



ELSEVIER

1 July 2001

OPTICS  
COMMUNICATIONS

Optics Communications 194 (2001) 167–173

www.elsevier.com/locate/optcom

# Quantum effects in the collective light scattering by coherent atomic recoil in a Bose–Einstein condensate

N. Piovella <sup>\*</sup>, M. Gatelli, R. Bonifacio

*Dipartimento di Fisica, Università Degli Studi di Milano, INFN & INFM, Sezione di Milano, Via Celoria 16, Milano I-20133, Italy*

Received 15 March 2001; accepted 14 May 2001

## Abstract

We extend the semiclassical model of the collective atomic recoil laser (CARL) to include the quantum mechanical description of the center-of-mass motion of the atoms in a Bose–Einstein condensate (BEC). We show that when the average atomic momentum is less than the recoil momentum  $\hbar\vec{q}$ , the CARL equations reduce to the Maxwell–Bloch equations for two momentum levels. In the conservative regime (no radiation losses), the quantum model depends on a single collective parameter,  $\rho$ , that can be interpreted as the average number of photons scattered per atom in the classical limit. When  $\rho \gg 1$ , the semiclassical CARL regime is recovered, with many momentum levels populated at saturation. On the contrary, when  $\rho \leq 1$ , the average momentum oscillates between zero and  $\hbar\vec{q}$ , and a periodic train of  $2\pi$  hyperbolic secant pulses is emitted. In the dissipative regime (large radiation losses) and in a suitable quantum limit, a sequential superfluorescence scattering occurs, in which after each process atoms emit a  $\pi$  hyperbolic secant pulse and populate a lower momentum state. These results describe the regular arrangement of the momentum pattern observed in recent experiments of superradiant Rayleigh scattering from a BEC. © 2001 Elsevier Science B.V. All rights reserved.

PACS: 42.50.Fx; 42.50.Vk; 03.75.Fi

Keywords: CARL; BEC; Atom laser

With the realization of Bose–Einstein condensation (BEC) in dilute alkali gases [1], it is now possible to study the coherent interaction between light and an ensemble of atoms prepared in a single quantum state. For example, Bragg diffraction [2] of a BEC by a moving optical standing wave can be used to diffract any fraction of a BEC into a selectable momentum state, realizing an atomic beam splitter. Among the multitude of experiments studying the behavior of a BEC under

the action of external laser beams, only a small number have been devoted to the active role caused by the atoms in the condensate on the radiation. In particular, collective light scattering and matter–wave amplification caused by coherent center-of-mass motion of atoms in a condensate illuminated by a far off-resonant laser were recently observed [3–5]. These experiments have been interpreted in Ref. [3] as superradiant Rayleigh scattering, and successively investigated in Refs. [6,7] using a quantum theory based on a quantum multi-mode extension of the collective atomic recoil laser (CARL) Hamiltonian model originally derived by Bonifacio et al. [8–11]. In

<sup>\*</sup> Corresponding author. Fax: +39-2-2392-208.

E-mail address: nicola.piovella@mi.infn.it (N. Piovella).

particular, the original semiclassical CARL model was extended in Refs. [12,13] to include a quantum mechanical description of the center-of-mass motion of the atoms in the condensate. Whereas the analysis of Refs. [12,13] is limited to the study of the onset of the collective instability starting from quantum fluctuations, some nonlinear effects due to momentum population depletion were discussed in Refs. [6,7].

Recently, we have shown [14] that the superradiant Rayleigh scattering from a BEC can be satisfactorily interpreted in terms of the CARL mechanism using a semiclassical model in the ‘mean-field’ approximation [15,16], in which the rapid escape of the radiation from the condensate is modeled by a decay of the field amplitude at the rate  $\kappa_c = c/2L$ , where  $L$  is the sample length. The main drawback of the semiclassical model is that, as it considers the center-of-mass motion of the atoms as classical, it cannot describe the discreteness of the recoil velocity, as has been observed in the experiment of Ref. [3].

The aim of this work is to extend the semiclassical CARL model to include the quantum mechanical description of the center-of-mass motion of a sample of cold atoms. The quantum model that we obtain is equivalent to that derived by Moore and Meystre [12] using second quantization techniques. However, whereas the work of Ref. [12] is focused on the linear regime and on the startup of the instability, we study the full nonlinear regime and the quantum and classical limits of the model. Our basic result is that the atomic motion is quantized when the average recoil momentum is comparable to  $\hbar\vec{q}$  (where  $\vec{q} = \vec{k}_2 - \vec{k}_1$  is the difference between the incident and the scattered wave vectors), i.e. the recoil momentum gained by the atom trading a photon via absorption and stimulated emission between the incident and scattered waves. In this limit, the quantum CARL equations reduce to the Maxwell–Bloch equations for two momentum levels [17]. In the ‘conservative’ (or ‘Hamiltonian’) regime, in which the radiation losses are negligible, this occurs for  $\rho < 1$ , where the CARL parameter  $\rho$  represents the average number of photons scattered per atom in the classical limit. In the superradiant regime, for  $\kappa > 1$  (where  $\kappa = \kappa_c/\omega_r\rho$ ,  $\kappa_c$  is the radiation

loss,  $\omega_r\rho$  is the collective recoil bandwidth,  $\omega_r = \hbar|\vec{q}|^2/2M$  is the recoil frequency and  $M$  is the atomic mass), the atomic motion becomes quantized for  $\rho < \sqrt{2\kappa}$ . In this limit, we demonstrate that a sequential superfluorescence (SF) scattering occurs, in which, during each process, the atoms emit a  $\pi$  hyperbolic secant pulse and populate a lower momentum level, as it has been observed in the MIT experiment [3].

Our starting point is the classical model of equations for  $N$  two-level atoms exposed to an off-resonant pump laser, whose electric field  $\vec{E}_0 = \hat{e}\mathcal{E}_0 \cos(\vec{k}_2 \cdot \vec{x} - \omega_2 t)$  is polarized along  $\hat{e}$ , propagates along the direction of  $\vec{k}_2$  and has a frequency  $\omega_2 = ck_2$  with a detuning from the atomic resonance,  $\Delta_{20} = \omega_2 - \omega_0$ , much larger than the natural line width of the atomic transition,  $\gamma$ . We assume the presence of a scattered field (‘probe beam’) with frequency  $\omega_1 = \omega_2 - \Delta_{21}$ , wave number  $\vec{k}_1$  making an angle  $\phi$  with  $\vec{k}_2$  and electric field  $\vec{E} = (\hat{e}/2)[\mathcal{E}(t)e^{i(\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{x} - \omega_1 t)} + \text{c.c.}]$  with the same polarization of the pump field. In the absence of an injected probe field, the emission starts from fluctuations and the propagation direction of the scattered field is determined either by the geometry of the condensate (as in the case of the MIT experiment [3], where the condensate has a cigar shape) or by the presence of an optical resonator tuned on a selected longitudinal mode. By adiabatically eliminating the internal atomic degree of freedom, the following semiclassical CARL equations has been derived [8–10]:

$$\frac{d\theta_j}{d\tau} = \bar{p}_j, \quad (1)$$

$$\frac{d\bar{p}_j}{d\tau} = -[\tilde{A}e^{i\theta_j} + \text{c.c.}], \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{d\tilde{A}}{d\tau} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N e^{-i\theta_j} + i\delta\tilde{A}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\tau = \rho\omega_r t$  is the interaction time in units of  $\omega_r\rho$ ,  $\theta_j = (\vec{k}_1 - \vec{k}_2) \cdot \vec{x}_j = qz_j$  and  $\bar{p}_j = qv_{zj}/\rho\omega_r$  (where  $q = |\vec{q}|$ ) are the dimensionless position and velocity of the  $j$ th atom along the axis  $\hat{z}$ ,  $\tilde{A} = -i(\epsilon_0/n_s\hbar\omega\rho)^{1/2}\mathcal{E}(\tau)e^{i\delta\tau}$ ,  $\delta = \Delta_{21}/\omega_r\rho$  and  $\rho = (\Omega_0/2\Delta_{20})^{2/3}(\omega\mu^2 n_s/\hbar\epsilon_0\omega_r^2)^{1/3}$  is the collective

CARL parameter.  $\Omega_0 = \mu \mathcal{E}_0 / \hbar$  is the Rabi frequency of the pump,  $n_s = N/V$  is the average atomic density of the sample (containing  $N$  atoms in a volume  $V$ ) and  $\mu$  is the dipole matrix element. We assume  $\omega_2 \approx \omega_1 = ck$ , so that  $q \approx 2k \sin(\phi/2)$ . Eqs. (1)–(3) are formally equivalent to those of the free electron laser model [18]. In order to quantize both the radiation field and the center-of-mass motion of the atoms, we consider  $\theta_j$ ,  $p_j = (\rho/2)\bar{p}_j = Mv_{zj}/\hbar q$  and  $a = (N\rho/2)^{1/2}\tilde{A}$  as quantum operators satisfying the canonical commutation relations  $[\theta_j, p_j] = i\delta_{jj}$  and  $[a, a^\dagger] = 1$ . With these definitions, Eqs. (1)–(3) are the Heisenberg equations of motion associated with the Hamiltonian:

$$H = \frac{1}{\rho} \sum_{j=1}^N p_j^2 + ig \left( \sum_{j=1}^N a^\dagger e^{-i\theta_j} - \text{h.c.} \right) - \delta a^\dagger \tilde{a} = \sum_{j=1}^N H_j(\theta_j, p_j), \tag{4}$$

where  $g = \sqrt{\rho/2N}$ . We note that  $[H, Q] = 0$ , where  $Q = a^\dagger a + \sum_{j=1}^N p_j$  is the total momentum in units of  $\hbar q$ . In order to obtain a simplified description of a BEC as a system of  $N$  noninteracting atoms in the ground state, we use the Schrödinger picture for the atoms (instead of the usual Heisenberg picture [19]), i.e.  $|\psi(\theta_1, \dots, \theta_N)\rangle = |\psi(\theta_1)\rangle \cdots |\psi(\theta_N)\rangle$ , where  $|\psi(\theta_j)\rangle$  obeys the single-particle Schrödinger equation,  $i(\partial/\partial\tau)|\psi(\theta_j)\rangle = H_j(\theta_j, p_j)|\psi(\theta_j)\rangle$ . In this paper we describe the light field classically. Hence, considering the field operator  $a$  as a  $c$ -number, Eq. (3) yields:

$$\frac{da}{d\tau} = i\delta a + g \sum_{j=1}^N \langle \psi(\theta_j) | e^{-i\theta_j} | \psi(\theta_j) \rangle. \tag{5}$$

Let us now expand the single-atom wave function on the momentum basis,  $|\psi(\theta_j)\rangle = \sum_n c_j(n) |n\rangle_j$ , where  $p_j |n\rangle_j = n |n\rangle_j$ ,  $n = -\infty, \dots, \infty$  and  $c_j(n)$  is the probability amplitude of the  $j$ th atom having momentum  $-n\hbar\tilde{q}$ . This description of the atomic motion in a BEC assumes that the atoms are unlocalized inside a condensate of dimension  $W$  and that the temperature is so small that the momentum uncertainty  $\sigma_p \approx \hbar/\sigma_x$  can be neglected if  $\sigma_x \approx W$ . Introducing the collective density matrix:

$$S_{m,n} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N c_j(m)^* c_j(n) e^{i(m-n)\delta\tau}, \tag{6}$$

a straightforward calculation yields, from Eqs. (4) and (5), the following closed set of equations:

$$\frac{dS_{m,n}}{d\tau} = i(m-n)\delta_{m,n}S_{m,n} + \frac{\rho}{2} [A(S_{m+1,n} - S_{m,n-1}) + A^*(S_{m,n+1} - S_{m-1,n})], \tag{7}$$

$$\frac{dA}{d\tau} = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} S_{n,n+1} - \kappa A, \tag{8}$$

where  $\delta_{m,n} = \delta + (m+n)/\rho$  and we have redefined the field as  $A = \sqrt{2/\rho N} a e^{-i\delta\tau}$ . We have also introduced a damping term  $-\kappa A$  in the field equation, where  $\kappa = \kappa_c/\omega_r \rho$ ,  $\kappa_c = c/2L$  and  $L$  is the sample length along the probe propagation, which provides an approximated model describing the escape of photons from the atomic medium. In the presence of a ring cavity of length  $L_{\text{cav}}$  and reflectivity  $R$ ,  $\kappa_c = -(c/L_{\text{cav}}) \ln R$ , as shown in the usual ‘mean-field’ approximation [11]. Eqs. (7) and (8) are completely equivalent to the CARL equations (1)–(3) and determine the temporal evolution of the density matrix elements for the momentum levels. In particular,  $p_n = S_{n,n}$  is the probability of finding the atom in momentum level  $|n\rangle$ ,  $\langle p \rangle = \sum_n n S_{n,n}$  is the average momentum and  $\sum_n S_{n,n+1}$  is the bunching parameter. Eqs. (7) and (8) are identical to these derived by Moore and coworkers [12] second quantizing the single-particle Hamiltonian  $H_j$  and introducing Bosonic creation and annihilation operators of a given center-of-mass momentum. For a constant field  $A$ , Eq. (7) describes a Bragg scattering process, in which  $m-n$  photons are absorbed from the pump and scattered into the probe, changing the initial and final momentum states of the atom from  $m$  to  $n$ . Conservation of energy and momentum require that during this process  $\omega_1 - \omega_2 = (m+n)\omega_r$ , i.e.  $\delta_{m,n} = 0$ . Eqs. (7) and (8) conserve the norm, i.e.  $\sum_m S_{m,m} = 1$ , and, when  $\kappa = 0$ , also the total momentum  $Q = (\rho/2)|A|^2 + \langle p \rangle$ . Fig. 1a shows  $|A|^2$  vs.  $\tau$ , for  $\kappa = 0$ ,  $\delta = 0$  and  $A(0) = 10^{-4}$ , comparing the semiclassical solution with the quantum solution in the classical limit,  $\rho \gg 1$ : the dashed line is the numerical solution of Eqs. (1)–(3), for a




Fig. 1. Classical limit of CARL for  $\rho \gg 1$  in the case  $\kappa = 0$ : (a)  $|A|^2$  vs.  $\tau$  as obtained from the classical equations (1)–(3) (---) and from the quantum equations (7) and (8) for  $\rho = 10$  (—); (b) population level  $p_n$  vs.  $n$  at the occurring of the first maximum of  $|A|^2$ , at  $\tau = 12.4$ . The other parameters are  $\delta = 0$  and  $A(0) = 10^{-4}$ .

classical system of  $N = 200$  cold atoms, with initial momentum  $p_j(0) = 0$  (where  $j = 1, \dots, N$ ) and phase  $\theta_j(0)$  uniformly distributed over  $2\pi$ , i.e. unbunched; the continuous line is the numerical solution of Eqs. (7) and (8) for  $\rho = 10$  and a quantum system of atoms initially in the ground state  $n = 0$ , i.e. with  $S_{n,m} = \delta_{n0}\delta_{m0}$ . Fig. 1a shows that the quantum system behaves, with good approximation, classically. Because from Fig. 1a the maximum dimensionless intensity is  $|A|^2 \approx 1.4$ , the constant of motion  $Q$  gives  $\langle p \rangle \approx -0.7\rho$  and the maximum average number of emitted photons is about  $\langle a^\dagger a \rangle \sim N\rho$ . Hence, the CARL parameter  $\rho$  can be interpreted as the maximum average number of photons emitted per atom (or equiva-

lently, as the maximum average momentum recoil, in units of  $\hbar q$ , acquired by the atom) in the classical limit. Fig. 1b shows the distribution of the population level  $p_n$  at the first peak of the intensity of Fig. 1a, for  $\tau = 12.4$ . We observe that, at saturation, 25 momentum levels are occupied, with an induced momentum spread comparable to the average momentum.

Let us now consider the equilibrium state with no probe field,  $A = 0$ , and all the atoms in the same momentum state  $n$ , i.e. with  $S_{n,n} = 1$  and the other matrix elements zero. This is equivalent to assume the temperature of the system equal to zero and all the atoms moving with the same velocity  $-n\hbar q$ , without spread. This equilibrium state is unstable for certain values of the detuning. In fact, by linearizing Eqs. (7) and (8) around the equilibrium state, the only matrix elements giving linear contributions are  $S_{n-1,n}$  and  $S_{n,n+1}$ , showing that in the linear regime the only transitions allowed from the state  $n$  are these towards the levels  $n - 1$  and  $n + 1$ . Introducing the new variables  $B_n = S_{n,n+1} + S_{n-1,n}$  and  $P_n = S_{n,n+1} - S_{n-1,n}$ , Eqs. (7) and (8) reduce to the linearized equations:

$$\frac{dB_n}{d\tau} = -i\delta_n B_n - \frac{i}{\rho} P_n, \quad (9)$$

$$\frac{dP_n}{d\tau} = -i\delta_n P_n - \frac{i}{\rho} B_n - \rho A, \quad (10)$$

$$\frac{dA}{d\tau} = B_n - \kappa A, \quad (11)$$

where  $\delta_n = \delta + 2n/\rho$ . Seeking solutions proportional to  $e^{i(\lambda - \delta_n)\tau}$ , we obtain the following cubic dispersion relation:

$$(\lambda - \delta_n - i\kappa)(\lambda^2 - 1/\rho^2) + 1 = 0. \quad (12)$$

In the exponential regime, when the unstable (complex) root  $\lambda$  dominates,  $B(\tau) \sim e^{i(\lambda - \delta_n)\tau}$  and, from Eq. (9),  $P_n \approx -\rho\lambda B_n$ . The semiclassical limit is recovered for  $\rho \gg 1$  (when  $\kappa = 0$ ) or  $\rho \gg \sqrt{\kappa}$  (when  $\kappa > 1$ ) and  $\delta_n \approx \delta$ , i.e. neglecting the shift due to the recoil frequency  $\omega_r$ . In this limit, maximum gain occurs for  $\delta = 0$ , with  $\lambda = (1 - i\sqrt{3})/2$  when  $\kappa = 0$  or  $\lambda = -(1 + i)/\sqrt{2\kappa}$  when  $\kappa > 1$ . Furthermore,  $|S_{n,n+1}| \sim |S_{n-1,n}|$ , so that the atoms may experience both emission and absorption.

This result can be interpreted in terms of single-photon emission and absorption by an atom with initial momentum  $-n\hbar\vec{q}$ . In fact, energy and momentum conservation impose  $\omega_1 - \omega_2 = (2n \mp 1)\omega_r$  (i.e.  $\delta_n = \pm 1/\rho$ ) when a probe photon is emitted or absorbed, respectively. In the semiclassical limit, the gain bandwidths are  $\Delta\omega \sim \omega_r\rho \gg \omega_r$  when  $\kappa = 0$  and  $\Delta\omega \sim \kappa_c \gg \omega_r$  when  $\kappa > 1$ , and the atoms may both emit or absorb a probe photon. On the contrary, in the quantum limit the recoil energy  $\hbar\omega_r$  cannot be neglected, and there is emission without absorption if  $|S_{n,n+1}| \ll |S_{n-1,n}|$ , i.e.  $B_n \approx -P_n$  and  $\lambda \approx 1/\rho$ . This is true for  $\rho < 1$  when  $\kappa = 0$ , with the unstable root  $\lambda \approx 1/\rho + \delta'_n/2 - (1/2)\sqrt{\delta_n'^2 - 2\rho}$  (where  $\delta'_n = \delta_n - 1/\rho$ ), and for  $\rho < \sqrt{2\kappa}$  when  $\kappa > 1$ , with  $\text{Re}\lambda \approx 1/\rho + (\rho\delta'_n/2)/(\delta_n'^2 + \kappa^2)$  and  $\text{Im}\lambda \approx -(\rho\kappa/2)/(\delta_n'^2 + \kappa^2)$ . In both cases, maximum gain occurs for  $\delta_n = 1/\rho$  (i.e.  $A_{21} = (1 - 2n)\omega_r$ ), within a gain bandwidth of  $\Delta\omega \sim \omega_r\rho^{3/2}$  for  $\kappa = 0$  and  $\Delta\omega \sim \kappa_c$  for  $\kappa > 1$ . Hence, in the quantum limits  $\rho < 1$  for  $\kappa = 0$  and  $\rho < \sqrt{2\kappa}$  for  $\kappa > 1$ ,  $\lambda \approx 1/\rho$  and the gain is due exclusively to emission of photons, whereas in the semiclassical limit gain results from the positive difference between the emission and absorption average rates. When  $\kappa = 0$ , the resonant gain in the limit  $\rho < 1$  is  $G_S = \omega_r\rho\sqrt{2\rho} = \sqrt{3/2\pi}(\Omega_0/2A_{20})\gamma\sqrt{N_{\text{eff}}}$ , where  $\gamma = \mu^2k^3/3\pi\hbar\epsilon_0$  is the natural decay rate of the atomic transition and  $N_{\text{eff}} = (\lambda^2/A)(c/\gamma L)N$  is the effective atomic number in the volume  $V = AL$ , where  $A$  and  $L$  are the cross-section and the length of the sample. When  $\kappa > 1$ , the resonant SF gain in the limit  $\rho < \sqrt{2\kappa}$  is  $G_{\text{SF}} = \omega_r\rho^2/\kappa = G_S^2/2\kappa_c = (3/2\pi)\gamma(\Omega_0/2A_{20})^2(\lambda^2/A)N$ , in agreement (except for a factor 16) with the expression of Ref. [6] obtained from a multi-mode theory.

The above results show that the combined effect of the probe and pump fields on a collection of cold atoms in a pure momentum state  $n$  is responsible of a collective instability that leads the atoms to populate the adjacent momentum levels  $n - 1$  and  $n + 1$ . However, in the quantum limit  $\rho < 1$  when  $\kappa = 0$  (or  $\rho < \sqrt{2\kappa}$  when  $\kappa > 1$ ) conservation of energy and momentum of the photon constrains the atoms to populate only the lower momentum level  $n - 1$ . This holds also in the nonlinear regime, as we have verified solving nu-

merically Eqs. (7) and (8). In the quantum limit above, the exact equations reduce to those for only three matrix elements,  $S_{n,n}$ ,  $S_{n-1,n-1}$  and  $S_{n-1,n}$ , with  $S_{n-1,n-1} + S_{n,n} = 1$ . Introducing the new variables  $S_n = S_{n-1,n}$  and  $W_n = S_{n,n} - S_{n-1,n-1}$ , Eqs. (7) and (8) reduce to the well-known Maxwell–Bloch equations [20]:

$$\frac{dS_n}{d\tau} = -i\delta'_n S_n + \frac{\rho}{2} A W_n, \quad (13)$$

$$\frac{dW_n}{d\tau} = -\rho(A^* S_n + \text{h.c.}), \quad (14)$$

$$\frac{dA}{d\tau} = S_n - \kappa A, \quad (15)$$

where  $\delta'_n = \delta + (2n - 1)/\rho$ . When  $\kappa = 0$  and  $\delta'_n = 0$ , if the system starts radiating incoherently by pure quantum mechanical spontaneous emission, the solution of Eqs. (13)–(15) is a periodic train of  $2\pi$  hyperbolic secant pulses [21] with  $|A|^2 = (2/\rho)\text{sech}^2[\sqrt{\rho/2}(\tau - \tau_n)]$ , where  $\tau_n = (2n + 1)\ln(\rho/2)/\sqrt{\rho/2}$ . Furthermore, the average momentum  $\langle p \rangle = n + \tanh^2[\sqrt{\rho/2}(\tau - \tau_n)] - 1$  oscillates between  $n$  and  $n - 1$  with period  $\tau_n$ . We observe that the maximum number of photons emitted is  $\langle a^\dagger a \rangle_{\text{peak}} = (\rho N/2)|A|_{\text{peak}}^2 = N$ , as expected. Fig. 2 shows the results of a numerical integration of Eqs. (7) and (8), for  $\kappa = 0$ ,  $\rho = 0.2$  and  $\delta = 5$ , with the atoms initially in the momentum level  $n = 0$  and the field starting from the seed value  $A_0 = 10^{-5}$ . Fig. 2a and b show the intensity  $|A|^2$  and the average momentum  $\langle p \rangle$  vs.  $\tau$ , in agreement with the predictions of the reduced equations (13)–(15).

In the superradiant regime,  $\kappa > 1$ , Eqs. (13)–(15) describe a single SF scattering process in which the atoms, initially in the momentum state  $n$ , ‘decay’ to the lower level  $n - 1$  emitting a  $\pi$  hyperbolic secant pulse, with intensity  $|A|^2 = 1/[4(\kappa^2 + \delta_n'^2)]\text{sech}^2[(\tau - \tau_D)/\tau_{\text{SF}}]$  and average momentum  $\langle p \rangle = n - (1/2)\{1 + \tanh[(\tau - \tau_D)/\tau_{\text{SF}}]\}$ , where  $\tau_{\text{SF}} = 2(\kappa^2 + \delta_n'^2)/\rho\kappa$  is the ‘SF time’ [15,16],  $\tau_D = \tau_{\text{SF}} \text{arcsech}(2|S_n(0)|) \approx -\tau_{\text{SF}} \ln \sqrt{2|S_n(0)|}$  is the delay time and  $|S_n(0)| \ll 1$  is the initial polarization. Fig. 3a and b show  $|A|^2$  and  $\langle p \rangle$  vs.  $\tau$  calculated solving Eqs. (7) and (8) numerically with  $\kappa = 10$ ,  $\rho = 2$ ,  $\delta = 0.5$  and the same initial




Fig. 2. Quantum limit of CARL for  $\rho < 1$  in the case  $\kappa = 0$ : (a)  $|A|^2$  and (b)  $\langle p \rangle$  vs.  $\tau$ , for  $\rho = 0.2$ ,  $\delta = 5$ ,  $A(0) = 10^{-5}$  and the atoms initially in the state  $n = 0$ . We note that  $\langle p \rangle = -(\rho/2)(|A|^2 - |A(0)|^2)$ .

conditions of Fig. 2. We observe a sequential SF scattering, in which the atoms, initially in the level  $n = 0$ , change their momentum by discrete steps of  $\hbar\vec{q}$  and emit a SF pulse during each scattering process. We observe that for  $\delta = 1/\rho$  the field is resonant only with the first transition, from  $n = 0$  to  $n = -1$ ; for a generic initial state  $n$ , resonance occurs when  $\delta = (1 - 2n)/\rho$ , so that in the case of Fig. 3a the peak intensity of the successive SF pulses is reduced (by the factor  $1/[\kappa^2 + (2n/\rho)^2]$ ) whereas the duration and the delay of the pulse are increased. However, the pulse retains the characteristic sech<sup>2</sup> shape and the area remains equal to  $\pi$ , inducing the atoms to decrease their momentum by a finite value  $\hbar\vec{q}$ . We note that, although the SF time in the quantum limit ( $\tau_{\text{SF}} = 2\kappa/\rho$  at resonance) can be considerable longer than the char-




Fig. 3. Sequential SF regime of CARL: (a)  $|A|^2$  and (b)  $\langle p \rangle$  vs.  $\tau$ , for  $\rho = 2$ ,  $\delta = 0.5$ ,  $\kappa = 10$ , and the same initial conditions of Fig. 2.

acteristic superradiant time obtained in the classical limit,  $\tau_{\text{SR}} = \sqrt{2\kappa}$ , the peak intensity of the pulse in the quantum limit is always approximately half of the value obtained in the semiclassical limit (see Ref. [14] for details).

In conclusion, we have shown that the CARL model describing a system of atoms in their momentum ground state (as those obtained in a BEC) and properly extended to include a quantum mechanical description of the center-of-mass motion, allows for a quantum limit in which the average atomic momentum changes in discrete units of the photon recoil momentum  $\hbar\vec{q}$  and reduce to the Maxwell–Bloch equations for two momentum levels.

These results demonstrate that the regular arrangement of momentum pattern observed in the MIT experiment [3] can be interpreted as being due to sequential SF scattering. However, the

single-mode, one-dimensional theory presented here describes more appropriately the experimental configuration of Ref. [5], where a cigar-shaped condensate was exposed to the driven laser along its major axis and a single scattered mode was observed in the opposite direction. In this case,  $\vec{q} \approx 2\vec{k}$  and the atomic recoil momentum is parallel to the incident and scattered fields. In contrast, in the MIT experiment the condensate was exposed to the driven laser along its minor axis  $\hat{y}$  and two counterpropagating scattered modes were observed along the major axis, i.e. along  $\pm\hat{z}$ , with atoms moving at  $45^\circ$  with respect to  $\hat{y}$ , i.e. along the unit vectors  $\hat{e}_{1,2} = (\hat{y} \mp \hat{z})/\sqrt{2}$ . In this case, the atoms may scatter photons into each mode and the atomic momentum is determined by the discrete number of recoil events they have experienced with each mode, i.e.  $\vec{p} = \hbar q(n_1\hat{e}_1 + n_2\hat{e}_2)$ , where  $q = \sqrt{2}k$  and  $n_{1,2}$  is the number of scattered photons into the modes 1 and 2, respectively. The main difference from the single-mode case is that mixed orders (1, 1), (2, 1), etc. may be observed in addition to the two independent atomic families  $(n_1, 0)$  and  $(0, n_2)$ . The single-mode theory presented here can be easily generalized with two modes, allowing for a more detailed description of the momentum distribution observed in the MIT experiment. Furthermore, a decoherence mechanism taking into account the atomic dephasing responsible of the coherence decay can be included into the model, as suggested in Ref. [6].

We note that our theory extends the model of Ref. [6], taking into account (although for only a single mode) all the higher-order ‘side modes’  $n$ , corresponding to multiple scattering of the pump photons. The analysis of Ref. [6] is limited to the exponential buildup of the first-order side modes, (1, 0) and (0, 1), from quantum fluctuations and to the nonlinear effects due to population depletion of the mode (0, 0). The analysis of Ref. [6] has been further extended in Ref. [7], where a bi-dimensional sequential superradiance, with two scattered modes, is described, including however only the second-order contributions (0, 0) and (1, 1) in addition to the first-order contributions (1, 0) and (0, 1).

A detailed study of sequential SF, including two-mode emission, bi-dimensional matter wave

formation, decoherence and other aspects of the MIT experiment will be the object of a future extended publication.

## Acknowledgements

We thank G.R.M. Robb for a careful reading of the manuscript and for helpful discussions.

## References

- [1] M.H. Anderson, J.R. Ensher, M.R. Matthews, C.E. Wieman, E.A. Cornell, *Science* 269 (1995) 198.
- [2] M. Kozuma, L. Deng, E.W. Hagley, J. Wen, R. Lutwak, K. Helmerson, S.L. Rolston, W.D. Phillips, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 82 (1999) 871.
- [3] S. Inouye, A.P. Chikkatur, D.M. Stamper-Kurn, J. Stenger, D.E. Pritchard, W. Ketterle, *Science* 285 (1999) 571.
- [4] S. Inouye, T. Pfau, S. Gupta, A.P. Chikkatur, A. Görlitz, D.E. Pritchard, W. Ketterle, *Nature* 402 (1999) 641.
- [5] M. Kozuma, Y. Suzuki, Y. Torii, T. Sugiura, T. Kugam, E.W. Hagley, L. Deng, *Science* 286 (1999) 2309.
- [6] M.G. Moore, P. Meystre, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 83 (1999) 5202.
- [7] O.E. Mustecaplioglu, L. You, *Phys. Rev. A* 62 (2000) 063615.
- [8] R. Bonifacio, L. De Salvo Souza, *Nucl. Instrum. Meth. Phys. Res. A* 341 (1994) 360.
- [9] R. Bonifacio, L. De Salvo Souza, L.M. Narducci, E.J. D’Angelo, *Phys. Rev. A* 50 (1994) 1716.
- [10] R. Bonifacio, L. De Salvo, *Appl. Phys. B* 60 (1995) S233.
- [11] R. Bonifacio, G.R.M. Robb, B.W.J. McNeil, *Phys. Rev. A* 56 (1997) 912.
- [12] M.G. Moore, P. Meystre, *Phys. Rev. A* 58 (1998) 3248.
- [13] M.G. Moore, O. Zobay, P. Meystre, *Phys. Rev. A* 60 (1999) 1491.
- [14] N. Piovella, R. Bonifacio, B.W.J. McNeil, G.R.M. Robb, *Opt. Commun.* 187 (2001) 165.
- [15] R. Bonifacio, P. Schwendimann, F. Haake, *Phys. Rev. A* 4 (1971) 302.
- [16] R. Bonifacio, L.A. Lugiato, *Phys. Rev. A* 11 (1975) 1507.
- [17] S. Inouye, R.F. Low, S. Gupta, T. Pfau, A. Görlitz, T.L. Gustavson, D.E. Pritchard, W. Ketterle, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85 (2000) 4225.
- [18] R. Bonifacio, C. Pellegrini, L.M. Narducci, *Opt. Commun.* 50 (1984) 373.
- [19] R. Bonifacio, *Opt. Commun.* 146 (1998) 236.
- [20] F.T. Arecchi, R. Bonifacio, *IEEE Quant. Electron.* 1 (1965) 169.
- [21] R. Bonifacio, G. Preparata, *Phys. Rev. A* 2 (1970) 336.