

# Generation of field mediated three qubit entangled state shared by Alice and Bob

Paulo Jose dos Reis and S. Shelly Sharma\*

*Departamento de Física, Universidade Estadual de Londrina, Londrina 86051-990, PR Brazil*

A scheme to generate shared tripartite entangled states, with two-trapped atoms in a cavity held by Alice (qubits  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ ) entangled to a single trapped atom in a remote lab owned by Bob ( $B$ ), is proposed. The entanglement is generated through interaction of trapped atoms with two mode squeezed light shared by the two cavities. The proposed scheme is an extension of the proposal of ref. [W. Son, M. S. Kim, J. Lee, and D. Ahn, *J. Mod. Opt.* 49, 1739 (2002)], where the possibility of entangling two remote qubits using a bipartite continuous variable state was examined. While the global negativity detects the free entanglement of the three atom mixed state, the bound entanglement is detected by the negativity calculated from pure state decomposition of the state operator. The partial negativities calculated by selective partial transposition of the three atom mixed state detect the pairwise entanglement of qubit pairs  $A_1B$ ,  $A_2B$ , and  $A_1A_2$ . The entanglement of three atoms is found to be W-like, no GHZ like quantum correlations being generated.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum systems with discrete energy spectrum are often used for storing, manipulating, and transmitting information encoded in quantum states belonging to finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. A two-level atom is an example of two-dimensional quantum systems, universally known as qubits. All possible superposition states of a two-level system can be expressed in terms of linear combinations of two-dimensional orthonormal states defining the standard computational basis. On the other hand, the electromagnetic field is characterized by continuous variables that is observables with a continuous spectrum of eigenvalues. Quantum information based on continuous variables is encoded in quantum states belonging to infinite-dimensional Hilbert spaces. The entanglement of remote qubits is a resource for implementation of communication protocols [1] and information processing [2] using quantum systems. W. Son et al. [3] have shown the possibility of entangling two remote qubits using a bipartite continuous variable state. In this article, a scheme to generate shared tripartite entangled states of two-trapped atoms in a cavity held by Alice (qubits  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ ) and a single trapped atom in a remote lab owned by Bob ( $B$ ), is proposed. A single mode of the two-mode squeezed electromagnetic field, generated by a squeezed light source, is injected into each cavity by a beam splitter. The entanglement is generated through interaction of trapped atoms with quantized electromagnetic field shared by the two cavities. No direct interaction amongst the atoms takes place.

The dynamical evolution of three atom entanglement due to atom field interaction is investigated after tracing over the field degrees of freedom. We use the global negativity and the partial 2-way negativities to analyze the entanglement dynamics. Negativity [4, 5, 6], based on Peres Horodecki [7, 8] criterion, has been shown to be an entanglement monotone [9]. A comparison of global negativity with respect to qubit  $B$  and the linear entropy calculated from the state operator for qubit  $B$  indicates that for certain ranges of interaction parameter values the global negativity fails to detect the entanglement. Using pure state decomposition (PSD) of mixed three atom state, we recalculate the negativity by making a weighted sum of pure states contributions to global negativity. The global negativity calculated from pure state decomposition (PSDG) of the state operator is not a proper measure of entanglement because it is not invariant with respect to local operations and classical communication (LOCC). It does, however, detect the bound entanglement being greater or equal to the convex roof extension (CRE) of negativity shown to be an entanglement monotone [10]. We use the global negativity and partial 2-way negativities of pure state decomposition, primarily, to understand how quantum coherences present in the three atom state, evolve with interaction time. The 2-way negativity refers to the negativity of a partial transpose of three qubit state operator constructed by imposing specific constraints during transposition. The coherences of a multipartite composite system having three subsystems can be quantified by 3-way and 2-way negativities [11]. Partial 2-way negativity is the contribution of a specific 2-way partial transpose to global negativity. For canonical states, the partial 2-way negativities measure the pairwise entanglement of the system [11, 12]. We use the negativities calculated from the pure state decomposition of three atom mixed state to study the dynamics of two-body coherences of qubit pairs  $A_1B$ ,

---

\*Electronic address: shelly@uel.br

$A_2B$ , and  $A_1A_2$ . The qubits  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  are shown to form a bell pair with certain probability, which is entangled to qubit  $B$ . The degree of entanglement depends on the squeeze parameter as well as the coefficient of reflection of the beam splitter.

## II. THE CAVITY FIELD

Consider two cavities prepared in the vacuum state at  $t = 0$ . The beam splitter used to inject the external field into a cavity is represented by the operator

$$\hat{B}(\theta) = \exp \left[ \frac{\theta}{2} (\hat{c}\hat{f}^\dagger - \hat{c}^\dagger\hat{f}) \right], \quad (1)$$

where  $\hat{c}$  ( $\hat{f}$ ) and  $\hat{c}^\dagger$  ( $\hat{f}^\dagger$ ) are creation and destruction operators for photons in the cavity (external field), respectively. The coefficient  $r = \cos \frac{\theta}{2}$  is the reflection coefficient of the beam splitter. For a single cavity in vacuum state the cavity field  $\hat{\rho}_c$  at  $t = 0$  is given by

$$\hat{\rho}_c(0) = \text{tr}_f \hat{B}(\theta) |0\rangle \langle 0|_c \hat{B}^\dagger(\theta). \quad (2)$$

The two mode squeeze operator acting on two mode vacuum state

$$\hat{S}(s) |0, 0\rangle = \exp(-s\hat{a}\hat{b} + s\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{b}^\dagger) |0, 0\rangle, \quad (3)$$

produces a two-mode squeezed field in composite state

$$|\Psi_F\rangle = \frac{1}{\cosh s} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} (\tanh s)^n |n, n\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where  $s$  is the squeeze parameter. The bosonic creation and destruction operators for mode one are  $\hat{a}^\dagger$ ,  $\hat{a}$  and for mode two are  $\hat{b}^\dagger$ ,  $\hat{b}$ , respectively. The two mode squeezed state is an entangled state having bipartite entanglement determined by the value of squeeze parameter  $s$ . Using beam splitters (represented by operator of Eq. (2)) to inject the modes one and two of the squeezed field (Eq. (ref. 5)) into independent cavities  $c_1$  and  $c_2$ , the cavity field state reads as

$$\hat{\rho}_{c_1c_2} = \left( \frac{1}{\cosh s} \right)^2 \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k,l=0}^{\min[n,m]} (\tanh s)^{n+m} G_{kl}^{nm}(\theta) |n-k, n-l\rangle \langle m-k, m-l|, \quad (5)$$

where

$$G_{kl}^{nm}(\theta) = C_k^n(\theta) C_k^m(\theta) C_l^n(\theta) C_l^m(\theta), \quad (6)$$

$$G_{kl}^{nn}(\theta) = \frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!} \frac{n!}{l!(n-l)!} \cos^{2k} \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \sin^{2n-2k} \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \cos^{2l} \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \sin^{2n-2l} \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right), \quad (7)$$

and

$$C_k^n(\theta) = \sqrt{\frac{n!}{k!(n-k)!}} \cos^k \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right) \sin^{n-k} \left( \frac{\theta}{2} \right). \quad (8)$$

The operator  $\hat{\rho}_{c_1c_2}$  represents a mixed composite state of cavity field.

### III. ATOM FIELD INTERACTION

The interaction of  $N$  two-level atoms with a resonant single mode quantized electromagnetic field in rotating wave approximation is described by Tavis -Cummings model [14] Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_N = \hbar\omega_0\hat{a}^\dagger\hat{a} + \sum_{i=1,N} \frac{\hbar\omega_0}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z^i + \sum_{i=1,N} \hbar g [\hat{\sigma}_+^i\hat{a} + \hat{\sigma}_-^i\hat{a}^\dagger], \quad (9)$$

where  $\omega_0$  is the atomic transition frequency and  $g$  the atom field coupling strength. Eigen states of Pauli operator  $\hat{\sigma}_z^i$  model the internal states of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  atom ( $i = 1, 2$ ) with eigenvalue  $m_\sigma^i = -1$  ( $+1$ ) standing for the ground (excited) state of the atom. Defining the composite operator,  $\hat{\sigma}_k = \sum_i \hat{\sigma}_k^i$  where  $k = (z, +, -)$ , we may construct the eigen basis of operators  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_z$  to represent  $N$  atom internal states. A typical coupled basis vector is written as  $|\sigma, m_\sigma\rangle$ , with eigenvalues of  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_z$  given by  $\sigma(\sigma + 2)$  and  $m_\sigma$ , respectively.

Consider two atoms trapped in cavity  $c_1$  radiated by the single mode resonant cavity field in photon number state  $|n\rangle$ . Interaction with the cavity field generates entanglement of internal states of the atom, and the cavity field state. Working in the field-atom basis  $|\sigma, m_\sigma, n\rangle$ , the relevant basis states for the case when two atoms are prepared in their ground states at  $t = 0$  are  $|2, -2, n\rangle$ ,  $|2, 0, n-1\rangle$ , and  $|2, 2, n-2\rangle$  and the Hamiltonian matrix reads as

$$H_{1I} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \hbar g B_n & 0 \\ \hbar g B_n & 0 & \hbar g A_n \\ 0 & \hbar g A_n & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

where  $A_n = \sqrt{2(n-1)}$ ,  $B_n = \sqrt{2n}$ . Defining interaction parameter  $\tau = gt$ , the unitary operator  $\hat{U}_1^n(\tau) = \exp\left[-\left(i\hat{H}_{1I}t\right)/\hbar\right]$  is found to be

$$U_1^n(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{[B_n^2 \cos(f_n\tau) + A_n^2]}{A_n^2 + B_n^2} & \frac{-iB_n \sin(f_n\tau)}{\sqrt{(A_n^2 + B_n^2)}} & \frac{A_n B_n [\cos(f_n\tau) - 1]}{A_n^2 + B_n^2} \\ \frac{-iB_n \sin(f_n\tau)}{\sqrt{(A_n^2 + B_n^2)}} & \cos(f_n\tau) & \frac{-iA_n \sin(f_n\tau)}{\sqrt{(A_n^2 + B_n^2)}} \\ \frac{A_n B_n [\cos(f_n\tau) - 1]}{A_n^2 + B_n^2} & -iA_n \sin(f_n\tau) & \frac{[A_n^2 \cos(f_n\tau) + B_n^2]}{A_n^2 + B_n^2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (11)$$

where  $f_n = \sqrt{2(2n-1)}$ .

For a single atom interacting with the cavity field in cavity  $c_2$ , the unitary matrix that determines the time evolution of the system in the basis  $|1, -1, m\rangle, |1, 1, m-1\rangle$  is

$$U_2^m(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\sqrt{m}\tau) & -i \sin(\sqrt{m}\tau) \\ i \sin(\sqrt{m}\tau) & \cos(\sqrt{m}\tau) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

The evolution operator  $\hat{U}_{12}^{nm}(\tau)$  for the two cavity composite system is obtained by taking the tensor product

$$\hat{U}_{12}^{nm}(\tau) = \hat{U}_1^n(\tau) \otimes \hat{U}_2^m(\tau). \quad (13)$$

### IV. THREE QUBIT STATE OPERATOR

Consider two-trapped atoms in a cavity held by Alice ( qubits  $A_1$  and  $A_2$ ) and a single trapped atom (qubit  $B$ ) in a remote cavity controlled by Bob. The atoms are cooled down to their ground state with cavities prepared in vacuum state at  $t = 0$ . A squeezed light source generates the two mode electromagnetic field. The two mode squeezed field is injected into the cavities, with each cavity receiving a single mode of the field. The composite state of field in two cavities is given by  $\hat{\rho}_c$  as in Eq. (5). The state of the composite system without atom field interaction is represented by

$$\hat{\rho}_{(0)} = \hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(0) \otimes \hat{\rho}_c, \quad (14)$$

where  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(0) = |2, -2\rangle |1, -1\rangle \langle 2, -2| \langle 1, -1|$  in the coupled basis (labelled by eigenvalues of  $\hat{\sigma}^2$  and  $\hat{\sigma}_z$ ). The state operator, after interaction between the atoms and the respective squeezed fields in the two cavities for a time  $t = \tau/g$ , is given by

$$\hat{\rho}(\tau) = \hat{U}_{12}(\tau) \hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(0) \otimes \hat{\rho}_c(0) \hat{U}_{12}^\dagger(\tau)$$

Using the interaction operators for atom-field interaction in cavities one and two (Eq. (13)), the state of the composite system after interaction time  $t$  is written as

$$\begin{aligned}
\hat{\rho}(\tau) &= \left(\frac{1}{\cosh s}\right)^2 \hat{U}_{12}(\tau) \left[ \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} (\tanh s)^{n+m} \right. \\
&\quad \left. \sum_{k,l=0}^{\min[n,m]} G_{kl}^{nm}(\theta) |2, -2, n-k\rangle |1, -1, n-l\rangle \langle 2, -2, m-k| \langle 1, -1, m-l| \right] \hat{U}_{12}^\dagger(\tau) \\
&= \left(\frac{1}{\cosh s}\right)^2 \sum_{n,m=0}^{\infty} \sum_{k,l=0}^{\min[n,m]} (\tanh s)^{n+m} G_{kl}^{nm}(\theta) \left\{ \hat{U}_1^{n-k}(\tau) \otimes \hat{U}_2^{n-l}(\tau) \right. \\
&\quad \left. |-2, n-k\rangle |-1, n-l\rangle \langle -2, m-k| \langle -1, m-l| \hat{U}_1^{\dagger m-k}(\tau) \otimes \hat{U}_2^{\dagger m-l}(\tau) \right\}. \tag{15}
\end{aligned}$$

The reduced state operator for atoms is obtained from  $\hat{\rho}(\tau)$ , by tracing over the field modes, that is

$$\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) = \text{Tr}_c(\hat{\rho}(\tau)).$$

Associating, single qubit states  $|0\rangle$  ( $|1\rangle$ ) with ground (excited) state of the two-level atom, the initial state of three atoms in computational basis reads as  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(0) = (|00\rangle_{c_1} \langle 00|) \otimes (|0\rangle_{c_2} \langle 0|)$ . The matrix  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$  in the computational basis  $|00\rangle_{c_1} |0\rangle_{c_2}$ ,  $|10\rangle_{c_1} |0\rangle_{c_2}$ ,  $|01\rangle_{c_1} |0\rangle_{c_2}$ ,  $|11\rangle_{c_1} |0\rangle_{c_2}$ ,  $|00\rangle_{c_1} |1\rangle_{c_2}$ ,  $|10\rangle_{c_1} |1\rangle_{c_2}$ ,  $|01\rangle_{c_1} |1\rangle_{c_2}$ ,  $|11\rangle_{c_1} |1\rangle_{c_2}$ , reads as

$$\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11}^{A_1 A_2 B} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\rho_{15}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\rho_{15}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\rho_{22}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{2} & \frac{\rho_{22}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\rho_{26}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & \frac{\rho_{22}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{2} & \frac{\rho_{22}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\rho_{26}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{33}^{A_1 A_2 B} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{44}^{A_1 A_2 B} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \frac{\rho_{15}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\rho_{55}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{2} & \frac{\rho_{55}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{\rho_{15}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{\rho_{55}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{2} & \frac{\rho_{55}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{\rho_{26}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{\rho_{26}^{A_1 A_2 B}}{\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \rho_{66}^{A_1 A_2 B} \end{pmatrix}, \tag{16}$$

with the matrix elements given by

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{11}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) &= \left(\frac{1}{\cosh s}\right)^2 \sum_{n=0k,l=0}^{\infty} \sum^n (\tanh s)^{2n} G_{kl}^{nn}(\theta) \cos^2(\tau\sqrt{n-l}) \\
&\quad \left(\frac{n-k-1}{2n-2k-1} + \frac{n-k}{2n-2k-1} \cos(f_{nk}\tau)\right)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{22}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) &= \left(\frac{1}{\cosh s}\right)^2 \sum_{n=0k,l=0}^{\infty} \sum^n (\tanh s)^{2n} G_{kl}^{nn}(\theta) \cos^2(\tau\sqrt{n-l}) \\
&\quad \frac{(n-k)}{(2n-2k-1)} \sin^2(f_{nk}\tau),
\end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
\rho_{33}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) &= \left(\frac{1}{\cosh s}\right)^2 \sum_{n=0k,l=0}^{\infty} \sum^n (\tanh s)^{2n} G_{kl}^{nn}(\theta) \cos^2(\tau\sqrt{n-l}) \\
&\quad \frac{(n-k)(n-k-1)}{(2n-2k-1)^2} (\cos(f_{nk}\tau) - 1)^2,
\end{aligned}$$

$$\rho_{44}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) = \left( \frac{1}{\cosh s} \right)^2 \sum_{n=0k,l=0}^{\infty} \sum^n (\tanh s)^{2n} G_{kl}^{nn}(\theta) \sin^2 \left( \tau \sqrt{n-l} \right) \\ \frac{1}{(2n-2k-1)^2} \left( (n-k-1) + (n-k) \cos(f_{nk}\tau) \right)^2,$$

$$\rho_{55}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) = \left( \frac{1}{\cosh s} \right)^2 \sum_{n=0k,l=0}^{\infty} \sum^n (\tanh s)^{2n} G_{kl}^{nn}(\theta) \sin^2 \left( \tau \sqrt{n-l} \right) \\ \frac{(n-k)}{(2n-2k-1)} \sin^2(f_{nk}\tau),$$

$$\rho_{66}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) = \left( \frac{1}{\cosh s} \right)^2 \sum_{n=0k,l=0}^{\infty} \sum^n (\tanh s)^{2n} G_{kl}^{nn}(\theta) \sin^2 \left( \tau \sqrt{n-l} \right) \\ \frac{(n-k)(n-k-1)}{(2n-2k-1)^2} (\cos(f_{nk}\tau) - 1)^2,$$

$$\rho_{51}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) = \left( \frac{1}{\cosh s} \right)^2 \sum_{n=0k,l=0}^{\infty} \sum^n (\tanh s)^{2n+1} G_{kl}^{nn+1}(\theta) \frac{\sqrt{(n-k+1)}}{\sqrt{(2n-2k+1)}} \\ \cos \left( \tau \sqrt{n-l} \right) \sin \left( \tau \sqrt{n-l+1} \right) \sin(f_{n+1k}\tau) \\ \left( \frac{(n-k-1)}{(2n-2k-1)} + \frac{(n-k)}{(2n-2k-1)} \cos(f_{nk}\tau) \right),$$

$$\rho_{62}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) = \left( \frac{1}{\cosh s} \right)^2 \sum_{n=0k,l=0}^{\infty} \sum^n (\tanh s)^{2n+1} G_{kl}^{nn+1}(\theta) \frac{\sqrt{(n-k-1)}}{\sqrt{(2n-2k-1)}} \\ \frac{\sqrt{(n-k)(n-k+1)}}{(2n-2k+1)} \cos \left( \tau \sqrt{n-l} \right) \\ \sin \left( \tau \sqrt{n-l+1} \right) (\sin(f_{nk}\tau)) (\cos(f_{n+1k}\tau) - 1).$$

## V. PROBABILITY OF GENERATING THREE QUBIT ENTANGLED STATES

We have calculated, numerically, the matrix elements of state operator  $\widehat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$  using a simple fortran program. The sum  $\sum_{n=0}^{\infty}$  in Eq. (5) is approximated by  $\sum_{n=0}^{n_{\max}}$ , where the value of  $n_{\max}$  is determined by the choice of parameter  $s$ . By analyzing the variation of  $\rho_{ii}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$  ( $i = 1-6$ ) with parameter  $s$  we have chosen  $s = 1.2$  as the preferred value of squeeze parameter and  $n_{\max} = 80$ . Figure (1) displays the probabilities  $P_i$  ( $i = 1-8$ ) of finding the three atoms in the local basis states  $|i_1 i_2\rangle_{c_1} |i_3\rangle_{c_2}$  ( $i = i_1 + 2i_2 + 4i_3 + 1$ ), for  $s = 1.2$  and  $\theta = \pi$ . We notice that the probability of finding the atoms in their ground states drops to 0.34 at  $\tau = 0.8$ , which is already less than  $\sum_{i=2-8} P_i$  at  $\tau \sim 0.4$ . For  $s = 1.2$ , the probability of initial atomic state interacting with the field is reasonably large, while the mean photon number is not too large. In case the mean photon number is large, the cavity decay must be taken into account.

The operator  $\widehat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$  of Eq. (16), can be rewritten in diagonal form as

$$\widehat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) = \sum_{i=1}^6 p_i |\Phi_i\rangle \langle \Phi_i|, \quad (17)$$




FIG. 1: The probabilities, versus  $\tau (= g\eta t)$  for  $s = 1.2$ .

where  $p_i$ , and  $|\Phi_i\rangle$  are the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$  given by

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\Phi_1\rangle &= a_{000} |00\rangle_{c_1} |0\rangle_{c_2} + a_{101} \left( \frac{|10\rangle_{c_1} + |01\rangle_{c_1}}{\sqrt{2}} \right) |1\rangle_{c_2}, \\
 p_1 &= \frac{(\rho_{11}^A + \rho_{55}^A)}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\rho_{11}^A - \rho_{55}^A)^2 + 4(\rho_{15}^A)^2},
 \end{aligned} \tag{18}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\Phi_2\rangle &= b_{000} |00\rangle_{c_1} |0\rangle_{c_2} + b_{101} \left( \frac{|10\rangle_{c_1} + |01\rangle_{c_1}}{\sqrt{2}} \right) |1\rangle_{c_2}, \\
 p_2 &= \frac{(\rho_{11}^A + \rho_{55}^A)}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\rho_{11}^A - \rho_{55}^A)^2 + 4(\rho_{15}^A)^2},
 \end{aligned} \tag{19}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\Phi_3\rangle &= c_{100} \left( \frac{|10\rangle_{c_1} + |01\rangle_{c_1}}{\sqrt{2}} \right) |0\rangle_{c_2} + c_{111} |11\rangle_{c_1} |1\rangle_{c_2}, \\
 p_3 &= \frac{\rho_{22}^A + \rho_{66}^A}{2} + \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\rho_{22}^A - \rho_{66}^A)^2 + 4\rho_{26}^2},
 \end{aligned} \tag{20}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\Phi_4\rangle &= d_{100} \left( \frac{|10\rangle_{c_1} + |01\rangle_{c_1}}{\sqrt{2}} \right) |0\rangle_{c_2} + d_{111} |11\rangle_{c_1} |1\rangle_{c_2}, \\
 p_4 &= \frac{\rho_{22}^A + \rho_{66}^A}{2} - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\rho_{22}^A - \rho_{66}^A)^2 + 4\rho_{26}^2},
 \end{aligned} \tag{21}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\Phi_5\rangle &= |11\rangle_{c_1} |0\rangle_{c_2}, & p_5 &= \rho_{33}^A, \\
 |\Phi_6\rangle &= |00\rangle_{c_1} |1\rangle_{c_2}, & p_6 &= \rho_{44}^A.
 \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

The coefficients  $a_{000}$ ,  $a_{101}$ ,  $b_{000}$ ,  $b_{101}$ ,  $c_{100}$ ,  $c_{111}$ , and  $d_{100}$ ,  $d_{111}$  are known in terms of the matrix elements of  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$ . The probabilities  $p_i$  determine the entanglement distribution amongst the three qubits in the system. The states  $|\Phi_i\rangle$ ,  $i = 1$  to 4 are W-like states. The state  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$  is a mixture of W-like states. Alice can perform a controlled not gate on qubits  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  transforming the state into a mixture of GHZ like states.




FIG. 2: The global negativity  $N_G^B$ , linear entropy  $S_l$ , and negativity  $N_{PSDG}^B$ , versus  $\tau (= g\eta t)$  for  $s = 1.2$ .

## VI. THREE QUBIT MIXED STATE ENTANGLEMENT DYNAMICS

The global partial transpose [9] of  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$  with respect to sub-systems,  $A_1$ ,  $A_2$ , or  $B$  is obtained by using the relations

$$\begin{aligned} \langle i_1 i_2 i_3 | \rho_G^{T_{A_1}}(\tau) | j_1 j_2 j_3 \rangle &= \langle j_1 i_2 i_3 | \hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) | i_1 j_2 j_3 \rangle, \\ \langle i_1 i_2 i_3 | \rho_G^{T_{A_2}}(\tau) | j_1 j_2 j_3 \rangle &= \langle i_1 j_2 i_3 | \hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) | j_1 i_2 j_3 \rangle, \\ \langle i_1 i_2 i_3 | \rho_G^{T_B}(\tau) | j_1 j_2 j_3 \rangle &= \langle i_1 i_2 j_3 | \hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) | j_1 j_2 i_3 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

The  $K$ -way partial transpose ( $K = 2, 3$ ) of tri-partite state  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}$  with respect to subsystem  $A_1$  is constructed by applying the following constraints:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle i_1 i_2 i_3 | \rho_K^{T_{A_1}} | j_1 j_2 j_3 \rangle &= \langle j_1 i_2 i_3 | \hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B} | i_1 j_2 j_3 \rangle, \quad \text{if } \sum_{m=1}^N (1 - \delta_{i_m, j_m}) = K, \\ \langle i_1 i_2 i_3 | \hat{\rho}_K^{T_{A_1}} | j_1 j_2 j_3 \rangle &= \langle i_1 i_2 i_3 | \hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B} | j_1 j_2 j_3 \rangle \quad \text{if } \sum_{m=1}^N (1 - \delta_{i_m, j_m}) \neq K, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where  $\delta_{i_m, j_m} = 1$  for  $i_m = j_m$ , and  $\delta_{i_m, j_m} = 0$  for  $i_m \neq j_m$ .

We also define the partial transpose [13]  $\rho_2^{T_{A_1 - A_1 A_2}}$ , involving only the pair of subsystems  $A_1 A_2$ , as

$$\langle i_1 i_2 i_3 | \rho_2^{T_{A_1 - A_1 A_2}}(\tau) | j_1 j_2 i_3 \rangle = \langle j_1 i_2 i_3 | \hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) | i_1 j_2 i_3 \rangle,$$

and for all the matrix elements with  $i_3 \neq j_3$

$$\langle i_1 i_2 i_3 | \rho_2^{T_{A_1 - A_1 A_2}}(\tau) | j_1 j_2 j_3 \rangle = \langle i_1 i_2 i_3 | \hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau) | j_1 j_2 j_3 \rangle.$$

The partial transposes  $\rho_2^{T_{A_1 - A_1 B}}(\tau)$  and  $\rho_2^{T_{B - A_2 B}}(\tau)$  are defined likewise. Negativity of  $\rho^{T_p}$  is defined as

$$N^p = \frac{1}{d_p - 1} (\|\rho^{T_p}\| - 1) = \frac{2}{d_p - 1} \sum_i |\lambda_i^-|, \quad (25)$$




FIG. 3: The negativity  $N_{PSDG}^{A_1}$ ,  $E_{PSD}^{A_1 A_2}$ , and  $E_{PSD}^{A_1 A_1 B}$  versus  $\tau (= g\eta t)$  for  $s = 1.2$ .

where  $\|\rho^{T_p}\|$  and  $\lambda_i^-$  are the trace norm and negative eigen values of  $\rho^{T_p}$ , respectively. For a state having  $p^{th}$  subsystem separable, the value of  $N_G^p$  is zero, whereas in case the  $p^{th}$  subsystem is part of a maximally entangled state  $N_G^p = 1$ . The global negativity [9] of partial transpose of  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$  with respect to  $B$  is found to be

$$N_G^B = \frac{-2}{d_p - 1} (\lambda_1^- + \lambda_2^-),$$

where

$$\lambda_1^- = \left( \frac{\rho_{33}^{BA_1 A_2} + \rho_{55}^{BA_1 A_2}}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\rho_{33}^{BA_1 A_2} - \rho_{55}^{BA_1 A_2})^2 + 4(\rho_{26}^{BA_1 A_2})^2},$$

if

$$(\rho_{33}^{BA_1 A_2} + \rho_{55}^{BA_1 A_2}) < \sqrt{(\rho_{33}^{BA_1 A_2} - \rho_{55}^{BA_1 A_2})^2 + 4(\rho_{26}^{BA_1 A_2})^2},$$

and zero otherwise. Similarly

$$\lambda_2^- = \left( \frac{\rho_{22}^{BA_1 A_2} + \rho_{44}^{BA_1 A_2}}{2} \right) - \frac{1}{2} \sqrt{(\rho_{22}^{BA_1 A_2} - \rho_{44}^{BA_1 A_2})^2 + 4(\rho_{15}^{BA_1 A_2})^2},$$

if

$$(\rho_{22}^{BA_1 A_2} + \rho_{44}^{BA_1 A_2}) < \sqrt{(\rho_{22}^{BA_1 A_2} - \rho_{44}^{BA_1 A_2})^2 + 4(\rho_{15}^{BA_1 A_2})^2},$$

and  $\lambda_2^- = 0$ , if

$$(\rho_{22}^{BA_1 A_2} + \rho_{44}^{BA_1 A_2}) \geq \sqrt{(\rho_{22}^{BA_1 A_2} - \rho_{44}^{BA_1 A_2})^2 + 4(\rho_{15}^{BA_1 A_2})^2}.$$






FIG. 4: The negativity  $N_{PSDG}^B$ , and  $E_{PSD}^{B-A_1}$  versus  $\tau (= g\eta t)$  for  $s = 1.2$ .

The reduced state operator for qubit  $B$  is given by

$$\hat{\rho}^B(\tau) = \text{Tr}_{A_1 A_2} (\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)).$$

The purity of a state in Hilbert space of dimension  $d$  is measured by the linear entropy defined as

$$S_l(\rho) = \frac{d}{d-1} (1 - \text{tr}(\rho^2)).$$

The linear entropy is zero for a pure state and one for a maximally mixed state. Calculated  $S_l^B(\hat{\rho}^B(\tau))$  and  $N_G^B$  are shown as a function of parameter  $\tau (=gt)$  in Figure (2) for  $s = 1.2$  and  $\theta = \pi$ . We notice that for certain ranges of parameter  $\tau$ ,  $\rho_G^{TB}$  is found to be positive while  $S_l^B$  value indicates that the state is entangled. It is well known that the global negativity fails to detect bound entanglement of mixed states. Using pure state decomposition ( $PSD$ ) of  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$  given by Eq. (17), we calculate

$$N_{PSDG}^p(\hat{\rho}) = \sum_i p_i N_G^p(\hat{\rho}_i),$$

where  $p$  stands for one of the three qubits and subscript  $PSDG$  refers to global negativity calculated for a pure state decomposition. In ref. [10] the convex roof extension of global negativity ( $CRE$ ) has been shown to be an entanglement monotone capable of detecting bound entanglement. The convex roof extension of negativity for a mixed state is defined as

$$N_{CRE}^p(\hat{\rho}) = \min \left( \sum_i p_i N_G^p(\hat{\rho}_i) \right),$$

where  $\hat{\rho}_i = |\Psi_i(\tau)\rangle \langle \Psi_i(\tau)|$ ,  $|\Psi_i\rangle$  being the eigenvector of  $\hat{\rho}$  corresponding to eigenvalue  $p_i$ . The negativity  $N_{PSDG}^p(\hat{\rho})$ , satisfying the relation

$$N_{PSDG}^p(\hat{\rho}) \geq N_{CRE}^p(\hat{\rho}),$$

is not an entanglement monotone, but serves to detect bound entanglement. For the state of Eq. (17),  $N_3^p(\hat{\rho}_i) = 0$  that is the state does not have genuine tripartite entanglement. Genuine tripartite entanglement refers to tripartite




FIG. 5: The pure state decomposition negativities  $N_{PSDG}^{A_1}$ ,  $N_{PSDG}^B$ ,  $E_{PSD}^{A_1 A_2}$ , and  $E_{PSD}^{A_1 B}$  versus  $s$  for  $\tau = 14.5 (= g\eta t)$

entanglement due to correlations similar to those present in a three qubit GHZ-like state. Loss of a single qubit destroys this type of entanglement completely, leaving no residual entanglement. The tripartite entanglement of the state  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$  is due to two qubit coherences because  $N_G^p(\hat{\rho}_i) = N_2^p(\hat{\rho}_i)$  for all  $\hat{\rho}_i$ . We further split  $N_{PSDG}^B(\hat{\rho})$  as

$$N_{PSDG}^B(\hat{\rho}) = E_{PSD}^{B-BA_1}(\hat{\rho}) + E_{PSD}^{B-BA_2}(\hat{\rho}),$$

where partial negativity  $E_{PSD}^{B-BA_1}(\hat{\rho})$  or  $E_{PSD}^{B-BA_2}(\hat{\rho})$ , associated with pure state decomposition, is defined as

$$E_{PSD}^{B-BA}(\hat{\rho}) = \sum_i p_i \sum_{\mu} \langle \Phi_{\mu,i}^- | (\hat{\rho}_i)_{2^{B-BA}}^T | \Phi_{\mu,i}^- \rangle,$$

where  $\Phi_{\mu,i}^-$  is the  $\mu^{th}$  eigenvector corresponding to negative eigenvalue  $\lambda_{\mu,i}$  of the partial transpose  $((\hat{\rho}_i)_G^T)^{T_B}$ . The eigenvalues and eigenvectors of  $\hat{\rho}^{A_1 A_2 B}(\tau)$  are used to calculate numerically the negativity  $N_{PSDG}^B(\hat{\rho})$ , and partial negativities  $E_{PSD}^{B-BA_1}(\hat{\rho})$ , and  $E_{PSD}^{B-BA_2}(\hat{\rho})$ . We notice that  $N_{PSDG}^B(\hat{\rho})$ , also plotted in Figure (2), detects bound entanglement. Figure (3) displays  $N_{PSDG}^{A_1}(\hat{\rho}) = N_{PSDG}^{A_2}(\hat{\rho})$ ,  $E_{PSD}^{A_1-A_1A_2}(\hat{\rho})$ , and  $E_{PSD}^{A_1-A_1B}(\hat{\rho})$  versus parameter  $\tau$  for  $s = 1.2$  and  $\theta = \pi$ . The negativity  $N_{PSDG}^B(\hat{\rho})$ , and  $E_{PSD}^{B-BA_1}(\hat{\rho}) = E_{PSD}^{B-BA_2}(\hat{\rho})$  are plotted in figure (4).

The calculated negativities  $N_{PSDG}^{A_1}(\hat{\rho})$ ,  $N_{PSDG}^B(\hat{\rho})$ ,  $E_{PSD}^{A_1-A_1B}(\hat{\rho})$  and  $E_{PSD}^{A_1-A_1A_2}(\hat{\rho})$  versus squeeze parameter  $s$  at  $\tau = 14.5$  for  $\theta = \pi$ , are shown in Fig. (5). The decrease in the probability of finding the cavities in vacuum state with increase in the value of  $s$  results in an increase in the probability of finding the system in an entangled state. The peak value of  $N_{PSDG}^B(\hat{\rho})$  occurs for  $s = 0.95$  while  $N_{PSDG}^{A_1}(\hat{\rho})$  is maximized at  $s = 1.04$ . We have selected  $s = 1.2$  as the squeeze parameter for the reason that the probability of finding the qubits  $A_1$ , and  $A_2$  in entangled state is appreciable for this choice.

## VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have studied the entanglement generation through interaction of squeezed light, shared by two remote cavities, with two atoms in cavity  $c_1$  and a single atom in cavity  $c_2$ . No direct interaction amongst the atoms takes place. Analytical expressions for the matrix elements of the three atom mixed state as a function of atom-field coupling strength and interaction time, are obtained. The decrease in the probability of finding the cavities in vacuum state

with increase in the value of squeeze parameter  $s$  results in an increase in the probability of finding the system in an entangled state. Numerical calculations to study the dynamics of three atom entanglement show the qubit pair  $A_1A_2$  in Bell-like state entangled to remote qubit  $B$ . From the reduced state operators for three atom system, the linear entropy is calculated and compared with negativities of partially transposed state operators as well as negativities calculated from the pure state decomposition of the state operator. The bound entanglement of the mixed state is not detected by the global negativity, however, the negativity  $N_{PSDG}^B(\hat{\rho})$  calculated from the pure state decomposition of the state operator detects the bound entanglement. The degree of entanglement depends on the squeeze parameter as well as the coefficient of reflection of the beam splitter. For  $\tau = 14.5$ , the pure state decomposition negativity is seen to be maximum for qubit  $A_1$  when  $s = 1.04$ , whereas the peak value of  $N_{PSDG}^B(\hat{\rho})$  occurs for  $s = 0.95$ . A higher value of squeeze parameter,  $s = 1.2$ , has been selected to study the entanglement dynamics of the system since the probability of finding the qubits  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  in entangled state is higher than that for  $s = 1.04$ . The partial negativities calculated by selective partial transposition of the three atom mixed state detect the pairwise entanglement of qubit pairs  $A_1B$ ,  $A_2B$ , and  $A_1A_2$ . The entanglement of three atoms is found to be W-like, no GHZ like quantum correlations being generated. It is well known, however, that a GHZ state can be distilled from a W-like tripartite state, by local operations and classical communication. The advantage of having qubits  $A_1$  and  $A_2$  in Bell-like entangled state is that the entanglement between qubits  $A_1$  and  $B$  can be enhanced through local operations on qubit  $A_2$ . The entangled states, generated in the scheme proposed here, can be used for implementing quantum communication protocols and for quantum computation.

### A. Acknowledgements

Financial support from Capes, Fundação araucaria and FAEP-UEL, Brazil is acknowledged.

- 
- [1] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 661 (1991).
  - [2] D. Bouwmeester, A. Ekert, and A. Zeilinger, The Physics of Quantum Information (Berlin: Springer) (2000).
  - [3] W. Son, M. S. Kim, J. Lee, and D. Ahn, J. Mod. Opt. 49, 1739 (2002).
  - [4] K. Zyczkowski, P. Horodecki, A. Sanpera, and M. Lewenstein, Phys. Rev. A 58, 883 (1998).
  - [5] G. Vidal, J. Mod. Opt. 47, 355 (2000).
  - [6] J. Eisert, PhD thesis (University of Potsdam, February 2001).
  - [7] A. Peres Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 1413(1996).
  - [8] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A 223, 1(1996).
  - [9] G. Vidal and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. Vol. 65, 032314 (2002).
  - [10] S. Lee, D. P. Chi, S. D. Oh, J. Kim, Phys. Rev. A68 062304 (2003).
  - [11] S. S. Sharma, and N. K. Sharma, Phys. Rev. A 76, 012326 (2007).
  - [12] S. S. Sharma, and N. K. Sharma, Phys. Rev. A 77, 042117 (2008).
  - [13] S. S. Sharma, and N. K. Sharma, arXiv:0806.0887v1[quant-ph].
  - [14] Tavis and F.W. Cummings, Phys. Rev. 170, 379 (1968).