Multiple photon subtraction from Gaussian states cannot produce arbitrary non-Gaussian quantum states of light
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Gaussian states and measurements collectively are not powerful-enough resources for quantum computing, as any Gaussian dynamics can be simulated efficiently, classically. Photon subtraction from squeezed vacuum—a single-mode Gaussian state in quantum optics—can produce a cat state, a macroscopic superposition of two coherent states. Furthermore, it is known that any one non-Gaussian Hamiltonian, along with Gaussian unitaries, makes for universal quantum resources. Photon subtraction therefore, has been a popular tool to try and engineer non-Gaussian states for universal quantum processing. In this paper, we show that photon subtraction on multi-mode entangled Gaussian states cannot produce arbitrary non-Gaussian quantum states. We show this by considering a specific N-mode entangled non-Gaussian state—a coherent cat-basis cluster state (CCCS), a resource sufficient for universal quantum computing—and proving that the fidelity between the state produced by photon subtraction on a Gaussian state and the CCCS is bounded above by 1/2^N. At the same time, we prove that photon subtraction can be used to prepare states whose fidelity with coherent GHZ states is very close to one.

Introduction. Production of non-Gaussian quantum states of light, and all-optical realization of non-Gaussian quantum unitary operations, are critical for most applications of photonic quantum information processing, e.g., universal photonic quantum computation [1], quantum-enhanced receivers for optical communications [2], all-optical quantum repeaters for long-distance entanglement distribution [3, 4], and quantum-enhanced optical sensing [5–9].

Gaussian states and Gaussian unitaries, produced by the action linear and quadratic Hamiltonians on the vacuum state, have efficient and complete mathematical representations [10–12]. Non-Gaussian states is a vast set—it consists of states generated via the action of a unitary with Hamiltonian that is a third or higher-order polynomial in the field operators on the multi-mode vacuum state. Therefore, non-Gaussian states are inherently under-explored.

Deterministic realization of non-Gaussian unitary operations, such as the self-Kerr gate [13, 14] and the cubic-phase gate [15] is near impossible at optical frequencies [16]. The extreme resource inefficiency resulting from this deficiency, combined with the fact that Gaussian states and Gaussian unitaries are a classically-simulable resource [17], have kept all-photonic quantum computing from being pursued as one of the top contenders for quantum computing, despite their obvious importance in optical communications and sensing applications and not requiring quantum transduction for networking far-flung quantum processors—a major benefit unique to photonic quantum encodings.

Recent advances in discrete variable (DV), i.e., single-photon-qubit based, quantum computing [13] have revealed that deterministic production of even small non-Gaussian resource states (e.g., a 3-photon-entangled GHZ state) can enable resource-efficient universal photonic quantum computing, despite two-qubit gates being inherently probabilistic [1, 18]. However, a systematic understanding of the resource-optimal production of even such simple non-Gaussian states as GHZ states and realization of simple two-qubit non-Gaussian measurements (e.g., Bell-state measurements) required for DV quantum computing has proven extremely difficult [19].

A major attraction of continuous variable (CV) quantum computing [15] is that large Gaussian entangled (cluster) states can be produced experimentally in a one-shot deterministic fashion [20, 21]. Since Gaussian states are not universal [17], one needs a non-Gaussian operation to enable universal quantum computing [22]. Experimentally, the most readily-available non-Gaussian resource is photon number resolving (PNR) detection [23]. One common modality in which a PNR detector can be used to probabilistically engineer non-Gaussian states is photon subtraction. Photon subtraction from multi-mode fields has been achieved experimentally [24, 26] and
A Gaussian unitary $\hat{U}$ acting on the $N$-mode vacuum state to produce the most general $N$-mode Gaussian state $|\Psi\rangle$ with zero displacements. We consider $m_i$ photons subtraction from the $i$-th mode of $|\Psi\rangle$ using a beam-splitter of transmissivity $\tau_i$, for all $i \in \{1, \ldots, N\}$, producing a non-Gaussian state $|\Psi_{\tau,-\mathbf{m}}\rangle$. We show that $|\Psi_{\tau,-\mathbf{m}}\rangle$ is not the most general non-Gaussian state and its fidelity with coherent cat cluster states can be upper bounded by $1/2^N$. (b) The optical circuit to subtract $m_i$ photons from any mode of the state $|\Psi\rangle$ involves a beam-splitter of transmissivity $\tau$ and a PNR detector denoted here as $(m_i)$. If the PNR detector registers $m_i$, that many photons have been subtracted from the $i$-th mode of the state $|\Psi\rangle$.

FIG. 1. (a) A Gaussian unitary $\hat{U}$ along with a single PNR detector can be used to subtract $m$ photons from a single-mode state $|\psi\rangle$. If $|\psi\rangle$ is a single mode squeezed vacuum state, which is readily produced using optical parametric amplification, then the photon subtracted state $|\psi\rangle_{\tau,-m}$ is close to a coherent cat state, $\mathcal{N}_- (|\alpha\rangle - |\alpha\rangle)$, where $\mathcal{N}_-$ accounts for normalization of the superposed coherent states $|\pm \alpha\rangle$. This scheme and several variants have been analyzed as a tool for quantum computing, and cat states have been experimentally produced using this scheme [35].

Main result. The facts that cat states can be produced with high fidelity using photon subtraction on a single-mode Gaussian state, and that the plus and minus cat states $\mathcal{N}_\pm (|\alpha\rangle \pm |\alpha\rangle)$, $\mathcal{N}_\pm = [2(1 + e^{-2|\alpha|^2})]^{-1}$, form an orthogonal (qubit) basis, make it very tempting to believe that a universal (non-Gaussian) quantum state can be prepared via photon subtraction on all $N$ modes of a general $N$-mode entangled Gaussian state. If that were true, we would be able to produce arbitrary quantum optical states and unitaries using multi-mode entangled Gaussian states and photon subtraction, both of which are readily realizable experimentally.

The main result of this paper is that the above presumption of the possibility of universal state preparation using photon subtraction on multi-mode, entangled, zero-displacement, Gaussian states is false. For the specific examples we will examine, we consider an $N$-mode pure Gaussian state which can be entangled across all its $N$ modes, i.e., one which is produced by the action of the unitary operator $U = \exp (-i\hat{H})$ on the $N$-mode vacuum $|0\rangle^\otimes N$. The generating Hamiltonian is,

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{i}{2} \sum_{i,j} G_{ij} \left( \hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_j^\dagger - \hat{a}_i \hat{a}_j \right),$$

which represents a general multi-mode squeezer. $G$ is a real symmetric matrix. A special class of multi-mode squeezed states, often termed CV cluster states, have $G_{ij} = r g_{ij}$, where $r > 0$ is a squeezing strength, and $g_{ij}$ takes values in $\{-1, 0, 1\}$. Using different squeezing strength does not affect the results it just makes the algebra more cumbersome.

We consider a photon-subtraction circuit of the form shown in Fig. 1 and show by construction a particular non-Gaussian entangled state—a coherent cat basis cluster state (CCCS)—which cannot be approximated well by the photon-subtracted state $|\Psi_{\tau,-\mathbf{m}}\rangle$. In fact, the fidelity between an $N$-mode CCCS and $|\Psi_{\tau,-\mathbf{m}}\rangle$ is upper bounded by $1/2^N$. The photon subtraction scenario we examine, we find that the system is trying to subtract as many photons as possible to obtain optimal results in terms of fidelity. Because of this energy loss, the initial state is rendered to a low amplitude non-Gaussian state and therefore its fidelity with a target non-Gaussian state is close to the fidelity between vacuum and the target state, ergo the $1/2^N$ fidelity upper bound between the resulting and target states, as we will put in mathematical terms in the rest of the paper.

However, it is important to note that this no-go result does not apply to non-Gaussian states engineered via PNR detection on a subset of the modes of an $N$-mode Gaussian state. In that case, the post-selected state can be exactly, and efficiently, calculated using the coherent-basis formalisms prescribed in Refs. [36, 37]. In fact, in the recent work [37] it...
was shown that arbitrary single-mode pure states can be engineered modulo a reasonable conjecture on the existence of a solution to a set of non-linear simultaneous equations. It remains open whether an arbitrary multi-mode non-Gaussian pure state can be engineered using this scheme. It is further instructive to note that employing PNR detection on a subset of the modes of an $N$-mode Gaussian state can be obtained by choosing $\tau = 1$ on the first $K$ modes and $\tau = 0$ on the last $N-K$ modes of the photon-subtraction circuit shown in Fig. 1. So, our no-go result is specific to the equal-$\tau$ case shown in Figure 1 when photon subtraction is performed on all modes of an $N$-mode Gaussian state.

The photon-subtracted state. Let the initial state be $|\Psi\rangle = U|0\rangle \otimes |\alpha\rangle$. We follow the formalism presented in Ref. 36, that is we expand the Gaussian state $|\Psi\rangle$ on the coherent states basis. The coherent basis is a natural basis for the purposes at hand as photon subtraction of say $m$ photons corresponds to an operator which is proportional to $\hat{a}^{m*}$, where $\hat{a}$ is the annihilation operator whose eigenvectors are the coherent states $|\alpha\rangle$, i.e., the basis we use. State $|\Psi\rangle$ can be written

$$|\Psi\rangle = \int \! d^{2N} \bar{x}_{\alpha} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_{\alpha}^T B \bar{x}_{\alpha} \right] |\bar{\alpha}\rangle \tag{2}$$

where $V$ is the covariance matrix (CM) of $|\Psi\rangle$, $\Gamma = V + I/2$ with $I$ the identity matrix, and $B = \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}} \left( A + \frac{1}{2} (C + CT) \right)$, $A = \frac{1}{\bar{\alpha}} \left( B - \frac{1}{2} (C + CT) \right)$, where $A = A^T$, $B = B^T$, and $C$ are the blocks of $\Gamma^{-1} = \left( \begin{array}{cc} A & C \\ C^T & B \end{array} \right)$. 

We consider that zero displacements for $|\Psi\rangle$, since we are interested only in its correlations. We work with $\hbar = 1$, i.e., the vacuum’s CM is $I/2$ and $\alpha = (q_\alpha + i p_\alpha)/\sqrt{2}$. Also, we denote, $\bar{x}_{\alpha,\beta} = (q_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}, \ldots, q_{\alpha_N,\beta_N}, \ldots, p_{\alpha_1,\beta_1}, \ldots, p_{\alpha_N,\beta_N})$. For simplicity and because we are interested only in photon subtraction (not partial PNR detection as discussed above), we will consider that when photon subtraction is performed in different modes, it happens with the same transmissivity $\tau$. This is a reasonable assumption; since photon subtraction is expected to happen for a $\tau \ll 1$. If $m_i$ photons are subtracted from the $i$-th mode, the final, post-selected, non-Gaussian state is

$$|\Psi_{-\vec{m}}\rangle = \frac{(\sqrt{1-\tau})^{MN}}{\sqrt{P^{2MN/2} (\vec{m})^N/2(2\pi)^N ((\det \Gamma))^{1/4}}} \times \int \! d^{2N} \bar{x}_{\alpha} \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_{\alpha}^T \left( B + \frac{1}{2} - \tau I \right) \bar{x}_{\alpha} \right] \times \prod_{j=1}^{N} (q_{\alpha_j} + iP_{\alpha_j})^{m_j/|\sqrt{\tau} \vec{m}|}, \tag{3}$$

where $\vec{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_N)$, $M = m_1 + \ldots + m_N$, $\vec{m}! = m_1! \ldots m_N!$, and $P$ is the probability of success (see Ref. 36 or App. 1) given by the normalization $\langle \Psi_{-\vec{m}} | \Psi_{-\vec{m}} \rangle = 1$.

Coherent cat cluster and GHZ states. Let $|\gamma\rangle$ be a coherent state. We define the qubit basis, $|\bar{0}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_0}} (|\gamma\rangle + |-\gamma\rangle)$, $|\bar{1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_1}} (|\gamma\rangle - |-\gamma\rangle)$, where $N_0^2 = 2 + 2 \exp (-2|\gamma|^2)$ and $N_1^2 = 2 - 2 \exp (-2|\gamma|^2)$. Also, let a $C_Z$ gate, $C_Z|\bar{0}\rangle = |\bar{0}\rangle$ and $C_Z|\bar{1}\rangle = -|\bar{1}\rangle$. We define the rotated qubit basis, $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\bar{0}\rangle + |\bar{1}\rangle)$, $|-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\bar{0}\rangle - |\bar{1}\rangle)$, from which we have, $|\pm\rangle = c_\pm |\gamma\rangle + c_{\mp} |-\gamma\rangle$, where $c_\pm = (N_0^{-1} + N_1^{-1})/\sqrt{2}$.

The coherent cat cluster state (CCCS) is defined by a given pattern of $C_Z$ operations, denoted as $C_{Zcl}$, entangling the different $|+\rangle$ qubits, i.e., $|CCCS\rangle = C_{Zcl} |+\rangle \otimes |\gamma\rangle$. When the CCCS is written in the coherent basis it would be a superposition of vectors, for example $|\gamma, \gamma, \ldots, -\gamma, \ldots, \gamma\rangle$, with different combinations of $\pm$ in front of each $\gamma$, prescribed by the specific $C_{Zcl}$ which generates the CCCS. We note that the target state $|C\rangle$ is not restricted to be $|CCCS\rangle$ or $|GHZ\rangle$. Indeed, since we examine states which are superposed vectors of the form $|\gamma, \gamma, \ldots, -\gamma, \ldots, \gamma\rangle$, with different combinations of $\pm$, state $|C\rangle$ can be considered arbitrary, i.e., think of $|C\rangle$ as any $|CCCS\rangle$ state with arbitrary coefficients.

In this work we will also examine the GHZ state which is defined as, $|GHZ\rangle = \frac{1}{N_{GHZ}} (|\gamma\rangle \otimes |\gamma\rangle + |-\gamma\rangle \otimes |-\gamma\rangle)$, where $N_{GHZ}^2 = 2 + 2 \exp (-2|\gamma|^2)$.

The fidelity. When comparing two states to see how close they are to each other, fidelity, i.e., their squared overlap if the states at hand are pure, is perhaps the most common figure of merit used. Especially, in probabilistic state engineering, many works use fidelity to quantify the quality of the produced state compared to the target state. Strictly speaking, fidelity is not sufficient for the said tasks. For example, states of the form $|\gamma\rangle + |-\gamma\rangle$ have a
decently high fidelity with the vacuum state if $|\gamma|$ is small. For this reason, any low energy (e.g., low amplitude, low squeezing) continuous variable state that has been supposedly engineered to look like $|\gamma\rangle + |-\gamma\rangle$, it might give high fidelity only because both states have energy close to zero. Therefore, fidelity is a good necessary criterion, but not sufficient. In this work we will consider fidelity as indeed a necessary criterion for probabilistic state engineering. We will focus on the fidelity between the state given in Eq. (3) and the CCCS and GHZ states, as they provide a counter-example and an example respectively of what be achieved with photon subtraction. Both of these states assume an expansion on the coherent basis, just as $|\Psi_{-m}\rangle$ of Eq. (4), therefore the calculation becomes tractable. The fidelity is defined as $F = |\langle C | \Psi_{-m} \rangle|^2$, where $|C\rangle$ can be $|\text{CCCS}\rangle$, $|\text{GHZ}\rangle$, or any other state which is a superposition of products of coherent states. The fidelity assumes the form (see App. 2),

$$F = |N^\otimes \langle 0 | C \rangle|^2 R,$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

where $|0\rangle$ is the vacuum state and

$$R = |J|^2 / J$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

with $J = \int d^2N x_\alpha e^{-\frac{1}{2} 2N \sum_i (\beta^I + \frac{1}{2}) x_i + \sum_i x_i \sum_j N_j (q_{\alpha j} + ip_{\alpha j}) n_j}$,

$$J' = \int d^2N x_\alpha d^2N x_\beta e^{-\frac{1}{2} 2N \sum_i (\beta^I + \frac{1}{2}) x_i + \sum_i x_i \sum_j N_j (q_{\alpha j} + ip_{\alpha j}) n_j}$$

$$x' = \left( \begin{array}{c} I \\ iI \\ -iI \\ I \end{array} \right).$$

Both terms in the product of Eq. (4) depend on the target state’s amplitude $x_\alpha$. On top of that, the first term in Eq. (4) depends on which target state we choose, while $R$ holds information on the Gaussian state that the photon subtraction was performed on. We find (see App. 3),

$$F \leq |N^\otimes \langle 0 | C \rangle|^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)

The upper bound in inequality (6) is valid for any state of Eq. (3), i.e., the Hamiltonian which produces the Gaussian state of Eq. (3) does not have to be specified (see App. 2). Inequality (6) is attained for small $x_\alpha$ and $\tau$, as physically expected. Moreover, in this limit, the behavior of the fidelity is (see App. 4),

$$F = \hat{A}(x_\gamma).$$  \hspace{1cm} (7)

As two examples, we consider the Hamiltonian of Eq. (1), and the states $|C\rangle = |\text{CCCS}\rangle$, $|C\rangle = |\text{GHZ}\rangle$. For said states, $\hat{A}(x_\gamma)$ has the form (see App. 4)

$$\hat{A}_{\text{CCCS}}(x_\gamma) = \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2} (N-f_N \gamma) q^2 + \frac{1}{2} (N+f_N \gamma) p^2}}{\left(1 + e^{-q^2 - p^2}\right)^N} \hspace{1cm} (8)$$

$$\hat{A}_{\text{GHZ}}(x_\gamma) = \frac{2e^{-\frac{1}{2} (N-f_N \gamma) q^2 - \frac{1}{2} (N+f_N \gamma) p^2}}{1 + e^{-Nq^2 - Np^2}} \hspace{1cm} (9)$$

where $|f_N| \leq N \tilde{T} \tanh(Gr) I$, and the vector $\tilde{I} = (1, \ldots, 1)$ has matching dimensions to matrix $G$. The exact form of $f_N$ depends on the initial Gaussian state and more details can be found in [?]. Since the fidelity is dominated by exponentially decreasing functions with respect to $x_\gamma$, the fidelity reaches a maximum upper bound for $x_\gamma \to 0$.

$$F_{\text{CCCS}} \leq \frac{1}{2N} \hspace{1cm} (10)$$

$$F_{\text{GHZ}} \leq 1. \hspace{1cm} (11)$$

Note that Eqs. (10) and (11) do not depend on the choice of Hamiltonian. Indeed, they depend only on the choice of $|C\rangle$, and they can be derived directly from Eq. (6).

The contribution of photon subtraction is found in the $-\tau f_N$ term (for $|f_N| > 0$ and $p_\gamma = 0$) in the exponential of Eqs. (8) and (9). The term $-\tau f_N$ allows fidelity to decrease slower, starting from its initial maximum value as $q_\gamma$ increases in the region close to zero.

Conclusions and discussion. Photon subtraction has been long held to be an important primitive for non-Gaussian bosonic state engineering because it can be used to prepare a cat state from a squeezed vacuum state. We showed however that photon number subtraction—performed using a beam-splitter and a photon number resolving detector—on every mode of a general multimode Gaussian state, cannot be used to herald an arbitrary non-Gaussian state of light. We found a simple-to-evaluate condition on the target non-Gaussian state, in terms of its overlap with the vacuum state, which if small implies that given state cannot be prepared to a good fidelity via photon number subtraction on a Gaussian state.

Equation (6) gives an upper bound to the Fidelity with which any given state can be prepared using photon subtraction. In this paper, we specialized this general bound to (10) and (11) which correspond to attempting to prepare coherent cat cluster states (CCCS) and the coherent-basis GHZ state. The fact that the fidelity upper bound for the $N$-mode CCCS works out to be $1/2N$ implies that state is unreachable with photon subtraction on Gaussian states. On the other hand, the coherent state basis
GHZ states are reachable with photon subtraction on Gaussian states. The latter should not be a surprise, since we know that a single-mode coherent cat state can be prepared with photon subtraction on the squeezed vacuum state to high fidelity, and that an $N$-mode coherent basis GHZ state can be produced deterministically using a a single-mode coherent cat state and an equal $N$ splitter. Then, by considering the specific Hamiltonian of Eq. (1), we revealed what is the contribution of photon subtraction on the behavior of fidelity in the region of its maximum value for the CCCS and coherent-basis GHZ state (see point (iii) below).

Below are some key observations about and intuitive explanations of the specific results presented in the paper.

(i) The procedure of preparing non-Gaussian states using photon subtraction is probabilistic. Indeed, the integral $J$ in Eq. (5) comes from the probability of occurrence of the PNR pattern when performing photon subtraction across the modes. Integral $J$ is also an increasing function of $\tau$. Further, observing that $J(\tau \rightarrow 0) = |I(x_{\gamma} = 0)|^2$ we get the upper bound $R(\tau \rightarrow 0) < 1$. This upper bound is the reason we got from Eq. (4) to Eq. (9). However, this did not affect high-fidelity production of the GHZ state, as we showed the bound (11) is attainable [36].

(ii) It is known that PNR detectors and Gaussian states comprise a universal resource set [22]. Further, it is likely that partial post-selection on the modes of a Gaussian state on Fock basis might be capable of generating any target state approximation [37]. Therefore, the non-universality we find stems also from the specific set-up: Photon subtraction on an $N$-mode Gaussian state, is essentially partial Fock basis post-selection on a specific $2N$-mode Gaussian state obtained via a mixing each mode of a general $N$-mode Gaussian state with a vacuum mode on a beam-splitter, and detecting one of the output mode of each of those $N$ beam-splitters. Consequently, photon subtraction is a specific type of partial Fock basis post-selection, which we have shown is not capable of generating all non-Gaussian states.

(iii) Let $F_0$ be the fidelity between vacuum and the target state, which appears as the first product term in Eq. (4). Equation (1) says that photon subtraction cannot help $F$ surpass $F_0$. It can only help $F$ survive a bit longer around $F_0$, i.e., photon subtraction helps $F$ to decrease slower as a function of $x_{\gamma}$ from the initial value $F_0$.

Questions remain open. The holy grail of this line of research would be a systematic theory for non-Gaussian state engineering for specific classes of states that are useful in various quantum information processing tasks such as cluster states for quantum computing, all-optical quantum repeaters, metrologically-optimal states in distributed quantum sensing, etc. One specific interesting question that relates to the states considered in this paper is: Whether the GHZ states considered in this work can be transformed into the CCCS by using local unitaries (e.g., it is known that a star-topology cluster state and a GHZ state are local-Hadamard equivalent), where the local unitaries are themselves realized by post-selected non-Gaussian ancilla states which in turn were heralded using Gaussian states and PNR detectors [39]. The present work's no-go result and the mathematical formalism we developed in [36] to analyze non-Gaussian state engineering using general Gaussian states and PNR detection, could catalyze further progress toward the aforesaid holy grail.
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[38] Only assumption is that first moments (displacements) are zero, as we are interested in effects stemming from intra-mode and inter-mode correlations.
APPENDIX

1. Probability of success and the $J$ integral

The final state is,

$$
|\Psi_{-\bar{m}}\rangle = \frac{(-\sqrt{1-\tau})^{MN}}{\sqrt{P_{2MN/2}(\bar{m}!)(2\pi)^N(\det \Gamma)^{1/4}}} \int d^{2N} \vec{x}_\alpha \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \vec{x}_\alpha^T \left( \mathcal{B} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{I} \right) \vec{x}_\alpha \right] \\
\times \prod_{j=1}^{N} (q_{\alpha_j} + ip_{\alpha_j})^{m_j} |\sqrt{\tau} \vec{\alpha}\rangle,
$$

(A1)

where $\bar{m} = (m_1, \ldots, m_N)$, $M = m_1 + \ldots + m_N$, $\bar{m}! = m_1! \ldots m_N!$. $P$ is the probability of occurrence of any specific PNR pattern (or simply the probability of success if one is interested in a specific pattern to occur) is given by the normalization condition $\langle \Psi_{-\bar{m}} | \Psi_{-\bar{m}} \rangle = 1$. We get,

$$
P = \frac{(1-\tau)^{MN}}{2^{MN}(\bar{m}!)^N(2\pi)^{2N}(\det \Gamma)^{1/2}} \\
\times \int d^{2N} \vec{x}_\alpha d^{2N} \vec{x}_\beta \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \vec{x}_\alpha^T \left( \mathcal{B} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{I} \right) \vec{x}_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} \vec{x}_\beta^T \left( \mathcal{B}^* + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{I} \right) \vec{x}_\beta + \frac{\tau}{2} \vec{x}_\alpha^T \mathcal{X} \vec{x}_\beta \right] \\
\times \prod_{j=1}^{N} (q_{\alpha_j} + ip_{\alpha_j})^{m_j} (q_{\beta_j} - ip_{\beta_j})^{m_j},
$$

(A2)

where,

$$
\mathcal{X} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{I} & i\mathcal{I} \\ -i\mathcal{I} & \mathcal{I} \end{pmatrix}.
$$

(A3)

In deriving Eq. (A2), we remind the reader that coherent states are not orthogonal to each other. We write Eq. (A2) as,

$$
P = \frac{(1-\tau)^{MN}}{2^{MN}(\bar{m}!)^N(2\pi)^{2N}(\det \Gamma)^{1/2}} J,
$$

(A4)

where $J$ is the integral part of Eq. (A2).

2. The fidelity

Consider any state $|C\rangle$ to be a superposition of products of coherent states. Let one of the vectors in the coherent basis expansion of $|C\rangle$ be $|\gamma_k, -\gamma_{N-k}\rangle$, where there are $k$ positive $\gamma$'s and $N-k$ negative. To find the fidelity $F = |\langle C | \Psi_{-\bar{m}} \rangle|^2$, we need to calculate $\langle \gamma_k, -\gamma_{N-k} | \Psi_{-\bar{m}} \rangle$. We get,

$$
\langle \gamma_k, -\gamma_{N-k} | \Psi_{-\bar{m}} \rangle = \frac{(-\sqrt{1-\tau})^{MN}}{\sqrt{P_{2MN/2}(\bar{m}!)(2\pi)^N(\det \Gamma)^{1/4}}} \exp \left( -\frac{1}{4} \vec{x}_\gamma^T \vec{x}_\gamma \right) \\
\times \int d^{2N} \vec{x}_\alpha \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \vec{x}_\alpha^T \left( \mathcal{B} + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{I} \right) \vec{x}_\alpha + \sqrt{\tau} \vec{x}_\gamma^{(k,N-k)} \mathcal{X} \vec{x}_\alpha \right] \\
\times \prod_{j=1}^{N} (q_{\alpha_j} + ip_{\alpha_j})^{m_j},
$$

(A5)

where $\vec{x}_\gamma^{(k,N-k)}$ denotes a vector whose $q_\gamma$'s and $p_\gamma$'s have some specified + or - signs, e.g. $\vec{x}_\gamma^{(3,1)} = (q_\gamma, q_\gamma, q_\gamma, -q_\gamma, p_\gamma, p_\gamma, p_\gamma, -p_\gamma)$. The minus signs of $\vec{x}_\gamma^{(k,N-k)}$ can be assigned to $\vec{x}_\alpha$, i.e., $\vec{x}_\gamma^{(k,N-k)} \mathcal{X} \vec{x}_\alpha = \vec{x}_\gamma^{(k,N-k)} \mathcal{X} \vec{x}_\alpha$. 


\( \vec{x}^T \mathcal{X} \vec{x}^{(k,N-k)} \). Whichever \( q_{\alpha_j}, p_{\alpha_j} \), took a minus, can be restored to a plus sign with change of variables \( q_{\alpha_j} \rightarrow -q_{\alpha_j}, p_{\alpha_j} \rightarrow -p_{\alpha_j} \). Now, the target state \( |C\rangle \) has the general form,

\[
|C\rangle = \sum_i c_i |\tilde{\gamma}(i)\rangle,
\]

where \( |\tilde{\gamma}(i)\rangle \) is a product of coherent states \( |\pm\rangle \) and \( (i) \) labels the specific \( \pm \) pattern and \( i \) takes values depending on the state \( |C\rangle \). Then, all integral in Eq. \( (A5) \) will be the same,

\[
I = \int d^{2N} \vec{x}_\alpha \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \vec{x}_\alpha^T \left( B + \frac{1}{2} I \right) \vec{x}_\alpha + \frac{\sqrt{F}}{2} \vec{x}_\gamma^T \mathcal{X} \vec{x}_\alpha \right] \prod_j (q_{\alpha_j} + ip_{\alpha_j})^{m_j},
\]

in the fidelity \( |\langle C|\Psi_{-\gamma}\rangle|^2 \) and each one will be multiplied with a prefactor \( c_1, c_2,(-1)^{m_1} + (-1)^{m_2} + \ldots, c_3,(-1)^{m_1+m_2} + (-1)^{m_1+m_2} + \ldots, \ldots \). If we choose \( m_j \)'s to give a positive number when they multiply \( c_i \) in the prefactors, e.g., all \( m_j = \) even, then the fidelity is maximized as terms of the kind \( (-1)^{m_1} + (-1)^{m_2} + \ldots \) take their maximum value.

For the fidelity we have,

\[
F = |\langle C|\Psi_{-\gamma}\rangle|^2 = \sum_i c_i^2 \exp \left( -\frac{1}{2} \vec{x}_\gamma^T \vec{x}_\gamma \right) |\frac{I^2}{J}|.
\]

The first two terms in the product of Eq. \( (A8) \) give the fidelities between \( N \)-mode vacuum \( |0\rangle^\otimes N \) and \( |C\rangle \),

\[
F = |\langle N \otimes |0\rangle^C\rangle|^2 \frac{|I|^2}{J},
\]

\[
F = |\langle N \otimes |0\rangle^C\rangle|^2 R,
\]

where,

\[
R = \frac{|I|^2}{J}.
\]

Let us now consider two specific \( |C\rangle \) states and calculate \( |\langle N \otimes |0\rangle^CCCS\rangle|^2 \). First, we consider the state \( |CCCS\rangle = C_{Zcl}|+\rangle^\otimes N \). The resulting state is,

\[
|CCCS\rangle = \frac{1}{2^{N/2}} C_{Zcl} (|\tilde{0}\rangle + |\tilde{1}\rangle)^\otimes N
= \frac{1}{2^{N/2}} \left( |\tilde{0}\rangle^\otimes N \pm |\tilde{0}0\ldots0\rangle \pm |\tilde{1}0\ldots0\rangle \pm |\tilde{1}\rangle^\otimes N \right),
\]

where in Eq. \( (A12) \) all possible combinations of \( \tilde{0} \) and \( \tilde{1} \) appear and the \( \pm \) signs are decided by \( C_{Zcl} \). Since,

\[
\langle 0|\tilde{0}\rangle = \frac{1}{N_0} \langle 0|\gamma\rangle + \langle 0| - \gamma\rangle = \frac{2 \exp \left( -\frac{q_\gamma^2 + p_\gamma^2}{4} \right)}{\sqrt{2 + 2 \exp (-q_\gamma^2 - p_\gamma^2)}}
\]

\[
\langle 0|\tilde{1}\rangle = \frac{1}{N_1} \langle 0|\gamma\rangle - \langle 0| - \gamma\rangle = 0,
\]

we have,

\[
|\langle N \otimes |0\rangle^CCCS\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{2^N} |\langle N \otimes |0\rangle^\otimes N\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{2^N} |\langle 0|0\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{2^N} \frac{4^N \exp \left( -\frac{Nq_\gamma^2 + Np_\gamma^2}{2} \right)}{\left[ 2 + 2 \exp \left( -q_\gamma^2 - p_\gamma^2 \right) \right]^N}
\]

\[
= \frac{\exp \left( -\frac{Nq_\gamma^2}{2} - \frac{Np_\gamma^2}{2} \right)}{\left[ 1 + \exp \left( -q_\gamma^2 - p_\gamma^2 \right) \right]^N}.
\]
For \( q_\gamma \to 0 \) and \( p_\gamma \to 0 \), \( \langle N^\otimes \langle 0 \rangle | \text{CCCS} \rangle \rangle^2 \to 1/2 \).

Now, let \( |C\rangle \) be the state \( |\text{GHZ}\rangle = (1/\sqrt{N_{\text{GHZ}}})(|\gamma\rangle + |-\gamma\rangle) \). We have,

\[
|N^\otimes \langle 0 \rangle | \text{GHZ} \rangle \rangle^2 = \frac{1}{N_{\text{GHZ}}^2} |\langle 0 \rangle |^N + |\langle -\gamma \rangle |^N|^2 = \frac{4}{N_{\text{GHZ}}^2} |\langle 0 \rangle |^2^N
\]

\[
= \frac{4 \exp \left( -\frac{N}{2} q_\gamma^2 - \frac{N}{2} p_\gamma^2 \right)}{2 + 2 \exp \left( -\frac{N}{2} q_\gamma^2 - \frac{N}{2} p_\gamma^2 \right)} = \frac{2 \exp \left( -\frac{N}{2} q_\gamma^2 - \frac{N}{2} p_\gamma^2 \right)}{1 + \exp \left( -\frac{N}{2} q_\gamma^2 - \frac{N}{2} p_\gamma^2 \right)}.
\]  \( \text{(A16)} \)

For \( q_\gamma \to 0 \) and \( p_\gamma \to 0 \), \( |N^\otimes \langle 0 \rangle | \text{GHZ} \rangle \rangle^2 \to 1 \).

### 3. The term \( R \)

The term \( R \) was defined in Eq. \( \text{(A11)} \). We write the integrals \(|I|^2 \) and \( J \),

\[
|I|^2 = \int d^2 x_\alpha d^2 x_\beta \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} x_\alpha^T \left( B + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L} \right) x_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} x_\beta^T \left( B^* + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L} \right) x_\beta + \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{2}} x_\gamma x_\alpha + \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{2}} x_\gamma^T x_\beta \right]
\]

\[
\times \prod_{j=1}^N \left( q_{\alpha j} + ip_{\alpha j} \right)^{m_j} \left( q_{\beta j} - ip_{\beta j} \right)^{m_j}, \tag{A17}
\]

\[
J = \int d^2 x_\alpha d^2 x_\beta \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} x_\alpha^T \left( B + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L} \right) x_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} x_\beta^T \left( B^* + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L} \right) x_\beta + \frac{\tau}{2} x_\tau^T x_\alpha \right]
\]

\[
\times \prod_{j=1}^N \left( q_{\alpha j} + ip_{\alpha j} \right)^{m_j} \left( q_{\beta j} - ip_{\beta j} \right)^{m_j}. \tag{A18}
\]

For \( \tau = 0 \), Eq. \( \text{(A17)} \) is the same as Eq. \( \text{(A18)} \), which means that \( R(\tau = 0) = R_0 = 1 \). Also, \( R \) does not depend on any property of the target state \( |C\rangle \) other than the amplitude \( x_\alpha \), i.e., it does not depend on which specific entangled state \( |C\rangle \) we are interested in, no matter if it is CCCS, GHZ, or any other state, \( R \) will be the same. However, \( R \) depends on the details of the Gaussian initial state.

The first derivative of \( R \) with respect to \( \tau \) is,

\[
\left. \frac{dR}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0} = \left. \frac{d|I|^2}{d\tau} - \frac{dJ}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0}, \tag{A19}
\]

where \( J > 0 \), \( \forall \ 0 \leq \tau \leq 1 \). The two derivatives in Eq. \( \text{(A19)} \) are,

\[
\left. \frac{d|I|^2}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0} = \int d^2 x_\alpha d^2 x_\beta \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} x_\alpha^T \left( B + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L} \right) x_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} x_\beta^T \left( B^* + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L} \right) x_\beta \right]
\]

\[
\times \left( \frac{1}{4\sqrt{\tau}} x_\gamma^T x_\alpha + \frac{1}{4\sqrt{\tau}} x_\gamma x_\alpha^T \right) \tag{A20}
\]

\[
\left. \frac{dJ}{d\tau} \right|_{\tau=0} = \frac{1}{2} \int d^2 x_\alpha d^2 x_\beta \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} x_\alpha^T \left( B + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L} \right) x_\alpha - \frac{1}{2} x_\beta^T \left( B^* + \frac{1}{2} \mathcal{L} \right) x_\beta \right] \left( x_\beta^T x_\alpha \right) = 0. \tag{A21}
\]

We examine the case of \( \tau \to 0 \). In this limit the integral in Eq. \( \text{(A21)} \) becomes a product of two integrals which are equal to zero because the polynomial terms increase their power by one, rendering the integrals from even to odd (we assume that initially we have \( J > 0 \) so that the probability of occurrence is finite, therefore the \( J \) integral is even for \( \tau \to 0 \), this is easily achieved by for example setting \( N \) to be an even number and subtracting the same number of photons per mode). Also, for \( \tau \to 0 \), Eq. \( \text{(A20)} \) gives zero as long as \( (q_\gamma, p_\gamma) \to (0, 0) \) so that it makes physical sense since the \( \sqrt{\tau} \) is in the denominator. Then the integral
of Eq. \( (A20) \) is zero for the same reason that Eq. \( (A21) \) is zero. Therefore, at \( \tau \to 0 \) and for \( (q_\gamma, p_\gamma) \to 0 \), \( R \) has an extremum. The second derivative of \( R \) with respect to \( \tau \) is found to be,

\[
\frac{d^2 R}{d\tau^2} = \frac{-1}{J} \left. \frac{d^2 J}{d\tau^2} \right|_{\tau=0} < 0,
\]

which is negative because \( J > 0, \forall 0 \leq \tau \leq 1 \) and \( \left. \frac{d^2 J}{d\tau^2} \right|_{\tau=0} > 0 \) represents an even integral which is basically proportional to the probability of subtracting more photons (and therefore it is anticipated to be positive for the additional physical reason of representing probability up to a positive coefficient given in Eq. \( (A4) \)).

Therefore, \( R < 1 \) with maximum value at \( \tau \to 0 \) and \( (q_\gamma, p_\gamma) \to (0,0) \). In Eq. \( (A8) \), the ratio \( R \) can be dropped and the equality turns into an inequality,

\[
F \leq |N \otimes \langle 0 |C \rangle|^2,
\]

(A23)

regardless the state \( |C \rangle \).

4. On the fidelity’s amplitude dependence

In this Section, we go beyond Eq. \( (A23) \) to extract an \( x_\gamma \)-dependence of the upper bound Eq. \( (A23) \) using \( \tau \ll 1 \). The integral \( I \) is given in Eq. \( (A7) \). Let us rewrite it here for convenience,

\[
I = \int d^2N \bar{x}_\alpha \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_\alpha^T \left( B + \frac{1}{2} I \right) \bar{x}_\alpha + \frac{\sqrt{\tau}}{2} \bar{x}_\gamma^T \bar{x}_\alpha \right] \prod_{j=1}^N (q_{\alpha_j} + i p_{\alpha_j})^{m_j}.
\]

(A24)

Using our standard notation \( \bar{x}_\alpha = (\bar{q}_\alpha, \bar{p}_\alpha) \), defining \( \Lambda = (\bar{\lambda}, i \bar{\lambda}) \) (where \( \bar{\lambda} \) has the same dimension as \( \bar{q}_\alpha \) and \( \bar{p}_\alpha \)), and using the identity \( \exp(x) x^k = d^k / d\lambda^k |_{\lambda=0} \exp(\lambda x) \), we write,

\[
I = D_\Lambda \int d^2N \bar{x}_\alpha \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_\alpha^T \left( B + \frac{1}{2} I \right) \bar{x}_\alpha + \left( \frac{\sqrt{\tau}}{2} \bar{x}_\gamma + \Lambda \right) \bar{x}_\alpha \right],
\]

(A25)

where,

\[
D_\Lambda (\cdot) = \prod_{j=1}^N \left. \frac{d^m}{d\lambda^m_{\alpha_j}} (\cdot) \right|_{\bar{\lambda}=\bar{\lambda}_0}.
\]

Integral of Eq. \( (A25) \) is Gaussian, with kernel \( \exp \left[ -\frac{1}{2} \bar{x}_\alpha^T \left( B + \frac{1}{2} I \right) \bar{x}_\alpha \right] \) and linear terms \( \left( \frac{\sqrt{\tau}}{2} \bar{x}_\gamma + \Lambda \right) \bar{x}_\alpha \).

Before we proceed with calculating said integral, let us give the expression of \( B + \frac{1}{2} I \). In \[36\], for Gaussian states \( \hat{U}|0 \rangle^{\otimes N} \), where \( \hat{U} = \exp(-i \hat{H}) \) and the Hamiltonian is

\[
\hat{H} = -\frac{ir}{2} \sum_{i,j}^N G_{ij} \left( \hat{a}_i \hat{a}_j^\dagger - \hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_j \right),
\]

(A27)

it was proven that,

\[
B = \frac{1}{2} I + \frac{1}{2} \hat{G},
\]

(A28)

where \( \hat{G} \) has block matrix form,

\[
\hat{G} = \begin{pmatrix}
-\tanh(Gr) & i \tanh(Gr) \\
-i \tanh(Gr) & \tanh(Gr)
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(A29)
Therefore,
\[ B + \frac{1}{2} I = \mathcal{I} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{G}. \] (A30)

Note that no matter what the matrix \( G \) is, the matrix \( \hat{G} \) has the property \( \hat{G}^2 = 0 \), where \( 0 \) denote the matrix with all entries being 0, i.e., the matrix \( \hat{G} \) is nilpotent. Therefore,
\[ \left( B + \frac{1}{2} I \right)^{-1} = \left( \mathcal{I} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{G} \right)^{-1} = \mathcal{I} - \frac{1}{2} \hat{G}. \] (A31)

Equation (A31) is required to calculate the integral in Eq. (A25) which gives,
\[ I = \exp \left[ \frac{1}{4} (q_\gamma^2 - p_\gamma^2) \tau \mathcal{T}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{T} \right] \times D_{\mathcal{X}} \exp \left[ (q_\gamma - ip_\gamma) \sqrt{\tau} \mathcal{T}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{X} \right], \] (A32)

where \( \mathcal{T} = (1, \ldots, 1) \) and come from the fact the all \( q_\gamma \)’s and \( p_\gamma \)’s in \( \mathcal{X} \) are the equal, i.e., \( q_\gamma = q_\gamma \mathcal{T} \) and \( p_\gamma = p_\gamma \mathcal{T} \). Since we are interested only in the \( \mathcal{X} \)-dependence of \( I \), a prefactor \((2\pi)^N \det \left( \mathcal{I} + \frac{1}{2} \hat{G} \right)^{-1/2}\) the integral would give is omitted. In other words this prefactor has been accounted for in the ratio \( R \) as \( \tau \rightarrow 0 \). We also take into account that the matrix \( G \) is symmetric (and therefore \( \tanh(Gr) \) is symmetric). Therefore, we are interested in the function,
\[ I = \exp \left[ \frac{1}{4} (q_\gamma - ip_\gamma)^2 \tau \mathcal{T}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{T} \right] D_{\mathcal{X}} \exp \left[ (q_\gamma - ip_\gamma) \sqrt{\tau} \mathcal{T}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{X} \right]. \] (A33)

The squared absolute value of \( I \) then is,
\[ |I|^2 = \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2} (q_\gamma^2 - p_\gamma^2) \tau \mathcal{T}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{T} \right] |D_{\mathcal{X}} \exp \left[ (q_\gamma - ip_\gamma) \sqrt{\tau} \mathcal{T}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{X} + \mathcal{X}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{X} \right]|^2. \] (A34)

There are two terms in Eq. (A34): An exponential and a polynomial term coming from the derivatives with respect to the \( \lambda_j \)’s. The polynomial terms for \( \tau \ll 1 \) can be simplified greatly as most of them go to zero, while at the same time the exponential term would approach 1. Therefore we have,
\[ |I|^2 = \exp \left[ \frac{1}{2} (q_\gamma^2 - p_\gamma^2) \tau \mathcal{T}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{T} \right] |D_{\mathcal{X}} \exp \left[ \mathcal{X}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{X} \right]|^2. \] (A35)

Note that the minus sign in \( q_\gamma^2 - p_\gamma^2 \) stems from squeezing. The minus’ position is controlled by the entry-wise signs of \( G \), something that will become clear when we reach Eq. (A41) below. We define \( f_N = \mathcal{T}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{T} \), which is the summation of all entries of \( \tanh(Gr) \). Equations (A36), (A16), (A10) give the numerators of \( R \),
\[ A_{\text{CCCS}}(x_\gamma) = \frac{\exp \left[ -\frac{q_\gamma^2}{2} (N - \tau f_N) - \frac{p_\gamma^2}{2} (N + \tau f_N) \right]}{1 + \exp \left( -\frac{q_\gamma^2 - p_\gamma^2}{2} \right)^N} |D_{\mathcal{X}} \exp \left[ \mathcal{X}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{X} \right]|^2 \] (A36)
\[ A_{\text{GHZ}}(x_\gamma) = \frac{2 \exp \left[ -\frac{q_\gamma^2}{2} (N - \tau f_N) + \frac{p_\gamma^2}{2} (N + \tau f_N) \right]}{1 + \exp \left( -Nq_\gamma^2 - Np_\gamma^2 \right)} |D_{\mathcal{X}} \exp \left[ \mathcal{X}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{X} \right]|^2. \] (A37)

The terms \( |D_{\mathcal{X}} \exp \left[ \mathcal{X}^T \tanh(Gr) \mathcal{X} \right]|^2 \) will cancel out with corresponding terms from the \( J \) integral for \( \tau \ll 1 \) (and in any case it does not have any \( x_\gamma \)-dependence). We have,
\[ \tilde{A}_{\text{CCCS}}(x_\gamma) = \frac{\exp \left[ -\frac{q_\gamma^2}{2} (N - \tau f_N) - \frac{p_\gamma^2}{2} (N + \tau f_N) \right]}{1 + \exp \left( -\frac{q_\gamma^2 - p_\gamma^2}{2} \right)^N} \] (A38)
\[ \tilde{A}_{\text{GHZ}}(x_\gamma) = \frac{2 \exp \left[ -\frac{q_\gamma^2}{2} (N - \tau f_N) - \frac{p_\gamma^2}{2} (N + \tau f_N) \right]}{1 + \exp \left( -Nq_\gamma^2 - Np_\gamma^2 \right)}. \] (A39)
As discussed in Sec. 3 for $\tau \ll 1$ small-amplitude non-Gaussian states are expected to be produced. Therefore, the approximation Eqs. (A38) and (A39) are valid for small $x_\gamma = (q_\gamma, p_\gamma)$.

Using $\tanh x = \sum_{n=1}^\infty b_n x^{2n-1}$, $b_n = \frac{2^{2n} \text{Be}(2n)}{(2n)!}$, where $\text{Be}(\cdot)$ is the Bernoulli number, $f_N$ can be written as,

$$f_N = \vec{1}^T \text{tanh}(Gr) \vec{1} = \sum_{n=1}^\infty b_n r^{2n-1} \vec{1}^T G^{2n-1} \vec{1}. \quad (A40)$$

Taking into account that $G_{ij}$ takes values $-1, 0, 1$ with $G_{ii} = 0$, and $G$ is symmetric, from Eq. (A40) it is understood that the maximum (minimum) value of $\vec{1}^T G^{2n-1} \vec{1}$ is given if we choose $G_{ij} = 1$, $G_{ii} = 0$ ($G_{ij} = -1$, $G_{ii} = 0$). Therefore,

$$-N \tanh [(N-1)r] \leq f_N \leq N \tanh [(N-1)r], \quad (A41)$$

which renders the exponential in the Eqs. (A36), (A37) symmetric, i.e., the minus sign can be interchanged by changing the squeezing direction. The in-between possible terms of inequality (A41) are of the form $\pm e_N \tanh(w N r)$, where $w_N$ is linear with respect to $N$ and is the summation of the $\pm 1$ entries of $G$, and $e_N > 0$ takes the maximum value $\vec{1}^T \vec{1} = N$. Since $|f_N| < N$ and $0 < \tau < 1$, the exponential part of Eqs. (A36), (A37) reach maxima $1/2^N$ (for CCCS) and 1 (for GHZ) at $q_\gamma = p_\gamma = 0$.

A usual case of interest in the literature is $G$ to be self-inverse (SI), i.e., $G_{SI}^{-1} = G_{SI} \Rightarrow G_{SI}^2 = I$. Even though we do not need to assume a SI $G$ matrix, we consider it as a special case of interest. From Eq. (A40) we get,

$$f_N^{(SI)} = \sum_{n=1}^\infty b_n r^{2n-1} \vec{1}^T G_{SI}^{2n-1} \vec{1} = (\vec{1}^T G_{SI} \vec{1}) \tanh r, \quad (A42)$$

where the structure of $G_{SI}$ is,

$$G_{SI} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & O \\ O^T & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A43)$$

where $O$ is any orthogonal matrix and $0$ is the zero matrix. The quantity $\vec{1}^T G_{SI} \vec{1}$, as mentioned before, is given by the summation of all matrix elements of $G_{SI}$. Using Cauchy’s inequality, we show $\vec{1}^T G_{SI} \vec{1} < N$ and therefore, $f_N^{(SI)} < N$ since tanh $r < 1$. Indeed,

$$\sum_j G_{SIj} \leq \sqrt{\sum_j |G_{SIj}|^2} = 1, \quad (A44)$$

where the last equality holds because the matrix $G_{SI}$ is orthogonal. We sum over the index $i$ both sides of (A44),

$$\sum_{ij} G_{SIj} \leq N \Rightarrow \vec{1}^T G_{SI} \vec{1} \leq N. \quad (A45)$$