Achieving two-dimensional optical spectroscopy with temporal and spectral resolution using quantum entangled three photons
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Recent advances in techniques for generating quantum light have stimulated research on novel spectroscopic measurements using quantum entangled photons. One such spectroscopy technique utilizes non-classical correlations among entangled photons to enable measurements with enhanced sensitivity and selectivity. Here, we investigate spectroscopic measurement utilizing entangled three photons generated through cascaded parametric down-conversion. In this measurement, time-resolved entangled photon spectroscopy with monochromatic pumping [J. Chem. Phys. 153, 051102 (2020)] is integrated with the frequency-dispersed two-photon counting technique, which suppresses undesired accidental photon counts in the detector and thus allows one to separate the weak desired signal. This time-resolved frequency-dispersed two-photon counting signal, which is a function of two frequencies, is shown to provide the same information as that of coherent two-dimensional optical spectra. The spectral distribution of the phase-matching function works as a frequency filter to selectively resolve a specific region of the two-dimensional spectra, whereas the excited-state dynamics under investigation are temporally resolved in the time region longer than the entanglement time. The signal is not subject to Fourier limitations on the joint temporal and spectral resolution, and therefore, it is expected to be useful for investigating complex molecular systems in which multiple electronic states are present within a narrow energy range.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum entanglement is one of the properties that is unique to quantum mechanics. When the state of the entire system cannot be described as a product of the quantum states of its constituent particles, such a system is referred to as being entangled.$^1$ The most common types of entanglement are the polarization entanglement of photon pairs and the spin entanglement of electron pairs. They also include correlations related to continuous quantities such as the position-momentum of two particles,$^2$–$^6$ which was first discussed in the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen paradox.$^7$ Energy and charge transports in photosynthetic proteins were also discussed from the perspective of quantum entanglement.$^8$–$^{14}$

Entangled states also play essential roles in state-of-the-art quantum technologies.$^{15}$–$^{19}$ In the past few decades, advances in techniques for generating broadband frequency-entangled photons and shaping the time-frequency structures of entangled photons have stimulated research on novel spectroscopic measurements using entangled photon pairs.$^{20}$–$^{33}$ One such entangled photon spectroscopy technique utilizes non-classical photon correlations to enable measurements with enhanced sensitivity and selectivity when compared to conventional techniques based on classical physics. For instance, two-photon absorption induced by entangled photon pairs varies linearly rather than quadratically with light intensity.$^{20,23,34}$–$^{36}$ It has also been argued that two-photon excitation in molecules can be manipulated to specific electronic states.$^{37}$–$^{51}$ Two-photon coincidence detection$^{52,53}$ and double-crystal interference experiments$^{54,55}$ have also been studied with respect to spectroscopic applications. In a typical coincidence scheme, one pair of entangled photons is employed as a probe field that is transmitted through the molecular sample. The remaining one is detected in coincidence. This type of measurement improves the signal-to-noise ratio.$^{21,22,25,56}$ It is also possible to conduct infrared spectroscopy using visible detectors by exploiting the non-classical correlations between entangled photon pairs.$^{27,31}$

To date, experimental explorations have been limited to steady-state spectroscopic measurements as stated above. Given the growing need to understand dynamical processes in complex molecular systems and materials, it is important to extend entangled photon spectroscopy to time-resolved measurements. Pump-probe and stimulated Raman spectroscopic measurements with two-photon counting were theoretically proposed through a combination of biphoton spectroscopy with additional laser pulses.$^{57,58}$ In a previous study,$^{59}$ we theoretically investigated the frequency-dispersed transmission measurement of an entangled photon pair that was generated using a monochromatic laser. It was demonstrated that the non-classical correlation between this photon pair enabled time-resolved spectroscopy using monochromatic pumping. However, transmission measurements are not background-free; weak nonlinear signals must be separated from the probe field that is transmitted through a sample. Therefore, the signal-to-noise ratio is limited by shot noise. Furthermore, it becomes difficult to detect nonlinear optical signals induced by photon pairs in regimes with low photon fluxes.

In this study, we investigate a spectroscopic method to overcome the difficulties associated with implementing time-resolved entangled photon spectroscopy. The central idea is to use entangled three photons$^{60}$–$^{75}$ and frequency-dispersed two-photon coincidence counting measurements. In this scheme, two of the three photons are irradiated into the molecular sample to induce a nonlinear optical process, while the remaining photon is detected in coincidence with the probe field transmitted through the sample. Coincidence-based transmission measurements suppress undesired accidental photon counts in the detector which measures the probe field.$^{21,22,25}$ Thus, this technique enables us to separate the genuine spec-
trosopic signal. We show how the non-classical correlation among the entangled three photons can be exploited such that two-photon coincidence measurements can provide information on dynamical processes in molecules, similar to transmission measurements of an entangled photon pair.\textsuperscript{59}

This paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we address the quantum states of the entangled three photons generated via cascaded PDC.\textsuperscript{64-67} We also describe the frequency-dispersed two-photon coincidence counting signal in the three photon state. In Sec. III, we present numerical results to clarify the influence of entanglement times on the spectroscopic signals. Section IV is devoted to the concluding remarks.

II. THEORY

A. Generation of entangled three photons via cascaded PDC

One of the most widespread techniques for generating these quantum resources is parametric down-conversion (PDC).\textsuperscript{76} In this process, a photon originating from a pump laser is converted into an entangled photon pair in a way that satisfies the energy and momentum conservation laws. In this work, we address entangled three photons generated through the cascaded PDC process with two nonlinear crystals,\textsuperscript{64-67} as shown in Fig. 1. In the primary PDC, the pump photon, which has a frequency of $\omega_p$, passes through the first crystal and is split into a pair of daughter photons (photons 0 and 1) with frequencies of $\omega_0$ and $\omega_1$. In the second crystal, photon 0 serves as the pump field for the secondary conversion, creating a pair of granddaughter photons (photons 2 and 3) with frequencies of $\omega_2$ and $\omega_3$. For simplicity, we consider the electric fields inside the one-dimensional nonlinear crystals. In the weak down-conversion regime, the state vector of the generated three photons is written as\textsuperscript{65,71,75}

$$|\psi_{3}\rangle \simeq \int \int \int d^3 \omega f(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3) \hat{a}^\dagger_1(\omega_1) \hat{a}^\dagger_2(\omega_2) \hat{a}^\dagger_3(\omega_3) |\text{vac}\rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.1)

In the above equation, $\hat{a}^\dagger_n(\omega)$ denotes the creation operator of a photon of frequency $\omega$ against the vacuum state $|\text{vac}\rangle$. The operator satisfies the commutation relation $[\hat{a}_n(\omega), \hat{a}_m^\dagger(\omega')] = \delta_{n,m}\delta(\omega - \omega')$. The three-photon amplitude, $f(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$, is expressed as

$$f(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3) = \eta A_p(\omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3) \phi(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3),$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.2)

where $A_p(\omega)$ is the normalized pump envelope and $\phi(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3) = \text{sinc}[\Delta k_1(\omega_2 + \omega_3) L_1/2] \text{sinc}[\Delta k_2(\omega_2, \omega_3) L_2/2]$ denotes the phase-matching function of the overall cascaded PDC process. The momentum mismatch between the input and output photons in the $n$-th nonlinear crystal is expressed by $\Delta k_n(\omega, \omega')$, and the length of the $n$-th crystal is given by $L_n$. The momentum mismatches may be linearly approximated around the central frequencies of the generated beams, $\omega_p$, as in\textsuperscript{71,75}

$$\Delta k_1(\omega_0, \omega_1) L_1 = (\omega_0 - \omega_1) T_{p0} + (\omega_1 - \omega_1) T_{p1},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.3)

$$\Delta k_2(\omega_2, \omega_3) L_2 = (\omega_2 - \omega_1) T_{p0} + (\omega_3 - \omega_3) T_{p3},$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.4)

where $T_{p0} = L_1/v_0 - L_1/v_p$ and $T_{p1} = L_2/v_0 - L_2/v_p$. Here, $v_p$ and $v_1$ represent the group velocities of the pump laser and the generated beam at the frequency $\omega_p$, respectively. Without loss of generality, we assume that $T_{p0} \geq T_{p1}$ and $T_{p1} \geq T_{p3}$. We merge all other constants into a factor, $\eta$, in Eq. (2.2), which corresponds to the conversion efficiency of the cascaded PDC process.

In this study, we focus on monochromatic pumping with frequency $\omega_p$ for the cascaded PDC process. In this situation, the energy conservation in the two processes is satisfied as

$$\omega_0 = \omega_1 + \omega_2 + \omega_3.$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.5)

where $r(\omega_1, \omega_3) = \phi(\omega_1, \omega_p - \omega_1 - \omega_3, \omega_3)$ is written as

$$r(\omega_1, \omega_3) = \text{sinc} \left(\frac{\omega_1 - \omega_1}{2} T_{01} \right) \times \text{sinc} \left(\frac{\omega_1 - \omega_1}{2} T_{02} + \frac{\omega_3 - \omega_3}{2} T_{03} \right).$$  \hspace{1cm} (2.6)

The difference, $T_{01} = T_{00} - T_{p1}$, is the entanglement time between photons 0 and 1,\textsuperscript{38} which represents the maximum relative delay between photons 0 and 1. Similarly, in the secondary PDC, the entanglement time between photons 2 and 3 is defined by $T_{02} = T_{02} - T_{03}$.

B. Frequency-dispersed two-photon coincidence counting measurement

We considered the frequency-dispersed two-photon coincidence counting measurement using the entangled three photons. The delay intervals among the photons are governed by $T_{01}^{(01)}$, $T_{02}^{(23)}$, and $T_{02}$. However, the delay intervals among the three photons can be further controlled by adjusting the path differences between the beams.\textsuperscript{52,77} This external time delay is herein denoted as $\Delta t$. As presented in Fig. 1, photon 2 is employed as the pump field, whereas photon 1 is used

FIG. 1. Schematic of frequency-dispersed two-photon coincidence counting measurement using entangled three photons generated via cascaded PDC pumped with a monochromatic laser of frequency $\omega_p$. Photons 1 and 2 are directed onto a sample with the external time delay $\Delta t$. Photon 3 does not interact with the sample and is detected in coincidence with photon 1, the latter of which is transmitted through the sample by the coincidence counter (CC).
for the probe field with the time delay $\Delta t \geq 0$. Photon 3 does not interact with the sample; it serves as a reference for
the coincidence measurement. We assume that the efficiency
of the photon detectors is perfect. In this situation, the
detection of photon 3 makes it possible to verify the generation
of entangled three photons. Consequently, the coincidence
measurements of photons 1 and 3 enable us to distinguish the
genuine spectroscopic signal induced by two of the entangled
three photons from undesired accidental photon counts in the
photon 1 detector. This is a potential benefit of utilizing two-
photon coincidence detection to conduct measurements.

We consider a system comprising molecules and light fields.
The positive-frequency component of the electric field
operator, which interacts with the molecules, is written as

$$\hat{E}^+(t) = \hat{E}_{1+}^+(t) + \hat{E}_{2+}^+(t + \Delta t),$$

where $\hat{E}_{\alpha}^+(t) = (2\pi)^{-1} \int d\omega \hat{a}_{\alpha}(\omega)e^{-i\omega t}$. Here, the slowly
varying envelope approximation has been adapted with the bandwidth of
the fields assumed to be negligible in comparison to the central frequency. Under the rotating-wave
approximation, the molecule–field interaction can be written as:

$$H_{\text{mol-field}}(t) = -\hat{\mu}_+ \hat{E}^+(t) - \hat{\mu}_- \hat{E}^-(t),$$

where $\hat{\mu}_+$ and $\hat{\mu}_-$ denote the excitation and de-excitation parts, respec-
tively, of the dipole operator, $\hat{\mu} = \hat{\mu}_+ - \hat{\mu}_-$. Here, $\hat{\mu}_+$ is
defined by $\hat{\mu}_+ = \sum_{\alpha} \mu_{\alpha 0}\langle \epsilon_{\alpha} | 0 \rangle + \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \mu_{\alpha \beta} | f_3 \rangle \langle \epsilon_{\alpha} |$. and $\hat{\mu}_-$ is introduced for any operand
$\hat{\mu}_+$. In the above, $| 0 \rangle$ represents the electronic ground state in the
molecules. The summations are performed on indices that run over electronized states in the single-excitation manifold $\{|\epsilon_{\alpha}\rangle\}$ and double-excitation manifold $\{|f_3\rangle\}$. The probe fields transmitted through the
sample, $\hat{E}_1$, and the reference field, $\hat{E}_3$, are both frequency-
dispersed. Then, changes in the two-photon counting rate,
$\text{tr}[\hat{a}_1^\dagger(\omega_1)\hat{a}_1^\dagger(\omega_1)\hat{a}_3(\omega_2)\hat{a}_3(\omega_2)]$, are measured. Thus, the
frequency-dispersed two-photon counting signal is written as

$$S(\omega, \omega'; \Delta t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\omega't} \times \text{tr}[\hat{a}_1^\dagger(\omega_1)\hat{a}_3(\omega_2)\hat{E}_{1+}^+(\omega)\hat{\rho}(\infty)],$$

where $\hat{\rho}(\infty) = | 0 \rangle\langle 0 | \otimes | \psi_{\text{tri}} \rangle\langle \psi_{\text{tri}} |$. The lowest-order contribution of Eq. (2.8) only comprises the absorption of photon 1. However, the absorption signal is independent of the PDC pump frequency, $\omega_p$, reference fre-
quency, $\omega_1$, and the delay time, $\Delta t$. In the two-photon coincidence
measurement, which improves the signal-to-noise ratio, this process can be separated from the pump-probe-type two-
photon process. Consequently, the perturbative expansion of
$\hat{\rho}(t)$ with respect to the molecule–field interaction, $H_{\text{mol-field}}$, yields the third-order term as the leading order contribution.

The resultant signal is expressed as the sum of eight contributions,
which are classified into ground-state bleaching (GSB), stimulated emission (SE), excited-state absorption (ESA), and
double-quantum coherence (DQC). Typically, the coherence
between the electronic ground state and a doubly-excited state
decays rapidly compared to the others; hence, the DQC con-
tribution is disregarded in this work. Thus, Eq. (2.8) can be expressed as

$$S(\omega, \omega'; \Delta t) = \sum_{x=\text{GSB, SE, ESA}} \sum_{y=r, ar} S_{x}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega'; \Delta t)$$

with

$$S_{x}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega'; \Delta t) = \text{Im} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\omega t} \int \int \int 0 d^3s \times \Phi_{x}^{(y)}(s_3, s_2, s_1) C_{x}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega', t; s_3, s_2, s_1),$$

where $x$ indicates GSB, SE, or ESA, and $y$ indicates “rephasing” (r) or “non-rephasing” (ar). The function $\Phi_{x}^{(y)}(s_3, s_2, s_1)$ is the third-order response function associated with the Liouville pathway indicated by $x$ and $y$. $C_{x}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega', t; s_3, s_2, s_1)$ is the six-body correlation function of field operators such as $C_{x}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega', t; s_3, s_2, s_1) = \langle \hat{E}_{1+}^-(t) \hat{E}_{1+}^+(t - s_3) \hat{E}_{1+}^-(t - s_3 - s_2) \hat{E}_{1+}^+(t - s_3 - s_2) \rangle$. Here, parentheses denote the expectation value in terms of the photon state in each case, and $\langle \ldots \rangle = \langle \psi_{\text{tri}} | \ldots | \psi_{\text{tri}} \rangle$.

To obtain a concrete but simple expression of the signal, here the memory effect straddling different time intervals in the response function is ignored. The response function can thus be expressed in a simpler form, $\Phi(t_3, t_2, t_1) = (i/\hbar)^3 \text{tr}[\hat{\mu} \hat{G}(t_1) \hat{\mu} \hat{G}(t_2) \hat{\mu} \hat{G}(t_3) \hat{\mu}] | 0 \rangle\langle 0 |$, where $\hat{G}$ is the trace is computed only for the photothermal degrees of freedom, $\{ | \epsilon_{\alpha} \rangle \}$, and $\{ | f_3 \rangle \}$. In this equation, $\hat{G}(t)$ denotes the time-evolution operator used to describe the molecular excitation. The superoperator notation, $\hat{\mu} \hat{O} = [\hat{\mu}, \hat{O}]$, has been introduced for any operator $\hat{O}$. Hereafter, the reduced Planck constant, $\hbar$, is omitted. For example, the rephasing contribution of the ESA signal is written as $\Phi_{x}^{(y)}(t_3, t_2, t_1) = -i^3 \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta} \hat{G}_{\gamma \delta - \alpha \beta}^{(y)}(t_3 - t_2 - t_1) \hat{G}_{\gamma \delta - \alpha \beta}^{(y)}(t_2) \hat{G}_{\gamma \delta - \alpha \beta}^{(y)}(t_1)$, where $G_{\gamma \delta - \alpha \beta}(t)$ is the matrix element of the time-evolution operator defined by $G_{\gamma \delta - \alpha \beta}(t_3 - t_2 - t_1) = \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta} \gamma_{\gamma \gamma - \alpha \beta}(t_3 - t_2 - t_1) \hat{G}_{\gamma \delta - \alpha \beta}^{(y)}(t_3 - t_2 - t_1)$, and $G_{\gamma \delta - \alpha \beta}(t)$ describes the time evolution of the $| \epsilon_{\alpha} \rangle | \epsilon_{\beta} \rangle$ coherence. The Fourier-Laplace transform of $G_{\alpha \beta}(t)$ is introduced as $G_{\alpha \beta}(\omega) = \int_{0}^{\infty} dt e^{-i\omega t} G_{\alpha \beta}(t)$. Consequently, the individual contributions in Eq. (2.9) can be written as

$$S_{\text{ESA}}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega'; \Delta t) = +\text{Re} \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta} \mu_{\alpha \beta} \mu_{\gamma \delta} \hat{G}_{\gamma \delta - \alpha \beta}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega'; \Delta t),$$

$$S_{\text{SE}}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega'; \Delta t) = -\text{Re} \sum_{\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \delta} \mu_{\alpha \beta} \mu_{\gamma \delta} \hat{G}_{\gamma \delta - \alpha \beta}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega'; \Delta t) + \Delta S_{\text{SE}}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega'),$$

$$S_{\text{GSB}}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega'; \Delta t) = -\text{Re} \sum_{\alpha, \beta} \mu_{\alpha \beta}^{2} \hat{G}_{\gamma \delta - \alpha \beta}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega'; \Delta t) + \Delta S_{\text{GSB}}^{(y)}(\omega, \omega').$$
In the Hamiltonian, the excitation...This approximation is justified when...\( |x\rangle\) can be simplified as...

\[
F_{\gamma,\delta-\alpha,\beta}(\omega,\omega; t) = \gamma \delta \langle \omega | \hat{e}^{(2\omega)} | \omega \rangle
\]

in terms of...

\[
F_{\gamma,\delta-\alpha,\beta}(\omega,\omega; t) = G_{\gamma,\delta-\alpha,\beta}(\omega,\omega; t) + D_{\gamma,\delta-\alpha,\beta}(\omega,\omega; t)
\]

where \( G_{\gamma,\delta-\alpha,\beta}(\omega,\omega; t) \) and \( D_{\gamma,\delta-\alpha,\beta}(\omega,\omega; t) \) have been introduced. In deriving Eq. (2.19), we assume that...

\[
S(\omega,\omega; \Delta t) \approx S_{\Delta t}(\omega,\omega; t,\omega)
\]

except for the \( \Delta t \)-independent terms in Eqs. (A.5) and (A.6), respectively. Equation (2.20) indicates that the two-photon counting signal...

III. NUMERICAL RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

To numerically demonstrate Eq. (2.9) using Eqs. (2.11) – (2.17), we consider the electronic excitations in a coupled dimer. The electronic excitations Hamiltonian is expressed as...

\[
H_{\text{ex}} = \sum_m \hbar \Omega_m \hat{B}_m^{\dagger} \hat{B}_m + \sum_{m,n} \hbar J_{mn} \hat{B}_m^{\dagger} \hat{B}_n,
\]

where \( \hbar \Omega_m \) is the Franck-Condon transition energy of the \( m \)-th molecule and \( \hbar J_{mn} \) is the electronic coupling between the \( m \)-th and \( n \)-th molecules. In the Hamiltonian, the excitation creation operator \( \hat{B}_m^{\dagger} \) is introduced for the excitation vacuum \( |0\rangle \), such that \( |m\rangle = \hat{B}_m^{\dagger} |0\rangle \) and \( |mn\rangle = \hat{B}_m^{\dagger} \hat{B}_n^{\dagger} |0\rangle \).

In the eigenstate representation, the excitation Hamiltonian can be written as...

\[
H_{\text{ex}} = \epsilon_0 |0\rangle \langle 0| + \sum_m \epsilon_m |m\rangle \langle m| + \sum_{m,n} \epsilon_{mn} |m\rangle \langle n| + |n\rangle \langle m|,
\]

where \( \epsilon_m = \sum_{m,n} V_{mn} |m\rangle \). In the eigenstate representation, the excitation Hamiltonian can be written as...

\[
g_{mn}(t) = \int_0^t dt' \int_0^t dt'' g_{mn}(t') g_{mn}(t'')\text{cos} \nu t - \text{sin} \nu t
\]

in terms of the spectral density, \( \nu_{mn}(\omega) \). In this study, the spectral density is modeled as...

\[
j_m(\omega) = 4 \pi m^2 |V_m|^2 \omega/(\omega^2 + |V_m|^2).
\]
where $E_{\text{env}}$ and $2/\Gamma_m = \tau_{\text{env}}$ represent the energy and timescale of the environmental reorganization, respectively. To describe the time-evolution of the electronic excitations in the waiting time, the electronic coherence in the single excitation manifold is ignored, and hence, $G_{\beta\beta\rightarrow\alpha\alpha}(t)$ in Eq. (2.16) is computed with the master equation,

$$\frac{d}{dt}G_{\beta\beta\rightarrow\alpha\alpha}(t) = \sum_{\xi(\neq \beta)} k_{\beta\rightarrow\xi} G_{\xi\xi\rightarrow\alpha\alpha}(t)$$

$$- \sum_{\xi(\neq \beta)} k_{\xi\rightarrow\beta} G_{\beta\beta\rightarrow\alpha\alpha}(t), \quad (3.1)$$

where the rate constant $k_{\beta\rightarrow\alpha}$ is obtained with the modified Redfield theory.\(^{84,85}\) With the initial condition of $G_{\beta\beta\rightarrow\alpha\alpha}(0) = \delta_{\beta\alpha}$, the equation leads to

$$G_{\beta\beta\rightarrow\alpha\alpha}(t) = \sum_{\xi} g_{\beta\alpha}(\xi) e^{-\lambda_{\xi} t}, \quad (3.2)$$

with $g_{\beta\alpha}(\xi) = U_{\beta\xi}(U^{-1})_{\xi\alpha}$, where $\lambda_{\xi}$ is the $\xi$-th eigenvalue of the matrix whose element is $K_{\xi\xi} = \delta_{\xi\xi} - \sum_{\gamma(\neq \xi)} k_{\xi\rightarrow\gamma} + (1 - \delta_{\xi\xi})k_{\xi\rightarrow\xi}$. For simplicity, we set the transition dipole strengths as $\mu_{10} = \mu_{20} = 1$. We set the reorganization energy, relaxation time, and temperature as $E_{1\text{env}} = E_{2\text{env}} = 35 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, $\tau_{1\text{env}} = \tau_{2\text{env}} = 50 \text{ fs}$, and $T = 77 \text{ K}$, respectively. Under this condition, the energy gap between the eigenstates, $\omega_{20} - \omega_{10} = 224 \text{ cm}^{-1}$, is much higher than the thermal energy. Therefore, the influence of the uphill excitation transfer, $e_1 \rightarrow e_2$, on the signal can be considered to be small.

### A. Limit of short entanglement time

To demonstrate how the spectrum provides time-resolved information on the state-to-state dynamics, we first investigate the limit of the short entanglement time. $T_{\text{c}}(01) = T_{\text{c}}(23) = T_{01} = 0$. As shown in Eqs. (2.12) and (2.13), the spectrum contains $\Delta t$-independent contributions. Therefore, we consider the difference spectrum,

$$\Delta S(\omega, \omega_t; \Delta t) = S(\omega, \omega_t; \Delta t) - S(\omega, \omega_t; 0). \quad (3.3)$$

Figure 3(a) presents the difference spectra of the model dimer for two different waiting times, $\Delta t$, when the pump frequency is $\omega_p = 31800 \text{ cm}^{-1}$. The waiting times are $\Delta t = 500 \text{ fs}$ and $2000 \text{ fs}$. Figure 3(a) shows strong signatures of the ESA signal at the location A, and strong signatures of the SE signal at the location labeled B. As was clarified in Eq. (2.19), the possible pairs of optical transitions probed at frequency $\omega = \omega_\xi$ are restricted by the resonance condition, $\omega_{10} + \omega_\xi + \omega_t \approx \omega_p$, which is imposed by the non-classical correlations among the entangled three photons. Hence, the negative peak at A corresponds to the pair of optical transitions $(0 \rightarrow e_2, e_1 \rightarrow f_3)$, while the positive peak at B corresponds to the pair of optical transitions $(0 \rightarrow e_2, e_1 \rightarrow 0)$. The increases in these signal amplitudes during the waiting period $\Delta t$ reflect the excitation relaxation $e_2 \rightarrow e_1$, as shown in Fig. 3(b). Therefore, the two-photon counting signal temporally resolves the excitation relaxation $e_2 \rightarrow e_1$ through the changes in the amplitudes of peaks A or B during the waiting period, $\Delta t$.

In Fig. 3(a), strong ESA and SE signals can also be observed at locations C and D, respectively. These ESA and SE signals correspond to the pairs of optical transitions $(0 \rightarrow e_1, e_1 \rightarrow f_3)$ and $(0 \rightarrow e_1, e_1 \rightarrow 0)$, respectively. As shown in Fig. 3(b), the difference spectrum exhibited changes in the amplitudes of peaks C and D occurring within $500 \text{ fs}$; these peaks are much faster than the excitation relaxation, $e_2 \rightarrow e_1$. Moreover, Fig. 3(b) exhibits the oscillatory transients of peaks A and B, which persisted up to $\Delta t < 500 \text{ fs}$. However, the electronic coherence in the single-excitation manifold is not considered in this instance. To understand these transient behaviors, we consider the non-rephasing contribution of the
ESA signal in Eq. (2.15). For demonstration purposes, we assume that the time evolution in the \( t_1 \) period is denoted by \( G_{a_0}(t_1) = e^{-(i\omega_{a_0} + \Gamma_{a_0})t_1} \). With the use of Eqs. (2.18) and (3.2), the expression of \( I_{e_\beta}^{(nr)}(\omega, \omega_{\uparrow}; \Delta t) \) in Eq. (2.15) can be expressed as

\[
I_{e_\beta}^{(nr)}(\omega, \omega_{\uparrow}; \Delta t) = -iG_{e_\beta}[\omega] \sum_{\xi=1,2} \gamma_{e_\beta}^{(a)} e^{i(\Delta \omega_{a_0} \Delta t - \Gamma_{a_0} \Delta t) - e^{-\lambda_1 \Delta t}} \Delta \omega_{a_0} + i(\Gamma_{a_0} - \lambda_1 \xi),
\]

where \( \lambda_1 = 0, \lambda_2 = \lambda, \) and \( \Delta \omega_{a_0} = \omega_a - \omega_{\uparrow} - \omega_{\uparrow} \). Equation (3.4) demonstrates that the amplitude of peak A oscillates at the frequency \( \Delta \omega_{a_0} \). This is the detuning of the \( 0 \rightarrow e_2 \) transition from the frequency of photon 2. Similarly, the transient dynamics in peak C reflect the decay of the \( |e_1\rangle \langle 0| \) coherence. Therefore, the transient dynamics in peaks A and C are not directly related to the dynamics in the single-excitation manifold during the \( t_2 \) period. The SE contributions to peaks B and D in the short-time region can also be understood in the same manner. If coherence \( |e_\alpha\rangle \langle e_\beta| \) is considered, the time-evolution operator is modeled as \( G_{\alpha_\beta}^{(nr)}(t_2) = e^{-(i\omega_{a_\beta} + \Gamma_{a_\beta})t_2} \). Thus, Eq. (2.15) yields

\[
I_{e_\beta}^{(nr)}(\omega, \omega_{\uparrow}; \Delta t) = -iG_{e_\beta}[\omega] e^{i(\Delta \omega_{a_\beta} \Delta t - \Gamma_{a_\beta} \Delta t) - e^{-\lambda_1 \Delta t}} \Delta \omega_{a_\beta} + i(\Gamma_{a_\beta} - \lambda_1 \xi).
\]

Equation (3.5) includes the oscillating component at the detuning frequency \( \Delta \omega_{a_\beta} \), as well as the oscillation originating from the \( |e_\alpha\rangle \langle e_\beta| \) coherence. In complex molecular systems such as photosynthetic light-harvesting proteins, the lifetime of the electronic coherence is typically a few hundred femtoseconds. On this time scale, the contribution of the \( |e_\alpha\rangle \langle 0| \) coherence during the \( t_1 \) period to the signal in Eq. (3.5) cannot be ignored. In this respect, Eq. (3.5) indicates that it is difficult to extract relevant information on the electronic coherence from the oscillatory dynamics in the signal.

B. Cases of finite entanglement times

We investigate the effects of finite entanglement times on the spectrum. For simplicity, we assume \( v_1 = -v_0 \) and \( v_2 = -v_3 \), which can be fulfilled through the use of periodically poled lithium niobate crystals. This condition leads to the equality of \( T_{e_\alpha}^{(01)} = T_{e_\alpha}^{(23)} = 2T_{e_\alpha} \), and therefore, we consider cases that satisfy \( T_{e_\alpha} = T_{e_\alpha}^{(01)} = T_{e_\alpha}^{(23)} = 2T_{e_\alpha} \) in what follows.

Figure 4 presents the difference spectra of the molecular dimer in the cases of (a) \( T_{e} = 10 \) fs, (b) \( T_{e} = 50 \) fs, (c) \( T_{e} = 100 \) fs, and (d) \( T_{e} = 500 \) fs. The central frequencies of the entangled three photons that have been generated can be varied by tuning the phase-matching conditions for the two PDC processes. Therefore, we set the three central frequencies of the entangled three photons, that is, \( \omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega_3 = \omega_p/3 = 10600 \text{ cm}^{-1} \), which nearly resonate with the \( 0 \rightarrow e_2 \) transition. The other parameters are the same as those shown in Fig. 3. The signal in Fig. 4(a) appears to be identical to the signal obtained under the three photon state in the limit of \( T_{e} = 0 \) fs, illustrated in Fig. 3(a). However, the intensities of peaks B, C, and D decrease with increasing entanglement time, \( T_{e} \), as presented in Figs. 4(b) – (d), respectively. In the case of \( T_{e} = 500 \) fs, peaks B, C, and D almost dis-
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cases of (a)
\[ T_e = 10 \text{ fs} \]
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\[ T_e = 50 \text{ fs} \]
(c) \[ T_e = 100 \text{ fs} \]
(d) \[ T_e = 500 \text{ fs} \]. We set the central frequencies of the entangled three photons to \( \omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega_3 = \omega_p / 3 = 10600 \text{ cm}^{-1} \).

![Fig. 5](image-url) The phase-matching function \( r(\omega, \omega_r) \) in Eq. (2.6) for the cases of (a) \( T_e = 10 \text{ fs} \), (b) \( T_e = 50 \text{ fs} \), (c) \( T_e = 100 \text{ fs} \), and (d) \( T_e = 500 \text{ fs} \). We set the central frequencies of the entangled three photons to \( \omega_1 = \omega_2 = \omega_3 = \omega_p / 3 = 10600 \text{ cm}^{-1} \).

![Fig. 6](image-url) Time evolution of the amplitude of (a) peak A \( \omega_p = 10658 \text{ cm}^{-1}, \omega = 10571 \text{ cm}^{-1} \) in the case of \( T_e = 10 \text{ fs} \) and (b) peak A \( \omega_p = 10598 \text{ cm}^{-1}, \omega = 10598 \text{ cm}^{-1} \) in the case of \( T_e = 500 \text{ fs} \). In both panels, the grey dashed line shows the amplitude of peak A \( \omega_p = 10658 \text{ cm}^{-1}, \omega = 10571 \text{ cm}^{-1} \) in the limit of \( T_e = 0 \text{ fs} \) as a reference. The normalization of the plots is such that the maximum value of peak A is unity.

To understand this dependence on the entanglement time, the rephasing contribution in Eq. (2.16) is considered as an example. Here, we note that \( D_1(\omega, t) \) is non-zero when \( |t| \leq 0.75 T_e \), as shown in Fig. 2. In the case of \( \Delta t > 0.75 T_e \), the expression of \( F_{\beta\beta-\alpha\alpha}(\omega, \omega_r; \Delta t, 0) \) is obtained as

\[
F_{\beta\beta-\alpha\alpha}(\omega, \omega_r; \Delta t, 0) = r(\omega, \omega_r) \sum_{\xi=1,2} r(\omega + i\lambda\xi, \omega_r) g^{(\xi)}_{\beta\alpha} e^{-\lambda\xi \Delta t}. \tag{3.6}
\]

The bandwidth of the phase-matching function in Eq. (2.6) is related to the inverse of the entanglement time, \( T_e \). Equation (3.6) indicates that the finite entanglement time acts as a frequency filter through the spectral distribution of the phase-matching function, which limits the accessible spectral range. Figure 5 presents the spectral distribution of the phase-matching function in Eq. (2.6). Comparing Figs. 4 and 5 reveals that all optical transitions that are outside the bandwidth of the phase-matching function are suppressed. Therefore, the finite entanglement times can be used to selectively enhance specific Liouville pathways when the center frequencies of the entangled three photons are tuned to resonate with certain optical transitions. It is noteworthy that a similar property in terms of the finite entanglement time was discussed in the context of entangled two-photon spectroscopy.

Further, we investigate the time-evolution of peak A observed in the difference spectra (illustrated in Fig. 4). In the case of \( \Delta t > 0.75 T_e \), the contribution of the ESA signal at peak A in Eq. (3.6) is written as

\[
F_{11 \leftarrow 22}(\bar{\omega}_1, \bar{\omega}_3; \Delta t, 0) = g^{(1)}_{12} + \lambda g^{(2)}_{12} e^{-\lambda_2 \Delta t} \tag{3.7}
\]

with \( \lambda = 8(\lambda_\xi T_e)^{-2} \sinh(\lambda_\xi T_e/2) \sinh(\lambda_\xi T_e/4) \), where the approximations of \( \bar{\omega}_1 \simeq \omega_p / 3 \) and \( \bar{\omega}_3 \simeq \omega_p - \omega_p / 2 = \omega_p / 2 \) are employed. The \( \Delta t \)-dependence of Eq. (3.7) reflects the monotonous decay governed by the rate of the excitation transfer \( \lambda_2 = k_{1 \leftarrow 2} + k_{2 \leftarrow 1} \). Therefore, the signal provides information on the dynamics of \( e_2 \rightarrow e_1 \) when \( \Delta t > 0.75 T_e \), as shown in Fig. 6(b). When the entanglement time, \( T_e \), is sufficiently short compared to the timescales of the excited-state dynamics, Eq. (3.7) becomes \( F_{11 \leftarrow 22}(\bar{\omega}_1, \bar{\omega}_3; \Delta t, 0) \simeq G_{11 \leftarrow 22}(\Delta t) \), as presented in Fig. 6(a). In contrast, in the case of \( \Delta t < 0.75 T_e \), Eq. (2.16) becomes

\[
F_{11 \leftarrow 22}(\bar{\omega}_1, \bar{\omega}_3; \Delta t, 0) = -g^{(1)}_{12} - \frac{2 g^{(2)}_{12}}{\lambda_2^2 T_e} e^{-\lambda_2 \Delta t} \times [(1 + \lambda_2 \Delta t) e^{-\lambda_2 \Delta t} + (1 - \lambda_2 \Delta t) e^{\lambda_2 \Delta t}] \tag{3.8}
\]

Equation (3.8) demonstrates the complicated time-evolution, making it impossible to extract relevant information on the excited-state dynamics from the signal. This can clearly be seen in Fig. 6(b), where it is not possible to temporally resolve the fast oscillatory transients within \( 0.75 T_e = 375 \text{ fs} \). Figures 4 - 6 suggest that the manipulation of the phase-matching function enables filtering out a specific frequency region of the spectra while maintaining ultrafast temporal resolution, resulting in the achievement of the joint temporal and frequency resolution.
IV. CONCLUDING REMARKS

The time-resolved spectroscopic measurement using the entangled photon pairs investigated in the preceding study faces the challenge in that it is difficult to separate the weak nonlinear optical signals from the linear absorption signal. In this work, we theoretically investigated the time-resolved spectroscopy utilizing entangled three photons generated via the cascaded PDC to overcome this difficulty. In this measurement, time-resolved spectroscopy with monochromatic pumping was integrated with the two-photon counting technique, which suppresses the undesired accidental photon counts in the detector and thus allows one to separate the weak nonlinear optical components from the remaining signals. It was also demonstrated that the frequency-dispersed two-photon counting signal provides the same spectral information as in a coherent 2D optical spectrum that requires the control of multiple laser pulses. Furthermore, we investigated the influence of the finite entanglement times on the two-photon counting signal. The spectral distribution of the phase-matching function acts as a frequency filter to selectively resolve a specific region of the 2D spectrum, while the excited state dynamics under investigation are temporally resolved in a time domain that is longer than the entanglement time. This results in the achievement of the joint temporal and frequency resolution. It is thus anticipated that the time-resolved spectroscopy using the entangled three-photon system may be useful for investigating the dynamical processes in complex molecular systems, such as photosystem II reaction center, in which multiple electronic states are present within a narrow energy region. However, it is still necessary to address several practical challenges in implementing the proposed spectroscopic scheme. The first issue is the low efficiency of three-photon generation via the cascaded PDC process. Second, the performance of the coincidence measurement is very sensitive to the efficiency of the photon detector. These issues could be overcome by devising a new entangled three-photon source, and by using the double-crystal interference technique, which does not require detection of photons transmitted through the sample. The extensions of the present work in these directions are to be explored in future studies.
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Appendix A: Δt-independent terms in SE and GSB contributions

The Δt-independent terms in Eqs. (2.12) and (2.13) are computed as follows:

$$\Delta S_{\text{SE}}^{(t)}(\omega, \omega_t) = -\text{Re} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \mu_{\delta\alpha} \mu_{\gamma\beta} \mu_{\delta\alpha} G_{\gamma\delta}(\omega) G_{\gamma\delta}(\omega) [0]$$

$$\times \int_0^\infty ds_1 e^{-i(\omega t - \omega_1) s_1} G_{\gamma\delta}(s_1) D_2(\omega_t, s_1), \quad (A.1)$$

$$\Delta S_{\text{SE}}^{(nt)}(\omega, \omega_t) = -\text{Re} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \mu_{\delta\alpha} \mu_{\gamma\beta} \mu_{\delta\alpha} G_{\gamma\delta}(\omega) G_{\gamma\delta}(\omega) [0]$$

$$\times \int_0^\infty ds_1 e^{i(\omega t - \omega_1) s_1} G_{\gamma\delta}(s_1) D_2(\omega_t, s_1), \quad (A.2)$$

$$\Delta S_{\text{GSB}}^{(t)}(\omega, \omega_t) = -\text{Re} \sum_{\alpha\beta} \mu_{\delta\alpha}^2 \mu_{\gamma\beta}^2 G_{\gamma\delta}(\omega) \int_0^\infty ds_1 e^{-i\omega s_1} G_{\gamma\delta}(s_1)$$

$$\times \int_0^\infty ds_2 e^{i(\omega t - \omega_1) + \omega_1) (s_2 + s_1)} D_2(\omega_t, s_2 + s_1), \quad (A.3)$$

$$\Delta S_{\text{GSB}}^{(nt)}(\omega, \omega_t) = -r(\omega, \omega_t)^2 \text{Re} \sum_{\alpha\beta} \mu_{\delta\alpha}^2 \mu_{\gamma\beta}^2 G_{\gamma\delta}(\omega) G_{\gamma\delta}(\omega) [0]. \quad (A.4)$$

The contributions to the total signal in Eqs. (2.9) can be removed by considering the difference spectrum in Eq. (3.3). In the limits of $T_{e1}^{(01)} \to 0$, $T_{e2}^{(23)} \to 0$, and $T_{e2}^{(01)} \to 0$, we obtain $r(\omega_1, \omega_3) = 1$ and $D_2(\omega, t) = \delta(t)$. Hence, Eqs. (A.1) – (A.4) are simplified as follows:

$$\Delta S_{\text{SE}}^{(g)}(\omega) = -\text{Re} \sum_{\alpha\beta\gamma\delta} \mu_{\delta\alpha} \mu_{\gamma\beta} \mu_{\delta\alpha} G_{\gamma\delta}(\omega) G_{\gamma\delta}(\omega) [0], \quad (A.5)$$

$$\Delta S_{\text{GSB}}^{(g)}(\omega) = -\text{Re} \sum_{\alpha\beta} \mu_{\delta\alpha}^2 \mu_{\gamma\beta}^2 G_{\gamma\delta}(\omega) G_{\gamma\delta}(\omega) [0]. \quad (A.6)$$


