

# Schroedinger Cat: Entanglement test in a Micro-Macroscopic system

Francesco De Martini<sup>1,2</sup>, Fabio Sciarrino<sup>3,1</sup>, and Chiara Vitelli<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Dipartimento di Fisica dell'Università "La Sapienza" and Consorzio Nazionale Interuniversitario per le Scienze Fisiche della Materia, Roma, 00185 Italy*

<sup>2</sup>*Accademia Nazionale dei Lincei, via della Lungara 10, I-00165 Roma, Italy*

<sup>3</sup>*Centro di Studi e Ricerche "Enrico Fermi", Via Panisperna 89/A, Compendio del Viminale, Roma 00184, Italy*

A Macro-state consisting of  $N \approx 3.5 \times 10^4$  photons in a quantum superposition and entangled with a far apart single-photon state (Micro-state) is generated. Precisely, an entangled photon pair is created by a nonlinear optical process, then one photon of the pair is injected into an optical parametric amplifier (OPA) operating for any input polarization state, i.e. into a phase-covariant cloning machine. Such transformation establishes a connection between the single photon and the multi particle fields. We then demonstrate the non-separability of the bipartite system by adopting a local filtering technique within a positive operator valued measurement.

PACS numbers:

In recent years two fundamental aspects of quantum mechanics have attracted a great deal of interest, namely the investigation on the irreducible nonlocal properties of Nature implied by quantum entanglement and the physical realization of the ‘‘Schroedinger Cat’’ [1, 2]. The last concept, by applying the nonlocality property to a combination of a microscopic and of a Macroscopic systems, enlightens the concept of the quantum state, the dynamics of large systems and ventures into the most intriguing philosophical problem, i.e. the emergence of quantum mechanics in the real life. In recent years quantum entanglement has been demonstrated within a two photon system [3], within a single photon and atomic ensemble [4, 5] and within atomic ensembles [6, 7, 8]. While, according to the 1935 proposal the nonlocal correlations were conceived to connect the dynamics of two ‘‘microscopic’’ objects, i.e. two spins within the well known EPR-Bohm scheme [3], in the present work the entanglement is established between a ‘‘Microscopic’’ and a ‘‘Macroscopic’’, i.e. multi-particle quantum object, via cloning amplification: Fig. 1. The amplification is achieved by adopting a high-gain nonlinear (NL) parametric amplifier acting on a single-photon input carrier of quantum information, i.e., a qubit state:  $|\phi\rangle$ . This process, referred to as ‘‘quantum injected optical parametric amplification’’ (QI-OPA) [9, 10] turned out to be particularly fruitful in the recent past to gain insight into several little explored albeit fundamental, modern aspects of quantum information, as *optimal* quantum cloning machines [9, 11, 12], *optimal* quantum U-NOT gate [13], quantum no-signaling [14]. Here, by exploiting the amplification process, we convert by a unitary transformation a single photon qubit into a single Macro-qubit involving a large number of photons, typically  $5 \times 10^4$ . At variance with the previous works [14, 15], here we demonstrate for the first time the entanglement between the microscopic qubit and the macroscopic one obtained by the amplification process. This result is achieved performing a local dichotomic measure-




FIG. 1: Schematic diagram showing the single photon Quantum-Injected Optical Parametric Amplification (QI-OPA).

ment on the multiphoton field. Let us venture in a more detailed account of our endeavor.

An entangled pair of two photons in the singlet state  $|\Psi^-\rangle_{A,B} = 2^{-\frac{1}{2}} (|H\rangle_A |V\rangle_B - |V\rangle_A |H\rangle_B)$  was produced through a Spontaneous Parametric Down-Conversion (SPDC) by the NL crystal 1 (C1) pumped by a pulsed UV pump beam: Fig.2. There  $|H\rangle$  and  $|V\rangle$  stands, respectively, for a single photon with horizontal and vertical polarization while the labels  $A, B$  refer to particles associated respectively with the spatial modes  $\mathbf{k}_A$  and  $\mathbf{k}_B$ . Precisely,  $A, B$  represent the two space-like separated Hilbert spaces coupled by the entanglement. The photon belonging to  $\mathbf{k}_B$ , together with a strong ultra-violet (UV) pump laser beam, was fed into an optical parametric amplifier consisting of a NL crystal 2 (C2) pumped by the beam  $\mathbf{k}'_P$ . The crystal 2, cut for collinear operation, emitted over the two modes of linear polarization, respectively horizontal and vertical associated with  $\mathbf{k}_B$ . The interaction Hamiltonian of the parametric amplification  $\hat{H} = i\chi\hbar\hat{a}_H^\dagger\hat{a}_V^\dagger + h.c.$  acts on the single spatial mode  $\mathbf{k}_B$  where  $\hat{a}_\pi^\dagger$  is the one photon creation operator associated with the polarization  $\vec{\pi}$ . The main feature of this Hamiltonian is its property of ‘‘phase-covariance’’ for ‘‘equatorial’’ qubits  $|\phi\rangle$ , i.e. representing equatorial states of polarization,  $\vec{\pi}_\phi = 2^{-1/2} (\vec{\pi}_H + e^{i\phi}\vec{\pi}_V)$ ,  $\vec{\pi}_{\phi\perp} = \vec{\pi}_\phi^\perp$ ,

in a Poincaré sphere representation having  $\vec{\pi}_H$  and  $\vec{\pi}_V$  as the opposite "poles" [15]. The equatorial qubits are expressed in terms of a single phase  $\phi \in (0, 2\pi)$  in the basis  $\{|H\rangle, |V\rangle\}$ . The overall output state amplified by the OPA apparatus is expressed, in any polarization equatorial basis  $\{\vec{\pi}_\phi, \vec{\pi}_{\phi^\perp}\}$ , by the Micro-Macro entangled state [16]:

$$|\Sigma\rangle_{A,B} = 2^{-1/2} (|\Phi^\phi\rangle_B |1\phi^\perp\rangle_A - |\Phi^{\phi^\perp}\rangle_B |1\phi\rangle_A) \quad (1)$$

where the mutually orthogonal multi-particle "Macro-states" are:

$$|\Phi^\phi\rangle_B = \sum_{i,j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{ij} \frac{\sqrt{(1+2i)!(2j)!}}{i!j!} |(2i+1)\phi; (2j)\phi^\perp\rangle_B \quad (2)$$

$$|\Phi^{\phi^\perp}\rangle_B = \sum_{i,j=0}^{\infty} \gamma_{ij} \frac{\sqrt{(1+2i)!(2j)!}}{i!j!} |(2j)\phi; (2i+1)\phi^\perp\rangle_B \quad (3)$$

with  $\gamma_{ij} \equiv C^{-2}(-\frac{\Gamma}{2})^i (\frac{\Gamma}{2})^j$ ,  $C \equiv \cosh g$ ,  $\Gamma \equiv \tanh g$ , being  $g$  the NL gain [13]. There  $|p\phi; q\phi^\perp\rangle_B$  stands for a Fock state with  $p$  photons with polarization  $\vec{\pi}_\phi$  and  $q$  photons with  $\vec{\pi}_{\phi^\perp}$  over the mode  $\mathbf{k}_B$ . Most important, any injected single-particle qubit  $(\alpha|\phi\rangle_B + \beta|\phi^\perp\rangle_B)$  is transformed by the *information preserving* QI-OPA operation into a corresponding Macro-qubit  $(\alpha|\Phi^\phi\rangle_B + \beta|\Phi^{\phi^\perp}\rangle_B)$  macroscopic quantum superposition [10]. The quantum states of Eq.(2-3) deserve some comments. The multi-particle states  $|\Phi^\phi\rangle_B, |\Phi^{\phi^\perp}\rangle_B$  are orthonormal and exhibit observables bearing macroscopically distinct average values. Precisely, for the polarization mode  $\vec{\pi}_\phi$  the average number of photons is  $\bar{m} = \sinh^2 g$  for  $|\Phi^{\phi^\perp}\rangle_B$ , and  $(3\bar{m} + 1)$  for  $|\Phi^\phi\rangle_B$ . For the  $\pi$ -mode  $\vec{\pi}_{\phi^\perp}$  these values are interchanged among the two Macro-states. On the other hand, as shown by [10], by changing the representation basis from  $\{\vec{\pi}_\phi, \vec{\pi}_{\phi^\perp}\}$  to  $\{\vec{\pi}_H, \vec{\pi}_V\}$ , the same Macro-states,  $|\Phi^\phi\rangle_B$  or  $|\Phi^{\phi^\perp}\rangle_B$  are found to be quantum superpositions of two orthogonal states  $|\Phi^H\rangle_B, |\Phi^V\rangle_B$  which differ by a single quantum. This unexpected and quite peculiar combination, i.e. a large difference of a measured observable when the states are expressed in one basis and a small Hilbert-Schmidt distance of the same states when expressed in another basis turned out to be a useful and lucky property since it rendered the coherence patterns of our system very robust toward coupling with environment, e.g. losses. The decoherence of our system was investigated experimentally and theoretically in the laboratory: cfr: [12, 15, 17].

As shown in Figure 2, the single particle field on mode  $\mathbf{k}_A$  was analyzed in polarization through a Babinet-Soleil phase-shifter (PS), i.e. a variable birefringent optical retarder, two waveplates  $\{\frac{\lambda}{4}, \frac{\lambda}{2}\}$  and polarizing beam splitter (PBS). It was finally detected by two single-photon detectors  $D_A$  and  $D_A^*$  (ALICE box). The multiphoton QI-OPA amplified field associated with the mode  $\mathbf{k}_B$  was sent, through a single-mode optical fiber (SM), to a




FIG. 2: Optical configuration of the QI-OPA apparatus. The excitation source was a Ti:Sa Coherent MIRA mode-locked laser amplified by a Ti:Sa regenerative REGA device operating with repetition rate  $250kHz$ . The output beam, frequency-doubled by second-harmonic generation, provided the OPA excitation field beam at the UV wavelength (wl)  $\lambda_P = 397.5nm$  with power:  $750 \div 800mW$ . A type II BBO crystal (crystal 1: C1) generates pair of photons with wavelength  $\lambda = 2\lambda_P = 795nm$ . C1 generates an average photon number per mode equal to about 0.35, while the overall detection efficiency of the trigger mode was estimated to be  $\simeq 5\%$  with detection rates of about  $5kHz$ . The NL BBO crystal 2: C2, realizing the optical parametric amplification (OPA), is cut for collinear type II phase matching. Both crystals C1 and C2 are 1.5 mm thick. The fields are coupled to single mode (SM) fibers. The overall detection efficiency on mode  $\mathbf{k}_B$  has been estimated to be  $\sim 2\%$ .

measurement apparatus consisting of a set of waveplates  $\{\frac{\lambda}{4}, \frac{\lambda}{2}\}$ , a (PBS) and two photomultipliers (PM)  $P_B$  and  $P_B^*$  (BOB box). The output signals of the PM's were analyzed by an "orthogonality filter" (OF) that will be described shortly in this paper.

We now investigate the bipartite entanglement between the modes  $\mathbf{k}_A$  and  $\mathbf{k}_B$ . We define the  $\frac{1}{2}$ -spin Pauli operators  $\{\hat{\sigma}_i\}$  for a single photon polarization state, where the label  $i = (1, 2, 3)$  refer to the polarization bases:  $i = 1 \iff \{\vec{\pi}_H, \vec{\pi}_V\}$ ,  $i = 2 \iff \{\vec{\pi}_R, \vec{\pi}_L\}$ ,  $i = 3 \iff \{\vec{\pi}_+, \vec{\pi}_-\}$ . Here  $\vec{\pi}_R = 2^{-1/2}(\vec{\pi}_H - i\vec{\pi}_V)$ ,  $\vec{\pi}_L = \vec{\pi}_R^\perp$  are the right and left handed circular polarizations and  $\vec{\pi}_\pm = 2^{-1/2}(\vec{\pi}_H \pm \vec{\pi}_V)$ . It is found  $\hat{\sigma}_i = |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| - |\psi_i^\perp\rangle\langle\psi_i^\perp|$  where  $\{|\psi_i\rangle, |\psi_i^\perp\rangle\}$  are the two orthogonal qubits corresponding to the  $\vec{\pi}_i$  basis, e.g.,  $\{|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_1^\perp\rangle\} = \{|H\rangle, |V\rangle\}$ , etc. By the QI-OPA unitary process the single-photon  $\hat{\sigma}_i$  operators evolve into the "Macro-spin" operators:  $\hat{\Sigma}_i = \hat{U}\hat{\sigma}_i\hat{U}^\dagger = |\Phi^{\psi_i}\rangle\langle\Phi^{\psi_i}| - |\Phi^{\psi_i^\perp}\rangle\langle\Phi^{\psi_i^\perp}|$ . Since the operators  $\{\hat{\Sigma}_i\}$  are built from the unitary evolution of eigenstates of  $\hat{\sigma}_i$ , they satisfy the same commutation rules of the single particle  $\frac{1}{2}$ -spin:  $[\hat{\Sigma}_i, \hat{\Sigma}_j] = \varepsilon_{ijk}2i\hat{\Sigma}_k$  where  $\varepsilon_{ijk}$  is the Levi-Civita tensor density. The generic

state  $(\alpha|\Phi^H\rangle_B + \beta|\Phi^V\rangle_B)$  is a Macro-qubit in the Hilbert space  $B$  spanned by  $\{|\Phi^H\rangle_B, |\Phi^V\rangle_B\}$ , as said. To test whether the overall output state is entangled, one should measure the correlation between the single photon spin operator  $\hat{\sigma}_i^A$  on the mode  $\mathbf{k}_A$  and the Macro-spin operator  $\hat{\Sigma}_i^B$  on the mode  $\mathbf{k}_B$ . We then adopt the criteria for two qubit bipartite systems based on the spin-correlation. We define the “visibility”  $V_i = \left| \left\langle \hat{\Sigma}_i^B \otimes \hat{\sigma}_i^A \right\rangle \right|$  a parameter which quantifies the correlation between the systems  $A$  and  $B$ . Precisely  $V_i = |P(\psi_i, \Phi^{\psi_i}) + P(\psi_i^\perp, \Phi^{\psi_i^\perp}) - P(\psi_i, \Phi^{\psi_i^\perp}) - P(\psi_i^\perp, \Phi^{\psi_i})|$  where  $P(\psi_i, \Phi^{\psi_i})$  is the probability to detect the systems  $A$  and  $B$  in the states  $|\psi_i\rangle_A$  and  $|\Phi^{\psi_i}\rangle_B$ , respectively. The value  $V_i = 1$  corresponds to perfect anti-correlation, while  $V_i = 0$  expresses the absence of any correlation. The following upper bound criterion for a separable state holds [18]:

$$S = (V_1 + V_2 + V_3) \leq 1 \quad (4)$$

In order to measure the expectation value of  $\hat{\Sigma}_i^B$  a discrimination among the pair of states  $\{|\Phi^{\psi_i}\rangle_B, |\Phi^{\psi_i^\perp}\rangle_B\}$  for the three different polarization bases 1, 2, 3 is required. Consider the Macro-states  $|\Phi^+\rangle_B, |\Phi^-\rangle_B$  expressed by Equations 2-3, for  $\phi = 0$  and  $\phi = \pi$ . In principle, a perfect discrimination can be achieved by identifying whether the number of photons over the  $\mathbf{k}_B$  mode with polarization  $\vec{\pi}_+$  is even or odd, i.e. by measuring an appropriate “parity operator”. This requires the detection of the macroscopic field by a perfect *photon-number resolving* detectors operating with an overall quantum efficiency  $\eta \approx 1$ , a device out of reach of the present technology.




FIG. 3: Theoretical probability distributions  $P^\pm(m, n)$  of the number of photons associated with the Macro-states  $|\Phi^\pm\rangle$  ( $g = 1.6$ ). Probabilistic identification of the wavefunctions  $|\Phi^\pm\rangle$  by OF-filtering the  $P^\pm(m, n)$  distributions over the photon number two-dimensional space  $\{m, n\}$ . The white section in the cartesian plane  $(m, n)$  corresponds to the “inconclusive events” of our POVM OF-filtering technique.

It is nevertheless possible to exploit, by a somewhat sophisticated electronic device dubbed “Orthogonality Filter” (OF), the macroscopic difference existing between the functional characteristics of the probability distributions of the photon numbers associated with the quantum

states  $\{|\Phi^\pm\rangle_B\}$ . The measurement scheme works as follows: Figures 2 and 3. The multiphoton field is detected by two PM’s ( $P_B, P_B^*$ ) which provide the electronic signals  $(I_+, I_-)$  corresponding to the field intensity on the mode  $\mathbf{k}_B$  associated with the  $\pi$ -components  $(\vec{\pi}_+, \vec{\pi}_-)$ , respectively. By (OF) the difference signals  $\pm(I_+ - I_-)$  are compared with a threshold  $\xi k > 0$ . When the condition  $(I_+ - I_-) > \xi k$  is satisfied, the detection of the state  $|\Phi^+\rangle_B$  is inferred and a standard transistor-transistor-logic (TTL) electronic square-pulse  $L_B$  is realized at one of the two output ports of (OF). This corresponds to the measurement of the eigenvalue +1 of the operator  $\hat{\Sigma}_3^B$ . Likewise, when the condition  $(I_- - I_+) > \xi k$  is satisfied, the detection of the state  $|\Phi^-\rangle_B$  is inferred, a TTL pulse is realized at other output port of (OF) and the eigenvalue of  $\hat{\Sigma}_3^B$  is  $-1$ . The PM output signals are discarded for  $-\xi k < (I_+ - I_-) < \xi k$ , i.e. in condition of low state discrimination. By increasing the value of the threshold  $k$  an increasingly better discrimination is obtained together with a decrease of detection efficiency. This “local distillation” procedure is conceptually justified by the following theorem: since entanglement cannot be created or enhanced by any “local” manipulation of the quantum state, the non-separability condition demonstrated for a “distilled” quantum system, e.g., after application of the OF-filtering procedure, fully applies to the same system in absence of distillation [18]. This statement can be applied to the measurement of  $I_\phi$  and  $I_{\phi^\perp}$  for any pair of quantum states  $\{|\Phi^\phi\rangle_B, |\Phi^{\phi^\perp}\rangle_B\}$ . This method is but an application of a Positive Operator Value Measurement procedure (POVM) [19] by which a large discrimination between the two states  $\{|\Phi^\pm\rangle_B\}$  is attained at the cost of a reduced probability of a successful detection.

The present experiment was carried out with a gain value  $g = 4.4$  leading to a number of output photons  $N \approx 3 \times 10^4$ , after OF filtering. In this case the probability of photon transmission through the OF filter was:  $p \approx 10^{-4}$ . A NL gain  $g = 6$  was also achieved with no substantial changes of the apparatus. Indeed, an unlimited number of photons could be generated in principle by the QI-OPA technique, the only limitation being due to the fracture of the NL crystal 2 in the focal region of the laser pump. In order to verify the correlations existing between the single photon generated by the NL crystal 1 and the corresponding amplified Macro-state, we have recorded the coincidences between the single photon detector signal  $D_A$  (or  $D_A^*$ ) and the TTL signal  $L_B$  (or  $L_B^*$ ) both detected in the same  $\pi$ -basis  $\{\vec{\pi}_+, \vec{\pi}_-\}$ : Figure 2. This measurement has been repeated by adopting the common basis  $\{\vec{\pi}_R, \vec{\pi}_L\}$ . Since the filtering technique can hardly be applied to the  $\{\vec{\pi}_H, \vec{\pi}_V\}$  basis, because of the lack of a broader  $SU(2)$  covariance of the amplifier, the quantity  $V_1 > 0$  could be measured adopting a photon number resolving detector with quantum efficiency equal to 1: a device not made available by the present tech-

nology. The phase  $\phi$  between the  $\pi$ -components  $\vec{\pi}_H$  and  $\vec{\pi}_V$  on mode  $\mathbf{k}_A$  was determined by the Babinet-Soleil variable phase shifter (*PS*). Figure 4 shows the fringe patterns obtained by recording the rate of coincidences of the signals detected by the Alice's and Bob's measurement apparatus, for different values of  $\phi$ . These patterns were obtained by adopting the common analysis basis  $\{\vec{\pi}_R, \vec{\pi}_L\}$  with a filtering probability  $\simeq 10^{-4}$ , corresponding to a threshold  $\xi k$  about 8 times higher than the average photomultiplier signals  $I$ . In this case the average visibility has been found  $V_2 = (54.0 \pm 0.7)\%$ . A similar oscillation pattern has been obtained in the basis  $\{\vec{\pi}_+, \vec{\pi}_-\}$  leading to:  $V_3 = (55 \pm 1)\%$ . Since always is  $V_1 > 0$ , our experimental result  $S = V_2 + V_3 = (109.0 \pm 1.2)\%$  implies the violation of the separability criteria of Equation (4) and then demonstrates the non-separability of our Micro-Macro system belonging to the space-like separated Hilbert spaces  $A$  and  $B$ . By evaluating the experimental value of the “concurrence” for our test, connected with the “entanglement of formation”, it is obtained  $C \geq 0.10 \pm 0.02 > 0$  [20, 21]. This result again confirms the non-separability of our bipartite system. The value of  $C$  could be increased by improving the matching of the injected photon with the pump field on crystal  $C2$ . A method similar to ours to test the non-separability of a 2-atom bi-partite system was adopted recently by [7].

In conclusion we have demonstrated the entanglement of a Micro-Macro system, in which the Macro state has been obtained by the amplification of a 1-photon qubit. The QI-OPA approach could be directly applicable to the field of Quantum Information and Computation in virtue of the intrinsic *information-preserving* property of the QI-OPA dynamics. Indeed, this property implies the direct realization of the quantum map  $(\alpha|\phi\rangle + \beta|\phi^\perp\rangle) \rightarrow (\alpha|\Phi^\phi\rangle + \beta|\Phi^{\phi^\perp}\rangle)$  connecting any single-particle qubit to a corresponding Macro-qubit, by then allowing the extension to the multi particle regime of most binary logic algorithms and techniques. For instance, let's consider a 2-qubit phase gate in which the control-target interaction is provided by a Kerr-type optical nonlinearity. The strength of this nonlinearity is far too small to provide a sizable interaction between the “control” and the “target” single-particle qubits. However, by replacing these ones by the corresponding Macro-qubits associated with  $N$  photons, the NL interaction strength can be enhanced by many orders of magnitude since the 3d-order NL polarization scales as  $N^{3/2}$ . This application is made possible by another general property of the QI-OPA scheme, i.e., the direct accessibility of the Macro-states at the output of the QI-OPA. In summary, the amplification process applied to a Micro system is a natural approach to enlighten the quantum-to-classical transition and to investigate the persistence of quantum phenomena into the “classical” domain by measurement procedures ap-




FIG. 4: Coincidence counts  $[L_B, D_A]$  versus the phase  $\phi$  of the injected qubit for the basis  $\{\vec{\pi}_+, \vec{\pi}_-\}$  (circle data) and the basis  $\{\vec{\pi}_R, \vec{\pi}_L\}$  (square data). The experimental points corresponding to the minima and maxima have been adopted to estimate  $V_2$  and  $V_3$ . Accordingly, they have been determined by a higher statistics and exhibit a smaller error flag.

plied to systems of increasing size.

We acknowledge support and collaboration from Sandro Giacomini, Giorgio Milani, Eleonora Nagali, Tiziano De Angelis, Nicolo' Spagnolo. Work supported by the PRIN 2005 of MIUR and INNESCO 2006 of CNISM.

- 
- [1] A. Einstein, et al., *Phys. Rev.* **47**, 777 (1935).
  - [2] E. Schroedinger, *Naturwissenschaften* **23**, 807812, 823 828, 844849 (1935).
  - [3] P.G. Kwiat, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4337 (1995).
  - [4] D. N. Matsukevich, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 040405 (2005).
  - [5] H. de Riedmatten, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 113603 (2006).
  - [6] B. Julsgaard, et al., *Nature* **413** 400 (2001).
  - [7] Moehring et al., *Nature(London)***449**, 68 (2007).
  - [8] C. W. Chou et al., *Nature* **438**, 828 (2005).
  - [9] F. De Martini et al., *Prog. in Quantum Electronics* **29**, 165 (2005).
  - [10] F. De Martini, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 2842 (1998); *Phys. Lett. A* **250**,15 (1998).
  - [11] D. Pelliccia, et al., *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042306 (2003); F. De Martini, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 067901 (2004).
  - [12] F. De Martini, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 240401 (2005).
  - [13] F. De Martini, et al., *Nature (London)* **419**, 815 (2002).
  - [14] T. De Angelis, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 193601 (2007).
  - [15] E. Nagali, et al., *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 042126 (2007).
  - [16] W.P. Schleich, *Quantum Optics in Phase Space* (Wiley, New York, 2001), Chaps. 11 and 16.
  - [17] M. Caminati, et al., *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 062304 (2006).
  - [18] H.S. Eisenberg, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 0193901 (2004); G.A. Durkin, Ph.D. Thesis (2004).
  - [19] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Methods and Concepts* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, Dordrecht,1995).
  - [20] C.H. Bennett, et al., *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996).
  - [21] S. Hill, et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 5022 (1997).