New perspectives on quantum simulation with Alkaline-earth atoms

Ana Maria Rey







Boulder Summer School, July 19-23 (2021)





- Brief overview of alkaline earth-atoms and atomic clocks
- Collisions and SU(N) Interactions
- Density shifts in spin polarized gases
- Probing SU(N) orbital magnetism
- Spin-Orbit Coupling

Alkaline Earth (-like) Atoms: AEA

A TALE OF TWIN ELECTRONS



Fermionic isotopes have nuclear spin I > 0.

Why?: Bosonic isotopes have nuclei with even number of protons and neutrons: I=0 Fermionic Isotopes have even number of protons and odd number of neutrons

Alkaline earth(-like) atoms Unique atomic structure

•Long lived metastable ${}^{3}P_{0}$ state: ${}^{3}P_{0}$ - ${}^{1}S_{0}$ is a dipole and spin forbidden transition with a **linewidth** ~ **mHz**. \Rightarrow **Spectral resolution**

Dipole ($J=0 \rightarrow J=0$) and Spin forbidden ($S=0 \rightarrow S=1$) transition





Alkaline earth(-like) atoms Unique atomic structure

•Long lived metastable ${}^{3}P_{0}$ state: ${}^{3}P_{0} - {}^{1}S_{0}$ is a dipole and spin forbidden transition with a **linewidth** ~ **mHz**. \Rightarrow **Spectral resolution**

• Total electronic angular momentum $J=0 \rightarrow Only$ nuclear spin I

Strontium: 87 Sr



Why alkaline-earth (like) atoms?

(Jun Ye : Presentation)

Strontium: ⁸⁷ Sr $(5s5p)^{1}P_{1}$ ${}^{1}P_{1}$ 461 nm ${}^{3}P_{0}(e)$ $(5s5p)^{3}P_{1}$ (~ 5 ns) 461 698 nm $\frac{1}{2} (5s5p)^{3}P_{0}$ (~150/s) 689 ${}^{1}S_{0}(g)$ 698 $(5s^2)^1S_0$

$${}^{3}P_{0} = {}^{3}P_{0}^{(0)} + a {}^{3}P_{1}^{(0)} + b {}^{3}P_{2}^{(0)} + c {}^{1}P_{1}^{(0)}$$

 $(5s5p)^{3}P_{2}$

Because Hyperfine Interactions $H = AI \cdot J$ Why? How about Strontium: ⁸⁸ Sr?

Why alkaline-earth (like) atoms?

(Jun Ye : Presentation)





Ramsey Spectroscopy





Detuning

See handwritten notes



N. Ramsey. Nobel prize 1989



g

δτ

Optical clocks

- Accuracy approaching 10⁻¹⁸
- Low stability: only single ion

Trapped ions: ¹⁹⁹Hq+ 27AI+ 40Ca+ 88Sr+ 171**Yb**+ NIST/JILA NPL PTB NRC SYRTE 87Sr 199**Hg** 171Yb 40Ca Cold atoms: List of labs not exhaustive Accuracy at 10⁻¹⁸

High stability: 10³⁻⁴ Many atoms

About 1000 times better than current cesium standard

Neither gain nor lose one second in some 15 billion years—roughly the age of the universe.



1D lattice clock: T~µK

What happens in the real experiment with many atoms? **No interaction:** All the spins precess collectively

Large collective spin: Better signal to noise



-00-00-00-00-00

$$\widehat{S}^{x,y,z} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i} \widehat{\sigma}_{i}^{x,y,z} \qquad S = N/2$$
$$\left\langle \widehat{S}^{z}(\tau) \right\rangle = \frac{N}{2} \sin \theta \cos(\delta \tau)$$

Requirement:

- ✓ All experience same Rabi frequency (Resource for spin-orbit coupling)
- ✓ All have same detunings: No Doppler& Stark Shifts: Deep Magic Lattice
 □ Atomic Collisions?



More atoms better signal to noise

Atomic collisions change the frequency. Packing more atoms makes the error worse

Interactions:



JILA:G. Campbell *et al* Science 324, 360 (09)

NIST: N. Lemke *et al* PRL 103,063001 (09)

Need to understand interactions

• Degraded signal: Even in identical fermionic atoms. In 2008 gave rise to the second largest uncertainty to the 10⁻¹⁶ error budget

Why alkaline-earth (like) atoms?



Basic Scattering in quantum mechanics



 $\mathbf{R}=(\mathbf{r}_1+\mathbf{r}_2)/2$ Center of Mass coordinate, M=2m, Total mass

Partial Wave Expansion

Angular momentum is quantized: $\ell = 0, 1, 2... s$ -, p-, waves, ...

There is only a phase shift at long range!!

Solve Schrödinger equation for each ℓ to get δ_{ℓ} , $C_{\ell,m}$

$$f(\theta) = \sum_{\ell} (2\ell + 1) P_{\ell}(\cos \theta) f_{\ell} \qquad f_{\ell} = \frac{(e^{2i\delta_{\ell}} - 1)}{2ik}$$

Low Energy Collisions

(1) At ultra-cold temperatures $k \rightarrow 0$ $\ell = 0$ collisions dominate!!

 $\frac{\delta_\ell}{k} \to A_\ell(A_\ell k)^{2\ell}$

 $A_0 = a$ "scattering length" Characterize s-wave collisions

 $A_1 = b^3$ "scattering volume" Characterize *p*-wave collisions

(2) Quantum statistics matter: Pauli Exclusion principle Identical bosons: even ℓ Identical fermions: odd ℓ





But Identical fermions

- \Rightarrow No low energy (l = 0)collisions:
- ⇒ Only (ℓ =1, p-wave): cost energy

I like Fermions

Pseudo-Potential



Once there was a farmer who was not happy with his milk farm and wanted to increase the milk production. He invited 3 people to check out what is going on!

The first one was a psychologist — who observed the farm and told the farmer to paint the walls green. So that cows will be happy and produce more milk.

The farmer thought — Huh if life was that easy!

So he invited another person — the Engineer — who observed the farm and said, the milking machine is not very effective. So I will design a new one for you.

The farmer thought — Can I get a better perspective!

Well, now he invited a physicist — who looked around the place and drew a spherical cow on the board saying — Let me consider a spherical cow in a vacuum, emanating milk uniformly in all directions!

The farmer now was totally confused!

Pseudo-Potential

- \bullet Two interaction potentials V and $V_{\scriptscriptstyle ps}$ are equivalent if they have the same scattering length
- So: after measuring *a*, *b* for the real system, we can model with a very simple potential.

$$\langle \mathbf{k} | V_{ps} | \mathbf{k}' \rangle = \frac{1}{L^3} \int d^3 \mathbf{r} \, \mathrm{e}^{-i\mathbf{k}\cdot\mathbf{r}} V_{ps}(\mathbf{r}) \mathrm{e}^{i\mathbf{k}'\cdot\mathbf{r}},$$
$$\langle \mathbf{k} | V_{ps} | \mathbf{k}' \rangle = \frac{4\pi\hbar^2}{L^3m} \sum_{\ell} (2\ell+1) A_{\ell}^{2\ell+1} k^{\ell} k'^{\ell} P_{\ell}(\hat{k}\cdot\hat{k}')$$

Note, it is suppressed at low energies

Huang and Yang, Phys. Rev. 105, 767 (1957) E. Fermi Ricerca Scientifica, 7: 13–52 (1936) Breit Phys. Rev. 71, 215 (1947), Blatt and Weisskopf Theoretical Nuclear Physics (Wiley, New York, 1952), pp. 74–75 Idziaszek PRA 79, 062701 (2009)

For *p*-wave collisions $\langle \mathbf{k} | \mathbf{V}_{ps}^{\ell=1} | \mathbf{k}' \rangle = \frac{12\pi\hbar^2}{L^3m} b^3 (\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{k}')$

For *s*-wave collisions $\langle \mathbf{k} | \mathbf{V}_{ps}^{\ell=0} | \mathbf{k}' \rangle = \frac{4\pi\hbar^2}{L^3m}a$

See uploaded by Anjun Chu notes for details

Alkaline-earth Collisions

See handwritten notes

Alkaline-earth Collisions



Electrons independent of nuclear spin \rightarrow collisions independent of nuclear spin. (except via Fermi statistics).

See handwritten notes

M. Cazalilla and A. M Rey Reports on Progress in Physics 77, 124401 (2014)

Alkaline-earth Collisions



Electrons independent of nuclear spin \rightarrow collisions independent of nuclear spin. (except via Fermi statistics).

SU(N=2I+1) symmetry:



Nuclear spin independent scattering parameters

No spin changing collisions.

M. Cazalilla and A. M Rey Reports on Progress in Physics 77, 124401 (2014)

SU(N) interaction parameters



Many-body Hamiltonian: Spin polarized system

Many-body Hamiltonian

Rey *et al* Annals of Physics 340, 311(2014)

$$\hat{\Psi}_{\alpha}(\mathbf{R}) = \phi_{0}^{Z}(Z) \sum_{\mathbf{n}} \hat{c}_{\alpha\mathbf{n}} \phi_{n_{X}}(X) \phi_{n_{Y}}(Y), \quad \phi_{n}(x) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n} n!}} \cdot \left(\frac{m\omega}{\pi\hbar}\right)^{1/4} \cdot e^{-\frac{m\omega x^{2}}{2\hbar}} \cdot H_{n}\left(\sqrt{\frac{m\omega}{\hbar}}x\right)^{1/4}$$
$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\alpha,\beta,\mathbf{n},\mathbf{n}',\mathbf{n}'',\mathbf{n}'''} \frac{\hbar}{4} \left(v^{\alpha,\beta} P_{\mathbf{n}\mathbf{n}'\mathbf{n}''}\right) \hat{c}_{\alpha\mathbf{n}}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\beta\mathbf{n}'}^{\dagger} \hat{c}_{\beta\mathbf{n}''} \hat{c}_{\alpha\mathbf{n}'''}, \qquad v^{\alpha,\beta} = \frac{6}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \sqrt{\omega_{Z} \omega_{R}} \frac{b_{\alpha,\beta}^{3}}{a_{ho}^{R}}.$$

$$\begin{split} P_{\mathbf{nn'n'''n'''}} &= s(n_X, n'_X, n''_X, n'''_X) p(n_Y, n'_Y, n''_Y, n'''_Y) + p(n_X, n'_X, n''_X, n'''_X) s(n_Y, n'_Y, n''_Y, n'''_Y), \\ s(n, n', n'', n''') &= \frac{\int d\xi e^{-2\xi^2} H_n(\xi) H_{n'}(\xi) H_{n''}(\xi) H_{n''}(\xi) d\xi}{\pi \sqrt{2^{n+n'+n''+n'''} n! n'! n''! n'''!}}, \\ p(n, n', n'', n''') &= \frac{\int d\xi e^{-2\xi^2} \left[\left(\frac{d}{d\xi} H_n(\xi) \right) H_{n'}(\xi) - H_n(\xi) \left(\frac{d}{d\xi} H_{n'}(\xi) \right) \right] \left[\left(\frac{d}{d\xi} H_{n''}(\xi) \right) H_{n''}(\xi) - H_{n''}(\xi) \left(\frac{d}{d\xi} H_{n''}(\xi) \right) \right]}{\pi \sqrt{2^{n+n'+n''+n'''} n! n'! n''! n'''!}} \end{split}$$



Hamiltonian can be reduced to a Spin model with long range couplings

Two spin polarized atoms - two modes

$$\begin{aligned} \begin{array}{l} \text{Singlet State} \\ \text{Interaction} \\ \left| s \right\rangle &= \frac{\left| \bullet \bullet \right\rangle^{-} \left| \bullet \bullet \right\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\left| n_{1} n_{2} \right\rangle + \left| n_{2} n_{1} \right\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \end{array} \\ \hline \text{Triplet States} \\ \left| t^{+} \right\rangle &= \left| \bullet \bullet \right\rangle \frac{\left| n_{1} n_{2} \right\rangle - \left| n_{2} n_{1} \right\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \left| t^{-} \right\rangle &= \left| \bullet \bullet \right\rangle \frac{\left| n_{1} n_{2} \right\rangle - \left| n_{2} n_{1} \right\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \left| t^{0} \right\rangle &= \left| \frac{\bullet \bullet \right\rangle + \left| \bullet \bullet \right\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\left| n_{1} n_{2} \right\rangle - \left| n_{2} n_{1} \right\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \left| t^{0} \right\rangle &= \left| \frac{\bullet \bullet \right\rangle + \left| \bullet \bullet \right\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \frac{\left| n_{1} n_{2} \right\rangle - \left| n_{2} n_{1} \right\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \hline \\ H_{s+P} &= \begin{pmatrix} \delta + V_{gg} & 0 & \overline{\Omega} / \sqrt{2} & 0 \\ 0 & -\delta + V_{ee} & \overline{\Omega} / \sqrt{2} & 0 \\ \overline{\Omega} / \sqrt{2} & \overline{\Omega} / \sqrt{2} & + V_{eg} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & U_{eg} \end{pmatrix} \\ \begin{array}{c} \text{Wh} \\ \text{Rey et} \end{cases} \end{aligned}$$



Only p-wave interactions relevant. No coupling to singlet

What happens if $\Omega_1 \neq \Omega_2$?

Rey et al PRL (2009), Gibble PRL (2009), Yu et al PRL (2010)

<u>Two atom - two modes</u>



Understanding collisions in the clock

Atoms as a quantum magnet: frozen in energy space

M. Martin et al, Science 341, 632 (2013), Rey et al Annals of Physics 340, 311(2014)

$$\widehat{H} \approx -\delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}^{z} + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[J_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{\perp} (\vec{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}} \cdot \vec{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}) + \chi_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}^{z} \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}) + \frac{K_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{4} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j}} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}) + \frac{K_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{4} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j}} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}) + \frac{K_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{4} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j}} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}) + \frac{K_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{4} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j}} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}) + \frac{K_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{4} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j}} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j'},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j'},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j'},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'},\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j'},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'},\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j'},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'},\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j'},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'},\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'},\mathbf{n}_{j'}} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} I_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j$$

Delocalized modes: Long range interactions

 $J_{\mathbf{n}_{i},\mathbf{n}_{i'}}^{\perp} = \frac{V_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{eg} - U_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{eg}}{2},$ $\chi_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}} = \frac{V_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{ee} + V_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{gg} - 2V_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{eg}}{2},$ $C_{\mathbf{n}_j,\mathbf{n}_{j'}} = \frac{(V_{\mathbf{n}_j,\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{ee} - V_{\mathbf{n}_j,\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{gg})}{2}$ $K_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}} = \frac{(V_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{ee} + V_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{gg} + V_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{eg} + U_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{eg})}{2}.$

Many-body Hamiltonian



Understanding collisions in the clock Atoms as a quantum magnet: frozen in energy space

M. Martin et al, Science 341, 632 (2013), Rey et al Annals of Physics 340, 311(2014)

$$\widehat{H} \approx -\delta \sum_{j=1}^{N} \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}^{z} + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\chi_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}} \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}^{z} \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j'}}^{z} \right] + \sum_{j \neq j'}^{N} \left[\frac{C_{\mathbf{n}_{j},\mathbf{n}_{j'}}}{2} (\widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}^{z} + \widehat{S}_{\mathbf{n}_{j}}^{z}) \right]$$

Delocalized modes: Long range interactions

Collective spin model

$$\widehat{H} \approx -\delta \widehat{S}^{z} + \overline{\chi} (\widehat{S}^{z})^{2} + \overline{C} N \widehat{S}^{z}$$

 $\overline{\chi}$ and \overline{C} : Mean P-wave Interaction parameters

$$\hat{S}^{\alpha} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \hat{S}^{\alpha}_{n_j} \qquad \qquad \overline{C} = (\overline{V}^+_{ee} - \overline{V}^+_{gg})/2$$
$$\overline{\chi} = (\overline{V}^+_{ee} - 2\overline{V}^+_{eg} + \overline{V}^+_{gg})/2$$



Treat other surrounding atoms as an average $-\delta \hat{S}^{z} + \overline{\chi} (\hat{S}^{z})^{2} + \overline{C} N \hat{S}^{z} \rightarrow -\delta \hat{S}^{z} + 2\overline{\chi} \langle \hat{S}^{z} \rangle \hat{S}^{z} + \overline{C} N \hat{S}^{z}$



Density Shift $\delta \to \delta - 2\bar{\chi}\langle \hat{S}^z \rangle + \bar{C} N$

Spin precesses at a rate that depends on atom number and excitation fraction

Controlled by pulse area θ

P-wave interactions: 1D lattice clock

M. Martin et al, Science 341, 632 (2013), Rey et al Annals of Physics 340, 311(2014)

Theory vs experiment



$$\langle \widehat{S}^{-}(\tau) \rangle = \left[\langle \widehat{S}^{-}(\tau) \rangle \right] e^{-i(\delta + \Delta \delta)\tau}$$

Contrast Phase

$$\Delta\delta \sim N \left(\overline{C} - \overline{\chi} \cos\theta\right)$$

- Determine p-wave interaction parameters
- Operate sweet spot: no density shift

In Yb: Lemke et al PRL 107, 103902 (2011) Ludlow et al, Phys. Rev. A 84, 052724 (2011)

Quantum correlations – beyond mean field

M. Martin et al, Science 341, 632 (2013), Rey et al Annals of Physics 340, 311(2014)

$$\langle \widehat{S}^{-}(\tau) \rangle = \left[\langle \widehat{S}^{-}(\tau) \rangle \right] e^{-i(\delta + \Delta \delta)\tau}$$

Contrast Phase

• At the mean field level interaction only affect the precession rate.

But.... in the experiments there are many pancakes with different atom number.

Mean-field interactions causes the pancakes with more atoms to precess faster.



Signal adds \rightarrow contrast decay due to dephasing

• Atom number decay also leads to decay of the amplitude

Comparisons with experiment

M. Martin *et al*, Science **341**, 632 (2013)

Ramsey fringe decay vs. the spin tipping angle

To eliminate the effect of decay we normalize the amplitude $2\pi/3$ with atom number $\pi/2$

Symbols: Exp data lines: mean field





Quantum correlations – beyond mean field

M. Martin et al, Science 341, 632 (2013), Rey et al Annals of Physics 340, 311(2014)

Contrast: $\sqrt{\langle S^x \rangle^2 + \langle S^y \rangle^2}$

Quantum correlations induce faster decay of the amplitude

We can solve for the full many body solution using the Truncated Wigner Approximation: Average over random initial conditions that account for quantum noise distribution



See: Polkovnikov Annals of Physics 325,1790 (2010), J. Schachenmayer et al PRX 5, 011022 (2015)

Why alkaline-earth (like) atoms?





P-wave Many body Hamiltonain

$$\begin{split} H_{p} &= \frac{3\pi\hbar^{2}b_{gg}^{3}}{2M}\sum_{mm'}\int \mathrm{d}^{3}\mathbf{r} \left[(\nabla\psi_{gm}^{\dagger})\psi_{gm'}^{\dagger} - \psi_{gm}^{\dagger}(\nabla\psi_{gm'}^{\dagger}) \right] \cdot \left[\psi_{gm'}(\nabla\psi_{gm}) - (\nabla\psi_{gm'})\psi_{gm} \right] \\ &+ \frac{3\pi\hbar^{2}b_{ee}^{3}}{2M}\sum_{mm'}\int \mathrm{d}^{3}\mathbf{r} \left[(\nabla\psi_{em}^{\dagger})\psi_{em'}^{\dagger} - \psi_{em}^{\dagger}(\nabla\psi_{em'}^{\dagger}) \right] \cdot \left[\psi_{em'}(\nabla\psi_{em}) - (\nabla\psi_{em'})\psi_{em} \right] \\ &+ \frac{3\pi\hbar^{2}[(b_{eg}^{+})^{3} + (b_{eg}^{-})^{3}]}{2M}\sum_{mm'}\int \mathrm{d}^{3}\mathbf{r} \left[(\nabla\psi_{gm}^{\dagger})\psi_{em'}^{\dagger} - \psi_{gm}^{\dagger}(\nabla\psi_{em'}^{\dagger}) \right] \cdot \left[\psi_{em'}(\nabla\psi_{gm}) - (\nabla\psi_{em'})\psi_{gm} \right] \\ &+ \frac{3\pi\hbar^{2}[(b_{eg}^{+})^{3} - (b_{eg}^{-})^{3}]}{2M}\sum_{mm'}\int \mathrm{d}^{3}\mathbf{r} \left[(\nabla\psi_{gm}^{\dagger})\psi_{em'}^{\dagger} - \psi_{gm}^{\dagger}(\nabla\psi_{em'}^{\dagger}) \right] \cdot \left[\psi_{em}(\nabla\psi_{gm}) - (\nabla\psi_{em})\psi_{gm'} \right] . \end{split}$$

Probing Exchange Interactions: Two ¹⁷³ Yb Atoms

G. Cappellini et al PRL 113, 120402 (2014) && F. Scazza et al Nature Physics 10, pages 779 (2014)



Exchange $V_{ex} = \frac{U_{eg}^+ - U_{eg}^-}{2}$

Probing Exchange Interactions: Two ¹⁷³ Yb Atoms

G. Cappellini et al PRL 113, 120402 (2014) && F. Scazza et al Nature Physics 10, pages 779 (2014)





Density shifts and SU(N) symmetry

Zhang et al Science, 345,1467 (2014)



• SU(N): density shift only depends on the total number of spectators not on its distribution

 $\Delta v = \Delta v + \Delta v$ Interrogated atoms p-wave shift Spectators generate a density shift $\Delta v^{I} \sim \mathcal{N}_{I} \left(\overline{C} - \cos \theta \ \overline{\chi} \right)$

$$\Delta v^{S} = \overline{\Lambda} \mathcal{N}_{S}$$

$$\downarrow$$
Both *s* and *p*-wave contributions



Determination of scattering parameters

Use: Relation between p and s-wave through Van-der-Waals coefficient Z. Idziaszek, P. S. Julienne, Phys. Rev. Lett. 104, 113202 (2010).

Channel	S-wave(ao)	P-wave(ao)	Determination
			[S-wave] Two-photon photo-
gg	96.2(1)	74(2)	associative
			[P-wave] Analytic relation
			[S-wave] Analytic relation
eg+	169(8)	-169(23)	[P-wave] Density shift in a
			polarized sample
eg			[S-wave] Density shift in a spin
	68(22)	$-42\substack{+103 \\ -22}$	mixture at different
			temperatures [P-wave]
			Analytic relation
			[S-wave] Analytic relation
	176(11)	-119(18)	[P-wave] Density shift in a
(elastic)			polarized sample
ee inelastic)	$\widetilde{a}_{ee} =$ 46(19)	$\widetilde{b}_{ee} =$ 125(15)	Two-body loss measurement

$$\frac{A_{\eta}}{\bar{a}} = 1 + \left(\frac{B_{\eta}}{\bar{a}}\right)^3 \left[\left(\frac{B_{\eta}}{\bar{a}}\right)^3 + 2.128\right]^{-1}$$

$$\bar{a} = \frac{2\pi}{\Gamma\left(\frac{1}{4}\right)^2} \left(\frac{2\mu C_6}{\hbar^2}\right)^{1/4}, \, \Gamma\left(\frac{1}{4}\right) \approx 3.626$$



www.idigitaltimes.com/big-bang-theory-season-8-premiere-spoilers-will-sheldons-spin-symmetry-theory-paper-pass-peer-review

I 🗍 Getting Started



According to scientists working on the big bang theory it all began with Sheldon's participation in a <u>JILA research</u> team hoping to confirm via direct observation the <u>spin symmetry theory</u> in quantum physics. Sheldon, used to working in the theoretical realm, found his colleagues alienating, like Penny in Seasons 1 through 3 of "The Big Bang Theory." However, under the tutelage of <u>Ana Maria Rey</u> and <u>Jun Ye</u>, Sheldon has learned how best to unify the two fields, resulting in their remarkable new findings.

g+