

Entanglement, local measurements, and symmetry

A A Klyachko and A S Shumovsky

Faculty of Science, Bilkent University, Bilkent, Ankara, 06800, Turkey

A definition of entanglement in terms of local measurements is discussed. *Viz*, the maximum entanglement corresponds to the states that cause the highest level of quantum fluctuations in all local measurements determined by the dynamic symmetry group of the system. A number of examples illustrating this definition is considered.

03.65.Ud, 42.50.Ct, 03.67.-a

I. INTRODUCTION

Celebrating the Centenary of Eugene Paul Wigner, one cannot but reward Wigner's approach to quantum mechanics that has been formulated in his famous papers (Wigner 1931, Wigner, 1939). According to this approach, the general properties of a quantum mechanical system are specified by the dynamical symmetry of the corresponding Hilbert space. For years, the approach has been used in quantum mechanics and quantum field theory and has demonstrated an "unexpected efficiency" (Wigner 1967). The main aim of this paper is to apply Wigner's approach to the investigation of the phenomenon of quantum entanglement.

It has been recognized that the notion of entanglement has a deep conceptual meaning, touching on the problems of locality and reality in quantum mechanics. At the same time, entanglement is considered to be a base of quantum computing, communications, and cryptography (see: Bowmester et al 2000 and Tombesi and Hirota 2001 and references therein). In spite of a great success in engineered entanglement (for a recent review, see: Zeilinger 1999, Raimond et al 2001, Gisin et al 2002), there is still no agreement of opinion among the experts on the very definition of entanglement and its proper measure (e.g., see: Peres 1998, Verdal and Plenio 1998, Brukner et al 2001).

In the usual treatment, the entanglement is associated with nonseparability of corresponding states. It should be stressed that the nonseparability is not a sufficient condition of maximum entanglement, and probably of the entanglement at all (Horodecki et al 1998).

It has been shown recently (Can et al 2002 (a)) that the entangled states of physical systems obey a certain condition, *viz* the local measurements have the maximum uncertainty in comparison with the other states allowed for a system under consideration. This condition can be used as an operational definition of maximum entanglement (definition in terms of what can be measured). At the same time, there is an adequate mathematics hidden behind this physical definition that has been unveiled recently (Klyachko 2002).

Let us note first that this novel definition has a deep physical meaning. One can choose to interpret the entangled state shared between Alice and Bob as a quantum communication channel, in which the information is carried mostly by the correlations between the sides of the channel (Brukner et al 2001). These correlations manifest themselves in terms of local measurements performed at the ends of the channel and the maximum correlation corresponds to the maximum uncertainty of local measurements (Klyachko and Shumovsky 2002).

We now note that the set of possible independent measurements for a given system is specified by the symmetry properties of the Hilbert space, corresponding to this physical system. Beginning with this fact, reflecting the key idea of Wigner's approach, it is possible to examine the notion of entanglement in terms of the geometric invariant theory (Klyachko 2002) (for references on geometric invariant theory see Mumford et al 1994).

In this paper we continue the discussion of the new definition of maximum entanglement and consider a number of physical examples.

The paper is arranged as follows. In section II, we consider the definition of entangled states in terms of the maximum uncertainty of local measurements. This definition is illustrated by a number of examples involving the two- and three-qubit systems. In section III, we show that the above definition of entanglement can also be expressed in terms of a certain property of the matrix of coefficients, specifying the entangled state. *Viz*, the parallel slices of this matrix should be orthogonal and should have the same measure. In section IV, we consider a realization of long-lived, easy monitored entanglement in a system of three-level Λ -type atoms. Finally, in section V we briefly discuss the obtained results and their implementation.

II. DEFINITION OF ENTANGLEMENT

In the usual treatment, the entanglement is associated with the states of the composite systems. Consider a composite system defined in the Hilbert space

$$H = \bigotimes_{i=1}^N H_i; \quad (1)$$

where $N \geq 2$ is the number of components and each component has the dimension n_i (the number of independent quantum degrees of freedom). Then, the dynamic symmetry group, corresponding to a component, is

$$G_i = SU(n_i); \quad (2)$$

An example of some considerable interest is provided by the N -qubit system, consisting of the spin-1/2 particles. In this case, for all i , $n_i = 2$ and $G_i = SU(2)$.

The local measurements, providing the information about entanglement, are defined by the observables g_i from the Lie algebra $Lie G_i$ of the dynamic symmetry group G_i (2).

Assume that $g_i \in Lie G_i$ is a local measurement that gives the spin projection on a given axis. Then, the result of the local measurements is specified by the expectation values

$$\langle g_i \rangle = \langle \psi | g_i | \psi \rangle \quad (3)$$

and by the variances

$$\langle (g_i)^2 \rangle = \langle \psi | (g_i)^2 | \psi \rangle - \langle g_i \rangle^2; \quad (4)$$

determining the quantum error of measurements. Here $|\psi\rangle$ denotes a state in (1).

Consider the variance (4). First of all, it is well known that

$$\langle (g_i)^2 \rangle \geq 0$$

for all $|\psi\rangle \in H$. Then, the operators $(g_i)^2$ always have diagonal form and eigenvalues that can be equal only to 1 and 0 (Serre 1992). Therefore, the maximum uncertainty of a local measurement is achieved when the second term in (4), corresponding to the squared expectation value (3), is equal to zero. It is clear that this condition requires a special choice of the state $|\psi\rangle \in H$.

Following our previous discussions (Can et al 2002 (a), Klyachko and Shumovsky 2002, Klyachko 2002), let us define the maximum entangled state in (1) by the condition

$$\langle g_i \rangle = 0; \quad g_i \in Lie G_i. \quad (5)$$

This means that the perfect entanglement of a composite system provides the maximum uncertainty of all local measurements performed over all components. In other words, the maximum entanglement corresponds to a state, in which all projections of the spin are equal to zero.

Before we begin to discuss this definition in details, let us note that the coherent states of photons are widely used for decades in quantum optics. It is interesting that these states can also be defined in terms of the dynamic symmetry approach (Perelomov 1986). According to Perelomov's analysis, the coherent states provide the minimum uncertainty of local measurements. That is why the coherent states are usually considered as almost classical states.

It is clear that the maximum entangled states defined in terms of condition (5) represent the very reverse case with respect to the coherent states. Thus, the perfect entangled states, corresponding to the maximum uncertainty of local measurements, should be considered as the fundamentally quantum states.

Let us return to the example of N -qubit system. Then, each subspace in (1) is spanned by the two vectors

$$e_i^{(1)} = |j_+ \rangle_i; \quad e_i^{(2)} = |j_- \rangle_i;$$

where $|j_{\pm}\rangle_i$ denotes the spin-up and spin-down states of the i -th spin, respectively. The physical realization of "spin" variable can be chosen differently. For example, it can be polarization of photons or state of a two-level atom. In this local basis, the infinitesimal generators of the $SU(2)$ group have the following form

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{x} &= |j_+ \rangle_i \hat{i} \hbar |j_+ \rangle_i + |j_- \rangle_i \hat{i} \hbar |j_- \rangle_i \\ \hat{y} &= |j_+ \rangle_i \hat{i} \hbar |j_+ \rangle_i - |j_- \rangle_i \hat{i} \hbar |j_- \rangle_i \\ \hat{z} &= |j_+ \rangle_i \hat{i} \hbar |j_+ \rangle_i - |j_- \rangle_i \hat{i} \hbar |j_- \rangle_i \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

so that

$$j = x; y; z \quad (j)^2 = 1;$$

where 1 is the unit operator.

Consider the simplest case of only two components ($N = 2$). Then, the Hilbert space (1) is spanned by the four base vectors

$$j_{ik} = e_1^{(i)} e_2^{(k)}; \quad i, k = 1, 2;$$

Any state in such a space can be represented as follows

$$j = \sum_{i,k=1}^2 j_{ik} j_{ik}; \quad (7)$$

where the complex coefficients j_{ik} obey the standard normalization condition

$$j_{11}^2 + j_{12}^2 + j_{21}^2 + j_{22}^2 = 1; \quad (8)$$

Employing the definition (5) with the measurements defined by (6) then gives the following set of six equations

$$\begin{aligned} & \text{Re}(j_{11}j_{21} + j_{12}j_{22}) = 0 \\ & \text{Im}(j_{11}j_{21} + j_{12}j_{22}) = 0 \\ & \text{Re}(j_{11}j_{12} + j_{22}j_{21}) = 0 \\ & \text{Im}(j_{11}j_{12} + j_{21}j_{22}) = 0 \\ & j_{11}j_{12} + j_{12}j_{21} + j_{21}j_{22} + j_{22}j_{11} = 0 \\ & j_{11}j_{12} - j_{12}j_{21} + j_{21}j_{22} - j_{22}j_{11} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Thus, the state (7) is characterized by eight real coefficients (absolute values and phases of j_{ij}), while the normalization condition (8) together with conditions (9) give only seven equations. Since one parameter remains free, there are infinitely many maximum entangled states in the 2-qubit system.

In general, a state of N -qubit system is specified by 2^{N+1} real parameters, while conditions (5) together with normalization condition give only $(3N + 1)$ equations. Thus, there are infinitely many maximum entangled states in an arbitrary N -qubit composite system ($N \geq 2$).

It follows from the normalization condition (8) and Eqs. (9) that

$$\begin{aligned} & j_{22}j_{11} = j_{11}j_{22} \\ & j_{21}j_{12} = j_{12}j_{21} \\ & j_{11}j_{12} + j_{12}j_{21} = 1/2 \\ & \cos \frac{j_{11}j_{22} - j_{12}j_{21}}{2} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

where $j_{ik} = |j_{ik}| e^{i \arg j_{ik}}$. Consider some realization of Eqs. (10). It is easily seen that the choice of either $j_{11}j_{22} = 0$ or $j_{12}j_{21} = 0$ leads to the conventional Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen (EPR) and Bell states

$$\begin{aligned} j_{\text{EPR}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(j_{+1}j_{-2} + j_{-1}j_{+2}); \\ j_{\text{Bell}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(j_{+1}j_{+2} - j_{-1}j_{-2}); \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

respectively. The states (11) form a basis in the four-dimensional Hilbert space. Let us stress that each state in (11) contains only two base vectors j_{ij} out of four. The conditions (10) permit us to construct the maximum entangled states containing all four base vectors. For example

$$j = \frac{1}{2}(j_{+1}j_{+1} + j_{+1}j_{-2} + j_{-1}j_{+2} + j_{-1}j_{-2}) \quad (12)$$

is the maximum entangled two-qubit state.

Let us stress that, from the mathematical point of view, there is only one maximum entangled state of the two-qubit system, viz the EPR state. All other maximum entangled states defined by the conditions (10) are equivalent to the EPR state to within the action of the dynamic symmetry group. At the same time, these states can be different from

the physical point of view because they are realized under different conditions caused by the physical environment of the system.

We now note that Eqs. (9) can be obtained in a different way. Let us note that the coefficients c_{ij} in (7) form a (2×2) matrix $[C]$. Then, it is easily seen that the above equations express the orthogonality conditions for the parallel rows and columns of this matrix $[C]$ and the condition that different rows and columns have the same norm. The generalization of this result is discussed in the next section.

Consider now another example of some considerable importance provided by the three-qubit states. The simplest case is represented by the Greenberger-Horne-Zeilinger (GHZ) states

$$|\psi_{GHZ}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|j_{+1} + j_{+2} + j_{+3}\rangle - |j_{-1} - j_{-2} - j_{-3}\rangle); \quad (13)$$

The general three-qubit state has the following form

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i,j,k,m} c_{ikm} e_1^{(i)} e_2^{(k)} e_3^{(m)}; \quad i,j,k,m = 1,2; \quad (14)$$

where $e_i^{(i)}$ are the same base vectors as above and the coefficients c_{ikm} obey the normalization condition

$$\sum_{i,j,k,m} |c_{ikm}|^2 = 1; \quad (15)$$

In this case, the (2×3) matrix $[C]$ is specified by eight complex or sixteen real parameters. In turn, the conditions (5) together with (15) give only ten equations. Thus, there is infinitely many maximally entangled three-qubit states.

Through the use of definition (5) with Pauli operators (6), we can get a number of restrictions on the coefficients c_{ikm} , providing the entanglement in (14). Leaving aside the general case, we restrict our consideration by the two examples. Consider first the state

$$|\psi_1\rangle = |j_{+1} + j_{+2} + j_{+3}\rangle - |j_{-1} - j_{-2} - j_{-3}\rangle; \quad (16)$$

Clearly, this is a nonseparable space in (1) and thus it can be considered as a candidate for entangled state. Then, the use of the definition (5) gives

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j=1}^8 & |j_{+1} + j_{+2} + j_{+3}\rangle \cos(\theta_{+1} - \theta_{+2}) = 0 \\ & |j_{+1} + j_{+2} + j_{+3}\rangle \sin(\theta_{+1} - \theta_{+2}) = 0 \\ & |j_{+1} + j_{+2} + j_{+3}\rangle + |j_{-1} - j_{-2} - j_{-3}\rangle = 0 \\ & |j_{+1} + j_{+2} + j_{+3}\rangle - |j_{-1} - j_{-2} - j_{-3}\rangle = 0 \end{aligned}$$

where θ_{ikm} again denotes the phase of the complex coefficients. It is seen that the only solution of these equations is

$$|j_{+1} + j_{+2} + j_{+3}\rangle = |j_{-1} - j_{-2} - j_{-3}\rangle; \quad |j_{+1} - j_{+2} - j_{+3}\rangle = 0;$$

This solution reduces the state (16) to one of the GHZ states (13) that definitely obey the definition of entanglement in terms of the maximally uncertainty of local measurements (see Can et al 2002 (a)). At any $|j_{+1} + j_{+2} + j_{+3}\rangle \neq 0$, the nonseparable state (16) does not manifest entanglement. It should be stressed in this connection that the nonseparability by itself is not a sufficient condition of entanglement (Horodecki et al 1998).

Consider now another, more symmetric realization of the three-qubit state (14)

$$|\psi_2\rangle = |j_{+1} + j_{+2} + j_{+3}\rangle - |j_{-1} - j_{-2} + j_{-3}\rangle - |j_{+1} - j_{+2} + j_{-3}\rangle - |j_{-1} - j_{-2} - j_{-3}\rangle; \quad (17)$$

Through the use of definition (5) and normalization (15) we can obtain the set of ten equations that can be reduced to the following conditions

$$\begin{aligned} |j_{+1} + j_{+2} + j_{+3}\rangle + |j_{-1} - j_{-2} - j_{-3}\rangle &= \frac{1}{2}; \\ |j_{+1} - j_{+2} - j_{+3}\rangle &= |j_{-1} + j_{-2} - j_{-3}\rangle; \\ |j_{+1} + j_{+2} - j_{+3}\rangle &= |j_{-1} - j_{-2} + j_{-3}\rangle; \\ |j_{+1} - j_{+2} + j_{+3}\rangle + |j_{-1} + j_{-2} - j_{-3}\rangle &= 0; \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

In contrast to the GHZ states (13), the coefficients here do not have fixed values but lie on a circle of radius $1/2$. Again, the state (18) is equivalent to the GHZ state (13) to within the action of the dynamic symmetry group $SU(2) \times SU(2) \times SU(2)$. The conditions (5) can also be used to construct the basis of eight three-qubit maximally entangled states.

The maximum entanglement of a nonseparable state is usually defined in terms of the reduced density matrix. Viz, the reduced entropy should have the maximum value, same for all components of the composite system (e.g., see Scully and Zubairy 1997). It is then a straightforward matter to show that this condition follows from the definition of entanglement in terms of local measurements (5).

Let us now note that the scheme that has been discussed in the previous section can be reformulated through the use of the properties of the matrix of coefficients [1]. It was shown in previous section that, in the case of two-qubit system, this matrix obey a certain condition. Consider now the generalization of this result.

Let the factor spaces in the Hilbert space (1) be spanned by the orthonormal bases $\{e_i^{(1)}\}$, $\{e_j^{(2)}\}$. Then, a state of a composite system defined in (1) can be described by the normalized state vector of the form

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \dots, i_N} c_{i_1 i_2 \dots i_N} e_{i_1}^{(1)} e_{i_2}^{(2)} \dots e_{i_N}^{(N)} \quad (19)$$

The results of the previous section show us that the entanglement of the state (19) is specified by a certain choice of the many-dimensional matrix [1] of the coefficients in (19).

It has been proven (Klyachko 2002) that the state $|\psi\rangle \in H$ manifests the maximum entanglement if and only if parallel slices of its matrix [1] are orthogonal and have the same norm. (About parallel slices of multidimensional matrices see Gelfand et al 1994. In the simplest case of two-qubit system considered in the previous section, the parallel slices are represented by rows and columns of the (2×2) matrix [1]. In the case of three-qubit system, this is a (2×3) matrix.)

This general statement can be illustrated in the simplest case by the state (12) whose matrix of coefficients has the form

$$[1] = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 2 \\ 2 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad ;$$

It is clear that

$$[1]_{i=2} [1]_{j=2} = 0;$$

so that the parallel slices are orthogonal. In turn

$$[1]_{i=2} [1]_{j=2} = [1]_{i=1} [1]_{j=1} = \frac{1}{2};$$

The fact that (12) represents the maximum entangled state can also be verified through the calculation of reduced entropies. It is straightforward to show that, in the case of state (12)

$$S_1 = S_2 = \ln 2;$$

as all one can expect for the maximum entangled two-qubit state (Scully and Zubairy 1997). Here

$$S_k = -\text{Tr}_{i \in k} (\rho_k \ln \rho_k); \quad \rho_k = \text{Tr}_{i \notin k} |\psi\rangle \langle \psi|$$

is the reduced entropy. The above condition of maximum entanglement together with the Eqs. (10) permits us to construct another maximum entangled two-qubit states that involve all four base vectors $e_{e_{11}}^{(1)}; e_{e_{11}}^{(2)}$ at $i = 1; 2$. For example, the states

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi^0\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (|j+1\rangle + |j+2\rangle + |j+1\rangle + |j+2\rangle + |j+1\rangle + |j+2\rangle + |j+1\rangle + |j+2\rangle); \\ |\psi^1\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (|ij+1\rangle + |ij+2\rangle + |j+1\rangle + |j+2\rangle + |j+1\rangle + |j+2\rangle + |ij+1\rangle + |ij+2\rangle); \\ |\psi^2\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (|ij+1\rangle + |ij+2\rangle + |j+1\rangle + |j+2\rangle + |j+1\rangle + |j+2\rangle + |ij+1\rangle + |ij+2\rangle) \end{aligned}$$

are the maximum entangled two-qubit states, forming together with (12) an orthonormal basis in the Hilbert space (1) (Can et al 2002 (a)). This basis is equivalent to (11) to within the action of the dynamical symmetry group $SU(2) \times SU(2)$.

In a more general case of a two-component entangled state

$$j_{i2} H = H_1 - H_2;$$

the matrix of coefficients [] has the dimensionality $n_1 \times n_2$ where $n_i = \dim H_i$. The orthogonal rows and columns have the norm $1 = \sqrt{n_1}$ and $1 = \sqrt{n_2}$, respectively. Thus, the maximum entanglement is allowed only if $n_1 = n_2$. In this case, [] is similar to the unitary matrix. This implies the uniqueness of the maximum entangled state to within the action of the dynamic symmetry group $SU(n) \times SU(n)$.

By performing a similar analysis, it is a straightforward matter to show that the three-qubit state (17), (18) also manifests the maximum entanglement.

Our consideration so far have dealt with the composite systems of spin-1=2 particles (qubit systems). The scheme can be generalized on the case of an arbitrary spins $s_1=2$ as well. The examples of the spin-1 entangled states were discussed by Burlakov et al (Burlakov et al 1999) in the context of photon pairs in symmetric Fock states and by Can et al (Can et al 2002 (a)) in connection with polarization of multipole waves of photons. The application of such a states to the quantum cryptography was considered by Bechmann-Pasquinucci and Peres (Bechmann-Pasquinucci and Peres 2000).

According to the definition of maximum entanglement (5) discussed in section 2, the entangled state should give the average spin projection onto every direction equal to zero. Let us denote the spin-1 states by $+i$, $0i$, and $-i$. Consider the cascade decay of a two-level atom with the excited state specified by the angular momentum $j = 2$ and projection of the angular momentum on the quantization axis $m = 0$, and the ground state $j^0 = 0$; $m^0 = 0$. This transition gives rise to photon twins (Mandel and Wolf 1995) that can be observed in the states

$$j_{+1} - 2i; \quad j_{01} 0i; \quad j_{-1} + 2i \quad (20)$$

because of the conservation of the total angular momentum in the process of radiation. It is then easily seen that the so-called SU(2) phase states of photons (Shumovsky 2000)

$$j_{ki} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} (j_{+1} - 2i + e^{ik} j_{01} 0i + e^{2ik} j_{-1} + 2i; \quad (21)$$

where

$$k = \frac{2k}{3}; \quad k = 0; 1; 2;$$

obey the condition (5) and form a basis of entangled states dual to (20).

The principle difference between the systems with spin 1=2 and spin 1 is that the maximum entangled state (in the sense of definition (5)) can be realized in the composite system, consisting of at least two particles in the former case and in a single-particle system in the latter case. Consider, for example, the superposition state

$$j_i = \sum_i j_{+i} + j_{0i} + j_{-i}; \quad \sum_i j_i^2 = 1; \quad (22)$$

Then, the measurement of projections gives in view of the definition (5) the following equations

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_i j_{+i}^2 - j_{-i}^2 = 0 \\ & j_{+j_0} \cos(\theta'_0 - \theta'_+) + j_{0j_0} \cos(\theta'_0 - \theta'_0) = 0 \\ & j_{+j_0} \sin(\theta'_0 - \theta'_+) + j_{0j_0} \sin(\theta'_0 - \theta'_0) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

where $\theta'_i = \arg j_i$. One of the possible solutions, manifesting the single spin-1 particle entanglement then is $j_0 j_- = 0$ and

$$j_{+i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (j_{+i} + e^i j_{-i}); \quad (24)$$

where i is an arbitrary complex number. Another solution has the form $j_{+j_-} = j_{-j_+} = 0$, $j_0 j_+ = 1$, so that

$$j_{+i} = j_{0i}; \quad (25)$$

One more solution of (23) is specified by the conditions

$$j_{+j_-} = j_{-j_+} \quad 2j_{+j_0}^2 + j_{0j_0}^2 = 1; \quad \cos \frac{\theta'_+ + \theta'_-}{2} = 0; \quad (26)$$

As a consequence of evolution generated by the Hamiltonian (28), the pumping photon can be absorbed by either atom with equal probability, so that the system passes into the entangled state

$$|j_1 i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j;1i\rangle + |j;2i\rangle) \quad |j_P i\rangle \quad |j_S i\rangle$$

The lifetime of this state is completely defined by the dipole radiative processes $2 \rightarrow 1$ and $2 \rightarrow 3$ and therefore is very short.

As the next step, the first term in the right-hand side of (30) generates evolution to another entangled state

$$|j_2 i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j;1i\rangle + |j;3i\rangle) \quad |j_P i\rangle \quad |j_S i\rangle$$

The absorption of the Stokes photon described by the Liouville term in (30) then leads to the final, long-lived state (31).

The scheme can be easily realized with the modern experimental technique. First of all, the single-photon excitation of the cavity field can be prepared (see Walther 1997, Walther 2001 and references therein). One of the atoms can be trapped inside the cavity, while the other atom should pass through the cavity in the same way as in the experiments on excitation of Fock states of photons (Walther 2001). Another way is to send a beam of three-level atoms through the cavity with single pumping photon so that every time there would be just two atoms inside the cavity.

Concerning the experimental realization, let us note that the Raman-type process with emission of Stokes photon in a single atom has been observed recently (Henrich et al 2000).

In principle, the process can be realized in the system of more than two three-level atoms, interacting with single cavity photon. In fact, the Fock states with more than one photon have been successfully generated (Walther 2001). The use of the definition of entanglement (5) then shows that if the number of pumping photons in the cavity is n , then the number of atoms, interacting at once with these photons should be $2n$ (Can et al 2002 (a)). In this case, the entangled atomic states can be constructed as the $SU(2)$ phase states have been discussed by Can et al (Can et al 2002 (a)).

Another realization of long-lived entanglement in the system of three-level atoms that has been considered by Can et al (Can et al 2002 (b)) assumes that the Stokes photons can leave the cavity freely. In this case, detection of Stokes photons outside the cavity can be considered as a signal that the long-lived atomic entangled state was created.

V. CONCLUSION

Let us briefly discuss the obtained results. The general scheme has been discussed in sections II and III has the following structure. To specify the entangled states of a composite system defined in the Hilbert space (1) it is necessary:

- 1) to specify the dynamic symmetry group G of the factor spaces in (1);
- 2) to specify the local measurements defined by the Lie algebra, corresponding to the dynamic symmetry group G ;
- 3) to apply the condition (5) that determines the matrix of coefficients of a general state in (1), corresponding to the entanglement (maximum entanglement).

The maximum entangled state can also be specified by the condition that the parallel slices of matrix [] are mutually orthogonal and have the same norm. It can be proven that this definition entails the conventional condition expressed in terms of reduced entropy (Klyachko 2002).

As it follows from the definition (5), the entangled states show the maximum level of quantum fluctuations in all local measurements. Therefore, they should be considered as the fundamentally quantum states in contrast to the almost classical coherent states, showing the minimum of quantum fluctuations.

The scheme discussed in section II superposes the elements of the operational approach (zero result for all local measurements allowed for an entangled state) with the deep mathematics lying behind the definition of entanglement (5). In particular, it is possible to show that an arbitrary entangled state (not necessary the maximum entangled state) can be defined to be the semistable vector in the Hilbert space $H(1)$ and that the rate of entanglement can be specified by the length of minimal vector in complex orbit of entangled state (Klyachko 2000).

It is interesting, that the definition of entanglement represented by the condition (5) permits us to consider the single-particle entangled states in the case of spins ≤ 1 in addition to the conventional composite-system states.

The practical realization of long-lived easily monitored entanglement discussed in section IV seems to be accessible with the present experimental technique. Let us note that, instead of the three-levels interacting with the cavity mode, another environment can be used. An interesting example is provided by the system of atoms in the presence of dispersive and absorbing objects (Dung et al 1998, Dung et al 2002, Welsch et al 2002).

The definition of entanglement in terms of condition (5) is a general one and may exceed the limits of quantum optics and quantum information. For example, the combinations of quarks corresponding to mesons can be treated in terms of the possible states with the dynamic symmetry provided by the hadron group $SU(3)$. Then, the definition (5) shows that ρ^0 corresponds to the entangled combination of quarks, while ρ^1 are specified by the coherent combinations (Klyachko 2002). It seems to be tempting to associate the short lifetime of ρ^0 with respect to ρ^1 by the strong quantum fluctuations in the entangled state and very weak in the coherent state.

The authors would like to thank Dr. A. Beige, Prof. J.H. Eberly, Prof. P.L. Knight, Prof. A. Vourdas, Prof. D.-G. Welsch, and Prof. A. Zeilinger for useful discussions.

REFERENCES

- Bednarski P and Peres A 2000 Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 3313
- Bednarski P and Walther H 2000 Advances in Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics, Vol. 42 (New York: Academic Press)
- Beige A, Munro W J and Knight P L 2000 Phys. Rev. A 62 052102
- Bowen D, Ekert A K and Zeilinger A 2000 The Physics of Quantum Information (Berlin: Springer-Verlag)
- Brukner C, Zukowski M and Zeilinger A 2001 E-print quant-ph/0106119
- Burlakov A V, Chekhova M V, Karabutova O A, Klyachko D N and Kulik S P 1999 Phys. Rev. A 60 R4209
- Can M A, Klyachko A A, and Shumovsky A S 2002 a Phys. Rev. A 66, 022111
2002 b Appl. Phys. Lett. 81 5072
- Dung H T, Knoll L and Welsch D-G 1998 Phys. Rev. A 57 3931
- Dung H T, Scheel S, Welsch D-G and Knoll L 2002 J. Optics B 4 S169
- Gelfand I M, Kapranov M M and Zelevinsky A V. 1994 Discriminants, Resultants, and Multidimensional Determinants (Boston: Birkhauser)
- Gisin N, Ribordy G, Tittel W and Zbinden H 2002 Rev. Mod. Phys. 74 145
- Greenberger D M, Horne M and Zeilinger A 1998 in Bell's Theorem, Quantum Theory, and Conceptions of the Universe (Dordrecht: Kluwer)
- Henrich M, Legero T, Kun K and Rempe G 2000 Phys. Rev. Lett. 85 5872
- Horodecki M, Horodecki P and Horodecki R 1998 Phys. Rev. Lett. 80 5239
- Julsgaard B, Kozhekin A and Polzik E 2001 Nature 413 400
- Klyachko A A 2002 E-print quant-ph/0206012
- Klyachko A A and Shumovsky A S 2002 E-print quant-ph/0203099
- Mandel L and Wolf E 1995 Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics (New York: Cambridge University Press)
- Mumford D, Fogarty J and Kirwan F 1994 Geometric Invariant Theory (Berlin: Springer)
- Miyatake C J, King B E, Turchette Q A, Sackett C A, Kielpinski D, Itano W H, Monroe C and Wineland D J 2000 Nature 403 269
- Perelomov A 1986 Generalized Coherent States and Their Applications (Berlin: Springer)
- Peres A 1998 Physica Scripta 76 52
- Plenio M B, Huelga S F, Beige A and Knight P L 1999 Phys. Rev. A 59 2468
- Raimond J M, Brune M and Haroche S 2001 Rev. Mod. Phys. 73 565
- Rempe G 2000 Ann. Phys. (Leipzig) 9 843
- Scully M O and Zubairy M S 1997 Quantum Optics (New York: Cambridge University Press)
- Serre J P 1992 Lie Algebras and Lie Groups (New York: Springer-Verlag)
- Shumovsky A S 2001 in Modern Nonlinear Optics edited by M. W. Evans (New York: Wiley)
- Tombs P and Hirota O 2001 Quantum Communications, Computing, and Measurements (New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers)
- Verdal V and Plenio M B 1998 Phys. Rev. A 57 1619
- Vourdas A 1990 Phys. Rev. A 41 1653
2002 Phys. Rev. A 65 042321
- Walther H 1997 in Quantum Optics and the Spectroscopy of Solids edited by T. Hakioglu and A. S. Shumovsky (Dordrecht: Kluwer)
- 2001 in Quantum Communications, Computing, and Measurements edited by P. Tombs and O. Hirota (New York: Kluwer Academic/Plenum Publishers)
- Welsch D-G, Dung H T and Knoll L 2002 E-print quant-ph/0205192
- Wigner E P 1931 Gruppentheorie und ihre Anwendungen auf die Quantenmechanik der Atomspektren (Braunschweig: Vieweg)

1939 Ann. Math. 40 149

1967 Symmetries and Reflections (Bloomington: Indiana University Press)

Zeilinger A. 1999 Rev. Mod. Phys. 71 S288