

# On the distribution of 1550-nm photon pairs efficiently generated using a periodically poled lithium niobate waveguide

Shigehiko Mori, Jonas Söderholm, Naoto Namekata, Shuichiro Inoue

*Institute of Quantum Science, Nihon University, 1-8 Kanda-Surugadai,  
Chiyoda-ku, Tokyo 101-8308, Japan*

---

## Abstract

We report on the generation of photon pairs in the 1550-nm band suitable for long-distance fiber-optic quantum key distribution. The photon pairs were generated in a periodically poled lithium niobate waveguide with a high conversion-efficiency. Using a pulsed semiconductor laser with a pulse rate of 800 kHz and a maximum average pump power of 50  $\mu\text{W}$ , we obtained a coincidence rate of 600  $\text{s}^{-1}$ . Our measurements are in agreement with a Poissonian photon-pair distribution, as is expected from a comparison of the coherence time of the pump and of the detected photons. An average of 0.9 photon pairs per pulse was obtained.

*Key words:* Photon-pair generation, Spontaneous parametric down-conversion, Photon statistics

*PACS:* 42.65.Lm, 42.50.Ar, 42.65.Wi

---

## 1 Introduction

Efficient generation of photon pairs in the 1550-nm fiber-optic communication band would be useful for practical realizations of quantum communication, for example, long-distance fiber-optic quantum key distribution (QKD) [1,2]. Photon pairs are usually generated at visible wavelengths using the process of spontaneous parametric down conversion (SPDC) in second-order nonlinear bulk crystals [3]. Recently, however, photon-pair generation in the 1550-nm band has been demonstrated [4,5]. In these experiments, large-sized lasers with high power, such as Ti:sapphire lasers, were used due to the low conversion efficiency of the photon-pair sources. However, a periodically poled lithium niobate waveguide (PPLN-WG) has the potential to generate photon pairs much more efficiently than the bulk crystals previously used. This stems from

the fact that the largest nonlinear coefficient  $d_{33}$  can be utilized through quasi-phase-matching (QPM), and that the guiding structure permits confinement of the pump beam over the entire interaction length. Therefore, small, handy, and low-cost semiconductor lasers can be used in combination with these nonlinear waveguides [6,7,8,9].

In most quantum information applications, the probability for generating simultaneous multiple photon pairs must be kept low. It is therefore important to investigate the photon-pair distribution when characterizing a source. Direct measurements of photon-number distributions have recently been demonstrated using a visible-light photon counter [10] and a superconducting transition-edge sensor [11]. However, these measurements were carried out under cryogenic conditions and are too extreme to allow for common use.

In this paper, we report on efficient generation of photon pairs at 1550 nm using a PPLN-WG pumped by a pulsed semiconductor laser. By analyzing the detected single and coincidence counts as functions of the pump power, we find that our measurements are in agreement with a Poissonian photon-pair distribution. This is also found to be in agreement with a comparison of the coherence times of the pump and photon pairs.

## 2 The experimental setup

In Fig. 1, our experimental setup is schematically depicted. A 3 cm long PPLN-WG (HC Photonics) is pumped by a pulsed semiconductor laser (Pico Quant PDL 800). The laser light has a wavelength of 774 nm and is generated in  $\sim 40$  ps long pulses with a peak power of  $\sim 340$  mW and a repetition rate of 800 kHz. QPM for degenerate down-conversion at 1548 nm is obtained by heating the waveguide to 70°C, which also suppresses the photorefractive effect [6]. Both the signal and idler photon of each photon pair have the same polarization as the pump. In order to measure only the down-converted photons, the emerging light from the waveguide goes through an interference filter (IF) with a full width at half maximum (FWHM) of 30 nm centered around 1550 nm. The transmitted down-converted photons are subsequently coupled to a 50/50 single-mode fiber coupler (50/50 FC) before they are detected by two single-photon detectors (D1 and D2). The detectors are InGaAs/InP avalanche photodiodes (Epitaxx EPM239BA) operated in gated passive quenching mode at -40°C [12]. A delay/pulse generator (Stanford Research Systems DG535) is used to gate the detectors. The gate pulses are  $\sim 1$  ns long and the gating rate is 800 kHz, that is, the same as the optical pulse rate. The output signals from the detectors are finally sent to a coincidence counter (Stanford Research Systems SR400). The maximum value of the coincidence counts is obtained by synchronizing the gate pulses with the optical pulses at each detector. The




Fig. 1. Schematic experimental setup. L1, L2, and L3: lenses, IF: interference filter, 50/50 FC: 50/50 single-mode fiber coupler, D1 and D2: single-photon detectors,  $S_1$ : count rate at D1,  $S_2$ : count rate at D2,  $C$ : count rate at the coincidence counter.

quantum efficiency of D1 was 25% and its dark-count probability was  $6 \times 10^{-5}$ . The corresponding values for D2 were 10% and  $4 \times 10^{-4}$ , respectively.

### 3 Photon-pair distributions

Since our detectors cannot distinguish if one or more photons make them click, the single-count rate at detector  $k$  (when neglecting dark counts) can be expressed as

$$S_k = R \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{p(m)}{2^{2m}} \sum_{n=0}^{2m} \binom{2m}{n} [1 - (1 - T\eta_k)^n], \quad (1)$$

where  $R$  is the pulse rate,  $p(m)$  denotes the probability for  $m$  photon pairs to be generated,  $T$  is the transmittivity of the optical components, and  $\eta_k$  is the detector efficiency. Similarly, the coincidence-count rate can be written as

$$C = R \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} \frac{p(m)}{2^{2m}} \sum_{n=0}^{2m} \binom{2m}{n} [1 - (1 - T\eta_1)^n][1 - (1 - T\eta_2)^{2m-n}]. \quad (2)$$

As we will describe below, the photon-pair distribution  $p(m)$  resulting from the SPDC process depends on the experimental conditions.

### 3.1 The degenerate SPDC process

It is well known that the degenerate SPDC process produces the squeezed vacuum state when no initial photons are present in the down-conversion mode. The corresponding photon-pair distribution [13] can be expressed as

$$p_{\text{sv}}(\mu, m) = \frac{(2m-1)!!\mu^m}{(2m)!!(\mu+1)^{m+1/2}}, \quad (3)$$

where  $\mu = \sinh^2 r$  is the average number of photons, and the squeezing parameter  $r$  is proportional to the electric field of the pump [14]. Assuming that the pump pulse has the same form for all pump powers, we thus obtain

$$\mu = \sinh^2 \sqrt{KP_{\text{ave}}}, \quad (4)$$

where  $K$  is a constant and  $P_{\text{ave}}$  is the average pump power. We note that  $\mu \approx KP_{\text{ave}}$  for small squeezing parameters  $r = (KP_{\text{ave}})^{1/2} \ll 1$ .

### 3.2 The nondegenerate SPDC process

With no initial photons in the signal and idler modes, the nondegenerate SPDC process produces the two-mode squeezed vacuum state. The photon-pair distribution is then thermal [15]

$$p_{\text{th}}(\mu, m) = \frac{\mu^m}{(\mu+1)^{m+1}}, \quad (5)$$

where  $\mu$  denotes the average number of photon pairs. Analogous to the degenerate case, we obtain relation (4).

### 3.3 Many distinguishable SPDC processes

If we instead assume that the detected photons originate from many distinguishable down-conversion processes, the photon-pair distribution can be approximated by the Poissonian distribution

$$p_{\text{poi}}(\nu, m) = \frac{\nu^m e^{-\nu}}{m!}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\nu$  is the average value of the total number of photon pairs generated by a single pump pulse [16]. As there are many distinguishable processes, the average photon-pair number in each of them is usually small ( $\mu \ll 1$ ), and therefore proportional to average pump power. For both degenerate and nondegenerate SPDC, we then get  $\nu \approx \mathcal{K}P_{\text{ave}}$ , where  $\mathcal{K}$  is a constant.

### 3.4 Experimental results and curve fitting

The effects of losses are slightly involved due to the fact that photon pairs are generated throughout the waveguide. The optical pump power in the waveguide should be well described by  $P(x) = P_0 \exp(-L_p x)$ , where  $P_0$  is the optical power coupled into the guided mode, and  $L_p$  and  $x$  are the loss and propagation distance in the waveguide, respectively. As discussed above, the average number of generated photon pairs is proportional to the pump power when  $\mu \ll 1$ . Denoting the corresponding constant as  $\kappa$  and the length of the waveguide as  $d$ , these assumptions give us the following expression for the average number of photons generated by a single pump pulse

$$N_{\text{gen}} = 2\kappa P_0 \int_0^d e^{-L_p x} dx = \frac{2\kappa P_0 (1 - e^{-L_p d})}{L_p}. \quad (7)$$

Losses for the down-converted light will split photon pairs and make the photon distribution consist of both even and odd numbers of photons. Using the notation  $L_{\text{dc}}$  for this loss in the waveguide, the average number of photons reaching the back facet at  $x = d$  is found to be

$$N_{\text{facet}} = 2\kappa P_0 \int_0^d e^{-L_p x - L_{\text{dc}}(d-x)} dx = \frac{2\kappa P_0 (e^{-L_p d} - e^{-L_{\text{dc}} d})}{L_{\text{dc}} - L_p}, \quad (8)$$

where we have assumed  $L_{\text{dc}} \neq L_p$ . The length of our waveguide is  $d = 3$  cm and its losses are approximately  $\mathcal{L}_p = 0.7$  dB/cm and  $\mathcal{L}_{\text{dc}} = 0.35$  dB/cm, according to the manufacturer. Since the losses expressed in decibel are related to the losses in the equations above according to  $10L = \mathcal{L} \ln 10$ , we find the effective internal transmittivity to be  $T_{\text{int}} = N_{\text{facet}}/N_{\text{gen}} \approx 0.880$ . The facet is antireflection coated for 1550 nm, and the corresponding waveguide-air transmittivity is  $T_{\text{AR}} \approx 0.99$ .

In an independent measurement, using a laser with a wavelength of 1550 nm (Hamamatsu PLP-01), the total transmittivity of the optical components after the waveguide was found to be  $T_{\text{ext}} \approx 0.17$ . The obtained overall transmittivity for the down-converted photons in our setup is thus  $T = T_{\text{int}} T_{\text{AR}} T_{\text{ext}} \approx 0.148$ .




Fig. 2. Experimental and theoretical count rates. In a), the circles and squares correspond to the measured single-count rates at the two detectors for different pump powers. In b), the triangles represent the measured coincidence-count rates. The dark counts have been subtracted from the experimental data. The dotted, dashed, and solid lines are the theoretical curves for a single degenerate SPDC process, a single nondegenerate SPDC process, and many distinguishable SPDC processes, respectively. Hence, the dashed lines correspond to a thermal photon-pair distribution, and the solid lines to a Poissonian one.

Using the experimental parameters  $R = 800\,000$ ,  $T = 0.148$ ,  $\eta_1 = 0.25$ , and  $\eta_2 = 0.10$  together with any of the photon-pair distributions (3), (5), or (6), the corresponding theoretical curves given by Eqs. (1) and (2) can be fitted to the experimental data by varying the unknown parameter  $K$  or  $\mathcal{K}$ . We have used relative weighting for determining the best curve fits. Hence, we have minimized expressions of the form  $\sum_k (\mathcal{E}_k - \mathcal{T}_k)^2 / \mathcal{E}_k^2$ , where  $\mathcal{E}_k$  and  $\mathcal{T}_k$  denote the experimental and theoretical value, respectively, for a given pump power. In this way, the single-count and coincidence-count errors can be treated simultaneously, even though their values are very different. For single degenerate and nondegenerate processes, we obtain the values  $K = 23.2 \text{ mW}^{-1}$  and  $K = 14.4 \text{ mW}^{-1}$ , respectively. Assuming a Poissonian photon-pair distribution, the errors are minimized for  $\mathcal{K} = 18.5 \text{ mW}^{-1}$ .

The experimental results and the curve fits are plotted in Fig. 2. Since the measured count rates were far below saturation of the detectors, we have simply subtracted the dark-count rates  $\delta_1 = 48 \text{ s}^{-1}$  and  $\delta_2 = 320 \text{ s}^{-1}$  from the raw single-count data to obtain  $S_1$  and  $S_2$ , respectively. By measuring the coincidence counts when one of the two beams after the beam splitter was blocked, the dark-count-induced coincidence rate  $(S_1\delta_2 + S_2\delta_1 + \delta_1\delta_2)/R$  was experimentally verified. Subtracting it from the raw coincidence data thus gave us the true coincidence-count rate  $C$  presented in Fig. 2. The Poissonian photon-pair distribution is seen to fit well to the experimental data. The best curve fits for a single degenerate and a single nondegenerate SPDC process are considerably worse, the former in particular. The reasons for these differences

will be discussed below.

### 3.5 Spectra and coherence times

The Poissonian photon-pair distribution can be theoretically justified by comparing the coherence time of the pump  $\tau_p$  with that of the down-converted light  $\tau_{dc}$ , as was recently discussed by de Riedmatten *et al.* [16]. We expect the coherence length of the laser to be close to the pulse length, that is,  $\tau_p \approx 40$  ps. The generated photon pairs on the other hand, have a wide spectrum and the coherence length of the detected photons should therefore be determined by the 30-nm filter. We here follow the reasoning in Ref. [16], but offer some more detailed arguments. Let us assume that the spectrum of the light transmitted through the filter can be approximated with a Gaussian function, whose FWHM is given by the corresponding wavelengths of the filter. For a general filter, these wavelengths are given by  $\lambda_{1,2} = \lambda_c \pm B/2$ , where  $\lambda_c$  and  $B$  are the filter's central wavelength and FWHM bandwidth, respectively. Expressed in the angular frequency  $\omega = 2\pi f$ , the spectrum is thus assumed to satisfy

$$S(\omega) \propto \exp \left\{ -\frac{[\omega - \pi(f_1 + f_2)]^2 \ln 2}{\pi^2(f_1 - f_2)^2} \right\}, \quad (9)$$

where  $f_k = c/\lambda_k$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , and  $c$  is the speed of light in vacuum. Assuming that the down-converted light pulses are transform limited, the temporal FWHM of the pulse's intensity  $W_t$ , and the FWHM of the spectrum  $W_f$ , are related according to  $W_t W_f = (2 \ln 2)/\pi$ . Approximating the coherence length of the pulses with the FWHM of their intensity, we thus arrive at

$$\tau_{dc} = \frac{(4\lambda_c^2 - B^2) \ln 2}{2\pi c B}. \quad (10)$$

Usually  $B \ll \lambda_c$ , in which case we recover the relation  $\tau_{dc} \approx 0.44\lambda_c^2/cB$  given in Ref. [16].

In Fig. 3, we have plotted the coherence time as a function of the filter bandwidth for different central wavelengths of the filter. As  $\lambda_c = 1548$  nm and  $B = 30$  nm for our filter, the coherence time is found to be  $\tau_{dc} \approx 118$  fs. We thus have  $\tau_p \gg \tau_{dc}$ , which results in a Poissonian photon-pair distribution [16]. We also note that since the detected down-converted light has a spectral width of 30 nm, which is considerably wider than that of the pump, the observed process cannot be degenerate. In light of this, it appears natural that a single nondegenerate process gives a better curve fit than a single degenerate one, as found in Fig. 2.




Fig. 3. The coherence time set by the filter bandwidth when the transmitted spectrum is assumed to be Gaussian. The three curves correspond to filters with central wavelengths of 400 nm, 800 nm, and 1550 nm, respectively.

According to the plot in Fig. 3, we can obtain  $\tau_p \approx \tau_{dc}$  with the present source, if a very narrow filter with a bandwidth of about one tenth of a nanometer is used. We would then expect the photon-pair distribution to be given by a single degenerate or nondegenerate SPDC process, which would increase the ratio between coincidence and single counts. However, due to the use of such a narrow filter, the count rates would then be much smaller. Also, even if the filter is centered around the frequency for degenerate down-conversion, the photon distribution may be affected by the spectral width of the pump in this case.

#### 4 Comparisons and improvements

In Table 1, our experimental results obtained at the maximum average pump power of 50  $\mu$ W are presented. Here,  $S_{ave} = (S_1 + S_2)/2$  is the average single-count rate for the two detectors, and  $P_{peak}$  denotes the peak pump power. For comparison, results of previous studies carried out at 1550 nm are also listed. Semiconductor and Ti:sapphire pump lasers have been abbreviated as SC and Ti:S, respectively. The photon-pair sources used in the earlier experiments were: a PPLN-WG [9], four wave mixing (FWM) in a dispersion-shifted fiber (DSF) [4], a periodically poled silica fiber (PPSF) [5], and a PPLN bulk crystal [17]. Since the contribution to the maximum coincidence-count rate from independent photon pairs and dark counts is unknown in the experiments with a cw pump [5,9], the accidental coincidence-count rate (measured with a long delay between the two detector signals) has been subtracted to obtain the values of  $C$  in these cases. As a simple measure of the efficiency of the different setups, we have calculated the probability of a coincidence count



Table 1

Comparison of the present experiment and previous studies in the 1550-nm band.

Source	PPLN-WG	PPLN-WG [9]	FWM in DSF [4]	PPSF [5]	Bulk PPLN [17]
Pump	SC (pulsed)	SC (cw)	Ti:S (pulsed)	Ti:S (cw)	SC (pulsed)
$P_{\text{ave}}$	0.05 mW	0.15 mW	2 mW	600 mW	0.05 mW
$P_{\text{peak}}$	0.34 W	NA	9 W	NA	0.34 W
$R$	0.8 MHz	2 MHz	0.588 MHz	NA	0.8 MHz
$\eta_1, \eta_2$	25%, 10%	19.0%, 17.3%	25%, 20%	1.7%, 1.4%	25%, 25%
$S_{\text{ave}}$	17 000 s <sup>-1</sup>	24 000 s <sup>-1</sup>	18 000 s <sup>-1</sup>	275 000 s <sup>-1</sup> <sup>a</sup>	88 s <sup>-1</sup>
$C$	600 s <sup>-1</sup>	800 s <sup>-1</sup> <sup>b</sup>	1000 s <sup>-1</sup>	500 s <sup>-1</sup> <sup>b</sup>	0.5 s <sup>-1</sup>
$C/P_{\text{ave}}R$	15 W <sup>-1</sup>	2.7 W <sup>-1</sup>	0.85 W <sup>-1</sup>	NA	0.012 W <sup>-1</sup>

<sup>a</sup> Reported in Ref. [9].<sup>b</sup> Accidental coincidence-count rate subtracted.

divided by the average pump power and the repetition rate in the bottom line of Table 1. Due to the high conversion efficiency of the PPLN-WG and the high peak intensity of the pulsed laser, the highest value is obtained in the present experiment. However, the coincidence rate is low for a practical QKD system. Assuming an average of  $\nu = 0.1$  generated photon pairs per pulse, which is the value most frequently adopted in QKD experiments, and obtained at a pump power of  $P_{\text{ave}} = 5.4 \mu\text{W}$  in the present experiment, the resulting coincidence rate is only  $C = 26 \text{ s}^{-1}$ .

There are several ways to increase the useful rate of coincidences with current technology. First of all, detector D2 has an efficiency that is considerable lower than that of D1. It is, of course, possible to have two detectors with the higher efficiency.

Secondly, the repetition rate can be increased. In our experiment, we were limited to 800 kHz by the delay/pulse generator. For repetition rates exceeding 1 MHz, the effects of afterpulsing have to be considered [12], but a repetition rate of 10 MHz with negligible afterpulse probability has recently been achieved using discharge-pulse counting [18].

Thirdly, it is possible to improve the coupling of the down-converted light into the single-mode fiber [19]. In this first experiment, the optics was not optimized and resulted in an estimated fiber-coupling efficiency of only 25%.

Fourthly, the useful coincidence rate can be increased by using a QPM device that generates nondegenerate photon pairs, whose two photons are of easily separable frequencies [20]. As our photon pairs are close to degenerate,

we have to perform beam splitting in order to simultaneously detect the two constituting photons. This reduces the number of coincidence counts by half compared to the distinctly nondegenerate case, in which the photons can be separated efficiently by a prism, dichroic mirror, or wavelength division multiplexing module. Moreover, with an appropriate QPM device, the signal and idler photons can have very different wavelengths. If the signal wavelength is short enough, a highly efficient Si-based detector with low dark count can be used to detect the signal photons, and thereby the signal-to-noise ratio can be improved drastically [21,22,23].

Using InGaAs/InP detectors and the improvements above, the values  $\eta_2 = 0.25$ ,  $R = 10$  MHz, and  $T_{\text{ext}} = 0.50$  are feasible. If we further assume that no beam splitting is necessary, the coincidence rate becomes  $C \approx 14\,000\text{ s}^{-1}$  as the average number of generated photon pairs is  $\nu = 0.1$ .

## 5 Conclusions

We have shown that a PPLN-WG is a highly efficient source of photon pairs at 1550 nm. In the present experiment, the coincidence rate was found to be too low for a practical QKD system, but we have argued that a reasonable rate is within reach of present technology. With these improvements the PPLN-WG should be a suitable source for long-distance QKD system, since it can be pumped by a cheap semiconductor laser, and light at the single-photon level can be generated in the minimum-loss window of common optical fibers. Our measurements also suggest that the down-converted light can be described by a Poissonian photon-pair distribution, which is in accordance with theory. Using the value  $\mathcal{K} = 18.5\text{ mW}^{-1}$  obtained through curve fitting, we can deduce that an average number of photon pairs per pulse of  $\nu \approx \mathcal{K}P_{\text{ave}} = 0.9$  was achieved with a pump power of  $P_{\text{ave}} = 50\ \mu\text{W}$ .

## Acknowledgements

This work was partly supported by the National Institute of Information and Communications Technology.

## References

- [1] C.H. Bennett, G. Brassard, Quantum cryptography: Public key distribution and coin tossing, in: Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Computers,

- Systems, and Signal Processing, Institute of Electrical and Electronics Engineers, New York, 1984, pp. 175-179.
- [2] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, H. Zbinden, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* 74 (2002) 145-195.
  - [3] P.G. Kwiat, K. Mattle, H. Weinfurter, A. Zeilinger, A.V. Sergienko, Y. Shih, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 75 (1995) 4337-4341.
  - [4] M. Fiorentino, P.L. Voss, J.E. Sharping, P. Kumar, *IEEE Photonics Technol. Lett.* 14 (2002) 983-985.
  - [5] G. Bonfrate, V. Pruneri, P.G. Kazansky, P. Tapster, J.G. Rarity, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 75 (1999) 2356-2358.
  - [6] S. Tanzilli, H. De Riedmatten, W. Tittel, H. Zbinden, P. Baldi, M. De Micheli, D.B. Ostrowsky, N. Gisin, *Electron. Lett.* 37 (2001) 26-28.
  - [7] K. Sanaka, K. Kawahara, T. Kuga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 86 (2001) 5620-5623.
  - [8] A. Yoshizawa, R. Kaji, H. Tsuchida, *Electron. Lett.* 39 (2003) 621-622.
  - [9] A. Yoshizawa, R. Kaji, H. Tsuchida, *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.* 42 (2003) 5652-5653.
  - [10] E. Waks, E. Diamanti, B.C. Sanders, S.D. Bartlett, Y. Yamamoto, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 92 (2004) 113602/1-4.
  - [11] A.J. Miller, S.W. Nam, J.M. Martinis, A.V. Sergienko, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* 83 (2003) 791-793.
  - [12] N. Namekata, Y. Makino, S. Inoue, *Opt. Lett.* 27 (2002) 954-956.
  - [13] H.P. Yuen, *Phys. Rev. A* 13 (1976) 2226-2243.
  - [14] M.O. Scully, M.S. Zubairy, *Quantum Optics*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1997, Chap. 16.
  - [15] B.R. Mollow, R.J. Glauber, *Phys. Rev.* 160 (1967) 1076-1096.
  - [16] H. de Riedmatten, V. Scarani, I. Marcikic, A. Acín, W. Tittel, H. Zbinden, N. Gisin, *J. Mod. Opt.* 51 (2004) 1637-1649.
  - [17] S. Mori, N. Namekata, Y. Takamura, S. Inoue, Generation of correlated photon-pair in the telecom wavelength, in: *Proceedings of the Seventh Quantum Information Technology Symposium*, IEICE, Tokyo, 2002, pp. 145-148 (in Japanese).
  - [18] A. Yoshizawa, R. Kaji, H. Tsuchida, *Jpn. J. Appl. Phys.* 43 (2004) L735-L737.
  - [19] K. Banaszek, A.B. U'Ren, I.A. Walmsley, *Opt. Lett.* 26 (2001) 1367-1369.
  - [20] N. Namekata, S. Mori, S. Inoue, submitted.
  - [21] E.J. Mason, M.A. Albota, F. König, F.N.C. Wong, *Opt. Lett.* 27 (2002) 2115-2117.

- [22] M. Pelton, P. Marsden, D. Ljunggren, M. Tengner, A. Karlsson, A. Fragemann, C. Canalias, F. Laurell, *Opt. Express* 12 (2004) 3573-3580.
- [23] S. Fasel, O. Alibart, S. Tanzilli, P. Baldi, A. Beveratos, N. Gisin, H. Zbinden, *New J. Phys.* 6 (2004) 163/1-11.