Entanglement of a pair of quantum emitters under continuous fluorescence measurements
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We explore a measurement protocol to generate quantum entanglement between two remote qubits, through joint homodyne detection of their spontaneous emission. Such a quadrature measurement scheme is a realistic two–qubit extension of existing circuit–QED experiments which obtain quantum trajectories by homodyning or heterodyning a superconducting qubit’s spontaneous emission, and could be implemented on other platforms. We develop a physically–motivated model for the two qubit case, and simulate stochastic quantum trajectories for a variety of measurement protocols; we use this tool to compare our proposed homodyne scheme with the comparable photodetection– based Bell state measurement, and heterodyne detection–based scheme. We discuss the quantum trajectories and concurrence dynamics in detail across a variety of example measurements. As with other measurement–based entanglement strategies, the entanglement yield between our qubits corresponds to our ability to erase information distinguishing certain two–qubit states from the measurement record. We demonstrate that the photon which–path information acquisition, and therefore the entanglement yield, is tunable under our homodyne detection scheme, generating at best equivalent average entanglement dynamics as in the comparable photodetection case.

I. INTRODUCTION

Our present work draws on three distinct areas of research: continuous measurement and quantum trajectories, measurement induced entanglement, and spontaneous emission all play a role in what follows. The spontaneous emission of photons from (two–level) atoms has been a topic of great interest in quantum mechanics and quantum optics since the early days of quantum theory; the first theoretical investigations by Einstein [1], Dirac [2], and Weisskopf and Wigner [3], spawned near constant attention to this area and its many offshoots [4–8]. Entanglement has interested and confounded the physics community since it was first noted [9–18]. Stochastic quantum trajectories (SQTs) have emerged comparatively recently [19–31]; progress in building quantum limited amplifiers [32–35] has made continuous monitoring of the state of individual quantum systems possible, and dramatically more efficient over the past few decades, leading to rapid experimental progress [36–38], and revealing new phenomena and insights into the quantum measurement process [39–44] and applications to quantum control [45–47].

There has been some interaction between these three areas in the past. Spontaneous emission has been combined with ideas about entanglement and measurement in proposals and experiments in which spatially–separated emitters are entangled by making joint photodetection measurements of their fluorescence, or similar [48–57]; such methods have been leveraged to realize loophole–free Bell tests [18], and such Bell state measurements are a key ingredient in many proposed designs for quantum repeaters [58, 59]. SQTs obtained specifically by heterodyning or homodyning a single qubit’s fluorescence have been proposed and realized experimentally [60–68]; such measurements form a small but growing share of the quantum trajectory literature, complimenting the more widespread dispersive measurement techniques [31, 33] which are now routinely performed in superconducting circuit devices around the world. Dispersive measurements have been adapted to monitor the parity of two qubit systems, and to thereby generate entanglement [69–79]. Such parity (or partial–parity) measurements are unable to distinguish between a pair of two–qubit basis states, and thereby entangle the qubits (placing the un–differentiated basis states in superposition). Typical implementations of such measurements involve probing a pair of qubits in the same cavity, or probing two qubit–cavity systems in series. An analogous statement, when qubits are placed in some parallel geometry suitable for creating remote entanglement [48, 49, 52, 54, 56, 77], as we will emphasize below, is that the which–path information must be erased for the measurement to be entangling (the measurement must be unable to tell which qubit makes contributions to the signal).

Our present work lies not at the intersection of any two of these areas, but rather all three. We consider systems in which the fluorescence of two qubits is mixed on a beamsplitter, as shown e.g. in Fig. 1, and contin–
uously monitored. Several existing works consider these types of scenarios, or related ones, from the standpoint of continuous monitoring [55, 80–85]. Additionally, the entangling properties of such measurements have been studied outside of a continuous monitoring framework [86–88]. In order to perform our quantum trajectory analysis, applying such measurements to the decay channels of qubits, we develop a Kraus operator model, from physical considerations, to update our two-qubit state under fluorescence dynamics, which builds off of that in Refs. [61, 68], in Sec. II. We confirm that such an approach allows us to re–derive some of the key results known from past works [55, 81, 84], and then undertake a more in–depth numerical analysis extending those results. Along the way, we provide a careful discussion connecting our model to intuitive and conceptual points; for instance, we are able to distinguish the entangling properties of all measurements we consider in terms of the erasure of which–path information, and explain that all of the successful entangling measurements we consider operate by effecting optimal entanglement swapping operations. We begin this general discussion in Sec. III, and then continue as we discuss the particular examples of photodetection measurements in Sec. IV, and homodyne measurements in Sec. V. In this way, our analysis draws connections between several distinct ideas which are present in, but scattered throughout, the literature. Additionally, we provide a comprehensive exploration of the types of entangled states generated by the homodyne detection scheme we consider. Conclusions and outlook are included in Sec. VI. A shorter summary of the present work can be found in [89].

II. CONTINUOUSLY MONITORING TWO–QUBIT FLUORESCENCE: FORMALISM

The formalism we use throughout this manuscript follows directly from prior work performed on single qubit fluorescence monitoring [61, 68]; we here describe how we adapt such methods to the device shown in Fig. 1, wherein we have two qubit–cavity systems, a mixing element (beamsplitter), and a pair of measurements. The qubit denoted A and the cavity output mode it is coupled to, initially in vacuum, evolve due to spontaneous emission from state $|A_t\rangle = |0\rangle \otimes (\zeta |e\rangle + \phi |g\rangle)$ to

$$|A_f\rangle = \sqrt{1-\epsilon} |0e\rangle + \phi |0g\rangle + \sqrt{\epsilon} |1g\rangle,$$

(1)
after a short interval $dt$. We suppose the qubit naturally fluoresces into the cavity at rate $\gamma = 1/T_1$, and that the measurements are weak (i.e. that $dt \ll T_1$). This state update could be equivalently written as a operation

$$\left( \begin{array}{c} \sqrt{1-\epsilon} \zeta \\ \phi + \sqrt{\epsilon} \zeta \hat{a}^\dagger \end{array} \right) = \left( \begin{array}{cc} \sqrt{1-\epsilon} & 0 \\ \sqrt{\epsilon} \hat{a}^\dagger & 1 \end{array} \right) \left( \begin{array}{c} \zeta \\ \phi \end{array} \right),$$

(2)
in the $(|e\rangle, |g\rangle)$ qubit basis, where a photon vacuum state $|0\rangle$ is assumed coupled in everywhere (but has not been explicitly written). The operator $\hat{a}^\dagger$ creates a photon in the relevant cavity mode, through which it travels to an input on the beamsplitter (i.e. $\hat{a}^\dagger |0\rangle = |1\rangle$). We use $\epsilon = \gamma dt$, such that $\gamma dt$ is the probability that there is spontaneous emission in a short time interval $dt$, given that the qubit is in $|e\rangle$.

We wish to extend this treatment to a system in which qubits in each of two separate cavities may emit. For simplicity, we only the consider the case where the qubits, cavities, and decay rates $\gamma$ of the two cavities are identical. A schematic of the sort of setup we imagine can be found in Fig. 1, where a beamsplitter implements a uni-

FIG. 1. A sketch of the kind of setup we envisage. Qubits in cavities A and B emit spontaneously into spatial modes 1 or 2, respectively. Each cavity and transmission line can be engineered to capture the fluorescence with high efficiency. These single–photon signals are mixed on a 50/50 beamsplitter and any phase in the two paths (relative to an external reference) is characterized with a pair of phase plates. The combined effect of these unitary transformations on modes 1 and 2 before they reach the detector at outputs 3 and 4 are summarized by the relations (6). We consider continuous monitoring, with three different measurement options shown on the right, at the outputs $D_1^a$ and $D_1^b$. Continuous monitoring amounts to sequential measurements over finite timesteps $dt$, where this measurement time is much faster than other dynamics in the system (i.e. $dt \ll T_1$). Direct photodetection of the emitted signal leads to a number of clicks in each timestep (zero, one, or two photons may arrive at a detector). Homodyne and heterodyne detection involve measuring one or both quadratures of the field, respectively; both rely on mixing the signal with a strong coherent state local oscillator (LO). The relative phase $\theta$ or $\vartheta$ between each signal and LO determines the particular quadrature(s) which are monitored. In contemporary circuit QED (i.e. on superconducting circuit) devices, homo–/hetero–dyne detections are effectively implemented by some Josephson junction based quantum–limited amplifiers (QLAs). Homodyne detection corresponds to a “phase–sensitive” amplification, which returns a single stochastic value at each timestep containing information about one field quadrature (the un–monitored quadrature is squeezed out). Heterodyne detection corresponds to “phase–preserving” amplification, which returns a pair of stochastic readouts, one corresponding to each field quadrature. For a detailed introductory review of such fluorescence measurements in the single–qubit case, see [68] and references therein.
tary mixing operation on the optical modes coming from either cavity, and some measurement devices can then be placed at the output ports 3 and 4. A two-qubit two-cavity system may be expressed by a pair of operators of the type above

\[
A = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1-\epsilon} & 0 \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}\hat{a}_1^\dagger & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{1-\epsilon} & 0 \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}\hat{a}_2^\dagger & 1 \end{pmatrix},
\]  

emitting into different spatial modes (where \(\hat{a}_1^\dagger\) and \(\hat{a}_2^\dagger\) create photons in modes 1 and 2, respectively). Then the two-qubit two-mode state update goes as

\[
|\psi_{dt}\rangle = (A \otimes B)(|A_i\rangle \otimes |B_i\rangle),
\]  

which gives a short-time state update, now in the two-qubit basis \(\{|ee\rangle, |eg\rangle, |ge\rangle, |gg\rangle\}\) (assuming some state \(|B_i\rangle = |0\rangle \otimes (\xi |e\rangle + \varphi |g\rangle)\) which transforms like \(|A_i\rangle\).

This is equivalently notated \(|\psi_{dt}\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \epsilon \\ \sqrt{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} \hat{a}_3^\dagger e^{i\theta} - \hat{a}_4^\dagger e^{i\theta} \\ \sqrt{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} \hat{a}_3^\dagger e^{i\theta} + \hat{a}_4^\dagger e^{i\theta} \\ \xi \sqrt{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} \hat{a}_3^\dagger \hat{a}_3 e^{2i\theta} - \hat{a}_4^\dagger \hat{a}_4 e^{2i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \zeta \xi \\ \zeta \varphi \\ \xi \varphi \\ \varphi \varphi \end{pmatrix}, \]  

where a vacuum state in both beamsplitter inputs \(|0,0\rangle\) is assumed (not yet traced or projected out to leave only the qubit states), but not explicitly notated.

The effect of the beamsplitter and phase plates can be characterized by the unitary transformations

\[
\hat{a}_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-i\theta} \left(\hat{a}_1^\dagger + \hat{a}_2^\dagger\right), \quad \hat{a}_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-i\theta} \left(\hat{a}_1^\dagger - \hat{a}_2^\dagger\right). \]  

The state-update matrix \(\mathcal{M}\) can be modified accordingly, to represent these optical transformations, leading to the outputs \(D_3^\alpha\) and \(D_4^\beta\), and then reads

\[
\mathcal{M} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 1 - \epsilon \\ \sqrt{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} \hat{a}_3^\dagger e^{i\theta} - \hat{a}_4^\dagger e^{i\theta} \\ \sqrt{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} \hat{a}_3^\dagger e^{i\theta} + \hat{a}_4^\dagger e^{i\theta} \\ \xi \sqrt{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} \hat{a}_3^\dagger \hat{a}_3 e^{2i\theta} - \hat{a}_4^\dagger \hat{a}_4 e^{2i\theta} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\]  

The operator that updates the two-qubit state under particular measurement outcomes is then obtained by projecting out final optical states \(|\psi_{f,3,4}\rangle\) consistent with the measurement process, i.e. \(\mathcal{M}_f = \langle \psi_{f,3,4}\rangle \mathcal{M} |0,0\rangle\) acts purely on the qubit state, and provides updates (conditioned on optical measurement outcomes) via

\[
\rho(t + dt) = \frac{\hat{M}_f \rho(t) \hat{M}_f^\dagger}{\text{tr} \left(\hat{M}_f \rho(t) \hat{M}_f^\dagger\right)}.
\]  

Such an approach will ultimately form the basis of virtually all of our derivations and numerical modeling below.

Note that an update of this type is the state update an observer can make at \(t + dt\) given previous knowledge of the state \(\rho(t)\), and access to the measurement record at both outputs 3 and 4, under the assumption that no information is lost to the environment at any stage between the qubits and detectors. (In other words, the joint qubit–field system remains perfectly isolated except for ideal, perfectly-eficient, measurements made at ports 3 and 4). In assuming that such an observer’s state update applies in real time, we implicitly assume that the photon travel times between the qubits and detectors are negligible (as is the case, e.g., in any circuit–QED experiment in a single dilution refrigerator).

Fluorescence moves the qubits from their excited states to their ground states. The clearest way to generate entanglement then involves starting with \(|ee\rangle\), counting photons, and creating a Bell state \(|\Psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|ee\rangle \pm |eg\rangle \pm |ge\rangle \pm |gg\rangle)\). Consider (with \(\theta = 0 = \vartheta\))

\[
\langle 1304 | M |0,0\rangle |ee\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{\epsilon(1-\epsilon)} & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} |ee\rangle
\]  

\(\rightarrow |\Psi^+\rangle\), which describes the update of the two-qubit state by the jump operator, which occurs conditioned on the detector at output 3 registering the arrival of a single photon in the requisite timestep. If a click occurs at output 4 instead, we take \(|ee\rangle\) to \(|\Psi^-\rangle\) (up to a sign) via
the operation $\langle 03_14|\mathcal{M}|03_04 \rangle \langle ee \rangle$. The key point to take away from this standard Bell–state measurement (BSM), going forward, is that depending on which channel registers an event, we get a different Bell state, and the matrix elements highlighted in purple are primarily responsible for generating entanglement, by correlating or anti–correlating $|eg\rangle$ and $|ge\rangle$ as amplitude decays out of $|ee\rangle$. When a second click is registered, we know that both qubits have emitted, and the state is updated to $|gg\rangle$ (with the entanglement destroyed).

Two–photon events (events in which both qubits emit “simultaneously”) exhibit interference, similar to the type exhibited in the classic Hong–Ou–Mandel experiment [90]. Our model coarse–grains the notion of simultaneity to mean merely that both emissions occur within the same detector integration interval $dt$. The probability of emission within the same interval $dt$ is sufficiently small (to $O(e^2)$ at worst) that the effects of this simplification to our model should be negligible. Related points are discussed in Appendix A.

We do ultimately wish to proceed to considering homodyne or heterodyne measurements instead of photodetections. Heterodyne monitoring can be modeled by projecting onto coherent state outcomes instead of Fock states [91, 92], i.e., we use a Kraus operator $\mathcal{M}_{\alpha\beta} = \langle \alpha | \beta \rangle \mathcal{M} | 00 \rangle = $ 

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
1 - \epsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\sqrt{(1 - \epsilon)/2} (\alpha^* e^{i\theta} - \beta^* e^{i\vartheta}) & 0 & -\sqrt{\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)} & 0 \\
\sqrt{(1 - \epsilon)/2} (\alpha^* e^{i\theta} + \beta^* e^{i\vartheta}) & 0 & \sqrt{1 - \epsilon} & 0 \\
\sqrt{\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)/(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} - \beta^* e^{i\vartheta})} & \sqrt{\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)/(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} + \beta^* e^{i\vartheta})} & \sqrt{1 - \epsilon} & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (10)

Physically, this is achieved by mixing the signal beams with a strong coherent state local oscillator (LO), or equivalently doing some “phase preserving” quantum–limited amplification (see Fig. 1). As in the one qubit case [61, 68], our four readouts are related to the coherent state eigenvalues by

\[
\alpha = \sqrt{\frac{dt}{2}} (r_j + i r_Q), \quad \beta = \sqrt{\frac{dt}{2}} (r_X + i r_Y).
\] (11)

Homodyne detection is similar to heterodyne detection\(^1\), but information is only collected about one quadrature instead of both (the unmeasured one is effectively squeezed out). We model this by choosing our final optical states to be eigenstates of a particular quadrature, i.e. we take the eigenstates of the $\hat{X} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\hat{a}^\dagger + \hat{a})$ quadrature at both outputs [25] (without loss of generality, since $\theta$ and $\vartheta$ are completely tunable), such that we have $\mathcal{M}_{34} = |X_3 X_4 \rangle \langle \mathcal{M} | 00 \rangle \propto $ 

\[
e^{-\left( X_3^2 + X_4^2 \right)/2} \begin{pmatrix}
1 - \epsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\sqrt{(1 - \epsilon)/(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} - \beta^* e^{i\vartheta})} & 0 & \sqrt{1 - \epsilon} & 0 \\
\sqrt{(1 - \epsilon)/(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} + \beta^* e^{i\vartheta})} & 0 & \sqrt{1 - \epsilon} & 0 \\
\sqrt{\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)/(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} - \beta^* e^{i\vartheta})} & \sqrt{\epsilon(1 - \epsilon)/(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} + \beta^* e^{i\vartheta})} & \sqrt{1 - \epsilon} & 1
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (12)

We have used the standard Hermite polynomial solutions in the appropriate matrix elements, i.e. we have the usual expressions

\[
|X|0 \rangle = \pi^{-\frac{1}{4}} e^{-X^2/2}, \quad (13a)
\]
\[
|X|1 \rangle = \pi^{-\frac{1}{4}} e^{-X^2/2} X \sqrt{2}, \quad (13b)
\]
\[
|X|2 \rangle = \pi^{-\frac{1}{4}} e^{-X^2/2} \left( \frac{2X^2 - 1}{\sqrt{2}} \right). \quad (13c)
\]

\(^1\) The most substantial difference between optical homodyne and heterodyne detection is addressed directly in their names; homodyne detection involves a signal and LO at the same frequency, whereas in heterodyne detection the signal and LO have different frequencies.

\[
\int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \int_0^\infty \mathcal{M}_{34} \mathcal{M}_{34} \propto 1
\] (15)

indicating that it forms a POVM. For derivations and an overview of the analogous quantities in the single qubit case, see [61], and for a very detailed treatment of the single qubit heterodyne case, see [61].
Note that it is very common to adopt a different approach to continuous measurement problems, by using the Stochastic Master Equation (SME) [22, 27, 30]. The general Itô SME for diffusive quantum trajectories reads

$$d\rho = i[\rho, \hat{H}]dt + \sum_c \left( \hat{L}_c[\rho, \hat{L}_c]dt + \sqrt{\eta_c} \hat{M}[\rho, \hat{L}_c]dW_c \right).$$

The super–operators are the Lindblad dissipation term

$$\hat{L}_c[\rho, \hat{L}_c] \equiv \hat{L}_c\rho\hat{L}_c^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \left( \hat{L}_c^\dagger\hat{L}_c\rho + \rho\hat{L}_c^\dagger\hat{L}_c \right),$$

and the measurement backaction term

$$\hat{M}[\rho, \hat{L}_c] \equiv \hat{L}_c\rho + \rho\hat{L}_c^\dagger - \rho \text{ tr} \left( \hat{L}_c\rho + \rho\hat{L}_c^\dagger \right).$$

Each of the operators $\hat{L}_c$ describes a particular measurement channel, which is monitored with efficiency $\eta_c \in [0, 1]$, where $\eta_c = 1$ denotes a channel from which all possible information is collected, and $\eta_c = 0$ indicates that the channel is open to the environment but none of the information leaking out is collected. Any unitary part of the dynamics can be applied using the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}$.

Expanding the state update equation (8) for homodyne or heterodyne monitoring, to $O(dt)$ and using the usual rules of calculus, leads to an equation that is identical to the Stratonovich version of the equation offered by the SME (16), as is typical in comparing these two approaches [36, 40, 61, 68]. Appendix D contains further details on this point. For example, the four readouts for the heterodyne measurement correspond to measurements of each field quadrature, at each output port, and in the SME picture are related to the channels (e.g. for $\theta = 0 = \vartheta$)

$$\hat{L}_I = i\frac{\gamma}{2} (\hat{\sigma}_A^+ + \hat{\sigma}_B^-), \quad \hat{L}_Q = -i\frac{\gamma}{2} (\hat{\sigma}_A^- + \hat{\sigma}_B^+),$$

$$\hat{L}_X = i\frac{\gamma}{2} (\hat{\sigma}_A^- - \hat{\sigma}_B^+), \quad \hat{L}_Y = -i\frac{\gamma}{2} (\hat{\sigma}_A^+ - \hat{\sigma}_B^-),$$

such that $r_I = (\hat{L}_I + \hat{L}_I^\dagger) + \xi_I$, and so on for the other measurement channels, where $\xi_I \sim dW_I/dt$ is Gaussian white noise. For more details about heterodyne simulations, see appendix B.

The SME has been fruitfully applied in past work on systems similar to those we consider here [55, 80–82, 84, 85]. While the SME is a terrific tool for the purposes of calculations, developing the corresponding Kraus operator treatment as we have done above has some advantages; specifically, our Kraus operators 1) are physically motivated and allow us a different window into understanding the process we describe, and 2) offer a good alternative to direct integration of the SME in numerical modeling, improving the efficiency of our codes (see [30] for closely–related comments). See appendix D for derivations demonstrating the equivalence of the two approaches to $O(dt)$.

III. WHICH–PATH INFORMATION AND INTERFERENCE

We now consider in detail the ability of photodetection, homodyne, and heterodyne detection schemes, to deduce any which–path information about the single photon signals they monitor.

A. Photodetection and Interference

An ideal photodetector at port 3 measures the photon number $\hat{N}_3 = \hat{a}_3^\dagger\hat{a}_3$ at each timestep, and the photodetector at port 4 measures $\hat{N}_4 = \hat{a}_4^\dagger\hat{a}_4$. Notice that $\hat{N}_3$ and $\hat{N}_4$ are totally independent of the phases $\theta$ and $\vartheta$ (see Fig. 1), so these do not impact the measurement at all in this case. If a photon is inserted with certainty at either port 1 or port 2, the probability that the ensuing click is registered at 3 or 4 is the same either way; this overlap in the probabilities associated with the measurement outcomes between our two paths is an indication that the which–path information is erased by this measurement. This means that, given an initial two–qubit state for which the photon origin is ambiguous, this measurement will be unable to disambiguate the which–path information, and can therefore generate entanglement.

Our model predicts that certain qubit states lead to complete destructive interference at either output ports 3 or 4. This is because entangled states of the qubits / emitters map directly onto entangled photon states. Consider the two–qubit Bell state $|\Psi^\pm\rangle = (|eg\rangle \pm |ge\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. The resulting photon emission is given by

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \hat{a}_1^\dagger \pm \hat{a}_2^\dagger \right) |0_10_2\rangle,$$

and the beamsplitter relations (6) show that these then become either

$$e^{i\theta} \hat{a}_3^\dagger |0_30_4\rangle (+), \quad e^{i\vartheta} \hat{a}_4^\dagger |0_30_4\rangle (-).$$

This means that when the qubits are in a state $|\Psi^+\rangle$, for instance, port 4 is completely dark, and $|\Psi^-\rangle$ leaves port 3 dark. A direct consequence is that in the photodetection case, the second photon measured must be seen at the same detector as the first (because the first click creates one of the two Bell states $|\Psi^\pm\rangle$, which in turn creates an interference effect for the next photon). The interference occurs independently of the type of measurements performed after the beamsplitter, and some interesting consequences of this are developed in appendix B.

B. Quadrature Measurements and Which–Path Information

What happens when the observer makes some measurement along one (homodyne) or both (heterodyne)
quadratures at ports 3 and 4 instead? Consider measuring e.g.

\[ \hat{X}_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_3^\dagger + \hat{a}_3), \hat{P}_3 = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_3^\dagger - \hat{a}_3), \]

\[ \hat{X}_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_4^\dagger + \hat{a}_4), \hat{P}_4 = \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_4^\dagger - \hat{a}_4), \]  \quad (22)

by interfering the signal with a strong LO of known reference phase. From the beamsplitter relations (6), it is apparent that (e.g. for \( \theta = 0 = \vartheta \)), we can have situations where a photon originating from port 1 leads to an in–phase measurement event, as experienced between 3 and 4, whereas a photon originating from port 2 leads to an effect which is 180° out of phase between ports 3 and 4. We need to be careful then: depending on which quadrature(s) we measure at each output, a pair of homodyne detections may be able to determine whether information was reflected or transmitted at a beamsplitter; we will confirm that in situations where we can thereby make inferences about the which–qubit origin of information in the measurement signals, the possibility to create entanglement between the qubits with that measurement is destroyed.

We proceed by looking more closely at measurements involving information from only one quadrature i.e. homodyne detection (equivalently, measurements made via phase–sensitive amplification). We can consider a probability density associated with the blue terms in (12). It is useful to consider a photon state \( \hat{a}_3^\dagger|0_10_2\rangle \) (+) or \( \hat{a}_3^\dagger|0_10_2\rangle \) (−) (a single photon enters from one input or the other), for which the output optical state at the detectors is given by

\[ |\psi_{3,4}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \hat{a}_3 \hat{e}^{i\theta} \pm \hat{a}_4 \hat{e}^{i\vartheta} \right) |0_30_4\rangle. \]  \quad (23)

These states, by definition, carry perfect which path information, and the two–qubit states \( |gc\rangle \) or \( |eg\rangle \) which map onto them are therefore unsuited to entanglement production. Our point here, however, is to see which measurements preserve or erase that information, which we are presently inserting into the system in the most definite way we can. The optical state (23) leads to the probability density

\[ \varphi(X_3, X_4|\text{single photon input}) = |\langle X_3X_4|\psi_{3,4}\rangle|^2 \]

\[ \propto e^{-X_3^2-X_4^2} \left( X_3^2 + X_4^2 \pm 2X_3X_4 \cos(\theta - \vartheta) \right). \]  \quad (24)

It is obvious that the distributions (24) will be different between the ± cases (and therefore those cases are at least partially distinguishable, except for a choice of \( \theta \) and \( \vartheta \) such that \( \cos(\theta - \vartheta) = 0 \)). In other words, we can erase the which path information by choosing \( \theta = 0 \) and \( \vartheta = 90^\circ \), which is effectively equivalent to measuring the \( \hat{X} \) quadrature of mode 3, and the \( \hat{P} \) quadrature of mode 4. See Fig. 2. The function \( \varphi \) is a proper probability density, because the states \( \{|X\rangle\} \) form a complete set.

We can make similar comments about the heterodyne case by looking at the joint (two–mode) Husimi–Q function at the outputs 3 and 4. If \( |\psi_{3,4}\rangle \) describes the output photon state, the \( Q \) function is given by

\[ Q(\alpha, \beta) = \frac{1}{\pi^2} |\langle \alpha\beta|\psi_{3,4}\rangle|^2 \]  \quad (25)

where we are using a coherent state \( a_3|\alpha\rangle = \alpha |\alpha\rangle \) at mode 3, and a coherent state \( a_4|\beta\rangle = \beta |\beta\rangle \) at mode 4. We will decompose the complex coherent state eigenvalues according to \( \alpha = X_3 + iP_3 \) and \( \beta = X_4 + iP_4 \). Then

\[ \begin{align*}
\varphi(X_3, X_4|\text{single photon input}) &= |\langle X_3X_4|\psi_{3,4}\rangle|^2 \\
&= e^{-X_3^2-X_4^2} \left( X_3^2 + X_4^2 \pm 2X_3X_4 \cos(\theta - \vartheta) \right).
\end{align*} \]
we may write

\[ Q = \frac{1}{2\pi^2} e^{-|\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2} e^{i\theta |\alpha^* e^{i\theta} \pm \beta^* e^{i\theta}|^2} \]

\[ = e^{-X_2^2 - X_2^2 - P_2^2 - P_2^2} \frac{2\pi^2}{\text{2pi}^2} \left[ X_3^2 + X_3^2 + P_3^2 + P_4^2 \right. \]

\[ \pm 2(X_3X_4 + P_3P_4)\cos(\theta - \theta) \]

\[ \pm 2(X_4P_3 - X_3P_4)\sin(\theta - \theta) \right], \]

where the + corresponds to the case where a photon started in port 1, and the − corresponds to the case where a photon started in port 2. This derivation works in a similar spirit to the one used in the homodyne case, with the notable difference that the \( Q \)-function is a quasiprobability distribution (because the states \(|\alpha\rangle\), unlike the states \(|X\rangle\), form an overcomplete basis). We can immediately see that functional form (26) would allow for the + and − case to be distinguished if we collect information about both quadratures at both output ports; this suggests that it is impossible to erase all of the which–path information if we perform heterodyne monitoring; such measurements are consequently expected to be much less interesting to us from and entanglement genesis standpoint (which we confirm below and in appendix B).

Above we have provided simple arguments 1) for how joint homodyne detection can lead to erasure of the which–path information in our system (and therefore lead to some entanglement generation), and 2) that this information erasure is impossible for the cases of interest using heterodyne detection. We present another argument against heterodyne detection of spontaneous emission as an entangling operation, and then focus on the more promising homodyne case. The heterodyne measurement, as discussed above, prepares coherent states \(|\alpha\rangle\) and \(|\beta\rangle\) respectively on the ports 3 and 4, satisfying the relations

\[ \delta_3 |\alpha_3\beta_4\rangle = \alpha |\alpha_3\beta_4\rangle \quad \text{&} \quad \delta_4 |\alpha_3\beta_4\rangle = \beta |\alpha_3\beta_4\rangle . \]

Inverting the beamsplitter relations (6), we can establish that the action of \( a_1 \) and \( a_2 \) on such a state follows

\[ \hat{a}_1 |\alpha_3\beta_4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( e^{-i\theta} |\alpha \rangle + e^{-i\theta} |\beta \rangle \right) |\alpha_3\beta_4\rangle , \]

\[ \hat{a}_2 |\alpha_3\beta_4\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( e^{-i\theta} |\alpha \rangle - e^{-i\theta} |\beta \rangle \right) |\alpha_3\beta_4\rangle . \]

This implies that \(|\alpha_3\beta_4\rangle\) can be written as a product of coherent states in modes 1 and 2 as well, i.e.

\[ |\alpha_3\beta_4\rangle = \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( e^{-i\theta} |\alpha \rangle + e^{-i\theta} |\beta \rangle \right) \right| \text{ mode 1} \]

\[ \left| \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( e^{-i\theta} |\alpha \rangle - e^{-i\theta} |\beta \rangle \right) \right| \text{ mode 2} \]

This proves that joint heterodyne measurement is effectively preparing separable states on modes one and two, leading to no entanglement generation between qubits. The same separability argument can be made for the homodyne measurement, in the case \( \theta = \theta \) which maximizes which–path distinguishability (minimizes which–path information erasure).

C. Understanding Which–Path Information Erasure in Terms of Entanglement Swapping

Here we argue that the generation of entanglement in our optimal homodyne scheme, as described above, can also be understood as entanglement swapping, using a continuous variable Einstein–Podolski–Rosen (EPR) basis measurement [9]. In entanglement swapping, one has two pairs of initially–entangled parties (four parties in total). To swap the entanglement, one generically performs a measurement in an entangled basis, on two parties—one from each initially entangled pair. This, in turn, entangles the remaining parties, effectively swapping the quantum entanglement between them. In our context, the fluorescence process naturally generates some time–dependent entanglement between each qubit and its cavity output mode (qubit \( A \) is entangled to mode 1, qubit \( B \) to mode 2); by jointly measuring the fields (modes 3 and 4), we can swap the entanglement around so that the two qubits share correlations instead.

This can be realized as follows: The observables \( \hat{X}_+ = \hat{X}_1 + \hat{X}_2 \) and \( \hat{P}_- = \hat{P}_1 - \hat{P}_2 \) commute, and completely characterize the two mode quantum state. Jointly measuring them can generate EPR correlations between the modes 1 and 2. A measurement of \( \hat{X}_+ \) with readout \( r_+ \) and a measurement of \( \hat{P}_- \) yielding readout \( r_- \), prepare a continuous variable EPR state with \( X_1 + X_2 = r_+ \) and \( P_1 - P_2 = r_- \). We first focus on the perfectly correlated scenario \( X_1 + X_2 = 0 \) and \( P_1 - P_2 = 0 \); the two mode wavefunction is then is [93]

\[ \langle X_1X_2|\psi_{1,2}\rangle \propto \delta(X_1 + X_2) \]

in the position basis, and

\[ \langle P_1P_2|\psi_{1,2}\rangle \propto \delta(P_1 - P_2) \]

in the momentum basis. The particular state (30) (which has the same symmetry of a photon pair produced from vacuum) can also be written in the Wigner form as [94],

\[ W(X_1, X_2, P_1, P_2) = \delta(X_1 + X_2)\delta(P_1 - P_2) . \]

An arbitrary readout set \{\( r_-, r_+ \)\} preparing maximally entangled field modes are related to the state (30) by a local unitary operation in either of the modes, which is a generic single mode displacement operation that preserve the entanglement. The state (30) is also the limit of maximal squeezing in a two mode squeezed vacuum state [93, 95],

\[ |\psi^\prime_{1,2}\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{\cosh(s)} \tanh(s)^n |n_1\rangle |n_2\rangle . \]

The wavefunction \( \langle X_1, X_2|\psi^\prime_{1,2}\rangle \) is identical to (30) in the limit \( s \to \infty \) [93], highlighting the role of the squeezing operation implicit in homodyne detection.

In our setting, the modes \( \hat{X}_+ \) and \( \hat{P}_- \) are realized from modes 1 and 2 by passing them through the beamsplitter.
Then local measurements of quadratures on the outgoing ports realize the measurements of the sum \( \hat{X}_4 \) and difference \( \hat{P}_4 \) quadratures of the input modes. We can formalize this statement by noting that \( (\hat{X}_1 + \hat{X}_2)/\sqrt{2} \rightarrow \hat{X}_3 \) and \( (\hat{P}_1 - \hat{P}_2)/\sqrt{2} \rightarrow \hat{P}_4 \) under the beamsplitter relations (6), with \( \theta = 0 = \vartheta \). Equivalently, we have \( (\hat{P}_1 - \hat{P}_2)/\sqrt{2} \rightarrow \hat{X}_4 \) with \( \theta = 0 \) and \( \vartheta = 90^\circ \) (for the generalized \( \hat{X}_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_1e^{i\theta} + \hat{a}_4e^{-i\vartheta}) \)); thus, the measurement we have claimed erases which–path information has previously been shown to be the optimal diffusive unraveling \( \varepsilon \) of \( \hat{X}_4 \) with \( |\theta - \vartheta| = 90^\circ \), is exactly of the EPR form just discussed.

We note that there is some precedent for the double homodyne detection device we emphasize; quite similar devices have been used to verify the properties of continuous–variable (optical) EPR states [9, 15, 96], as well as in related experiments concerned with the steerability of such states [86, 87]. The entanglement–swapping interpretation we give above has also been used in explaining the effect of such homodyne measurements [88]. Implementations of these concepts directly using microwave amplification hardware, that is critical in realizing quantum trajectory experiments with superconducting qubits, have been proposed and realized; specifically, the sorts of EPR measurements of interest have been performed on microwave quantum optics (without qubits at the source) [97], and implementation of the measurement of interest has been proposed in the context of dispersive qubit measurement [77]. Furthermore, the homodyne measurement of fluorescence we derive above as optimal for erasing which path information has previously been shown to also be the optimal diffusive unraveling of the two–qubit master equation based on decay channels for the purposes of entanglement preservation [81]. As we explore numerical results for this case in Sec. V, we will be able to further confirm that result, and elaborate substantially on it.

This concludes our general overview of all the measurements we wish to consider. The remainder of the paper is dedicated to detailing the dynamics of the two–qubit states for specific measurement cases, using numerical simulation. We review the case of photodetection and jump trajectories in Sec. IV to establish some baseline expectations. We then develop the homodyne detection case in Sec. V, drawing comparisons with the photodetection case.

IV. JUMP TRAJECTORIES FROM CONTINUOUS PHOTODETECTION

We turn our attention to photodetection and jump trajectories. Three types of events that can occur within a single measurement timestep are of primary interest; either no photons are detected, as described by \( \mathcal{M}_{00} = \langle 0_0 0_1 | \mathcal{M} | 0_0 0_0 \rangle \), a photon is measured in output 3 as described by \( \mathcal{M}_{10} = \langle 1_3 0_1 | \mathcal{M} | 0_0 0_0 \rangle \), or a photon is measured in output 4 as described by \( \mathcal{M}_{01} = \langle 0_3 1_4 | \mathcal{M} | 0_0 0_0 \rangle \).

There is also the more remote possibility that both cavities emit at once (within the same detector integration interval \( dt \)), described by \( \mathcal{M}_{20} \) or \( \mathcal{M}_{02} \). These Kraus operators are given by

\[
\mathcal{M}_{00} = \begin{pmatrix}
1 - \epsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \sqrt{1 - \epsilon} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \sqrt{1 - \epsilon} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}_{10} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\sqrt{\epsilon (1 - \epsilon) / 2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\sqrt{\epsilon (1 - \epsilon) / 2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \sqrt{2} & \sqrt{2} & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}_{01} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\sqrt{\epsilon (1 - \epsilon) / 2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\sqrt{\epsilon (1 - \epsilon) / 2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \sqrt{2} & -\sqrt{2} & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}_{20} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\epsilon \sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix},
\]

\[
\mathcal{M}_{02} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-\epsilon \sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

These form a complete set of outcomes, such that \( \sum \mathcal{M}_{ij} \mathcal{M}_{ij}^\dagger = \mathbb{I} \), where the sum is over all five of the matrices above. Simulations of this situation simply involve applying the appropriate \( \mathcal{M}_{ij} \) to \( \rho \) according to

\[
\rho(t + dt) = \frac{\mathcal{M}_{ij} \rho(t) \mathcal{M}_{ij}^\dagger}{\text{tr} \left( \mathcal{M}_{ij} \rho(t) \mathcal{M}_{ij}^\dagger \right)},
\]

where the outcomes of different combinations of detector clicks are generated randomly over time, according to the correct statistics. To do this, we derive the probabilities

\[
w_{ij} = \text{tr} \left( \mathcal{M}_{ij} \rho \mathcal{M}_{ij}^\dagger \right),
\]

assigned to each outcomes above, which are normalized such that \( \sum w_{ij} = 1 \). Then we may draw a number from a multinomial distribution at every timestep, each possibility of which corresponds to a given detector outcome. The weight factors are

\[
w_{00} = 1 - dt \gamma \Xi + dt^2 \gamma^2 \Theta,
\]

(37a)
\[ w_{10} = \gamma dt \left( \frac{q_1}{\sqrt{2}} - \frac{q_4}{\sqrt{2}} \right) - \gamma^2 dt^2 \Theta, \quad (37b) \]

\[ w_{01} = \gamma dt \left( \frac{q_1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{q_4}{\sqrt{2}} \right) - \gamma^2 dt^2 \Theta, \quad (37c) \]

\[ w_{02} = \frac{\gamma^2 dt^2}{2} \Theta = w_{20}, \quad (37d) \]

for

\[ \Xi = 1 + \frac{q_1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{q_2}{\sqrt{6}} + \frac{2q_3}{2\sqrt{3}}, \]

\[ \Theta = \frac{1}{4} + \frac{q_1}{\sqrt{2}} + \frac{q_2}{\sqrt{6}} + \frac{q_3}{2\sqrt{3}}, \quad (37e) \]

We have introduced a set of two–qubit generalized Bloch coordinates \( q_j \), with \( 1 \leq j \leq 15 \) (see Appendix C2 for details).

We run some simulations of this scenario, shown in Fig. 3, and find that we can create substantial entanglement between the two qubits, as expected. Specifically, if both qubits are prepared in the excited state, the overwhelming majority of trajectories involve two photons coming out within a few \( T_1 = \gamma^{-1} \) of the start of the experiment. A Bell state is prepared when the first photon comes out, and then the qubits must be in \(|gg\rangle\) after the second exits. Some jump trajectories computed according to the scheme above, along with the average concurrence \(|\Psi\rangle\) (see Sec. C1) are plotted in Fig. 3. In some cases it is simple to derive analytic expressions for the curves denoting the average entanglement under the measurement process. Consider the initial state \(|ee\rangle\) for example; a simple expression of the decay process says that each individual qubit–cavity system evolves from \(|e0\rangle\) to a state

\[ |\psi_1\rangle = \sqrt{e^{-\gamma t}} |e0\rangle + \sqrt{1 - e^{-\gamma t}} |g1\rangle \quad (38) \]

after some time \( t \). We may multiply two such terms together when considering the pair of qubits and cavities, which gives us a state \(|\psi_{1,2}\rangle = \)

\[ e^{-\gamma t} |ee\rangle |0_10_2\rangle + (1 - e^{-\gamma t}) |gg\rangle |1_11_2\rangle + \sqrt{2} e^{-\gamma t} (1 - e^{-\gamma t}) \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |eg\rangle |0_11_2\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |ge\rangle |1_10_2\rangle \right] \]

(39)

before the beamsplitter. It is the projection of the optical field into either \(|0_10_2\rangle\) or \(|1_10_4\rangle\) (i.e. into the \(|1_10_2\rangle\) subspace) that generates an entangled state under photodetection. We see that from \(|ee\rangle\) at \( t = 0 \), the probability to land in this subspace with concurrence \( \tilde{C} = 1 \) between the two qubits (after the beamsplitter) goes like

\[ \tilde{C}(t) = 2e^{-\gamma t}(1 - e^{-\gamma t}) \quad (40) \]

![FIG. 3. The concurrence of a dozen individual trajectories (low opacity, in multiple colors unique to each trajectory), and the average concurrence over an ensemble of 10,000 quantum trajectories (blue) are plotted above. The surrounding pale blue envelope denotes the standard deviation of the concurrence of the underlying ensemble. All figures are generated with simulations described in Sec. IV and assume that ideal photodetectors are placed at ports 3 and 4, as defined in Fig. 1. We use \( \gamma = 1 \text{ MHz} = 1 \text{ (µs)}^{-1} \), and \( dt = 5 \text{ ns} \) for numerical purposes, with a total duration \( T = 5T_1 \). Both qubits are assumed to have the same decay rate \( \gamma = T_1^{-1} \). The qubits are initialized in the state \(|ee\rangle\) (a), \(|\Psi\rangle\) (b), and \(|\Phi\rangle\) (c), where \(|\Psi\rangle = (|eg\rangle ± |ge\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \) and \(|\Phi\rangle = (|ee\rangle ± |gg\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \) are Bell states. In (a) we see the rise and fall of entanglement generated by the measurement given the initial state \(|ee\rangle\), which follows \( \tilde{C} = 2e^{-\gamma t}(1 - e^{-\gamma t}) \) (dotted red; see (40)). In (b) and (c) we see that the measurement gradually erodes the initial two–qubit entanglement, which asymptotically approaches \( \tilde{C} = 0 \) for \( t \gg T_1 \). The averages from simulation (solid blue) are in good agreement with the expressions \( \tilde{C} = e^{-\gamma t}(2 - e^{-\gamma t}) \) and \( \tilde{C} = e^{-\gamma t} \) in (b) and (c), respectively (dotted red).]
after some time $t$. We denote this $\bar{C}$ however, because the probability to get a state with concurrence 1 is precisely the average concurrence between the two qubits across quantum trajectories under the ideal measurement jump process; see Fig. 3(a) for a comparison between the analytic expression $\bar{C}$ and the average concurrence computed from an ensemble simulation of continuous measurements. The process described above can also be understood as an entanglement swap, and has been interpreted in this way elsewhere [55]. Comparisons between this solution and the homodyne case, drawing on related works [81, 84] will be undertaken in the following section.

We comment briefly on the decay of concurrence from different Bell states under this measurement protocol, as illustrated in Fig. 3(b–c). Initializing our qubits in $|\Phi^{\pm}\rangle = (|ee\rangle \pm |gg\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ leads to the longest-lived average concurrence under photodetection; the slope of the average concurrence $\bar{C} = e^{-\gamma t}(2 - e^{-\gamma t})$ is zero at $t = 0$, indicating a prolonged entanglement lifetime before the exponential decay sets in. This is best understood in comparison with Fig. 3(c); there the average concurrence from $|\Psi^{\pm}\rangle = (|eg\rangle \pm |ge\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ decays simply as $\bar{C} = e^{-\gamma t}$. This is because an initial state $|\Psi^{\pm}\rangle$ generates only one jump in any realization, and that jump drops the concurrence from $C = 1$ to $C = 0$; then the characteristic decay rate $\gamma$ of the individual qubits maps directly onto the decay of the concurrence. By contrast, the states $|\Phi^{\pm}\rangle$ lead to either two jumps or no jumps in any given realization; the concurrence stays high at the beginning of the no–jump case, before we can infer with high confidence that we aren’t going to get a photon, and the first jump in the two–jump case does not kill the concurrence, but rather creates the other Bell states $|\Psi^{\pm}\rangle$, which then decay to $C = 0$ only after the second jump. Thus the states $|\Phi^{\pm}\rangle$ exhibit a longer entanglement lifetime on average, by effectively delaying their decay to the separable state $|gg\rangle$. This brings to mind other works, which have shown that changing the encoding of an entangled state can make it more or less susceptible to disentanglement under certain environmental noises [99–101]; we will be able to elaborate further on additional connections present in the continuous measurement case [81, 84] in the following section.

V. ENTANGLEMENT BY JOINT HOMODYNE FLUORESCENCE DETECTION

We now investigate the case where both of the outputs are homodyned, i.e. we consider dynamics generated by a measurement of the type (12). Recall from the discussion above that we can optimally erase the which-path information by choosing $|\theta - \vartheta| = 90^\circ$ in this scenario, and therefore expect these settings to correspondingly be optimal for generating two–qubit entanglement.

A. Concurrence Yield

We develop the remaining expressions from (12) that we need to perform simulations. The denominator of the state update equation (8) describes the probability density from which the readouts are drawn at each time step. As in the single qubit cases [61, 68], it is

![Figure 4](image-url)
We consequently see that our readouts obey in the readout, and this case is no exception. The readout in Fig. 4(a) to the photodetection case of the entanglement dynamics. Comparing the homodyne case in Fig. 4(a), we immediately see that there are, of course, stark difference in character between individual trajectories under photodetection, as compared with quadrature measurements. The diffusive trajectories we obtain from homodyning do not even allow us to say that the photon was emitted at any particular time, as in the one-qubit case [68]; the system diffuses from $|ee\rangle$ to $|gg\rangle$ without any single well-defined emission event. Despite these differences, however, the average concurrence over the duration of the simulation is identical to the expression (40) we derived in the photodetection case. It has already been shown by Viviescas et al. [81] (using completely different arguments) that a measurement satisfying $|\theta - \vartheta| = 90^\circ$ is the optimal one among those utilizing decay channels to generate two-qubit diffusive trajectories for the purposes of preserving two-qubit entanglement. One of their key results is the derivation of a differential equation describing the evolution of the average concurrence: They use the stochastic Schrödinger equation\(^2\) to derive

$$\dot{\mathcal{C}} = -\gamma \mathcal{C} + 2\gamma \rho_{ee} e^{-2\gamma t},$$

(43)

where $\mathcal{C}$ again denotes the average concurrence, dots denote time derivatives, and $\rho_{ee}$ is the excited state population. We again consider the case $\rho_{ee} = 1$ (which implies the initial value $\mathcal{C}(t = 0) = 0$), and find that the solution to (43) in this case is precisely the function (40) we derived from the photodetection case. This suggests that the average entanglement yield between these two measurements are not just similar, but formally equivalent when $\theta$ and $\vartheta$ are chosen optimally; such an equivalence has been noted before [84]. While it may be surprising that the two protocols we have discussed lead to identical concurrence yield on average, in the face of the differences between jump and diffusive trajectories, it follows naturally from the entanglement swapping ideas [55, 88] we have discussed; from that viewpoint, the fluorescence process generates a certain amount of entanglement in the system (between each qubit and its output mode) as a function of time, irrespective of the subsequent measurements; both photodetection and Bell state measurements are able to perform an optimal swap in this case, rearranging that entanglement. They do this in very different ways, but the two measurements are ultimately manipulating the same resources in the system, leading to the same average concurrence yield.

Less-than-ideal measurements could be understood as wasting some of that potential entanglement; for example, in Fig. 4(b) we see that changing the relationship between $\theta$ and $\vartheta$ retains the shape of the curve from Fig. 4(a), but modulates it down by an overall factor.

\(^2\) The SSE is a stochastic differential equation modeling ideal measurements and pure state evolution, which generalizes to the SME (16) when $\eta \neq 1$ or mixed states are otherwise necessary.
state we reach at times of maximal concurrence $C$ beyond previous discussions \cite{81}. The simulations are of the double homodyne measurement with $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$. We use an ensemble of 100,000 states, each obtained from the first timestep in which a quantum trajectory initialized at $|ee\rangle$ reaches $C \geq 0.999$. The colorbar denotes count density per bin in the two-dimensional histograms ($\star$ and $\blacklozenge$), while relative counts ($rc$) per bin are plotted in the one-dimensional (marginal) histograms ($\blacklozenge$). In the figures marked $\star$ and $\blacklozenge$ we plot using our Bell basis amplitudes $B$, $C$, and $E$; one-dimensional histograms $\blacklozenge$ are aligned with the two-dimensional histograms $\star$ such that summing out a row or column of bins in the 2-d plots would give the accompanying 1-d plot. We see that the distributions in $C$ and $E$ are symmetric, and centered about 0 with their peak there. Normalization then demands that the single most-likely state about which the distribution is peaked occurs at $B = 1$, i.e. the state which is most-likely to occur when the concurrence is maximized, under the given measurement settings, is $|\Phi^-\rangle = (|ee\rangle - |gg\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. However, the maximally concurrent states which we obtain are generically superpositions of the Bell states (46), and while states with $B = 0$ are the least-likely, the system does explore the full space of states for $C, E \in [-1,1]$, and $B \in [0,1]$, which satisfy the normalization condition $B^2 + C^2 + E^2 = 1$. The additional density plot $\star$ in which we histogram $q_4$ against $q_7$ is significant in that it shows that $q_7$ is never positive for the maximally concurrent states in the simulated sample; this indicates that $A = 0$, as discussed in the main text, justifying its exclusion from the other plots.

$\sim |\sin(\theta - \vartheta)|$ as the degree of which-path distinguishability is changed (flatlining to zero two-qubit concurrence for all time, in the case of total distinguishability $\theta = 0 = \vartheta$. We finally note that under the ideal homodyne measurements with $|\theta - \vartheta| = 90^\circ$, some trajectories do reach the maximum $C = 1$ within a few $T_1$ of the start of the simulation.

B. Maximally-Entangled States

We extend the quantum trajectory analysis of the homodyne scheme beyond previous discussions \cite{81}. The state we reach at times of maximal concurrence $C = 1$ are a superposition of three of the four Bell states. Any pure two-qubit state may be expressed in the Bell basis according to

$$|\psi\rangle = A|\Phi^+\rangle + B|\Phi^-\rangle + C|\Psi^+\rangle + D|\Psi^-\rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (44)

The concurrence of the state is given, in this representation, by $C = |A^2 + D^2 - B^2 - C^2|$. For trajectories initialized at $|ee\rangle$, the blue terms in (12) guarantee that we generate correlations with a real $C$ (generated by $r_3$) and imaginary $D$ (generated by $ir_4$) in the odd-parity subspace. The amplitude $|ee\rangle$ at any given time is given by $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(A + B)$, which remains real and nonnegative along the duration of any trajectory initialized at $|ee\rangle$. Re-parameterizing $D = iE$, and assuming $A$, $B$, and $C$ are real (consistent with all our simulations initialized at $|ee\rangle$ for $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$), we then have

$$C = |A^2 - B^2 - C^2 - E^2|. \hspace{1cm} (45)$$
FIG. 6. We plot a dozen individual simulated SQTs initialized at $|ee\rangle$, monitored according to our double homodyne detection scheme with $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$; as discussed in the main text, these parameters are ideal for erasing which-path information and generating two-qubit entanglement. The sampling of trajectories shown here are the same as those plotted in Fig. 4(a), with matched colors. They lead to the average concurrence in the ensemble peaking at $C = \frac{1}{2}$, with the best realizations reaching $C = 1$ at points in their evolution. The plots above are arranged similarly to the density matrix. The population is plotted down the diagonal, the real parts of the coherences are plotted in the upper triangular region, and the imaginary parts of the coherences are plotted in the lower triangular region (in inverse color). A key clarifying this layout and the colored plot markers is provided in (C15). The correlations between different elements of $\rho$, in individual realizations, are visible. For instance, the populations in $|eg\rangle$ & $|ge\rangle$ are perfectly correlated in all realizations. Similarly, the real parts of the coherence / transition elements from $|ee\rangle$ towards $|eg\rangle$ and $|ge\rangle$ (■ & ■) are perfectly correlated, as are those transitioning from $|eg\rangle$ and $|ge\rangle$ toward $|gg\rangle$ (■ & ■); the imaginary parts of these same elements are perfectly anti-correlated, i.e. ♦ & ♦, and ♦ & ♦ form anti-correlated pairs. (Equivalently, $q_5$ & $q_6$, and $q_8$ & $q_9$, exhibit perfect correlations in all realizations, at all times. Likewise, $q_{11}$ & $q_{12}$, and $q_{14}$ & $q_{15}$, exhibit perfect anti-correlations in all realizations, at all times.) This indicates that we have a correlated and coherent link between $|ee\rangle$ and $|gg\rangle$; every possible transition of amplitude from $|ee\rangle$ toward $|gg\rangle$ exhibits internal correlations. That the measurement at hand generates entanglement between our two emitters is a reflection of this. We note the asymmetry in the $|ee\rangle\langle gg|$ element; the system clearly exhibits a preference for correlations of the type $|\Phi^-\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|ee\rangle - |gg\rangle)$ over those of type $|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|ee\rangle + |gg\rangle)$.

Under these conditions, we find that $C$ is maximized when $A = 0$, i.e. we maximize $C$ when the measurement pushes the two-qubit state into a form

$$
|\psi\rangle = B |\Phi^-\rangle + C |\Psi^+\rangle + iE |\Psi^-\rangle,
$$

(46)

for real $B$, $C$, and $E$. The particular values of these normalized amplitudes depend on the measurement record in a given realization. Upon obtaining such a maximally entangled state, one can shift it to a single Bell state through a local unitary operation on a single qubit. For example, consider applying a pulse to qubit $B$ according to

$$
U_B |\psi\rangle = \mathbb{I}_A \otimes \left( \frac{B}{-\sqrt{(C + iE)(C - iE)}} \begin{pmatrix} B & C - iE \\ -C + iE & B \end{pmatrix} \right) |\psi\rangle = |\Phi^-\rangle,
$$

(47)

where $|\psi\rangle$ on the LHS is of the form (46).

We may consider the statistics of the maximally–concurrent states created by our homodyne measurement. To this end, we generate an ensemble of maximally–concurrent states from simulation, obtained from the first timestep in which a trajectory achieves $C \geq 0.999$, from the initial state $|ee\rangle$ with $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$; we then confirm that $A = 0$ for all such states,
FIG. 7. We plot the density of SQTs as a function of time, with the ensemble of 10,000 initialized from $|ee\rangle$ with $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$. This gives the density profile of each matrix element, corresponding to the individual realizations plotted in Fig. 6. The layout follows (C15), with the populations down the diagonal (yellow and orange), the real parts of the coherence in the upper triangular region (yellow and green), and the imaginary parts of the coherences in the lower triangular region (inverse color). Correlations between the density matrix elements on aggregate are visible in this representation; the ability of the measurement to generate entanglement is however also captured by the fact these correlations exist not just on aggregate, but also within individual realizations of the continuous measurement process, as described in Fig. 6. This becomes clearer through comparison with the same plots for the non–entangling measurements, e.g. as in Figs. 8 and 9.

and look at the distribution of the non–zero Bell basis amplitudes $B$, $C$, and $E$ in the ensemble. The analysis in question is shown in Fig. 5. What we find is somewhat surprising, in so far as it highlights a substantial difference between the homodyne and photodetection cases. Recall that for the photodetection case, the concurrence appears in the form $|\Psi^+\rangle$ or $|\Psi^-\rangle$ only. The homodyne measurement not only adds the possibility of having $|\Phi^-\rangle$ appear, but in fact, $|\Phi^-\rangle$ is the single most–likely state for a trajectory to reach as it attains $C = 1$; in Fig. 5, we clearly see that the histogrammed distributions (probability density) of state amplitudes are peaked about $B = 1$, and $C = 0 = E$. A generic realization is not restricted any one Bell state, or even a small subset of them, however; the distribution covers the entire space of normalized states for $C, E \in [-1, 1]$, and $B \geq 0$. The probability density within those possibilities has positive amplitude $B$, and is symmetric in $C$ and $E$, but no other constraints appear on the range of possible random $C = 1$ states which arise from this measurement.

We turn our attention to the stochastic trajectories, in order to understand how individual realizations of the measurement process generate the class of states (46). In Figs. 6 and 7 we show trajectories according to their density matrix components, and the ensemble density of SQTs; all are initialized at $|ee\rangle$ with $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$. Several additional insights emerge from these figures. First, we can see that at the level of individual trajectories there are perfect correlations between the real parts of the coherences involved with amplitudes moving in and out of the $|eg\rangle$ and $|ge\rangle$ subspace (coordinates $q_5 \& q_6$, and $q_8 \& q_9$, in the notation of appendix C 2), and perfect anti–correlations in the imaginary parts of those coherences ($q_{11} \& q_{12}$, and $q_{14} \& q_{15}$). Note that the
FIG. 8. We plot a dozen simulated SQTs, initialized from $|ee\rangle$ and computed with $\theta = 0 = \vartheta$. As noted throughout the main text, this measurement scenario does not generate entanglement. Note the lack of clear (anti–)correlations in individual realizations of the measurement process, in contrast with the entangling case (see Fig. 6). Instead of getting clear correlations among the real parts of coherences according the measurement record $r_3$, and anti–correlations in the imaginary parts of the coherences according to the measurement record $r_4$, both measurement records send their uncorrelated noise to the real parts of the density matrix; this effectively generates a competition between $|\Psi^+\rangle$–type correlations and those of the $|\Psi^-\rangle$–type, destroying entanglement. No trajectory plotted above exhibits any two–qubit concurrence at any point in its evolution. The layout follows (C15), reflecting the two–qubit density matrix, with populations down the diagonal, the real parts of the coherences in the upper triangular region, and the imaginary parts of the coherences plotted in the lower triangular region (in inverse color).

means of the signals represent combinations of precisely these terms. Reaching maximal entanglement requires that the coherences within the $|eg\rangle$ and $|ge\rangle$ subspace be able to explore their full range $[-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ (we refer to elements described by coordinates $q_4$ associated with $C$, and $q_{10}$ associated with $E$). The central elements of Figs. 6 and 7 show that we are able to do this. Likewise, entanglement in the even–parity Bell subspace depends on the coherences between $|ee\rangle$ and $|gg\rangle$ being able to explore their whole range (coordinates $q_7$ and $q_{13}$); we see that the imaginary part of this coherence is never used by the measurement we consider now ($q_{13}$ is zero for all time), while the real part is able to explore its full negative range $[-\frac{1}{2}, 0]$, but not its full positive range; the range of the real part of the $|ee\rangle$ $|gg\rangle$ element is only able to access $[0, \frac{1}{2}]$ while the range $[\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}]$ associated with fully manifesting the state $|\Phi^+\rangle$ appears forbidden. We infer that our homodyne measurement with $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$ seems to “prefer” generating correlations of the type $|\Phi^-\rangle$ as opposed to those of type $|\Phi^+\rangle$ (consistent with the arguments made in and around (45)). One clear expression which contributes to this are the factors $-\frac{1}{2}$ in the red matrix element of (12), which moves population directly from $|ee\rangle$ to $|gg\rangle$. For further comments in this vein, see appendix A. We can spot particular realizations in Figs. 4 and 6 which conform especially well to the different options we see in the statistical discussion surrounding Fig. 5; the burgundy path in Figs. 4 and 6, for instance, is a prototypical path which maximizes $C$ by generating large $B$ and low $|C|$ and $|E|$, while the lavender–colored path exhibits the reverse, maintaining an unremarkable $B$ and maximizing its concurrence by generating amplitude in $C$ and $E$ instead.

Some of the points we make are clearer in contrast with a non–entangling case of the dynamics. We show trajectories and densities for the case $\theta = 0 = \vartheta$ in Figs. 8 and
FIG. 9. We plot the density of simulated SQTs in the case of homodyne detection, with \( \theta = 0 = \vartheta \). As discussed in the main text, this choice of quadrature measurements leads to the acquisition of which–path information, and does not generate entanglement at any point in time, in any of the underlying SQTs (see Fig. 8). The plots are arranged to reflect the layout of the density matrix, with the populations down the diagonal (yellow and orange), the real parts of the coherences in the upper triangular region (corresponding to \( q_4 \) through \( q_9 \), in yellow and green), and the imaginary parts of the coherences in the lower triangular region (corresponding to \( q_{10} \) through \( q_{15} \), in inverse color). See appendix C 2, and equation (C15) in particular, for details about this labeling scheme. Notice that many of the density matrix elements appear correlated on aggregate, but they aren’t in individual realizations (see Fig. 8), which spoils the possibility of entanglement.

9. Coherences associated with moving amplitude in and out of the \( \{ |eg\rangle, |ge\rangle \} \) subspace appear correlated on aggregate, but are not at the level of individual trajectories. Furthermore, the coherences within the \( \{ |ee\rangle, |gg\rangle \} \) \((q_7)\) and \( \{ |eg\rangle, |ge\rangle \} \) \((q_4)\) subspaces which are key to generating Bell states are all restricted to a truncated range. Both of these features are consistent with our observation that no trajectory achieves any concurrence at any point in its evolution for these measurement settings. Only the real parts of the density matrix are utilized for \( \theta = 0 = \vartheta \). In the Bell state basis notation of (44), this corresponds to having D be completely real instead of completely imaginary. We can consequently understand the entangling measurement \( \theta = 0 \) and \( \vartheta = 90^\circ \) as allowing the readouts \( r_3 \) and \( r_4 \) to work cooperatively in generating concurrence. By contrast, the non–entangling measurement \( \theta = 0 \) \( \vartheta \) causes C and D to be forced into direct competition, destroying the possibility of generating concurrence (in contrast with the expression (45)).

C. Entanglement Preservation

A final example, shown in Fig. 10, serves to illustrate the behavior of different types of correlations in response to our measurement; we choose each of the Bell states as initial two–qubit states, and look at the evolution of the concurrence under homodyne \( \theta = 0 \) and \( \vartheta = 90^\circ \) measurement. We find that they exhibit different average lifetimes, such that the Bell state \( |\Phi^+\rangle \) whose correlation type runs against entangling dynamics of the measurement \( \theta = 0 \) and \( \vartheta = 90^\circ \) decays on average at least twice as fast as any of the others. This is in contrast with the photodetection case, where this faster decay does not
appear. Dynamics originating from the other three Bell states, under our homodyne scheme, have clear counterparts in the photodetection case, however, which are apparent from comparing Figs. 3 and 10. This again reinforces the notion that our measurement exhibits some preferred type of correlations, as well as the connection between different types of measurements which perform an entanglement swap; further discussion can be found in appendix A. The solutions obtained analytically for the photodetection case in Fig. 3, and in the homodyne case Figs. 4 and 10(a,b), are all solutions to the equation (43) derived by Viviescas et al. [81]. Note however, that the solution in Fig. 10(c) is not a solution to (43), because the choice $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$ is the least optimal choice of measurement settings given $|\Phi^+\rangle$, and (43) assumes the optimal unraveling. The problem can be rotated in several ways; if we want to preserve e.g. $|\Phi^+\rangle$ instead of $|\Phi^-\rangle$, we may change our measurement settings to $\theta = -90^\circ$ and $\vartheta = 0$, and thereby swap the behavior seen in Figs. 10(b) and 10(c). While our discussion above has focused on $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$ for clarity, all the results we discuss there are conceptually correct for any choice satisfying $\vartheta = \theta + 90^\circ$, up to a corresponding rotation of all the amplitudes. Given a state

$$|\psi\rangle = a |ee\rangle + d e^{i\delta} |gg\rangle + e^{i\theta} (X |\Psi^+\rangle + iY |\Psi^-\rangle) ,$$

moderately more general than (46), assuming $\vartheta = \theta + 90^\circ$, and with $a, d, X, Y$ all real, the optimal choice of measurement parameters is given by $\theta = (\delta - \pi)/2$. Such considerations are formally dealt with in Ref. [81].

In summary, we find that the entangling double homodyne measurement creates a set of dynamics in which in the overall decay from $|ee\rangle \to |gg\rangle$ is achieved by a process that exhibits correlation between different two-qubit basis states, at every step of the decay. For the measurement settings $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$, with an initial amplitude 1 on $|ee\rangle$, every Bell state except $|\Phi^+\rangle$ contributes constructively to the two-qubit entanglement, as per (45); in this sense, the measurement exhibits some asymmetry, admitting only truncated manifestations of $|\Phi^+\rangle$, but allowing for completely coherent manifestations of the other Bell states. These features of Fig. 6 are best understood in contrast with their non-entangling counterparts in Fig. 8. While the average entanglement yields are identical between photodetection and optimal homodyne detection, the measurements differ in virtually every other qualitative sense.

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

We have conducted a relatively thorough analysis of the quantum trajectories which can be obtained from a pair of identical qubits and mixed decay channel measurements under ideal conditions. The device geometry we have imagined to do this, shown in Fig. 1, resembles that typically associated with performing a Bell–state
measurement. We have gone beyond the typical analysis of a Bell–state measurement by considering time–continuous measurements and developing a consistent theoretical framework suitable for efficient numerical implementation, allowing us to explore different measurement dynamics in detail. Our Kraus operators for the setup of Fig. 1 are physically motivated, and allow us to simulate SQITs more efficiently than via direct integration of the SME, in the same spirit as e.g. Ref. [30]. We predict that homodyne monitoring of quadratures $90^\circ$ apart is the optimal quadrature measurement for entangling our two qubits, consistent with other works [81, 86–88]. The degree to which this double–homodyne measurement can entangle the emitters is tunable, and depends on the relative phase between the quadratures measured at each output. We are able to explain this tunability, and the success or failure of any of the fluorescence measurements we have considered to generate two–qubit entanglement, in terms of the erasure of information about which qubit originated any given signal. Equivalently, we have been able to interpret our successful measurements as performing an entanglement swapping operation, which takes correlations between individual qubits and their field modes created in the spontaneous emission process, and entangle the qubits with each other instead. We find that the average entanglement yield of the optimal double homodyne measurement is equivalent to that of the better–known photodetection case (from the initial state $|ee\rangle$), consistent with past works which have found the same equivalence from the standpoint of entanglement preservation [84]; thus we are able to clearly explain our numerical results by invoking a number of conceptual elements scattered about the literature. Despite the equivalence of optimal photodetection and homodyne schemes on average, all details of the dynamics are markedly different. Photodetection behaves optimally regardless of measurement phase settings (as long as the mixing beamsplitter is balanced, the which–path information remains indistinguishable), and creates Bell states when entanglement is generated. Homodyne detection includes LO phase settings which must be tuned conditioned on the initial state in order to achieve the same average yield as photodetection, and generates both partially–entangled states in some realizations, and a wide variety of maximally–entangled states in its best realizations.

We see many immediate opportunities to test and expand on this work. Homodyne and heterodyne measurements of single superconducting qubits’ fluorescence, generating diffusive quantum trajectories, have recently been achieved in the lab [62–67]; scaling these experiments to two qubits, as we propose here, appears feasible. We have studied the quantum trajectories in a continuous–measurement–based two–qubit entanglement protocol, which leverages the natural $T_1$ process of our qubits to generate entanglement. Entanglement is widely understood to be a quantum information resource. Platforms with limited photodetection capability, such as those in the microwave regime, may benefit from alternative types of entangling measurements, like those described here. Furthermore, diffusive and jump trajectories offer markedly different opportunities for feedback control, which can be leveraged to promote entanglement genesis beyond what the bare measurement dynamics allow; this continues to be an important avenue in contemporary research, and such an extension of the homodyne measurement we consider above has recently been carried out [103]. While the diffusive entangling scheme we discuss exhibits more complicated behavior than the photodetection case, such advances reinforce the motivation for considering such schemes. We have developed a physically–motivated theoretical framework, and accompanying numerical methods, to study quantum trajectories and entanglement from spontaneous emission, across different measurements such as photodetection, homodyne detection, or combinations thereof. Scaling our methods to larger numbers of qubits, as has been proposed elsewhere [55], also appears feasible. Thus we feel that in addition to the insights we have emphasized throughout the text, our work here may form the basis for continued investigation along a variety of avenues, both of fundamental interest and practical importance.
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**Appendix A: One–Step Entanglement Tests**

We define a “one–step test” for entanglement genesis, starting from the excited state $|ee\rangle = (1, 0, 0, 0)$. Effectively, we take one step from $|ee\rangle$ which is separable ($C = 0$), with an idealized measurement (such that the state is still pure), and see how the concurrence behaves. We have already dealt with this problem both by several analytical arguments (which path information, separability of the optical states), and numerical methods (longer–time simulations) in the main body of the text. The single step test we consider now is simple enough to keep useful analytic expressions in play; while it is less general than the numerics already presented, some fea-
tutes of these simple arguments can help us understand what we see numerically, and add to the analytic arguments we have already presented.

If we heterodyne both outputs our state update after one step goes like

$$\mathcal{M}_{\alpha\beta} |ee\rangle \propto \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1-\epsilon}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{1-(1-\epsilon)}{2}}(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} - \beta^* e^{i\theta}) \\ -\sqrt{\frac{1-(1-\epsilon)}{2}}(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} + \beta^* e^{i\theta}) + \frac{\epsilon}{2}(\alpha^2 e^{2i\theta} - \beta^2 e^{2i\theta}) \end{pmatrix},$$  \hspace{1cm} (A1)

such that we find

$$C \propto \epsilon(1-\epsilon)\left|\alpha^* e^{i\theta} - \beta^* e^{i\theta}\right|^2 - \left(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} - \beta^* e^{i\theta}\right)\left(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} + \beta^* e^{i\theta}\right) = 0.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A2)

So we see again that in the heterodyne case, in which we can always in principle get information about the photon source, there is no possibility to get any entanglement from $|ee\rangle$, independent of the choices of LO phases $\theta$ and $\vartheta$. Simulations show that the situations does not improve as the system continues to evolve; see appendix B.

Let us contrast this with the corresponding calculation in the homodyne case. We have

$$\mathcal{M}_{34} |ee\rangle \propto \begin{pmatrix} \frac{1-\epsilon}{2} + \sqrt{\frac{1-(1-\epsilon)}{2}}(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} X_3 - e^{i\theta} X_4) \\ -\sqrt{\frac{1-(1-\epsilon)}{2}}(\alpha^* e^{i\theta} X_3 + e^{i\theta} X_4) + \epsilon e^{2i\theta}(X_3^2 - \frac{1}{2}) - e^{2i\theta}(X_4^2 - \frac{1}{2}) \end{pmatrix},$$  \hspace{1cm} (A3)

where we note that both $X_3$ and $X_4$ are real numbers (as opposed to $\alpha^*$ and $\beta^*$, which were complex; this allows for the cooperative behavior between different types of correlations, rather than competition, as described in and around (45)). The concurrence after one measurement step goes like

$$C \propto \epsilon(1-\epsilon)\left|e^{2i\theta}(X_3^2 - \frac{1}{2}) - e^{2i\theta}(X_4^2 - \frac{1}{2}) - (e^{i\theta} X_3 - e^{i\theta} X_4)(e^{i\theta} X_3 + e^{i\theta} X_4)\right| \propto \epsilon(1-\epsilon)\frac{1}{2}e^{2i\theta} - e^{2i\theta}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A4)

Notice that we now have $C = 0$ for $\theta = 0 = \vartheta$ as above, but have $C > 0$ (and with the greatest possible increase) for the cases which maximize the photon indistinguishability, e.g. $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$.

The constant term in the Hermite polynomials $X^2 + \frac{1}{2}$ is very important for avoiding complete cancellation of terms in the concurrence. Furthermore, this actually leads to a potentially desirable property: entanglement genesis in the first step does not depend at all on the measurement records, and is therefore deterministic. The appearance of the second order Hermite polynomials is connected to our beamsplitter relations (6), and pertain to the matrix element which (at least in the photodetection case) is best ascertained to double/simultaneous emission events. Given the apparent importance of these terms in the concurrence generation, we infer that they are enforcing the source–indistinguishability requirement we have discussed at length (this term reflects that photons, or more generally signals, coming from one qubit or the other, must be indistinguishable if we are to generate entanglement).

It is possible to take a second step in the evolution, and still obtain expressions which help us to understand the dynamics apparent from simulation. Consider, for $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$, a sequence of two measurements $\mathcal{M}_{34} \mathcal{M}_{34} |ee\rangle \propto$ 

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 - 2\epsilon \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}(X_3 + X_4' - iX_4 - iX_4') \\ \sqrt{\epsilon}(X_3 + X_4' + iX_4 + iX_4') \end{pmatrix} + O(\epsilon^2).$$  \hspace{1cm} (A5)

We see the continued growth of correlations between $|eg\rangle$ and $|ge\rangle$: in the language of $(44)$, the sequence of outcomes $X_3$ promote the growth of $C$ across sequential measurements, and the sequence of outcomes $X_4$ perform the same role for $D$ or $E$. What is more striking however, is the way amplitude appears in $|gg\rangle$: there are higher order (in $\epsilon$) corrections to this term $-2\epsilon$ which depend on the measurement outcomes, but what we essentially see to $O(\epsilon)$ is that there is quasi–deterministic growth of correlations of the type $B$ over a sequential pair of measurements. This helps to underscore what we mean when we say that the system “prefers” correlations of type $|\Phi^+\rangle$ over $|\Phi^-\rangle$, and offers hints as to how the state $|\Phi^-\rangle$, which never plays a role in the photodetection scenario, actually ends up being the single most–likely maximally–concurrent state which can emerge from the homodyne scenario, under our chosen measurement settings.

Appendix B: Heterodyne Monitoring and Mixed Measurements

Despite our heterodyne measurement’s limited interest as an entanglement generator, we can still develop examples incorporating it which reveal interesting features of our system. We choose to emphasize 1) the flexibility our theoretical framework offers with regards to numerical simulation, and 2) the impact of interference effects when several different types of measurements are present.

We will focus on an example which combines heterodyne detection at one port and photodetection at the other, as shown in Fig. 11. There are generically two modes in which to operate the device; either the photodetector is turned off, and the output at port 4 is discarded, or it is turned on, and we get occasional clicks (jump trajectories), with the possibility of diffusive behavior between jump events. If we want to focus on the dynamics under diffusion only, there is generically some possibility that we may have to post–select on no–jump trajectories. The interference effects described in the main text can play an interesting role in this system,
for the photodetector, we update our state by

\[ \rho(t + dt) = \frac{\mathcal{M}_{\alpha j} \rho(t) \mathcal{M}_{\alpha j}^\dagger}{\text{tr} \left( \mathcal{M}_{\alpha j} \rho(t) \mathcal{M}_{\alpha j}^\dagger \right)} \]

(B4)

whereas if the output of channel 4 is irretrievably lost, the state update is given by

\[ \rho(t + dt) = \frac{\sum_{j=0,1,2} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha j} \rho(t) \mathcal{M}_{\alpha j}^\dagger}{\text{tr} \left( \sum_{j=0,1,2} \mathcal{M}_{\alpha j} \rho(t) \mathcal{M}_{\alpha j}^\dagger \right)} \]

(B5)

FIG. 11. We sketch an apparatus which employs heterodyne detection at output 3, and photodetection at output 4. Trajectories behave purely diffusively conditioned on no photons exiting at output 4, but jumps may also occur unless interference effects prohibit a click event at port 4. Both beamsplitters are assumed to be 50/50 (such that the cavities’ signals are mixed symmetrically, and the heterodyne detection is balanced).

however, as any effect which creates a dark port at either port 3 or 4 then also selects a completely different type of measurement backaction.

The particular forms of the Kraus operators \( \mathcal{M}_{\alpha j} \) we are now interested in (using \( \theta = 0 = \vartheta \)) are:

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\alpha 0} = e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} \begin{pmatrix}
1 - \epsilon & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
\alpha^* \sqrt{(1-\epsilon)} & \sqrt{1-\epsilon} & 0 & 0 \\
\alpha^* \sqrt{(1-\epsilon)} & 0 & \sqrt{1-\epsilon} & 0 \\
\frac{\epsilon}{2} (\alpha^*)^2 & \alpha^* \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} & \alpha^* \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} & 1
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(B1)

for \( \langle \alpha_3 0 4 | \mathcal{M} | 0 0 0 4 \rangle \) (no click at output 4),

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\alpha 1} = e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} \sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{2}} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-\sqrt{1-\epsilon} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \sqrt{1-\epsilon} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & -1 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(B2)

for \( \langle \alpha_3 1 4 | \mathcal{M} | 0 0 0 4 \rangle \) (one click at output 4), and finally

\[
\mathcal{M}_{\alpha 2} = e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} \frac{\epsilon}{2} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
-\sqrt{2} & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

(B3)

for \( \langle \alpha_3 2 4 | \mathcal{M} | 0 0 0 4 \rangle \) (two clicks at output 4). These also form a proper POVM (verifiable by summing over \( j = 0, 1, 2 \), and integrating out \( d^2 \alpha \)). In the event that we turn on the photodetector, we update our state by

\[ \rho(t + dt) = \frac{\mathcal{M}_{\alpha j} \rho(t) \mathcal{M}_{\alpha j}^\dagger}{\text{tr} \left( \mathcal{M}_{\alpha j} \rho(t) \mathcal{M}_{\alpha j}^\dagger \right)} \]

instead. The latter is equivalent to performing heterodyne measurement only, with 50% efficiency.

Heterodyning one port and discarding the other does not lead to entanglement genesis. The purity of the system \( \text{tr}(\rho^2) \) drops considerably on its way from \( |\alpha\rangle \) to \( |gg\rangle \), a fact which would substantially impeded the creation of entanglement on its own, even without the other problematic properties of heterodyne detection with respect to generating concurrence (recall e.g. the argument in and around (29)). The purity recovers as the system decays, since \( |gg\rangle \) is technically a pure state. We show the purity in Fig. 12.

We proceed to the case where the (ideal) photodetector in Fig. 11 is turned on, such that the click record at that port is available, and the two–qubit state update goes like (B4). The operation (B1), which describes the diffusive dynamics due to heterodyning between click events, does nominally generate some correlations between \( |eg\rangle \) and \( |ge\rangle \), according to the matrix elements highlighted in green, but does not generate concurrence. We can again attribute this to the argument in and around (29), although many of the other points we have mentioned above apply as well. Any concurrence generated by this mixed detection scheme is generated by the click detector at port 4, not the diffusive dynamics from the heterodyne measurement at port 3.
1. Simulation Procedures

We describe how the operators (B1), (B2), (B3), and state update (B4) are implemented numerically to simulate the stochastic trajectory dynamics, and then show results for a few revealing initial states. As in the main text, we expand the denominator of the state update equation to approximate the probability distribution describing possible measurement outcomes at each step. This leads us to define $G_0$, such that

$$\text{tr} \left( M_{rj} M_{rj}^\dagger \right) \approx e^{C_j + G_j dt + O(dt^2)}. \quad (B6)$$

It turns out that when we do this kind of expansion, we will find some Gaussian terms with some additional state-dependent coefficients attached, i.e. we find

$$w_0 = G_0 = -\frac{1}{2} \left( r_I - \chi_I \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \right)^2 - \frac{1}{2} \left( r_Q - \chi_Q \sqrt{\frac{\gamma}{2}} \right)^2 - \gamma \Xi + \frac{1}{2} \left( \chi_I^2 + \chi_Q^2 \right), \quad \text{with}$$

$$\chi_I \equiv \cos \theta(q_5 + q_6 + q_8 + q_9)$$
$$- \sin \theta(q_{11} + q_{12} + q_{13} + q_{15}), \quad (B8b)$$

$$\chi_Q \equiv - \sin \theta(q_5 + q_6 + q_8 + q_9)$$
$$- \cos \theta(q_{11} + q_{12} + q_{14} + q_{15}). \quad (B8c)$$

The coordinates $Q$ parameterizing the two-qubit density matrix are described in C 2, and we defined $\Xi$ in (37c). We thus have Gaussians with variance $1/dt$ and means $\chi_I \sqrt{\gamma/2}$ and $\chi_Q \sqrt{\gamma/2}$ for $r_I$ and $r_Q$, respectively. The remaining terms are included to the weight factor used to determine the correct statistics for the no-click event, which is

$$w_0 = N \exp \left[ -\gamma \Xi + \frac{1}{2} \left( \chi_I^2 + \chi_Q^2 \right) \right]. \quad (B9)$$

The term $N$ is a normalization for the click probabilities, used to make $\sum_j w_j = 1$. The remaining Gaussians in $r_I$ and $r_Q$, for the one-click and two-click terms, both have mean zero, and the same variance $1/dt$. This indicates that in the event of a click, we know the photon went to port 4, and therefore did not go to the heterodyne detection at port 3; the heterodyne readouts then contain no signal in the requisite timestep (there is no information at port 3 without the possibility of a photon having arrived there), and only pure noise from the LO. These conditions are key to enforcing that correlations between the optical modes are properly reflected in simulations, in this case. The probabilities associated with these jump events are given by

$$w_1 = N \gamma dt \frac{\varsigma}{6\sqrt{2}} \exp \left[ -\frac{\gamma}{\varsigma \sqrt{2}} \right], \quad \text{and} \quad (B10)$$

$$w_2 = N \frac{dt^2 \gamma^2}{24} \left( 3 + 6\sqrt{2}q_1 + 2\sqrt{6}q_2 + 2\sqrt{3}q_3 \right), \quad (B11)$$

where we have shorthanded some expressions

$$\varsigma \equiv 3\sqrt{2} + 3q_1 + \sqrt{3}q_2 + 2\sqrt{6}q_3 - 6q_4, \quad (B12a)$$
$$\kappa \equiv \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}} + 6q_1 + 2\sqrt{3}q_2 + \sqrt{6}q_3. \quad (B12b)$$

for ease of notation.

The simulation procedure in each timestep can then be summarized as:

1. Use the state-dependent $w_j$ as probabilities in a multinomial distribution; draw an outcome for the number of clicks at the detector at port 4 accordingly.

2. Given the outcome at the click detector, draw $r_I$ and $r_Q$ from the appropriate Gaussian distributions, with variance $1/dt$ and state-dependent means, to simulate the heterodyne measurement at port 3.

3. Choose the appropriate operator (B1), (B2), or (B3), according to the jump outcome, put in the stochastic readouts $r_I$ and $r_Q$, and then update the state with (B4). Repeat until desired evolution time is reached.

The procedure outlined above is relatively numerically efficient, even when including extra commands to catch numerical errors which may occur when $\kappa$ and $\varsigma$ are both close to zero. The procedure for the codes in the main body of the text is quite similar. We have here shown, however, that it generalizes relatively easily to cases in which we mix diffusive and jump trajectories; we are unaware of any prior efforts to model the quantum trajectories of a system like that of Fig. 11 in the quantum trajectory literature. Very few works have studied the dynamics under simultaneous different types of continuous measurements (i.e. jumps and diffusion) at all [104, 105].
FIG. 13. We plot concurrence as a function of time, originating either from $|\psi^+\rangle$ (top) or $|\psi^-\rangle$ (bottom) (C6b), in the setup of Fig. 11 which combines heterodyne detection at one port with photodetection at the other. Time is again in units of $T_1$ (because $\gamma = 1$ MHz, such that $T_1 = 1\mu$s). The effect of the interference at the beamsplitter created by the correlation or anti–correlation between $|eg\rangle$ and $|ge\rangle$ is clearly visible here, because determining the output port determines the type of measurement backaction; dynamics originating from $|\psi^+\rangle$ only interact with the heterodyne device, resulting in diffusive quantum trajectories of the two–qubit state, whereas only jump dynamics arise from $|\psi^-\rangle$, since all of the output goes to the photodetector in that case. The average concurrence is in good quantitative agreement with $\bar{C}(t) = e^{-\gamma t}$ in both cases shown above, consistent with the photodetection case in Fig. 3(b) and the homodyne case of Fig. 10(a). No post–selection is used in the simulations above, because the interference conditions for the states in question perfectly select one output or the other.

2. Interference Effects

We put the numerical strategies we just described to work. In Fig. 13, we plot the state evolution originating from $|\psi^\pm\rangle$ (C6b). We immediately see that one Bell state allows for trajectories which only experience diffusion ($|\psi^+\rangle$ sends all its output to the heterodyne detector at output 3), and the other allows only jumps ($|\psi^-\rangle$ sends all its output to the photodetector at output 4). The pure states which generate these interference conditions are, more generally, of the form

$$|\psi\rangle = N \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ a \\ \pm a \\ b \end{pmatrix}.$$ (B13)

It is apparent from simulation that the relevant measurement dynamics preserve the correlations and coherence in the $|eg\rangle$ and $|ge\rangle$ terms, even as the population is shifted to $|gg\rangle$ over time by the natural decay process. Therefore the conditions for complete interference do not only appear at the beginning of the simulation, but are preserved for its duration once they are established. We also understand that the interference effect is naturally reproduced by the weight factors (B9), (B10), and (B11); we have applied them in the codes without adding any further constraints. The concurrence in Fig. 13 decays on average at the rate $\gamma$ at which the individual qubits relax, despite exhibiting very different traces in the trajectories for individual realizations. We have an example of a situation in which interference effects can be leveraged to select different measurement devices, or different kinds of dynamics generated by completely different kinds of measurement backaction.

We also see that the concurrence among the diffusive trajectories originating from $|\psi^+\rangle$ does not decrease monotonically in individual realizations; although we cannot generate entanglement from simple separable states using heterodyne detection, certain trajectories do exhibit partial decay and regrowth of concurrence, indicating that this measurement scheme shows some promise for preserving entanglement as part of a feedback scheme. While potentially of some interest, we stop our exploration here, noting that the present scheme will still never outperform comparable concepts implemented with the other measurement configurations (photodetection, homodyne detection, or combinations thereof) discussed in the main text.

Appendix C: Review of Two–Qubit Density Matrices and Entanglement

A two–qubit density matrix $\rho$ can be any $4 \times 4$ matrix which satisfies the properties $\rho_{ij} = \rho_{ji}^*$, and $\text{tr}(\rho) = 1$, as demanded by quantum mechanics and normalization of probability densities. A subset of such density matrices describes separable systems. We discuss two–qubit entanglement in section C 1, and then go through some details of a general coordinate parameterization of the two–qubit density matrix in Sec. C 2.

1. Two–qubit entanglement and concurrence

A commonly–accepted measure of entanglement between two qubits is concurrence [98]. The concurrence...
\( C \) of a two-qubit density matrix is given by
\[
C[\rho] = \max \{0, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4\} \tag{C1}
\]
where the \( \lambda_i \) are the eigenvalues of the Hermitian matrix
\[
\hat{R} = \sqrt{\rho(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)\rho^* (\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)\sqrt{\rho}} \tag{C2}
\]
listed in decreasing order. In practice, it is often easier to compute the eigenvalues of \( \rho(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)\rho^* (\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y) \), which give \( \lambda_i^2 \) instead. We have used the usual definition of the Pauli matrix
\[
\hat{\sigma}_y = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & -i \\
0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} . \tag{C3}
\]
The qubits described by \( \rho \) are said to be entangled iff \( C > 0 \), and are unentangled (separable) when \( C = 0 \).

Note that this simplifies nicely for the case of a pure two-qubit state
\[
|\psi\rangle = (a^*, b^*, c^*, d^*) , \tag{C4}
\]
(where we are still assuming a basis \( \{|ee\rangle,|eg\rangle,|ge\rangle,|gg\rangle\} \)). The concurrence reduces in this case to
\[
C = 2|ad - bc| . \tag{C5}
\]
The concurrence \( C \) may range from 0 to 1, where \( C = 0 \) denotes a separable state, and \( C = 1 \) denotes a maximally entangled state, e.g., any of the standard Bell states
\[
|\Phi^\pm\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |ee\rangle \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |gg\rangle , \tag{C6a}
\]
\[
|\Psi^\pm\rangle \equiv \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |eg\rangle \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |ge\rangle . \tag{C6b}
\]

If we instead express our generic two-qubit pure state in the Bell basis
\[
|\psi\rangle = A |\Phi^+\rangle + B |\Phi^-\rangle + C |\Psi^+\rangle + D |\Psi^-\rangle , \tag{C7}
\]
the concurrence reads
\[
C = |A^2 - B^2 - C^2 + D^2| . \tag{C8}
\]
The mapping between the two bases listed here is given by the unitary
\[
U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\
0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & -1 & 0
\end{pmatrix} , \tag{C9}
\]
such that, if \( |\psi\rangle \) is in the standard \( \{a, b, c, d\} \) basis, \( U |\psi\rangle \) is the same state expressed in the Bell basis \( \{A, B, C, D\} \).

2. Generalized Gell–Mann matrices and effective system coordinates

We here describe the coordinate parameterization of the two-qubit density matrix which we use in the main text, and throughout our simulations. It is always possible to decompose an \( n \times n \) density matrix according to
\[
\rho = \frac{1}{n} I_n + q \cdot \hat{\Gamma} . \tag{C10}
\]
Here \( q \) is a generalized Bloch vector, and \( \hat{\Gamma} \) is the vector of generalized Gell–Mann matrices. There are \( n^2 - 1 = \dim(q) \) coordinates and matrices. In the two-dimensional case, \( q \) is the usual Bloch coordinates, and \( \hat{\Gamma} \) are the Pauli matrices. Parameterizing a \( 4 \times 4 \) density matrix requires 15 coordinates in the most general case.

We adapt the matrices from [106] to define some coordinates for our two-qubit system, beginning with the three diagonal matrices
\[
\hat{\Gamma}_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} , \quad \hat{\Gamma}_2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -2 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} , \quad \hat{\Gamma}_3 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{12}} \begin{pmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -3
\end{pmatrix} . \tag{C11}
\]

Next we list the six symmetric matrices of the set
\[
\hat{\Gamma}_4 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} , \quad \hat{\Gamma}_5 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} , \quad \hat{\Gamma}_6 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} , \tag{C12}
\]
\[
\hat{\Gamma}_7 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
1 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} , \quad \hat{\Gamma}_8 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix} , \quad \hat{\Gamma}_9 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{pmatrix} .
We conclude with the remaining six anti–symmetric matrices of the set
\[
\begin{align*}
\hat{\Gamma}_{10} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & -i & 0 \\
0 & i & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \hat{\Gamma}_{11} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i & 0 & 0 \\
i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
i & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \hat{\Gamma}_{12} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i & 0 \\
i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
\hat{\Gamma}_{13} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
i & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \hat{\Gamma}_{14} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & i \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
i & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & \hat{\Gamma}_{15} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & -i \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & i & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.
\end{align*}
\] (C13)

Using (C10), we may write an arbitrary $4 \times 4$ density matrix in terms of the 15 generalized Bloch coordinates $\mathbf{q}$. This yields
\[
\rho = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} + q_1 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} q_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} q_3 & q_5 - i q_{11} & q_6 - i q_{12} & q_7 - i q_{13} \\
q_5 + i q_{11} & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} q_2 + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} q_3 - q_1 & q_6 - i q_{12} & q_7 - i q_{13} \\
q_6 + i q_{12} & q_6 + i q_{12} & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} q_3 - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} q_2 & q_9 - i q_{15} \\
q_7 + i q_{13} & q_8 + i q_{14} & q_9 + i q_{15} & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}} q_3 \end{pmatrix}.
\] (C14)

We see that the populations are described by coordinates 1–3 (corresponding to matrices (C11)), and that the coherences are described by the remaining coordinates, with real parts corresponding to (C12) and the imaginary parts to (C13). We can also codify this information visually, as it relates to the arrays of plots in Figs. 6 through 9, by
\[
\rho = \begin{pmatrix}
\begin{array}{cccc}
\text{•} & \text{•} & \text{+} & \text{□} \\
\text{+} & \text{•} & \text{□} & \text{-} \\
\text{□} & \text{□} & \text{•} & \text{-} \\
\text{□} & \text{□} & \text{□} & \text{□} \\
\end{array}
\end{pmatrix},
\end{pmatrix}
\] (C15)

In terms of the above coordinates, the purity of the state is described by
\[
\text{tr}(\rho^2) = \frac{1}{4} + \sum_i q_i^2.
\] (C16)

### Appendix D: Two–Qubit Equations of Motion: Connections between Kraus Operators and the SME

Our expectation, based on the one–qubit cases [61, 68] and other dispersive measurements, is that the equations of motion derived from the SME can be taken as Itô equations, converted to their Stratonovich form, and will then be found to be identical to the equations of motion derived by expanding the state update with our Kraus operators to $O(dt)$. Recall that the Itô and Stratonovich conventions basically concern which Reimann sum is used to integrate a stochastic differential equation (SDE). The details of either convention, and the rules for converting between them are well understood (see e.g. [102]). We perform the requisite computations and conversions for our two–qubit homodyne detection and heterodyne detection models in turn.

#### 1. Homodyne Detection

Let us start with our Kraus operator methods. We will use double homodyne detection, in the entangling case $\theta = 0$ and $\vartheta = 90^\circ$. We may expand our operator (12) according to
\[
\mathcal{M}_{34e^{2\pi i/2 + x^2/2}} \approx I + 3dt + O(dt^2),
\] (D1)

where we can eliminate the Gaussian term which appears in every matrix element of the operator, because it will cancel off from the state update normalization momentarily anyway. Then the state update can be be approximated by
\[
\rho(t + dt) \approx \frac{(I + 3dt)\rho(t)(I + 3^\dagger dt)}{\text{tr}((I + 3 + 3^\dagger dt)\rho(t)(I + 3^\dagger dt))}
\] (D2)

which can then be rearranged according to $\rho(t + dt) - \rho(t) \approx dt \rho$, such that
\[
\dot{\rho} \approx 3\rho + 3^\dagger - \rho \text{ tr}(3\rho + 3^\dagger).
\] (D3)

The non–trivial part of the Kraus operator, to $O(dt)$, is
\[
3 = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}(r_3 - ir_4) & -\gamma/2 & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}(r_3 + ir_4) & 0 & -\gamma/2 & 0 \\
-\gamma & \sqrt{2}(r_3 + ir_4) & \frac{\sqrt{2}}{4}(r_3 - ir_4) & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (D4)
The equation of motion (D3) with (D4) is best represented as 15 coupled equations in the coordinates \( \mathbf{q} \), obtained as \( \dot{\mathbf{q}} = \text{tr}(\mathbf{A}_0 \dot{\rho}) \); for the sake of brevity we do not list them out here.

The SME is derived in a similar spirit, using Itô calculus [27]. Recall that the corresponding measurement channel operators for the SME (42)

\[
\hat{L}_3 = \sqrt{2} (\hat{\sigma}_A + \hat{\sigma}_B), \quad \hat{L}_4 = i \sqrt{2} (\hat{\sigma}_A - \hat{\sigma}_B),
\]

which denote the observables in channels 3 and 4, and be used in (16) with \( c = 3, 4 \). We are able to obtain another 15–dimensional system of equations (represented in \( \mathbf{q} \)) from this SME–derived expression for \( \dot{\rho} \), expressed in terms of the white noise terms \( \xi_i \sim dW_i/dt \) and \( \xi_i \sim dW_i/dt \) in channels 3 and 4, respectively. If the system of SDEs from the SME are a set of Itô equations

\[
\dot{\mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{q}) \text{ } \xi_3 + \mathbf{b}_4(\mathbf{q}) \text{ } \xi_4,
\]

then they can be converted to the corresponding Stratonovich form

\[
\dot{\mathbf{q}} = \mathbf{A}(\mathbf{q}) + \mathbf{b}_3(\mathbf{q}) \text{ } \xi_3 + \mathbf{b}_4(\mathbf{q}) \text{ } \xi_4
\]

which is defined according to

\[
\mathcal{M} \alpha \beta e^{(\alpha^2 + \beta^2)/2} \approx \mathbb{I} + \mathbf{A} dt + O(dt^2).
\]

As above, we can then write some first–order state update rule

\[
\dot{\rho} \approx \mathbf{A} \rho + \rho \mathbf{A}^\dagger - \rho \text{ tr } (\mathbf{A} \rho + \rho \mathbf{A}^\dagger)
\]

using the approximate measurement operator \( \mathbf{A} \).

The readouts have means \( \sqrt{2}(q_5 + q_6 + q_8 + q_9) \) (for \( r_1 \)), \( -\sqrt{2}(q_{11} + q_{12} + q_{14} + q_{15}) \) (for \( r_2 \)), \( \sqrt{2}(q_{11} + q_{12} + q_{14} - q_{15}) \) (for \( r_3 \)), and \( \sqrt{2}(-q_5 + q_6 + q_7 - q_9) \) (for \( r_4 \)). This is eminently sensible as compared with the homodyne case, as we have \( r_1 \sim r_3/\sqrt{2} \), and \( r_X \sim r_4/\sqrt{2} \). We can thus infer the corresponding SME operators, which are

\[
L_I = \sqrt{2} (\hat{\sigma}_A + \hat{\sigma}_B), \quad L_Q = -i \sqrt{2} (\hat{\sigma}_A - \hat{\sigma}_B),
\]

\[
L_X = i \sqrt{2} (\hat{\sigma}_A + \hat{\sigma}_B), \quad L_Y = \sqrt{2} (\hat{\sigma}_A - \hat{\sigma}_B),
\]

according to the transformation [102]

\[
\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{a} - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{b}_3 \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{b}_3 - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{b}_4 \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{b}_4,
\]

where \( \nabla \) is here the vector derivative in all 15 coordinates \( \mathbf{q} \). Again without listing out the 15 equations or details of the transformation, we find for the example at hand that the Stratonovich version of the SME equations (D7) are exactly equivalent to the equations (D3), with the relationship

\[
\begin{align*}
    r_3 &= \sqrt{\gamma} (q_5 + q_6 + q_8 + q_9) + \xi_3, \\
    r_4 &= \sqrt{\gamma} (-q_{11} + q_{12} + q_{14} - q_{15}) + \xi_4,
\end{align*}
\]

between the readouts and white noise (valid to \( O(dt) \)). Thus the two approaches we have described are equivalent, provided we correct for the fact that we have carried each of them out using a different stochastic calculus.

2. Heterodyne Detection

We repeat the analysis above for the cases of interest involving heterodyne detection, again for the case \( \theta = 0 \) and \( \phi = 90^\circ \) emphasized in the main text. Recall that the full operator is (10), which leads to an approximate form

\[
\mathbf{A} = \mathbf{a} - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{b}_3 \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{b}_3 - \frac{1}{2}(\mathbf{b}_4 \cdot \nabla)\mathbf{b}_4
\]

Using these operators in the SME, we find the usual relationship between the equation of motion (16) and (D12); specifically, taking the Itô equation (16) and converting to its Stratonovich form leads to an expression identical to (D12).

We thereby conclude that our Kraus operator methods and subsequent simulations, as a whole, are entirely formally equivalent to the Markovian stochastic master equation (16) to \( O(dt) \). This is expected, and serves as a check that we have derived and implemented our methods correctly. We note, however, that while the two methods are formally equivalent to first order, there are considerable numerical advantages to performing simulations with a Kraus operator based method, rather than integrating the SME directly [30].


