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Quantum simulation with ultra-cold atoms

- Anderson localisation, 2D, 3D, weak, strong: Rb, K
- 1D gases: Rb on chip
- Optical lattice: He*
- Long range interactions: Sr

Quantum atom optics

- HBT, Correlated pairs, HOM: He*
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1. Two “quantum mysteries”
2. The HBT effect with photons
3. Quantum Atom Optics with He*: HBT
4. The HOM effect with photons
5. HOM effect with atoms
6. Outlook
Two great “quantum mysteries”

Wave-particle duality: single particle interference

- A particle (an electron) also behaves as a wave
- A wave (light) can also behave as a particle (single photon effects)

Entanglement: interference between two-particles amplitudes

- Photon description of Hanbury Brown-Twiss effect
- Hong-Ou-Mandel effect
- Bell's inequalities violation

Classical concepts, in ordinary space-time

Interference in Hilbert space. No classical model in ordinary space-time
The first quantum revolution?

A revolutionary concept: Wave particle duality

- Understanding the structure of matter, its properties, its interaction with light
  - Electrical, mechanical properties
- Understanding “exotic properties”
  - Superfluidity, supraconductivity, Bose Einstein Condensate

Revolutionary applications

- Inventing new devices
  - Laser, transistor, integrated circuits
- Information and communication society

As revolutionary as the invention of heat engine (change society)
Not only conceptual, also technological
The second quantum revolution

Two concepts at the root of a new quantum revolution

Entanglement

• A revolutionary concept, as guessed by Einstein and Bohr, strikingly demonstrated by Bell, put to use by Feynman et al.
• Drastically different from concepts underlying the first quantum revolution (wave particle duality).

Individual quantum objects

• experimental control
• theoretical description (quantum Monte-Carlo)

Examples: electrons, atoms, ions, single photons, photons pairs
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HB&T: correlations in light intensity

Measurement of the correlation function of the photocurrents at two different points and times

\[ g^{(2)}(r_1, r_2; \tau) = \frac{\langle i(r_1, t) i(r_2, t + \tau) \rangle}{\langle i(r_1, t) \rangle \langle i(r_2, t) \rangle} \]

Semi-classical model of photodetection (classical em field, quantized detector):
Measurement of the correlation function of light intensity:

\[ i(r, t) \propto I(r, t) = |E(r, t)|^2 \]
HB&T: correlations in light intensity

Light from incoherent source: time and space correlations

\[ g^{(2)}(r_1 = r_2; \tau) > 1 \]

• time coherence

\[ \tau_c \approx \frac{1}{\Delta \omega} \]
HB&T: correlations in light intensity

Light from incoherent source: time and space correlations

\[ g^{(2)}(r_1 - r_2; \tau = 0) > 1 \]

- time coherence
  \[ \tau_c \approx 1/\Delta\omega \]
- space coherence
  \[ L_c \approx \lambda/\alpha \]

A measurement of \( g^{(2)} - 1 \) vs. \( \tau \) and \( r_1 - r_2 \) yields the coherence volume
The HB&T stellar interferometer: astronomy tool

Measure of the coherence area $\Rightarrow$ angular diameter of a star

$$g^{(2)}(L;0) = \frac{\langle i(r_1,t)i(r_1+L,t+\tau) \rangle}{\langle i(r_1,t) \rangle \langle i(r_2,t) \rangle} \Rightarrow L_C$$

$$\alpha = \frac{\lambda}{L_C}$$
The HB&T stellar interferometer: astronomy tool

Measure of the coherence area $\Rightarrow$ angular diameter of a star

$g^{(2)}(L;0) = \frac{\langle i(r_1,t)i(r_1+L,t+\tau) \rangle}{\langle i(r_1,t) \rangle \langle i(r_2,t) \rangle} \Rightarrow L_C$

$\alpha = \frac{\lambda}{L_C}$

Equivalent to the Michelson stellar interferometer?

Visibility of fringes

$g^{(1)}(r_1,r_2;\tau) = \frac{\langle E(r_1,t)E(r_2,t+\tau) \rangle}{\langle |E(r_1,t)|^2 \rangle^{1/2} \langle |E(r_2,t+\tau)|^2 \rangle^{1/2}}$
The HB&T stellar interferometer: astronomy tool

Measure of the coherence area $\Rightarrow$ angular diameter of a star

$$g^{(2)}(L;0) = \frac{\langle i(r_1,t)i(r_1+L,t+\tau) \rangle}{\langle i(r_1,t) \rangle \langle i(r_2,t) \rangle} \Rightarrow L_C$$

$$\alpha = \frac{\lambda}{L_C}$$

Not the same correlation function: $g^{(2)}$ vs $g^{(1)}$

HB&T insensitive to atmospheric fluctuations!

Equivalent to the Michelson stellar interferometer?

Visibility of fringes

$$g^{(1)}(r_1,r_2;\tau) = \frac{\langle E(r_1,t)E(r_2,t+\tau) \rangle}{\langle |E(r_1,t)|^2 \rangle^{1/2} \langle |E(r_2,t+\tau)|^2 \rangle^{1/2}}$$
HBT and Michelson stellar interferometers yield the same quantity

Many independent random emitters:
complex electric field = sum of many independent random variables

$$E(P,t) = \sum_j a_j \exp \left\{ \phi_j + \frac{\omega_j}{c} M_j P - \omega_j t \right\}$$

Central limit theorem
⇒ Gaussian random process

$$g^{(2)}(r_1, r_2; \tau) = 1 + \left| g^{(1)}(r_1, r_2; \tau) \right|^2$$

Incoherent source
The HB&T stellar interferometer: it works!

The installation at Narrabri (Australia): it works!

HB et al., 1967
HBT intensity correlations: classical or quantum?

HBT correlations were predicted, observed, and used to measure star angular diameters, 50 years ago. Why bother?

The question of their interpretation provoked a debate that prompted the emergence of modern quantum optics!

Classical or quantum?
Classical wave explanation for HB&T correlations (1): Gaussian intensity fluctuations in incoherent light

Many independent random emitters: complex electric field fluctuates

\[
\langle I(t)^2 \rangle \geq \langle I(t) \rangle^2 \iff g^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2; 0) \geq 1
\]

Gaussian random process \(\Rightarrow\) \(g^{(2)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2; \tau) = 1 + |g^{(1)}(\mathbf{r}_1, \mathbf{r}_2; \tau)|^2\)

For an incoherent source, intensity fluctuations (second order coherence function) are related to first order coherence function
Classical wave explanation for HB&T correlations (2): optical speckle in light from an incoherent source

Many independent random emitters: complex electric field $= \sum a_j \exp\left\{\phi_j + \frac{\omega_j}{c} M_j P - \omega_j t\right\}$

Gaussian random process $\Rightarrow g^{(2)}(r_1, r_2; \tau) = 1 + \left|g^{(1)}(r_1, r_2; \tau)\right|^2$

Intensity pattern (speckle) in the observation plane:

- Correlation radius $L_c \approx \frac{\lambda}{\alpha}$
- Changes after $\tau_c \approx \frac{1}{\Delta \omega}$
The HB&T effect with photons: a hot debate

Strong negative reactions to the HB&T proposal (1955)

In term of photon counting

\[ M_j \]

\[ P_1 \]

\[ P_2 \]

\[ g^{(2)}(r_1, r_2; \tau) \]

joint detection probability

\[ g^{(2)}(r_1, r_2; \tau) = \frac{\langle \pi(r_1, r_2; t, t + \tau) \rangle}{\langle \pi(r_1, t) \rangle \langle \pi(r_2, t) \rangle} \]

single detection probabilities

For independent detection events \( g^{(2)} = 1 \)

\[ g^{(2)}(0) = 2 \implies \text{probability to find two photons at the same place larger than the product of simple probabilities: bunching} \]

How might independent particles be bunched?
The HB&T effect with photons: a hot debate

Strong negative reactions to the HB&T proposal (1955)

\[ g^{(2)}(0) > 1 \implies \text{photon bunching} \]

How might photons emitted from distant points in an incoherent source not be statistically independent?

HB&T answers

- Experimental demonstration!
- Light is both wave and particles.
  - Uncorrelated detections easily understood as independent particles (shot noise)
  - Correlations (excess noise) due to beat notes of random waves

\[ g^{(2)}(r_1, r_2; \tau) = 1 + \left| g^{(1)}(r_1, r_2; \tau) \right|^2 \]

cf. Einstein’s discussion of wave particle duality in Salzburg (1909), about black body radiation fluctuations
The HB&T effect with photons: Fano-Glauber quantum interpretation

Two paths to go from THE initial state to THE final state

Initial state:
- Emitters excited
- Detectors in ground state

Final state:
- Emitters in ground state
- Detectors ionized

Amplitudes of the two process interfere ⇒ $\pi(r_1, r_2, t) \neq \pi(r_1, t) \cdot \pi(r_2, t)$

Incoherent addition of many interferences: factor of 2 (Gaussian process)
The HB&T effect with particles: a non trivial quantum effect

Two paths to go from one initial state to one final state: quantum interference of two-photon amplitudes

Two photon interference effect: quantum weirdness “of the second kind”
- happens in configuration space, not in real space
- related to entanglement (violation of Bell inequalities), HOM, etc…

Lack of statistical independence (bunching) although no “real” interaction
cf. Bose-Einstein Condensation (letter from Einstein to Schrödinger, 1924)
1960: invention of the laser (Maiman, Ruby laser)

• 1961: Mandel & Wolf: HB&T bunching effect should be easy to observe with a laser: many photons per mode

• 1963: Glauber: laser light should NOT be bunched: \( \rightarrow \) quantum theory of coherence

• 1965: Armstrong: experiment with single mode AsGa laser: no bunching well above threshold; bunching below threshold

• 1966: Arecchi: similar with He Ne laser: plot of \( g^{(2)}(\tau) \)
Intensity correlations in laser light? yet more hot discussions!

1960: invention of the laser (Maiman, Ruby laser)

1961: Mandel & Wolf: HB&T bunching effect should be easy to observe with a laser: many photons per mode

1963: Glauber → quantum theory of coherence

1965: Armstrong: experiment with single mode AsGa laser: no bunching well above threshold; bunching below threshold

1966: Arecchi: similar with He Ne laser: plot of $g^{(2)}(\tau)$

Simple classical model for laser light:

$$E = E_0 \exp \{-i\omega t + \phi_0\} + e_n$$

$$|e_n| = |E_0|$$

Quantum description identical by use of Glauber-Sudarshan P representation (coherent states)
The Hanbury Brown and Twiss effect: a landmark in quantum optics

• Easy to understand if light is described as an electromagnetic wave

• Subtle quantum effect if light is described as made of photons

Intriguing quantum effect for particles*

Hanbury Brown and Twiss effect with atoms?

* See G. Baym, Acta Physica Polonica (1998) for HBT with high energy particles
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The HB&T effect with atoms: Yasuda and Shimizu, 1996

- Cold neon atoms in a MOT (100 \( \mu \)K) continuously pumped into an untrapped (falling) metastable state

  - Single atom detection (metastable atom)
  - Narrow source (<100\( \mu \)m): coherence volume as large as detector viewed through diverging lens: no reduction of the visibility of the bump

Effect clearly seen

- Bump disappears when detector size \( \gg L_C \)
- Coherence time as predicted: \( h / \Delta E \approx 0.2 \mu s \)

Totally analogous to HB&T: continuous atomic beam
Atomic density correlation (“noise correlation”): a new tool to investigate quantum gases

3 atoms collision rate enhancement in a thermal gas, compared to a BEC

- Factor of 6 ($\langle n^3(r) \rangle = 3!\langle n(r) \rangle^3$) observed (JILA, 1997) as predicted by Kagan, Svistunov, Shlyapnikov, JETP lett (1985)

Interaction energy of a sample of cold atoms

- $\langle n^2(r) \rangle = 2\langle n(r) \rangle^2$ for a thermal gas (MIT, 1997)
- $\langle n^2(r) \rangle = \langle n(r) \rangle^2$ for a quasicondensate (Institut d’Optique, 2003)

Noise correlation in absorption images of a sample of cold atoms (as proposed by Altmann, Demler and Lukin, 2004)

- Correlations in a quasicondensate (Ertmer, Hannover 2003)
- Correlations in the atom density fluctuations of cold atomic samples
  - Atoms released from a Mott phase (I Bloch, Mainz, 2005)
  - Molecules dissociation (D Jin et al., Boulder, 2005)
  - Fluctuations on an atom chip (J. Estève et al., Institut d’Optique, 2005)
  - … (Inguscio, …)
Atomic density correlation (“noise correlation”): a new tool to investigate quantum gases

3 atoms collision rate enhancement in a thermal gas, compared to a BEC

- Factor of 6 (\( \langle n^3(r) \rangle = 3! \langle n(r) \rangle^3 \)) observed (JILA, 1997) as predicted by Kagan, Svistunov, Shlyapnikov, JETP lett (1985)

Interaction energy of a sample of cold atoms

- \( \langle n^2(r) \rangle = 2 \langle n(r) \rangle^2 \) for a thermal gas (MIT, 1997)
- \( \langle n^2(r) \rangle = \langle n(r) \rangle^2 \) for a quasicondensate (Institut d’Optique, 2003)

Noise correlation in absorption images of a sample of cold atoms (as proposed by Altmann, Demler and Lukin, 2004)

Measurements of atomic density averaged over small volumes

What about individual atoms correlation function measurements?
Metastable Helium $2 \ ^3S_1$
A tool for Quantum Atom Optics

- Triplet ($\uparrow\uparrow$) $2 \ ^3S_1$ cannot *radiatively* decay to singlet ($\uparrow\downarrow$) $1 \ ^1S_0$ (lifetime 9000 s)
- Laser manipulation on closed transition $2 \ ^3S_1 \rightarrow 2 \ ^3P_2$ at $1.08 \ \mu m$ (lifetime 100 ns)

- Large electronic energy stored in He*
  $\Rightarrow$ ionization of any collider
  $\Rightarrow$ extraction of electron from metal:
  single atom detection with Micro Channel Plate detector

Similar techniques in Canberra, Amsterdam, ENS, Stony Brook, Vienna
He* laser cooling and trapping, and MCP detection: unique tools

**Clover leaf trap**

@ 240 A:

- $B_0$: 0.3 to 200 G;
- $B' = 90$ G/cm;
- $B'' = 200$ G/cm²

$\omega_z/2\pi = 50$ Hz; $\omega_\perp/2\pi = 1800$ Hz

**He* on the Micro Channel Plate:**

- an electron is extracted
- multiplication
- observable pulse

**Single atom detection of He***

Analogue of single photon counting development, in the early 50’s

Tools crucial to the discovery of He* BEC (2000)
Position and time resolved detector: a tool for atom correlation experiments

- Delay lines + Time to digital converters: detection events localized in time and position
- Time resolution in the ns range
- Dead time: 30 ns
- Local flux limited by MCP saturation
- Position resolution (limited by TDC): 200 µm

$10^5$ single atom detectors working in parallel!
Atom atom correlations in the atom cloud

- Cool the trapped sample to a chosen temperature (above BEC transition)
- Release onto the detector
- Monitor and record each detection event $n$:
  - Pixel number $i_n$ (coordinates $x$, $y$)
  - Time of detection $t_n$ (coordinate $z$)

\[
(i_1, t_1), \ldots (i_n, t_n), \ldots = \text{a record}
\]

of the atom positions in a single cloud

Repeat many times (accumulate records) at same temperature

Pulsed experiment: 3 dimensions are equivalent $\neq$ Shimizu experiment
$g^{(2)}$ for a thermal sample (above $T_{\text{BEC}}$) of $^4\text{He}^*$

- For a given record (ensemble of detection events for a given released sample), evaluate probability of a pair of atoms separated by $\Delta x$, $\Delta y$, $\Delta z$.
  $\rightarrow [\pi^{(2)}(\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z)]_i$

- Average over many records (at same temperature)

- Normalize by the autocorrelation of average (over all records)
  $\rightarrow g^{(2)}(\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z)$

$g^{(2)}(\Delta x = \Delta y = 0; \Delta z)$

Bump visibility = $5 \times 10^{-2}$
Agreement with prediction (resolution)

$\Rightarrow$ HBT bump around $\Delta x = \Delta y = \Delta z = 0$

1.3 $\mu$K
$g^{(2)}$ for a thermal sample (above $T_{\text{BEC}}$) of $^4\text{He}^*$

• For a given record (ensemble of detection events for a given released sample), evaluate probability of a pair of atoms separated by $\Delta x$, $\Delta y$, $\Delta z$.
  $$\rightarrow [\pi^{(2)}(\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z)]_i$$

• Average over many records (at same temperature)

• Normalize by the autocorrelation of average (over all records)
  $$\rightarrow g^{(2)}(\Delta x, \Delta y, \Delta z)$$

$\Rightarrow$ HBT bump around $\Delta x = \Delta y = \Delta z = 0$

$g^{(2)}(\Delta x; \Delta y; \Delta z = 0)$

Extends along $y$ (narrow dimension of the source)
The detector resolution issue

If the detector resolution $\Delta x_{\text{det}}$ is larger than the HBT bump width $L_{cx}$, then the height of the HB&T bump is reduced:

$$g^{(2)} - 1 \approx \frac{L_{C}}{\Delta x_{\text{det}}} < 1$$

At 1 $\mu$K,

- $\Delta y_{\text{source}} \approx 4 \mu$m $\Rightarrow L_{cy} = 500 \mu$m
- $\Delta x_{\text{source}} \approx 150 \mu$m $\Rightarrow L_{cy} = 13 \mu$m

Resolution (200 $\mu$m) sufficient along $y$ but insufficient along $x$. Expected reduction factor of 15

NB: vertical resolution is more than sufficient: $\Delta z_{\text{det}} \approx \sqrt{\Delta t} \approx 1$ nm
Role of source size ($^4\text{He}^*$ thermal sample)

Temperature controls the size of the source (harmonic trap)
**$g^{(2)}$ for a $^{4}\text{He}^*$ BEC ($T < T_c$)**

Experiment more difficult: atoms fall on a small area on the detector \(\Rightarrow\) problems of saturation

\[ g^{(2)}(0;0;0) = 1 \]

No bunching: analogous to laser light

(see also Öttl et al.; PRL 95,090404)
Atoms are as fun as photons?

They can be more!

In contrast to photons, atoms can come not only as bosons (most frequently), but also as fermions, e.g. $^3$He, $^6$Li, $^{40}$K...

Possibility to look for pure effects of quantum statistics

• No perturbation by a strong “ordinary” interaction (Coulomb repulsion of electrons)

• Comparison of two isotopes of the same element ($^3$He vs $^4$He).
The HB&T effect with fermions: antibunching

Two paths to go from one initial state to one final state: quantum interference

Amplitudes added with opposite signs: antibunching

Two particles interference effect: quantum weirdness, lack of statistical independence although no real interaction

… no classical interpretation

\[ \langle n(t)^2 \rangle < \langle n(t) \rangle^2 \]  impossible for classical densities
The HB&T effect with fermions: antibunching

Two paths to go from one initial state to one final state: quantum interference

Amplitudes added with opposite signs: antibunching
Two particles interference effect: quantum weirdness, lack of statistical independence although no real interaction

… no classical interpretation

$$\langle n(t)^2 \rangle < \langle n(t) \rangle^2$$ impossible for classical densities

Not to be confused with antibunching for a single particle (boson or fermion): a single particle cannot be detected simultaneously at two places
Evidence of fermionic HB&T antibunching

Electrons in solids or in a beam:
M. Henny et al., (1999); W. D. Oliver et al. (1999);
H. Kiesel et al. (2002).

Neutrons in a beam:
Iannuzzi et al. (2006)

Heroic experiments, tiny signals!
HB&T with $^3$He* and $^4$He*
an almost ideal fermion vs boson comparison

Neutral atoms: interactions negligible

Samples of $^3$He* and $^4$He* at same temperature (0.5 µK, sympathetic cooling) in the trap:

⇒ same size (same trapping potential)

⇒ Coherence volume scales as the atomic masses (de Broglie wavelengths)

⇒ ratio of 4 / 3 expected for the HB&T widths

Collaboration with VU Amsterdam (W Vassen et al.)
HB&T with $^3\text{He}^*$ and $^4\text{He}^*$ an almost ideal fermion vs boson comparison


Collaboration with VU Amsterdam (W Vassen et al.)

Direct comparison:
- same apparatus
- same temperature

Ratio of about 4 / 3 found for HB&T signals widths (mass ratio, ie de Broglie wavelengths ratio)

Pure quantum statistics effect
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The Hong-Ou-Mandel effect (photons)

Measurement of Subpicosecond Time Intervals between Two Photons by Interference


When the two photon wave packets exactly overlap: both photons emerge on the same side of the beam splitter (randomly)

Initial emphasis: Time correlation measured with fs accuracy
HOM: an intriguing quantum effect

Indistinguishable photons: same initial and final states, two paths: destructive interference between two photons amplitudes

\[ w^{(2)}(D_3; D_4) = \left| \langle \gamma_1 | D_3 \rangle \langle \gamma_2 | D_4 \rangle + \langle \gamma_1 | D_4 \rangle \langle \gamma_2 | D_3 \rangle \right|^2 = 0 \]

A spectacular evidence of two photons interference

See also: Fourth order interference in parametric down conversion J. Rarity and P.Tapster, Josa B 6, 1221 (1989)
HOM: an intriguing quantum effect

Indistinguishable photons: same initial and final states, two paths: destructive interference between two photons amplitudes

No classical description

- Classical particles
- Classical waves

See also: Fourth order interference in parametric down conversion J. Rarity and P. Tapster, Josa B 6, 1221 (1989)
HOM: no classical particles model

Classical particles

1 particle in input 1 and 1 particle in input 2

- Each particle has probability 1/2 to be transmitted, and 1/2 to be reflected
- They are independent

\[
P(2 \text{ particles in } 3) = \frac{1}{4}
\]

\[
P(2 \text{ particles in } 4) = \frac{1}{4}
\]

\[
P(1 \text{ particle in } 3 \text{ and } 1 \text{ particle in } 4) = \frac{1}{2}
\]

No HOM dip (no suppression of joint detection at D_3 and D_4)
HOM: no classical wave model

Classical waves: independent wave-packets

Rates of single detections (one set of wave packets)
\[ w^{(1)}(D_3) \propto I \]
\[ w^{(1)}(D_4) \propto I \]

Rate of joint detections
\[ w^{(2)}(D_3; D_4) = w^{(1)}(D_3) \cdot w^{(1)}(D_4) \]

Average over many pairs of wave-packets

Rates of single detections
\[
\frac{w^{(1)}(D_3)}{w^{(1)}(D_4)} \propto \bar{I}
\]

Rate of joint detections
\[
\bar{w}^{(2)}(D_3; D_4) = \frac{w^{(1)}(D_3)}{w^{(1)}(D_4)} \propto \frac{\bar{I}}{w^{(1)}(D_4)}
\]
\[
= \bar{I}^2 \geq \left( \frac{\bar{I}}{w^{(1)}(D_4)} \right) = \frac{w^{(1)}(D_3)}{w^{(1)}(D_4)} \]

No dip
HOM: no classical wave model

Coherent classical waves (relative phase $\phi$)

Average over $\phi$ (to mimick randomness)

Rate of single detections

$$w^{(1)}(D_3) \propto |E(t)|^2$$

$$w^{(1)}(D_4) \propto |E(t)|^2$$

Rate of joint detections

$$w^{(2)}(D_3; D_4) \propto |E(t)|^4 \sin^2 2\phi = \frac{1}{2} |E(t)|^4$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} w^{(1)}(D_3) \cdot w^{(1)}(D_4)$$

Rates of single detections

$$w^{(1)}(D_3) \propto 2 |E(t)|^2 \cos^2 \phi$$

$$w^{(1)}(D_4) \propto 2 |E(t)|^2 \sin^2 \phi$$

Rate of joint detections

$$w^{(2)}(D_3; D_4) = w^{(1)}(D_3) \cdot w^{(1)}(D_4)$$

$$= 4 |E(t)|^4 \cos^2 \phi \sin^2 \phi = |E(t)|^4 \sin^2 2\phi$$

Dip visibility $1/2$
**HOM: no classical wave model**

Classical waves: wave-packets with mutual coherence

\[ \mathcal{E}_1(t) = \mathcal{E}(t) \]
\[ \mathcal{E}_2(t) = \mathcal{E}(t) \exp \{ i\phi \} \]

Rate of joint detections
\[ w^{(2)}(D_3; D_4) = w^{(1)}(D_3) \cdot w^{(1)}(D_4) \]
\[ = 4|\mathcal{E}(t)|^4 \cos^2 \phi \sin^2 \phi = |\mathcal{E}(t)|^4 \sin^2 2\phi \]

Average over \( \phi \) and wave packets fluctuations

Rate of single detections
\[ w^{(1)}(D_3) \propto 2|\mathcal{E}(t)|^2 \cos^2 \phi \]
\[ w^{(1)}(D_4) \propto 2|\mathcal{E}(t)|^2 \sin^2 \phi \]

Rate of joint detections
\[ \geq \frac{1}{2} w^{(1)}(D_3) \cdot w^{(1)}(D_4) \]

Dip visibility < 1/2
HOM: a mile-stone in Quantum Optics

Interference between two photons amplitudes

Two photons entangled state in the output space

No classical description

- Classical particles: no dip
- Classical waves: dip not below 50%

The simplest example of a "quantum mystery of the second kind"
HOM for photons from distinct sources

Interference between two photons amplitudes

The two one-photon modes must be indistinguishable
HOM for photons from distinct sources

Interference between two photons amplitudes

Quantum interference between two single photons emitted by independently trapped atoms

J. Beugnon¹, M. P. A. Jones¹, J. Dingjan¹, B. Darquié¹, G. Messin¹, A. Browaeys¹ & P. Grangier¹

The two one-photon modes must be indistinguishable
The HBT and HOM effects: from photons to atoms
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Production of atom pairs by spontaneous atomic 4-Wave Mixing

2 colliding BEC’s

\[ p_2 = -p_1 \]
\[ P_1 = P_2 \]

\[ P_4 = P_3 = P_1 = P_2 \]

Observation of the full s-wave scattering spherical shell

s-wave collision halo (cf. MIT, Penn state, Amsterdam)

p reconstruction by elementary kinematics (free fall)

Do we really have atom pairs?
Production of atom pairs by spontaneous atomic 4-Wave Mixing

2 colliding BEC’s
\[ p_2 = -p_1 \]
\[ P_1 = P_2 \]

\[ P_4 = P_3 = P_1 = P_2 \]

Observation of the full s-wave scattering spherical shell
s-wave collision halo (cf. MIT, Penn State, Amsterdam)

Do we really have atom pairs?
Pairs correlated in velocity

Colliding BEC’s

\[ p_2 = -p_1 \]

\[ p_4 = -p_3 \]

\[ |p_3| = |p_4| = \text{const} \]

Momentum correlation in scattered atoms

Correlation of antipodes on momentum sphere

Atoms in pairs of opposite momenta

A. Perrin et al. PRL 2007
Pairs correlated in velocity

We have pairs, but emitted in all directions in space 😞

Colliding BEC’s

\[ p_2 = -p_1 \]

\[ p_4 = -p_3 \]

\[ |p_3| = |p_4| = \text{const} \]

Momentum correlation in scattered atoms

Correlation of antipodes on momentum sphere

Atoms in pairs of opposite momenta

A. Perrin et al. PRL 2007

\[ g^{(2)}(V_{1p} + V_{2p}) \]

\[ g^{(2)}(V_{1\perp} + V_{2\perp}) \]
A phase matched source of atom pairs

1D atomic 4-wave mixing with a superimposed moving optical lattice proposed by Hilingsoe and Molmer as a phase matching condition (2005), demonstrated by Campbell et al. (2006). See also B. Wu and Q. Niu (PRA 2001).

Non-trivial dispersion relation in lattice: one lattice velocity $\rightarrow$ well defined velocities $v_1$ and $v_2$ for produced pair

A tunable source of correlated atom pairs (correlations checked) : Bonneau et al., 2013

Production of atom pairs with well defined velocities, in a well defined direction
Improved phase matched source of He* atom pairs

- Lattice perfectly aligned with the long direction of the BEC
- After pair production, atoms initially in m = 1 Zeeman sublevel transferred into m = 0 (field insensitive) by Raman transition
- Optical trap switched off: atoms fall freely; the atoms of the pairs separate from the atoms of the BEC
- Measurement of autocorrelation function in each beam: mostly one atom (2 atoms component < 25%)
Mirrors and beam-splitter: Bragg reflection

Initial atom velocities:
\( v_a = 12 \text{ cm/s} \); \( v_b = 7 \text{ cm/s} \)

Laser standing wave moving as the center of gravity of the two atoms: atoms move with opposite velocities (\( \pm 9.5 \text{ cm/s} \)) in the optical lattice, whose period is adjusted (angle between the beams) to match this velocity: Bragg condition fulfilled; 100% reflection possible; 50% for a duration two times shorter: mirror, beam-splitter
Conjugate modes filtering

We select for each beam small volumes in the velocity space exactly conjugate of each other in the beam-splitter: Indistinguishable modes
Two indistinguishable paths to go from an initial state (two atoms emitted) to a final state (two atoms detected), with indistinguishable atoms:

Interference of two atoms amplitudes

Opposite signs because of properties of beam splitter

Destructive interference

Null probability to detect atoms on both detectors
Atomic HOM dip

The exact overlap between the modes is scanned by tuning the time of implementation of the beam-splitter.

Visibility of the dip larger than 50%: cannot be explained by “ordinary” interferences between “classical” matter-waves: two atom interference effect, in the configuration space of tensor products of the two atoms: no image in ordinary space.
The HBT and HOM effects: from photons to atoms

1. Two “quantum mysteries”
2. The HBT effect with photons
3. Quantum Atom Optics with He*: HBT
4. The HOM effect with photons
5. HOM effect with atoms
6. Outlook
Summary and outlook

Unambiguous observation of the atomic HOM effect: interference of two-atom amplitudes, second quantum mystery

- Dip below 50% : no wave interpretation possible
- Non zero value of the dip: "slightly more" than one atom in each beam (direct evaluation on our data)

Other demonstrations of two atoms amplitudes interference:

- Atomic Hanbury Brown and Twiss effect (Palaiseau/Amsterdam, Canberra)
- Two-atom Rabi oscillation in tunnel-coupled optical tweezers (Boulder, C Regal, 2013)
- Condensed matter experiments (C Glattli, M Heiblum)
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What next ? A yet stronger evidence of entanglement, Bell test
## Quantum Optics milestones

### Light
- Interference (Young, Fresnel)
- Single photons (1974, 1985)
- Photon correlation: HBT (1955)
- $\chi^{(2)}$ photon pairs (1970's)
- Beyond SQL (squeezing, 1985)
- Bell inequalities tests: with radiative cascades (1972, 1982)
- HOM with $\chi^{(2)}$ pairs (1987)
- Bell inequalities tests with $\chi^{(2)}$ pairs (1989-1998-2015)

### Atoms
- Interference (1990)
- Atom correlations: HBT (2005)
- $\chi^{(3)}$ photon pairs (2007)
- Beyond SQL (squeezing, 2010)
- Bell inequalities tests with molecule dissociation?
- HOM with $\chi^{(3)}$ pairs (2014)
- Bell inequalities tests with $\chi^{(3)}$ pairs?
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A Bell inequalities test with entangled atom momenta

Our scheme (cf. Rarity - Tapster experiment with photons, 1990)

\[ |\Psi\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} (|p_3, p_4\rangle + |p'_3, p'_4\rangle) \]

Test of Bell's inequalities with mechanical observables of massive particles

Frontier between QM and gravity? (Decoherence due to quantum fluctuations?)
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