Joint measurement of non-classical correlations

Kengo Matsuyama, Holger F. Hofmann and Masataka linuma

AdSE, Hiroshima University, Japan YIQIS 2020, Online event, poster session

Uncertainty trade-off of joint measurement

The Z side is clear but the other sides are completely unclear (precise measurement of Z side).



The X side is clear and the other sides are completely unclear (precise measurement of X side).

Realization of the joint measurements using polarizer settings

Effective polarization directions on the Bloch sphere

Alice's system



Bob's system $y_B = +1$





Concept

Measurement resolutions of X and Z are limited by an uncertainty trade-off[1-3] depending on the implementation of the measurement.





 \hat{X}_A : Horizontal-Vertical linear polarization \widehat{Y}_A : Diagonal-Antidiagonal linear polarization θ describes the uncertainty trade-off between \hat{X} and \hat{Y} in both systems.

The uncertainty trade-off can be optimized to achieve zero probability results at the Cirel'son bound.



$$V_{\alpha} \equiv \frac{\langle \alpha \rangle_{joint}}{\langle \alpha \rangle_{precise}} \quad (\alpha = X_A, Y_A).$$

CAL J.

LD : Laser Diode, Pol C : polarization controller, SMF : Single mode fiber, FC : V_{α} fiber coupler, PBS : Polarizing beam splitter, HWP : Half wave plate, DM : $\langle \alpha \rangle_{joint}$ Dichroic mirror, GT : Glan-Taylor prism, BPF : Band pass filter, SPCM : Single $\langle \alpha \rangle_{precise}$ photon counting module PerkinElmer (SPCM-AQR-14-FC13237-1) and EXCELITAS (SPCM-AQRH-14-FC24360)



Positivity of joint measurement outcomes prevents joint measurements beyond the uncertainty limit. Separate measurement can be precise, but no joint probability distribution $p(x_A, y_A)$ is obtained.

Results of joint probabilities $p(x_A, y_A, x_B, y_B)$ for a joint measurement of correlations violating Bell's inequalities



	Outcomes of Alice's system					0.1
system	$p(\mathbf{x}_{A}, \mathbf{y}_{A}, \mathbf{x}_{B}, \mathbf{y}_{B})$	$x_A = +1$ $y_A = +1$	$\begin{aligned} x_A &= +1 \\ y_A &= -1 \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} x_A &= -1 \\ y_A &= +1 \end{aligned}$	$\begin{aligned} x_A &= -1 \\ y_A &= -1 \end{aligned}$	0.1 ≩ 0.1
	$x_B = +1$ $y_B = +1$	P(+,+,+,+)	P(+,−,+,+)	P(-,+,+,+)	P(-,-,+,+)	obabi
RODS	$x_B = +1$ $y_B = -1$	P(+, +, +, -)	P(+, -, +, -)	P(-,+,+,-)	P(-, -, +, -)	ā 0.0





θ[deg] The error bars of all experimental results are smaller than the size of the dots. The two results marked \bigcirc are close to zero. If the non-classical correlation was increased beyond the Cirel'son bound, the differences between p(+, +, +, +) and p(-, -, +, +)and between p(+, -, +, -) and p(-, +, +, -) would have to increase, which is impossible if the lower probabilities are already at zero. Therefore, the zero probability points are experimental evidence that the Cirel'son bound is defined by the uncertainty limited resolution of local measurements [4].

$$\begin{array}{c} x_B = -1 \\ y_B = +1 \\ x_B = -1 \\ y_B = -1 \\ y_B = -1 \end{array} \begin{array}{c} P(+,+,-,+) \\ P(+,+,-,+) \\ P(+,-,-,+) \\ P(+,-,-,+) \\ P(-,+,-,-) \\ P(-,+,-,-) \\ P(-,-,-,-) \\ P(-,-,-,-) \end{array}$$

 $b \equiv x_A x_B + x_A y_B + y_A x_B - y_A y_B$

Values of Bell correlations for the 16 possible outcomes of joint measurements. Outcomes shown in yellow have a value of b = +2, outcomes shown in green have a value of b = -2. Since a Bell inequality violation corresponds to an average b-value below -2, low probabilities of yellow results are a characteristic signature of non-classical correlations.

Same graph as the picture on the left for a different set of outcomes. p(-, -, -, -) and p(+, -, -, +) are found to be close to zero at uncertainty trade-offs of 20 degrees and 70 degrees respectively. The purple line marks the probability of 1/16 obtained when the outcomes are completely random. The average value of p(-, -, -, -) and p(+, +, -, -) and the average value of p(-, +, -, +) and p(+, -, -, +) are equal to 1/16 at all measurement resolutions.

[1] B. G. Englert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 2154, (1996).

[3] M. linuma, Y. Suzuki, G. Taguchi, Y. Kadoya, and H. F. Hofmann, New J. Phys. 13, 033041, (2011).

[2] E. Andersson, S. M. Barnett, and A. Aspect. Phys. Rev. A 72. 042104. (2005).

[4] H. F. Hofmann, Phys. Rev. A Vol. 100, 012123, (2019).