

Signifying the nonlocality and mesoscopic quantum coherence of NOON states using Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering inequalities

R.Y. Teh, L. Rosales-Zárate, B. Opanchuk and M. D. Reid

Centre for Quantum and Optical Science, Swinburne University of Technology, Melbourne, Australia

We construct Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) steering signatures for the nonlocality of the entangled “Schrodinger cat-type” superposition state described by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{|N\rangle|0\rangle + |0\rangle|N\rangle\}$, often called the NOON state. The signatures are a violation of an EPR steering inequality based on an uncertainty relation. The violation confirms a generalised EPR paradox, or “EPR steering”, between the two modes and involves certification of an inter-mode correlation for both number and quadrature phase amplitude observables. We also explain how the signatures certify an N th order quantum coherence, so the system (for larger N) can be signified to be in a “cat” superposition of mesoscopically distinct states. Realisation for larger $N > 1$ would thus give evidence of mesoscopic EPR steering and entanglement. We include treatment of nonideal cases. Finally, we examine the limitations imposed for lossy scenarios, discussing how experimental realisations may be possible for $N = 2, 3$.

I. INTRODUCTION

The generation and signification of a macroscopic quantum superposition state is an outstanding challenge for modern physics. In his famous Schrodinger cat paradox, Schrodinger explained that according to quantum mechanics such a state is created by coupling a macroscopic system (like a cat) to a microscopic system prepared initially in a quantum superposition [1]. The macroscopic system becomes *entangled* with the microscopic one. Schrodinger pointed out the paradoxical nature of such a macroscopic system, that it cannot be interpreted as being in a mixture of two macroscopically distinguishable states (“dead” or “alive”). In realistic scenarios, couplings to external environments make the generation of a Schrodinger cat difficult [2, 3]. Despite that, progress has been made toward creating and detecting “Schrodinger cat” quantum superposition states [4].

One of the most interesting of such states is the two-mode NOON state, given by [5–16]

$$|\psi_{\text{NOON}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{|N\rangle|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}|0\rangle|N\rangle\} \quad (1)$$

Here, N boson particles (or photons) are in a superposition of being either in the first mode (denoted a) or the second mode (denoted b). The modes may correspond to different spatial paths. Denoting the creation and destruction operators for the two modes by \hat{a} , \hat{a}^\dagger and \hat{b} , \hat{b}^\dagger , $|n\rangle|m\rangle$ is the simultaneous Fock eigenstate of numbers $\hat{n}_a = \hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a}$ and $\hat{n}_b = \hat{b}^\dagger\hat{b}$, with eigenvalues n and m respectively. Where N is very large, the NOON state is a superposition of two macroscopically distinguishable states, and is thus a prototype “Schrodinger cat” state. Experiments have used spontaneous parametric down conversion (SPDC) to generate photonic NOON states for N up to 5 [5, 8–13]. The generation of atomic NOON states with $N > 1$ is a challenge. Recent experiments achieve Hong-Ou-Mandel interference with atoms (for $N = 2$) [17] and proposals exist for Bose-Einstein condensates (BEC) [18–23] which is especially interesting given the

open question about the existence of macroscopic superposition states for massive particles [24]. NOON states are typically signified by way of interference fringes or fidelity [8–13, 15]. This gives evidence for the superposition nature of the state (1), and its “size” N .

Our motivation in this paper is to signify the *nonlocality* of the NOON state (or of an approximate NOON state that may be generated experimentally). The ultimate objective is to experimentally verify the sort of mesoscopic entanglement described by Schrodinger in his “cat” paradox. In this paper, we derive a set of *Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering inequalities* [25–27] based on the uncertainty relation

$$\Delta\hat{n}\Delta\hat{P}^N \geq \frac{1}{2}|\langle[\hat{n}, \hat{P}^N]\rangle| \quad (2)$$

where \hat{n} is the mode number and \hat{P} is the mode quadrature amplitude (defined below). “EPR steering” has been established as a distinct type of nonlocality, different to both Bell’s nonlocality and entanglement [25] and can be regarded as a generalisation of the original EPR paradox [28]. “Steering” is the term used by Schrodinger [29] to describe the effect where an observer at one location can apparently change the quantum state at another – the effect Einstein called “spooky action-at-a-distance” [30]. The violation of the steering inequalities that we derive would therefore (as $N \rightarrow \infty$) signify an EPR steering nonlocality at a mesoscopic level.

The testing of nonlocality for mesoscopic systems is topical [31] and some EPR steering and Bell inequalities have been developed for NOON states [32, 33]. For $N = 1$, there have been experimental Bell tests [34] and steering inequalities have been used to give conclusive proof of the collapse of the wavefunction [35, 36]. It has been suggested [37] that the asymmetrical nature of the steering nonlocality [38] may give insight into the “Schrodinger cat-like” entanglement between macroscopic/ microscopic systems created by optomechanical devices.

It is necessary to ensure that the EPR steering certified by our inequalities is indeed due to *mesoscopic* super-

position effects, given that realistically the experimental system will not be the ideal NOON state. This motivated us to consider the relation (2), which (we explain in Section VIII) is the basis for a test of the nonzero N th order quantum coherence of a single mode ‘‘cat-state’’ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{|N\rangle + |0\rangle\}$. In Section VIII, we confirm that violation of the steering inequalities will signify an N th order quantum coherence and are thus also signatures of the (entangled) ‘‘cat’’ N -superposition state (1), provided the number measurements \hat{n} yield only results 0 and N . In the nonideal scenarios where there may be outcomes for mode number different to 0 and N , we explain how to use the steering inequalities with binned outcomes, in order to confirm an N th order quantum coherence.

Our proposed EPR steering inequalities are derived in Sections II and III of this paper. For $N = 2$ and $\phi \neq 0$ we show that a suitable signature for the steering nonlocality of a NOON state is the violation of the EPR steering inequality

$$\Delta_{inf} \hat{n}_b \Delta_{inf} (\hat{P}_b^2) \geq |\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle|_{inf} / 2 \quad (3)$$

where $\hat{C}_b = 2\hat{X}_{b,\pi/4}^2 - \hat{X}_b^2 - \hat{P}_b^2$. Here we define the rotated quadrature phase amplitudes for mode b as $\hat{X}_{b,\theta} = \hat{X}_b \cos \theta + \hat{P}_b \sin \theta$ and $\hat{P}_{b,\theta} = -\hat{X}_b \sin \theta + \hat{P}_b \cos \theta$ where $\hat{X}_b = \hat{b} + \hat{b}^\dagger$, $\hat{P}_b = (\hat{b} - \hat{b}^\dagger)/i$. Also $\hat{X}_a = \hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger$, $\hat{P}_a = (\hat{a} - \hat{a}^\dagger)/i$. The $\Delta_{inf} \hat{n}_b$ is the uncertainty in the prediction for \hat{n}_b based on measurement of \hat{n}_a . Similarly $\Delta_{inf} \hat{P}_b^2$ is the uncertainty in \hat{P}_b^2 based on the measurement \hat{X}_a ; and $|\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle|_{inf}$ is the magnitude of the mean value of \hat{C}_b based on the measurement \hat{X}_a . An EPR steering inequality is obtained by replacing the quantities of an uncertainty relation (in this case (2)) with their predicted (‘‘inferred’’) values [39–42]. In Section II, we summarise the Local Hidden State (LHS) Model developed by Wiseman, Jones and Doherty [25]. Using the methods of Cavalcanti et al [26], we prove that (3) is a steering inequality the violation of which falsifies LHS models, so that steering of the mode b (by measurements on the mode a) can be confirmed.

In Sections II and III, we provide similar inequalities for arbitrary N , including one for odd N and $\phi = 0$. Specifically, EPR steering of the mode b is confirmed if

$$E_N^{(p)} = \frac{\Delta_{inf} \hat{n}_b \Delta_{inf} \hat{P}_b^N}{\frac{1}{2} |\langle [\hat{n}_b, \hat{P}_b^N] \rangle|_{inf}} < 1 \quad (4)$$

or

$$E_N^{(x)} = \frac{\Delta_{inf} \hat{n}_b \Delta_{inf} \hat{X}_b^N}{\frac{1}{2} |\langle [\hat{n}_b, \hat{X}_b^N] \rangle|_{inf}} < 1 \quad (5)$$

For the ideal NOON state, $\Delta_{inf} \hat{n}_b = 0$ and the usefulness of the inequality depends on whether the denominator is nonzero. We show that the first criterion is useful provided $\cos \phi \neq 0$ for N odd or $\sin \phi \neq 0$ for N even, and the second criterion is useful for all N provided $\sin \phi \neq 0$.

We explain in Section VII for N up to 3 how the denominator of the inequality can be measured via homodyne detection. For $N = 1$ the inequality becomes straightforwardly

$$\Delta_{inf} \hat{n}_b \Delta_{inf} \hat{P}_b < |\langle \hat{X}_b \rangle|_{inf} / 2 \quad (6)$$

The cases of $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ are analysed in detail in Sections IV and V.

What is the implication of an experiment that confirms steering via the inequalities (3-5)? Such an experiment gives a realisation of the EPR steering nonlocality for the NOON state and thus extends to higher N the investigations into the nonlocality of the single photon, where violations of Bell inequalities and steering inequalities were realised for the case $N = 1$ [34–36]. The steering inequalities for larger N may also open a way to investigate the collapse of the wave packet of a ‘‘cat state’’.

The inequalities (3-5) involve measurement of number (\hat{n}_a, \hat{n}_b) and hence have the drawback of low detection efficiencies (in the photonic case). In the first instance, we propose that the correlation be established by postselection of the events where a total of N quanta (photons) are detected at the sites of both modes. A second problem is distinguishing between the detection of two and one photons at a given site. Here, beam splitters or photon number-resolving detectors are used [10, 13] in conjunction with postselection over events where a total N photons is counted. The measurement of observables \hat{X}^N, \hat{P}^N could be achieved via optical homodyne techniques that are highly efficient. Nonetheless, we explain in Sections VI, VII and IX that losses have a significant effect (measurement efficiencies of $\eta > .94$ are required for $N = 3$) and that care needs to be taken to avoid possible loopholes created by asymmetrical losses for the number and quadrature measurements.

II. EPR STEERING INEQUALITIES BASED ON UNCERTAINTY RELATIONS

In this Section we give the formal derivation of the EPR steering criteria summarised in the Introduction I. We show in Section III how we can use the inequalities to detect EPR steering for a NOON state.

A. EPR steering inequalities

EPR steering is verified as a failure of a Local Hidden State model (LHS). The LHS model was pioneered in the papers by Wiseman, Jones and Doherty [25] and is based on the Local Hidden Variable models (LHV) considered by Bell [43]. We define two subsystems A and B and consider space-like separated measurements on each of them. The measurements are described quantum mechanically by observables $\hat{X}_A(\theta)$ and $\hat{X}_B(\phi)$ (respectively) and the outcomes are given by the numbers $X_A(\theta)$ and $X_B(\phi)$ (written without the ‘‘hats’’). Here θ and ϕ

denote the measurement choice at the locations A and B . To prove Bell's nonlocality, one falsifies a description of the statistics based on a Local Hidden Variable (LHV) model, where the averages are given as

$$\langle X_B(\phi)X_A(\theta) \rangle = \int_{\lambda} d\lambda P(\lambda) \langle X_B(\phi) \rangle_{\lambda} \langle X_A(\theta) \rangle_{\lambda} \quad (7)$$

Here $\int_{\lambda} P(\lambda) d\lambda = 1$ so that the $P(\lambda)$ is a probability density (or probability if the integral is replaced by a discrete summation, as explained in Bell's papers [43]). The λ denotes a set of variables $\{\lambda\}$ that take the role of the hidden variables postulated in Bell's LHV model. A system described by the model can be treated as being in a probabilistic mixture of hidden variable states symbolised by λ , with probabilities $P(\lambda)$. The $\langle X_A \rangle_{\lambda}$ denotes the average of the results X_A for the system in the particular hidden variable state denoted by λ ; and similarly for $\langle X_B \rangle_{\lambda}$. The $P(\lambda)$ is independent of the θ and ϕ . The factorisation that occurs for the moments in the integrand is due to the assumption of "locality" as explained extensively in Bell's papers and subsequent reviews [43].

To prove EPR steering of subsystem B , we need to falsify a description of the statistics based on a Local Hidden State (LHS) model where the averages are given as [25, 26]

$$\langle X_B(\phi)X_A(\theta) \rangle = \int_{\lambda} d\lambda P(\lambda) \langle X_B(\phi) \rangle_{\lambda, \rho} \langle X_A(\theta) \rangle_{\lambda} \quad (8)$$

Here an extra condition is placed on the average $\langle X_B \rangle_{\lambda}$. The ρ subscript denotes that the average is to be consistent with that of a *quantum density operator* ρ_{λ}^B . This is the case for all choices ϕ of measurement at B . For example, if $X_B(\theta) = X_B$ and $X_B(\pi/2) = P_B$ then the statistics for the LHS model must be consistent with a local uncertainty principle namely $\langle (X_B - \langle X_B \rangle)^2 \rangle_{\lambda} \langle (P_B - \langle P_B \rangle)^2 \rangle_{\lambda} \geq 1$. The ρ_{λ}^B is an example of a Local Quantum State (for site B). No such constraint is made for the moments $\langle X_A(\theta) \rangle_{\lambda}$, written without the subscript.

In this paper we consider three quantum observables defined through the uncertainty relation:

$$\Delta \hat{\sigma}_B^X \Delta \hat{\sigma}_B^Y \geq |\langle \hat{\sigma}_B^Z \rangle|/2 \quad (9)$$

Following the approach given in Refs. [39–41] used to derive a criterion for the EPR paradox [28] and also for EPR steering [25, 40], we consider the average conditional uncertainty $\Delta_{inf} \sigma_B^X$ defined by

$$(\Delta_{inf} \hat{\sigma}_B^X)^2 = \sum_{x_j^A} P(x_j^A) (\Delta(\sigma_B^X | x_j^A))^2 \quad (10)$$

Here, we denote the possible results of a measurement \hat{X}_A at A by $\{x_j^A\}$. $P(x_j^A)$ is the probability for obtaining the result x_j^A . The uncertainty (10) is a measure of the

(average) uncertainty in the *inferred* value (which we take to be the mean of the conditional distribution $P(\sigma_B^X | x_j^A)$) for a measurement $\hat{\sigma}_B^X$ at B given a measurement \hat{X}_A at A . Specifically, $(\Delta(\sigma_B^X | x_j^A))^2$ is the variance of the conditional distribution $P(\sigma_B^X | x_j^A)$. We define similarly

$$(\Delta_{inf} \hat{\sigma}_B^Y)^2 = \sum_{y_j^A} P(y_j^A) (\Delta(\sigma_B^Y | y_j^A))^2 \quad (11)$$

noting that the y_j^A are the set of results for a measurement \hat{Y}_A made at A to infer the value of the measurement of $\hat{\sigma}_B^Y$ at B . Further, we define an (average) inferred value for the modulus of the mean of measurement of $\hat{\sigma}_B^Z$ given a measurement \hat{Z}_A at A as

$$|\langle \hat{\sigma}_B^Z \rangle|_{inf} = \sum_{z_j^A} P(z_j^A) |\langle \sigma_B^Z \rangle_{z_j^A}| \quad (12)$$

Here $\langle \sigma_B^Z \rangle_{z_j^A}$ is the mean of the conditional distribution $P(\sigma_B^Z | z_j^A)$ and the $\{z_j^A\}$ is the set of values for a measurement \hat{Z}_A at A , that we use to infer outcomes for $\hat{\sigma}_B^Z$. Using these definitions, we can prove the following result [42].

Result (1): – The EPR steering inequality

The LHS model (8) implies the inequality

$$(\Delta_{inf} \hat{\sigma}_B^X)(\Delta_{inf} \hat{\sigma}_B^Y) \geq |\langle \hat{\sigma}_B^Z \rangle|_{inf}/2 \quad (13)$$

Hence, violation of this inequality (called an EPR steering inequality) implies failure of the LHS model, and therefore steering of system B by (measurements at A). The proof is given in the Appendix A.

III. STEERING INEQUALITIES FOR THE NOON STATE

To arrive at a steering signature for a NOON state, we consider the three observables: number \hat{n} , and the two quadrature phase amplitudes \hat{X} and \hat{P} , for each mode. Specifically: $\hat{n}_a = \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a}$, $\hat{X}_a = \hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger$ and $\hat{P}_a = (\hat{a} - \hat{a}^\dagger)/i$, and $\hat{n}_b = \hat{b}^\dagger \hat{b}$, $\hat{X}_b = \hat{b} + \hat{b}^\dagger$ and $\hat{P}_b = (\hat{b} - \hat{b}^\dagger)/i$. Where the notation is clear, we omit the "hat" for these operators. Using the Result (1) given by Eq. (13), we can write down EPR steering criteria associated with the three observables: We certify EPR steering (of B by A) if either one of the following hold:

$$\Delta_{inf} n_b \Delta_{inf} P_b^N < |\langle [n_b, P_b^N] \rangle|_{inf}/2 \quad (14)$$

and

$$\Delta_{inf} n_b \Delta_{inf} (X_b^N) < |\langle [n_b, X_b^N] \rangle|_{inf}/2 \quad (15)$$

Here, $\Delta_{inf} n_b$ refers to the average uncertainty of the result for n_b given a measurement \hat{O}_n at A , as defined by

(10). Similarly, $\Delta_{inf} P_b^N$ refers to the average uncertainty of the result for P_b^N given a measurement \hat{O}_p at A . The $\Delta_{inf} X_b^N$ refers to the average uncertainty of the result for X_b^N given a measurement \hat{O}_x at A . The $|\langle \hat{C} \rangle|_{inf}$ where $\hat{C} = [n_b, P_b^N]$ (or $[n_b, X_b^N]$) is defined similarly, by (12), as the average value of the modulus of the expectation value of \hat{C} conditioned on a measurement \hat{O}_c at A . The steering inequalities of this paper take $\hat{O}_p = \hat{X}_a$, $\hat{O}_x = \hat{X}_a$ and $\hat{O}_c = \hat{X}_a$.

To evaluate the right side of the inequalities (14-15), we determine the commutation relations: $[n, X] = -iP$ and $[n, P] = iX$. By ordering the P 's to be always on the left of the X 's and since $[X, P] = 2i$, we arrive at the commutation relation $[X, P^k] = 2ikP^{k-1}$. It can be shown that $[n, P^N] = iN\{P^{N-2}[PX + (N-1)i]\}$ and $[n, X^N] = -iN\{X^{N-2}[XP - (N-1)i]\}$. We use this result to further evaluate the right side of the steering inequalities. Most generally, the right side of the steering inequality (14) can be written

$$|\langle [n_b, P_b^N] \rangle|_{inf} = N|\langle P_b^{N-1}X_b + i(N-1)P_b^{N-2} \rangle|_{inf} \quad (16)$$

so that the procedure is to measure the modulus of the expectation value of the measurement $\hat{C} = P_b^{N-1}X_b + i(N-1)P_b^{N-2}$ made on mode b , given a specific result for a measurement \hat{O}_c is made on mode a , and then take the weighted average as defined by (12). The expectation value of \hat{C} can be inferred from the expectation values of $P_b^{N-1}X_b$ and P_b^{N-2} , given the specific result for measurement \hat{O}_c . We discuss methods for measuring $P_b^{N-1}X_b$ where $N = 1, 2, 3$ in Section VII below.

To investigate whether the steering inequalities will be useful for the NOON states (1) with phase ϕ , we evaluate the prediction for the right side of the steering inequality (14) in the general NOON case. We will take \hat{O}_c to be the measurement X_a and denote the result of that measurement by x . We find

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle [n_b, P_b^N] \rangle|_{inf} &= N|\langle P_b^{N-2}(P_b X_b + (N-1)i) \rangle|_{inf} \\ &= N|\langle (b^N) + (-1)^{N+1} \langle b^{\dagger N} \rangle|_{inf} \\ &= N\sqrt{N!} \left| \frac{e^{i\phi} + (-1)^{N+1} e^{-i\phi}}{2} \right| \\ &\quad \times \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\langle x|0\rangle \langle x|N\rangle| dx \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where $|x\rangle$ are the eigenstates of X . The cases $N = 1$ and $N = 2$ are presented in the Sections IV and V below. We find similarly

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle [n_b, X_b^N] \rangle|_{inf} &= N|\langle X_b^{N-2} [X_b P_b - (N-1)i] \rangle|_{inf} \\ &= N| -\langle b^N \rangle + \langle (b^\dagger)^N \rangle|_{inf} \\ &= N\sqrt{N!} |\sin \phi| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\langle x|0\rangle \langle x|N\rangle| dx \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Now we determine when each of the steering criteria (14) and (15) will be useful. For the NOON state, the mode numbers are always correlated, and we observe that $\Delta_{inf} n_b = 0$. Hence either of the steering criteria (14) and (15) will be effective to detect steering in NOON states, *provided* that the right side of the inequality is not zero, and provided the variances $\Delta_{inf}(X_b^N)$, $\Delta_{inf}(P_b^N)$ are finite. Since the integral $\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\langle x|0\rangle \langle x|N\rangle| dx$ is nonzero for the NOON state, we see from the expressions (17) and (18) that the condition for the right side of the inequalities (14) and (15) to be nonzero is: for N odd, $\cos \phi \neq 0$ and $\sin \phi \neq 0$ respectively; for N even, $\sin \phi \neq 0$ in both cases.

To summarise, we rewrite the EPR steering criteria (14) and (15) as

$$E_N^{(p)} = \frac{\Delta_{inf} n_b \Delta_{inf} P_b^N}{\frac{1}{2} |\langle [n_b, P_b^N] \rangle|_{inf}} < 1 \quad (19)$$

and

$$E_N^{(x)} = \frac{\Delta_{inf} n_b \Delta_{inf} X_b^N}{\frac{1}{2} |\langle [n_b, X_b^N] \rangle|_{inf}} < 1 \quad (20)$$

Steering is obtained if $E_N^{(x/p)} < 1$. Either criterion is sufficient to certify an EPR paradox, or EPR steering. For the NOON state $|\psi_{\text{NOON}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{|N\rangle|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}|0\rangle|N\rangle\}$ the first criterion is useful provided $\cos \phi \neq 0$ for N odd or $\sin \phi \neq 0$ for N even, and the second criterion is useful for all N provided $\sin \phi \neq 0$. We comment that the right side of the steering inequalities (14) and (15) needs to be *measured* in the experiment. We examine how this can be done below in Section VII, finding that cases of low N are much more accessible to experiment. We also point out that except where $N = 1$ or 2 , the equivalence of the first two lines in equations (17) and (18) holds only for the expectation values as calculated for the ideal NOON state (1).

In Section VI, we will evaluate predictions for non-ideal case where loss is present. To complete the prediction for the steering inequalities with loss present, we also need to calculate $\Delta_{inf}(P^N)$, $\Delta_{inf}(X^N)$. In this paper, we use $\hat{O}_x = \hat{O}_p = \hat{X}_a$ as the measurement on mode a . As above, we take x to be the result of the measurement X_a .




Figure 1: **Predictions for EPR steering of the NOON states.** EPR steering is observed when $E_N^{(p)} < 1$. It is assumed that the two-mode NOON state is created and that each mode is then (independently) subjected to losses. The model for loss (described in Section VI) is a beam splitter coupled to each mode with transmission efficiencies η_a and η_b respectively. Here we take $\eta = \eta_a = \eta_b$. We select the NOON state (1) with $\phi = 0$ for N odd and $\phi = \pi/2$ for N even.

We evaluate

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{inf}^2(P_b^N) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(x) \{\Delta(P_b^N|x)\}^2 dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(x) [\langle P_b^{2N} \rangle_x - \langle P_b^N \rangle_x^2] dx \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where $\langle \dots \rangle_x$ denotes the expectation value conditioned on the result x , as defined for (12). The $\langle P_b^{2N} \rangle_x$ and $\langle P_b^N \rangle_x$ can be expressed in terms of the momentum representation functions $\langle p|N \rangle$ as shown in Appendix D. Similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{inf}^2(X_b^N) &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(x) \{\Delta(X_b^N|x)\}^2 dx \\ &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(x) [\langle X_b^{2N} \rangle_x - \langle X_b^N \rangle_x^2] dx \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The $\langle X_b^N \rangle_x$ and $\langle X_b^{2N} \rangle_x$ can be solved in terms of the harmonic oscillator wavefunctions $\langle x|N \rangle$ (27) as shown in Appendix D and explained for $N = 1, 2$ below. We have introduced the shorthand notation $\Delta^2 x \equiv (\Delta x)^2$ to avoid overuse of brackets. We have solved for the effect of loss on the NOON states using the methods outlined in Section VI and the results for the steering inequalities are plotted in Figure 1.

IV. SPECIAL CASE OF $N = 1$

Steering for the case of $N = 1$ has been proposed by Jones and Wiseman [35] and experimentally achieved by Fuwa et al [36]. The inequalities used in those papers verified steering in the high efficiency limit based on homodyne detection, thus giving a firm experimental proof of the nonlocality of the NOON ($N = 1$) state. Here, we outline the application of the steering inequalities (14) and (15) for this case.

For $N = 1$, the relevant Heisenberg uncertainty relations are $\Delta n \Delta P \geq |\langle X \rangle|/2$ and $\Delta n \Delta X \geq |\langle P \rangle|/2$. We see from (13) that a criterion sufficient to certify EPR steering of mode b by measurements on mode a is

$$\Delta_{inf} n_b \Delta_{inf} P_b < |\langle X_b \rangle_{inf}|/2 \quad (23)$$

The inequality $\Delta_{inf} n_b \Delta_{inf} X_b < |\langle P_b \rangle_{inf}|/2$ is also a steering criterion. Note we can also define the corresponding criteria for steering of the a mode by interchanging the a and b indices. The quantities have been defined above in Section II and III. The choices of \hat{O}_c, \hat{O}_p are generally so as to optimise the criterion for a given state, but is otherwise not explicitly specified in the criterion. We take $\hat{O}_n = \hat{n}_a, \hat{O}_p = \hat{X}_a, \hat{O}_x = \hat{X}_a$ and $\hat{O}_c = \hat{X}_a$.

We give one possibility as follows: We examine the NOON state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{|N\rangle|0\rangle + |0\rangle|N\rangle\}$ ($\phi = 0$) and restrict therefore to the steering criterion (23). The measurement of n_a will enable a perfectly accurate prediction for the number n_b , so that $\Delta_{inf} n = 0$. We next take $\hat{O}_c = X_a$ and evaluate the mean of X_b (or P_b) at b , given a result x for measurement of X_a at A . This enables us to evaluate $|\langle X_b \rangle_{inf}$ and $|\langle P_b \rangle_{inf}$ for a valid steering criterion. If we measure X_a with result x , the normalised reduced wave function is (we denote the eigenstate of X for mode a by $|x\rangle$)

$$|\psi\rangle_x = \frac{\langle x|N\rangle|0\rangle + \langle x|0\rangle|N\rangle}{\sqrt{|\langle x|N\rangle|^2 + |\langle x|0\rangle|^2}} \quad (24)$$

Thus we write the reduced density operator as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{red,x} &= \frac{1}{2P(x)} \{ |\langle x|N\rangle|^2 |0\rangle\langle 0| + |\langle x|0\rangle|^2 |N\rangle\langle N| \\ &\quad + \langle 0|x\rangle\langle x|N\rangle |0\rangle\langle N| + \langle N|x\rangle\langle x|0\rangle |N\rangle\langle 0| \} \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where the probability distribution for obtaining a result x for X_a is

$$P(x) = \frac{1}{2} \{ |\langle x|0\rangle|^2 + |\langle x|N\rangle|^2 \} \quad (26)$$

Here $\langle x|N \rangle$ are the standard oscillator wave functions

$$\langle x|n \rangle = (\sqrt{\pi} 2^n n!)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \frac{2^{\frac{1}{4}}}{\sqrt{c}} e^{-\frac{x^2}{c^2}} H_n \left(\frac{\sqrt{2}}{c} x \right) \quad (27)$$

involving Hermite polynomials H_n and derived using that $\hat{x} = \frac{c}{2}(\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger)$, $\hat{p} = \frac{c}{2i}(\hat{a} - \hat{a}^\dagger)$. In this paper we have taken $c = 2$. Now we see that the mean for X_b given the result x for X_a is

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X_b \rangle_x &= Tr(\rho_{red,x} X_b) \\ &= \frac{1}{2P(x)} \{ \langle 0|x \rangle \langle x|N \rangle \langle N|X_b|0 \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle N|x \rangle \langle x|0 \rangle \langle 0|X_b|N \rangle \} \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

and similarly

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P_b \rangle_x &= Tr(\rho_{red,x} P_b) \\ &= \frac{1}{2P(x)} \{ \langle 0|x \rangle \langle x|N \rangle \langle N|P_b|0 \rangle \\ &\quad + \langle N|x \rangle \langle x|0 \rangle \langle 0|P_b|N \rangle \} \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

In fact the mean $\langle X_b \rangle_x$ will be nonzero only for $N = 1$, in which case the steering criterion (23) is satisfied because $\Delta_{inf} n_b = 0$ (and $\Delta_{inf} P_b \neq \infty$). Hence, the inequality (23) is a suitable steering criterion for $N = 1$. Specifically, following the definition (12), we evaluate

$$|\langle X_b \rangle_{inf}| = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(x) |\langle X_b \rangle_x| dx = \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \quad (30)$$

where $\langle X_b \rangle_x$ is the conditional quantity between two modes, as defined in (12). To complete the prediction for the steering inequality, we calculate a suitable value for $\Delta_{inf} P_b$ by taking the measurement X_a at A. We denote the result of that measurement by x . Then the reduced density operator is $\rho_{red,x}$ as above, which for $N = 1$ gives

$$(\Delta(P_b|x))^2 = \frac{1}{2P(x)} \{ |\langle x|1 \rangle|^2 + 3|\langle x|0 \rangle|^2 \} \quad (31)$$

and thus

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{inf}^2 P_b &= \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} P(x) \{ \Delta(P_b|x) \}^2 dx \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \{ |\langle x|1 \rangle|^2 + 3|\langle x|0 \rangle|^2 \} = 2 \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

where to avoid overuse of brackets we introduce the shorthand notation $\Delta^2 x \equiv (\Delta x)^2$. We obtain an EPR steering when $E_1^{(p)} \equiv \frac{\Delta_{inf} n_b \Delta_{inf} P_b}{|\langle X_b \rangle_{inf}|^2} < 1$. For the ideal NOON state with no losses, $E_1^{(p)} = 0$ and the steering is always detectable via this criterion. The situation with loss is studied in Section VI and presented in Figure 1. Efficiencies $\eta > 0.92$ are required to detect the steering.

V. SPECIAL CASE OF $N = 2$

We now examine the details for the NOON state with $N = 2$ which represents an important case potentially

accessible to experiment, in view of recent advances [13, 17, 36]. Firstly, $[n, X^2] = -i(XP + PX) = -2iXP - 2 = 2(a^{\dagger 2} - a^2)$. Similarly, $[n, P^2] = i(XP + PX) = -2(a^{\dagger 2} - a^2)$. The steering criteria are

$$\Delta_{inf} n \Delta_{inf} (X^2) < |\langle a^{\dagger 2} - a^2 \rangle_{inf}| \quad (33)$$

and

$$\Delta_{inf} n \Delta_{inf} (P^2) < |\langle a^{\dagger 2} - a^2 \rangle_{inf}| \quad (34)$$

For the NOON state (1) with $N = 2$ we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle a^{\dagger 2} - a^2 \rangle_{inf}| &= \int P(x) |\langle \hat{a}^2 | x \rangle - \langle (\hat{a}^\dagger)^2 | x \rangle| dx \\ &= \sqrt{2} |\sin \phi| \int |\langle x|0 \rangle \langle x|2 \rangle| dx \\ &= 2 \sqrt{\frac{2}{e\pi}} |\sin \phi| = 0.968 |\sin \phi| \end{aligned}$$

Both the steering criteria (33) and (34) become useful for the NOON state with $\phi = \pi/2$. We show in Appendix D by integration of the Hermite polynomials that $\Delta_{inf} (X^2) = 3.18$ and $\Delta_{inf} (P^2) = 3.18$. For the ideal case with no detection loss, $\Delta_{inf} n = 0$ and the steering for the NOON state with $N = 2$ is detectable using either criterion. The effect of the losses is studied as outlined below in Section VI and the results shown in Figure 1.

VI. INCLUDING LOSSES

Signatures of the NOON state superposition are known to be fragile to losses. We examine the effect of loss on the signatures proposed here, by using a simple model for loss. We couple each mode a and b to second independent fields taken as single modes and initially in independent vacuum states, following the beam splitter model introduced for the study of the decoherence of a macroscopic superposition state by Yurke and Stoler [3]. We thus evaluate the moments of detected fields with boson operators a_{det} , b_{det} given by

$$\begin{aligned} a_{det} &= \sqrt{\eta_a} a + \sqrt{1 - \eta_a} a_v \\ b_{det} &= \sqrt{\eta_b} b + \sqrt{1 - \eta_b} b_v \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

Here the a_v and b_v are destruction operators for independent external vacuum modes that couple to the modes of the NOON state. These external modes model the presence of an external environment into which quanta can be lost from the a and b modes. The amount of coupling for each mode is determined by the efficiency factors η_a and η_b respectively. The $\eta_{A/B} = 1$ indicates zero loss; low $\eta_{A/B}$ indicates high loss. The model is effective for optical NOON states where thermal noise can be neglected. The full calculation is explained in Appendix E. We find for $N = 1$ and $\phi = 0$




Figure 2: **Contour plot shows the effect of loss on the EPR steering:** EPR steering is observed when $E_N^{(p)} < 1$. The η_a and η_b are the efficiencies for detection of mode a and b respectively.

$$\begin{aligned}
 E_1^{(p)} &\equiv \frac{\Delta_{inf} n \Delta_{inf} P}{|\langle X \rangle|_{inf}/2} \\
 &= 2 \left[\frac{\eta_b (\eta_a + \eta_b - 2)}{2(\eta_a - 2)} (1 + \eta_b) \right]^{\frac{1}{2}} / \left[\sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \sqrt{\eta_a \eta_b} \right]
 \end{aligned} \tag{36}$$

The expressions for higher N are more complex but are explained in Appendix E and evaluated numerically. Figure 1 shows $E_N^{(p)}$ versus η , for the case of symmetrical efficiency $\eta = \eta_a = \eta_b$. The criterion for EPR steering is satisfied for $N = 1$ provided $\eta > 0.92$ but as expected for the NOON state, the cut-off efficiency increases sharply for higher N . For $N = 2$ there is asymmetrical dependence on η_a and η_b as evident by the contour plots of Figure 2. The signature appears more sensitive to the efficiency η_B of mode b . Such asymmetrical sensitivity depending on the steering direction has been noted previously [37, 38].

We note that the model (35) describes losses that occur *prior* to detection. It is assumed that the subsequent detection process gives no further loss. Alternatively, if the beam splitter is to model detection losses, then the losses would need to be assumed *identical* for each of the detection processes (number or homodyne). In reality, for low N the numbers n_a, n_b are usually detected via counting techniques where the efficiency of detection is often small. On the other hand, the quadratures X and P are measured via homodyne detection where efficiencies are high (at least for optical fields). This creates a situation where the loss coefficient η is dependent on the choice of measurement made at each site, which we point out can *create loopholes* in the use of the signature for a practical experiment if not considered carefully [43, 44]. We discuss this further in the Conclusion.

VII. MEASUREMENT

We next consider how to experimentally *measure* the moments on the right side of the steering inequalities (14) and (15). For $N = 1$ this is straightforward as explained in Section IV. For $N = 2$, on examining the expressions (17) and (18), we see we need to measure $\langle [n, P^2] \rangle = \langle XP + PX \rangle$. We define the measurable rotated quadrature phase amplitudes as $X_\theta = X \cos(\theta) + P \sin(\theta)$ and $P_\theta = -X \sin(\theta) + P \cos(\theta)$. Hence, $X_{\pi/4} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{X + P\}$ and $P_{\pi/4} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{-X + P\}$ and we note that $\langle X_{\pi/4}^2 \rangle = \langle X^2 + P^2 + XP + PX \rangle/2$. Thus, we can deduce either $\langle XP \rangle$ or $\langle PX \rangle$ by measuring the moments $\langle X^2 \rangle$, $\langle P^2 \rangle$ and $\langle X_{\pi/4}^2 \rangle$. The steering criteria (4-5) for $N = 2$ can be written as (here we drop the subscripts b for convenience)

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta_{inf} n \Delta_{inf} (P^2) &< |\langle [n, P^2] \rangle|_{inf}/2 \\
 &= |\langle X_{\pi/4}^2 - X^2/2 - P^2/2 \rangle|_{inf}
 \end{aligned} \tag{37}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta_{inf} n \Delta_{inf} (X^2) &< |\langle [n, X^2] \rangle|_{inf}/2 \\
 &= |\langle X_{\pi/4}^2 - X^2/2 - P^2/2 \rangle|_{inf}
 \end{aligned} \tag{38}$$

The moments of X , P and $X_{\pi/4}$ are each measurable using homodyne detection.

For $N = 3$, we see from (17) and (18) that we need to measure $[n, P^3] = 3\langle P^2 X + 2iP \rangle$ the other measurements being straightforward. Expanding gives

$$\langle X_{\pi/4}^3 - P_{\pi/4}^3 \rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\langle X^3 \rangle + 6i\langle P \rangle + 3\langle P^2 X \rangle)$$

Hence we can measure $\langle X_{\pi/4}^3 \rangle$, $\langle P_{\pi/4}^3 \rangle$, $\langle X^3 \rangle$, $\langle P \rangle$ and consequently infer the value of $\langle P^2 X \rangle$. Specifically, the steering inequalities become

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta_{inf} n \Delta_{inf} (P^3) &< |\langle [n, P^3] \rangle|_{inf}/2 \\
 &= |\langle \sqrt{2} (X_{\pi/4}^3 - P_{\pi/4}^3) - X^3 \rangle|_{inf}/2
 \end{aligned} \tag{39}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \Delta_{inf} n \Delta_{inf} (X^3) &< |\langle [n, X^3] \rangle|_{inf}/2 \\
 &= |\langle \sqrt{2} (X_{\pi/4}^3 + P_{\pi/4}^3) - P^3 \rangle|_{inf}/2
 \end{aligned} \tag{40}$$

We comment that the inequalities (37-40) are valid as a sufficiency test of EPR steering for *all* states i.e. we do not assume ideal NOON states.

VIII. STEERING INEQUALITIES AS CRITERIA FOR THE N TH ORDER QUANTUM COHERENCE OF THE NOON STATE

For large $N \rightarrow \infty$, the NOON state is a ‘‘cat-state’’ in analogy with Schrodinger’s original paradox. For finite $N > 1$, the NOON state is a superposition of two states distinct by N quanta, and the terminology often used in the literature is that the state is an N -scopic ‘‘cat’’ or ‘‘kitten’’ state. The NOON state

$$|\psi_{\text{NOON}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{|N\rangle|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}|0\rangle|N\rangle\} \quad (41)$$

is distinguished from the mixture

$$\rho = P_0|N\rangle|0\rangle\langle 0|\langle N| + P_N|0\rangle|N\rangle\langle N|\langle 0| \quad (42)$$

by the presence of the nonzero N th order quantum coherence term

$$\langle 0|\langle N|\rho|0\rangle|N\rangle \neq 0 \quad (43)$$

Measurements that confirm (43) (such as higher order interference which confirms $\langle a^{\dagger N} b^N \rangle \neq 0$) become signatures of the NOON cat-state.

In this Section we clarify that the steering uncertainty inequalities (3-5) derived in this paper are also signatures of an N -scopic coherence and can thus signify an N -scopic cat-state. For the system in the *ideal* NOON state, the results for number \hat{n} are 0 or N , but in realistic experiments, when losses and noise are included, the distribution p_n for a result n will be spread over a wider range of n . It is not then obvious whether certification of EPR steering will also imply an N -scopic quantum coherence. This is because EPR steering negates classical mixtures that are *fully separable* between the two modes, which is in some cases different to certifying an N th order coherence (see below).

A. Single mode case

We first examine the simple case of the single mode superposition

$$|\psi_N\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\{|N\rangle + e^{i\phi}|0\rangle\} \quad (44)$$

which can also be regarded as a cat state. This N -scopic cat state can be confirmed if the single-mode coherence is nonzero:

$$\langle N|\rho|0\rangle \neq 0 \quad (45)$$

The definitions of a cat-state do not normally require entanglement. The nonzero coherence can be signified via uncertainty relations based on (2). We see that $\langle a^{\dagger N} \rangle \neq 0$ is a signature for the nonzero coherence, but this can be difficult to measure for higher N .

Our approach is to postulate that the system is in a classical mixture of type

$$\rho_{\text{mix}} = P_1\rho_1 + P_2\rho_2 \quad (46)$$

where $P_1 + P_2 = 1$ and ρ_i ($i = 1, 2$) is a density operator giving a range of predictions in n with mean $\langle n \rangle_i$ and variance $(\Delta n)_i^2$. For any mixture (46) the following Result holds.

Result (2): –The predictions for the mixture ρ satisfy the following inequality:

$$\left\{ \sum_i (\Delta \hat{n}_i)^2 \right\} (\Delta \hat{P}^N)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} |\langle \hat{C} \rangle|^2 \quad (47)$$

where $\hat{C} = [\hat{n}, \hat{P}^N]$.

Proof: The proof is given in Appendix B and is based on the fact that for the mixture $(\Delta \hat{P}^N)^2 \geq \sum_i P_i (\Delta \hat{P}^N)_i^2$ where $(\Delta \hat{P}^N)_i^2$ is the variance of \hat{P}^N for the state ρ_i . It is also necessary to use that for each ρ_i the quantum uncertainty relation

$$\Delta \hat{n} \Delta \hat{P}^N \geq \frac{1}{2} |\langle \hat{C} \rangle| \quad (48)$$

(2) must hold. \square

If indeed the results for n and p_n are as for the ideal state (44), then the only mixture of type (46) that could be consistent with the statistics has $\langle n \rangle_1 = N$, $\langle n \rangle_2 = 0$ and $(\Delta n)_i^2 = 0$. This corresponds to the mixture $\rho = P_0|0\rangle\langle 0| + P_N|N\rangle\langle N|$. But then this possibility is negated by the Result 2. We see this because for the quantum superposition, $(\Delta \hat{P}^N)^2$ is finite and hence left side of the inequality is zero whereas $\langle \hat{C} \rangle$ can be shown to be nonzero. The violation of the uncertainty relation (47) then signifies the N -scopic quantum coherence (43) and is the signature of the N -scopic ‘‘cat’’ state.

More generally, in order to signify a cat state we would want to negate mixtures of type (46) that have *well-separated* mean values $\langle n \rangle_1$ and $\langle n \rangle_2$. For the nonideal case where some losses or noise are present, the distribution p_n will have two peaks, one near N and the second near 0. If we allow that each $(\Delta \hat{n})_i^2$ defined in Result 2 is nonzero ($(\Delta \hat{n})_i^2 \neq 0$), we can negate mixtures of states ρ_i with an extended range of predictions for n , using the Result 2. In particular, we can select each $(\Delta \hat{n})_i^2$ as being equal to the variances associated with the two peaks (but so that ρ is consistent with the p_n) i.e. the choice of the n_i and variances $(\Delta \hat{n})_i^2$ is constrained by p_n . The Result 2 can be then be used to negate this mixture, and to signify a quantum coherence (cat-state) of order $\sim N$. Precise links between the negation of the mixture (46) and the order of quantum coherence that can be signified for non-ideal states are discussed elsewhere (see for example Refs. [45]).

It is noted in the expression (46) that *no other* assumptions are made about the ρ_i . For instance, ρ_i can be any superposition of number states consistent with the assumption of a variance $(\Delta n)_i^2$. It is because of this

generality that the violation of the uncertainty-type relation (47) becomes a genuine signature of an N -scopic quantum coherence.

B. Two mode case

Our real interest however is in the two-mode case for which we derive a different Result. We consider the mixture

$$\rho_{mix}^{ab} = P_1\rho_1^{ab} + P_2\rho_2^{ab} \quad (49)$$

Here $P_1 + P_2 = 1$ and ρ_i^{ab} ($i = 1, 2$) is a two-mode density operator giving a range of predictions for \hat{n}_b with mean $\langle n_b \rangle_i$ and variance $(\Delta n_b)_i^2$. The symbols ab are introduced as superscripts to denote the two-mode nature of each ρ_i . For any such mixture, the following Result holds.

Result (3): –The predictions for the mixture (49) satisfy

$$\left\{ \sum_i P_i (\Delta \hat{n}_b)_i^2 \right\} (\Delta_{inf} \hat{P}_b^N)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} |\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle_{inf}^2| \quad (50)$$

where the inf quantities are defined in Sections II and III as the average variances and means of conditional distributions for measurement on mode b given measurements on mode a . In this case however, we specify as in (3) that the inferred values for \hat{P}_b^N and \hat{C}_b are calculated using the same observable at mode a .

Proof: The proof is given in the Appendix C and is based on the uncertainty relation

$$(\Delta \hat{n}_b)^2 (\Delta_{inf} \hat{P}_b^N)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} |\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle_{inf}^2| \quad (51)$$

that holds for any two-mode state. A similar Result has been given for continuous variables in Ref. [46] \square

It is important to note that *no other* assumptions are made in (49) about the ρ_i^{ab} apart from consistency with the statistics for measurements of n_a and n_b . For instance, ρ_i^{ab} can be an *entangled superposition* of number states. However because ρ_i^{ab} must also imply a variance $(\Delta n)_i^2$, the ρ_i^{ab} cannot describe the mesoscopic entanglement of the NOON state.

It is now straightforward to see how the steering criteria (3-5) as proposed in this paper also certify the N -scopic quantum coherence of the cat-state. The steering inequalities

$$\Delta_{inf} \hat{n}_b \Delta_{inf} (\hat{P}_b^N) \geq |\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle_{inf}| / 2 \quad (52)$$

involve the term $(\Delta_{inf} \hat{n}_b)^2$ defined as the average variance of the conditional distributions for n_b given the measurement n_a :

$$(\Delta_{inf} \hat{n}_b)^2 = \sum_{n_a} P(n_a) (\Delta(n_b|n_a))^2$$

We first consider the case where the statistics would be measured as predicted by the ideal NOON state. Here, $P(n_a)$ is zero unless $n_a = N$ or 0 , and the conditionals satisfy $\Delta(n_b|n_a)^2 = 0$. The only mixture ρ_{mix}^{ab} of type (49) with a wide separation of means $\langle n_b \rangle_i$ that is consistent with the statistics has $\langle n_b \rangle_1 = N$, $\langle n_b \rangle_2 = 0$ and $(\Delta n_b)_i^2 = 0$. We then suppose the two-mode system to be in a such a mixture (49), which in fact corresponds to the mixture (42). Using Result 3, we see that the violation of the steering inequality (52) is then a *negation* of that mixture ((49) and (42)) and is thus a signature of the N th order quantum coherence (43).

We note that in this case, we can also justify that the N th order quantum coherence arises from an *N -scopic entanglement*. This is because the violation of the steering inequality (52) is a negation of *both* separability (in the form of the LHS model (8) and of the mixture ρ_{mix}^{ab} (49) (with $\langle n_b \rangle_1 = N$, $\langle n_b \rangle_2 = 0$ and $(\Delta n_b)_i^2 = 0$). Consequently, if we consider any more general mixture

$$\rho = p_1 \rho_{sep} + p_2 \rho_{mix}^{ab} \quad (53)$$

where $p_1 + p_2 = 1$ and p_1, p_2 are probabilities, then the violation of the steering inequality (52) will negate this ρ . The proof is straightforward using the result Eq. (B1) for the variances of mixtures and the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality. The quantum state that negates this ρ has an N th order coherence that cannot be explained by any separable state e.g. $(|N\rangle + |0\rangle)\sqrt{2}$, nor by any mixtures of “microscopic” entangled states where the predictions for n_b are spread over a range smaller than N . The coherence therefore comes from the N -scopic entanglement, through the terms $|N\rangle|0\rangle$ and $|0\rangle|N\rangle$.

It is also useful to outline strategies for the nonideal case. In the Conclusion of this paper, we suggest it may be necessary to include the effect of a small amount of loss in the number measurements. To prove N th order quantum coherence in this case, we form binary outcomes for n_a . Where the outcomes for n_a can be different (but near) to N and 0 , one can create binary outcomes $i = \pm 1$ for n_a by binning results as either closer to 0 or N . The two distributions $P(n_b|i)$ (of \hat{n}_b given the binned outcome $+1$ or -1 for n_a) are distinct sets that are either (or close to) $n_b = 0$ or $n_b = N$. These sets are denoted $i = 1, 2$ and the associated two conditional variances $\Delta(n_b|i)^2$ can be measured. One may postulate the mixture (49) associated with the two sets $i = 1, 2$ so that $\langle n_b \rangle_i$ and variance $(\Delta n_b)_i^2 = \Delta(n_b|i)^2$ are the means and variances of $P(n_b|i)$. The mixture is negated if the inequality (50) of Result 3 can be violated. Because the two sets are well separated, it is then straightforward to prove that the failure of the mixture confirms a quantum coherence of order $\sim N$ (see Refs. [45, 46] for further explanation).

IX. CONCLUSION

We have proposed to investigate the nonlocality of the NOON state using EPR steering inequalities. The in-

equalities can also be used to signify the ‘‘Schrodinger cat’’ behaviour of the quantum NOON state. We envisage a NOON state created in an interferometer, so that the state is path entangled being a superposition of states $|N\rangle|0\rangle$ (N quanta in one arm) and $|0\rangle|N\rangle$ (N quanta in the other arm). When the two arms are spatially separated, these inequalities enable a demonstration of the EPR steering paradox at an N -scopic level.

The particular steering inequalities we present in this paper involve measurements of number as well as quadrature phase amplitude correlation. Number measurements often entail poor efficiencies. It would seem feasible to perform in the first instance an experiment based on post-selection of the events where a total of N quanta (e.g. photons) are detected across both sites. The problem of distinguishing multiple from single photon counts at a given location require photon number-resolving detectors, or could be handled with N -photon counts being evaluated using multiple beam splitters [10, 13].

The experiment for $N = 2$ would be a demonstration of a higher order (more mesoscopic) nonlocality than for $N = 1$ and would seem not unrealistic given the high efficiencies available with homodyne detection. Our calculations show that $\eta > 0.94$ is required. Care is needed to model the homodyne inefficiency as a *loss before detection*, and this small amount of loss must therefore *also* enter into the evaluation of the number correlation, to avoid the well-documented possible loopholes associated with losses that depend on measurement choices. The experiment for $N = 1$ is feasible. Such an experiment would complement that performed recently by Fuwa et al based on a different EPR steering inequality.

Finally, we point out that the steering inequalities (4-5) might be useful for detecting steering in other two-mode systems, especially where there is an inter-mode photon number correlation so that $\Delta_{inf}n_b = 0$. For instance, we can apply the first order inequality $\Delta_{inf}\hat{n}_b\Delta_{inf}\hat{P}_b < |\langle\hat{X}_b\rangle|_{inf}/2$ (Eq. (6)) to the two-mode squeezed state. Denoting the two-mode squeeze parameter by r , the solutions for this state give $\Delta_{inf}n_b = 0$ for all r . Further, it is well known that there is an EPR correlation between the quadrature phase amplitudes of the two modes for all r [39, 40], so that $|\langle\hat{X}_b\rangle|_{inf} \neq 0$ and $\Delta_{inf}\hat{P}_b \rightarrow 0$ as $r \rightarrow \infty$. While steering has been experimentally achieved for this state via the alternative EPR steering inequality $\Delta_{inf}\hat{X}_b\Delta_{inf}\hat{P}_b < 1$ [39, 48], it is quite possible that the use of the steering inequality with the number correlation $\Delta_{inf}n_b = 0$ (which is valid for all r) may provide advantages in some regimes.

Acknowledgments

We thank the Australian Research Council for support through Discovery Project Grants. We also thank Bryan Dalton, Peter Drummond and M. Chekhova for stimulating discussions about NOON states.

Appendix A: Proof of Result (1)

We will assume that the LHS model holds, for which moments are given by

$$\begin{aligned}\langle X_A(\theta)X_B(\phi)\rangle &= \int_{\lambda} d\lambda P(\lambda)\langle X_A(\theta)\rangle_{\lambda,\rho}\langle X_B(\phi)\rangle_{\lambda} \\ &\equiv \sum_R P_R\langle X_A(\theta)\rangle_{R,\rho}\langle X_B(\phi)\rangle_R\end{aligned}\quad (\text{A1})$$

Here we give two alternative (but equivalent) notations for the hidden variable-type parameters, denoting the continuous variable option by the symbol λ as in Bell’s work and the discrete option by R . The proof is unchanged whether we use integrals (λ) or discrete summations (R).

We consider the inference variance $(\Delta_{inf}\sigma_A^X)^2$. Based on the definitions given in Section III, we see that $\sum_{x_j^B} P(x_j^B)\{\Delta(\sigma_A^X|x_j^B)\}^2 = \sum_{x_j^B} P(x_j^B)\sum_{\sigma_A^X} P(\sigma_A^X|x_j^B)\{\sigma_A^X - \langle\sigma_A^X\rangle_{x_j^B}\}^2$ which we can re-express as $\sum_{x_j^B,\sigma_A^X} P(x_j^B,\sigma_A^X)\{\sigma_A^X - \langle\sigma_A^X\rangle_{x_j^B}\}^2$ and hence as $\sum_R P_R\sum_{x_j^B,\sigma_A^X} P_R(x_j^B,\sigma_A^X)\{\sigma_A^X - \langle\sigma_A^X\rangle_{x_j^B}\}^2$. This follows using that for a probabilistic (hidden variable) mixture $P(x_j^B,\sigma_A^X) = \sum_R P_R P_R(x_j^B,\sigma_A^X)$. Now we note that $\langle(x - \delta)^2\rangle \geq \langle(x - \langle x\rangle)^2\rangle$ where δ is any number. Hence the expression becomes bounded from below, and we can simplify further to show that

$$\begin{aligned}&\sum_R P_R\sum_{x_j^B,\sigma_A^X} P_R(x_j^B,\sigma_A^X)\{\sigma_A^X - \langle\sigma_A^X\rangle_{x_j^B}\}^2 \\ &\geq \sum_R P_R\sum_{x_j^B} P_R(x_j^B)\{\Delta_R(\sigma_A^X|x_j^B)\}^2 \\ &= \sum_R P_R\{\Delta_{inf,R}\sigma_A^X\}^2\end{aligned}$$

Here, the subscripts R imply that the probabilities, averages and variances are with respect to the state R and we have used that $\{\Delta_R(\sigma_A^X|x_j^B)\}^2 = \sum_{\sigma_A^X} P_R(\sigma_A^X|x_j^B)\{\sigma_A^X - \langle\sigma_A^X\rangle_{x_j^B,R}\}^2$. We note that the symbol λ is used alternatively to R in the main text, to describe that the variables may also be continuous. The proof follows similarly in either case. Now, if we assume the separability between the bipartition $A-B$ for each state R , in accordance with the LHS model (8), then

$$P_R(x_j^B,\sigma_A^X) = P_R(x_j^B)P_R(\sigma_A^X)\quad (\text{A2})$$

This implies $\langle\sigma_A^X\rangle_{x_j^B,R} = \langle\sigma_A^X\rangle_R$ and $\{\Delta_R(\sigma_A^X|x_j^B)\}^2 = (\Delta_R\sigma_A^X)^2$. Then we find, on using $\sum_{x_j^B} P_R(x_j^B) = 1$, that we can write $\{\Delta_{inf,R}\sigma_A^X\}^2 = \{\Delta_R\sigma_A^X\}^2$. Thus, on

applying the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality, we see that

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta_{inf}^2 \sigma_A^X \Delta_{inf}^2 \sigma_A^Y &\geq \left(\sum_R P_R \{ \Delta_R \sigma_A^X \}^2 \right) \left(\sum_R P_R \{ \Delta_R \sigma_A^Y \}^2 \right) \\ &\geq \left(\sum_R P_R \{ \Delta_R \sigma_A^X \} \{ \Delta_R \sigma_A^Y \} \right)^2\end{aligned}$$

where we define $\Delta_{inf}^2 \sigma_A^X \equiv (\Delta_{inf} \sigma_A^X)^2$ and

$$\Delta_{inf}^2 \sigma_A^Y \equiv (\Delta_{inf} \sigma_A^Y)^2 = \sum_{y_j^B} P(y_j^B) \{ \Delta(\sigma_A^X | y_j^B) \}^2$$

noting that the y_j^B are the set of results for a measurement y made at B to infer the value of the measurement of σ_A^Y at A . We consider an LHS model (8) where we assume the states at A are local *quantum* states, so that we can use quantum uncertainty relations to derive a final steering inequality: e.g. $\{ \Delta_R(\sigma_A^X) \} \{ \Delta_R(\sigma_A^Y) \} \geq |\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_R|/2$ for any quantum state denoted by R . Using the above results, the LHS model implies

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta_{inf} \sigma_A^X)(\Delta_{inf} \sigma_A^Y) &\geq \sum_R P_R \{ \Delta_R \sigma_A^X \} \{ \Delta_R \sigma_A^Y \} \\ &\geq \sum_R P_R (|\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_R|/2)\end{aligned}$$

However, for a separable model, we know that $\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_{z_j^B, R} = \langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_R$ and hence

$$\begin{aligned}\sum_{z_j^B} P(z_j^B) \sum_R P_R |\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_{z_j^B, R}| &= \sum_R P_R \sum_{z_j^B} P(z_j^B) |\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_R| \\ &= \sum_R P_R |\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_R|\end{aligned}$$

where here the z_j are the set of results for a measurement z at B , that we use to infer results for σ_A^Z . Hence

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta_{inf} \sigma_A^X)(\Delta_{inf} \sigma_A^Y) &\geq \sum_{z_j^B} P(z_j^B) \sum_R P_R |\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_{z_j^B, R}|/2 \\ &= \sum_{z_j^B} P(z_j^B) |\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_{z_j^B}|/2\end{aligned}$$

We have used (for states constrained by the LHS model),

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_{z_j^B} &= \sum_{\sigma_A^Z} \sigma_A^Z P(\sigma_A^Z | z_j^B) \\ &= \sum_{\sigma_A^Z} \sigma_A^Z \sum_R P_R P_R(\sigma_A^Z | z_j^B) \\ &= \sum_R P_R \langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_{z_j^B, R}\end{aligned}$$

Defining $|\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_{inf}| = \sum_{z_j^B} P(z_j^B) |\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_{z_j^B}|$, we see finally that the LHS model implies $(\Delta_{inf} \sigma_A^X)(\Delta_{inf} \sigma_A^Y) \geq |\langle \sigma_A^Z \rangle_{inf}|/2$. Violation of this inequality implies failure of the LHS model, and therefore implies steering of A by B . The result is steering of B by A if the A and B indices are exchanged (as in the main text). This completes the proof. \square

Appendix B: Proof of Result 2

For the mixture, it is true that [49]

$$(\Delta O)_\rho^2 \geq \sum_i P_i (\Delta O)_i^2 \quad (\text{B1})$$

where O is any quantum observable (including \hat{P}^N). Also, for any ρ_i the quantum uncertainty relation (2) must hold. Thus we can write

$$\begin{aligned}\left\{ \sum_i P_i (\Delta \hat{n}_i)^2 \right\} (\Delta \hat{P}^N)^2 &\geq \left\{ \sum_i P_i (\Delta \hat{n}_i)^2 \right\} \\ &\quad \times \left\{ \sum_i P_i (\Delta \hat{P}^N)_i^2 \right\} \\ &\geq \left| \sum_i P_i (\Delta \hat{n}_i) (\Delta \hat{P}^N)_i \right|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \left| \sum_i P_i |\langle \hat{C} \rangle_i| \right|^2\end{aligned}$$

where we have applied the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and defined the commutator as $\hat{C} = \langle [\hat{n}, \hat{P}^N] \rangle$. The subscript i denotes the expectation value with respect to the state ρ_i . We note that $|\langle \hat{C} \rangle_i| \geq \langle \hat{C} \rangle_i$ and write that for the mixture

$$\begin{aligned}\left\{ \sum_i P_i (\Delta n)_i^2 \right\} (\Delta P^N)^2 &\geq \frac{1}{4} \left| \sum_i P_i \langle \hat{C} \rangle_i \right|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} |\langle \hat{C} \rangle|^2\end{aligned}$$

which proves the Result. \square

Appendix C: Proof of Result 3

First we prove the the uncertainty relation

$$(\Delta \hat{n}_b)^2 (\Delta_{inf} \hat{P}_b^N)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} |\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle_{inf}|^2 \quad (\text{C1})$$

which holds for any two-mode state. The variance is defined as $(\Delta \hat{n}_b)^2 = \sum_{n_b} P(n_b) (n_b - \langle n_b \rangle)^2$ (denoting the outcomes of \hat{n}_b by n_b). We can consider marginals and joint distributions for the measurements on both modes a and b . Thus we write $(\Delta \hat{n}_b)^2 = \sum_{n_b, p_a} P(n_b, p_a) (n_b - \langle n_b \rangle)^2$ and then $(\Delta \hat{n}_b)^2 = \sum_{n_b, p_a} P(n_b | p_a) P(p_a) (n_b - \langle n_b \rangle)^2$. Thus

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta \hat{n}_b)^2 &= \sum_{p_a} P(p_a) \sum_{n_b} P(n_b | p_a) (n_b - \langle n_b \rangle)^2 \\ &\geq \sum_{p_a} P(p_a) \sum_{n_a} P(n_b | p_a) (n_b - \langle n_b \rangle_{p_a})^2 \\ &= \sum_{p_a} P(p_a) (\Delta(n_b | p_a))^2\end{aligned}$$

where $(\Delta(n_b | p_a))^2 = \sum_{n_a} P(n_b | p_a) (n_b - \langle n_b \rangle_{p_a})^2$ and $\langle n_b \rangle_{p_a}$ is the mean of the conditional distribution

$P(n_b|p_a)$. For each p_a we have defined the distribution $P(n_b|p_a)$ as $P_{p_a}(n_b)$ and we see that the quantity $\sum_{n_b} P_{p_a}(n_b)(n_b - X)^2$ where X is any constant, is minimised by the choice $X = \langle n_b \rangle_{p_a} = \sum_{n_b} P_{p_a}(n_b)n_b$. Next, we write

$$\begin{aligned} (\Delta \hat{n}_b)^2 (\Delta_{inf} \hat{P}_b^N)^2 &\geq \left\{ \sum_{p_a} P(p_a) (\Delta(n_b|p_a))^2 \right\} \\ &\quad \left\{ \sum_{p_a} P(p_a) (\Delta(P_b^N|p_a))^2 \right\} \\ &\geq \left| \sum_{p_a} P(p_a) \Delta(n_b|p_a) \Delta(P_b^N|p_a) \right|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \left| \sum_{p_a} P(p_a) \langle C_b \rangle_{p_a} \right|^2 = \frac{1}{4} |\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle_{inf}^2| \end{aligned}$$

where we apply the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and use the uncertainty relation (2) that holds for the state of b conditioned on the measurement result p_a of mode a . This proves (C1). Then we can say that for the mixture ρ^{ab} of Result 3 (using that for a mixture, similar to (B1), $(\Delta_{inf} P_b^N)^2 \geq \sum_i P_i (\Delta_{inf} P_b^N)_i^2$ [50]):

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \sum_i P_i (\Delta \hat{n}_b)_i^2 \right\} (\Delta_{inf} \hat{P}_b^N)^2 &\geq \left\{ \sum_i P_i (\Delta n_b)_i^2 \right\} \\ &\quad \left\{ \sum_i P_i (\Delta_{inf} P_b^N)_i^2 \right\} \\ &\geq \left| \sum_i P_i (\Delta n_b)_i (\Delta_{inf} P_b^N)_i \right|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \left| \sum_i P_i |\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle_{inf,i}|^2 \right|^2 \quad (C2) \end{aligned}$$

where we use the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality and that the uncertainty relation (2) holds for each ρ_i^{ab} . Now we see that $\sum_{p_a} P(p_a) \langle C_b \rangle_{p_a} = \sum_{p_a} P(p_a) \left| \sum_{c_b} C_b P(C_b|p_a) \right|$. If the system is described by the mixture ρ^{ab} then

$$\begin{aligned} \langle C_b \rangle_{p_a} &= \sum_{c_b} C_b P(C_b|p_a) \\ &= \sum_{C_b} C_b \frac{P(C_b, p_a)}{P(p_a)} \\ &= \sum_{C_b} C_b \sum_i P_i \frac{P_i(C_b, p_a)}{P(p_a)} \\ &= \sum_i P_i \sum_{C_b} C_b \frac{P_i(p_a)}{P(p_a)} P_i(C_b|p_a) \quad (C3) \end{aligned}$$

where the subscript i denotes the probabilities for the component ρ_i^{ab} . We can write

$$\begin{aligned} \left| \sum_i P_i \sum_{C_b} C_b \frac{P_i(p_a)}{P(p_a)} P_i(C_b|p_a) \right| &\leq \sum_i P_i \frac{P_i(p_a)}{P(p_a)} \\ &\quad \times \left| \sum_{C_b} C_b P_i(C_b|p_a) \right| \end{aligned}$$

Thus from (C3)

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{p_a} P(p_a) |\langle C_b \rangle_{p_a}| &\leq \sum_i P_i \sum_{p_a} P_i(p_a) \left| \sum_{C_b} C_b P_i(C_b|p_a) \right| \\ &= \sum_i P_i |\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle_{inf,i}| \end{aligned}$$

where $|\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle_{inf,i}| = \sum_{p_a} P_i(p_a) \left| \sum_{C_b} C_b P_i(C_b|p_a) \right|$. Thus we have proved that

$$\sum_i P_i |\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle_{inf,i}| \geq \sum_{p_a} P(p_a) |\langle C_b \rangle_{p_a}|$$

Hence we can write from (C2) that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\{ \sum_i P_i (\Delta n_b)_i^2 \right\} (\Delta_{inf} P_b^N)^2 &\geq \frac{1}{4} \left| \sum_i P_i |\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle_{inf,i}|^2 \right|^2 \\ &\geq \frac{1}{4} \left| \sum_{p_a} P(p_a) |\langle C_b \rangle_{p_a}|^2 \right|^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{4} |\langle \hat{C}_b \rangle_{inf}|^2 \end{aligned}$$

This proves the Result 3. \square

Appendix D: Evaluation of inferred variances

Here we will evaluate the inferred uncertainties $\Delta_{inf}(X^N)$ and $\Delta_{inf}(P^N)$ for the NOON state given in Eq. (1). We first consider $X \equiv X_b$ and evaluate $\Delta_{inf}^2(X_b^N) \equiv (\Delta_{inf}(X_b^N))^2$, which is given by (22). The terms of the form $\langle X_b^n \rangle_{inf,x} \equiv \langle X_b^n | x \rangle$, with $n = N$ or $n = 2N$, are evaluated using the reduced density operator $\rho_{red,x}$:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{red,x} &= \frac{1}{2} \{ |\langle x|N\rangle|^2 |0\rangle\langle 0| + e^{-i\phi} \langle x|N\rangle \langle 0|x\rangle |0\rangle\langle N| \\ &\quad + |\langle x|0\rangle|^2 |N\rangle\langle N| + e^{i\phi} \langle x|0\rangle \langle N|x\rangle |N\rangle\langle 0| \} \end{aligned}$$

and the fact that operators \hat{X} and \hat{P} can be described in terms of a complete set of projectors as $\hat{X}_B^n = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} x_B^n |x_B\rangle\langle x_B| dx_B$ and $\hat{P}_B^n = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} p_B^n |p_B\rangle\langle p_B| dp_B$. Therefore we get:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X^n \rangle_{inf,x} &= Tr(\rho_{red,x} X^n) \\ &= \frac{1}{2P(x)} \left[|\langle x|N\rangle|^2 \int x_B^n |\langle x_B|0\rangle|^2 dx_B \right. \\ &\quad + e^{-i\phi} \langle x|N\rangle \langle 0|x\rangle \int x_B^n \langle N|x_B\rangle \langle x_B|0\rangle dx_B \\ &\quad + e^{i\phi} \langle x|0\rangle \langle N|x\rangle \int x_B^n \langle 0|x_B\rangle \langle x_B|N\rangle dx_B \\ &\quad \left. + |\langle x|0\rangle|^2 \int x_B^n |\langle x_B|N\rangle|^2 dx_B \right] \end{aligned}$$

where $P(x) = \frac{1}{2} [|\langle x|0\rangle|^2 + |\langle x|N\rangle|^2]$ is the probability of measuring X_A and getting outcome x and $\langle x|N\rangle$ are

the harmonic oscillator functions given in Eq. (27). The value for $\Delta_{inf}(X_b^N)$ is obtained on evaluating the expressions of $\langle X^n \rangle_{inf,x}$, with $n = N$ or $2N$, and substituting on the expression given in Eq. (22). Similarly we evaluate the inferred variance of $P \equiv P_b$, which is given by (21). Using the reduced density operator $\rho_{red,x}$ given above we find:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P^n \rangle_{inf,x} = & \frac{1}{2P(x)} \left[|\langle x|N \rangle|^2 \int p_B^n |\langle p_B|0 \rangle|^2 dp_B \right. \\ & + e^{-i\phi} \langle x|N \rangle \langle 0|x \rangle \int p_B^n \langle 0|p_B \rangle \langle p_B|N \rangle dp_B \\ & + e^{i\phi} \langle x|0 \rangle \langle N|x \rangle \int p_B^n \langle N|p_B \rangle \langle p_B|0 \rangle dp_B \\ & \left. + |\langle x|0 \rangle|^2 \int p_B^n |\langle p_B|N \rangle|^2 dp_B \right] \quad (D1) \end{aligned}$$

1. Inferred variances for $N = 2$

We consider $\phi = \pi/2$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle X^2 \rangle_{inf,x} = & \frac{1}{2P(x)} \left[|\langle x|2 \rangle|^2 \int x_B^2 |\langle x_B|0 \rangle|^2 dx_B \right. \\ & \left. + |\langle x|0 \rangle|^2 \int x_B^2 |\langle x_B|2 \rangle|^2 dx_B \right] \\ = & 1 + \frac{8}{3 - 2x^2 + x^4} \end{aligned}$$

and

$$\langle X^4 \rangle_{inf,x} = \frac{3(x^4 - 10x^2 + 35)}{x^4 - 2x^2 + 3}$$

where we have used that $P(x) = \frac{e^{-\frac{x^2}{2}}}{2\sqrt{2\pi}} \left(\frac{(2x^2-2)^2}{8} + 1 \right)$. On performing the integration using the above results we get $\Delta_{inf}^2(X_b^4) = 10.1351$ and $\Delta_{inf}(X_b^2) = 3.18356$. Similarly we evaluate $\Delta_{inf}^2(P_b^N)$:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle P^2 \rangle_{inf,x} = & 1 + \frac{8}{3 - 2x^2 + x^4} \\ \langle P^4 \rangle_{inf,x} = & \frac{3(x^4 - 10x^2 + 35)}{x^4 - 2x^2 + 3} \end{aligned}$$

These results are the same as for P , since for this value of angle $e^{i\phi} = i = -e^{-i\phi}$, and also

$$\begin{aligned} \int p_B^n \langle 0|p_B \rangle \langle p_B|2 \rangle dp_B & = \int p_B^n \langle 2|p_B \rangle \langle p_B|0 \rangle dp_B \\ & = \int x_B^n \langle 0|x_B \rangle \langle x_B|2 \rangle dx_B \end{aligned}$$

so that the second and third terms of equations (D1) cancel, obtaining $\Delta_{inf}^2(P_b^2) = 10.1351$ and $\Delta_{inf}(P_b^2) = 3.18356$.

Appendix E: Including losses

The detected fields $\hat{a}_{det}, \hat{b}_{det}$ are given by

$$\begin{aligned} a_{det} & = \sqrt{\eta_a} a + \sqrt{1 - \eta_a} a_v \\ a_{loss} & = -\sqrt{1 - \eta_a} a + \sqrt{\eta_a} a_v \end{aligned}$$

with similar definitions for the mode operators b_{det} and b_{loss} . Using these transformations it is possible to write the operators a, b and hence the NOON state $|\psi\rangle$ of Eq. (1) in terms of $a_{det}^\dagger, a_{loss}^\dagger, b_{det}^\dagger$ and b_{loss}^\dagger . We will denote the vacuum state for all four modes by $|0\rangle$. The density operator $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ can then also be expressed in terms of these operators. Since we are not interested in the modes a_{loss} and b_{loss} (which we label $A, loss$ and $B, loss$) we take the trace over the states of the loss mode to evaluate $\rho' \equiv Tr_{A,loss;B,loss}\rho$. After using the binomial expansion for terms such as $(\sqrt{\eta_a} a_{det}^\dagger - \sqrt{(1 - \eta_a)} a_{loss}^\dagger)$ and performing the trace, the reduced density operator for the detected modes is:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho' = & \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_a)^{N-s} (1 - \eta_a)^s |N-s\rangle_{A,det} \langle N-s| \otimes |0\rangle_{B,det} \langle 0| + (\sqrt{\eta_a \eta_b})^N e^{-i\phi} |N\rangle_{A,det} \langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle_{B,det} \langle N| \right. \\ & \left. + (\sqrt{\eta_a \eta_b})^N e^{i\phi} |0\rangle_{A,det} \langle N| \otimes |N\rangle_{B,det} \langle 0| + \sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_b)^{N-s} (1 - \eta_b)^s |0\rangle_{A,det} \langle 0| \otimes |N-s\rangle_{B,det} \langle N-s| \right] \quad (E1) \end{aligned}$$

1. Calculating $\Delta_{inf}^2(P_b^N)$ and $\Delta_{inf}^2(X_b^N)$

The $\Delta_{inf}^2(P_b^N)$ and $\Delta_{inf}^2(X_b^N)$ are the inferred variances of quantities P_b^N and X_b^N due to a measurement

in X_a . These are given by (21) and (22). We evaluate

these inferred variances using the density operator for modes a_{det} and b_{det} given in Eq. (E1). For the inferred variances we evaluate the density operator ρ'' , where we

consider that the mode A, det is in the state $|x\rangle$. This density operator is given by:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho'' &= \frac{|x\rangle_{A,det}\langle x|\rho'|x\rangle_{A,det}\langle x|}{P(x)} \\ &= \frac{1}{2P(x)} \left[\sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_a)^{N-s} (1-\eta_a)^s \times \langle x|N-s\rangle_{Ad}\langle N-s|x\rangle_{Ad}\langle x| \otimes |0\rangle_{Bd}\langle 0| \right. \\ &\quad + (\sqrt{\eta_a\eta_b})^N e^{-i\phi} \langle x|N\rangle_{Ad}\langle 0|x\rangle_{Ad}\langle x| \otimes |0\rangle_{Bd}\langle N| + (\sqrt{\eta_a\eta_b})^N e^{i\phi} \langle x|0\rangle_{Ad}\langle N|x\rangle_{Ad}\langle x| \otimes |N\rangle_{Bd}\langle 0| \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_b)^{N-s} (1-\eta_b)^s \times \langle x|0\rangle_{Ad}\langle 0|x\rangle_{Ad}\langle x| \otimes |N-s\rangle_{Bd}\langle N-s| \right] \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} P(x) &= Tr[|x\rangle_{A,det}\langle x|\rho'|x\rangle_{A,det}\langle x|] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[\sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_a)^{N-s} (1-\eta_a)^s |\langle x|N-s\rangle|^2 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_b)^{N-s} (1-\eta_b)^s |\langle x|0\rangle|^2 \right] \quad (E2) \end{aligned}$$

Here we are using the following notation for the modes: $Ad \equiv A, det$ and $Bd \equiv B, det$. In order to compute $\Delta^2(P_b^N|x)$ and $\Delta^2(X_b^N|x)$, we trace out the A, det mode to get the reduced density operator for B, det mode:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{red,det,x} &= Tr_{A,det}(\rho'') \\ &= \frac{1}{2P(x)} \left[\sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_a)^{N-s} (1-\eta_a)^s \times \langle x|N-s\rangle_{Ad}\langle N-s|x\rangle_{Ad}|0\rangle_{Bd}\langle 0| \right. \\ &\quad + (\sqrt{\eta_a\eta_b})^N e^{-i\phi} \langle x|N\rangle_{Ad}\langle 0|x\rangle_{Ad}|0\rangle_{Bd}\langle N| + (\sqrt{\eta_a\eta_b})^N e^{i\phi} \langle x|0\rangle_{Ad}\langle N|x\rangle_{Ad}|N\rangle_{Bd}\langle 0| \\ &\quad \left. + \sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_b)^{N-s} (1-\eta_b)^s \times \langle x|0\rangle_{Ad}\langle 0|x\rangle_{Ad}|N-s\rangle_{Bd}\langle N-s| \right] \quad (E3) \end{aligned}$$

The inferred variances are defined as:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta^2(X_b^N|x) &= \langle X_b^{2N}|x\rangle - \langle X_b^N|x\rangle^2 \\ \Delta^2(P_b^N|x) &= \langle P_b^{2N}|x\rangle - \langle P_b^N|x\rangle^2 \quad (E4) \end{aligned}$$

Next we evaluate $\langle X_b^N|x\rangle = Tr[\rho_{red,det,x}X_b^N]$ and $\langle P_b^N|x\rangle = Tr[\rho_{red,det,x}P_b^N]$ using the density operator given in Eq. (E3) obtaining:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle X_b^n | x \rangle &= \frac{1}{2P(x)} \left[\sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_a)^{N-s} (1-\eta_a)^s \langle x | N-s \rangle_{Ad} \langle N-s | x \rangle \int x_B^n \langle 0 | x_B \rangle \langle x_B | 0 \rangle dx_B \right. \\
&+ (\sqrt{\eta_a \eta_b})^N e^{-i\phi} \langle x | N \rangle_{Ad} \langle 0 | x \rangle \int x_B^n \langle N | x_B \rangle \langle x_B | 0 \rangle dx_B + (\sqrt{\eta_a \eta_b})^N e^{i\phi} \langle x | 0 \rangle_{Ad} \langle N | x \rangle \int x_B^n \langle 0 | x_B \rangle \langle x_B | N \rangle dx_B \\
&\left. + \sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_b)^{N-s} (1-\eta_b)^s \langle x | 0 \rangle_{Ad} \langle 0 | x \rangle \int x_B^n \langle N-s | x_B \rangle \langle x_B | N-s \rangle dx_B \right] \quad (E5)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle P^n \rangle_{inf,x} &= \frac{1}{2P(x)} \left[\sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_a)^{N-s} (1-\eta_a)^s \langle x | N-s \rangle_{A,det} \langle N-s | x \rangle \int p_B^n \langle 0 | p_B \rangle \langle p_B | 0 \rangle dp_B \right. \\
&+ (\sqrt{\eta_a \eta_b})^N e^{-i\phi} \langle x | N \rangle_{Ad} \langle 0 | x \rangle \int p_B^n \langle N | p_B \rangle \langle p_B | 0 \rangle dp_B + (\sqrt{\eta_a \eta_b})^N e^{i\phi} \langle x | 0 \rangle_{Ad} \langle N | x \rangle \int p_B^n \langle 0 | p_B \rangle \langle p_B | N \rangle dp_B \\
&\left. + \sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} (\eta_b)^{N-s} (1-\eta_b)^s \langle x | 0 \rangle_{A,det} \langle 0 | x \rangle \int p_B^n \langle N-s | p_B \rangle \langle p_B | N-s \rangle dp_B \right] \quad (E6)
\end{aligned}$$

The value of the corresponding variances for $\Delta^2(X_b^N | x)$ and $\Delta^2(P_b^N | x)$ of equations (E4) is evaluated using the expressions given in equations (E5) and (E6) considering $n = N$ or $n = 2N$.

2. Inferred variances $\Delta_{inf}^2(n_b)$ including losses

$\Delta_{inf}^2(n_b)$ is the inferred variance of n_b due to a measurement in n_a . In order to evaluate this variance we will consider that the outcome in n_a is m . We define $P(m)$ as the probability for obtaining the result m for n_a . Next, we evaluate the reduced density operator ρ_m for the modes A, det and B, det given that the outcome is m :

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_m &= \frac{1}{P(m)} [|m\rangle_{Ad} \langle m | \rho' | m\rangle_{Ad} \langle m |] \\
&= \left[\binom{N}{m} \eta_a^m (1-\eta_a)^{N-m} |m\rangle_{Ad} \langle m | \otimes |0\rangle_{Bd} \langle 0 | \right. \\
&+ \sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} \eta_b^{N-s} (1-\eta_b)^s \\
&\left. \times |0\rangle_{Ad} \langle 0 | \otimes |N-s\rangle_{Bd} \langle N-s | \right] / (2P(m))
\end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
P(m) &= Tr [|m\rangle_{A,det} \langle m | \rho' | m\rangle_{A,det} \langle m |] \\
&= \frac{1}{2} \binom{N}{m} \eta_a^m (1-\eta_a)^{N-m} + \frac{1}{2} \quad (E7)
\end{aligned}$$

In order to write the last line we have used that $\sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} \eta_b^{N-s} (1-\eta_b)^s = 1$.

Next we evaluate $\langle n_B \rangle_{inf,m} = Tr[\rho_m n_B]$ and $\langle n_B^2 \rangle_{inf,m} = Tr[\rho_m n_B^2]$ obtaining:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle n_B \rangle_{inf,m} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} \eta_b (1-\eta_b)^s \delta_{m,0} (N-s)}{P(n_A = m)} \\
\langle n_B^2 \rangle_{inf,m} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\sum_s \binom{N}{N-s} \eta_b (1-\eta_b)^s \delta_{m,0} (N-s)^2}{P(n_A = m)}
\end{aligned}$$

Since $n_A = m = 0$ is the only non-zero contribution for the statistical moments we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle n_B \rangle_{inf,0} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{N\eta_b}{P(n_A = 0)} \\
\langle n_B^2 \rangle_{inf,0} &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{\eta_b (N - N\eta_b + N^2\eta_b)}{P(n_A = 0)} \\
P(n_A = 0) &= \frac{1}{2} \left((1-\eta_a)^N + 1 \right)
\end{aligned}$$

Using the above results we evaluate the inferred variance for $m = 0$, which we denote by $\Delta_{inf}^2 n_{b,0}$:

$$\Delta_{inf}^2 n_{b0} = \frac{\eta_b (N - N\eta_b) + N\eta_b (1-\eta_a)^N (1-\eta_b + N\eta_b)}{\left((1-\eta_a)^N + 1 \right)^2}$$

In order to get variance of the inferred value n_B , we sum over all possible values of m obtaining:

$$\begin{aligned}\Delta^2 n_{inf} &= \sum_m^N P(n_A = 0) \Delta^2 n_{inf, m=0} \\ &= \frac{\eta_b(N - N\eta_b) + N(1 - \eta_a)^N (\eta_b - \eta_b^2 + N\eta_b^2)}{2((1 - \eta_a)^N + 1)}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{E8})$$

3. Evaluation of $|\langle [n_b, X_b^N] \rangle|_{inf}$ and $|\langle [n_b, P_b^N] \rangle|_{inf}$

The expression for the terms $|\langle [n_b, X_b^N] \rangle|_{inf}$ and $|\langle [n_b, P_b^N] \rangle|_{inf}$ are calculated from Eq. (16) and the first line of Eq. (18). Where $N \leq 5$, full evaluation reveals that these expressions (for the lossy system) can be given in terms of the annihilator and creator operators as:

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle [n_b, X_b^N] \rangle|_{inf} &= N |-\langle b^N \rangle + \langle b^{\dagger N} \rangle|_{inf} \\ |\langle [n_b, P_b^N] \rangle|_{inf} &= N |\langle b^N \rangle + (-1)^{N+1} \langle b^{\dagger N} \rangle|_{inf}\end{aligned}\quad (\text{E9})$$

We evaluate $\langle b^N \rangle = \text{Tr}[\rho_{red, det, x} b^N]$ and $\langle b^{\dagger N} \rangle = \text{Tr}[\rho_{red, det, x} (b^\dagger)^N]$ using the reduced density matrix given in Eq. (E3) and performed the corresponding trace we get:

$$\langle b^N \rangle_{inf, x} = \frac{1}{2P(x)} (\sqrt{\eta_a \eta_b})^N e^{i\phi} \langle x|N \rangle \langle 0|x \rangle \sqrt{N!}$$

and $\langle (b^\dagger)^N \rangle_{inf, x} = (\langle b^N \rangle_{inf, x})^*$. We obtain:

$$\begin{aligned}\langle b^N \rangle_{inf, x} + \langle (b^\dagger)^N \rangle_{inf, x} &= \frac{C_\eta}{P(x)} \langle x|N \rangle \langle 0|x \rangle \cos \phi \\ \langle b^N \rangle_{inf, x} - \langle (b^\dagger)^N \rangle_{inf, x} &= i \frac{C_\eta}{P(x)} \langle x|N \rangle \langle 0|x \rangle \sin \phi\end{aligned}$$

On integrating over all possible values we get

$$\begin{aligned}|\langle b^N \rangle + \langle (b^\dagger)^N \rangle|_{inf} &= C_\eta |\cos \phi| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\langle x|N \rangle \langle 0|x \rangle| dx \\ |\langle b^N \rangle - \langle (b^\dagger)^N \rangle|_{inf} &= C_\eta |\sin \phi| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\langle x|N \rangle \langle 0|x \rangle| dx\end{aligned}$$

where $C_\eta = \sqrt{N!} (\sqrt{\eta_a \eta_b})^N$. Substituting into (E9) gives

$$|\langle [n_b, X_b^N] \rangle|_{inf} = NC_\eta |\sin \phi| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\langle x|N \rangle \langle 0|x \rangle| dx$$

For $|\langle [n_b, P_b^N] \rangle|_{inf}$ the expression for N odd is given by

$$|\langle [n_b, P_b^N] \rangle|_{inf} = NC_\eta |\cos \phi| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\langle x|N \rangle \langle 0|x \rangle| dx$$

while for N even we find:

$$|\langle [n_b, P_b^N] \rangle|_{inf} = NC_\eta |\sin \phi| \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} |\langle x|N \rangle \langle 0|x \rangle| dx$$

-
- [1] E. Schroedinger, *Naturwiss.* **23**, 807 (1935).
[2] W. H. Zurek, *Physics Today* **44** (10), 36-44 (1991). A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, *Phys. Rev. A* **31**, 1059 (1985). D. F. Walls, and G. J. Milburn, *Phys. Rev. A* **31**, 2403 (1985).
[3] B. Yurke and D. Stoler, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **57**, 13 (1986).
[4] M. Brune et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 4887 (1996). C. Monroe et al., *Science* **272**, 1131 (1996). J. Friedman et al., *Nature* **406** 43 (2000). D. Leibfried et al., *Nature* **438**, 04251 (2005). A. Ourjoumtsev et al., *Nature* **448**, 784 (2007).
[5] C. K. Hong, Z. Y. Ou, and L. Mandel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 2044 (1987). Z. Y. Ou, L. J. Wang, X. Y. Zou and L. Mandel, *Phys. Rev. A* **41**, 566 (1990); *ibid Phys. Rev. A* **42**, 2957 (1990).
[6] J. P. Dowling, *Contemporary Physics* **49**, 125 (2008).
[7] Hwang Lee, Pieter Kok and Jonathan P. Dowling, *Journal of Modern Optics* **49**, 2325 (2002). P. Kok, H. Lee, and J. P. Dowling, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 052104 (2002). J. Fiurášek, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 053818 (2002).
[8] P. Walther, J.-W. Pan, M. Aspelmeyer, R. Ursin, S. Gasparoni, and A. Zeilinger, *Nature* **429**, 158–161 (2004).
[9] M. W. Mitchell, J. S. Lundeen and A. M. Steinberg, *Nature* **429**, 161 (2004).
[10] I. Afek, O. Ambar and Y. Silberberg, *Science* **328**, 879 (2010).
[11] Y. Israel, I. Afek, S. Rosen, O. Ambar and Y. Silberberg, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 022115 (2012).
[12] H. Kim, H. S. Park, S.-K. Choi, *Opt. Express* **17**, 19720 (2009).
[13] R. Kruse, L. Sansoni, S. Brauner, R. Ricken, C. S. Hamilton, I. Jex, and C. Silberhorn, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 053841 (2015). J. Lugani, S. Ghosh, and K. Thyagarajan, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 062333 (2011).

- [14] A. Boto et al. Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2733 (2000). Y.-H. Kim and Y. H. Shih, Found. Phys. **29**, 1849 (1999).
- [15] M. Angelo, M. Chekhova and Y. Shih, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 13602 (2001).
- [16] R. W. Boyd and J. P. Dowling, Quantum Information Processing **11**, 891 (2012).
- [17] R. J. Lewis-Swan and K. V. Kheruntsyan, Nat. Commun. **5**, 3752 (2014). S. S. Hodgman, R. G. Dall, A. G. Manning, K. G. H. Baldwin, A. G. Truscott, Science, **331** (6020), 1046 (2011).
- [18] G. J. Milburn, J. Corney, E. M. Wright and D. F. Walls, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 4318 (1997).
- [19] J. I. Cirac, M. Lewenstein, K. Molmer, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 1208 (1998). D. M. Gordan and C. M. Savage, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 4623, (1999). J. Dunningham and K. Burnett, Journ. Modern Optics, **48**, 1837, (2001). C. Lee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 150402 (2006).
- [20] T. J. Haigh, A. J. Ferris, and M. K Olsen, Opt. Commun. **283**, 3540 (2010).
- [21] L. D. Carr, D. R. Dounas-Frazer, and M. A. Garcia-March, Europhys. Lett. **90**, 10005 (2010).
- [22] H. Cablel, F. Lalo'e and W. J. Mullin, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 053626 (2011).
- [23] Q. Y. He, P. D. Drummond, M. K. Olsen and M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 023626 (2012). S. Giri et al, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 033628 (2014).
- [24] G. C. Ghirardi, A. Rimini, and T. Weber, Phys. Rev. D **34**, 470 (1986). G. Ghirardi, R. Grassi, A. Rimini, Phys. Rev. A **42**, 1057 (1990). L. Diósi, Phys. Lett. A **120**, 377 (1987). R. Penrose, Gen. Relativ. Gravit. **28**, 581 (1996).
- [25] H. M. Wiseman, S. J. Jones, and A. C. Doherty, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 140402 (2007). S. J. Jones, H. M. Wiseman, A. C Doherty, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 052116 (2007).
- [26] E. G. Cavalcanti, S. J. Jones, H. M. Wiseman, M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 032112 (2009).
- [27] D. Smith et al., Nat. Commun. **3**, 625 (2012). B. Wittmann et al., New J. Phys. **14**, 053030 (2012). A. J. Bennet et al., Phys. Rev. X **2**, 031003 (2012).
- [28] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935).
- [29] E. Schrödinger, Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **31**, 555 (1935); **32**, 446 (1936).
- [30] Max Born, *Born-Einstein Letters, 1916-1955: Friendship, Politics and Physics in Uncertain Times* (Palgrave MacMillan, 2005).
- [31] N. D. Mermin, Phys. Rev. D **22**, 356 (1980). P. D. Drummond, Phys. Rev. Lett. **50**, 1407 (1983). M. Zukowski, Phys. Lett. A **177**, 290 (1993). A. Peres, Found. Phys. **29**, 589 (1999). H. Weinfurter and M. Zukowski, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 010102 (2001). M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 2765 (2000). M. Zukowski, and C. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 210401 (2002). D. Collins et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 040404 (2002). M. D. Reid, W. J. Munro, and F. De Martini, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 033801 (2002). M. Eibl et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 200403 (2003). A. Lamas-Linares, J. Howell & D. Bouwmeester, Nature **412**, 887 (2001).
- [32] P. Chowdhury, T. Pramanik, A. S. Majumdar, and G. S. Agarwal, Phys. Rev. A **89**, 012104 (2014). P. Chowdhury, T. Pramanik and A. S. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 042317 (2015).
- [33] C. Wildfeuer, A. Lund and J. Dowling, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 052101 (2007). F. Toppel, M. Chekhova and G. Leuchs, presented at Heraeus Seminar on Macroscopic Entanglement, 2016.
- [34] S. M. Tan, D. F. Walls, and M. J. Collett, Phys. Rev. Lett. **66**, 252 (1991). L. Hardy, Phys. Rev. Lett. **73**, 2279 (1994). J. Dunningham and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 180404 (2007). S. A. Babichev, J. Appel, and A. I. Lvovsky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 193601 (2004).
- [35] S. Jones and H.M. Wiseman, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 012110 (2011).
- [36] M. Fuwa, S. Takeda, M. Zwierz, H. M. Wiseman, and A. Furusawa, Nat. Commun. **6**, 6665 (2015).
- [37] Q. Y. He and M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 052121 (2013). S. Kiesewetter et al, Phys. Rev. A **90** 043805 (2014). E. G. Cavalcanti and M. D Reid, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 062108 (2008). L. Rosales-Zarate et al, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **32** A82 (2015).
- [38] S. L. W. Midgley, A. J. Ferris, and M. K. Olsen, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 022101 (2010). V. Händchen *et al.*, Nature Photon. **6**, 596 (2012). J. Schneeloch et al., Phys. Rev. A **87**, 062103 (2013). J. Bowles et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 200402 (2014). Q. Y. He, Q. H. Gong, and M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 060402 (2015). I. Kogias, A. R. Lee, S. Ragy and G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 060403 (2015). M. Wang, Y. Xiang, Q. He, and Q. Gong, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **32**, A20 (2015). S. Wollmann et al., to be published Phys. Rev. Lett.. K. Sun et al., to be published Phys. Rev. Lett.
- [39] M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 913 (1989).
- [40] M. D. Reid et al., Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 1727 (2009).
- [41] E. G. Cavalcanti and M. D. Reid, , Journ. Mod. Opt. **54**, 2373 (2007).
- [42] M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. A **88**, 062338 (2013).
- [43] J. S. Bell, Physics **1**, 195 (1964). J. F. Clauser and A. Shimony, Rep. Prog. Phys. **41**, 1881 (1978). S. J. Freedman and J. F. Clauser, Phys. Rev. Lett. **28**, 938 (1972). N. Brunner et al, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 419 (2014).
- [44] P. Pearle, Phys. Rev. D **2**, 1418 (1970).
- [45] E. G. Cavalcanti and M. D. Reid, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 170405 (2006). C. Marquardt et al., Phys. Rev. A **76** 030101 (2007).
- [46] E. G. Cavalcanti and M. D. Reid, Phys Rev A **77**, 062108 (2008). B. Opanchuk et al., to be published.
- [47] M. D. Reid and P. D Drummond, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 2731 (1988).
- [48] Z. Y. Ou et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 3663 (1992).
- [49] H. Hofmann and S. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 032103 (2003).
- [50] M. J. Mallon, M. D. Reid and M. K. Olsen, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys, **41**, 015501 (2008).