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Abstract

Quantum Illumination is a protocol that allows detecting of an object using the entanglement even in the noisy and lossy environment, or rather with the significant post-entanglement correlations. On the other hand, there is a natural question of whether we can detect such action of the quantum illumination that tries to detect a target. We assume a detecting system on the target and study if it is possible to discover the quantum illumination measurement and in what conditions. We found that the possibility or the advantage of the detection of the quantum illumination measurement strongly depends on the realization of the quantum illumination protocol.
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1 Introduction

Quantum illumination (QI) is a quantum protocol for detecting and imaging objects in a noisy and lossy environment utilizing quantum entanglement [1]. Within this protocol, two entangled beams denoted as an ancilla and as a signal, are created. The ancilla beam is retained in the system, and the signal beam is sent to the region where the target may present. Then, the joint measurement of ancilla and the reflected signal photons is performed. Quantum illumination is in the spotlight of the current research because it preserves the substantial advantage in the error probability in comparison with classical protocols of the same average photon number. The advantage of quantum illuminations is carried on in such an environment where no entanglement survives at the detector due to strong noise and losses.

Quantum illumination has been intensively studied, and the QI protocol was extended from single photon [1] over multiphoton [2] up to quantum Gaussian states [3]. Quantum illumination was for the first time experimentally realized in [4] and then fully confirmed in [5].

Most of quantum sensing systems are very sensitive of decoherence and, subsequently, their using in the lossy and noisy environment is limited. Therefore, many studies with various application of quantum illumination appeared, e.g., secure quantum communication [6, 7], or for quantum sensing [1, 2, 3, 8, 9, 10].

One of the applications of quantum sensing is a quantum radar where quantum illumination is a very suitable candidate [11, 12] especially if the protocol is extended to the microwave regime [13, 14]. Since one party uses quantum radar, it is a legitimate question whether the other party (target) can detect the using of quantum radar.

The study of the possibility of detection of the quantum illumination is the motivation of this paper. For this purpose, we define the quantum illumination system (QIS), see Fig. 1 down, that uses the quantum illumination measurement to detect the target, and the target detection system (TS), see Fig. 1 up, which tries to detect the signal beam from the QIS. The advantage of quantum illumination is in the correlation of the ancilla and signal beams where the ancilla beam is kept in the QI system and is not available to the target, or, generally, any measurement outside the QIS. Therefore, we lost this significant advantage of strong quantum correlations in the detection at the target. On the other side, the advantage at the target side is higher signal beam detection efficiency, ηT, which represents the losses during the signal beam propagation to the target and the detection efficiency on the target. The detection efficiency at the quantum illumination system, ηR, includes not only losses due to the propagation to/from the target and detector efficiency but also the probability of reflection from the target back to the detector of the quantum illumination system, i.e., ηR ∼ ηT.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. 2 we study the measurement procedure for the quantum illumination and the error probability and in Sec. 3 we introduce the detection of the signal beam at the target, where we present a
quantity that shows for which system (QIS or TS) we need less number of photons for the same accuracy of detection. In Sec. 4 we present the numerical results whose consequences are commented in Sec 5. Finally, the conclusions are in Sec. 6.

2 Quantum Illumination Measurement

In [1] the quantum illumination protocol was presented, and the theoretical limit for detecting was discussed. However, no particular detection scheme was introduced. The search for an optimal detection scheme has been a topic for many papers not only for quantum illumination but also, for example, ghost imaging, sub-shot-noise quantum imaging, etc. For general overview see e.g., [15] or [16].

In this work, we will come out of two possible realizations of QI represented by the single-photon (SP) schema presented in [4, 17] and the second schema using the Gaussian states (GS), particularly the two-mode squeezed state obtained from continuous-wave spontaneous parametric downconversion (SPDC) [3] realized in [5]. The first, the SP schema is more accessible to realize and more corresponds to the real-world requirements on price-performance ratio. However, it does not utilize the full potential of the entanglement as the GS schema based on the homodyne-detection receiver [8]. The main disadvantage of the GS schema using the homodyne detection is the requirement on idler beam storage which storage time is appropriate to the target distance.

In [4, 17], The signal-to-noise ration (SNR) of the QI measurement is based on the covariance measurement between the total photon numbers $N_1$ and $N_2$ of correlated detectors (one measures signal+noise and one ancilla beam, respectively)

$$\text{SNR} = \frac{|\langle S_{in} - S_{out} \rangle|}{\sqrt{\text{var}(S_{in} - S_{out})}},$$

where the covariance reads $\langle S \rangle \equiv \text{cov}(N_1, N_2) = \langle N_1 N_2 \rangle - \langle N_1 \rangle \langle N_2 \rangle$, and the variance of covariance has a form $\langle \delta^2 S \rangle = \langle \delta N_1 \delta N_2 \rangle^2 - \langle \delta N_1 \delta N_2 \rangle^2$. Indexes in and out denote the presence and the absence of the target, respectively.

After application of some algebra and photon statistics, one can get the following result for a very noisy environment

$$\text{SNR} \approx \frac{\sqrt{K \langle \delta N_1 \delta N_2^{(in)} \rangle}}{\sqrt{2 \langle \delta^2 N_1 \rangle \langle \delta^2 N_2 \rangle}},$$

where was assumed the statistical independence of the total number of background photons, $\langle N_b \rangle$, and dropped small contributions. Factor $K$ represents the number of trials.

Homodyne-type detection in [5] is based on the joint-measurement receiver uses a low-gain, $G = 1 + \epsilon^2$, $\epsilon^2 \ll 1$, optical parametric amplifier (OPA) discussed e.g. in [8]. The total signal-to-noise ratio reads

$$\text{SNR} = \frac{4(\hat{N}_1(0) - \hat{N}_1(\pi))^2}{\left(\sqrt{\delta^2 N_1(0)} + \sqrt{\delta^2 N_1(\pi)}\right)^2},$$

where $\hat{N}_1(0)$ and $\hat{N}_1(\pi)$ are the operators for the number of photons in the $0\rightarrow\pi$ and $\pi \rightarrow 0$ states, respectively.
where $N_f(\phi)$ is the mean number of detected photons from OPA, and $\phi$ is the phase of the signal beam. After application of some algebra and photon statistics, one can get the following result

$$\text{SNR} \approx \frac{4\eta_R M|\langle \hat{a}_S(0)\hat{a}_I \rangle - (a_S(\pi)\hat{a}_I)|^2}{\mu_B},$$

(4)

where $\hat{a}_S(\phi)$ is the detected beam mode and $\hat{a}_I$ is the idler mode. The off-diagonal term $\langle a_S(\phi)\hat{a}_I \rangle = e^{i\phi}\sqrt{\mu(\mu+1)}$ is a consequence of the entanglement-specific behaviour. For more detail see [3, 5, 8]. In [4] was assumed the mean number of photons in one mode for signal $\mu \ll 1$, and for a number of background photons are $\mu_B \gg 1$.

The principal difference between the SP and GS methods can be imagined as easily as follow. In the SP approach, we generate using the SPDC two beam pulses (the ancilla and the signal) including $M$ modes each with $\mu$ photons, where the signal beam pulse is sent towards the target and back to the detector. This is repeated $K$-times until the required precision is reached. On the other hand, in the GS approach, two beam pulses are also generated using the SPDC. However, each includes only one mode with $\mu$ photons. Here, the measurement takes time $T$ which with the phase-matching bandwidth $W$ gives the number of created modes $M = WT$ in the continuous regime. The experiment time $T$ is as long as we reach the required precision. More details can be found, e.g., in [2].

From SNR, for equally-likely hypotheses, we can get the error detection probability as

$$P_{err} = \frac{1}{2}\text{erfc}\left(\sqrt{\frac{\text{SNR}}{8}}\right).$$

(5)

3 Detection of Quantum Illumination Measurement

The detection of a quantum illumination measurement is, generally, a challenge. The power of QI measurement is arising from the post-entanglement correlation between the ancilla and signal beams. In the target or wherever outside of the quantum illumination system, we have potentially access only to the signal beam. However, the advantage is a lower loss of the signal photons. If we assume the detection of QI measurement at the target, we have a photon loss coming from the attenuation during the propagation towards the target, $\mu_T$. On the other hand, the QI measurement accumulates other losses such as the attenuation during the propagation back to the QI system and the reflectivity of the target exactly back to the detector of QIS, $\mu_R$. In reality, there are many more factors, such as detection of the signal photons at the same frequency, i.e., the same modes; parameters and the size of detectors, etc. In this work, we assume the ideal case, where the detector on the target detects the same modes as are used by the QIS; also we presume the same parameters of the detectors at both sides. Note, the goal of this report is not to find the best protocol of detection of the QI measurement but instead study its possibility.

Our approach to the measurement is based on the direct measurement (DR) of the beam. Our starting point will be the Eq. [1], where $\langle S_{in} \rangle$ corresponds to the beam + background photons, whereas $\langle S_{out} \rangle$ includes the background photons only, i.e.,

$$\langle S_{in} \rangle = \langle N_S \rangle + \langle N_B \rangle, \quad \langle S_{out} \rangle = \langle N_B \rangle.$$  

(6)

Nevertheless, this simple approach assumes that it is possible to detect the mean number of background photons separately. If this condition could not be fulfilled, the previous assumed direct measurement based on direct discrimination is not possible to use. In such a case, the usual way is to use some kind of correlation. Because the QI schemas exhibit the best performance for the mean number of photons smaller than one, $\mu \ll 1$, one could assume to measure the anti-bunching effect using the HBT correlations. However, to the author is not known any measurement protocol that would be able to do this measurement with the background at correlated detectors.

Now, we are going to study the advantage/disadvantage of the direct measurement in comparison with the QI measurement methods. Assuming $\mu \ll 1$, the ratio of SP-to-DR SNR reads

$$\frac{\text{SNR}_{SP}}{\text{SNR}_{DR}} = \frac{\sqrt{\eta_A}}{\sqrt{M\mu}},$$

(7)

where $M$ denotes the number of modes, and $\eta_A$ losses on the ancilla beam. Eq. [7] shows independence on the background and advantage of SP method only for small total number of the signal photons, $M\mu \ll 1$. This ratio is visualized in Fig. [2] for more realistic calculation of SNR including imperfections of storing/transmitting ancilla beam and 50% efficiency of detectors.

For the GS QI method, assuming $\mu_B \gg 1$, we have the ratio of SNRs as

$$\frac{\text{SNR}_{GS}}{\text{SNR}_{DR}} \approx 32\eta_A\sqrt{M}.$$  

(8)
In (8) we can see the direct advantage of GS method of QI over the direct measurement as strong as high is \( M \). This is confirmed in Fig. 3 with a more realistic calculation. Note, with the increasing number of background photons, \( \mu_B \), also increases the ratio \( \text{SNR}_{GS}/\text{SNR}_{DR} \).

However, greater informative value has the real number of photons needed to reach the same precision of the target/QIS detection. The possible orders of magnitude of difference in the required signal photon numbers can lead to a significant time advantage. Therefore, within this report, we will investigate the advantage or disadvantage of QI measurement over its detection in the form of how many detected photons are required to reach the same probability of detection on both sides. For this reason, we introduce a photon number ratio

\[
R_M = \frac{n_T}{n_R}
\]

where \( T \) denotes target and \( R \) the QI system, respectively. The photon number \( n_t \) corresponds to the number of modes necessary to reach a certain probability in case of GS approach, or the number of trials in the case of SP approach, or generally to the number of photon pulses. It can be obtained from Eq. (5), where we seek such \( K \) in (2) (for SP) or \( M \) in (3) (for GS) and (7) to get the required \( P_{\text{err}} \). In this work, we used a threshold of \( 2\sigma \) (95.45%) for the detection in the target system as well as in the QI system.

The ratio \( R_M \) says how many times more photons we need to detect on the target system in comparison with the QI system. We highlight three regimes, first regime, \( R_M < 1 \), means that the presence of some QI system will be detected on the target system before the QI system discover the target. Second region, \( R_M > 1 \), corresponds to the situation when the presence of QI measurement will discover the target before the target notice the QIS presence. The last region is for \( R_M \gg 1 \), where it is very difficult or practically impossible to detect the QI measurement at the target.
4 Results

The first result, presented in Fig. 4, shows the ratio $R_M$ for the SP realization of QI as a function of the total number of signal photons $\langle N_S \rangle = M \mu$ and the ratio $\eta_R/\eta_T$. Variables $\eta_R$ and $\eta_T$ represents all losses, i.e., attenuation during the propagation, reflection, detector loss, etc. For the calculation in Fig. 4 we used the following values, $\mu = 0.00001$, $\eta_T = 0.0001$, $M = 100$, $\eta_D = 0.5$, and $\eta_A = 0.8$. The black line in Fig. 4 visualizes the situation for $R_M = 1$, i.e., both, the target system and the QI system, need the same amount of photon pulses for the required detection probability.

Fig. 4 shows that the direct detection at the target would have a substantial advance in the detection of the SP quantum illumination system before itself would be detected. Assuming the same background at the QI system and the target system, we found negligible dependence on the number of background photons that can be neglected. In the case of the different backgrounds, we have approximately $R_M \rightarrow R_M (\langle N_{B_{\text{radar}} \text{target}} \rangle / \langle N_{B_{\text{radar}}} \rangle)$, where $\langle N_B \rangle$ is the total number of background photons in all modes.
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Figure 4: Ratio $R_M$ as a function of the number of signal photons $\langle N_S \rangle$ and the ratio $\eta_R/\eta_T$ for $\eta_T = 0.0001, M = 100$. The black line visualizes the situation for $R_M = 1$.

In Fig. 5 we show the $R_M$ ratio for the GS realization of QI as function of the ratio $\eta_R/\eta_T$ and number of background photons. This figure demonstrate the significant advantage of the QI system fully utilizing the entanglement even in the significantly worse conditions ($\mu_R \ll \mu_T$) in comparison with the direct measurement at the target system. In the case of different number of background photons at the target and in QI system, we get a relation $R_M \rightarrow R_M (\mu_{B_{\text{target}}} \langle N_{B_{\text{target}}} \rangle) / \mu_{B_{\text{target}}}$ for $\epsilon^2 \mu_B \ll 1$ and $R_M \rightarrow R_M (\mu_{B_{\text{target}}} \langle N_{B_{\text{target}}} \rangle) / \mu_{B_{\text{target}}}$ for $\epsilon^2 \mu_B \gg 1$, where $\epsilon^2$ is a parameter of the OPA.
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Figure 5: Ratio $R_M$ as a function of the number of background photons $N_B$ and the ratio $\eta_R/\eta_T$ for $\eta_T = 0.0001$. The black line visualizes the situation for $R_M = 1$.

In the case of different number of background photons at the target and in QI system, we get a relation $R_M \rightarrow R_M (\mu_{B_{\text{target}}} \langle N_{B_{\text{target}}} \rangle) / \mu_{B_{\text{target}}}$ for $\epsilon^2 \mu_B \ll 1$ and $R_M \rightarrow R_M (\mu_{B_{\text{target}}} \langle N_{B_{\text{target}}} \rangle) / \mu_{B_{\text{target}}}$ for $\epsilon^2 \mu_B \gg 1$, where $\epsilon^2$ is a parameter of the OPA.
From the form of the $SNR_{QI}/SNR_{DR}$ also follows that for the SP approach the $R_M$ does not depend on the required precision, or equivalently on $P_{err}$. Nevertheless, for the GS approach, such a statement is not valid. Generally, the $R_M$ ratio decreases with the lower required precision.

5 Discussion

The possibility of detection of the quantum illumination measurement strongly depends on the used QI measurement schema. Generally, in case of the SP schema of QI system, it could be simple to detect the QI system at the target, probably before the target itself would be exposed. On the other hand, the detection of the QI using the GS schema would be very difficult if even possible.

Particularly, the SP schema yet in the ratio of QI and target SNR’s rate, see in Fig.2 showed that it would have the advantage only for $\langle N_S \rangle = M \mu < 1$. However, even a very small number of signal photons in combination with $\eta_R/\eta_T \ll 1$ does not give an advantage for QI system in comparison with the direct measurement at the target. On the contrary, the target can detect the QI measurement in advance and does some counteraction, such as change of the trajectory.

The GS schema is the demonstration of the entanglement strength, however technically difficult due to the requirement of the simultaneous detection of the signal and the ancilla beam. In Fig.3 we can see the high advantage of GS QI system in SNR over the direct measurement and the advantage increases with the stronger background. Moreover, the ratio $SNR_{GS}/SNR_{DR} \approx \sqrt{M}$ and the fact that we need high $M$ to have the required precision of the detection gives a clue that in terms of $R_M$ the QI system will be in a huge advantage over the direct measurement at the target. This is confirmed in Fig. 5, where we extended the $\eta_R/\eta_T$ ratio to see if there can be some advantage for the target (only for $\eta_R/\eta_T \ll 1$ and $\mu_B \lesssim 1$).

Useful is also the study of the asymmetric background at QI and target systems. The typical schema of the quantum radar procedure could be to activate some jamming system, that could masquerade the measurement of the QI system. This is more significant in the GS realisation where the ten-times higher background leads to the 100-times higher requirement of the photons needed for the required precision at the target system.

Nevertheless, we studied only the very essence of the quantum illumination principle. There are many more questions and challenges at the technical level. For example, the target system needs to know which frequencies (which modes) are used for the signal beam, otherwise will need to spend time on the scanning of more frequencies. This can be especially difficult in the application at radio frequencies, particularly at microwave frequencies bands with increasing spectrum demand and using [18]. The significant role will also play the detectors on both sides, their efficiency, size, operating parameters, etc. All these factors were not assumed in this study and require a more detailed review, especially the detection strategy in the environment with more source of different background and noise photons.

6 Conclusions

In this report, we studied the possibility of the detection of QI measurement that tries to detect a target. We assumed a detection system at the target for discovery the signal beam from the QI system using the direct measurement. Such a study is intriguing since one can use the quantum illumination as a quantum radar, then its detection at the target can work as a quantum radar warning receiver (QRWR).

For our study, we assumed a simple background, the same detector performance at both sides and focused only on the principal possibility of the detection of each other in the configuration QI system - target system. For the QI system, we assumed two possible realizations, the single-photon (SP) approach using simple post-measurement correlations. The second approach is based on the Gaussian states (GS) realized by the two-mode squeezing states and homodyne detection receiver which utilizes the full entanglement advantage.

We found a very good chance to detect the presence of the QI measurement in the case of the SP method for QI, even with high probability that the QI system could be discovered before the target itself will be exposed. This gives to the target time for some counter action such as the change of trajectory.

In the case of the GS approach for the QI, the question now is not about how much in advance the target will detect the QI system before itself will be discovered, but if even the QI system presence will be detected. GS method is an example of the direct utilization of the quantum entanglement which gives a considerable advantage. Nevertheless, this method has a substantial restriction in the precedent knowledge of the target for the simultaneous joint measurement of the signal and ancilla beams.

Moreover, because of two measurements at different locations, we also discussed the case of asymmetric background, i.e., different background at QI and the target system, respectively.
In this report, we discovered that it is principally possible to detect the signal beam on the target system and we studied its behavior as a variety of different parameters. However, the conclusion, if it is realistic to detect the signal beam on the target system or not, will depend on the future studies of realistic background and $\eta_R, \eta_T$ parameters which includes the detection efficiency, attenuation during the propagation, i.e., they will depend on the distance of the target-QI systems, and the reflectivity of the signal photons from the target.
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