

# Kinematic approach to off-diagonal geometric phases of nondegenerate and degenerate mixed states

D.M. Tong<sup>1</sup>, Erik Sjöqvist<sup>2\*</sup>, Stefan Filipp<sup>3,4†</sup>, L.C. Kwek<sup>1,5</sup>, and C.H. Oh<sup>1‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, National University of Singapore,  
10 Kent Ridge Crescent, Singapore 119260, Singapore*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Quantum Chemistry, Uppsala University, Box 518, Se-751 20 Uppsala, Sweden*

<sup>3</sup>*Atominstitut der Österreichischen Universitäten, Stadionallee 2, A-1020 Vienna, Austria*

<sup>4</sup>*Institut Laue Langevin, Boîte Postale 156, F-38042 Grenoble Cedex 9, France*

<sup>5</sup>*National Institute of Education, Nanyang Technological University, 1 Nanyang Walk, Singapore 639798, Singapore*

(Dated: November 6, 2018)

Off-diagonal geometric phases have been developed in order to provide information of the geometry of paths that connect noninterfering quantal states. We propose a kinematic approach to off-diagonal geometric phases for pure and mixed states. We further extend the mixed state concept proposed in [Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 050403 (2003)] to degenerate density operators. The first and second order off-diagonal geometric phases are analyzed for unitarily evolving pairs of pseudopure states.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Vf

## I. INTRODUCTION

Pancharatnam's [1] work on the geometric phase in interference of light waves in distinct states of polarization plays a prominent role among early anticipations of the concept of geometric phase. It found its quantal counterpart when Berry [2] discovered geometric phase factors accompanying cyclic adiabatic changes. Since then there has been an immense interest in holonomy effects in quantum mechanics, which has led to many generalizations of the notion of geometric phase. The extension to nonadiabatic cyclic evolution was developed by Aharonov and Anandan [3, 4]. Samuel and Bhandari [5] generalized the pure state geometric phase further by extending it to noncyclic evolution and sequential projection measurements. Mukunda and Simon [6] put forward a kinematic approach to the geometric phase. Further generalizations and refinements, by relaxing the conditions of adiabaticity, unitarity, and the cyclic nature of the evolution, have since been carried out [7, 8].

The concept of geometric phases for pure states has been extended to mixed states. This was first addressed by Uhlmann [9, 10] within the mathematical context of purification. Sjöqvist *et al.* [11] introduced an alternative definition of geometric phase for density operators with all the nonzero eigenvalues being nondegenerate, based upon the experimental context of quantum interferometry. Singh *et al.* [12] gave a kinematic description of the mixed state geometric phase in Ref. [11] and extended it to degenerate density operators. The generalization to nonunitary evolution has also been addressed in Refs. [13, 14, 15] and experimental test of the phase concept in Ref. [11] has been carried out using nuclear magnetic

resonance [16].

All the above notions of geometric phase break down in cases where the interference visibility between the initial and final states vanishes leading to an interesting nodal point structure in the experimental parameter space that could be monitored in a history-dependent manner [17, 18, 19, 20, 21, 22]. This problem may be overcome by introducing the concept of off-diagonal geometric phases, as was first put forward for pure states in adiabatic evolution by Manini and Pistoiesi [23]. Mukunda *et al.* [24] removed the adiabaticity assumption of Ref. [23] and Hasegawa *et al.* [25, 26] verified the off-diagonal pure state geometric phase by a neutron experiment. The concept of off-diagonal geometric phase has been extended to mixed states [27, 28] represented by nondegenerate density operators, as well as to the Uhlmann holonomy [29]. These off-diagonal mixed state geometric phases contain information about the geometry of state space along the path connecting pairs of density operators, when the standard mixed state geometric phases in Refs. [9, 10, 11] are undefined. In this paper, we propose a kinematic approach to the off-diagonal mixed state geometric phase in Refs. [27, 28] and further extend it to the degenerate case.

## II. KINEMATIC APPROACH TO OFF-DIAGONAL GEOMETRIC PHASES

Consider an  $N$  dimensional quantum system  $s$ , the pure states of which represented by vectors of Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_s$ . Let  $|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_N\rangle$  denote an arbitrary orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{H}_s$  and  $\{U^\parallel(t)|t \in [0, \tau], U^\parallel(0) = I\}$  be a one-parameter family of unitarities fulfilling the parallel transport conditions [11]

$$\langle \psi_k | U^{\parallel\dagger}(t) \dot{U}^\parallel(t) | \psi_k \rangle = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, N \quad (1)$$

relative to the chosen basis. For any pair of basis vectors  $|\psi_{j_1}\rangle$  and  $|\psi_{j_2}\rangle$  such that  $\langle \psi_{j_1} | U^\parallel(\tau) | \psi_{j_2} \rangle \neq 0$  and

\*Electronic address: eriks@kvac.uu.se

†Electronic address: sfilipp@ati.ac.at

‡Electronic address: phyohch@nus.edu.sg

$\langle \psi_{j_2} | U^\parallel(\tau) | \psi_{j_1} \rangle \neq 0$ , the quantity

$$\gamma_{j_1 j_2}^{(2)} = \Phi \left[ \langle \psi_{j_1} | U^\parallel(\tau) | \psi_{j_2} \rangle \langle \psi_{j_2} | U^\parallel(\tau) | \psi_{j_1} \rangle \right], \quad (2)$$

where  $\Phi[z] \equiv z/|z|$  for any nonzero complex number  $z$ , is gauge invariant and therefore a property of the pair of paths  $\mathcal{C}_{j_1}, \mathcal{C}_{j_2} : t \in [0, \tau] \rightarrow |\psi_{j_1}(t)\rangle \langle \psi_{j_1}(t)|, |\psi_{j_2}(t)\rangle \langle \psi_{j_2}(t)|$  in projective Hilbert space. The set  $\{\gamma_{j_1 j_2}^{(2)}\}$  constitutes the second order off-diagonal pure state geometric phase factors [23]. It may be extended by considering  $l \leq N$  states yielding the  $l$ th order off-diagonal pure state geometric phase factors

$$\gamma_{j_1 \dots j_l}^{(l)} = \prod_{a=1}^l \Phi \left[ \langle \psi_{j_a} | U^\parallel(\tau) | \psi_{j_{a+1}} \rangle \right], \quad (3)$$

where  $|\psi_{j_{l+1}}\rangle = |\psi_{j_1}\rangle$  and  $\langle \psi_{j_a} | U^\parallel(\tau) | \psi_{j_{a+1}} \rangle \neq 0$  for all  $a = 1, \dots, l$ .

Notice that there is an equivalence set  $\mathcal{S}$  of unitarities  $\tilde{U}(t)$  that all realize  $\{\mathcal{C}_k\}$ , namely those of the form

$$\tilde{U}(t) = U(t) \sum_{k=1}^N e^{i\theta_k(t)} |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k|, \quad (4)$$

where  $U(t) \in \mathcal{S}$  and  $\theta_k(t)$  are real time-dependent parameters such that  $\theta_k(0) = 0$ . We may in particular identify  $U^\parallel(t) \in \mathcal{S}$  by substituting  $U^\parallel(t) = \tilde{U}(t)$  into Eq. (1), so that we obtain

$$\theta_k(t) \equiv \theta_k^\parallel(t) = i \int_0^t \langle \psi_k | U^\dagger(t') \dot{U}(t') | \psi_k \rangle dt' \quad (5)$$

and

$$U^\parallel(t) = U(t) \sum_{k=1}^N e^{-\int_0^t \langle \psi_k | U^\dagger(t') \dot{U}(t') | \psi_k \rangle dt'} |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k|. \quad (6)$$

Inserting this expression into Eq. (2) for  $U^\parallel(t)$ , we obtain a kinematic expression for the  $l = 2$  off-diagonal geometric phase factors as

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{j_1 j_2}^{(2)} &= \Phi \left[ \langle \psi_{j_1} | U(\tau) | \psi_{j_2} \rangle \langle \psi_{j_2} | U(\tau) | \psi_{j_1} \rangle \right] \\ &\times e^{-\int_0^\tau \langle \psi_{j_1} | U^\dagger(t) \dot{U}(t) | \psi_{j_1} \rangle dt} \\ &\times e^{-\int_0^\tau \langle \psi_{j_2} | U^\dagger(t) \dot{U}(t) | \psi_{j_2} \rangle dt}. \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

In the above expression, the unitary operator  $U(t) \in \mathcal{S}$  need not satisfy the parallel transport conditions. One may verify that  $\gamma_{j_1 j_2}^{(2)} | \tilde{U}(t) \rangle = \gamma_{j_1 j_2}^{(2)} | U(t) \rangle$  for any choice of  $\theta_k(t)$ .

An interesting aspect of Eq. (7) is that in the qubit case with  $|\psi_1\rangle = |0\rangle$  and  $|\psi_2\rangle = |1\rangle$ , it follows that  $\langle 0 | U^\dagger(t) \dot{U}(t) | 0 \rangle = -\langle 1 | U^\dagger(t) \dot{U}(t) | 1 \rangle$  for any  $SU(2)$  operation, leading to

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{01}^{(2)} &= \Phi \left[ \langle 0 | U(\tau) | 1 \rangle \langle 1 | U(\tau) | 0 \rangle \right] \\ &= \Phi \left[ \langle 0 | U^\parallel(\tau) | 1 \rangle \langle 1 | U^\parallel(\tau) | 0 \rangle \right] = -1, \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

whenever  $\langle 0 | U(\tau) | 1 \rangle \neq 0$  and  $\langle 1 | U(\tau) | 0 \rangle \neq 0$ . Thus, the  $\pi$  shift in the qubit case is independent of the fulfillment of the parallel transport condition Eq. (1); a result that has been experimentally verified for neutron spin [25, 26].

Similarly, for the higher order off-diagonal geometric phases [23], we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{j_1 \dots j_l}^{(l)} &= \prod_{a=1}^l \Phi \left[ \langle \psi_{j_a} | U(\tau) | \psi_{j_{a+1}} \rangle \right] \\ &\times e^{-\int_0^\tau \langle \psi_{j_a} | U^\dagger(t) \dot{U}(t) | \psi_{j_a} \rangle dt}, \quad l \leq N \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

upon substitution of Eq. (6) into Eq. (3). Once again, one may verify that  $\gamma_{j_1 \dots j_l}^{(l)} | \tilde{U}(t) \rangle = \gamma_{j_1 \dots j_l}^{(l)} | U(t) \rangle$ .

We now put forward a kinematic approach to the off-diagonal geometric phases of nondegenerate mixed states proposed in Refs. [27, 28]. Let

$$\rho_1 = \lambda_1 |\psi_1\rangle \langle \psi_1| + \dots + \lambda_N |\psi_N\rangle \langle \psi_N|, \quad (10)$$

where for all nonzero eigenvalues we have  $\lambda_k \neq \lambda_{l \neq k}$ . Furthermore, introduce the unitarity

$$W = |\psi_1\rangle \langle \psi_N| + |\psi_N\rangle \langle \psi_{N-1}| + \dots + |\psi_2\rangle \langle \psi_1| \quad (11)$$

in terms of which any pair of members  $\rho_{j_1}, \rho_{j_2}, j_1 \neq j_2$ , of the set

$$\rho_n = W^{n-1} \rho_1 (W^\dagger)^{n-1}, \quad n = 1, \dots, N \quad (12)$$

are unitarily connected and do not interfere since  $\text{Tr}(W^{j_2 - j_1} \rho_{j_1})$  vanishes. In analogy with the pure state case, the density operators  $\rho_n$  constitute a set of states in terms of which we may define the off-diagonal mixed state geometric phase factors as [27, 28]

$$\gamma_{\rho_{j_1} \dots \rho_{j_l}}^{(l)} = \Phi \left[ \text{Tr} \left( \prod_{a=1}^l U^\parallel(\tau) \sqrt{\rho_{j_a}} \right) \right] \quad (13)$$

as long as the trace in the argument of  $\Phi$  does not vanish. Here,  $U^\parallel(t)$  satisfies the parallel transport conditions in Eq. (1) and  $l \leq N$ . Apparently  $\gamma^{(1)}$  are the standard mixed state geometric phase factors associated with the unitary paths  $\mathcal{M}_n : t \in [0, \tau] \rightarrow \rho_n(t)$  in state space. Furthermore, it has been demonstrated [27, 28] a physical scenario for the  $l = 2$  case in terms of two-particle interferometry.

As the nonzero eigenvalues of all mixed states under consideration are nondegenerate, the parallel transport conditions are still given by Eq. (1) and  $U^\parallel(t)$  by Eq. (6). Substituting Eq. (6) into Eq. (13), we obtain the kinematic expression for the off-diagonal geometric phase factors for mixed states under evolution  $U(t)$  as

$$\gamma_{\rho_{j_1} \dots \rho_{j_l}}^{(l)} = \Phi \left[ \sum_{i_1, \dots, i_l=1}^N \sqrt{\lambda_{i_1-j_1+1} \dots \lambda_{i_N-j_N+1}} \langle \psi_{i_1} | U(\tau) | \psi_{i_2} \rangle \langle \psi_{i_2} | U(\tau) | \psi_{i_3} \rangle \dots \langle \psi_{i_N} | U(\tau) | \psi_{i_1} \rangle \right] \times \exp \left( - \int_0^\tau \sum_{a=1}^l \langle \psi_{i_a} | U^\dagger(t) \dot{U}(t) | \psi_{i_a} \rangle dt \right), \quad (14)$$

where  $\lambda_{-p} = \lambda_{N-p}$ ,  $p = 0, \dots, N-1$ . One may verify that the phase factors  $\gamma_{\rho_{j_1} \dots \rho_{j_l}}^{(l)}$  are gauge invariant in that they are independent of the choice of  $U(t) \in \mathcal{S}$ .

### III. OFF-DIAGONAL GEOMETRIC PHASES FOR DEGENERATE DENSITY OPERATORS

We now generalize the concept of off-diagonal geometric phases of nondegenerate mixed states to degenerate mixed states. Let

$$\rho_1 = \lambda_1 P_{1;1}^{(m_1)} + \dots + \lambda_K P_{1;K}^{(m_K)}, \quad (15)$$

where the nonzero eigenvalue  $\lambda_k$ ,  $k = 1, \dots, K \leq N$ , is  $m_k$  fold degenerate and  $P_{1;k}^{(m_k)}$  the corresponding projector of rank  $m_k$ . The choice  $|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_N\rangle$  of orthonormal Hilbert space basis and concomitant permutation unitarity  $W = |\psi_1\rangle\langle\psi_N| + |\psi_N\rangle\langle\psi_{N-1}| + \dots + |\psi_2\rangle\langle\psi_1|$ , defines a set of noninterfering density operators

$$\rho_n = \lambda_1 P_{n;1}^{(m_1)} + \dots + \lambda_K P_{n;K}^{(m_K)}, \quad n = 1, \dots, N, \quad (16)$$

where  $P_{n;k}^{(m_k)} = W^{n-1} P_{1;k}^{(m_k)} (W^\dagger)^{n-1}$ ,  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Note that  $P_{n;k}^{(m_k)} \neq P_{n';k}^{(m_k)}$  for  $n \neq n'$ .

The parallel transport conditions for a unitary path

$t \rightarrow \rho_n(t)$  with  $\rho_n(0) = \rho_n$ , could be taken as

$$P_{n;k}^{(m_k)} U_n^{\parallel\dagger}(t) \dot{U}_n^{\parallel}(t) P_{n;k}^{(m_k)} = 0, \quad k = 1, \dots, K. \quad (17)$$

In terms of the orthonormal Hilbert space basis  $|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_N\rangle$ , Eq. (17) is equivalent to the more familiar parallel transport conditions [12]  $\langle \psi_\mu | U_n^{\parallel\dagger}(t) \dot{U}_n^{\parallel}(t) | \psi_\nu \rangle = 0$ ,  $\forall$  pairs  $|\psi_\mu\rangle, |\psi_\nu\rangle \in P_{n;k}^{(m_k)}$ , and reduces to those of Ref. [11] in the nondegenerate case where  $K = N$ .

Now, suppose there is a one-parameter family of unitarities  $\{U(t) | t \in [0, \tau], U(0) = I\}$  defining the paths  $\mathcal{M}_n : t \in [0, \tau] \rightarrow \rho_n(t) = U(t) \rho_n U^\dagger(t)$ ,  $n = 1, \dots, N$ . Then, for each  $\rho_n$ , there is an equivalence set  $\mathcal{S}_n$  of unitarities  $\tilde{U}_n(t)$  that all realize  $\mathcal{M}_n$ , namely those of the form

$$\tilde{U}_n(t) = U(t) V_n(t) \quad (18)$$

with

$$V_n(t) = \alpha_{n;1}(t) + \dots + \alpha_{n;K}(t), \quad (19)$$

where  $\alpha_{n;k}(t)$  is unitary on the  $k$ th degenerate subspace, i.e.,  $\alpha_{n;k}(t) \alpha_{n;k}^\dagger(t) = \alpha_{n;k}^\dagger(t) \alpha_{n;k}(t) = P_{n;k}^{(m_k)}$ , and  $\alpha_{n;k}(0) = P_{n;k}^{(m_k)}$ . We can identify  $U_n^{\parallel}(t) \in \mathcal{S}_n$  by substituting  $U_n^{\parallel}(t) = \tilde{U}_n(t)$  into Eq. (17), and obtain

$$\alpha_{n;k}^{\parallel}(t) = P_{n;k}^{(m_k)} \mathbf{T} \exp \left( - \int_0^t P_{n;k}^{(m_k)} U^\dagger(t') \dot{U}(t') P_{n;k}^{(m_k)} dt' \right) P_{n;k}^{(m_k)}, \quad (20)$$

where  $\mathbf{T}$  denotes time ordering. The parallel transporting unitary operators for  $\rho_n$  may be expressed as  $U_n^{\parallel}(t) = U(t) V_n^{\parallel}(t)$  with supplementary operators  $V_n^{\parallel}(t) = \alpha_{n;1}^{\parallel}(t) + \dots + \alpha_{n;K}^{\parallel}(t)$ .

In the presence of degenerate subspaces, some of the parallel transporting unitarities  $U_n^{\parallel}(t)$  must be different from each other. Thus, unlike the nondegenerate case, where a common parallel transporting  $U^{\parallel}(t)$  can always be found, such a common operator parallel transporting all the states  $\rho_n$  does not exist in the degenerate case; we need to take  $U_1^{\parallel}(t), \dots, U_N^{\parallel}(t)$  to parallel

transport  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_N$ , respectively. Substituting  $U_{j_a}^{\parallel}(t) = U(t) V_{j_a}^{\parallel}(t)$ ,  $a = 1, \dots, l$ , into Eq. (13) for the  $a$ th  $U^{\parallel}(t)$ , we obtain the off-diagonal geometric phase factors of the degenerate mixed states as

$$\gamma_{\rho_{j_1} \dots \rho_{j_l}}^{(l)} = \Phi \left[ \text{Tr} \left( \prod_{a=1}^l U(\tau) V_{j_a}^{\parallel}(\tau) \sqrt{\rho_{j_a}} \right) \right] \quad (21)$$

for nonvanishing trace in the argument of  $\Phi$ . The phase value calculated in Eq. (21) is manifestly gauge invariant under choice of the set  $\{\tilde{U}_n(t)\}$ , which shows that it is

only dependent upon the paths traced by the states. We may verify this point by repeating the demonstration of Ref. [12].

Again, once the paths of states are defined by some unitary operator  $U(t)$ , the supplementary operators  $V_{j_a}^{\parallel}(t)$ ,  $a = 1, \dots, l$ , and therefore  $U_{j_a}^{\parallel}(t)$ , may be different for each  $\rho_{j_a}$ . However, if all the states  $\rho_{j_a}$  have the same degeneracy structure [31], they share a common unitary operator  $U^{\parallel}(t)$ . For a general set of states  $\rho_{j_1}, \dots, \rho_{j_l}$ , whether a common unitary parallel transporting operator exists depends both upon the states and the unitarity  $U(t)$ . In the case where a common parallel transporting unitary operator does not exist, two or more unitary operators are necessary to calculate the off-diagonal geometric phases. For this reason, experimental tests of off-diagonal geometric phases may be difficult to implement in such cases.

#### IV. EXAMPLE: PSEUDOPURE STATES

Let us illustrate the above for pseudopure states, which take the form

$$\rho_n = \frac{1-\epsilon}{N}I + \epsilon|n\rangle\langle n|, \quad n = 1, \dots, N \geq 2 \quad (22)$$

with  $0 < \epsilon \leq 1$ , and  $|n\rangle$  any  $p$ -qubit state. Such states have a single nondegenerate eigenvector  $|n\rangle$  with eigenvalue  $(1 + (N-1)\epsilon)/N$  and an  $N-1$  fold degenerate eigenvalue  $(1-\epsilon)/N$  with eigenprojector  $I - |n\rangle\langle n|$ . Pseudopure states appear generically as input states to standard liquid-state NMR quantum computers, in case of which  $N = 2^p$ ,  $p$  being the number of nuclear spin qubits [30].

Now, we wish to compute the two lowest order ( $l = 1$  and  $l = 2$ ) geometric phases for the pseudopure states  $\rho_n$  and  $\rho_m$  with  $\langle n|m\rangle = 0$ . Let

$$U(t) = I - P_{nm} + U_{nm}(t), \quad (23)$$

where  $P_{nm}$  is the projection operator onto the subspace spanned by  $\{|n\rangle, |m\rangle\}$  and  $U_{nm}(t)U_{nm}^{\dagger}(t) = U_{nm}^{\dagger}(t)U_{nm}(t) = P_{nm}$ . In the case of liquid-state NMR quantum protocols, one may for example take

$$\begin{aligned} |n\rangle &= |0\rangle_1 \otimes \dots \otimes |0\rangle_q \otimes \dots \otimes |0\rangle_p, \\ |m\rangle &= |0\rangle_1 \otimes \dots \otimes |1\rangle_q \otimes \dots \otimes |0\rangle_p, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

where  $1 \leq q \leq p$  so that  $U(t)$  represents single-qubit operations on the  $q$ th nuclear spin. Using Eq. (19), we obtain the parallel transporting unitarities

$$\begin{aligned} U_n^{\parallel} &= U_m^{\parallel} = I - P_{nm} + U_{nm}|n\rangle\langle n| \\ &\times e^{-\int_0^t \langle n|U_{nm}^{\dagger}(t')\dot{U}_{nm}(t')|n\rangle dt'} + U_{nm}|m\rangle\langle m| \\ &\times e^{-\int_0^t \langle m|U_{nm}^{\dagger}(t')\dot{U}_{nm}(t')|m\rangle dt'}. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Thus, due to the specific form of  $U$ , there is a single unitarity parallel transporting both  $\rho_n$  and  $\rho_m$ . This property may be advantageous in experimental tests of the  $l = 1$  and  $l = 2$  geometric phases for  $\rho_n$  and  $\rho_m$ . Note that a separate treatment of the random mixture ( $\epsilon = 0$ ) yields  $U_n^{\parallel} = U_m^{\parallel} = I$ .

Let us first analyze the  $l = 1$  geometric phase factors for  $\rho_n$  and  $\rho_m$  in the  $\epsilon > 0$  case. Inserting Eqs. (22) and (25) into Eq. (21) yields

$$\begin{aligned} \gamma_{\rho_n}^{(1)} &= (\gamma_{\rho_m}^{(1)})^* = \Phi \left[ (N-2)(1-\epsilon) + \eta(1+(N-1)\epsilon)e^{-i\Omega/2} + \eta(1-\epsilon)e^{i\Omega/2} \right] \\ &= \exp \left( -i \arctan \left( \frac{\eta N \epsilon \sin \frac{\Omega}{2}}{(N-2)(1-\epsilon) + \eta(2+(N-2)\epsilon) \cos \frac{\Omega}{2}} \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

whenever the phase factor is defined. Here,  $\Omega$  is the geodesically closed solid angle on the Bloch sphere defined by projection of the two-dimensional subspace spanned by the pure state components  $|n\rangle$  and  $|m\rangle$  and  $\eta = |\langle n|U_{nm}|n\rangle| = |\langle m|U_{nm}|m\rangle|$  is the pure state visibility. In the absence of noise ( $\epsilon = 1$ ) the  $l = 1$  geometric phases become undefined iff  $\eta = 0$ , corresponding to the case where  $|n\rangle$  and  $|m\rangle$  are interchanged. When  $\eta \neq 0$ , we obtain the standard pure state geometric phases  $\gamma_{\rho_n}^{(1)} = (\gamma_{\rho_m}^{(1)})^* = e^{-i\Omega/2}$ . In the general case ( $0 < \epsilon < 1$ ), the nodal points, defined as those points in parameter space  $(\eta, \epsilon, \Omega)$  where  $\gamma_{\rho_n}^{(1)}$  and  $\gamma_{\rho_m}^{(1)}$  are un-

defined, are obtained as solutions of

$$\begin{aligned} &\left( (N-2)(1-\epsilon) + \eta(2+(N-2)\epsilon) \cos \frac{\Omega}{2} \right)^2 \\ &+ \eta^2 N^2 \epsilon^2 \sin^2 \frac{\Omega}{2} = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

For  $N = 2$  (nondegenerate case), the nodal points are those where  $\eta = 0$ , which is consistent with Refs. [27, 28], and when  $\eta \neq 0$  we have

$$\gamma_{\rho_n}^{(1)} = (\gamma_{\rho_m}^{(1)})^* = \exp \left( -i \arctan \left( \epsilon \tan \frac{\Omega}{2} \right) \right), \quad (28)$$

which is consistent with Refs. [11, 16] by identifying  $\epsilon$  as the length of the Bloch vector. For  $N \geq 3$  a necessary condition for a nodal point is  $\Omega/2 = (2k+1)\pi$ ,  $k$  integer, and  $\eta \neq 0$ . For these solid angles, Eq. (27) reduces to

$$\eta = \frac{(N-2)(1-\epsilon)}{2+(N-2)\epsilon}. \quad (29)$$

Physical solutions (i.e., fulfilling  $\eta \leq 1$ ) of this equation exist provided

$$\epsilon \geq \frac{N-4}{2(N-2)}. \quad (30)$$

Thus, for  $N \geq 5$ , there is a lower bound on the amount of noise for the existence of nodal points, i.e., in too noisy input states the  $l=1$  geometric phases are always well-defined for this  $U$ .

Let us now turn to the  $l=2$  geometric phase for  $\rho_n$  and  $\rho_m$ . First notice that  $\gamma_{\rho_n \rho_m}^{(2)} = \gamma_{\rho_m \rho_n}^{(2)}$ , which is due to the symmetry of trace under cyclic permutations. Explicit calculation yields

$$\gamma_{\rho_n \rho_m}^{(2)} = \Phi \left[ (N-2)(1-\epsilon) + (2+(N-2)\epsilon)(-1+\eta^2) + 2\eta^2 \sqrt{(1-\epsilon)(1+(N-1)\epsilon)} \cos \Omega \right]. \quad (31)$$

Thus,  $\gamma_{\rho_n \rho_m}^{(2)} = \pm 1$ , changing sign across a nodal surface in the parameter space  $(\epsilon, \eta, \Omega)$ . This nodal surface is defined by vanishing argument of  $\Phi$  in Eq. (31), i.e., the solution of

$$\eta^2 = \frac{2(N-2)\epsilon - N + 4}{2+(N-2)\epsilon + 2\sqrt{(1-\epsilon)(1+(N-1)\epsilon)} \cos \Omega}. \quad (32)$$

If  $\cos \Omega \geq 0$ , solutions fulfilling  $\eta \leq 1$  always exist for all  $N$  as long as Eq. (30) is satisfied. In the case where  $\cos \Omega < 0$ , however,  $0 \leq \eta^2 \leq 1$  yields

$$\frac{N-4}{2(N-2)} \leq \epsilon \leq \frac{(N-2)^2 - 4 \cos^2 \Omega}{4(N-1) \cos^2 \Omega + (N-2)^2}. \quad (33)$$

Thus, there are nodal points only for the amount of noise satisfying the above equation. In the limiting case  $N=2$ , the upper bound on  $\epsilon$  is negative and thus no nodal points exist, which is consistent with Refs. [27, 28].

Now we wish to check  $\gamma_{\rho_n \rho_m}^{(2)}$  at the nodal points of  $\gamma_{\rho_n}^{(1)} = (\gamma_{\rho_m}^{(1)})^*$ . For  $N=2$  we obtain that the nodal points for  $l=1$  and  $l=2$  never coincide. For  $N \geq 3$ , insert  $\Omega/2 = (2k+1)\pi$ ,  $k$  integer, into Eq. (32) and eliminate  $\epsilon$  by using Eq. (29), yielding

$$\eta^2 + \eta - 1 + \frac{2\eta^2}{N-2} \sqrt{\eta(N-2-\eta)} \equiv f(\eta, N) = 0, \quad (34)$$

the solutions of which are the common nodal points of  $\gamma_{\rho_n \rho_m}^{(2)}$  and  $\gamma_{\rho_n}^{(1)}$ . In Fig. 1 we have depicted  $f(\eta, N)$  for

$N=3, 4, 5, 6$  and we conclude that there are coinciding nodal points for  $N > 2$ . For these rare parameter values one has to resort to  $l \geq 3$  geometric phases to retain some information about the geometry of the path in state space.




FIG. 1: Common nodal points of  $\gamma_{\rho_n \rho_m}^{(2)}$  and  $\gamma_{\rho_n}^{(1)} = (\gamma_{\rho_m}^{(1)})^*$  for pseudopure states  $\rho_n$  and  $\rho_m$  are given by vanishing  $f(\eta, N)$ , which is depicted for  $N=3, 4, 5, 6$ . Thus, except for the qubit case ( $N=2$ ), there may arise situations where the  $l=1$  and  $l=2$  geometric phases are undefined simultaneously.

To measure  $\gamma_{\rho_1 \rho_2}^{(2)}$  we add an ancillary system  $a$  and consider pure states  $|\Psi_n\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_s \otimes \mathcal{H}_a$ ,  $\dim \mathcal{H}_a = N$ , such that the partial trace  $\text{Tr}_a |\Psi_n\rangle \langle \Psi_n| = \rho_n$ . For pseudopure states, the purifications take the form

$$|\Psi_n\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{1-\epsilon}{N}} \sum_{k \neq n} |k\rangle \otimes |\varphi_k\rangle + \sqrt{\epsilon + \frac{1-\epsilon}{N}} |n\rangle \otimes |\varphi_n\rangle, \quad (35)$$

where  $|\varphi_1\rangle, \dots, |\varphi_N\rangle$  is an orthonormal basis of  $\mathcal{H}_a$ .  $\gamma_{\rho_1 \rho_2}^{(2)}$  may be measured interferometrically as a shift in the interference pattern

$$\mathcal{I} \propto |U_s \otimes U_a |\Psi_n\rangle + V_s \otimes V_a |\Psi_n\rangle|^2 \quad (36)$$

by choosing  $U_s = e^{i\chi} W^{m-n}$ ,  $V_s = U_n^{\parallel}$ ,  $U_a = W^{m-n}$ , and  $V_a = (U_n^{\parallel})^T$ ,  $T$  being transpose with respect to the ancilla basis  $|\varphi_1\rangle, \dots, |\varphi_N\rangle$  and  $\chi$  a variable  $U(1)$  phase shift [28].

In liquid-state NMR, such a test could in principle be implemented as follows. By adding an ‘auxiliary’ nuclear spin qubit pair in the state  $|0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$ , prepare the total input

$$|\Gamma\rangle = |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |\Psi_n\rangle. \quad (37)$$

Apply  $\mathbf{H} \otimes \mathbf{H} \otimes I_s \otimes I_a$ ,  $\mathbf{H} \otimes \mathbf{H}$  being Hadamard on each auxiliary qubit, followed by the conditional transformation

$$U_c = |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0| \otimes U_s \otimes U_a + |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes |1\rangle \langle 1| \otimes V_s \otimes V_a \quad (38)$$

with  $U_s, U_a, V_s$ , and  $V_a$  chosen as above. Finally, apply another Hadamard transform on the auxiliary qubits and measure the output in the 00 channel. The resulting intensity should confirm Eq. (36).

## V. CONCLUSIONS

We have put forward a kinematic approach to the off-diagonal geometric phases of pure states [23] and nondegenerate mixed states [27, 28]. The kinematic approach to off-diagonal geometric phases presented in this paper emphasizes the path in state space as the primary concept for the geometric phase and provides a tool to efficiently calculate off-diagonal geometric phases for arbitrary unitary operators and arbitrary density matrices. We have extended the concept of off-diagonal geometric phases of nondegenerate mixed states to degenerate mixed states. This kind of extension is essential since the geometric phase of degenerate mixed states [12] is undetermined in the case where the interference visibility between the initial and final states vanishes leading to

an interesting nodal point structure in the experimental parameter space that could be monitored in a history-dependent manner. On the other hand, the notion of off-diagonal geometric phase put forward for nondegenerate mixed state in Refs. [27, 28] breaks down in the case of degenerate mixed states, while the latter case does really include the most general quantum states and therefore this extension is physically important. Our extension makes it possible to obtain information of the geometry along the path in state space when the standard notion of geometric phase for degenerate density operators is undetermined. We have argued that liquid-state NMR protocols constitute a possible physical scenario for test of off-diagonal geometric phases for degenerate mixed quantum states.

The work by Tong was supported by NUS Research Grant No. R-144-000-071-305. E.S. acknowledges partial financial support from the Swedish Research Council. S.F. acknowledges support from the Austrian Science Foundation, Project No. F1513.

- 
- [1] S. Pancharatnam, Proc. Indian Acad. Sci., Sect. A **44**, 247 (1956).
- [2] M.V. Berry, Proc. R. Soc. London Ser. A **392**, 45 (1984).
- [3] Y. Aharonov and J. Anandan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 1593 (1987).
- [4] J. Anandan and Y. Aharonov, Phys. Rev. D **38**, 1863 (1988).
- [5] J. Samuel and R. Bhandari, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 2339 (1988).
- [6] N. Mukunda and R. Simon, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) **228**, 205 (1993).
- [7] A.K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 2576 (1995).
- [8] A.K. Pati, J. Phys. A **28**, 2087 (1995).
- [9] A. Uhlmann, Rep. Math. Phys. **24**, 229 (1986).
- [10] A. Uhlmann, Lett. Math. Phys. **21**, 229 (1991).
- [11] E. Sjöqvist, A.K. Pati, A. Ekert, J.S. Anandan, M. Ericsson, D.K.L. Oi, and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2845 (2000).
- [12] K. Singh, D.M. Tong, K. Basu, J.L. Chen, and J.F. Du, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 032106 (2003).
- [13] M. Ericsson, E. Sjöqvist, J. Brännlund, D.K.L. Oi, and A.K. Pati, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 020101(R) (2003).
- [14] J.G. Peixoto de Faria, A.F.R. de Toledo Piza, and M.C. Nemes, Europhys. Lett. **62**, 782 (2003).
- [15] D.M. Tong, E. Sjöqvist, L.C. Kwek, and C.H. Oh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 080405 (2004).
- [16] J.F. Du, P. Zou, M. Shi, L.C. Kwek, J.-W. Pan, C.H. Oh, A. Ekert, D.K.L. Oi, and M. Ericsson, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 100403 (2003).
- [17] R. Bhandari, Phys. Lett. A **157**, 221 (1991).
- [18] R. Bhandari, Phys. Lett. A **171**, 262 (1992).
- [19] R. Bhandari, Phys. Lett. A **171**, 267 (1992).
- [20] R. Bhandari, Phys. Lett. A **180**, 15 (1993).
- [21] R. Bhandari, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 268901 (2002).
- [22] J.S. Anandan, E. Sjöqvist, A.K. Pati, A. Ekert, M. Ericsson, D.K.L. Oi, and V. Vedral, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 268902 (2002).
- [23] N. Manini and F. Pistolesi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 3067 (2000).
- [24] N. Mukunda, Arvind, S. Chaturvedi, and R. Simon, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 012012 (2002).
- [25] Y. Hasegawa, R. Loidl, M. Baron, G. Badurek, and H. Rauch, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 070401 (2001).
- [26] Y. Hasegawa, R. Loidl, G. Badurek, M. Baron, N. Manini, F. Pistolesi, and H. Rauch, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 052111 (2002).
- [27] S. Filipp and E. Sjöqvist, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 050403 (2003).
- [28] S. Filipp and E. Sjöqvist, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 042112 (2003).
- [29] S. Filipp and E. Sjöqvist, e-print: quant-ph/0403204.
- [30] N. Gershenfeld and I. Chuang, Science **275**, 350 (1997).
- [31] By saying that the unitarily connected mixed states  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_l$  have the same degeneracy structure, we mean that an eigenvector  $|\psi\rangle$  of  $\rho_n$  corresponding to an  $m_i$ -fold degenerate eigenvalue  $\lambda_i$  is also an eigenvector of  $\rho_{n' \neq n}$  corresponding to an  $m_i$ -fold degenerate eigenvalue  $\lambda_j$ . Note that  $\lambda_i \neq \lambda_j$ , in general.