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Abstract
Entanglement is a fundamental property of quantum mechanics, and is a primary resource in quantum information systems. Its manipulation remains a central challenge in the development of quantum technology. In this work, we demonstrate a device which can generate, manipulate, and analyse two-qubit entangled states, using miniature and mass-manufacturable silicon photonics. By combining four photon-pair sources with a reconfigurable six-mode interferometer, embedding a switchable entangling gate, we generate two-qubit entangled states, manipulate their entanglement, and analyse them, all in the same silicon chip. Using quantum state tomography, we show how our source can produce a range of entangled and separable states, and how our switchable controlled-Z gate operates on them, entangling them or making them separable depending on its configuration.
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1. Introduction
Photons remain a promising vehicle for the development of next-generation quantum technology [1, 2]. Integrated quantum photonics, with its intrinsic phase stability and miniature devices, is necessary to bring linear optics to the large scale [3–5]. Several integrated photonic platforms have emerged to solve this problem, including silica-on-silicon [3, 6–8], direct-write glass [9–13], lithium niobate [14–17], silicon nitride [18, 19] and silicon-on-insulator [20]. Silicon quantum photonics promises to simultaneously achieve the required functionality, performance, and scale.

Several important quantum optical functionalities have already been shown with high performance in silicon. Photon pairs can be generated using spontaneous four-wave mixing (SFWM) [21–26], and interfered with high visibility [26–30]. Single-photon [31] and pump-rejection [32, 33] spectral demultiplexers, as well as two-mode interferometers [34], have been...
demonstrated with very high extinction. Finally, single-photon detectors, based on superconducting nanowires have shown excellent performance on silicon waveguides [35, 36]. The very high refractive index contrast of silicon-on-insulator waveguides yields micron-scale components (e.g. [37]), while miniature ring resonator SFWM sources [22], and quantum interferometric networks [38] facilitate devices on a very large scale.

The integration of entangled qubit sources with entangling quantum logic, together on a common platform, is an important next step. Here, we show a new method for generating path-encoded, variably entangled two-qubit states. We perform multi-qubit quantum logic on these states and study their entanglement. We implemented this scheme on a reconfigurable, silicon photonic device to generate a wide range of two-qubit states. We integrated this source with arbitrary state preparation, a switchable two-qubit gate, and an interferometer for tomographic analysis. The implemented quantum circuit is similar to the one reported in [39].

We tested the device’s quantum logic capabilities with several experiments. We analysed the source performance using reversed-Hong–Ou–Mandel-type (RHOM) [28, 40] quantum interference, and qubit tomography on a wide range
of possible states. We followed this with an exploration of the on-chip quantum logic, with the switchable two-qubit gate in both entangling ($\hat{c}z$) and non-entangling ($\hat{I}$) configurations, and using the purity ($P$) [41], the CHSH parameter ($S$) [42] and the Schmidt number ($K$) [43] as diagnostic metrics.

2. Device structure and operation

A schematic of the device is shown in figure 1(a). It comprises a reconfigurable source of two path-encoded entangled photons, controlled by the parameters $\phi_J$, $\phi_T$ and $\phi_B$. The source is followed by a reconfigurable interferometer, able to implement any two-qubit projector (including entangled projections). This second part of the device can be divided into three sections: arbitrary single qubit gates, a switchable post-selected controlled-Z ($cz$) gate [44], and final single-qubit unitaries, used to implement projectors for quantum state tomography, to reconstruct the output state.

The device comprised $500 \times 220\ \text{nm}^2$ waveguides, directional couplers (approximate length $45.9\ \mu\text{m}$), a waveguide crossing (>20 dB isolation), and resistive metallic heaters (length $54.0\ \mu\text{m}$). It was coupled to fibre via edge coupling, fibre lenses, and polymer spot-size converters. Electrical connections were achieved through multi-contact electrical probes and $200\ \mu\text{m}$ pitch on-chip gold pads (approximately $120 \times 200\ \mu\text{m}^2$). Fabrication of the device proceeded as in [31].

The experimental setup is presented in figure 1(b). Photons are generated on the chip via SFWM, pumped by an amplified continuous-wave tunable laser, and filtered to remove in-band noise. An average facet-to-facet transmission of $\approx 28\ \text{dB}$ was observed. The dominant sources of loss were scattering at the chip facets, and propagation loss in the spiralled source waveguides. Inside the device the light was reconfigurably manipulated by an interferometric network, composed of evanescent coupler beam-splitters and thermo-optic phase-shifters [38, 45]. Photons were collected from the device, demultiplexed and separated from the pump using dense wavelength-division multiplexers, detected using superconducting nanowire detectors [46], and finally converted into coincidence counts by a time-interval analyser.

2.1. Photon-pair generation

The strong nonlinear properties of silicon waveguides are well known [47]. SFWM, an effect of the $\chi^{(3)}$ nonlinearity, is now commonly used to produce photon pairs in silicon quantum photonic devices [21, 28].
In the non-degenerate SFWM process used here, two photons from a bright pump are annihilated, producing two correlated photons with different wavelengths (figure 1(a)). The two generated photons, ‘signal’ and ‘idler’, emerge spectrally on either side of the pump, conserving energy and momentum. In our experiment, spiralled 21 mm long waveguides were used to produce photon-pairs, with the pump, signal, and idler photon wavelengths being 1551, 1547, and 1555 nm. These photons were generated in a continuous spectrum and the chosen wavelengths were post-selected by the off-chip demultiplexers.

2.2. Entangled qubits generation

Our device uses a new scheme to generate entangled path-encoded states, which can subsequently be interfered, using pairs of non-degenerate photons. Pump laser is distributed between two reverse-HOM structures using a reconfigurable power splitter (splitting ratio \( \sin^2(\phi_f/2) \)). Each RHOM contains two spiralled waveguides and a thermal phase shifter, as in [28]. The internal RHOM phases (\( \phi_T \) and \( \phi_B \)) were set to \( \pi/2 \), such that the produced photon-pairs emerged deterministically split, one in each output waveguide, and in a state symmetrical between signal and idler photons. \( \phi_f \) allows us to control the balance of photon-pair emission between the two RHOM structures, and so to control the entanglement present in the two-qubit output state.

Following figure 1(b), if \( \phi_f = \pi \), photons will be generated only in the top RHOM, and the photon number output state, after the waveguide crossing, will be \( |00\rangle \) or \( |11\rangle \) in the qubit basis. On the other hand, if \( \phi_f = 0 \), only the bottom RHOM generates photons, leading to \( |0101\rangle/\sqrt{2} \), where \( \theta \) is a fixed phase factor due to the chip’s intrinsic path-length mismatch. Thus, the output state from the entangled qubit generator is

\[
|\psi\rangle = \sqrt{\beta} |00\rangle + e^{i\theta} \sqrt{1-\beta} |11\rangle
\]  

(1)

which can be continuously varied across a wide range of separable and entangled states, depending on the balance parameter, \( \beta \). The balance depends on the square of the power division of the state control Mach–Zehnder interferometers (MZI) (controlled by the phase \( \phi_f \)), due to the two-photon dependence of SFWM:

\[
\beta = \left[ \frac{\sin^2(\phi_f/2)}{\sqrt{\sin^4(\phi_f/2) + \cos^4(\phi_f/2)}} \right]^2.
\]

(2)

2.3. Quantum logic and analysis

The state \( |\psi\rangle \) is fed into a two-qubit circuit, composed of single-qubit rotations, and a switchable entangling gate. We implemented the arbitrary rotations on each qubit by cascading phase-shifters and MZI. These were used to realise \( \hat{R}_z \) and \( \hat{R}_y \) rotations, respectively, obtaining an arbitrary SU(2) with the combination \( \hat{R}_z \cdot \hat{R}_y \cdot \hat{R}_z \).
We implemented a switchable entangling gate using a scheme based on [44], but replacing the 1/3 beam-splitters with tunable-reflectivity MZIs. In this way, we can switch the gate’s controlled-Z operation on and off. When on, the cz operation succeeds with probability 1/9. In the remaining 8/9 cases, non-qubit states are generated, which are filtered by the coincidence-counting post-selection. Note that only the on \((\cos(\theta_G) = 1/3)\) and off \((\cos(\theta_G) = -1)\) gate configurations produce unitary operations. The two-qubit gate is followed by rotations (parametrised by \(\theta_{M_2}, \theta_{M_2}, M \in \{T, B\}\)) used to implement quantum state tomography, via the method described in [48].

### 2.4. Calibration

Since the phase shifter parameters (phase-per-electrical-power, and phase offset) varied between phase modulators, a calibration process was essential. Measuring the bright-light transmission from the inputs (IN and IN') to the outputs (OUT\(_T\), OUT\(_B\), OUT\(_T\), OUT\(_B\)), we were able to characterise the electro-optic parameters of each thermal phase shifter, in a similar way to that described in [49]. We learned the parameters associated with each phase according to the scheme:

\[
\begin{align*}
\text{IN}' &\rightarrow \text{OUT}_{T'}, \text{OUT}_{B'}: \phi_{B}, \theta_{B1}, \theta_{CZB}, \theta_{T1}, \theta_{CTZ} \\
\text{IN} &\rightarrow \text{OUT}_{T}, \text{OUT}_{B}: \phi_{T}, \theta_{T1}, \theta_{T2}, \theta_{B1} \\
\text{IN} &\rightarrow \text{OUT}_{T}: \theta_{CZT}, \theta_{T1}, \theta_{T2}, \theta_{T3} \\
\text{IN} &\rightarrow \text{OUT}_{B}: \theta_{B1}, \theta_{B2}, \theta_{B3}.
\end{align*}
\]

We observed instabilities in the calibration data, due to changes in electrical contact resistance between our probe card and the on-chip gold pads. To mitigate this, we periodically recalibrated the on-chip parameters. Metallurgical wire-bonded contacts can prevent this in future. Low levels of thermal and common-ground crosstalk were observed but not compensated. Recent results suggest that crosstalk can be reduced through efficiency improvements, passive compensation methods, and by current driving of the thermal phase shifters [38, 49, 50].

The offsets of the tomographic z-rotation phases \((\theta_{T3}, \theta_{B3})\) were left at zero, meaning that additional random (fixed) \(z\) rotations were applied to each qubit before measurement. This choice was necessitated by the combined difficulty of:

1. calibrating the nonlinear phase source with bright light,
2. doing this for each setting of the gate, in the device’s finite stability time.

### 3. Results

#### 3.1. Source performance

One of the key metrics of a photon-pair source is its pair-generation efficiency [51]. This quantity is obtained from the photon-pair detection rate as a function of the input power, accounting for loss and detector efficiency. Inside the 1 nm wide signal and idler spectral bands, we measured a brightness of 20 kHz mW\(^{-2}\).

The indistinguishability between photon-pair sources is also important. The contrast of the RHOM block’s quantum interference fringes indicates the indistinguishability of the block’s constituent photon-pair sources. We measured RHOM quantum interference fringes on each source by configuring the chip to maximise photon flux at the OUT\(_T\) and OUT\(_B\) outputs, then varying \(\phi_T\) and \(\phi_B\) to obtain the fringes of figure 2. We pumped the bottom source via the auxiliary input IN', and the top source via IN and the state-control MZI, integrating each point for 5 s. We observed \(C = 93.2\% \pm 1.4\%\) and \(72.9\% \pm 0.8\%\) fringe contrasts, respectively, for the top and bottom sources. Here, \(C = (N_{\text{max}} - N_{\text{min}})/(N_{\text{max}} + N_{\text{min}})\), where \(N_{\text{max}}\) and \(N_{\text{min}}\) are the accidental-subtracted maximum and minimum fitted count rates. The reduced contrasts can be explained by deviations (from the ideal \(\eta = 50\%) in the input evanescent couplers of each RHOM structure; they are compatible with reflectivity values of \(\eta \approx 43\%\) and \(\eta \approx 36\%\) for the top and bottom sources, respectively.

#### 3.2. Quantum logic

We next quantified the device’s control over entanglement. Quantum state tomography was used to extract the purity \((P = \text{Tr}(\rho^2))\) in the CHSH parameter, a strict measurement of quantum correlations, and the Schmidt number, analogous to the number of pure states represented in a given density

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source state</th>
<th>Gate</th>
<th>Purity (P)</th>
<th>Schmidt number (K)</th>
<th>CHSH (S)</th>
<th>Fidelity (F')</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>000</td>
<td>Bypassed</td>
<td>0.995 ± 0.012</td>
<td>1.012 ± 0.011</td>
<td>1.577 ± 0.072</td>
<td>0.973 ± 0.011</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>000</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>0.946 ± 0.031</td>
<td>1.034 ± 0.017</td>
<td>1.465 ± 0.064</td>
<td>0.962 ± 0.016</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>Bypassed</td>
<td>0.998 ± 0.008</td>
<td>1.004 ± 0.006</td>
<td>1.511 ± 0.049</td>
<td>0.984 ± 0.007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>0.949 ± 0.055</td>
<td>1.048 ± 0.037</td>
<td>1.601 ± 0.121</td>
<td>0.948 ± 0.031</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((00) + [11])/(\sqrt{2})</td>
<td>Bypassed</td>
<td>0.864 ± 0.019</td>
<td>1.905 ± 0.022</td>
<td>2.560 ± 0.037</td>
<td>0.909 ± 0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((00) + [11])/(\sqrt{2})</td>
<td>(I)</td>
<td>0.832 ± 0.040</td>
<td>1.936 ± 0.025</td>
<td>2.538 ± 0.072</td>
<td>0.900 ± 0.026</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1++</td>
<td>(cz)</td>
<td>0.931 ± 0.036</td>
<td>1.657 ± 0.045</td>
<td>2.560 ± 0.078</td>
<td>0.873 ± 0.038</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>((00) + [11])/(\sqrt{2})</td>
<td>(cz)</td>
<td>0.900 ± 0.071</td>
<td>1.166 ± 0.055</td>
<td>1.907 ± 0.137</td>
<td>0.839 ± 0.013</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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\[ \phi \] between 0 and \( \pi \) to prepare variably entangled states in the form of (1). When \( \beta = 0 \) or 1, separable states result, while when \( \beta = 1/2 \), a maximally entangled state is produced. States obtained directly from the source (bypassing the gate) showed good agreement with (1). These were measured using the \( \text{OUT}_0' \) and \( \text{OUT}_4' \) auxiliary outputs (see figure 1(b)). Measured and calculated variations of the balance, Schmidt number, and CHSH parameter are plotted in figure 3, versus the state control parameter \( \phi \).

In figure 4 we show a sample of density matrices arising from the main device configurations, and we list their properties (purity, Schmidt number, CHSH parameter, and fidelity with the ideal \( z \)-rotated state) in table 1. Errors were obtained from Monte-Carlo simulations, based on 200 samples of Poissonian photon noise and accompanying tomographic reconstructions [54]. As expected, the \( I \)-mode gate did not substantially affect the properties of the input states. The \( cz \)-mode gate, however, acted to entangle separable states, and separate entangled states, though it also degraded the purity. The limited contrast in the quantum interference of the two RHOM sources contributed to this reduction, by occasionally depositing two photons into one ‘qubit’. Gate and tomography calibration errors likely also contributed.

Since the entangling gate operates on the input state’s phase, we must examine with care the phase of the output state, \( \text{arg} [\hat{\rho}] \). The intrinsic and uncalibrated \( z \)-rotations on each qubit result in complicated phase pictures (figures 4(e) and (f)). To compare these to their ideal counterparts, we computationally applied \( \hat{R}_z(\zeta_i) \otimes \hat{R}_z(\zeta_o) \) to the reconstructed output state, and optimised the fidelity over local \( z \)-rotations \( \zeta_i, \zeta_o \). The resulting fidelities are listed in table 1 and the process is shown visually in figure 5.

4. Discussion

We have presented a silicon-on-insulator quantum photonic device which embeds capabilities for the generation, manipulation, and analysis of two-qubit entangled states, by leveraging on-chip linear and nonlinear optics. We showed how the device can prepare a variety of entangled and separable states, and operate on them using a switchable entangling gate. We demonstrated a new reconfigurable source of variably path-entangled non-degenerate photon pairs, using RHOM quantum interference, and used on-chip quantum state tomography to measure its performance. The integration of this source with a complex integrated linear optical network enabled both the entanglement and disentanglement of the on-chip generated quantum states.

Device performance was hindered by imperfect beamsplitters and high coupling losses, leading to issues with stability, and ultimately limiting the measurable purity and entanglement. However, the use of more advanced fibre couplers, such as those based on ultra-low loss gratings [55], together with adaptive methods, employing multiple imperfect MZIs for the realisation of a very high-quality one [34], can overcome these limitations, and enable high-performance,
large-scale silicon photonic quantum devices in the near future.
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