_L^2/2M$  to the trap oscillation frequency  $\nu$ . In the expression for the superoperator  $\mathcal{J}$ , the exponentials are related to the photon recoil that takes place in each spontaneous emission process, and the integral takes into account the different angles at which that photon can be emitted, with a normalized dipole pattern  $N(u)$ . In the Hamiltonian describing the coupling with the lasers,  $\Omega$  is the Rabi frequency, and  $\phi$  characterizes the relative position of the trap center with respect to the node of the laser standing wave. Here we will assume that either  $\phi = 0$  (excitation at the node of the standing wave) or  $\phi = \pi/2$  (excitation at the antinode).

We will proceed now by simplifying the master equation for the ion in a regime defined by three limits which are typically fulfilled in experiments [15,16]: (i) Lamb-Dicke, (ii) strong confinement (iii) low intensity. The first one allows to expand the above master equation in terms of the Lamb-Dicke parameter  $\eta \ll 1$ , retaining only the orders that contribute to the dynamics. The second one assumes  $\Gamma \ll \nu$  and together with the third one allows to include in the coupling Hamiltonian only on-resonance terms (secular approximation). Finally, the third one assumes a sufficiently low laser intensity (the specific form of this limit will be given later), and will serve us to adiabatically eliminate the internal excited level  $|e\rangle$ .

Let us start by simplifying the coupling Hamiltonian under the above limits. To do that, we move to a rotating frame defined by the unitary operator  $\mathcal{U} = e^{-i(H_{tp}+H_{int})t}$ . Following Ref. [13] we assume that: (i) For excitation at the node ( $\phi = 0$ ),  $\delta = \omega_L - \omega_0 = (2k + 1)\nu$  ( $k = 0, \pm 1, \dots$ ) (ii) For excitation at the antinode ( $\phi = \pi/2$ ),  $\delta = 2k\nu$  ( $k = 0, \pm 1, \dots$ ). In this rotating frame, after performing the rotating wave approximation and the Lamb–Dicke expansion, we obtain  $H_{cou} = \frac{\Omega'}{2}(\sigma_+ f + f^\dagger \sigma_-)$ , where both  $\Omega'$  and the form of the operator  $f$  depend on the frequency of the laser. For example, for  $\delta = -\nu$ , we have  $f = a$ , and  $\Omega' = \Omega\eta/2$ , whereas for  $\delta = -2\nu$ ,  $f = a^2$ , and  $\Omega' = -\Omega\eta^2/6$ . Apart from the strong confinement, in the first case, the secular approximation can be performed for  $\Omega' \ll \nu$ , whereas in the second case it is needed  $\Omega^2/\nu \ll \Omega'$ . This two conditions can always be fulfilled for low enough laser intensity, and together with  $\Omega' \ll \Gamma$  define the low intensity limit.

In the next step we eliminate adiabatically the internal excited state using standard procedures of quantum optics [11]. Physically, since  $\Omega' \ll \Gamma$  the ion practically spends no time in the excited level and therefore we can eliminate it. Finally, expanding in powers of  $\eta$  we find the desired master equation (2), with corrections of the order  $\eta^2$ . The master equation will be valid for times such that these corrections are not important, that is for times  $t \ll (\gamma\eta^2\bar{n})^{-1}$  where  $\bar{n}$  is the typical phonon number of the state of the ion. Nevertheless in the Lamb–Dicke limit this time can be much longer than the time required to reach the steady state using the approximated master equation. Note that through the adiabatic elimination we are coupling effectively the motion of the ion with the environment. The fact that this coupling takes place through the absorption of laser photons, and we have to choose the way on how this actually happens, allows one to manipulate the coupling system–environment.

According to our analysis, by varying the laser frequency we obtain the master equation (2) with different coupling operators  $f$ . In Fig. 2 we have illustrated the laser configurations which produce several  $f$  operators. In Fig. 2(a), for example, the laser is tuned to the so-called “lower motional sideband,”  $\delta = -\nu$ , and the ion is located at the node of the standing

wave field which leads to a coupling operator  $f = a$ . This can be easily understood by noting that in each absorption and spontaneous emission cycle one phonon is annihilated on a time scale given by the optical pumping time. Similarly, in Fig. 2(b) the laser is tuned to the “second lower sideband”  $\delta = -2\nu$  at the antinode of the laser standing wave which gives the two-phonon coupling  $f = a^2$ . These two cases of linear and quadratic coupling correspond to the two examples discussed in Figs. 1(b,c). In fact, these figures were obtained by a numerical solution of the full master equation (3) with quantum Monte-Carlo wavefunctions simulations [18]. As noted before, the decoherence acts in a different way depending on the coupling operator, according to our previous discussion.

It is simple to generalize the above derivation to find situations with other interesting (and perhaps unusual) coupling operators  $f$ . For example, consider the case in which two lasers of frequency  $\omega_0 + \nu$  and  $\omega_0 - \nu$  interact with the ion [Fig 2(c)]. This corresponds to a coherent excitation of the lower and upper motional sidebands [13]. In this case, following the same arguments, one can easily show that the operator is  $f = \mu a + \nu a^\dagger$ , where  $\mu^2 - \nu^2 = 1$  and  $\mu/\nu$  is the quotient of the Rabi frequencies. This operator corresponds to a squeezed vacuum coupling which has been the basis for numerous theoretical predictions in quantum optics [11]. In particular, choosing equal Rabi frequencies, the coupling is  $f = a + a^\dagger \propto X$ . This corresponds to the case analyzed theoretically by Unruh and Zurek, Caldeira and Leggett, and other authors [2,3] to describe the decoherence process in terms of the projection of the state of the system onto the pointer basis given, in this case, by the position eigenstates. Another interesting combination of lasers [Fig. 2(d)] yields  $f = (a - \alpha)(a - \beta)$ , where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are given complex numbers. For  $\alpha = -\beta$  the Schrödinger cat state (1) is an eigenstate of this operator with zero eigenvalue, and thus this state does not decohere under this form of coupling. As an aside we note that one can employ this particular form of system-reservoir coupling to generate a cat state (1) by choosing as the initial state the ground level  $|0\rangle$  [9,19]. Tuning a laser on resonance at the antinode of a standing light wave one can design the coupling in the form of a quantum nondemonolition measurement of the phonon number,  $f = a^\dagger a$ , with the Fock states as the pointer basis. Using more complicated laser

configurations one can readily show that, for example,  $f$ -operators like  $a(a^\dagger a - n)$  can be engineered. The operator  $a^\dagger a - n$  projects out a subspace with exactly  $n$  phonons. Finally, exotic combination of operators such as  $a(a^\dagger a - n) - a^\dagger(a^\dagger a - n - 1) - 1$  can be realized, such that the system is driven into the superpositon state  $|n\rangle + |n + 1\rangle$ .

Obviously, there are numerous possibilities to generalize the concept of reservoir engineering in ion traps. First of all, decoherence of a two or three-mode system can be studied by considering the two or three dimensional motion of a trapped ion, respectively. Furthermore, a master equation with more than one decoherence channel, i.e., an equation containing sums of damping terms of the form (2) with different operators  $f_i$  ( $i = 1, \dots, N$ ) [11], can also be easily implemented. This can be accomplished by exciting transitions with several incoherent lasers. Another important generalization concerns the possibility of coupling a two-level system to a harmonic oscillator (Jaynes-Cummings model) which in turn is coupled to an environment. In particular, this will allow to test experimentally one of the outstanding predictions of quantum optics [20], namely the damping of a two-level system interacting with a squeezed reservoir. Finally, these ideas can be extended to linear ion traps [21] in order to study collective effects in an  $N$ -atom + harmonic oscillator system.

In summary, we have shown how the coupling of a harmonic oscillator (represented by the motion of a trapped ion) to an environment can be engineered. We believe that this opens a new field in the sense that it will allow for the first time to study experimentally in a controlled and systematic way the effects of decoherence in a quantum system.



## REFERENCES

- \* Permanent address: Departamento de Física, Universidad de Castilla–La Mancha, 13071 Ciudad Real, SPAIN.
- [1] P. A. M. Dirac, “The Principles of Quantum Mechanics”, (Clarendon, Oxford, ed. 4, 1984).
- [2] W. H. Zurek, Phys. Today **44**, No. 10, 36 (1991). W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **24**, 1516 (1981); *ibid.* **26**, 1862 (1982). W. G. Unruh and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **40**, 1071 (1989).
- [3] D. F. Walls and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A **31**, 2403 (1985); A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, Phys. Rev. A **31**, 1059 (1985).
- [4] “Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik”, J. von Neumann (Springer, Berlin, 1932).
- [5] “Quantum Theory and Measurement”, J. A. Wheeler and W. H. Zurek, Eds. (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, NJ, 1983).
- [6] D. P. DiVincenzo, Science **270**, 255 (1995).
- [7] I. L. Chuang *et al.*, Science **270**, 1633 (1995).
- [8] L. Davidovich *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **71**, 2360 (1993).
- [9] B. R. Garraway and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **50**, 2548 (1994); **49**, 1266 (1994); C. C. Gerry and E. E. Hach III, Phys. Lett. A **174**, 185 (1993).
- [10] P. Goetsch *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 136 (1995).
- [11] See, for example, C. W. Gardiner, *Quantum Noise*, (Springer–Verlag, Berlin, 1992) and references therein.
- [12] D. J. Wineland and W. M. Itano, Physics Today, **40**, No. 6, 34 (June, 1987).

- [13] J. I. Cirac *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 556 (1993); **70**, 762 (1993). The way to preparing arbitrary states of motion is shown in S. A. Gardiner *et al* (unpublished).
- [14] J. F. Poyatos *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A (to be published); S. Wallentowitz and V. Vogel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2932 (1995).
- [15] C. Monroe *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4714 (1995); D. M. Meekhof *et al* (unpublished).
- [16] C. Monroe *et al.* (unpublished).
- [17] E. Schrödinger, Naturwissenschaften **23**, 807 (1935); **23**, 823 (1935); **23** 844 (1935).
- [18] P. Zoller and C. W. Gardiner in “Quantum fluctuations”, Les Houches, E. Giacobino *et al* (Elsevier, NY, in press).
- [19] R. L. de Matos Filho and W. Vogel Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 608 (1996).
- [20] C. W. Gardiner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **56**, 1917 (1986).
- [21] J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4091 (1995).
- [22] We acknowledge discussions with R. Blatt, C. Monroe, D. Wineland, and W. Zurek. J. F. P. acknowledges a grant of The Junta de Comunidades de Castilla–La Mancha. Work supported by Austrian Science Foundation.

## FIGURES

FIG. 1. (a)  $\rho(x, x')$  for the state (1) ( $\alpha = 3$ ). (b,c) Numerical simulation of the interaction with a laser for a time  $\tau = 0.06\gamma^{-1}$  and  $\eta = 0.03$ : (b)  $\omega_L = \omega_0 - \nu$ , ( $f = a$ ); (c)  $\omega_L = \omega_0 - 2\nu$ , ( $f = a^2$ ).

FIG. 2. Laser configurations for several coupling operators  $f$ . (a) Laser tuned to  $|n, g\rangle \rightarrow |n - 1, e\rangle$ , which rapidly decays into the state  $|n - 1, g\rangle$  leading to  $f = a$ . (b)  $f = a^2$ . (c)  $f = \mu a + \nu a^\dagger$ . (d)  $f = (a - \alpha)(a - \beta)$ .

This figure "fig1.gif" is available in "gif" format from:

<http://arxiv.org/ps/atom-ph/9603002v1>