

Ultrafast optical signature of quantum superpositions in a nanostructure

F.J.Rodríguez¹, L.Quiroga¹ and N.F.Johnson²

¹ *Departamento de Física, Universidad de Los Andes, A.A. 4976, Bogotá D.C., Colombia*

² *Physics Department, Clarendon Laboratory, Oxford University, Oxford OX1 3PU, U.K.*

We propose an unambiguous signature for detecting quantum superposition states in a nanostructure, based on current ultrafast spectroscopy techniques. The reliable generation of such superposition states via Hadamard-like quantum gates is crucial for implementing solid-state based quantum information schemes. The signature originates from a remarkably strong photon antibunching effect which is enhanced by non-Markovian dynamics.

PACS numbers: 71.35.Lk, 71.35.Ee

The possibility of performing quantum information processing in nanostructure systems is of great interest from the perspectives of both fundamental science and future emerging technologies. Quantum dots (QDs) are solid-state nanostructures which are analogs of real atoms¹; semiconductor QDs are seen as excellent candidates for performing quantum information processing tasks²⁻⁴. There are also many inorganic and organic structures that qualify as ‘nanostructures’ and may therefore become good candidates; for example carbon buckyballs, and even micro-biological molecular structures such as the photosynthetic complexes in purple bacteria⁵. Essential steps toward the implementation of standard quantum information schemes in such nanostructures, include: (1) the identification of the basic qubit (quantum bit), and (2) the application of one- and two-qubit quantum gates in order to generate quantum superpositions and entanglement. An important example of a one-qubit gate is the Hadamard-like gate, since it generates a superposition state (e.g. $|0\rangle + |1\rangle$) from an un-superposed initial state (e.g. $|0\rangle$). Reference[2] showed that (1) and (2) can be achieved with excitons generated using current techniques in ultrafast optical spectroscopy⁶. Several experimental groups are now actively pursuing this route. We note that such qubit control has already been achieved in neutral atoms⁷ and ions in an ion trap⁸, however scalability issues may limit such non solid-state devices to just a few qubits.

A crucial third step is to verify the reliability of the quantum superpositions (entanglements) generated in the single nanostructure (pair of nanostructures) by the one-qubit (two-qubit) quantum gate. In time-resolved experiments a distinction between the different initial states is difficult. The coherent second-order emission properties used by Becher et al.⁹ have a limited resolution of approximately 420 ps, thus cannot give reliable information for times shorter than 50 ps. How can we therefore show experimentally that we have gen-

erated such superposition (entanglement)? This Letter addresses this question for the important first step of a single nanostructure (e.g. a single QD). Specifically, we consider the ultrafast second-order coherence function of the emitted light from the optically-generated exciton in a single nanostructure (QD). This quantity $g^{(2)}$ is calculated for the QD interacting with two baths: (i) photon environment and (ii) a phonon system. A strong antibunching effect is predicted in the resonance fluorescence response at very short times, *if and only if the initial exciton state comprises a quantum superposition*. This strong effect does not arise for initial states described by a statistical mixture, i.e. non-superposed states. Non-Markovian effects, which cannot be neglected a priori in such ultrafast regimes, are found to enhance the antibunching signal. Apart from the quantum superposition test, our results may prove useful in designing photon-emitting devices with controllable and accurate emission rates¹⁰.

In atomic systems, resonance fluorescence experiments have already proved themselves to be extremely valuable¹¹. Similar experiments in solid-state systems have only recently been performed. In particular it has been demonstrated that for a single CdSe QD at room temperature^{12,13} and a single self-assembled InAs QD at cryogenic temperatures^{9,14}, strong antibunching effects are observed in fluorescence experiments. This provides direct evidence that single QDs present the same kind of nonclassical light emission as a single two-level atom. However, our present work is the first to consider the sensitivity of the antibunching effect to the initial state.

We consider a QD semiconductor excited by light of low intensity, hence the number of excitons generated is small. The solid-state system of interest here comprises an electron-hole pair (exciton) confined within a nanostructure (e.g. a QD) of any shape, coupled to the electromagnetic field and to a heat bath, represented by a set of harmonic oscillators, which provides the basic source of temperature dependence. A single exciton in its ground state can be described by a two-level system². The Hamiltonian is given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 H = \epsilon\sigma_z + \sum_k \omega_k a_k^\dagger a_k + \sum_k (g_k \sigma^+ a_k + g_k^* \sigma^- a_k^\dagger) \quad (1) \\
 + \sum_q \Omega_q b_q^\dagger b_q + \sum_q \sigma_z (f_q b_q + f_q^* b_q^\dagger) + \\
 E(t)\sigma^+ e^{i\omega t} + c.c.
 \end{aligned}$$

where a_k and b_q represent the annihilation operators for photons and phonons respectively, ϵ is the total exci-

ton energy, ω_k (Ω_q) denotes the photon (phonon) frequencies, g_k (f_q) the exciton-photon (exciton-phonon) coupling and $E(t)$ describes the envelope of a classical source of light of frequency ω acting on the QD. The exciton population is described by $\sigma_z = |X\rangle\langle X| - |0\rangle\langle 0|$ where $|X\rangle$ stands for a one exciton state while $|0\rangle$ denotes the QD vacuum, i.e. no exciton. Similarly the raising and lowering pseudo-spin operators are $\sigma^+ = |X\rangle\langle 0|$ and $\sigma^- = |0\rangle\langle X|$, respectively. From Eq.(1) it is seen that the photon field is associated with the dissipative dynamics of the QD whereas the phonon field is responsible for dephasing effects. This phonon dephasing accounts for the temperature effects. The photon field is assumed to remain at zero temperature but non-Markovian effects are included for both exciton-photon and exciton-phonon couplings. One of the advantages of this model is that it is reasonably simple, yet sufficiently complex to manifest many important features of the ultrafast response of nanostructures.

In order to proceed further, a master equation in the Lindblad form is used. This kind of master equation can properly account for the coupling of the QD system to its environment, and can go beyond the Markov approximation using time dependent damping coefficients¹⁵. Master equations with time-independent damping coefficients are unable to account for the evolution of an open system on very short time scales. At resonance, i.e. $\omega = \epsilon$, and using the rotating wave approximation, the Liouvillian acting on any QD operator O is given by:

$$L(t)O = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[E\sigma^+ + E^*\sigma^-, O] + \quad (2)$$

$$\gamma_{relax}(t)[\sigma^- O \sigma^+ - \frac{1}{2}O\sigma^+\sigma^- - \frac{1}{2}\sigma^+\sigma^- O]$$

$$+ \gamma_{dph}(T_e, t)[\sigma_z, [\sigma_z, O]]$$

where the coupling to photons, $\gamma_{relax}(t)$, and the coupling to phonons, $\gamma_{dph}(T_e, t)$ (T_e is temperature), include non-Markovian effects through their time dependences. Solving the Liouville equation for the QD density matrix ρ , for different Rabi frequencies $\Omega = \frac{\mu|E|}{\hbar}$ (μ is the dipole moment), expectation values for any QD operator may be evaluated and the characteristics of the emitted photon field hence obtained.

The coherence properties of the emitted photon field can be properly accounted for by the second-order coherence function given by¹⁶

$$g^{(2)}(T, \tau) = \frac{\langle \sigma^+(T)\sigma^+(T+\tau)\sigma^-(T+\tau)\sigma^-(T) \rangle}{\langle \sigma^+(T)\sigma^-(T) \rangle \langle \sigma^+(T+\tau)\sigma^-(T+\tau) \rangle} \quad (3)$$

where $\tau = t_1 - t_2$ represents the time difference between the photons arrival at the detector and $T = \frac{t_1+t_2}{2}$. This coherence function can be expressed in a very simple form, valid for any initial condition of the QD, as follows:

$$g^{(2)}(T, \tau) = \frac{\langle X | \mathcal{T} e^{\int_0^\tau L(t') dt'} (|0\rangle\langle 0|) | X \rangle}{\rho_{X,X}(T+\tau)} \quad (4)$$

where \mathcal{T} denotes the time-ordering operator and ρ is the QD reduced density matrix. By changing the initial preparation state of the QD, the value of the non-stationary second-order coherence function, should change through its dependence on $\rho_{X,X}$. A closed expression for $g^{(2)}$ and the antibunching effect, characterized by the growth of $g^{(2)}$ from zero for $\tau = 0$, has been well documented *in the steady-state* situation, with non-zero relaxation decay γ_0 and with $\gamma_{dph} = 0$ ¹⁶. However an expression for Eq.(4) in closed form for the ultrafast regime, valid for any T and τ , is not available. A numerical solution of the Bloch equations for the different elements of the QD reduced density matrix must therefore be performed. Our present work represents a far more general study of the variations of $g^{(2)}$, and includes the effect of different initial QD states. In particular, it is interesting to quantify the variations of $g^{(2)}$ for the following initial conditions: (i) a pure state comprising a quantum superposition (QS) of type $|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + i|X\rangle)$ where $\rho(0) = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$, and (ii) the usual experimental case in which the QD is prepared in its ground state (GS) given by $\rho(0) = |0\rangle\langle 0|$.

As a starting point, we consider a single QD containing only one electron-hole pair, within the Markov approximation. The experimentally obtained decay rate⁶, $\hbar\gamma_{relax}(t) = \hbar\gamma_0 = 20\mu eV$ is used in the calculations and $\gamma_{dph} = 0.5\gamma_0$. The Rabi frequency is $2.25\gamma_0$ ($\mu \approx 15$ Debye). Results for $g^{(2)}$ are shown in Fig. 1a. A clear sub-poissonian character is observed at very short times. The enhancement property of $g^{(2)}$ can be readily understood from Eq.(4), in particular from a vanishing value of the element $\rho_{X,X}$ of the QD density matrix. After some algebra and using the quantum regression theorem¹¹, the second-order time correlation function can be written as $g^{(2)}(T, \tau) = (\rho_{X,X}(\tau)|_{\rho(\tau=0)=|X\rangle\langle X|})/\rho_{X,X}(T, \tau)$, where the numerator represents the density matrix element given that the QD is in its ground state. By solving the Bloch equations for ρ at very short times, it can be seen that this enhancement appears for $\tau \approx (\Omega - \gamma_0)^{-1}$, i.e. when $\rho_{X,X}(T, \tau) \rightarrow 0$ in agreement with Fig.1a. We stress that this condition *cannot* be obtained if the system is initially prepared in its Ground State (GS) or in a Statistical Mixture of states (not shown). Previous experiments⁹ with their limited resolution times could not have detected this new feature because the correlations always vanish for long detection times.

Since this antibunching behaviour occurs at very short times, it is necessary to consider the effects of non-Markovian phenomena characterized by time-dependent damping rates. The initial photon state is the vacuum; hence an explicit expression for $\gamma_{relax}(t)$, which is appropriate for a situation with only one emitted photon, is as follows¹⁵

$$\gamma_{relax}(t) = \frac{2\gamma_0 \sinh(dt/2)}{(d/\lambda) \cosh(dt/2) + \sinh(dt/2)} \quad (5)$$

where $d = \sqrt{\lambda^2 - 2\gamma_0\lambda}$, γ_0 is the constant Markov decay

rate (time-independent) and γ_0/λ is the ratio between the photon reservoir correlation time and a typical time scale on which the exciton QD changes. For $\gamma_0/\lambda \ll 1$, this yields $\gamma_{relax}(t)/\gamma_0 = 1 - e^{-\lambda t}$. This explicit expression for $\gamma_{relax}(t)$, is appropriate for a Lorentzian photon reservoir (only one emitted photon)¹⁷. A memoryless photon environment corresponds to λ going to infinity in which case the Markov situation is recovered. It is worth noting that by slightly changing this form of $\gamma_{relax}(t)$, non-Markovian effects in a structured photon environment, such as a microcavity could also be modeled¹⁵.

For the pure dephasing rate, the standard form of the independent boson model¹⁸ is taken as

$$\gamma_{dph}(T_e, t) = \sum_q |f_q|^2 \coth\left(\frac{\Omega_q}{2T_e}\right) \frac{1 - \cos(\Omega_q t)}{\Omega_q^2}. \quad (6)$$

In the continuum limit for phonon \vec{q} vectors, all information about the bath which is essential to the dynamics of the QD, is contained in the compact form of the spectral density function $J(\omega) = \frac{\pi}{2} \sum_q |f_q|^2 \delta(\omega - \Omega_q)$. An appropriate choice for the spectral function $J(\omega)$, and its associated cut-off frequency, can be made according to the QD environment. In terms of the Debye model the natural cutoff is the Debye frequency (ω_D) yielding a spectral function of the form $J(\omega) \sim \omega^3 e^{-\omega/\omega_D}$. An explicit form for γ_{dph} , with the latter choice for $J(\omega)$, has been derived by Palma et al.¹⁹. For different temperatures ($\eta = T_e/\omega_D$), $\gamma_{relax}(t)$ and γ_{dph} are shown in Fig.1b. On very short time-scales the effective decay rates for both processes, radiative and pure dephasing, are very low indicating that Markov approximations (which are valid on long time-scales) overestimate the decay effects at short times. As demonstrated, this explicit form of $\gamma_{relax}(\tau)$ and $\gamma_{dph}(T_e, \tau)$ leads to an inefficient damping at times $\tau < \gamma_0^{-1}$; hence the Markov approximation overestimates the damping effects in the ultrafast regime. Therefore, any antibunching enhancement that occurs on a very short time scale, should be reinforced by non-Markovian phenomena. A demonstration of this statement is shown in Fig. 1c with $\eta = 2.85$ and $\Omega = 2.25\gamma_0$, for different resolution detecting times. In order to detect two photons, the condition $T < 2\tau$ must be fulfilled. Clearly, the QS shows a strong enhancement compared with a GS. The second-order time correlation function at very short times, therefore provides information about the initial state preparation. The main result of this Letter is that for times smaller than the time scale in which dissipation of energy takes place, a new antibunching effect is predicted. Within this time scale the correlations between the dot and the environment are not very important and clearly non-classical light emission is enhanced. As a consequence, antibunching enhancement should be most prominent in QDs fabricated from II-VI semiconductors, III-V nitrides, organic materials or hybrid heterostructures due to the fact that in these systems exciton-photon coupling is not necessarily weak and non-Markovian effects can be important.

Figure 2 shows how the bunching peak develops a symmetric shape, growing quite large at low Rabi frequencies. For a QS initial state the antibunching peak is observed at very short times and the light emission evolves rapidly into a mere statistical mixtures of states (not shown). We now turn our attention to the long time behaviour ($\tau \gg \gamma_0^{-1}$) for $g^{(2)}(\tau)$. In the inset of Fig. 2, the antibunching effect is clearly observed, however the peak intensities are not as large as those predicted for the QS state. To avoid confusion concerning this sub-Poissonian characteristic, we stress that this peak intensity comes from the natural Rabi oscillations of the QD-light coupled system. The bunching peak reported in this Letter is observed when the vacuum fluctuations dominate, if and only if the system is prepared in a QS. Therefore the QS initial state for typical experimental values at very short times is insensitive to the decoherence mechanism

In summary, we have shown that ultrafast fluorescence intensity-correlation measurements in single QDs provide a sensitive probe not only of the photonic and phononic environment, but also of memory effects such as those determined by specific initial state preparation. At the heart of our results is an enhancement of the lack of photon coincidence on short time-scales as a result of the exciton superposition state. As a side-product of our findings, the transformation from sub-Poissonian ($g^{(2)} < 1$) to super-Poissonian ($g^{(2)} > 1$) behavior on short time-scales may be of practical interest in the design of devices which act as triggered single photon sources. This paper has concentrated on the basic building block comprising single nanostructures and superpositions created by the application of one-qubit gates. Nonclassical light features in the fluorescence of coupled QD systems will be dealt with elsewhere.

The authors acknowledge support from COLCIENCIAS (Colombia) projects No.1204-05-10326, 1204-05-1148 and Banco de la República (Colombia)

¹ L. Jacak, P. Hawrylak and A. Wojs, *Quantum Dots*, (Springer, Berlin, 1998).

² L. Quiroga and N.F. Johnson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 2270 (1999); J.H. Reina, L. Quiroga, and N.F. Johnson, Phys. Rev. **A62**, 12305 (2000).

³ A. Imamoglu, D.D. Awschalom, G. Burkard, D.P. DiVincenzo, D. Loss, M. Sherwin and A. Small, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4204 (1999).

⁴ D. Loss and D.P. DiVincenzo, Phys. Rev. **A57**, 120 (1998).

⁵ X. Hew and K. Schulten, Physics Today, 28 August 1997, p.28.

⁶ N.H. Bonadeo et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2759 (1998).

⁷ D. Jaksch, J.I. Cirac, P. Zoller, S.L. Rolston, R. Cote and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2208 (2000).

⁸ J.I. Cirac and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4071 (1995).

- ⁹ C. Becher, A. Kiraz, P. Michler, A. Imamoglu, W.V. Schoenfeld, P.M. Petroff, L. Zhang and E. Hu, Phys. Rev. **B63**, 121312(R) (2001).
- ¹⁰ Ch.Santori, M.Pelton, G.Solomon, Y.Dale and Y.Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 1502 (2001).
- ¹¹ M.O. Scully and M.S. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997).
- ¹² P. Michler, A. Imamoglu, M.D. Mason, P.J. Carson, G.F. Strouse and S.K. Buratto, Nature **406**, 968 (2000).
- ¹³ B. Lounis, H.A. Bechtel, D. Gerion, P. Alivisatos and W.E. Moerner, Chem. Phys. Lett. **329**, 399 (2000).
- ¹⁴ D.V.Regelman, U.Mizrahi, D.Gershoni, E.Ehrenfreund, W.V.Schoenfeld and P.M.Petroff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 257401 (2001).
- ¹⁵ H.-P. Breuer, B. Kappler and F. Petruccione, Phys. Rev. **A59**, 1633 (1999).
- ¹⁶ H.J. Charnichael, *An Open Systems Approach to Quantum Optics*, Lectures Notes in Physics, Vol. 18 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993).
- ¹⁷ T.Yu, L.Diosi, N.Gisin and W.T.Strunz, Phys.Rev. **A60**, 91 (1999).
- ¹⁸ G.D. Mahan, *Many-Particle Physics* (Plenum Press, New York, 1990).
- ¹⁹ G.M. Palma, K.-A. Suominen and A. Ekert, Proc. Roy. Soc. Lon. **A452**, 567 (1996).

Figure Captions

FIG. 1. Second-order coherence function in the Markov approximation for $\eta = 2.85$, $\lambda = 2.0\gamma_0$ and $\Omega = 2.25\gamma_0$. (a) $g^{(2)}$ for three different detecting times in a QS initial state using the Markov approximation. (b) Time evolution of the decay rate $\gamma(t)$ and pure dephasing rate $\gamma_{dph}(T, t)$ for different temperatures and $\lambda = 2\gamma_0$. (c) Second-order coherence function including non-Markovian effects for initial quantum superposition and ground states.

FIG. 2. Second-order coherence function including non-Markovian effects for different Rabi frequencies $\Omega = 2\gamma_0$ (continuous line), $\Omega = 2.25\gamma_0$ (dotted-line), $\Omega = 2.75\gamma_0$ (dashed-line), $\Omega = 6\gamma_0$ (dot-dashed line). Inset: The stationary limit when the system was prepared in a quantum superposition initial state.



