Heralded orthogonalisation of coherent states and their conversion to discrete-variable superpositions

Abstract: The nonorthogonality of coherent states is a fundamental property which prevents them from being perfectly and deterministically discriminated. Here, we present an experimentally feasible protocol for the probabilistic orthogonalisation of a pair of coherent states, independent of their amplitude and phase. In contrast to unambiguous state discrimination, a successful operation of our protocol is heralded without measuring the states. As such, they remain suitable for further manipulation and the obtained orthogonal states serve as a discrete-variable basis. Therefore, our protocol doubles as a simple continuous-to-discrete variable converter, which may find application in hybrid continuous-discrete quantum information processing protocols.
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1 Introduction

One of the fundamental properties of coherent states is that they are over complete, i.e. each coherent state shares some non-zero overlap with every other. In the context of state discrimination, this non-zero overlap manifests as errors when one wishes to distinguish two such states. One option to try and discriminate between the two states is by a direct measurement (DM). However, as the two states share a finite overlap, we cannot obtain a result with absolute certainty. The limits of the DM approach are determined by a minimal error, the so-called Helstrom bound [1–6]. These errors can be overcome using established unambiguous state discrimination protocols [7]. The original proposals considered schemes in which nonorthogonal states were first orthogonalised, and then measured with a suitable detection scheme [8, 9]. However, for a valid implementation, these steps must be combined [10–21], such that orthogonalisation is post-selected on the appropriate measurement outcome, non-destructive [22, 23] or otherwise. Yet, in some cases it may be necessary to orthogonalise the input states without a post-selected measurement.

One application where this is needed is the conversion of continuous-variable (CV) to discrete-variable (DC) quantum states. In quantum information, hybrid approaches that utilise methods from both the CV and DV world offer significant advantages compared to pure CV or DV protocols [24, 25]. From a fundamental perspective, similar hybrid schemes have also been used to investigate phenomena such as micro-macro entanglement, in which a path-entangled photon (DV entanglement) is coherently displaced (a CV operation) [26–28]. By combining the best of both worlds, hybrid schemes can save on resources in teleportation, quantum computing and error correction schemes [29–32] or may reduce the effect of loss on the distribution of CV entanglement [33]. To obtain a functioning scheme, hybrid protocols require a reliable and efficient transfer of information from the continuous to the discrete part of the protocol [25, 34]. Recently, such a protocol has been proposed and demonstrated [35]. However, it relies critically on an entangled resource-state [31] and utilises a teleportation scheme [30], which leaves the question whether a more resource-efficient approach may be found.

In this paper, we develop a practical scheme for heralded, non-destructive state orthogonalisation of continuous-variable states, which doubles as a continuous-to-discrete-variable qubit converter. Our protocol describes the probabilistic transformation of non-orthogonal CV states, namely weak coherent states of opposite phase, to displaced DV states, i.e. \( \hat{D}(\beta) (c_0 |0\rangle + c_1 |1\rangle) \), where \( \beta \), \( c_0 \), \( c_1 \) depend on the inter-
action parameters. These interaction parameters can be specified \textit{a priori} to ensure that the resulting output states are orthogonal to one another. That is, the input states \(|\psi\rangle, -\psi\rangle\), where \(|\psi\rangle - \psi\rangle = 0\) transform to new states \(|\psi'\rangle, -\psi'\rangle\), whereby \(|\psi'\rangle - \psi'\rangle = 0\). Note that this is related but different to input state orthogonalisations [36–38], in which the output state is orthogonal to the input state, i.e. \(|\psi\rangle \rightarrow \psi'\rangle\), where \(|\psi \psi'\rangle = 0\).

Contrary to other orthogonalisation schemes, the conversion is heralded by a predetermined detection event without destroying the input state. To obtain the desired orthogonalisation, we utilise quantum-optical catalysis [39–41], where an ancilla photon interferes with a CV input state on a beam splitter and a predetermined detection event in one beam splitter output heralds the desired displaced DV state in the other output. As this procedure is coherent, it may also be used on single-mode coherent displaced DV state in the other output. As this procedure is coherent, it may also be used on single-mode coherent states [36, 37], where an ancilla photon interferes with a CV input state on a beam splitter and a predetermined detection event in one beam splitter output heralds the desired displaced DV state in the other output. As this procedure is coherent, it may also be used on single-mode coherent displaced DV state in the other output.

To implement our scheme, we utilise the “quantum catalysis” (or “photon replacement”) technique [39–41], as depicted in Fig. 1. An input state from the non-orthogonal set \(|\alpha\rangle, -\alpha\rangle\) is incident on mode \(a\) of a beam splitter, simultaneously with an ancilla photon in mode \(b\). Dependent on the amplitude of the coherent states \(|\alpha\rangle\), we pick the transmissivity of the beam splitter \(T\) \(|\alpha\rangle\) such that, given a particular outcome of a photon number measurement \(|m\rangle \langle m|\) on one output mode of the beam splitter, the input state is projected on either \(|\Psi^+\rangle\) or \(|\Psi^-\rangle\), depending on the sign of the incident coherent state. The transformation coefficients of an \(n\)-photon Fock state for this replacement operation are then given via

\[
|\Psi_{\text{out}}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{m!(n+k-m)!}{n!k!}} \sum_{j=0}^{k} \binom{n}{m-j} \binom{k}{j} (-1)^j \times \sqrt{T}^{n-m+2j} \sqrt{1-T}^{m+k-2j} |n+k-m\rangle_c \otimes |m\rangle_d,
\]

with, in general, \(k\) ancilla and \(m\) herald photons for the success event. The transformation of the incident coherent states can then be calculated with the photon number basis representation \(|\alpha\rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{\frac{1}{2} \alpha^2} \frac{\alpha^n}{\sqrt{n!}} |n\rangle\).

As an example, let us consider the case sketched in Fig. 1. At the replacement stage, we define a success event such that one photon is heralded in mode \(d\), i.e. \(|m\rangle \langle m| = |1\rangle \langle 1|\). The final output state \(|\Psi^\pm\rangle\) is given by

\[
|\Psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \exp \left(-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{2}\right) \exp \left(\mp \alpha \sqrt{T} c^\dagger\right) \times \left(\pm \alpha (1-T) c^\dagger \mp \sqrt{1-T} \right) |0\rangle_c \otimes |1\rangle_d,
\]

where \(\sqrt{N}\) is the normalisation after the non-unitary transformation and the probability of this event happening is given by \(N = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n^2 \text{(repl.)} + c_0 \text{(repl.)} = e^{-\frac{1}{2} \alpha^2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \sqrt{T}^{n-1} |1-n(1-T)\rangle\text{ as the state coefficients in the photon number basis. A more detailed discussion about the output states can be found in e.g. [39–41]. Writing the output state of the replacement stage in this form illustrates how the state orthogonalisation is possible with this protocol. Calculating the overlap \(|\Psi^+\rangle \langle \Psi^-|\) and setting it to zero yields a quadratic equation with (at least) one real valued solution due to the different signs of \(\alpha\) (a closed-form expression for \(T(\alpha)\) is given in the Appendix).
In Fig. 2(c), we consider the full parameter space for the replacement. We calculate and plot the overlap after replacement depending on the coherent state amplitude $|\alpha|$ and the beam splitter transmissivity $T$. For high amplitudes and splitter transmissivities, we find a large region where the overlap is very small. However, only for the combination of coherent state amplitudes and transmissivities that are represented by the green line the overlap becomes zero. Since this is the goal of the state discrimination, this curve defines the appropriate beam splitter transmissivity $T(|\alpha|)$ for any given $|\alpha|$ in the protocol. The sensitivity of the scheme to the control of the transmissivity can be seen in the gradient of the colour map in Fig. 2(c): it is much sharper at low $|\alpha|$, indicating higher sensitivity to errors in controlling $T$. The corresponding probability of success, i.e. the probability of detecting a desired heralding event is plotted in Fig. 2(d). For each amplitude $|\alpha|$, we calculated the optimal transmissivity $T(|\alpha|)$, where $|\langle \Psi^+ | \Psi^-\rangle| = 0$. Further details are provided in the Appendix. From the photon number coefficients $c_n$(repl.), we have then determined the success probability shown in red. Comparing the success probability to the IDP bound (black) from unambiguous state discrimination for small $|\alpha|$, we find that we already operate close to the optimum predicted for probabilistic discrimination protocols. However, for larger amplitudes we are still some way from optimal operation.

3 Projection on displaced discrete variable qubit states

It is instructive to ask the nature of the state once it has undergone a successful discrimination operation. In Fig. 3 we plot the Wigner function of the state $|\psi^+\rangle$ when $\alpha = 0.5$ and $T = 0.13$, the parameters required to discriminate the state from $|\psi^-\rangle$. This state has a fidelity of $\geq 98\%$ with the state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$. Similarly, the state $|\psi^\prime\rangle$, for which $\alpha = -1/2$ for the same $T$, shares $\geq 98\%$ fidelity with the state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$. Thus the discrimination operation heralds the generation of a close approximation to the state $|\alpha\rangle \Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$ and $|-\alpha\rangle \Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ with reasonable fidelity.

With these transformations in mind, we consider the transformations of superpositions of coherent states as inputs. The even coherent state superposition (CSS) state $|\alpha\rangle + |-\alpha\rangle$, with amplitude $|\alpha| = 0.5$, transforms into the state $|\psi^+\rangle + |\psi^-\rangle$, the Wigner function of which is shown Fig. 4 (a). Under the conditions for orthogonalised output states, i.e. $T = 0.13$, this state has a fidelity of 96% with...
the vacuum state $|0\rangle$, but >99% fidelity with the squeezed vacuum state (squeezed by 2.4 dB). Similarly, the odd CSS state $|\alpha\rangle - |\alpha\rangle$ transforms to the state $|\psi^+\rangle - |\psi^-\rangle$, shown in Fig. 4, which exhibits >99% fidelity to the single-photon Fock state.

More generally, we can rewrite the state generated by the successful interaction from Eq. 2 as a displaced discrete-variable superposition state, i.e.

$$|\psi^\alpha\rangle = \hat{D}(\alpha \sqrt{T}) [ c_0 (\alpha) |0\rangle + c_1 (\alpha) |1\rangle ]$$

(3)

with the (unnormalised) coefficients given by $c_0 (\alpha) = \sqrt{T} [1 - (1 - T) |\alpha|^2]$ and $c_1 (\alpha) = -(1 - T) \alpha$. From this, one can calculate a value of $T (|\alpha|)$ for which the displaced equal superposition state $\hat{D}(\beta) \left( |0\rangle + e^{i\phi} |1\rangle \right)$ is generated; a full expression is given in the appendix for completeness. Note that this value of $T$ is not the same as that which discriminates the states, since, in general, displaced superpositions are nonorthogonal.

Similarly, the output state after acting on an even and odd CSS states is the coherent superposition of the individual output states in Eq. 3, i.e.

$$|\alpha\rangle + |\alpha\rangle \rightarrow \hat{D}(\sqrt{T}) c_0 |0\rangle + c_1 |1\rangle$$

(4)

where the coefficients $c_0$ and $c_1 (\alpha)$ are as before, and we use $c_1 (-\alpha) = -c_1 (\alpha)$. This state is a hybrid CV-DV state; the coherent superposition of positive and negative displacements (a non-Gaussian CV operation) act on the superposition of the single-rail DV qubit state $c_0 |0\rangle + c_1 |1\rangle$, with $c_{0,1}$ determined by the interaction parameters. Indeed, this can be seen as the single-rail analogue of the entangled state produced by Ulanov et al. in Ref. [35]. Of course, this state requires CSS states as an input, the generation of which remains challenging, notwithstanding substantial experimental progress in both the optical [47–50] and superconducting circuit [51] domains.

### 4 Iterative operation

In contrast to conventional protocols, we have the advantage that our protocol does not destroy the input state, even in case of failure. We can therefore further operate on the state to try to obtain the desired states. With the information we gain from the heralding event, we can feed forward to subsequent stages to try and recover the desired states. However, due to the large number of possible detection events $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle, |3\rangle, \ldots$ the output states that condition the adaptation of the protocol span a large space. Here, we consider optimising iterative operation of the protocol to target orthogonal states; we restrict ourselves to a few specific examples of failure modes and will not exhaust the full parameter space of cascading multiple stages with multiple failure modes.

In particular as sketched in Fig. 5(a), we only consider two detection events as valid and discard the rest. Let us start with a known $|\alpha\rangle$ at the first replacement stage. Here, we consider heralding on one photon as success and measuring vacuum as failure. Other events, such as detecting 2, 3 or more photons are consequently discarded and the protocol aborted. The failure state from heralding on vacuum is known and we can already prepare the second stage to reattempt to obtain orthogonal states. That is, we can determine the success and failure event of the second stage and adjust the splitter transmissivity accordingly. Going one step further, we then also know the state
after the second failure event and can adjust the third stage etc.

In Fig. 5 (b), we consider three of these cascading protocols to optimise the success probability for a given amplitude $|\alpha| = 1.0$. A simple example is the repetition of the first replacement stage, i.e. using one photon as an ancilla and heralding on one photon for success. As the single failure event, we consider measuring vacuum in mode $d$. However, this simple protocol does not give the highest success probability. We can improve it by adapting the success event to the stage number such that we herald on increasing photon number. This means, in stage one we herald on $|1\rangle$, in stage two on $|2\rangle$ and so on. This approach conserves the photon number between initial and output state if we consider measuring vacuum as the single failure mode. While this protocol gives higher success probability as sketched in gray, it is still possible to improve. In green, we have sketched the success probabilities when also adapting the failure mode from vacuum to measuring one photon less than required for the success event. This is the most likely failure event at any given stage of the protocol. As the success probabilities for the higher stage numbers scale with the failure probabilities in the previous ones, choosing a more likely failure event will increase the overall success efficiency.

However, in each of the depicted protocols in Fig. 5 we do not reach the IDP bound in black. Extrapolating the success probabilities, we assume that the considered cases do not reach the optimal success probability of state discrimination, even in the limit of many stages. However, we have not considered the possibility of other failure modes due to the large parameter space. When considering those, we are likely to improve the overall success probability, however it remains to be seen whether a generalisation of this particular protocol indeed reaches the appropriate bound.

We also note some interesting behaviour of the overlap between the output states behaves in the cases where we detect a failure event. In general, when a state discrimination protocol fails, the overlap after the failure event will be higher than before. In the case of optimal success probability (IDP), a failure will project the two initial states onto the same output state and consequently prohibit any further attempts to distinguish. In our case, we have more than one failure mode for which we may consider the overlap after replacement. In Fig. 6, we plot the overlap for different failure events in the first and second stage compared to the initial overlap. Let us consider the overlap after the first stage in Fig. 6(a). For comparison, the initial overlap (grey) between the states $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ is depicted dependent on $|\alpha|$. In case of measuring vacuum (shown in purple), the overlap after the replacement increases as expected. Especially in the case of low coherent state amplitudes $|\alpha| \lesssim 0.2$, where the success probability is close to the IDP limit, the overlap after the transition.
mation approaches unity. This behaviour prohibits further distinguishing of the states, as expected.

The interesting case occurs when we detect more photons than necessary for the success event, i.e. more than one in the first stage. Then, for small coherent state amplitudes the overlap decreases compared to the initial states. This is atypical for state discrimination protocols and we attribute this effect to the presence of many failure modes where the overlap after failure can be “distributed” among them. To verify that this is not only true for this special case in the first stage, we also compare the overlap after the second replacement stage in Fig. 6(b). In this case, both the vacuum case (pink) and single photon herald case (purple) show an increase in overlap compared to the initial state (grey). However, when detecting a higher photon number than required for the success event (here: three photons (red)) the protocol behaves atypically and the overlap decreases.

5 Conclusion

In conclusion, we have proposed and discussed a scheme for practical heralded state discrimination. We have shown that for each coherent state amplitude $|\alpha|$ we can find a beam splitter transmissivity $T(|\alpha|)$ such that $\{|\alpha\rangle, -|\alpha\rangle\}$ is probabilistically mapped onto an orthogonal set $\{|\Psi^+\rangle, |\Psi^-\rangle\}$. We have discussed the success probability of such a scheme for cascaded replacement stages and have observed that the overlap after replacement behaves differently to USD for certain failure modes. The success probability is closest to optimal at low $|\alpha|$, when the coherent states share large overlap initially. At larger coherent state amplitudes, interaction parameters can still be found to orthogonalise the states, however there is already minimal initial overlap in this regime, and the amount of failure modes increases since there are more photons involved in the interaction, resulting in a reduced probability from the optimal case. From these transformations, we have shown that one can construct a heralded coherent converter from continuous-variable coherent states to discrete-variable superposition states, and from coherent state superpositions to eigenstates of the photon number basis with reasonably high fidelities. This makes this operation an interesting and potentially useful tool in hybrid quantum information processing.
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A Appendix

A.1 Analytical results for first replacement stage

In the main text, we have claimed that we find at least one real valued solution for the beam splitter transmissivity to set the overlap in equation (3) to zero. While for our case we find three real valued solutions only one is bounded between zero and one. This is the branch that we consider to implement the physical transmissivities

\[
T(\alpha) = \frac{1}{12|\alpha|^4} \left( 4|\alpha|^2 (3 + 2|\alpha|^2) - \frac{4(-2)^{1/3}|\alpha|^6 (6 + |\alpha|^4)}{|\alpha|^2 [27 - 2|\alpha|^2 (9 + |\alpha|^6)] + 3\sqrt{3} \sqrt{-|\alpha|^{12} [5 + 4|\alpha|^4 (9 + |\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^6)]}^{1/3}} \right) + 2(-2)^{2/3} \left[ |\alpha|^6 [27 - 2|\alpha|^2 (9 + |\alpha|^6)] + 3\sqrt{3} \sqrt{-|\alpha|^{12} [5 + 4|\alpha|^4 (9 + |\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^6)]}^{1/3} \right].
\]

Furthermore, we give a formula to calculate the success probability for the first replacement stage

\[
P_{\text{success}} = e^{-(1-T(\alpha))|\alpha|^4} \left[ T(\alpha) + (1 - T(\alpha)) (1 - 3T(\alpha)) |\alpha|^2 + (1 - T(\alpha))^2 T(\alpha) |\alpha|^4 \right].
\]

A.2 Generating displaced discrete-variable superposition states

In equation 3, we write the output state of the protocol as the superposition of the vacuum and single photon Fock states, displaced by an amount \(\alpha \sqrt{T}\). One solution for equal amplitudes of the two coefficients is achieved when

\[
T(\alpha) = \frac{1}{6|\alpha|^2} \left( 4a^2 - 2 + \frac{2^{6/3} a^2 (a^4 - 4a^2 - 2)}{b} + 2^{2/3} b \right)
\]

where

\[
b = \left[ 3\sqrt{3} \sqrt{3} + 4a^2 + 20a^4 - 4a^6 + \left( 7 - 2a^2 \right) \left( 3 - 6a^2 + a^4 \right) \right]^{1/3}.
\]