

# All path-symmetric pure states achieve their maximal phase sensitivity in conventional two-path interferometry

Holger F. Hofmann\*

*Graduate School of Advanced Sciences of Matter, Hiroshima University,  
Kagamiyama 1-3-1, Higashi Hiroshima 739-8530, Japan*

It is shown that the condition for achieving the quantum Cramer-Rao bound of phase estimation in conventional two-path interferometers is that the state is symmetric with regard to an (unphysical) exchange of the two paths. Since path symmetry is conserved under phase shifts, the maximal phase sensitivity can be achieved at arbitrary bias phases, indicating that path symmetric states can achieve their quantum Cramer-Rao bound in Bayesian estimates of a completely unknown phase.

PACS numbers: 42.50.St 03.67.-a 42.50.Dv 42.50.Lc

One of the most intriguing features of quantum physics is the effect of quantization on the observation of classical interference effects. In conventional two-path interferometers such as the widely studied Mach-Zehnder interferometer, phase shifts are estimated from the intensity difference between the two output ports. In quantum metrology, the phase shift is estimated from the discrete particle statistics observed in the output. For  $N$  uncorrelated particles, the randomness of the outcome results in a lower bound of the phase sensitivity given by the shot noise limit (or standard quantum limit) of  $\delta\phi \geq 1/\sqrt{N}$ . However, quantum correlations between the particles can overcome this limit, as was first demonstrated in the 1980s using squeezed light [1, 2, 3]. Following this breakthrough, the theoretical requirements for optimal phase estimates of general quantum states were thoroughly studied [4, 5, 6, 7], but the experimental technologies for the detailed investigation of non-classical photon statistics were not available at the time. Recently, there has been a renewed interest in quantum metrology due to the first experimental realizations of maximally path entangled “NOON” states [8, 9] and the subsequent demonstrations of super phase sensitivity using pair state inputs [10], and due to the emerging possibilities of atom interferometry [11]. Consequently, new questions arise regarding the implications of the theoretical results for the recently developed experimental capabilities. In particular, it is a highly relevant practical question whether present photon counting experiments can provide an optimal phase estimation strategy for a specific phase sensitive input state - that is, whether the experiments can achieve the quantum Cramer-Rao bound of the state or not.

In general, the phase sensitivity of the experimental data will itself depend on the bias phase, as confirmed by two recent studies of the experimental phase sensitivities achieved by four photon pair states [12, 13]. These studies suggest that the Cramer-Rao bound can only be achieved around specific phase shifts. However, the esti-

mation strategies used only a subset of the possible output measurements. On the other hand, it has already been shown that the quantum Cramer-Rao bound can be achieved at any phase bias in shot noise limited interferometry [14]. As further work by the same group indicates, this result also applies to the states created by interference between squeezed light and coherent light [15].

In the following, it is shown that these important results can be generalized to all pure states that are symmetric under a (non-physical) exchange of the paths in the interferometer. This class of states covers most of the states considered for non-classical phase measurements, including maximally path entangled states [8, 9], pair states [10, 12, 13], the  $N$ -photon components of coherent light and squeezed or down-converted light [15, 16, 17], and states generated by photon subtraction [18]. As experimental methods improve, it should therefore become possible to observe a phase independent uncertainty limited phase sensitivity at the quantum Cramer-Rao bound for a wide range of non-classical input states.

For the discussion of quantum properties of  $N$ -particle interferometry, it is convenient to express the quantum mechanics of two-paths interferometers in terms of the spin- $N/2$  algebra of the Schwinger representation,

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{J}_1 &= \frac{1}{2}(\hat{a}_1^\dagger\hat{a}_2 + \hat{a}_2^\dagger\hat{a}_1) \\ \hat{J}_2 &= \frac{-i}{2}(\hat{a}_1^\dagger\hat{a}_2 - \hat{a}_2^\dagger\hat{a}_1) \\ \hat{J}_3 &= \frac{1}{2}(\hat{a}_1^\dagger\hat{a}_1 - \hat{a}_2^\dagger\hat{a}_2),\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{a}_1$  and  $\hat{a}_2$  are the annihilation operators of the paths inside the interferometer. A phase shift of  $\Phi$  between the arms of the interferometer can then be expressed by the unitary transformation  $\hat{U}(\Phi) = \exp(-i\Phi\hat{J}_3)$ . Experimentally, the effects of a small phase shift can be observed by measuring the average of an estimator observable  $\hat{A}$ . The differential change of this average is given by the expectation value of the commutation relation between the generator  $\hat{J}_3$  and the estimator

---

\*Electronic address: hofmann@hiroshima-u.ac.jp

$\hat{A}$ ,

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi} \langle \hat{A} \rangle = -i \langle [\hat{A}, \hat{J}_3] \rangle. \quad (2)$$

Since the same commutation relation also determines the minimal product of the uncertainties  $\Delta J_3$  and  $\Delta A$ , the observable effects of a small phase change are limited by the generator-estimator uncertainty,

$$\Delta J_3 \Delta A \geq \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial \Phi} \langle \hat{A} \rangle. \quad (3)$$

As pointed out in [5, 7], this generalization of the Mandelstam-Tamm uncertainty for energy and time directly defines the quantum Cramer-Rao bound as

$$\delta \phi^2 = \left( \frac{\Delta A}{\frac{\partial}{\partial \phi} \langle \hat{A} \rangle} \right)^2 \geq \frac{1}{(2\Delta J_3)^2}. \quad (4)$$

Thus the quantum Cramer-Rao bound of a pure state is given by its path uncertainty  $\Delta J_3$ . In principle, the bound can always be achieved if there are no restrictions of the possible measurements [5]. However, conventional  $N$ -particle interferometry is limited to the detection of the particle distribution in the two output ports. It is therefore interesting to take a closer look at the properties of the specific estimators that minimize the uncertainty relation (3).

In Hilbert space, the generator-estimator uncertainty is based on the Cauchy-Schwarz inequality for the inner product of the vector  $-i\hat{J}_3 | \psi \rangle$  representing the differential change of the quantum state and the vector  $\hat{A} | \psi \rangle$  representing the uncertainty of the estimator. The quantum Cramer-Rao bound is achieved if the estimator  $\hat{A}$  satisfies the relation

$$\lambda \hat{A} | \psi \rangle = -i \hat{J}_3 | \psi \rangle. \quad (5)$$

It is easy to see that a large number of estimators fulfil this relation, since it merely defines the matrix elements in one column and one line of the  $(N+1) \times (N+1)$  matrix describing  $\hat{A}$  in any orthogonal basis that includes  $| \psi \rangle$ . However, the situation changes drastically when one requires that the eigenstates of the operator  $\hat{A}$  must be given by the particle number states of the output ports. In terms of the spin- $N/2$  algebra defined in eq.(1), these are the  $\hat{J}_1$ -eigenstates  $\{ | m_1 \rangle \}$ . Eq.(5) then provides a unique definition of the eigenvalues  $A_m$  for each eigenstate  $| m_1 \rangle$ ,

$$\lambda A_m = \frac{-i \langle m_1 | \hat{J}_3 | \psi \rangle}{\langle m_1 | \psi \rangle}. \quad (6)$$

Since the eigenvalues of the estimator observable  $\hat{A}$  must be real, the Cramer-Rao bound can only be achieved if the right hand side of eq.(6) is real as well.

As can be understood from the cyclic properties of the spin algebra, the matrix elements of  $\hat{J}_2$  in the  $\hat{J}_3$ -basis

are all imaginary (just like the matrix elements of  $\hat{J}_3$  in the  $\hat{J}_1$ -basis). Therefore, eq. (6) results in real estimator values  $A_m$  if all quantum state components  $\langle m_1 | \psi \rangle$  are real. Specifically, the necessary and sufficient condition to obtain only real  $A_m$  for any state with non-zero components  $\langle m_1 | \psi \rangle$  is that all components have the same phase factor  $\chi_0$ ,

$$\langle m_1 | \psi \rangle = \langle m_1 | \psi \rangle^* e^{-2i\chi_0}. \quad (7)$$

This condition can be interpreted as an invariance of the quantum state under a symmetry operation. To visualize the physical meaning of this operation, the complex conjugation of amplitudes in the  $\hat{J}_1$ -basis can be applied to the operators  $\hat{J}_i$ . Since only the matrix elements of  $\hat{J}_3$  are real, the symmetry operation maps  $\hat{J}_3$  to  $-\hat{J}_3$  without changing either  $\hat{J}_1$  or  $\hat{J}_2$ . This means that the intensities in the two paths of the interferometer are exchanged without changing the phase relation between the paths. Note that this unphysical exchange of paths is different from the one achieved by physically exchanging the modes in the two arms, since such an exchange would flip either  $\hat{J}_1$  or  $\hat{J}_2$ , or a linear combination of the two specified by an appropriate reference phase. On the other hand, the unphysical exchange of the paths does not depend on any reference phase between the arms of the interferometer. Hence, phase shifts do not change path symmetry and a path symmetric quantum state will be path symmetric at any bias phase  $\phi$ .

The conservation of path symmetry under phase shifts can also be shown by transforming the symmetry condition of eq.(7) into the  $\hat{J}_3$ -basis. The result reads

$$\langle m_3 | \psi \rangle = \langle -m_3 | \psi \rangle^* e^{-2i\chi_0}. \quad (8)$$

In this representation, the unphysical complex conjugation compensates the opposite signs of the phase shifts generated by the unitary transform  $\exp(-i\phi\hat{J}_3)$  at the  $m_3$  and  $-m_3$  components, so that a phase shift of  $\phi$  multiplies both sides of eq.(8) with the same phase factor of  $\exp(-i\phi m_3)$ .

To summarize the main result of the above analysis, a state that achieves its quantum Cramer-Rao bound in a conventional Mach-Zehnder interferometer must be path-symmetric as defined by eq.(8). Since this equation is invariant under phase shifts, a path-symmetric state achieves the quantum Cramer-Rao bound at any bias phase, indicating that the experimentally observed phase sensitivity of path-symmetric pure state should not depend on phase. Any phase dependences of sensitivity such as the ones reported in [12, 13] are therefore the result of either non-optimal estimation techniques, or of experimental deviations from the intended pure state due to decoherence.

Interestingly, the states most commonly considered for quantum metrology are already path-symmetric. Path-symmetry is a natural property of phase sensitive states since there is no reason to prefer one path over another. One important class of path-symmetric states used for

metrology is the class generated by mixing two independent single mode states,  $|\sigma_1\rangle$  and  $|\sigma_2\rangle$ , at the input ports of the beam splitter. In that case, the amplitudes  $\langle m_1 | \psi \rangle$  of the  $N$ -photon components are equal to products of the amplitudes of the photon number components of the two states. According to condition (7), path symmetry is automatically obtained when both states can be written in terms of real amplitudes  $\langle n | \sigma_{1/2} \rangle = \langle n | \sigma_{1/2} \rangle^*$ . This condition can be fulfilled by using coherent states, squeezed states, or photon number states. Thus the states generated by putting coherent light into one port of the interferometer and squeezed vacuum in the other are all path-symmetric, as are the pair states generated by interfering two squeezed vacuum states. Additionally, new types of phase sensitive path-symmetric states could be generated by putting photon number states into one port and coherent states or squeezed vacuum states in the other.

We can thus conclude that the quantum states used for two-path interferometry are usually path-symmetric and therefore achieve their Cramer-Rao bound in conventional photon counting experiments at any phase. The significance of this result is that it greatly simplifies the analysis of phase sensitivities for two-path interferometry with non-classical states. In particular, it shows that the recently derived result [15] that the phase sensitivity of squeezed-coherent light is independent of bias phase and that it achieves its Cramer-Rao bound applies to all other path-symmetric states as well. It is therefore sufficient to determine the phase sensitivity of conventional photon detection experiments with path-symmetric input states directly from the quantum Cramer-Rao bound of

$$\frac{1}{\delta\phi^2} = 4\langle \psi | \hat{J}_3^2 | \psi \rangle. \quad (9)$$

Although the previous discussion assumed a fixed photon number  $N$ , its application to fluctuating photon numbers is straightforward, since photon counting measurements can distinguish subspaces with different photon numbers  $N$ . Thus eq.(9) can be applied directly to the phase sensitivity of path-symmetric states with fluctuating photon numbers such as the ones considered in [15]. The only difficulty that arises from dealing with fluctuating photon numbers is that the proper identification of the maximal phase sensitivity cannot be obtained from the usual Heisenberg limit of  $\delta\phi = 1/N$ , since  $N$  should be the precise number of photons used in a single phase estimate. Pezze et al. tried to solve this problem by combining several measurements into one, reducing the total photon number fluctuations at the expense of additional shot noise caused by the independent measurements [15]. However, eq.(9) suggests a more direct definition of the ultimate quantum limit of phase sensitivity for fluctuating photon numbers. For an  $N$ -photon state, the Heisenberg limit is obtained from the maximal value of the path uncertainty  $\langle \hat{J}_3^2 \rangle = N^2/4$  achieved by a maximally path entangled (NOON) state. If photon numbers fluctuate, the maximal value of  $\langle \hat{J}_3^2 \rangle$  is obtained by averaging over

the *squared* photon numbers,

$$\frac{1}{\delta\phi^2} \leq \langle \hat{N}^2 \rangle. \quad (10)$$

Thus the correct form of the Heisenberg limit is actually higher than the square of the average photon number, indicating that the maximal phase sensitivity will be underestimated if photon number fluctuations are neglected.

The closeness of a non-classical state to the Heisenberg limit can be determined from the ratio of  $4\langle \hat{J}_3^2 \rangle$  and  $\langle \hat{N}^2 \rangle$ . For the combination of coherent light and squeezed vacuum discussed in [15], the result can be obtained from the coherent amplitude  $\alpha$  and the squeezing factor of  $\exp[2r]$ . In the limit of high photon number, the result depends only on the ratio of photon number averages in the two ports,  $q = 4\alpha^2/\exp[2r]$ . Interestingly, the maximum of  $4\langle \hat{J}_3^2 \rangle/\langle \hat{N}^2 \rangle$  is obtained at  $q = \sqrt{3}$ , and not at equal intensities ( $q = 1$ ) as assumed in [15]. The phase sensitivity at  $q = \sqrt{3}$  is  $2/(\sqrt{3} + 1) \approx 0.73$  times the Heisenberg limit of  $\langle \hat{N}^2 \rangle$ , indicating that the majority of the  $N$ -photon components generated come close to achieving the phase sensitivity of maximally path entangled states [15, 16]. This result can be compared with the phase sensitivity of the  $N$ -photon pair states generated by interfering two squeezed vacuum states. For a squeezing factor of  $\exp[2r] \gg 1$ , the phase sensitivity is  $4\langle \hat{J}_3^2 \rangle = \exp[4r]/4$  and the Heisenberg limit is given by  $\langle \hat{N}^2 \rangle = \exp[4r]/2$ . Thus, the phase sensitivity is 0.5 times the Heisenberg limit, lower than the maximum of 0.73 achieved by having coherent light in one input port of the interferometer.

It may also be interesting to compare the strategy of increasing phase sensitivity by squeezing the vacuum in the “empty” port of the interferometer with the alternative of exchanging it with a well defined photon number state. For a high amplitude coherent state in the other port, the increase in phase sensitivity given by eq.(9) only depends on the increase of quantum fluctuations in the quadrature component that determines the interference term  $\hat{J}_3$  between the coherent amplitude and the modified vacuum. Hence, using a photon number state is the equivalent of a squeezing factor of  $\exp[2r] = 2n + 1$ . For a single photon, this is equivalent to the effect of 4.8 dB squeezing.

From the experimental side, the consequence of the above result is that the complete output statistics of phase sensitive states should be measured and evaluated. In previous approaches like the ones reported in [12, 13], only a specific photon number distribution was measured in the output, resulting in a theoretical phase dependence of sensitivity for the ideal pure state. If the complete output data is used, the phase dependence of sensitivity originates only from experimental imperfections and provides an insight into the robustness of the quantum state against decoherence and noise. Interestingly, an estimate of the robustness may be obtained

from the (phase dependent) estimator values  $\lambda A_m$  defined by eq.(6). Specifically, the estimator amplifies any background noise in the measurement result  $m$  by a factor of  $\lambda^2 A_m^2$ . Therefore, a convenient definition of the phase dependent robustness  $R$  of a path-symmetric pure state can be obtained by taking the inverse of the sum of the squared estimator values,  $R = 1/(\sum \lambda^2 A_m^2)$ . This robustness is a phase dependent feature that characterizes and distinguishes different path-symmetric states. It may thus be a useful tool for the practical optimization of quantum metrology strategies.

In conclusion, the result that conventional photon counting based two-path interferometry achieves the quantum Cramer-Rao bound for all path-symmetric pure states allows a generalization of the specific results in [14, 15] to include the majority of states considered for

quantum metrology. In essence, this means that it is enough to determine the path uncertainty  $4\langle \hat{J}_3^2 \rangle$  of a path-symmetric pure state to obtain the phase sensitivity obtained with that state at any bias phase. Quantitative predictions for experiments are greatly simplified, and states approaching the ultimate limit of phase estimation given by the generalized Heisenberg limit of eq.(10) can be identified and evaluated more efficiently. Thus the concept of path-symmetry may pave the way for further progress in the field of quantum metrology.

Part of this work has been supported by the Grant-in-Aid program of the Japanese Society for the Promotion of Science.

- 
- [1] C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 1693 (1981).  
 [2] M. Xiao, L. A. Wu, and H. J. Kimble, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 278 (1987).  
 [3] P. Grangier, R. E. Slusher, B. Yurke, and A. LaPorta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **59**, 2153 (1987).  
 [4] S. L. Braunstein, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 3598 (1992).  
 [5] S. L. Braunstein and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **72**, 3439 (1994).  
 [6] B. C. Sanders and G. J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 2944 (1995).  
 [7] S. L. Braunstein, C. M. Caves, and G. J. Milburn, Ann. Phys. **247**, 135 (1996).  
 [8] P. Walther, J.-W. Pan, M. Aspelmeyer, R. Ursin, S. Gasparoni, and A. Zeilinger, Nature (London) **429**, 158 (2004).  
 [9] M.W. Mitchell, J. S. Lundeen, and A.M. Steinberger, Nature (London) **429**, 161 (2004).  
 [10] T. Nagata, R. Okamoto, J.L. O'Brien, K. Sasaki, and S. Takeuchi, Science **316**, 726 (2007).  
 [11] *Atom Interferometry*, edited by P. R. Berman (Academic Press, London, 1997).  
 [12] R. Okamoto, H.F. Hofmann, T. Nagata, J.L. O'Brien, K. Sasaki and S. Takeuchi, New J. Phys.**10**, 073033 (2008).  
 [13] F.W. Sun, B.H. Liu, Y.X. Gong, Y.F. Huang, Z.Y. Ou, and G.C. Guo, EPL **82**, 24001 (2008).  
 [14] L. Pezze, A. Smerzi, G. Khoury, J. F. Hodelin, and D. Bouwmeester, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 223602 (2007).  
 [15] L. Pezze and A. Smerzi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 073601 (2008).  
 [16] H. F. Hofmann and T. Ono, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 031806(R) (2007).  
 [17] T. Ono and H. F. Hofmann, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **41**, 095502 (2008).  
 [18] H. F. Hofmann, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 013808 (2006).