

Number-phase uncertainty relations and bipartite entanglement detection in spin ensembles

Quantum 7, 914 (2023)

G. Vitagliano^{1,2}, M. Fadel^{3,4}, I. Apellaniz^{2,5,6}, M. Kleinmann^{7,2},
B. Lücke⁸, C. Klempf^{8,9}, G. Tóth^{2,5,10,11,12}

¹IQOQI, Wien, Austria, ²University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Bilbao, Spain

³Department of Physics, ETH Zürich, Zürich, Switzerland

⁴Department of Physics, University of Basel, Basel, Switzerland

⁵EHU Quantum Center, University of the Basque Country UPV/EHU, Spain

⁶University of Mondragon, Spain, ⁷University of Siegen, Germany

⁸Institut für Quantenoptik, Leibniz Universität Hannover, Hannover, Germany

⁹Deutsches Zentrum für Luft- und Raumfahrt e.V. (DLR)

¹⁰Donostia International Physics Center (DIPC), San Sebastián, Spain

¹¹IKERBASQUE, Basque Foundation for Science, Bilbao, Spain

¹²Wigner Research Centre for Physics, Budapest, Hungary



Outline

1

Motivation

- Why entanglement is important?

2

Detecting bipartite entanglement of Dicke states

- Bipartite entanglement from multipartite entanglement in BEC
- Creating Dicke states in BEC
- Entanglement detection in Dicke states
- Our criteria work under realistic conditions

Why multipartite entanglement is important?

- Many experiments are aiming to create entangled states with many atoms.
- Full tomography is not possible, we still have to say something meaningful.
- Only collective quantities can be measured.
- Thus, entanglement detection seems to be a good idea.
- In many cases, we need to detect bipartite entanglement.

Outline

1 Motivation

- Why entanglement is important?

2 Detecting bipartite entanglement of Dicke states


- Bipartite entanglement from multipartite entanglement in BEC
- Creating Dicke states in BEC
- Entanglement detection in Dicke states
- Our criteria work under realistic conditions

Bipartite entanglement from bosonic multipartite entanglement

- In the BEC, "all the particles are at the same place."
- In the usual formulation, entanglement is between spatially separated parties.
- Is multipartite entanglement within a BEC useful/real?
- Answer: yes!


Bipartite entanglement from bosonic multipartite entanglement II

- Dilute cloud argument




[See, e.g., P. Hyllus, L. Pezzé, A Smerzi and GT, PRA 86, 012337 (2012)]

$$|n_0 = 1\rangle |n_1 = 1\rangle$$



Bipartite entanglement from bosonic multipartite entanglement III

- After splitting it into two, we have bipartite entanglement if we had before multipartite entanglement.
- The splitting does not generate entanglement, if we consider projecting to a fixed particle number.



[N. Killoran, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, PRL 112, 150501 (2014).]

Outline

1 Motivation

- Why entanglement is important?

2 Detecting bipartite entanglement of Dicke states

- Bipartite entanglement from multipartite entanglement in BEC
- **Creating Dicke states in BEC**
- Entanglement detection in Dicke states
- Our criteria work under realistic conditions

Experiment in the group of Carsten Klempt at the University of Hannover

- Rubidium BEC, spin-1 atoms.
- Initially all atoms in the spin state $|j_z = 0\rangle$.
- Dynamics

$$H = a_0^2 a_{+1}^\dagger a_{-1}^\dagger + (a_0^\dagger)^2 a_{+1} a_{-1}.$$

Tunneling from mode 0 to the mode +1 and -1.

- Understanding the tunneling process

$$\begin{aligned}|j_z = 0\rangle |j_z = 0\rangle &\rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j_z = +1\rangle |j_z = -1\rangle + |j_z = -1\rangle |j_z = +1\rangle) \\&= \text{Dicke state of 2 particles.}\end{aligned}$$

Experiment in the group of Carsten Klempt at the University of Hannover II

- After some time, we have a state

$$|n_0, n_{-1}, n_{+1}\rangle = |N - 2n, n, n\rangle.$$

- That is, $N - 2n$ particles remained in the $|j_z = 0\rangle$ state, while $2n$ particles form a symmetric Dicke state given as


$$|D_N\rangle = \left(\frac{N}{\frac{N}{2}}\right)^{-\frac{1}{2}} \sum_k \mathcal{P}_k \left(|0\rangle^{\otimes \frac{N}{2}} \otimes |1\rangle^{\otimes \frac{N}{2}} \right),$$

where we use $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ instead of $|j_z = -1\rangle$ and $|j_z = +1\rangle$.

- Half of the atoms in state $|0\rangle$, half of the atoms in state $|1\rangle$ + symmerization.

Experiment in the group of Carsten Klempt at the University of Hannover III

- Important: first excited spatial mode of the trap was used, not the ground state mode.
- It has two "bumps" rather than one, hence they had a split Dicke state.



[K. Lange, J. Peise, B. Lücke, I. Kruse, G. Vitagliano, I. Apellaniz, M. Kleinmann, G. Tóth, and C. Klempt, Entanglement between two spatially separated atomic modes, Science 360, 416 (2018).]

Correlations for Dicke states


- For the Dicke state

$$\begin{aligned}(\Delta(J_x^a - J_x^b))^2 &\approx 0, \\ (\Delta(J_y^a - J_y^b))^2 &\approx 0, \\ (\Delta J_z)^2 &= 0.\end{aligned}$$

- Measurement results on well "b" can be predicted from measurements on "a"

$$\begin{aligned}J_x^b &\approx J_x^a, \\ J_y^b &\approx J_y^a, \\ J_z^b &= -J_z^a.\end{aligned}$$

Correlations for Dicke states - experimental results



$$\text{Here, } J_{\perp}^{(n)} = \cos \alpha J_x^{(n)} + \sin \alpha J_y^{(n)}.$$

Experiment in K. Lange *et al.*, Science 334, 773–776 (2011).

Outline

1 Motivation

- Why entanglement is important?

2 Detecting bipartite entanglement of Dicke states

- Bipartite entanglement from multipartite entanglement in BEC
- Creating Dicke states in BEC
- Entanglement detection in Dicke states
- Our criteria work under realistic conditions

Number-phase-like uncertainty

- We start from the sum of two Heisenberg uncertainty relations

$$(\Delta J_z)^2[(\Delta J_x)^2 + (\Delta J_y)^2] \geq \frac{1}{4}(\langle J_x \rangle^2 + \langle J_y \rangle^2).$$

Then,

$$(\Delta J_z)^2[(\Delta J_x)^2 + (\Delta J_y)^2] + \frac{1}{4}[(\Delta J_x)^2 + (\Delta J_y)^2] \geq \frac{1}{4}(\langle J_x^2 \rangle + \langle J_y^2 \rangle).$$

- Simple algebra yields


$$\left[(\Delta J_z)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \right] \times \frac{(\Delta J_x)^2 + (\Delta J_y)^2}{\langle J_x^2 \rangle + \langle J_y^2 \rangle} \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$

- Note that $\langle J_x^2 \rangle$ appears, not $\langle J_x \rangle^2$.

Number-phase-like uncertainty II

- Uncertainty relation

$$\underbrace{\left[(\Delta J_z)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \right]}_{\sim \text{fluctuation of } J_z} \times \underbrace{\frac{(\Delta J_x)^2 + (\Delta J_y)^2}{\langle J_x^2 \rangle + \langle J_y^2 \rangle}}_{\sim \text{phase fluctuation}} \geq \frac{1}{4}.$$



Handwaving description:

J_z and ϕ cannot be defined both with high accuracy.

Normalized variables

- Let us introduce the normalized variables

$$\mathcal{J}_m^n = \frac{J_m^n}{\sqrt{j_n(j_n + 1)}},$$

where $m = x, y$ and $n = a, b$ (i.e., left well, right well), the total spin is

$$j_n = \frac{N_n}{2},$$

- Normalized variables → resistance to experimental imperfections.

Uncertainty with normalized variables

Our uncertainty relation is now

$$\left[(\Delta J_z)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \right] \left[(\Delta \mathcal{J}_x)^2 + (\Delta \mathcal{J}_y)^2 \right] \geq \frac{1}{4} \langle \mathcal{J}_x^2 + \mathcal{J}_y^2 \rangle.$$

The two-well entanglement criterion

Suggestion of the experimentalists: we need a product criterion, since it is good for realistic noise.

Main result I

For separable states,

$$\left[(\Delta J_z)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \right] \left[(\Delta \mathcal{T}_x^-)^2 + (\Delta \mathcal{T}_y^-)^2 \right] \geq \frac{1}{16} \langle \mathcal{T}_x^2 + \mathcal{T}_y^2 \rangle^2$$

holds.

Here,

$$J_z = J_z^a + J_z^b,$$

$$\mathcal{T}_m^- = \mathcal{T}_m^a - \mathcal{T}_m^b$$

for $m = x, y$.

The two-well EPR-Steering criterion

Main result II

For states with a hidden state model,

$$\left[(\Delta J_z)^2 + \frac{1}{4} \right] \left[(\Delta \mathcal{J}_x^-)^2 + (\Delta \mathcal{J}_y^-)^2 \right] \geq \frac{1}{4} \langle (\mathcal{J}_x^a)^2 + (\mathcal{J}_y^a)^2 \rangle^2$$

holds.

Any state violating the inequality cannot be described by a hidden state model, i.e., the state is *steerable*.

Outline

1 Motivation

- Why entanglement is important?

2 Detecting bipartite entanglement of Dicke states

- Bipartite entanglement from multipartite entanglement in BEC
- Creating Dicke states in BEC
- Entanglement detection in Dicke states
- Our criteria work under realistic conditions

Problem 1: Varying particle number

- The experiment is repeated many times. Each time we find a somewhat different particle number.
- Postselecting for a given particle number is not feasible.
- Consider a density matrix

$$\varrho = \sum_{j_a, j_b} Q_{j_a, j_b} \varrho_{j_a, j_b},$$

where ϱ_{j_a, j_b} are states with $2j_a$ and $2j_b$ particles in the two wells, Q_{j_a, j_b} are probabilities.

- ϱ is entangled iff at least one of the ϱ_{j_a, j_b} is entangled.

Problem 1: Varying particle number II

- Even if we have a constant total particle number, the ensemble will not be evenly split.
- Probability distribution for having $N/2 + x$ particles

$$p_x = 2^{-N} \binom{N}{N/2 + x}.$$

- Variance

$$\text{var}(N_a) = \text{var}(x) = \langle x^2 \rangle = \frac{N}{4}.$$

- Collective variance

$$[\Delta(J_I^a - J_I^b)]^2 \approx \sum_{x=-N/2}^{N/2} p_x \left(\frac{N}{8} + \frac{1}{2}x^2 \right) = \frac{N}{8} + \frac{1}{2}\text{var}(x) = \frac{N}{4}.$$

Twice as large due to the unequal splitting.

Problem 1: Varying particle number III

- Let use the normalized quantity mentioned before

$$\mathcal{J}_l^- = \frac{1}{\sqrt{j_a(j_a + 1)}} J_l^a - \frac{1}{\sqrt{j_b(j_b + 1)}} J_l^b$$

for $l = x, y, z$.

- For the variance of \mathcal{J}_l we obtain

$$(\Delta \mathcal{J}_l)^2 \approx \frac{N}{N^2/2 + 4N - 2x^2}.$$

After splitting $|x| \lesssim \sqrt{N/4}$.

- We have


$$(\Delta \mathcal{J}_l)^2 \approx \frac{2}{N}.$$

$(\Delta \mathcal{J}_l)^2$ is not sensitive to the fluctuation of x if N is large.

Problem 2: States are not always symmetric in a BEC of two-state atoms

- Ideally, the BEC is in a single spatial mode.
- The state of an ensemble of the two-state atoms must be symmetric.
- In practice, the BEC is not in a single spatial mode, so there is no perfect symmetry.
- Our criterion must handle this.

Violation of the criterion: entanglement is detected II




LHS/RHS for (top) our present work, and (bottom) for Science 2018.

Collaborators on entanglement conditions for double-well Dicke states



C. Klempf, I. Kruse, J. Peise,
K. Lange, B. Lücke

Hannover



G. Vitagliano

IQOQI, Wien



I. Apellaniz

Bilbao (G.T.)



M. Fadel



M. Kleinmann

ETH Zürich, Basel U. of Siegen

Other similar experiments at the same time in Science in 2018

Spatial entanglement patterns and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen steering in Bose-Einstein condensates,

M. Fadel, T. Zibold, B. Décamps, P. Treutlein

Spatially distributed multipartite entanglement enables EPR steering of atomic clouds,

P. Kunkel, M. Prüfer, H. Strobel, D. Linnemann, A. Frölian, T. Gasenzer, M. Gärtnner, M. K. Oberthaler

Summary

- Detection of bipartite entanglement and EPR steering close to Dicke states. It works also for split spin-squeezed states.
- Non-symmetric states within the wells and a varying particle number can also be handled.

G. Vitagliano, I. Apellaniz, M. fadel, M. Kleinmann,
B. Lücke, C. Klempert, and G. Tóth,

Number-phase uncertainty relations and bipartite entanglement
detection in spin ensembles,

[Quantum 7, 914 \(2023\)](#)

K. Lange *et al.*, [Science 334, 773–776 \(2011\)](#)

THANK YOU FOR YOUR ATTENTION!
www.gtoth.eu