

QUANTUM ILLUMINATION WITH NON-GAUSSIAN THREE PHOTONS STATES

Fraunhofer Institute for High Frequency Physics and Radar Techniques FHR
 Department of Mathematics, University of Primorska
 Ricardo Gallego Torromé¹

ABSTRACT. It is shown that quantum illumination with three photons non-Gaussian states, where the signal is described by a two photons state and the idler is described by a one photon state, can outperform in sensitivity standard Gaussian quantum illumination in a high noisy background. In particular, there is a reduction in the probability due to an increase in the probability of error exponent by a factor $1/N_S$, where N_S is the average number of photons per mode of the signal state.

Keywords: Quantum Radar, Quantum Illumination, Quantum Enhancement, Non-Gaussian states.

1. QUANTUM ILLUMINATION

Quantum illumination is a quantum sensing protocol that exploits the benefits of inherited quantum correlations from entanglement to harvest an improvement in detection sensitivity [1, 2] or target detection accuracy [3]. Quantum illumination is also a prominent example of quantum protocol with benefits against equivalent classical strategies, even if the initial entanglement is lost due to losses and background noise, making it likely to be implemented for technological applications without the concerns that plague other quantum protocols based upon quantum phenomena.

The standard protocol of quantum illumination works according to the following scheme. From a source of entangled photon pairs and for each pair, one of the photons (signal photon) is sent to explore a region of spacetime, while the partner photon (idler) is kept alive in the laboratory system. When the return photon arrives to the receiver, a joint measurement received photon/idler states is performed. In situations of high noise background, quantum illumination with Gaussian quantum illumination of Tan et al. offers an advantage over coherent illumination of $6dB$ in probability of error over the equivalent coherent state illumination [2]. It was showed that, quantum illumination with two mode squeezed vacuum states, when idler and signal beams have the same intensities, provides an advantage of $6dB$ over coherent light illumination with the same characteristics of frequency and intensity beam [2, 4]. Furthermore, theoretical analysis have revealed that the TMVS quantum illumination provides the optimal strategy to minimize the probability of error [11, 12]. However, such studies limit their scope to two photon states.

Quantum illumination protocol is applicable at optical and microwave frequency domains [7] and several experimental demonstrations have confirmed the theoretical advantage over coherent light [5, 6, 8, 9, 10].

The scheme of quantum illumination with multiple entangled photons was proposed in [15], see Fig. 1 for the case under study of three-photon states. From a source of three photon entangled states, two signal photons are sent to explore a region of spacetime where a possible target can be located, while the companion third photon is kept alive in the laboratory frame as idler photon. When the return pair of photons return, a joint measurement together with the idler photon is performed. Note that a detection is declared if two simultaneous received photons are detected and correlated with the idler photon.

In ref. [15] quantum illumination with multiple entangled states was analyzed for the case of a direct generalization of Lloyd's quantum illumination [1]. Such models, although of interest to conceptualize the main ideas of quantum illumination, are less interesting from a more practical point of view, because coherent illumination can offer a better performance [16] and because, as in the case of atmospheric applications, the conditions assumed by the models, do not hold in generic realistic situations.

Date: November 28, 2023.

¹Email: rigato39@gmail.com




FIGURE 1. **Quantum illumination with three entangled photons.** Three photons correlated in time and in frequency are generated. Two photons (signal photons) are sent to explore a region where a target could be located; one photon is either retained or recorded (idler photon). The two signal photons are simultaneously measured in a joint measurement with the idler photon.

The aim of the present paper is to describe the sensitivity properties of certain generalization of quantum illumination that potentially overcome the applicability loopholes of the theory described in [15]. Recent advances in three-photon entangled states generation based on non-Gaussian states whose beams reach intensities comparable to the generation of two-photon states, has opened the possibility to use non-gaussian entanglement [17]. Therefore, it is natural to ask whether the three photons states investigated in [17] can be used for quantum illumination. In particular, we will consider in this paper if quantum illumination with such states non-Gaussian states have advantage with respect to standard Gaussian quantum illumination in terms of probability of errors. Our result is that, similarly as the case studied in [15] showed an improvement with respect to Lloyd's protocol, the three-photon entangled states that phenomenologically describe [17], the probability of error can be significantly smaller than for Gaussian quantum illumination [2]. Indeed, in a reduced scope scenario of very high noise compared with the reflectivity of the target, the reduction in probability of error exponent is equal to the probability of error exponent of Tan et al. model but multiplied by factor $1/N_S$. This is translated as a reduction in the probability of error, that for the conditions of low N_S , can decrease the probability of error dramatically.

2. NON-GAUSSIAN THREE PHOTONS STATES AND QUANTUM ILLUMINATION

The process of generation of three-photon entangled states that we consider here is a four wave mixing process in the form of a three-photon spontaneous parametric down conversion in the microwave domain, producing tri-squeezed states [17]. After averaging out highly oscillating terms, the effective interacting Hamiltonian for the process in question is of the form

$$(2.1) \quad \hat{H}_I^3 = \hbar g_0 \left(a_1 a_2 a_3 + a_1^\dagger a_2^\dagger a_3^\dagger \right),$$

where g_0 is a constant. Specifically, we are interested in three-photon spontaneous parametric down conversion to multiple modes with frequencies ω_1 , ω_2 and ω_3 . Such processes were experimentally realized by means of a *meandered design* SQUID, that allowed a reduction of the pump intensity required for the three-photon conversion up to three order magnitude than in previous experiments, a critical factor to enhance the required conversion.

The initial state associated to the pump flux is described by a thermal state. After the interaction is applied and up to third order in gt , the system is described by the state

$$(2.2) \quad |\widetilde{\psi}\rangle = \left(1 - \frac{1}{2}(gt)^2 \right) |000\rangle -igt |111\rangle.$$

The state (2.2) provides an effective theoretical description of the phenomenology observed [17]. Hence we adopt this state for our considerations. Assuming that $\theta := gt$ is small, a condition that is compatible

with the above mentioned experiments, the parameter θ^2 is approximately equal to the average photon number per mode of the signal photons n_s is given by the expression

$$(2.3) \quad n_s := \langle \widetilde{\psi} | \hat{a}_1^\dagger \hat{a}_1 | \widetilde{\psi} \rangle = \theta^2 + \mathcal{O}(\theta^3).$$

We can re-cast the state $|\widetilde{\psi}\rangle$ in a close form. Up to third order in θ , the state (2.2) is equivalent to

$$|\psi\rangle = \cos(\theta)|000\rangle - \imath \sin(\theta)|111\rangle,$$

that can be succinctly re-cast as

$$(2.4) \quad |\psi\rangle = \mathbf{U}|000\rangle,$$

where the unitary transformation $\mathbf{U} : V \rightarrow V$ in the 2-dimensional space V spanned by $\{|000\rangle, |111\rangle\}$ is determined by the matrix

$$U := \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta) & -\imath \sin(\theta) \\ -\imath \sin(\theta) & \cos(\theta) \end{pmatrix}.$$

With this notation, the density matrix for the idler-signal system is of the form

$$(2.5) \quad \rho_\psi(t) = \mathbf{U}|000\rangle\langle 000|\mathbf{U}^\dagger.$$

The idler state, when separated from the signal and if not altered, takes the form

$$(2.6) \quad |I\rangle_1 = U|0\rangle_1.$$

that corresponds to the partial trace of $\rho_\psi(t)$ with respect to the signal photon subspaces.

Finally, the back-ground noise is modeled by thermal states. For the case that we are discussing, the back-ground state is the product of two thermal states, one that corresponds to the photon with frequency ω_1 and the other to the photon with frequency ω_2 . The thermal state is of the form

$$(2.7) \quad \rho_{th} = \sum_{n=0}^{+\infty} \frac{\bar{n}^n}{(\bar{n} + 1)^{n+1}} |n\rangle\langle n|$$

where \bar{n} is the average number of photons per mode as is a function of the frequency ω . Since in the case that we are considering there are two simultaneous photons in the signal state, one needs to consider the product state $\tilde{\rho}_B = \rho_{th}(\omega_2) \otimes \rho_{th}(\omega_3)$. When $\bar{n} \gg 1$, this state can be expressed as $\rho_{th} \simeq I_n/\bar{n}$. Thus the state describing the back-ground noise will be of the form,

$$(2.8) \quad \rho_B \approx \frac{I}{\bar{n}_2} \otimes \frac{I}{\bar{n}_3}, \quad I = \sum_{k=0}^{+\infty} |k\rangle\langle k|.$$

where \bar{n}_2 and \bar{n}_3 are the average numbers of photons per mode for the corresponding frequencies. Note the expression for ρ_B in (2.8) is a convenient approximation for $\rho_{th} \otimes \rho_{th}$. In order to have a consistent expression for the density it needs to be normalized to have trace equal to 1. Not being directly normalized in the full infinitesimal Hilbert space of all possible modes, I/\bar{n} is a multiple of a resolution of the unity. The substitution of $\tilde{\rho}_B$ by ρ_B is very close to 1 and being multiplicative of the form $(1 + \alpha(\bar{n})/\bar{n})$, with $\alpha(\bar{n})/\bar{n} \rightarrow 0$ when $\bar{n} \rightarrow +\infty$, it will be approximated to 1 in our considerations.

3. PROBABILITY OF ERROR AND COMPARISON WITH TWO MODES GAUSSIAN QUANTUM ILLUMINATION

The main task is to discriminate between two equally plausible situations, one where the target is absent, a possibility that is described by the state ρ_0 , and the second situation corresponding to the presence of a target, a possibility represented by the state ρ_1 . One standard resolution of this problem makes use the quantum Chernoff bound. Let us assume a *positive operator valued measure* (POVM), that consists in this case of two operators E_0, E_1 such that $E_0 + E_1 = \mathbb{I}$ and $E_i \geq 0$. Given two possible quantum states with corresponding a priori assigned probabilities π_0, π_1 , the probability of error is given by the expression

$$(3.1) \quad P_{err} = \pi_0 Tr[E_1 \hat{\rho}_0] + \pi_1 Tr[E_0 \hat{\rho}_1].$$

The basic problem to solve is to understand how the error probability behaves for M experiments where the state can be either in state $\hat{\rho}_0$ (hypothesis H_0) or in the state $\hat{\rho}_1$ (hypothesis H_1). The resolution in the asymptotic case of M determines the quantum Chernoff's theorem, that for the case under consideration

implies that the probability of error of making a binary decision after M large independent measurements is determined by Chernoff's type bound,

$$(3.2) \quad P_{err}(M) \leq \exp(-M C_q),$$

where the exponent is given by the expression

$$(3.3) \quad C_q = \lim_{M \rightarrow \infty} -\frac{\log(P_{err}(M))}{M}.$$

In the limit $M \rightarrow +\infty$, the bound is saturated and one has an equality.

It is useful to reformulate the above Quantum Chernoff's type bound as follows. The probability of error $P_{err}(M)$ is bounded as

$$P_{err}(M) \leq \frac{1}{2} \exp(-\alpha M),$$

where

$$\alpha = -\log \left(\inf_{s \in [0,1]} \text{Tr}(\rho_0^s \rho_1^{1-s}) \right)$$

This limit can be re-written as

$$(3.4) \quad P_{err}(M) \leq \frac{1}{2} \left[\inf_{0 \in [0,1]} Q_s \right],$$

where

$$(3.5) \quad Q_s := \text{Tr}(\rho_0^s \rho_1^{1-s}).$$

These expressions for the quantum Chernoff's bounds and specially the expression (3.4), is the general result used for any scheme of quantum illumination. In particular, it used to evaluate the probability of errors in Lloyd's quantum illumination [1] and for Gaussian quantum illumination [14, 2].

In Gaussian quantum illumination, a simplified form the Chernoff's bound consist to the evaluation of the case $s = 1/2$ (Bhattacharyya's bound),

$$(3.6) \quad P_B(M) := \frac{1}{2} \left[\text{Tr}(\rho_0^{1/2} \rho_1^{1/2}) \right]^M.$$

This expression is formally easier to determine, but it leads to a bound $P_{err} \leq P_B(M)$ which is weaker than Chernoff's bound (3.4). However, in the limit when ρ_1 and ρ_0 are very close to each other in the sense that for large M , P_B provides an estimate for the probability of error very close to Chernoff's bound [14]. Since P_B is theoretically not smaller than Chernoff's bound, to show that non-Gaussian quantum illumination presents advantage in sensitivity with respect to two mode Gaussian quantum illumination, it is enough to show that the Bahttacharyya's bound (3.6) is smaller than Chernoff's bound for Gaussian quantum illumination in Tan et. al theory.

3.1. Bhattacharyya's bound for three modes quantum illumination. In the domain when $\theta \ll 1$ and $\bar{n}_2, \bar{n}_3 \gg 1$ the Bhattacharyya's bound can be computed analytically. In order to make the argument more elegant and less cumbersome we assume that $\bar{n}_2 \approx \bar{n}_3$ that we denoted by \bar{n} . We differentiate two scenarios. When the target is not there (Hypothesis H_0), the state describing the idler and the received signal is of the form

$$(3.7) \quad \rho_0 = (U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes \frac{I}{\bar{n}} \otimes \frac{I}{\bar{n}},$$

where the first two factors are attached to the signal photons, while the third factor describes the idler photon.

In the case when target is there, the state at the receiver is a random mix between idler-signal and idler-background states, the mix determined by the reflectivity coefficient η . If the signal is not affected by the scattering with the target, then the state is of the form

$$(3.8) \quad \rho_1 = (1 - \eta)\rho_0 + \eta\rho_\psi.$$

This state can be expressed in a compact way,

$$\rho_1 = (U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes (1 - \eta) \frac{I}{\bar{n}} \otimes \frac{I}{\bar{n}} + \eta \mathbf{U}|000\rangle\langle 000|\mathbf{U}^\dagger.$$

For the estimation of upper bounds of the probability of error, in particular, the Bhattacharyya's bound, it is enough to calculate the trace $[Tr(\rho_0^{1/2} \rho_1^{1/2})]$. For Gaussian quantum illumination, well established calculational kit-tool have been developed [14]. But in the case on hand in the present paper, that are non-Gaussian states, the Gaussian theory as developed in [14] is not applicable. Therefore, we have proceed to evaluate the trace from first principles. The details are discussed in *Appendix A*. Disregarding terms proportional to $1/\bar{n}^2$ with respect to terms proportional to η , but still adopting the condition $\eta \ll 1$, the trace $Tr[\rho_0^{1/2} \rho_1^{1/2}]$ is of the form

$$Tr[\rho_0^{1/2} \rho_1^{1/2}] = 1 - \frac{\eta^{1/2}}{\bar{n}} + \mathcal{O}(\theta^2 \eta^{1/2}).$$

The probability of error for M independent identical experiments using three photons non-Gaussian states takes the form

$$(3.9) \quad P_{err}^{3\gamma}(M) \leq \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{M\eta^{1/2}}{\bar{n}}\right),$$

that besides the above conditions, is approximately valid disregarding terms of order $\frac{1}{\bar{n}^2}$ or higher, in the regime where $\bar{n} \gg 1$, $\eta \ll 1$, $\theta \ll 1$ and $1/\bar{n}^2 \ll \eta$. Remarkably, the probability of error is independent of the average number per mode $n_s = \theta^2$.

We aim to compare the bound (3.9) for non-Gaussian quantum illumination with three photons states with the corresponding bounds for the probability of error for Gaussian quantum illumination in a noisy background regime where $\bar{n} \gg 1$ under the conditions of [2]. Recall that the theoretical probability of error is in this case such that

$$(3.10) \quad P_{err}^{2\gamma}(M) \leq \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{M\kappa N_S}{\bar{n}}\right).$$

where κ is the emitter-to-target-to-receiver transitivity that we identify with $\eta^{1/2}$. This expression is valid in the regime where $0 < \kappa \ll 1$, $N_S \ll 1$ and $N_B \ll 1$. To compare the probability of non-Gaussian quantum illumination with three modes with the probability of error of Gaussian illumination we start identifying the identify $n_s = \theta^2$ with N_S . This is reasonable when the signal beam of the three photon states is characterized by the average number state $n_s = \theta^2$, while in Tan et al. the state is characterized by N_S , the average number per mode m . If we assume these identifications, then we have

$$P_{err}^{3\gamma}(M) \leq \frac{1}{2} \exp\left(-\frac{M\kappa}{\bar{n}}\right).$$

Since $\theta \ll 1$, it is clear that $P_{err}^{3\gamma}(M) \ll P_{err}^{2\gamma}(M)$ as long as $N_S < 1$. Note that in applying (3.9) there is the supplementary restriction $1/\bar{n}^2 \ll \eta$. For fixed background, this is a constraint on the type of targets under consideration. Under this additional restriction, the regime of validity of (3.9) is compatible with the regime of validity of Tan et al. quantum illumination. Thus assuming the above identifications and under this additional restriction on the nature of the target, the probability of error exponent is increased by a factor $1/N_S$ with respect to Gaussian. For example, for the figures usually discussed in the literature [4], $N_S = 0.01$, that implies an increase of a factor 100 in the probability error exponent for non-Gaussian quantum illumination with respect to Tan et al. Gaussian quantum illumination.

4. CONCLUSION

In this paper it has been shown that for quantum illumination based upon non-Gaussian three photons entangled states of the form (2.2) there is an enhancement in sensitivity with respect to two modes Gaussian quantum illumination that is reflected in a reduction of the probability of error exponent in a factor of order $1/N_S$. This result is in the same vein as the theory developed in [15]. Given the demonstrated experimental feasibility of the three photons states with remarkably high intensities [17], it is realistic to expect the possibility of experimental demonstrations of the advantage of three mode quantum illumination with respect to Tan et al. Gaussian quantum illumination.

Acknowledgements. This work was financially supported by the Fraunhofer Institute for High Frequency Physics and Radar Techniques.

APPENDIX A. EVALUATION OF THE TRACE $Tr[\rho_0^{1/2}\rho_1^{1/2}]$.

The trace $Tr[\rho_0^{1/2}\rho_1^{1/2}]$ can be evaluated directly under certain assumptions, providing analytic, compact expressions for the probability of error detection. One key point of the calculation below is that the matrices determining ρ_0 and ρ_1 are linear combination of projector operators, except for certain operator components acting on the subspace $V = \text{span}\{|000\rangle, |111\rangle\}$ that are not projectors and that are related with the entanglement of the system.

For the square root of ρ_0 we find the expression

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_0^{1/2} &= (\cos^2 \theta |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sin^2 \theta |1\rangle\langle 1| - \imath \sin \theta \cos \theta |1\rangle\langle 0| + \imath \cos \theta \sin \theta |0\rangle\langle 1|) \otimes \\ &\otimes \frac{1}{\bar{n}} \left(|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1| + \sum_{k=2}^{+\infty} |k\rangle\langle k| \right) \otimes \left(|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1| + \sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right), \end{aligned}$$

where for the first factor we have used that $(U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger)^{1/2} = \pm U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger$ and taking the positive sign. In the subsequent calculations we will choose the positive sign in the square root.

The evaluation of $\rho_1^{1/2}$ is more involved. We first re-cast ρ_1 in a convenient way,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &= \cos^2 \theta \left(\frac{(1-\eta)}{\bar{n}^2} + \eta \right) |000\rangle\langle 000| + \sin^2 \theta \left(\frac{(1-\eta)}{\bar{n}^2} + \eta \right) |111\rangle\langle 111| - \\ &- \imath \eta \cos \theta \sin \theta |111\rangle\langle 000| + \imath \eta \sin \theta \cos \theta |000\rangle\langle 111| + \\ &+ \frac{(1-\eta)}{\bar{n}^2} (\sin^2 \theta (|100\rangle\langle 100| + |101\rangle\langle 101| + |110\rangle\langle 110|) + \cos^2 \theta (|011\rangle\langle 011| + |001\rangle\langle 001| + |010\rangle\langle 010|)) \\ &+ \frac{(1-\eta)}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \right) + \\ &+ \frac{(1-\eta)}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \right) + \\ &+ \frac{(1-\eta)}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{k=2}^{+\infty} |k\rangle\langle k| \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

We make now the approximation of disregarding terms proportional to $1/\bar{n}^2$ with respect terms proportional to η . Although this approximation is not essential and constrains the scope of our calculation, it is useful to provide clean analytical expressions. Also, we consider the condition $\eta \ll 1$ and disregard η with respect to 1 when they appear in an addition. Under these approximation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &\approx \eta (\cos^2 \theta |000\rangle\langle 000| + \sin^2 \theta |111\rangle\langle 111| - \imath \cos \theta \sin \theta |111\rangle\langle 000| + \imath \sin \theta \cos \theta |000\rangle\langle 111|) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \right) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \right) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{k=2}^{+\infty} |k\rangle\langle k| \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The first line can be re-cast in a shorter way, since it is equal to $\eta \mathbf{U}|000\rangle\langle 000|\mathbf{U}^\dagger$,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1 &\approx \eta \mathbf{U}|000\rangle\langle 000|\mathbf{U}^\dagger \\ &+ \frac{1}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \right) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \right) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{k=2}^{+\infty} |k\rangle\langle k| \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

Since most of the components are in terms of orthogonal projectors to the subspace $V = \{|000\rangle, |111\rangle\}$, the square root $\rho^{1/2}$ can be evaluated easily. Considering that each component brings its own possible two signs for each of the square roots. One needs to choose the signs consistent with the possible interpretations of the trace $\text{Tr}[\rho_0^{1/2} \rho_1^{1/2}] < 1$ for the evaluation of the Chernoff's bounds. Since we have the square roots, the square root

$$(\mathbf{U}|000\rangle\langle 000|\mathbf{U}^\dagger)^{1/2} = \pm \mathbf{U}|000\rangle\langle 000|\mathbf{U}^\dagger$$

according to the above criterion, we will choose the minus sign, while for the rest of components we choose the same positive sign than the analogous components in ρ_0 . Then we have

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_1^{1/2} &\approx -\eta^{1/2} (\cos^2 \theta |000\rangle\langle 000| + \sin^2 \theta |111\rangle\langle 111| - i \cos \theta \sin \theta |111\rangle\langle 000| + i \sin \theta \cos \theta |000\rangle\langle 111|) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \right) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \right) + \\ &+ \frac{1}{\bar{n}^2} \left((U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger) \otimes \left(\sum_{j=2}^{+\infty} |j\rangle\langle j| \right) \otimes \left(\sum_{k=2}^{+\infty} |k\rangle\langle k| \right) \right). \end{aligned}$$

The calculation follows now by multiplying $\rho_0^{1/2}$ and $\rho_1^{1/2}$ and taking the trace. Since we have choose the same sign in the square roots of the projectors orthogonal to V , we have

$$\rho_1^{1/2} = \rho_0^{1/2} - \eta^{1/2} \mathbf{U}|000\rangle\langle 000|\mathbf{U}^\dagger - \frac{1}{\bar{n}} (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \otimes (U|0\rangle\langle 0|U^\dagger).$$

The last terms, being finite and proportional to the factor $1/\bar{n}$, when multiplied by ρ bring a factor of order $1/\bar{n}^2$, that it is disregarded. Therefore, we have

$$\text{Tr}[\rho_0^{1/2} \rho_1^{1/2}] = \text{Tr}[\rho_0^{1/2} (\rho_0^{1/2} - \eta^{1/2} \mathbf{U}|000\rangle\langle 000|\mathbf{U}^\dagger)] = 1 - \text{Tr}[\rho_0^{1/2} \eta^{1/2} \mathbf{U}|000\rangle\langle 000|\mathbf{U}^\dagger].$$

The task now is to evaluate the part of the product where the subspace $\{|000\rangle, |111\rangle\}$. In particular, we need to evaluate the part of the trace

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}[\rho_0^{1/2} \eta^{1/2} \mathbf{U}|000\rangle\langle 000|\mathbf{U}^\dagger] &= \text{Tr}\left[\frac{1}{\bar{n}} \eta^{1/2} (\cos^2 \theta |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sin^2 \theta |1\rangle\langle 1| - i \sin \theta \cos \theta |1\rangle\langle 0| + i \cos \theta \sin \theta |0\rangle\langle 1|) \otimes \right. \\ &\otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \otimes (|0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1|) \otimes (\cos^2 \theta |0\rangle\langle 0| + \sin^2 \theta |1\rangle\langle 1| - i \sin \theta \cos \theta |1\rangle\langle 0| + i \cos \theta \sin \theta |0\rangle\langle 1|) \cdot \\ &\cdot (\cos^2 \theta |000\rangle\langle 000| + \sin^2 \theta |111\rangle\langle 111| - i \cos \theta \sin \theta |111\rangle\langle 000| + i \sin \theta \cos \theta |000\rangle\langle 111|)] \\ &= \frac{\eta^{1/2}}{\bar{n}} + \mathcal{O}(\theta^3). \end{aligned}$$

Disregarding terms proportional to $1/\bar{n}^2$ with respect to η , but still adopting the condition $\eta \ll 1$, is

$$(A.1) \quad \text{Tr}[\rho_0^{1/2} \rho_1^{1/2}] = 1 - \frac{\eta^{1/2}}{\bar{n}} + \mathcal{O}(\theta^2 \eta^{1/2}),$$

where we have made use of the approximation $\sin(\theta) \approx \theta$, since θ is small and we have disregarded terms of order $\mathcal{O}(\theta^3)$ and of order $1/\bar{n}^2$ compared with terms of order η .

REFERENCES

- [1] S. Lloyd, *Enhanced Sensitivity of Photodetection via Quantum Illumination*, Science **321**, 1463 (2008).
- [2] Si-Hui Tan, B. I. Erkmen, V. Giovannetti, S. Guha, S. Lloyd, L. Maccone, S. Pirandola and J. H. Shapiro *Quantum Illumination with Gaussian States*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 253601 (2008).
- [3] Q. Zhuang and J. H. Shapiro, *Ultimate Accuracy Limit of Quantum Pulse-Compression Ranging*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **128**, 010501 (2022).
- [4] J. H. Shapiro, *The Quantum Illumination Story*, IEEE Aerospace and Electronic Systems Magazine **35**, Issue: 4, April 1 (2020).
- [5] Z. Zhang et al., *Entanglement-enhanced sensing in a lossy and noisy environment*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 110506 (2015).
- [6] D. G. England, B. Balaji and B. J. Sussman, *Quantum-enhanced standoff detection using correlated photon pairs*, Phys. Rev. A **99**, 023828 (2019).
- [7] S. Barzanjeh, S. Guha, C. Weedbrook, D. Vitale, J. H. Shapiro and S. Pirandola, *Microwave quantum illumination*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 080503 (2015).
- [8] S. Barzanjeh, S. Pirandola, D. Vitali and J. M. Fink, *Microwave Quantum Illumination using a digital receiver*, Science Advances Vol. **6**, no. 19, eabb0451 (2020).
- [9] D. Luong, C. W. Sandbo Chang, A. M. Vadiraj, A. Damini, C. M. Wilson and B. Balaji, *Receiver Operating Characteristics for a Prototype Quantum Two-Mode Squeezing Radar*, IEEE Transactions on Aerospace and Electronic Systems, Volume: **56**, Issue: 3, June (2020).
- [10] D. Luong, S. Rajan and B. Balaji *Quantum Two-Mode Squeezing Radar and Noise Radar: Correlation Coefficients for Target Detection*, IEEE Sensors Journal, Vol: **20**, Issue: 10, May15, 15 (2020).
- [11] G. de Palma and J. Borregaard, *The minimum error probability of quantum illumination*, Phys. Rev. A **98**, 012101 (2018).
- [12] R. Nair and M. Gu, *Fundamental limits of quantum illumination*, Optica, Vol. 7, 771 (2020).
- [13] S. Guha and B. I. Erkmen, *Gaussian-state quantum illumination receivers for target detection*, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 052310 (2009).
- [14] S. Pirandola and S. Lloyd, *Computable bounds for the discrimination of Gaussian states*, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 012331, (2008).
- [15] R. Gallego Torromé, *Quantum illumination with multiple entangled photons*, Advanced Quantum Technologies, Volume **4**, Issue 11, DOI: 10.1002/qute.202100101.
- [16] J. H. Shapiro and S. Lloyd, *Quantum illumination versus coherent-state target detection*, New Journal of Physics **11** 063045 (2009).
- [17] C.W. Sandbo Chang et al., *Observation of Three-Photon Spontaneous Parametric Down-Conversion in a Superconducting Parametric Cavity*, Physical Review X **10**, 011011 (2020).