

Coherent Destruction of Photon Emission from a Single Molecule Source: A Renormalization Group Approach

Igor Rozhkov, E. Barkai

Department of Chemistry and Biochemistry, Notre Dame University, Notre Dame, IN 46556

The photon emission from a single molecule driven simultaneously by a laser and a slow electric radio frequency (rf) field is studied. We use a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian approach which accounts for the radiative decay of a two level system modeling a single molecule source. We apply the renormalization group method for differential equations to obtain long time solution of the corresponding Schrödinger equation, which allows us to calculate the average waiting time for the first photon emission. Then, we analyze the conditions for suppression and enhancement of photon emission in this dissipative two-level system. In particular we derive a transcendental equation, which yields the non-trivial rf field control parameters, for which enhancement and suppression of photon emission occurs. For finite values of radiative decay rate an abrupt transition from the molecule's localization in its ground state to delocalization is found for certain critical values of the rf field parameters. Our results are shown to be in agreement with the available experiments [Ch. Brunel *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2679 (1998)].

I. INTRODUCTION

Pump-probe experimental setup, used and studied in optical spectroscopy for years (see, for example, [1]) plays a significant role in fluorescence spectroscopy of single molecules. When a monochromatic off-resonant electromagnetic field is added to already present near-resonant one, a single molecule exhibits a great variety of quantum optical effects. Just a few to be mentioned in this connection, are the light-shift of the zero-phonon line, Autler-Townes splitting [2], multiphoton resonances [3] and rf Rabi resonances [4]. The current interest in this field, within the context of single molecule spectroscopy, stems from the ability to use the slow rf field to manipulate the single molecule, in such a way that a single photon or a few photons are emitted per rf period. Such single photon spectroscopy, is likely to be the most delicate measurement one can perform on a molecule using optics. Furthermore, such an approach might be useful for quantum cryptology, and quantum computing.

Possible frameworks for the analysis of existing low temperature optical experiments on fluorescence spectra of a single molecule [5] are provided by a well known two-level atom picture. Among these frameworks is a description of photon emission by a single molecule via optical Bloch equations. This approach has a long history in quantum optics, and in studies of nuclear magnetic resonance and electron-spin resonance [6]. Quite frequently, however, one has to settle for the numerical solution to compare Bloch equations description of a single molecule with laboratory measurements.

Another common analytical tool in this context is the quantum jump approach [7]. It treats the two-level system (TLS) emitting photons as an open or dissipative system where the time evolution of the system is governed by the Schrödinger equation with an effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian operator. The system evolves from its ground state $|g\rangle$ to a superposition of excited state $|e\rangle$ and state $|g\rangle$, and jumps back into state $|g\rangle$

emitting a photon. Then the process starts over again. It is possible to characterize such jumps statistically, and therefore to get the statistics of photon emission by single molecule source.

The objective of this paper is to study the average waiting time of the emission event by a SM interacting with laser and off-resonant rf field. Using the renormalization group (RG) method for differential equations [8] we carry out the perturbative solution of time dependent Schrödinger equation with effective quantum jump Hamiltonian. Our goal is to obtain the conditions for enhancement and suppression of photon emission, as the rf field control parameters are changed. As discussed in Ref. [9], this problem is related to the problem of coherent destruction of tunneling (CDT) for a particle in a double well potential [10].

From CDT studies it is known that specific rf field parameters may cause particle's localization in one of the wells [10], when the transition probability between the two states of the system is made vanishingly small. Such a suppression or coherent destruction of tunneling [10] corresponds to a suppression of emission in a SM [9]. However, the SM system is fundamentally different than an electron in a double well potential, since the SM emits photons. Therefore, we are left with the task of establishing the influence of radiative life time of the molecule on the existing CDT picture.

This is done in Section II, where we present the RG analysis for the equations governing the evolution of the dissipative TLS. In Section III we derive the criteria for localization of the system in its ground state for the cases of small and finite radiative decay rate and discuss the transition from localization to delocalization as well as critical behavior of the spectrum. The conclusions are given in Section IV. A brief summary of our results was given in [11].

Finally, in connection to the fluorescence peak suppression condition it is worth mentioning the well known result from the theory of dressed states in quantum optics.

The intensity of the resonances of the atom dressed by the rf photons is given by $J_1(\delta)^2$ ($\delta = 0; 1; 2; \dots$), where the modulation index δ is equal to the inner product of systems dipole moment and external field in units of driving frequency [4, 6] (see details below). Therefore, the weight of the resonance can be made infinitesimal, by tuning the modulation index to one of the zeroes of the corresponding Bessel function. For the connection between the theory of dressed states and perturbation theory used in the present paper see Ref. [12]. Note that the $\delta = 0$ case is precisely the CDT condition [10]. In this paper we find a new condition for the peak suppression which takes into consideration the radiative part of the Hamiltonian and modifies “zeros of Bessel function” condition, well known in quantum tunneling and quantum optics.

II. RG ANALYSIS OF THE SCHRÖDINGER EQUATION FOR A SINGLE MOLECULE

For a molecule with a ground electronic state $|g\rangle$ and an excited electronic state $|e\rangle$, in the presence of a laser and a slower rf fields, the Schrödinger equation has the form

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} j_g(t) \\ j_e(t) \end{pmatrix} = H(t) \begin{pmatrix} j_g(t) \\ j_e(t) \end{pmatrix};$$

$$H(t) = V_g \cos(\omega_{rf} t) \begin{pmatrix} |g\rangle\langle g| & \\ & |e\rangle\langle e| \end{pmatrix} + \frac{V_e}{2} (\begin{pmatrix} |g\rangle\langle e| \\ |e\rangle\langle g| \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} |e\rangle\langle g| \\ |g\rangle\langle e| \end{pmatrix})$$

Here ω_{rf} is rf field frequency, δ is the laser detuning, $V_{eg} = \langle e | \hat{V} | g \rangle$, $V_g = \langle g | \hat{V} | g \rangle$ (the Rabi frequency), where \hat{V} are permanent dipole moments of the molecule in states $|g\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$, E is the transition dipole, and E and E_{rf} stand for the amplitudes of the laser and the rf fields respectively. The emission event is taken into account by adding a non-Hermitian part $-\frac{\gamma}{2} \begin{pmatrix} |g\rangle\langle g| \\ |e\rangle\langle e| \end{pmatrix}$ to the TLS Hamiltonian [6],

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} j_g(t) \\ j_e(t) \end{pmatrix} = (H(t) - \frac{\gamma}{2} \begin{pmatrix} |g\rangle\langle g| \\ |e\rangle\langle e| \end{pmatrix}) \begin{pmatrix} j_g(t) \\ j_e(t) \end{pmatrix}; \quad (1)$$

where γ is the rate of radiative decay, also referred to as damping coefficient. We are interested in the evolution of $j_g(t) = \langle g | \hat{\rho} | g \rangle + \langle e | \hat{\rho} | e \rangle$, or, to be precise in the evolution of the survival probability

$$P_0(t) = |j_g(t)|^2 + |j_e(t)|^2;$$

i.e. the probability of no emission event to occur in the time interval between 0 and t . Note, that in Eq. (1) the TLS Hamiltonian $H(t)$ is taken in the rotating wave approximation for the fast on-resonant laser field, but not for the slow off-resonant rf field.

From the survival probability the average waiting time $\langle t \rangle$ for emission event [7, 9] is readily obtained, according

to

$$\langle t \rangle = \int_0^\infty P_0(t) dt = \int_0^\infty (|j_g(t)|^2 + |j_e(t)|^2) dt; \quad (2)$$

This quantity yields the average waiting time for the first emission when $j_g(0) = 1$, and the phase of the rf field (Eq. (1)) is initially equal to zero. It can serve as an estimate for the mean time between successive emissions, provided we can neglect the effect of the phase of the rf field. When the Rabi frequency is small enough, such an effect can be minimal, because the excited state population is proportional to δ^2 , when only laser field is present.

In what follows, we discuss two cases: $\omega_{rf} \ll 1$, $\omega_{rf} \approx 1$ and $\omega_{rf} \gg 1$, $\omega_{rf} \approx 1$. The first one, allows the comparison with fluorescence measurements carried out in Ref. [4] and illustrates the localization condition of a single molecule in its ground state, induced by the rf field. In the second case the localization gets destroyed with the increase in dimensionless damping coefficient $\gamma \approx 1$, and we are able to follow the transition from localization to delocalization.

We should also note, that Eq. (1) has time-dependent coefficients, and no closed form solution is known for a general set of laser and rf fields parameters. The simplification introduced by choosing a small Rabi frequency in Eq. (1) ($\omega_{rf} \ll 1$) leads to the possibility of perturbative calculation of $j_g(t)$.

A. RG analysis in the limit of small radiative decay rate

First of all we select the time scale of our problem and nondimensionalize all its parameters. This can be done as follows: $t \rightarrow \tau$, $\omega_{rf} \rightarrow \omega_{rf}$, $V_{eg} \rightarrow V_{eg}$, $V_g \rightarrow V_g$, $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma$, $\delta \rightarrow \delta$, $\omega_{rf} \rightarrow \omega_{rf}$, $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma$, $\delta \rightarrow \delta$. By referring to the Rabi frequency as being small we mean, that it is small compared to the frequency of the rf field. We can further simplify our analysis of Eq. (1) by assuming the system dissipation to be small as well. More explicitly, $\gamma \ll 1$, $\gamma \ll 1$.

Next step is the change of variables according to: $j_g(t) = c_g(\tau) \exp(-i\omega_{rf}\tau)$, $j_e(t) = c_e(\tau) \exp(-i\omega_{rf}\tau)$, to prepare for the integration in Eq. (1). Then, we make use of the identity [13]

$$\exp(i\omega_{rf}\tau) = \sum_{k=-1}^1 e^{ik\tau} J_k(\omega_{rf}); \quad (3)$$

and the original system (Eq. (1)) reduces to the following set of coupled ordinary differential equations:

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} c_g = -i \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{k=-1}^1 e^{ik\tau} J_k(\omega_{rf});$$

$$\frac{d}{d\tau} c_e = -i \frac{\gamma}{2} \sum_{k=-1}^1 e^{ik\tau} J_k(\omega_{rf}) - \frac{\gamma}{2} c_e(\tau); \quad (4)$$

where we introduced the modulation index $\delta = V_e - V_g$.

We now turn to the perturbation analysis, with the objective to get an asymptotic solution of Eqs. (4) which would be valid globally in time. To do that we apply the RG method introduced in [8]. Unlike conventional singular perturbation methods [14], the RG procedure starts with the construction of the naive expansion. It takes the form of a power series in the small parameter ϵ :

$$C(t) = C^{(0)}(t) + \epsilon C^{(1)}(t) + \epsilon^2 C^{(2)}(t) + O(\epsilon^3) : \quad (5)$$

The naive solution is then obtained by substituting $C(t)$ into Eq. (4) and solving for the gauge functions $c^{(n)}(t)$ at each order ϵ^n . It is assumed, that the gauge functions are $O(1)$ for all t . However, this is almost always not the case. Usually, for large enough times one or several $c^{(n)}(t)$ become greater than their predecessors $c^{(m)}(t)$ ($m < n$). Then, the naive expansion becomes nonuniform and cannot be used as an approximate solution. The terms causing nonuniformity are called secular terms [14]. The RG procedure regularizes the naive expansion by identifying the secular terms and eliminating them.

Although, there exist a bulk of literature on RG method and its applications [15], we outline its key steps and details in Appendix A.

In the naive expansion (Eq. (5)), which we now substitute into Eq. (4), all the gauge functions are two-component vectors $c^{(n)} = \begin{pmatrix} c_g^{(n)} \\ c_e^{(n)} \end{pmatrix}^T$. At $O(\epsilon^0)$, the solution of Eq. (4) is a constant vector $c^{(0)} = \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix}^T$. One can see, that at $O(\epsilon)$ this leads to the linearly growing terms (secular terms) at integer values of detuning: $\delta = 1$. Thus, to be able to treat other values of detuning simultaneously with the integer ones, we set $\delta = 1 + \epsilon$, where $\epsilon = O(1)$ is the “detuning of the detuning” and proceed. The solution we are about to obtain describes the vicinity of fluorescence peak (cf. Ref. [4]). The entire spectrum can be approximated as a sum of such peaks, located at different integer values of detuning, provided that the peaks are not too wide. Since we consider the small dissipation and small Rabi frequency case, this assumption is secure.

We introduce a parameter ϵ into Eq. (4) to get

$$\frac{d}{dt} C = i \begin{pmatrix} B \\ A \end{pmatrix} e^{i\epsilon t} J_1(\epsilon) + \sum_{k \neq 1} \frac{1}{2} e^{i\epsilon t + i\epsilon t J_k(\epsilon)} C; \quad (6)$$

with $C = \begin{pmatrix} c_g \\ c_e \end{pmatrix}^T$, and $C(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}^T$. From Eq. (6) the result to $O(\epsilon)$ reads

$$C = \begin{pmatrix} A \\ B \end{pmatrix} \frac{iB}{2} J_1(\epsilon) (t - t_0) + \frac{iA}{2} J_1(\epsilon) (t - t_0) \frac{1}{2 + iB(t - t_0)}; \quad (7)$$

where t_0 is an arbitrary time scale used to regularize the naive expansion (See Appendix A). In the $O(\epsilon)$ solution we dropped all the terms other than secular, due to the irrelevance of such terms for the next steps of the procedure. The RG equations are obtained by imposing $dC/dt_0 = 0$ at $t_0 = t$. We have:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} A_R \\ B_R \end{pmatrix} = i \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ \frac{1}{2} J_1(\epsilon) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A_R \\ B_R \end{pmatrix}; \quad (7)$$

where subscript “ R ” indicates, that we are solving for the renormalized values of A and B . Finally, solving Eq. (7) with the initial conditions $C(0) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}^T$ we obtain the following renormalized zero order solution $C(t) = \begin{pmatrix} A_R(t) \\ B_R(t) \end{pmatrix}^T + O(\epsilon)$:

$$A_R(t) = \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \epsilon t\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \epsilon t\right); \quad (8)$$

$$B_R(t) = \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \epsilon t\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \epsilon t\right); \quad (9)$$

$$1/\epsilon = \frac{1}{4} - \frac{i}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{1}{16} - \frac{1}{4} \epsilon^2 - 4i\epsilon};$$

Here, by “ $\sqrt{}$ ”, we specified two different square roots, and

$$1 = \frac{J_1(\epsilon)}{2};$$

We can now set $\epsilon = 1$, as we do not need it anymore.

After the integration in Eq. (2), it can be shown, that h_{i_1} , the average waiting time, when the detuning is close to the integer value 1, is given by

$$h_{i_1} = \frac{2 + 8 \frac{1}{2} + 4 \frac{1}{2}}{4 \frac{1}{2}};$$

Then, for arbitrary laser detuning δ , the average waiting time, can be approximated as

$$h_{i_1} \approx \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{2 + 8 \frac{1}{2} + 4 \frac{1}{2}}{4 \frac{1}{2}}; \quad (10)$$

The equality sign in Eq. (10) indicates the approximate nature of this formula, which we mentioned above. The first thing that catches attention is the presence of Bessel functions in the denominators of each term in a sum.

This opens the possibility to suppress the fluorescence peak (to infinitely extend waiting time), and to localize the single molecule in its ground state. For integer values of the detuning $\delta = 1$ (in units of Ω_{rf}) we can always select parameters of the rf field, i.e. modulation index β , so that $J_0(\beta) = 0$.

In Fig. 1a, we compare the RG result (Eq. (10)) with the numerical solution of Bloch equations, previously done in Ref. [4] in order to match it with their experimental results. We repeat numerical simulations of Ref. [4] for the same set of system parameters and calculate the fluorescence spectra. The prediction of Eq. (10) is in a good agreement with the numerical solution for the three smallest values of Rabi frequency (Fig. 1). The slight discrepancy observed for the highest value of Rabi frequency (top graph in Fig. 1a) is due to the fact that perturbation parameter $\Omega_{rf}/\omega = 0.46$ in this case is rather close to 1. In particular, the RG solution (to this order) does not capture the shifts in the fluorescence peaks position, found in experiments for $\Omega_{rf}/\omega = 0.32$ [4]. In Fig. 1b we demonstrate the outcome of changing the value of modulation index β from 1.14 of Ref. [4] to the first root of zeroth order Bessel function ($\beta = 2.4048$). We can see that the criterion for destruction of emission ($J_0(\beta) = 0$) is supported by numerical solution of Bloch equations, as the central peak ($\delta = 0$) gets suppressed for the latter value of β .

Now we further explore the emission suppression case. Keeping the same parameters as in Ref. [4] we change value of β to make the side peaks disappear. The results are presented in Fig. 2. We also observe, that for suffi-

ciently large β , i.e. large number of the Bessel function root, we can suppress more than two side peaks, corresponding to positive and negative integer detunings. Taking β to be the 8th root of $J_1(\beta)$ we eliminate the third peaks, while taking it to be the 8th root of $J_2(\beta)$ we eliminate the central peak ($\delta = 0$) as well. This can be explained by the behavior of zeroes of Bessel functions, which fall densely on the real axis, as the argument increases. For the large modulation index one expects the entire spectrum to be suppressed [16].

B. Average waiting time for the case of finite decay rate

The evolution of survival probability alters significantly when the dissipation coefficient γ is larger, or of the same order as the driving frequency Ω_{rf} . This becomes clear from the structure of the secular terms as we take on the long time asymptotic solution for this case. We still consider Rabi frequency to be small ($\Omega_{rf} \ll \omega$), but keep $\gamma = O(1)$. First of all, we focus on the case of zero detuning ($\delta = 0$). The Schrödinger equation then reads

$$i\frac{\partial}{\partial t} \begin{pmatrix} c_g \\ c_e \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} V_g \cos t & 0 \\ 0 & V_e \cos t \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_g \\ c_e \end{pmatrix} \quad (11)$$

The transformation to “amplitude” variables is almost the same as before: $c_g(t) = c_g(t)e^{iV_g \sin t}$; $c_e(t) = c_e(t)e^{iV_e \sin t}$. Once again, we face a set of coupled linear ODEs:

$$\frac{d}{dt} \begin{pmatrix} c_g \\ c_e \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{i}{2} & P \\ \frac{i}{2} & -1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_g \\ c_e \end{pmatrix} \quad (12)$$

Proceeding with the naive solution, we observe that the secular terms do not appear in this expansion at $O(1)$, as they did in the case of weak dissipation.

At $O(1)$, the solution is a constant vector $c^{(0)} = (A; B)^T$. Substitution of this result into the $O(1)$ equations yields:

$$c_g^{(1)} = i \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} B J_k(\beta) e^{-i2kt} \left(1 - \frac{2ik}{2 + 4k^2} \right);$$

$$c_e^{(1)} = i \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} A J_k(\beta) e^{-i2kt} \left(1 - \frac{2ik}{2 + 4k^2} \right);$$

which, in turn, leads to the following $O(2)$ equations:

$$\frac{d}{dt} c_g^{(2)} = \sum_{k,l=1}^{\infty} \frac{A}{2} J_k(\beta) J_l(\beta) e^{-i2kt} \left(1 - \frac{2il}{2 + 4l^2} \right);$$

$$\frac{d}{dt} c_e^{(2)} = \sum_{k,l=1}^{\infty} \frac{B}{2} J_k(\beta) J_l(\beta) e^{-i2kt} \left(1 - \frac{2il}{2 + 4l^2} \right);$$

Further integration produces secular terms (for $k = l$)

$$c_g^{(2)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{A}{2} \frac{J_k^2(\beta)}{2 + 4k^2} + N S T;$$

$$c_e^{(2)} = B \frac{t^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k^2(\Delta)}{2 + 4k^2} + \text{NST};$$

where “NST” stands for nonsecular contribution to O^2 solutions. The RG equations (to order O^3) for the regularized “constants” A and B are:

$$\frac{dA_R}{dt} = A_R \frac{t^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k^2(\Delta)}{2 + 4k^2};$$

$$\frac{dB_R}{dt} = B_R \frac{t^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k^2(\Delta)}{2 + 4k^2};$$

Hence, to O^3 A_R and B_R satisfy

$$A_R(t) = A(0) \exp \left(\frac{t^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k^2(\Delta)}{2 + 4k^2} \right);$$

$$B_R(t) = B(0) \exp \left(\frac{t^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k^2(\Delta)}{2 + 4k^2} \right); \quad (13)$$

At time $t = 0$ we assume that the molecule is in the ground state: $c_e(0) = 0$, $c_g(0) = 1$. Applying these initial conditions and replacing A and B with their renormalized values (Eqs. (13)) in $c^{(0)}$ we obtain O^2 perturbation results for amplitudes c_e and c_g . Then, we switch back to the original variables $c_{e/g}(t)$ and arrive at

$$c_g = e^{iV_g \sin t} \exp \left(\frac{t^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k^2(\Delta)}{2 + 4k^2} \right) \sum_{k \in \mathbb{Z}} \frac{J_k(\Delta) J_1(2\Delta)}{2 + 2ik} \frac{e^{i(1-k)t}}{1-k} \frac{e^{-t+2ikt}}{2+2ik} \quad (14)$$

$$c_e = i e^{iV_e \sin t} \exp \left(\frac{t^2}{2} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k^2(\Delta)}{2 + 4k^2} \right) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} J_k(\Delta) e^{-t+2ikt} \frac{2ik}{2 + 4k^2}; \quad (15)$$

Then, using Eq. (2) we calculate the mean waiting time $\langle \tau \rangle$; the O^2 result reads

$$\langle \tau \rangle^{-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k^2(\Delta)}{2 + 4k^2} + O\left(\frac{\Delta^2}{2}\right); \quad (16)$$

The corresponding result for the case of nonzero detuning can be calculated in a similar fashion. Formally, this case is different from the one we just considered by addition of imaginary part to the decay rate: $\gamma \rightarrow \gamma + 2i$. Therefore, the general formula for the case of arbitrary laser detuning can be written as

$$\langle \tau \rangle^{-1} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k^2(2\Delta)}{2 + 4(k \pm \frac{\gamma}{2})^2} + O\left(\frac{\Delta^2}{2}\right); \quad (17)$$

The possibility of locking the system in state $|g\rangle$ for a long time, is still present. As one can see, the presence of

finite damping has only modified the corresponding condition, and made $\langle \tau \rangle$ finite at all values of Δ in contrast to the results of Eq. (10). In other words, the average waiting time can be maximized for certain values of modulation index, but the height of the peaks at the maxima positions is now finite even at the leading order in small Rabi frequency. In Fig. 3 present the comparison of this prediction with the results of numerical solution of Eq. (1). Predictions for all three values of γ are adequate.

From Fig. 3 we observe, that when the dimensionless γ is not too large, the maxima in the average waiting time occur at zeroes of $J(\Delta)$, in accord with the results obtained in small dissipation limit. If the decay rate is increased, one expects the peaks to get broaden and shifted. This result does follow from the comparison of $\gamma = 0.5$ and $\gamma = 1.0$ cases (see Fig. 3). Meanwhile, the third curve in Fig. 3, corresponding to the case of $\gamma = 3.0$, points to a less trivial feature in the peaks be-

havior. Considering the presence of well defined maxima in \bar{h}_i as a sign of localization (in ground state) effect, we can refer to their disappearance as a delocalization effect.

The detailed study of such a transition is the purpose of the next Section.

III. TRANSITION FROM LOCALIZED TO DELOCALIZED REGIME

As long as the decay rate does not exceed certain threshold value, the average waiting time \bar{h}_i , plotted as a function of γ , appears as a sequence of alternating minima and maxima (see Fig. 3). Those extremums correspond to the enhancement and reduction in photon emission rate, respectively. Setting $d\bar{h}_i/d\gamma = 0$ and differentiating Eq. (16) we obtain the following conditions for the extremums:

$$\begin{aligned} J_0(\gamma) &= \frac{2}{J_1(\gamma)} \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k(\gamma) (J_{k-1}(\gamma) - J_{k+1}(\gamma))}{2 + 4k^2} \\ &= G(\gamma); \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Thus, for zero laser detuning, if γ is infinitesimal, the n th maxima would be located at γ_n , the n th zero of the Bessel function $J_0(\gamma)$ (see also Appendix A for the deriva-

tion of corresponding condition in absence of dissipation). When dissipation becomes noticeable, the peaks of \bar{h}_i shift with respect to the γ_n . Assuming that these shifts are still small, one can estimate them perturbatively from Eq. (16).

A. Condition for the emission suppression in the small shifts limit

At the position of a maximum, we have $d\bar{h}_i/d\gamma = 0$. Upon differentiation in Eq. (16), we use the sum rule [13] $\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} J_k^2(\gamma) = 2 - J_0^2(\gamma) = 1 - J_0^2(\gamma)$, which implies

$$\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} J_k(\gamma) \frac{dJ_k(\gamma)}{d\gamma} = -J_0(\gamma) \frac{dJ_0(\gamma)}{d\gamma};$$

and find, that

$$\frac{d\bar{h}_i}{d\gamma} / \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k(\gamma) \frac{dJ_k(\gamma)}{d\gamma}}{2 + 4k^2} k^2 = 0;$$

Then we use an identity $dJ_k(\gamma)/d\gamma = (J_{k-1}(\gamma) - J_{k+1}(\gamma))/2$ and addition theorem [13] $J_k(u-v) = \sum_{l=1}^{\infty} J_{k-1}(u) J_l(v) (-j)^{k-l}$ to get

$$\frac{d\bar{h}_i}{d\gamma} / \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sum_{l=1}^{\infty} J_{k-1}(\gamma_n) J_l(\gamma_n) \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} J_{k-1}(\gamma_n) J_m(\gamma_n) g_m}{2 + 4k^2} k^2 = 0;$$

where γ_n is the shift of the n th peak. Next we make use of the small γ_n asymptotics of Bessel functions: $J_0(\gamma_n) \approx 1 - \gamma_n^2/4$, $J_1(\gamma_n) \approx \gamma_n/2$ ($\gamma_n \ll 1$). Keeping the zeroth and the first order terms, and solving for γ_n we arrive at

$$\gamma_n = \frac{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k^2}{2 + 4k^2} J_k(\gamma_n) f J_{k-1}(\gamma_n) - J_{k+1}(\gamma_n) g}{\sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{k^2}{2 + 4k^2} (P_k + Q_k)}; \quad (19)$$

with

$$P_k = f J_{k-1}(\gamma_n) - J_{k+1}(\gamma_n) g^2;$$

$$Q_k = J_k(\gamma_n) f J_{k-2}(\gamma_n) - 2J_k(\gamma_n) + J_{k+2}(\gamma_n) g$$

For $n = 1$ through 4, we plot the relative shifts $\gamma_n = \gamma_n$, given by Eq. (19), as a function of damping coefficient in Fig. 4 and compare them with numerical solution of the transcendental Eq. (18).

It is clear that estimates given by Eq. (19) predict the shifts, which are less than 10%, but fail to reproduce the larger shifts. Further analysis of extremums behavior has to be done by solving Eq. (18) numerically.

B. Condition for the emission suppression for arbitrary shifts

In Fig. 5 we plot $G(\gamma)$ and $J_0(\gamma)$ versus γ to illustrate the solution of the transcendental Eq. (18) for two values of γ . When $\gamma = 1.0$ the corresponding curves cross close to γ_n (Fig. 5a). However, as γ is increased to 2.5, Eq. (18) does not have any solutions in the vicinity of γ_1 and γ_2 and the first two maxima of \bar{h}_i disappear (Fig. 5b). We also notice, that for this value of the decay rate, the first two minima of \bar{h}_i , located next to the zeroes of $J_1(\gamma)$ (Eq. (18)) for smaller γ , disappear as well.

Apparently, maxima and minima of the waiting time \bar{h}_i do not vanish gradually due to the peaks broadening. Instead, there is a critical value of γ (γ_{rf} in original units) for each extremum. Therefore, with an increase in dimensionless decay rate $\gamma = \gamma_{\text{rf}}$ a single molecule undergoes the transition from localized-like behavior to delocalized behavior, for which we can no longer speak about maximizing average waiting time, or about the localization of a molecule in its ground state. The transition

manifests itself as a motion of the neighboring pairs of maxima and minima towards each other with subsequent annihilation at the same values of critical damping γ_{cr} (see Fig. 5). The shifts, given by numerical solution of Eq. (18) are plotted versus radiative decay rate γ in Fig. 6. They are in accord with the shifts obtained from the numerical solution of the Schrödinger equation (1) for the first two peaks of average waiting time. Slopes of both curves in Fig. 6 start to diverge, as the dissipation grows, in anticipation of critical points. For example, $\gamma_{cr} \approx 1.7$ for the first peak.

At a critical point, the slopes of $J_0(\gamma)$ and $G(\gamma; \gamma_{cr})$ in Fig. 5 coincide. For the dissipation approaching its critical value we can use this fact and determine the asymptotic behavior of extremums. Expansion in Taylor series of the Eq. (18) in the vicinity of critical point $(\gamma_{cr}; \gamma_{cr})$, produces

$$\frac{d^2 J_0(\gamma)}{d\gamma^2} (\gamma - \gamma_{cr})^2 = \frac{dG(\gamma; \gamma_{cr})}{d\gamma} (\gamma - \gamma_{cr}) :$$

Here we retained only the leading terms in both sides of the equation. Thus, the position of extremum scales with the decay rate as $\gamma_{cr} \propto 1/(\gamma_{cr} - \gamma)$, with $\alpha = 1/2$. Further illustration to the transition from localization to delocalization is provided in Fig. 7, where we display the graphical solution of Eq. (18) in $(\gamma; \gamma_{cr})$ -plane.

IV. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We have shown, that a dissipative two-level system, interacting with continuous laser field can be localized in its ground state by appropriate choice of parameters of additional driving field. To demonstrate this we considered a single molecule governed by a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian in rotating wave approximation for the laser field. The added slow rf field interacting with a molecule via dipole moments of its ground and excited states makes the TLS Hamiltonian time dependent. Our main quantity of interest, the average waiting time for the first emission requires knowledge of the survival probability, which, in turn, demands the solution of Schrödinger equation.

Generally, this goal can be achieved only by perturbation analysis in the case when some of the governing parameters are small. For this reason, throughout the

paper we assumed that the Rabi frequency Ω of a single molecule is small compared to the frequency of the driving rf field ω_{rf} . On the other hand, to provide a correct estimate for the average waiting time, the resulting survival probability has to be given by a uniformly convergent series. In this paper we overcame this difficulty by applying the RG procedure formulated in Ref. [8]. For the radiative decay rate of the excited state γ , we considered two limiting situations: $\gamma = \omega_{rf}$ and $\gamma \ll \omega_{rf}$. The RG calculation for the first case generates two important results.

(i) The fluorescence spectra of single molecule, calculated as a reciprocal average waiting time reproduces experimental results of Ref. [4].

(ii) There is a condition for suppression of fluorescence peaks, which resembles the criteria of coherent destruction of tunneling [10] of electron in a double well.

Similar procedure in the second case also produces the correct estimates for the average waiting time \bar{h} , which was verified by numerical solution of Schrödinger equation for a single molecule. However, the localization of a molecule in its ground state is achieved for the values of modulation index different from those in the small limit (the well known condition $J_0(\gamma) = 0$ does not apply). Moreover, at a certain critical value of dissipation coefficient, the neighboring minima and maxima of \bar{h} annihilate, and the localization no longer persists.

In connection with the transition from the localized behavior to the delocalized one, we were able to estimate the shifts in the positions of extremums of average waiting time for a given dissipation, and to determine the critical values of $\gamma = \omega_{rf}$ for a given extremum.

Finally, we remark, that similar analysis can be carried out for the system of optical Bloch equations, which represents a standard tool in single molecule spectroscopy, nuclear magnetic resonance and electronic spin resonance.

Acknowledgments

This work was supported by National Science Foundation award CHE-0344930. IR wants to thank Alexei Akolzin for valuable comments and suggestions.

-
- [1] S. Mukamel, *Principles of Nonlinear Optical Spectroscopy* (Oxford University Press, New York, 1995); S. H. Autler and C. H. Townes, Phys. Rev. **100**, 703 (1955); B. R. Mollow, Phys. Rev. A **5**, 2217 (1972); Y. Prior, J. A. Kash, and E. L. Hahn, Phys. Rev. A **18**, 2603 (1978); M. T. Gruneisen, K. R. MacDonald, A. L. Gaeta, R. W. Boyd, and D. J. Harter, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 3464 (1989).
- [2] Ph. Tamarat, B. Lounis, J. Bernard, M. Orrit, S. Kummer, R. Kettner, S. Mais, and Th. Basche, Phys. Rev.

- Lett. **75**, 1514 (1995).
- [3] B. Lounis, F. Jelezko, and M. Orrit, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 3673 (1997).
- [4] Ch. Brunel, B. Lounis, Ph. Tamarat, and M. Orrit, Phys. Rev. Lett. **81**, 2679 (1998).
- [5] M. Orrit, J. Chem. Phys. **117**, 10938 (2002); E. Barkai, Y. Jung, and R. Silbey, Ann. Rev. of Phys. Chem. **55**, 457 (2004).
- [6] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dipont-Roc, and G. Grynberg,

Atom-Photon Interactions (Wiley, New York, 1992); C. Cohen-Tannoudji, *Atoms in Electromagnetic Fields*, (World Scientific, London, 1994).

- [7] M. B. Plenio and P. L. Knight, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **70**, 101 (1998); H. J. Carmichael, *An Open System Approach to Quantum Optics*, Lecture Notes in Physics (Springer-Verlag, 1993); G. C. Hegerfeldt, *Irreversible Quantum Dynamics*, Lecture Notes in Physics 622, F. Benatti and R. Floreanini (eds.), p. 233 (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003).
- [8] L. Y. Chen, N. Goldenfeld, and Y. Oono, *Phys. Rev. E* **54**, 376 (1996).
- [9] D. E. Makarov and H. Metiu, *J. Chem. Phys.* **115**, 5989 (2001).
- [10] F. Grossmann, T. Dittrich, P. Jung, and P. Hangi, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **67**, 516 (1991); M. Holthaus, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **69**, 351 (1992); J. M. Gomez Llorente and J. Plata, *Phys. Rev. A* **45**, R6958 (1992); Y. Dakhnovskii and H. Metiu *Phys. Rev. A* **48**, 2342 (1993); Y. Kayanuma *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, 843 (1994); X.-G. Zhao, *Phys. Letters A* **193**, 5 (1994); M. Grifoni, P. Hangi, *Phys. Rep.* **304**, 229 (1998); M. I. Klinger and M. Gitterman, *Phys. Rev. B* **61** 3353 (1999); *Europhys. Lett.* **48** 29 (1999); M. Gitterman, *J. Phys. A* **34**, 10119 (2001); C. E. Creffield, *Phys. Rev. B* **67**, 165301 (2003).
- [11] Igor Rozhkov and E. Barkai, e-print quant-ph/0404033 (2004).
- [12] M. Frasca, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 165315 (2003).
- [13] M. Abramowitz and I. A. Stegun, *Handbook of Mathematical Functions* (Dover, New York, 1965).
- [14] A. H. Nayfeh, *Perturbation methods* (John Willy and Sons, New York, 1973); C. M. Bender and S. A. Orszag, *Advanced Mathematical Methods for Scientists and Engineers*. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1978).
- [15] T. Kunihiro, *Prog. Theor. Phys.* **97**, 179 (1997); e-print patt-sol/9709003; *Prog. Theor. Phys. Suppl.* **131**, 459 (1998); G. C. Paquette, *Physica A* **276**, 122 (2000); Y. Oono, unpublished lecture notes (2000); K. Nozaki and Y. Oono, *Phys. Rev. E* **63**, 046101 (2001).
- [16] Ch. Brunel, Ph. Tamarat, B. Lounis, and M. Orrit, in *Single molecule spectroscopy*, Nobel Conference Lectures, eds. R. Rigler, M. Orrit, T. Basche (Springer-Verlag, 1993), p. 99.
- [17] M. Frasca, e-print cond-mat 0404692 (2004).

Appendix A: RENORMALIZATION GROUP METHOD FOR DIFFERENTIAL EQUATIONS

Here we illustrate basic steps of the RG method [8] on two examples. The first one is a trivial linear differential equation

$$\partial_t \psi + i! \psi = 0;$$

with $\psi(0) = 1$. Although the exact solution is known, we wish to recover it perturbatively. Below, and everywhere in the text, the regularization of the naive solution is achieved by analyzing the integration constants entering the solution. These “constants” play the role of bare quantities of quantum field theory and statistical mechanics. They are treated as functions of time and are modified (renormalized) in order to remove secular terms.

We start by looking for a solution given as a power series in small parameter ϵ :

$$\psi = \psi_0 + \epsilon \psi_1 + \epsilon^2 \psi_2 + O(\epsilon^3); \quad (A1)$$

where ψ_k are $O(1)$ quantities. At lowest order, we have

$$\partial_t \psi_0 + i! \psi_0 = 0 \Rightarrow \psi_0 = A \exp f - i! t g;$$

We substitute this result into the equation for the first correction to get

$$\partial_t \psi_1 + i! \psi_1 = A \exp f - i! t g;$$

which leads to

$$\psi_1 = A t \exp f - i! t^2 g/2;$$

as we only need a special solution of the inhomogeneous equation (the solution to the homogeneous one is absorbed into the zeroth order perturbation result ψ_0). The first correction grows linearly, and after $1/\epsilon$ amount of time is elapsed ψ_1 becomes comparable to supposedly dominating term ψ_0 . Thus,

$$\psi = A \exp f - i! t g + t A \exp f - i! t g + O(\epsilon^2); \quad (A2)$$

does not represent uniformly valid result. Nevertheless, according to the RG formalism, this expansion gives us all we need for the construction of $O(\epsilon^2)$ long time asymptotic expansion.

We now assume that A is not a constant, but a function of some arbitrary time scale t_0 . The renormalization consists of two stages: first, we remove divergency to $O(\epsilon^2)$ by the following manipulation:

$$\begin{aligned} &= A(1 + t_0) \exp f - i! t g + (t - t_0) A \exp f - i! t g \\ &= A_R(t_0) \exp f - i! t g + (t - t_0) A_R(t_0) \exp f - i! t g; \end{aligned} \quad (A3)$$

literally “renormalizing” A , and introducing new variable A_R instead. The latter expansion, is uniform in time, as t_0 can be chosen arbitrarily large. However, t_0 should not be a function of some artificial time scale. Therefore, at the second stage, we require

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial t_0} (t_0 = t) = 0 \quad (A4)$$

Next, we eliminate t_0 by setting it equal to t (since t_0 is arbitrary, it is at our disposal). As a result of Eq. (A4), we obtained differential equation (called the RG equation) governing our former constant A . It reads:

$$\frac{d}{dt} A_R(t) = A_R(t) + O(\epsilon^2);$$

Finally, solving the RG equation, substituting the result into the expansion (A3), and setting $t = t$ we arrive at the long time asymptotic solution uniformly valid to the next order in ϵ :

$$\psi = A(0) \exp - t - i! t + O(\epsilon^2 t) + O(\epsilon^2);$$

For this simple problem it can be further shown, by repetition of the above procedure at all orders, that $\psi = A(0) \exp f(t) \psi_0$ is actually a global solution.

A more complicated example of Schrödinger equation for the electron in a double well potential [10] can be also treated using RG method. Here, our presentation is slightly different from solution of the this problem given in Ref. [12], but it leads to the same results and illustrates all the main steps of the derivations in Section II.

The TLS Hamiltonian in this case, is:

$$H = V_g \cos(\frac{t}{2}) \sigma_x + V_e \cos(\frac{t}{2}) \sigma_z + \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_x + \sigma_z) :$$

With this Hamiltonian, the Schrödinger equation for the TLS, which is initially in its ψ_0 state results in the following system of coupled ordinary differential equations for amplitudes c_e and c_g

$$\frac{dC}{dt} = \frac{i}{2} \begin{pmatrix} B \\ A \end{pmatrix} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} e^{ik\frac{t}{2}} J_k(\frac{t}{2}) \begin{pmatrix} C \\ C \end{pmatrix} \quad (A5)$$

where $C = (c_g; c_e)^T$, and $C(0) = (1; 0)^T$ and we used Eq. (3).

At O^0 , the solution is simply $C^{(0)} = (A; B)^T$, with both A and B being constants. Naively, we would apply the initial conditions at this stage. Instead, we substitute this result into the equations for next order correction, and obtain

$$c_g^{(1)} = \frac{i}{2} B f J_0(\frac{t}{2}) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k(\frac{t}{2}) e^{ikt}}{k} ;$$

$$c_e^{(1)} = \frac{i}{2} A f J_0(\frac{t}{2}) + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k(\frac{t}{2}) e^{ikt}}{k} ;$$

The renormalized asymptotic expansions are

$$c_g = A_R - i B_R \frac{t}{2} J_0(\frac{t}{2}) + NST + O^2 ;$$

$$c_e = B_R - i A_R \frac{t}{2} J_0(\frac{t}{2}) + NST + O^2 ;$$

where NST stands for the nonsecular terms. As the next step, we obtain following RG equations:

$$\frac{dA_R}{dt} = \frac{i}{2} B_R J_0(\frac{t}{2}) + O^2 ;$$

$$\frac{dB_R}{dt} = -\frac{i}{2} A_R J_0(\frac{t}{2}) + O^2 ;$$

The latter system is readily solved, and with the initial conditions $c_g(0) = 1$, $c_e(0) = 0$ produces:

$$c_g = \cos \frac{J_0(\frac{t}{2}) t}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\sin \frac{J_k(\frac{t}{2}) t}{k}}{k} + O^2 ; \quad (A6)$$

$$c_e = \sin \frac{J_0(\frac{t}{2}) t}{2} + \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{\cos \frac{J_k(\frac{t}{2}) t}{k}}{k} + O^2 ; \quad (A7)$$

Note, that coherent destruction of tunneling condition $J_0(2) = 0$ [10] follows immediately from these results (see also Ref. [12]). Continuing the procedure to order O^2 , we obtain

$$\frac{dA_R}{dt} = \frac{t^2}{4} F A_R - \frac{i}{2} B_R J_0(\frac{t}{2}) ;$$

$$\frac{dB_R}{dt} = \frac{i}{2} A_R J_0(\frac{t}{2}) - \frac{t^2}{4} F B_R ; \quad (A8)$$

with

$$F_1 = -i J_0(\frac{t}{2}) \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k(\frac{t}{2})}{k} - i \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} \frac{J_k^2(\frac{t}{2})}{k}$$

Even without solving Eq. (A8), we observe, that localization condition holds to order O^3 . For the recently found third order corrections see Ref. [17] and references therein.




Figure 1: Comparison of the predictions for $\rho_{11}(\delta)$ given by Eq. (10) (solid lines) with the excited state population calculated from Bloch equations (empty triangles) (Ref. [4]) for various values of Rabi frequencies (from bottom to the top): $\Omega = 0.29; 0.9; 3.2$ in units of Γ . Parameters are taken from experiment of Ref. [4]: $\Delta_{eff} = 140$ MHz, (a) $\Omega = 1.14$; (b) Ω is the first root of $J_0(\Omega) = 0$, $\Delta = 20$ MHz. The results are arbitrarily shifted vertically for transparency, therefore, units on vertical axis are arbitrary. Our predictions in (a) are in accord with experiments [4]. In (b) we observe the suppression of the fluorescence for $\Omega = 0$.




Figure 2: Suppression of the fluorescence peaks for different values of modulation index. Here $\gamma = 0.9$, $\omega_2 = 20$ MHz (parameters of Ref. [4]). (a) is the first root of $J_1(\xi) = 0$; (b) is the first root of $J_2(\xi) = 0$; (c) is the eighth root of $J_1(\xi) = 0$; (d) is the eighth root of $J_2(\xi) = 0$.




Figure 3: Scaled mean time between emission $\langle \tau \rangle_{1 \leftarrow 2}$ is plotted as a function of modulation index ξ for the case of zero detuning. The solid line represents RG prediction of Eq. (16), dots correspond to the numerical solution of Eq. (1). Grid-lines indicate the positions of zeroes of $J_0(\xi)$. The Rabi frequency is $\Omega = 0.1$. The radiative decay rates are $\gamma = 0.5, 1.5, 3.0$ (from top to bottom). We notice the shifts in maximum of $\langle \tau \rangle_{1 \leftarrow 2}$ relative the zeroes of $J_0(\xi)$.




Figure 4: Shifts in the position of maxima of h_i (see Fig. 3) with respect to (a) h_1 (top) and h_2 (bottom); (b) h_3 (top) and h_4 (bottom), plotted as a function of Γ .




Figure 5: Illustration to the transcendental Eq. (18). Bessel function J_0 (solid line) plotted as a function of ξ together with the right hand side of Eq. (18), $G(\Gamma, \xi)$. Radiative decay rates are (a) $\Gamma = 1.0$, (b) $\Gamma = 2.5$. Grid-lines indicate zeroes of J_0 (). In localization case (a), the solutions of Eq. (18) are slightly shifted with respect to ξ_n . In delocalization case (b), these solutions do not exist since the curves do not cross.




Figure 6: The shifts $(\omega_n - \omega_n^0) = \Delta\omega_n$ found from Eq. (18) (solid lines) are compared to those found from numerical solution of Eq. (1) (boxes). They are plotted as a function of Γ ($\Gamma = \Gamma_{rf}$ in original units) for the peaks close to the first (upper curve) and the second (lower curve) zeroes of J_0 (the first two peaks in Fig. 3). Critical points are marked by stars. They indicate values of $\Gamma = \Gamma_{rf}$ above which the transition to delocalization occurs.




Figure 7: Graphical solution to Eq. (18) represented as a solid curve in $(\xi; \Gamma)$ -plane. The solution represents the value of control parameters which maximize and minimize $\hbar \dot{\omega}$. The left edge of each “tooth” corresponds to the maxima (intersecting the ξ -axis at the zeroes of J_0 (ξ): 2.40483, 5.52008, 8.65373, etc.); the right edge corresponds to the minima. The critical points (we can see three of them) are identified as “teeth” tips (cf. Fig. 5).