On the purity and indistinguishability of down-converted photons
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Abstract
Photons generated by spontaneous parametric down conversion (SPDC) are one of the most useful resources in quantum information science. Two of their most important characteristics are the purity and the indistinguishability, which determine just how useful they are as a resource. We show how these characteristics can both be accessed through Hong, Ou and Mandel type interferences using a single pair source. We also provide simple and intuitive analytical formulas to extract their values from the depth of the resulting interference patterns. The validity of these expressions is demonstrated by a comparison with experimental results and numerical simulations. These results provide an essential tool for both engineering SPDC sources and characterizing the quantum states that they emit, which will play an increasingly important role in developing complex quantum photonic experiments.

(Some figures may appear in colour only in the online journal)

Introduction
The ability to engineer and characterize quantum photonic states is of paramount importance as the complexity of the experiments in quantum information science increases. In particular, it is fundamental to be able to combine multiple independent sources [1, 2] and this is usually done via interference, e.g. through a Bell state measurement (BSM). At the heart of interference there are two concepts, two characteristics, of the photonic states: purity—how close the real photons are to the theorist’s ideal of a single mode quantum object, and the indistinguishability—how alike the different photons are [3, 4]. Indistinguishability is a fairly clear concept and its role in interference experiments has been widely accepted for some time, in contrast to the purity, whose effect on the interferometric visibilities is sometimes ignored.

The indistinguishability and purity can be increased either by filtering, or by engineering the source itself. As we will see, filtering is an option for some applications, but it is also a loss factor and potentially a significant one. If one wants efficient, even scalable, multi-photon systems, then one needs to go to the source [5]. In this paper we will focus on spontaneous parametric down conversion (SPDC) as this provides one of the most widespread and flexible resources for experiments in quantum information science.

SPDC sources probabilistically generate two-photon states with diverse features in space and frequency and in those degrees of freedom the photons can be anywhere from maximally entangled to totally uncorrelated. A common way to characterize SPDC-generated photons is by using two-photon interferometers. These were first introduced by Hong, Ou and Mandel (HOM) [6] as a tool to measure the relatively narrow bandwidth of SPDC photons. The basic idea is to observe the coincidence statistics at the output of a 50/50 beamsplitter (BS) as a function of the delay between two photons at the BS input. Due to their bosonic nature the photons may bunch, giving rise to the characteristic dip in the coincidences. This interference effect will depend on the indistinguishability and purity of the photons and whether they are from the same, or independent, sources. Therefore, the question arises as to what information concerning the indistinguishability and purity can be extracted from these HOM-like interference patterns?

By focusing on the frequency degree of freedom, in this paper we discuss what information can be obtained from the interference patterns of different interferometers. We provide simple analytical formulas relating the SPDC parameters with the characteristics of the interference patterns. Such formulas can therefore be used to engineer photonic states with specific values of indistinguishability and purity. These are shown to...
be in good agreement with both experiment and numerical modelling.

1. The two-photon state

In SPDC, pairs of photons are generated by the interaction of a classic pump beam and a nonlinear material. Conservation of energy and momentum set the relations between frequency and spatial distribution for the pump and the generated photons: signal and idler. The correlations between the degrees of freedom can be minimized by a careful design of the source [7], or can be erased by projecting the state into a single mode in one of the degrees of freedom. In those cases, the two-photon state is a product between a spatial and a frequency part. Here, we focus on the frequency part, but an analogous analysis is possible for the more general case.

When considering only the spectral component, the two-photon state generated in SPDC is described by the pure state

$$\rho = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|,$$

where

$$|\Psi\rangle = \int d\Omega_1 d\Omega_2 \hat{\Phi}(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \hat{a}^\dagger(\Omega_1) \hat{a}^\dagger(\Omega_2) |0, 0\rangle.$$  

(1)

If we define \(w_n\) as the frequency of the photons, then \(\Omega_n = w_n - w_n^0\) gives the deviation from the central frequency \(w_n^0\). All of the information about the frequency distribution of the generated pair of photons is described by the normalized mode function \(\Phi(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)\). The state of a single photon is calculated by tracing out the other photon from the two-photon density matrix \(\rho\), i.e., \(\rho_s = \text{Tr}[|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|]\), which can be written as

$$\rho_s = \int d\Omega_1 d\Omega_2 \phi_s(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \hat{a}^\dagger(\Omega_1) |0\rangle \langle 0| \hat{a}(\Omega_2),$$

(2)

where the single-photon mode function is

$$\phi_s(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = \int d\Omega_1 \Phi(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \Phi^*(\Omega_1, \Omega_2).$$

(3)

To explicitly calculate the mode function, consider a Gaussian-pulsed laser with a bandwidth \(\sigma_p\), and a crystal with a length \(L\), in that case \(\Phi(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)\) is given by

$$\Phi(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = N \exp \left[-\frac{(\Omega_1 + \Omega_2)^2}{4\sigma_p^2} - \frac{\Delta_k L}{2}\right] \sin\left[\frac{\Delta_k L}{2}\right] \exp \left[-i\Delta_k L\right].$$

(4)

Here \(N\) is a normalization constant, such that \(|\Phi(\Omega_1, \Omega_2)|^2 = 1\) and the first exponential is due to the spectral distribution of the pump, assuming a Gaussian profile. The properties of the material appear through the phase-matching term \(\Delta_k = k_p - k_s - k_i\) and the last exponential represents any possible spectral filtering of the photons, which we model as Gaussian functions with bandwidths \(\sigma_k\) and \(\sigma_i\).

Some approximations are useful when calculating the properties of the mode function in (4). For instance, by taking the first-order terms in the Taylor expansion of \(\Delta_k\), it is possible to write the phase-matching term as \(\Delta_k = (N_p - N_i)\Omega_s + (N_p - N_i)\Omega_i\), where \(N_p\), \(N_i\), and \(N_s\) are the inverse group velocities of the pump, signal and idler. Another common approximation is to replace the function \(\text{sinc}(x)\) by \(\exp(-\alpha x^2)\) where, if \(\alpha = 0.193\), both functions have the same FWHM. Under these approximations the mode function becomes,

$$\Phi(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) = N \exp \left[-\frac{a\Omega_1^2}{4} - \frac{b\Omega_2^2}{4} - \frac{c\Omega_1\Omega_2}{2} - \frac{i n\Omega_1 + n\Omega_2}{2}\right].$$

(5)

where we define

$$a = \alpha^2 m^2 + 1/\sigma_p^2 + 1/\sigma_i^2,$$

$$b = \alpha^2 n^2 + 1/\sigma_p^2 + 1/\sigma_i^2,$$

$$c = \alpha^2 mn + 1/\sigma_p^2.$$

(6)

The remaining factors \(m = L(N_p - N_s)\) and \(n = L(N_p - N_i)\), are dependent on the crystal length and the difference in the inverse group velocities for the different fields.

Writing the mode function as a product of exponentials as in (5) makes it possible to analytically calculate many quantities related to the two-photon state [7]. It also provides a useful and intuitive geometrical picture of what is happening in the frequency space of the joint function—the first three terms clearly describe an ellipse with the axes defined by \(a\) and \(b\) and the \(c\) component defining a rotation about \(\Omega_1\) and \(\Omega_2\). The last term describes the relative phase between \(\Omega_1\) and \(\Omega_2\).

In the following sections we derive the functions describing the indistinguishability and purity of photons for these sources after passing through two-photon, HOM-type, interferometers.

2. On HOM interference and indistinguishability

The indistinguishability \(I\) of two photons quantifies the overlap between their quantum states, i.e. for states with no overlap, \(I = 0\), while for indistinguishable photons \(I = 1\). The most natural way to test this, is to try to make the photons bunch, which is exactly what HOM did in their seminal paper about two-photon interference [6]. In a so-called HOM interferometer, as shown in figure 1, the signature interference dip can be observed if the temporal resolution of the detector
is longer than the coherence time of the photons. If this holds, the probability $R_{cc}$ of having a coincidence between the outputs of the BS is given by the integral over the detection times $(t_a, t_b)$ of the second-order coherence function $G^{(2)}(t_a, t_b) = \langle \rho \hat{E}^{(-)}(t_a) \hat{E}^{(-)}(t_b) \hat{E}^{(+)}(t_b) \hat{E}^{(+)}(t_a) \rangle$, where $\hat{E}_a$ and $\hat{E}_b$ are the field operators at the detectors $a$ and $b$, then the integral in (9) has analytic solutions. By calculating this probability as a function of the temporal delay $\Delta t$ between the photons, one can show that the coincidences have the characteristic interference pattern given by

$$R_{cc}(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{4} [1 - I(\Delta t)],$$

where

$$I(\Delta t) = \int d\Omega_a d\Omega_b \Phi(\Omega_a, \Omega_b) \Phi^*(\Omega_a, \Omega_b) \exp[-i(\Omega_b - \Omega_a) \Delta t].$$

The exact and approximated calculations for the HOM dip compared with a dip obtained experimentally. In the experiment, the interaction of a 780 nm pump laser beam with a 2 cm PPLN crystal generated pairs of photons frequency-degenerated at 1560 nm and orthogonally polarized. Polarization controllers were used to guarantee indistinguishability in polarization, and the photons where filtered by 1.4 nm Gaussian filters.

The oscillations outside the dip can be explained by a drift of the central frequency of the photons, due to fluctuations of the temperature of the crystal during the experiment. The results are illustrated in figure 2. The estimated visibility is 85.5 ± 3.2% for the experimental data, 87.6% for the exact calculation and 90.0% when using the approximations. The experimental data closely matches the theoretical calculations. The oscillations outside the dip can be explained by a drift of the central frequency of the photons, due to fluctuations of the temperature of the crystal during the experiment.

The Sellmeier equations for PPLN used in our calculations were taken from [11]. Considering an OOE configuration, with a pump at 780 nm and degenerated photons at 1560 nm, we found that $N_p = 7.9086 \times 10^{-9}$, $N_r = 7.31979 \times 10^{-9}$ and $N_i = 7.45633 \times 10^{-9}$. The Sellmeier equations for PPLN used in our calculations were taken from [11]. Considering an OOE configuration, with a pump at 780 nm and degenerated photons at 1560 nm, we found that $N_p = 7.9086 \times 10^{-9}$, $N_r = 7.31979 \times 10^{-9}$ and $N_i = 7.45633 \times 10^{-9}$.
Consideration. It is also always possible to generate indistinguishable photons by using identical ultra narrow filters, such that $1/\sigma_s \gg a L(N_p - N_i)$, $1/\sigma_i \gg a L(N_p - N_i)$ and $\sigma_i = \sigma_s$, but the number of photons will be drastically reduced.

Figure 3. Indistinguishability as a function of the bandwidth of the filter for the signal photon, when the idler is filtered with a 1 nm filter. For this calculation we consider the crystal and pump parameters described in figure 2.

From (6), one sees that perfect indistinguishability requires

$$\frac{1}{\sigma_i^2} - \frac{1}{\sigma_s^2} = \alpha^2 L^2 (N_p - N_i)^2 - \alpha^2 L^2 (N_p - N_i)^2. \quad (13)$$

In type-II configurations where $N_s \neq N_i$, and therefore the natural bandwidth of the photons are different, this condition cannot be satisfied using identical filters (unless they are significantly narrower than the bandwidth of the photons$^4$). Therefore, even though it is rather counter-intuitive, to optimize the visibility of non-degenerate systems, one needs to use different filters for each photon. If we take the same experimental parameters as in figure 2, then figure 3 shows how, when the bandwidth of the idler filter is 1.0 nm (FWHM), the maximum indistinguishability is obtained for a 0.6 nm filter for the signal. For identical filters, with 1.0 nm bandwidth, the indistinguishability is only 94.0%. These values will obviously be different for the particular experimental scenario under consideration.

3. On HOM interference and single photon purity

While the indistinguishability is a property of one photon with respect to the other, the purity is a property of a single photon state. The purity $P$ of a state $\rho$, is defined as the trace of its density matrix squared $P = \text{Tr}[\rho^2]$. Since it is a second-order function of the density matrix, a measurement of the purity requires at least two copies of the state [13]. One of the most common ways to generate those copies is by using two identical crystals, cf figure 4(a), where two photons, 1 and 2, from independent SPDC sources are combined on a 50/50 BS. The interference pattern obtained while varying the delay between their arrival times, will have unit visibility as a signature of perfect indistinguishability and purity [14–16].

$$R_c(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{2}[1 - P(\Delta t)], \quad (14)$$

provided there is one and only one photon in each of the two consecutive pulses. The function $P(\Delta t)$ is given by

$$P(\Delta t) = \int d\Omega_1 \ d\Omega_2 \phi_1(\Omega_1, \Omega_2) \phi_2^*(\Omega_2, \Omega_1) \times \exp[-i(\Omega_1 - \Omega_2)\Delta t]. \quad (15)$$

To simplify the notation we use the single-photon mode function given by (3). The visibility of the interference pattern
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described by (14) is \( V = P(0) \). It is possible to show that 
\[
P(0) = \text{Tr}[\rho_1 \rho_2],
\]
which can also be written as [14–16]
\[
V = \frac{\text{Tr}[\rho_1^2] + \text{Tr}[\rho_2^2] - \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|^2}{2}, \tag{16}
\]
where \( \|\rho\|^2 = \text{Tr}[\rho^\dagger \rho] \). Therefore, the visibility \( V \) depends on both the indistinguishability between the two photons \( (\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|^2) \) and the purity of each of them \( (\text{Tr}[\rho_1^2], \text{Tr}[\rho_2^2]) \).

If we do not detect the idler photons, it is not possible to distinguish whether there is one photon in each pulse or, two photons in one of the pulses, which reduces the maximum visibility to \( V = P(0)/3 \) but not our information on the photon characteristics. A more general study on the effects of multi-pair emission on the interference patterns has previously been detailed elsewhere [22–25].

There are two trivial cases in which these quantities are independent. First, when both photons come from a maximally entangled pair, such that \( \text{Tr}[\rho_1^2] = \text{Tr}[\rho_2^2] = 0 \), whereby the visibility \( V \) is a measurement of the photon indistinguishability through the norm \( \|\rho_1 - \rho_2\|^2 \). Second, when the photons are totally indistinguishable \( (\|\rho_1 - \rho_2\| = 0) \), and then the visibility is a direct measurement of the purity of the single photon state \( \rho_1 \). In our scheme, cf figure 4(b), it is reasonable to assume that an experiment is stable from pulse to pulse, such that successive photons are indistinguishable. Therefore, in this case, the visibility gives a direct estimation of the purity.

As before, the simplified mode function of (5) allows one to calculate analytically the interference pattern described by (14). In the case of indistinguishable input photons, this is thus given by
\[
R_c(\Delta t) = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 - P \exp \left( -\frac{\Delta t^2}{a} \right) \right], \tag{17}
\]
where the purity of the input state \( P = P(0) \), can be written as a function of the SPDC parameters from equation (6) as [21]
\[
P = \sqrt{1 - \frac{c^2}{ab}}, \tag{18}
\]
\( P = 0 \) corresponds to the case where the generated photons are maximally mixed, which corresponds to \( c^2 = ab \). The generation of pure photons is achieved for \( ab \gg c \), which is possible by using narrow filters, at the cost of reduced photon flux. Alternatively, one can set \( c = 0 \), i.e. from (6)
\[
\frac{1}{\sigma_p^2} = -\alpha^2 L^2 (N_p - N_i) (N_p - N_i), \tag{19}
\]
which is only achievable for certain materials [15, 16, 26–28].

4. Discussion

One can see that there is a significant difference between the interference pattern obtained in a two-photon interferometer compared to the pattern obtained when two independent photons interfere, as described by (12) and (17) and illustrated in figure 5. These two equations are defined in terms of the SPDC parameters and hence provide a means to engineer the photonic states with the desired indistinguishability and purity.

In this paper, we have also proposed a novel interferometric technique that allows for the purity to be measured using only a single SPDC source. This greatly simplifies the experimental complexity, and more importantly, does not rely on any assumption that photons from independent SPDC sources are indistinguishable. We expect that this simple and intuitive approach to characterizing and engineering SPDC photon sources will be of increasing importance for experiments combining multiple sources and engineering complex photonic networks.
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