Entanglement estimation in non-optimal two-qubit states
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We study the entanglement properties of two-qubit states that are generated via the action of a squeezing operator. We analyse the quantum Fisher information associated with one component of the total spin operator and we show that, even in the case of non-optimal states, the quantum Fisher information is able to detect entanglement. Remarkably, the maximally entangled states are associated with stationary points of this quantity. We have studied the symmetry properties under spin exchange of the maximally entangled states, and we have investigated the consequences of spin exchange symmetry breaking on the quantum Fisher information and the Husimi function. Finally, we suggest a scheme for an interferometer able to detect the entanglement in a large class of two-spin states.

The entanglement-generating operator we use is inspired to the one introduced in Ref. [10]. We denote by $\sigma^z_j$, $\sigma^x_j$ and $\sigma^y_j$ the Pauli matrices operating on the $j$-th qubit ($j = 1,2$). Furthermore, we denote with $\Pi^+_j = (\mathbb{1} + \sigma^z_j)/2$ and $\Pi^-_j = (\mathbb{1} - \sigma^z_j)/2$ the projector operators onto the eigenstates of $\sigma^z_j$, $|0\rangle_j$ (with eigenvalue +1) and $|1\rangle_j$ (with eigenvalue −1), respectively. The entanglement-generating operator is

$$U_0(\phi) = \exp(-i\phi H_0),$$

where

$$H_0 = \Pi^+_0 \Pi^-_2.$$  

Initially, the system is prepared in the state

$$|r,0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \otimes (|0\rangle + |1\rangle),$$

that is tensor product of $\sigma^z_j$’s eigenstates. The action of the non-local unitary operator $U_0$ on the initial (separable) state $|r,0\rangle$ gives the state vector

$$|r,\phi\rangle = U_0(\phi)|r,0\rangle = \frac{1}{2}((|00\rangle + e^{-i\phi}|01\rangle + |10\rangle + |11\rangle).$$

For $\phi = 2k\pi$ with $k \in \mathbb{Z}$, this state is separable, whereas, for all the other choices of the value $\phi$, it is entangled. In particular, as shown in [10], the values $\phi = (2k+1)\pi$, ($k \in \mathbb{Z}$), give the maximally entangled state

$$|r,(2k+1)\pi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle - |01\rangle + |10\rangle + |11\rangle).$$

The latter state may be written, up to a suitable local

Entanglement is considered one of the most non-classical manifestations of quantum mechanics. It is not just a source of inspiration for philosophical debates on the inexplicable behaviours of quantum mechanics but, nowadays, it is considered an essential component necessary to accomplish a step forward to realize advanced quantum-based technologies. Indeed, it plays a fundamental role in the field of quantum cryptography and quantum computation, in teleportation, in the frequency standard improvement problem and in metrology, based on the quantum phase estimation [1].

Despite its key role, due to its complexity, entanglement is still so elusive that the problem of its characterization and quantification is up to now open [2, 3].

A question that usually one tries to answer to is how to detect entanglement of a state in an optimal way [4–8]. On the contrary, in the present work, we adopt a different point of view, aiming to detect entanglement also in non-optimal configurations. In particular, we consider a system of two qubits, initially prepared in a separable state, that are entangled by means of the action of a non-local unitary operator $U_0(\phi)$ that depends on a continuous parameter $\phi$. The entanglement degree of this state depends on the value of such a parameter.

We generate a class of try states, by means of the action of unitary local operators on such entangled state. Of course, such operations do not affect the entanglement of these states [9]. In order to investigate the degree of entanglement of each state of the considered class, we have calculated their quantum Fisher information (QFI), associated with a local operator $H_1$. We found that the maximally entangled states are associated with stationary points of the quantum Fisher information, as a function of $\phi$. In particular, the maximally entangled states do not always correspond to maxima of the QFI, in fact, we report an explicit example where they are associated to a local minimum of the QFI. Furthermore, we investigate in detail the symmetry properties under spin exchange of the entangled states. We relate the behaviour of the quantum Fisher information and the Husimi function to the breaking of such symmetry that is induced by $U_0(\phi)$. Finally, we suggest a scheme for an interferometer able to detect the entanglement in a large class of two-spin states.
unitary transformation on one spin, in the following standard form [10] as a Bell state

\[ |\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle + |11\rangle). \]  

(6)

It is worth emphasizing that the local unitary transformation considered just above does not preserve the symmetry under exchange of the two qubits. Indeed, the final state \( |\Phi^+\rangle \) is invariant under the qubits exchange, whereas the state \( |r, (2k+1)\pi\rangle \) is not symmetric under the same exchange. From a different point of view, the vector \( |\Phi^+\rangle \) belongs to the spin-1 irreducible representation of \( SU(2) \), whereas \( |r, (2k+1)\pi\rangle \) has a component either in the spin-1 and in the spin-0 representation. Hence, a local unitary transformation has matrix elements between basis elements of different irreducible representations, even if it leaves unaltered the degree of entanglement of the states.

By varying \( \phi \), the degree of entanglement of the state \( |r, \phi\rangle \) varies accordingly. In the present manuscript, we are interested in establishing a simple way to detect the maximally entangled states. We focus on the case of two qubits, albeit many of our results can be extended to the case of many qubits [11]. In Ref. [10] it is also argued that the class of entangled states, generated in an array of \( M \)-qubit with the unitary transformation \( U_I(\phi) = \exp(-i\phi \sum a_i |0\rangle |i\rangle \langle i+1|) \), is different from both the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) [12] class and the \( W \) class of \( M \)-qubits states introduced in Ref. [13]. In particular, in [10] it is argued that the states that are derived in Ref. [10] are much more entangled than the GHZ states since they have a higher degree of connectedness and persistency of entanglement. Where the notions of maximal connectedness and persistency of entanglement of an entangled state have been introduced in the same paper. The first notion has to do with the possibility that in an \( M \)-qubit state, it may possible to project any subset of qubits into a highly entangled state by performing local measurements on the other qubits. The second notion relates the amount of entanglement of a \( M \)-qubit state, to the operational effort necessary to destroy, by means of local operations, all the entanglement of the state. In this perspective, it appears evident the importance to be able to compare the degree of entanglement of two given states and, especially, to find the maximally entangled states even with non-optimized operators. In fact, the most likely condition, in a generic real situation, is that to have non-optimized operators and states.

The expectation values and the uncertainties for the components of the total angular momentum operator \( \mathbf{J} = (\sigma^1 + \sigma^2)/2 \) on the state (4) result

\[ \langle J_x \rangle = \frac{1 + \cos(\phi)}{2}, \quad (\Delta J_x)^2 = \frac{2 - \cos(\phi) - \cos^2(\phi)}{4}, \]

\[ \langle J_y \rangle = 0, \quad (\Delta J_y)^2 = \frac{1 + \cos(\phi)}{4}, \]

\[ \langle J_z \rangle = 0, \quad (\Delta J_z)^2 = \frac{1}{2}. \]

Hence, for \( \phi \neq \pi k (k \in \mathbb{Z}) \) the state (4) is squeezed, namely the variance of one spin component of \( \mathbf{J} \) is smaller than the shot noise limit 1/2. It is in addition worth noting that the states corresponding to \( \phi = 0 \) and \( \phi = \pi \) strongly differ from one another. In fact, they are both non-squeezed, but the first is a separable eigenstate of the operators \( J_x \) and \( J^2 \), whereas the second is a non-separable eigenstate only of \( J_y \).

A rather natural choice for the local operator to evaluate the quantum Fisher information is

\[ H_1 = J_z = \frac{\sigma^1_z + \sigma^2_z}{2}. \]  

(7)

A direct calculation of the quantum Fisher information on the state (4) gives

\[ F_q(|r, \phi\rangle, H_1) = 4(\Delta J_z)^2 = 2. \]  

(8)

Since in the last expression the parameter \( \phi \) is missing, the Fisher information is unable to distinguish between entangled and non-entangled states. In fact, for a pure two-qubit state the condition \( F_q > 2 \) is sufficient for particle entanglement, whereas the limit for a separable state is \( F_q \leq 2 \) [5].

In order to make the quantum Fisher information a better witness of entanglement, it is necessary to consider a more general try state. To this end, we consider local unitary transformations in order not to modify the entanglement properties of the original state. Hence, the try state \( |s(\phi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)\rangle \) is achieved by applying two separated rotations around the \( y \) axis to the spins 1 and 2. The first spin is rotated by an angle \( \varphi_1 \) and the second of \( \varphi_2 \), thus it reads

\[ |s(\phi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)\rangle = e^{-i\frac{\varphi_1}{2} \sigma^y_1} e^{-i\frac{\varphi_2}{2} \sigma^y_2} |r, \phi\rangle. \]  

(9)

In the following, we will refer to this state simply as \( |s\rangle \) for brevity. The quantum Fisher information for this state results

\[ F_q(|s\rangle, H_1) = 4 \left\{ 2 + \sin(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1)[1 - \cos(\phi)] + \sin(\varphi_1) \sin(\varphi_2)[1 + \cos(\phi)] + \frac{1}{4} [1 + \cos(\phi)]^2 [\sin(\varphi_1) + \sin(\varphi_2)]^2 \right\}. \]  

(10)

In this case, the quantum Fisher information depends on the parameter that drives entanglement of the state \( |s\rangle \).
We note that (10) is invariant under the transformations $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \to (-\varphi_2, -\varphi_1)$ and $\phi \to -\phi$. In Fig. 1 we plot $\mathcal{F}_q(|s\rangle, H_1)$ versus $\phi$ for several choices of the values of $\varphi_1$ and $\varphi_2$ detailed in the caption of the figure. From the result (10) one deduces that the detection of the maximally entangled state (which corresponds to $\phi = \pi$) via stationary points of the QFI is optimized, for instance, with the values $\varphi_1 = -\pi/2$ and $\varphi_2 = 0$. However, in the case with $\varphi_1 = \pi/2$ and $\varphi_2 = 0$, the maximally entangled state is associated to a null quantum Fisher information. In this respect, the value of QFI appears unreliable in the task of detecting the degree of entanglement of a given state.

A further state representation, useful for what we are going to discuss in the following, is given by the Husimi function. For a given state $|s(\phi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)\rangle$, this is achieved by plotting onto the Bloch sphere the Husimi function [14]

$$Q(\theta, \xi) = |\langle \theta, \xi | s(\phi, \varphi_1, \varphi_2) \rangle|^2,$$  (11)

where the coherent spin state

$$|\theta, \xi\rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{M} \cos^k \left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \sin^{M-k} \left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \cdot e^{-i\xi(M-k)} \left(M \atop k\right)^{1/2} |M, k\rangle $$ (12)
is given in terms of the Dicke states

$$|M, k\rangle = \left(M \atop k\right)^{-1/2} \mathcal{P}\{|0\rangle^\otimes k \otimes |1\rangle^\otimes M-k\}.$$ (13)

These are states completely symmetric under particle exchanges, which are derived considering all the possible particle permutations $\mathcal{P}$. In the present case the number of particles considered is $M = 2$.
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**FIG. 1.** The figure plots $\mathcal{F}_q(|s\rangle, H_1)$ vs $\phi$ for several choices of $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$. In dashed line we report the plot corresponding to the choices $(0, 0), (0, \pi), (\pi, 0), (\pi, \pi)$. In continuous line we report the quantum Fisher information vs $\phi$ corresponding to $(-\pi/2, 0)$ and in dotted line the case corresponding to $(\pi/2, 0)$.

We compare the analysis of the entanglement properties of the state $|s\rangle$, provided by the Husimi function and by the Fisher information, in two distinctive cases: the first corresponds to the choice $\varphi_1 = -\pi/2$, $\varphi_2 = 0$, and the second to the choice $\varphi_1 = \pi/2$, $\varphi_2 = 0$. In both the cases we have analysed the Husimi function and the Fisher information as functions of the parameter $\phi$. Fig. 1 shows that in the case of the first choice ($\varphi_1 = -\pi/2$, $\varphi_2 = 0$) for $|s\rangle$, the QFI has a peak in correspondence of the state with the maximum entanglement ($\phi = \pi$). Even the Husimi function detects the state with the maximum entanglement, in fact Fig. 2 shows an increasing squeezing culminating in $\phi = \pi$. In the case of the second choice ($\varphi_1 = \pi/2$, $\varphi_2 = 0$), while the QFI has a minimum in correspondence of $\phi = \pi$ (see Fig. 1), the Husimi function experiences a complete loss of information. This is shown in Fig. 2 where such loss is evident and where no localization on the Bloch sphere is observed. In both these examples, the state with the maximum degree of entanglement ($\phi = \pi$) is located at the zeros of the $d\mathcal{F}_q/d\phi$, thus at the stationary points.
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**FIG. 2.** In the panel a) we plot $Q(\theta, \xi)$ for the separable state obtained with the choice $\phi = 0$, $\varphi_1 = 0$ and $\varphi_2 = 0$. The panel b) reports the plot of $Q(\theta, \xi)$ for the maximally entangled state corresponding to $\phi = \pi$, $\varphi_1 = -\pi/2$ and $\varphi_2 = 0$. The panel c) shows the maximally entangled state given by $\phi = \pi$, $\varphi_1 = \pi/2$ and $\varphi_2 = 0$. 

The result (10) is invariant under the transformations $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2) \to (-\varphi_2, -\varphi_1)$ and $\phi \to -\phi$. In Fig. 1 we plot $\mathcal{F}_q(|s\rangle, H_1)$ versus $\phi$ for several choices of the values of $\varphi_1$ and $\varphi_2$ detailed in the caption of the figure. From the
On the contrary, while with the first choice of rotations, the Husimi function is able to detect the maximal entangled state via its squeezing, in the second example, it is not able to determine such state. The unreliability shown by the Husimi function in the task of detecting the former states is well explained if one takes into account the symmetry under spin exchange of the two try states. In this perspective, we split up the state \(|s\rangle\) as a sum of its components: the symmetric \(|+\rangle = (|s\rangle + \mathcal{P}|s\rangle)/2\) and the antisymmetric \(|-\rangle = (|s\rangle - \mathcal{P}|s\rangle)/2\). The Husimi function selects only the symmetric component of the state. Moreover, in the case of the second couple of rotations, \(\varphi_1 = \pi/2, \varphi_2 = 0\), the norm of \(|+\rangle\) goes to zero for \(\phi \rightarrow \pi\) and this explains the behaviour of the Husimi function highlighted above. A similar mechanism does not occur with the QFI. The phenomenon discussed above is described in Fig. 3 where we plot the norm-square of the anti-symmetric component \(|-\rangle\) of the state \(\mathcal{P}|s\rangle\). Remarkably, the QFI is a faithful witness of entanglement for the whole class of states defined in Eq. (9). In fact, from Eq. (10) one obtains for the derivatives of the QFI with respect to \(\phi\)

\[
\frac{d\mathcal{F}_q(|s\rangle, H_1)}{d\phi} = 4\left\{ \sin(\varphi_2 - \varphi_1) - \sin(\varphi_1)\sin(\varphi_2) + \frac{1}{2}[\sin(\varphi_1) + \sin(\varphi_2)][1 + \cos(\phi)] \right\}\sin(\phi),
\]

and this expression shows that the vanishing of \(d\mathcal{F}_q/d\phi\) is a necessary condition.

Remarkably, the entanglement of these states is strongly linked to the symmetry breaking under spin exchange, that is induced by the unitary operator \(U_0\). This fact can be illustrated by the conceptual model of an interferometer able to detect the maximally entangled state, that we describe in the following. Such interferometer is obtained by the interference of two states. The first is derived from the initial state (4) after the action of the following operator

\[
O_1 = R_y(-\pi/2)R_y^\dagger(\pi/2),
\]

where \(R_y^\dagger(\pi/2) = e^{-i\sigma_y^z\pi/4}\) rotates by \(\pi/2\) the first spin around the \(y\)-axis and \(R_y(-\pi/2) = e^{i(\sigma_x^z + \sigma_y^z)\pi/4}\) rotates by \(-\pi/2\) both the spins around the \(z\)-axis. The second state is obtained starting from the same initial state, under the action of the operator

\[
O_2 = \mathcal{P}R_y(-\pi/2)R_y^2(\pi/2),
\]

where \(R_y^2(\pi/2) = e^{-i\sigma_x^z\pi/4}\) rotates by \(\pi/2\) the second spin around the \(y\)-axis. Thus, the interference between the two states

\[
\mathcal{A}(\phi) = \langle r, \phi|O_2^\dagger O_1|r, \phi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos(\phi))
\]

is completely destructive in the case of the maximally entangled state. The link between the entanglement of these states and the symmetry breaking induced by \(U_0(\phi)\) is highlighted by recalling the definition of state (4), \(|r, \phi\rangle = U_0(\phi)|r, 0\rangle\) and noting that the state (3) is fully symmetric under spin exchange, that is \(\mathcal{P}|r, 0\rangle = |r, 0\rangle\).

By using these relations in Eq. (17) one easily gets

\[
\mathcal{A}(\phi) = \langle r, 0|U_0^\dagger(\phi)\mathcal{P}U_0(\phi)|r, 0\rangle.
\]

The latter relation emphasizes that the operator \(U_0(\phi)\) in addition to generating the entanglement it is responsible for the \(P\)-symmetry breaking.

The class of states of Eq. (9) can be further enlarged by adding a rotation around the \(x\)-axis for each spin, in the following way

\[
|s(\phi, \theta_1, \theta_2, \varphi_1, \varphi_2)\rangle = e^{-i\frac{\varphi_2}{2}\sigma_z^x}e^{-i\frac{\theta_2}{2}\sigma_z^x}e^{-i\frac{\varphi_1}{2}\sigma_z^y}e^{-i\frac{\theta_1}{2}\sigma_z^y}|r, \phi\rangle.
\]
By direct calculations, it is possible to derive the QFI, its derivative with respect to $\phi$ and then evaluating the latter at $\phi = \pi$. For brevity, we report just the latter result,

$$
\left. \frac{dF_q}{d\phi} \right|_{\phi=\pi} = \cos \theta_1 \sin \theta_2 (\sin \varphi_1 - \cos \varphi_1) + \\
- \sin \theta_1 \cos \theta_2 (\sin \varphi_2 + \cos \varphi_2). \tag{20}
$$

Let us determine the zeros for Eq. (20). This results into solving the following expression

$$
\tan \theta_2 \sin \left( \varphi_1 - \frac{\pi}{4} \right) = \tan \theta_1 \sin \left( \varphi_2 + \frac{\pi}{4} \right). \tag{21}
$$

Among all the infinite solutions, we have identified four couples of *magic numbers*,

$$(\theta_1 = 0, \theta_2 = 0), \quad \left( \varphi_1 = \frac{\pi}{4}, \varphi_2 = \frac{3}{4} \pi \right), \tag{22}
$$

$$(\theta_1 = 0, \varphi_1 = \frac{\pi}{4}), \quad \left( \theta_2 = 0, \varphi_2 = \frac{3}{4} \pi \right).$$

In fact, by choosing one of these couples Eq. (21) is satisfied independently from the value assigned to the remaining angles. In addition to these special solutions of the Eq. (21), additional infinite solutions exist. Just as an example, we have plotted in Fig. 4 some solutions $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$ corresponding to the choices $\theta_2 = 0, \pi/3, \pi/2, 3\pi/4$ and maintaining the fixed value $\theta_1 = \pi/3$. In the figure is evident the presence of the quadruple point corresponding to the second of the special solutions just discussed.

In summary, we have shown that for a large class of one-parameter two-qubit states, the maximally entangled states are associated with stationary points of the quantum Fisher information, as a function of such parameter.

Furthermore, we have emphasized the link between the breaking of the symmetry under the spin exchange and the entanglement induced by the unitary transformation $U_0(\phi)$, and we have proposed a scheme for an interferometer that, exploiting such link, it is useful to detect the entanglement in a large class of two-spin states.
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FIG. 4. The figure shows the solutions $(\varphi_1, \varphi_2)$ for $dF_q/d\phi = 0$, evaluated with $\phi = \pi$ and $\theta_1 = \pi/3$, and for some values of $\theta_2$. The continuous line corresponds to the choice $\theta_2 = 0$. The dot-dashed one corresponds to the $\theta_2 = \pi/3$. In dotted line we report the solutions corresponding to $\theta_2 = \pi/2$, and in dashed line the case corresponding to $\theta_2 = (3/4)\pi$. It is noteworthy the presence of the quadruple point in $\varphi_1 = \pi/4$ and $\varphi_2 = 3\pi/4$ that corresponds to the second of the special solutions (22).
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