

Universal entangler with photon pairs in arbitrary states

Bing He,^{1,*} János A. Bergou,¹ and Yuhang Ren¹

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Hunter College of the City University of New York, 695 Park Avenue, New York, NY 10065, USA*

(Dated: September 11, 2019)

We propose a setup that transforms a single copy of a photon pair in arbitrary mixed state to an exact Bell state. The setup involves linear optical circuits processing the individual photons and quantum non-demolition (QND) measurements working with cross Kerr nonlinearity. With the realistic photon detectors, the system can reach a high success probability of 0.5 per try. The applications of the setup include a heralded entangled pair source of high quality and the restoration of the entanglement of photon pairs mixed with noise. The elimination of the decoherence effects in its operation is also discussed.

I. INTRODUCTION

Polarization entangled photon pair sources have wide applications in quantum cryptography, teleportation, dense coding, and quantum computation because of the practical simplicity in manipulating these photonic states with the current technologies [1, 2]. The generation of such photonic states therefore attracts extensive research in the recent years. The primary method of experimentally generating entangled photon pairs at the present time is the spontaneous parametric down conversion in $\chi^{(2)}$ crystals [3, 4] (here we only cite the seminal works). For the practical applications, however, an ideal entangled pair source should be event-ready and highly efficient, and the individual photons of the pairs should be correlated only in their polarizations as the maximally entangled states

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^\pm\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|HH\rangle_{A,B} \pm |VV\rangle_{A,B}), \\ |\Psi^\pm\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|HV\rangle_{A,B} \pm |VH\rangle_{A,B}), \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where H and V represent the horizontal and the vertical polarization, respectively, and the indexes A and B denotes the sharing parties of the entanglement. In long-distance quantum communications based on coherent interaction between single photons and atomic ensembles [5, 6], biphoton sources of narrow-bandwidth should be needed to increase the transmission distance. The transmission and storage of entangled photon pairs also demand the solutions to coupling the entangled photons into the standard optical fibers [7, 8, 9]. A polarization entangled pair source satisfying the above-mentioned requirements and flexibility is desirable in quantum information technology.

In transporting entangled photon pairs, one will also face the problem of their decoherence in a noisy channel [10]. Under the decoherence effects the correlation between the polarization of the photons could be damaged

or even completely destroyed, and the photon pairs could degenerate into the unknown mixed states if we have no knowledge about the noisy channel. The available approach to restoring the entanglement in noisy photon pair is entanglement purification [11]. The simplest purification method is to filter a photon pair to higher fidelity by local operations [12, 13], and has been experimentally investigated with various types of polarization biphoton states [14, 15]. However, the success probability of the procedure will decrease as one improves on the fidelity of the output, since the fidelity of a single copy of a full rank state can not be generally increased by any local operation [17, 18]. All proposed purification protocols beyond local filtering are, therefore, the procedures of extracting entangled pairs with higher fidelity out of a larger number of less-entangled pairs through local operations and classical communications (LOCC). Like an original proposal of Bennett, *et al.* [19], the previous entanglement purification or concentration experiments [20, 21, 22, 23] require two identical input photon pairs for operation. Moreover, the complete information about the raw input state should be available and, only then, could one determine if its remnant entanglement or initial fidelity is above the distillation lower bound specified by a purification protocol. Under these restrictions, it is impossible to purify a single copy of photon pair in unknown mixed state with any LOCC entanglement purification protocol.

In the present work we propose a method to realize the maximally entangled states in Eq. (1) with an input photon pair in arbitrary mixed state

$$\rho_{in} = \sigma_1|\Lambda_1\rangle\langle\Lambda_1| + \sigma_2|\Lambda_2\rangle\langle\Lambda_2| + \sigma_3|\Lambda_3\rangle\langle\Lambda_3| + \sigma_4|\Lambda_4\rangle\langle\Lambda_4|. \quad (2)$$

Here σ_i are the eigenvalues of ρ_{in} and $|\Lambda_i\rangle$, the pure state components as its eigenvectors, are the linear combinations of $|\Phi^\pm\rangle$ and $|\Psi^\pm\rangle$. If ρ_{in} is the tensor product of the states of two independent single photons, this setup will naturally work as an entangler. Single photon sources have been close to practical applications recently (for an overview on the single photon sources based on parametric down-conversion in $\chi^{(2)}$ media, see [24]). A bright source of heralded narrow-band single photons was experimentally realized using a double-resonant optical parametric oscillator (OPO) [25]. Also with electromag-

*Electronic address: bhe98@earthlink.net

netic induced transparency (EIT) technique, it is possible to generate single photons with narrow bandwidth which is actually the same as that of the control laser (typically about 1 MHz). To entangle single photons efficiently will, therefore, provide a feasible approach to realizing the good-quality entangled polarization biphoton sources, if we only correlate the polarizations of the individual photons from two single photon sources. In our system, we transmit the correlation of two individual photons by laser beams in coherent states, which interact with the single photon through cross phase modulation (XPM) processes in Kerr media. Continuous variable (CV) states, such as coherent state, undergo the different decoherence from those on single photons [26], and the dominant decoherence effect on the coherent beams transmitted through the standard optical fiber is simply amplitude damping due to loss [27]. Using the proposed entangling setup to process the coherent beams sent through lossy optical fiber, we can also restore the entanglement of a single copy of a photon pair distributed through the same optical fiber without determining its state, since the σ_i and $|\Lambda_i\rangle$ in Eq. (2) can be unknown to operation.

The rest of the article is organized as follows: in Sec. II we explain the notation we use for the transformations of biphoton states; and in Sec. III, IV and V, the detailed procedures of transforming an arbitrary biphoton state in Eq. (2) to the exact Bell states in Eq. (1) are presented; the decoherence effect on the coherent beams transmitting the quantum correlation between the individual photons is discussed in Sec. VI; finally, we conclude with a brief summary.

II. NOTATION

In what follows, we adopt a notation of operator-vector duality [28, 29, 30, 31] for a bipartite quantum state. This notation provides a natural correspondence between a pure state $|\Lambda\rangle$ (or the pure state components $|\Lambda_i\rangle$ in Eq. (2)) and its coefficient matrix Λ (or Λ_i). The general input in Eq. (2) is represented in the Bell state basis $\{|\Phi^\pm\rangle, |\Psi^\pm\rangle\}$, and these basis vectors can be rewritten as

$$|B_{ij}\rangle = (\hat{a}_{A,1}^\dagger, \hat{a}_{A,2}^\dagger) B_{ij} \begin{pmatrix} \hat{a}_{B,1}^\dagger \\ \hat{a}_{B,2}^\dagger \end{pmatrix} |0\rangle, \quad (3)$$

with their coefficient matrices B_{ij} being defined as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} B_{00} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, & B_{01} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \\ B_{10} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & B_{11} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Here we have converted the basis vectors to a which-path space over the tracks 1 and 2 for later use; if we don't perform the step with two polarization beam splitters

(PBS), the indexes $\{i, j\}$ will be still the polarization basis $\{|H\rangle, |V\rangle\}$. We divide these coefficient matrices into the even parity set with $\Lambda = B_{00}$ or B_{01} , which correspond to $|\Phi^\pm\rangle$, and the odd parity set with $\Lambda = B_{10}$ or B_{11} , which correspond to $|\Psi^\pm\rangle$. The coefficient matrix Λ of a general 2×2 dimensional pure state $|\Lambda\rangle$ is the linear combination of B_{ij} .

With this notation, the local operations A and B respectively from two sharing parties of the entanglement is given as (T represents the matrix transpose):

$$A \otimes B |\Lambda\rangle = |A\Lambda B^T\rangle. \quad (5)$$

If the entangled state is of a photon pair, the unitary and the non-unitary transformations of A and B on the individual single photons can be realized following the procedures in [32] and [33], respectively, and A and B can also be implemented one after another since $A \otimes B |\Lambda\rangle = (A \otimes I)(I \otimes B)|\Lambda\rangle$.

III. UNITARY TRANSFORMATIONS IN THE EXTENDED SPACE

We now apply the notation introduced in the last section to study the transformations of the general input state in Eq. (2). It is sufficient to look at the transformation of its basis vectors in Eq. (3) and Eq. (4), since any pure state component of the general input is their linear combination. First, we transform an input state in polarization space to a which-path space with two PBS at both location A and B. Without loss of generality, all photonic components after the conversion can be temporarily transformed to H polarization with half wave plate (HWP) or $\lambda/2$ in Fig. 1. Then, the local operations on a pure state $|\Lambda\rangle$ in the which-path space can be performed in its extended space [31]. If both of the sharing parties apply the identical 4×4 local rotation

$$U_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} I & I \\ -I & I \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

in the extended space of $|\Lambda\rangle$, for example, they will realize a bipartite state $|\Sigma\rangle$ with the following 4×4 coefficient matrix from Eq. (5) (we represent a zero submatrix with 0):

$$\Sigma = U_1 \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} U_1^T = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda & -\Lambda \\ -\Lambda & \Lambda \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

Here we embed the 2×2 coefficient matrix Λ in the extended space in the transformation. As an example, such local operations on a Bell state $|\Lambda\rangle = |B_{00}\rangle$, the coefficient matrix of which is defined in Eq. (4), will lead to a 4×4 bipartite state

$$\begin{aligned} |\Sigma\rangle &= \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} (\hat{a}_{A,1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{B,1}^\dagger + \hat{a}_{A,2}^\dagger \hat{a}_{B,2}^\dagger) |0\rangle \\ &\quad - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} (\hat{a}_{A,1}^\dagger \hat{a}_{B,3}^\dagger + \hat{a}_{A,2}^\dagger \hat{a}_{B,4}^\dagger) |0\rangle \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& - \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_{A,3}^\dagger \hat{a}_{B,1}^\dagger + \hat{a}_{A,4}^\dagger \hat{a}_{B,2}^\dagger)|0\rangle \\
& + \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(\hat{a}_{A,3}^\dagger \hat{a}_{B,3}^\dagger + \hat{a}_{A,4}^\dagger \hat{a}_{B,4}^\dagger)|0\rangle, \quad (8)
\end{aligned}$$

where the indexes ranging from 1 to 4 represent four different tracks. The linear optical implementation of U_1 is illustrated in Fig. 1. Since any unitary transformation operating on a single photon in which-path space corresponds to a linear optical circuit [32], in the later steps, we will only show the necessary transformations on the coefficient matrix Λ of a pure state component in an input without demonstrating their corresponding circuits.

The second pair of local unitary transformations we apply is

$$U_2 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & iV \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} iV & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & I \\ I & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

with the submatrix

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

The operation U_2 can be implemented by three totally reflecting mirrors and the appropriate phase shifters. Under the joint local action of U_2 , a bipartite state with the following coefficient matrix will be obtained from $|\Sigma\rangle$:

$$\Xi = U_2 \Sigma U_2^T = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where $A = -V\Lambda V^T$, $B = -iV\Lambda$, $C = -i\Lambda V^T$ and $D = \Lambda$. If $\Lambda = B_{ij}$, we will obtain the submatrices for the

different parity sets as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= - \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & \lambda_1 \end{pmatrix}, & B &= -i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda_2 \\ -\lambda_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \\
C &= -i \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\lambda_1 \\ \lambda_2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & & (12)
\end{aligned}$$

where Λ of the even parity set are diagonal with the entries $\lambda_1 = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $\lambda_2 = \pm 1/\sqrt{2}$;

$$\begin{aligned}
A &= \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \lambda_2 \\ \lambda_1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, & B &= -i \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda_1 \end{pmatrix}, \\
C &= -i \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_1 & 0 \\ 0 & -\lambda_2 \end{pmatrix}, & & (13)
\end{aligned}$$

where Λ of the odd parity set are off-diagonal with the entries $\lambda_1 = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $\lambda_2 = \pm 1/\sqrt{2}$.

Now, we continue to apply the third pair of local unitary operations U_1^T to obtain a bipartite state $|\Lambda'\rangle$ with $\Lambda' = U_1^T \Xi U_1$. We embed the state $|\Lambda'\rangle$ into a further extended space of 8×8 dimension, and perform one more pair of local unitary operations K constructed with the projection operators,

$$P_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & I \end{pmatrix}, \quad P_2 = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

where $P_1 + P_2 = I_4$, the identity operator in four dimensional space. Such unitary operations K are realized in the extended space as follows:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Omega &= K \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda' & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} K^T = \begin{pmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \\ P_2 & -P_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda' & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} P_1 & P_2 \\ P_2 & -P_1 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} P_1 \Lambda' P_1 & P_1 \Lambda' P_2 \\ P_2 \Lambda' P_1 & P_2 \Lambda' P_2 \end{pmatrix} \\
&= \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A+B+C+D & A+C-B-D & 0 \\ 0 & A-C+B-D & A-B-C+D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (15)
\end{aligned}$$

If we substitute the results in Eqs. (12) and (13) into the non-zero block $A + B + C + D$, we will obtain the following transformations for the coefficient matrices of the Bell states:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Lambda = B_{00} &\rightarrow 0, & \Lambda = B_{01} &\rightarrow 1/2(B_{01} + iB_{10}), \\
\Lambda = B_{11} &\rightarrow 0, & \Lambda = B_{10} &\rightarrow 1/2(B_{10} - iB_{01}). \quad (16)
\end{aligned}$$

After we convert the states back to polarization space as in Fig. 2, we will correspondingly realize the non-unitary

transformations of the Bell states,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Phi^+\rangle &\rightarrow 0, & |\Phi^-\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2}(|\Phi^-\rangle + i|\Psi^+\rangle), \\
|\Psi^-\rangle &\rightarrow 0, & |\Psi^+\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{2}(|\Psi^+\rangle - i|\Phi^-\rangle), \quad (17)
\end{aligned}$$

over the tracks K_A and K_B . Only two Bell states survive in the transformations. Similar relations will be obtained from the other three non-zero blocks. We find that, in the non-zero parts of $P_1 \Lambda' P_1$ and $P_2 \Lambda' P_2$ blocks, the pure state components of an input ρ_{in} are mapped to a subspace spanned by $\{|B_{01}\rangle, |B_{10}\rangle\}$ or $\{|\Phi^-\rangle, |\Psi^+\rangle\}$

but, in the non-zero sub-matrices of two other blocks, they will be mapped to that spanned by $\{|B_{00}\rangle, |B_{11}\rangle\}$ or $\{|\Phi^+\rangle, |\Psi^-\rangle\}$ instead. These non-zero matrix blocks respectively correspond to the output components on tracks $\{K_A, K_B\}$, $\{R_A, R_B\}$, $\{K_A, R_B\}$ and $\{R_A, K_B\}$ in Fig. 2. Therefore, if one projects out the components corresponding only to one of the blocks, the resulting state from a general input ρ_{in} will be in a subspace with only two Bell states (one even parity but the other odd parity) as the basis vectors.

IV. REALIZATION OF PROJECTION WITH QND MODULES

To project out the output on tracks K_A and K_B , for example, we use two quantum non-demolition detection (QND) modules shown in Fig. 3. In the modules, one of the coherent beams $|\alpha\rangle$ couples to the photonic components on the track K_A or K_B through a cross phase modulation (XPM) process in Kerr medium, which is described by the Hamiltonian

$$H_{kerr} = \hbar\chi\hat{a}_p^\dagger\hat{a}_p\hat{a}_s^\dagger\hat{a}_s. \quad (18)$$

\hat{a}_p and \hat{a}_s here correspond to the probe and signal modes, respectively, and χ is the coupling constant determined by the medium property. Through an ideal XPM process, a coherent beam and a single photon Fock state $|1\rangle$ evolve within the interaction time t as follows:

$$U_K|\alpha\rangle|1\rangle = |\alpha e^{i\theta}\rangle|1\rangle, \quad (19)$$

where $U_K = \exp(iH_{kerr}t)$ and $\theta = \chi t$. After the interaction the coherent beam $|\alpha e^{i\theta}\rangle$ is compared with the

second beam $|\alpha\rangle$ which is untouched. The success probability of comparing two coherent beams is [34]

$$P_s = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2}|\alpha - \alpha e^{i\theta}|^2\right). \quad (20)$$

For the sufficient large $|\alpha\theta| \gg 1$, we can project out the desired photonic components almost with certainty.

We here illustrate the general result with an example of input photon pair in the state $|HH\rangle = 1/\sqrt{2}(|\Phi^+\rangle + |\Phi^-\rangle)$, and it is straightforward to generalize the result to the state in Eq. (2) by considering the transformations of the Bell state basis vectors in each pure state component. After a sequence of unitary transformations discussed in the last section, the total output will be an 8×8 bipartite state in the which-path space. With Eq. (17) we obtain its unnormalized output on tracks K_A and K_B as

$$|\Omega\rangle_{K_A, K_B} = 1/4(|H\rangle_A + i|V\rangle_A)(|H\rangle_B + i|V\rangle_B). \quad (21)$$

Before the detection by the QND modules, the normalized state of the total system including the output photonic components on all different tracks and the coherent beams in the QND modules is

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle_{tot} &= (|\Omega\rangle_{K_A, K_B} + |\Omega\rangle_{R_A, R_B} + |\Omega\rangle_{R_A, K_B} + |\Omega\rangle_{K_A, R_B}) \\ &\times |\alpha\rangle_{K_A, 1} |\alpha\rangle_{K_A, 2} |\alpha\rangle_{K_B, 1} |\alpha\rangle_{K_B, 2}. \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

Under the action of the Kerr nonlinearities and a 50/50 beam splitter in both QND modules, this state will evolve as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle_{tot} &\rightarrow \frac{1}{4}(|H\rangle_A + i|V\rangle_A) \otimes \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha(e^{i\theta} - 1)\right\rangle_{K_A, 1} \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha(e^{i\theta} + 1)\right\rangle_{K_A, 2} \otimes (|H\rangle_B + i|V\rangle_B) \\ &\otimes \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha(e^{i\theta} - 1)\right\rangle_{K_B, 1} \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha(e^{i\theta} + 1)\right\rangle_{K_B, 2} \\ &+ |\Omega\rangle_{R_A, R_B} \otimes |0\rangle_{K_A, 1} |\sqrt{2}\alpha\rangle_{K_A, 2} |0\rangle_{K_B, 1} |\sqrt{2}\alpha\rangle_{K_B, 2} + |\Omega\rangle_{R_A, K_B} \otimes |0\rangle_{K_A, 1} |\sqrt{2}\alpha\rangle_{K_A, 2} \\ &\otimes \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha(e^{i\theta} - 1)\right\rangle_{K_B, 1} \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha(e^{i\theta} + 1)\right\rangle_{K_B, 2} \\ &+ |\Omega\rangle_{K_A, R_B} \otimes \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha(e^{i\theta} - 1)\right\rangle_{K_A, 1} \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\alpha(e^{i\theta} + 1)\right\rangle_{K_A, 2} |0\rangle_{K_B, 1} |\sqrt{2}\alpha\rangle_{K_B, 2}. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

If one detects the first coherent beam of the QND modules at both location A and B with a simple photodiode, the desired output $|\Omega\rangle_{K_A, K_B}$ will be immediately projected out with the responses of the two photodiodes together. This operation is equivalent to applying the projection

$$P'_1 = \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

at both location A and B on the total output with the coefficient matrix in Eq. (15):

$$\Omega_{K_A, K_B} = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A+B+C+D & A+C-B-D \\ A-C+B-D & A-B-C+D \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} I & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} A+B+C+D & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

Since $P'_1 + P'_2 = I_A$ and $[P'_1, P'_2] = 0$, P'_1 can be simultaneously implemented with another projection P'_2 realized with two more QND modules at both locations, with one of them getting the measurement result 1. Therefore, two QND modules responding to either K_A or R_A at location A, together with the other two QND modules responding to either K_B or R_B at location B, will project out the outputs over four groups of ports $\{K_A, K_B\}$, $\{R_A, R_B\}$, $\{K_A, R_B\}$ and $\{R_A, K_B\}$, respectively. In the actual operations, we send the result of which QND module responds at one location to another, where it is matched to another QND measurement result to determine the pair of output ports for setting up an entangled state.

V. SEPARATION OF DIFFERENT PARITY SECTORS OF PHOTON PAIRS

We demonstrate how to extract one Bell state with the example of the input state $|HH\rangle$ again. From this input state, we obtain the output $|\Omega\rangle_{K_A, K_B}$ in Eq. (21) over ports K_A and K_B . As illustrated in Fig. 2, we continue to interact two identical coherent beams $|\alpha\rangle$ with photon B through two Kerr nonlinearities inducing $U_{k,i}$ ($i = 1, 2$), evolving the state of the total system to (with the global coefficient neglected)

$$\begin{aligned} U_{k,1}U_{k,2}|\Omega\rangle_{K_A, K_B} &= (|H\rangle_A + i|V\rangle_A)\{U_{k,1}(|H\rangle_B|\alpha\rangle_1) U_{k,2}|\alpha\rangle_2 + iU_{k,2}(|V\rangle_B|\alpha\rangle_2) U_{k,1}|\alpha\rangle_1\} \\ &= (|H\rangle_A + i|V\rangle_A)(|H\rangle_B|\alpha e^{i\theta}\rangle_1|\alpha\rangle_2 + i|V\rangle_B|\alpha\rangle_1|\alpha e^{i\theta}\rangle_2) \\ &= |\Psi_1\rangle_{tot}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

The first coherent beam here is only coupled to the H component of photon B while the second is only coupled to the V component. After the interaction, the modes of photon B are stored in any type of quantum memory, and the coherent beams are sent to location A, where we use Kerr nonlinearities inducing the same phase shift to couple them with photon A in the inverse way as that at location B, with the first beam being coupled to the V component of photon A and the second to its H component. Then, two phase shifters of $-\theta$ are applied to adjust the state to

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_2\rangle_{tot} &= (|HH\rangle - |VV\rangle)|\alpha\rangle_1|\alpha\rangle_2 \\ &\quad + i|VH\rangle|\alpha e^{i\theta}\rangle_1|\alpha e^{-i\theta}\rangle_2 + i|HV\rangle|\alpha e^{-i\theta}\rangle_1|\alpha e^{i\theta}\rangle_2 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

The comparison of the two coherent beam is performed by a 50/50 beam splitter and a photon detector D as illustrated in Fig. 2. The final state before the detection is

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_3\rangle_{tot} &= (|HH\rangle - |VV\rangle)|0\rangle_1|\sqrt{2}\alpha\rangle_2 \\ &\quad + i|HV\rangle| -i\sqrt{2}\alpha \sin\theta\rangle_1 |\sqrt{2}\alpha \cos\theta\rangle_2 \\ &\quad + i|VH\rangle |i\sqrt{2}\alpha \sin\theta\rangle_1 |\sqrt{2}\alpha \cos\theta\rangle_2. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Suppose that we have an ideal Fock state projector,

$$I = |0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1| + \dots + |n\rangle\langle n| + \dots, \quad (29)$$

the Bell states can be obtained by the photon number projection on the first coherent beam. If the photon number $n = 0$, the resulting state will be $|\Phi^-\rangle$; if the photon number $n \neq 0$, we will obtain $1/\sqrt{2}(e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}n}|HV\rangle + e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}n}|VH\rangle)$, which can be transformed to $|\Psi^+\rangle$ with two phase shifters. There is the ideal efficiency of 100% for realizing the Bell states over tracks $\{K_A, K_B\}$, $\{R_A, R_B\}$, $\{K_A, R_B\}$ and $\{R_A, K_B\}$ in Fig. 2.

In reality, we could only be provided with the photodiodes to detect the coherent beams without resolving their photon numbers, so the total success probability will be lowered to 0.5 per try. We can also compare the second coherent state, which is $|\sqrt{2}\alpha\rangle_2$ in the even parity sector and $|\sqrt{2}\alpha \cos\theta\rangle_2$ in the odd parity sector, with a prepared state $|\sqrt{2}\alpha \cos\theta\rangle_3$ at location A. Then we have such detection pattern for the generated states: if the second coherent beam is responded by a photodiode, we will realize the even parity Bell states $|\Phi^\pm\rangle$ with the success probability 50%; if the first coherent beam is detected, on the other hand, what we obtain will be a mixture of the odd parity Bell states $|\Psi^\pm\rangle$ by the other 50% probability. The entangled photon pair generation rate of the system could be limited by the dead time of the photodiodes in the QND modules in Fig. 2, but the detection inefficiency (such as that in detecting single photons) can be overcome by using sufficiently bright coherent beams. Since the photon pairs are correlated only in their polarizations by the setup, the wavelengths

and the bandwidths of the generated entangled pairs are just determined by the single photon sources.

As an extension of the setup in Fig. 2, we can also generate graph states [35] from a set of independent photons at various locations. This type of multi-party entangled states is an important resource in quantum computation [36]. By our scheme, the maximal entanglement can be created between any pair of photons independent of their initial states. These entangled links can be connected to a network of arbitrary shape and size.

VI. ELIMINATION OF DECOHERENCE EFFECTS

In the previous discussion we assume that the coherent beams are lossless in the transmission and the XPM processes. However, the losses of the coherent beams are not negligible if the distance between location A and B is large and the coherent beams are transmitted through the standard optical fiber. One such example we will discuss is the application of the system to restore the entanglement of a photon pair distributed over a noisy channel. To a dissipative nonlinear Kerr medium such loss should also be considered in an XPM process [37]. The dissipative evolution of a state ρ in an environment with the loss rate ζ is described by the master equation

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = \zeta(2\hat{a}\rho\hat{a}^\dagger - \hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a}\rho - \rho\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a}), \quad (30)$$

where \hat{a} represents the optical mode. The state ρ of the total system could therefore decohere in operation.

First, we look at the Kerr media that are suitable to realizing the XPM processes in our system. A normal Kerr crystal based on $\chi^{(3)}$ nonlinearity could be too weak to work in a practical situation [38]. The satisfactory performance of the similar parity gate working with the normal cross Kerr nonlinearity, such as that in [39], could also be spoiled by phase noise [40]. Beyond the normal Kerr nonlinearities, the possible candidates for realizing the XPM process described by Eq. (19) are the atomic systems working under EIT conditions. Although the dissipation in an EIT Kerr medium is considerable too, we only need to generate a very small phase shift θ in Eq. (26). This small phase shift, e.g., $\theta \sim 10^{-7}$, can be the smallest realizable value for the phase shifter of $-\theta$ (in Fig. 2) by the current optical technology, and reduces the concurrent losses of single photon and coherent beam in the EIT media to a very low level. By using the sufficiently bright coherent beams $|\alpha\rangle$ we can still realize the high efficiency of the proposed entangler. This is one of the advantages of our setup.

On the other hand, if we apply the system to purify the noisy entangled photon pairs distributed through the standard optical fiber, such small dissipation of the coherent beams, which arises from the XPM processes, can be included in the dissipation due to their transmission in the same fiber. We can extend the effective length of

the optical fiber to add into this part of losses. Under the effect described by Eq. (30), the dissipation of the coherent beams over an optical fiber with the length L can be modeled by a beam splitter of transmission $\eta = e^{-\zeta L}$, which discards a portion of the beam to the environment [27]. After the transmission, the state involving photon B and two coherent beams in Eq. (26) will be decohered to

$$\rho_{B,1,2} = \frac{1 + |\chi|^2}{2} |\Phi^1\rangle_{B,1,2} \langle\Phi^1| + \frac{1 - |\chi|^2}{2} |\Phi^2\rangle_{B,1,2} \langle\Phi^2|, \quad (31)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^1\rangle_{B,1,2} &= |H\rangle_B |\sqrt{\eta}\alpha\rangle_1 |\sqrt{\eta}\alpha e^{i\theta}\rangle_2 \\ &\quad + i|V\rangle_B |\sqrt{\eta}\alpha e^{i\theta}\rangle_1 |\sqrt{\eta}\alpha\rangle_2, \\ |\Phi^2\rangle_{B,1,2} &= |H\rangle_B |\sqrt{\eta}\alpha\rangle_1 |\sqrt{\eta}\alpha e^{i\theta}\rangle_2 \\ &\quad - i|V\rangle_B |\sqrt{\eta}\alpha e^{i\theta}\rangle_1 |\sqrt{\eta}\alpha\rangle_2 \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

and $|\chi| = |\langle\sqrt{1-\eta}\alpha e^{i\theta}|\sqrt{1-\eta}\alpha\rangle|$. The entangled state generated by the setup will be therefore the mixture of the even or the odd parity Bell states. To eliminate the undesired component $|\Phi^2\rangle_{B,1,2}$, we choose the proper parameters for the transmitted coherent beams such that $|\chi|^2 \sim 1$. For example, if $|\alpha|$ is set to the order of 10^3 and θ is in the order 10^{-5} , the proportion of $|\Phi^1\rangle_{B,1,2}$ component in Eq. (31) will be larger than $1 - 10^{-4}$. Under the operations discussed in the last section, the dominant component of the state $|\Phi^1\rangle_{B,1,2}$ and that of photon A evolve as

$$\begin{aligned} &(|H\rangle_A + i|V\rangle_A) |\Phi^1\rangle_{B,1,2} \\ \rightarrow &(|HH\rangle - |VV\rangle) |0\rangle_1 |\sqrt{2\eta}\alpha\rangle_2 \\ &+ i|VH\rangle |i\sqrt{2\eta}\alpha \sin\theta\rangle_1 |\sqrt{2\eta}\alpha \cos\theta\rangle_2 \\ &+ i|HV\rangle |-i\sqrt{2\eta}\alpha \sin\theta\rangle_1 |\sqrt{2\eta}\alpha \cos\theta\rangle_2. \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

Due to the setting of $|\chi|^2 \sim 1$ for eliminating $|\Phi^2\rangle_{B,1,2}$ component, the overlap of the coherent state $|0, \sqrt{2\eta}\alpha\rangle_{1,2}$ with the pair of the states in the odd parity sector, $|\pm i\sqrt{2\eta}\alpha \sin\theta, \sqrt{2\eta}\alpha \cos\theta\rangle_{1,2}$, will be large, limiting the overall efficiency of separating the different parity sectors to the half of the upperbound success probability [41, 42, 43] for unambiguously discriminating such coherent states:

$$P_{pur} = \frac{1}{2} (1 - |\langle 0|i\sqrt{2\eta}\alpha \sin\theta\rangle \langle\sqrt{2\eta}\alpha|\sqrt{2\eta}\alpha \cos\theta\rangle|). \quad (34)$$

This feature is different from that of the locally operated entangler discussed in the last section, where the overlap of the coherent states in the above equation can be lowered to a vanishing quantity by increasing the amplitude $|\alpha|$ of the coherent beams.

We compare the setup's purification efficiency with that of a LOCC scheme by the example of the raw photon

pair in the state $F|\Phi^+\rangle\langle\Phi^+|+(1-F)|\Psi^+\rangle\langle\Psi^+|$. This mixture of the different parity Bell states can be asymptotically purified to Bell state by the linear optical realization [44, 45] or the cross Kerr nonlinearity realization [46] of LOCC purification protocol. By the scheme in [44], for instance, there should be at least 8 copies of the input state to realize the purification to the fidelity $F' = 0.96$, if the initial fidelity of the state is $F = 0.6$, and the overall success probability of the purification with these 8 copies is about 0.017. If there is only one such copy available and we have to purify it with our entangler, its final fidelity will be determined by the coherent beam amplitude $|\alpha|$, XPM phase shift θ and the transmission of the optical fiber, which are independent of its initial state. The fiber transmission of the coherent beams is about 0.67 for the distance between two locations $L = 10$ km and the attenuation length of the coherent beam $L_{att} = 25$ km. Then the corresponding success probability of purifying the single copy to the final fidelity $F' = 0.96$ will be approximately 0.077. The disadvantage of this method compared with the LOCC schemes is that its efficiency will drop quickly if the distance between two locations is going larger. Within the attenuation length L_{att} of the coherent beams (with η not being too small in Eq. (34)), the setup could practically perform the purification of the noisy entangled photons separated by the distance L .

VII. CONCLUSION

In summary, we illustrate a setup that transforms a photon pair in arbitrary mixed state to an exact Bell

state. By employing the permutation symmetry of the four Bell states in Eqs. (3) and (4), we could realize such transformation with linear optics and Kerr nonlinearity that generates a very small XPM phase shift at the single photon level. Provided with the single photon sources of high repetition rate, this setup can be used as a good-quality photon pair entangler with its entanglement generation rate as large as the half of the single photon source repetition rate in principle. Because the entangled photons are only correlated in polarization, such source also enjoys much more flexibility than the other types of entangled pair sources. Another application of the setup is to restore the entanglement of the photon pairs distributed over a noisy channel. To guarantee the high fidelity of the purified photon pairs, we will have a purification efficiency limited by the upperbound of that for the unambiguous discrimination of two coherent states. Given a single copy of a photon pair in unknown mixed state, however, it is a feasible method to purify the pair to the higher fidelity. This universal entangler is realizable with the current technology if we find the proper XPM process that stably generates a small phase shift θ .

Acknowledgments

This work is supported in part by the Petroleum Research Fund and PSC-CUNY award. B.H. thanks Y.-F. Chen for helpful discussions.

-
- [1] *The Physics of Quantum Information*, edited by D. Bouwmeester, A. Ekert, and A. Zeilinger (Springer, Berlin, 2000).
 - [2] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 145 (2002).
 - [3] D. C. Burnham and D. L. Weinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **25**, 84 (1970).
 - [4] P. G. Kwiat, K. Mattle, H. Weinfurter, A. Zeilinger, A. V. Sergienko, and Y. H. Shih, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4337 (1995).
 - [5] L.-M. Duan, M. D. Lukin, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, *Nature* **414**, 413 (2001).
 - [6] S. Lloyd, M. S. Shahriar, J. H. Shapiro, and P. R. Hemmer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 167903 (2001).
 - [7] F. A. Bovino, *et al.*, *Opt. Commun.* **227**, 343 (2003).
 - [8] S. Castelletto, I. P. Degiovanni, A. Migdall, and M. Ware, *New J. Phys.* **6**, 87 (2004).
 - [9] R. Andrews, E. R. Pike, and S. Sarkar, *Opt. Express* **12**, 3264 (2004).
 - [10] W. Dür, M. Hein, J. I. Cirac, and H.-J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 052326 (2005).
 - [11] W. Dür and H. J. Briegel, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **70**, 1381 (2007).
 - [12] N. Gisin, *Phys. Lett. A* **210**, 151 (1996).
 - [13] F. Verstraete, J. Dehaene, and B. DeMoor, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 010101(R) (2001).
 - [14] P. G. Kwiat, *et al.*, *Nature* **409**, 1014 (2001).
 - [15] N. A. Peters, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 133601 (2004).
 - [16] Z.-W. Wang, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 220505 (2006).
 - [17] N. Linden, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 3279 (1998).
 - [18] A. Kent, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 2839 (1998).
 - [19] C. H. Bennett, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 722 (1996).
 - [20] J.-W. Pan, *et al.*, *Nature* **423**, 417 (2003).
 - [21] T. Yamamoto, *et al.*, *Nature* **421**, 343 (2003).
 - [22] Z. Zhao, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 207901 (2003).
 - [23] P. Walther, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 040504 (2005).
 - [24] S. A. Castelletto and R. E. Scholten, *Eur. Phys. J. Appl. Phys.* **41**, 181 (2008).
 - [25] J. S. Neergaard-Nielsen, B. Melholt Nielsen, H. Takahashi, A. I. Vistnes, and E. S. Polzik, *Opt. Exp.* **15**, 7940 (2007).
 - [26] A. Serafini, M. G. A. Paris, F. Illuminati, and S. De Siena, *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt.* **7**, R19 (2005).
 - [27] J. K. Asbóth, P. Adam, M. Koniorczyk, and J. Janszky, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **30**, 403 (2004).
 - [28] G. M. D'Ariano, *et al.*, *Phys. Lett. A* **272**, 32 (2000).
 - [29] J. Calsamiglia, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 030301(R) (2002).

- [30] C. Li, H.-S Song, and Y.-X. Luo, *Phy. Lett. A* **297**, 121 (2002).
- [31] B. He and J. A. Bergou, Arxiv: 0708.4184 (2007).
- [32] M. Reck, A. Zeilinger, H. J. Bernstein, and P. Bertani, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **73**, 58 (1994).
- [33] B. He, J. A. Bergou, and Z.-Y. Wang, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 042326 (2007).
- [34] E. Andersson, M. Curty, and I. Jex, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 022304 (2006).
- [35] M. Hein, *et al.*, Proceedings of the International School of Physics *Enrico Fermi* on *Quantum Computers, Algorithms and Chaos*, Varenna, Italy, July, 2005; quant-ph/0602096.
- [36] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 5188 (2001).
- [37] H. Jeong, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 034305 (2005).
- [38] P. Kok, H. Lee, and J. P. Dowling, *Phys. Rev. A*, **66**, 063814 (2002).
- [39] W. J. Munro, K. Nemoto, and T. P. Spiller, *New J. Phys.* **7**, 137 (2005).
- [40] J. H. Shapiro and M. Razavi, *New J. Phys.* **9**, 16 (2007).
- [41] I. D. Ivanovic, *Phys. Lett. A* **123**, 257 (1987).
- [42] D. Dieks, *Phys. Lett. A* **126**, 303 (1988).
- [43] A. Peres, *Phys. Lett. A* **128**, 19 (1988).
- [44] J.-W. Pan, C. Simon, C. Brukner, and A. Zeilinger, *Nature* **410**, 1067 (2001).
- [45] C. Simon and J.-W. Pan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 257901 (2002).
- [46] Y.-B. Sheng, F.-G. Deng, and H.-Y. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 042308 (2008).

Caption of Fig.1: Linear optical implementation of the local unitary operation U_1 . As a part of the linear optical circuits A or B in Fig. 2, two 50/50 beam splitters transform the input 2×2 bipartite state to a 4×4 bipartite state. Then the output on the tracks from 1 to 4 will be processed further.

Caption of Fig.2: Layout of the entangler. The wavy line represents the correlation between the individual

photons input from port A1 and B1. Since the input pair can be in any state of Eq. (2), we here use a general input state, in which the photons could be entangled to some extent. The photons can be totally uncorrelated from the independent single photon sources as well. Two linear optical circuits A and B process the input photon pairs. Over tracks K_A and K_B , for example, the output projected out by two QND module is the linear combination of only $|\Phi^-\rangle$ and $|\Psi^+\rangle$. At location B, one coherent beam interacts with the H component of the processed photon in Kerr medium, while the second with its V component. Transmitted to location A, the beams are coupled to the detected photon in the opposite way, and are transformed by two phase shifters of $-\theta$ to the different forms in the even and the odd parity sector of the photon pair state as in Eq. (28). Whether or not one of the coherent beams after a 50/50 beam splitter is responded by photodiode D, together with the detection of the photons by the QND modules, determines the photon pair state over A2 and B2. The unmeasured coherent beam C can be compared with another locally prepared beam to confirm the generation of the state $|\Phi^-\rangle$. $|\Phi^-\rangle$ and $|\Phi^+\rangle$ are realized over the tracks $\{K_A, K_B\}$, $\{R_A, R_B\}$ and $\{K_A, R_B\}$, $\{R_A, K_B\}$, respectively.

Caption of Fig.3: Configuration of the QND modules in Fig. 2. One of the probe coherent beams $|\alpha\rangle$ of the QND module is coupled to the photonic components on one of the output tracks through Kerr medium, picking up a phase shift θ if the photon is present. The 50/50 beam splitter transforms two coherent states $|\alpha\rangle_1|\beta\rangle_2$ to $|\frac{\alpha-\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\rangle_1|\frac{\alpha+\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\rangle_2$ (with the proper phase shifters). A response of the photodiode D indicates that the two beams $|\alpha\rangle_1$ and $|\beta\rangle_2$ are different with $|\frac{\alpha-\beta}{\sqrt{2}}\rangle_1 \neq |0\rangle_1$.





