

Geometric quantum discord of a Jaynes-Cummings atom and an isolated atom

Wen-Chao Qiang¹

Lei Zhang²

Hua-Ping Zhang¹

¹ Faculty of Science, Xi'an University of Architecture and Technology, Xi'an, 710055, China

² Huaqing College, Xi'an University of Architecture and Technology, Xi'an, 710055, China

E-mail: qwcqj@163.com (Wen-Chao Qiang)

Abstract.

We studied the geometric quantum discord of a quantum system consisted of a Jaynes-Cummings atom, a cavity and an isolated atom. The analytical expressions of the geometric quantum discord for two atoms, every atom with cavity and the total system were obtained. We showed that the geometric quantum discord is not always zero when entanglement fall in death for two-atom subsystem; the geometric measurement of quantum discord of the total system developed periodically with a single frequency if the initial state of two atoms was not entangled, otherwise, it oscillates with two or four frequencies according to the cavity is initially empty or not, respectively.

1. Introduction

The cavity quantum electrodynamics (CQED) system is one of the fundamental subjects of quantum mechanics and quantum information theory because atoms can be used to store quantum information and photons are suitable for transfer of quantum information [1]. The study of CQED system has attracted researcher's much interest. Many authors investigated the system that composed of several atoms, which were trapped in cavities, but these cavities were connected by optical fibers or isolated each other. Some authors proposed various schemes to generate some useful quantum states [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] or realize some quantum gates [6, 7, 8] in quantum information process and quantum computation.

On the other hand, some authors undertook to study the properties of entanglement of the CQED system. Ting Yu and J. H. Eberly investigated two entangled qubits, which individually interact with vacuum noise. They showed that this system can present a complete disentanglement after a finite-time [9]. They and their co-worker further studied two completely isolated double Jaynes-Cummings (JC) system and showed that the entanglement of two initially entangled atoms can fall abruptly to zero and recovers for a period of time [10]. Zhi-Jian Li *et al* discussed the dynamics of the entanglement of a system composed of a JC system and an isolated atom. They showed that the sudden death of entanglement between atom A in its cavity and the isolated atom B appears when the cavity lies in the nonzero number state. Further more, the entanglement resurrection can occur after a period of time, which does not dependent on the degree of entanglement of the initial state [11]. More recently, Dao-Ming Lu examined a CQED system, which was comprised of three JC two-level atoms resonantly interacting with three cavities that are coupled by two optical fibers [12]. Their results demonstrate that the entanglement between non-adjacent atoms or that between adjacent cavities has a nonlinear relation with increasing of the atom-cavity coupling coefficient, but the entanglement between non-adjacent cavities is strengthened and the entanglement between adjacent atoms is weakened with increasing of atom-cavity coupling constant. Though these studies revealed some important properties of entanglement or other correlation, but only the subsystem involved in the study. We do not know total correlation properties of these CQED systems. Even though for subsystems containing a cavity, the concurrence yet was not given. To remedy these defects, this paper will employ the geometric quantum discord (GQD) to measure the correlation character of all subsystem and total system for a CQED system. For simplicity, we chose JC system with an isolated atom in Ref.[11].

This paper is arranged as follows. In Sec.2, we provide a brief review of geometric measure of quantum discord. In Sec.3, we calculate GQD for bipartite subsystems. In Sec.4, we give the GQD of the total system and discuss the monogamy for the system. Finally, we further discuss the results of our calculation in detail and summarize the paper in Sec.5.

2. Brief review of geometric measure of quantum discord

Before starting, we give a brief review of geometric measure of quantum discord. Quantum discord is a quantum-versus-classical paradigm for correlations [13, 14, 15] and is not in the entanglement-versus-separability framework [16, 17]. The quantum discord of a bipartite state ρ on a system $H^a \otimes H^b$ with marginals ρ^a and ρ^b can be expressed as

$$Q(\rho) = \min_{\Pi^a} \{I(\rho) - I(\Pi^a(\rho))\}. \quad (1)$$

Here the minimum is over von Neumann measurements (one-dimensional orthogonal projectors summing up to the identity) $\Pi^a = \{\Pi_k^a\}$ on subsystem a , and

$$\Pi^a(\rho) = \sum_k (\Pi_k^a \otimes I^b) \rho (\Pi_k^a \otimes I^b) \quad (2)$$

is the resulting state after the measurement. $I(\rho) = S(\rho^a) + S(\rho^b) - S(\rho)$ is the quantum mutual information, $S(\rho) = -\text{tr} \rho \ln \rho$ is the von Neumann entropy, and I^b is the identity operator on H^b .

The calculation of quantum discord involves a difficult optimization procedure. It is generally hard to obtain analytical results except for a few families of two-qubit states [18, 19, 20, 21, 22, 23, 24, 25, 26]. Huang has proved that computing quantum discord is NP-complete: the running time of any algorithm for computing quantum discord is believed to grow exponentially with the dimension of the Hilbert space. Therefore, computing quantum discord in a quantum system even with moderate size is impossible in practice [27]. In order to overcome this problem, Dakić *et al.* proposed the following geometric measure of quantum discord [28]:

$$D(\rho) = \min_{\chi} \|\rho - \chi\|_2^2, \quad (3)$$

where the minimum is over the set of zero-discord states [i.e., $Q(\chi) = 0$] and $\|A\|_2 := \sqrt{\text{tr}(A^\dagger A)}$ is the Frobenius or Hilbert-Schmidt norm. The density operator of any two-qubit state can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho = \frac{1}{4} & \left(\mathbf{I}^A \otimes \mathbf{I}^B + \sum_{i=1}^3 (x_i \sigma_i \otimes \mathbf{I}^B + \mathbf{I}^A \otimes y_i \sigma_i) \right. \\ & \left. + \sum_{i,j=1}^3 t_{ij} \sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j \right), \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

where $\{\sigma_i, i = 1, 2, 3\}$ denote the Pauli spin matrices. Then, the geometric measure of quantum discord of any two-qubit state is evaluated as

$$D(\rho) = \frac{1}{4} (\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 + \|\mathbf{T}\|^2 - k_{\max}), \quad (5)$$

where $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, x_2, x_3)^t$ is a column vector, $\|\mathbf{x}\|^2 := \sum_i x_i^2$, $x_i = \text{tr}(\rho(\sigma_i \otimes \mathbf{I}^b))$, $T := (t_{ij})$ is a matrix and $t_{ij} = \text{tr}(\rho(\sigma_i \otimes \sigma_j))$, k_{\max} is the largest eigenvalue of matrix $\mathbf{x}\mathbf{x}^t + \mathbf{T}\mathbf{T}^t$.

Since Dakić *et al.* proposed the geometric measure of quantum discord, many authors extended Dakić's results to the general bipartite states. Luo and Fu evaluated

the geometric measure of quantum discord for an arbitrary state and gave a tight lower bound for geometric discord of arbitrary bipartite states [29]. Recently, a different tight lower bound for geometric discord of arbitrary bipartite states was given by S. Rana *et al.* [30], and Ali Saif M. Hassan *et al.* [31] independently. Alternatively, D. girolami *et al.* found an explicit expression of geometric discord for two-qubit system and extended it to $2 \otimes d$ dimensional systems [32]. T. Tufarelli *et al.* also gave another formula of geometric discord for qubit-qudit system, which is available to $2 \otimes d$ dimensional systems including $d = \infty$ [33]. It worth noting that authors of [32, 33] added a normalization factor 2 to the definition of the geometric measure of quantum discord in Eq.(3) to ensure the maximum value of the geometric discord of Bell states is 1. Then, for a quantum state ρ_{AB} , with A being a qubit and B being an arbitrary (finite or infinite) d -dimensional system, they defined a vector $\mathbf{v} = \text{Tr}_A(\rho_{AB}\boldsymbol{\sigma})$ and derived the normalized geometric discord

$$D_G(\rho_{AB}) = \text{tr}(S) - \lambda_{\max}(S), \quad (6)$$

with $S = \text{tr}_B(\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^t)$. In the following sections, we are going to use this algorithm to calculate the geometric discord of a quantum system consisted of a Jaynes-Cummings atom and an isolated atom.

3. Geometric quantum discord of bipartite subsystems




Figure 1. (Color online) The schematic diagram of a Jaynes-Cummings atom and an isolated atom.

The Hamiltonian of a quantum system, which we are considering, can be written as ($\hbar = 1$)[34]:

$$H_{\text{tot}} = \frac{\omega}{2}\sigma_z^A + \frac{\omega}{2}\sigma_z^B + g(a^\dagger\sigma_-^A + a\sigma_+^A) + \nu a^\dagger a, \quad (7)$$

where σ_z^x ($x = A, B$) is the third Pauli matrix for atom x , σ_\pm are the atomic raising and lowering operators and $a^\dagger(a)$ is the creation (annihilation) operator of the cavity field. Obviously, atom B interacts neither with atom A nor with cavity C (see Figure 1). We can prepare the two atoms initially in an entangled pure state and cavity C in the Fork

state $|n\rangle$. The initial state of the total system can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_0\rangle &= (\cos\alpha|1_A0_B\rangle + \sin\alpha|0_A1_B\rangle) \otimes |n_C\rangle \\ &= (\cos\alpha|1_A0_Bn_C\rangle + \sin\alpha|0_A1_Bn_C\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

The state of the system at time t can be expressed as

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = x_1(t)|1_A0_Bn_C\rangle + x_2(t)|0_A1_Bn_C\rangle + x_3(t)|0_A0_B(n+1)_C\rangle + x_4(t)|1_A1_B(n-1)_C\rangle. \quad (9)$$

For simplicity, we only consider the case of detuning $\Delta = \omega - \nu = 0$. The solution of the Schrödinger equation with Hamiltonian (7) is [34]

$$\begin{aligned} x_1(t) &= e^{-i\nu t} \cos(g\sqrt{n+1}t) \cos\alpha, \\ x_2(t) &= e^{-i\nu t} \cos(g\sqrt{n}t) \sin\alpha, \\ x_3(t) &= -ie^{-i\nu t} \sin(g\sqrt{n+1}t) \cos\alpha, \\ x_4(t) &= -ie^{-i\nu t} \sin(g\sqrt{n}t) \sin\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

The density operator of the system ABC is

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{ABC} &= |x_4(t)|^2 |0_A0_B(n-1)_C\rangle\langle 0_A0_B(n-1)_C| + x_4(t)^* x_1(t) |0_A1_Bn_C\rangle\langle 0_A0_B(n-1)_C| \\ &\quad + x_4(t)^* x_2(t) |1_A0_Bn_C\rangle\langle 0_A0_B(n-1)_C| \\ &\quad + x_4(t)^* x_3(t) |1_A1_B(n+1)_C\rangle\langle 0_A0_B(n-1)_C| \\ &\quad + x_1(t)^* x_4(t) |0_A0_B(n-1)_C\rangle\langle 0_A1_Bn_C| + |x_1(t)|^2 |0_A1_Bn_C\rangle\langle 0_A1_Bn_C| \\ &\quad + x_1(t)^* x_2(t) |1_A0_Bn_C\rangle\langle 0_A1_Bn_C| + x_1(t)^* x_3(t) |1_A1_B(n+1)_C\rangle\langle 0_A1_Bn_C| \\ &\quad + x_2(t)^* x_4(t) |0_A0_B(n-1)_C\rangle\langle 1_A0_Bn_C| + x_2(t)^* x_1(t) |0_A1_Bn_C\rangle\langle 1_A0_Bn_C| \\ &\quad + |x_2(t)|^2 |1_A0_Bn_C\rangle\langle 1_A0_Bn_C| + x_2(t)^* x_3(t) |1_A1_B(n+1)_C\rangle\langle 1_A0_Bn_C| \\ &\quad + x_3(t)^* x_4(t) |0_A0_B(n-1)_C\rangle\langle 1_A1_B(n+1)_C| \\ &\quad + x_3(t)^* x_1(t) |0_A1_Bn_C\rangle\langle 1_A1_B(n+1)_C| \\ &\quad + x_3(t)^* x_2(t) |1_A0_Bn_C\rangle\langle 1_A1_B(n+1)_C| \\ &\quad + |x_3(t)|^2 |1_A1_B(n+1)_C\rangle\langle 1_A1_B(n+1)_C|. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

Taking the trace over the cavity C , we obtain the reduced density operator ρ_{AB} between two atoms,

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{AB} &= |x_4(t)|^2 |0_A0_B\rangle\langle 0_A0_B| + |x_1(t)|^2 |0_A1_B\rangle\langle 0_A1_B| \\ &\quad + x_1(t)^* x_2(t) |1_A0_B\rangle\langle 0_A1_B| + x_2(t)^* x_1(t) |0_A1_B\rangle\langle 1_A0_B| \\ &\quad + |x_2(t)|^2 |1_A0_B\rangle\langle 1_A0_B| + |x_3(t)|^2 |1_A1_B\rangle\langle 1_A1_B|. \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

Recall that Pauli spin matrices can be expressed by Dirac notation,

$$\sigma_x^a = |0_a\rangle\langle 1_a| + |1_a\rangle\langle 0_a|, \quad (13a)$$

$$\sigma_y^a = i(|1_a\rangle\langle 0_a| - |0_a\rangle\langle 1_a|), \quad (13b)$$

$$\sigma_z^a = |0_a\rangle\langle 0_a| - |1_a\rangle\langle 1_a|, \quad (13c)$$

where $\sigma_x^a (x = 1, 2, 3)$ is Pauli spin matrix expressed by basis vectors $|0_a\rangle$ and $|1_a\rangle$ of qubit a ($a = A, B$). To calculate $D_G(\rho_{AB})$, we first calculate the vector \mathbf{v} and obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{v} = \text{tr}_A(\rho_{AB} \cdot \sigma^A) = & \{x_2(t)^* x_1(t) |1_B\rangle \langle 0_B| + x_1(t)^* x_2(t) |0_B\rangle \langle 1_B|, \\ & i(x_2(t)^* x_1(t) |1_B\rangle \langle 0_B| - x_1(t)^* x_2(t) |0_B\rangle \langle 1_B|), \\ & -|x_2(t)|^2 |0_B\rangle \langle 0_B| + |x_4(t)|^2 |0_B\rangle \langle 0_B|\}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

According to $S = \text{tr}_B(\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^T)$, we get a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements

$$S = \{2|x_1(t)x_2(t)|^2, 2|x_1(t)x_2(t)|^2, (|x_1(t)|^2 - |x_3(t)|^2)^2 + (|x_2(t)|^2 - |x_4(t)|^2)^2\}. \quad (15)$$

Obviously, matrix S has three eigenvalues

$$\lambda_1 = \lambda_2 = 2|x_1(t)x_2(t)|^2, \quad \lambda_3 = (|x_1(t)|^2 - |x_3(t)|^2)^2 + (|x_2(t)|^2 - |x_4(t)|^2)^2. \quad (16)$$

We finally get GQD of ρ_{AB}

$$\begin{aligned} D_G(\rho_{AB}) = & 4|x_1(t)x_2(t)|^2 + (|x_1(t)|^2 - |x_3(t)|^2)^2 + (|x_2(t)|^2 - |x_4(t)|^2)^2 \\ & - \text{Max}[2|x_1(t)x_2(t)|^2, (|x_1(t)|^2 - |x_3(t)|^2)^2 + (|x_2(t)|^2 - |x_4(t)|^2)^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

To reveal properties of $D_G(\rho_{AB})$ with time t and parameter α and n , we plot $D_G(\rho_{AB})$ as a function of t for some typical values of α and n in Figure 2. Using the same procedure




Figure 2. (Color online) Plots of geometric measure of quantum discord $D_G(\rho_{AB})$ as functions of t for some typical values of α : $\alpha = \pi/4$ (solid and red line); $\alpha = \pi/6$ (dotted and blue line); $\alpha = \pi/12$ (dashed and purple line); $\alpha = 0$ (Dot-Dashed and Black line).

used above, we can obtain $D_G(\rho_{AC})$ and $D_G(\rho_{BC})$ as follows,

$$\begin{aligned} D_G(\rho_{AC}) = & |x_1(t)|^4 + |x_2(t)|^4 + |x_3(t)|^4 + |x_4(t)|^4 \\ & - 2|x_1(t)x_2(t)|^2 + 4(|x_1(t)x_3(t)|^2 + |x_2(t)x_4(t)|^2) \\ & - \text{Max}[|x_1(t)|^4 + |x_2(t)|^4 + |x_3(t)|^4 + |x_4(t)|^4 - 2|x_1(t)x_2(t)|^2, \\ & 2(|x_1(t)x_3(t)|^2 + |x_2(t)x_4(t)|^2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_G(\rho_{BC}) = & |x_1(t)|^4 + |x_2(t)|^4 + |x_3(t)|^4 + |x_4(t)|^4 \\ & - 2|x_1(t)x_2(t)|^2 + 4(|x_2(t)x_3(t)|^2 + |x_1(t)x_4(t)|^2) \\ & - \text{Max}[|x_1(t)|^4 + |x_2(t)|^4 + |x_3(t)|^4 + |x_4(t)|^4 - 2|x_1(t)x_2(t)|^2, \\ & 2(|x_2(t)x_3(t)|^2 + |x_1(t)x_4(t)|^2)]. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$




Figure 3. (Color online) Plots of geometric measure of quantum discord $D_G(\rho_{AC})$ as functions of t for some typical values of α : $\alpha = \pi/4$ (solid and red line); $\alpha = \pi/6$ (dotted and blue line); $\alpha = \pi/12$ (dashed and purple line); $\alpha = 0$ (Dot-Dashed and Black line).




Figure 4. (Color online) Plots of geometric measure of quantum discord $D_G(\rho_{BC})$ as functions of t for some typical values of α : $\alpha = \pi/4$ (solid and red line); $\alpha = \pi/6$ (dotted and blue line); $\alpha = \pi/12$ (dashed and purple line); $\alpha = 0$ (Dot-Dashed and Black line).

We also plot $D_G(\rho_{AC})$ and $D_G(\rho_{BC})$ as functions of t for some typical values of α and n in Figure 3 and Figure 4 respectively.

4. Geometric quantum discord of total system and the monogamy

To calculate the geometric measure of quantum discord for total system ρ_{ABC} , we make a von Newmann measurement on atom A , $\Pi^A(\rho_{ABC}) = \Pi_+^A \rho_{ABC} \Pi_+^A + \Pi_-^A \rho_{ABC} \Pi_-^A$, where

$$\Pi_{\pm}^A = \frac{\mathbf{I}^A \pm \mathbf{\Pi} \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}^A}{2} \quad (20)$$

and $\mathbf{\Pi} = \{\alpha, \beta, \gamma\}$ with $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 + \gamma^2 = 1$. Now, after a tedious and direct calculation and simplification, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \|\rho_{ABC} - \Pi^A(\rho_{ABC})\|^2 &= \text{tr}(\rho_{ABC} - \Pi^A(\rho_{ABC}))^2 \\ &= \frac{1}{2}[1 - (|x_1(t)|^2 - |x_2(t)|^2 - |x_3(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2)^2 \gamma^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$




Figure 5. (Color online) Plots of geometric measure of quantum discord $D_G(\rho_{ABC})$ as function of t for some typical values of α : $\alpha = \pi/4$ (solid and red line); $\alpha = \pi/6$ (dotted and blue line); $\alpha = \pi/12$ (dashed and purple line); $\alpha = 0$ (Dot-Dashed and Black line).

It is obvious that when $\gamma = \pm 1$, $\|\rho_{ABC} - \Pi(\rho_{ABC})\|^2$ get its minimum values. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned}
 D_G(\rho_{ABC}) &= 2\min_{\Pi^A}(\|\rho_{ABC} - \Pi^A(\rho_{ABC})\|^2) \\
 &= 1 - (1 - 2|x_2(t)|^2 - 2|x_3(t)|^2)^2 \\
 &= 4(|x_1(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2)(|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2).
 \end{aligned} \tag{22}$$

In the above equation, we have written it in a more symmetrical form in the last step by using $|x_1(t)|^2 + |x_2(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2 = 1$. To show the evolution of $D_G(\rho_{ABC})$ with time t , we plot it as a function of t for different α and n in Figure 5.

It should be pointed out that because up to now no approaches and methods to calculate the geometric measurements of quantum discord for a tripartite system have been reported, we have calculated $D_G(\rho_{ABC})$ based on the original definition of the geometric measurements of quantum discord. However, there are at least three alternative approaches to accomplish this task. First, we can generalize the formula $S = \text{Tr}_B(\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^T)$ to $S = \text{tr}_{BC}(\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^T) = \text{tr}_C(\text{tr}_B(\mathbf{v}\mathbf{v}^T))$, but keep Eqs.(6) unchanged. Second, we can consider subsystem BC as a four-level system when $n \geq 1$ and a three-level system when $n = 0$. Specifically, we let $|0_X\rangle = |0_B n_C\rangle$, $|1_X\rangle = |1_B(n-1)_C\rangle$, $|2_X\rangle = |1_B n_C\rangle$, $|3_X\rangle = |0_B(n+1)_C\rangle$, then, the wave-function of the system can be written as

$$|\psi_{AX}(t)\rangle = x_1(t)|1_A 0_X\rangle + x_2(t)|0_A 2_X\rangle + x_3(t)|0_A 3_X\rangle + x_4(t)|1_A 1_X\rangle. \tag{23}$$

We can now treat this equivalent 2×4 system by using the methods used in section 2. Third, we can further rewrite Eq.(9) as

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sqrt{|x_1(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2}|1_A 0_X\rangle + \sqrt{|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2}|0_A 1_X\rangle, \tag{24}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}
 |0_X\rangle &= \frac{x_1(t)|0_B n_C\rangle + x_4(t)|1_B(n-1)_C\rangle}{\sqrt{|x_1(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2}}, \\
 |1_X\rangle &= \frac{x_2(t)|1_B n_C\rangle + x_3(t)|0_B(n+1)_C\rangle}{\sqrt{|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2}}.
 \end{aligned} \tag{25}$$

The corresponding density matrix is

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & |x_2(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2 & \sqrt{(|x_1(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2)(|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2)} & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{(|x_1(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2)(|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2)} & |x_1(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

Equation(24) exhibits that the total system ABC equivalent to a two-qubit system AX . So we can now use all methods applicable to any two-qubit system to calculate the geometric measurements of quantum discord for system AX . Especially, equation (26) shows that the equivalent system AX is an X state, therefore, we can directly use the formula of X states for the geometric measurements of quantum discord in Ref.[35] to obtain the geometric measurements of quantum discord of the total system[‡]. Of cause, the results obtained by using above three methods are the same as equation (22). We stress to calculate the geometric measurements of quantum discord of a complex quantum systems, the first one of the above three approaches can be used for any multipartite quantum system that including at least one qubit subsystem; the latter two ones are applicable to any pure quantum states that also contain at least one qubit subsystem.

Getting geometric discord of the state ρ_{ABC} enables us to study the monogamy of this state. The monogamy is an important property of a tripartite system. A correlation measure \mathcal{Q} is monogamous if and only if the following Coffman-Kundu-Wootters (CKW) monogamy inequality

$$\mathcal{Q}_{A|BC} \geq \mathcal{Q}_{AB} + \mathcal{Q}_{AC} \quad (27)$$

holds for any tripartite state ρ_{ABC} [36].

Using Eqs.(17), (18) and (22), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} & D_G(\rho_{ABC}) - D_G(\rho_{AB}) - D_G(\rho_{AC}) \\ &= \begin{cases} -2[|x_1(t)|^4 + |x_2(t)|^4 - 2|x_2(t)x_4(t)|^2 \\ -2|x_1(t)|^2(|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2) + (|x_3(t)|^2 - |x_4(t)|^2)^2] \\ \geq -2\{|x_1(t)|^4 + |x_2(t)|^4 - 2|x_2(t)x_4(t)|^2 - 2|x_1(t)|^2|x_3(t)|^2 \\ -[(|x_1(t)|^2 - |x_3(t)|^2)^2 + (|x_2(t)|^2 - |x_4(t)|^2)^2] \\ + (|x_3(t)|^2 - |x_4(t)|^2)^2\} = 4|x_3(t)x_4(t)|^2 \geq 0, \\ \text{for } 2|x_1(t)|^2|x_2(t)|^2 \geq (|x_1(t)|^2 - |x_3(t)|^2)^2 + (|x_2(t)|^2 - |x_4(t)|^2)^2; \\ 4|x_3(t)x_4(t)|^2 \geq 0, \\ \text{for } 2|x_1(t)|^2|x_2(t)|^2 < (|x_1(t)|^2 - |x_3(t)|^2)^2 + (|x_2(t)|^2 - |x_4(t)|^2)^2. \end{cases} \quad (28) \end{aligned}$$

In the above equation, we have replaced $2|x_1(t)|^2|x_2(t)|^2$ by $(|x_1(t)|^2 - |x_3(t)|^2)^2 + (|x_2(t)|^2 - |x_4(t)|^2)^2$, which is not greater than $2|x_1(t)|^2|x_2(t)|^2$, after the first greater-than-equal sign on the right side of the large semi-brace. Equation (28) shows the inequality $D_G(\rho_{ABC}) \geq D_G(\rho_{AB}) + D_G(\rho_{AC})$ holds in the present situation.

[‡] The geometric measurements of quantum discord was defined as $D_G(\rho) = \min_{\chi} \|\rho - \chi\|^2$ in Ref.[35], so the right side of Equation (35) of Ref.[35] has been multiplied a factor 2 in this paper.

Using the same procedure employed in deriving Eqs. (22) and (17), we can get

$$\begin{aligned} D_G(\rho_{BAC}) &= 2\min_{\Pi^B}(\|\rho_{ABC} - \Pi^B(\rho_{ABC})\|^2) \\ &= 4(|x_1(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2)(|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2). \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

$$\begin{aligned} D_G(\rho_{BA}) &= |x_1(t)|^4 + |x_2(t)|^4 + |x_3(t)|^4 + |x_4(t)|^4 \\ &+ 2|x_1(t)|^2(2|x_2(t)|^2 - |x_4(t)|^2) - 2|x_2(t)|^2|x_3(t)|^2 \\ &- \text{Max}[2|x_1(t)|^2|x_2(t)|^2, |x_1(t)|^4 + |x_2(t)|^4 + |x_3(t)|^4 + |x_4(t)|^4 \\ &- 2|x_2(t)|^2|x_3(t)|^2 - 2|x_1(t)|^2|x_4(t)|^2]. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

Combining above two equations and Eq.(19), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} &D_G(\rho_{BAC}) - D_G(\rho_{BA}) - D_G(\rho_{BC}) \\ &= \begin{cases} 4|x_3(t)x_4(t)|^2 \geq 0, \\ \text{for } |x_1(t)|^4 + |x_2(t)|^4 + |x_3(t)|^4 + |x_4(t)|^4 \\ \geq 2(|x_2(t)|^2|x_3(t)|^2 + |x_1(t)|^2|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_1(t)|^2|x_4(t)|^2); \\ 4(|x_1(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2)(|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2) \\ - 2(|x_1(t)|^4 + |x_2(t)|^4 + |x_3(t)|^4 + |x_4(t)|^4) \\ \geq 4(|x_1(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2)(|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2) \\ - 2(|x_2(t)|^2|x_3(t)|^2 + |x_1(t)|^2|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_1(t)|^2|x_4(t)|^2) \\ \geq 2(|x_1(t)|^2 + |x_3(t)|^2)(|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_4(t)|^2) \geq 0, \\ \text{for } |x_1(t)|^4 + |x_2(t)|^4 + |x_3(t)|^4 + |x_4(t)|^4 \\ < 2(|x_2(t)|^2|x_3(t)|^2 + |x_1(t)|^2|x_2(t)|^2 + |x_1(t)|^2|x_4(t)|^2). \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

Therefore, we can conclude that the geometric quantum discord of the state ρ_{ABC} is monogamous when the von Neumann measurements act on the qubit A or B was carried out.

5. discussion and summary

We have calculated the geometric measurements of quantum discord for subsystem AB, AC, BC and whole system ABC . Now, we give some useful remarks. First, we compare Figure 2 with Figure 2 in Ref.[34]. The Figure 2 of Ref.[34] showed the sudden death of entanglement between atom A and B can occur when the cavity lies in the nonzero number state. Our Figure 2 shows though the geometric measurements of quantum discord roughly have similar behavior with the entanglement, but the geometric measurements of quantum discord are not always zero in the time interval for the zero entanglement. This confirms that even some separable states can still contain nonclassical correlation [37] and the quantum discord is a reliable indicator of the quantum nature of the correlations [38].

Second, Figure 2, Figure 3 and Figure 4 show that the dependence on the degree of entanglement of the initial state (scaled by α) of the amplitude, with which $D_G(\rho_{AB}), D_G(\rho_{AC})$ and $D_G(\rho_{BC})$ vibrate, are different. The vibrating or quasi-vibrating amplitude of $D_G(\rho_{AB})$ and $D_G(\rho_{BC})$ are decreasing with the decrease of the degree of




Figure 6. (Color online) LogLogPlots of Fourier transform of geometric measure of quantum discord $D_G(\rho_{ABC})$ as function of ω for some typical values of α : $\alpha = \pi/4$ (solid and red line); $\alpha = \pi/6$ (dotted and blue line); $\alpha = \pi/12$ (dashed and purple line); $\alpha = 0$ (Dot-Dashed and Black line).

entanglement of the initial state (α decreases from $\pi/4$ to 0 or increases from $\pi/4$ to $\pi/2$). Especially, $D_G(\rho_{AB}) = D_G(\rho_{BC}) = 0$ for $\alpha = 0$. The situation for $D_G(\rho_{AC})$ is just contrary. The vibrating or quasi-vibrating amplitude of $D_G(\rho_{AC})$ is increasing with the decrease of the degree of entanglement of the initial state and $D_G(\rho_{AC})$ is not always zero for $\alpha = 0$.

Third, Figure 5 shows that $D_G(\rho_{ABC})$ vibrates with time t . When $\alpha = 0$, $D_G(\rho_{ABC})$ vibrates with a single frequency, otherwise, it does multi-frequency vibration. In order to get a better physical insight into the above phenomenon we take into account the power spectrum of $D_G(\rho_{ABC})$. Considering the frequency ω and time t are positive, we use the Fourier transformation

$$FD_G(\omega) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}} \int_0^\infty D_G(\rho_{ABC}) e^{i\omega t} dt \quad (32)$$

and make a LogLogPlot (LogLogPlot effectively generates a curve in which $\text{Log}[f]$ is plotted against $\text{Log}[x]$, but with tick marks indicating the original values of f and x .) of $FD_G(\omega)$ for $n = 3$ and $n = 0$ in Figure 6. If we plot $FD_G(\omega)$ in the same way as in Figure 6 for $n = 1, 2, 4, 5, \dots$, we shall obtain the similar graphics as Figure 6(a). These figures clearly show that $FD_G(\omega) \sim \omega$ curves only have one very sharp peak for $\alpha = 0$, which independent of n , but have four very sharp peaks for $n > 0$, two very sharp peaks for $n = 0$ when $\alpha \neq 0$.

In summary, our results demonstrate that the geometric measurement of quantum discord surpasses the entanglement to describe quantum correlation. It can show better evolutionary behavior of a quantum system especially when entanglement is zero. In addition, we obtained the analytical expressions of the geometric measurement of quantum discord for $2 \times n$ ($n = 0, 1, 2, 3, \dots$) subsystem AC and BC , which is contrasted with the situation in Ref.[34] where though the expressions of the negativity for subsystem AC and BC were given when $n > 0$, but the expressions of the concurrence for the same subsystems were not reported. Furthermore and more important, we

studied the geometric measurement of quantum discord for total system ABC and found that the correlation of the system ABC developed periodically if the initial state of two atoms was not entangled; it oscillates with two or four frequencies according to $n = 0$ or $n > 0$, respectively. Finally, we put forward an idea to make any multipartite quantum pure states including at least one qubit subsystem equivalent to qubit-qudit or two qubit states. These approaches will greatly simplify the calculation of various measurements of quantum correlation of a quantum system including at least one qubit subsystem.

References

- [1] S. B. Zheng, Eur. Phys. J. D **54**, 719-722 (2009).
- [2] Sai-Yun Ye, Zhi-Rong Zhong, and Shi-Biao Zheng, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 014303 (2008).
- [3] Shi-Biao Zheng, Zhen-Biao Yang, and Yan Xia, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 015804 (2010).
- [4] Michael J. Hartmann, Fernando G. S. L. Brandão, and Martin B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 160501 (2007).
- [5] B. Bellomo, R. Lo Franco, and G. Compagno, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 160502 (2007).
- [6] Shi-Biao Zheng, Chui-Ping Yang, and Franco Nori, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 042327 (2010).
- [7] Alessio Serafini, Stefano Mancini, and Sougato Bose, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 010503 (2006).
- [8] Zhang-qi Yin and Fu-li Li, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 012324 (2007).
- [9] Ting Yu and J. H. Eberly, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 140404 (2004).
- [10] Muhammed Yönaç, Ting Yu and J H Eberly, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **39**, S621-S625 (2006).
- [11] Zhi-Jian Li, Jun-Qi Li, Yan-Hong Jin and Yi-Hang Nie, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **40**, 3401 (2007).
- [12] Dao-Ming Lu, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **52**, 3057 (2013).
- [13] M. Piani, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 090502 (2008).
- [14] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 022301 (2008).
- [15] N. Li and S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **78**, 024303 (2008).
- [16] R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **40**, 4277 (1989).
- [17] R. Horodecki *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
- [18] M. Ali, A. R. P. Rau, and G. Alber, Phys. Rev. A **81**, 042105 (2010).
- [19] M. Ali, A. R. P. Rau, and G. Alber, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 069902 (2010).
- [20] J. Oppenheim, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 180402 (2002).
- [21] D. Kaszlikowski, A. Sen(De), U. Sen, V. Vedral, and A. Winter, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 070502 (2008).
- [22] N. Li and S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 032327 (2007).
- [23] S. Luo, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 042303 (2008).
- [24] R. Dillenschneider, Phys. Rev. B **78**, 224413 (2008).
- [25] M. S. Sarandy, Phys. Rev. A **80**, 022108 (2009).
- [26] M. D. Lang and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 150501 (2010).
- [27] Y. Huang, New J. Phys. **16**, 033027 (2014).
- [28] B. Dakić, V. Vedral, and C. Brukner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 190502 (2010).
- [29] S. Luo and S. Fu, Phys. Rev. A **82**, 034302 (2010).
- [30] S. Rana and P. Parashar, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 024102 (2012).
- [31] Ali Saif M. Hassan, B. Lari, and Pramod S. Joag, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 024302 (2012).
- [32] D. Girolami, R. Vasilic and G. Adesso, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **27**, 1345020 (2012).
- [33] T. Tufarelli *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 052326 (2012).
- [34] Zhi-Jian Li, Jun-Qi Li, Yan-Hong Jin and Yi-Hang Nie, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **40**, 3401 (2007).
- [35] Wen-Chao Qian, Hua-Ping Zhang and Lei Zhang, arXiv:1406.1964v2 [quant-ph] 2 Sep 2014.
- [36] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 052306 (2000).
- [37] A. S. M. Hassan, B. Lari, and P. S. Joag, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 024302 (2012).
- [38] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2002).