arXiv:1912.07020v1 [quant-ph] 15 Dec 2019

Quantum memory assisted entropic uncertainty relation with moving quantum memory inside a leaky cavity

S. Haseli[1,*]

[1]Faculty of Physics, Urmia University of Technology, Urmia, Iran

(Dated: February 19, 2024)

Uncertainty principle has a fundamental role in quantum theory. This principle states that it is not possible to measure two incompatible observers simultaneously. The uncertainty principle is expressed logically in terms of standard deviation of the measured observables. In quantum information it has been shown that the uncertainty principle can be expressed by means of Shannon's entropy. Entropic uncertainty relation can be improve by consider an additional particle as the quantum memory. In the presence of quantum memory the entropic uncertainty relation is called quantum memory assisted entropic uncertainty relation. In this work we will consider the case in which the quantum memory moves inside the leaky cavity. We will show that by increasing the velocity of the quantum memory the entropic uncertainty lower bound decreased.

PACS numbers:

I. INTRODUCTION

In the classical world the measurement error is due to the inaccuracy of the measuring device. While in quantum theory, it is not possible to measure two incompatible observables simultaneously, even if the measurement instrument is accurate. It is because of the uncertainty principle in quantum theory. The first uncertainty relation was proposed by Heisenberg [1]. The Heisenberg uncertainty relation is related to momentum and position observables which are two incompatible observables. Kennard [2] formalized Heisenberg uncertainty principle as $\Delta\hat{x}\Delta\hat{p}_x \geq \hbar/2$, where $\Delta\hat{x}$ and $\Delta\hat{p}_x$ are standard deviations of the position $\hat{x}$ momentum $\hat{p}_x$, respectively. Robertson [3] and Schrödinger [4] generalized Heisenberg uncertainty relation for arbitrary two incompatible observables $\hat{Q}$ and $\hat{R}$. Based on their results, one has the following relation for arbitrary quantum state $|\psi\rangle$

$$\Delta\hat{Q}\Delta\hat{R} \geq \frac{1}{2}|\langle\psi|[\hat{Q},\hat{R}]|\psi\rangle|, \tag{1}$$

where $\Delta\hat{Q} = \sqrt{\langle\psi|\hat{Q}^2|\psi\rangle - \langle\psi|\hat{Q}|\psi\rangle^2}$ and $\Delta\hat{R} = \sqrt{\langle\psi|\hat{R}^2|\psi\rangle - \langle\psi|\hat{R}|\psi\rangle^2}$ are the standard deviations of the observables $\hat{Q}$ and $\hat{R}$, respectively, and $\left[\hat{Q},\hat{R}\right] = \hat{Q}\,\hat{R} - \hat{R}\,\hat{Q}$. The left hand side (l.h.s) of Eq.(1) is called uncertainty and the right hand side (r.h.s) is called uncertainty lower bound. This uncertainty lower bound is depend on quantum state $|\psi\rangle$, which can be lead to a trivial bound when the commutator has zero expectation value. To avoid this drawback and to consider the notion of uncertainty as the (lack of) knowledge about a measurement outcome, it has been suggested to use the Shannon entropy, in an information theoretical framework, as the measure of uncertainty. The important version of entropic uncertainty relation (EUR) was proposed by Kraus [5] and then proved by Maassen and Uffink [6]. According to their results, one has the following EUR for the state ρ_A on a finite dimension Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_A$

$$H(\hat{Q}) + H(\hat{R}) \geq \log_2\frac{1}{c}, \tag{2}$$

where $\hat{Q} = \{|q_i\rangle\}$ and $\hat{R} = \{|r_j\rangle\}$ represents the orthonormal bases on $\mathcal{H}_A$, $H(\hat{O}) = -\sum_o p_o \log_2 p_o$ is the Shannon entropy of the measured observable $\hat{O} \in \{\hat{Q},\hat{R}\}$, p_o is the probability distribution of the outcome o, and $c = \max_{\{i,j\}}|\langle q_i|r_j\rangle|^2$ defines the complementarity between the observables. The above EUR provides a constant lower bound compared with Heisenberg' s uncertainty relation, because complementarity between the observables does not depend on particular states. The entropic uncertainty lower bound in Eq.(2) was improved for mixed state ρ_A as

$$H(Q) + H(R) \geq \log_2\frac{1}{c} + S(\rho_A) \tag{3}$$

where $S(\rho_A) = -tr(\rho_A \log_2 \rho_A)$ is the von Neumann entropy of the state ρ_A. Berta et al. [7], generalized the EUR in Eq.(3) by considering additional particle B as a quantum memory. It is supposed that Bob have access to a particle B and Alice have access to a particle A. Berta et al. showed that, Bob's uncertainty about the outcome of measurements $\hat{Q}$ and $\hat{R}$, is bounded by

$$S(\hat{Q}|B) + S(\hat{R}|B) \geq \log_2\frac{1}{c} + S(A|B), \tag{4}$$

where $S(\hat{P}|B) = S(\rho^{PB}) - S(\rho^B)$ is the conditional von Neumann entropy of the post measurement state

$$\rho^{PB} = \sum_i (|p_i\rangle\langle p_i| \otimes \mathbb{I})\rho^{AB}(|p_i\rangle\langle p_i| \otimes \mathbb{I}), \tag{5}$$

which $|p_i\rangle$ is the eigenstate of the observable $\hat{P}$, and $\mathbb{I}$ is the identity operator. EUR with quantum memory is called quantum-memory-assisted entropic uncertainty relation (QMA-EUR). QMA-EUR has the wide range of application

*Electronic address: soroush.haseli@uut.ac.ir

such as entanglement detection [8–10] and quantum cryptography [11, 12]. Many works have been done to tight the uncertainty bound of QMA-EUR [13–22]. However, so far the tightest bound is provided by Adabi et al. [19]. According to their results QMA-EUR is given by

$$S(\hat{Q}|B) + S(\hat{R}|B) \geq \log_2 \frac{1}{c} + S(A|B) + \max\{0, \delta\}, \quad (6)$$

where

$$\delta = I(A;B) - (I(\hat{Q};B) + I(\hat{R};B)). \quad (7)$$

Where $I(\hat{P};B))$ is the Holevo quantity. When Alice measures observable $\hat{P}$ on her particle, the i-th outcome is obtained with probability $p_i = tr_{AB}(\Pi_i^A \rho^{AB} \Pi_i^A)$ and post measurement state of the Bob is obtained as $\rho_i^B = \frac{tr_A(\Pi_i^A \rho^{AB} \Pi_i^A)}{p_i}$. Then we have the following relation for Holevo quantity $I(\hat{P};B))$

$$I(\hat{O};B) = S(\rho^b) - \sum_i p_i S(\rho_i^B) \quad (8)$$

which is equal to upper bound of Bob's accessible information about Alice's measurement outcomes.

In the real world each quantum system can interacts with its surrounding, so the study of open quantum systems has the special significance[23]. In the most recent work, it has been assumed that the quantum memory B have an interaction with environment. In this situation the effects of environmental parameter on the bound of QMA-EUR is studied[24–39, 41]. The bound of QMA-EUR can be control in a dissipative environment by using the quantum weak measurements and measurement reversal [40, 42]. In this work we will consider the situation that the quantum memory moves inside a leaky cavity. We will show that the lower bound of QMA-EUR is decreased by increasing the velocity of the moving quantum memory inside leaky cavity.

II. MODEL

Let us consider the quantum system consist of a two level quantum system and structured environment. The a structure of the environment consists of two mirrors at $z = -L$ and $z = l$ along with partially reflecting mirror in $z = 0$. It actually forms a sort of two sequential cavities $(-L, 0)$ and $(0, l)$. The structure of the environment is sketched in Fig.(1).

The classical electromagnetic field $E(z,t)$ in $(-L, l)$ can be written as

$$E(z,t) = \sum_k E_k(t) U_k(z) + E_k^*(t) U_k^*(z), \quad (9)$$

where $E_k(t)$ is the amplitude in the k-th mode and $U_k(z)$'s are exact monochromatic modes at frequency $\omega_k = ck$[44–46]. It is assumed that the electromagnetic field is polarized along the x-direction inside the cavity. The mode functions $U_k(z)$ is given by

$$U_k(z) = \begin{cases} \varepsilon_k \sin k(z+L) & z < 0; \\ \\ J_k \sin k(z-L) & z > 0, \end{cases} \quad (10)$$




Figure 1: Schematic representation of the model where quantum memory moves inside leaky cavity. While Alice performs measurement on her particle.

where ε gives the values 1 , -1 going from each mode to the subsequent one. J_k for good cavity is given by

$$J_k = \frac{\sqrt{c\lambda^2/l}}{\sqrt{(\omega_k^2 - \omega_n)^2 + \lambda^2}}, \quad (11)$$

where $\omega_n = n\pi c/l$ is the frequency of the quasi mode, λ is the damping of the cavity and determine the spectral width of the coupling, it also quantifies the photon leakage from cavity mirrors. Let us consider the case in which the qubit only interacts with the second cavity $(0, l)$. The qubit also moves along z-axis with constant velocity v.

The Hamiltonian of the total system can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &= \omega_0 |0\rangle_s\langle 0| + \sum_k \omega_k a_k^\dagger a_k \\ &= \sum_k f_k(z) \left[g_k |1\rangle_s\langle 0| a_k + g_k^* |0\rangle_s\langle 1| a_k^\dagger \right], \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where ω_0 is the transition frequency, $|0\rangle_s$ and $|1\rangle_s$ are the excited and ground state of the qubit system, respectively. $a_k^\dagger$ and a_k are creation and annihilation operators, respectively. g_k quantifies the coupling between the qubit and the cavity. The function $f_k(z)$ represent the form of the qubit motion along z-axis which is given by[46, 47]

$$f_k(z) = f_k(vt) = \sin(k(z-l)) = \sin(\omega_k(\beta t - \tau)), \quad (13)$$

where $\beta = v/c$ and $\tau = l/c$. According to the results which have obtained in Ref. [48], we will choose the parameter β as $\beta = (x) \times 10^{-9}$. This value is equivalent to $v = 0.3(x)$ for the ^{85}Rb Rydberg microwave qubit . Now, we assume that the initial state of the total system has the following form

$$|\psi(0)\rangle = [c_1|0\rangle_s + c_2|1\rangle_s] \otimes |0\rangle_c, \quad (14)$$

where $|c_1|^2 + |c_2|^2 = 1$ and the cavity mode in the vacuum state $|0\rangle_c$. Then at time t the quantum state of the system can be written as

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = c_1 A(t)|0\rangle_s|0\rangle_c + c_2|1\rangle|0\rangle_c + \sum_k B_k(t)|1\rangle_s|1_k\rangle_c, \quad (15)$$

where $|1_k\rangle_c$ shows the cavity state containing one excitation in the k-th mode. By making use of the schrÖdinger equation one can obtain

$$i\dot{A}(t) = \omega_0 A(t) + \sum_k g_k J_k f_k(vt) B_k(t), \quad (16)$$

$$i\dot{B}_k(t) = \omega_k B_k(t) + g_k^* J_k f_k(vt) A(t), \quad (17)$$

Solving Eq. 17 and inserting its solution to Eq. 16 leads to

$$\dot{A}(t) + i\omega_0 A(t) = - \int_0^t dt' A(t') \sum_k |g_k|^2 J_k^2 f_k(vt) f_k(vt') e^{-i\omega_k(t-t')}. \quad (18)$$

By succession the probability amplitude as $A(t') = \tilde{A}(t')e^{i\omega_0 t'}$, Eq. (18) can be rewritten as

$$\dot{\tilde{A}} + \int_0^t dt' F(t,t')\tilde{A}(t') = 0 \quad (19)$$

where the memory kernel $F(t,t')$ has the following form

$$F(t,t') = \sum_k |g_k|^2 J_k^2 f_k(vt) f_k(vt') e^{-i(\omega_k-\omega_0)(t-t')}. \quad (20)$$

The kernel function in the continuous limit is given bye

$$F(t,t') = \int_0^\infty J(\omega_k) f_k(t,t') e^{-i(\omega_k-\omega_0)(t-t')} d\omega_k, \quad (21)$$

where $f_k(t,t') = \sin(\omega_k(\beta t - \tau))\sin(\omega_k(\beta t' - \tau))$ and $J(\omega_k)$ is the spectral density of the electromagnetic field inside the cavity. Here we assume that the spectral density has the Lorentzian form

$$J(\omega_k) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \frac{\gamma\lambda^2}{(\omega_n - \omega_k)^2 + \lambda^2}, \quad (22)$$

where ω_k is the frequency of k-th cavity mode and ω_n is the center frequency of the cavity modes. The spectral width of the coupling λ is related to the correlation time of the cavity τ_c via $\tau_c = 1/\lambda$. The parameter γ is connected to the time scale τ_s, over which the state of the system changes, by $\tau_s = 1/\gamma$. In the continuous limit ($\tau \longrightarrow \infty$) when $t > t'$ we have

$$F(t,t') = \frac{\gamma\lambda}{4} \cosh\left[\theta(t-t')\right] e^{\bar{\lambda}(t-t')}, \quad (23)$$

where $\bar{\lambda} = \lambda - i\Delta$ and $\theta = \beta(\bar{\lambda} + i\omega_0)$. Inserting Eq.(23) to Eq.(19) and using Bromwich integral formula on can obtain $\tilde{A}(t)$ as

$$\tilde{A}(t) = \frac{(q_1+u_+)(q_1+u_-)}{(q_1-q_2)(q_1-q_3)} e^{q_1\gamma t} - \frac{(q_2+u_+)(q_2+u_-)}{(q_1-q_2)(q_2-q_3)} e^{q_2\gamma t} + \frac{(q_3+u_+)(q_3+u_-)}{(q_1-q_3)(q_2-q_3)} e^{q_3\gamma t}, \quad (24)$$

where q_i's ($i = 1,2,3$) satisfy the following cubic equation as

$$q^3 + 2(y_1 - iy_3)q^2 + (u_+u_- + \frac{y_1}{4})q + \frac{y_1(y_1 - iy_3)}{4} = 0 \quad (25)$$

where $y_1 = \lambda/\gamma$, $y_2 = \omega_0/\gamma$, $y_3 = (\omega_0 - \omega_n)/\gamma$ and $u_\pm = (1\pm\beta) \pm i\beta y_2 - i(1\pm\beta)y_3$. So, from Eq.(24), one can obtain the ecolved density matrix as

$$\rho(t) = \begin{pmatrix} |c_1|^2|A(t)|^2 & c_1c_2^*A(t) \\ c_2c_1^*A^*(t) & 1-|c_1|^2|A(t)|^2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

III. LOWER BOUND OF QMA-EUR WITH MOVING QUANTUM MEMORY INSIDE A LEAKY CAVITY

In this section we provide our model to study the dynamics of the lower bound of QMA-EUR. Bob prepares the correlated two qubit state ρ^{AB}. Then, he sends one part to Alice and keeps other as a quantum memory. In our model the quantum memory B moves inside a leaky cavity. So, the evolution of the prepared state ρ^{AB} can be characterize by local dynamical map Λ_t, such that

$$\rho^{AB_t} = (\mathbb{I} \otimes \Lambda_t)\rho^{AB}. \quad (27)$$

Then, Alice and Bob reach an agreement on the measurement of two incompatible observables which is done by Alice on her part. Alice declares her choice of the measurement to Bob who wants to guess the Alice's measurement outcomes with a better accuracy. Due to the interaction between quantum memory B with leaky cavity the correlation between measured particle A and quantum memory B will decrease. Due to the inverse relation between correlation and the lower bound of QMQ-EUR, the lower bound will increase. In our model we will examine the effect of moving the quantum memory inside a leaky cavity on the lower bound of QMA-EUR. Schematic representation of our model for QMA-EUR with moving quantum memory inside a leaky cavity is sketched in Fig. (1).

A. Examples

Maximally entangled state: As the first example we consider the case in which Bob prepares a maximally entangled pure state $|\phi\rangle^{AB} = 1/\sqrt{2}(|00\rangle_{AB} + |11\rangle_{AB})$. We assumed that the quantum memory B moves inside leaky cavity while Alice particle does not change. The dynamic of the prepared maximally entangled state is given by

$$\rho^{AB}(t) = \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} |A(t)|^2 & 0 & 0 & A(t) \\ 0 & 1-|A(t)|^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ A^\star(t) & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

Now, Alice and Bob reach an agreement on measurement of two observables $\hat{\sigma_x}$ and $\hat{\sigma_z}$. The lower bound of QMA-EUR




Figure 2: Entropic uncertainty lower bound with moving quantum memory inside a leaky cavity for different value of the speed of quantum memory in non-Markovian regime $\lambda = 0.01\gamma_0$ and $\omega_0 = \omega_n = 1.53GHz$, for maximally entangled prepared state. (Solid blue line)$\beta = 0$, (dashed green line)$\beta = 0.05 \times 10^{-9}$, (dotted red line)$\beta = 0.1 \times 10^{-9}$, (dotted dashed black line)$\beta = 0.3 \times 10^{-9}$




Figure 3: Entropic uncertainty lower bound with moving quantum memory inside a leaky cavity for different value of the speed of quantum memory in Markovian regime $\lambda = 3\gamma_0$ and $\omega_0 = \omega_n = 1.53GHz$, for maximally entangled prepared state. (Solid blue line)$\beta = 0$, (dashed green line)$\beta = 10 \times 10^{-9}$, (dotted red line)$\beta = 50 \times 10^{-9}$, (dotted dashed black line)$\beta = 100 \times 10^{-9}$

in Eq.(6) is obtained as

$$U_R = 1 + S_{bin}(\frac{1-|A(t)|^2}{2}) - S_{bin}(\frac{|A(t)|^2}{2}) + \max\{0, \delta\}, \tag{29}$$

where $S_{bin}(x) = -x\log_2 x - (1-x)\log_2(1-x)$ and

$$\begin{aligned}\delta &= -\frac{1}{2} - \frac{1-\eta}{2}\log_2(\frac{1-\eta}{4}) - \frac{1+\eta}{2}\log_2(\frac{1+\eta}{4}) \\ &- \frac{|A(t)|^2}{2}\log_2\frac{|A(t)|^2}{2} - \frac{1-|A(t)|^2}{2}\log_2\frac{1-|A(t)|^2}{2} \\ &- S_{bin}(\frac{1-|A(t)|^2}{2}) - S_{bin}(\frac{|A(t)|^2}{2}),\end{aligned} \tag{30}$$

with $\eta = \sqrt{1-|A(t)|^2+|A(t)|^4}$.

In Fig. (2), the lower bound of QMA-EUR, U_R is shown as a function of time in non-Markovian regime $\lambda = 0.01\gamma_0$ for different value of the quantum memory speed β inside a leaky cavity. From Fig. (2), one can see because of the interaction between moving quantum memory and leaky cavity, EULB is increased through time . It is obvious that the lower bound decreases by increasing the speed of the quantum memory B. In Fig. (3), U_R is represented as a function of time in Markovian regime $\lambda = 3\gamma_0$ for different value of the quantum memory speed β . From Fig. (3), it is obvioused that U_R is increased over time, while it is decreased by increasing the speed of the quantum memory.

Bell diagonal state: As the second example, we consider the set of two-qubit states with the maximally mixed marginal states

$$\rho^{AB_i} = p|\psi^-\rangle\langle\psi^-| + \frac{1-p}{2}(|\psi^+\rangle\langle\psi^+| + |\phi^+\rangle\langle\phi^+|), \tag{31}$$

where $p \in [0,1]$ and $|\phi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle]$ and $|\psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle]$ are the Bell diagonal states. We supposed that the quantum memory B moves inside leaky cavity, while Alice particle does not change. We consider the Bell diagonal state with $p = 1/2$. The dynamic of the prepared Bell diagonal state is given by

$$\rho_{AB} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{11}^t & 0 & 0 & \rho_{14}^t \\ 0 & \rho_{22}^t & \rho_{23}^t & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{32}^t & \rho_{33}^t & 0 \\ \rho_{41}^t & 0 & 0 & \rho_{44}^t \end{pmatrix} \tag{32}$$

with

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{11}^t &= \frac{1+p}{4}|A(t)|^2, \quad \rho_{14}^t = \frac{1-p}{2}|A(t)| \\ \rho_{22}^t &= \frac{1-p}{4} + \frac{1+p}{4}\left(1-|A(t)|^2\right), \quad \rho_{23}^t = \frac{1-3p}{2}A(t) \\ \rho_{33}^t &= \frac{1}{4}(1-p)|A(t)|^2, \quad \rho_{44}^t = \frac{1+p}{4} + \frac{1}{4}(1-p)\left(1-|A(t)|^2\right).\end{aligned}$$

Now, Alice and Bob reach an agreement on measurement of two observables $\hat{\sigma_x}$ and $\hat{\sigma_z}$. The lower bound of QMA-EUR in Eq.(6) is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}U_R &= 1 - (a_- - b)\log_2(a_- - b) - (a_+ - b)\log_2(z_+ - b) \\ &- (a_- + b)\log_2(a_- + b) - (a_+ + b)\log_2(a_+ + b) \\ &+ \max\{0, \delta\} - S_{bin}(\frac{|A(t)|^2}{2}),\end{aligned} \tag{33}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned}a_\pm &= (2 \pm |A(t)|^2)/2, \\ b &= (\sqrt{1-|A(t)|^2+|A(t)|^4})/4,\end{aligned} \tag{34}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}\delta &= (a_- - b)\log_2(a_- - b) + (a_+ - b)\log_2(a_+ - b) \\ &+ (a_- + b)\log_2(a_- + b) + (a_+ + b)\log_2(a_+ + b) \\ &- S_{bin}(\frac{|A(t)|^2}{2}) + S(\rho_{\hat{\sigma_z}B}) + S(\rho_{\hat{\sigma_x}B}).\end{aligned} \tag{35}$$




Figure 4: Entropic uncertainty lower bound with moving quantum memory inside a leaky cavity for different value of the speed of quantum memory in non-Markovian regime $\lambda = 0.01\gamma_0$ and $\omega_0 = \omega_n = 1.53GHz$, for Bell diagonal prepared state with $p = 1/2$. (Solid blue line)$\beta = 0$, (dashed green line)$\beta = 0.05 \times 10^{-9}$, (dotted red line)$\beta = 0.1 \times 10^{-9}$, (dotted dashed black line)$\beta = 0.3 \times 10^{-9}$.




Figure 5: Entropic uncertainty lower bound with moving quantum memory inside a leaky cavity for different value of the speed of quantum memory in Markovian regime $\lambda = 3\gamma_0$ and $\omega_0 = \omega_n = 1.53GHz$, for Bell diagonal prepared state with $p = 1/2$. (Solid blue line)$\beta = 0$, (dashed green line)$\beta = 10 \times 10^{-9}$, (dotted red line)$\beta = 50 \times 10^{-9}$, (dotted dashed black line)$\beta = 100 \times 10^{-9}$.

with post measurement von Neumann entropies as

$$
\begin{aligned}
S(\rho_{\hat{\sigma_x}B}) &= -\frac{|A(t)|^2}{2}\log_2\frac{|A(t)|^2}{4} \\
&- \frac{2-|A(t)|^2}{2}\log_2\frac{2-|A(t)|^2}{4}, \\
S(\rho_{\hat{\sigma_z}B}) &= -\frac{|A(t)|^2}{8}\log_2\frac{|A(t)|^2}{8} - \frac{3|A(t)|^2}{8}\log_2\frac{3|A(t)|^2}{8} \\
&- \frac{4-3|A(t)|^2}{8}\log_2\frac{4-3|A(t)|^2}{8} \\
&- \frac{4-|A(t)|^2}{8}\log_2\frac{4-|A(t)|^2}{8}, \qquad (36)
\end{aligned}
$$

In Fig. (4), the lower bound of QMA-EUR, U_R is shown as a function of time for prepared Bell diagonal state in non-Markovian regime $\lambda = 0.01\gamma_0$ for different value of the quantum memory speed β inside a leaky cavity. From Fig. (4), one can see because of the interaction between moving quantum memory and leaky cavity, EULB is increased through time . It is obvious that the lower bound decreases by increasing the speed of the quantum memory B. In Fig. (3), U_R is represented as a function of time in Markovian regime $\lambda = 3\gamma_0$ for different value of the quantum memory speed β . From Fig. (4), it is obvioused that U_R is increased over time, while it is decreased by increasing the speed of the quantum memory.

IV. CONCLUSION

In this work we have studied the lower bound of QMA-EUR for the case in which the quantum memory part moves inside the leaky cavity. As it is expected the lower bound of QMA-EUR increases due to the interaction between quantum memory and leaky cavity. As it has been shown, the the lower bound of QMA-EUR can be improve by increasing the speed of the quantum memory inside the leaky cavity.

[1] W. Heisenberg , Z. Phys.,43 173 (1927).
[2] E. H. Kennard, Z. Phys.,44 326 (1927).
[3] H.P. Robertson : The uncertainty principle. Phys. Rev. 34, 163 (1929).
[4] E. Schrödinger, : About Heisenberg uncertainty relation. Proc. Pruss. Acad. Sci. XIX, 296 (1930).
[5] K. Kraus, Phys. Rev. D 35, 3070 (1987).
[6] H. Maassen and J. B. M. Uffink, Phys. Rev. Lett. 60, 1103 (1988).
[7] M. Berta,M. Christandl, R. Colbeck, J.M. Renes, andR.Renner, Nat. Phys. 6, 659 (2010).
[8] Y. Huang, Phys. Rev. A 82, 012335 (2010).
[9] R. Prevedel, D. R. Hamel, R. Colbeck, K. Fisher and K. J. Resch, Nature Phys. 7, 757 (2011).
[10] L. Chuan-Feng, J.-S.Xu, X.-Y.Xu, K. Li and G.-C.Guo, Nature Phys. 7, 752 (2011).
[11] M. Tomamichel, C. C. W. Lim, N. Gisin and R. Renner, Nature Commun. 3, 634 (2012).
[12] N. H. Y. Ng, M. Berta and S. Wehner, Phys. Rev. A 86, 042315 (2012).
[13] A. K. Pati, M. M.Wilde, A. R. Usha Devi, A. K. Rajagopal and Sudha, Phys. Rev. A 86, 042105 (2012).
[14] T. Pramanik, P. Chowdhury, and A. S. Majumdar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 110, 020402 (2013).
[15] P. J. Coles and M. Piani, Phys. Rev. A 89, 022112 (2014).
[16] S. Liu, L.-Z. Mu, H. Fan, Phys. Rev. A 91, 042133 (2015).
[17] J. Zhang, Y. Zhang and C-s. Yu, Sci Rep. 5, 11701 (2015).
[18] T. Pramanik, S. Mal and A. S. Majumdar, Quantum Inf. Process. 15, 981 (2016).
[19] F. Adabi, S. Salimi, S. Haseli, Phy. Rev. A 93 (6), 062123 (2016).
[20] F. Adabi, S. Salimi, S. Haseli,EPL (Europhysics Letters) 115

(6), 60004 (2016).
[21] H Dolatkhah, S Haseli, S Salimi, SA Khorashad, Quant. Inf. Process. 18:13 (2019).
[22] Jin-Long Huang,Wen-Cong Gan, Yunlong Xiao, Fu-Wen Shu, Man-Hong Yung, Eur. Phys. J. C 78, 545(2018).
[23] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, The Theory of Open Quantum
[24] J. Zhang, L. Liu and Y. Han, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **57**, 2523 (2018).
[25] H. M. Zou and M. F. Fang, Chin. Phys. Lett. **33**, 070307 (2016).
[26] G. Karpat, J. Piilo and S. Maniscalco, EPL **111**, 50006 (2015).
[27] D. Wang, A. J. Huang, R. D. Hoehn, F. Ming, W. Y. Sun, J. D. Shi, L. Ye and Sabre Kais, Sci. Rep. **7**, 1066 (2017).
[28] D. Wang, F. Ming, A. J. Huang, W. Y. Sun and L. Ye, Laser Phys. Lett. **14**, 095204 (2017).
[29] Y. Zhang, M. Fang, G. Kang and Q. Zhou, Quant. Inf. Process. **17**, 62 (2018).
[30] Z. Huang and H. Situ, Quant. Inf. Process. **18**, 38 (2019).
[31] J. L. Huang, W. C. Gan, Y. Xiao, F. Wen Shu and M. H. Yung, Eur. Phys. J. C **78**, 545 (2018).
[32] D. Wang, W.-Nan Shi, R. D. Hoehn, F. Ming, Quant. Inf. Process. **17**, 335 (2018).
[33] G. Q. Zhang and J. B. Xu, Journal of the Opt. Soc. of America B Vol. 36, Issue 2, 205-214 (2019).
[34] P. F. Chen, L. Ye and D. Wang, Eur. Phys. J. D **73**, 108 (2019).
[35] S. Haseli and F. Ahmadi, Eur. Phys. J. D **73**, 65 (2019).
[36] J.-Q. Li, L. Bai and J.-Q. Liang, Quant. Inf. Process. **17**, 206 (2018).
[37] X.-M. Bai, N.-T. Xue, N. Liu, J.-Q. Li and J.-Q. Liang, Ann. Phys. (Berlin) **531**, 1900098 (2019).
[38] M. L. Hu and H. Fan, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 032338 (2012).
[39] M. N. Chen, D. Wang and L. Ye, Phys. Lett. A **383**, 977 (2019). Systems (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2007)
[40] S. Haseli, H. Dolatkhah, S. Salimi and A. S. Khorashad, Laser Phys. Lett. **16**, 045207 (2019).
[41] S. Haseli, F. Ahmadi, arXiv:1911.0305
[42] Y. L. Zhang, M. F. Fang, G. D. Kang and Q. P. Zhou, Int. J. Quant. Inf. Process. **13**, 1550037 (2015).
[43] S. H. Ho, S. P. Chao, C. H. Chou and F. L. Lin, New J. Phys. **16**, 113062 (2014).
[44] R. Lang, M. O. Scully, and W. E. Lamb, Phys. Rev. A 7, 1788 (1973).
[45] J. Gea-Banacloche, N. Lu, L. M. Pedrotti, S. Prasad, M. O. Scully, and K. Wodkiewicz, Phys. Rev. A 41, 369 (1990).
[46] C. Leonardi and A. Vaglica, Opt. Commun. 97, 130 (1993).
[47] A. Mortezapour, M. Borji, and R. Lo Franco, Laser Phys. Lett. 14, 055201 (2017).
[48] A. Mortezapour, M. Ahmadi Borji, D. Park, R. L. Franco, Open Systems & Information Dynamics Vol. 24, No. 3 1740006 (2017).