By taking a Poisson limit for a sequence of rare quantum particles, I derive simple formulas for the Uhlmann fidelity, the quantum Chernoff quantity, the relative entropy, and the Helstrom information. I also present analogous formulas in classical information theory for a Poisson model. An operator called the intensity operator emerges as the central quantity in the formalism to describe Poisson states. It behaves like a density operator but is unnormalized. The formulas in terms of the intensity operators not only resemble the general formulas in terms of the density operators, but also coincide with some existing definitions of divergences between unnormalized positive-semidefinite matrices. Furthermore, I show that the effects of certain channels on Poisson states can be described by simple maps for the intensity operators.

1 Introduction

The Poisson limit theorems, also called the laws of rare events or the laws of small numbers, underlie the ubiquity of Poisson statistics and enable a variety of simplifications in probability theory [1, 2]. In this paper, I examine the consequences of taking a similar limit in quantum information theory and demonstrate that elegant formulas emerge under the limit. This body of work may be called Poisson quantum information, which has the potential to grow into a fruitful research topic on par with Gaussian quantum information [3, 4].

The results put forth are a generalization and culmination of our earlier efforts concerning weak thermal light [5–8]. They are especially relevant to the recent literature on the application of quantum information theory to partially coherent imaging [8–17], where there is some confusion regarding the correct formulas for the information quantities, leading to inconsistent results by different groups. This paper resolves the debate in support of Refs. [6, 10] and extends the results, beyond the Helstrom and Fisher information quantities considered there. While special weak-thermal-light models have already found success by enabling substantial simplifications in many previous studies in quantum optics [5, 6, 8, 18–21], the general theory here stands on its own and does not require the quantum state to be bosonic or exactly thermal, so it may be applied to particles and systems beyond photons, such as electrons and quasiparticles, whenever a quantum treatment of rare events is needed.

2 Poisson states

Let the density operator be

\[
\rho = \tau^\otimes M, \quad \tau = \bigoplus_{l=0}^1 \pi_l \tau_l, \quad \pi_0 = 1 - \epsilon, \quad \pi_1 = \epsilon,
\]

where \(\tau^\otimes M\) denotes the tensor product of \(M\) identical density operators \(\tau\) in \(M\) temporal modes, \(\tau_0\) is the vacuum density operator on a 1-dimensional Hilbert space \(H_0\), and \(\tau_1\) is the one-particle density.
operator on a $d$-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1$, $\oplus$ denotes the direct sum, and $\epsilon$ is the probability of having one particle in each temporal mode. In the context of optics, $\tau_1$ may denote the one-photon density operator in $d$ spatial and polarization modes. The formalism, in itself, is generic however—$\tau_1$ may denote the state of any system with creation or survival probability $\epsilon$ and $\tau_0$ may denote a failure state resulting from failed creation or loss. For example, to study intensity interferometry [22], where two-photon-coincidence events are postselected and one-photon events are ignored, $\tau_1$ can be used to denote the two-photon density operator.

Define the Poisson limit with respect to $(\epsilon, M, N)$ as

$$\epsilon \to 0, \quad M \to \infty, \quad N \equiv M \epsilon \text{ fixed},$$

(2.2)

where $N$ is the expected particle number in total. In this limit, a central quantity in the ensuing theory is

$$\Gamma \equiv N\tau_1,$$

(2.3)

which I call the intensity operator. Similar to $\tau_1$, it is a positive-semidefinite operator on $\mathcal{H}_1$. Unlike $\tau_1$, however, its trace

$$\text{tr} \Gamma = N$$

(2.4)

is not normalized, as the particle number need not be conserved.

Let $\mathcal{N}^{(k)} \equiv (\mathcal{N}_1^{(k)}, \ldots, \mathcal{N}_d^{(k)})$ be the output random variable of a mode-resolved particle-counting measurement with respect to the $k$th temporal mode. Let its probability distribution be

$$P_{\mathcal{N}_j^{(k)}}(0, \ldots, 0) = \text{tr} \left[ (I_0 \oplus 0_1) \tau \right] = 1 - \epsilon,$$

(2.5)

$$P_{\mathcal{N}_j^{(k)}}(0, \ldots, n_j = 1, \ldots, 0) = \text{tr} \left[ (0_0 \oplus |1_j\rangle \langle 1_j|) \tau \right] = \epsilon \langle 1_j| \tau |1_j\rangle,$$

(2.6)

where $I_l$ and $0_l$ denote the identity operator and the zero operator on $\mathcal{H}_l$ and $\{|1_j\rangle : j = 1, \ldots, d\}$ is an orthonormal basis of $\mathcal{H}_1$. Under the Poisson limit, the integrated random variable $M \equiv \sum_{k=1}^M \mathcal{N}^{(k)}$ has the Poisson distribution given by [1, 2]

$$P_M(m) = \prod_{j=1}^d \exp(-\Lambda_j) \frac{\Lambda_j^m}{m_j!},$$

(2.7)

where each intensity value is given by

$$\Lambda_j = \langle 1_j| \Gamma |1_j\rangle.$$

(2.8)

In view of the Poissonian properties, the quantum state given by Eqs. (2.1), together with the Poisson limit given by Eqs. (2.2), may be called a Poisson state. Although a rigorous treatment of Poisson states may require quantum stochastic calculus [23], I take the more convenient approach of assuming Eqs. (2.1) and taking the Poisson limit only at the end of a calculation. In a slight abuse of terminology, I may refer to the states before taking the limit as Poisson states, under the promise that the limit will be taken eventually.

If only the particles are of interest and the timings of the particle arrivals are ignored, the state can be rewritten as

$$\Pi(\rho) = \bigoplus_{l=0}^M P_L(l) \tau_0^{\otimes l},$$

(2.9)

where $\Pi$ denotes the map that transforms Eqs. (2.1) into this representation, $L$ is the binomial random variable for the total particle number, and $\tau_0^{\otimes 0} = \tau_0$ is assumed. In the Poisson limit, $L$ becomes Poisson, viz.,

$$P_L(l) = \exp(-N) \frac{N^l}{l!},$$

(2.10)
and $\Pi(\rho)$ becomes

$$
\Pi(\rho) \rightarrow \bigoplus_{l=0}^{\infty} \exp\left(-N\right)\frac{\Gamma^l}{l!}.
$$

Equation (2.11) may serve as an alternative definition of a Poisson state. Equation (2.7) can also be derived directly from Eq. (2.11), while many of the following results remain the same when computed using Eq. (2.11). Equations (2.1) are more intuitive from the physics point of view, however, and will be used instead of Eq. (2.11) in the following.

### 3 Information quantities

To define information quantities, assume two Poisson states $\rho$ and $\rho'$. Assume that $M$ and $\tau_0$ are the same for the two states, while the other quantities may vary. The quantities for the second state are denoted with a prime; for example, the intensity operator is $\Gamma'$ and $N' = \text{tr} \Gamma' = Me'$. My first proposition concerns the Uhlmann fidelity [24], the most notable application of which is to set useful bounds for quantum hypothesis testing [25].

**Proposition 1.** The Uhlmann fidelity

$$
F(\rho, \rho') \equiv \text{tr} \sqrt{\rho \rho'} \sqrt{\rho}
$$

between two Poisson states is given by

$$
F(\rho, \rho') = \exp \left[-\frac{N + N'}{2} + F(\Gamma, \Gamma')\right].
$$

**Proof.** Let $\varepsilon = \max\{\epsilon, \epsilon'\}$. Given the tensor product and the direct sum in Eqs. (2.1), it can be shown that [25]

$$
F(\rho, \rho') = [F(\tau, \tau')]^M,
$$

and

$$
F(\tau, \tau') = \sum_{l} F(\pi_l \tau_l, \pi'_l \tau'_l) = 1 - \frac{\epsilon + \epsilon'}{2} + \sqrt{\epsilon \epsilon'} F(\tau_1, \tau'_1) + O(\varepsilon^2).
$$

Taking the Poisson limit of $F(\rho, \rho')$ for both $(\epsilon, M, N)$ and $(\epsilon', M, N')$ then leads to the proposition.

Equation (3.2) has a self-similar feature: it contains a fidelity expression, in terms of the intensity operators $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma'$, that has the same form as the general formula for the density operators. Another remarkable feature is that the right-hand side of

$$
-2 \ln F(\rho, \rho') = N + N' - 2F(\Gamma, \Gamma') \equiv d_B^2(\Gamma, \Gamma')
$$

coincides with the squared Bures-Wasserstein distance between unnormalized positive-semidefinite operators [24, 26].

The next two propositions concern the quantum Chernoff quantity and the relative entropy. The Chernoff quantity is used in the quantum Chernoff bound for hypothesis testing [25, 27], while the relative entropy is, of course, a fundamental quantity in quantum thermodynamics [28] and communication theory [4, 25]. The proofs are similar to that of Proposition 1 and omitted for brevity.

**Proposition 2.** The quantum Chernoff quantity

$$
C_s(\rho, \rho') \equiv \text{tr} \rho^s \rho'^{1-s}, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 1
$$

for two Poisson states is given by

$$
C_s(\rho, \rho') = \exp \left[-sN - (1-s)N' + A_s(\Gamma, \Gamma')\right].
$$
Proposition 3. The relative entropy

\[ D(\rho || \rho') \equiv \text{tr} \rho' - \text{tr} \rho + \text{tr} \rho (\ln \rho - \ln \rho') \]  

(3.8)

between two Poisson states is given by

\[ D(\rho || \rho') = D(\Gamma || \Gamma'). \]  

(3.9)

If \( \text{supp} \Gamma \nsubseteq \text{supp} \Gamma' \), where \( \text{supp} \) denotes the support [4], then \( \text{supp} \rho \nsubseteq \text{supp} \rho' \), and \( S(\rho || \rho') = S(\Gamma || \Gamma') = \infty \).

In Eq. (3.8), the relative entropy is expressed in a more general form so that it is appropriate for unnormalized positive-definite operators as well [29–31]. Similar to Eq. (3.2), Eqs. (3.7) and (3.9) have a self-similar feature. It is also remarkable that the expressions on the right-hand side of

\[-\frac{1}{s(1-s)} \ln C_s(\rho, \rho') = \frac{1}{s(1-s)} [sN + (1-s)N' - C_s(\Gamma, \Gamma')] \equiv D_s(\Gamma, \Gamma') \]  

(3.10)

and

\[ D(\Gamma || \Gamma') = N' - N + \text{tr} \Gamma (\ln \Gamma - \ln \Gamma') \]  

(3.11)

coincide with the alpha-divergences between unnormalized positive-semidefinite matrices in the matrix-analysis literature [30, 31].

The classical Poisson model given by Eq. (2.7) leads to analogous formulas for the corresponding quantities in classical information theory. The proofs are trivial and omitted for brevity; see, for example, Ref. [32] for similar results. Assume two Poisson distributions and again denote the quantities for the second distribution with a prime.

Proposition 4. The Chernoff quantity

\[ C_s(P_M, P'_M) \equiv \sum_m P^s_M P'^{1-s}_M, \quad 0 \leq s \leq 1 \]  

(3.12)

for two Poisson distributions is given by

\[ C_s(P_M, P'_M) = \exp \{-sN - (1-s)N' + C_s(\Lambda, \Lambda')\}. \]  

(3.13)

Proposition 5. The relative entropy

\[ D(P_M || P'_M) \equiv \sum_m \left( P'_M - P'_M + P_M \ln \frac{P_M}{P'_M} \right) \]  

(3.14)

between two Poisson distributions is given by

\[ D(P_M || P'_M) = D(\Lambda || \Lambda'). \]  

(3.15)

If \( \text{supp} \Lambda \nsubseteq \text{supp} \Lambda' \), then \( \text{supp} P_M \nsubseteq \text{supp} P'_M \), and \( D(P_M || P'_M) = D(\Lambda || \Lambda') = \infty \).

Equations (3.13) and (3.15) resemble Eqs. (3.7) and (3.9) and also possess a self-similar feature. Similar to the quantum case, the expressions on the right-hand side of

\[-\frac{1}{s(1-s)} \ln C_s(P_M, P'_M) = \frac{1}{s(1-s)} [sN + (1-s)N' - C_s(\Lambda, \Lambda')] \equiv D_s(\Lambda, \Lambda') \]  

(3.16)

and

\[ D(\Lambda || \Lambda') = N' - N + \sum_j \Lambda_j \ln \frac{\Lambda_j}{\Lambda'_j} \]  

(3.17)

coincide with the alpha-divergences between unnormalized positive distributions [33]. \( D_{1/2}(\Lambda, \Lambda') \), in particular, is the squared Hellinger distance [26].

A fundamental relation between the quantum and classical information quantities is monotonicity. It is interesting to note that it manifests for the Poisson states on two levels: on the level of \( \rho \) and on the level of \( \Gamma \).
Proposition 6.

\begin{align}
F(\rho, \rho') & \leq C_{1/2}(P_M, P'_M), \\
C_s(\rho, \rho') & \leq C_s(P_M, P'_M), \\
D(\rho || \rho') & \geq D(P_M || P'_M).
\end{align}

Proof. These bounds follow directly from the monotonicity relations [25]. Alternatively, one may take \( \Gamma = N\tau_1 \) and \( \Gamma' = N'\tau'_1 \), define \( p_j \equiv \langle 1_j | \tau_1 | 1_j \rangle = \Lambda_j / N \) and \( p_j' \equiv \langle 1_j | \tau'_1 | 1_j \rangle = \Lambda'_j / N' \), and apply the monotonicity relations to \( (\tau_1, \tau'_1) \) and \( (p, p') \) in order to obtain

\begin{align}
F(\Gamma, \Gamma') &= \sqrt{NN'}F(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \leq \sqrt{NN'C_{1/2}(p, p')} = C_{1/2}(\Lambda, \Lambda'), \\
C_s(\Gamma, \Gamma') &= N^sN'^{1-s}C_s(\tau_1, \tau'_1) \leq N^sN'^{1-s}C_s(p, p') = C_s(\Lambda, \Lambda'), \\
D(\Gamma || \Gamma') &= N' - N + N \ln N / N' + ND(\tau_1 || \tau'_1) \geq N' - N + N \ln N / N' + ND(p || p') = D(\Lambda || \Lambda'),
\end{align}

which also lead to the bounds via Propositions 1–5.

Last but not the least, I present propositions concerning the Helstrom information and the Fisher information [18, 25], which play crucial roles in parameter estimation. Let \( \Gamma \) be a function of an unknown vectorial parameter \( \theta \equiv (\theta_1, \ldots, \theta_q) \in \Theta \subseteq \mathbb{R}^q \).

Proposition 7. Define the \( q \times q \) Helstrom information matrix as

\[ K_{\mu \nu}(\rho) \equiv \text{tr} (\sigma_\mu \circ \sigma_\nu) \rho, \]

where \( a \circ b \equiv (ab + ba)/2 \) denotes the Jordan product and \( \sigma_\mu \) is a symmetric logarithmic derivative (SLD) of \( \rho \), defined as a positive-semidefinite-operator solution to

\[ \frac{\partial \rho}{\partial \theta_\mu} = \sigma_\mu \circ \rho. \]

For a Poisson state, \( K \) is given by

\[ K_{\mu \nu}(\rho) = K_{\mu \nu}(\Gamma) = \text{tr} (S_\mu \circ S_\nu) \Gamma, \]

where \( S_\mu \) is an SLD of \( \Gamma \).

Proof. Given the tensor product in Eqs. (2.1), it is known that [25]

\[ K(\rho) = MK(\tau). \]

Given the direct sum in Eqs. (2.1), it can also be shown that

\[ K_{\mu \nu}(\tau) = \sum_l \text{tr} \left( S_l^{(0)} \circ S_l^{(1)} \right) \pi_l \tau_l, \]

where \( S_l^{(0)} \) is an SLD of \( \pi_l \tau_l \). Then \( S_l^{(0)} = (\partial \pi_l / \partial \theta_\mu) / \pi_0 = - (\partial \pi_l / \partial \theta_\mu) / (1 - \epsilon) \), \( S_l^{(1)} = S_{\mu \nu} \), and

\[ K_{\mu \nu}(\rho) = \frac{1}{M(1 - \epsilon)} \frac{\partial N}{\partial \theta_\mu} \frac{\partial N}{\partial \theta_\nu} + \text{tr} (S_\mu \circ S_\nu) \Gamma. \]

Taking the Poisson limit leads to the proposition.

Proposition 8 (well known; see, for example, Refs. [1, 2]). The Fisher information matrix

\[ J_{\mu \nu}(P_M) \equiv \sum_m P_M \frac{\partial \ln P_M}{\partial \theta_\mu} \frac{\partial \ln P_M}{\partial \theta_\nu}, \]

for a Poisson distribution is given by

\[ J(P_M) = J(\Lambda). \]
Again, with the Poisson limit, the Helstrom and Fisher information quantities observe a self-similar feature—they are given by the same formulas as the general ones, except that the unnormalized $\Gamma$ or $\Lambda$ is substituted into each. The information quantities obey a monotonicity relation, which follows from the monotonicity of Helstrom information in two ways.

**Proposition 9.**

$$K(\rho) = K(\Gamma) \geq J(\Lambda) = J(P_M),$$  \hspace{2cm} (3.32)

_in the sense that $K(\rho) - J(P_M)$ and $K(\Gamma) - J(\Lambda)$ are positive-semidefinite._

*Proof.* The monotonicity [25] holds on two levels: $K(\rho) \geq J(P_M)$, and also $K(\Gamma) \geq J(\Lambda)$, which can be proved independently by expressing $\Gamma$ and $\Lambda$ in terms of $N, \tau_1$, and $p \equiv \Lambda/N$ and applying the monotonicity relation to $\tau_1$ and $p$. \hfill $\square$

### 4 Poisson states versus independent and identically distributed states

It is important to emphasize that the Poisson theory is in general different from the usual theory for the $L$-particle state $\tau_1^{\otimes L}$. For example, from Eq. (3.2), the fidelity for the Poisson states can be expressed in terms of $\tau_1$ and $\tau'_1$ as

$$F(\rho, \rho') = \exp \left[ -\frac{N + N'}{2} + \sqrt{NN'} J(\Gamma_1, \tau'_1) \right],$$  \hspace{2cm} (4.1)

which is quite different from

$$F(\tau_1^{\otimes L}, \tau'_1^{\otimes L}) = [F(\tau_1, \tau'_1)]^L.$$  \hspace{2cm} (4.2)

As $\Gamma$ and $\Gamma'$ are not normalized, their fidelity is bounded as

$$0 \leq F(\Gamma, \Gamma') = \sqrt{NN'} J(\Gamma_1, \tau'_1) \leq \sqrt{NN'}.$$  \hspace{2cm} (4.3)

When $F(\tau_1, \tau'_1) = 1$ and $F(\Gamma, \Gamma') = \sqrt{NN'}$, $F(\rho, \rho')$ in the Poisson theory is still less than 1 if $N \neq N'$, because the different expected particle numbers still lead to distinguishability. On the other hand, if $F(\tau_1, \tau'_1) = 0$ and $F(\Gamma, \Gamma') = 0$, $F(\rho, \rho')$ is still positive, because both states contain the identical $\tau_0$. Another example is the Helstrom information

$$K_{\mu\nu}(\rho) = K_{\mu\nu}(\Gamma) = N \frac{\partial \ln N}{\partial \theta_\mu} \frac{\partial \ln N}{\partial \theta_\nu} + NK_{\mu\nu}(\tau_1),$$  \hspace{2cm} (4.4)

which is different from

$$K(\tau_1^{\otimes L}) = LK(\tau_1).$$  \hspace{2cm} (4.5)

It is not difficult to prove that, on the per-particle basis,

$$\frac{K(\Gamma)}{N} \geq K(\tau_1),$$  \hspace{2cm} (4.6)

as $N$ may also depend on $\theta$ and the total particle number may give extra information.

In the context of optics, the thermal state in an ultraviolet limit can be shown to approach the Poisson state, with the mutual coherence matrix in statistical optics [22] becoming a matrix representation of $\Gamma$ [5, 6, 8]. Alternative analyses of the exact thermal state have yielded results that are consistent with the Poisson theory [19, 34–36]. In the context of partially coherent imaging, Propositions 7 and 8 are consistent with our treatment in Ref. [10], although many other studies on this topic [9, 11–13, 15] compute the Helstrom information using $K(\tau_1)$ only and may underestimate the amount of information. The Poisson model is more realistic than the $L$-particle model because the former can account for the effects of inefficiency and loss, which are unavoidable for sources imaged with a finite aperture [17]. The use of $K(\tau_1)$ is justified only if $N$ does not depend on $\theta$, in which case $K(\Gamma) = NK(\tau_1)$. This is the case for incoherent sources [6], but $N$ may depend on $\theta$ for partially coherent sources because of interference, and one should use $K(\Gamma)$ instead.
5 Poisson channels

For the Poisson theory to remain useful for problems involving quantum channels, the channels should preserve the Poissonianity of a state. I call such channels Poisson channels. To be specific, let \( \rho(\Gamma) \) be the Poisson state with respect to an intensity operator \( \Gamma \) in the sense of Eqs. (2.1)–(2.3). Let the set of positive-semidefinite operators on a Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \) be \( \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}) \). A trace-preserving completely-positive (TPCP) map \( \Phi \) on \( \rho \) is Poisson if

\[
\Phi[\rho(\Gamma)] = \rho(\Phi(\Gamma)),
\]

where \( \Phi : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_1) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_1') \) is a map from an intensity operator to another intensity operator induced by \( \Phi \). Then the information quantities \( d_B(\Gamma,\Gamma') \), \( D_s(\Gamma,\Gamma') \), \( D(\Gamma||\Gamma') \), and \( K(\Gamma) \) in Eqs. (3.5), (3.10), (3.11), and (3.26) also observe monotonicity relations with respect to \( \Phi \).

**Proposition 10.** Let \( \Phi : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_1) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_1') \) be a map defined in the sense of Eq. (5.1) with respect to a TPCP map \( \Phi \). Then

\[
d_B(\Gamma,\Gamma') \geq d_B\left[\Phi(\Gamma),\Phi(\Gamma')\right],
\]

\[
D_s(\Gamma,\Gamma') \geq D_s\left[\Phi(\Gamma),\Phi(\Gamma')\right],
\]

\[
D(\Gamma||\Gamma') \geq D\left[\Phi(\Gamma)||\Phi(\Gamma')\right],
\]

\[
K(\Gamma) \geq K\left[\Phi(\Gamma)\right]. \quad (\text{if } \Phi \text{ does not depend on } \theta)
\]

**Proof.** These monotonicity relations follow from the monotonicity of the information quantities with respect to the density operators in Eqs. (3.5), (3.10), (3.11), and (3.26).

I present some examples of \( \Phi \) in the following. They all originate from the assumption

\[
\Phi(\rho) = [\phi(\tau)]^\otimes M,
\]

where \( \phi : \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1) \to \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_0'' \oplus \mathcal{H}_1') \) is a TPCP map that preserves the rare-particle structure given by Eqs. (2.1), such that the Poisson limit for \( \Phi(\rho) \) still makes sense. The Choi-Kraus forms of the maps are most conveniently expressed in terms of some orthonormal bases of \( \mathcal{H}_0, \mathcal{H}_0'', \mathcal{H}_1, \) and \( \mathcal{H}_1' \), which are written as \( |0\rangle, |0''\rangle, \{|1_j\rangle : j = 1, \ldots, d\}, \) and \( \{|1'_k\rangle \subseteq k = 1, \ldots, d''\} \), respectively. The \( \tau \) state, for example, can be expressed as

\[
(1 - \epsilon) \tau_0 \oplus \epsilon \tau_1 = (1 - \epsilon) |0\rangle \langle 0| + \epsilon \sum_{j,k} g_{jk} |1_j\rangle \langle 1_k|,
\]

where \( g \) is the density matrix of \( \tau_1 \) with respect to the basis above.

**Example 1** (particle-number-preserving channel). Let a Choi-Kraus form of the \( \phi \) map in Eq. (5.6) be

\[
\phi(\tau) = \tau_0 \ominus \epsilon \tau_1 + \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} C_{\alpha} \tau_0 \ominus \epsilon \tau_1,
\]

\[
C_0 = |0''\rangle \langle 0|,
\]

\[
C_{\alpha} = \sum_{j,k} C_{\alpha j k} |1'_j\rangle \langle 1_k|, \quad \alpha \in \mathcal{A},
\]

such that

\[
\phi\left[\left(1 - \epsilon\right) \tau_0 \oplus \epsilon \tau_1\right] = \left[\left(1 - \epsilon\right) \tau_0''\right] \oplus [\epsilon \phi(\tau_1)],
\]

where \( \tau_0'' = |0''\rangle \langle 0''| \) and

\[
\Phi(\tau_1) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathcal{A}} C_{\alpha} \tau_1 \ominus \epsilon \tau_1
\]

is a TPCP map. In the Poisson limit,

\[
\Phi(\Gamma) = \phi(\Gamma).
\]
The trace-preserving nature of the $\phi_1$ map means that the channel preserves the particle number. More specific examples include the unitary map

$$\phi_1(\Gamma) = UTU^\dagger,$$

which models a lossless linear device via a unitary operator $U$, and the map

$$\phi_1(\Gamma) = \Lambda,$$

where $\Lambda_j = \text{tr} E_j \Gamma$, (5.15)

which models a 100%-efficient particle-counting measurement via a positive operator-valued measure $E$. In particular, Eq. (2.8), which relates the intensity operator to the intensity distribution of a projective particle-counting measurement, can be framed as a TPCP map, so Propositions 6 and 9 are special cases of Proposition 10.

As the particle number need not be conserved, $\tilde{\Phi}$ need not be trace-preserving. The next examples of $\tilde{\Phi}$ are noteworthy departures from the usual TPCP maps in quantum information theory.

**Example 2** (loss). Let $H''_l = H_l$ and

$$\phi(\tau) = I_0 \tau I_0 + \sum_{j=1}^d C_j \tau C_j^\dagger + T \tau T,$$

$$I_0 = |0\rangle \langle 0|,$$

$$C_j = \sqrt{1 - \eta_j} |0\rangle \langle 1_j|,$$

$$T = \sum_{j=1}^d \sqrt{\eta_j} |1_j\rangle \langle 1_j|,$$

where $0 \leq \eta_j \leq 1$ is the transmission coefficient for each mode. Then

$$\phi [(1 - \epsilon) \tau_0 \oplus \epsilon \tau_1] = [(1 - \epsilon \text{tr} T \tau_1 T) \tau_0] \oplus (\epsilon T \tau_1 T).$$

In the Poisson limit,

$$\tilde{\Phi}(\Gamma) = TTT.$$

**Example 3** (spontaneous emission). Let $H''_l = H_l$ and

$$\phi(\tau) = C_0 \tau C_0^\dagger + \sum_{j=1}^d C_j \tau C_j^\dagger + I_1 \tau I_1,$$

$$C_0 = \sqrt{1 - \epsilon'} |0\rangle \langle 0|,$$

$$C_j = \sqrt{\epsilon' \gamma_{jj}} |1_j\rangle \langle 0|,$$

$$I_1 = \sum_{j=1}^d |1_j\rangle \langle 1_j|,$$

where $\epsilon'$ and $\gamma \in \mathcal{P}(H_1)$ (with $\text{tr} \gamma = 1 \leq 1/\epsilon'$) are properties of the channel and $\{|1_j\rangle\}$ is assumed to be an eigenbasis of $\gamma$ without loss of generality. Then

$$\phi [(1 - \epsilon) \tau_0 \oplus \epsilon \tau_1] = [(1 - \epsilon \text{tr} T \tau_1 T) \tau_0] \oplus (\epsilon T \tau_1 T).$$

In the Poisson limit for $(\epsilon, M, N)$ and $(\epsilon', M, N')$,

$$\tilde{\Phi}(\Gamma) = \Gamma + N' \gamma.$$

Setting $\epsilon'$, the spontaneous-emission probability per temporal mode, to be infinitesimal ensures that the occurrence of particles remains rare and the Poisson limit for $\Phi(\rho)$ still makes sense. In reality, however, a channel with a high spontaneous-emission probability may make the final
state non-Poisson and may also involve other processes such as stimulated emission, so one should double-check the accuracy of the Poisson approximation before applying the Poisson theory to a real spontaneous-emission channel.

Equation (5.27) is a quantum analog of the fact that the sum of two Poisson processes is also a Poisson process. It may be useful for modeling dark counts or background noise [37–39]. Another version of this fact is the following.

**Example 4** (composition). The tensor product of two Poisson states may be expressed as

\[ \rho(\Gamma) \otimes \rho(\Gamma') = \rho(\Gamma \oplus \Gamma'). \]  

(5.28)

To derive this relation, consider

\[ \tau \otimes \tau' = \left[ (1 - \epsilon)(1 - \epsilon')\tau_0 \otimes \tau'_0 \right] \oplus \left( \epsilon \tau_0 \otimes \tau'_1 \right) \oplus \left( \epsilon' \tau_1 \otimes \tau'_0 \right) \oplus \left( \epsilon \epsilon' \tau_1 \otimes \tau'_1 \right). \]

(5.29)

In the Poisson limit for both \((\epsilon, M, N)\) and \((\epsilon', M, N')\), all \(O(\epsilon \epsilon')\) terms in Eq. (5.29), including the two-particle component \(\epsilon \epsilon' \tau_1 \otimes \tau'_1\), are negligible, and the resulting intensity operator is

\[ (\Gamma \otimes \tau'_0) \oplus (\tau_0 \otimes \Gamma'). \]

(5.30)

Since \(\tau_0 = |0\rangle \langle 0|\) and \(\tau'_0 = |0'\rangle \langle 0'|\) are 1-dimensional, any tensor product of an operator with \(\tau_0\) or \(\tau'_0\) is isomorphic to the original operator, and Eq. (5.30) can be abbreviated as \(\Gamma \oplus \Gamma'\).

**Example 5** (marginalization). Let \(\tau\) be a density operator on \(\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1\otimes \mathcal{H}_1'\otimes \mathcal{H}_1'\), and \(\tau\) be an intensity operator on \(\mathcal{H}_1 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1'\). Let

\[ \phi(\tau) = \text{tr}' \tau \]

(5.31)

denote the partial trace with respect to \(\mathcal{H}_0 \oplus \mathcal{H}_1'\). A Choi-Kraus form is

\[ \phi(\tau) = \langle 0' | \tau | 0' \rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{d'} \langle 1_j' | \tau | 1_j' \rangle. \]

(5.32)

Expressing \(\tau\) in terms of the basis \(\{|0\rangle \otimes |0'\rangle, |1_j\rangle \otimes |0'\rangle, |0\rangle \otimes |1_k\rangle : j = 1, \ldots, d, k = 1, \ldots, d'\}\), it is not difficult to show that

\[ \tilde{\Phi}(\Gamma) = I_1 \Gamma \Gamma_1, \]

(5.33)

where \(I_1\) is the projection operator into \(\mathcal{H}_1\) given by Eq. (5.25).

Equations (5.13), (5.21), (5.27), (5.28), and (5.33) in the examples demonstrate that, for Poisson channels, the maps can be much simplified if expressed in terms of the intensity operators. They resemble the typical maps in quantum information theory, although they need not be trace-preserving. The extent to which the representations of Choi, Kraus, and Stinespring [25, 40] can be applied to the theory of \(\tilde{\Phi}\) for physical Poisson channels is an interesting open question.

6 Conclusion

In conclusion, I have shown that the Poisson limit leads to elegant results in quantum information theory, with the intensity operator emerging as the central quantity. The familiar appearances of the formulas mean that one may borrow existing results from general information theory and apply them to the intensity operators in the study of Poisson states. Although the unnormalized nature of the operators may require extra care, one can still take advantage of many known results concerning unnormalized positive-semidefinite matrices [30, 31, 33, 40], as the formulas here coincide with many of them.

There are many potential generalizations and extensions. It should be possible to define the Poisson limit more generally for a tensor product of non-identical states and an infinite-dimensional \(\Gamma\), in analogy with the more general Poisson limit theorems [1, 2]. The mathematical rigor of the
limit may be improved through quantum stochastic calculus [23]. The theory of Poisson channels is by no means complete.

In terms of applications, some specialized aspects of the Poisson theory have already found success in the study of weak thermal light for optical sensing and imaging [8, 18], but a consolidation of the results under the umbrella of Poisson quantum information may reveal new insights. Given the importance of the classical Poisson theory in diverse areas [1, 2], the quantum Poisson theory is envisioned to see wider applications in quantum technologies beyond optics, wherever a sequence of rare events may be encountered.
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