

Comment on “Berry Phase in a Composite System”

Li Han and Yong Guo*

Department of Physics, Tsinghua University, Beijing 100084, People’s Republic of China

PACS numbers: 03.65.Vf

We show in this comment that in addition to the sign error in coefficient d_j acknowledged by Yi et al. in their recent erratum [2] for Ref. [1], the definition of subsystem Berry phase $\gamma = \sum_j p_j \gamma_j$, $\gamma_j = i \int_0^T dt \langle E_j(t) | \dot{E}_j(t) \rangle$ proposed as Eq. (7) in Ref. [1] is ambiguous and not gauge invariant.

The fact is that each γ_j has a 2π uncertainty depending on phase convention of the eigenstate $|E_j(t)\rangle$, which makes the weighted sum $\sum_j p_j \gamma_j$ to be multi-valued modulo 2π . To see this 2π uncertainty, we multiply the eigenstate $|E_j(t)\rangle$ with a time-dependent phase factor $e^{-i\varphi_j(t)}$, where $\varphi_j(t)$ is an arbitrary smooth function with condition $\varphi_j(T) = \varphi_j(0) + 2\pi m_j$ (m_j is an arbitrary integer) to ensure that $|\tilde{E}_j(t)\rangle = e^{-i\varphi_j(t)} |E_j(t)\rangle$ is cyclic too. In this new gauge, γ_j transforms as $\tilde{\gamma}_j = i \int_0^T dt \langle \tilde{E}_j(t) | \dot{\tilde{E}}_j(t) \rangle = \gamma_j + 2\pi m_j$. The subsystem Berry phase γ then transforms as $\tilde{\gamma} = \sum_j p_j \tilde{\gamma}_j = \gamma + 2\pi \sum_j p_j m_j$. As a result, the subsystem Berry phase is not invariant modulo 2π under a gauge transformation when the Schmidt’s coefficient p_j satisfies $0 < p_j < 1$, which is the case when the composite system is entangled. The definition of subsystem Berry phase in Ref. [1] is therefore ambiguous and not well-defined.

To overcome this ambiguity, we propose a proper definition of subsystem Berry phase as $\gamma = \arg(\sum_j p_j e^{i\gamma_j})$, where it is constructed from a weighted sum of individual phase factors rather than phases. The phase factor $e^{i\gamma_j}$ eliminates the 2π uncertainty in each γ_j and makes the new definition to be manifestly gauge invariant. This definition coincides with the geometric phase defined in Ref. [3] for a mixed state. Based on this definition, the relation found from Eq. (9) in Ref. [1] that the Berry phases of the subsystems add up to be that of the composite system no longer holds generally, except when the system is unentangled [4].

We present in Fig. 1 the Berry phases of the composite system (denote as $\gamma(m)$, $m = 1, 2, 3, 4$) and its subsystems (denote as $\gamma_{I,II}(m)$), using the correct form of co-

efficient d_j and the proper definition of subsystem Berry phase. The plots are considerably different from Fig. 6 in Ref. [1] in that (1) $\gamma(1) = -\gamma(2)$, $\gamma(3) = -\gamma(4)$ (mod 2π) and (2) $\gamma(m) \neq \gamma_I(m) + \gamma_{II}(m)$ when the coupling constant $g \neq 0$.

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (No. 10474052).




FIG. 1: Berry phases of the composite system (solid line), subsystem I (dashed line), subsystem II (dash-dotted line), and sum of Berry phases of the subsystems (dotted line) at $\theta = \frac{\pi}{4}$.

* Electronic address: guoy66@tsinghua.edu.cn

- [1] X. X. Yi, L. C. Wang, and T. Y. Zheng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 150406 (2004).
- [2] X. X. Yi, L. C. Wang, and T. Y. Zheng, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 139903(E) (2007).
- [3] K. Singh, D. M. Tong, K. Basu, J. L. Chen, and J. F. Du, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 032106 (2003); E. Sjöqvist *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2845 (2000).
- [4] E. Sjöqvist, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 022109 (2000).