Electrically driven, optically levitated microscopic rotors
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We report on the electrically driven rotation of 2.4-μm-radius, optically levitated dielectric microspheres. Electric fields are used to apply torques to a microsphere’s permanent electric dipole moment, while angular displacement is measured by detecting the change in polarization state of light transmitted through the microsphere (MS). This technique enables greater control than previously achieved with purely optical means because the direction and magnitude of the electric torque can be set arbitrarily. We measure the spin-down of a microsphere released from a rotating electric field, the harmonic motion of the dipole relative to the instantaneous direction of the field, and the phase lag between the driving electric field and the dipole moment of the MS due to drag from residual gas. We also observe the gyroscopic precession of the MS when the axis of rotation of the driving field and the angular momentum of the microsphere are orthogonal. These observations are in quantitative agreement with the equation of motion. The control offered by the electrical drive enables precise measurements of microsphere properties and torque as well as a method for addressing the direction of angular momentum for an optically levitated particle.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The ability to manipulate microscopic objects has found important applications in science and technology. The interest in optical levitation of dielectric objects in vacuum, pioneered by Ashkin and Dziedzic [1,2], has grown in recent times, with applications in precision measurements [3–8], surface science [9], and quantum technology [10–18]. The suggestion was made in [1] that the rotational degrees of freedom (DOFs) of an optically levitated dielectric microsphere (MS) could be manipulated using the angular momentum in circularly polarized light. This has been realized in more recent times [19–32]. Here we present a technique for manipulating the rotational DOFs of an optically levitated MS by using electric fields to apply a torque to the |d| ∼ 100 e μm permanent electric dipole moment [5] found in 2.4-μm-radius silica MSs grown using the Stöber process [33]. The orientation of the dipole moment follows the orientation of the driving field so that the angular velocity, ωMS, can be set in both magnitude and direction [34]. Using the control afforded by electric torques, we observe the spin down of a MS suddenly released from a rotating electric field, measure the MS dipole moment by tuning the libration frequency, test the relationship between residual gas pressure and drag, and induce gyroscopic precession by rapidly changing the electric field axis of rotation. Because the electric field and dipole moment are both known in this system, precise quantitative measurements are possible.

II. EXPERIMENTAL TECHNIQUES AND PRINCIPLES

The rotational response of a trapped MS, including an applied electric field, is described by the equation of motion

\[ \mathbf{L} = \mathbf{T} = \mathbf{d} \times \mathbf{E} - \frac{\beta}{I} \mathbf{L} + \mathbf{T}_{\text{opt}}, \]

where \( \mathbf{T} \) is the total torque, \( \mathbf{d} \) is the electric dipole moment, \( \mathbf{E} \) is the electric field, \( \mathbf{L} \) is the angular momentum related to the angular velocity by \( \omega_{MS} = \mathbf{L}/I \), \( \beta \) is the rotational damping coefficient, \( I \) is the moment of inertia, and \( \mathbf{T}_{\text{opt}} \) is the optical torque. The part of the optical torque which does not average to zero over a rotation is generally negligible compared to the electric torques used here [35].

The angular velocity and the rotational phase of the MS are measured optically. As the MS rotates, it couples some of the incident linearly polarized optical power, \( P_0 \), into the cross-polarized optical power, \( P_\perp \), according to

\[ P_\perp = P_0 \sin \left( \eta/2 \right)^2 \sin \phi^2, \]

where \( \eta \) is the phase retardation between the fast and slow axes, and \( \phi \) is the angular displacement of the MS relative to an origin in which the fast axis is aligned with the incident polarization [36]. The \( \sin \phi^2 \) term implies that the phase of the MS is encoded as a modulation of \( P_\perp \), at twice the rotation frequency, \( \omega_{MS} \).

The optical trap is identical to that described in Ref. [37] with the addition of polarization optics to measure the cross-polarized light, \( P_\perp \). One polarizing beam splitter (PBS) is inserted before the trap to define the linear polarization of the incident light, and a second PBS is placed after the trap to extract \( P_\perp \) and measure the rotational phase of the MS. The remainder of the optical system, described in Ref. [37], is capable of stabilizing the optical trap at high vacuum.

*arider@stanford.edu
The residual gas pressure is controlled and measured between $\sim 2 \times 10^{-6}$ and 1 mbar. The vacuum pressure is tuned by introducing or removing N$_2$ gas and is measured by a cold-cathode gauge for pressures below $10^{-4}$ mbar, a capacitance manometer for pressures between $10^{-4}$ and $10^{-2}$ mbar, and a Pirani gauge for pressures between $10^{-3}$ and 1 mbar. The cold-cathode gauge is found to affect the charge of the MS, so it is only used to measure the $\sim 2 \times 10^{-6}$ mbar base pressure of the vacuum system after an experiment. The capacitance manometer does not cover the full range of vacuum pressures, so the Pirani gauge is calibrated against the more accurate capacitance manometer, where there is overlap. This system is capable of measuring the pressure to an accuracy of 10% for N$_2$ over the range of interest [38,39].

The trapping region of the apparatus is illustrated in Fig. 1, which shows a cross section of the truncated pyramidal electrodes used to apply torquing electric fields to the MS. A cone is bored into the back of each pyramidal electrode to allow optical and mechanical access to the trapping region. The six electrodes define a cubic trapping cavity 4 mm on a side. Each electrode is connected to a high-bandwidth, high-voltage amplifier driven by a digitally synthesized analog signal. This apparatus is capable of producing arbitrary three-dimensional electric fields up to 100 kV/m in magnitude at frequencies as high as 1 Mrad/s, which limits the rotation frequencies achieved here. To produce a spinning electric field, a sinusoidal voltage is applied to a set of four electrodes in a plane, with a phase offset of $\pi/2$ between successive electrodes. A finite element analysis is used to calculate the electric field. It is found that the x component of the field in the center of the trap, $E_x$, is well approximated by $E_x = 0.66(\Delta V_d/\Delta x)$, where $\Delta V_d$ is the potential difference across a pair of electrodes, and $\Delta x = 4$ mm is the electrode separation. The same statement applies to $E_y$ and $E_z$.

Before performing a measurement, the MS is discharged as described in Refs. [4,9,40]. In addition, the MS is prepared in a state of known angular momentum and rotational phase by dissipating any initial angular velocity using 0.1 mbar of N$_2$ gas. An electric field rotating at $\omega_0 = 2\pi$ rad/s with $E = 41$ kV/m is then turned on to align d with E. The chamber pressure is reduced to the base pressure of the vacuum system and $\omega_0$ is increased at a rate of 300 rad/s$^2$ to the desired rotation frequency. Changes in the rotational dynamics in response to changes in the electric field magnitude and direction, as well as the damping coefficient, $\beta$, can then be observed. The data presented here were collected with one specific MS. Similar qualitative behavior is observed with other MSs, and the measured dipole moment is representative of the population.

III. OBSERVATIONS AND DYNAMICS

A typical amplitude spectrum of $P_{\perp}$, in the region around twice the drive frequency, with $\omega_0 = 100\pi$ rad/s is shown in the top panel of Fig. 2. A clear peak which follows the frequency, $\omega_0$, of the electric driving signal is observed at $2\omega_0$. The $\sim 10$ ppm amplitude modulation caused by rotation of the MS implies that the relative phase retardation of this MS is $\eta \sim 10^{-2}$. The prominent sidebands are caused by harmonic oscillation of the dipole about the electric field, which can be seen by demodulating the phase of $P_{\perp}$ relative to the electric field carrier signal as shown in the bottom panel of Fig. 2.
\[ L(t) = e^{-\omega/\tau} L(0). \] (3)

Here, the damping time \( \tau \) is related to the damping coefficient by \( \tau = I/\beta \). This decay is illustrated in Fig. 3 at the base pressure of the vacuum system (2 \( \times \) 10^{-6} mbar). For the first 1000 s, \( \omega_{MS} \gtrsim 150 \) krad/s, the drag torque dominates, and the data are well modeled by an exponential decay. The behavior beyond 1000 s can be attributed to an optical torque, \( T_{opt} \sim 10^{-23} \) N m.

The average optical torque on a birefringent particle is given approximately by

\[ T_{opt} \approx P_{opt} \omega_{opt} \left[ 1 - \cos (k \Delta n \sin \phi). \right] \] (4)

where \( P \) is the \(~1\) mW trapping beam power, \( \omega_{opt} \sim 10^{15} \) rad/s is the optical frequency, \( k \sim 2\pi/(1 \) \( \mu m \) is the wave number, \( r = 2.35 \) \( \mu m \) is the radius of the microsphere, \( \Delta n \) is the birefringence, and \( \phi \) is the degree of ellipticity [35,41]. The terminal angular velocity of the microsphere can then be explained by a fluctuating \(~100\) ppm degree of ellipticity in the trapping beam.

B. Libration

The simplest dynamics with the electric dipole interacting with a rotating electric field can be analyzed in the case where the electric field is rotating about a fixed axis with the dipole lying in the same plane as the electric field. In the frame corotating with \( \mathbf{E} \), Eq. (1) reduces to an equation of motion for \( \phi \), the angle between the electric field and the dipole, \( \phi = -\omega_0 \sin \phi - \frac{1}{\tau} (\omega + \phi) \), (5)

where

\[ \Omega = Ed/(I\omega_0). \] (6)

For sufficiently low damping, \( \tau \Omega > 1 \), this equation has an equilibrium solution,

\[ \phi_{eq} = -\arcsin \left( \frac{1}{\tau \Omega} \right) = -\arcsin \left( \frac{\beta \omega_0}{Ed} \right), \] (7)

and can be linearized to give harmonic oscillation at the frequency

\[ \omega_\phi = \sqrt{\cos (\phi_{eq}) \omega_0 \Omega} = \sqrt{\cos (\phi_{eq}) Ed/I}. \] (8)

This results in the sidebands shown in Fig. 2. The dependence of \( \omega_\phi \) on the magnitude of the driving electric field, \( E \), is well modeled by Eq. (8), as shown in Fig. 4. The equilibrium phase lag \( \phi_{eq} \) may be neglected because \( \tau \Omega \gg 1 \) at the base pressure of the vacuum system. The fit shown in Fig. 4 extracts the ratio \( d/l \), which can be used to determine the dipole moment, \( d \), if the MS is assumed to be a uniform sphere with the radius, \( r_{MS} = 2.35 \pm 0.02 \) \( \mu m \) and mass \( M_{MS} = 85 \pm 9 \) pg, measured for this lot of MS in Ref. [42]. This procedure gives \( I = (1.9 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-25} \) kg m², which implies \( d = 127 \pm 14 \) e \( \mu m \), in agreement with Ref. [5]. The ability to measure the dipole moment from the frequency of harmonic oscillation enables precise measurements of torques on an optically levitated particle in high vacuum by balancing an unknown torque against an electric torque.

C. Drag from residual gas

Once the dipole moment is known, it is possible to measure the drag due to residual gas and verify models of dissipation for optically levitated particles. The equilibrium phase lag \( \phi_{eq} \) between \( d \) and \( \mathbf{E} \) is expected to increase with the pressure \( P \), as the drag from the gas increases. In the molecular flow regime, the damping coefficient, \( \beta \), can be written as \( \beta = kP \), where \( k \) is a constant that depends on the geometry of the MS,
The fit reports $k = (4.1 \pm 0.6) \times 10^{-25}$ m$^3$s, assuming $d = 127 \pm 14 \mu$m. This is consistent with the value $k = 3.4 \times 10^{-25}$ m$^3$s predicted in Refs. [43,44] for a 2.35-$\mu$m-radius MS in thermal equilibrium with 300 K N$_2$ gas. No evidence for increased dissipation due to an elevated MS temperature or surface roughness is observed. This measurement of $k$ can be used to infer the base vacuum pressure in the vicinity of the MS for the spin-down time measured in Fig. 3 from $P = I/(k\tau)$. This give $P = (5.1 \pm 0.9) \times 10^{-6}$ mbar, which is roughly a factor of 2 greater than the pressure measured after the experiment with the cold cathode gauge. This discrepancy could be due to another source of dissipation which becomes significant at low pressures, inaccuracy of the cold-cathode gauge, or a real pressure difference between the residual gas pressure in the trap and the cold-cathode gauge at the end of the measurement.

D. Gyroscopic precession

When the electric field rotation axis and the angular momentum are not aligned, the dynamics are complex and
depend sensitively on the initial conditions. For $\Omega \ll \omega_0$, and a field $E(t) = E [\cos (\omega_0 t) \hat{x} - \sin (\omega_0 t) \hat{y}]$, rotating about the $\hat{x}$ axis, an approximate solution is given by

$$L(t) = L \left[ \cos \left( \frac{\Omega}{2} t \right) \hat{z} + \sin \left( \frac{\Omega}{2} t \right) \hat{y} \right]$$

and

$$d(t) = -d \left[ \cos \left( \left( \omega_0 + \frac{\Omega}{2} \right) t \right) \hat{x} + \sin \left( \left( \omega_0 + \frac{\Omega}{2} \right) t \right) \cos \left( \frac{\Omega}{2} t \right) \hat{y} - \sin \left( \left( \omega_0 + \frac{\Omega}{2} \right) t \right) \sin \left( \frac{\Omega}{2} t \right) \hat{z} \right],$$

in the absence of dissipation.

The angular momentum vector $\mathbf{L}$ undergoes left-handed precession about the electric field axis of rotation at an angular frequency $\Omega/2$. The factor of 1/2 is due to the fact that the torque is averaged over a rotation of the MS. This behavior is observed as a low-frequency modulation of the cross-polarized light most prominently at twice the precession frequency. The amplitude spectra for a precessing MS driven by a range of electric field magnitudes are shown in Fig. 6, in which the MS is spinning at $\omega_0 = 100\pi$ krad/s. The low-frequency amplitude modulations of the cross-polarized light are larger than those for rotation about the trapping beam axis because of the coupling with the feedback used to stabilize the microsphere at low frequencies. As expected, the precession frequency is proportional to the magnitude of the driving electric field and the slope of $\Omega$ vs $E$, which implies $(d/I) = 106 \pm 2$ (s A)/(kg m), is consistent with the value of $(d/I) = 108 \pm 2$ (s A)/(kg m) from the measurement of libration.

IV. CONCLUSION

We have demonstrated electrically driven rotation of optically levitated particles. Although this would be technically challenging to reach the ~1 GHz rotation frequencies achieved with optical rotation [21], electrically driven rotation offers precise control over the direction and magnitude of the torque, making the quantitative measurements presented here possible. This is in contrast to optically driven rotation, where the coupling to the optical torque depends on the geometry and birefringence of the trapped particle, as well as the exact optical properties of the laser beam used to apply the torque. The ability to measure and control system parameters has implications for the field of optical levitation and manipulation.

The libration of an optically levitated dipole trapped in an electric field is a degree of freedom that can be exploited for cooling and precision measurement. Libration of a dipole trapped in a rotating electric field can be cooled by simple phase modulation of the electric field driving the rotation.
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