

Bell-inequality test of spatial mode entanglement

Libby Heaney^{1,2} and Janet Anders³

¹*The School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, United Kingdom.*

²*Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, Singapore 117543, Singapore.*

³*Department of Physics and Astronomy, University College London, London WC1E 6BT, United Kingdom*

Experiments showing the violation of Bell inequalities have formed our belief that the world at its smallest is genuinely non-local. While many non-locality experiments use the first quantised picture, the physics of fields of indistinguishable particles, such as bosonic gases, is captured most conveniently by second quantisation. This implies the possibility of non-local correlations, such as entanglement, between modes of the field. In this paper we propose an experimental scheme that tests the theoretically predicted entanglement between modes in space occupied by *massive* bosons. Moreover, the implementation of the proposed scheme is capable of proving that the particle number superselection rule is not a fundamental necessity of quantum theory but a consequence of not possessing a distinguished reference frame.

Introduction - The powerful correlations of entanglement are a fundamental feature of quantum mechanical systems and an important resource for quantum information processing [1]. Experimental demonstrations of entanglement between pairs of single, localised particles, such as photons, have been achieved [2]. In many of these examples entanglement lives between the (discrete) internal degrees of freedom of the particles, such as spin or polarisation. Entanglement can also exist between (continuous) external degrees of freedom, such as position, for instance between individual ions in a chain that collectively follow a lattice mode [3]. Moreover, in continuous systems of indistinguishable particles the possibility arises for entanglement to exist between second quantised field modes [4], rather than between the particles themselves. One important choice of modes are spatial modes, since correlations stretching over space lie at the heart of phase transition effects, such as Bose-Einstein condensation (BEC). However, it is still disputed whether mode entanglement is as ‘genuine’ as discrete spin entanglement [5].

A number of works [6–9] investigate the presence of entanglement between spatial regions of massive bosonic quantum fields, establish sufficient conditions for when entanglement exists and link its existence to the spatial coherence present in the BEC at low temperatures. However, while these theoretical works give strong support for the existence of entanglement clear experimental evidence has so far been lacking. One way to experimentally confirm (bipartite) spatial mode entanglement is via a Bell-inequality test between two local parties, each having access to only one spatial region. To perform the test, each party has to measure their part in (at least) two different measurement settings. However, it was until now unresolved how to measure modes of a massive bosonic field in any other way than just the particle number basis (also known as Fock basis), refuting any experimental proof and promoting arguments that this kind of entanglement is not ‘real’ but just an artefact of the quantum statistics.

In this paper we solve this problem by uniting a number of ingredients from recent advances in theory and

experiment to establish an unambiguous experimental confirmation of spatial entanglement, should it ‘really’ exist. We consider a massive bosonic particle confined in some volume consisting of two spatial modes which are each guided coherently to two separated atomic beam-splitters, see Fig. 1. At the beam splitters additional reference states are mixed in that allow to change the basis of the spatial mode on demand. The beam splitter operation is an essential part as it introduces a reference frame allowing to circumvent the superselection rules for massive particles. After the beam splitting operation detectors measure the number of atoms in each of the output modes and the correlations between several measurement outcomes are analysed in a Bell-inequality. Our results show that certain measurements settings can reveal entanglement of the spatial modes.

Entanglement between spatial modes - The energy modes of any quantum field, labeled by k , can be ‘excited’ by applying creation operators \hat{a}_k^\dagger , where $[\hat{a}_k, \hat{a}_l^\dagger] = \delta_{kl}$, on the vacuum state, $\hat{a}_k^\dagger|vac\rangle = |0_1 0_2 \dots 1_k 0_{k+1} \dots\rangle$. An excitation is called ‘a particle’, which can be a photon or a massive boson with corresponding quantised energy, $E_k = \hbar\omega_k$, where ω_k is the frequency of the k -th energy eigenmode. Instead of describing the system using its energy modes, one can use a different set of modes, such as the *spatial modes*. The description of the system in space can be obtained by a transformation via the energy eigenfunctions (for the non-interacting gas they are identical to the momentum modes),

$$\hat{a}_k^\dagger|vac\rangle = \int dx \phi_k(x) \hat{\psi}^\dagger(x) |vac\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $\phi_k(x)$ is the k -th energy eigenfunction and $\hat{\psi}^\dagger(x)$ creates a particle at point x in space. Populating an energy mode with one particle is therefore equivalent to populating all spatial modes, that is, all points in space, in a distributed manner. The occupation number of each spatial point, x , is $\hat{n}(x) = \hat{\psi}^\dagger(x)\hat{\psi}(x)$ with eigenvalues, $n(x) = 0, 1, 2, \dots$, for a bosonic field.

Let us divide space into two extended regions, A and B , see Fig. 1, and populate the box with a single par-




FIG. 1: A massive bosonic particle is distributed over a box, occupying, for example, the k -th energy eigenmode with spatial distribution, $\phi_k(x)$. Two parties each have access to a region of the box, A and B . Each party then coherently guides the boson from their region to a beamsplitter at which it meets a reference state. Two detectors measure the state after the beamsplitter for each party.

ticle in the k -th energy eigenmode, Eq. (1). General scenarios with more particles and multiple spatial modes are theoretically possible yet experimentally increasingly challenging. The pure state of the two spatial modes is a superposition of states with either one or zero particles in each spatial region,

$$|\psi\rangle = \hat{a}_k^\dagger |vac\rangle = \alpha |01\rangle_{AB} + \beta |10\rangle_{AB}, \quad (2)$$

where $|01\rangle_{AB}$ denotes a particle in region B and no particle in A and α and β are normalised complex coefficients. For general values of the coefficients this state can *not* be written as a product between the regions and is considered non-separable according to the mathematical definition of entanglement. However, for massive particles there are subtle issues regarding the physicality of this entanglement due to the existence of superselection rules.

Superselection rules - Classical correlations are fixed to a certain basis, for example two spin-1/2 particles can be perfectly classically correlated when measured locally in, say, their z -basis. However, entanglement permits correlations *independent* of the basis in which the system is measured locally. Perfect correlations can exist in both the z - and x -bases for entangled spins - an impossible property for any classical theory. For particles occupying modes, the number basis, $\{|0\rangle_z, |1\rangle_z\}$, is identified with the z -basis, implying that the x -basis would be a superposition of number states, i.e. $\{|0\rangle_x = \frac{|0\rangle_z + |1\rangle_z}{\sqrt{2}}, |1\rangle_x = \frac{|0\rangle_z - |1\rangle_z}{\sqrt{2}}\}$. The existence of superpositions of number states of massive particles is heavily debated [10, 11]. Unlike a spin state that can be rotated using an external reference frame, the magnetic field, spatial modes have

no such external ‘knob’. Rotating the number state $|0\rangle$ to a superposed state $(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ implies the creation of a massive particle some of the time - a physical impossibility for an isolated, non-relativistic system. This impossibility results in a *superselection rule* [10–12], stating that no coherent superposition of eigenstates of different mass can exist.

However, recent research shows that the particle number superselection rule is not fundamental as such [13–15] but depends on a suitable reference frame [13, 16]. To illustrate this point, consider an example superposition state, $|\theta\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + e^{i\theta}|1\rangle)$, of different particle numbers, where $e^{i\theta}$ is a phase defined with respect to a background reference. Without a background reference, the state would become an incoherent average over all possible orientations of the phase, $\int_0^{2\pi} d\theta |\theta\rangle\langle\theta| = \frac{1}{2}|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle\langle 1|$. This state has lost its quantum properties and is now a classically mixed state of different, fixed particle numbers.

To maintain superpositions of massive particles despite the superselection rule we introduce a BEC as a local reference, similar to a local oscillator in a homodyne measurement. The BEC firstly tracks the relative phase of the quantum state of the system. Secondly, the BEC must be treated as an *internal* dynamical object, since this allows particles to be locally exchanged between the BEC and system, which enables coherent rotations to bases other than the particle number basis.

Bell-inequality test of spatial entanglement - The use of a reference frame provides the tools to enable standard protocols, such as entanglement swapping [17] and teleportation [18], using spatially entangled states. It also opens the possibility to perform a Bell-inequality test for spatial entanglement of massive bosons. Bell introduced his inequality [19] to argue against the existence of non-locality in classical physics. The inequality limits the maximum correlations a joint system can contain under the assumption that the outcomes of the measurements can be locally assigned, prior to the measurement. In practice, one tests a variation of Bell’s inequality proposed by Clauser-Horn-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) [20], with a joint system shared between two (arbitrarily separated) parties, A and B , and is measured locally by both parties in one of two settings. In any classical (local, realistic) theory, the four joint expectation values of the measurements, $E(\theta_i^A, \theta_j^B)$, with $|E(\theta_i^A, \theta_j^B)| \leq 1$ for A measuring in setting θ_i^A and B measuring in setting θ_j^B for $i, j = 1, 2$, obey the CHSH inequality

$$C = |E(\theta_1^A, \theta_1^B) + E(\theta_1^A, \theta_2^B) + E(\theta_2^A, \theta_1^B) - E(\theta_2^A, \theta_2^B)| \leq 2. \quad (3)$$

Many entangled quantum states fail to obey this inequality and therefore defy local realism. This has been consistently verified in a number of experiments of improving accuracy [2, 21–23]. For any theoretical model of entanglement it is desirable to experimentally confirm entanglement by its unusual property of violating a Bell-inequality.

We now calculate the expected value of C for the simplest example of spatial entanglement, i.e. equation (2) describing a single boson in a single energy eigenmode of some confining volume. This could be a uniform three-dimensional box or a cigar-shaped harmonic trap. The confining volume is divided into two spatial modes which are individually fed into two atomic wave guides. Each spatial mode, A for Alice and B for Bob, can be measured in a rotated basis by using an interference set up in which it meets a reference state with a particular phase, $|\theta^{A(B)}\rangle$, on a 50:50 beamsplitter, see Fig. 1. For instance, Alice's beamsplitter mixes her mode, \hat{a} , with a reference state in mode, \hat{x}_A , through the transformations, $\hat{a} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{d} + \hat{c})$ and $\hat{x}_A = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\hat{d} - \hat{c})$ and likewise for Bob. This mixing facilitates the local exchange of particles between the reference and system. Furthermore, Alice and Bob both need to choose between their two measurement settings ($\theta_{1,2}^{A(B)}$) at random, which corresponds to changing the phase of the reference state by $\frac{\pi}{2}$. The phase of the reference states, $|\theta^{A(B)}\rangle$, is shifted by applying to it a laser pulse for a desired length of time, which acts differently on the number states, $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$.

After the beamsplitting operation Alice and Bob locally detect the arriving bosons in the output ports, \hat{c} , \hat{d} , \hat{C} and \hat{D} , and establish coincidences. Information is gained in the events that two of the detectors click once; one in the A -side and one on the B -side of the setup. From the joint probabilities of the suitable clicks one can deduce the expectation value of the measurements for all four settings as

$$E(\theta_j^A, \theta_k^B) = 2|\alpha| \sqrt{1 - |\alpha|^2} \cos(\gamma + \theta_j^A - \theta_k^B),$$

where γ is the phase of $\alpha\beta^*$ fixed by the symmetry of the populated eigenmode and $\theta_{j(k)}^{A(B)}$ for $j, k = 1, 2$ is the phase of Alice's or Bob's reference states. The quantity, C , Eq. (3), becomes $2\sqrt{2}$ for the optimal choice of the phases of the local measurements, $\theta_2^A = \theta_1^A + \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\theta_2^B = \theta_1^B - \frac{\pi}{2}$ and $\theta_1^B = \gamma + \theta_1^A + \frac{\pi}{4}$ and under the assumption of a symmetric split between A and B implying equal probability of finding the particle in either of the boxes, $|\alpha| = |\beta| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$. The violation of the inequality, Eq. (3), is achieved whenever $C > 2$, which can be verified experimentally.

Let us note that there are also click events not matching the prescribed pattern. These events measure the system in a basis not required for the Bell-inequality test and are thus disregarded from the experimental data. However, the full clicking pattern of the detectors builds up a tomography of the state, that, under the assumption of a correct theoretical model, allows the mathematical exact characterisation of its entanglement.

This expected behaviour of C is correct under the assumption that the state is of the pure form (2). However, preparing a single boson in a single energy mode cannot be achieved with perfection in an experiment. The state of the two regions will generally be mixed and can be




FIG. 2: The quantity C vs. mixing probability $0 \leq p \leq 1$ and for phase $d = \gamma_1 + \theta_1^A - \theta_1^B$ which can be chosen by the experimenter to give optimal violation. Here we have assumed $|\alpha_1|^2 = |\alpha_2|^2 = |\beta_1|^2 = |\beta_2|^2 = \frac{1}{2}$. Violation of the inequality is achieved whenever $C > 2$.

written in the diagonalised form

$$\rho_{AB} = p|\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_1| + (1-p)|\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_2|, \quad (4)$$

where the two states, $|\psi_1\rangle$ and $|\psi_2\rangle$, with coefficients, $\alpha_{1,2}$ and $\beta_{1,2}$, are orthogonal and the probability of mixing is $1 \geq p \geq 0$. The theoretical prediction for the Bell-inequality quantity, C , is shown in Fig. 2 detecting entanglement for mixing probabilities below $p \approx 0.15$ and appropriate phase difference, $\theta_1^A - \theta_1^B$.

The most promising implementation of a Bell-inequality test of a single massive particle would be via integrated elements (e.g beamsplitters and phase shifters [24, 25]) on an atomic chip [26]. However, although some recent progress has been made using microcavities on atomic chips [27–29], single atom detection, which is required for this scheme, is still considered technically challenging. The ability to extract two reference states, $|\theta\rangle$, from a reservoir BEC is also needed. One possible method is via an atomic quantum dot (AQD) coupled to the BEC [30]. For tightly confined AQDs, the large on-site interaction causes a collisional blockade, where only one or zero atoms can occupy the dot at any instance. By controlling couplings to the BEC, a perfectly coherent two-level system, of the form $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, where $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ represent no and one atom in the dot, is realised [30]. This is precisely the reference state that is required for the beamsplitting operations. If the reservoir BEC has a high average particle number, the reference state is separable with respect to the condensate and can be transferred into an atomic beamsplitter [25] by shifting the minimum of the confining laser.

Discussion and conclusions - In Bell-inequality tests it is essential to guarantee that no additional non-locality is introduced to the shared system during the test. For the present discussion, this could happen via the reference states that are used by both parties. The reference states can be generated from a reservoir BEC. If

the BEC is of *unfixed* particle number and is sufficiently dilute, it can be written as a convex combination of coherent states, $\hat{\rho} = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\theta |\alpha\rangle\langle\alpha|$, which is separable with respect to any spatial partitioning [6]. Therefore two reference states that are locally drawn from different regions of the BEC *cannot* become entangled. If, however, the BEC used for reference is not as diluted and experiences significant interactions between the particles, entanglement may emerge between the two reference states drawn from it and used by Alice and Bob and could consequently be the origin of the violation of the Bell-inequality. But this is precisely the type of entanglement that we are verifying with the setup proposed here. Whether the spatial entanglement originates from the reference BEC or from the actual system is irrelevant for the proof that non-locality appears between spatial regions. This is in contrast to the method proposed in a recent paper [31], addressing single photon entanglement, which uses initially independent reference states that become correlated only after the measurement has taken place.

In addition to ensuring that the non-locality only arises from entanglement between spatial regions, one should also take into consideration other loopholes associated with Bell-inequality tests. The most important two loopholes are the detection and locality loopholes. The detection loophole means that particles are not always detected in both arms of the setup, which in turn admits a local-hidden variable description of the experiment. Thus, efficient single atom detection is crucial for this scheme. Additionally, locality demands that the two arms of the setup are separated by distances great enough to avoid communication during the measurement, which is, in general, not possible with massive particles [23].

In this paper we have demonstrated that it should be possible to violate a Bell-inequality with two spatial field modes that are entangled as a result of a massive boson being coherently distributed between them. Prior to this paper it was unresolved how to measure the spatial

modes in any basis other than particle number, preventing a Bell-inequality test of spatial entanglement. Here we show that one can measure the spatial modes in different bases by locally mixing each spatial mode with a reference state at a beamsplitter. The role of the reference states is twofold. Firstly, since the reference states for both Alice and Bob are drawn from the same condensate, they act like a local oscillator that keeps track of the phase between each arm of the system. Secondly, the reference states allow one to circumvent the superselection rule for massive particles by locally exchanging bosons with the system. After the beamsplitter the number of atoms at the outputs are detected and the results are analyzed in a Bell-inequality. For certain measurement settings a maximum violation of the Bell-inequality is predicted.

Our scheme also serves as a test of whether superselection rules are fundamental, since if the Bell-inequality is violated, the reference frame must have played an indispensable role in the measurement process.

Theoretically it is straightforward to extend these results to volumes containing N particles [32]. However, devising a suitable experimental scheme would be technically very challenging as accurate number measurements of multiple atoms would be needed. Finally, this scheme has drawn light on how one could manipulate spatial entanglement for quantum information processing, if it is found to exist. This is particularly interesting, since if spatial entanglement does occur naturally in Bose gases, one may be able to harness it for other purposes, which would bypass the need to manually create other complicated entangled states. We expect future research to address these questions.

Acknowledgements.—We would like to acknowledge inspiring and fruitful discussions with V. Vedral. J.A. is supported by the EPSRC's QIPIRC programme. L. H. is grateful to EPSRC (UK) and the National Research Foundation (Singapore) for support.

-
- [1] Nielsen, M.A. and Chuang, I.L., *Quantum computation and quantum information*, Cambridge University Press (2000).
- [2] Aspect, A., Phys. Rev. Lett., **49** 1804 (1982).
- [3] Anders, J., Phys. Rev. A, **77** 062102 (2008).
- [4] Vedral, V., Cent. Euro. J. Phys., **2** 289 (2003).
- [5] Greenberger, D.M., Horne, M.A. and Zeilinger, A., *Quantum Interferometry*, F. DeMartini et al. (Eds.), VCH Publishers (1996).
- [6] Simon, Ch., Phys. Rev. A, **66** 052323 (2002).
- [7] Anders, J., Kaszlikowski, D., Lunkes, Ch., Ohshima, T. and Vedral, V., N. J. Phys., **8** 140 (2006).
- [8] Heaney, L., Anders, J., Kaszlikowski, D. and Vedral, V., Phys. Rev. A, **76** 053605 (2007).
- [9] Heaney, L., arXiv:0711.0942v1 (2007).
- [10] Wick, G. C., Wightman, A. S. and Wigner, E. P., Phys. Rev., **88** 101 (1952).
- [11] Giulini, D., Joos, E., Kiefer, C., Kupsch, J., Stamatescu, I.-O. and Zeh, H. D., *Decoherence and the appearance of the classical world in quantum theory*, Springer-Verlag (1996).
- [12] Giulini, D., arXiv:0710.1516v1 (2007).
- [13] Bartlett, S. D, Rudolph, T. and Spekkens, R. W., Rev. Mod. Phys., **79** 555 (2007).
- [14] Aharonov, Y. and Susskind, L., Phys. Rev., **155** 1428 (1967).
- [15] Mirman, R. Phys. Rev., **186** 1380 (1969).
- [16] Dowling, M. R., Bartlett, S. D., Rudolph, T. and Spekkens, R. W., Phys. Rev. A, **74** 052113 (2006).
- [17] Zukowski, M., Zeilinger, A., Horne, M. A. and Ekert, A. K., Phys. Rev. Lett., **71** 4287 (1993).
- [18] Bennett, C. H., Brassard, G., Crepeau, C., Jozsa, R.,

- Peres, A. and Wootters, W., Phys. Rev. Lett. **71** 1895 (1993).
- [19] Bell, J.S., Physics, **1** 195 (1964).
- [20] Clauser, J. F., Horne, M. A., Shimony, A and Holt, R. A., Phys. Rev. Lett., **23** 880 (1969).
- [21] Tittel, W., Brendel, H., Zbinden, H. and Gisin, N., Phys. Rev. Lett., **81** 3563 (1998).
- [22] Weihs, G., Jennewein, T., Simon, C., Weinfurter, H. and Zeilinger, A., Phys. Rev. Lett., **81** 3563 (1998).
- [23] Rowe, M. A., Kielpinski, D., Meyer, V., Sackett, C. A., Itano, W. M., Monroe, C., and Wineland D. J., Nature, **409** 791 (2001).
- [24] Cassettari, D., Hessmo, B., Folman, R., Maier, T. and Schmiedmayer, J., Phys. Rev. Lett., **85** 5483 (2000).
- [25] Cassettari, D., Chenet, A., Folman, R., Haase, A., Hessmo, B., P. Krueger, T. M., Schneider, S., Calarco, T. and Schmiedmayer, J., Appl. Phys. B: Lasers Opt., **70** 721 (2000).
- [26] Jozsef, Fortagh and Zimmermann, C., Rev. Mod. Phys., **79** 235 (2007).
- [27] Horak, P., Klappauf, B. G., Haase, A., Folman, R., Schmiedmayer, J., Domokos, P. and Hinds, E. A., Phys. Rev. A, **67**, 043806 (2003).
- [28] Haase, A. and Schmiedmayer, J., Opt. Lett., **31**, 268 (2006).
- [29] Teper, I., Lin, Y-J. and Vuletic, V., cond-mat/0603675v1.
- [30] Recati, A., Fedichev, P. O., Zwerger, W., Delft, J. von and Zoller, P., Phys. Rev. Lett., **94** 040404 (2005).
- [31] Cooper, J., Dunnigham, J., arXiv/0807.0109v1.
- [32] Son, W., Lee, J. and Kim, M., Phys. Rev. Lett., **96** 060406 (2006).