Two-phonton interference without bunching two photons

Yoon-Ho Kim
Center for Engineering Science Advanced Research
Computer Science & Mathematics Division
Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN 37831
Tel: 865-241-0912, Fax: 865-241-0381, Email: kimy@ornl.gov

Abstract: We report a novel interference experiment in which the two-photon entangled state interference cannot be pictured in terms of the overlap and bunching of two individual photons on a beamsplitter. We also demonstrate that two-photon interference, or photon bunching effect on a beamsplitter, does not occur if the two-photon Feynman amplitudes are distinguishable, even though individual photons do overlap on a beamsplitter.
© 2002 Optical Society of America
OCIS codes: (270.0270) Quantum Optics;

Among many different two-photon quantum interference effects in spontaneous parametric down-conversion field, the observation of null (or close to zero) coincidence counts between the detectors placed at the two output ports of a beamsplitter, when two photons of SPDC are brought back together on the beamsplitter from the different input ports at the same time, has attracted a lot of attention over the years [1]. The two-photon interference, in this case, occurs because the two two-photon amplitudes leading to a coincidence count (both photons are reflected at the beamsplitter, r-r, or both photons are transmitted at the beamsplitter, t-t) become indistinguishable, *even in principle*, and cancel each out when the photons arrive the beamsplitter simultaneously. As a result, it has been commonly understood that two photons must overlap at the beamsplitter to exhibit such two-photon interference effect.

Is the overlap of the two photons indeed necessary for interference? Pittman *et al.* first reported an experiment which dealt with this question [2]. In their experiment, a delay, which is bigger than the individual photons' coherence times, introduced to one photon before the beamsplitter is compensated by twice the delay introduced to its twin photon after the beamsplitter (postponed compensation). They were then able to observe interference even though the two photons did not overlap at the beamsplitter. However, the laser which pumps the SPDC process must have coherence time much bigger than the delay introduced between the photon pairs for Pittman *et al.*'s scheme to work. In fact, a cw Argon ion laser, which had several orders of magnitude bigger coherence time than the delay time, was used in their experiment. Since it is known that the entangled photon pair of SPDC collectively has the properties of the pump photon, it may be said that the SPDC photons do overlap at the beamsplitter within the coherence time of the pump photon in Pittman *et al.*'s scheme. Thus, Pittman *et al.*'s experiment does not provide us with a clear answer to the question.

In this paper, we wish to report an experiment which conclusively demonstrates that the 'photons overlapping and bunching at the beamsplitter' picture is not a valid explanation of general two-photon interference effect (whether 'photons' refer to the pump photons or the SPDC photons). In this experiment, the two photon-wavepackets not only never overlap at the beamsplitter but also the arrival time difference between the photon pair at the beamsplitter is much bigger than the coherence time of the pump photon (pulse). We also present an experiment in which the SPDC photons do overlap at the beamsplitter, but interference does not (and cannot) occur.

The basic idea of the experiment can be seen in Fig. 1. The photon pair is generated from a 3 mm thick type-II BBO crystal, pumped by an ultrafast laser pulse with coherence time of approximately 130 fsec. The pump pulse has the central wavelength of 390 nm and the wavelengths of the SPDC photons are centered at 780 nm. We consider the intersections of the cones made by the e- and o-rays exiting the BBO crystal. In each of these two directions, a photon of either polarization (horizontal or vertical) may be found, with the orthogonal polarization found in the conjugate photon (i.e., individual photons are unpolarized). Each photon then passes through a 21.2 mm long quartz rod, QR1 and QR2, (slow axis vertical) which generates a relative group delay of 668 fsec between the two photons. This delay is much bigger than the pump pulse

duration as well as the 100 fsec single-photon wavepacket determined by the 20 nm spectral filters inserted in front of the detectors. Photon pairs are then detected by two single-photon counting modules (D1 and D2) after passing through polarizers (A1 and A2).



Fig. 1. Experimental setup and data. Experimental data show 87% visibility. Lower left figures show the two-photon Feynman amplitudes for the current experiment. Even though photons do not overlap at the polarizing beamsplitter, the resulting two-photon amplitudes are indistinguishable.

The experimental data for this case are shown in Fig. 1. The measurement were made for two different polarizer settings: A1/A2 = 45°/45° and 45°/ − 45°. High-visibility quantum interference is apparent from the data and the visibility is higher than the classical limit (50%) as well as the limit for the Bell-inequality violation (71%). This clearly establishes that the observed interference is of quantum origin.

To make the photons overlap at the beamsplitter, we need to set the optic axes of the quartz rods orthogonally: QR1 = V and QR2 = H. In this case, the photons do overlap but the two Feynman alternatives now become distinguishable as one amplitude always would click earlier than the other one. As a result, quantum interference should disappear and we have confirmed this experimentally.

This experiment clearly demonstrates that two-photon quantum interference effect is indeed due to indistinguishability of two-photon amplitudes but not due to the 'photon bunching' effect of individual photon wavepackets. It also demonstrates that genuine higher-order interference effects should not and cannot be explained by using lower-order interference picture (such as photon bunching at a beamsplitter).

This research was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Basic Energy Sciences and the National Security Agency. The Oak Ridge National Laboratory is managed for the U.S. DOE by UT-Battelle, LLC, under contract No. DE-AC05-00OR22725.

References

1. Y.H. Shih and C.O. Alley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **61**, 2921 (1988).
2. T.B. Pittman *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 1917 (1996).
3. Y.-H. Kim, to be published.