

Adiabatic Fidelity for Atom-Molecule Conversion in a Nonlinear Three-Level Λ -system

Shao-Ying Meng^{1,2}, Li-Bin Fu¹, Jie Liu^{1,*}

1. *Institute of Applied Physics and Computational Mathematics, P.O.Box 8009, Beijing 100088, P.R.China*

2. *Graduate School, China Academy of Engineering Physics, P.O.Box 8009-30, Beijing 100088, P.R.China*

We investigate the dynamics of the population transfer for atom-molecule three-level Λ -system on stimulated Raman adiabatic passage(STIRAP). We find that the adiabatic fidelity for the coherent population trapping(CPT) state or dark state, as the function of the adiabatic parameter, approaches to unit in a power law. The power exponent however is much less than the prediction of linear adiabatic theorem. We further discuss how to achieve higher adiabatic fidelity for the dark state through optimizing the external parameters of STIRAP. Our discussions are helpful to gain higher atom-molecule conversion yield in practical experiments.

PACS numbers: 42.65.Dr, 05.30.Jp

In the field of ultracold atomic physics, conversion of an atomic pair to a molecule by means of photoassociation[1] or magnetic Feshbach resonances[2] is a hot topic both in experiment and in theory. Photoassociation creates molecules in excited electronic level, while magneto-association creates molecules in high vibrational quantum state. In both cases, the resulting molecules are energetically unstable and suffer from large inelastic loss rate.

One possible scheme to overcome the difficulty is to employ the stimulated Raman adiabatic passage (STIRAP)[3, 4, 5], whose success relies on the existence of the coherent population trapping(CPT) state, or dark state[6]. In the traditional atomic Λ -system, the CPT state exists when the two-photon resonance condition is satisfied, hence STIRAP can be straightforwardly implemented by appropriately choosing the laser frequencies. In parallel to the atomic Λ -system, the atom-molecule Λ -system also supports a dark state, which facilitates the use of the STIRAP for creating the ultracold stable molecular state and therefore is a possible way to achieve the molecular Bose-Einstein condensates(BECs) from its atomic counterpart[5].

Now, a lot of recent theoretical works[5, 7, 8] have been devoted to studying the dynamics, approving the adiabatic condition and improving the conversion efficiency of the atom-molecule coupling model. However, different from the atomic Λ -system, the atom-molecule Λ -system is essentially a nonlinear system in which the Hamiltonian is the functional of instantaneous quantum wavefunctions. More toughly, the system is no longer invariant under $U(1)$ -transformation. With these difficulties, the adiabatic fidelity that is usually defined by the amplitude of the inner production between the exact solution and the CPT wavefunction, is not available, and therefore the quantitative study of the adiabaticity for the CPT state in the atom-molecule system is still in lack.

In the present paper, we properly define the fidelity




Figure 1: (a) Three-level system coupled by two lasers, Ω_1, Ω_2 are the Rabi frequencies for the pump and Stokes laser, Δ and δ are one and two-photon detunings, respectively; (b) Time dependence of Ω_1, Ω_2 . t_1, t_2 are the centers of the two pulses respectively, and Δt is the time delay between the two pulses.

for the CPT state in the nonlinear Λ -system, and taking advantage of it, we study the adiabaticity in the atom-molecule conversion system quantitatively. We find that the adiabatic fidelity for the dark state, as the function of the adiabatic parameter, approaches to unit in a power law. However, the power exponents are much less than the prediction from the linear adiabatic theorem. Then, we further discuss how to optimize the external parameters of STIRAP process to achieve higher adiabatic fidelity for the dark state.

Our model is schematically sketched in Fig.1(a). The initial state $|a\rangle$ (atomic state) and the intermediate state $|e\rangle$ (excited molecular state) are coupled by pump laser with Rabi frequency Ω_2 , while state $|e\rangle$ and the target state $|g\rangle$ (ground molecular state) are coupled by Stokes laser with Rabi frequency Ω_1 . The frequencies of the applied lasers are expressed in terms of the single- and two-photon detunings Δ and δ , respectively. Without loss of generality, we assume that the Rabi frequencies $\Omega_{1,2}$ are real and positive. Under the two-photon resonance condition, the Hamiltonian in second quantized form reads,

*liu_jie@iapcm.ac.cn

$$H_{am} = -\hbar\Delta\hat{\psi}_e^\dagger\hat{\psi}_e + \frac{\hbar}{2}\left(-\Omega_2\hat{\psi}_e^\dagger\hat{\psi}_a\hat{\psi}_a + \Omega_1\hat{\psi}_e^\dagger\hat{\psi}_g + h.c.\right). \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{\psi}_i$ and $\hat{\psi}_i^\dagger$ are the annihilation and creation operators for state $|i\rangle$, respectively. Under the mean-field approximation, i.e., $\hat{\psi}_i$ and $\hat{\psi}_i^\dagger$ are replaced by c -number ψ_i and ψ_i^* , the Schrödinger equation are,

$$i\dot{\psi}_a = -\Omega_2\psi_a^*\psi_e, \quad (2a)$$

$$i\dot{\psi}_e = -\Delta\psi_e - \frac{\Omega_2}{2}\psi_a^2 + \frac{\Omega_1}{2}\psi_g, \quad (2b)$$

$$i\dot{\psi}_g = \frac{\Omega_1}{2}\psi_e. \quad (2c)$$

In the above model, the nonlinear collisions between particles are neglected, so the only nonlinearity comes from the fact that it takes two atoms to form a molecule. Mathematically, we see that the Hamiltonian in the above Schrödinger equation is the functional of the instantaneous wavefunction as well as its conjugate.

The adiabatic theory for nonlinear quantum systems has been set up recently in paper[9], where new adiabatic conditions and adiabatic invariants are given. However, these discussions are restricted to systems that have $U(1)$ invariance. For the atom-molecule Λ -system, because the Hamiltonian is the functional of both the wavefunction and its conjugate, the $U(1)$ -invariance is broken. Instead, the system is invariant under the following transformation,

$$U(\phi) = e^{i\Theta(\phi)}, \Theta(\phi) = \begin{pmatrix} \phi & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 2\phi & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2\phi \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

Under this transformation, $|\psi\rangle = (\psi_a, \psi_e, \psi_g)^T \rightarrow |\psi'\rangle = U(\phi)|\psi\rangle = (\psi_a e^{i\phi}, \psi_e e^{i2\phi}, \psi_g e^{i2\phi})^T$. In fact, when the diagonal terms in the above matrix are identical, the transformation $U(\phi)$ degenerates to the $U(1)$ transformation.

This new kind of symmetry allows the following stationary states with chemical potential μ ,

$$\psi_a = |\psi_a| e^{i\theta_a} e^{-i\mu t}, \quad \psi_{e,g} = |\psi_{e,g}| e^{i\theta_{e,g}} e^{-i2\mu t}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$2\theta_a - \theta_e = \text{constant}, \quad \theta_g - \theta_e = \text{constant}. \quad (5)$$

Under the normalized condition $|\psi_a|^2 + 2|\psi_e|^2 + 2|\psi_g|^2 = 1$, it is easy to show, as in the atomic counterpart, the atom-molecule Λ -system supports a CPT eigenstate [7, 8] with zero eigenvalue.

$$|CPT\rangle = \left(\frac{(\Omega_1\Omega_{eff}^{nl} - \Omega_1^2)^{\frac{1}{2}}}{2\Omega_2}, 0, \frac{\Omega_{eff}^{nl} - \Omega_1}{4\Omega_2} \right)^T, \quad (6)$$

where $\Omega_{eff}^{nl} = \sqrt{\Omega_1^2 + 8\Omega_2^2}$.

When the Rabi laser pulses are ramped up adiabatically, i.e., $\Omega_{1,2}$ vary in time slowly, an state that is initially prepared as the CPT state is expected to close to the instantaneous CPT state during the whole process. The problem is how close is the above adiabatic approximation. To clarify the above question and formulate it quantitatively, we introduce two physical quantities, namely the adiabatic fidelity and the adiabatic parameter.

For the linear system, adiabatic fidelity is introduced as $F_{ad} = |\langle\psi(t)|\psi_{ad}\rangle|^2$, where $|\psi_{ad}\rangle$ and $|\psi(t)\rangle$ are defined as the adiabatic approximate solution and the real one. The adiabatic fidelity approaches to unit in a power law of the adiabatic parameter[10], i.e., $1 - F_{ad} \sim \epsilon^2$. Here, the adiabatic parameter ϵ is the ratio between the rate of energy's change and level space. For linear quantum systems, evaluating the adiabatic fidelity gives an good estimation on how close the real solution is to the adiabatic approximate solution[11].

For the atom-molecule nonlinear system, the traditional definition of fidelity is no longer suitable because the system is not invariant under $U(1)$ -transformation. We need to define new fidelity for such system. For convenience, we denote the fidelity of two states $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$ as $F^{am}(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle)$ that should satisfy $F^{am}(|\psi\rangle, U(\phi)|\psi\rangle) = 1$ for any ϕ . With this consideration, we define the adiabatic fidelity as $F^{am}(|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle) = |\langle\bar{\psi}_1|\bar{\psi}_2\rangle|^2$, where $|\bar{\xi}\rangle = (\xi_a^2/|\xi_a|, \sqrt{2}\xi_e, \sqrt{2}\xi_g)^T$ is the rescaled wavefunction of $|\xi\rangle = (\xi_a, \xi_e, \xi_g)^T$. One can prove that the definition satisfies the above conditions and the others for fidelity definition [12]. Because we only concern the adiabatic evolution of the CPT state throughout, we denote the adiabatic fidelity as $F^{am} = |\langle\bar{\psi}(t)|\bar{CPT}\rangle|^2$ where $|\psi(t)\rangle = (\psi_a, \psi_e, \psi_g)^T$ is the exact solution of the Schrödinger equation.

For the atom-molecule three-level Λ -system, owing to the invalid of the concept of an orthogonal set of energy eigenstates and the linear superposition principle involving these states, the adiabatic parameter has nothing to do with the energy level spacing[9]. Moreover, noticing that the eigenstates correspond to extremum points or fixed points of the system energy, the fundamental frequencies of periodic orbits around the fixed points serves as the adiabatic parameter. These frequencies can be evaluated by linearizing Eq.(2) about the fixed points and are identical to the Bogolubov excitation spectrum of the corresponding eigenstate, as is demonstrated in [7, 9], then the adiabatic parameter is expressed as,

$$\epsilon^{am} = \left| \frac{\dot{\Omega}_1\Omega_2 - \Omega_1\dot{\Omega}_2}{\Omega_1 + \Omega_{eff}^{nl}} \right| \frac{1}{\Omega_{eff}^{nl}\Omega_1/2}. \quad (7)$$

For the atom-molecule Λ -system, we introduce

$$\Omega_{1,2} = \Omega'_{1,2} e^{-(t-t_{1,2})^2}. \quad (8)$$




Figure 2: (Color online) Time evolution of the adiabatic fidelity for the atom-molecule three-level system with $\Delta = 0$, $t_1 = 5.0$, $t_2 = 6.0$, $\Delta t = 1.0$, $\Omega_0 = 10, 100$.

The property of the system is related to three parameters, i.e., the amplitude of the two pulses $\Omega'_{1,2}$ and the time delay Δt . So, our discussions are divided in two cases: the two pulses having equal amplitudes and unequal amplitudes. In each case, the dependence on different time delays will also be studied.

Firstly, for convenience, we consider the two pulses having equal amplitudes, i.e., $\Omega'_1 = \Omega'_2 = \Omega_0$. Substituting Eq.(8) into Eq.(7), we obtain the adiabatic parameter of the atom-molecule system:

$$\epsilon^{am} \sim \frac{1}{\Omega_0}. \quad (9)$$

In the STIRAP, it is required that $t_1 < t_2$ and only level $|a\rangle$ is populated initially, then the system evolve under H_{am} .

For easy to understand the dynamics of the population transfer, in figure 2, we show a typical change of the adiabatic fidelity with time for the atom-molecule case with $\Delta t = 1.0$. Here and henceforth, the exact solution $\Psi(t) >$ is obtained from directly solving Eq.(2) numerically using the 4-5 order Runge-Kutta algorithm. We only focus on the final and the smallest adiabatic fidelity which is marked with F_f^{am} and F_s^{am} (which points are labelled by * in figure 2) to understand the whole property of the system, since F_s^{am} denotes the maximal deviation from CPT state in the whole process and F_f^{am} denotes the final conversion efficiency. The bigger F_s^{am} is, the better the adiabaticity is. And the bigger F_f^{am} is, the higher the conversion efficiency is. From this figure, we can see that $F_f^{am} = F_s^{am}$ and $F_f^{am}(\Omega_0 = 100) > F_f^{am}(\Omega_0 = 10)$. Indeed, we are interested in the relationship between $F_{f,s}^{am}$ and the amplitude Ω_0 , and moreover we can further find the relationship between the adiabatic fidelity and the adiabatic parameter.

Figure 3 shows the final adiabatic fidelity F_f^{am} and the smallest adiabatic fidelity F_s^{am} as a function of Ω_0 for the atom-molecule system with $\Delta t = 1.0$. From this figure, one can see that the larger the amplitude Ω_0 is, the bigger $F_{f,s}^{am}$ is, which is conformed by figure 2 (where




Figure 3: (Color online) Final and smallest adiabatic fidelity for the atom-molecule three-level system as a function of the amplitude Ω_0 with $\Delta = 0$, $t_1 = 5.0$, $t_2 = 6.0$, $\Delta t = 1.0$.




Figure 4: (Color online) Final adiabatic fidelity of atom-molecule three-level system plotted against the pulse delay Δt for: (a) different Ω_0 (denoted on the respective curves with numbers); (b) different Ω'_2 (denoted on the respective curves with numbers) at $\Omega'_1 = 10$

$F_f^{am}(\Omega_0 = 100) > F_f^{am}(\Omega_0 = 10)$). We obtain the asymptotic behaviors of the lower bounds of F_f^{am} and F_s^{am} which can be expressed as

$$1 - F_f^{am} = 1 - F_s^{am} = 0.326 \left(\frac{1}{\Omega_0} \right)^{0.6} \sim (\epsilon^{am})^{0.6}. \quad (10)$$

As in the linear system, there exists a power law relationship between the adiabatic fidelity and the adiabatic parameter in the atom-molecule conversion system, but the exponent is 0.6 rather than 2. Here, the power exponent is not universal, it depends on the time delay Δt . For example, when $\Delta t = 0.8$, it is 0.5, $\Delta t = 1.2$, it is 1.3.

In the above, we have discussed the situation when the two pulses having equal amplitudes Ω_0 with $\Delta t = 1.0$, and find that the larger the amplitude Ω_0 is, the better the adiabaticity is, and hence the higher the conversion efficiency is. That is to say, we can optimize conversion efficiency by increasing the amplitude of the pulses Ω_0 .

How the conversion efficiency changes with the time delay is also interesting because it is most concerned in

practical experiments. In figure 4(a), the final adiabatic fidelity F_f^{am} is plotted as a function of the pulse delay Δt for several different values of Ω_0 in the atom-molecule system. We can see that, as the delay Δt increases, the final adiabatic fidelity increases firstly, then reaches a steady stage depending on the amplitude Ω_0 , finally decreases beyond certain values of Δt , which is similar to the result in atomic system in article[4]. So, for the atom-molecule system, there is a optimum segment of time delay Δt , which increases as the amplitude Ω_0 grows, making the conversion efficiency to be optimal.

Now, we turn to consider the two pulses having unequal amplitudes, and study the conversion efficiency and the adiabatic property, further find how to optimize conversion efficiency.




Figure 5: (Color online) Final and smallest adiabatic fidelity for atom-molecule three-level system (a) as a function of Ω'_2/Ω'_1 with fixed $\Omega'_1 = 10$ and (b) as a function of Ω'_1/Ω'_2 with fixed $\Omega'_2 = 10$, $\Delta = 0$, $t_1 = 5.0$, $t_2 = 6.0$, $\Delta t = 1.0$.

Figure 5 shows F_f^{am} and F_s^{am} as a function of Ω'_2/Ω'_1 and Ω'_1/Ω'_2 with $\Delta t = 1.0$. In figure 5(a), Ω'_1 is fixed, as Ω'_2 increases, we can see that both F_f^{am} and F_s^{am} increase until reach a critical point (at about $\Omega'_2 = 15$ in figure

5(a)), F_s^{am} begins to decrease while F_f^{am} stays close at 1 with vibration, which means the adiabaticity of the system is weakened as Ω'_2 increases, but the process can still realize completely population transfer. The physics behind this is that the effective coupling between $|a\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ scaled as Ω_2/ψ_a is weakened by decreasing atom population on $|a\rangle$, hence a higher pump Rabi frequency can remedy this kind of weakening, and enhance the two-photon process. So, we can improve the conversion efficiency by enlarging the amplitude of the pump laser Ω'_2 with the optimal match between Ω'_2 and Ω'_1 . However, we cannot increase the conversion efficiency through increasing the amplitude of the stoke laser Ω'_1 , because both F_f^{am} and F_s^{am} decrease after the critical points, as is shown in figure 5(b). Therefore, in the following discussion, we only consider how the conversion efficiency changes with the time delay when Ω'_1 is fixed and Ω'_2 is changed.

In figure 4(b), the final adiabatic fidelity F_f^{am} is plotted as a function of the pulse delay Δt for several different values of Ω_2 with $\Omega_1 = 10$. We find that, as the case of equal amplitudes, there are also a segment and some preferable points of time delay Δt making the conversion efficiency of the atom-molecule system to be the optimal. Moreover the segment increases as the the amplitude of the pump laser Ω'_2 grows.

In conclusion, we study the adiabatic fidelity for the the coherent population trapping(CPT) state in the atom-molecule three-level Λ -system on stimulated Raman adiabatic passage(STIRAP) quantitatively, and discuss how to achieve higher adiabatic fidelity for the dark state through optimizing the external parameters of STIRAP. Our discussions are helpful to achieve higher atom-molecule conversion rate in practical experiments.

This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (No.10474008,10604009), the National Fundamental Research Programme of China under Grant No. 2006CB921400,2007CB814800.

-
- [1] K. Bergmann, H. Theuer, and B. W. Shore, Rev. Mod. Phys. **70**, 1003 (1998).
 - [2] E. Timmermans, et al. Phys. Rep. **315**, 199 (1999); Thorsten Köhler, Krzysztof Góral and Paul S. Julienne. Rev. Mod. Phys. **78**(4), 1311 (2006), and reference therein.
 - [3] U. Gaubatz, et al, Chem. Phys. Lett. **149**, 463 (1988); J.R.Kuklinski, et al. Phys. Rev. A. **40** 1989; N. V. Vitanov, et al, Annu. Rev. Phys. Chem. **52**, 763 (2001).
 - [4] P. A. Ivano, N. V. Vitanov, and K. Bergmann, Phys. Rev. A. **70**, 063409 (2004); **72**, 053412 (2005).
 - [5] J. J. Hope, M. K. Olsen, and L. I. Plimak, Phys. Rev. A. **63**, 043603 (2001); M. Mackie, R. Kowalski, and J. Javanainen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, (2000); M. Mackie, et al, Phys. Rev. A. **70**, 013614 (2004); M. Mackie, A. Collin, and J. Javanainen, Phys. Rev. A. **71**, 017601 (2005); P. D. Drummond, et al, Phys. Rev. A. **65**, 063619(2002); **71**, 017602 (2005).
 - [6] K. Winkler, et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 063202 (2005); S. Moal, et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 023203(2006).
 - [7] Han Pu, Peter Maenner, Weiping Zhang, and Hong Y. Ling. Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 050406 (2007);
 - [8] Hong Y. Ling, Han Pu, and Brian Seaman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 250403 (2004); Hong Y. Ling, Peter Maenner, Weiping Zhang, and Han Pu. Phys. Rev. A. **75**, 033615 (2007).
 - [9] Jie Liu, Biao Wu, and Qian Niu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 170404 (2000).
 - [10] P. Ehrenfest, Ann. Phys. (Berlin) **51**, 327 (1916); M. Born and V. Fock, Z. Phys. **51**, 165 (1928); L. D. Landau, Zeitschrift, **2**, 46 (1932); C. Zener, Proc. R. Soc. A **137**, 696 (1932).

- [11] Jie Liu, Li-Bin Fu, *Singularity of Berry Connections Inhibits the Accuracy of Adiabatic Approximation*, arXiv:quant-ph/0612088 (2006), to appear in Phys. Lett. A.
- [12] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000), pp. 399–424; Jing-Ling Chen, Libin Fu, Abraham A. Ungar, and Xian-Geng Zhao, Phys. Rev. A 65, 054304 (2002); Jing-Ling Chen, Libin Fu, Abraham A. Ungar, and Xian-Geng Zhao, Phys. Rev. A 65, 024303 (2002).