

# Quantum Coherence Versus Non-Classical Correlations in Optomechanics

Y. Lahlou<sup>a1</sup>, M. Amazioug<sup>b,c2</sup>, J. El Qars<sup>c,d3</sup>, N. Habiballah<sup>c,d,e4</sup>, M. Daoud<sup>e,f5</sup> and M. Nassik<sup>c6</sup>,

<sup>a</sup>*LPHE-MS, Department of Physics, Faculty of Sciences, Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco*

<sup>b</sup>*Ecole Normale Supérieure, Mohammed V University, Rabat, Morocco*

<sup>c</sup>*EPTHE, Department of Physics, Faculty of Sciences, Ibn Zohr University, Agadir, Morocco*

<sup>d</sup>*Faculty of Applied Sciences, Ibn Zohr University, Ait-Melloul, Morocco*

<sup>e</sup>*Abdus Salam International Centre for Theoretical Physics, Strada Costiera, 11, 34151 Trieste, Italy*

<sup>f</sup>*Department of Physics, Faculty of Sciences, University Ibn Tofail, Kenitra, Morocco*

## Abstract

Coherence arises from the superposition principle, where it plays a central role in quantum mechanics. In [Phys.Rev.Lett.114,210401(2015)], it has been shown that the freezing phenomenon of quantum correlations beyond entanglement, is intimately related to the freezing of quantum coherence (QC). In this paper, we compare the behaviour of entanglement and quantum discord with quantum coherence in two different subsystems (optical and mechanical). We use respectively the entanglement of formation (EoF) and the Gaussian quantum discord (GQD) to quantify entanglement and quantum discord. Under thermal noise and optomechanical coupling effects, we show that EoF, GQD and QC behave in the same way. Remarkably, when entanglement vanishes, GQD and QC remain almost unaffected by thermal noise, keeping non zero values even for high temperature, which is in concordance with [Phys.Rev.Lett.114,210401(2015)]. Also, we find that the coherence associated with the optical subsystem are more robust against thermal noise than those of the mechanical subsystem. Our results confirm that optomechanical cavities constitute a powerful resource of QC.

---

<sup>1</sup>email: youness\_lahlou@um5.ac.ma

<sup>2</sup>email: amazioug@gmail.com

<sup>3</sup>email: j.elqars@gmail.com

<sup>4</sup>email: n.habiballah@uiz.ac.ma

<sup>5</sup>email: m\_daoud@hotmail.com

<sup>6</sup>email: m.nassik@uiz.ac.ma

# 1 Introduction

Quantum coherence (QC) is one of the most important features of quantum physics [1, 2]. Such non-classical property is more fundamental than entanglement, where it arises due to the superposition principle [3]. Unlike quantum correlations (e.g., entanglement [4], quantum discord [5] and quantum steering [6]), QC can appear among multi-partite systems as well as in single-partite systems [7].

In the last decades, many works have been shown that QC can constitute an important resource for quantum information tasks [8]. We cite for instance, quantum teleportation [9], quantum error correction [10], quantum cryptography [11] and quantum dense coding [12].

In the Ref [7], it has been established a rigorous framework for quantifying QC in finite dimensional quantum states, while, in the Ref [13] a framework for quantifying QC in Gaussian states has been provided based on the relative entropy [4].

On the other hand, QC has long been considered as the border between the quantum and classical worlds [14]. Nowadays, it has been shown that entanglement is also an important ingredient for several quantum information tasks [15]. In general, a system of two or more subsystems is qualified entangled, when non-separable quantum correlations are sharing between the different subsystems. In other words, a quantum state describing two or more subsystems is said to be entangled, if cannot be mathematically written as a simple product of the quantum states associated with the different subsystems [4].

Because of their theoretical as well as experimental interest in quantum information processing, many efforts have been accomplished to quantify entanglement in Gaussian states [4]. In this sense, miscellaneous computable entanglement quantifiers for two-mode Gaussian states (TMGS) were proposed, e.g., the logarithmic negativity [16], the Gaussian Renyi-2 entanglement [17], and the entanglement of formation [18].

Notice here that such measures cannot capture globally the non-classical feature of the state under investigation [5]. Indeed, it was proven that some separable states (unentangled states) which reach a certain level of mixture might also present non-zero quantum correlations, i.e., quantumness of correlations [19]. In this context, Gaussian quantum discord has been initially proposed as an approach to quantify quantum correlations mainly in Gaussian separable states [20]. Later, other measure of quantumness of correlations in TMGS were proposed, e.g., the Gaussian geometric discord [21], the operational Gaussian Discord [22], the Gaussian Hellinger distance [23], and the Gaussian Renyi-2 discord [24].

We emphasize that the concept of quantum discord has aroused great interest as a resource which is more robust than entanglement versus the decoherence phenomenon [5], offering exponential speed up of certain computational algorithms [19].

In this paper, we give a comparative study under influence of thermal noise and optomechanical coupling between quantum coherence, entanglement and quantum discord as three indicators of non-classicality in a double-cavity optomechanical system. For this, we focus

our attention into two bi-mode Gaussian states. The first(second) one is composed by two mixed mechanical(optical) modes or equivalently to a mechanical(optical) subsystem. Quantum optomechanics studies inside an optomechanical cavity the interactions between mechanical degrees of freedom and optical modes via radiation pressure effect [24]. With recent progresses in micro-fabrication techniques, it is possible actually to generate and test various impressive quantum effects using optomechanical setups. Proposals include cooling a mechanical mode near its ground state [25, 26], generation of quantum superposition [27], realizing entanglement between mechanical and/or optical modes [28, 29], quantum state transfer [30], creation of massive quantum superpositions or so-called Schrodinger's cat states [31] and gravitational wave detection [32].

The article is organized as follows. In Sec. 2, we describe our optomechanical model and we derive the Heisenberg-Langevin equations governing the dynamics of the system under study. In Sec. 3, we linearize these equations, while in Sec. 4, we obtain the explicit formula of the covariance matrix describing four-mode Gaussian state. In Sec. 5, we discuss three indicators of non-classicality in two different subsystems (mechanical and optical), and we compare them under influence of thermal noise and optomechanical coupling. Finally, a conclusion closes the paper.

## 2 Model




Figure 1: A double-cavity optomechanical system pumped by squeezed light and driven by coherent laser sources.

In Fig. 1, we consider two Fabry-Perot cavities coupled to a common two-mode squeezed light, where each cavity is composed by a fixed mirror (partially transmitting) and a movable mirror (labeled  $M_P = 1, 2$ ) perfectly reflecting. The mass and the frequency of the  $p$ th movable mirror are respectively  $\mu_p$  and  $\omega_{M_p}$ . The  $p$ th cavity receives a single mode of the input squeezed vacuum

light, and pumped by coherent laser field. Moreover, the  $p$ th intra-cavity field is coupled to its corresponding movable mirror via radiation pressure, with coupling rate  $g_p = \frac{\omega_{ap}}{L_p} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{\mu_p \omega_{M_p}}}$  [24], where  $\omega_{ap}(L_p)$  is the frequency(length) of the  $p$ th cavity.

In a frame rotating with frequency  $\omega_{L_p}$ , the Hamiltonian of the system is given by [33]

$$\mathcal{H}/\hbar = \sum_{p=1}^2 \left[ \omega_{M_p} b_p^\dagger b_p + (\omega_{ap} - \omega_{L_p}) a_p^\dagger a_p + g_p a_p^\dagger a_p (b_p^\dagger + b_p) + (a_p^\dagger \varepsilon_p e^{i\phi_p} + a_p \varepsilon_p e^{-i\phi_p}) \right] \quad (1)$$

where  $\phi_p$  and  $\varepsilon_p = \sqrt{\frac{2\kappa_p \mathcal{P}_p}{\hbar \omega_{L_p}}}$  ( $p = 1, 2$ ) are respectively the phase and the strength of the  $p$ th input coherent field, and  $\kappa_p$  is the cavity decay rate. Moreover,  $\mathcal{P}_p(\omega_{L_p})$  is the drive pump power(the frequency) of  $p$ th input laser field. The movable mirrors are considered as quantum harmonic oscillators with annihilation and creation operators  $b_p$  and  $b_p^\dagger$ , with  $[b_p, b_p^\dagger] = 1$  ( $p = 1, 2$ ). On the other hand,  $a_p$  and  $a_p^\dagger$  are the annihilation and creation operators of the  $p$ th cavity mode, with  $[a_p, a_p^\dagger] = 1$  ( $p = 1, 2$ ). Considering equ(1), the non-linear quantum Langevin equations describing the dynamics of the movable mirrors as well as the optical modes are written as [34] :

$$\dot{b}_p = - \left( i\omega_{M_p} + \frac{\gamma_p}{2} \right) b_p - ig_p a_p^\dagger a_p + \sqrt{\gamma_p} b_p^{in} \quad (2)$$

$$\dot{a}_p = - \left( \frac{\kappa_p}{2} - i\Delta_p \right) a_p - ig_p a_p (b_p^\dagger + b_p) - i\varepsilon_p e^{i\phi_p} + \sqrt{\kappa_p} a_p^{in} \quad (3)$$

where  $\Delta_p$  and  $\Delta_p = \omega_{L_p} - \omega_{ap}$  are respectively the mechanical damping rate and the laser detuning ( $p = 1, 2$ ).  $b_p^{in}$  is the  $p$ th noise operator describing the coupling between the  $p$ th mechanical mode and its own environment, whereas,  $a_p^{in}$  is the squeezed vacuum operator acting on the  $p$ th optical cavity mode.

For a large value of the mechanical quality factor  $\mathcal{Q}_p = \omega_{M_p}/\gamma_p \gg 1$  the mechanical baths can be considered as Markovian [35]. So, assumed this, we have the non-zero correlation relations [35, 36]

$$\langle b_p^{in}(\omega) b_p^{in+}(\omega') \rangle = (n_{th_p} + 1) \delta(\omega + \omega') \quad (4)$$

$$\langle b_p^{in+}(\omega) b_p^{in}(\omega') \rangle = n_{th_p} \delta(\omega + \omega') \quad (5)$$

where  $n_{th_p} = \left[ \exp \left( \frac{\hbar \omega_{M_p}}{k_B T_p} \right) - 1 \right]^{-1}$  is the mean phonons number of the  $p$ th thermal bath with temperature  $T_p$ .  $k_B$  is the Boltzmann constant. The squeezed vacuum operator  $a_p^{in}$  has the following non-zero correlations properties [37]

$$\langle a_p^{in}(\omega) a_p^{in+}(\omega') \rangle = (N + 1) \delta(\omega + \omega'), p \in \{1, 2\} \quad (6)$$

$$\langle a_p^{in+}(\omega) a_p^{in}(\omega') \rangle = N \delta(\omega + \omega'), p \in \{1, 2\} \quad (7)$$

$$\langle a_q^{in}(\omega) a_p^{in+}(\omega') \rangle = M \delta(\omega + \omega' - 2\omega_M), q \neq p \in \{1, 2\} \quad (8)$$

$$\langle a_q^{in+}(\omega) a_p^{in}(\omega') \rangle = M \delta(\omega + \omega' + 2\omega_M), q \neq p \in \{1, 2\} \quad (9)$$

where  $\mathcal{N} = \sinh^2 r$ ,  $\mathcal{M} = \sinh r \cosh r$  with  $r$  is the squeezing parameter.

### 3 Linearization of quantum Langevin equations

The non-linear quantum Langevin equations (2)-(3) are in general non solvable analytically. In this way, we use the scheme of linearization given in Ref. [38], i.e., we write each operator as follows

$$b_p = \bar{b}_p + \delta b_p \quad ; \quad a_p = \bar{a}_p + \delta a_p \quad (10)$$

where  $\delta b_p$  and  $\delta a_p$  are the operators of fluctuations.  $\bar{b}_p$  and  $\bar{a}_p$  are respectively the mean values of the operators  $b_p$  and  $a_p$ . Considering Eqs. (2)-(3) in their steady state, one can obtain :

$$\bar{a}_p = \frac{-i\varepsilon_p e^{i\phi_p}}{\frac{\kappa_p}{2} - i\Delta'_p} \quad ; \quad \bar{a}_p = \frac{-ig_p |\bar{a}_p|^2}{\frac{\gamma_p}{2} - i\omega_{M_p}} \quad (11)$$

where  $\Delta'_p = \Delta_p - g_p (\bar{b}_p + \bar{b}_p^*)$  is the effective cavity detuning which depends on the displacement of the mirrors due to the radiation pressure force [24]. Replacing (10) in Eqs. (2) and (3), thus we have

$$\delta \dot{b}_p = - \left( i\omega_{M_p} + \frac{\gamma_p}{2} \right) \delta b_p + \mathcal{G}_p (\delta a_p - \delta a_p^+) + \sqrt{\gamma_p} b_p^{in} \quad (12)$$

$$\delta \dot{a}_p = - \left( \frac{\kappa_p}{2} - i\Delta'_p \right) \delta a_p - \mathcal{G}_p (\delta b_p^+ + \delta b_p) + \sqrt{\kappa_p} a_p^{in} \quad (13)$$

where  $\mathcal{G}_p = g_p |\bar{a}_p|$  is the  $p$ th effective optomechanical coupling [24].  $\phi_p$  is an arbitrary phase of the  $p$ th input laser, which can be chosen to be  $\phi_p = -\arctan\left(\frac{2\Delta'_p}{\kappa_p}\right)$  and therefore  $\bar{a}_p = -i |\bar{a}_p|$  [39]. Using the notations  $\delta a_p(t) = \delta \tilde{a}_p(t) e^{i\Delta'_p t}$ ,  $\delta b_p(t) = \delta \tilde{b}_p(t) e^{-i\omega_{M_p} t}$ ,  $\tilde{a}_p^{in} = e^{-i\Delta'_p t} a_p^{in}$  and  $\tilde{b}_p^{in} = e^{i\omega_{M_p} t} b_p^{in}$ , the equations (12) and (13) became

$$\dot{\delta \tilde{b}_p} = -\frac{\gamma_p}{2} \delta \tilde{b}_p + \mathcal{G}_p \left( \delta \tilde{a}_p e^{i(\Delta'_p + \omega_{M_p})t} - \delta \tilde{a}_p^+ e^{-i(\Delta'_p - \omega_{M_p})t} \right) + \sqrt{\gamma_p} \tilde{b}_p^{in} \quad (14)$$

$$\dot{\delta \tilde{a}_p} = -\frac{\kappa_p}{2} \delta \tilde{a}_p - \mathcal{G}_p \left( \delta \tilde{b}_p^+ e^{-i(\Delta'_p - \omega_{M_p})t} + \delta \tilde{b}_p e^{-i(\Delta'_p + \omega_{M_p})t} \right) + \sqrt{\kappa_p} \tilde{a}_p^{in} \quad (15)$$

Next, using the rotating wave approximation (RWA) [24, 30] (i.e.  $\omega_{M_p} \gg \kappa_p$  with  $p = 1; 2$ ), the effective cavity detuning is reduced to  $\Delta'_p \approx \Delta_p$ , and one can neglect the terms rotating at  $\pm 2\omega_{M_p}$ . In addition, when the cavity is driven at the red sideband ( $\Delta'_p = -\omega_{M_p}$  with  $p = 1; 2$ ), the equations (14) and (15) can be written

$$\begin{pmatrix} \dot{\delta \tilde{b}_p} \\ \dot{\delta \tilde{a}_p} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{\gamma_p}{2} & \mathcal{G}_p \\ -\frac{\kappa_p}{2} & -\mathcal{G}_p \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} \delta \tilde{b}_p \\ \delta \tilde{a}_p \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{\gamma_p} \tilde{b}_p^{in} \\ \sqrt{\kappa_p} \tilde{a}_p^{in} \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

Finally, from Eq. (16) and using the Fourier transform, one can obtain

$$\delta \tilde{b}_p(\omega) = -\frac{\mathcal{G}_p}{b(\omega)} \sqrt{\gamma_p} \tilde{b}_p^{in}(\omega) + \frac{(\frac{\gamma_p}{2} + i\omega)}{b(\omega)} \sqrt{\kappa_p} \tilde{a}_p^{in}(\omega) \quad (17)$$

$$\delta \tilde{a}_p(\omega) = \frac{(\frac{\gamma_p}{2} + i\omega)}{\xi_p(\omega)} \sqrt{\gamma_p} \tilde{b}_p^{in}(\omega) + \frac{\mathcal{G}_p}{\xi_p(\omega)} \sqrt{\kappa_p} \tilde{a}_p^{in}(\omega) \quad (18)$$

where  $\xi_p(\omega) = \mathcal{G}_p^2 + (\frac{\gamma_p}{2} + i\omega)(\frac{\kappa_p}{2} + i\omega)$

## 4 Steady state covariance matrix

The linear quantum Langevin equations allow us to deduce the covariance matrix (CM) that describes the evolution of steady states of the system [4, 41]. Therefore, this allows us to characterize the non-classical behaviour between the various pairwise modes using different quantifiers of quantum correlations.

For the sake of simplicity, we consider two identical cavities driven by two identical coherent laser sources, and identical thermal baths. So,  $\mu_{1,2} = \mu$ ,  $\omega_{a1,2} = \omega_a$ ,  $\omega_{M1,2} = \omega_M$ ,  $\kappa_{1,2} = \kappa$  and  $\gamma_{1,2} = \gamma$  and  $T_1 = T_2 = T$  ( $n\hbar_{1,2} = n\hbar$ ), etc. To derive the explicit formula of the CM describing the whole system, we consider the EPR-type quadrature operators  $\delta\tilde{X}_{j_p}$  and  $\delta\tilde{Y}_{j_p}$  ( $j = m(o)$ ) for the mechanical(optical) subsystem defined by [39]

$$\delta\tilde{X}_{m_p} = \frac{\delta\tilde{b}_p^+ + \delta\tilde{b}_p}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \delta\tilde{Y}_{m_p} = \frac{\delta\tilde{b}_p - \delta\tilde{b}_p^+}{i\sqrt{2}}; \quad p = 1, 2 \quad (19)$$

$$\delta\tilde{X}_{o_p} = \frac{\delta\tilde{a}_p^+ + \delta\tilde{a}_p}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad \delta\tilde{Y}_{o_p} = \frac{\delta\tilde{a}_p - \delta\tilde{a}_p^+}{i\sqrt{2}}; \quad p = 1, 2 \quad (20)$$

The CM-elements of the system in the steady state, are given by [37]

$$\mathcal{V}_{ii'} = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} \int_{-\infty}^{+\infty} d\omega d\omega' e^{-i(\omega+\omega')t} \mathcal{V}_{ii'}(\omega, \omega') \quad (21)$$

where the frequency-domain correlation function between the elements  $i$  and  $i'$  of the vector  $U^T(t) = (\delta\tilde{X}_{m_1}, \delta\tilde{Y}_{m_1}, \delta\tilde{X}_{m_2}, \delta\tilde{Y}_{m_2}, \delta\tilde{X}_{o_1}, \delta\tilde{Y}_{o_1}, \delta\tilde{X}_{o_2}, \delta\tilde{Y}_{o_2})$  are defined by [4]

$$\mathcal{V}_{ii'} = \frac{1}{2} \langle \{U_i(\omega), U_{i'}(\omega')\} \rangle \quad \text{for } i, i' = 1; \dots; 8 \quad (22)$$

After some algebra, we finally obtain

$$\mathcal{V} = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_1 & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{13} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{15} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{17} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{V}_1 & 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{13} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{15} & 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{17} \\ \mathcal{V}_{13} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_1 & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{17} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{15} & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{13} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_1 & 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{17} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{15} \\ \mathcal{V}_{15} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{17} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_2 & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{57} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{V}_{15} & 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{17} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_2 & 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{57} \\ \mathcal{V}_{17} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{15} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{57} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{17} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{15} & 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{57} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (23)$$

The sub-covariance matrix of the mechanical(optical) subsystem labeled  $\mathcal{V}_m$  ( $\mathcal{V}_o$ ) can be obtained considering the global covariance matrix given by Eq. (23), where

$$\mathcal{V}_m = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_1 & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{13} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{V}_1 & 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{13} \\ \mathcal{V}_{13} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_1 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{13} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_1 \end{pmatrix} ; \quad \mathcal{V}_o = \begin{pmatrix} \mathcal{V}_2 & 0 & \mathcal{V}_{57} & 0 \\ 0 & \mathcal{V}_2 & 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{57} \\ \mathcal{V}_{57} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_2 & 0 \\ 0 & -\mathcal{V}_{57} & 0 & \mathcal{V}_2 \end{pmatrix} \quad (24)$$

with

$$\mathcal{V}_1 = \frac{\kappa C \cosh(2r) + (1 + 2n_{th})(\kappa + \gamma + \gamma C)}{2(\kappa + \gamma)(1 + C)} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{V}_{13} = \frac{\kappa C \sinh(2r)}{2(\kappa + \gamma)(1 + C)} \quad (25)$$

$$\mathcal{V}_2 = \frac{(\kappa + \gamma + \kappa C) \cosh(2r) + (1 + 2n_{th})\gamma C}{2(\kappa + \gamma)(1 + C)} \quad ; \quad \mathcal{V}_{57} = \frac{(\kappa + \gamma + \kappa C) \sinh(2r)}{2(\kappa + \gamma)(1 + C)} \quad (26)$$

where  $C$  is the optomechanical cooperativity given by [24]

$$C = \frac{4G}{\gamma\kappa} = \frac{8\omega_a^2}{\mu\gamma\omega_M\omega_L L^2} \frac{P}{\left[\left(\frac{\kappa}{2}\right)^2 + \omega_M^2\right]} \quad (27)$$

The matrices  $V_m$  and  $V_o$  given by Eq. (24) correspond to two-mode symmetric squeezed thermal states [4], and thus can be written in the following form

$$\mathcal{V}_j = \begin{pmatrix} s_j & 0 & k_j & 0 \\ 0 & s_j & 0 & -k_j \\ k_j & 0 & s_j & 0 \\ 0 & -k_j & 0 & s_j \end{pmatrix} \equiv \begin{pmatrix} s_{j_1} & k_{j_1 j_2} \\ k_{j_1 j_2} & s_{j_2} \end{pmatrix} \quad for \quad j \in \{o, m\} \quad (28)$$

where the index  $j_1(j_2)$  represents the first(second) mechanical mode (for  $j = m$ ) or the first(second) optical mode (for  $j = o$ ).  $S_{j_1} = S_{j_2} = diag(s_j, s_j)$  are the sub-matrices describing the first and second modes in the considered subsystem, while the correlations between them are described by the submatrix  $K_{j_1 j_2} = diag(k_j, -k_j)$ . For the mechanical subsystem  $j \equiv m$  ( $s_m = \mathcal{V}_1$  and  $k_m = \mathcal{V}_{13}$ ); while, for the optical one  $j \equiv o$  ( $s_o = \mathcal{V}_2$  and  $k_o = \mathcal{V}_{57}$ ). Notice that using Eq. (28), we can investigate various quantities (i.e., quantum coherence, entanglement and quantum discord) witnessing the non-classical behaviour of the mechanical and optical subsystems.

## 5 Quantum coherence vs quantum correlations

### 5.1 Gaussian quantum coherence

Coherence arises from the superposition principle, where it is responsible of many important quantum effects such as entanglement and other types of quantum correlations [1]. In the Ref [7], it has been established a rigorous framework for quantifying the coherence of finite dimensional quantum states, while, in [13] a framework for quantifying coherence of Gaussian states has been provided. A state  $\rho$  (of discrete or continuous variables) is said to be incoherent if it is diagonal when it expressed in a fixed orthonormal basis [13]. A quantum map is called incoherent operation (ICPTP) if it is completely positive, trace-preserving, and maps any incoherent states into incoherent states. For the case of Gaussian states, the necessary conditions that any coherence measure (labeled  $\mathcal{C}$ ) should satisfy are

i)  $\mathcal{C}(\rho) \geq 0$  and  $\mathcal{C}(\rho) = 0$  iff  $\rho \in \mathcal{I}$ , where  $\mathcal{I}$  denotes the set of all incoherent states.



ii) the measure  $\mathcal{C}$  is monotone under all incoherent completely positive and trace-preserving (ICPTP) maps, i.e.,  $\mathcal{C}(\rho) \geq \mathcal{C}(ICPTP(\rho))$ .

For any one-mode Gaussian state  $\rho$  with the block matrix  $\mathcal{S}_{j_p} = \text{diag}(s_j, s_j)$  for  $p = 1, 2$  and  $j \in \{o, m\}$ , a coherence measure is defined as

$$C(\rho) = \inf_{\delta} \{S(\rho \parallel \delta), \quad \delta \text{ is an incoherent state}\} \quad (29)$$

where  $S(\rho \parallel \delta) = \text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho) - \text{tr}(\rho \ln \delta)$ ; is the relative entropy,  $\inf$  runs over all incoherent Gaussian states. The entropy  $S(\rho) = -\text{tr}(\rho \ln \rho)$  of  $\rho$  and  $\inf [\text{tr}(\rho \ln \delta)]$  are given by [13, 42]

$$S(\rho) = f(\eta_{j_p}) \quad (30)$$

$$\inf [\text{tr}(\rho \ln \delta)] = (\bar{n}_{j_p} + 1) \ln(\bar{n}_{j_p} + 1) - \bar{n}_{j_p} \ln \bar{n}_{j_p} \quad (31)$$

where  $n_{j_p} = \sqrt{\det \mathcal{S}_{j_p}}$ ,  $\bar{n}_{j_p} = \frac{1}{2}(s_j - 1)$  (for  $p = 1, 2$  and  $j \in \{o, m\}$ ) and the function  $f(x)$  is defined by

$$f(x) = \left(x + \frac{1}{2}\right) \ln \left(x + \frac{1}{2}\right) - \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right) \ln \left(x - \frac{1}{2}\right) \quad (32)$$

Similar to the one-mode case, Eqs.(30)-(31) can be generalized into multi-mode Gaussian states. So, for the simple case of symmetric two-mode Gaussian state  $\rho(\mathcal{V}_j)$  with covariance matrix  $(\mathcal{V}_j)$  (Eq. 28) a coherence measure is defined as [13]

$$C^j(\rho) = -\sum_{p=1}^2 f(\eta_{j_p}) + \sum_{p=1}^2 [(\bar{n}_{j_p} + 1) \ln(\bar{n}_{j_p} + 1) - \bar{n}_{j_p} \ln \bar{n}_{j_p}] \quad \text{for } j \in \{o, m\} \quad (33)$$

where  $\{\eta_{j_p}\}_{p=1}^2 = \{\eta_{j,+}, \eta_{j,-}\}$  are the set of symplectic eigenvalues of the CM  $\mathcal{V}_j$  (Eq. 28) [43], and  $\bar{n}_{j_p} = \frac{1}{2}(s_j - 1)$  is determined by the  $p$ th-mode covariance matrix  $s_{j_p}$ . Moreover, using explicit expressions of  $\eta_{j,+}, \eta_{j,-}$  given by [44]

$$\eta_{j,\pm} = \sqrt{\frac{\Delta_j \pm \sqrt{\Delta_j^2 - 4 \det \mathcal{V}_j}}{2}} \quad (34)$$

coherence of the optical(mechanical) sub-system  $\mathcal{C}^o(\mathcal{C}^m)$  can be quantified as [13]

$$C^j = -f(\eta_{j,+}) - f(\eta_{j,-}) + 2f(s_j) \quad \text{for } j \in \{o, m\} \quad (35)$$

where  $\Delta_j = \det \mathcal{S}_{j_1} + \det \mathcal{S}_{j_2} + 2 \det \mathcal{K}_{j_1 j_2}$  and the function  $f$  is defined by Eq. (32).

## 5.2 Entanglement of formation

A convenient and useful way to quantify entanglement in continuous variables systems is by means of the entanglement of formation (EoF) [9]. It quantifies the minimal amount of entanglement, which is needed in order to prepare the state by mixing pure entangled states [18]. It is defined as [18]

$$E_F(\rho) = \inf \left\{ \sum p_k E(|\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k|) \mid \rho = \sum p_k |\psi_k\rangle \langle \psi_k| \right\} \quad (36)$$



where  $E(|\psi_k\rangle\langle\psi_k|)$  is the amount of entanglement of the pure bipartite state  $|\psi_k\rangle$ .

Eq. (36) corresponds to an infimum over all (possibly continuous) convex decompositions of the state into pure states with respective entanglement  $E(\psi) = S(\text{tr}_B[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|])$ , where  $S(X) = -\text{tr}(X \log X)$  is the von Neumann entropy. In general, the derivation of an explicit expression of the EoF for arbitrary states is not a trivial task even for special quantum states. However, analytical expressions of the EoF have been obtained in a few finite-dimensional cases [4]. We cite for instance, two qubit states [45], isotropic states [46], and Werner states [47]. For continuous variable states, and particularly for symmetric two-mode Gaussian states, EoF has been evaluated [18, 48]. With symmetric CM  $\mathcal{V}_j$  (Eq. 28), the EoF can be written as [18, 48]

$$E_F^j = \begin{cases} f\left(\frac{\tilde{\theta}_{j,-}^2 + 1/4}{2\tilde{\theta}_{j,-}^2}\right) & \text{iff } \tilde{\theta}_{j,-} < 1/2 \\ 0 & \text{iff } \tilde{\theta}_{j,-} > 1/2 \end{cases} \quad \text{for } j \in \{o, m\} \quad (37)$$

where  $f(x)$  is defined by Eq. (32), and  $\tilde{\theta}_{j,-}$  is the minimum symplectic eigenvalue of the partially transposed CM given by [44]

$$\tilde{\theta}_{j,-} = \sqrt{\frac{\tilde{\Delta}_j - \sqrt{\tilde{\Delta}_j^2 - 4 \det \mathcal{V}_j}}{2}} \quad (38)$$

$$\tilde{\Delta}_j = \det \mathcal{S}_{j_1} + \det \mathcal{S}_{j_2} - 2 \det \mathcal{K}_{j_1 j_2}.$$

### 5.3 Gaussian quantum discord

In the previous subsection, we presented the entanglement of formation as a measure of non-separable quantum correlations those can be captured in the two considered Gaussian subsystems. Here, we present the Gaussian quantum discord as a general measure of quantum correlations that can be nonzero even in separable states (i.e, when EoF is zero). For two-mode Gaussian state describing by the covariance matrix (28), the GQD of the considered bi-mode subsystems is given by [20]

$$D^j = f\left(\sqrt{\det \mathcal{V}_j}\right) - f(\eta_{j,+}) - f(\eta_{j,-}) + f(\Phi_j) \quad (39)$$

where the function  $f$  and the symplectic eigenvalues  $\eta_{j,\pm}$  are respectively given by Eq. (32) and Eq. (34), while,  $\Phi_j$  is defined by [20]

$$\Phi_j = \frac{\sqrt{\det \mathcal{S}_{j_1}} + 2 \det \mathcal{S}_{j_1} + 2 \det \mathcal{K}_{j_1 j_2}}{1 + 2\sqrt{\det \mathcal{S}_{j_1}}} = \frac{s_j + 2s_j^2 - 2k_j^2}{1 + 2s_j} \quad (40)$$

where the elements  $s_j$  and  $k_j$  are defined from Eq. (28).

## 5.4 Results and Discussion

Fig. 2 shows that for a fixed value of the squeezing parameter  $r$ , the entanglement of formation EoF, the Gaussian quantum discord GQD and quantum coherence QC of the two mechanical modes as well as the two optical modes decrease with increasing of the mean thermal phonons number  $n_{th}$ , meaning that the temperature degrades the quantum feature of the two studied subsystems. In addition, Fig. 2 shows that under thermal noise, both mechanical and optical entanglement decay rapidly to zero comparing with the GQD and QC. In particular, we remark




Figure 2: EoF(green line), GQD(blue line) and QC(red line) versus the thermal phonons number  $n_{th}$  for two values of the squeezing  $r$ . [(a)-(b)] and [(c)-(d)] correspond respectively to the mechanical and optical subsystems. We used  $C = 34$  and  $\gamma/\kappa = 0.05$ .

that the mechanical entanglement (Figs. 2(a)-2(b)) is more affected by thermal noise than the optical one (Figs. 2(c)-2(d)). Interestingly, Fig. 2 shows that beyond entanglement (i.e., when EoF=0), GQD and QC undergo a *frozen behaviour* versus the temperature effect. Indeed, GQD and QC in the two considered subsystems decrease monotonically when the temperature increases. On the other hand, when entanglement is completely vanishes, the GQD and QC still persist and remain almost constantreaching an asymptotic regimeeven for high values of the mean thermal phonons number  $n_{th}$  (i.e., high temperature) [49]. More importantly, Fig. 2 reveals a very important behaviour of the GQD and QC under thermal noise. Moreover, in both mechanical and optical subsystems, the GQD and QC corresponding to the entangled states have a tendency to decrease drastically under the temperature effect. On the other hand,

the GQD and QC associated with the unentangled states show a robust behaviour, i.e., they decrease asymptotically, remaining almost constant (*frozen*) even for high values of the mean thermal phonons number  $n_{th}$ . We emphasize here that such remarkable cadence corresponding to the freezing phenomenon of GQD and QC beyond entanglement, is completely in concordance with the physical interpretation given in [19, 49]. Furthermore, comparing Fig. 2(a) with Fig. 2(c); and Fig. 2(b) with Fig. 2(d), we remark that under thermal effect, quantum coherence measured in the optical subsystem are important than those measured in the mechanical subsystem. Here, the explanation is that the optical subsystem is influenced by the zero-point




Figure 3: EoF(green line), GQD(blue line) and QC(red line) versus the the optomechanical cooperativity  $C$  for two values of  $n_{th}$ . [(a)-(b)] and [(c)-(d)] correspond respectively to the mechanical and optical subsystems. We used  $r = 1.5$  and  $\gamma/\kappa = 0.05$ .

fluctuation from the vacuum environment. In contrast, the mechanical subsystem is influenced by the thermal noise of its bath. So, this justify the fact that the two optical modes which are in a much more coherent environment than the two mechanical modes, must have a larger amount of coherence [41].

Next, fixing the squeezing parameter as  $r = 1.5$ , Fig. 3 shows the dependence of the EoF, GQD and QC of the considered subsystems on the optomechanical cooperativity  $C$  for two different values of the mean phonons number ( $n_{th} = 1$ ;  $n_{th} = 2$ ). Remarkably, unlike the optical entanglement illustrated in Figs. 3(c)-3(d), Figs. 3(a)-3(b) show that the condition  $C \neq 0$  is necessary to create entanglement between the two mechanical resonators. In addition, Fig. 3 shows that under the same circumstances, EoF, GQD and GQC of the two optical modes

behave in opposite way comparing with those of the two mechanical modes. Indeed, for a fixed value of the mean thermal phonons number  $n_{th}$ , we remark that when the optomechanical cooperativity  $C$  increases, the mechanical EoF, GQD and GQC increase (Figs. 3(a)-3(b)), whereas, the optical EoF, GQD and GQC decrease (Figs. 3(c)-3(d)). This can be interpreted as quantum coherence transfer from the optical subsystem to the mechanical subsystem (i.e., light to matter quantum coherence transfer).

Finally, as can be seen from Figs. 2-3, in both mechanical and optical subsystems, GQD and QC are always non zero even in the regions where EoF is zero. So, on the one hand, non zero GQD in separable states witnesses the presence of *quantumness of correlations* in such states. On the other hand, non zero QC in these states traduces the non-classical feature of the two considered subsystems without entanglement.

## 6 Conclusions

In this work, we have compared the behaviour of entanglement and quantum discord with quantum coherence in two different bipartite systems. The first one is composed by two mixed mechanical modes, while the second is constituted by two mixed optical modes. We used respectively the entanglement of formation EoF and the standard Gaussian quantum discord GQD to quantify entanglement and quantum discord. To quantify quantum coherence QC, we have employed the Gaussian quantum coherence measure proposed in [13]. Essentially, we have interested by the influence of the thermal noise and the optomechanical coupling on the three studied measures.

In the two considered subsystems, we showed that EoF suffers more than GQD and QC against thermal noise, where it vanishes rapidly with increasing of the temperature. In particular, EoF of the two optical modes is found more robust than the mechanical EoF. This makes optical modes useful for quantum information processing, mainly in dissipative and noisy environments.

Especially, beyond entanglement (i.e., when EoF is zero), it has been found that the behaviour of the GQD follows "uniformly" that of QC. Indeed, both GQD and QC show a resistive behaviour against thermal noise, where they decrease asymptotically with increasing of the mean thermal phonons number  $n_{th}$ . Moreover, they remain almost constant without vanishing even for high values of  $n_{th}$ , which corresponds to a *frozen behaviour*.

Interestingly enough, all the obtained results show that the amount of GQD and EoF can never exceed that of QC, meaning that quantum coherence are a resource of non-classical correlations.

Our work constitutes a contribution in optomechanics of the mean result that carried out in the Ref. [49] i.e., beyond entanglement, freezing quantum discord and quantum coherence are two phenomena those can not be separated each to other. In addition, this work may contribute to the understanding of the non-classical behaviour of optomechanical systems in

dissipative-noisy environments. This is very interesting for several applications in quantum information processing and communication.

## References

- [1] A. Streltsov, G. Adesso, M. B. Plenio, Rev. Mod. Phys. **89**, 041003 (2017).
- [2] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, K. Horodecki, Rev. Mod. Phys. **81**, 865 (2009).
- [3] R. Lo Franco, G. Compagno, Sci. Rep. **6**, 20603 (2016); R. Lo Franco, B. Bellomo, S. Maniscalco, G. Compagno, Int. J. Mod. Phys. B **27**, 1345053 (2013).
- [4] G. Adesso, Entanglement of Gaussian states, PhD thesis, University of Salerno (2007).
- [5] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017901 (2001); L. Henderson and V. Vedral, J. Phys. A **34**, 6899 (2001).
- [6] A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. **47**, 777 (1935); E. Schrodinger, Math. Proc. Cambridge Philos. Soc. **31**, 555 (1935).
- [7] T. Baumgratz, M. Cramer, and M. B. Plenio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 140401 (2014).
- [8] I. A. Silva, A. M. Souza, T. R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, R. Marx, R. S. Sarthour, I. S. Oliveira, R. Lo Franco, S. J. Glaser, E. R. deAzevedo, D. O. Soares-Pinto, G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 160402 (2016).
- [9] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Josza, A. Peres, W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [10] M. B. Plenio, V. Vedral, P. L. Knight, Phys. Rev. A **55**, 67 (1997).
- [11] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. **67**, 661 (1991).
- [12] C. H. Bennett, S. J. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. **69**, 2881 (1992).
- [13] J. Xu, Phys. Rev. A **93**, 032111 (2016).
- [14] S. D. Du, L. W. Zhou, Z. Z. Xu, W. Q. Zhang and Y. Li, J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys. **31**, 4895 (1998).
- [15] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
- [16] G. Vidal and R.F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 032314 (2002); G. Adesso et al, Phys. Rev. A **70**, 022318 (2004).

- [17] G. Adesso, D. Girolami and A. Sera ni, Phys. Rev. Lett. **109**, 190502 (2012).
- [18] G. Giedke, M. M. Wolf, O. Kruger, R. F. Werner and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 107901 (2003);
- [19] K. Modi, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 1655 (2012).
- [20] G. Adesso and A. Datta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 030501 (2010); P. Giorda and M. G. A. Paris, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 020503 (2010).
- [21] G. Adesso, D. Girolami. Int. J. Quantum Inform. **09**, 1773 (2011).
- [22] S.R.-Keshari, T.C. Ralph, and C.M. Caves. *New J. Phys.* **17**, 063037 (2015).
- [23] P. Marian, T. A. Marian, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical. **48**, 115301 (2015).
- [24] M. Aspelmeyer, T. J. Kippenberg, and F. Marquardt, Rev. Mod. Phys. **86**, 1391 (2014).
- [25] J. Teufel, T. Donner, D. Li, J. Harlow, M. Allman, K. Cicak, A. Sirois, J. Whittaker, K. Lehnert, and R. Simmonds, Nature **475**, 359 (2011).
- [26] M. Bhattacharya and P. Meystre, Phys.Rev. Lett. **99** 073601(2007).
- [27] J. Q. Liao and L. Tian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 163602 (2016).
- [28] S. Mancini, V. Giovannetti, D. Vitali, and P. Tombesi, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 120401 (2002).
- [29] D. Vitali, S. Gigan, A. Ferreira, H. R. Bohm, P. Tombesi, A. Guerreiro, V. Vedral, A. Zeilinger, and M. Aspelmeyer, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98** (2007) 030405.
- [30] J. Zhang , K. Peng and S. L. Braunstein. Phys. Rev. A **68**, 013808 (2003).
- [31] S. Bose , K. Jacobs and P. L. Knight. Phys. Rev. A **59**, 3204 (1999); Marshall W, C. Simon, R. Penrose and D. Bouwmeester, Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 130401 (2003).
- [32] P. Verlot, A. Tavernarakis, T. Briant, P.-F. Cohadon, and A. Heidmann, Phys. Rev. Lett **102**, 103601 (2009).
- [33] C. K. Law, Phys. Rev. A **51**, 2537 (1995).
- [34] Y.-D. Wang and A. A. Clerk, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 153603 (2012).
- [35] R. Benguria, and M. Kac, Phys. Rev. Lett, **46**, 1 (1981).
- [36] V. Giovannetti and D. Vitali, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 023812 (2001).
- [37] L. Mazzola and M. Paternostro, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 062335 (2011).



- [38] E. A. Sete, H. Eleuch, and S. Das, Phys. Rev. A **84**, 053817 (2011).
- [39] E. A. Sete, H. Eleuch, and C. H. R. Ooi, J. Opt. Soc. Am. B **31**, 2821 (2014).
- [40] Y. D. Wang, S. Chesi and A. A. Clerk, Phys. Rev. A **91**, 013807 (2015).
- [41] W. P. Bowen and G. J. Milburn, Quantum Optomechanics, Boca Raton, (2015).
- [42] C. S. Withers Bull. Austral. Math. Soc. **32**, 103 (1985).
- [43] C. Weedbrook, S. Pirandola, R. García-Patrón, N. J. Cerf, T. C. Ralph, J. H. Shapiro, and S. Lloyd, Rev. Mod. Phys. **84**, 621 (2012).
- [44] S. Olivares, Eur. Phys. J. Special Topics **203**, 3 (2012).
- [45] W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. **80**, 2245 (1998).
- [46] Barbara M. Terhal and K. G. H. Vollbrecht, Phys. Rev. Lett. **85**, 2625 (2000).
- [47] K. G. H. Vollbrecht and R. F. Werner, Phys. Rev. A **64**, 062307 (2001).
- [48] P. Marian and T. A. Marian, Phys. Rev. Lett. **101**, 220403 (2008).
- [49] T.R. Bromley, M. Cianciaruso, G. Adesso, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 210401 (2015).