Quantum Imaging: Spooky images at a distance (and what to do with them)
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Ever wonder how to make a quantum image? Probably not,... but what you would do with a quantum image if you had one?

but first... just what is a “quantum image”?

Having faced these questions I can give you our answers...

motivation: quantum information processing, image processing, general marketing
Quantum Advantages?

using “squeezed light”

Note that there have not been an incredible number of applications that have rolled out over the years...

Generally it has to:
(1) be worth the substantial hassle, and
(2) not just be easier to turn up the power.

⇒ You are left with light-starved applications or places where you just can’t or don’t want to turn up the power for fear of burning things...
motivations...

- lets face it... “quantum” generally means “fragile” as well - where is this potentially useful?

- soft tissue imaging or imaging live cells or other bits where you can’t turn up the laser

- satellite imaging?

- LIGO
metrology motivation

- interferometry
- length metrology
- sensitive detection
- quantum information processing
- photodiode calibrations/ calibrated light sources

we are NIST, after all...
our program:

make quantum images
  (and do something with them)

quantum images to make higher resolution or sensitivity

information processing (quantum or classical) with improved performance; optical memory

fundamental questions, such as, how fast can a quantum correlation go?

we are not alone... others have gone before us!
Noise limits all measurements, and the ultimate limit of noise is quantum noise.

“Ordinary” laser light can never be measured better than this “shot noise” limit. Similar shot noise limitations apply to important measurements like atomic fountain and trapped ion clocks. These limitations are fundamental, based on Heisenberg’s uncertainty principle.
Heisenberg: \[ \Delta x \Delta p \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \]
\[ \Delta N \Delta \phi \geq 1 \]

For laser light: \( \Delta \phi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \) and \( \Delta N = \sqrt{N} \)

\[ \frac{\Delta N}{N} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \]

But we can make \( \Delta N \) smaller at the expense of making \( \Delta \phi \) larger (when we don’t care about phase).

This is called “quantum squeezing.”

Doing this is so hard that typically one just accepts the shot noise limit and makes \( N \) bigger. But sometimes the available or allowable \( N \) is small enough, and the application is critical enough that you turn to squeezing:

• Atomic Clocks;
• Laser Interferometer Gravity-wave Observatory (LIGO) (neither of which yet use squeezing for “real” measurements.)
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Another Application for Quantum Light: Imaging

N.B.: over-simplified example

- Detector array
- Read-out

- "Classical" light
- "Squeezed" light

- Shot noise limited
- Sub-shot noise
making use of correlations

A weak signal, buried in noise, is hard to detect.
If we \textit{exactly duplicate} the fluctuating probe, then subtract the noise, it is easier to detect the signal.
the PROBLEM of classical correlations

A beamsplitter or half-silvered mirror can “duplicate” only the classical noise on the beam; the “shot noise” due to photons “randomly deciding” which way to go is uncorrelated and adds.
the advantage of quantum correlations

If we duplicate the fluctuating probe, *including* its quantum noise, then subtract, it is even easier to detect the signal.
A “twin beam” squeezed-light source will duplicate the fluctuating probe, including any quantum noise. Thus we can subtract even the quantum noise, and detect previously undetectable signals.
4-Wave Mixing

\[ P_4(t) = \chi^{(3)} E_1(t)E_2(t)E_3(t) \]

a “parametric” process; it leaves the (atomic) medium in the state that it started in...

it does not have to involve a “real” transition and can be off-resonant.
four-wave mixing
(the optical scientist’s universal tool)

when you have a hammer
everything looks like a nail
we use it to make:
• squeezed light
• amplifiers
• slow light
• fast light

when it works... you go with it
What do we expect from 4-Wave-Mixing (4WM) in the quantum limit?

- non-classical, sub-shot-noise intensity difference between the “twin beams”
- amplified probe
- relatively squeezed
- correlated conjugate

- twin-beam generation
- multi-spatial-mode quantum correlations (quantum imaging)
- acts as a phase insensitive amplifier (PIA)
phase matching conditions

energy conservation: \( \omega_1 + \omega_2 = \omega_3 + \omega_4 \)

\[
\begin{array}{c}
\omega_1, k_1 \\
\omega_2, k_2 \\
\omega_3, k_3 \\
\omega_4, k_4 \\
\end{array}
\]

momentum conservation: \( \vec{k}_1 + \vec{k}_2 = \vec{k}_3 + \vec{k}_4 \)
phase sum and intensity difference relations

phase-sum squeezing

\[ \phi_0 + \phi_0 = \phi_p + \phi_c \]

“intensity-difference squeezing” is really “photon-number-difference squeezing” (same number of photons in each beam)
4wm vs. OPOs ...or... $\chi^{(3)}$ vs $\chi^{(2)}$ media

OPO (optical parametric oscillator)

4WM (four-wave mixing)
entangled twin beams

- intensity difference squeezing tells you about correlations
- entanglement requires two variables simultaneously squeezed: intensity-difference and phase-sum correlations

- inseparability of the wavefunction
- continuous-variable EPR violations (guarantee for mixed state) require a level of squeezing beyond 50% (3 dB) in each variable

\[ \omega_0, k_0 \quad \rightarrow \quad \omega_p, k_p \quad \rightarrow \quad \omega_c, k_c \]
high-tech equipment:

ok, we have some nice lasers too...
sophisticated experimental arrangements
Single-mode squeezing

- Mode of frequency $\omega \equiv$ harmonic oscillator of frequency $\omega$
- $\hat{x} \rightarrow \hat{X}$
  $\hat{p} \rightarrow \hat{Y}$
  with the rotation taken out
- Coherent state:
  $\langle \Delta \hat{X}^2 \rangle = 1$
  $\langle \Delta \hat{Y}^2 \rangle = 1$
- Squeezing:
  $\langle \Delta \hat{X}^2 \rangle < 1$
  $\langle \Delta \hat{Y}^2 \rangle > 1$
- Pairs of photons
- Generalize to bright beam
Two-mode squeezing: phase-insensitive amplifier

Coupled Gain correlations

two vacuum modes → two noisy, but entangled, vacuum modes
Squeezing quadratures

- Generalized quadratures:
  \[ \hat{X}_- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{X}_1 - \hat{X}_2) \]
  \[ \hat{Y}_+ = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{Y}_1 + \hat{Y}_2) \]

- Squeezing:
  \[ \langle \Delta \hat{X}_-^2 \rangle < 1 \]
  \[ \langle \Delta \hat{Y}_+^2 \rangle < 1 \]

- Individual modes are noisy:
  \[ \langle \Delta \hat{X}_1^2 \rangle > 1 \]
  \[ \langle \Delta \hat{Y}_1^2 \rangle > 1 \]
homodyne detection

• mix signal with bright beam of same frequency
• get amplification of a small signal
• local oscillator fluctuations cancel out
• phase sensitive

\[ |E + \varepsilon|^2 = |E|^2 + |\varepsilon|^2 + E^* \varepsilon + E \varepsilon^* \]
\[ |E - \varepsilon|^2 = |E|^2 + |\varepsilon|^2 - E^* \varepsilon - E \varepsilon^* \]
\[ E \gg \varepsilon \]
noise
“squeezed light” implies, in some form, reduced fluctuations
this is usually compared to “shot noise”

N particles/second => noise \sim N^{1/2}

state of the art; (linear and log)

3 dB = factor of 2; 10% noise = -10 dB

world records:
(using an OPO): -9.7 dB (11%) for twin beams

last week: -10.6 dB (9%) from 4WM!

-12.5 dB for single-mode quadrature squeezing
4WM to generate quantum correlations

- twin-beam generation
- multi-spatial-mode squeezing
- acts as a phase insensitive amplifier

$^{85}\text{Rb}$ in a 12 mm cell
Temp. $\sim 120 \, ^\circ \text{C}$
$\sim 1 \, \text{GHz}$ detuned
$\sim 400 \, \text{mW}$ pump
$\sim 100 \, \text{W}$ probe
narrowband
no cavity

double-$\varphi$ scheme; ground state coherences with modest gain but very little loss
strong twin-beam squeezing

intensity-difference squeezing indicates correlations but homodyne detection required to demonstrate entanglement

no cavity, so freedom for complex and multiple spatial modes!
demonstrating entanglement

scan LO phase

alignment and bright beam entanglement

phase stable local oscillators at +/- 3GHz from the pump
demonstrating entanglement

vacuum squeezing

unsqueezed vacuum

probe

conjugate

pumps

pzt mirror

+ and -

signal pump

LO pump

50/50 BS

scan LO phase
“twin beam” vacuum quadrature entanglement

- Piezos are scanned simultaneously
- Local oscillators are created by 4WM

measurements at 0.5 MHz
entangled images

- Almost arbitrary mode shape
- High penalty for mode mismatch

measurements at 0.5 MHz

many modes possible in photon 4WM

seeded, bright modes

cone of vacuum-squeezed modes
(allowed by phase matching)

we could, theoretically, use
many spatial modes in parallel
entangled “images”

arbitrarily-shaped local oscillators can be used
(we used a “T”-shaped beam)
squeezing in both quadratures;
(equivalent results in all quadratures)
Gaussian bright-beam (-3.5 dB) or
vacuum (-4.3 dB); T-shaped vacuum (-3.7 dB)
implies EPR-levels of CV-entanglement could be measured in each case

\[ E_{12} = \text{var}(X_1|X_2)\text{var}(Y_1|Y_2) \]
\[ I = \text{var}(X_-) + \text{var}(Y_+) \]

no feedback loops or mode cleanup cavities!
squeezed and entangled cats

local oscillators for measurements of 1 dB quadrature squeezed vacuum

bright beams showing intensity-difference squeezing

squeezed cats

~1 dB “whole image” intensity-difference squeezing
enhanced graphics!
Another (indirect) result of the uncertainty principle:

No perfect amplifiers!

\[ \Delta N \Delta \phi = 1 \]  
(quantum perfect)

\[ \Delta N = \sqrt{N} \]  
(perfect “coherent” state, Poisson statistics)

\[ \Delta N \Delta \phi > 1 \]  
(worse than the quantum limit)

\[ \Delta N > \sqrt{N} \]  
(noisier than Poisson statistics)

But a **phase-sensitive** quantum amplifier **CAN** be “perfect” (for a certain phase of the input); the price is that it de-amplifies, and increases the noise, for signals out-of-phase.
Noiseless image amplification

sounds too good to be true; like something that must be forbidden...

There is a “no-cloning theorem” which might say that ...

...but if you don’t want “all the information” ... maybe something can be done.

Images typically contain amplitude, but not phase information. If you are happy to amplify the intensity and throw extra noise into the phase, you can do it.

Phase-sensitive amplifiers have been built and can perform noiseless image amplification!

PSAs and PIAs

• quantum information processing

• most activity related to fiber amplifiers and fiber communications; better noise figure

• EU PHASORS program (fiber communications)

• DARPA Quantum Sensors Program (P. Kumar, Northwestern)

• multi-mode parametric downconversion (Italy, France, US...)

(images) - our work falls into this area as well;

low gain, low resolution, but proof-of-concept amps
set to stun?
phase-(in)sensitive amplifiers

the phase of the injected beam, with respect to those of the pumps, will determine whether the beam will be amplified or de-amplified.

One can design an amplifier for given field quadratures - useful for signal processing!

given the phase of 3 “input” beams the 4th phase is free to adjust for gain:

\[ \phi_{+} = 2\phi_{0} - \phi_{-} \]

phase-insensitive

phase-sensitive

no free parameter

gain:

\[ 0 = 2\phi_{0} - \phi_{-} - \phi_{+} \]
noise limits

phase insensitive amplifier

PIA: \( NF = \frac{\text{SNR}_{in}}{\text{SNR}_{out}} = \frac{2G-1}{G} \rightarrow 2 \)

large G limit

phase sensitive amplifier

PSA: \( NF = 1 \) (in the ideal case, for the correct choice of signal phase)
Phase-insensitive amplifier

- 1 MHz *classical* signal amplified with moderate gain
- noise figure \((\text{SNR}_{\text{out}}/\text{SNR}_{\text{in}})<1\) is close to theoretical limit

Phase Sensitive Amplifier: Quadrature squeezing

• de-amplification phase produces intensity squeezing
• 3 dB single-mode vacuum quadrature squeezing
• multiple spatial modes

PSA noise figure measurement

- Phase-sensitive amplifier can provide “noiseless” amplification
  \[ \text{NF} = \frac{\text{SNR}_{\text{in}}}{\text{SNR}_{\text{out}}} \]
  (inverse of what we used before)

- Modest gains, but multi-spatial-mode and nearly “noiseless”

EU PHASORS program has demonstrated higher gain single-mode, fiber-based PSA
PSA noise figure (cont.)

Gain

PIA limit
PSA
PSA w/ loss

Gain

Noise Figure

△ One-Photon Detuning [GHz]
“noiseless” image amplification

- “images” amplified, but thus far only good noise figure data from looking at a time-modulation signal
- We will need to look at spatial information and quantify with spatial Fourier transforms; noise spectral density and Detective Quantum Efficiency

previous work:
Quantum Sensors Program (DARPA)
P. Kumar (NU), M. Vasilyev (UTA) (SPIE proceedings, to be published)
quantum memory

• we have chosen the gradient echo memory (GEM) technique developed at ANU (suited to Rb wavelength)
• ANU group has achieved 87% recovery efficiency using a Rb vapor system and demonstrated the ability to store and manipulate multiple pulses in a single spatial mode
• using a slightly different implementation (transitions, polarizations, detunings) we have achieved 62% recovery efficiency
• we have stored multi-spatial-mode images and even a (very short!) movie (classical!)

implementation of GEM memory

- apply magnetic field gradient
- store frequency components distributed in space
  - (turn off control field for storage time)
- flip field gradient
- allow rephased dipoles to radiate echo
current status of GEM studies in our lab

- storage of images (classical)
- simultaneous multiple image storage
- studies of diffusion/storage time on resolution
- studies of crosstalk between stored images
- “random access” of local spatial regions
- stored “movie” (short)
- generation and detection of 4 dB of pulsed squeezing/entangled beams
classical optical image memory

0-800ns insert N
800-1700 insert T
1900-4000 recover T
4000- recover N

the future is quantum (memory)

~2 microseconds of read-in, 2 microseconds of storage (flip magnetic field), and 2 microseconds of read-out
“Cloud Storage”

“random access” (low resolution)

QuickTime™ and a decompressor are needed to see this picture.
manipulation of dispersion with 4WM

EIT (less loss) spectrum with associated dispersion

4WM gain features imply dispersion and slow light as well
4WM for "Fast Light"

- effective fast light generation with 4WM system
- want to investigate "fast light" propagation of quantum information
- fast light with images

a somewhat different 4WM configuration leads to a different dispersion character and "fast light"
Superluminal pulse propagation limits to fast light advance $\sim T_p$ with reasonable gain ($\sim 100$) (ref: B. Macke, B. Segard and F. Wielonsky, “Optimal superluminal systems,” Phys. Rev. E 72, 035601 (2005))

here we achieve $\sim 0.5 \left| T_p \right|$ with gain $\sim 1$

superluminal probe propagation plus generation of superluminal(?) conjugate beam
Fast Light studies

• some of the best pulse advances ever (65%)
• fast images
• fast classical (spatial) information
• fast quantum information ???
• correlate fast light pulses:

fast light 4wm medium

?
summary of future desires
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