

Postselected multiphoton entanglement through Bell-multiport beam splitters

Yuan Liang Lim^{1*} and Almut Beige^{2,1}

¹*Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London, Prince Consort Road, London SW7 2BZ, United Kingdom*

²*Department of Applied Mathematics and Theoretical Physics, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, United Kingdom*

(Dated: February 9, 2020)

One of the main obstacles for the efficient implementation of linear optics quantum computing is the generation of multiphoton entanglement using only single photons as a resource. Here we show that a wide range of highly-entangled photon states is obtained when passing photons simultaneously through a Bell-multiport beam splitter under the condition of the collection of one photon per output port. Some multiphoton states can be prepared more easily than others. For example, the success rate of the proposed W -state preparation scheme decreases non monotonically with the photon number.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn, 42.50.Dv

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement spurs a great deal of interest in quantum information processing [1, 2], quantum cryptography [3, 4] and fundamental tests of quantum mechanics [5]. For many practical purposes, the polarisation states of photons provide the most favoured qubits as they possess very long lifetimes and an ease in distribution. However, it is impossible to create a direct interaction between photons and because of this they are difficult to entangle. One way to overcome this problem is to create photon polarisation entanglement via pair creation within the same source as in atomic cascade [6] and parametric down-conversion experiments [7]. Other schemes employ the features of the combined level structure of an atom-cavity system or distant single photon sources [8, 9, 10].

It is also possible to prepare a highly entangled N -photon state using only independently generated single photons, with no entanglement in the initial state, by overlapping them within their coherence time inside a linear optics setup and performing postselective measurements on the N output ports. For example in 1988, Shih and Alley experimentally verified the generation of maximally entangled photon pairs after passing two photons simultaneously through a 50:50 beam splitter and detecting them in different output ports [11, 12].

In this paper we study the possibility of generating multiphoton entanglement by passing N photons simultaneously through a symmetric $N \times N$ Bell-multiport beam splitter (see Figure 1). As in the 2-photon case [11], we consider the state preparation as successful under the condition of the collection of one photon per output port. Using this approach has the feature that this case can easily be distinguished from cases with several photons at the same output port, even in the absence of detectors with photon number resolution. In addition,




FIG. 1: Experimental setup for the generation of multiphoton entanglement by passing N photons simultaneously through an $N \times N$ Bell-multiport beam splitter. The state preparation is considered successful under the condition of the collection of one photon per output.

the final state contains only spatially separated photons which can easily be processed further.

Studies, similar to the one we present here, have already been performed in the past. In Ref. [13], Żukowski *et al.* showed that the $N \times N$ Bell multiport can be used to analyse entanglement between two N -dimensional subsystems. Here we are interested in the generation of entanglement between the 2-dimensional polarisation states of N photons. Also a variety of different linear optics setups has been considered for the generation of photon entanglement via postselection and interference (see e.g. Refs. [14, 15, 16, 17, 18, 19]). Some authors propose to create photon path entanglement [19]; others aim at the generation of polarisation entanglement [14, 15, 16, 17, 18].

In the following we consider only non-entangled input states and assume that each input port i of the $N \times N$ Bell-multiport is entered by a single photon with polarisation $|\lambda_i\rangle$. The preparation of the initial state does not require precise control over the relative phases between the states of the incoming photons, since the phase of each photon contributes at most to a global phase with no physical consequences. Furthermore, we consider Bell-multiport beam splitters since they can be implemented efficiently by combining single beam splitters into a linear optics network with N input and N output ports [13, 20].

*Email: yuan.lim@imperial.ac.uk

The photon state, that is actually prepared in the setup in case of a successful photon redistribution, depends on the input state. Even if the input is a product state, it is very likely that the final state of the system is highly entangled. The reason for this is that during the transition through the linear optics network, the *which way* information, i.e. the information about the origin of each photon, might be erased. In general, there are several possibilities to obtain an output state with exactly one photon per output port. All of these possibilities contribute coherently to the final state.

This paper is organised as follows. In Section II we introduce the notation for the description of photon scattering through a linear optics setup. Section III shows that a wide range of highly entangled states can be obtained for $N = 4$, including the W -state, the GHZ-state and a double singlet state. Afterwards we discuss the generation of W -states for arbitrary photon numbers N and calculate the corresponding success rates. Finally we conclude our results in Section V.

II. PHOTON SCATTERING THROUGH A LINEAR OPTICS SETUP

Let us first introduce the notation for the description of the transition of a given photon state through an $N \times N$ multiport beam splitter. We assume that each input port i is entered by one independently generated photon prepared in the superposition $|\lambda_i\rangle = \alpha_{i+}|+\rangle_i + \alpha_{i-}|-\rangle_i$. Here $|\pm\rangle$ is a state with one “+” or “-” polarised photon, respectively, and $\alpha_{i\pm}$ are complex coefficients with $|\alpha_{i+}|^2 + |\alpha_{i-}|^2 = 1$. If $b_{i\lambda}^\dagger$ denotes the creation operator for a photon with polarisation λ in input port i , the input state of the system can be written as

$$|\phi_{\text{in}}\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{\lambda=+,-} \alpha_{i\lambda} b_{i\lambda}^\dagger \right) |0_{\text{in}}\rangle \quad (1)$$

with $|0_{\text{in}}\rangle$.

Let us now introduce the unitary $N \times N$ -multiport transformation operator, the scattering matrix S , that connects a given input state to the output state of the system such that

$$|\phi_{\text{out}}\rangle = S |\phi_{\text{in}}\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Using Eq. (1) and the relation $S^\dagger S = \mathbb{I}$ yields

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_{\text{out}}\rangle &= S \left(\sum_{\lambda=+,-} \alpha_{1\lambda} b_{1\lambda}^\dagger \right) S^\dagger S \left(\sum_{\lambda=+,-} \alpha_{2\lambda} b_{2\lambda}^\dagger \right) \\ &\quad \cdot \dots \cdot S^\dagger S \left(\sum_{\lambda=+,-} \alpha_{N\lambda} b_{N\lambda}^\dagger \right) S^\dagger S |0_{\text{in}}\rangle \\ &= \prod_{i=1}^N \left(\sum_{\lambda=+,-} \alpha_{i\lambda} S b_{i\lambda}^\dagger S^\dagger \right) |0_{\text{out}}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

where $|0_{\text{out}}\rangle = S |0_{\text{in}}\rangle$ is the vacuum state of the output ports.

In the following, the matrix elements U_{ji} of the unitary transformation matrix U give the amplitude for the redirection of a photon in input i to output j . If the multiport beam splitter does not contain any elements that change the polarisation of the incoming photons, the transition matrix U does not depend on λ . Denoting the creation operator for a single photon with polarisation λ in output port j by $c_{j\lambda}^\dagger$ therefore yields

$$S b_{i\lambda}^\dagger S^\dagger = \sum_j U_{ji} c_{j\lambda}^\dagger. \quad (4)$$

Inserting this into Eq. (2) we can now calculate the output state of the $N \times N$ multiport given the initial state (1) and obtain

$$|\phi_{\text{out}}\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^N \left[\sum_{j=1}^N U_{ji} \left(\sum_{\lambda=+,-} \alpha_{i\lambda} c_{j\lambda}^\dagger \right) \right] |0_{\text{out}}\rangle. \quad (5)$$

This equation describes the independent redirection of all photons to the potential output ports. Conservation of the norm of the state vector is provided by the unitarity of the transition matrix U .

Let us now determine the final state of the system under the condition of the collection of one photon per output port. To calculate this state we apply the corresponding projector to the output state (5). Each term of the projected output state can be characterised by a certain permutation of the N input photons to the output ports of the multiport beam splitter and $|\phi_{\text{pro}}\rangle$ equals, up to normalisation,

$$|\phi_{\text{pro}}\rangle = \sum_{\sigma} \left[\prod_{i=1}^N U_{\sigma(i)i} \left(\sum_{\lambda=+,-} \alpha_{i\lambda} c_{\sigma(i)\lambda}^\dagger \right) \right] |0_{\text{out}}\rangle. \quad (6)$$

Here σ are the $N!$ possible permutations of the N items $\{1, 2, \dots, N\}$. Note that the norm of the state (6) squared,

$$P_{\text{suc}} = \| |\phi_{\text{pro}}\rangle \|^2, \quad (7)$$

gives the success rate of the scheme.

A. The Bell-multiport beam splitter

In this paper, we are interested in the generation of highly entangled photon states of high symmetry, an example being W -states. This suggests to consider symmetric multiports, which redirect each incoming photon with equal probability to all output ports. A special example, whose transformation matrix

$$U_{ji} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \omega_N^{(j-1)(i-1)} \quad (8)$$

is also known as a discrete fourier transform matrix and which has been widely considered in the literature [13,

20, 21], is the $N \times N$ Bell-multiport beam splitter. Here ω_N denotes the N -th root of unity,

$$\omega_N \equiv \exp(2i\pi/N) . \quad (9)$$

Proceeding as in Section II.D of Ref. [13], it can easily be verified that U is unitary as well as symmetric. Especially for $N = 2$, the transition matrix (8) describes a single 50:50 beam splitter.

III. THE GENERATION OF 4-PHOTON STATES

Before we discuss a more general case, let us investigate the possibility to prepare highly entangled 4-photon states using only four single photons and a 4×4 Bell-multiport. In this case, the transition matrix (8) becomes

$$U = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & \omega_4 & \omega_4^2 & \omega_4^3 \\ 1 & \omega_4^2 & \omega_4^4 & \omega_4^6 \\ 1 & \omega_4^3 & \omega_4^6 & \omega_4^9 \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & i & -1 & -i \\ 1 & -1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & -i & -1 & i \end{pmatrix} . \quad (10)$$

Discussing this specific example allows us to see the richness of the problem as well as it motivates possible generalisations to the case of arbitrary photon numbers.

A. Impossible output states

Let us first have a look at the trivial case where every input port of the multiport is fed by one photon with the same polarisation, say polarisation “+”, so that

$$|\phi_{\text{in}}\rangle = b_{1+}^\dagger b_{2+}^\dagger b_{3+}^\dagger b_{4+}^\dagger |0_{\text{in}}\rangle . \quad (11)$$

Using Eqs. (6) and (10), we find that the collection of one photon per output port prepares the system in the state

$$|\phi_{\text{pro}}\rangle = \sum_{\sigma} \left[\prod_{i=1}^4 U_{\sigma_j(i)} c_{i+}^\dagger \right] |0_{\text{out}}\rangle = 0 . \quad (12)$$

This implies that the probability for a successful state preparation, given the input state (11), equals zero. In general, it is impossible to prepare a 4-photon state where all photons have the same polarisation, and therefore also any superposition containing the states $c_{1+}^\dagger c_{2+}^\dagger c_{3+}^\dagger c_{4+}^\dagger |0_{\text{out}}\rangle$ or $c_{1-}^\dagger c_{2-}^\dagger c_{3-}^\dagger c_{4-}^\dagger |0_{\text{out}}\rangle$. This is due to destructive interference of photons within the linear optics setup.

B. The 4-photon W -state

We now focus our attention on the case where the first photon has polarisation “+” while all the other photons have polarisation “-” and

$$|\phi_{\text{in}}^W\rangle = b_{1+}^\dagger b_{2-}^\dagger b_{3-}^\dagger b_{4-}^\dagger |0_{\text{in}}\rangle . \quad (13)$$

Using again Eqs. (6) and (10), we find that the conditional output state (6) is now given by

$$|\phi_{\text{pro}}^W\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^4 U_{j1} c_{j+}^\dagger \sum_{\sigma_j} \left[\prod_{i=2}^4 U_{\sigma_j(i)} c_{\sigma_j(i)-}^\dagger \right] |0_{\text{out}}\rangle , \quad (14)$$

where the σ_j are the $3!$ permutations that map the list $\{2, 3, 4\}$ onto the list $\{1, \dots, (j-1), (j+1), \dots, 4\}$. Let us introduce the notation where $|j_{\text{out}}\rangle$ is the state with one “+” polarised photon in output port j and one “-” polarised photon everywhere else,

$$|j_{\text{out}}\rangle \equiv c_{N-}^\dagger \dots c_{(j+1)-}^\dagger c_{j+}^\dagger c_{(j-1)-}^\dagger \dots c_{1-}^\dagger |0_{\text{out}}\rangle . \quad (15)$$

Then the output state (14) can then be written as

$$|\phi_{\text{pro}}^W\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^4 \beta_j |j_{\text{out}}\rangle , \quad (16)$$

where β_j are complex probability amplitudes. In addition, we introduce the short hand notation $U_{\text{red}}(j)$ which denotes a matrix obtained by deleting the first column and the j -th row of the matrix U . This allows us to write the amplitude β_j as

$$\beta_j = U_{j1} \sum_{\sigma_j} \prod_{i=2}^4 U_{\sigma_j(i)} = U_{j1} \text{perm} (U_{\text{red}}^T(j)) . \quad (17)$$

The output state (16) equals a W -state, if the coefficients β_j are all of the same size and differ from each other at most by a phase factor [22].

To prove that this is the case, we denote the $U_{\text{red}}^T(j)$ by C_j and find [23]

$$C_1 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \omega_4 & \omega_4^2 & \omega_4^3 \\ \omega_4^2 & \omega_4^4 & \omega_4^6 \\ \omega_4^3 & \omega_4^6 & \omega_4^9 \end{pmatrix} , \quad C_2 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega_4^2 & \omega_4^3 \\ 1 & \omega_4^4 & \omega_4^6 \\ 1 & \omega_4^6 & \omega_4^9 \end{pmatrix} , \\ C_3 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega_4 & \omega_4^3 \\ 1 & \omega_4^2 & \omega_4^6 \\ 1 & \omega_4^3 & \omega_4^9 \end{pmatrix} , \quad C_4 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega_4 & \omega_4^2 \\ 1 & \omega_4^2 & \omega_4^4 \\ 1 & \omega_4^3 & \omega_4^6 \end{pmatrix} . \quad (18)$$

The coefficients β_j differ at most by a phase factor, if $|\text{perm}(C_j)|$ is for all j the same. This applies if the matrices C_j can all be transformed into C_1 by multiplying the different rows of each matrix with suitable phase factors and changing the order of their columns. To show this we define the vector

$$\mathbf{v} = (\omega_4, \omega_4^2, \omega_4^3)^T \quad (19)$$

and multiply each column of the matrix C_1 exactly $(j-1)$ times with \mathbf{v} . Such a multiplication amounts physically to the multiplication of the final state of the corresponding output port with the overall phase factor ω_4, ω_4^2 or

ω_4^3 , respectively, and transforms the matrices C_j into the matrices F_j with

$$F_1 = C_1, F_2 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \omega_4^2 & \omega_4^3 & 1 \\ \omega_4^4 & \omega_4^6 & 1 \\ \omega_4^6 & \omega_4^9 & 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

$$F_3 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} \omega_4^3 & 1 & \omega_4 \\ \omega_4^6 & 1 & \omega_4^2 \\ \omega_4^9 & 1 & \omega_4^4 \end{pmatrix}, F_4 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \omega_4 & \omega_4^2 \\ 1 & \omega_4^2 & \omega_4^4 \\ 1 & \omega_4^3 & \omega_4^6 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

Using cyclic symmetry of the permanent, we see immediately that $\text{perm}(C_j) = \text{perm}(F_j)$. This means that the norm of the coefficients β_j in Eq. (16) is for all j the same. Furthermore, using the above argument based on the multiplication of phase factors to the output ports, we find that

$$\beta_j = \beta_1 \left(\prod_{k=0}^3 \omega_4^k \right)^{j-1}. \quad (21)$$

After normalisation [24], the output state (14) indeed becomes the W -state

$$|\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^W\rangle = \frac{1}{2} [c_{1+}^\dagger c_{2-}^\dagger c_{3+}^\dagger c_{4-}^\dagger - c_{1-}^\dagger c_{2+}^\dagger c_{3-}^\dagger c_{4+}^\dagger + c_{1-}^\dagger c_{2-}^\dagger c_{3+}^\dagger c_{4-}^\dagger - c_{1-}^\dagger c_{2-}^\dagger c_{3-}^\dagger c_{4+}^\dagger] |0_{\text{out}}\rangle. \quad (22)$$

Analogously one can show that the output for a state, where the first photon is “-” and all other input photons have polarisation “+”, is

$$|\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^{W'}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} [c_{1-}^\dagger c_{2+}^\dagger c_{3+}^\dagger c_{4+}^\dagger - c_{1+}^\dagger c_{2-}^\dagger c_{3+}^\dagger c_{4+}^\dagger + c_{1+}^\dagger c_{2+}^\dagger c_{3-}^\dagger c_{4+}^\dagger - c_{1+}^\dagger c_{2+}^\dagger c_{3+}^\dagger c_{4-}^\dagger] |0_{\text{out}}\rangle. \quad (23)$$

Both of these states, (22) and (23), can be generated with probability

$$P_{\text{suc}} = \frac{1}{16}. \quad (24)$$

By further implementing a Pauli σ_z operation (polarisation dependent sign flip) on either the first and the third or on the second and the fourth output, the usual form of a W -state (with equal coefficients) [22] is obtained.

C. The 4-photon GHZ-state

Besides generating W -states, the proposed setup can generate a 4-photon GHZ-state. This is achieved if two “+” polarised photons enter the input ports 1 and 3 and “-” polarised photons are fed into the input ports 2 and 4 thus that

$$|\phi_{\text{in}}^{\text{GHZ}}\rangle = b_{1+}^\dagger b_{2-}^\dagger b_{3+}^\dagger b_{4-}^\dagger |0_{\text{in}}\rangle. \quad (25)$$

Calculating again the output state under the condition of the detection of one photon per output port, we obtain

$$|\phi_{\text{pro}}^{\text{GHZ}}\rangle = \sum_{\sigma} U_{\sigma(1)1} U_{\sigma(2)2} U_{\sigma(3)3} U_{\sigma(4)4} c_{\sigma(1)+}^\dagger c_{\sigma(2)-}^\dagger c_{\sigma(3)+}^\dagger c_{\sigma(4)-}^\dagger |0_{\text{out}}\rangle, \quad (26)$$

where the σ 's are the 4! permutations that map the list $\{1, 2, 3, 4\}$ onto itself. On simplification, one finds that there are only two constituent states with non-zero coefficients and

$$|\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^{\text{GHZ}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [c_{1+}^\dagger c_{2-}^\dagger c_{3+}^\dagger c_{4-}^\dagger - c_{1-}^\dagger c_{2+}^\dagger c_{3-}^\dagger c_{4+}^\dagger] |0_{\text{out}}\rangle. \quad (27)$$

This state can be prepared with probability

$$P_{\text{suc}} = \frac{1}{8} \quad (28)$$

and is already equivalent to a GHZ-state under local operations. Transformation into the usual form of a GHZ-state requires flipping the polarisation of two of the photons. This can be realised by applying a Pauli σ_x operation to the first output port as well as a σ_y operation to the third output.

Note that the success rate for the creation of a GHZ-state (28) is twice as high as the probability for the generation of a W -state (24). The reason is again the presence of interference. Altogether, there are six different photon product states that could potentially contribute to finding one photon per output port. Destructive interference cancels out four of these states but constructive interference yields relatively large probability amplitudes for the remaining two which constitute the GHZ-state.

Unfortunately, the experimental setup shown in Figure 1 does not allow for the preparation of GHZ-states for arbitrary photon numbers N . For a detailed description of such a scheme using a different network of beam splitters as well as polarising beam splitters see Ref. [17].

D. The 4-photon double singlet state

For completeness, we now ask the question concerning potential output states, given the input state

$$|\phi_{\text{in}}\rangle = b_{1+}^\dagger b_{2+}^\dagger b_{3-}^\dagger b_{4-}^\dagger |0_{\text{in}}\rangle. \quad (29)$$

Proceeding as above we find that this state results under the condition of one photon per output port in the preparation of the state

$$|\phi_{\text{pro}}^{\text{DS}}\rangle = \sum_{\sigma} U_{\sigma(1)1} U_{\sigma(2)2} U_{\sigma(3)3} U_{\sigma(4)4} c_{\sigma(1)+}^\dagger c_{\sigma(2)+}^\dagger c_{\sigma(3)-}^\dagger c_{\sigma(4)-}^\dagger |0_{\text{out}}\rangle \quad (30)$$

with σ defined as in Section III C and yielding

$$|\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^{\text{DS}}\rangle = \frac{1}{2} [c_{1+}^\dagger c_{2+}^\dagger c_{3-}^\dagger c_{4-}^\dagger + c_{1-}^\dagger c_{2-}^\dagger c_{3+}^\dagger c_{4+}^\dagger - c_{1+}^\dagger c_{2-}^\dagger c_{3-}^\dagger c_{4+}^\dagger - c_{1-}^\dagger c_{2+}^\dagger c_{3+}^\dagger c_{4-}^\dagger] |0_{\text{out}}\rangle. \quad (31)$$

This state can be prepared with probability

$$P_{\text{suc}} = \frac{1}{16}. \quad (32)$$

Note that the state (31) is a double singlet state, i.e. a tensor product of two 2-photon singlet state, which has applications in decoherence-free quantum information processing [25].

E. The general 4-photon case

Finally, we consider the most general situation where the input state is of the general form (1). Calculating Eq. (6) for this case by brute force, we obtain the unnormalised output state

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi_{\text{pro}}\rangle &= \frac{i}{4}(\gamma_1 + \gamma_2 - \gamma_3 - \gamma_4) |\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^{\text{DS}}\rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}(\gamma_5 - \gamma_6) |\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^{\text{GHZ}}\rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_8 + \gamma_{10} - \gamma_7 - \gamma_9) |\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^{\text{W}}\rangle \\ &+ \frac{1}{4}(\gamma_{12} + \gamma_{14} - \gamma_{11} - \gamma_{13}) |\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^{\text{W}'}\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

with the coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_1 &= \alpha_{1+}\alpha_{2+}\alpha_{3-}\alpha_{4-}, & \gamma_2 &= \alpha_{1-}\alpha_{2-}\alpha_{3+}\alpha_{4+}, \\ \gamma_3 &= \alpha_{1-}\alpha_{2+}\alpha_{3+}\alpha_{4-}, & \gamma_4 &= \alpha_{1+}\alpha_{2-}\alpha_{3-}\alpha_{4+}, \\ \gamma_5 &= \alpha_{1+}\alpha_{2-}\alpha_{3+}\alpha_{4-}, & \gamma_6 &= \alpha_{1-}\alpha_{2+}\alpha_{3-}\alpha_{4+}, \\ \gamma_7 &= \alpha_{1+}\alpha_{2-}\alpha_{3-}\alpha_{4-}, & \gamma_8 &= \alpha_{1-}\alpha_{2+}\alpha_{3-}\alpha_{4-}, \\ \gamma_9 &= \alpha_{1-}\alpha_{2-}\alpha_{3+}\alpha_{4-}, & \gamma_{10} &= \alpha_{1-}\alpha_{2-}\alpha_{3-}\alpha_{4+}, \\ \gamma_{11} &= \alpha_{1-}\alpha_{2+}\alpha_{3+}\alpha_{4+}, & \gamma_{12} &= \alpha_{1+}\alpha_{2-}\alpha_{3+}\alpha_{4+}, \\ \gamma_{13} &= \alpha_{1+}\alpha_{2+}\alpha_{3-}\alpha_{4+}, & \gamma_{14} &= \alpha_{1+}\alpha_{2+}\alpha_{3+}\alpha_{4-}. \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

Without loss of generalisation we could restrict ourselves to the case where $\alpha_{1+} = 1$ and $\alpha_{1-} = 0$. However, in its present form, Eq. (34) reflects the full symmetry of the transformation. We see how each of the entangled states $|\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^{\text{DS}}\rangle$, $|\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^{\text{GHZ}}\rangle$, $|\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^{\text{W}}\rangle$ and $|\hat{\phi}_{\text{pro}}^{\text{W}'}\rangle$ are generated independently from the different constituent parts of the input (1). Besides, Eq. (33) shows that the output state is constrained to be of a certain symmetry, namely the symmetry introduced by the $N \times N$ Bell-multiport into the system.

IV. THE GENERATION OF N -PHOTON W -STATES

Using the same arguments as in Section III B before, we now show that the $N \times N$ Bell-multiport can be used for the generation of W -states for arbitrary photon numbers N . Like Bell states, W -states are highly entangled but their entanglement is more robust [22]. Furthermore, as N increases, W -states perform better than the corresponding GHZ states against noise admixture in experiments to violate local realism [26]. Besides, W -states

are an important ingredient for optimal cloning protocols [27].

In analogy to Eq. (13) we assume that the input state contains one “+” polarised photon in the first input port and one “-” polarised photon in every other, so that

$$|\phi_{\text{in}}\rangle = b_{1+}^\dagger \prod_{i=2}^N b_{i-}^\dagger |0_{\text{in}}\rangle. \quad (35)$$

Using Eq. (6), we find that the state of the system under the condition of the collection of one photon per output port equals

$$|\phi_{\text{pro}}\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^N U_{j1} c_{j+}^\dagger \sum_{\sigma_j} \left[\prod_{i=2}^N U_{\sigma_j(i)i} c_{\sigma_j(i)-}^\dagger \right] |0_{\text{out}}\rangle, \quad (36)$$

where the σ_j are the $(N-1)!$ permutations that map the list $\{2, 3, \dots, N\}$ onto the list $\{1, 2, \dots, (j-1), (j+1), \dots, N\}$. As expected, the output is a superposition of all states with a “+” polarised photon in one output and a “-” polarised photon everywhere else.

To show that Eq. (36) indeed describes a W -state we use again notation (16), write

$$|\phi_{\text{pro}}\rangle \equiv \sum_j \beta_j |j_{\text{out}}\rangle \quad (37)$$

and show that the coefficients β_j differ from β_1 at most by a phase factor. As in Eq. (17), the amplitude β_j can now be written as

$$\beta_j = U_{j1} \sum_{\sigma_j} \prod_{i=2}^N U_{\sigma_j(i)i} = U_{j1} \text{perm} (U_{\text{red}}^{\text{T}}(j)). \quad (38)$$

Inserting the concrete form of the transition matrix U we then obtain

$$\beta_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^N}} \sum_{\sigma_j} \prod_{i=2}^N \omega_N^{(\sigma_j(i)-1)(i-1)}. \quad (39)$$

Proceeding as in Section III B, we now multiply β_j with the factor

$$v_j \equiv \left(\prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega_N^k \right)^{-(j-1)} \quad (40)$$

and find

$$\begin{aligned} v_j \beta_j &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^N}} \sum_{\sigma_j} \prod_{i=2}^N \omega_N^{(\sigma_j(i)-j)(i-1)} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^N}} \sum_{\sigma_j} \prod_{i=2}^N \omega_N^{(\text{mod}_N(\sigma_j(i)-j))(i-1)}. \end{aligned} \quad (41)$$

The expression $\text{mod}_N(\sigma_j(i)-j)+1$ describes a set of $(N-1)!$ permutations that map $\{2, 3, \dots, N\}$ onto the




FIG. 2: The success rate for the generation of N -photon W -states P_{suc} as a function of N . The solid line approximates the exact results via the equation $P_{\text{suc}} = e^{a-bN}$ with $a = 1.35 \pm 1.32$ and $b = 1.27 \pm 0.10$

list $\{2, 3, \dots, N\}$ and is therefore equivalent to the permutations $\sigma_1(i)$. This allows us to simplify Eq. (41) even further and to show that

$$v_j \beta_j = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^N}} \sum_{\sigma_1} \prod_{i=2}^N \omega_N^{(\sigma_1(i)-1)(i-1)} = \beta_1. \quad (42)$$

From this and the fact that $1+2+\dots+(N-1) = \frac{1}{2}N(N-1)$ one finally arrives at the relation

$$\beta_j = \left(\prod_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega_N^k \right)^{j-1} \beta_1 = \begin{cases} \beta_1, & \text{if } N \text{ is odd,} \\ (-1)^{j-1} \beta_1, & \text{if } N \text{ is even.} \end{cases} \quad (43)$$

This shows that the amplitudes β_j are all of the same size and the Bell multipoint can indeed generate N -photon W -states. If one wants the coefficients β_j to be exactly the same, the unwanted phase factors (-1) in case of even photon numbers can be corrected by applying a σ_z operation to the output ports corresponding to even numbers j .

For example in the case $N = 2$, the state preparation reduces to the familiar example where oppositely polarised photons pass through a 50:50 beam splitter. The collection of a photon in the each output port prepares the system in the state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [c_{1+}^\dagger c_{2-}^\dagger - c_{1-}^\dagger c_{2+}^\dagger] |0_{\text{out}}\rangle$. This can easily be transformed into $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [c_{1+}^\dagger c_{2-}^\dagger + c_{1-}^\dagger c_{2+}^\dagger] |0_{\text{out}}\rangle$ by performing a polarisation-dependent sign flip in one of the output ports.

A. Success probabilities

Finally, we comment on the success rate of the proposed W -state preparation scheme. Calculating this

probability with the help of Eq. (7) involves finding the amplitude β_1 with the help of Eq. (38). Although the definition of the permanent of a matrix is superficially similar to that of a determinant, there exist only few theorems to simplify the calculation of permanents, except for some restricted cases [28]. In fact, the computation of the permanent is an NP-complete problem in complexity. We therefore calculate P_{suc} numerically (see Figure 2).

As with postselective schemes in general, the success probability becomes unfavourably low as N increases. Here the probability scales on average as a decreasing exponential. However we observe the interesting effect of a non-monotonic decreasing success probability as N increases. For example, the probability of success for $N = 13$ is higher than for $N = 9$. Furthermore, for $N = 6$ and $N = 12$, W -state generation is not permitted due to destructive interference. Interestingly, this does not apply to $N = 18$ which is also a multiple of 6.

V. CONCLUSIONS

A very practical approach for the creation of multiphoton entanglement is the performance of postselective measurements on the state of several, independently generated photons. In the presence of interference, which removes the information about the origin of the individual photons, this can result in the creation of an entangled state even in the absence of any photon-photon interaction. Here we were especially interested in the creation of multiphoton polarisation entanglement by passing N photons through a $N \times N$ Bell-multipoint beam splitter. A state preparation is considered successful in case of the collection of one photon per output port.

First we analysed the case $N = 4$ and showed that a 4×4 Bell-multipoint allows the creation of a great variety of highly-symmetric polarisation-entangled states including the W -state, the GHZ-state and the double-singlet states. It was found that some states are easier to prepare than others. A straightforward generalisation of the 4-photon case, yields a scheme for the creation of N -photon W -states. The rates for successful state preparations were calculated. A non-monotonic exponential decrease of the success probability with N was observed.

Acknowledgments

Y. L. L. thanks T. Rudolph for useful discussions and acknowledges the DSO National Laboratories in Singapore for funding as a PhD student. A. B. thanks the Royal Society and the GCHQ for funding as a James Ellis University Research Fellow. This work was supported in part by the European Union and the UK Engineering and Physical Sciences Research Council.

-
- [1] D. Gottesman and I. L. Chuang, *Nature* **402**, 390 (1999).
- [2] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and G. J. Milburn, *Nature* **409** 46 (2001).
- [3] C. H. Bennett and G. Brassard, in *Proceedings of the IEEE International Conference on Computers, Systems and Signal Processing, Bangalore, India* (IEEE, New York, 1984), pp. 175-179.
- [4] A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
- [5] J. S. Bell, *Physics* **1**, 195 (1965).
- [6] A. Aspect, P. Grangier, and G. Roger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 91 (1982).
- [7] P. G. Kwiat, K. Mattle, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4337 (1995).
- [8] K. M. Gheri, C. Saavedra, P. Törmä, J.I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, R2627 (1998).
- [9] W. Lange and H. J. Kimble, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 063817 (2000).
- [10] Y. L. Lim and A. Beige, *Photon polarisation entanglement from distant dipole sources*, quant-ph/0308095.
- [11] Y. H. Shih and C. O. Alley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **61**, 2921 (1988).
- [12] For a more recent experiment see D. Fattal, K. Inoue, J. Vuckovic, C. Santori, G. S. Solomon, and Y. Yamamoto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 037903 (2004).
- [13] M. Żukowski, A. Zeilinger, and M. Horne, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 2564 (1997).
- [14] D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, M. Daniell, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 1345 (1999).
- [15] X. Zou, K. Pahlke, and W. Mathis, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 014102 (2002).
- [16] X.-B. Wang, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042304 (2003).
- [17] Y. Sagi, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042320 (2003).
- [18] J. Fiurasek, S. Massar, and N. J. Cerf, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042325 (2003).
- [19] G. J. Pryde and A. G. White, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 052315 (2003).
- [20] P. Törmä and S. Stenholm, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 4853 (1995).
- [21] P. Törmä, *Phys. Rev. Lett* **81**, 2185 (1998).
- [22] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062314 (2000).
- [23] The reason for not simplifying the matrices is that the following equations provide the motivation for the proof of the general case in Section IV.
- [24] In the following we mark normalised states with the $\hat{\cdot}$ symbol.
- [25] M. Bourennane, M. Eibl, S. Gaertner, C. Kurtsiefer, A. Cabello, and H. Weinfurter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 107901 (2004).
- [26] A. Sen(De), U. Sen, M. Wieśniak, D. Kaszlikowski, and M. Żukowski, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 062306 (2003).
- [27] V. Bužek and M. Hillery, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 1844 (1996).
- [28] R. A. Horn and C. R. Johnson, *Matrix Analysis*, Cambridge University Press (1985).