Detection of unbroken phase of non-Hermitian system via Hermitian factorization surface

Leela Ganesh Chandra Lakkaraju, Aditi Sen(De)
Quantum Information and Computation Group, Harish-Chandra Research Institute,
HBNI, Chhatnag Road, Jhunsi, Allahabad 211 019, India

In the traditional quantum theory, one-dimensional quantum spin models possess a factorization surface where the ground states are fully separable having vanishing bipartite as well as multipartite entanglement. We report that in the non-Hermitian counterpart of these models, these factorization surfaces either can predict the exceptional points where the unbroken to the broken transition occurs or can guarantee the reality of the spectrum, thereby proposing a procedure to reveal the unbroken phase. We first analytically demonstrate it for the nearest-neighbor rotation-time (RT)-symmetric XY model with uniform and alternating transverse magnetic fields, referred as iATXY model. Exact diagonalization techniques are then employed to establish this fact for the RT-symmetric XYZ model with short- and long-range interactions as well as for the variable-ranged iATXY model. Moreover, we show that although the factorization surface prescribes the unbroken phase of the non-Hermitian model, the bipartite nearest-neighbor entanglement at the exceptional point is non-vanishing.

I. INTRODUCTION

Over the years, studying phenomena and properties of one-dimensional short-ranged quantum spin models in presence of magnetic fields have created lots of interest [1, 2] since several such Hamiltonians can be mapped to spinless fermions [3] or hard-core bosons [4], thereby ensuring the analytical study of the single-, two- or multi-site features. Moreover, they can be simulated in laboratories with physical substrates like ultracold atoms [5], nuclear magnetic resonances [6–8], ion traps [9]. Apart from investigating phenomena like quantum phase transitions at zero-temperature, quantum dynamical transition in evolution, these systems are shown to be potential candidates for designing quantum technologies [10–13]. Moreover, these models also possess a factorization surface or volume in the parameter space, [14–20] at which the ground state is doubly degenerate and is fully separable, having vanishing bipartite as well as multipartite entanglement [21].

On the other hand, in the seminal paper by Bender and Boettcher [22], it was shown that non-Hermitian Hamiltonian having both parity and time reversal symmetry, (together called PT-symmetry), can have real and positive energy spectrum while the breaking of symmetry leads to the complex eigenenergy and the phase transition from symmetry broken to an unbroken phase occurs at the exceptional point. These results simulate a significant amount of research to characterize non-Hermitian quantum theory, both theoretically and experimentally, especially in optics [23], cold atoms [24], cavities [25, 26]. In this respect, discrete systems like tight binding model, quantum spin systems, specifically, one-dimensional quantum XY models turn out to be important platforms to verify the properties in non-Hermitian Hamiltonian [27–36]. It was also noticed that instead of PT-symmetry, linear rotation operator, R, which rotates each spin by a certain amount around a fixed axis, along with time reversal operator (T) can together prompt non-Hermiticity in the quantum spin models [37]. Specifically, it was shown that the nearest-neighbor transverse XY model with imaginary anisotropy parameter has RT-symmetry and undergoes a transition from the unbroken phase to a broken one which can again be detected via the existence of reality of spectrum to imaginary ones. Both in non-Hermitian fermionic and bosonic systems [38], Berry curvature, [39], multipartite entanglement [40] are used to describe the broken-to-unbroken transitions.

In the current work, we first investigate the one-dimensional (1D) RT-symmetric nearest-neighbor XY model in presence of uniform as well as alternating magnetic fields [41] which we call as iATXY model. The Hermitian version of this model possesses a richer phase diagram than that of the transverse XY model. In particular, it has paramagnetic-II (PM-II) phase having a high amount of bipartite entanglement along with antiferromagnetic (ferromagnetic), and paramagnetic-I phases [42, 43]. Moreover, like the XY model, it can also be diagonalized by Jordan-Wigner, Fourier, and Bogoliubov transformations [1, 37, 44–46]. By employing similar transformations in the non-Hermitian case, we report that the exceptional points which divide the real and imaginary spectrum can be inferred by the factorization surface of the corresponding Hermitian Hamiltonian. The finite-size exact diagonalization calculations also confirm this result, thereby motivating us to consider quantum spin models which cannot be solved analytically.

Towards establishing the relation between the broken to the unbroken transition of the non-Hermitian model and the factorization surface of the Hermitian counterpart, we study both nearest-neighbor and variable-ranged RT-symmetric XYZ model as well as iATXY model with long-range interactions. In all these systems, numerical simulations strongly suggest that the unbroken phase of the RT-symmetric models can be identified by the corresponding Hermitian factorization surface. Specifically, we find that the energy spectrum is
real at and above the surface predicted via the factorization surface of the Hermitian Hamiltonian, thereby providing a sufficient condition for the reality of the spectrum. Interestingly, we observe that at the surface, the bipartite nearest neighbor entanglement of the \( iATXY \) model is nonvanishing.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we discuss the way to diagonalize pseudo-Hermitian \( iATXY \) model while the broken to unbroken transition identified via factorization surface of the corresponding Hermitian model is presented in Sec. III. In the next section (Sec. IV), we confirm the sufficient condition predicted by the factorization surface by considering nearest-neighbor \( RT \)-symmetric XYZ model. In Sub-Sec. IVB, the procedure of detecting the unbroken phase for both the models with variable-range interactions having \( RT \) symmetry is provided. The behavior of bipartite entanglement in the transition surface of the \( iATXY \) model is described in Sec. V while we conclude in Sec. VI.

II. PSEUDO-HERMITIAN \( iATXY \) MODEL

Let us first consider the pseudo-Hermitian one-dimensional nearest-neighbor \( XY \) model with imaginary anisotropy factor in presence of uniform and alternating transverse magnetic field. The Hamiltonian reads as

\[
\hat{H}_{iATXY} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left[ \frac{1 + i\gamma}{4} \sigma_i^{x} \sigma_{i+1}^{x} + \frac{1 - i\gamma}{4} \sigma_i^{y} \sigma_{i+1}^{y} \right] + \frac{h_1}{2} \sigma_i^{z},
\]

where \( J \neq 0 \) is the coupling constant, \( \sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z \) are Pauli matrices, and \( i\gamma \) is the imaginary anisotropy parameter while \( h_1 - h_2 \) and \( h_1 + h_2 \) are the strengths of magnetic fields on odd and even spins respectively. We also assume periodic boundary condition throughout the paper, i.e., \( \sigma_{N+1} = \sigma_1 \). Like the XY model with uniform field [37], we will show that the non-Hermitian \( \hat{H}_{iATXY} \) with \( RT \) symmetry has real spectrum in the unbroken phase where \( \mathcal{R} \) is the application of \( \frac{\pi}{2} \) rotation about the \( z \) axis, given by \( \mathcal{R} \equiv e^{-i(\pi/4) \sum_{i} \sigma_i^y} \), and the time reversal, \( \mathcal{T} \), is the complex conjugation in case of finite dimensional systems while the complex eigenenergy is found in the broken phase. The Hamiltonian is not individually invariant under either \( \mathcal{R} \) or \( \mathcal{T} \) operators but when combined, the Hamiltonian is invariant under \( \mathcal{RT} \), i.e., \([H, \mathcal{RT}] = 0\). As shown in Ref. [37], the effects of \( \mathcal{RT} \) symmetry is similar to that of \( \mathcal{PT} \) symmetry. In particular, the Hamiltonian always commutes with \( \mathcal{RT} \), although \( H \) and \( \mathcal{RT} \) do not always share the same eigenvectors due to the anti-linearity of \( \mathcal{T} \), which leads to the parametric dependence to have a real spectrum.

A. Energy spectrum of \( iATXY \) model

By performing Jordan-Wigner transformation followed by a Fourier transform of the fermionic operators, the \( iATXY \) model in Eq. (1) can be diagonalized by employing the similar procedure as Hermitian \( ATXY \) model [42, 43, 47–49]. First, let us convert \( H_{iATXY} \) in terms of \( \sigma^+ \) and \( \sigma^- \) operators where \( \sigma^x = \frac{\sigma^+ \sigma^-}{2} \), \( \sigma^y = \frac{i(\sigma^+ + \sigma^-)}{2} \) and \( \sigma^z = \sigma^+ \sigma^- - \frac{1}{2} \). The Jordan-Wigner transformation

\[
\hat{\sigma}^+_{2j} = \hat{\sigma}^x_{2j} \exp \left( i\pi \sum_{j=1}^{N} \hat{\sigma}^z_{2j} \right)
\]

maps the system into a 1D two-component Fermi gas, where the even and odd sites correspond to fermions, following the fermionic commutation rules, governed by \( \gamma \) and \( \delta \) respectively. The corresponding Hamiltonian takes the form as

\[
\hat{H}_{iATXY} = \sum_{i=1}^{N/2} \left[ \left\{ \hat{\chi}_i + \hat{\gamma}_i \right\} + i\gamma \left( \hat{\chi}_i + \hat{\gamma}_i \right) \right] + h_0 \mathcal{N}_i^0 + h_c \mathcal{N}_i^1,
\]

where \( \hat{\chi}_i = \hat{\sigma}^z_{2i-1} \hat{\sigma}^x_{2i} + h.c. \), \( \hat{\gamma}_i = \hat{\sigma}^z_{2i} \hat{\sigma}^x_{2i-1} + h.c. \), \( \hat{\chi}_i = \hat{\sigma}^z_{2i-1} \hat{\sigma}^x_{2i} + h.c. \), and \( \mathcal{N}_i = \hat{\sigma}^z_{2i-1} \hat{\sigma}^x_{2i} + h.c. \). Here the number of odd and even fermions are given by the \( \mathcal{N}_i^0 = \delta^z_{2i-1} \delta^x_{2i} \) with the field \( \lambda_0 = (h_1 - h_2)/J \) and \( \mathcal{N}_i^1 = \delta^z_{2i} \delta^x_{2i-1} \) with the field \( \lambda_c = 2(h_1 + h_2)/J \). We set \( h_1/J = \lambda_0, i = 1, 2 \). Using Fourier transformations, given by

\[
\delta^z_{2j+1} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{N}} \sum_{p=-N/4}^{N/4} \exp [i(2j + 1)p] \delta^z_p,
\]

\[
\delta^x_{2j} = \sqrt{\frac{2}{N}} \sum_{p=-N/4}^{N/4} \exp [i(2j)p] \delta^x_p,
\]

where \( \phi_p = 2\pi Np \), the Hamiltonian can be written in the Fourier basis as \( \hat{S}^z \), the Hamiltonian can be written in the Fourier basis as \( \hat{S}^z \), as

\[
H_{iATXY} = \sum_{k} H_{iATXY}^{k} = \sum_{k} (\hat{S}^z)^\dagger \hat{H}_{iATXY}^{k} \hat{S}^z.
\]

Here \( H_{iATXY}^{k} \) reads as

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\lambda_1 + \cos k & -\gamma \sin k & 0 & -\lambda_2 \\
\gamma \sin k & -\lambda_1 - \cos k & -\lambda_2 & 0 \\
0 & \lambda_2 & \cos k - \lambda_1 & -\gamma \sin k \\
-\lambda_2 & 0 & \gamma \sin k & -\cos k + \lambda_1 \\
\end{bmatrix}
\]

Diagonalizing \( H_{iATXY}^{k} \) gives the single-particle energy spectrum of the model in each \( k \) subspace in terms of
It turns out that the value of \( k \) found numerically (the value of \( \lambda_1 \) at which the spectrum becomes real) and the predicted value, \( \lambda_4 \) (according to (8)) are fixed in each plot as mentioned at the top. The difference decreases with the increase of system-sizes (\( N = 6, 8 \) and 10 are chosen to show convergence). Both the axes are dimensionless.

\[
\lambda_i, \ (i = 1, 2) \text{ and } \gamma \text{ as }
\]

\[
E_{\pm}^k = \left[ \lambda_1^2 + \lambda_2^2 + \cos^2 k - \gamma^2 \sin^2 k \pm 2\sqrt{\lambda_1^2 \lambda_2^2 + h_1^2 \cos^2 k + \lambda_2^2 \gamma^2 \sin^2 k} \right]^{1/2},
\]

which finally leads to the energy spectrum of the model and hence can be used for obtaining the exceptional points, dividing the regions of broken and unbroken phases in the iATXY model.

### III. BROKEN-UNBROKEN TRANSITION OF QUANTUM iATXY MODEL AT FACTORIZATION SURFACE OF THE HERMITIAN MODEL

After obtaining energy for each momentum space, \( k \), let us concentrate on the transition from broken to unbroken phase. In other words, in the unbroken phase, the spectrum becomes real if the same set of eigenvectors spans both \( H \) and \( RT \). This observation is not possible since \( \gamma > 0 \). Hence the transition from broken to unbroken phase happens when \( \lambda_1 = \sqrt{1 + \lambda_2^2 + \gamma^2} \). Notice that for the uniform XY model, i.e., when \( \lambda_2 = 0 \), the eigenvalues go from real to complex pairs when \( \lambda_1 \geq \sqrt{1 + \gamma^2} \) as found in Ref. [37]. Notice also that \( E^k_+ \) does not lead to any useful condition in terms of \( \lambda_1, \lambda_2 \) and \( \gamma \).

Apart from quantum critical points, the Hermitian ATXY model possess a special point (surface) known as the factorization surface [14, 41, 50], denoted by \( \Lambda^{f}_{I(H)} \), which can be represented as

\[
\Lambda^{f}_{I(H)} = \sqrt{1 + \lambda_2^2 - \gamma^2}
\]

in the parameter space. At this surface, the ground state is doubly degenerate and fully separable, having vanishing bipartite as well as multipartite entanglement.

If we now replace \( \gamma \) by \( i\gamma \) in Eq. (9), we recover the first condition of having real spectrum of the iATXY model given in (8). We denote the right hand side of (8) as \( \Lambda^{f}_1 \). It suggests that the symmetry-broken phase to the unbroken phase of the \( RT \)-symmetric Hamiltonian can be identified by the factorization surface of the corresponding Hermitian Hamiltonian.

Therefore, we propose the following: if the Hermitian Hamiltonian has a factorization surface, \( \Lambda^{f}_{I(H)}(\eta, \eta', \ldots) \), which is specified by the parameters of the Hamiltonian, \( \eta, \eta', \ldots \), the corresponding \( RT \)-symmetric
Hamiltonian possess real eigenvalues when \( \Lambda \geq \Lambda'(i\eta, i\eta', \ldots) \) where some parameters can be complex for preserving the symmetry of the Hamiltonian.

Since \( iATXY \) model can be solved analytically, we are able to derive the transition surface analytically. The above interesting observation can give us an important tool for detecting the phases of the non-Hermitian models, especially those models which cannot be solved analytically. In the rest of the paper, we demonstrate that the known factorization surface of the Hermitian model can indeed give the sufficient condition for the non-Hermitian nearest-neighbor \( iXYZ \) model with imaginary anisotropy parameter and also variable-ranged \( iATXY \) models. All these models have \( R \bar{T} \) symmetry although they cannot be solved analytically. As mentioned before, we apply exact diagonalization tool to diagonalize the pseudo-Hermitian Hamiltonian and find the parameter space in which the eigenvalues are real.

A. \( iXYZ \) model: Numerical vs. prediction

where \( \hat{\Lambda} \) is the strength of the interaction in the \( z \)-plane and other parameters are same as in \( \hat{H}_{ATXY} \). Here we set \( \Lambda = \hat{\Lambda}/J \) and \( \lambda = h/J \). It can be easy to find that \([\hat{H}_{iXYZ}, R\bar{T}] = 0 \). Since we cannot diagonalize this Hamiltonian analytically, let us follow the prescription mentioned above to find the parametric condition for which the Hamiltonian has real eigenvalues. In this case, the factorization surface of the Hermitian XYZ model \([15]\) is known to be

\[
\lambda^f_{(H)} = \sqrt{(1 + \Delta)^2 - \gamma^2}. \tag{11}
\]

We propose that the spectrum becomes real when the magnetic field satisfies the condition given by

\[
\lambda \geq \lambda^d \equiv \sqrt{(1 + \Delta)^2 + \gamma^2}. \tag{12}
\]

For a given \( \gamma \) and \( \Delta \), we numerically find the actual \( \lambda^d \) for which all eigenvalues are real. In Fig. 2, for three different values of \( \gamma \), the difference between the detected magnetic value \( \lambda^d \) and the predicted value, \( \lambda^f \), according to (12) are plotted. We observe that with the increase of \( N, (\lambda^d - \lambda^f) \) are of the order of \( \pm 0.05 \) where the step size of \( \Delta \) is also considered to be 0.05. As shown in the case of \( iATXY \) model, we can also report here that the prediction and the numerical values are in a good agreement, thereby certifying the prescription proposed to find the reality of the spectrum.

B. Pseudo-Hermitian model with long-range interactions

Upto now, all the spin models that we discussed have the nearest-neighbor interactions and we show that the unbroken to broken transition can faithfully be detected via the factorization surface of the respective Hermitian model. Let us now move to \( iATXY \) as well as \( iXYZ \) models having variable-range interactions and exhibit whether the sufficient condition of identifying reality of the spectrum still remains valid or not. It is important to note here that the long ranged models are more natural to occur in experiments \([56-62]\) and restricting interactions to just nearest neighbors is a tedious task in laboratories. Hence a more experimental-friendly model is the one where the strength of the interactions decreases as the distance between the neighbors increases. We now carry out our analysis with this kind of models.
having \( RT \) symmetry. In order to build the long ranged model with \( RT \) symmetry, we realize that other than the anisotropy strength involved in the interactions of the \( xy \)-plane, we should not add imaginary terms in \( \Delta \) or \( \lambda_2 \) since they fail to keep the symmetry.

1. \( iATXY \) model with variable-range interactions

Consider the \( iATXY \) model with long-range interactions, given by

\[
\hat{H}_{iATXY}^L = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\substack{i+j \neq \gamma \neq 0}} I_{ij} \left[ \frac{1 + i\gamma}{4} \sigma_i^x \sigma_j^x + \frac{1 - i\gamma}{4} \sigma_i^y \sigma_j^y \right] \\
+ \frac{\hbar_1 + (-1)^i \hbar_2}{2} \sigma_i^z,
\]

where the parameters except \( I_{ij} \) have the same features as in \( H_{iATXY} \) in Eq. (1). Here we consider power-law interactions, i.e., \( I_{ij} = \frac{1}{|i-j|^{\alpha}} \), where \( \alpha \) dictates how fast the interaction falls off with distance. For example, a very high a value essentially imitates a nearest neighbor model while a low value corresponds to the situation when all of the spins are interacting with every other spin.

In this case, the factorization surface \([17, 18, 63]\) are given to be

\[
\lambda_{1(i)}^{f}(\alpha) = \sqrt{1 + \lambda_2^2 - \eta^2} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \frac{1}{|i-j|^{\alpha}},
\]

and hence according to our recipe, the spectrum of \( \hat{H}_{iATXY}^L \) is real when

\[
\lambda_1^f \geq \lambda_{1(i)}^{f}(\alpha) \equiv \sqrt{1 + \lambda_2^2 + \gamma^2} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \frac{1}{|i-j|^{\alpha}}.
\]

By performing exact diagonalization of \( \hat{H}_{iATXY}^L \) for different system sizes, we uncover that for a fixed \( \lambda_2 \), the difference between our prediction and the value of \( \lambda_1^f \) at which then entire spectrum becomes real is not exactly zero. The reason behind such an observation is that the spectrum starts becoming real for some range of \( \lambda_1^f \) and then again becomes imaginary, thereby creating a difficult situation for finding the exact transition point. However, when we start looking at and above \( \lambda_1^f (\alpha = 1) \), we find that the eigenvalues always remain real. To ensure it, in steps of 0.05, we check from the predicted \( \lambda_1^f (\alpha = 1) \) to \( \lambda_1^f (\alpha = 1) + 5.0 \) and confirm that in all of 100 points, the spectrum is real for a given \( \lambda_2 \).

Thus, as prescribed, \( \lambda_{1(i)}^{f}(\alpha) \) of the Hermitian model can suitably predict \( \lambda_1^f \) which provides a sufficient condition for the unbroken phase of the pseudo-Hermitian model.

2. Long-range \( iXYZ \) model: Sufficient condition for unbroken phase

Let us now analyze the \( RT \)-symmetric \( iXYZ \) model when it is fully connected according to the power-law decay, represented as

\[
\hat{H}_{iXYZ} = \sum_{i,j} \sum_{\substack{i+j \neq \gamma \neq 0}} I_{ij} \left[ \frac{1 + i\gamma}{4} \sigma_i^x \sigma_j^x + \frac{1 - i\gamma}{4} \sigma_i^y \sigma_j^y + \frac{\Delta}{2} \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z \right] \\
+ \frac{\hbar_1}{2} \sigma_i^z,
\]

where \( I_{ij} \) behave similarly as in Eq. (13). The factorization surface of the corresponding Hermitian model reads as

\[
\lambda_{1(i)}^{f}(\alpha) = \sqrt{(1 + \Delta)^2 + \gamma^2} \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \frac{1}{|i-j|^{\alpha}},
\]
which suggests that the point at which the eigenvalues of $H_{iXYZ}$ become real is

$$\lambda(\alpha) \geq \lambda^s(\alpha) = \sqrt{(1 + \Delta)^2 + \gamma^2 \sum_{j=i+1}^{N} \frac{1}{|i-j|^s}}.$$  (18)

Like the long-range $iATXY$ model, for a given $\Delta$, finding $\lambda(\alpha)$ at which the spectrum becomes completely real, is hard to find numerically. However, we apply the similar method as before, i.e., by fixing $\Delta$ and varying $\lambda(\alpha)$ with $\alpha = 1$ in the range $[\lambda^s(\alpha), \lambda^s(\alpha) + 5.0]$, we observe that the eigenenergies are always real in that range, thereby confirming the sufficient condition for detecting unbroken phase.

V. TRENDS OF BIPARTITE ENTANGLEMENT AT THE UNBROKEN PHASE

We know that the factorization point in Hermitian systems corresponds to a completely factorised ground state of the form $|\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |\psi_N\rangle$ having vanishing entanglement in all bipartitions. Let us examine the trends of entanglement at the surface where the broken to unbroken transition occurs in the $iATXY$ model. In particular, we find that when we replace $\gamma$ by $i\gamma$, the exceptional point, $\lambda_1$ is indeed not a factorization surface. We observe that the nearest-neighbor entanglement, $E_{12}$, of the reduced bipartite state obtained from ground state is nonvanishing at the exceptional surface given in (8) as depicted in Fig. 3. Notice that due to translational symmetry of the model, any two-party nearest-neighbor state is same and hence we calculate logarithmic negativity [64, 65] of $\rho_{12}$ which is obtained after tracing out all the parties except the first and the second parties. The results possibly indicate that introducing $RT$-symmetry in the system is another way to generate entanglement in the factorization surfaces (cf. [14]).

VI. CONCLUSION

We found that factorization points of Hermitian quantum spin models dictate exceptional points for the corresponding rotation-time ($RT$)-symmetric non-Hermitian Hamiltonians. For demonstration, we analytically proved that the exceptional points of the non-Hermitian XY model with uniform and alternating transverse magnetic fields ($iATXY$ model) matches with the expression of the factorization surface of the nearest neighbor $ATXY$ model when the anisotropy parameter of the $ATXY$ model is replaced by the imaginary one. Following this prescription, we were able to predict and numerically verify the exceptional points of the nearest-neighbor $iXYZ$ model. Other possible $RT$-symmetric models considered here are long-range models, whose exceptional points are hard to find numerically. Hence we provided a sufficient condition for obtaining the real energy spectrum using the factorization surface of the corresponding Hermitian model. Specifically, we observed that as long as the parameters of the non-Hermitian long-range $iATXY$ and $iXYZ$ models are above the factorization-like surfaces, the energy spectrum are always real. Moreover, at the exceptional points, we computed the bipartite entanglement of nearest-neighbor two-site reduced state obtained from the ground state and showed that it is non-vanishing although entanglement vanishes at the factorization surface of the Hermitian counterpart.

Quantum spin models in higher dimensional lattices as well as with long-range interactions can only be studied by using approximate methods or by numerical techniques. On the other hand, finding real or complex eigenvalues of the non-Hermitian spin models require careful analysis of the entire energy spectrum which is a difficult numerical task as also mentioned in Ref. [52]. Therefore, the method proposed here to uncover the unbroken phase of the non-Hermitian models can be a useful mechanism to bypass the extensive numeri-
cal search.
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[65] Entanglement of a bipartite state, $\rho_{ij}$, can be measured by logarithmic negativity, which is defined as follows:

$$E(\rho_{ij}) = \log_2(2N(\rho_{ij}) + 1),$$

where $N$ quantifies the sum of absolute values of all negative eigenvalues of partially transposed matrix, denoted by $\rho_{ij}^T$. 