arXiv:quant-ph/0612082v2 8 Sep 2007

Photon storage in -type optically dense atom ic media. I. Cavity model

A lexey V.Gorshkov, 1 AxelAndre, 1 M ikhailD.Lukin, 1 and Anders S.S rensen 2

¹P hysics D epartm ent, H arvard U niversity, C am bridge, M assachusetts 02138, U SA

²QUANTOP, Danish National Research Foundation Centre of Quantum Optics,

Niels Bohr Institute, DK-2100 Copenhagen , Denmark

(Dated: April 17, 2024)

In a recent paper [G orshkov et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 123601 (2007)], we used a universal physical picture to optimize and demonstrate equivalence between a wide range of techniques for storage and retrieval of photon wave packets in -type atom ic media in free space, including the adiabatic reduction of the photon group velocity, pulse-propagation control via o -resonant R am an techniques, and photon-echo-based techniques. In the present paper, we perform the same analysis for the cavity model. In particular, we show that the retrieval e ciency is equal to C = (1 + C) independent of the retrieval technique, where C is the cooperativity parameter. We also derive the optim al strategy for storage and, in particular, demonstrate that at any detuning one can store, with the optim all ciency of C = (1 + C), any sm ooth input mode satisfying T C 1 and a certain class of resonant input modes satisfying T C 1, where T is the duration of the input m ode and 2 is the transition linew idth. In the two subsequent papers of the series, we present the full analysis of the free-space m odel and discuss the e ects of inhom ogeneous broadening on photon storage.

PACS num bers: 42.50 G y, 03.67.-a, 32.80 Q k, 42.50 F x

I. IN TRODUCTION

The faithful storage of a traveling light pulse in an atom ic m em ory and the subsequent retrieval of the state are currently being pursued in a num ber of laboratories around the world [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. A strong motivation for this research com es from the eld of quantum communication, where quantum information is easily transmitted by photons, but the photonic states need to be stored locally to process the information. Such applications as well as other ideas from quantum -information science have led to a strong interest in techniques to facilitate a controlled interaction between atom s and single photons [16, 17]. A conceptually simple realization of a matter-light quantum interface consists of a single atom absorbing a single photon. However, due to the very weak coupling of a single atom to light, this approach is extremely challenging and requires the use of very high-nesse cavities to e ectively increase the coupling [1, 2]. To circum vent the problem of weak coupling, it has recently been realized that one can use an optically thick ensemble of atoms, and severaldi erent proposals have been m ade for how external classical control elds can be used to controllably map photon states onto collective atom ic states [3, 18, 19, 20]. The goal in all of these approaches is to map an incom ing signal pulse into a long-lived atom ic coherence (referred to as a spin wave), so that it can be later retrieved \on dem and "with the highest possible e ciency. Rem arkable experim ental progress has already been m ade toward the implementation of these protocols in atom ic gases [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9] and in impurities embedded in a solid statem aterial [10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. A central question that emerges from these advances is which approach represents the best possible strategy for given experim ental param eters and for desired m em ory characteristics, and

how the control elds or possibly the shape of the input photon wave packet can be chosen to achieve the maximum e ciency. In a recent paper [21], we presented a novelphysical picture that uni es a wide range of di erent approaches to photon storage in -type atom icm edia and yields the optim al control strategy. This picture is based on two key observations. First, we showed that the retrievale ciency of any given stored spin wave depends only on the optical depth of the medium and not on the properties of the control pulse. Physically, this follows from the fact that the branching ratio between collectively enhanced emission into desired modes and spontaneous decay depends only on the optical depth. The second observation is that the optim al storage process is the time reverse of retrieval (see also [20, 22, 23]). This universal picture in plies that the maximum e ciency for the combined process of storage followed by retrieval is the same for all approaches considered and depends only on the optical depth [24]. The optim um can be attained by adjusting the control or the shape of the photon wave packet. In the present paper and in the two papers that follow, Refs. [25, 26], which we will refer to henceforth as paper II and paper III, respectively, we present all the details behind this universal picture and the optim al control shaping that it is plies, as well as consider several extensions of this analysis beyond the results of Ref. [21]. In particular, in the present paper we discuss the cavity model to be compared in paper Π to the free-space model. In paper II, the full analysis of the free-space model is presented, and, in addition, the e ects of spin-wave decay and of nondegeneracy of the two lower levels of the system are discussed. Finally, in paper III, we generalize our treatm ent to two di erent regim es of inhom ogeneous broadening: with and without redistribution between frequency classes during the storage time.



FIG.1: (Cobronline) -type medium coupled to a classical eld (solid) with Rabi frequency (t) and a quantum eld (dashed). Due to collective enhancement [27], the quantum eld couples to the spin-wave excitations with an eld coupling constant g \overline{N} , where N is the number of atoms in the medium.

A generic model for a quantum memory uses the type level con guration shown in Fig. 1, in which a weak (quantum) signal eld (the dashed line) is detuned by a frequency from the jgi transition, whose optical coherence decays with rate $_{e}=2$, where is the spontaneous emission rate from state jei. A copropagating (classical) controlbeam (the solid line) with the same detuning from the jsi iei transition and tim e-dependent Rabi frequency envelope is used to coherently manipulate the signal propagation and map the photonic state onto the atom s, and vice versa. In the present paper and in papers II and III, we discuss several di erent approaches to photon storage, including far-o -resonant R am an, electrom agnetically induced transparency (EII), and photon-echo techniques. If we neglect the decay of the jsi jgi coherence, i.e., the decay of the spin wave, the only sources of loss in all of these approaches are the decay of the optical polarization on the jpi jei transition during both storage and retrieval, and the leakage of the pulse through the medium during storage. To achieve the maximum storage e ciency, one has to m in im ize these two types of loss, and, in fact, as we will show in the present paper and in papers II and III , one has to make a comprom ise between them .

H igher optical depth increases the coherent coupling between the quantum signal eld and the atom s and, thus, allows for higher photon storage e ciencies. It has therefore been suggested to put a cavity around the atom ic ensemble [17, 28, 29], which will e ectively increase the free-space optical depth d by a factor equal to the number of passes a photon makes in the cavity before leaking out. W e will denote this increased e ective optical depth by the cooperativity parameter C. H ighe ciency retrieval of a photon from an ensemble enclosed in a cavity has been recently demonstrated [9]. In addition to being a promising experimental setup in itself [30], the slightly simpler theoretical treatment of the cavity m odel o ers a very useful tool for understanding the m ore complicated free-space m odel. Thus, in the present paper, we will treat photon storage in the cavity model, to be compared in paper Π to the free-space model.

We will now review the three photon storage protocols (R am an, electrom anetically induced transparency, and photon echo) that are offen discussed in the literature on photon storage and that we treat as special cases of our general form alism. The rem ainder of this section is intended as an introduction to both the present paper and paper II and will thus make use of the gures of merit of both the cavity model (the cooperativity parameter C) and the free-space model (the optical depth d). It will be implied in the following discussion that all the form ulas containing C (d) refer to the cavity (free-space) model.

One possible strategy for light storage uses the Ram an conguration, where the elds have a large detuning (we will show that the appropriate lim it is j j d or јj C rather than jj , as one m ight naively assume by analogy with the single-atom case) and the photons are absorbed into the stable ground state 'si by stimulated Raman transitions [18, 31, 32]. W ith far-o resonant interactions, the excited state jei can be adiabatically elim inated to give sim pli ed and solvable equations [33, 34]. Based on these simplied equations, the Ram an scheme for storage of quantum states of light in atom ic ensembles was proposed in Ref. [18] and, simultaneously with the present work, has been analyzed in detail and optim ized under the constraint of lim ited control power [31]. We show in the present paper and in paper II that, in the lim it of large cooperativity param eter C or large optical depth d, one can ignore the decay of the optical joi jei coherence, as is done in R ef. [1].

A n alternative storage strategy is based on electrom agnetically induced transparency [19, 27, 35], where resonant control elds (j j d or j j C) are used to open a spectral transparency window for the quantum eld. In this approach, the quantum eld travels at a reduced group velocity, which is then adiabatically reduced to zero. Sim ilarly to the R am an case, the excited state can also be elim inated on resonance, provided the control eld is su ciently weak. This again sim pli es the equations to analytically solvable ones [35].

We will treat both the far-o -resonant Ram an scheme and the resonant EIT scheme as special cases of a more general \adiabatic" lim it, i.e., the lim it in which the excited state can be adiabatically elim inated. W e will show that, for the purposes of optim al photon storage, the condition of validity of the adiabatic elimination is almost independent of the single-photon detuning (in particular, it is sim ilar in the R am an and resonant cases) and is given by Td 1 or TC 1, where T is the duration of the incom ing pulse. We will show that, provided a (sm ooth) incoming photon wave packet is long enough that this condition is satis ed (T 1=(d) or 1=(C), it can be stored with the maximum pos-Т sible e ciency, which depends only on the optical depth d or the cooperativity parameter C and not on the detuning or the shape of the wave packet. In the case

of the cavity model discussed in the present paper, this maximum e ciency is simply given by C = (1 + C).

F inally, in the photon-echo-based approach to storage, a resonant photon is rst allowed to get absorbed by the ensemble with the control eld o . While the phrase \photon echo" often refers to a wide class of experim ents, we shall here consider a special case where one applies then a short resonant pulse, which maps excitations from the unstable excited state jei into the stable ground state jsi. Because this approach uses very short control pulses and because, as we will show, it is most e cient in storing short input pulses (T 1=(d) or T 1=(C)), we will refer to this approach as fast" storage. This technique was originally suggested in Ref. [20] for the case of D oppler-broadened atom s and has since been extensively studied both theoretically [15, 22, 23, 26] and experim entally [13, 14]. In Ref. [20], it was noted that, if the photons are retrieved by using a control laser pulse traveling in the backward direction com pared to storage, the Doppler broadening is reversed, and the dephasing occurring during storage is therefore also reversed, resulting in an \echo," which may result in high e ciencies. In Refs. [15, 22], it was proposed to use controlled reversible inhom ogeneous broadening (CRIB), that is, to arti cially add an inhom ogeneous broadening to an originally hom ogeneously broadened line and then to reverse this broadening to achieve an echo signal. In the present paper and in paper II, we consider a di erent lim it of this proposal, where there is no inhom ogeneous broadening of the optical transition, and storage is simply achieved by applying a fast pulse at the right time. Retrieval, which is accomplished with a second pulse, results [36] in a directional output (as opposed to the loss due to the decay rate) exactly as in the adiabatic lim it. W e will show that in the lim it of large d or C this procedure leads to an ideal storage and retrieval of the photonic state, while at every nite value of d or C there exists an optim alinput photon m ode that can be stored with e ciency equal to the maximum adiabatic storage e ciency (given by C = (1 + C) in the case of the cavity model). For com parison, in paper III, we will discuss how this approach m easures up to the CR IB approach and show that adding and reversing inhom ogeneous broadening as proposed in Refs. [15, 22] m ay lead to an improvement in the storage e ciency, although the improvement is rather limited.

The optim ization of storage in allofthese schemes consists of nding the optim albalance between two sources of error: leakage of the input pulse through the ensemble and scattering of the input photons into 4 due to spontaneous emission. In the EIT approach, a stronger control eld is desirable, since it produces more robust interference and a wider transparency window, thus minimizing spontaneous emission losses. On the other hand, higher control power means larger group velocity and hence the inability to localize the input pulse inside the medium. The optimization in this case inds the optiminal power and shape for the control eld, given the duration and shape of the input pulse. In contrast, in the Ram an scheme, a high value of is required to have a su cient coupling of the input photon to the spin wave [31]. On the other hand, large will increase the decay rate due to spontaneous emission, which is given by the optical pum ping rate 2 = 2. The optimization with respect to the shape and power of for a given input mode again balances between these two sources of error. Finally, in the fast storage scheme the control elds are xed to be perfect

pulses, but one can optim ize with respect to the duration T and the shape of the input m ode. The input m ode should be m ade as short as possible in order to avoid the loss due to optical polarization decay $\exp(-T)$. However, a m ode that is too short will be too wide in frequency space and will not be absorbed by the ensemble (i.e., it will leak through). The optim ization with respect to the duration and shape of the input m ode nds the optim al balance between these two sources of error.

In all the photon storage techniques considered, ideal perform ance (i.e., unit e ciency) can be achieved in the lim it of in nite optical depth d or in nite cooperativity parameter C. For example, in the EIT regime in free space, the world the of the spectral transparency window is $!_{ETT} = v_{g} d=L$, where L is the length of the ensemble and v_q / j j²=d is the EIT group velocity [37]. Thus, for a given T and a given large value of d, one can st make , and hence v_{α} , small enough for the pulse to t inside the m edium $\cdot_p \underline{T} \underline{h} en the enhancement of ! EIT$ by an extra factor of d will ensure, if d is su ciently large, that the transparency window is still wide enough to induce negligible spontaneous emission. In the R am an regime, to avoid spontaneous em ission decay via the opticalpum ping rate 2 = 2, one should make su ciently sm all. If the optical depth or the cooperativity param eter is large enough, the coupling of the input m ode to the atom swill then still be su cient to avoid leakage even at this small value of . Finally, in fast storage, the pulse that is short enough (T 1) to avoid optical polarization decay can still be absorbed in a free-space medium provided d is large enough (T d 1, as we will show in paper II). In the cavity model discussed in the present paper, due to the availability of only one spin-wavem ode (the one that couples to the cavity mode), high-e ciency fast storage is harder to achieve than in free space: only pulses of a particular shape and duration (T 1=(C)) give high fast storage e ciencies.

A lthough ideal perform ance can be achieved at in nite optical depth, in practice, optical depth is always lim ited by experim ental in perfections such as a lim ited num ber of atom s in a trap (e.g., Ref. [7], where the opticaldepth is roughly 8), com peting four-wave m ixing processes (e.g., Ref. [6], where the optical depth is roughly 4), inhom ogeneous broadening of im purity levels in solid state sam ples [15], or other types of experim ental im perfections. Therefore, the optim ization of storage protocols at nite optical depth is essential.

Before proceeding with our analysis, we would like to specially note the recent work of Dantan et al., which also considers and illum inates som e of the issues we dis-

cuss in the present paper [38, 39, 40, 41] and in paper II [41]. In particular, in Refs. [38, 39, 40], focusing on broadband squeezed states as the input, the authors consider adiabatic storage in a cavity, derive an e ciency expression equivalent to ours, and recognize the interesting sim ilarity between R am an and resonant regimes, both of which feature reduced sensitivity to spontaneous em ission. We show in the present paper how, for the case of a single incoming spatiotem poral eld mode, proper control eld shaping can be used to achieve the sam e optim ale ciency independent of detuning. This e ectively m akes the Raman, the resonant, and the interm ediate regim es all exhibit equally reduced sensitivity to spontaneous em ission. In Ref. [41], as in paper II, the authors com pare adiabatic storage in a cavity to adiabatic storage in free space and recognize in portant sim ilarities and di erences. In particular, it is recognized that the error in the cavity case scales as the inverse of the atom ic density (as we also nd in the present paper), while in free space it may scale as the inverse of the square root of the density. We show in paper II how proper optim ization can be used to make the error in the free-space case also scale as the inverse of atom ic density. We also bridge in free space the gap between the EIT and Raman cases, showing how proper control eld shaping can be used to achieve the same optimale ciency independent of detuning.

We would also like to note that the connection between optim alphoton storage and time reversal that we present was rst made in the context of photon-echobased techniques. In particular, it was rst shown in Ref. [20] and then discussed in detail in Refs. [22, 23] that under certain conditions, such as high optical depth and su ciently slow optical polarization decay rate, photonecho techniques can result in ideal storage and retrieval, and that the retrieved photon eld is then the time reverse of the original input eld. W e generalize this result in Ref. [21], in the present paper, and in papers II and III by dem onstrating that the ideas of time reversal can be used to optim ize photon storage even when the dynam ics of the system are not completely reversible and when the ideal unit e ciency cannot be achieved. This is the case for nite cooperativity parameter C in the cavity model and for nite optical depth d in the free-space model. W e also generalize the tim e-reversal-based optim ization of photon storage from photon-echo-based techniques to any storage technique including, but not lim ited to, EIT and R am an techniques in hom ogeneously (present paper, Ref. [21], and paper II) and inhom ogeneously (paper III) broadened -type media.

W e would also like to point out that m athem atically some of the optim ization problem s we are solving in the present work (including R ef. [21], the present paper, and papers II and III) fall into a rich and well-developed eld ofm athem atics called optim alcontrol theory [42, 43, 44]. In particular, we are interested in shaping the control pulse to m axim ize the storage e ciency (or e ciency of storage followed by retrieval) for a given input pho-

ton mode in the presence of optical polarization decay. Since in the equations of motion the control multiplies a dependent variable (optical polarization), this problem is a nonlinear optim al control problem [42]. A general solution to all nonlinear optim al control problem s does not exist, so that such problem s have to be treated on a case by case basis. We believe that the methods we suggest, such as the iterative time-reversal method introduced in Secs. IV and V of paper II, may be useful in solving optimal control problems in other open (as well as closed) quantum systems. Similar iterative m ethods are a standard tool in applied optim al control [43, 44, 45, 46] and have been used for a variety of applications, including laser control of chem ical reactions [47, 48], design of NMR pulse sequences [49], loading of Bose-E instein condensates into an optical lattice [50], and atom transport in time-dependent superlattices [51]. In fact, an optim ization procedure that is based on gradient ascent [49], and that is very sim ilar to that of Refs. [43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50], is directly applicable to our problem of nding the optim al control pulse, as we will discuss elsewhere [52]. How ever, in the present paper and in papers II and III, we use tim e-reversal iterations for optim alcontrol in a way di erent from the m ethods of Refs. [43, 44, 45, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, 51], as we will discuss in Sec.V of paper II. In particular, we will show that, in addition to being a convenient com putational tool, our iterative optim ization algorithm is, in fact, experim entally realizable [53].

The remainder of this paper is organized as follows. Section II applies to both the cavity and the free-space models and discusses our gure of merit for the performance of the photon storage. The rest of the paper discusses storage and retrieval of photons using hom ogeneously broadened atom ic ensembles enclosed in a cavity. In Sec. III, we introduce the model. In Sec. IV, without fully solving the equations analytically, we show that both the retrievale ciency and the optim al storage e ciency are equal to C = (1 + C) (where C is the cooperativity parameter), and derive the optim al storage strategy. In Secs. V and VI, we solve the equations analytically in the adiabatic and fast lim its, respectively, and dem onstrate that the optim al storage e ciency can be achieved for any sm ooth input m ode at any detuning satisfying T C 1 and a certain class of resonant input m odes satisfying T C 1, where T is the duration of the input mode. In Sec.VII, we sum marize the discussion of the cavity m odel. F inally, in the Appendixes, we present som e details om itted in the main text.

II. FIGURE OF MERIT

W hen comparing di erent storage and retrieval approaches, it is essential to have a gure of merit characterizing the perform ance of the m em ory. The discussion in this section of the appropriate gure of merit applies both to the cavity m odel discussed in this paper and to the free-space models discussed in papers II and III. Throughout this work we shall assume that we initially have a single incoming photon in a known spatiotem – poral mode denoted by E_{in} (t) (or, for the case of com – puting retrievale ciency alone, a single excitation in a known atom ic spin-wavemode). We denote the e ciency

ofall the mappings we consider (storage alone, retrieval alone, or storage followed by retrieval) as the probability to nd the excitation in the output mode (photonic or atom ic, as appropriate) after the interaction. Depending on the application one has in mind, this single-photon e ciency may or may not be the right quantity to consider, but provided that we are interested in a situation where we are mapping a single input mode into a single output mode, any other quantities may be derived from the single-photon e ciency .

For all the interactions we consider, the full evolution results in a passive (beam -splitter-like) transform ation

$$\hat{b}_{j} = \bigcup_{k} U_{jk} \hat{a}_{k}; \qquad (1)$$

where \hat{a}_i and \hat{b}_k denote the annihilation operators for all the input and output modes, respectively (all photonic, spin-wave, and Langevin noise operators), with commutation relations $[\hat{a}_{j}; \hat{a}_{k}^{y}] = _{j;k}$ and $[\hat{b}_{j}; \hat{b}_{k}^{y}] = _{j;k}$. Here the matrix U has to be unitary to preserve the commutation relations. The mapping from a certain input m ode \hat{a}_0 to an output m ode $\hat{b}_0 = \frac{p}{1} - \hat{a}_0 + \frac{p}{1} - \hat{c}_r$ where \hat{c} satisfies $[\hat{c}; \hat{c}^{V}] = 1$ and represents some linear combination of all other input modes orthogonal to \hat{a}_0 . If all input modes other than \hat{a}_0 are in the vacuum state, the parameter completely characterizes the mapping. If, for instance, the mode we are storing is in an entangled state with som e other system $(\mathcal{D}i_{\hat{a}_0} j_{xi} + j l_{\hat{a}_0} j_{yi}) = 2$, where $\mathcal{D}i_{\hat{a}_0}$ and jli_a, are the zero-and one-photon Fock states of the input mode, and jxi and jyi are two orthonorm alstates of the other system, the delity of the entangled state after the mapping is easily found to be F = (1 +)=2. Sim ilarly, R efs. [38, 39, 40, 41] characterize the perform ance in terms of squeezing preservation parameter squeeze. If the input state is a squeezed vacuum state in a given mode \hat{a}_0 , the squeezing preservation parameter can be shown to be equivalent to single-photon e ciency, i.e., squeeze = . W e will show below in the description of our model why in most experimental situations it is indeed reasonable to assume that the incoming noise (which is included in ĉ) is vacuum noise.

III. M O D E L

The details of the model and the derivation of the equations of motion are provided in Appendix A. In this section, we only give a brief introduction to the model and present the equations of motion without derivation. We consider a medium of N -type atoms with two metastable lower states, as shown in Fig. 1, interacting with two single-mode elds. We neglect reabsorption of spontaneously emitted photons and treat the problem in a one-dimensional approximation. The jgi jei transition of frequency $!_{eg}$ of each of the atoms is coupled to a quantized traveling-wave cavity radiation mode (e.g., a mode of a ring cavity with one of the mirrors partially transmitting) with frequency $!_1 = !_{eg}$ described by a slow ly varying annihilation operator E (t). The cavity decay rate is 2 and the corresponding input-output relation is [54]

$$\hat{E}_{out}(t) = {}^{p} \overline{2} \hat{E}(t) \hat{E}_{in}(t)$$
: (2)

In addition, the transitions jai jei of frequency $!_{es}$ are driven by a single-m ode copropagating classical planewave control eld with frequency $!_2 = !_{es}$ (i.e., at two-photon resonance $!_1 \quad !_2 = !_{sg}$, where $\sim !_{sg}$ is the energy di erence between the two m etastable states) described by a slow ly varying Rabi frequency envelope (t).

In the dipole and rotating-wave approximations, assuming that alm ost all atoms are in the ground state at all times, and dening the polarization annihilation operator $\hat{P}(t) = \hat{P}(t) = N$ and the spin-wave annihilation operator $\hat{S}(t) = \hat{P}(t) = N$ (where \hat{P} are slowly varying collective atom ic operators dened in Appendix A), to rst order in \hat{E} , the Heisenberg equations of motion are

$$\hat{\mathbf{E}} = \hat{\mathbf{E}} + i \mathbf{g} \frac{\mathbf{p}}{\mathbf{N}} \hat{\mathbf{P}} + \frac{\mathbf{p}}{2} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{in}; \qquad (3)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{P}} = (+i)\hat{\mathbf{P}} + i\hat{\mathbf{g}} N\hat{\mathbf{E}} + i\hat{\mathbf{S}} + \hat{\mathbf{Z}}\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{\mathbf{P}}; \quad (4)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{S}} = {}_{\mathrm{s}}\hat{\mathbf{S}} + \mathrm{i} \quad \hat{\mathbf{P}} + {}^{\mathrm{F}} \frac{1}{2} {}_{\mathrm{s}}\hat{\mathbf{F}}_{\mathrm{s}}; \qquad (5)$$

where we have introduced the polarization decay rate , the spin-wave decay rate $_{\rm s}$, and the corresponding Langevin noise operators $\hat{F_{\rm P}}$ and $\hat{F_{\rm S}}$. The coupling constant g (assumed to be real for simplicity) between the atom s and the quantized $_p \, \underline{e} \underline{h} \, m \, o \underline{g} \underline{e} \, \underline{i} s$ collectively enhanced [27] by a factor of N to g N.

As described in Appendix A, under reasonable experim ental conditions, the incom ing noise described by $\hat{F_P}$ and $\hat{F_S}$ is vacuum, i.e., all norm ally ordered noise correlations are zero. This is precisely the reason why, as noted in Sec. II, e ciency is the only number we need in order to fully characterize the mapping.

W e assume that allatom s are initially pumped into the ground state, i.e., no \hat{P} or \hat{S} excitations are present in the atom s. W e also assume that the only input eld excitations initially present are in the quantum eld mode with an envelope shape h_0 (t) nonzero on [0;T]. The goal is to store the state of this mode in \hat{S} and, starting at a time $T_r > T$, retrieve it back into a eld mode. Since we are interested only in computing e ciencies (de ned below) and since the incom ing noise is vacuum, we can ignore the noise operators in Eqs. (3)-(5) and treat these

equations as complex number equations. During storage, the initial conditions are P (0) = 0, S (0) = 0, and the input mode is E_{in} (t) = h_0 (t) (normalized according to ${}_0^{R_T} dt E_{in}$ (t) f = 1). We have here dropped the carets on the operators to denote their complex number representations. The storage e ciency is then

$$s = \frac{(\text{num ber of stored excitations})}{(\text{num ber of incom ing photons})} = \beta (T) f: (6)$$

Similarly, during retrieval, the initial and boundary conditions are P $(T_{\rm r})$ = 0, S $(T_{\rm r})$ = S (T), and $E_{\rm in}$ (t) = 0. $E_{\rm out}$ (t) then represents the shape of the quantum mode into which we retrieve, and the total ciency of storage followed by retrieval is given by

$$tot = \frac{(num \text{ ber of retrieved photons})}{(num \text{ ber of incom ing photons})} = \int_{T_r}^{2} dt E_{out}(t) f$$
(7)

If we instead take $S(T_r) = 1$, we obtain the retrieval e ciency:

$$r = \frac{(\text{num ber of retrieved photons})}{(\text{num ber of stored excitations})} = \int_{T_r}^{L_1} dt \mathbf{E}_{\text{out}}(t) \mathbf{f}:$$
(8)

From now on wewillneglect the slow decay of the spin wave (i.e., set $_{\rm s}$ = 0) but, as brie y discussed below at the ends of Secs. V A and V B, spin-wave decay is not hard to include. Nonzero $_{\rm s}$ will simply introduce an exponential decay without making the solution or the optim al control shaping harder.

To get the closest analogy to the free-space regime, we assume we are always in the \bad cavity" limit (g N), in which E in Eq. (3) can be adiabatically eliminated to give

$$E_{out} = E_{in} + i \frac{p}{2 CP}; \qquad (9)$$

$$P_{-} = ((1+C) + i)P + iS + i \frac{p}{2 CE_{in}};(10)$$

$$S_{-} = i P;$$
 (11)

where $C = q^2 N = ($) is the cooperativity parameter. To relate to the free space situation discussed in paper II, we can write the cooperativity parameter as C = 2d[(1=(2))=(L=c)], where $d = g^2NL=(c)$ is the de nition of optical depth used in the free-space model of paper II and where the factor in the square brackets (proportional to cavity nesse) is equal to the number of passes a photon would make through an empty cavity before leaking out (i.e., the photon lifetime in the cavity divided by the time a single pass takes). Thus, up to a factor of order unity, the cooperativity parameter C represents the e ective optical depth of the medium in the cavity, so that the e ciency dependence on C in the cavity should be compared to the e ciency dependence on d in free space. W e note that, although Eqs. (9)-(11) describe our case of quantized light coupled to the jui jei transition, they will also precisely be the equations describing the propagation of a classical probe pulse. To

see this one can simply take the expectation values of Eqs. (3)-(5) and use the fact that classical probe pulses are described by coherent states.

It is convenient to reduce Eqs. (10) and (11) to a single equation

This second-order di erential equation cannot, in general, be fully solved analytically. However, in the next section we derive a number of exact results about the optim ale ciency anyway.

IV. OPTIMAL STRATEGY FOR STORAGE AND RETRIEVAL

In this section, we derive several important results regarding the optim alstrategy for maxim izing the storage e ciency, the retrievale ciency, and the combined (storage followed by retrieval) e ciency without making any more approximations.

It is convenient to rst consider retrieval. A lthough we cannot, in general, analytically solve for the output eld $E_{out}(t)$, we will now show that the retrieval e ciency is always C = (1 + C) independent of the detuning and the control shape (t) provided that no excitations are left in the atom s at t = 1, i.e., P(1) = 0 and S(1) = 0. From Eqs. (10) and (11) and using $E_{in}(t) = 0$, we nd

$$\frac{d}{dt} \mathcal{P}\hat{f} + \mathcal{P}\hat{f} = 2 (1 + C) \mathcal{P}\hat{j}; \quad (13)$$

U sing this and Eqs. (8) and (9), the retrievale ciency becomes

$$r = \frac{C}{1+C} \quad (T_r)f + P(T_r)f \quad (T_r)f \quad (T$$

which reduces to C = (1 + C) for $S(T_r) = 1$, $P(T_r) = P(1) = S(1) = 0$. The value of the retrieval error $(1_r = 1 = (1 + C))$ and its independence from and

follow directly from the branching ratio between the decay rates in Eq. (10) (or equivalently in Eq. (13)). The decay rate for P into undesired modes is , while the decay rate for P into the desired mode E_{out} is C. The retrievale ciency, which is the ratio between the desired decay rate and the total decay rate, is, therefore, equal to C = (1 + C) independent of the control eld.

W e have thus shown that, provided our controlpulse is su ciently long and/or powerful to leave no excitations in the atoms (we will refer to this as complete retrieval), the retrievale ciency is independent of and (t) and is always equal to C = (1 + C). Therefore, any control eld is optim al for retrieval provided it pumps all excitations out of the system. U sing this know ledge of the retrieval e ciency, in the remainder of this section we will use a tim e-reversal argument to deduce the optim al storage strategy and the optim al storage e ciency. Here we will only give the essence of and the intuition behind the timereversal argum ent, and leave the derivation to Secs. IV and V of paper II. In the rem ainder of the paper, we will independently con rm the validity of this argum ent in the adiabatic and fast limits.

Applied to the present situation, the essence of the tim e-reversal argum ent is as follows. Suppose one xes the cooperativity parameter C and the detuning and considers complete retrieval from the spin wave with a given control eld (t) into an output mode E out (t) of duration Tout. A coording to the tim e-reversal argum ent, the e ciency for storing the time reverse of the output eld (E_{in} (t) = E_{out} (T_{out} t)) with (T_{out} t), the tim e reverse of the retrieval control eld, into the spin wave is equal to the retrieval e ciency [55]. Although this claim is not trivial to prove (see paper II), it is rather intuitive: since the retrieval procedure can be regarded as a generalized beam -splitter-like transform ation (Sec. II), the equality of the two e ciencies is simply the statem ent that the probability of going from a given input port of the beam splitter to a given output port is equal to the probability of going backward from that output port to the original input port.

Therefore, the tim e-reversal argum ent shows that the maximum e ciencies for storage and storage followed by retrievalare C = (1 + C) (i.e., the retrievale ciency) and $C^{2} = (1 + C)^{2}$ (i.e., its square), respectively. Moreover, it says that these maximum e ciencies are obtained if the input eld E_{in} (t) and the storage control eld (t) are such that **(**T t), i.e., the time reverse of (t), retrieves the spin-wave excitation into the output mode $E_{out}(t) = E_{in}(T - t)$, i.e., the time reverse of $E_{in}(t)$. In order to say for which input elds the optim al storage control (t) can be found (or, equivalently, into which output elds a spin-wave excitation can be retrieved), we need to consider the lim its, in which Eq. (12) can be fully solved analytically. These lim its, adiabatic and fast, will be discussed in the following sections.

V. AD IABATIC RETRIEVAL AND STORAGE

A. A diabatic retrieval

In the previous section, we have found, based on time reversal, them aximum storage e ciency and the scenario under which it can be achieved. Since the optim al storage into a given input mode requires the ability to carry out optim al retrieval into the time reverse of this mode, we will, in the following sections (Secs. V and VI), solve Eq. (12) analytically in two important limits to nd out which modes we can retrieve into and store optim ally. The rst such limit, which we will discuss in this section (Sec. V), corresponds to smooth control and input elds, such that the term in the square brackets in Eq. (12) can be dropped. This \adiabatic" limit corresponds to an adiabatic elimination of P in Eq. (10). The precise conditions for this approximation will be discussed in Sec.VC. In this section, we discuss the retrieval process.

It is instructive to recognize that in the adiabatic approximation (i.e., with P- in Eq. (10) replaced with 0), if one uses rescaled variables E_{in} (t)= (t), E_{out} (t)= (t), and P (t)= (t) and makes a change of variables t ! h (T_r;t), where

$$h(t;t^{0}) = \int_{t}^{Z} (t^{0}) f dt^{0}; \qquad (15)$$

then Eqs. (9)–(11) become independent of $\$ and can be solved in this -independent form, so that for any given

the solution in the original variables would follow by simple rescaling. However, since the equations are su - ciently simple and in order to avoid confusion introduced by additional notation, we will solve Eqs. (9)-(11) directly without making the change of variables.

To compute the output eld during adiabatic retrieval, we assume for simplicity that retrieval begins at time t = 0 rather than at time t = T_r and adiabatically eliminate P in Eqs. (10) and (11) (i.e., replace P-in Eq. (10) with zero) to obtain a rst-order linear ordinary dimensial equation for S. Then, using S (0) = 1 and E_{in} (t) = 0, we solve this equation to nd

$$E_{out}(t) = \frac{P}{2 C} \frac{(t)}{(1 + C) + i} e^{-\frac{1}{(1 + C) + i} h(0;t)} : (16)$$

The t-dependent phase ih $(0;t) = (^{2}(1 + C)^{2} + ^{2})$ in the last factor is the ac Stark shift, which results in a shift of the output eld frequency away from bare two-photon resonance. Computing the retrievale ciency using Eq. (16), we nd

$$r = \frac{C}{1+C} \quad 1 \quad e^{\frac{2(1+C)}{2(1+C)^{2}+2}h(0;1)} ; \quad (17)$$

which is equal to C = (1 + C) provided the control pulse is su ciently powerful and/or long to ensure that

$$\frac{2 (1 + C)}{(1 + C)^{2} + 2} h(0; 1) = 1;$$
(18)

which is the same as the condition P(1) = S(1) = 0. Note that adiabatic elimination did not a ect the exact value of the e ciency and kept it independent of (t) and

by preserving the branching ratio between the desired and undesired state transfers. A lso note that, unlike the general argum ent in the previous section, which assumed P (1) = S(1) = 0, Eq. (17) allows for the precise calculation of the retrievale ciency for any h (0;1).

As noted in the Introduction, two important subsets of the adiabatic lim it, the resonant lim it and the R am an lim it, are offen discussed in the literature. A lthough, as we show in this work, the basic physics based on the branching ratio and tim e-reversal arguments is shared by both of these approaches to quantum memory, a more detailed discussion of the physics behind them involves signi cant di erences. In fact, prior to this work, the fact that the two approaches are in a sense equivalent was not recognized to our know ledge: only interesting similarities were pointed out [38, 39, 41]. As an example of an im – portant di erence, the resonant and Ram an limits give di erent dependences on C of the duration of the output pulse in Eq. (16):

$$T_{out} = \frac{{}^{2}C^{2} + {}^{2}}{C j j^{2}}; \qquad (19)$$

where we assumed C & 1. In the resonant limit (C j **)**, T _{out} C = j \hat{j} , while in the Ram an limit (C j **)**, T _{out} 2 =(C j j^{2}). It is worth emphasizing that the Ram an limit condition is C j j and not j j, as one m ay naively think by analogy with the single-atom case.

It follows from the concept of time reversal that the m odes that can be stored optim ally are the time reverses of the m odes onto which a spin wave can be retrieved. W e will now show that, in the adiabatic limit, at any given and C, we can shape (t) to retrieve onto any normalized m ode e(t). Integrating the norm squared of Eq. (16) with E_{out} (t) = C = (1 + C)e(t), we get

$$Z_{t} = \frac{2(1+C)h(0;t)}{2(1+C)^{2}} = 1 \qquad e^{\frac{2(1+C)h(0;t)}{2(1+C)^{2}+2}} :$$
 (20)

Solving this equation for h(0;t) and then taking the square root of its derivative with respect to t, we nd j (t) j. K nowing h(0;t), the phase of (t) can be determined from Eq. (16). Putting the magnitude and the phase together, we have

$$(t) = \frac{(1+C)+i}{2(1+C)} q \frac{e(t)}{t} e^{(t)} e^{i \frac{h(0;t)}{2(1+C)^{2}+2}};$$
(21)

where h(0;t) should be determined from Eq. (20). For any e(t), this expression gives the control (t) that retrieves the spin wave into that mode. The phase of (t), up to an unimportant constant phase, is given by the phase of the desired output mode plus compensation for the Stark shift (the last factor). It is also worth noting that, up to a minus sign and a factor equal to the rst fraction in Eq. (21), (t) is simply equal to e(t)=S(t).

W e note that, if one wants to shape the retrieval into a mode e(t) that drops to zero at some time T_{out} su ciently rapidly, j(t) jin Eq. (21) will go to 1 att = T_{out} . The in nite part can, however, be truncated without signi cantly a ecting the e ciency or the precision of e(t) generation. One can con m that the loss in e ciency is small by inserting into the adiabatic solution in Eq. (17) a value of h(0;1) that is nite but large enough to satisfy Eq. (18). One can similarly con m that the generation of e(t) can be precise with truncated control elds by using Eq. (16). However, to be com pletely certain that the truncation is harm less, one has to solve Eqs. (9)-(11) num erically without m aking the adiabatic approximation. W e will do this in Sec.VC for the case of storage, where the sam e truncation issue is present.

We brie y mention that the spin-wave decay rate s, which we have ignored so far, sim ply introduces a decay described by exp($_{s}t$) into Eq. (16) and, unless we retrieve much faster than 1= s, makes retrieval e ciency control dependent. With nonzero s, we can still shape retrieval to go into any mode: we shape the control using Eq. (21) as if there were no s decay except that the desired output mode e(t) should be replaced with the norm alized version of e(t) exp($_{s}t$), i.e.,

e(t) ! e(t)est
$$dt^{0}\dot{p}(t^{0})f^{2}e^{st^{0}}$$
 : (22)

The retrieval e ciency will, however, be output-modedependent in this case: it will be multiplied (and hence reduced) by $\begin{bmatrix} R_1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} dt^0 \mathbf{j} (t^0) \mathbf{j} \exp (2 \mathbf{s} t^0)^{-1}$.

B. A diabatic storage

In principle, using the solution for retrieval from the previous section, the time-reversal argument of Sec. IV in mediately guarantees that, provided we are in the adiabatic limit (conditions to be discussed in Sec. V C), we can always shape the control eld to store any input mode $E_{\rm in}$ (t) at any detuning with the maximum e ciency C = (1 + C). However, for completeness, and to verify that the optimal storage control eld is indeed the time reverse of the control eld that retrieves into $E_{\rm in}$ (T t), we give in this section the solution to adiabatic storage.

In the adiabatic approximation, we use a procedure very similar to that used in the retrieval solution, to nd

$$S(T) = \frac{r}{\frac{C}{1+C}} \sum_{0}^{Z} dtf(t)E_{in}(t); \quad (23)$$

where

$$f(t) = \frac{(t)^{p} \overline{2(1+C)}}{(1+C)+i} e^{-\frac{h(t;T)}{(1+C)+i}} : \quad (24)$$

The storage e ciency is then

$$_{s} = \frac{C}{1 + C} \int_{0}^{Z} dtf (t) E_{in} (t)^{2} :$$
 (25)

We are interested in computing the control that maximizes $_{\rm s}$ for a given ${\rm E}_{\rm in}$ (t). We nd in Appendix B that the maximum storage e ciency is C = (1 + C) and that it can be achieved (in the adiabatic limit) for any and ${\rm E}_{\rm in}$ (t), and that the optim alcontrol is

$$(t) = \frac{p(1+C)}{2(1+C)} \frac{q}{q} \frac{E_{in}(t)}{E_{in}(t^{0})fdt^{0}} e^{i\frac{h(t;T)}{2(1+C)^{2}+2}};$$
(26)

where h(t;T) can be found by inserting Eq. (26) into Eq. (15). The phase of (t), up to an unimportant constant phase, is thus given by the phase of the input mode plus compensation for the Stark shift (the last factor). A s for the retrieval control discussed in the previous section, we note that, although j (t) jin Eq. (26) goes to 1 at t = 0, the in nite part can be truncated without signi cantly a ecting the e ciency. This can be con med analytically using Eq. (25) provided the adiabatic lim it is satis ed. W e will also con m this num erically in the next section without making the adiabatic approximation.

As expected from the time-reversal argument, the optimal control we derived is just the time reverse ((t) !

(T t)) of the control that retrieves into $E_{\rm in}$ (T t), the time reverse of the input mode. We verify this in Appendix B .

Although optim al storage e ciencies are the same in the Raman and adiabatic limits, as in the case of retrieval, rather di erent physical behavior can be seen in the two lim its. It is now the dependence on C of the optimalcontrolintensity (which can be found from Eq. (26)) that can be used to separate resonant and R am an behavior. A ssum ing for simplicity C & 1, in the resonant lim it Ç=T, while in the Raman limit (C زز **،(**زز CT. Since com plete retrieval (C j**),** j j jj⊨ and optim al storage are just tim e reverses of each other, it is not surprising that these relations are identical to the ones we derived for the dependence of output pulse duration on C in the previous section. This opposite dependence of j j on C in the Ram an and E IT lim its is, in fact, the signature of a sim ple physical fact: while the coupling of the input photon to the spin wave increases with increasing in the Raman case, it e ectively decreases in the EIT regime where a very large will give a very wide transparency window and a group velocity equal to the speed of light. This is why as the cooperativity parameter changes, the control has to be adjusted di erently in the two regimes.

As for retrieval, we brie y mention that nonzero $_{\rm s}$ simply introduces exp($_{\rm s}$ (T t)) decay into Eq. 24). The optimal storage control can still be found using Eq. (26) as if there were no decay, except that the input mode should be replaced with the normalized version of E_{in}(t) exp($_{\rm s}$ (T t)), i.e.,

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{"Z}_{\text{I}} \\ \text{E}_{\text{in}} (t) ! \\ \text{E}_{\text{in}} (t) \text{e}^{s(T t)} \\ 0 \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{"Z}_{\text{I}} \\ \text{dt}^{0} \\ \text{E}_{\text{in}} (t^{0}) \\ \text{f} \\ \text{e}^{2 s(T t^{0})} \\ \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{#} \\ \frac{1}{2} \\ \text{:} \\ \end{array}$$

However, the optimal storage e ciency will now depend on input pulse duration and shape: it will be multiplied (and hence reduced) by $_0^{\rm R_{I}}$ dt⁰E_{in} (t⁰) $f \exp(2_{\rm s}({\rm T}-t))$. It is important to note that with nonzero spin-wave decay the optimal storage e ciency of a particular input mode is no longer identical to the retrievale ciency into its time reverse. This is not at variance with the timereversal argument discussed in detail in paper II (which still applies when $_{s} \in 0$), since the corresponding optimal storage and retrieval control shapes are no longer the time reverses of each other, and, in contrast to the $_{s} = 0$ case, the retrieval e ciency is now control dependent. Finally, we note that, when we consider storage followed by retrieval, in order to take into account the spin-wave decay during the storage time [T;T_r], one should just multiply the total e ciency by exp(2_s(T_r T)).

C. A diabaticity conditions

We have found that, provided we are in the adiabatic lim it, any input mode can be stored optimally. In this section we show that, independent of , the su cient and necessary condition for optimal adiabatic storage of a pulse of duration T to be consistent with the adiabatic approximation is T C 1.

To nd the conditions for the adiabatic elimination of P in Eq. (10), we do the elimination and then require its consistency by enforcing [56]

(we assume for simplicity throughout this section that C & 1). During retrieval, su cient conditions for Eq. (28) are

which lim it, respectively, the power and the bandwidth of the control pulse. These are easily satis ed in practice by using su ciently weak and smooth retrieval control pulses.

D using storage, the satisfaction of Eq. (28) requires, in addition to conditions (29) and (30), the satisfaction of

$$\frac{E_{in}}{E_{in}} j C + i j$$
(31)

which lim its the bandwidth of the input pulse. In particular, for a sm ooth input pulse of duration T, this condition is im plied by

Let us now show that for optimal storage, the condition (32) also implies conditions (29) and (30) and is thus the only required adiabaticity condition (provided E_{in} is smooth). Application of Eq. (26) reduces Eq. (29) to Eq. (32). Equation (30), in turn, reduces to the conditions on how fast the magnitude j j and the phase

(which compensates for the Stark shift) of the control can change:

where = j jexp(i). Application of Eq. (26) shows that Eq. (32) in plies Eq. (33).

We have thus shown that TC 1 is a su cient condition for the validity of adiabatic elim ination in optim al storage. But, in fact, from the amplitude of the optim al storage control eld (Eq. (26)), one can see that Eq. (29) implies that TC 1 is also a necessary condition for the validity of adiabatic elim ination in optim al storage. (To show that TC 1 is a necessary condition, one also has to use the extra condition on the adiabatic value of P (0) [56] to rule out the special situation when (t) is such that Eq. (28) is satis ed but Eq. (29) is not.)

To verify the adiabaticity condition in Eq. (32) and investigate the breakdown of adiabaticity for short input pulses, we consider a Gaussian-like input mode (shown in Fig. 3 of paper II)

$$E_{in}$$
 (t) = A (e^{30 (t=T 0:5)²} e^{7:5}) = $p \overline{T}$; (34)

where for computational convenience we have required $E_{in}(0) = E_{in}(T) = 0$ and where A 2:09 is a normalization constant. We x the cooperativity parameter C , the detuning $\$, and the pulse duration T , and use Eq. (26) to shape the control eld. We then use Eqs. (10) and (11) without the adiabatic approximation to calculate num erically the actual storage e ciency that this control eld gives, and multiply it by the controlindependent retrievale ciency C = (1 + C), to get the total e ciency of storage followed by retrieval. As we decrease T, we expect this e ciency to fall below $(C = (1 + C))^2$ once TC 1 is no longer satis ed. And indeed in Fig. 2(a) we observe this behavior for = 0 and C = 1;10;100;1000. In Fig. 2(b), we x C = 10 and show how optim al adiabatic storage breaks down at different detunings from 0 to 1000 . From Fig. 2(b), we see that, as we move from the resonant lim it (C jj to the Raman limit (C j), we can go to slightly smaller values of TC before storage breaks down. How ever, since the curves for = 100 and = 1000alm ost coincide, it is clear that TC 1 is still the relevant condition no matter how large is, which must be the case since the condition (29) breaks down for shorter T. The most likely reason why in the Raman lim it adiabaticity is slightly easier to satisfy is because in the Raman lim it it is only condition (29) that reduces to TC 1, while conditions (30) and (31) reduce to Т 1, which is weaker than TC 1 (since С in the Raman limit). In the resonant limit, in contrast, all three conditions (29)-(31) reduce to TC 1.

Before turning to the discussion of fast retrieval and storage, we note that the use of Eq. (26) to calculate the storage control elds for Fig. 2 resulted in a control eld (t) whose magnitude went to 1 at t = 0, as predicted in the previous section. To generate Fig. 2, the optim al j (t) j were therefore cut o for t < T=100 to take the value j (T=100) j. The fact that the optim al efciency of (C = (1 + C))² represented by the dashed lines in Fig. 2 is still achieved by the dotted curves, despite the use of truncated controls, proves that truncation of the



FIG.2: B reakdown of optim al adiabatic storage in a cavity at TC . 10. In (a), the total e ciency of storage followed by retrieval is plotted for = 0 and C = 1;10;100, and 1000. The horizontal dashed lines are the maxim al values (C $= (1 + C))^2$. Dotted lines are obtained for the input from Eq. (34) using adiabatic Eq. (26) to shape the storage control but then using exact Eqs. (10) and (11) to num erically com pute the e ciency. In (b), the same plot is made for C = 10 and = 0;1;10;100, and 1000.

storage control does not signi cantly a ect the storage e ciency. Since the retrieval eld generation is directly related to optim al storage by tim e reversal, as explained in Sec. IV, this also means that truncating retrieval controls does not signi cantly a ect the precision with which a given retrievalm ode e(t) can be generated. The losses associated with truncation are insigni cant only if the conditions in Eq. (18) and Eq. (B1) are still satis ed for the truncated retrieval and storage control elds, respectively. If the lim it on the control pulse energy is so tight that these conditions are not satis ed, a separate optim ization problem, which is beyond the scope of the present paper, has to be solved.

VI. FAST RETRIEVAL AND STORAGE

We have shown that adiabatic storage allows us to store optim ally a mode of duration T, having any sm ooth shape and any detuning , provided that the adiabatic-

11

ity condition TC 1 is satisted. In this section we solve Eq. (12) analytically in the second in portant limit, the so-called \fast" limit, and show that this limit allows for optimal storage of a certain class of input modes of duration T 1=(C).

The fast lim it corresponds to the situation when is very large during a short control pulse (j j C and j), so that we can neglect all terms in Eq. (12) ij except $j j^2 S$ and S. This corresponds to keeping only term s containing on the right-hand side of Eqs. (10) and (11) and results in undam ped Rabioscillations between optical and spin polarizations P and S. One can use this lim it to implement a \fast" storage scheme, in which the input pulse is resonant (= 0) and the control pulse is a short pulse at t = T, as well as fast retrieval, in which the control is a -pulse at $t = T_r$. Provided the pulse is applied on resonance and at approximately constant intensity, the condition for perfect

pulse perform ance is jj C (assuming C & 1). To fully describe these processes, we furtherm ore need to solve Eq. (12) while the control is o, which can also be done analytically.

During fast retrieval, assuming the pulse takes place at time t = 0 instead of time $t = T_r$ and assuming the

pulse is perfect, the initial S = 1 results after the pulse in P = i. We then solve for P (t) from Eq. (10) and insert the solution into Eq. (9) to obtain

$$E_{out}(t) = p = (1+c)t$$
 (35)

Consistent with the general expression in Eq. (14) and the branching ratio argument in Sec. IV, the retrieval e ciency is again C = (1 + C).

An alternative explanation for why the fast retrieval gives the same retrieval e ciency as the adiabatic retrieval is that, thanks to the adiabatic elimination of P, the adiabatic limit e ectively describes a two-level system. Therefore, Eq. (35) is in fact a special case of Eq. (16) with

$$(t) = ((1 + C) + i)e^{it}$$
: (36)

A lthough, at this (t), Eq. (16) is not a good approxim ation to the actual output eld because, for example, condition (29) is not satis ed, this illustrates the equivalence of the two approaches.

Since the control eld in fast retrieval is not adjustable (it is always a perfect pulse), fast retrieval gives only one possible output mode, that of Eq. (35). By time reversal, the time reverse of this mode of duration T 1=(C) is thus the only mode that can be optimally stored (with e ciency C = (1 + C)) using fast storage at this C.

For completeness and to con m the time-reversal argument, the optimal input mode for fast storage can also be calculated directly. For an input mode $E_{\rm in}$ (t) that comes in from t = 0 to t = T, assuming a perfect pulse at t = T, we nd by a method similar to the one used in

fast retrieval that

$$S(T) = \frac{r}{\frac{C}{1+C}} \sum_{0}^{Z} dtf(t)E_{in}(t); \quad (37)$$

where

$$f(t) = e^{(1+C)(tT)^{p}} \frac{2(1+C)}{2(1+C)};$$
(38)

Similarly to retrieval, Eq. (38) is a special case of Eq. (24) with (t) = ((1 + C) i) exp(i (T t)) (the time reverse of the right-hand side of Eq. (36)). Since f(t) is real and normalized according to $_{0}^{R_{T}}$ f(t)²dt = 1, this integral is a scalar product similar to Eq. (25) discussed in Appendix B, and the optimal fast storage e ciency of C = (1+C) is achieved for a single input mode E_{in} (t) = f(t) (up to an arbitrary overall unimportant phase). This optimal E_{in} (t) is precisely the (renormalized) time reverse of the output of fast readout in Eq. (35), as expected by time reversal.

Two comments are in order regarding the optimal input pulse $E_{in}(t) = f(t)$. First, we would like to note that short exponentially varying pulses, as in our optimal solution $E_{in}(t) = f(t)$, have been proposed before to achieve e cient photon-echo-based storage [57]. Second, it is worth noting that, although $E_{in}(t) = f(t)$ gives the optimal storage, generating such short exponentially rising pulses may in practice be hard for high C. Since the e ciency is given by the overlap of $E_{in}(t)$ with f(t) (see Eq. (37)), fast storage in a cavity is inferior in this respect to fast storage in free space, because in the latter case any input pulse satisfying T 1 and dT 1 results in storage e ciency close to unity [25].

VII. SUMMARY

In conclusion, we have treated in detail the storage and retrieval of photons in hom ogeneously broadened -type atom icm edia enclosed in a running-wave cavity. We have shown that, provided that no excitations are left in the atoms at the end of the retrieval process, the retrieval e ciency is independent of the control and the detuning and is equal to C = (1 + C). We have also derived the optim al strategy for storage in the adiabatic and fast lim its and, therefore, demonstrated that one can store, with the optim ale ciency of C = (1 + C), any smooth input mode satisfying TC 1 and having any detuning and a certain class of resonant input modes satisfying

TC 1. We have also noted that the optim all storage control eld for a given input mode is the time reverse of the control eld that accomplishes retrieval into the time reverse of this input mode. This fact and the equality of maximum storage e ciency and the retrieval e ciency are, in fact, the consequence of a general time-reversal argument to be presented in detail in paper II. In paper II, we will also present the full discussion of photon storage in hom ogeneously broadened -type atom ic media in free space, while in paper III, we will consider the e ects of inhom ogeneous broadening on photon storage.

F inally, it is in portant to note that, to achieve the optim ale ciencies derived in the present paper, it is necessary to have rigid tem poral synchronization between the input pulse and the storage control pulse, which m ay becom e di cult in practice for short input pulses. In fact, since there is only one accessible atom ic mode in the case of hom ogeneously broadened media enclosed in a cavity (unless one varies the angle between the control and the input [9]), this tem poral synchronization is necessary to obtain high e ciencies even if the cooperativity param eter is very large. This problem can, how ever, be alleviated whenever multiple atom ic modes are accessible, which is the case for hom ogeneously broadened media in free space considered in paper II and for inhom ogeneously broadened m edia considered in paper III. In those cases, in nite optical depth allows one to achieve unit e ciency without rigid synchronization. However, despite this disadvantage of the cavity setup, we will discuss in paper II that the cavity setup is superior to the free-space setup in other respects, such as the enhancem ent of the optical depth by the cavity nesse and the avoidance of the unfavorable scaling of the error as 1= N (vs 1=C / 1=N), which som etim es occurs in the free-space model.

VIII. ACKNOW LEDGMENTS

W e thank M .F leischhauer, M .D .E isam an, E .Polzik, J. H. M uller, A . Peng, I. Novikova, D . F . Phillips, R .L. W alsworth, M . Hohensee, M .K lein, Y . X iao, N . K haneja, A . S .Zibrov, P . W alther, and A . Nem iroski for fruitful discussions. This work was supported by the N SF, D anish N atural Science Research C ouncil, D A R PA, H arvard-M IT C U A, and S loan and P ackard Foundations.

APPENDIX A:DETAILS OF THE MODEL AND THE DERIVATION OF THE EQUATIONS OF MOTION

In Sec. III, we gave a brief introduction to the model and presented the equations of motion without derivation. In this appendix, the details of the model and the derivation of the equations of motion (3)-(5) are provided.

The electric-eld vector operator for the cavity eld is given by

$$\hat{E}_{1}(z) = \frac{-!_{1}}{2_{0}V} \qquad \hat{a}e^{i!_{1}z=c} + \hat{a}^{y}e^{i!_{1}z=c} ; (A1)$$

where a^y is the mode creation operator, $!_1$ is the mode frequency, $_1$ is the polarization unit vector, $_0$ is the permittivity of free space, V is the quantization volume for the eld, and c is the speed of light.

The copropagating single-m ode classical plane-wave control eldwith frequency $!_2$ is described by an electric-eld vector

$$E_2(z;t) = _2E_2(t)\cos(!_2(t z=c));$$
 (A2)

where $_2$ is the polarization unit vector, and E_2 (t) is the am plitude. Then, using the dipole and rotating-wave approxim ations, the H am iltonian is

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}} = \hat{\mathbf{H}}_0 + \hat{\mathbf{V}}; \qquad (A3)$$

$$\hat{H}_{0} = \sim !_{1} \hat{a}^{Y} \hat{a} + \frac{x^{2}}{1} \sim !_{se} \hat{a}^{i}_{ss} + \sim !_{ge} \hat{a}^{i}_{ee} ; \qquad (A 4)$$

- ₹

$$\hat{\nabla} = \hat{d}_{i} \quad (E(z_{i};t) + \hat{E}_{1}(z_{i})) \quad (A5)$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{X^{N}} (t)^{i} e^{i! 2(t z_{i}=c)} + age^{i! z_{i}=c i} + hc.$$

Here h.c. stands for Herm itian conjugate, ^i = j i_{ii}h j is the internal state operator of the ith atom between states j i and j i, z_i is the position of the ith atom, \hat{d}_i is the dipole moment vector operator for the ith atom, $(t) = {}_ihej(\hat{d}_i {}_2)ji_iE_2(t)=(2\sim)$ (assumed to be equal for all i) is the Rabi frequency of the classical eld, and $g = {}_ihej(\hat{d}_i {}_1)jj_i \frac{1}{2\sim {}_0V}$ (assumed to be real for sim – plicity and equal for all i) is the quantized eld mode. We note that, in order to avoid carrying extra factors of 2 around,

is de ned as half of the traditional de nition of the Rabi frequency, so that a pulse, for example, takes time = (2).

In the H eisenberg picture, we introduce slow ly varying collective atom ic operators

...

$$^{\wedge} = \overset{X}{\overset{\wedge^{i}}{}}; \qquad (A 6)$$

$$\sum_{es} = \sum_{i=s}^{X} e^{i! 2(t z_i = c)}; \quad (A7)$$

$$Y_{eg} = \bigvee_{eg}^{Ai} e^{i! \cdot (t \cdot z_i = c)}; \quad (A8)$$

$$\gamma_{sg} = \sum_{i=1}^{X^{-}} \gamma_{sg}^{i} e^{i(!_{1} ! 2)(t_{z_{i}}=c)}; \quad (A9)$$

and a slow ly varying cavity mode annihilation operator

$$\hat{\mathbf{E}} = \hat{\mathbf{a}} e^{i!_{1}t}; \qquad (A \ 10)$$

which satisfy sam e-tim e commutation relations

$$\begin{bmatrix} & (t) \\ & (t) \end{bmatrix} = (t) \\ (t$$

$$\hat{E}(t); \hat{E}^{y}(t) = 1;$$
 (A 12)

and yield an e ective rotating fram e H am iltonian

$$\hat{H} = \sim \hat{}_{ee}$$
 (~ (t) $\hat{}_{es} + \sim g \hat{E} \hat{}_{eg} + h c$:): (A 13)

The equations of motion are then given by

$$\begin{split} \hat{\mathbf{F}} &= \hat{\mathbf{E}} + \mathbf{ig} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ge} + \hat{\mathbf{F}}_{2} \hat{\mathbf{E}}_{in}; \\ \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{gg} &= \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{g} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ee} + \mathbf{ig} \hat{\mathbf{E}}^{Y} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ge} + \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{gg}; \\ \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ss} &= \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ee} \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ee} + \mathbf{i}_{es} + \mathbf{i}_{se} + \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ss}; \\ \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ee} &= \hat{\mathbf{e}}_{ee} + \mathbf{i}_{es} \hat{\mathbf{i}}_{se} + \mathbf{ig} \hat{\mathbf{E}}^{e} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{eg} \quad \mathbf{ig} \hat{\mathbf{E}}^{Y} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ge} + \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ee}; \\ \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ge} &= (\mathbf{i}_{ee} + \mathbf{i}_{es}) \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{gs} + \mathbf{ig} \hat{\mathbf{E}} (\hat{\mathbf{f}}_{gg}) \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ee} + \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{ge}; \\ \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{es} &= (\hat{\mathbf{0}}_{ee}) \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{es} + \mathbf{i}_{ee} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{es}, \quad \mathbf{ig} \hat{\mathbf{E}}^{Y} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{gs} + \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{es}; \\ \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{gs} &= \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{gs} + \mathbf{i}_{ee} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{es} + \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{gs}; \quad (\mathbf{A} 14) \end{split}$$

with the input-output relation for the quantum edd given by Eq. (2).

In Eqs. (A 14) we have introduced decay, which, in turn, necessitated the introduction of Langevin noise operators \hat{F} for the atom ic operators and the input eld $\hat{E_{in}}$ for the quantum eld. The radiative decay rate of the excited state jei is $e = e_s + e_q$, the sum of decay rates into jsi and into jgi. The decay rate of optical coherence ^ge is $= e^{2} + deph$ where, in addition to radiative decay, we allow for extra dephasing, such as, for example, that caused by collisions with bu ergas atom s in warm vapor cells. Similarly, the decay rate $^{0} = _{e}=2 + _{deph}^{0}$ of $^{e}_{es}$ allows for possible extra dephasing, while the decay rate $_{\rm s}$ of $^{\rm as}$ is due to dephasing only. In some experiments [6], $_{\rm s}$ com es from the transverse di usion of atom s out of the region de ned by the quantized light mode. In these cases, the decay of ^gs will be accompanied by population redistribution between states joi and joi. In order to ensure that the corresponding incoming noise is vacuum (which our analysis requires, as we explain below and in Sec. II), we will assume in such cases that the incom ing atom s are fully pum ped into the level jgi, which would correspond to a 2 $_{\rm s}$ decay rate of $^{\rm *}_{\rm ss}$ into $^{\rm *}_{\rm gg}$ (not included in Eqs. (A14) since it does not a ect the nal equations). This is indeed the case if, as in Ref. [6], the controlbeam diam eter is much greater than the diam eter of the quantized light mode.

A ssum ing that alm ost all atom s are in the ground state at all times ($^{\circ}_{gg}$ N and $^{\circ}_{ss}$ $^{\circ}_{ee}$ $^{\circ}_{es}$ 0), de ning polarization $\hat{P} = ^{\circ}_{ge} = N$ and spin wave $\hat{S} = ^{\circ}_{gs} = N$, and working to rst order in \hat{E} , we obtain Eqs. (3)-(5), where $\hat{F}_{p} = \hat{F}_{ge} = \frac{p}{2} \frac{N}{N}$ and $\hat{F}_{s} = \hat{F}_{gs} = \frac{p}{2} \frac{N}{sN}$.

U sing the generalized E instein relations [58, 59]

.

$$\mathbf{h} \mathbf{f} (\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{f} (\mathbf{t}) \mathbf{i} = \mathbf{h} \mathbf{D} (^{\land}) \mathbf{D} (^{\land})^{\land}$$

 $^{\land} \mathbf{D} (^{\land}) \mathbf{i} (\mathbf{t} \mathbf{t});$ (A15)

where D (^) denotes the determ inistic part (i.e., with noise on itted) of the equation for \frown in Eqs. (A 14), and again using the approximation that alm ost all atom s are in the ground state, we not that the only nonzero noise correlations between \hat{F}_P , \hat{F}_S , \hat{F}_P^Y , and \hat{F}_S^Y are

$$h\hat{F}_{P}(t)\hat{F}_{P}^{y}(t^{0})i = h\hat{F}_{S}(t)\hat{F}_{S}^{y}(t^{0})i = (t \quad 0): \quad (A16)$$

The fact that norm ally ordered correlations are zero m eans that the incom ing noise is vacuum, which is precisely the reason why, as noted in Sec. II, e ciency is

the only number we need in order to fully characterize the mapping. The property of Eqs. (A14) that guarantees that the incoming noise is vacuum is the absence of decay out of state jgi into states jei and jsi. The decay into state jei does not happen because the energy of an optical transition (on the order of 10⁴ K) is much greater than the tem perature, at which typical experiments are done. In contrast, the energy of the 'si 'gi transition in some experiments, such as the one in Ref. [6], may be sm aller than the tem perature. How ever, the jsi άi transition is typically not dipole allowed, so that the rate of jgi decay into jsi can be neglected, as well. As noted above, for the case when atom s are di using in and out of the quantized light mode, to keep the decay rate of jgi zero, we assume that the incoming atoms are fully pum ped into jgi.

From Eq. (A11) and with the usual $_{gg}$ N assum p-tion, we have

$$\hat{P}(t); \hat{P}^{y}(t) = 1:$$
 (A18)

In particular, this m eans that \hat{S} can be thought of as an annihilation operator for the spin-wavem ode, into which we would like to store the state of the incom ing photon mode.

The input and output elds, which propagate freely outside of the cavity, satisfy [54]

and can be expanded in terms of any orthonormal set of eld (envelope) modes fh (t)g de ped fort 2 [0;1), satisfying the orthonormality relation $_{0}^{1}$ dth (t)h (t) = and completeness relation h (t)h (t⁰) = (t t), as

$$\hat{E}_{in}(t) = h(t)\hat{a};$$
 (A 20)

$$\hat{E}_{out}$$
 (t) = h (t) \hat{b} ; (A 21)

where annihilation operators fâg and \hat{b} for the input and the output photon m odes, respectively, satisfy

$$\begin{array}{cccc} h & i & h & i \\ a & ; a^{y} &= & \hat{b} & ; \hat{b}^{y} &= & : \end{array} \quad (A 22)$$

Repeating for clarity the setup from Sec. III, we recall that all atom s are initially pumped into the ground state, i.e., no \hat{P} or \hat{S} excitations are present in the atom s. We also assume that the only input eld excitations initially present are in the quantum eld mode with annihilation operator \hat{a}_0 and envelope shape h_0 (t) nonzero on [0;T]. The goal is to store the state of this mode into \hat{S} and at a time $T_r > T$ retrieve it back onto a eld mode. D uring storage, we can, in principle, solve the operator

Eqs. (3)-(5) for \hat{S} (T) as some linear functional of \hat{E}_{in} (t), \hat{F}_{P} (t), \hat{F}_{S} (t), \hat{S} (0), and \hat{P} (0). The storage e ciency is then given by

$$s = \frac{\text{(num ber of stored excitations)}}{\text{(num ber of incom ing photons)}} = \frac{h\hat{S}^{Y}(T)\hat{S}(T)i}{R_{\text{in}}^{T}dth\hat{E}_{\text{in}}^{Y}(t)\hat{E}_{\text{in}}(t)i};$$
(A 23)

Since $\hat{S}(0)$ and $\hat{P}(0)$ give zero when acting on the initial state, and since all norm ally ordered noise correlations are zero, only the term in \hat{S} (T) containing $\hat{E_{in}}$ (t) will contribute to the e ciency. Moreover, h_0 (t) \hat{a}_0 is the only part of \hat{E}_{in} (t) that does not give zero when acting on the initial state. Thus, for the purposes of nding the storage e ciency, we can ignore $\hat{F_P}$ and $\hat{F_S}$ in Eqs. (3)-(5) and treat these equations as com plex num ber equations with P (0) = 0, S (0) = 0, and $E_{in}(t) = h_0(t)$. We have here dropped the carets on the operators to denote their com plex num ber representations. To get back the nonvacuum part of the original operator from its com plex number counterpart, we should just multiply the com plex num ber version by \hat{a}_0 .

Sim ilarly, during retrieval, we can ignore $\hat{F_{\text{P}}}$ (t) and \hat{F}_{s} (t) and can treat Eqs. (3)–(5) as complex num ber equations with the initial and boundary conditions given in Sec. III.

APPENDIX B:SHAPING THE CONTROL FIELD FOR THE OPT IM AL AD IABATIC STORAGE

In this appendix, we present the derivation of Eq. (26), which gives the optim al storage control eld during adiabatic storage. We then verify that this optim al control is just the time reverse of the control that retrieves into the time reverse of the input mode.

To solve for the control eld (t) that maxim izes the storage e ciency s in Eq. (25), we note that f (t) de ned in Eq. (24) satisfies $\int_{0}^{R_{T}} f(t) f(t) = 1$, with the equality achieved when

$$\frac{2 (1 + C)}{(1 + C)^2 + 2} h(0;T) = 1;$$
 (B1)

which is equivalent to the requirem ent we had in Eq. (18) for complete retrieval. Since we also have $\int_{0}^{K_{T}} E_{in}(t) f =$ 1, the integral in Eq. (25) can be seen as a simple scalar product between states, and the e ciency is therefore C = (1 + C) with the equality achieved when (up to an unde ned overall unim portant phase)

$$f(t) = E_{in}(t)$$
: (B2)

We will now show that, for any given $E_{in}(t)$, , and C, there is a unique control that satis es Eq. (B2) and thus gives the maximum storage e ciency C = (1 + C). In Refs. [60, 61], this control was found through a quantum im pedance m atching Bernoulli equation obtained by differentiating Eq. (B2). In order to be able in paper II to generalizem ore easily to free space, we will solve Eq. (B2)directly. To do this, we follow a procedure very similar to that in Sec. VA. We integrate the norm squared of Eq. (B2) from 0 to t to get

$$\sum_{\substack{0\\0}} E_{in} (t^{0}) f^{2} dt^{0} = e^{\frac{2h (t;T) (1+C)}{2(1+C)^{2}+2}} e^{\frac{2h (0;T) (1+C)}{2(1+C)^{2}+2}} (B3)$$

Since h (T;T) = 0, the norm alization of E_{in} (t) requires the satisfaction of Eq. (B1). A ssum ing it is satis ed to the desired precision, we solve Eq. (B3) for h (t; T), and then taking the square root of the negative of its derivative with respect to t, we nd j (t) j. Knowing h (t; T), the phase of (t) can then be determined from Eq. (B2). Putting the magnitude and the phase together, we obtain the expression for the optim alcontrolgiven in Eq. (26).

We will now show that, as expected from the timereversalargum ent, the optim alcontrolwe derived is just the time reverse ((t) ! t)) of the control that (T retrieves into E_{in} (T t), the time reverse of the input mode. To see this, we note that from Eq. (20) it follows that the magnitude of the control eld (t) that retrieves into $e(t) = E_{in}(T - t)$ is determined by

$$\int_{0}^{Z} t^{0} E_{in}(t^{0}) f^{2} = e^{\frac{2(1+C)}{2(1+C)^{2}+2}h(0;T t)} :$$
 (B4)

Putting $e(t) = E_{in}$ (T t) into Eq. (21), taking the com plex conjugate of the result, and evaluating at T t, we aet.

$$(\mathbf{T} \quad \mathbf{t}) = \frac{\mathbf{p} (\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{C}) \quad \mathbf{i}}{2 \quad (\mathbf{1} + \mathbf{C})} \quad \mathbf{q} \frac{\mathbf{E}_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{t})}{\mathbf{R}_{\text{t}}} \mathbf{g}_{\text{in}} \frac{\mathbf{E}_{\text{in}}(\mathbf{t})}{\mathbf{p}^{2} d\mathbf{t}^{0}} e^{\mathbf{i} \frac{\mathbf{h} \left(0, \mathbf{r} - \mathbf{t}\right)}{2 \left(1 + \mathbf{C}\right)^{2} + 2}} :$$
(B.5)

Since h (0;T t) determined by Eq. β 4) and h(t;T) determined by Eq. (B3) are equal, the right-hand side of Eq. (B5) is, in fact, equal to the right-hand side of Eq. (26), as desired.

- [1] J. M cK eever, A. Boca, A. D. Boozer, R. Miller, J. R. Buck, A.Kuzmich, and H.J.Kimble, Science 303, 1992 (2004).
- S.Polzik, Nature (London) 432, 482 (2004).
- (London) 409, 490 (2001).
- [2] A.Kuhn, M.Hennrich, and G.Rempe, Phys.Rev.Lett. 89,067901 (2002).
- [3] B. Julsgaard, J. Sherson, J. I. Cirac, J. Fiurasek, and E.

[4] C.Liu, Z.Dutton, C.H.Behroozi, and L.V.Hau, Nature

- [5] D.F.Phillips, A.Fleischhauer, A.Mair, R.L.Walsworth,
- and M.D.Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 783 (2001).
- [6] M.D.Eisaman, A.Andre, F.Massou, M.Fleischhauer,

A.S.Zibrov, and M.D.Lukin, Nature (London) 438, 837 (2005).

- [7] T.Chaneliere, D.M atsukevich, S.D.Jenkins, S.-Y.Lan, T.A.B.Kennedy, and A.Kuzmich, Nature (London) 438,833 (2005).
- [8] C. W. Chou, H. de Riedmatten, D. Felinto, S. V. Polyakov, S.J. van Enk, and H.J.K im ble, Nature (London) 438, 828 (2005).
- [9] J.K. Thom pson, J. Sim on, H. Loh, and V. Vuletic, Science 313, 74 (2006).
- [10] P.R.Hemmer, A.V.Turukhin, M.S.Shahriar, and J. A.Musser, Opt.Lett. 26, 361 (2001).
- [11] A.V.Turukhin,V.S.Sudarshanam,M.S.Shahriar,J. A.Musser,B.S.Ham, and P.R.Hemmer, Phys.Rev. Lett.88,023602 (2002).
- [12] J.J.Longdell, E.Fraval, M.J.Sellars, and N.B.M anson, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 063601 (2005).
- [13] A.L.A lexander, J.J.Longdell, M.J.Sellars, and N.B. Manson, Phys. Rev.Lett. 96, 043602 (2006).
- [14] S. R. Hastings-Sim on, M. U. Staudt, M. A fzelius, P. Baldi, D. Jaccard, W. Tittel, and N. Gisin, Opt. Commun. 266, 716 (2006); M. U. Staudt, S. R. Hastings-Sim on, M. A fzelius, D. Jaccard, W. Tittel, and N. Gisin, ibid. 266, 720 (2006); M. U. Staudt, S. R. Hastings-Sim on, M. Nilsson, M. A fzelius, V. Scarani, R. Ricken, H. Suche, W. Sohler, W. Tittel, and N. Gisin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 113601 (2007).
- [15] M.Nilsson and S.K roll, Opt. Commun. 247, 393 (2005).
- [16] H. J. Briegel, W. Dur, S. J. van Enk, J. I. Cirac, and P.Zoller in The Physics of Quantum Information, edited by D. Bouwm eester, A. Ekert, and A. Zeilinger (Springer, Berlin, 2000), pp. 281-293.
- [17] L. M. Duan, M. D. Lukin, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Nature (London) 414, 413 (2001).
- [18] A.E.Kozhekin, K.M Imer, and E.Polzik, Phys. Rev. A 62, 033809 (2000).
- [19] M.Fleischhauer, S.F.Yelin, and M.D.Lukin, Opt.Commun.179, 395 (2000); M.Fleischhauer and M.D.Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 5094, (2000).
- [20] S.A.M oiseev and S.K roll, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 173601 (2001).
- [21] A. V. Gorshkov, A. Andre, M. Fleischhauer, A. S. S rensen, and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 123601 (2007).
- [22] B.Kraus, W. Tittel, N.Gisin, M.Nilsson, S.Kroll, and J.I.Cirac, Phys. Rev. A 73, 020302 (R) (2006).
- [23] S.A.M oiseev and B.S.Ham, Phys.Rev.A 70,063809 (2004); S.A.M oiseev and M.I.Noskov, LaserPhys.Lett. 1,303 (2004); S.A.M oiseev, Izv.Ross.Akad.Nauk, Ser. Fiz. 68, 1260 (2004) [Bull.Russ.Acad.Sci.Phys. 68, 1408 (2004)]; S.A.M oiseev, C.Simon, and N.G isin, e-print arX iv quant-ph/0609173; N.Sangouard, C.Simon, M.Afzelius, and N.G isin, Phys.Rev.A 75,032327 (2007).
- [24] W e note for the sake of clarity that the storage scheme employed in Ref. [3] cannot be regarded as a subset of the general scheme considered in the present work, and more work has to be done in order to compare the perform ance of the two.
- [25] A. V. Gorshkov, A. Andre, M. D. Lukin, and A. S. S rensen, Phys. Rev. A 76, 033805 (2007).
- [26] A. V. Gorshkov, A. Andre, M. D. Lukin, and A. S. S rensen, Phys. Rev. A 76, 033806 (2007).
- [27] M.D.Lukin, Rev.Mod.Phys.75, 457 (2003).

- [28] J.F. Roch, K. Vigneron, Ph. G relu, A. Sinatra, J.-Ph.Poizat, and Ph.G rangier, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 634 (1997).
- [29] A. Kuzmich, N. P. Bigelow, and L. Mandel, Europhys. Lett. 42, 481 (1998).
- [30] For clarity, we note that, although it m ight, in principle, be possible to describe the experim ental setup in Ref. [9] by our model, this setup is slightly di erent from our model in that the propagation directions of the control and the photon are orthogonal (rather than the sam e) and the cavity mode is a standing-wave mode (rather than a running-wave mode).
- [31] J.Nunn, I.A.W alm sley, M.G.Raymer, K.Surmacz, F. C.W aldermann, Z.W ang, and D.Jaksch, Phys.Rev.A 75,011401(R) (2007).
- [32] O S. M ishina, D. V. Kupriyanov, J.H. M uller, and E.S. Polzik, Phys. Rev. A 75, 042326 (2007).
- [33] M.G.Raymer and J.M ostowski, Phys.Rev.A 24, 1980
 (1981)
- [34] M.G.Raymer, I.A.Walmsley, J.Mostowski, and B. Sobolewska, Phys. Rev. A 32, 332 (1985).
- [35] M. Fleischhauer and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. A 65, 022314 (2002).
- [36] M.O. Scully, E.S. Fry, C.H. Raymond Ooi, and K. Wodkiewicz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 010501 (2006).
- [37] M.Fleischhauer, A.Im am oglu, and J.P.M arangos, Rev. M od. Phys. 77, 633 (2005).
- [38] A. Dantan and M. Pinard, Phys. Rev. A 69, 043810 (2004).
- [39] A. Dantan, A. Bram ati, and M. Pinard, Laser Phys. 15, 170 (2005).
- [40] A.Dantan, J.Cviklinski, M.Pinard, and Ph.Grangier, Phys. Rev. A 73, 032338 (2006).
- [41] A. Dantan, A. Bram ati, and M. Pinard, Phys. Rev. A 71,043801 (2005).
- [42] L.S.Pontryagin, V.G.Boltyanskii, R.V.Gam krelidze, and E.F.M ishchenko, The Mathematical Theory of Optimal Processes, translated by K.N.Trirogo, edited by L.W.Neustadt (Gordon and Breach Science Publishers, New York, 1986).
- [43] V.F.K rotov, G lobal M ethods in O ptim alC ontrol T heory (M arcel D ecker, N ew York, 1996).
- [44] A.E.Bryson Jr. and Y.-C.Ho, Applied Optim alControl (Hem isphere, W ashington, DC, 1975).
- [45] V F. K rotov and IN. Feldman, Eng. Cybern. 21, 123 (1983).
- [46] A J. K onnov and V F. K rotov, Autom . R em ote C ontrol 60, 1427 (1999).
- [47] M. Shapiro and P. Blum er, Principles of the Quantum Control of Molecular Processes (John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, NJ, 2003).
- [48] R.Koslo, S.A.Rice, P.G aspard, S.Tersigni, and D.J. Tannor, J.Chem. Phys. 139, 201 (1989).
- [49] N.Khaneja, T.Reiss, C.Kehlet, T.Schulte-Herbruggen, and S.J.G laser, J.M agn. Reson. 172, 296 (2005).
- [50] S.E.Sklarz and D.J.Tannor, Phys. Rev. A 66, 053619 (2002).
- [51] T. Calarco, U. Domer, P. S. Julienne, C. J. W illiam s, and P.Zoller, Phys. Rev. A 70, 012306 (2004).
- [52] A.V.Gorshkov et al. (to be published).
- [53] I. Novikova, A. V. Gorshkov, D. F. Phillips, A. S. S rensen, M. D. Lukin, and R. L. W alsworth, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 243602 (2007).
- [54] D F.W alls and G J.M ilburn, Quantum Optics (Springer-

Verlag, New York, 1994).

- [55] To be m ore precise, such tim e-reversed storage stores into the com plex conjugate of the original spin-wave m ode. W e study in paper II how, for the case of nonzero energy di erence ! sg between states jji and jsi, the positiondependent phase exp (2iz!sg=c), by which a given spin wave and its com plex conjugate di er, reduces the optim al e ciency of storage followed by backward retrieval, where backward retrieval m eans that the retrieval and storage controls are counter-propagating. How ever, in the present paper, we assume that, for storage followed by retrieval, the k vectors of the storage and retrieval control ekls are pointing in the sam e direction, in which case nonzero ! sg is not a problem .
- [56] To be precise, another condition in addition to Eq. (28) required for the validity of the adiabatic elim ination is that P (0) derived from adiabatic elim ination must be much less than 1, so that it is close to the given value of P (0) = 0.D uring retrieval, this condition, how ever, is

equivalent to condition (29) evaluated at t = 0. Sim ilarly, during storage of a su ciently smooth pulse (which will, thus, satisfy $E_{in}(0) \cdot 1 = T$), the desired condition on the adiabatic value of P (0) is implied by condition (32). Thus, we do not state this condition on the adiabatic value of P (0) separately.

- [57] A.A.Kalachev and S.K roll, Phys. Rev. A 74, 023814
 (2006); A.A.Kalachev and V.V.Sam artsev, K vantovaya
 Elektron. (M oscow) 35, 679 (2005) [Quantum Electron.
 35, 679 (2005)].
- [58] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupon-Roc, and G. Grynberg, Atom Photon Interactions (W iley, New York, 1992).
- [59] J.Hald and E.Polzik, J.Opt.B: Quantum Sem iclassical Opt.3, S83 (2001).
- [60] M. D. Lukin, S. F. Yelin, and M. Fleischhauer, Phys. Rev.Lett. 84, 4232 (2000).
- [61] J.Sherson, A.S.S rensen, J.Fiurasek, K.M Imer, and E.S.Polzik, Phys. Rev. A 74, 011802 (R) (2006).