

# **A two-component Bose-Einstein condensate can ‘bypass’ the no-cloning theorem**

**Shouvik Datta\***

*Department of Physics, Indian Institute of Science Education and Research,*

*Pune 411008, Maharashtra, India*

\*Email: shouvik@iiserpune.ac.in

## **ABSTRACT**

No-cloning theorem in quantum cryptography prevents an eavesdropper from perfectly duplicating any arbitrary quantum state. Here we argue that an experimental scheme for producing a two-component quantum superposition of Bose-Einstein condensates can, in principle, generate  $N$  bosonic clones of a single quantum state at large  $N$  thermodynamic limit and thus operationally ‘bypass’ the restrictions imposed by the above mentioned theorem. It is possible because the quantum statistical nature of this ‘cloning operation’ does not require the unitary evolution of standard quantum mechanics. On the other hand, generation of a two-component Bose-Einstein condensate helps in generating the bosonic clones with high fidelity. Such operationally executable ‘perfect’ quantum cloning machine will significantly impact existing understanding of quantum cryptography and also that of relativity, in general, by allowing superluminal signaling.

# 1. INTRODUCTION

The original no-cloning theorem [1,2] says that linearity and unitarity of quantum mechanics prevents perfect copying of an arbitrary quantum superposition state. As such various amplification schemes were proposed and reviewed [3] for cloning ‘albeit imperfectly’ [4,5] up to an optimal level. However, most reports of such ‘optimal’ cloning of photons in quantum cryptography relied on the process of duplication within the constraints of the 1st quantized Hilbert space of a closed quantum system. This is, to the best of our understanding, need not be followed exactly from an ‘operational’ perspective to execute quantum cloning involving a series of intermediate quantum statistical mechanical processes evolving towards an open quantum system. We will show that the fidelity and coherence of the final quantum state with respect to the initial quantum state can, however, be preserved by ensuring equal amplifications of both quantum channels (polarizations) and by using Bose-Einstein condensate (BEC) having identical bosonic clones.

To elaborate further, here we take the example of quantum superposition state of a two-component BEC [6] and extend that to excitons or electron-hole pairs to execute such quantum cloning using optical interferometry. Here, we are not violating any linearity, unitarity of 1st quantized formalism of norm preserving Hilbert space while executing the quantum cloning using the creation of a quantum statistical object like an excitonic BEC. It is mainly because the ‘quantum copier’ which process the cloning mechanism by generating the two-component BEC will be ‘operationally’ mapped from the 1st quantized state of incoming photon (e.g a closed quantum system) to a 2nd quantized Fock space or many-body Hilbert space of BEC where creations and destructions of particles (excitons) are allowed through a sequence of transitions to an open quantum system mediated by amplification of individual polarizations and subsequently




Fig. 1. Schematic of the quantum cloning process using a two-component exciton based Bose-Einstein condensate. We purposely desist from knowing/tracking any time resolved individual outcome(s) of the beam splitting, reflections from the mirrors as well as that of the amplification processes. We treat the whole system as a black box till the two-component exciton BEC emits those cloned photons in a phase coherent way. This is necessary so that we do not disturb the phase coherence between the vertical  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and horizontal  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  polarizations by the process of measurements.

by the formation of a two component BEC via Josephson like interactions [6] as prescribed in the past for atomic BECs. We will show that such two-component BEC [6] can then be used along with usual and allowed amplifications of individual polarization states and an interferometer to ‘bypass’ the no-cloning theorem and thereby successfully clone any arbitrary quantum superposition state. The whole ‘operational’ process of cloning can then happen by stepping

outside the stringent theoretical framework of ‘unitary’ evolutions of single particle quantum mechanics in the first place, which is the all-important basis for the well-known no-cloning theorem [1,2].

## 2. EXPERIMENTAL PROPOSAL

The schematic of this quantum mechanical cloning machine (QCM) is described in Fig. 1. We assume that the incoming photon is linearly polarized such that the resultant polarization vector is in an unknown quantum superposition state

$$|\varphi\rangle = \alpha|\uparrow\rangle + \beta|\rightarrow\rangle \quad (1)$$

where  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are complex numbers. The states  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  are vertical and horizontal polarizations respectively and form an orthonormal, complete basis in Hilbert space of those two states. The net polarization of state  $|\varphi\rangle$  is at an unknown angle  $\theta$  with respect to the vertical axis. In actual experimental realization, one may also use a superposition of left and right circularly polarized light instead of  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and  $|\rightarrow\rangle$ . Please note that the choice of  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  as basis states here is merely to bring notational similarity with original no-cloning literatures in quantum cryptography.

Operationally speaking, one can design the QCM in the following manner as shown in Fig.

1. First – (a) a polarizing beam splitter can separate the respective vertical  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and horizontal  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  polarizations of the incoming photon. Although, it was argued in the no cloning literature that there exists no QCM which can perfectly amplify an arbitrary superposition of polarization states. However, it is always recognized [1,7] that those same arguments do not actually rule out the possibility of having some devices which can separately amplify two different polarization states  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and  $|\rightarrow\rangle$ . Therefore, one can first split these orthogonal polarizations and then one – (b) can amplify the weak signals of  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  separately. Any standard polarization dependent and/or

even polarization insensitive amplifications can be used with either electrically or optically driven gain mediums. For example, one can use phase sensitive amplification processes using degenerate parametric amplifier with a strong pump beam such that  $\omega_{signal} = \omega_{idler} = \frac{\omega_{pump}}{2} = \omega$ . Finally, one can - (c) allow these two amplified beams to interfere on a cloning device ‘D’ without any additional phase lag introduced between the two arms of the interferometer. The final stage of this QCM is the device ‘D’ which can be made of any light sensitive excitonic material/structure having high quantum yields of optical absorption ( $\eta$ ) in the first place. Specifically, if we are using ‘D’ which can generate excitons using linear optical absorption of light and if all of those excitons can be driven to a two-component BEC, then we will be able to create a quantum superposition of this two-component excitonic BEC along with some additional interactions [6].

It is to be strictly noted here that one cannot detect and/or track these photon(s) during the beam splitting, amplification and final interference process in the excitonic device ‘D’. As a result, we will not be destroying the quantum phase coherence of vertical  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and horizontal  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  polarization states of the incoming photon by excluding these measurement induced direct disturbances to the quantum state.

Overall, the choice of the physical process of amplification of both channels need not have any ramifications for the cloning procedures in general. Such amplifications of (say) 1 to N photons will only be required to generate sufficiently large enough numbers of photons to drive the excitonic BEC in this cloning device ‘D’. One may also plan to use degenerate parametric amplification technique using non-linear optics to preserve the phase as a parameter of the incoming photon with respect to a known pump beam as mentioned above. Presence of any spontaneous emission won’t really matter in the process subsequent to these amplifications. In fact, because the photons are bosons themselves, such phase preserving amplification of vertical

$|\uparrow\rangle$  or horizontal  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  polarization in both channels of the interferometer and then their subsequent interference via bosonic symmetrization is always possible and will be described below.

We are also assuming that each photon incident on ‘D’ will generate one exciton in the device ‘D’ through linear optical absorption processes. Initially, excitons photo generated with vertical  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and horizontal  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  polarizations can be driven to separate BECs having the respective quantum ground states as  $|\psi_{\uparrow}\rangle$  and  $|\psi_{\rightarrow}\rangle$ . Then another light source can be tuned in to generate ‘Josephson’ like coupling between  $|\psi_{\uparrow}\rangle$  and  $|\psi_{\rightarrow}\rangle$  to form a two-component BEC exactly in a way described <sup>6</sup> in the past. Tuning of Josephson like coupling can drive these two sets of excitons into two separate BECs having ground states  $|\psi_{\uparrow}\rangle$  and  $|\psi_{\rightarrow}\rangle$ . This will prevent any phase randomization during the formative stages of these two BECs. The material/structure of the cloning device ‘D’ must also be sensitive for such spin/polarization selective optical transitions as well as allow for coherent interactions between these two excitonic states of  $|\psi_{\uparrow}\rangle$  and  $|\psi_{\rightarrow}\rangle$ .

### 3. RESULTS

Consequently, the resultant one particle ground state of this two-component BEC will then look like

$$|\psi_1\rangle = \alpha'|\psi_{\uparrow}\rangle + \beta'|\psi_{\rightarrow}\rangle \quad (2)$$

where coefficients are  $\alpha' = \eta\alpha$  and  $\beta' = \eta\beta$  respectively. We are only assuming that the common amplification factor  $\eta$  can be kept same for both polarization channels. Bosonic symmetrization of photons, excitons along with the phase sensitive amplification processes described above for vertical  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and horizontal  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  polarizations can ensure that  $|\psi_1\rangle$  is  $= \alpha'|\psi_{\uparrow}\rangle + \beta'|\psi_{\rightarrow}\rangle$  along with  $(\alpha')^2 + (\beta')^2 = 1$  as the single particle normalization factor. Correspondingly, under the mean field approximation, if ‘N’ such excitons can be produced in the cloning device ‘D’ with N

amplified photons having either vertical  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and horizontal  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  polarization and then tuned with additional Josephson like interactions to form a two-component BEC ground state of N excitons as prescribed [6], then one gets the final state of two-component excitonic BEC as (similar to that described by Eq. 7 of Ref. 6 in the context of cold atoms)

$$|\psi_{2\text{-component-BEC}}\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_1\rangle \dots \otimes |\psi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}} [\alpha' a^\dagger + \beta' b^\dagger]^N |0\rangle \quad (3)$$

where  $|0\rangle$  is the vacuum state of the two-component quantum superposition of excitonic BEC states and  $a^\dagger, b^\dagger$  are creation operators of excitons in  $|\psi_\uparrow\rangle$  &  $|\psi_\rightarrow\rangle$  BEC states respectively and  $(\alpha_N)^2 + (\beta_N)^2 = N$  where  $\alpha_N = \sqrt{N}\alpha', \beta_N = \sqrt{N}\beta'$  for respective polarizations. It is assuming that each incoming photon having either vertical  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and horizontal  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  polarizations produce only and only one exciton in the device D. Most importantly, the fidelity can be maintained by ensuring that the population of excitons in each excitonic BECs are proportional to  $|\alpha'|^2 = |\eta\alpha|^2$  and  $|\beta'|^2 = |\eta\beta|^2$  respectively. Then this normalization factor at the large N thermodynamic limit will, in general, always produce [8,9] this particular quantum state  $|\psi_{2\text{-component-BEC}}\rangle$ . Detailed theoretical calculations to yield this final state of  $|\psi_{2\text{-component-BEC}}\rangle$  were already reported [8,9] in a different context for condensation of Helium-3 as well. Therefore, here we refrain from writing down the same equations already elaborated in these past reports [6,8,9] as well as for sake of keeping a much wider generality in our quantum cloning procedure using a such a two-component BEC at this stage. As described in the past, this final quantum state  $|\psi_{2\text{-component-BEC}}\rangle$  can be the harmonic oscillator like ground state of this two-component BEC of N excitons as direct product of identical  $|\psi_1\rangle = \alpha'|\psi_\uparrow\rangle + \beta'|\psi_\rightarrow\rangle$  as single particle excitonic excitations which are tuned via Josephson like coupling. The relative phase fluctuations of the  $|\psi_{2\text{-component-BEC}}\rangle$  will decrease as  $N^{-\frac{1}{2}}$  [8,9] and will be practically negligible at the large N thermodynamic limit to

generate this quantum  $|\psi_{2\text{-component-BEC}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}}[\alpha'a^\dagger + \beta'b^\dagger]^N|0\rangle$  having a well-defined phase similar to the incoming photon with  $|\varphi\rangle$ .

At this stage, the linearity of optical absorption process in the excitonic cloning device ‘D’ is, however, important. This will be required to prevent the generation of any higher order, multi particle superposition such as  $[|\psi_{\uparrow\uparrow}\rangle + |\psi_{\rightarrow}\rangle]$  etc., which can form if the interference of amplified vertical  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and horizontal  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  polarizations is not being mediated using a BEC having bosonic clones. So the use of an exciton BEC mediated generation of  $|\psi_1\rangle = \alpha'|\psi_{\uparrow}\rangle + \beta'|\psi_{\rightarrow}\rangle$  will be crucial here as compared to the result of any linear or non-linear optical interference taking place in a detector. This is because superposition states like  $[|\psi_{\uparrow}\rangle + |\psi_{\rightarrow}\rangle]$  and  $[|\psi_{\uparrow\uparrow}\rangle + |\psi_{\rightarrow}\rangle]$  etc., as a result of any interference of phase preserved, amplified photons are qualitatively different from states  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{N!}}[\alpha'a^\dagger + \beta'b^\dagger]^N|0\rangle$  which is required for the universal cloning operations using such two-component BEC [6].

Finally, we expect that M of these excitons in identical quantum state of  $|\psi_1\rangle = \alpha'|\psi_{\uparrow}\rangle + \beta'|\psi_{\rightarrow}\rangle$  within that two-component BEC ground state will radiatively decay in to photons having vertical  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and horizontal  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  polarizations. This is because, photons emitted through the recombination of all these excitons in the BEC ground state will be spontaneously coherent by themselves. However, such emissions can also happen via polarization conserving stimulated emissions with quantum efficiency ( $\xi$ ). One may also use an additional optical cavity to trigger these stimulated emissions as well. Thereafter, we finally recover the initial quantum superposition state  $|\varphi\rangle = \alpha|\uparrow\rangle + \beta|\rightarrow\rangle$  of the incoming photon from this two-component quantum superposition of excitonic BEC states as

$$|\psi_{\text{cloned}}\rangle = |\varphi\rangle \otimes |\varphi\rangle \otimes |\varphi\rangle \dots \otimes |\varphi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{M!}}[\alpha''c^\dagger + \beta''d^\dagger]^M|0\rangle \quad (4)$$



where  $c^\dagger, d^\dagger$  are creation operators of photons in  $|\uparrow\rangle$  &  $|\rightarrow\rangle$  states respectively and generated from the two-component BEC as defined in Eq. 3 and  $\alpha_{M'} = \sqrt{M} \alpha'' = \sqrt{M} \xi \alpha' = \sqrt{M} \xi \eta \alpha = C \alpha$  and  $\beta_{M'} = \sqrt{M} \beta'' = \sqrt{M} \xi \beta' = \sqrt{M} \xi \eta \beta = C \beta$  such that  $(\alpha_{M'})^2 + (\beta_{M'})^2 = M$  and  $C = \sqrt{M} \xi \eta$  where  $C$  is the experimentally determined constant factor. As a result, apart from a different normalization factor due to non-ideal quantum yields of the optical absorption and emission at the cloning device ‘D’, one can, in principle, duplicate any incoming pure state in arbitrary quantum superposition like  $|\varphi\rangle = \alpha|\uparrow\rangle + \beta|\rightarrow\rangle$  as

$$|\psi_{cloned}\rangle \equiv |\varphi\rangle \otimes |\varphi\rangle \otimes |\varphi\rangle \dots \otimes |\varphi\rangle = \frac{(\xi\eta)^M}{\sqrt{M!}} [\alpha c^\dagger + \beta d^\dagger]^M |0\rangle \quad (5)$$

Obviously, in practice, there will also be some Stokes shifts and the energy of the emitted photons can be red shifted from those of the absorbed one in the excitonic device ‘D’. However, a prior knowledge of the photon energy of the incoming signal being used for communication can be helpful to up-convert the energies of amplified photons suitably with respect to the incoming one. This up-conversion for energy matching is in no way going to affect the overall quantum cloning process of the incoming arbitrary superposition state as described above.

#### 4. DISCUSSIONS

Such quantum duplication scheme is possible because bosons within a BEC are quantum clones of each other in the first place. The process of generating photo generated excitons (bosons) to a macroscopically large two-component BEC state and subsequently their radiative recombinations are certainly not any norm conserving unitary process within 1st quantization. Therefore, in this proposed QCM, we are not violating the no-cloning theorem but just ‘bypassing’ it to make quantum clones of any arbitrary superposition of quantum states. We are using a series

of open, quantum statistical interactions of generating a two-component BEC. This is possible once the individual polarization modes can be first separated, then amplified in a phase coherent way and eventually interfered without any phase lag to generate the quantum superposition state of a two-component BEC [6, 8, 9] via bosonic symmetrization and Josephson like interactions. We also argued how this scheme of mapping an arbitrary quantum superposition on to a two-component BEC can prevent unwanted multi-particle superposition(s) and produce quantum cloning of photons through this generation and re-emission processes mediated by a two-component excitonic BEC. Moreover, one can also extend this scheme beyond such photo generated excitonic ensembles to any other two-component BEC systems including polaritons, photons and even to atomic systems as well. Moreover, the relative error of generating the  $|\psi_{2\text{-component-BEC}}\rangle$  state as shown in Eq. 3 will be practically vanish at the large N thermodynamic limit. Therefore, having abundantly many bosonic clones of BEC can increase the cloning fidelity and reduce errors for a perfect cloning to an insignificant level by producing a large number of clones.

The security of quantum cryptography can still be recovered by ‘operationally’ moving from a simple ‘qubit’ like 2-level quantum system to a quantum system having large and unknown ‘d’ dimensional ‘qudits’ or even to an infinite dimensional continuum basis states to transfer information. This can make the process of identifying a suitable material system to execute a well-defined d-component BEC mediated QCM enormously complicated, if not impossible for large, unknown and possibly a randomly variable ‘d’ for successive usages. Such qudit based quantum processors [10, 11] and communication [12] devices are certainly being developed in the recent past.

## 5. CONCLUSIONS

Finally, formation a two-component BEC is not a norm conserving, linear process restricted within the domain of 1st quantized Hilbert space but belongs to the domain of quantum statistical mechanics of interactive, open quantum system. Thus generating bosonic clones using BEC ground state is a suitable medium for operational execution of ‘perfect’ cloning of any arbitrary quantum state.

Moreover, perfect cloning is also a sufficient condition for allowing communication of information between space-like separated points using entanglement. Therefore, by that same token, such possibilities of ‘perfect’ quantum cloning of any maximally entangled state of photon, which are ‘not’ limited [13, 14] by the constraints of the linearity, unitarity and completeness of the 1st quantized wave functions of Hilbert space, may no longer prohibit superluminal [15,16], EPR [17] like signal communications using the above mentioned scheme involving 2nd quantized state of field operators intermediated via the formation of a two-component BEC.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

The author acknowledges the Department of Science and Technology (DST), India (Grants # DIA/2018/000029, CRG/2019/000412) for supports.

---

## REFERENCES

- [1] W. K. Wothers and W. H Zurek, A single quantum cannot be cloned. *Nature* **299**, 802 (1982).
- [2] W. K. Wothers and W. H. Zurek, The no-cloning theorem. *Physics Today* **62**, 76 (2009).
- [3] N. J. Cerf and J. Fiurasek, Optical Quantum Cloning. *J. Progress in Optics* **49**, 455, Edited by E. Wolf (Elsevier) (2006).
- [4] V. Buzek and M. Hillery, Quantum copying: Beyond the no-cloning theorem. *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1844 (1996).
- [5] V. Scarani, S. Iblisdir, N. Gisin and A. Acín, A. Quantum cloning. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77**, 1225 (2005).

- 
- [6] J. I. Cirac, M. Lewenstein, K. Mølmer and P. Zoller, . Quantum superposition states of Bose-Einstein condensates. *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 1208 (1998).
- [7] L. Mandel, Is a photon amplifier always polarization dependent? *Nature* **304**, 188 (1983).
- [8] A. J. Leggett, Broken Gauge Symmetry in a Bose Condensate, in *Bose-Einstein Condensation* edited by A. Griffin, D. W. Snoke and S. Stringari, Cambridge University Press, 1995.
- [9] A. J. Leggett and F. Sols, On the concept of spontaneously broken gauge symmetry in condensed matter physics. *Found. Phys.* **21**, 353 (1991).
- [10] Y. Chi, Y. et. al. A programmable qudit-based quantum processor. *Nat. Comm.* **13**, 1166 (2022).
- [11] Y. Wang, Z. Hu, B. C. Sanders and S. Kais, Qudits and High-Dimensional Quantum Computing. *Front. Phys.* **8**, 589504 (2020).
- [12] D. Cozzolino, B. D. Lio, D. Bacco and L. K. Oxenløwe, High-Dimensional Quantum Communication: Benefits, Progress, and Future Challenges. *Adv. Quantum Technol.* **2**, 1900038 (2019).
- [13] D. Bruss, G. M. D'Ariano, C. Macchiavello and M. F. Sacchi, Approximate quantum cloning and the impossibility of superluminal information transfer. *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062302 (2000).
- [14] C. Simon, V. Bužek and N. Gisin, The no-signaling condition and quantum dynamics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 170405 (2001).
- [15] N. Herbert, A superluminal communicator based upon a new kind of quantum measurement. *Found. Phys.* **12**, 1171 (1982).
- [16] D. Dieks, Communication by EPR devices. *Phys. Lett. A* **92**, 271 (1982).
- [17] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky and N. Rosen, Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete? *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 777 (1935).