Enhancement of antiferromagnetic magnon-magnon entanglement inside a cavity
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Magnon-photon coupling has been experimentally realized inside a cavity and the emerging field known as cavity spintronics has attracted significant attention for its potential docking with quantum information science. However, one seldom knows whether this coupling implies an entanglement state among magnons and photons or not, which is crucial for its usage in quantum information. Here we study the entanglement properties among magnons and photons in an antiferromagnet-light system and find that the entanglement between magnon and photon is nearly zero while the magnon-magnon entanglement is very strong and it can be further enhanced through the coupling with the cavity photons. The maximum enhancement occurs when the antiferromagnet reaches resonant with the light and it can be further manipulated by tuning the external field, the coupling strength of magnet-light and the dissipation rate of the cavity. The essential physics can be well understood within the picture of deep strong coupling of antiferromagnet magnons. Our results may provide an alternate to manipulate the quantum correlations of continuous variable entanglement with a generic stable condition and easy tunability.

Introduction.— Antiferromagnetic (AFM) spintronics emerges for its better stability and fast dynamics over its ferromagnetic counterpart [1, 2]. Of particular interest is the antiferromagnetic spin waves (magnons) that show much richer physics than ferromagnets, such as the spin pumping at the interface of an AFM/normal metal bilayer [3], magnon spin current enhancement through an AFM layer [4–7], long-distance magnon transport [8–10], and magnon-driven magnetic structure motion [11–13]. Recently, it is theoretically proposed [14] and experimentally demonstrated [15] that antiferromagnetic magnon can be strongly coupled to the light by placing an AFM element into a cavity, which serves a promising candidate to realize coherent information transfer between magnons and photons for its superb stability and tunability of magnons properties through external knobs. One promising application of the hybridized magnon-photon polariton is to connect it with the quantum information science [16, 17], similar to the cavity electrodynamics that rises 20 years ago and has found its role in the implementation of quantum qubits and quantum computing circuits[18]. To push the development of cavity spintronics along this line, it is crucial to have a clear insight on the quantum correlation among magnons and photons, especially their entanglement properties, which is a central resource for quantum computing and quantum technologies.

Intuitively, one may think that the quantum coupling between magnons and photons could always imply the quantum entanglement between them, however, this is not essentially true. Here both magnons and photons are bosons with continuous excitation spectrum while determining the existence and quantity the strength of entanglement between these continuous modes are highly non-trivial issues [19–24]. As widely investigated in quantum optics [19, 23], if the two continuous variables (a and b) are coupled in a beam-splitter-type (a†b+b†a), there is no entanglement between them in a steady state, while if their interaction is parametric-down-conversion-type (a†b†+ab), a and b can be entangled. Li et al. [25] first uses the fluctuation-dissipation theory in quantum optics to describe the entanglement among magnons, photons and phonons in a ferromagnet. In an AFM, the situation becomes more complex since the two types of magnons themselves are coupled and both of them are coupled, but in different way with the photon mode. Yet to be known is how magnons and photons interplay to entangle with each other in this three mode system.

In this letter, we study the entanglement properties among magnons and photons in an AFM-light system and find that the entanglement between magnon and photon is very weak near the anticrossing point of the spectrum. Surprisingly, the magnon-magnon entanglement is very strong at this point and it becomes even larger than the magnon-magnon entanglement in the absence of light, which is ascertained to be a unique feature of the deep strong coupling between magnons. Moreover, such an entanglement enhancement can be effectively tuned by varying the coupling strength of magnon and photon as well as the dissipation rate of the cavity. These results may be significant if one tends to extend the cavity spintronics to quantum manipulation, where the entanglement among magnons and photons is an important resource.

General formalism.— Without loss of simplicity, we present a general theory to study the magnon-light interaction in a two-sublattice magnet as shown in Fig. 1 and then concentrate on the AFM case followed by a short discussion on ferromagnetic (FM) and ferrimag-
otic (FiM) case. The Hamiltonian of the magnet coupled with the microwave inside a cavity though its magnetic field component can be written as $H = H_{\text{FiM}} + H_{\text{ph}} + H_{\text{int}}$, where $H_{\text{FiM}}$, $H_{\text{ph}}$, $H_{\text{int}}$ are respectively the Hamiltonian for FiM, photon and their interaction that read,

$$H_{\text{FiM}} = -J \sum_{l, \delta} \mathbf{S}_l \cdot \mathbf{S}_{l+\delta} - \sum_{l} \left( H - H_{\text{an}} \right) \cdot \mathbf{S}_l,$$

$$H_{\text{ph}} = \frac{1}{2} \int \left( \epsilon_0 \mathbf{E}^2 + \frac{1}{\mu_0} \mathbf{B}^2 \right) \text{d}x \text{d}y \text{d}z,$$

$$H_{\text{int}} = -\sum_{l} \mathbf{S}_l \cdot \mathbf{H}_f,$$

where $J > 0$ is exchange constant, $\mathbf{S}_l$ is the spin on site $l$ and $\delta$ is the displacement of two nearest spins. $H$ and $H_{\text{an}}$ are respectively the external static field and anisotropy field. $\mathbf{E}$ and $\mathbf{B}$ are electric field and magnetic inductance components of the electromagnetic (EM) wave, while $\mathbf{H}_f$ is the corresponding magnetic field and $\epsilon_0$, $\mu_0$ are respectively vacuum permittivity and susceptibility.

Using Holstein-Primakoff transformation [26], the ferrimagnetic Hamiltonian $H_{\text{FiM}}$ can be written as

$$H_{\text{FiM}} = \sum_{q} \left[ \omega_a a_q a_q + \omega_b b_q b_q + g_{ab}(a_q b_q^* + a_q b_q) \right],$$

where $\omega_a = H_{\text{ex},b} + H_{\text{an},a} + H_a$, $\omega_b = H_{\text{ex},a} + H_{\text{an},b} - H$, $H_{\text{ex},\mu} = 2zJS_{\mu}^2$ ($\mu = a, b$), $S_{\mu}$ is the magnitude of spin vector, $z$ is the coordination number, $g_{ab} = \sqrt{H_{\text{ex},a}H_{\text{ex},b}} \cos(\delta)$ is the coupling of magnon modes excited on the two sublattices. Here $a_q$, $b_q$, $a_q$ and $b_q$ refer to the magnon creation/annihilation on the two sublattices with wavevector $q$, respectively, and they satisfy the commutation relations for bosons.

Further, a circular-polarized EM wave can be quantized as $H_{\text{ph}} = \sum_{q} \omega_c c_q c_q$ with $\omega_c$ is photon frequency [27] and then the resulting interaction term between the photon and magnon becomes $H_{\text{int}} = \sum_{q} \left[ g_{ac}(a_q c_q^* + a_q c_q) + g_{ac}(b_q c_q^* + b_q c_q) \right]$, where $g_{\mu c} = \sqrt{\mu \omega_c} S_{\mu} N/2\hbar V$ ($\mu = a, b$) is the interaction strength between magnons and photons [14], $h, N, V$ are the Planck constant, the number of spins on each sublattice, and the volume of the cavity. Above all, the total Hamiltonian becomes,

$$H = \sum_{q} \left[ \omega_a a_q a_q + \omega_b b_q b_q + g_{ab}(a_q b_q^* + a_q b_q) \right] + \sum_{q} \left[ \omega_c c_q c_q + g_{ac}(a_q c_q^* + a_q c_q) + g_{bc}(b_q c_q^* + b_q c_q) \right],$$

(3)

Since the slope of the photon dispersion is much steeper than that of the magnon, the photon can only couple with the magnon around $q = 0$, i.e. the magnetic resonance mode. For simplicity, we treat $q = 0$ such that the sum in Hamiltonian (1) can be removed and $g_{ab} = \sqrt{H_{\text{ex},a}H_{\text{ex},b}}$. From now on, we also eliminate the subscript $q$ for expression simplicity, then the resultant Hamiltonian reads,

$$H = \omega_a a^\dagger a + \omega_b b^\dagger b + g_{ab} (a^\dagger b^\dagger + ab) + \omega_c c^\dagger c + g_{ac} (a^\dagger c^\dagger + ac) + g_{bc} (b^\dagger c + bc^\dagger).$$

(4)

The Hamiltonian (4) leads to the quantum Langevin equations,

$$\frac{da}{dt} = -\left( \gamma_a + i\omega_a \right) a - ig_{ab} b^\dagger - ig_{ac} c^\dagger + \sqrt{2\gamma_a} \alpha_{in},$$

$$\frac{db}{dt} = -\left( \gamma_b + i\omega_b \right) b - ig_{ac} a^\dagger - ig_{bc} c + \sqrt{2\gamma_b} \beta_{in},$$

$$\frac{dc}{dt} = -\left( \gamma_c + i\omega_c \right) c - ig_{ac} a^\dagger - ig_{bc} b + \sqrt{2\gamma_c} \epsilon_{in},$$

(5a)

(5b)

(5c)

where we have introduced the dissipation ($\gamma_a, \gamma_b, \gamma_c$) and input quantum noise ($\alpha_{in}, \beta_{in}, \epsilon_{in}$) for each mode according to the standard fluctuation-dissipation theorem [27]. Here the noise has zero mean average and delta-correlation in the form of $\langle \alpha_{in}(t) \alpha_{in}^\dagger(t') \rangle = \delta(t-t'), \langle \beta_{in}(t) \beta_{in}^\dagger(t') \rangle = \delta(t-t'), \langle \epsilon_{in}(t) \epsilon_{in}^\dagger(t') \rangle = \langle n_{in} \rangle \delta(t-t')$, where $n_{in}$ is the Bose-Einstein distribution function for the photons.

To quantify the entanglement of arbitrary two modes in the system, we first define the quadrature operators of each mode as $X_\mu = (\mu + \mu^\dagger)/\sqrt{2}, Y_\mu = (\mu - \mu^\dagger)/\sqrt{2i}$ ($\mu = a, b, c$). Then the Langevin equation (5) can be reformulated in a matrix form,

$$\frac{d\mathbf{u}}{dt} = M \mathbf{u} - \Lambda \mathbf{u}_{in},$$

(6)

where $\mathbf{u} = (X_a, Y_a, X_b, Y_b, X_c, Y_c)^T$, the noise $\mathbf{u}_{in} = (X_{in,a}, Y_{in,a}, X_{in,b}, Y_{in,b}, X_{in,c}, Y_{in,c})^T$, the matrix $\Lambda = \text{diag}(\sqrt{2\gamma_a}, \sqrt{2\gamma_b}, \sqrt{2\gamma_b}, \sqrt{2\gamma_c}, \sqrt{2\gamma_c})$, and the drift
The strength of entanglement of a state of the three mode system is a Gaussian state, fully characterized by a steady covariant matrix $V$. According to the Routh-Hurwitz criterion, the system is stable if all the eigenvalues of $M$ have negative real parts [28], which is almost automatically satisfied for an AFM that will be explained below.

The linearity of the Langevin equation together with the Gaussian nature of the noise imply that the steady state of the three mode system is a Gaussian state, fully characterized by a steady covariant matrix $V$, that can be obtained by solving the Lyapunov equation [29],

$$MV + VM^T = -D,$$

where $D = \text{diag}(\gamma_a, \gamma_b, \gamma_c, (2n_{th} + 1)\gamma_c, (2n_{th} + 1)\gamma_c)$. To consider the entanglement of particular two modes such as $a$ and $b$, we reduce $V_{6 \times 6}$ to its subspace $V_{4 \times 4}$ expanded by $(X_a, Y_a, X_b, Y_b)$ as,

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ C^T & B \end{pmatrix}.$$  

The strength of entanglement of $a$ and $b$ is quantified by the logarithmic negativity defined as,

$$E_N = \text{max}[0, -\log(2\eta^-)],$$

where $\eta^- = 2^{-1/2} \left[ \sum(V) - \left( \sum(V)^2 - 4 \det V \right)^{1/2} \right]^{1/2}$, $\sum(V) = \det A + \det B - 2 \det C$.

**Antiferromagnetic case.**— In an AFM, the sublattice permutation symmetry implies $S_a = S_b \equiv S$, $\gamma_a = \gamma_b \equiv \gamma_m$, $g_{ab} = H_{ex} \equiv 2cJS^2$, $g_{ac} = g_{bc} \equiv g_{mp}$, we can analytically solve the eigenequation $\det(\lambda I - M) = 0$, and obtain $\lambda_{1,2,3,4} = -\gamma_m \pm iH_0, \lambda_{5,6} = -\gamma_c \pm i(H_{ex} - H_0)$. Because the dissipation rates $\gamma_m > 0, \gamma_c > 0$, the system can always reach a steady state, regardless of the initial states. This stability condition is much weaker than the traditional three modes system in optomechanics, where a strict constrain on the coupling strength and dissipation rate is required [29].

Figure 2a shows entanglement of the magnon modes and photon modes for photon frequency $\omega_c = 0.8H_{sp}$ (blue line), $0.85H_{sp}$ (red line) and $0.9H_{sp}$ (black line), respectively, where $H_{sp}$ is the spin-flop field defined as $H_{sp} = H_{an}H_{an} + 2H_{ex})$. Neither $a$-type nor $b$-type magnon is entangled with the photon (merged dashed lines at $E_N = 0$) while the two magnon-modes themselves are entangled and the strength of entanglement is even larger than that in a system without photons (red dashed line around $2 \pm 1$ [31]). Furthermore, the magnon-magnon entanglement reaches a maximum value at $H = 0.2H_{sp}, 0.15H_{sp}, 0.10H_{sp}$, respectively. Detailed analysis shows that the peak positions are coincident with the resonant field of the system [32] with an example shown in Fig. 2b when $\omega_c = 0.85H_{sp}$, where a typical anticrossing spectrum is identified at $H = 0.15H_{sp}$ (vertical dashed line), indicating the existence of magnon-polariton.

The entanglement enhancement of $a$ and $b$ is non-intuitive, since it is expected that the $g_{ac}$ will compete with $g_{ab}$ due to the nature of parametric-down-conversion-type coupling and consequently the modes $a$ and $c$ may share some finite entanglement ($E_{N,ac}$) and...
weaken the entanglement of $a$ and $b$ ($E_{N,ab}$). Here we stress that this intuition only applies in strong coupling regime ($g_{ab} \sim 0.01H_{ex} \sim 0.01\omega_a, \omega_b$) and fails in the deep strong coupling regime ($g_{ab} \sim \omega_a, \omega_b$) for AFM. To demonstrate this point, we plot the entanglement properties of the three modes in Fig. 3a when $g_{ab} = 0.01H_{ex}$, at the resonant condition. With the increase of $g_{mp}$, indeed, $a$ and $c$ modes share an entanglement and could even suppress $E_{N,ab}$ at a higher $g_{mp}$, while $E_{N,ac}$ decreases slightly (see the relative position of black line and red dashed line in Fig. 3a). A fair comparison in the deep strong regime is given in Fig. 3b for $g_{ab} = 1.0H_{ex}$. Now the enhancement of $E_{N,ab}$ appears and it even increases with $g_{mp}$ while $E_{N,ac}$ is completely suppressed to be zero by the entanglement of $a$ and $b$. A phase diagram of the entanglement distribution in the $g_{mp} - g_{ab}$ plane is shown in Fig. 3c. Clearly, the enhancement (compared with the bottom line of the diagram with $g_{mp} = 0$) only becomes significant when $g_{ab}$ falls into the deep strong coupling regime (red dashed box). Physically, this enhancement can be partially understood from superposition of direct entanglement of $a$ and $b$ through $g_{ab}$ and indirect entanglement of $a$ and $b$ transferred by the mode $c$ through $g_{bc}$.

Furthermore, to identify the magnon-magnon entanglement as well as magnon-polariton near the anticrossing, the coupling strength of magnon and photon is essentially stronger than the dissipation rate of the system ($g_{mp} > \gamma_m, \gamma_c$), otherwise, the noise will smear out the anticrossing [14]. Then it is meaningful to study the influence of dissipation rate on the entanglement enhancement. Figure 4a shows the magnon entanglement as a function of $\gamma_m$. For $g_{mp} = 0.01H_{ex}$, the entanglement keeps decreasing with $\gamma_m$ and saturates at the value without photons (red dashed line). For $\gamma_m < g_{mp}$, the enhancement is always there. At a given $\gamma_m$, the enhancement increases with the coupling strength of magnon-photon $g_{mp}$. When we tune the dissipation rate of the cavity, there exists an optimized $\gamma_c$, where the entanglement enhancement reaches a maximum, as shown in Fig. 4b. The peak position falls into the regime $\gamma_c < g_{mp}$, such that anticrossing spectrum can be identified and it is feasible to observe the magnon-plariton and the enhancement of magnon-magnon entanglement simultaneously.

Ferri-/Ferro-magnetic case.— For a two-sublattice ferromagnet ($S_a \neq S_b, g_{ac} \neq g_{bc}$), the entanglement properties are the same as an antiferromagnet once the deep strong coupling condition is satisfied, i.e. $g_{ab} \sim \omega_a, \omega_b$. A ferromagnet corresponds to the limiting case ($S_a \rightarrow 0$), then $g_{ab} \propto S_a S_b \rightarrow 0$, and the physics becomes different. Specifically, for a single sublattice ferromagnet coupled with the light, Eq. (4) is reduced to $\mathcal{H} = \omega_b b^\dagger b + \omega_c c^\dagger c + g_{bc}(b^\dagger c + bc^\dagger)$, the spectrum of which takes the form, $\omega_{1,2} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\omega_b + \omega_c \pm \sqrt{(\omega_b - \omega_c)^2 + g_{bc}^2}\right)$, which has an anticrossing near the point $\omega_b = \omega_c$ [33]. However, the stable state is not an entangled state, because the magnon mode $b$ is coupled with the photon $c$ in a beam-splitter-type,

Discussions and Conclusions.— Firstly, we focus on the continuous modes entanglement for a stable thermal state and the results presented above are not necessarily valid for Fock states. Take the the beam-splitter-type interaction ($b^\dagger c + bc^\dagger$) for an example, an initial Fock state $|01\rangle$ will evolve into an entangled state $((01) + |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, periodically. Secondly, the magnetoeelastic interaction is not included in the Hamiltonian such that coupling between magnon and phonon is zero. Once the magnetoeelastic interaction cannot be neglected, we will have a four-mode system and can follow a similar approach to investigate the entanglement properties of these modes, but the analysis will be much more complex. A pioneering work on ferromagnets with one magnon mode, one photon mode and one phonon mode shows that the tripartite entanglement can be realized in a specific parameter regime [25].

In conclusion, we have studied the entanglement properties of magnons and photons inside a cavity and find that the entanglement between magnons and photons are very weak. Instead, the magnons excited on the two sublattices of an AFM are strongly entangled and this entanglement can be enhanced to its maximum when the magnons are coupled with the photon in the resonant condition. The maximum entanglement enhancement increases monotonically with the coupling strength between magnons and photons while it optimizes at a particular dissipation rate of the cavity. We ascertain that such enhancement is a unique feature of the antiferromagnet with deep strong coupling between two magnons and it disappears for normal system with strong coupling. Our results is not good new if one tends to produce entanglement between magnon and photon near the anticrossing point, but may be useful if one prefers to use the magnon-magnon entanglement as a resource, which will have the advantages of almost auto-established stability and wide tunability of the entanglement strength.
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SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

A. Classification of the coupling regime

Here we analytically show how the relative magnitude of coupling strength \((g_{ab})\) and intrinsic frequency \(\omega_{a(b)}\) can lead to distinguishable phase of entanglement properties of \(a\) and \(b\).

Let us start from the standard two-mode covariance matrix \([19]\),

\[
V = \begin{pmatrix} A & C \\ C^T & B \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_a & 0 & \Lambda_+ & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda_a & 0 & \Lambda_- \\ \Lambda_+ & 0 & \Lambda_b & 0 \\ 0 & \Lambda_- & 0 & \Lambda_b \end{pmatrix}.
\]  

(10)

Then we can derive the smallest symplectic eigenvalue as,

\[
\eta^{-} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ \sum(\mathbf{V}) - \left[ \sum(\mathbf{V})^2 - 4 \text{det} \mathbf{V} \right]^{1/2} \right]^{1/2}
\]

\[
= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ (\Lambda_a^2 + \Lambda_b^2 - 2 \Lambda_+ \Lambda_-) - [(\Lambda_a^2 + \Lambda_b^2 - 2 \Lambda_+ \Lambda_-)^2 - 4(\Lambda_a \Lambda_b - \Lambda_+^2)(\Lambda_a \Lambda_b - \Lambda_-^2)]^{1/2} \right]^{1/2}
\]  

(11)

where \(\sum(\mathbf{V}) = \text{det} \mathbf{A} + 2 \text{det} \mathbf{C} = \Lambda_a^2 + \Lambda_b^2 - 2 \Lambda_+ \Lambda_-\), \(\text{Det}(\mathbf{V}) = (\Lambda_a \Lambda_b - \Lambda_+^2)(\Lambda_a \Lambda_b - \Lambda_-^2)\). For the two-sublattice antiferromagnet with a drift matrix \((7)\) in the absence of light, we have the correspondence \(\Lambda_a = \Lambda_b = \Lambda, \Lambda_- = -\Lambda_+ = \Lambda_c > 0\), where

\[
\Lambda = \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + \frac{g_{ab}^2}{(H_{ex} + H_a)^2 - g_{ab}^2 + \gamma_m^2} \right), \Lambda_c = \frac{g_{ab}(H_{ex} + H_a)}{2[(H_{ex} + H_a)^2 - g_{ab}^2 + \gamma_m^2]}
\]  

(12)

Then we can derive \(\eta^{-}\) as,

\[
2\eta^{-} = (\Lambda - \Lambda_c) = 1 + \frac{g_{ab}^2 - g_{ab}(H_{ex} + H_a)}{(H_{ex} + H_a)^2 - g_{ab}^2 + \gamma_m^2}
\]  

(13)

Now we can first classify two limiting phases (1) In the deep strong coupling regime, i.e. \(g_{ab} \sim H_{ex}\), we have \(2\eta^{-} \approx 1/2, E_{N,ab} = -\ln(2\eta^{-}) = \ln 2 = 0.6931\). (2) In the strong coupling regime, i.e. \(g_{ab} \ll H_{ex}\), we have \(2\eta^{-} = 1 - g_{ab}/H_{ex}, E_{N,ab} = -\ln(2\eta^{-}) = g_{ab}/H_{ex} \rightarrow 0\). In general, the phase diagram is summarized in Table I as follows.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Regimes</th>
<th>Strong</th>
<th>Ultrastrong</th>
<th>Deep strong</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>(g_{ab} \sim 0.01 H_{ex})</td>
<td>(g_{ab} \sim 0.1 H_{ex})</td>
<td>(g_{ab} \sim H_{ex})</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(2\eta^{-})</td>
<td>(1 - g_{ab}/H_{ex})</td>
<td>(1 + g_{ab}/H_{ex})</td>
<td>(1/2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(E_{N,ab})</td>
<td>(<del>0.01</del>)</td>
<td>(<del>0.1</del>)</td>
<td>(\ln 2)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Enhance?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>NA</td>
<td>Yes</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I. Entanglement properties of modes \(a\) and \(b\) in the three distinguishable coupling regimes.

B. The entanglement of magnon eigenmodes and photons

In the main text, we focus on the entanglement properties of magnons directly excited on the two sublattices. Due to the intersublattice coupling \((g_{ab})\), neither \(a\)–type nor \(b\)–type magnons are the eigenmodes of the system. By performing the Bogliubov transformation \(\alpha = \cosh \theta a + \sinh \theta \beta a^\dagger, b = \cosh \theta \beta + \sinh \theta a\), where \(\alpha, \beta\) are a new set of Boson modes that satisfy the boson commutation relations, \(\cosh 2\theta = (\omega_a + \omega_b)/\sqrt{(\omega_a + \omega_b)^2 - 4g_{ab}^2}\), we can decouple the two magnons and obtain \(\hat{H}_{\text{AFM}} = \omega_a \alpha^\dagger \alpha + \omega_b \beta^\dagger \beta\), where \(\omega_{a,b} = \pm H + H_{sp}\). When we tune the external field, the optical mode \(\alpha\) is left unchanged while the acoustic mode \(\beta\) while the coupled with the photon mode \(c\), as shown in Fig. 2b. Here we further ask the question how the eigenmodes of an AFM be entangled with the photon mode.

Let us start from the reduced Hamiltonian,
\[ H = \omega_\alpha \alpha^\dagger \alpha + \omega\beta \beta^\dagger \beta + \omega_c c^\dagger c + \chi_{\text{mp}} (\alpha^\dagger \alpha^\dagger + \alpha \alpha + \beta^\dagger \beta^\dagger + \beta \beta) \]  

(14)

where \( \chi_{\text{mp}} = g_{ac} (\cosh \theta + \sinh \theta) \) is the coupling strength between the magnons and photons. Following a similar procedure to derive the entanglement among \( a, b, c \) modes, now we can calculate the entanglement among the \( \alpha, \beta \) and \( c \) modes. Figure 5a shows that both the \( \beta \)-magnon and photon are weakly entangled with the \( \alpha \)-magnon while \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) entanglement is about two times of magnitude smaller than that of \( \alpha \) and \( c \), i.e. \( E_{N,\alpha\beta} \ll E_{N,\alpha c} \ll E_{N,\alpha \beta} \). Here the \( \beta \) and \( c \) entanglement can be readily understood since they are coupled in a parametric-down-conversion-type while the \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) entanglement is the result that \( \alpha \) and \( c \) first entangles and then the beam-splitter-type interaction between \( \beta \) and \( c \) swaps \( c \) and \( \beta^\dagger \), thus generating the observed entanglement [34].

**FIG. 5.** (a) The steady entanglement among the eigenmodes of the antiferromagnet (\( \alpha, \beta \)) and the photon mode (\( c \)) as a function of external field \( \omega_c/H_{\text{sp}} = 0.80 \) (black line), 0.85 (red line), 0.90 (blue line), respectively. The solid, dashed and dotted lines represent entanglement of (\( \alpha, \beta \)), (\( \alpha, c \)) and (\( \beta, c \)), respectively. The entanglement of \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) without light is zero. \( \gamma_\alpha = \gamma_\beta = 0.001, \gamma_c = 0.003 \).

**Ferrimagnetic case.**— There are two types of magnons excited in a two-sublattice ferrimagnet and the entanglement between them is similar to the antiferromagnetic case while the entanglement among \( \alpha \)-magnon, \( \beta \)-magnon and photon depends on the anisotropy of the system. Given \( H_{\text{an},a} = H_{\text{an},b} = 0 \), we can analytically derive that \( g_{ac} = 0 \) by using the relation \( \tanh \theta = -\sqrt{S_a/S_b} \), hence the remaining beam-splitter-type coupling between \( \beta \) magnon and photon mode cannot be entangled. In this sense, ferrimagnet is similar to a ferromagnet. For a ferrimagnet with non-zero anisotropy, both \( g_{ac} \) and \( g_{bc} \) exist and the entanglement properties among \( \alpha, \beta \) and \( c \) resembles an antiferromagnet in a qualitative level.