Quanti cation of C om plem entarity in M ulti-Q ubit System s

X inhua Peng^{1;2;}, X iwen Zhu², D ieter Suter¹, Jiangfeng Du³, M aili Liu², and Kelin Gao²

¹Fachbereich Physik, Universitat Dortmund, 44221 Dortmund, Germany

²W uhan Institute of Physics and M athem atics, Chinese Academ y of Sciences, W uhan 430071, P.R.China and

³H efei N ational Laboratory for Physical Sciences at M icroscale and D epartm ent of M odern Physics,

University of Science and Technology of China, Hefei, Anhui 230026, P.R. China

(Dated: April 17, 2024)

C om plem entarity was originally introduced as a qualitative concept for the discussion of properties of quantum m echanical objects that are classically incompatible. M ore recently, com plem entarity has become a quantitative relation between classically incompatible properties, such as visibility of interference fringes and "which-way" information, but also between purely quantum m echanical properties, such as measures of entanglem ent. W e discuss di erent com plem entarity relations for system s of 2-, 3-, or n qubits. U sing nuclear magnetic resonance techniques, we have experim entally veri ed som e of these com plem entarity relations in a two-qubit system.

PACS num bers: 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ud, 76.60.-k

I. IN TRODUCTION

Complementarity is one of the most characteristic properties of quantum mechanics, which distinguishes the quantum world from the classical one. In 1927, Bohr[1] rst reviewed this subject, observing that the wave-and particle-like behaviors of a quantum mechanical object are mutually exclusive in a single experiment, and referred to this as complem entarity. Probably the most popular representation of Bohr complem entarity is the wave-particle duality'[2, 3], which is closely related to the long-standing debate over the nature of light [4]. This type of complementarity is often illustrated by means of two-way interferom eters: A classical particle can take only one path, while a classical wave can pass through both paths and therefore display interference fringes when the two partial waves are recombined. Depending on their state, quantum mechanical systems (quantons) can behave like particles (go along a single path), like waves (show interference), or remain in between these extrem e cases by exhibiting particle-as well. as wave-like behavior. This can be quantied by the predictability P, which speci es the probability that the system will go along a speci c path, and the visibility V of the interference fringes after recombination of the two partial waves, which quanti es the wavelike behavior. A quantitative expression for the com plem entarity is the inequality [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]

$$P^{2} + V^{2} = 1;$$
 (1)

which states that the more particle-like a system behaves, the less pronounced the wave-like behavior becomes.

In composite systems, consisting of two (or more) quantons, it is possible to optim ize the \which-way" information of one particle: one rst performs an ideal projective measurement on the second particle. By an appropriate choice of the measurement observable, one can then maxim ize the predictability for the rst partial system. This optim ized property, which is called distinguishability D, obeys a similar inequality [5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10]**:**

$$D^{2} + V^{2}$$
 1: (2)

For pure states, the lim iting equality holds,

$$D^2 + V^2 = 1;$$
 (3)

while the inequality holds for mixed states. This issue has been experimentally investigated in the context of interferom etric experiments, using a wide range of physical objects including photons[11], electrons[12], neutrons[13], atom s[14] and nuclear spins in a bulk ensemble with nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) techniques [15, 16].

In system s of strongly correlated pairs of particles, it is often useful to consider particle pairs as com posite particles with an independent identity. Such com posite particles that consist of identical particles include pairs of electrons (Cooper pairs) and photon pairs[17]. M any interesting phenom ena, such as superconductivity, are much easier to understand in terms of the composite particles than in terms of the individual particles. Suitable experim ents, such as two-photon interference [17, 18] can m easure properties of the com posite particles. These experim ents m ade it possible to quantify the \com positeness" of a two-particle state. Extrem e cases are product states, which show no signal in two-particle interference experim ents, while maxim ally entangled states maxim ize the two-particle visibility but show vanishing visibility in experiments testing the interference of individual particles [19]. Between these extremes lies a continuum of states for which the com plem entarity relation

$$V_{k}^{2} + V_{12}^{2}$$
 1; (k = 1;2) (4)

holds, which is valid for bipartite pure states [9, 20]. Here, V_k is the single-particle visibility for particle k, while V_{12} represents the two-particle visibility. This interm ediate regime of the complementarity relation of one- and two-photon interference has only recently been experimentally demonstrated in a Young's double-slit experiment by Abouraddy et al.[21].

From a quantum information theoretic point of view, com posite quantum systems involve inevitably the concept of entanglem ent, which is a uniquely quantum resource with no classical counterpart. Does entanglement constitute a physical feature of quantum systems that can be incorporated into the principle of com plem entarity? Som e authors have explored this question and obtained some important results, such as the complem entarities between distinguishability and entanglem ent [22], between coherence and entanglem ent [23] and between local and nonlocal inform ation [24] etc. Additionally, som e complementarity relations in n-qubit pure systems are also observed such as the relationships between multipartite entanglem ent and m ixedness for special classes of n-qubit system s[25], and between the single particle properties and the n bipartite entanglem ents in an arbitrary pure state of n qubits[26].

M ore recently, Jakob and B ergou [27] derived a generalized duality relation between bipartite and single partite properties for an arbitrary pure state of two qubits, which in some sense accounts for m any previous results. They showed that an arbitrary norm alized pure state j i of a two-qubit system satis es the expression [27]:

$$C^{2} + V_{k}^{2} + P_{k}^{2} = 1$$
: (5)

Here the concurrence C [28, 29] is de ned by

as a measure of entanglement. $y^{(k)}$ is the y component of the Pauli operator on qubit k and j i is the com – plex conjugate of j i. The concurrence is a bipartite quantity, which quanti es quantum nonlocal correlations of the system and is taken as a measure of the bipartite character of the composite system. The complement

$$S_k^2 = V_k^2 + P_k^2$$
 (7)

com bines the single-particle fringe visibility V_k and the predictability P_k . This quantity is invariant under local unitary transform ations (though V_k and P_k are not), and is therefore taken as a quantitative measure of the single-particle character of qubit k.

Since the two-particle visibility is equal to the concurrence, V_{12} C [27], we can rewrite Eq. (5) as

$$V_{12}^2 + V_k^2 + P_k^2 = 1;$$
 (k = 1;2): (8)

T his turns the inequality (4) into an equality and identies the m issing quantity as the predictability P_k .

For pure bipartite system s, an equation sim ilar to Eq. (3) holds, $D_k^2 + V_k^2 = 1$. Here, the index k = 1;2 refers to the di erent particles as the interfering objects in the bipartite system . C om bining this with Eq. (5), we obtain

$$D_{k}^{2} = P_{k}^{2} + C^{2}$$
: (9)

Apparently, D $_k$ contains both the a priori W W inform ation P $_k$ and the additional information encoded in the

quantum correlation to an additional quantum system which serves as the possible information storage. This quantum correlation can be measured by the concurrence. This reveals explicitly that quantum correlation can help to optim ize the information that can be obtained from a suitable measurement; without entanglement, the available W W information is limited to the a priori W W know ledge P_k .

For mixed states, a weaker statement for the complementarity (5) is found in the form of an inequality $C^2 + V_k^2 + P_k^2$ 1. However, there is no corresponding inequality for the two-particle visibility V_{12} in the mixed two-particle sources because it is very di cult to get a clear and de nite expression for V_{12} and the direct relation between concurrence and two-particle visibility ceases to exist for mixed states [27].

In this paper, we give a proof-of-principle experim ental dem onstration of the com plem entarities (3), (5) and (8)in a two-qubit system. In addition, we extend the com plementarity relation (5) to multi-qubit systems. The rem ainder of the paper is organized as follow s: In Sec Π , we introduce NMR interferom etry as a tool for m easuring visibilities and which-way information. Sec. III and Sec. IV discuss m easurem ents of the visibilities and the "which-way" information in pure bipartite systems. Sec. V is an experim ental investigation of the com plem entarity relation for a pure bipartite system on the basis of liquid-state NMR. For this purpose, we express the entanglem ent (concurrence) in term sofdirectly measurable quantities: the two-particle visibility V_{12} and the distinquishability D_k. This allows us to test two interferom etric com plem entarities (8) and (3) by speci c num erical examples. In section VI we generalize the complem entarity relation (5) to multi-qubit systems. A quantitative com plem entarity relation exists between the singleparticle property and the bipartite entanglem ent between the particle and the remainder of the system in pure multi-qubit systems. This allows us to derive, for pure three-qubit system, a relation between the single-particle, bipartite and tripartite properties, which should generalize to arbitrary pure states of n qubit systems. Finally, a brief sum m ary with a discussion is given in Sec. V II.

II. NMR INTERFEROMETRY

C om plem entarity relations are often discussed in term s of photons or other particles propagating along di erent paths. A nother, very exible approach is to simulate these systems in a quantum computer. In particular liquid-state NMR has proved very successful for such investigations. O ptical interferom eters can readily be sim – ulated by NMR -interferom etry [30].

Figure 1 show show such an interferom etric experiment can be implemented by a sequence of radio-frequency pulses. Assuming an ideal spin $I = \frac{1}{2}$ particle, the H ilbert space H₁ associated with the particle is spanned by vec-



FIG.1: Principle of NMR interferom etry: (a) Path representation and (b) Pulse sequence.

tors j(m = $+\frac{1}{2}$) and j(m = $\frac{1}{2}$). A beam splitter, which puts the particle incoming from one port into a superposition of both paths is realized by a radio frequency pulse that puts the spin in a superposition of the two basis states. If the ip angle of the pulse is taken as $\frac{1}{2}$, it corresponds to a symmetric beam splitter. A relative phase shift between the two paths, which corresponds to a path length di erence, can be realized by a rotation of the spin around the z-axis. The second $\frac{1}{2}$ radio frequency pulse recombines the two paths.

For the discussion of the complementarity of interferencevs. \which-way" information, we consider the superposition state behind the rst beam splitter as the starting point. The action of the phase shifter and the second beam splitter can then be summarized into a transducer. M athematically, this transducer maps the input state into an output state by the transformation

U () =
$$e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}} e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}} = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}} e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}} e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}}$$
 (10)

In the NMR interferom eter, a num ber of di erent possibilities exist for in plem enting the action of the transducer. We chose the following pulse sequence, which provides high delity for a large range of experim ental param eters:

Here, we have used the usual convention that [] refers to an rfpulse with $\rm ip\mbox{-}angle$ and phase .

The resulting populations of both states in the output space vary with the phase angle . As shown in Fig. 1, they can be read out by rst deleting coherence with a eld gradient pulse (FGP) and then converting the population di erence into observable transverse m agnetization by a $\frac{1}{2}$ read-out pulse. The amplitude of the resulting FID (= the integral of the spectrum) m easures then the populations:

$$S_{NMR} p(Di) p(Ji) = 2p(Di) 1;$$

where we have taken into account that the sum of the populations is unity. The experimental signal can be normalized to the signal of the system in thermal equilibrium.

Figure 2 shows, as an example, the interference pattern for the single proton spin in H_2O . The amplitude of the spectral line shows a sinusoidal variation with the phase angle , which implies the sinusoidal variation of the population $p(\dot{p}i)$ or $p(\dot{q}i)$.

The visibility of the resulting interference pattern is de $n\varepsilon$



FIG.2: NMR signals versus the phase angle $\$.

Since an input state

where

$$^{(i)} = \frac{1}{2} \quad 1 + s^{(i)} \quad \sim \tag{13}$$

with an initial B loch vector $\mathbf{s}^{(i)} = \mathbf{s}_x^{(i)}; \mathbf{s}_y^{(i)}; \mathbf{s}_z^{(i)}$ and Pauli spin operators ~ = (x; y; z) is transformed into

^{(i) U} (⁾ (^{f)} =
$$\frac{1}{2}$$
 1+ $\mathbf{s}^{(f)}$ ~ (14)

with $s^{(f)} = s_z^{(i)}; s_x^{(i)} \sin + s_y^{(i)} \cos ; s_x^{(i)} \cos s_y^{(i)} \sin$ by the transducer, we nd for the visibility

$$V = s_{x}^{(i)} + s_{y}^{(i)}$$
(15)

and for the predictability

$$P = s_z^{(i)}$$
 : (16)

W ith the described experiment, it is thus straightforward to verify the inequality (1).

ιl



FIG. 3: Schematic two-particle interferom eter using beam splitters BS_1 , BS_2 and phase shifters 1, 2.

The NMR interferom etry experiment can easily be expanded to multi-qubit systems. We start with a discussion of pure bipartite systems, where we explore the visibility in dimensional discussion etric experiments, geared towards single- and bipartite properties. Figure 3 shows the reference setup: The source S emits a pair of particles 1 and 2, one of which propagates along path A and/or A⁰, through a variable phase shifter $_1$ impinging on an ideal beam splitter BS₁, and is then registered in either beam K₁ or L₁. On the other side there is the analogous process for the other particle with paths B and B⁰.

W ithout loss the generality, we rst associate states $Ai; Bi; K_1i; and K_2i in Fig. 3 with the spin-up state$ $Di and <math>A^{0}i, B^{0}i, J_1i$, and J_2i with the spin-down state jli. A particle pair on itted from the source S can be expressed as the general pure two-qubit state j i:

$$ji = _{1} Di_{1} Di_{2} + _{2} Di_{1} Ji_{2} + _{3} Ji_{1} Di_{2} + _{4} Ji_{1} Ji_{2}$$
(17)

with complex coe cients $_{i}$ that are normalized to 1.

A ssum ing that the transducers consist of variable phase shifters and symmetric beam splitters, they can be described by the unitary operation

$$U(_{1};_{2}) = U_{1}(_{1}) \quad U_{2}(_{2})$$
 (18)

where each transducer is de ned according to Eq. (10). Here the subscripts label two di erent particles. A pplying the transducer (18) to the initial state (17), we can calculate the detection probabilities in the output channels as

$$p(\dot{\mathbf{x}}\dot{\mathbf{i}}_{1}) = \frac{1}{2} + (1)^{x} \dot{\mathbf{j}}_{1 3} + 2 \dot{\mathbf{i}}_{2} \dot{\mathbf{j}}_{2} \mathbf{s} (1 1)^{x} \dot{\mathbf{j}}_{2} + 3 \dot{\mathbf{i}}_{2} \dot{\mathbf{j}}_{2} \mathbf{s} (1 1)^{x} \dot{\mathbf{j}}_{1 2} + 3 \dot{\mathbf{i}}_{2} \dot{\mathbf{j}}_{2} \mathbf{s} (2 2);$$
(19)

where x = 0 or 1, $1_3 + 2_4 = j_{1_3} + 2_4 je^{i_1}$ and $1_2 + 3_4 = j_{1_2} + 3_4 je^{i_2}$. The single particle count rates $p(jxi_k)$ reach their maxim a and m inim a when the phase shifters are set to k = n + k; (n = 0; 1). From Eqs. (12) and (19), the single particle visibilities can be obtained as

$$V_1 = 2j_{1_3} + 2_4j$$
 $V_2 = 2j_{1_2} + 3_4j$: (20)

Two-particle properties can be measured by higher order correlations. Following reference [9, 20], we use the \corrected" two-particle fringe visibility

$$V_{12} = \frac{\left[\overline{p} \left(\dot{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{i}_{1} \ \dot{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{i}_{2}\right)\right]_{\text{max}}}{\left[\overline{p} \left(\dot{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{i}_{1} \ \dot{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{i}_{2}\right)\right]_{\text{max}} + \left[\overline{p} \left(\dot{\mathbf{x}} \mathbf{i}_{1} \ \dot{\mathbf{y}} \mathbf{i}_{2}\right)\right]_{\text{min}}};$$
(21)

where x;y = 0 or 1. The \corrected" joint probability $\overline{p}(\dot{x}i_1 \dot{y}i_2) = p(\dot{x}i_1 \dot{y}i_2) p(\dot{x}i_1)p(\dot{y}i_2) + \frac{1}{4}$ are defined such that single-particle contributions are eliminated [9, 20]. $p(\dot{x}i_1 \dot{y}i_2)$ denotes the probabilities of joint detections. As the visibilities explicitly depend on the form of the transducers involved and the details of them easurement (e.g., them easurement basis f K i, j ig is chosen as f j i, j l ig), we use the symbols V_k , V_{12} here, to indicate the experimental visibilities under a specific experimental con guration, as opposed to the maximal visibilities V_k , V_{12} .

The \corrected" two-particle joint probabilities can be calculated as

$$\overline{p} (\dot{x}i_1 \dot{y}i_2) = \frac{1}{4}f1 + (1)^{x+y} [M j\cos(1+2)] + N j\cos(1+2)]$$

$$+ N j\cos(1+2) + N j\sin(1+2) +$$

where

$$M = {}_{1 4} ({}_{1 3} + {}_{2 4}) ({}_{1 2} + {}_{3 4}) = M je^{1};$$

$$N = {}_{2 3} ({}_{1 3} + {}_{2 4}) ({}_{1 2} + {}_{3 4}) = M je^{1};$$

(23)

The maxim aland minim alvalues of \overline{p} (\dot{y} i₁ \dot{y} i₂) are thus

$$\overline{p}_{\max,\min} (j_{x} i_{1} j_{2} i_{2}) = \frac{1}{4} [1 \quad 2 (j_{1} j_{1} j_{1} j_{1})]: \quad (24)$$

These values are reached only when the phase shifters are set to $(1; 2) = n + \frac{1+2}{2}; m + \frac{1-2}{2}$, where the parameters n; m can be (n; m = 0; 1). Hence, on substituting for the maxim aland m inim alvalues of these probabilities in Eq. (21), we nd

$$V_{12} = 2 (M_j + N_j):$$
 (25)

W ith Eqs. (20), (23), and (25), the complementarity relation (4) is obtained, valid for arbitrary pure bipartite states.

B. Experim ents on two extrem e cases

For the experimental measurements, we used the nuclear spins of ^{13}C -labeled chloroform as a representative 2-qubit quantum system. We identied the spin of the ^{1}H nuclei with particle 1 and the carbon nuclei (^{13}C) with particle 2. The spin-spin coupling constant J between ^{13}C and ^{1}H is 214.95 Hz. The relaxation times were measured to be T_1 = 16.5 sec and T_2 = 6.9 sec for the proton, and T_1 = 21.2 sec and T_2 = 0.35 sec for the carbon nuclei. Experiments were performed on an In nity+ NMR spectrometer equipped with a D oty probe at the frequencies 150.13M Hz for ^{13}C and at 599.77M Hz for ^{1}H , using conventional liquid-state NMR techniques.

For most of the experiments that we discuss in the following, the system was rst prepared into a pseudopure state $_{00} = \frac{1}{tr(1)}1 + "j0ih00j$. Here, 1 is the unity operator and " a small constant of the order of 10⁵ determined by the thermal equilibrium. We used the spatial averaging technique [31] and applied the pulse sequence:

$$\frac{h_{1}}{3} = \frac{h_{1}}{2} + \frac{h_{1}}{4} = \frac{-2}{J} + \frac{h_{1}}{4} = \frac{h_{1}}{J} + \frac{h_{1}}{4} = \frac{h_{1}}{J} + \frac{h_{1}}{J} = \frac{h_{1}}{J} = \frac{h_{1}}{J} + \frac{h_{1}}{J} = \frac{h_{1$$

where G_z is a eld gradient pulse that destroys the transverse m agnetizations. The upper indices of the pulses indicate to which qubit the rotation is applied.

Starting from this pseudo-pure state, we then prepared the two-particle source states j i. As an example, we consider a product state j i

$$ji = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}}(ji_1 + ji_1) \qquad \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}}(ji_2 + ji_2);$$
 (27)

and a maxim ally entangled state ji

$$ji = \frac{1}{\frac{p}{2}} (p_{i_1} p_{i_2} + p_{i_1} p_{i_2}):$$
 (28)

They can be prepared from $_{00}$ by the following pulse sequences:

ji:
$$\frac{1}{2} = 2 \frac{2}{2} = 2$$

ji: $\frac{1}{2} = 2 \frac{2}{2} = 2 \frac{2}{2$

where $-_{J}$ represents a free evolution for this time under the scalar coupling.

The actual interferom eterw as realized by applying the transducers U ($_1$; $_2$) of Eq. (18) to the prepared state j i, which describes the e ect of the phase shifters and sym metric beam splitters. The transducer pulse sequence (11) is simultaneously applied to both qubits.

The probabilities that enter the complementarity relations can be expressed in terms of populations of the four spin states. To determ ine these spin states, we used a simplied quantum state tom ography scheme to reconstruct only the diagonal elements of the density matrix. This was realized by

$$\begin{array}{ccc} h & i_k \\ G_z & \frac{1}{2} & F & ID_k \end{array} \tag{30}$$

for k = 1;2. F ID k represents to recording the F ID of qubit k after a eld gradient pulse G_z and a read-out pulse $\frac{1}{2}^{k}_{=2}$. Fig. 4 show sthe NMR signals after Fourier transform ation of the corresponding F ID s for the proton and carbon spins in ¹³CHC k at k = 0 when they are prepared in the product state j i or the maximally entangled state j i. The signals measure the populations:



FIG.4: Experimental spectra of proton and carbon at $_{k} = 0$: (a) and (b) for the product state j i; (c) and (d) for the entangled state j i. (a), (c) are the proton signals and (b), (d) are the carbon signals.

$$S_{N M R} (Carbon) p(\mathfrak{I}_{1}; \mathfrak{x}_{2}) p(\mathfrak{I}_{1}; \mathfrak{x}_{2});$$

$$S_{N M R} (Proton) p(\mathfrak{x}_{1}; \mathfrak{I}_{2}) p(\mathfrak{x}_{1}; \mathfrak{I}_{2});$$
(31)

where x = 0 for the high-frequency resonance line and 1 for the low-frequency line.

To create an interferogram, we varied the phases kfrom 0 to 2, incrementing both simultaneously in steps of =16. The resulting interference pattern of the proton is shown in Fig. 5. The carbon signals have a similar behavior as a function of $_2$ for the states ji and ji, as Fig. 5 shows. From these experimental data points, we calculated the probabilities $p(\dot{x}i_k)$ and $\overline{p}(\dot{x}i_1 \dot{y}i_2)$ and tted those to a cosine function: $y = A \cos(x + x_0) + B$. From the tted values of the amplitude A and the o set B , we extracted the experim ental visibilities as V_1 = 1:04 0:02; $V_2 = 0:99$ 0:01, $V_{12} = 0:05$ 0:01 for the product state j i and $V_1 = 0.03$ 0.01; $V_2 = 0.14$ 0.01, $V_{12} = 0.86$ 0.02 for the entangled state j i by the de nitions of Eqs.(12) and (21). As theoretically expected, the product state j i shows one-particle interference fringes, but alm ost no two-particle interference fringes, while the situation is reversed for the entangled state ji. It can also be seen that the discrepancies from the theory is



FIG.5: Experim ental spectra of proton with the phase $_1$: (a) for the product state j i and (b) for the entangled state j i.

larger for the entangled state j i than for the product state j i. This is easily understood by realizing that the state preparation is more complicated for the entangled state.

IV. "W HICH-WAY" INFORMATION IN BIPARTITE SYSTEMS

A. Predictability

For the same system, we can calculate the predictabilities, i.e. the probabilities for correctly predicting which path the particle will take, from the expectation value of the $_{z}^{(k)}$ observable on the state j i, i.e., P $_{k}$ = h j $_{z}^{(k)}$ j i :

$$P_{1} = j_{1} f + j_{2} f j_{3} f j_{4} f$$

$$P_{2} = j_{1} f j_{2} f + j_{3} f j_{4} f ; \quad (32)$$

where $z^{(k)}$ is the z component of the Pauli operator on qubit k. P_k is thus the magnitude of the di erence between the probabilities that particle k takes path $\mathcal{D}i_k$ or the other path jli_k .

For the experim entalm easurem ent of the predictability P_k , we measure the observable $z^{(k)}$ by partial quantum state tom ography: a eld gradient pulse destroys

coherences and a readout pulse $\frac{1}{2} \sum_{z=2}^{k} converts \sum_{z=1}^{k} into \sum_{x=1}^{k} converts \sum_{z=1}^{k} into \sum_{x=1}^{k} converts x$, which is recorded as the FID. Upon Fourier transformation, the integral of both lines yields h $z^{(k)}$ i, and its magnitude corresponds to the predictability P_k.

Figure 6 shows the measurement of the predictability P₂ on ¹³CHCl₃ for two specic examples: the product state j ()i = $\frac{p_1^1}{2}$ ($\mathcal{D}i_1 + \mathcal{J}i_1$) $\cos_{\overline{2}}\mathcal{D}i_2 + \sin_{\overline{2}}\mathcal{J}i_2$ and the entangled state j ()i = $\frac{p_1^1}{2}\mathcal{D}i_1 + \frac{p_1^1}{2}\mathcal{D}i_2 + \mathcal{J}i_2$, $\cos_{\overline{2}}\mathcal{D}i_2 + \sin_{\overline{2}}\mathcal{J}i_2$.



FIG. 6: Experim ental m eaurem ent of the predictability P_2 for j ()i (denoted by) and j ()i (denoted by). The solid lines are the theoretical expectations. The insets are, respectively, the experim ental spectra at $= 0;_{7};$.

B. Distinguishability

In a bipartite system, the which-way information for particle k can be optimized by rst performing a projective measurement on particle j ($j \in k$). For this measurement, we rst have to choose the optimal ancilla observable W $_{j}^{(opt)}$. A coording to Englert's quantitative analysis of the distinguishability [10], we start by writing the quantum state j i as the sum of two components corresponding to two paths of qubit k:

$$j i = a_{k+} j D_{i_k} j m_{+} i_j + a_k j l_{i_k} j m_{-} i_j$$
: (33)

Each component is coupled to a di erent state of qubit j:

The coe cients a_k are

$$a_{k+} = \Pr^{p} \frac{\overline{j_{1} f + j_{1+k} f}}{j_{4} k f + j_{4} f} :$$
 (35)

A suitable measurement is performed on qubit j to make qubit k acquire the maximal \which-way" information. To determ ine the most useful ancilla observable, we write it as $W_j = \mathfrak{D}^{(j)}$. The probability that the ancilla observable nds eigenvalue diers for the two component states:

$$p_{+}() = a_{k+}^{2} h j(j_{m} + i_{j}h_{m} + j_{j})j i$$

$$p() = a_{k}^{2} h j(j_{m} i_{j}h_{m} j_{j})j i$$
(36)

where is the corresponding eigenvector.

The distinguishability D_k for qubit k is obtained by maxim izing the di erence of the measurem ent probabilities for the two components,

$$D_{k} = max \quad \dot{p}_{+} () p ()j : (37)$$

U sing the notation

$$jm ihm j = m \sim ~; \qquad (38)$$

۱

where m~ are vectors on the B loch sphere, we write

$$D_{k} = \max \mathcal{B} \quad a_{k+}^{2} \mathfrak{m}_{+} \quad a_{k}^{2} \mathfrak{m} \quad : \quad (39)$$

C learly the maximum is reached if the two vectors \hat{b} and $a_{k+}^2 \, \hat{m}_{+} a_k^2 \, \hat{m}_{-}$ are parallel. Since \hat{b} has unit length, the distinguishability becomes

$$D_{k} = a_{k+}^{2} \operatorname{m}_{+} a_{k}^{2} \operatorname{m}_{+}$$
$$= \frac{q}{1 \quad 2a_{k+}^{2} a_{k}^{2} \quad (1 + \operatorname{m}_{+} \operatorname{m}_{+}): \quad (40)$$

C om bining Eqs. (20) and (40), we obtain the com plementarity relation (3), i.e., $D_k^2 + V_k^2 = 1$ for k = 1;2.

For the experimental measurement, we rst have to perform a "measurement" on the ancilla qubit j, using the optim alobservable $W_j = \mathfrak{D}_j$. This is done by applying a unitary transformation R to rotate the eigenbasis fj i_j g of the observable $W_j^{(opt)}$ into the computational basis fjDi_j; JLi_jg B2]. The subsequent eld gradient pulse destroys coherence of qubit j B3], as well as qubit k and joint coherences (= zero and double quantum coherences). A fler this ancilla measurement, the distinguishability D_k can be measured by a readout pulse, detection of the FID, Fourier transformation, and taking the sum of the magnitudes of both resonance lines.

Figure 7 shows the observed distinguishability D_2 for the states j ()i and j ()i. From Eq. (39), we nd the optim al observable $W_1^{(opt)}$ is $z^{(1)}_z$ for j ()i, and $\sin(=2) x^{(1)} + \cos(=2) z^{(1)}$ with $= \arctan(\sec(\frac{1}{4} z))$ for j ()i. Therefore, the transformation R was realized by the NMR pulses $\frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2}$ and $[\frac{1}{2}]$. As there is no entanglement in the state j ()i, $D_2 = P_2$, while for the entangled state j ()i we nd $D_2 > P_2$. The experimental data also satisfy the relation $D_2^2 = P_2^2 + C^2$ of Eq. (9).



FIG. 7: Experim ental m eaurem ent of the distinguishability D_2 for j ()i (denoted by) and j ()i (denoted by). The solid lines are the theoretical expectations and the dotted line is the theoretical expectation of the predictability P_2 for j ()i. The insets are, respectively, the experim ental spectra at $= 0; \frac{1}{2};$.

V. COM PLEM ENTARITY RELATIONS FOR BIPARTITE SYSTEM S

W ith the same experimental scheme we now explore the complementarity relations for bipartite quantum systems. Between the single particle visibility V_k (see Eq. (20)), the two-particle visibility V_{12} (Eq. (25)), and the predictability P_k (Eq. (32)), we can verify that the relation

$$V_{12}^2 + V_k^2 + P_k^2$$
 1 (k = 1;2); (41)

holds in a pure bipartite system for any experimental setting and measurement basis.

If the initial state j i has only real coe cients $_{i}$, the inequality becomes an equality. In this case, the two-particle visibility V_{12} becomes equal to the concurrence C, V_{12} C = $2j_{14}$ $_{23}j$. However, when the coe cients $_{i}$ are arbitrary com plex numbers, the two-particle visibility V_{12} can be smaller than the concurrence, V_{12} C. As a specic example consider ji=

0.3 jD0i 0.2e $\frac{i\frac{3}{5}}{5}$ jD1+ 0.8e $\frac{i\frac{5}{25}}{5}$ jL0i+ 0.4796e $\frac{i\frac{5}{12}}{12}$ jL1i. U sing sym metric beam splitters and them easurement basis fjDi; jLig), we nd V_{12} = 0.1627 and C = 0.2110, i.e. V_{12} < C.

By the Schm idt decom position [34], any pure state j i can be transform ed into one with realcoe cients by local unitary operations. Therefore, one can design a di erent experiment using beam splitters that im plement the transform ation $e^{i\frac{k}{2}(x^{(k)}\cos x + y^{(k)}\sin x)}$ instead of the symmetric one $e^{i\frac{4}{4}y^{(k)}}$. In this case, the single-particle transducers in plement the operation

$$U_{k}(_{k};_{k};_{k}) = e^{\frac{i-k}{2} \binom{(k)}{x} \cos_{k} + \frac{(k)}{y} \sin_{k}} e^{\frac{i-k}{2} \frac{(k)}{z}}$$
(42)

instead of U_k ($_k$) in Eq. (10). Note that the singleparticle character S_k (Eq. (7)) is invariant under local unitary transform ations though its constituents V_k and P_k are not. By de ning the maximal visibility $V_{12} = \max_{f_k, k, g} fV_{12}$ (k; k)g, we obtain V_{12} C and

$$V_{12}^2 + S_k^2 = 1;$$
 (k = 1;2): (43)

This shows that the complementarity relation (8) in the equality form is fulled for any pure bipartite system. An alternative way is to keep the symmetric beam splitters and change the measurement basis. One can always choose an optimal basis which consists of the eigenvectors of an observable $W = W_1 \quad W_2$ that maximizes the visibility V_{12} , i.e., $V_{12} = \max_{fW|g} fV_{12}$ (W)g C. Being invariant under local unitary transformations, this maximal two-particle visibility V_{12} (= concurrence C) is a good measure of the bipartite property encoded in the pure state.

In a pure bipartite system, the complementarity relation (43), together with the identity V_{12} C and the denition (7) of the single particle character S_k o ers a method for quantifying entanglement in terms of the directly measurable quantities, in this case visibilities, predictability and distinguishability. In this section, we experimentally explore these complementarity relations for the states

$$j (_{1};_{2})i = \frac{1}{p\frac{1}{2}} [jDi_{1} \qquad \cos \frac{1}{2}]Di_{2} + \sin \frac{1}{2}]Ii_{2} + jIi_{1} \qquad \cos \frac{2}{2}]Di_{2} + \sin \frac{2}{2}]Ii_{2}](44)$$

by preparing the state in the nuclear spins of m olecules, and m easuring the visibilities, predictability and distinguishability by NM R according to the procedure outlined above.

Table I lists the theoretical expectations for the various quantities involved in the complem entarity relation for this state. The single particle character S_k and the concurrence C (the maximal two-particle visibility V_{12}) satisfy the duality relation of Eq. (43). For the state j (1; 2)i (Eq. (44)), the maximal two-particle visibility V_{12} by setting the measurement basis f $j_{k1}y_{2}$ is obtained from the experimental visibility V_{12} by setting the measurement basis f $j_{k1}y_{2}$ is to the computational basis f j_{k2} = 0 or 1 ig. The predictabilities for the two particles are qualitatively dimenses $V_{2}^{2} + V_{12}^{2}$ 1. The special case with $_{1} + _{2} =$ was discussed in detail in Ref.[20]; in that case, both predictabilities vanish, $P_{1} = P_{2} = 0$. However, $V_{12}^{2} + V_{k}^{2} + P_{k}^{2} = 1$ and $D_{k}^{2} + V_{k}^{2} = 1$ are still satis ed for k = 1 or 2.

To verify these relations, we used an experim ental procedure sim ilar to that discussed in Section IIIB. To prepare the state j ($_1$; $_2$) i from the pseudo-pure state $_{00}$, we used the following NMR pulse sequence:

$$j (_{1};_{2})i: \frac{h}{2} \frac{i_{1}}{a_{2}} \frac{h}{2} \frac{i_{2}}{a_{2}} \frac{1}{2} \frac{1}{2} \frac{h}{2} \frac{i_{2}}{a_{2}} \frac{1+a_{2}}{a_{2}} \frac{1+a_{2}}{a_{$$

When $\begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 2 \end{pmatrix} = 2$ J is negative, we generate the required evolution by inserting two pulses on one of the two qubits before and after the evolution period of j_1 2j=2 J.

W emeasured the visibilities for the state j (1; 2) iby rst scanning 1 while xing 2 to =2, then repeated the experiment with xed 1 and variable 2. This provides the maxim alprobabilities $\overline{p}_{m ax,m in}$ (jki₁ jyi₂) of the \corrected" joint probabilities, which occur at (1; 2) = $n + \frac{1}{2}$; $m + \frac{1}{2}$ for j (1; 2) i.

As a specic example, we present the experim ental results for j $(_1;_2)$ i with $_1 + _2 = \frac{1}{2}$. The resulting interference fringes were closely sim ilar to those shown in Fig. 5. Using the procedure described in Section IIIB, we extracted the relevant visibilities V_k and V_{12} from the experimental data. The visibilities and the predictability were measured as a function of 1 varying from =4to 3 =4 in steps of =8. The single-particle character $\overline{V_k^2 + P_k^2}$ and the two-particle visibility V_{12} from $S_k =$ these experim ents are displayed in Fig. 8, together with plots of the theoretical com plem entarity relations (solid curves) indicating $V_{12}^2 + S_k^2 = 1$ for the pure two-qubit states. A t of these data to the equation $x^2 + y^2 = r^2$ resulted in an amplitude r = 0.98 0.01 for the data of Fig. 8 (a) and 0.97 0.01 for the data of Fig. 8 (b).



FIG.8: (C olor online) Experim ental veri cation of the com – plem entarity relation $V_{12}^2 + S_k^2 = 1$ in a pure two-qubit system : (a) for qubit 1 and (b) for qubit 2. Solid curves represent the theoretical com plem entarity relation of single-particle character S_k versus two-particle visibility V_{12} . Experim ental results are indicated by circles.

For the quantitative m easurem ent of the distinguishability D_k, the optim all observable W_j^(opt) for j (1; 2)i is a spin operator parallel to $\tilde{b} = (\sin (-2); 0; \cos (-2))$ with $= \frac{1+2}{2}$ for D₁, in agreement with Ref. [16], and = arctan ($\cot(\frac{1+2}{2}) = \sin(\frac{1-2}{2})$) for D₂, according to the analysis of section IV B. The transformation R_j was realized by a [$\frac{1}{2}$ pulse. Figure 9 compares the measured values of the single particle visibilities V_k and the distinguishabilities D_k to the theoretical complementiation (solid curves) D_k² + V_k² = 1. The tted values of the amplitude r are 0:99 0.01 for the data in Fig. 9(a) and 0:98 0.01 for Fig. 9(b).

Particle k	C V ₁₂	S _k ; V _k P _k	D _k
1	cin 1 2	$\cos \frac{1}{2}^{2}$; $\cos \frac{1}{2}^{2}$ 0	$\cos \frac{1}{2}$
2		$\cos \frac{1}{2} ; \sin \frac{1+2}{2} \cos \frac{1-2}{2} \\ \cos \frac{1+2}{2} \cos \frac{1+2}{2} \\ \sin \frac{1+2}{2} \\ \cos \frac{1+2}{2} \\ \cos \frac{1+2}{2} \\ \sin \frac{1+2}{2} \\ \cos $	$q = \frac{1}{1 \sin^2(\frac{1+2}{2})\cos^2(\frac{1-2}{2})}$

TABLE I: The various quantities involved in the complementarity relation for the family of states $j(_1;_2)i$ in Eq. (44).



FIG.9: (Color online) Experim ental veri cation of the com – plem entarity relation of $D_k^2 + V_k^2 = 1$ in a pure two-qubit system. (a) for qubit 1 and (b) for qubit 2. Solid curves represent the ideal com plem entarity relationship, while experim ental results are indicated by circles.

In Fig. 10, we compare two independent ways form easuring the concurrence C, either through the two-particle visibility V_{12} , or through the single-particle quantities, as $D_k^2 P_k^2$. Both data sets are plotted against 1, together with the theoretical concurrence C. The gure shows clearly that the two procedure give the same results, within experimental errors. Apparently, both m ethods allow one to experimentally determ ine the entanglement of pure two-qubit states. At the same time, the data verify the complementarity relation (5).



FIG.10: (C obr online) M easured concurrence from the experimental values of V_{12} (denoted by 5) and ${}^{\rm P} D_k^2 - P_k^2$ (denoted, respectively, by and for k = 1 and 2) verus 1. The solid curve represent the theoretical concurrence C = sin(1 $\frac{1}{4}$).

In these experim ents, the maxim alabsolute errors for

the quantities V_k , V_{12} and P_k were about 01. The error is primarily due to the inhom ogeneity of the radio frequency eld and the static magnetic eld, imperfect calibration of radio frequency pulses, and signal decay during the experiments. A maximal experimental error about 6% results for the veri cation of the complementarity relations. If we take into account these imperfections, the measured data in our NMR experiments agree well with the theory.

VI. MULTI-QUBIT SYSTEMS

To generalize the complementarity relation (5) to multi-qubit systems, we consider a pure state j i with n qubits i; j;k; :::;m . A coording to the generalized concurrence for pairs of quantum systems of arbitrary dimension by Rungta et al. [35, 36], we calculate the bipartite concurrence $C_{k(ij::m)}$ between qubit k and the system with the remaining n 1 qubits (ij::m) in terms of the marginal density operator $_{k}$

$$C_{k(ij::m)} = \frac{q}{2[1 Tr(\frac{2}{k})]}; \quad (46)$$

In terms of the single particle character S_k (Eq. (7)), and using Tr $_k^2$ = $\frac{1}{2}$ 1+ S_k^2 , we obtain the complementarity relation

$$C_{k(ij::m)}^{2} + S_{k}^{2} = 1$$
 (47)

This is a rst generalization of the tradeo between individual particle properties, quanti ed by S_k , and the biparticle entanglem ent $C_{k(ij::m)}$ to m any particle system s. It in plies also the relation $P_{k(ij::m)} + S_k^2 = n$ derived by Tessier[26].

To characterize the pairw is entanglem ents of qubit k with the other qubits, we sum over the squares of the concurrences of all two-partite subsystem s involving qubit k,

$${}_{2}^{(k)} = {}_{j \in k}^{X} C_{kj}^{2}$$
; (48)

Here, the concurrence C_{kj} is defined in terms of the marginal density operator $_{kj}$ for the kj subsystem, using the definition of C ($_{kj}$) = maxf $_1$ $_2$ $_3$ 4;0g, where $_i$ (i = 1;2;3;4) are the square roots of

the eigenvalues of $_{kj} \begin{pmatrix} k & (j) \\ y & y \end{pmatrix} _{kj} \begin{pmatrix} k & (j) \\ y & y \end{pmatrix}$ in decreasing order[28, 29].

We now specialize to pure three-qubit systems. Here, it is possible to specify three-partite entanglement by the 3-tangle $_3$ [37] as

$$_{3} = C_{k(ij)}^{2} C_{ki}^{2} C_{kj}^{2}$$
 (49)

C om bining Eqs (47), (48), and (49), we nd a com – plem entarity between single-particle properties S_k , pairwise entanglem ent $_2^{(k)}$, and three-partite entanglem ent $_3$, which is valid for each individual qubit:

$$_{3} + {}_{2}^{(k)} + S_{k}^{2} = 1;$$
 (50)

For speci c examples, we have listed in Table II different three-qubit states and calculated the 1-, 2-, and 3-qubit quanti ers appearing in Eq. (50). As can be veri ed from the table, these states satisfy Eq. (50) in di erent ways. The product states of the rst entry only have single particle character. As discussed by D ur et al. [38], the states listed in the second entry represent bipartite entanglem ent between the second and third qubit, while the rst qubit is in a product state with them . The G H Z states are pure three-particle entangled states, while the W states exhibit no genuine three-particle entanglem ent, but two- and one particle properties.

Since there is no generalization of the 3-tangle to larger system s, we can only speculate here if it is possible to extend the relation (50) to more than three qubits. On a heuristic basis, we consider two types of pure n-qubit system s. One is a generalization of the GHZ states to n qubits: $\int H Z_n i = a_1 \int i^n + a_2 \int i^n$. This is a state with pure n-way entanglement, i.e.,

$$n = 4ja_{1}a_{2}f; \qquad {}^{(k)}_{m} = 0 \text{ for } 1 < m < n$$

$$S_{k}^{2} = ja_{1}f ja_{2}f^{2}; \qquad (51)$$

where $_{m}^{(k)}$ denotes the pure m -tangle regarding qubit k. Here, the m -tangle denotes m -way or m -party entanglem ent that critically involves all m parties, which is di erent from the I-tangle in R ef. [35, 36] and a recently introduced m easure of multi-partite entanglem ent de ned by C $_{(n)}^{2} = Tr(\sim)$ with a spin- ip operation $\sim y^{n} y^{n}$ by A.W ong and N.Christensen [39]. Currently, there is no general way to m easure this form of entanglem ent beyond three qubits.

The W states of Table II m ay also be generalized to n qubits as $\mathcal{W}_n i = a_1 \ jl00 \dots 0i + a_2 \ jl10 \dots 0i + a_3 \ jl01 \dots 0i + \dots 0$

In these two cases the complem entarity relation generalizes to $P_m = {}^{(k)}_m + S_k^2 = 1$.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

C om plem entarity is a universal relationship between properties of quantum objects. However, it behaves in di erent ways for di erent quantum objects. The purpose of this paper was to analyze the di erent com plementarity relations that exist in two- and multi-qubit system s and to illustrate some of them in a simple NMR system.

We experimentally veried the complementarity relation between the single-particle and bipartite properties: $C^2 + S_k^2 = 1$ in a pure two-qubit system. To determine the entanglement, we used either the two-particle visibility V_{12} or the distinguishability D_k and the predictability P_k . A coordingly, two complementarity relations: $V_{12}^2 + V_k^2 + P_k^2 = 1$ and $D_k^2 + V_k^2 = 1$ were tested for di erent states including maximally entangled, separable, as well as partially entangled (intermediate) states.

Furtherm ore, the complementarity $C^2 + S_k^2 = 1$ between one- and two-particle character was generalized to systems of n qubits. The complementarity relation $C_{k(ij::m)}^{2} + S_{k}^{2} = 1$ holds for an arbitrary pure n-qubit state, which implies a tradeo between the local singleparticle property $(S_k^2 = V_k^2 + P_k^2)$ and the nonlocal bipartite entanglem ent between the particle and the remainder of the system $(C_{k(ij::m)}^2)$. More interesting, in a pure three-qubit system, the single-particle character (S_k^2) , the two-particle property regarding this particle m easured by the sum of all pair-w ise entanglem ents involving the particle ($_2^{\ (k)}$), and the three-particle property measured by the genuine tripartite entanglem ent (3) are complementary, i.e., $_3 + _2^{(k)} + S_k^2 = 1$. However, the generalization of the sim ilar relationship to a largerqubit system requires the identi cation and quanti cation of multi-partite entanglement for pure and mixed states beyond three-qubit systems that still remains an open question currently. A similar relationship cannot be directly generalized to larger qubit system s. Som e specic samples might be helpful to conjecture the relation $\frac{P^n}{m} \frac{(k)}{m} + S_k^2 = 1$: the single-particle property (bcal) of a particle m ight be com plem entary to all possible pure multi-particle properties (non bcal) connected to this particle.

C om plem entarity and entanglem ent are two im portant phenom ena that characterize quantum mechanics. From these observations, we conclude that entanglem ent in its various form s is an important parameter for the di erent form s of com plem entarity relations in multi-partite system s. D i erent form s of entanglem ent quantify the am ount of inform ation encoded in the di erent quantum correlations of the system, indicating the multi-partite

C lass	3	(k) 2	$S_{k}^{2} = V_{k}^{2} + P_{k}^{2}$
P roduct states	0	0	1
Bipartite entanglem ent	0	0;(k = r)	1; (k = r)
j _{r st} i= ĵDi _r (a ₁ ĵD0i+ a ₂ ĵl1i) _{st}	0	$4 j a_1 a_2 j^2$; (k = s;t)	$(ja_1 j^2 ja_2 j^2)^2$; (k = s;t)
W states	0	P $\frac{2}{1}$	$(\frac{1}{10}, \frac{2}{1}, \frac{P}{10}, \frac{2}{10})^2$
jv i= a1 j001i+ a2 j010i+ a3 j100i	0	j€k	ر زهر لمعر) j 6 k
GHZ states	4 ja ₁ a ₂ j ²	0	$(\frac{1}{2},\frac{2}{1},\frac{2}{2})^2$
jGHZi= a₁ j000i+ a₂ j111i		0	(ز₂مو ز⊥مر)

TABLE II: Some examples for the complementarity relation $_3 + \frac{_{(k)}}{_2} + S_k^2 = 1$ in a pure 3-qubit system.

quantum attributes. These results have also implications on the connection between entanglement sharing and complementarity and maybe in turn provide a possible way to study the entanglement in multi-partite quantum systems by complementarity. We hope that these ndings will be useful for future research into the nature of complementarity and entanglement.

ACKNOW LEDGM ENTS

- N.Bohr, 1928 Naturw issenschaften 16 245; Nature (London) 121 580 (1928).
- [2] R.P.Feynman, R.B.Leifhton, and M. Sands, the Feynam n Lectures of Physics, Vol. III.Q uantum M echanics, Addison - W esley, Reading (1965).
- [3] M.O.Scully, B.-G.Englert and H.W alther, 1991 Nature 351 111.
- [4] K. Sim onyi, "Kulturgeschichte der Physik" Verlag Harri Deutsch, Thun, (1990).
- [5] W.K.W ootters and W.H.Zurek, Phys.Rev.D 19 473 (1979); L.S.Bartell, ibid. 21 1698 (1980); D.M.Greenberger and A.Yasin, Phys.Lett. A 128 391 (1988); L. M andel, Opt.Lett.16 1882 (1991).
- [6] L.S.Bartell, Phys.Rev.D 21 1698 (1980).
- [7] D.M.Greenberger and A.Yasin, Phys.Lett.A 128 391 (1988).
- [8] L.M andel, Opt. Lett. 16 1882 (1991).
- [9] G. Jaeger, A. Shim ony and L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. A 51 54 (1995).
- [10] B.-G. Englert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 2154 (1996); B.-G. Englert, and J.A. Bergou, Opt. Comm. 179, 337 (2000).
- [11] G. I. Taylor, Proc. Cam b. Phil. Soc. 15, 114 (1909); P. M ittelstaedt, A. Prieur and R. Schieder, Found. Phys. 17, 891 (1987); P. D. D. Schwindt, P. G. Kwiat and B. -G. Englert, Phys. Rev. A 60, 4285 (1999).
- G.M ollenstedt and C.Jonsson, Z.Phys.155, 472 (1959);
 A.Tonom ura, J.Endo, T.M atsuda, and T.Kawasaki, Am.J.Phys.57, 117 (1989).
- [13] A. Zeilinger, R. Gahler, C. G. Shull, W. Treimer, and W. Mampe, Rev. Mod. Phys. 60, 1067 (1988); H. Rauch and J. Summhammer, Phys. Lett. A 104, 44 (1984); J. Summhammer, H. Rauch and D. Tuppinger, Phys. Rev. A 36, 4447 (1987).
- [14] O. Camal and J. M lynek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 66, 2689 (1991); S.D urr, T.N onn and G. Rem pe, Phys. Rev. Lett.

We thank Reiner Kuchler for help with the experiments. X.Peng acknowledges support by the Alexander von Humboldt Foundation. This work is supported by the NationalN aturalScience Foundation of China (Grant NO.10274093 and 10425524) and by the NationalFundamentalResearch Program (2001CB 309300).

81, 5705 (1998); P.Bertet, S.Osnaghl, A.Rauschenbeutel, G.Nogues, A.Au eves, M.Brune, J.M.Ralmond and S.Haroche, Nature 411, 166 (2001).

- [15] X. Zhu, X. Fang, X. Peng, M. Feng, K. G ao and F. Du, J. Phys. B 34, 4349 (2001).
- [16] X.Peng, X.Zhu, X.Fang, M.Feng, M.Liu, and K.Gao, J.Phys. A 36, 2555 (2003).
- [17] R. Ghosh and L. Mandel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 1903 (1987).
- [18] C.O. A lley and Y.H. Shih, in Proceedings of the Second International Symposium on Foundations of Quantum M echanics in Light of New Technology, edited by M. Namiki et al. (Physical Society of Japan, Tokyo, 1986), p. 47; Y.H. Shih and C.O. A lley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 61, 2921 (1988); C.K. Hong, Z.Y.Ou, and L.M andel, Phys. Rev. Lett. 59, 2044 (1987); J.G. Rarity and P.R. Tapster, ibid. 64, 2495 (1990); P.G. Kwiat, W.A. Vereka, C. K. Hong, H.N athel, and R.Y. Chiao, Phys. Rev. A 41, R2910 (1990); M. Horne, A. Shim ony, and A. Zeilinger, in Quantum Coherence, edited by J. Anandan (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1990), p. 356.
- [19] M.A.Home and A.Zeilinger in Proceedings of the Symposium on the Foundations of Modern Physics, edited by P.Lahtiand P.M ittelstaedt (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1985), p435.
- [20] G. Jaeger, M. A. Home and A. Shimony, Phys. Rev. A 48, 1023 (1993).
- [21] A. F. Abouraddy, M. B. Nasr, B. E. A. Saleh, A. V. Sergienko and M. C. Teich, Phys. Rev. A 63, 063803 (2001).
- [22] J. Oppenheim, K. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. A 68, 022307 (2003)
- [23] B.E.A.Saleh, A.F.Abouraddy, A.V.Sergienko, and M.C.Teich, Phys. Rev. A 62, 043816 (2000).

- [24] S.Bose and D.Home, Phys.Rev.Lett.88,050401 (2002).
- [25] G. Jaeger, A. V. Sergienko, B. E. A. Saleh, and M. C. Teich, Phys. Rev. A 68, 022318 (2003).
- [26] T.E.Tessier, Found. Phys. Lett. 18, 107 (2005), also see arX iv: quant-ph/0302075.
- [27] M. Jakob and J.A. Bergou, arX iv: quant-ph/0302075.
- [28] W .K.W ootters, Phys.Rev.Lett. 80, 2245 (1998).
- [29] W .K.W ootters, Quantum . Inf. Com put. 1, 27 (2001).
- [30] D. Suter, K. T. M ueller, and A. Pines, Phys. Rev. Lett., 60, 1218 (1988).
- [31] D. G. Cory, A. F. Fahm y and T. F. Havel, Proc. Natl. A cad, Sci. USA, 94, 1634 (1997); N. A. Gershenfeld and I. L. Chuang, Science, 275, 350 (1997).
- [32] G.Brassard, S.Braunstein and R.Cleve, Phys.D 120, 43 (1998).
- [33] G. Teklem ariam, E. M. Fortunato, M. A. Pravia, T. F.

Havel, and D.G.Cory, Phys.Rev.Lett.86, 5845 (2001).

- [34] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [35] P. Rungta and C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. A 67, 012307 (2003).
- [36] P.Rungta, V.Buzek, C.M. Caves, M.Hillery, and G.J. Milburn, Phys. Rev. A 64, 042315 (2001).
- [37] V.Coman, J.Kundu and W.K.Wootters, Phys. Rev. A 61, 052306 (2000).
- [38] W .D ur, G .V idaland J.I.C irac, Phys. Rev. A 62, 062314 (2000).
- [39] A.W ong and N.Christensen, Phys. Rev. A 63, 044301 (2001).