

Non-quantum Entanglement Resolves a Fundamental Issue in Polarization Optics

B. Neethi Simon

Department of Applied Mechanics, IIT Madras, Chennai 600 036

Sudhavathani Simon

Department of Computer Science, Women's Christian College, Chennai 600 006

F. Gori and Massimo Santarsiero

Dipartimento di Fisica, Università Roma Tre and CNISM, Vila della Vasca Navale 84, I-00146 Rome

Riccardo Borghi

Dipartimento di Elettronica Applicata, Università Roma Tre and CNISM, Vila della Vasca Navale 84, I-00146 Rome

N. Mukunda

Centre for High Energy Physics, Indian Institute of Science, Bangalore 560 012

R. Simon

The Institute of Mathematical Science, Tharamani, Chennai 600 113

The issue raised in this Letter is classical in the sense of being quite ancient: which subset of 4×4 real matrices should be accepted as physical Mueller matrices in polarization optics? Non-quantum entanglement between the polarization and spatial degrees of freedom of an electromagnetic beam is shown to provide the physical basis to resolve this issue in a definitive manner.

PACS numbers: 42.25.Ja, 42.25.Kb, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.-a

Entanglement is traditionally studied almost exclusively in the context of quantum systems. However, this notion is basically kinematic, and so is bound to present itself whenever and wherever the state space of interest is the tensor product of two (or more) vector spaces. Polarization optics of paraxial electromagnetic beams happens to have precisely this kind of a setting, and so one should expect entanglement to play a significant role in this situation. It turns out that entanglement in this non-quantum setup is not just a matter of academic curiosity: we shall show in this paper that *consideration of this non-quantum entanglement resolves a fundamental issue in classical polarization optics*. It will appear that this issue could not have been resolved without explicit consideration of entanglement. We begin by outlining the structure of classical polarization optics [1, 2, 3, 4]

The Mueller-Stokes Formalism: Traditional Mueller-Stokes formalism applies to plane electromagnetic waves or, more generally, to elementary beams (see below). If the wave propagates along the positive z -axis, the components E_1 , E_2 of the transverse electric field along the x and y directions can be arranged into a column vector

$$\mathbf{E} \equiv \begin{bmatrix} E_1 \\ E_2 \end{bmatrix} \in \mathcal{C}^2 \quad (1)$$

called the Jones vector, analogous to the state vector of a qubit. [A scalar factor of the form $e^{i(kz - \omega t)}$ has been suppressed.] While $\mathbf{E}^\dagger \mathbf{E} = |E_1|^2 + |E_2|^2$ is (a measure of) the intensity, the ratio $\gamma = E_1/E_2$ of the (complex)

components specifies the state of polarization.

When $\mathbf{E}$ is not deterministic, the state of polarization is described by the *coherency or polarization matrix*

$$\Phi \equiv \langle \mathbf{E} \mathbf{E}^\dagger \rangle = \begin{bmatrix} \langle E_1 E_1^* \rangle & \langle E_1 E_2^* \rangle \\ \langle E_2 E_1^* \rangle & \langle E_2 E_2^* \rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

where $\langle \dots \rangle$ denotes ensemble average. The two defining properties of the coherency matrix are hermiticity, $\Phi^\dagger = \Phi$, and positivity, $\Phi \geq 0$: every 2×2 matrix obeying these two conditions is a valid coherency matrix.

It is clear that the intensity corresponds to $\text{tr} \Phi$, and fully polarized (pure) states describable by Jones vectors $\mathbf{E}$ correspond to $\det \Phi = 0$. Partially polarized or mixed states correspond to $\det \Phi > 0$. Thus coherency matrices are analogous to the density operators of a qubit.

Since Φ is hermitian, it can be conveniently described as *real* linear combination of the four hermitian matrices $\tau_0 = 1_{2 \times 2}$, $\tau_1 = \sigma_3$, $\tau_2 = \sigma_1$, $\tau_3 = \sigma_2$ which are mutually orthogonal, $\text{tr} \tau_a \tau_b = 2\delta_{ab}$:

$$\Phi = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a=0}^3 S_a \tau_a \Leftrightarrow S_a = \text{tr}(\tau_a \Phi). \quad (3)$$

The coefficients S_a define the components of the *Stokes vector* $S \in \mathbf{R}^4$. The intensity equals $S_0 = \text{tr} \Phi$.

While hermiticity of Φ is equivalent to reality of the Stokes vector $S \in \mathbf{R}^4$, the positivity conditions $\text{tr} \Phi > 0$, $\det \Phi \geq 0$ read, respectively, $S_0 > 0$, $S_0^2 - S_1^2 - S_2^2 - S_3^2 \geq 0$. Thus, *permissible polarization states correspond*

to the positive light cone and its interior (solid cone). Pure states live on the surface of this cone.

Typical systems of interest in polarization optics are spatially homogeneous (in the transverse plane), in the sense that their action is independent of the coordinates (x, y) . If such a system is deterministic and acts linearly on the field amplitude, it is described by a complex 2×2 numerical matrix J , the Jones matrix of the system:

$$J : \quad \mathbf{E} \rightarrow \mathbf{E}' = J\mathbf{E} \quad \Leftrightarrow \quad \Phi \equiv \langle \mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^\dagger \rangle \rightarrow \Phi' = \langle \mathbf{E}'\mathbf{E}'^\dagger \rangle = J\Phi J^\dagger. \quad (4)$$

Such Jones systems are analogous to hamiltonian evolutions of a qubit; since the intensity $S_0 = \text{tr } \Phi$ need not be preserved, J need not be unitary. It is clear that Jones systems map pure states ($\det \Phi = 0$) into pure states.

We can go from a pair of indices, each running over 1 and 2, to a single index running over 0 to 3 and vice versa. Thus, the elements of Φ can be written as an associated column vector $\tilde{\Phi}$ with $\tilde{\Phi}_0 = \Phi_{11}$, $\tilde{\Phi}_1 = \Phi_{12}$, $\tilde{\Phi}_2 = \Phi_{21}$, and $\tilde{\Phi}_3 = \Phi_{22}$. The one-to-one relationship (3) between S and Φ may thus be written as the vector equation

$$\begin{bmatrix} S_0 \\ S_1 \\ S_2 \\ S_3 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i & -i & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \tilde{\Phi}_0 \\ \tilde{\Phi}_1 \\ \tilde{\Phi}_2 \\ \tilde{\Phi}_3 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

Thus, while $\Phi = \langle \mathbf{E}\mathbf{E}^\dagger \rangle$ the associated column vector $\tilde{\Phi} \equiv \langle \mathbf{E} \otimes \mathbf{E}^* \rangle$. The 4×4 numerical matrix A exhibited above is essentially unitary: $A^{-1} = \frac{1}{2}A^\dagger$.

Optical systems of interest can be more general than the ones described by Jones matrices. Such a general system is said to be non-deterministic, and acts directly on the Stokes vector rather than through the Jones vector. It is specified by a 4×4 real matrix called the Mueller matrix, transforming the Stokes vectors linearly:

$$M : S \rightarrow S' = MS. \quad (6)$$

Mueller matrix of a Jones system J will be called Mueller-Jones matrix $M(J)$.

Since M produces a linear transformation on S , the linear invertible relationship (3) or (5) between S and Φ implies that M will induce a linear transformation $H^{(M)}$ on Φ , which we may write in the form:

$$H^{(M)} : \Phi \rightarrow \Phi', \quad \Phi'_{ij} = \sum_{k\ell} H_{ik,j\ell}^{(M)} \Phi_{k\ell}. \quad (7)$$

The fact that Φ' needs to be hermitian for all hermitian Φ demands that the map or super-operator $H^{(M)}$, viewed as a 4×4 matrix with ik (going over 0 to 3) labeling the rows and $j\ell$ labeling the columns, be hermitian. Let us define a new matrix $B^{(M)}$ by permuting the indices of $H^{(M)}$:

$$B_{ij,k\ell}^{(M)} = H_{ik,j\ell}^{(M)}. \quad (8)$$

i.e., $B^{(M)}$ is obtained from $H^{(M)}$ by simply interchanging $H_{02}^{(M)}$ with $H_{10}^{(M)}$, $H_{03}^{(M)}$ with $H_{11}^{(M)}$, $H_{22}^{(M)}$ with $H_{30}^{(M)}$, and $H_{23}^{(M)}$ with $H_{31}^{(M)}$. In terms of $B^{(M)}$, Eq. (7) transcribes into the vector equation $\tilde{\Phi}' = B^{(M)}\tilde{\Phi}$, and in view of (5) we have the invertible relationship

$$B^{(M)} = A^{-1}MA, \quad M = AB^{(M)}A^{-1}. \quad (9)$$

Thus, the correspondence between real matrices M and hermitian matrices $H^{(M)}$, established through (8) and (9), is indeed one-to-one. Elements of $H^{(M)}$ in terms of those of M can be found in Eq. (8) of Ref. [3].

If the system described by M is a Jones system with Jones matrix J , it is clear from the transformation law $\Phi \rightarrow \Phi' = J\Phi J^\dagger$ given in (4) that $B^{(M)} = J \otimes J^*$ and, consequently, $H^{(M)} = \tilde{J}\tilde{J}^\dagger$, where $\tilde{J}$ is the column vector associated with the 2×2 matrix J . Thus we arrive at the following result of fundamental importance [3].

Proposition 1: A Mueller matrix M represents a Jones system if and only if the associated hermitian matrix $H^{(M)}$ is a one-dimensional projection. If $H^{(M)}$ is such a projection $\tilde{J}\tilde{J}^\dagger$, then $M = M(J)$, J being the 2×2 matrix associated with the column vector $\tilde{J}$.

As a consequence, which is mathematically trivial but quite important for the issue on hand, we have [4]

Proposition 2: A real matrix M can be realized as a positive sum (ensemble) of Mueller-Jones matrices if and only if the associated hermitian matrix $H^{(M)}$ is positive semidefinite. If $H^{(M)} = \sum_k \tilde{J}^{(k)}\tilde{J}^{(k)\dagger}$, then $M = \sum_k M(J^{(k)})$ where $M(J^{(k)}) = A(\tilde{J}^{(k)} \otimes \tilde{J}^{(k)*})A^{-1}$ is the Mueller-Jones matrix associated with $J^{(k)}$.

With this brief outline, we are now ready to describe the fundamental issue being addressed in this Letter.

The Issue: The Mueller-Stokes formalism takes as state space $\Omega^{(\text{pol})}$ the collection of all Stokes vectors:

$$\Omega^{(\text{pol})} = \{ S \in \mathbf{R}^4 \mid S_0 > 0, \quad S^T G S \geq 0 \}, \quad (10)$$

where $G = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1, -1)$. Thus given a 4×4 real matrix M , in order that it qualifies to be a Mueller matrix one should demand that it maps the state space $\Omega^{(\text{pol})}$ into itself. Let us denote by $\mathcal{M}$ the collection of all (real) M matrices which map $\Omega^{(\text{pol})}$ into itself. While the set of M matrices which map $\Omega^{(\text{pol})}$ onto itself is clearly the six-parameter family $SO(3,1) \cup GSO(3,1)$, where $SO(3,1)$ is the proper orthochronous Lorentz group, $\mathcal{M}$ is much larger; it is a sixteen-parameter family.

Let us denote by $\mathcal{M}^{(+)}$ the collection of M matrices which can be realized as positive sum of Mueller-Jones systems $M(J)$. It is clear that $\mathcal{M}^{(+)}$ is contained in $\mathcal{M}$. The structure of $\mathcal{M}^{(+)}$ is fairly simple: it is clear from Proposition 1 [3] that elements of $\mathcal{M}^{(+)}$ are in one-to-one correspondence with nonnegative 4×4 matrices [4]. But the structure of $\mathcal{M}$ is considerably more involved. Owing to a sequence of developments [5, 6, 7, 8, 9], which are surprisingly recent in relative terms, we now have a

complete characterization of $\mathcal{M}$. The basic tool has been orbits of M under double-coseting by $SO(3, 1)$ [8].

That elements of $\mathcal{M}^{(+)}$ are Mueller matrices is clear, for they are *realized* as convex sums of Jones systems. That M matrices which fall outside $\mathcal{M}$ are not Mueller matrices is also clear, for they fail to map the state space $\Omega^{(\text{pol})}$ into itself. *Thus the issue is really one about the grey domain ‘in between’, the complement of $\mathcal{M}^{(+)}$ in $\mathcal{M}$: are these M matrices physical Mueller matrices?*

By definition, members of this domain cannot be realized as positive sums of Jones systems; but they map $\Omega^{(\text{pol})}$ into itself. No one has come up with a scheme to realize them physically. On the other hand there are Mueller matrices, extracted from actual experiments, which fall deep into this grey domain (see Ref. [8] for examples from Ref. [10]).

There are two difficulties in simply dismissing these matrices as unphysical: first, the experimenters *did not realize them* as convex sums of Jones systems, and so the fact that they fall outside $\mathcal{M}^{(+)}$ cannot be enough reason to dismiss them; and secondly, within the Mueller-Stokes formalism *there seems to exist no additional qualification we can demand of a Mueller matrix, over and above the requirement that it should map $\Omega^{(\text{pol})}$ into itself.*

As a simple illustration of this grey region between $\mathcal{M}^{(+)}$ and $\mathcal{M}$, let us consider M matrices of the diagonal form $\text{diag}(1, d_1, d_2, d_3)$. It is clear that M will map $\Omega^{(\text{pol})}$ into $\Omega^{(\text{pol})}$, and hence be in $\mathcal{M}$, if and only if $d_k \leq 1$, $k = 1, 2, 3$. In the Euclidean space $\mathbf{R}^3$ spanned by the parameters (d_1, d_2, d_3) this corresponds to the solid cube with vertices at $(\pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1)$.

The hermitian matrix $H^{(M)}$ associated with $\text{diag}(1, d_1, d_2, d_3)$ is, from (10),

$$H^{(M)} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1+d_1 & 0 & 0 & d_2+d_3 \\ 0 & 1-d_1 & d_2-d_3 & 0 \\ 0 & d_2-d_3 & 1-d_1 & 0 \\ d_2+d_3 & 0 & 0 & 1+d_1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

Clearly, $H^{(M)} \geq 0$ if and only if $-d_1-d_2-d_3 \leq 1$, $-d_1+d_2+d_3 \leq 1$, $d_1+d_2-d_3 \leq 1$, and $d_1-d_2+d_3 \leq 1$. i.e., iff (d_1, d_2, d_3) is in the solid tetrahedron with vertices at $(1, 1, 1)$, $(1, -1, -1)$, $(-1, 1, -1)$ and $(-1, -1, 1)$.

Proposition 3: For M matrices of the restricted form $\text{diag}(1, d_1, d_2, d_3)$, $\mathcal{M}$ corresponds to the cubical region with vertices at $(d_1, d_2, d_3) = (\pm 1, \pm 1, \pm 1)$, whereas $\mathcal{M}^{(+)}$ corresponds to the inscribed solid tetrahedron with vertices at $(1, 1, 1)$, $(1, -1, -1)$, $(-1, 1, -1)$ and $(-1, -1, 1)$.

In this Letter we present a compelling *physical ground* which judges every M matrix which is not an element of $\mathcal{M}^{(+)}$ as unphysical. And this physical ground comes from consideration of entanglement between the polarization and spatial degrees of freedom of an electromagnetic beam.

Non-quantum Entanglement: Let us now go beyond plane waves and consider paraxial electromagnetic

beams. The simplest beam field has, in a transverse plane $z = \text{constant}$ described by coordinates $(x, y) \equiv \boldsymbol{\rho}$, the form $\mathbf{E}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = (E_1 \hat{\mathbf{x}} + E_2 \hat{\mathbf{y}}) \psi(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, where E_1, E_2 are complex constants, and the scalar-valued function $\psi(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ may be assumed to be square-integrable over the transverse plane: $\psi(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$. $\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}$ are unit vectors along the x, y axes. It is clear that the polarization part $(E_1 \hat{\mathbf{x}} + E_2 \hat{\mathbf{y}})$ and the spatial dependence or modulation part $\psi(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ of such a beam are well separated, allowing one to focus attention on one aspect at a time. When one is interested in only the modulation aspect, the part $(E_1 \hat{\mathbf{x}} + E_2 \hat{\mathbf{y}})$ may be suppressed, thus leading to ‘scalar optics’. On the other hand, if the spatial part $\psi(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ is suppressed we are led to the traditional polarization optics or Mueller-Stokes formalism for plane waves.

Beams whose polarization and spatial modulation separate in the above manner will be called *elementary beams*. Suppose we superpose or add two such elementary beam fields $(a\hat{\mathbf{x}} + b\hat{\mathbf{y}}) \psi(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ and $(c\hat{\mathbf{x}} + d\hat{\mathbf{y}}) \chi(\boldsymbol{\rho})$. The result is not of the elementary form $(e\hat{\mathbf{x}} + f\hat{\mathbf{y}}) \phi(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, for any $e, f, \phi(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, unless either (a, b) is proportional to (c, d) so that one gets committed to a *common* polarization, or $\psi(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ and $\chi(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ are proportional so that one gets committed to a *fixed* spatial mode. Thus, *the set of elementary fields is not closed under superposition.*

Since superposition principle is essential for optics, we are led to consider beam fields of the more general form $\mathbf{E}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = E_1(\boldsymbol{\rho})\hat{\mathbf{x}} + E_2(\boldsymbol{\rho})\hat{\mathbf{y}}$, and consequently to pay attention to the implications of inseparability or entanglement of polarization and spatial variation. This more general form is obviously closed under superposition. We may write $\mathbf{E}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ as a (*generalised*) *Jones vector*

$$\mathbf{E}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \begin{bmatrix} E_1(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \\ E_2(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \end{bmatrix}, \quad E_1(\boldsymbol{\rho}), E_2(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \in L^2(\mathbf{R}^2). \quad (12)$$

The intensity at location $\boldsymbol{\rho}$ corresponds to $|E_1(\boldsymbol{\rho})|^2 + |E_2(\boldsymbol{\rho})|^2$. This field is of the elementary or separable form iff $E_1(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ and $E_2(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ are linearly dependent (proportional to one another). Otherwise, polarization and spatial modulation are inseparably entangled.

The point is that the set of possible beam fields in a transverse plane constitutes the *tensor product* space $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$. But the set of all elementary fields constitutes just the *set product* $\mathcal{C}^2 \times L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$ of $\mathcal{C}^2$ and $L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$, and hence forms a *measure zero subset* of the tensor product $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$. In other words, in beam fields represented by *generic elements* of $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$ polarization and spatial modulation should be expected to be entangled: *Entanglement is not an exception; it is the rule in $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$* , the space of pure states appropriate for electromagnetic beams.

To handle fluctuating beams, we need the beam-coherence-polarization (BCP) matrix $\Phi(\boldsymbol{\rho}; \boldsymbol{\rho}') \equiv$

$\langle \mathbf{E}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \mathbf{E}(\boldsymbol{\rho}')^\dagger \rangle$ [11]:

$$\Phi(\boldsymbol{\rho}; \boldsymbol{\rho}') = \begin{bmatrix} \langle E_1(\boldsymbol{\rho}) E_1(\boldsymbol{\rho}')^* \rangle & \langle E_1(\boldsymbol{\rho}) E_2(\boldsymbol{\rho}')^* \rangle \\ \langle E_2(\boldsymbol{\rho}) E_1(\boldsymbol{\rho}')^* \rangle & \langle E_2(\boldsymbol{\rho}) E_2(\boldsymbol{\rho}')^* \rangle \end{bmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

As the name suggests, the BCP matrix describes both the coherence and polarization properties. It is a generalization of the numerical coherency matrix of Eq. (2), now to the case of beam fields.

It is clear from the very definition (13) of BCP matrix that this matrix kernel, viewed as an operator from $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes L^2(\mathbf{R}^2) \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^2 \otimes L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$, is hermitian nonnegative:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\rho}; \boldsymbol{\rho}') &= \Phi_{kj}(\boldsymbol{\rho}'; \boldsymbol{\rho})^*, \quad j, k = 1, 2; \\ \int d^2 \boldsymbol{\rho} d^2 \boldsymbol{\rho}' \mathbf{E}(\boldsymbol{\rho})^\dagger \Phi(\boldsymbol{\rho}; \boldsymbol{\rho}') \mathbf{E}(\boldsymbol{\rho}') &\geq 0, \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

$\forall \mathbf{E}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) \in \mathcal{C}^2 \otimes L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$. These are the *defining properties* of the BCP matrix: *every 2×2 matrix of two-point functions $\Phi_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\rho}; \boldsymbol{\rho}')$ meeting just these two conditions is a valid BCP matrix of some beam of light.*

Resolution of the Issue: In the BCP matrix (16), each of the four blocks $\Phi_{jk}(\boldsymbol{\rho}; \boldsymbol{\rho}') = \langle E_j(\boldsymbol{\rho}) E_k(\boldsymbol{\rho}')^* \rangle$ is an (infinite-dimensional) operator $L^2(\mathbf{R}^2) \rightarrow L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$. For the issue on hand, however, it turns out to be sufficient to restrict the spatial dependence to just two orthonormal spatial modes $\psi_1(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, $\psi_2(\boldsymbol{\rho})$. This amounts to considering in place of $L^2(\mathbf{R}^2)$ the two-dimensional space $\mathcal{C}^2$, the linear span of $\psi_1(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ and $\psi_2(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, so that the BCP matrix $\Phi(\boldsymbol{\rho}; \boldsymbol{\rho}')$ is a positive operator mapping $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^2 \rightarrow \mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^2$, the first $\mathcal{C}^2$ being for the polarization degree of freedom and the second $\mathcal{C}^2$ for the spatial degree of freedom.

Choice of a product basis in $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^2$ transcribes the BCP matrix into a hermitian nonnegative numerical 4×4 matrix of four 2×2 blocks, with the polarization (Roman) indices labeling the blocks and the spatial (Greek) indices labeling entries within each block [12]. The following orthonormal product basis suggests itself naturally:

$$\chi_{1\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \psi_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \quad \chi_{2\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \psi_\alpha(\boldsymbol{\rho}), \quad (15)$$

for $\alpha = 1, 2$. Thus a Jones vector $E(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ in $\mathcal{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{C}^2$ necessarily has the form $\sum_{j=1}^2 \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 C_{j\alpha} \chi_{j\alpha}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$. It is of the separable or elementary form if and only if $C_{11}/C_{12} = C_{21}/C_{22}$. It can be identified with a four-dimensional numerical column vector $\mathbf{C}$ whose entries are the expansion coefficients $C_{j\alpha}$: $\mathbf{C} = [C_{11}, C_{12}, C_{21}, C_{22}]^T$. It follows that the corresponding (pure state) BCP matrix $\Phi(\boldsymbol{\rho}, \boldsymbol{\rho}') = E(\boldsymbol{\rho}) E(\boldsymbol{\rho}')^\dagger$ can be identified with the (numerical) projection matrix $\hat{\Phi} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{C}^\dagger$. The M matrix acts on $\hat{\Phi}$ through the associated hermitian matrix $H^{(M)}$:

$$H^{(M)} : \hat{\Phi} \rightarrow \hat{\Phi}', \quad \hat{\Phi}'_{i\alpha, j\beta} = \sum_{k\ell} H_{ik, j\ell}^{(M)} \hat{\Phi}_{k\alpha, \ell\beta}. \quad (16)$$

Note that the Greek indices are left unaffected, consistent with the (transverse) spatial homogeneity of M .

Now consider the special Jones vector $E(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \chi_{11}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) + \chi_{22}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$ corresponding to $\mathbf{C} = [1, 0, 0, 1]^T$ and $\hat{\Phi} = \mathbf{C} \mathbf{C}^\dagger$. Since $C_{j\alpha} = \delta_{j\alpha}$, we have $\hat{\Phi}_{j\alpha, k\beta} = \delta_{j\alpha} \delta_{k\beta}$. That is, the only nonzero elements of the 4×4 matrix $\hat{\Phi}$ are $\hat{\Phi}_{00} = \hat{\Phi}_{03} = \hat{\Phi}_{30} = \hat{\Phi}_{33} = 1$.

Given an M matrix, let $\hat{\Phi}'$ be the result of the action of M on $\hat{\Phi}$. We have from (16)

$$\hat{\Phi}'_{i\alpha, j\beta} = \sum_{k\ell} H_{ik, j\ell}^{(M)} \hat{\Phi}_{k\alpha, \ell\beta} = H_{i\alpha, j\beta}^{(M)}. \quad (17)$$

This is our final result. Suppose $H^{(M)}$ is not positive then $\hat{\Phi}'$, the result of M acting on the entangled Jones vector $E(\boldsymbol{\rho}) = \chi_{11}(\boldsymbol{\rho}) + \chi_{22}(\boldsymbol{\rho})$, fails to be positive and hence is unphysical, showing in turn that M could not have been physical. Thus $H^{(M)} \geq 0$ is a necessary condition for M to be a physical Mueller matrix. On the other hand, we have seen that if $H^{(M)} \geq 0$ then M can be realized as a convex sum of Jones systems, showing that $H^{(M)} \geq 0$ is a sufficient condition for M to be a Mueller matrix. We thus have

Theorem: The necessary and sufficient condition for M to be a physical Mueller matrix is that the associated hermitian matrix $H^{(M)} \geq 0$. *Every physical Mueller matrix is a convex sum of Mueller-Jones matrices.*

Thus M matrices which map $\Omega^{(\text{pol})}$ into itself should be called *pre-Mueller matrices* rather than Mueller matrices. For, to be promoted to the status of Mueller matrices they need to meet the stronger condition $H^{(M)} \geq 0$ arising from consideration of entanglement. In view of the rapidly growing current interest in an unified approach to coherence and polarization in optics, it is hoped that our result will stimulate further research into the kinematic role of entanglement in classical optics.

-
- [1] L. Mandel and E. Wolf, *Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics* (Cambridge University Press, 1995), Chap. 6.
 - [2] C. Brosseau, *Fundamentals of Polarized Light: A Statistical Approach* (Wiley, N.Y., 1998).
 - [3] R. Simon, Opt. Commun. **42**, 293 (1982).
 - [4] K. Kim, L. Mandel, and E. Wolf, J. Opt. Soc. Am. A **4**, 433 (1987).
 - [5] M.S. Kumar and R. Simon, Opt. Commun. **88**, 464 (1992).
 - [6] C.R. Givens and B. Kostinski, J. Mod. Opt. **40**, 471 (1993).
 - [7] V.M. van der Mee, J. Math. Phys. **34**, 5072 (1993).
 - [8] R. Sridhar and R. Simon, J. Mod. Opt. **41**, 1903 (1994).
 - [9] A.V. G. Rao, K.S. Mallesh, and Sudha, J. Mod. Opt. **45**, 955 (1998); **45** 989 (1998).
 - [10] J.J. van Zyl, C.H. Papas, and C. Elachi, IEEE Trans. Antennas Prop. **AP-35**, 818 (1987).
 - [11] F. Gori, Opt. Lett. **23**, 241 (1998).
 - [12] M. Santarsiero, F. Gori, R. Borghi, and G. Gattari, J. Opt. A: Pure Appl. Opt. **9**, 593 (2007).