Control of the coupling strength and linewidth of a cavity magnon-polariton
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The full coherent control of hybridized systems such as strongly coupled cavity-magnon states is a crucial step to enable future information processing technologies. Thus, it is particularly interesting to engineer deliberate control mechanisms such as the full control of the coupling strength which can act as a measure for coherent information exchange. In this work, we employ cavity resonator spectroscopy to demonstrate the complete control of the coupling strength of hybridized cavity-magnon states. For this, we use two driving microwave inputs which can be tuned at will. For these inputs, both the relative phase $\phi$ and relative amplitude ratio $\delta_0$ can be independently controlled. We demonstrate that for specific quadratures between both tones we can increase the coupling strength, close the anticrossing gap, and enter a regime of level merging. At the transition, the absolute cavity signal is modified by 30 dB and we observe an additional linewidth decrease of 13% at resonance level merging. This kind of control over the coupling, and hence linewidth, opens an avenue to enable or suppress an exchange of information and bridges the gap between quantum information and spintronics applications.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Polaritons are the quasiparticles associated with the coupling of electromagnetic waves with an excited state of matter [1,2]. Such hybridized systems are promising candidates for applications as they can combine the advantages of the different physical systems and overcome the limitations of a single one [3–5]. While hybrid quantum circuits represent a tool for the deliberate control of quantum states, polaritons originating from light-matter interactions can be considered as a tool to study macroscopic systems through different kinds of hybrid systems such as exciton-photon or magnon-polaritons (MPs) [6–13]. For instance, MPs enable examining the spin-photon interaction, where the magnons are the associated quanta of a collective spin excitation [14]. The study and manipulation of spin-photon interactions could lead to the development of spintronic applications [15–20]. However, realizing such applications requires full control over the macroscopic coupling strength $g_{\text{eff}} = g_0 \sqrt{(\Delta N S)}$, where $g_0$ is the single spin coupling strength, $N$ is the total number of contributing spins and $S$ the spin number of the utilized material [21,22]. Since it represents a measure for the coherent information exchange, achieving full control over $g_{\text{eff}}$ would enable the deliberate enhancement or suppression of the information exchange [23]. This is of broad interest and has been studied for various systems such as single atoms, optomechanical circuits, exciton or surface plasmon-polaritons, and nanocavity-quantum dot systems [24–28].

Within cavity magnon-polariton (CMP) spectroscopy, various recent experiments studied MPs using an yttrium-iron-garnet (YIG) sphere as the magnonic sample in a cavity resonator with a single microwave signal as an input. At resonance, the photon states fully hybridize with the magnon states, creating a CMP [29] as originally predicted in Ref. [21]. In the strong coupling regime, $g_{\text{eff}}$ is related to the anticrossing gap by $\Delta \omega = 2g_{\text{eff}}$ and set by the resonator geometry and the sample [22,30]. CMPs have been well studied for different configurations in recent years [16,20,29,31–39]. At room temperature, the origin of the coherent cavity-magnon coupling can be attributed to a fixed phase correlation of the electromagnetic fields [29]. By finding a possibility to tune the phase relation between the cavity photon and the magnon, $g_{\text{eff}}$ could be manipulated. This has been recently shown to be possible when changing the position of the sample inside the cavity [40] and theoretically predicted in the case when a second field is introduced driving only magnons [41]. Here, we report on a tunable, and in principle also on-chip compatible, approach which allows full external control over the coupling strength $g_{\text{eff}}$, and thus of the hybridized states.

Specifically, the coupling strength is tuned by controlling the relative phase $\phi$ and amplitude ratio $\delta_0$ between the cavity field and the corresponding field of a newly introduced second microwave drive. This second drive acts only on the magnons and it is not coupled to the cavity field generated from the
cavity port, which corresponds to the only microwave drive employed in previous experiments on single-input driven CMPs (e.g., in Refs. [22,30,40]).

Then, by simply controlling these inputs, the anticrossing gap can be enhanced or closed, leading to “level merging” exactly at the transition and level attraction beyond the closure of the gap. As we focus here on the special transition point of “level merging,” we discuss the impact of changing \( \phi \) and \( \delta_0 \) on the linewidth and total amplitude (in power units), which is beyond simple interference of the cavity photon and magnon response. In contrast to other works, our approach is entirely externally tunable. It is not necessary to modify the experimental environment such as moving the magnonic sample in the cavity resonator or changing the resonator geometry [40,42,43].

II. REALIZING AND MODELING A TWO DRIVE EXPERIMENT

Our experiment consists of a commercially bought YIG sphere (\( \text{Y}_3\text{Fe}_5\text{O}_{12}, r = 0.1 \text{ mm} \)) [44], placed in the antinode of the alternating current (AC) magnetic field of a reentrant cavity resonator with \( \omega_c/2\pi = 6.50 \text{ GHz} \) [45–48]. The additional input, called magnon port, is composed of a metallic loop around the YIG sphere (cf. Ref. [49]). Its driving field acts only on the magnons and does not couple directly to the cavity photons (cf. Fig. 1(b)). Experimentally, we observe a direct coupling of the signal from the magnon port to the cavity photons. This coupling is what we denote as crosstalk and it is measured as a transmission signal at the cavity port; i.e., it overlaps with the reflection measurement of interest (cf. Ref. [49]). However, the contribution of crosstalk can be neglected for the low-\( \delta_0 \) regime (0 < \( \delta_0 \approx 1 \)) discussed in this work, as it has no impact on the signal from the reflection measurement. The vector network analyzer (VNA) serves as the only microwave source to obtain two coherent microwave drives up to this phase and we measure in reflection \( |S_{11}(\omega)| \) [cf. Fig. 1(a)]. While \( \phi \) is modulated by a mechanically tunable phase shifter added to path \( P_1 \), the relative amplitude of both tones is controlled by the attenuators inserted in both paths.

The time-varying intracavity magnetic fields drive the spins in the YIG sphere out of equilibrium. Their dynamics can be described by the Landau-Lifshitz-Gilbert equation [50]. Here, we can quote the effective field acting on the magnon response. In contrast to other works, our approach is beyond simple interference of the cavity photon and magnon response. In other words, our approach is entirely externally tunable. It is not necessary to modify the experimental environment such as moving the magnonic sample in the cavity resonator or changing the resonator geometry [40,42,43].

FIG. 1. (a) Schematics of the experimental setup showing the coherent signal from port I [output power level −5 dBm (0.3 mW)] divided by a power splitter. The value for \( \delta_0 \) is controlled by a variable (0 to 9 dB) permanently inserted attenuator in the path of the cavity port and, if necessary, fixed attenuators (10 dB each). A mechanically tunable phase shifter in the path of the magnon port modulates the phase uncertainty of ±0.02π/8. The system’s response is measured in reflection at port II. (b) Orientation of the coupling loop and alignment of the intracavity magnetic fields (cf. Ref. [49]).

Our direct external drive on the magnons by the magnon port establishes an open system and is described by \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{ext}} = \mathcal{H}_{\text{bath}} + \mathcal{H}_{\text{sys}} \), where \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{bath}} \) denotes the microwave feedline couplings including the microwave drives at either port and \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{sys}} \) are the interactions in the cavity including the coupling strength. For the description of the coupling strength of our two-tone driven CMP, we neglect \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{bath}} \) (cf. Ref. [49]). In order to model our open system, we introduce the non-Hermitian Hamiltonian \( \mathcal{H}_{\text{sys}} = h_0 a^\dagger a + h_0\text{om}^m m^\dagger + h_{\text{eff}}(m^\dagger a + a^\dagger m) + h\Omega(a^\dagger m) \). The penultimate term denotes the intracavity cavity photon-magnon interaction. The magnon port’s contribution as an indirect drive to the cavity photons via the coupling of the magnons is considered in the last term by the “driving frequency” \( \Omega = \beta\delta_0 e^{i\phi} \). The reflection scattering parameter \( S_{11}(\omega) \) can be derived employing input-output theory (including the bath contributions) as [23]

\[
S_{11}(\omega) = -1 + \frac{2\kappa_r - 2\kappa_e \delta_0 e^{i(1+\delta_0\phi)}\sqrt{\kappa_r + \kappa_e}}{\kappa_r + \kappa_e - i(\omega - \omega_c + \kappa_e)} - i(\omega - \omega_c + \kappa_e) + \frac{2\kappa_e \delta_0 e^{i(1+\delta_0\phi)}}{\kappa_r + \kappa_e - i(\omega - \omega_c + \kappa_e)},
\]

where \( \kappa_e, \kappa_r, \kappa_r, \) and \( \kappa_0 \) denote the dissipation parameters due to the coupling of the feedline into the resonator at the magnon and cavity port, the total resonator losses, and the magnon linewidth, respectively.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Our findings begin by comparing the expressions for a one-port driven CMP [47] with Eq. (1), we introduce a new expression of the coupling strength considering the
FIG. 2. Experimental spectra for (a) $\phi = 0$ and (b) $\phi = \pi$ for three different regimes of $\delta_0$: In I we see level repulsion [$\delta_0 < 1$], in II the transition [$\delta_0 \approx 1$], and in III level merging [$\delta_0 > 1$]. The different combinations of values for $\phi$ and $\delta_0$ lead to different effective couplings, i.e., $g'(\delta_0, \phi)$. Note that level repulsion is always observed for $\phi = 0$. All plots are normalized by the mean value of the signal’s background amplitude and displayed in units of the resonance field $H_{\text{res}}$, i.e., where $\omega_c = \omega_{\text{ms}}$.

deendence on $\phi$ and $\delta_0$ as

$$g'(\delta_0, \phi) = g_{\text{eff}} \sqrt{1 + \delta_0 e^{i \phi}}.$$  

where the value of $g_{\text{eff}}$ denotes a complete suppression of the magnon drive ($\delta_0 = 0$) and for certain combinations of $\delta_0$ and $\phi$, Eq. (2) becomes complex and leads to level attraction (cf. Figs. 2(b) II, (b) III, and 3). This observation is also in line with the sign change for level merging shown in Ref. [25]. In addition, the analytical expectation from Eq. (2) is in accordance with the experimental data and the theoretical expectation of Ref. [41] for Fig. 3(c). As can be inferred from Eq. (2), the modulus of the coupling strength contains both real and imaginary contributions, i.e., $|g'(\delta_0, \phi)| = g_{\text{eff}} \sqrt{1 + \delta_0 e^{i \phi}}$. For real (level repulsion) and imaginary (level attraction) parts are nonzero, for $\phi = \pi$ only $\text{Im}(g'(\delta_0, \phi)) \neq 0$. (c) Experimental data (points) and fit (solid lines) of $g'(\delta_0, \phi)$ for different values of $\delta_0$, confirming the findings in panel (a). The value to $\delta_0$ is calculated from the fit result of panels (a) and (b) (cf. Ref. [49]). The solid lines are fits of Eq. (2).

![FIG. 3. Dependence of the real (a) and imaginary (b) parts of the coupling strength on $\delta_0$ for $\phi \in [0, \pi/2, \pi]$. For all $\phi$, the real part value merges to the same value within the error bars at very low $\delta_0$. For $\phi = 0$ (red circles) and $\phi = \pi/2$ (green diamonds), the coupling strength increases. However, higher values of the coupling strength are seen for $\phi = 0$. For $\phi = \pi$ (blue squares), we see a decrease toward the limit $\delta_0 \rightarrow 1$ where $g'(\delta_0, \phi)$ disappears. These behaviors are related to the imaginary part shown in panel (b). While for $\phi = \pi/2$ this increase is suppressed as real (level repulsion) and imaginary (level attraction) parts are nonzero, for $\phi = \pi$ only $\text{Im}(g'(\delta_0, \phi))$ is nonzero. (c) Experimental data (points) and fit (solid lines) of $g'(\delta_0, \phi)$ for different values of $\delta_0$, confirming the findings in panel (a). The value to $\delta_0$ is calculated from the fit result of panels (a) and (b) (cf. Ref. [49]). The solid lines are fits of Eq. (2).](image-url)
exchange between cavity photons and magnons, the coupling quantified by the coupling strength can be considered as an additional channel for energy dissipation for one subsystem or gain for the other subsystem within a single oscillation period for the energy exchange. Thus, for a dominating imaginary part in Eq. (2), the dissipative coupling is the strongest contribution which results in level attraction. Depending on the orientation of the effective acting torque (with contributions by both tones), the damping of the magnons is either enhanced or compensated for $\delta_0 = 1.02 \pm 0.09$ [cf. Fig. 2(b), part II]. Hence, a strong absolute change $|\Delta A|^2$ of the signal of $S_1(\omega)$ and decrease of the linewidth at level merging are expected at resonance.

Figure 3 shows the dependence of real [Fig. 3(a)] and imaginary [Fig. 3(b)] parts of $g'(\delta_0, \phi)$ for $\delta_0 = \text{const}$ and $\phi \in [0, \pi, 2\pi]$ and the real part for $\phi = \text{const}$ [Fig. 3(c)], including a fit based on Eq. (2) for the same range of $\delta_0$ and $\phi$. While Re$[g'(\delta_0, \phi)]$ was determined from the minimal gap distance evaluating both the amplitude and phase data [cf. Ref. [49]], the imaginary contribution for $\phi \neq 0$ and $\delta_0 > 1$ was extracted from the horizontal width of level merging, which corresponds to $4\text{Im}[g'(\delta_0, \phi)]$ [cf. Figs. 3(a) and 3(b)] [25,49].

For $\delta_0 \to 0$, the three curves merge and $g'(\delta_0, \phi) = g_{\text{eff}}$ as the influence of $\phi$ on $g'(\delta_0, \phi)$ vanishes. The cavity driven photon-magnon coupling dominates and results in an anticrossing gap of $2g'(\delta_0 \to 0)$. Since for $\phi = 0$, Im$[g'(\delta_0, \phi)] = 0$ for all $\delta_0$, and Re$[g'(\delta_0, \phi)] = 0$ for $\phi = \pi$ and $\delta_0 \geq 1$, the real part can be attributed to a repulsive interaction (anticrossing) and the imaginary part to an attractive one (level merging). In accordance with the expectation from Eq. (2) [cf. Fig. 3(a)] for $\phi = 0$, Re$[g'(\delta_0, \phi)] = 0$ increases toward $\delta_0 = 1$. On the other hand, for $\phi = \pi$ and $\delta_0 < 1$, the increasing contribution from the additional torque decreases the gap. The increase is lower than the total decrease at $\phi = \pi$, because here the coupling strength is “just” increased by $g'(\delta_0, 0) \propto \sqrt{1 + \delta_0}$. Furthermore, for $\phi = \frac{\pi}{2}$, we also observe a coexistence of anticrossing and level merging (cf. Ref. [58]). This results in a smaller increase for Re$[g'(\delta_0, \phi = \pi/2)]$ and demonstrates the broad tunability of our system. Figure 3(c) confirms that the two-tone driven CMP can be effectively described as a single-tone driven CMP with $g' = g_{\text{eff}}$ for $\delta_0 \to 0$ (black triangles), and that the onset of level merging is observed for $\phi = \pi$ and $\delta_0 = 1$ [cf. Fig. 3(c), blue squares].

Previously, for a CMP created by the cavity port only, an increase of the signal’s linewidth at resonance has also been reported [40]. However, in the transition to level merging, a decrease in linewidth accompanied by a strong absolute change of the resonance amplitude is expected [41]. As shown in Fig. 4, we observe an absolute change of the signal in power units by 30 dB and decrease in linewidth at the level merging transition for $\delta_0 = 1$ and $\phi = \pi$ below the simple addition of the cavity photon’s and the magnon’s linewidth from interference. Figure 4(a) shows the relative increase of the amplitude compared to the off-resonant cavity resonator’s amplitude ($H_{\text{ext}} \ll H_{\text{res}}$, cf. inset) below, at, and above the cavity’s resonance frequency.

Since the CMP can be regarded as the quasiparticle from a system of two coupled harmonic oscillators, the linewidth is found by fitting the sum of two Lorentzian functions to the data and determined by the geometric mean between lower and upper bounds. While the lower bound is given by the maximal function, which always takes the higher value of the set of both linewidths [56], the upper bound is given by the sum of the individual linewidths. For a further decrease of the linewidth at level merging, the average from both bounds needs to be below the average of the off-resonant linewidths of magnon and cavity photon. They are determined to be $\kappa/2\pi = 3.79 \pm 0.003$ MHz and $\kappa_m/2\pi = 1 \pm 0.5$ MHz; i.e., the linewidth has to be below its geometric mean of 2.4 $\pm$ 0.25 MHz. On average, we observe an additional decrease of the linewidth by $\approx 13\%$ below the geometric mean including the error bar [gray shaded, cf. Fig. 4(b)]. This decrease in
level merging is supported by the observation of a corresponding increase in the total linewidth for $\phi = 0$ (cf. Fig. 4 in Ref. [49]).

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In summary, we demonstrated a method to achieve full control of the coupling strength of CMPs. This is done by tuning the relative phase $\phi$ and via the external attenuators the internal amplitude ratio $\delta_0$ between the cavity photon’s and magnon’s AC magnetic fields (through a second port and the coupling into both ports). By controlling these parameters, we observe a full collapse of the anticrossing gap at resonance, a regime we call “level merging.” This is observed only if the relative phase is set to $\phi = \pi$ as well as the relative amplitude ratio to $\delta_0 = 1$ [57]. We note that this transition, mediated by the two-toned system, is particularly interesting as it can be used to strongly increase the absolute amplitude of the signal. Moreover, our system realizes a fully automated tuning mechanism wherein we can easily shift through various levels of coupling, i.e., from level repulsion to recently studied level attraction [40]. We achieve level merging by externally controlling the coupling strength, whereas in other works, level attraction is observed by tuning the hybrid system’s dissipation [25] or adding a “dielectric” contribution to the system [40,55]. With our system, it is also possible to deeply move into the regime of level attraction (using higher $\delta_0$’s) [58]. In our two-tone driven CMP experiment, however, the control over the coupling regime is realized without any direct changes of the experimental setup, thus reducing the error and being advantageous for real applications. Such an automated control mechanism over the spin-photon interaction could pave the way for deliberately turning the coherent exchange of information on and off. Furthermore, the presented spectroscopic two-tone control can be extended to time-dependent control to cavity-magnon polaron modes (cf. Ref. [59]). This could enable future applications for data storage and information processing by the addition of a nonlinear component such as a superconducting circuit to the spin-photon system.
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