The metrology of ghost imaging: quantum vs. classical
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Frequency correlations are a versatile and powerful tool which can be exploited to perform spectral analysis of objects whose direct measurement might be unfeasible. This is achieved through a so-called ghost spectrometer, that can be implemented with quantum and classical resources alike. While there are some known advantages associated to the former or the latter choice, an analysis of their metrological capabilities has not yet been performed. Here we report on the metrological comparison between a quantum and a classical ghost spectrometer.

We perform the estimation of the transmittivity of a bandpass filter using frequency-entangled photon pairs. Our results show that a quantum advantage is achievable, depending on the values of the transmittivity and on the number of frequency modes analysed.

Accessing hardly reachable objects with light, while maintaining the possibility of performing detailed analysis at the output is a well-known conundrum, yet a task with substantial relevance. Correlations in multimode light constitute a widely explored way to circumvent technical limitations. The object is illuminated by part of the emission, which is then directly detected; the analysis is actually carried out remotely on the rest. When applied to spatial analysis, this technique is able to produce an image even if the object is physically removed from the detection line, hence the name ghost imaging (GI) [1].

While originally recognised as an exquisite quantum effect produced in parametric down conversion [1], later it has been found that many features of GI can be replicated by multimode thermal emission [2,3]. This has lead to an intense activity focused on extending applications towards genuine remote imaging [4], and polarisation domains [8]. Thermal GI requires less demanding equipment than its fully quantum counterpart, and it typically provides superior brightness. There exist however aspects of the quantum technique that can not be replicated with classical light, in particular when inspecting the optical resolution [9], and the signal-to-noise ratio of the image [10].

In this article, we discuss quantitative differences of the quantum and classical scheme in the light of a different paradigm in quantum metrology, viz. quantum parameter estimation [11–14].

We discuss the capability of a GI system in estimating the image of an object, considered as a collection of transmission parameters. The presence of quantum correlations is well known to deliver sub-shot noise measurement of intensity [16,22], and these can lead to quantum-enhanced applications [23–32]. In particular, Ref. [33] has discussed the use of quantum light for the measurement of a single transmittance, while Ref. [34] has demonstrated how this task benefits from adopting quantum correlations. We build on these results to discuss resource counting in quantum GI in comparison with its classical counterpart at fixed energy.

In our approach, the object to be imaged - be it a genuine spatial image or a spectral profile - is modelled as a collection of $K$ values of transmittivity $T_k$, $1 \leq k \leq K$, each associated to a mode. Our aim is then to estimate these values.

The quantum technique to implement GI uses the correlations between single photons produced in spontaneous parametric down-conversion (SPDC): a single incoming pump photon creates a pair of photons strongly correlated in their emission modes [55]. Each photon is in a mixture of the $K$ modes, all of which arrive on the object, and are then measured by a mode-insensitive bucket detector. Due to the correlations in the pair production process, the analysis of the correlated photon in coincidence with the bucket detector provides information about what has occurred to its twin.
This is the experimental approach we have followed in our investigation, but, differently from the most frequent case, we have explored the spectral domain. The photon reaching the frequency-independent bucket detector passes through a spectral object, an interference filter with full-width at half-maximum 7.3 nm. The second photon was analysed using a spectrometer, as described in Fig. 1.

We reconstruct the spectral profile of the filter in the analysis arm by scanning the detector in the spectrometer. We collect a series of $N_s = 100$ points, with a resolution of 0.33 nm, estimated by comparing the obtained profile with the one measured in Ref. [15]. We can then define the spectral modes as $K = N_s/j$, with $j = 1 - 100$, so that each single mode $k$ is obtained by regrouping $j$ measured points. The transmissivity $T_k$, considering the spectral object as well as the intrinsic loss of the arm, is calculated as a Klyshko efficiency:

$$T_k = C_k / N_k,$$

with $C_k$ being the coincidence counts and $N_k$ the total counts of the spectrometer detector for the $k$-th mode; this allows to obtain an estimation of each $T_k$, independently on the other. In Fig. 2 (a-c) we report the obtained transmittivities for $K = 10, 50, 100$.

The uncertainty on the transmittivity is calculated by considering that $N_k$ events have been collected, a fraction $C_k$ of which lead to a coincidence. Thus, $N_k$ is considered as fixed, while $C_k$ is a binomial variable, with variance $C_k(1-T_k)$, leading to:

$$\Delta^2 T_k = T_k(1 - T_k)/N_k. \quad (1)$$

However, proper resource counting need including those events discarded due to the efficiency $\eta$ of the detection arm: these are $N_{tot} = N_k/\eta$ - in our experiment we have estimated $\eta = 0.35$ by a modified Klyshko method taking into account the multimode detection on arm 1.

We derive the equivalent strategy based on multiple thermal states, as our classical benchmark. We assume we can make use of a collection of independent modes, with the same structure as our quantum source, each presenting thermal population. This multi-thermal emission is split on a 50:50 beam splitter, with the measuring apparatus performing essentially the same operation as above: one half of the beam reaches the object and then the bucket detector, the other half the analysis apparatus. Looking at the cross correlation between the two detection signals, one observes a value of second-order correlation $g^{(2)}(0) > 1$ if the two are correlated, and $g^{(2)}(0) = 1$ otherwise. The value of the second-order correlation will depend on the transmission profile, thus making it possible to obtain information on the object. Since $g^{(2)}(0) \geq 1$ for classical light, the visibility of our signal is decreased with respect to the quantum case [3, 4, 9, 10]. Notably, this mechanism cannot be replicated by means of coherent states, since no intensity correlations emerge when these are divided on a beam splitter.

Each thermal mode is taken to have mean photon number $n_{th}$, so that, on average, $\bar{n} = n_{th}/2$ photons per mode reach the object, and allow for $M$ repetitions of the measurement such that $\bar{n}M = N_{tot}$, in order to compare strategies with the same...
number of total resources. Near-optimal working conditions are for \( n \sim 1 \). Since the measurement scheme on the object arm 1 is mode insensitive, all possible combinations leading to the detection of \( n_1 \) photons from the \( K \) modes are taken into account. On the analysis arm 2, we can assume that all photons \( n_2 \) arise from a single mode \( k \). The relevant conditional photon detection probabilities are:

\[
P_k(n_1, n_2|T_i) = \sum_{\sum_{\nu_i=0}^{n_1}} p_k(\nu_k, n_2|T_k) \prod_{j \neq k} p_{\nu_i}(\nu_j|T_j) 
\]

Here, the sum is on all possible sets \( \{\nu_i\} \) of photons on the \( K \) modes hitting the bucket detector, \( p_{\nu_i}(n|m) \) is the thermal statistics with mean photon number \( m \), and \( p_k(\nu_k, n_2|T_k) \) is the joint statistics for the split thermal mode undergoing loss \( 1-T_k \) on arm 1 (see more details on the derivation of these probabilities in the Supplementary Material [37]).

The conventional measurement estimates the correlation \( \langle n_1, n_2 \rangle \), from which the transmittivities \( T_k \) can be inferred (notice that each transmittivity \( T_k \) will be estimated separately by selecting only the clicks of the second detector corresponding to the \( k \)-th frequency). Each uncertainty can thus be quantified as

\[
\Delta^2 T_k(c) = \frac{1}{\langle \Delta C_{12}^k \rangle^2} \frac{\Delta^2 C_{12}^k}{M},
\]

where \( \Delta^2 C_{12}^k = \langle n_1^2 n_2^2 \rangle_k - \langle n_1 n_2 \rangle_k^2 \). The evaluation of \( C_{12}^k \) and \( \Delta^2 C_{12}^k \) directly from (13) is computationally demanding, thus we adopted an approach based on moment generating functions. These are defined as

\[
G_k(x, y|T_i) = \sum_{n_1, n_2=0}^{\infty} P_k(n_1, n_2|T_i)e^{nx_1+ny_2},
\]

and the moments of the distributions are found as

\[
\langle n_1\nu_2^k \rangle_k = \frac{\partial^n}{\partial \nu_2^n} G_k(x, y|T_i)|_{x=0,y=0}.
\]

The key property we exploit is that for probabilities based on a convolution such as (14), the total generating function is readily found as the product of the individual functions (see more details in the Supplementary Material [37]):

\[
G_k(x, y|T_i) = g_k(x, y|T_k) \prod_{j \neq k} g_{\nu_i}(y_j|T_j) 
\]

This formula gives computable forms for the uncertainties in (3), also for large values of the number of modes \( K \). We remark that the comparison is conducted by allowing the classical strategy to employ also those resources that have been wasted due to loss.

The errors evaluated for these two strategies are reported in panels (d-f) of Fig. 2 for \( K = 10, 50, 100 \). This shows that for the conventional estimators, the quantum strategy, although lossy, always outperforms the classical one, and that the enhancement increases with the number of modes, when the transmittivities are estimated individually for each mode.

This classical strategy is inspired by the standard measurement carried out for ghost imaging; furthermore, since there is no coherence among the different photon number states, the choice of the observable is bound to be optimal. However, the estimator \( C_{12} \) may be not a more suitable choice \( f(n_1, n_2) \), while based on the same observable, may lead to improved uncertainties. On the other hand, finding an explicit expression, due to the dissipative nature of the transmission process, is not immediate, as we can not apply the standard machinery for unitary parameters. Anyhow, the ultimate bound is in fact given by the Cramé-Rao bound (CRB) [13]

\[
\Delta T_k^2 \geq \frac{1}{MF_k},
\]

where \( M \) is the number of repetitions of the experiments, while

\[
F_k = \sum_{n_1, n_2=0}^{\infty} P_k(n_1, n_2|T_i) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial T_k} \log P_k(n_1, n_2|T_i) \right)^2
\]

denotes the Fisher information corresponding to the estimation of the parameter \( T_k \). While this does not apply strictly to a genuine multiparameter estimation of all \( \{T_i\} \) [14], it still sets a lower bound to the attainable error in the general case.
– accounting for statistical correlations among transmittivities can only decrease the available information.

Because of the difficulties in evaluating the probability distribution $P_{\theta}$ in an analytical form, we have been able to obtain the Fisher information, and thus the corresponding CRB, only numerically and for a small number of modes $K$, by exploiting the exact relationship between the Fisher information and the Hellinger distance [38] (see more details in the Supplementary Material [37]).

The comparison between the classical CRB with the errors previously discussed is reported in Fig. 3 for modes $K = 3,5,7,9$. The results show that quantum light does not provide an advantage conditionally. In fact, when only few modes are considered, an optimal classical estimator can outperform the quantum strategy, especially for higher transmittivities. When the number of modes is increased, however, the quantum advantage is recovered, hence the quantum estimation becomes the preferable choice for every transmittivity value considered. It should be noted that, in order to be optimal, the classical protocol requires $n_{th} \sim 1$, thus prompting comparable experimental difficulties to those of the quantum scenario. This is indeed quite a different regime than the one for conventional thermal ghost imaging [4].

Concluding, we have investigated in which conditions a ghost imaging setup may provide enhanced parameter estimation of a collection of transmittivity values representing the imaged object. We have illustrated this with an experiment of quantum ghost spectrometry performing the measurement of a bandpass filter. We have then compared the measurement precision with that of an analogous classical scheme using thermal modes. Our analysis shows that adopting the quantum strategy can be favourable in specific conditions, dictated by the values of the transmittivities at hand, and by resolution of the modes. The higher the resolution and the lower the transmittivities, the greater the enhancement that can be achieved through quantum estimation, although, it should be emphasised that the details do depend on the whole profile of the transmittivities.
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SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

In this supplementary material we include some details on the derivation of the classical benchmark for ghost imaging via thermal states.

GHOST IMAGING VIA THERMAL STATES

We here consider the protocol of ghost imaging that exploits thermal states as input of the interferometer. A multimode thermal state can be written in the diagonal form in the Fock basis as

\[ \gamma_{n_{t_h}} = \bigotimes_{k=1}^{K} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} p_{n_{t_h}}(m|n_{t_h}) |m\rangle_{k} \langle m|, \]

where the thermal profile is given by the photon-number probability

\[ p_{n_{t_h}}(m|n_{t_h}) = \frac{1}{n_{t_h} + 1} \left( \frac{n_{t_h}}{n_{t_h} + 1} \right)^m. \]

The thermal state is splitted in balanced beam-splitter and, as in the experiment described in Fig. 1 of the main text, one half of the beam reaches the filter and then the bucket detector, while the other half reaches the analysis apparatus. The key quantity needed to evaluate the classical benchmark for ghost imaging, that is the error that one would obtain in estimating the set of transmittivities \( \{T_k\} \) describing the filter is the joint conditional probability \( P(n_1, n_2|\{T_k\}) \) of detecting \( n_1 \) and \( n_2 \) photons in the bucket detector and in the frequency analyzer.

Let us now consider what happens in the single-mode scenario, after the 50/50 beam splitter, and after passing through the filter at transmittivity \( T_k \). The probability of observing \( n_1 \), \( n_2 \) and \( n_0 \) respectively in the first arm, in the second arm of the interferometer, and in the virtual mode ‘0’, coupled to the arm ‘1’ via the filter, can be readily obtained and reads

\[ p_k(n_1, n_2, n_0|T_k) = \binom{n_1 + n_2 + n_0}{n_1 + n_0} \binom{n_1 + n_0}{n_0} T_k^{n_1} (1 - T_k)^{n_0}. \]

By discarding the mode ‘0’, one obtains the marginal probability

\[ p_k(n_1, n_2|T_k) = \sum_{n_0=0}^{\infty} p_k(n_1, n_2, n_0|T_k). \]

As expected, by averaging also over the detector output \( n_2 \) one obtains the photon-number statistics of a thermal state with \( T_k n_{t_h}/2 \) photons, i.e.

\[ \mathbb{E}[k(n_1, n_2|T_k)] = p_{n_{t_h}}(n_1|T_k\tilde{n}), \]

where \( \tilde{n} = n_{t_h}/2 \). If we now get back to the multi-mode scenario, the conditional probability of observing \( n_2 \) photons at frequency \( k \) in the frequency-dependent detector, and \( n_1 \) photons in the bucket detector, can be indeed obtained via the quantities introduced above via the equation

\[ P_k(n_1, n_2|\{T_j\}) = \sum_{\{y_i\}: \sum x_i=n_1} p_k(y_k, n_2|T_k) \prod_{j \neq k} p_{n_{t_h}}(y_j|T_j, \tilde{n}), \]

where the sum is taken over all the possible set \( \{y_i\} \) of photons, summing to \( n_1 \), that is that have hit the bucket detector.

As mentioned in the manuscript, for large number of modes \( K \) the evaluation of these probabilities is highly demanding. However, in order to derive the error obtained by estimating the set \( \{T_k\} \) from the coincidences, one can exploit the corresponding moment-generating functions [7], defined as

\[ G_k(x, y|\{T_i\}) = \sum_{n_1, n_2=0}^{\infty} P_k(n_1, n_2|\{T_i\}) e^{n_1 x + n_2 y}. \]

By exploiting the fact that for probabilities based on a convolution, such as \( G_k \), the total moment-generating function can be obtained as the product of the individual generating functions as

\[ G_k(x, y|\{T_i\}) = g_k(x, y|T_k) \prod_{j \neq k} g_{n_{t_h}}(x|T_j, \tilde{n}), \]

where one can readily evaluate

\[ g_k(x, y|T_k) = \sum_{n_1, n_2=0}^{\infty} p_k(n_1, n_2|T_k) e^{n_1 x + n_2 y}, \]

\[ = [1 + n_{t_h} (1 + T_k - e^x - T_k e^x)]^{-1}, \]

\[ = (1 + m - m e^x)^{-1}. \]

The ultimate limit on the error in the estimation of each transmittivity \( T_k \) via the experimental setup described above is given by the Cramér-Rao bound

\[ \Delta T_k^2 \geq \frac{1}{MF_k}, \]

where \( M \) is the number of repetitions of the experiments, while

\[ F_k = \sum_{n_1, n_2=0}^{\infty} P_k(n_1, n_2|T_k) \left( \frac{\partial}{\partial T_k} \log P_k(n_1, n_2|T_k) \right)^2 \]

denotes the Fisher information corresponding to the estimation of the parameter \( T_k \). As these probabilities can only be obtained numerically and for a small number of modes \( K \), we
have been able to evaluate the Fisher information numerically by exploiting the relationship \[38\]
\[
F_k = \lim_{\epsilon \to 0} \frac{4 \left( D_H[P_k(n_1, n_2|\{T_i\}), P_k^{(\epsilon)}(n_1, n_2|\{T_i\})] \right)^2}{\epsilon^2},
\]
(23)
where \(P_k^{(\epsilon)}\) is obtained from \(P_k\) by replacing the \(k\)-th trasmit-tivity with \(T_k + \epsilon\), and where we have defined the Hellinger distance between two probability distributions as
\[
D_H[p_1(x), p_2(x)] = \sqrt{\sum_x \left( \sqrt{p_1(x)} - \sqrt{p_2(x)} \right)^2}.
\]
(24)
In more detail, to obtain the results shown in Fig. 3 of the main text, we have evaluated numerically the probability distributions \(P_k\) and \(P_k^{(\epsilon)}\) via (14) with \(\epsilon = 10^{-7}\), numerically checking that the quantity
\[
\tilde{F}_k = \frac{4 \left( D_H[P_k(n_1, n_2|\{T_i\}), P_k^{(\epsilon)}(n_1, n_2|\{T_i\})] \right)^2}{\epsilon^2},
\]
(25)
is stable by further decreasing the value of \(\epsilon\), such that one can safely assume that \(F_k \approx \tilde{F}_k\).