

Entangling power of holonomic gates in atom-cavity systems

Vahid Azimi Mousolou^{1,2} and Erik Sjöqvist³

¹*Department of Mathematics, Faculty of Science,
University of Isfahan, Box 81745-163 Isfahan, Iran*

²*School of Mathematics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P. O. Box 19395-5746, Tehran, Iran*

³*Department of Physics and Astronomy, Uppsala University, Box 516, SE-751 20 Uppsala, Sweden*

Our goal is to provide a new approach to the construction of geometry-induced entanglement between a pair of Λ type atoms in a system consists of N identical atoms by means of nonadiabatic quantum holonomies. By employing the quantum Zeno effect, we introduce a tripod type interaction Hamiltonian between two selected atoms trapped in an optical cavity, which allows arbitrary geometric entangling power. This would be a substantial step toward resolving the feasibility of realizing universal nonadiabatic holonomic entangling two-qubit gates.

I. INTRODUCTION

Environment induced noise and decoherence is a great bane in realizing quantum computers. There are diverse theoretical proposals developed for physical implementations, which try to avoid noise completely or at least protect against the effect of noise. Decoherence free subspaces [1–3], dynamical decoupling [4, 5], noiseless subsystems [6, 7], topological [8, 9] and geometric [10–13] approaches, and quantum error-correction methods [14, 15] are among these proposals.

As one of the key approaches in achieving fault-tolerant quantum computation, geometric/holonomic quantum computation has caught a great deal of interest in recent years. Holonomic quantum computation was initially introduced in the adiabatic regime [10, 16–19] and subsequently developed for nonadiabatic processes [11–13, 20–22], the latter being compatible with the short coherence time of quantum bits (qubits). Nonadiabatic holonomic gates have been experimentally implemented in various physical settings, such as NMR [23, 24], superconducting transmon [25], NV centers in diamond [26–29]. Further feasible schemes have been established for nonadiabatic geometric processing with spin qubit systems [30], and pseudo-spin charge qubits [31]. Moreover, nonadiabatic holonomic quantum computation has been incorporated with decoherence free subspaces [32–39], noiseless subsystems [40], and dynamical decoupling [41]. Nonetheless, the construction of an externally controlled multipartite system with full entangling power for nonadiabatic holonomic processing is one of the main and challenging obstacles from a practical perspective.

In this paper, we discuss an atom-cavity system, which not only allows for combining two fault-tolerant methods in quantum computing, namely, decoherence-free subspaces and holonomic quantum processing, but also allows for full geometry-induced entangling power. The system we present here consists of separated three-level atoms placed at fixed positions inside an optical cavity, which can be implemented by using current technology. Taking the advantage of the quantum Zeno effect, we establish a tripod interaction in a decoherence-free sub-

space corresponding to two selected atoms in this cavity, each of which represents a qubit system. We then demonstrate that this tripod arrangement permits implementation of nonadiabatic holonomic two-qubit gates with arbitrary entangling power. The generic nature of the proposed scheme would help to overcome the practical challenges in realizing universal holonomic quantum information processing.

II. ATOM-CAVITY SYSTEM

The system we have in mind consists of N identical atoms, arranged in a line and trapped along the symmetry axis of an optical cavity so that each atom can be addressed individually (see Fig. 1). To create geometry-induced entanglement between atom pairs, we further assume that the selected atoms have fixed positions inside the cavity. Without loss of generality, we select the atoms fixed at the first and second position in the chain.

Each atom exhibits a three-level Λ -type structure, with the atomic ground states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ coupled to an excited state $|e\rangle$. The ground state levels $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ span a qubit state space. The atomic transitions $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |e\rangle$ and $|1\rangle \leftrightarrow |e\rangle$ are assumed to be in resonance with the field mode in the cavity. For simplicity, the atom-cavity coupling constant is taken to be g for all atoms. For no photon in the cavity mode, one finds that the computational states $|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle$ and the maximally entangled trapped state $|\alpha\rangle = (|1e\rangle - |e1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ of the two atoms span a decoherence-free subspace (DFS) with respect to cavity emissions [42].

In order to generate entanglement between the selected atoms, we introduce a mechanism to manipulate the states inside the above DFS by means of geometric phases. For this, we apply resonant laser pulses addressing each atom individually. The Rabi frequencies of the laser pulses inducing $|0^{(i)}\rangle \leftrightarrow |e^{(i)}\rangle$ and $|1^{(i)}\rangle \leftrightarrow |e^{(i)}\rangle$ transitions in atom $i = 1, 2$, are taken to be $\Omega_0^{(i)}$ and $\Omega_1^{(i)}$, respectively. These frequencies are generally complex-valued. Thus, the laser part of the conditional Hamilto-

nian that describes the dynamics of the system is given by

$$H_{\text{laser}} = \hbar \sum_{i=1}^2 \sum_{j=0}^1 \Omega_j^{(i)} |j^{(i)}\rangle \langle e^{(i)}| + \text{H.c.} \quad (1)$$




FIG. 1. (Color online) The upper panel shows a system of identical atoms arranged in a line and trapped along the symmetry axis of an optical cavity. The lower panel illustrates two selected Λ type atoms trapped in the cavity tuned with strength g on resonance with the $|1^{(i)}\rangle \leftrightarrow |e^{(i)}\rangle$, $i = 1, 2$, transitions. The desired tripod type interaction shown in Fig. 2 may be achieved by applying distinct laser pulses with tuned Rabi frequencies $\Omega_0^{(i)}$ and $\Omega_1^{(i)}$, respectively inducing $|0^{(i)}\rangle \leftrightarrow |e^{(i)}\rangle$ and $|1^{(i)}\rangle \leftrightarrow |e^{(i)}\rangle$ transitions in the corresponding atom $i = 1, 2$.

If the amplitude of the Rabi frequencies are much smaller than κ and g^2/κ , where κ is the decay rate of a single photon inside the resonator, then with the help of the environment-induced quantum Zeno effect, the system can be kept inside the DFS during the evolution of the system [42, 43]. In this regime, the effective Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \mathbf{P} H_{\text{laser}} \mathbf{P}, \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{P} is the projection operator on the DFS, leads to the following tripod configuration (see Fig. 2)

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} \left(-\Omega_0^{(1)} |01\rangle \langle \alpha| + \Omega_0^{(2)} |10\rangle \langle \alpha| \right. \\ \left. + (\Omega_1^{(2)} - \Omega_1^{(1)}) |11\rangle \langle \alpha| + \text{H.c.} \right), \quad (3)$$

where we have used the short-hand notation $|j^{(1)}k^{(2)}\rangle \equiv |jk\rangle$, $j, k = 0, 1$.

Solving the eigenvalue problem of H_{eff} , we obtain orthonormal eigenstates

$$|D_1\rangle = e^{-i\phi_2} \sin \theta |01\rangle + e^{-i\phi_1} \cos \theta |10\rangle, \\ |D_2\rangle = e^{-i\phi_3} \cos \varphi |x\rangle - \sin \varphi |11\rangle, \\ |B_{\pm}\rangle = \frac{|y\rangle \pm |\alpha\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad (4)$$




FIG. 2. (Color online) The conditional tripod interaction picture, where the atoms, the cavity mode as well as the environment-induced quantum Zeno effect are taken into account.

and corresponding eigenenergies $E_{D_1} = E_{D_2} = 0$, and $E_{B_{\pm}} = \pm \frac{\hbar\omega}{\sqrt{2}}$. Here,

$$\omega = \sqrt{|\Omega_0^{(1)}|^2 + |\Omega_0^{(2)}|^2 + |\Omega_1^{(2)} - \Omega_1^{(1)}|^2}, \\ \Omega_0^{(1)} = \omega e^{i\phi_1} \sin \varphi \cos \theta, \\ \Omega_0^{(2)} = \omega e^{i\phi_2} \sin \varphi \sin \theta, \\ \Omega_1^{(2)} - \Omega_1^{(1)} = \omega e^{i\phi_3} \cos \varphi, \\ |x\rangle = e^{i\phi_2} \sin \theta |10\rangle - e^{i\phi_1} \cos \theta |01\rangle, \\ |y\rangle = \sin \varphi |x\rangle + e^{i\phi_3} \cos \varphi |11\rangle. \quad (5)$$

These parameters are kept constant for the duration $[0, \tau]$ of the laser pulses, resulting in the time evolution operator of the DFS

$$\mathcal{U}(\tau, 0) = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^\tau H_{\text{eff}} dt} = |D_1\rangle \langle D_1| + |D_2\rangle \langle D_2| \\ + \cos a_\tau (|y\rangle \langle y| + |\alpha\rangle \langle \alpha|) \\ - i \sin a_\tau (|y\rangle \langle \alpha| + |\alpha\rangle \langle y|), \quad (6)$$

where $a_\tau = \frac{\omega\tau}{\sqrt{2}}$.

III. QUANTUM HOLONOMIES AND GEOMETRY-INDUCED ENTANGLEMENT

By choosing the run time $\tau = \sqrt{2}\pi/\omega$ such that $a_\tau = \pi$, the three dimensional subspace $\text{Span}\{|01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$ undergoes cyclic evolution in the four dimensional part $\text{Span}\{|01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle, |\alpha\rangle\}$ of the DFS, while the remaining two-qubit state $|00\rangle$ is fully decoupled. Moreover, along this evolution we would have

$$\mathcal{U}(t, 0) \mathbf{P}_c \mathcal{U}^\dagger(t, 0) H_{\text{eff}} \mathcal{U}(t, 0) \mathbf{P}_c \mathcal{U}^\dagger(t, 0) = 0 \quad (7)$$

for the projection $\mathbf{P}_c = |01\rangle \langle 01| + |10\rangle \langle 10| + |11\rangle \langle 11|$. In other words, the three dimensional subspace $\text{Span}\{|01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$ evolves along a loop \mathcal{C} in the Grassmannian $G(4, 3)$, i.e., the space of three dimensional subspaces of the four dimensional DFS, along which the dynamical phase vanishes [44]. It follows that

$$U(\mathcal{C}) = \mathbf{P}_c \mathcal{U}(\tau, 0) \mathbf{P}_c \quad (8)$$

is the nonadiabatic quantum holonomy of the loop \mathcal{C} in the Grassmannian $G(4, 3)$ [44].

It is instructive to compare the present scheme with the tripod-based single-qubit architecture for adiabatic geometric manipulation proposed in Ref. [17]. In addition to being based on adiabatic evolution, the loop corresponding to each geometric single-qubit gate in Ref. [17] resides in the Grassmannian $G(3, 2)$ since the qubit levels are encoded in the two dark states evolving in the three

dimensional space $\text{Span}\{|01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$.

Since the computational basis state $|00\rangle$ does not contribute to the dynamics described by the effective Hamiltonian in Eq. (3), it remains unchanged during the evolution. Therefore, the evolution results in the following two-qubit nonadiabatic holonomic gate

$$U = |00\rangle\langle 00| + U(\mathcal{C}), \quad (9)$$

which takes the following form in the computational ordered basis $\{|00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle\}$

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 - 2\sin^2\varphi \cos^2\theta & e^{-i\phi_{21}} \sin 2\theta \sin^2\varphi & e^{-i\phi_{31}} \sin 2\varphi \cos\theta \\ 0 & e^{i\phi_{21}} \sin 2\theta \sin^2\varphi & 1 - 2\sin^2\varphi \sin^2\theta & -e^{-i\phi_{32}} \sin 2\varphi \sin\theta \\ 0 & e^{i\phi_{31}} \sin 2\varphi \cos\theta & -e^{i\phi_{32}} \sin 2\varphi \sin\theta & -\cos 2\varphi \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

where $\phi_{lk} = \phi_l - \phi_k$, $l, k = 1, 2, 3$.

An important feature of the above two-qubit gate U is that it provides geometric gates with arbitrarily large entangling power. To see this, let us look at some entangling characteristics of U . Evaluating the local invariants [45], one obtains

$$\begin{aligned} G_1 &= -\sin^8\varphi \sin^4 2\theta, \\ G_2 &= \cos 2\varphi + 2\sin^2\varphi (\cos^2\varphi + \cos 4\theta \sin^2\varphi), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

which consequently results in the entangling power [46, 47]

$$\begin{aligned} e_p(U) &= \frac{2}{9}(1 - |G_1|) \\ &= \frac{2}{9}(1 - \sin^8\varphi \sin^4 2\theta). \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$




FIG. 3. (Color online) Entangling power, $e_p(U)$, of the two-qubit nonadiabatic holonomic gate U as a function of the control parameters θ and φ in a single period.

As shown in Fig. 3, a careful tuning of the laser pulses can provide any entangling power.

From Eqs. (11) and (12), one may note that the entangling nature of the gate U does not in general depend on the complex nature of the Rabi frequencies $\Omega_0^{(i)}$ and $\Omega_1^{(i)}$, $i = 1, 2$. Extracting the corresponding symmetry reduced geometric coordinate (c_1, c_2, c_3) of U on the Weyl chamber [48], which classifies non-local two-qubit gates, we have

$$(c_1, c_2, c_3) = \left(\frac{\pi}{2}, c, c\right), \quad (13)$$

where

$$c = \arcsin\left(2\left|\Omega_0^{(1)}\Omega_0^{(2)}\right|\omega^{-2}\right). \quad (14)$$

This indicates that the geometric gate U covers the whole equivalence classes of two-qubit gates along the line segment connecting the equivalence class of special perfect entanglers [CNOT], represented by the coordinate $(\frac{\pi}{2}, 0, 0)$, to the class of local gates represented by the coordinate $(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{2})$ on the Weyl chamber. Moreover, if the lasers are tuned so that

$$\left|\Omega_0^{(1)}\Omega_0^{(2)}\right| = \frac{\omega^2}{2\sqrt{2}}, \quad (15)$$

then the geometric gate U belongs to the equivalence class of perfect entanglers corresponding to the point $(\frac{\pi}{2}, \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{4})$ on the Weyl chamber. The entangling nature in fact depends on the absolute frequency ratios $\left|\Omega_0^{(2)}/\Omega_0^{(1)}\right|$ and $\left|(\Omega_1^{(2)} - \Omega_1^{(1)})/\omega\right|$. The gate U tends to the equivalence class of special perfect entanglers, denoted as [CNOT], with maximum entangling power of $\frac{2}{9}$, when $\left|\Omega_0^{(2)}/\Omega_0^{(1)}\right| \rightarrow 0, \infty$ or $\left|(\Omega_1^{(2)} - \Omega_1^{(1)})/\omega\right| \rightarrow 1$. Table I specifies some frequencies to achieve different class of entangling gates.

TABLE I. Entanglement characteristics of the geometric two-qubit entangling gate U for some specific frequencies

#	$(\Omega_0^{(1)}, \Omega_0^{(2)}, \Omega_1^{(2)} - \Omega_1^{(1)})$	G_1	G_2	$e_p(U)$	Weyl chamber coordinate
1	$(0, 0, \neq 0)$	0	1	2/9	$(\pi/2, 0, 0) = [\text{CNOT}]$
2	$(0, \neq 0, 0)$	0	1	2/9	$(\pi/2, 0, 0) = [\text{CNOT}]$
3	$(\neq 0, 0, 0)$	0	1	2/9	$(\pi/2, 0, 0) = [\text{CNOT}]$
4	$(0, \neq 0, \neq 0)$	0	1	2/9	$(\pi/2, 0, 0) = [\text{CNOT}]$
5	$(\neq 0, 0, \neq 0)$	0	1	2/9	$(\pi/2, 0, 0) = [\text{CNOT}]$
6	$(\neq 0, \neq 0, 0)$	$-\sin^4 2\theta$	$2 \cos 4\theta - 1$	$(2/9)(1 - \sin^4 2\theta)$	$(\pi/2, 2\theta, 2\theta), 0 < \theta \leq \frac{\pi}{4}$
7	$(\neq 0, \neq 0, \neq 0)$	$-\sin^8 \varphi$	$1 - 4 \sin^4 \varphi$	$\frac{2}{9}(1 - \sin^8 \varphi)$	$(\pi/2, c, c)$ $0 < c = \arcsin(\sin^2 \varphi) \leq \pi/2$

Note that the tripod configuration in Fig. 2 reduces to a two level interaction system for the three first upper cases in the table I. Therefore, in these cases, the loop \mathcal{C} would effectively reside in the Grassmannian $G(2, 1)$ and its corresponding nonadiabatic quantum holonomy given in Eq. (8) would describe only an Abelian nonadiabatic geometric phase [49]. However, in the other cases listed in the table, the tripod structure reduces to a three-level Λ structure, which would instead correspond to the effective loop \mathcal{C} reside in the Grassmannian $G(3, 2)$ and the accompanying non-Abelian quantum holonomy. In other words, Tab. I shows that perfect geometry-induced entanglement can be achieved through both Abelian and non-Abelian quantum holonomies in the above proposed interaction picture.

One may notice that the approach in Ref. [42] is a special example of the case listed in row four of the table I. The present work, in other words, is an expansion of the proposal in Ref. [42] introducing a wider class of entangling gates with more freedom in the choice of frequencies. Our analysis shows that nonadiabatic holonomies have full entangling power.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have followed the nonadiabatic geometric approach to study the entangling power of quantum holonomy in

an atom-cavity system. We have established a nonadiabatic holonomic manipulation of two decoherence-free qubits, described in terms of quantum Zeno effect in the study of a chain of identical atoms trapped in an optical cavity. We achieved arbitrary geometry-induced entangling power through the proposed nonadiabatic holonomic approach. Moreover, the proposed system benefits from both decoherence-free subspace and holonomic manipulation methods to gain robustness to decoherence effects and parameter noises, respectively, and to introduce an efficient way of entangling qubit systems. Our scheme is generic, scalable, and can be implemented in a wide range of atomic and ionic systems trapped in cavities [50, 51].

V. ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This work was supported by Department of Mathematics at University of Isfahan (Iran). V.A.M. acknowledges financial support from the Iran National Science Foundation (INSF) through Grant No. 96008297. E.S. acknowledges financial support from the Swedish Research Council (VR) through Grant No. 2017-03832.

-
- | | |
|--|--|
| <p>[1] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, Mod. Phys. Lett. B, 11, 1085 (1997).</p> <p>[2] D. A. Lidar, I. L. Chuang, and K. B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett., 81, 2594 (1998).</p> <p>[3] D. A. Lidar and K. B. Whaley, <i>Irreversible Quantum Dynamics</i>, edited by F. Benatti and R. Floreanini, Lecture Notes in Physics, Vol. 622 (Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, p. 83, 2003).</p> <p>[4] L. Viola and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. A, 58, 2733 (1998).</p> | <p>[5] L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett., 82, 2417 (1999).</p> <p>[6] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, Phys. Rev. Lett., 79, 3306 (1997).</p> <p>[7] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and L. Viola, Phys. Rev. Lett., 84, 2525 (2000).</p> <p>[8] M. H. Freedman, Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences, 95(1), 98 (1998).</p> <p>[9] A. Y. Kitaev, Annals of Phys, 303, 2 (2003).</p> |
|--|--|

- [10] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, *Phys. Lett. A*, **264**, 94 (1999).
- [11] W. Xiang-Bin and M. Keiji, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **87**, 097901 (2001).
- [12] S.-L. Zhu and Z. D. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **89**, 097902 (2002).
- [13] E. Sjöqvist, D. Tong, L. Andersson, B. Hessmo, M. Johansson, and K. Singh, *New J. Phys.*, **14**, 103035 (2012).
- [14] P. W. Shor, *Phys. Rev. A*, **52**, R2493(R) (1995).
- [15] A. M. Steane, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **77**, 793 (1996).
- [16] A. Ekert, M. Ericsson, P. Hayden, H. Inamori, J. A. Jones, D. K. L. Oi, and V. Vedral, *J. Mod. Opt.*, **47**, 2501 (2000).
- [17] L.-M. Duan, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, *Science*, **292**, 1695 (2001).
- [18] L. Faoro, J. Siewert, and R. Fazio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **90**, 028301 (2003).
- [19] P. Solinas, P. Zanardi, N. Zanghì, and F. Rossi, *Phys. Rev. B*, **67**, 121307(R) (2003).
- [20] S.-L. Zhu and Z. D. Wang, *Phys. Rev. A*, **67**, 022319 (2003).
- [21] S.-L. Zhu and Z. D. Wang, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **91**, 187902 (2003).
- [22] V. A. Mousolou, C. M. Canali, and E. Sjöqvist, *New J. Phys.*, **16**, 013029 (2014).
- [23] G. Feng, G. Xu, and G. Long, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **110**, 190501 (2013).
- [24] H. Li, Y. Liu, and G. Long, *Sci. China Phys. Mech. Astron.*, **60**, 080311 (2017).
- [25] A. A. Abdumalikov, J. M. Fink, K. Juliusson, M. Pechal, S. Berger, A. Wallraff, and S. Filipp, *Nature*, **496**, 482 (2013).
- [26] S. Arroyo-Camejo, A. Lazariév, S. W. Hell, and G. Balasubramanian, *Nat. Commun.*, **5**, 4870 (2014).
- [27] C. Zu, W.-B. Wang, L. He, W.-G. Zhang, C.-Y. Dai, F. Wang, and L.-M. Duan, *Nature (London)*, **514**, 72 (2014).
- [28] B. B. Zhou, P. C. Jerger, V. Shkolnikov, F. J. Heremans, G. Burkard, and D. D. Awschalom, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **119**, 140503 (2017).
- [29] Y. Sekiguchi, N. Niikura, R. Kuroiwa, H. Kano, and H. Kosaka, *Nature Photonics*, **11**, 309 (2017).
- [30] V. A. Mousolou, *Phys. Rev. A*, **96**, 012307 (2017).
- [31] V. A. Mousolou, *Europhys. Lett.*, **117**, 10006 (2017).
- [32] G. F. Xu, J. Zhang, D. M. Tong, E. Sjöqvist, and L. C. Kwek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **109**, 170501 (2012).
- [33] G. F. Xu and G. L. Long, *Sci. Rep.*, **4**, 6814 (2014).
- [34] Z.-T. Liang, Y.-X. Du, W. Huang, Z.-Y. Xue, and H. Yan, *Phys. Rev. A*, **89**, 062312 (2014).
- [35] Z.-Y. Xue, J. Zhou, and Z. D. Wang, *Phys. Rev. A*, **92**, 022320 (2015).
- [36] J. Zhou, W.-C. Yu, Y.-M. Gao, and Z.-Y. Xue, *Opt. Express*, **23**, 14027 (2015).
- [37] Z.-Y. Xue, J. Zhou, Y.-M. Chu, and Y. Hu, *Phys. Rev. A*, **94**, 022331 (2016).
- [38] P. Z. Zhao, G. F. Xu, Q. M. Ding, E. Sjöqvist, and D. M. Tong, *Phys. Rev. A*, **95**, 062310 (2017).
- [39] V. A. Mousolou, *Europhys. Lett.* (to appear), arxiv:1710.02281.
- [40] J. Zhang, L. C. Kwek, E. Sjöqvist, D. M. Tong, and P. Zanardi, *Phys. Rev. A*, **89**, 042302 (2014).
- [41] G. F. Xu and G. L. Long, *Phys. Rev. A*, **90**, 022323 (2014).
- [42] A. Beige, D. Braun, B. Tregenna, and P. L. Knight, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **85**, 1762 (2000).
- [43] A. Beige, D. Braun, and P. L. Knight, *New J. Phys.*, **2**, 22 (2000).
- [44] J. Anandan, *Phys. Lett. A*, **133**, 171 (1988).
- [45] Y. Makhlin, *Quantum Inf. Process.*, **1**, 243 (2002).
- [46] P. Zanardi, C. Zalka, and L. Faoro, *Phys. Rev. A*, **62**, 030301(R) (2009).
- [47] S. Balakrishnan and R. Sankaranarayanan, *Phys. Rev. A*, **82**, 034301 (2010).
- [48] J. Zhang, J. Vala, S. Sastry, and K. B. Whaley, *Phys. Rev. A*, **67**, 042313 (2003).
- [49] Y. Aharonov and J. Anandan, *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, **58**, 1593 (1987).
- [50] J. Pachos and P. Zanardi, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. B*, **15**, 1257 (2001).
- [51] M. D. Lukin, *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, **75**, 457 (2003).