

# Optimal cloning of single photon polarization by coherent feedback of beam splitter losses

Holger F. Hofmann\*

*Graduate School of Advanced Sciences of Matter, Hiroshima University,  
Kagamiyama 1-3-1, Higashi Hiroshima 739-8530, Japan*

Toshiki Ide

*Okayama Institute for Quantum Physics,  
1-9-1 Kyoyama, Okayama City,  
Okayama, 700-0015, Japan*

Light fields can be amplified by measuring the field amplitude reflected at a beam splitter of reflectivity  $R$  and adding a coherent amplitude proportional to the measurement result to the transmitted field. By applying the quantum optical realization of this amplification scheme to single photon inputs, it is possible to clone the polarization states of photons. We show that optimal cloning of single photon polarization is possible when the gain factor of the amplification is equal to  $1/\sqrt{1-R}$ .

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 42.50.Ar, 42.50.Dv, 03.65.Ta

One of the fundamental features of quantum information is that it is impossible to generate perfect copies (or "clones") of an unknown quantum state input [1]. This no-cloning theorem is particularly interesting in the light of the wave-particle dualism of optics, since the wavefunction of a classical wave can be copied perfectly by any classical amplification process. Soon after the first formulation of the no-cloning theorem, it was pointed out that perfect cloning by phase sensitive optical amplification is prevented by the unavoidable spontaneous emission in such processes [2, 3]. However, it was later found that stimulated emission is in fact an optimal approximation to perfect quantum cloning [4]. This insight was quickly followed by the first experimental realizations of optical quantum cloning using parametric optical amplification [5, 6, 7, 8]. Recently, it has also been discovered that the bunching properties of light fields can be used to obtain optimal clones by post-selecting the output of a beam splitter [9]. In general, optical cloning methods thus exploit the natural wave-particle dualism of light to clone the quantum coherence of photons by manipulating the (classical) optical coherence of the light field.

A more direct way to access the field properties of photons is to measure the quadrature components  $\hat{x}$  and  $\hat{y}$  of the complex field amplitude,  $\hat{a} = \hat{x} + i\hat{y}$ . As demonstrated by a number of experimental results [10, 11, 12, 13, 14], such measurements provide quantum mechanically precise information on the coherent field properties associated with photon number states. It seems obvious that this method can also be used to measure the polarization state of a photon, since the polarization of light is completely described by the two complex amplitudes  $\hat{a}_H$  and  $\hat{a}_V$  of a pair of orthogonal polarizations  $H$  and  $V$ . For a single photon input, the measurement of the two complex amplitudes  $\hat{a}_H$  and  $\hat{a}_V$  by homodyne detection is indeed equivalent to a quantum mechanically precise detection of the photon in the polarization defined by the measurement results obtained for the amplitudes. A particularly simple cloning scheme could thus be realized by measuring the complex amplitudes of the input photon and modulating a coherent laser beam to emit multiple photons with the same polarization amplitudes.

However, homodyne detection can also be applied to fields of unknown photon number. It is therefore possible to obtain partial information about the polarization of a photon by "dividing" the one photon input at a beam splitter of reflectivity  $R$  and measuring only the reflected fraction of the light. While this procedure initially reduces the transmitted amplitude by a factor of  $\sqrt{1-R}$ , it is possible to compensate these losses by using the measurement results obtained in the field measurement [15]. In fact, the transmitted field can now be amplified by the linear addition of a coherent field proportional to the measurement results of the polarization amplitudes. In the following, it is shown that this optical amplification of a single photon input field results in optimal cloning of the photon if the amplitude is amplified by a gain factor of  $1/\sqrt{1-R}$ . Interestingly, this kind of cloning process does not require any optical non-linearity to achieve the desired field amplification. Instead, the phase information needed to clone a quantum coherent state is obtained explicitly in the form of optical measurement data, and the amplification is performed by adding the desired coherent light field amplitude using linear interference between the transmitted light and an appropriately modulated strong laser field.

Fig. 1 shows the schematic setup of the proposed optimal cloning machine. The center piece is the beam splitter of reflectivity  $R$  that splits the single photon input into two fields. The quadrature components of the reflected field are then measured by homodyne detection, and a coherent feedback is applied to displace the field amplitude of the




FIG. 1: Schematic setup of the optimal cloning machine. The one photon input state  $|\psi_{\text{in}}\rangle$  is split at a beam splitter of reflectivity  $R$ . The reflected part is split once more to allow the simultaneous uncertainty limited measurement of the four quadrature components  $\hat{x}_H, \hat{x}_V, \hat{y}_H$  and  $\hat{y}_V$  by homodyne detection. The measurement result is then transmitted to an optical modulation setup that displaces the transmitted field amplitudes by a feedback of  $f_R$  times the measured amplitudes.

transmitted field by  $f_R$  times the measurement result  $\vec{\beta} = (\beta_H, \beta_V)$ . For the following discussion, it will be most convenient to define the input state in terms of the creation operators  $\hat{a}_H^\dagger$  and  $\hat{a}_V^\dagger$ , since these operators also represent the complex conjugate field amplitudes. The unknown polarization state of the input photon can then be written in the photon number basis of the two mode field as

$$|\psi_{\text{in}}\rangle_a = c_H |0; 1\rangle_{HV} + c_V |1; 0\rangle_{HV} = \left( c_H \hat{a}_H^\dagger + c_V \hat{a}_V^\dagger \right) |0; 0\rangle_{HV}. \quad (1)$$

The quantum information encoded in this state is expressed by the probability amplitudes  $c_H$  and  $c_V$  of the horizontally ( $H$ ) and vertically ( $V$ ) polarized one photon states. The effect of the beam splitter on this state can be obtained by transforming the input modes into a coherent superposition of transmitted modes  $\hat{a}_i$  and reflected modes  $\hat{b}_i$ ,

$$\hat{U}_{\text{BS}} |\psi_{\text{in}}\rangle_a \otimes |0; 0\rangle_b = \left( \sqrt{1-R} (c_H \hat{a}_H^\dagger + c_V \hat{a}_V^\dagger) + \sqrt{R} (c_H \hat{b}_H^\dagger + c_V \hat{b}_V^\dagger) \right) |0; 0\rangle_a \otimes |0; 0\rangle_b. \quad (2)$$

As indicated by fig. 1, the reflected mode is then split into equal parts at a beam splitter of reflectivity  $1/2$ , and polarization sensitive homodyne detection is applied to both parts to obtain the two quadrature components of the complex amplitudes  $\beta_H = x_H + iy_H$  and  $\beta_V = x_V + iy_V$ . In terms of quantum measurement theory, this kind of measurement projects the state in the reflected modes  $\hat{b}_i$  onto a coherent field state  $|\beta_H; \beta_V\rangle_{HV}$ . The properly normalized positive operator valued measure of this measurement reads

$$|P(\vec{\beta})\rangle = \frac{1}{\pi} |\beta_H; \beta_V\rangle_{HV} \quad \text{with} \quad \int d^4 \vec{\beta} |P(\vec{\beta})\rangle \langle P(\vec{\beta})| = \hat{1}. \quad (3)$$

The conditional output state of the transmitted field modes  $\hat{a}_i$  after the measurement is then given by

$$\begin{aligned} \sqrt{p(\vec{\beta})} |\psi(\vec{\beta})\rangle_a &= \frac{1}{\pi_b} \langle \beta_H; \beta_V | \hat{U}_{\text{BS}} | \psi_{\text{in}} \rangle. \\ &= \frac{1}{\pi} \exp(-|\vec{\beta}|^2/2) \left( \sqrt{1-R} (c_H \hat{a}_H^\dagger + c_V \hat{a}_V^\dagger) + \sqrt{R} (\beta_H^* c_H + \beta_V^* c_V) \right) |0; 0\rangle_a, \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where  $p(\vec{\beta})$  is the probability of obtaining the measurement result  $\vec{\beta}$ .

It is now possible to modify the output state by coherently adding field amplitudes of  $f\beta_H$  and  $f\beta_V$  to the polarization components of the output field. This kind of field addition can be achieved by interfering the output field

and an appropriately modulated laser beam at a highly reflective beam splitter [16]. Theoretically, such a feedback is described by the unitary displacement operator  $\hat{D}(f\vec{\beta})$  [17]. The effects of this operator on the field operators  $\hat{a}_H^\dagger$  and  $\hat{a}_V^\dagger$  can be given by the relations

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{D}(f\beta_H, f\beta_V) \left( \hat{a}_H^\dagger + f\beta_H^* \right) &= \hat{a}_H^\dagger \hat{D}(f\beta_H, f\beta_V) \\ \hat{D}(f\beta_H, f\beta_V) \left( \hat{a}_V^\dagger + f\beta_V^* \right) &= \hat{a}_V^\dagger \hat{D}(f\beta_H, f\beta_V).\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

Comparison with eq.(4) shows that a special feedback condition exists where the displacement can eliminate the products of the input state amplitudes  $c_{H/V}$  and the measurement results  $\beta_{H/V}^*$ . Specifically, the feedback compensated output state for a feedback factor of  $f_R = \sqrt{R/(1-R)}$  reads

$$\sqrt{p(\vec{\beta})} \hat{D}(f_R\beta_H, f_R\beta_V) | \psi(\vec{\beta}) \rangle_a = \frac{1}{\pi} \exp(-|\vec{\beta}|^2/2) \sqrt{1-R} \left( c_H \hat{a}_H^\dagger + c_V \hat{a}_V^\dagger \right) \hat{D}(f_R\beta_H, f_R\beta_V) | 0; 0 \rangle_a. \quad (6)$$

Thus the output state at this special feedback condition is described by the action of the creation operator of the original input photon on a coherent state. As will be clarified in the following, this application of the input photon creation operator to a randomly polarized state describes an optimal cloning process. The unique feedback condition  $f_R = \sqrt{R/(1-R)}$  thus converts the beam splitter attenuation into an optimal cloning process.

The fact that the coherent feedback of a field amplitude can be used to clone photons at one (and only one) specific feedback factor  $f_R$  seems to be a rather unintuitive result that we have derived by a purely formal analogy between the effects of measurement back action given by eq. (4) and the effects of the feedback displacement given by eq.(5). To gain a better understanding of this relation between field and photon properties, it may be useful to express the feedback factor in terms of the field amplification achieved by the feedback. If the input was a classical field, e.g. a coherent state with amplitude  $|\alpha| \gg 1$ , the average measurement result  $\vec{\beta}$  of the reflected light would be equal to  $\sqrt{R} \alpha$ . The feedback would then add an average amplitude of  $f\sqrt{R} \alpha$  to the transmitted amplitude of  $\sqrt{1-R} \alpha$ , for a total amplitude of  $g \alpha$ , where the gain factor of the amplification is  $g = f\sqrt{R} + \sqrt{1-R}$ . The special feedback condition  $f_R$  thus corresponds to a gain factor of

$$g_R = f_R \sqrt{R} + \sqrt{1-R} = 1/\sqrt{1-R}. \quad (7)$$

Interestingly, this gain factor is exactly the inverse of the attenuation suffered by the transmitted amplitude at the beam splitter. The feedback thus turns the attenuation of the field into a corresponding amplification. Although the precise connection between this symmetry of the feedback condition and the optimal cloning effect is still unclear, it might be possible that it provides an important clue to a deeper understanding of the intricate relation between photons and fields.

To show that the effect of this beam splitter amplification on a single photon input is indeed an optimal cloning process, it is necessary to consider the output statistics averaged over all measurement results  $\vec{\beta}$ . The density operator of the output state is given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{\rho}(\text{out}) &= \int d^4\vec{\beta} p(\vec{\beta}) \hat{D}(f_R\beta_H, f_R\beta_V) | \psi(\vec{\beta}) \rangle \langle \psi(\vec{\beta}) | \hat{D}^\dagger(f_R\beta_H, f_R\beta_V) \\ &= (1-R) \left( c_H \hat{a}_H^\dagger + c_V \hat{a}_V^\dagger \right) \hat{\eta}_R \left( c_H^* \hat{a}_H + c_V^* \hat{a}_V \right),\end{aligned}\quad (8)$$

where the operator  $\hat{\eta}_R$  is the density operator of a thermal light field state with an average photon number of  $f_R^2 = R/(1-R)$  in each mode. The cloning process is thus described by the application of the input photon creation operator to a completely unpolarized light field state. It is now possible to separate  $\hat{\rho}(\text{out})$  into contributions with different output photon number  $N$ ,

$$\hat{\rho}(\text{out}) = \sum_{N=1}^{\infty} P(N) \left( c_H \hat{a}_H^\dagger + c_V \hat{a}_V^\dagger \right) \hat{C}_N \left( c_H^* \hat{a}_H + c_V^* \hat{a}_V \right), \quad (9)$$

where  $P(N)$  is the probability of an  $N$ -photon output, and  $\hat{C}_N$  is the properly normalized operator of the completely unpolarized  $(N-1)$ -photon state before the application of the input photon creation operator,

$$P(N) = \frac{(1-R)^3}{2R} R^N N(N+1), \quad (10)$$

$$\hat{C}_N = \frac{2}{N(N+1)} \sum_{n=1}^N |n-1; N-n\rangle \langle n-1; N-n|. \quad (11)$$

The average number of clones can be controlled by varying the reflectivity  $R$  of the beam splitter, with high reflectivities generating large numbers of clones and low reflectivities generating only a few clones. It is thus far easier to increase the number of clones than in cloning methods relying on parametric downconversion, where it is rather difficult to increase the parametric gain [18]. For practical purposes, however, it may be desirable to keep the cloning probabilities low, since the quantum efficiency of photon detection is usually limited, and the only way to ensure that the detection of  $N$  photons really corresponds to  $N$  output photons is to keep the probability of generating  $N + 1$  photons much lower than the probability for  $N$  photons. Eq. (10) is therefore essential for the optimal choice of  $R$  in an experiment with limited detector efficiencies.

Using the operator  $\hat{C}_N$ , it is now possible to determine the output statistics of the  $1 \rightarrow N$  photon cloning process. The normalized density matrix  $\hat{\rho}_N$  of the  $N$ -photon output reads

$$\hat{\rho}_N = \left( c_H \hat{a}_H^\dagger + c_V \hat{a}_V^\dagger \right) \hat{C}_N \left( c_H^* \hat{a}_H + c_V^* \hat{a}_V \right). \quad (12)$$

This output is a mixture of photon number states with  $n$  photons in the correct input polarization and  $N - n$  photons in the opposite polarization. The statistical weight of each state is determined by the factor of  $n$  introduced by the application of the creation operator of the input photon to both sides of the unpolarized operator  $\hat{C}_N$ . The normalized probability distribution  $P(n|N)$  of the number of correctly polarized photons  $n$  among  $N$  output photons thus reads

$$P(n|N) = \frac{2n}{N(N+1)}. \quad (13)$$

The fidelity of the  $1 \rightarrow N$  photon cloning process is then given by the ratio between the average photon number in the input polarization and the total output photon number,

$$F_{1 \rightarrow N} = \sum_{n=0}^N p(n|N) \frac{n}{N} = \frac{2N+1}{3N}. \quad (14)$$

This is the optimal fidelity for  $1 \rightarrow N$  cloning [19]. Thus, the coherent feedback setup shown in fig. 1 is indeed an optimal cloning machine.

Although the averaged output of the coherent cloning process can be written as a mixture of photon number states, it should be remembered that the measurement information  $\vec{\beta}$  of an individual cloning process is still available as classical data. Thus, the actual output state of the cloning process is the conditional pure state given by eq.(6). The polarization statistics of this state depend on both the original single photon polarization  $(c_H, c_V)$  and the measurement result  $\vec{\beta}$ , indicating the effect of the measurement back action given by eq.(4). It is interesting to note that the cloning process is still optimal, despite the information obtained in the measurement. Obviously, the loss of quantum information due to the measurement back action is balanced by the usefulness of the classical measurement information  $\vec{\beta}$  for the generation of quantum clones. This balance also explains the existence of an optimal gain: at  $g > 1/\sqrt{1-R}$ , the measurement information obtained is not sufficient to optimize the fidelity of the high number of clones generated, and at  $g < 1/\sqrt{1-R}$ , the measurement back action caused by the unnecessary precision of the measurement introduces additional cloning errors.

It may also be worth noting that, due to the formal equivalence of continuous variable teleportation errors and beam splitter losses [15], a closely related optimal cloning process can be implemented by the continuous variable teleportation of single photon states [20, 21]. In this case, the optimal gain condition depends on the squeezed state entanglement, with low entanglement requiring a correspondingly higher gain. At a teleportation gain of  $g = 1$ , the teleportation errors will be greater than the minimal cloning errors due to the additional information obtained about the input polarization in the teleportation measurement [22].

In conclusion, we have shown that an amplification of the light field by coherent feedback of the reflection losses at a beam splitter of reflectivity  $R$  optimally clones the polarization state of a single photon input if the feedback induced gain is equal to  $g_R = 1/\sqrt{1-R}$ . This cloning method does not require any non-linear optical elements and multiple clones easy to obtain. It may therefore be particularly useful for closing the gap between output photon numbers of  $N = 2$  and  $N \rightarrow \infty$ . By employing field measurements to manipulate the polarization states of photons, this cloning methods also illustrates the fundamental relation between the continuous field variables and the discrete photon number distributions of the quantized light field. Photon cloning by coherent feedback amplification thus shows how fundamental aspects of the wave-particle dualism of light can be applied to realize quantum information processes.

Part of this work has been supported by the JST-CREST project on quantum information processing.

---

\* Electronic address: h.hofmann@osa.org

- [1] W.K.Wootters and W.H. Zureck, *Nature (London)* **299**, 802 (1982).
- [2] P.W. Miloni and M.L. Hardies, *Phys. Lett. A* **92**, 321 (1982).
- [3] L. Mandel, *Nature (London)* **304**, 188 (1983).
- [4] C. Simon, G. Weihs, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2993 (2000).
- [5] F. DeMartini, V. Mussi, F. Bovino, *Opt. Commun.* **179**, 581 (2000).
- [6] A. Lamas-Linares, C. Simon, J.C. Howell, and D. Bouwmeester, *Science* **296**, 712 (2002).
- [7] F. DeMartini, V. Buzek, F. Sciarrino, and C. Sias, *Nature (London)* **419**, 815 (2002).
- [8] S. Fasel, N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, V. Scarani, and H. Zbinden, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 107901 (2002).
- [9] W.T.M. Irvine, A.L. Linares, M.J.A. de Dood, and D. Bouwmeester, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 047902 (2004).
- [10] A. I. Lvovsky, H. Hansen, T. Aichele, O. Benson, J. Mlynek, and S. Schiller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 050402 (2001).
- [11] A. I. Lvovsky and J. Mlynek *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 250401 (2002).
- [12] A. I. Lvovsky and S. A. Babichev *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 011801(R) (2002).
- [13] A. Zavatta, S. Viciani, and M. Bellini, *Science* **306**, 660 (2004).
- [14] A. Zavatta, S. Viciani, and M. Bellini *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 053821 (2004).
- [15] H.F. Hofmann, T. Ide, T. Kobayashi, and A. Furusawa, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 040301(R) (2001).
- [16] Feedback of this kind is a standard procedure in continuous variable quantum teleportation. See for example A. Furusawa, J.L. Sorensen, S.L. Braunstein, C.A. Fuchs, H.J. Kimble and E.S. Polzik, *Science* **282**, 706 (1998).
- [17] For a detailed discussion of the displacement operator and its properties, see page 12 of D.F. Walls and G.J. Milburn, *Quantum Optics*(Springer, Berlin, 1994).
- [18] A. Lamas-Linares, J.C. Howell, and D. Bouwmeester, *Nature (London)* **412**, 887 (2001).
- [19] N. Gisin and S. Massar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2153 (1997).
- [20] T. Ide, H. F. Hofmann, T. Kobayashi and A. Furusawa, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 012313 (2002).
- [21] T. Ide, H.F. Hofmann, A. Furusawa, and T. Kobayashi, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 062303 (2002).
- [22] T. Ide and H.F. Hofmann, e-print quant-ph/0511220 (2005).