

# Parameter estimation of correlated photon pairs

Internship report

submitted by

Jan Gößwein

Registration number 212968

Supervisor: Masoud Safari  
Institute: Insitute of Applied Physics

© Jena, September 1, 2025

This work, including its parts, is **protected by copyright**. Any utilization outside outside the narrow limits of copyright law without the consent of the author is not permitted and is punishable by law. This applies in particular to reproductions, translations, microfilming and storage and processing in electronic systems.



# Contents

1	Introduction . . . . .	1
2	Theory . . . . .	2
2.1	Quantum description of light . . . . .	2
2.2	Coherent light . . . . .	2
2.3	Thermal light . . . . .	2
2.4	Subpoissonian light . . . . .	2
3	Experimental Setup . . . . .	2
4	Results . . . . .	3
5	Conclusion . . . . .	3
6	Summary . . . . .	3
	<b>Bibliography . . . . .</b>	<b>5</b>



# 1 Introduction

- why quantum light
- goal of parameter estimation
- Approach of adding external noise

In recent years, several fields got influenced by quantum technologies, such as communication, computing or imaging. All of them have in common that quantum mechanical properties of particles are utilized to improve state of the art technology beyond existing limits.

In quantum imaging specifically, the quantum nature of light is exploited and therefore not only a light beam but single photon events are used.

Imaging is a central tool for exploring and understanding the physical world, from revealing microscopic biological structures to mapping distant astronomical objects. Despite the remarkable capabilities of modern classical imaging systems, they remain fundamentally constrained by limits such as diffraction and shot noise, both of which arise from the wave-particle duality of light. These constraints impose trade-offs between spatial resolution, sensitivity, and illumination intensity, often limiting the ability to study low-signal or delicate samples. Quantum imaging seeks to surpass these boundaries by exploiting uniquely quantum properties of light—including entanglement, squeezing, and photon-number correlations, to achieve capabilities unattainable with classical techniques [5, 7].

Among the various sources of quantum light, spontaneous parametric down-conversion (SPDC) has emerged as a very powerful one for generating photon pairs exhibiting strong correlations in multiple degrees of freedom, such as position, momentum, polarization, and time [7]. These correlations form a versatile resource for imaging, enabling protocols that reduce noise below the shot-noise limit, improve spatial resolution beyond the Rayleigh criterion, enhance phase sensitivity, and even form images from photons that never directly interact with the object [5, 7].

Temporal correlations between SPDC photons offer particular advantages in imaging. When one photon of a pair interacts with a sample, its detection time can be used to herald the arrival of its twin, enabling time-gated acquisition that suppresses background noise and improves signal fidelity [7]. Heralded imaging schemes can reduce the effective detection window to a few nanoseconds, substantially lowering dark counts and ambient light interference. Furthermore, temporal coincidence measurements isolate true photon-pair events from uncorrelated noise, which is particularly valuable in low-light-level imaging and remote sensing. By exploiting such correlations, quantum imaging can operate with fewer photons, thereby minimizing sample exposure and reducing photo-damage, which is a critical benefit for fragile biological specimens or light-sensitive materials.




Figure 1: Caption

## 2 Theory

### 2.1 Quantum description of light

### 2.2 Coherent light

### 2.3 Thermal light

### 2.4 Subpoissonian light

- quantum description of light
- squeezed light
- correlated photons
- SPDC
- SNSPD

## 3 Experimental Setup

- experimental setup
- measurement procedure





Figure 2: Conservation processes of collinear Type-0 SPDC



## 4 Results

## 5 Conclusion

## 6 Summary

### Single-arm (unheralded) counts

In SPDC, each output arm alone behaves like a thermal (Bose–Einstein) source. Theory predicts that a single-mode two-mode squeezed vacuum has marginal photon-number variance  $\text{Var} = \langle n \rangle^2 + \langle n \rangle$ , i.e. “bunched” super-Poissonian statistics [4]. In contrast, joint (signal–idler) coincidences follow Poisson statistics at low pair rates, since downconversion events occur randomly in time [1, 4].

Experimentally, unheralded single-arm counts exhibit thermal statistics. For example, [2] measured a CW-pumped bulk SPDC source and found  $g^{(2)}(0) \approx 2$ , consistent with a thermal field. Integrated SPDC sources show similar results: in an AlN microring with CW pump, the measured self-correlation was  $g^{(2)}(0) = 2.07 \pm 0.12$ , matching the ideal value of 2 for a single-mode thermal state [6]. Likewise, a periodically-poled LiNbO<sub>3</sub> micro-ring with pulsed pump and photon-number-resolving detection yielded  $g^{(2)}(0) \approx 1.99$  in each arm, verifying the thermal statistics of each channel. In that work, all higher-order photon counts (up to three photons) fit a Bose–Einstein (negative-binomial) distribution [4], with variance  $\gg \langle n \rangle$ . Recent experiments using multiplexed detectors have reconstructed full photon-number histograms: for both CW and pulsed SPDC, the observed single-arm distributions are best described by a thermal model, whereas a Poisson model underestimates the probability of multi-photon events [4].

These observations confirm that under low-gain CW pumping, the statistics of unheralded SPDC photons in each arm are super-Poissonian (thermal), as predicted by theory [1, 4].

## Coincidence counts

By contrast, coincidence (paired) counts are nearly Poissonian at low brightness. When the pair-generation probability is  $\ll 1$  per mode, individual pair events are essentially independent. Theory shows that in this regime the joint (signal+idler) photon count follows a Poisson distribution [1, 4]. Experimentally, high-visibility signal–idler coincidences (large coincidence-to-accidental ratios) are routinely observed, and the fluctuations of the coincidence counts match Poisson (shot-noise) behavior. SPDC source characterizations often assume Poissonian error bars on singles and coincidences [8]. One modeling study found that measured singles and total coincidence counts in a pulsed SPDC source could be equally well described by Poisson or thermal statistics, but in practice coincidences scale linearly with pump power (as expected for independent events) [1, 3].

In summary, experiments agree with theory: CW-pumped SPDC in single spatial/spectral modes yields thermal, super-Poissonian photon statistics in each arm (variance  $> \langle n \rangle$ ) [4, 6], whereas coincidence counts follow a near-Poissonian distribution at low pump. This conclusion is confirmed by measurements of the mean and variance (or  $g^{(2)}$ ) of the singles and correlated counts [4, 6] and by fitting full photon-count histograms to Bose–Einstein versus Poisson models. These results hold under the low pair-generation probability ( $\ll 1$  per coherence time) required for heralded single-photon sources; in that limit, multi-pair contributions are negligible and the above distributions dominate [1, 4].



## Bibliography

- [1] M. Avenhaus et al. “Photon Number Statistics of Multimode Parametric Down-Conversion”. In: *Physical Review Letters* 101.5 (Aug. 2008), p. 053601. ISSN: 0031-9007, 1079-7114. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.053601](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.101.053601). (Visited on 08/28/2025).
- [2] Bibiane Blauensteiner et al. “Photon Bunching in Parametric Down-Conversion with Continuous-Wave Excitation”. In: *Physical Review A* 79.6 (June 2009), p. 063846. ISSN: 1050-2947, 1094-1622. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.79.063846](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.79.063846). (Visited on 08/28/2025).
- [3] G Brida, M Genovese, and M Gramegna. “Twin-Photon Techniques for Photo-Detector Calibration”. In: *Laser Physics Letters* 3.3 (Mar. 2006), pp. 115–123. ISSN: 1612-2011, 1612-202X. DOI: [10.1002/lapl.200510077](https://doi.org/10.1002/lapl.200510077). (Visited on 08/28/2025).
- [4] Andreas Christ et al. “Probing Multimode Squeezing with Correlation Functions”. In: *New Journal of Physics* 13.3 (Mar. 2011), p. 033027. ISSN: 1367-2630. DOI: [10.1088/1367-2630/13/3/033027](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/13/3/033027). (Visited on 08/28/2025).
- [5] Hugo Defienne et al. “Advances in Quantum Imaging”. In: *Nature Photonics* 18.10 (Oct. 2024), pp. 1024–1036. ISSN: 1749-4885, 1749-4893. DOI: [10.1038/s41566-024-01516-w](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41566-024-01516-w). arXiv: [2411.08415](https://arxiv.org/abs/2411.08415) [quant-ph]. (Visited on 08/28/2025).
- [6] Xiang Guo et al. “Parametric Down-Conversion Photon-Pair Source on a Nanophotonic Chip”. In: *Light: Science & Applications* 6.5 (Nov. 2016), e16249–e16249. ISSN: 2047-7538. DOI: [10.1038/lsa.2016.249](https://doi.org/10.1038/lsa.2016.249). (Visited on 08/28/2025).
- [7] Paul-Antoine Moreau et al. “Imaging with Quantum States of Light”. In: *Nature Reviews Physics* 1.6 (May 2019), pp. 367–380. ISSN: 2522-5820. DOI: [10.1038/s42254-019-0056-0](https://doi.org/10.1038/s42254-019-0056-0). (Visited on 08/28/2025).
- [8] Justin B. Spring et al. “Boson Sampling on a Photonic Chip”. In: *Science* 339.6121 (Feb. 2013), pp. 798–801. ISSN: 0036-8075, 1095-9203. DOI: [10.1126/science.1231692](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1231692). (Visited on 08/28/2025).