

Quantum transition-edge detectors and other stuff

Mankei Tsang Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering Department of Physics National University of Singapore

eletmk@nus.edu.sg
http://mankei.tsang.googlepages.com/

August 23, 2013

Fundamental quantum limits to optomechanical sensing



- Braginsky and Khalili, *Quantum Measurement*
- Caves *et al.*, RMP **52**, 341-392 (1980).

nis=Hur

Fundamental quantum limits to optomechanical sensing



- Quantum Cramér-Rao Bound (QCRB):
 - No-go theorem
 - Lower bound on mean-square estimation error given initial state and dynamics
 - Valid for any measurement (POVM) on A_{out}
 - No clue on attainability and best measurement
- M. Tsang, H. M. Wiseman, and C. M. Caves, PRL **106**, 090401 (2011).
- Detection (Helstrom) bounds: M. Tsang and R. Nair, PRA 86, 042115 (2012).
- Decoherence: M. Tsang, NJP 15, 073005 (2013).



- K. Iwasawa, K. Makino, H. Yonezawa, M. Tsang, A. Davidovic, E. Huntington, A. Furusawa, arXiv:1305.0066 (PRL?)
- Coherent state/phase-squeezed light + classical PZT mirror + homodyne phase-locked loop + smoothing



Experimental results

- Green: Coherent states
- Red: Phase-squeezed light
- Solid line: classical Wiener theory
- Dashed lines: QCRB
- This is remarkable because
 - QCRB offers no clue about whether it is attainable.
 - QCRB offers no clue about what's the best measurement to approach it.
 - Large number of parameters in a waveform.
 - Large number of optical modes in continuouswave beam.
 - Homodyne phase-locked loop + smoothing is pretty good.
 - More complicated photonic circuit/quantum computer won't help much.





System and observation equations:

$$\frac{dz(t)}{dt} = \mathbf{F}z(t) + \xi(t),\tag{1}$$

$$y(t) = Cz(t) + \eta(t),$$
(2)

$$\langle \xi(t)\xi(t')\rangle = Q\delta(t-t'),$$
(3)

$$\langle \eta(t)\eta(t')\rangle = \mathbf{R}\delta(t-t').$$
 (4)

- Our study so far assumes F, C, Q, R are known exactly and we estimate z(t) from y(t) (linear estimation).
- What if we don't know and linearization doesn't work?
 - System Identification: How to perform parameter estimation?
 - **Experimental Design**: How to enhance sensitivity to parameters?
 - Quantum Limits?
- **Applications**: many sensing applications rely on these parameters:
 - **Optical resonance frequency**: cavity enhanced detection of nanoparticles
 - ◆ Mechanical resonance frequency: e.g., Albrecht, Rugar et al., JAP 69, 668 (1991).
 - Noise power/Damping rate: Thermometry/bolometry, rheology, etc.
 - System identification: Demonstration of optomechanical phenomena, e.g., cooling, ponderomotive squeezing, BAE, etc.



- Most optomechanics experiments don't do statistics properly, e.g., Gavartin, Verlot, Kippenberg, Nature Nanotech. 7, 509 (2012).
- S. Z. Ang, G. I. Harris, W. P. Bowen, M. Tsang, arXiv:1307.3800:
 - Analytic results for classical Cramér-Rao bounds
 - Expectation-Maximization (EM) algorithm (smoothing + iteration, converges to maximum-likelihood) [Shumway and Stoffer, *Time Series Analysis and its Applications*]
 - EM can also estimate most of the other parameters, e.g., mechanical resonance frequency, damping rate, useful for **system identification**.
 - See also Guta and Yamamoto, arXiv:1303.3771.



Next question: How to enhance parameter sensitivity?







Photon induces avalanche electron-hole-pair creation



■ Yariv and Yeh, *Photonics*

V

Example #2: Superconducting transition-edge sensor

Bias temperature just below critical



- Increase in temperature induces phase transition and gigantic increase in resistance
- Irwin and Hilton, Cryogenic Particle Detection, Topics Appl. Phys. 99, 63152 (2005).

Final straw that broke a camel's back

- **TES** is an example of **classical phase transitions**.
- What if we want to detect optical phase shifts/resonance frequency shifts:

$$H_I = \omega a^{\dagger} a? \tag{5}$$

■ use quantum phase transitions:

$$H = \omega a^{\dagger} a + H_C \tag{6}$$

- Think of H_C as a coherent control Hamiltonian that increase the system sensitivity (e.g., ground state) to ω .
- Examples:
 - Ising (spin-spin interaction, magnetic field)
 - Dicke (light-atom interaction)
 - Bose-Hubbard (bosons in lattice)
 - Dicke-Ising (Heisenberg-scaling metrology: Gammelmark and Molmer, NJP 13, 053035 (2011))

Sachev, Quantum Phase Transitions

Laser/OPO near threshold (sensitive to cavity detuning)

is=Hw

$$H = \boldsymbol{\omega} a^{\dagger} a + \lambda \left(a^2 + a^{\dagger 2} \right) + \dots$$
 (7)

Two Hamiltonians:

$$H_0 = \omega_0 a^{\dagger} a + H_C \tag{8}$$

$$H_1 = (\omega_0 + \delta) a^{\dagger} a + H_C \tag{9}$$

• Let $|\psi\rangle$ be, say, ground state of H_0 . Define

$$F = \left| \langle \psi | U_1^{\dagger} U_0 | \psi \rangle \right|^2 \tag{10}$$

called Loschmidt echo (Peres, Quantum Theory).

- Used to study time reversibility of quantum chaos. Big drop in F for small $\Delta \omega$ implies time irreversibility, chaos. [Gorin *et al.*, Phys. Rep. **435**, 33156 (2006)].
- **Quantum metrology**: Suppose $H = H_0$ when no perturbation and $H = H_1$ when there is.

$$\min_{E(Y)} P_e = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{1 - F} \right).$$
(11)

- Small F means small P_e (for the optimal POVM).
- Don't worry about photon-number constraints (photons are cheap)
- Coherent state, no H_C : $-\ln P_{emin} \approx -\ln F \propto \delta^2 t^2$, $\delta \propto 1/t$
- Ground state of H_0 , parametric H_C , H_1 is above critical point: $-\ln F \propto \sqrt{\delta}t$, $\delta \propto 1/t^2$,
- M. Tsang, PRA 88, 021801(R) (2013).

Continuous measurements

- Continuous homodyne/heterodyne measurements
- Classical fidelity (Bhattacharyya distance) below threshold:

$$-\ln F = \frac{t}{2} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \ln \frac{|S_1(\Omega) + S_0(\Omega)|}{2\sqrt{|S_1(\Omega)||S_0(\Omega)|}}$$
(12)

■ Fisher information *G*:

$$F(\omega, \omega + \delta) \approx 1 - G(\omega)\delta^2/4$$
 (13)

■ Schliesser *et al.*, PRL **97**, 243905 (2006):

■ Hertzberg *et al.*, Nature Phys. **6**, 213 (2010):

- Question: how to demonstrate quantized mechanical energy?
- Thompson *et al.*, Nature; Sankey *et al.*, Nature Phys. 6, 707 (2010)
 - ◆ Santamore, *et al.*, PRB **70**, 144301 (2004)
 - ◆ Jacobs *et al.*, PRL 98, 147201 (2007)
 - Miao et al., PRL 103, 100402 (2009)
 - Clerk et al., PRL 104, 213603 (2010).
- Begging the question: prove quantum mechanics by assuming quantum mechanics
- **Expected values** can't be measured in finite time.
- Asymmetric sidebands with heterodyne
 - ◆ Safavi-Naeini *et al.*, PRL **108**, 033602 (2012).
 - Brahms et al., PRL 108, 133601 (2012).
 - http://www.youtube.com/watch?v=pktWhH6m_DM
- Linear Gaussian model:
 - ◆ Khalili *et al.*, PRA **86**, 033840 (2012).
 - ◆ Jayich *et al.* NJP **14**, 115018 (2012).
 - ◆ Safavi-Naeini *et al.*, NJP **15**, 035007 (2013).
 - M. Tsang, arXiv:1306.2699.

Quantum hypothesis testing

Compare quantum model with your **best** classical model
 e.g., under quantum hypothesis H₁:

$$dy_t = n_t dt + dV_t, \tag{14}$$

 n_t is energy of quantized harmonic oscillator in thermal bath. compare against classical hypothesis \mathcal{H}_0 :

$$dy_t = \mathcal{E}_t dt + dV_t. \tag{15}$$

 \mathcal{E}_t should be energy of classical harmonic oscillator in thermal bath.

- Statistical hypothesis testing:
 - ♦ M. Tsang, PRL 108, 170502 (2012).
 - Do likelihood-ratio test.
 - Nice formula (valid for any $dy_t = X_t dt + dV_t$):

$$\Lambda = \frac{P(Y|\mathcal{H}_1)}{P(Y|\mathcal{H}_0)} = \exp\left[\int \frac{dy}{R} \left(\mu_1 - \mu_0\right) - \frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dt}{R} \left(\mu_1^2 - \mu_0^2\right)\right]$$
(

Quantum filtering expectations: μ_0 $E[X_t|\mathcal{H}_0], \ \mu_1 = E[X_t|\mathcal{H}_1].$

Classical case: Duncan, Inform. Control 13, 62 (1968).

16 / 21

Expected information

- How well is the testing procedure expected to work?
- Information measure: relative entropy

$$n\Lambda \to E\left[\ln\Lambda |\mathcal{H}_1\right] \equiv D(P_1||P_0) \tag{17}$$

Increases with more data

Cute formula valid for $dy_t = X_t dt + dV_t$ and any X_t (unpublished, use martingale property of innovation $E[dy_t - \mu_1 dt | \mathcal{Y}_t, \mathcal{H}_1] = 0$ and orthogonality principle for quantum conditional expectations $E[h(Y)(\mu_1 - X) | \mathcal{Y}_t, \mathcal{H}_1] = 0$):

$$D(P_1||P_0) = E\left[\int \frac{dy}{R} \left(\mu_1 - \mu_0\right) - \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{dt}{R} \left(\mu_1^2 - \mu_0^2\right) \left|\mathcal{H}_1\right]$$
(18)

$$= E\left[\int \frac{\mu_1 dt}{R} (\mu_1 - \mu_0) - \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{dt}{R} (\mu_1^2 - \mu_0^2) \left| \mathcal{H}_1 \right]$$
(19)

$$=\frac{1}{2}\int \frac{dt}{R}E\left[\left(\mu_{1}-\mu_{0}\right)^{2}\Big|\mathcal{H}_{1}\right]$$
(20)

$$= \frac{1}{2} \int \frac{dt}{R} E\left[(\mu_0 - X)^2 - (\mu_1 - X)^2 \, \Big| \, \mathcal{H}_1 \right]$$
(21)

- Relates relative entropy to mismatched quantum filtering error.
- Classical case: Weissman, IEEE TIT 56, 4256 (2010).
- Relates mutual information, classical filtering and smoothing errors: Duncan, SIAM JAM 19, 215 (1970); Guo, Shamai, and Verdu, IEEE TIT 51, 1261 (2005), etc.

ihý=Hý

- Quantum-mechanics-free systems:
 - QND condition in Heisenberg picture

$$\left[O_j(t), O_k(t')\right] = 0.$$

- Measurement of the commuting observables only
- Spectral theorem: Any classical deterministic/stochastic model can be framed this way.
 - Koopman, PNAS 17, 315 (1931).
 - Gough and James, IEEE TAC **54**, 2530 (2009).
- Backaction-evading
 - Caves et al., RMP 52, 341-392 (1980).
 - Tsang and Caves, PRX **2**, 031016 (2012).
 - If one has access to these commuting observables only, he/she would never find out about quantum mechanics.

(22)

iĥψ=Hψ

- Efficiently simulable by classical stochastic systems
- Examples:
 - linear Gaussian (nonnegative Wigner)
 - Gottesman-Knill theorem
 - Any dynamics with nonnegative quasiprobability representations
- ad-hoc rules on system/observation noise (epistemic restrictions)
- This class is incredibly important for QIP as a **no-go**:
 - Quantum computing
 - No need for quantum computer
 - Quantum simulation
 - Good news for quantum chemistry, condensed matter etc.
 - Quantum filtering/estimation
 - Good news because we can use finite-dimensional classical algorithms to avoid curse of dimensionality:

- Kalman filter
- Monte Carlo/particle filters

- Bell-type (Bell, CHSH, Kochen-Specker, etc.) theorems rule out a wide class of classical models
 - Contextuality
 - Nonlocality: related to contextuality. (Mermin RMP)
- Universal quantum computation: Single-photon sources, beam splitters, phase shifters, photodetectors (Knill-Laflamme-Milburn)
- **Boson sampling** (Aaronson *et al.*)

Summary

Waveform QCRB

- Theory: M. Tsang, H. M. Wiseman, and C. M. Caves, PRL 106, 090401 (2011); M. Tsang, NJP 15, 073005 (2013).
- Experiment: Iwasawa *et al.*, arXiv:1305.0066.
- Optomechanical parameter estimation
 - S. Z. Ang *et al.*, arXiv:1307.3800.
- Quantum transition-edge detectors
 - M. Tsang, PRA **88**, 021801(R) (2013).
- Continuous quantum hypothesis testing
 - M. Tsang, PRL **108**, 170502 (2012).
 - M. Tsang, "Relative entropy and mismatched quantum filtering error," unpublished.
 - M. Tsang, arXiv:1306.2699v2.
- supported by the Singapore National Research Foundation Fellowship (NRF-NRFF2011-07).

