Nonreciprocal control and cooling of phonon modes in an optomechanical system
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Mechanical resonators are important components of devices that range from gravitational wave detectors to cellular telephones. They serve as high-performance transducers, sensors and filters by offering low dissipation, tunable coupling to diverse physical systems, and compatibility with a wide range of frequencies, materials and fabrication processes. Systems of mechanical resonators typically obey reciprocity, which ensures that the phonon transmission coefficient between any two resonators is independent of the direction of transmission1,2. Reciprocity must be broken to realize devices (such as isolators and circulators) that provide one-way propagation of acoustic energy between resonators. Such devices are crucial for protecting active elements, mitigating noise and operating full-duplex transceivers. Until now, nonreciprocal phononic devices3–5 have not simultaneously combined the features necessary for robust operation: strong nonreciprocity, in situ tunability, compact integration and continuous operation. Furthermore, they have been applied only to coherent signals (rather than fluctuations or noise), and have been realized exclusively in travelling-wave systems (rather than resonators). Here we describe a scheme that uses the standard cavity-optomechanical interaction to produce robust nonreciprocal coupling between phononic resonators. This scheme provides about 30 decibels of isolation in continuous operation and can be tuned in situ simply via the phases of the drive tones applied to the cavity. In addition, by directly monitoring the dynamics of the resonators we show that this nonreciprocity can control thermal fluctuations, and that this control represents a way to cool phononic resonators.

Reciprocity is a generic feature of linear, time–invariant oscillator systems. It may be broken in various ways, such as by introducing bias, nonlinearity or parametric time dependence4–6. In phononic systems, nonreciprocal bias can be introduced by imposing rotational motion8 or a magnetic field9–11. However, the former is impractical in many settings, and the latter typically produces weak nonreciprocity. Likewise, nonlinearity-based approaches6–8 have required bulky components and generally result in signal distortion. By contrast, parametric modulation can produce nonreciprocity with considerable flexibility (as demonstrated recently for electromagnetic waves12–18).

Parametric modulation of phononic resonators arises naturally in cavity optomechanical systems, which consist of an electromagnetic cavity that is detuned by the motion of mechanical oscillators19. In particular, electromagnetic drive tones applied to the cavity can tune the mechanical oscillators’ frequencies, dampings and couplings, an effect known as ‘dynamical backaction’19. This effect has been used to realize transient nonreciprocity (by adding a slow time dependence to the mechanical oscillators’ frequencies, dampings and couplings, an effect known as ‘dynamical backaction’19). This effect has been used to realize transient nonreciprocity (by adding a slow time dependence to the parametric modulation10,11); by contrast, the scheme described here uses stationary modulation and operates continuously.

The phononic resonators studied here are two normal modes of a SiN membrane20 with dimensions 1 mm × 1 mm × 50 nm. We focus on a pair of low-order drumhead-like modes with resonant frequencies ω1 = 2π × 557.473 kHz and ω2 = 2π × 705.164 kHz and damping rates γ1 = 2π × 0.39 Hz and γ2 = 2π × 0.38 Hz. The membrane is positioned inside a cryogenic Fabry–Perot optical cavity with linewidth κ = 2π × 180 kHz and coupling rate κin = 2π × 70 kHz (for light with wavelength λ = 1.064 nm). The mechanical resonators couple to the cavity with rates g1 = 2π × 2.11 Hz and g2 = 2π × 2.12 Hz. The device construction and characterization are described in refs 10,11. The wide separation between ω1 and ω2 enables the motion of both modes to be inferred from a single record of the cavity detuning, which is provided by a probe laser that drives the cavity with fixed intensity and detuning.

Near-resonant coupling can be induced between these modes by modulating the dynamical backaction at a frequency close to δω ≃ ω1 − ω2. Such modulation arises from the intracavity beat note produced when the cavity is driven by two tones, the detunings of which (relative to the cavity resonance) are δ1 = −ω1 + Δ1 and Δ2 = −ω2 + Δ1. In this arrangement, a photon can scatter from one drive tone to the other by transferring a phonon between the modes. This process (illustrated by the red arrows in Fig. 1a, b) occurs via a virtual state in which the photon is at a mechanical sideband of the drive tones. The participation of the various mechanical sidebands can be enhanced or suppressed by the cavity’s resonance; for the detunings shown in Fig. 1a, the cavity ensures that the sideband with detuning Δ1 is the dominant path by which phonon transfer takes place.

This phonon transfer process has two crucial features. First, the transfer amplitude is proportional to the complex-valued cavity susceptibility χ(Δ1) (where χ(ω) ≡ (κ/2 |ω − ωc|)−1) regardless of the direction of transfer, and so has both a dissipative and a coherent character. Second, the phase of the intracavity beat note appears explicitly in the transfer coefficient. While these features alone do not result in nonreciprocal energy transfer (for example, the beat note phase can be gauged away), interference between two such processes can break reciprocity12,23–27. To accomplish this, the experiments described here incorporate a second pair of drive tones (orange arrows in Fig. 1a). The detunings of the four tones Δ1, Δ2, Δ3, and Δ4 are chosen to provide two beat notes that each induce near-resonant coupling between the modes (that is, Δ1 = Δ3 = Δ3 = Δ4 ≈ δω) and hence two distinct copies of the phonon transfer process. The four detunings Δ1, Δ2, Δ3, and Δ4 are also chosen so that the dominant mechanical sideband in each transfer process has a distinct detuning: Δ1 = Δ2 + Δ3 ≈ Δ1 + ω1 and Δ3 = Δ4 + Δ2 ≈ Δ1 + ω2. As described below, interference between these two processes results in nonreciprocal energy transfer between the phonon modes. Moreover, this interference is controlled by the relative phase between the two beat notes (which cannot be gauged away).

This system can be described via the standard linearized optomechanical equations of motion for one cavity mode and two mechanical modes19 (see Methods). The cavity mode is subject to a drive of the form ∑ n=1 4 Pn e^i(Δn + ωn + φ) where Pn is the power of the nth tone. The detuning, power and phase (φn) of each tone is set by a microwave generator that produces the four tones from a single laser via an acousto-optic modulator. Adiabatically eliminating the cavity field leaves equations of motion for the two mechanical mode amplitudes...
that correspond to the effective time-dependent Hamiltonian (see Methods):

\[
H = \begin{pmatrix}
\omega_1 - i\gamma_1/2 + f_1 & [ge^{i\theta_{12}} + he^{i\theta_{14}}]e^{i\Delta t} \\
[g^*e^{-i\theta_{12}} + h^*e^{-i\theta_{14}}]e^{-i\Delta t} & \omega_2 - i\gamma_2/2 + f_2
\end{pmatrix}
\]

where \( t \) is time, \( \Delta \equiv \Delta_1 - \Delta_3 \), and \( \theta_{\alpha\beta} \equiv \arg(-i\chi(\Delta_{\alpha\beta})) \). The diagonal elements of \( H \) represent the usual single-tone dynamical backaction: \( f_\alpha \approx -i\sum_{\alpha'=1}^{4} P_{\alpha'\alpha} g_{\alpha'\alpha} h_{\alpha'\alpha} \chi(\Delta_{\alpha'}) \chi(\Delta_{\alpha}) |\chi(\Delta_{\alpha})| \) where \( \alpha \in \{1, 2\} \). By contrast, the off-diagonal components of \( H \) describe the coupling between the two mechanical modes mediated by the intracavity beat notes. The phases of these beat notes are \( \phi_{12} \equiv \phi_1 - \phi_2 \) and \( \phi_{14} \equiv \phi_3 - \phi_4 \). The coefficients are \( g \approx -i\sqrt{P_{11} P_{22}} g_{12} g_{21} h_{12} \chi(\Delta_1) \chi(\Delta_2) |\chi(\Delta_1)| |\chi(\Delta_2)| \) and \( h \approx -i\sqrt{P_{11} P_{22}} g_{14} g_{24} h_{14} \chi(\Delta_1) \chi(\Delta_2) |\chi(\Delta_1)| |\chi(\Delta_2)| \). For clarity, the present discussion ignores smaller terms in \( f \), \( g \), and \( h \) that are due to nonresonant mechanical sidebands (these terms are included in the analysis and fits presented below, and in the full description in Methods).

Isolation between the two mechanical modes (corresponding to \( |H_{1,2}| \ll |H_{1,2}| \) or \( |H_{2,1}| \ll |H_{2,1}| \)) can be achieved by first choosing \( P_1 \) and \( \Delta_4 \) so that \( |g| \) and \( |h| \) are nearly equal. For the present device, this is realized with all the \( P_n = 5 \mu W \) and \( \Delta_n = \{-\omega_1 + \Delta_1 + \Delta_3 - \omega_2 + \Delta_4, -\omega_1 + \Delta_1 + \Delta_3 - \omega_2 + \Delta_4\} \) where \( \Delta_4 = -2\pi \times 60 \text{ kHz} \) and \( \Delta_4 = 2\pi \times 150 \text{ kHz} \). The constant \( \epsilon_0 \) is the detuning of the beat notes relative to \( \delta \omega_k \) and is set to \( 2\pi \times 100 \text{ Hz} \). With the condition \( |g| \approx |h| \) satisfied, \( \phi_{12} \) and \( \phi_{14} \) may be adjusted via the microwave generator to ensure that one off-diagonal element of \( H \) nearly vanishes while the other does not. This is shown in Fig. 1c, which plots \( H_{1,2} \) and \( H_{2,1} \) as a function of \( \phi \). For \( \phi \approx \pi/2 \), \( H \) allows energy to flow from mode 1 to mode 2 but not vice versa. The situation is reversed when \( \phi \approx -\pi/2 \). By contrast, \( \phi \approx 0 \) gives \( H_{1,2} \approx H_{2,1} \). This tunability between isolation, reciprocity and reversed isolation occurs while keeping the \( P_n \) and \( \Delta_4 \) fixed, and varying only the \( \phi_n \). This avoids cross-talk between the nonreciprocity and other device parameters (such as the mechanical frequencies, which depend only weakly on \( \phi_n \)).

To demonstrate the tunability of the nonreciprocity, we measured the transfer of energy between the two modes for various choices of \( \phi \). Two measurements with \( \phi = \pi/2 \) are shown in Fig. 1d, which plots \( F_1(t) \) and \( F_2(t) \): the energy in each mode (as inferred from the probe beam). For \( t < 0 \) the control tones are off, and one mode is driven to an average energy of about \( 10^{-18} \text{ J} \) (corresponding to an amplitude of about \( 5 \times 10^{-11} \text{ m} \)). The other mode is undriven, except by thermal fluctuations consistent with the bath temperature \( T_{\text{bath}} = 4.2 \text{ K} \). At \( t = 0 \) the drive is turned off and the control tones are turned on for a duration \( \tau = 3 \text{ ms} \). For \( t > \tau \) the control tones are off again. Figure 1d demonstrates the isolation described above: under the influence of control tones with \( \phi = \pi/2 \), an excitation prepared in mode 1 is transferred to mode 2 (upper panel) while an excitation prepared in mode 2 is not transferred to mode 1 (lower panel).
Figure 2 shows the energy transmission coefficients $T_1$ and $T_2$ as a function of the control tones’ duration $\tau$ (a to c) and phase $\phi$ (d). Each point is determined from measurements similar to those in Fig. 1d. The error bars for the statistical uncertainties are smaller than the symbols. The solid lines are the theoretical prediction described in the main text.

Experiments on nonreciprocal devices (in the phononic as well as other domains) typically measure the scattering matrix that describes propagating waves incident on and emanating from the device. By contrast, the measurements described here directly probe the devices’ internal degrees of freedom. This opens up the possibility of controlling the state of the resonators via their nonreciprocal interactions. To demonstrate this, we use the nonreciprocity described above to modify the thermal fluctuations of the resonators and to realize a form of cooling with no equivalent in reciprocal systems.

To describe the system’s steady-state fluctuations, we note that both modes couple to the thermal bath ($T_{\text{bath}} = 4.2$ K) and to the cavity field (the effective temperature of which can be approximated as zero for the present discussion). In the absence of coupling between the phonon modes, these two ‘baths’ would cause each mode to equilibrate to a temperature $T_a = (\gamma_a/2|f_a|^2)T_{\text{bath}}$ where $a \in \{1, 2\}$ and we assume the single-tone optical damping $\text{Im}[f_a] \gg \gamma_a$. This reduction of $T_a$ with respect to $T_{\text{bath}}$ is the well-known effect of ‘cold damping’ or ‘laser cooling’. However, in the present system the modes also couple to each other. When the resulting energy transport is reciprocal ($[H_{1,2}] = [H_{2,1}]$) thermal phonons are exchanged between the modes, tending to bring $T_1$ and $T_2$ closer together. By contrast, if $H$ is chosen to give unidirectional energy transport (for example, for $\phi = \pm \pi/2$), then the isolated mode emits thermal phonons into the other mode but not vice versa. This leads to cooling of the isolated mode and heating of the other mode, even if the former is initially the colder of the two.

To realize this isolation-based cooling we use the same $\Delta_n$ as above and $P_n = 2.5$ μW (resulting in $H_{1,2}$ and $H_{2,1}$ as in Fig. 1c but reduced by a factor of two). No external drive is applied to the phonon modes, and their undriven motion is recorded by the probe laser. Figure 4a shows the spectral density of each oscillator’s energy $S_{E_1}$ and $S_{E_2}$ for $\phi = -\pi/2$, 0 and $+\pi/2$. For all values of $\phi$, the mechanical linewidth is dominated by $\text{Im}[f_a]$ (which is independent of $\phi$). Asymmetric line-shapes are commonly observed in coupled damped oscillators with nearly degenerate modes; however, in the present system the modes are non-degenerate and the line-shapes reflect interference between the two paths by which the thermal bath drives a given mode. For example, mode 1 is driven directly by bath fluctuations at frequencies near 557 kHz, but also by bath fluctuations near 705 kHz, which are first filtered by the response of mode 2 and then transferred to frequencies near 557 kHz by $H$. The solid lines in Fig. 4a are fits to the expected form (a constant background plus the square modulus of the sum of two Lorentzians).

To measure the effect of nonreciprocity on the mode temperatures, $T_1$ and $T_2$ are determined from the area under the peaks in $S_{E_1}$ and $S_{E_2}$ at several values of $\phi$ (see Methods and Extended Data Fig. 1). The result is plotted in Fig. 4b as the normalized temperature difference $\Theta(\phi) \equiv 1 - \langle T_1(\phi)/T_1(0) \rangle / \langle T_2(\phi)/T_2(0) \rangle$ where $\langle \ldots \rangle$ denotes the average over $\phi$. Maximizing the isolation between the modes (that is, setting $\phi = \pm \pi/2$) results in the most extreme values of $\Theta$. We emphasize that changing the sign of $\Theta$ is equivalent to reversing the direction of heat flow between the modes. As $\langle T_1/T_2 \rangle = 1.79 > 1$ in these measurements, heat is transported from the colder mode to the hotter mode when $\Theta < 0$.

The solid line in Fig. 4b shows $\Theta$ as calculated from the optomechanical equations of motion (Methods). The agreement between the measured and predicted cooling extends over a wide range of parameters, as illustrated in Fig. 4b–e, which shows $\Theta(\phi)$ for various $\Delta_n$. The main effect of varying $\Delta_n$ is to increase the difference between $|g|$ and $|h|$, which results in weakened isolation and suppression of $\Theta$. We also emphasize that the data in each panel of Fig. 4b–e were taken with fixed $P_n$ and $\Delta_n$ and that the additional cooling of one mode is accomplished just by varying the phases of the control tones. Because conventional laser cooling techniques (for example, those using the single-tone dynamical backaction) are independent of these phases,
this shows that the nonreciprocity demonstrated here represents an additional resource for controlling the thermal fluctuations of phononic resonators.

In conclusion, we have demonstrated a robust, compact, stationary and tunable scheme for inducing nonreciprocity between phononic resonators. We have applied this nonreciprocal control to external signals as well as to the resonators' thermal motion. The nonreciprocity is produced by a cavity optomechanical interaction, but the same scheme may be realized in other multimode oscillator systems with parametric controls, including those in the electrical, mechanical and optical domains.
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Fig. 4 | Cooling by nonreciprocity. a, The power spectral density of the two modes’ thermal motion. For clarity, the data have been offset horizontally so that the two modes (which oscillate at 557 kHz and 705 kHz) can be compared directly. From left to right, the three panels correspond to \( \phi = -\pi/2 \), 0 and \( +\pi/2 \). b–e, The normalized difference between the two modes’ temperatures. The standard error of the mean is indicated by the error bars. In each panel, the control beam detunings are as given in the main text, plus an additional offset \( \Delta \text{off} \).
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METHODS

Theoretical model. We consider two phonon modes coupled to a single optical mode via the usual optomechanical interaction described by the Hamiltonian

\[ H_{\text{OM}} = \sum_{n=1}^{2} \hbar g_{n} (c_{n} + c_{n}^{\dagger}) a \]  

Here \( g \) is the reduced Planck’s constant, \( g_{n} \) is the single-photon coupling strength between the \( n \)th phonon mode and the optical mode, \( a \) is the optical mode’s annihilation operator, and \( c_{n} \) is the annihilation operator for the \( n \)th phonon mode. The equations of motion for the modes are then:

\[ \dot{c}_{1} = -\frac{\gamma_{1}}{2} + i\omega_{1} c_{1} - ig_{1} a^{\dagger} a + \sqrt{n_{1}} \eta_{1} \]  

\[ \dot{c}_{2} = -\frac{\gamma_{2}}{2} + i\omega_{2} c_{2} - ig_{2} a^{\dagger} a + \sqrt{n_{2}} \eta_{2} \]  

\[ a = -\frac{\kappa_{1}}{2} + i\Omega_{1} a - i(g_{1} c_{1} + g_{2} c_{2})a + \sqrt{\eta_{3}} a_{\text{in}} \] 

where \( \Omega_{1} \) is the cavity resonance frequency, and \( \eta_{1} \) and \( \eta_{2} \) are the drives for, respectively, the phonon modes and the optical mode.

The cavity is driven by two pairs of control lasers to induce nonreciprocity between the phonon modes. The control lasers’ detunings (with respect to the cavity resonance) are: \( \Delta_{1} = -\omega_{1} + \Delta_{1}, \Delta_{2} = -\omega_{2} + \Delta_{2}, \Delta_{3} = -\omega_{1} + \Delta_{3}, \Delta_{4} = -\omega_{2} + \Delta_{4} \). Numerical values for these detunings are given in the main text (note that \( \zeta \ll \omega_{1}, \omega_{2}, \Delta_{1} \) and \( \Delta_{2} \)).

The cavity resonance frequency is not strictly in thermal equilibrium, and so one needs to specify exactly what is meant by the effective temperature of each mechanical mode. We recap here the standard approach to this problem (see, for example, ref. 28 for a pedagogical review).

We use the above definition of \( T \) to define the effective temperature for each mechanical mode in the main text.

We make some important remarks on this procedure. First, if our oscillator was truly in thermal equilibrium at a temperature \( T \) then (via the fluctuation dissipation theorem) \( T \equiv T \), irrespective of the particular shape of \( \chi_{\omega} \). Thus our definition does not require the mechanical mode to have a simple Lorentzian resonance. Second, for a standard damped mechanical harmonic oscillator of mass \( m \), spring constant \( k \), and damping rate \( \gamma \), the susceptibility takes the usual form:

\[ \chi_{\omega} = \frac{1}{m \omega^{2} - \Omega^{2} + \gamma \omega} \]

\[ \chi_{\omega} = \frac{1}{m \omega^{2} - \Omega^{2} + \gamma \omega} \]

where \( \Omega = (k/m)^{1/2} \). In this case, \( k_{\text{eff}} = k \) (that is, it is just the spring constant of the mode), recovering the usual equipartition theorem.

For application to our system, we note that the modification of the mechanical susceptibility of each mode due to optomechanical interactions implies that \( k_{\text{eff}} \) could in principle deviate from \( k \). By explicitly calculating \( \chi_{\omega} \) from \( H \) (which is defined in the main text) and using equation (13), we find that \( k_{\text{eff}} \) could differ by about \( 10^{-4} \), which is insignificant. We thus use equation (11) to define the effective temperature \( T \) of each mode from the measured position fluctuation spectral density, using the bare spring constant, that is, with \( k_{\text{eff}} \rightarrow k \).
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Extended Data Fig. 1 | Temperature of each phononic mode as a function of the control tone phase. This data was used to calculate the normalized temperature ratio shown in Fig. 4b. The error bars show the standard error of the mean.