

# Coherence phenomena

V.I. Yukalov<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Bogolubov Laboratory of Theoretical Physics,  
Joint Institute for Nuclear Research, Dubna 141980, Russia*

<sup>2</sup>*Institut für Theoretische Physik,  
Freie Universität Berlin, Arnimallee 14, D-14195 Berlin, Germany*

The word coherence comes from the Latin *cohaerens* which means *being in relation*. This implies that several objects are in some sense interrelated or correlated with each other. Coherence phenomena are those displaying a high level of correlation between several objects.

From the physical point of view, it is necessary to distinguish between two types of coherence, which may be named state coherence and transition coherence. The *state coherence* characterizes correlations between static properties of the considered objects, while the *transition coherence* describes correlated dynamical processes. When mentioning coherence, one very often keeps in mind solely the second type, that is, the transition coherence which is related to radiation processes. In so doing, one forgets about the state coherence. Or, in the best case, these two types of coherence are treated separately, as being divorced from each other. However, both these types of coherence are two sides of the same story, and one can infer a more correct insight from considering them together.

To catch an intuitive idea of these two types of coherence, one can imagine the following picture. Let a group of soldiers stay being immovable, all of them keeping the same position. This is what corresponds to state coherence. If all soldiers would keep different positions, some staying, some sitting, some laying, there would be no state coherence between them. Now, if one conceives well aligned rows of soldiers in a parade, moving synchronously with respect to each other, one should say that they are displaying transition coherence. And if they would march with different velocities and in different directions, transition coherence would be absent.

Coherence, being the property of well correlated objects, is, clearly, also related to the existence of a kind of order. Be it a static order defining the same positions or an ordered motion of a group. Then the notion, opposite to coherence, should also be an antonym to order, that is, chaos. Thus, the *state chaos* means the absence of any static order among several objects, and the *transition chaos* implies an absolutely disorganized motion of an ensemble constituents.

The notion of coherence is implicit in the existence of correlation among several objects. The latter can be enumerated with the index  $i = 1, 2, \dots, N$ . Each object, placed in the spatial point  $\mathbf{r}_i$ , at time  $t$ , can be associated with a set  $\{Q_\alpha(\mathbf{r}_i, t)\}$  of observable quantities labelled by  $\alpha$ . To formalize the definition of the state and transition coherence, one may proceed as follows. For brevity, one may write  $Q_i^\alpha = Q_\alpha(\mathbf{r}_i, t)$ . Let  $Q_i^z$  correspond to a state property of an object, while  $Q_i^x$  and  $Q_i^y$  describe its motion. As an illustration, one could keep in mind that  $Q_i^\alpha$  are the spin components. Another example could be in assuming that  $Q_i^z$  is the population difference of a resonant atom, while  $Q_i^x$  and  $Q_i^y$  are its transition

dipoles. Instead of considering the latter separately, it is convenient to introduce the complex combinations  $Q_i^\pm \equiv Q_i^x \pm iQ_i^y$ . In general,  $Q_i^\alpha$  are not simply classical quantities but are operators. If the considered system is associated with a statistical operator  $\hat{\rho}$ , then the observable quantities are the *statistical averages*

$$\langle Q_i^\alpha \rangle \equiv \text{Tr} \hat{\rho} Q_i^\alpha , \quad (1)$$

expressed by means of the trace operation. A handy way of describing the system features is by introducing the dimensionless quantities, normalized to the number of objects  $N$  and to the maximal value  $Q \equiv \max \langle Q_i^z \rangle$ . Then one may define the *state variable*

$$s \equiv \frac{1}{QN} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle Q_i^z \rangle \quad (2)$$

and the *transition variable*

$$u \equiv \frac{1}{QN} \sum_{i=1}^N \langle Q_i^- \rangle . \quad (3)$$

In the possible collective state of a system, one may distinguish two opposite cases, when the individual states of all objects are the same and when they are randomly distributed. These two limiting cases give

$$|s| = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{state coherence} \\ 0, & \text{state chaos} . \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Considering the transition characteristic (3), one may keep in mind collective motion of an ensemble of oscillators. Then again there can be two opposite situations, when the oscillation frequencies of all oscillators, as well as their initial phases, are identical and when these take randomly different values. For the corresponding limiting cases of completely synchronized oscillations and of an absolutely random motion, respectively, one has

$$|u| = \begin{cases} 1, & \text{transition coherence} \\ 0, & \text{transition chaos} . \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

In the intermediate situation, one may say that there is *partial state coherence* if  $0 < |s| < 1$  and that there occurs *partial transition coherence* when  $0 < |u| < 1$ .

Accepting that coherence is not compulsory total, when all parts of a system are perfectly correlated, but that it can be partial, one comes to the necessity of defining qualitative characteristics for such a partial coherence. For this purpose, since coherence and correlation are intimately interrelated, one introduces correlation functions. Let  $Q_\alpha^+(\mathbf{r}, t)$  denote Hermitian conjugation for an operator  $Q_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t)$ . When  $Q_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t)$  is a nonoperator function, Hermitian conjugation means complex conjugation. For any two operators from the set  $\{Q_\alpha(\mathbf{r}, t)\}$  one may define the *correlation function*

$$C_{\alpha\beta}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1, \mathbf{r}_2, t_2) \equiv \langle Q_\alpha^+(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) Q_\beta(\mathbf{r}_2, t_2) \rangle . \quad (6)$$

The function  $C_{\alpha\alpha}(\dots)$  for coinciding operators is called *autocorrelation function*. One also uses the shifted correlation function

$$B_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \langle Q_{\alpha}^{+} Q_{\beta} \rangle - \langle Q_{\alpha}^{+} \rangle \langle Q_{\beta} \rangle ,$$

where, for brevity, the spatio-temporal variables are not written down explicitly. For describing coherent processes, one often employs the normalized correlation function

$$K_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \frac{\langle Q_{\alpha}^{+} Q_{\beta} \rangle}{(\langle Q_{\alpha}^{+} Q_{\alpha} \rangle \langle Q_{\beta}^{+} Q_{\beta} \rangle)^{1/2}} , \quad (7)$$

which sometimes is termed *coherence function*. The functions (6) and (7) can be specified as *second-order correlation functions* since, in general, it is possible to define higher-order correlation functions, such as the  $2p$ -order function

$$C_{\alpha_1 \dots \alpha_{2p}} = \langle Q_{\alpha_1}^{+} \dots Q_{\alpha_p}^{+} Q_{\alpha_{p+1}} \dots Q_{\alpha_{2p}} \rangle .$$

Such correlation functions are closely related to reduced density matrices.

Correlations are usually strongest at the closest spatio-temporal points. Thus, function (7) varies in the interval  $0 \leq |K_{\alpha\beta}| \leq 1$ , being maximal for the autocorrelation function  $|K_{\alpha\alpha}| = 1$  at the coinciding points  $\mathbf{r}_1 = \mathbf{r}_2$ ,  $t_1 = t_2$ . When either spatial or temporal distance between two points increases, correlations diminish, which is named *correlation decay*. At asymptotically large distance, the correlation function (6) for two local observables displays the property of correlation weakening or *correlation decoupling*

$$\langle Q_{\alpha}^{+}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) Q_{\beta}(\mathbf{r}_2, t_2) \rangle \simeq \langle Q_{\alpha}^{+}(\mathbf{r}_1, t_1) \rangle \langle Q_{\beta}(\mathbf{r}_2, t_2) \rangle , \quad (8)$$

where either  $|\mathbf{r}_1 - \mathbf{r}_2| \rightarrow \infty$  or  $|t_1 - t_2| \rightarrow \infty$ . It is important to stress that property (8) holds only for local observables. But for operators representing no observable quantities, such a property of correlation decoupling generally has no sense.

Referring to coherence, one characteristically implies correlations between similar objects, which requires the usage of autocorrelations functions. Describing coherence decay also needs to fix a point from which this decay is measured. It is customary to place the reference point at  $\mathbf{r} = 0$  and  $t = 0$  and to study coherence decay by considering an autocorrelation function

$$C_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t) \equiv \langle Q_{\alpha}^{+}(\mathbf{r}, t) Q_{\alpha}(0, 0) \rangle . \quad (9)$$

In many cases, there exists a spatial direction of particular importance. This, e.g., could be the direction of field propagation. Then it is natural to associate this special direction with the longitudinal  $z$ -axis and the transverse direction with the radial variable  $r_{\perp}$ . The characteristic scale of coherence decay in the longitudinal direction is called *coherence length*  $l_{coh}$ ,

$$l_{coh}^2 \equiv \frac{\int z^2 |C_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t)|^2 d\mathbf{r}}{\int |C_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t)|^2 d\mathbf{r}} , \quad (10)$$

where the integration is over the whole space volume. Coherence decay in the transverse direction is classified as *transverse coherence radius*  $r_{coh}$

$$r_{coh}^2 \equiv \frac{\int r_{\perp}^2 |C_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t)|^2 d\mathbf{r}}{\int |C_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t)|^2 d\mathbf{r}} . \quad (11)$$

For isotropic systems, one replaces  $r_{\perp}$  by the spherical radius  $r$  and obtains from equation (11) *coherence radius*. It is straightforward to call  $A_{coh} \equiv \pi r_{coh}^2$  *coherence area* and  $V_{coh} \equiv A_{coh} l_{coh}$ , *coherence volume*. The typical scale of temporal correlation decay is termed *coherence time*  $t_{coh}$ ,

$$t_{coh}^2 \equiv \frac{\int_0^{\infty} t^2 |C_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t)|^2 dt}{\int_0^{\infty} |C_{\alpha}(\mathbf{r}, t)|^2 dt} . \quad (12)$$

As is seen, the coherence length (10) and coherence radius (11) are related to a fixed moment of time, while the coherence time (12) defines the temporal coherence decay at a given spatial point. All equations (10)-(12) have to do with a particular coherence phenomenon characterized by the correlation function (9).

*Phase transitions* in equilibrium statistical systems are the collective phenomena demonstrating a variety of different types of *state coherence* arising under adiabatically slow variation of thermodynamic or system parameters. The latter can be temperature, pressure, external fields, and so on. A phase transition is a transformation between different thermodynamic phases that are conventionally specified by means of *order parameters*, which are defined as statistical averages of operators corresponding to some local observables. The order parameter is assumed to be zero in a disordered phase, while nonzero in an ordered phase. For example, the order parameter at Bose-Einstein condensation is the fraction or density of particles in the single-particle ground state. The order parameter for superconducting phase transition is the density of Cooper pairs or the related gap in the excitation spectrum. Superfluidity is characterized by the fraction or density of the superfluid component. For magnetic phase transitions, the order parameter is the average magnetization. Thermodynamic phases can also be classified by *order indices*. Let the autocorrelation function (9) be defined for the operator related to an order parameter. Then, for a disordered phase, the coherence length is close to the interparticle distance and the coherence time is about the interaction time. But for an ordered phase, the coherence length is comparable with the system size and the coherence time becomes infinite.

In the quasiequilibrium picture of phase transitions, taking account of heterophase fluctuations, there appear *mesoscopic coherent structures*, with the coherence length much larger than interparticle distance but much smaller than the system size. The coherence time of these mesoscopic coherent structures, which is their lifetime, is much longer than the local equilibrium time, though may be shorter than the observation time. Such coherent structures are similar to those arising in turbulence.

Electromagnetic *coherent radiation* by lasers and masers presents a perfect example of *transition coherence*. Such radiation processes are accompanied by *interference patterns*. Interference is a phenomenon typical of coherent radiation. The latter can be produced by atoms, molecules, nuclei or other radiating objects. Interference effects caused by light beams are studied in nonlinear optics. But coherent radiation, and related interference effects, also exist in other diapasons of electromagnetic radiation frequencies, e.g., in infrared-, radio-, or gamma-regions. Moreover, there exist other types of field radiation, such as acoustic radiation or emission of matter waves formed by Bose-condensed atoms. Registration of interference between a falling beam and that reflected by an object is the basis for holography that is the method of recording and reproducing wave fields. The description of interference involves the usage of correlation functions. Let  $Q_i(t)$  represent a field at time  $t$ , produced by a radiator

at a spatial point  $\mathbf{r}_i$ . The radiation intensity of a single emitter may be defined as

$$I_i(t) \equiv \langle Q_i^+(t) Q_i(t) \rangle . \quad (13)$$

Then the radiation intensity for an ensemble of  $N$  emitters writes

$$I(t) = \sum_{i,j=1}^N \langle Q_i^+(t) Q_j(t) \rangle . \quad (14)$$

Separating here the sums with  $i = j$  and with  $i \neq j$  results in

$$I(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N I_i(t) + \sum_{i \neq j}^N \langle Q_i^+(t) Q_j(t) \rangle , \quad (15)$$

which shows that intensity (14) is not simply a sum of the intensities (13) of individual emitters, but also includes the interference part, expressed through the autocorrelation functions of type (9). The first term in equation (15) is the intensity of incoherent radiation, while the second term corresponds to the intensity of coherent radiation.

Coherence phenomena, related both to state coherence and transition coherence, have found wide use in various applications.

*See also* Bose-Einstein condensation; Chaotic dynamics; Critical phenomena; Dynamical systems; Feedback; Ferroelectricity and ferromagnetism; Lasers; Maxwell-Bloch system; Nonequilibrium statistical mechanics; Nonlinear acoustics; Nonlinear optics; Order parameters; Pattern formation; Phase transitions; Quantum chaos; Quantum nonlinearity; Spatio-temporal chaos; Spin systems; Structural complexity; Superconductivity; Superfluidity; Turbulence

### Further Reading

Andreev, A.V., Emelyanov, V.I., and Ilinski, Y.A. 1993. *Cooperative Effects in Optics*, Bristol: Institute of Physics

Benedict, M.G., Ermolaev, A.M., Malyshev, V.A., Sokolov, I.V. and Trifonov, E.D. 1996. *Superradiance: Multiatomic Coherent Emission*, Bristol: Institute of Physics

Bogolubov, N.N. 1967. *Lectures on Quantum Statistics*, Vol. 1, New York: Gordon and Breach.

Bogolubov, N.N. 1970. *Lectures on Quantum Statistics*, Vol. 2, New York: Gordon and Breach.

Coleman, A.J. and Yukalov, V.I. 2000. *Reduced Density Matrices*, Berlin: Springer

Klauder, J.R. and Skagerstam, B.S. 1985. *Coherent States*, Singapore: World Scientific

Klauder, J.R. and Sudarshan, E.C.G. 1968. *Fundamentals of Quantum Optics*, New York: Benjamin

Lifshitz, E.M. and Pitaevskii, L.P. 1980. *Statistical Physics: Theory of Condensed State*, Oxford: Pergamon

Mandel, L. and Wolf, E. 1995. *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics*, Cambridge: Cambridge University

Nozières, P. and Pines, D. 1990. *Theory of Quantum Liquids: Superfluid Bose Liquids*, Redwood: Addison-Wesley

Perina, J. 1985. *Coherence of Light*, Dordrecht: Reidel

Scott, A.C. 1999. *Nonlinear Science: Emergence and Dynamics of Coherent Structures*, Oxford: Oxford University

Ter Haar, D. 1977. *Lectures on Selected Topics in Statistical Mechanics*, Oxford: Pergamon

Yukalov, V.I. 1991. Phase transitions and heterophase fluctuations. *Physics Reports*, 208: 395–492

Yukalov, V.I. and Yukalova, E.P. 2000. Cooperative electromagnetic effects. *Physics of Particles and Nuclei*, 31: 561–602