

# Superluminal advancement of a single photon far beyond its coherence length

S. Cialdi\*, I. Boscolo, F. Castelli and V. Petrillo  
INFN and University of Milan, via Celoria 16, 20133 Milano, Italy\*  
(Dated: June 21, 2024)

We present experimental results relevant to superluminal propagation based on a single photon traveling along a path having in between an optical system, called 4f-system, which with we operate singularly on the phases of the spectral components. The single photon is created by a down-conversion process of CW laser light. The introduction of a linear dispersion on the photon spectral components will lead to a superluminal propagation of the photon wavefunction. Detection of the superluminal velocity is done via interferometric measurement between the acted upon photon-wavepacket and a correlated but untouched one. The detected shift of the superluminal photon-wavepacket is far beyond the coherence length of the photon itself. The observed superluminal photon wavefunction propagation complies with the causality. The operation of the optical system allows to enlighten the origin of the superluminal photon velocity.

PACS numbers: 42.25.Bs, 42.25.Hz, 42.50.Ex

*Introduction.* Einstein's theory of the special relativity establishes that the velocity of the light in vacuum  $c$  is an invariant under a reference frame change [1, 2, 3]. Superluminal single objects under Lorentz transformations lead to violation of the principle of relativistic causality and, in turn, to the paradox of effect preceding its cause [4]. Nevertheless, many experiments with faster-than- $c$  propagation of light were done and discussed [5, 6, 7, 8]. In fact the theoretical framework of the special relativity stands even without the assumption that  $c$  is the velocity upper limit [9, 10, 11, 12].

Works on superluminality refer mostly on the tunneling of barriers, by both radiation pulses [5, 6] or single photons [7], and on active media crossing [13]. The barrier tunneling of a light pulse is substantially governed by a very low transmission coefficients and an almost linear delay time  $\tau_d = d\phi(\omega)/d\omega$  of the light spectral components. The argument of one interpretation is that the light pulse after the barrier crossing is so much lower than the entering one (or photon crossing probability so much low) that the possible information carried by the pulse results destroyed, therefore, the causality principle is not broken down [7, 8, 14]. Another proposed argument [15] is that no propagation occurs inside the barrier, hence we are not allowed to speak of advancing velocity. In the experiments on optical pulse propagation within so-called fast-light media, that is media with anomalous dispersion [7, 8] (precisely, with gain-assisted linear anomalous dispersion) the shape of the pulse is preserved and the phase is approximately linear with frequency in the region of interest. The slope of the line  $dn/d\omega$  leads to a group velocity  $v_g$  exceeding the vacuum speed  $c$  of light and can even become negative [7, 8]. In a superluminal experiment carried out with a microwave pulse crossing a birefringent two-dimensional crystal and settled in such a way that the pulse polarization of the incident and detected fields relative to the fast axis of the crystal was well controlled, came out a clear superlu-

minal group velocity from the interference of the pulses which had traveled along the two crystal axis [14, 16]. The experimental results on these systems renewed the debate about the information velocity. The point relevant to the discussion is that the speed of a light pulse crossing a media is not precisely defined being the pulse an ensemble of optical components each one travelling at a well defined phase velocity  $v_p = c/n(\omega)$  where  $n(\omega)$  is the refractive index of the optical material at that frequency. The peak of the pulse usually travels at the group velocity  $v_g = c/n_g$  where  $n_g = n + \omega dn/d\omega|_{\omega=\omega_0}$  is the group index and  $\omega_0$  is the central frequency of the wavepacket [17]. The wave nature of the wavepacket allows the superluminal light propagation. The discussion is about the fact that  $v_g$  does not coincide with the information velocity  $v_i$  and there is a debate about the nature of these velocities [4, 7, 8]. Since the analysis of the problem made by Sommerfeld and Brillouin it is discussed that the "front" velocity of a square pulse does not exceed  $c$ , and Refs. [4, 7, 18] suggest a non-analytic point of the pulse amplitude as transporting information, by observing that this is a generalization of the "front" point of the pulse.

In all the performed experiments, the temporal forward shift of the pulse or of the single-photon-wavepacket is much smaller with respect to their total length, and this necessarily puts interpretation problems. In this respect, the definition of the information velocity as the propagation speed of a particular point in the profile [18] leads to information velocities always less or equal to  $c$ .

Because experiments show that superluminal effects appear as long as the moving object is a superposition of elementary sub-objects (a light pulse is the superposition of monochromatic waves, a moving electron is, in Quantum Mechanics, a superposition of momentum eigenstates  $|k\rangle$ ), we may argue that this is the necessary characteristic for that effect. Within this view, the possibility of a superluminal effect with a single photon




FIG. 1: Sketch of the experimental apparatus. Laser: a diode laser of 405 nm wavelength, 40 mW power. BBO: beta-Barium-Borate nonlinear crystal. HWP: half wave plate. G1, G2 : gratings with 1200 lines/mm. L1, L2 : lenses with  $f = 100$  mm. SLM : liquid crystal spatial light modulator (640 pixels). C1, C2 : calcite crystals. P : polarizer oriented at  $45^\circ$ . D : optic coupler + multimode optic fiber + single photon detector.

lies on the fact that a photon is always a superposition of monochromatic Fock states  $|1, \omega\rangle$  encompassing a frequency bandwidth, due to Heisenberg principle and the fact that the photon is generated in a definite space region. We would like to underline that in Quantum Mechanics a single particle as a photon is a superposition of many states, even if it is revealed in laboratory as a single detection event (*i.e.*, a single *click*). Therefore, Quantum Mechanics allows superluminal propagation of single particles. We show in our experiment that the photon velocity can be made superluminal as a result of interference of its optical components whose phases are acted upon by the optical-system described below. Because of the interference process, the observed result is not at odd with causality. Aiming to avoid questions about the kind and the physical meaning of the different definitions of velocity, we set the experiment in such a way that the shift between the normal and superluminal photons is notably wider than the width of the corresponding wave-packets.

*The experiment.* In Fig. 1 we show the experimental device consisting, in sequence, of a CW pump laser, a non-linear BBO crystal that generates photons via parametric down-conversion, a 4f-system with a phase mask (a SLM, *Spatial Light Modulator*) in the middle providing a time delay among optical components [19, 20, 21], and finally an interferometer followed by a single photon detector for measuring the time delay. A pair of photons, usually called *signal* and *idler* photons, is generated by a parametric non-collinear down-conversion [22] of a CW 40 mW 405 nm almost monochromatic laser radiation within a non-linear BBO crystal of 3mm thickness. The state of this photon pair can be written as  $|\Psi_0\rangle = \int d\omega f(\omega)|H, \omega\rangle|H, -\omega\rangle$  [23], where  $\omega$  is the frequency shift with respect to the central frequency  $\omega_0$  and H indicates the horizontal polarization. The factor  $f(\omega)$

[24] gives the probability amplitude as a function of the frequency shift. The signal photon enters the 4f-system, where the required linear delay  $\tau_d$  is generated by the mask. The 4f-system consists of two gratings with 1200 lines/mm and of two 100 mm focal lenses. By means of this device the spectral components of the photon are spatially dispersed in a linear way by the first grating, and then focused onto the array of pixels of the liquid crystal mask (our mask is composed by 640 pixels 100  $\mu\text{m}$  wide) capable to set the relative phases almost at will. Finally the optical components are again synthesized by the second grating. The transmission coefficient of the 4f-system depends on the efficiency of the two gratings, and in our apparatus is around 50%. This device is more flexible than the fast-light medium and, more important, allows for the investigation of the action on each single optical component. In this context we want also to stress that in our experiment the optical components of the entering photon-wavepacket are opened up in a transverse plane, thus the pattern of the traveling light lies on the  $(x, z)$  plane, contrary to all other experiments where it travels along the propagation axis.

Now we analyze the propagation of the signal photon along the experimental apparatus. A half-wave-plate (HWP) set in front of the the 4f-system rotates the photon polarization of a suitable angle  $\theta$  (see below), hence the state of the entering photon is changed into a superposition of a horizontal and a vertical polarized states:  $|H, \omega\rangle \rightarrow \cos(\theta)|H, \omega\rangle + \sin(\theta)|V, \omega\rangle$ . Then the signal photon propagates through the 4f-system. The spectral phase function that we introduce is applied only on the horizontal polarization, while the vertical polarization experiences only the delay due to the transit through the mask pixels, becoming therefore our temporal reference. Taking into consideration only the path sections which have different optical thickness for H and V polarizations, we obtain the two phase variations:

$$\begin{cases} \phi_H^m(\omega) = (\omega_0 + \omega) \tau_H^m + \phi^{SLM}(\omega_0 + \omega) \\ \phi_V^m(\omega) = (\omega_0 + \omega) \tau_V^m \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

where  $\phi^{SLM}$  is the spectral phase function imposed by mask pixels. In our case we introduce a linear function  $\phi^{SLM}(\omega_0 + \omega) = (\omega_0 + \omega) \tau$ , with  $\tau$  a constant parameter. The times  $\tau_H^m$  and  $\tau_V^m$  are the time delays due to the crossing of the pixel slab. We found experimentally that  $\Delta\tau^m = \tau_H^m - \tau_V^m = 10$  fs. Moreover we also have to consider the fact that the amplitude transmission coefficients  $t_H$  and  $t_V$  of the 4f-system are different being different the efficiency of the gratings for the two polarizations.

The interferometer set after the 4f-system for the diagnostics of the signal photon at the exit of the optical system is made by two calcite crystals, an HWP and a polarizer set at  $45^\circ$ . This device, described in [25], interchanges the two polarizations and inserts in between a

delay time which can be changed simply by rotating the second crystal. We also have to take into account a certain dispersion introduced by the crystals because they are relatively long. However this dispersion, described by the parameter  $\beta$ , can be assumed nearly equal for the two polarizations with a very good approximation. The propagation of the photon state in the crystals is then described by the following spectral phase variations:

$$\begin{cases} \phi_H^d(\omega) = (\omega_0 + \omega)\tau_H^d + \frac{1}{2}\beta(\omega_0 + \omega)^2 \\ \phi_V^d(\omega) = (\omega_0 + \omega)\tau_V^d + \frac{1}{2}\beta(\omega_0 + \omega)^2 \end{cases} \quad (2)$$

The last step to be analyzed is the propagation through the polarizer placed at  $45^\circ$ . This item does the crucial action for the phenomenon detection. In fact, the polarizer mixes up the H and V polarization states with the result that the two states interfere and a pattern of fringes within the coherence length are created. Summing up the state evolution along the entire trajectory, the signal component  $|H, \omega\rangle$  at the output will be

$$\begin{aligned} |H, \omega\rangle \Rightarrow & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( t_H \cos(\theta) e^{i\phi_H^m(\omega) + i\phi_H^d(\omega)} \right. \\ & \left. + t_V \sin(\theta) e^{i\phi_V^m(\omega) + i\phi_V^d(\omega)} \right) |45^\circ, \omega\rangle = A(\omega) |45^\circ, \omega\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The probability of having one count relative to the signal photon, ignoring the idler one, is given by the trace of the density matrix  $|\Psi_p\rangle\langle\Psi_p|$  where  $|\Psi_p\rangle = \int d\omega f(\omega) A(\omega) |45^\circ, \omega\rangle |H, -\omega\rangle$ . After some mathematics we get

$$\begin{aligned} P(\tau, \Delta\tau) = & t^2 \int d\omega |f(\omega)|^2 \\ & \times \left[ 1 + \text{Re} \left\{ e^{i(\Delta\tau^m + \tau + \Delta\tau)(\omega_0 + \omega)} \right\} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $t = t_H = t_V$  is obtained with a proper rotation of the HWP set in front of the 4f-system, and  $\Delta\tau = \tau_H^d - \tau_V^d$  is the delay time introduced by the interferometer.

This results accounts for our experimental data shown in Fig. 2. Curve (a) is the reference case  $\tau = 0$  (which sets the origin of the time scale). Curves (b) and (c) present an advance and a retardation of  $\tau = \mp 100$  fs, respectively. All data show that the interference fringes are present under a coherence length of  $30 \text{ fs} < |\tau|$ .

*Discussion of the results.* Let's fix our attention, as usual, to the propagation of the entire photon-wavepacket. The horizontal and vertical polarized parts of the photon travel at the same velocity within the vacuum sections and the lenses (that are isotropic). But their velocities are different within the phase mask. From the mask characteristics (as given by the company booklet) the group velocity for the vertical polarization results to be  $v_V^g = c/1.488$  and the pixel thickness  $\ell_m = 10 \mu\text{m}$ .




FIG. 2: The interference records of the advanced (b) and retarded (c) photon-wavepackets, referred to the reference  $\tau = 0$  (a). The top frame shows an expanded view of the interference fringes.

Using the measured delay between V and H states, we can write the group velocity of the horizontal polarization as

$$v_H^g = \frac{\ell_m}{\ell_m/v_V^g + \Delta\tau^m + \tau} \quad (5)$$

The group velocity defined in this way results greater than  $c$  when  $\tau$  is lower than  $-30$  fs and even negative for  $\tau < -60$  fs. Within this picture of the phenomena, we may say that we have observed superluminal single photon propagation with a shift of the wavepacket much larger than its proper dimension. In this picture of the phenomenon problems may arise with the causality principle [26].

We now approach the investigation from a detailed point of view, following the spatially sectioned sub-wavepackets crossing the mask pixels. Each one of these sub-packets has the limited spectrum selected by the pixel dimension. That portion of the spectrum corresponds to a coherence length of 3 ps. These sub-packets have subluminal velocity in every part of the device, included the mask. In this view, the recombination of the sub-packets on the second grating leads to either the forward or backward shift of the total photon-wavepacket with respect to the non-acted photon state, depending

on the setting of the component phases. This superluminal effect was already observed in Refs. [14, 16].

The question of the information velocity in our experiment does not set itself within the discussion presented so far and in progress in the matter, that is within the models of pulse reshaping and on the consideration of peculiar points of the pulse (as front or non-analytic ones). In our experiment the input photon-wavepacket reconstruction may occur within the entire 3 ps coherence length of a sub-wavepacket, which means a shift backward or forward of the reconstructed wavepacket very much far from the tail of the reference one. An observation is in order: the delay introduced by the lenses, which is about 30 ps, is larger than the 3 ps of maximum advance allowed, and this does not permit a direct measurement of superluminality downstream the 4f-system. However, in principle one can substitute the refractive optics with parabolic mirrors [27], eliminating in this way the elements responsible of the delay.

The propagation of the spectral sub-wavepackets crossing the pixels is certainly in order with causality. In fact, we can consider Kramers-Kronig relations for the sub-packets, and represent the evolution by means of a Green function that satisfies the requirements of causality. For different pixels they are independent one another, the phase of each pixel can be programmed at will. There is no contradiction, then, in saying that the propagation is causal, but the information is superluminal. From this analysis one can infer that the relevant time is not the coherence time of the photon-wavepacket, but the coherence time of the sub-packet that reaches the single pixel.

*In conclusion*, we have done an experiment on a notable superluminal effect obtained with single photon propagation. The superluminal group velocity is such that the preserved entire photon-wavepacket shows up at distances from the vacuum site which are very larger with respect to the length of the photon-wavepacket. This result was allowed by an optical system capable to manage the phases of the single components of the wavepacket independently one another, at variance with to all the other experiments. We have shown that our observations are consistent with the principle of causality even if the nominal group velocity is highly superluminal.

It is important to observe that in our experiment, owing to CW laser light, we could not directly encode information in the photon-wavepacket. However, our result about superluminal effect can be consistently extended to an apparatus with a pulsed laser, where an information can be effectively encoded on a photon. Thus we may conclude that the information transported by a single photon-wavepacket can propagate with a superluminal velocity.

We wish to acknowledge fruitful discussions with C.

Maroli and S. Olivares, and the extended help in the experimental work by A. Schiavi. We would like to remark the support by M. Giammarchi. One of the authors thanks V.S. Olkhovsky for stimulating interest in the subject.

---

\* Electronic address: simone.cialdi@mi.infn.it

- [1] A. Einstein, *Ann. Phys.* **17**, 891 (1905).
- [2] A. Einstein, H. A. Lorentz, H. Minkowski and H. Weyl, in *The principle of relativity, Collected papers*, (Dover, New York, 1952).
- [3] L. Brillouin, *Wave propagation and group velocity* (Academic Press, New York, 1960).
- [4] J.C. Garrison, M.W. Mitchell, R.Y. Chiao and E.L. Bolda, *Phys. Lett. A* **245**, 19 (1998).
- [5] S. Longhi, M. Marano, P. Laporta and M. Belmonte *Phys. Rev. E* **64**, 055602 (2001).
- [6] Ch. Spielmann, R. Szipöcs, A. Stingl and F. Krausz *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 2308 (1994).
- [7] A.M. Steinberg, P.G. Kwiat and R.Y. Chiao *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **71**, 708 (1993).
- [8] L.J. Wang, A. Kuzmich and A. Dogariu, *Nature (London)* **406**, 277 (2000) and references therein.
- [9] W.A. von Ignatowsky, *Verh. Deutsch. Phys. Ges.* **12**, 788 (1910).
- [10] J. Mark and L. Leblond, *Am. J. Phys.* **44**, 271 (1976).
- [11] L.A. Lugiato and V. Gorini, *J. Math. Phys.* **13**, 665 (1972).
- [12] V.S. Olkhovsky and E. Recami, *Phys. Rep.* **214**, 339 (1992).
- [13] L.-G. Wang, N.-H. Liu, Q. Lin and S.-Y. Zhu, *Phys. Rev. E* **68**, 066606 (2003) and references therein.
- [14] D.R. Solli *et. al.* *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 143906 (2003).
- [15] H.G. Winful, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 023901 (2003).
- [16] N. Brunner, V. Scarani, M. Wegmuller, M. Legrè and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **93**, 203902 (2004).
- [17] G.P. Agrawal, *Nonlinear optics*, (Academic Press, San Diego, 2001).
- [18] M.D. Stenner, D.J. Gauthier and M.A. Neifeld, *Nature (London)* **425**, 695 (2003).
- [19] M.M. Wefers and K.A. Nelson, *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **12**, 1343 (1994).
- [20] A.M. Weiner, *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **71** 1929 (2000).
- [21] S. Cialdi and I. Boscolo, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods A* **526**, 239 (2004).
- [22] C.K. Hong and L. Mandel, *Phys. Rev. A* **31**, 2409 (1985).
- [23] A. Joobeur, B.E.A. Saleh, T.S. Larchuk and M.C. Teich, *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 4360 (1996).
- [24] S. Cialdi, F. Castelli, I. Boscolo and M.G.A. Paris, *Appl. Opt.* **47**, 1832 (2008).
- [25] A. Gogo, W.D. Snyder and M. Beck, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 052103 (2005).
- [26] J. Peatross, S.A. Glasgow and M. Ware, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2370 (2000).
- [27] D.H. Reitze, A.M. Weiner, and D.E. Leaird, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **61**, 1260 (1992).