

Entanglement of a mixed state of two qubit system

L. Chotorlishvili

Institute for Physik, Universitat Augsburg, 86135 Augsburg, Germany

Abstract

Interaction with environment may lead to the transition of quantum system from pure state to the mixed one. In this case, the problem of definition of entanglement may arise. In particular, quantitative measure of entanglement concurrence is introduced differently for pure and mixed states. To solve this problem, alternative definition of concurrence of mixed states is introduced in present work. In particular, concurrence of mixed states is determined as an average of pure states concurrences. Averaging is carried out over the quantum ensemble, corresponding to all possible realization of random variable.

PACS numbers: 0367.Mn.89.70.+c

When studying complex quantum systems, characteristics, related to the correlation of quantum states, often manifest themselves. This leads to necessity of introduction and consideration of entangled states. The first attempts to analyze characteristics of entangled states were made by Einstein [1] and Schrödinger [2] in the 30-th of the 20- century. In spite of traditional fundamental significance of entangled state, the present splash of interest is motivated by possible application to the new physical problems. In recent years entangled states have become important concept of new applied disciplines such as quantum cryptography [3], quantum theory of information [4], and physics of quantum computation [5]. It is well known, that entanglement is a specific quantum form of correlation, which, however, possesses a number of essential differences from classical correlations [6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14]. That is why, it describes exclusively a state of quantum mechanical system and defuse classical description. Entanglement of spin systems is of special interest [15, 16]. This kind of problems arise in the field of Cavity Quantum Electrodynamics (CQED) [17, 18, 19] for example. This field, in its turn, is one of the promising trends for quantum computing [20, 21]. As is known [6], quantum correlations are connected with coherent superposition states of compound quantum systems. That is why, the first simplest definitions of entangled states were introduced for pure quantum mechanical states [6]. In particular, it turned out, that quantum correlation could be described with the aid of concurrence. Concurrence was originally introduced as an auxiliary quantity, used to calculate the entanglement of formation of 2×2 systems. However, concurrence can also be considered as an independent entanglement measure [24, 26]. The original definition of concurrence for bipartite two-level systems is given in terms of a special basis [6]:

$$|e_1\rangle = |\Phi^+\rangle, \quad |e_2\rangle = i|\Phi^-\rangle, \quad |e_3\rangle = i|\Psi^+\rangle, \quad |e_4\rangle = |\Psi^-\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $|\Phi^\pm\rangle = (|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\Psi^\pm\rangle = (|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ are the Bell states [5]. Using this particular basis, the concurrence of a pure state $|\Psi\rangle$ is defined as:

$$C(\Psi) = \left| \sum_i \langle e_i | \Psi \rangle^2 \right|. \quad (2)$$

The value of $C(\Psi)$ determines the existence of quantum correlation in the system . in particular the condition $C(\Psi) = 0$ corresponds to the absence of correlation. The maximum value of concurrence is reached for Bell states and is equal to $C(e_j) = \left| \sum_i \langle e_i | e_j \rangle^2 \right| = 1$. But pure entangled states are only the simplest case of quantum correlated systems. Generalization

of introduced concepts and characteristics, for the case of mixed states, is non trivial and often equivocal. Formally, entanglement of mixed state is determined as minimal average value of entanglement of ensemble of pure states, that realize the given mixed state. The concurrence of mixed states is given by [22]:

$$C_{mixed}(\rho) = \inf_{\{P_i, \Psi_i\}} \sum_i P_i C(\Psi_i), \quad (3)$$

where

$$\rho = \sum_i P_i |\Psi_i\rangle \langle \Psi_i|, \quad P_i > 0. \quad (4)$$

Formula (3) makes it possible to compute concurrence of mixed states for arbitrary states of two qubits system. In particular, as was shown in [22, 23]

$$C_{mixed}(\rho) = \max\{0, -\lambda_1, -\lambda_2, -\lambda_3, -\lambda_4\} \quad (5)$$

where λ_i are the eigenvalues, in decreasing order, of the Hermitian matrix $R \equiv \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho} \tilde{\rho} \sqrt{\rho}}$ and $\tilde{\rho} = (\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y) \rho^* (\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y)$. But as we have noted definition of concept of entanglement for mixed state is not trivial. When studying non-stationary dynamics of chaotic quantum mechanical systems, subjected to the action of environment, the following scenario may be realized: At the initial moment of time $t = 0$, the system being in the pure quantum mechanical state, during time evolution performs irreversible transition to mixed state [24, 25]. In this case, is not clear which definition (2) or (3) needs to be applied. Since, at the different moments of time, system is in different states. In this work we shall try to introduce alternative, more adequate for non-stationary chaotic systems, definition of concurrence. With that end in view we shall consider generalized Jaynes-Cummings model, introduced in the work [26]. This model describes a system of two interacting qubits, under the action of cavity field. Mixed state is formed due to the averaging over quantum ensemble corresponding to all possible realizations of stochastic parameter. As it will be shown below, random trajectory of a system plays a role of this parameter. It should also be noted, that the values of mixed state parameters P_i in (4) are determined exactly in our case. That is why we can not consider them as free parameters, with respect to which the expression (3) should be minimized (As requires common definition of concurrence of mixed states [6]). This is one more confirmation of necessity of introduction of alternative definition of concurrence for non-stationary chaotic systems. As we have noted, the system we are interested in, presents

itself the generalized Jaynes-Cummings model for the case of two interacting two-level atoms [26]. The Hamiltonian of the problem under study has the following form:

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{H} &= \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2m} + \hat{H}_s + \hat{H}_{SB} + \hat{H}_B, \\ \hat{H}_S &= \omega_0(\hat{S}_1^z + \hat{S}_2^z) + \Omega(\hat{S}_1^+ \hat{S}_2^- + \hat{S}_1^- \hat{S}_2^+), \\ \hat{H}_{SB} &= -g(x)((\hat{S}_1^+ + \hat{S}_2^+) \hat{b} + (\hat{S}_1^- + \hat{S}_2^-) \hat{b}^+),\end{aligned}\tag{6}$$

where $\hbar = 1$, ω_0 is the Zeeman frequency of the spins located in the field inside the resonator, Ω is a constant of interaction between spins in frequency units, $\hat{S}_{1,2}^z$, $\hat{S}_{1,2}^\pm$ are spin operators of two-level atoms. The last term in (6) is the Hamiltonian of the field: $\hat{H}_B = \omega_f \hat{b}^+ \hat{b}$, \hat{b}^+ and \hat{b} are respectively the photon creation operator and the annihilation operator. As was shown in [26], due to nonlinear dependence of the interaction constant on the system's coordinate $g(x) = g_0 \cos(kx)$, dynamics has very complex and chaotic character. Time dependence $x(t)$ itself may be considered as random Wiener process. This makes a definite influence upon quantum mechanical time evolution of the system [25, 26]. As a result, the problem is reduced to the stochastic Schrödinger equation, having the following form in interaction representation:

$$i \frac{d|\hat{\Psi}(t)\rangle}{dt} = \hat{V}|\hat{\Psi}(t)\rangle,\tag{7}$$

where \hat{V} is a potential, stochasticity of which is provided by chaotic time dependence of the coordinate of the system $x(t)$:

$$\hat{V} = \Omega(\hat{S}_1^+ \hat{S}_2^- + \hat{S}_1^- \hat{S}_2^+) + \omega_f \hat{b}^+ \hat{b} - g_0 \cos(k_f x)((\hat{S}_1^+ + \hat{S}_2^+) \hat{b} + (\hat{S}_1^- + \hat{S}_2^-) \hat{b}^+)\tag{8}$$

Assume, that at the time zero ($t = 0$), the wave function represents itself the direct product of system and fields wave functions:

$$|\Psi(t = 0)\rangle = |\Psi_{system}\rangle \otimes |\Psi_{field}\rangle\tag{9}$$

. Here

$$\begin{aligned}|\Psi_{system}\rangle &= C_{00}|00\rangle + C_{01}|01\rangle + C_{10}|10\rangle + C_{11}|11\rangle, \\ |\Psi_{field}\rangle &= \sum_n W_n |n\rangle.\end{aligned}\tag{10}$$

Due to interaction (8), only following transitions between states are possible:

$$\begin{aligned}
|0, 0, n+1\rangle &\leftrightarrow |0, 1, n\rangle, & |0, 0, n+1\rangle &\leftrightarrow |1, 0, n\rangle \\
|0, 1, n\rangle &\leftrightarrow |1, 1, n-1\rangle, & |1, 0, n\rangle &\leftrightarrow |1, 1, n-1\rangle \\
|1, 0, n\rangle &\leftrightarrow |0, 1, n\rangle.
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

On the basis of equations (11), we shall search for the solution of equation (7) in the following form:

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_n C_{0,0,n+1}|0, 0, n+1\rangle + \sum_n C_{0,0,n}|0, 1, n\rangle + \sum_n C_{1,0,n}|1, 0, n\rangle + \sum_n C_{1,1,n-1}|1, 1, n-1\rangle. \tag{12}$$

Substituting Eq.(12) into Eq.(7) and taking into account Eq.(8), one can deduce system of differential equations, for time dependent coefficients of resolution of wave function. Corresponding calculations takes up a lot of space and for brevity we don't bring them here [26]. But here we note that, time dependence of the coefficients of wave function in (12) are determined by the functional:

$$Q[\omega(t)] = e^{i \int_0^t \omega(t') dt'} \tag{13}$$

where

$$\omega(t) = \sqrt{2(2n+1)}g_0 \cos(k_f x(t)). \tag{14}$$

On the other hand, as was shown in [25], because of the chaotic dynamics, $x(t)$ may be treated as a classical random process. In this case, for the determination of the systems state it is necessary to average the functional in (13) by all realizations of the stochastic variable $x(t)$. This leads to the transition of the system from pure state to the mixed one. Since non-diagonal matrix elements of density matrix [25, 26]:

$$\rho_{ijkl} = \rho_{system} \otimes \rho_{field} = C_{a_i n_j} \cdot C_{a_k n_l}^* \tag{15}$$

after statistical averaging, decays in time

$$\langle \rho \rangle \sim \langle e^{2i\Omega t} Q^{-1}[\omega(t)] \rangle = e^{2i\Omega t} \exp\left(-\frac{t}{2} \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{\alpha_0}} \text{Erf}(t\sqrt{\alpha_0})\right) \tag{16}$$

where $\text{Erf}(\dots)$ is an error function [27]. Thus the time of transition from pure to mixed state is completely determined by the width of autocorrelation function of random variable $x(t)$:

$$\langle x(t+\tau)x(t) \rangle = e^{-\alpha_0 \tau^2} \tag{17}$$

In the time interval $0 < t < \sqrt{\alpha_0/\pi}$, the state of the system may be considered as pure. The transition to mixed state takes place at $t > \sqrt{\alpha_0/\pi}$ [26]. In order to define level populations of the spin subsystem, we summarize all possible contributions from the different field states (12)

$$\begin{aligned} W(t, |11\rangle) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |C_{1,1,n-1}(t)|^2, & W(t, |10\rangle) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |C_{1,0,n-1}(t)|^2, \\ W(t, |01\rangle) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |C_{0,1,n-1}(t)|^2, & W(t, |00\rangle) &= \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |C_{0,0,n+1}(t)|^2, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Using Eq.(18), the wave function of spin subsystem may be presented in the following form:

$$|\Psi_{system}\rangle = \sqrt{W(t, |11\rangle)}|11\rangle + \sqrt{W(t, |01\rangle)}|01\rangle + \sqrt{W(t, |10\rangle)}|10\rangle + \sqrt{W(t, |00\rangle)}|00\rangle \quad (19)$$

Not, that quantities $W(t, |i, j\rangle)$ contain terms with random time dependence. But in time interval $0 < t < \sqrt{\alpha_0/\pi}$, the system is still in the pure state [26]. That is why, for determination of entanglement of spin system definition for pure states (2) should be used. Taking into account (19), we obtain:

$$C(|\Psi(t)\rangle_s) = 2|\sqrt{W(t, |11\rangle)W(t, |00\rangle)} - \sqrt{W(t, |01\rangle)W(t, |10\rangle)}| \quad (20)$$

After lapse of time $t > \sqrt{\alpha_0/\pi}$, random character of quantity $x(t)$ becomes of great importance. Therefore (20) should be averaged over all possible realizations of random variable.

In order to do this, one should replace the quantities $W(t, |i, j\rangle)$ by their statistically averaged values $\langle W(t, |i, j\rangle) \rangle$. Formation of mixed state in the system, is manifested in zeroing of time dependent interference terms in $\langle W(t, |i, j\rangle) \rangle$. Since this means also zeroing of non-diagonal matrix elements of the density matrix (16). As a result, statistically averaged concurrence of pure state $C(|\Psi(t)\rangle)$ will correspond to the concurrence of mixed state:

$$C_{mixed}(|\Psi(t > \sqrt{\alpha_0/\pi})\rangle) = \langle C_{pure}(|\Psi\rangle) \rangle \quad (21)$$

The expression (21) may be considered as alternative definition of concurrence of mixed states. As a result, after decay of interference terms $t \gg \sqrt{\alpha_0/\pi}$, we obtain:

$$C_{mixed} = 2|\sqrt{W_{11}W_{00}} - \sqrt{W_{01}W_{10}}|, \quad (22)$$

where

$$W_{ij} = \langle W(t > \sqrt{\alpha_0/\pi} |ij) \rangle$$

. Quantities W_{ij} are not arbitrary constants, by which the expression (22) needs to be minimized. This is principal difference of our definition (21) from the standard one (3). Standard definition has nothing to do with the mechanisms of formation of mixed state and implies all possible realizations of it. While, in our case mixed state is exactly defined by the features of the dynamic. Explicit expressions for W_{ij} were obtained in [26]. It turned out that quantities W_{ij} are expressed in terms of generalized hypergeometric functions and depend on average number of photons inside of cavity $W_{ij}(\bar{n})$.

$$\langle W(t, |1, 0\rangle) \rangle = \langle W(t, |0, 1\rangle) \rangle = \frac{C^2}{2} + \frac{C^2}{32} \left(12 - \frac{2}{\bar{n}} + \frac{\exp(\bar{n})\sqrt{\pi}(1-2\bar{n})^2 \text{Erfi}(\sqrt{\bar{n}})}{\bar{n}^{3/2}} \right), \quad (23)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle W(t, |1, 1\rangle) \rangle &= C^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} - \frac{\exp(-\bar{n})\sqrt{\pi} \text{Erfi}(\bar{n})}{4\bar{n}} \right) + \frac{C^2 \exp(-\bar{n})}{2} \left(\frac{1}{3}(3-2\bar{n}+\bar{n}^2) \cdot \right. \\ &\cdot F \left[\left\{ \frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{5}{2}, \frac{5}{2} \right\}, \bar{n} \right] \left. + \frac{C^2 \exp(-\bar{n})}{2} \left(\frac{1}{25}(13\bar{n}-2\bar{n}^2) F \left[\left\{ \frac{5}{2}, \frac{5}{2} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{7}{2}, \frac{7}{2} \right\}, \bar{n} \right] \right. \right. \\ &\left. \left. + \frac{3}{49}\bar{n}^2 F \left[\left\{ \frac{7}{2}, \frac{7}{2} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{9}{2}, \frac{9}{2} \right\}, \bar{n} \right] \right) \right), \quad (24) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle W(t, |0, 0\rangle) \rangle &= C^2 \left(\frac{1}{2} + \frac{\exp(-\bar{n})\sqrt{\pi} \text{Erfi}(\bar{n})}{4\bar{n}} \right) + \frac{C^2}{1058400\bar{n}^{3/2}} \cdot \\ &\cdot \left\{ 3075 [2\sqrt{\bar{n}}(-16\bar{n} + \exp(-\bar{n})(3-14\bar{n}-16\bar{n}^2)) - 3\sqrt{\pi}(1-2\bar{n})^2 \text{Erfi}(\sqrt{\bar{n}})] + \right. \\ &+ 32\bar{n}^{3/2} \left[33075\bar{n} F \left[\left\{ \frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right\}, \bar{n} \right] + 3675(12+5\bar{n}^2) F \left[\left\{ \frac{3}{2}, \frac{3}{2} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{5}{2}, \frac{5}{2} \right\}, \bar{n} \right] + \right. \\ &+ 27\bar{n} \left[147(14-2\bar{n}+\bar{n}^2) F \left[\left\{ \frac{5}{2}, \frac{5}{2} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{7}{2}, \frac{7}{2} \right\}, \bar{n} \right] - 50(12+\bar{n})\bar{n} F \left[\left\{ \frac{7}{2}, \frac{7}{2} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{9}{2}, \frac{9}{2} \right\}, \bar{n} \right] \right] + \\ &\left. \left. + 1225\bar{n}^3 F \left[\left\{ \frac{9}{2}, \frac{9}{2} \right\}, \left\{ \frac{11}{2}, \frac{11}{2} \right\}, \bar{n} \right] \right] \right\}. \quad (25) \end{aligned}$$

Explicit form of dependence $W_{ij}(\bar{n})$ gives us possibility to start from essentially quantum domain $\bar{n} \sim 1$ and see what happens in the semiclassical limit $W_{ij}(\bar{n})$. In other words, let us proof, how realistic the situation is.

In quasi-classical limit $\bar{n} \gg 1$, the form of coefficients is oversimplified [26].

$$W(t > \sqrt{\alpha_0/\pi}|11\rangle) = W(t > \sqrt{\alpha_0/\pi}|00\rangle) = W(t > \sqrt{\alpha_0/\pi}|10\rangle) = W(t > \sqrt{\alpha_0/\pi}|01\rangle). \quad (26)$$

As a consequence $C_{mixed}(\bar{n} \gg 1) = 0$. The absence of quantum correlations in quasi-classical limit proves correctness of definition (21).

-
- [1] A. Einstein, B., N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. v.47,p.777,(1935).
 - [2] E. Schrödinger, Naturwissenschaften 23,807 (1935).
 - [3] N. Gisin, G.Ribordy,W.Tittel, H.Zbinden, Rev. Mod. Phys. v.74,p.145, (2002)
 - [4] A.M.Childs, J.Preskill, J.Renes, J.Mod.Opt 47, 155, (2000).
 - [5] L.Amico, R,Fazio, A.Osterloh, V.Vedral, Rev.Mod. Phys. v.80, p.517,(2008).
 - [6] F. Mintert, A.Carvalho, M.Kus, A.Buchleitner, Phys, Rep. 415, 207 (2005)
 - [7] Jin-Liang Guo, He-Shan Song, J.Phys. A 41, 085302 (2008).
 - [8] C.H. Bennett, D.P. Divincenzo, Nature 404, 247 (2000).
 - [9] K.G. Schlegel, S. Förster, Phys. Lett.A 372, 3620 (2008).
 - [10] Xiao Qiang Su, An Min Wang Phys. Lett. A 369, 196 (2007).
 - [11] B.M. Garraway, S. Stenholm, J.Phys. A. 41, 075304 (2008).
 - [12] Yuanfeng Wang, Junpeng Cao, Yupeng Wang, Phys. Lett.A 342, 375 (2005).
 - [13] D. Tolkunov, V.Privman, P.K.Aravind, Phys. Rev. A 71, 060308(R)(2005).
D.Solenov, D. Tolkunov, V.Privman,Phys. Rev. B, 75,035134 (2007).
 - [14] F. Mintert, Phys.Rev. A75, 052302 (2007)
 - [15] S. Schenk, G.L. Ingold, Phys. Rev. A75, 022328 (2007)
 - [16] Xiang-Ting Liang, Phys.Lett. A,349,98 (2006).
 - [17] T. Aoki et al, Nature 443,671 (2006).
 - [18] H.Mabuchi and A. Doherty, Science, 298,1372 (2002)
 - [19] C.J. Hood et al., Science 287,1447 (2000).
 - [20] J. Raimond, M. Brune, S. Haroche, Rev. Mod. Phys. 73,565 (2001)
 - [21] Q.A. Turchette et al., Phys Rev. Lett. 75, 4710 (1995).
 - [22] W.K.Wootters, Phys.Rev.Lett.80 2245 (1998)

- [23] S.Hill, W.K.Wootters, Phys.Rev.Lett. 78,5022 (1997)
- [24] L.Chotorlishvili, V.Skrinnikov, Phys. Lett.A,372,761 (2008)
- [25] L. Chotorlishvili, Z.Toklikishvili, Phys. Lett.A, 372, 2806 (2008).
- [26] L.Chotorlishvili, Z. Toklikishvili Eur. Phys.J. D 47, 433 (2008)
- [27] Handbook of Mathematical Functions, National Bureau of standards, Applied Mathematical Series, 55 (U.S. Government Printing, Washington DC,1964).