New Frontiers in Quantum Measurement: Protective Measurement, Genetic Quantum Measurement and Robust Weak Measurement

F. Piacentini[1], A. Avella[1], E. Rebufello[1,2], S. Virzì[1,3], M. A. de Souza[4], R. Lussana[5], F. Villa[5], A. Tosi[5], M. Gramegna[1], G. Brida[1], M. G. A. Paris[6], E. Cohen[7], J. Dziewior[8,9], L. Vaidman[10], I. P. Degiovanni[1], M. Genovese[1]

[1]Istituto Nazionale di Ricerca Metrologica, Torino, Italy
[2]Politecnico di Torino, Torino, Italy
[3]Università degli Studi di Torino, Dipartimento di Fisica, Torino, Italy
[4]National Institute of Metrology, Quality and Technology – INMETRO, Rio de Janeiro, Brazil
[5]Politecnico di Milano, Dipartimento di Elettronica, Informazione e Bioingegneria, Milano, Italy
[6]Università degli Studi di Milano, Dipartimento di Fisica, Milano, Italy
[7]Faculty of Engineering and the Institute of Nanotechnology and Advanced Materials, Bar Ilan University, Ramat Gan, Israel
[8]Max-Planck-Institut für Quantenoptik, Garching, Germany
[9]Department für Physik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität, München, Germany
[10]Raymond and Beverly Sackler School of Physics and Astronomy, Tel-Aviv University, Tel-Aviv, Israel

Measurement has a crucial role in quantum mechanics, because of features like the wave function collapse (after a "strong" measurement) or the fact that measuring a quantum observable erases the information on its conjugate. Nevertheless, quantum mechanics allows for different measurement paradigms, e.g. weak measurements, i.e. measurements performed with an interaction sufficiently weak not to collapse the original state.
These measurements result in weak values [1-6], exploited for research in fundamental physics [7-13], as well as in applied physics being powerful tools for quantum metrology [14-20].
Another example is given by protective measurements (PMs) [21], a new technique able to extract information on the expectation value of an observable even from a single measurement on a single (protected) particle [22].
In addition, other novel measurement protocols have stemmed from these measurement paradigms. It is the case of genetic quantum measurement (GQM), presenting analogies with the typical mechanisms of genetic algorithms [23] and yielding uncertainties even below the quantum Cramér-Rao bound for prepare-and-measure schemes.
Recently, we have also been exploring a new technique named robust weak value measurement (RWM), able to extract a weak value not as an average on an ensemble of weakly measured particles, but even from a single particle (provided it survives the whole measurement process).
In this talk, we present the first experimental implementation of PM [22], showing unprecedented measurement capability and demonstrating how the expectation value of an observable can be obtained without statistics.
Afterwards, we introduce the GQM paradigm, illustrating its features and advantages, verified by the experimental results obtained in our proof-of-principle demonstration.
Finally, we will present RWM and show the results achieved by our experimental implementation of such protocol.

References

[1] A.G. Kofman, S. Ashhab, F. Nori, Phys. Rep. 52, 43 (2012).
[2] B. Tamir and E. Cohen, Quanta 2, 7 (2013).
[3] Y. Aharonov, D.Z. Albert, and L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 1351 (1988).
[4] N.W.M. Ritchie, J.G. Story, and R.G. Hulet, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 1107 (1991).
[5] G.J. Pryde, J.L. O'Brien, A.G. White, T.C. Ralph, and H.M. Wiseman, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 220405 (2005).
[6] O. Hosten and P. Kwiat, Science 319, 787 (2008).
[7] Y. Aharonov et al., Phys. Lett. A 301, 130 (2002).
[8] H.M. Wiseman, New J. Phys. 9, 165 (2007).
[9] R. Mir et al., New J. Phys. 9, 287 (2007).
[10] N.S. Williams and A.N. Jordan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 026804 (2008).
[11] M.E. Goggin et al., PNAS 108, 1256 (2011).
[12] M. Pusey, Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 200401 (2014).
[13] F. Piacentini et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 116, 180401 (2016).
[14] O. Hosten and P. Kwiat, Science 319, 787 (2008).
[15] K.J. Resch, Science 319, 733 (2008).
[16] P.B. Dixon, D.J. Starling, A.N. Jordan, and J.C. Howell, Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 173601 (2009).
[17] J.M. Hogan et al., Opt. Lett. 36, 1698 (2011).
[18] O.S. Magaña-Loaiza, M. Mirhosseini, B. Rodenburg, and R. W. Boyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. 112, 200401 (2014).
[19] J. Salvail et al., Nature Phot. DOI 10.1038;
[20] J. Lundeen, B. Sutherland, A. Patel, C. Stewart, and C. Bamber, Nature 474, 188 (2011).
[21] Y. Aharonov and L. Vaidman, Phys. Lett. A 178, 38 (1993).
[22] F. Piacentini et al., Nat. Phys. 13, 1191–1194 (2017).
[23] M. Mitchell, An Introduction to Genetic Algorithms, Cambridge, MA: MIT Press (1996).