

Entropy of phase measurement: Quantum phase via quadrature measurement

Zdenek Hradil, Robert Myska, Tomáš Opatrný, and Jirí Bajer
Department of Optics, Palacký University
17. listopadu 50, 772 07 Olomouc, Czech Republic
()

The content of phase information of an arbitrary phase-sensitive measurement is evaluated using the maximum likelihood estimation. The phase distribution is characterized by the relative entropy (a nonlinear functional of input quantum state). As an explicit example the multiple measurement of quadrature operator is interpreted as quantum phase detection achieving the ultimate resolution predicted by the Fisher information.

There are many approaches addressing the problem of quantum phase measurement nowadays. Besides the purely theoretical phase concepts anticipating the existence of quantum phase as an observable conjugated canonically to the number (or difference number) operator, there are several operational treatments addressing the problem of phase shift measurement within the quantum mechanics. Particularly, two methods how to derive the phase information from the phase sensitive measurement of quadrature operator have been proposed recently. The former one, so called "phase (measurement) without phase (states)" was formulated by Vogel and Schleich [1]. The method is motivated by the geometrical meaning of the quadrature (and ideal phase) measurements in phase space. The quadrature eigenstates rotated by an angle are used to define a phase distribution of a single mode of the radiation field: A balanced homodyne (detection scheme measures the electric field strength (variable x) probability

$$p(x; \varphi) = \langle \hat{X}(\varphi) | \rho | \hat{X}(\varphi) \rangle \quad (1)$$

in dependence on the actual phase of local oscillator φ : This quantum detection may be interpreted as measurement of rotated quadrature operator

$$\hat{X}(\varphi) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\hat{a} e^{-i\varphi} + \hat{a}^\dagger e^{i\varphi}] \quad (2)$$

The probability of finding zero electric field plotted versus local oscillator phase

$$P(0) = \langle \hat{X} | \rho | \hat{X} \rangle = 0 \quad (3)$$

constitutes the proposed phase distribution on the interval $[0; 2\pi)$: The phase sensitive data (1) resulting from the homodyne detection have been interpreted in different

way by Beck, Smithy and Raymer [2]. Using the optical homodyne tomography method [3], the density matrix may be reconstructed and represented in the phase space. Particularly, the authors used the representation by Wigner function $W(x;p)$ and linked the phase distribution to the marginal distribution of Wigner function

$$P(\varphi) = \int_0^{2\pi} r dr W(x = r \cos \varphi; p = r \sin \varphi) \quad (4)$$

The resulting phase distribution is then periodic on the interval $[0; 2\pi)$: Nevertheless, such an approach is suffering by formal law. Since the "probability distribution" (4) yields negative values for superposition of coherent states (so called "Schrodinger cat-like states") [4], the corresponding operator measure is not positively defined. The procedure cannot be therefore interpreted as any generalized measurement [5]. To get physically reasonable interpretation, another distribution function as for example the Q -function should be used. The purpose of this Rapid Communication is to evaluate the phase information included in the phase-sensitive data using maximum likelihood estimation. The phase distribution then yields the ultimate resolution corresponding to the Fisher information. As an explicit example, the quadrature measurement is interpreted as quantum phase measurement. The proposed method deals with the observed data (1) in the optimum way.

Let us formulate the problem for an arbitrary multiple measurement of discrete phase-sensitive observable [6]. The case of quantum observable with continuous spectrum will be obtained by a straightforward limiting procedure. Assume the quantum measurement of quantum variable \hat{Y} yielding discrete spectrum y_k enumerated for brevity by a (multi) index k : The purpose of phase detection is to determine the non-random complex displacement parameter φ in the given interval entering the phase displacement transformation [5] of quantum state as $j(\varphi) = e^{i\hat{N}\varphi} j$; \hat{N} being a Hermitian operator. The variable φ represents the true value of the phase shift. The estimation on the interval $2\pi [0; 2\pi)$ will be considered for concreteness. The probability of finding the complex amplitude y_k by performing the measurement in transformed quantum state $j(\varphi)$ is given by quantum mechanics as

$$p_k(\varphi) = \langle j | e^{i\hat{N}\varphi} | y_k \rangle^2$$

Knowing all these probabilities in dependence on the induced phase shift, an unknown phase shift may be in-

ferred on the basis of multiple output data y_1, y_2, \dots, y_n : Following the approach used in the Ref. [6], the conditional phase distribution of inferring phase shift when is true, is given by the normalized likelihood function [7] as

$$P(j) = \frac{1}{C_n(j)} \prod_k p_k(j) : \quad (5)$$

The normalization is $C_n(j) = \sum_k p_k(j)$ and index k exhausts all the possible values appearing with nonzero probability. The number of samples n is assumed to be sufficiently large in order to get statistically significant sampling. The likelihood function may be expressed using the relative entropy

$$S(j) = - \sum_k p_k(j) \ln p_k(j) \quad (6)$$

as

$$P(j) / e^{nS(j)} : \quad (7)$$

The case of phase sensitive observables with continuous spectrum may be easily incorporated in this step defining the relative entropy as

$$S(j) = - \int dy p(y; j) \ln p(y; j) : \quad (8)$$

The preferred phase shift is given by the true value θ , since the relative entropy has minimum at $S(\theta = j)$ due to the Gibbs inequality [8]

$$S(j) \geq S(\theta = j) : \quad (9)$$

The estimation is biased, but may be sometimes well approximated by the Gaussian distribution with the variance predicted by the Fisher information. Using the Taylor decomposition of $\ln p_k(j)$ at the point θ the relative entropy (6) reads

$$S(j) = - \sum_k p_k(\theta) \ln p_k(\theta) - \frac{1}{2} \sum_k \frac{p_k''(\theta)}{p_k(\theta)} [j - \theta]^2 + \dots : \quad (10)$$

The prime denotes the derivative $p_k'(\theta) = dp_k(\theta)/d\theta$: The first term represents the Shannon entropy

$$S(\theta) = - \sum_k p_k(\theta) \ln p_k(\theta) ;$$

whereas the second one is the Fisher information

$$I(\theta) = \sum_k \frac{p_k''(\theta)}{p_k(\theta)} :$$

The variance of phase distribution in this approximation is simply

$$= \frac{1}{nI} :$$

Provided that the Gaussian approximation cannot be used, the phase resolution may be always evaluated using dispersion

$$D(j) = \frac{1}{n} \frac{d^2 S(j)}{dj^2} :$$

Here the averaging over the phase is performed in the specified phase interval. Dispersion depends on the true value of phase shift, in general. For sharp measurements it corresponds to the ordinary notion of variance D restricted to the finite interval [5,9].

As an explicit example assume now the quantum measurement of phase (sensitive quadrature component (2) performed for concreteness in the coherent state with the complex amplitude $\alpha = j e^{i\theta}$; $j = D(\theta)$: Here the displacement operator is $\hat{D}(\alpha) = \exp(\alpha \hat{a}^\dagger - \alpha^* \hat{a})$: The phase shift of single mode field is generated by the photon number operator $\hat{N} = \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a}$: The probability of finding the value x of rotated quadrature operator (2) may be specified for the given signal state as

$$p(x; \theta) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi}} \exp \left\{ -\frac{1}{2} [x - j \cos \theta]^2 \right\} : \quad (11)$$

where $\theta = \theta_s - \theta_o$ is the phase difference between local oscillator and signal fields. The quantum estimation problem is the following: The distribution (11) is explicitly known as a function of quadrature phase difference θ and quadrature component x : These dependencies are always experimentally measurable and for example may be scanned in advance. The particular choice of Gaussian distribution represents an easy example consistent with the assumptions of Refs. [1] and [2]. Using this knowledge, an a priori unknown fixed phase difference should be inferred as accurate as possible on the basis of limited number of measured data x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n : The straightforward application of the theory yields the relative entropy as

$$S(j, \theta) = \frac{1}{2} \ln \pi + \frac{1}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx p(x; \theta) [x - j \cos \theta]^2 : \quad (12)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \ln \pi + \frac{1}{2} + 2j^2 \cos^2 \theta ;$$

where θ is estimated (inferred) phase difference. The phase distribution inferred after n trials then reads

$$P(j, \theta) = C(j, \theta) \exp \left\{ -2nj^2 \cos^2 \theta \right\} : \quad (13)$$

where the normalization is

$$C(j, \theta) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dx \exp \left\{ -2nj^2 \cos^2 \theta \right\} = 1 :$$

Significantly, the resulting phase distribution is not shift invariant depending only on the difference θ : In general, the phase estimation is biased. It may be interpreted

using the standard definition of the normal distribution on the circle (von Mises) [9]

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2 I_0(\gamma)} \exp[\gamma \cos(x - \theta)]; \quad (14)$$

$x; \theta \in [0; 2\pi)$; which is centered at θ and characterized by the dispersion $D^2 = 1/I_1(\gamma) = I_0(\gamma)^{-2}$; $I_0(\gamma)$; $I_1(\gamma)$ being the modified Bessel functions. The phase distribution (13) may be written as the normalized product of two von Mises distributions

$$P(\varphi) / f_1(\varphi) f_2(\varphi) \quad (15)$$

centered at $\varphi_1 = 0$; $\varphi_2 = \varphi_0$: The parameters are $\gamma_1 = 4n\gamma^2 \cos^2 \varphi_0$; $\gamma_2 = n\gamma^2$:

Let us detail the phase information included in such a phase measurement. The phase distribution (13) exhibits the mirror symmetry since $P(\varphi) = P(2\varphi_0 - \varphi)$: Hence the phase measurement yields the one (peak distribution on the interval $[0; 2\pi)$ only if $\varphi_0 = 0$ or $\varphi_0 = \pi$: These two possibilities are of course distinguishable by the sign of the measured quadrature components x_i ; as the probability distribution (11) indicates. Unfortunately, the phase measurement near the points $\varphi_0 = 0$ or $\varphi_0 = \pi$ yields rather bad resolution, as will be seen in the following. In all the other cases of phase differences φ_0 , the detected phase sensitive data corresponding to the statistics (11) do not distinguish between the values φ_0 and $2\pi - \varphi_0$ and therefore neither the inferred phase distribution (13) does. This ambiguity of phase measurement may be avoided estimating the phase difference on the half-width interval $[0; \pi)$ only. Normalization should be changed to the half value in comparison to the multiplicative factor in distribution (13). The inferred phase distribution in dependence on the true phase shift is plotted in the Fig. 1 for the input coherent field with the real amplitude ($\gamma = 0$): The estimated phase shift is always localized around the true value, but in general the phase estimation is biased. The accuracy may be easily assessed for an appropriately squeezed input state characterized by the wave function analogous to (11)

$$p_{sq}(x; \varphi_0) = \frac{e^{-r}}{\pi} \exp[-e^{2r} |x - \sqrt{2} \gamma \cos \varphi_0|^2]; \quad (16)$$

r being the squeezed parameter. The value $r = 0$ corresponds to the coherent state.

The phase information is the sharpest near the point $\varphi_0 = \pi/2$: The resolution may be evaluated as

$$\Delta \varphi_0 = \pi/2 / \frac{e^{-r}}{n\gamma^2}:$$

Assuming further the optimum partition of squeezed state energy $N = \gamma^2 + \sinh^2 r$ as $e^r = 2\gamma^2$ $N=2$; the optimum resolution corresponds to the well known ultimate limit of squeezed state interferometry $\Delta \varphi_0 = \pi/N^2$: No optimization is necessary in the case of coherent

state yielding the limit of coherent state interferometry $\Delta \varphi_0 = \pi/N$: This statistical analysis well corresponds to the semiclassical (linear) approximation, when the phase resolution is predicted by the intrinsic fluctuations of the signal

$$\frac{d\langle X(\varphi_0) \rangle}{d\varphi_0} \Delta \varphi_0 = \langle X(\varphi_0) \rangle:$$

Using the distribution (16) we conclude $\langle X(\varphi_0) \rangle = \sqrt{2} \gamma \cos \varphi_0$; $\langle X(\varphi_0) \rangle = e^r = \sqrt{2}$ and therefore

$$\Delta \varphi_0 = \frac{e^{-r}}{\gamma \sin \varphi_0}:$$

Semiclassical treatment represents good estimation in the regime of the best resolution, nevertheless it fails at the points close to $\varphi_0 = 0$: Moreover, here also the Fisher information tends to zero, since the quadratic term in the relative entropy (12) disappears. The necessary assumptions concerning the existence of the Fisher information are not fulfilled and, for example, the Cramér-Rao bound is not valid [10]. Nevertheless, the analysis of the phase distribution (13) shows that the phase resolution reads

$$\Delta \varphi_0 = \frac{\pi}{\gamma \sin \varphi_0};$$

yielding considerably worse phase resolution at this point.

The block diagram of the phase detection based on the maximum likelihood estimation is sketched in the Fig. 2. Assuming the phases of the local oscillator and input coherent states as φ_0 and φ ; the balanced homodyne detection measures the statistics of the quadrature operator (2) at the point $\varphi + \varphi_0 = \pi/2$: The phase difference may be estimated using the likelihood function of measured phase sensitive data yielding the conditional phase distribution

$$P_{\text{homod}}(\varphi) / \exp[-2n\gamma^2 (\sin \varphi_0 \sin \varphi)^2]; \quad (17)$$

The predicted phase resolution is as in the Fig. 1, but shifted by the value $\pi/2$ in both the true and inferred phases. The best resolution is then achieved if $\varphi_0 = 0$: For coherent input field the phase distribution at this point reads

$$P(\varphi) / \exp(-2n\gamma^2 \sin^2 \varphi):$$

Assuming further the total energy needed for such a realization of multiple measurement as $n\gamma^2$; the phase distribution may be compared with the proposal of Vogel and Schleich [1]. The relations (3) and (11) at the phase $\varphi + \varphi_0 = \pi/2$ yield in this particular case the phase distribution predicted by the maximum likelihood estimation. Nevertheless, it need not be necessarily so in the general case of detection of an arbitrary phase shift, using an arbitrary input state or using an arbitrary phase sensitive variable. Estimation theory therefore naturally extends the "phase without phase concept".

We demonstrated that any phase(sensitive measurement may serve for statistical prediction of phase shift. The content of phase information may be evaluated using the relative entropy of the phase in dependence on the observable probabilities only. The resolution predicted by the Fisher information is achieved if it exists. The proposed method based on the maximum likelihood estimation uses the information accumulated in the process of multiple measurement in the optimum way. This treatment better suits to the experimental conditions than sophisticated phase concepts. Particularly, the phase distribution obtained in the process of measurement is rather associated with nonlinear functionals (likelihood functional, relative entropy) than with the linear ones such as the distribution functions on the phase space are (Wigner function, Q -function). Moreover, since the phase distribution in realistic experiments is biased and phase shift dependent, the detailed statistical analysis free of any a priori restricting assumptions is always necessary.

This contribution was partially supported by the internal grant of Palacky University.

Joint Laboratory of Optics, Palacky University and Czech Academy of Sciences, 17. listopadu 50, 772 07 Olomouc, Czech Republic

^y Department of Theoretical Physics, Palacky University, Svobody 26, 772 00 Olomouc, Czech Republic

- [1] W. Vogel and W. Schleich, Phys. Rev. A 44, 7642 (1991).
- [2] M. Beck, D. T. Smith, and M. G. Raymer, Phys. Rev. A 48, 890 (1993).
- [3] K. Vogel, and H. Risken, Phys. Rev. A 40, 2847 (1989).
- [4] B. M. Garraway, and P. L. Knight, Physica Scripta T 48, 66 (1993).
- [5] C. W. Helstrom, Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory (Academic Press 1974, New York) chap. 8.
- [6] Z. Hradil, Phys. Rev. A 51, 1870 (1995).
- [7] S. L. Braunstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 3598 (1992).
- [8] C. M. Caves, and P. D. Drummond, Rev. Mod. Phys. 66, 481 (1994).
- [9] R. C. Rao, Linear Statistical Inference and Its Applications (New York, Wiley, 1973).
- [10] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 3439 (1994).

FIG. 1. Phase distribution as function of inferred phase shift in dependence on the true phase shift for coherent input with total energy $n_j \hbar \omega = 100$:

FIG. 2. Scheme of homodyne detection used for phase difference measurement.



