

# Parametric down-conversion from a wave-equations approach: geometry and absolute brightness.

Morgan W. Mitchell<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*ICFO-Institut de Ciències Fotoniques, Mediterranean Technology Park, 08860 Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain*

(Dated: 17 July 2008)

We consider the relationship between parametric up-conversion and down-conversion in the narrow-band regime. It is well known that these processes are in some sense inverses of each other. Here we make this relationship precise, using a Green-function based description of the nonlinear optical process. We find simple expressions in terms of mode overlap integrals for the absolute pair production rate, and simple relationships between the efficiencies of the classical and quantum processes. The theory is applied to both degenerate and non-degenerate SPDC. We also find a time-domain expression for the correlation function between filtered signal and idler fields.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Spontaneous parametric down-conversion (SPDC) has become a workhorse technique for generation of photon pairs and related states in quantum optics. Zel'dovich and Klyshko first considered the photon statistics, proposing to use a mode expansion and a solution of a classical problem seeded by vacuum noise [1]. After the observation of SPDC temporal correlations by Burnham and Weinberg [2], Mollow presented a far more elaborate theory to describe detectable field correlation functions (coincidence distributions) in terms of source-current correlations and Green functions of the wave equation [3]. Hong and Mandel [4] used a mode-expansion and computed correlation functions based on the Heisenberg-picture evolution arising from an interaction Hamiltonian of the form

$$H_I = \frac{1}{2} \int d^3x \chi^{(2)} E^3. \quad (1)$$

Ghosh, *et al.* [5] used the same Hamiltonian in a Schrödinger-picture description, truncating the time evolution at first order to derive a "two-photon wave function." This last method has become the most popular description of SPDC [6]. It has the advantage that it gives a clear relationship between phase matching and photon correlations, of interest both for the spatial and spectral correlations of the generated light [7, 8]. Because of the mode expansion, it can treat non-paraxial geometries and arbitrary propagation directions in birefringent media. However, the first-order treatment of time evolution means the Schrödinger picture state is not normalized and never contains more than two down-conversion photons. While not a problem for calculating relative distributions, this makes calculation of absolute brightness difficult.

In recent years, advances in crystal growth and quasi-phase-matched materials have led to a number of very efficient sources based on periodically-poled materials [9]. In most cases the optic axis is normal to the direction of propagation, inducing zero spatial walk-off. This allows long interaction lengths and efficient conversion with paraxial beams. At the same time, many experiments now collect SPDC photons into single-mode fibres, either to achieve spatial mode purity or for compatibility with telecommunications devices. Finally, SPDC sources are becoming bright enough that narrow-band filtering may produce sources with bandwidth comparable with the widths of atomic resonances [10]. All of these developments provide motivation for this calculation.

We note that in a single-mode, paraxial situation, there is no calculational advantage to mode-expansion approaches, and in fact the local nature of the  $\chi^{(2)}$  mixing process suggests that a real-space treatment is more natural. We develop here a treatment of SPDC based on coupled wave equations, a standard approach for multi-wave mixing in non-linear optics [11]. The calculations are done in the Heisenberg picture, so that the evolution of the quantum fields is exactly parallel to that of the classical fields described by nonlinear optics. This allows the re-use of well-known classical calculations such as those by Boyd and Kleinman [12]. As in the approach of Mollow, we use Green functions to describe the propagation, and find results that are not specific to any particular crystal or beam geometry.

In this article we focus on the case of narrow-band parametric down-conversion, for which the results are particularly simple. By narrow-band, we mean that the bandwidths of the pump and of the collected are much less than the band-

width of the SPDC process, as set by the phase-matching conditions. This includes recent experiments with very narrow filters [13], but also ‘garden-variety’ SPDC, which is often performed with a down-conversion bandwidth of  $\sim 10$  nm and filters of  $< 1$  nm.

## II. FORMALISM

### A. description of propagation

We are interested in the envelopes  $\mathcal{E}_\pm$  for forward- and backward-directed of parts of the quantum field  $E^{(+)}(t, \mathbf{x}) = (\mathcal{E}_+ \exp[+ikz] + \mathcal{E}_- \exp[-ikz]) \exp[-i\omega t]$  where  $k$  is the average wave-number and  $\omega$  is the carrier frequency. These propagate according to a paraxial wave equation

$$\mathcal{D}_\pm \mathcal{E}_\pm = \mathcal{S}_\pm, \quad (2)$$

where  $\mathcal{D}_\pm$  is a differential operator and  $\mathcal{S}_\pm$  is a source term (later due to a  $\chi^{(2)}$  non-linearity).

The formal (retarded) solution to equation (2) is

$$\mathcal{E}_\pm(x) = \mathcal{E}_{0\pm}(x) + \int d^4 x' \mathcal{G}_\pm(x; x') \mathcal{S}_\pm(x') \quad (3)$$

where  $x$  is the four-vector  $(t, \mathbf{x})$ ,  $\mathcal{E}_{0\pm}(x)$  is a solution to the source-free ( $\mathcal{S} = 0$ ) equation, and  $\mathcal{G}_\pm$  are the time-forward Green functions, defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\pm \mathcal{G}_\pm(x; x') &= \delta^4(x - x') \\ \mathcal{G}_\pm(x; x') &= 0 \quad t < t'. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

For illustration, we consider the paraxial wave equation (PWE), for which

$$\mathcal{D}_\pm \equiv \nabla_T^2 \pm 2ik(\partial_z \pm v_g^{-1} \partial_t) \quad (5)$$

where  $\nabla_T^2 = \partial_x^2 + \partial_y^2$  is the ‘‘transverse Laplacian,’’  $k = n(\omega)\omega/c$  is the wave-number, and  $v_g \equiv \partial\omega/\partial k_z$  is the group velocity. We note that  $\mathcal{D}_\pm$  is invariant under translations of  $x$ , and that time reversal  $t \rightarrow -t$  is equivalent to direction-reversal and complex conjugation, i.e.,  $\mathcal{D}_\pm \rightarrow \mathcal{D}_\mp^*$ . The results we obtain will be valid for any equation obeying these symmetries. In particular, the results will also apply to propagation with dispersion and/or spatial walk-off, which can be included by adding other order time and/or spatial derivatives to  $\mathcal{D}$ .

From the symmetries of  $\mathcal{D}_\pm$ , it follows that the Green functions depend only on the difference

$x - x'$ , and that  $\mathcal{G}_+(t, \mathbf{x}; t', \mathbf{x}') = \mathcal{G}_-(t, \mathbf{x}', t', \mathbf{x})$ . Also, the time-backward (or ‘‘advanced’’) Green functions  $\mathcal{H}_\pm$ , defined by

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_\pm \mathcal{H}_\pm(x; x') &= \delta^4(x - x') \\ \mathcal{H}_\pm(x; x') &= 0 \quad t > t' \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

obey  $\mathcal{H}_\pm(x; x') = \mathcal{G}_\pm^*(x', x)$ .

### B. boundary and initial value problems

If the value of the field is known on a plane  $z = z_{\text{src}}$ , the field downstream of that plane is

$$\mathcal{E}_\pm(x) = \beta_z \int d^4 x' \mathcal{G}_\pm(x; x') \mathcal{E}_\pm(x') \delta(z' - z_{\text{src}}) \quad (7)$$

where  $\beta_z \equiv \pm 2ik$ . Similarly, if the field is known at an initial time  $t = t_0$ , the field later is

$$\mathcal{E}_\pm(x) = \beta_t \int d^4 x' \mathcal{G}_\pm(x; x') \mathcal{E}_\pm(x') \delta(t' - t_0) \quad (8)$$

where  $\beta_t = 2ik/v_g$ . Similar relationships hold for the advanced Green functions. If the field is known in some plane  $z = z_0$  downstream, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\pm(x) &= \beta_z^* \int d^4 x' \mathcal{H}_\pm(x; x') \mathcal{E}_\pm(x') \delta(z' - z_0) \\ &= \beta_z^* \int d^4 x' \mathcal{E}_\pm(x') \delta(z' - z_0) \mathcal{G}_\pm^*(x; x') \end{aligned}$$

while if the field is known at some time  $t_f$  in the future,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_\pm(x) &= \beta_t^* \int d^4 x' \mathcal{H}_\pm(x; x') \mathcal{E}_\pm(x') \delta(t' - t_f) \\ &= \beta_t^* \int d^4 x' \mathcal{E}_\pm(x') \delta(t' - t_f) \mathcal{G}_\pm^*(x; x') \end{aligned}$$

### C. quantization

The field envelopes are operators which obey the equal-time commutation relation

$$[\mathcal{E}(\mathbf{x}, t), \mathcal{E}^\dagger(\mathbf{x}', t)] = A_\gamma^2 \delta^3(\mathbf{x}' - \mathbf{x}) \quad (11)$$

where  $A_\gamma \equiv \sqrt{\hbar\omega/2nn_g\varepsilon_0}$  is a photon units scaling factor and  $n_g \equiv c/v_g$  is the group index. For narrow-band fields,  $A_\gamma^{-2} \langle \mathcal{E}^\dagger \mathcal{E} \rangle$  describes a photon number density, and  $v_g A_\gamma^{-2} \langle \mathcal{E}^\dagger \mathcal{E} \rangle$  and  $v_{gs} v_{gi} A_{\gamma_i}^{-2} A_{\gamma_s}^{-2} \langle \mathcal{E}_s^\dagger \mathcal{E}_i^\dagger \mathcal{E}_i \mathcal{E}_s \rangle$  describe single and pair fluxes. We find the unequal-time commutation relation from equation (8)

$$[\mathcal{E}(x), \mathcal{E}^\dagger(x')]_{t > t'} = \beta_t A_\gamma^2 \mathcal{G}(x; x') \quad (12)$$

so that  $\langle 0 | \mathcal{E}(x) \mathcal{E}^\dagger(x') | 0 \rangle = \beta_t A_\gamma^2 \mathcal{G}(x; x')$  for  $t > t'$ . For the PWE,  $A_\gamma^{-2} v_g = 2nc\varepsilon_0/\hbar\omega$  and  $\beta_t A_\gamma^2 = i\hbar\omega^2/c^2\varepsilon_0$ .

When we look at singles rates, we will need to evaluate expressions of the form  $\langle \mathcal{E} \mathcal{E}^\dagger \rangle$ . For this, a useful expression is derived in the Appendix: Equation (A2)

$$\langle \mathcal{E}(x) \mathcal{E}^\dagger(x') \rangle = \frac{2\hbar n \omega^3}{c^3 \varepsilon_0} \int d^4 x'' \delta(z'' - z_0) \times \mathcal{G}^*(x''; x) \mathcal{G}(x''; x'). \quad (13)$$

Here  $z_0$  is any plane down-stream of  $x$  and  $x'$ .

#### D. single spatial modes

A single spatial mode  $M_\pm(\mathbf{x})$  is a time-independent solution to the source-free wave equation  $\mathcal{D}_\pm M_\pm(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ .  $M_\pm^*(\mathbf{x})$  is the corresponding momentum-reversed solution  $\mathcal{D}_\mp M_\pm^*(\mathbf{x}) = 0$ . We assume the normalization  $\int d^3 x |M_\pm(\mathbf{x})|^2 \delta(z) = 1$ , so that the optical power is (MKS units)  $P_M(t) = 2nc\varepsilon_0 \int d^3 x |\mathcal{E}(t, x)|^2 \delta(z - z_0) = 2nc\varepsilon_0 |\mathcal{E}_M(t)|^2$ . For single-mode collection, it will be convenient to define the projection of a field  $\mathcal{E}(x)$  onto the mode  $M$  as

$$\mathcal{E}_M(t) \equiv \int d^3 x M^*(\mathbf{x}) \delta(z - z_0) \mathcal{E}(x) \quad (14)$$

(here and below, the  $+/-$  propagation direction is the same for  $\mathcal{E}, M$ ). Here  $z_0$  is some plane of interest, and  $\mathcal{E}_M(t)$  describes the magnitude of the field component in this plane. Similarly, if the envelope is constant, the field distribution is

$$\mathcal{E}(x) = \mathcal{E}_M(t) M(\mathbf{x}). \quad (15)$$

Given an upstream source  $\mathcal{S}(x)$ , the  $M$  component of the generated field is

$$\mathcal{E}_M(t) = \int d^3 x d^4 x' M^*(\mathbf{x}) \delta(z - z_0) \times \mathcal{G}(x; x') \mathcal{S}(x'). \quad (16)$$

If the source is time-independent, then Equation (9) and the time-translation symmetry of  $\mathcal{G}$  imply

$$\mathcal{E}_M(t) = \frac{1}{\beta_z} \int d^3 x' M^*(\mathbf{x}') \mathcal{S}(x'). \quad (17)$$

Similarly, if a product  $\mathcal{E}_1(x_1) \mathcal{E}_2(x_2)$  is given by a constant pair source  $\mathcal{S}^{(2)}(x)$  as

$$\mathcal{E}_1(x_1) \mathcal{E}_2(x_2) = \int d^4 x' \mathcal{G}_1(x_1; x') \mathcal{G}_2(x_2; x') \times \mathcal{S}^{(2)}(x'). \quad (18)$$

then the time-integrated mode-projected component is

$$\int dt_1 \mathcal{E}_{1M_1}(t_1) \mathcal{E}_{2M_2}(t_2) = \frac{1}{\beta_{1z} \beta_{2z}} \int d^3 x' M_1^*(\mathbf{x}') \times M_2^*(\mathbf{x}') \mathcal{S}^{(2)}(x'). \quad (19)$$

#### E. Coupled wave equations

We now introduce a  $\chi^{(2)}$  nonlinearity, which produces a nonlinear polarization that appears as a source term in the propagation equations. We consider three fields, “signal,” “idler” and “pump” with carrier frequencies  $\omega_s, \omega_i, \omega_p$  and wave-numbers  $k_s, k_i, k_p$ , respectively. The respective field envelopes  $\mathcal{E}_s, \mathcal{E}_i, \mathcal{E}_p$  evolve according to

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_p \mathcal{E}_p &= \omega_p^2 g \mathcal{E}_s \mathcal{E}_i \exp[i\Delta k] \\ \mathcal{D}_s \mathcal{E}_s &= \omega_s^2 g \mathcal{E}_p \mathcal{E}_i^\dagger \exp[-i\Delta k] \\ \mathcal{D}_i \mathcal{E}_i &= \omega_i^2 g \mathcal{E}_p \mathcal{E}_s^\dagger \exp[-i\Delta k] \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

where  $g = -\chi^{(2)}/c^2$  and  $\Delta k \equiv k_p - k_s - k_i$  is the wave-number mismatch. We can take  $\Delta k = 0$  without loss of generality, as the phase oscillation can be incorporated directly in the envelopes. The propagation directions ( $\pm$ ) will be omitted unless needed for clarity. Note that for transparent materials  $\chi^{(2)}$  is real, and  $\chi^{(2)}(\omega_p; \omega_s + \omega_i) = \chi^{(2)}(\omega_s; \omega_p - \omega_i) = \chi^{(2)}(\omega_i; \omega_p - \omega_s)$ .

First-order perturbation theory is sufficient to describe situations in which pairs are produced. For example, if  $\mathcal{E}_{0s}, \mathcal{E}_{0i}, \mathcal{E}_{0p}$  are source-free solutions, then

$$\mathcal{E}_s = \mathcal{E}_{0s} + \omega_s^2 \int d^4 x' \mathcal{G}_s(x; x') \times g(x') \mathcal{E}_{0p}(x') \mathcal{E}_{0i}^\dagger(x') + O(g^2). \quad (21)$$

and similar expressions for  $\mathcal{E}_i, \mathcal{E}_p$  are sufficient to give the lowest-order contribution to the pair-detection rate  $W^{(2)} \propto \langle \mathcal{E}_s^\dagger \mathcal{E}_i^\dagger \mathcal{E}_i \mathcal{E}_s \rangle$ . Higher-order expansions would be necessary for double-pair production, etc.

#### F. narrow-band frequency filters

In most down-conversion experiments, some sort of frequency filter is used. Assuming this filter is linear and stationary, the field reaching the

detector is

$$\mathcal{E}^{(F)}(t) = \int dt' F(t-t')\mathcal{E}(t') + G(t-t')\mathcal{E}_{\text{res}}(t'). \quad (22)$$

Here  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{res}}$  is a reservoir field required to maintain the field commutation relations. We assume the reservoir is in the vacuum state, will not produce detector clicks, and can be safely ignored. Defining  $H_F(t_i, t_s) \equiv \langle \mathcal{E}_i^{(F_i)}(t_i)\mathcal{E}_s^{(F_s)}(t_s) \rangle$ , the fields that leave the filter obey

$$H_F(t_i, t_s) = \int dt' dt'' F_i(t_i - t')F_s(t_s - t'') \times \langle \mathcal{E}_i(t')\mathcal{E}_s(t'') \rangle. \quad (23)$$

In the narrowband case, i.e., when the correlation time between signal and idler is much less than the time-scale of the impulse response functions, we can take  $\langle \mathcal{E}_i(t')\mathcal{E}_s(t'') \rangle \approx \mathcal{A}\delta(t' - t'')$  where the constant  $\mathcal{A} \equiv \int dt_i \langle \mathcal{E}_i(t_i)\mathcal{E}_s(t_s) \rangle$ . We find

$$H_F(t_i, t_s) \approx \mathcal{A} \int dt' F_i(t_i - t')F_s(t_s - t') \equiv \mathcal{A}f(t_s - t_i). \quad (24)$$

With this, we see that the flux of pairs is

$$W^{(2)}(t_s - t_i) = \frac{4n_s n_i c^2 \varepsilon_0^2}{\hbar^2 \omega_s \omega_i} |\mathcal{A}f(t_s - t_i)|^2 \quad (25)$$

with a total coincidence rate of

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(2)} &= \int dt_i W^{(2)}(t_s - t_i) \\ &= \frac{n_s n_i c^2 \varepsilon_0^2}{\hbar^2 \omega_s \omega_i} |\mathcal{A}|^2 \int dt_i |2f(t_s - t_i)|^2 \\ &\equiv \frac{n_s n_i c^2 \varepsilon_0^2}{\hbar^2 \omega_s \omega_i} |\mathcal{A}|^2 \Gamma_{\text{eff}}. \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

$\Gamma_{\text{eff}}$  is the effective line-width for the combined signal and idler filters. Also important will be the singles rate

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(1)} &= A_{\gamma_s}^{-2} v_{gs} \langle [\mathcal{E}_s^{(F_s)}(t_s)]^\dagger \mathcal{E}_s^{(F_s)}(t_s) \rangle \\ &= \frac{2n_s c \varepsilon_0}{\hbar \omega_s} \int dt' dt'' F_s^*(t_s - t')F_s(t_s - t'') \\ &\quad \times \langle \mathcal{E}_s^\dagger(t')\mathcal{E}_s(t'') \rangle \\ &\approx \frac{2n_s c \varepsilon_0}{\hbar \omega_s} \mathcal{C} \int dt' |F_s(t_s - t')|^2 \\ &\equiv \frac{n_s c \varepsilon_0}{2\hbar \omega_s} \mathcal{C} \Gamma_{\text{eff},s} \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

where  $\mathcal{C} \equiv \int dt' \langle \mathcal{E}_s^\dagger(t')\mathcal{E}_s(t'') \rangle$ .  $\Gamma_{\text{eff},s}$  is the effective line-width for the signal filter.

### III. CALCULATIONS

With the calculational tools described above, we now demonstrate the central results of this paper. We first express the efficiency of continuous-wave sum-frequency generation (SFG) in terms of a mode-overlap integral. This effectively reduces the non-linear optical problem to three uncoupled propagation problems. We then show that the efficiency of parametric down-conversion in the same medium is proportional to the SFG efficiency, for modes with the same shapes but opposite propagation direction. The constant of proportionality is found, allowing calculations of absolute efficiency based either on material properties such as  $\chi^{(2)}$  or measured SHG efficiencies. Similarly, the singles production efficiency is related to difference-frequency generation (DFG) and the collection efficiency is calculated. The same quantities for the degenerate case are also found.

#### A. sum-frequency generation

We consider first the process of SFG, for undepleted signal and idler and no input pump. Signal and idler are constant and come from single-modes,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_{M_p}(t_p) &= \mathcal{E}_{M_i}\mathcal{E}_{M_s} \frac{\omega_p^2}{\beta_{z,p}} \\ &\quad \times \int d^3x' M_p^*(x')g(x')M_i(x')M_s(x') \\ &\equiv \frac{\mathcal{E}_{M_i}\mathcal{E}_{M_s}\omega_p^2}{\beta_{z,p}} I_{SFG}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

The conversion efficiency is

$$\begin{aligned} Q_{SFG} &\equiv \frac{P_{M_p}}{P_{M_s}P_{M_i}} = \frac{\omega_p^4 n_p |I_{SFG}|^2}{2n_s n_i c \varepsilon_0 |\beta_{z,p}|^2} \\ &= \frac{c\omega_p^2}{8\varepsilon_0 n_p n_s n_i} |I_{SFG}|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

The efficiency of a cw, single-mode source is thus proportional to the spatial overlap of the pump, signal, and idler modes, weighted by the nonlinear coupling  $g$ .

### B. non-degenerate parametric down-conversion

Next we consider the process of parametric down-conversion. Using Equation (21), we can calculate to first order in  $g$  the correlation function

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{E}_i(x_i)\mathcal{E}_s(x_s) \rangle &= \omega_s^2 \int d^4x' \mathcal{G}_s(x_s, x') \\ &\quad \times \langle \mathcal{E}_{0,i}(x_i)\mathcal{E}_{0,i}^\dagger(x') \rangle \\ &\quad \times g(x')\mathcal{E}_{0,p}(x') \\ &= i \frac{\hbar\omega_i^2\omega_s^2}{c^2\varepsilon_0} \int d^4x' \mathcal{G}_s(x_s, x') \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{G}_i(x_i, x')g(x')\mathcal{E}_{0,p}(x') \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

For constant pump and single-mode collection we have

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{M_i M_s} &\equiv \int dt_s \langle \mathcal{E}_{M_i}(t_i)\mathcal{E}_{M_s}(t_s) \rangle \\ &= \frac{-i\hbar\omega_s\omega_i\mathcal{E}_{M_p}}{4\varepsilon_0 n_s n_i} \\ &\quad \times \int d^3x' M_s^*(x')M_i^*(x')g(x')M_p(x') \\ &\equiv \frac{-i\hbar\omega_s\omega_i\mathcal{E}_{M_p}}{4\varepsilon_0 n_s n_i} I_{DC}. \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

We note that  $I_{DC} = I_{SFG}^*$ . Also, the conjugate modes describe backward-propagating fields, as if the source fields were sent through the nonlinear medium in the opposite direction. Thus if we want to know the brightness of down-conversion when all beams are propagating to the left, it is sufficient to calculate (or measure) the efficiency of up-conversion when all beams are propagating to the right. Using equations (29) and (31) we find

$$|\mathcal{A}_{M_i M_s}|^2 = \frac{\hbar^2\omega_i^2\omega_s^2}{4c^2\varepsilon_0^2 n_s n_i \omega_p^2} P_p Q_{SFG}. \quad (32)$$

### C. brightness

We can now consider the brightness of the filtered, single-mode source. The rate of detection of pairs is

$$\begin{aligned} W^{(2)} &= \frac{n_s n_i c^2 \varepsilon_0^2}{\hbar^2 \omega_s \omega_i} |\mathcal{A}|^2 \Gamma_{\text{eff}} \\ &= \Gamma_{\text{eff}} \frac{\omega_i \omega_s}{4\omega_p^2} P_p Q_{SFG} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

This simple expression is the first main result: The rate of pairs is simply the joint collection

bandwidth  $\Gamma_{\text{eff}}$ , times the ratio of frequencies, times the pump power, times the up-conversion efficiency  $Q_{SFG}$ . Note that the last quantity can be calculated if the mode shapes and  $\chi^{(2)}(\mathbf{x})$  are known, for example in the paper of Boyd and Kleinman, or simulated for more complicated situations. Most importantly, it is directly measurable.

### D. difference-frequency generation

We now consider the classical situation in which pump and signal beam are injected into the crystal and idler is generated. We will see that this directly measurable process is related to the singles generation rate by parametric down-conversion. The generated idler is

$$\mathcal{E}_i(x) = \omega_i^2 \int d^4x' \mathcal{G}_i(x; x')g(x')\mathcal{E}_{0p}(x')\mathcal{E}_{0s}^*(x').$$

If pump and signal are from modes  $M_P, M_S$ , respectively, we find

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_i(x) &= \omega_i^2 \mathcal{E}_{M_p}(t_p)\mathcal{E}_{M_s}^*(t_s) \int d^4x' \mathcal{G}_i(x; x') \\ &\quad \times g(x')M_p(x')M_s^*(x'). \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

The total power generated is  $P_i = 2cn_i\varepsilon_0 \int d^3x_i \delta(z_i - z_0)|\mathcal{E}_i(x_i)|^2$  where  $z_0$  indicates a plane downstream of the generation.

$$\begin{aligned} P_i &= \frac{\omega_i^2 c}{8\varepsilon_0 n_s n_i n_p} P_p P_s \int d^3x_i \delta(z_i - z_0) \\ &\quad \times \left| \beta_{z,i} \int d^4x' \mathcal{G}_i(x_i; x')g(x')M_p(x')M_s^*(x') \right|^2 \\ &\equiv P_p P_s \frac{c\omega_i^2}{8\varepsilon_0 n_s n_i n_p} |I_{DFG}^{(s)}|^2 \\ &\equiv P_p P_s Q_{DFG}. \end{aligned} \quad (35)$$

### E. singles rates in PDC

We can find the rate of detection of singles in the mode  $M_S$  by equation (27) and using Equation

(A2)

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{C} &= \int dt_s \langle \mathcal{E}_{M_S}^\dagger(x_s) \mathcal{E}_{M_S}(x'_s) \rangle \\
&= \int dt_s d^3x_s d^3x'_s M_s(\mathbf{x}_s) M_s^*(\mathbf{x}'_s) \\
&\quad \times \delta(z_s - z_0) \delta(z'_s - z_0) \langle \mathcal{E}_s^\dagger(x_s) \mathcal{E}_s(x'_s) \rangle \\
&= \frac{|\mathcal{E}_{M_p}|^2 \omega_s^4}{|\beta_{z,s}|^2} \int d^3x d^3x' M_s(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{x}) M_p^*(\mathbf{x}) \\
&\quad \times \langle \mathcal{E}_{0i}(x) \mathcal{E}_{0i}^\dagger(x') \rangle M_s^*(\mathbf{x}') g(\mathbf{x}') M_p(\mathbf{x}') \\
&= \frac{\hbar c \omega_i \omega_s^2}{8 n_s^2 n_i \varepsilon_0} |\mathcal{E}_{M_p}|^2 \int d^4x'' \delta(z'' - z_0) \\
&\quad \times \left| \beta_{i,z} \int d^3x G_i(x''; x) M_s^*(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{x}) M_p(\mathbf{x}) \right|^2
\end{aligned}$$

so that

$$\begin{aligned}
W^{(1)} &= \frac{c \omega_i \omega_s}{32 n_p n_s n_i \varepsilon_0} P_p |I_{DFG}^{(s)}|^2 \Gamma_{\text{eff},s} \\
&= \frac{\omega_s}{4 \omega_i} \Gamma_{\text{eff},s} P_p Q_{DFG}^{(s)} \quad (37)
\end{aligned}$$

### F. conditional efficiency

The conditional efficiency for the idler (probability of collecting the idler, given that the signal was collected) is

$$\eta_s \equiv \frac{W^{(2)}}{W_s^{(1)}} = \frac{\Gamma_{\text{eff}} |I_{SFG}|^2}{\Gamma_s |I_{DFG}^{(s)}|^2} \quad (38)$$

### G. degenerate processes

Up to this point, we have discussed only non-degenerate processes, i.e., those in which the signal and idler fields are distinct and do not interfere. This is always the case for type-II down-conversion, and will be the case for type-I down-conversion if the frequencies and/or directions of propagation are significantly different. We now consider degenerate processes, in which there is only one down-converted field (signal).

The above discussion is modified only slightly. The signal and pump evolve by

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{D}_p \mathcal{E}_p &= \omega_p^2 g \mathcal{E}_s \mathcal{E}_s \\
\mathcal{D}_s \mathcal{E}_s &= 2 \omega_s^2 g \mathcal{E}_p \mathcal{E}_s^\dagger. \quad (39)
\end{aligned}$$

## H. second harmonic generation

The calculation of second-harmonic generation (SHG) proceeds exactly as in sum-frequency generation, but with all “idler” variables replaced by “signal” variables. Thus we find

$$P_p = P_s^2 Q_{SHG} \quad (40)$$

where

$$Q_{SHG} = \frac{c \omega_p^2}{8 \varepsilon_0 n_p n_s^2} |I_{SHG}|^2 \quad (41)$$

and

$$I_{SHG} \equiv \int d^3x M_p^*(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{x}) M_s(\mathbf{x}) M_s(\mathbf{x}) \quad (42)$$

### I. average parametric gain

The other classical process of interest is parametric amplification of the signal by the pump. The first-order solution for the signal field is

$$\begin{aligned}
\mathcal{E}_s &= \mathcal{E}_{0s} + 2 \omega_s^2 \int d^4x' \mathcal{G}_s(x; x') \\
&\quad \times g(x') \mathcal{E}_{0p}(x') \mathcal{E}_{0s}^\dagger(x') \\
&\equiv \mathcal{E}_{0s} + \mathcal{E}_{1s}. \quad (43)
\end{aligned}$$

The signal power at the output is

$$\begin{aligned}
P_s &= 2 n_s c \varepsilon_0 \int d^3x_s \delta(z_s - z_0) |\mathcal{E}_s(x_s)|^2 \\
&= 2 n_s c \varepsilon_0 \int d^3x_s \delta(z_s - z_0) (|\mathcal{E}_{0,s}(x_s)|^2 \\
&\quad + 2 \text{Re}[\mathcal{E}_{0,s}(x_s) \mathcal{E}_{1,s}^*(x_s)] + |\mathcal{E}_{1,s}(x_s)|^2) \quad (44)
\end{aligned}$$

The first term is the input signal power  $P_{0,s}$ , the second term depends on the relative phase  $\phi_p - 2\phi_s$ , and the last term is the phase-independent contribution to the gain, an experimentally accessible quantity. We have

$$\begin{aligned}
\overline{\delta P} &\equiv \langle P_s - P_{0,s} \rangle_{\phi_s} \\
&= 2 n_s c \varepsilon_0 \int \int d^3x_s \delta(z_s - z_0) |\mathcal{E}_{1,s}(x_s)|^2 \\
&= \frac{2 \omega_s^2 c^3 \varepsilon_0}{n_s} |\mathcal{E}_{0s}|^2 |\mathcal{E}_p|^2 \int d^4x_s \delta(z_s - z_0) \\
&\quad \times \left| \beta_{z,s} \int d^3x' \mathcal{G}_s(x_s; x') \right. \\
&\quad \times \left. g(\mathbf{x}') M_p(\mathbf{x}') M_s^*(\mathbf{x}') \right|^2 \\
&\equiv P_{0s} P_p \frac{\omega_s^2 c}{2 n_s^2 n_p \varepsilon_0} |I_{APG}|^2 \\
&\equiv P_{0s} P_p Q_{APG}. \quad (45)
\end{aligned}$$

## J. degenerate PDC

Next we consider the process of degenerate parametric down-conversion, for which

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}_s &= \mathcal{E}_{0s} + 2\omega_s^2 \int d^4x' \mathcal{G}_s(x; x') \\ &\quad \times g(x') \mathcal{E}_{0p}(x') \mathcal{E}_{0s}^\dagger(x'). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

We find the correlation function

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{E}_s(x_s) \mathcal{E}_s(x'_s) \rangle &= 2\omega_s^2 \int d^4x'' \mathcal{G}_s(x_s, x'') \\ &\quad \times \langle \mathcal{E}_{0,s}(x'_s) \mathcal{E}_{0,s}^\dagger(x'') \rangle g(x'') \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{E}_{0,p}(x'') \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

at which point it is clear that the only difference from the non-degenerate case will be the replacement of idler variables with signal variables and the factor of two. We find

$$W^{(2)} = \Gamma_{\text{eff}} \frac{\omega_s^2}{\omega_p^2} P_p Q_{SHG} = \frac{\Gamma^s}{8} P_p Q_{SHG}. \quad (48)$$

We note that this differs by a factor of four from the non-degenerate efficiency in Equation (33). The difference lies in the definitions of  $Q_{SFG}$  and  $Q_{SHG}$ . For example: consider SFG and SHG with the same total input and output powers. If the SFG input power is equally divided between signal and idler,  $Q_{SFG} = 4Q_{SHG}$ .

## K. Singles rates (degenerate)

As before, we can find the rate of detection of singles in the mode  $M_s$  by equation (27) and

$$\begin{aligned} C &= \int dt'_s \langle \mathcal{E}_{M_s}^\dagger(t'_s) \mathcal{E}_{M_s}(t'_s) \rangle \\ &= \int dt'_s d^3x'_s d^3x'_s M_s(\mathbf{x}'_s) M_s^*(\mathbf{x}'_s) \\ &\quad \times \delta(z'_s - z_0) \delta(z''_s - z_0) \langle \mathcal{E}_s^\dagger(x'_s) \mathcal{E}_s(x''_s) \rangle \\ &= \frac{4|\mathcal{E}_{Mp}|^2 \omega_s^4}{|\beta_{z,s}|^2} \int d^3x' d^3x'' M_s(\mathbf{x}') g(\mathbf{x}') M_p^*(\mathbf{x}'') \\ &\quad \times \langle \mathcal{E}_{0i}(x') \mathcal{E}_{0i}^\dagger(x'') \rangle M_s^*(\mathbf{x}'') g(\mathbf{x}'') M_p(\mathbf{x}'') \\ &= \frac{\hbar c \omega_s^3}{2n_s^3 \varepsilon_0} |\mathcal{E}_{Mp}|^2 \int d^4x'' \delta(z'' - z_0) \\ &\quad \times \left| \beta_{s,z} \int d^3x G_s(x''; x) M_s^*(\mathbf{x}) g(\mathbf{x}) M_p(\mathbf{x}) \right|^2 \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

The singles rate is thus

$$W_s^{(1)} = \frac{1}{4} \Gamma_{\text{eff},s} P_p Q_{APG}^{(s)}. \quad (50)$$

## L. Conditional efficiency (degenerate)

The conditional efficiency is

$$\eta_s \equiv \frac{W^{(2)}}{W_s^{(1)}} = \frac{\Gamma_{\text{eff}}}{\Gamma_{\text{eff},s}} \frac{|I_{SHG}|^2}{|I_{APG}^{(s)}|^2} \quad (51)$$

## IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have considered nonlinear optical processes with quantum fields in the paraxial and narrow-band regime. Coupled paraxial wave equations describe the three-wave mixing processes and Green functions describe the spatio-temporal evolution of the fields. We find expressions for the time-correlations of the output in terms of temporal filters, and show that the efficiency of single-mode processes are given in terms of mode-overlap integrals. Furthermore, the efficiency of spontaneous parametric down-conversion can be found from the efficiency for sum-frequency generation under very general conditions. The photon collection efficiency can be found by comparing the efficiencies of SFG and difference-frequency generation. Similar relationships are found for degenerate signal and idler fields and corresponding classical three-wave mixing processes. We expect these results to be important both for designing SPDC sources, as the results of well-known classical calculations can be used, and for building and optimizing such sources.

## APPENDIX A: ALTERNATE PROPAGATOR

We can use Equations (10) and (11) to express the propagator as

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathcal{E}(x) \mathcal{E}^\dagger(x') \rangle &= |\beta_t|^2 \int d^4x'' d^4x''' \delta(t'' - t_f) \\ &\quad \times \delta(t''' - t_f) \langle \mathcal{E}(x'') \mathcal{E}^\dagger(x''') \rangle \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{G}^*(x''; x) \mathcal{G}(x'''; x'). \\ &= |A_\gamma \beta_t|^2 \int d^4x'' \delta(t'' - t_f) \\ &\quad \times \mathcal{G}^*(x''; x) \mathcal{G}(x''; x') \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A1})$$

Noting that  $\int d^4x'' \delta(t'' - t_f) \mathcal{G}^*(x''; x) \mathcal{G}(x''; x') = \int d^4x'' \delta(z'' - z_0) \mathcal{G}^*(x''; x) \mathcal{G}(x''; x')$

$z_0\rangle\mathcal{G}^*(x'';x)\mathcal{G}(x'';x')$  we find

$$\langle\mathcal{E}(x)\mathcal{E}^\dagger(x')\rangle = \frac{2\hbar n\omega^3}{c^3\varepsilon_0} \int d^4x''\delta(z''-z_0) \times \mathcal{G}^*(x'';x)\mathcal{G}(x'';x') \quad (\text{A2})$$

## APPENDIX B: LORENTZIAN FILTER

A common filter has a Lorentzian transfer function and an exponential impulse response

$$F(\tau) = \frac{\Gamma}{2}\theta(\tau)\exp[-\Gamma\tau/2]. \quad (\text{B1})$$

It is easy to check that this describes unity transmission for a constant  $\mathcal{E}$ . If we put a filter of this sort in each arm, the output has

$$f(t_s-t_i) = \frac{\Gamma_s\Gamma_i}{4} \int dt'\theta(t_s-t')\theta(t_i-t') \times \exp[-\Gamma_i(t_i-t')/2] \times \exp[-\Gamma_s(t_s-t')/2] \quad (\text{B2})$$

or

$$f(\tau) = \frac{\Gamma_s\Gamma_i}{2(\Gamma_s+\Gamma_i)} \begin{cases} \exp[-\Gamma_s\tau/2] & \tau > 0 \\ \exp[\Gamma_i\tau/2] & \tau < 0 \end{cases} \quad (\text{B3})$$

The effective bandwidth is

$$\Gamma_{\text{eff}} = 4 \int d\tau |f(\tau)|^2 = \frac{\Gamma_s\Gamma_i}{\Gamma_s+\Gamma_i} \quad (\text{B4})$$

It is worth noting that in the limit  $\Gamma_s \rightarrow \infty$  (the limit of a broad-band filter in the signal beam, or in practical terms, not having a filter there at

all), filter becomes

$$f(t_s-t_i) = \frac{\Gamma_i}{2} \begin{cases} 0 & t_i < t_s \\ \exp[-\Gamma_i(t_i-t_s)/2] & t_i > t_s \end{cases} \quad (\text{B5})$$

That is, the idler photon will always arrive later, and with a distribution (after the signal arrival) that is precisely the transfer function of the idler-beam filter. Another interesting limit is for matched filters,  $\Gamma_s = \Gamma_i = \Gamma$ . Then we find

$$f(t_s-t_i) = \frac{\Gamma}{4} \exp[-\Gamma|t_s-t_i|/2]. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Note that for  $\Gamma_s \rightarrow \infty$ , the detection rate is  $|\mathcal{A}|^2\Gamma_i/4$ , i.e., proportional to the idler filter bandwidth  $\Gamma_i$ . The reverse,  $s \leftrightarrow i$  is also true, of course. From this we can get an idea of the conditional efficiency: The rate for filtered signal with any idler is proportional to

$$\Gamma_s \geq \frac{\Gamma_i\Gamma_s}{\Gamma_s+\Gamma_i}. \quad (\text{B7})$$

For example, putting matched filters  $\Gamma_s = \Gamma_i = \Gamma$  will give a rate proportional to  $\Gamma_i\Gamma_s/(\Gamma_s+\Gamma_i)$  i.e., half of the rate without the idler filter. This indicates that, of the signal photons that pass the the signal filter, half of their "twin" idler photons do not pass the idler filter.

## Acknowledgements

We thank A. Cerè, F. Wolfgramm, G. Molina, A. Haase, and N. Piro for helpful discussions.

- 
- [1] Y. Zeldovich and D. Klyshko, JETP LETTERS-USSR **9**, 40 (1969).  
 [2] D. Burnham and D. Weinberg, PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS **25**, 84 (1970).  
 [3] B. Mollow, PHYSICAL REVIEW A **8**, 2684 (1973).  
 [4] C. Hong and L. Mandel, PHYSICAL REVIEW A **31**, 2409 (1985).  
 [5] R. Ghosh, C. Hong, Z. Ou, and L. Mandel, PHYSICAL REVIEW A **34**, 3962 (1986).  
 [6] D. Ljunggren and M. Tengner, PHYSICAL REVIEW A **72** (2005).  
 [7] A. Valencia, A. Cere, X. Shi, G. Molina-Terriza, and J. Torres, PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS **99** (2007).  
 [8] P. Mosley, J. Lundeen, B. Smith, P. Wasylczyk, A. U'ren, C. Silberhorn, and I. Walmsley, PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS **100**, 133601 (2008), ISSN 0031-9007.  
 [9] M. Fejer, G. Magel, D. Jundt, and R. Byer, IEEE JOURNAL OF QUANTUM ELECTRONICS **28**, 2631 (1992).  
 [10] M. Fiorentino, G. Messin, C. Kuklewicz, F. Wong, and J. Shapiro, PHYSICAL REVIEW A **69**, 041801 (2004), ISSN 1050-2947.  
 [11] R. W. Boyd, *Nonlinear Optics* (Academic Press, Burlington, MA, 2008), 3rd ed.  
 [12] G. Boyd and D. Kleinman, JOURNAL OF APPLIED PHYSICS **39**, 3597 (1968).  
 [13] J. Eschner, personal communication (2008).