

Spatial entanglement between two quantum walkers with exchange symmetric coins

Ibrahim Yahaya Muhammad^{1,2}, Tanapat Deesuwan^{1,2,3}, Sikarin Yoo-Kong⁴,
Suwat Tangwancharoen^{1,2}, and Monsit Tanasittikosol¹

¹Theoretical and Computational Physics (TCP) Group, Department of Physics, Faculty of Science, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Bangkok 10140, Thailand

²Theoretical and Computational Science Center (TaCS), Faculty of Science, King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Bangkok 10140, Thailand

³Quantum Computing and Theory Center (QX), King Mongkut's University of Technology Thonburi, Bangkok 10140, Thailand

⁴The Institute for Fundamental Study (IF), Naresuan University, Phitsanulok 65000, Thailand

We investigate the dynamics of the spatial entanglement between two initially independent walkers that perform discrete-time quantum walk with respect to symmetric and anti-symmetric initial coin states. By considering the symmetry associated with the setting and post-selecting the states of the two coins accordingly, we show that, for the anti-symmetric initial coin state, the entanglement corresponding to all the anti-symmetric results are always constant, while that corresponding to the symmetric result is underdamped-like with period of oscillation (T) being inversely proportional to the coin operator parameter (θ). The results are the opposite way around for the case of symmetric initial coin states. We also discover that the underdamped-like behaviour of the spatial entanglement show up in the cases of both initial coin states when the post-selected results have no symmetry. Our findings reveal some interesting aspects of symmetry and entanglement dynamics in quantum walk, which may be useful for applications in quantum communication and other quantum technology.

1 Introduction

The significance of classical random walk for the design of classical algorithms motivates the study

of quantum walk to implement quantum algorithms [1, 2] that are flexible and solve problems more efficiently. Quantum walks have become an interesting area of research in quantum information and quantum computation [3–6]. Quantum walk was first studied by Aharonov *et al* in 1993 [7]. Quantum properties such as superposition, entanglement that occur in the quantum walks allow it to have more advantages over classical random walk [8–10]. The physical implementation of quantum walk in some physical systems such as trapped ions [11, 12], nuclear magnetic resonance [13], cold atoms [14, 15], integrated photonics [16, 17], and superconducting qubits [18, 19], show its promising role in future quantum technologies. An introductory overview and a review of the quantum walk can be found in [20, 21].

One of the fundamental aspects of quantum walk that has been discussed since the invention of the scheme is the entanglement among the walkers and the coins. For example, in [22, 23], the dynamics of the entanglement between one walker and one coin were shown to change with the walking step similar to how a damped oscillator moves. Also, entanglement in two-particle quantum walks have been studied in several literature [24–30]. Moreover, the entanglement between many particles undergoing quantum walk can be found in [31]. The spatial entanglement between two walkers sharing one coin state have been studied in [32, 33], by performing measurement on the coin basis to generate entanglement between the two walkers.

In this paper, starting with two entangled coins state that has symmetric and anti-symmetric

Tanapat Deesuwan: tanapat.dee@kmutt.ac.th

Monsit Tanasittikosol: monsit.tan@kmutt.ac.th

exchange symmetry, we study the dynamics of spatial entanglement between two walkers undergoing discrete-time quantum walk on a one-dimensional lattice, with and without post-selection on the coin states. Particularly, we investigate how the initial exchange symmetry of the coins affect the entanglement between the walkers. The structure of the paper is the following. In Section 2, we present a brief overview of the quantum walk for one walker with one coin and two walkers with two identical coins. In Section 3, we show the entanglement dynamics between two walkers and discuss our key results. The final section 4 provides the conclusion of our study.

2 Quantum walk

Let us first start with an overview of the one walker and two walkers quantum walk together with the mathematical notations which will be used throughout the text.

2.1 One walker with one coin

To introduce the discrete-time quantum walk with one walker in one dimension, we imagine the motion of a walker on a one-dimensional lattice. The position of the walker lattice point i is assigned by the state $|i\rangle$, where $i \in \mathbb{Z}$, belonging to the walker Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_w . In order to make the walker move randomly, a coin is needed to assign to the walker and the coin Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_c is defined by two orthonormal states: $|\uparrow\rangle$ and $|\downarrow\rangle$. The total state of the system (walker+coin) then belongs to the product space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_c \otimes \mathcal{H}_w$. There are 3 operations involved in the quantum walk as follows:

- **Operation 1:** Apply the coin operator $\hat{C}_1(\theta)$ to the coin state. The coin operator is defined as

$$\hat{C}_1(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & \sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & -\cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (1)$$

where θ is the angle that determines how biased the coin is. For example, $\theta = \pi/4$ means we have an unbiased coin, while $\theta = n\pi$, where n is an integer means only one side of the coin always show up, i.e., we have a maximally biased coin.

- **Operation 2:** Apply the shift operation \hat{S}_1 to the walker state. The shift operator is defined as

$$\hat{S}_1 = |\uparrow\rangle \langle \uparrow| \otimes \sum_i |i+1\rangle \langle i| + |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow| \otimes \sum_i |i-1\rangle \langle i|. \quad (2)$$

Note that the first two operations can be combined into a single unitary operator:

$$\hat{U}_1 = \hat{S}_1(\hat{C}_1 \otimes \hat{I}). \quad (3)$$

where \hat{I} is the identity operator acting on the position state of the walker. The operator \hat{U}_1 will be applied to the system as many times as one needs before proceeding to the last operation. We will say the n^{th} steps of the walk is done after \hat{U}_1 is applied to the system n times.

- **Operation 3:** Perform measurement on the coin state. The measurement basis is usually formed by the following operators,

$$\hat{M}_\uparrow = |\uparrow\rangle \langle \uparrow|, \quad \hat{M}_\downarrow = |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow|. \quad (4)$$

2.2 Two walkers with two identical coins

Let us now consider two walkers, each of which *separately* but *identically* evolves according to the previously discussed one walker protocol with respect to each own coin. The Hilbert space of the total system, in this case, is the product space \mathcal{H} given by $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2 = (\mathcal{H}_c \otimes \mathcal{H}_w)_1 \otimes (\mathcal{H}_c \otimes \mathcal{H}_w)_2$, where \mathcal{H}_1 is the combined Hilbert space of walker 1 and coin 1, and \mathcal{H}_2 is the combined Hilbert space of walker 2 and coin 2. The coin operator in this case is

$$\hat{C}(\theta) = \hat{C}_1(\theta) \otimes \hat{C}_2(\theta). \quad (5)$$

We only consider the case where the angles for the two coins operators are the same. The shift operator is

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{S} &= \hat{S}_1 \otimes \hat{S}_2 \\ &= |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle \langle \uparrow\uparrow| \otimes \sum_{ij} |i+1, j+1\rangle \langle i, j| \\ &\quad + |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle \langle \uparrow\downarrow| \otimes \sum_{ij} |i+1, j-1\rangle \langle i, j| \\ &\quad + |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle \langle \downarrow\uparrow| \otimes \sum_{ij} |i-1, j+1\rangle \langle i, j| \\ &\quad + |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow\downarrow| \otimes \sum_{ij} |i-1, j-1\rangle \langle i, j|. \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Thus, the combination of these two operators gives the evolution operator in the form,

$$\hat{U}(\theta) = \hat{S}(\hat{C}(\theta) \otimes I). \quad (7)$$

Furthermore, the measurement basis considered in this case are composed of the following operators,

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow} &= |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\uparrow|, \quad \hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow} = |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow\downarrow| \\ \hat{M}_{\downarrow\uparrow} &= |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\uparrow|, \quad \hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow} = |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow\downarrow|. \end{aligned} \quad (8)$$

Note that all of these are basically two copies of the one walker quantum walk operators that apply to the two walkers separately. The fact that all the operations considered are “local” implies that the entanglement between the two walkers cannot be increased by these operations.

3 Our settings and results

Suppose that the initial state of the system can be written in the following form,

$$|\psi\rangle_0 = |Bell\rangle \otimes |0,0\rangle, \quad (9)$$

where $|Bell\rangle$ is one of the Bell states ($|\Psi^\pm\rangle = \frac{|\uparrow,\downarrow\rangle \pm |\downarrow,\uparrow\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$, $|\Phi^\pm\rangle = \frac{|\uparrow,\uparrow\rangle \pm |\downarrow,\downarrow\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$). We can classify the initial coin states above according to the exchange symmetry into two types, symmetric ($|\Psi^+\rangle$, $|\Phi^+\rangle$) and anti-symmetric state ($|\Psi^-\rangle$). The symmetric state represents the states of two bosons while the anti-symmetric state represents the state of two fermions. Without loss of generality, we will choose the initial positions of the walkers to be at the origin but in principle, we can choose it to be at any point as long as they are the same.

Now, we will investigate the entanglement dynamics between the two walkers. Each of the walkers undergoes an identical but separate discrete-time quantum walk as is discussed in the previous section. Throughout this work, we will use the logarithmic negativity

$$E(\rho) = \log_2 \left[\sum_j (|\lambda_j| - \lambda_j) + 1 \right]. \quad (10)$$

as the entanglement measure. Here λ_j are the eigenvalues of the partial transpose of the density matrix ρ with respect to subsystem 1 or subsystem 2. To start with, let us first proof the following two Theorems

Theorem 1. *Given a bipartite system, a completely positive map that is symmetric under the exchange of the order of the input state cannot change the symmetric property of the whole system.*

Proof. Let us define an exchange operator \hat{P} , which is simultaneously Hermitian and unitary operator. Now, we apply \hat{P} to the state $|a,b\rangle$.

$$\hat{P}|a,b\rangle = \pm |b,a\rangle; \quad \hat{P}^2 = \hat{I}$$

The value $+1$ means the state is symmetric and -1 means the state is anti-symmetric. We also consider a completely positive operator $\hat{\varphi}_{ab}$, where $\hat{\varphi}_{ab} = \hat{\varphi}_{ba}$. In other words, the way this operator works does not depend on the order of the input states. Then

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{P}\hat{\varphi}_{ab}|\psi\rangle_{ab} &= \hat{P}\hat{\varphi}_{ab}\hat{P}^2|\psi\rangle_{ab} \\ \hat{P}\hat{\varphi}_{ab}|\psi\rangle_{ab} &= \hat{\varphi}_{ba}\hat{P}|\psi\rangle_{ab} \\ (\hat{P}\hat{\varphi}_{ab} - \hat{\varphi}_{ba}\hat{P})|\psi\rangle_{ab} &= 0 \\ [\hat{P}, \hat{\varphi}_{ab}]|\psi\rangle_{ab} &= 0. \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

□

Therefore $[\hat{P}, \hat{\varphi}_{ab}] = 0$ which indicates that the operator $\hat{\varphi}_{ab}$ do not change the symmetric property of the system.

Corollary 1. *Two identical local operations cannot change the symmetric property of a system.*

Proof. Let us define two local operator Ω_a and Ω_b , where $\Omega_a = \Omega_b = \Omega$ and $\Omega_{ab} = \Omega_a \otimes \Omega_b = \Omega \otimes \Omega$. It is clear that $\Omega_{ab} = \Omega_{ba}$, hence Ω_{ab} does not affect the exchange symmetry of the system according to Theorem 1. □

Theorem 2. *If the initial state of a walker is pure, then the reduced density matrix of that walker after post-selection on the corresponding coin state always has at most rank 2.*

Proof. Let us consider our scenario but only on Alice’s side. Without loss of generality, we choose Alice’s initial state to be

$$\rho_A = (q_1 |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| + q_2 |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|) \otimes |w\rangle\langle w| \quad (12)$$

where $q_1 + q_2 = 1$ and $|w\rangle$ is the initial state of the walker. Note that this does not mean the walker has to occupy only at one definite point initially. A superposition of points is allowed as

long as the state is pure. Now if we run quantum walk by applying the operator \hat{U} in Eq. (3),

$$\hat{U} |\uparrow\rangle |w\rangle = \lambda_1 |\uparrow\rangle |w_1\rangle + \lambda_2 |\downarrow\rangle |w_2\rangle \quad (13)$$

$$\hat{U} |\downarrow\rangle |w\rangle = \lambda_3 |\uparrow\rangle |w_3\rangle + \lambda_4 |\downarrow\rangle |w_4\rangle \quad (14)$$

where λ_i are probability amplitudes. Suppose we post-selected in $|\uparrow\rangle \langle\uparrow|$, the state becomes

$$\rho_A^\uparrow = |\uparrow\rangle \langle\uparrow| \otimes \rho_w^\uparrow, \quad (15)$$

where $\rho_w^\uparrow = \frac{|\lambda_1|^2 |w_1\rangle \langle w_1| + |\lambda_3|^2 |w_3\rangle \langle w_3|}{|\lambda_1|^2 + |\lambda_3|^2}$ is the corresponding walker state. Note that $|w_1\rangle \langle w_1|$ and $|w_3\rangle \langle w_3|$ are individually *pure state* and pure state always has rank 1. Using the relation

$$\text{rank}(M + N) \leq \text{rank}(M) + \text{rank}(N), \quad (16)$$

we can conclude that

$$\text{rank}(\rho_w^\uparrow) \leq 2 \quad (17)$$

Note that this is also true if we post-select in $|\downarrow\rangle \langle\downarrow|$ state. In other words, the walker effectively becomes a qubit after post-selection. \square

3.1 With post-selection

Now, we will consider the post-selection case where the measurement basis is formed by the “local” measurement operators described in Eq. (8).

$$|\psi\rangle_2 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} [|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle (|0, 2\rangle - |2, 0\rangle) + |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle (|2, -2\rangle + |0, 0\rangle) - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle (|0, 0\rangle + |-2, 2\rangle) + |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle (|0, -2\rangle - |-2, 0\rangle)]. \quad (19)$$

We can see that the state of the system after the second step is still anti-symmetric under the exchange of coins and walkers. This is because \hat{U} acts symmetrically on both sides. In fact, with Theorem 1, it is clear that the state $|\psi\rangle_n$ after any n^{th} steps must be anti-symmetric. Now let us perform measurements on the coins. After the second step, the state of the walkers for the post-

The reason we are interested in post-selection is that, in many situations, post-selection can reveal some hidden correlations between the systems which then may be used to perform some interesting tasks that would be impossible otherwise, for example, quantum teleportation or quantum key distribution. And the reason we are interested in local measurement operators is that local measurement cannot increase entanglement between the systems and in many real-world situations is very difficult to do the non-local measurement.

Without loss of generality, we will only consider the cases where we post-select the outcomes that are corresponding to the operators $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ and $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}$. The reason we can do this is because the outcome of $\hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ will be the same as $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ and the result of $\hat{M}_{\downarrow\uparrow}$ will be the same as $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ due to the symmetry of the setting.

3.1.1 Anti-symmetric Coin State (ACS)

The initial state of the system is given by

$$|\psi\rangle_0 = |\Psi^-\rangle \otimes |0, 0\rangle. \quad (18)$$

This state is anti-symmetric. We will perform the quantum walk with the unitary operator $\hat{U}(\pi/4)$ in Eq. (7). This choice of angle is just for the sake of convenience but the result does not actually depend on any particular value of the chosen angle θ as long as $\hat{U}(\theta)$ satisfies Theorem 1. Now we will consider, for example, the state after the second step of the quantum walk.

selected outcomes of $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}$, $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}$, $\hat{M}_{\downarrow\uparrow}$ and $\hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0, 2\rangle - |2, 0\rangle), \\ |\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle (|2, -2\rangle + |0, 0\rangle), \\ |\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_{\downarrow\uparrow}} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle (|0, 0\rangle + |-2, 2\rangle), \\ |\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle (|0, -2\rangle - |-2, 0\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

We can see that the states of the two walkers are anti-symmetric for $\{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}, \hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}\}$ because we post-selected with the outcomes that are identical on both sides. In fact, according to Theorem

1, the state of the two walkers must also be anti-symmetric if the $|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$ or $|\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$ is post-selected after any n^{th} steps. We can write the general form of an anti-symmetric bipartite state as

$$|\xi\rangle = \sum_{ij} \alpha'_{ij} (|a_i, a_j\rangle - |a_j, a_i\rangle) \quad (21)$$

where $\{|a_i\rangle\}$ forms an orthonormal basis. With the use of Theorem 2, the reduced density matrix of a single walker in Eq. (21) can only have rank 2 at most. In other words, the state is equivalent to a qubit. Therefore, only one pair would remain in Eq. (21). Without loss of generality, we choose that pair to be of the form $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|a, b\rangle - |b, a\rangle)$. This form is equivalent to $|\Psi^-\rangle$, which is the only state that is anti-symmetric, and its reduced density matrix has at most rank 2. This explains the reason why we have constant entanglement for $\{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}, \hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}\}$ post-selection as shown in Fig. 1(a).

For $\{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}, \hat{M}_{\downarrow\uparrow}\}$ post-selection, Theorem 2 is still satisfied. However, the walkers' state has no symmetry because the states of the coins being post-selected are not identical according to Theorem 1. Therefore, the walkers' state cannot be a Bell state and would not have constant maximum entanglement as in the previous case. This is shown by the plot in Fig. 1(b).

From the above analysis, the only way we can get a Bell state is when the state of the two walkers after post-selection is anti-symmetric. To support this claim, let us change $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}$ and $\hat{M}_{\downarrow\uparrow}$ in the measurement basis of Eq. (8) to $\hat{M}_+ = \frac{1}{2}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle)(\langle\uparrow\downarrow| + \langle\downarrow\uparrow|)$ and $\hat{M}_- = \frac{1}{2}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle)(\langle\uparrow\downarrow| - \langle\downarrow\uparrow|)$ which, together with $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ and $\hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ still forms a complete basis. Now our measurement basis consists of non-local measurement operators \hat{M}_+ and \hat{M}_- . However, these non-local measurement operators may come with the concern of increasing entanglement of the system and also most of the time is very difficult task to perform in the real-world application. We may call this new basis the triplet-singlet basis. The reason we change to this basis is to make sure that no matter which post-selection outcome we obtain, the state of the two walkers is always either symmetric or anti-symmetric. To be more precise, the state of the walkers is always anti-symmetric for

\hat{M}_+ post-selection and symmetric for \hat{M}_- post-selection.

As an illustration, we will consider the state after the second step of the quantum walk Eq. (19), the state of the walkers for the post-selection outcome of \hat{M}_+ and \hat{M}_- are given by

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_+} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|2, -2\rangle - |-2, 2\rangle), \\ |\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_-} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|2, -2\rangle + 2|0, 0\rangle + |-2, 2\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

The walkers' state corresponding to \hat{M}_+ is anti-symmetric while \hat{M}_- is symmetric as expected. Figure 1(c) shows that the entanglement dynamics is constant for \hat{M}_+ post-selection. But the entanglement dynamics of \hat{M}_- post-selection is oscillating as shown in Fig. 1(d).




Figure 1: Entanglement between two walkers for ACS case (as in Eq. (18)) using operator $\hat{U}(\pi/4)$ for different post-selection (a) $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}$, (b) $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}$, (c) \hat{M}_+ (d) \hat{M}_- .

3.1.2 Symmetric Coin State (SCS)

The initial state of the system which is symmetric is given by

$$|\psi\rangle_0 = |\Psi^+\rangle \otimes |0, 0\rangle. \quad (23)$$

We can use Theorem 1 to show that the state $|\psi\rangle_n$ after the n^{th} steps is symmetric, for instance, the state after the second step of the quantum walk using the unitary operator $\hat{U}(\pi/4)$ is

$$|\psi\rangle_2 = \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} [|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle (|2,2\rangle - |0,0\rangle) + |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle (|2,0\rangle + |0,-2\rangle) + |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle (|0,2\rangle + |-2,0\rangle) + |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle (|0,0\rangle - |-2,-2\rangle)], \quad (24)$$

which is symmetric under the exchange of both coins and walkers. Now, let us measure the state after the second step. The walkers' state for the post-selected outcomes of $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}$, $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}$, $\hat{M}_{\downarrow\uparrow}$ and $\hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}$ are provided by

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|2,2\rangle - |0,0\rangle), \\ |\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|2,0\rangle + |0,-2\rangle), \\ |\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_{\downarrow\uparrow}} &= \frac{1}{2} (|0,2\rangle + |-2,0\rangle), \\ |\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0,0\rangle - |-2,-2\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

It can be seen that if we post-select with the symmetric measurement operators $\{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}, \hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}\}$, the state of the two walkers is symmetric under the exchange. In fact, according to Theorem 1, the state of the walkers after any n^{th} step is symmetric as long as you post-select the outcomes corresponding to these two operators. In general, a symmetric bipartite state is of the form

$$|\xi\rangle = \sum_{i \neq j} \left[\frac{\alpha'_{ij}}{2} (|a_i, a_j\rangle + |a_j, a_i\rangle) + \beta'_i |a_i, a_i\rangle \right], \quad (26)$$

where $\{|a_i\rangle\}$ form an orthonormal basis and $\alpha'_{ij} = \alpha'_{ji}$. However, with Theorem 2, the reduced density matrix of one walker has at most rank 2. This means at most only one α'_{ij} and two β'_i are non-zero. Without loss of generality, Eq. (26) may be written as

$$|\xi\rangle = \frac{\alpha'_{ab}}{2} (|a, b\rangle + |b, a\rangle) + \beta'_a |a, a\rangle + \beta'_b |b, b\rangle. \quad (27)$$

In general, the state of this form would not be a Bell state except for the following two special cases,

- If $\beta'_a = \beta'_b = 0$
The two walkers completely occupy different

space. The state becomes $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|a, b\rangle + |b, a\rangle)$ which is equivalent to the Bell state $|\Psi^+\rangle$.

- If $\alpha'_{ab} = 0$ and $|\beta'_a| = |\beta'_b|$
The state becomes $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|a, a\rangle \pm |b, b\rangle)$ which is equivalent to Bell state $|\Phi^\pm\rangle$.

Theoretically, since there is no other constraint that will guarantee either of the above condition is always satisfied, it is very unlikely in general that the entanglement between the walkers will always be constant at maximum. This is confirmed numerically as shown in Fig. 2(a) for $\{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}, \hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}\}$ post-selection outcomes.

Let us now consider the other two possible post-selections that are corresponding to the measurement operators, $\{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}, \hat{M}_{\downarrow\uparrow}\}$. Similar to the ACS cases, the state of the two walkers cannot be a Bell state and the entanglement would not be constant as shown in Fig. 2(b).

Before proceeding further, let us elaborate that, unlike ACS, no post-selection with respect to the measurement basis $\{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}, \hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}, \hat{M}_{\downarrow\uparrow}, \hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}\}$ yields constant entanglement. In fact, this is also true for any local measurement basis because the only way one can obtain constant entanglement is when the reduced state of the walkers effectively become the anti-symmetric state ($|\Psi^-\rangle$). However, given that the initial state of the whole system is symmetric, this is achievable if and only if one can post-select an anti-symmetric coin state. Since no local measurement could collapse the state being measured into an anti-symmetric state, it is impossible for the reduced state of the walkers to be equivalent to $|\Psi^-\rangle$. In a sense, anti-symmetry really is a non-local property.

Now we will change from the computational basis to the triplet-singlet basis. This replaces two local measurement operators ($\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}, \hat{M}_{\downarrow\uparrow}$) in the previous case with two non-local ones (\hat{M}_+, \hat{M}_-), hence it is not possible to post-select an anti-symmetric result. The state of the two walkers is always symmetric for \hat{M}_+ post-selection and anti-symmetric for \hat{M}_- post-selection. Consider, for example, the post-selection outcomes of \hat{M}_+ and \hat{M}_- after the second step of the quantum walk given as

$$|\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_+} = \frac{1}{2} [\{(|2\rangle + |-2\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle\} + \{|0\rangle \otimes (|2\rangle + |-2\rangle)\}] , |\psi\rangle_{2,w}^{\hat{M}_-} = \frac{1}{2} [\{(|2\rangle - |-2\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle\} - \{|0\rangle \otimes (|2\rangle - |-2\rangle)\}] . \quad (28)$$

We can see that the walkers state is symmetric for \hat{M}_+ and the entanglement dynamics is oscillating as shown in Fig. 2(c). On the other hand, post-selection with the singlet basis \hat{M}_- forces the state of the walkers to be anti-symmetric. The state of the walkers become $|\Psi^-\rangle$ now, similar to the *ACS* with post-selected in triplet outcomes and the entanglement between the two walkers is constant as shown in Fig. 2(d).




Figure 2: Entanglement between two walkers for *SCS* case (as in Eq. (23)) using operator $\hat{U}(\pi/4)$ for different post-selection (a) $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}$, (b) $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}$, (c) \hat{M}_+ (d) \hat{M}_- .

Another initial state of the system which is *SCS* is

$$|\psi\rangle_0 = |\Phi^\pm\rangle \otimes |0,0\rangle . \quad (29)$$

After we perform quantum walk for n^{th} steps, the state $|\psi\rangle_n$ is also symmetric. Similar to the $|\Psi^+\rangle$ case above, if we post-select with the operators $\{\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}, \hat{M}_{\uparrow\downarrow}, \hat{M}_+\}$, the state of the two walkers becomes symmetric under exchange in accordance with Theorem 1. We observe oscillating behaviour in the entanglement dynamics between the walkers for these post-selections. However, if we post-select with operator \hat{M}_- , the state of the two walkers become anti-symmetric (i.e. $|\Psi^-\rangle$) and the entanglement is constant.

3.1.3 Period of oscillation

In the cases where we have damped oscillation, even though we still do not fully understand the mechanism behind the oscillation, we observe

that the relationship between the period per repeated pattern of the entanglement dynamics and the angle parameter of the coins is

$$T = n\pi/\theta \quad (30)$$

where n is the number of cycles per repeated pattern as shown Fig. 3(a) and Fig. 3(b). We believe that this observation is a significant step toward the fully understanding of the damping behaviour in this scenario.




Figure 3: Entanglement between two walkers for *SCS* with different $U(\theta)$, but with the same $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ post-selection :

- (a) $\hat{U}(\pi/6)$: each repeated pattern contains 6 points and 1 cycle
- (b) $\hat{U}(2\pi/9)$: each repeated pattern contains 9 points and 2 cycles.

3.2 Without post-selection

Figure 4 shows the entanglement between the two walkers at the end of each step of the quantum walk process, using the triplet-singlet basis, without post-selecting the coin states. The damped oscillating behaviour of the entanglement, showing up in part of “with post-selection” above, is still featured in these two non-post-selecting circumstances, all with the same period of oscillation. This is to be expected since the non-post-selecting case is basically an average of all the post-selecting cases. Note that, without post-selection, the hidden relation between the symmetry of the initial coin state and the measurement result will be very obscure, especially for

the constant entanglement cases discussed above.




Figure 4: Entanglement between two walkers using $\hat{U}(\pi/4)$ for the initial state (a) SCS (b) ACS

4 Conclusion

We present our analytical and numerical study of the behaviour of the spatial entanglement between two walkers, given that: 1. The initial state of each walker is pure, 2. Each one of them undergoes a discrete-time quantum walk process with respect to its corresponding coin, and 3. The state of two coins are initially bosonic (symmetric coin state: SCS) or fermionic (anti-symmetric coin state: ACS). First, we find that the state of the individual walker after its corresponding coin is measured and post-selected is always equivalent to a qubit, no matter how many steps the walker has already moved. We also discover the combined state of the two walkers is always equivalent to the singlet Bell state $|\Psi^-\rangle$, again, no matter how many steps the walkers have already moved, in the following two cases: 1. ACS where the coins are being post-selected in one of the triplet outcomes and 2. SCS where the coins are being post-selected in the singlet outcome. As a consequence, the spatial entanglement between the two walkers in these two cases remain constant at the maximum value at all steps. These results are very interesting and maybe useful for some applications in quantum technology. It should also be noted that, since the probability of yielding such a result for the ACS case is 3 times more than that for the SCS case, it should be more efficient to opt for ACS if it is possible to

do so. However, in some situations, we may be limited to perform only local measurements. In such circumstances, we show that we can still get the maximum entanglement if we post-select the state corresponding to $\hat{M}_{\uparrow\uparrow}$ or $\hat{M}_{\downarrow\downarrow}$, but only for the ACS case. This, again, suggests an advantage of preparing the system with ACS over SCS. For the SCS case, the state of the two walkers after post-selection on the local coin states is not always equivalent to any of the Bell states and hence the entanglement is not constant. Rather, it oscillates similar to a damped oscillator as can be seen from our numerical results. We discover that similar damping behaviour also shows up in the non-post-selection case of both ACS and SCS. Even though we do not yet fully understand what is the mechanism behind this damped oscillation, we observe that the period per repeated pattern depends on the angle parameter in the coin operators. To be more precise, the relation between the period per repeated pattern (T) and the angle parameter of the coin operators (θ) is $T = n\pi/\theta$, where n is the number of cycles per pattern.

5 Acknowledgements

This research has received funding support from the NSRF via the Program Management Unit for Human Resources & Institutional Development, Research and Innovation [grant number B05F640051]. The first author was supported by the ‘‘Petchra Pra Jom Klao Ph.D. Research Scholarship from King Mongkut’s University of Technology Thonburi’’ Contract No. 14/2561. The researchers would like to thank Dr. Ekkarat Pongphas for inspiring discussions and useful suggestions. The researchers also acknowledge TaCS and INNOSOFT for allowing access to their high-performance computing resources.

References

- [1] Neil Shenvi, Julia Kempe, and K Birgitta Whaley. Quantum random-walk search algorithm. *Physical Review A*, 67(5):052307, 2003. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.67.052307](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.67.052307).
- [2] Miklos Santha. Quantum walk based search algorithms. In *International Conference on Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*, pages 31–46. Springer, 2008. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-540-79228-4_3](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-79228-4_3).

- [3] Neil B Lovett, Sally Cooper, Matthew Everitt, Matthew Trevers, and Viv Kendon. Universal quantum computation using the discrete-time quantum walk. *Physical Review A*, 81(4):042330, 2010. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.81.042330](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.81.042330).
- [4] Andrew M Childs. Universal computation by quantum walk. *Physical review letters*, 102(18):180501, 2009. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.180501](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.102.180501).
- [5] Viv Kendon. How to compute using quantum walks. In *Proceedings 9th International Conference on Quantum Simulation and Quantum Walks*, 2020. DOI: [10.4204/EPTCS.315.1](https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.315.1).
- [6] Yu Wang, Yun Shang, and Peng Xue. Generalized teleportation by quantum walks. *Quantum Information Processing*, 16(9):1–13, 2017. DOI: [10.1007/s11128-017-1675-y](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11128-017-1675-y).
- [7] Yakir Aharonov, Luiz Davidovich, and Nicim Zagury. Quantum random walks. *Physical Review A*, 48(2):1687, 1993. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.48.1687](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.48.1687).
- [8] Siamak Dadras, Alexander Gresch, Caspar Groiseau, Sandro Wimberger, and Gil S Summy. Quantum walk in momentum space with a bose-einstein condensate. *Physical review letters*, 121(7):070402, 2018. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.070402](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.121.070402).
- [9] Xiu-Bo Chen, Ya-Lan Wang, Gang Xu, and Yi-Xian Yang. Quantum network communication with a novel discrete-time quantum walk. *IEEE Access*, 7:13634–13642, 2019. DOI: [10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2890719](https://doi.org/10.1109/ACCESS.2018.2890719).
- [10] Taira Giordani, Luca Innocenti, Alessia Suprano, Emanuele Polino, Mauro Paternostro, Nicolò Spagnolo, Fabio Sciarrino, and Alessandro Ferraro. Entanglement transfer, accumulation and retrieval via quantum-walk-based qubit–qudit dynamics. *New Journal of Physics*, 23(2):023012, 2021. DOI: [10.1088/1367-2630/abdbel](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/abdbel).
- [11] Hector Schmitz, Robert Matjeschk, Ch Schneider, Jan Glueckert, Martin Enderlein, Thomas Huber, and Tobias Schaetz. Quantum walk of a trapped ion in phase space. *Physical review letters*, 103(9):090504, 2009. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.090504](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.103.090504).
- [12] Franziska Zähringer, Gerhard Kirchmair, Rene Gerritsma, Enrique Solano, Rainer Blatt, and Christian F Roos. Realization of a quantum walk with one and two trapped ions. *Physical review letters*, 104(10):100503, 2010. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.100503](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.100503).
- [13] Colm A Ryan, Martin Laforest, Jean-Christian Boileau, and Raymond Laflamme. Experimental implementation of a discrete-time quantum random walk on an nmr quantum-information processor. *Physical Review A*, 72(6):062317, 2005. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.72.062317](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.72.062317).
- [14] Philipp M Preiss, Ruichao Ma, M Eric Tai, Alexander Lukin, Matthew Rispoli, Philip Zupancic, Yoav Lahini, Rajibul Islam, and Markus Greiner. Strongly correlated quantum walks in optical lattices. *Science*, 347(6227):1229–1233, 2015. DOI: [10.1126/science.1260364](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1260364).
- [15] Samuel Muel, Alessio Celi, Pietro Massignan, János K Asbóth, Maciej Lewenstein, and Carlos Lobo. Topological bound states of a quantum walk with cold atoms. *Physical Review A*, 94(2):023631, 2016. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.94.023631](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.94.023631).
- [16] Andreas Schreiber, Katuscia N Cassemiro, V Potoček, Aurél Gábris, Peter James Mosley, Erika Andersson, Igor Jex, and Ch Silberhorn. Photons walking the line: a quantum walk with adjustable coin operations. *Physical review letters*, 104(5):050502, 2010. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.050502](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.104.050502).
- [17] Alberto Peruzzo, Mirko Lobino, Jonathan CF Matthews, Nobuyuki Matsuda, Alberto Politi, Konstantinos Poulios, Xiao-Qi Zhou, Yoav Lahini, Nur Ismail, Kerstin Wörhoff, et al. Quantum walks of correlated photons. *Science*, 329(5998):1500–1503, 2010. DOI: [10.1126/science.1193515](https://doi.org/10.1126/science.1193515).
- [18] Emmanuel Flurin, Vinay V Ramasesh, Shay Hacoheh-Gourgy, Leigh S Martin, Norman Y Yao, and Irfan Siddiqi. Observing topological invariants using quantum walks in superconducting circuits. *Physical Review X*, 7(3):031023, 2017. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevX.7.031023](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.7.031023).
- [19] Jia-Qi Zhou, Ling Cai, Qi-Ping Su, and Chui-Ping Yang. Protocol of a quantum walk in circuit qed. *Physical Review A*,

- 100(1):012343, 2019. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.100.012343](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.100.012343).
- [20] Julia Kempe. Quantum random walks: an introductory overview. *Contemporary Physics*, 44(4):307–327, 2003. DOI: [10.1080/00107151031000110776](https://doi.org/10.1080/00107151031000110776).
- [21] Salvador Elías Venegas-Andraca. Quantum walks: a comprehensive review. *Quantum Information Processing*, 11(5):1015–1106, 2012. DOI: [10.1007/s11128-012-0432-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11128-012-0432-5).
- [22] Ivens Carneiro, Meng Loo, Xibai Xu, Mathieu Girerd, Viv Kendon, and Peter L Knight. Entanglement in coined quantum walks on regular graphs. *New Journal of Physics*, 7(1):156, 2005. DOI: [10.1088/1367-2630/7/1/156](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/7/1/156).
- [23] G Abal, R Siri, A Romanelli, and R Donangelo. Quantum walk on the line: Entanglement and nonlocal initial conditions. *Physical Review A*, 73(4):042302, 2006. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.73.042302](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.73.042302).
- [24] Y Omar, N Paunković, L Sheridan, and S Bose. Quantum walk on a line with two entangled particles. *Physical Review A*, 74(4):042304, 2006. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.74.042304](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.74.042304).
- [25] Scott D Berry and Jingbo B Wang. Two-particle quantum walks: Entanglement and graph isomorphism testing. *Physical Review A*, 83(4):042317, 2011. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.83.042317](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.83.042317).
- [26] GR Carson, Thomas Loke, and Jingbo B Wang. Entanglement dynamics of two-particle quantum walks. *Quantum Information Processing*, 14(9):3193–3210, 2015. DOI: [10.1007/s11128-015-1047-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11128-015-1047-4).
- [27] M Štefanák, T Kiss, I Jex, and B Mohring. The meeting problem in the quantum walk. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 39(48):14965, 2006. DOI: [10.1088/0305-4470/39/48/009](https://doi.org/10.1088/0305-4470/39/48/009).
- [28] PK Pathak and GS Agarwal. Quantum random walk of two photons in separable and entangled states. *Physical Review A*, 75(3):032351, 2007. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.75.032351](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.75.032351).
- [29] CM Chandrashekar, Sandeep K Goyal, and Subhashish Banerjee. Entanglement generation in spatially separated systems using quantum walk. *Journal of Quantum Information Science*, 2(2):15–22, 2012. DOI: [10.4236/jqis.2012.22004](https://doi.org/10.4236/jqis.2012.22004).
- [30] Shivani Singh, Radhakrishnan Balu, Raymond Laflamme, and CM Chandrashekar. Accelerated quantum walk, two-particle entanglement generation and localization. *Journal of Physics Communications*, 3(5):055008, 2019. DOI: [10.1088/2399-6528/ab1c6e](https://doi.org/10.1088/2399-6528/ab1c6e).
- [31] Sandeep K Goyal and CM Chandrashekar. Spatial entanglement using a quantum walk on a many-body system. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 43(23):235303, 2010. DOI: [10.1088/1751-8113/43/23/235303](https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8113/43/23/235303).
- [32] Salvador E Venegas-Andraca and Sougato Bose. Quantum walk-based generation of entanglement between two walkers. 2009. URL <https://arxiv.org/abs/0901.3946>.
- [33] B Allés, Semra Gündüç, and Yigit Gündüç. Maximal entanglement from quantum random walks. *Quantum Information Processing*, 11(1):211–227, 2012. DOI: [10.1007/s11128-011-0240-3](https://doi.org/10.1007/s11128-011-0240-3).