

Phase transitions, entanglement and quantum noise interferometry in cold atoms

Florian Mintert,^{1,2,3} Ana Maria Rey,³ Indubala I. Satija,^{4,5} and Charles W. Clark⁶

¹ Department of Physics, Harvard University, 17 Oxford Street, Cambridge Massachusetts, USA

² Physikalisches Institut, Albert-Ludwigs Universität Freiburg, Hermann-Herder-Str. 3, Freiburg, Germany

³ Institute for Theoretical Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics,
Harvard University, Cambridge, Massachusetts 02138, USA

⁴ National Institute of Standards and Technology, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899, USA

⁵ Department of Physics, George Mason University, Fairfax, Virginia 22030, USA

⁶ Joint Quantum Institute, National Institute of Standards and Technology and University of Maryland, Gaithersburg, Maryland 20899, USA

We show that entanglement monotones can characterize the pronounced enhancement of entanglement at a quantum phase transition if they are sensitive to long-range *high order* correlations. These monotones are found to develop a sharp peak at the critical point and to exhibit universal scaling. We demonstrate that similar features are shared by noise correlations and verify that these experimentally accessible quantities indeed encode entanglement information and probe separability.

Quantum entanglement represents one of the most fascinating features of quantum theory and has emerged as an important resource in quantum information science [1]. As entanglement represents a unique form of correlations that do not occur in classical systems, the investigation of connections between entanglement and quantum phase transitions is an emerging field of research which promises to complement the understanding of critical phenomena in condensed matter physics and quantum field theory.

Iconic examples of exactly solvable models exhibiting quantum phase transitions, such as the Ising-like spin chain, are becoming paradigms for investigating the suitability of proposed entanglement measures, e.g. the concurrence and entanglement entropy [2], to quantify the entangling resources of a system close to its quantum critical point. Among the various entanglement measures the concurrence has [2] gained particular attention in view of its universal scaling [3, 4] close to the phase transition. However, the regular bipartite concurrence has the drawback that even at the critical point where spin-spin correlations extend over a long range (as the correlation length is diverging for an infinite system) only the next and next-to nearest neighbor concurrences are non zero. Moreover, it is not the concurrence that peaks at the transition but its first derivative.

The expected enhancement of entanglement at the phase transition has been observed with the help of generalizations of the bipartite concurrence [5] or the entanglement entropy S_ℓ between a block of ℓ consecutive spins and the rest of the chain [6, 7]. However, there is no systematic understanding of why some entanglement measures capture this enhancement whereas other fail to do so. In the present letter we provide a general explanation for the different abilities of various entanglement measures to describe quantum phase transitions.

With the help of a sequence of entanglement measures we illustrate the importance of *higher order* correlations in encoding long range correlations near quantum phase transition. For this purpose we characterize the entanglement properties of a chain of interacting spins with different entanglement monotones and study how correlations are established over different ranges. We see that there is a qualitatively different

behavior of long-range correlations as opposed to their short-range analogues, as well as between two- and many-body entanglement.

Whereas entanglement measures have become common tools for theoretical investigations, they are significantly less popular in the experimental community since they are typically extremely arduous if not practically impossible to measure. For the verification of theoretical findings and for the investigation of theoretically intractable systems it is therefore necessary to have efficient *experimental* means to probe entanglement properties. Among the various physical systems exhibiting quantum phase transitions, cold atoms loaded in optical lattices offer considerable advantages over more traditional set-ups since they allow to engineer various Hamiltonians with high precision and to include or remove noise and randomness in a controlled way. In these systems many-body correlations are extractable from absorption images of the atomic cloud after its release from the trap [8, 9, 10]. However such images typically do not provide sufficient information to recover a proper entanglement measure. Here we give a general prescription of how to extract the pronounced enhancement of entanglement at a phase transition from the limited accessible experimental data.

We consider the ground state of the one dimensional spin-1/2 anisotropic XY model in a transversal magnetic field characterized by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{J}{2} \sum_{j=1}^N (1 + \gamma) \sigma_j^x \sigma_{j+1}^x + (1 - \gamma) \sigma_j^y \sigma_{j+1}^y + h \sigma_j^z, \quad (1)$$

where J is the nearest neighbor coupling constant, h is a transversal magnetic field, γ is the anisotropy parameter, $0 \leq \gamma \leq 1$, σ_j^α are Pauli matrices ($\alpha = x, y, z$) and periodic boundary conditions are assumed throughout. For $0 < \gamma \leq 1$, \hat{H} belongs to the Ising universality class and exhibits a quantum phase transition from a paramagnetic to a ferromagnetic phase when $\lambda = h/J$ takes its critical value $\lambda_c = 1$ [11]. The XY model is exactly solvable, and any correlation function can be expressed in terms of Töplitz-like determinants after a Jordan-Wigner transformation that maps spin operator into

fermionic operators[12, 13]. The evaluation of *all* four-point correlations is however more cumbersome than the commonly used prescription for computing two-point functions, and details about the procedure will be provided elsewhere[21].

A severe problem for the investigations of entanglement in many-body systems is that such entanglement often *cannot* be discovered in terms of few-body correlations. Thus, a few-body state that is obtained via a partial trace over a many-body state often shows only weak or no entanglement even if the underlying many-body state is highly entangled [3, 4]. Therefore, we will not consider entanglement properties of reduced few-body states, but only investigate properties of the ground state of the entire many-body system. Instead of focusing on quantifying the entanglement remaining in a subsystem of a few spins after tracing over the others, we focus on the entanglement shared between these spins and the rest. The latter does encode information about the entanglement of the pure many-body state.

There is an enormous zoo of entanglement monotones and measures to quantify the entanglement of many-body systems [14], and there is no generally accepted choice that elevates one above the rest. For bipartite systems, both entanglement entropy and concurrence play an important role, since they are the first monotones that could be evaluated by purely algebraic means for mixed states [15, 16]. Entanglement entropy is defined in terms of the degree of mixing of the reduced density matrix ρ_r of either of the two subsystems: $S(\Psi) = -\text{Tr}\rho_r \log \rho_r$, and the most frequently used definition of concurrence is $c(\Psi) = |\langle \Psi^* | \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y | \Psi \rangle|$, where σ_y is the second Pauli matrix, $\langle \Psi^* |$ is the complex conjugate of $\langle \Psi |$, that is the transpose of $|\Psi\rangle$, with the conjugation/transposition performed in the eigenbasis of the third Pauli matrix σ_z . For a system of two spin-1/2 objects concurrence and entanglement entropy are equivalent as one is a bijective function of the other. However, for the case of multipartite systems that we consider here, this is no longer the case; in particular, there is no unique generalization to many-body systems for either of these measures, and our choices are taken in accordance with the currently investigated situation without any claim to be a canonical choice.

In the case of entanglement entropy we will divide the spin chain into two blocks of not necessarily consecutive spins and consider the entanglement entropy between those blocks. In the case of concurrence we will use generalizations based on the popular redefinition $c(\Psi) = \sqrt{2(1 - \text{Tr}\rho_r^2)}$ [17] of concurrence: we will focus on the discrete set of generalized tangles (squared concurrence) [18]:

$$T_k = 2 - \frac{2}{D_k} \sum_{\nu \in \kappa_k} \text{Tr}\rho_\nu^2 \quad (2)$$

where the ρ_ν are reduced density matrices of 1 to k spins, and the summation is performed over all reduced density matrices of up to k spins. Formally, this means that κ_N contains all 1 to k tuples of pairwise different elements labeling the individual sites. The constants $D_k = \sum_{i=0}^{k-1} \prod_{j=0}^i (N-j)$ are chosen




FIG. 1: (color online) Various multipartite variations of the tangle (squared concurrence) T_1 long-dashed (pink), T_2 dashed (yellow), T_3 solid (red), and T_4 dotted (blue) as function of λ for $\gamma = 1$ (right panel) and $\gamma = 0.5$ (left panel). T_1 and T_2 do not show a distinct peak around the phase transition. T_k are obtained by numerical computation of Töplitz determinants for a system of size $N = 175$.

such that fully separable states yield a vanishing value of T_k . The advantage of this choice of entanglement monotone as compared to the various alternative options is that the present objects can easily be evaluated in terms of the four point correlation functions that can be expressed in terms of Töplitz determinants. T_1 describes the average entanglement between an individual spin and the rest of the chain. T_2 includes in addition the entanglement contribution between pairs of spins and the residual system, and T_3 and T_4 contain ever higher order correlations. This hierarchy extends to the multipartite concurrence [19] that provides a quantification for the entire entanglement content of a multipartite system. However, for practical reasons we will restrict the present investigation to T_1 - T_4 since the evaluation of 5-point quantities becomes impractical for large systems.

A clear difference between the behavior of bipartite and multipartite entanglement can be seen already going from T_1 to T_4 as shown in Fig. 1, where the different multipartite tangles are plotted as function of λ for $\gamma = 1$, and $\gamma = 0.5$. In both cases neither T_1 nor T_2 show a distinct peak around the phase transition, but their behavior rather resembles the step-like behavior of the bipartite concurrence [3]. But starting from T_3 for the case of $\gamma = 1$, and T_4 for $\gamma = 0.5$, there is a clear peak arising around the critical point. As it can be seen for $\gamma = 1$ the peak becomes more pronounced with increased order of correlation in T_k . This shows that the long-range correlations that are established around a quantum phase transition are displayed in terms of multipartite entanglement, whereas the bipartite entanglement between blocks of consecutive spins do not display this behavior.

In order to quantify the growth of multipartite entanglement in T_4 at the critical point we study the scaling with system size of its peak height and position. The right inset of Fig. 2 shows the growth of the peak with increasing number of spins. Since T_4 is a bounded quantity, it can not diverge even in the thermodynamic limit. Nevertheless, the increase follows a logarithmic fit (solid line). The left inset of Fig. 2 shows that, with increasing system size, the position of the peak, λ_m ,




FIG. 2: The main plot shows the universality of $\Gamma \equiv (T_4 - T_4^*)^{-1}$ around the phase transition: $\Gamma(\lambda) - \Gamma(\lambda_m)$ is plotted for various system sizes, from $N = 75$ to 175, as function of $N(\lambda - \lambda_m)$, and the same behavior is found for all system sizes that are displayed with different symbols. The insets show the growth (right) and position (left) of the peak with increasing system size.

gets shifted towards the expected value in the thermodynamic limit, $\lambda_m = 1$, however, according to the logarithmic fit that follows the data, it does not reach $\lambda_m = 1$. Instead it overshoots a bit towards the value of 0.97. We do not attribute too much meaning to this observation, but rather expect that more data for larger systems would result in a slightly more accurate extrapolation.

Considering the well known universal behavior of Ising-like models at a phase transition, it is central to check whether our presently utilized quantification of entanglement reveals universality. Since by definition T_4 is always finite a more appropriate quantity to study universal scaling is $\Gamma \equiv (T_4 - T_4^*)^{-1}$ since it exhibits a logarithmic divergence at the critical point. Here T_4^* is the maximum value reached by T_4 in the thermodynamic limit at $\lambda_m = 1$, which we calculate to be $\pi/2$. Again T_4^* does not agree exactly with the value we get from our finite size scaling which yields 1.77 however as we mention before we attribute it to the size limitation we have in calculating four point correlations and expect a more accurate fit for larger systems. Fig. 2 shows that $\Gamma(\lambda) - \Gamma(\lambda_m) = f[N^{1/\nu}(\lambda - \lambda_m)]$ exhibits universal behavior with the scaling exponent $\nu = 1$ characteristic for the Ising model [11]: When we plot this quantity as function of $N(\lambda - \lambda_m)$ for different system sizes, there is an almost perfect coincidence of the various data points into a single curve. Furthermore, the shape of the universal curve closely resembles the universal curve underlying concurrence [3].

In order to show that it is exactly the long range correlations that grow, as opposed the entanglement between close neighbors, and that the above findings are not a particularity of the employed tangles T_i , we present a similar analysis as above also for a different, well established entanglement measure, the *entanglement entropy*. In contrast to previous studies [6, 7] which considered bipartition of the spin chain into ℓ consecutive spins and the rest of the chain here we study the

entanglement entropy $S_4(L)$ extracted by bipartition of the spin-chain into four spins that are separated by equal distance L , (say spin 1, $1 + L$, $1 + 2L$, and $1 + 3L$) and the rest of the system. This quantity is shown in Fig. 3. Note that similarly to T_4 , also $S_4(L)$ remains finite in the thermodynamic limit, $S_4(L) \leq 4$. While there is only a tiny enhancement of the entanglement entropy around the phase transition for $L = 1$, a peak grows with increasing separation L of the spins, and takes its maximum for $L \simeq N/4$, *i.e.* in the case of maximum separation. This behavior again gives evidence of the long-range character of the correlations.




FIG. 3: Entanglement entropy, $S_4(L)$, as function of λ for different spacings between the four spins. $S_4(L)$ grows monotonously with increasing separation and reaches its maximum value when $L = N/4$. Here $N = 201$.

Having defined proper entanglement quantifiers that capture the properties of a quantum phase transition we will now address the issue of how the latter can be linked to experimentally accessible observables. Here we will focus our discussion on cold atomic systems in view of their appeal as ideal quantum simulators of iconic condensed matter Hamiltonians. In these systems absorption images taken after releasing the atoms from the trap are the commonly used diagnostic tools: the average density profile after time of flight maps to the quasi-momentum distribution $n(q)$ of the atoms at the release time, and the density-density correlations known as *noise correlations* [8] yield the momentum-momentum correlations $\Delta(q_1, q_2)$. These functions are just Fourier transforms of two and four-point correlations of the atomic field creation and annihilation operators at the various lattice sites, $\hat{a}_n, \hat{a}_n^\dagger$:

$$n(q) \equiv \langle \hat{n}_q \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{n,m} e^{i\frac{2\pi}{N}q(n-m)} \langle \hat{a}_n^\dagger \hat{a}_m \rangle \quad (3)$$

$$\Delta(q_1, q_2) \equiv \langle (\hat{n}_{q_1} - \langle \hat{n}_{q_1} \rangle)(\hat{n}_{q_2} - \langle \hat{n}_{q_2} \rangle) \rangle. \quad (4)$$

The noise correlations $\Delta(q_1, q_2)$ contain the same non-local correlations as those included in T_4 and $S_4(L)$. In contrast to T_4 and S_4 , $\Delta(q_1, q_2)$ is not a proper entanglement monotone, but it is accessible to measurement. Therefore, the natural question that we address below is: how much information about the enhancement of many-body entanglement at the critical point can be inferred from noise correlations.

In view of the well known mapping between hard-core bosons (HCB) and spin-1/2 operators [13], noise correlations for the spin chains can be defined by using the following relations between the spins and atomic operators: $\sigma_j^+ = \hat{a}_j^\dagger$, $\sigma_j^- = \hat{a}_j$ and $\sigma_j^z = \hat{a}_j^\dagger \hat{a}_j$. In the following we use this mapping to study the behavior of $\Delta(0,0)$ and $n(0)$ as λ is varied across the critical point. Our aim is to use this exactly solvable system as a benchmark of the behavior of these correlations in more general systems, which are harder to deal theoretically but on the other hand where noise correlations can be accessed experimentally. Whereas their quantitative properties will depend on the details of the underlying Hamiltonian, we believe their general features will be generic due to the inherent universal scaling of a quantum phase transition.

Fig. 4 shows that $\Delta(0,0)$ captures the enhancement of entanglement at the quantum critical point, whereas $n(0)$ fails to do so. While $n(0)$ exhibits a step-like functional dependence of λ (similar to T_2), the noise autocorrelation function $\Delta(0,0)$ is sharply peaked around the phase transition (similar to T_4). $\Delta(0,0)$ contains the higher order non-local correlations which are the key to properly extract the enhancement of entanglement at the quantum phase transition.




FIG. 4: (color online) $n(0)$ and $\Delta(0,0)$ as a function of λ for $N = 95$ spins and two different anisotropies: The dot-dashed blue (red dotted) curves and solid black (dashed green) correspond to $n(0)$ and $\Delta(0,0)$ for $\gamma = 1$ ($\gamma = 0.5$). The horizontal line at 12 is the maximal value that $\Delta(0,0)$ can take for a separable state and the peaks of $\Delta(0,0)$ exceed this threshold. The inset shows the numerical scaling of the $\Delta(0,0)$ peak vs N which is in agreement with the analytic prediction of a powerlaw with exponent $3/2$.

Our calculations for noise correlations also verify that they can be related to entanglement because they probe separability. For any separable state $|\Phi_s\rangle$ of a spin-1/2 system (*i.e.* a state that can be expressed in terms of one-body states $|\phi_i\rangle$ as $|\Phi_s\rangle = |\phi_1\rangle \otimes |\phi_2\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\phi_N\rangle$), yields a value of $\Delta(0,0)$ that is smaller than [21]

$$\Delta_{\max}(\Phi_s) = \frac{1}{8}(1 + N) \quad (5)$$

That is, if the obtained value of $\Delta(0,0)$ exceeds this threshold then the underlying state is entangled. In Fig. 4 we indi-

cate $\Delta_{\max}(\rho_s)$ for $N = 95$. The peak of $\Delta(0,0)$ clearly exceeds the separability threshold and the excess becomes even more pronounced with increasing system size. The reason is the following: While $\Delta(0,0)$ grows algebraically with the system size as $N^{3/2}$, the separability threshold of Eq. (5) grows linearly with N , so that the excess of the peak over this threshold increases as \sqrt{N} . The exponent $3/2$ in the noise correlation peak height follows from the universal scaling of $\langle \sigma_x \rangle \sim (\lambda - 1)^{1/8}$ which yields a divergence of the noise correlation peak as $(\lambda - 1)^{-3/2}$ in the thermodynamic limit and to a $N^{3/2}$ scaling for finite samples.

Even though the above investigations were focused on the anisotropic XY model Hamiltonian, we emphasize that Eq. (5) provides a general criterion for arbitrary spin systems and consequently corresponds to a useful benchmark to study entanglement properties in more general systems such as disordered spin or spins at finite temperature. Additionally, preliminary calculations done in comparatively small 1D soft core bosons undergoing a superfluid to Mott insulator transition [12, 20] also indicate a similar peaked behavior of Δ close to the critical point. This suggests that the growth of Δ can be a generic signature of a quantum phase transition and that noise correlations are suitable observables to experimentally verify the enhancement of entanglement.

F.M. acknowledges financial support by Alexander v. Humboldt foundation and the ITAMP visitors program, and A.M.R. by NSF through a grant from ITAMP.

-
- [1] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Communication*, Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge (2000).
 - [2] L. Amico *et al.*, quant-ph/0703044.
 - [3] A. Osterloh *et al.*, Nature **416**, 608 (2002)
 - [4] T. J. Osborne, M. A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 032110(2002).
 - [5] T. R. Oliveira *et al.* Phys. Rev. A **73**, 010305(R)(2006).
 - [6] J. I. Latorre *et al.*, Quantum Inf. Comput. **4**, 48 (2004).
 - [7] G. Vidal, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 227902 (2003).
 - [8] E. Altman *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 013603 (2004).
 - [9] S. Foelling *et al.*, Nature **434**, 481 (2005).
 - [10] I. B. Spielman, *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett., **98** 080404 (2007)
 - [11] S. Sachdev, *Quantum Phase Transitions*, Cambridge University Press, (1999).
 - [12] A. M. Rey, I. I. Satija and C. W. Clark, J. Phys. B, **39**, S177 (2006).
 - [13] E. H. Lieb and W. Liniger, Phys. Rev. **130**, 1605 (1963).
 - [14] R. Horodecki *et al.*, arXiv:quant-ph/0702225
 - [15] S. Hill and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5022 (1997).
 - [16] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998)
 - [17] P. Rungta *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 042315 (2001)
 - [18] F. Mintert, M. Kuś, A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 260502 (2005)
 - [19] A. R. R. Carvalho, and F. Mintert and A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 230501 (2004)
 - [20] A. M. Rey, I. I. Satija, C. W. Clark, New J. of Phys. **8**, 155 (2006).
 - [21] F. Mintert, A. Rey and I. Satija, in preparation