Generation and detection of non-Gaussian phonon-added coherent states in optomechanical systems

Jie Li,1,2 Simon Gröblacher,3 Shi-Yao Zhu,1 and G. S. Agarwal2,4

1Department of Physics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China
2Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering and Department of Biological and Agricultural Engineering, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, USA
3Kavli Institute of Nanoscience, Delft University of Technology, 2628CI Delft, Netherlands
4Department of Physics and Astronomy, Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, USA

(Dated: March 23, 2018)

Abstract—The realization of nonclassical states of light has opened up the possibility of using quantum optics for a variety of applications in quantum sensing [1, 4], and quantum information science [4, 5], as well as for extremely sensitive measurements [6]. Optomechanical systems on the other hand offer an exciting opportunity to study quantum states of macroscopic systems [7]. Considerable progress has been made in controlling these massive systems down to the quantum level. Recent breakthroughs include optomechanical squeezing of light [8, 9] and of mechanical motion [10, 11], quantum entanglement between mechanics and a cavity field [12, 13], as well as between two mechanical oscillators [14, 15], and nonclassical photon-phonon correlations by measuring the second-order cross-correlation $g^{(2)}$ [16].

Recent interest has focused on generating non-Gaussian states of mechanical systems, e.g., preparing the mechanical oscillator in a single-phonon Fock state. Following several theory proposals [13, 17], this has been realized by exploiting the optomechanical parametric down-conversion combined with single photon detection [18] in close analogy to early quantum optics experiments. It could also be generated by transferring the single photon state from an optical field to a mechanical resonator (MR) [19]. Alternative ways to create non-Gaussian states of a mechanical system include exploiting the intrinsic nonlinearity of the optomechanical interaction [20], or by making measurements on the optical field [21]. The preparation of such nonclassical states of a massive object is important in connection with the studies of quantum effects at the macroscopic scale [22, 23]. There are many other non-Gaussian states, such as quantum superposition states [24], and excitation-added/subtracted coherent and squeezed states [25, 26]. The addition of excitations on a coherent state, for example, provides a way to observe quantum effects of a radiation field, such as quadrature squeezing, sub-Poissonian character, and negative Wigner distributions [26].

Single-photon-added coherent states of light have been generated using parametric down-conversion in a nonlinear crystal in combination with single photon detection [28]. In this Letter, we apply this concept to the motional state of a mechanical oscillator. Specifically, we work on cavity optomechanics [7] and provide a full scheme to generate and detect single-phonon-added coherent states of mechanical motion [25]. As a first step, we prepare the MR in a coherent state using electromagnetically induced transparency (EIT) [29, 30], where the cavity is bichromatically driven by a strong red-detuned field and a much weaker field on cavity resonance. The former can also help cool the mechanical motion close to its quantum ground state [31, 32], and the latter is used to displace the ground state in phase space to a coherent state. We then add a single phonon onto the coherent state by implementing an effective two-mode squeezing interaction combined with single photon detection. This can be realized by sending a weak

FIG. 1: (a) Sketch of the generic system for preparing coherent states of the mechanical motion. (b) Pulse sequence of the scheme. Two laser pulses of duration $\tau$ are used to generate a mechanical coherent state. Once the MR is prepared in a desired state, the two lasers are switched off and after some time $k^{-1} \ll \tau_{pd} \ll \gamma^{-1}$, during which all cavity photons decay, while the mechanical state remains unchanged, a write pulse is sent. This blue-detuned pulse of duration $\tau_W$ prepares the MR in a single-phonon-added coherent state provided that a single photon is detected in the interval $\tau_E$. The red-detuned readout pulse of duration $\tau_r$ then transfers the mechanical state to the cavity output field for subsequent measurements. In order to neglect mechanical damping, $\tau_{pd} + \tau_b + \tau_d + \tau_r \ll \gamma^{-1}$ is assumed.
blue-detuned laser pulse into the optomechanical cavity. Finally we confirm the generated phonon state by using a relatively strong red-detuned pulse which realizes a state swap operation between the MR and the light pulse. We then measure the Mandel Q parameter of the cavity output field, confirming the sub-Poissonian character of the mechanical state. Alternatively, homodyning the cavity output and measuring the variance of the quadrature can be used to detect squeezing of the mechanical state. Lastly, we analyse the effects of residual thermal excitations in the coherent-state-preparation stage on the results of the ideal case where the motion of the MR is cooled exactly into its quantum ground state (mean phonon number $\hbar \nu_0 = 0$).

**Preparing mechanical coherent states.**—We consider an optical cavity mode with resonance frequency $\omega_c$ and annihilation (creation) operator $a$ ($a^\dagger$) ($\{a, a^\dagger\} = i$) coupled to a MR with frequencies $\omega_m$ via radiation pressure, as depicted in Fig. 1(a). The cavity mode is bichromatically driven by a strong red-detuned field at $\omega \approx \omega_c - \omega_m$ and a much weaker field on cavity resonance $\omega_p = \omega_c$. The Hamiltonian describing such a system reads

$$H = \hbar \omega_c a^\dagger a + \frac{1}{2} \hbar \omega_m (q^2 + p^2) - \hbar g a^\dagger a q + i \hbar [(E_0 e^{-i\omega t} + E_1 e^{-i\omega_1 t}) a^\dagger - h.c.]$$

(1)

Here, $q$ and $p$ are the dimensionless position and momentum quadratures of the MR satisfying the canonical commutation relation $[q, p] = i$. $g$ is the single-photon optomechanical coupling rate. $E_0$ and $E_1$ are respectively related to the power of the two driving fields $P_0$ and $P_1$ by $|E_0|^2 = 2x_0 P_0/\hbar \omega_l$ and $|E_1|^2 = 2x_1 P_1/\hbar \omega_p$, where $\kappa$ is the cavity decay rate. Such a system has been employed for the study of EIT in optomechanics [29, 30]. Instead of looking at the mean field response of the system to the probe field (i.e., the weak field at $\omega_p$), we focus on the mechanical part here and include quantum fluctuations. The mechanical motion can be cooled close to its quantum ground state ($\hbar \nu_0 \ll 1$) provided that the system is working in the resolved sideband limit and has a large cooperativity [31, 32]. We work in this deep cooling regime and show that by including a weak ”probe” field, the MR can be prepared in a coherent state, where the averages of the mechanical quadratures show periodic behaviors [33], while the fluctuations almost remain unchanged (close to those of the ground state). This can easily be understood, as the red-detuned strong light beam realizes an effective beamsplitter interaction which maps the coherent state of the weak field on cavity resonance onto the state of the MR [34].

By taking average values and using the factorization $\langle AB \rangle \approx \langle A \rangle \langle B \rangle$ ($A$ and $B$ are arbitrary system operators), we obtain the Langevin equations responsible for the first moments, which in the reference frame rotating at $\omega_l$ are

$$\langle \dot{q} \rangle = \omega_m \langle p \rangle, \quad \langle \dot{p} \rangle = -\omega_m \langle q \rangle - \gamma \langle p \rangle + g (a^\dagger) \langle a \rangle,$$

$$\langle \dot{a} \rangle = -(\kappa + i \Delta_0) \langle a \rangle + ig \langle a^\dagger \rangle \langle q \rangle + E_0 + E_1 e^{-i\omega t},$$

(2)

where $\gamma$ denotes the mechanical damping rate, and $\Delta_0 = \omega_c - \omega_l$, and $\delta = \omega_p - \omega_l$. In the long time limit, $t \gg \gamma^{-1}$, all average values have the form $\langle O \rangle = \sum_{n=\infty} e^{-\gamma t} \langle O_n \rangle$ ($O = q, p, a$) [31], where $\langle O_n \rangle$ are time independent. The substitution of $\langle O \rangle$ in Eq. (2) yields an hierarchy of coupled equations. Nevertheless, by assuming a weak “probe” field $|E_1| \ll |E_0|$, one can terminate the series in $\langle O \rangle$ at $n = 1$. Substituting the truncated series of $\langle O \rangle$ ($n = 0, \pm 1$) in Eq. (2) and equating the coefficients of different Fourier components, simple solutions of the averages can be obtained by making proper approximations, which are [33]

$$\langle q \rangle \approx \langle q_0 \rangle + 2Re(q_1) \cos \omega_m t + 2Im(q_1) \sin \omega_m t, \quad \langle p \rangle \approx 2Re(p_1) \cos \omega_m t + 2Im(p_1) \sin \omega_m t$$

(3)

for the mechanical mode, $\langle q_0 \rangle \approx \frac{\delta}{\omega_m} \langle [\{a, a^\dagger\}]^2 \rangle$, $\langle q_1 \rangle \approx \frac{\delta}{2} \langle a^\dagger a \rangle$, and $\langle p_1 \rangle = -i \langle q_1 \rangle$. In deriving the above expressions, we have taken $\delta = \omega_m$ and effective detuning $\Delta \equiv \Delta_0 - \delta (q_0) = \omega_m \gg \kappa$, which means that the frequency component at $\omega_c + \omega_m$ is resonantly enhanced, while the component at $\omega_c - \omega_m$ is significantly suppressed, leading to the fact that $\langle a \rangle_1 \ll \langle a \rangle$. We can therefore safely neglect this frequency component in the cavity field $\langle a \rangle$. We have also assumed $G_1^c \kappa / |x_1| < 1$ ($G_0 = g(a^\dagger a)$) in deriving $\langle a \rangle_0$, implying that a sufficiently weak “probe” field is used. The expression of $\langle a \rangle_1 \approx \frac{\delta}{\omega_m} \langle \{a, a^\dagger\} \rangle$ for a large cooperativity $C_0 = G_0^c / |x_1| > 1$ ($G_0 = g(0)$) indicates the EIT effect: the amplitude of the frequency component $\omega_m \approx \omega_l$ becomes very small when the red-detuned pump is strong enough.

Apart from nonzero first moments, a coherent state implies that the quantum fluctuations must be as (or very close to) those of the vacuum state. We therefore turn to the quantum dynamics by writing any operator as $O(t) = \langle O(t) \rangle + \delta O(t)$. We assume that $\langle [a, a^\dagger] \rangle = 0$, allowing us to safely neglect second-order terms in the expansion of each $O(t)$. The linearized quantum Langevin equations (QLEs) describing the quantum fluctuations ($\delta q$, $\delta p$, $\delta \chi$, $\delta \gamma$), with $\delta x = (\delta a + \delta a^\dagger) / \sqrt{2}$ and $\delta \gamma = \frac{\delta (\gamma a + a^\dagger)}{\sqrt{2}}$, are given by

$$\delta \dot{q} = \omega_0 \delta p,$$

$$\delta \dot{p} = -\omega_0 \delta q - \gamma \delta p + \sqrt{2} \sum_{n=\pm 1} e^{-i\omega n t} G_n^c \delta \chi G_n^d \delta \chi + \xi,$$

$$\delta \dot{\chi} = -\kappa \delta \chi + \Delta \delta \chi - \sqrt{2} \sum_{n=\pm 1} e^{-i\omega n t} G_n^c \delta q + \sqrt{2} \kappa \delta \gamma,$$

$$\delta \dot{\gamma} = -\kappa \delta \chi - \Delta \delta \chi + \sqrt{2} \sum_{n=\pm 1} e^{-i\omega n t} G_n^c \delta q + \sqrt{2} \kappa \delta \gamma,$$

(4)

where we have defined $G_n^c = \text{Re} G_n$ and $G_n^d = \text{Im} G_n$ ($n = 0, 1$), and assumed time-dependent detuning $\Delta = \Delta_0 - \delta (q) \approx \Delta_0$. This is a good approximation when $|E_1| \ll |E_0|$. $\xi$ and $\chi^m$, $\gamma^m$ are input noise operators for the mechanical and cavity mode, respectively, which are zero mean and characterized by their auto correlation functions: $\langle \xi(t) \xi'(t') \rangle = 2 \gamma (2n+1) \delta (t-t')$ (in the Markovian approximation valid in current experimental regime, and $\hbar = \cdots}$
we thus have
\[ \langle \hat{x}^2(t) \rangle = \langle \hat{x}^2(t) \rangle' = \frac{1}{2} \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} (t - \tau ). \]

The QLEs can be conveniently solved in the frequency domain, and analytical expressions of \( \langle \hat{q}^2 \rangle \) and \( \langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle \) can be achieved, which are, however, too lengthy to be reported here. Nevertheless, we find numerically that the “probe” field has a negligible effect on the fluctuations \( \langle \hat{q}^2 \rangle \) and \( \langle \hat{p}^2 \rangle \) provided that \( \left| \hat{E}_1 \right| \ll \left| \hat{E}_0 \right| \) (see [35]) for numerical verification with parameters used in [18]. Combining with the strong red-detuned pump responsible for cooling the mechanical motion close to its ground state \( \hat{n}_0 \ll 1 \) [18,22], the MR is prepared approximately in a coherent state [35]. This directly follows from the linearity of the QLEs [4].

Adding a phonon onto coherent states.—Once the MR is prepared in the desired coherent state, we switch off the pump and “probe” fields. After a time \( \kappa^{-1} \ll \tau_{pd} \ll \gamma^{-1} \) (see Fig. 1(b)), all cavity photons decay and the mechanical state remains effectively unchanged. The system is then in the state \( |0\rangle_0 |\beta\rangle_{\alpha m} \), where \( \beta \) is determined by \( \langle q \rangle_t \) and \( \langle p \rangle_t \). Specifically, \( |\beta\rangle = \sqrt{2} |q|_t \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\omega_m}{\omega_0}} |\gamma\rangle_1 \), where \( \kappa \ll \omega_m \) and \( \omega_0 \gg 1 \). Adopting the parameters from a recent experiment [18]: \( \omega_m / 2\pi = 5.25 \) GHz, \( \gamma = \omega_m / 3.8 \times 10^{10} \), \( \kappa / 2\pi = 846 \) MHz, \( g / 2\pi = \sqrt{2} \times 869 \) KHz, cavity resonance of wavelength \( \lambda = 1554.35 \) nm, and taking \( P_1 = 0.2 \) mW, \( 5.4 \) pW \( < P_1 < 48 \) pW corresponds to a coherent state with amplitude \( 1 < |\beta| < 3 \), where, as we will show later, the mechanical squeezing is most notable. Note that, in practice, the MR is prepared in a thermal coherent state (e.g., due to the absorption heating) with phonon occupancy \( \hat{n}_0 \ll 1 \) (we work in the deep cooling regime [18,32]). We shall first consider the case of \( \hat{n}_0 = 0 \) and then study the effect of the residual excitations on the results of this idealized case.

Adding a single phonon onto a coherent state can be implemented by sending a weak blue-detuned write pulse at frequency \( \omega_w = \omega_0 - \omega_m \), which yields the effective linearized Hamiltonian \( H_0 = \hbar G_b (a^\dagger b + ab^\dagger) [35] \), where \( b = (q + ip) / \sqrt{2} \). \( G_b = g \sqrt{\hat{n}_0 / 2} \) is the effective optomechanical coupling rate, and \( n_b = 2kP_b / [\hbar \omega_0 (\kappa^2 + \omega_m^2)] \) is the intracavity photon number \( (P_b \) is the power of the laser pulse). This Hamiltonian generates a two-mode squeezing interaction. To simplify the model, we consider flat-top pulses. We consider the pulse duration to be much shorter than the mechanical decoherence time \( \tau_b \ll \gamma^{-1} \), such that the decay of mechanical energy can be neglected. This leads to the QLEs during the write pulse: \( \dot{\delta}_0 = -\kappa \delta_0 + iG_b \delta b^\dagger + \sqrt{2\kappa} \alpha^\dagger \), and \( \dot{\delta}_b = iG_b \delta_b + \sqrt{2\kappa} \alpha_b^\dagger \). We have defined \( G_b = G / \kappa \). We introduce the temporal modes for the cavity pulse of duration \( \tau_b \),

\[
A^{in(out)}(\tau_b) = \left[ \pm 2G_b / (1 - e^{2\kappa \tau_b}) \right]^{1/2} \int_0^{\tau_b} e^{2G_b s + iA^{in(out)}(s)} ds \]  

and \( A^{in/out}(\tau_b) = \) (after some algebra) the expressions \( A^{in/out}(\tau_b) = e^{iG_\tau A^{in}(\tau_b)} + i \sqrt{e^{G_\tau} - 1} b(0) + i \sqrt{e^{-G_\tau} - 1} A^{in}(\tau_b) \). A propagator \( U(\tau) \) that satisfies \( A^{out}(\tau_b) = U(\tau_b) A^{in}(\tau_b) U \) and \( b(\tau_b) = U(\tau_b) b(0) U \) can be extracted,

\[
U(\tau_b) = e^{(1/2 \tau_b) \sqrt{\tau_b} A^{in}(\tau_b)} e^{-i (1/\pi) \sqrt{\tau_b} A^{out}(\tau_b)} = e^{G_\tau A^{in}(\tau_b)} b(0) + i \sqrt{e^{G_\tau} - 1} A^{in}(\tau_b) \]  

where \( Z(\tau_b) = e^{-G_\tau \tau_b} (0 < \tau_b \ll 1) \). For an initial state \( |0\rangle_0 |\beta\rangle_{\alpha m} \), the system, at the end of the pulse, is prepared in the state

\[
|\phi(\tau_b)\rangle = Z e^{-e^{G_\tau} (1 - \tau_b^2) / 2} \sum_{n_0}^{\infty} \frac{(1 - \tau_b^2)^{n_0} (A^{in})^n(0) |0\rangle_0 |Z\beta\rangle_{\alpha m} |Z\beta\rangle_{\alpha m} \]  

For taking “\( \approx \)” in Eq. (5), we have assumed \( 1 - \tau_b^2 \ll 1 \) \( (G_b \tau_b \ll 1) \), i.e., the probability of generating a photon-phonon pair is sufficiently low, such that the possibility of generating more than one photon-phonon pair is negligible. The MR is then prepared with a high probability in a single-phonon-added coherent state \( |\beta\rangle_{\alpha m} \), with a slightly reduced amplitude \( |\beta| \rightarrow |\beta| \sqrt{1 - G_\tau} \), on the condition that a single photon is detected on cavity resonance. This probability can be as high as 98.8% in a recent experiment [18]. This is similar to the proposals [17,37] and experiments [18,28] for preparing single photon and single phonon states.

Readout of phonon-added coherent states.—The state of the MR can be read out by sending a red-detuned laser pulse at frequency \( \omega_r = \omega_0 - \omega_m \), which yields the effective Hamiltonian \( H_r = \hbar G_r (a^\dagger b + ab^\dagger) [35] \), with the effective optomechanical coupling rate \( G_r = g \sqrt{\hat{n}_0 / 2} \), and the intracavity photon number \( n_r = 2kP_r / [\hbar \omega_0 (\kappa^2 + \omega_m^2)] \) \( (P_r \) being the power of the readout pulse). Again, we assume the pulse duration

![FIG. 2: (a) \( Q(Z\beta, 1) \) vs \( |\beta| \) for different values of \( B(\tau_r) \). Solid lines from bottom to top (top to bottom down the dashed line) correspond to \( B = 0.01, 0.25, 0.5, 0.75 \), respectively. 1-\( B^2 \) is the state-swap efficiency of the readout pulse. The dashed line denotes \( Q(Z\beta, 0) = 0 \) for \( |4(\Delta x_0)^2|^2 = 1 \) for coherent states. (c)-(d) Contour plots of \( 4(\Delta x_0)^2 \) as a function of some key parameters: \( B = 0.15 \) in (c) and \( \theta = \frac{\pi}{2} \) in (d). \( 4(\Delta x_0)^2 = 1 \) corresponds to vacuum fluctuations. We take \( \tau_r = \pi / 4 \times 10^{-3} \) s and \( G_r = G / \sqrt{2} \times 10^3 \) Hz \( \ll \kappa \), close to the parameter regime of [18], which yield \( Z(\tau_r) \approx 0.98 \) and \( B(\tau_r) \approx 0.15 \).]
In Fig. 2 (a), we show the parameter write pulse and a single photon being detected (see Fig. 1 (b)). For the initial state and \(\langle e\rangle\), seeing such a nonclassical feature. The parameter can be calculated more conveniently using the expression

\[
\langle A^\dagger A \rangle = \frac{(A^{\text{out}} A^{\text{out}})^2 - (A^{\text{out}} A^{\text{out}})^2}{(A^{\text{out}} A^{\text{out}})^2 - 1},
\]

which is defined for an \(m\)-phonon-added coherent state \((\alpha, m) \equiv N b^{bm}[a]\), with the normalization constant \(N = \sqrt{m! M_m(-|\alpha|^2)^{1/2}}\), where \(L_m(x)\) is the Laguerre polynomial of order \(m\). In the present scheme, we have \(m = 1\) and \(\alpha = Z(t_0)\beta\). A negative value of \(Q(\alpha, m)\) represents the sub-Poissonian character of the state. For \(m = 0, Q(\alpha, 0) = 0\), corresponding to coherent states, while for \(a = 0, Q(0, m) = -1\). The \(\langle e\rangle\) parameter can be calculated more conveniently using the formula

\[
\langle A^\dagger A \rangle = \frac{\langle A^\dagger A \rangle^2 - 3\langle A^\dagger A \rangle + 1}{\langle A^\dagger A \rangle^2 - 1},
\]

for the initial state \(|0\rangle_\alpha, |1\rangle_m\), i.e., the state generated after the write pulse and a single photon being detected (see Fig. 3(b)).

In Fig. 3(a), we show the parameter \(Q(\beta, 1)\) as a function of \(|\beta|\) for different values of \(B(t_\tau)\). \(Q(\beta, 1)\) well below zero for small values of \(|\beta|\) is a clear sign of the sub-Poissonian character of the state, and a small value of \(B(t_\tau)\) is preferred for seeing such a nonclassical feature.

Another important property of the mechanical state \(|\alpha, 1\rangle\) is quadrature squeezing [22]. To demonstrate this, we define the quadrature \(x_\alpha\) of the cavity output field, \(x_\alpha = \langle A^{\text{out}} e^{i\phi} + A^{\text{out}} e^{-i\phi} \rangle i/2\), and if its variance \((\Delta x_\alpha)^2 = \langle x_\alpha^2 \rangle - \langle x_\alpha \rangle^2\) is less than that of the vacuum state, the quadrature \(x_\alpha\) of the field is squeezed, implying that the quadrature of the mechanical mode is squeezed. The expression of \((\Delta x_\alpha)^2\) can be obtained, given by

\[
(\Delta x_\alpha)^2 = \frac{3 - 2B^2 + (1-B^2)(e^{2\theta}a^2 + e^{-2\theta}a^2) + 2|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4}{4(1 + |\alpha|^2)^2},
\]

which becomes \((\Delta x_\alpha)^2 = \frac{1}{2}\) for \(B = 1\) corresponding to the vacuum state of the cavity output. In Fig. 2(b-d), we display \(4(\Delta x_\alpha)^2\) versus some key parameters. It shows that \(\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}\) and \(B(t_\tau) \to 0\) (\(B_{\text{min}}\) is bounded by \(\tau_\epsilon \ll \gamma^{-1}\) and \(G_\tau \ll k\) for optimal observing quadrature squeezing, and considerable squeezing below vacuum has been found in the cavity output field as a result of the nonclassical phonon state.

**Effects of residual thermal excitations.** We now discuss the effects of the residual thermal excitations \(n_0 \ll 1\) in the state of preparing a mechanical coherent state. That is to say, we prepare a thermal coherent state (a thermal state displaced by \(|\beta|\) in phase space) with nonzero phonon occupancy [18, 32]. Before applying the write pulse, the MR is in the state \(\rho_{\text{th.c}} = (1-s) \sum_i s^i D(\beta_i)|\beta_i\rangle \langle \beta_i| (\beta_i)\), with \(s = r_0/(1+r_0)\). For \(n_0 < 0.45\), the MR is most likely (>90%) either in the state \(|0\rangle\) or \(|1\rangle\). We thus truncate the Fock state basis up to \(n = 1\), and \(\rho_{\text{th.c}}\) can be approximated as \(\rho_{\text{th.c}} \approx (1-s)|\beta\rangle \langle \beta| + (1-s)D(\beta)|1\rangle \langle 1|D(\beta)\). This leads to the conditional state of the MR (unnormalized) [35]

\[
\rho_{\text{th.c}}(\tau_\epsilon) \approx \frac{b^\dagger |\alpha\rangle \langle b| + s(b^\dagger b^\dagger)|\alpha\rangle \langle b| + 2Z^2 b^\dagger b^\dagger|\alpha\rangle \langle b| - b^\dagger b^\dagger b^\dagger b^\dagger}{s^2 - 2s \bar{n} + s^2 (\bar{n} + 1)}
\]

after the write pulse and the detection of a single photon, which contains the component of a two-phonon-added coherent state due to the small probability of the initial state in \(|1\rangle_m\). By measuring the cavity output of the readout pulse, we obtain the \(Q\) parameter, which takes the form \(Q = \frac{N_Q}{\sqrt{\langle 1 + s|\beta|^2 \rangle}} Q_1 + s(Z^2 Q_2 - \beta Z Q_3 - \beta Z Q_4)\), where \(Q_1 = \text{tr} \left[ Q(0) \right] (0 \otimes b^\dagger b |\alpha\rangle \langle b| \right] (j = 1, 2), Q_1 = \text{tr} \left[ Q(0) \right] (0 \otimes b^\dagger b^\dagger |\alpha\rangle \langle b| \right] ^2\), and \(Q_4 = \text{tr} \left[ Q(0) \right] (0 \otimes b^\dagger b^\dagger |\alpha\rangle \langle b| \right] \). The normalization constant \(N_Q = 1 + s(|\beta|^2 + \bar{n}^2 - \beta^2 Z - \bar{Z}^2)\) is introduced to keep \(Q = 0\) for coherent (Fock) states. For \(s = 0\), \(Q\) is equal to \(Q(\alpha, 1)\) for the ideal case of \(n_0 = 0\). Figure 3(a) shows the effect of the residual excitations on the \(Q\) parameter and no appreciable effect is found in particular for small \(|\beta|\). A similar form of \((\Delta x_\alpha)^2\) can be derived [35], which is more sensitive to the residual excitations, as shown in Fig. 3(b). Nevertheless, for small \(n_0\) significant sub-Poissonian character and squeezing of the state are present, characterizing its nonclassical features. We note that for \(|\beta| \to 0\), we also generate phonon-added thermal states of the MR. Such states also exhibit nonclassical properties as is known from the corresponding studies on photons [39].

**Conclusions.** We have presented a scheme to generate and detect single-phonon-added coherent states of the mechanical motion in optomechanical systems. It is designed for pulses and combines ground state cooling, two basic optomechanical interactions (the parametric down-conversion and beam-splitter interaction), and single photon detection. Our scheme
can also be applied to electromechanical systems and opens promising perspectives for the generation of a series of non-Gaussian states of a mechanical oscillator. While we discussed phonon addition, the process of subtraction can be carried out by using the red-detuned pump and by detecting a single photon \[40\] for phonons prepared in arbitrary states.
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[35] See supplementary material for additional proofs.
SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

Part I: Preparing mechanical coherent states

A: Derivation of analytical solutions for the first moments

We now solve the Langevin equations \(^\text{(2)}\) in order to get the analytical solutions (by making proper approximations) for the system average values. Due to the fact that the cavity is bichromatically driven by a strong pump at \(\omega_p \approx \omega_m\) and a weak field at \(\omega_p \approx \omega_c\), the cavity field would be modulated at \(\delta = \omega_p - \omega_c\) \(^\text{[1]}\). The mean value of the system operators in the long time limit, \(t \gg \gamma^{-1}\), would have the form \((\langle \hat{O} \rangle) = \sum_{n \to -\infty} e^{i \omega n} \langle \hat{O} \rangle_n \langle O = a, q, p\rangle\). We assume that the “probe” field is much weaker than the strong pump, \(|E_1| \ll |E_0|\), so that we can terminate the series in \(\langle \hat{O} \rangle\) at \(n = 1\), i.e., we can write

\[
\langle \hat{O} \rangle(t) \approx \langle \hat{O}_0 \rangle + \langle \hat{O} \rangle e^{-i \omega t} + \langle \hat{O} \rangle e^{i \omega t}, \quad (O = a, q, p). \tag{8}
\]

Substituting Eq. \(^\text{(6)}\) in Eq. \(^\text{(2)}\), equating the coefficients of different Fourier components, and solving the corresponding sets of equations, we obtain (setting \(\delta = \omega_m\))

\[
\langle q \rangle_0 = \frac{g}{\omega_m} \sum_{j=1}^{1} |\langle a \rangle_j|^2, \quad \langle p \rangle_0 = 0, \tag{9}
\]

\[
\langle q \rangle_1 = \frac{g}{\gamma} \left( \langle a \rangle_0 \langle a \rangle_1 + \langle a \rangle_0^\ast \langle a \rangle_1 \right), \quad \langle p \rangle_1 = -i \langle q \rangle_1, \tag{10}
\]

\[
\langle q \rangle_{-1} = \langle q \rangle_1^\ast, \quad \langle p \rangle_{-1} = \langle p \rangle_1^\ast, \tag{11}
\]

for the mechanical mode and

\[
\langle a \rangle_0 = \frac{1}{\kappa + i \Delta} \left[ E_0 + ig \langle a \rangle_0 \langle q \rangle_1 + \langle a \rangle_{-1} \langle q \rangle_1 \right], \tag{12}
\]

\[
\langle a \rangle_1 = \frac{1}{\kappa + i \Delta - i \omega_m} \left( E_1 + ig \langle a \rangle_0 \langle q \rangle_1 \right), \tag{13}
\]

\[
\langle a \rangle_{-1} = \frac{1}{\kappa + i \Delta + i \omega_m} g \langle a \rangle_0 \langle q \rangle_{-1}, \tag{14}
\]

for the cavity mode, where we have defined \(\Delta \equiv \kappa - g \langle q \rangle_0\). Taking \(\Delta = \omega_m\) (i.e., \(\omega_p = \omega_m\)), and assuming \(\omega_m \gg \kappa\), the cavity field component \(\langle a \rangle_1\) is resonantly enhanced, while \(\langle a \rangle_{-1}\) is significantly suppressed, resulting in \(\langle a \rangle_{-1} \ll \langle a \rangle_1\). We thus neglect the component \(\langle a \rangle_{-1}\) in the cavity field \(\langle a \rangle\). This leads to the following approximated solutions

\[
\langle q \rangle_0 \approx \frac{g}{\omega_m} (|\langle a \rangle_0|^2 + |\langle a \rangle_1|^2), \tag{15}
\]

\[
\langle q \rangle_1 \approx \frac{ig}{\gamma} \langle a \rangle_0 \langle a \rangle_1, \tag{16}
\]

and

\[
\langle a \rangle_0 \approx \frac{E_0}{\kappa + i \omega_m - \frac{g^2}{\gamma} |\langle a \rangle_0|^2}, \tag{17}
\]

\[
\langle a \rangle_1 \approx \frac{E_1}{\kappa + \frac{g^2}{\gamma} |\langle a \rangle_0|^2}. \tag{18}
\]

The equations of \(\langle a \rangle_0\) and \(\langle a \rangle_1\) are nonlinear. However, by using a sufficiently weak “probe” field \(\frac{g^2}{\gamma} |\langle a \rangle_0|^2 \ll \kappa\), i.e., \(G^2/\gamma \kappa \ll 1\), we can get simple approximated solutions

\[
\langle a \rangle_0 \approx \frac{E_0}{\kappa + i \omega_m}, \quad \langle a \rangle_1 \approx \frac{E_1}{\kappa + \frac{g^2}{\gamma} |\langle a \rangle_0|^2}. \tag{19}
\]

B: Negligible effects of the weak “probe” field on the fluctuations

We solve the QLEs \(^\text{(4)}\) in the frequency domain by taking Fourier transform of each equation. Eq. \(^\text{(4)}\) can be written as

\[
\tilde{A}(\omega) \tilde{u}(\omega) = \tilde{n}(\omega), \tag{20}
\]

where \(\tilde{u}(\omega) = [u(\omega), u(\omega+\omega_m)]^T\), \(\tilde{n}(\omega) = [n(\omega), n(\omega+\omega_m)]^T\), and \(\tilde{u}(\omega)\) and \(\tilde{n}(\omega)\) are defined as \(u(\omega) = [\delta q(\omega), \delta p(\omega), \delta x(\omega), \delta y(\omega)]^T\) and \(n(\omega) = [0, \xi(\omega), \sqrt{\gamma} x(\omega), \sqrt{\gamma} y(\omega)]\). \(\tilde{A}(\omega)\) takes the following form

\[
\tilde{A}(\omega) = \begin{pmatrix} B_0 & A_1 \\ 0 & B_1 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{21}
\]

where \(B_j = \sqrt{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \omega_m & 0 & 0 \\ -\omega_m & 0 & \sqrt{2} G_0^x & \sqrt{2} G_0^y \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} G_0^x & 0 & -\kappa \Delta \\ 0 & \sqrt{2} G_0^y & \kappa \Delta & 0 \end{pmatrix} \tag{22}
\]

and

\[
A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & G_1^x & G_1^y \\ -G_1^x & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ G_1^y & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{23}
\]

We now look at the correlation properties of the noise vector \(n(\omega)^T\). The correlation functions can be constructed in the form of a matrix with its entries defined as

\[
\Phi_{ij}(\omega, \omega') = \langle \tilde{n}_i(\omega) \tilde{n}_j(\omega') \rangle + \langle \tilde{n}_i(\omega) \rangle \langle \tilde{n}_j(\omega') \rangle/2 \tag{24}
\]

\[
= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \langle \delta(\omega - \omega' + k \omega_m) D_k \rangle, \tag{25}
\]

where \(D_k\) are given in terms of \(4 \times 4\) blocks

\[
D_0 = \begin{pmatrix} D & 0 \\ 0 & D \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ D & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad D_{-1} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & D \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \tag{26}
\]

and \(D = \text{diag}[0, \gamma(2\tilde{a} + 1), \kappa, \kappa]\). The two frequency correlation function is defined as \(\tilde{V}_ij(\omega, \omega') = \langle \tilde{n}_i(\omega) \tilde{n}_j(\omega') \rangle + \langle \tilde{n}_i(\omega) \rangle \langle \tilde{n}_j(\omega') \rangle/2\), which forms an \(8 \times 8\) correlation matrix \(\tilde{V}(\omega, \omega')\), which can be achieved by

\[
\tilde{V}(\omega, \omega') = \tilde{A}^{-1}(\omega) \Phi(\omega, \omega') \tilde{A}^{-1}(\omega)^T. \tag{27}
\]
Note that we are interested only in the top left $4 \times 4$ block of $V_1(t)$, which we call $V_1(t) = [V_1^{(i)}(t)]_{i}$. From Eqs. (18) and (20), we obtain

$$V_1(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{4} V_k(t) \delta(\omega - \omega^r + k\omega_m),$$

(21)

where $V_k(t) = \left[ A_i^{-1}(\omega) D_k \left[ A_i^{-1}(\omega + k\omega_m) \right] \right]$. By taking inverse Fourier transform, we eventually achieve the time periodic correlation matrix $V(t)$, which contains all the components of $V_k$

$$V(t) = \sum_{k} e^{-i\omega t} V_k, \quad \text{where}$$

$$V_k = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \tilde{V}_k(\omega) d\omega.$$ 

(22)

The correlation matrix $V$ contains the second moments of the mechanical quadratures, i.e., $(\delta q^2) = V_{11}$ and $(\delta p^2) = V_{22}$, whose analytical expressions can be obtained, which takes the form of $(\delta q^2) = V_{11}^{(0)} + V_{11}^{(1)} e^{-i\omega t} + V_{11}^{(2)} e^{-i2\omega t} = V_{11}^{(0)} + 2Re V_{11}^{(1)} \cos \omega t + 2Im V_{11}^{(1)} \sin \omega t$, since $V_{11}^{(1)} = V_{11}^{(1)}$. The expressions of $V_{11}^{(1)} (k = 0, \pm 1)$ are, however, too lengthy to be reported. A similar form of expression for $(\delta p^2)$ can be found. Nevertheless, in the situation when the probe field is absent, we obtain relatively simple expressions, $(\delta q^2) = 2\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} V_q(\omega) d\omega$, and $(\delta p^2) = 2\int_{-\infty}^{\infty} V_p(\omega) d\omega$, where

$$V_q(\omega) = \frac{\omega_m^2}{d(\omega)} \left[ 2g^2 \kappa (\Delta^2 + \kappa^2 + \omega^2) E_0^2 \right]
+ \gamma \left( 1 + 2n \right) \left[ 4k^2 \omega^2 + (\Delta^2 + \kappa^2 - \omega^2)^2 \right],$$

(23)

and

$$V_p(\omega) = \frac{\omega_m^2}{d(\omega)} V_q(\omega),$$

(24)

with $d(\omega) = (\omega^2 + i\gamma \omega - \omega_m^2) [\Delta^2 + (\kappa - i\omega) \Delta^2] + 2g^2 \omega_m \Delta E_0^2 / (\kappa^2 + \Delta^2)$. $V_q(\omega)$ and $V_p(\omega)$ are thus the spectrum of fluctuations in the mechanical state. The Hamiltonian of the system reads

$$H = \hbar \omega_0 a^\dagger a + \hbar \omega_m b^\dagger b - \hbar g a^\dagger a b^\dagger b \sqrt{2} + i\hbar E (a^\dagger e^{-i\omega t} + \text{h.c.}).$$

(25)

FIG. 4: Periodic behavior of modulation terms $V_{11}(t)$ and $V_{22}(t)$.

on the fluctuations of the mechanical mode is negligible provided that $|E_1| \ll |E_0|$, which is also a condition for deriving the expressions of the first moments in Eq. (3).

Part II: Generation and detection of single-phonon-added coherent states

A: Linearized Langevin equations and effective Hamiltonians

Here we derive the linearized Langevin equations in the conventional optomechanical system, where a mechanical mode couples to a cavity mode via radiation pressure, and the cavity mode is driven by a laser which is tuned either on the red or blue mechanical sideband, i.e., $\omega_l = \omega_c \pm \omega_m$. We aim to obtain the effective Hamiltonians in these two situations which are responsible for two key steps of our scheme: the two-mode squeezing interaction (combined with single phonon detection) for adding a single phonon onto the mechanical coherent state, and the beamsplitter interaction for the readout of the mechanical state. The Hamiltonian of the system reads

$$H = \hbar \omega_0 a^\dagger a + \hbar \omega_m b^\dagger b - \hbar g a^\dagger a b^\dagger b \sqrt{2} + i\hbar E (a^\dagger e^{-i\omega t} + \text{h.c.}).$$

(25)

Taking into account the dissipations of the mechanical and optical mode and the input noises, the Hamiltonian (25) leads to the following QLEs (in the interaction picture with respect
to $\hbar\omega_a a^\dagger a + \hbar\omega_b b^\dagger b$)

$$\dot{a} = -(\kappa + i\Delta) a + i\frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} (a e^{i\omega_{0}t} + b^\dagger e^{-i\omega_{0}t}) + E + \sqrt{2}\kappa a^\dagger a,$$

$$\dot{b} = -\frac{\gamma}{2} (b - b^\dagger) e^{i\omega_{0}t} + i\frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} \left( a e^{i\omega_{0}t} + \frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{2}} \right).$$

(26)

When the intracavity field is strong, $|\langle a \rangle| \gg 1$, one can safely linearize the system dynamics (by writing operators as $a = \langle a \rangle + \delta a$ and $b = \langle b \rangle + \delta b$) around the average values and obtain the following linear QLEs for the quantum fluctuations

$$\delta\dot{a} = -(\kappa + i\Delta) \delta a + iG(\delta b e^{-i\omega_{0}t} + \delta b^\dagger e^{i\omega_{0}t}) + \sqrt{2}\kappa a^\dagger a,$$

$$\delta\dot{b} = -\frac{\gamma}{2} (\delta b - \delta b^\dagger) e^{i\omega_{0}t} + iG(\delta a + \delta a^\dagger) e^{i\omega_{0}t} + \frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{2}}.$$  

(27)

where $\Delta$ is the effective detuning including the frequency shift due to the optomechanical interaction, and $G = g(a)/\sqrt{2}$ is the effective optomechanical coupling rate. We have chosen the phase reference so that $\langle a \rangle$ is taken real. To see it more clearly, we move to the reference frame rotating at $\omega_m$ (for optical mode), and obtain

$$\delta\dot{a} = -\kappa\delta a + iG(\delta b^\dagger e^{-i\omega_{0}t} + \delta b e^{i\omega_{0}t}) + \sqrt{2}\kappa a^\dagger a,$$

$$\delta\dot{b} = -\frac{\gamma}{2} (\delta b - \delta b^\dagger) e^{i\omega_{0}t} + iG(\delta a - \delta a^\dagger) e^{i\omega_{0}t} + \frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{2}}.$$  

(28)

For a blue-detuned driving laser, $\Delta = -\omega_m$, we have

$$\delta\dot{a} = -\kappa\delta a + iG\delta b^\dagger + \sqrt{2}\kappa a^\dagger a,$$

$$\delta\dot{b} = -\frac{\gamma}{2} \delta b + iG\delta a + \frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{2}}.$$  

(29)

which yields an effective Hamiltonian $H_c/\hbar = G(a^\dagger b + ab)$, generating the two-mode squeezing interaction between the mechanical and optical modes. While for a red-detuned driving laser, $\Delta = \omega_m$, we get

$$\delta\dot{a} = -\kappa\delta a + iG\delta b + \sqrt{2}\kappa a^\dagger a,$$

$$\delta\dot{b} = -\frac{\gamma}{2} \delta b + iG\delta a + \frac{i\xi}{\sqrt{2}}.$$  

(30)

which corresponds to an effective Hamiltonian $H_c/\hbar = G(a^\dagger b + ab^\dagger)$, realizing the beamsplitter interaction responsible for the state swapping between the mechanical and optical modes. Note that in deriving Eqs. (29) and (30) we have neglected non-resonant fast oscillating terms, which is a good approximation when $\gamma, \kappa, G \ll \omega_m$ is fulfilled.

**B: Expressions of the $Q$ parameter and $(\Delta_\phi)^2$ for the case of thermal coherent states**

We now consider the nonideal situation where the MR is prepared in a thermal coherent state with mean phonon number $\bar{n}_0 \ll 1$, which can be achieved in current optomechanical experiments [18–32]. The density operator of such a state writes $\rho_{hc,c} = (1 - s) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} s^D|D(\beta)|^n\langle n | D^\dagger(\beta) | \rangle$, where $s = |\frac{\bar{n}_0}{\kappa}|$. For a small mean number $\bar{n}_0 \ll 1 (s \ll 1)$, the probability of the MR at higher than $n = 1$ excitation states is negligible. This allows us to truncate the Fock state basis up to $n = 1$, and $\rho_{hc,c}$ can be approximately written as (unnormalized)

$$\rho_{hc,c} \approx |\beta\rangle\langle \beta | + sD(\beta)|1\rangle\langle 1 | D^\dagger(\beta).$$  

(31)

The system at the end of the write pulse is prepared in the state $\rho(\tau_b) = U(|0\rangle, |0\rangle \otimes \rho_{hc,c}) U^\dagger = U(0,\beta)(0,\beta^\dagger) + sU(0,\beta)|1\rangle \otimes [D(\beta)|1\rangle \otimes D^\dagger(\beta) | U^\dagger$. The first component in $\rho(\tau_b)$ is actually the state of Eq. (5), i.e., $U(0,\beta)(0,\beta^\dagger) = |\phi(\tau_b)|\langle \phi(\tau_b)\rangle$. Using the fact that $D(\beta)|1\rangle = -\beta^* |\beta\rangle + e^{-\\|\beta\|^2/2} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{\beta^k}{\sqrt{k! + 1}} |k + 1\rangle$, we obtain

$$|\Psi(\tau_b)\rangle \equiv U(|0\rangle, \otimes D(\beta)|1\rangle = -\beta^* |\phi(\tau_b)| + |\phi(\tau_b)\rangle,$$

(32)

where

$$|\phi(\tau_b)\rangle = Z^2 e^{-\frac{\hbar^2}{2} i(1 - Z^2)\left[ |0\rangle, b^\dagger | 0\rangle, b\right] - i \sqrt{1 - Z^2} |1\rangle, b^\dagger | 1\rangle, b\right] m,$$

(33)

which contains an eigenstate of two-phonon-added coherent state $b^\dagger(\beta)|m\rangle$. $\rho(\tau_b)$ is therefore achieved, which is

$$\rho(\tau_b) = |\phi(\tau_b)\rangle\langle \phi(\tau_b)\rangle + s|\Psi(\tau_b)\rangle\langle \Psi(\tau_b)\rangle.$$

(34)

The conditional state of the MR when a single photon in the cavity output is detected is (unnormalized)

$$\rho_m(\tau_b) = \text{tr}_c\left[ \left( 1, 1 \right) \otimes I_b | \rho(\tau_b) \right]$$

$$= b^\dagger |\alpha\rangle\langle \alpha | b + s(\beta^* \beta^\dagger) |\alpha\rangle\langle \alpha | b^2 + Z^2 |\alpha\rangle\langle \alpha | b^2$$

$$- \beta^* Z |\alpha\rangle\langle \alpha | b^2 - \beta Z |\alpha\rangle\langle \alpha | b.$$  

(35)

This yields the initial state of the system, $|0\rangle, |0\rangle \otimes \rho_m(\tau_b)$, before sending the readout pulse. We then calculate the $Q$ parameter, which takes the following form

$$Q = \frac{(1 + s|\beta|^2) Q_1 + s(Z^2 Q_2 - \beta^* Z Q_3 - \beta Z Q_4)}{N_0},$$

(36)

where $Q_j = \text{tr}_d\left[ Q|0\rangle, 0 \otimes b^\dagger |\alpha\rangle b |\right] (j = 1, 2), Q_3 = \text{tr}_d\left[ Q|0\rangle, 0 \otimes b^\dagger |\alpha\rangle b |\right], Q_4 = \text{tr}_d\left[ Q|0\rangle, 0 \otimes b^2 |\alpha\rangle b |\right]$, and their specific expressions are given by
\[ Q_1 = \frac{B^2 + 2(1 + B^2)\alpha|^2 + 2(1 + B^2)\alpha^4 + |\alpha|^6}{1 + 4|\alpha|^2 + 4|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6} - 1, \]
\[ Q_2 = \frac{8B^2 + 4(3 + 8B^2)|\alpha|^2 + 4(6 + 13B^2)|\alpha|^4 + 24(1 + B^2)|\alpha|^6 + 4(2 + B^2)|\alpha|^8 + |\alpha|^{10}}{(2 + 4|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4)(4 + 14|\alpha|^2 + 8|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6)} - 1, \]
\[ Q_3 = \frac{8B^2 + (6 + 8B^2)|\alpha|^2 + (4 + 3B^2)|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6}{(2 + |\alpha|^2)(4 + 5|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4)} - 1, \quad Q_4 = Q_3. \]

Note that each \( Q_i \) (\( i = 1, ..., 4 \)) has been normalized, and the normalization constant \( N_Q = 1 + s |\beta|^2 + Z^2 - \beta^2 Z - \beta Z \) is introduced to keep \( Q = 0 \) (\(-1\)) for coherent (Fock) states.

We now look at the squeezing property of the mechanical state. To this end, we calculate the quantity \( (\Delta x_0)^2 \) of the output field of the readout pulse. It has a similar form of \( Q \), i.e.,
\[
(\Delta x_0)^2 = \frac{(1+s|\beta|^2)(\Delta x_1)^2 + s[Z^2(\Delta x_2)^2 - \beta^2 Z(\Delta x_3)^2 - \beta Z(\Delta x_4)^2]}{N_x},
\]
\[ (\Delta x_1)^2 = \frac{3 - 2B^2 + (1 - B^2)(e^{2\theta}\alpha^2 + e^{-2\theta}\alpha^2) + 2|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4}{4(1 + |\alpha|^2)^2}, \]
\[ (\Delta x_2)^2 = \frac{1}{4(2 + 4|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4)^2} \left\{ (1 - B^2)e^{-2\theta}(6 + 6|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4)^2(e^{2\theta}\alpha + \alpha^*)^2 + (2 + 4|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4) \times (2B^2 - 1)(2 + 4|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4) + 2(1 - B^2)(6 + 18|\alpha|^2 + 9|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6) + (B^2 - 1)(12 + 8|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4)(e^{2\theta}\alpha^2 + e^{-2\theta}\alpha^2) \right\}, \]
\[ (\Delta x_3)^2 = \frac{1}{4|\alpha|^2(2 + |\alpha|^2)^2} \left\{ (1 - B^2\alpha^2 + |\alpha|^2)^2 - e^{-2\theta}(2 + 4|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4)^2 + 2|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4 \times [ (2B^2 - 1)\alpha(2 + |\alpha|^2) + (B^2 - 1)e^{2\theta}\alpha^3(4 + |\alpha|^2) + (B^2 - 1)(6 + 6|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4)(e^{-2\theta}\alpha^2 - 2\alpha) \right\}], \]
\[ (\Delta x_4)^2 = \frac{8 - 4B^2 + (1 - B^2)(e^{2\theta}\alpha^2 + e^{-2\theta}\alpha^2) + 4|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4}{4(2 + |\alpha|^2)^2}. \]

Each \( (\Delta x_i)^2 \) in Eq. (39) has been normalized. All of \( (\Delta x_i)^2 \) for \( B = 1 \), and in this limit case the cavity output field is vacuum. At last, we introduce the normalization factor \( N_x = \frac{1}{4} \) in order to have \( 4(\Delta x_0)^2 = 1 \) for coherent states.