

Realistic photon-number resolution in Gaussian Boson Sampling

I. S. Yeremenko,¹ M. A. Dmytruk,² and A. A. Semenov^{1,3}

¹*Bogolyubov Institute for Theoretical Physics, NAS of Ukraine, Vul. Metrologichna 14b, 03143 Kyiv, Ukraine*

²*Physics Department, Taras Shevchenko National University of Kyiv, Prospect Glushkova 2, 03022 Kyiv, Ukraine*

³*Department of Theoretical and Mathematical Physics,*

Kyiv Academic University, Boulevard Vernadskogo 36, 03142 Kyiv, Ukraine

Gaussian Boson Sampling (GBS) is the model of non-universal quantum computation that has already demonstrated quantum supremacy in experiments. This model entails sampling photocounting events from a multimode Gaussian state at the outputs of a linear interferometer. In this scheme, collision events—those with more than one photon for each mode—are infrequent. However, they are still used for validation purposes. Therefore, the limitation of realistic detectors to perfectly resolve adjacent photon numbers becomes pivotal. We have derived the photocounting probability distribution in the GBS schemes, which is applicable for use with general detectors and photocounting techniques. This probability distribution is expressed in terms of functionals of the field-quadrature covariance matrix—e.g., Hafnian and Torontonian in the well-known special cases of photon-number resolving and on-off detectors, respectively. Based on our results, we have considered a GBS validation technique involving detectors with realistic photon-number resolution.

I. INTRODUCTION

Since the time when Aaronson and Arkhipov proposed the Boson Sampling (BS) model and demonstrated its computational complexity [1], significant progress has been made towards its experimental implementation. A lead reason for this is the reformulation of the basic idea to Gaussian Boson Sampling (GBS) proposed in Ref. [2]. A key distinction of GBS is that it uses nonclassical Gaussian states instead of single-photon states at the input of the linear interferometer. This replacement simplifies the experimental setup, making it feasible to create large-scale quantum devices that demonstrate quantum supremacy [3–5]. As experimental techniques have evolved, the issue of certification has increased in prominence. However, in the case of BS and GBS, the classical data required for the direct comparison with the data generated by the quantum device are not available. This makes full certification impossible.

Consequently, the emphasis has shifted from full certification to validation, aiming to exclude possibilities of replicating the generated data using various classical models. Most validation methods were initially developed for BS but have since been extended to encompass GBS. These include efficient algorithms capable for classical simulations of GBS [6–13]. Potential complications in experiments, such as photon distinguishability [14–17] and photon losses [18–23], have been explored. These factors can affect the problem of complexity and might even enable classical simulation of the experiment [24].

Beyond the question of what to validate lies the issue of how to perform this validation. Until recently, GBS experiments were conducted using a model proposed in Ref. [25], which lacks photon-number resolution at the output. This approach simplified experiments but, at the same time, limited the validation methods available to enhance our confidence in the experimental setup. Under these conditions, a number of validation methods have been proposed. For instance, these are tests based

on Bayesian methods [8, 26, 27], statistical properties of two-point correlation functions [28–30] or higher-order correlations [26], grouped [31, 32] and marginal [16, 33] probabilities.

The use of photon-number resolving (PNR) detectors in GBS experiments paves the way for an engaging class of validation methods. For example, in Ref. [34], the authors have raised questions about a validation of GBS with ideal PNR detectors based on components of graph feature vectors, known as orbits. In Ref. [5] the GBS experiment has been performed with so-called click detectors [35–41]. Although the photon-number resolution for this detection technique is imperfect, see Ref. [42], such experiments still provide an opportunity to explore validation methods not accessible in the case of on-off detectors.

Building ideal PNR detectors is a challenging task for currently available technologies. Therefore, it is important to consider the GBS model incorporating detectors with realistic photon-number resolution, as is considered for the BS model [43]. In addition, the appropriate validation techniques should be reformulated for such detectors.

There are several widely-used experimental techniques enabling an approximate resolution between adjacent numbers of photons. The first one is related to the click detectors mentioned above. In this case, the light beam is demultiplexed in several spatial [35–38] or temporal [39–41] modes and each of them is analyzed with an on-off detector. The outcome of such detectors corresponds to the number of triggered detectors (clicks). The theoretical description of such detectors has been developed in Ref. [42].

Another technique is based on counting photocurrent pulses within a measurement time window. In this case, the dead time of the detection may significantly reduce the ability to resolve between numbers of photons. A theoretical description of this photodetection technique has been presented in Refs. [44–50] and Ref. [51] for clas-

sical and quantum light, respectively. When using superconducting nanowire single-photon detectors (SNSPDs) [52–57], one should additionally account for the relaxation time; see Ref. [58] for a theoretical description of photocounting measurements in this case.

In this paper we systematically consider the GBS model, accounting for photon-number resolution of realistic detectors. Firstly, we have shown that the photocounting distribution is expressed in terms of a matrix functional specific to each type of detection. In particular, this functional reduces to well-known forms—e.g., Torontonian or Hafnian—for on-off and PNR detectors, respectively. Secondly, we have considered the computational complexity of the GBS when realistic detectors with negligible dark count rates are employed. Finally, we have tailored validation methods for GBS to the case of realistic photon-number resolution.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce a universal formula for the photocounting distribution in the GBS model with realistic photon-number resolution. A validation method tailored to GBS with realistic photon-number resolution is considered in Sec. III. A summary and some concluding remarks are given in Sec. IV.

II. PHOTOCOUNTING PROBABILITIES WITH REALISTIC PHOTON-NUMBER RESOLUTION

In this Section we derive a formula for photocounting distribution in GBS with an arbitrary type of detectors. First, let us consider the standard GBS scheme. Gaussian states with no coherent displacement (including the vacuum states) are injected at the inputs of a linear interferometer. The modes are analyzed by photouncounters at the output of this interferometer. Each measurement event is represented by a click pattern $\mathbf{n} = (n_1, \dots, n_M)$, where M is the number of the interferometer outputs. As it is shown in Ref. [2], the probability distribution of this pattern reads

$$P^{(i)}(\mathbf{n}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\sigma_Q|}} \prod_{i=1}^M \frac{1}{n_i!} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i^* \partial \alpha_i} \right)^{n_i} \times \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\xi}^\dagger A \boldsymbol{\xi} \right) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\xi}=0}. \quad (1)$$

Here $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_M, \alpha_1^*, \dots, \alpha_M^*)^T$ is the vector of complex amplitudes and their complex conjugations, $A = \mathbb{I} - \sigma_Q^{-1}$, and σ_Q is the covariance matrix of the Q -function for the state at the interferometer outputs, related to the covariance matrix σ of the Wigner function as $\sigma_Q = \sigma + \mathbb{I}/2$.

The photocounting distribution for detectors with realistic photon-number resolution can be obtained from the general form of the photocounting formula, which in

the considered case is given by

$$P(\mathbf{n}) = \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\Pi}(\mathbf{n}) \hat{\rho} \right). \quad (2)$$

Here $\hat{\rho}$ is the density operator,

$$\hat{\Pi}(\mathbf{n}) = \bigotimes_{i=1}^M \hat{\Pi}_{n_i}, \quad (3)$$

and $\hat{\Pi}_{n_i}$ is the positive operator-valued measure (POVM) for the detection process of a single mode. We will use two representations for the POVM. The first is the Fock-state representation,

$$P_{n_i|m_j} = \langle m_j | \hat{\Pi}_{n_i} | m_j \rangle. \quad (4)$$

This expression can be interpreted as the probability distribution to get n_i clicks of the detector given m_j photons at its input. Here $|m_j\rangle$ is the Fock state. Another representation is given by the Q -symbols of the POVM,

$$\Pi_{n_i}(\alpha^*, \alpha) = \langle \alpha | \hat{\Pi}_{n_i} | \alpha \rangle, \quad (5)$$

where $|\alpha\rangle$ is a coherent state. Two representations are related to each other as

$$\Pi_{n_i}(\alpha^*, \alpha) = \sum_{m_j=0}^{\infty} \frac{|\alpha|^{2m_j}}{m_j!} e^{-|\alpha|^2} P_{n_i|m_j}. \quad (6)$$

Importantly, if the detection process does not involve dark counts, afterpulses, and other clicks that are not directly related to the detected photons, then $P_{n_i|m_j} = 0$ for $m_j < n_i$.

Similar to the case of BS, involving detectors with realistic photon-number resolution [43], the probability distribution for GBS can be expressed as

$$P(\mathbf{n}) = \sum_{m_1=0}^{\infty} \dots \sum_{m_M=0}^{\infty} P_{n_1|m_1} \dots P_{n_M|m_M} P^{(i)}(\mathbf{m}). \quad (7)$$

Substituting Eq. (1) into Eq. (7) and taking into account Eq. (6), we can derive a general expression for the probability distribution for the click pattern \mathbf{n} in the case of GBS with an arbitrary photodetector,

$$P(\mathbf{n}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\sigma_Q|}} \mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\Pi} [A]. \quad (8)$$

Here

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\Pi} [A] = \prod_{i=1}^M \Pi_{n_i} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i^*}, \frac{\partial}{\partial \alpha_i} \right) \exp \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i^* \partial \alpha_i} \right) \times \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\xi}^\dagger A \boldsymbol{\xi} \right) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\xi}=0} \quad (9)$$

is a functional of the matrix A , whose form depends on the POVM for the given detection scheme. Examples of

the POVMs for common detection techniques are given in Appendix A.

The matrix functional $\mathcal{F}_n^\Pi[A]$ reduces to the already known forms for GBS with the detection methods considered in literature. Firstly, let us consider the original variant of GBS [2]. The corresponding POVM is given by Eq. (A1) assuming $\eta = 1$. In this case, the functional $\mathcal{F}_n^\Pi[A]$ is expressed in terms of the Hafnian as

$$\mathcal{F}_n^\Pi[A] = \frac{1}{n!} \text{Haf}[XA_n]. \quad (10)$$

Here $n! = \prod_{i=1}^M n_i!$, $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \mathbb{I} \\ \mathbb{I} & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, \mathbb{I} is the $n \times n$ identity matrix and $n = \sum_{i=1}^M n_i$ is the total number of clicks. The $2n \times 2n$ matrix A_n is derived from matrix A by retaining solely the rows and columns associated with triggered detectors. Each of these selected rows and columns is repeated until their number matches the number of photons at the corresponding output.

Secondly, let us consider GBS with on-off detectors [25]. In this case, the POVM is given by Eq. (A3) with $K = 1$. The functional $\mathcal{F}_n^\Pi[A]$ is then reduced to

$$\mathcal{F}_n^\Pi[A] = \text{Tor}[A_{S(\mathbf{n})}], \quad (11)$$

where $\text{Tor} A$ is the Torontonian of the matrix A , and the matrix $A_{S(\mathbf{n})}$ is defined similarly to the matrix A_n in the previous case but without repeating rows and columns. In a more general case of click detectors, the POVM is again given by Eq. (A3) but with $K \geq 1$. For such a scenario, experimentally implemented in Ref. [5], the above functional is given by

$$\mathcal{F}_n^\Pi[A] = \text{Ken}[A_{S(\mathbf{n})}]. \quad (12)$$

Here the matrix functional reads, cf. Ref. [59],

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Ken}[A_{S(\mathbf{n})}] &= \prod_{i=1}^N \binom{K}{c_i} \\ &\times \sum_{k_1=0}^{c_1-1} \cdots \sum_{k_N=0}^{c_N-1} \prod_{i=1}^N \binom{c_i}{k_i} (-1)^{k_i} \text{Tor}(B_{S(\mathbf{n})}), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where

$$B_{S(\mathbf{n})} = \text{diag} \left(\sqrt{\frac{c_i - k_i}{K}} \right) A_{S(\mathbf{n})} \text{diag} \left(\sqrt{\frac{c_i - k_i}{K}} \right). \quad (14)$$

In these expressions, the numbers c_i are $c_i = n_{l_i} \neq 0$. That is, they are non-zero numbers of clicks. The indices l_i belong to the set $S(\mathbf{n}) = \{l_1, \dots, l_N\}$ and N is the total number of triggered detectors. Here and in the following the elements of the $2N \times 2N$ matrix $\text{diag}(b_i)$ are defined as $[\text{diag}(b_i)]_{k,l} = [\text{diag}(b_i)]_{k+N,l+N} = b_k \delta_{k,l}$ for $k, l = 1, \dots, N$. For details see Appendix B.

Let us consider another scenario when photocurrent pulses are counted within a measurement time window

duration of τ_m . The corresponding POVM in the most general form is given by Eq. (A4). When using avalanche photodiodes (APD), i.e. $\eta_r = 0$ in Eq. (A8), limitations in photon-number resolution are mainly caused by the dead time of detection. Assuming that the quantum states of light are prepared for a non-monochromatic mode with a rectangular envelope [cf. Eq. (A9)], the corresponding POVM, cf. Ref. [51], is given by Eqs. (A10), (A11), and (A12). For other envelopes, related to the intensity function $I(t)$ in Eq. (A4) with $\eta_r = 0$, this POVM should be modified; see Ref. [43] for an example. When using this counting technique with SPNSDs, one should also consider the relaxation time, see Ref. [58] and Eq. (A7) for an analytical model.

The direct application of the POVM (A4) to Eq. (9) results the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_n^\Pi[A] &= \int_{T_{c_1}} d^{c_1} \mathbf{t}_1 \cdots \int_{T_{c_N}} d^{c_N} \mathbf{t}_N \prod_{j=1}^N \mathcal{I}_{c_j}(\mathbf{t}_j) \\ &\times \frac{\text{Haf}(X\Omega_{S(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{n})})}{\sqrt{|\mathbb{I} - \text{diag} \sqrt{1 - \Xi_{c_i}(\mathbf{t}_i)} A_{S(\mathbf{n})} \text{diag} \sqrt{1 - \Xi_{c_i}(\mathbf{t}_i)}|}}, \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\mathcal{I}_n(\mathbf{t})$ and $\Xi_n(\mathbf{t}_j)$ are given by Eqs. (A5) and (A6), respectively. The $2n \times 2n$ matrix $\Omega_{S(\mathbf{n},\mathbf{n})}$ is derived from the matrix

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_{S(\mathbf{n})} &= \text{diag}(\Xi_{c_i}(\mathbf{t}_i)) \\ &- \left((1 - A_{S(\mathbf{n})})^{-1} + \text{diag} \left(\frac{1}{\Xi_{c_i}(\mathbf{t}_i)} - 1 \right) \right)^{-1} \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

by repeating each i th rows and columns until their number matches the corresponding number of clicks (pulses), c_i .

For the case of APDs, $\tau_r = 0$, and the rectangular envelope [cf. Eq. (A9)], the integrals in Eq. (15) can be evaluated analytically for $n_i = \{0, 1\}$, i.e. for the collision-free subspace,

$$\mathcal{F}_n^\Pi[A] = \sum_{Z \in P[N]} \frac{(-1)^{|Z|} \text{Haf}(D_{S(\mathbf{n}),Z})}{\sqrt{|\mathbb{I} - (1 - \eta_1)A_{S(\mathbf{n}),Z}|}} \quad (17)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} D_{S(\mathbf{n}),Z} &= X_{|Z|} \\ &\left(2\mathbb{I} - [\eta_1(\mathbb{I} - A_{S(\mathbf{n}),Z})^{-1} + (1 - \eta_1)\mathbb{I}]^{-1} \right). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Here $P([N])$ is the power set (the set of all subsets) of $[N] := \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$, Z denotes its elements, and $|Z|$ is the number of these elements, i.e. its cardinality. The $2|Z| \times 2|Z|$ matrix $A_{S(\mathbf{n}),Z}$ is obtained from the matrix $A_{S(\mathbf{n})}$ by retaining solely the rows and columns related to each element of the set Z .

III. VALIDATION OF GBS WITH REALISTIC PHOTON-NUMBER RESOLUTION

As mentioned in Introduction, full certification is infeasible in the GBS scenario. Obviously, any sampling for detectors with realistic photon-number resolution can be used to derive a sampling for on-off detectors. Since the latter can be computationally hard, cf. Ref. [25], the same can be stated for the former. Therefore, for validation purposes we need to consider marginal or grouped probabilities that can be reconstructed in experiments and compare them with classically modeled distributions. An example of such coarse-grained events is given by orbits considered in Refs. [34, 60, 61].

In the most general case, the orbit $\mathcal{O}_{[n_1, \dots, n_M]}$ is a group of click patterns that can be obtained from a given pattern $\mathbf{n} = \{n_1, \dots, n_M\}$ by permutations of its components. The probability of the orbit can be obtained as the sum of the probabilities for each click pattern. Typically, such a coarse-grained probability can be estimated from the sampling data, while the same is impossible for the probability of an individual click pattern. In the case of ideal PNR detectors, the probabilities of orbits are related to the feature vectors of graphs encoded in the device; see, e.g., [61–63]. In the GBS scenarios with realistic GBS, such a connection with graph theory is generally unclear.

Following the idea of Ref. [34], we will use the orbits with almost all collision-free events and a few events with two clicks. For such orbits we will use the notation \mathcal{O}_l^n , where l is the number of outputs with detected two clicks and n is the total number of clicks. We have tailored two methods presented in Ref. [61] and in Ref. [32, 64] to detectors with realistic photon-number resolution to estimate the probability of such orbits on a classical device.

A. Orbit probability estimation

The first method to evaluate the probability of orbits, cf. Ref. [61], consists of the following steps. Firstly, we randomly select N_S click patterns $\mathbf{n}_i \in \mathcal{O}_l^n$. Secondly, we compute the corresponding probabilities $P(\mathbf{n}_i)$. Notably, we still have a way to efficiently compute the Torontonian [65] and Hafnian for a small number of photons, in our case up to $n = 16$. Finally, we approximate the orbit probability as

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{O}_l^n) \approx \frac{|\mathcal{O}_l^n|}{N_S} \sum_{i=1}^{N_S} P(\mathbf{n}_i), \quad (19)$$

where $|\mathcal{O}_l^n|$ is the number of click patterns in the orbit. The accuracy of such a procedure has been considered in Ref. [61] based on a result presented in Ref. [66]. This method is efficiently used to estimate the orbit probabilities in the case of ideal PNR, on-off, and click detectors for small n . We use it to control our results obtained with the second method.

The second method [32, 64] is based on the technique of phase-space simulation from the positive P -function [67, 68]. We have tailored this method to estimate the orbit probabilities $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{O}_l^n)$ in the case of GBS with realistic photon-number resolution. In contrast to the first method, this simulation technique shows high scalability and computational speed, making it applicable to larger numbers of photons.

Let m_1 and m_2 be a number of outputs with one and two clicks, respectively, i.e., $l = m_2$ and $n = m_1 + 2m_2$. This means that $\mathcal{O}_l^n = \mathcal{O}_{m_2}^{m_1+2m_2}$. As it follows from Eq. (2), the orbit probability in this case is given by

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{O}_{m_2}^{m_1+2m_2}) = \text{Tr} \left(\hat{\rho} \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathcal{O}_{m_2}^{m_1+2m_2}} \hat{\Pi}(\mathbf{n}) \right). \quad (20)$$

Formally we also assume that $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{O}_{m_2}^{m_1+2m_2}) = 0$ for $m_1 + m_2 > M$. Next we consider the discrete characteristic function of this probability distribution, by providing the corresponding Discrete Fourier Transform with respect to the variables m_1 and m_2 ,

$$C(k_1, k_2) = \sum_{m_1, m_2=0}^M \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{O}_{m_2}^{m_1+2m_2}) e^{-i(k_1 m_1 + k_2 m_2)\theta}. \quad (21)$$

Combining this expression with Eqs. (3) and (20) we get

$$C(k_1, k_2) = \text{Tr} \left[\hat{\rho} \left(\hat{\Pi}_0 + \hat{\Pi}_1 e^{-ik_1\theta} + \hat{\Pi}_2 e^{-ik_2\theta} \right)^{\otimes M} \right], \quad (22)$$

where $\theta = \frac{2\pi}{M+1}$, $k_{1,2} = 0, \dots, M$.

Equation (22) can be rewritten in the generalized P -representation as

$$C(k_1, k_2) = \left\langle \prod_{i=1}^M [\pi_i(0|\alpha_i, \beta_i) + \pi_i(1|\alpha_i, \beta_i)e^{-ik_1\theta} + \pi_i(2|\alpha_i, \beta_i)e^{-ik_2\theta}] \right\rangle_P. \quad (23)$$

Here

$$\pi_i(l|\alpha_i, \beta_i) = \langle \beta_i^* | \hat{\Pi}_l | \alpha_i \rangle, \quad (24)$$

$|\alpha\rangle$ is the coherent state. The averaging is taken over the positive P -function, $P(\boldsymbol{\alpha}, \boldsymbol{\beta})$, where $\boldsymbol{\alpha} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_M)^T$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta} = (\beta_1, \dots, \beta_M)^T$. Based on this expression, the method can be summarized as follows: (i) sampling complex amplitudes $\boldsymbol{\alpha}$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}$ from the positive P -function (see Refs. [32, 64] and Appendix C for details); (ii) estimating the characteristic function (23) from the generated sample set; (iii) using the Inverse Discrete Fourier

Transform,

$$\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{O}_{m_2}^{m_1+2m_2}) = \frac{1}{(M+1)^2} \times \sum_{k_1=0}^M \sum_{k_2=0}^M C(k_1, k_2) e^{i(k_1 m_1 + k_2 m_2)\theta}, \quad (25)$$

to reconstruct the probabilities of the orbits $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{O}_{m_2}^{m_1+2m_2})$.

B. Validation procedure

In order to demonstrate the significance of realistic photon-number resolution for validation procedures, we provide simulations of orbit probabilities for an interferometer with $M = 400$ output ports. Thermalized squeezed vacuum states, characterized by the covariance matrix

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \cosh 2r & (1-\epsilon) \sinh 2r \\ (1-\epsilon) \sinh 2r & \cosh 2r \end{pmatrix}, \quad (26)$$

where r is the squeezing parameter and $\epsilon = 0.1$ is the thermalization factor, are supposed to be injected into 200 input ports. The overall efficiency, which includes both interferometer and detector losses, is $\eta = 0.8$. The squeezing parameter is chosen such that the expectation value of the total number of photons in all ports after all losses is 20.

The probabilities of orbits \mathcal{O}_l^n for different detection techniques are shown in Fig. 1 for different number of clicks n . As intuitively expected, the probabilities of the orbits \mathcal{O}_2^n are highest for the ideal PNR detectors. It is significantly smaller for click detectors with $K = 2$ and $K = 3$ on-off detectors in the array. We also consider counting photocurrent pulses for an APD within the measurement-time window of duration τ_m with the dead time $\tau_d = 0.05\tau_m$. This results in a curve that is relatively close to the curve associated with ideal PNR detectors. However, when using an SNSPD with the same dead time and relaxation time $\tau_r = 0.2\tau_m$, the corresponding curve is characterized by significantly smaller probabilities of orbits \mathcal{O}_2^n . Therefore, for validation techniques based on estimations of the probabilities $P(\mathcal{O}_l^n)$, it is crucial to consider the effect of imperfect photon-number resolution.

For validation, we compare the orbit probabilities $P(\mathcal{O}_l^n)$ for the thermalized squeezed vacuum states with the same probabilities obtained for classical states characterized by non-negative P -functions. For the latter states, we provide direct classical simulations of the click patterns \mathbf{n} using the method of Ref. [24]. In particular, we use inputs with thermal and squashed states, characterized by the covariance matrices

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + 2n_{\text{th}} & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + 2n_{\text{th}} \end{pmatrix} \quad (27)$$




FIG. 1. The probabilities for the orbits $\{\mathcal{O}_0^n, \mathcal{O}_1^n, \mathcal{O}_2^n\}$ for different numbers of clicks, n , are shown for thermalized squeezed vacuum states at input ports. See the main text for parameters characterizing the states, losses and interferometer. Circles correspond to the ideal PNR detector. Triangles correspond to counting pulses within a measurement-time window with an APD and $\tau_d = 0.05\tau_m$. Stars correspond to the same technique and dead time with an SNSPD with the relaxation time $\tau_r = 0.2\tau_m$. Crosses and squares correspond to click detectors with $K = 2$ and $K = 3$ on-off detectors in the array, respectively.

and

$$\sigma = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 + 4n_{\text{th}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (28)$$

respectively. Here n_{th} is the number of thermal photons, chosen such that the expectation number of photons in all ports after all losses is 20.

Unlike the validation method proposed in [34], the phase-space simulation technique is more efficient in using direct statistical comparisons, similar to the group probabilities in [32]. In particular, it enables us to estimate the orbit probabilities $P(\mathcal{O}_l^n)$ for large numbers of n . In Fig. 2 we show the orbit probabilities for thermal, squashed and thermalized squeezed vacuum states as a function of the number of clicks, n , for counting photocurrent pulses by an APD within a measurement time window and for the on-off detectors. The plots for the thermal state are strongly different from the plots for the thermalized squeezed vacuum states in all cases. This difference is small when using squashed states and on-off detectors. However, even an imperfect ability to distinguish between numbers of photons improves this difference.

In order to quantitatively characterize the difference between classical and quantum statistics, we use the Pearson chi-squared method, similar to that done in Ref. [32] for grouped probabilities. For this purpose, we




FIG. 2. The probabilities for the orbit set $\{\mathcal{O}_0^n, \mathcal{O}_1^n, \mathcal{O}_2^n\}$ for different numbers of clicks, n , are shown. The plots (a-c) correspond to counting photocurrent pulses within a measurement time window with an APD and dead time $\tau_d = 0.05\tau_m$. The plot (d) corresponds to on-off detectors. Circles, crosses, and squares correspond to the thermalized squeezed vacuum state, thermal states, and squashed states, respectively. See the main text for parameters characterizing the states, losses, and interferometer.

first generate click patterns $\mathbf{n}[i]$ for classical states and estimate the corresponding orbit probabilities $\mathcal{P}^{\text{cl}}(\mathcal{O}_l^{n[i]})$.

In particular, we generate 10^8 click patterns for the considered types of detectors and detection techniques, except counting photocurrent pulses within a measurement time window with SNSPDs, for which we generate 10^6 patterns. Next, we select only orbits with patterns recorded more than 10 times. The probabilities for the remaining orbits are estimated based on the obtained frequencies and normalized. The chi-squared statistics is evaluated as

$$\chi_s^2(l) = N_l \sum_{i=1}^k \frac{[\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{O}_l^{n[i]}) - \mathcal{P}^{\text{cl}}(\mathcal{O}_l^{n[i]})]^2}{\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{O}_l^{n[i]})}, \quad (29)$$

where k is the number of orbits used for its estimation and N_l is the number of the corresponding click patterns.

Results from the similar statistics should have $\chi_s^2(l)/k \approx 1$. In the case of significant discrepancy, $\chi_s^2(l)/k \gg 1$ should hold. The test results for various detection techniques are presented in Table I. From these data we can conclude that the presented chi-squared test enables to distinguish between classical and quantum statistics with a high confidence.

IV. CONCLUSION

Registrations of collision events in GBS are characterized by a low probability in a reason of preserving classical computational hardness. Nevertheless, these events are used for validation purposes. Therefore, the ability of detectors to discriminate between numbers of photons can play a crucial role.

We have derived a general expression for the photocounting probability distribution at the output of the GBS device, assuming general realistic detectors characterized by the POVMs. The result depends on a matrix functional of the covariance matrix of the output state. It is reduced to known forms, e.g., Hafnian or Torontonian, in the special cases of ideal PNR or on-off detectors. We have extended these sets of functionals to the photocounting techniques, which are based on counting pulses of photocurrent within a measurement time window. The general equation includes the shapes of the output mode and the time-dependent recovery efficiency of the detectors and generally requires numerical integration. However, it is reduced to an analytical form for collision-free events in the case of rectangular mode and use of APD, which are usually characterized by negligible relaxation time.

We have tailored validation protocols for GBS to the case of detectors with realistic photon-number resolution. This protocol assumes the estimation of probabilities of

TABLE I. The chi-squared statistics χ_s^2/k for different types of detection techniques are shown. See the main text for parameters characterizing the states, losses, and interferometer.

Detector/Detection technique	Thermal states			Squashed states		
	\mathcal{O}_0^n	\mathcal{O}_1^n	\mathcal{O}_2^n	\mathcal{O}_0^n	\mathcal{O}_1^n	\mathcal{O}_2^n
ideal PNR detector	5.8×10^4	1.9×10^5	2.8×10^5	8.5×10^4	3.6×10^4	1.8×10^4
on-off detector	3.1×10^5			1.7×10^5		
click detector, $K = 2$	1.8×10^5	3.2×10^5	2.7×10^5	8.6×10^4	7.7×10^4	3.6×10^4
click detector, $K = 3$	1.3×10^5	2.9×10^5	3×10^5	6.7×10^4	7.2×10^4	4.5×10^4
counting pulses with APD	7.4×10^4	2.2×10^5	3×10^5	8.7×10^4	3.7×10^4	1.9×10^4
counting pulses with SNSPD	5×10^3	1×10^4	1×10^4	3.5×10^3	4×10^3	2×10^3

orbits—group events that contain click patterns obtained from each other by mutual permutations. In particular, we focused on three types of orbits characterized by zero, one, and two outputs registering collision events. The corresponding coarse-grained probabilities can be estimated from experimental data, in contrast to the probabilities of individual click patterns.

The method of phase-space simulations based on the positive P -function showed a high applicability to estimate orbit probabilities for a high number of output photons. This task is computationally hard with other simulation techniques. We have estimated the orbit probabilities for an interferometer with 400 input and output ports, assuming that light is injected in 200 ports and the expectation number of output photons is 20. These probabilities are shown to be highly dependent on a type of detection technique. However, a proper consideration of a realistic photon-number resolution enables one to distinguish between the statistics of quantum and classical fields at the output.

Therefore, our results have shown that detailed information about the POVM of detectors is crucial for a proper analysis of the output statistics. In particular, it could be important for validation techniques. However, even the statistics of collision-free events are modified by the imperfect ability of detectors to distinguish between the number of photons. In our opinion, this factor should be taken into account in relevant theoretical and experimental studies of GBS.

I.S.Ye. and A.A.S. appreciate support from the National Research Foundation of Ukraine through the Project Nr. 2020.02/0111, Nonclassical and hybrid correlations of quantum systems under realistic conditions.

Appendix A: POVM for detection techniques with realistic photon-number resolution

In this appendix, we list POVMs for various detection techniques that enable an approximate resolution between photon numbers. We start with the ideal PNR

detectors [69, 70], the POVM for which is given by

$$\hat{\Pi}_k = \hat{F}_k(1) = |k\rangle\langle k|, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $|k\rangle$ is the Fock state,

$$\hat{F}_k(\eta) =: \frac{(\eta \hat{n})^k}{k!} e^{-\eta \hat{n}} : \quad (\text{A2})$$

is the POVM for PNR detectors with losses characterized by the efficiency $\eta \in [0, 1]$, \hat{n} is the photon-number operator, and $: \dots :$ denotes normal ordering.

The counting technique for click detectors is based on a spatial [35–38] or temporal [39–41] splitting of a light mode into K modes and detecting each of them separately with an on-off detector. The corresponding POVM was derived in [42],

$$\hat{\Pi}_k = \binom{K}{k} : \left(1 - e^{-\frac{\hat{n}}{K}}\right)^k e^{-\hat{n} \frac{(K-k)}{K}} : \dots \quad (\text{A3})$$

For $K = 1$ we get the POVM for the on-off detector.

Consider a detection technique based on counting photocurrent pulses within a measurement time window of duration τ_m . In this case, dead time (for APDs) and relaxation of the detector to a previous state (for APDs and SNSPDs) result in missing detection losses. In the general case, the corresponding POVM is given by, cf. Ref. [58],

$$\hat{\Pi}_n =: \hat{n}^n \int_{T_n} d^n \mathbf{t} \mathcal{I}_n(\mathbf{t}) \exp[-\hat{n} \Xi_n(\mathbf{t})] : \quad (\text{A4})$$

where integration is performed over the time-ordering domain T_n such that $0 \leq t_1 \leq t_2 \leq \dots \leq t_n \leq \tau_m$,

$$\mathcal{I}_n(\mathbf{t}) = I(t_1) \prod_{i=2}^n I(t_i) \xi(t_i - t_{i-1}), \quad (\text{A5})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \Xi_n(\mathbf{t}) = & \int_0^{t_1} dt I(t) + \sum_{i=1}^{n-1} \int_{t_i}^{t_{i+1}} dt I(t) \xi(t - t_i) \\ & + \int_{t_n}^{\tau_m} dt I(t) \xi(t - t_n) \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

In these expressions, $I(t)$ is the normalized intensity shape and $\xi(t)$ is the time-dependent efficiency, describing the relaxation of the SNSPDs after registering a photon.

For the SNSPDs one could use a model for the time-dependent efficiency

$$\xi(t) = \theta(t - \tau_d) \eta_r(t - \tau_d). \quad (\text{A7})$$

Here τ_d is the dead time, $\theta(t - \tau_d)$ is the Heaviside step-function, and $\eta_r(t)$ is the recovering efficiency. The latter can be modeled as

$$\eta_r(t) = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{t}{\tau_r}\right), \quad (\text{A8})$$

where τ_r is the relaxation time.

Let us consider this detection technique with the APDs. In this case the relaxation time is negligible, i.e. $\eta_r = 0$. We also assume that the quantum state is prepared for a rectangular mode, i.e.

$$I(t) = \frac{1}{\tau_m}. \quad (\text{A9})$$

This scenario has been considered for classical light in Ref. [44–50] and for quantum light in Ref. [51]. The corresponding POVM reads

$$\hat{\Pi}_0 = \hat{F}_0(\eta) \quad (\text{A10})$$

for $n = 0$,

$$\hat{\Pi}_k = \sum_{l=0}^k \hat{F}_l(\eta_k) - \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \hat{F}_l(\eta_{k-1}) \quad (\text{A11})$$

for $k = 1, \dots, K$, and

$$\hat{\Pi}_{K+1} = 1 - \sum_{l=0}^K \hat{F}_l(\eta_K). \quad (\text{A12})$$

Here

$$\eta_k = \frac{\tau_m - k\tau_d}{\tau_m} \quad (\text{A13})$$

is the adjustment efficiency.

It is worth noting that all equations in this appendix are given for detectors with no losses, i.e. $\eta = 1$. This is a consequence of the fact that we attribute all losses, including the detection losses, to the prepared quantum state. In order to explicitly include the detection losses in the POVM, one needs to replace \hat{n} with $\eta\hat{n}$ under the sign of the normal ordering.

Appendix B: Photocounting probabilities with realistic photon-number resolution

In this appendix, we present the derivation of Eqs. (12), (15), and (17), representing the matrix functional (9) for different detection schemes. First, we consider the functional,

$$F(W, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{a}) = \prod_{i=1}^L \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \right)^{m_i} \exp\left(a_i \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*}\right) \exp\left(\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\xi}^\dagger (\mathbb{I} - W) \boldsymbol{\xi}\right) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\xi}=\mathbf{0}}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

which is used for further analysis. Here, $\mathbf{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_L)$, $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_L)$, $a_i \in [0, 1]$, $\boldsymbol{\xi} = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_L, \alpha_1^*, \dots, \alpha_L^*)^T$, and $W \in \mathcal{C}^{2L \times 2L}$ is a positive semi-definite matrix, for example $(\mathbb{I} - A_{\mathbf{n}})$. Applying the Weierstrass transform,

$$\exp\left(a_i \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*}\right) \exp(\alpha_i^* \beta_i - \beta_i^* \alpha_i + |\alpha_i|^2) = \frac{1}{1 - a_i} \exp\left(\frac{\alpha_i^* \beta_i - \beta_i^* \alpha_i + |\alpha_i|^2}{1 - a_i}\right), \quad (\text{B2})$$

we obtain

$$F(W, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{\pi^L \sqrt{|W|}} \int_{\mathcal{C}^{2L}} d^{2L} \boldsymbol{\beta} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger \left[W^{-1} + \text{diag}\left(\frac{a_i}{1 - a_i}\right)\right] \boldsymbol{\beta}\right) \prod_{i=1}^L \frac{1}{1 - a_i} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \right)^{m_i} \exp\left(\frac{\alpha_i^* \beta_i - \beta_i^* \alpha_i + |\alpha_i|^2}{1 - a_i}\right) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\xi}=\mathbf{0}}. \quad (\text{B3})$$

Changing the variables, $\beta_i = \gamma_i \sqrt{1 - a_i}$, $\alpha_i = \mu_i \sqrt{1 - a_i}$, and integration, we arrive at the expression

$$F(W, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{a}) = \prod_{i=1}^L (1 - a_i)^{m_i} \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \mu_i \partial \mu_i^*} \right)^{m_i} \exp \left(\boldsymbol{\mu}^\dagger \left[\mathbb{I} - (\text{diag} \sqrt{1 - a_i} W^{-1} \text{diag} \sqrt{1 - a_i} + \text{diag} (a_i))^{-1} \right] \boldsymbol{\mu} \right) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\mu}=\mathbf{0}}, \quad (\text{B4})$$

which can also be given in terms of the Hafnian as

$$F(W, \mathbf{m}, \mathbf{a}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathbb{I} - \text{diag} \sqrt{a_i} (\mathbb{I} - W) \text{diag} \sqrt{a_i}|}} \text{Haf} \left(X \left[\text{diag}(1 - a_i) - \left(W^{-1} + \text{diag} \left(\frac{a_i}{1 - a_i} \right) \right)^{-1} \right]_{\mathbf{m}} \right). \quad (\text{B5})$$

Here the subscript \mathbf{m} indicates that the matrix $A_{\mathbf{m}}$ is derived from matrix A by retaining solely the rows and columns with indexes i and $i + L$ for which $m_i \neq 0$ and repeating each of them m_i times.

1. Click detectors

Let us consider the derivation of Eq. (12) for click detectors. The Q -symbol of the POVM, $\Pi_n(\alpha)$, can be obtained from the POVM (A3) via replacing \hat{n} by $|\alpha|^2$ under the sign of the normal order.

Substituting it into Eq. (9) yields

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\Pi} [A] = \prod_{i=1}^N \binom{K}{c_i} \sum_{k_1=0}^{c_1} \cdots \sum_{k_N=0}^{c_N} \prod_{i=1}^N \binom{c_i}{k_i} (-1)^{k_i} \exp \left(\frac{c_i - k_i}{K} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \right) \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\xi}^\dagger A_{S(\mathbf{n})} \boldsymbol{\xi} \right) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\xi}=\mathbf{0}}. \quad (\text{B6})$$

Then we use Eq. (B5) with $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{c}$, $a_i = \frac{c_i - k_i}{K}$, $W = (\mathbb{I} - A_{S(\mathbf{n})})$, which gives

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\Pi} [A] = \text{Ken}[A_{\mathbf{n}}] = \prod_{i=1}^N \binom{K}{c_i} \sum_{k_1=0}^{c_1} \cdots \sum_{k_N=0}^{c_N} \prod_{i=1}^N \binom{c_i}{k_i} (-1)^{k_i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{|\mathbb{I} - B_{S(\mathbf{c})}^{\mathbf{k}}|}} \quad (\text{B7})$$

where $B_{S(\mathbf{c})}^{\mathbf{k}}$ is given by Eq. (14)

It is also useful to consider the relation between two matrix functionals: Ken and Tor. Equation (B7), can be rewritten as

$$\text{Ken}[A_{S(\mathbf{n})}] = \prod_{i=1}^N \binom{K}{c_i} \sum_{k_1=0}^{c_1-1} \cdots \sum_{k_N=0}^{c_N-1} \prod_{i=1}^N \binom{c_i}{k_i} (-1)^{k_i} \sum_{Z \in P(\{N\})} \frac{(-1)^{|z|}}{\sqrt{|\mathbb{I} - (B_{S(\mathbf{c})}^{\mathbf{k}})_Z|}}. \quad (\text{B8})$$

Applying here the definition of Tor, cf. [25], we can obtain the Eq. (13). Substituting $K = 1$ into Eq. (B8), we arrive at Eq. (11).

2. Photocounting with SPNSDs

Consider the scenario of photocounting with SPNSDs, describing by the POVM (A4). Similar to the previous case, the Q -symbol of the POVM, $\Pi_n(\alpha)$, is obtained via replacing \hat{n} by $|\alpha|^2$ under the sign of the normal order. Applying it in Eq. (9), we get

$$\mathcal{F}_{\mathbf{n}}^{\Pi} [A] = \int_{T_{c_1}} d^{c_1} \mathbf{t}_1 \cdots \int_{T_{c_N}} d^{c_N} \mathbf{t}_N \prod_{j=1}^N \mathcal{I}_{c_j}(\mathbf{t}_j) \times \left(\frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_j \partial \alpha_j^*} \right)^{c_j} \exp \left([1 - \Xi_{c_j}(\mathbf{t}_j)] \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \right) \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\xi}^\dagger A_{S(\mathbf{n})} \boldsymbol{\xi} \right) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\xi}=\mathbf{0}}. \quad (\text{B9})$$

Then we use the Eq. (B5) with $\mathbf{m} = \mathbf{c}$, $a_i = [1 - \Xi_{c_j}(\mathbf{t}_j)]$, $W = (1 - A_{S(\mathbf{n})})$, which leads to Eq. (15).

3. Photocounting with APDs

Photocounting with the APDs can be considered as a particular case of photocounting with the SNSPDs, for which $\tau_r = 0$. We also suppose that the nonmonochromatic light mode has a rectangular envelop, see Eq. (A9). Our consideration is restricted by $n_i = \{0, 1\}$, i.e. by the collision-free events. The required POVM elements are given by Eq. (A10) and Eq. (A11). The corresponding Q -symbols are obtained in the standard way via replacing \hat{n} by $|\alpha|^2$ under the sign of the normal order. Applying them in Eq. (9) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_n^\Pi[A] &= \prod_{i=1}^N \left[\left(1 + \eta_1 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \right) \exp \left([1 - \eta_1] \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \right) - 1 \right] \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\xi}^\dagger A_{S(n)} \boldsymbol{\xi} \right) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\xi}=\mathbf{0}} \\ &= \sum_{Z \in P[N]} (-1)^{|Z|} \prod_{i=1}^{|Z|} \left(1 + \eta_1 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \right) \exp \left([1 - \eta_1] \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \right) \exp \left(\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\xi}^\dagger A_{S(n), Z} \boldsymbol{\xi} \right) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\xi}=\mathbf{0}}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B10})$$

where $P[N]$ is explained after Eq. (18). Utilizing Eq. (B4), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_n^\Pi[A] &= \sum_{Z \in P[N]} \frac{(-1)^{|Z|}}{\pi^N \sqrt{|\mathbb{I} - A_{S(n), Z}|}} \int_{\mathcal{C}^{2N}} d^{2N} \boldsymbol{\beta} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\beta}^\dagger \left[(\mathbb{I} - A_{S(n), Z})^{-1} + \mathbb{I} \left(\frac{1}{\eta_1} - 1 \right) \right] \boldsymbol{\beta} \right) \\ &\times \prod_{i=1}^{|Z|} \frac{1}{\eta_1} \left(1 + \eta_1 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \right) \exp \left(\frac{\alpha_i^* \beta_i - \beta_i^* \alpha_i + |\alpha_i|^2}{\eta_1} \right) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\xi}=\mathbf{0}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B11})$$

Next, we use the equality

$$\left(1 + \eta_1 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \right) \exp \left(\frac{\alpha_i^* \beta_i - \beta_i^* \alpha_i + |\alpha_i|^2}{\eta_1} \right) \Big|_{\alpha_i=0} = 2 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \exp \left(\frac{\alpha_i^* \beta_i - \beta_i^* \alpha_i}{\sqrt{2\eta_1}} + |\alpha_i|^2 \right) \Big|_{\alpha_i=0} \quad (\text{B12})$$

and change variables as $\beta = \gamma \sqrt{2\eta_1}$. This give us the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_n^\Pi[A] &= \sum_{Z \in P[N]} \frac{(-1)^{|Z|}}{\pi^N \sqrt{|\mathbb{I} - A_{S(n), Z}|}} \int_{\mathcal{C}^{2N}} d^{2N} \boldsymbol{\gamma} \exp \left(-\frac{1}{2} \boldsymbol{\gamma}^\dagger [2\eta_1 (\mathbb{I} - A_{S(n), Z})^{-1} + 2(1 - \eta_1) \mathbb{I}] \boldsymbol{\gamma} \right) \\ &\times \prod_{i=1}^{|Z|} 4 \frac{\partial^2}{\partial \alpha_i \partial \alpha_i^*} \exp \left(\alpha_i^* \gamma_i - \gamma_i^* \alpha_i + |\alpha_i|^2 \right) \Big|_{\boldsymbol{\xi}=\mathbf{0}} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B13})$$

Finally, we can see that this expression has a structure similar to Eq. (B3), which is transformed into Eq. (B5). This leads to Eq. (17).

Appendix C: Phase-space simulation

In this appendix we briefly sketch the evaluation procedure of the characteristic function $C(k_1, k_2)$, cf. Eq. (22), using the methods presented in Refs. [31, 32, 64, 71]. First, one generates samples $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^l = \{\tilde{\alpha}_1^l, \dots, \tilde{\alpha}_M^l\}$ and $\tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^l = \{\tilde{\beta}_1^l, \dots, \tilde{\beta}_M^l\}$ for the interferometer inputs, where $l = 1, \dots, E_S$. As discussed in Ref. [32], in the case of the thermalized squeezed states with the thermalization factor ϵ_j and the squeezing parameter r_j , the amplitudes $\tilde{\alpha}_j^l$ and $\tilde{\beta}_j^l$ for the j th input mode and the l th sampling can be obtained as

$$\tilde{\alpha}_j^l = \delta_{j+\omega_j^l} + i\delta_{j-\omega_{j+M}^l}, \quad (\text{C1})$$

$$\tilde{\beta}_j^l = \delta_{j+\omega_j^l} - i\delta_{j-\omega_{j+M}^l}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

where ω_i^l are sampled as real Gaussian variables with $\langle \omega_i^l \omega_j^l \rangle_P = \delta_{ij}$, and

$$\delta_{j\pm} = \sqrt{\frac{\sinh^2(r_j) \pm (1 - \epsilon_j) \sinh(r_j) \cosh(r_j)}{2}}.$$

The samples for the output amplitudes are obtained as $\boldsymbol{\alpha}^l = U \tilde{\boldsymbol{\alpha}}^l$ and $\boldsymbol{\beta}^l = U^* \tilde{\boldsymbol{\beta}}^l$, where U is a unitary matrix, describing the transformation of the coherent amplitudes of the electromagnetic field at the interferometer. The characteristic function can be estimated as

$$\begin{aligned} C(k_1, k_2) &\approx \frac{1}{E_S} \sum_{l=1}^{E_S} \left[\prod_{i=1}^M [\pi_i(0|\alpha_i^l, \beta_i^l) \right. \\ &\left. + \pi_i(1|\alpha_i^l, \beta_i^l) e^{-ik_1\theta} + \pi_i(2|\alpha_i^l, \beta_i^l) e^{-ik_2\theta}] \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C3})$$

where $\pi_i(l|\alpha_i^l, \beta_i^l)$ is given by Eq. (24).

-
- [1] S. Aaronson and A. Arkhipov, The Computational Complexity of Linear Optics, *Theory Comput.* **9**, 143 (2013).
- [2] C. S. Hamilton, R. Kruse, L. Sansoni, S. Barkhofen, C. Silberhorn, and I. Jex, Gaussian Boson Sampling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **119**, 170501 (2017).
- [3] H.-S. Zhong, H. Wang, Y.-H. Deng, M.-C. Chen, L.-C. Peng, Y.-H. Luo, J. Qin, D. Wu, X. Ding, Y. Hu, P. Hu, X.-Y. Yang, W.-J. Zhang, H. Li, Y. Li, X. Jiang, L. Gan, G. Yang, L. You, Z. Wang, L. Li, N.-L. Liu, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, Quantum computational advantage using photons, *Science* **370**, 1460 (2020).
- [4] H.-S. Zhong, Y.-H. Deng, J. Qin, H. Wang, M.-C. Chen, L.-C. Peng, Y.-H. Luo, D. Wu, S.-Q. Gong, H. Su, Y. Hu, P. Hu, X.-Y. Yang, W.-J. Zhang, H. Li, Y. Li, X. Jiang, L. Gan, G. Yang, L. You, Z. Wang, L. Li, N.-L. Liu, J. J. Renema, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, Phase-Programmable Gaussian Boson Sampling Using Stimulated Squeezed Light, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 180502 (2021).
- [5] Y.-H. Deng, Y.-C. Gu, H.-L. Liu, S.-Q. Gong, H. Su, Z.-J. Zhang, H.-Y. Tang, M.-H. Jia, J.-M. Xu, M.-C. Chen, J. Qin, L.-C. Peng, J. Yan, Y. Hu, J. Huang, H. Li, Y. Li, Y. Chen, X. Jiang, L. Gan, G. Yang, L. You, L. Li, H.-S. Zhong, H. Wang, N.-L. Liu, J. J. Renema, C.-Y. Lu, and J.-W. Pan, Gaussian Boson Sampling with Pseudo-Photon-Number-Resolving Detectors and Quantum Computational Advantage, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **131**, 150601 (2023).
- [6] P. Clifford and R. Clifford, The Classical Complexity of Boson Sampling (2017), [arXiv:1706.01260 \[cs.DS\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/1706.01260).
- [7] N. Quesada and J. M. Arrazola, Exact simulation of Gaussian Boson Sampling in polynomial space and exponential time, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **2**, 023005 (2020).
- [8] N. Quesada, R. S. Chadwick, B. A. Bell, J. M. Arrazola, T. Vincent, H. Qi, and R. García-Patrón, Quadratic speed-up for simulating Gaussian Boson Sampling, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 010306 (2022).
- [9] C. Oh, Y. Lim, B. Fefferman, and L. Jiang, Classical simulation of Boson Sampling based on graph structure, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 190501 (2022).
- [10] J. F. F. Bulmer, B. A. Bell, R. S. Chadwick, A. E. Jones, D. Moise, A. Rigazzi, J. Thorbecke, U.-U. Haus, T. V. Vaerenbergh, R. B. Patel, I. A. Walmsley, and A. Laing, The boundary for quantum advantage in Gaussian Boson Sampling, *Sci. Adv.* **8**, eabl9236 (2022).
- [11] A. S. Popova and A. Rubtsov, Cracking the quantum advantage threshold for Gaussian Boson Sampling, in *Quantum 2.0 Conference and Exhibition* (Optica Publishing Group, 2022) p. QW2A.15.
- [12] D. Cilluffo, N. Lorenzoni, and M. B. Plenio, Simulating Gaussian Boson Sampling with tensor networks in the heisenberg picture (2023), [arXiv:2305.11215 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.11215).
- [13] C. Oh, M. Liu, Y. Alexeev, B. Fefferman, and L. Jiang, Tensor network algorithm for simulating experimental Gaussian Boson Sampling (2023), [arXiv:2306.03709 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2306.03709).
- [14] J. J. Renema, A. Menssen, W. R. Clements, G. Triginer, W. S. Kolthammer, and I. A. Walmsley, Efficient classical algorithm for Boson Sampling with partially distinguishable photons, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 220502 (2018).
- [15] A. E. Moylett, R. García-Patrón, J. J. Renema, and P. S. Turner, Classically simulating near-term partially-distinguishable and lossy Boson Sampling, *Quantum Sci. Technol.* **5**, 015001 (2019).
- [16] J. J. Renema, Simulability of partially distinguishable superposition and Gaussian Boson Sampling, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 063840 (2020).
- [17] J. Shi and T. Byrnes, Gaussian Boson Sampling with partial distinguishability (2021), [arXiv:2105.09583 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2105.09583).
- [18] M. Oszmaniec and D. J. Brod, Classical simulation of photonic linear optics with lost particles, *New J. Phys.* **20**, 092002 (2018).
- [19] R. García-Patrón, J. J. Renema, and V. Shchesnovich, Simulating Boson Sampling in lossy architectures, *Quantum* **3**, 169 (2019).
- [20] D. J. Brod and M. Oszmaniec, Classical simulation of linear optics subject to nonuniform losses, *Quantum* **4**, 267 (2020).
- [21] H. Qi, D. J. Brod, N. Quesada, and R. García-Patrón, Regimes of classical simulability for noisy Gaussian Boson Sampling, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 100502 (2020).
- [22] C. Oh, K. Noh, B. Fefferman, and L. Jiang, Classical simulation of lossy Boson Sampling using matrix product operators, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 022407 (2021).
- [23] M. Liu, C. Oh, J. Liu, L. Jiang, and Y. Alexeev, Complexity of Gaussian Boson Sampling with tensor networks (2023), [arXiv:2301.12814 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2301.12814).
- [24] S. Rahimi-Keshari, T. C. Ralph, and C. M. Caves, Sufficient conditions for efficient classical simulation of quantum optics, *Phys. Rev. X* **6**, 021039 (2016).
- [25] N. Quesada, J. M. Arrazola, and N. Killoran, Gaussian Boson Sampling using threshold detectors, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 062322 (2018).
- [26] Y. Wu, W.-S. Bao, S. Cao, F. Chen, M.-C. Chen, X. Chen, T.-H. Chung, H. Deng, Y. Du, D. Fan, M. Gong, C. Guo, C. Guo, S. Guo, L. Han, L. Hong, H.-L. Huang, Y.-H. Huo, L. Li, N. Li, S. Li, Y. Li, F. Liang, C. Lin, J. Lin, H. Qian, D. Qiao, H. Rong, H. Su, L. Sun, L. Wang, S. Wang, D. Wu, Y. Xu, K. Yan, W. Yang, Y. Yang, Y. Ye, J. Yin, C. Ying, J. Yu, C. Zha, C. Zhang, H. Zhang, K. Zhang, Y. Zhang, H. Zhao, Y. Zhao, L. Zhou, Q. Zhu, C.-Y. Lu, C.-Z. Peng, X. Zhu, and J.-W. Pan, Strong quantum computational advantage using a superconducting quantum processor, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 180501 (2021).
- [27] N. Spagnolo, C. Vitelli, M. Bentivegna, D. J. Brod, A. Crespi, F. Flamini, S. Giacomini, G. Milani, R. Ramponi, P. Mataloni, and et al., Experimental validation of photonic Boson Sampling, *Nat. Photonics* **8**, 615 (2014).
- [28] M. Walschaers, J. Kuipers, J.-D. Urbina, K. Mayer, M. C. Tichy, K. Richter, and A. Buchleitner, Statistical benchmark for bosonsampling, *New J. Phys.* **18**, 032001 (2016).
- [29] D. S. Phillips, M. Walschaers, J. J. Renema, I. A. Walmsley, N. Treps, and J. Sperling, Benchmarking of Gaussian Boson Sampling using two-point correlators, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 023836 (2019).

- [30] T. Giordani, F. Flamini, M. Pompili, N. Viggianiello, N. Spagnolo, A. Crespi, R. Osellame, N. Wiebe, M. Walschaers, A. Buchleitner, and F. Sciarrino, Experimental statistical signature of many-body quantum interference, in *Frontiers in Optics / Laser Science* (Optica Publishing Group, 2018) p. JTU3A.60.
- [31] A. Dellios, P. D. Drummond, B. Opanchuk, R. Y. Teh, and M. D. Reid, Simulating macroscopic quantum correlations in linear networks, *Physics Letters A* **429**, 127911 (2022).
- [32] P. D. Drummond, B. Opanchuk, A. Dellios, and M. D. Reid, Simulating complex networks in phase space: Gaussian Boson Sampling, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 012427 (2022).
- [33] B. Villalonga, M. Y. Niu, L. Li, H. Neven, J. C. Platt, V. N. Smelyanskiy, and S. Boixo, Efficient approximation of experimental Gaussian Boson Sampling (2022), [arXiv:2109.11525 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.11525).
- [34] T. Giordani, V. Mannucci, N. Spagnolo, M. Fumero, A. Rampini, E. Rodolà, and F. Sciarrino, Certification of Gaussian Boson Sampling via graphs feature vectors and kernels, *Quantum Sci. Technol.* **8**, 015005 (2023).
- [35] H. Paul, P. Törmä, T. Kiss, and I. Jex, Photon chopping: New way to measure the quantum state of light, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 2464 (1996).
- [36] S. A. Castelletto, I. P. Degiovanni, V. Schettini, and A. L. Migdall, Reduced deadtime and higher rate photon-counting detection using a multiplexed detector array, *J. Mod. Opt.* **54**, 337 (2007).
- [37] V. Schettini, S. V. Polyakov, I. P. Degiovanni, G. Brida, S. Castelletto, and A. L. Migdall, Implementing a multiplexed system of detectors for higher photon counting rates, *IEEE J. Sel. Top. Quantum Electron.* **13**, 978 (2007).
- [38] J.-L. Blanchet, F. Devaux, L. Furfaro, and E. Lantz, Measurement of sub-shot-noise correlations of spatial fluctuations in the photon-counting regime, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 233604 (2008).
- [39] D. Achilles, C. Silberhorn, C. Śliwa, K. Banaszek, and I. A. Walmsley, Fiber-assisted detection with photon number resolution, *Opt. Lett.* **28**, 2387 (2003).
- [40] M. J. Fitch, B. C. Jacobs, T. B. Pittman, and J. D. Franson, Photon-number resolution using time-multiplexed single-photon detectors, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 043814 (2003).
- [41] J. Řeháček, Z. Hradil, O. Haderka, J. Peřina, and M. Hamar, Multiple-photon resolving fiber-loop detector, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 061801(R) (2003).
- [42] J. Sperling, W. Vogel, and G. S. Agarwal, True photocounting statistics of multiple on-off detectors, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 023820 (2012).
- [43] V. Y. Len, M. M. Byelova, V. A. Uzunova, and A. A. Semenov, Realistic photon-number resolution in generalized hong-ou-mandel experiment, *Phys. Scr.* **97**, 105102 (2022).
- [44] L. M. Ricciardi and F. Esposito, On some distribution functions for non-linear switching elements with finite dead time, *Kybernetik* **3**, 148 (1966).
- [45] J. W. Müller, Dead-time problems, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods* **112**, 47 (1973).
- [46] J. W. Müller, Some formulae for a dead-time-distorted poisson process: To André Allisy on the completion of his first half century, *Nucl. Instrum. Methods* **117**, 401 (1974).
- [47] B. I. Cantor and M. C. Teich, Dead-time-corrected photocounting distributions for laser radiation*, *J. Opt. Soc. Am.* **65**, 786 (1975).
- [48] M. C. Teich, L. Matin, and B. I. Cantor, Refractoriness in the maintained discharge of the cat's retinal ganglion cell, *J. Opt. Soc. Am.* **68**, 386 (1978).
- [49] G. Vannucci and M. C. Teich, Effects of rate variation on the counting statistics of dead-time-modified Poisson processes, *Opt. Commun.* **25**, 267 (1978).
- [50] J. Rapp, Y. Ma, R. M. A. Dawson, and V. K. Goyal, Dead time compensation for high-flux ranging, *IEEE Trans. Signal Process.* **67**, 3471 (2019).
- [51] A. A. Semenov, J. Samelin, C. Boldt, M. Schünemann, C. Reiher, W. Vogel, and B. Hage, Photocounting measurements with dead time and afterpulses in the continuous-wave regime, *Phys. Rev. A* **109**, 013701 (2024).
- [52] C. M. Natarajan, L. Zhang, H. Coldenstrodt-Ronge, G. Donati, S. N. Dorenbos, V. Zwiller, I. A. Walmsley, and R. H. Hadfield, Quantum detector tomography of a time-multiplexed superconducting nanowire single-photon detector at telecom wavelengths, *Opt. Express* **21**, 893 (2013).
- [53] L. You, Superconducting nanowire single-photon detectors for quantum information, *Nanophotonics* **9**, 2673 (2020).
- [54] A. D. Semenov, G. N. Gol'tsman, and A. A. Korneev, Quantum detection by current carrying superconducting film, *Physica C Supercond.* **351**, 349 (2001).
- [55] G. N. Gol'tsman, O. Okunev, G. Chulkova, A. Lipatov, A. Semenov, K. Smirnov, B. Voronov, A. Dzardanov, C. Williams, and R. Sobolewski, Picosecond superconducting single-photon optical detector, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **79**, 705 (2001).
- [56] H. Zhang, L. Xiao, B. Luo, J. Guo, L. Zhang, and J. Xie, The potential and challenges of time-resolved single-photon detection based on current-carrying superconducting nanowires, *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.* **53**, 013001 (2019).
- [57] I. Esmaeil Zadeh, J. Chang, J. W. N. Los, S. Gyger, A. W. Elshaari, S. Steinhauer, S. N. Dorenbos, and V. Zwiller, Superconducting nanowire single-photon detectors: A perspective on evolution, state-of-the-art, future developments, and applications, *Applied Physics Letters* **118**, 190502 (2021).
- [58] V. A. Uzunova and A. A. Semenov, Photocounting statistics of superconducting nanowire single-photon detectors, *Phys. Rev. A* **105**, 063716 (2022).
- [59] G. Bressanini, H. Kwon, and M. S. Kim, Gaussian Boson Sampling with click-counting detectors (2023), [arXiv:2305.00853 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2305.00853).
- [60] K. Brádler, S. Friedland, J. Izaac, N. Killoran, and D. Su, Graph isomorphism and Gaussian Boson Sampling, *Spec. Matrices* **9**, 166 (2021).
- [61] M. Schuld, K. Brádler, R. Israel, D. Su, and B. Gupt, Measuring the similarity of graphs with a Gaussian boson sampler, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 032314 (2020).
- [62] J. M. Arrazola and T. R. Bromley, Using Gaussian Boson Sampling to find dense subgraphs, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 030503 (2018).
- [63] J. M. Arrazola, T. R. Bromley, and P. Rebentrost, Quantum approximate optimization with Gaussian Boson Sampling, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 012322 (2018).

- [64] B. Opanchuk, L. Rosales-Zárate, M. D. Reid, and P. D. Drummond, Simulating and assessing Boson Sampling experiments with phase-space representations, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 042304 (2018).
- [65] Ágoston Kaposi, Z. Kolarovszki, T. Kozsik, Z. Zimborás, and P. Rakyta, Polynomial speedup in torontonian calculation by a scalable recursive algorithm (2022), [arXiv:2109.04528 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2109.04528).
- [66] N. Shervashidze, S. Vishwanathan, T. Petri, K. Mehlhorn, and K. Borgwardt, Efficient graphlet kernels for large graph comparison, in *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, Proceedings of Machine Learning Research, Vol. 5, edited by D. van Dyk and M. Welling (PMLR, Hilton Clearwater Beach Resort, Clearwater Beach, Florida USA, 2009) pp. 488–495.
- [67] P. D. Drummond and C. W. Gardiner, Generalised P-representations in quantum optics, *J. Phys. A: Math. and Gen.* **13**, 2353 (1980).
- [68] P. D. Drummond, C. W. Gardiner, and D. F. Walls, Quasiprobability methods for nonlinear chemical and optical systems, *Phys. Rev. A* **24**, 914 (1981).
- [69] P. L. Kelley and W. H. Kleiner, Theory of electromagnetic field measurement and photoelectron counting, *Phys. Rev.* **136**, A316 (1964).
- [70] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1995).
- [71] A. S. Delliós, M. D. Reid, and P. D. Drummond, Simulating Gaussian Boson Sampling quantum computers (2023), [arXiv:2308.00908 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2308.00908).