Towards efficient shaping of bright Schrödinger cat states

Dmitry A. Kuts1, Sergey A. Podoshvedov1∗ and Ba An Nguyen2,3

1Laboratory of Quantum Information Processing and Quantum Computing, Institute of Natural and Exact Sciences, South Ural State University (SUSU), Lenin Av. 76, Chelyabinsk, Russia
2Institute of Physics, Vietnam Academy of Science and Technology (VAST), 18 Hoang Quoc Viet, Cau Giay, Hanoi, Vietnam
3Thang Long Institute of Mathematics and Applied Sciences (TIMAS), Thang Long University, Nghiem Xuan Yem, Hoang Mai, Hanoi, Vietnam

∗sapodo68@gmail.com

Abstract: We report an efficient way to generate both even and odd optical analogs of Schrödinger cat states (SCSs) which are a superposition of two coherent states with opposite amplitudes. The resources consumed are single mode squeezed vacuum (SMSV) state and single photon. SCSs are formed after superimposing the input states with the subsequent detection of the number of photons in the auxiliary mode. We report the generation of even/odd SCSs with amplitude $4.2$ with fidelity $> 0.99$ and an acceptable for offline experiments success probability. There is a tendency towards an increase in the size of the SCSs with the fidelity $> 0.99$ more demonstrated with an increase in the number of extracted photons.

Efficient engineering of a desired nonclassical state is fundamental to most quantum communication protocols [1]. A nonclassical state can be defined as that whose Wigner function is not a classical probability distribution for position and momentum values [2]. If a quantum optical state contains only even or odd number of photons, it has definite parity which is even or odd, respectively. An example of such states with a certain parity can be optical analogs of Schrödinger cat states (SCSs) [3-13], either even SCSs or odd SCSs depending on their photon number distribution. Such an even (odd) SCS is in fact a superposition of two coherent states with opposite amplitudes and the same phase (de-phased by $\pi$). SCSs of large amplitude ($\beta \geq 2$) can be used as good CV qubits in quantum teleportation [14-17] and quantum computing [18,19]. SCSs have been extensively studied in quantum physics for their foundational importance, however, even best experiments concerning covering free-propagating SCSs have amplitudes not exceeding $\beta = 1.85$ [11,20-22]. This is mainly due to the fact that the conventional methods do not allow restoring photon distribution corresponding to SCSs with amplitude larger than 2 that are shifted towards higher order number states and are centered near the Fock state $|n\rangle$ with $n\sim|\beta|^2$. A standard method for the SCSs generation is photon subtraction [5-13,23,24] from the single-mode squeezed vacuum (SMSV) being another example of a state with definite, even, parity. In this method, part of photons of the SMSV is diverted to tapping detection channel, moreover, the redirection of photons occurs by beam splitter with a high transmittance coefficient, which can also serve as an obstacle for more efficient implementation of the SCSs. This method needs improvement to brighten its potential in shaping of even/odd SCSs needed for quantum information processing with even/odd SCSs.

Here, we report the generation of large-amplitude even/odd SCSs (say, those of $\beta \approx 4.2$ which we call bright cats) with fidelity higher than 0.99 by extracting a large number of photons from the SMSV. No restrictions on the beam splitter are imposed in our method. The number
of possibilities in terms of the success probability, the squeezing parameter of the original SMSV state and the parameter of the beam splitter for generating even/odd SCSs of large amplitude is incredibly large. This opens a new door into quantum engineering of bright even/odd SCSs.

We begin by describing ingredients to the optical scheme in Fig. 1. There are two input states to the beam splitter (BS), labeled mode 1 and mode 2 in the figure. The input state of mode 1 is a single-mode squeezed vacuum (SMSV) state

$$|\text{SMSV}\rangle = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_{2l} |2l\rangle,$$

(1)

with amplitudes

$$b_{2l} = \frac{(\tanh s)^l \sqrt{(2l)!}}{\sqrt{\cosh s}} 2^{l!},$$

(1a)

where $s$ is the squeezing parameter of the SMSV state, whereas the input state of mode 2 may be either the vacuum state $|0\rangle$ or a single-photon state $|1\rangle$. The SMSV state (1) has a definite parity, which is referred to as even, since it consists exclusively of Fock states with an even number of photons. Another state with definite even parity is the even SCS which has the form (1) but with the replacement

$$b_{2l} \rightarrow 2N_+ (\beta) \exp(-|\beta|^2/2) \frac{\beta^{2l}}{\sqrt{(2l)!}}$$

(2a)

That is, if we denote the even SCS by $|\text{SCS}_+ (\beta)\rangle \equiv |\text{SCS}_+ \rangle$, then its full expression reads

$$|\text{SCS}_+ \rangle = 2N_+ (\beta) \exp(-|\beta|^2/2) \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{\beta^{2l}}{\sqrt{(2l)!}} |2l\rangle,$$

(2)

where we assume for simplicity that the amplitude $\beta$ is real positive and $N_+ = \left(2(1 + \exp(-2\beta^2))\right)^{-1/2}$ is the normalization factor. As for an example of the state with definite odd parity, we may mention the so-called odd SCS denoted by $|\text{SCS}_- (\beta)\rangle \equiv |\text{SCS}_- \rangle$ with its full expression as

$$|\text{SCS}_- \rangle = 2N_- (\beta) \exp(-|\beta|^2/2) \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} \frac{\beta^{2l+1}}{\sqrt{(2l+1)!}} |2l + 1\rangle,$$

(3)

with the corresponding normalization factor $N_- = \left(2(1 - \exp(-2\beta^2))\right)^{-1/2}$. Note also that the parameter $\beta$ in Eqs. (2) and (3) specify the size of the SCSs.

If we subtract (add) an even number of photons from (to) the state (1), then it will naturally preserve its parity, namely, it will remain even, nevertheless it is transformed into another state with a photon number distribution different from that of the initial one. Likewise, subtraction (addition) of an odd number of photons from (to) the SMSV state leads to a change in the parity of the initial state (1), converting it to a state with the odd parity. To make use of such properties, let us first consider possible output states of mode 1 in Fig. 1 when there is nothing to be inputted into mode 2 (formally, it implies that the input state of mode 2 is $|0\rangle$). Then, after the SMSV state passes through a lossless beam splitter $BS = \begin{bmatrix} t & -r \\ r & t \end{bmatrix}$, with $t$ and $r$ the real transmittance and reflectance coefficients satisfying the physical condition $t^2 + r^2 = 1$, we have [25]

$$BS_{12} (|\text{SMSV}\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2) = \sum_{l=0}^{\infty} b_{2l} BS_{12} (|2l\rangle_1 |0\rangle_2) =$$

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{r^{2m}}{\sqrt{(2m)!}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_{2(k+m)} t^{2k} \left(\frac{2(k+m)!}{(2k)!}\right) |2k\rangle_1 |2m\rangle_2 -$$

$$\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{r^{2m+1}}{\sqrt{(2m+1)!}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_{2(k+m+1)} (-r)^{2k} \left(\frac{2(k+m+1)!}{(2k+1)!}\right) |2k + 1\rangle_1 |2m + 1\rangle_2.$$

(4)

Depending on the parity of the measurement outcome in the output mode 2, i.e., whether an even or an odd number of photons is detected by a photon number resolving (PNR) detector [26,27] in Fig. 1, the output state of mode 1 differs. If the detector finds an even photon number $n = 2m$, then the following conditional state is outputted
|\Psi_{2m}\rangle = L_{2m} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_{2(k+m)} t^{2k} \sqrt{(2(m+k))!} \langle 2k |,
\] where the normalization factor is \( L_{2m} \) and the success probability is
\[ F_{2m}^{(0)} = |r|^{4m}/(2m)! I_{2m}^2, \]
with the superindex "(0)" indicating the case when the input mode 2 is the vacuum state |0\rangle. Otherwise, if an odd photon number \( n = 2m + 1 \) is found, then the output state reads
\[ |\Psi_{2m+1}\rangle = L_{2m+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} b_{2(k+m+1)} t^{2k} \sqrt{(2(m+k+1))!} \langle 2k + 1 |,
\] with the normalization factor \( L_{2m+1} \) and the success probability
\[ F_{2m+1}^{(0)} = |r|^{2(2m+1)} t^{2}/(2m + 1)! I_{2m+1}^2. \]
The physical condition \( \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (P_{2m}^{(0)} + P_{2m+1}^{(0)}) = 1 \) is guaranteed as can be directly checked. Obviously, the conditional state in Eq. (5) is even while that in Eq. (6) is odd. Roundly speaking, the output state (5) looks resembling the original input SMSV state, except the shifted amplitudes \( b_{2(k+m)} \). As for the output state (6), its parity changes compared with that of the original input SMSV state and its distribution in photon numbers is determined by the other shifted amplitudes \( b_{2k} \) of the original SMSV state acquire additional factors associated with the transformation due to the BS. The proximity between the output states and the even/odd SCSs is evaluated by the fidelities
\[ F_{2m}^{(0)} (\beta) = |\langle SCS_+ | \Psi_{2m} \rangle|^2 \]
and
\[ F_{2m+1}^{(0)} (\beta) = |\langle SCS_- | \Psi_{2m+1} \rangle|^2. \]
The shape of the output states \( |\Psi_{2m}\rangle \) and \( |\Psi_{2m+1}\rangle \) in Eqs. (5) and (6) depends on the squeezing parameter \( s \) of the input squeezed state |SMSV\rangle, the transmittance coefficient \( t \) of the BS and the detection outcome \( n \), while the target states |SCS_\pm\rangle depend only on \( \beta \). So, the fidelities \( F_n^{(0)} \) depend on all the parameters \( s, t, n \) and \( \beta \), but the probabilities \( P_n^{(0)} \) depend only on \( s, t \) and \( n \). We display in Fig. 2a and Fig. 2b our numerical simulation for the dependence on \( \beta \) and \( n \) of the fidelity maximalized over \( s \) and \( t \), i.e., \( F_n^{(0)} = \max_{s,t} F_n^{(0)} (\beta, n, s, t) \). Such maximum values of the fidelity appear as a smooth curve with the following behaviors: for a given \( n \) the maximalized fidelity decreases with increasing \( \beta \) and for a given \( \beta \) it increases with increasing \( n \). Generally, an arbitrarily high value of the fidelity with a desired value of \( \beta \) can be obtained if \( n \) is large enough. For example, as seen from Figs. 2a and 2b, a fidelity greater than or equal to 0.99 for \( \beta \geq 2 \) is achievable for \( n \geq 10 \). Note that the similar scheme with subtraction of small Fock states including a vacuum is studied in [3-13,20-22], which may lead to the generation of the even/odd SCSs state of small amplitude \( < 2 \). Although values of the parameters \( s, t \) can be determined that make the fidelities maximal, these maximizing parameters are largely scattered, i.e., they appear very different even with a slight variation in \( \beta \). This feature leads to a significant spread in the output state’s generation probability as shown by colored symbols in Fig. 2c that corresponds to Fig. 2a and Fig. 2d that is associated with Fig. 2b. The probability distributions in Figs. 2c and 2d resemble a swarm in which there is no structuring.

To get rid of random walks of the success probability, we optimize the values by reducing the fidelity by less than one percent. The optimization procedure is as follows. First, the maximum possible fidelity \( F_{\text{max}} \) is found (Figs. 2a, 2b) and the range of values near \( F_{\text{max}} \) is taken, that is \((0.99F_{\text{max}} - F_{\text{max}})\). After that, all the points for which the fidelity falls within the given range are found. Of all these points, only one is chosen which provides the maximum success probability, which is reflected in Figs. 2h and 2i. This procedure allows one to observe a more regular pattern in the figures 2h and 2i. The optimized probabilities obey a rule: the
more photons are extracted from the initial state, the less the probability of success in the formation of the corresponding SCS. For example, we observe the following values: \( F_{30}^{(0)} (\beta = 3.7) = 0.983262 \), \( P_{30}^{(0)} (\beta = 3.7) = 6.4154 \cdot 10^{-5} \) for \( s = 1.313 \) and \( t = 0.598 \); \( F_{31}^{(0)} (\beta = 3.7) = 0.984126 \), \( P_{31}^{(0)} (\beta = 3.7) = 4.9582 \cdot 10^{-6} \) for \( s = 1.16 \) and \( t = 0.607 \).

In order to achieve a high fidelity for a large value of \( \beta \) but with reduced value of the squeezing parameter \( s \), consider the case when a single photon is inputted into mode 2 of the scheme in Fig. 1. Then, the mixing of the SMSV state and the single photon on the BS results in [25]

\[
BS_{12}(|\text{SMSV}\rangle_1|1\rangle_2) = BS_{12}(\sum_{t=0}^\infty b_{2,t} |2\rangle_1|1\rangle_2) = \sum_{t=0}^\infty b_{2,t} BS_{12}(|2\rangle_1|1\rangle_2) = r_r (\sum_{k=0}^\infty b_{2k} t^{2k} \sqrt{k+1} |2k + 1\rangle_1) |0\rangle_2 - \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{r^{m-1} \sqrt{2m}}{(2m-1)!} \left( \sum_{k=0}^\infty b_{2k+m} t^{2k} \sqrt{2k+1} |2k + 1\rangle_1 \right) |2m\rangle_2 + \sum_{m=0}^\infty \frac{r^{m+1} \sqrt{2m}}{(2m+1)!} \left( \sum_{k=0}^\infty b_{2k+m} t^{2k} \sqrt{2k+1} |2k + 1\rangle_1 \right) |2m + 1\rangle_2. \tag{7}
\]

Since the parity of a single-photon state is transparently odd, registration of an even number of photons \( n = 2m \) in mode 2 outputs in mode 1 a state of odd parity of the form

\[
|\Phi_{2m}\rangle = K_{2m} \sum_{k=0}^\infty b_{2k+m} t^{2k} \sqrt{2k+1} \left( t^2 - \frac{2k+1}{2m+1} r^2 \right) |2k + 1\rangle_1 \tag{8}
\]

which occurs with the probability

\[
P_{2m}^{(1)} = (2m)! |r|^2 \left( (2m-1)! \right)^2 K_{2m}^2. \tag{8a}
\]

In Eq. (8) \( K_{2m} \) is the normalization factor, while in Eq. (8a) the superindex “(1)” implies that the single-photon state \( |1\rangle \) is inputted into mode 2. Particularly, if a vacuum outcome \( n = 0 \) happens, the conditional state in Eq. (8) becomes \( |\Phi_0\rangle = K_0 \sum_{k=0}^\infty b_{2k} t^{2k} \sqrt{2k+1} |2k + 1\rangle_1 \). Otherwise, if an odd number of photons \( n = 2m + 1 \) is detected in mode 2, the output state of mode 1 has an even parity of the form

\[
|\Phi_{2m+1}\rangle = K_{2m+1} \sum_{k=0}^\infty b_{2k+m} t^{2k+1} \sqrt{2k+1} \left( t^2 - \frac{2k+1}{2m+1} r^2 \right) |2k\rangle_1 \tag{9}
\]

with \( K_{2m+1} \) the corresponding normalization factor and the probability of this event is

\[
P_{2m+1}^{(1)} = (2m + 1)! |r|^2 |r|^{4m} \left( (2m)! \right)^2 K_{2m+1}^2. \tag{9a}
\]

Of course, \( \sum_{m=0}^\infty P_{2m}^{(1)} + P_{2m+1}^{(1)} = 1 \) as should be. The proximity of the output states (8) and (9) to the odd and even SCSs (3) and (2), respectively, is characterized by the fidelity

\[
F_{2m}^{(1)} = |\langle \text{SCS}_-|\Phi_{2m}\rangle|^2 \tag{9b}
\]
and

\[
F_{2m+1}^{(1)} = |\langle \text{SCS}_+|\Phi_{2m+1}\rangle|^2, \tag{9c}
\]

which is completely determined by the set of experimental initial parameters \( (s, t) \), the size \( \beta \) of the target SCS and the measurement outcome \( n \in \{2m, 2m + 1\} \). We numerically plot the dependences of maximum values of the fidelities \( F_{2m+1}^{(1)} (\beta) \) and \( F_{2m}^{(1)} (\beta) \) in Fig. 3a and Fig. 3b, respectively. Similar to Fig. 2a and Fig. 2b, both \( F_{2m+1}^{(1)} (\beta) \) and \( F_{2m}^{(1)} (\beta) \) increase with the detected number of photons for a given \( \beta \), but decrease with increasing \( \beta \) for a given measurement outcome \( n \in \{2m, 2m + 1\} \). It is interesting to note that in contrast to the previous consideration with the vacuum state inputted into mode 2, now the corresponding probabilities \( p_{2m+1}^{(1)} (\beta) \) and \( p_{2m}^{(1)} (\beta) \) show up as smooth functions of \( \beta \) for each given outcome \( n = 2m + 1 \) or \( n = 2m \) as seen in Fig. 3c or Fig. 3d, respectively. Yet, the dependence of the probabilities \( p_{n}^{(1)} (\beta) \) on \( \beta \) and \( n \) is opposite to that of the fidelities \( F_{n}^{(1)} (\beta) \). Namely, as it follows from Fig. 3c and Fig. 3d, \( p_{n}^{(1)} (\beta) \) decrease with increasing \( n \) for a given \( \beta \), but increase with increasing
\( \beta \) for a given \( n \). The plots in Figs. 3e, 3g, 3h and 3i show the values of \( s, t \) on \( \beta \) which provide the fidelity maximum and corresponding success probabilities. So, the plots in Figs. 3(e) and 3(h) display values of the parameters \( s \) and \( t \) under which the plots in Figs. 3(a) and Fig. 3(c) are obtained. The plots in Figs. 3(g) and 3(i) show values of the parameters \( s \) and \( t \) under which the plots in Figs. 3(b) and Fig. 3(d) are constructed. There are domains of \( \beta \) in which the parameter \( s (t) \) changes in an abrupt manner as visual from Fig. 3h (Fig. 3i) which is due the maximum value of fidelity disappears in one range of values \( (s, t) \) and appears in another. Numerically, a fidelity larger than 0.99 is traced for \( \beta \leq \beta_{0.99}^{(1)} = 4.2 \) and \( \beta_{0.99}^{(0)} \leq \beta_{0.99}^{(1)} \). Now, we can also observe fidelities larger than 0.98 even for \( \beta \leq 5 \). The calculated success probabilities are small but more than sufficient for off-line shaping of the SCs. Therefore, the use of a single photon as an input to mode 2 makes it possible to increase the fidelity of the output state in comparison with the use of the vacuum state as an input to mode 2 (Compare Fig. 3 and Fig. 2). For example, we obtain the following values: \( F_{31}^{(1)}(\beta = 5) = 0.980997, \)

\[
P_{30}^{(0)}(\beta = 5) = 7.7977 \cdot 10^{-7} \quad \text{for} \quad s = 1.198 \quad \text{and} \quad t = 0.775; \quad F_{31}^{(1)}(\beta = 4.9) = 0.981176, \]

\[
P_{30}^{(0)}(\beta = 4.9) = 1.0778 \cdot 10^{-6} \quad \text{for} \quad s = 1.194 \quad \text{and} \quad t = 0.775. \]

The structure of the amplitudes of the conditioned output states (5), (6), (8) and (9) looks similar and directly follows from the amplitude distribution \( b_{2k} \) in Eq. (1) of the original input SMSV state. Conditioned on the measurement outcomes, the amplitudes of the output states are shifted forward by either \( m \) (\( k \to k + m \)) if nothing is inputted to mode 2 or \( m + 1 \) (\( k \to k + m + 1 \)) if a single photon is inputted. This shift in amplitudes of the generated states displaces the SMSV distribution (1) towards Fock states with larger photon numbers, which took small but almost the same values in the SMSV amplitude distribution. That is \( b_{2k} > b_{2(k+1)} \) \( \forall k \) but \( b_{2k} \to b_{2(k+1)} \approx 0 \) for \( k \gg 1 \). In addition to the subscript shift of the amplitudes towards an almost uniform distribution, each of them receives an extra factor that may amplify them. If one chooses the values of \( (s, t) \) in an appropriate way, then the photon number distributions of the conditioned state and the target even/odd SCs can coincide with a fidelity greater than or equal to 0.99 despite some discrepancy in probabilities (see Fig. 4). So the maximum discrepancy \( d_n \), where subscript \( n \) indicate on Fock state, in the probabilities is as follows: \( d_{10} = 0.032906 \) (top left plot), \( d_{11} = 0.031252 \) (top right plot), \( d_{18} = 0.023296 \) (lower left plot) and \( d_{17} = 0.05161 \) (lower right plot). This discrepancy of probabilities can be significantly reduced with increasing fidelity.

So far we have considered the case of perfect PNR detection when the quantum efficiency \( \eta \) is 1. In reality, PNR detectors are imperfect whose efficiency, though can be very close to 1, remains less than 1, i.e., \( \eta < 1 \) [26,27]. We model the efficiency of imperfect detector by placing the fictitious beam splitter of transmissivity \( \eta \) before the real beam splitter which is responsible for the loss of some of the unregistered photons to derive the positive-operator values measure (POVM) element of the PNR detector with imperfect detection efficiency \( \eta < 1 \), for example, for \( n = 2m \): \( \Pi_{2m}(\eta) = \sum_{l=2m}^{\infty} C_{l}^{2m} \eta^{2m} (1-\eta)^{l-2m} |l\rangle\langle l| = \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} C_{2(m+x)}^{2m} \eta^{2m} (1-\eta)^{2x} |2(m+x)\rangle\langle 2(m+x)| + \sum_{x=0}^{\infty} C_{2(m+x)+1}^{2m} \eta^{2m} (1-\eta)^{2x+1} |2(m+x)+1\rangle\langle 2(m+x)+1| \). We then compute the final state conditioned by measurement of \( 2m \) photons in second auxiliary mode after passing the even state through the beam splitter \( p_{2m}^{(0)} = tr_{2} \left( \rho_{2m}^{(0)} \Pi_{2m}(\eta) \right) / tr_{12} \left( \rho_{2m}^{(0)} \Pi_{2m}(\eta) \right) \), where \( \rho_{0}^{(0)} = BS_{12} |even_{1}\rangle|0_{2}\rangle |(even_{1}\rangle|0_{2}\rangle)BS_{12}^{+} \) is an initial state transformed by BS and \( tr_{2} \) and \( tr_{12} \) stand for trace over modes 1 and 2, respectively. Calculating \( F^{(0)} \), one obtains the fidelity of the generated state

\[
F_{2m}^{(0)} = tr \left( \rho_{2m}^{(0)} |SCS_{+}\rangle\langle SCS_{+}| \right) = \]

5
Using the approach, we can analyze the influence of imperfect efficiency of the PNR detector on the quality of the shaped state in the rest three cases: $\text{Fid}_{2m+1}^{(0)}$, $\text{Fid}_{2m}^{(1)}$ and $\text{Fid}_{2m+1}^{(1)}$. For example, taking into account that $|\Phi_{2m}^{(e)}\rangle$ is odd state in its parity as well as $|\text{SCS}_{-}\rangle$ and applying the POVM element to the state $ρ_{2m+1}^{(1)} = tr_2 \left( ρ_{12}^{(1)} \Pi_{2m+1}(\eta) \right) / tr_{12} \left( ρ_{12}^{(1)} \Pi_{2m+1}(\eta) \right)$, one obtains

$$\text{Fid}_{2m}^{(1)} = tr \left( ρ_{12}^{(1)} |\text{SCS}_{-}\rangle \langle \text{SCS}_{-}| \right) = \frac{∑_{x=0}^{∞} \frac{c_2^{m}(1-\eta)^{2x}(r^2)^{2}(m+x)}{2^2(2(m+x)+1)} |\text{SCS}_{-}\rangle \langle \text{SCS}_{-}|_2^{(e)}}{∑_{x=0}^{∞} \frac{d_2^{m}(1-\eta)^{2x}(r^2)^{2}(m+x)+1}{2^2(2(m+x)+1)+1}}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (11)

In conclusion, we have proposed a simple and efficient way to generate even/odd SCs of large amplitude with high fidelity and an acceptable for offline experiments success probability. In particular, even and odd SCs of amplitude $β = 4.2$ with fidelity $> 0.99$ are observed. Original SMSV state is used for shaping even/odd SCs. Extraction of a large enough number of photons from the SMSC allows the formation of a distribution very similar to the target one by proper increasing an almost uniform distribution after the SMSV distribution experiences an appropriate displacement comparable to the number of extracted photon. We discovered that mixing of SCSV with a single photon improves characteristic of the output state. In general, the values of subtracted photons are not limited and there is a tendency to increase the amplitude of the target SCs with the same fidelity $> 0.99$. This could be done by detecting a larger number of photons in the auxiliary mode compared to the one used in our study in which we subtracted a maximum of 31 photons from SMSV in the auxiliary mode. Success probabilities to detect desired states are reasonable enough for offline implementation of even/odd SCs. Sufficiently large values of the squeezing parameter may be an obstacle in the practical implementation of even/odd SCs of large amplitude. This challenge can be overcome by cascading generation when detecting a large number of photons is divided into detecting a smaller number of photons following each other that requires a separate study.
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Fig. 1 The optical scheme used to shape either even or odd Schrödinger cat states (SCSs). A single-mode squeezed vacuum state (|SMVS>) is inputted into one path (mode 1) of a beam splitter (BS), while either the vacuum state (|0>) or a single-photon state (|1>) enters the other path (mode2). Conditioned on the number n of photons detected in the output of mode 2, the output of mode 1 may be shaped, by choosing proper transmittance/reflectance coefficient of the BS and the squeezing parameter of the |SMVS>, to be a desired bright SCS, either |SCS+> or |SCS->, with high fidelity.
Fig. 2 Dependencies of the maximum values of fidelities $F_n^{(0)}$ and corresponding probabilities $P_n^{(0)}$ on $\beta$ and $n$ when a,c) $n = 2m$ and c,d) $n = 2m + 1$. In a,b) the values of $s,t$ are chosen to maximize the fidelities. With so chosen values of $s,t$ the probabilities are irregularly scattered, as shown in c,d). The quantities in e,g,h,i) are plotted with parameters optimized over the probability (see text).
Fig. 3 Dependencies of the maximum values of fidelities $F_n^{(1)}$ and corresponding probabilities $P_n^{(1)}$ on $\beta$ and $n$ when a,c) $n = 2m + 1$ and c,d) $n = 2m$. The dependences of s e) and t h) on $\beta$ provide the fidelities and probabilities in a,c), while the dependences of s g) and t i) on $\beta$ provide the fidelities and probabilities in b,d). Sharp changes in $s$ and $t$ (and partly in fidelity) are associated with the transition of the maximum values of the fidelity from one range of parameters $(s, t)$ to another.
Fig. 4 Comparison of Fock state distributions in conditional and target even/odd SCSs. The maximum calculated discrepancy in the probabilities is $d_{10} = 0.032906$ (difference of probabilities in state $|10\rangle$ for top left distribution), which is sufficient for the states under consideration to coincide with fidelity larger than or equal to 0.99.