Spin-2

The procedure for the spin-2 case is identical as the previous for spin-1. However, its description is substantially more complex. Consequently, for numerical performance, we shall consider a smaller number of parties.

1 Local operators and their collective representation

 $ln[8]:= o = Table[Proj[MatSpin[[a]], s], {a, 1, 3}, {s, {-2, -1, 1, 2}}];$

```
MatSpin = RepMatrices[SU2, {4}]; (* Spin-2 matrices *)
   MatGM = N[RepMatrices[SU5, {1, 0, 0, 0}]]; (* Gell-Mann SU(5) matrices *)

We might want to precompute the collective matrix representation of the generators.

(* MatSU5= N[RepMatrices[SU5, {Np,0,0,0}]]
        Save["MatSU5susyno_n"<>ToString[Np]<>".mx",MatSU5] *)

MatSU5 = Import["Path to MatSU5susyno_n24.mx"];
   dim = Dimensions[MatSU5][[2]];

In[5]= Ir[o_] := Sum[2 * Tr[o.MatGM[[a]]] * MatSU5[[a]], {a, 1, First[Dimensions[MatSU5]]}] +
        Np * Tr[o] * IdentityMatrix[dim, SparseArray] / First[Dimensions[MatGM[[1]]]];

In[6]= Pro[o_, m_] := Sum[KroneckerDelta[m, Eigensystem[o][[1]][[a]]] *
        KroneckerProduct[Eigensystem[o][[2]][[a]]*, Eigensystem[o][[2]][[a]]],
        {a, 1, First[Dimensions[o]]}];
   Proj[o_, m_] := Pro[o, m] / Tr[Pro[o, m]];

We follow an example with local operators the projectors to all non-zero magnetic sublevels along three orthogonal directions, {x,y,z}, to probe for entanglement.
```

Whose separable bound as computed in "find_betabound.py" is

```
In[9]:= beta = 3 / 2;
```

2 The five-level spinor Bose gas model

In this case, there is a second relevant channel characterized by a singlet-pair amplitude (see https://doi.org/10.1016/j.physrep.2012.07.005)

```
ln[10]:= J2 = Ir[MatSpin[[1]]].Ir[MatSpin[[1]]] + Ir[MatSpin[[2]]].Ir[MatSpin[[2]]] +
        Ir[MatSpin[[3]]].Ir[MatSpin[[3]]]; (* Total spin *)
     t[i_{j}] := SparseArray[{\{i, j\} \rightarrow 1, \{5, 5\} \rightarrow 0\}];
     PairAmp = Ir[t[3, 3]].(Ir[t[3, 3]] - SparseArray[IdentityMatrix[dim]]) +
       4 * (Ir[t[2, 2]].Ir[t[4, 4]] + Ir[t[1, 1]].Ir[t[5, 5]] + Ir[t[3, 1]].Ir[t[3, 5]] -
           Ir[t[3, 2]].Ir[t[3, 4]] - 2 * Ir[t[2, 1]].Ir[t[4, 5]]);
     (*Singlet-pair amplitude*)
     PairAmp = PairAmp + ConjugateTranspose[PairAmp];
     Qz = Ir[MatSpin[[3]].MatSpin[[3]]]; (* Quadrupole *)
ln[14]:= IdxRed =
      Flatten[Position[Re[Normal[Diagonal[Ir[MatSpin[[3]]]]]], _?(Abs[#] < 0.01 &)]];
     (* We only consider the basis elements with J_z=0 *)
    H[c_{p}, p_{q}] := (c * J2 / Np + p * PairAmp / Np + q * Qz) [[IdxRed, IdxRed]];
In[15]:= GS[H_] := First[Eigenvectors[H + Norm[H] * IdentityMatrix[Dimensions[H][[1]]], -1]];
     (* Ground state *)
     EV[0_, S_] := Re[Tr[KroneckerProduct[Conjugate[S], S].0]];
     (* Expectation value of the GS with respect collective operator 0 *)
```

a) Quantum data

Inferred from local operators o

```
ln[16]: m[state_] := Flatten[Table[EV[Ir[o[[a, m]]]][[IdxRed, IdxRed]], state] / Np,
         {a, 1, 3}, {m, 1, Dimensions[o][[2]]}]];
     of = Flatten[o, 1];
     Cor[state_] := Table[ EV[(Ir[of[[k]]].Ir[of[[r]]] + Ir[of[[r]]].Ir[of[[k]]] -
              Ir[of[[k]].of[[r]] + of[[r]].of[[k]]]) [[IdxRed, IdxRed]], state] /
         (2 * Np * (Np - 1)) , {k, 1, Dimensions[of][[1]]}, {r, 1, Dimensions[of][[1]]}];
```

3 Data-driven entanglement detection

```
In[19]:= Ctilde[Cor_, m_] := Np * (Cor - KroneckerProduct[m*, m]);
     CtildeXYZ[Cor_, m_] :=
      DiagonalMatrix[Unevaluated@{Ctilde[Cor, m][[{1, 2, 3, 4}, {1, 2, 3, 4}]],
           Ctilde[Cor, m][[{5, 6, 7, 8}, {5, 6, 7, 8}]],
           Ctilde[Cor, m][[{9, 10, 11, 12}, {9, 10, 11, 12}]]}] // ArrayFlatten
```

```
In[21]:= (* Sum of negative eigenvalues of C *)
     Pscalar[C_] :=
        Sum[(1 - Round[HeavisideTheta[Eigenvalues[C][[a]]]]) * Eigenvalues[C][[a]],
         {a, 1, First[Dimensions[C, 1]]}];
      (* Optimal projector *)
     PP[C_] := Sum[(1 - Round[HeavisideTheta[Eigenvalues[C][[a]]]]) * KroneckerProduct[
           Eigenvectors[C][[a]]*, Eigenvectors[C][[a]]], {a, 1, First[Dimensions[C, 1]]}];
      (* Entanglement witness *)
     W[Cor_, m_] := Pscalar[CtildeXYZ[Cor, m]] - Tr[Cor] + beta;
     We test our algorithm with the GS of the spinor gas at c = 1, p = -1, q = 0. Under this conditions the
     ground state is a condensate of singlet-pairs.
ln[24]:= C = 1;
     p = -1;
     q = 0;
In[27]:= state = GS[H[c, p, q]];
     ms = m[state];
     Cors = Cor[state];
      (*May take a while to compute the multiplications of the large Irep matrices,
     more efficient methods may exist taking into account the symmetries of H*)
In[30]:= W[Cors, ms]
Out[30]= -0.40807453
```

Therefore, quantum entanglement is certified with a witness characterized by the optimal projector:

```
In[31]:= Popt = PP[CtildeXYZ[Cors, ms]];
     Popt // MatrixForm
```

Out[32]//MatrixForm=

auxrorm=					
	0.5	$\textbf{6.6728929} \times \textbf{10}^{-16}$	$\textbf{7.8504623} \times \textbf{10}^{-16}$	-0.5	0.
	$\textbf{6.6728929} \times \textbf{10}^{-16}$	0.5	-0.5	$-8.2429854\times 10^{-16}$	0.
	$\textbf{7.8504623} \times \textbf{10}^{-16}$	-0.5	0.5	$-6.2803698\times 10^{-16}$	0.
	-0.5	$-8.2429854\times 10^{-16}$	$-6.2803698\times 10^{-16}$	0.5	0.
	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.5
	0.	0.	0.	0.	$\textbf{6.6728929} \times \textbf{10}^{-16}$
	0.	0.	0.	0.	$\textbf{7.0654161} \times \textbf{10}^{-16}$
	0.	0.	0.	0.	-0.5
	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.
	0.	0.	0.	0.	0.

Interestingly, this witness is not violated for the other singlet 'flavour', the condensation of trios, which is realized in c = 1, q = 1:

```
In[33]:= state = GS[H[1, 1, 0]];
    mt = m[state];
     Cort = Cor[state];
     (*May take a while to compute the multiplications of the large Irep matrices,
    more efficient methods may exist taking into account the symmetries of H*)
```

```
In[36]:=

Tr[Popt.CtildeXYZ[Cort, mt] - Cort] + beta

Out[36]= 5.5621118
```

4 Correlations' feasible region

The calculations are in complete analogy with the spin-1 case.