



# Quantum Noise in Multipixel Image Processing

Nicolas Treps, Vincent Delaubert, Agnès Maître, Jean-Michel Courty, Claude Fabre

## ► To cite this version:

Nicolas Treps, Vincent Delaubert, Agnès Maître, Jean-Michel Courty, Claude Fabre. Quantum Noise in Multipixel Image Processing. *Physical Review A: Atomic, molecular, and optical physics* [1990-2015], 2005, 71, pp.013820. 10.1103/PhysRevA.71.013820 . hal-00002383

**HAL Id: hal-00002383**

**<https://hal.science/hal-00002383>**

Submitted on 29 Jul 2004

**HAL** is a multi-disciplinary open access archive for the deposit and dissemination of scientific research documents, whether they are published or not. The documents may come from teaching and research institutions in France or abroad, or from public or private research centers.

L'archive ouverte pluridisciplinaire **HAL**, est destinée au dépôt et à la diffusion de documents scientifiques de niveau recherche, publiés ou non, émanant des établissements d'enseignement et de recherche français ou étrangers, des laboratoires publics ou privés.

# Quantum Noise in Multipixel Image Processing

N. Treps, V. Delaubert, A. Maître, J.M. Courty and C. Fabre<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Laboratoire Kastler Brossel, UPMC, Case 74, 4 Place Jussieu, 75252 Paris cedex 05, France*

(Dated: July 29, 2004)

We consider the general problem of the quantum noise in a multipixel measurement of an optical image. We first give a precise criterium in order to characterize intrinsic single mode and multimode light. Then, using a transverse mode decomposition, for each type of possible linear combination of the pixels' outputs we give the exact expression of the detection mode, i.e. the mode carrying the noise. We give also the only way to reduce the noise in one or several simultaneous measurements.

PACS numbers: 42.50.Dv; 42.30.-d; 42.50.Lc

## Introduction

Multipixel photodetectors such as diode arrays or CCD sensors are now frequently used to record images. These sensors provide signals in which the useful information is mixed with random noise. A contribution to this noise originates from the quantum nature of light : the arrival of individual photons is a random process. Contrarily to technical noise, due to imperfections in the source, the optical system or the detector, this quantum noise can not be reduced by eliminating the defects in the measurement process. The purpose of this paper is to determine the precise origin of this noise and to analyze whether and how it can be reduced. With the analysis of the spatial distribution of this noise, we will single out the precise transverse modes whose fluctuations are at the origin of this quantum noise, and determine the parameters that have to be changed in order to reduce this noise.

As images are complex objects which carry a great deal of information, there are actually many ways to extract information from them, depending on the image user needs[1, 2, 3]. We will focus our attention to the extraction from the image of one or several continuous parameters, the variation of which modifies the light distribution in the image plane and not its total intensity. In such a case, the quantity of a priori information on the image is very important, as one assumes that the variation of the image under observation is only due to the variation of a searched parameter  $M$ . A second use to which our calculations can apply is the determination of predefined patterns in the image, such as given shapes, surfaces, borders, textures... It is a very difficult problem per se, and the incidence of quantum noise on it, to the best of our knowledge, has not been precisely studied so far. A contrario, we do not consider the search of the smallest possible details, where resolution is at stake. In this problem, there is very little to none a priori information and the problem of quantum limits to resolution has been already considered in other publications [4, 5].

In most cases, the light used to carry the image comes from "classical sources", such as lamps or usual lasers, in which the photons are randomly distributed in the image plane. This gives rise to a spatial shot noise which will yield a "standard quantum limit" in the measure-

ment of a very small variation of  $M$ . It is now well-known that "non-classical light", such as squeezed light or sub-Poissonian light, is likely to reduce quantum fluctuations on a given measurement [6]. The aim of the last part of the present paper is to identify the best "non-classical light" enabling us to reduce the quantum noise in the measurement of the quantity  $M$  performed in the image. It has been already shown [7] that non-classical light in a single transverse mode, though very effective to reduce the noise for a measurement performed on the total beam, is of little use for a measurement performed on an image. One therefore needs "multi-transverse-mode non-classical light" for our purpose. This is the reason why we devote the first section of this paper to a precise analysis of such a concept, before considering in the second section the problem of information extraction : we identify the exact noise source in the measurement of  $M$ , and show how to choose the best configuration which allows us to measure a variation of  $M$  with a sensitivity beyond the standard quantum limit.

## I. "INTRINSIC" MULTIMODE LIGHT

We consider the propagation of light in the vacuum along the  $z$  direction, and call  $\vec{r}$  the transverse coordinate. We assume that the light frequency is  $\omega_0$  with a linewidth  $\delta\omega$  much smaller than  $\omega_0$ , and that it has a well defined polarization. One knows that it is possible to find several basis of transverse modes  $\{u_i(\vec{r}, z)\}$  such as

- each mode verifies the propagation equation of the field in vacuum projected onto the polarization axis :

$$\Delta(u_i e^{ikz}) + \frac{\omega_0^2}{c^2} u_i = 0 \quad (1)$$

- it is an orthonormal basis :

$$\int u_i^*(z, \vec{r}) u_j(z, \vec{r}) d^2r = \delta_{ij} \quad (2)$$

- it verifies a completeness relation :

$$\sum_i u_i^*(z, \vec{r}) u_i(z, \vec{r}') = \delta(\vec{r} - \vec{r}') \quad (3)$$

For instance, the usual Laguerre-Gauss  $\text{TEM}_{pq}$  basis verifies these conditions. Considering a light beam, the electric field is written as the sum of the positive and negative frequencies components :

$$E(\vec{r}, z, t) = E^{(+)}(\vec{r}, z)e^{-i(\omega_0 t - kz)} + c.c. \quad (4)$$

It is possible to expand the electric field positive frequency envelope in the transverse modes basis as

$$E^{(+)}(\vec{r}, z) = \sum_i \mathcal{E}_i u_i(\vec{r}, z). \quad (5)$$

#### A. Single mode or multimode light : classical approach

For a  $\text{TEM}_{pq}$  basis field expansion, when more than one  $\mathcal{E}_i$  is non zero, it seems at first sight natural to say that this field is multimode. However, if the  $\mathcal{E}_i$  coefficients are fixed (i.e. we consider a *coherent superposition of modes* and not a statistical one), one can always define a new transverse mode :

$$v_0 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_i |\mathcal{E}_i|^2}} \sum_i \mathcal{E}_i u_i \quad (6)$$

and construct a basis  $\{v_i\}$  in which  $v_0$  is the first element. In this basis, the field is proportional to  $v_0$  which means it is single mode. We can conclude that for a coherent superposition of mode, there is no intrinsic definition of a multimode beam (i.e. a definition independent of the choice of the basis). We will restrict our analysis to spatial variables, but it can be applied to any physical dimension. For instance, in the time domain, a mode locked laser is single mode, as it is a coherent superposition of many temporal modes. If the temporal modes are incoherent with each other then the system is unambiguously multimode. More precisely, if the field is a stochastic superposition of modes, the  $v_0$  mode cannot be defined and the multimode character has a clear meaning. We will exclude this case in the following.

#### B. Single Mode light : quantum approach

In order to give the quantum description of the transverse plane of a light beam, it is very common to quantize the field starting from a transverse mode basis as the one we just defined in the previous section. In order to obtain standard formulas, we consider that all measurements are performed in an exposure time  $T$  and associate to each vector of the mode basis a set of creation and annihilation operators  $\hat{a}_i^\dagger$  and  $\hat{a}_i$  such as the field  $\mathcal{E}_i$  of the previous section is replaced by the operator  $i\sqrt{\frac{\hbar\omega_0}{2\epsilon_0 cT}}\hat{a}_i$ . With these notations we obtain the standard commutation relations  $[\hat{a}_i, \hat{a}_j^\dagger] = \delta_{ij}$ , and the positive field envelope operator can

be written as [8]

$$\hat{E}^+(\vec{r}, z) = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar\omega_0}{2\epsilon_0 cT}} \hat{A}^+(\vec{r}, z) \quad (7)$$

with

$$\hat{A}^{(+)}(\vec{r}, z) = \sum_i \hat{a}_i(z) u_i(\vec{r}, z) \quad (8)$$

so that  $\hat{A}^{(+)\dagger}\hat{A}^{(+)}$  is a photon number per unit surface.

In order to give a proper definition of a single mode case, let's write the most general state of the field in the Fock state basis  $|n_1, \dots, n_i, \dots\rangle$ , where  $n_i$  stands for the number of photons in the mode  $i$  :

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_i, \dots} C_{n_1, \dots, n_i, \dots} |n_1, \dots, n_i, \dots\rangle \quad (9)$$

and the mean value of the electric field is given by :

$$\langle\psi|\hat{A}|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \left( \sum_{n_1, \dots, n_i > 1, \dots} C_{n_1, \dots, n_i-1, \dots}^* C_{n_1, \dots, n_i, \dots} \right) \sqrt{n_i} u_i(\vec{r}) \quad (10)$$

Following the definition for the classical beams, we can give a definition of a single mode beam :

**Definition 1** A state is single mode if it exists a mode basis  $\{v_0, v_1, \dots\}$  in which it can be written :

$$|\psi\rangle = |\phi\rangle \otimes |0, \dots, 0, \dots\rangle$$

where  $|\phi\rangle$  is the state of the field in the first transverse mode.

The question is now whether, in contrast with the classical states, it exists quantum states that cannot be written as (1). To answer this question, we will demonstrate the following proposition :

**Proposition 1** A quantum state of the field is single mode if and only if the action on it of all the annihilation operators of a given basis give collinear vectors.

One can note that if this property stands for a given basis, it then stands for the action of any annihilation operator.

Let's assume first that our field  $|\psi\rangle$  is single mode with respect to the basis  $\{u_i, \hat{a}_i\}$ , then

$$\hat{a}_0|\psi\rangle = |\psi_0\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{a}_i|\psi\rangle = 0 \quad \forall i \neq 0 \quad (11)$$

Consider now any linear combination of the operators

$$\hat{b} = \sum_i c_i \hat{a}_i \quad (12)$$

where  $\sum_i |c_i|^2 = 1$  which ensures that  $[\hat{b}, \hat{b}^\dagger] = 1$ . The action of this operator on the field is given by :

$$\hat{b}|\psi\rangle = \sum_i c_i \hat{a}_i|\psi\rangle = c_0|\psi_0\rangle \quad (13)$$

This demonstrates the first implication of our proposition : all the actions of annihilation operators on the field are proportional.

To prove the other implication, consider now a field  $|\psi\rangle$  on which the action of any annihilation operator  $\hat{a}_i$  is proportional to  $|\psi_0\rangle$ . This is in particular true for the basis  $\{u_i, \hat{a}_i\}$  :

$$\hat{a}_i|\psi\rangle = \alpha_i|\psi_0\rangle \quad (14)$$

If we assume that  $\sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 = 1$  (which is always possible by changing the normalization of  $|\psi_0\rangle$ ), we can define a new basis  $\{v_i(\vec{r}, z), \hat{b}_i\}$  such as

$$\hat{b}_0 = \sum_i \alpha_i^* \hat{a}_i, \quad v_0 = \sum_i \alpha_i^* u_i \quad (15)$$

and complete the basis by defining a unitary matrix  $[c_{ij}]$  such as

$$\hat{b}_i = \sum_j c_{ij} \hat{a}_j \quad \text{with } c_{0j} = \alpha_j^* \quad \text{and} \quad \sum_j c_{ij} c_{kj}^* = \delta_{ik}. \quad (16)$$

It is then straightforward to show that

$$\hat{b}_i|\psi\rangle = \delta_{0i}|\psi_0\rangle \quad (17)$$

which concludes the demonstration.

In addition to the proposition, equation (15) gives the expression of the mode in which "lies" the mean field, knowing the action of a particular basis. We can also note that to show that a field is single mode, it is sufficient to show that all its projections on the annihilation operators of one particular basis are proportional.

To illustrate the proposition, if one considers the superposition of coherent states

$$|\psi\rangle = |\alpha_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\alpha_i\rangle \otimes \dots \quad (18)$$

it is straightforward to show that the actions of all the annihilation operators on this state are proportional to the state itself ; we have a single mode beam. The basis in which it is single mode is the same as the one for the classical case, setting  $v_0$  as in equation (6).

Using this proposition, we can also look for the different states that fulfill our definition of single mode quantum beam. As a state that cannot be written as follows in any mode basis :

$$|\psi\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\phi_i\rangle \otimes \dots \quad (19)$$

is obviously not a single mode beam, we will consider now such a factorized state of the field, on which the action of the annihilation operators gives :

$$\hat{a}_i|\psi\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes (\hat{a}_i|\phi_i\rangle) \otimes \dots \quad (20)$$

Consequently, there are only two possibilities to have all these states proportional :

- either only one of the action is different from zero, which means we are already in the basis in which the state is single mode.
- or all the states are coherent states.

We have described here all the possible single mode states, which agree with the intuitive description one can have. For instance, if one considers the superposition of several transverse modes, if at least one of them is a non-coherent state, one gets a quantum multimode state.

### C. Multimode light : quantum approach

A beam of light is said multimode, from a quantum point of view, when it is not single mode according to definition 1. We can characterize such a beam by its degree  $n$  (this degree equals one for a single mode beam):

**Definition 2** For a beam  $|\psi\rangle$ , the minimum number of modes necessary to describe it (or the minimum number of non-vacuum modes in its modal decomposition), reached by choosing the appropriate basis, is called the degree  $n$  of a multimode beam. Any corresponding basis is called a minimum basis for the field  $|\psi\rangle$ .

The degree of a multimode beam can also be related to the generalization of proposition (1) to a  $n$ -mode beam. Using the same technique, one can show that a quantum field is a  $n$ -mode beam if and only if the action on it of all the annihilation operators belongs to the same  $n$  dimensioned sub-space.

Whereas the previous paragraph gives a good definition of the degree of a multimode beam, it is not very convenient as one has no information on the basis in which the beam is exactly described by  $n$  modes. We can however define a particular basis, useful for calculations :

**Proposition 2** For a beam  $|\psi\rangle$  of degree  $n$ , it is always possible to find a basis  $\{u_i, \hat{a}_i\}$  such as

- The mean value of the electric field is non zero only in the first mode.
- It is a minimum basis for the field  $|\psi\rangle$ .

we will call that basis an eigenbasis.

In order to demonstrate this proposition, let's consider a minimum basis  $\{u_i, \hat{a}_i\}$  for the field  $|\psi\rangle$ . This basis is supposed to be ordered such as the  $n$  first modes are the relevant ones. We can then define a new basis  $\{v_i, \hat{b}_i\}$  such as :

$$\begin{aligned} v_0 &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{\sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \langle \hat{a}_i \rangle^2}} \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} \langle \hat{a}_i \rangle u_i \\ v_i, 0 < i < n &= \sum_{j=0}^{n-1} c_{ij} u_j \\ v_i, i \geq n &= u_i \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

where the coefficient  $\{c_{ij}\}$  are chosen in order to get an orthonormal basis. Definitions similar to the one of equ. (21) apply for the annihilation operators. The first vector of this basis is the same as the one defined for a classical beam in equation (6). In that basis, the mean field is single mode in a classical sense. However the energy lying in all the other modes is not necessarily zero, only the electric field mean value is zero for these modes, and as the modes for  $i \geq n$  were not changed, this new basis is still a minimum one for the field  $|\psi\rangle$ . This demonstrates the proposition. The demonstration illustrates the construction of a basis as defined in proposition (2) from a minimum basis, even though thanks to the  $\{c_{ij}\}$  coefficients an infinite number of basis are possible.

The existence of this basis is also a confirmation of the intuitive idea of the difference between single mode and multimode quantum light. Indeed, for a single mode beam, the spatial variation of the noise is the same as the one of the mean field. For a multimode beam, the previous description shows that some of the modes orthogonal to the mean field are sources of noise but do not contribute to the mean field. This implies that the variation of the noise is independent of the one of the mean field. This property can be used to experimentally characterize the multimode character of light. One of the difficulties of such experiments is the knowledge of the mode structure of the field, as it is not possible to test all the transverse modes. We have shown that [10] the quantum multimode character of light can be demonstrated using an iris whose aperture size is continuously varied. We applied it to the case of quantum correlated light coming out of an optical parametric oscillator.

We have defined the theoretical basis required to develop a study on optical image measurements. The following section on information extraction will indeed strongly rely on the propositions and definitions of the first part.

## II. DIFFERENCE MEASUREMENTS

### A. Description

A widely used technique in optics, and more generally in physics, to improve the signal to noise ratio in a measurement is to perform a *difference measurement* : it consists in producing two identical signals from the light source used in the experiment. When one monitors the difference between these two signals, one gets of course a zero mean signal, but one also cancels all the common mode noises, for example the one arising from the classical intensity fluctuations of the source. The remaining noise arises from the noise sources affecting differently the two channels.

One simple way to produce the two identical beams is to use a 50% beamsplitter. In this case, the vacuum noise coming from the unused side of the splitter is such a not-common mode noise and remains on the difference

measurement : whatever the actual excess noise of the beam impinging on the beam splitter, the remaining noise corresponds to the shot noise of this beam.

This simple technique of noise cancellation is used for example to measure very small absorptions [11] by inserting the absorbing medium in one of the arms of the difference set-up, or very small frequency shifts, by inserting a Fabry-Perot cavity in one of the arms. It is also extensively used in multipixel measurements, either with split-detectors or quadrant detectors, to measure sub-micrometer displacements, for example of nanoscale fluorophores in biological samples [12] and in Atomic Force Microscopy [13], and ultra-small absorptions by the mirage effect [14].

The problem of the determination of the origin of quantum noise on a split detector and of its reduction has been already investigated theoretically [7] and experimentally [15, 16, 17]. We will here extend these considerations to more general configurations.

More formally, we consider the measurement by a detector consisting of a set of pixels, each one occupying a transverse area  $D_i$ . The pixels cover the whole transverse plane, with no overlap between them. Each photodetector delivers a power given by :

$$\hat{I}(D_i) = \int_{D_i} 2\epsilon_0 c \hat{E}^\dagger(\vec{r}) \hat{E}(\vec{r}) d^2r \quad (22)$$

This can also be written in photon number measured during the exposure time  $T$  of the detector :

$$\hat{N}(D_i) = \int_{D_i} \hat{A}^\dagger(\vec{r}) \hat{A}(\vec{r}) d^2r \quad (23)$$

In this section, the measurement  $M$  is defined by :

$$\hat{M}(\{\sigma_i\}) = \sum_i \sigma_i \hat{I}(D_i) \quad \text{such as } \sigma_i = \pm 1 \quad (24)$$

or again in terms of number of photons per second :

$$\hat{N}(\{\sigma_i\}) = \sum_i \sigma_i \hat{N}(D_i) \quad (25)$$

where  $\sigma_i = \pm 1$  corresponds to the electronic gain of detector  $i$ .

Considering a light beam in state  $|\psi\rangle$ , the measurement is a difference measurement for that beam if its mean value is zero, i.e. if

$$\langle \hat{N}(\{\sigma_i\}) \rangle = 0 \quad (26)$$

### B. One difference measurement

If one consider one difference measurement performed with a coherent state, which has spatially uncorrelated quantum fluctuations, the noise arising from the measurement will not depend on the choice of  $\{\sigma_i\}$  if  $\sigma_i = \pm 1$ , and will be equal to the square root of the total number

of photons. This is what is called the standard quantum noise. In the general case, in order to compute the noise, an analysis equivalent to the one performed in the case of a small displacement measurement, as done in reference [7], is necessary. We recall it here and extend it to the general case of transverse modes of any shape, in order to show the following proposition :

**Proposition 3** *The noise on a difference measurement performed on a beam  $|\psi\rangle$  originates from a single mode, orthogonal to the mean field : the "flipped mode". In order to reduce the noise in that measurement, it is necessary and sufficient to inject a squeezed state in this flipped mode.*

In order to perform the general noise calculation, let us define the two "detectors" :

$$\begin{aligned} D_+ &= \bigcup_{i, \sigma_i=+1} D_i \\ D_- &= \bigcup_{i, \sigma_i=-1} D_i \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

which gives

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{N}_- &= \hat{N}(D_+) - \hat{N}(D_-) \\ &= \sum_{i,j} \hat{a}_i^\dagger \hat{a}_j \left[ \int_{D_+} u_i^*(\vec{r}) u_j(\vec{r}) d^2r \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \int_{D_-} u_i^*(\vec{r}) u_j(\vec{r}) d^2r \right] \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

Considering small quantum fluctuations for which  $\delta \hat{a}_i = \hat{a}_i - \langle \hat{a}_i \rangle$ , the fluctuations of  $\hat{N}_-$  are

$$\begin{aligned} \delta \hat{N}_- &= \hat{N}_- - \langle \hat{N}_- \rangle \\ &= \sum_i [\delta \hat{a}_i^\dagger C_-^i + \delta \hat{a}_i C_-^{i*}] \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

with  $C_-^i$  defined as

$$\begin{aligned} C_-^i &= \sum_j \langle \hat{a}_j \rangle \left[ \int_{D_+} u_i^*(\vec{r}) u_j(\vec{r}) d^2r - \int_{D_-} u_i^*(\vec{r}) u_j(\vec{r}) d^2r \right] \\ &= \int_{D_+} u_i^*(\vec{r}) A_\psi(\vec{r}) d^2r - \int_{D_-} u_i^*(\vec{r}) A_\psi(\vec{r}) d^2r \end{aligned}$$

and where  $A_\psi(\vec{r})$  is the mean value of the electric field  $\langle \psi | \hat{A}(\vec{r}) | \psi \rangle$ . The  $C_-^i$  coefficients are the partial overlap integrals between the modes  $u_i$  and the mean field.

We can now compute the noise related to this measurement :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \delta \hat{N}_-^2 \rangle &= \sum_i |C_-^i|^2 + \left[ \sum_{i,j} \langle \delta \hat{a}_i^\dagger \delta \hat{a}_j^\dagger \rangle C_-^i C_-^j \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \langle \delta \hat{a}_i^\dagger \delta \hat{a}_j \rangle C_-^i C_-^{j*} + c.c. \right] \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Using the completeness relation, the first term of the last equation can be shown to be equal to the total number

of incident photons per second  $N_0$ . This shows that the noise related to this measurement arises a priori from all the modes.

We will now demonstrate that the noise comes in fact from a single mode when we write  $\langle \delta \hat{N}_-^2 \rangle$  in the appropriate basis.

We call  $v_0$  the mode of the mean field as defined in the previous part :

$$v_0(\vec{r}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_0}} A_\psi(\vec{r}). \quad (31)$$

If  $v_0$  is the first mode of a basis, the mean value of the electric field in all the other modes will be zero, as shown in the previous section. We define now the mode  $v_1$ , which we will refer to as the "flipped mode" of  $v_0$ , such as :

$$\begin{aligned} v_1(\vec{r}) &= v_0(\vec{r}) \quad \text{if } r \in D_+ \\ v_1(\vec{r}) &= -v_0(\vec{r}) \quad \text{if } r \in D_- \end{aligned} \quad (32)$$

As we have assumed that the mean value of the measurement is zero,  $v_1$  is orthogonal to  $v_0$ , which means that we can find a basis  $\{v_i, \hat{b}_i\}$  where  $v_0$  and  $v_1$  are the two first modes. In that basis, the overlap integrals become :

$$\begin{aligned} C_-^i &= \sqrt{N_0} \left[ \int_{D_+} v_i^*(\vec{r}) v_0(\vec{r}) d^2r - \int_{D_-} v_i^*(\vec{r}) v_0(\vec{r}) d^2r \right] \\ &= \sqrt{N_0} \int_D v_i^*(\vec{r}) v_1(\vec{r}) d^2r \\ &= \sqrt{N_0} \delta_{i,1} \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

These integrals are different from zero only for the flipped mode. The noise of equation (30) becomes

$$\langle \delta \hat{N}_-^2 \rangle = N_0 \langle (\delta \hat{b}_1^\dagger + \delta \hat{b}_1)^2 \rangle \quad (34)$$

which shows that the noise only arises from the quadrature of the flipped mode of  $v_0$  in phase with the mean field mode. For this reason, we call this mode the eigenmode of the measurement. An other standard notation is

$$\langle \delta \hat{N}_-^2 \rangle = N_0 \langle \delta X_1^{+2} \rangle \quad (35)$$

where  $X_1^+ = \hat{b}_1 + \hat{b}_1^\dagger$  is the quadrature of the flipped mode, and  $N_0$  represents the shot noise. Consequently, having a squeezed state in that mode is necessary and sufficient to reduce the noise related to the measurement.

This calculation shows that, for a difference measurement, the noise in the measurement is exactly the one of the flipped mode. Changing the noise properties of the flipped mode is then the only way to change the noise in the measurement. We have a necessary and sufficient condition to improve the measurement compared to the standard quantum limit.

This demonstration imposes the noise properties of only one quadrature of the flipped mode, but there is no condition on the other quadrature, and all the other modes can be in any state. Then, there is not only one practical solution.

### C. Multiple difference measurement

We have demonstrated which mode one needs to squeeze in order to perform one difference measurement on a beam. We can now expand this analysis in the case of several difference measurements. Let us consider  $n$  difference measurements of the type of equation (26). We will assume that these measurements are independent, which means that none of them is a linear combination of the other ones. One can show that the corresponding flipped modes are then also linearly independent. We have shown that in order to improve simultaneously the sensitivity of all these measurements it is necessary, and sufficient, to squeeze all these flipped modes. Practically these modes are in general not orthogonal, but one can find an orthogonal basis of the subspace generated by these modes. Injecting squeezed vacuum states in each of these modes will result in squeezed states in each of the flipped modes.

Regarding the degree of the beam necessary to improve simultaneously all the measurements, it is clear that in order to perfectly squeeze all the flipped modes, a beam of degree  $n + 1$  is necessary (and sufficient). We can summarize all the considerations of section II into a proposition :

**Proposition 4** *In order to reduce the noise simultaneously in  $n$  independent difference measurements it is necessary and sufficient to use a beam of degree at least  $n+1$  that can be described in a transverse mode basis  $\{\hat{a}_i, u_i\}$  such as :  $u_0$  is proportional to the electric field profile of the beam;  $\{u_i\}_{0 < i \leq n}$  is the basis of the space-vector generated by the flipped modes of the measurements and all these modes are perfectly squeezed.*

### III. LINEAR MEASUREMENT

Difference measurements are obviously not the only ones performed in image processing [1, 2, 3]. The extraction of the pertinent information arises generally from the numerical computation of a function  $F(I(D_1), I(D_2), \dots, I(D_n))$  from the intensities  $I(D_i)$  ( $i = 1, \dots, n$ ) measured on each pixel. To simplify the following discussion, we will restrict ourselves to the case when this function is *linear* with respect to the intensities  $I(D_i)$ , as it is a case often encountered in real situations, for example when one wants to determine the spatial Fourier components of the image, or when the variations of the parameter to measure are small enough so that the function  $F$  can be linearized.

In the formalism of equations (24) and (25), using a linear function correspond to let the gain  $\sigma_i$  of the detectors

take any real value and not only  $\pm 1$  :

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{M}(\{\sigma_j\}) &= \sum_j \sigma_j \hat{I}(D_j) \\ \hat{N}_\sigma &= \sum_j \sigma_j \hat{N}(D_j)\end{aligned}\quad (36)$$

We emphasize that, contrary to the previous section, the mean value of the measurement is not necessarily zero. In that case, we will show the following proposition :

**Proposition 5** *Considering a field state  $|\psi\rangle$  described in an eigenbasis  $\{\hat{b}_i, v_i\}$ , and considering a linear measurement performed with an array of detectors  $D_i$ , each detector having a gain  $\sigma_i$ . The noise on the measurement  $\hat{N}_\sigma = \sum_j \sigma_j \hat{N}(D_j)$  arises only from the generalized flipped mode  $w$  defined by :*

$$\forall \vec{r}, \vec{r} \in D_i \Rightarrow w_1(\vec{r}) = \frac{1}{f} \sigma_i v_0(\vec{r}) \quad (37)$$

where  $f$  is a normalisation factor.

Here, there is not much sense in defining the positive and negative gain domains. We can anyway extend the notion of overlap integral between a basis vector and the mean field :

$$C_\sigma^i = \sum_j \sigma_j \int_{D_j} u_i^*(\vec{r}) A_\psi(\vec{r}) d^2 r \quad (38)$$

which leads to a formula equivalent to equation (30)

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \delta \hat{N}_\sigma^2 \rangle &= \sum_i |C_\sigma^i|^2 + \left[ \sum_{i,j} \langle \delta \hat{a}_i^\dagger \delta \hat{a}_j^\dagger \rangle C_\sigma^i C_\sigma^j \right. \\ &\quad \left. + \langle \delta \hat{a}_i^\dagger \delta \hat{a}_j \rangle C_\sigma^i C_\sigma^{j*} + c.c. \right] \quad (39)\end{aligned}$$

Recalling that  $A_\psi(\vec{r}) = \sqrt{N_0} v_0(\vec{r})$ , we can also extend the notion of flipped mode, and define a *detection mode* by

$$\forall \vec{r}, \vec{r} \in D_i \Rightarrow w_1(\vec{r}) = \frac{1}{f} \sigma_i v_0(\vec{r}) \quad (40)$$

where  $f$  ensures the normalization of  $w_1$  :

$$f^2 = \sum_j \sigma_j^2 \int_{D_j} v_0^*(\vec{r}) v_0(\vec{r}) d^2 r. \quad (41)$$

However, as the mean value of the measurement can be different from zero, the detection mode  $w_1$  is not in general orthogonal to the mean field mode  $v_0$ . In order to calculate the noise in the measurement, it is necessary to construct a basis that contain the detection mode  $w_1$ . As the mean value of the electric field in this mode is different from zero, it is not possible to obtain an eigenbasis with  $w_1$ , but we can still choose  $w_0$  such as the mean field mode  $v_0$  is a linear combinaison of  $w_0$  and  $w_1$ . Choosing

all the other modes  $w_i$  (with  $i \geq 2$ ) in order to obtain an orthonormal basis, we obtain a basis such as the mean field is distributed in the two first modes, the detection mode is  $w_1$  and the mean value of the electric field in all the other modes is zero. We can then perform a calculation similar to the one of the previous section that gives :

$$C_\sigma^i = \sqrt{N_0}f \int_D w_i(\vec{r})^* w_1(\vec{r}) d^2r = \sqrt{N_0}f \delta_{i,1} \quad (42)$$

Once again the detection mode is the only one that is relevant for the calculation of the noise related to the measurement. Taking into account that the normalization giving rise to the shot noise has changed :

$$\sum_i |C_\sigma^i|^2 = |C_\sigma^1|^2 = N_0 f^2 \quad (43)$$

the noise formula becomes :

$$\langle \delta \hat{N}_\sigma^2 \rangle = f^2 N_0 \langle (\delta \hat{c}_1^\dagger + \delta \hat{c}_1)^2 \rangle \quad (44)$$

where the  $\{\hat{c}_i\}$  are the annihilation operators associated with the transverse mode basis  $\{w_i\}$ .

The  $f^2$  factor is a global effect of the gain, and modifies both the measured signal and shot noise level. In any case, if the flipped mode is perfectly squeezed, we can still perform a perfect measurement. However, the experimental configuration is much more complicated as, in general, the mean value of the electric field in mode  $w_1$  is different from 0, which means that, as is shown in the appendix, generating the good mode is difficult. An appropriate approach would be to describe the field back into an eigenbasis, and check how to set the noise of the different modes in that basis. We will see in appendix III how this can be done in a simple case. The important result of this part is that whatever the measurement we perform the noise arises only from one mode. Changing the noise of this mode allows us to improve the sensitivity of the measurement. As in the previous section, it is also possible in that general case to perform several simultaneous measurements, and to identify the subspace of modes responsible for the noise.

It is interesting to note that, in the particular case of a measurement where the gains are adapted to have  $\langle \hat{M}(\{\sigma_j\}) \rangle = 0$ , the mode  $v_0$  coincides with  $w_0$ . Indeed,  $v_0$  is here orthogonal to  $w_1$  :

$$\begin{aligned} \int_D w_1^*(\vec{r}) v_0(\vec{r}) d^2r &= \sum_j \frac{\sigma_j}{f} \int_{D_j} v_0^*(\vec{r}) v_0(\vec{r}) d^2r \\ &\propto \langle \sum_j \sigma_j \hat{N}(D_j) \rangle \\ &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

hence the basis is an eigenbasis of the field. Again, that case is relevant experimentally as it means that one can act on the noise without perturbing the mean field mode.

## Conclusion

We have shown in that article how to properly define the degree of multimode character of a light beam. We have used the basis decomposition associated with that definition in order to single out, in a linear transverse measurement, the transverse mode carrying the noise. We have shown that it was possible to go beyond the standard quantum noise limit by injecting in that mode squeezed light, and that this could be done simultaneously for several independent measurement.

It order to implement the theory developed here to complex experimental configurations we have shown that it was preferable that the various detection modes be orthogonal to the mean field (i.e. they do not contribute to the mean electric field), and it is necessary to mix them without introducing losses. For instance, one can use the proposal we have detailed in [17] and used to mix two non-classical beams in orthogonal transverse modes, and a mean coherent field, in order to improve the sensitivity of the transverse position measurement of a laser beam.

In this paper, we have analyzed in great detail the origin of quantum noise in a multi-pixel measurement. What remains to be considered now is the signal, and not only the noise in the measurement. This will be the natural continuation of our work, and we will describe in a future publication what is the influence of the gain configuration to the signal to noise ratio and how to optimize a given measurement in an optical image.

## Acknowledgments

Laboratoire Kastler Brossel, of the Ecole Normale Supérieure and University Pierre et Marie Curie, is associated to CNRS. This work has been supported by the European Union in the frame of the QUANTIM network (contract IST 2000-26019).

## APPENDIX : TWO ZONE MEASUREMENT

In this article, we have exhibited the mode structure of the light in a multipixel measurement, using a basis that contain the detection mode. However, when the mean value of the measurement is different from zero, we have shown that this detection mode has a mean electric field value different from zero. In that configuration, it is very difficult experimentally to address the detection mode without modifying the mean field distribution. We have shown that the only basis pertinent for such a task was an eigenmode basis, we will show here what is the structure of that basis for a two zone measurement of non-zero mean value.

Using the notations of the previous sections, we consider two detectors  $D_+$  and  $D_-$  whose gains are respectively  $+1$  and  $-1$ . We recall here the mode structure




FIG. 1: Electric field profile of the constituent modes used to form the non-classical multimode beam.

defined in the main text of that article.  $v_0$  is the transverse mode carrying the mean field of the beam and  $w_1$  is the detection mode as define in equation (40) (which, in that case is equivalent to the flipped mode of equation (32)).  $w_0$  is the mode orthogonal to  $w_1$  in the subspace generated by  $v_0$  and  $w_1$ . Let us call  $i_+$  and  $i_-$  the partial integrals of  $v_0$  on each zone,

$$i_+ = \int_{D_+} v_0^*(\vec{r}) v_0(\vec{r}) d^2r \quad \text{and} \quad i_- = \int_{D_-} v_0^*(\vec{r}) v_0(\vec{r}) d^2r$$

a simple calculation gives

$$\begin{aligned} w_0(\vec{r}) &= \sqrt{\frac{i_-}{i_+}} v_0(\vec{r}) \quad \text{if } r \in D_+ \\ w_0(\vec{r}) &= \sqrt{\frac{i_+}{i_-}} v_0(\vec{r}) \quad \text{if } r \in D_- \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

The first mode of an eigenbasis for the field is  $v_0$ . The

second one,  $v_1$  is defined as the mode orthogonal to  $v_0$  in the subspace generated by  $w_0$  and  $w_1$ , its expression is found to be

$$v_1 \text{ such as } \begin{cases} v_1(\vec{r}) = w_0(\vec{r}) & \text{if } r \in D_+ \\ v_1(\vec{r}) = -w_0(\vec{r}) & \text{if } r \in D_- \end{cases} \quad (47)$$

As  $w_0$  is orthogonal to  $w_1$ , which is the flipped mode of  $v_0$ , one can show that  $v_0$  is orthogonal to  $v_1$ , which is the flipped mode of  $w_0$  (see figure 1). In order to calculate the noise in the measurement using that basis, the flipped mode is expressed as a linear combinaison of the two first modes of the eigenbasis :

$$w_1 = \alpha v_0 + \beta v_1 \quad (48)$$

where  $\alpha = i_+ - i_-$  and  $\beta = 2\sqrt{i_+ i_-}$ , which leads to :

$$\begin{aligned} \langle (\delta \hat{c}_1^\dagger + \delta \hat{c}_1)^2 \rangle &= \alpha^2 \langle (\delta \hat{b}_0^\dagger + \delta \hat{b}_0)^2 \rangle \\ &+ \beta^2 \langle (\delta \hat{b}_1^\dagger + \delta \hat{b}_1)^2 \rangle \\ &+ 2\alpha\beta \langle (\delta \hat{b}_0^\dagger + \delta \hat{b}_0)(\delta \hat{b}_1^\dagger + \delta \hat{b}_1) \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Expressed in an eigenbasis, that do not contain the detection mode, we see that the noise arises from the individual noise of the two first modes and from their correlation function. In that basis, in order to reduce the noise we have several solutions : either the two first modes are perfectly squeezed, either they are perfectly correlated, or any solution in between. Anyway, we can assume that if we want to make a lot of different measurements, it is very difficult to produce correlation between the mean field and the different vacuum modes, hence the easiest solution is to have the mean field squeezed, and the corresponding vacuum squeezed. The same argument as before applies, and we show that we still need an extra mode for each extra information.

- 
- [1] M. Bertero and P. Boccacci. *Introduction to inverse problems in imaging*. IOP Publishing, 1998.
  - [2] A.K. Jain, *Fundamentals of digital image processing* information and system sciences series. Prentice Hall, 1989.
  - [3] A.K. Katsaggelos. *Digital image restoration*, volume 23 of Springer Series in Information Sciences. Springer-Verlag, 1991.
  - [4] M. Bertero and E. R. Pike, *Opt. Acta* **29**, 727 (1982)
  - [5] M. I. Kolobov, and C. Fabre, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 3789-3792 (2000).
  - [6] H-A Bachor, *A guide to experiments in quantum optics*. (Wiley-VCH, Weinheim, 1998).
  - [7] C. Fabre, J.B. Fouet, A. Maître, *Optics Letters* **25**, 76 (1999).
  - [8] C. Fabre, Quantum fluctuations, Les Houches LXIII (1995).
  - [9] C.K. Hong, L. Mandel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 58 (1986).
  - [10] M. Martinelli, N. Treps, S. Ducci, S. Gigan, A. Maître and C. Fabre *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 023808 (2003).
  - [11] C. Schwob, P. H. Souto Ribeiro, A. Maître, C. Fabre, *Optics Letters* **22**, 1893 (1997), and refs in.
  - [12] C. Tischer, S. Altmann, S. Fisinger, J. K. H. Hrber, E. H. K. Stelzer, and E.-L. Florin, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **79**, 3878 (2001)
  - [13] Tim J. Senden, *Current Opinion In Colloid & Interface Science* **6**, 95 (2001)
  - [14] C. Boccara, D. Fournier and J. Badoz, *Appl. Phys. Letters* **36**, 130 (1980).
  - [15] N. Treps, U. Andersen, B. Buchler, P. K. Lam, A. Maître, H.-A. Bachor, and C. Fabre, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **88**, 203601 (2002).
  - [16] N. Treps, N. Grosse, W.P. Bowen, C. Fabre, H-A. Bachor and P.K. Lam, *Science*, **301**, 940 (2003).
  - [17] N. Treps, N. Grosse, W. Bowen, M.T.L. Hsu, A. Maître, C. Fabre, H.A. Bachor, P.K. Lam, *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt.* **6** S664-674.