

# Entanglement And Cross-Correlations In Cavity QED

P. R. Rice

*Department of Physics, University of Maryland,*

*College Park, MD 20742, USA and*

*Department of Physics, Miami University, Oxford, OH 45056, USA*

J. Gea-Banacloche

*Department of Physics, University of Maryland,*

*College Park, MD 20742, USA and*

*Department of Physics, University of Arkansas, Fayetteville, AR 72701, USA*

M. L. Terraciano, D. L. Freimund, and L. A. Orozco

*Department of Physics, University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742, USA*

(Dated: May 24, 2019)

## Abstract

We investigate entanglement in an open quantum system, specifically a single atom in a driven optical cavity with cavity loss and spontaneous emission. In the weak driving limit, the system reaches a pure state in the steady state. We find that any normalized cross-correlation function, of the type historically considered in quantum optics, is an indicator of the entanglement in a system. In particular we find that the zero delay intensity-field cross correlation  $h_0^{TF}(0) = \langle (a^\dagger + a)\sigma_+\sigma_- \rangle / \langle a^\dagger + a \rangle \langle \sigma_+\sigma_- \rangle$  is proportional to the entanglement of formation for weak driving fields. Other correlation functions are considered as indicators, or witnesses, of entanglement.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In recent years, there has been much interest in understanding the central differences between classical and quantum physics, and how those differences may be utilized for practical purposes. In particular, entanglement as a physical resource has emerged as a central theme in this work. Two particles (or systems),  $A$  and  $B$  are said to be in an entangled state if the wave function of the system does not factorize, that is  $|AB\rangle \neq |A\rangle|B\rangle$ . The consequence of this form of the wavefunction is that a measurement on system  $A$  yields information about system  $B$  without any direct interaction with system  $B$ . A state is said to be maximally entangled if one gains complete knowledge of  $B$  by measurements on  $A$ , or vice-versa. An example that is of relevance to our work here is the maximally entangled state of an atom and a field mode,  $|\Psi\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2})(|1, g\rangle + |0, e\rangle)$  with the first index denoting the number of photons in the field mode and the second ( $e = \textit{excited}$ ,  $g = \textit{ground}$ ) denoting the state of the atom. A measurement of the state of the atom immediately tells us the number of photons in the field mode; or a measurement of the photon number immediately tells us the state of the atom.

For a given bipartite quantum system in a pure state, there is general agreement as to how to quantify the amount of entanglement that exists; this is the von Neumann entropy  $E = -\text{tr}_A(\rho_A \log_2 \rho_A)$  of the reduced density matrix of system  $A$ ,  $\rho_A = \text{tr}_B(\rho_{AB})$ . [1] For mixed states the situation is not as clear, there have been several proposals. One method, known as the entanglement of formation utilizes a decomposition of the quantum state  $\rho = \sum_j P_j |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j| = \sum_j P_j \rho_j$ , and then defines  $E = \sum_j P_j E_j$  where  $E_j$  is the von Neumann entropy for the density matrix  $\rho_j = |\psi_j\rangle\langle\psi_j|$ . This measure of entanglement depends upon the decomposition of the density matrix; typically one calculates the EOF for a wide range of possible decompositions and then reports the minimum of those values as  $E$ . [1, 2]. Recently Carmichael has proposed a different approach [3] where the proper decomposition of the density matrix to use is the one that is appropriate for how the entanglement is to be used, or measured. That is a measuring device/interaction must be specified, and then that device/interaction determines which unraveling of the density operator (in the language of quantum trajectory theory) is appropriate. There are other measures that have been proposed, such as the negativity and the entanglement of distillation; however these are difficult to calculate, and may have ordering problems [4]. Our approach here is to ask how




FIG. 1: Single atom in a weakly driven optical cavity. Here  $g$  is the reversible coupling rate between the mode of the cavity and the atom,  $\kappa$  is the decay rate of the field mode of the cavity,  $\gamma$  is the spontaneous emission rate.  $Y$  is the external drive (taken to be a classical field).

we might interact with the quantum system, and understand how those physical interactions can yield information about the entanglement of the system, and how the results of these measurements compare to definitions of entanglement that stem from a quantum information theoretic basis.

## II. CAVITY QED SYSTEM

The system we wish to study is that of a two-level atom in a driven optical cavity, as shown in Fig. 1.

We consider a single ended cavity, with the intracavity field decaying via the output mirror at rate  $\kappa$ . The atom has a spontaneous emission rate to modes out the sides of the cavity denoted by  $\gamma$ , which is generally less than the free space Einstein  $A$  coefficient. The coupling between the atom and the field mode is given by  $g = \mu_{eg} \sqrt{\omega/2\hbar\epsilon_0 V}$  with  $\mu_{eg}$  the dipole matrix element,  $\omega$  the transition frequency and  $V$  the volume of the cavity mode. Our results are valid for  $N$  atoms localized within a wavelength, or otherwise having the same coupling to the cavity field. The driving field is taken to be a strong field incident on the input mirror, with small transmission, so that the incident flux (in photon units) inside

the cavity is given by  $Y \propto E_{out}\sqrt{T_{in}}$

We utilize the quantum trajectory method in which the system is characterized by a wave function and non-Hermitian Hamiltonian,

$$|\psi_c(t)\rangle = \sum_{n,0}^{\infty} \left( C_{g,n}(t)e^{-iE_{g,n}t}|g, n, l\rangle + C_{e,n}(t)e^{-iE_{e,n}t}|e, n, l\rangle \right) \quad (1)$$

$$H = \hbar g (a^\dagger \sigma_- + a \sigma_+) - i\kappa a^\dagger a - i\frac{\gamma}{2} \sigma_+ \sigma_- + i\hbar Y (a^\dagger - a) \quad (2)$$

where we also have collapse operators

$$\mathcal{C} = \sqrt{\kappa}a \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{A} = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{2}}\sigma_- \quad (4)$$

associated with photons exiting the output mirror and spontaneous emission out the side of the cavity. The indices  $e(g)$  indicate the atom in the excited (ground) state,  $n$  is the photon number. The energies are  $E_{e,n} = E_{g,n+1} = \hbar\omega(n + 1/2)$ . We have the usual creation ( $a$ ) and annihilation ( $a^\dagger$ ) operators for the field, and Pauli raising and lowering operators  $\sigma_\pm$  for the atom.

In the weak driving limit, the system obtains a steady-state wave function, which is

$$|\Psi\rangle = |0g\rangle + A_{1g}|1g\rangle + A_{0e}|0e\rangle + A_{2g}|2g\rangle + A_{1e}|1e\rangle + A_{0ee}|0ee\rangle \quad (5)$$

where the  $A_{ij}$  are known [6, 7]. They are

$$A_{1g} = \alpha \quad (6)$$

$$A_{0e} = \beta \quad (7)$$

$$A_{1e} = \alpha\beta q \quad (8)$$

$$A_{2g} = \alpha^2 pq / \sqrt{2} \quad (9)$$

$$A_{0,2e} = \beta^2 qr / \sqrt{2} \quad (10)$$

The quantities  $p, q$ , and  $r$  would be 1 for coupled harmonic oscillators. In the cavity QED system they differ from unity due to the non-harmonic, or saturable, nature of the atom oscillator. The last amplitude,  $A_{0ee}$  is the coefficient of a no photon, two excited atom state,

when there are  $N$  atoms. The variables are

$$\alpha = \frac{Y}{\kappa(1+2C)} \quad (11)$$

$$\beta = \frac{-2\sqrt{N}g}{\gamma}\alpha \quad (12)$$

$$p = 1 - 2C'_1 \quad (13)$$

$$q = \frac{(1+2C)}{(1+2C-2C'_1)} \quad (14)$$

$$r = \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{N}} \quad (15)$$

$$C = \frac{Ng^2}{\kappa\gamma} \quad (16)$$

$$C'_1 = C_1(1 + \gamma/2\kappa)^{-1} \quad (17)$$

Note that the one-excitation amplitudes  $A_{1,g}$  and  $A_{0,e}$  are proportional to the driving field  $Y$ ; the two-excitation amplitudes  $A_{2,g}$ ,  $A_{1,e}$ , and  $A_{0,ee}$  are proportional to the square of the driving field  $Y^2$ . [6] Also note that the norm of this wave function is  $||\Psi|| = \sqrt{1 + O(Y^2)}$ ; hence to lowest order in  $Y$ , the coefficient of the vacuum should be  $(1 - (1/2)O(Y^2))$ . The term  $O(Y^2)$  makes no contribution to lowest nonzero order in  $Y$  for the correlation functions or entanglement measures considered here, and so we ignore it.

The entanglement of formation for this system is calculated from the density matrix after tracing over the field variables:

$$\rho_{atom} = Tr_{field} |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi| \quad (18)$$

$$= \begin{pmatrix} 1 + A_{1g}^2 + A_{2g}^2 & A_{1e}A_{1g} + A_{0e} \\ A_{1e}A_{1g} + A_{0e} & A_{1e}^2 + A_{0e}^2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (19)$$

The eigenvalues of this matrix are, to lowest nonvanishing order,

$$\lambda_1 = (A_{1g}A_{0e} - A_{1e})^2 \quad (20)$$

$$\lambda_2 = 1 - (A_{1g}A_{0e} - A_{1e})^2 \quad (21)$$

and so, the entropy  $E = -\lambda_1 \log_2 \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 \log_2 \lambda_2$  is then

$$\begin{aligned} E &= (A_{1g}A_{0e} - A_{1e})^2 \\ &= |A_{1g}|^2 |A_{0e}|^2 \left(1 - \frac{A_{1e}}{A_{0e}A_{1g}}\right)^2 \\ &= |A_{1g}|^2 |A_{0e}|^2 (q - 1)^2. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

where  $q$  is defined in Eq. (14). In the weak field limit, the “impurity” (or “linear entropy”),  $1 - \text{Tr} \rho_{atom}^2$  is also  $(A_{1g}A_{0e} - A_{1e})^2$  to lowest order.

As we will show later,  $q^2$  is the ratio of cross-coincident counting rate to the product of the singles counting rates. To see why  $q = A_{1e}/A_{0e}A_{1g}$  may be a good indication of entanglement, consider what happens if the wavefunction is a product state (just considering the single-atom case for now). We could write

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle_P &= |\psi_F\rangle \otimes |\phi_A\rangle \\ &= (D_0|0\rangle + D_1|1\rangle + D_2|2\rangle) \otimes (C_g|g\rangle + C_e|e\rangle) \\ &= D_0C_g|0g\rangle + D_1C_g|1g\rangle + D_0C_e|0e\rangle + D_2C_g|2g\rangle + D_1C_e|1e\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

For weak excitations, we know that the coefficient of the ground state of the system is  $D_0C_g = 1$ , or  $C_g = D_0 = 1$ . Then our product state is

$$|\Psi\rangle_P = |0g\rangle + D_1|1g\rangle + C_e|0e\rangle + D_2|2g\rangle + D_1C_e|1e\rangle \quad (24)$$

Just knowing the one excitation amplitudes does not tell you anything about entanglement in the weak field limit, as one could easily have  $A_{1g} = D_1$  and  $A_{0e} = C_e$ . The squares of these is related to the rate of transmitted and fluorescent clicks, or mean intensities. Also one could have  $A_{2g} = D_2$ . The entanglement shows up in the value of  $A_{1e}$ ; if this value does not satisfy  $A_{1e} = D_1C_e = A_{0e}A_{1g}$ , then we cannot write the state as a product state. The rate of coincidence clicks in transmission and fluorescence is proportional to  $|A_{1e}|^2$ . So a measure of the zero time cross correlation between the atom and the field, as well as the mean transmitted and fluorescent intensities yields a measure of entanglement in the weak field limit. In the presence of a non-zero vacuum contribution (as any real quantum state will have), one can learn nothing about entanglement simply by measurement of one-excitation amplitudes or probabilities. Measurement of one-excitation amplitudes conditioned by a previous measurement *can* yield information about entanglement. This can be accomplished by utilizing quantum cross-correlation functions.

### III. CORRELATION FUNCTIONS

Traditionally, quantum opticians have calculated and measured normalized correlation functions, first introduced by Glauber[8, 9]. Generally these correlation functions involve

comparing a field (intensity) of one mode with the field (intensity) of the same mode at a later time (or different spatial location), with some exceptions [10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15]. Particularly in light of the generation of highly correlated modes of the electric field it is of interest to look at correlations between two different modes.

Consider a general cross-correlation function for two-modes of the electromagnetic field, which might correspond to the transmitted and fluorescent light from a CQED system. let

$$G = \langle d(b^\dagger, b) f(a^\dagger, a) \rangle / \langle d(b^\dagger, b) \rangle \langle f(a^\dagger, a) \rangle \quad (25)$$

with  $f$  and  $d$  well behaved functions, in the sense of a convergent Taylor series on the Hilbert space of interest. If  $|\psi\rangle$  is a product state, the correlation function factorizes and then this is unity. If it is *not* a product state, then this will manifest itself in a non-unit value for the normalized cross-correlation functions.

The simplest cross correlation function to consider is  $g_{TF}^{(1)}(\tau)$ . This could be obtained by measuring the visibility of the fringe pattern formed by interfering the transmitted and fluorescent light. For the weakly driven cavity-QED system, this is

$$\begin{aligned} g_{TF}^{(1)}(\tau) &= \frac{\langle \sigma_+(0) a(\tau) \rangle}{\langle a \rangle \langle \sigma_- \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\alpha \beta}{\alpha \beta} \\ &= 1 + O(Y^2) \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

so to lowest order, there is no information in this correlation function about entanglement. The next order correlation function is

$$g_{TF}^{(2)}(\tau) = \frac{\langle \sigma_+(0) a^\dagger(\tau) a(\tau) \sigma_-(0) \rangle}{\langle a^\dagger a \rangle_{ss} \langle \sigma_+ \sigma_- \rangle_{ss}} \quad (27)$$

This yields the probability that a transmitted photon is detected at time  $\tau$  conditioned on the detection of a fluorescent photon at  $\tau = 0.0$ . For zero time delay, i.e. simultaneous detection of a fluorescent and transmitted photon, we have  $g_{TF}^{(2)}(0) = q^2$ . Recall that if  $g_{TF}^{(2)}(0) = q = 1$  there is no entanglement; so a non-unit value of  $q$  indicates entanglement.

It is instructive to consider  $g_{TF}^{(2)}(0)$  as a conditioned measurement. We have

$$\begin{aligned} g_{TF}^{(2)}(\tau) &= \frac{\langle \sigma_+(0) a^\dagger(\tau) a(\tau) \sigma_-(0) \rangle}{\langle a^\dagger a \rangle_{ss} \langle \sigma_+ \sigma_- \rangle_{ss}} \\ &= \frac{\langle \sigma_+(0) \sigma_-(0) \rangle \langle \psi_c | a^\dagger(\tau) a(\tau) | \psi_c \rangle}{\langle a^\dagger a \rangle_{ss} \langle \sigma_+ \sigma_- \rangle_{ss}} \end{aligned}$$

$$= \frac{\langle \psi_c | a^\dagger(\tau) a(\tau) | \psi_c \rangle}{\langle a^\dagger a \rangle_{ss}} \quad (28)$$

where we define the collapsed state after detection of a fluorescent photon as

$$|\psi_c\rangle = \frac{\sigma_- |\psi_{ss}\rangle}{|\sigma_- |\psi_{ss}\rangle|} = \frac{\sigma_- |\psi_{ss}\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle \sigma_+ \sigma_- \rangle_{ss}}} \quad (29)$$

Thus we see that the cross correlation function  $g_{TF}^{(2)}(\tau)$  contains information about the average photon number *after* a measurement of the fluorescence relative to the average photon number in the absence of any interrogation of the fluorescence.

A way to measure  $q$  directly utilizes a conditioned homodyne measurement of the field conditioned on the detection of a fluorescent photon, [16, 17, 18]

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\theta=0}^{TF}(0) &= \frac{\langle I_T E_F \rangle}{\langle I_T \rangle \langle E_F \rangle} \\ &= \frac{\langle a^\dagger a (\sigma_- + \sigma_+) \rangle}{\langle a^\dagger a \rangle \langle (\sigma_- + \sigma_+) \rangle} \\ &= \langle a_\theta \rangle_c / \langle a_\theta \rangle \\ &= \frac{A_{1,e}}{A_{0,e} A_{1,g}} \\ &= q \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Thus it would seem that  $(h_{\theta=0}^{TF}(0) - 1)^2$  is essentially the entanglement in the system, with a prefactor. This prefactor depends on various system parameters, and is essentially the product of the average photon number and the average excited state population. The overall entanglement scales as  $Y^4$ , and is vanishingly small in the weak field limit. This is due to the fact that the dominant component of the steady state wave function is  $|0, g\rangle$  with other terms being proportional to  $Y$  or  $Y^2$ . What makes this measurement possible is the conditioning that selects only times when there is a fluctuation and the rest of the time (when the vacuum is present) no data is collected. Again, this is a natural measurement of entanglement in that we have  $h_{\theta=0}^{TF}(0) = \langle a_\theta \rangle_c / \langle a_\theta \rangle$ ; we see that this conditioned homodyne measurement tells us how the expectation value of the field quadrature is different when it is conditioned by a measurement on the atoms, in this case detection of a fluorescent photon.

The measurement of non-classicality with correlation functions do not imply entanglement. For example for two oscillators one could have  $|\psi\rangle = |\alpha, 0\rangle + |0, \alpha\rangle$ , where there is entanglement, but each individual mode shows no nonclassical behavior. Conversely, one can






FIG. 2: Entanglement (scaled by  $Y^4$ ) as a function of  $\kappa/\gamma$  and  $g/\gamma$  for weak excitation.

have nonclassical behavior with no entanglement, say for example the atom in the ground state and the field in a squeezed coherent state.

For the specific case of the system we are considering here, we may note, in particular, the particular form of the Schwartz inequality

$$(g_{TF}^{(2)}(0) - 1)^2 \leq (g_{TT}^{(2)}(0) - 1)(g_{FF}^{(2)}(0) - 1) \quad (31)$$

that must be satisfied for a classical field. Here  $TT$  and  $FF$  denote zero delay intensity correlations for the transmitted and fluorescent fields respectively. In the one-atom limit,  $g_{FF}^{(2)}(0) = 0$ , and  $g_{TT}^{(2)}(0) = q^2 p^2$ , so this inequality becomes  $|q^2 - 1|^2 \leq |q^2 p^2 - 1|$  which depends on the entanglement  $q$ , but also on the parameter  $p$  (Eq. (13)), which can be varied independently. Hence, there is no one-to-one relationship between Schwarz inequality violations and entanglement (by this measure)

#### IV. ENTANGLEMENT FOR WEAK EXCITATION

The amount of entanglement in the system is

$$E = \frac{N g^2 \alpha^4}{\gamma^2} (q - 1)^2 = \frac{8 C C_1'^2 Y^4}{\gamma \kappa^3 (1 + 2C)^4 (1 + 2C - 2C_1')^2} \quad (32)$$

In Fig. 2 we plot the entanglement in the system as a function of  $g/\gamma$  and  $\kappa/\gamma$ .

The amount of entanglement goes up when the good coupling  $g$  is larger than  $\kappa$  and  $\gamma$ .

Spontaneous emission ( $\gamma$ ) is worse for entanglement than cavity loss ( $\kappa$ ). This is due to the fact that a  $\gamma$  event *must* come from an atom, while a  $\kappa$  event could be a driving photon coming through, or a photon emitted by the atom into the cavity mode coming through. In the case of a single atom in the cavity, a spontaneous emission event leaves the atom in the ground state, and hence the system wavefunction factorizes. There is an optimal cavity loss rate for entanglement. If  $\kappa$  is too small, for a fixed  $Y$ , a large field builds up in the cavity as the mean cavity field is  $\alpha = Y/\kappa(1 + 2C)$ , and eventually, the intracavity field will saturate the atom which will lead to a state of the form  $|\psi\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2})|\alpha\rangle(|e\rangle + |g\rangle)$ ; that is the atom will be equally likely to be in the excited or ground state, and the field state will be a coherent state. Similarly, if  $\kappa$  is too large, then there too small an intracavity field to probe the nonlinearity, and so there is no entanglement. Our results here are consistent with the numerical results of Nha and Carmichael [3].

Considering the cross-correlation function that results from a homodyne measurement of the transmitted light conditioned on detection of a fluorescent photon, we have

$$h_{\theta}^{TF}(0) - 1 = q - 1 = \frac{2C'_1}{1 + 2C - 2C'_1} \quad (33)$$

For one atom, this becomes

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\theta}^{TF}(0) - 1 &= q - 1 \\ &= \frac{2g^2/\gamma^2}{(\kappa/\gamma + 1/2 + g^2/\kappa\gamma)} \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

The qualitative behavior of this correlation function is similar to the entanglement. The connection is that  $E = (4Ng^2\alpha^4/\gamma^2)(h_{\theta}^{TF}(0) - 1)^2$

For a large number ( $N$ ) atoms, we find that  $q$  scales as  $1/N$ . With the excitation spread over  $N$  atoms, for weak driving, it is unlikely that saturation is ever reached, even for large coupling  $g$ . Either a large number of atoms, or large spontaneous emission rate is sufficient to kill entanglement.

What about our other indicator of entanglement? We find

$$g_{TF}^{(2)}(0) = \frac{|A_{1e}|^2}{|A_{1g}A_{0e}|^2} = q^2 \quad (35)$$

Therefore,  $q^2 - 1$  is an indicator of entanglement.

$$g_{TF}^{(2)}(0) - 1 = q^2 - 1 = \frac{4C'_1(1 + 2C - C'_1)}{(1 + 2C - 2C'_1)^2} \quad (36)$$




FIG. 3:  $q^2 - 1$

For one atom, this becomes

$$\begin{aligned}
 g_{TF}^{(2)}(0) - 1 &= q^2 - 1 \\
 &= \frac{4g^2/\kappa\gamma[1 + \gamma/2\kappa + g^2/\kappa\gamma + g^2/\kappa^2]}{(1 + \gamma/2\kappa + g^2/\kappa^2)^2}
 \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

Again, the qualitative behavior of  $g_{TF}^{(2)}(0) - 1$  is similar to  $E$  and  $(h_\theta^{TF}(0) - 1)^2$ . For many atoms, one has

$$\begin{aligned}
 g_{TF}^{(2)}(0) - 1 &= q^2 - 1 \\
 &= (4/N)(1 + \gamma/2\kappa)^{-1}
 \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

This tends to zero as the atom number gets large, but is independent of  $g$ .

## V. CONCLUSION

We have shown that for a weakly driven open quantum system that a variety of cross-correlation functions are indicators, or witnesses, of entanglement. We have seen that entanglement is characterized by comparison of two-excitation probability amplitudes to single excitation amplitudes, in particular the amplitude involving one excitation in each subsystem. One can learn nothing about the entanglement by examining only one- or two- excitation amplitudes separately. In particular we find that a measurement of two-mode squeezing, or a

conditioned homodyne measurement is directly proportional to the entanglement calculated via the reduced von Neumann entropy. The measurement of entanglement in this system is  $q = A_{1e}/A_{0e}A_{1g}$ , the relative size of the amplitude for simultaneous excitation of the atom and cavity to that of the single excitation amplitudes. We find that as entanglement is characterized by a two-excitation amplitude, a small saturation photon number that enhances the nonlinear response will generate a larger entanglement. If however the saturation photon is smaller than the intracavity photon number, the amount of entanglement will decrease. The amount of entanglement grows with coupling  $g/\gamma$ , but there is an optimal amount of cavity loss  $\kappa/\gamma$ . This can be explained in terms of the effect of the two decay processes on the system. If we detect a fluorescent photon we know it has come from the atom, and hence the atom is in the ground state. If we obtain a transmitted photon, it could have been emitted from the atom into the cavity mode, or just be a driving field photon that has passed through the cavity without interaction with the atom. It is the interference of these two indistinguishable processes that leads to nonclassical effects in the transmitted field. The amount of entanglement between the atom and field mode generally decreases as the number of atoms increases. This work has been supported by NSF and NIST.

- 
- [1] C. H. Bennett et al., Phys. Rev. A **54**, 3824 (1996).
  - [2] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
  - [3] H. Nha and H. J. Carmichael, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 120408 (2004)
  - [4] M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 090503 (2005)
  - [5] We follow the method in H. J. Carmichael, An Open Systems Approach To Quantum Optics, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1993), L. Tian and H. J. Carmichael, Phys. Rev. A. **46**, R6801 (1992).
  - [6] H. J. Carmichael, R. J. Brecha, and P. R. Rice, Optics Communications **82**, 73 (1991).
  - [7] R.J. Brecha, P. R. Rice, and X. Min, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 2392 (1999).
  - [8] R. J. Glauber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **10**, 8486 (1963)
  - [9] For a comprehensive review, see *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics*, L. Mandel and E. Wolf, Cambridge (2000).
  - [10] P. Grangier, G. Roger, A. Aspect, A. Heidmann, and S. Reynaud, Phys. Rev. Lett. **57**, 687

- (1986).
- [11] D.V. Regelman, U. Mizrahi, D. Gershoni, E. Ehrenfund, W. V. Schoenfeld, and P. M. Petroff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 257401 (2001).
  - [12] A. J. Berglund, A. C. Doherty, and H. Mabuchi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 068101 (2002).
  - [13] A. Kuzmich, W. P. Bowen, A. D. Boozer, A. Boca, C. W. Chou, L.-M. Duan, and H. J. Kimble, Nature **423**, 731 (2003).
  - [14] M. G. Moore and P. Meystre, Phys. Rev. A **59**, R1754,(1999).
  - [15] J. Leach, C. E. Strimbu, and P. R. Rice, Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **6** S722S729 (2004).
  - [16] H. J. Carmichael, H. M. Castro-Beltran, G. T. Foster, and L. A. Orozco, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 1855 (2000).
  - [17] G. T. Foster, L. A. Orozco, H. J. Carmichael, and H. M. Castro-Beltran, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3149 (2000).
  - [18] H.J. Carmichael, G.T. Foster, L.A. Orozco, J.E. Reiner, and P.R. Rice, Progress in Optics vol. 46 (Elsevier, North Holland, 2004).