

Im provem ent of m easurem ent accuracy in $SU(1,1)$ interferom eters

C .B rif and Y .Ben-A ryeh

D epartm ent of Physics, Technion { Israel Institute of Technology, Haifa 32000, Israel

published in Quantum & Sem iclassical Optics 8, 1 (1996)

A bstract

W e consider an $SU(1,1)$ interferom eter employing four-wave m ixers that is fed with two-m ode states which are both coherent and intelligent states of the $SU(1,1)$ Lie group. It is shown that the phase sensitivity of the interferom eter can be essentially im proved by using input states with a large photon-num ber di fference between the m odes.

The im provem ent of m easurem ent accuracy in interferom eters is of signi cant im portance in m odern experim ental physics. Much work has been done on the reduction of the quantum noise in interferom eters by using input light elds prepared in nonclassical photon states. It was pointed out by Caves [1] and Bondurant and Shapiro [2] that the quantum uctuations can be dim inished by feeding squeezed states of light into the interferom eter. The interferom eters considered in [1, 2] employ passive lossless devices, such as beam splitters. Yurke, M cCall and Klauder [3] showed that such interferom eters can be characterized by the $SU(2)$ group. They also introduced a class of interferom eters which employ active lossless devices, such as four-wave m ixers, and are characterized by the $SU(1,1)$ group. It was shown [3] that the use of squeezed light in $SU(2)$ interferom eters can yield a phase sensitivity $1=N$ (where N is the total num ber of photons passing through the interferom eter), while $SU(1,1)$ interferom eters can achieve a phase sensitivity of $1=N$ with only vacuum uctuations entering the input ports.

In the present work we study the possibility to im prove further the accuracy of $SU(1,1)$ interferom eters by using specially prepared states (other than vacuum). W e apply the idea of Hillery and Mlodinow [4] who proposed to use intelligent states (IS) [5] for im proving the phase sensitivity of interferom eters. They analysed [4] the case of $SU(2)$ IS. Since we discuss here interferom eters characterized by $SU(1,1)$, it is natural to use IS of this group [6, 7, 8]. There is a problem of generating IS since, in general, they are constructed by nonunitary operators [5, 6]. However, there are some IS which sim ultaneously are generalized coherent states (CS) [9, 10] of the corresponding Lie group, i.e., an intersection occurs between these two types of states [6]. This intersection is of special im portance in physics because IS that also are CS can be created by Hamiltonians for which a given Lie group is the dynam ical sym m etry group. Recently we developed [7] a general group-theoretical approach to $SU(1,1)$ IS by representing them in the corresponding coherent-state basis. This approach yields the m ost full characterization of the coherent-intelligent intersection. The above results will be used in the present work for analysing $SU(1,1)$ interferom eters fed with states which are both IS and CS of the $SU(1,1)$ Lie group.

An $SU(1,1)$ interferom eter is described schem atically in gure 1. Two light beam s represented by m ode annihilation operators a_1 and a_2 enter into the input ports of the rst four-wave m ixer FW M 1. A fter leaving FW M 1, beam s accumulate phase shifts ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , respectively, and then they enter

E-m ail: costya@ physics.technion.ac.il

the second four-wave mixer FWM 2. The photons leaving the interferometer are counted by detectors D1 and D2.

For the analysis of such an interferometer it is convenient to consider the Hermitian operators

$$K_1 = \frac{1}{2}(a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger + a_1 a_2); \quad K_2 = \frac{1}{2i}(a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger - a_1 a_2); \quad K_3 = \frac{1}{2}(a_1^\dagger a_1 + a_2 a_2^\dagger); \quad (1)$$

These operators form the two-mode boson realization of the SU(1,1) Lie algebra:

$$[K_1, K_2] = iK_3; \quad [K_2, K_3] = iK_1; \quad [K_3, K_1] = iK_2; \quad (2)$$

It is also useful to introduce raising and lowering operators

$$K_+ = K_1 + iK_2 = a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger; \quad K_- = K_1 - iK_2 = a_1 a_2; \quad (3)$$

The Casimir operator

$$K^2 = K_3^2 - K_1^2 - K_2^2 \quad (4)$$

for any unitary irreducible representation is the identity operator times a number:

$$K^2 = k(k-1)I; \quad (5)$$

Thus a representation of SU(1,1) is determined by a single number k that is called Bargmann index. For the discrete-series representations [11] the Bargmann index acquires discrete values $k = \frac{1}{2}; 1; \frac{3}{2}; 2; \dots$. By using the operators (1), one gets

$$K^2 = \frac{1}{4}(a_1^\dagger a_1 - a_2^\dagger a_2)^2 - \frac{1}{4}; \quad (6)$$

The photon-number difference between the modes $n_0 = \frac{1}{2}(a_1^\dagger a_1 - a_2^\dagger a_2)$ is a constant (chosen to be positive) for each irreducible representation and it is related to the Bargmann index via $k = \frac{1}{2}(n_0 + 1)$. The corresponding state space is spanned by the complete orthonormal basis $|j; n\rangle$ ($n = 0; 1; 2; \dots$) that can be expressed in terms of Fock states of two modes:

$$|j; n\rangle = |j + n_0; n_1; n_2\rangle; \quad (7)$$

The actions of the interferometer elements on the vector $K = (K_1; K_2; K_3)$ can be represented as Lorentz boosts and rotations in the (2+1)-dimensional space-time [3]. FWM 1 acts on K as a Lorentz boost with the transformation matrix

$$L(\beta) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ \beta & 0 & \cosh \beta & \sinh \beta \\ 0 & 0 & \sinh \beta & \cosh \beta \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix}; \quad (8)$$

The transformation matrix of FWM 2 is $L(-\beta)$, i.e., two four-wave mixers perform boosts in opposite directions. Phase shifters rotate K about the 3rd axis by an angle $\alpha = \alpha_1 + \alpha_2$. The transformation matrix of this rotation is

$$R(\alpha) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cos \alpha & \sin \alpha & 0 \\ \beta & \sin \alpha & \cos \alpha & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} B \\ C \\ A \end{pmatrix}; \quad (9)$$

The overall transformation performed on K is

$$K_{\text{out}} = L(-\beta)R(\alpha)L(\beta)K; \quad (10)$$

The information on α is inferred from the photon statistics of the output beams. One should measure the total number of photons in the two output modes, N_{out} , or, equivalently, the operator $K_{3out} = \frac{1}{2}(N_{out} + 1)$. The mean-square fluctuation in α due to the photon statistics is given by [3]

$$(\Delta\alpha)^2 = \frac{(K_{3out})^2}{\langle K_{3out} \rangle^2} : \quad (11)$$

From Eq. (10), we find

$$K_{3out} = (\sinh \alpha \sin \theta) K_1 + \sinh \alpha \cosh \alpha (\cos \theta - 1) K_2 + (\cosh^2 \alpha - \sinh^2 \alpha \cos \theta) K_3 : \quad (12)$$

If only vacuum fluctuations enter the input ports, then Eq. (11) with K_{3out} of form (12) reduces to the known result [3]

$$(\Delta\alpha)^2 = \frac{\sin^2 \theta + \cosh^2 \alpha (1 - \cos \theta)^2}{\sin^2 \theta - \sinh^2 \alpha} : \quad (13)$$

For $\theta = 0$ the $(\Delta\alpha)^2$ is minimized, $(\Delta\alpha)^2 = 1/\sinh^2 \alpha$.

We would like to investigate a more general case when the interferometer is fed with an SU(1,1) intelligent state. The motivation for using IS is as follows. By putting $\theta = 0$, we can simplify Eq. (11) with K_{3out} given by (12) to the form

$$(\Delta\alpha)^2 = \frac{(K_3)^2}{\sinh^2 \alpha \langle K_1 \rangle^2} : \quad (14)$$

The commutation relation $[K_2, K_3] = iK_1$ implies the uncertainty relation

$$(K_2)^2 (K_3)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4} \langle K_1 \rangle^2 : \quad (15)$$

Therefore,

$$(\Delta\alpha)^2 \geq \frac{1}{4 \sinh^2 \alpha (K_2)^2} : \quad (16)$$

For IS an equality is achieved in the uncertainty relation. Such K_2 - K_3 IS with large values of K_2 would allow us to measure small changes in α . For these states Eq. (16) reads

$$(\Delta\alpha)^2 = \frac{1}{4 \sinh^2 \alpha (K_2)^2} : \quad (17)$$

The K_2 - K_3 IS $|j, i_{23}\rangle$ are determined from the eigenvalue equation

$$(K_2 + i K_3) |j, i_{23}\rangle = \lambda |j, i_{23}\rangle ; \quad (18)$$

where λ is a complex eigenvalue and $\lambda = \lambda_r + i \lambda_i$ is a real parameter given by

$$\lambda_r = K_2 = K_3 : \quad (19)$$

For $\lambda_i > 1$ IS are squeezed in K_3 and for $\lambda_i < 1$ IS are squeezed in K_2 .

In order to be able to create IS, we must choose states which lie in the intersection of the SU(1,1) intelligent and coherent states. The generalized SU(1,1) CS were introduced by Pereboom [9]:

$$\begin{aligned} |k; i\rangle &= \exp(K_+ - K_-) |k; 0\rangle \\ &= (1 - \lambda^2)^k \exp(K_+) |k; 0\rangle \\ &= (1 - \lambda^2)^k \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(n+2k)^{1/2}}{n! (2k)!} \lambda^n |k; n\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Here $\alpha = (j-j)\tanh j$, so $j-j < 1$. In the case of the two-mode boson realization the SU (1,1) CS can be recognized as well-known two-mode squeezed states with α being a squeezing parameter [6]. Any intelligent state can be represented in the coherent-state basis [7]. By using this analytic representation, we can find that a K_2 - K_3 intelligent state is also coherent when its eigenvalue is [7]

$$= \frac{q}{ik^2 + 1}: \quad (21)$$

The corresponding coherent-state amplitude α is real:

$$= \frac{1}{p \frac{1}{k^2 + 1}}: \quad (22)$$

The condition $j-j < 1$ is satisfied if $\alpha > 0$ for upper sign and $\alpha < 0$ for lower sign. Squeezing in K_3 ($j-j > 1$) corresponds to values $j-j < 0.414$.

By using the definition (20) of the SU (1,1) CS, one can easily calculate the variance of K_2 [6]

$$(K_2)^2 = \frac{k(1 + j-j)^2}{2(1 - j-j)^2}: \quad (23)$$

For a coherent-intelligent state, α is real, so we obtain $(K_2)^2 = k=2$. Other expectation values over j ; i are

$$(K_3)^2 = \frac{2kj-j}{(1 - j-j)^2}; \quad (24)$$

$$\langle K_1 \rangle = \frac{2k\text{Re}}{1 - j-j}: \quad (25)$$

Then it is straightforward to check that an equality is achieved in the uncertainty relation (15) provided that expectation values are calculated over an SU (1,1) coherent state with real α . It is seen that the states that belong to the coherent-intelligent intersection lead to the best measurement accuracy among all the SU (1,1) CS. The mean-square fluctuation in α given by Eq. (17) is, for the interferometer fed with an SU (1,1) coherent-intelligent state,

$$(\alpha)^2 = \frac{1}{2k \sinh^2}: \quad (26)$$

We see that the phase sensitivity is independent of the value of squeezing represented by α . It depends only on parameter k of the four-wave mixer and on the photon-number difference between the two input modes ($n_0 = 2k - 1$). Therefore, α can be taken to be zero, i.e., one can choose an input state with a fixed number of photons in the one mode and the vacuum in the other. The value of α is restricted by properties of available four-wave mixers. We see from Eq. (26) that for a given value of

the phase sensitivity of the SU (1,1) interferometers can be essentially improved by choosing input states with large values of the photon-number difference between the two modes. When $n_0 = 0$ (in particular, when the vacuum enters both input ports), the phase fluctuations come to the known value $(\alpha)^2 = 1/\sinh^2$.

It is usual to examine the interferometer efficiency by expressing the phase sensitivity in terms of the total number N of photons passing through the phase shifters. In the case of the interferometer considered here, N is the total number of photons emitted by FWM1:

$$N = 2\langle K_3 \rangle; \quad (27)$$

where $K^0 = L(\alpha)K$, so $K_3^0 = (\cosh \alpha)K_3 - (\sinh \alpha)K_2$. By calculating the expectation value over a coherent-intelligent state, we obtain

$$N = 2k \frac{1 + \alpha^2}{1 - \alpha^2} \cosh \alpha: \quad (28)$$

Solving this equation for \sinh^2 we finally find

$$(\delta)^2 = \frac{1}{2k} \left(4 - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{2}{N+1}} \right) \frac{1}{2k} \quad (29)$$

We see that the phase sensitivity approaches $1/N$. The best interferometer efficiency is achieved for $\delta = 0$ and $n_0 = 0$ ($k = 1/2$). Then one gets the result for the vacuum input¹ [3]:

$$(\delta)^2 = \frac{1}{N(N+2)} \quad (30)$$

For a given N , $(\delta)^2$ is optimized by taking the vacuum in both input modes. However, for a given value of δ (dictated by practical considerations), the phase sensitivity is improved by choosing input modes with a large photon-number difference between them.

References

- [1] Caves C M 1981 Phys. Rev. D 23 1693
- [2] Bondurant R S and Shapiro J H 1984 Phys. Rev. D 30 2548
- [3] Yurke B, McCall S L and Klauder J R 1986 Phys. Rev. A 33 4033
- [4] Hillery M and Mlodinow L 1993 Phys. Rev. A 48 1548
- [5] Aragone C, Guerri G, Salam o S and Tani J L 1974 J. Phys. A 7 L149
Aragone C, Chabaud E and Salam o S 1976 J. Math. Phys. 17 1963
Ruschin S and Ben-Aryeh Y 1976 Phys. Lett. A 58 207
- [6] Wodkiewicz K and Eberly J H 1985 J. Opt. Soc. Am. B 2 458
- [7] Brif C and Ben-Aryeh Y 1994 J. Phys. A 27 8185
- [8] Gerry C C and Grobe R 1995 Phys. Rev. A 51 4123
- [9] Pereboomov A M 1972 Commun. Math. Phys. 26 222; 1986 Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications (Berlin: Springer)
- [10] Zhang W M, Feng D H and Gilmore R 1990 Rev. Mod. Phys. 62 867
- [11] Bargmann V 1947 Ann. Math. 48 568

Figure captions

Figure 1: An SU(1,1) interferometer. Two light modes a_1 and a_2 are mixed by four-wave mixer FW M 1, accumulate phase shifts ϕ_1 and ϕ_2 , respectively, and then they are again mixed by four-wave mixer FW M 2. The photons in output modes are counted by detectors D 1 and D 2.

¹Please note a minor difference between this result and equation (9.31) of Ref. [3] where ' δ ' is erroneously printed instead of ' δ^2 '.