

Nonclassicality of states and measurements by breaking classical bounds on statistics

Ángel Rivas*

*School of Physics, Astronomy and Mathematics, University of Hertfordshire College Lane,
Hatfield, Hertfordshire, AL10 9AB, United Kingdom*

Alfredo Luis†

*Departamento de Óptica, Facultad de Ciencias Físicas,
Universidad Complutense, 28040 Madrid, Spain*

(Dated: August 28, 2021)

We derive exceedingly simple practical procedures revealing the quantum nature of states and measurements by the violation of classical upper bounds on the statistics of arbitrary measurements. Data analysis is minimum and definite conclusions are obtained without evaluation of moments, or any other more sophisticated procedure. These nonclassical tests are independent of other typical quantum signatures such as sub-Poissonian statistics, quadrature squeezing, or oscillatory statistics.

Nonclassicality is a key concept supporting the necessity of the quantum theory [1, 2]. A customary signature of nonclassical behavior is the failure of the Glauber-Sudarshan P phase-space representation to exhibit all the properties of a classical probability density. This occurs when P takes negative values, or when it fails to be a proper function becoming a generalized function or distribution.

Within standard quantum theory, quantum states play two dissimilar but complementary roles: (i) they express the state of the system, and (ii) they determine the statistics of measurements by projection on the system state. We may refer to them as measured and measuring states respectively. When the measuring states are nonclassical we will say that the measurement is nonclassical. More specifically, measurements are described by positive operator-valued measures (POVMs) Δ_m , with $\Delta_m \geq 0$, such that the statistics of the measurement is $p_m = \text{tr}(\Delta_m \rho)$, where ρ is the measured state. Usually, the POVMs elements Δ_m define quantum states $\rho_m \propto \Delta_m$, such as for example for photon number and field quadrature measurements in quantum optics. In any case we will say that the measurement is nonclassical when the P representative of Δ_m takes negative values or is a generalized function.

While the characterization of nonclassical (measured) states has been well developed [1, 2], much less attention has received the characterization of measurements [3]. One of the purposes of this work is to contribute to fill this gap. More specifically, the main contributions of this work are:

(i) We derive exceedingly simple practical procedures that can reveal the quantum nature of states and measurements. These are upper bounds on measurement statistics which are satisfied by all states and measurements for which the P representative is a nonnegative function compatible with classical physics. The lack of compliance of these statistical bounds is thus a nonclassical signature.

(ii) This approach can be applied to arbitrary mea-

surements, which may involve for example single- or two-mode electromagnetic fields, observables with continuous or discrete spectrum, systems on finite- or infinite-dimensional spaces, ideal or noisy measurements, etc. Some of these possibilities are considered below while further examples will be examined elsewhere [4].

(iii) A key point of this approach is that data analysis is reduced to minimum. At difference with other tests of nonclassical behavior, in our case definite conclusions can be obtained without evaluation of moments, or any other more sophisticated data elaborations [1, 2]. This is reflected on the robustness under practical imperfections that may even favour the observation of nonclassical behavior.

(iv) These nonclassical tests are independent of other typical quantum signatures of nonclassical behavior such as sub-Poissonian statistics, squeezing, or oscillatory statistics [1]. To this end we propose examples of quantum states violating classical bounds that present no such typical quantum signatures.

To derive the nonclassical tests we will use the P and Q phase-space representatives associated to any operator A , defined as $A = \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha)|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|$, $Q(\alpha) = \langle\alpha|A|\alpha\rangle/\pi$, where $|\alpha\rangle$ are coherent states, $a|\alpha\rangle = \alpha|\alpha\rangle$, and a is the annihilation or complex-amplitude operator. They are suitably normalized $\int d^2\alpha P(\alpha) = \int d^2\alpha Q(\alpha) = \text{tr}A$, with $d^2\alpha = dx dy$, where x, y are the real and imaginary parts of $\alpha = x + iy$. The measured statistics $p_m = \text{tr}(\Delta_m \rho)$ can be then expressed as

$$p_m = \pi \int d^2\alpha P_m(\alpha)Q(\alpha) = \pi \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha)Q_m(\alpha), \quad (1)$$

where $P(\alpha)$ and $Q(\alpha)$ are the P and Q representatives of the measured state ρ , while $P_m(\alpha)$ and $Q_m(\alpha)$ are the ones associated to the POVM Δ_m .

Nonclassical measurements.- From Eq. (1) we can derive classical bounds disclosing nonclassical measurements. For every ordinary nonnegative function $P_m(\alpha) \geq 0$ it holds that for every α

$$P_m(\alpha)Q(\alpha) \leq P_m(\alpha)Q_{\max}, \quad (2)$$

where Q_{\max} is the maximum of $Q(\alpha)$ (note that $Q(\alpha)$ is always a positive, well behaved function). Applying this to the first equality in Eq. (1) we get the following upper bound for p_m , provided that $\text{tr}\Delta_m$ is finite

$$p_m \leq \pi Q_{\max} \text{tr}\Delta_m. \quad (3)$$

Equation (3) can be violated if $P_m(\alpha)$ fails to be positive or when it becomes a generalized function. In both cases Eq. (2) fails to be true. Therefore, the violation of condition (3) is a signature of nonclassical measurement. The existence of $P_m(\alpha)$ as a classical probability density for all m allows understanding the measurement as a classical stochastic process [5] between the phase space and the sample space, with transition probability kernel given by $K(m, \alpha) = \pi P_m(\alpha)$. Conversely the failure of $K(m, \alpha)$ to be a classical conditional probability density denotes the quantum nature of the measurement process.

The only prior information required about the measurement being performed is the trace $\text{tr}\Delta_m$. This is not a very stringent condition since in most practical situations this can be inferred from simple rough analyses of the experimental arrangement in action, by symmetry considerations, etc. This is next illustrated with the examples of photon number and field quadrature measurements performed on a single mode electromagnetic field.

The simplest example is the ideal photon-number measurement, $\Delta_n = \rho_n = |n\rangle\langle n|$, where $|n\rangle$ are number states. Let us consider that both the measuring and measured states are one-photon states $|n=1\rangle$. In such a case $p_1 = 1$, $\text{tr}\Delta_n = 1$, $Q(\alpha) = (|\alpha|^2/\pi) \exp(-|\alpha|^2)$, $\pi Q_{\max} = 1/e$, and $p_1 = 1 > \pi Q_{\max} \text{tr}\Delta_1 = 1/e$, so that the measurement is nonclassical.

Concerning quadrature measurements (implemented in practice by homodyne detection [1]) we have $\Delta_x = |x\rangle\langle x|$, where $|x\rangle$ are the eigenstates of the quadrature operator $X = (a^\dagger + a)/2$, $X|x\rangle = x|x\rangle$, being the optical analog of mechanical position or linear momentum. In this case $\text{tr}\Delta_x$ is not finite since $|x\rangle$ are not normalizable $\langle x|x'\rangle = \delta(x-x')$. In order to avoid this difficulty we can appreciate that $P(\alpha = x' + iy')$ does not depend on y' (this is an observable property for example via the independence of statistics under displacements of the measured state along this coordinate). Thus we can rearrange Eq. (1) in the form

$$p_x = \pi \int dx' P_x(x') \tilde{Q}(x'), \quad \tilde{Q}(x') = \int dy' Q(x', y'), \quad (4)$$

so that Eq. (3) is replaced by $p_x \leq \pi \tilde{Q}_{\max} \text{tr}_x \Delta_x$, where \tilde{Q}_{\max} is the maximum of $\tilde{Q}(x)$ when x is varied, and

$$\text{tr}_x \Delta_x = \int dx' P_x(x') = \int dx' Q_x(x'), \quad (5)$$

where P_x, Q_x are the representatives of Δ_x , with

$$Q_x(x') = \frac{1}{\pi} |\langle x|\alpha = x' + iy'\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{\pi} \sqrt{\frac{2}{\pi}} \exp[-2(x-x')^2]. \quad (6)$$

This leads to $\text{tr}_x \Delta_x = 1/\pi$ and to the classical upper bound

$$p_x \leq \tilde{Q}_{\max} = p_{b,x}. \quad (7)$$

In order to look for violations of this bound let us consider that the measured state ρ is the thermal-chaotic state, that describes most classical light sources, whose expression in the photon-number basis is

$$\rho_{tc} = (1-\xi) \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \xi^n |n\rangle\langle n|, \quad (8)$$

where ξ is a real parameter with $1 > \xi \geq 0$. The mean number of photons n_{tc} and the quadrature variance are

$$n_{tc} = \frac{\xi}{1-\xi}, \quad (\Delta X)^2 = \frac{1}{4} (1 + 2n_{tc}), \quad (9)$$

while the Q and \tilde{Q} functions are

$$Q(\alpha) = \frac{1}{\pi(n_{tc}+1)} \exp\left(-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{n_{tc}+1}\right), \\ \tilde{Q}(x') = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(n_{tc}+1)}} \exp\left(-\frac{x'^2}{n_{tc}+1}\right), \quad (10)$$

so that the upper bound in Eq. (7) reads $p_{b,x} = 1/\sqrt{\pi(n_{tc}+1)}$. The statistics of the quadrature measurement is

$$p_x = |\langle x|\rho_{tc}|x\rangle|^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}\Delta X} \exp\left[-\frac{x^2}{2(\Delta X)^2}\right]. \quad (11)$$

The output most likely to break the bound (3) is $x = 0$, since it maximizes p_x . This will infringe the bound provided that

$$p_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(n_{tc} + \frac{1}{2})}} > p_{b,x} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\pi(n_{tc} + 1)}}, \quad (12)$$

which holds for every n_{tc} . In particular for $n_{tc} = 0$ (the vacuum state) we have $p_0 = 0.80$ and $p_{b,x} = 0.56$, so that the classical upper bound is very clearly surpassed. Moreover, for $n_{tc} = 0$ the outputs x that contravene Eq. (7) are all x in the interval $0.42 \geq x \geq -0.42$, which occur with a 60 % probability, $\int_{-0.42}^{0.42} p_x dx \simeq 0.60$.

Nonclassical states.- Next we derive classical bounds disclosing nonclassical measured states. They can be derived from the last equality in Eq. (1) by considering that for every ordinary nonnegative function $P(\alpha) \geq 0$

$$P(\alpha) Q_m(\alpha) \leq P(\alpha) Q_{m,\max}, \quad (13)$$

where $Q_{m,\max}$ is the maximum of $Q_m(\alpha)$. Applying this to the last equality in Eq. (1) we get the following upper bound for p_m

$$p_m \leq \pi Q_{m,\max}, \quad (14)$$

that holds for every $P(\alpha)$ compatible with classical physics. If this condition is violated for any m the state is not classical.

Moreover, when the measured state is pure $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ we have that $|\psi\rangle$ is nonclassical if and only if there is at least a measurement for which the classical bound (14) is violated. The violation of bound (14) is clearly a sufficient condition. This is also necessary since for every non-classical $|\psi\rangle$ we can consider a POVM with $\Delta_0 = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. In such a case the upper bound (14) is surpassed because $p_0 = 1$ while $\pi Q_{0,\max} = |\langle\alpha_{\max}|\psi\rangle|^2 < 1$, since otherwise the equality $|\langle\alpha_{\max}|\psi\rangle| = 1$ would imply that $|\psi\rangle$ is a coherent state and thus classical.

Let us illustrate this approach by considering the simple example of photon-number measurements $\Delta_n = |n\rangle\langle n|$ for which the Q function

$$Q_n(\alpha) = \frac{1}{\pi} \exp(-|\alpha|^2) \frac{|\alpha|^{2n}}{n!} \quad (15)$$

has the maximum at $|\alpha| = \sqrt{n}$

$$Q_{n,\max} = \frac{1}{\pi} \exp(-n) \frac{n^n}{n!}. \quad (16)$$

Thus if the measured state is classical, the photon-number statistics p_n is bounded by

$$p_n \leq \exp(-n) \frac{n^n}{n!} = p_{b,n}. \quad (17)$$

As a feasible state that can infringe Eq. (17) let us consider the incoherent superposition of the thermal-chaotic state (8) and the photon number state $|n_0\rangle$

$$\rho = p\rho_{tc} + (1-p)|n_0\rangle\langle n_0|, \quad (18)$$

where $1 \geq p \geq 0$, leading to a photon-number statistics

$$p_n = p(1-\xi)\xi^n + (1-p)\delta_{n,n_0}. \quad (19)$$

For example, for $p = 0.5$, $n_0 = 1$, and $n_{tc} = 9$ the probability of detecting a single photon is $p_1 = 0.56$, while the upper bound in (17) is $p_{b,1} = 1/e = 0.37$, so there is a clear infringement of the classical upperbound (17).

Next we show that the non-classical behavior revealed by the violation of Eq. (17) is independent of other quantum signatures. To this end we compute the Mandel parameter assessing the deviation from Poissonian statistics [1] $Q_M = (\Delta n)^2 / \langle n \rangle - 1$. For the state (18) with $n_0 = 1$, $p = 0.5$, and $n_{tc} = 9$ we get $Q_M = 11.2$, so that the photon-number distribution is highly super-Poissonian.

Furthermore, the state (18) presents no quadrature squeezing since for the quadrature operators $X_\theta =$

$[a^\dagger \exp(-i\theta) + a \exp(i\theta)]/2$ and $n_0 = 1$, $p = 0.5$, $n_{tc} = 9$, for example, we get $(\Delta X_\theta)^2 = 11/4$ for all θ , which is far above the upper limit for squeezing $(\Delta X_\theta)^2 = 1/4$. Finally, it can be appreciated in Eq. (19) that there are no oscillations of the number distribution.

Moreover, concerning the independence with respect to sub-Poissonian statistics, we can show that there are sub-Poissonian states that satisfy the classical bounds (17) for all n . This is the case of the state, in the number basis, $\rho = (1-p)|0\rangle\langle 0| + p|N\rangle\langle N|$ with $1 \geq p > 0$. For $N = 1$ this state is sub-Poissonian for all p , with $Q_M = -p$, and satisfies the upper bounds (17) for all n when $p \leq 1/e$.

Effect of imperfections.- One of the key features of this approach is that data analysis is reduced to minimum. This favours obtaining reliable results from non ideal measurements affected by imperfections, such as damping, finite efficiencies or finite sampling. Moreover, we stress that this approach applies to any measurement, both ideal and imperfect. Experimental imperfections can be regarded as embodied into the measuring POVM.

Nevertheless, since imperfections usually deteriorate nonclassical properties it is reasonable to investigate their effect on the above nonclassical criteria. For definiteness we consider real detectors affected by field damping (with bath at zero temperature) and finite quantum efficiency, which can be modeled by placing a beam splitter of amplitude-transmission coefficient $t = \sqrt{\eta}$ in front of a perfect detector, where $\eta \leq 1$ represents both losses and efficiencies [6]. The effect of the beam splitter can be easily accounted for by computing the state ρ_t after the beam splitter as $\rho_t = \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha) |t\alpha\rangle\langle t\alpha|$, where $P(\alpha)$ is the P function of the measured state. The measured statistics $p_{t,m} = \text{tr}(\Delta_m \rho_t)$ becomes $p_{t,m} = \pi \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha) Q_m(t\alpha)$. Since the maximum of $Q_m(t\alpha)$ when α is varied is the same as the maximum of $Q_m(\alpha)$ there is no change in the classical upper bound in the right-hand side of Eq. (14).

Nevertheless, imperfections affect the statistics replacing p_m by $p_{t,m}$ in the left-hand side of Eq. (14). This can be easily seen, for example, for photon-added thermal states, that in the photon-number basis read [2]

$$\rho_1 = (1-\xi)a^\dagger \rho_{tc} a = (1-\xi)^2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} \xi^{n-1} n |n\rangle\langle n|, \quad (20)$$

where ρ_{tc} is in Eq. (8). The P representation is well-behaved but nonpositive [2]. The probability of registering one photon by the imperfect detector is

$$p_{t,1} = \eta \frac{1 + 2n_{tc} - \eta n_{tc}}{(1 + \eta n_{tc})^3}, \quad (21)$$

where n_{tc} is in Eq (9). In Fig. 1 we have represented $p_{t,1}$ as a function of η for $n_{tc} = 0.7$, showing that the classical bound (17) is surpassed for η in the interval $0.89 \geq \eta \geq 0.30$.




FIG. 1: $p_{t,1}$ in Eq. (21) as a function of η for $n_{tc} = 0.7$.

It is worth pointing out that, at difference with other nonclassical tests, in this case larger losses and decreasing efficiencies may favour nonclassical behavior. This noticeable effect arises because imperfections rearrange the probability distribution p_n , so that with increasing imperfection some probabilities may increase beyond the classical bounds, as is the case of $p_{t,1}$ in this example.

Finally let us consider the effect of finite sampling. When the number of measurements N is finite, the probability p_m becomes an statistical variable that can be expressed as $p_m(N) = k/N$, where the integer k is the number of outcomes m after N trials. The dichotomic character of the measurement (outcome m with probability p_m and outcome not m with probability $1 - p_m$) implies that k follows the binomial distribution

$$\mathcal{P}_k(N) = \binom{N}{k} p_m^k (1 - p_m)^{N-k}, \quad (22)$$

so we have $\langle p_m(N) \rangle = \langle k \rangle / N = p_m$, and $\Delta p_m(N) = \Delta k / N = \sqrt{p_m(1 - p_m)} / N$. For all the above examples we have roughly $p_m \simeq 0.5$, so that for $N \simeq 100$ we have $\Delta p_m / p_m \simeq 0.1$. Thus, even for moderate number of trials, the uncertainty caused by finite sampling is clearly below the amount of violation of classical upper bounds $p_{b,m}$, since $(p_m - p_{b,m}) / p_{b,m}$ is at least five time larger than $\Delta p_m / p_m$ in the above examples.

Summarizing, we have provided simple, practical, and robust procedures to reveal the quantum nature of mea-

surements. For photon-number and quadrature measurements this can be carried out with simple input states, such as one-photon and chaotic-thermal states. The same approach provides nonclassical tests for states, which can be performed with arbitrary measuring schemes. These nonclassical tests are independent of other typical quantum signatures such as sub-Poissonian statistics, squeezing, or oscillatory statistics.

We thank to Dr. Shashank Virmani for fruitful discussions. A.R. acknowledges financial support from the University of Hertfordshire and the EU Integrated Project QAP. A. L. acknowledges support from project No. FIS2008-01267/FIS of the Spanish Dirección General de Investigación del Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación.

* Electronic address: A.Rivas@herts.ac.uk

† Electronic address: alluis@fis.ucm.es

- [1] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1995); M. O. Scully and M. S. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 1997); V. V. Dodonov, J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt. **4**, R1 (2002); U. M. Titulaer and R. J. Glauber, Phys. Rev. **140**, B676 (1965); L. Mandel, Phys. Scr. **T12**, 34 (1986); D.N. Klyshko, Phys. Lett. A, **213**, 7 (1996); D.-G. Welsch, W. Vogel, and T. Opatrný, in *Progress in Optics*, edited by E. Wolf (Elsevier Science, Amsterdam, 1999), Vol. 39; T. Richter and W. Vogel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 283601 (2002); E. V. Shchukin and W. Vogel, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 043808 (2005); R. Alicki and N. Van Ryn, J. Phys. A **41**, 062001 (2008).
- [2] G. S. Agarwal and K. Tara, Phys. Rev. A **46**, 485 (1992); A. Zavatta, V. Parigi, and M. Bellini, *ibid.* **75**, 052106 (2007).
- [3] A. Luis and L.L. Sánchez-Soto, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 3573 (1999); J. Fiurášek, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 024102 (2001); J. S. Lundeen *et al.*, e-print arXiv:0807.2444.
- [4] A. Rivas and A. Luis, unpublished.
- [5] D. R. Cox and H. D. Miller, *Theory of Stochastic Processes* (Chapman & Hall/CRC, London, 1977).
- [6] B. Yurke, Phys. Rev. A **32**, 311 (1985).