

Beating the diffraction limit in astronomy via quantum cloning (Corrigendum)

A. Kellerer

Cavendish Laboratory, University of Cambridge, Cambridge CB3 0HE, UK
e-mail: ak935@cam.ac.uk

A&A 561, A118 (2014), DOI: 10.1051/0004-6361/201322665

Key words. telescopes – instrumentation: high angular resolution – errata, addenda

In Sect. 3.3 of Kellerer (2014) I suggested detector read-out times below the coherence time of photons. If one assumes, instead, read-out times not less than the coherence time, $\Delta t = \lambda^2/(c \Delta \lambda)$, the spontaneous photons exceed, even for a very small field-of-view, the number of stimulated photons per incoming photon.

With the notation employed in Kellerer (2014) the mean number of cloned photons per incoming photon is:

$$N - 1 = \frac{\sigma}{S} I \quad (1)$$

where I is the number of excited atoms, σ is the cross-section of excited atoms and S is the aperture- and amplifier-area. A field of angular diameter $\theta = 2.44 \lambda/D$ – where D is the aperture diameter – corresponds to the Airy disc up to its first minimum. Within the read-out time $\Delta t = \lambda^2/(c \Delta \lambda)$, equal to the photon coherence time, this “diffraction area” receives a mean number of spontaneous photons:

$$M = \frac{\pi \theta^2}{4} \cdot \frac{1}{4\pi} \cdot A \Delta t \quad (2)$$

A is the spontaneous emission rate.

From these relations one obtains the average fluence ratio of spontaneous and stimulated photons on the diffraction area:

$$\frac{M}{N - 1} = 0.74 \pi^2 \sim 7.3 \quad (3)$$

in line with calculations by Prasad (1994) and his conclusions that the spontaneous emissions dominate the stimulated ones. On the other hand, on average 0.64 N cloned photons end up on the central standard deviation range of diameter 1/3 of the Airy disc. This area is 9 times smaller than the Airy disc considered above. Thus the ratio of spontaneous to stimulated fluence is not 7.3 but merely $7.3/(9 \times 0.64) \sim 1.3$ in this region around the centre of the cloned photons.

The spontaneous photons will prevent a large improvement of resolution as long as our set-up lacks a stage to recognize events where the stimulated emissions dominate. Such a stage is in principle possible, see notably the probabilistic noiseless amplification processes discussed by Duan & Guo (1998), Ralph & Lund (2009). The main message of my article remains: it is fundamentally possible to improve the resolution of a telescope beyond the diffraction limit at the price of sensitivity, i.e. it is possible to trade sensitivity against resolution. The set-up that I have suggested will be incomplete unless it is given a suitable heralding stage.

References

- Duan, L.-M., & Guo, G.-C. 1998, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **80**, 4999
Kellerer, A. 2014, *A&A*, **561**, A118
Prasad, S. 1994, *J. Optic. Soc. Am. A*, **11**, 2799
Ralph, T. C., & Lund, A. P. 2009, in *AIP Conf. Ser.* 1110, ed. A. Lvovsky, 155