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The required set of operations for universal continuous-variable quantum computation can be divided into two primary categories: Gaussian and non-Gaussian operations. Furthermore, any Gaussian operation can be decomposed as a sequence of phase-space displacements and symplectic transformations. Although Gaussian operations are ubiquitous in quantum optics, their experimental realizations are generally approximations of the ideal Gaussian unitaries. In this work, we study different performance criteria to analyze how well these experimental approximations simulate the ideal Gaussian operations. In particular, we find that none of these experimental approximations converge uniformly to the ideal Gaussian processes. However, convergence occurs in the strong sense, or if the discrimination strategy is energy bounded, then the convergence is uniform. We indicate how these energy-constrained bounds could be used for experimental implementations of these Gaussian operations in order to achieve any desired accuracy.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum computers use quantum properties such as superposition of quantum states and entanglement for information processing and computational tasks\textsuperscript{1}. One of the notions of universal quantum computation consists of the manipulation of qubits encoded in discrete quantum systems and the application of a universal set of quantum operations on these qubits\textsuperscript{1}. Another way to implement discrete-variable (DV) quantum computation is to encode a finite amount of quantum information into a continuous-variable (CV) system\textsuperscript{2-4}. This approach is appealing given that already existing advanced optical technologies can be used for state preparation, manipulation of states, and measurement for the required quantum computational tasks\textsuperscript{5}.

The notion of quantum computation can be further extended to CV systems such that the transformations involved are arbitrary polynomial functions of those continuous variables\textsuperscript{6}. Recently, there have been many interesting advances in the context of CV quantum cryptography\textsuperscript{7}, CV quantum computing\textsuperscript{8,9}, and quantum machine learning\textsuperscript{10}. One of the advantages of CV quantum computation could be in simulating CV systems more efficiently in comparison to a DV quantum computer\textsuperscript{11}. Moreover, a hybrid of DV and CV quantum computation could be efficient for distributed quantum computing and other related tasks\textsuperscript{12,14}.

The required operations for universal CV quantum computation can be divided into two primary categories: Gaussian and non-Gaussian operations\textsuperscript{6,15}. Gaussian operations correspond to the evolution of the state of light under a Hamiltonian that is an arbitrary second-order polynomial in the electromagnetic field operators. In particular, any second-order Hamiltonian can be decomposed as a sequence of phase-space displacements (elements of the Heisenberg–Weyl group) and symplectic transformations (see, e.g.,\textsuperscript{16} for a review). In general, along with Gaussian unitary operations, access to a Hamiltonian of at least the third power in the quadrature operators is sufficient to approximate any non-Gaussian (polynomial in the quadrature operators) Hamiltonian\textsuperscript{6,17}.

These CV Gaussian quantum gates have been extensively investigated both theoretically and experimentally in the context of quantum optics and quantum information processing\textsuperscript{18-21}. In general, these quantum gates are not realized in their ideal form. Rather, one approximates these operations using a sequence of other basic operations. For example, a displacement unitary on an arbitrary input state is commonly approximated by sending it through a particular beamsplitter along with a highly excited coherent state\textsuperscript{18}. Moreover, squeezing and SUM transformations are generally implemented using strongly pumped nonlinear processes, which are inherently noisy, and their high sensitivity to the coupling of optical fields in a nonlinear medium makes their implementation on an arbitrary quantum state challenging\textsuperscript{19}. Rather, one can approximately realize these gates by using a sequence of passive transformations, homodyne measurements, and off-line squeezed vacuum states\textsuperscript{19-21}.

Even if the different components involved in approximating a CV quantum gate are considered ideal, it is natural to ask the following question: in what sense does a sequence of these approximations converge to the desired quantum gate? More formally, let \( \{ \mathcal{M}^k \}_k \) denote a sequence of quantum channels corresponding to the approximations of a quantum channel \( \mathcal{N} \). Then in what sense does the sequence \( \{ \mathcal{M}^k \}_k \) converge to \( \mathcal{N} \)? Since these quantum channels are superoperators (completely positive and trace-preserving maps from density operators to density operators), one needs to consider various topologies on the set of quantum channels in order to study convergence. In the present context,
we focus on three different notions of convergence for quantum channels: uniform and strong convergence (as presented in [22]), and uniform convergence on the set density operators whose marginals on the channel input have bounded energy (as presented in [23, 24]; see supplementary material for more details).

In this work, we study the aforementioned three different performance criteria to analyze how well experimental approximations simulate ideal Gaussian operations. We mainly focus on particular Gaussian unitaries, such as displacement operators, single-mode squeezer, and SUM gate operation, which, along with phase rotations, are sufficient to generate any arbitrary Gaussian unitary operation acting on $n$ modes of the electromagnetic field [25]. Results of a similar spirit, but for different examples, appeared recently in [24, 26, 29].

In particular, we prove that none of these experimental approximations converge uniformly to the ideal Gaussian processes. Qualitatively, the uniform convergence of a sequence of experimental approximations to an ideal Gaussian operation implies that the convergence is independent of the input state [22]. As stated in [22], it is the same as convergence in the well-known diamond norm [27], which is typically considered in the context of infinite-dimensional quantum channels. Therefore, our results indicate that the notion of uniform convergence for these experimental approximations of the desired Gaussian unitary operation is too strong, and we note here that similar observations have been made in the context of infinite-dimensional channels in [22, 24, 28] (see supplementary material for more details).

Next, we study the strong convergence of these experimental approximations to the ideal Gaussian unitaries. The notion of strong convergence [22] corresponds to the convergence of a sequence of approximations to an ideal process, considered for each possible fixed input quantum state. In particular, we show that these experimental approximations of an ideal displacement operator, single-mode squeezer, and SUM gate converge to the ideal unitaries in the strong sense.

A physical meaning for these two kinds of convergence was discussed in [29] by using game-theoretic arguments. In particular, it was shown that the success probability in distinguishing some CV quantum channels from their teleportation simulations is related to these two kinds of convergence, for a specific construction of the “CV teleportation game” [29, Section III].

One can infer from the definitions of strong and uniform convergence that the notion of strong convergence is a weaker notion of convergence, in fact implied by uniform convergence. Another notion of convergence, which is experimentally relevant, is uniform convergence on the set of density operators whose marginals on the channel input have bounded energy (as presented in [23, 24]). Recently, it has been shown that the strong convergence of a sequence of infinite-dimensional channels is equivalent to uniform convergence on the set of energy-bounded density operators [23]. Therefore, our results imply that these experimental approximations of an ideal displacement operator, single-mode squeezer, and SUM gate converge uniformly to the ideal unitaries on the set of energy-bounded density operators. In this work, we take the energy observable to be the number operator, and we use the terminology “energy” and “mean photon number” interchangeably.

In order to experimentally approximate these different unitary operations, it is important to study how the uniform convergence over the set of energy-bounded operators depends on different experimental parameters. In particular, we consider the energy-constrained sine distance [30, Section 12] as a metric to bound the energy-constrained diamond distance between an ideal displacement operator and its experimental approximation. We first show that the fidelity between the ideal displacement and its experimental approximation when acting on a fixed input state is equal to the fidelity between a pure-loss channel and an ideal channel when acting on the same input state. We then provide an analytical expression to bound the energy-constrained diamond distance between an ideal displacement and its experimental approximations, by using the recent result of [31]. Furthermore, we study different performance metrics to analyze how well an experimental approximation simulates a tensor product of different displacement operators.

Similarly, we study uniform convergence over the energy-bounded quantum states of some experimental approximations of an ideal single-mode squeezing operation by considering several experimentally relevant input quantum states.

These Gaussian unitaries are key elements for CV quantum computation [6], CV quantum error correction [32, 34], CV quantum teleportation [35], improving the sensitivity of an interferometer in the context of quantum metrological tasks [36], and for generating a quantum non-demolition interaction between different modes [19]. Therefore, our results quantifying the performance of their experimental approximations play a critical role in understanding how to achieve any desired accuracy for several practical applications.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. We first briefly summarize different notions of convergence considered in this paper. We next describe experimental implementations of a displacement operator, a single-mode squeezer, and a SUM gate, and then we study different notions of convergence for these gates individually. Finally, we conclude with a brief summary. We note that the supplementary material provides detailed proofs of all statements that follow.
II. NOTIONS OF CONVERGENCE FOR QUANTUM CHANNELS

In this section, we briefly summarize three different notions of convergence for quantum channels: uniform and strong convergence (as presented in [22]), and uniform convergence on the set of density operators whose marginals on the channel input have bounded energy (as presented in [23–24]).

We begin by reviewing some definitions relevant for the rest of the paper (see supplementary material for more details). Let \( \mathcal{H} \) denote an infinite-dimensional, separable Hilbert space. Let \( T(\mathcal{H}) \) denote the set of trace-class operators, i.e., all operators \( M \) with finite trace norm: \( \|M\|_1 \equiv \text{Tr}\{\sqrt{M^\dagger M}\} < \infty \). Let \( D(\mathcal{H}) \) denote the set of density operators (positive semi-definite with unit trace) acting on \( \mathcal{H} \). The trace distance between two quantum states \( \rho, \sigma \in D(\mathcal{H}) \) is given by \( \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \). The fidelity between \( \rho \) and \( \sigma \) is defined as \[ F(\rho, \sigma) \equiv \|\sqrt{\rho} \sqrt{\sigma}\|^2. \]

The sine distance or C-distance between two quantum states \( \rho \) and \( \sigma \) is defined as \[ C(\rho, \sigma) \equiv \sqrt{1 - F(\rho, \sigma)}, \]

and it is a metric [38–41]. The following bounds hold between the fidelity and the trace distance between two quantum states \( \rho, \sigma \in D(\mathcal{H}) \):

\[ 1 - \sqrt{F(\rho, \sigma)} \leq \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \sigma\|_1 \leq \sqrt{1 - F(\rho, \sigma)}, \]

with the lower bound following from the Powers-Størmer inequality [42] and the upper bound from Uhlmann’s theorem [37].

In our paper, we employ the two-mode squeezed vacuum state with parameter \( N \geq 0 \), which is defined as

\[ |\psi_{\text{TMS}}(N)\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{N+1}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{n!} \frac{n!}{(N+1)!} |n\rangle_R |n\rangle_A, \]

where \( |n\rangle \) denote a photon-number state with \( n \) photons.

It is important to note that even though the state in (4) is a well-defined quantum state for all \( N \in [0, \infty) \), the limiting object, often called “ideal EPR state” \[ \lim_{N \to \infty} |\psi_{\text{TMS}}(N)\rangle \] [43], is not a quantum state, as it is unnormalizable and it is thus not contained in the set of density operators. Similarly, the eigenvectors of the position- and momentum-quadrature operators, denoted as \( |x\rangle \) and \( |p\rangle \), respectively, are also not quantum states. In spite of this, the notions of uniform and strong convergence involve a supremum over the set of density operators, and so these objects can be approached in a suitable limit. Note that this point has been clarified previously in the context of uniform and strong convergence [29].

We now recall the notion of uniform convergence for quantum channels. Let \( \{M^k_{A \to B}\}_k \) denote a sequence of quantum channels, where each channel takes a trace class operator acting on a separable Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_A \) to a trace class operator acting on a separable Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_B \). Then the channel sequence \( \{M^k_{A \to B}\}_k \) converges uniformly to another quantum channel \( \mathcal{N}_{A \to B} \) if the following holds:

\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} \|M^k_{A \to B} - \mathcal{N}_{A \to B}\|_\diamond_E = 0, \]

where \( \|\mathcal{L}_{A \to B}\|_\diamond \) denotes the diamond norm of a Hermiticity preserving linear map \( \mathcal{L}_{A \to B} \), defined as

\[ \|\mathcal{L}_{A \to B}\|_\diamond \equiv \sup_{\psi_{RA} \in D(\mathcal{H}_R \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)} \| (\mathcal{I}_R \otimes \mathcal{L}_{A \to B})(\psi_{RA}) \|_1, \]

where \( \mathcal{I}_R \) is an identity channel acting on Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}_R \), \( \psi_{RA} \) is a pure state, and system \( R \) is isomorphic to the channel input system \( A \) [27]. Due to the supremum being taken, note that the diamond norm might only be achieved in the limit (for example, for a sequence of two-mode squeezed vacuum states with squeezing strength becoming arbitrarily large, as discussed in [29]).

The channel sequence \( \{M^k_{A \to B}\}_k \) converges to another quantum channel \( \mathcal{N}_{A \to B} \) in the strong sense if for all \( \psi_{RA} \in D(\mathcal{H}_R \otimes \mathcal{H}_A) \), the following holds:

\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} \| (\mathcal{I}_R \otimes M^k_{A \to B})(\psi_{RA}) - (\mathcal{I}_R \otimes \mathcal{N}_{A \to B})(\psi_{RA}) \|_1 = 0, \]

which can be summarized more compactly as

\[ \sup_{\psi_{RA} \in D(\mathcal{H}_R \otimes \mathcal{H}_A)} \lim_{k \to \infty} \| M^k_{A \to B}(\psi_{RA}) - \mathcal{N}_{A \to B}(\psi_{RA}) \|_1 = 0, \]

where it is implicit that the identity channel acts on the reference system \( R \). Therefore, convergence in the strong sense is the statement that, for each fixed input quantum state \( \psi_{RA} \), the sequence \( \{M^k_{A \to B}(\psi_{RA})\}_k \) of states converges to the state \( \mathcal{N}_{A \to B}(\psi_{RA}) \) in trace norm.

It is important to note that the different orders in which the limits and suprema are taken in (6) and (7) lead to physically distinct situations, as discussed in [29].

Let \( \mathcal{H}_A \) denote an energy observable corresponding to the quantum system \( A \). Then the channel sequence \( \{M^k_{A \to B}\}_k \) converges uniformly (on the set of density operators whose marginals on the channel input have bounded energy) to another quantum channel \( \mathcal{N}_{A \to B} \) if the following holds for some \( E \in [0, \infty) \):

\[ \lim_{k \to \infty} \| M^k_{A \to B} - \mathcal{N}_{A \to B}\|_\diamond_E = 0, \]
where the energy-constrained diamond distance is defined as [23, 24]

\[
\| \mathcal{M}_{A\rightarrow B} - \mathcal{N}_{A\rightarrow B} \|_{\infty} \equiv \sup_{\psi_{RA}, \text{Tr}(H_A \psi_A) \leq E} \left\| \mathcal{M}_{A\rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA}) - \mathcal{N}_{A\rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA}) \right\|_1 ,
\]

where it is again implicit that the identity channel acts on the reference system $R$.

The energy-constrained sine distance between two quantum channels $\mathcal{N}_{A\rightarrow B}$ and $\mathcal{M}_{A\rightarrow B}$ is defined for $E \in [0, \infty)$ as [20] Section 12

\[
C_E(\mathcal{N}_{A\rightarrow B}, \mathcal{M}_{A\rightarrow B}) \equiv \sup_{\psi_{RA}, \text{Tr}(H_A \psi_A) \leq E} \sqrt{1 - F(\mathcal{N}_{A\rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA}), \mathcal{M}_{A\rightarrow B}(\psi_{RA}))}.
\]

### III. APPROXIMATION OF A DISPLACEMENT OPERATOR

We now analyze convergence of the experimental implementation of a displacement operator from [18] to the ideal displacement operator. For a single-mode light field, a unitary displacement operator is defined as [16]

\[
D(\alpha) \equiv \exp(\alpha \hat{a}^\dagger - \alpha^* \hat{a}),
\]

where $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$, $\hat{a} = (\hat{x} + \hat{p}) / \sqrt{2}$ is an annihilation operator, and $\hat{x}$ and $\hat{p}$ are position- and momentum-quadrature operators, respectively. The action of a displacement operator on a single-mode Gaussian state $\rho$ can be understood as a displacement of the mean values $\langle \hat{x} \rangle_\rho$ and $\langle \hat{p} \rangle_\rho$. Moreover, any displacement operator acting on $n$ modes can be decomposed as a tensor product of displacement operators acting on each mode [16].

Let $\rho_A$ be a single-mode input quantum state. We then simulate the action of $D(\alpha)$ on the state $\rho_A$, according to [18], by employing a beamsplitter $B^\eta_{AB}$ of transmissivity $\eta \in (0,1)$ and an environment state prepared in a coherent state $|\beta\rangle_B$ [16], where $\beta$ is chosen such that $\sqrt{1 - \eta} \beta = \alpha$. We denote the channel corresponding to the experimental implementation of the displacement operator $D(\alpha)$ by

\[
\tilde{D}^\eta_{A\rightarrow B} = D^\eta \sqrt{1 - \eta}.
\]

As described in Figure 1, the simulation of the ideal channel $D^\alpha(\rho_A) \equiv D(\alpha) \rho_A D(-\alpha)$ realized by the displacement operator $D(\alpha)$ is given by the following transformation:

\[
\tilde{D}^\eta_{A\rightarrow B}(\rho_A) \equiv \text{Tr}_B \{ B^\eta_{AB} (\rho_A \otimes |\beta\rangle \langle \beta|_B) \}.
\]

We first show that the fidelity between the ideal displacement and its experimental approximation when acting on a fixed input state is equal to the fidelity between a pure-loss channel and an ideal channel when acting on the same input state. By using the following simplification

\[
B^\eta_{AB} \circ D^\beta_B = \left[ D^\beta_A \otimes D^\eta_B \right] \circ B^\eta_{AB},
\]

we get the following simplification

\[
(\text{Tr}_B \circ B^\eta_{AB}) (\rho_A \otimes |\beta\rangle \langle \beta|_B) = (D^\alpha_A \circ \mathcal{L}^\eta_A) (\rho_A),
\]

where $\mathcal{L}^\eta_A (\rho_A) = (\text{Tr}_B \circ B^\eta_{AB}) (\rho_A \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_B)$ denotes a pure-loss channel with transmissivity $\eta$ and $|0\rangle$ denotes the vacuum state.

Now let $\psi_{RA}$ denote an arbitrary two-mode pure state. Computing the fidelity between the ideal displacement $D^\alpha$ and its experimental approximation $\tilde{D}^\eta_{A\rightarrow B}$ by using (8) and the unitary invariance of the fidelity, we find that

\[
F(D^\alpha(\psi_{RA}), \tilde{D}^\eta \sqrt{1 - \eta} (\psi_{RA})) = F(\psi_{RA}, \mathcal{L}^\eta_A (\psi_{RA})).
\]

Therefore, analyzing the convergence of the sequence $\{ \tilde{D}^\eta \sqrt{1 - \eta} \}_{\eta \in [0,1]}$ to $D^\alpha$ is equivalent to analyzing the convergence of a sequence of pure-loss channels to an ideal channel.

We now prove that the sequence $\{ \tilde{D}^\eta \sqrt{1 - \eta} \}_{\eta \in [0,1]}$ does not converge uniformly to $D^\alpha$, which follows from...
[9] and [24 Proposition 2]. Let $|\delta\rangle$ be a pure input coherent state. Then we find that

$$F(D^a(|\delta\rangle\langle\delta|), \tilde{D}^a_{\eta}(|\delta\rangle\langle\delta|)) = \exp[-|\delta|^2(1 - \eta)^2],$$

where we used (9) and the fact that $|\langle\gamma|\delta\rangle|^2 = \exp(-|\gamma - \delta|^2)$ for coherent states $|\gamma\rangle$ and $|\delta\rangle$. Therefore,

$$\lim_{|\delta|^2 \to \infty} F(D^a(|\delta\rangle\langle\delta|), \tilde{D}^a_{\eta}(|\delta\rangle\langle\delta|)) = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (10)

Let $|\phi\rangle_{RA} = [0]_R|\delta\rangle_A$. Using (3), (10), and the fact that $\|\rho \otimes \omega - \sigma \otimes \omega\|_1 = \|\rho - \sigma\|_1$, for any density operators $\rho, \sigma, \omega$, we find that

$$\lim_{|\delta|^2 \to \infty} \left\| I_R \otimes D^a_{\eta}(\psi_{RA}) - I_R \otimes \tilde{D}^a_{\eta}(|\delta\rangle\langle\delta|)(\psi_{RA}) \right\|_1 = 2,$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

which is the maximum value of the diamond distance between any two quantum channels. Therefore, the definition in (5) and the equality in (11) imply that the sequence $\{\tilde{D}^a_{\eta}\}_{\eta \in (0,1]}$ does not converge uniformly to the ideal displacement channel $D^a$. The equality in (11) indicates that the ideal displacement $D^a$ and its experimental approximation $\tilde{D}^a_{\eta}$ become perfectly distinguishable in the limit that the input state has unbounded energy. We note that the lack of uniform convergence of a sequence of pure-loss channels to another pure-loss channel was recently studied in [24 Proposition 2].

We now argue that the sequence $\{\tilde{D}^a_{\eta}\}_{\eta \in (0,1]}$ converges to $D^a$ in the strong sense. Let $\chi_{\rho_A}(x, p)$ denote the Wigner characteristic function [16] for the input state $\rho_A$. Let $\tilde{\rho}_{A\text{out}}^\eta$ denote the state after the action of $\tilde{D}^a_{\eta}$ on $\rho_A$:

$$\tilde{\rho}_{A\text{out}}^\eta = \tilde{D}^a_{\eta}(\rho_A).$$

Then the characteristic function of $\tilde{\rho}_{A\text{out}}^\eta$ is given by

$$\chi_{\tilde{\rho}_{A\text{out}}}^\eta = \chi_{\rho_A}(\sqrt{\eta}x, \sqrt{\eta}p)e^{[i\sqrt{\eta}(pRe(a) - xIm(a)) - (1/4)(x^2 + p^2)(1 - \eta)]}.$$ 

Moreover, the characteristic function after the action of an ideal displacement channel $D^a$ on $\rho_A$ is given by

$$\chi_{D^a(\rho_A)}(x, p) = \chi_{\rho_A}(x, p)e^{[i\sqrt{2}(pRe(a) - xIm(a))]}.$$ 

Therefore, for each $\rho_A \in D(H_A)$, and for all $x, p \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{\eta \to 1} \chi_{\rho_A}^\eta(x, p) = \chi_{D^a(\rho_A)}(x, p).$$  \hspace{1cm} (12)

We have thus shown that the sequence of characteristic functions $\chi_{\rho_A}^\eta$ converges pointwise to $\chi_{D^a(\rho_A)}$.

which implies by [28 Lemma 8] that the sequence $\{\tilde{D}^a_{\eta}\}_{\eta \in (0,1)}$ converges to $D^a$ in the strong sense.

We now discuss uniform convergence of the sequence $\{\tilde{D}^a_{\eta}\}_{\eta \in (0,1)}$ to $D^a$ on the set of density operators whose marginals on the channel input have bounded energy. As observed in [23], a sequence of quantum channels converges strongly to a quantum channel if and only if it converges uniformly on the set of density operators whose marginals on the channel input have bounded energy. Therefore, the sequence $\{\tilde{D}^a_{\eta}\}_{\eta \in (0,1)}$ converges uniformly to $D^a$ if the input states have a finite energy constraint.

However, from an experimental perspective, it is important to know how the energy-constrained uniform convergence depends on experimental parameters. Using (3) and (9), we find that

$$\frac{1}{2} \left\| D^a - \tilde{D}^a_{\eta} \right\|_{\varnothing E} \leq \sup_{\psi_{RA} : \text{Tr}(H_A\psi_{RA}) \leq E} \sqrt{1 - F[\psi_{RA}, L^a_{\eta}(\psi_{RA})]} \leq \sqrt{1 - [(1 - \{E\})\sqrt{E} + \{E\}\sqrt{E}]^2},$$  \hspace{1cm} (13)

where $\{E\} = E - |E|$. The equality follows from the recent result of [31] (see also the earlier result in [44]), where the energy-constrained Bures distance [45] between two pure-loss channels was calculated. From (13), it is easy to see that

$$\lim_{\eta \to 1} \frac{1}{2} \left\| D^a - \tilde{D}^a_{\eta} \right\|_{\varnothing E} = 0,$$

which justifies the energy-constrained uniform convergence of $\{\tilde{D}^a_{\eta}\}_{\eta \in (0,1)}$ to $D^a$. Furthermore, the optimal state $\psi_{RA}$ that saturates the equality in (13) is $|\psi\rangle_{RA} = \sqrt{1 - \{E\}|E\rangle_A\tau_R + \{E\}|E\rangle_A\tau_R^\perp}$, which follows directly from [31].

Next, we perform numerical evaluations to see how close the experimental approximation $\tilde{D}^a_{\eta}$ is to the ideal displacement channel $D^a$. We denote the energy-constrained sine distance [30 Section 12] obtained in [13] as

$$f(\eta, E) = \sqrt{1 - [(1 - \{E\})\sqrt{E} + \{E\}\sqrt{E}]^2}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (14)

In Figure 2 we plot $f(\eta, E)$ versus $\eta$ for certain values of the energy constraint $E$. In particular, we find that for all values of $E$, the experimental approximation $\tilde{D}^a_{\eta}$ simulates the ideal displacement $D^a$ with a high accuracy for values of $\eta \approx 1$. Moreover, for a fixed value
Therefore, for a given energy constraint on input states, and to implement an ideal displacement channel $D^a$ with any desired accuracy, one can find $\eta$ from (13)–(15), and the corresponding $\beta$ from $\sqrt{1-\eta} \beta = a$. The equality in (15) illustrates just how difficult it is to achieve a good accuracy in simulating an ideal displacement channel: in order to achieve the same fidelity, one requires an exponential increase in $\eta$ to match only a linear increase in $E$.

Let us briefly discuss these different notions of convergence for experimental approximations of a tensor product of ideal displacement channels. Let $\{D_i^a\}_{i=1}^K$ be a set of $K$ different displacement channels. We approximate the tensor product of these operators by a tensor product of $\{D_i^a, \beta_i\}_{i=1}^K$, such that $\sqrt{1-\eta_i} \beta_i = a_i$, for $i \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. From the same counterexample given above (coherent states with large energy), it follows directly that the sequence $\{\otimes_{i=1}^K D_{\eta_i, a_i}^{\eta_i, 1} \}_{\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_K \in [0,1]}$ does not converge uniformly to $\otimes_{i=1}^K D_i^a$. Rather, the convergence holds in the strong sense, as a consequence of [29, Proposition 1]. Moreover, suppose that there is an average energy constraint on the input state to the tensor product of displacement operators, i.e., $\text{Tr}(\tilde{H}_{A^k} \psi_{A^k}) \leq E$, where

$$\tilde{H}_{A^k} \equiv H_A \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I} + \cdots + \mathbb{I} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes H_A,$$

and $E \in [0, \infty)$. Let $\text{Tr}(H_A \psi_{A_i}) = E_i$, where $E_i \in [0, \infty)$, $i \in \{1, \ldots, K\}$. Then by using triangle inequality for the sine distance, monotonicity of the sine distance, [29, Proposition 1], and (13), we find that

$$\max_{\{E_i\} : \sum_i E_i \leq E} \sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{1 - [(1 - E_i)/\sqrt{\eta_i}]^2} \leq \frac{1}{2} \left| \otimes_{i=1}^K D_i^{a_i} - \otimes_{i=1}^K \tilde{D}_{\eta_i, a_i}^{\eta_i, 1} \right|_{\phi E} \leq \frac{1}{2} \sum_{i=1}^K \sqrt{1 - [(1 - E_i)/\sqrt{\eta_i}]^2}.$$

See the supplementary material for more details. Therefore, $\{\otimes_{i=1}^K D_{\eta_i, a_i}^{\eta_i, 1} \}_{\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_K \in [0,1]}$ converges uniformly to $\otimes_{i=1}^K D_i^a$ on the set of density operators whose marginals on the channel input have bounded energy.

IV. APPROXIMATION OF A SINGLE-MODE SQUEEZER

In this section, we analyze the convergence of the experimental implementation of a measurement induced single-mode squeezer from [19] to the ideal single-mode squeezer. A single-mode squeezer is a unitary operator defined as

$$S(\xi) \equiv \exp[\{\xi^a \hat{a} - \xi^b \hat{b}^2 \}/2],$$

where $\xi = re^{i\theta}$, with $r \in [0, \infty)$ and $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ (see, e.g., [46] for a review). A squeezing transformation realizes a decrement in the variance of one of the quadratures.
at the expense of a corresponding increment in the variance of the complementary quadrature, which is helpful for improving the sensitivity of an interferometer \cite{36} and for other quantum metrological tasks \cite{46}.

Let $\rho_A$ be an input quantum state, and let $\hat{x}_A$ and $\hat{p}_A$ denote the position- and momentum-quadrature operators for mode $A$, respectively. As described in Figure \cite{4}, the simulation from \cite{19} of $S'(\rho_A) = S(r)\rho_A S(-r)$, such that $e^{-r} = \sqrt{\eta}$, is given by the following transformation of the mode operators:

\[ \hat{x}_A \to \sqrt{\eta} \hat{x}_A + \sqrt{1-\eta} e^{-rE} \hat{x}_E^0 , \]
\[ \hat{p}_A \to \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta}} \hat{p}_A , \]

where $\hat{x}_E^0$ is the position-quadrature operator corresponding to the vacuum state and $r_E$ is the squeezing parameter corresponding to the squeezed vacuum state.

We denote the channel corresponding to the experimental implementation of an ideal single-mode squeezer by $\hat{S}_{e^rE} = \hat{S}e^{-2rE}$. Furthermore, by applying the inverse $S^{-r}$ of the ideal single-mode squeezer $S'$ on the output of $\hat{S}e^{-2rE}$, we arrive at the following transformation:

\[ \hat{x}_{\text{out}} = \hat{x}_A + \frac{\sqrt{1-\eta}}{\sqrt{\eta}} e^{-rE} \hat{x}_E^0 , \]
\[ \hat{p}_{\text{out}} = \hat{p}_A . \]

We denote the channel induced by the transformation in (17)–(18) by $\Xi_{e^rE}$. Since all the elements involved in the transformation are Gaussian, the channel $\Xi_{e^rE}$ can be described by its action on the mean and covariance matrix of the input state $\rho_A$. In particular, there are two $2 \times 2$ real matrices, the scaling matrix $X_{\Xi_{e^rE}}$ and the noise matrix $Y_{\Xi_{e^rE}}$, which characterize the Gaussian channel $\Xi_{e^rE}$ completely (background on Gaussian channels can be found in the supplementary material). It is easy to check that the action of $\Xi_{e^rE}$ does not change the mean vector of $\rho_A$. Therefore, the scaling matrix $X_{\Xi_{e^rE}} = I_2$, where $I_2$ is a two-dimensional identity matrix. Moreover, the expectation value of the anticommutator $\{\hat{x}_A, \hat{x}_E^0\}$ is equal to zero, which further implies that the noise matrix $Y_{\Xi_{e^rE}}$ has the following form:

\[ Y_{\Xi_{e^rE}} = \text{diag} \left( (1-\eta)e^{-2rE} / \eta, 0 \right) . \]

Let us study the channel $\Xi_{e^rE}$ in further detail. As observed in \cite{47}, all single-mode bosonic Gaussian channels can be categorized into six different canonical forms. In particular, the canonical form $\Phi_{B_1}$ has the following $X_{\Phi_{B_1}}$ and $Y_{\Phi_{B_1}}$ matrices \cite{47}:

\[ X_{\Phi_{B_1}} = I_2 \]
\[ Y_{\Phi_{B_1}} = \text{diag} (0, 1) . \]

We now show that the channel $\Xi_{e^rE}$ is unitarily equivalent to the canonical form $\Phi_{B_1}$. Let $\rho$ be a quantum state with the covariance matrix $V_\rho$. Then the symplectic matrix $\sigma_x = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$ transforms the covariance matrix $V_\rho$ as follows:

\[ V'_\rho = \sigma_x V_\rho \sigma_x^T \].

We then apply the symplectic transformation corresponding to the symplectic matrix $K = \text{diag} (\xi, 1/\xi)$, where $\xi = \sqrt{1 - (1-\eta)e^{-2rE}/\eta}$, on the covariance matrix $V'_{\rho}$. The transformed covariance matrix is given by $V''_\rho = KV'_\rho K^T$. We now apply the canonical form $\Phi_{B_1}$ on the transformed state, and get the following transformation of the covariance matrix $V'''_{\rho}$:

\[ V'''_\rho = V''_\rho + Y_{\Phi_{B_1}} \]

which implies that the overall transformation is the same as the action of the channel $\Xi_{e^rE}$ on the state $\rho$. Therefore, we have shown that the Gaussian channel $\Xi_{e^rE}$ is unitarily equivalent by Gaussian input and output unitaries to the canonical form $\Phi_{B_1}$. This gives a physical interpretation to channels in the class $\Phi_{B_1}$, in terms of the measurement-induced squeezing approximation from \cite{19}.

We now prove that the sequence $\{\tilde{S}_{e^rE}\}_{r \in [0, \infty)}$ does not converge uniformly to the ideal single-mode squeezer $S'$. Let $|z\rangle$ be a squeezed-vacuum input state with the covariance matrix $V_{|z\rangle} = \text{diag}(z, 1/z)$ and mean vector $\mu_{|z\rangle} = (0, 0)^T$, where $z \in [0, \infty)$. Then
under the action of $\Xi^\eta_{x,E}$, the covariance matrix $V_{\{z\}}(\{z\})$ transforms as follows:

$$V_{\{z\}}^\text{out}(\{z\}) = \text{diag}(z + (1 - \eta)e^{-2r_E} / \eta, 0).$$

We can use these expressions in the Uhlmann fidelity formula for single-mode Gaussian states [48, 49]. By using the unitary invariance of fidelity, we find that

$$F(S'(\{z\}) \mid \tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}(\{z\})) = F(|z\rangle \langle z|, \Xi^\eta_{x,E}(\{z\})).$$

(20)

Moreover, we find that [50]

$$F(\{z\} \mid \tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}(\{z\})) = \sqrt{\frac{2z}{2z + (e^{2r} - 1)e^{-2r_E}}},$$

Therefore, for fixed $r_E$

$$\lim_{z \to 0} F(S'(\{z\}) \mid \tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}(\{z\})) = 0,$$

(21)

which implies that the sequence $\{\tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}\}_{r \in [0, \infty)}$ does not converge uniformly to the ideal single-mode squeezing transformation $S'$. The reasoning behind (21) can be intuitively explained as follows: the channel $\Xi^\eta_{x,E}$ adds noise to the $\hat{x}$ quadrature only. Therefore, it can be discriminated from an identity channel by using an input state that has vanishing noise in the $\hat{x}$ quadrature operator. Since an infinitely squeezed vacuum state (infinitely squeezed in the position quadrature) satisfies such a condition, then (21) follows.

We now argue that the sequence $\{\tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}\}_{r \in [0, \infty)}$ converges to $S'$ in the strong sense. Let $\chi_{\rho_A}(x, p)$ denote the Wigner characteristic function of the input state $\rho_A$. Let $\rho_A^\text{out}$ denote the state after the action of $\tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}$ on $\rho_A$:

$$\rho_A^\text{out} = \tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}(\rho_A).$$

Then the characteristic function of $\rho_A^\text{out}$ is given by

$$\chi_{\rho_A^\text{out}}(x, p) = \chi_{\rho_A}(e^r x, e^{-r} p) e^{-\frac{1}{4}(e^{2r} - 1)e^{-2r_E} p^2}.$$ 

Moreover, the characteristic function of $S'(\rho_A)$ is given by

$$\chi_{S'(\rho_A)}(x, p) = \chi_{\rho_A}(e^r x, e^{-r} p).$$

Therefore, for each $\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(H_A)$, and for all $x, p \in \mathbb{R}$

$$\lim_{r_E \to -\infty} \chi_{\rho_A^\text{out}}(x, p) = \chi_{S'(\rho_A)}(x, p).$$

(22)

Therefore, we have shown that the sequence of characteristic functions $\chi_{\rho_A^\text{out}}(x, p)$ converges pointwise to $\chi_{S'(\rho_A)}(x, p)$, which implies that the sequence $\{\tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}\}_{r \in [0, \infty)}$ converges strongly to $S'$ [28, Lemma 8].

As described in Figure 4, the simulation of an ideal single-mode unitary consists of an ideal displacement. We now briefly discuss the case when the displacement operator involved in the simulation of $S'$ is not ideal. By using the counterexample from before, we find that convergence of the simulation of a single-mode squeezing operation to an ideal single-mode squeezing operation is not uniform. From (12), (22), and [29] Proposition 2, it follows that convergence holds in the strong sense.

Furthermore, the strong convergence of the sequence $\{\tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}\}_{r \in [0, \infty)}$ to $S'$ implies that the experimental approximations of an ideal single-mode squeezer, as described in Figure 4, simulate the desired unitary operation uniformly on the set density operators whose marginals on the channel input have bounded energy [23]. However, as discussed previously, from an experimental perspective, it is important to know how this convergence depends on the experimental parameters. We now consider experimentally relevant input Gaussian states with energy constraints, such as single-mode squeezed states, coherent states, and two-mode squeezed vacuum states. For any fixed finite value of the energy constraint, we find that, among these Gaussian states, inputting a two-mode squeezed vacuum state provides the largest value of the sine distance between the ideal single-mode squeezer and its experimental approximation.

Let us study in detail the case when the input state is the two-mode squeezed vacuum state with parameter $N$, as defined in [4]. The fidelity between $S'(\psi_{\text{TMS}}(N))$ and $\tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}(\psi_{\text{TMS}}(N))$ is given by [50]

$$F(S'(\psi_{\text{TMS}}(N)), \tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}(\psi_{\text{TMS}}(N))) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (N + 1/2)(e^{2r} - 1)e^{-2r_E}}}.$$ 

(23)

Next, we perform numerical evaluations to see how close the experimental approximation $\tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}$ is to the ideal squeezing operation $S'$ for a fixed input quantum state $\psi_{\text{TMS}}(N)$. Fix the squeezing parameter $r = 0.46$, which corresponds to the squeezing strength 4 dB. We use the relation $10 \log_{10}(\exp(2r)) \approx 8.686$ to convert the squeezing parameter $r$ to units of dB. Let $g(r_E, N)$ denote the sine distance between $S'(\psi_{\text{TMS}}(N))$ and $\tilde{S}^{e^{-2r_E} \chi}(\psi_{\text{TMS}}(N)):

$$g(r_E, N) = \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + (N + 1/2)(e^{2r} - 1)e^{-2r_E}}}},$$ 

(24)

where we used [23].

In Figure 5, we plot $g(r_E, N)$ in (24) versus the offline squeezing strength $r_E$ for certain values of the input mean photon number $N$. In particular, we find that the simulation of $S'$ is more accurate for low values of the energy constraint on the input states. The figure indicates that an offline squeezing strength of 15 dB, which
is what is currently experimentally achievable \cite{51}, is not sufficient to simulate an ideal squeezing operation with squeezing strength 4 dB, with a high accuracy, by using the protocol from \cite{19}. We further investigate the strength of the offline squeezing required to simulate the ideal squeezing operator with high accuracy. In Figure 6, we plot Figure 5 for high values of the squeezing parameter $r_E$. The figure indicates that for the low input mean photon number $N \approx 0.06$, approximately 26 dB offline squeezing strength is required to achieve a reasonable accuracy ($\approx 97\%$).

V. APPROXIMATION OF A SUM GATE

In this section, we analyze the convergence of experimental approximations of a measurement-induced SUM gate from \cite{19} to the ideal SUM gate. A SUM gate is a quantum nondemolition (QND) interaction between two modes, the CV analog of the CNOT gate \cite{25}:

$$\text{SUM}^G \equiv \exp(-i\, G\hat{x}_1 \otimes \hat{\rho}_2),$$

where $\hat{x}_1$ and $\hat{\rho}_2$ correspond to the position- and momentum-quadrature operators of modes 1 and 2, respectively, and $G$ is the gain of the interaction. Generally, $G = 1$ is sufficient for quantum information processing tasks. Other than universal quantum computation, this CV entangling quantum gate has applications in CV quantum error correction \cite{33,34} and CV coherent communication \cite{52,53}.

Let $\rho_{12}^{\text{in}}$ denote a two-mode input quantum state. As described in Figure 7, the simulation of $\text{SUM}^G(\rho_{12}^{\text{in}})$ from \cite{19} is given by the following transformation of the mode operators $\hat{x}_1$, $\hat{x}_2$, $\hat{\rho}_1$, and $\hat{\rho}_2$ of $\rho_{12}^{\text{in}}$:

$$\hat{x}_1^{\text{in}} \rightarrow \hat{x}_1^{\text{in}} - \sqrt{\frac{1 - R}{1 + R}} e^{-r_A \hat{x}_A^0},$$

$$\hat{\rho}_1^{\text{in}} \rightarrow \hat{\rho}_1^{\text{in}} - G \hat{\rho}_2^{\text{in}} + \sqrt{\frac{R(1 - R)}{1 + R}} e^{-r_B \hat{\rho}_B^0},$$

$$\hat{x}_2^{\text{in}} \rightarrow \hat{x}_2^{\text{in}} + G \hat{x}_1^{\text{in}} + \sqrt{\frac{R(1 - R)}{1 + R}} e^{-r_A \hat{x}_A^0},$$

$$\hat{\rho}_2^{\text{in}} \rightarrow \hat{\rho}_2^{\text{in}} + \sqrt{\frac{1 - R}{1 + R}} e^{-r_B \hat{\rho}_B^0},$$

where $G = 1/\sqrt{R - \sqrt{R}, r_A}$ and $r_B$ denote the squeezing parameter corresponding to the modes $A$ and $B$, respectively, and $0 < R \leq 1$. We denote the channel corresponding to the experimental implementation of an ideal $\text{SUM}^G$ by $\tilde{\text{SUM}}^{r_{rA},r_B,R}$. Furthermore, by applying the inverse of $\text{SUM}^G$ on the output of $\text{SUM}^{r_{rA},r_B,R}$, we get the following transformation of the mode operators:

$$\hat{x}_1^{\text{out}} = \hat{x}_1^{\text{in}} - \sqrt{\frac{1 - R}{1 + R}} e^{-r_A \hat{x}_A^0},$$

$$\hat{\rho}_1^{\text{out}} = \hat{\rho}_1^{\text{in}} + \sqrt{\frac{1 - R}{R(1 + R)}} e^{-r_B \hat{\rho}_B^0},$$

$$\hat{x}_2^{\text{out}} = \hat{x}_2^{\text{in}} + \sqrt{\frac{1 - R}{R(1 + R)}} e^{-r_A \hat{x}_A^0},$$

$$\hat{\rho}_2^{\text{out}} = \hat{\rho}_2^{\text{in}} + \sqrt{\frac{1 - R}{1 + R}} e^{-r_B \hat{\rho}_B^0}.$$
We denote the channel induced by this overall transformation by \( \Lambda^r_{A,r_B,R} \). Since all the elements involved in the transformation are Gaussian, the channel \( \Lambda^r_{A,r_B,R} \) can be described by its action on the mean vector and covariance matrix of the input state \( \rho^{\text{in}}_{12} \). We now find two \( 4 \times 4 \) real matrices \( X^r_{A,r_B,R} \) and \( Y^r_{A,r_B,R} \), which characterize the Gaussian channel \( \Lambda^r_{A,r_B,R} \) completely (background on Gaussian channels can be found in the supplementary material). From the aforementioned equations, it is clear that the mean vector of \( \rho^{\text{in}}_{12} \) is invariant under the action of the channel \( \Lambda^r_{A,r_B,R} \). Therefore, the scaling matrix \( X^r_{A,r_B,R} = I_4 \), where \( I_4 \) is a four-dimensional identity matrix. Moreover, the noise matrix \( Y^r_{A,r_B,R} \) has the following form:

\[
Y^r_{A,r_B,R} = \begin{bmatrix}
\alpha(r_A) & 0 & -\alpha(r_A) & 0 \\
0 & \alpha(r_A) & 0 & \alpha(r_A) \\
0 & 0 & \beta(r_B) & 0 \\
0 & \beta(r_B) & 0 & \beta(r_B)
\end{bmatrix}
\]

where \( \alpha(r_A) = [(1 - R)e^{-2r_A}]/(1 + R) \), and \( \beta(r_B) = [(1 - R)e^{-2r_B}]/(1 + R) \).

We now prove that the sequence \( \{\text{SUM}^r_{A,r_B,R}\}_{r_A,r_B \in [0,\infty)} \) does not converge uniformly to the ideal SUM\( G \) gate. Let \( |\psi\rangle_{12} = |z\rangle_1 |z\rangle_2 \), where \( |z\rangle \) denotes a single-mode squeezed-vacuum state with the covariance matrix \( V_{|z\rangle} = \text{diag}(z, 1/z, 1/z) \), where \( z \in [0, \infty) \). The covariance matrix of \( \psi_{12} \) is \( V_{\psi_{12}} = \text{diag}(z, 1/z, z, 1/z) \), and its mean vector is \( \mu_{\psi_{12}} = (0, 0, 0, 0)^T \). Under the action of \( \Lambda^r_{A,r_B,R} \), the covariance matrix \( V_{\psi_{12}} \) transforms as follows:

\[
V_{\psi_{12}}^\text{out} = \begin{bmatrix}
z + \alpha(r_A) & 0 & -\alpha(r_A) & 0 \\
0 & 1 + \beta(r_B) & 0 & 0 \\
-\alpha(r_A)/\sqrt{R} & 0 & z + \alpha(r_A) & 0 \\
0 & \beta(r_B)/\sqrt{R} & 0 & 1 + \beta(r_B)
\end{bmatrix}
\]

We now use these expressions in the Uhlmann fidelity formula for two-mode Gaussian states [54]. By using the unitary invariance of fidelity, we find that

\[
F(\text{SUM}^G_{\psi_{12}}, \text{SUM}^r_{A,r_B,R}(\psi_{12})) = F(\psi_{12}, \Lambda^r_{A,r_B,R}(\psi_{12})).
\]

Moreover, we find that [50]

\[
F(\psi_{12}, \Lambda^r_{A,r_B,R}(\psi_{12})) = \frac{2\sqrt{R}}{\sqrt{(2\sqrt{R} + (1 - R)e^{-2r_A}) (2\sqrt{R} + (1 - R)e^{-2r_B})}}.
\]

Therefore, for fixed \( r_A, r_B \)

\[
\lim_{z \to 0} F(\text{SUM}^G_{\psi_{12}}, \text{SUM}^r_{A,r_B,R}(\psi_{12})) = 0,
\]

which implies that the sequence \( \{\text{SUM}^r_{A,r_B,R}\}_{r_A,r_B \in [0,\infty)} \) does not converge uniformly to the ideal SUM\( G \) gate.
SIMULATE A DISPLACEMENT OPERATOR IS IMPORTANT FOR SEVERAL PRAGMATIC APPLICATIONS. IT IS AN OPEN QUESTION TO ESTABLISH ANALYTICAL BOUNDS TO QUANTIFY THE PERFORMANCE OF THESE EXPERIMENTAL APPROXIMATIONS OF A SUM GATE WITH RESPECT TO AN ENERGY-CONSTRAINED DISTANCE MEASURE.

VI. CONCLUSION

IN THIS PAPER, WE STUDIED DIFFERENT PERFORMANCE METRICS TO ANALYZE HOW WELL AN IDEAL DISPLACEMENT OPERATOR, AN IDEAL SINGLE-MODE SQUEEZER, AND AN IDEAL SUM GATE CAN BE SIMULATED EXPERIMENTALLY. IN PARTICULAR, WE PROVED THAT NONE OF THESE EXPERIMENTAL APPROXIMATIONS CONVERGE UNIFORMLY TO THE IDEAL GAUSSIAN PROCESSES. RATHER, CONVERGENCE OCCURS IN THE STRONG SENSE.

WE ALSO DISCUSSED THE NOTION OF UNIFORM CONVERGENCE ON THE SET OF DENSITY OPERATORS WHOSE MARGINALS ON THE CHANNEL INPUT HAVE BOUNDED ENERGY, WHICH IS THE MOST RELEVANT FROM AN EXPERIMENTAL PERSPECTIVE, GIVEN THAT EXPERIMENTS ARE GENERALLY ENERGY SENSITIVE. IN PARTICULAR, WE REDUCED THE PROBLEM OF DISTINGUISHING AN IDEAL DISPLACEMENT OPERATOR FROM ITS EXPERIMENTAL APPROXIMATION TO THE PROBLEM OF DISTINGUISHING A PURE-LOSS CHANNEL FROM AN IDEAL CHANNEL. WE PROVIDED AN ANALYTIC EXPRESSION FOR THE ENERGY-CONSTRAINED SINE DISTANCE BETWEEN AN IDEAL DISPLACEMENT UNITARY AND ITS APPROXIMATION IN TERMS OF EXPERIMENTAL PARAMETERS, BY USING THE RESULT OF [31]. THIS BOUND COULD BE USED TO DETERMINE THE REQUIREMENTS NEEDED TO IMPLEMENT A DISPLACEMENT OPERATOR TO ANY DESIRED ACCURACY. THE DISPLACEMENT OPERATOR IS UBQUITOUS IN QUANTUM OPTICS AND PLAYS A CRITICAL ROLE IN CV QUANTUM TELEPORTATION, CV QUANTUM ERROR CORRECTION AND QUANTUM COMPUTATION, AND QUANTUM METROLOGY. THEREFORE, QUANTIFICATION OF THE ACCURACY IN SIMULATING A DISPLACEMENT OPERATOR IS IMPORTANT FOR SEVERAL PRACTICAL APPLICATIONS.

SIMILARLY, WE DISCUSSED THE NOTION OF UNIFORM CONVERGENCE ON THE SET OF DENSITY OPERATORS WHOSE MARGINALS ON THE CHANNEL INPUT HAVE BOUNDED ENERGY FOR EXPERIMENTAL APPROXIMATIONS OF BOTH SINGLE-MODE SQUEEZING UNITARY AND SUM GATE. WE CONSIDERED SEVERAL EXPERIMENTALLY RELEVANT INPUT QUANTUM STATES AND STUDIED HOW CLOSE THESE EXPERIMENTAL APPROXIMATIONS ARE TO THE IDEAL QUANTUM PROCESSES. IT IS AN INTERESTING OPEN QUESTION TO DETERMINE THE OPTIMAL VALUE OF ENERGY-CONSTRAINED DISTANCE MEASURES AND THE CORRESPONDING OPTIMAL STATE TO COMPLETELY CHARACTERIZE THESE EXPERIMENTAL APPROXIMATIONS OF THE IDEAL QUANTUM PROCESSES.

IN THIS PAPER, HOMODYNE MEASUREMENTS INVOLVED IN SIMULATING A SINGLE-MODE SQUEEZER AND A SUM GATE WERE CONSIDERED IDEAL. WE EXPECT THAT THE WELL-KNOWN EXPERIMENTAL APPROXIMATION OF HOMODYNE DETECTION CONVERGES STRONGLY TO IDEAL HOMODYNE DETECTION, BASED ON THE CALCULATION OF [55, APPENDIX K], AND WE ALSO EXPECT THAT THE EXPERIMENTAL APPROXIMATION WILL NOT CONVERGE UNIFORMLY. HOWEVER, IT IS AN OPEN QUESTION TO DETERMINE THE OPTIMAL VALUE OF ENERGY-CONSTRAINED DISTANCE MEASURES AND CORRESPONDING OPTIMAL STATES WHEN HOMODYNE MEASUREMENTS INVOLVED IN THESE SIMULATIONS ARE NOT IDEAL. ANOTHER INTERESTING DIRECTION IS TO USE THESE RESULTS TO STUDY THE ERROR PROPAGATION IN AN EXPERIMENT BASED ON QUANTUM OPTICAL ELEMENTS. WE LEAVE THIS FOR FUTURE WORK.
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Supplementary material

Appendix A: Preliminaries

We begin by reviewing some definitions and prior results relevant for the rest of the supplementary material. We point readers to [16, 56] for background.

### Gaussian states and channels

Let \( \mathcal{H} \) denote an infinite-dimensional, separable Hilbert space. Let \( \mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}) \) denote the set of trace-class operators, i.e., all operators \( M \) with finite trace norm: \( \|M\|_1 \equiv \text{Tr}\{\sqrt{M^TM}\} < \infty \). Let \( \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) \) denote the set of density operators acting on \( \mathcal{H} \), i.e., those that are positive semi-definite with unit trace. The continuous-variable system of interest in this work is \( n \) quantized modes of the electromagnetic field. Any physical state of \( n \) bosonic modes can be described by density operators acting on a tensor-product Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H}^{\otimes n} = \otimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i \), where \( \mathcal{H}_i \) is the Hilbert space corresponding to the \( i \)th mode. Let \( \hat{x}_i \) and \( \hat{p}_i \) denote the respective position- and momentum-quadrature operators of the \( i \)th mode. Let \( \hat{r} \equiv (\hat{x}_1, \hat{p}_1, \ldots, \hat{x}_n, \hat{p}_n)^T \). Then the following commutation relation holds:

\[
[\hat{r}, \hat{p}^T] = i\Omega ,
\]

where \( \Omega = \bigoplus_{i=1}^n \Omega_0 \), and \( \Omega_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \). Furthermore, we take the annihilation operator for the \( i \)th mode as \( \hat{a}_i = (\hat{x}_i + \hat{p}_i)/\sqrt{2} \).

For \( r \in \mathbb{R}^{2n} \), we define the unitary displacement operator \( D(r) \equiv \exp(i r^T \Omega \hat{r}) \). Moreover, the set \( \{D(r)\}_r \) forms an orthogonal complete set on the space of operators acting on the Hilbert space \( L^2(\mathbb{R}^n) \) of square integrable functions, in the sense that \( \text{Tr}\{D(r)D(-r')\} = (2\pi)^n \delta^{2n}(r-r') \). Therefore, any quantum state \( \rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) \) can be represented as follows:

\[
\rho = \frac{1}{(2\pi)^n} \int d^{2n}r \, \chi_\rho(r)D(r) ,
\]

where \( \chi_\rho(r) \equiv \text{Tr}\{D(-r)\rho\} \) is the Wigner characteristic function of the state \( \rho \). Moreover, a quantum state \( \rho \) is Gaussian if its characteristic function has the following form:

\[
\chi_\rho(r) = \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4} r^T \Omega^T V_\rho \Omega r + i r^T \Omega^T \mu_\rho \right) ,
\]

where \( \mu_\rho \equiv \langle \hat{r} \rangle_\rho \) is the mean vector of \( \rho \) and \( V_\rho \equiv \langle \{(\hat{r} - \mu_\rho), (\hat{r} - \mu_\rho)^T\}\rangle_\rho \) is the covariance matrix.

Quantum channels that take any Gaussian input state to another Gaussian state are called quantum Gaussian channels. Let \( \rho \) be an input state with the characteristic function \( \chi_\rho(r) \). Then under the action of a Gaussian channel \( \mathcal{N} \) from \( n \) modes to \( m \) modes, \( \chi_\rho(r) \) transforms as follows:

\[
\chi_\rho(r) \rightarrow \chi_{\mathcal{N}(\rho)}(r) = \chi_\rho\left(\Omega^T X^T \Omega r\right) \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4} r^T \Omega^T Y \Omega r + i r^T \Omega^T d\right) ,
\]

where \( X \) is a real \( 2m \times 2n \) matrix, \( Y \) is a real \( 2m \times 2m \) positive semi-definite symmetric matrix, and \( d \in \mathbb{R}^{2m} \), such that they satisfy the following condition for \( \mathcal{N} \) to be a physical channel:

\[
Y + i\Omega - iX\Omega X^T \geq 0 .
\]

Furthermore, since a Gaussian state \( \rho \) can be completely characterized by its mean vector \( \mu_\rho \) and covariance matrix \( V_\rho \), the action of a Gaussian channel on \( \rho \) can be described as follows

\[
\mu_\rho \rightarrow X\mu_\rho + d ,
\]

\[
V_\rho \rightarrow XV_\rho X^T + Y .
\]

Let \( Y = 0 \). Then from (A5) we get \( X\Omega X^T = \Omega \), which further implies that \( X \) is an element of the real symplectic group \( Sp(2n, \mathbb{R}) \). The symplectic group is a set of transformations that preserve the anti-symmetric form \( \Omega \) when
acting by congruence, i.e., \( S\Omega S^T = \Omega, \forall S \in Sp(2n, \mathbb{R}) \). Therefore, the group of Gaussian unitaries is identified with \( Sp(2n, \mathbb{R}) \).

Let \( \rho \) be an \( n \)-mode Gaussian quantum state with the mean vector \( \mu_\rho \) and the covariance matrix \( V_\rho \). The Wigner function of \( \rho \) is given by

\[
W(r) = \frac{2^n}{\pi^n \sqrt{\det(V_\rho)}} \exp\left[-(r - \mu_\rho)^T V_\rho^{-1} (r - \mu_\rho)\right].
\] (A7)

Gaussian state transformations can also be described in the phase-space formalism. In particular, the action of a symplectic transformation \( S \) on a Gaussian state is given by

\[
W(r) \rightarrow W(S^{-1} r).
\] (A8)

Moreover, the Wigner function of a Gaussian input state transforms under a linear displacement \( D(\bar{r}) \rho D(\bar{r})^\dagger \) as

\[
W(r) \rightarrow W_G(r - \bar{r})
\] (A9)

A coherent state \( |\alpha\rangle \) is an eigenvector of the annihilation operation \( \hat{a} \) with eigenvalue \( \alpha \), i.e., \( \hat{a} |\alpha\rangle = \alpha |\alpha\rangle \). The coherent state \( |\alpha\rangle \) can also be represented as \( |\alpha\rangle = D(\alpha) |0\rangle \) and \( |\beta\rangle \) is given by

\[
\langle \beta | \alpha \rangle = \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} |\alpha - \beta|^2 \right) \exp \left[\frac{1}{2} (\alpha \beta^* - \alpha^* \beta) \right].
\] (A10)

A single-mode thermal state with mean photon number \( \bar{n} = 1/(e^{\beta \omega} - 1) \) has the following representation in the photon number basis:

\[
\theta(\bar{n}) = \frac{1}{1 + \bar{n}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{\bar{n}}{n+1} \right)^n |n\rangle \langle n|.
\] (A11)

In our paper, we employ the two-mode squeezed vacuum state with parameter \( \tilde{n} \), which is equivalent to a purification of the thermal state in (A11) and is defined as

\[
|\psi_{TMS}(\tilde{n})\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\tilde{n} + 1}} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{ \left( \frac{\tilde{n}}{n + 1} \right)^n } |n\rangle_R |n\rangle_A .
\] (A12)

**Quantum pure-loss channel.** A quantum pure-loss channel is a Gaussian channel that can be characterized by a beamsplitter of transmissivity \( \eta \in (0, 1) \), coupling the signal input state with the vacuum state, and followed by a partial trace over the environment. In the Heisenberg picture, the beamsplitter transformation is given by the following Bogoliubov transformation:

\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{b} &= \sqrt{\eta} \hat{a} + \sqrt{1 - \eta} \hat{e}, \\
\hat{e}' &= -\sqrt{1 - \eta} \hat{a} + \sqrt{\eta} \hat{e},
\end{align*}
\] (A13, A14)

where \( \hat{a}, \hat{b}, \hat{e}, \) and \( \hat{e}' \) are the annihilation operators representing the sender’s input mode, the receiver’s output mode, an environmental input mode, and an environmental output mode of the channel, respectively.

**Topologies of convergence** Uniform and strong convergence in the context of infinite-dimensional quantum channels were studied in [22]. A connection between the notion of strong convergence and the notion of uniform convergence over energy-bounded states was established in [23]. Later, these different topologies of convergence were studied in the context of linear bosonic channels and Gaussian dilatable channels in [28]. Furthermore, topologies of convergence in the context of teleportation simulation of physically relevant phase-insensitive bosonic Gaussian channels have been investigated in [29].
Appendix B: Convergence of the experimental implementation of a displacement operator

In this section, we provide a detailed proof of the convergence of the experimental implementation of a displacement operator from \(\text{[13]}\) to the ideal displacement operator.

We begin by showing that the channel corresponding to the experimental implementation of a displacement operator is equivalent to a pure-loss channel followed by the ideal displacement operator. Consider that

\[
(\text{Tr}_B \circ B^\eta_{AB})(\rho_A \otimes |\beta\rangle \langle \beta|_B) = (\text{Tr}_B \circ B^\eta_{AB} \circ D^\beta_B)(\rho_A \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_B)
\]

\[
= (\text{Tr}_B \circ [D^\sqrt{1-\eta^2} \otimes D^\eta_B \circ B^\eta_{AB}](\rho_A \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_B)
\]

\[
= (\text{Tr}_B \circ D^\sqrt{1-\eta^2} \circ B^\eta_{AB})(\rho_A \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_B)
\]

\[
= (D^\sqrt{1-\eta^2} \circ \text{Tr}_B \circ B^\eta_{AB})(\rho_A \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_B)
\]

\[
= (D^\sqrt{1-\eta^2}_A \circ \mathcal{L}_A^\eta)(\rho_A).
\]

The first equality follows from the definition of a coherent state. The second equality follows from the following covariance of the beamsplitter unitary with respect to displacement operators \([16]\):

\[
B^\eta_{AB} \circ D^\beta_B = [D^\sqrt{1-\eta^2}_A \otimes D^\eta_B] \circ B^\eta_{AB}.
\]

The third equality follows from the cyclicity of partial trace. In the final equality we defined the pure-loss channel as \(\mathcal{L}_A^\eta(\rho_A) = (\text{Tr}_B \circ B^\eta_{AB})(\rho_A \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_B)\).

Let \(\psi_{RA}\) be an arbitrary two-mode state. To compute the fidelity between the ideal displacement operator and its experimental approximation, consider that

\[
F(D^\alpha_A(\psi_{RA}), (D^\alpha_A \circ \mathcal{L}_A^\eta)(\psi_{RA})) = F(\psi_{RA}, \mathcal{L}_A^\eta(\psi_{RA})),
\]

where we employed the unitary invariance of the fidelity.

Let \(|\delta\rangle\) be a coherent state. Then \(|\delta\rangle\) transforms under the pure-loss channel \(\mathcal{L}_A^\eta\) to \(|\eta \delta\rangle\). Therefore, by using \([A10]\), we get

\[
F(\psi_{RA}, \mathcal{L}_A^\eta) = \exp \left[ -|\delta|^2(1-\eta)^2 \right],
\]

which converges to zero as \(|\delta|^2 \to \infty\), and in turn implies that the sequence \(\{\tilde{D}^\eta_{\sqrt{1-\eta}}\}_{\eta \in [0,1]}\) does not converge uniformly to the ideal displacement channel \(D^\alpha\).

We now show that convergence occurs in the strong sense. Let \(\rho_A\) denote the input state. Let \(\chi_{\rho_A}(x, p)\) denote the Wigner characteristic function of the state \(\rho_A\). Then from \([A4]\), the Wigner characteristic function of the output of an ideal displacement channel is given by

\[
\chi_{D^\alpha(\rho_A)}(x, p) = \chi_{\rho_A}(x, p) \exp \left[ i \sqrt{2} (p \text{Re}(\alpha) - x \text{Im}(\alpha)) \right].
\]

We now find \(X, Y\) matrices and \(d\) vector corresponding to the Gaussian channel \(\tilde{D}^\eta_{\sqrt{1-\eta}}\). By using \([B5]\), we get \(X = \text{diag}(\sqrt{\eta}, \sqrt{\eta}), Y = \text{diag}(1 - \eta, 1 - \eta)\), and \(d = (\sqrt{2} \text{Re}(\alpha), \sqrt{2} \text{Im}(\alpha))^T\). Let \(\rho_{\text{out}}^A = \tilde{D}^\eta_{\sqrt{1-\eta}}(\rho_A)\). Then from \([A4]\), the Wigner characteristic function of \(\rho_{\text{out}}^A\) is given by

\[
\chi_{\rho_{\text{out}}^A}(x, p) = \chi_{\rho_A}(\sqrt{\eta} x, \sqrt{\eta} p) \exp \left[ i \sqrt{2} (p \text{Re}(\alpha) - x \text{Im}(\alpha)) - (1/4)(x^2 + p^2)(1-\eta) \right].
\]

Therefore, for each \(\rho_A \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A)\), and for all \(x, p \in \mathbb{R}\)

\[
\lim_{\eta \to 1} \chi_{\rho_{\text{out}}^A}(x, p) = \chi_{D^\alpha(\rho_A)}(x, p),
\]

which implies that the sequence \(\{\tilde{D}^\eta_{\sqrt{1-\eta}}\}_{\eta \in [0,1]}\) converges to \(D^\alpha\) in the strong sense \([28]\,\text{Lemma 8.}\)

We now discuss the notion of uniform convergence on the set density operators whose marginals on the channel input have bounded energy for experimental approximations of a tensor product of ideal displacement channels. Let
Consider the following chain of inequalities:

\[
\frac{1}{2} \left\| \bigotimes_{i=1}^{K} D^{\alpha_i} \right\| \left( \psi_{RAK} \right) - \left( \bigotimes_{i=1}^{K} \tilde{D}^{\eta_i, \alpha_i/\sqrt{1-\eta_i}} \right) \left( \psi_{RAK} \right) \right\|_1 \leq \sum_{i=1}^{K} C \left( \mathcal{E}_{\mathcal{A}_i}^{\eta_i}(\psi_{RA_i}), \mathcal{I}_{\mathcal{A}_i}(\psi_{RA_i}) \right)
\]

\[
\leq \max_{\{E_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{E}}} \sum_{i=1}^{K} \sqrt{1 - \left( (1 - \{E_i\}) \sqrt{\eta_i^{E_i]} + \{E_i\} \sqrt{\eta_i^{E_i]} \right)^2}.
\]

The first inequality follows from (3) and [29, Proposition 1]. The last inequality follows from the recent result of [31], and due to the maximization over a set of energy values satisfying the input energy constraint. Since the chain of inequalities is true for all input states satisfying the input energy constraint, the following holds

\[
\frac{1}{2} \left\| \bigotimes_{i=1}^{K} D^{\alpha_i} - \bigotimes_{i=1}^{K} \tilde{D}^{\eta_i, \alpha_i/\sqrt{1-\eta_i}} \right\|_{\mathcal{E}_E} \leq \max_{\{E_i\}_{i \in \mathbb{E}}} \sum_{i=1}^{K} \sqrt{1 - \left( (1 - \{E_i\}) \sqrt{\eta_i^{E_i]} + \{E_i\} \sqrt{\eta_i^{E_i]} \right)^2}.
\]

Therefore, \( \bigotimes_{i=1}^{K} \tilde{D}^{\eta_i, \alpha_i/\sqrt{1-\eta_i}]_{\eta_1, \ldots, \eta_K \in [0,1]} \) converges uniformly to \( \bigotimes_{i=1}^{K} D^{\alpha_i} \) on the set of density operators whose marginals on the channel input have bounded energy.