On collective Rabi splitting in nanolasers and nano-LEDs
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We analytically calculate the optical emission spectrum of nanolasers and nano-LEDs based on a model of many incoherently pumped two-level emitters in a cavity. At low pump rates we find two peaks in the spectrum for large coupling strengths and numbers of emitters. We interpret the double-peaked spectrum as a signature of collective Rabi splitting, and discuss the difference between the splitting of the spectrum and the existence of two eigenmodes. We show that a LED will never exhibit a split spectrum, even though it can have distinct eigenmodes. For systems where the splitting is possible we show that the two peaks merge into a single one when the pump rate is increased. Finally, we compute the linewidth of the systems, and discuss the influence of inter-emitter correlations on the lineshape.

I. INTRODUCTION

It is a well-established fact that the interaction of light and matter depends on the environment of the electric field and the emitters. By placing emitters in photonic cavities it is possible to increase or decrease the spontaneous emission rate [3], and manipulate the emitter-field coupling strength. When this coupling strength becomes large enough to overcome the losses of the system, an excitation can be exchanged multiple times between the emitters and the field before it decays, giving rise to Rabi oscillations [2, 3] and a splitting of the cavity transmission spectrum. This may involve a single emitter interacting with the cavity or multiple emitters acting coherently to create a collective Rabi splitting. These phenomena have been seen in transmission experiments involving several two-level atoms in a cavity [4] and a single trapped atom in a cavity [5, 6]. Rabi splitting has also been observed in micro- and nanocavities with incoherently pumped single emitters [7–11], and this has been successfully modelled in e.g. [11, 12]. Here we present a model for a large collection of incoherently pumped two-level emitters in a cavity and show that collective Rabi splitting can occur in this system. Our model is relevant for nanolasers and -LEDs, which have gained much interest in recent years [13–15] as ideal candidates for integrated light emitters for optical interconnects [14] and on-chip optical circuits [15].

We find a condition for strong coupling and collective eigenmode splitting equivalent to that in [7,10], but identify a separate condition for the optical emission spectrum to exhibit two peaks. We further find that the magnitude of the eigenmode splitting and the position of the peaks of the spectrum depend on the pump rate, and predict a transition from strong to weak collective coupling as the pump rate increases similarly to the case of a single emitter laser [11]. Importantly, we find that there is a correlation between a double-peaked spectrum and the possibility of lasing.

In section 2 we outline basic equations and procedures. In section 3 we examine the properties of the optical emission spectrum, and discuss the conditions for observing collective Rabi splitting. We show that the splitting decreases with increasing pump rate, and consider the difference between eigenmode splitting and a double-peaked spectrum. In section 4 we compute the linewidth of the emission spectrum when there is only a single peak. Results are summarized and discussed in section 5.

II. THE MODEL AND THE SPECTRAL APPROACH

As in [16], we consider a collection of $N_0 \gg 1$ identical two-level emitters in a single mode cavity of resonant angular frequency $\omega_0$ with no detuning between the emitters and the cavity mode. We describe the dynamics of the operators $\hat{a}$ for the electric field, $\hat{v}$ for the total polarization and $\hat{N}_e, \hat{N}_g$ for the excited and ground state populations by the Maxwell-Bloch equations [17]

\begin{align}
\dot{\hat{a}} &= \Omega_0 \hat{v} - \kappa \hat{a} + \hat{F}_a \\
\dot{\hat{v}} &= -\gamma_{\perp} \hat{v} + \Omega_0 f(\hat{N}_e - \hat{N}_g)\hat{a} + \hat{F}_v \\
\dot{\hat{N}}_e &= \gamma_{\parallel}(P\hat{N}_g - \hat{N}_e) - \gamma_{\perp}\hat{a} \hat{v}^\dagger + \hat{v} \hat{a}^\dagger + \hat{F}_{N_e} \\
\dot{\hat{N}}_g &= -\gamma_{\parallel}(P\hat{N}_g - \hat{N}_e) + \gamma_{\perp}\hat{a} \hat{v}^\dagger + \hat{v} \hat{a}^\dagger + \hat{F}_{N_g}
\end{align}

Here $\Omega_0$ is the vacuum Rabi frequency and $2\kappa$ is the decay rate of the cavity mode. The decay rates of the polarization and the upper level population are $\gamma_{\perp}$ and $\gamma_{\parallel}$, respectively, and $\gamma_{\parallel} P$ is the pump rate. The factor $f$ denotes the average of squared couplings between emitters and the cavity mode, and $\hat{F}_a$ is the Langevin force associated with the operator $\hat{a} = \{\hat{a}, \hat{v}, \hat{N}_e, \hat{N}_g\}$.

Using (1)-(4) we derived in [16] equations describing the mean dynamics of the binary products of operators...
for the photon number \( \langle n \rangle := \langle \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} \rangle \), the population inversion \( \langle N \rangle := \langle \hat{N}_c \rangle - \langle \hat{N}_g \rangle \), the emitter-field correlation \( ⟨Σ⟩ := ⟨\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{v}⟩ + ⟨\hat{v}^\dagger \hat{a}⟩ \) and the emitter-emitter correlations \( ⟨D⟩ \). While \( ⟨Σ⟩ \) is often adiabatically eliminated under the assumption that \( γ_\perp ≫ 2κ \), leading to a negligible contribution from \( D \), we forego this assumption thus including collective excitation trapping [18, 19].

Here we aim to describe the steady-state spectral characteristics of the system, which were inaccessible in our previous approach, by considering the Fourier components of the operators. We will focus primarily on the region of pump power below and near threshold, where \( ⟨n⟩ ≪ N_0 \) and stimulated emission plays only a small role, meaning the influence of population variations on the photon number is negligible, as in [20]. Hence, the population inversion operator \( \hat{N} = \hat{N}_c - \hat{N}_g \) will be replaced by its mean value \( N := ⟨N⟩ \). From Eqs. (11) and (2), we then obtain the following expressions for the Fourier components of the field and polarization operators

\[
(\kappa - iω) \hat{a}(ω) = Ω_0 \hat{v}(ω) + \hat{F}_a(ω)
\]

(5)

\[
\left(\frac{γ_\perp}{2} - iω\right) \hat{v}(ω) = Ω_0 f \hat{a}(ω) N + \hat{F}_v(ω).
\]

(6)

By solving (5)-(6) for \( \hat{a}(ω) \) and \( \hat{v}(ω) \) and evaluating in inverse Fourier integrals (see appendix A), we can then compute the steady-state photon number \( ⟨n⟩ = ⟨\hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a}⟩ \) and the emitter-field correlation \( ⟨Σ⟩ \) as functions of the pump rate, and these are exactly the same as we found in [16] using another method. In this approach, however, we gain access to the optical emission spectrum, allowing us to consider the spectral characteristics.

### III. OPTICAL EMISSION SPECTRUM

In general, the steady-state mean intra-cavity photon number can be written in terms of the optical emission spectrum \( n_ω \) as

\[
⟨n⟩ = \frac{1}{2π} \int_{−∞}^{∞} dω \ n_ω.
\]

(7)

In appendix A it is shown from Eqs. (5)-(6) that

\[
n_ω = \frac{g^2 γ_\perp N_0}{(ω^2 - ω^2_+)(ω^2 - ω^2_-)}
\]

(8)

where the \( ω_± \) are given by

\[
ω_± = \frac{i}{4} (2κ + γ_\perp ± \sqrt{(2κ + γ_\perp)^2 - 16g^2(N_0 - N)})
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{4} (2κ + γ_\perp ± i\sqrt{(2κ - γ_\perp)^2 + 16g^2N}),
\]

(9)

Here we have introduced the semi-classical threshold value \( N_\text{th} := \kappa γ_\perp/2g^2 \) of the population inversion, given in terms of the effective emitter-field coupling strength \( g := \sqrt{Ω^2_0/2} \). Observe that the \( ω_± \) depend on the steady-state population inversion \( N \), implying that when \( N \) is less than

\[
N_e := -\frac{(2κ − γ_\perp)^2}{16g^2}
\]

(10)

the otherwise purely imaginary roots \( ω_± \) gain non-zero real parts. The two Lorentzian distributions constituting the spectrum (8) then obtain central frequencies away from the cavity resonance frequency, corresponding to two distinct coupled modes.

As long as the \( ω_± \) are purely imaginary, the spectrum exhibits a single peak, which becomes increasingly narrow as the pump rate increases (Fig. (H(a))). However, when \( ω_± \) obtain sufficiently large real parts, the spectrum splits into two peaks (Fig. (H(b))). Note that the spectrum does not necessarily exhibit two peaks even if the \( ω_± \) have non-zero real parts: Only if \( N \) is smaller than the critical inversion

\[
N_e := -\frac{4κ^2 + γ^2}{8g^2} = -\frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2κ}{γ_\perp} + \frac{γ_\perp}{2κ}\right) N_\text{th}
\]

(11)

will the splitting be resolved. When the pump rate increases, so too does the population inversion, and therefore the two peaks in the spectrum eventually merge to one (Fig. (H(b))).

The critical population inversion (11) corresponds to a
critical pump rate

\[ P_c := \left[ 1 + \frac{\beta}{(1 + 2\kappa/\gamma) / (1 - N_e/N_{th})} \right] \frac{N_0 + N_c}{N_0 - N_c}. \tag{12} \]

where \( \beta^{-1} := \gamma / g^2 \) is the saturation photon number [21]. In Fig. 1(c), \( P_c \) is plotted as a function of \( g^2 \), along with the semi-classical threshold pump rate \( P_{th} := (N_0 + N_{th}) / (N_0 - N_{th}) \). There are four distinct regions of interest: (i) where the coupling is so weak that \( N_{th} > N_0 \) meaning the system will not be able to achieve lasing, regardless of the pump rate; (ii) where the coupling is strong enough that the system could potentially achieve lasing, but not strong enough for collective Rabi splitting and the pump rate is still too small to cross the threshold; (iii) where the coupling is sufficiently strong and the pump sufficiently weak, so the spectrum exhibits two peaks but not yet lasing; and (iv), where the pump rate has exceeded the semiclassical threshold value, and lasing can be achieved. Depending on our choice of parameters, the full blue curve marking the edge of region (iii) can be closer to or farther from region (i), though it can never cross the vertical limit between regions (i) and (ii). We can conclude, therefore, that a system described by this model, which cannot achieve lasing at high pump rates, will not exhibit a splitting of the spectrum at low pump rates. Conversely, a split spectrum at low pump rates implies that lasing should be possible at larger pump rates.

Since the minimal population inversion is \( N = -N_0 \) when \( P = 0 \), we can deduce from (11) that the spectrum exhibits two peaks at low pump if and only if \( N_c > -N_0 \), which is equivalent to

\[ 8g^2N_0 > 4\kappa^2 + \gamma^2. \tag{13} \]

Thus, only when the product of the number of emitters and the single emitter-field coupling strength is sufficiently large will the spectrum be split at low pump rates. This allows an interpretation of the phenomenon as a collective Rabi splitting of the spectrum, due to the strong coupling between the field and all emitters. Indeed, the system can be said to be in the collective strong coupling regime as long as \( N < N_c \), i.e. \( P < P_c \).

In the literature, the collective strong coupling regime is often defined by the splitting of the eigenmodes, which occurs when \( N < N_E \). This is possible if and only if

\[ g\sqrt{N_0} > |2\kappa - \gamma|/4, \tag{14} \]

and only for pump rates \( P \) less than

\[ P_E := \left[ 1 + \frac{8\kappa/\gamma}{1 + 2\kappa/\gamma} \right] \frac{N_0 + N_E}{N_0 - N_E}. \tag{15} \]

The condition (14) is equivalent to that typically used to demarcate the region of (collective) strong coupling in theory and experiments regarding transmission spectra of cavities containing resonant two-level emitters [4, 5, 22], and incoherently pumped single emitters [7, 10]. In systems as [9, 11, 23] the collective Rabi splitting is also seen to decrease and vanish as the intensity of the incident light is increased. It is interesting that we find a similar behaviour in the systems described by our model, and that the exact same condition appears for collective normal mode splitting. In particular it is remarkable that our model, in which the integrated optical emission spectrum gives a mean intra-cavity photon number exhibiting excitation trapping [18, 19], yields the condition (13) also found in models where inter-emitter correlations are not taken into account. This seems to suggest that the emitter-emitter correlations do not affect the shape of the spectrum, but only reduce its amplitude.

In Fig. 1(c) \( P_E \) is plotted with a thin dashed line, and we see that this always lies above the full blue curve associated with \( P_c \). This means that the existence of two eigenmodes is a necessary but not a sufficient condition for collective Rabi splitting in the optical emission spectrum. It is worth noting that the area under the thin dashed line may overlap with region (i) in Fig. 1(c), so it should be possible for an LED to exhibit normal-mode splitting, though it will never exhibit a double-peaked emission spectrum.

Regardless of whether one chooses to define the collective strong coupling regime in terms of the normal-mode splitting or the splitting of the combined spectrum, we see from Fig. 1(c) that it is possible for the system to transition from strong to weak coupling by increasing the pump rate.

### IV. LINEWIDTH

Here we will discuss the case where the spectrum exhibits a single peak, i.e. \( N > N_c \) and it makes sense to define the linewidth of the emitted light in the usual way as the FWHM of the spectrum. From (8) we find for the linewidth

\[ \Delta\omega = \frac{2\kappa + \gamma}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ r - 1 + \sqrt{r^2 + (r - 1)^2} \right]^{1/2}, \tag{16} \]

where

\[ r := \frac{8g^2(N_{th} - N)}{(2\kappa + \gamma)^2} = \frac{N_{th} - N}{N_{th} - N_c}. \tag{17} \]

In Fig. 2 the linewidth found from (16) is shown as a function of the pump rate for two different values of \( N_0 \), along with the photon number \( \langle n \rangle \). For the full blue graphs, \( N_0 > N_{th} \), and we see a rapid decrease in the linewidth \( \Delta\omega \) along with a sharp increase of the mean intra-cavity photon number \( \langle n \rangle \) as \( P \) increases, in accordance with the transition to lasing. On the other hand, for the red dashed graphs the linewidth shows only a slight decrease, and the photon number saturates as the pump rate increases. This is because \( N_0 < N_{th} \) for these graphs, whereby lasing is impossible. Indeed, the
linewidth and photon number results replicate the behavior of an LED rather than a laser.

In a system where $N_{th} < N_0$, we see that $r \ll 1$ for large pump rates, and Eq. (16) can then be approximated by

$$\Delta \omega \approx \frac{2\kappa + \gamma_\perp}{2} r = \left( \frac{2\kappa\gamma_\perp}{2\kappa + \gamma_\perp} \right) \frac{\hbar \omega_0}{\langle P_{out} \rangle N_{th}} N_e.$$  

In this expression, $\langle P_{out} \rangle = \hbar \omega_0 2\kappa \langle n \rangle$ is the mean power of the light exiting the cavity. Eq. (18) is similar to expressions for the linewidth of a laser above threshold at zero detuning found elsewhere [24, 25], except for a factor of $1/2$ which does not appear in Eq. (18). This is a known discrepancy; attributable to the neglect of population fluctuations above threshold [24]. This approximation is only valid below threshold [27, 28], where the non-linearity associated with stimulated emission gives a relatively small contribution. Apart from this factor, our model thus reproduces results for the lineshape found in other models where the inter-emitter correlations are not taken into account, which again suggests that these correlations have little influence on the general shape of spectrum.

V. SUMMARY AND DISCUSSION

We have considered a quantum Maxwell-Bloch equation model for nanolasers and -LEDs, and analyzed their steady-state in terms of the Fourier components of the operators for the field and polarization, including collective effects, but neglecting fluctuations of level populations. We found that the steady-state characteristics are exactly equivalent to a previous approach [16], and we obtained an analytic expression for the emission spectrum. It was seen that, depending on our choice of parameters, the emission spectrum behaves in qualitatively different ways: When the coupling strength and number of emitters are small, the spectrum has a single peak for any pump rate, while if the coupling strength and the number of emitters becomes large enough to satisfy the inequality [13], the spectrum exhibits two peaks at low pump rates. The splitting of the spectrum decreases as the pump rate is increased, and we have presented the exact values of the population inversion and the associated pump rate at which the two peaks merge into one. We have identified the splitting of the spectrum as a collective Rabi splitting, and suggested the occurrence of this phenomenon as a way to define collective strong coupling. In conjunction with this we have discussed another possible definition of collective strong coupling in terms of eigenmode splitting, and derived an analytical condition [14] for this to occur. The latter condition is equivalent to that found in the literature regarding Rabi splitting in transmission spectra of many emitters in a passive cavity excited by a resonant external field [4, 22]. In [12, 24, 30] the authors consider single emitters in a cavity including incoherent pumping, and the splitting of the eigenmodes is also suggested as the way to define whether or not a system is in the strong-coupling regime; though those authors, like we ourselves, deduce that this definition allows for a situation where the system is in the strong-coupling regime while the spectrum still only has a single peak. In particular, we have shown that it is possible for LEDs to have two distinct eigenmodes, while it is impossible for LEDs to exhibit a split emission spectrum.

In the case where the spectrum exhibits only a single peak for all pump rates, we have derived an analytical expression for the width of the peak, and we have found an approximate expression for the linewidth of a lasing system at high pump rates, which is similar to the reduced Schawlow-Townes linewidth found in the literature regarding the linewidth of micro- and nanolasers [24, 25]. The integrated emission spectrum yields a mean intracavity photon number which agrees with that derived from the steady-state Maxwell-Bloch equations, and our model describes both systems that behave like lasers, with threshold kinks in $\langle n \rangle$ and a sudden reduction of the linewidth; as well as systems that behave like LEDs, where the photon number saturates at high pump rates, and the lineshape narrows only slightly. Surprisingly, it seems that the inter-emitter correlations, which give rise to the excitation trapping exhibited in the mean intracavity photon number, do not change the general lineshape of the system, and thus do not affect the linewidth.

Our results contribute to the understanding of spectral and noise properties of quantum optical devices, and they can be expanded upon in straightforward ways: For instance, it would be interesting to include inhomogeneous broadening of the gain medium into the theory, and to connect our current model to the regime of few and single emitters. We believe that our predictions should be readily verifiable in experiments with current technology, and we would welcome any experimental tests of our model.
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Appendix A: Deriving the optical emission spectrum and the equivalence to previous approach

Consider Eqs. (3)-(4) for the Fourier components of the field and total polarization operators. At temperatures appropriate for most experiments the effects of thermal photons are negligible, so contributions from the Langevin force $F\delta(\omega)$ can be omitted from the computations. We can then easily solve (5)-(6) for $a(\omega)$ and $\bar{a}(\omega)$ and we find the following expression for the Fourier components of the field operator:

$$a(\omega) = \frac{\Omega_0 \hat{P}_v(\omega)}{-\omega^2 - i(\kappa + \gamma_\perp/2)\omega + g^2(N_{th} - N)},$$ (A1)

where we have introduced the effective emitter-field coupling strength $g = \sqrt{\Omega_0^2 f}$ and the semi-classical threshold population inversion $N_{th} := \kappa \gamma_\perp/2g^2$. The roots of the quadratic function in the denominator are found to be

$$\omega_{\pm} = -\frac{i}{4} \left[ 2\kappa + \gamma_\perp \pm \sqrt{(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)^2 - 16g^2(N_{th} - N)} \right]$$ (A2)

$$= -\frac{i}{4} \left( 2\kappa + \gamma_\perp \right) \mp i \sqrt{\frac{(2\kappa - \gamma_\perp)^2}{16} + g^2 N}.$$ (A3)

Hence, the expression for $a(\omega)$ may be written as

$$a(\omega) = \frac{-\Omega_0 \hat{P}_v(\omega)}{(\omega - \omega_+)(\omega - \omega_-)}.$$ (A4)

Note that $\omega_\pm$ are entirely imaginary numbers, unless the quantity in the square root becomes negative; that is

$$\text{Re}(\omega_\pm) \neq 0 \iff N \leq -\frac{(2\kappa - \gamma_\perp)^2}{16g^2},$$ (A5)

with the equality implying that the quantity in the square root is exactly zero, at which point $\omega_+ = \omega_-$. The population inversion at which this happens is exactly $N_E$ defined in (10).

If the population inversion $N$ does not satisfy (A5), both roots lie on the imaginary axis, and as $N$ increases, $|\omega_+|$ increases and $|\omega_-|$ decreases. Observe that $\omega_-$ only crosses the real axis if $N$ becomes greater than or equal to the semi-classical threshold value $N_{th}$, so we assume that $N < N_{th}$ for all values of the pump rate.

Suppose that the system is being pumped at some rate given by $\gamma_\parallel P$, and that at time $t$ steady state has been reached. Then the mean intra-cavity photon number is

$$\langle N \rangle = \langle a^\dagger a \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega' \langle a^\dagger(-\omega)a(\omega') \rangle e^{i(\omega + \omega')t}.$$

From the expression (A4) for $a(\omega)$ it is found that

$$\langle a^\dagger(-\omega)a(\omega') \rangle = \frac{\Omega_0^2 \langle F_v^\dagger(\omega)f_v(\omega') \rangle}{(\omega + \omega_+^*)(\omega + \omega_-^*)(\omega' - \omega_+)(\omega' - \omega_-)}.$$ (A6)

Using the fact that

$$\langle F_v^\dagger(\omega)f_v(\omega') \rangle = 2D_{v^+} \delta(\omega + \omega'),$$ (A7)

one has

$$\langle a^\dagger(-\omega)a(\omega') \rangle = \frac{\Omega_0^2}{2\pi} 2D_{v^+} \delta(\omega + \omega') \frac{1}{(\omega + \omega_+^*)(\omega + \omega_-^*)(\omega' - \omega_+)(\omega' - \omega_-)}.$$ (A8)

Here, the diffusion coefficient is simply $2D_{v^+} = f_\gamma(\langle N_v \rangle)$, as we have assumed that the population dynamics are slow. Hence,

$$\langle n \rangle = \frac{g^2 \gamma_\perp \langle N_v \rangle}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega' \frac{1}{(\omega + \omega_+^*)(\omega + \omega_-^*)(\omega' - \omega_+)(\omega' - \omega_-)}.$$ (A9)

The integral can be evaluated using Cauchy’s residue theorem, as follows:

First assume that $N < N_E$, so we may write

$$\omega_\pm = \pm \sqrt{g^2(N_E - N)} - \frac{i}{4} \frac{2\kappa + \gamma_\perp}{4},$$

where the first term is real. Then

$$\omega_\mp = \pm \sqrt{g^2(N_E - N)} + \frac{i}{4} \frac{2\kappa + \gamma_\perp}{4}$$

$$= -\omega_\pm,$$ (A10)

meaning the integral to be calculated can be expressed
as

\[ I = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{1}{(\omega - \omega_+)(\omega - \omega_-)(\omega + \omega_+)(\omega + \omega_-)}. \]

(A11)

Note that this implies that the mean intra-cavity photon number may be written as

\[ \langle n \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \, n_\omega, \]

with \( n_\omega \) given in (S).

Define the function \( \mathcal{L} : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C} \) as

\[ \mathcal{L}(u) = \frac{1}{(u - \omega_+)(u - \omega_-)(u + \omega_+)(u + \omega_-)}. \]

(A12)

Then \( \mathcal{L} \) is a holomorphic function on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \{\omega_+, \omega_-, -\omega_+, -\omega_-\} \), which is exactly equal to the integrand of (11) on the real axis, with simple poles located at \( u = \omega_+ \) and \( u = -\omega_- \). Let \( \rho > |\omega_+|, |\omega_-| \) and let \( C_\rho \) be the semi-circle of radius \( \rho \) centered at the origin, spreading into the upper half-plane of \( \mathbb{C} \) with positive orientation (Fig. (S)(d)). By Cauchy’s residue theorem,

\[ \oint_{C_\rho} du \, \mathcal{L}(u) = 2\pi i \left[ \text{Res}(\mathcal{L}, -\omega_+) + \text{Res}(\mathcal{L}, -\omega_-) \right] \]

(A13)

\[ = 2\pi i \left[ \frac{1}{(-2\omega_+)(-\omega_+ - \omega_-)(-\omega_+ + \omega_-)} + \frac{1}{(-2\omega_-)(-\omega_- - \omega_+)(-\omega_- + \omega_+)} \right] \]

\[ = \frac{\pi i}{\omega_+\omega_-(-\omega_+ + \omega_-)}, \]

(A14)

so since

\[ \omega_+\omega_- = -g^2(N_{th} - N) \quad \text{and} \quad \omega_+ + \omega_- = -i(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp), \]

(A15)

we have

\[ \int_{C_\rho} du \, \mathcal{L}(u) = \frac{2\pi}{g^2(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)(N_{th} - N)}. \]

(A16)

The integral around \( C_\rho \) can be split into a part along the real axis and a part consisting of the arc into the upper half-plane, and it must hold that

\[ \int_{arc} du \, \mathcal{L}(u) \leq \rho \pi \sup_{arc} \left\{ \frac{1}{|(u - \omega_+)(u - \omega_-)(u + \omega_+)(u + \omega_-)|} \right\} \]

\[ \leq \rho \pi \frac{1}{\rho^2 - \omega_+^2} \left| \frac{\rho^2 - \omega_-^2}{\rho^2 - \omega_+^2} \right| \]

\[ \rho \to \infty \to 0, \]

(A17)

so the integral \( \text{[A11]} \) is evaluated to

\[ I = \lim_{\rho \to \infty} \left\{ \oint_{C_\rho} du \, \mathcal{L}(u) - \int_{arc} du \, \mathcal{L}(u) \right\} \]

\[ = \frac{2\pi}{g^2(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)(N_{th} - N)}. \]

(A21)

Inserting this in \( \text{[A9]} \), we find

\[ \langle n \rangle = \frac{\gamma_\perp \langle N_e \rangle}{(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)(N_{th} - N)}. \]

(A22)

Now suppose that \( N > N_E \). Then \( \omega_\pm \) are purely imaginary, and \( \omega_+^* = -\omega_- \). The integral in \( \text{[A9]} \) again takes the form \( \text{[A11]} \), and by the same arguments as above, the result \( \text{[A22]} \) is found again.

When \( N = N_E \), we have \( \omega_+ = \omega_- = -i(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)/4 \), so the integral in \( \text{[A9]} \) can be written as

\[ \tilde{I} = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \frac{1}{(\omega - \omega_+)^2(\omega + \omega_+)^2}. \]

(A23)

Defining \( \tilde{\mathcal{L}} : \mathbb{C} \to \mathbb{C} \) as

\[ \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(u) = \frac{1}{(u - \omega_+)^2(u + \omega_+)^2}, \]

(A24)

we have a holomorphic function on \( \mathbb{C} \setminus \{\omega_+, -\omega_+\} \), which is exactly equal to the integrand of \( \text{[A21]} \) on the real axis, with second order poles located at \( u = \omega_+ \) and \( u = -\omega_+ \). The residue of \( \tilde{\mathcal{L}} \) at \( -\omega_+ \) is

\[ \text{Res}(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}, -\omega_+) = \lim_{u \to -\omega_+} \frac{d}{du} \left( \frac{1}{(u - \omega_+)^2} \right) = \frac{2\pi}{(2\omega_+)^3}, \]

(A25)

so with \( \rho > |\omega| \) and \( C_\rho \) defined as above, we find

\[ \int_{C_\rho} du \, \tilde{\mathcal{L}}(u) = \frac{\pi i}{2\omega_+^2} = \frac{32\pi}{(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)^3}. \]

(A26)

By the same token as earlier, the contribution of the arc to the integral vanishes as the radius \( \rho \) tends to infinity, so we have

\[ I = \frac{32\pi}{(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)^3}, \]

(A27)

and hence

\[ \langle n \rangle = \frac{16g^2 \gamma_\perp \langle N_e \rangle}{(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)^3} = \frac{\gamma_\perp \langle N_e \rangle}{(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)(N_{th} - N)}. \]

We see, then, that \( \text{[A23]} \) is valid for all values of \( N \), as long as \( N < N_{th} \). Moreover, the form

\[ n_\omega = \frac{g^2 \gamma_\perp \langle N_e \rangle}{(\omega^2 - \omega_+^2)(\omega^2 - \omega_-^2)}. \]

(A28)
of the photon power spectrum also holds for all values of \( N \).

To evaluate \( \langle \Sigma \rangle = \langle a^\dagger v \rangle + \langle v^\dagger a \rangle \), an expression for \( v(\omega) \) is needed. From Eqs. (\ref{eq1})-(\ref{eq2}) it can be shown that

\[
v(\omega) = -\frac{(\kappa - i\omega) F_\theta(\omega)}{(\omega - \omega_+)(\omega - \omega_-)}, \tag{A29}
\]

where the roots \( \omega_\pm \) are the same as defined earlier. Using this, it is possible to find expressions for \( \langle a^\dagger(-\omega)v(\omega') \rangle \) and \( \langle v^\dagger(-\omega)a(\omega') \rangle \), and from these one can calculate

\[
\langle \Sigma \rangle = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\omega' \left[ \langle a^\dagger(-\omega)v(\omega') \rangle + \langle v^\dagger(-\omega)a(\omega') \rangle \right] e^{i(\omega + \omega')t}.
\]

Hence,

\[
\Omega_0 \langle \Sigma \rangle = \frac{2\kappa \gamma_\perp \langle N_e \rangle}{(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)(N_{th} - N)}.
\]

This may be inserted into the steady state expression for the mean population inversion \( N := \langle N_e \rangle - \langle N_g \rangle \) obtained from Eqs. (\ref{eq3})-(\ref{eq4}),

\[
0 = -2\Omega_0 \langle \Sigma \rangle + 2\gamma_\parallel \langle P \rangle \langle N_g \rangle - \langle N_e \rangle \tag{A30}
\]

\[
= \frac{2\kappa \gamma_\perp \langle N_e \rangle}{(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)(N_{th} - N)} + 2\gamma_\parallel \langle P \rangle \langle N_g \rangle - \langle N_e \rangle, \tag{A31}
\]

from which we can derive expressions for the steady state population inversion and mean intra-cavity photon number as functions of the normalized pump rate \( P \)

\[
N = \frac{N_{th}}{2(P + 1)} \left[ \frac{2(P - 1)N_0}{N_{th}} - \theta(P) - \sqrt{\theta^2(P) + 8\beta_c N_0 \frac{P}{N_{th}}} \right], \tag{A32}
\]

\[
\langle n \rangle = \frac{1}{4\beta} \left[ \theta(P) + \sqrt{\theta^2(P) + 8\beta_c N_0 \frac{P}{N_{th}}} \right], \tag{A33}
\]

\[
\theta(P) = \frac{(P - 1)N_0}{N_{th}} - P - 1 - \beta_c. \tag{A34}
\]

Here we have introduced the rescaled saturation photon number \( \beta_c^{-1} = (1 + 2\kappa/\gamma_\perp)\beta^{-1} = \gamma_\parallel(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)/4g^2 \), which takes into account arbitrary relative sizes of the cavity decay rate \( 2\kappa \) and dephasing rate \( \gamma_\perp \). These steady state solutions are exactly the same as those in \[16\].

**Appendix B: Computing the critical population inversion and spectral splitting**

Here we will derive (11) and the maximal spectral splitting. First, we determine the location of the maxima of the photon power spectrum \( n_\omega \) given in (A28). The derivative of the spectrum w.r.t. the frequency \( \omega \) is

\[
\frac{\partial n_\omega}{\partial \omega} = -\frac{2\omega}{(\omega^2 - \omega^2_+)(\omega^2 - \omega^2_-)} \tag{B1}
\]

and we see that this vanishes if and only if

\[
n_\omega = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \omega = 0 \quad \text{or} \quad \omega = \pm \sqrt{\frac{\omega^2_+ + \omega^2_-}{2}}. \tag{B2}
\]

The first condition is only satisfied when the pump rate is exactly zero, at which point the upper level population \( N_c \) vanishes. For all non-zero pump rates, the other two conditions reveal that the spectrum has either one or three local extrema: There will always be an extremum at \( \omega = 0 \), while the existence of the two other extrema depend on whether the square root \( (\omega^2_+ + \omega^2_-)/2 \) is real or not. From (A2) we find that

\[
\frac{\omega^2_+ + \omega^2_-}{2} = g^2(N_{th} - N) - \frac{(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)^2}{8},
\]

so the square root in the last of the conditions (B2) is real if and only if

\[
g^2(N_{th} - N) \geq \frac{(2\kappa + \gamma_\perp)^2}{8} \quad \Rightarrow \quad N \leq N_c := -\frac{4\kappa^2 + \gamma_\perp^2}{8g^2}. \tag{B3}
\]

This means that the spectrum \( n_\omega \) has two peaks centered at \( \omega = \pm \sqrt{(\omega^2_+ + \omega^2_-)/2} = \pm \sqrt{g^2(N_c - N)} \) as long as the population inversion \( N \) is smaller than the critical inversion \( N_c \), while for \( N \geq N_c \) the spectrum has only one peak at \( \omega = 0 \). The pump rate corresponding to the critical population inversion may be computed by equating (A32) and \( N_c \) from (B3), and is given in (12).

The difference in the central frequencies of the two peaks when \( N < N_c \) is clearly

\[
\Omega = 2\sqrt{g^2(N_c - N)} = 2\sqrt{-g^2N - \frac{4\kappa^2 + \gamma_\perp^2}{8}}. \tag{B4}
\]

Since the population inversion is minimal when all emitters are in the ground state, \( N = -N_0 \), the spectrum can exhibit two peaks if and only if

\[
-N_0 \leq N_c \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad 8g^2N_0 \geq 4\kappa^2 + \gamma_\perp^2,
\]

and the maximal splitting of the peaks is then

\[
\Omega_{\text{max}} = 2\sqrt{g^2(N_c + N_0)} = 2\sqrt{g^2N_0 - \frac{4\kappa^2 + \gamma_\perp^2}{8}}. \tag{B5}
\]

However, this happens only when the pump rate approaches zero, at which point the magnitude of \( n_\omega \) is vanishingly small.