

Preprint INRNE TH 96/6 (April 1996)  
quant-ph/9609017

# SCHRODINGER INTELLIGENT STATES AND LINEAR AND QUADRATIC AMPLITUDE SQUEEZING

D. A. Trifonov  
Institute of Nuclear Research,  
72 Tzarigradsko Chaussee,  
1784 Sofia, Bulgaria

## Abstract

A complete set of solutions  $|\psi; u; v\rangle_{sa}$  of the eigenvalue equation  $(ua^2 + va^{\dagger 2})|\psi; u; v\rangle = z|\psi; u; v\rangle$  ( $[a, a^\dagger] = 1$ ) are constructed and discussed. These and only these states minimize the Schrodinger uncertainty inequality for the squared amplitude (s.a.) quadratures. Some general properties of Schrodinger intelligent states (SIS)  $|\psi; u; v\rangle$  for any two observables  $X, Y$  are discussed, the sets of even and odd s.a. SIS  $|\psi; u; v\rangle$  being studied in greater detail. The set of s.a. SIS contain all even and odd coherent states (CS) of Dodonov, Malkin and Man'ko, the Perelomov  $SU(1,1)$  CS and the squeezed Hermite polynomial states of Bergou, Hillery and Yu. The even and odd SIS can exhibit very strong both linear and quadratic squeezing (even simultaneously) and super- and subpoissonian statistics as well. A simple sufficient condition for superpoissonian statistics is obtained and the diagonalization of the amplitude and s.a. uncertainty matrices in any pure or mixed state by linear canonical transformations is proven.

PACS number(s): 03.65.Fd, 42.50.Dv

## I. Introduction

In the last decade or so there has been a great interest in squeezed states (SS) [1] as nonclassical states with promising applications (see the review papers [2] and references therein). Originally SS of electromagnetic field are defined as states in which the variance of one of the two quadratures  $q$  and  $p$  of the photon annihilation operator  $a$ ,  $a = (q + ip)/\sqrt{2}$ , are less than the variance  $\sigma_0 = 1/2$  of  $q$  and  $p$  in the Glauber coherent states (CS)  $|j\rangle$  [3]. Such SS are the Stoler states  $|j; i\rangle$  [4], which are the same [5] as the Yuen two photon CS [4], the Dodonov et al. correlated states [6] and the CS

constructed earlier in refs.[7, 8]. In analogy to the term canonical CS [9] for the CS  $j$  i one can call the Stoler states and their equivalents canonical SS in order to distinguish them from other types of q-p SS [10, 11, 12] and from SS for other observables [13, 14, 15, 16, 17]. The q-p SS are also called amplitude SS or ordinary SS. The reduction of the variance of an observable with continuous spectrum (continuous observable) is of practical interest since there are no (normalizable) states with vanishing variance of such observables. In quantum optics the reduction of fluctuations (squeezing) in q or p entails squeezing of magnetic ( $H$ ) or electric field ( $E$ ). The two quadratures  $X_{sa}; Y_{sa}$  of  $a^2$  (the s.a. quadratures),

$$a^2 = \frac{1}{2} (X_{sa} + iY_{sa}) \quad (1)$$

are continuous. They are related to the two invariant characteristics  $EH$  and  $E^2 - H^2$  of the field. In case of mass particle they describe the energy of the inverted oscillator and the friction respectively. Therefore it is of interest to look for the states in which these quantities are sub-uctuant, i.e. to look for s.a. SS. Another motivation is the result of paper [18]: s.a. squeezing (called also quadratic squeezing) in a given field mode can be transferred to another mode as ordinary one.

With the aim to look for squared amplitude SS and for new nonclassical states we construct in this paper the family of all states which satisfy the equality in the Schrodinger uncertainty relation (u.r.) (called also Robertson-Schrodinger u.r.) [20, 19] for the quadrature components  $X_{sa}; Y_{sa}$  of the squared boson operator  $a^2$ . This is achieved by solving the eigenvalue problem for the complex linear combination  $ua^2 + va^{*2}$  which in this case is the necessary and sufficient condition for the minimization of Schrodinger inequality [21]. States which provide the equality in Schrodinger relation should be referred here as Schrodinger intelligent states (SIS). Similarly, the states which minimize the Heisenberg u.r. will be called Heisenberg intelligent states (HIS). HIS are a subset of SIS. The constructed s.a. SIS  $|z; u; v\rangle_{sa}$  turned out to exhibit very strong linear and quadratic squeezing (even simultaneously), sub- and superpoissonian photon statistics and to contain in a natural way several known sets of states (Dodonov, Malkin and Man'ko even and odd CS (e.o. CS) [22], the Perelomov SU(1,1) CS [23], the Bergou, Hillery and Yu squeezed Hermite polynomial states [18], the Spiridonov parity CS [24]). The principle possibility of joint linear and quadratic amplitude squeezing stems from the fact that commutators of q; p and  $X_{sa}; Y_{sa}$ , are not positive (nor negative) definite (see section IV).

A definition of SS for any pair of (dimensionless) observables  $X; Y$  has been given in ref. [14] on the base of the Heisenberg uncertainty relation (established for arbitrary  $X; Y$  in fact by Robertson [19]): a state  $|i\rangle$  is  $X-Y$  SS if one of the two squared variances  $\sigma_X^2(|i\rangle)$  or  $\sigma_Y^2(|i\rangle)$  is less than one half of the modulus of the mean of the commutator  $[X; Y]$ ,

$$\sigma_i^2(|i\rangle) < \frac{1}{2} |\langle [X; Y] \rangle_i|; \quad i = X \quad \text{or} \quad Y: \quad (2)$$

This definition has been used in refs. [15, 13] to examine the quadratic squeezing in e.o. CS [22] and the squeezing of generators  $K_1; K_2$  of  $SU(1;1)$  in Perebromov  $SU(1;1)$  CS [23] and in Barut-Girardello CS [25]. However in many cases the inequality in eq.(1) holds when both  $\sigma_X^2(|i\rangle)$  and  $|\langle [X; Y] \rangle_i|$  are very large and even tend to infinity and then one hardly can call the corresponding states squeezed. Such are the cases of the  $SU(1;1)$  CS with  $X; Y$  being the generators of  $SU(1;1)$  [13] and the cases of quadratic squeezing, considered in ref. [15].

Here we use the more precise definition: a state is  $X-Y$  SS if

$$\sigma_i^2(|i\rangle) < \sigma_0^2; \quad i = X \quad \text{or} \quad Y; \quad (3)$$

where  $\sigma_0^2$  is the joint minimal value of the two squared variances  $\sigma_X^2(|i\rangle); \sigma_Y^2(|i\rangle)$  and half of the mean of the commutator  $|\langle [X; Y] \rangle_i|/2$ :  $\sigma_0^2$  is minimal level at which the equality of the above three quantities,

$$\sigma_X^2(|i\rangle) = \sigma_Y^2(|i\rangle) = \frac{1}{2} |\langle [X; Y] \rangle_i| \quad (4)$$

can be maintained. This is very natural definition since (as one can easily verify) the equalities (4) yield the equality in the Heisenberg u.r. and eqs.(4) hold if and only if  $|i\rangle$  is an eigenstate of one of the two nonhermitean operators  $X \pm iY$  (see Proposition 1). Such eigenstates are denoted here as  $|zi\rangle$ ,  $z$  being the (complex) eigenvalue. Note that if a state is SS according to the definition (3) then the inequality (2) follows, while the inverse is not true. The explicitly considered s.a. and  $SU(1;1)$  squeezing in refs. [15, 18, 13] (in canonically squeezed Fock states, in Perebromov CS and in Barut-Girardello CS) obeys the relative definition (2) only, not (3). We are looking here for s.a. SS which can exhibit strong squeezing according to the definition (3).

A natural term for states  $|zi\rangle$  which obey eq.(4) is  $X-Y$  equal uncertainty HUS. In case of the canonical variables  $q$  and  $p$  the equal uncertainty HUS  $|zi\rangle$  coincide with the canonical CS (the Glauber CS)  $|j\rangle$  [3] and they are minimum uncertainty states. In

general case however the equal uncertainties depend on some state parameters, so that the equal uncertainty H IS are not minimum uncertainty states. The latter states are among the H IS  $|\psi_i\rangle$  and are denoted here as  $|\psi_0\rangle$ . The corresponding variance  $\langle z^2 \rangle_0$  is denoted in the definition (3) as  $\sigma_0$ .

There has been a resurgence of interest in the last few years in the even and odd CS (e.o. CS)  $|\psi_i\rangle$  [22, 26] as one of the promising examples of superposition of macroscopically distinguishable states (Schrodinger cat states) (see e.g. refs. [12, 24, 27, 28, 29]). These states can be experimentally realized in several ways [12, 27] and could be used for example in interferometric gravitational wave detector to increase its sensitivity [28]. The nonclassical properties of e.o. CS have been considered in e.g. ref. [11, 30, 31]. They can exhibit ordinary amplitude squeezing (i.e.  $q$ ;  $p$  squeezing) of about 55 % [11], but, like the Perelomov CS (which also are even/odd states), do not exhibit quadratic squeezing according to definition (3). Along these lines our aim is to construct generalized even and odd CS (denoted here as  $|\psi; u; v; i\rangle$ ) which do exhibit strong quadratic squeezing and contains the latter states as natural subsets. The set of these generalized e.o. CS are constructed as SIS and contain also the "Hermite polynomial amplitude-squared SS" of Bergou, Hillery and Yu [18] (the latter's being a subset of the H IS).

As we have noted above the method we use is based on the minimization of the Schrodinger u.r. and on the result of paper [21] that a sufficient condition for a state  $|\psi_i\rangle$  to minimize this relation for quadrature components  $X$  and  $Y$  of any operator  $A$ , is  $|\psi_i\rangle$  to be eigenstate  $|\psi; u; v; i\rangle$  of the linear combination  $uA + vA^\dagger$  ( $u, v$  - complex parameters) of  $A$  and  $A^\dagger$  (see eq.(6)). This is a natural extension to any nonhermitean operator  $A$  of the known property of the canonical SS to be eigenstates of the linear combination  $ua + va^\dagger$  (Bogolubov transform of  $a$  and  $a^\dagger$ ,  $u^2 - v^2 = 1$ ) and to minimize the Schrodinger u.r.. The property of canonical SS to obey the equality in Schrodinger relation for  $q$  and  $p$  was established in fact in paper [6], where such states have been called correlated. Eigenstates of linear combinations  $ua + va^\dagger$  have been constructed and discussed earlier in refs. [7] as time evolution of initial Glauber CS of quadratic Hamiltonian systems. Here the generalized e.o. CS  $|\psi; u; v; i\rangle$  are constructed as two independent solutions of the eigenvalue eq.(37), i.e. they are e.o. square amplitude SIS. Any s.a. SIS  $|\psi; u; v; i_{sa}\rangle$  is a linear combination of these e.o. SIS. In particular any equal uncertainty s.a. H IS  $|\psi_{sa}\rangle$  is a linear combination of the ordinary e.o. CS. The Yurke-Stoler states (and their one angle parameter generalization [32]) and the Spiridonov [24] parity states are also such square amplitude H IS  $|\psi_i\rangle$ . We note that H IS for the pair  $K_1; K_3$ , i.e.  $K_1 - K_3$  equal uncertainty H IS, ( $K_i$  being the generators of

$SU(1;1)$  are constructed in the very recent paper[33].

The paper is organized as follows. In section II we consider a sufficient condition (eq.(6)) for a state  $|\psi\rangle$  to minimize the Schrodinger u.r. for the quadratures  $X; Y$  of any operator  $A$ . We also prove that a necessary and sufficient condition for a state  $|\psi\rangle$  to be  $X-Y$  equal uncertainty H IS is to be an eigenstate of  $A$  or  $A^\dagger$ . In analogy to the canonical case the general  $X-Y$  squeeze operator  $S(u;v)$  is defined as a map from equal uncertainty H IS  $|\psi\rangle$  to the SIS  $|\psi;u;v\rangle$ . The  $2 \times 2$   $X-Y$  uncertainty matrix in any state can be diagonalized by  $SU(1;1)$  linear transformations of  $X$  and  $Y$ .

In section III first we review some properties of the ordinary e.o. states and some other Schrodinger cat states in the light of the Heisenberg u.r. The diagonalization of  $3 \times 3$  and  $2 \times 2$  s.a. uncertainty matrices by linear commutator preserving transformations (in particular by canonical ones) is considered. In subsection III.B we construct the corresponding generalizations as e.o. SIS solving the eigenvalue equation (37) in the Glauber CS representation and reveal some important particular cases of these e.o. SIS. Completeness properties of the e.o. SIS and the half unitarity (isometricity) of s.a. squeeze operator are commented.

In section IV the nonclassical properties of the e.o. SIS are considered: some representative results are shown on Figs. 1-3. A simple sufficient condition for superpoissonian statistics is obtained in terms of the "length" of the quasispin mean vector. Finally in Section V we discuss the  $sl(2;C)$  algebraic properties of SIS and problems of stable evolution of and generation of s.a. SIS and SS from known states, in particular by canonical squeezing of finite superpositions of Fock states and of e.o. CS.

## II. The Heisenberg and Schrodinger intelligent states

In this section we consider the minimization conditions of the Schrodinger uncertainty relation (u.r.) for any two observables  $X; Y$  and discuss some general properties of the minimizing states (called here Schrodinger intelligent states (SIS)), squeeze operators and  $X-Y$  uncertainty matrix.

The Schrodinger u.r. [20] for any two observables  $X; Y$  and any (pure or mixed) state reads

$$\frac{\sigma_X^2}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_Y^2} + \frac{\sigma_Y^2}{\sigma_X^2 + \sigma_Y^2} - \frac{1}{4} |\text{Tr}(\hat{X}\hat{Y})|^2 \geq 0 \quad (5)$$

where  $\sigma_X^2(\psi); \sigma_Y^2(\psi)$  are the squared variances of  $X$  and  $Y$  in the state  $\psi$  and  $\text{Tr}(\hat{X}\hat{Y})$  is their covariance. It recovers the Heisenberg (in fact Robertson-Heisenberg [19]) relation

which is obtained with  $[X, Y] = 0$  in eq.(5). The equality in the above relation (5) holds in pure states  $|z; u; v\rangle$  only, which obey the eigenvalue eq.(6),

$$(uA + vA^\dagger)|z; u; v\rangle = z|z; u; v\rangle; \quad (6)$$

where  $z$  is the (complex) eigenvalue,  $u; v$  are arbitrary complex parameters and

$$A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X + iY); \quad (7)$$

Eq.(6) is a sufficient condition for the equality in eq.(5) [21]. In most cases it is also necessary. They are only some of the eigenstates of  $X$  and  $Y$ , if exist, which make exceptions. When the two observables  $X$  and  $Y$  are continuous (i.e. with no discrete spectrum of their eigenvalues) then the commutator  $[A, A^\dagger] = i[X, Y]$  is positive or negative definite and in such cases the eigenvalue eq.(6) is necessary and sufficient condition for the equality in the Schrodinger relation (5) [21]. We call such minimizing states  $|z; u; v\rangle$  Schrodinger intelligent states (SIS), or more precisely  $X-Y$  SIS. The term intelligent state (IS) is introduced in ref. [34] on the example of spin states which provide the equality in the Heisenberg u.r. (i.e.  $[X, Y] = 0$  in eq.(5)). The eigenvalue eq.(6) for the canonical observables  $q; p$  has been taken in ref. [6] as a definition of the correlated states. Correlated states coincide [5] with the canonical SS  $|j; i\rangle$ , (or Stoler states [4]),

$$|j; i\rangle = \exp \frac{1}{2} (a^2 - a^{\dagger 2}) |j; i\rangle = S(\alpha) |j; i\rangle = S(\alpha) D(\beta) |j; i\rangle; \quad (8)$$

which in the Yuen notations [4] are  $|j; i\rangle$ ,  $j^2 - i^2 = 1$ . So the canonical SS should be referred also as canonical SIS or  $q-p$  SIS. The squeezed vacuum states  $|j; 0\rangle$  coincide with the Perelomov  $SU(1;1)$  CS  $|j; 0\rangle$  [23],  $\alpha = \tanh j \exp(i\phi)$ ,  $\beta = \arg \alpha$  for the nonsquare integrable representation with Bargmann index  $k = 1/4$ .

In any  $X-Y$  SIS  $|z; u; v\rangle$  the three second moments of  $X$  and  $Y$  are proportional to the mean commutator  $[A, A^\dagger] = i[X, Y]$  and read

$$\langle X^2 \rangle (z; u; v) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{j^2 - v^2}{j^2} \hbar [A, A^\dagger] |i\rangle; \quad (9)$$

$$\langle Y^2 \rangle (z; u; v) = \frac{1}{2} \frac{j^2 + v^2}{j^2} \hbar [A, A^\dagger] |i\rangle; \quad (10)$$

$$\langle XY \rangle (z; u; v) = \frac{2 \operatorname{Im}(uv)}{j^2 - v^2} \hbar [A, A^\dagger] |i\rangle; \quad (11)$$

where  $\langle [A; A^\dagger] \rangle = \langle \psi; u; z | [A; A^\dagger] | \psi; u; v \rangle$ . One can check that the above second moments obey the equality in the Schrodinger relation (5) identically.

Formulas (9)–(11) are valid for any  $u; v$  but the relation  $u = v$  is admitted only if the commutator  $[A; A^\dagger]$  is not positive (negative) definite. In the latter case at  $\langle j \rangle^2 - \langle v \rangle^2 = 0$  the mean commutator also vanishes. If the commutator  $[A; A^\dagger]$  is positive (negative) definite then normalized SIS  $|\psi; u; v\rangle$  exist for  $\langle j \rangle^2 - \langle v \rangle^2 > 0$  ( $\langle j \rangle^2 - \langle v \rangle^2 < 0$ ) only [21]. In such cases we easily derive from the eigenvalue equation that the number of significant real parameters of SIS is four (or two complex). Such are for example  $z=u$  and  $v=u$ . In case of positive commutator  $[A; A^\dagger]$  it is also convenient to fix

$$\langle j \rangle^2 - \langle v \rangle^2 = 1 \quad (12)$$

(or  $\langle j \rangle^2 - \langle v \rangle^2 = -1$  in case of negative commutator) as one usually does in the canonical case to ensure the boson commutation relations for the transformed operators  $a^0 = u a + v a^\dagger$  and  $a^{0\dagger} = u a^\dagger + v a$ . Here we note that for any operators  $A; A^\dagger$  the relation (12) provides invariance of the commutator  $[A; A^\dagger] = i[X; Y]$  under linear transformation,

$$A \rightarrow A^0 = u A + v A^\dagger; \quad (13)$$

where  $X^0; Y^0$  are quadratures of  $A^0$  ( $(12) \rightarrow [A^0; A^{0\dagger}] = [A; A^\dagger]$ ),

$$A^0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (X^0 + i Y^0); \quad (14)$$

We have to warn that in general  $A$  and  $A^0$  are not unitary equivalent (they are equivalent in the case of  $A = a$  due to the Stone–von Neumann theorem). The commutator  $[A; A^\dagger]$  is positive definite for  $A$  being e.g. any positive integer power of the boson destruction operator  $a^k$  or lowering Weyl generator of any  $SU(1;1)$  discrete series representation  $D^-(k)$ . The commutator is not positive nor negative definite for example in the case of  $A = J$ ,  $J$  being spin operators ( $SU(2)$  generators) and of  $A = \alpha + i X_{sa}^\sim$ , where  $\alpha$  is one of the quadratures of  $a$ , and  $X_{sa}^\sim$  is one of the quadratures of  $a^2$ . In the latter cases the SIS  $|\psi; u; v\rangle$  exist for any value of  $u$  and  $v$ , including  $u = v$ .

If SIS  $|\psi; u; v\rangle$  exist for  $[A; A^\dagger]$  positive (negative) definite then we see from formulas (9)–(11), that  $u = 0$  ( $v = 0$ ) is not admitted, that is the eigenstates of  $A^\dagger$  ( $A$ ) do not exist. For positive (negative) definite commutator the limit  $v = 0$  ( $u = 0$ ) is admitted: then the covariance of  $X$  and  $Y$  is vanishing and the two variances  $\frac{\langle X^2 \rangle}{2}$ ,  $\frac{\langle Y^2 \rangle}{2}$  are equal to each other and to the one half of the mean commutator  $\langle [A; A^\dagger] \rangle$ , obeying the equality in the Heisenberg relation. That is the states  $|\psi; u; v = 0\rangle$  ( $|\psi; u = 0; v\rangle$ ) are

nonsqueezed  $X-Y$  H IS, i.e.  $X-Y$  equal uncertainty H IS. For equal uncertainty H IS one can prove the following

Proposition 1. A state  $|j\rangle$  is equal uncertainty H IS for given two physical observables (hermitian operators)  $X; Y$  if and only if it is an eigenstate  $|j\rangle$  of  $A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X + iY)$  or  $A^\dagger$ ,

$$A|j\rangle = z|j\rangle; \text{ or } A^\dagger|j\rangle = z|j\rangle: \quad (15)$$

The proof can be carried out considering the means of the operators  $F^\dagger F$  and  $F F^\dagger$ , where  $F = X + iY = \hbar(X + iY)/\hbar$ , and using positivity of the norm of Hilbert space vectors.

Recall that the eigenstates  $|j\rangle$  are known in the following cases of  $A$ :  $A = a$  (Glauber CS  $|j\rangle$ );  $A = a^2$  (e.o. CS  $|j\rangle$  [22]);  $A = a^k$ ;  $k \geq 2$  ("k-photon CS" [11, 10]);  $A = K$  (Baut-Girardello CS [25]),  $K$  being the lowering and raising generators of square integrable (discrete series) representations  $D(k)$  of  $SU(1;1)$ ;  $A = J$ ,  $J$  being the generators of  $SU(2)$  (spin operators). In all cases but  $A = a^k$ ,  $k \geq 2$ , the generalizations of the equal uncertainty H IS  $|j\rangle$  to the SIS  $|j; u; v\rangle$  are established [6, 21]. In the next section we shall construct the SIS  $|j; u; v\rangle$  for the case  $A = a^2$ , generalizing in this way the e.o. CS  $|j\rangle$ . But before this let us consider the  $X-Y$  uncertainty matrix and the notion of squeeze operator in the light of Heisenberg and Schrodinger u.r..

The linearity of the transformation  $A \rightarrow A^0$  entails linear relations between second moments of the new quadratures  $X^0; Y^0$  and second moments of the old ones  $(X; Y)$  in any pure or mixed state  $\rho$ . It turned out that the constrain (12), which makes the commutator preserving transformation (13) belonging to  $SU(1;1)$ , ensure the invariance of the determinant of the uncertainty matrix  $\Delta(\rho)$ . Moreover, the linear  $SU(1;1)$  transformation can be used to diagonalize this uncertainty matrix for any pure or mixed state  $\rho$ . We formulate this statement as a second proposition,

Proposition 2. The  $SU(1;1)$  linear transformation of any pair of operators  $A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(X + iY)$  and  $A^\dagger$  preserves the determinant of the  $X-Y$  uncertainty matrix  $\Delta(\rho)$  invariant and can diagonalize  $\Delta(\rho)$  for any pure or mixed state  $\rho$ .

Proof. The proof uses significantly the transformation property of the uncertainty matrix  $\Delta(\rho; X; Y)$ ,

$$\Delta_{ij}(\rho) = \Delta_{ij}(\rho); \quad i = X; Y; \quad j = X; Y: \quad (16)$$

under linear transformations (13). The new quadratures  $X^0; Y^0$  are related to the old



one by means of the symplectic matrix  $2 \times 2 \text{ Sp}(2; \mathbb{R})$

$$\begin{pmatrix} X^0 \\ Y^0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ v & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X \\ Y \end{pmatrix}; \quad = \begin{pmatrix} \text{Re}(u+v) & \text{Im}(u-v) \\ \text{Im}(u+v) & \text{Re}(u-v) \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X \\ Y \end{pmatrix}; \quad (17)$$

Then the uncertainty matrices for the new and old quadratures are congruent

$$\begin{pmatrix} X^0 & Y^0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ v & u \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X & Y \end{pmatrix}^T \begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ v & u \end{pmatrix}; \quad (18)$$

wherefrom it follows that  $\det \begin{pmatrix} X^0 & Y^0 \end{pmatrix} = \det \begin{pmatrix} X & Y \end{pmatrix}$ .

The possibility to diagonalize the uncertainty matrix by means of symplectic matrix (corresponding to linear transformation (13)) is based on its positive definiteness and on its positive determinant [35]. The positivity of  $\det$  follows from the Schrodinger relation (5). So we have to prove the positive definiteness of  $\begin{pmatrix} X^0 & Y^0 \end{pmatrix}$  only. For this purpose we have to consider the quadratic form  $\sum_{ij} x_i x_j$  (summation over repeated indices) and to show that it is positive for any nonvanishing  $x_i$ ,  $i = 1, 2$ . And this is the case, since using again the uncertainty relation (5) we get

$$\sum_{ij} x_i x_j = \frac{1}{2} (x_1^2 + x_2^2 - 2j_{12} x_1 x_2) > \left( \frac{x_1}{j_{11}} - \frac{x_2}{j_{22}} \right)^2 \geq 0; \quad (19)$$

and this ends the proof of Proposition 2.

We note the generality of the above result: the required positivity of commutator  $i[X, Y] = [A, A^\dagger]$  holds for any operators  $X, Y$  with continuous spectrum [21], in particular for quadratures of  $a^k$ ;  $k = 1, 2, \dots$  and for generators  $K_{1/2}$  of any discrete series reps of  $SU(1,1)$ . In particular case of  $X = q, Y = p$  (that is  $A = a$ ) the Proposition 2 recovers the result of refs. [36, 37] for diagonalization of one mode uncertainty matrix by means of linear canonical transformations. We have to note that the  $N$  mode uncertainty matrix  $\begin{pmatrix} X & Y \end{pmatrix}$  under linear canonical transformations is transformed as in eq. (18) with  $N \times N$  symplectic matrix [36] and therefore can be diagonalized by if it is positive definite. In ref. [36] it is shown that the  $N$  mode is positive definite and therefore is diagonalizable in any state. In ref. [37] a diagonalization procedure is described. It is worth noting another general property of the commutator preserving transformation (13) (or its equivalent (17)). We can take in it real  $u$  and  $v$ ,  $u^2 - v^2 = 1$  to get diagonal symplectic  $\begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ v & u \end{pmatrix}$  which performs scaling transformation  $X^0 = X; Y^0 = Y$ ,  $\begin{pmatrix} u & v \\ v & u \end{pmatrix} = u + v$ . Then when  $u > 1$  ( $u < 0$ ) we get absolute squeezing of  $Y^0$  ( $X^0$ ) in any state. This in fact stems from the Proposition 2.

The canonical squeeze operator in quantum optics  $S(\lambda)$  [1, 2], eq. (8) (and its general  $SU(1,1)$  form as well), in fact maps the nonsqueezed q-p equal uncertainty H I S  $j_i$  (in

eq.(6) these are the canonical CS  $|j\rangle$  into q-p SIS  $|\tilde{j};u;v\rangle$  (in (6) these are the canonical SS  $|j\rangle$ ). This observation suggests to define squeeze operator  $S(u;v)$  for any observables  $X;Y$  as a map  $HIS \rightarrow SIS$ ,

$$|\tilde{j};u;v\rangle = S(u;v)|j\rangle \quad (20)$$

This is a correct definition of the operator  $S(u;v)$  in Hilbert space in all cases, in which the equal uncertainty  $HIS |j\rangle$  form an overcomplete set (a set of general CS [9]) since in those cases any state can be expressed in terms of  $|j\rangle$  (for example in cases  $A = a$ ,  $A = a^2$ ,  $A = K$ ). In such cases we easily get that the generalized squeeze operator  $S(u;v)$ , eq.(20), performs the isometric transformation of  $A^0$  (proof in the Appendix),

$$S^\dagger(u;v)A^0S(u;v) = A \quad (21)$$

The concepts of squeeze operator is important in practical purposes for generation of the SIS  $|\tilde{j};u;v\rangle$  from  $HIS |j\rangle$ , trying to realize  $S$  as a quantum evolution operator to describe the time evolution of initial  $|j\rangle$  (when the latter's are available). In canonical case this method is effectively applied for generation SS from Glauber CS [2]. However not always  $S(u;v)$  is unitary, as we shall see below. It is unitary in the canonical case of  $A = a$ . When  $S(u;v)$  is unitary ( $S^\dagger S = 1 = S S^\dagger$ ) we have also  $S^\dagger A^0 S = A^2$  in addition to eq.(21). Then we get that the three second moments  $\langle X^2; Y^2; XY \rangle$  of  $X^0 = S X S^\dagger, Y^0 = S Y S^\dagger$  coincide with the moments of old quadratures  $X;Y$  in the transformed state  $^0 = S^\dagger S$  and similarly the moments of  $S^\dagger X S; S^\dagger Y S$  in are equal to those of  $X;Y$  in  $S S^\dagger$ . The discussion after the Proposition 2 proves that one can get arbitrary strong  $X$  or  $Y$  squeezing applying  $S(u;v)$  to any state. Thus all states  $S(u;v) S^\dagger(u;v)$  are  $X-Y$  SS. They are SIS if  $|j\rangle$  is SIS or HIS, (HIS SIS), that is if  $|j\rangle = |\tilde{j};u;v\rangle$  or  $|\tilde{j};u;z\rangle$ .

### III. Squared amplitude Schrodinger and Heisenberg intelligent states

#### A. Equal uncertainty HIS and even and odd CS

In this subsection we provide a brief review of the properties (noting some new ones) of the even and odd CS (e.o. CS) [22, 26] and some other Schrodinger cat states in the light of the Heisenberg uncertainty relation for the quadratures  $X_{sa}; Y_{sa}$  of the squared amplitude  $a^2$ . The e.o. CS, Yurke-Stoler states [32] and the recently discussed

parity CS [24] all are squared amplitude (s.a.) equal uncertainty H IS  $|j\rangle_{sa}$ . Finally we note that in any H IS the three dimensional uncertainty matrix for the s.a. quadratures  $X_{sa}; Y_{sa}$  and the number operator  $N = a^\dagger a$  is diagonal.

The e.o. CS  $|j\rangle_i$ , which are discussed intensively in the recent literature as an example of Schrodinger cat states [12, 27, 29], have been first introduced by Dodonov, Malkin and Man'ko [22] as

$$|j\rangle_i = N^{-1/2} (j!)^{-1/2} |j-i\rangle |i\rangle; \quad (22)$$

( $N^{-1/2} (j!)^{-1/2} (1 - \exp(-2j))^{1/2}$ ) where  $|j\rangle_i$  is the canonical CS. These states form overcomplete families of e.o. states,

$$1 = \frac{1}{\pi} \int d^2 j |j\rangle_i \langle j| \quad (23)$$

where  $1$  are the unit operators in the space of e.o. states respectively. It was noted [22] that they are eigenstates of the squared boson annihilation operator  $a^2$ ,  $a^2 |j\rangle_i = -j |j\rangle_i$ . Comparing this equation with eq.(6) we see that e.o. CS are particular case of the SIS  $|j; u; v\rangle$  with  $A = a^2$ ,  $u = 1$ ,  $v = 0$  and  $z = -j$ . More precisely they are equal uncertainty s.a. H IS (see eq.(4)) for the quadratures  $X_{sa}; Y_{sa}$  of  $a^2$ ,

$$X_{sa} = \frac{1}{2} (a^2 + a^{y2}); \quad Y_{sa} = \frac{i}{2} (a^2 - a^{y2}); \quad (24)$$

$$[A; A^\dagger] = -i[X_{sa}; Y_{sa}] = [a^2; a^{y2}] = 4a^\dagger a + 2; \quad (25)$$

The mean number operator and the variances are

$$\langle a^\dagger a \rangle_{+i} = j \tanh j; \quad \langle a^\dagger a \rangle_{-i} = j \coth j; \quad (26)$$

$$\langle X_{sa}^2 \rangle = \langle Y_{sa}^2 \rangle = 1 + 2\langle a^\dagger a \rangle; \quad \langle X_{sa} Y_{sa} \rangle = 0; \quad (27)$$

In both type of states the lowest level  $|0\rangle$  of the equality (4) for the operators  $X_{sa}; Y_{sa}$  is  $|0\rangle = 1$  and is reached at  $j = 0 = z$ . We see that both variances  $\langle X_{sa}^2 \rangle$  and  $\langle Y_{sa}^2 \rangle$  are greater than  $|0\rangle = 1$ . Therefore the e.o. CS are not amplitude-squared SS neither according to the definition (3), nor according to the relative definition (2). It worth to note that due to the positivity of the commutator  $[a^2; a^{y2}]$  any s.a. equal H IS is an eigenstate of  $a^2$ . Then due to the linearity of the eigenvalue equation  $a^2 |j\rangle_{sa} = z |j\rangle_{sa}$  (see eq. (40) below) the general form of the s.a. equal uncertainty H IS is a linear combination of one even and one odd CS,

$$|j\rangle_{sa} = C_+ (j) |j\rangle_{+i} + C_- (j) |j\rangle_{-i}; \quad (28)$$

where  $\mathcal{J}_-(\alpha)^2 + \mathcal{J}_+(\alpha)^2 = 1$  and the eigenvalue  $z = \alpha^2$ . Important physical examples of equal uncertainty H IS (28) are the Yurke-Stoler states [32]

$$|j\rangle_{\text{YS}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (\exp(-i\alpha) |j\rangle + \exp(i\alpha) |j\rangle); \quad (29)$$

and more general Spiridonov parity CS  $|j\rangle_p$  [24], defined as eigenstates of the product  $Pa$ , where  $P$  is the operator of inversion (parity operator) and  $a$  is boson destruction operator. Indeed, let  $Pa|j\rangle_p = |j\rangle_p$ . Then from  $PaP = -a$ ,  $P^2 = 1$  we get  $(Pa)^2 = PaPa = -a^2$  and therefore  $|j\rangle_p$  is eigenstate of  $a^2$ . The inverse is not true, i.e. parity CS  $|j\rangle_p$  are particular case of s.a. H IS  $|j\rangle_{\text{sa}}$ .

The nonclassical properties of e.o. CS  $|j\rangle_i$  have been considered for example in refs. [11, 30, 31]. Note that in e.o. CS the second moments of  $q$  and  $p$  do not yield the equality in the Schrodinger relation (5), i.e. they are not q-p SIS.

Consider briefly the uncertainty matrices in H IS  $|j\rangle_{\text{sa}}$ . The q-p uncertainty matrix in s.a. H IS can be or can not be diagonal. For example in e.o. CS the covariance is  $\sigma_{qp}(\alpha) = \text{Im} \alpha^2$  in both  $|j\rangle_i$ . Contrary to this the  $X_{\text{sa}}-Y_{\text{sa}}$  uncertainty matrix (and even the 3  $\times$  3 s.a. uncertainty matrix for the three operators  $X_{\text{sa}}; Y_{\text{sa}}; a^\dagger a$ ) is diagonal in all H IS  $|j\rangle_{\text{sa}}$  and this can be checked directly, using the eigenvalue property (15). The nonvanishing diagonal elements are

$$\sigma_X^2(z) = \sigma_Y^2(z) = \frac{1}{4} (2\hbar a^\dagger a + 1); \quad \sigma_{a^\dagger a}^2(z) = j^2 + \hbar a^\dagger a^2; \quad (30)$$

The Proposition 2 in the preceding section guaranties that the 2  $\times$  2 s.a. uncertainty matrix  $(\alpha; X_{\text{sa}}; Y_{\text{sa}})$  can always be diagonalized by commutator preserving linear transformation (13). For  $(\alpha; X_{\text{sa}}; Y_{\text{sa}})$  there is one more possibility to be diagonalized – this is by means of linear canonical transformations (note that the latter's are not s.a. commutator preserving ones).

**Proposition 3.** The 2  $\times$  2 squared amplitude uncertainty matrix in any pure or mixed state can be diagonalized by linear canonical transformation.

**Proof.** Let us consider three independent quadratic boson operators (the standard SU(1;1) generators)  $K_i, i = 1; 2; 3$ ,

$$K_1 = \frac{1}{4} (a^2 + a^{\dagger 2}); K_2 = i\frac{1}{4} (a^2 - a^{\dagger 2}); K_3 = \frac{1}{4} (2a^\dagger a + 1); \quad (31)$$

Linear canonical transformations

$$a \rightarrow a^0 = a + \alpha a^\dagger; \quad j \rightarrow j^0 = j + \alpha^2 = 1 \quad (32)$$

are generated by the unitary metaplectic operators (summation over repeated indices)

$$U(\tilde{\alpha}) = \exp(i_j K_j); \quad \tilde{\alpha} = (\alpha_1; \alpha_2; \alpha_3); \quad (33)$$

where  $\alpha_i$  are 3 real parameters. These operators act on the components  $K_i$  as (pseudo) rotations in Minkowski space  $M_3$  and they contain rotations in the space-like plane of  $K_1$  and  $K_2$ ,

$$U^y(\tilde{\alpha}) K_j U(\tilde{\alpha}) = K_j^0 = \Lambda_{jl}(\tilde{\alpha}) K_l; \quad (34)$$

where the Lorentz matrices  $\Lambda(\tilde{\alpha}) = (\Lambda_{jl})$  obey the relation  $\Lambda^T(\tilde{\alpha}) g \Lambda(\tilde{\alpha}) = g$ ,  $g$  being the metric tensor. Under such transformation the  $3 \times 3$  matrix  $(\alpha; K_1; K_2; K_3)$  transforms as a second rank symmetric tensor  $(\alpha^0 = (\alpha; K_1^0; K_2^0; K_3^0)$ ,

$$\alpha^0(\tilde{\alpha}) = \Lambda(\tilde{\alpha}) \alpha \Lambda^T(\tilde{\alpha}); \quad (35)$$

The matrix  $(\alpha; K_1; K_2)$  is the left upper  $2 \times 2$  block and under rotations in the space-like plane transforms according to (18) with orthogonal matrix  $\Lambda$ . Therefore it can always be brought to diagonal form by means of linear canonical transformations. End of proof.

Thus linear canonical transformations can diagonalize both amplitude (canonical) and squared amplitude  $2 \times 2$  uncertainty matrices. Let us point out states which are not SIS but in which the s.a. matrix is diagonal: those are Fock states  $|j\rangle$ . In the latter states all covariances  $K_i K_{k \neq i}$  are vanishing and the variances are

$$\langle K_1^2 \rangle = \langle K_2^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2}(n^2 + 2n + \frac{1}{2}); \quad \langle K_3^2 \rangle = 0; \quad (36)$$

The diagonalization of uncertainty matrix of any  $n$  observables  $X_i$  is a minimization of the Robertson inequality [38]  $\langle X_1^2 \rangle \langle X_2^2 \rangle \cdots \langle X_n^2 \rangle \geq \det \Delta$ .

## B. Squared amplitude SIS and generalized even and odd CS

In the previous subsection we have written down explicitly the general form of the s.a. equal uncertainty HES  $|j\rangle_{\text{sa}}$  as superposition of one even and one odd CS (eq. (20)). Our aim now is to find general solution for the s.a. SIS  $|j; u; v\rangle_{\text{sa}}$  in quite analogous form. We shall construct two independent sets of even and odd SIS which could be considered as a generalization of e.o. CS  $|j\rangle$ . From the point of view of boson squeezing the aim is to obtain nonclassical states that can exhibit strong amplitude-squared squeezing (quadratic squeezing) in the sense of definition of eq. (3) and ordinary squeezing (linear squeezing or q;p squeezing) as well.

According to the discussion in the preceding section we are looking for normalizable solutions  $\psi; u; v$  of the eigenvalue problem (6) with  $A = a^2$ . The commutator  $[A; A^\dagger]$  now is given by the eq.(25), which shows that it is positive definite. Then the normalized solutions of eq.(6) could exist for  $j = u, j > 1$  only [21]. Thus we have to solve the eigenvalue equation

$$(ua^2 + va^{j^2})\psi; u; v|_{sa} = z\psi; u; v|_{sa} : \quad (37)$$

We shall solve this equation using the canonical CS representation [9]. In this representation pure states  $|j\rangle$  are represented by entire analytic functions of order  $l=2$  and type 2 (quadratic exponent type), i.e. of growth  $(l=2; 2)$ ,

$$|j\rangle \rightarrow f(\alpha) = \exp(-|\alpha|^2/2) h_j(\alpha) : \quad (38)$$

and the boson destruction and creation operators are

$$a = \frac{d}{d\alpha}; \quad a^\dagger = \alpha : \quad (39)$$

The number states  $|j\rangle$  are represented by  $(\alpha)^n = \frac{1}{n!}$  and the Glauber CS  $|j\rangle$  by  $\exp(-|\alpha|^2/2) h_j(\alpha)$ . So in canonical CS representation the eigenvalue eq.(37) is the following second order differential equation,

$$(u\frac{d^2}{d\alpha^2} + v - z)\psi(\alpha) = 0 : \quad (40)$$

This equation is easily reduced to the Kummer hypergeometric equation [39]. Then we have the following two independent solutions of eq.(40)

$$\psi_+(\alpha; z; u; v) = N_+ \exp(-|\alpha|^2/2) {}_1F_1(-a_+; \frac{1}{2}; -|\alpha|^2) : \quad (41)$$

$$\psi_-(\alpha; z; u; v) = N_- \exp(-|\alpha|^2/2) {}_1F_1(-a_-; \frac{3}{2}; -|\alpha|^2) : \quad (42)$$

where  $N_\pm$  are normalization constants (they are functions of  $z; u; v$ ),

$$a_\pm = (v=u)^{1/4}; \quad a_+ = \frac{1}{4}(1 + z = \frac{1}{uv}); \quad a_- = \frac{1}{4}(3 + z = \frac{1}{uv});$$

and  ${}_1F_1(a; b; z)$  is the Kummer confluent hypergeometric function [39]. For  $b \in \mathbb{N}$  (as in our case, where  $b = 1/2$  or  $b = 3/2$ ) it is an entire analytical function of  $z$  which for  $|z| \rightarrow \infty$  increases not faster than  $\exp(|z|)$ . Thus the properties of  ${}_1F_1(a; b = 1/2; 3/2; z)$  ensure the required growth and analyticity of solutions (28), (29)

so that they represent normalizable states  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle$  provided the inequality  $|j-u| < 1$  holds. This is an explicit example of the general statement that if the commutator  $[A; A^\dagger]$  is positive, then the normalizable SIS exist for  $|j-u| < 1$  only [21]. The explicit realizations of the above SIS  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle$  i, eqs. (41,42), demonstrates, that up to a phase factor they are determined by the two complex parameters  $z=u$  and  $v=u$ , so that we can write  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle = |\bar{j}; u; v=u\rangle$  i. The normalization constants also depend (up to phase factors) on  $z=u; v=u$  only and are given by the integrals

$$N^{-2}(z; u; v) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int d^2 \bar{z} \sim (\bar{z}; z; u; v) \sim (\bar{z}; z; u; v) I_N; \quad (43)$$

which are convergent due to the right analytical properties of solutions (41). Solutions (41) and (42) were obtained and briefly discussed in [36].

The above solutions (41) are e.o. functions of  $\bar{z}$  respectively so that they represent the e.o. SIS. The odd states  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle$  i are orthogonal to the even states  $|\bar{j}; u; v; + i$ . Since the eigenvalue eq.(37) is necessary and sufficient condition for a state to be s.a. SIS and since it is a linear second order differential equation we have the result that any s.a. SIS  $|\bar{j}; u; v; i_{sa}$  is a solution of the eq.(37) and takes the form of linear combination of one even and one odd SIS  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle$  i,

$$|\bar{j}; u; v; i_{sa} = C_-(z; u; v) |\bar{j}; u; v\rangle i + C_+(z; u; v) |\bar{j}; u; v; + i; \quad (44)$$

where  $C_-^2 + C_+^2 = 1$ . This generalizes the H IS relation (28) to the case of SIS.

Let us consider some interesting subsets of the e.o. SIS  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle$  i. First of all, as eq.(37) shows, when  $v = 0$  the states  $|\bar{j}; u = 1; v = 0\rangle i_{sa}$  are eigenstates of  $A = a^2$ , that is  $|\bar{j}; u = 1; v = 0\rangle$  i have to coincide with some subset of s.a. equal uncertainty H IS  $|\bar{j}; i_{sa}$ . The precise subset of equal uncertainty H IS is obtained by substitution  $u = 1; v = 0$  in solutions (41) and (42). We have

$$\tilde{+}(\bar{z}; 1; 0) = \cosh(\sqrt{p} \bar{z}); \quad \tilde{-}(\bar{z}; 1; 0) = \sinh(\sqrt{p} \bar{z});$$

which proves that  $|\bar{j}; 1; 0\rangle$  i coincide with the Dodonov et. al. e.o. CS [22]  $j$  i with  $\sqrt{p} \bar{z}$  since functions  $\sinh(\sqrt{p} \bar{z})$  and  $\cosh(\sqrt{p} \bar{z})$  represent (up to normalization factors) the e.o. CS  $j$  i in the canonical CS representation respectively. The ordinary e.o. CS form overcomplete family of states in the sense of the resolution of unity operator, eqs.(23), (overcompleteness in the strong sense [9]). Then the SIS  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle$  i form at least dense set in Hilbert space and according to ref.[9] could be called CS (at least) in a weak sense. This is the motivation to call  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle$  i generalized e.o. CS.

Similarly any specific combination  $C_- \hat{J};u;v; -i + C_+ \hat{J};u;v; +i$  could be considered as a generalization of the corresponding amplitude-squared equal uncertainty H IS (28), in particular of Yurke-Stoler states or any parity CS  $\hat{J};i_p$ .

We note that the s.a. squeeze operator  $S_{sa}(u;v)$ , defined according to general definition (20) is isometric, but not unitary, (proof in the Appendix) and therefore the sets of SIS  $\hat{J};u;v; -i$  do not resolve the unity operators  $1_-$  and  $1_+$  (eq.(23)) by integration of the projectors  $\hat{J};u;v; -i h; v; z$  against the old measure  $d(\cdot) = (1-\cdot)^2, z = \cdot^2$ : the integration against this measure yields orthogonal projectors  $P_-(u;v)$  on the linear span of SIS  $\hat{J};u;v; -i$  with fixed  $u;v$ ,

$$P_-(u;v) = \frac{1}{\pi} \int d^2 z \hat{J}^2;u;v; -i h; v; u; \cdot^2 \hat{J} \quad (45)$$

The second subsets we note here are rather unexpected: those are the sets of canonical squeezed vacuum states  $\hat{J};0i$  (in Perelomov notation  $\hat{J};0i, \hat{J}^2 \hat{J} < 1$ ) and squeezed one photon states  $\hat{J};1i$ ,

$$\hat{J};0i = (1 - \hat{J}^2)^{\frac{1}{4}} \exp -\frac{1}{2} \hat{J}^2 \hat{J} i; \quad \hat{J};1i = (1 - \hat{J}^2)^{\frac{3}{4}} \exp -\frac{1}{2} \hat{J}^2 \hat{J} i; \quad (46)$$

These states are recovered by our generalized e.o. CS  $\hat{J};u;v; -i$  when the following relations between parameters  $z; u$  and  $v$  are imposed

$$z = \frac{P_-}{uv} \quad \text{or} \quad z = \frac{P_+}{3P_-} \frac{P_-}{uv}; \quad (47)$$

Substituting these into solutions (41), (42) we get ( $w = v= u$ )

$$\hat{\psi}_-(\cdot) = \exp -\frac{1}{2} \frac{P_-}{w}; \quad \hat{\psi}_+(\cdot) = \exp -\frac{1}{2} \frac{P_+}{w}; \quad (48)$$

which coincide (up to normalization factors) with the Glauber CS representation of  $\hat{J};0i$  and  $\hat{J};1i$  respectively with  $\cdot = \frac{P_-}{w}$ . This proves that the Perelomov  $SU(1;1)$  CS with Bargmann index  $k = 1=4; 3=4$  minimize the Schrodinger u.r. for the generators  $K_{1,2}$ . For the cases of any square integrable representation  $D(k); k = 1=2; 1; \dots$  the above property of  $S(1;1)$  CS was established in [21] using the representation of Barut-Girardello CS [25]. It worth noting that if in the Barut-Girardello representation  $h\hat{K}; z^0 \hat{J}; \cdot k i$  of  $SU(1;1)$  SIS  $\hat{J}; \cdot k i$ , constructed in ref.[21], we put  $k = 1=4, z^0 = \cdot^2=2$  we would get the s.a. SIS (41,42) in Glauber CS representation in spite of the fact that the Barut-Girardello representation is correct for Bargmann indices  $k = 1=2; 1; \dots$  only.

Let us recall the known fact that the  $SU(1;1)$  CS  $\hat{J};0i$  (equal to canonically squeezed vacuum  $\hat{J};0i$ ) are also eigenstates of the linear combination  $\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger, \hat{J}^2$



$j^2 = 1$ , and therefore satisfy the equality in Schrodinger u.r. for the amplitude quadratures  $q; p$ . Thus  $SU(1;1)$  CS  $|j; 0\rangle$  are very symmetric family of boson field states which minimize the Schrodinger u.r. for both amplitude and s.a. quadratures (double SIS). It is known that they exhibit strong linear amplitude squeezing according to the definition (3). But they do not exhibit amplitude-squared squeezing: one can check that the variances  $X(\alpha)$  and  $Y(\alpha)$  for any  $\alpha \neq 0$  are greater than  $\sigma_0 = 1$ . Only relative squeezing in the sense of eq.(2) holds: the ratio  $2(X(\alpha))^2 = \hbar[X; Y]_{\alpha}$  here is equal to  $\hbar(1 + \alpha^2 j^2) = (1 + j^2)^2$  and when  $\alpha \rightarrow 0$  it tends to 0 (i.e. 100% relative squeezing).

A third type of particular cases of SIS  $|j; u; v; i$  is obtained when  $z$  is related to  $u$ , and  $v$  according to

$$z = (4n + 1)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{uv} \quad \text{or} \quad z = (4n + 3)^{\frac{1}{2}} \sqrt{uv}; \quad (49)$$

where  $n$  is positive integer. In this cases the Kummer function  ${}_1F_1(a; 1=2; z^2=2)$  to within a constant factor coincides with Hermite polynomial  $H_{2n}(z)$  and  ${}_1F_1(a; 3=2; z^2=2)$  to within a factor coincides with  $(1=z)H_{2n+1}(z)$  [39]. Then from the explicit form of solution (41), (42) and the representation (39) we derive that the e.o. SIS  $|j; u; v; i$  under the restrictions (49) take the form of finite superposition of ordinary squeezed number states  $|n\rangle$ . If furthermore in addition to (49) we take in  $|j; u; v; i$   $u$  and  $v$  real,

$$u = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \alpha); \quad v = \frac{1}{2}(1 - \alpha); \quad \alpha > 0; \quad (50)$$

we would get the "minimum uncertainty states for amplitude-squared squeezing" (or the squeezed Hermite polynomial states) considered in refs.[18]. The latter's constitute a subset of s.a. H IS. Our squeezed Hermite polynomial states, corresponding to restrictions (49) in  $|j; u; v; i$  only, (being SIS) are more general – they e.g. admit nonvanishing  $X_{sa}-Y_{sa}$  covariance (correlated [6] Hermite polynomial states).

Using the correspondence (39) we can write the even and odd s.a. SIS as double series in terms of Fock states,

$$|j; u; v; + i = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g_{2n} |2n\rangle; \quad |j; u; v; - i = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} g_{2n+1} |2n+1\rangle; \quad (51)$$

where  $(a)_k$  is the Pochhammer symbol

$$g_{2n} = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{(2n)!} \left( \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{v}{u}} \right)^{n-k} \frac{(a_+)_k}{\frac{1}{2}^k};$$

$$g_{2n+1} = \sum_{k=0}^n \frac{1}{(2n+1)!} \left( \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{\frac{v}{u}} \right)^{n-k} \frac{(a_-)_k}{\frac{3}{2}^k};$$

In conclusion to this section it worth noting that the functions (41), (42) are solutions of the eigenvalue equation (40) for any complex parameters  $u, v$  and  $z$ . When  $|v|=|u|<1$  they represent normalized states. When  $|v|=|u|=1$  these solutions could be considered as nonnormalizable states. For example when  $u, v$  are real and  $v = u$  we get the eigenfunctions of continuous observables  $X_{sa}$  and  $Y_{sa}$ . The situation is the same in the canonical case of  $q$  and  $p$ : the canonical SS are solutions of eigenvalue equation (6) with  $A = a$  and if we write down this equation in CS representation we would get nonnormalized solutions for  $u = v$  which could be considered as nonnormalized eigenstates of  $q$  and  $p$  (recall the nonnormalizable plane wave as eigenstate of  $p$  in  $q$  representation).

#### IV . Squeezing and photon distributions in squared amplitude IS

The constructed e.o. squared amplitude SIS  $|z; u; v\rangle$  turned out to exhibit strong both linear (ordinary) and quadratic amplitude squeezing and to show super- and subpoissonian photon statistics as well. Here we consider these properties explicitly.

The possibility for joint linear and quadratic amplitude squeezing stems from the spectral properties of the commutators between quadratures of  $a$  and of  $a^2$ . Indeed, let  $q$  denotes  $q$  or  $p$  and  $X$  denotes  $X$  or  $Y$ . Then consider the commutator  $[q, X]$ . It is proportional to  $q$  and therefore is non positive and non negative definite. Then states  $|j\rangle$  exist in which the mean of this commutator vanishes. Such are all e.o. states for example. Thus for the quadratures  $q$  and  $X$  Heisenberg relation for such states reads

$$\langle q^2 \rangle \langle X^2 \rangle \geq 0; \quad (52)$$

which means that in these states both variances  $\langle q^2 \rangle$  and  $\langle X^2 \rangle$  could be simultaneously small (but only one could tend to zero). There is no restriction from the above as well, i.e. these variances could be simultaneously large. A similar inequality holds for the variances of  $q$  and the number operator  $N = a^\dagger a$ ,

$$\langle q^2 \rangle \langle N \rangle \geq 0; \quad (53)$$

which explains the nonexistence of any relation between super- or subpoissonian statistics and  $q$  or  $p$  squeezing [2].

#### A . Linear squeezing in squared amplitude SIS

The variances of the canonical operators  $q; p$  and their covariance in any s.a. SIS  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle$  can be easily obtained in terms of the means of  $a^\dagger a$  and  $q$  and  $p$  (expressing  $q; p$  in terms of  $A^0(u; v); A^0$  and taking into account the eigenvalue eq.(37)). In the e.o. states  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle$  these formula simplify due to the orthogonality  $\langle \bar{j}; v; z | \bar{j}; u; v\rangle = \delta_{z=u}$  which lead to  $\langle q \rangle = 0 = \langle p \rangle$ .

$$\langle q^2 \rangle(z; u; v) = \langle q^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} + \langle v; u; z | \bar{j} a^\dagger a | \bar{j}; u; v \rangle + \text{Re}[(u - v)z]; \quad (54)$$

$$\langle p^2 \rangle(z; u; v) = \langle p^2 \rangle = \frac{1}{2} + \langle v; u; z | \bar{j} a^\dagger a | \bar{j}; u; v \rangle - \text{Re}[(u - v)z]; \quad (55)$$

$$\langle qp \rangle(z; u; v) = \frac{1}{2} \langle qp \rangle + \langle pq \rangle = \text{Im}[(u - v)z]; \quad (56)$$

The means  $\langle \bar{j}; v; z | \bar{j} a^\dagger a | \bar{j}; u; v \rangle$  can be calculated in the canonical CS representation, using (39), (41) and (42). Since the integrals  $I_N(z; u; v)$  cannot be expressed in a simple closed form in terms of known special functions we have to resort to numerical calculations or to analytical approximation. Using the known formula

$$\int_0^\infty \exp(-j^2) j^{2n} d^2 = n! / n!$$

we can convert the integrals into series and regroup the terms in an appropriate way to obtain good approximations. For example in the case of even states  $|\bar{j}; u; v; + i\rangle$  we get

$$\langle \bar{j}; v; z | \bar{j} a^\dagger a | \bar{j}; u; v; + i \rangle = [I_{N+}(z; u; v)]^{-1} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2n)!}{(2n)!} \langle \bar{j}; u; v; + i | \bar{j} a^\dagger a | \bar{j}; u; v; + i \rangle; \quad (57)$$

$$I_{N+}(z; u; v) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(2n)!}{(2n)!} \langle \bar{j}; u; v; + i | \bar{j} a^\dagger a | \bar{j}; u; v; + i \rangle; \quad (58)$$

where

$$f_n(z; u; v) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)^k \frac{(a_+(z; u; v))_{n-k}}{k! (n-k)! \left( \frac{1}{2} \right)_{n-k}}; \quad a_+(z; u; v) = \frac{1}{4} (1 + z = \frac{p}{uv});$$

$(a)_n$  being the Pochhammer symbol. Both series (57) and (58) are with positive terms and are convergent by construction. Therefore their first several terms can be used as approximations to the exact functions for small  $z=u$  and  $v=u$  (recall that the normalized eigenstates  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle$  exist for  $|z=u| < 1$  only).

In this manner we find that in the family of e.o. SIS  $|\bar{j}; u; v\rangle$  there are states which exhibit very strong linear amplitude squeezing. As illustration we show on Fig.1 the plots of the variance of  $q$  in the three even SIS  $|\bar{j}; u; v; + i\rangle$  with  $z = 1; 2; 5; v =$

$x; x > 0$  as functions of  $x$ , where  $x$  is positive. We see that the variance of  $q$  has broad and well pronounced minimums which are deeper for large (real)  $z$ . This squeezing is very strong (much stronger than in ordinary e.o. CS  $j+i$ ) { the squared variance  $\sigma_q^2(z;u;v)$  for  $z = 5; v = 5; u = \sqrt{26}$  is less than 0.0025, and the ratio  $\sigma_q^2(z;u;v) = \sigma_0^2$  { less than 0.01 (99% squeezing). Similar to this (but not identical) is the squeezing of  $p$  in the symmetric states  $j;u;v; i$  with  $z = 1; 2; 5; v = x; x > 0$ : The photon statistics in these particular  $q-p$  squeezed even SIS is superpoissonian (positive Mandel  $Q$ -factor). On Fig.3 we show the photon distribution  $f(n)$  in the strongly  $q$ -squeezed state  $j = 5; \sqrt{37}; 6; +i$ . In the large family of even SIS  $j;u;v; +i$  there are states with subpoissonian photon statistics ( $Q < 0$ ). Those are for example SIS  $j = 5; u = 1 + j^2; v = x; +i$  when  $0 < x < 0.5$  (on Fig.3 we show  $f(n)$  in  $j = 5; \sqrt{1.04}; 0.2i$ ). Recall that for  $v = 0$  in the ordinary even CS  $j+i$  the statistics is superpoissonian for any  $x \neq 0$ . It is subpoissonian in the odd CS  $j-i$ , which however are not  $q-p$  squeezed. Thus the e.o. SIS exhibit more  $q-p$  squeeze and statistical properties. Squeezing in some SIS from the subset, determined by the restrictions (49) and (50) have been considered in ref.[18] (but in the sense of definition (2), not (3)). The Mandel  $Q$ -factor,  $Q = \langle a^\dagger a a^\dagger a \rangle - \langle a^\dagger a \rangle^2$  in any SIS  $j;u;v; i_{sa}$  is given by the formula

$$Q(z;u;v) = 4jv^2 \langle a^\dagger a \rangle + \frac{1}{\langle a^\dagger a \rangle} [2jv^2 + j^2(1 + 2jv^2) - 2\text{Re}(u v z^2)] : \quad (59)$$

We see that subpoissonian statistics is most likely to occur in SIS with  $\text{Re}(u v z^2) > 0$ .

## B. Quadratic squeezing in squared amplitude SIS

The three second moments of the s.a. quadratures in our SIS  $j;u;v; i_{sa}$  are obtained from the general  $X-Y$  formula, eqs.(9-11), in the form

$$\sigma_{X_{sa}}^2(z;u;v) = j + v^2(2\langle a^\dagger a \rangle + 1); \quad (60)$$

$$\sigma_{Y_{sa}}^2 = j + v^2(2\langle a^\dagger a \rangle + 1); \quad \sigma_{XY} = 4\text{Im}(u v) (2\langle a^\dagger a \rangle + 1) : \quad (61)$$

From these formula and from the eigenvalue equation for s.a. SIS it follows that in the limits  $v \rightarrow 0$  (possible only when  $j \neq 1$ ) the variances of  $X_{sa}$  or  $Y_{sa}$  should become arbitrary small. For finite  $v$  we get finite quadratic squeezing. On Fig. 2 we show the plots of the variance of  $Y_{sa}$  as function of  $x$  in the strongly  $q$  squeezed even SIS  $j; \sqrt{1+x^2}; x; +i, z = 1; 2; 5$  and  $x > 0$ . The quadratic squeezed vacuum

states  $|0\rangle; \sqrt{\frac{p}{1+x^2}}; x; +i$  (which are annihilated by  $ua^2 + va^{v2}$  and at  $v = 0$  coincide with the true vacuum  $|0\rangle$ ) also exhibit strong s.a. squeezing. Here we have to point out that e.g. the states  $|5\rangle; \sqrt{\frac{p}{1+x^2}}; x; +i$  in the interval  $4.5 < x < 8$  are q- and  $Y_{sa}$  {squeezed simultaneously (joint q and  $Y_{sa}$  squeezing). Symmetric to these are states  $|5\rangle; \sqrt{\frac{p}{1+x^2}}; x; +i$  which are also double squeezed, this time p and  $X_{sa}$  being squeezed simultaneously. One can expect that the squeezed states with joint linear and quadratic squeezing should be useful in optical communications to reduce further the noise of the chd.

For any quantum state we can establish simple geometric condition, which is sufficient for the state to exhibit superpoissonian photon statistics. This condition is shown to be more efficient for s.a. equal uncertainty states and necessary and sufficient for s.a. equal uncertainty H I S  $|j\rangle_{sa}$ , eq.(28). The possibility for such relation is provided by the Casimir operator of  $SU(1;1)$  for the representation (31):  $C = K_1^2 + K_2^2 - K_3^2 = -k(k-1) = -3=16$ . Using this we can express the variance of number operator  $N = a^\dagger a = 2K_3 - 1=2$  in terms of the variances of  $X_{sa}, Y_{sa}$  and the components of the mean quasi spin vector  $\langle \underline{K} \rangle = (\langle K_1 \rangle; \langle K_2 \rangle; \langle K_3 \rangle)$ ,

$$\langle \underline{K} \rangle^2 = \langle K_1 \rangle^2 + \langle K_2 \rangle^2 - \langle K_3 \rangle^2; \quad (62)$$

and thus to establish relation between the Mandel Q -factor and the squared amplitude variances. We have (in any state)

$$\langle N \rangle Q = 4 \left( \frac{2}{K_1} + \frac{2}{K_2} + 4\langle \underline{K} \rangle^2 - 2\langle K_3 \rangle \right) \frac{1}{4}; \quad (63)$$

Using the Schrodinger relation (5) we get the desired sufficient condition

$$\langle \underline{K} \rangle^2 \geq \frac{1}{16} - \frac{1}{2}\langle K_3 \rangle; \quad (64)$$

This condition involves first moments of  $K_i$  only and has the further advantage that the "length" of mean quasi spin vector  $\langle \underline{K} \rangle^2$  is invariant under linear canonical transformations,

$$\langle \tilde{j}; \underline{K} \tilde{j}; \rangle^2 = \langle \underline{K} \rangle^2; \quad (65)$$

$$\tilde{j}; i = U(\tilde{\ }) j i; \quad (66)$$

$U(\tilde{\ })$  being the metaplectic operator (33), which generates linear canonical (homogeneous for simplicity) transformations and when  $\tilde{\ } = 0$  coincides with the canonical squeeze operator  $S(\tilde{\ })$ , eq.(8). Thus in all states of the form  $U(\tilde{\ }) j i$  we have to

calculate in fact the mean of  $K_3$  and the mean quasi spin in  $j-i$  only. Condition (64) is satisfied by squeezed even CS  $S(j+i)$  when the quantity  $\sinh r \operatorname{Re}(e^{2i\theta}) = 0$  ( $\theta = r e^i$ ), in particular by all even CS  $j+i$ . Squeezed number states  $j-i$  satisfy the above condition when  $\sinh^2 r + \cosh^2 r = n+1$ .

It worth noting that neither ordinary squeezed CS  $j-i$  nor ordinary squeezed number states  $j-i$  exhibit quadratic squeezing in the sense of eq.(3) what could be verified after some tedious calculations. Only quadratic squeezing after definition (2) could exist in  $j-i$  and  $j-i$ . So the SIS constructed here are probably the first examples of squeezed states with joint amplitude and amplitude-squared squeezing.

## V. On the stable evolution and generation of SIS

In this section we consider some aspects of the problem of time evolution of initial SIS  $|j_0; u_0; v_0\rangle$  in greater detail treating the s.a. SIS. We discuss possible generation of s.a. SIS and SS from other known states.

If  $U(t)$  is an evolution operator for a given quantum system then the time evolution of the initial SIS is  $U(t)|j_0; u_0; v_0\rangle = |j; z_0; u_0; v_0\rangle$ . The evolution is called stable if  $|j; z_0; u_0; v_0\rangle$  is again SIS. That is (up to a phase factor)

$$|j; z_0; u_0; v_0\rangle = |j(t); u(t); v(t)\rangle; \quad (67)$$

where complex parameters  $z(t) = z$ ;  $u(t) = u$ ;  $v(t) = v$  are functions of time. Physical importance of stable evolution of a given set of states is in that such states can be realized for the system described by  $U(t)$  and they can be generated by acting with  $U(t)$  on some known states from the same set. If the evolution is stable for a subset only, then other states from the set can not be realized for this system (the time evolution operator would destroy such states).

For a quantum system with Hamiltonian  $H$  (possibly time dependent) the evolution of a given set of SIS  $|j; u; v\rangle$  is stable if the following (sufficient) condition is satisfied

$$\frac{\partial A^0}{\partial t} - i[A^0; H] = 0; \quad (68)$$

where

$$A^0 = fA^0 + g; \quad A^0 = uA + vA^\dagger;$$

$f$  and  $g$  (and  $u$  and  $v$ ) being functions of time,  $z = (z_0 - g)/f$ ,  $f \neq 0$ . Indeed, let  $|j_0; u_0; v_0\rangle$  be an initial SIS, that is an eigenstate of  $A_0 = u_0A + v_0A^\dagger$ . Then the time

evolved state  $U(t)|z_0; u_0; v_0\rangle$  is eigenstate of operator  $A_{inv} = U(t)A_0U^\dagger(t)$  with the same eigenvalue  $z_0$  ( $U(t)$  is the evolution operator). This operator  $A_{inv}$  is an integral of motion [7, 40] and satisfy the equation  $\partial_t A_{inv} - i[A_{inv}, H] = 0$ . If now  $A_{inv}$  takes the form  $A_{inv} = fA^0 + g$  we get eq.(68) and the evolved state is SIS with  $z = (z_0 - g)/f$ . If the H IS  $|z_i\rangle$  are an overcomplete set, then one could get that eq.(68) is also necessary.

So for any given system  $H$  we have to look for integrals of motion which are linear combination of  $A$  and  $A^\dagger$ . In canonical case of  $A = a$ ,  $A^\dagger = a^\dagger$  such linear invariants (and their eigenstates as well) have been constructed in ref.[7] for  $n$  dimensional quadratic Hamiltonians. Here we have to look for systems  $H$  which admit integrals of motion of the form  $f(ua^2 + va^{\dagger 2}) + g$  to establish stable evolution and possible generation of s.a. SIS  $|z_i; u; v\rangle_{sa}$ .

The simplest but very important system is the free electromagnetic field (or equivalently the harmonic oscillator) with  $H = \frac{1}{2}(a^\dagger a + 1) = H_{ho}$  ( $\hbar = 1$ ). From (68) we get the equations for the state parameters

$$\dot{u} + \frac{f}{f}u - 2i!u = 0; \quad \dot{v} + \frac{f}{f}v + 2i!v = 0; \quad \dot{g} = 0: \quad (69)$$

We easily find solutions

$$\begin{aligned} g &= g_0 \quad \text{const.}; \quad f = f_0 e^{i\phi_0 t}; \quad z = \frac{z_0 - g_0}{f} \\ u &= u_0 e^{i(2! - \phi_0)t}; \quad v = v_0 e^{i(2! + \phi_0)t}; \end{aligned} \quad (70)$$

where  $\phi_0$  is an arbitrary parameter, and  $g_0; f_0; u_0; v_0$  are initial values. Note that s.a. SIS depend effectively on the ratios  $z = \frac{p}{uv}$  and  $v = u$  only (see eqs. (41,42)) which do not depend on  $\phi_0$ . Furthermore we take  $g_0 = z_0 - z_0^2$ ,  $f_0 = z_0$  and  $\phi_0 = 2!$  and get  $z = z_0 \exp(i2!t)$ .

Thus for the free field Hamiltonian all s.a. SIS are stable in time with parameters

$$z = z_0 \exp(i2!t); \quad u = u_0 \exp(i4!t); \quad v = v_0 \quad (70a):$$

This means that in principle all s.a. SIS are realizable for the electromagnetic field (or harmonic oscillator). It is a separate problem how to prepare the system in this states or how to generate them from other known states. As the solutions (70) reveals, the free field evolution operator  $U_{ho}(t) = T \exp\left(\int_0^t H_{ho}(t)dt\right)$  acts in a highly reducible way on the set of SIS: it can not change the modulus of  $z; u; v$ , therefore can't generate SIS  $|z_i; u; v\rangle$  from equal uncertainty H IS  $|z_i\rangle$ . That is  $U_{ho}$  can't generate s.a. squeezing as one expects: the (squared) variances of s.a. quadratures  $X_{sa}; Y_{sa}$  can only oscillate in

time between their minimal and maximal values. The relative variances of  $X_{sa}; Y_{sa}$ , oscillate in time with frequency  $4!$  ( $\phi_0 = \arg u_0 + \arg v_0$ ),

$$r_{X,Y}(t) = \frac{\frac{1}{2} \frac{d^2}{dt^2} \langle X_{sa}^2; Y_{sa}^2 \rangle(t)}{\frac{1}{2} \langle X_{sa}^2; Y_{sa}^2 \rangle(t)} = j_0^2 j^2 + j_0^2 j^2 - 2j_0 j j_0 j \cos(4!t + \phi_0); \quad (71)$$

Let us recall that the relative q and p variances (the ratios  $r_{q,p}(t)$ ) in the free field evolution of canonical SS oscillate with  $2!$ . It worth noting the periodicity of the time evolution of s.s. SIS: the states return their shape after time  $T = 2\pi/4!$  as it is seen from eqs.(70a) and (41,42).

We can consider s.a. uncertainty ellipses with pulsating in time semiaxes  $a(t) = r_X(t)$  and  $b(t) = r_Y(t)$ . Combining this with the solution (70a) for  $z(t)$  we get the picture, quite similar to the known one for the canonical SS [2, 41]: the radius  $|z|$  rotates with  $2!$ , the length of semiaxes oscillates with  $4!$  (in canonical case the frequencies are  $1!$  and  $2!$ ). These picture applies also to the evolution of the uncertainty ellipses of  $K_1; K_2$  in  $SU(1;1)$  SIS [21], governed by Hamiltonian  $H = 2!K_3$ , where  $K_i$  are  $SU(1;1)$  generators in any discrete series representation.

The next Hamiltonian system we consider is general quadratic boson system (homogeneous for simplicity),

$$H = \sum_{j=1}^N X_j^3(t) K_j = H_{quad}; \quad (72)$$

where the generators  $K_j$  are quadratic combinations of  $a$  and  $a^\dagger$ , eq.(31). The necessary and sufficient condition (68) for all s.a. SIS to be stable in time now is not satisfied by  $H_{quad}$  unless  $\phi_1 = 0 = \phi_2$  (the previous case). Then we have to look for stable evolution of some subsets (which are not overcomplete in the whole Hilbert space) or to look for other states  $|j_0\rangle$  which evolve in time as s.a. SIS. Let  $|j_0\rangle$  be a state which at  $t > 0$  (driven by  $H_{quad}$ ) evolves into the set of s.a. SIS  $|j; u; v\rangle_{sa}$ ,

$$|j; u; v\rangle_{sa} = U(t) |j_0\rangle; \quad (73)$$

where  $U(t)$  is the evolution operator, corresponding to  $H$ . One can readily see that  $|j_0\rangle$  has to be an eigenstate of  $U^\dagger(t) A_{sa}(u; v) U(t)$ ,

$$U^\dagger(t) A_{sa}(u; v) U(t) |j_0\rangle = z |j_0\rangle; \quad (74)$$

When  $H = H_{quad}$  the operator  $U(t)$  is an element  $U_{Mp}$  of the metaplectic group, which covers the  $SU(1;1)$  [23] – the Lie algebra of the two groups is the same  $su(1;1)$ . It can



be decomposed as [23]  $U_{M_p} = S(\zeta) \exp(i K_3)$ , where  $S(\zeta)$  is the canonical squeeze operator (8). The factor  $\exp(i K_3)$  describes the previous case and for simplicity is omitted henceforth ( $\zeta = 0$ ). Using the known BCH formula we rewrite (74) as

$$(h_3 K_3 + h_+ K_+ + h_- K_-) j_0 i = z j_0 i; \quad (75)$$

where ( $\zeta = r e^{i\theta}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} h_3 &= (u + v) \cos \theta \sinh(2r); \quad h_- = (u \cosh^2 r + v \sinh^2 r) e^{2i\theta}; \\ h_+ &= u \sinh^2 r e^{-2i\theta} + v \cosh^2 r; \end{aligned} \quad (76)$$

We arrived at the conclusion that s.a. SIS can be generated from a state  $j_0 i$  by means of metaplectic evolution operator  $U_{M_p}(t)$  if  $j_0 i$  is an eigenstate of a complex linear combination (75) of all  $SU(1;1)$  generators (31).

Complex linear combinations of generators of any Lie algebra close another (larger) algebra, called complex form of the original one. The complex form of  $su(1;1)$  is denoted as  $su^c(1;1)$ . By this reason we could call the eigenstates of operators, which are elements of  $su^c(1;1)$  algebraic  $su^c(1;1)$  CS. S.a. SIS are their particular cases and can be generated from states  $j_0 i$  from another subset of  $su^c(1;1)$  CS, determined by the relations (75). Solutions of the eq.(75) do exist. Using normal ordered form of  $S(\zeta)$  [23], the BCH formula and expression (41) we can represent the even SIS  $j; u; v; + i$  in the form  $j; u; v; + i = S(\zeta) j_0 i$  with the following  $j_0 i$  ( $\zeta = r e^{i\theta}$ ),

$$j_0 i = N_+ \cosh^{-2} j \mathcal{M}_{a_+} \left( \frac{1}{2}; p_2(a; a^y) \right) j_0 i \quad j; \quad ; \quad u; + i_{Kummer}; \quad (77)$$

where  $\theta$  is the phase of  $u$ ,  $\tanh r \exp(i\theta) = \frac{q}{p} \frac{v}{u}$ ,  $j < 1$ ,  $\mathcal{M}(a; b; z)$  is the Kummer function [39],  $a_+ = (1 + z \frac{q}{p} uv) = 4$  and  $p_2(a; a^y)$  is a second order polynomial of  $a$  and  $a^y$  (element of  $su(2;C)$ ),

$$p_2(a; a^y) = \ln(1 - j^2) a^{y2} + \frac{1}{2} a^2 - a^y a - 2; \quad (78)$$

One can consider  $z$ ,  $\theta$  and the angle  $\theta$  as free parameters of an initial  $su(2;C)$  CS which evolves into SIS  $j; u; v; + i$ . Similarly one can treat the problem of metaplectic generation of odd s.a. SIS  $j; u; v; - i$ .

Consider some particular cases of the Kummer function states (77). When  $a_+(z; \theta; u) = 0$  (then  $\mathcal{M}(0; b; z) = 1$ ) we get the initial states as  $j_0 i$  and then s.a. SIS  $j; u; v; + i$  are Perelomov CS (canonically squeezed vacuum). When  $a_+(z; \theta; u) = 1/2$  the Kummer function is an exponent and the initial state is a Perelomov CS, the normal one

being again such CS and s.a. SIS as well. Perelomov CS are stable under the action of metaplectic evolution operators. When  $a_+(z; \eta) = \frac{m}{2} = 1; 2; \dots$  the above Kummer function is a Hermite polynomial [39]  $H_{2m}(2p_2(a; a^y))$  and the initial state is clearly a finite superposition of Fock states  $|j\rangle$ . Following ref. [18] we can call  $H_{2m}(2p_2(a; a^y))|j\rangle$  Hermite polynomial states – these are more general and recover those in [18] when  $p_2(a; a^y) = \text{const} a^{y/2}$ . The squeeze operator  $S(\eta)$  does not affect the Kummer function parameter  $a_+$ . Therefore in this case the final state is an even s.a. SIS of the form  $S(\eta) H_{2m}(\frac{p}{2} a^y) |j\rangle$ .

Fock states  $|j\rangle$  can be constructed by means of  $n+1$  Glauber CS  $|j\rangle$  and in principle any finite superposition of  $|j\rangle$  as well [42]. Thus the subset of s.a. SIS of the form of squeezed Hermite polynomial states can be in principle experimentally created, using Hermite polynomial states e.g. as input states for the degenerate parametric amplifier. To get other type of s.a. SIS by means of metaplectic evolution operator one needs first to create Kummer function states, which in general are in finite superpositions of number states. Due to the fact that s.a. HCS  $|j\rangle_{sa}$  are available (e.g. the e.o. CS  $|j\rangle_i$  [27] or the Yurke-Stoler states [32]) it is desirable to look for generation of s.a. SIS from s.a. HCS. However the s.a. squeeze operator  $S_{sa}(u; v)$  is not unitary (it is isometric only) and one has to look for processes with nonunitary quantum dynamics of boson system. In principle this could be expected if interaction with other systems is present not in parametric form.

Dealing with s.a. squeezing by metaplectic evolution it is natural to try to produce s.a. SS other than SIS, taking as input some of experimentally available boson states. As such input states let us consider the Glauber CS  $|j\rangle$ , the Fock states  $|j\rangle$  and the e.o. CS  $|j\rangle_i$ . After some standard but long calculations and analysis we can find that quadratic squeezing (after the definition (3)) occurs in the third case only. As an example we take the ordinary squeezed even states  $|j; z; +i\rangle$ ,

$$|j; z; +i\rangle = \exp \frac{1}{2} (a^{y/2} - a^2) |j; +i\rangle; \quad (78)$$

where  $|j; +i\rangle = |j; +i; z = \infty\rangle$ . The variances of the amplitude quadrature  $q$  and s.a. quadrature  $X_{sa}$  and the Mandel  $Q$ -factor in  $|j; z; +i\rangle$  are obtained in the form ( $\eta = re^{i\phi}$ ,  $z = e^{i\theta}$ )

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_q^2(\eta; z) = & \frac{1}{2} + \sinh^2 r + \text{Re} a^y \text{Ai} (\cosh(2r) + \cos \phi \sinh(2r)) + \frac{1}{2} \cos \phi \sinh(2r) \\ & + \text{Re} z \cosh r + e^{i\phi} \sinh r^2; \quad (79) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\chi_{sa}^2(\alpha; z) &= 2 \cos^2 \theta \sinh^2(2r) e^{-2\alpha} + \hbar^2 \alpha^2 (1 - \hbar^2 \alpha^2) + s_1^2 + s_2^2 + 2s_1 s_2 \cos(2\theta) \\
&\quad [1 + 2\hbar^2 \alpha^2 + 4 \cos \theta \sinh(2r) [\sin \theta \cos(\alpha) + s_2 \cos(2\theta)]]; \quad (80) \\
\chi_{sa}^2(\alpha; z) &= \cosh^2(2r) e^{-2\alpha} + \hbar^2 \alpha^2 (1 - \hbar^2 \alpha^2) + \frac{1}{2} \sinh^2(2r) (1 + 2\hbar^2 \alpha^2) \\
&\quad \hbar^2 \cosh(2r) \sinh^2 r + \sinh(2r) \cos(\theta) [2 \cosh(2r) - 1]; \quad (81)
\end{aligned}$$

where  $\hbar^2 \alpha^2 = \hbar^2 \alpha^2 \cosh^2 r$ ;  $s_1 = \cosh^2 r$ ;  $s_2 = \sinh^2 r$ :

Strong q-squeezing (asymptotically, when  $r \rightarrow 1$ , absolute one) we get, e.g. in the family of states  $j = r; z = \alpha + i$ . Quadratic squeezing ( $\chi_{sa}$ -squeezing) is obtained e.g. in the family  $j = r; z = \alpha + i$  with small  $r$  and  $\alpha$ . This is illustrated by the plots on Fig.4. Since the quadratic squeezing here is not strong and is observed in short interval of  $r$  we have used scaling factors in order to combine the two graphics in one figure. Joint q and  $\chi_{sa}$  squeezing is also possible - it occurs e.g. in  $j = r; z = 0.4 + i$  when  $0.12 < r < 0.34$ . The photon statistics in these linear and quadratic amplitude SS is obtained as superpoissonian. Subpoissonian statistics occurs in the families  $j = ir; z = -i$  for small  $r$  and large  $\alpha$ , e.g. for  $r = 0.1$  and  $\alpha > 2$  (but they again are not SS). The occurrence of linear amplitude squeezing in  $j = r; z = \alpha + i$  is normal since application of the canonical q-p squeeze operator  $S(\alpha)$  to any ( $\alpha$  independent) state always produce q- and p-squeezing. This result stems from transformation properties of the uncertainty matrix  $(\alpha; q; p)$  under linear canonical transformations (see section III) [36]. Generation of quadratic squeezing by means of  $S(\alpha)$  was not quite expected. We note that s.a. SS  $j = r; z = \alpha + i$  can be easily realized since H IS  $j = r; z = \alpha + i$  are available and could be used e.g. as input states in degenerate parametric amplifier.

## V I. Conclusion

We have considered some general properties of states  $j = r; u; v; i$ , which minimize the Schrodinger uncertainty relation (5) for arbitrary pair of observables  $X$  and  $Y$ , terming such states Schrodinger intelligent states (SIS). SIS are eigenstates of complex linear combination of  $X$  and  $Y$ . The uncertainty matrix for  $X$  and  $Y$  in any state with density matrix  $\rho$  can be diagonalized by linear transformation of  $X$  and  $Y$ , which preserves the commutator  $[X^0; Y^0] = [X; Y]$ . Such transformation is an  $SU(1;1)$  transformation and when  $[X; Y] = i$  it is the canonical one. In the important physical case of  $X; Y$  being the quadratures of the squared boson (photon) destruction operator  $a^2$  all SIS are explicitly constructed and discussed.

The even and odd s.a. SIS contain in a natural way many known Schrodinger cat states and exhibit interesting physical properties such as very strong amplitude and squared amplitude squeezing (even simultaneously), super- and subpoissonian statistics. A subset of s.a. which are of the form of ordinary squeezed complex Hermite polynomial states could be realized in the degenerate parametric amplifier scheme using the finite (Hermite polynomial) superposition of number states as an input. Number states can be in principle experimentally created [42]. We have also shown that the ordinary squeezed even CS,  $S(\alpha) |j; +i = |j; z; +i$ , eq.(78), can exhibit strong amplitude and light amplitude-squared squeezing. These double squeezed states,  $|j; z; -i$ , can be easily realized e.g. in the degenerate amplifier scheme, since the ordinary even and odd CS are available [12, 27]. It is desirable from this point of view to examine for linear and quadratic squeezing other ordinary squeezed equal uncertainty HISS  $(\alpha) |j; i_{sa}$  (in a recent paper [33] such states have been briefly considered as "SU(1;1) minimum uncertainty states with equal variance in two observables").

From the algebraic point of view s.a. SIS and other s.a. states considered here are eigenstates of operators, which are complex linear combinations of the SU(1;1) generators  $K_i$  in the s.a. representation (31). The set of all complex linear combinations of  $K_i$  closes the Lie algebra  $su^\mathbb{C}(1;1) = sl(2; \mathbb{C})$ , which is the complex form of  $su(1;1)$ . By this reason one can call such eigenstates  $su^\mathbb{C}(1;1)$  CS. So we have constructed here several subsets of the  $su^\mathbb{C}(1;1)$  CS in the representation (31). In this representation another subset of  $su^\mathbb{C}(1;1)$  CS (different from ours  $|j; u; v; i_{sa}$ ,  $|j; z; -i$  and Kummer function states (77)) has been constructed in the recent paper by Wunsch [43]. In ref. [21] eigenstates of  $uK_1 + vK_2$  (the SU(1;1) SIS) for any discrete series (square integrable) representation have been constructed using Barut-Girardello CS representation. Eigenstates of  $K_3 - iK_1$  are considered in the very recent paper [33]. Let us note that the ordinary squeezed Fock states  $S(\alpha) |j; i$  are also s.a.  $su^\mathbb{C}(1;1)$  CS.

After the first e-print submission my attention was kindly brought to the recent preprints [44] where eigenstates of complex linear combinations of SU(1;1) generators are also constructed (using the similar approach) and discussed as squeezed and intelligent states. Eigenstates of complex combinations  $ua^2 + va^{y2}$  are also presented in [36] (using present approach) and in [45] (using an algebraic approach).

Acknowledgment. The work is partially supported by the Bulgarian science foundation under contract # F-559.

## V II. Appendix

Nonunitarity of the squared amplitude squeeze operator. The squeeze operator for arbitrary pair of observables  $X, Y$  is defined as a map "HIS  $\rightarrow$  SIS",

$$|j\rangle \rightarrow |j; u; v\rangle = S(u; v)|j\rangle \quad (82)$$

This defines the operator  $S(u; v)$  correctly in the whole Hilbert space if the set of HIS  $|j\rangle$  is overcomplete [9], since in such cases any state  $|j\rangle$  is linear span of HIS  $|j\rangle$ . Such is the case of squared amplitude (s.a.) HIS and SIS, we are interesting here. Indeed, any  $|j\rangle$  is known to be decomposed as a sum of one even and one odd state,  $|j\rangle = |j_+ \rangle + |j_- \rangle$  and every  $|j_\pm \rangle$  can be expanded as an integral over even/odd CS  $|j_\pm \rangle$  using the resolution formulas (23). For brevity here we omit the subscript sa in s.a. SIS  $|j; u; v\rangle$  and s.a. squeeze operator.

The so defined s.a. squeeze operator  $S(u; v)$  is isometric, i.e. it preserves the norm of the states. This can be proved most easily using the analyticity of the canonical CS representation [9]: the canonical CS diagonal matrix elements  $\langle j | Z | j \rangle$  uniquely determine the operator  $Z$ . We take  $Z = S^\dagger S$  and consider  $\langle j | S^\dagger S | j \rangle$ . The operator  $S$  (and  $S^\dagger S$  as well) by definition preserves the parity of the states. Then expressing CS  $|j\rangle$  in terms of even and odd CS  $|j_\pm \rangle$ ,  $\langle j | S^\dagger S | j \rangle = \langle j_+ | S^\dagger S | j_+ \rangle + \langle j_- | S^\dagger S | j_- \rangle$ ,

$$|j\rangle = f_+ |j_+\rangle + f_- |j_-\rangle$$

where  $|f_+|^2 + |f_-|^2 = 1$ , and taking into account that the constructed even/odd SIS  $|j; u; v\rangle$ ,  $|j_\pm; u; v\rangle = S|j_\pm \rangle$  are normalized and orthogonal to each other, we arrive at  $\langle j | S^\dagger S | j \rangle = 1$ , which proves that  $S(u; v)$  is isometric,  $S^\dagger S = 1$ .

Now we shall prove that s.a.  $S(u; v)$  is not unitary, that is  $SS^\dagger \neq 1$ . The proof can be carried out by admitting the inverse. Let  $SS^\dagger = 1$ . Considering the canonical CS diagonal matrix elements of  $A = a^2$  and  $S^\dagger A^0 S$  ( $A^0 = uA + vA^\dagger$ ) we get the same result, i.e.  $A = S^\dagger A^0 S$  and then  $A^0 = SAS^\dagger$ . Now let us recall that the commutators  $[A^0, A^0]$  and  $[A, A^\dagger]$  are equal as a consequence of  $|j_+|^2 - |j_-|^2 = 1$  (otherwise they are proportional). Thus if  $S$  is unitary then it commutes with the operator  $[A, A^\dagger]$  and then the mean commutator  $\langle j; u; v | [A, A^\dagger] | j; u; v \rangle$  in SIS  $|j; u; v\rangle$  does not depend on parameters  $u$  and  $v$ . But if  $\langle j; u; v | [A, A^\dagger] | j; u; v \rangle = \langle j | [A, A^\dagger] | j \rangle$  then from the formula (54), (55) we could get negative variances of  $q$  and  $p$  for fixed  $z$  and large  $|j|$ . Indeed,  $\text{Re}[(u - v)z] = |z|(u - v)\cos(\phi_1)$  and  $|j_+ - j_-|^2 = 1 + 2|j|^2 - 2|j_+ j_-|\cos(\phi_2)$ , where  $\phi_1 = \phi_2 - \arg z$ . Then for e.g.  $\phi_2 = \pi/2$ ,  $\arg z = \pi/2$  and large  $|j|$  we get  $\text{Re}[(u - v)z] = |z|(1 + 2|j|^2)$  which leads to negative variance of  $q$ , eq.(54), for large  $|j|$ . End of the proof.

It worth to note that the set of operators  $S(u;v)$  realizes a nonunitary representation of  $SU(1;1)$ . Indeed, one can check that the product of two commutator preserving  $SU(1;1)$  transformations (13) is again such a transformation and the inverse as well. Thus both the amplitude (the ordinary) squeeze operators (we mean the full metaplectic operators (33),  $U(\tilde{\gamma}) = S(\gamma) \exp(iK_3)$ ) and the squared amplitude squeeze operators realize representations of  $SU(1;1)$  – in the first case it is unitary, in the second case it is isometric only. However so far we do not have the squared amplitude squeeze operator expressed in closed form in terms of boson operators  $a$  and  $a^\dagger$ . We note that one can apply to s.a. H I S  $\tilde{\gamma}_{i_{sa}}$  the metaplectic unitary operators  $U(\tilde{\gamma})$  (in particular  $S(\gamma)$ ) and obtain another large family of states  $\tilde{\gamma}; \tilde{\gamma}_{i_{sa}}$ , which however are not  $K_1$ - $K_2$  SIS.

## References

- [1] C M . Caves, Phys. Rev. D 23, 1693 (1981); N N Hollenhorst, PhysRev. D 19, 1669 (1985).
- [2] D F . Walls, Nature (London) 306, 141 (1983); R . Loudon and P L . Knight, J. Mod. Opt. 34, 709 (1987); B . Schumaker, Phys. Rep. 135, 17 (1986); V . V . Dodonov, A . V . Klimov and V . I . Man'ko, in Trudy FIAN, v 200, p 56-105 ("Nauka", M . 1991) (Nuova Science, Commack, N . Y ., 1993, v 205, p.61-107).
- [3] R J . Glauber, Phys. Rev. 131, 2726 (1963).
- [4] D A . Stoler, Phys. Rev. D 1, 3217 (1970); H . Yuen, Phys. Rev. A 13, 2226 (1976).
- [5] D A . Trifonov, J. Math. Phys. 34 (1), 100 (1993).
- [6] V . V . Dodonov, E . Kuryshchev and V . I . Man'ko, Phys. Lett. A 79, 150 (1980).
- [7] I A . Malkin, V . I . Man'ko and D A . Trifonov, Phys. Lett. A 30, 414 (1969); Phys. Rev. D 2, 1371 (1970); N . Cim ento A 4, 773 (1971).
- [8] A . Holz, Lett. N . Cim . 4, 1319 (1970); E . Y . Lu, Lett. N . Cim . 2, 1241 (1971).
- [9] J R . Klauder and B . S . Skagerstam . Coherent States (World Scientific, Singapore, 1985).
- [10] P . Kral, J. Mod. Opt. 37, 889 (1990); J . Sun, J . Wang and C . Wang, Phys. Rev. A 44, 3369 (1991).
- [11] V . Buzek, I . Jex and T . Quang, J. Mod. Opt. 37, 159 (1990).

- [12] E.E. Hach III and C.C. Gerry, J. Mod. Opt. 39, 2501 (1992); Phys. Lett. A 174 (3), 185 (1993).
- [13] V. Buzek, J. Mod. Opt. 37, 303 (1990).
- [14] K. Wodkiewicz and J. Eberly, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B 2, 458 (1985).
- [15] M. Hillery, Phys. Rev. A 36 (8), 3796 (1987).
- [16] J. Vaccaro and D. Pegg, J. Mod. Opt. 37 (1), 17 (1990); I. Medas, J.B. Popovic, Phys. Rev. A 52 (6), 4356 (1995); Phys. Rev. A 50 (2), 947 (1994).
- [17] M. Kitagawa and M. Ueda, Phys. Rev. A 47, 5138 (1993); D.A. Trifonov, Phys. Lett. A 187, 284 (1994).
- [18] J.A. Bergou, M. Hillery and D. Yu, Phys. Rev. A 43, 515 (1991).
- [19] H.P. Robertson, Phys. Rev. 34, 163 (1929); Phys. Rev. 35 (5), 667 (1930).
- [20] E. Schrodinger, in Sitzungsberichte der Preussischen Akademie der Wissenschaften (Phys. Math. Klasse, p 296) (Berlin, 1930).
- [21] D.A. Trifonov, J. Math. Phys. 35 (5), 2297 (1994).
- [22] V.V. Dodonov, I.A. Malkin and V.I. Man'ko, Physica 72, 597 (1974).
- [23] A.M. Perebromov, Commun. Math. Phys. 26, 222 (1972); Uspehi Phys. Nauk 123, 23 (1977).
- [24] V. Spiridonov, Phys. Rev. A 52 (3), 1909 (1995).
- [25] A.O. Barut and L. Girardello, Commun. Math. Phys. 21, 41 (1971).
- [26] J. Perina, Quantum Statistics of Linear and Nonlinear Optical Phenomena (Reidel, Dordrecht, 1984), p.78.
- [27] L. Gilles, B. Garraway and P.L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A 49 (4) 2789 (1995); S. Haroche, N. Ci mento B 110, 545 (1995).
- [28] N. Ansari, L. Di Fiore, M.A. Man'ko, V.I. Man'ko, R. Romano, S. Solimeno and F. Zaccari, NASA Conference Publication 3286, 165 (1995); Phys. Rev. A 49, 2151 (1994).
- [29] M.S. Kim and V. Buzek, Phys. Rev. A 47 (1), 610 (1993); J.Y. Zhu and L.M. Kuang, Phys. Lett. A 193 (3), 227 (1994); J. Johsi and M. Singh, J. Mod. Opt. 42 (4), 775 (1995); P. Goetsch, R. Graham, and F. Haake, Phys. Rev. A 51 (1), 136 (1995); V. Dodonov, V. Man'ko and D. Nikonov, Phys. Rev. A 51, 3328 (1995).
- [30] J. Janszky and A.K. Vinogradov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 64, 277 (1990).

- [31] V .Buzek, P.L.Knight and A.V.Barranco, NASA Conference Publication 3135, 181 (1992).
- [32] B .Yurke and D .Stoler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 13 (1986); H .Moya-Cessa and A . Vidiella-Buranco, J. Mod. Opt. 42 (7), 1547 (1995).
- [33] R.R.Puri and G.S.Agarwal, Phys. Rev. A 53 (3), 1786 (1996).
- [34] C.Aragone, E.Chalband and S.Salamo, J. Math. Phys. 17, 1963 (1976).
- [35] F.Gantmacher. Teoriya matrits (Moskva, "Nauka", 1975).
- [36] D.A.Trifonov, Preprints INRNE-TH-95/4; INRNE-TH-95/5.
- [37] E.C.G.Sudarshan, C.B.Chiu and G.Bhamathi, Phys. Rev. A 52 (1), 43 (1995).
- [38] H.P.Robertson, Phys. Rev. 46, 794 (1934).
- [39] Handbook of mathematical functions, edited by M.Abramowitz and I.A.Stegun (National bureau of standards, 1964) (Russian translation, M."Nauka", 1979).
- [40] D.A.Trifonov, Bulg. J. Phys. 2, 303 (1975).
- [41] M.M.Nieto, in Frontiers of Nonequilibrium Statistical Mechanics. Eds. G.T.Moore and M.O.Scully (Plenum, N.Y., 1986).
- [42] J.Janszky, P.Domokos, S.Szabo and P.Adam, Phys. Rev. A 51 (5), 4191 (1995).
- [43] A.Wunsche, Acta Phys. Slovaca 45 (3), 413 (1995).
- [44] C.Brif, E-print quant-ph/9605006; C.Brif, A.Vourdas and A.Mann, E-print quant-ph/9607002.
- [45] P.Shanta, S.Chaturvedi and V.Srinivasan, E-print quant-ph/9608034.



## F i g u r e   c a p t i o n s

Fig.1. Variance  ${}^2q(x)$  in even SIS  $|j;u;v\rangle + i$ ,  $u = \sqrt{\frac{p}{1+j^2}}$ . a)  $z = 1$ ,  $v = x$ ; b)  $z = 2$ ;  $v = x$ ; c)  $z = 5$ ;  $v = x$ ;  $x > 0$ .

The variance is squeezed if  ${}^2q < 0.5$ .

Fig.2. Variance  ${}^2Y_{sa}(x)$  in even SIS  $|j;u;v\rangle + i$ . a, b, c the same states as in Fig.1. The s.a. variance is squeezed if  ${}^2Y_{sa} < 1$ .

Fig.3. Photon distribution  $f(n)$  in even SIS  $|j;u;v\rangle + i$ ,  $u = \sqrt{\frac{p}{1+j^2}}$ .  
a)  $z = 5$ ;  $v = 6$ :  $Q > 0$ , double SS; b)  $z = 5$ ;  $v = 0.2$ :  $Q < 0$ , not SS.

Fig.4. Linear and quadratic squeezing in even states  $|j;z\rangle + i$ , eq. (78).

a)  $r = 1$ ;  $z = 4$ ,  $f(r) = 2 {}^2q(r)$ .

b)  $r = 0.3$ ;  $z = 0.4$ ,  $f(r) = {}^2X_{sa}(0.3r)$ .