

Entanglement distribution in fermion model with long-range interaction

Long Xiong,¹ Yue-Xing Huang,¹ Yu-Chun Wu,^{1,2} Yong-Sheng Zhang,^{1,2} Guang-Can Guo,^{1,2} and Ming Gong^{1,2,*}

¹Key Lab of Quantum Information, Chinese Academy of Sciences, School of physics,
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, P.R. China

²Synergetic Innovation Center of Quantum Information and Quantum Physics,
University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, 230026, P.R. China

(Dated: March 22, 2022)

How two-party entanglement (TPE) is distributed in the many-body systems? This is a fundamental issue because the total TPE between one party with all the other parties, \mathcal{C}^N , is upper bounded by the Coffman, Kundu and Wootters (CKW) monogamy inequality, from which $\mathcal{C}^N \leq \sqrt{N-1}$ can be proved by the geometric inequality. Here we explore the total entanglement \mathcal{C}^∞ and the associated total tangle τ^∞ in a p -wave free fermion model with long-range interaction, showing that $\mathcal{C}^\infty \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ and τ^∞ may become vanishing small with the increasing of long-range interaction. However, we always find $\mathcal{C}^\infty \sim 2\xi\tau^\infty$, where ξ is the truncation length of entanglement, beyond which the TPE is quickly vanished, hence $\tau^\infty \sim 1/\xi$. This relation is a direct consequence of the exponential decay of the TPE induced by the long-range interaction. These results unify the results in the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick (LMG) model and Dicke model and generalize the Koashi, Buzek and Imono bound to the quantum many-body models, with much broader applicability.

Entanglement is essential for quantum information [1–4] and quantum computation [5–7]. In the many-body systems, entanglement can be distributed between two arbitrary parties, which hereafter will be named as two-party entanglement (TPE) [8–11]. In general, the long-range interaction is required for long-distance TPE [12–15]. However, the monogamy of entanglement from the Coffman, Kundu, Wootters (CKW) conjecture restricts the total entanglement shared between one party with all the other parties with [10, 11, 16–18]

$$\tau^N := \sum_{i \neq 1}^N \tau(\rho_{A_1, A_i}) \leq \tau(\rho_{A_1 | A_2 A_3 \dots A_N}), \quad (1)$$

where the N qubits are denoted by A_i , with the density matrix is denoted by $\rho_{A_1, A_2, \dots, A_N}$. This inequality also holds in all multimode Gaussian states [19, 20]. Here the tangle is given by $\tau(\rho) = \mathcal{C}^2(\rho)$, where \mathcal{C} is the two-party concurrence [10]. The right-hand side of the inequality is bounded from above by $\tau(\rho_{A_1 | A_2 A_3 \dots A_N}) \leq 1$, which is the maximum entropy of a single particle density matrix measured for A_1 . This inequality is tight and can be satisfied by some pure states (such as the W states); see [17, 21–24]. By the geometric inequality

$$\mathcal{C}^N := \sum_{i \neq 1}^N \mathcal{C}(\rho_{A_1 A_i}) \leq \sqrt{N-1} < \sqrt{N}, \quad (2)$$

in which the tightness can be achieved using some asymmetric W states [21, 25]. However, in the realistic many-body models, the total entanglement \mathcal{C}^N is much smaller than the above upper bound. In the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick (LMG) model with identical interaction between two arbitrary parties [26–31], it has been found that $\tau(\rho_{A_1, A_i}) \sim 1/N^2$ and $\mathcal{C}(\rho_{A_1 A_i}) \sim 1/N$, thus while the total entanglement $\mathcal{C}^N \rightarrow \mathcal{O}(1) \ll \sqrt{N}$, the total tangle $\tau^N \sim 1/N$ becomes vanishing small as $N \rightarrow \infty$

[29, 32, 33]. The large N limit is nothing but just the classical approximation of the quantum spin operator, based on which its phase transition can be solved. These results are also found in the Dicke state, spin coherent state and spin squeezed states [27, 28]. For the symmetric case, the upper bound $\mathcal{C}(\rho_{A_1 A_i}) \leq 2/N$ is proven by Koashi, Buzek and Imono (KBI) [34]. These results raise an important yet intriguing question that how the total entanglement is distributed in the general many-body models in the thermodynamic limit? Obviously, when the LMG and Dicke models approach the classical limit without TPE at $N \rightarrow \infty$, it will be totally different in the other quantum systems with nonzero short-distant TPE. The answer to this question maybe useful for us to understand the role of entanglement in the many-body models and their phase transitions.

We aim to explore the distribution of TPE restricted by the CKW monogamy inequality in the many-body system with long-range interaction, which may induce long-distance TPE. We will focus on an artificial p -wave superconducting model with long-range interaction in the thermodynamic limit. We find that: (I) Both the long-range interaction and large chemical potential are important for long-distance TPE; when the chemical potential is small, the TPE can not be distributed between distance qubits. (II) In the presence of long-distance TPE, the scaling laws of these long-distance TPE at the critical point can be used to diagnose the phase transition; however, the central charge from the entanglement entropy is still $c = 1$ for free bosons; (III) In the condition with long-distance TPE, we always have $\mathcal{C}^\infty \sim 2\xi\tau^\infty$ and $\mathcal{C}^\infty \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, which have the same feature as the LMG model by replacing the total number of qubits N using the truncation length ξ . These results may represents some general features of TPE in the many-body systems.




FIG. 1. (a) One dimensional free fermion model with long-range interaction. (b) The phase diagram of Eq. 3, with phase boundaries given by Eq. 8 (see the white lines). The dotted line is the global energy gap $E_g = \min\{2E(k)\}$ at $\alpha = \beta = 0.511$, which closes and reopens at the boundaries. When $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, this model is reduced to the transverse XY model with phase boundaries at $\mu = \pm 2$, which corresponds to the transition from the ferromagnetic (FM) phase to the paramagnetic (PM) phase. (c) The spectra of the Hamiltonian at the two phase boundaries and the intermediate phase using $\alpha = 0.511$, $\Delta = 1.3$ for $\mu = -5.0, 0, 1.25$ from left to right figures, respectively.

We consider the following p -wave superconducting model with long-range interaction (see Fig. 1 (a))

$$H = -\mu \sum_{i=0}^{\infty} c_i^\dagger c_i + \sum_{i,j}^{\infty} [-t(d)c_i^\dagger c_j + \Delta(d)c_i c_j + \text{h.c.}], \quad (3)$$

where μ is the chemical potential, and $t(d) = te^{-\alpha|d|+\alpha}$, $\Delta(d) = \Delta e^{-\beta|d|+\beta}$ are the hopping and pairing strengths between the sites i and j with separation $d = i - j$. This model is a direct generalization of the Kitaev chain for Majorana edge modes [35], which has been a toy model for searching of Majorana modes in experiments [36–38]. After a non-local Jordan-Wigner transformation, it is changed to the transverse XY model, which is the limiting case of a lot of spin models [39–42]. Thus the above model may have features that can be found in a lot of many-body models.

In the limit of short-range interaction $t(d) = t\delta_{d=\pm 1}$, $\Delta(d) = \Delta\delta_{d=\pm 1}$, this model has been studied in [35,

43, 44], showing of only singularity in the first derivative of the nearest-neighbor TPE with some kind of universal scaling laws. This is a general feature of short-ranged interacting models [12, 13]. For the realization of long-distance TPE, one may need the long-range interaction, as evidenced by the LMG and Dicke models [26–31]. When $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ and $\beta \rightarrow 0$, it can be regarded as a infinitely coordinated system [32], such as that in the LMG model. We emphasize that all the features demonstrated below do not depend on the particular forms of the long-range interaction. In the momentum space

$$H = \sum_k (c_k^\dagger \ c_{-k}) \begin{pmatrix} \epsilon_1 & i\epsilon_2 \\ -i\epsilon_2 & -\epsilon_1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_k \\ c_{-k}^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\epsilon_1(k) = \mu + t \exp(\alpha) \frac{\sinh(\alpha) - \cosh(\alpha) + \cos(k)}{\cosh(\alpha) - \cos(k)}, \quad (5)$$

$$\epsilon_2(k) = \Delta \exp(\beta) \frac{\sin(k)}{\cosh(\beta) - \cos(k)}. \quad (6)$$

The eigenvalues are

$$E(k) = \pm \sqrt{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2}, \quad E_g = \min_{k \in [-\pi, \pi]} (2E(k)). \quad (7)$$

The second term defines the global energy gap used in Fig. 1 (b). The closing and reopening of the energy gap yields the phase boundaries at (independent of β and Δ)

$$\alpha^* = \ln(\mu/(2t \pm \mu)). \quad (8)$$

For simplicity, hereafter, we let $t = 1$ as the basic energy scale of the above Hamiltonian. The phase diagram of H is given in Fig. 1 (b), with typical band structure shown in Fig. 1 (c) for the two phase transitions at $k = 0$ and $k = \pi$, respectively. At these boundaries, the spectra are linearized, indicating of criticality with nonzero central charge from conformal field theory.

The TPE derived from the formation of entanglement [11, 45] is well defined, termed as concurrence. We find that the two-party density matrix with separation d can be obtained as [46–50]

$$\rho_d = \rho = \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} a & 0 & 0 & f \\ 0 & b & e & 0 \\ 0 & e^* & b & 0 \\ f^* & 0 & 0 & d \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where $a = P_{00} + 2P_{z0} + P_{zz}$, $d = P_{00} - 2P_{z0} + P_{zz}$, $b = P_{00} - P_{zz}$, $e = P_{xx} + P_{yy}$, $f = P_{xx} - P_{yy}$. These coefficients are determined by [44, 47, 48]

$$P_{00} = 1, \quad P_{zz} = \mathcal{G}_0^2 - \mathcal{G}_d \mathcal{G}_{-d}, \quad P_{z0} = P_{0z} = -\mathcal{G}_0, \\ P_{xx} = \det(T(\mathcal{G}_{i-j-1})), \quad P_{yy} = \det(T(\mathcal{G}_{i-j+1})), \quad (10)$$

where T is a $d \times d$ Toeplitz matrix with entries $T_{i,j} = \mathcal{G}_{i-j-k}$, with

$$\mathcal{G}_x = \int_{-\pi}^{\pi} \frac{\epsilon_2 \cos(kx) - \epsilon_1 \sin(kx)}{2\pi \sqrt{\epsilon_1^2 + \epsilon_2^2}} dk. \quad (11)$$

The concurrence of this density matrix reads as [10, 11]

$$\mathcal{C}_d(\rho_d) = \max\left\{0, \frac{1}{2}(|f| - |b|), \frac{1}{2}(|e| - \sqrt{ad})\right\}. \quad (12)$$

Due to the translational symmetry in H , it is sufficient to characterize the total entanglement between one arbitrary party with all the other parties using

$$\mathcal{C}^N = 2 \sum_{d=1}^N \mathcal{C}_d(\rho_d), \quad \tau^N = 2 \sum_{d=1}^N \tau_d(\rho_d), \quad (13)$$

where $\tau_d = \mathcal{C}_d^2$ and the factor 2 comes from the inversion symmetry of $\mathcal{C}_{-d} = \mathcal{C}_d$. We find a truncation length ξ , which means the farthest distance d that the TPE can be achieved. This distance is well-defined for the reason that when the distance $|d| > \xi$, \mathcal{C}_d will quickly approach zero (see Fig. 2 (a) - (b)). When $d \ll \xi$, \mathcal{C}_d will decay exponentially with the increase of separation. This is in stark contrast to the model with short-range interaction [43, 44], in which $\xi \sim 1/3$, thus only the nearest-neighbor sites have significant TPE. Moreover, only the entanglement of $\mathcal{C}_{\pm 1}$ exhibits singularity at the critical boundaries, which has been used to characterize the phase transitions [44, 51]. Hence we can define the total entanglement shared between one party with all the other parties as $\mathcal{C}^\infty = 2 \sum_{d=1}^\infty \mathcal{C}_d$ and $\tau^\infty = 2 \sum_{d=1}^\infty \tau_d$.

The long-range interaction is necessary but not sufficient to induce long-distance TPE. The truncation length ξ as a function of μ and α (assuming $\alpha = \beta$) are shown in Fig. 2 (c) - (d), showing that when $\mu = 0$, ξ will approach a small value $\xi \sim 1$. On the other hand, for fixed μ , ξ will also approach a constant independent of μ when $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ (the long-range limit), for the reason of divergence of ϵ_1 , ϵ_2 and the energy gap E_g at $\alpha \rightarrow 0$. However, we emphasize that while the long-range interaction can induce long-distance TPE, at the phase boundary the many-body entanglement measured using the Shannon entropy is not dramatically affected. By fitting the entanglement entropy using $S_A = \frac{c}{6} \log_2 L + s_0$, we obtain $c = 1$ [46, 49, 50]; however, the longer the interaction is, the longer the length L is required to obtain this perfect linear relation (see Fig. 2 (f)).

The long-range interaction can induce long-distance TPE, which exhibit some universal scaling laws in their first derivative. We want to show that (see Fig. 3) [43, 52]

$$\frac{\partial \mathcal{C}_d}{\partial \alpha} \simeq k_d \ln(|\alpha - \alpha^*|), \quad k_d = q|d| + q', \quad (14)$$

where α^* is the critical values. This relation is also true as a function of the other parameters. The interesting point is that the long-range interaction can induce not only short-range TPE (by \mathcal{C}_1), but also long-distance TPE (by \mathcal{C}_d for $|d| > 1$), which is strictly forbidden in the transverse XY model [43]. The slope k_d depends strongly on the value of d in a linear manner (inset of Fig. 3 (b)). The same scaling form can be obtained as a function of




FIG. 2. (a) - (b) TPE as a function of μ and $\alpha = \beta$ with fixed $\Delta = -1.0$. ξ is the truncation length of TPE, beyond which the TPE \mathcal{C}_d will quickly drop to zero; while when $|d| < \xi$, it decays exponentially with the distance d (see the dashed line). (c) - (d) Effect of μ and $\alpha = \beta$ on the truncation length ξ . These two parameters are essential for the long-distance TPE. (e) The entanglement entropy S_A in a finite block for various α . In the gapless regime, S_A scales logarithmic as a function of $\log_2 L$ as shown in (f), which is used to extract the central charge $c = 1$ from the slope $k = c/6$. Saturation of S_A is expected in the fully gapped phase [46].

chemical potential with critical μ^* . A detailed analysis shows that the above logarithmic divergence arises from the logarithmic divergence of $\partial \mathcal{G}_d / \partial \alpha$, which is independent of the particular forms of long-range interaction.

The upper bounds of CKW and KBI inequalities yield some dilemma to the total entanglement in the thermodynamic limit. These relations in the few-party systems (using the entangled photon pairs) have been intensively verified [53–57]; yet in the many-body quantum systems they are rarely discussed. In 29, the concurrence in the LMG model has been studied using $H = -\frac{\lambda}{N} \sum_{i < j} (\sigma_x^i \sigma_x^j + \gamma \sigma_y^i \sigma_y^j) - \sum_i \sigma_z^i$, finding ($\lambda < 1$)

$$\mathcal{C}_d = \frac{1 - \sqrt{\frac{1-\lambda}{1-\gamma\lambda}}}{N-1}, \quad \tau^N \sim \frac{1}{N}. \quad \mathcal{C}^N \sim N\tau^N. \quad (15)$$

This model can be derived from the Dicke model [58–60]. In [27, 28], Wang *et. al.* have found the same scaling rela-




FIG. 3. Universal scaling of TPE induced by the long-range interaction α . (a) The first derivation of C_d as a function of α , with critical point at $\alpha^* = 0.09$ (using Eq. 8). Here not only the nearest-neighbor TPE, but also the long-distance TPE, diverge at the same α^* . (b) $\partial C_d / \partial \alpha$ as a function of $\ln|\alpha - \alpha^*|$ for various separation d . Inset shows k_d as a function of d , with $q = 0.0012$ and $q' = -0.022$. In all figures $\mu = -23.23722$, $\Delta = 1.3$ and $\beta = 0.027$.




FIG. 4. (a) - (b) The total entanglement C^N as a function of N , with fixed $\alpha = \beta = 0.015$. (c) - (d) The corresponding total tangle τ^N for the above two cases. (e) - (f) Relation between the total entanglement C^∞ , total tangle τ^∞ and the truncation length of entanglement ξ , showing of Eq. 16. In (e) $\alpha = \beta = 0.015$; and (f) $\mu = 100$. In all figures $\Delta = 1.3$.

tion that $C_d \sim 1/N$ in the Dicke state, spin coherent state and spin squeezed state (see [61]). This is a somewhat expected feature since the phase transition in these models can be understood using classical approximation [29, 32, 33], hence the entanglement should be vanishing small. Then what will happen in the quantum models? We will provide a possible solution to the above dilemma for the quantum models, which meanwhile satisfies the CKW conjecture in the thermodynamic limit.

In Fig. 4 (a) - (d), we calculate the total entanglement and total tangle as a function of N . In all the cases, due to the truncation of entanglement ξ , these two quantities are saturated to a finite value. However, while the total concurrence is significant, the total tangle is very small. One of the central results, stimulated by Eq. 15, is that

$$C^\infty \sim 2\tau^\infty\xi, \quad \tau^\infty \sim C_1 \sim 1/\xi. \quad (16)$$

This relation can be regarded as a generalized KBI bound [34], replacing N by ξ . It is a direct consequence of exponential decaying of TPE with respect to d , assuming $C_d = C_1 e^{-|d|/\xi}$ (see Fig. 2 (a) - (b)). Using the upper bound of τ^∞ from the CKW inequality, we have $C_1 \leq 1/\sqrt{\xi}$. The actual condition is, we find $C^\infty \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, thus $C_1 < 1/\xi$, and $\tau^\infty \sim 1/\xi$. Hence the bigger ξ is, the smaller the tangle τ^∞ to be. This relation unifies Eq. 15 in the LMG model and Dicke model by replacing N with ξ and generalizes its validity to much more quantum many-body models.

To conclude, we examine the distribution of TPE in a fermion model with long-range interaction, which is upper bounded by the CKW monogamy inequality. We show that the long-range interaction induces long distant TPE, all of which can exhibit universal scaling laws at the critical boundaries. A finite truncation length ξ is required to describe the TPE. Based on this quantity, we find a general relation $C^\infty \sim 2\xi\tau^\infty \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$, which holds in both the gapped and gapless phases. Our new relation is a generalized KBI bound, which has much broader applicability in the quantum many-body models.

Acknowledgments: This work is supported by the National Key Research and Development Program in China (Grants No. 2017YFA0304504 and No. 2017YFA0304103), the strategic Priority Research Program(B) of the Chinese Academy of Sciences (Grant No. XDB01030100 and No. XDB01030300) and the National Natural Science Foundation of China (NSFC) with No. 11774328, No. 11674306 and No. 92065113.

* gongm@ustc.edu.cn

- [1] Nicolas Gisin, Grégoire Ribordy, Wolfgang Tittel, and Hugo Zbinden, "Quantum cryptography," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 145 (2002).
- [2] Artur K Ekert, "Quantum cryptography based on bell's theorem," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).

- [3] Charles H Bennett, Gilles Brassard, Claude Crépeau, Richard Jozsa, Asher Peres, and William K Wootters, “Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [4] Dik Bouwmeester, Jian-Wei Pan, Klaus Mattle, Manfred Eibl, Harald Weinfurter, and Anton Zeilinger, “Experimental quantum teleportation,” *Nature* **390**, 575–579 (1997).
- [5] Michael A Nielsen and Isaac Chuang, “Quantum computation and quantum information,” (2002).
- [6] Michael J Bremner, Christopher M Dawson, Jennifer L Dodd, Alexei Gilchrist, Aram W Harrow, Duncan Mortimer, Michael A Nielsen, and Tobias J Osborne, “Practical scheme for quantum computation with any two-qubit entangling gate,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 247902 (2002).
- [7] Jun Zhang, Jiri Vala, Shankar Sastry, and K Birgitta Whaley, “Geometric theory of nonlocal two-qubit operations,” *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 042313 (2003).
- [8] Asher Peres, “Separability criterion for density matrices,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 1413 (1996).
- [9] M Horodecki, P Horodecki, and R Horodecki, “Separability of mixed states: necessary and sufficient conditions,” *Phys. Lett. A* **223**, 1–8 (1996).
- [10] Scott Hill and William K Wootters, “Entanglement of a pair of quantum bits,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 5022 (1997).
- [11] Wootters, “Entanglement of formation of an arbitrary state of two qubits,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2245 (1998).
- [12] L Campos Venuti, C Degli Esposti Boschi, and Marco Roncaglia, “Long-distance entanglement in spin systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 247206 (2006).
- [13] L Campos Venuti, SM Giampaolo, F Illuminati, and P Zanardi, “Long-distance entanglement and quantum teleportation in XX spin chains,” *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 052328 (2007).
- [14] Salvatore M Giampaolo and Fabrizio Illuminati, “Long-distance entanglement in many-body atomic and optical systems,” *New Journal of Physics* **12**, 025019 (2010).
- [15] S Sahling, G Remenyi, C Paulsen, P Monceau, V Saligrama, C Marin, A Revcolevschi, LP Regnault, S Raymond, and JE Lorenzo, “Experimental realization of long-distance entanglement between spins in antiferromagnetic quantum spin chains,” *Nature Physics* **11**, 255–260 (2015).
- [16] Valerie Coffman, Joydip Kundu, and William K Wootters, “Distributed entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 052306 (2000).
- [17] Tobias J Osborne and Frank Verstraete, “General monogamy inequality for bipartite qubit entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 220503 (2006).
- [18] Jeong San Kim and Barry C Sanders, “Monogamy of multi-qubit entanglement using rényi entropy,” *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **43**, 445305 (2010).
- [19] Gerardo Adesso and Fabrizio Illuminati, “Continuous variable tangle, monogamy inequality, and entanglement sharing in Gaussian states of continuous variable systems,” *New Journal of Physics* **8**, 15 (2006).
- [20] Tohya Hiroshima, Gerardo Adesso, and Fabrizio Illuminati, “Monogamy inequality for distributed gaussian entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 050503 (2007).
- [21] Yong-Cheng Qu and Heng Fan, “Monogamy inequality in terms of negativity for three-qubit states,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 062308 (2007).
- [22] W. Dür, G. Vidal, and J. I. Cirac, “Three qubits can be entangled in two inequivalent ways,” *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 062314 (2000).
- [23] Robert Lohmayer, Andreas Osterloh, Jens Siewert, and Armin Uhlmann, “Entangled three-qubit states without concurrence and three-tangle,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 260502 (2006).
- [24] PJ Geetha, KO Yashodamma, *et al.*, “Monogamous nature of symmetric N -qubit states of the W class: Concurrence and negativity tangle,” *Chinese Physics B* **24**, 110302 (2015).
- [25] For the W state $|W\rangle = \alpha_1|1000\dots\rangle + \alpha_2|0100\dots\rangle + \dots + \alpha_N|\dots0001\rangle$, where $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and $\sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 = 1$ [21], we have $\mathcal{C}_{A_1 A_i}^2 = 4\alpha_i^2 \alpha_i^2$, and $\mathcal{C}_{A_1 | A_2 A_3 \dots A_N}^2 = 4\alpha_1^2 (\sum_{i=2}^N \alpha_i^2)$. We can prove that the upper bound of Eq. 2 with $\mathcal{C}^N = \sqrt{N-1}$ in the main text can be achieved by $\alpha_1 = 1/\sqrt{2}$ and $\alpha_i = 1/\sqrt{2(N-1)}$ for $i = 2, \dots, N$, which is an asymmetric state. When all $\alpha_i = 1/\sqrt{N}$ for a pure symmetric state, the total entropy will be immediately reduced to $\mathcal{C}^N = 2(N-1)/N < 2$. This upper bound is rigorously proven by Koashi, Buzek and Imono [34], assuming that in a symmetric N qubits system, the two-party density matrix $\rho_{A_i A_j}$ ($i \neq j$) is independent of the choice of the pair i and j .
- [26] Harry J Lipkin, N Meshkov, and AJ Glick, “Validity of many-body approximation methods for a solvable model:(i). exact solutions and perturbation theory,” *Nuclear Physics* **62**, 188–198 (1965).
- [27] Xiaoguang Wang and Klaus Mølmer, “Pairwise entanglement in symmetric multi-qubit systems,” *The European Physical Journal D-Atomic, Molecular, Optical and Plasma Physics* **18**, 385–391 (2002).
- [28] Xiaolei Yin, Xiaoqian Wang, Jian Ma, and Xiaoguang Wang, “Spin squeezing and concurrence,” *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **40**, 015501 (2011).
- [29] Sébastien Dusuel and Julien Vidal, “Finite-size scaling exponents of the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 237204 (2004).
- [30] Sébastien Dusuel and Julien Vidal, “Continuous unitary transformations and finite-size scaling exponents in the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model,” *Phys. Rev. B* **71**, 224420 (2005).
- [31] Román Orús, Sébastien Dusuel, and Julien Vidal, “Equivalence of critical scaling laws for many-body entanglement in the Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 025701 (2008).
- [32] R Botet, R Jullien, and P Pfeuty, “Size scaling for infinitely coordinated systems,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **49**, 478 (1982).
- [33] Vasilii Makhlov, Tanish Satoor, Alexandre Evrard, Thomas Chalopin, Raphael Lopes, and Sylvain Nascimben, “Probing quantum criticality and symmetry breaking at the microscopic level,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **123**, 120601 (2019).
- [34] Masato Koashi, Vladimír Bužek, and Nobuyuki Imoto, “Entangled webs: Tight bound for symmetric sharing of entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 050302 (2000).
- [35] A. Yu Kitaev, “Unpaired majorana fermions in quantum wires,” *Physics-Uspekhi* **44**, 131 (2001).
- [36] Jason Alicea, “New directions in the pursuit of majorana fermions in solid state systems,” *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **75**, 076501 (2012).
- [37] C. W. J. Beenakker, “Search for majorana fermions in

- superconductors,” *Annu. Rev. Condens. Matter Phys.* **4**, 113 (2013).
- [38] Masatoshi Sato and Satoshi Fujimoto, “Majorana Fermions and Topology in Superconductors,” *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **85**, 072001 (2016).
- [39] Martin Greiter, Vera Schnells, and Ronny Thomale, “The 1D Ising model and the topological phase of the Kitaev chain,” *Annals of Physics* **351**, 1026–1033 (2014).
- [40] Kartik Chhajed, “From the Ising model to Kitaev Chain—An introduction to topological phase transitions,” *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.01078* (2020).
- [41] Elisa Ercolessi, Stefano Evangelisti, Fabio Franchini, and Francesco Ravanini, “Essential singularity in the Rényi entanglement entropy of the one-dimensional XYZ spin- $\frac{1}{2}$ chain,” *Phys. Rev. B* **83**, 012402 (2011).
- [42] Hongze Xu, Shun Yao Zhang, Guangcan Guo, and Ming Gong, “Exact dimer phase with anisotropic interaction for one dimensional magnets,” *Scientific Reports* **11**, 6462 (2021).
- [43] Tobias J Osborne and Michael A Nielsen, “Entanglement in a simple quantum phase transition,” *Phys. Rev. A* **66**, 032110 (2002).
- [44] Andreas Osterloh, Luigi Amico, Giuseppe Falci, and Rosario Fazio, “Scaling of entanglement close to a quantum phase transition,” *Nature* **416**, 608–610 (2002).
- [45] Richard Jozsa, “Fidelity for mixed quantum states,” *Journal of modern optics* **41**, 2315–2323 (1994).
- [46] Guifre Vidal, José Ignacio Latorre, Enrique Rico, and Alexei Kitaev, “Entanglement in quantum critical phenomena,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 227902 (2003).
- [47] Pierre Pfeuty, “The one-dimensional Ising model with a transverse field,” *Annals of Physics* **57**, 79–90 (1970).
- [48] Elliott Lieb, Theodore Schultz, and Daniel Mattis, “Two soluble models of an antiferromagnetic chain,” *Annals of Physics* **16**, 407–466 (1961).
- [49] B-Q Jin and Vladimir E Korepin, “Quantum spin chain, toeplitz determinants and the Fisher-Hartwig conjecture,” *Journal of statistical physics* **116**, 79–95 (2004).
- [50] José Ignacio Latorre, Enrique Rico, and Guifré Vidal, “Ground state entanglement in quantum spin chains,” *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0304098* (2003).
- [51] Luigi Amico and Dario Patane, “Entanglement crossover close to a quantum critical point,” *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **77**, 17001 (2006).
- [52] Shi-Jian Gu, Guang-Shan Tian, and Hai-Qing Lin, “Ground-state entanglement in the XXZ model,” *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 052322 (2005).
- [53] Jie Zhu, Meng-Jun Hu, Yan-Kui Bai, S. Camalet, Chengjie Zhang, Chuan-Feng Li, Guang-Can Guo, and Yong-Sheng Zhang, “Realization of the tradeoff between internal and external entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. Research* **2**, 043068 (2020).
- [54] O. Jiménez Farías, A. Valdés-Hernández, G. H. Aguilar, P. H. Souto Ribeiro, S. P. Walborn, L. Davidovich, Xiaofeng Qian, and Eberly J. H., “Experimental investigation of dynamical invariants in bipartite entanglement,” *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 012314 (2012).
- [55] G. H. Aguilar, A. Valdés-Hernández, L. Davidovich, S. P. Walborn, and P. H. Souto Ribeiro, “Experimental entanglement redistribution under decoherence channels,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 240501 (2014).
- [56] N. Friis, G. Vitagliano, M. Malik, and M. Hübner, “Entanglement certification from theory to experiment,” *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **1**, 72 (2019).
- [57] M. Genovese, “Research on hidden variable theories: A review of recent progresses,” *Phys. Rep.* **413**, 319 (2005).
- [58] S. Morrison and A. S. Parkins, “Dynamical Quantum Phase Transitions in the Dissipative Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick Model with Proposed Realization in Optical Cavity QED,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 040403 (2008).
- [59] Clive Emary and Tobias Brandes, “Chaos and the quantum phase transition in the Dicke model,” *Phys. Rev. E* **67**, 066203 (2003).
- [60] Clive Emary and Tobias Brandes, “Quantum Chaos Triggered by Precursors of a Quantum Phase Transition: The Dicke Model,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **90**, 044101 (2003).
- [61] We summarize the major pairwise entanglement in several many-body states. In [27, 28], Wang *et. al.* find that: (i) For the Dicke state $|\psi\rangle = |N/2, M\rangle$ in the Dicke model, the entanglement $\mathcal{C} = A(N, M)/N$, where $1 \leq A(N, M) \leq 2$ for all $|M| \leq N/2$. (ii) For the spin squeezed state in the Kitagawa-Ueda Hamiltonian $H = \chi S_x^2$, with $|\psi\rangle = e^{-i\chi t S_x^2}|11 \dots 11\rangle$, $\mathcal{C} \leq 1/N$ for all χt . For the GHZ state without entanglement in its subset, $\mathcal{C} = 0$. (iii) For the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen state with $|\psi\rangle \propto \sum_{l=0}^N |l\rangle \otimes |l\rangle$, $\mathcal{C} = 1/N$. (iv) For the isotropic and anisotropic Heisenberg models, $\mathcal{C} = 0$ in their thermal states. Thus in all these states, we have, at most, $\mathcal{C} \sim 1/N$. The saturation of the total entanglement yields $\mathcal{C}^N \sim \mathcal{O}(1)$ and $\tau^N \rightarrow 1/N$. In [24], Geetha *et. al.* find that for the W state $|W\rangle = \cos(\frac{\theta}{2})|000 \dots\rangle + \sin(\frac{\theta}{2})(|1000 \dots\rangle + |0100 \dots\rangle + \dots + |\dots 0001\rangle)/\sqrt{N}$, $\mathcal{C}_d = (1 - \cos(\theta))/N \leq 2/N$, hence $\mathcal{C}^N = (1 - \cos(\theta)) \leq 2$ and $\tau^N \sim 1/N$. This upper bound is tight and can be reached by the W state. These results are comparable with the KBI upper bound [34]. In the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) state $|\psi\rangle = (|000 \dots 0\rangle + |111 \dots 1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, where the two-party density matrix is independent of N , we expect $\mathcal{C}_d \leq 2/N$ for all N , implying of $\mathcal{C}_d = 0$. This property is well-known that tracing out one party of the GHZ state will completely destroys the entanglement, yielding a fully mixed separable state.