

# Propagation of initial uncertainties to Arthurs-Kelly inequality

Mi-Ra Hwang<sup>1,2</sup>, Eylee Jung<sup>1,2</sup>, and DaeKil Park<sup>1,2,3\*</sup>

<sup>1</sup> *Quanta, Changdong 76, Masan, 51730, Korea*

<sup>2</sup> *Department of Electronic Engineering,*

*Kyungnam University, Changwon 631-701, Korea*

<sup>3</sup> *Department of Physics, Kyungnam University, Changwon 631-701, Korea*

## Abstract

When the interaction Hamiltonian is  $\hat{H}_I = \kappa(\hat{x}_3\hat{p}_1 + \hat{p}_3\hat{p}_2)$  for large  $\kappa$  and the initial quantum state is  $\Psi_{in}(x_1, x_2, x_3) = \prod_{j=1}^3 \phi_j(x_j)$ , the joint measurement of complementary variables  $x_3$  and  $p_3$  at  $t = 1/\kappa$  induces the uncertainty  $\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}(t = 1/\kappa)\Delta_{\hat{x}_2}(t = 1/\kappa) \geq \frac{1}{2}(\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}\Delta_{\hat{p}_1} + \Delta_{\hat{x}_2}\Delta_{\hat{p}_2}) + \Delta_{\hat{x}_3}\Delta_{\hat{p}_3}$ , where the standard deviations in the right hand are the deviations at  $t = 0$ . This is a generalized version of the well-known Arthurs-Keller inequality  $\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}(t = 1/\kappa)\Delta_{\hat{x}_2}(t = 1/\kappa) \geq 1$  arising when all  $\phi_j(x_j)$  are the minimal uncertainty Gaussian states. If the initial probe state is entangled, it is shown that the generalized Arthurs-Kelly inequality can be violated. We show the violation explicitly by introducing a special example.

---

\* corresponding author, dkpark@kyungnam.ac.kr

## I. INTRODUCTION

The uncertainty principle (UP) is a fundamental concept in quantum physics. The idea of UP was first proposed by Heisenberg[1] by considering the measurement of electron's position by means of scattered light, which at the same time leads to a disturbance of the electron's momentum. He estimated the lower bound for the product of the mean errors of position and momentum to be of the order of Planck constant. The most familiar expression of the UP is Heisenberg-Robertson form[2];

$$\Delta_{\hat{x}}\Delta_{\hat{p}} \geq \frac{\hbar}{2} \quad (1.1)$$

where  $\left(\Delta_{\hat{A}}^2\right)_{\psi} \equiv \langle\psi|\hat{A}^2|\psi\rangle - \langle\psi|\hat{A}|\psi\rangle^2$  is a variance computed in the measurement of the observable  $\hat{A}$  when the state vector is  $|\psi\rangle$ . In the following  $\hbar = 1$  will be chosen for simplicity. Also we will drop the quantum state  $|\psi\rangle$  when it is evident in a context.

For a long time it is believed that Eq. (1.1) states that the position and momentum of a particle cannot be simultaneously measured with arbitrary precision[3, 4]. However, recent study indicates that the inequality (1.1) is not related to the simultaneous measurement. This can be understood from the fact that Eq. (1.1) does not involve the effect of the measurement apparatus. Rather, the interpretation of Eq. (1.1) is related to a restriction on quantum state preparation[5–10]. This is summarized in Ref.[11], where the following comment is presented: *The correct interpretation of the UP is that if we prepare a large number of quantum systems in identical state,  $|\psi\rangle$ , and then perform measurements of  $\hat{x}$  on some of those systems, and of  $\hat{p}$  in others, then the standard deviation  $\Delta_{\hat{x}}$  times the standard deviation  $\Delta_{\hat{p}}$  will satisfy the inequality (1.1).*

The first quantum-mechanical description of the joint measurement of complementary variables came up with a paper by Arthurs and Kelly (AK) [12]. They generalized the von Neumann measurement process[13], where a position measurement was considered via a single additional pointer system. For the simultaneous measurement AK introduced two probes for the measurement process. Thus, the whole system consists of three parties: one of them which is “3” in the following is a physical particle, whose position and momentum will be jointly measured, and two of them which are “1” and “2” are the pointer systems. The interaction Hamiltonian is chosen as a form  $\hat{H}_{int} = \kappa(\hat{x}_3\hat{p}_1 + \hat{p}_3\hat{p}_2)$  with large coupling constant  $\kappa$ . It is assumed that the joint measurement is performed at time  $t = 1/\kappa$  for

simplicity. Then, AK showed that if the initial state is written as  $\Psi_{in}(x_1, x_2, x_3 : t = 0) = \phi_1(x_1)\phi_2(x_2)\phi_3(x_3)$  and each  $\phi_j$  is a Gaussian state with minimum uncertainty, the uncertainty for the meters holds the inequality

$$\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}(t = 1/\kappa)\Delta_{\hat{x}_2}(t = 1/\kappa) \geq 1. \quad (1.2)$$

This is twice of the Heisenberg uncertainty given in Eq. (1.1). The experimental test of the joint measurement was also discussed in Ref. [14–16].

In this letter we examine the dependence of the initial state in the AK inequality (1.2). In particular, we will examine the effect of the initial entangled probe state in detail. For the purpose we choose the initial state as  $\Psi_{in}(x_1, x_2, x_3 : t = 0) = \psi(x_1, x_2)\phi_3(x_3)$ , where  $\psi$  and  $\phi$  are arbitrary normalized wave function. The time evolution of quantum state will be determined by deriving the Feynman propagator[17, 18] of the AK system explicitly. In next section the main results of this letter is summarized. In section III the Feynman propagator of the AK system is explicitly derived. In section IV the main results introduced in section II are derived. Also, in order to discuss the effect of the entangled probe states, we introduce a special example in this section. In section V a brief conclusion is given.

## II. MAIN RESULTS

The final and main results of this letter can be summarized as following. At time  $t = 1/\kappa$  the variances  $\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}^2(t = 1/\kappa)$  and  $\Delta_{\hat{x}_2}^2(t = 1/\kappa)$  are expressed in terms of the variances at  $t = 0$  as following:

$$\begin{aligned} \Delta_{\hat{x}_1}^2(t = 1/\kappa) &= \Delta_{\hat{x}_1}^2 + \Delta_{\hat{x}_3}^2 + \frac{1}{4}\Delta_{\hat{p}_2}^2 + \alpha \\ \Delta_{\hat{x}_2}^2(t = 1/\kappa) &= \Delta_{\hat{x}_2}^2 + \Delta_{\hat{p}_3}^2 + \frac{1}{4}\Delta_{\hat{p}_1}^2 - \beta \end{aligned} \quad (2.1)$$

where

$$\alpha = \langle \hat{x}_1 \hat{p}_2 \rangle - \langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{p}_2 \rangle \quad \beta = \langle \hat{x}_2 \hat{p}_1 \rangle - \langle \hat{x}_2 \rangle \langle \hat{p}_1 \rangle. \quad (2.2)$$

In the following any variances and means without explicit time are assumed to be computed at  $t = 0$ . Therefore, Eq. (2.1) shows the propagation of uncertainties from  $t = 0$  to  $t = 1/\kappa$  for large  $\kappa$ .

If the initial probe states is uncorrelated, i.e.  $\psi(x_1, x_2) = \phi_1(x_1)\phi_2(x_2)$ , then  $\alpha = \beta = 0$ , and the inequality (1.2) is generalized as a form:

$$\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}(t = 1/\kappa)\Delta_{\hat{x}_2}(t = 1/\kappa) \geq \Gamma = \Gamma_1 + \Gamma_2 + \Gamma_3 \quad (2.3)$$

where  $\Gamma_j$  is a contribution of each probe states and system as a form

$$\Gamma_1 = \frac{1}{2}\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}\Delta_{\hat{p}_1} \quad \Gamma_2 = \frac{1}{2}\Delta_{\hat{x}_2}\Delta_{\hat{p}_2} \quad \Gamma_3 = \Delta_{\hat{x}_3}\Delta_{\hat{p}_3}. \quad (2.4)$$

If each state obeys the minimal uncertainty, it is obvious that Eq. (1.2) is reproduced. If initial probe states are correlated with each other, it is shown that the generalized AK inequality (2.3) can be violated because of nonzero of  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . This fact will be explicitly illustrated by choosing a general entangled Gaussian probe state.

### III. FEYNMAN PROPAGATOR

In order to derive the Feynman propagator we need to introduce the kinetic Hamiltonian as well as the interaction Hamiltonian. Since we will take the large coupling constant, it is free to choose any kinetic Hamiltonian because its contribution to the uncertainties is negligible. Thus, we will take the simplest one, the free particle Hamiltonian. Thus the total Hamiltonian is

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_{free} + \hat{H}_{int} \quad (3.1)$$

where

$$\hat{H}_{free} = \frac{\hat{p}_1^2}{2m_1} + \frac{\hat{p}_2^2}{2m_2} + \frac{\hat{p}_3^2}{2m_3} \quad \hat{H}_{int} = \kappa(\hat{x}_3\hat{p}_1 + \hat{p}_3\hat{p}_2). \quad (3.2)$$

Now, we consider the classical mechanics with total Hamiltonian<sup>1</sup>  $H$ . From the total Hamiltonian the classical Hamilton equations  $\dot{x}_j = \frac{\partial H}{\partial p_j}$  and  $\dot{p}_j = -\frac{\partial H}{\partial x_j}$  can be easily derived. Eliminating the conjugate momenta  $p_j$  from the Hamilton equations, one can derive the classical equations of motion in the form:

$$\begin{aligned} \ddot{x}_1 - \kappa\dot{x}_3 &= 0 & \ddot{x}_2 - \kappa m_3 \ddot{x}_3 &= 0 \\ \frac{m_3}{b}(m_2\kappa\ddot{x}_2 - \ddot{x}_3) &= -m_1\kappa(\dot{x}_1 - \kappa x_3) \end{aligned} \quad (3.3)$$

---

<sup>1</sup> Since we are considering the classical mechanics and path-integral quantum mechanics in this section, the hat, which denotes operator, will be dropped.

where

$$b = m_2 m_3 \kappa^2 - 1. \quad (3.4)$$

For the derivation of the Feynman propagator we need an action, from which the classical equations of motion (3.3) are derived from the least action principle. The action can be explicitly derived by a trial and error in the form:

$$S = \int_0^t dt L(\dot{x}_j, x_j) \quad (3.5)$$

where the Lagrangian  $L(x_j, \dot{x}_j)$  is

$$L = \frac{m_1}{2} (\dot{x}_1 - \kappa x_3)^2 - \frac{1}{2b} (m_2 \dot{x}_2^2 + m_3 \dot{x}_3^2 - 2\kappa m_2 m_3 \dot{x}_2 \dot{x}_3). \quad (3.6)$$

Generally, the Feynman propagator can be computed by a path-integral

$$K[x_j(t) : x_j(0) : t] = \int Dx_1 Dx_2 Dx_3 e^{iS}. \quad (3.7)$$

Since, however, the action in Eq. (3.5) is quadratic, we do not need to compute the path-integral explicitly. It is expressed in terms of the classical action  $S_{cl}$  and the prefactor  $F(t)$  in the form

$$K[x_j(t) : x_j(0) : t] = F(t) e^{iS_{cl}}. \quad (3.8)$$

In order to compute the classical action we should solve Eq. (3.3) explicitly. Inserting the classical solutions into the action (3.5) one can derive the classical action as following:

$$S_{cl} = \frac{1}{2a(t)bt} \left[ 12m_1 m_3 b z_1^2 - m_2 a(t) z_2^2 - m_3 a(t) z_-^2 + 3m_1 m_3 \kappa^2 t^2 b z_+^2 \right. \\ \left. - 12m_1 m_3 \kappa t b z_1 z_+ + 2m_2 m_3 \kappa a(t) z_2 z_- \right]. \quad (3.9)$$

where  $a(t) = 12m_3 + m_1 \kappa^2 t^2$  and

$$z_1 = Q_1 - q_1 \quad z_2 = Q_2 - q_2 \quad z_{\pm} = Q_3 \pm q_3. \quad (3.10)$$

When deriving the classical action we used the boundary conditions as  $x_j(0) = q_j$  and  $x_j(T) = Q_j$ . When  $\kappa = 0$ ,  $S_{cl}$  reduces to

$$S_{cl} = \frac{m_1 z_1^2 + m_2 z_2^2 + m_3 z_-^2}{2t}. \quad (3.11)$$

This is just the classical action for three free particle systems.

Now, let us consider the prefactor  $F(t)$ . In the following we will compute  $F(t)$  explicitly without using the path-integral. First we note that if  $\kappa = 0$ ,  $F(t)$  should become

$$F(t) = \sqrt{\frac{m_1}{2\pi it}} \sqrt{\frac{m_2}{2\pi it}} \sqrt{\frac{m_3}{2\pi it}} = \sqrt{\frac{im_1 m_2 m_3}{8\pi^3 t^3}}. \quad (3.12)$$

In order to compute  $F(t)$  we use the identity[17, 18]

$$\begin{aligned} & K[Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 : q_1, q_2, q_3 : t] \\ &= \int dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 K[Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 : x_1, x_2, x_3 : t_1] K[x_1, x_2, x_3 : q_1, q_2, q_3 : t - t_1], \end{aligned} \quad (3.13)$$

which yields

$$F(t) = \pi^{3/2} F(t_1) F(t - t_1) \sqrt{\frac{2ibt_1^3(t - t_1)^3 a(t_1) a(t - t_1)}{3m_1 m_2 m_3^2 t^3 a(t)}}. \quad (3.14)$$

Solving Eq. (3.14), one can show

$$F(t) = \sqrt{\frac{3m_1 m_2 m_3^2}{2\pi^3 i b t^3 a(t)}}. \quad (3.15)$$

When  $\kappa = 0$ ,  $a = 12m_3$  and  $b = -1$ , which makes Eq. (3.15) coincide with Eq. (3.12) exactly. Therefore, the Feynman propagator or Kernel for the system (3.1) is

$$K[Q_1, Q_2, Q_3 : q_1, q_2, q_3 : t] = \sqrt{\frac{3m_1 m_2 m_3^2}{2\pi^3 i b t^3 a(t)}} e^{iS_{cl}} \quad (3.16)$$

where  $S_{cl}$  is explicitly given in Eq. (3.9). One can derive the Feynman propagator (3.16) differently by making use of the time evolution operator given in Ref. [19], where the effect of free particle evolution is examined in AK inequality without adopting the large  $\kappa$  assumption.

#### IV. DERIVATION OF MAIN RESULTS

Since the Feynman propagator is a coordinate representation of the time-evolution operator, it is possible to derive the wave function at  $t = T$  from the wave function at  $t = 0$  as follows:

$$\Psi(x_1, x_2, x_3 : T) = \int dq_1 dq_2 dq_3 K[x_1, x_2, x_3 : q_1, q_2, q_3 : T] \psi(q_1, q_2) \phi_3(q_3). \quad (4.1)$$

It is convenient to express the Feynman propagator in a form:

$$K[x_1, x_2, x_3 : q_1, q_2, q_3 : T] = \sqrt{\frac{3m_1 m_2 m_3^2}{2\pi^3 i a b T^3}} e^{iS_{cl}} \quad (4.2)$$

where  $a = a(T) = 12m_3 + m_1\kappa^2T^2$  and  $S_{cl}$  is

$$S_{cl} = \frac{f(x_1, x_2, x_3)}{2abT} + A_1q_1^2 + A_2q_2^2 + A_3q_3^2 + 2A_{13}q_1q_3 + 2A_{23}q_2q_3 + B_1q_1 + B_2q_2 + B_3q_3. \quad (4.3)$$

In Eq. (4.3)  $f(x_1, x_2, x_3)$  is

$$f(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 12m_1m_3bx_1^2 - m_2ax_2^2 - (m_3a - 3m_1m_3\kappa^2T^2b)x_3^2 - 12m_1m_3\kappa Tbx_1x_3 + 2m_2m_3\kappa ax_2x_3 \quad (4.4)$$

and the coefficients are

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 &= \frac{6m_1m_3}{aT} & A_2 &= -\frac{m_2}{2bT} & A_3 &= \frac{m_3(3m_1\kappa^2T^2b - a)}{2abT} & A_{13} &= \frac{3m_1m_3\kappa}{a} \\ A_{23} &= \frac{m_2m_3\kappa}{2bT} & B_1 &= \frac{6m_1m_3(\kappa Tx_3 - 2x_1)}{aT} & B_2 &= \frac{m_2(x_2 - m_3\kappa x_3)}{bT} \\ B_3 &= \frac{m_3}{abT} \left[ (a + 3m_1\kappa^2T^2b)x_3 - 6m_1\kappa Tbx_1 - m_2\kappa ax_2 \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (4.5)$$

It is worthwhile noting that among all coefficients only  $B_j$  ( $j = 1, 2, 3$ ) depend on  $x_j$ . Therefore,  $\Psi(x_1, x_2, x_3 : T)$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(x_1, x_2, x_3 : T) &= \sqrt{\frac{3m_1m_2m_3^2}{2\pi^3iabT^3}} \exp \left[ \frac{i}{2abT} f(x_1, x_2, x_3) \right] \\ &\times \int dq_1 dq_2 dq_3 \exp \left[ iA_1q_1^2 + iA_2q_2^2 + iA_3q_3^2 + 2iA_{13}q_1q_3 + 2iA_{23}q_2q_3 \right. \\ &\quad \left. + iB_1q_1 + iB_2q_2 + iB_3q_3 \right] \psi(q_1, q_2) \phi_3(q_3). \end{aligned} \quad (4.6)$$

Now, let us take  $T = 1/\kappa$  for simplicity. Also, we will take large  $\kappa$  limit subsequently. In this case the coefficients becomes  $a(T) \equiv a = m_1 + 12m_3$  and  $b \approx m_2m_3\kappa^2$ . The other coefficients given in Eq. (4.5) should be replaced with their dominant terms in this limit. Then, the normalization condition of  $\Psi(x_1, x_2, x_3 : T)$  can be proved by noting

$$\int dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 e^{iB_1(q_1 - q'_1) + iB_2(q_2 - q'_2) + iB_3(q_3 - q'_3)} = \frac{(2\pi)^3 a}{12m_1m_3\kappa} \delta(\theta_1) \delta(\theta_2) \delta(\theta_3) \quad (4.7)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \theta_1 &= (q_1 - q'_1) + \frac{1}{2}(q_3 - q'_3) & \theta_2 &= \frac{1}{m_3\kappa}(q_2 - q'_2) - (q_3 - q'_3) \\ \theta_3 &= \frac{6m_1m_3\kappa}{a}(q_1 - q'_1) - (q_2 - q'_2) + \frac{3m_1m_3\kappa}{a}(q_3 - q'_3). \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

When deriving Eq. (4.7) we used  $\delta(ax) = \delta(x)/|a|$ . Furthermore, one can show

$$\delta(\theta_1)\delta(\theta_2)\delta(\theta_3) = \delta(q_1 - q'_1)\delta(q_2 - q'_2)\delta(q_3 - q'_3), \quad (4.9)$$

which is proved in appendix A. Using Eq. (4.9) it is easy to show  $\int dx_1 dx_2 dx_3 |\Psi(x_1, x_2, x_3 : T)|^2 = \int dq_1 dq_2 |\psi(q_1, q_2)|^2 \int dq_3 |\phi(q_3)|^2 = 1$ .

### A. calculation of $\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}^2(t = 1/\kappa)$

For the derivation of  $\langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa)$  we need a following formula

$$\begin{aligned} & \int dq_1 dq_2 dq_3 \delta'(\theta_1)\delta(\theta_2)\delta(\theta_3)g(q_1, q_2, q_3) \\ &= - \left[ \left(1 - \frac{3m_1}{a}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial q'_1} + \frac{6m_1 m_3 \kappa}{a} \frac{\partial}{\partial q'_2} + \frac{6m_1}{a} \frac{\partial}{\partial q'_3} \right] g(q'_1, q_2, q'_3). \end{aligned} \quad (4.10)$$

where the prime in delta function means the derivative with respect to the argument. This is proved in appendix A. By making use of Eq. (4.10) it is straightforward to show

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa) &= \frac{a}{12m_1 m_3 \kappa} \left(1 - \frac{3m_1}{a}\right) \langle \hat{p}_1 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \hat{p}_2 \rangle + \frac{1}{2m_3 \kappa} \langle \hat{p}_3 \rangle \\ &+ \left[ \frac{a}{6m_1 m_3 \kappa} \left(1 - \frac{3m_1}{a}\right) A_1 + \frac{1}{m_3 \kappa} A_{13} \right] \langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle + \left( A_2 + \frac{1}{2m_3 \kappa} A_{23} \right) \langle \hat{x}_2 \rangle \\ &+ \left[ \frac{a}{6m_1 m_3 \kappa} \left(1 - \frac{3m_1}{a}\right) A_{13} + A_{23} + \frac{1}{m_3 \kappa} A_3 \right] \langle \hat{x}_3 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.11)$$

Taking large  $\kappa$  limit it is easy to derive

$$\langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa) \approx \langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle + \langle \hat{x}_3 \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \hat{p}_2 \rangle. \quad (4.12)$$

Appendix A also proves

$$\begin{aligned} & \int dq_1 dq_2 dq_3 \delta''(\theta_1)\delta(\theta_2)\delta(\theta_3)g(q_1, q_2, q_3) \\ &= \left[ \left(1 - \frac{3m_1}{a}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial q'_1} + \frac{6m_1 m_3 \kappa}{a} \frac{\partial}{\partial q'_2} + \frac{6m_1}{a} \frac{\partial}{\partial q'_3} \right]^2 g(q'_1, q_2, q'_3). \end{aligned} \quad (4.13)$$

Then, it is straightforward to show

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{x}_1^2 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa) &= \langle \hat{x}_1^2 \rangle + \langle \hat{x}_3^2 \rangle + 2\langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{x}_3 \rangle + \frac{a - 3m_1}{6m_1 m_3 \kappa} [\langle \hat{x}_1 \hat{p}_1 \rangle + \langle \hat{x}_3 \rangle \langle \hat{p}_1 \rangle] \\ &+ \langle \hat{x}_1 \hat{p}_2 \rangle + \langle \hat{p}_2 \rangle \langle \hat{x}_3 \rangle + \frac{1}{m_3 \kappa} [\langle \hat{x}_3 \hat{p}_3 \rangle + \langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{p}_3 \rangle] + \frac{a - 3m_1}{12m_1 m_3 \kappa} \langle \hat{p}_1 \hat{p}_2 \rangle \\ &+ \frac{a - 3m_1}{12m_1 m_3^2 \kappa^2} \langle \hat{p}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{p}_3 \rangle + \frac{1}{2m_3 \kappa} \langle \hat{p}_2 \rangle \langle \hat{p}_3 \rangle + \left( \frac{a - 3m_1}{12m_1 m_3 \kappa} \right)^2 \langle \hat{p}_1^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle \hat{p}_2^2 \rangle + \frac{1}{4m_3^2 \kappa^2} \langle \hat{p}_3^2 \rangle \\ &\approx \langle \hat{x}_1^2 \rangle + \langle \hat{x}_3^2 \rangle + 2\langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{x}_3 \rangle + \langle \hat{x}_1 \hat{p}_2 \rangle + \langle \hat{p}_2 \rangle \langle \hat{x}_3 \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle \hat{p}_2^2 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.14)$$



The final expression in the right hand of Eq. (4.14) is derived by taking large  $\kappa$  limit. Therefore  $\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}^2(t = 1/\kappa) \equiv \langle \hat{x}_1^2 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa) - \langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle^2(t = 1/\kappa)$  can be computed from Eqs. (4.12) and (4.14), which results in first equation of Eq. (2.1).

### B. calculation of $\Delta_{\hat{x}_2}^2(t = 1/\kappa)$

Applying similar way one can compute  $\langle \hat{x}_2 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa)$  and  $\langle \hat{x}_2^2 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa)$ , whose explicit expressions are

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{x}_2 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa) &\approx \langle \hat{x}_2 \rangle + \langle \hat{p}_3 \rangle - \frac{1}{2} \langle \hat{p}_1 \rangle \\ \langle \hat{x}_2^2 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa) &\approx \langle \hat{x}_2^2 \rangle + \langle \hat{p}_3^2 \rangle + 2\langle \hat{x}_2 \rangle \langle \hat{p}_3 \rangle - \langle \hat{x}_2 \hat{p}_1 \rangle - \langle \hat{p}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{p}_3 \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle \hat{p}_1^2 \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4.15)$$

Thus,  $\langle \hat{x}_2 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa)$  and  $\langle \hat{x}_2^2 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa)$  are derived from  $\langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa)$  and  $\langle \hat{x}_1^2 \rangle(t = 1/\kappa)$  by changing  $\hat{x}_1 \rightarrow \hat{x}_2$ ,  $\hat{x}_3 \rightarrow \hat{p}_3$ , and  $\hat{p}_2 \rightarrow -\hat{p}_1$ . Using this rule one can derive the second equation of Eq. (2.1).

### C. Generalized Arthurs-Kelly inequality : case for separable probe state

If the probe states is  $\psi(x_1, x_2) = \phi_1(x_1)\phi_2(x_2)$ , it is easy to prove  $\alpha = \beta = 0$ . Let us define  $K_j \equiv \Delta_{\hat{x}_j}^2 \Delta_{\hat{p}_j}^2$ . Then, it is easy to show

$$\begin{aligned} &\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}^2(t = 1/\kappa) \Delta_{\hat{x}_2}^2(T = 1/\kappa) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}(K_1 + K_2) + K_3 + \frac{K_1 K_2}{x} + \frac{K_2 K_3}{y} + K_1 \frac{y}{x} + \frac{K_3 x}{4y} + \frac{x}{16} + \frac{y}{4} \end{aligned} \quad (4.16)$$

where  $x = \Delta_{\hat{p}_1}^2 \Delta_{\hat{p}_2}^2$  and  $y = \Delta_{\hat{p}_2}^2 \Delta_{\hat{p}_3}^2$ . This is minimized if the equations

$$\begin{aligned} -\frac{K_1 K_2}{x^2} - K_1 \frac{y}{x^2} + \frac{K_3}{4} \frac{1}{y} + \frac{1}{16} &= 0 \\ -\frac{K_2 K_3}{y^2} + \frac{K_1}{x} - \frac{K_3}{4} \frac{x}{y^2} + \frac{1}{4} &= 0 \end{aligned} \quad (4.17)$$

hold. Eq. (4.17) is solved by  $x = 4\sqrt{K_1 K_2}$  and  $y = 2\sqrt{K_2 K_3}$ . Inserting  $x$  and  $y$  into Eq. (4.16) one can derive the main result (2.3).

#### D. Case for correlated probe state

In this case  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  are generally nonzero and nonnegative. From Eq. (2.1) One can show that  $\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}^2(t = 1/\kappa)\Delta_{\hat{x}_2}^2(t = 1/\kappa)$  can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} & \Delta_{\hat{x}_1}^2(t = 1/\kappa) \Delta_{\hat{x}_2}^2(t = 1/\kappa) \\ &= \frac{1}{4}(K_1 + K_2) + K_3 + \frac{K_1 K_2}{x} + \frac{K_2 K_3}{y} + K_1 \frac{y}{x} + \frac{K_3 x}{4y} + \frac{x}{16} + \frac{y}{4} - \alpha\beta \\ &+ \alpha \left[ K_2 \sqrt{\frac{z}{xy}} + \sqrt{\frac{yz}{x}} + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{xz}{y}} \right] - \beta \left[ K_1 \sqrt{\frac{y}{xz}} + K_3 \sqrt{\frac{x}{yz}} + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{xy}{z}} \right] \end{aligned} \quad (4.18)$$

where  $z = \Delta_{\hat{p}_3}^2 \Delta_{\hat{p}_1}^2$ . This does not seem to have physically relevant lower bound because equation  $\frac{\partial}{\partial z} \Delta_{\hat{x}_1}^2(t = 1/\kappa) \Delta_{\hat{x}_2}^2(t = 1/\kappa) = 0$  does not provide the positive solution for  $z$ . Of course, one can make a lower bound by removing  $\alpha \left[ K_2 \sqrt{\frac{z}{xy}} + \sqrt{\frac{yz}{x}} + \frac{1}{4} \sqrt{\frac{xz}{y}} \right]$  term in Eq. (4.18). However, this does not seem to be the tight lower bound.

Eq. (4.18) implies the violation of the generalized AK inequality (2.3) or more strongly the original AK inequality (1.2) depending on  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$ . In order to confirm this fact we consider the special example in the following, where the general Gaussian probe state is chosen. In this special example we find the violation of (2.3), but unfortunately, the violation of (1.2) is not found.

#### E. special example

Let us choose the initial correlated probe state as a following general Gaussian state

$$\psi(x_1, x_2) = \mathcal{N} \exp \left[ -\frac{A}{2} x_1^2 - \frac{B}{2} x_2^2 + C x_1 x_2 + D_1 x_1 + D_2 x_2 \right] \quad (4.19)$$

where  $A, B, C, D_1,$  and  $D_2$  are complex numbers. Of course,  $\mathcal{N}$  is a normalization constant given by

$$|\mathcal{N}|^2 = \frac{\sqrt{A_R B_R - C_R^2}}{\pi} \exp \left[ -\frac{A_R D_{2,R}^2 + B_R D_{1,R}^2 + 2D_{1,R} D_{2,R} C_R}{A_R B_R - C_R^2} \right] \quad (4.20)$$

where  $z_R = \text{Re}z$  and  $z_I = \text{Im}z$ . After some calculation one can show

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{B_R}{A_R B_R - C_R^2} & \Delta_{\hat{x}_2}^2 &= \frac{1}{2} \frac{A_R}{A_R B_R - C_R^2} \\
\Delta_{\hat{p}_1}^2 &= \frac{A_R}{2} + \frac{A_R C_I^2 + A_I^2 B_R - 2A_I C_R C_I}{2(A_R B_R - C_R^2)} \\
\Delta_{\hat{p}_2}^2 &= \frac{B_R}{2} + \frac{A_R B_I^2 + B_R C_I^2 - 2B_I C_R C_I}{2(A_R B_R - C_R^2)} \\
\alpha &\equiv \langle \hat{x}_1 \hat{p}_2 \rangle - \langle \hat{x}_1 \rangle \langle \hat{p}_2 \rangle = \frac{B_R C_I - B_I C_R}{2(A_R B_R - C_R^2)} \\
\beta &\equiv \langle \hat{x}_2 \hat{p}_1 \rangle - \langle \hat{x}_2 \rangle \langle \hat{p}_1 \rangle = \frac{A_R C_I - A_I C_R}{2(A_R B_R - C_R^2)}.
\end{aligned} \tag{4.21}$$

Thus, the imaginary parts of  $A$ ,  $B$ , and  $C$  make  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  to be nonzero.




FIG. 1: (Color online) We compare the lower bound  $\Gamma$  for the uncorrelated case in Eq. (4.24) and  $\Gamma_C = \Delta_{x_1}(T = 1/\kappa)\Delta_{x_2}(T = 1/\kappa)$  for correlated case given in (4.25) when (a)  $B_R = C_R = 1$  and (b)  $B_R = 1$  and  $C_R = 2$ . The red boundary regions in (a) and (b) are regions where  $\Gamma_C \leq \Gamma$ . In this sense the generalized AK inequality (2.3) is violated in this region. Unfortunately, we cannot find the violation of the original AK inequality expressed in Eq. (1.2) in this example.

Now, for simplicity, we set

$$A_I = \frac{C_R C_I}{B_R} \quad B_I = \frac{C_R C_I}{A_R}. \tag{4.22}$$

In this case we get

$$\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}^2 \Delta_{\hat{p}_1}^2 = \Delta_{\hat{x}_2}^2 \Delta_{\hat{p}_2}^2 = \frac{A_R B_R + C_I^2}{4(A_R B_R - C_R^2)}. \tag{4.23}$$

Finally, we choose the state for the system simply as  $\phi(x_3) = \exp(-x_3^2/2)/\pi^{1/4}$ , which gives  $\Delta_{\hat{x}_3}^2 = \Delta_{\hat{p}_3}^2 = 1/2$ . Thus the lower bound of the generalized AK inequality given in Eq. (2.3) is

$$\Gamma = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \sqrt{\frac{A_R B_R + C_I^2}{A_R B_R - C_R^2}} \right]. \quad (4.24)$$

If  $C_R = C_I = 0$ ,  $\psi(x_1, x_2)$  becomes separable and hence, the original inequality (1.2) is reproduced. For the entangled case one can compute  $\Delta_{\hat{x}_1}(t = 1/\kappa)\Delta_{\hat{x}_2}(t = 1/\kappa) = \Gamma_C$  where

$$\Gamma_C = \frac{\sqrt{f_1 f_2}}{8\sqrt{A_R B_R}(A_R B_R - C_R^2)} \quad (4.25)$$

with

$$\begin{aligned} f_1 &= 4A_R B_R + (A_R B_R - C_R^2)(A_R B_R + 4A_R + C_I^2 + 4C_I) \\ f_2 &= 4A_R B_R + (A_R B_R - C_R^2)(A_R B_R + 4B_R + C_I^2 - 4C_I). \end{aligned} \quad (4.26)$$

If  $C_R = C_I = 0$  and  $A_R = B_R = 2$ ,  $\Gamma_C$  also becomes one.

We compare  $\Gamma$  and  $\Gamma_C$  in Fig. 1 when (a)  $B_R = C_R = 1$  and (b)  $B_R = 1$  and  $C_R = 2$ . The red boundary regions in both figures represent the region of  $\Gamma_C \leq \Gamma$  in the  $A_R - C_I$  plane. In this sense the correlated probe states yields the violation of the generalized AK inequality (2.3). However, we cannot find the violation of the original AK inequality (1.2) in this example.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

It is needless to say that the UP is essential in the theoretical ground of quantum physics. Furthermore, it is also important from the aspect of quantum technology, because the reduction of the UP enhance the accuracy[20]. In this reason our main result is important, because the entangled detector can violate the generalized AK inequality in the joint measurement of the complementary variables as shown explicitly in the special example. Similarly, the violation of the Heisenberg sequential noise-disturbance principle was debated in Ref. [21, 22]. We are not sure whether the entangled probe states can violate the original AK inequality or not even though we have not found it in the special example. One can also try to find a violation of the original AK inequality by considering the tripartite entanglement[23] including the state of the physical system. At the present stage we do not know whether the

violation of the original AK inequality is possible or not. We hope to explore this issue in the future.

- 
- [1] W. Heisenberg, *Über den anschaulichen Inhalt der quantentheoretischen Kinematik und Mechanik*, Z. Phys. **43** (1927) 172.
  - [2] H. P. Robertson, *The Uncertainty Principle*, Phys. Rev. **34** (1929) 163.
  - [3] See Wikipedia in [https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uncertainty\\_principle](https://en.wikipedia.org/wiki/Uncertainty_principle).
  - [4] C. Cohen-Tannoudji, B. Diu, and F. Laloë, *Quantum Mechanics* (John Wiley & Sons, Toronto, ON, 1977).
  - [5] E. B. Rodríguez and L. M. A. Aguilar, *Disturbance-Disturbance uncertainty relation: The statistical distinguishability of quantum states determines disturbance*, Sci. Rep. **8** (2018) 4010.
  - [6] L. E. Ballentine, *The Statistical Interpretation of Quantum Mechanics*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **42** (1970) 358.
  - [7] M. Bußhardt and Matthias Freyberger, *Timing in quantum measurements of position and momentum*, Phys. Rev. **A 82** (2010) 042117.
  - [8] M. Ozawa, *Realization of measurement and the standard quantum limit* in “Squeezed and Nonclassical light”, edited by P. Tombesi and E. R. Pike (Plenum Press, 1989, New York).
  - [9] D. M. Appleby, *Concept of Experimental Accuracy and Simultaneous Measurements of Position and Momentum*, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **37** (1998) 1491.
  - [10] M. G. Raymer, *Uncertainty principle for joint measurement of noncommuting variables*, Am. J. Phys. **62** (1994) 986.
  - [11] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
  - [12] E. Arthurs and J. Kelly, *On the Simultaneous Measurement of a Pair of Conjugate Observables*, *The Bell System Technical Journal*, **44** (1965) 725.
  - [13] J. von Neumann, *Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik* (Springer, Berlin, 1932).
  - [14] Y. Zhao, P. Kurzyński, G. Xiang, C. Li, and G. Guo, *Heisenberg’s error-disturbance relations: a joint measurement-based experimental test*, Phys. Rev. **A 95** (2017) 040101.
  - [15] M. Ringbauer, D. N. Biggerstaff, M. A. Broome, A. Fedrizzi, C. Branciard, and A. G. White, *Joint quantum measurements with minimum uncertainty*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112** (2014) 020401.

- [16] A. Trifonov, G. Bjork, and J. Soderholm, *Simultaneous minimum-uncertainty measurement of discrete-valued complementary observables*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86** (2001) 4423.
- [17] R. P. Feynman and A. R. Hibbs, *Quantum Mechanics and Path Integrals* (McGraw-Hill, 1965, New York).
- [18] H. Kleinert, *Path integrals in Quantum Mechanics, Statistics, and Polymer Physics* (World Scientific, 1995, Singapore).
- [19] J. A. Mendoza-Fierro, L. M. Arévalo Aguilar, and V. M. Velázquez Aguilar, *Effects of the free evolution in the Arthurs-Kelly model of simultaneous measurement and in the retrodictive predictions of the Heisenberg uncertainty relations*, Euro. Phys. J. Plus, **136** (2021) 954.
- [20] Q. Zhuang, Z. Zhang, and J. H. Shapiro, *Entanglement-Enhanced Lidars for Simultaneous Range and Velocity Measurements*, Phys. Rev. **A 96** (2017) 040304.
- [21] A. D. Lorenzo, *Correlations between detectors allow violation of the Heisenberg noise-disturbance principle for position and momentum measurements*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **110** (2013) 120403.
- [22] T. J Bullock and P. Busch, *Focusing in Arthurs-Kelly-type Joint Measurements with Correlated Probes*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113** (2014) 120401.
- [23] V. Coffman, J. Kundu and W. K. Wootters, *Distributed entanglement*, Phys. Rev. **A61** (2000) 052306.

## Appendix A: Derivation of Eq. (4.9) and Eq. (4.10)

In order to prove Eq. (4.9) we compute

$$J = \int dq_1 dq_2 dq_3 \delta(\theta_1) \delta(\theta_2) \delta(\theta_3) g(q_1, q_2, q_3) \quad (\text{A.1})$$

for arbitrary function  $g(q_1, q_2, q_3)$ , First we note  $\delta(\theta_1)\delta(\theta_2)\delta(\theta_3)$  can be written as  $\delta(X - A)\delta(Y - B)\delta(Z - C)$ , where

$$\begin{aligned} X &= q_1 + \frac{q_3}{2} & Y &= \frac{q_2}{m_3\kappa} - q_3 & Z &= \frac{6m_1m_3\kappa}{a}q_1 - q_2 + \frac{3m_1m_3\kappa}{a}q_3 \\ A &= q'_1 + \frac{q'_3}{2} & B &= \frac{q'_2}{m_3\kappa} - q'_3 & C &= \frac{6m_1m_3\kappa}{a}q'_1 - q'_2 + \frac{3m_1m_3\kappa}{a}q'_3. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A.2})$$

Inverting Eq. (A.2) one can show

$$q_1 = \left(1 - \frac{3m_1}{a}\right)X + \frac{Y}{2} + \frac{Z}{2m_3\kappa} \quad q_2 = \frac{6m_1m_3\kappa}{a}X - Z \quad q_3 = \frac{6m_1}{a}X - Y - \frac{Z}{m_3\kappa}. \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Computing the Jacobian, one can show  $dq_1 dq_2 dq_3 = dX dY dZ$ . Thus,  $J$  can be written as  $J = g(q'_1, q'_2, q'_3)$ , which implies Eq. (4.9).

Eq. (4.10) can be derived by making use of Eq. (A.3) as follows:

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_1} \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial X} = \frac{\partial q_1}{\partial X} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_1} + \frac{\partial q_2}{\partial X} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_2} + \frac{\partial q_3}{\partial X} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_3} = \left(1 - \frac{3m_1}{a}\right) \frac{\partial}{\partial q_1} + \frac{6m_1m_3\kappa}{a} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_2} + \frac{6m_1}{a} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_3}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

Similarly, it is easy to show

$$\frac{\partial}{\partial\theta_2} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{\partial}{\partial q_1} - \frac{\partial}{\partial q_3}. \quad (\text{A.5})$$

Then, taking a partial integration one can prove Eq. (4.10). Furthermore, it is easy to prove Eq. (4.13) by taking partial integration twice.