

Higher-order sidebands in optomechanically induced transparency

Hao Xiong,^{1,*} Liu-Gang Si,^{1,†} An-Shou Zheng,^{1,2} Xiaoxue Yang,¹ and Ying Wu¹

¹Wuhan National Laboratory for Optoelectronics and School of Physics, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan, 430074, People's Republic of China

²College of Mathematics and Physics, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan 430074, People's Republic of China

(Received 2 November 2011; published 11 July 2012)

Higher-order sidebands in optomechanically induced transparency are discussed in a generic optomechanical system. We take account of nonlinear terms and give an effective method to deal with such problems. It is shown that, if a strong control field with frequency ω_1 and a weak probe field with frequency ω_p are incident upon the optomechanical system, then there are output fields with frequencies $\omega_1 \pm 2\Omega$ generated, where $\Omega = \omega_p - \omega_1$. We analyze the amplitude of the output field $\omega_1 + 2\Omega$ and look at how it varies with the control field and show that the amplitude of the second-order sideband can be controlled by the strong control field.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevA.86.013815

PACS number(s): 42.50.Wk, 03.65.Ta

I. INTRODUCTION

The optomechanical system is a rapidly growing field, and many theoretical [1–29] and experimental [30–41] analyses have been done. Figure 1(a) shows a schematic diagram of a generic optomechanical system. The optomechanical system consists of an optical cavity, in which one mirror of the cavity is movable with angular frequency Ω_m and mass m . This optomechanical system is driven by a strong control field with frequency ω_1 and a weak probe field with frequency ω_p . This emerging subject leads to some remarkable and interesting topics, such as cooling of micromechanical cantilevers to the ground state of motion [1–4], gravitational-wave detectors [5], and optomechanically induced transparency [10,11,30,31], which is an analog of electromagnetically induced transparency. Electromagnetically induced transparency (EIT), which was originally discovered in atomic vapors, has led to many important developments in optical physics [42–46] and has been reported in many different systems [47,48]. It has been demonstrated recently that a form of induced transparency is enabled by the radiation-pressure coupling of an optomechanical system, and such an effect is called optomechanically induced transparency (OMIT).

OMIT is a very interesting phenomenon and can be explained by the Heisenberg-Langevin equations. Many fundamental works dealing with this topic have been carried out [6–9]. The Heisenberg-Langevin equations are nonlinear, and it is very difficult to get an analytic solution to these equations. If the probe field is far weaker than the control field, one can use the perturbation method to deal with such a problem. Considering that the control field provides a steady-state solution to the system, we write the intracavity field and the mechanical displacement at the steady state as \bar{a} and \bar{x} . The probe field can be simply considered as a perturbation of the control field. The total solution of the intracavity field and the mechanical displacement under both the control field and probe field can be written as $a = \bar{a} + \delta a$ and $x = \bar{x} + \delta x$. Using the linearization of the Heisenberg-Langevin equations, OMIT can be described. In the present work, we take into

account the nonlinear terms $-iG\delta x\delta a$ and $\frac{\hbar G}{m}\delta a^*\delta a$, where G is the coupling constant which describes the coupling between the cavity field and the movable mirror, and we give an effective method to deal with the problem of higher-order sidebands in OMIT. These terms are ignored in most studies [1–30]; however, we show that these nonlinear terms can lead to some interesting phenomena of the optomechanical system, such as second and higher-order sidebands [49,50].

Figure 1(b) shows the frequency spectrogram of a generic optomechanical system. The frequency of the control field, shown by the yellow line, is detuned by $\bar{\Delta}$ from the cavity resonance frequency which has a linewidth of κ . The first upper sideband with respect to the pump, viz., the control field, is referred to as the anti-Stokes field, while the first lower sideband is referred to as the Stokes field. We choose that $\bar{\Delta}$ approximately equals $-\Omega_m$, and ω_p is offset by the tunable frequency Ω from ω_1 . There are higher-order sidebands in such a generic optomechanical system due to the nonlinear terms $-iG\delta x\delta a$ and $\frac{\hbar G}{m}\delta a^*\delta a$. In the higher-order sideband processes the strong control field with frequency ω_1 and the weak probe field with frequency ω_p are incident upon the optomechanical system, and then there are output fields with frequencies $\omega_1 \pm n\Omega$ generated, where n is an integer. The output fields with frequencies $\omega_1 + 2\Omega$ is the second order upper sideband, while $\omega_1 - 2\Omega$ is the lower sideband. In the present work, we only focus on the second-order upper sideband. We show that higher-order sidebands can also be tuned by the strong control field.

II. DERIVATION OF HIGHER-ORDER SIDEBANDS IN OPTOMECHANICALLY INDUCED TRANSPARENCY

In this section, we give a full description of the derivation of higher-order sidebands in optomechanically induced transparency. We begin our discussion by introducing the Hamiltonian formulation of a generic optomechanical system [10,30]:

$$H = \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + \frac{m\Omega_m^2\hat{x}^2}{2} + i\hbar\sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_1(\hat{a}^\dagger e^{-i\omega_1 t} - \hat{a}e^{i\omega_1 t}) + i\hbar\sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}(\hat{a}^\dagger\varepsilon_p e^{-i\omega_p t} - \hat{a}\varepsilon_p^* e^{i\omega_p t}) + \hbar\omega_c\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} + \hbar Gx\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a}, \quad (1)$$

*haoxiong1217@gmail.com

†siliugang@gmail.com




FIG. 1. (Color online) (a) Schematic diagram of a generic optomechanical system. The optomechanical system is driven by a strong control field with frequency ω_1 . If the weak probe field with frequency ω_p is incident upon the optomechanical system, then some interesting phenomena occur, such as optomechanically induced transparency. (b) Frequency spectrogram of a generic optomechanical system. The frequency of the control laser is detuned by Δ from the cavity mode which has a linewidth of κ . We choose that $\bar{\Delta}$ approximately equals $-\Omega_m$, and $\omega_p - \omega_1$, which is recorded as Ω , is over the optical resonance of the cavity. There are higher-order sidebands in such a generic optomechanical system due to the nonlinear terms $-iG\delta x\delta a$ and $\frac{\hbar G}{m}\delta a^*\delta a$.

where \hat{p} and \hat{x} are the momentum and position operators of the movable mirror with effective mass m and angular frequency Ω_m . The term $\hbar\omega_c\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a}$ is the free Hamiltonian of the cavity field and the term $\hbar Gx\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a}$ denotes the interaction between the cavity field and the movable mirror. The term $i\hbar\sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_1(\hat{a}^\dagger e^{-i\omega_1 t} - \hat{a}e^{i\omega_1 t}) + i\hbar\sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}(\hat{a}^\dagger\varepsilon_p e^{-i\omega_p t} - \hat{a}\varepsilon_p^* e^{i\omega_p t})$ describes the driving field, and in the present work it contains a strong control field and a weak probe field. The amplitudes of the pump field and the probe field are normalized to a photon flux at the input of the cavity [30] and are defined as $\varepsilon_1 = \sqrt{P_1/\hbar\omega_1}$ and $\varepsilon_p = \sqrt{P_p/\hbar\omega_p}$, where P_1 is the pump power and P_p is the power of the probe field. κ is the total loss rate which contains an intrinsic loss rate κ_0 and an external loss rate κ_{ex} . The coupling parameter $\eta_c = \kappa_{ex}/(\kappa_0 + \kappa_{ex})$, which can be continuously adjusted, is chosen to be the critical coupling 1/2 here, with the best contrast achieved [30].

In a frame rotating at ω_1 , the Heisenberg-Langevin equations read as follows [30]:

$$\dot{\hat{a}} = (i\Delta - iGx - \kappa/2)\hat{a} + \sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_1 + \sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_p e^{-i\Omega t} + \hat{a}_{in}, \quad (2)$$

$$\dot{\hat{x}} = \hat{p}/m, \quad (3)$$

$$\dot{\hat{p}} = -m\Omega_m^2\hat{x} - \hbar G\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} - \Gamma_m\hat{p} + \hat{F}_{th}, \quad (4)$$

where $\Delta = \omega_1 - \omega_c$ and $\Omega = \omega_p - \omega_1$, and the decay rates of the cavity field (κ) and mechanical oscillators (Γ_m) are introduced classically. The quantum noise of the mirror and cavity are described by \hat{a}_{in} and \hat{F}_{th} with $\langle\hat{a}_{in}(t)\hat{a}_{in}^\dagger(t')\rangle = \delta(t-t')$, $\langle\hat{a}_{in}(t)\rangle = 0$, $\langle\hat{F}_{th}(t)\hat{F}_{th}^\dagger(t')\rangle = \Gamma_m \int e^{-i\omega(t-t')} [\coth(\hbar\omega/2k_B T) + 1] d\omega/2\pi \Omega_m$, and $\langle\hat{F}_{th}(t)\rangle = 0$. In this work, we are interested in the mean response of the system to the probe field, so the operators can be reduced to their expectation values, viz., $a(t) \equiv \langle\hat{a}(t)\rangle$, $a^*(t) \equiv \langle\hat{a}^\dagger(t)\rangle$, $x(t) \equiv \langle\hat{x}(t)\rangle$, and $p(t) \equiv \langle\hat{p}(t)\rangle$. In this case we reduce the operator equations to the mean value equations and drop the quantum and thermal noise terms because $\langle\hat{a}_{in}(t)\rangle = 0$

and $\langle\hat{F}_{th}(t)\rangle = 0$. The Heisenberg-Langevin equations then become

$$\dot{a} = (i\Delta - iGx - \kappa/2)a + \sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_1 + \sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_p e^{-i\Omega t}, \quad (5)$$

$$\dot{x} = p/m, \quad (6)$$

$$\dot{p} = -m\Omega_m^2 x - \hbar G a^\dagger a - \Gamma_m p. \quad (7)$$

For the case that the control field is much stronger than the probe field, we can use the perturbation method to deal with Eqs. (5)–(7). The control field provides a steady-state solution (\bar{a}, \bar{x}) of the system, while the probe field is treated as the noise, or perturbation of the steady state. The total solution of the intracavity field and the mechanical displacement under both the control field and the probe field can be written as $a = \bar{a} + \delta a$ and $x = \bar{x} + \delta x$. The steady-state solution of Eqs. (5)–(7) can be obtained as

$$\bar{a} = \frac{\sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_1}{-i\bar{\Delta} + \kappa/2}, \quad \bar{x} = -\frac{\hbar G|\bar{a}|^2}{m\Omega_m^2}, \quad (8)$$

where $\bar{\Delta} = \Delta - G\bar{x}$. Equations (8) give functions mapping the intracavity photon number $|\bar{a}|^2$ to the displacement \bar{x} . This system has bistability if the control field is strong enough. Figure 2 shows the displacement \bar{x} varies with the power of the control field by solving Eqs. (8) numerically. We use $m = 20$ ng, $G/2\pi = -12$ GHz/nm, $\Gamma_m/2\pi = 41.0$ kHz, $\kappa/2\pi = 15.0$ MHz, $\Omega_m/2\pi = 51.8$ MHz, and $\Delta = -\Omega_m$. All of these parameters are chosen from a recent experiment [30]. The wavelength of the control field is chosen to be 532 nm. For the case where $P_1 < 18$ mW, only one solution exists and the system has no bistability. For the case where P_1 is larger than 18 mW but less than 150 mW, three solutions exist and the green dashed line in Fig. 2 indicates the unstable solutions. So the system gives rise to bistability in this case. To obtain an OMIT, the one solution region should be chosen, and we hold $P_1 < 18$ mW throughout this work.




FIG. 2. (Color online) Calculation results of the solutions of Eqs. (8). Here we plot \bar{x} under different P_1 . The green dashed line indicates the unstable solutions. We use $m = 20$ ng, $G/2\pi = -12$ GHz/nm, $\Gamma_m/2\pi = 41.0$ kHz, $\kappa/2\pi = 15.0$ MHz, $\Omega_m/2\pi = 51.8$ MHz, and $\Delta = -\Omega_m$.

Now we turn to consider the perturbation made by the probe field. By using $a = \bar{a} + \delta a$ and $x = \bar{x} + \delta x$, Eqs. (5)–(7) become

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{d}{dt}\delta a &= \Theta\delta a - iG(\bar{a}\delta x + \delta x\delta a) + \sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_p e^{-i\Omega t}, \\ \hat{\Psi}\delta x &= -\frac{\hbar G}{m}(\bar{a}\delta a^* + \bar{a}^*\delta a - \delta a^*\delta a), \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where $\Theta = i\Delta - iG\bar{x} - \kappa/2$ and $\hat{\Psi} = \frac{d^2}{dt^2} + \Gamma_m \frac{d}{dt} + \Omega_m^2$. In what follows, we show that the nonlinear terms $-iG\delta x\delta a$ and $\frac{\hbar G}{m}\delta a^*\delta a$ can lead to some interesting effects of the optomechanical system.

We solve the problem of inputting a probe field, $\varepsilon_p e^{-i\Omega t}$, by using the following ansatz:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta a &= \delta a^{(1)} + \delta a^{(2)} + \dots, \quad \delta a^* = \delta a^{*(1)} + \delta a^{*(2)} + \dots, \\ \delta x &= \delta x^{(1)} + \delta x^{(2)} + \dots, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $\delta a^{(1)} = A_1^- e^{-i\Omega t} + A_1^+ e^{i\Omega t}$, $\delta a^{(2)} = A_2^- e^{-2i\Omega t} + A_2^+ e^{2i\Omega t}$, $\delta a^{*(1)} = (A_1^+)^* e^{-i\Omega t} + (A_1^-)^* e^{i\Omega t}$, $\delta a^{*(2)} = (A_2^+)^* e^{-2i\Omega t} + (A_2^-)^* e^{2i\Omega t}$.

$(A_2^-)^* e^{2i\Omega t}$, $\delta x^{(1)} = X_1 e^{-i\Omega t} + X_1^* e^{i\Omega t}$, and $\delta x^{(2)} = X_2 e^{-2i\Omega t} + X_2^* e^{2i\Omega t}$. The physical picture of such an ansatz is that there are output fields with frequencies $\omega_1 \pm n\Omega$ generated, due to the nonlinear terms $-iG\delta x\delta a$ and $\frac{\hbar G}{m}\delta a^*\delta a$, where n is a integer. If one ignores such nonlinear terms, then the terms of the higher-order sidebands in the ansatz cannot be self-consistent. In the present work, we only consider the second-order sideband, and the higher-order sidebands (for example, 3Ω) are ignored. So we can simplify the ansatz as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \delta a &= A_1^- e^{-i\Omega t} + A_1^+ e^{i\Omega t} + A_2^- e^{-2i\Omega t} + A_2^+ e^{2i\Omega t}, \\ \delta a^* &= (A_1^+)^* e^{-i\Omega t} + (A_1^-)^* e^{i\Omega t} + (A_2^+)^* e^{-2i\Omega t} + (A_2^-)^* e^{2i\Omega t}, \\ \delta x &= X_1 e^{-i\Omega t} + X_1^* e^{i\Omega t} + X_2 e^{-2i\Omega t} + X_2^* e^{2i\Omega t}. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

In what follows, we solve Eqs. (9) by using ansatz (11) and give the amplitude of the second-order sideband. Substituting Eqs. (11) into Eqs. (9) leads to six equations:

$$\begin{aligned} (\Theta + i\Omega)A_1^- &= iG(\bar{a}X_1 + X_1^*A_2^- + X_2A_1^+) - \sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_p, \quad (\Theta - i\Omega)A_1^+ = iG(\bar{a}X_1^* + X_1A_2^+ + X_2^*A_1^-), \\ (\Theta + 2i\Omega)A_2^- &= iG(\bar{a}X_2 + X_1A_1^-), \quad (\Theta - 2i\Omega)A_2^+ = iG(\bar{a}X_2^* + X_1^*A_1^+), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$(\Omega_m^2 - \Omega^2 - i\Gamma_m\Omega)X_1 = -\frac{\hbar G}{m}[\bar{a}(A_1^+)^* + \bar{a}^*A_1^- - (A_1^-)^*A_2^- - (A_2^+)^*A_1^+],$$

$$(\Omega_m^2 - 4\Omega^2 - 2i\Gamma_m\Omega)X_2 = -\frac{\hbar G}{m}[\bar{a}(A_2^+)^* + \bar{a}^*A_2^- - (A_1^+)^*A_1^-].$$

We consider that such a second-order sideband is a second-order process whose amplitude is much smaller than the probe field, so we can simplify these six equations into two groups: one group describes the linear case,

$$(\Theta + i\Omega)A_1^- = iG\bar{a}X_1 - \sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_p, \quad (\Theta - i\Omega)A_1^+ = iG\bar{a}X_1^*, \quad (\Omega_m^2 - \Omega^2 - i\Gamma_m\Omega)X_1 = -\frac{\hbar G}{m}[\bar{a}(A_1^+)^* + \bar{a}^*A_1^-], \quad (13)$$

and the other group describes the the second-order sideband,

$$(\Theta + 2i\Omega)A_2^- = iG(\bar{a}X_2 + X_1A_1^-), \quad (\Theta - 2i\Omega)A_2^+ = iG(\bar{a}X_2^* + X_1^*A_1^+), \quad (14)$$

$$(\Omega_m^2 - 4\Omega^2 - 2i\Gamma_m\Omega)X_2 = -\frac{\hbar G}{m}[\bar{a}(A_2^+)^* + \bar{a}^*A_2^- - (A_1^+)^*A_1^-].$$

Equations (13) were obtained in previous work [30] and are used to study the effect of optomechanically induced transparency. The equations can easily be solved and A_1^- and X_1 are obtained as follows:

$$A_1^- = \frac{1 + if(\Omega)}{\kappa/2 - i(\bar{\Delta} + \Omega) + 2\bar{\Delta}f(\Omega)}\sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_p, \quad X_1 = \frac{-\hbar G\bar{a}\chi(\Omega)}{\kappa/2 - i(\bar{\Delta} + \Omega) + 2\bar{\Delta}f(\Omega)}\sqrt{\eta_c\kappa}\varepsilon_p, \quad (15)$$

where $\chi(\Omega) = 1/m(\Omega_m^2 - \Omega^2 - i\Gamma_m\Omega)$ and $f(\Omega) = \hbar G^2|\bar{a}|^2\chi(\Omega)/[\kappa/2 + i(\bar{\Delta} - \Omega)]$.

Equations (14) describe the second-order sideband of such an optomechanical system. We also can solve the equations and obtain A_2^- as follows:

$$A_2^- = \frac{G^2\bar{a}f^{(2)}(\Omega)X_1^2 + GA_1^-X_1[f^{(2)}(\Omega)(i\kappa + 3\Omega - 2\bar{\Delta}) - 1]}{2\bar{\Delta}f^{(2)}(\Omega)(-\bar{\Delta} + \Omega + i\kappa/2) - (\bar{\Delta} + 2\Omega + i\kappa/2)}, \quad (16)$$

with

$$f^{(2)}(\Omega) = \frac{\hbar G^2|\bar{a}|^2\chi(2\Omega)}{(-\bar{\Delta} + \Omega + i\kappa/2)(-\bar{\Delta} + 2\Omega + i\kappa/2)}. \quad (17)$$

Equation (16) is made up of two terms: the first term is a direct second-order sideband, and the other term is an upconverted first-order sideband. The direct second-order sideband, whose amplitude is proportional to $G^2\bar{a}X_1^2$, arises from the two-phonon upconverted process of the control field.

By using the input-output notation, we can obtain the output fields as follows:

$$s_{\text{out}} = c_1 e^{-i\omega_1 t} + c_p e^{-i\omega_p t} - \sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} A_2^- e^{-i(2\omega_p - \omega_1)t} - \sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} A_1^+ e^{-i(2\omega_1 - \omega_p)t} - \sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} A_2^+ e^{-i(3\omega_1 - 2\omega_p)t}, \quad (18)$$

where $c_1 = \varepsilon_1 - \sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} \bar{a}$ and $c_p = \varepsilon_p - \sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} A_1^-$. The terms $c_1 e^{-i\omega_1 t}$ and $c_p e^{-i\omega_p t}$ describe the output fields with the frequencies of ω_1 and ω_p , respectively. The transmission of the probe field is defined as $t_p = c_p / \varepsilon_p$. Some previous works [30] have used c_p to study OMIT. It can be obtained that

$$t_p = 1 - \frac{1 + if(\Omega)}{\kappa/2 - i(\bar{\Delta} + \Omega) + 2\bar{\Delta}f(\Omega)} \eta_c \kappa. \quad (19)$$

The term $-\sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} A_1^+ e^{-i(2\omega_1 - \omega_p)t}$ describes the Stokes process and has been studied in Ref. [6]. The term $-\sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} A_2^- e^{-i(2\omega_p - \omega_1)t}$ describes the second-order upper sideband process, in which the output field with frequency $\omega_1 + 2\Omega$ can be produced, while the term $-\sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} A_2^+ e^{-i(3\omega_1 - 2\omega_p)t}$ describes the second-order lower sideband process, in which the output field with frequency $\omega_1 - 2\Omega$ can be produced. In what follows, we present a discussion of the amplitude of the second-order upper sideband. One also can discuss the amplitude of the second-order lower sideband by using the same method.

III. DISCUSSION

Now we turn to discuss how the amplitude of the second-order upper sideband varies with ε_1 or equivalent P_1 . After such discussion we find that the second-order sideband can also be tuned by the strong control field.

The amplitude of the input probe light is ε_p , while the amplitude of the output field with the second-order sideband is $|\sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} A_2^-|$. We define $\eta = |\sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} A_2^- / \varepsilon_p|$, which is dimensionless, as the efficiency of the second-order sideband process. It should be noted that η , for which we choose 20% here, for example, just means that the amplitude of the output second-order sideband is 20% of the amplitude of the input probe light, which is not the case of that 20% of the probe light being shifted into the second-order sideband.

Figure 3 shows $|t_p|^2$ and η vary with Ω by using Eq. (16). We use $\varepsilon_p / \varepsilon_1 = 0.05$, and all of the other parameters are exactly the same as those in Fig. 2. Figures 3(a) and 3(b) show $|t_p|^2$ and η vary with Ω under the same control field $P_1 = 9.33 \mu\text{W}$. In Fig. 3(a) $|t_p|^2$ is very low near $\Omega / \Omega_m = 1$, which means that the probe field is almost completely absorbed near the resonance condition $\Omega = -\Delta = \Omega_m$. It seems that $|t_p|^2$ reaches its minimum at $\Omega = \Omega_m$; however, if one zooms in sufficiently, there is a local maximum at $\Omega = \Omega_m$. From Fig. 3(b), it can be seen that generation of $\omega_1 + 2\Omega$ is obvious only when the resonance condition $\Omega = \Omega_m$ is reached. Figures 3(c) and 3(d) show $|t_p|^2$ and η vary with Ω under a stronger control field, $P_1 = 149.3 \mu\text{W}$. Figure 3(c) shows that there is a transparent window near the resonance condition $\Omega = \Omega_m$, which, however, is not very deep. Figure 3(d) shows η under the same control field. It can be seen that η also becomes obvious near $\Omega = \Omega_m$. However, on an enlarged scale, a local minimum is shown.




FIG. 3. (Color online) Calculation results of $|t_p|^2$ and η vary with Ω under different ε_1 . In panels (a) and (b), we use $P_1 = 9.33 \mu\text{W}$, and in panels (c) and (d), we use $P_1 = 149.3 \mu\text{W}$.

Now we consider a stronger control field, for example, $P_1 = 933.0 \mu\text{W}$. Figure 4(a) shows $|t_p|^2$ in such a control field. There is a transparent window near the resonance condition $\Omega = \Omega_m$. The transparent window is obvious and much deeper than the case in Fig. 3(c). Figure 4(b) shows η varies with Ω under the same P_1 . Unlike the case shown in Fig. 3(b), in Fig. 4(b) η reaches its local minimum within a frequency window corresponding to about the cavity linewidth at $\Omega / \Omega_m = 1$. There is a narrow dip near the resonance condition $\Omega = \Omega_m$, in which η becomes very small. This means that when the OMIT occurs, the second-order sideband process is subdued. Such a result can also be seen in Figs. 4(c) and 4(d). In Fig. 4(c),




FIG. 4. (Color online) Calculation results of $|t_p|^2$ and η vary with Ω under different ε_1 . In panels (a) and (b), we use $P_1 = 933.0 \mu\text{W}$, and in panels (c) and (d), we use $P_1 = 3.7 \text{ mW}$. Other parameters are the same as those in Fig. 2.




FIG. 5. (Color online) Calculation results of the real and imaginary parts of η under different control fields, ε_1 . We use $P_1 =$ (a) 37.3 μW , (b) 149.3 μW , (c) 335.9 μW , and (d) 3.7 mW. Other parameters are the same as those in Fig. 2.

a control field of $P_1 = 3.7$ mW is used. Compared to the case in Fig. 4(a), it can be seen that the transparent window is wider, and the effect of OMIT is more obvious. Furthermore, Figure 4(d) shows that the dip is becoming wider. The value of η at the dip is not exactly zero since Γ_m is nonzero. Taken together Figs. 3 and 4 show that if P_1 is small, and the effect of OMIT does not take place, then the probe field is almost completely absorbed near the resonance condition $\Omega = \Omega_m$, and meanwhile the second-order sideband field achieves the maximum amplitude at $\Omega = \Omega_m$. For the case where the effect of OMIT takes place, there is a transparent window for the probe field near the resonance condition $\Omega = \Omega_m$, while the second-order sideband field reaches its local minimum within a frequency window corresponding to about the cavity linewidth when $\Omega/\Omega_m = 1$. It is a suppressive window for the second-order sideband field. As the power of the control field becomes larger, both the transparent window for the probe field and the suppressive window for the second-order sideband field become wider. The real and imaginary parts of $A_c \equiv \sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} A_2^- / \varepsilon_p$ under different control fields are shown in Fig. 5. It can be seen that both the real and imaginary parts of $\sqrt{\eta_c \kappa} A_2^- / \varepsilon_p$ have essential changes during the process of turning up the control field. Figure 6 shows the calculation results of $|t_p|^2$ and η vary with the optical power of the control field at the resonance condition $\Omega = \Omega_m$. $|t_p|^2$ increases with the optical power of the control field, while η does not. For the case where the optical power of the control field is weaker than about 0.12 mW, η increases sharply with the optical power of the control field. η reaches its maximum at about $P_1 = 0.12$ mW. For the case of a larger P_1 , η decreases slowly with the optical power of the control field. All of the results obtained from Figs. 3–6 show that the amplitude of the second-order sideband can be controlled by the strong field ε_1 .

Up to now, we have shown that taking account of the nonlinear terms will lead to higher-order sidebands in a generic




FIG. 6. (Color online) Calculation results of $|t_p|^2$ and η vary with the optical power of the control field at the resonance condition $\Omega = \Omega_m$. We use $\varepsilon_p/\varepsilon_1 = 0.05$, and all of the other parameters are exactly the same as those in Fig. 2. The blue solid curve represents the calculation results of $|t_p|^2$ and the green dashed curve represents the calculation results of η .

optomechanical system, and the amplitude of the second-order sideband can also be tuned by the strong control field. However, the amplitude of the second-order sideband is very small. Figure 4 shows that the efficiency of the second-order sideband process is only about 2%. This means that the field at the frequency of $\omega_1 + 2\Omega$ is significantly weaker than the probe field. In what follows, we show that the amplitude of the second-order sideband can be made obvious by tuning Δ .

Figure 7 shows the numerical results of $|t_p|^2$ and η vary with Ω by using different Δ . In Figs. 7(a) and 7(b), we use $\Delta = -\Omega_m$, and the results are the same as those in Figs. 4(c) and 4(d). In this case, the efficiency of the second-order sideband process is only about 2%. When we change Δ , the trough of $|t_p|^2$ also changes. In Fig. 7(c) we find that the trough of $|t_p|^2$ is located at $\Omega/\Omega_m \approx 1.4$. There is a dip at $\Omega/\Omega_m = 1$, and it means that the probe field is absorbed greatly in this case. Figure 7(d) shows that there is an obvious second-order sideband at $\Omega/\Omega_m = 1$, and the efficiency of the second-order sideband process is about 15%. Similar results also can be seen in Figs. 7(e) and 7(f). It should be noted that Figs. 7(c) to 7(f) do not show OMIT. Obviously, there are two absorption peaks in Figs. 7(c) and 7(e). The first absorption peak is near the resonance condition of the moving mirror $\Omega = \Omega_m$, while the second one is near the resonance condition of the cavity $\Omega = -\bar{\Delta}$. If the resonance condition of the moving mirror is the same as the resonance condition of the cavity, the destructive interference between the probe field photons and the sideband excitations of the control field, which are induced by the mechanical oscillation, causes a tunable transparency window. The detailed process is as follows: The control and probe fields induce a radiation-pressure force oscillating at the frequency Ω , which is the beat frequency between the control and probe fields. If Ω is close to the resonance frequency of the moving mirror Ω_m , the mirror starts to oscillate coherently. As a result, Stokes and anti-Stokes fields will emerge. If the resonance condition of the moving mirror is the same as the resonance condition of the cavity, the anti-Stokes field is resonantly enhanced, so that the probe laser interferes with




FIG. 7. (Color online) Calculation results of $|t_p|^2$ and η vary with Ω under $\varepsilon_1 = 100.0$ MHz. We use $\Delta = -\Omega_m$ in panels (a) and (b), $\Delta = -1.4\Omega_m$ in panels (c) and (d), and $\Delta = -1.8\Omega_m$ in panels (e) and (f). Other parameters are the same as those in Fig. 2.

the anti-Stokes sideband and leads to a tunable transparency window [30,33,41]. If we choose Δ to be off resonance with the anti-Stokes field, here we take $\Delta = -1.4\Omega_m$ as an example, then the anti-Stokes field is subdued, and the effect of OMIT disappears. However, the density of states of the cavity field at the second-order sideband is larger than the density of states of the case $\Delta = -\Omega_m$, so we get a higher η .

The physical interpretation of why the efficiency of the second-order sideband has a local minimum on resonance is that the upconverted first-order sideband process is weak when OMIT occurs, because the destructive interference between the probe field and the anti-Stokes field leads to the cavity field at the frequency Ω being very weak. A mathematical interpretation of why the efficiency of the second-order sideband has a local minimum on resonance can be made by using Eq. (16), which is made up of two terms as has been shown before: the direct second-order sideband term and the upconverted first-order sideband term. If considering $\Omega/\Omega_m \approx 1$, $f^{(2)}(\Omega)$ can be estimated to be of the order of $\sim 10^{-12}$. So the first term, which describes the two-phonon upconverted process of the control field, is much smaller than

the second term. Then Eq. (16) can be simplified as

$$A_2^- \approx \frac{G A_1^- X_1}{\bar{\Delta} + 2\Omega + i\kappa/2}. \quad (20)$$

If $\Delta = -\Omega_m$ and when OMIT occurs, then $|A_2^-|$ reaches the local minimum within a frequency window corresponding to about the cavity linewidth when $\Omega/\Omega_m = 1$ because both the $|A_1^-|$ and X_1 reach the local minimum in this case. A possible interpretation of the obvious second-order sideband for the case $\Delta \approx -1.5\Omega_m$ is that the density of states of the cavity field at the first- and second-order sidebands is equal when $\Delta \approx -1.5\Omega_m$. Therefore two-step scattering into the second-order sideband is rendered more probable than it would otherwise be. This result also can be obtained by using the simplified expression of Eq. (16). When we tune Δ , the effect of OMIT disappears, and both $|A_1^-|$ and X_1 become larger. More importantly, $\bar{\Delta} + 2\Omega$ in the denominator of Eq. (20) is smaller, so it leads to an obvious second-order sideband.

IV. CONCLUSION

The propagation of electromagnetic fields in various systems covers a wide range of issues [41–57]. An optomechanical system is a promising approach to manipulate the propagation of light [41,49,50]. In this work, we show that a generic optomechanical system driven by a pump field with frequency ω_1 and a weak probe field with frequency ω_p can lead to the generation of second-order sideband signals $\omega_1 \pm 2\Omega$ by taking account of nonlinear terms. We give an effective method to calculate the amplitudes of such fields. We find that the second-order sidebands can also be tuned by the strong control field. There are some connections between OMIT and the second-order sideband process. When OMIT occurs, the second-order sideband process is subdued. We also show that the amplitude of the second-order sideband can be controlled by detuning Δ .

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work was supported in part by the National Science Foundation (NSF) of China (Grants No. 10975054, No. 91021011, and No. 11005057), the National Fundamental Research Program of China (Grant No. 2012CB922103), the Research Fund for the Doctoral Program of Higher Education of China (Grant No. 200804870051), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, HUST (Grant No. 2012QN115). H.X. is also supported in part by the Program for Excellent Doctoral Student, granted by the Ministry of Education China, and the Doctorate Innovation Foundation of the Huazhong University of Science and Technology. We also acknowledge the anonymous referees for their insightful comments.

- [1] T. W. Hansch and A. L. Schawlow, *Opt. Commun.* **13**, 68 (1975).
 [2] D. J. Wineland, R. E. Drullinger, and F. L. Walls, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **40**, 1639 (1978).
 [3] S. Chu, L. Hollberg, J. E. Bjorkholm, A. Cable, and A. Ashkin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 48 (1985).

- [4] R. Riviere, S. Deleglise, S. Weis, E. Gavartin, O. Arcizet, A. Schliesser, and T. J. Kippenberg, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 063835 (2011).
 [5] C. M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **45**, 75 (1980).
 [6] S. Huang and G. S. Agarwal, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 033830 (2010).

- [7] T. J. Kippenberg, H. Rokhsari, T. Carmon, A. Scherer, and K. J. Vahala, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 033901 (2005).
- [8] V. B. Braginsky, S. E. Strigin, and S. P. Vyatchanin, *Phys. Lett. A* **287**, 331 (2001).
- [9] V. B. Braginsky, S. E. Strigin, and S. P. Vyatchanin, *Phys. Lett. A* **305**, 111 (2002).
- [10] G. S. Agarwal and S. Huang, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 041803 (2010).
- [11] S. Huang and G. S. Agarwal, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 043826 (2011).
- [12] C. Joshi, J. Larson, M. Jonson, E. Andersson, and P. Öhberg, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 033805 (2012).
- [13] J.-Q. Liao, H. K. Cheung, and C. K. Law, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 025803 (2012).
- [14] F.-Y. Hong, Y. Xiang, W. H. Tang, Z.-Y. Zhu, L.Z. Jiang, and L.N. Wu, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 012309 (2012).
- [15] T. Botter, D. W. C. Brooks, N. Brahms, S. Schreppler, and D. M. Stamper-Kurn, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 013812 (2012).
- [16] S. Barzanjeh, M. H. Naderi, and M. Soltanolkotabi, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 063850 (2011).
- [17] M. Tomes, F. Marquardt, G. Bahl, and T. Carmon, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 063806 (2011).
- [18] S. G. Hofer, W. Wiczczyk, M. Aspelmeyer, and K. Hammerer, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 052327 (2011).
- [19] J.-Q. Liao and C. K. Law, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 053838 (2011).
- [20] A. Xuereb, R. Schnabel, and K. Hammerer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 213604 (2011).
- [21] B. Chen, C. Jiang, J.-J. Li, and K.-D. Zhu, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 055802 (2011).
- [22] S. Zaitsev, A. K. Pandey, O. Shtempluck, and E. Buks, *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 046605 (2011).
- [23] M. H. Schleier-Smith, I. D. Leroux, H. Zhang, M. A. Van Camp, and V. Vuletić, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 143005 (2011).
- [24] S. K. Steinke and P. Meystre, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 023834 (2011).
- [25] Q. Sun, X.-H. Hu, W. M. Liu, X. C. Xie, and A.-C. Ji, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 023822 (2011).
- [26] H. K. Cheung and C. K. Law, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 023812 (2011).
- [27] T. G. McRae, K. H. Lee, G. I. Harris, J. Knittel, and W. P. Bowen, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 023825 (2010).
- [28] G. A. T. Pender, P. F. Barker, F. Marquardt, J. Millen, and T. S. Monteiro, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 021802 (2012).
- [29] J. Hofer, A. Schliesser, and T. J. Kippenberg, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**, 031804 (2010).
- [30] S. Weis *et al.*, *Science* **330**, 1520 (2010).
- [31] A. H. Safavi-Naeini *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **472**, 69 (2011).
- [32] T. P. Purdy, D. W. C. Brooks, T. Botter, N. Brahms, Z.-Y. Ma, and D. M. Stamper-Kurn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 133602 (2010).
- [33] A. Schliesser and T. J. Kippenberg, *Physics* **4**, 97 (2011).
- [34] A. Schliesser, O. Arcizet, R. Rivière, G. Anetsberger, and T. J. Kippenberg, *Nat. Phys.* **5**, 509 (2009).
- [35] G. Anetsberger, O. Arcizet, Q. P. Unterreithmeier, R. Rivière, A. Schliesser, E. M. Weig, J. P. Kotthaus, and T. J. Kippenberg, *Nat. Phys.* **5**, 909 (2009).
- [36] G. Anetsberger, R. Rivière, A. Schliesser, O. Arcizet, and T. J. Kippenberg, *Nat. Photonics* **2**, 627 (2008).
- [37] Y.-S. Park and H. Wang, *Nat. Physics* **5**, 489 (2009).
- [38] I. Favero and K. Karrai, *Nat. Photonics* **3**, 201 (2009).
- [39] E. Verhagen, S. Deléglise, S. Weis, A. Schliesser, and T. J. Kippenberg, *Nature (London)* **482**, 63 (2012).
- [40] T. J. Kippenberg and K. J. Vahala, *Science* **321**, 1172 (2008).
- [41] A. Schliesser and T. J. Kippenberg, *Adv. At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **58**, 207 (2010).
- [42] Y. Wu and X. Yang, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 013832 (2007).
- [43] W.-X. Yang, A.-X. Chen, R.-K. Lee, and Y. Wu, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 013835 (2011).
- [44] X.-T. Xie and M. A. Macovei, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 073902 (2010).
- [45] Y. Wu and X. Yang, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 013608 (2003).
- [46] W.-X. Yang, J.-M. Hou, Y. Y. Lin, and R.-K. Lee, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 033825 (2009).
- [47] Y. Wu and X. Yang, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 054425 (2007).
- [48] Y. Wu and X. Yang, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 053806 (2005).
- [49] F. Marquardt, J. G. E. Harris, and S. M. Girvin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 103901 (2006).
- [50] A. Schliesser, R. Rivière, G. Anetsberger, O. Arcizet, and T. J. Kippenberg, *Nat. Physics* **4**, 415 (2008).
- [51] H. Xiong, L.-G. Si, P. Huang, and X. Yang, *Phys. Rev. E* **82**, 057602 (2010).
- [52] H. Xiong, L.-G. Si, J. F. Guo, X.-Y. Lü, and X. Yang, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 063845 (2011).
- [53] H. Xiong, L.-G. Si, C. Ding, X. Yang, and Y. Wu, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 043841 (2011).
- [54] H. Xiong, L.-G. Si, C. Ding, X.-Y. Lü, X. Yang, and Y. Wu, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 016602 (2012).
- [55] H. Xiong, L.-G. Si, C. Ding, X. Yang, and Y. Wu, *Phys. Rev. E* **85**, 016606 (2012).
- [56] V. Y. Fedorov and T. Nakajima, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 143903 (2011).
- [57] N. Pappasimakis, V. A. Fedotov, N. I. Zheludev, and S. L. Prosvirnin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 253903 (2008).