

Feedback control of the fluorescence light squeezing

A. Barchielli,* M. Gregoratti,* and M. Licciardo

Mathematics Department, Politecnico di Milano, piazza Leonardo da Vinci 32, I-20133, Milano, Italy

(Dated: October 29, 2018)

We consider a two-level atom stimulated by a coherent monochromatic laser and we study how to enhance the squeezing of the fluorescence light and of the atom itself in the presence of a Wiseman-Milburn feedback mechanism, based on the homodyne detection of a fraction of the emitted light. Besides analyzing the effect of the control parameters on the squeezing properties of the light and of the atom, we also discuss the relations among these. The problem is tackled inside the framework of quantum trajectory theory.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Dv, 42.50.Ct, 42.50.Lc, 03.65.Ta

Photo-detection theory in continuous time has been widely developed [1, 2, 3, 4] and applied, in particular, to the fluorescence light emitted by a two-level atom stimulated by a coherent monochromatic laser [4, 5]. As well as various feedback schemes on the atom evolution, based on the outgoing photocurrent, have been proposed [6, 7]. However the introduction and the analysis of feedback have been mainly focused on the control of the atom [7].

Here, we are interested not only in the atom, but also, and mainly, in the emitted light and in employing control and feedback processes to enhance the squeezing properties of both systems. The squeezing of the fluorescence light can be checked by homodyne detection and spectral analysis of the output current [8, 9]. For these reasons we consider the mathematical description of photo-detection based on quantum trajectories, as it is suitable both to consistently compute the homodyne spectrum of fluorescence light, and to introduce feedback and control in the mathematical formulation. We study how the squeezing depends on the various control parameters, how feedback mechanisms can be successfully introduced and which is the relationship among the squeezing properties of the quantum systems involved. We consider only Markovian feedback schemes à la Wiseman-Milburn [6], as they leave the homodyne spectrum explicitly computable.

Two-level atom and atomic squeezing. Consider a two-level atom with Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^2 and lowering and rising operators σ_- and σ_+ . Let us denote by $\vec{\sigma}$ the vector $(\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ of the Pauli matrices. Let the eigenprojectors of σ_z be denoted by P_+ and P_- and, for every angle ϕ , let us introduce the unitary selfadjoint operator

$$\sigma_\phi = e^{i\phi} \sigma_- + e^{-i\phi} \sigma_+ = \cos \phi \sigma_x + \sin \phi \sigma_y.$$

A state ρ of the atom is represented by a point \vec{x} in the Bloch sphere, $\rho = (1 + \vec{x} \cdot \vec{\sigma})/2$, with $\vec{x} \in \mathbb{R}^3$, $|\vec{x}| \leq 1$.

Walls and Zoller [10] suggested to define the squeezing of a two-level atom from the Heisenberg-Robertson uncertainty relations for σ_x and σ_y . By using the equatorial component σ_\perp of $\vec{\sigma}$ with minimum variance $\Delta\sigma_\perp^2$, we say that the atomic state ρ is squeezed if

$$\Delta\sigma_\perp^2 = 1 - (x^2 + y^2) < |\langle \sigma_z \rangle| = |z|.$$

We call *atomic squeezing parameter* of ρ the quantity

$$AS_\rho = 1 - (x^2 + y^2) - |z|,$$


so that ρ is squeezed if $AS_\rho < 0$. Thus $\min_\rho AS_\rho = -1/4$, attained by pure states with $x^2 + y^2 = 3/4$ and $z^2 = 1/4$.

Detection and feedback scheme. We admit an open Markovian evolution for the atom, subjected to ‘dephasing’ effects and to interactions both with a thermal bath and with the electromagnetic field, via absorption and emission of photons. The atom is stimulated by a coherent monochromatic laser and the emitted light is partially lost in the *forward channel* and partially gathered in two *side channels* for homodyne detection.

Let the free Hamiltonian of the atom be $\omega_0 \sigma_z/2$, with $\omega_0 > 0$. Let the natural line-width of the atom be $\gamma > 0$, let the intensities of the dephasing and thermal effects be $k_d \geq 0$ and $\bar{n} \geq 0$, let the stimulating laser have frequency $\omega > 0$. Finally, let the Rabi frequency be $\Omega \geq 0$ and let $\Delta\omega = \omega_0 - \omega$ denote the detuning.

Let the fractions of light emitted in the forward and in the two side channels be $|\alpha_0|^2$, $|\alpha_1|^2$, $|\alpha_2|^2$, respectively ($|\alpha_0|^2 + |\alpha_1|^2 + |\alpha_2|^2 = 1$); for $k = 1, 2$, we can say that $|\alpha_k|^2$ is the efficiency of the detector k . Let the initial phase of the local oscillator in each detector be ϑ_k , included in the parameter $\alpha_k \in \mathbb{C}$ by setting $\vartheta_k = \arg \alpha_k$. To change ϑ_k means to change the measuring apparatus. Let the two homodyne photocurrents be I_1 and I_2 .

We introduce a feedback scheme à la Wiseman-Milburn based on I_1 . Assuming instantaneous feedback, we modify the amplitude of the stimulating laser by adding a term $g e^{-i\omega t} I_1(t)/\sqrt{\gamma}$ proportional to I_1 , with the same frequency ω and with initial phase possibly different from that of the original laser. Let this phase difference be φ .



Then the atom has a Markovian evolution, whether we condition its state on continuous monitoring of the photocurrents, or we do not. Let us call *a priori* state η_t the unconditioned one and let us call *a posteriori* state ρ_t the conditioned one. Of course η_t is the mean of ρ_t . Let us write the evolution equations in the rotating frame, where they result to be time-homogeneous. Let us introduce first the parameters $c = |g| |\alpha_0| / \sqrt{\gamma} \geq 0$, and $\Delta\omega_c = \Delta\omega + c\gamma |\alpha_1| \cos(\vartheta_1 - \varphi) \in \mathbb{R}$. The *a priori* state η_t is governed by the master equation $d\eta_t = \mathcal{L}\eta_t dt$, where

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{L}\rho = & -i \left[\frac{\Delta\omega_c}{2} \sigma_z + \frac{\Omega}{2} \sigma_x, \rho \right] + \gamma k_d (\sigma_z \rho \sigma_z - \rho) \\ & + \gamma \bar{n} \left(\sigma_+ \rho \sigma_- - \frac{1}{2} \{P_-, \rho\} \right) \\ & + \gamma (\bar{n} + 1 - |\alpha_1|^2) \left(\sigma_- \rho \sigma_+ - \frac{1}{2} \{P_+, \rho\} \right) \\ & + \gamma (\alpha_1 \sigma_- - ic \sigma_\varphi) \rho (\bar{\alpha}_1 \sigma_+ + ic \sigma_\varphi) \\ & - \frac{\gamma}{2} \left\{ \left(|\alpha_1|^2 - 2c|\alpha_1| \sin(\vartheta_1 - \varphi) \right) P_+ + c^2, \rho \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

The *a posteriori* state ρ_t is governed by the non-linear stochastic master equation

$$\begin{aligned} d\rho_t = & \mathcal{L}\rho_t dt + \sqrt{\gamma} \mathcal{D}[\alpha_1 \sigma_- - ic \sigma_\varphi] \rho_t dW_1(t) \\ & + \sqrt{\gamma} \mathcal{D}[\alpha_2 \sigma_-] \rho_t dW_2(t), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\mathcal{D}[a]\rho = a\rho + \rho a^* - \rho \text{Tr}[(a + a^*)\rho]$ for every matrix a , and where W_1 and W_2 are two independent standard Wiener processes. The two homodyne photocurrents are given by the generalized stochastic processes

$$I_k(t) = \sqrt{\gamma} |\alpha_k| \text{Tr}[\sigma_{\vartheta_k} \rho_t] + \dot{W}_k(t). \quad (2)$$

We suppose that $|\alpha_0|$ is assigned by experimental constraints and that the control parameters are Ω , $\Delta\omega$, ϑ_1 , ϑ_2 , c , φ and, eventually, $|\alpha_1|$ and $|\alpha_2|$. Of course, if $c = 0$ there is no feedback action on the atom, so that its *a priori* dynamics is independent of the measurement process, that is of α_1 , α_2 and φ . On the contrary, if $c > 0$, then the *a priori* dynamics is modified by the feedback loop and it depends also on α_1 , φ and c .

In the Bloch sphere language \mathcal{L} is an affine map. Let its linear part be given by the matrix $-A$, where

$$\begin{aligned} A = & \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & 0 \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & \Omega \\ 0 & -\Omega & a_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \\ a_{11} = & \gamma \left(\frac{1}{2} + \bar{n} + 2k_d + 2c|\alpha_1| \cos \vartheta_1 \sin \varphi + 2c^2 \sin^2 \varphi \right), \\ a_{12} = & \Delta\omega_c - \gamma \left(c|\alpha_1| \cos(\vartheta_1 + \varphi) + c^2 \sin 2\varphi \right), \\ a_{21} = & -\Delta\omega_c - \gamma \left(c|\alpha_1| \cos(\vartheta_1 + \varphi) + c^2 \sin 2\varphi \right), \\ a_{22} = & \gamma \left(\frac{1}{2} + \bar{n} + 2k_d - 2c|\alpha_1| \sin \vartheta_1 \cos \varphi + 2c^2 \cos^2 \varphi \right), \\ a_{33} = & \gamma \left(1 + 2\bar{n} - 2c|\alpha_1| \sin(\vartheta_1 - \varphi) + 2c^2 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Apart from the exceptional case $\det A = 0$, which occurs if and only if $k_d = \bar{n} = 0$, $|\alpha_1| = 1$, $2c \sin(\vartheta_1 - \varphi) = 1$, $\Omega \sin \vartheta_1 = 0$, $\Delta\omega = -\gamma c \cos(\vartheta_1 - \varphi)$, the *a priori* dynamics has a unique stable stationary state $\eta_{\text{eq}} = (1 + \vec{x}_{\text{eq}} \cdot \vec{\sigma}) / 2$, which is asymptotically reached by η_t for every initial preparation of the atom:

$$\vec{x}_{\text{eq}} = -\gamma \left(1 - 2c|\alpha_1| \sin(\vartheta_1 - \varphi) \right) A^{-1} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Homodyne incoherent spectrum and fluorescence light squeezing. In a description of photo-detection based on quantum trajectories (1), (2), the electromagnetic field has been traced out. Nevertheless, this description is fully consistent with a model which includes also a quantum description of the electromagnetic field and of its interaction with the atom and where I_1 and I_2 are the outputs of measurements performed just on the emitted light [3]. Therefore an analysis of the homodyne photocurrents can reveal properties of the light detected in the corresponding channels. In order to study the squeezing properties of the light in channel k , the fundamental tool is the incoherent spectrum of I_k [12]

$$\begin{aligned} S_k(\mu) = & \lim_{T \rightarrow +\infty} \frac{1}{T} \left\{ \mathbb{E} \left[\left| \int_0^T e^{i\mu s} I_k(s) ds \right|^2 \right] \right. \\ & \left. - \left| \mathbb{E} \left[\int_0^T e^{i\mu s} I_k(s) ds \right] \right|^2 \right\}. \end{aligned}$$

It is the limit of the normalized variance of the Fourier transform of the photocurrent I_k ; as usual, we call incoherent the part of the spectrum due to the fluctuations of the output. The asymptotic behaviour of the atomic *a priori* state η_t ensures that the limit exists. It is a positive even function of its real argument μ which can be computed from equations (1) and (2) by Ito calculus and by the full theory of quantum continual measurements, which can provide the first and second moments of I_1 [2, 4]. Thus, for every initial state of the atom, we get

$$S_k(\mu) = 1 + 2\gamma |\alpha_k|^2 \vec{s}_k \cdot \left(\frac{A}{A^2 + \mu^2} \vec{t}_k \right), \quad (3)$$

where \vec{s}_k and \vec{t}_k are the vectors in \mathbb{R}^3 defined as

$$\begin{aligned} \vec{s}_k = & (\cos \vartheta_k, \sin \vartheta_k, 0), \\ \vec{t}_k = & \text{Tr} \left[(e^{i\vartheta_k} \sigma_- \eta_{\text{eq}} + e^{-i\vartheta_k} \eta_{\text{eq}} \sigma_+ - \text{Tr}[\sigma_{\vartheta_k} \eta_{\text{eq}}] \eta_{\text{eq}} \right. \\ & \left. + \delta_{k1} \frac{ic}{|\alpha_1|} [\eta_{\text{eq}}, \sigma_\varphi]) \vec{\sigma} \right]. \end{aligned}$$

Each spectrum S_k depends on μ , k_d , \bar{n} , Ω , $\Delta\omega$, α_k , c and φ . Moreover, S_2 depends on α_1 , too. In the case $c = 0$ (no feedback) each dependence on φ disappears and S_2 becomes independent of α_1 ; then, $S_1 = S_2$ if $\alpha_1 = \alpha_2$.

When $c = 0$, for every μ and ϑ_k , the value of $S_k(\mu; \vartheta_k)$ is the variance of a quadrature of the light in channel k , the value of $S_k(\mu; \vartheta_k + \pi/2)$ is the variance of the conjugate quadrature and Heisenberg-type relations imply that $S_k(\mu; \vartheta_k) S_k(\mu; \vartheta_k + \pi/2) \geq 1$ [12]. The light in channel k is in a squeezed state if the variance of one quadrature is below the standard quantum limit, that is if $S_k(\mu) < 1$ for some μ and ϑ_k .

When $c > 0$, only the light in channel 2 is potentially available for homodyne detection with arbitrary ϑ_2 , as well as it could be employed for different uses. On the contrary, the light in channel 1 is a part of the feedback loop, it has to be detected, and a change of ϑ_1 implies a change of the atomic dynamics and, so, of the state of the emitted light itself, not only a change of the quadrature under consideration. Of course, the spectrum S_1 can be considered also in this case, but when $S_1(\mu) < 1$ one can speak only of ‘in-loop squeezing’. Its meaning and possible usefulness are discussed by Wiseman [11].

For each channel we can give a measure of the ‘mean squeezing’ of the light by introducing the quantity

$$\Pi_k(\vartheta_k) = \frac{1}{2\pi\gamma} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} [S_k^{\text{inel}}(\mu; \vartheta_k) - 1] d\mu = |\alpha_k|^2 \vec{t}_k \cdot \vec{s}_k.$$

When $\Pi_k(\vartheta_k) < 0$ for some ϑ_k , the light in channel k is surely squeezed, but the spectrum can go below 1 even if $\Pi_k(\vartheta_k)$ is positive. Moreover, we introduce the *squeezing parameter* of the state of the light in channel 2

$$\Sigma_2 = \inf_{\vartheta_2} \Pi_2(\vartheta_2) = |\alpha_2|^2 [AS_{\eta_{\text{eq}}} + z_{\text{eq}} + |z_{\text{eq}}|]. \quad (4)$$

Control of squeezing. We are interested in the squeezing properties of the fluorescence light and of the atom. Regarding the fluorescence light, we can consider the squeezing of the light in the channels 1 and 2. Regarding the atom, we can consider the squeezing of the a posteriori state ρ_t and of the a priori state η_t , and in particular of its limit η_{eq} . Let us stress that the definition of atomic squeezing does not depend on the fact that we are working in the rotating frame. Let us start by investigating the effect of the control parameters.

Independently of the presence of the feedback loop, every time a parameter $|\alpha_k|$ vanishes, the corresponding photocurrent I_k reduces to a pure white noise (shot noise due to the local oscillator) with spectrum $S_k = 1$.

The case $c = 0$. In this case the dependence of each spectrum S_k on the corresponding $|\alpha_k|$ reduces to the explicit multiplication coefficient in (3). Therefore, when the control parameters Ω and $\Delta\omega$ give squeezed light in channel k , the lowering of S_k under the shot noise level is anyhow directly proportional to the fraction of emitted light gathered in that channel.

For $\Omega = 0$ and $\bar{n} = 0$ there is no fluorescence light in the long run, so that each photocurrent I_k asymptotically reduces to a pure white noise and $S_k = 1$.




FIG. 1: Channel 1




FIG. 2: Channel 2

For $\Omega = 0$ and $\bar{n} > 0$ there is no dependence on ϑ_k and $S_k > 1$. In this case there is only thermal light with carrier frequency ω_0 , while the local oscillator is at frequency ω . The result are two temperature dependent Lorentzian peaks at $\mu = \pm\Delta\omega$.

When $\Omega > 0$, S_k becomes ϑ_k -dependent and it can go below the shot noise level. This fact means that some negative correlation between the terms of the photocurrent (2) has been developed. Some examples are plotted for both channels. All the figures are always in the case $\gamma = 1$, $k_d = \bar{n} = 0$ and $|\alpha_1|^2 = |\alpha_2|^2 = 0.45$, with the control parameters used first to fix the position of the minima of S_k and, then, to have the lowest minima. Figures 1 and 2 show S_1 and S_2 (which are equal in this case) for minima in $\mu = 0$ (line 1, with $\Delta\omega = 0$, $\Omega = 0.2976$, $\vartheta_k = -\pi/2$) and in $\mu = \pm 2.5$ (line 2, with $\Delta\omega = 1.8195$, $\Omega = 1.7988$, $\vartheta_k = -0.1438$).

One could also compare the homodyne spectrum with and without k_d and \bar{n} , thus verifying that the squeezing is very sensitive to any small perturbation.

Regarding the atom, $AS_{\eta_{\text{eq}}}$ depends only on k_d , \bar{n} , Ω , $\Delta\omega$. In the case $k_d = \bar{n} = 0$, the condition $AS_{\eta_{\text{eq}}} < 0$ becomes $0 < 2\Omega^2 < 4\Delta\omega^2 + \gamma^2$ and the minimum value of $AS_{\eta_{\text{eq}}}$ is $-1/8$, reached for $6\Omega^2 = 4\Delta\omega^2 + \gamma^2$.

The case $c \geq 0$. The optimal squeezing in channel 1 is always found for $\Omega = 0$ and the feedback loop is very helpful, giving good visible minima of S_1 also when

$|\alpha_1|$ is not close to 1. For example, FIG. 1 shows S_1 for minima in $\mu = 0$ (line 3, with $\Delta\omega = 0$, $\Omega = 0$, $c = 0.2936$, $\varphi - \vartheta_1 = \pi/2$) and in $\mu = \pm 2.5$ (line 4, with $\Delta\omega = 2.5499$, $\Omega = 0$, $c = 0.3772$, $\vartheta_1 = -1.3354$, $\varphi = -0.0646$). The utility of the feedback scheme can be appreciated by comparing line 1 with line 3 and line 2 with line 4.

If we are interested in the light emitted in channel 2 and if $|\alpha_1|$ and $|\alpha_2|$ are assigned by some constraints, then the squeezing in channel 2 can be enhanced by a feedback scheme based on the photocurrent coming from channel 1, but the feedback performance is not as good as it can be for the squeezing in channel 1 itself. FIG. 2 shows S_2 for minima in $\mu = 0$ (line 3, with $\Delta\omega = 0$, $\Omega = 0.2698$, $\vartheta_1 = \pi/2$, $c = 0.0896$, $\varphi = 0$, $\vartheta_2 = -\pi/2$) and in $\mu = \pm 2.5$ (line 4, with $\Delta\omega = 1.6920$, $\Omega = 1.9276$, $\vartheta_1 = 2.8168$, $c = 0.1326$, $\varphi = 1.2460$, $\vartheta_2 = -0.0851$).

Anyway, if the only constraint is $|\alpha_1|^2 + |\alpha_2|^2 = 1 - |\alpha_0|^2$ and we are free in the choice of $|\alpha_1|$ and $|\alpha_2|$, then the best observable squeezing in channel 2 is obtained in the case $|\alpha_1| = 0$, $c = 0$. That is, when the whole non-lost light is gathered just in channel 2 and the white noise I_1 revealed in channel 1 is ignored.

The feedback loop can be really efficient also to enhance the atomic squeezing. For example, in the ideal situation $|\alpha_1| = 1$, $k_d = \bar{n} = 0$, with $\gamma = 1$, $\Delta\omega = 3$, $\Omega = 4$, $\vartheta_1 = \pi/2$, $c = 1.3372$, $\varphi = -\pi/40$, we get $AS_{\eta_{\text{eq}}} = -0.2414$, which is very close to the bound $-1/4$. In this case η_{eq} is almost pure so that also the a posteriori state ρ_t is frozen in a neighbourhood of η_{eq} and AS_{ρ_t} is maximized, too.

Fluorescence light vs atomic squeezing. There are not simple relations among the squeezing properties of fluorescence light in channel 1, of fluorescence light in channel 2, of atomic a priori equilibrium state and of atomic a posteriori state. Indeed, changing the parameters of our model, we can observe a wide variety of behaviours.

The only clear link is the one mentioned above: if $AS_{\eta_{\text{eq}}} \simeq -1/4$, then η_{eq} is almost pure and ρ_t is frozen in a neighbourhood of η_{eq} , so that AS_{ρ_t} is minimized, too, and the fluorescence light squeezing disappears as there is not incoherent scattering of light. One can check that actually only the coherent scattering survives, giving a δ -contribution in $\mu = 0$ to the complete spectrum. If the freezing of the atom is only approximate, one can check that all the spectra tend to become flatter and the fluorescence light squeezing tends to disappear.

There is also the link (4) between $AS_{\eta_{\text{eq}}}$ and Σ_2 . This gives a direct relation between atomic and fluorescence light squeezing in absence of feedback. Indeed, in this case we have $z_{\text{eq}} \leq 0$, so that $\Sigma_2 = |\alpha_2|^2 AS_{\eta_{\text{eq}}}$, and we can consider the case $|\alpha_1| = 0$, so that $|\alpha_2|^2$ is the fraction of the whole detected light. This relation is essentially the same found by Walls and Zoller considering a single mode for the emitted light [10]. However the relation is

not fundamental, as the feedback loop can give $z_{\text{eq}} > 0$ and in this case we have always $\Sigma_2 \geq 0$ even if $AS_{\eta_{\text{eq}}} < 0$.

There is no relation between fluorescence light squeezing revealed in channel 1 and in channel 2, even if we fix the constraint $|\alpha_1| = |\alpha_2|$. For example, the lowest minima of S_1 are found for $c > 0$ and $\Omega = 0$, but, every time $\Omega = 0$, the light in channel 2 is not squeezed as it can be proved that $S_2 \geq 1$ for every μ and every ϑ_2 .

It is worth mentioning also the case $|\alpha_1| = 1$, $\gamma = 1$, $k_d = \bar{n} = 0$, with $\Delta\omega = 0$, $\Omega = 0$, $\vartheta_1 = \pi/2$, $c = 1.2818$, $\varphi = 0$. Then we have an extremely visible squeezing in channel 1 (S_1 reaches 0.3183), there is no squeezing of the atomic a priori equilibrium state ($AS_{\eta_{\text{eq}}} = 0.0922$), while numerical simulations show that the a posteriori state ρ_t tends to become pure (as $|\alpha_1| = 1$) with AS_{ρ_t} stochastically moving between $-1/4$ and 0.

Finally let us remark that the idea of the papers [7] is to choose the control parameters in such a way that, in the rotating frame, the atom is frozen in a preassigned pure state $h_0 \in \mathbb{C}^2$, i.e. in such a way that, in the rotating frame, both the a priori state η_t and the a posteriori state ρ_t asymptotically reach $\eta_{\text{eq}} = |h_0\rangle\langle h_0|$. This is possible in an exact way only in a very ideal case, which in our notations corresponds to $|\alpha_1| = 1$, $k_d = \bar{n} = 0$, $\Delta\omega = 0$, $\vartheta_1 = \pm\pi/2$, $\varphi = 0$, which implies in particular $a_{12} = a_{21} = 0$ and $x_{\text{eq}} = 0$. Then, ρ_t is driven to a pure given state if Ω and c are such that $y_{\text{eq}}^2 + z_{\text{eq}}^2 = 1$ and $2c \sin \vartheta_1 = 1 + z_{\text{eq}}$. But this implies $\vec{t}_1 = 0$ and the two incoherent spectra reduce to pure shot noise.

* also: INFN, Sezione di Milano

- [1] E. B. Davies, *Quantum Theory of Open Systems* (Academic, London, 1976); A. Barchielli, V. P. Belavkin, J. Phys. A: Math. Gen. **24**, 1495 (1991).
- [2] A. Barchielli, *Quantum Opt.* **2**, 423 (1990).
- [3] A. Barchielli, A. M. Paganoni, *Quantum Semiclass. Opt.* **8**, 133 (1996).
- [4] A. Barchielli, in *Open Quantum Systems III*, edited by S. Attal, A. Joye, C.-A. Pillet, Lecture Notes in Mathematics **1882**, p. 207 (Springer, Berlin, 2006).
- [5] H. M. Wiseman, G. J. Milburn, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 1652 (1993).
- [6] H. M. Wiseman, G. J. Milburn, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 548 (1993); H. M. Wiseman, *Phys. Rev. A* **49**, 2133 (1994).
- [7] J. Wang, H. M. Wiseman, *Phys. Rev. A* **64** (2001) 063810; J. Wang, H. M. Wiseman, G. J. Milburn, *Chemical Physics* **268**, 221 (2001); H. M. Wiseman, S. Mancini, J. Wang, *Phys. Rev. A* **66** (2002) 013807.
- [8] D. F. Walls, G. J. Milburn, *Quantum Optics* (Springer, Berlin 1994).
- [9] A. Barchielli, M. Gregoratti, M. Licciardo, arXiv:0801.4710.
- [10] D. F. Walls, P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **47**, 709 (1981).
- [11] H. M. Wiseman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3840 (1998).
- [12] A. Barchielli, M. Gregoratti, arXiv:0802.1877.