Utilizing single-mode squeezing and non-Gaussianity metrics to investigate bipartite and tripartite entanglement in three-mode ponderomotive optomechanics simulations
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Quantum entanglement is a crucial resource for a wide variety of quantum technologies. However, the current state-of-the-art methods to generate quantum entanglement in optomechanical systems are not as efficient as all-optical methods utilizing nonlinear crystals. This article proposes a new scheme in which two single-mode squeezed light fields are injected into an optomechanical cavity. We demonstrate through our numerical simulations that the quantum entanglement can be substantially enhanced with the careful selection of squeezing strength and squeezing angle of the two quadrature squeezed light fields. Our results represent a significant improvement in output bipartite optical entanglement over the previously demonstrated schemes using two coherent light fields as inputs. These simulations predict a maximum increase in Gaussian entanglement by a factor of about 6, as well as increases in the quantum noise and non-Gaussianity of the output light. This non-Gaussianity is attributed to tripartite entanglement between the two optical fields and the optomechanical oscillator (OMO). At particular squeezing angles, the Gaussianity can be increased, thus introducing a method of optically controlling the intracavity entanglement. These mechanisms can benefit various optical quantum technologies utilizing optomechanical entanglement and continuous variable quantum optics.

INTRODUCTION

Quantum entanglement is one of the most important resources for a variety of quantum technologies such as quantum metrology [1, 2], quantum communication [3], quantum sensing [4], quantum simulation [5], and quantum imaging [6]. Producing entanglement via exploitation of the three-wave mixing process in optomechanical cavities (OMC) is an attractive and innovative process for generating entangled photons [7, 8]. However, the current performances of optomechanical cavities to produce entanglement are not as robust as other methods utilizing nonlinear crystals [9].

Our previous study has suggested that ponderomotive (optomechanical) entanglement is highly dependent on input quantum noise [10]. Conveniently, squeezed light—a non-classical state of light widely used in quantum optical applications—has suppressed/enhanced quadrature noise that can be tailored based on the squeezing strength and squeezing angle [11–13]. In order to further investigate the relationship between quantum noise and the strength of ponderomotive entanglement, we inject such a light field, squeezed coherent light. The primary motivation of this project is to study the effect of the input quantum noise on the nonlinear dynamics in the optomechanical cavity (OMC). We expected that, under certain conditions, the output bipartite optical entanglement should also be enhanced by the input squeezing [14]. Furthermore, there are now several publications discussing non-Gaussian output from OMCs, with only Gaussian inputs [15–18]. This phenomenon is only reported in systems that exhibit the full $\chi^{(3)}$ nonlinear interaction or in linearized systems that exhibit strong quantum coupling [15, 16]. This is not the case for these simulations. Thus, we utilize these Gaussianity metrics to examine higher-order statistics that present in the two-mode statistics of tripartite entangled states [19, 20]. The results of the simulation (at least) strongly imply that the high-order correlations appear from the quadruple homodyne measurement of two (of three) modes of a tripartite entangled system.

We report (“linearized”) simulations of an optomechanical cavity in the unresolved sideband regime that exhibits intracavity quantum noise dominance (though in the weak quantum coupling regime) [14, 21, 22]. Moreover, the injection of single-mode squeezed light enhances both optical bipartite entanglement output from optomechanical cavity and tripartite entanglement of the intracavity quantum states [8]. These simulations assume sideband squeezing of the input coherent light into an optomechanical cavity with a small movable end mirror optomechanical oscillator (rest mass of $\approx 50$ ng). These simulations are performed in a parameter regime that yields bipartite optical ponderomotive entanglement without input squeezing (the intracavity quantum noise dominance regime) (squeezing strength $r$ equal to zero) [10, 23, 24].

Since our simulations demonstrate non-Gaussian continuous-variable output, popular methods of entanglement quantification are obscured, specifically the logarithmic negativity and Duan’s measure of separability [25, 26]. After considering limited resources, these devices may be competitive to conventional entanglement methods in certain conditions, especially those that can exploit the non-Gaussian continuous-variable quantum states.
FIG. 1. Schematic diagram of the proposed experimental setup. The two frequency-locked pump lasers and nonlinear crystals produce two single-mode squeezed light fields. The two quadrature squeezed light fields are injected into the optomechanical cavity. Balanced-homodyne measurements are proposed to quantify the output fields’ entanglement from the optomechanical cavity. The two input fields are detuned from the same cavity resonance (carrier detuning coefficient 0.3 and -1.5 for the subcarrier).

PONDEROMOTIVE QUANTUM COUPLING

Optomechanics is critical to a plethora of precision devices and instruments [27]. Optomechanics (and Cavity Optomechanics) applications are a go-to solution for classical optics-based technologies and an emerging technology for Photonics and continuum Quantum Optics applications [28, 29]. Optomechanical devices are optical devices that contain a mechanical oscillator coupled to the propagating optical modes. Optomechanics even appears as an attractive method for cutting edge quantum computing devices such as quantum memory and quantum teleportation for quantum computing IO device development [30]. The utility of optomechanics will further expand into Quantum Information Science technologies as a means of producing quantum states and quantum measurements in various applications.

The simulations all consider the optical apparatus depicted in figure 1. Two coherent states are squeezed by arbitrary black-box squeezers that impart the squeezing parameters, $\xi_1$ and $\xi_2$ (where $\xi_j = r_j e^{i\theta_j}$), on their respective coherent state. For the purpose of this report, consider these squeezers to have easily tunable squeezing strength ($r_1$ and $r_2$) and squeezing angle ($\theta_1$ and $\theta_2$); at times swap out the squeezing strength $r_j$ to a tunable nonlinearity coefficient, $\mu_1$ and $\mu_2$ (where $r_j = \sqrt{\mu_j}$), to better consider management (maximization) of quantum resources. The optomechanical cavity is a cantilever shaped movable $\mu$mirror [23, 31]. Which has higher-order vibrational modes that affect output entanglement [10, 24]. Though there is some discussion of sideband frequency dependence in the appendix, the sideband frequency dependence in these simulations follows the same behavior as the unsqueezed case discussed in a previous publication.

First, consider two unsqueezed coherent states input into the cavity that may yield bipartite entangled optical mixed quantum states. The Hamiltonian for dual coherent fields incident onto an optomechanical cavity with a $\mu$mirror oscillator (movable endmirror with small mass) has the following optical-mechanical interaction term:

$$H_{int} = \hbar (g_1 \hat{n}_1 + g_2 \hat{n}_2) \sum_k (-1)^k \left( \frac{\hat{X}_\mu}{k!} - 1 \right)^k ,$$

(1)

where $g$ is some optomechanical coupling constant, $\hat{X}_\mu$ is the position quadrature operator corresponding to the $\mu$mirror, $\hat{n}_j = \hat{a}_j^\dagger \hat{a}_j$ is the photon number of the $j^{th}$ intracavity field, and $L$ is the cavity length when input quantum noise is zero [32].

Linearized Hamiltonian

The linearization provides a more intuitive Hamiltonian and is valid in the simulation’s regime. The goal is to write the interaction Hamiltonian using the fluctuations in the optical cavity field around a steady-state average coherent amplitude, $\alpha_j$. For a cavity driven by coherent fields $|\alpha_j\rangle$ this involves the substitution $\hat{a}_j \rightarrow \alpha_j + \delta \hat{a}_j$ into the Hamiltonian.

$$H_{int} \approx (g_1 \hat{n}_1 + g_2 \hat{n}_2) \hat{X}_\mu$$

$$H_{int}^{lin} = \sum_j g_j' (\delta \hat{a}_j^\dagger + \alpha_j^* \hat{a}_j)(\delta \hat{a}_j + \alpha_j) \hat{X}_\mu$$

$$H_{int}^{lin} = \sum_j g_j' (\delta \hat{a}_j^\dagger \delta \hat{a}_j + |\alpha_j|^2 + \alpha_j \delta \hat{a}_j^\dagger + \alpha_j^* \delta \hat{a}_j) \hat{X}_\mu$$

(2)

Take the new rest position of the mechanical oscillator to be displaced by the average radiation pressure force, $g_j' |\alpha_j|^2 \langle \hat{X}_\mu \rangle$. Then,

$$H_{int}^{lin} = \sum_j g_j' (\delta \hat{a}_j^\dagger \delta \hat{a}_j + \alpha_j \delta \hat{a}_j^\dagger + \alpha_j^* \delta \hat{a}_j) \hat{X}_\mu$$

(3)

In cases of weak quantum coupling, the term $g_j' \delta \hat{a}_j^\dagger \delta \hat{a}_j$ is negligible since the other terms have factors $\alpha_j$. Thus the Hamiltonian simplifies to,

$$H_{int}^{lin} = \sum_j g_j' (\alpha_j \delta \hat{a}_j^\dagger + \alpha_j^* \delta \hat{a}_j) \hat{X}_\mu$$

$$H_{int}^{lin} = \sum_j g_j' (\alpha_j \delta \hat{a}_j^\dagger + \alpha_j^* \delta \hat{a}_j)(\hat{b}_j + \hat{b}^\dagger)$$

(4)

where $z_{p,\xi}g_j' \rightarrow g_j'$. In our simulations the two input fields are blue and red-detuned from the cavity resonance. This means that the dominate terms in the above Hamiltonian become the following:

$$g_1' \alpha_1 \delta \hat{a}_1^\dagger \hat{b}_j + g_2' \alpha_2 \delta \hat{a}_2^\dagger \hat{b}_j + g_1' \alpha_1^* \delta \hat{a}_1 \hat{b}_j + g_2' \alpha_2^* \delta \hat{a}_2 \hat{b}_j^\dagger$$

(5)
These competing photon-phonon processes (for example the input relation for the carrier field, \(\gamma'_1\alpha_1\delta a_1^\dagger b_1\), competes with the input relation for the subcarrier field \(\gamma'_2\alpha_2\delta a_2^\dagger b_2\) and likewise for the outputs) will cause additional fluctuations in the mean cavity coherent amplitudes, \(\alpha_j\); though not in this linearized simulation, previous work has shown that a single cavity field has an intricate dependence on the change in cavity linewidth \([33]\). However, in this simulation, the cavity photon fluctuations can be seen in the sideband photon numbers (\(\delta a_1^\dagger \delta a_1\)), though not significant enough to move the system into the quantum coupling regime.

The optomechanical coupling modulation could also be due to two-tone optomechanical instabilities that occur within particular choices of carrier and subcarrier field detunings in the unresolved sideband regime \([34–36]\).

**SQUEEZED INPUT BOOSTS ENTANGLEMENT**

Following the Quantum Langevin method, the Langevin equation for squeezed light injection is very similar to the unsqueezed OM entanglement calculations in previous publications \([37, 38]\). Since the coupling matrix, \(K\), does not change for lossless squeezing, we only consider alterations to the input noise spectra \((G)\) \([18, 39]\). Recall that the quantum Langevin equations calculate (in Heisenberg’s picture of quantum mechanics) the time derivative of the intracavity quadrature operators. Let \(u_c\) be the vector of intracavity mode operators, and the vector \(u_N\) be the vector of input mode operators. Then, the intracavity modes change in time according to the relation:

\[
\dot{u}_c = Ku_c + u_N. \tag{6}
\]

After Fourier transforming to the sideband frequency \(\Omega\), applying cavity input-output theory to establish the vector of quadratures of the output optical fields \(v\), and arranging the terms into a covariance matrix, we see that the correlations in the input noises \((G)\) evolves into the output optical correlations, covariance matrix \(V\):

\[
V(\Omega) = Re(Q(G(\Omega))Q^\dagger), \tag{7}
\]

where \(Q = \sqrt{2\gamma}M(\Omega) + I\), and \(M(\Omega) = [K + i\Omega]^{-1}\).

To quantify the entanglement with the logarithmic negativity \(E_N\) begin with the direct computation of the elements of the quadrature covariance matrix, \(V\):

\[
E_N = \max[ 0, -\ln \sqrt{2\eta - 2\sqrt{\eta^2 - 4\det V}}], \tag{8}
\]

where \(\eta = \det V_{11} + \det V_{22} - 2\det V_{12}\). This is a popular metric for Gaussian entanglement in continuous variable systems. One reason for its popularity is that for quantum Gaussian states, logarithmic negativity amounts to an exact entanglement cost \([40, 41]\).

Note that the quadrature covariance matrix is of the form:

\[
V = \begin{pmatrix}
(X_1 X_1)_+ & (X_1 Y_1)_+ & (X_1 X_2)_+ & (X_1 Y_2)_+ \\
(Y_1 X_1)_+ & (Y_1 Y_1)_+ & (Y_1 X_2)_+ & (Y_1 Y_2)_+ \\
(X_2 X_1)_+ & (X_2 Y_1)_+ & (X_2 X_2)_+ & (X_2 Y_2)_+ \\
(Y_2 X_1)_+ & (Y_2 Y_1)_+ & (Y_2 X_2)_+ & (Y_2 Y_2)_+
\end{pmatrix}. \tag{9}
\]

were \(\langle u^* v \rangle = \frac{(u^* + u + v + v^*)}{2}\), or in block form:

\[
V = \begin{pmatrix}
V_{11} & V_{12} \\
V_{21} & V_{22}
\end{pmatrix}. \tag{10}
\]

Of the 16 terms in the optical output covariance matrix, the four diagonal terms are (somewhat) trivial, and six others can be calculated directly from the remaining six. Therefore, we only need to calculate six terms to construct the matrix (see appendix). The six terms can be written and calculated a six products terms of the form \([42]\):

\[
\tilde{S}^\dagger_\ell(\xi_\ell)Y_\ell \tilde{S}_\ell(\zeta_\ell) = \tilde{S}^\dagger_\ell(\zeta_\ell - \xi_\ell)\gamma_\ell(\xi_\ell), \tag{11}
\]

with \(\zeta = r' e^{i\theta}\), and \(\gamma_\ell(\xi_\ell) = \frac{1}{2}[(\cosh r'_\ell + e^{i\theta} \sinh r'_\ell)\alpha_\ell^\dagger - (\cosh r'_\ell + e^{-i\theta} \sinh r'_\ell)\alpha_\ell^\dagger]a\).

\[
\langle \hat{G}\rangle_{j,j} = \begin{pmatrix}
A_j \alpha_j^2 + B_j \alpha_j^2 + 1 & (A_j \alpha_j^2 - A_j \alpha_j + 1) \\
-(A_j \alpha_j^2 - A_j \alpha_j + 1) & A_j \alpha_j^2 + B_j \alpha_j^2 + 1
\end{pmatrix}, \tag{12}
\]

where \(A_j = \cosh r_j - e^{-i\theta} \sinh r_j\) and \(B_j = \cosh r_j - e^{i\theta} \sinh r_j\).

The two measures of entanglement used here are only ideal for continuous-variable states that are Gaussian. Notably, the two measures (logarithmic negativity and Duan’s measure of inseparability) do not agree (figure 2). The optical states produced by these simulations non-Gaussian. Here, applying the logarithmic negativity yields indeterminate entanglement for moderate squeezing in the simplified system (see figure 3). Figure 3 is a plot of a more ideal system where the losses are zero and many noise factors are not considered. Considering realistic conditions (losses, thermal noise, more realistic OMO dampening, and higher-order mechanical modes in the OMO) bounds the \(E_N\) to a finite number as seen in figure 2, yet the entanglement maxima and minima are at near opposite squeezing angle combinations (relative to Duan’s measure). Although recent theoretical studies expect that the logarithmic negativity can approach infinity for ideal cases of Gaussian entanglement, those apply to cases of infinite squeezing \([43]\). Here the Logarithmic negativity fails at very reasonable values of squeezing strength.

**GAUSSIANITY METRICS**

To further study the non-Gaussianity of the output optical fields we use the Genoni’s metric for deviation
FIG. 2. The simulation shows the same two-mode periodicity due to the dependence on two squeezing angles. This dependence is consistent with our presented theoretical results Quantum Langevin calculations. The maximum output $E_N$ varies strongly with input squeezing and angle. Temperature is set to 4 K (the simulation fails at room temperature), and see table I for other parameters used. The maxima occur when input squeezing angles are odd integer multiples of $\pi/2$ and minima at even integer multiples of $\pi/2$. The last plot in the figure shows the results from applying Duan’s measure in the same simulated conditions. Their discrepancy is due to non-Gaussianity in the output fields.

As we include an alternate measure of entanglement, so too shall we include an alternate for Gaussianity. The more direct method of confirming non-Gaussian statistics is to measure the higher-order cumulants. To measure the higher-order cumulants we increase the number of parallel homodyne detection from two (dual homodyne; see figure 1) to four (quadruple homodyne). To calculate the fourth-order cumulants in the ponderomotive regime, one must find:

$$\kappa_{jk\ell p} = \langle Q_j Q_k Q_\ell Q_p \rangle - 3 \langle Q_j Q_k \rangle \langle Q_\ell Q_p \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

(15)

(15)

In Figure 4, entanglement measure results are also included. All four plots are at zero losses and 10nK and equal squeezing strengths ($r_1 = r_2 = 0.3$) to simplify Gaussianity measures and show changes with squeezing angle. The logarithmic negativity is calculated from the Gaussian statistics of the state only. Therefore, if only the Gaussian fields are considered, the entanglement persists and is still boosted by the squeezing. This happens at the angles where Duan’s measure is minimum. Since the $E_N$ does not consider the higher-order statistics, the maxima in Duan’s measure must be due to the non-Gaussian entanglement in the optical output adding to the measured value. The results from the Gaussianity metrics further confirm this. Where there is non-Gaussian entanglement, the fourth-order cumulant measure should be higher since the correlations for non-Gaussian entanglement persist throughout the higher-order cumulants (keeping them nonzero). Using Genoni’s measure, however, a different depiction of the changes
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in the overall Gaussianity. This metric will be positive not only when there is tripartite entanglement but when there is bipartite entanglement between one optical field and the OMO. This is because it measures how the pure three-mode state was poorly approximated by the two-mode Gaussian state created from the measurement data. Consequentially, this minima in this measure highlight where the squeezing boosts the Gaussianity, which are the same regions where the squeezing boosts the $E_N$. These regions must not pertain to tripartite entangled states and thus correspond to the production of Gaussian photon-photon entanglement by the OMC. The $E_N$ is maximum where the squeezing increases the Gaussianity. However, where the squeezing reduces the Gaussianity, the $E_N$ is not zero, implying higher overall entanglement at points of low Gaussianity. Duan’s measure here shows that the non-Gaussian regions have the highest relative entanglement. The fourth-order cumulant better reflects regions of high non-Gaussian entanglement, confirmed by the Duan measure results since it depends on some of the higher-order correlations in the cumulant matrix. The cumulant metric is maximum where tripartite entanglement is maximum. These results are consistent with the quantum noise results, when input quantum noise is maximum entanglement (including tripartite entanglement) is maximum.

**OMC ENTHALMENT DEVICE EFFICACY**

Optomechanical cavity-based entanglement generating devices can yield entanglement without squeezing the coherent input fields. However, this may not be efficient enough to rival two-mode squeezed vacuum entanglement generation methods. The figures above and below show much higher (factor of 6 for $E_N$) output entanglement for squeezed input fields, yet the $E_N$ yields are not competitive for intense squeezing (about $r > 0.5$ or larger than a decibel).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Notation</th>
<th>Stable and $E_N \neq 0$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Temperature</td>
<td>$T$</td>
<td>4K</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulating carrier power</td>
<td>$P_1$</td>
<td>0.2816W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Circulating subcarrier power</td>
<td>$P_2$</td>
<td>0.2238W</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loss</td>
<td>$L_s$</td>
<td>25 ppm</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier detuning</td>
<td>$d_1$</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subcarrier detuning</td>
<td>$d_2$</td>
<td>-1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality factor</td>
<td>$Q$</td>
<td>17000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cavity Length</td>
<td>$L_n$</td>
<td>0.01 m</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**TABLE I.** Set of variable simulation parameters, and a stable configuration that yield non-zero entanglement.

Two coherent states input into an optomechanical cavity has been shown theoretically and experimentally to generate entanglement [7, 9, 14, 49]. Moreover, recent work has provided more insight into what drives this quantum process. Specifically, the relationships between output entanglement and input quantum noise; not only does the output entanglement thrive when the quantum

FIG. 4. All four plots are at zero loses and 10nK and equal squeezing strengths ($r_1 = r_2 = 0.3$) to simplify the measures of Gaussianity and show changes with squeezing angle. A: The top left plot is the logarithmic negativity ($E_N$). The logarithmic negativity is calculated from the Gaussian statistics of the state only. Therefore, if only the Gaussian fields are considered, the entanglement persists and is still boosted by the squeezing. B: The top right plot depicts results from Duan’s measure of separability $R$ rewritten here as $1 - R$ to be positive for entanglement and zero or less for any separable state. Duan’s measure of separability is more reliable than the logarithmic negativity when involving non-Gaussian statistics. The peaks in this plot occur at different angles versus the $E_N$. Since the $E_N$ does not consider the higher-order statistics, these new maxima must be due to the non-Gaussian entanglement adding to the measured value. If this is the case, the non-Gaussianity should be higher at these points, and the following plots are in agreement. C: The bottom left plot is the measured deviation from Gaussianity ($\delta$) in the output optical fields. The higher the value, the more non-Gaussian the state. This implementation of this metric only holds for pure states, so we have set temperature and loss to their minimums for this figure. The angles for higher Gaussianity (lower $\delta$) coincide with the regions of maximum log negativity. This suggests that when these systems are tuned to produce more Gaussian states, the output entanglement is at least somewhat conserved. D: The last plot in the figure is of the fourth-order cumulant. The fourth-order cumulant measure is somewhat a direct yet unrefined measure of non-Gaussianity. For the most part, higher values for this measure mean that there is likely more non-Gaussianity, especially where the two measures agree. Interestingly, the injection of squeezed light can both increase and decrease the Gaussianity of the output light. The strength of this effect, of course, varies with squeezing strength (see figure 8).
FIG. 5. Above plots correspond to the dual single-mode squeezed input simulations (table I) with $r_1 = r_2 = 0.8$. Without squeezed input light, the quantum to thermal noise ratio greatly determined the cavity’s entanglement output. When $r > 0$, this somewhat holds, but the overall increase in entanglement is much less than when unsqueezed coherent light is input. In the two plots, the quantum to thermal noise ratio is maximum at the input squeezing angles where output entanglement is maximum (at about $(n\pi, m\pi)$ where $n$ and $m$ are some arbitrary integers); these findings are in full agreement with the entanglement simulation results. The boosted quantum noise in the injected field still corresponds to a boosted output entanglement even when working with non-Gaussian states.

noise is dominant in the optomechanical cavity, but that, at low thermal noise (lower than room temperature for this system), the quantum noise itself is more indicative of the output entanglement than the ratio. Thus, to increase the entanglement output from the optomechanical cavity, we need to increase the input quantum noise while keeping the mechanical oscillator’s temperature reasonably low. For the oscillator to maintain the low relative classical noise, the input light must remain at or near minimum uncertainty at the input; increasing the fluctuations in the input light’s amplitude consequentially decreases the fluctuations in that light’s phase to maintain this quantum only input noise [13]. Thus, we intentionally amplify the intracavity quantum noise by injecting displaced squeezed states (or squeezed coherent light).

While entanglement generation methods’ advantages will vary with system parameters, the maximal overall benefit provided by OM methods to entanglement production only seems slight at first glance. This middling benefit to entanglement is seemingly in contrast to the significant increase in the quantum noise (see figure 5). The expectation is that the quantum noise drives (or is an indicator of) the optomechanical entanglement. Figure 5 shows notable quantum variances that are at most two orders of magnitude higher than the unsqueezed input variances [10], yet the output entanglement seems only weakly boosted.

The output entanglement could be increasing proportionally to the increase in input quantum noise, but the increase in non-Gaussianity obscures the evidence in our metrics, effectively hiding the entanglement in the non-Gaussian bulk of the optical state. Concurrently, the temperature dependence is greatly lessened. This effect was also found to be the case in other publications with squeezed light injection into OMCs [37]. This is likely due to the squeezing changing the OMO’s zero-point fluctuations or temperature, and this effect should be investigated further in the ponderomotive regime. Thus, we observe an increase in output entanglement is about six times the entanglement output instead of about 30 times the output (as is the case for the quantum to thermal noise ratio).

FIG. 6. The above plots demonstrate the utility of optomechanically enhanced entanglement generation methods concerning access to high-quality nonlinear crystals. The value of Duan’s measure of the output cavity field is higher (for Gaussian states, this implies more entanglement) than squeezed light with beamsplitter methods at all values of crystal nonlinearity. The Duan Measure of bipartite entanglement, $1 - R$, in the two plots is devoid of singularities that appear in the logarithmic negativity. The input power for the carrier and subcarrier is kept constant at 46 µW and 1.1 mW, respectively; thus, the squeezing strength is $r$ where $r \equiv \mu_1 \sqrt{P_1}$.

In regions of higher Gaussian entanglement we can compare the OMC boosted entanglement rates with those from conventional entanglement methods that also utilize squeezing. For this comparison assume the conventional methods (SPDC) produce sideband entanglement. We see the OMC-enhanced circuit could be preferable at low squeezing when input coupling loss is zero; this result is more akin to intracavity squeezing. The horizontal line represents the OMC performance when input coupling is considered. In this case there is no advantage offered by squeezing the input fields due to poor coupling in the circuit $\approx 50$ ppm.
**CONCLUSIONS**

Entanglement and squeezing are valuable quantum resources in quantum technologies. Quantum Cavity Optomechanics contains new means of producing squeezed and entangled light. Generating entanglement via squeezed light injection into sideband unresolved OMCs may well be a competitive method for producing, enhancing, or processing entanglement from single-mode squeezing resources for continuous-variable quantum devices. To this end, an understanding of the output fields’ Gaussianity is necessary. These simulations show a non-trivial relationship between input squeezing, intracavity entanglement, two-mode Gaussianity, and intracavity quantum noise. At the right squeezing angles, implementing an optomechanical cavity in a conventional entanglement circuit could increase output entanglement, quantified by Duan’s measure of separability, by a factor of 2 or greater due to the increase in the injected quantum noise. These results are consistent in our theoretical results (Quantum Langevin) and our simulations (two-photon formalism quadrature propagation). The increase in quantum noise due to squeezing helps mitigate unwanted effects due to thermal noises, as was the case in previous studies [37]. When the OMO is entangled with one or both optical fields, the output fields from these OMCs are non-Gaussian CV fields in these cases and are not well quantified by the logarithmic negativity or Duan’s measure. Lastly, the intracavity entanglement can be controlled by controlling the squeezing angle of the input light, and in the region of increased Gaussianity, there is increased bipartite optical entanglement (Logarithmic negativity).
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**APPENDIX**

**Computational methods**

Much of the computational framework from our previous project was preserved for this work. Here the matrix \( \mathcal{F} \) describes how the sideband operators transform due to single-mode squeezing

\[
\mathcal{F}(r, \theta) = \begin{pmatrix}
\cos 2\theta \sinh r + \cosh r & \sin 2\theta \sinh r \\
\sin 2\theta \sinh r & \cosh r - \cos 2\theta \sinh(r)
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

Since the program assumes squeezing of the sideband fields prior to injection, none of the squeezing is lost due to the cavity input coupling.

The two-photon formalism’s flexibility allows for the thorough simulation of the sideband quadratures’ homodyne measurement [10, 23, 24, 31, 51, 52]. Such flexibility creates a robust platform for understanding how the output entanglement and quantum noise are affected by laboratory complications and loss parameters.

**Squeezing angle dependence**

In this section we note the steps to calculate the expected value of \( \hat{S}^\dagger(\xi)\hat{S}(\zeta) \). Before we begin we note that \( \hat{S}^\dagger(\xi)\hat{S}(\zeta) = 1 \) when \( \xi = \zeta \) and \( \hat{S}^\dagger(\xi)\hat{S}(\xi) = \hat{S}(\xi) \) when \( \xi = 2\zeta \) (will be shown in the following notes). Let’s begin with the following:

\[
\hat{S}^\dagger(\xi)\hat{S}(\zeta) = e^{-\xi^*\hat{a}^2 + \xi^{12}} e^{\zeta^*\hat{a}^2 - \zeta^{12}},
\]

where

\[
A = -\xi^*\hat{a}^2 + \xi^{12}, \quad B = \zeta^*\hat{a}^2 - \zeta^{12}.
\]
\[
\hat{S}_\dagger(\zeta)\hat{S}(\zeta) = e^{-\zeta^*\hat{a}^2 + \zeta\hat{a}^*\hat{a}^2 - \zeta\hat{a}^2} = \exp\left[-(\zeta^* + \zeta)\hat{a}^2 + (\zeta - \zeta^*)\hat{a}^2 + \hat{Z}\right]
\]  
(19)

where \( \hat{Z} = \frac{1}{2}\hat{k}_0 + \frac{1}{4\zeta^2}(\hat{f}_2(-\zeta)\hat{k}_0) - \frac{1}{4\zeta^2}\hat{f}_2(\zeta)\hat{k}_0) + \ldots \)

with \( \hat{k}_0 = \frac{1}{2}(-\zeta^*\hat{a}^2 + \zeta\hat{a}^2 + \zeta\hat{a}^2 - \zeta\hat{a}^2) \).

\[
\hat{k}_0 = \left[\xi\hat{a}^2 - \xi^*\hat{a}^2, \xi^*\hat{a}^2 - \zeta\hat{a}^2\right] = \left[\xi^2\hat{a}^2, \xi^*\hat{a}^2, -\xi\hat{a}^2\right]
\]
(20)

since, \([\hat{a}^2, \hat{a}^2] = -2(2\hat{n} + 1)\) and \([\hat{a}^2, \hat{a}^2] = 2(2\hat{n} + 1)\)

we can write eqn 20 as

\[
2(\xi^* - \xi^*\hat{a}^2)(2\hat{n} + 1) .
\]
(21)

Thus, the resulting operator is highly dependent on the input squeezing angle difference and is not very sensitive to differences in squeezing strength between the two inputs. To make this more clear we can write \( \hat{k}_0 \) in a different form than above if we assume \( \xi = r_1 e^{i\phi} \) and \( \zeta = r_2 e^{i\phi} \):

\[
\hat{k}_0 = 4i r_1 r_2 \sin(\theta - \phi)(2\hat{n} + 1) .
\]
(22)

If the squeezing angles are the same, the term \( \hat{k}_0 \) vanishes; the real parts of the squeezing parameters do not change the form of the operator unless they are zero. Furthermore, at higher orders there are terms with dependence on \( \sin(\theta + \phi) \) and \( \cos(\theta + \phi) \); there is still some non-trivial complications to the squeezing operator around the line \( \theta = \phi \). These complications may account for the peaks in the dual single-mode squeezed input entanglement results which appear to show that the entanglement is maximum when \( \theta \approx \phi \); it is likely that when \( \theta \) exactly equals \( \phi \) that the \( E_N \) falls (or rises) sharply.

**Frequency dependence**

Considering the results in figure 4 with those depicted in figure 7, the input squeezing, at the angles that yield increased Gaussianity, does not change the separability in Duan’s measure; meaning there is no net change in output entanglement at these squeezing angles. In this configuration, the input squeezing transfers non-Gaussian entanglement to Gaussian entanglement.

**Increasing Gaussianity with input squeezing**

Continuous-variable non-Gaussian systems are cumbersome analytically. Thus, a valuable feature of these
systems is that injecting squeezed light can increase the Gaussianity of the output fields. However, in our simulations, intense squeezing consistently decreases the output Gaussianity, see figure 8.
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