

Toward experimental determination of spin entanglement of nucleon pairs

Dong Bai^{1,*}

¹*College of Mechanics and Engineering Science, Hohai University, Nanjing 211100, China*

Nuclear entanglement is a flagship in the interdisciplinary direction of nuclear physics and quantum information science. Spin entanglement, a special kind of nuclear entanglement, is ubiquitous in nuclear structures and dynamics. Based on the idea of quantum state tomography, the problem of experimental determination of spin entanglement of two-nucleon pure states is studied directly within the scope of nuclear physics. It is shown that the amount of spin entanglement can be obtained by measuring three spin polarizations of one nucleon in polarization experiments. The errors from imperfect preparation of nucleon pairs are also analyzed. This work not only complements the existing literature of nuclear entanglement but also provides new opportunities for nuclear physics with polarized particles.

I. INTRODUCTION

Nuclear entanglement is the latest frontier for the century-long exploration of the quantum nature of nuclear systems, revealing a previously unexplored aspect of nuclear quantumness [1–32]. It refers to a novel kind of nonclassical correlation that is ubiquitous in nuclear systems but would be absent if nuclear physics obeyed classical laws. The study of nuclear entanglement is inspired by recent progress in quantum information science and can be regarded a systematic extension of traditional approaches to nuclear correlations. It also provides valuable guidance to solve nuclear many-body problems on classical and quantum computers.

In 1976, Laméhi-Rachti and Mittig tested Bell’s inequalities by measuring spin correlations in low-energy proton-proton scattering [33]. In 2006, Sakai *et al.* gave a new nuclear Bell test by using proton pairs coming from the $p(d, {}^2\text{He})n$ reaction, improving Laméhi-Rachti and Mittig’s analysis in several key aspects [34] (see also Ref. [35]). Given the close connection between Bell’s inequality violation and quantum entanglement, these studies actually pioneer the direction of nuclear entanglement. Although widely recognized and highly cited by the quantum information community, these studies do not attract much attention from the nuclear physics community, since both nuclear Bell tests and nuclear entanglement have remained outside the main stream of nuclear physics for decades.

The situation is changing now. In the last few years, nuclear entanglement has been studied by several groups from the theoretical side and a number of interesting theoretical results are obtained for nuclear structure and reaction problems [1–32]. Given these theoretical achievements, it may be timely to also investigate how to determine the amount of nuclear entanglement experimentally. As far as I know, this problem has not been discussed publicly in low-energy nuclear physics. In quantum information science, the experimental determination of the amount of quantum entanglement has been studied from

the formal aspects by Refs. [36–40] for two-qubit pure states. A straightforward protocol is based on quantum state tomography (QST) [41], reconstructing the reduced density matrix from a couple of local measurements on one of the qubits and then evaluating the entanglement measure correspondingly (see Sec. II for a detailed description). It is shown by Ref. [36] that the QST protocol is actually optimal under the following three conditions: (1) only one pair of qubits can be measured at each time, (2) there are no auxiliary qubits available and only projective measurements are allowed in experiments, and (3) the measurement protocol remains unchanged in experiments. Later on, it was found that, if the second condition is relaxed, an improved protocol can be designed with a single local measurement, provided the availability of an auxiliary two-qubit system in the same state as the original one [37, 38]. Both protocols have been realized successfully in photonic experiments [37, 38, 42]. However, the experimental techniques for nucleon manipulation are generally different from those for photon manipulation. Some projective operators realizable in photonic experiments may be too complicated to be implemented in nuclear experiments. A detailed discussion will be given in Sec. IIB, related to the second protocol mentioned above. Therefore, it is necessary to work out the experimental protocol directly within the scope of low-energy nuclear physics.

As a first attempt, I study the experimental determination of spin entanglement of two-nucleon pure states with unknown spin wave functions. Explicitly, the neutron-proton pair is under consideration. In principle, the discussions could also be extended to proton-proton and neutron-neutron pairs, after taking into consideration the additional complexity due to identical particles. Spin entanglement is a special example of nuclear entanglement involving only spin degrees of freedom. It is ubiquitous in nuclear systems as nucleons are spin-1/2 particles and nuclear forces are spin dependent. These two nucleons could be produced by nucleon-nucleon scattering, dinucleon decays, knockout reactions, etc, and all these processes are named as entanglement sources for convenience. It is assumed that an ideal entanglement source can produce an infinite number of identical two-nucleon pure states,

* dbai@hhu.edu.cn




FIG. 1. The coordinate system for the nucleon pair in the laboratory frame, with \mathbf{p}_i ($i = A, B$) being the nucleon momentum and $\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i, \hat{z}_i$ being three unit vectors given by Eq. (1). In this coordinate system, the two nucleons move along the \hat{z}_A and \hat{z}_B axes in the \hat{x}_A - \hat{z}_A plane (equivalently, the \hat{x}_B - \hat{z}_B plane), while \hat{y}_A and \hat{y}_B point to the same direction perpendicular to the scattering plane.

upon which the experimental measurements are carried out. The remainder of this work is organized as follows. In Sec. II, the basic properties of reduced density matrix and spin entanglement are discussed with the emphasis on an entanglement measure called concurrence and its representations in terms of spin polarizations. In Sec. III, the possible experimental setups to determine spin polarizations are discussed, from which the experimental estimation of concurrence could be obtained. In Sec. V, conclusions are drawn.

II. SPIN ENTANGLEMENT

A. Reduced density matrix

Suppose there is an entangled neutron-proton pair emitted from an entanglement source. The momenta of the two nucleons (labeled as A and B) are given by \mathbf{p}_A and \mathbf{p}_B in the laboratory frame. For the later convenience, the following coordinate system is introduced for each nucleon ($i = A, B$) with the orthonormal vectors given by

$$\hat{z}_i = \frac{\mathbf{p}_i}{|\mathbf{p}_i|}, \quad \hat{y}_i = \frac{\mathbf{p}_A \times \mathbf{p}_B}{|\mathbf{p}_A \times \mathbf{p}_B|}, \quad \hat{x}_i = \hat{y}_i \times \hat{z}_i. \quad (1)$$

See also Fig. 1. In this coordinate system, the two nucleons move along \hat{z}_A and \hat{z}_B , respectively, and \hat{y}_A and \hat{y}_B point to the same direction perpendicular to the scattering plane spanned by \mathbf{p}_A and \mathbf{p}_B . For either set of $\{\hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i, \hat{z}_i\}$, the corresponding Pauli matrices are denoted by $\{\sigma_{\hat{x}_i}, \sigma_{\hat{y}_i}, \sigma_{\hat{z}_i}\}$.

Without loss of generality, the following wave function

is considered for the two nucleons,

$$|\Psi_{AB}\rangle = |\mathbf{p}_A \mathbf{p}_B\rangle \otimes |\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle, \quad (2)$$

$$|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle = \alpha_{00} |0_A 0_B\rangle + \alpha_{01} |0_A 1_B\rangle + \alpha_{10} |1_A 0_B\rangle + \alpha_{11} |1_A 1_B\rangle \quad (3)$$

with $|0_i\rangle$ and $|1_i\rangle$ being the eigenstates of $\sigma_{\hat{z}_i}$ satisfying $\sigma_{\hat{z}_i} |0_i\rangle = |0_i\rangle$ and $\sigma_{\hat{z}_i} |1_i\rangle = -|1_i\rangle$, and $\alpha_{00}, \alpha_{01}, \alpha_{10}, \alpha_{11}$ are the expansion coefficients satisfying $|\alpha_{00}|^2 + |\alpha_{01}|^2 + |\alpha_{10}|^2 + |\alpha_{11}|^2 = 1$. The two-nucleon wave function $|\Psi_{AB}\rangle$ in the form of Eq. (2) can be produced naturally by the nucleon-nucleon scattering [26]. The reduced density matrix $\rho_A^{\text{spin}} = \text{Tr}_B |\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle \langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}|$ ($\rho_B^{\text{spin}} = \text{Tr}_A |\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle \langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}|$) is obtained from the spin wave function $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$ by tracing out B (A). Explicitly, ρ_A^{spin} is given by

$$\rho_A^{\text{spin}} = \begin{bmatrix} |\alpha_{00}|^2 + |\alpha_{01}|^2 & \alpha_{00}^* \alpha_{10} + \alpha_{01}^* \alpha_{11} \\ \alpha_{00} \alpha_{10}^* + \alpha_{01} \alpha_{11}^* & |\alpha_{10}|^2 + |\alpha_{11}|^2 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

and ρ_B^{spin} can be derived in a similar way. As a 2×2 Hermitian matrix, ρ_i^{spin} ($i = A, B$) can also be parametrized by

$$\rho_i^{\text{spin}} = \frac{1}{2} (1 + \langle \sigma_{\hat{x}_i} \rangle_i \sigma_{\hat{x}_i} + \langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_i} \rangle_i \sigma_{\hat{y}_i} + \langle \sigma_{\hat{z}_i} \rangle_i \sigma_{\hat{z}_i}) \quad (5)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 + \langle \sigma_{\hat{z}_i} \rangle_i & \langle \sigma_{\hat{x}_i} \rangle_i - i \langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_i} \rangle_i \\ \langle \sigma_{\hat{x}_i} \rangle_i + i \langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_i} \rangle_i & 1 - \langle \sigma_{\hat{z}_i} \rangle_i \end{bmatrix} \quad (6)$$

with $\langle \sigma_{\hat{r}_i} \rangle_i = \text{Tr}_i(\sigma_{\hat{r}_i} \rho_i^{\text{spin}}) / \text{Tr}_i(\rho_i^{\text{spin}})$ being the expectation value of the Pauli matrix $\sigma_{\hat{r}_i}$ with respect to ρ_i^{spin} ($\hat{r}_i = \hat{x}_i, \hat{y}_i, \hat{z}_i$), which is also known as spin polarization in the literature. Eq. (5) can be regarded as the theoretical foundation for the QST analysis of ρ_i^{spin} , which shows how ρ_i^{spin} can be reconstructed from spin polarizations $\langle \sigma_{\hat{x}_i} \rangle_i, \langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_i} \rangle_i$, and $\langle \sigma_{\hat{z}_i} \rangle_i$.

B. Concurrence

Several entanglement measures have been adopted to study nuclear entanglement, including entanglement entropy [43, 44], entanglement power [45], negativity [46], and concurrence [47]. For the spin wave function $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$ given by Eq. (3), the (spin) concurrence is given by

$$\mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle) \equiv \left\langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}*} \left| \sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \otimes \sigma_{\hat{y}_B} \right| \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}} \right\rangle \quad (7)$$

$$= 2|\alpha_{00}\alpha_{11} - \alpha_{01}\alpha_{10}| \quad (8)$$

$$= 2\sqrt{\det(\rho_A^{\text{spin}})}. \quad (9)$$

Eq. (7) is widely adopted as the definition of concurrence for pure states with “*” being complex conjugate. Eqs. (8) and (9) can be derived directly from Eq. (7) with the help of Eq. (3). They will be used in later discussions. As $2|\alpha_{00}\alpha_{11} - \alpha_{01}\alpha_{10}| \leq 2|\alpha_{00}\alpha_{11}| + 2|\alpha_{01}\alpha_{10}| \leq$

$|\alpha_{00}|^2 + |\alpha_{01}|^2 + |\alpha_{10}|^2 + |\alpha_{11}|^2 = 1$, the spin concurrence satisfies $0 \leq \mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle) \leq 1$, with $\mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle) = 0$ corresponding to the separable $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$ and $\mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle) = 1$ corresponding to the maximally entangled $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$.

If α_{00} , α_{01} , α_{10} , and α_{11} are real numbers, the complex conjugate operator “*” makes no transformation on $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$. In this case, $\mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle)$ could be reduced to the form of $\langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}} | \sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \otimes \sigma_{\hat{y}_B} | \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}} \rangle$, which is nothing but a spin correlation function with respect to $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$. Therefore, $\mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle)$ can be determined by measuring the expectation value of a single operator $\sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \otimes \sigma_{\hat{y}_B}$. In the general case where α_{00} , α_{01} , α_{10} , and α_{11} are complex numbers, it is shown by Refs. [37, 38] that the concurrence can be determined by measuring the expectation value of a single projective operator with respect to two copies of $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$, i.e., $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle \otimes |\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$. This approach will be named as the Walborn protocol after the first author of Refs. [37, 38]. Explicitly, the master formula for the Walborn protocol is given by

$$\mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle) = \sqrt{\langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}} | \otimes \langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}} | \mathcal{W} | \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}} \rangle \otimes | \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}} \rangle}, \quad (10)$$

with $\mathcal{W} \equiv 4|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|$ being a projective operator made of $|\chi\rangle = (|0_A 0_B 1_A 1_B\rangle - |0_A 1_B 1_A 0_B\rangle - |1_A 0_B 0_A 1_B\rangle + |1_A 1_B 0_A 0_B\rangle)/2$ [37, 38]. Although Eq. (10) always holds mathematically, implementing it in different physical systems can be highly nontrivial. In Refs. [37, 38], an experimental setup has been designed to implement Eq. (10) in quantum optics, which provides an elegant experimental probe for the amount of spin entanglement in photon pairs. On the other hand, it is very difficult to implement the same equation in nuclear experiments for the following reasons. First, given $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$ as a two-nucleon state, $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle \otimes |\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$ corresponds to a four-nucleon state. As a result, the experimental determination of the expectation value $\langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}} | \otimes \langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}} | \mathcal{W} | \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}} \rangle \otimes | \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}} \rangle$ needs coincident measurements of spin degrees of freedom of four nucleons in the final state, which is a nontrivial task in nuclear physics. In addition, it is not clear how to implement the projection operator $\mathcal{W} = 4|\chi\rangle\langle\chi|$ in nuclear systems.

Given the difficulties in realizing the Walborn protocol in nuclear physics, it is reasonable to consider the more conservative QST protocol. Substituting Eq. (6) into Eq. (9), the concurrence can be rewritten in terms of spin polarizations as follows:

$$\mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle) = \sqrt{1 - \langle \sigma_{\hat{x}_A} \rangle_A^2 - \langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \rangle_A^2 - \langle \sigma_{\hat{z}_A} \rangle_A^2}, \quad (11)$$

which means that $\mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle)$ can be determined by measuring the spin polarizations $\langle \sigma_{\hat{x}_A} \rangle_A$, $\langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \rangle_A$, and $\langle \sigma_{\hat{z}_A} \rangle_A$ for the nucleon A from the entangled nucleon pair. The above discussion can be applied equally to the nucleon B . Compared to the Walborn protocol, the QST protocol has the disadvantage that the expectation values of three different quantum operators have to be measured instead of one in the Walborn protocol, but has the key advantage that it can be realized easily in nuclear experiments.




FIG. 2. The experimental setup for determining the transverse spin polarization $\langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \rangle_A$ by the scattering between the nucleon A from the entangled nucleon pair and the spin-0 nucleus T . The momenta \mathbf{p}_A and \mathbf{p}'_A lying in the \hat{x}_A - \hat{z}_A plane are the initial and final momenta before and after the scattering. $\langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \rangle_A$ could be determined by the left-right asymmetry measurement. The other transverse spin polarization $\langle \sigma_{\hat{x}_A} \rangle_A$ can be determined by using a similar experimental setup, with the final momentum \mathbf{p}'_A selected instead in the \hat{y}_A - \hat{z}_A plane.

III. EXPERIMENTAL IMPLEMENTATIONS

In this section, how to measure spin polarizations $\langle \sigma_{\hat{x}_A} \rangle_A$, $\langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \rangle_A$, and $\langle \sigma_{\hat{z}_A} \rangle_A$ experimentally is shown. As mentioned before, once their values are determined, the concurrence of $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$ can be obtained according to Eq. (11). Nuclear scattering with polarized nucleons will be used heavily in the following discussions, which is the standard method to measure spin polarizations. Theoretical and experimental studies of polarized nucleons rose in the 1950s, got boosted in the 1960s, and became relatively mature in the 1970s. See Refs. [48–54] for review articles and textbooks. Although this direction remains to be important in, e.g., understanding the nature of nucleon forces [55, 56], nowadays, it is fair to say that it is less popular than before. Before going to details, it is crucial to stress that the following discussions should be understood as a proof of concept. The primary goal is to convince the community that the amount of spin entanglement of an entangled nucleon pair is measurable in nuclear experiments at least in principle and stimulate further discussions for even better experimental protocols. Given the high complexity of running realistic nuclear experiments, it is natural to expect that nontrivial efforts have to be made before turning the present protocol or the similar ones into reality.

First, I would like to discuss how to measure the transverse spin polarization $\langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \rangle_A$ of the nucleon A , which is a classical problem in nuclear physics with polarized nucleons. The standard method is scattering the nucleon




FIG. 3. The experimental setup for determining the longitudinal spin polarization $\langle\sigma_{z_A}\rangle_A$ by a double scattering of the nucleon A against two spin-0 nuclei T_1 and T_2 . In the first scattering given by the upper part of this figure, the initial and final momenta \mathbf{p}_A and \mathbf{p}'_A lie in the \hat{x}_A - \hat{z}_A plane. In the second scattering given by the lower part of this figure, the initial and final momenta \mathbf{p}'_A and \mathbf{p}''_A lie in the \hat{y}'_A - \hat{z}'_A plane.

A against a spin-0 target T (e.g., the ^{12}C nucleus). It is assumed that the nucleus T is much heavier than a nucleon such that the recoil effect of T could be neglected for simplicity. The nucleus B is left undetected. See Fig. 2 for the experimental setup. The momenta \mathbf{p}_A and \mathbf{p}'_A are the initial and final momenta before and after the scattering. Noticeably, they are chosen to lie in the \hat{x}_A - \hat{z}_A plane. The differential cross section for the parity-conserving A - T scattering is given by [51]

$$I(\theta, \phi) = I_0(\theta) [1 + \mathcal{A}(\theta) \langle\boldsymbol{\sigma}_A\rangle_A \cdot \mathbf{n}] \quad (12)$$

$$= \begin{cases} I_0(\theta) [1 + \mathcal{A}(\theta) \langle\sigma_{y_A}\rangle_A] \equiv I_L(\theta) & \text{if } \phi = 0, \\ I_0(\theta) [1 - \mathcal{A}(\theta) \langle\sigma_{y_A}\rangle_A] \equiv I_R(\theta) & \text{if } \phi = \pi, \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

where θ is the relative angle between \mathbf{p}_A and \mathbf{p}'_A , \mathbf{n} is the unit vector along the direction $\mathbf{p}_A \times \mathbf{p}'_A$, ϕ is the relative angle between the polarization vector $\langle\boldsymbol{\sigma}_A\rangle_A \equiv (\langle\sigma_{x_A}\rangle_A, \langle\sigma_{y_A}\rangle_A, \langle\sigma_{z_A}\rangle_A)$ and the unit vector \mathbf{n} , $I(\theta, \phi)$ is the differential cross section for the A - T scattering, $I_0(\theta)$ is the differential cross section obtained as if the nucleon A was completely unpolarized, with the corresponding reduced density matrix given by $\rho_A^{\text{spin}} = \mathbf{1}_2/2$ ($\mathbf{1}_2$ as the 2×2 identity matrix), and $\mathcal{A}(\theta)$ is the so-called analyzing power, which could be measured priorly via the polarized nucleon- T scattering. As \mathbf{p}_A and \mathbf{p}'_A lie in the \hat{x}_A - \hat{z}_A plane, the unit vector \mathbf{n} points to the direction of \hat{y}_A if \mathbf{p}'_A points to the left-handed side of the beam direction ($\phi = 0$) and to the opposite direction of \hat{y}_A if \mathbf{p}'_A points to the right-handed side of the beam direction ($\phi = \pi$). If the analyzing power $\mathcal{A}(\theta)$ is known, the spin polarization $\langle\sigma_{y_A}\rangle_A$ could be determined by the left-right asymmetry measurement,

$$\langle\sigma_{y_A}\rangle_A = \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}(\theta)} \frac{N_L(\theta) - N_R(\theta)}{N_L(\theta) + N_R(\theta)}. \quad (14)$$

Here, $N_L(\theta)$ and $N_R(\theta)$ are the numbers of events counted by left and right detectors, which are proportional to the differential cross sections $I_L(\theta)$ and $I_R(\theta)$. The other transverse spin polarization $\langle\sigma_{x_A}\rangle_A$ can be measured in a similar way by selecting the final momentum \mathbf{p}'_A in the \hat{y}_A - \hat{z}_A plane. In this case, the vector \mathbf{n} points to the direction of \hat{x}_A or the opposite, and the scalar product $\langle\boldsymbol{\sigma}_A\rangle_A \cdot \mathbf{n}$ in Eq. (12) is reduced to $\pm \langle\sigma_{x_A}\rangle_A$, whose value could be determined by the left-right asymmetry measurement in the \hat{y}_A - \hat{z}_A plane.

Then, I would like to discuss how to measure the longitudinal spin polarization $\langle\sigma_{z_A}\rangle_A$ of the nucleon A . This can be done by a double scattering experiment, combined with transverse spin polarizations $\langle\sigma_{x_A}\rangle_A$ and $\langle\sigma_{y_A}\rangle_A$ obtained in the previous paragraph. The corresponding experimental setup is given by Fig. 3 with the upper part showing the first scattering between the nucleon A and the spin-0 nucleus T_1 and the lower part showing the second scattering between the nucleon A and another spin-0 nucleus T_2 . The double scattering process is drawn in two parts for the convenience of illustration. In the first scattering, the initial and final momenta are \mathbf{p}_A and \mathbf{p}'_A lying in the \hat{x}_A - \hat{z}_A plane. For the parity-conserving scattering, one has [51]

$$I(\theta) = I_0(\theta) [1 + \langle\sigma_{y_A}\rangle_A \mathcal{A}(\theta)], \quad (15)$$

$$I(\theta) = \frac{I_0(\theta)}{\langle\sigma_{x'_A}\rangle_A} \left[\langle\sigma_{x_A}\rangle_A \mathcal{K}_{x'_A}^{\hat{x}'_A}(\theta) + \langle\sigma_{z_A}\rangle_A \mathcal{K}_{z'_A}^{\hat{x}'_A}(\theta) \right], \quad (16)$$

where $I(\theta)$ is the differential cross section of the A - T_1 scattering, $I_0(\theta)$ is the unpolarized differential cross section obtained as if the nucleon A is completely unpolarized, $\langle\sigma_{x_A}\rangle_A$, $\langle\sigma_{y_A}\rangle_A$, and $\langle\sigma_{z_A}\rangle_A$ are the spin polarizations in the initial state along the directions of \hat{x}_A , \hat{y}_A , and \hat{z}_A , $\langle\sigma_{x'_A}\rangle_A$ is the spin polarization in the final state along the direction of $\hat{x}'_A = \mathbf{p}'_A/|\mathbf{p}'_A|$, $\mathcal{A}(\theta)$ is the analyzing power, $\mathcal{K}_{x'_A}^{\hat{x}'_A}(\theta)$ and $\mathcal{K}_{z'_A}^{\hat{x}'_A}(\theta)$ are two polarization

transfer coefficients. Substituting Eq. (15) into Eq. (16) to eliminate $I(\theta)$ and $I_0(\theta)$, one has

$$\begin{aligned} & \langle \sigma_{\hat{z}_A} \rangle_A \\ &= \frac{\langle \sigma_{\hat{x}'_A} \rangle_A [1 + \langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \rangle_A \mathcal{A}(\theta)] - \langle \sigma_{\hat{x}_A} \rangle_A \mathcal{K}_{\hat{x}_A}^{\hat{x}'_A}(\theta)}{\mathcal{K}_{\hat{z}_A}^{\hat{x}'_A}(\theta)}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

On the right-hand side of Eq. (17), the transverse spin polarizations $\langle \sigma_{\hat{x}_A} \rangle_A$ and $\langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \rangle_A$ can be measured by following the experimental procedure presented in the previous paragraph, while the values of $\mathcal{A}(\theta)$, $\mathcal{K}_{\hat{x}_A}^{\hat{x}'_A}(\theta)$ and $\mathcal{K}_{\hat{z}_A}^{\hat{x}'_A}(\theta)$ can be taken from other experimental studies. Therefore, the longitudinal spin polarization $\langle \sigma_{\hat{z}_A} \rangle_A$ can be worked out once $\langle \sigma_{\hat{x}'_A} \rangle_A$ is known. This is done by scattering the outgoing nucleon in the first step to the second spin-0 nucleus T_2 as shown by the lower part of Fig. 3, where the initial momentum becomes \mathbf{p}'_A and the final one is denoted by \mathbf{p}''_A . It is crucial to stress that \mathbf{p}'_A and \mathbf{p}''_A are chosen to be in the \hat{y}'_A - \hat{z}'_A plane such as $\langle \sigma_{\hat{x}'_A} \rangle_A$ can be determined by the left-right asymmetry measurement similar to that given by Eq. (18),

$$\langle \sigma_{\hat{x}'_A} \rangle_A = \frac{1}{\mathcal{A}'(\theta')} \frac{N'_L(\theta') - N'_R(\theta')}{N'_L(\theta') + N'_R(\theta')}, \quad (18)$$

where θ' , \mathcal{A}' , N'_L , N'_R are the scattering angle, the analyzing power, and the numbers of events counted by left and right detectors in the second scattering. This completes the experimental measurement of $\langle \sigma_{\hat{z}_A} \rangle_A$, and the concurrence $\mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle)$ can be determined correspondingly according to Eq. (11).

I would also like to discuss the connections and differences between the present work and Ref. [33] (also Refs. [34, 35]). As mentioned before, spin correlations are measured for the two-proton system in Ref. [33] to test Bell's inequalities. As all entangled pure states violate a Bell's inequality [57], the present work is related to Ref. [33] in the sense that both works lie on entangled spin wave functions. However, these works have different goals. While Ref. [33] is aimed at testing Bell's inequalities by using entangled spin wave functions produced by the proton-proton scattering, the present work is aimed towards an experimental protocol to determine the concurrence of general spin wave functions of nucleon pairs. Moreover, it is the spin correlations $\langle \sigma_A \cdot \mathbf{n}_A \sigma_B \cdot \mathbf{n}_B \rangle$ that are measured experimentally in Ref. [33], with \mathbf{n}_A and \mathbf{n}_B being the spin orientations of the two nucleons A and B . In contrast, it is the three spin polarizations $\{\langle \sigma_{\hat{x}_A} \rangle_A, \langle \sigma_{\hat{y}_A} \rangle_A, \langle \sigma_{\hat{z}_A} \rangle_A\}$ of one nucleon (say, the nucleon A) that are proposed to be measured in the present work. Therefore, different spin observables are dealt with in these two works.

IV. ERRORS FROM IMPERFECT PREPARATION

In previous sections, it is assumed that the spin component of the entangled nucleon pair is prepared in a pure state $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$. However, in realistic nuclear experiments, it is difficult to fulfill this condition perfectly. In general, the entangled nucleon pair is often prepared in a mixed state, which, without loss of generality, is chosen to be

$$\bar{\rho}_{AB}^{\text{spin}} = (1 - \varepsilon) |\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle \langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}| + \varepsilon |\tilde{\Psi}_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle \langle \tilde{\Psi}_{AB}^{\text{spin}}|, \quad (19)$$

where $|\tilde{\Psi}_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$ is the impurity spin wave function mixed with $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$ and $\varepsilon \ll 1$ is the probability of $|\tilde{\Psi}_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle$ in $\bar{\rho}_{AB}^{\text{spin}}$. It is important to estimate the error caused by mistaking $\bar{\rho}_{AB}^{\text{spin}}$ for the idealized pure state $|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle \langle \Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}|$. In this case, the realistic spin polarization of the nucleon A is found to be

$$\langle \tilde{\sigma}_{\hat{r}_A} \rangle_A = (1 - \varepsilon) \langle \sigma_{\hat{r}_A} \rangle_A + \varepsilon \langle \tilde{\sigma}_{\hat{r}_A} \rangle_A \quad (20)$$

with $\hat{r}_A \equiv \hat{x}_A, \hat{y}_A, \hat{z}_A$, $\langle \tilde{\sigma}_{\hat{r}_A} \rangle_A \equiv \text{Tr}(\sigma_{\hat{r}_A} \bar{\rho}_{AB}^{\text{spin}}) / \text{Tr}(\bar{\rho}_{AB}^{\text{spin}})$, and $\langle \sigma_{\hat{r}_A} \rangle_A \equiv \text{Tr}(\sigma_{\hat{r}_A} \rho_{AB}^{\text{spin}}) / \text{Tr}(\rho_{AB}^{\text{spin}})$. It is then straightforward to see that the concurrence $\mathcal{C}(\bar{\rho}_{AB}^{\text{spin}})$ derived from $\langle \tilde{\sigma}_{\hat{r}_A} \rangle_A$ by Eq. (11) deviates from the target $\mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle)$ by a small error proportional to ε ,

$$\mathcal{C}(\bar{\rho}_{AB}^{\text{spin}}) = \mathcal{C}(|\Psi_{AB}^{\text{spin}}\rangle) + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon). \quad (21)$$

In other words, the error caused by imperfect preparation of nucleon pairs is roughly proportional to the probability of the impurity state.

V. CONCLUSIONS

Nuclear entanglement has attracted much attention from the theoretical side. In this work, the problem of how to measure it in nuclear experiments is explored. Explicitly, the experimental determination of the amount of spin entanglement of nucleon pairs is studied under the inspiration of QST. Although not the unique approach, it is argued that QST is more suitable for nuclear physics than, e.g., the Walborn protocol. It is shown that the concurrence of the spin wave function can be determined by measuring three spin polarizations of one nucleon from the entangled pair via several polarization experiments. The errors caused by imperfect preparation of the entangled nucleon pair are also discussed.

This work could be improved and generalized in several directions. First, the present study should be regarded as a proof of concept rather than a detailed experimental plan, and it is important to go deeper into the experimental details of the measurement protocol described in Sec. III. This calls for further cooperation between theoretical and experimental sides of nuclear physics. Second, it seems feasible to generalize the discussions to entangled states made of nuclei with spin-1/2 and higher spins.

These states could be produced naturally in nucleus-nucleus scattering and reaction processes. Third, it is interesting to explore how to measure the amount of entanglement in forms other than spin entanglement. In several nuclear structure studies, orbital entanglement is calculated for a couple of nuclei. It is interesting to explore the experimental determination of orbital entanglement as well. If worked out, it will promote the research of nuclear entanglement significantly. Last but not least, it would also be interesting to generalize the present work to more than two nucleons. Several multipartite entanglement measures have been proposed in quantum information science, such as n -tangle [58, 59], multipartite

concurrence [60, 61], and concurrence fill [62, 63]. Noticeably, n -tangle has been adopted in Ref. [29] to study multipartite entanglement and information rearrangement in nuclear many-body systems. Nevertheless, these problems are beyond my current scope and are left for future studies.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12375122) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities (Grant No. B230201022).

-
- [1] E. Kwaśniewicz, *J. Phys. G* **41**, 015107 (2014).
[2] Y. Kanada-En'yo, *Phys. Rev. C* **91**, 034303 (2015).
[3] Y. Kanada-En'yo, *Prog. Theor. Exp. Phys.* **2015**, 043D04 (2015).
[4] Ö. Legeza, L. Veis, A. Poves, and J. Dukelsky, *Phys. Rev. C* **92**, 051303(R) (2015).
[5] E. Kwaśniewicz, *Acta Phys. Pol. B* **47**, 2297 (2016).
[6] E. Kwaśniewicz and D. Kurzyk, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. E* **26**, 1750023 (2017).
[7] O. C. Gorton, *Efficient modeling of nuclei through coupling of proton and neutron wavefunctions*, Master's thesis, San Diego State University, 2018 (unpublished).
[8] C. W. Johnson, *Entanglement entropy and proton-neutron interactions*, presented at the ESNT Workshop on Proton-Neutron Pairing, 2019 (unpublished).
[9] S. R. Beane, D. B. Kaplan, N. Klco, and M. J. Savage, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 102001 (2019).
[10] A. T. Kruppa, J. Kovács, P. Salamon, and Ö. Legeza, *J. Phys. G* **48**, 025107 (2021).
[11] C. Robin, M. J. Savage, and N. Pillet, *Phys. Rev. C* **103**, 034325 (2021).
[12] I. Low and T. Mehen, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 074014 (2021).
[13] S. R. Beane, R. C. Farrell, and M. Varma, *Int. J. Mod. Phys. A* **36**, 2150205 (2021).
[14] M. A. Jafarizadeh, M. Ghapanvari, and N. Amiri, *Phys. Rev. C* **105**, 014307 (2022).
[15] A. T. Kruppa, J. Kovács, P. Salamon, Ö. Legeza, and G. Zaránd, *Phys. Rev. C* **106**, 024303 (2022).
[16] A. Bulgac, M. Kafker, and I. Abdurrahman, *Phys. Rev. C* **107**, 044318 (2023).
[17] A. Bulgac, *Phys. Rev. C* **107**, L061602 (2023).
[18] E. Pazy, *Phys. Rev. C* **107**, 054308 (2023).
[19] A. Tichai, S. Knecht, A. T. Kruppa, Ö. Legeza, C. P. Moca, A. Schwenk, M. A. Werner, and G. Zarand, *Phys. Lett. B* **845**, 138139 (2023).
[20] D. Bai and Z. Ren, *Phys. Rev. C* **106**, 064005 (2022).
[21] Q. Liu, I. Low, and T. Mehen, *Phys. Rev. C* **107**, 025204 (2023).
[22] C. W. Johnson and O. C. Gorton, *J. Phys. G* **50**, 045110 (2023).
[23] D. Bai, *Phys. Rev. C* **107**, 044005 (2023).
[24] C. Gu, Z. H. Sun, G. Hagen, and T. Papenbrock, *Phys. Rev. C* **108**, 054309 (2023).
[25] Z. H. Sun, G. Hagen, and T. Papenbrock, *Phys. Rev. C* **108**, 014307 (2023).
[26] D. Bai, *Phys. Lett. B* **845**, 138162 (2023).
[27] G. A. Miller, *Phys. Rev. C* **108**, L031002 (2023).
[28] G. A. Miller, *Phys. Rev. C* **108**, L041601 (2023).
[29] S. M. Hengstenberg, C. E. P. Robin, and M. J. Savage, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **59**, 231 (2023).
[30] A. Pérez-Obiol, S. Masot-Llima, A. M. Romero, J. Menéndez, A. Rios, A. García-Sáez, and B. Juliá-Díaz, *Eur. Phys. J. A* **59**, 240 (2023).
[31] W. Kou, J. Chen, and X. Chen, *Phys. Lett. B* **849**, 138453 (2024).
[32] T. Kirchner, W. Elkamhawy, and H. W. Hammer, arXiv:2312.14484 [nucl-th].
[33] M. Laméhi-Rachti and W. Mittig, *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 2543 (1976).
[34] H. Sakai, T. Saito, T. Ikeda, K. Itoh, T. Kawabata, H. Kuboki, Y. Maeda, N. Matsui, C. Rangacharyulu, M. Sasano, Y. Satou, K. Sekiguchi, K. Suda, A. Tamii, T. Uesaka, and K. Yako, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 150405 (2006) [Erratum: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 179901(E) (2006)].
[35] C. Polachic, C. Rangacharyulu, A. van den Berg, M. Harakeh, M. de Huu, H. Wortche, J. Heyse, C. Baumer, D. Frekers, and J. Brooke, *Phys. Lett. A* **323**, 176 (2004).
[36] J. M. G. Sancho and S. F. Huelga, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 042303 (2000).
[37] S. P. Walborn, P. H. Souto Ribeiro, L. Davidovich, F. Mintert, and A. Buchleitner, *Nature* **440**, 1022 (2006).
[38] S. P. Walborn, P. H. Souto Ribeiro, L. Davidovich, F. Mintert, and A. Buchleitner, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 032338 (2007).
[39] S.-M. Fei, M.-J. Zhao, K. Chen, and Z.-X. Wang, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 032320 (2009).
[40] M. Li, M.-J. Zhao, S.-M. Fei, and Z.-X. Wang, *Front. Phys.* **8**, 357 (2013).
[41] M. Paris and J. Reháček, *Quantum State Estimation* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2004).
[42] A. G. White, D. F. V. James, P. H. Eberhard, and P. G. Kwiat, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 3103 (1999).
[43] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information - 10th Anniversary Edition* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2010).
[44] G. Benenti, G. Casati, D. Rossini, and G. Strini, *Principles of Quantum Computation and Information: A Comprehensive Textbook* (World Scientific Publishing, Singa-

- pore, 2019).
- [45] P. Zanardi, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 040304(R) (2001).
- [46] G. Vidal and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032314 (2002).
- [47] S. A. Hill and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **78**, 5022 (1997).
- [48] L. Wolfenstein, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **6**, 43 (1956).
- [49] M. H. MacGregor, M. J. Moravcsik, and H. P. Stapp, Ann. Rev. Nucl. Sci. **10**, 291 (1960).
- [50] N. Hoshizaki, Suppl. Prog. Theor. Phys. **42**, 107 (1968).
- [51] G. G. Ohlsen, Rep. Prog. Phys. **35**, 717 (1972).
- [52] H. P. g. Schieck, *Nuclear Physics with Polarized Particles* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2012).
- [53] S. B. Nurushev, M. F. Runtso, and M. N. Strikhanov, *Introduction to Polarization Physics* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2012).
- [54] Q.-B. Shen, *Polarization Theory of Nuclear Reactions* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2023).
- [55] A. Watanabe, S. Nakai, Y. Wada, K. Sekiguchi, A. Deltuva, T. Akieda, D. Etoh, M. Inoue, Y. Inoue, K. Kawahara, H. Kon, K. Miki, T. Mukai, D. Sakai, S. Shibuya, Y. Shiokawa, T. Taguchi, H. Umetsu, Y. Utsuki, M. Watanabe, S. Goto, K. Hatanaka, Y. Hirai, T. Ino, D. Inomoto, A. Inoue, S. Ishikawa, M. Itoh, H. Kanda, H. Kasahara, N. Kobayashi, Y. Maeda, S. Mitsumoto, S. Nakamura, K. Nonaka, H. J. Ong, H. Oshiro, Y. Otake, H. Sakai, A. Taketani, A. Tamii, D. T. Tran, T. Wakasa, Y. Wakabayashi, and T. Wakui, Phys. Rev. C **103**, 044001 (2021).
- [56] A. Watanabe, S. Nakai, K. Sekiguchi, A. Deltuva, S. Goto, K. Hatanaka, Y. Hirai, T. Ino, D. Inomoto, M. Inoue, S. Ishikawa, M. Itoh, H. Kanda, H. Kasahara, Y. Maeda, K. Miki, K. Nonaka, H. J. Ong, H. Oshiro, D. Sakai, H. Sakai, S. Shibuya, D. T. Tran, H. Umetsu, Y. Utsuki, and T. Wakasa, Phys. Rev. C **106**, 054002 (2022).
- [57] N. Gisin, Phys. Lett. A **154**, 201 (1991).
- [58] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000).
- [59] A. Wong and N. Christensen, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 044301 (2001).
- [60] A. R. R. Carvalho, F. Mintert, and A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 230501 (2004).
- [61] L. Aolita and F. Mintert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 050501 (2006).
- [62] S. Xie and J. H. Eberly, Phys. Rev. Lett. **127**, 040403 (2021).
- [63] S. Xie, D. Younis, Y. Mei, and J. H. Eberly, arXiv:2304.03281 [quant-ph].