Manipulating strongly interacting individual quanta: photon molecules and 51 atomic qubits

Vladan Vuletić

In collaboration with Mikhail Lukin and Markus Greiner (Harvard)



Massachusetts Institute of Technology MIT-Harvard Center for Ultracold Atoms

Outline

- Rydberg mediated photon-photon interactions
 - Principle: quasiparticles made of photons and collective atomic excitations
 - Dispersive interactions: bound states of two and three photons
 - Repulsive interactions between photons
- 51-atom quantum simulator
 - Deterministic preparation of many individual atoms
 - Quantum phase transition in Ising-type model
 - Rydberg quantum gates

Strong photon-photon interactions



Joint experiment with Mikhail Lukin's group (Harvard)

T. Peyronel, O. Firstenberg, Q.-Y. Liang, S. Hofferberth, A.V. Gorshkov, T. Pohl, M.D. Lukin, and V. Vuletić, Nature **488**, 57-60 (2012).

O. Firstenberg, T. Peyronel, Q.-Y. Liang, A.V. Gorshkov, M.D. Lukin, and V. Vuletić, Nature **502**, 71-74 (2013).

Q.-Y. Liang, A.V. Venkatramani, S.H. Cantu, T.L. Nicholson, M.J. Gullans, A.V. Gorshkov, J.D. Thompson, C. Chin, M.D. Lukin, and V. Vuletić, Science **359**, 783 (2018).

Electromagnetically induced transparency (EIT) with interacting Rydberg atoms



EIT to high-lying Rydberg state via unstable $| P \rangle$ level in dense cold ^{87}Rb gas



Sharp variation of transmission and dispersion with frequency in an otherwise opaque medium

Electromagnetically induced transparency





 v_g

EIT for lasers without inversion 1989

Steve Harris

Electromagnetically Induced Transparency

• EIT produces slow light by converting photons into collective atomic (spin) excitations



Light travels at v=1 km/s for our conditions.

No population of unstable p state due to destructive interference: no absorption

Rydberg states

Very highly excited hydrogen-like states Extremely large size, dipole moment, polarizability Strong Rydberg-Rydberg interactions $V(R)=C_6/R^6$



Detuned Rydberg EIT: Bound states of two and three photons



O. Firstenberg, T. Peyronel, Q.-Y. Liang, A.V. Gorshkov, M.D. Lukin, and V. Vuletic, Nature **502**, 71-74 (2013).

Q.-Y. Liang, A.V. Venkatramani, S.H. Cantu, T.L. Nicholson, M.J. Gullans, A.V. Gorshkov, J.D. Thompson, C. Chin, M.D. Lukin, and V. Vuletić, Science 359, 783–786 (2018).

Rydberg EIT off resonance



Blockade radius r_b



Blockade radius r_b

Rydberg EIT off resonance



Rydberg EIT off resonance



Rydberg blockade as square well potential



Index of refraction as experienced by 2nd photon

Ζ

Rydberg induced nonlinear phase shift

Probe frequency detuning [(2π) MHz]

No EIT for photons within blockade radius -> light experiences no phase shift outside blockade radius, but non-zero phase shift within blockade radius.

Curvature of dispersion relation: Photons also acquire mass $\sim 1000 \ \hbar \omega/c^2$ Typical group velocity v_g = 1000 m/s Slow, massive photons

Three-photon correlations - setup

3-photon correlation function or 3- photon phase measurement (phase measurement conditioned on detection of two photons).

Three-photon correlation measurements

Three-photon wavefunction twice more tightly bound than two-photon wavefunction.

Conditional three-photon phase

Conditional 3-photon phase for two photons detected at time t=0

Two-photon bound state

of dispersion).

Repulsive interactions?

- Switching the sign of one-photon detuning switches the sign of Rydberg interaction, but also the sign of the mass:
- We can have V<O and m>O or V>O and m<O, both map onto attraction for positive mass.
- Adding a second EIT process gives more free parameters to tune interaction and mass separately.
- Second EIT can be non-interacting, ground-state EIT.

Double EIT for repulsive interactions

Additional coupling to other hyperfine ground state yields independent control of photon interaction and mass.

Two- and three-photon repulsive interactions $g^3(\tau_{31}, \tau_{21})$

g3(tau1, tau2), tau bins (usec) = 0.015

tau = |t2 - t1| (microsec)

$$\tau_{21} = |t_2 - t_1| \; [\mu sec]$$

Photon bound state - disclaimer

Photon bound state - disclaimer

low polaritons with ma forces acting

Photon bound state - disclaimer

51-atom quantum simulator

In collaboration with Mikhail Lukin and Markus Greiner (Harvard)

Array of individually trapped atoms

Problem: each trap is only loaded with ~50% probability

Trapped atoms in different configurations

| А | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | 10µm |
|-----------|-----|------|-------|----------|-----|-------------|--|------|---------|----------|------|----|------------|--------|---------------|------|-------|-----------|------|-----------|------|---------|-----|--------|
| | a' | *** | | | * * | | | | | | | | | 1111 | | | | | 2.5 | | | | • | |
| | 0 | Ula | | 1.0 | | | | | | | | | | | _ | | | | | | | | | |
| | | | | | | | | **** | | | **** | | | - | 4.1 | | | 1.24 | 1.20 | 1.2 | | 1.5.7 | 1.1 | 1.1 |
| В | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| | | **** | **** | | | | | **** | | | **** | | | | | ÷ 4 | 182.0 | | 1 | e . 87 | 1 | 122 | | 121.20 |
| | *** | | | | | | | **** | | *** | | | | 1. NO. | 22 | 14 | 1.44 | 1. 132 | 1 | | 15.1 | (Market | 199 | 622 B. |
| | *** | | 11201 | | | | | | 1 4 4 0 | + + + + | | | | **** | (*)* | 1-12 | 16 | 1 - C. 37 | - S. | 1.15 | | 1.00 | 5 | |
| С | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| 1.1 | | | | | ** | | | ** | 17 | | | | | ** | | | ** | | ** | | | ** | ** | ** |
| | * 3 | ** | | ** | | | | | | | ** | ** | ** | ** | | | ** | | ** | | ** | ** | ** | |
| | ** | + + | | | | | | | | | | ** | . ** | | | | | ** | ** | | | | ** | ** |
| ********* | | | | | | ** ******** | | | | | | | ****** *** | | | | | ********* | | | | | | |
| | | | | The last | | | | | | | | | | | ********* | | | | 2 | ********* | | | | 13.17 |
| | | | | | | | | | | ******** | | | | | ********* | | | | | ********* | | | | - |
| D | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |
| U | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | | |

Green color: real images of individual atoms

Feeback (rearrangement) is crucial

Individual atoms in reconfigurable traps Greiner – Lukin – Vuletic collaboration

M. Endres, H. Bernien, A. Keesling, H. Levine, E. Anschuetz, A. Krajenbrink, C. Senko, V. Vuletić, M. Greiner, and M.D. Lukin, Science **354**, 1024-1027 (2016).

Collective Rabi flopping under Rydberg blockade

Small trap separation d=2.9 μ m « blockade radius r_b

N^{1/2} scaling of collective Rabi frequency observed.

Different ordered phases

Order of ground state depends on trap distance relative to blockade radius

Adiabatic ramp across phase transition

Macroscopic population of ground state prepared adiabatically for up to 51 atoms

Ground state reached much more often than any other state.

Macroscopic population of ground state prepared adiabatically for up to 51 atoms

Crystal preparation at finite speed

The crystal is not perfect, but contains domain walls, due to finite preparation speed, or imperfect state detection.

Small systems dominated by edge effects

Antiferromagnetic correlations due to Rydberg blockade

Surprisingly long-lived oscillations between two macroscopic antiferromagnetic states observed.

Collective oscillations after a sudden quench

Quantum many-body scars?

C. J. Turner, A. A. Michailidis, D. A. Abanin, M. Serbyn, and Z. Papic, arxiv 1711.03528 (2017).

Rydberg quantum gates

H. Levine, A. Keesling, A. Omran, H. Bernien, S. Schwartz, A.S. Zibrov, M. Endres, M. Greiner, V. Vuletić, and M.D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **121**, 123603 (2018).

Single-qubit Rabi flopping

Single-qubit coherence and phase control

Rydberg lifetime Phase coherence

Phase coherence with spin echo pulse

Two-qubit quantum gate

H. Levine, A. Keesling, A. Omran, H. Bernien, S. Schwartz, A.S. Zibrov, M. Endres, M. Greiner, V. Vuletic, and M.D. Lukin, submitted to PRL (2018).

Two-qubit quantum gate

Two-qubit quantum gate fidelity F=0.97 before detection errors

Outlook

- Strong interactions between individual photons (slow-light polaritons) demonstrated
 - Bound states of 2 and 3 photons observed
 - Towards repulsive photon-photon interactions (Tonks gas of photons?)
- Towards large quantum simulators
 - 100-300 qubits within reach in next 1-2 years
 - Transition to 2D arrangement
 - 10-atom correlation length and 10x10 qubits system completely quantum coherent
 - Can we find the solutions to hard classical calculations via adiabatic evolution (adiabatic quantum computing, quantum approximate optimization algorithm)?

Quantum Kibble-Zurek mechanism

Probing critical dynamics across quantum phase transitions on a programmable Rydberg simulator. A. Keesling, A. Omran, H.
Levine, H. Bernien, H. Pichler, S. Choi, R. Samajdar, S.
Schwartz, P. Silvi, S. Sachdev, P. Zoller, M. Endres, M. Greiner, V. Vuletić, and M.D. Lukin, submitted (9/2018).

Kibble-Zurek mechanism

Freezing out of correlations when ramp timescale exceeds correlation formation timescale near critical point.

Ramping across phase transition and measuring density of defects in antiferromagnet.

Phase boundaries for ordered phases

Order of ground state depends on trap distance relative to blockade radius

Phase boundaries for ordered phases

Order of ground state depends on trap distance relative to blockade radius

Appearance of domain walls at finite sweep rate into ordered phase

At finite sweep rate, random phase boundaries (domain walls) appear as sweep time becomes faster than equilibration time. The average density of domain walls increases for faster sweeps.

Kibble-Zurek mechanism for quantum phase transition into Z₂ phase

Universality of correlations

Different branches correspond to different types of defect

Distance rescaled by measured critical exponent

Nontrivial correlations between domain walls.

Different defects in Z₃ phase

Type of defects changes with atomic distance a/R_B .

Power law scaling for different distances

Fraction of correct final state for different orders.

Scaling exponent varies near phase boundaries.