# Storage of quantum coherences as phase labeled local polarization using magnetic field gradients in NMR

María Belén Franzoni,\* Rodolfo H. Acosta, and Patricia R. Levstein<sup>[†](#page-0-1)</sup>

*Facultad de Matemática, Astronomía y Física and Instituto de Física Enrique Gaviola,* 

*Universidad Nacional de C´ordoba, 5000 C´ordoba, Argentina*

Long decay times were previously observed in samples such as  $^{29}Si$ ,  $C_{60}$ ,  $Y_2O_3$  by applying multipulse nuclear magnetic resonance sequences to measure decoherence times. They are originated in stimulated echoes caused by the pulse angle distributions predictable for inhomogeneously broadened lines. In the present work, a detailed analysis describing how the stimulated echoes can be exploited as quantum coherence memories is presented. We introduce a method based on field gradients to storage coherences as polarization in a controlled way in homogeneous samples. The possibility to keep a coherent state frozen while another part of the sample is subjected to quantum operations opens new perspectives in the field of quantum information. Upon recovery of the storaged coherences, interactions among the whole system can be turned on. However, in order to perform quantum computation, the knowledge of the true coherence time is necessary. We applied the proposed method to demonstrate under the stimulated echo formalism, the appropriate experimental scheme that enables a quenching of the coherence storage, thus rendering a measurement of the coherence decay time  $T_2$ .

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 76.20.+q , 76.60.Lz, 82.56.Jn

## I. INTRODUCTION

Recently, much effort has been devoted to understand and control quantum coherence processes [\[1](#page-4-0), [2](#page-4-1)] in solid state systems. Particularly, the interest focuses in those systems which have been proposed as possible candidates for quantum computation [\[3](#page-4-2), [4](#page-4-3)]. It has been shown that Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) is a very suitable tool as a quantum dynamics simulator and quantum phenomenon monitor [\[5](#page-4-4)[–7](#page-5-0)]. For example, very interesting works controlling the nuclear and electron spin entanglement in a system of  $N@C_{60}$  [\[8\]](#page-5-1) and quantum spin memories in <sup>31</sup>P [\[9\]](#page-5-2) have been reported.

In NMR, the spin-spin decoherence time  $(T_2)$  is a characteristic time that should be very well known before any attempt of quantum computation is carried out. Only during intervals shorter than this time the sample behaves as a quantum object and it is possible to perform quantum operations such as quantum gates.

In previous reports [\[10,](#page-5-3) [11\]](#page-5-4), we have shown that the long decay times observed in different samples, as <sup>29</sup>Si;  $C_{60}$  and  $Y_2O_3$  [\[12](#page-5-5)[–15\]](#page-5-6) by applying multipulse sequences such as the Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill (CPMG) [\[16](#page-5-7), [17\]](#page-5-8), have been misinterpreted as  $T_2$  decoherence decay times. We were able to prove that these long decay times are not originated in coherences but in polarization. These pseudocoherences appear as a consequence of the formation of unexpected stimulated echoes originated in pulse angle distributions due to inhomogeneously broadened lines. Indeed, in all these samples, the spin-spin decay

time measured with a Hahn echo sequence  $(T_{2HE})$  [\[18](#page-5-9)] was about an order of magnitude longer than the free induction decay time  $(T_2^*)$ , evidencing the line inhomogeneity.

A similar effect arises in a system with two different spin species,  ${}^{1}H$  and  ${}^{13}C$ , when measuring the survival probabilities of the <sup>13</sup>C spin subjected to trains of multiple  $\pi$  pulses with different phases. In this case, once the effect of the  ${}^{1}H$  is eliminated through a fast enough dynamical decoupling, the coherence seems to be preserved as labeled polarization. This can be well identified by working with different initial conditions and comparing with the Hahn echo experiments [\[19\]](#page-5-10).

In the present work, we exploit the understanding of the origin of the long magnetization tails to generate the effect in a controlled way. We show that the stimulated echo in multipulse sequences can be used as a quantum coherence memory. Under these conditions, quantum coherence can be storaged for times much longer than the decoherence time  $T_{2HE}$ . A method to artificially create the appropriate conditions for the long tails to be observed after a CPMG measurement even for homogeneously broadened samples, is presented. The method uses the fact that homogeneous lines, evolving under the influence of a field gradient, are inhomogeneously broadened giving rise to stimulated echoes with the consequent long tails.

Few years ago, a method for storage of non stationary light fields in optically dense atomic ensembles was proposed [\[20](#page-5-11)]. This approach to quantum memories, based on controlled reversible inhomogeneous broadening, is related to our present realization in the NMR field.

It is worthwhile to emphasize that the long tails are not a manifestation of long decoherence times but of a storage of coherence as polarization during times much longer than  $T_{2HE}$ . During these long times the coherences are

<span id="page-0-0"></span><sup>∗</sup> [franzoni@famaf.unc.edu.ar](mailto:franzoni@famaf.unc.edu.ar)

<span id="page-0-1"></span><sup>†</sup> [patricia@famaf.unc.edu.ar](mailto:patricia@famaf.unc.edu.ar)

kept frozen as a passive system, i.e. they can not be used to perform quantum operations. Nevertheless, this "storage time" can be exploited to perform operations over another (active) system. Upon recovery of the coherences from the passive system, interactions with the active system can be turned on. The results presented here would be useful to keep a coherent state between a nuclear specie while quantum operations as pulse sequences are applied to another nuclear specie or electron spins.

Additionally, the correct phase cycle to use in multipulse sequences in order to measure the true  $T_2$  in inhomogeneous samples is shown. This sequence, whose result has been empirically known for a while [\[21](#page-5-12)[–23\]](#page-5-13), should be taken as a standard to obtain a clean  $T_2$  measurement. Here, we explain how the stimulated echoes are canceled out eliminating their main effects: the long tails.

# II. THE STIMULATED ECHO AS A QUANTUM COHERENCE MEMORY

In order to take advantage of the occurrence of the stimulated echo, it is important to correctly understand the processes behind it. To clarify the details, let us go back to the simplest stimulated echo sequence:

$$
STE: \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)_x - \tau - \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)_y - t_1 - \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)_y - t \tag{1}
$$

In Fig. [1](#page-2-0) the stimulated echo formation is schematized using a vectorial spin model. The model provides a pictorial view where it can be observed that the magnetization is indeed storaged as polarization and then reconverted to transversal magnetization. The information on the coherence state created in the first evolution period,  $\tau$ , is conserved during  $t_1$  and refocused in the third period at  $t=\tau$ . The coherence pathways during the three pulse sequence are also plotted at the bottom of the figure. During the first period a single coherence  $(p = 1)$ evolves during a time  $\tau$  then, this coherence is transferred to a zero quantum coherence which remains unaffected by the evolution until the third pulse transforms it into a single quantum coherence  $(p = -1)$ . Finally, after an evolution period  $\tau$  the evolution as  $p = -1$  will unwind the first evolution as  $p = 1$  and the stimulated echo is formed [\[24](#page-5-14), [25](#page-5-15)].

Let us consider a Hamiltonian linear in the spin operators with no interactions between different spins,

<span id="page-1-0"></span>
$$
\mathcal{H} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \delta \omega_j I_j^z.
$$
 (2)

If the delta pulse approximation is taken and we consider the system in thermal equilibrium before the first pulse, the evolution of the density matrix can be written as:

<span id="page-1-1"></span>
$$
\rho(\tau^{-}) = -\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left[ \cos(\delta \omega_j \tau) I_j^y - \sin(\delta \omega_j \tau) I_j^x \right]
$$
 (3)

The expression above represents a coherent state (transversal magnetization), which immediately after the second pulse becomes,

$$
\rho(\tau^+) = -\sum_{j=1}^N \left[ \cos(\delta \omega_j \tau) I_j^y + \sin(\delta \omega_j \tau) I_j^z \right] \tag{4}
$$

After the second evolution period  $(t_1)$ , the new state of the system can be expressed as:

<span id="page-1-2"></span>
$$
\rho(\tau + t_1) = -\sum_{j=1}^{N} \left\{ \cos(\delta \omega_j \tau) [I_j^y \cos(\delta \omega_j t_1) - I_j^x \sin(\delta \omega_j t_1)] + \sin(\delta \omega_j \tau) I_j^z \right\}
$$
\n
$$
(5)
$$

This expression contains the clue for the application we are proposing. During the time  $t_1$ , there is a component of the initial magnetization storaged as non equilibrium polarization in the  $I_j^z$ . This component does not evolve during  $t_1$  under the chemical shift Hamiltonian in Eq.[\(2\)](#page-1-0). The above expression defines a polarization grating which lodges in its amplitude the information of the coherent state, i.e. the phase, of Eq. [\(3\)](#page-1-1). The useful interpretation is that the coherent state created during the first evolution period remains frozen as a polarization amplitude during a long period  $t_1$ . It should be noted that during the second period the polarization in Eq. [\(5\)](#page-1-2) is not in thermal equilibrium (there is not a Boltzmann distribution because of the  $\delta\omega$  dependence). The spin-lattice relaxation, characterized by  $T_1$ , will lead to a decay of the polarization grating during  $t_1$ .

The third  $\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)_y$  pulse will convert the polarization of Eq. [\(5\)](#page-1-2) in transversal magnetization as

$$
\rho(\tau + t_1^+) = -\sum_{j=1}^N \left\{ \cos(\delta \omega_j \tau) [I_j^y \cos(\delta \omega_j t_1) + I_j^z \sin(\delta \omega_j t_1)] + \sin(\delta \omega_j \tau) I_j^x \right\}
$$
\n(6)

which will evolve under the linear Hamiltonian influence as:

<span id="page-1-3"></span>
$$
\rho(t + \tau + t_1) = -\sum_{j=1}^{N} \cos(\delta \omega_j \tau) \left\{ \cos(\delta \omega_j t_1) [I_j^y \cos(\delta \omega_j t) - I_j^x \sin(\delta \omega_j t)] + I_j^z \sin(\delta \omega_j t_1) \right\} + \sin(\delta \omega_j \tau) \left( I_j^x \cos(\delta \omega_j t) + I_j^y \sin(\delta \omega_j t) \right)
$$
(7)



<span id="page-2-0"></span>FIG. 1. Stimulated echo sequence. The coherence states created during the first evolution period,  $\tau$ , are storaged as z-amplitude during  $t_1$  and then reconverted to coherence states in the evolution plane after the third pulse.

The last two terms in Eq.[\(7\)](#page-1-3) do not depend on  $t_1$  and gives rise to the stimulated echo at time  $t = \tau$ . As can be seen from Eq.[\(7\)](#page-1-3), if  $t_1=0$  the sequence is reduced to a simple  $\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)_X - \tau - \left(\pi\right)_Y - \tau$  Hahn echo sequence and all the initial polarization is again at the -y axis. On the other hand, if  $t_1 >> T_{2HF}$ , but still shorter than the spin-lattice relaxation time, only the term that do not depend on  $t_1$  survive and the coherences created during the first evolution period are refocused at  $t=\tau$ .

Taking into account the former results, it is easy to see that the long tails observed because of the formation of stimulated echoes can be interpreted as storage of local polarization. For example, the magnetization in  $C_{60}$  was storaged as polarization for times two orders of magnitude longer than the decoherence time  $(T_{2HE})$  [\[10,](#page-5-3) [11\]](#page-5-4).

## III. CONTROLLED STORAGE OF **COHERENCES**

In this section, we introduce a method developed to artificially create, even in homogeneous samples, the conditions under which the stimulated echoes are formed. Then, these echoes can be exploited as quantum memories.

The system we have previously studied,  $C_{60}$ , presents an inhomogeneously broadened line which satisfies  $T_{2HE} \approx 7T_2^*$ . Similar situations were observed in all the systems that manifest long decay times when CPMG sequence are applied [\[10](#page-5-3)[–12](#page-5-5)].

The key of the method is to reproduce the conditions observed in the inhomogeneous samples, by applying field gradients. When a field gradient,  $G = \partial B_z / \partial z$ , is applied in the direction of the static magnetic field  $B_0z$ , the z component of the magnetic field is written as:

$$
B_z = B_0 + zG.\t\t(8)
$$

As a consequence of the field gradient presence, the spin frequency is modified as follows:

$$
\omega(z) = \omega_0 + \omega_G(z) \tag{9}
$$

where  $\omega_G(z) = \gamma Gz$ , with  $\gamma$  the gyromagnetic factor.

Similarly to  $Eq.(2)$  $Eq.(2)$ , the field gradient produces a Hamiltonian linear in spin operators. If a strong enough gradient is applied, the main interaction for the spin evolution is:

$$
\mathcal{H}_G = \gamma \hbar G \sum I_i^z z_i.
$$
 (10)

The presence of this Hamiltonian term causes an inhomogeneously broadened line whose width depends on the applied field gradient. In the polydimethylsiloxane (PDMS) sample used here as example [\[26,](#page-5-16) [27](#page-5-17)], the condition  $T_{2HE} \approx 7 T_2^*$  is easily satisfied with a field gradient of strength around 5 G/cm.

### IV. RESULTS

In Ref. [\[10\]](#page-5-3), we studied theoretically and experimentally two different sequences derived from Carr-Purcell [\[16](#page-5-7)] and Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill [\[17\]](#page-5-8) sequences which produce long decay times compared to the Hahn echo in inhomogeneous samples.

These sequences were named considering the number of phases for the  $\pi$  pulses as follows:

$$
CP2: \left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)_X - \left[\tau - (\pi)_X - \tau \right] - \text{echo} -
$$

$$
\tau - (\pi)_{-X} - \tau - \text{echo}\big|_n, \qquad (11)
$$

CPMG1: 
$$
\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)_X - \left[\tau - (\pi)_Y - \tau - \text{echo}\right]_n;
$$
 (12)

In the present work, the magnetization decay observed by applying these multipulse sequences is compared with the decay of a Hahn echo in a PDMS sample. If the system is not perturbed with a field gradient, the decays observed with the multipulse and with the Hahn echo sequences are the same. This is independent of the  $\tau$  value in the multipulse sequences. However, as long as stronger field gradients are applied, longer decay times are generated by the multipulse sequences manifesting the storage of coherences, as can be seen in Fig. [2.](#page-3-0) The results are shown for gradient fields between 0 and 6.25 G/cm for  $\tau = 200 \mu s$ . In analogy to what occurs in naturally inhomogeneous samples as  $C_{60}$ , for a fixed gradient field, longer decay times are observed for shorter  $\tau$  values.



<span id="page-3-0"></span>FIG. 2. Remaining magnetization as a function of field gradient strength for  $\tau = 200 \,\mu s$  in the CP2 sequence. The Hahn echo and CP2 decays coincide in the absence of field gradients.

For each  $\tau$  in the multipulse sequence, the magnetization decay can be characterized by two very distinct contributions. One contribution is easily assigned to the Hahn echo and is characterized by the short decay time  $T_{2HE}$  and an amplitude  $A_s$ . The other contribution, with amplitude  $A_l$ , is originated in the coherence stored as polarization and is characterized by a long decay time  $t_l$ . This characteristic time depends on  $\tau$  and provides information about the storage time. From a comparison between the Hahn echo and the long tail amplitudes, an estimative percentage of the coherence stored can be calculated as  $A_l/A_s \times 100$ . In fig [3,](#page-3-1) these parameters are shown for different field gradients. The storage time  $t_l$ was scaled with  $T_{2HE}$  in order to emphasize the fact that the coherence can be preserved for times an order of magnitude longer than the decoherence time. Under favorable experimental conditions  $2\tau/T_{2HE}$  can be decreased to get a better  $t_l/T_{2HE}$  ratio (see the dependence of  $t_l/T_{2HE}$  on  $2\tau/T_{2HE}$  in Fig. [3\)](#page-3-1). From the bottom panel in the figure, it can be seen that for the strongest gradient applied and for the shortest  $\tau$ , more than 35% of the initial magnetization was stored as polarization and then refocused during the multipulse sequence. This amount can also be improved when shorter delays  $\tau$  are experimentally affordable.



<span id="page-3-1"></span>FIG. 3. Storaged time,  $t_l$ , and percentage of coherence stored as a function of the temporal window  $\tau$  in the multipulse sequence. An enhancement of the storaged coherence is achieved by increasing the field gradients and/or decreasing τ .

A very important fact is observed at  $2\tau \approx T_{2HE}$  in Fig. [3.](#page-3-1) For those interpulse windows, the flip-flop part of the dipolar interaction produces a "spin diffusion" process that "homogenizes" the different precession frequencies, preventing the formation of stimulated echoes and thus, the storage of polarization. Besides, as the dipolar interaction becomes operative, it will generate a nonnegligible dephasing. Thus, the assumptions performed in our calculations, where only the chemical shifts were considered, are not valid anymore.

Finally, we address the possibility of performing experiments with multipulse sequences that do not produce coherence storage as polarization. The four phase cycles multipulse sequence Eq. [\(13\)](#page-3-2), has been empirically shown to be the the most suitable for preventing unexpected artifacts in a  $T_2$  measurement [\[23\]](#page-5-13).

<span id="page-3-2"></span>CPMG4 : <sup>π</sup> 2 x − (τ − π<sup>y</sup> − τ − echo − τ − π<sup>y</sup> − τ − echo − τ − πy¯ − τ − echo − τ − πy¯ − τ − echo )<sup>n</sup> (13)

In Fig. [4](#page-4-5) a comparison between a Hahn echo and a CPMG4 measurement with and without field gradient is plotted.

It can be observed that the magnetization decay agrees perfectly well for the three cases. The reason why this



<span id="page-4-5"></span>FIG. 4. Magnetization observed by applying the CPMG4 with gradient off and on compared to the Hahn Echo decay.

sequence is the appropriate to measure  $T_2$  can be understood from the stimulated echo perspective presented previously [\[10\]](#page-5-3). The CPMG4 sequence does not accumulate magnetization contributions from the constructive interference between normal and stimulated echoes, and this is clearly manifested in the results shown in Fig. [4.](#page-4-5) Even in the presence of an inhomogeneous field, long tails are not observed when this sequence is applied.

# V. CONCLUSIONS

The long tails observed when multipulse sequences as CPMG are applied to inhomogeneous samples were assigned to polarization that encodes quantum coherences. In this way the coherences are storaged for times much longer than  $T_{2HE}$ . It has been shown that the responsible of the long tails are the stimulated echoes, formed due to the inhomogeneity of the sample. In this paper we showed that the stimulated echoes preserve coherent states in the direction of the static magnetic field, then bring them back to the plane where they are refocused and observed. It is important to remark that the magnetization decay is very long because the coherences are storaged as polarization. So, these long decays should not be interpreted as a long decoherence time during which quantum operations can be performed. However, this interpretation is still very fruitful in quantum information and can be exploited to design quantum spin memories in nuclear or electron spin systems. The main idea presented here highlights the capability to keep coherent states frozen while another part of the sample is subjected to quantum operations an then, upon recovery of the storaged coherences, interactions among the whole system can be turned on. The concept introduced in this paper was indeed indirectly exploited in Ref. [\[9\]](#page-5-2). There, coherences induced in electron spins were transformed to a coherent state between nuclear spins, storaged by applying the CPMG1 sequence and transferred back to electron spins.

In this work, we introduced a method to create the experimental conditions in homogeneous samples that induce, in a controlled way, the stimulated echoes in multipulse sequences. The method is based on the application of field gradients that produce a frequency distribution across the sample. This, in turn, generates a pulse angle distribution that sets the conditions under which the stimulated echoes appear. An important fact deduced from these experiments is that the origin of the inhomogeneity of the samples is not relevant for the long tails observations. Whether the inhomogeneity arises from a random distribution of nuclear spins (as occurs for <sup>29</sup>Si) or on a linear dependent gradient, like the one used in the present experiments, the consequences are the same. Moreover, the use of suitable field gradients will allow a more selective spatial manipulation of the quantum memories.

The method was applied to a PDMS sample, for which we were able to perform a complete quantification of the storaged coherences, i.e. the storage time and ratio of coherence survival.

Finally, we applied the method to test the CPMG4 sequence under inhomogeneous properties. We verified the empirically known robustness of the sequence. The true T<sup>2</sup> decay time can be measured under this pulse sequence either for homogeneous or inhomogeneous samples. The mechanism behind the correct operation of this pulse sequence can be understood under the stimulated echoes interferences previously reported [\[10](#page-5-3)].

We acknowledge support from Fundación Antorchas, CONICET, FoNCyT, SeCyT-UNC and the Partner Group for NMR Spectroscopy with High Spin Polarization FaMAF-MPIP. We thank M. A. Villar, E. M. Vallés and D. A. Vega for sample preparation; F. M. Pont for helping with figure 1 and G. A. Monti for helpful discussions on multipulse sequences.

- <span id="page-4-0"></span>[1] W. Zhang, N. Konstantinidis, K. A. Al-Hassanieh, and V. V. Dobrovitski, J. Phys. Cond. Matt., 19, 083202 (2007).
- <span id="page-4-4"></span>[5] D. G. Cory, A. F. Fahmy, and T. F. Havel, Proc. Natl.

150503 (2006).

- Acad. Sci. U.S.A., 94, 1634 (1997).
- <span id="page-4-1"></span>[2] W. H. Zurek, Reviews of Modern Physics, 75 (2003). [3] D. P. DiVincenzo, Science, **270**, 255 (1995).
- <span id="page-4-3"></span><span id="page-4-2"></span>[4] H. G. Krojanski and D. Suter, Phys. Rev. Lett., 97,
- [6] J. Baugh, O. Moussa, C. A. Ryan, R. Laflamme, C. Ramanathan, T. F. Havel, and D. G. Cory, Phys. Rev. A, 73, 022305 (2006).
- <span id="page-5-0"></span>[7] E. Rufeil-Fiori, C. M. Sánchez, F. Y. Oliva, H. M. Pastawski, and P. R. Levstein, Phys. Rev. A, 79, 032324 (2009).
- <span id="page-5-1"></span>[8] M. Mehring, W. Scherer, and A. Weidinger, Phys. Rev. Lett., 93 (2004).
- <span id="page-5-2"></span>[9] J. J. L. Morton, A. M. Tyryshkin, R. M. Brown, S. Shankar, B. W. Lovett, A. Ardavan, T. Schenkel, E. E. Haller, J. W. Ager, and S. A. Lyon, Nature, 455, 1085 (2008).
- <span id="page-5-3"></span>[10] M. B. Franzoni and P. R. Levstein, Phys. Rev. B, 72, 235410 (2005).
- <span id="page-5-4"></span>[11] M. B. Franzoni, P. R. Levstein, J. Raya, and J. Hirschinger, Phys. Rev. B, 78, 115407 (2008).
- <span id="page-5-5"></span>[12] A. E. Dementyev, D. Li, K. MacLean, and S. E. Barrett, Phys. Rev. B, 68, 153302 (2003).
- [13] T. D. Ladd, D. Maryenko, Y. Yamamoto, E. Abe, and K. M. Itoh, Phys. Rev. B, 71, 014401 (2005).
- [14] D. Li, A. Dementyev, Y. Dong, R. G. Ramos, and S. E. Barrett, Phys. Rev. Lett., 98, 190401 (2007).
- <span id="page-5-6"></span>[15] D. Li, Y. Dong, R. G. Ramos, J. D. Murray, K. MacLean, A. E. Dementyev, and S. E. Barrett, Phys. Rev. B, 77, 214306 (2008).
- <span id="page-5-7"></span>[16] H. Y. Carr and E. M. Purcell, Phys. Rev., 94, 630 (1954).
- <span id="page-5-8"></span>[17] S. Meiboom and D. Gill, [Rev. Sci. Instrum.,](http://link.aip.org/link/?RSI/29/688/1) 29, 688 (1958).
- <span id="page-5-9"></span>[18] E. L. Hahn, Phys. Rev., 80, 580 (1950).
- <span id="page-5-10"></span>[19] G. A. Alvarez, A. Ajoy, X. Peng, and D. Suter, arXiv:1008.1962 (2010).
- <span id="page-5-11"></span>[20] B. Kraus, W. Tittel, N. Gisin, M. Nilsson, S. Kroll, and J. I. Cirac, Physical Review A, 73, 020302 (2006).
- <span id="page-5-12"></span>[21] T. F. M. H. Levitt, R. Freeman, *Advances in Magnetic Resonance J. S. Waugh, Ed.* (Academic Pr, 1983).
- [22] T. Gullion, D. B. Baker, and M. S. Conradi, Journal of Magnetic Resonance (1969), 89, 479 (1990).
- <span id="page-5-13"></span>[23] K. Saalwchter, B. Herrero, and M. A. López-Manchado, Macrom., **38**, 4040 (2005).
- <span id="page-5-14"></span>[24] R. R. Ernst, G. Bodenhausen, and A. Wokaun, *Principles of Nuclear Magnetic Resonance in One and Two Dimensions* (Oxford Science Publications, 1988).
- <span id="page-5-15"></span>[25] M. Levitt, *Spin Dynamics: Basics of Nuclear Magnetic Resonance* (John Wiley & Sons, 2001).
- <span id="page-5-16"></span>[26] R. H. Acosta, G. A. Monti, M. A. Villar, E. M. Valls, and D. A. Vega, Macrom., 42, 4674 (2009).
- <span id="page-5-17"></span>[27] R. H. Acosta and G. A. Monti, Private Communication. *A double quantum filter before each pulse sequence was applied to select the contribution of the elastic chains, i.e. the solid like behavior.*