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Intensity modulation in Weak Coherent State (WCS)-based Quantum Key Distribution can be achieved either by using an external optical modulator positioned after a laser diode or direct modulation of the laser diode injection current. Former approach requires an additional optical modulator and a dedicated driver circuit, which increases cost of implementation. The latter approach, as reported, results in distinguishable signal and decoy state. We have considered a quantum well based gain switched laser diode and analyzed cause of distinguishability in directly modulated laser diodes. In addition, we have proposed a method of generation of indistinguishable signal and decoy state by direct modulation of injected current into the laser diode. In this work, we estimate parameters affecting the distinguishability of signal and decoy state for small signal laser diode models, theoretically characterize emission of a laser diode, and using numerical simulation extended our analysis to large signal excitation of the laser diode. Experimental results align with trend predicted by numerical simulation for large signal excitation. Statistically, we further evaluate indistinguishability of signal and decoy state. The proposed implementation of QKD will be cheaper and have smaller form factor.
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I. INTRODUCTION

Widely used asymmetric cryptography and symmetric cryptography are intractable problems based on complexity conjecture P$\neq$NP [3]. Albeit these cryptography are based on conjecture, it is more about how long it will take to solve the problem using brute force method using unlimited resources. Tools like quantum computers can render public key cryptography insecure due to Shor’s algorithm [17]. Moreover, this insecurity cannot be physically detected should the public key get compromised.

There exists another type of cryptography algorithm: Quantum Cryptography, based on Quantum Mechanical laws that provides information theoretic security. Main advantage of this hardware-based encryption, ideally, is provision for detection of Eavesdropper and is not based on conjectures. One of the implementations of Quantum Cryptography is Quantum Key Distribution (QKD) that allows exchange of random keys on quantum channel. Although ideal implementation of QKD provides provable secure implementation, imperfection in these implementations often open doors to side channels [9][10][12]. In an ideal implementation, source for QKD should emit one photon at a time and on demand. Unfortunately, single photon source is expensive to implement, has low collection efficiency, making them as good as alternative source. Also, implementation of high rate single photon source is yet to be demonstrated [4]. Implementation of QKD using alternative source has been widely discussed in [2], [11], [14].

In this paper, we propose a method of generation of indistinguishable signal–decoy state in temporal domain by using a gain switched single laser diode for each polarization encoded qubit. Behavior of free running laser diode at room temperature for low cost QKD framework has been studied. This work provides further extension to [1] by fine-tuning the shape of the injection current and hence obtain similar shape for output pulses for signal and decoy state. We have theoretically estimated parameters to control distinguishability for small signal excitation and have extended our analysis to large signal excitation, for the laser diode, by numerical solving the laser rate equation for quantum well based laser diodes. Further, we theoretically characterize emission of a laser diode and explains its generation from vacuum state. Trend predicted by theoretical estimation for small signal excitation and numerical simulation for large signal excitation, agrees with the experimental results, and indistinguishability of signal and decoy state are then quantified.

II. DECOY STATE BASED QUANTUM KEY DISTRIBUTION

Weak Coherent Source from attenuated laser diode is widely used photon source in QKD. In single electromagnetic mode of photon, coherent state $|\alpha\rangle$ can be represented as (in ideal case; practically it will be a mixed
\[ |\alpha\rangle = e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^n}{\sqrt{n!}} |n\rangle \]  

where \( \alpha \) is a complex number.

Density matrix for coherent field state in \(|n\rangle\) basis state can be written as:

\[ \rho = \sum \rho_{nm} |n\rangle \langle m| \]  

where

\[ \rho_{nm} = \langle n|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|m\rangle = \frac{\alpha^n\alpha^*m}{\sqrt{n!m!}} e^{-|\alpha|^2} \]  

Then probability distribution of ideal coherent source in number state can be written as:

\[ P_n = \rho_{nn} = \frac{|\alpha|^2 e^{-|\alpha|^2}}{n!} \]  

Theoretical bound for probability of obtaining more than 1 photon can then be approximated from [4] as a conditional probability:

\[ P_{multi-photon} \geq \frac{|\alpha|^2}{2} \]  

where \( \alpha \) which is magnitude square of eigen value of destruction operator, representing mean number of photon in a laser pulse. This is one of the major drawbacks and a security flaw of using WCS because practical implementation of the coherent source, which is achieved by using inexpensive laser diodes, emits multiple photons. Consequently, if Alice sends multi-photon state to Bob, the eavesdropper can split multi-photon state, retain one copy of Alice state and send the remaining state to Bob, while selectively suppressing the signal state without getting detected (Photon Number Splitting attack). Finally, when Alice and Bob exchange basis selection on a public channel, Eve will have access to entire/partial key.

In order to overcome this drawback in the implementation of WCS based QKD, decoy state based QKD was proposed [15]. In decoy state implementation, a pulse whose average photon number is different from that of the signal pulse, is sent together with the signal pulse at random. Both of these pulses differ only in terms of mean number of photons, but has indistinguishable characteristics like pulse-width, frequency etc..Alice can transmit either a signal or decoy state to Bob by simply varying mean number of photon (intensity) of the WCS pulse, as defined in [4]. If \( Y_j \) represents yield by a Bob’s detector to a pulse sent by Alice containing \( j \) photons i.e. conditional probability of detection of photon at Bob’s receiver when Alice sends a signal with \( j \) number of photons, then:

\[ Y_j = 1 - (1 - Y_0)(1 - \eta)^j \]  

where \( Y_0 \) is the yield with number of photon as zero i.e. it represents dark count rate, and \( \eta \) is the transmission probability of signal containing \( j \) photons. Considering probabilistic distribution of photons in weak coherent pulse, we can then define gain of detecting pulse for Bob with \( j \) photons sent by Alice as:

\[ Q_j = Y_j \frac{|\alpha|^2 e^{-|\alpha|^2}}{n!} \]  

Then overall gain or probability of a pulse with mean number of photon \( n \), at Bob’s receiver is:

\[ Q = \sum_{j}^{n} Y_j \frac{|\alpha|^2 e^{-|\alpha|^2}}{j!} \]  

If \( \eta \) represents overall efficiency of the bit transmission from Alice to Bob, including channel efficiency, setup efficiency, with dark count error yield of \( \epsilon_{darkcount} \) and Bob’s detection efficiency \( \epsilon_{detector} \), then error rate of detecting a pulse with \( j \) photons is defined as:

\[ \epsilon_j = \frac{\epsilon_{darkcount} + \epsilon_{detector}\eta}{Y_j} \]  

then, QBER for each yield is given by:

\[ E_j = \epsilon_j Y_j \frac{|\alpha|^2 e^{-|\alpha|^2}}{n!} \]  

and overall QBER is expressed as:

\[ EQ = \sum_{j}^{n} \epsilon_j Y_j \frac{|\alpha|^2 e^{-|\alpha|^2}}{j!} \]  

Alice and Bob can experimentally determine gain \( Q \) and overall QBER \( EQ \). From eqn. [8] and eqn. [11] \( \epsilon_j \) and \( Y_j \) for a pulse containing \( j \) photons can be estimated and acceptable ranges can be determined. Any attempt by Eve will affect \( \epsilon_j \) and \( Y_j \) beyond the acceptable range thereby revealing presence of Eve.

Based on equation for yield and error rate, secure key rate for WCS based QKD can be written as [22]:

\[ S \geq q(-Q_\mu f(E_\mu)H_2(E_\mu) + Q_1[1 - H_2(e_1)]) \]  

Where \( S \) is the key rate, \( q = \) ratio of signal state for both Alice and Bob to total number of pulses sent by Alice. Mean photon number \( \mu \) depends on injection current, \( Q_\mu \) is the fractional yield rate and \( E_\mu \) represents error rate of the signal state detected by Bob. \( Q_1 \) and \( e_1 \) are fractional yield and error rate of the decoy detection by Bob for a single photon state. \( H_2 \) is the Shannon information entropy which represents statistical fluctuation in error rate due to pulse with \( \mu \) photons and \( f(E_\mu) \) represents error correction function. \( Q_\mu, E_\mu \) can be obtained as discussed in eqn. [8]-[12].

In order to detect presence of Eve, indistinguishability between signal state and decoy state is hence one the fundamental requirements. Consequenly, Eve can only know number of photons in each pulse detected, but
should not be able to differentiate between whether the photon detected was from signal state or decoy state. If yield and error rates are tightly bounded, it will be possible to then detect presence of Eve because when Eve detects actual photon number of signal state or decoy state, it has no information about statistical distribution of either signal or decoy state. Once Alice and Bob have characterized their channel, they can measure bounds for yield and error rate for signal and decoy state. Any attempt by Eve to detect these states will impact statistical distribution of signal and decoy states.

In order for signal state and decoy state to be completely indistinguishable they must have same spatial, spectral and temporal behavior. One of the interesting ways to implement this will be using photons from resonantly excited systems such as quantum dots[16], 2D materials[17], which results in Fourier transform limited characteristics of the emitted photon. Implementations of signal – decoy state have been analyzed by [1], [2]. Experimental realization of decoy state can be implemented either by using an external intensity modulator with dedicated driver circuit, or by varying injected pump current in the laser diode [1]. In former case, separate optical attenuator along with dedicated driving circuit is needed. Not only it impacts the overall form factor of the implementation, also it adds to cost. In later case, indistinguishability was lost due to relaxation oscillation of the laser diode and delay in emission w.r.t injected current. Additionally, due to distinguishability of pulse generated from injection current pumping technique, security rate was found to be zero i.e. the transmission was absolutely insecure. Implementation mentioned in [2] needs two diodes for each basis state. For four basis state, eight diodes are needed in a specially constructed holder. This arrangement not only adds to cost, but also puts strict restriction on selection of eight laser diodes, and positioning of laser diodes in the setup. In this work, with smaller form factor and cost of implementation in mind, we propose generation of indistinguishable signal and decoy state using direct modulation of laser diode.

III. THEORY

Earlier reported literature [1] has observed that direct modulation of injection pump current results in distinguishability of signal and decoy state. This distinguishability has been attributed to effect of relaxation oscillation and characterstic delay between the signals. Characterization of this relaxation oscillation has been widely described in details[8],[11]. Increase in injection current increases photon emission, as a result electron carrier density rate decreases, consequently at certain level of electron density, rate of generation of photon starts to decrease. So, contribution of stimulated emission decreases thereby increasing carrier concentration. This periodic cycle results in relaxation oscillation until it achieves a steady state level. These distinguishable attributes in the pump current will have a signature in the output pulse of the laser too i.e. if there are multiple peaks in the injection current, laser output will follow this profile.

In our implementation, indistinguishable signal state and decoy state are generated by direct modulation and temporal tuning of injection current into a AlGaInP based laser diodes with heterojunction quantum well and can be represented as shown in FIG. 1.

![FIG. 1. General representation of quantum well based laser diode. Current injection, spontaneous emission, stimulated emission, intra-band relaxation result in change in carrier concentration and governs rate of emission from the laser diode. Above the injection threshold, stimulated emission dominates, while below the threshold, phenomenon of spontaneous emission is dominant. Photon density in the active region builds up when emission overcomes cavity loss. Carrier lifetime τc of 1ns and photon lifetime τp of 1ps has been considered in our estimation.](image)

Wave-function for an exciton: electron in conduction band and hole in valence band in quantum well, with wave vector \(k_c\) and \(k_h\), can be represented as:

\[
|\psi(t)\rangle = |\psi_{n,j}^{i}\rangle = \sum_{k_c,k_h,i,j} \psi_{k_c,k_h,i,j} |k_c,i,k_h,j\rangle
\]  

And individual wavefunction of electron and hole in periodic lattice potential at lattice point \(i\) and \(j\) respectively can be expressed as Fourier transform:

\[
|\psi_{e,i}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NV_c}} \sum e^{ik_cR} \phi_i(r)
\]

\[
|\psi_{h,i}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NV_c}} \sum e^{ik_hR} \phi_j(r)
\]

This represents a Bloch function where \(\phi\) represents variation in local potential around lattice point, \(r\) is the relative position of e-h pair, \(N\) is the number of cell and \(V_c\) is the volume of cell. For the exciton wavefunction, density
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\[
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where \( N_{ch} \) is the electron distribution in conduction band 

\( \Delta_i \) is the charge injection, and \( N_0 \) is the total electron density conduction and valence band, \( R \) is the dipole moment of charge particles, \( \rho_0 \) and \( \rho_b \) represents electron distribution at thermal equilibrium and quasi electron distribution at higher electron energy respectively, \( \tau_b \) and \( \tau_{spon} \) are intra-band relaxation and spontaneous rate respectively.

Considering the entire spatial volume of the active region, we can write rate of change of electron density and photon density interms of following variables, as seen in eqn.\[21\]. If \( n \) is carrier concentration(same as electron distribution \( N_{ch} \)), \( I \) is the injected current, \( q \) is the charge, \( V \) is the volume of active region, \( d \) is the thickness of active region, \( \tau \) is the carrier lifetime, \( \tau_p \) is the photon lifetime, \( \eta_q \) is the carrier concentration when active region becomes transparent, \( \epsilon \) is the gain compression factor, \( N_s \) is the photon concentration, \( \Gamma \) the mode confinement factor.

In our analysis, we evaluate following extreme scenarios: (I) Small signal excitation about steady state value such that laser injection current follows step response near the threshold. Here, excitation is maintained above the threshold for certain duration before turning it off. Once the excitation is turned off, steady state value below the threshold is reached. This case-examples simulates the behavior of the laser diode near its threshold region (ii) Another scenario is large signal excitation of the laser diode. In this scenario, laser is pre-biased near the threshold and it is then excited by a short-duration, large-signal exci-
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electron wave-function in a laser cavity can then be derived as:

\[
\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \frac{1}{i\hbar} [H_e - cr.E, \rho] 
\]

where \( H_e \) is the hamiltonian of electron, \( r \) is the position vector. Eqn.\[19\] represents interaction between optical 

wave and electron wave-function in laser cavity resulting in stimulated emission, which further results in change in electron distribution.

Current pumping in laser diode, represented as a diag-

onal matrix, as paraphrased from [13], results in popul-

ation inversion. Additionally, based on dynamic equation for diagonal and off-diagonal, element, rate of change of electron density in conduction band due to light matter interaction, intra-band relaxation, spontaneous emission and current pumping can be written following [13]:

\[
\frac{dn}{dt} = -\frac{\Gamma a(n-n_g)}{1 + \epsilon N_0} N_s + \frac{I}{qV} 
\]

\[
\frac{dN_s}{dt} = \frac{\Gamma a(n-n_g)}{1 + \epsilon N_0} N_s + \frac{\Gamma \beta n}{\tau_{mode}} - \frac{N_s}{\tau_p} 
\]

where,

\[
\frac{1}{\tau_n} = \frac{1}{\tau_{nr}} + \frac{1}{\tau_{mode}} 
\]

with \( \tau_{nr} \) being non-radiative rate;in Eqn.\[21\] \( \Gamma a \) is the gain coefficient, \( n \) is the electron distribution above the threshold where stimulated emission dominates, and it remains constant around the steady state value. For small signal excitation, linearizing change in electron distribution and output emission density about its steady state value, we can write:

\[
\frac{d^2 \Delta n}{dt^2} + \left( \frac{1}{\tau_n} + \frac{\Gamma a N_s}{1 + \epsilon (N_s + \Delta N_s)} \right) \frac{d\Delta n}{dt} + \frac{\Gamma a N_s}{1 + \epsilon (N_s + \Delta N_s)} \frac{1}{\tau_p} \Delta n = 0 
\]

Where \( \Delta n \) is the small change in electron density in con-

duction band and \( \Delta N_s \) is corresponding change in photon
density. Since $\Delta N$ is smaller than $N_s$, it can be ignored. On solving the second order differential equation eq. (23), $\Delta n$ can then be written as:

$$\Delta n = \Delta n_0 e^{-\left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\tau_n} + \frac{\Gamma a N_s}{1 + \epsilon N_s} \right] - i\omega t}$$  \hspace{1cm} (25)$$

if we represent rate at which photon concentration confines within cavity modes as $N_p$, we can then simplify $\omega$ as:

$$\omega = \sqrt{\frac{N_p}{\tau_p} - \frac{1}{\tau_n} - \frac{N_p^2}{4}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)$$
given that $\tau_p >> \tau_n$

$$\omega = \sqrt{\frac{N_p}{\tau_p} - \frac{1}{\tau_n} - \frac{N_p^2}{4}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (28)$$

For sub-threshold region:

$$N_s = \frac{\tau_n \tau_p \Gamma \beta I}{\tau_{mode} qV}$$  \hspace{1cm} (29)$$

above the threshold:

$$N_s = \frac{\tau_p}{\tau_n} \left[ I - \frac{n_{sp} q d}{qV} \right]$$  \hspace{1cm} (30)$$

From the eq. (25)-(30), secondary fluctuation in electron density, at $t > 0$, will reduce with increase in injection bias current. Similar relation holds true for photon density and can be expressed as:

$$\frac{d^2 \Delta N_\lambda}{dt^2} + \left[ \frac{1}{\tau_n} + \frac{\Gamma a N_s}{1 + \epsilon(N_s + \Delta N_s)} \right] \frac{d\Delta N_\lambda}{dt} + \frac{1}{1 + \epsilon(N_s + \Delta N_s)} \Delta N_\lambda = 0$$  \hspace{1cm} (31)$$
on neglecting the $\Delta N_s$

$$\Delta N_\lambda = \Delta N_0 e^{-\left[\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{\tau_n} + \frac{\Gamma a N_s}{1 + \epsilon N_s} \right] - i\omega t}$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)$$

When excitation current below the threshold is injected into the laser diode, carrier concentration increases from certain initial value $n_i$ to a final value $n_f$. This change in carrier concentration has some associated rise time, $t_r$. When increase in this carrier concentration is such that rate of spontaneous emission is more than cavity loss in the active medium, based on eq. (23), photon concentration gradually increases. It should be noted that, above

it is significant to notice real part of the exponential in eq. (25). For $t > 0$, secondary peak will be attenuated with increase in the value of its real part. And it is this behavior we tune in-order to suppress secondary peak.

Here, the threshold region, electron concentration can be approximated to a constant value $n_{constant}$. And this rise time for electron concentration where photon emission initiates, can be expressed as:

$$t_r = \tau_n \ln \frac{I - qV n_i}{I - qV n_{constant}}$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)$$

where $\tau_n$ represents carrier lifetime, and eq. (33) can be interpreted as follow: if injected current is very high w.r.t the threshold, this rise time or characteristic delay in output emission theoretically approaches zero. Moreover, any residual delay, otherwise, can be adjusted by a tunable laser driver.

We have proven indistinguishability of directly modulated laser diode, we now prove: if output of such laser diodes can be realized as a (weak) coherent source? If dipole moment $d$ is written as:

$$d(t) = e(r_0 e^{i\omega t} + r_0^* e^{-i\omega t})$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)$$

where $r_0$ is the position vector associated with electron and is expressed as a real quantity, then interaction hamiltonian from eqn.(34) can be written as:

$$H_{interaction}(t) = d(t).E$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)$$

If $\kappa$ is propagation vector, $\epsilon$ as polarization modes and $V$ as quantization volume, we can write quantized transverse electric field as:

$$E_{\kappa} = i \sum_{\kappa,\epsilon} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar \omega_{\kappa}}{2 \epsilon_0 V}} (a_{\kappa,\epsilon} e^{i\kappa R} - a_{\kappa,\epsilon}^\dagger e^{-i\kappa R})$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)$$

with Hamiltonian for charge particle and free field is written as[16]:

$$H_0 = -\frac{\hbar^2}{2m_e} \nabla^2 e - \frac{\hbar^2}{2m_h} \nabla^2 R e - \frac{e^2}{|e|} + \sum_{\kappa} \hbar \omega_{\kappa} (a_{\kappa}^\dagger a_{\kappa} + \frac{1}{2})$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)$$
is also the eigenvalue equation:

$$H_0|n\rangle = E_n|n\rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)$$
so the overall Hamiltonian, considering charge particle, free field and interaction, can be written as:

\[ H_{\text{total}} = H_0 - d(t) \cdot i \sum_{\kappa, \epsilon_k} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar \omega_k}{2e_0 V}} (a_{\kappa, \epsilon_k} e^{i \epsilon_k R} - a_{\kappa, \epsilon_k}^\dagger e^{-i \epsilon_k R}) \]  

(39)

In the Dirac interpretation, Hamiltonian can then be written as:

\[ H_i(t) = e^{iH_0t/\hbar} H(t) e^{-iH_0t/\hbar} \]  

(40)

\[ H_i(t) = -d(t) \cdot i \sum_{\kappa, \epsilon_k} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar \omega_k}{2e_0 V}} (e^{iH_0t/\hbar} a_{\kappa, \epsilon_k} e^{-iH_0t/\hbar} \epsilon_k e^{i \epsilon_k R} - e^{iH_0t/\hbar} a_{\kappa, \epsilon_k}^\dagger e^{-iH_0t/\hbar} \epsilon_k e^{-i \epsilon_k R}) \]  

(41)

In interaction picture, time evolution of quantum state is obtained from time-dependent Schrodinger equation:

\[ i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\psi(t)\rangle = H(t)|\psi(0)\rangle \]  

(42)

considering vacuum state as initial state, solution to eq. (42) can be represented as:

\[ |\psi(t)\rangle = U(t, t_0)|0\rangle \]  

(43)

Due to injection current profile, Hamiltonian at time \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \) is such that \( [H(t_1), H(t_2)] \neq 0 \) then, \( U(t, t_0) \) can be expressed in terms of Dyson series as:

\[ U(t_1, t_0) = I + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{n-1}} dt_n H(t_1) H(t_2) \cdots H(t_n) \]  

(44)

From eqn. (44), it can be observed that limit of the integration determines integration variable in later instance for \( t_n \) and so on. In order to avoid this, we can re-write it in terms of product of operators as:

\[ U(t_1, t_0) = I + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_1 \int_{t_0}^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_0}^{t_{n-1}} dt_n T[H(t_1) H(t_2) \cdots H(t_n)] \]  

(45)
or,

\[ U(t_1, t_0) = Te^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{t_0}^{t_1} H(t)dt} \]  

(46)

where \( T \) is the time ordered product operator.

\[ |\psi(t)\rangle = Te^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{t_0}^{t} H(t)dt} |0\rangle \]  

(47)

and exponential term can be expressed following approach as discussed in[19]:

\[ \frac{i}{\hbar} \int_{t_0}^{t} H_i(t) dt = \sum_{\kappa, \epsilon_k} [-\alpha_k^*(t)a_k + \alpha_k(t)a_k^\dagger] \]  

(48)

where

\[ \alpha_k(t) = \frac{1}{\hbar} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar \omega_k}{2e_0 V}} \int_{t_0}^{t} dt(t)(e^{iH_0t/\hbar} a_{\kappa, \epsilon_k} e^{-iH_0t/\hbar} \epsilon_k e^{i \epsilon_k R}) \]  

(49)

from eqn. (47)-(49):

\[ |\psi_i(t)\rangle = T e^{\sum_{\kappa, \epsilon_k} [-\alpha_k^*(t)a_k + \alpha_k(t)a_k^\dagger]} |0\rangle \]  

(50)
or

\[ |\psi_i(t)\rangle = T \prod_{\kappa} e^{-\alpha_k^*(t)a_k + \alpha_k(t)a_k^\dagger} |0\rangle \]  

(51)

which can also be represented in terms of displacement operator as

\[ |\psi_i(t)\rangle = \prod_{\kappa} D_{\kappa} |0\rangle \]  

(52)

From eqn. (52), in a laser diode, displacement operation due to injection current results in multi-mode coherent state emission. Further, understanding time evolution of this vacuum state can provide insight into how stimulated emission is generated in this process. From eqn. (45), if we define the scattering matrix as:

\[ S(t', t) = U(t, 0) U^\dagger (t', 0) \]  

(53)

we can write \( S(t', t) \) as:

\[ S(t', t) = I + \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{n!} \int_{t_0}^{t} dt_1 \int_{t}^{t'} dt_2 \cdots \int_{t_{n-1}}^{t_n} dt_n T[H(t_1) H(t_2) \cdots H(t_n)] \]  

(54)

We can then define two particle Zero-temperature Green's function(or Causal Green's function):

\[ G(x_1, t_1; x_2, t_2) = -i \langle GS | a_{x_2}^\dagger(t_2) a_{x_1}^\dagger(t_1) a_{x_1}(t_1) a_{x_2}(t_2) | GS \rangle \]  

(55)

Since ground state of non-interacting Hamiltonian is calculated from Schrodinger equation, it is an eigen-state of non-interacting Hamiltonian. So, \( \langle GS \rangle \), the eigen state of overall Hamiltonian, comprising of non-interacting and interaction Hamiltonian, is then estimated using Gell-Mann and Low equation[21]:

\[ |GS\rangle = \hat{S}(0,-\infty)|0\rangle \]  

(56)
For electron-hole pair (EHP), eqn. (55) can be written in terms of creation and annihilation operator as:

$$G(x', t'; x, t) = -i\langle GS[T[a_{x'}^+(t')a_{x'}(t')a_{a}^+(t)a_{a}(t)]GS] \rangle$$

(57)

Physical interpretation of Green’s function[19] for EHP can be visualized from eqn. (57). EHP is created at time \( t' > t \). EHP then propagates through the system as resulting state is not the eigen-state of overall Hamiltonian. At \( t' \), EHP is removed from the system by annihilation operators. Writing operators in interaction picture, we can then write Green’s function in terms of S-matrix, with electron and hole momentum as \( |k| \) as:

$$G(x', t'; x, t) = -i\langle 0|T[\hat{S}(0, \infty)\hat{S}(\infty, t)a_{-k}(t')\hat{S}(t, t')a_{k}(t)]\hat{S}(t', 0)\hat{S}(0, -\infty)|0\rangle/\langle 0|\hat{S}(\infty, -\infty)|0\rangle$$

(58)

Feynman diagram for spontaneous emission can then be represented from eqn. (58) as: At time \( t \), EHP with momentum \( |k| \) annihilates at time \( t' \) to emit photon of wavelength \( \lambda \). When rate of emission builds up, photon density increases. Before a steady value of carrier density and photon density is reached, then increase in photon density results in reduction of EHP due to recombination. Further, spatial coherence of the emission is ensured by selecting the cavity such that emission wavelength is near to the spectral peak, resulting in narrow spectrum of the laser emission.

**IV. NUMERICAL SIMULATION**

In section 2, we analyzed parameter affecting relaxation oscillation in the laser diode under small signal excitation. More practically significant scenario is when the laser diode is excited by a large signal. Similar to excitation mentioned in [1], where the laser was excited using a large signal with zero pre-bias, which resulted in distinguishable signal and decay state, we can evaluate this use-case to analyze such phenomenon. Similar to discussed in [1], we apply a large step excitation to the laser diode under study. This condition was simulated by solving rate equation using Euler’s iterative method for parameters defined as:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameters</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Volume</td>
<td>1e-17 m³</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Carrier relaxation time</td>
<td>3 ns</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tangential coefficient</td>
<td>1e-11 m²/s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Confine factor</td>
<td>0.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Phot on lifetime</td>
<td>0.22 μs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Spontaneous emission factor</td>
<td>0.0001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Gain compression factor</td>
<td>1.5e-17</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Fig. 3 represents solution to rate equation using a large signal step function; Inset in carrier concentration graph zooms oscillation. If the step function is turned off at 1.5ns, the responses will resemble a pulse excitation with two peaks.

Fig. 4 represents response of the carrier and photon concentration when the laser diode is excited by large signal step function. It can be observed that photon concentration follows carrier concentration graph with some delay, as expected. Had this excitation turned off at 1.5ns, it would have resembled excitation profile described in [1]. In order for the decoy state described in [1] to be indistinguishable from the signal state, secondary peak of the signal state must cease to exist, otherwise, the decoy state, which is obtained by reducing injection current, above the threshold will have one peak, while the signal will have two peaks. Following the trend predicted by eq. (25) and eq. (32) for small signal excitation and Fig. 4 for large step excitation, we next evaluate large signal excitation when the pre-bias current into the laser diode is non-zero. Fig. 5 represents solution to rate equation under large signal excitation profile, with short duration pulse with a non-zero bias current.

We have considered two simulation models: In the first model, pre-bias current was set constant such that it is < \( I_{\text{threshold}} \) Fig. 5a. In the second model, pre-bias current was adjusted to > \( I_{\text{threshold}} \) Fig. 5b. No other simulation parameters were varied. Perturbation of du-
FIG. 5. Simulation of relaxation oscillation for different value of injection current. Fig. a represents change in carrier concentration and photon concentration when the laser diode is excited by a short duration pulse, with pre-bias current of 13mA i.e. below the threshold. Fig. b represents change in carrier concentration and photon concentration when the laser diode is excited by a short duration pulse, with pre-bias current of 20mA i.e. above the threshold. As seen from Fig. a and Fig. b, amplitude of the secondary oscillation peak decreases when pre-bias current is increased. Also, difference between the primary peak and secondary peak increases.

V. EXPERIMENT

The measurement setup, as represented in Fig. 6, comprises of a transmitter; for this we developed a tunable laser driver capable of generating dc bias superimposed on modulated injection current into a HL6748MG laser diode at room temperature. The driver can generate sub-nanosecond injection current pulse at the rate of 100KHz (rate will be improved to GHz range in next version). Selection criteria for this diode emanates from wavelength, frequency of operation, form size and cost. In our intended application, aim is to have a laser diode as cheap as possible and have minimal form factor. Measurement has been done without using a constant optical attenuator because weak photon pulses in single photon regime will approximately follow same characteristics as un-attenuated pulse. In our setup, polarization basis of photon is selected using a polarizer and half wave-plate. For receiver: we developed SAP500 APD based detector, capable of measuring photons in linear mode as well as in Geiger mode. For this measurement, the receiver was configured to operate in linear region. Injection current through the laser diode was measured using differential probe D420-A-PB with 4GHz DX20-SI tip connected to 4GHz, Lecroy 640Zi Waverunner. This interface has rise time of 122.5ps. On receiver, output of APD was interfaced to the same oscilloscope with active probe ZS2500, 2GHz bandwidth; rise time of the interface was 175ps. Additionally, considering 500ps rise/fall time of the APD, sharp peaks in the ideal waveform of period, say, 300ps, will still be observed, albeit not as sharp as reported in [1]. The laser diode in study has threshold of 18.4mA. For receiver: we developed SAP500 APD based detector, capable of measuring photons in linear mode as well as in Geiger mode. For this measurement, the receiver was configured to operate in linear region. Injection current through the laser diode was measured using differential probe D420-A-PB with 4GHz DX20-SI tip connected to 4GHz, Lecroy 640Zi Waverunner. This interface has rise time of 122.5ps. On receiver, output of APD was interfaced to the same oscilloscope with active probe ZS2500, 2GHz bandwidth; rise time of the interface was 175ps. Additionally, considering 500ps rise/fall time of the APD, sharp peaks in the ideal waveform of period, say, 300ps, will still be observed, albeit not as sharp as reported in [1]. The laser diode in study has threshold of 18.4mA. For receiver: we developed SAP500 APD based detector, capable of measuring photons in linear mode as well as in Geiger mode. For this measurement, the receiver was configured to operate in linear region. Injection current through the laser diode was measured using differential probe D420-A-PB with 4GHz DX20-SI tip connected to 4GHz, Lecroy 640Zi Waverunner. This interface has rise time of 122.5ps. On receiver, output of APD was interfaced to the same oscilloscope with active probe ZS2500, 2GHz bandwidth; rise time of the interface was 175ps. Additionally, considering 500ps rise/fall time of the APD, sharp peaks in the ideal waveform of period, say, 300ps, will still be observed, albeit not as sharp as reported in [1]. The laser diode in study has threshold of 18.4mA. For receiver: we developed SAP500 APD based detector, capable of measuring photons in linear mode as well as in Geiger mode. For this measurement, the receiver was configured to operate in linear region. Injection current through the laser diode was measured using differential probe D420-A-PB with 4GHz DX20-SI tip connected to 4GHz, Lecroy 640Zi Waverunner. This interface has rise time of 122.5ps. On receiver, output of APD was interfaced to the same oscilloscope with active probe ZS2500, 2GHz bandwidth; rise time of the interface was 175ps. Additionally, considering 500ps rise/fall time of the APD, sharp peaks in the ideal waveform of period, say, 300ps, will still be observed, albeit not as sharp as reported in [1]. The laser diode in study has threshold of 18.4mA. For receiver: we developed SAP500 APD based detector, capable of measuring photons in linear mode as well as in Geiger mode. For this measurement, the receiver was configured to operate in linear region. Injection current through the laser diode was measured using differential probe D420-A-PB with 4GHz DX20-SI tip connected to 4GHz, Lecroy 640Zi Waverunner. This interface has rise time of 122.5ps. On receiver, output of APD was interfaced to the same oscilloscope with active probe ZS2500, 2GHz bandwidth; rise time of the interface was 175ps. Additionally, considering 500ps rise/fall time of the APD, sharp peaks in the ideal waveform of period, say, 300ps, will still be observed, albeit not as sharp as reported in [1]. The laser diode in study has threshold of 18.4mA.
multi-peak laser emission due to relaxation oscillation. Fig. 8 represents variation of peak of secondary oscillation as a function of injected current (no additional electronic filter was implemented). As observed, magnitude of injected bias current and amplitude of secondary peak are inversely related. For injected bias current above threshold, amplitude of secondary peak is non-zero. On implementing an electronic filter on the laser driver, secondary peak was further reduced, as observed in Fig. 9 and amplitude of the secondary peak approaches zero for injected current of 11mA. Increase in difference between amplitude of the primary and secondary peak with biased current into the laser diode, when it approaches threshold current value, is observed in Fig. 10. This increase is attributed to the fact that increase in current injection into the laser diode reduces amplitude of the secondary peak and increases the magnitude of primary peak. Fig. 11 represents numerical simulation result for estimating variation in difference between primary and secondary peak. As expected, the difference between the peaks increases with increase in injection current. Further, Fig. 12 represents numerical simulation result of variation in amplitude of the secondary peak. As expected, secondary peak reduces with increase in injection current into the laser diode.

Fig. 14 represents output emission from the laser diode measured by APD, with laser pre-bias current of 19.3mA as seen in Fig. 13. In our measurement setup, voltage drop across APD series resistor of 500K was 10V which corresponds to 200uA of APD current. This is

FIG. 7. Differential profile across laser diode terminal. The graph has been averaged over 1500 samples

FIG. 8. Variation of oscillation peak as a function of injected dc bias current (without filters). As observed, the secondary oscillation peak is still non-zero. This secondary peak must be suppressed to zero and should approach to zero or below.

FIG. 9. Variation of oscillation peak as a function of injected dc bias current (with filters). Non-zero peak as seen in Fig. 8 is suppressed. At approximately 11mA, secondary oscillation peak approaches to zero. Further, when injection current is increased, secondary peak approaches sub-zero level.

FIG. 10. Variation of difference in peak of signal and secondary oscillation (without filters). As the injection current increases and approaches threshold level, difference between primary and secondary oscillation peak.

FIG. 11. Variation of difference in peak of signal and secondary oscillation (simulation result). As compared with Fig. 10, trend observed in the measurement result is corroborated in simulation. Difference between amplitude values for measurement and simulation can be attributed to deviation in simulation model from actual device value.

FIG. 12. Variation of difference in peak of signal and secondary oscillation (simulation).
the maximum allowed current into the APD. With sub-nanosecond peak pulse emission from the laser diode, with power 120mW. Considering overall coupling efficiency of 2.5%, with 50 ohm APD load resistor and responsivity of 14.8A/W for 672nm wavelength, expected output voltage on the oscilloscope is 555mV. So, plot in Fig.14, which represents output response from APD biased in linear region, looks reasonable.

Fig. 16 represents APD output response for the laser diode pre-bias current near to the threshold level. Comparing it with Fig. 13 light pulse profile looks similar, hence indistinguishable in shape. Side bumps observed in Fig.14 and 16 is due to parasitic on the transmitter and receiver PCB.Limited bandwidth of the APD and probes results in some positive offset instead of expected zero line at 5ns.

Another factor that can render these pulses distinguishable is the delay between signal and decoy state. As observed from eq. (33), delay between laser excitation and laser output depends on current injection. From Fig.14 and Fig. 16 relative delay between two output pulses is around 400ps. This can be attributed to difference in injection current, which in turn governs the delay between carrier density and photon emission. Further, from Fig.13 and Fig.14 it appears that absolute delay between laser excitation pulse and output of APD is in ns. This can be attributed to distance of APD from laser (3.3ns), APD response time, rise time of the probe. Further, we compared the signal state and decoy state response on APD, as shown below:

Further, we statistically evaluate distributions shown in Fig.17, using Kolmogorov-Smirnov test and estimated the p-value as 0.999664 which is greater than 0.05. So we can accept the hypothesis that both of these responses came from same distribution i.e. both of them are indistinguishable. Additionally, Fig.18 represents cumulative
FIG. 16. APD output for laser diode biased near to the threshold at 15mA bias current. Multiple oscillations are due to large inductance and appearance of double peak above the threshold is due to delay introduced by the oscilloscope probe. Profile with pre-bias current of 19.3mA (figure 6) and profile for pre-bias current of 15mA are same.

FIG. 18. Cumulative distribution function for signal and decoy state. Based on p-value=0.9996641050220288 and statistic=0.024875621890547265, it can be concluded that both signal and decoy state data belong to same distribution.

Further, we have discussed parameters that can control amplitude of secondary peak in laser relaxation oscillation and its suppression. Theoretical estimate for small signal excitation and numerical simulation for large signal excitation shows similar trend. Also, we have theoretically derived characteristics of emission from laser diode and presented the phenomenon of laser emission emanating from vacuum state. Moreover, numerical simulation for large signal excitation corroborates trend observed in experimental measurement. We have further demonstrated indistinguishability of signal and decoy state by suppressing relaxation side peaks. It was shown that tuning of pre-bias current into the laser diode results in suppression of the laser relaxation oscillation. Moreover, any residual relaxation oscillation signature in injection current profile can be further be reduced using any basic low pass filter in the laser diode driver. Results of the proposed relaxation oscillation suppression will be of interest in implementation of two photon interference and reduction in transient chirps for indistinguishability in frequency domain.

VI. CONCLUSION

We analyzed cause of distinguishability between signal and decoy state in a pump modulated laser diode. Further, we have discussed parameters that can control amplitude of secondary peak in laser relaxation oscillation and its suppression. Theoretical estimate for small signal excitation and numerical simulation for large signal excitation shows similar trend. Also, we have theoretically derived characteristics of emission from laser diode and presented the phenomenon of laser emission emanating from vacuum state. Moreover, numerical simulation for large signal excitation corroborates trend observed in experimental measurement. We have further demonstrated indistinguishability of signal and decoy state by suppressing relaxation side peaks. It was shown that tuning of pre-bias current into the laser diode results in suppression of the laser relaxation oscillation. Moreover, any residual relaxation oscillation signature in injection current profile can be further be reduced using any basic low pass filter in the laser diode driver. Results of the proposed relaxation oscillation suppression will be of interest in implementation of two photon interference and reduction in transient chirps for indistinguishability in frequency domain.
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