

Quantum interference effects in degenerate systems. Spontaneous and stimulated radiation.

A. A. Panteleev, Vl. K. Roerich¹

¹*FSUE "SRC RF TRINITI", Federal State unitary Enterprise "State Research Center of Russian Federation Troitsk Institute for Innovation and Fusion Research", TRINITI, Troitsk, Moscow region, Russia 142190**

We study the effect of quantum interference on the structure and properties of spontaneous and stimulated transitions in a degenerate V -type three-level atom with an arbitrary total momentum of each state. Explicit expressions for the factors in the terms of the relaxation operator and stimulated transition operator with account of quantum interference effects are obtained. It has been demonstrated that the condition for the dipole transition moments to be parallel is insufficient and for conventional atoms the interference cross terms are zeros for both operators. The conditions when quantum interference influences the properties of the relaxation operators have been analysed. For the stimulated transitions this condition is shown to be anisotropy of the photon field interacting with the atoms. This case is minutely studied for the D -line of alkali metals.

I. INTRODUCTION.

Analysis of spontaneous decay of excited atomic states and spectral-angular, polarization, spatial, and other characteristics of scattered radiation has long been the major focus of research in quantum optics.

Recent studies have substantially raised attention to the phenomenon of quantum interference occurring at spontaneous emission from two or more closely separated neighbor states. Such a trend is explained by the fact that these interference processes result in a range of various effects which are likely to have important practical applications. Quantum interference at spontaneous emission is the interference phenomenon of Fano type [1] and is due to the fact that the states decay to the common continuum. In [1] it was demonstrated that in such a case the relaxation operator contains off-diagonal terms. In [2] the off-diagonal terms in the relaxation operator were obtained in a similar form while solving the problem of crossed quasi-steady states interaction with continuous spectrum. A similar operator was derived in [3] to describe exchange interaction for single-nucleon quasi-steady states.

The recent interest towards interference effects in spontaneous emission arose in connection with the works of Harris and Imamoglu [4, 5, 6] where they demonstrated a possibility of lasing without inversion when two excited states interact with common quantized radiation field. The subsequent changes in absorption and amplification profiles were explained by the off-diagonal terms in the relaxation operator. Lasing without inversion due to quantum interference in a V -type three-level system was also studied in [7, 8, 9]. It must be noted that a significant change in the profile of absorption and amplification is as well possible for two-level systems in a strong field. In this case there can be amplification of resonant pho-

tons near the frequencies detuned from the central peak by the value of Rabi frequency [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. This phenomenon was experimentally observed in the radiofrequency range [16] and in optical range as reported in [17]. It is also worth noting that lasing without inversion was also discussed, for instance, in [18, 19, 20] when treating the three-level system of Λ -type.

In further studies of quantum interference a great number of other effects were predicted. The prime phenomenon to mark out is the effect of spectral line narrowing. Zhou and Swain were the first to show this effect while they were studying the spontaneous decay of a V -type three-level atom. This effect as well as observation of so-called dark states were analysed in [21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26, 27, 28]. In [24, 29, 30] they demonstrated the possibility for quenching of spontaneous emission. In [31] this phenomenon was experimentally verified for molecular transitions in sodium dimer systems. The initiation of quantum beats during spontaneous decay was studied in [32, 33, 34, 35, 36]. Quantum interference was studied for the cases of both monochromatic and biharmonic external fields. The conditions for coherent population trapping in a biharmonic laser field were considered in [30, 37, 38]. Besides, in [39, 40, 41, 42] it was demonstrated that for such systems the line shape is highly dependable on the phase difference of the driving fields. In [40, 41, 42] they studied the conditions for spontaneous intensity control by means of variation of laser field phase and phase switch-on time.

At least two correlated paths are required for quantum interference to occur. The two elementary systems to provide these conditions are the nondegenerate three-level atoms of V and Λ types for which all of the above mentioned effects are already true. By now this has mainly been the model used to study quantum interference. However, some modifications have also been introduced, i.e., the system was studied with some additional levels in various configurations, several driving fields, etc. Yet, it must be noted that such a system is nothing but a model and does not reflect some proper-

*Email address: vroerich@triniti.ru

ties of real physical systems being of great importance for practical implementations and likely to change essentially the consideration of the quantum interference itself. Some drawbacks of this model are the facts that it does not take any account for possible level degeneration, neglects angular and polarization distribution of both driving and spontaneous fields. In the papers we referred to above the quantum interference was conditioned by nonorthogonal (parallel ideally) dipole transition vectors [44], [22], [43], [35], [36]. However, as we show it in this paper below this condition is insufficient if a rather full-scale model is considered.

The aim of this work is to study the effect of quantum interference upon radiative relaxation for real atomic transitions with account for level degeneracy in the magnetic moment projection. In this work we fully focus on the properties of the V -type model for both spontaneous and stimulated transitions allowing for the hyperfine splitting. The Λ -type model can be as well studied by means of the techniques described below.

This work is a sequel of our earlier series of papers [47, 48, 49], devoted to studying the properties of spontaneous emission of an atom exposed to a strong monochromatic field of arbitrary polarization composition. This paper is structured as follows. In the section II we state the problem and derive the basic equations. Section III is to study spontaneous processes. Section IV is devoted to stimulated phenomena. We derive the operator to describe transitions stimulated by a non-coherent field and consider thoroughly the cases of homogeneous and heterogeneous fields for the D -line of alkaline metals. In the appendix we derive the relaxation operator subject to the hyperfine level splitting.

II. BASIC EQUATIONS.

We consider a quantized electromagnetic field interacting with a degenerate V -type three-level atom with $b \rightarrow d$, $c \rightarrow d$ (see Fig. (1)) allowed transitions having the total angular momentum J_j , $j = b, c, d$. Using the dipole approximation, the Hamiltonian (in units $1/\hbar$) of the system can be written as a sum:

$$\hat{H} = H_a + \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} H_f + \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} V_{af}. \quad (1)$$

Here, in (1) H_a describes an unperturbed atomic system:

$$H_a = \sum_{j=b,c} \sum_{M_j} \frac{\epsilon(J_j, M_j)}{\hbar} |j, M_j\rangle \langle M_j, j|, \quad (2)$$

where $\epsilon(J_j, M)$ is the energy of an atomic state with the total angular momentum J_j and its projection M_j on the quantization axis (z), while $\langle M_j, j|$ is the corresponding vector for this state. Since we further neglect splitting of the magnetic sublevels as well as other effects resulting into magnetic moment projection dependence of the




FIG. 1: Degenerate three-level atom.

energy, we write:

$$H_a = \sum_{j=b,c} \sum_{M_j} \omega_{jd} |j, M_j\rangle \langle M_j, j|, \quad (3)$$

where ω_{jd} is the $j \rightarrow d$ transition frequency for any pair of sublevels.

The second term in (1) describes the Hamiltonian of the quantized field:

$$\hat{H}_f = \omega_k \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}, \quad (4)$$

with ω_k being the photonic frequency with wave vector \mathbf{k} , $k = |\mathbf{k}|$ and polarization $\lambda = \pm 1$, $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^\dagger$ and $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ are the creation and annihilation operators for the photons respectively.

The atom-field interaction is described by the expression:

$$V_{af} = i \sum_{j=b,c} \sum_{m_j m_d} g_{jd}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda} (M_j M_d) \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} |j M_j\rangle \langle M_d d| + H.c \quad (5)$$

where

$$g_{jd}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda} (M_j M_d) = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\omega_k}{\hbar W}} (\vec{\mu}_{jd} (M_j M_d), \epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \lambda)) \quad (6)$$

is the coupling constant with $\vec{\mu}_{jd} (M_j M_d)$ being the dipole transition operator. $\epsilon(\mathbf{k}, \lambda)$ is the unitary polarization vector, and W denotes the quantization volume. Using the Wigner-Eckart theorem [50] the coupling constant (6) can be written as

$$g_{jd}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda} (M_j M_d) = \frac{C_{J_d M_d 1 \sigma}^{J_j M_j}}{\sqrt{2J_j + 1}} \|\mu_{jd}\| \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\omega_k}{\hbar W}} D_{\lambda \sigma}^1. \quad (7)$$

where $C_{J_d M_d 1 \sigma}^{J_j M_j}$ are the Glebsch-Gordan coefficients, $D_{\lambda \sigma}^1 = D_{\lambda \sigma}^1(\alpha = \phi, \beta = \theta, \gamma = 0)$ is the Wigner function [51], with the angles ϕ, θ determining the direction of the

wave vector \mathbf{k} of an emitted photon to the quantization axis (z). It must be noted that due to the properties of the Glebsch-Gordan coefficients $g_{jd}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_j M_d)$ is different from zero only if $\sigma = M_j - M_d$, while σ can be 0, ± 1 because of the selection rules.

It is now advantageous for us to change to the interaction picture where the Hamiltonian has the form:

$$\hat{H}_i = \tilde{V}_{af}, \quad \tilde{V}_{af}(t) = i \sum_{j=b,c} \sum_{m_j m_d} g_{jd}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_j M_d) \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} |j M_j\rangle \langle M_d| e^{i(\omega_{jd} - \omega_k)t} + H.c \quad (8)$$

We further treat the system using the cluster expansion of the Bogolubov-Born-Green-Kirkwood-Yvon (BBGKY) hierarchy of equations for the reduced density operators [45]. Let us note that this approach was applied when we studied transient spectra of resonance fluorescence [46].

As the value of the coupling constant is usually small it is sufficient to use just the Born approximation to study the radiative relaxation processes. In the framework of this approach we write

$$\begin{aligned} i \frac{d\rho^a}{dt} - \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \text{Tr}_f[\tilde{V}_{af}, \rho_f \rho^a] &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \text{Tr}_f[\tilde{V}_{af}, g_{af}], \\ i \frac{d\rho_f}{dt} - \text{Tr}_a[\tilde{V}_{af}, \rho_f \rho^a]^a &= \text{Tr}_a[\tilde{V}_{af}, g_{af}], \\ i \frac{dg_{af}}{dt} &= [\tilde{V}_{af}, \rho^a \rho_f], \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where ρ^a, ρ_f are the atomic and field single particle density operators respectively, while g_{af} is the single atom - single photon correlation operator. Tr_a, Tr_f denote tracing operation over field and atomic variables.

Operator $\text{Tr}_a[\tilde{V}_{af}, \rho_f \rho^a]$ describes polarization of the medium induced by the external field and $\sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \text{Tr}_f[\tilde{V}_{af}, \rho_f \rho^a]$ introduces the mean field contribution. Since our focus is to study the relaxation processes only we further disregard the contribution of these terms.

Finding a formal solution for g_{af} we substitute it to the equations for the atomic and field density operators:

$$\begin{aligned} i \frac{d\rho^a}{dt} &= \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \text{Tr}_f[\tilde{V}_{af}(t), \int_0^t [\tilde{V}_{af}(\tau), \rho^a(\tau) \rho_f(\tau)] d\tau], \\ i \frac{d\rho_f}{dt} &= \text{Tr}_a[\tilde{V}_{af}(t), \int_0^t [\tilde{V}_{af}(\tau), \rho^a(\tau) \rho_f(\tau)] d\tau]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The right-hand-side terms in the equation for the atomic density operator is the operator which describes both stimulated and spontaneous transitions while the right-hand-side terms in the equation for the field density operator describes the variation of the number of photons due to such atomic transitions.

III. SPONTANEOUS TRANSITIONS

To consider properties of spontaneous transitions one needs to substitute $\rho_f(\tau) \equiv |0_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\rangle \langle 0_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}|$ to the right-hand side of the equation for the density operator. It is clear that the terms proportional to $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^+ \rho_f, \rho_f \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^+, \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^+ \rho_f \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ remain while the others vanish. Taking the latter into account it is now possible to follow the well known Wigner-Weisskopf theory to transform to

$$\begin{aligned} i \frac{d\rho^a}{dt} &= -i \sum_{j_1, j_2=b,c} \sum_{M_{j_1} M_{j_2}} (\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2}) e^{i(\omega_{j_1 d} - \omega_{j_2 d})t} |j_1 M_{j_1}\rangle \langle M_{j_2} j_2| \rho^a + \\ &- \sum_{M_{d_1} M_{d_2}} \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M_{j_1} M_{d_1}, M_{j_2} M_{d_2}) e^{i(\omega_{j_1 d} - \omega_{j_2 d})t} |d M_{d_1}\rangle \langle M_{j_1} j_1| \rho^a |j_2 M_{j_2}\rangle \langle M_{d_2} d| + H.c.), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2}) &= \int \sum_{M_d \sigma \sigma'} \sum_{\lambda=\pm 1} g_{j_1 d}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_{j_1} M_d) g_{d j_2}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_d M_{j_2}) \delta(\omega_{j_2 d} - \omega_k) \frac{W d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} = \sum_{M_d \sigma, \sigma'} Q_{J_d M_d \sigma \sigma'}^{J_{j_1} M_{j_1} J_{j_2} M_{j_2}}, \\ \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M_{j_1} M_{d_1}, M_{j_2} M_{d_2}) &= \int \sum_{\lambda=\pm 1} g_{j_1 d}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_{j_1} M_{d_1}) g_{d j_2}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_{d_2} M_{j_2}) \delta(\omega_{j_2 d} - \omega_k) \frac{W d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} = Q_{J_d M_d \sigma \sigma'}^{J_{j_1} M_{j_1} J_{j_2} M_{j_2}} \\ &= S_{J_{j_1} J_{j_2}} C_{J_d M_d 1 \sigma}^{J_{j_1} M_{j_1}} C_{J_d M_d 1 \sigma'}^{J_{j_2} M_{j_2}} K^R(\sigma, \sigma'), \\ S_{j_1 j_2} &= \frac{2 \|\mu_{j_1 d}\| \|\mu_{j_2 d}\| \omega_{j_2 d}^3}{\hbar c^3 \sqrt{(2J_{j_1} + 1)(2J_{j_2} + 1)}}, \quad K^R(\sigma, \sigma') = \int \sum_{\lambda=\pm 1} (D_{\lambda \sigma'}^1)^* D_{\lambda \sigma}^1 \frac{dO}{8\pi^2}, \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where dO is the spatial angle element. Now by using the $\rho^a \rightarrow e^{iH_a t} \rho^a e^{-iH_a t}$ transformation we change the

equation (11) to the form with the constant coefficients:

$$i \frac{d\rho^a}{dt} - [H_a, \rho^a] - \Gamma^R[\rho^a] = 0 \quad (13)$$

where $\Gamma^R[\rho^a]$ is the relaxation operator for a degenerate system of V -type.

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^R[\rho^a] = & -i \sum_{j_1, j_2=b, c} \sum_{M_{j_1} M_{j_2}} \left(\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2}) |j_1 M_{j_1}\rangle \langle M_{j_2} j_2 | \rho^a + \rho^a \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2}) |j_2 M_{j_2}\rangle \langle M_{j_1} j_1| \right. \\ & \left. - \sum_{M_{d_1} M_{d_2}} \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M_{j_1} M_{d_1}, M_{j_2} M_{d_2}) (|d M_{d_1}\rangle \langle M_{j_1} j_1 | \rho^a |j_2 M_{j_2}\rangle \langle M_{d_2} d| + |d M_{d_1}\rangle \langle M_{j_2} j_2 | \rho^a |j_1 M_{j_1}\rangle \langle M_{d_2} d|) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

In Eq.(14) the first two terms inside brackets describe radiative relaxation of the density operator and transitions to the lower levels while the third term describes populating of the lower levels. Eqs. (12) and (14) determine the relaxation processes completely for the model under consideration. In [48] we showed that the operator in charge of radiative depopulation is of diagonal structure for most of real systems. It follows directly from orthogonality of the Wigner functions [51] that:

$$\int \left(D_{\lambda \sigma_1}^{J_1} \right)^* D_{\lambda \sigma_2}^{J_2} \frac{dO}{4\pi} = \frac{1}{2J+1} \delta_{J_1 J_2} \delta_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2}, \quad (15)$$

allowing for the property [50]:

$$\sum_{M_d} C_{J_d M_d 1 \sigma}^{J_{j_1} M} C_{J_d M_d 1 \sigma}^{J_{j_2} M} = \delta_{J_{j_1} J_{j_2}}. \quad (16)$$

From Eqs. (15)(16) it follows that $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M_{j_1} M_{j_2})$ is different from 0 only if $j_1 = j_2$ and $M_{j_1} = M_{j_2}$.

It must be noted that this property of the Wigner functions (15) and the properties of the dipole transition moments stated in [22], [35], [36],[43],[44] are indeed the expressions for the same common property which reflects the fact that interference is only possible for the fields with the same projections of the magnetic moment in the atomic coordinates. However, as it was demonstrated earlier it is insufficient for the dipole transition moments to be parallel to ensure $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2})$ being different from zero.

The properties of the coefficients which describe the populating processes for the lower levels are somewhat similar to those discussed above, i.e., the consequence of the orthogonal property of Wigner's functions (15). Factors $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M_{j_1} M_{d_1}, M_{j_2} M_{d_2})$ are different from zero only if $M_{j_1} - M_{d_1} = M_{j_2} - M_{d_2}$. However, it must be noted that in a general case the relaxation operator describing the process of population of the lower levels is not of the diagonal structure. Off-diagonal terms describe so called polarization transport at spontaneous transitions. This process was analysed in [52].

Let us note that our analysis presumes implicitly that the influence of the environment around the atom upon the rate and the properties of the spontaneous radiation is rather weak. However, a different situation could be observed in a medium with modified density of states

of electromagnetic modes. In this case the off-diagonal terms in the relaxation operator could be different from zero. We shall mark out the following cases:

1. The atoms are placed in a high-Q cavity which changes the density of states of electromagnetic modes. In this case the cavity's axis determines the designated direction (quantization axis). The density of states for photons of different polarization can vary significantly so the interference cancellation in (16) is broken. Naturally, one has to take account for the Parcell effect being the change of conventional spontaneous decay rates $\Gamma_{j_1 j_1}$ in cavities.

As an example we shall adduce the values of $K^R(\sigma, \sigma')$ for an atom placed between two thin plates with the reflection factor r and the inter-plate distance d satisfying $kd \ll 1$. The normal line to the plate's plane is chosen to be the quantization axis. It is easy to see that due to the chosen symmetry $K^R(\sigma, \sigma') = 0$ if $\sigma \neq \sigma'$. Besides, $K^R(1, 1) = K^R(-1, -1) \sim \gamma_{\perp}$, $K^R(0, 0) \sim \gamma_{\parallel}$, where $\gamma_{\perp}, \gamma_{\parallel}$ are the probabilities of spontaneous transitions for dipoles oriented either normally or parallel to the plate's plane respectively. We will use the results of [53] where it had been demonstrated for such a configuration that

$$\gamma_{\perp} = \gamma \frac{1 + |r|}{1 - |r|}, \quad \gamma_{\parallel} = \gamma \frac{1 - |r|}{1 + |r|} \quad (17)$$

where γ is the spontaneous decay rate in vacuum.

$$\begin{aligned} K^R(1, 1) = K^R(-1, -1) &= K_{vac}^R(1, 1) \frac{1 - |r|}{1 + |r|}, \\ K^R(0, 0) &= K_{vac}^R(0, 0) \frac{1 + |r|}{1 - |r|}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Thus, Eq.(16) cannot be realized and the off-diagonal terms in the relaxation operator are different from zero. Moreover, for $r \approx 1$ the dipole transitions oriented parallel to the plate's plane are cancelled completely. As a consequence, the only possible transitions are those which are oriented normally to the plates. Thus, all possible transitions have parallel dipole moments and the magnitude of the off-diagonal term is maximum in this case. Namely, if, similarly to [22], [35], [36],[43], p is defined as $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M, M) = p \sqrt{\Gamma_{j_1 j_1}(M, M) \Gamma_{j_2 j_2}(M, M)}$ and used as the factor determining the quantum interference effects, in this case $|p| \approx 1$.

2. The atoms are placed in a photonic crystal. In this case, one can as well see a change in the density of states of the electromagnetic field with respect to polarization as it was discussed in the previous paragraph. However, there is also frequency variation of the density of the field states [54] giving rise to the frequency gaps. A transition within this gap is completely quenched [55] as well as the corresponding off-diagonal terms should turn to zero. If it is assumed that the transition frequencies are the functions of the magnetic moment projection, e.g., in a magnetic field, one can set the frequency gap to include one of the transitions with a definite σ which would not meet the condition for Eq.(16). In its turn that would make the off-diagonal terms of the relaxation operator different from zeros.

Let us note that for a photonic crystal there should be a strong condition for $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2} \neq \Gamma_{j_2 j_1}$ to be true. As one can see from Eq.(12) this effect could be observed for a free atom as well, however, being utterly insignificant in value and of the order of $O(3(\omega_{j_1 d} - \omega_{j_2 d})/\omega_{j_1 d})$. This is explained by the fact that in a free space the density of the field modes is proportional to $N(\omega_k) = 2\omega_k^2/c^3$ and varies weakly for different transitions as long as the frequency difference is much smaller than the transition frequency. For an isotropic photonic crystal the mode density near the upper bound of the frequency gap ω_e has the form [54]:

$$\omega_k = \omega_e + A(k - k_0)^2, \\ N(\omega_k) = \sqrt{\frac{\omega_k - \omega_e}{A^3}} \Theta(\omega_k - \omega_e)$$

which should result in strong frequency dependence of $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}$.

Thus, if the density of states of the electromagnetic field is anisotropic and the probabilities of photon emission with different polarization are unequal the off-diagonal terms in the relaxation operator are different from zero. A similar situation takes place for the opera-

tor in charge of stimulated transitions when an atom is considered under action of the field of thermal photons. We shall discuss this matter in detail in the following section.

IV. STIMULATED TRANSITIONS

We assume that a single-photon density operator is in its excited state which characterizes some incoherent field (not necessarily meeting the Planck distribution) and has the diagonal structure:

$$\rho_f = \sum_{n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}} \rho_f(n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}) |n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}\rangle \langle n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}|. \quad (19)$$

In this case one can define the average number of photons in a mode as

$$N_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} = \sum_{n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}} \langle n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} | \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^+ \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \rho_f | n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \rangle = \sum_{n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}} n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \rho_f(n_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}). \quad (20)$$

This number can be a function of vector \mathbf{k} and have a non-trivial angular and polarization distribution.

We now will examine the properties of the transition operator (10) taking into account the properties of the field density operator stipulated above. Unlike the situation considered in the previous section, the terms different from zero are not only those proportional to $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^+ \rho_f$, $\rho_f \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^+$, $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^+ \rho_f \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$, but also the ones proportional to $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^+ \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \rho_f$, $\rho_f \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^+ \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$, $\hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} \rho_f \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^+$. Following the steps of Wigner-Weisskopf theory and the steps taken in the previous section we get the equation for the atomic density operator in the form:

$$i \frac{d\rho^a}{dt} - [H_a, \rho^a] - \Gamma^S[\rho^a] - \Gamma^R[\rho^a] = 0, \quad (21)$$

where operator $\Gamma^S[\rho^a]$ describes transitions in a degenerate V -type system

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^S[\rho^a] = & -i \sum_{j_1, j_2 = b, c} \sum_{M_{j_1} M_{j_2}} \left(\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2}) |j_1 M_{j_1}\rangle \langle M_{j_2} j_2 | \rho^a + \rho^a \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2}) |j_2 M_{j_2}\rangle \langle M_{j_1} j_1 | \right. \\ & \left. - \sum_{M_{d_1} M_{d_2}} \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1} M_{d_1}, M_{j_2} M_{d_2}) (|d M_{d_1}\rangle \langle M_{j_1} j_1 | \rho^a |j_2 M_{j_2}\rangle \langle M_{d_2} d | + |d M_{d_2}\rangle \langle M_{j_2} j_2 | \rho^a |j_1 M_{j_1}\rangle \langle M_{d_1} d |) \right) - \\ & -i \sum_{M_{d_1} M_{d_2}} \left(\Gamma_{dd}^S(M_{d_1}, M_{d_2}) |d M_{d_1}\rangle \langle M_{d_2} d | \rho^a + \rho^a \Gamma_{dd}^S(M_{d_1}, M_{d_2}) |d M_{d_2}\rangle \langle M_{d_1} d | - \right. \\ & \left. - \sum_{j_1 j_2 = b, c} \sum_{M_{j_1} M_{j_2}} \Gamma_{dd}^S(M_{d_1} M_{j_1}, M_{d_2} M_{j_2}) (|j_1 M_{j_1}\rangle \langle M_{d_1} d | \rho^a |d M_{d_2}\rangle \langle M_{j_2} j_2 | + |j_2 M_{j_2}\rangle \langle M_{d_2} d | \rho^a |d M_{d_1}\rangle \langle M_{j_1} j_1 |) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2}) &= \int \sum_{M_d \sigma \sigma'} \sum_{\lambda = \pm 1} g_{j_1 d}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_{j_1} M_d) g_{d j_2}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_d M_{j_2}) \delta(\omega_{j_2 d} - \omega_k) \frac{W d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} = \sum_{M_d \sigma, \sigma'} B_{J_d M_d \sigma \sigma'}^{J_{j_1} M_{j_1} J_{j_2} M_{j_2}}, \\ \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1} M_{d_1}, M_{j_2} M_{d_2}) &= \int \sum_{\lambda = \pm 1} g_{j_1 d}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_{j_1} M_{d_1}) g_{d j_2}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_{d_2} M_{j_2}) \delta(\omega_{j_2 d} - \omega_k) \frac{W d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} = B_{J_d M_d \sigma \sigma'}^{J_{j_1} M_{j_1} J_{j_2} M_{j_2}}, \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

$$\Gamma_{dd}^S(M_{d_1}, M_{d_2}) = \int \sum_{j=b,c} \sum_{M_j \sigma \sigma'} \sum_{\lambda=\pm 1} g_{dj}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_d M_j) g_{jd}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_j M_d) \delta(\omega_{jd} - \omega_k) \frac{W d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} = \sum_{j=b,c} \sum_{M_j \sigma, \sigma'} B_{J_d M_d \sigma \sigma'}^{J_j M_j J_j M_j},$$

$$\Gamma_{dd}^S(M_{d_1} M_{j_1}, M_{d_2} M_{j_2}) = \int \sum_{\lambda=\pm 1} g_{dj_1}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_{d_1} M_{j_1}) g_{j_2 d}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(M_{j_2} M_{d_2}) \delta(\omega_{j_2 d} - \omega_k) \frac{W d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} = \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1} M_{d_1}, M_{j_2} M_{d_2}),$$

$$B_{J_d M_d \sigma \sigma'}^{J_j M_j J_j M_j} = S_{j_1 j_2} C_{J_d M_d 1 \sigma}^{J_{j_1} M_{j_1}} C_{J_d M_d 1 \sigma'}^{J_{j_2} M_{j_2}} K^S(\sigma, \sigma'),$$

$$K^S(\sigma, \sigma') = \int \sum_{\lambda=\pm 1} N_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(\omega_k = \omega_{j_2 d}) (D_{\lambda \sigma'}^1)^* D_{\lambda \sigma}^1 \frac{dO}{8\pi^2}.$$

In Eq.(22) the terms in the first parentheses describe stimulated transitions emitting a photon, while the terms in the second parentheses describe stimulated transitions with absorption of a photon. In case the photonic field is homogeneous and the average number of photons in each mode does not depend on the wave vector direction the properties of $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2}), \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1} M_{d_1}, M_{j_2} M_{d_2}); j_1, j_2 = b, c, d$ are absolutely the same as those of the relaxation operator components $\Gamma^R[\rho^a]$. This is conditioned by the fact that we can exclude $N_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}$ from the integration and use the orthogonality properties of the Wigner functions (15) and of the Glebsch-Gordan coefficients (16). In this case, similar to the relaxation operator for $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2}), \Gamma_{dd}^S(M_{d_1}, M_{d_2})$ the terms different from zero are those being diagonal, i.e., $j_1 = j_2, M_{j_1} = M_{j_2}, M_{d_1} = M_{d_2}$. Coefficients $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1} M_{d_1}, M_{j_2} M_{d_2}), \Gamma_{dd}^S(M_{d_1} M_{j_1}, M_{d_2} M_{j_2})$ are non-zero only for $M_{j_1} - M_{d_1} = M_{j_2} - M_{d_2}$.

In case the photonic field is anisotropic the orthogonality property (15) is not applicable so the off-diagonal terms can be non-zero. It makes the relaxation operator complete and rather complicated. As an example, we shall consider and compare the structure of the relaxation terms $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2})$ for D -line ($P_{3/2} \rightarrow S_{1/2}, P_{3/2} \rightarrow P_{1/2}$) of alkaline metal vapor when the photonic field has relatively simple axisymmetric along the (z) axis structure.

$$N_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(\omega_k = \omega_{j_2 d}) = N \cos^2(\theta). \quad (24)$$

The integration over the spatial angle has the form:

$$K^S(\sigma, \sigma') = \sum_{\lambda=\pm 1} \int_0^{2\pi} e^{i(\sigma-\sigma')\phi} d\phi \times \int_0^\pi N_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(\omega_k = \omega_{j_2 d}) s_{\lambda \sigma'}^1 s_{\lambda \sigma}^1 \frac{d\theta}{8\pi^2}. \quad (25)$$

To perform further calculations we need the explicit expressions for $s_{m' m}^1(\beta)$ which determine the transformations of the wave functions when the coordinate system is rotated around the “knot” line [51]:

$$s_{10}^1 = s_{0-1}^1 = -s_{01}^1 = -s_{-10}^1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sin \beta,$$

$$s_{11}^1 = s_{-1-1}^1 = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos \beta), \quad (26)$$

$$s_{1-1}^1 = s_{-11}^1 = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \cos \beta).$$




FIG. 2: Transitions for the D -line of alkali metals.

Both in case of the homogeneous field and the field with the axisymmetric along the (z) axis distribution $K(\sigma, \sigma') = 0$ at $\sigma \neq \sigma'$ which is conditioned by integration over angle ϕ . Consequently, the constants different from zero are those which are of the form $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M, M)$.

Now we list the values of $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M, M)$ expressed through $K^S(\sigma, \sigma)$ (see Figs. 2,3):

$$\Gamma_{bb}^S\left(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\right) = S_{bb}K^S(1, 1),$$

$$\Gamma_{bb}^S\left(-\frac{3}{2}, -\frac{3}{2}\right) = S_{bb}K^S(-1, -1),$$

$$\Gamma_{bb}^S\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) = S_{bb} \frac{K^S(1, 1) + 2K^S(0, 0)}{3},$$

$$\Gamma_{bb}^S\left(-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\right) = S_{bb} \frac{K^S(-1, -1) + 2K^S(0, 0)}{3},$$

$$\Gamma_{cc}^S\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) = S_{cc} \frac{2K^S(1, 1) + K^S(0, 0)}{3}, \quad (27)$$

$$\Gamma_{cc}^S\left(-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\right) = S_{cc} \frac{2K^S(-1, -1) + K^S(0, 0)}{3},$$

$$\Gamma_{bc}^S\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) = S_{bc} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} (K^S(0, 0) - K^S(1, 1)),$$

$$\Gamma_{bc}^S\left(-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\right) = S_{bc} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} (K^S(-1, -1) - K^S(0, 0)),$$

$$\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S\left(\pm \frac{1}{2}, \pm \frac{1}{2}\right) = \Gamma_{j_2 j_1}^S\left(\pm \frac{1}{2}, \pm \frac{1}{2}\right).$$

For $K^S(\sigma, \sigma)$ and homogeneous field we have:




FIG. 3: Additional interference transitions for the D -line of alkali metals.

$$\begin{aligned}
 K^S(0,0) &= N \int_0^\pi \sin^2(\theta) \frac{\sin \theta}{2} d\theta = N \frac{2}{3}, \\
 K^S(1,1) &= K^S(-1,-1) = \\
 &= N \int_0^\pi \frac{(1 + \cos^2(\theta)) \sin \theta}{2} d\theta = N \frac{2}{3}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{28}$$

Let us mark out the well known fact that:

$$\frac{\|\mu_{bd}\|}{\sqrt{2J_b + 1}} = \frac{\|\mu_{cd}\|}{\sqrt{2J_c + 1}}, \tag{29}$$

which makes all the constants $S_{j_1 j_2} = S$ equal from which it follows that with account for (28) and $\Gamma_{jj}^S(M, M)$ the values for magnetic sublevels also become equal ¹

$$\Gamma_{jj}^S(M, M) = SN \frac{2}{3}. \tag{30}$$

Consequently, just as we expected, the off-diagonal terms $\Gamma_{bc}^S(M, M)$ appeared to be strictly equal to zero.

For the field distribution (24) factors $K^S(\sigma, \sigma')$ have the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 K^S(0,0) &= N \int_0^\pi \sin^3(\theta) \frac{\cos^2 \theta}{2} d\theta = N \frac{4}{15}, \\
 K^S(1,1) &= K^S(-1,-1) = \\
 &= N \int_0^\pi \frac{(1 + \cos^2(\theta)) \cos^2(\theta) \sin \theta}{2} d\theta = N \frac{4}{75}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{31}$$

Taking into account (27), (29) factors $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M, M)$ can

be written as

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Gamma_{bb}^S\left(\frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2}\right) &= \Gamma_{bb}^S\left(-\frac{3}{2}, -\frac{3}{2}\right) = 12/225NS, \\
 \Gamma_{bb}^S\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) &= \Gamma_{bb}^S\left(-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\right) = 44/225NS, \\
 \Gamma_{cc}^S\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) &= \Gamma_{cc}^S\left(-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\right) = 28/225NS, \\
 \Gamma_{bc}^S\left(\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right) &= -\Gamma_{bc}^S\left(-\frac{1}{2}, -\frac{1}{2}\right) = 16\sqrt{2}/225NS.
 \end{aligned} \tag{32}$$

Thus, if an atom interacts with an anisotropic and incoherent field the factors $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}^S(M_{j_1}, M_{j_2})$, which determine induced transitions emitting photons, change considerably both in the absolute value and the structure, or in other words, some additional off-diagonal terms are produced. It must be noted that for the configuration chosen the value of the off-diagonal term becomes quite substantial. Namely, if by analogy with previous section we define the factor p as $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M, M) = p \sqrt{\Gamma_{j_1 j_1}(M, M) \Gamma_{j_2 j_2}(M, M)}$ and used it as the gauge for quantum interference, then for transitions $P_{3/2}(\pm 1/2) \rightarrow S_{1/2}(\pm 1/2), P_{1/2}(\pm 1/2) \rightarrow S_{1/2}(\pm 1/2)$ this relation would take the form:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Gamma_{bc}^S\left(\pm \frac{1}{2}, \pm \frac{1}{2}\right) &\approx \\
 &\approx \pm 0.64 \sqrt{\Gamma_{bb}^S\left(\pm \frac{1}{2}, \pm \frac{1}{2}\right) \Gamma_{cc}^S\left(\pm \frac{1}{2}, \pm \frac{1}{2}\right)}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

V. CONCLUSIONS

Now in this section we summarize the main results of this work. We used the approach based on the cluster expansion of the BBGKY hierarchy for the reduced density operators and the Wigner-Weisskopf approximation to derive explicitly the relaxation terms for V -type degenerate systems with an arbitrary total angular momentum of each level. Our main focus was to study the effect of quantum interference on the structure and properties of the relaxation terms. The radiation emission term has been shown to be diagonal for most real systems. The condition for the dipole transition moments to be parallel, discussed in [22], [35], [36], and [43], appears to be insufficient to give rise to quantum interference. We show that some additional conditions are necessary, one of which is anisotropy of the density of states of the electromagnetic field or its strong frequency dependence. This fact also follows from the analysis of the relaxation operator carried out in Appendix with account for the hyperfine splitting of atomic levels. This conditions can be well realised for a high-Q cavity or a photonic crystal. In this case the interference terms can reach their maximum theoretically predicted magnitude.

For stimulated transitions the condition for the quantum interference to occur can be substantially weakened. This case was considered in Sec. (IV) where we studied the effect of quantum interference upon the structure

¹ From which it directly follows (see (12)), that the factors to the relaxation terms for magnetic sublevels $\Gamma_{jj}^S(M, M)$ in atoms of alkali metals are equal.

of the terms describing stimulated transitions in the external photonic field. It has been shown that for such field the additional off-diagonal terms are likely to appear. This case was thoroughly analysed for the D -line in the spectrum of alkaline metal vapour as well as for the atom interacting with an axisymmetric field.

The stimulated transition operator has been derived and shown to have the off-diagonal terms as high as 64% of the maximum of theoretically predicted value for the chosen field configuration.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The authors are grateful to Prof. A.N. Starostin for fruitful discussions and valuable remarks. This work was supported by the Russian Foundation for Basic Research 02-02-17153, as well as by grants MK 1565.2003.02, and NSh 1257.2003.02 of the President of the Russian Federation.

VII. APPENDIX. RELAXATION OPERATOR, HYPERFINE SPLITTING.

In this section we will derive explicitly the relaxation operator for a doublet V -type atom with account for the hyperfine splitting. Under this approximation the Hamiltonian (in $1/\hbar$ units) can be written a sum:

$$\hat{H} = H_a + \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} H_f + \sum_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} V_{af}. \quad (34)$$

In (34) H_a describes an unperturbed system:

$$H_a = \sum_{j=b,c,d} \sum_{F_j} \sum_{M_F} \omega_j(F_j) |jF_j M_{F_j}\rangle \langle M_{F_j} F_j j|, \quad (35)$$

where $\hbar\omega_j(F_j)$ is the atomic state energy with the total angular momentum J_j , total momentum F_j and its projection M_F^j to the quantization axis (z), $|j, F_j, M_F\rangle$ is the corresponding vector.

The next term in (34) is nothing but the one used in Sec. II and describes the Hamiltonian of the quantized field:

$$\hat{H}_f = \omega_k \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}^\dagger \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda}, \quad (36)$$

The atom-field interaction is described by

$$V_{af} = i \sum_{j=b,c} \sum_{F_j F_d} \sum_{M_{F_j} M_{F_d}} g_{jd}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(F_j M_{F_j}; F_d M_{F_d}) \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}\lambda} |jF_j M_{F_j}\rangle \langle M_{F_d} F_d d| + H.c. \quad (37)$$

where

$$g_{jd}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(F_j M_{F_j}; F_d M_{F_d}) = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\omega_k}{\hbar W}} (\vec{\mu}_{jd}(F_j M_{F_j}; F_d M_{F_d}), \epsilon(\mathbf{k}\lambda)), \quad (38)$$

describes the coupling constant with $\vec{\mu}_{jd}(F_j M_{F_j}; F_d M_{F_d})$ being the transition dipole moment. Using the Wigner Ekkart theorem [50] and taking into account the fact that the transition dipole moment commutes with the nucleus spin (6) the coupling constant can be written as [57]:

$$g_{jd}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(F_j M_{F_j}; F_d M_{F_d}) = (-1)^{I+1-F_j-F_d} \sqrt{(2F_d+1)W(J_j F_j J_d F_d; I1)} C_{F_d M_{F_d} 1\sigma}^{F_j M_{F_j}} \|\mu_{jd}\| \sqrt{\frac{2\pi\omega_k}{\hbar W}} D_{\lambda\sigma}^1, \quad (39)$$

where $W(J_j F_j J_d F_d; I1)$ are the Racah coefficients and I is the nucleus spin. Now leaving out the transformations similar to those described in Sec. III we straightforwardly write the relaxation operator in the following form:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma^R[\rho^a] = & -i \sum_{j_1, j_2=b,c} \sum_{F_1 F_2} \sum_{M_1 M_2} \left(\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(F_1 M_1, F_2 M_2) |j_1 F_1 M_1\rangle \langle M_2 F_2 j_2 | \rho^a \right. \\ & \left. - \sum_{M_{d_1} M_{d_2}} \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(F_1 M_1, F_1^d M_1^d; F_2 M_2, F_2^d M_2^d) |d F_2^d M_2^d\rangle \langle M_2 F_2 j_2 | \rho^a |j_1 F_1 M_1\rangle \langle M_1^d F_1^d d| + H.c. \right), \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

where for the sake of simplicity we introduced the following notations: $F_{j_1} \rightarrow F_1, F_{j_2} \rightarrow F_2, M_{F_{j_1}} \rightarrow M_1, M_{F_{j_2}} \rightarrow M_2, F_{d_1} \rightarrow F_1^d, F_{d_2} \rightarrow F_2^d, M_{F_{d_1}} \rightarrow M_1^d, M_{F_{d_2}} \rightarrow M_2^d$, while the factors of the relaxation operator are expressed as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(F_1 M_1, F_2 M_2) &= \int \sum_{M_d \sigma \sigma'} \sum_{\lambda \pm 1} g_{j_1 d}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(F_1 M_1, F_d M_d) g_{d j_2}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(F_d M_d, F_2 M_2) \delta(\omega_{j_2 d} - \omega_k) \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} = \\ &= Q \sum_{F^d} (2F_d + 1) (-1)^{2(I+1)-F_1-F_2-2F^d} W(J_{j_1} F_1 J_d F_d; I1) W(J_{j_2} F_2 J_d F_d; I1) \sum_{M_d \sigma \sigma'} C_{F_d M_d 1\sigma}^{F_1 M_1} C_{F_d M_d 1\sigma'}^{F_2 M_2} K^R(\sigma, \sigma'), \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(M_1 M_1^d, M_2 M_2^d) &= \int \sum_{\lambda \pm 1} g_{j_1 d}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(F_1 M_1, F_1^d M_1^d) g_{d j_2}^{\mathbf{k}\lambda}(F_2^d M_2^d, F_2 M_2) \delta(\omega_{j_2 d} - \omega_k) \frac{d\mathbf{k}}{(2\pi)^3} = \\ &= Q (2F_d + 1) (-1)^{2(I+1)-F_1-F_2-F_1^d-F_2^d} W(J_{j_1} F_1 J_d F_1^d; I1) W(J_{j_2} F_2 J_d F_2^d; I1) C_{F_1^d M_1^d 1\sigma}^{F_1 M_1} C_{F_2^d M_2^d 1\sigma'}^{F_2 M_2} K^R(\sigma, \sigma'), \end{aligned}$$

$$Q = \frac{2 \parallel \mu_{j_1 d} \parallel \parallel \mu_{j_2 d} \parallel \omega_{j_2 d}^3}{\hbar c^3}.$$

Let us now analyse the properties of factors $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(F_1 M_1, F_2 M_2)$. Taking into account that Wigner functions are orthogonal (15) and the property of the sums (16) we have:

$$\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(F_1 M_1, F_2 M_2) = \frac{2Q}{3} \sum_{F_d} (2F_d + 1) (-1)^{2(I+1)-F_1-F_2-2F_d} W(J_{j_1} F_1 J_d F_d; I1) W(J_{j_2} F_2 J_d F_d; I1) \delta_{F_1 F_2} \delta_{M_1 M_2}. \quad (42)$$

using the $6j$ representation for the Racah coefficients [57]:

$$W(l_1 l_2 l_3 l_4; l_5 l_6) = (-1)^{-l_1-l_2-l_3-l_4} \left\{ \begin{matrix} l_1 & l_2 & l_5 \\ l_4 & l_3 & l_6 \end{matrix} \right\}, \quad (43)$$

and their permutation symmetry as well as the property [57]:

$$\sum_l (2l+1) \left\{ \begin{matrix} l_1 & l_2 & l' \\ l_3 & l_4 & l \end{matrix} \right\} \left\{ \begin{matrix} l_3 & l_2 & l \\ l_1 & l_4 & l'' \end{matrix} \right\} = \frac{\delta_{l' l''}}{2l'' + 1}, \quad (44)$$

we finally get:

$$\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(F_1 M_1, F_2 M_2) = \frac{4 \parallel \mu_{j_1 d} \parallel \parallel \mu_{j_2 d} \parallel \omega_{j_2 d}^3}{4\hbar c^3 (2J_{j_1} + 1)} \times \delta_{J_{j_1} J_{j_2}} \delta_{F_1 F_2} \delta_{M_1 M_2}. \quad (45)$$

Thus, the properties of the factors $\Gamma_{j_1 j_2}(F_1 M_1, F_2 M_2)$ are absolutely similar to those discussed in Sec. III, which indicates that the operator describing spontaneous transitions to the lower states is strictly diagonal.

-
- [1] U. Fano, Phys. Rev. **124**, 1866 (1961).
[2] Devdariani A.Z., Ostrovsky V.N., Sebyakin Y.N., Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz **71**, 909 (1976).
[3] Dalidchik F.I., Yad. Fiz. **21**, 51 (1975).
[4] A. Imamoglu, S.E. Harris, Opt. Lett. **14**, 1344 (1989).
[5] S.E. Harris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **62**, 1033, (1989).
[6] A. Imamoglu, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 2835 (1989).
[7] P. Zhou, S. Swain., Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 832 (1997).
[8] E. Paspalakis, S.Q. Gong, P.L. Knight., Opt. Commun. **152**, 293 (1998).
[9] E. Paspalakis, S.Q. Gong, P.L. Knight., J. Mod. Opt. **45**, 2433 (1998).
[10] P.A. Apanasevich, Fundamentals of the theory of interaction of light and substance. Minsk: (1977) (in Russian).
[11] S.G. Rautian, G.J. Smirnov and A.M. Shalagin Nonlinear Resonances in the Spectra of Atoms and Molecules (Novosibirsk: Nauka) 1979 (in Russian).
[12] S.G. Rautian, I.I. Sobelman, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **41**, 456 (1961) [Sov. Phys. JETP **14**, 328 (1962)].
[13] Schwartz S.E., Tan T.Y., Appl. Phys. Lett., **10**, 4 (1967).
[14] V. M. Fain and Y. I. Khanin, Quantum Radiophysics (Sov. Radio, Moscow, 1965).
[15] Mollow B.R., Phys. Rev. A, **5**, 2217 (1972).
[16] A. M. Bonch-Bruevich, V. A. Khodovoi, and N. A. Chigir', Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **67**, 2069 (1974) [Sov. Phys. JETP **40**, 1027 (1975)].
[17] Wu F.Y., Ezekiel S., Ducloy M., and Mollow B.R., Phys.Rev. Lett., **38**, 1077, (1977).
[18] O. A. Kocharovskaya and Ya. I. Khanin, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **90**, 1610 (1986) [Sov. Phys. JETP **63**, 945 (1986)].
[19] O. A. Kocharovskaya and Ya. I. Khanin, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **48**, 581 (1988)[JETP Lett. **48**, 630 (1988)].
[20] C.H. Keitel, O. Kocharovskaya, L.M. Narducci, M.O. Scully, S.-Y. Zhu and H.M. Doss, Phys. Rev. A **48** 3196 (1993).
[21] H. Keitel. Phys. Rev. Lett, **83**, 1307 (1999).
[22] H. R. Xia, C. Y. Ye, and S. Y. Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1032 (1996);
[23] S. Y. Zhu, R. C. F. Chan, and C. P. Lee, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 710 (1995);
[24] S. Y. Zhu, and M. O. Scully, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 388 (1996);
[25] H. Lee, P. Polynkin, M. O. Scully, and S. Y. Zhu. Phys. Rev. A **55**, 4454 (1997);
[26] H. Huang, S. -Y. Zhu, and M. S. Zubairy. Phys. Rev. A **55**, 744 (1997).
[27] F. Li, S. -Y. Zhu, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 2330 (1999).
[28] A. A. Pantelev, Vl. K. Rerikh, and A. N. Starostin, JETP 90, 50 (2000) .
[29] P. Zhou, S. Swain. Phys. Rev. Lett, **77**, 3995 (1996).
[30] P. Zhou, S. Swain., Phys. Rev. A **56**, 3011 (1997).
[31] H. Xia, C. Ye, S. Zhu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1032 (1996).
[32] G. C. Hegerfeldt, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 373 (1992);
[33] G. C. Hegerfeldt, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. A, **47**, 2186 (1993);
[34] T. P. Altenmüller, Z. Physik D **34**, 157 (1995).
[35] A. K. Patnaik, and G. S. Agarwal, J. Mod. Opt. **45**, 2131 (1998);
[36] A. K. Patnaik, and G. S. Agarwal, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 3015 (1999).
[37] S. Menon, G.S. Agarwal, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 013807 (2000).
[38] S. Menon, G.S. Agarwal, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 4014 (1998).
[39] M. A. G. Martinez, P. R. Herczfeld, C. Samuels, L. M. Narducci, and C. H. Keitel, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 4483 (1997).
[40] E. Paspalakis, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 293, (1998);
[41] E. Paspalakis, C. H. Keitel, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev.

- A **58**, 4868 (1998);
- [42] E. Paspalakis, N. J. Kylstra, and P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 293, (1998).
- [43] P. R. Berman, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 4886 (1998).
- [44] G. S. Agarwal, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5500 (2000).
- [45] Bonitz M. Quantum Kinetic Theory. B.G.Teubner Stuttgart-Leipzig (1998).
- [46] A. A. Pantelev, Vl. K. Roerich, and A. N. Starostin, JETP **96**, 222 (2003); Vl.C.Roerich, M.G.Gladush, "Progress in Nonequilibrium Green's Functions II", M. Bonitz and D. Semkat (eds.), World Scientific Publ., Singapore (2003); Vl.C. Roerich, A.N. Starostin, Pantelev A.A. ibild.
- [47] A. A. Pantelev, JETP **84**, 241 (1997).
- [48] A. A. Pantelev and Vl. K. Rerikh, JETP **91**, 273 (2000).
- [49] A. A. Pantelev and Vl. K. Roerich, JETP **92**, 210 (2001).
- [50] D. A. Varshalovich, A. N. Moscalev, and V. K. Khersonsky, "Quantum Theory of Angular Momentum" (World Scientific, Singapore, 1988). .
- [51] Landau, L.D. and Lifschitz, E. M. Quantum Mechanics (Non-Relativistic Theory), 3rd ed. Oxford, England: Pergamon Press, 1977.
- [52] S.G. Rautian, Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. **108**, 1186 (1995).
- [53] F. De Martini, M. Marrocco, P. Mataloni, L. Crescentini, and R. Loudon Phys. Rev. A **43**, 2480 (1991).
- [54] N. Vats, S. John, and K. Busch Phys. Rev. A **65**, 043808 (2002).
- [55] E. Yablonovich Phys. Rev. Lett **58**, 2059 (1987).
- [56] Mollow B.R. Phys. Rev., **188**, 1969 (1969) .
- [57] I.I. Sobelman, Introduction to the Theory of Atomic Spectra (Pergamon, New York, 1972).