

Quantum sensing with ultracold atoms in phase modulated optical lattices

Dr Carrie Weidner Quantum Engineering Technology Labs University of Bristol 3 April 2024

bristol.ac.uk



Physical Sciences Research Council

The preliminaries

Making bosonic atoms very cold

- If you get bosonic atoms cold enough (≈100 nK), their deBroglie wavelength is on the order of the inter-particle spacing
 - This is known as a Bose-Einstein condensate, or BEC.

er to

The atoms become mutually coherent, like the photon:



ATOM LASER



Trapping atoms with light

- Light induces a dipole moment in an atom $\vec{d} = \alpha \vec{E}$
- This gives rise to a force and potential $\vec{F} = -\nabla U \propto -\alpha(\omega) I(\vec{r})$
- For red-detuned light ($\Delta = \omega_{light} \omega_{atom} < 0$) this potential is attractive, and the atoms move towards the intensity maxima.
- Depth

 $U \propto I(\vec{r})/\Delta$

Scattering rate

 $\Gamma_{\rm sc} \propto I(\vec{r})/\Delta^2$

• We want a lot of power from a laser fardetuned from resonance!



The optical lattice: an egg carton for atoms

 Reflect a dipole laser back on itself to create a sinusoidally-varying potential

 $V(x) = V_0 \cos(2k_L x)$

 Depth typically expressed in recoils

$$V_0 = sE_R = s\frac{\hbar^2 k_L^2}{2m}$$

Can work in (up to) three dimensions!



How do we describe the atom wavefunction in a lattice?

- Two (equivalent) bases are commonly used
- Bloch functions
 - Atoms delocalized in position, localized in momentum space
 - Gives rise to band structure within a Brillouin zone
- Wannier functions
 - Atoms localized in position space (to a single lattice site), delocalized in momentum space
 - Composed of sums of Bloch functions in a given band
- Localized or delocalized? It depends on the lattice depth (and the problem).
 - Deeper lattices: more localized atoms
 - SLI uses shallow lattices—we control the momentum states of the atoms!







Inertial sensing with ultracold atoms trapped in phase-modulated optical lattices [PRL **120**, 263201, (2018)]

Experimental Demonstration of Shaken-Lattice Interferometry

C. A. Weidner and Dana Z. Anderson *

Department of Physics and JILA, University of Colorado, Boulder, Colorado 80309-0440, USA

(Received 28 January 2018; published 27 June 2018)

Shaken lattice interferometry: building a sensor with atoms in optical lattices

The recipe:

- Take your favourite atom, and make it very cold
- Load it into the ground state of a shallow optical lattice potential
- Modulate the lattice to implement the atom-optical elements of an interferometer $V(x,t) = V_0 \cos(2kx + \phi(t))$ What we control!



Building a shaken lattice interferometer

- Work in the Bloch basis: atoms delocalized in position, localized in momentum
- Starting with atoms in the ground state of the lattice potential, we implement:
 - Splitting
 - Propagation
 - Reflection
 - Reverse propagation
 - Recombination back into the ground state
- The best shaking function φ(t) is determined via optimal control



Building a shaken lattice interferometer

- Measurement: relative population in the atoms' momentum states
 - Define a vector \vec{P} with elements $\{P_n\}$ containing the relative population in the $2n\hbar k$ state
 - We do not have access to phase information!
- Once the shaking function is known, it is fixed.
 - Can then calibrate the system's response to a signal (acceleration *a*)
 - Scale sensitivity by changing the total interrogation (shaking) time T





Image credit C. LeDesma et al. arXiv:2305.17603, (2023).

But is it a sensor? Adding a signal

- We determine a signal by measuring how the atom momentum populations change with the applied signal
- The magnitude and direction of a signal is easily determined here, due to symmetry breaking as the lattice begins to shake
- Use the classical Fisher information F_c to define a minimum detectable acceleration $\delta a = 1/\sqrt{F_c}$ given the momentum population vectors \vec{P} that we measure.
- CFI:

$$F_{C}(a) = N_{at} \sum_{n=-N}^{N} \frac{\left(\frac{\partial P_{a,n}}{\partial a}\right)^{2}}{P_{a,n}}$$

- Use this to find how δa scales with T
- Simulations (experiments) give $n = 2.21 \pm 0.31 (1.96 \pm 0.13)$ consistent with typical atom interferometers where n = 2.



- Build a 3D lattice system in Bristol
- Demonstrate a multi-axis inertial sensor (3 axes of acceleration, 3 axes of rotation)





- Build a 3D lattice system in Bristol
- Demonstrate a multi-axis inertial sensor (3 axes of acceleration, 3 axes of rotation)
- Open question #1: What is the best scaling with T that we can qet?

Abstract

New Journal of Physics The open access journal at the forefront of physics

ikalische Gesellschaft DPG **IOP** Institute of Physics with: Deutsche Physikalische Gesellschaft and the Institute of Physics

PAPER

Simplified landscapes for optimization of shaken lattice interferometry

CA Weidner and DZ Anderson

Motivated by recent results using shaken optical lattices to perform atom interferometry, we explore the splitting of an atom cloud trapped in a phase-modulated ('shaken') optical lattice. Using a simple analytic model we are able to show that we can obtain the simplest case of $\pm 2\hbar k_{\rm L}$ splitting via single-frequency shaking. This is confirmed both via simulation and experiment. Furthermore, we are able to split with a relative phase θ between the two split arms of 0 or π depending on our shaking frequency. Addressing higher-order splitting, we determine that $\pm 6\hbar k_{\rm L}$ splitting is sufficient to be able to accelerate the atoms in counterpropagating lattices. Finally, we show that we can use a genetic algorithm to optimize $\pm 4\hbar k_{\rm L}$ and $\pm 6\hbar k_{\rm L}$ splitting to within $\approx 0.1\%$ by restricting our optimization to the resonance frequencies corresponding to single- and two-photon transitions between Bloch bands. As a proof-of-principle, an experimental demonstration of simplified optimization of $4\hbar k_{\rm L}$ splitting is presented.

- Build a 3D lattice system in Bristol
- Demonstrate a multi-axis inertial sensor (3 axes of acceleration, 3 axes of rotation)
- Open question #1: What is the best scaling with T that we can get?
- Open question #2: How robust is this method in the real world?

Statistically characterizing robustness and fidelity of quantum controls and quantum control algorithms

PHYSICAL REVIEW A 107, 032606 (2023)



Analyzing and Unifying Robustness Measures for Excitation Transfer Control in Spin Networks



Time-Domain Sensitivity of the Tracking Error

Sean O'Neil[©], *Member, IEEE*, Sophie Schirmer[©], *Member, IEEE*, Frank C. Langbein[©], *Member, IEEE*, Carrie A. Weidner[©], *Member, IEEE*, and Edmond A. Jonckheere[©], *Life Fellow, IEEE*

-0.6 -0.4 -0.2 0.0 0.2 0.4 0.6

Wavelength variation (%)

- Build a 3D lattice system in Bristol
- Demonstrate a multi-axis inertial sensor (3 axes of acceleration, 3 axes of rotation)
- Open question #1: What is the best scaling with T that we can get?
- Open question #2: How robust is this method in the real world?
- Open question #3: What are the fundamental limitations of shaken lattice interferometry?





Thanks to:

--The Bristol team: Dr. Vineet Bharti (experiment), Dr. Dhritiman Chakraborty (theory), Harry Kendell (both experiment and theory) --Collaborators Prof. Sophie Schirmer (Swansea), Prof. Frank Langbein (Cardiff), Prof. Edmond Jonckheere and Sean O'Neil (USC)

Thank you for listening!

bristol.ac.uk

