How much entanglement can be created in a closed system?
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In a closed system, the total number of particles is fixed. We ask how much does this conservation law restricts the amount of entanglement that can be created. We derive a tight upper bound on the bipartite entanglement entropy in closed systems, and find what a maximally entangled state looks like in such a system. Finally, we illustrate numerically on an isolated system of one-dimensional fermionic gas, that the upper bound can be reached during its unitary evolution, when starting in a pure state that emulates a thermal state with high enough temperature. These results are in accordance with current experiments measuring Rényi-2 entanglement entropy, all of which employ particle-conserving Hamiltonian, where our bound acts as a loose bound, and will become especially important for bounding the amount of entanglement that can be spontaneously created, once a direct measurement of entanglement entropy becomes feasible.

Entanglement is one of the most intriguing characteristics of quantum systems. It evolved from its perception as a mathematical artifact, as a result of EPR paradox \cite{EPR}, to becoming closely related and applicable to the fields of condensed matter \cite{RevModPhys.80.881, condmat.0703053, condmat.1108.1658, condmat.1609.04860, condmat.1906.02678}, quantum information \cite{RevModPhys.81.865, PhysRevLett.96.230504, PhysRevLett.96.240502, PRB.81.094306, PhysRevLett.106.110501, PhysRevLett.107.120503}, quantum metrology \cite{RevModPhys.82.1303, PhysRevLett.95.250401, PhysRevLett.105.050501, PhysRevLett.116.080501, PhysRevLett.120.150403}, and quantum gravity \cite{CQG.30.103001, 1367-2630-16-1-013005, 1367-2630-16-6-063024}.

In the field of quantum information, entangled states are the backbone of quantum information protocols as they are considered a resource for tasks such as quantum teleportation \cite{PhysRevLett.85.4444, PhysRevLett.99.100502}, cryptography \cite{PhysRevLett.84.5128}, and dense coding \cite{PhysRevLett.65.3811}.

In these quantum information protocols, more entanglement usually leads to a better performance. Therefore, it is important to set precise upper bounds on how much entanglement is in principle available in performing these tasks \cite{RevModPhys.75.705, PhysRevLett.81.2594, PhysRevLett.86.4279, PhysRevLett.87.140402, PhysRevLett.89.257906, PhysRevLett.99.040504}.

As different tasks require different types of entangled states, numerous measures of entanglement have been introduced \cite{PhysRevLett.82.1882, PhysRevLett.87.067902, PhysRevLett.97.010502, PhysRevLett.113.110501}. An important measure of entanglement is entanglement entropy \cite{PhysRevLett.82.1882, PhysRevLett.87.067902, PhysRevLett.97.010502, PhysRevLett.113.110501}. It is defined as the von Neumann entropy of the reduced density matrix $\hat{\rho}_A = \text{tr}_B(\hat{\rho})$, where $\hat{\rho}$ denotes the density matrix of the composite system,

$$S_{\text{ent}} \equiv S(\hat{\rho}_A).$$

This is a valuable measure as it draws a direct connection between density matrix and the amount of non-local correlations present in a given system. Entanglement entropy also gained significant attention in the past few decades due to the discovery of its geometric scaling in thermal state as well as ground states (famously known as the volume law \cite{PhysRevLett.103.030501} and the area law \cite{PhysRevLett.106.110501, PhysRevLett.107.120503, PhysRevLett.120.150403} respectively), and its use for characterizing quantum phase transition \cite{RevModPhys.82.865, PhysRevLett.120.150403, 1367-2630-16-6-063024, PhysRevLett.116.080503}.

Despite its importance, this quantity has proven extremely difficult to probe experimentally, and related Rényi-2 entanglement entropy has been measured instead \cite{PhysRevLett.113.080402, PhysRevLett.120.150403, PhysRevLett.120.150404}. However, an experimental proposal has been put forward recently \cite{2019arXiv190602678S}, opening new exciting possibilities.

There exists a general bound on entanglement entropy. For a pure state of a bipartite system, it is straightforward to show that $S_{\text{ent}} \equiv S(\hat{\rho}_A) = S(\hat{\rho}_B)$. This leads to \cite{PhysRevLett.113.070503},

$$S_{\text{ent}} \leq \ln \min\{\dim \mathcal{H}_A, \dim \mathcal{H}_B\}. \quad (2)$$

However, one could wonder whether Eq. (2) is stringent enough for systems with additional conservation laws, that effectively restrict some degrees of freedom.

For example, consider a system of 2 fermionic particles contained on a lattice of size 6 sites, partitioned into two sublattices of 3 sites. Since there can be any number 0, 1, and 2 particles in each sublattice, the upper bound on entanglement entropy given by Eq. (2) is $S_{\text{ent}} \leq \ln (\binom{6}{0} + \binom{6}{1} + \binom{6}{2}) = \ln 7$, yet because of the conservation law, this could be considerably larger than the actually achievable entropy.

This is important because, among the aforementioned quantum tasks, those that incorporate massive particles — like the constituents of condensed matter systems — often exhibit constrains such as the conservation of total number of particles or charge \cite{condmat.1108.1658, condmat.1609.04860, condmat.1906.02678, condmat.1610.07249, condmat.1809.04674, condmat.1902.01975}. Such restrictions are described by superselection rules \cite{RevModPhys.82.661, PhysRevLett.120.150403}. It has been suggested that these restrictions can in fact be used as a resource and can enhance the security of quantum communication \cite{PhysRevLett.99.040504, PhysRevLett.107.120503, PhysRevLett.120.150403, PhysRevLett.105.050501, PhysRevLett.116.080503} and measurement accuracy \cite{PhysRevLett.120.150403, PhysRevLett.120.150404, PhysRevLett.116.080503}. However, among the vast literature on quantum information protocols, specific bounds on entanglement entropy in the presence of superselection rules are not sufficient.

Given the commonality of these conservation laws and recent efforts in probing entanglement entropy experimentally, it is an incentive to provide precise bounds for this quantity. In this paper, we derive a general tight upper bound on entanglement entropy for closed systems (in thermodynamic sense), which are defined as those...
where the total number of particles stays constant. This can be applied to quantum systems evolved with a time-independent or a time-dependent Hamiltonian, as long as this evolution conserves the total number of particles.

**BOUND ON ENTANGLEMENT ENTROPY**

For a bipartite system of $n$ spinless particles moving on a system of $L$ number of sites, which is partitioned into two subsystems $A$ and $B$ with $M = L - M$ number of sites ($\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$), assuming that the state of the composite system is pure and that $n \leq M \leq L - M$, the entanglement entropy is bounded by

$$S_{\text{ent}} \leq \ln \sum_{n_A=0}^{n} \min \left\{ \dim \mathcal{H}^{(n_A)}_A, \dim \mathcal{H}^{(n-n_A)}_B \right\},$$

(3)

where $\mathcal{H}^{(n_A)}_A$ denotes the Hilbert spaces of exactly $n_A$ particles contained in the subsystem $A$, and $\mathcal{H}^{(n-n_A)}_B$ denotes the Hilbert space of exactly $n - n_A$ particles contained in subsystem $B$ respectively. This is a tight bound, meaning that it can be saturated with a specific wave function of $n$ particles. An application of this result is shown in Fig. 2.

The above formula can be generalized to include cases $n > M$, but the fermionic and bosonic cases must be treated separately. For fermionic systems (or systems of hard-core bosons) this leads to

$$S_{\text{ent}} \leq \ln \sum_{n_A=\max(0,n-L-M)}^{\min(n,M)} \min \left\{ \binom{M}{n_A}, \binom{L-M}{n-n_A} \right\},$$

(4)

while for bosonic systems this leads to

$$S_{\text{ent}} \leq \ln \sum_{n_A=0}^{n} \min \left\{ \binom{M + n_A - 1}{n_A}, \binom{L - M + n - n_A - 1}{n - n_A} \right\}.$$  

(5)

This means that any wavefunction $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ can be written as

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{n_A=0}^{n} a_{n_A} |\psi_{n_A}\rangle,$$

(7)

where $|\psi_{n_A}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}^{(n_A)}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}^{(n-n_A)}_B$. Applying the Schmidt decomposition, we can write each of these vectors as

$$|\psi_{n_A}\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d_{n_A}} b_i^{(n_A)} |\chi_i^{(n_A)}\rangle \otimes |\phi_i^{(n-n_A)}\rangle,$$

(8)

where $d_{n_A} = \min \left\{ \dim \mathcal{H}^{(n_A)}_A, \dim \mathcal{H}^{(n-n_A)}_B \right\}$, and $\{|\chi_i^{(n_A)}\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d_{n_A}}$ and $\{|\phi_i^{(n-n_A)}\rangle\}_{i=1}^{d_{n_A}}$ form orthogonal sets. Also any two vectors $|\chi_i^{(n_A)}\rangle$ and $|\chi_j^{(n_A)}\rangle$, $n_A \neq \tilde{n}_A$, are orthogonal to each other, because they belong into subspaces associated with different eigenvalues $n_A$ of a Hermitian operator $\hat{N}_A$ (measuring the number of particles in sublattice $A$). The same argument can be made for vectors $|\phi_i^{(n-n_A)}\rangle$ using $\hat{N}_B$. This allows us to...
compute the reduced density matrix,
\[
\hat{\rho}_A = \text{tr}_B [\ket{\psi} \bra{\psi}] = \sum_{n_A=0}^{d_A} \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} |a_{n_A}|^2 |\phi_{n_A}^i\rangle \langle \phi_{n_A}^i| (\chi_i^{n_A}),
\]
and since vectors \(|\chi_i^{n_A}\rangle\) are orthogonal to each other, we can also compute the entanglement entropy as
\[
S_{\text{ent}} \equiv S(\hat{\rho}_A) = -\sum_{n_A=0}^{d_A} \sum_{i=1}^{d_A} |a_{n_A}|^2 |\phi_{n_A}^i\rangle \langle \phi_{n_A}^i| \ln |a_{n_A}|^2 |\phi_{n_A}^i\rangle \langle \phi_{n_A}^i|.
\]
Using Jensen’s theorem on the strictly concave function \(f(x) = \ln x\), which is a standard procedure for bounding the Shannon entropy, we derive
\[
S_{\text{ent}} \leq \ln \sum_{n_A=0}^{d_A} d_{n_A},
\]
which proves the theorem for \(n \leq M\). The inequality is saturated if and only if all the probabilities are equal, i.e.,
\[
|a_{n_A}|^2 |\phi_{n_A}^i\rangle \langle \phi_{n_A}^i| = \frac{1}{\sum_{n_A=0}^{d_A} d_{n_A}} \sum_{n_A=0}^{d_A} d_{n_A}
\]
for all \(n_A\) and \(i\). This is the condition for the maximally entangled state in a closed system.

Now let us take a look at cases of \(n \geq M\). For a fermionic system, we have to split this problem into two additional subproblems: \(M \leq n \leq L - M\), and \(M \leq L - M < n\). For the first subproblem, the Hilbert space can be decomposed as
\[
\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{n_A=0}^{M} \mathcal{H}_{n_A}^{(n_A)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}^{(n-n_A)},
\]
while for the second subproblem, it is
\[
\mathcal{H} = \bigoplus_{n_A=M-n+M}^{\infty} \mathcal{H}_{n_A}^{(n_A)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B}^{(n-n_A)}.
\]

The rest of the analysis proceeds analogously. Considering that \(\dim \mathcal{H}_{n_A}^{(n_A)} = \binom{M}{n_A}\) (combination: number or ways we can distribute \(n_A\) particles in a sublattice of \(M\) sites, where no repetition is possible due to Pauli exclusion principle) and \(\dim \mathcal{H}_{B}^{(n-n_A)} = \binom{L-M}{n-n_A}\), we obtain
\[
S_{\text{ent}} \leq \begin{cases} \ln \sum_{n_A=0}^{n_M} \min \left\{ \binom{M}{n_A}, \binom{L-M}{n-n_A} \right\}, & n < M \leq L - M \\ \ln \sum_{n_A=0}^{n_M} \min \left\{ \binom{M}{n_A}, \binom{L-M}{n-n_A} \right\}, & M \leq n \leq L - M \\ \ln \sum_{n_A=n-M+M}^{n_M} \min \left\{ \binom{M}{n_A}, \binom{L-M}{n-n_A} \right\}, & M \leq L - M < n \end{cases}
\]
for a bosonic system, the decomposition of Hilbert space is identical to Eq. (6) for any \(n\). The formula therefore remains the same, and considering that for a bosonic system we have \(\dim \mathcal{H}_{n_A}^{(n_A)} = \binom{M+n_A-1}{n_A}\) (combination with repetition: number or ways we can distribute \(n_A\) particles in a sublattice of \(M\) sites, where multiple particles can be in a single site) and \(\dim \mathcal{H}_{B}^{(n-n_A)} = \binom{L-M+n-n_A-1}{n-n_A}\), we obtain Eq. (5).

The condition for the maximally entangled state, Eq. (12), has an interesting implication. It gives prediction for the number of particles in each of the subsystems: if the state is maximally entangled, then the probability of measuring \(n_A\) particles in sublattice \(A\) (which must be the same as the probability of measuring \(n-n_A\) particles in sublattice \(B\)) is equal to
\[
p_{n_A} = \frac{d_{n_A}}{\sum_{n_A=0}^{\max\{n_M,M\}} d_{n_A}},
\]
for the bosonic gas, and
\[
p_{n_A} = \frac{d_{n_A}}{\sum_{n_A=0}^{\max\{n_M,M\}} d_{n_A}},
\]
for the fermionic gas. The mean number of particles in sublattice \(A\) is \(\bar{n_A} = \sum_{n_A=0}^{\max\{n_M,M\}} p_{n_A} n_A\) and \(\bar{n_B} = \sum_{n_A=0}^{\max\{n_M,M\}} p_{n_A} n_A\) (while \(\bar{n_B} = n - \bar{n_A}\) for the fermionic and the bosonic gas respectively). Therefore, if a state of a closed system does not satisfy these properties, it cannot be maximally entangled.

One can also notice that the derived bound stops depending on the total system size \(L\) if it is large enough. Specifically, for fermionic systems and
\[
L \geq \max \left\{ \max_{n_A \in \{0, \ldots, \min\{n_M,M\}\}} \left\{ \frac{M}{n_A} \right\}, n \right\} + M,
\]
the bound becomes
\[
S_{\text{ent}} \leq \ln \left( 1 + \sum_{n_A=0}^{\min\{n_M,M\}-1} \left( \frac{M}{n_A} \right) \right),
\]
which does not depend on \(L\) anymore.

If in addition \(n \geq M\), then
\[
S_{\text{ent}} \leq \ln \sum_{n_A=0}^{M} \left( \frac{M}{n_A} \right) = \ln 2^{M},
\]
which is equal to the maximal entropy of subsystem \(\mathcal{H}_A\). This is the same result that could be recovered from the original bound, Eq. (2). Therefore, for fermionic systems with large enough baths (subsystems B), and a large number of particles, these bounds are the same. The same does not hold for bosonic systems however, for which \(S_{\text{ent}} \leq \ln \left( 1 + \sum_{n_A=0}^{M+n_A-1} \left( \frac{M+n_A-1}{n_A} \right) \right) < \ln \sum_{n_A=0}^{M+n_A-1} \left( \frac{M+n_A-1}{n_A} \right) = \ln \dim \mathcal{H}_A\), irrespective of \(n\), for large \(L\) and \(M > 1\).
In this section, we provide numerical evidence for the upper bound expressed in Eq. (4). We specifically focus on the case where $n < M \leq L - M$. The other cases turned out to be very similar, and we shall not show them here. We consider a system of $n$ spin-less fermions in a 1-dimensional lattice of size $L$, with Hamiltonian

$$
\hat{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{L} \left[ -t(f_i^d f_{i+1} + h.c.) + V n_i^f n_{i+1}^f ight] - t'(f_i^d f_{i+2} + h.c.) + V'n_i^f n_{i+2}^f, \tag{21}
$$

where $f_i$ and $f_i^d$ are fermionic annihilation and creation operators for site $i$ and $n_i^f = f_i^d f_i$ is the local density operator. The nearest-neighbor (NN) and next-nearest-neighbor (NNN) hopping terms are respectively $t$ and $t'$ and the interaction strengths are $V$ and $V'$ as illustrated in Fig. 3. We choose this Hamiltonian since it has been extensively studied in literature [69–74].

In the simulation depicted in Fig. 4, we take $t = t' = 1.9$, $V = V' = 0.5$, total number of particles $n = 3$, and we take subsystem $A$ to be the $M = 4$ sites on the left side of the chain, while the full system size $L$, and inverse temperature $\beta = 1/T$ are both varied.

We take the initial state to be the complex random pure thermal state (RPTS) (also known as thermal pure quantum or canonical thermal pure quantum state [43, 75, 76]), which we define as

$$
|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{Z}} \sum_{E} c_E e^{-\beta E/2} |E\rangle, \tag{22}
$$

where $|E\rangle$s are the eigenstates of the total Hamiltonian, computed using exact diagonalization. The coefficients $\{c_E\}$ are random complex numbers, $c_E \equiv (x_E + i y_E)/\sqrt{2}$, with $x_E$ and $y_E$ obeying the standard normal distribution $\mathcal{N}(0, 1)$, and $Z = \sum_{E} |c_E|^2 e^{-\beta E}$ is the normalization constant. This state emulates a thermal state, while being pure. It is then evolved as $|\psi_i\rangle = e^{-i\hat{H}t}|\psi\rangle$.
ple test of whether the state can be maximally entangled.

These results could be also directly transferred to lattices of identical spin-1/2 particles with the total spin conserved, where spin-up and spin-down take place of a particle and a hole respectively, or to lattices of qubits consisting of different energy states (such as cold atoms [4, 50, 51, 80], trapped ions [52, 81, 82], or superconducting qubits [83–86]), when the total energy, and therefore also the total number of excited states is conserved, while neglecting the interaction energy.

Another implication of this result is with regards to Rényi entropies of higher order. For a general density matrix, entanglement entropy (Rényi entropy of order \(\alpha = 1\)) is related to Rényi entropies of higher order, \(S_{\alpha > 1}\), by inequality \(S_{\alpha=1} (|\rho\rangle\langle\rho|) \geq S_{\alpha > 1} (|\rho\rangle\langle\rho|)\) [87]. This means that the upper bound on entanglement entropy found in this study, could be taken as a loose upper bound on \(S_{\alpha > 1} (|\rho\rangle\langle\rho|)\).

This is important due to the existence of experiments involving measurements on Rényi-2 entanglement entropy \(S_{n=2}\) [50–52], which allows us to compare our bound with experimental data. Ref. [50] used a system of ultracold bosonic atoms trapped in an optical lattice, evolving by Bose-Hubbard Hamiltonian. The maximum Rényi entropy of a ground state for a system of \(L = 4\) sites and \(n = 4\) particles, and various sizes of subsystems \(M = [1, 2, 4]\) was obtained from Fig. 4 in [50] (including an offset of about 0.5) as \(S_{n=2} \approx [0.4, 0.9, 0.0]\), which is above the bound \(S_{\text{ent}}^{\text{bound}} (n, M) = [1.6, 2.2, 0]\) calculated from Eq. (5). The maximal achieved entropy obtained from Fig. 6 in [50] for \(L = n = 2\) and \(M = 1\) is the bound \(S_{\text{ent}}^{\text{bound}} (n, M) = 0.8\) which is much closer to the bound \(S_{\text{ent}}^{\text{bound}} (n, M) = 1.1\). Ref. [51] focused on measuring Rényi entropy of an evolving system using the same model. The maximum values of Rényi entropy read out from Fig. 3 in [51] for \(L = n = 6\) and \(M = [1, 2, 3, 6]\) are \(S_{n=2} \approx [0.8, 1.9, 2.6, 0]\), while the bound gives \(S_{\text{ent}}^{\text{bound}} (n, M) = [1.9, 3.0, 3.4, 0]\). Finally, Ref. [52] used a system of trapped ions, each carrying a spin, evolved by XY Hamiltonian which conserves the total spin. This model is therefore mathematically identical to a lattice of spinless fermions. \(L = 10\) atoms were prepared in the Néel state \((n = 5)\), and after 5 ms the Rényi entropy was read out for \(M = [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]\) (Fig. 2 in [52]) at values scattered around \(S_{n=2} \approx [0.6, 1.3, 1.7, 2.1, 2.4, 2.3, 1.9, 1.5, 0.8]\) (recalculated by changing the base of logarithm \(\log_2 \rightarrow \ln\)). These values are comparable but two of them are slightly higher than the bound \(S_{\text{ent}}^{\text{bound}} (n, M) = [0.7, 1.4, 2.1, 2.8, 3.5, 2.8, 2.1, 1.4, 0.7]\) calculated from Eq. (4), due to inadvertently introduced decoherence (the total Rényi entropy was 0.5 at the time of measurement).

We conclude that our are results are in accordance with current experiments, and will become especially useful for bounding the amount of entanglement spontaneously created in closed systems, once a direct measurement of entanglement entropy becomes feasible.
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