

Spectral shift and dephasing of electromagnetically induced transparency in an interacting Rydberg gas

Jingshan Han,¹ Thibault Vogt,^{1,2} and Wenhui Li^{1,3}

¹*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117543*

²*MajuLab, CNRS-UNS-NUS-NTU International Joint Research Unit UMI 3654, Singapore 117543 and*

³*Department of Physics, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117542*

We perform spectroscopic measurements of electromagnetically induced transparency (EIT) in a strongly interacting Rydberg gas, and observe a significant spectral shift of the transparency from the single-atom EIT resonance as well as a spectral dephasing of the same order. We characterize the shift and dephasing as a function of atomic density, probe Rabi frequency, and principal quantum number of Rydberg states, and demonstrate that the observed spectral shift and dephasing are reduced if the size of a Gaussian atomic cloud is increased. We simulate our experiment with a semi-analytical model, which gives results in good agreement with our experimental data.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Gy, 32.80.Ee, 32.80.Rm

Atomic systems driven in the configuration of electromagnetically induced transparency involving a Rydberg state (Rydberg EIT) [1] are promising systems for the investigation of quantum nonlinear optics [2, 3] and quantum many-body physics [4, 5] with strong interactions and correlations. With Rydberg EIT, non-linearity at the single photon level has been demonstrated with the remarkable realizations of photon filters, deterministic single photon sources, and interaction between pairs of photons [6–8], and also been utilized to implement single-photon transistors [9, 10]. Moreover, the recent demonstration of interaction enhanced absorption imaging (IEAI) [11, 12] confirms the great potential of Rydberg EIT for the study of many-body physics with Rydberg atoms.

In Rydberg EIT, highly correlated many-body atomic states arising from the interaction-induced blockade [13–16] result in strong nonlinear optical response, and can be mapped onto the probe field propagating through the medium. Thus detailed studies on the spectral, temporal, and spatial properties of the transmitted probe light are crucial for proper understanding of such systems and their further applications in quantum optics, quantum information, and quantum many-body physics. Because of the large parameter space and complex dynamics of Rydberg EIT ensembles in the blockade regime, many questions remain open in spite of significant investigation efforts, both experimental [3, 17–23] and theoretical [19, 24–31]. All of Rydberg EIT experiments in the blockade regime have observed the reduction of the EIT transparency at the probe resonance due to Rydberg blockade induced dissipation, also called photon blockade [32], and most of them have seen the spectral dephasing as well. However, the spectral shift of the transparency resonance, as predicted by several theoretical models, has only been observed in two experiments [23, 33], but remains elusive in others. Theoretical calculations, while succeeding to describe certain experimental observations, have yet converged to a comprehensive physical picture

due to the challenges posted by strong correlation and dissipation in such systems.

In this letter we present a set of Rydberg EIT measurements that clearly show the spectral shift and dephasing and their dependence on atomic density, interaction strength, and input probe light intensity. Our experimental data agree well with the simulation results of a simple model based on previous semi-analytical results obtained from the Monte Carlo rate equations approach [26] and the superatom model [25]. Furthermore, we demonstrate that as the size of a Gaussian atomic cloud is increased, the observed spectral shift and dephasing are reduced. This study provides important experimental evidences to advance the understanding on the spectral properties of Rydberg EIT.

The experiment was performed with a ^{87}Rb atomic cloud released from a horizontally positioned single-beam optical dipole trap (ODT), which was formed by a 1064 nm laser beam with a power of 3.1 W and a $1/e^2$ Gaussian radius of 42.6 μm . Atoms were loaded into the ODT from a molasses cooled atomic ensemble, the preparation of which was detailed in Ref.[34]. Subsequently, a guiding field of approximately 3.5 Gauss along the vertical direction pointing downwards was switched on to define the quantization axis z , and the atoms in the ODT were optically pumped into the $|5s_{1/2}, F=2, m_F=2\rangle$ ($|g\rangle$) state. At this stage, the atomic cloud had a temperature in the range 40 to 60 μK . The atomic cloud was then released for a time of flight (TOF) before the spectroscopic measurement. By changing the ODT loading efficiency and/or the TOF duration, the peak atomic density of the ground state $|g\rangle$, n_0 , and the $1/e^2$ radius of the cloud along the vertical direction, w_z , could be varied independently in the ranges of $0.1 - 3 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ and $15 - 80 \mu\text{m}$, respectively.

Shown in Fig. 1 are the schematics of the energy levels and the optical setup for Rydberg EIT, the details of which are similar to that in Ref.[34]. At each experimental cycle after TOF of the atomic cloud, the probe




FIG. 1. (a) Three-level Rydberg EIT scheme for spectroscopic measurements. A probe beam of Rabi frequency Ω_p is detuned Δ_p from the $|5s_{1/2}, F=2, m_F=2\rangle (|g\rangle) \rightarrow |5p_{3/2}, F=3, m_F=3\rangle (|e\rangle)$ transition and a coupling beam of Rabi frequency Ω_c is on resonance with the $|5p_{3/2}, F=3, m_F=3\rangle \rightarrow |ns_{1/2}, J=1/2, m_J=1/2\rangle (|r\rangle)$ transition, where n is the principal quantum number of a Rydberg state. (b) Schematics of the experimental configuration. The probe and coupling beams counter-propagate coaxially along the z direction in the $\sigma^+ - \sigma^-$ polarization configuration. While the probe beam has a collimated $1/e^2$ Gaussian radius of 3.45 mm, the coupling beam is focused at the center of the atomic cloud with a $1/e^2$ Gaussian radius of 50 μm and a peak Rabi frequency of Ω_{c0} . The transparent spot in the shadow of the atomic cloud on the EMCCD (electron-multiplying charge-coupled device) camera screen illustrates the transparency window opened by the coupling beam for the probe beam to pass through.

and coupling beams were turned on simultaneously for 15 μs during which an EMCCD camera was exposed to acquire the image of the probe beam transmitted through the atomic cloud via a diffraction limited optical system. To obtain an EIT transmission spectrum, a set of images of the transmitted probe light were taken while varying the probe beam detuning Δ_p from shot to shot to scan through the resonance of the $|g\rangle \leftrightarrow |e\rangle$ transition but fixing the coupling beam frequency to be on resonance with the $|e\rangle \leftrightarrow |r\rangle$ transition. The probe transmission (I/I_0) was extracted by taking the ratio between the probe intensity I passing through the center of the coupling beam (with Rabi frequency Ω_{c0}) and that of the incoming probe beam without atomic cloud (I_0), and plotted vs. Δ_p to get the transmission spectra in Fig. 2.

In EIT of a non-interacting gas, the linear susceptibility for the probe light at the first order is given by

$$\chi^{(1)}(\vec{r}) = -i \frac{n_{at}(\vec{r}) \Gamma_e \sigma_0 \lambda}{4\pi \left(\gamma_{ge} - i\Delta_p + \frac{\Omega_c(\vec{r})^2}{4(\gamma_{gr} - i(\Delta_c + \Delta_p))} \right)}, \quad (1)$$

where λ is the wavelength of the probe transition, $\sigma_0 = 3\lambda^2/2\pi$ is the resonant cross-section of the probe transition, $\Gamma_e = 2\pi \times 6.067$ MHz is the decay rate of intermediate state $|e\rangle$, Δ_p and Δ_c are the detunings of the probe and coupling lights, and finally $\gamma_{ge} \approx \Gamma_e/2$ and γ_{gr} are the decay rates of atomic coherences. As the

atomic sample in this experiment is rather thin along the beam propagation direction z , lensing can be neglected [34], and the spatial dependent terms in Eq. (1) are reduced to a constant Ω_{c0} and one-dimensional functions $\chi^{(1)}(z)$ and $n_{at}(z)$. As the incoming probe light of Rabi frequency Ω_{p0} propagates through the atomic sample, the solution of the one-dimensional Maxwell's equation $\partial_z \Omega_p = -\frac{ik}{2} \chi^{(1)} \Omega_p$ gives the transmission

$$T(\Delta_p, \gamma_{gr}, \Delta_c, OD) = \exp \left(-OD \times \text{Im} \left[-\frac{k\chi^{(1)}}{n_{at}\sigma_0} \right] \right), \quad (2)$$

where k is the wavenumber of the probe light $k = 2\pi/\lambda$ and OD corresponds to the optical density of the atomic cloud at the first order.

In an interacting Rydberg gas, the single-atom Rydberg energy level is shifted by the strong interaction, which for ns state in our experiment is the repulsive van der Waals interaction $V(r) = -C_6/r^6$, where the strength coefficient C_6 scales as n^{11} [35]. One of the most important consequences of this energy level shift is the blockade effect that allows only one Rydberg excitation among many atoms within a sphere of radius R_B . The interaction induced level shift and excitation blockade greatly modify the susceptibility of the EIT ensemble. The linear susceptibility in Eq. (1) is now changed to a nonlocal nonlinear susceptibility, which in principle is given by the solution of a full master equation of the interacting many-body system, and this change is reflected in the EIT transmission spectra. In a simple and intuitive physical picture, the shifted Rydberg energy level detunes the transparency away from that of the non-interacting EIT resonance, and the blockade effect results in scattering around each blockaded sphere, which gives rise to additional decoherence compared to that of the single-atom EIT. The resulting spectral shift and dephasing of the EIT transmission depend on the interaction strength C_6 , the density of blockaded spheres (Rydberg excitations) n_{Ryd} , and the number of atoms inside each blockaded sphere N_B .

A set of values around the middle of our experimental parameter range, $ns = 38s$, $n_0 = 2.1 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, $\Omega_{c0}/2\pi = 5.6$ MHz, $\Omega_{p0}/2\pi = 1.45$ MHz, $\Delta_p = 0$, gives the blockade radius $R_B = (-2C_6/\gamma_{EIT})^{1/6} = 2.4 \mu\text{m}$, the atom number per unit blockaded sphere $N_B = n_0 \times 4\pi R_B^3/3 = 5$, and the Rydberg atom density $n_{Ryd} = n_0 \times f_R = 1.05 \times 10^{10} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, where $\gamma_{EIT} = \Omega_{c0}^2/\Gamma_e$ is the on resonance single atom EIT linewidth [7] and f_R is the Rydberg excitation fraction. This indicates that the Rydberg EIT system in our experiment goes into the blockade regime of this interacting many-body system. In the three sets of transmission spectra in Fig. 2, there is an increasing blue shift of transparency away from the single atom EIT resonance ($\Delta_p = 0$) as well as an increasing dephasing, when the ground state atomic density n_0 , the incoming probe Rabi frequency Ω_{p0} , or the principal




FIG. 2. Transmission spectra of the probe light. The spectra are taken at (a) $\Omega_{c0}/2\pi = 5.2$ MHz, $\Omega_{p0}/2\pi = 1.45$ MHz, $w_z = 18$ μm , and Rydberg state $ns = 38s$ with different atomic densities, $n_0 = 0.30 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ($\blacktriangle$), $1.17 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ($\bullet$), $1.82 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ($\blacklozenge$), and $2.64 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$ ($\blacktriangledown$), respectively; (b) $\Omega_{c0}/2\pi = 5.6$ MHz, $n_0 = 2.14 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, $w_z = 21$ μm , and $ns = 38s$ with different incoming probe Rabi frequencies $\Omega_{p0}/2\pi = 0.68$ MHz ($\blacktriangle$), 1.25 MHz ($\bullet$), and 1.8 MHz ($\blacklozenge$), respectively; (c) $\Omega_{c0}/2\pi = 5.6$ MHz, $n_0 = 2.14 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, $w_z = 21$ μm , and $\Omega_{p0}/2\pi = 1.45$ MHz with different Rydberg states, $27s$ ($\blacktriangle$), $33s$ ($\bullet$), $38s$ ($\blacklozenge$) and $43s$ ($\blacktriangledown$), respectively. The uncertainties for the experimental parameters are less than 10% for n_0 and w_z , and less than 3% for Ω_{c0} and Ω_{p0} . Each spectrum is an average of 3 or more scans. In (a), the dashed lines correspond to fittings of experimental data to Eq. (2), whereas the solid lines are generated by the theoretical model with the corresponding experimental parameters as inputs (see text).

quantum number n are increased.

To extract the amplitudes of the spectral shift V_R and dephasing γ_R , we fit the experimental EIT transmission spectra to Eq. (2) with Δ_c , γ_{gr} and OD as the fitting parameters. While experimentally the coupling light frequency is always on the resonance of the single-atom transition $|e\rangle \leftrightarrow |r\rangle$, Δ_c is set to be a fitting parameter to account for the shift $V_R = -\Delta_c$ due to Rydberg interactions. $\gamma_R = \gamma_{gr}$ is set to be a fitting parameter to account for the total dephasing rate coming from both the dephasing due to interaction and the decay of atomic coherence in the single-atom Rydberg EIT, which is $\gamma_0 \approx 100$ kHz in our experiment [34]. A couple sample fittings are shown in Fig. 2 (a), and the extracted shift $V_R = -\Delta_c$ and dephasing $\gamma_R = \gamma_{gr}$ are plotted against n_0 , Ω_{p0} and n in Fig. 3. The shift and dephasing are increasing with n_0 , Ω_{p0} , and n , and their amplitudes are




FIG. 3. Spectral shift and dephasing of EIT transmission spectra. The spectral shift $V_R = -\Delta_c$ and dephasing $\gamma_R = \gamma_{gr}$ are extracted by fitting the experimental ($\blacktriangleleft$) and the simulated ($\blacktriangleright$) transmission spectra to Eq. (2), and plotted against (a) n_0 , (b) Ω_{p0} , and (c) n . The solid lines are plots of Δ_R and $\sqrt{\vartheta_R}$ as expressed in Eqs. (4) and (5) with $n_{at} = n_0$ and $\Omega_p = \Omega_{p0}$. For these measurements done in the thin atomic samples, this simple expression of Δ_R seems to agree well with the observed shift, while $\sqrt{\vartheta_R}$ only gives a good account of the experimental data at very small dephasings.

of the same order.

We simulate our experimental transmission spectra by approximating the nonlinear susceptibility $\bar{\chi}$ of the interacting Rydberg EIT ensemble as a sum of two contributions [25, 31],

$$\bar{\chi} \approx \chi_B f_R (N_B - 1) + \chi_E (1 - f_R (N_B - 1)), \quad (3)$$

where $f_R(N_B - 1)$ is the fraction of atoms inside the blocked spheres excluding Rydberg atoms and every physical quantity in the equation is a function of z . χ_B in the first term is the susceptibility of atoms inside the blocked sphere, and is nearly equal to the two-level atom susceptibility. χ_E in the second term is the susceptibility of unblocked atoms (including Rydberg excitations themselves) more than R_B distance from any (other) Rydberg excitations. Since the unblocked atoms could be excited to interact with other Rydberg excitations, $\chi_E = \chi(\Delta_c = -\Delta_R, \gamma_{gr} = \sqrt{\vartheta_R} + \gamma_0)$ is the susceptibility of three-level Rydberg EIT with the shifted energy level obtained from the steady state solution of the single atom master equation to the fourth order [34], where Δ_R accounts for the average energy level shift due to interactions with surrounding Rydberg atoms, and $\sqrt{\vartheta_R}$

accounts for the deviation of the level shift from the mean value Δ_R . Δ_R and $\sqrt{\vartheta_R}$ are evaluated with a simple mean-field approach [23, 24], where the average shift felt by an atom i is the sum over the interactions with all Rydberg excitations j , $\Delta_R \approx \sum_j \frac{-C_6}{R_{ij}^6}$, and the variance

of this average shift is given by $\vartheta_R = \left(\sum \frac{-C_6}{R_{ij}^6} \right)^2 - \Delta_R^2$. At each spatial position z , Δ_R and ϑ_R are calculated by replacing the sum with an integral and using the local density approximation (LDA) for $n_{at}(z)$ and $\Omega_p(z)$, which yields:

$$\Delta_R \approx \int_{R_B}^{\infty} f_R n_{at} \frac{-C_6}{r^6} 4\pi r^2 dr = -\frac{4\pi C_6 f_R n_{at}}{3R_B^3}, \quad (4)$$

and

$$\vartheta_R \approx \int_{R_B}^{\infty} f_R n_{at} \frac{C_6^2}{r^{12}} 4\pi r^2 dr = \frac{4\pi C_6^2 f_R n_{at}}{9R_B^9}. \quad (5)$$

Here the excitation fraction f_R in the blockade regime is given in good approximation by $f_R = \frac{f_0}{1-f_0+f_0 n_{at} V_B}$ [30, 31], where $f_0 = \varrho_{rr}(\infty)$ is the Rydberg population of non-interacting Rydberg EIT, $V_B = \frac{4}{3}\pi R_B^3$ is the volume of the blockaded sphere, and R_B is defined as the distance between two atoms at which $\varrho_{rr}(R_B) = f_0/2$.

The simulated EIT spectra are produced by numerically solving the Maxwell's equation with the approximate susceptibility in Eq. (3) and the experimental parameters as inputs, and they agree reasonably well with the experimental spectra, as shown by the samples in Fig. 2 (a). The shift V_R and dephasing γ_R of these simulated spectra are extracted by fitting to Eq. (2) as in the case of experimental spectra, and plotted along with the experimental results in Fig. 3. The spectral shifts are definitely well captured by our model, and the dephasings deviate only at large n_0 , Ω_{p0} , or n . This discrepancy could be due to our very simple estimation of χ_E and/or due to the additional dissipative mechanism from the increasing correlation between Rydberg excitations, which is not properly accounted by the mean-field model. Moreover, the three plots of $\sqrt{\vartheta_R}$ in Fig. 3 indicate that a significant contribution to the dephasing comes from the dispersion of energy level shifts, which is of the same order as the mean value of energy shifts. This explains why the observed spectral shift and dephasing have similar amplitudes.

An important result from the above simulation, which agrees with our experimental observations, is that the spectral shift and dephasing appear to be smaller for a Gaussian atomic sample with larger size than for a smaller size one, while both have the same peak atomic density, as shown in Fig. 4. This reduction in the observed shift and dephasing can be explained by the inhomogeneity of the EIT ensemble together with the dependence shown in Fig. 3. As the probe light enters the atomic sample, it first sees the lower atomic density at the wing part of




FIG. 4. EIT transmission spectra obtained for different atomic cloud sizes, $w_z = 17 \mu\text{m}$ ($\blacksquare$), $w_z = 30 \mu\text{m}$ ($\bullet$) and $w_z = 66 \mu\text{m}$ ($\blacktriangle$), respectively, with experimental conditions $\Omega_{c0}/2\pi = 5.2 \text{ MHz}$, $\Omega_{p0}/2\pi = 1.5 \text{ MHz}$, $n_0 = 1.2 \times 10^{11} \text{ cm}^{-3}$, and $ns = 38s$. The uncertainties for the experimental parameters are the same as that in the caption of Fig. 2. Shown as well are the simulated spectral curves with the same experimental conditions and with the atomic cloud sizes of $w_z = 30 \mu\text{m}$ (solid line) and $w_z = 198 \mu\text{m}$ (dotted line), the latter of which can not be realized in our current experimental configuration.

the Gaussian density profile; and when the light reaches the center of the sample with the high atomic density, its intensity has already been attenuated due to scattering along its way. Given the similar peak atomic density, this effect of inhomogeneity in a thicker atomic sample obviously appears more pronounced than that in a thinner one, and correspondingly results in smaller spectral shift and dephasing.

In conclusion, we have observed the spectral shift and dephasing of Rydberg EIT and clearly mapped out their dependence on density, probe Rabi frequency, and Rydberg principal quantum number. While the spectral shifts agree very well with the theoretical prediction over the whole parameter range, the spectral dephasings are consistently larger than that predicted by the simple model at high Rydberg excitation or large blockade. This discrepancy invites further investigations. Furthermore, we demonstrate that the observed spectral shift and dephasing also depend on the size of the Gaussian atomic sample. This clear observation of spectral shift raises the prospect to realize interaction induced optical switches, and these spectroscopic measurements are highly relevant for imaging Rydberg excitations via IEAI based on Rydberg EIT. Moreover, it would be interesting to extend our experiment into the parameter regime, where collective excitations could give a Rydberg excitation fraction higher than that of a noninteracting Rydberg gas [36].

The authors acknowledge the support from the Ministry of Education and the National Research Founda-

tion, Singapore. This work is partly supported through the Academic Research Fund, Project No. MOE2015-T2-1-085.

-
- [1] M. Fleischhauer, A. Imamoglu, and J. P. Marangos, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 633 (2005).
 - [2] A. K. Mohapatra, M. G. Bason, B. Butscher, K. J. Weatherill, and C. S. Adams, *Nat. Phys.* **4**, 890 (2008).
 - [3] J. Pritchard, D. Maxwell, A. Gauguier, K. Weatherill, M. Jones, and C. Adams, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 193603 (2010).
 - [4] R. Löw, H. Weimer, J. Nipper, J. B. Balewski, B. Butscher, H. P. Büchler, and T. Pfau, *J. Phys. B* **45**, 113001 (2012).
 - [5] H. Weimer, M. Müller, I. Lesanovsky, P. Zoller, and H. P. Büchler, *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 382 (2010).
 - [6] Y. Dudin and A. Kuzmich, *Science* **336**, 887 (2012).
 - [7] T. Peyronel, O. Firstenberg, Q.-Y. Liang, S. Hofferberth, A. V. Gorshkov, T. Pohl, M. D. Lukin, and V. Vuletić, *Nature* **488**, 57 (2012).
 - [8] O. Firstenberg, T. Peyronel, Q.-Y. Liang, A. V. Gorshkov, M. D. Lukin, and V. Vuletić, *Nature* **502**, 71 (2013).
 - [9] H. Gorniaczyk, C. Tresp, J. Schmidt, H. Fedder, and S. Hofferberth, *Physical review letters* **113**, 053601 (2014).
 - [10] D. Tiarks, S. Baur, K. Schneider, S. Dürr, and G. Rempe, *Physical review letters* **113**, 053602 (2014).
 - [11] G. Günter, M. Robert-de Saint-Vincent, H. Schempp, C. Hofmann, S. Whitlock, and M. Weidemüller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 013002 (2012).
 - [12] G. Günter, H. Schempp, M. Robert-de Saint-Vincent, V. Gavryusev, S. Helmrich, C. Hofmann, S. Whitlock, and M. Weidemüller, *Science* **342**, 954 (2013).
 - [13] D. Jaksch, J. I. Cirac, P. Zoller, S. L. Rolston, R. Cote, and M. D. Lukin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 2208 (2000).
 - [14] D. Tong, S. Farooqi, J. Stanojevic, S. Krishnan, Y. Zhang, R. Côté, E. Eyler, and P. Gould, *Physical review letters* **93**, 063001 (2004).
 - [15] T. Vogt, M. Viteau, J. Zhao, A. Chotia, D. Comparat, and P. Pillet, *Physical review letters* **97**, 083003 (2006).
 - [16] R. Heidemann, U. Raitzsch, V. Bendkowsky, B. Butscher, R. Löw, L. Santos, and T. Pfau, *Physical review letters* **99**, 163601 (2007).
 - [17] K. J. Weatherill, J. D. Pritchard, R. P. Abel, M. G. Bason, A. K. Mohapatra, and C. S. Adams, *J. Phys. B* **41**, 201002 (2008).
 - [18] H. Schempp, G. Günter, C. Hofmann, C. Giese, S. Saliba, B. DePaola, T. Amthor, M. Weidemüller, S. Sevinçli, and T. Pohl, *Physical review letters* **104**, 173602 (2010).
 - [19] S. Sevinçli, C. Ates, T. Pohl, H. Schempp, C. Hofmann, G. Günter, T. Amthor, M. Weidemüller, J. Pritchard, D. Maxwell, *et al.*, *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics* **44**, 184018 (2011).
 - [20] U. Raitzsch, R. Heidemann, H. Weimer, B. Butscher, P. Kollmann, R. Löw, H. Büchler, and T. Pfau, *New Journal of Physics* **11**(5), 055014 (2009).
 - [21] T. Baluktsian, B. Huber, R. Löw, and T. Pfau, *Physical review letters* **110**, 123001 (2013).
 - [22] H. Zhang, L. Zhang, L. Wang, S. Bao, J. Zhao, S. Jia, and G. Raithel, *Physical Review A* **90**, 043849 (2014).
 - [23] B. DeSalvo, J. Aman, C. Gaul, T. Pohl, S. Yoshida, J. Burgdörfer, K. Hazzard, F. Dunning, and T. Killian, *Physical Review A* **93**, 022709 (2016).
 - [24] H. Weimer, R. Löw, T. Pfau, and H. P. Büchler, *Physical review letters* **101**, 250601 (2008).
 - [25] D. Petrosyan, J. Otterbach, and M. Fleischhauer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 213601 (2011).
 - [26] C. Ates, S. Sevinçli, and T. Pohl, *Physical Review A* **83**, 041802 (2011).
 - [27] S. Sevinçli, N. Henkel, C. Ates, and T. Pohl, *Physical review letters* **107**, 153001 (2011).
 - [28] K. P. Heeg, M. Gärttner, and J. Evers, *Physical Review A* **86**, 063421 (2012).
 - [29] M. Gärttner, K. P. Heeg, T. Gasenzer, and J. Evers, *Physical Review A* **86**, 033422 (2012).
 - [30] D. Petrosyan, M. Höning, and M. Fleischhauer, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 053414 (2013).
 - [31] M. Gärttner, S. Whitlock, D. W. Schönleber, and J. Evers, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 063407 (2014).
 - [32] A. V. Gorshkov, J. Otterbach, M. Fleischhauer, T. Pohl, and M. D. Lukin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 133602 (2011).
 - [33] C. Carr, R. Ritter, C. Wade, C. Adams, and K. Weatherill, *Physical review letters* **111**, 113901 (2013).
 - [34] J. Han, T. Vogt, M. Manjappa, R. Guo, M. Kiffner, and W. Li, *Physical Review A* **92**, 063824 (2015).
 - [35] K. Singer, J. Stanojevic, M. Weidemüller, and R. Côté, *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics* **38**, S295 (2005).
 - [36] M. Gärttner, S. Whitlock, D. W. Schönleber, and J. Evers, *Physical review letters* **113**, 233002 (2014).