

Correlation in states of two identical particles

D.L. Zhou

*Beijing National Laboratory for Condensed Matter Physics and
Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100080, China*

Applying the approach of maximal entropy construction, we propose a correlation measure for a quantum state of two particles, whether distinguishable or identical, to characterize how much residual information beyond what is contained in the one-particle reduced density matrix. For distinguishable particles, our correlation measure is equal to the two-particle mutual entropy. For two bosons or two fermions, although our correlation measures have not such explicit expressions, a computable method is given for arbitrary states. We also show that the degrees of correlation in the same two-particle states with different particle types will decrease in the following order: bosons, fermions, and distinguishable particles.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Ud, 03.67.Mn, 89.70.Cf

Introduction. — The characterization of different types of correlations in a multi-particle quantum system is fundamental both in many-body physics and in quantum information science. For example, quantum entanglement, briefly for quantum correlation of distinguishable particles in different spatial places, is regarded as a basic resource necessary for quantum teleportation.

Most work in literature on correlation characterization is focused on the systems composed by distinguishable particles. A correlation measure of a state for two distinguishable particles is shown to be the mutual entropy of the state [1, 2, 3]. For the system composed by more than two distinguishable particles, however, we encounter the conceptual or mathematical difficulties on characterization of the correlations in its state. [1, 4, 5, 6].

For the system composed by identical particles, we have more trouble than what we encountered in distinguishable particles. Even for a state of two identical particles, we have not a proper correlation measure yet. Note that many discussions on a quantum correlation measure of the states of two identical particles exist in literature [7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14], which are related intimately with the correlation measure in pure states as followed. For pure states of two identical particles, roughly speaking, there are two different viewpoints on correlation characterization: one is called mode-mode entanglement [7, 8, 9, 10], the other is called particle-particle correlation [11, 12, 13, 14]. In the first viewpoint, two subset of distinguishable modes must be artificially specified in advance. In the second viewpoint, only the intrinsic correlation properties of the state are addressed without requiring any additional artificial information. In this article, we adopt the viewpoint of particle-particle correlation.

The approach of maximal entropy construction [15] is used successfully to provide the correlation measures in a system of many distinguishable particles [1, 6]. Because this approach does not have any requirement on the structure of Hilbert space of the investigated system, we expect that it can be used to give the correlation mea-

asures of the system composed by identical particles. For simplicity of mathematics, we restrict ourselves in the system composed by two identical particles. To demonstrate the differences of correlations in the systems composed by different types of particles, we also include the correlation measure for the system composed by two distinguishable particles as a specific case.

In addition, we show that the degree of correlation is not only determined by the two-particle quantum state, but also essentially influenced by the types of the two particles. Actually, the degrees of correlation in the same two-particle states with different particle types will decrease in the following order: bosons, fermions, and distinguishable particles.

Definition. — We consider a system composed by two particles, whether distinguishable or identical. The state of the system is specified by a two-particle density matrix $\sigma^{(2)}$, whose 1-particle reduced density matrix $\sigma^{(1)}$ is defined by

$$\mathrm{Tr} \left(a_\eta \sigma^{(1)} a_\tau^\dagger \right) = \mathrm{Tr} \left(a_\eta \sigma^{(2)} a_\tau^\dagger \right), \quad (1)$$

where the operator a_η and a_τ^\dagger are the annihilation operator of mode η and the creation operator of mode τ respectively.

To define a correlation measure for the state $\sigma^{(2)}$, we adopt the approach of maximal entropy construction. We first define a set of two-particle states with the same 1-particle reduced density matrix as that of the state $\sigma^{(2)}$, *i.e.*,

$$D_1(\sigma^{(2)}) = \{ \rho^{(2)} | \rho^{(1)} = \sigma^{(1)} \}. \quad (2)$$

Next we find out, among the states in the set $D_1(\sigma^{(2)})$, the state $\sigma_1^{(2)}$ that takes the maximal entropy, *i.e.*,

$$S \left(\sigma_1^{(2)} \right) = \max_{\rho^{(2)} \in D_1(\sigma^{(2)})} S(\rho^{(2)}), \quad (3)$$

where the von Neumann entropy $S(\rho) = -\mathrm{Tr} \rho \ln \rho$. Then a correlation measure for the state $\sigma^{(2)}$ is defined

as

$$C_2(\sigma^{(2)}) = S(\sigma_1^{(2)}) - S(\sigma^{(2)}). \quad (4)$$

Let us explain why we choose the above way to define the correlation measure for a two-particle state. According to our understanding, the correlation in a two-particle state is the information contained in the two-particle state but not in its 1-particle reduced density matrix. The approach of maximal entropy provide us a natural way to extract all the information contained in the 1-particle reduced density matrix. Thus Eq. (4) is a natural definition of the degree of correlation in a two-particle system.

Standard form of state $\sigma_1^{(2)}$ — From Eq. (4), we know that the state $\sigma_1^{(2)}$ is a key element in evaluating the correlation measure of the state $\sigma^{(2)}$. Applying the method of Lagrange multipliers, we give the following standard form of the state $\sigma_1^{(2)}$:

$$\sigma_1^{(2)} = \exp\left(\sum_{\tau\eta} \Lambda_{\tau\eta} a_\tau^\dagger a_\eta\right), \quad (5)$$

where the parameters $\Lambda_{\tau\eta}$ are Lagrange multipliers, and the corresponding matrix Λ is Hermitian. Further more, we write it into the diagonalized form

$$\sigma_1^{(2)} = \exp\left(\sum_{\mu} \Gamma_{\mu} a_{\mu}^{\dagger} a_{\mu}\right) = \prod_{\mu} x_{\mu}^{\hat{n}_{\mu}}. \quad (6)$$

where the parameter Γ_{μ} is the μ -th eigenvalue of the matrix Λ , and $x_{\mu} = \exp(\Gamma_{\mu})$. In Eqs. (5) and (6), the total particle number $\hat{n} = \sum_{\mu} \hat{n}_{\mu} = 2$. The entropy of the state $\sigma_1^{(2)}$ is given by

$$S(\sigma_1^{(2)}) = - \sum_{\{n_{\mu}\}} \prod_{\mu} x_{\mu}^{n_{\mu}} \ln \prod_{\mu} x_{\mu}^{n_{\mu}}. \quad (7)$$

Following Eq. (6), the 1-particle reduced density matrix of the state $\sigma_1^{(2)}$ is

$$\sigma_1^{(1)} = \sum_{\mu} \langle \hat{n}_{\mu} \rangle |1_{\mu}\rangle \langle 1_{\mu}|. \quad (8)$$

Because the 1-particle reduced density matrix $\sigma_1^{(1)}$ is equal to the known $\sigma^{(1)}$, we can determined the mode μ and the average particle number in the mode $\langle \hat{n}_{\mu} \rangle$. The parameter x_{μ} are determined by

$$\sum_{\{n_{\nu}\}} \prod_{\nu} x_{\nu}^{n_{\nu}} n_{\mu} = \langle \hat{n}_{\mu} \rangle. \quad (9)$$

In the following, we will discuss Eq. (9) in detail for three cases: two bosons, two fermions, and two distinguishable particles.

Case of two bosons: For two bosons, Eq. (6) becomes

$$\sigma_1^{(2)} = \sum_{\mu} x_{\mu}^2 |2_{\mu}\rangle \langle 2_{\mu}| + \sum_{\mu < \nu} x_{\mu} x_{\nu} |1_{\mu} 1_{\nu}\rangle \langle 1_{\mu} 1_{\nu}|. \quad (10)$$

Then Eqs. (9) can be written as

$$x_{\mu} \sum_{\nu} x_{\nu} + x_{\mu}^2 = \langle \hat{n}_{\mu} \rangle. \quad (11)$$

By solving Eqs. (11), we obtain the values of $\{x_{\mu}\}$.

Case of two fermions: For two fermions, Eq. (6) becomes

$$\sigma_1^{(2)} = \sum_{\mu < \nu} x_{\mu} x_{\nu} |1_{\mu} 1_{\nu}\rangle \langle 1_{\mu} 1_{\nu}|. \quad (12)$$

Then Eqs. (9) can be written as

$$x_{\mu} \sum_{\nu} x_{\nu} - x_{\mu}^2 = \langle \hat{n}_{\mu} \rangle. \quad (13)$$

By solving Eqs. (13), we obtain the values of $\{x_{\mu}\}$.

Note that the solutions of Eq. (11) and Eq. (13) are not unique. To evaluate the correlation measure (4), we need to take the solutions that satisfy Eq. (3).

Case of two distinguishable particles: For two distinguishable particles A and B, the single particle modes can be denoted as $\{A\mu\}$ and $\{B\nu\}$ respectively. The particle number for particle A and particle B is conserved, i.e., $n_A = n_B = 1$. The two-particle state is denoted as $\sigma_{AB}^{(2)}$. Then the 1-particle reduced density matrix

$$\sigma_{AB}^{(1)} = \begin{pmatrix} \sigma_A^{(1)} & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_B^{(1)} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

In this case, Eq. (6) becomes

$$\sigma_1^{(2)} = \sum_{\mu\nu} x_{A\mu} x_{B\nu} |1_{A\mu} 1_{B\nu}\rangle \langle 1_{A\mu} 1_{B\nu}|. \quad (15)$$

Then Eqs. (9) can be written as

$$x_{A\mu} \sum_{\nu} x_{B\nu} = \langle \hat{n}_{A\mu} \rangle, \quad (16)$$

$$\sum_{\mu} x_{A\mu} x_{B\nu} = \langle \hat{n}_{B\nu} \rangle, \quad (17)$$

Note that $\sum_{\mu} x_{A\mu} \sum_{\nu} x_{B\nu} = 1$. Then the entropy $S(\sigma_1^{(2)}) = S(\sigma_A^{(1)}) + S(\sigma_B^{(1)})$. Therefore the correlation measure

$$C_2(\sigma_{AB}^{(2)}) = S(\sigma_A^{(1)}) + S(\sigma_B^{(1)}) - S(\sigma_{AB}^{(2)}). \quad (18)$$

Pure states of two particles. — Correlation in pure states of two particles are often called quantum correlation. For two distinguishable particles, it is also called quantum entanglement. For a two-particle pure state

$\sigma^{(2)}$, the entropy $S(\sigma^{(2)}) = 0$. Further more, pure states of two particles can be written in the Schmidt decomposition forms:

$$|\psi_B^{(2)}\rangle = \sum_{\mu} \frac{\sqrt{\langle n_{\mu} \rangle}}{2} |2_{\mu}\rangle, \quad (19)$$

$$|\psi_F^{(2)}\rangle = \sum_{\mu} \sqrt{\langle n_{2\mu} \rangle} |1_{2\mu-1}1_{2\mu}\rangle, \quad (20)$$

$$|\psi_{AB}^{(2)}\rangle = \sum_{\mu} \sqrt{\langle n_{A\mu} \rangle} |1_{A\mu}1_{B\mu}\rangle, \quad (21)$$

where $\langle n_{2\mu} \rangle = \langle n_{2\mu-1} \rangle$ in Eq. (20) and $\langle n_{A\mu} \rangle = \langle n_{B\mu} \rangle$ in Eq. (21). The advantages of these forms are that they give directly the information of the 1-particle reduced density matrixes. The correlation measures of pure states for two bosons, two fermions, and two distinguishable particles are determined by the Schmidt coefficients, $\langle n_{\mu} \rangle$, via Eqs. (11), (13), and (16,17), respectively.

Correlation inequality. — Note that, for a state $\sigma_{AB}^{(2)}$ of two distinguishable particles, there exist the counterpart states for two fermions and two bosons, which are obtained by regarding the particle indexes A and B as the indexes of the different subsets of modes. Here "the different subsets of modes" means that each mode in one subset is orthogonal to all modes in the other mode. Let us denote these states with the same form as $\sigma_D^{(2)}$, $\sigma_F^{(2)}$, and $\sigma_B^{(2)}$ for two distinguishable particles, for two fermions, and for two bosons, respectively. Then, we find the following general inequality on correlation for these three states.

Theorem: The degrees of correlations for the three states $\sigma_D^{(2)}$, $\sigma_F^{(2)}$, and $\sigma_B^{(2)}$ defined above satisfies the inequality:

$$C_2(\sigma_D^{(2)}) \leq C_2(\sigma_F^{(2)}) \leq C_2(\sigma_B^{(2)}). \quad (22)$$

Proof: According to the definition (2), we find

$$D_1(\sigma_D^{(2)}) \subseteq D_1(\sigma_F^{(2)}) \subseteq D_1(\sigma_B^{(2)}). \quad (23)$$

Then the above equation, combining with the definition (3), gives the inequality (20).

Example 1 — The first group of states we consider includes the following three states:

$$|\psi_B^{(2)}\rangle = |1_11_2\rangle, \quad (24)$$

$$|\psi_F^{(2)}\rangle = |1_11_2\rangle, \quad (25)$$

$$|\psi_{AB}^{(2)}\rangle = |1_{A1}1_{B1}\rangle. \quad (26)$$

Note that these three states describe the same physical picture: one particle occupies one mode, and the other particle occupies the other mode. According to our definitions of correlation measures, we find

that $C_2(|\psi_B^{(2)}\rangle) = \ln 3$, $C_2(|\psi_F^{(2)}\rangle) = 0$, and $C_2(|\psi_{AB}^{(2)}\rangle) = 0$.

The above results of correlations in the three states can be understood as follows. When we say two distinguishable particles A and B, we mean that one particle is particle A, the other is particle B, and the superposition of particle A's state and particle B's state is illegible. The 1-particle reduced density matrixes tell us that particle A is in the $A1$ state and particle B in the $B1$ state. Then the state $|\psi_{AB}^{(2)}\rangle$ is completely determined by the 1-particle reduced density matrixes, which implies that the correlation is zero.

When we say two identical particles, we mean that the total particle number is 2, and these 2 particles are distributed into different modes. For identical bosons, the particle number occupying each mode is arbitrary; For fermions, the particle number occupying each mode is 0 or 1. The 1-particle reduced density matrixes of the state $|\psi_B^{(2)}\rangle$ and the state $|\psi_F^{(2)}\rangle$ are the same, which give the following information. The average particle number in mode 1 is 1, and the average particle number in mode 2 is also 1. For fermions, this implies that there is 1 particle in mode 1, and 1 particle in mode 2, which gives all the information in the state $|\psi_F^{(2)}\rangle$. Therefore, the correlation in the state $|\psi_F^{(2)}\rangle$ is zero. For bosons, however, the fact that the average particle number value of one mode is 1 does not imply that there is 1 particle in the mode even if the total particle number is 2. For example, the mixed state

$$\rho_B^{(2)} = \frac{1}{3} (|1_11_2\rangle\langle 1_11_2| + |0_12_2\rangle\langle 0_12_2| + |2_10_2\rangle\langle 2_10_2|)$$

gives the same average particle numbers as those of the state $|\psi_B^{(2)}\rangle$. Therefore, the correlation in the state $|\psi_B^{(2)}\rangle$ is not zero.

We also note that for pure states of bosons, the correlation is zero if and only if the two bosons occupy the same mode. In this case, the one-particle reduced density matrix tells us that the average particle number in the mode is equal to the total particle number. Thus we can say that the two particles occupies the same mode, which is all the information in the two particle state. In another word, the correlation of such states are zero.

Example 2 — The second group of states we consider includes the following three states:

$$|\phi_B^{(2)}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} |1_11_2\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} |1_31_4\rangle, \quad (27)$$

$$|\phi_F^{(2)}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} |1_11_2\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} |1_31_4\rangle, \quad (28)$$

$$|\phi_{AB}^{(2)}\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} |1_{A1}1_{B1}\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}} |1_{A2}1_{B2}\rangle. \quad (29)$$

Similar as the first group of states, these three states also describe the same physical picture: the two particles occupy two different pairs of modes. Based on our definitions of correlation measures, we find that $C_2(|\phi_B^{(2)}\rangle) = \ln 10$, $C_2(|\phi_F^{(2)}\rangle) = \ln 6$, and $C_2(|\phi_{AB}^{(2)}\rangle) = \ln 4$.

To understand these results on correlation, we need to examine the constraint by the one-particle reduced density matrixes. In fact, for the first state $|\phi_B^{(2)}\rangle$, the corresponding subspace can be limited to 10 basis vectors $\{|1_i 1_j\rangle, |2_i\rangle, (i, j = 1, 2, 3, 4)\}$; for the second state $|\phi_F^{(2)}\rangle$, the corresponding subspace can be limited to 6 basis vectors $\{|1_i 1_j\rangle, (i, j = 1, 2, 3, 4)\}$; for the third state $|\phi_{AB}^{(2)}\rangle$, the corresponding subspace can be limited to 4 basis vectors $\{|1_{Ai} 1_{Bj}\rangle, (i, j = 1, 2)\}$. In fact, the degree of correlation for these three states are equal to the natural logarithm of the dimensions of the corresponding subspaces.

Discussions and summary. — We would like to compare our results with those obtained in Ref. [12]. Note that both give the same answer on whether a pure state of two identical particles is correlated or not. However, we overcome the somewhat strange difference in the correlation measure between fermions and bosons as emphasized in Ref. [12]. In Ref. [12], the authors pay all of their attention to the 1-particle reduced density matrix. Although we also pay our attention to the 1-particle reduced density matrix, we finally turn to find out the two-particle state which are constrained by the information in the 1-particle reduced density matrix.

In summary, we propose a correlation measure of two particles based on the approach of maximal entropy construction. Our correlation measure has the following two advantages: first, it gives the correlation measure of all kinds of two-particle states, whether of bosons or of fermions, whether of indistinguishable particles or of identical particles, whether pure or mixed. Second, it gives a simple physical picture for the correlation measure: the degree of correlation is measured by the amount of uncertainty difference between the two-particle state

and its uncorrelated counterpart — a two-particle state with the same 1-particle reduced density matrix as the two-particle state and with maximal uncertainties simultaneously. In addition, the approach can be directly generalized to treat with the correlations in more than two identical particles, which has been made for distinguishable particles in Refs. [1, 6]. Based on the definition of our correlation measure, we show that the degrees of correlation in the same two-particle states with different particle types will decrease in the following order: bosons, fermions, distinguishable particles.

This work is supported by NSF of China under Grant 10775176, and NKBRFSF of China under Grant 2006CB921206 and 2006AA06Z104.

-
- [1] N. Linden, S. Popescu, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 207901 (2002).
 - [2] B. Groisman, S. Popescu, and A. Winter, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 032317 (2005).
 - [3] B. Schumacher and M.D. Westmoreland, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 042305 (2006).
 - [4] D.L. Zhou, B. Zeng, Z. Xu, and L. You, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 052110 (2006).
 - [5] D.L. Zhou and L. You, arXiv: quant-ph/0701029.
 - [6] D.L. Zhou, arXiv:0803.2747.
 - [7] P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 042101 (2002); P. Zanardi and X. Wang, J. Phys. A **35**, 7947 (2002).
 - [8] J. R. Gittings and A. J. Fisher, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 032305 (2002).
 - [9] H. M. Wiseman and J. A. Vaccaro, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 097902 (2002).
 - [10] Y. Shi, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 024301 (2003).
 - [11] J. Schliemann, J. I. Cirac, M. Kus, M. Lewenstein, and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 022303 (2001).
 - [12] R. Paskauskas and L. You, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 042310 (2001).
 - [13] Y. S. Li, B. Zeng, X. S. Liu and G. L. Long, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 054302 (2001).
 - [14] G.C. Ghirardi and L. Marinatto, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 012109 (2004).
 - [15] E.T. Jaynes, Phys. Rev. **106**, 620 (1957).