

# Higher-order interference in quantum physics

Lee A. Rozema,<sup>1</sup> Zhao Zhuo,<sup>2</sup> Tomasz Paterek,<sup>2,3,4</sup> and Borivoje Dakić<sup>1,5</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Vienna Center for Quantum Science and Technology (VCQ), Faculty of Physics, University of Vienna, Boltzmannngasse 5, Vienna A-1090, Austria*

<sup>2</sup>*School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore 637371, Singapore*

<sup>3</sup>*MajuLab, International Joint Research Unit UMI 3654, CNRS, Universite Cote d'Azur, Sorbonne Universite,*

*National University of Singapore, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore*

<sup>4</sup>*Institute of Theoretical Physics and Astrophysics, Faculty of Mathematics, Physics and Informatics, University of Gdańsk, 80-308 Gdańsk, Poland*

<sup>5</sup>*Institute for Quantum Optics and Quantum Information (IQOQI), Austrian Academy of Sciences, Boltzmannngasse 3, A-1090 Vienna, Austria*

The double-slit experiment is the most direct demonstration of interference between individual quantum objects. Since similar experiments with more slits produce interference fringes reducible to a combination of double-slit patterns it is usually argued that quantum interference occurs between pairs of trajectories, compactly denoted as second-order interference. Here we show that quantum mechanics in fact allows for interference of arbitrarily high order. This occurs naturally when one considers multiple quantum objects interacting in the presence of a nonlinearity. We make this clear by treating a generalised M-slit interferometer using second-quantisation. We then present explicit experimentally-relevant examples both with photons interacting in nonlinear media and an interfering Bose-Einstein condensate with particle-particle interactions. These examples are all perfectly described by quantum theory, and yet exhibit higher-order interference.

Quantum states are represented by density matrices, whose elements can be estimated in interference experiments involving a superposition of only two suitable states at a time. Already at this abstract level one expects that any interference pattern should be fundamentally reducible to two-state interference. Indeed, it was shown theoretically, within the framework of generalised measure theories, that interference fringes observed in multi-slit experiments are simple combinations of patterns observed in double-slit and single-slit experiments [1]. Quantum mechanics has hence been termed a “second-order interference theory”. It is possible, however, to devise a family of post-quantum theories based on higher-order interference [1]. Motivated by this, experiments based on photons [2–4], nuclear magnetic resonance [5], spins in diamond NV centers [6] and large molecules [7] have placed bounds on higher-order interference, verifying, within experimental error, that in these setups higher-order interference is absent. A potentially more precise atomic analogue has also been proposed [8].

Intriguingly, a closer inspection of multi-slit experiments shows that a small third-order interference term can be measured [9–12]. The origin of this term lies in how the superposition principle is applied, and rests on different boundary conditions in multi-slit and single-slit setups. In particular, the wave function when only a single-slit is open can be different from the single-slit wave function when multiple slits are open due to so-called “looped trajectories”. The existence of such non-zero third-order interference has even been recently experimentally confirmed [13, 14]. However, the small third-order interference term in these experiments is not due to “post-quantum higher-order interference”, but

rather comes from additional looped paths in the experimental measurements [12].

Here we show a completely different origin of higher-order interference within quantum physics. It leads to strong observable deviations from second-order interference also when the issues due to boundary conditions are negligible. Our higher-order interference arises from nonlinear coupling between indistinguishable particles. We emphasise that it is also not genuine post-quantum higher-order interference, but rather an artifact of multi-particle interactions. Our results demonstrate that genuine higher-order interference should rely on single-particle states, and stress the need for high-quality single-particle sources in experiments searching for such deviations from quantum theory.

The paper is organised as follows. We will first show that all single-particle states give rise to only second-order interference. We will then introduce a means to quantify the order of interference in the framework of second quantization, and then show that all linear processes are limited to second-order interference. Finally, we will provide explicit examples of nonlinear processes with multi-particle input states that produce interference of arbitrary order. The required nonlinearity can be caused by different physical mechanisms, and we show examples of higher-order interference based on optical nonlinearity, nonlinear detector response, and particle-particle interaction in a Bose-Einstein condensate modeled by the Gross-Pitaevskii equation.




FIG. 1. Measuring interference. The simplest interference experiment involves two paths that can be individually blocked. This figure shows a configuration where the upper path is open and the lower path is blocked. Here  $\rho$  denotes the input state, and  $U$  is some unitary interaction between the two modes. Interference is present if the intensity measured with both paths open is different from the sum of the intensities measured with the individual paths open.

## THE ORDER OF INTERFERENCE

Consider first an experiment with only two paths, see Fig. 1. Each path can either be open (0) or blocked (1), so that the configuration in Fig. 1 is represented by sequence 01. Interference is said to occur if the mean number of particles (the intensity) measured with both paths open,  $I_{00}$ , is different from the sum of the intensities for individual paths blocked,  $I_{01} + I_{10}$ . It is hence natural to quantify two-path interference by  $\mathcal{I}_2 \equiv I_{00} - I_{01} - I_{10} + I_{11}$ , where we have introduced  $I_{11} = 0$  for symmetry reasons. A similar argument applied to a scenario with  $M$  paths leads to the definition of  $M$ -path interference when the following quantity is non-zero [1]:

$$\mathcal{I}_M = \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_M=0}^1 (-1)^{x_1 + \dots + x_M} I_{x_1 \dots x_M}. \quad (1)$$

Sorkin showed that when  $\mathcal{I}_M = 0$  for some  $M$ , then all the quantities  $\mathcal{I}_M$  with higher  $M$  also vanish [1]. The highest index  $M$  for which a theory predicts non-zero  $\mathcal{I}_M$  is then called the order of interference of that theory.

Classical particle experiments do not give rise to any form of interference; i.e. classically, one already has  $\mathcal{I}_2 = 0$ . In the quantum case, consider first  $N$  particles sent one-by-one into the setup in Fig. 1. Each particle is in state  $\rho$  spanned by kets  $|u\rangle$  and  $|d\rangle$ , describing propagation along upper and lower path respectively. The intensity  $I_{00}$  is given by  $Np_{00}$ , where  $p_{00}$  is the probability that the particle is in the upper path after the unitary, i.e.  $I_{00} = N\langle u|U\rho U^\dagger|u\rangle$ . Similarly  $I_{01} = N\rho_{uu}\langle u|U|u\rangle\langle u|U^\dagger|u\rangle$  and  $I_{10} = N\rho_{dd}\langle u|U|d\rangle\langle d|U^\dagger|u\rangle$ , where e.g.  $\rho_{uu} = \langle u|\rho|u\rangle$ . One finds that the second-order interference,  $\mathcal{I}_2$ , vanishes for all (classical) states that exhibit no coherence,  $\rho_{ud} = 0$ , independent of the choice of the unitary  $U$ .

On the other hand, particles in quantum states can undergo second-order interference. The maximum second-order interference is  $\mathcal{I}_2 = N/2$ , which is achieved for the input state  $(|u\rangle + |d\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$  and the unitary describing a 50-50 beam-splitter, as expected. Applying the same calculation applied to three-path experiment (with an arbitrary

unitary acting on all three paths) shows that  $\mathcal{I}_3 = 0$  for all input states and all unitaries. This leads to the usual statement that quantum theory is a second-order interference theory. However, we will now show that multiple quantum systems interacting nonlinearly can lead to non-zero  $\mathcal{I}_M$  for arbitrary  $M$ .

## INTERFERENCE OF INDISTINGUISHABLE PARTICLES

We will first show that all linear processes give rise to only second-order interference, i.e.  $\mathcal{I}_3 = 0$ , independently of the input multipartite state. A linear process is described by  $U = e^{iH}$ , where  $H$  is linear in the ladder operators:  $H = \sum_{nm=1}^3 h_{nm} a_n^\dagger a_m$  [15]. We consider a beam of indistinguishable particles in any state  $\rho$  loaded into a setup with  $M$  paths; later we will specify  $M = 3$ . The particle number does not have to be well defined, e.g. the input could be a series of coherent states of photons in the various input modes. With each path we associate local Fock space  $\mathcal{H}_m$  spanned by Fock states  $|n\rangle_m$  describing  $n$  excitations (photons) in the  $m$ th path (mode). The entire Hilbert space of this system is therefore a tensor product  $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_M$  and we need to specify how blocking paths is represented in this formalism. The Methods section shows that the operation of blocking the  $m$ th path,  $\Pi_m$ , has the following intuitive effect:  $\Pi_m(\rho) = |0\rangle_m \langle 0| \otimes \text{Tr}_m(\rho)$ , i.e. it produces vacuum in the blocked path and decorrelates it from all the other paths (here  $\text{Tr}_m(\rho)$  stands for the partial trace over the Fock space  $\mathcal{H}_m$ , meaning that the states in the other paths are unaffected by the blocker). With this notation the state after the blockers is given by

$$\rho_{x_1 \dots x_M} = \Pi_1^{x_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \Pi_M^{x_M}(\rho), \quad (2)$$

where we set  $\Pi_m^0$  to the identity operator. Recall  $x_i$  represents whether the blocker in mode  $i$  is present or not. By placing the final detector along the first path, the intensities can be computed from

$$I_{x_1 \dots x_M} = \text{Tr}(a_1^\dagger a_1 U \rho_{x_1 \dots x_M} U^\dagger), \quad (3)$$

where  $a_1^\dagger a_1$  is the number operator in  $\mathcal{H}_1$ . Since the same measurement is conducted for all the combinations of blocked paths, we introduce an ‘‘interference operator’’ via the relation  $\mathcal{I}_M = \text{Tr}(U^\dagger a_1^\dagger a_1 U \hat{\mathcal{I}}_M)$ , see Methods for its explicit form and properties. Any linear process satisfies  $U^\dagger a_1^\dagger U = \sum_m u_m a_m^\dagger$  and accordingly

$$\mathcal{I}_3 = \sum_{m, m'} u_m u_{m'}^* \text{Tr}(a_m^\dagger a_{m'} \hat{\mathcal{I}}_M) = 0, \quad (4)$$

where in the last equation we used the fact that the interference operator vanishes under the partial trace over any path, see Methods. Hence, we see that if either the




FIG. 2. Schematic for measurement of higher-order interference in quantum optics. The input coherent states propagate through blockers and then through a sequence of nonlinear phase shifters  $U_{1M}, \dots, U_{13}$ . The final element, marked BS, is a 50-50 beam splitter between the first and the second path, and the intensity is monitored in the first path. This setup gives rise to the  $M$ th-order interference, see Eq. (7).

interaction is linear or the input state is a single-particle state we have  $\mathcal{I}_3 = 0$ .

In general, the same line of reasoning applies to nonlinear processes and higher-order interference terms. A process of order  $k$ , i.e. where the creation operator  $a_1^\dagger$  is mapped to a polynomial  $\sum_{m_1, \dots, m_k} u_{m_1 \dots m_k} a_{m_1}^\dagger \dots a_{m_k}^\dagger$ , gives rise to vanishing higher-order interference terms  $\mathcal{I}_M$  with  $M > 2k$ . Note that non-linearity is necessary for higher-order interference, but not sufficient. For example, a non-linear process mapping  $a_1^\dagger$  to a sum of squared operators  $\sum_m u_m a_m^\dagger a_m^\dagger$  still admits  $\mathcal{I}_3 = 0$ , because in Eq. (4) each term in the sums couples only two paths and hence the partial trace argument gives vanishing  $\mathcal{I}_3$ . Thus, experimentally finding a non-zero  $\mathcal{I}_M$  indicates the presence of nonlinear multi-mode coupling in the underlying process (which could be completely unknown, i.e. a black box) and provides the minimal number of the coupled paths.

*Nonlinear phase shift.* Now we give an example of a nonlinear process from quantum optics (a two-mode nonlinear phase shifter, i.e. cross-phase modulation) whose concatenation gives rise to arbitrarily high order of interference. The exact setup is presented in Fig. 2. The unitary describing this nonlinear process between modes  $j$  and  $k$  has the following effect:

$$U_{jk}^\dagger a_j^\dagger U_{jk} = a_j^\dagger \exp(-i\theta a_k^\dagger a_k), \quad (5)$$

$$U_{jk}^\dagger a_k^\dagger U_{jk} = a_k^\dagger \exp(-i\theta a_j^\dagger a_j), \quad (6)$$

where  $\theta$  is the strength of non-linearity. It can range from  $10^{-18}$  for a bulk Kerr media, up to  $10^{-2}$  using electromagnetically-induced transparency, e.g. [16, 17]. For simplicity, we will assume that all the input coherent states have the same mean number of photons,  $\langle n \rangle = |\alpha|^2$ , but potentially different phases. In this case, the setup in Fig. 2 produces the following value of higher-order interference (see Methods for details):

$$\mathcal{I}_M = \left| \langle n \rangle \left( \exp[-\langle n \rangle (1 - e^{-i\theta})] - 1 \right)^{M-2} \right| \cos(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1 - \delta), \quad (7)$$

where  $\varphi_1$  and  $\varphi_2$  are the phases of the input light along the first two paths and  $\delta$  is a fringe offset. The phases of the remaining inputs do not enter the interference formula. For example, to achieve  $\mathcal{I}_3 \sim 1$  with natural Kerr nonlinearity of  $10^{-18}$  one requires a mean photon number of about  $10^{12}$ , which corresponds to  $\mu\text{W}$  power levels.

At this stage we would like to comment on two recent experiments which may seem related. Refs. [18, 19] observed genuine three-photon interference as a generalisation of the famous Hong-Ou-Mandel dip [20]. The higher-order interference we describe here is distinct from the observed multi-photon interference.

Before presenting examples of other nonlinearities that produce higher-order interference, let us note that due to the specific combination of terms entering the higher-order interference expression, any noise that is independent of the input signal is irrelevant, e.g. detector dark counts. If the noise alone is characterised by probability  $d(n)$  to observe  $n$  photons and the ideal signal has probabilities  $p(n)$ , the independence is encoded by the convolution  $r(n) = \sum_k p(k)d(n-k)$ , where  $r(n)$  is the probability of observing  $n$  photons with the noisy detector. Such noise just shifts the intensity of arbitrary input state by the same amount  $\Delta$ , see Methods. Therefore, the higher-order interference term in the presence of noise is given by

$$\tilde{\mathcal{I}}_M = \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_M=0}^1 (-1)^{x_1 + \dots + x_M} (\Delta + I_{x_1 \dots x_M}) = \mathcal{I}_M. \quad (8)$$

This shows the robustness of estimating higher-order interference in a real laboratory setting.

*Interacting Bose gas.* Nonlinearity in other physical systems can also lead to higher-order interference. For example, consider a Bose-Einstein condensate initialised in an even superposition of three Gaussian wave functions. We compute its one-dimensional dynamics according to the nonlinear Gross-Pitaevskii equation

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial \psi(x, t)}{\partial t} = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m} \frac{\partial^2 \psi(x, t)}{\partial x^2} + \frac{4\pi\hbar^2 N a}{m} |\psi(x, t)|^2 \psi(x, t), \quad (9)$$

where  $N$  is the number of atoms, each of mass  $m$ , and  $a$  is the scattering length. The initial wave function is normalised to unity. The system is evolved for a time  $\tau$  after which we record the distribution of particles in one dimension. Blocking the paths is modeled by removing the corresponding part of the initial superposition (and keeping the state unnormalised). Fig. 3 shows the results for  $\mathcal{I}_3$  confirming the experimental feasibility of observing third-order interference. The same conclusion is expected to hold in other physical systems with dynamics modeled by the Gross-Pitaevskii equation, e.g. polaritons [23].

*Detection nonlinearity.* Our last example is a photodetector with a nonlinear response. The main features of a real detector are: an essentially linear response in the




FIG. 3. Higher-order interference with Bose-Einstein condensates. The condensate is initially prepared in an even superposition of gaussian wave functions each with width  $1\mu\text{m}$  centered at  $\pm 5\mu\text{m}$  and 0. The solid line presents the values of  $\mathcal{I}_3$  for the repulsive condensate of  $^{87}\text{Rb}$  with parameters  $N = 10^3$  atoms,  $a = 5.8$  nm and  $m = 1.45 \times 10^{-25}$  kg after an evolution time of  $\tau = 1$  ms. The dashed line is for the attractive condensate of  $^7\text{Li}$  with parameters  $N = 500$  atoms,  $a = -1.2$  nm and  $m = 1.16 \times 10^{-26}$  kg. Both are experimentally feasible with present day technology [21, 22].

low intensity regime and saturation, which may set in for high input intensities. To illustrate our point, we are only interested in the saturation domain where the measured intensity  $I_r$  is modeled as  $I_r = I_i - \epsilon I_i^2$ , where  $I_i$  is the output of an ideal detector and  $\epsilon$  is the strength of nonlinear saturation. For single-photon detectors  $\epsilon$  is given by the detector dead time; this can be seen by expanding equation (A1) of [24]. With such detectors, even linear interactions can give rise to non-zero higher order interference; this has been discussed from an experimental perspective in Refs. [4, 24]. We now provide a simple theoretical example in which a non-zero  $\mathcal{I}_3$  appears in a setup with three paths combined on a symmetric tritter (a generalisation of a beam splitter to three paths). In particular the unitary describing the tritter has matrix elements given by  $U_{ij} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}}\omega^{ij}$ , where  $\omega = e^{i2\pi/3}$ . After the tritter we monitor the first output port with the nonlinear detector. Accordingly, the tritter unitary gives  $U^\dagger a_1^\dagger U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(a_1^\dagger + a_2^\dagger + a_3^\dagger)$  and the detector is represented by  $a_1^\dagger a_1 - \epsilon(a_1^\dagger a_1)^2$ . With this at hand one finds a third-order interference term of  $\mathcal{I}_3 = -4\epsilon|\alpha|^4$ , where we have also assumed that all three input modes are injected with the same coherent states  $|\alpha\rangle$ . Taking a dead time of 50 ns (which is a typical value for commercially available single-photon detectors), this leads to  $|\alpha|^2 \approx 2000$  for  $\mathcal{I}_3 = 1$ , which can be understood as the number of photons per detector deadtime. This is equivalent to  $\approx 10^{10}$  photons per second or about 10 nW.

## CONCLUSIONS

We have theoretically demonstrated the emergence of higher-order interference within the standard formalism of second quantisation. Its origin is traced to nonlinearity in multipartite processes. However, if either the interaction is linear or the input state is a single-particle state then  $\mathcal{I}_3 = 0$ . Moreover, the non-vanishing  $\mathcal{I}_3$  should be observable with present day technology such as with nonlinear optics or Bose-Einstein condensates. Our work shows that if one wishes to place limits on quantum theory, nonlinearities elsewhere in the system must be considered, and single-particle states should be used in the experiments.

Finally, it is worth stressing the difference between our higher-order interference and that arising from looped trajectories [9–14]. Looped trajectories arise as a consequence of real-world multi-slit experiments being multi-mode devices. In fact, it has been pointed out that if one replaces the traditional triple-slit experiment with single-mode beams interfering on a tritter (or some other unitary structure) the higher-order interference due to looped trajectories becomes negligible [4]. This is exactly the case in our proposal, which deals with  $M$  ideal single modes which do not have such exotic trajectories. Hence, the high-order interference that we predict cannot be understood as a systematic experimental error but is fundamental to multipartite nonlinear quantum systems. Nevertheless, both our nonlinear examples and the looped trajectories illustrate that different implicit assumptions are made in the claim that quantum mechanics is a second-order interference theory, and have direct consequences for experiments searching for higher-order interference.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank M. Radonjić and Č. Bukner for useful discussions. L.A.R. acknowledges support from the Templeton World Charity Foundation (fellowship no. TWCF0194) and the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) through BeyondC (F71). T.P. is supported by the Polish National Agency for Academic Exchange NAWA Project No. PPN/PPO/2018/1/00007/U/00001. B.D. acknowledges support from an ESQ Discovery Grant of the Austrian Academy of Sciences (OAW) and the Austrian Science Fund (FWF) through BeyondC (F71).

## METHODS

### Path blocker in second quantisation

We prove that  $\Pi_1(\rho) = |0\rangle_1\langle 0| \otimes \rho_{2\dots M}$ , where  $\rho_{2\dots M}$  is the reduced state on all the other paths. First of all,

clearly  $\Pi_1(\rho_1) = |0\rangle_1\langle 0|$ , i.e. any state injected to the blocked path results in the vacuum on that path. Arbitrary state  $\rho$  can be decomposed as  $\rho = \sum_{j,k} c_{jk} \rho_1^{(j)} \otimes \rho_{2\dots M}^{(k)}$ , where the coefficients are not necessarily non-negative, but all the summed matrices are proper quantum states. Since  $\Pi_1$  is a linear operation, we have  $\Pi_1(\rho) = |0\rangle_1\langle 0| \otimes \rho_{2\dots M}$  as claimed.

### Properties of the interference operator

The interference operator is defined via relation  $\mathcal{I}_M = \text{Tr}(U^\dagger a_1^\dagger a_1 U \hat{\mathcal{I}}_M)$ . It therefore has the following explicit expansion

$$\hat{\mathcal{I}}_M = \sum_{x_1, \dots, x_M=0}^1 (-1)^{x_1 + \dots + x_M} \rho_{x_1 \dots x_M}. \quad (10)$$

Its crucial property used in our arguments is

$$\text{Tr}_k(\hat{\mathcal{I}}_M) = 0, \quad (11)$$

where the partial trace is over arbitrary subset of paths denoted collectively as  $k$ .

### Derivation of Eq. (7)

First note that for the input state  $|\alpha_1\rangle \dots |\alpha_M\rangle$  the interference operator reads

$$\hat{\mathcal{I}}_M = (|\alpha_1\rangle\langle\alpha_1| - |0\rangle_1\langle 0|) \otimes \dots \otimes (|\alpha_M\rangle\langle\alpha_M| - |0\rangle_1\langle 0|). \quad (12)$$

The higher-order interference term for the setup of Fig. 2 is

$$\mathcal{I}_M = \text{Tr}(U_{1M}^\dagger \dots U_{13}^\dagger (a_1^\dagger a_1 + a_1^\dagger a_2 + a_2^\dagger a_1 + a_2^\dagger a_2) U_{13} \dots U_{1M} \hat{\mathcal{I}}_M), \quad (13)$$

where we have used the transformation of the beam splitter. Note that the first and the last term in the inner bracket do not contribute to  $\mathcal{I}_M$ , because they commute with the unitaries and due to the partial trace property in Eq. (11). From the definition of non-linear phase shift

$$\mathcal{I}_M = \text{Tr} \left( a_1^\dagger a_2 \exp(-i\theta(a_3^\dagger a_3 + \dots + a_M^\dagger a_M)) \hat{\mathcal{I}}_M \right) + \text{c.c.} \quad (14)$$

Assuming all the input coherent states differ just by phases, i.e.  $|\alpha_m\rangle = |\alpha e^{i\varphi_m}\rangle$ , using  $\exp(-i\theta a_m^\dagger a_m) |\alpha e^{i\varphi_m}\rangle = |\alpha e^{-i(\theta - \varphi_m)}\rangle$  and Eq. (12) we find

$$\mathcal{I}_M = e^{i(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1)} \frac{1}{2} |\alpha|^2 (\langle \alpha | \alpha e^{-i\theta} \rangle - 1)^{M-2} + \text{c.c.} \quad (15)$$

Let us denote the complex coefficient multiplying the first exponential by  $A = |A| e^{i\delta}$ . With this notation

$$\mathcal{I}_M = 2|A| \cos(\delta) \cos(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) \quad (16)$$

$$+ 2|A| \sin(\delta) \sin(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) \\ = 2|A| \cos(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1 - \delta). \quad (17)$$

In Eq. (7) we additionally used the formula for the overlap between coherent states.

### Intensity under independent noise

Here we show that any detector noise independent of the input state shifts the measured intensity by a constant. We model independent noise by adding an ancillary mode in the state  $|d\rangle = \sum_n \sqrt{d(n)} |n\rangle$ , and introduce measurement operators describing the detection of  $n$  photons by the noisy detector as follows:

$$\Pi_n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} |k\rangle\langle k| \otimes |n-k\rangle\langle n-k|, \quad (18)$$

where the first Hilbert space describes the measured system, the second space is for the ancilla and all the kets where  $n-k$  is negative are replaced by zeros. Indeed one verifies that  $r(n) = \text{Tr}((\rho \otimes |d\rangle\langle d|) \Pi_n)$ . The intensity of this noisy measurement reads:

$$\tilde{I} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n r(n) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \langle k | \rho | k \rangle \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} n | \langle d | n-k \rangle |^2. \quad (19)$$

We write  $n = (n-k) + k$  and accordingly split the second sum into:

$$S_1 = \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} (n-k) | \langle d | n-k \rangle |^2 = \langle d^\dagger d \rangle, \quad (20)$$

$$S_2 = \sum_{n=k}^{\infty} k | \langle d | n-k \rangle |^2 = k, \quad (21)$$

where in the first line we introduced the number operator  $d^\dagger d$  for the ancillary mode and in the second line we used the completeness relation. The expectation value  $\Delta = \langle d^\dagger d \rangle$  is calculated in the state  $|d\rangle$  describing the noise. Finally the noisy intensity is

$$\tilde{I} = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \langle k | \rho | k \rangle (\Delta + k) = \Delta + \langle a^\dagger a \rangle, \quad (22)$$

where  $\langle a^\dagger a \rangle$  gives the intensity of the ideal measurement.

- 
- [1] R. D. Sorkin, Mod. Phys. Lett. A **9**, 3119 (1994).
  - [2] U. Sinha, C. Couteau, T. Jennewein, R. Laflamme, and G. Weihs, Science **329**, 418 (2010).
  - [3] I. Söllner, B. Gschösser, P. Mai, B. Pressl, Z. Vörös, and G. Weihs, Found. Phys. **42**, 742 (2011).
  - [4] T. Kauten, R. Keil, T. Kaufmann, B. Pressl, Č. Brukner, and G. Weihs, New J. Phys. **19**, 033017 (2017).
  - [5] D. Park, O. Moussa, and R. Laflamme, New J. Phys. **14**, 113025 (2012).
  - [6] F. Jin, Y. Liu, J. Geng, P. Huang, W. Ma, M. Shi, C.-K. Duan, F. Shi, X. Rong, and J. Du, Physical Review A **95**, 012107 (2017).

- [7] J. P. Cotter, C. Brand, C. Knobloch, Y. Lilach, O. Cheshnovsky, and M. Arndt, *Sci. Adv.* **3**, e1602478 (2017).
- [8] K. S. Lee, Z. Zhao, C. Couteau, D. Wilkowski, and T. Paterek, arXiv:1911.12953 (2019).
- [9] H. Yabuki, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **25**, 159 (1986).
- [10] H. D. Raedt, K. Michielsen, and K. Hess, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 012101 (2012).
- [11] R. Sawant, J. Samuel, A. Sinha, S. Sinha, and U. Sinha, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 120406 (2014).
- [12] A. Sinha, A. H. Vijay, and U. Sinha, *Sci. Rep.* **5**, 10304 (2015).
- [13] O. S. Magana-Loaiza, I. D. Leon, M. Mirhosseini, R. Fickler, A. Safari, U. Mick, B. McIntyre, P. Banzer, B. Rodenburg, G. Leuchs, and R. W. Boyd, *Nat. Comms.* **7**, 13987 (2016).
- [14] G. Rengaraj, U. Prathwiraj, S. N. Sahoo, R. Somashekhar, and U. Sinha, *New J. Phys.* **20**, 063049 (2018).
- [15] C. Gerry, P. Knight, and P. Knight, *Introductory Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, 2005).
- [16] B.-W. Shiau, M.-C. Wu, C.-C. Liu, and Y.-C. Chen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106**, 193006 (2011).
- [17] H.-Y. Lo, Y.-C. Chen, P.-C. Su, H.-C. Chen, J.-X. Chen, Y.-C. Chen, I. A. Yu, and Y.-F. Chen, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 041804 (2011).
- [18] S. Agne, T. Kauten, J. Jin, E. Meyer-Scott, J. Z. Salvail, D. R. Hamel, K. J. Resch, G. Weihs, and T. Jennewein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 153602 (2017).
- [19] A. J. Menssen, A. E. Jones, B. J. Metcalf, M. C. Tichy, S. Barz, W. S. Kolthammer, and I. A. Walmsley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 153603 (2017).
- [20] C. K. Hong, Z. Y. Ou, and L. Mandel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **59**, 2044 (1987).
- [21] J. Söding, D. Guéry-Odelin, P. Desbiolles, F. Chevy, H. Inamori, and J. Dalibard, *Appl. Phys. B* **69**, 257 (1999).
- [22] C. Huepe, S. Metens, G. Dewel, P. Borckmans, and M.-E. Brachet, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 1616 (1999).
- [23] I. Carusotto and C. Ciuti, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 299 (2013).
- [24] T. Kauten, B. Pressl, T. Kaufmann, and G. Weihs, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **85**, 063102 (2014).