

# Experimental implementation of higher dimensional time-energy entanglement

D. Richart<sup>1,2</sup>, Y. Fischer<sup>1,2</sup>, H. Weinfurter<sup>1,2</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann-Str.1 D-85748 Garching, Germany

<sup>2</sup> Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, Schellingstr. 4, D-80797 München, Germany

Received: date / Revised version: date

**Abstract** Qudit entangled states have proven to offer significant advantages with respect to qubit states regarding the implementation of quantum cryptography or computation schemes. Here we propose and experimentally implement a scalable scheme for preparing and analyzing these states in the time-energy degree of freedom of two-photon pairs. Using the scheme the entanglement of  $2 \times 4$  dimensional states is demonstrated.

## 1 Introduction

Entanglement is an intrinsic property of quantum mechanics which has enabled the realization of classically impossible tasks, such as the implementation of more efficient computation algorithms, provably secure cryptographic schemes, and the teleportation of quantum particles. Compared with qubits, the application of qudits, i.e. states defined in a  $d$  dimensional Hilbert space offers interesting alternatives. For example, they allow the reduction of elementary gates, and consequently of the number of physical information carriers necessary to perform quantum computational tasks [1]. Moreover, the number of classical bits transmitted per photon pair can be increased by resorting to high dimensional superdense coding schemes [2], and the fault-tolerance bounds for quantum cryptography schemes can be significantly increased, e.g. to error rates of 35% for 4d encoding [3]. In this context we propose and experimentally implement a scalable scheme for preparing and analyzing high dimensional states in the time-energy degree of freedom of entangled two-photon pairs.

This paper is structured as follows: A short introduction of the theoretical framework will be given in the following. Chapter 2 describes in detail the experimental setup,

with a special focus on the stabilization scheme used. Finally, experimental results demonstrating entanglement between two ququats ( $d = 4$ ) will be presented in 3.

Since the first proposal for creating time-energy correlated quantum states by Franson [4], they have been used for long distance distribution and teleportation of entangled states [5,6] or for the implementation of QKD schemes [7]. As described schematically in Fig.1, a source of time-energy entangled photons can be any process, which coherently emits pairs of photons. Spontaneous parametric down-conversion (SPDC) driven by a source of coherent pump photons is such a process. Within the coherence time of each pump photon a continuous superposition of two-photon states  $|\Psi\rangle = \int_t |t\rangle|t\rangle dt$  defined for an emission time  $t$  is created. For the analysis of the state, each photon of a pair is distributed to the two observers Alice and Bob, which are provided with unbalanced interferometers implementing the very same time delay  $\Delta T$  and an additional phase shift  $\phi_A$  and  $\phi_B$ .


If  $\Delta T$  surpasses each SPDC photon's coherence time  $t_{c,ph}$ , the local phase shifts  $\phi_A$  and  $\phi_B$  will not determine the relative intensities at the outputs of the interferometers. Yet, if both parties agree to analyze coincident detections with 0 time delay, they will project the initial state  $|\Psi\rangle$  onto a superposition of the two-photon states  $|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B$  (both photons arrived at the detectors along the short arm) and  $|1\rangle_A|1\rangle_B$  (arrival via the long arm):

$$|\Psi\rangle_{2D}^{0\Delta T} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B + e^{i(\phi_A+\phi_B)}|1\rangle_A|1\rangle_B). \quad (1)$$


They will observe a variation of the coincidence rates in dependence of the relative phases their photons acquire at their respective interferometers according to

$$C_{2D}^{0\Delta T} = \cos^2(\phi_A + \phi_B) \quad (2)$$

This behaviour can only be attributed to second order interference between the two-photon states  $|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B$  and  $|1\rangle_A|1\rangle_B$ , resulting in the non-classical correlations




**Fig. 1** Scheme for analyzing time-energy entangled two-photon states in 2 dimensional Hilbert spaces. A coherent photon pair source is required to produce photon pairs within a continuous range of two-photon emission times. The parties Alice and Bob are provided each with a photon and an interferometer system. A 2d entangled state can be analyzed by performing projection measurements for a time delay  $t_A - t_B = 0$  between the detected photons. Each photon can be detected at any of the outputs  $\pm$  of the respective interferometer system.



**Fig. 2** Scheme for analyzing time-energy entangled two-photon states in higher dimensional Hilbert spaces. Extending the 2 dimensional configuration, the parties Alice and Bob use a double loop interferometer configuration to project onto a superposition of 4 two-photon detection times  $|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B$ ,  $|1\rangle_A|1\rangle_B$ ,  $|2\rangle_A|2\rangle_B$  and  $|3\rangle_A|3\rangle_B$  of a 4 dimensional entangled state.

between the measurement results.

Evidently, such a scheme is not limited to only two possible arrival times. As long as the sum of the delays is sufficiently shorter than the pump coherence time the effective dimensionality of the state is defined only by the number of delays used in the analyzers [8–10]. Fig. 2 depicts how a 4 dimensional state can be observed. Here, a time-energy correlated state is analyzed by choosing



**Fig. 3** Time distribution of the coincidence count rates as a function of  $t_A - t_B$ , Alice's and Bob's photon detection times. For a time delay of 0, coincidence count rates associated to a 4d entangled state can be selected. For delays  $\pm\Delta T$  and  $\pm 2\Delta T$  a projection onto states with a superposition of 3 and 2 two-photon probability amplitudes is realized, displaying correlations of 3 and 2 dimensional entangled states, respectively. No correlations can be observed in the coincidence windows  $\pm 3\Delta T$ , corresponding to a projection on a 1d state.

the emission time delays (in multiples of  $\Delta T$ )  $|0\rangle$ ,  $|1\rangle$ ,  $|2\rangle$  and  $|3\rangle$  within the coherence time of a pump photon as the 4d computational basis. In analogy to the 2d configuration, spontaneous parametric downconversion can be used to produce two-photon pairs.

They can be analyzed if one photon of a pair is sent to Alice and the other to Bob who are provided with multiple-path interferometer systems designed to project onto the 4 respective emission times. Here, the interferometers are constructed by loops with respective delays  $\Delta T$  and  $2\Delta T$  such that the probability of a photon acquiring a time delay  $i\Delta T$ , with  $i \in [0, 3]$ , is equal. They allow to project onto the two-photon states  $|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B$ ,  $|1\rangle_A|1\rangle_B$ ,  $|2\rangle_A|2\rangle_B$  and  $|3\rangle_A|3\rangle_B$  which are indistinguishable for a detection time delay  $t_A - t_B = 0$  (see Fig.3). If the maximal time delay fulfills  $3\Delta T \ll t_c$ , a coherent superposition can be observed:

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\Psi\rangle_{4D}^{0\Delta T} = & \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle_A|0\rangle_B + e^{i(\phi_{A,1} + \phi_{B,1})}|1\rangle_A|1\rangle_B \\
 & + e^{i(\phi_{A,2} + \phi_{B,2})}|2\rangle_A|2\rangle_B \\
 & + e^{i(\phi_{A,1} + \phi_{B,1} + \phi_{A,2} + \phi_{B,2})}|3\rangle_A|3\rangle_B) \quad (3)
 \end{aligned}$$

The coincidences between, say, the + output of each interferometer (Fig. 2) show a variation according to

$$C_{4D}^{0\Delta T} = \frac{1}{4} \cos^2\left(\frac{\phi_{A,1} + \phi_{B,1}}{2}\right) \cos^2\left(\frac{\phi_{A,2} + \phi_{B,2}}{2}\right) \quad (4)$$

as a function of their respective relative phase settings  $\phi_{A,1}$ ,  $\phi_{A,2}$ ,  $\phi_{B,1}$  and  $\phi_{B,2}$  at the  $\Delta T$  and  $2\Delta T$  loops. Similarly, both parties can agree on measuring coincidence count rates with different time delays which allows them to project onto two-photon superpositions

with a varying number of terms. Here, states with the same computational basis as the four dimensional state but with their respective coincidence functions showing an intrinsic dependence of 3- and 2 dimensional states are analyzed (see Fig. 3). A projection onto time delays  $t_A - t_B = \pm\Delta T$  and  $t_A - t_B = \pm 2\Delta T$  allows to project onto the 3d and 2d maximally entangled states

$$|\Psi\rangle_{3D}^{\Delta T} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|1\rangle_A|0\rangle_B + e^{i(\phi_{A,2} + \phi_{B,1} - \phi_{A,1})}|2\rangle_A|1\rangle_B + e^{i(\phi_{A,2} + \phi_{B,2})}|3\rangle_A|2\rangle_B) \quad (5)$$

$$|\Psi\rangle_{3D}^{-\Delta T} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}(|0\rangle_A|1\rangle_B + e^{i(\phi_{B,2} + \phi_{A,1} - \phi_{B,1})}|1\rangle_A|2\rangle_B + e^{i(\phi_{A,2} + \phi_{B,2})}|2\rangle_A|3\rangle_B) \quad (6)$$

$$|\Psi\rangle_{2D}^{2\Delta T} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|2\rangle_A|0\rangle_B + e^{i(\phi_{A,1} + \phi_{B,1})}|3\rangle_A|1\rangle_B) \quad (7)$$

$$|\Psi\rangle_{2D}^{-2\Delta T} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle_A|2\rangle_B + e^{i(\phi_{A,1} + \phi_{B,1})}|1\rangle_A|3\rangle_B). \quad (8)$$


For a projection onto the + outputs at the respective interferometers and normalized to the total coincidence count rates the following rates are obtained for delays  $t_A - t_B > 0$ :

$$C_{3D}^{\Delta T} = \frac{1}{64}(3 + 2 \cos(\phi_{A,1} - \phi_{B,1} - \phi_{A,2}) - 2 \cos(\phi_{A,2} + \phi_{B,2}) - 2 \cos(\phi_{A,1} - \phi_{B,1} + \phi_{B,2})) \quad (9)$$

$$C_{2D}^{2\Delta T} = \frac{1}{16}(1 - \cos(\phi_{A,1} + \phi_{B,1})) \quad (10)$$

In order to expand the dimensionality of the analyzed states, additional interferometer loops are required to double the previous time delays. As an advantage, the construction allows to increase the number of analyzed emission time delays, and consequently the dimensionality exponentially  $\propto 2^N$  (instead of linearly  $\propto N$  for similar interferometer proposals [10]) with  $N$ , the number of interferometer arms). As a drawback, the number of independent phase settings is smaller than the dimensionality of the states. Ultimately, only the pump laser coherence time and the minimal time resolution of the detection system limits the number of degrees of freedom and consequently the Hilbert space dimension as they impose constraints on the time delays  $\Delta T$  to be chosen. Alternatively, one can employ time-bin encoding by using a short pump pulse and an interferometric setup for the pump laser equivalent to the analyzer ones [11] or the many mutually coherent pulses of a mode-locked laser [12]<sup>1</sup>.

<sup>1</sup> For time-bin entangled states an additional phase modulator between the source and the interferometers could be added. Here, time dependent phase shifts enable to apply the phase shifts missing in (3), etc.



**Fig. 4** Experimental setup. Photon pairs are created by pumping a periodically poled KTP crystal using parametric downconversion. The photons are separated at a polarizing beamsplitter and sent to the respective interferometer system both parties (Alice and Bob) require to analyze the shared entangled states. The interferometers are constructed by using fused fiber couplers (FFC) as beamsplitters and a free space path to implement the required time delays. Finally, single photon avalanche detectors (APDs) are used to detect the photons at each interferometer output

## 2 Experimental Implementation

### 2.1 General Setup

A high brightness SPDC photon pair source based on a periodically poled KTP crystal is chosen to produce the entangled photons [13]. A poling period of  $9.67\mu m$  and type II degenerate phase matching is used to produce photon pairs with an efficiency of  $\eta = 49000(s \cdot mW)^{-1}$  at a central wavelength of  $805.9nm$  and with a bandwidth of  $\Delta\lambda < 1.1nm$  (corresponding to a coherence time of  $\approx 2ps$ ). The photon pairs are emitted collinearly and the  $H$  and  $V$  polarized photons are separated and coupled into single mode fibers respectively.

The implementation of the generic scheme (Fig.2) was based on various considerations. Fused fiber couplers (FFC) are used as beamsplitters as they warrant a better spatial mode overlap between the different paths. This enables a significantly better interference visibility, while requiring only a passive temperature stabilization [5]. As a drawback, the FFC are less suited for the near IR wavelength regime used here than for the telecom wavelengths for which chromatic dispersion can be compensated routinely. Dispersion is particularly disturbing in this type of interferometers due to the different path-lengths in the combined interferometers. Therefore, a hybrid interferometer configuration consisting of a fibre and a free space path implementing the time delay is chosen, such that both arms of the interferometer share the same path length made of fiber. Polarization mode dispersion between the different interferometer paths is less severe and is compensated by manual polarization controllers.

The minimal time delay required to distinguish between the different two-photon amplitudes in Fig.3 depends on the timing resolution of the single photon detection devices. Recently, CMOS based APDs are reported to reach FWHM timing resolutions down to 50ps [14]. However due to the higher detection efficiency in the NIR we choose the standard reach-through SPAD (Perkin Elmer, AQ4C-SPCM) with a typical resolution of 500ps. In order to make the overlap of the two-photon detection signals negligible we thus choose  $\Delta T > 2.4$ ns. A computer controlled time correlation module with a specified resolution of 82ps (ACAM TDC-GPX) is used for measuring the time differences between the detections at the outputs of each interferometer using 4 independent APDs. It is believed that further improvements in the detection efficiency and timing resolution of APDs will lead to a significant miniaturization and further scalability of the scheme. Furthermore, the minimal time delay  $\Delta T$  imposes a strict lower bound for the coherence time of the SPDC pump laser. For that purpose we use a grating stabilized blue laser diode at 402.8nm offering a coherence time of  $2.58\mu s \gg \Delta T$ .


Alice's and Bob's interferometer delays  $\Delta T$  and  $2\Delta T$  are equalized with respect to each other within the coherence time of their photons to enable the indistinguishability of the respective two-photon probability amplitudes. Similar adjustments are made to equalize the  $2\Delta T$  delays to the double of  $\Delta T$ .

## 2.2 Interferometer Stabilization

In order to warrant a stable phase relation in the interferometers over longer measurement times, a stabilization scheme compensating thermal and mechanical drifts of each interferometer has been developed.

**2.2.1 Polarization multiplexing scheme** As described before, time-energy correlated states offer an intrinsic insensitivity to the global phase acquired during the transmission of the photons to the respective analysis devices. Nevertheless, the fluctuation of the various phases of the unbalanced interferometers during the measurement time will cause a reduction or even loss of interference visibility. The variation  $\Delta\phi$  of the relative phases depends on the fluctuation of the path length difference  $\Delta L$  and wavelength variation  $\Delta\lambda_p$  of the pump laser. As temperature drifts and vibrations of the optical components will cause a variation of both parameters  $\Delta L$  and  $\Delta\lambda_p$  total path length differences of up to 2m require a stabilization scheme.

$\Delta\lambda_p$  is minimized by referencing the pump laser diode to a stabilized reference cavity using the Hänsch-Couillaud locking scheme. The cavity itself is stabilized by a grating stabilized laser diode at 780nm locked itself to a frequency comb mode (250kHz FWHM, 780nm central wavelength, Maser referenced) [15]. The same laser diode




**Fig. 5** Interferometer stabilization scheme using polarization multiplexing. An error signal dependent upon the interferometer phase is extracted by ensuring that the polarization transformation for a reference laser is orthogonal in both arms, while the the SPDC photons share the same polarization state at the output. It can be used to drive a feedback loop adjusting the relative phase  $\alpha_{SL}$  to a constant value while a change  $\alpha_{\lambda/2}$  of the analysis  $\lambda/2$  waveplate allows to vary the relative phase acquired by the SPDC photons without any shift of the components inside the interferometer.

is used to stabilize each interferometer to a subwavelength accuracy by using polarization multiplexing (depicted in Fig. 5).

Polarization multiplexing can be used for stabilizing standard interferometers as well as for the system implemented here, for which the reference laser and photon mode spatially overlap [16]. For similar methods, fringe locking on the reference laser interference signal would limit the range over which a stable interferometer phase change is possible, and also requires the measurement of the intensities at both outputs of the respective interferometer. Instead, for polarization multiplexing it suffices to make the polarization state of the stabilization laser in both arms mutually orthogonal, while the polarization state of the SPDC photons should not be changed (in this example  $H$ ). Thus, manual fiber polarization controllers (PC) are used first for equalizing the polarization of the SPDC photons in the respective interferometer paths. The stabilization laser is then coupled into one input of the interferometer polarized with  $45^\circ$ . The rotation of its polarization vector to  $-45^\circ$  is induced along the long arm (red) using a birefringent crystal (here an  $YVO_4$ ) with optical axes orientation along  $H$ . This leaves the SPDC photon's polarization  $H$  unchanged.

In this experiment wavelengths of 780nm and 806nm are chosen for the stabilization laser and SPDC photons respectively, allowing separation by a dichroic beamsplitter. The polarization analysis of the stabilization laser consists of an  $YVO_4$  crystal used to compensate for an additional phase  $\phi$  acquired in the fibers and the dichroic beamsplitter and a  $\lambda/2$  waveplate before projecting onto a polarizing beamsplitter (PBS) which reflects  $V$  (vertical) and transmits  $H$  (horizontal) polarized light. The polarization change by the waveplate rotation adds to



**Fig. 6** Time-multiplexing scheme of stabilization laser intensities SL1 and SL2 for stabilizing of different interferometer loops independently. The electronically demultiplexed error signals depend only on the respective phase settings  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  of the delays  $\Delta T$  and  $2\Delta T$ , allowing an independent stabilization and variation of the relative phases acquired by the photons. Here the interferometer delay  $2\Delta T$  is added by using an optical delay line between two mirrors.

the interferometer phase resulting in the error signal  $E(\phi_{SL}, \phi_{\frac{\lambda}{2}}) \propto \cos(\phi_{SL} - 2\phi_{\lambda/2})$  extracted by measuring the difference of the intensities  $H/V$  at both outputs of the PBS ( $\phi_{SL}$  is the relative phase difference mod  $2\pi$  between the interferometer arms, and  $\phi_{\lambda/2}$  is the rotation angle of the  $\lambda/2$  analysis waveplate). A P-I feedback control is applied to piezoelectrically lock the phase  $\phi_{SL}$  to 0, such that a rotation of  $\phi_{\lambda/2}$  will contribute to an effective phase change  $-\phi_{\lambda/2}$  acquired by the 806nm photons. Using this method we observe fluctuations of the error signal of each interferometer loop with  $\Delta\phi_{SD} \leq \pm 0.02\pi$ , resulting in a relative stability of all four loops of  $\Delta\phi_{SD} \leq \pm 0.059\pi$  as determined from coincidence measurements over one hour (See Fig. 7). We want to emphasize that for our method the phase change speed is ultimately limited by typical millisecond piezoactuator response times, while the probability of fringe skipping is minimized with respect to other stabilization schemes. More importantly, no optical component is placed in the path of the photons in order to vary their phase, therefore avoiding transmission losses and mode aberrations for the SPDC photon modes.

**2.2.2 Time-multiplexing scheme for stabilization of different interferometer arms.** Fig. 6 describes how the polarization multiplexing scheme can be applied in order to extract error signals dependent on the respective phases  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  caused by the two interferometer loops  $\Delta T$  and  $2\Delta T$ .

The  $H$  polarized photons obtained from the SPDC source are coupled into one input, and fiber polarization controllers are placed in each path to obtain  $H$  polarization at each output of the fibers. In order to obtain independent error signals SL1 and SL2, the stabilization laser


intensity is split up into two modes.

The first component (SL1) used to stabilize  $\Delta T$  is coupled into the free interferometer input and extracted at the long path of the  $2\Delta T$  interferometer using a dichroic beamsplitter with ideal transmittivity for 806nm and a 30% – 70% splitting ratio for 780nm. The error signal  $E(\phi_1, \phi_{1, \frac{\lambda}{2}}) \propto \cos(\phi_1 + \phi_{1, \frac{\lambda}{2}})$  can be extracted by applying the scheme described in Fig. 5. For referencing  $2\Delta T$  the intensity SL2 is coupled through the free space path of the first interferometer using a dichroic beamsplitter with the same characteristics. The intensities for SL2 are extracted by interference filters after their overlap at the last beamsplitter. The corresponding error signal displays a dependence only on the phase  $\phi_2$  acquired at the  $2\Delta T$  interferometer:  $E(\phi_2, \phi_{2, \frac{\lambda}{2}}) \propto \cos(\phi_2 + \phi_{2, \frac{\lambda}{2}})$ . The variation of  $\phi_{1, \frac{\lambda}{2}}$  and  $\phi_{2, \frac{\lambda}{2}}$  allows an independent variation of the relative phases acquired by the SPDC photons in both interferometer arms.


As the stabilization light for the two loops would mutually disturb the generation of the error signals, they are time multiplexed (100Hz frequency, offset  $> 20ms$ ) by transmitting each mode through alternating blades of an optical chopper before feeding the laser light into the interferometers. For demultiplexing the respective error signals depending on the phases  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  the P-I feedback electronics are driven by analog sample-and-hold circuits triggering a feedback loop only at the times at which the respective stabilization signals are detected. Despite the chromatic filtering between the stabilization laser and the SPDC photons, non-negligible background counts are still measured on the wavelength of 806nm. It is believed that they can be associated to scattering processes of the stabilization laser in the fibers and other optical components. For this reason the detection of SPDC photons and the transmission of both reference signals SL1 and SL2 are also time multiplexed with respect to each other, by transmitting the SPDC photons through a further set of blades of the same optical chopper. To minimize losses in the photon coincidence count rates the time-averaged transmission rate of the SPDC photons is set to  $\approx 75\%$  while the stabilization signals share  $\approx 25\%$  of the time. The scheme is scalable and can be applied on additional interferometer arms used to expand the dimensionality of the analyzed states.

### 3 Experimental Results

First, we evaluate the performance of the stabilization scheme by analyzing the time dependent variation of the coincidence count rates for the 4d state. Typical phase deviations for measurement times of up to 50min and integration times of 10s are displayed in Fig. 7. Average standard deviations of  $\Delta\phi_{4D} = \pm 0.059\pi$  are observed,  $\approx 3$  times larger than for the single interferometer sta-




**Fig. 7** Phase fluctuation of the 4d coincidence rate over measurement times of up to 1 hour. Routinely a standard deviation of  $\Delta\phi = \pm 0.059\pi$  is observed.



**Fig. 8** Coincidence count rate variation for a simultaneous scan of phases  $\phi_{A,1}$  and  $\phi_{A,2}$  in both interferometer arms of Alice. The function  $C_{4D}^{0\Delta T}$  is fitted to the experimental data while  $C_{2D}^{2\Delta T}$  corresponds to the theoretical coincidence function for a 2 dimensional state.

bilization scheme of  $\Delta\phi_{PM} = \pm 0.02\pi$  described in 2.2.1, but still sufficiently small for further measurements. The main contribution to this value is due to the independent fluctuations of four interferometer phases (Eq.3) and due to the additional phase uncertainty resulting from the short time span used for stabilization ( $\approx 8\%$ ).


In order to characterize and to evaluate the setup, first the dependence of the coincidence count rates (4),(9) and (10) for different dimensions is tested for phases  $\phi_1$  and  $\phi_2$  for each party. An illustrative way to display the difference between 2d and 4d entangled states is to simultaneously scan the phases  $\phi_{A,1}$  and  $\phi_{A,2}$  of Alice's interferometers ( $\phi_{B,1} = \phi_{B,2} = 0$ ). Then the coincidence functions as given in Eq. 3 and 9 simplify to  $C_{4D}^{0\Delta T} \propto \cos^4\phi$  and  $C_{2D}^{2\Delta T} \propto \cos^2\phi$ , respectively. As illustrated in Fig. 8, the coincidence count rates clearly show an excellent overlap with the function  $C_{4D}^{0\Delta T}$ . As described in [17,18] these characteristics can be used to



**Fig. 9** Experimental and theoretical coincidence probabilities for 4d, 3d and 2d states as a function of  $\phi_{A,2}$  (a) and b) and  $\phi_{A,1}$  (c) and d)).

define dimensional witnesses.

Next, we analyze the coincidence count rates observed for states of different dimensions by comparing the experimental data with the corresponding theoretical predictions. In Fig. 9 the coincidences for the +, + detector combination are shown as a function of  $\phi_{A,2}$  for a) and b) and in dependence of  $\phi_{A,1}$  for c) and d) while keeping the respective other phases constant at 0. In a) and b) the fringe visibility for the 4d data (blue) amounts to  $V_{4D} = 0.981(8)\%$  while the corresponding value for the 3d state (green) only amounts to  $V_{3D} = 0.654(7)\%$  and vanishes for the 2d state (red), in close correspondence with the theoretical predictions of  $V_{4D,th} = 1$ ,  $V_{3D,th} = 7/9 = 0.78$  and  $V_{2D,th} = 0$  according to equations (3),(8) and (9). The phase difference between both coincidence count rates of  $\Delta\phi = \phi_{3D} - \phi_{4D} = 1.024(2)\pi$  corresponds closely to the theoretical expected value of  $\pi$ . In contrast, when varying  $\phi_{A,1}$  (Fig. 9 c) and d)) the 3d coincidence function remains constant at  $1/9$  of the maximal probability, while the 2d coincidence count rate displays a visibility of  $V_{2D} = 0.919(11)\%$  in clear correspondence with the theoretical expectations ( $V_{2D,th} = 1$ ). Again, the phase difference  $\Delta\phi = \phi_{2D} - \phi_{4D} = 1.013(2)\pi$  displays the good reproducibility of the interferometer setup. The periods of all curves show a deviation of less than  $\approx 4\%$  with respect to the ideal value. A contribution of accidental coincidence count rates in the range of 1% of the maximal count rates of the 4d state is observed, resulting in a negligible reduction of its interference visibility. For the 2d state the count rates are reduced by a factor of 4 as compared to the 4d state (See Eq. 9) the same background causes a significantly lower signal/noise ratio and a higher reduction of the visibility.



**Fig. 10** Coincidence count rate of the 4d entangled state scanned as a function of the phase  $\phi_{A,1}$  of Alice's short interferometer.

A figure of merit for the suitability of the setup for preparing higher dimensional time-energy entanglement is the interference visibility of the coincidence curves. Following the considerations given in [19] a Bell inequality can be defined [18], which is violated only by  $2 \times 4$  dimensional entangled states. Here, the bound  $I \leq 2$  can be translated into a minimal fringe visibility of  $V_c = 78,4\%$  to allow a violation of local realism for the state space spanned by our interferometer system. The experimentally determined visibility (Fig. 10) of  $V_{exp} = 0.975(16)\%$  surpasses the bound by 12 standard deviations offering the potential for a violation of higher dimensional Bell inequalities [18].

#### 4 Conclusion

We introduced an experimental scheme which is suited for the preparation and analysis of 4d entangled photons. The experimental results exhibit high visibilities and are in good agreement with the described theoretical predictions, enabling the expansion of the scheme to entangled states of even higher dimensions. From the viewpoint of fundamental research they offer the opportunity for studying the increased non-classicality of high dimensional states as characterized by the violation of Bell tests [20,18] or allow studies on the non-contextual nature of quantum mechanics [21–23]. With increasing dimensionality of the encoded states, the application of mutually unbiased bases allows to increase the security bounds of quantum cryptography schemes [20] while minimizing the experimental effort for full state determination [24] with respect to standard tomographic techniques. It is thus of high relevance to utilize the benefits of the scheme demonstrated here and to further increase the dimensionality of qudit states.

#### Acknowledgements

We would like to thank Witlef Wieczorek, Nikolai Kiesel

and Wieslaw Laskowski for helpful discussions. We acknowledge the support by the DFG-Cluster of Excellence MAP and an exchange program by DAAD.

#### References

1. B. P. Lanyon, M. Barbieri, M. P. Almeida, T. Jennewein, T. C. Ralph, K. J. Resch, G. J. Pryde, J. L. O'Brien, A. Gilchrist, and A. G. White, *Nature Physics* **5**, 134 (2009).
2. J. T. Barreiro, T.-C. Wei, and P. G. Kwiat, *Nature Physics* **4**, 282 (2008).
3. G. M. Nikolopoulos, K. S. Ranade, and G. Alber, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 032325 (2006).
4. J. D. Franson, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **62**, 2205 (1989).
5. W. Tittel, J. Brendel, B. Gisin, T. Herzog, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 3229 (1998).
6. I. Marcikic, H. de Riedmatten, W. Tittel, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, *Nature* **421**, 509 (2003).
7. G. Ribordy, J. Brendel, J.-D. Gautier, N. Gisin, and H. Zbinden, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 012309 (2000).
8. R. T. Thew, A. Acin, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, *Physical Review Letters* **93**, 010503 (2004).
9. G. Weihs, M. Reck, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 893 (1996).
10. M. Zukowski, A. Zeilinger, and M. A. Horne, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, 2564 (1997).
11. I. Marcikic, H. de Riedmatten, W. Tittel, V. Scarani, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 062308 (2002).
12. H. de Riedmatten, I. Marcikic, V. Scarani, W. Tittel, H. Zbinden, and N. Gisin, *Physical Review A* **69**, 050304 (2004).
13. A. Fedrizzi, T. Herbst, A. Poppe, T. Jennewein, and A. Zeilinger, *Opt. Express* **15**, 15377 (2007).
14. F. Stellari, *IEEE Transactions on Electron Devices* **48**, 12 (2001).
15. T. W. Hänsch, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **78**, 1297 (2006).
16. O. Schulz, R. Steinhübl, M. Weber, B.-G. Englert, C. Kurtsiefer, and H. Weinfurter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 177901 (2003).
17. B.-J. Pors, F. Miatto, G. W. 't Hooft, E. R. Eliel, and J. P. Woerdman, *Journal of Optics* **13**, 064008 (2011).
18. To be published .
19. D. Collins, N. Gisin, N. Linden, S. Massar, and Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 040404 (2002).
20. N. J. Cerf, M. Bourennane, A. Karlsson, and N. Gisin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 127902 (2002).
21. G. Kirchmair, F. Zähringer, R. Gerritsma, M. Kleinmann, O. Gühne, A. Cabello, R. Blatt, and C. Roos, *Nature* **460**, 494 (2009).
22. E. Amselem, M. Rådmark, M. Bourennane, and A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 160405 (2009).
23. R. Lapkiewicz, P. Li, C. Schaeff, N. K. Langford, S. Ramelow, M. Wiesniak, and A. Zeilinger, *Nature* **474**, 490 (2011).
24. R. B. A. Adamson and A. M. Steinberg, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 030406 (2010).