

# Local quantum Fisher information and local quantum uncertainty for general X-states

M. A. Yurischev · Saeed Haddadi

Received:

**Abstract** A two-spin-1/2 Heisenberg XYZ model with Dzyaloshinsky–Moriya (DM) and Kaplan–Shekhtman–Entin-Wohlman–Aharony (KSEA) interactions in the presence of an inhomogeneous external magnetic field is considered at thermal equilibrium. Its density matrix has the general X form for which we derive explicit formulas for the local quantum Fisher information (LQFI) and local quantum uncertainty (LQU) directly in terms of model parameters. This allows us to perform a comparative study for the discord-type quantum correlations LQFI and LQU and to reveal a number of new features in their behavior. In particular, the sudden transitions of quantum correlations with a smooth change in temperature are found. Moreover, it is shown that there may be a sequence of such transitions for certain choices of interaction constants.

**Keywords** · Heisenberg XYZ spin model · DM and KSEA interactions · X density matrix · Local quantum Fisher information · Local quantum uncertainty

## 1 Introduction

For a long time, the phenomenon of entanglement was considered to be the only ingredient of quantum properties. Quantum entangled states play a critical role

---

M. A. Yurischev  
Federal Research Center of Problems of Chemical Physics and Medicinal Chemistry, Russian Academy of Sciences, Chernogolovka 142432, Moscow Region, Russia  
E-mail: yur@itp.ac.ru

S. Haddadi  
School of Physics, Institute for Research in Fundamental Sciences (IPM), P.O. Box 19395-5531, Tehran, Iran  
and  
Saeed's Quantum Information Group, P.O. Box 19395-0560, Tehran, Iran  
E-mail: saeed@ssqig.com

in quantum cryptography, quantum computing, superdense coding, quantum teleportation, etc. [1, 2, 3, 4, 5].

In quantum informatics, entanglement is viewed as a physical resource (“as real as energy” [5])<sup>1</sup>. This statement requires a mathematical definition, since, according to Kant, “in jeder besonderen Naturlehre nur so viel eigentliche Wissenschaft angetroffen werden könne, als darin Mathematik anzutreffen ist” (“in any special doctrine of nature there can be only as much *proper* science as there is *mathematics* therein”). Quantum entanglement was quantified in 1996, first for pure states [7, 8], and then for mixed states [9]. According to the accepted definition, the entanglement of a bipartite pure state is the von Neumann entropy either of the two subsystems.<sup>2</sup> The entanglement (of formation) of a bipartite mixed state is defined as the minimum entanglement of an ensemble over all ensembles realizing the mixed state. This gave impetus to quantifying entanglement (and then other quantum correlations) based on various criteria [11].

Despite the fundamental and practical importance of quantum entanglement, subsequent studies have shown that it does not exhaust all quantum correlations in a system. Using the model of deterministic quantum computation with one pure qubit (DQC1), Knill and Laflamme showed that computation can achieve an exponential improvement in efficiency over classical computers even without containing much entanglement [12].

In 2000, Żurek developed the concept of quantum discord [13]. Within this concept, discord was interpreted as “a measure of the quantumness of correlations” [14]. The quantum discord  $\mathcal{Q}$  for a bipartite system  $AB$  is defined as the minimum difference between the quantum generalizations of symmetric ( $I$ ) and asymmetric looking ( $J$ ) versions of the classical mutual information:  $\mathcal{Q} = \min_{\{\Pi_k\}} (I - J)$ , where  $\{\Pi_k\}$  is the measurement performed on *one* of the two subsystems [13, 14].

Quantum discord equals zero for the classically correlated states and coincides the entropy of entanglement for the pure states. It is remarkable that discord can exist even in separable (but mixed) states, i.e., when quantum entanglement is identically equal to zero. Thus, quantum discord is a different measure of quantum correlation than entanglement. Datta et al. [15, 16] calculated discord in the Knill-Laflamme DQC1 model and showed that it scales with the quantum efficiency, while entanglement remains vanishingly small throughout the computation. This attracted a lot of attention to the new measure of quantum correlation [17, 18, 19, 20].

The notion of quantum discord is based on local measurements and optimization. This idea was then applied to other physical or information quantities, and to date, a large number of discord-like measures of quantum correlation have been introduced [17, 21, 22, 23]. The local quantum uncertainty

---

<sup>1</sup> However, “it is important to realize that in physics today, we have no knowledge of what the energy *is*” [6], Sect. 4-1.

<sup>2</sup> Earlier, a similar definition was proposed by Everett for the *canonical correlation* [10].

(LQU) [24] and local quantum Fisher information (LQFI) [25, 26, 27] belong to this type of measures.

The behavior of LQFI and LQU in various specific two-qubit systems was considered by many researchers [28, 29, 30, 31, 32, 33, 34, 35, 36, 37, 38]. In the previous paper [39], the behavior of LQU and LQFI (together with the entropic discord) was studied on the example of Bell-diagonal states, which are a subclass of X states and allow to include both DM and KSEA interactions but without Zeeman's terms. Surprisingly, an excellent agreement of these quantifiers of quantum correlation was observed. In the present paper, we extend this consideration to general X states and describe new features and peculiarities in the behavior of LQFI and LQU.

The structure of the paper is as follows. Section 2 presents the Hamiltonian and the corresponding Gibbs density matrix; the diagonalization of the density matrix is also described here. Derivation of formulas for the LQFI and LQU is given in Sects. 3 and 4, respectively. In Sect. 5 we present the results and discuss them. Finally, Sect. 6 summarizes our findings.

## 2 Hamiltonian, density matrix and its diagonalization

Let there be a system with some Hamiltonian. Then its density operator (matrix) is found, say, from the quantum Liouville-von Neumann or Lindblad master equation, or has a thermal equilibrium Gibbs' form. Here we restrict ourselves to the latter case.

Consider a model with the following Hamiltonian [40]

$$H = J_x \sigma_x^1 \sigma_x^2 + J_y \sigma_y^1 \sigma_y^2 + J_z \sigma_z^1 \sigma_z^2 + D_z (\sigma_x^1 \sigma_y^2 - \sigma_y^1 \sigma_x^2) + \Gamma_z (\sigma_x^1 \sigma_y^2 + \sigma_y^1 \sigma_x^2) + B_1 \sigma_z^1 + B_2 \sigma_z^2, \quad (1)$$

where  $\sigma_\alpha^i$  ( $i = 1, 2$ ;  $\alpha = x, y, z$ ) are the Pauli spin operators,  $(J_x, J_y, J_z)$  the vector of interaction constants of the Heisenberg part of interactions,  $D_z$  the  $z$ -component of Dzyaloshinsky vector,  $\Gamma_z$  the strength of KSEA interaction, and  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  the  $z$ -components of external magnetic fields applied at the first and second spins, respectively. Thus, this model contains seven real independent parameters:  $J_x, J_y, J_z, D_z, \Gamma_z, B_1,$  and  $B_2$ .

In open form, the Hamiltonian (1) reads

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} J_z + B_1 + B_2 & \cdot & \cdot & J_x - J_y - 2i\Gamma_z \\ \cdot & -J_z + B_1 - B_2 & J_x + J_y + 2iD_z & \cdot \\ \cdot & J_x + J_y - 2iD_z & -J_z - B_1 + B_2 & \cdot \\ J_x - J_y + 2i\Gamma_z & \cdot & \cdot & J_z - B_1 - B_2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (2)$$

with the dots which were put instead of zero entries. This is the most general Hermitian traceless matrix having the X structure: ( $\times$ ); that is its nonzero entries may belong only to the main diagonal and anti-diagonal. Note that the set of X matrices is algebraically closed: their sums and products are again the X matrices.

Eigenlevels of the Hamiltonian under consideration are given by

$$E_{1,2} = J_z \pm R_1, \quad E_{3,4} = -J_z \pm R_2, \quad (3)$$

where

$$R_1 = [r_1^2 + (B_1 + B_2)^2]^{1/2}, \quad R_2 = [r_2^2 + (B_1 - B_2)^2]^{1/2}, \quad (4)$$

with

$$r_1 = [(J_x - J_y)^2 + 4\Gamma_z^2]^{1/2}, \quad r_2 = [(J_x + J_y)^2 + 4D_z^2]^{1/2}. \quad (5)$$

The Gibbs density matrix is written as

$$\rho = \frac{1}{Z} \exp(-\beta H). \quad (6)$$

Here, the partition function  $Z = \sum_n \exp(-\beta E_n)$  is expressed as

$$Z = 2[e^{-\beta J_z} \cosh(\beta R_1) + e^{\beta J_z} \cosh(\beta R_2)], \quad (7)$$

where  $\beta = 1/T$ , with  $T$  being the temperature in energy units. The operator  $\rho$  satisfies the conditions:  $\rho^\dagger = \rho$ ,  $\rho \geq 0$ , and  $\text{tr}\rho = 1$ .

Due to the functional relation (6) and algebraic closeness of X matrix set, the Gibbs density matrix has the following X form:

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} a & . & . & u \\ . & b & v & . \\ . & v^* & c & . \\ u^* & . & . & d \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

where the asterisk denotes complex conjugation. Performing the necessary calculations, we obtain expressions for the matrix elements of  $\rho$ :

$$\begin{aligned} a &= \frac{1}{Z} \{ \cosh(\beta R_1) - [(B_1 + B_2)/R_1] \sinh(\beta R_1) \} e^{-\beta J_z}, \\ b &= \frac{1}{Z} \{ \cosh(\beta R_2) - [(B_1 - B_2)/R_2] \sinh(\beta R_2) \} e^{\beta J_z}, \\ c &= \frac{1}{Z} \{ \cosh(\beta R_2) + [(B_1 - B_2)/R_2] \sinh(\beta R_2) \} e^{\beta J_z}, \\ d &= \frac{1}{Z} \{ \cosh(\beta R_1) + [(B_1 + B_2)/R_1] \sinh(\beta R_1) \} e^{-\beta J_z}, \\ u &= -\frac{1}{Z} [(J_x - J_y - 2i\Gamma_z)/R_1] \sinh(\beta R_1) e^{-\beta J_z}, \\ v &= -\frac{1}{Z} [(J_x + J_y + 2iD_z)/R_2] \sinh(\beta R_2) e^{\beta J_z}, \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

where  $R_1$  and  $R_2$  are given again by Eq. (4).

Using the invariance of quantum correlations under any local unitary transformations, we remove complex phases in the off-diagonal entries and change  $\rho \rightarrow \varrho$ , where

$$\varrho = \begin{pmatrix} a & . & . & |u| \\ . & b & |v| & . \\ . & |v| & c & . \\ |u| & . & . & d \end{pmatrix}, \quad (10)$$

with

$$|u\rangle = \frac{r_1 \sinh(\beta R_1)}{Z R_1} e^{-\beta J_z}, \quad |v\rangle = \frac{r_2 \sinh(\beta R_2)}{Z R_2} e^{\beta J_z}. \quad (11)$$

Due to the conditions of Hermiticity, non-negativity, and normalization of any density operator, the matrix elements  $a, b, c, d \geq 0$ ,  $a + b + c + d = 1$ ,  $ad \geq |u|^2$ , and  $bc \geq |v|^2$ . The quantum state  $\rho$  depends on five real parameters, for which we can take  $J_z, R_1, R_2, B_1$ , and  $B_2$  or, say,  $J_z, r_1, r_2, B_1$ , and  $B_2$ . Note that the quantum state (10) is reduced to the Bell-diagonal case when  $a = d$  and  $b = c$ , i.e., when  $B_1 = B_2 = 0$ .

Transform now the density matrix  $\rho$  into diagonal representation. We will perform this transformation in two steps. First, using symmetry of any X matrix with respect to the transformations of the group  $\{E, \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z\}$  [40], one can reduce the matrix (10) to the block-diagonal form. It can be achieved by a simultaneous permutation of 2-nd and 4-th rows and columns of X matrix:

$$P \rho P^t = \begin{pmatrix} a & |u| & \cdot & \cdot \\ |u| & d & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & c & |v| \\ \cdot & \cdot & |v| & b \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

where

$$P = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & 1 \\ \cdot & \cdot & 1 & \cdot \\ \cdot & 1 & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} = P^t. \quad (13)$$

Here the subscript  $t$  stands for matrix transpose. From Eq. (12), it is clear that the eigenvalues of  $\rho$  are equal to

$$p_{1,2} = \frac{1}{2} \left( a + d \pm \sqrt{(a-d)^2 + 4|u|^2} \right), \quad p_{3,4} = \frac{1}{2} \left( b + c \pm \sqrt{(b-c)^2 + 4|v|^2} \right). \quad (14)$$

Second, we now use orthogonal transformation (it is built from eigenvectors of the subblocks  $2 \times 2$ ; see, e.g., [41])

$$R = \begin{pmatrix} q_1/\sqrt{q_1^2 + |u|^2} & |u|/\sqrt{q_1^2 + |u|^2} & \cdot & \cdot \\ |u|/\sqrt{q_1^2 + |u|^2} & -q_1/\sqrt{q_1^2 + |u|^2} & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & q_2/\sqrt{q_2^2 + |v|^2} & |v|/\sqrt{q_2^2 + |v|^2} \\ \cdot & \cdot & |v|/\sqrt{q_2^2 + |v|^2} & -q_2/\sqrt{q_2^2 + |v|^2} \end{pmatrix} = R^t, \quad (15)$$

where

$$q_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left( a - d + \sqrt{(a-d)^2 + 4|u|^2} \right), \quad q_2 = \frac{1}{2} \left( c - b + \sqrt{(c-b)^2 + 4|v|^2} \right). \quad (16)$$

Note the useful expressions:

$$q_1^2 = (a-d)q_1 + |u|^2, \quad q_2^2 = (c-b)q_2 + |v|^2. \quad (17)$$

Here, one should keep the carefulness when  $|u|$  or  $|v|$  equals zero.

As a result,

$$RP_{\varrho}PR = \begin{pmatrix} p_2 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & p_1 & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & p_4 & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & p_3 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

where  $p_i$  are still the eigenvalues (with an insignificant permutation) of the matrix (10).

Now, using transformations (13) and (15), we find local spin matrices  $\sigma_{\mu} \otimes I$  ( $\mu = x, y, z$ ) in the diagonal representation of the density matrix  $\varrho$  (i.e, we get the sets of matrix elements  $\langle m | \sigma_{\mu} \otimes I | n \rangle$ ):

$$RP(\sigma_x \otimes I)PR = \frac{1}{\sqrt{(q_1^2 + |u|^2)(q_2^2 + |v|^2)}} \times \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & q_1 q_2 + |uv| & q_1 |v| - q_2 |u| \\ \cdot & \cdot & q_2 |u| - q_1 |v| & q_1 q_2 + |uv| \\ q_1 q_2 + |uv| & q_2 |u| - q_1 |v| & \cdot & \cdot \\ q_1 |v| - q_2 |u| & q_1 q_2 + |uv| & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

$$RP(\sigma_y \otimes I)PR = \frac{i}{\sqrt{(q_1^2 + |u|^2)(q_2^2 + |v|^2)}} \times \begin{pmatrix} \cdot & \cdot & |uv| - q_1 q_2 & -q_1 |v| - q_2 |u| \\ \cdot & \cdot & -q_1 |v| - q_2 |u| & q_1 q_2 - |uv| \\ q_1 q_2 - |uv| & q_1 |v| + q_2 |u| & \cdot & \cdot \\ q_1 |v| + q_2 |u| & |uv| - q_1 q_2 & \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix} \quad (20)$$

and

$$RP(\sigma_z \otimes I)PR = \begin{pmatrix} \frac{q_1(a-d)}{q_1^2 + |u|^2} & \frac{2q_1|u|}{q_1^2 + |u|^2} & \cdot & \cdot \\ \frac{2q_1|u|}{q_1^2 + |u|^2} & \frac{q_1(d-a)}{q_1^2 + |u|^2} & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \frac{q_2(b-c)}{q_2^2 + |v|^2} & \frac{-2q_2|v|}{q_2^2 + |v|^2} \\ \cdot & \cdot & \frac{-2q_2|v|}{q_2^2 + |v|^2} & \frac{q_2(c-b)}{q_2^2 + |v|^2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (21)$$

So, now everything is ready to start calculating LQFI and LQU.

### 3 Local quantum Fisher information

The LQFI measure is based on the quantum Fisher information  $F$  [42, 43]. It was suggested in Ref. [25] (see there especially Supplementary Information); see also [26, 27]. This measure which we will denote by  $\mathcal{F}$  equals the optimal

LQFI with the measuring operator  $H_A$  acting in the subspace of party  $A$  of the bipartite system  $AB$ :

$$\mathcal{F}(\varrho) = \min_{H_A} F(\varrho, H_A). \quad (22)$$

Remarkably, the authors [25] proved that, if the subsystem  $A$  is a qubit, the optimization in Eq. (22) can be performed and LQFI is

$$\mathcal{F} = 1 - \lambda_{max}^{(M)}, \quad (23)$$

where  $\lambda_{max}^{(M)}$  is the largest eigenvalue of the real symmetric  $3 \times 3$  matrix  $M$  with entries (see also [44, 45, 46, 47])

$$M_{\mu\nu} = \sum_{\substack{m,n \\ p_m+p_n \neq 0}} \frac{2p_m p_n}{p_m + p_n} \langle m | \sigma_\mu \otimes I | n \rangle \langle n | \sigma_\nu \otimes I | m \rangle. \quad (24)$$

Using Eqs. (19)–(21), we find that the matrix  $M$  is diagonal and its eigenvalues are equal to

$$M_{xx} = \frac{4}{(q_1^2 + |u|^2)(q_2^2 + |v|^2)} \left[ (q_1 q_2 + |uv|)^2 \left( \frac{p_1 p_3}{p_1 + p_3} + \frac{p_2 p_4}{p_2 + p_4} \right) + (q_1 |v| - q_2 |u|)^2 \left( \frac{p_1 p_4}{p_1 + p_4} + \frac{p_2 p_3}{p_2 + p_3} \right) \right], \quad (25)$$

$$M_{yy} = \frac{4}{(q_1^2 + |u|^2)(q_2^2 + |v|^2)} \left[ (q_1 q_2 - |uv|)^2 \left( \frac{p_1 p_3}{p_1 + p_3} + \frac{p_2 p_4}{p_2 + p_4} \right) + (q_1 |v| + q_2 |u|)^2 \left( \frac{p_1 p_4}{p_1 + p_4} + \frac{p_2 p_3}{p_2 + p_3} \right) \right] \quad (26)$$

and

$$M_{zz} = \frac{1}{(q_1^2 + |u|^2)^2} \left[ (a+d)(q_1^2 - |u|^2)^2 + 16 \frac{ad - |u|^2}{a+d} q_1^2 |u|^2 \right] + \frac{1}{(q_2^2 + |v|^2)^2} \left[ (b+c)(q_2^2 - |v|^2)^2 + 16 \frac{bc - |v|^2}{b+c} q_2^2 |v|^2 \right], \quad (27)$$

where  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are given by Eq. (16) and  $p_1$  to  $p_4$  are determined by Eq. (14).

Through tedious calculations, we arrive at expressions for the eigenvalues of matrix  $M$ :

$$M_{xx} = \frac{64(ac + bd + p_1 p_2 + p_3 p_4 + 2|uv|)[(a+d)p_3 p_4 + (b+c)p_1 p_2]}{[1 - (p_1 - p_2)^2 - (p_3 - p_4)^2]^2 - 4(p_1 - p_2)^2(p_3 - p_4)^2}, \quad (28)$$

$$M_{yy} = \frac{64(ac + bd + p_1 p_2 + p_3 p_4 - 2|uv|)[(a+d)p_3 p_4 + (b+c)p_1 p_2]}{[1 - (p_1 - p_2)^2 - (p_3 - p_4)^2]^2 - 4(p_1 - p_2)^2(p_3 - p_4)^2} \quad (29)$$

and

$$M_{zz} = 1 - 4 \left( \frac{|u|^2}{a+d} + \frac{|v|^2}{b+c} \right). \quad (30)$$

It is seen from Eqs. (28) and (29) that always  $M_{xx} \geq M_{yy}$  and therefore

$$\mathcal{F} = 1 - \max \{M_{xx}, M_{zz}\}. \quad (31)$$

Thus, this equation, together with expressions (28) and (30), is a closed formula for the LQFI directly in terms of matrix elements and eigenvalues of an arbitrary X-state.

Further, using Eqs. (9), (11) and relations  $p_i = \exp(-E_i/T)/Z$ , we get expressions for the branches  $\mathcal{F}_0 = 1 - M_{zz}$  and  $\mathcal{F}_1 = 1 - M_{xx}$  via model parameters:

$$\mathcal{F}_0 = \frac{2}{Z} \left[ \left( \frac{r_1}{R_1} \right)^2 \sinh \frac{R_1}{T} \tanh \frac{R_1}{T} e^{-J_z/T} + \left( \frac{r_2}{R_2} \right)^2 \sinh \frac{R_2}{T} \tanh \frac{R_2}{T} e^{J_z/T} \right] \quad (32)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}_1 = 1 - \frac{4}{Z} & \left( \cosh \frac{R_1}{T} e^{J_z/T} + \cosh \frac{R_2}{T} e^{-J_z/T} \right) \left( \cosh \frac{2J_z}{T} \right. \\ & + \cosh \frac{R_1}{T} \cosh \frac{R_2}{T} + \frac{r_1 r_2 + B_2^2 - B_1^2}{R_1 R_2} \sinh \frac{R_1}{T} \sinh \frac{R_2}{T} \left. \right) / \left[ \left( \cosh \frac{2J_z}{T} \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. + \cosh \frac{R_1}{T} \cosh \frac{R_2}{T} \right)^2 - \sinh^2 \frac{R_1}{T} \sinh^2 \frac{R_2}{T} \right]. \quad (33) \end{aligned}$$

So, LQFI is given as

$$\mathcal{F} = \min \{ \mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{F}_1 \}. \quad (34)$$

Equations (32)–(34) together give an analytical expression for the LQFI of the system (1) in a state of thermal equilibrium.

#### 4 Local quantum uncertainty

The LQU measure of quantum correlation,  $\mathcal{U}$ , is based on the Wigner-Yanase skew information  $\mathcal{I}$  [48, 49]. The LQU with respect to subsystem  $A$ , optimized over all local observables on  $A$ , is defined as [24]

$$\mathcal{U}(\varrho) = \min_{H_A} \mathcal{I}(\varrho, H_A). \quad (35)$$

Thus, it is defined as the minimum quantum uncertainty associated to a single measurement on one subsystem of bipartite system  $AB$ . It is worth mentioning that the LQU is a genuine quantifier of quantum correlations, and it has been shown that the LQU meets all the physical conditions of a criterion of quantum correlations.

Importantly, the authors [24] were able to perform optimization for qubit-qudit systems and presented the measure (35) in the form

$$\mathcal{U} = 1 - \lambda_{max}^{(W)}, \quad (36)$$

where  $\lambda_{max}^{(W)}$  denotes the maximum eigenvalue of the  $3 \times 3$  symmetric matrix  $W$  whose entries are

$$W_{\mu\nu} = \text{tr}\{\rho^{1/2}(\sigma_\mu \otimes \mathbf{I})\rho^{1/2}(\sigma_\nu \otimes \mathbf{I})\}, \quad (37)$$

with  $\mu, \nu = x, y, z$  and  $\sigma_{x,y,z}$  are the Pauli matrices as before.

Using Eqs. (18) and (19)–(21), we find that the matrix  $W$  for the system under consideration is diagonal and its eigenvalues are given by

$$W_{xx} = 2 \frac{(\sqrt{p_1 p_3} + \sqrt{p_2 p_4})(q_1 q_2 + |uv|)^2 + (\sqrt{p_1 p_4} + \sqrt{p_2 p_3})(q_1 |v| - q_2 |u|)^2}{(q_1^2 + |u|^2)(q_2^2 + |v|^2)}, \quad (38)$$

$$W_{yy} = 2 \frac{(\sqrt{p_1 p_3} + \sqrt{p_2 p_4})(q_1 q_2 - |uv|)^2 + (\sqrt{p_1 p_4} + \sqrt{p_2 p_3})(q_1 |v| + q_2 |u|)^2}{(q_1^2 + |u|^2)(q_2^2 + |v|^2)} \quad (39)$$

and

$$W_{zz} = \frac{q_1^2 [8|u|^2 \sqrt{p_1 p_2} + (a-d)^2(p_1 + p_2)]}{(q_1^2 + |u|^2)^2} + \frac{q_2^2 [8|v|^2 \sqrt{p_3 p_4} + (b-c)^2(p_3 + p_4)]}{(q_2^2 + |v|^2)^2}, \quad (40)$$

where  $q_1$  and  $q_2$  are given by Eq. (16) and  $p_1, \dots, p_4$  are defined by Eq. (14).

Further calculations lead to [50, 51, 52, 53]:

$$W_{xx} = (\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_2})(\sqrt{p_3} + \sqrt{p_4}) + \frac{(b-c)(d-a) + 4|uv|}{(\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_2})(\sqrt{p_3} + \sqrt{p_4})}, \quad (41)$$

$$W_{yy} = (\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_2})(\sqrt{p_3} + \sqrt{p_4}) + \frac{(b-c)(d-a) - 4|uv|}{(\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_2})(\sqrt{p_3} + \sqrt{p_4})} \quad (42)$$

and

$$W_{zz} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ (\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_2})^2 + (\sqrt{p_3} + \sqrt{p_4})^2 + \frac{(d-a)^2 - 4|u|^2}{(\sqrt{p_1} + \sqrt{p_2})^2} + \frac{(b-c)^2 - 4|v|^2}{(\sqrt{p_3} + \sqrt{p_4})^2} \right]. \quad (43)$$

It is clear from these expressions that  $W_{xx} \geq W_{yy}$ , so LQU formula for the general two-qubit X states is

$$\mathcal{U} = 1 - \max\{W_{xx}, W_{zz}\}. \quad (44)$$

Using, as for LQFI, the expressions for the matrix elements and eigenvalues of the density matrix  $\rho$ , we arrive at formulas for the branches  $\mathcal{U}_0 = 1 - W_{zz}$  and  $\mathcal{U}_1 = 1 - W_{xx}$ :

$$\mathcal{U}_0 = \frac{4}{Z} \left[ \left( \frac{r_1}{R_1} \right)^2 \sinh^2 \frac{R_1}{2T} e^{-J_z/T} + \left( \frac{r_2}{R_2} \right)^2 \sinh^2 \frac{R_2}{2T} e^{J_z/T} \right] \quad (45)$$

and

$$\mathcal{U}_1 = 1 - \frac{4}{Z} \left( \cosh \frac{R_1}{2T} \cosh \frac{R_2}{2T} + \frac{r_1 r_2 + B_2^2 - B_1^2}{R_1 R_2} \sinh \frac{R_1}{2T} \sinh \frac{R_2}{2T} \right). \quad (46)$$

So,

$$\mathcal{U} = \min \{\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1\}. \quad (47)$$

Equations (45)–(47) also give an explicit expression for the LQU of the system (1) in a state of thermal equilibrium.

## 5 Discussion

In the absence of external magnetic fields,  $B_1 = B_2 = 0$ , the system (1) contains only two-particle interactions: both the Heisenberg XYZ and DM-KSEA couplings. Its Gibbs density matrix belongs to the general Bell-diagonal state. Recently, the behavior of LQFI and LQU in this limiting case has been studied in detail [39]. In particular, it was found that the branches of both LQFI and LQU are separated the same boundary

$$r_1 + r_2 = 2|J_z|. \quad (48)$$

Thus, in the case of  $J_z \neq 0$ , the phase diagram in the parameter space is the plane  $(r_1, r_2)$ ; the quantity  $|J_z|$  plays the role of a normalized constant and can be considered as a unit without loss of generality. Note that the boundary does not depend on temperature. As a result, LQFI and LQU do not experience abrupt transitions with temperature changes.

The picture becomes essentially different in the transition to general X-states. For  $B_1 \neq B_2$ , the quantum correlations, generally speaking, depend on which qubit the measurement was performed; the asymmetry in  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  is clearly visible for branches  $\mathcal{F}_1$ , Eq. (33), and  $\mathcal{U}_1$ , Eq. (46). Moreover, the parameter space is now five-dimensional, the boundaries, defined by equations  $\mathcal{F}_0 = \mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{U}_0 = \mathcal{U}_1$ , are different and involved the temperature. The latter circumstance leads to the fact that with a smooth change temperature, transitions from one branch of functions (34) and (47) to another become possible, which will cause abrupt changes in the behavior of quantum correlations.

Taking into account the arising new difficulties, it is useful, when passing to general X-states, first of all to clarify the properties of LQFI and LQU at high and low temperatures.

### 5.1 High-temperature behavior

From expression (32) it follows that

$$\mathcal{F}_0(T)|_{T \rightarrow \infty} \approx \frac{r_1^2 + r_2^2}{2T^2} + \frac{(r_2^2 - r_1^2)J_z}{2T^3} - \frac{(5r_1^2 + 3r_2^2)R_1^2 + (3r_1^2 + 5r_2^2)R_2^2}{24T^4}. \quad (49)$$

Thus, the deviation from the Bell-diagonal case starts only from the fourth-order term  $1/T^4$ . The second branch of LQFI, Eq. (33), behaves as

$$\mathcal{F}_1(T)|_{T \rightarrow \infty} \approx \frac{4B_1^2 + 4J_z^2 + (r_1 - r_2)^2}{4T^2} + \frac{(R_2^2 - R_1^2)J_z}{2T^3}. \quad (50)$$

Likewise, for the LQU branches according to Eqs. (45) and (46) we have:

$$\mathcal{U}_0(T)|_{T \rightarrow \infty} \approx \frac{r_1^2 + r_2^2}{4T^2} + \frac{(r_2^2 - r_1^2)J_z}{4T^3} - \frac{(2r_1^2 + 3r_2^2)R_1^2 + (3r_1^2 + 2r_2^2)R_2^2}{48T^4} \quad (51)$$

and

$$\mathcal{U}_1(T)|_{T \rightarrow \infty} \approx \frac{4B_1^2 + 4J_z^2 + (r_1 - r_2)^2}{8T^2} + \frac{(R_2^2 - R_1^2)J_z}{4T^3}. \quad (52)$$

So, the quantum correlations decay at high temperatures according to the law  $1/T^2$ .

## 5.2 Zero-temperature limit

When  $T \rightarrow 0$ ,

$$\mathcal{F}_0(T)|_{T \rightarrow 0} \approx \frac{(r_1/R_1)^2 \exp[(R_1 - J_z)/T] + (r_2/R_2)^2 \exp[(R_2 + J_z)/T]}{\exp[(R_1 - J_z)/T] + \exp[(R_2 + J_z)/T]}. \quad (53)$$

Therefore, in the limit of zero temperature

$$\mathcal{F}_0|_{T=0} = \begin{cases} (r_1/R_1)^2, & \text{if } R_1 > R_2 + 2J_z \\ (r_2/R_2)^2, & \text{if } R_1 < R_2 + 2J_z \end{cases}. \quad (54)$$

The same is valid for the branch  $\mathcal{U}_0$ :

$$\mathcal{U}_0|_{T=0} = \begin{cases} (r_1/R_1)^2, & \text{if } R_1 > R_2 + 2J_z \\ (r_2/R_2)^2, & \text{if } R_1 < R_2 + 2J_z \end{cases}. \quad (55)$$

On the other hand, the second branch  $\mathcal{U}_1(T)$  at zero temperature reaches the maximum possible value equal to one:  $\mathcal{U}_1|_{T=0} = 1$ , if  $R_1 - R_2 \neq 2J_z$ .


Now we turn to the study of quantum correlations for arbitrary values of the model parameters.

## 5.3 Temperature dependence


Generally,  $J_z \neq 0$  and, consequently,  $|J_z|$  can be taken as a normalized constant. In this case, it is enough to consider functions  $\mathcal{F} = \mathcal{F}(T; r_1, r_2, B_1, B_2)$  and  $\mathcal{U} = \mathcal{U}(T; r_1, r_2, B_1, B_2)$  for  $J_z = 1$  and  $-1$ .

We performed calculations on the both quantum correlations for various choices of model parameters, trying to find and classify different types of their behavior.

Figure 1 shows the dependencies of  $\mathcal{F}(T)$  and  $\mathcal{U}(T)$  by ferromagnetic coupling  $J_z = -1$  and  $r_1 = 0.5$ ,  $r_2 = 1$ ,  $B_1 = -0.4$ , and  $B_2 = 0.7$ . Here,  $R_1 = 0.583095$  and  $R_2 = 1.486607$  and hence  $R_1 > R_2 + 2J_z$ . As can be seen from Fig. 1, the correlations decrease monotonically from  $(r_1/R_1)^2 = 0.735294$ , which is determined in accordance with Eqs. (54) and (55), to zero when the temperature increases from zero to infinity. Both curves are defined by the




**Fig. 1** Quantum correlations  $\mathcal{U}$  (line 1) and  $\mathcal{F}$  (line 2) versus temperature  $T$ . The curves are given by 0-branches. At  $T = 0$ , both  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  are equal to  $(r_1/R_1)^2 = 0.735294\dots$



**Fig. 2** Quantum correlations  $\mathcal{U}$  (line 1) and  $\mathcal{F}$  (line 2) versus the temperature  $T$ . **(a)** – External magnetic field is zero.  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  are the branches  $\mathcal{U}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_1$ , respectively. The correlations are equal to one at  $T = 0$ . **(b)** – Nonzero external magnetic field. The curves 1 and 2 have fractures at the temperatures respectively 1.1458 and 1.5821, where the quantum correlations suddenly pass from 1- to 0-branches. At zero temperature, both correlations equal  $(r_2/R_2)^2 = 0.5322245\dots$

branches  $\mathcal{F}_0(T)$  and  $\mathcal{U}_0(T)$ , and no sharp changes in the behavior of correlations are observed over the entire temperature range,  $T \in [0, \infty)$ .

Let us now put  $J_z = 1$  (anti-ferromagnetic coupling),  $r_1 = 3.4$ ,  $r_2 = 3.2$  and compare the behavior of correlations in the absence of an external magnetic field and at  $B_1 = -1.3$  and  $B_2 = 1.7$ . Look at Fig. 2. As long as there is no external magnetic field, the functions  $\mathcal{U}(T)$  and  $\mathcal{F}(T)$  are smooth. This is




**Fig. 3** Quantum correlations  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  and their branches depending on the temperature  $T$ . (a) – Lines 1 and 1' are branches  $\mathcal{U}_0$  and  $\mathcal{U}_1$ , respectively; they intersect at temperatures of 0.2565 and 0.6158. Lines 2 and 2' are branches  $\mathcal{F}_0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_1$ , respectively; they intersect at temperatures 0.4778 and 0.7708. (b) – correlations  $\mathcal{U}$  (line 1) and  $\mathcal{F}$  (line 2). Arrows-up show the sudden change points for  $\mathcal{U}$ , and arrows-down mark similar points for  $\mathcal{F}$ . At  $T = 0$ , both  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  are  $(r_1/R_1)^2 = 0.961538 \dots$

clearly seen in Fig. 2a. However, the picture changes dramatically when the system is exposed to magnetic fields (see Fig. 2b). At high temperatures, both quantum correlations are branches  $\mathcal{U}_1(T)$  and  $\mathcal{F}_1(T)$ , as in the case of the absence of an external field. But as the system cools, quantum correlations undergo sudden transitions in the presence of external fields, at first LQFI at the temperature  $T = 1.5821$  and then LQU at  $T = 1.1458$ . Correlation branches at these points change from  $\mathcal{F}_1$  and  $\mathcal{U}_1$  to  $\mathcal{F}_0$  and  $\mathcal{U}_0$ . The curves remain continuous, but fractures are observed at the indicated points. Finally, at absolute zero temperature, the values of both quantum correlations tend to  $(r_2/R_2)^2 = 0.5322245$ , which is in full agreement with predictions (54) and (55).

We discover another interesting phenomenon with a specific choice of model parameters, namely, the presence of more than one abrupt transition. Indeed, set, for definiteness,  $J_z = -1$ ,  $r_1 = 1$ ,  $r_2 = 0.5$ ,  $B_1 = -0.6$  and  $B_2 = 0.8$ . Figure 3a depicts the behavior of functions  $\mathcal{U}_0(T)$ ,  $\mathcal{U}_1(T)$ ,  $\mathcal{F}_0(T)$ , and  $\mathcal{F}_1(T)$ . Each of the pairs of curves 1, 1' and 2, 2' intersects at two points. This leads to the fact that the quantum correlations  $\mathcal{U} = \min\{\mathcal{U}_0, \mathcal{U}_1\}$  and  $\mathcal{F} = \min\{\mathcal{F}_0, \mathcal{F}_1\}$  experience *two* sudden transitions each (see Fig. 3b).

#### 5.4 Dependence on an external field

It was shown in Ref. [39] that LQFI and LQU in the system (1) without a magnetic field can undergo abrupt transitions as the exchange constants



**Fig. 4** Quantum correlations  $\mathcal{U}$  and  $\mathcal{F}$  and their branches versus the external magnetic field  $B_1$ . (a) – Solid lines 1 and 2 are the branches  $\mathcal{U}_0$  and  $\mathcal{F}_0$ , and dotted lines 1' and 2' are the branches  $\mathcal{U}_1$  and  $\mathcal{F}_1$ , respectively. (b) – Correlations  $\mathcal{U}$  (lines 1) and  $\mathcal{F}$  (lines 2)

smoothly vary. Therefore, it is not surprising that abrupt transitions occur in the entire system (1) when the fields  $B_1$  and  $B_2$  change. We illustrate this on an example.

Take the following set of fixed parameters:  $J_z = 1$ ,  $r_1 = 3$ ,  $r_2 = 5$ ,  $B_2 = -0.7$  and  $T = 4$ , and consider the behavior of quantum correlations and their individual branches as a function of an external magnetic field  $B_1$ . Figure 4a discloses the mechanism of appearance of fractures on the curves of quantum correlations. The reason again lies in the intersection of different branches. Together with the minimization conditions, required by Eqs. (34) and (47), this leads to piecewise-defined functions which branches are separated by points of sharp changes. The fractures on the curves of both quantum correlations are clearly seen in Fig. 4b.

## 6 Summary and outlook

In this paper, the two-qubit Heisenberg XYZ system influenced by both anti-symmetric Dzyaloshinsky–Moriya and symmetric Kaplan–Shekhtman–Entin–Wohlman–Aharony interactions and exposed to an external magnetic field has been considered at thermal equilibrium. For that, we have examined the behavior of two measures of discord-like quantum correlation, namely, the LQFI and LQU.

Both measures have been shown to exhibit sudden transitions with a smooth change in temperature, which are absent in the same spin systems, but without an external field. In addition, it has been found that quantum correlations can sequentially experience several such transitions.

Points of abrupt changes in the behavior of LQFI and LQU do not coincide for the general X state. As a result, in contrast to the Bell-diagonal quantum states, the quantitative agreement is now poorer, although the qualitative behavior of both correlations is still preserved.

The derived formulas for LQFI and LQU can also be useful in other problems with general two-qubit X-states, for example, when studying the dynamics of decoherence in various quantum systems.

## References

1. Gisin, N, Ribordy, G, Tittel, W., Zbinden, H.: Quantum cryptography. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 145 (2002)
2. Valiev, K.A.: Quantum computers and quantum computing. *Uspekhi Fiz. Nauk* **175**, 3 (2005) [in Russian]
3. Valiev, K.A.: Quantum computers and quantum computing. *Phys.-Usp.* **48**, 1 (2005) [in English]
4. Amico, L., Fazio, R., Osterloh, A., Vedral, V.: Entanglement in many-body systems. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 517 (2008)
5. Horodecki, R., Horodecki, P., Horodecki, M., Horodecki, K.: Quantum entanglement. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009)
6. Feynman, R.P., Leighton, R.B., Sands, M.: The Feynman lectures on physics. Vol. 1, Sect. 4-1. Addison-Wesley, Reading, Mass. (1964, second printing)
7. Bennett, C.H., Brassard, G., Popescu, S., Schumacher, B., Smolin, J.A., Wootters, W.K.: Purification of noisy entanglement and faithful teleportation via noisy channels. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **76**, 722 (1996); Erratum in: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **78**, 2031 (1997)
8. Bennett, C.H., Bernstein, H.J., Popescu, S., Schumacher, B.: Concentrating partial entanglement by local operations. *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 2046 (1996)
9. Bennett, C.H., DiVincenzo, D.P., Smolin, J.A., Wootters, W.K.: Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction. *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996)
10. Everett III, E.: The theory of the universal wave function. **In:** *The Many-Worlds Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*. Edited by B. S. DeWitt and N. Graham. Princeton University Press, Princeton, N.J. (1973)
11. Ganardi, R., Miller, M., Paterek, T., Żukowski, M.: Hierarchy of correlation quantifiers comparable to negativity. *Quantum* **6**, 654 (2022)
12. Knill, E., Laflamme, R.: Power of one bit of quantum information. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 5672 (1998)
13. Zurek, W.H.: Einselection and decoherence from an information theory perspective. *Ann. Phys. (Leipzig)* **9**, 855 (2000)
14. Ollivier, H., Zurek, W.H.: Quantum discord: a measure of the quantumness of correlations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 017901 (2001)
15. Datta, A.: Studies on the role of entanglement in mixed-state quantum computation. Dissertation. The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque (2008), arXiv:0807.4490v1 [quant-ph]
16. Datta, A., Shaji, A., Caves, C.M.: Quantum discord and the power of one qubit. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 050502 (2008)
17. Modi, K., Brodutch, A., Cable, H., Paterek, T., Vedral, V.: The classical-quantum boundary for correlations: discord and related measures. *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **84**, 1655 (2012)
18. Aldoshin, S. M., Fel'dman, E. B., Yurishchev, M. A.: Quantum entanglement and quantum discord in magnetoactive materials (Review Article). *Fiz. Nizk. Temp.* **40**, 5 (2014) [in Russian]
19. Aldoshin, S. M., Fel'dman, E. B., Yurishchev, M. A.: Quantum entanglement and quantum discord in magnetoactive materials (Review Article). *Low Temp. Phys.* **40**, 3 (2014) [in English]

20. Streltsov, A.: Quantum Correlations beyond Entanglement and Their Role in Quantum Information Theory. SpringerBriefs in Physics. Springer, Berlin (2015)
21. Adesso, G., Bromley, T.R., Cianciaruso, M.: Measures and applications of quantum correlations (Topical review). *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **49**, 473001 (2016)
22. Lectures on General Quantum Correlations and Their Applications. Fanchini, F.F., Soares-Pinto, D.O., Adesso, G. (eds.) Springer, Berlin (2017)
23. Bera, A., Das, T., Sadhukhan, D., Roy, S.S., Sen(De), A., Sen, U.: Quantum discord and its allies: a review of recent progress. *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **81**, 024001 (2018)
24. Ghorami, D., Tufarelli, T., Adesso, G.: Characterizing nonclassical correlations via local quantum uncertainty. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 240402 (2013)
25. Girolami, D., Souza, A.M., Giovannetti, V., Tufarelli, T., Filgueiras, J.G., Sarthour, R.S., Soares-Pinto, D.O., Oliveira, I.S., Adesso, G.: Quantum discord determines the interferometric power of quantum states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 210401 (2014); arXiv:1309.1472v4 (2014)
26. Bera, M.N.: Role of quantum correlation in metrology beyond standard quantum limit. arXiv:1405.5357v2 (2014)
27. Kim, S., Li, L., Kumar, A., Wu, J.: Characterizing nonclassical correlations via local quantum Fisher information. *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 032326 (2018)
28. Slaoui, A., Bakmou, L., Daoud, M., Ahl Laamara, R.: A comparative study of local quantum Fisher information and local quantum uncertainty in Heisenberg XY model. *Phys. Lett. A* **383**, 2241 (2019)
29. Haseli, S.: Local quantum Fisher information and local quantum uncertainty in two-qubit Heisenberg XYZ chain with Dzyaloshinskii-Moriya interactions. *Laser Phys.* **30**, 105203 (2020)
30. Ye, B.-L., Li, B., Liang, X.-B., Fei, S.-M.: Local quantum Fisher information and one-way quantum deficit in spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  XX Heisenberg chain with three-spin interaction. *Int. J. Quant. Inf.* **18**, 2050016 (2020)
31. Muthuganesan, R., Chandrasekar, V. K.: Quantum Fisher information and skew information correlations in dipolar spin system. *Phys. Scr.* **96**, 125113 (2021)
32. El Bakraoui, M., Slaoui, A., El Hadfi, H., Daoud, M.: Enhancing the estimation precision of an unknown phase shift in multipartite Glauber coherent states via skew information correlations and local quantum Fisher information. *J. Opt. Soc. Am. B* **39**, 1297 (2022)
33. Khedif, Y., Daoud, M., Sayouty, E.H.: Thermal quantum correlations in a two-qubit Heisenberg XXZ spin- $\frac{1}{2}$  chain under an inhomogeneous magnetic field. *Phys. Scr.* **94**, 125106 (2019)
34. Benabdallah, F., Anouz, K.E., Daoud, M.: Toward the relationship between local quantum Fisher information and local quantum uncertainty in the presence of intrinsic decoherence. *Eur. Phys. J. Plus* **137**, 548 (2022)
35. Elghaayda, S., Dahbi, Z., Mansour, M.: Local quantum uncertainty and local quantum Fisher information in two-coupled double quantum dots. *Opt. Quant. Electron.* **54**, 419 (2022)
36. Benabdallah, F., Rahman, A.U., Haddadi, S., Daoud, M.: Long-time protection of thermal correlations in a hybrid-spin system under random telegraph noise. *Phys. Rev. E* **106**, 034122 (2022)
37. Benabdallah, F., Haddadi, S., Arian Zad, H., Pourkarimi, M.R., Daoud, M., Ananikian, N.: Pairwise quantum criteria and teleportation in a spin square complex. *Sci. Rep.* **12**, 6406 (2022)
38. Dahbi, Z., Rahman, A.U., Mansour, M.: Skew information correlations and local quantum Fisher information in two gravitational cat states. *Physica A* **609**, 128333 (2023)
39. Fedorova, A.V., Yurischev, M.A.: Behavior of quantum discord, local quantum uncertainty, and local quantum Fisher information in two-spin-1/2 Heisenberg chain with DM and KSEA interactions. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **21**, 92 (2022)
40. Yurischev, M.A.: On the quantum correlations in two-qubit XYZ spin chains with Dzyaloshinsky–Moriya and Kaplan–Shekhtman–Entin-Wohlman–Aharony interactions. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **19**, 336 (2020)
41. Madelung, E.: Die mathematischen Hilfsmittel des Physikers. Springer Verlag, Berlin (1957)
42. Holevo, A.S.: Probabilistic and Statistical Aspects of Quantum Theory. North-Holland, Amsterdam (1982)

43. Braunstein, S.L., Caves, C.M.: Statistical distance and the geometry of quantum states. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **72**, 3439 (1994)
44. Dhar, H.S., Bera, M.N., Adesso, G.: Characterizing non-Markovianity via quantum interferometric power. *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 032115 (2015)
45. Mohamed, A.-B.A., Khalil, E.M., Yassen, M.F., Eleuch, H.: Two-qubit local Fisher information correlation beyond entanglement in a nonlinear generalized cavity with an intrinsic decoherence. *Entropy* **23**, 311 (2021)
46. Mohamed A.-B.A., Khedr, A.N., Haddadi, S., Rahman, A.U., Tammam, M., Pourkarimi, M.R.: Intrinsic decoherence effects on nonclassical correlations in a symmetric spin-orbit model. *Res. Phys.* **39**, 105693 (2022)
47. Zidan, V., Rahman, A.U., Haddadi, S., Czerwinski, A., Haseli, S.: Local quantum uncertainty and quantum interferometric power in an anisotropic two-qubit system. *Universe* **9**, 5 (2023)
48. Wigner, E.P., Yanase, M.M.: Information contents of distributions. *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **49**, 910 (1963)
49. Luo, S.: Wigner-Yanase skew information and uncertainty relations. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 180403 (2003)
50. Jebli, L., Benzimoun, B., Daoud, M.: Quantum correlations for two-qubit  $X$  states through the local quantum uncertainty. *Int. J. Quant. Inf.* **15**, 1750020 (2017)
51. Slaoui, A., Daoud, M., Ahl Laamara, R.: The dynamics of local quantum uncertainty and trace distance discord for two-qubit  $X$  states under decoherence: a comparative study. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **17**, 178 (2018)
52. Habiballah, N., Khedif, Y., Daoud, M.: Local quantum uncertainty in XYZ Heisenberg spin models with Dzyaloshinski-Moriya interaction. *Eur. Phys. J. D* **72**, 154 (2018)
53. Guo, Y.-N., Peng, H.-P., Tian, Q.-L., Tan, Z.-G., Chen, Y.: Local quantum uncertainty in a two-qubit Heisenberg spin chain with intrinsic decoherence. *Phys. Scr.* **96**, 075101 (2021)