

Detecting Acoherence in Radiation Fields

Sreenath K. Manikandan^{1,*} and Frank Wilczek^{2,3,4,5,6,1}

¹*Nordita, Stockholm University and KTH Royal Institute of Technology,*

Hannes Alfvéns väg 12, SE-106 91 Stockholm, Sweden

²*Center for Theoretical Physics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02139, USA*

³*T. D. Lee Institute, Shanghai 201210, China*

⁴*Wilczek Quantum Center, Department of Physics and Astronomy, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China*

⁵*Department of Physics and Origins Project, Arizona State University, Tempe, Arizona 25287, USA*

⁶*Department of Physics, Stockholm University, AlbaNova University Center, 106 91 Stockholm, Sweden*

(Dated: October 1, 2024)

We propose simple quantitative criteria, based on counting statistics in resonant harmonic detectors, that probe the quantum mechanical character of radiation fields. They provide, in particular, practical means to test the null hypothesis that a given field is “maximally classical”, i.e., accurately described by a coherent state. We suggest circumstances in which that hypothesis plausibly fails, notably including gravitational radiation involving non-linear or stochastic sourcing.

I. INTRODUCTION

Assuming the validity of quantum theory, in principle all radiation fields should be described as quantum-mechanical states (or density matrices). But alternative descriptions can often be adequate and, when they are, easier to use. In particular, a description based on classical physics can capture the properties of a class of states known as coherent states, that provide an adequate approximation in many situations of interest. Coherent states, in the relevant sense, are eigenstates of the field amplitude operators. They can be shown to arise when the radiation field is generated by linear coupling to a classical source. Coherent states have zero quantum mechanical variance (noise) for the field amplitude operators. They are widely used in quantum optics, and they are implicitly assumed whenever radiation is treated as a classical field.

* sreenath.k.manikandan@su.se

Deviation of radiation fields from coherent states demonstrate the inadequacy of a classical description, and can reveal important information about the radiation field and its sources. It is therefore desirable to identify simple experimental tests that discriminate the quantum state of the field from a coherent state. That is our goal here.

Since the word “coherence” is often with different meanings and different antonyms – *e.g.*, broadly, in the statistical characterization of disorder within classical optical fields (opposite: partial coherence) or quantum density matrices (opposite: partial decoherence) – here we will use mean by an *acoherent* state a state that is not a coherent state in the precise sense mentioned above, and by *acoherence* deviation from the generic behavior of such coherent states.

II. MEASUREMENT MODEL

We consider two resonantly coupled quantum harmonic oscillators. The interaction Hamiltonian between the two oscillators is assumed to be

$$V_I(t) = \hbar\sqrt{\gamma_0}[d(t)a^\dagger + d^\dagger(t)a]. \quad (1)$$

With one of the oscillators representing a mode of the radiation field and the other the detector, this set-up provides a useful model for practical detection schemes. $\sqrt{\gamma_0}$ is the effective coupling constant between the radiation field and the detector. It arises in the rotating wave approximation for the mode of the field (assumed, for simplicity, unique) at the detector’s resonant frequency. For a near resonant continuous radiation field incident on the detector, after making the rotating wave approximation and incorporating the density of modes, γ_0 can also be identified as the spontaneous emission rate of the detector [1–3] as shown in Appendix. A. Similar considerations also arise for two-state detectors, i.e. qubits [3].

We want to evaluate the time evolution operator for an interval of observation, in the form

$$U_I = e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} [d(t)a^\dagger + d^\dagger(t)a] dt}. \quad (2)$$

where $[d(t), d^\dagger(t')] = \delta(t - t')$. It is convenient to introduce operators $b = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\Delta t}} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} d(t)$ satisfying $[b, b^\dagger] = 1$. Using these, we can write the evolution operator as

$$U_I = e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0} \int_t^{t+\Delta t} [d(t)a^\dagger + d^\dagger(t)a] dt} = e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (ba^\dagger + b^\dagger a)}. \quad (3)$$

Involving the effective Hamiltonian $H_I \Delta t / \hbar \equiv \sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a) \equiv \kappa (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a)$, we can evaluate the probabilities P_n that the detector, initialized in its ground state, is excited to the n^{th} level. To

order κ^6 , in field state $|s\rangle$, we find:

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= 1 - \kappa^2 \langle s | a^\dagger a | s \rangle + \kappa^4 \langle s | \frac{1}{6} a^{\dagger 2} a^2 + \frac{1}{3} (a^\dagger a)^2 | s \rangle \\ &- \kappa^6 \langle s | \frac{17}{360} a^\dagger a a^\dagger a^2 + \frac{17}{360} a^{\dagger 2} a^2 a^\dagger a + \frac{2}{45} (a^\dagger a)^3 + \frac{1}{60} a^{\dagger 3} a^3 + \frac{1}{90} a^{\dagger 2} a a^\dagger a^2 | s \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} P_1 &= \kappa^2 \langle s | a^\dagger a | s \rangle - \kappa^4 \langle s | \frac{1}{3} (a^\dagger a)^2 + \frac{2}{3} a^{\dagger 2} a^2 | s \rangle \\ &+ \kappa^6 \langle s | \frac{8}{45} a^{\dagger 2} a a^\dagger a^2 + \frac{4}{45} a^{\dagger 2} a^2 a^\dagger a + \frac{4}{45} a^\dagger a a^\dagger a^2 + \frac{2}{45} (a^\dagger a)^3 + \frac{1}{10} a^{\dagger 3} a^3 | s \rangle \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

$$P_2 = \frac{\kappa^4}{2} \langle s | a^{\dagger 2} a^2 | s \rangle - \kappa^6 \langle s | \frac{1}{4} a^{\dagger 3} a^3 + \frac{1}{6} a^{\dagger 2} a a^\dagger a^2 + \frac{1}{24} a^{\dagger 2} a^2 a^\dagger a + \frac{1}{24} a^\dagger a a^{\dagger 2} a^2 | s \rangle \quad (6)$$

$$P_3 = \frac{\kappa^6}{6} \langle s | a^{\dagger 3} a^3 | s \rangle \quad (7)$$

In deriving these formulae we have made no assumption about the commutator $[a^\dagger, a]$.

III. EVOLUTION OF COHERENT STATES AND P REPRESENTATION

The expressions Eqn. 4-7 can be used directly to implement the criteria for acoherence to be discussed below for radiation fields that are characterized theoretically. An alternative, complementary approach that is closer to procedures commonly used in quantum optics is also possible, as we now describe (also see Appendix. B).

For a coherent state $|\alpha\rangle$ and the detector in its ground state we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a)} |\alpha\rangle |0\rangle &= e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a)} e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} e^{\alpha a^\dagger} e^{i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a)} e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a)} |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ &= e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a)} \left(\sum_n \frac{(\alpha a^\dagger)^n}{n!} \right) e^{i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a)} |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ &= e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} \left\{ \sum_n \frac{[\alpha e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a)} a^\dagger e^{i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a)}]^n}{n!} \right\} |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

From this, using $U_I a^\dagger U_I^\dagger = \cos(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}) a^\dagger - i \sin(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}) b^\dagger$, we find

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a)} |\alpha\rangle \otimes |0\rangle &= e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} e^{\alpha \cos(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}) a^\dagger - i \alpha \sin(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}) b^\dagger} |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle, \\ &= |\alpha \cos(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t})\rangle \otimes | -i \alpha \sin(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}) \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

A general density matrix can be expressed in the P representation as [4–6]

$$\rho = \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha) |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|. \quad (10)$$

Thus the density of the joint system after a time Δt is given by

$$\begin{aligned} U_I(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)U_I^\dagger &= \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha) U_I|\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|U_I^\dagger \\ &= \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha) |\alpha \cos(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})\rangle\langle\alpha \cos(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})| \otimes |-i\alpha \sin(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})\rangle\langle -i\alpha \sin(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})|. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

We obtain that the probability, P_n is given by,

$$P_n = \text{tr}_F\{\langle n|U_I(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|)U_I^\dagger|n\rangle\} = \frac{[\sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})]^n}{n!} \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha) |\alpha|^{2n} e^{-|\alpha|^2 \sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})}. \quad (12)$$

After the approximate substitution $\sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}) \rightarrow \gamma_0\Delta t$ this reproduces the result found in [6], with a simpler derivation. The limit can also be arrived at using qubit detectors, as explored in Appendix. C. The need for modification to the standard result from Ref. [6] has already been discussed, see for example, Ref. [7].

In Appendix. B, we show how to recover the consequences of Eqn. 4-7 from this standpoint.

IV. GLOBAL COUNTING STATISTICS

Using Eq. (12), the average occupation that would be measured in the resonant harmonic detector is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{n} &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n P_n = \sum_n \frac{[\sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})]^n}{(n-1)!} \int d^2\beta P(\beta) |\beta|^{2n} e^{-|\beta|^2 \sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})} \\ &= \sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}) \int d^2\beta |\beta|^2 P(\beta) = \sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}) \langle a^\dagger a \rangle_\rho, \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

and similarly

$$\overline{n(n-1)} = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} n(n-1) P_n = [\sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})]^2 \langle (a^\dagger)^2 a^2 \rangle_\rho. \quad (14)$$

Using this, one can write the variance as

$$(\Delta n)^2 \approx \bar{n} + (\gamma_0\Delta t)^2 Q \langle n \rangle, \quad (15)$$

where Q is the Mandel's Q parameter for the density matrix ρ , defined as the ratio,

$$Q = \frac{\langle (\Delta \hat{N})^2 \rangle_\rho - \langle \hat{N} \rangle_\rho}{\langle \hat{N} \rangle_\rho}, \quad (16)$$

with $\hat{N} = a^\dagger a$. For a coherent state, which exhibits Poisson statistics for the counts, we have $Q \rightarrow 0$ and $(\Delta n)^2 = \bar{n}$. For a thermal state we have the P representation

$$P(\alpha) = \frac{1}{\pi \bar{n}_{\text{th}}} e^{-|\alpha|^2/\bar{n}_{\text{th}}}. \quad (17)$$

leading to the super-Poissonian (variance $>$ mean) behavior

$$\bar{n} = \gamma_0 \Delta t \bar{n}_{\text{th}}, \quad Q = \bar{n}_{\text{th}}, \quad (\Delta n)^2 = \bar{n} + (\gamma_0 \Delta t)^2 \bar{n}_{\text{th}}^2. \quad (18)$$

For a squeezed vacuum state

$$|\psi_{sq}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\cosh(r)}} \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} (-\tanh(r))^m \frac{\sqrt{2m!}}{2^m m!} |2m\rangle. \quad (19)$$

we have

$$\langle n \rangle = \sinh(r)^2, \quad \bar{n} = \gamma_0 \Delta t \sinh(r)^2, \quad (\Delta n)^2 = \bar{n} + (\gamma_0 \Delta t)^2 \cosh(2r) \sinh(r)^2, \quad Q = \cosh(2r) \quad (20)$$

which is also super-Poissonian. For equal intensity of the radiation field (same \bar{n}), the quantum noise induced by a highly squeezed vacuum state is approximately two times the noise induced by a thermal state.

V. RATIO TEST

The Poissonian distribution induced by coherent states entails rigid relations between the probabilities for measuring small levels of excitation. These lead to simple yet sharp quantitative signals for coherence, as we now discuss. Applying Eqn. (12) to a coherent state we find

$$R \equiv \frac{2P_2 P_0}{P_1^2} = 1 \quad (21)$$

and

$$R' \equiv \frac{3P_3 P_1}{2P_2^2} = 1 \quad (22)$$

for coherent states.

For Fock states (i.e., number eigenstates) the P representation is awkward, but we can use Eqn. 4-7. To lowest order, we find $P_0 = 1$, $P_1 = \gamma_0 \Delta t n$, $P_2 = (\gamma_0 \Delta t)^2 n(n-1)/2$, $P_3 = (\gamma_0 \Delta t)^3 n(n-1)(n-2)/6$.

$$\begin{aligned} R &= 1 - \frac{1}{n}, \\ R' &= 1 - \frac{1}{n-1} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

For small n we are dealing with few quanta, so big deviations from classical behavior are to be expected (and our ratios can even bring in division by zero). For large n the deviations from $R = R' = 1$ approach zero. Nevertheless these are maximally sub-Poissonian states, with $Q = -1$.

For thermal states, using Eq. (12), we find

$$P_0 = \frac{1}{1 + n_{\text{th}}[\sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})]} \quad (24)$$

$$P_1 = \frac{[\sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})]n_{\text{th}}}{([\sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})]n_{\text{th}} + 1)^2}, \quad (25)$$

$$P_2 = \frac{([\sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})]n_{\text{th}})^2}{([\sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})]n_{\text{th}} + 1)^3}. \quad (26)$$

so that

$$R = \frac{2P_2P_0}{P_1^2} = 2. \quad (27)$$

Remarkably, the ratio is independent of temperature.

For squeezed vacuum states it is again convenient to use Eqn. 4-7. To lowest order, we find

$$R = \frac{2P_2P_0}{P_1^2} = 2 + \coth^2(r). \quad (28)$$

For large squeezing, $\lim_{r \rightarrow \infty} \coth^2(r) \rightarrow 1$ and so $\frac{2P_2P_0}{P_1^2} \rightarrow 3$.

We find that for coherent states and highly excited Fock states, our ratio R probabilities is approximately one, while for thermal states it is approximately two and for highly squeezed vacuum states it is approximately three. It also follows from observing that, using Eqns. 4-7 to leading order,

$$R \approx 1 + Q/\langle n \rangle. \quad (29)$$

This shows that for large $\langle n \rangle$ sub-Poissonian states with $-1 \leq Q < 0$ have $R \sim 1$, making them hard to discriminate from coherent states.

In Appendix. D we show how to evaluate the relevant count rates and the ratio R for a thermal state of average quanta n_{th} that is both displaced (in the phase space along the x direction by x_0) and squeezed (by amplitude r and phase ϕ relative to the direction of the displacement). To leading order, we find that,

$$R \approx \frac{4n_{\text{th}}^2 - 8n_{\text{th}}x_0^2 \cos(\phi) \sinh(2r) + 8(2n_{\text{th}} + 1)(x_0^2 - 1) \cosh(2r)}{2((2n_{\text{th}} + 1) \cosh(2r) + x_0^2 - 1)^2} + \frac{3(2n_{\text{th}} + 1)^2 \cosh(4r) + 4n_{\text{th}} - 8x_0^2 \cos(\phi) \sinh(r) \cosh(r) + 2x_0^4 - 8x_0^2 + 5}{2((2n_{\text{th}} + 1) \cosh(2r) + x_0^2 - 1)^2}. \quad (30)$$

Here we see substantial deviation from $R = 1$ for a generic Gaussian state of the radiation field. Note that for a highly occupied field mode, $1 \leq R \leq 3 + \operatorname{cosech}^2(r)$, with equality possible at both ends.

While we primarily focus on probing the acoherence of radiation fields for large $\langle n \rangle$ (which the relevant limit for gravitational radiation), it is evident from Eq. (29) that our ratio test can also be used to test strict non-classicality in terms of sub-Poissonian statistics, when the detector can register clicks at low intensities (eg., in quantum optics). A comparable ratio test for non-classicality using the width of the marginal distributions in phase-space have been discussed in Refs. [8, 9] to probe the sub-Poissonian nature of optical fields. Tight inequalities involving lowest order click probabilities to probe non-classicality have also been discussed in a very recent work [10].

VI. POSSIBLE PHYSICAL APPLICATIONS

Recent work [11] has made it plausible that resonant detection of gravitational waves, producing small levels of excitation, is a challenging but achievable goal. In this context the issue of counting statistics is especially interesting, since – as we have shown – it can probe essentially quantum features of the radiation.

It can be proved that linear coupling to deterministic (classical) sources produce coherent states of radiation fields, but stochastic or nonlinear couplings will generally bring in acoherence. Quadratic coupling to a deterministic source, for example, brings in squeezed states. We have demonstrated that acoherence can have quantitatively significant effects on the small count statistics even in cases where the underlying radiation fields have high intensity but are weakly coupled to the detector. Perhaps ironically, “bad” detectors, with low count rates, reveal the effects most clearly, since they are especially sensitive to fluctuations. Of course, it is possible to synthesize bad detectors from good ones, for example by sampling a slowly varying source in small time intervals. Also, for long wavelength radiation, one can sample from an array of bad detectors.

For the fundamental acoustic mode of the Weber bar as the resonant mass detector for gravitational waves treated quantum mechanically, the spontaneous emission rate γ_0 is given by (see Ref. [11]),

$$\gamma_0 = \frac{8GML^2\omega^4}{\pi^4 c^5}, \quad (31)$$

where G is the Newton’s constant, M, L are respectively the mass and length of the Weber bar, ω is the resonant frequency, and c is the speed of light. Using their values, the spontaneous emission rate

is estimated to be rather very small $\sim 10^{-33} s^{-1}$ for a typical resonant bar detector for gravitational waves in the kHz range where LIGO operates [11]. The deviation from Poissonian statistics has the form $\sim (\gamma_0 \Delta t)^2 Q \langle n \rangle$, where Q is the Mandel's parameter, and $\langle n \rangle$ is the number of quanta in the radiation field. For a gravitational wave in the LIGO band, $\langle n \rangle \sim 10^{36}$ [12]. In the interaction between a LIGO band gravitational wave and a typical bar detector for the duration of $\Delta t \sim 1$ ms, we can have measures of acoherence $(\gamma_0 \Delta t)^2 Q \langle n \rangle$. Therefore a large Q can make deviations from a pure coherent state of the field experimentally detectable by comparing the global statistics, or by using the ratio test from Sec. V. Thus meaningful tests of acoherence appear to be accessible on realistic timescales using the sorts of resonant mass detectors proposed in Ref. [11] for gravitational radiation in the LIGO band. Departures from coherent states in gravitational waves might also be observable using interferometric detectors [13–15], allowing for increased fidelity of detecting the acoherence of gravitational radiation using different detection schemes.

In the context of gravitational radiation, strongly nonlinear sources arise in the final stages of black hole mergers and in subsequent ring-downs. Here the driving field is robust, so deviation from Poisson statistics would implicate quantum theory. (The feasibility of detecting quantum effects in gravity is much debated; see *e. g.* [12, 16–19], in particular the difficulty in seeing sub-Poissonian statistics of gravitational radiation from global statistics was pointed out recently in [18, 19].) Note that ring-down through quasinormal modes is expected to depend on only a few parameters of the final state, so that one can aspire to compare and combine statistics from distinct sources, separated in space and time. Neutron star mergers, and possibly neutron star - black hole mergers, will plausibly involve complex, effectively stochastic processes as the neutron stars deform and shatter, again bringing in acoherence.

Outside these fundamental but challenging applications to gravitational radiation, the issue of acoherence arises in many other contexts, notably including the quantum description of single mode lasers, where it impacts the feasibility of continuous variable quantum teleportation [20, 21]. These and other technologies aimed at producing and exploiting radiation fields with well-characterized quantum properties can be informed by the sorts of calculations and measurements we have explored here.

VII. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

FW is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy under grant Contract Number DE-SC0012567 and by the Swedish Research Council under Contract No. 335-2014-7424. SKM is

supported in part by the Swedish Research Council under Contract No. 335-2014-7424 and in part by the Wallenberg Initiative on Networks and Quantum Information (WINQ). We thank Maulik Parikh and Igor Pikovski for stimulating conversations around these subjects.

Appendix A: Identifying γ_0 as the spontaneous emission rate of the detector

A generic interaction Hamiltonian for resonant interactions between a continuous radiation field and a resonant detector in the interaction picture to leading order has the following form,

$$H_I(t) = \hbar g \sum_{\nu} [a^\dagger b e^{i(\nu-\omega)t} + b^\dagger a e^{-i(\nu-\omega)t}], \quad (\text{A1})$$

where g is the coupling that captures the details of the interaction and \sum_{ν} represents summation over field modes near resonance to the detector. As an example, for the resonant bar detector for gravitational waves considered in Ref. [11], $g = \sqrt{\frac{8GML^2\omega^5}{\pi^3 c^5}}$. Our objective here is to map the resultant dynamics to a simplified single mode approximation, satisfying,

$$H_I t = \hbar \sqrt{\gamma_0} t (a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a), \quad (\text{A2})$$

with $\sqrt{\gamma_0}$ as the effective coupling, where γ_0 is the spontaneous emission rate of the detector.

In order to do so, we consider the resonant detector initially in the ground state and follow the standard approach to derive the Fermi-Golden rule transition rates. Considering the resonant detector in the first excited state, and the field is in the vacuum state, their joint state after time t to the leading order is given by,

$$|\psi'(t)\rangle = \sum_{\nu} -i g e^{i(\nu-\omega)t/2} \frac{2 \sin[(\omega - \nu)t/2]}{(\omega - \nu)} a_{\nu}^{\dagger} |0\rangle_F b |1\rangle_D. \quad (\text{A3})$$

This yields the following probability of observing a single quantum of the radiation field spontaneously emitted by the detector, given by,

$$P_{\text{spont.}} \approx \sum_{\nu} 4g^2 \frac{\sin^2[(\nu - \omega)t/2]}{(\nu - \omega)^2} = 4g^2 D(\omega) \int_{\omega-\delta/2}^{\omega+\delta/2} d\nu \frac{\sin^2[(\nu - \omega)t/2]}{(\nu - \omega)^2}, \quad (\text{A4})$$

where we have converted the summation to an integral using the density of field modes $D(\omega)$. For $t\delta \gg 1$, we have [22],

$$\int_{\omega-\delta/2}^{\omega+\delta/2} d\nu \frac{\sin^2[(\nu - \omega)t/2]}{(\nu - \omega)^2} \approx \frac{1}{2} \pi t. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Hence we obtain the probability of spontaneous emission as,

$$P_{\text{spont.}} \approx 2g^2 D(\omega) \pi t. \quad (\text{A6})$$

The density of states $D(\omega)$ of plane waves per volume V for a given polarization is,

$$\sum_{\Omega} = \int d\Omega D(\Omega) = \int d\Omega \frac{V\Omega^2}{2\pi^2 c^3}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

We can take the volume to be the reduced volume of a quanta of the field, $V = (c/\omega)^3$, which yields, $D(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi^2\omega}$. The probability of registering a click becomes,

$$P_{\text{spont.}} \approx 2g^2 D(\omega)\pi t = \frac{g^2 t}{\pi\omega} = \gamma_0 t, \quad (\text{A8})$$

where γ_0 is the spontaneous emission rate. Similarly, the state of the field and the detector when the detector is initially in the ground state and the field is in an arbitrary quantum state $|\psi_F(0)\rangle$ is given by,

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{\nu} -ig e^{-i(\nu-\omega)t/2} \frac{2 \sin[(\nu-\omega)t/2]}{(\nu-\omega)} a_{\nu} |\psi_F(0)\rangle b^{\dagger} |0\rangle_{\text{D}}. \quad (\text{A9})$$

The probability of registering a click in the detector is given by,

$$P_1 \approx \sum_{\nu} 4g^2 \frac{\sin^2[(\nu-\omega)t/2]}{(\nu-\omega)^2} \langle a_{\nu}^{\dagger} a_{\nu} \rangle_F = 4g^2 D(\omega) \langle a_{\omega}^{\dagger} a_{\omega} \rangle_F \int_{\omega-\delta/2}^{\omega+\delta/2} d\nu \frac{\sin^2[(\nu-\omega)t/2]}{(\nu-\omega)^2}. \quad (\text{A10})$$

Again taking the limit $t\delta \gg 1$, we obtain,

$$P_1 \approx 2g^2 D(\omega) \langle a_{\omega}^{\dagger} a_{\omega} \rangle_F \pi t = \frac{g^2 t}{\pi\omega} \langle a_{\omega}^{\dagger} a_{\omega} \rangle_F = \gamma_0 \langle a_{\omega}^{\dagger} a_{\omega} \rangle t, \quad (\text{A11})$$

where we have identified γ_0 as the spontaneous emission rate from Eq. (A8). We can now map the dynamics to an effective measurement model, noticing that an interaction Hamiltonian satisfying,

$$H_I t = \hbar \sqrt{\gamma_0 t} (a^{\dagger} b + b^{\dagger} a), \quad (\text{A12})$$

reproduces the probabilities derived above in the single mode approximation for the field. This allows us to identify the parameter γ_0 in our effective measurement model discussed in the main text, as the spontaneous emission rate, an intrinsic property of our detector.

Appendix B: Exact solution to the unitary dynamics on a coherent state of the field

We are interested in computing the general result for the field modes in a coherent state,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^{\dagger} b + b^{\dagger} a)} |\alpha\rangle |0\rangle &= e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^{\dagger} b + b^{\dagger} a)} e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} e^{\alpha a^{\dagger}} e^{i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^{\dagger} b + b^{\dagger} a)} e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^{\dagger} b + b^{\dagger} a)} |0\rangle |0\rangle \\ &= e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^{\dagger} b + b^{\dagger} a)} \left(\sum_n \frac{(\alpha a^{\dagger})^n}{n!} \right) e^{i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^{\dagger} b + b^{\dagger} a)} |0\rangle |0\rangle \\ &= e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} \left\{ \sum_n \frac{[\alpha e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^{\dagger} b + b^{\dagger} a)} a^{\dagger} e^{i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} (a^{\dagger} b + b^{\dagger} a)}]^n}{n!} \right\} |0\rangle |0\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B1})$$

Above, we have used the identity that $U_I(a^\dagger)^n U_I^\dagger |0\rangle|0\rangle = (U_I a^\dagger U_I^\dagger)^n |0\rangle|0\rangle$. We can therefore simplify, using, $U_I a^\dagger U_I^\dagger = \cos(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}) a^\dagger - i \sin(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}) b^\dagger$ to obtain,

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}(a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a)} |\alpha\rangle|0\rangle &= e^{-|\alpha|^2/2} e^{\alpha \cos(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}) a^\dagger - i\alpha \sin(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}) b^\dagger} |0\rangle|0\rangle, \\ &= |\alpha \cos(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t})\rangle - i\alpha \sin(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t})\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B2})$$

We can now use the result for a coherent state of the field obtained above to compute the time evolution of an arbitrary, but unknown quantum state of the field ρ , using the P representation for the field. In the P representation, we may write,

$$\rho = \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha) |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|. \quad (\text{B3})$$

The state of the joint system after a time Δt is given by,

$$\begin{aligned} U_I(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) U_I^\dagger &= \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha) U_I |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| U_I^\dagger \\ &\approx \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha) |\alpha \cos(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t})\rangle\langle\alpha \cos(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t})| \otimes |-i\alpha \sin(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t})\rangle\langle -i\alpha \sin(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t})|. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B4})$$

We obtain that the probability, P_n is given by,

$$P_n = \text{tr}_F \{ \langle n | U_I(\rho \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0|) U_I^\dagger | n \rangle \} = \frac{[\sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t})]^n}{n!} \int d^2\alpha P(\alpha) |\alpha|^{2n} e^{-|\alpha|^2 \sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t})}. \quad (\text{B5})$$

Note that the result is naturally in the normally ordered form as it is obtained using the P representation, and agrees to its standard form given in Ref. [6] when we approximate $\sin^2(\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}) \approx \gamma_0 \Delta t$.

For a coherent state of the field, we can also series expand the exact probabilities computed above in Eq. (B5) to the third order to find that (for $\kappa = \sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t}$),

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= \frac{1}{90} |\alpha|^2 \kappa^2 (-15(|\alpha|^2 + 2)|\alpha|^2 + 4)\kappa^4 + 15(3|\alpha|^2 + 2)\kappa^2 - 90 + 1, \\ P_1 &= \frac{1}{90} |\alpha|^2 \kappa^2 (-30(3|\alpha|^2 + 1)\kappa^2 + (45|\alpha|^4 + 60|\alpha|^2 + 4)\kappa^4 + 90), \\ P_2 &= \frac{1}{6} |\alpha|^4 \kappa^4 (3 - (3|\alpha|^2 + 2)\kappa^2), \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B6})$$

and,

$$P_3 = \frac{|\alpha|^6 \kappa^6}{6}. \quad (\text{B7})$$

Here we show that they agree to the probabilities computed in the main text using their normally ordered form,

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= \langle s | \left\{ 1 - \kappa^2 a^\dagger a + \kappa^4 \left[\frac{1}{6} a^{\dagger 2} a^2 + \frac{1}{3} (a^\dagger a + a^{\dagger 2} a^2) \right] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \kappa^6 \left[\frac{17}{180} (2a^{\dagger 2} a^2 + a^{\dagger 3} a^3) + \frac{2}{45} (a^\dagger a + 3a^{\dagger 2} a^2 + a^{\dagger 3} a^3) + \frac{1}{60} (a^{\dagger 3} a^3) + \frac{1}{90} (a^{\dagger 2} a^2 + a^{\dagger 3} a^3) \right] \right\} | s \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B8})$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &= \langle s | \left\{ \kappa^2 a^\dagger a - \kappa^4 \left[\frac{1}{3} (a^\dagger a + a^{\dagger 2} a^2) + \frac{2}{3} (a^{\dagger 2} a^2) \right] \right\} | s \rangle \\
&+ \kappa^6 \left[\frac{8}{45} (a^{\dagger 2} a^2 + a^{\dagger 3} a^3) + \frac{8}{45} (2a^{\dagger 2} a^2 + a^{\dagger 3} a^3) + \frac{2}{45} (a^\dagger a + 3a^{\dagger 2} a^2 + a^{\dagger 3} a^3) + \frac{1}{10} (a^{\dagger 3} a^3) \right] | s \rangle,
\end{aligned} \tag{B9}$$

$$P_2 = \langle s | \left\{ \frac{\kappa^4}{2} a^{\dagger 2} a^2 - \kappa^6 \left[\frac{1}{4} (a^{\dagger 3} a^3) + \frac{1}{6} (a^{\dagger 2} a^2 + a^{\dagger 3} a^3) + \frac{1}{12} (2a^{\dagger 2} a^2 + a^{\dagger 3} a^3) \right] \right\} | s \rangle. \tag{B10}$$

$$P_3 = \langle s | \left\{ \frac{\kappa^6}{6} a^{\dagger 3} a^3 \right\} | s \rangle. \tag{B11}$$

For a coherent state $|s\rangle = |\alpha\rangle$, we can write,

$$\begin{aligned}
P_0 &= 1 - \kappa^2 |\alpha|^2 + \kappa^4 \left[\frac{1}{6} |\alpha|^4 + \frac{1}{3} (|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4) \right] \\
&- \kappa^6 \left[\frac{17}{180} (2|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6) + \frac{2}{45} (|\alpha|^2 + 3|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6) + \frac{1}{60} (|\alpha|^6) + \frac{1}{90} (|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{B12}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
P_1 &= \kappa^2 |\alpha|^2 - \kappa^4 \left[\frac{1}{3} (|\alpha|^2 + |\alpha|^4) + \frac{2}{3} (|\alpha|^4) \right] \\
&+ \kappa^6 \left[\frac{8}{45} (|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6) + \frac{8}{45} (2|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6) + \frac{2}{45} (|\alpha|^2 + 3|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6) + \frac{1}{10} (|\alpha|^6) \right]
\end{aligned} \tag{B13}$$

$$P_2 = \frac{\kappa^4}{2} |\alpha|^4 - \kappa^6 \left[\frac{1}{4} (|\alpha|^6) + \frac{1}{6} (|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6) + \frac{1}{12} (2|\alpha|^4 + |\alpha|^6) \right]. \tag{B14}$$

$$P_3 = \frac{\kappa^6}{6} |\alpha|^6. \tag{B15}$$

Note that upon simplification, these are identical to Eqs. (B6)&(B7).

1. A useful approximation

For a general Gaussian state of the field, however, the P function is often not easy to compute. In this case, an approximate result for the statistics is also useful. To this end, we note that the Baker-Campbell-Hausdorff (BCH) expansion can be used. The time evolution operator can now be approximated by the BCH expansion,

$$\begin{aligned}
\exp(-iH\Delta t/\hbar) &\approx \exp(-i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}b^\dagger a) \exp(-i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}a^\dagger b) \exp(\gamma_0\Delta t[b^\dagger a, a^\dagger b]/2) \\
&= \exp(-i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}b^\dagger a) \exp(-i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}a^\dagger b) \exp(\gamma_0\Delta t(b^\dagger b(1+a^\dagger a) - (a^\dagger a(1+b^\dagger b))/2).
\end{aligned} \tag{B16}$$

The approximation is that we have neglected higher order non-commuting terms from the BCH expansion. Considering the b mode initialized in the vacuum state, the above approximation is valid for valid for $\gamma_0 \Delta t \langle a^\dagger a \rangle \ll 1$. In this case, we can simplify,

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-iH\Delta t/\hbar)|\psi\rangle|0\rangle &\approx \exp(-i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}b^\dagger a) \exp(-i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}a^\dagger b) \exp(-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a/2)|\psi\rangle|0\rangle \\ &\approx \exp(-i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}b^\dagger a) \exp(-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a/2)|\psi\rangle|0\rangle \\ &\approx \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{(-i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})^n}{\sqrt{n!}} |n\rangle a^n \exp(-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a/2)|\psi\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B17})$$

From this, we can estimate the measurement operators for observing n -th excitation, given by,

$$\hat{M}_n = \langle n | \exp(-iH\Delta t/\hbar) | 0 \rangle \approx \frac{(-i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t})^n}{\sqrt{n!}} a^n \exp(-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a/2). \quad (\text{B18})$$

These measurement operators can also be used to describe continuous quantum measurements and generate quantum trajectories of resonant fluorescence from harmonically trapped quantum particles, in the spirit of Refs. [1, 2]. The probability of measuring n -th excitation is given by,

$$P_n = \langle \psi | \hat{M}_n^\dagger \hat{M}_n | \psi \rangle \approx \frac{(\gamma_0\Delta t)^n}{n!} \langle \psi | \exp(-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a/2) (a^\dagger)^n a^n \exp(-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a/2) | \psi \rangle \quad (\text{B19})$$

For a coherent state, we can use,

$$\exp(-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a/2) |\alpha\rangle = e^{-\frac{|\alpha|^2}{2}(1-e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})} |\alpha e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t/2}\rangle, \quad (\text{B20})$$

and write the above probability for an initial coherent state as,

$$\begin{aligned} P_n &\approx \frac{(\gamma_0\Delta t)^n}{n!} \langle \alpha | \exp(-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a/2) (a^\dagger)^n a^n \exp(-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a/2) | \alpha \rangle \\ &= \frac{(\gamma_0\Delta t e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})^n}{n!} |\alpha|^{2n} e^{-|\alpha|^2(1-e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B21})$$

Note that the probability is approximately normalized. We have,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_n P_n &= \sum_n \frac{(\gamma_0\Delta t e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})^n}{n!} |\alpha|^{2n} e^{-|\alpha|^2(1-e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})} = e^{-|\alpha|^2(1-e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})} \sum_n \frac{(\gamma_0\Delta t e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})^n}{n!} |\alpha|^{2n} \\ &= e^{-|\alpha|^2(1-e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})} e^{|\alpha|^2\gamma_0\Delta t e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t}} = e^{-|\alpha|^2(1-e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t}-\gamma_0\Delta t e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})} \\ &\approx e^{-|\alpha|^2(1-1+\gamma_0\Delta t-\gamma_0\Delta t)} = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B22})$$

For an arbitrary density matrix, we can write,

$$\begin{aligned} P_n &= \text{tr}\{\rho \hat{M}_n^\dagger \hat{M}_n\} = \int d^2\beta P(\beta) \langle \beta | \exp(-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a/2) (a^\dagger)^n \frac{(\gamma_0\Delta t e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})^n}{n!} a^n \exp(-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a/2) | \beta \rangle \\ &= \frac{(\gamma_0\Delta t e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})^n}{n!} \int d^2\beta P(\beta) |\beta|^{2n} e^{-|\beta|^2(1-e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t})}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{B23})$$

In arriving at the above result, we have used the diagonal P representation for the density matrix in the basis of coherent states [4, 5],

$$\rho = \int d^2\beta P(\beta) |\beta\rangle\langle\beta|. \quad (\text{B24})$$

Note that, owing to the approximation we made, our result in Eq. (B23) varies slightly from Ref. [6] or Eq. (B5). However, starting from Eq. (B23) the standard result from Ref. [6] is recovered by taking the limit, $e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t} \approx 1 - \gamma_0\Delta t$, and $\gamma_0\Delta t e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t} \approx \gamma_0\Delta t$, where we can approximate,

$$P_n \approx \frac{(\gamma_0\Delta t)^n}{n!} \int d^2\beta P(\beta) |\beta|^{2n} e^{-|\beta|^2\gamma_0\Delta t}. \quad (\text{B25})$$

Returning to the approximate result Eq. (B19) in the number representation, we note that Eq. (B19) can be useful to estimate the counting statistics and the probabilities for a generic Gaussian state which can have a P-representation that is non-trivial. We discuss this in Appendix. D.

Appendix C: Taking the limit of a qubit detector and series of clicks

Here we consider an alternate derivation of the global statistics using a series of qubits functioning as detectors, for pedagogical reasons. To this end we approximate the time evolution operator by series,

$$\begin{aligned} \exp(-iH\Delta t/\hbar) &= 1 - i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}(a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a) - \frac{\gamma_0\Delta t}{2}[(a^\dagger b)^2 + (b^\dagger a)^2 + a^\dagger b b^\dagger a + b^\dagger a a^\dagger b] + \dots \\ &= 1 - i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}(a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a) - \frac{\gamma_0\Delta t}{2}[(a^\dagger b)^2 + (b^\dagger a)^2 + a^\dagger a(1 + b^\dagger b) + b^\dagger b(1 + a^\dagger a)] + \dots \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C1})$$

We may now consider the initial state, $|\psi\rangle|0\rangle$, where the b mode is initialized in vacuum. Here we show two alternate but simple approaches to get to Eq. (C11). The state evolves as,

$$\begin{aligned} &1 - i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}(a^\dagger b + b^\dagger a) - \frac{\gamma_0\Delta t}{2}[(a^\dagger b)^2 + (b^\dagger a)^2 + a^\dagger a(1 + b^\dagger b) + b^\dagger b(1 + a^\dagger a)] + \dots |\psi\rangle|0\rangle \\ \rightarrow &-i\sqrt{\gamma_0\Delta t}a|\psi\rangle|1\rangle + \left(1 - \frac{\gamma_0\Delta t}{2}a^\dagger a\right)|\psi\rangle|0\rangle - \frac{\gamma_0\Delta t}{2}a^2|\psi\rangle(b^\dagger)^2|0\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C2})$$

We assume that we have a qubit detector so that $(b^\dagger)^2 = 0$. First, note that in a single time step, the probability of exciting a qubit when the field is in a coherent state $|\psi\rangle = |\alpha\rangle$ is given by $P_1 = \epsilon|\alpha|^2$, where $\epsilon = \gamma_0 t$, and the probability of not exciting the qubit is $P_0 = 1 - \epsilon|\alpha|^2$. Now if we approximate each detector events as independent (as for small ϵ , a coherent state of the field

remains the same to leading order) with probabilities P_0 and $1 - P_0$, we arrive at Eq. (C7) from which Eq. (C11) follows.

Alternatively, for a series of detectors initialized in state $|0\rangle$ interacting sequentially with the radiation field (each for a brief duration Δt only), we can write,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi\rangle|0\rangle &\rightarrow (1 - \frac{\gamma_0 t}{2} a^\dagger a)|\psi\rangle|0\rangle - i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} a|\psi\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle \\
&\rightarrow (1 - \frac{\gamma_0 t}{2} a^\dagger a)[(1 - \frac{\gamma_0 t}{2} a^\dagger a)|\psi\rangle|0\rangle - i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} a|\psi\rangle|1\rangle|0\rangle] - i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} [(1 - \frac{\gamma_0 t}{2} a^\dagger a)|\psi\rangle|0\rangle \\
&\quad - i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} a|\psi\rangle|1\rangle|1\rangle] \\
&\rightarrow \dots
\end{aligned} \tag{C3}$$

In a compact form, we may write the global state before measuring the qubits,

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi\rangle|0\rangle &\rightarrow \hat{M}_0|\psi\rangle|0\rangle + \hat{M}_1|\psi\rangle|1\rangle \rightarrow (\hat{M}_0|0\rangle + \hat{M}_1|1\rangle)^{\otimes 2}|\psi\rangle \rightarrow \dots \\
&\rightarrow (\hat{M}_0|0\rangle + \hat{M}_1|1\rangle)^{\otimes N}|\psi\rangle \\
&\approx \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{\sqrt{N!}}{\sqrt{(N-j)!j!}} \{(\hat{M}_0)^{N-j}(\hat{M}_1)^j|\psi\rangle\} \{0\}^{\otimes(N-j)} \{1\}^{\otimes j}.
\end{aligned} \tag{C4}$$

We have defined $\hat{M}_0 = (1 - \frac{\gamma_0 t}{2} a^\dagger a)$ and $\hat{M}_1 = -i\sqrt{\gamma_0 \Delta t} a$ and have neglected their commutator to the leading order. Here the state $\{0\}^{\otimes(N-j)} \{1\}^{\otimes j}$ represents the normalized symmetrized state of j qubit detectors excited among a total of N detectors. We can simplify this result for a coherent state, $|\psi\rangle = |\alpha\rangle$,

$$|\psi(j, N)\rangle = \sum_{j=0}^N \frac{\sqrt{N!}}{\sqrt{(N-j)!j!}} (-i\sqrt{\epsilon}\alpha)^j (\hat{M}_0)^{N-j} |\alpha\rangle \{0\}^{\otimes(N-j)} \{1\}^{\otimes j}. \tag{C5}$$

The probability of observing j ticks in N steps is same as the probability of measuring the symmetrized state $\{0\}^{\otimes(N-j)} \{1\}^{\otimes j}$, given by,

$$p(j, N) = \frac{N!}{(N-j)!j!} (\epsilon|\alpha|^2)^j \langle \alpha | (\hat{M}_0^\dagger)^{N-j} (\hat{M}_0)^{N-j} | \alpha \rangle \tag{C6}$$

To leading order, we can approximate,

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \alpha | \{(\hat{M}_0^\dagger)^{N-j} (\hat{M}_0)^{N-j} | \alpha \rangle &\approx \langle \alpha | \{(1 - \epsilon a^\dagger a)^{N-j} | \alpha \rangle \\
&\approx \langle \alpha | (1 - (N-j)\epsilon a^\dagger a) | \alpha \rangle \approx 1 - (N-j)\epsilon |\alpha|^2 \approx (1 - \epsilon |\alpha|^2)^{N-j}.
\end{aligned}$$

We therefore have,

$$p(j, N) = \frac{N!}{(N-j)!j!} (\epsilon|\alpha|^2)^j (1 - \epsilon|\alpha|^2)^{N-j}. \tag{C7}$$

We define $N\epsilon|\alpha|^2 = \lambda$. Then we can write,

$$p(j, N) = \frac{N!}{(N-j)!j!} \left(\frac{\lambda}{N}\right)^j \left[1 - \left(\frac{\lambda}{N}\right)\right]^{N-j} = \frac{\lambda^j}{j!} \frac{N!}{(N-j)!N^j} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\lambda}{N}\right)\right]^{-j} \left[1 - \left(\frac{\lambda}{N}\right)\right]^N. \quad (\text{C8})$$

In the limit $N \rightarrow \infty$, we have,

$$\frac{N!}{(N-j)!N^j} \rightarrow 1, \quad \left[1 - \left(\frac{\lambda}{N}\right)\right]^{-j} \rightarrow 1, \quad \text{and} \quad \left[1 - \left(\frac{\lambda}{N}\right)\right]^N \rightarrow e^{-\lambda}. \quad (\text{C9})$$

Hence we obtain,

$$\lim_{N \rightarrow \infty} p(j, N) \rightarrow \frac{\lambda^j}{j!} e^{-\lambda} = \frac{(N\gamma_0\Delta t|\alpha|^2)^j}{j!} e^{-N\gamma_0\Delta t|\alpha|^2} = \frac{(\gamma_0 T|\alpha|^2)^j}{j!} e^{-\gamma_0 T|\alpha|^2} = p(j, T). \quad (\text{C10})$$

The average number of ticks in the duration $T = N\Delta t$ is $\bar{j} = N\gamma_0\Delta t|\alpha|^2 = \gamma_0|\alpha|^2 T$. Noow we can generalize Eqs. (C6)–(C10) using the diagonal P representation for an arbitrary initial state of the field, as,

$$P(j, T) = \int d^2\beta P(\beta) \frac{1}{j!} [\gamma_0|\beta|^2 T]^j e^{-\gamma_0|\beta|^2 T}, \quad (\text{C11})$$

that agrees to the result in Ref. [6].

Appendix D: The ratio test for a generic Gaussian state

In order to compute the ratio test for an arbitrary quantum mechanical state, we only need to evaluate the probability P_0 , as the probabilities P_1 and P_2 can be derived from P_0 using Eq. (B23). Here we estimate P_0 for an arbitrary Gaussian state, which can be a displaced, squeezed, thermal state. The key insight that allows us this calculating this is that,

$$P_0 = \langle e^{-\gamma_0\Delta t a^\dagger a} \rangle_\rho = \frac{e^{\gamma_0\Delta t}}{e^{\gamma_0\Delta t} - 1} \text{tr}[\rho \rho'_{\text{th}}], \quad (\text{D1})$$

where ρ'_{th} is the thermal state with effective temperature $\beta\hbar\omega = \gamma_0\Delta t$. The corresponding occupation number $n'_{\text{th}} = (e^{\gamma_0\Delta t} - 1)^{-1}$. Now in order to evaluate P_0 for a generic Gaussian state, we can use the Wigner representation of thermal states and the Weyl mapping, where,

$$P_0 = \frac{e^{\gamma_0\Delta t}}{e^{\gamma_0\Delta t} - 1} \text{tr}[\rho \rho'_{\text{th}}] = \frac{e^{\gamma_0\Delta t}}{e^{\gamma_0\Delta t} - 1} 2\pi \int \mathcal{W}_\rho(x, y) \mathcal{W}'_{\rho'_{\text{th}}}(x, y) dx dy. \quad (\text{D2})$$

For a generic Gaussian state, the Wigner function is given by,

$$\mathcal{W}_\rho(x, y) = \frac{1}{2\pi\sqrt{|V_\rho|}} e^{-(\vec{X}-\vec{X}_0)^T \cdot V_\rho^{-1} \cdot (\vec{X}-\vec{X}_0)/2}, \quad (\text{D3})$$

where $\vec{X} = \{x, p\}$ and V_ρ is the covariance matrix, given by (assuming squeezing parameter $\zeta = re^{i\phi}$),

$$V_\rho = \frac{2n_{\text{th}} + 1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} -\cos(\phi) \sinh(2r) + \cosh(2r) & -\sin(\phi) \sinh(2r) \\ -\sin(\phi) \sinh(2r) & \cosh(2r) + \cos(\phi) \sinh(2r) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{D4})$$

In our notation, the covariance matrix for ρ'_{th} has the form,

$$V_{\rho'_{\text{th}}} = \frac{2n'_{\text{th}} + 1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (\text{D5})$$

Now what remains to be evaluated to compute P_0 is the overlap integral of two Gaussian Wigner functions. It can be evaluated to obtain (see for example, Ref. [23]),

$$\begin{aligned} P_0 &= \frac{e^{\gamma_0 \Delta t}}{e^{\gamma_0 \Delta t} - 1} \text{tr}[\rho \rho'_{\text{th}}] = \frac{e^{\gamma_0 \Delta t}}{e^{\gamma_0 \Delta t} - 1} 2\pi \int \mathcal{W}_\rho(x, y) \mathcal{W}_{\rho'_{\text{th}}}(x, y) dx dy \\ &= \frac{e^{\gamma_0 \Delta t} \exp\left(-\frac{1}{2} \vec{X}_0^T V_\rho^{-1} \left(V_{\rho'_{\text{th}}}^{-1} + V_\rho^{-1}\right)^{-1} V_{\rho'_{\text{th}}}^{-1} \vec{X}_0\right)}{(e^{\gamma_0 \Delta t} - 1) \sqrt{|V_{\rho'_{\text{th}}}| |V_\rho| |V_{\rho'_{\text{th}}}^{-1} + V_\rho^{-1}|}}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D6})$$

Now, for the null test, note P_1 and P_2 can be computed using the relations,

$$P_1 = -(\gamma_0 \Delta t) \frac{d}{d(\gamma_0 \Delta t)} P_0, \quad \text{and} \quad P_2 = \frac{(\gamma_0 \Delta t)^2}{2} \left[\frac{d^2}{d(\gamma_0 \Delta t)^2} + \frac{d}{d(\gamma_0 \Delta t)} \right] P_0, \quad (\text{D7})$$

which follows from Eq. (B23). As an example, consider $\vec{X} = \{x_0, 0\}$. In this case, we find, to leading order,

$$\begin{aligned} R &\approx \frac{4n_{\text{th}}^2 - 8n_{\text{th}}x_0^2 \cos(\phi) \sinh(2r) + 8(2n_{\text{th}} + 1)(x_0^2 - 1) \cosh(2r)}{2((2n_{\text{th}} + 1) \cosh(2r) + x_0^2 - 1)^2} \\ &+ \frac{3(2n_{\text{th}} + 1)^2 \cosh(4r) + 4n_{\text{th}} - 8x_0^2 \cos(\phi) \sinh(r) \cosh(r) + 2x_0^4 - 8x_0^2 + 5}{2((2n_{\text{th}} + 1) \cosh(2r) + x_0^2 - 1)^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{D8})$$

We see that, for a generic Gaussian state that is highly occupied, $1 \leq R \leq 3 + \text{cosech}^2(r)$ approximately, demonstrating the significant deviation of R from one possible for generic Gaussian states. Coherent states and highly squeezed states are at opposite ends of the spectrum, with thermal states yielding $R = 2$.

[1] A. N. Jordan, A. Chantasri, P. Rouchon, and B. Huard, Anatomy of fluorescence: quantum trajectory statistics from continuously measuring spontaneous emission, [Quantum Studies: Mathematics and Foundations](#) **3**, 237 (2016).

- [2] P. Lewalle, S. K. Manikandan, C. Elouard, and A. N. Jordan, Measuring fluorescence to track a quantum emitter's state: a theory review, [Contemporary Physics](#) **61**, 26 (2020), publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- [3] J. A. Gross, C. M. Caves, G. J. Milburn, and J. Combes, Qubit models of weak continuous measurements: markovian conditional and open-system dynamics, [Quantum Science and Technology](#) **3**, 024005 (2018), publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [4] E. C. G. Sudarshan, Equivalence of semiclassical and quantum mechanical descriptions of statistical light beams, [Phys. Rev. Lett.](#) **10**, 277 (1963).
- [5] R. J. Glauber, Coherent and incoherent states of the radiation field, [Phys. Rev.](#) **131**, 2766 (1963).
- [6] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, [Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics](#) (Cambridge University Press, 1995).
- [7] M. Srinivas and E. Davies, Photon Counting Probabilities in Quantum Optics, [Optica Acta: International Journal of Optics](#) **28**, 981 (1981), publisher: Taylor & Francis eprint: <https://doi.org/10.1080/713820643>.
- [8] J. Park, J. Lee, and H. Nha, Verifying single-mode nonclassicality beyond negativity in phase space, [Phys. Rev. Res.](#) **3**, 043116 (2021).
- [9] C. Roh, Y.-D. Yoon, J. Park, and Y.-S. Ra, Continuous-variable nonclassicality certification under coarse-grained measurement, [Phys. Rev. Res.](#) **5**, 043057 (2023).
- [10] V. S. Kovtoniuk, E. V. Stolyarov, O. V. Kliushnichenko, and A. A. Semenov, Tight inequalities for nonclassicality of measurement statistics, [Phys. Rev. A](#) **109**, 053710 (2024).
- [11] G. Tobar, S. K. Manikandan, T. Beitel, and I. Pikovski, Detecting single gravitons with quantum sensing, [Nature Communications](#) **15**, 7229 (2024), publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [12] F. Dyson, Is a graviton detectable?, in [XVIIth International Congress on Mathematical Physics](#), pp. 670–682.
- [13] M. Parikh, F. Wilczek, and G. Zahariade, Quantum mechanics of gravitational waves, [Phys. Rev. Lett.](#) **127**, 081602 (2021).
- [14] M. Parikh, F. Wilczek, and G. Zahariade, Signatures of the quantization of gravity at gravitational wave detectors, [Phys. Rev. D](#) **104**, 046021 (2021).
- [15] M. Parikh, F. Wilczek, and G. Zahariade, The noise of gravitons, [International Journal of Modern Physics D](#) **29**, 2042001 (2020).
- [16] T. Rothman and S. Boughn, Can Gravitons be detected?, [Foundations of Physics](#) **36**, 1801 (2006).
- [17] S. Boughn and T. Rothman, Aspects of graviton detection: graviton emission and absorption by atomic hydrogen, [Classical and Quantum Gravity](#) **23**, 5839 (2006).
- [18] D. Carney, V. Domcke, and N. L. Rodd, Graviton detection and the quantization of gravity, [Phys. Rev. D](#) **109**, 044009 (2024).
- [19] D. Carney, [Comments on graviton detection](#) (2024), arXiv:2408.00094 [gr-qc, physics:hep-ph, physics:hep-th, physics:quant-ph].
- [20] T. Rudolph and B. C. Sanders, Requirement of Optical Coherence for Continuous-Variable Quantum Teleportation, [Physical Review Letters](#) **87**, 077903 (2001), publisher: American Physical Society.

- [21] H. M. Wiseman, Comment: There is no unmet requirement of optical coherence for continuous-variable quantum teleportation, [Journal of Modern Optics](#) **50**, 1797 (2003), publisher: Taylor & Francis.
- [22] R. Loudon, *The Quantum Theory of Light* (Oxford University Press, 2000).
- [23] J. Duda, [Gaussian AutoEncoder](#) (2019), arXiv:1811.04751 [cs, stat].