

Decomposition of thermal light with a flat spectrum into localized pulses

Yunkai Wang,^{1,2,*} Yujie Zhang,^{1,2,†} and Virginia O. Lorenz^{1,2}

¹*Department of Physics, University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA*

²*Illinois Quantum Information Science & Technology Center (IQUIST),*

University of Illinois Urbana-Champaign, Urbana, Illinois 61801, USA

(Dated: December 24, 2024)

Previous work [Physical Review Letters 114, 213601 (2015)] has shown that thermal light with a blackbody spectrum cannot be decomposed as a mixture of independent localized pulses. We find that thermal light with a flat spectrum, which can occur when spectral filtering is applied, can be decomposed into a direct product of independent localized pulses. Furthermore, we show in the weak-source limit that the first non-vacuum term of thermal light with a flat spectrum is a mixture of independent localized pulses. We quantify the deviation from independent pulses when the spectrum is not flat.

I. INTRODUCTION

Thermal light is ubiquitous in the natural world and plays an important role in emerging quantum optics protocols. In particular, recent proposals suggest using quantum networks for astronomical interferometry to study stellar sources [1–3]. It is commonly assumed that stellar light is in a thermal state upon detection on Earth’s surface and that the stellar source is an approximate blackbody. Here the term blackbody refers to a system in thermal equilibrium at a certain temperature, with a blackbody spectrum and thermal statistics [4]. In order to analyze quantum operations on thermal light, usually the state of thermal light is described in terms of its spatio-temporal modes. There is an implicit conundrum in such analyses: What does a temporal mode of thermal light look like? In particular, can thermal light be decomposed as a set of independent localized pulses such that operations can be performed on temporally distinct modes?

This question has been discussed in a series of papers [5–7] that show that thermal light with a blackbody spectrum cannot be decomposed as a mixture of independent localized pulses. So, in general, it is not correct to assume that operations can be performed on temporally distinct modes of thermal light without considering the correlations between modes. References [5, 6] prove that such a decomposition does not exist by calculating the first- and second-order correlation functions. It turns out that to reproduce the first-order correlation function of thermal light with a blackbody spectrum using a mixture of localized independent pulses, we must allow the density matrix to be trace-improper. They further show that even with such a trace-improper density matrix, the second-order correlation function still cannot

be reproduced. In subsequent work it was shown that if one allows the localized pulses to be correlated, it is possible to decompose thermal light into a mixture of sets of localized pulses [7]. These results have important implications on schemes that implement operations on thermal light, such as recent quantum-enhanced astronomical interferometry proposals [1–3]. In such schemes it is often assumed that the first non-vacuum terms in the expansion of thermal light are mixtures of independent localized pulses containing a single photon. Here we consider whether there are special cases where it is valid to make this assumption.

We note that Refs. [5–7] consider thermal light that has a blackbody spectrum. In many practical applications, such as astronomical interferometry, narrow-band filters are used before detecting blackbody radiation [8]. This leads to the question: if we filter the spectrum of thermal light to specific shapes other than the blackbody spectrum, is it possible to decompose thermal light into independent pulses? We find that when the spectrum of thermal light is flat, the light can indeed be decomposed into a direct product of independent localized pulses. We show that this decomposition gives the correct first- and second-order correlation functions. We further find that in the weak strength limit, the leading non-vacuum term is a mixture of independent localized pulses. Our results indicate that it is safe to work with independent pulses to describe thermal light with a flat spectrum. We also observe that the trace-improper density matrix constructed in Ref. [5, 6], which yields the correct first-order correlation function, naturally emerges in a similar form as the leading non-vacuum term in the weak-strength limit. The additional terms in the decomposition ensure proper normalization of the density matrix, making the overall state physical. Finally, we consider cases in which the spectrum is not perfectly flat. We quantify the deviation from independent pulses by calculating the fidelity between an approximated thermal state with a flat spectrum and thermal states with sloped and Gaussian-shaped spectra.

*Current affiliation: Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 2Y5, Canada; Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada

†Current affiliation: Institute for Quantum Computing, University of Waterloo, Waterloo, ON N2L 3G1, Canada

II. PRELIMINARY

We first review the theoretical framework that is needed for the decomposition of a thermal state in the frequency domain into localized modes in the spatial domain. As derived in Ref. [4], the density matrix of blackbody radiation

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \otimes_{\vec{k},\alpha} \rho_{\vec{k},\alpha}, \\ \rho_{\vec{k},\alpha} &= \sum_p \frac{n_{\vec{k},\alpha}^p}{(n_{\vec{k},\alpha} + 1)^{p+1}} |p\rangle \langle p|, \\ n_{\vec{k},\alpha} &= 1/[\exp(\hbar\omega_{\vec{k}}/k_B T) - 1], \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where $\rho_{\vec{k},\alpha}$ is a thermal state defined in the frequency mode [9], which is labeled by the wavevector \vec{k} and the polarization α . From this equation, it can be seen that blackbody radiation is the direct product of thermal states with different \vec{k}, α and that each of the frequency modes is independent. The spectrum of blackbody radiation is described by $n_{\vec{k},\alpha}$ and follows a Bose-Einstein distribution. Sending ρ through a band-pass filter can be described [10] by evolving each frequency mode $a_{\vec{k},\alpha} \rightarrow \sqrt{\eta_{\vec{k},\alpha}} a_{\vec{k},\alpha} + \sqrt{1 - \eta_{\vec{k},\alpha}} v_{\vec{k},\alpha}$, where $v_{\vec{k},\alpha}$ are auxiliary environmental modes. In this case thermal light can still be described as a direct product of independent thermal states, but with a different spectrum $n_{\vec{k},\alpha}$ that depends on the filter. For simplicity, we use the label m to represent \vec{k} and consider a fixed polarization α . We consider thermal light consisting of $N = 2q + 1$ frequency modes $a_{m=-q, -(q-1), \dots, 0, \dots, q}$ that has passed through such a band-pass filter and describe it as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \otimes_m \rho_m, \\ \rho_m &= \sum_p \frac{n_m^p}{(n_m + 1)^{p+1}} |p\rangle \langle p| \\ &= \int \frac{d^2\alpha_m}{\pi n_m} e^{-|\alpha_m|^2/n_m} |\alpha_m\rangle \langle \alpha_m|, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $|p\rangle$ is the Fock basis, $|\alpha_m\rangle$ is a coherent state, and n_m is the mean photon number of the m th mode. We will see that the spectrum described by n_m is important for the decomposition of thermal light.

Using a construction similar to Ref. [7], we define $\gamma_s = \sum_{m=-q}^q C_{sm} \alpha_m$, $c_s = \sum_{m=-q}^q C_{sm} a_m$, where $C_{sm} = \exp(2\pi i s m / N) / \sqrt{N}$, γ_s are complex numbers, and c_s are another set of annihilation operators. In the one-dimensional case with a quantization length L , the wavefunction of the state in frequency mode a_m is given as

$$\phi_m(z) = e^{i\vec{k}z} \chi_m(z), \quad \chi_m(z) = e^{i\kappa_m z} / \sqrt{L}, \quad (3)$$

where $\kappa_m = 2\pi m / L$, $m = -q, -(q-1), \dots, q$, $k_m =$

$\kappa_m + \tilde{k}$. So, the wavefunction of states in c_s is given by

$$\begin{aligned} a_m^\dagger |0\rangle &= \int dz \chi_m(z) |z\rangle, \\ c_s^\dagger |0\rangle &= \sum_m C_{sm}^* a_m^\dagger |0\rangle = \int dz \sum_m C_{sm}^* \chi_m(z) |z\rangle \\ &= \int dz \omega_s(z) |z\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\omega_s(z) = \sum_{m=-q}^q C_{sm}^* \chi_m(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NL}} \frac{\sin \frac{\pi(z-sl)}{l}}{\sin \frac{\pi(z-sl)}{L}}, \quad (5)$$

where $l = L/N$. As $L \rightarrow \infty$, $\omega_s(z) \rightarrow \sqrt{N/L} \text{sinc} \left(\frac{z-sl}{l} \right)$. This shows the states in c_s are spatially localized. The distance between pulses is l and the width of pulses is comparable to l . Note that the bandwidth in frequency is $2\pi/l$, which determines the width of spatially localized pulses.

This allows us to write Eq. 2 as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \int \left(\prod_{s=-q}^q \frac{d^2\tilde{\gamma}_s}{\pi} \right) F(\{\tilde{\gamma}_s\}) |\{\gamma_s\}\rangle \langle \{\gamma_s\}|, \\ F(\{\tilde{\gamma}_s\}) &= \exp \left(- \sum_{s,s'=-q}^q \tilde{\gamma}_s \Lambda_{ss'} \tilde{\gamma}_{s'}^* \right), \\ \Lambda_{ss'} &= \left(\prod_{m=-q}^q n_m \right)^{1/N} \sum_{m=-q}^q C_{sm}^* C_{s'm} n_m^{-1}, \\ |\{\gamma_s\}\rangle &= \exp \left(\sum_s \gamma_s c_s^\dagger - \gamma_s^* c_s \right) |0\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

where $\tilde{\gamma}_s = \gamma_s (\prod_{m=-q}^q n_m)^{-1/2N}$. This is the decomposition derived in Ref. [7]. Note that each spatially localized mode c_s is not independent of the others for a general spectrum including the blackbody spectrum, which is consistent with Ref. [5, 6].

III. DECOMPOSITION OF A THERMAL STATE WITH A FLAT SPECTRUM

Now we consider the decomposition of thermal light with a flat spectrum by choosing $n_m = n$ for $\forall m$. This choice results in $\Lambda_{ss'} = \delta_{ss'}$, which means the different c_s modes are independent of each other and Eq. 6 is simplified as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \otimes_s \rho'_s, \\ \rho'_s &= \int \frac{d^2\tilde{\gamma}_s}{\pi} \exp(-|\tilde{\gamma}_s|^2) |\gamma_s\rangle \langle \gamma_s| \\ &= \int \frac{d^2\gamma_s}{\pi n} \exp(-|\gamma_s|^2/n) |\gamma_s\rangle \langle \gamma_s|. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Note that each localized mode c_s is in a thermal state ρ'_s and all modes c_s are independent of each other.

If we further consider the weak limit, $n \rightarrow 0$, which is often drawn upon in studies of quantum-enhanced astronomical imaging at optical wavelengths [1–3], the decomposition in Eq. 7 can be expanded as

$$\rho = \left(\frac{1}{1+n} \right)^N \left[\otimes_s \rho_s^{(0)} + \epsilon \sum_s \rho_1^{(0)} \otimes \rho_2^{(0)} \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_s^{(1)} \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_N^{(0)} + O(\epsilon^2) \right], \quad (8)$$

where $\epsilon = n/(1+n) \rightarrow 0$, $\rho_s^{(0)} = |0\rangle\langle 0|$, $\rho_s^{(1)} = c_s^\dagger |0\rangle\langle 0| c_s$. The $O(\epsilon)$ term is a mixture of localized single pulses. All these pulses are vacuum except one which contains a single photon, representing the first non-vacuum contribution. We do not know which pulse contains the single photon, as reflected by the mixed state. This is a very common intuitive picture used in analyses of astronomical interferometry enhanced by quantum technologies [1–3]. With this result we confirm that for photon-click or photon-counting detection in which the detection probability is dominated by the leading-order non-vacuum term, the state can be treated as a mixture of localized pulses. Importantly, the terms of $O(\epsilon^2)$ and higher may not correspond to such mixtures. Thus, in quantum protocols that intentionally use more than one photon, the higher-order terms contain correlations that prevent the interpretation of the state as a mixture of independent localized pulses.




Figure 1: The fidelity between a thermal state with a linearly sloped spectrum, where the mean photon number in the frequency modes n_m increases linearly from n_{\min} to n_{\max} , and a thermal state with a flat spectrum, as defined in Eq. 7, where the mean photon number for all frequency modes is $n = (n_{\min} + n_{\max})/2$. Three cases are plotted: $n_{\min} = 0.01, 0.1, 0.5$, $\Delta n = n_{\max} - n_{\min}$. States with smaller n_{\min} achieve relatively higher fidelity due to greater dominance of vacuum contributions.

To provide a consistency check, we calculate the first- and second-order correlation functions for three different cases in Appendix A: the general case of unfiltered thermal light, without any assumptions, as described in Eq. 2, filtered thermal light with a flat spectrum given in Eq. 7, and filtered thermal light with a flat spectrum in the weak limit given in Eq. 8. Note that to obtain the




Figure 2: The fidelity between a thermal state with a Gaussian spectrum, where the mean photon number in frequency modes n_m follows the distribution $r \exp(-(\omega - \omega_0)^2)/\sqrt{\pi}$ over the range $\omega \in [\omega_0 - 4, \omega_0 + 4]$ with equally spaced modes, and a thermal state with a flat spectrum, as defined in Eq. 7, where the mean photon number for all frequency modes is n .

correct second-order correlation function for Eq. 8, it is necessary to include the $O(\epsilon^2)$ terms, as the second-order correlation function involves the intentional detection of more than one photon. In this case, the first non-vacuum term in Eq. 8 does not contribute to the measurement, and the state can no longer be interpreted as a mixture of independent localized pulses. With this distinction in mind, all the correlation functions exhibit the expected behavior characteristic of a thermal state.

IV. DISCUSSION OF THE TRACE-IMPROPER DENSITY MATRIX

The argument that blackbody radiation cannot be decomposed as a mixture of single pulses is based on comparisons of the first- and second-order correlation functions corresponding to thermal light and a mixture of independent localized pulses [5, 6]. Reference [5, 6] considers a mixture of single pulses $\rho = \sum_s \sigma_s/N$, where σ_s are spatially localized states, such as Gaussian-like pulses. Consider a volume of space Ω filled with spatially localized pulses with widths σ_s independent of Ω . Since blackbody radiation is not localized and fills the whole volume Ω , as we increase Ω , more localized pulses σ_s are required to mimic the behavior of blackbody radiation. If we consider the first-order correlation function $G^{(1)}(0)$ (for the case of a thermal state, this is the intensity at $\vec{r} = 0, t = 0$), only a few pulses localized around $\vec{r} = 0$ will contribute to $G^{(1)}(0)$ regardless of the total number of localized pulses. This means as $\Omega \rightarrow \infty$, $N \rightarrow \infty$, and hence $G^{(1)}(0) \rightarrow 0$. To fix this vanishing $G^{(1)}(0)$, Ref. [5, 6] introduced a trace-improper density matrix. A vanishing $G^{(1)}(0)$ is not a problem for the spectrally flat state of Eq. 7, since it is a direct product instead of the sum of many localized pulses, and so as Ω is increased, $G^{(1)}(0)$ is not affected. For the spectrally flat state in the weak strength limit of Eq. 8, assuming $\epsilon \ll 1/N$, terms higher order in ϵ will not significantly

contribute to the first-order correlation function. In this case, $O(\epsilon)$ terms give the correct first-order correlation function. The number of $O(\epsilon)$ terms increases as the volume Ω increases, similar to the behavior of the trace-improper density matrix in Ref. [5, 6], except in the limit $\epsilon \ll 1/N$, the trace of the whole density matrix in Eq. 8 is naturally maintained.

For the second-order correlation function, Ref. [5, 6] found that the decomposition will have vanishing $G^{(2)}(R)$ when $R \rightarrow \infty$. An intuitive interpretation is that the decomposition $\rho = \sum_s \sigma_s/N$ allows for only one localized pulse σ_s to be present in spatial location s . As a localized pulse, σ_s cannot provide photons at two well-separated locations simultaneously. This issue is naturally addressed in Eq. 7, which comprises localized pulses distributed over the whole volume Ω . If R is small, there exist correlations since R is within the same localized pulse. If $R \rightarrow \infty$, $g^{(2)}(R) = G^{(2)}(R)/(G^{(1)}(R)G^{(1)}(0)) = 1$ since R spans independent localized pulses in different locations. For the weak-limit expansion in Eq. 8, the contribution from $O(\epsilon)$ terms vanishes. Therefore, $O(\epsilon^2)$ terms must be included to obtain the correct $G^{(2)}(R)$ as given in Eq. A7.

V. DEVIATION FROM A FLAT SPECTRUM

We have focused on a perfectly flat spectrum in the above discussion. In practice, applying a band-pass filter to blackbody light may result in a spectrum that is not perfectly flat. Here we explore two simple cases where the spectrum deviates from flatness. First, we consider a state with a linearly sloped spectrum, where the mean photon number of frequency modes n_m increases from n_{\min} to n_{\max} . This spectrum represents a specific instance of the general thermal state described in Eq. 2. We calculate the fidelity between this thermal state and a thermal state with a flat spectrum, as defined in Eq. 7, where the mean photon number for all modes is $n = (n_{\min} + n_{\max})/2$. The result is shown in Fig. 1. We observe that as $\Delta n = n_{\max} - n_{\min}$ increases, the fidelity decreases as expected. The plot indicates a state with a linearly sloped spectrum remains close to the decomposition of thermal light into independent localized pulses provided the deviation Δn is not too large. Specifically, the fidelity stays above 90% provided that $n_{\max} - n_{\min}$ is less than n_{\min} for $n_{\min} = 0.01, 0.1, 0.5$. An interesting observation is that smaller values of n_{\min}, n_{\max} result in better fidelity for a given $\Delta n/n_{\min}$. We think this is due to the fact that as $n_m \rightarrow 0$, the fidelity calculation

becomes dominated by vacuum contributions. Applying appropriate compensation filters can ensure a flat spectrum; this is especially important for stronger sources, for which the fidelity is more sensitive to the slope. The second case we consider is a state with a Gaussian spectrum, where the mean photon number of frequency modes n_m follows a Gaussian distribution $r \exp(-(\omega - \omega_0)^2)/\sqrt{\pi}$, where r is a positive scalar. This case could correspond to the shape of the filtered spectrum being dominated by the width of the filter's edge transitions, which results in an approximately Gaussian shape. Alternatively, this case could represent a natural source with a Gaussian spectrum. For comparison with a thermal state with a flat spectrum as in Eq. 7, we numerically optimize the choice of the mean photon number n for all frequency modes in order to obtain the best fidelity for a given r . The results are shown in Fig. 2. For r smaller than 10^{-1} , corresponding to a low mean photon number, the fidelity remains above 90%. These calculations reveal that the decomposition of thermal light into independent localized pulses exhibits a certain degree of robustness and remains relatively stable under slight deviations from a flat spectrum.

VI. CONCLUSION

We have shown that thermal light with a flat spectrum is a direct product of independent localized pulses. In the weak-light limit, the first non-vacuum term of the expansion of thermal light with a flat spectrum in the Fock basis is a mixture of independent localized pulses. Intuitively, we can thus imagine thermal light with a flat spectrum being received as many localized pulses on which operations can be performed without the need to consider correlations. Our results serve as a prerequisite for quantum protocols involving thermal light emitted by a naturally occurring thermal source.

Acknowledgements

We are especially grateful to John E. Sipe for valuable feedback and comments. We also thank Paul Kwiat, Eric Chitambar, Andrew Jordan, John D. Monnier, Shayan Mookherjea, Michael G. Raymer, and Brian J. Smith for helpful discussions. This work was supported by the multiuniversity National Science Foundation Grant No. 1936321, QII-TAQS: Quantum-Enhanced Telescopy.

[1] E. T. Khabiboulline, J. Borregaard, K. De Greve, and M. D. Lukin, *Physical Review A* **100**, 022316 (2019).
 [2] E. T. Khabiboulline, J. Borregaard, K. De Greve, and M. D. Lukin, *Physical Review Letters* **123**, 070504 (2019).

[3] D. Gottesman, T. Jennewein, and S. Croke, *Physical Review Letters* **109**, 070503 (2012).
 [4] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical coherence and quantum optics* (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
 [5] A. Chenu, A. M. Brańczyk, and J. Sipe, *Physical Review*

- A **91**, 063813 (2015).
- [6] A. Chenu, A. M. Brańczyk, G. D. Scholes, and J. E. Sipe, *Physical Review Letters* **114**, 213601 (2015).
- [7] A. M. Brańczyk, A. Chenu, and J. Sipe, *JOSA B* **34**, 1536 (2017).
- [8] S. K. Saha, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **74**, 551 (2002).
- [9] C. Weedbrook, S. Pirandola, R. García-Patrón, N. J. Cerf, T. C. Ralph, J. H. Shapiro, and S. Lloyd, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **84**, 621 (2012).
- [10] U. Leonhardt, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **66**, 1207 (2003).

Appendix A: First- and second-order correlation functions

For the general case described in the frequency domain in Eq. 2, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
 G^{(1)}(z) &= \sum_m n_m/L, \\
 G^{(2)}(z) &= \sum_m 2n_m^2/L^2 \\
 &\quad + \sum_{m_1 \neq m_2} n_{m_1} n_{m_2} \left(\frac{1}{L^2} + \frac{1}{L^2} e^{i(\kappa_{m_2} - \kappa_{m_1})z} \right),
 \end{aligned} \tag{A1}$$

where $\kappa_m = 2\pi m/L$, $G^{(1)}(z)$ is the shorthand notation of the first-order correlation function $G^{(1)}(r = z, t = 0; r = 0, t = 0)$, $G^{(2)}(z)$ is the shorthand notation of the second order correlation function $G^{(2)}(r_1 = z, r_2 = 0, t_1 = t_2 = 0; r_1 = z, r_2 = 0, t_1 = t_2 = 0)$. These are the correlation functions for general thermal light. We would expect $G^{(2)}(z = 0)/[G^{(1)}(z = 0)]^2 = 2$, which can be confirmed directly as

$$G^{(2)}(z = 0) = \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{m_1, m_2} 2n_{m_1} n_{m_2} = 2[G^{(1)}(z = 0)]^2. \tag{A2}$$

As $z \rightarrow \infty$, we would expect $G^{(2)}(z \rightarrow \infty)/[G^{(1)}(z \rightarrow \infty)]^2 \rightarrow 1$. To prove this, we first note that by the Riemann-Lebesgue Lemma, the Fourier component of an integrable function vanishes as the frequency goes to infinity. We can regard $\sum_{m_1, m_2} n_{m_1} n_{m_2} e^{i(\kappa_{m_2} - \kappa_{m_1})z}$ as the modulo square of the Fourier transformation of n_{m_1} , which should go to zero as $z \rightarrow \infty$; thus

$$G^{(2)}(z \rightarrow \infty) = \frac{1}{L^2} \sum_{m_1, m_2} n_{m_1} n_{m_2} = [G^{(1)}(z \rightarrow \infty)]^2. \tag{A3}$$

If we start from thermal light with a flat spectrum described in the spatial domain as in Eq. 7,

$$\begin{aligned}
 G^{(1)}(z) &= Nn/L, \\
 G^{(2)}(z) &= N^2 n^2/L^2 + n^2 \frac{N}{L} \omega^2(z),
 \end{aligned} \tag{A4}$$

where $\omega(z) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{NL}} \frac{\sin \pi z/l}{\sin \pi z/L}$. Note if we choose a flat spectrum, i.e. $n_m = n$ in Eq. A1, Eq. A1 will be exactly equal to Eq. A4. One can also easily check that $G^{(2)}(z = 0) = 2[G^{(1)}(z = 0)]^2$ and $G^{(2)}(z \rightarrow \infty) = [G^{(1)}(z \rightarrow \infty)]^2$, as $\omega(z)$ has the shape of a sinc function as $L \rightarrow \infty$: $\omega(z) \approx \sqrt{N/L} \sin(\pi z/l)/(\pi z/l)$.

For thermal light with a flat spectrum in the weak limit described by Eq. 8, we need to further include the $O(\epsilon^2)$ terms to get the correct $G^{(2)}$. Starting from Eq. 7,

$$\rho = \int \left(\prod_s \frac{d^2 \gamma_s}{\pi n} \right) \exp \left(- \sum_s |\gamma_s|^2/n \right) (\otimes_s |\gamma_s\rangle \langle \gamma_s|), \tag{A5}$$

we will keep

$$\begin{aligned} \otimes_s |\gamma_s\rangle = & \exp\left(-\sum_s |\gamma_s|^2/2\right) \left(|0\rangle + \sum_s \gamma_s |1\rangle_s \right. \\ & \left. + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{s \neq s'} \gamma_s \gamma_{s'} |1\rangle_s |1\rangle_{s'} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \sum_s \gamma_s^2 |2\rangle_s + o(\gamma_s^2) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

where higher-order terms $o(\gamma_s^2)$ involve at least three photons and contribute nonzero terms to $G^{(2)}$, but the contributions are negligible compared to the $O(\gamma_s^2)$ terms. We can then calculate the correlation functions

$$\begin{aligned} G^{(1)}(z) &= \frac{n}{(n+1)^{N+1}} \frac{N}{L}, \\ G^{(2)}(z) &= \frac{n^2}{(n+1)^{N+2}} \left(\frac{N^2}{L^2} + \frac{N}{L} \omega^2(z) \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

If $n \rightarrow 0$, this result is consistent with Eq. A4. So, all of the correlation functions are consistent with each other. This is expected because Eqs. 7 and 8 are the exact decompositions for thermal light with a flat spectrum; their correlation functions will naturally be consistent with those of a thermal state described in the frequency domain. Similarly, we also have $G^{(2)}(z=0) = 2[G^{(1)}(z=0)]^2$, $G^{(2)}(z \rightarrow \infty) = [G^{(1)}(z \rightarrow \infty)]^2$ when $n \rightarrow 0$.