

# Entanglement-induced geometric phase of quantum states

Erik Sjöqvist,

*Department of Quantum Chemistry, Uppsala University, Box 518, Se-751 20  
Uppsala, Sweden*

---

## Abstract

The concept of relative state is used to introduce geometric phases that originate from correlations in states of composite quantum systems. In particular, we identify an entanglement-induced geometric phase in terms of a weighted average of geometric phase factors associated with a decomposition that define the entanglement of formation. An explicit procedure to calculate the entanglement-induced geometric phase for qubit pairs is put forward. We illustrate it for maximally entangled mixed states (MEMS) of two qubits.

*Key words:* Geometric phase; Quantum entanglement; Relative states  
*PACS:* 03.65.Vf, 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn

---

A quantum system may pick up a geometric phase when it evolves along a path in its state space [1,2]. This phase becomes additive for product states of composite systems since the uncorrelated subsystems pick up independent geometric phase factors. However, in the presence of quantum correlations the situation becomes less clear in that there is no unique assignment of phase factors to each subsystem in this case. This is related to the existence of several inequivalent forms of mixed state geometric phases [3,4,5,6,7,8,9], leading to different phase assignments when these forms are applied to the non-pure marginal states of the correlated subsystems. The effort to further clarify the role of geometric phases in composite systems has triggered attempts to find alternative geometric phase concepts and geometric phase-like structures that may capture explicitly the correlation structure of quantum states [10,11,12,13].

Recently, such an alternative concept was proposed [13] based on Everett's relative state [14]. This geometric phase is induced by quantum entanglement,

---

*Email address:* eriks@kvac.uu.se (Erik Sjöqvist).

if the full state is pure. On the other hand, classical correlations and quantum entanglement can coexist in mixed quantum states, which implies that the forms of mixed state geometric phases in [3,4], applied to the path of relative states, may contain contributions from both these types of correlations. Here, we show that one can take advantage of the decomposition freedom of mixed quantum ensembles [15] to develop another notion of relative state based geometric phase that is entanglement-induced in the sense that it can be non-zero only for inseparable (entangled) states. We find an explicit procedure to calculate this entanglement-induced geometric phase in the case of qubit systems.

Consider a mixed state of a composite quantum system described by a normalized density operator  $\varrho$  on the bipartite tensor product decomposition  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$  corresponding to two physical subsystems  $\mathcal{S}_A$  and  $\mathcal{S}_B$ . This state may contain both entanglement and classical correlations. The operator  $\varrho(\phi) = \langle \phi | \varrho | \phi \rangle$ ,  $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A$ , on  $\mathcal{H}_B$  is positive with  $\text{Tr} \varrho(\phi) \leq 1$ . We take it to be the state of  $\mathcal{S}_B$  relative  $\phi$ . For a path  $L : [0, 1] \ni s \mapsto \phi_s$  in projective Hilbert space  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ ,  $\varrho(\phi_s)$  traces out a path in the space  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$  of positive linear operators acting on  $\mathcal{H}_B$ . Associated with this path in  $\mathcal{T}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ , which is induced by the path  $L$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ , we wish to define geometric phases that reflect the correlation structure of  $\varrho$ .

Assume that the pure states  $\{\psi_k\}_k$  and probabilities  $\{p_k\}_k$  constitute a decomposition of  $\varrho$ . Let  $\{|\psi_k\rangle\}_k$  be a set of “subnormalized” vectors (i.e.,  $p_k = \langle \psi_k | \psi_k \rangle$ ) representing these states in  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ . We may write  $\varrho = \sum_k |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k|$ . A path  $L : [0, 1] \ni s \mapsto \phi_s$  in projective Hilbert space  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_A)$  defines a geometric phase distribution  $\{\gamma_{\psi_k(\phi)}, \langle \psi_k | \psi_k \rangle\}_k$  with each pure state geometric phase  $\gamma_{\psi_k(\phi)}$  given by

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\psi_k(\phi)} &= \arg \langle \psi_k(\phi_0) | \psi_k(\phi_1) \rangle - \text{Im} \int_0^1 \frac{\langle \psi_k(\phi_s) | \dot{\psi}_k(\phi_s) \rangle}{\langle \psi_k(\phi_s) | \psi_k(\phi_s) \rangle} ds \\ &= \arg \langle \phi_1 | \rho_{A;k} | \phi_0 \rangle + \text{Im} \int_0^1 \frac{\langle \phi_s | \rho_{A;k} | \dot{\phi}_s \rangle}{\langle \phi_s | \rho_{A;k} | \phi_s \rangle} ds, \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

where  $\rho_{A;k} = \text{Tr}_B |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k|$ . Equation (1) reduces to that of [13] when  $L$  is a loop, i.e, in the case of cyclic evolution. Note, in particular, the important properties  $\gamma_{\psi_k(\phi)} = 0$  if  $\psi_k$  is a product state and  $\gamma_{\psi_k(\phi)} = -\gamma_\phi$  if  $\psi_k$  is maximally entangled<sup>1</sup>. Following [6], the first moment of the phase distribution function  $P(\eta) = \sum_k \langle \psi_k | \psi_k \rangle \delta(e^{i\eta} - e^{i\gamma_{\psi_k(\phi)}})$  defines the geometric phase  $\Gamma$  as

<sup>1</sup> The minus sign originates from the antilinear nature of the relative state map  $\phi \mapsto \psi_k(\phi)$  [16].

$$e^{i\Gamma} = \Phi \left( \left\langle e^{i\eta} \right\rangle_{\rho} \right) = \Phi \left( \sum_k \langle \psi_k | \psi_k \rangle e^{i\gamma_{\psi_k}(\phi)} \right) \quad (2)$$

with  $\Phi(z) = z/|z|$  for any non-zero complex number  $z$ . The spectral decomposition  $\{|\varphi_k\rangle\}_k$  of  $\rho$  naturally defines a geometric phase  $\Gamma_{\rho(\phi)}$  that is induced by the overall correlations (classical or quantum) in the sense that it may be nontrivial only for non-product states, i.e., if  $\rho \neq \text{Tr}_B \rho \otimes \text{Tr}_A \rho$ . We now wish to find another decomposition that can identify the entanglement-induced contribution  $\Gamma_{\rho(\phi)}^E$  to  $\Gamma_{\rho(\phi)}$ .

We base our choice of preferred decomposition on entanglement of formation  $E$  [17], which for a pure bipartite state  $\Psi$  equals the von Neumann entropy of the reduced state of any of the subsystems, i.e.,  $E(\Psi) = -\text{Tr}(\rho_A \log_2 \rho_A) = -\text{Tr}(\rho_B \log_2 \rho_B)$  with  $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_B |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$  and  $\rho_B = \text{Tr}_A |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|$ . For a mixed state  $\rho$ ,  $E$  is defined as [17]  $E(\rho) = \min \sum_k \langle \psi_k | \psi_k \rangle E(\psi_k)$ , where the minimum is taken over all decompositions  $\{\psi_k\}_k$  of  $\rho$ . Let  $\{\zeta_k\}_k$  be such an entanglement-minimizing decomposition. We take  $\{\zeta_k\}_k$  to be the preferred decomposition and define the entanglement-induced geometric phase  $\Gamma_{\rho(\phi)}^E$  as

$$e^{i\Gamma_{\rho(\phi)}^E} = \Phi \left( \sum_{k=1}^n \langle \zeta_k | \zeta_k \rangle e^{i\gamma_{\zeta_k}(\phi)} \right). \quad (3)$$

Note that both  $\Gamma_{\rho(\phi)}^E$  and  $\Gamma_{\rho(\phi)}$  reduce to Eq. (1) in the pure state limit. In other words, there are no contributions to  $\Gamma_{\rho(\phi)}$  from classical correlations if the full state is pure. Furthermore, we see that  $e^{i\Gamma_{\rho(\phi)}^E} = 1$  for separable states.

For mixed qubit-pair states, concurrence  $C(\rho)$  determines uniquely  $E(\rho)$  and the corresponding entanglement-minimizing decomposition can be found [18]. Explicitly,  $C(\rho) = \max\{0, \sqrt{\lambda_1} - \sqrt{\lambda_2} - \sqrt{\lambda_3} - \sqrt{\lambda_4}\}$ , where  $\lambda_k$  are the eigenvalues in decreasing order of  $\rho \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y \rho^* \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y$  (“\*” stands for complex conjugation in the computational basis). This quantity ranges from  $C(\rho) = 0$  (separable states) and  $C(\rho) = 1$  (pure Bell states). In the qubit case, there exists an entanglement-minimizing decomposition  $\{\zeta_k\}_{k=1}^n$  with optimal cardinality  $n \leq 4$  such that  $C(\zeta_k) = C(\rho)$ ,  $\forall k$  [18]. We take such an “optimal” decomposition to be the preferred one for  $\Gamma_{\rho(\phi)}^E$ .

To calculate  $\Gamma_{\rho(\phi)}^E$  for inseparable qubit-pair states, we use the Wootters procedure [18] to find  $\{\zeta_k\}_k$ . An important element in this construction is the existence of a subnormalized “intermediate” decomposition  $\{|y_k\rangle\}_k$  of  $\rho$ , which is such that  $\langle y_1 | \tilde{y}_1 \rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_1}$  and  $\langle y_k | \tilde{y}_k \rangle = -\sqrt{\lambda_k}$ ,  $k = 2, \dots, n = \text{rank}(\rho)$ . One can associate a “preconcurrence”  $c(y_k) = \frac{\langle y_k | \tilde{y}_k \rangle}{\langle y_k | y_k \rangle}$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, n$ , to each  $y_k$ . We find the averaged preconcurrence  $\langle c \rangle = \sum_k \langle y_k | y_k \rangle c(y_k) = C(\rho)$ , which is preserved under orthogonal transformations  $|y_k\rangle \rightarrow |\zeta_k\rangle = \sum_l |y_l\rangle V_{lk}$ . The Wootters decomposition is obtained sequentially by letting  $V$  act pairwise on the  $y_k$  states

with largest and smallest preconcurrence until all preconcurrences are equal to  $C(\varrho)$ . For  $L : [0, 1] \ni s \mapsto \phi_s$ , the resulting set of paths  $\{[0, 1] \ni s \mapsto \zeta_k(\phi_s)\}_k$  is inserted into Eq. (3) and we obtain  $\Gamma_{\varrho(\phi)}^E$ .




Fig. 1. Correlation-induced geometric phases  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}$  (solid line),  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}^E$  (dashed line), and  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)} - \Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}^E$  (dotted line) for maximally entangled mixed qubit states defined in Eq. (4) as a function of concurrence  $C(\varrho_x) = x$ . The correlation-induced mixed state geometric phase  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}$  is the phase of the weighted average of geometric phase factors associated with the spectral decomposition of  $\varrho_x$ . We interpret  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}^E$  and  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)} - \Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}^E$  as the contribution to  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}$  from entanglement and classical correlations, respectively. We have chosen a loop in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_A)$  at constant latitude  $\theta = 0.45\pi$  on the Bloch sphere. Since  $\varrho_0$  is separable,  $\Gamma_{\varrho_0(\phi)}$  contains only contributions from classical correlations ( $\Gamma_{\varrho_0(\phi)}^E$  vanishes). At  $x = 1$  the state is pure and therefore  $\Gamma_{\varrho_1(\phi)} = \Gamma_{\varrho_1(\phi)}^E$ . Note that  $\Gamma_{\varrho_1(\phi)}^E = -\gamma_L = \pi(1 - \cos\theta) \approx 0.84\pi$ , which is consistent with the fact that  $\varrho_1$  is a Bell state. Furthermore,  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}^E$  has discontinuous first derivative at  $x = \frac{2}{3}$ , across which  $\text{rank}(\varrho_x) = 3 \rightarrow 2$ .

We illustrate the above procedure for maximally entangled mixed states (MEMS), which are two-qubit mixed states that maximize entanglement of formation for a given purity  $\text{Tr}\varrho^2$ . In the computational basis, these states may be written as [19]

$$\varrho_x = \begin{pmatrix} g(x) & 0 & 0 & \frac{x}{2} \\ 0 & 1 - 2g(x) & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{x}{2} & 0 & 0 & g(x) \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

up to local unitaries. Here,  $g(x)$  is a function on  $x \in [0, 1]$  such that  $g(x) = \frac{1}{3}$

for  $0 \leq x \leq \frac{2}{3}$  and  $g(x) = \frac{x}{2}$  for  $\frac{2}{3} \leq x \leq 1$ . One finds  $C(\varrho_x) = \max\{0, x\} = x$  and subnormalized eigenvectors  $|\varphi^\pm\rangle = i\sqrt{\frac{p_\pm}{2}}(|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)$  and  $|\varphi^0\rangle = i\sqrt{p_0}|01\rangle$  with  $p_\pm = g(x) \pm \frac{x}{2}$  and  $p_0 = 1 - 2g(x)$ . From the spectral decomposition, we find the correlation-induced geometric phase

$$e^{i\Gamma_{\varrho(\phi)}} = \Phi \left( 1 - 2g(x) + 2g(x)e^{-i\gamma_L} \right), \quad (5)$$

where we have used  $\gamma_{\varphi^0(\phi)} = 0$  and  $\gamma_{\varphi^\pm(\phi)} = -\gamma_L$ . The Wootters procedure yields the optimal decomposition

$$\begin{aligned} |\zeta_1\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( \sin \alpha |\varphi^+\rangle - \cos \alpha |\varphi^-\rangle + |\varphi^0\rangle \right), \\ |\zeta_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( -\sin \alpha |\varphi^+\rangle + \cos \alpha |\varphi^-\rangle + |\varphi^0\rangle \right), \\ |\zeta_3\rangle &= \cos \alpha |\varphi^+\rangle + \sin \alpha |\varphi^-\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Here,  $\cos 2\alpha = \frac{f(x)}{6f^2(x)-1}$  with  $f(x) = \frac{x}{2} + \frac{1}{3} - g(x)$ . Inserting into Eq. (3) gives the entanglement-induced geometric phase

$$\begin{aligned} e^{i\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}^E} &= \Phi \left\{ [2 - 9f^2(x)]e^{i\gamma_{\zeta_1(\phi)}} + [2 - 9f^2(x)]e^{i\gamma_{\zeta_2(\phi)}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + 2[1 - 9f^2(x)]e^{i\gamma_{\zeta_3(\phi)}} \right\}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

Notice that  $[1 - 9f^2(x)] > 0$  and  $[1 - 9f^2(x)] = 0$  on  $x \in [0, \frac{2}{3})$  and  $x \in [\frac{2}{3}, 1]$ , respectively, i.e., the rank of  $\varrho_x$  changes from  $n = 3$  to  $n = 2$  across  $x = \frac{2}{3}$ . For  $|\phi\rangle = |0\rangle + z|1\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A$  and the loop  $L_z : [0, 1] \ni s \mapsto z_s$  in the complex plane corresponding to the loop  $L : [0, 1] \ni s \mapsto \phi_s$  in  $\mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ , we obtain

$$\gamma_{\zeta_k(\phi)} = \text{Im} \oint_{L_z} \frac{(1 + \sqrt{1-x^2})P_k dP_k^* + (1 - \sqrt{1-x^2})Q_k dQ_k^*}{(1 + \sqrt{1-x^2})|P_k|^2 + (1 - \sqrt{1-x^2})|Q_k|^2}. \quad (8)$$

Here,  $P_k = \mu_k + \nu_k z^*$  and  $Q_k = -\nu_k + \mu_k z^*$ , where  $\mu_k, \nu_k$  satisfy  $\mu_k^2 + \nu_k^2 = 1$  and are determined by  $\zeta_k$  such that

$$\begin{aligned} \nu_1/\mu_1 &= -\nu_2/\mu_2 = \sqrt{2p_v} \frac{\sqrt{p_+} \sin \alpha + \sqrt{p_-} \cos \alpha}{p_v - \sqrt{p_+ p_-} \sin 2\alpha}, \\ \nu_3 &= 0, \quad \mu_3 = 1. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Numerical simulations of  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}$  and  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}^E$  for  $\arg(z)$  increasing from 0 to  $2\pi$  and  $|z| = \tan \frac{\theta}{2}$  with  $\theta = 0.45\pi$  (corresponding to a loop at constant latitude close to the equator of the Bloch sphere  $\sim \mathcal{P}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ ) are shown in Fig. 1. The remainder  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)} - \Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}^E$ , which may be associated with the ‘‘classical

correlations” in the states, is also shown. We see that  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}^E = 0$  at  $x = 0$  and  $\Gamma_{\varrho_0(\phi)}$  contains only contribution from classical correlations. Furthermore,  $\varrho_1$  is pure and therefore  $\Gamma_{\varrho_1(\phi)}$  becomes fully entanglement-induced; it takes the value  $\Gamma_{\varrho_1(\phi)} = \Gamma_{\varrho_1(\phi)}^E = -\gamma\phi = \pi(1 - \cos\theta) \approx 0.84\pi$ , where the second equality follows from the definition of MEMS that entails that  $\varrho_1$  is a Bell state. At all intermediate  $x$ , there are contributions to  $\Gamma_{\varrho_x(\phi)}$  from both entanglement and classical correlations. Notice, in particular, the abrupt change in slope that occurs across the point  $x = \frac{2}{3}$ , which separates the rank  $n = 2$  and  $n = 3$  regions.

The Wootters procedure may fail to give a unique decomposition in some cases, such as when two or more of the preconcurrences  $c(y_k)$  are equal. One important example when this happens is the class of mixed states that are diagonal in the Bell basis  $\{\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle), \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle)\}$ . Such a state is entangled iff the largest eigenvalue of the corresponding density operator exceeds  $\frac{1}{2}$ . One can show that the intermediate decomposition  $\{|y_k\rangle\}_k$  coincides with the Bell states. Assume the largest eigenvalue belongs to  $y_1$ . It follows that  $c(y_1) = -c(y_2) = \dots = -c(y_n) = 1$ . The non-uniqueness is now visible: if  $n = 3$  or  $n = 4$ , then the optimal decomposition depends on how the state of smallest preconcurrence is chosen among  $y_2, \dots, y_n$ .

We finally demonstrate that correlation-induced geometric phases of a mixed bipartite state  $\varrho = \sum_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|$  may be implemented interferometrically as geometric phases of decomposition dependent evolutions [20]. Prepare the separable state

$$\tilde{\varrho} = \sum_k |\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k| \otimes |e_k\rangle\langle e_k| \quad (10)$$

by attaching an ancilla system with Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_e$  spanned by the orthonormal vectors  $\{|e_k\rangle\}_k$ . Note that  $\varrho = \text{Tr}_e \tilde{\varrho}$ . Let  $[0, 1] \ni s \mapsto u_s$ , such that  $u_0 = \hat{1}_A$ , be a one-parameter family of unitary operators on  $\mathcal{H}_A$  realizing the path  $L : [0, 1] \ni s \mapsto |\phi_s\rangle = u_s|\phi_0\rangle$ . Define another one-parameter family of unitary operators of the form

$$U_s^\parallel = \sum_k e^{i\theta_k(s)} u_s^\dagger \otimes \hat{1}_B \otimes |e_k\rangle\langle e_k| \quad (11)$$

acting on  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B \otimes \mathcal{H}_e$ . Here, all  $\theta_k$  are chosen to satisfy the parallel transport condition  $\langle\psi_k(\phi_s)|\dot{\psi}_k(\phi_s)\rangle = \langle\dot{\psi}_k(\phi_s)|\psi_k(\phi_s)\rangle$ , which amounts to

$$\dot{\theta}_k(s) = \text{Im} \left( \frac{\langle\phi_s|\rho_{A;k}|\dot{\phi}_s\rangle}{\langle\phi_s|\rho_{A;k}|\phi_s\rangle} \right). \quad (12)$$

The resulting interference pattern obtained by post-selecting the state  $\phi_0$  on

the output of a Mach-Zehnder interferometer is determined by the quantity [4]  $\text{Tr}\langle\phi_0|U_1^\dagger\tilde{\varrho}|\phi_0\rangle = \mathcal{V}e^{i\tilde{\Gamma}}$ ,  $\mathcal{V} \geq 0$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}$  being the visibility and phase shift of the interference fringes. Explicitly,

$$e^{i\tilde{\Gamma}} = \Phi \left( \sum_k |\langle\phi_1|\rho_{A;k}|\phi_0\rangle| e^{i\gamma\psi_k(\phi)} \right), \quad (13)$$

i.e., correlation- and entanglement-induced geometric phases  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\varrho(\phi)}$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\varrho(\phi)}^E$  can be measured as shifts in the interference fringes by choosing  $\psi_k$  as the spectral and entanglement-minimizing decompositions, respectively. Note that the weight factors  $|\langle\phi_1|\rho_{A;k}|\phi_0\rangle|$  of  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\varrho(\phi)}$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\varrho(\phi)}^E$  differ from those of  $\Gamma_{\varrho(\phi)}$  and  $\Gamma_{\varrho(\phi)}^E$ ; nevertheless  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\varrho(\phi)}$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\varrho(\phi)}^E$  are correlation-induced in the sense that they vanish in absence of correlations and entanglement, respectively, in the state  $\varrho$ . Therefore, one may consider  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\varrho(\phi)}$  and  $\tilde{\Gamma}_{\varrho(\phi)}^E$  as alternative, experimentally justified, variants of correlation- and entanglement-induced geometric phases of mixed quantum states.

In conclusion, we have introduced geometric phases that are induced by quantum correlations, in the sense that they may be non-zero only for correlated quantum states. We have identified an entanglement-induced part of this phase in terms of a weighted average of geometric phase factors corresponding to a decomposition that minimizes the entanglement of formation of the state. We have demonstrated that correlation- and entanglement-induced geometric phases may be implemented interferometrically.

Financial support from the Swedish Research Council is acknowledged.

## References

- [1] M.V. Berry, Proc. Roy. Soc. London, Ser. A 392 (1984) 45.
- [2] Y. Aharonov, J.S. Anandan, Phys. Rev. Lett. 58 (1987) 1593.
- [3] A. Uhlmann, Rep. Math. Phys. 24 (1986) 229.
- [4] E. Sjöqvist, A.K. Pati, A. Ekert, J.S. Anandan, M. Ericsson, D.K.L. Oi, V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 (2000) 2845.
- [5] S. Chaturvedi, E. Ercolessi, G. Marmo, G. Morandi, N. Mukunda, R. Simon, Eur. Phys. J. C 35 (2004) 413.
- [6] K.-P. Marzlin, S. Ghose, B.C. Sanders Phys. Rev. Lett. 93 (2004) 260402.
- [7] P.B. Slater, Lett. Math. Phys. 60 (2002) 123.

- [8] M. Ericsson, A.K. Pati, E. Sjöqvist, J. Brännlund, D.K.L. Oi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 090405.
- [9] A.T. Rezakhani, P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A 73 (2006) 012107.
- [10] W.K. Wootters, J. Math. Phys. 43 (2002) 4307.
- [11] P. Levay, J. Phys. A 37 (2004) 4593.
- [12] M.S. Williamson, V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. A 76 (2007) 032115.
- [13] E. Sjöqvist, Europhys. Lett. 86 (2009) 30005.
- [14] H. Everett, Rev. Mod. Phys. 29 (1957) 454.
- [15] L.P. Hughston, R. Jozsa, W.K. Wootters, Phys. Lett. A 183 (1993) 14.
- [16] Z. Kurucz, M. Koniorczyk, J. Janszky, Fortschr. Phys. 49 (2001) 10.
- [17] C.H. Bennett, D.P. DiVincenzo, J.A. Smolin, W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A 54 (1996) 3824.
- [18] W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 (1998) 2245.
- [19] W.J. Munro, D.F.V. James, A.G. White, P.G. Kwiat, Phys. Rev. A 64 (2001) 030302(R).
- [20] D. Kult, E. Sjöqvist, Int. J. Quantum Inf. 2 (2004) 247.