



**HAL**  
open science

# SELECTIVE REFLECTION SPECTROSCOPY WITH A HIGHLY PARALLEL WINDOW: PHASE TUNABLE HOMODYNE DETECTION OF THE RADIATED ATOMIC FIELD

Aram V. Papoyan, G. G. Grigoryan, S. V. Shmavonyan, David Sarkisyan,  
Jocelyne Guéna, Michel Lintz, Marie-Anne Bouchiat

► **To cite this version:**

Aram V. Papoyan, G. G. Grigoryan, S. V. Shmavonyan, David Sarkisyan, Jocelyne Guéna, et al..  
SELECTIVE REFLECTION SPECTROSCOPY WITH A HIGHLY PARALLEL WINDOW: PHASE  
TUNABLE HOMODYNE DETECTION OF THE RADIATED ATOMIC FIELD. 8th EPS conference  
on atomic and molecular physics, 2004, Rennes, France. pp.4-84. hal-00002633v1

**HAL Id: hal-00002633**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00002633v1>**

Submitted on 20 Aug 2004 (v1), last revised 27 Aug 2004 (v2)

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.


L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# SELECTIVE REFLECTION SPECTROSCOPY WITH A HIGHLY PARALLEL WINDOW: PHASE TUNABLE HOMODYNE DETECTION OF THE RADIATED ATOMIC FIELD

A. V. Papoyan, G. G. Grigoryan, S. V. Shmavonyan, D. Sarkisyan,  
Institute for Physical research, NAS of Armenia, Ashtarak-2, 378410, ARMENIA  
J. Guéna, M. Lintz, M.-A. Bouchiat,  
LKB, Département de Physique de l'ENS 24 rue Lhomond, 75 231 Paris cedex 05, FRANCE  
(to be published in *Eur. Phys. J. D*)

the hidden side of the  
selective reflection signal


## "ordinary" selective reflection



Observable = reflected intensity:  $I_r = |E_{\text{refl}}|^2 = |E_{\text{refl}}^{(0)} + E_{\text{refl}}^{(1)}|^2 = |E_{\text{refl}}^{(0)}|^2 + 2\text{Re}(E_{\text{refl}}^{(0)*} E_{\text{refl}}^{(1)})$

- How to detect the imaginary part??** Some proposals have been made:
- Brewster incidence ( $E_{\text{refl}}^{(0)} = 0$ )? (Khalilov et al. Soviet J. Q. E. 18(1991), 416)
  - the sub-doppler feature of SR spectroscopy is lost;
  - **multidielectric coating?** (short work by Vorontsov and Zapor. Opt. Commun. 118(1994), 315)
  - the coating may be damaged by the atomic vapour
  - **metallic coating?** (Chocroffier et al. Phys Rev E48(1993), 2001)
  - considerable attenuation of the atomic signal, due to the required metal thickness

## The raw signal on the Cs D1 line ( $6S \rightarrow 6P_{3/2}$ , $F'=2,3,4$ )



- The interference pattern is obvious
- The atomic signal is small... (dilute vapour)
- the atomic signal is more evident
- (still a "wavy" offset pattern: the subtracted, off-resonance background has a non negligible dependence on the laser frequency)

## The model

Continuity equations at the two boundaries between the three media:

- air,  $n_1=1$
- (sapphire) window,  $n_2=1.76$
- vapour,  $n_3=1$

Maxwell equations for the propagation of the backward atomic field in the vapour (without using the slowly varying envelope approximation)

assuming cell length  $\gg$  absorption length (no backward beam coming from z=0)

then

where the  $t_1$  and  $r_1$ 's are the amplitude transmission and reflection coefficients and the backward atomic field is generated by the vapour atomic polarisation:

Defining the atomic response,  $\chi_a = \frac{\hbar \hbar \omega_a \exp(i\phi)}{1 - r_1 r_2 \exp(2i\phi)}$  and assuming the absence of saturation and non-linearity, we get  $(\nabla \cdot \mathbf{E}_a)$  homogeneous and Doppler widths:

$$\chi_a = \frac{\Delta \omega_a}{\hbar \omega_a} \sum_{\mathbf{k}} \hbar \mathbf{k} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{\exp(-\Gamma|\mathbf{k}|t)}{(\omega - \omega_a) + i\Gamma} dt$$

## selective reflection with a parallel window (qualitative approach)

depending on the relative phase between the two NR reflected beams, two opposite regimes are expected

- close to a reflection maximum:
- close to a reflection minimum:

then:

- $\text{Re}(E_{\text{refl}})$  does not interfere with  $E_{\text{refl}}^{(0)} + E_{\text{refl}}^{(1)}$  → not detected
- $\text{Im}(E_{\text{refl}})$  interferes with  $E_{\text{refl}}^{(0)} + E_{\text{refl}}^{(1)}$  → DETECTED!

- the  $\text{Im}(E_{\text{refl}}) \times (E_{\text{refl}}^{(0)} + E_{\text{refl}}^{(1)})$  signal changes sign around refl. minimum

## The experiment

How to change the interference condition in the window?

very easily, by changing the window temperature

For 0.5 mm sapphire window and  $\lambda=852\text{nm}$ :  
 $\Delta T = 30^\circ\text{C} \leftrightarrow 2\pi$  change of the interference

(see Adler et al. Appl Phys B71 (2000), 561 for the use of the "temperature tuning" of the windows for reflection-loss free vapour cells)

## Conclusion

The model and experiment agree very well (no fitted parameter) on the size and the temperature dependence of the spectra.




By using a "temperature tunable" window, one can detect at will

- the real (dispersive) part
- or the imaginary (absorptive) part of the atomic response.

SNR is better near the reflection minimum.

Changing from one regime to the other is obtained very easily, just by changing the window temperature by a few degree C.

## The raw and derivative signals



## zoom at...

## The minimum reflection regime

