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#### Abstract

C om plem entarity w as originally introduced as a qualitative concept for the discussion ofproperties of quantum $m$ echanical ob jects that are classically incom patible. M ore recently, com plem entarity has becom e a quantitative relation betw een classically incom patible properties, such as visibility of interference fringes and "which-w ay" inform ation, but also betw een purely quantum m echanical properties, such as $m$ easures of entanglem ent. W e discuss di erent com plem entarity relations for system sof $2-, 3-$, or $n$ qubits. U sing nuclearm agnetic resonance techn iques, w e have experim entally veri ed som e of these com plem entarity relations in a two-qubit system.
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## I. INTRODUCTION

Complem entarity is one of the m ost characteristic properties of quantum $m$ echanics, which distinguishes the quantum world from the classical one. In 1927, Bohr[ill rat reviewed this sub ject, observing that the w ave-and particle-like behavions of a quantum $m$ echanical ob ject are m utually exclusive in a single experim ent, and referred to this as com plem entarity. P robably the m ost popular representation of Bohr com plem entarity is the wave-particle duality' lated to the long-standing debate over the nature of light [4i]. This type of com plem entarity is often ilhustrated 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 w aves are recom bined. $D$ epending on their state, quantum $m$ echanical system $s$ (quantons) can behave like particles (go along a single path), like waves (show interference), or rem ain in betw een these extrem e cases by exhibiting particle-as well as w ave-like behavior. This can be quanti ed 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 partialwaves, which quanti es the wavelike behavior. A quantitative expression for the com plem entarity is the


$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}^{2}+\mathrm{V}^{2} \quad 1 ; \tag{1}
\end{equation*}
$$

which states that them ore particle-like a system behaves, the less pronounced the w ave-like behavior becom es.

In com posite systems, consisting of two (or more) quantons, it is possible to optim ize the \which-way" inform ation of one particle: one rst perform $s$ an ideal pro jective $m$ easurem ent on the second particle. By an appropriate choige of the $m$ easurem ent observable, one can then $m$ axim ize the predictability for the rst partial system. This optim ized property, which is called distinguishability D, obeys a sim ilar inequalty
[1]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{D}^{2}+\mathrm{V}^{2} \quad 1: \tag{2}
\end{equation*}
$$

For pure states, the lim iting equality holds,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{D}^{2}+\mathrm{V}^{2}=1 \tag{3}
\end{equation*}
$$

while the inequality holds for $m$ ixed states. This issue has been experim entally investigated in the context of interferom etric experim ents, using a wide range

 semble with nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) techniques $\left[15_{1}^{1}, 1\right]$

In system sofstrongly correlated pairs ofparticles, it is often usefiulto consider particle pairs as com posite particles $w$ ith an independent identity. Such com posite particles that consist of identicalparticles include pairs ofelectrons (C ooper pairs) and photon pairs [1] ]. M any interesting phenom ena, such as superconductivity, are much easier to understand in term s of the com posite particles than in term $s$ of the individual particles. Suitable experim ents, such as two-photon interference [12, 1d] can $m$ easure properties of the com posite particles. T hese experim ents $m$ ade it possible to quantify the \com positeness" of a tw o-particle state. E xtrem e cases are product states, which show no signal in tw o-particle interference experim ents, while $m$ axim ally entangled states $m$ axim ize the tw o-particle visibility but show vanishing visibility in experim ents testing the interference of individual particles $[1-1]$. 1 . Between these extrem es lies a continuum of states for which the com plem entarity relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{k}^{2}+V_{12}^{2} \quad 1 ;(k=1 ; 2) \tag{4}
\end{equation*}
$$

 $V_{k}$ is the single-particle visibility for particle $k$, while $V_{12}$ represents the two-particle visibility. T his interm ediate regim e of the com plem entarity relation of one- and twophoton interference has only recently been experim entally dem onstrated in a Young's double-slit experim ent by A bouraddy et al[ [1]

From a quantum inform ation theoretic point of view, com posite quantum system s involve inevitably the concept of entanglem ent, which is a uniquely quantum resource w ith no classical counterpart. D oes entanglem ent constitute a physical feature of quantum system $s$ that can be incorporated into the principle of com plem entarity? Som e authors have explored this question and obtained som e im portant results, such as the com plem entarities betw een distinguishability and entanglem ent [2خㄹㄹ, betw een coherence and entanglem ent [2]] and betw een $10-$ cal and nonlocal inform ation [24] etc. A'dditionally, som e com plem entarity relations in $\bar{n}$-qubit pure system $s$ are also observed such as the relationships betw een multipartite entanglem ent and $m$ ixedness for special classes of $n$-qubit system s[2] properties and the $n$ bipartite entanglem ents in an arbitrary pure state of $n$ qubits[26].

M ore recently, Jakob and B ergou 2$\left.]_{1}\right]$ derived a generalized duality relation betw een bipartite and single partite properties for an arbitrary pure state oftw o qubits, w hich in som e 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 [2]-1 :

$$
\begin{equation*}
C^{2}+V_{k}^{2}+P_{k}^{2}=1: \tag{5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here the concurrence C $[2,2]$ is de ned by

$$
\begin{equation*}
C \text { (ji) } \quad h \quad j \quad y_{y}^{(1)} \quad{ }_{y}^{(2)} \quad j \quad i \tag{6}
\end{equation*}
$$

as a m easure of entanglem ent. $y_{y}^{(k)}$ is the $y$ com ponent of the Pauli operator on qubit $k$ and $j i$ is the com plex conjugate of $j i$. The concurrence is a bipartite quantily, which quanti es quantum nonlocal correlations of the system and is taken as a $m$ easure of the bipartite character of the com posite system. T he com plem ent

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2} \tag{7}
\end{equation*}
$$

com bines the single-particle fringe visibility $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}$ and the predictability $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}$. T his quantily is invariant under local unitary transform ations (though $V_{k}$ and $P_{k}$ are not), and is therefore taken as a quantitative $m$ easure of the singleparticle character of qubit $k$.

Since the two-particle visibility is equal to the concur-


$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{12}^{2}+V_{k}^{2}+P_{k}^{2}=1 ; \quad(k=1 ; 2): \tag{8}
\end{equation*}
$$

$T$ his tums the inequality $\left(\overline{\Lambda_{1}^{1}}\right)$ into an equality and identies the $m$ issing quantity as the predictability $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}$.
For pure bipartite system s , an equation sim ilar to Eq . (3ై) holds, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}+\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=1$. Here, the index $\mathrm{k}=1 ; 2$ refers to the di erent particles as the interfering ob jects in the bipartite system. C om bining thisw ith Eq. ( $\overline{5} \mathbf{I N}_{1}$ ), we obtain

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{k}^{2}=P_{k}^{2}+C^{2}: \tag{9}
\end{equation*}
$$

A pparently, $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}$ contains both the a priori $W \mathrm{~W}$ inform ation $P_{k}$ and the additional inform ation encoded in the
quantum correlation to an additional quantum system which serves as the possible inform ation storage. This quantum correlation can be $m$ easured by the concurrence. This reveals explicitly that quantum correlation can help to optim ize the inform ation that can be obtained from a suitable m easurem ent; w ithout entanglem ent, the available $W$ W inform ation is lim ted to the a priori $W$ W know ledge $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}$.

For $m$ ixed states, a weaker statem ent for the complem entarity ( $\bar{N}_{1}^{\prime}$ ) is found in the form of an inequality $\mathrm{C}^{2}+\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2^{-}} \quad$ 1. H ow ever, there is no corresponding inequality for the two-particle visibility $V_{12}$ in the $m$ ixed tw o-particle souroes 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 form ixed states [2]_].

In this paper, we give a proofof-principle experim ental dem onstration of the com plem entarities $(\overline{3}),(\overline{\bar{G}})$ and $(\bar{q})$ in a tw o-qubit system. In addition, we extend the complem entarity relation ('క్ర (1) to multi-qubit system s . T he rem ainder of the paper is organized as follow s: In Sec II, we introduce NM R interferom etry as a tool for m easuring visibilities and which-w ay inform ation. Sec. III and Sec. IV discuss $m$ easurem ents of the visibilities and the "which-w ay" inform ation in pure bipartite system s. Sec. $V$ is an experim ental investigation of the com plem entarity relation for a pure bipartite system on the basis of liquid-state NM R. For this purpose, we express the entanglem ent (concurrence) in term sofdirectly m easurable quantities: the tw o-particle visibility $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ and the distinguishability $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}$. This allow s us to test tw o interferom etric com plem entarities $(\bar{q})$ and ( $(\bar{i})$ by speci c num erical exam ples. In section VI we generalize the com plem entarity relation (ST) to multi-qubit system s. A quantitative com plem entarity relation exists betw een the singleparticle property and the bipartite entanglem ent betw een the particle and the rem ainder of the system in pure m ulti-qubit system s . This allow s us to derive, for pure three-qubit system, a relation betw een the single-particle, bipartite and tripartite properties, which should generalize to arbitrary pure states of $n$ qubit system $S$. Finally, a brief sum $m$ ary w ith a discussion is given in Sec. V II.

## II. NM R 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 sim ulate these system $s$ in a quantum com puter. In particular liquid-state NM R has proved very successfiul for such investigations. O ptical interferom eters can readily be sim ulated by NM R -interferom etry [30,].
$F$ igureil1, show show such an interferom etric experim ent can be implem ented by a sequence of radio-frequency pulses. A ssum ing an idealspin $I=\frac{1}{2}$ particle, the H ibert space $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ associated w ith the particle is spanned by vec-


FIG.1: Principle of NM R interferom etry: (a) Path representation and (b) Pulse sequence.
tors joi $\left(m=+\frac{1}{2}\right)$ and jli $\left(m=\frac{1}{2}\right)$. A beam splitter, which puts the particle incom ing from one port into a supenposition ofboth paths is realized by a radio frequency pulse that puts the spin in a superposition of the tw o basis states. If the ip angle of the pulse is taken as $\frac{1}{2}$, it corresponds to a sym $m$ etric beam splitter. A relative phase shift betw een the tw o paths, which corresponds to a path length di erence, can be realized by a rotation of the spin around the $z$-axis. $T$ he second $\overline{2}$ radio frequency pulse recom bines the tw o paths.

For the discussion of the com plem entarity of interference vs. \w hich way" inform ation, 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 sum $m$ arized into a transducer. $M$ athem atically, this transducer $m$ aps the input state into an output state by the transform ation

$$
\begin{equation*}
U()=e^{i_{\overline{4}}^{y}} e^{i_{\overline{2}} z=P_{\overline{2}}^{1}} \quad e^{i=2} e^{i=2} \quad e^{i=2} e^{i=2} \quad: \tag{10}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
[]_{( } \quad{ }^{h}=2 \overline{2}_{=2}^{i}: \tag{11}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, we have used the usual convention that [ ] refers to an rfpulse with ip-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 w ith a eld gradient pulse (FGP) and then converting the population di erence into observable transverse m agnetization by a $\overline{2}$ read-out pulse. The am plitude of the resulting $F \mathbb{D}$ (= the integral of the spectrum ) m easures then the populations:

$$
S_{N M R} \quad p(j 0 i) \quad p(j 1 i)=2 p(j 0 i) \quad 1 ;
$$

where we have taken into account that the sum of the populations is unity. The experim ental signal can be norm alized to the signal of the system in them al equilibrium.

Figure ${ }_{2}$ tem for the single proton spin in $\mathrm{H}_{2} \mathrm{O}$. T he am plitude of the spectral line show s a sinusoidal variation $w$ th the phase angle, which im plies the sinusoidal variation of the population $p$ ( -0 ji ) or p ( jli ).

The visibility of the resulting interference pattem is de $n \epsilon$
whers and $n$


FIG. 2: NMR signals versus the phase angle.
Since an input state

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }^{\text {(i) }}=\frac{1}{2} 1+s^{(i)} \sim \tag{13}
\end{equation*}
$$

with an initial Bloch vector $s^{(\mathrm{i})}=\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{x}}^{(\mathrm{i})} ; \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{y}}^{(\mathrm{i})} ; \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{z}}^{(\mathrm{i})}$ and Paulispin operators $\sim=(x ; y ; z)$ is transform ed into

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { (i) }^{\mathrm{U}} \text { ! }^{\prime} \quad \text { (f) }=\frac{1}{2} 1+\mathrm{s}^{(\mathrm{f})} \quad \sim \tag{14}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
V=\frac{r}{s_{x}^{(i)}{ }^{2}+s_{y}^{(i)}{ }^{2}} \tag{15}
\end{equation*}
$$

and for the predictability

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{P}=\mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{z}}^{(\mathrm{i})}: \tag{16}
\end{equation*}
$$

W ith the described experim ent, it is thus straightforw ard to verify the inequality (1).
III. VISIBILIT ES IN B IPARTITE SYSTEM S
A. Theory


FIG. 3: Schem atic two-particle interferom eter using beam splitters B $S_{1}, B S_{2}$ and phase shifters 1 , 2 .

The NM R interferom etry experim ent can easily be expanded to $m$ ulti-qubit system $s . W$ e start $w$ th a discussion of pure bipartite system $s$, where we explore the visibility in di erent types of interferom etric experim ents, geared tow ards single-and bipartite properties. F igure show sthe reference setup: $T$ he source $S$ em its a pair of particles 1 and 2, one of which propagates along path A and/or $A^{0}$, through a variable phase shifter 1 impinging on an idealbeam splitter $\mathrm{BS}_{1}$, and is then registered in either beam $K_{1}$ or $L_{1}$. On the other side there is the analogous process for the other particle $w$ ith paths $B$ and B ${ }^{0}$.

W ithout loss the generality, we rst associate states A i; Bi; $\mathrm{K}_{1} \mathrm{i}$;and $\mathrm{K}_{2} \mathrm{i}$ in Fig . $\overline{1} \mathrm{i}$ w ith the spin-up state
 state jli. A particle pair em itted from the source $S$ can be expressed as the generalpure two-qubit state $j$ i:

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i={ }_{1} j 0 i_{1} j 0 i_{2}+{ }_{2} j 0 i_{1} j 1 i_{2}+\quad{ }_{3} j i_{1} j 0 i_{2}+{ }_{4} \mathcal{H} i_{1} j 1 i_{2} \tag{17}
\end{equation*}
$$

w ith complex coe cients $i$ that are nom alized to 1.
Assum ing that the transducers consist of variable phase shifters and sym m etric beam splitters, they can be described by the unitary operation

$$
\begin{equation*}
U(1 ; 2)=U_{1}(1) \quad U_{2}(2) \tag{18}
\end{equation*}
$$

where each transducer is de ned according to Eq. (10). H ere the subscripts label tw o di erent particles. A pplying the transducer (1]-1) to the initial state ( $\mathbf{1}_{1} \overline{7}_{1}$ ), we can calculate the detection probabilities in the output channels as

$$
\begin{align*}
& p\left(j \times i_{1}\right)=\frac{1}{2}+(1)^{x} j_{13}+2_{4} j \cos \left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 1
\end{array}\right) ;  \tag{19}\\
& p\left(\dot{x} i_{2}\right)=\frac{1}{2}+(1)^{x} j_{12}+{ }_{4}{ }_{4} j \cos \left(\begin{array}{ll}
2 & 2
\end{array}\right) \text {; }
\end{align*}
$$

 $1_{2}+3_{4}=j_{1}{ }_{2}+3_{4} \mathrm{je}^{\mathrm{i} 2}$. The single particle count ratesp ( $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{j}$ ) reach theirm axim a and m inim a w hen the phase shifters are set to $k=n+{ }_{k} ;(n=0 ; 1)$.
 can be obtained as

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{1}=2 j_{13}+2_{4} j \quad V_{2}=2 j_{12}+3_{4} j: \tag{20}
\end{equation*}
$$

T w o-particle properties can be m easured by higher order correlations. Follow ing reference $\left[\begin{array}{ll}19 \\ 1,2 \\ 2\end{array}\right]$ \corrected" tw o-particle fringe visibility
where $x ; y=0$ or 1. The \corrected" joint probabil-
 de ned such that single-particle contributions are elim -
 joint detections. A s the visibilities explicitly depend on the form of the transducers involved and the details of them easurem ent (e.g., them easurem ent basis $f$ k $i$, $\ddagger$ ig is chosen as $f j 01$, 71 lig), we use the sym bols $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}, \mathrm{V}_{12}$ here, to indicate the experim ental visibilities under a speci c experim ental con guration, as opposed to the $m$ axim al visibilities $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}, ~ \mathrm{~V}_{12}$.

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

$$
\begin{align*}
& \overline{\mathrm{p}}\left(\dot{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{i}_{1} \dot{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{i}_{2}\right)=\frac{1}{4} f 1+(1)^{\mathrm{x}+\mathrm{y}}\left[\mathrm{M} j \cos \left({ }_{1}+2 \quad 1\right)\right. \\
& +\begin{array}{lll}
\mathrm{N} \\
j \cos \left(\begin{array}{lll}
1 & 2 & 2
\end{array}\right) \mathrm{g} ; ~
\end{array} \tag{22}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& N=23\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 3
\end{array} 2_{4}\right)\left(\begin{array}{ll}
1 & 2
\end{array} 3_{4}\right)=\hat{N} \mathrm{Je}^{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{2} ; \tag{23}
\end{align*}
$$

Them axim aland $m$ inim alvalues of $\bar{p}\left(\dot{\chi} i_{1} \dot{y} i_{2}\right)$ are thus

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
V_{12}=2(\mathbb{M} j+\underset{N}{ }): \tag{25}
\end{equation*}
$$

 relation (4) is obtained, valid for arbitrary pure bipartite states.
B. Experim ents on tw o extrem e cases

For the experim entalm easurem ents, we used the nuclear spins of ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$-labeled chloroform as a representative 2-qubit quantum system. W e identi ed the spin of the ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ nuclei w ith particle 1 and the carbon nuclei ( ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ ) $w$ ith particle 2. The spin-spin coupling constant $J$ between ${ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ and ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$ is 214.95 Hz . The relaxation tim es were $m$ easured to be $T_{1}=16: 5 \mathrm{sec}$ and $T_{2}=6: 9 \mathrm{sec}$ for the proton, and $T_{1}=21: 2 \mathrm{sec}$ and $T_{2}=0: 35 \mathrm{sec}$ for the carbon nuclei. Experim ents were perform ed on an In $n$ ity + NM R spectrom eter equipped $w$ ith a D oty probe at the frequencies $150.13 \mathrm{M} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{z} \mathrm{for}{ }^{13} \mathrm{C}$ and at 599.77 M Hz for ${ }^{1} \mathrm{H}$, using conventional liquid-state NM R techniques.

For $m$ ost of the experim ents that we discuss in the follow ing, the system was rst prepared into a pseudopure state $00=\frac{1}{\operatorname{tr}(1)} 1+" j 00 i h 00 j$. Here, 1 is the unity operator and " a sm all constant of the order of $10{ }^{5}$ determ ined by the therm al equilibrium. W e used the spatial averaging technique [311] and applied the pulse sequence:
where $G_{z}$ is a eld gradient pulse that destroys the transverse $m$ agnetizations. The upper indioes 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 exam ple, we consider a product state ji

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i=\frac{1}{P^{2}}\left(j 0 i_{1}+j 1 i_{1}\right) \quad P_{\frac{1}{2}}^{P^{\prime}}\left(j 0 i_{2}+j i_{2}\right) ; \tag{27}
\end{equation*}
$$

and a maxim ally entangled state $j$ i

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i=\frac{1}{2}\left(j 0 i_{1} j 0 i_{2}+j i_{1} j i_{2}\right): \tag{28}
\end{equation*}
$$

They can be prepared from 00 by the follow ing pulse sequences:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { ji }: \overline{2}^{1}=2 \overline{2}^{2}=2 \\
& \text { ji }: \overline{2}_{1}{ }^{=}{ }_{=2} \overline{1}^{1} \quad \overline{2}^{1}=2 \overline{2}^{2} \quad \overline{2}^{2}=2 \quad \frac{=2}{\mathrm{~J}} \quad \overline{2}^{2}=2 \tag{29}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\bar{J}$ represents a free evolution for this tim e under the scalar coupling.

T he actualinterferom eter w as realized by applying the
 $j$ i, which describes the e ect of the phase shifters and sym $m$ etric beam splitters. T he transducer pulse sequence (111) is sim ultaneously applied to both qubits.

T he probabilities that enter the com plem entarity relations can be expressed in term $s$ of populations of the four spin states. To determ ine these spin states, we used
a sim pli ed quantum state tom ography schem e to reconstruct only the diagonal elem ents of the density $m$ atrix. This was realized by

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{z} \overline{2}_{=2}^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{k}} \quad \mathrm{FID}_{\mathrm{k}} \tag{30}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $k=1 ; 2$. $F I D_{k}$ represents to recording the $F \mathbb{D}$ of qubit $k$ after a eld gradient pulse $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{z}}$ and a read-out pulse $\overline{2}^{k}{ }_{=2}$.F ig. $\overline{14} \mathbf{4}$ ' show s the NM R signals after Fourier transform ation of the corresponding $F \mathbb{D} s$ for the proton and carbon spins in ${ }^{13} \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ at $k=0$ when they are prepared in the product state $j$ i or the $m$ axim ally entangled state $j i$. $T$ he signals $m$ easure the populations:


FIG.4: Experim entalspectra ofproton and carbon at $k=0$ : (a) and (b) for the product state $j i$; (c) and (d) for the entangled state ji. (a), (c) are the proton signals and (b), (d) are the carbon signals.

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{N M R}(C \text { anbon }) \quad p\left(j 0 i_{1} \dot{x} i_{2}\right) \quad p\left(j i_{1} j i_{2}\right) \text {; }  \tag{31}\\
& S_{\mathrm{NMR}} \text { (Proton) } \quad \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{j} \times i_{1} j 0 i_{2}\right) \quad \mathrm{p}\left(\mathrm{j} \times i_{1} j \mathrm{j}_{2}\right) \text {; }
\end{align*}
$$

where $\mathrm{x}=0$ for the high-frequency resonance line and 1 for the low-frequency line.

To create an interferogram, we varied the phases k from 0 to 2 , increm enting both sim ultaneously in steps of $=16$. The resulting interference pattem of the proton is shown in F ig. ${ }^{15}$. T he carbon signals have a sim ilar behavior as a function of 2 for the states $j i$ and $j i$, as Fig. ${ }^{1} \overline{1}_{1}^{1}$, show s. From these experim ental data points, we calculated the probabilities $p\left(j \times i_{k}\right)$ and $\bar{p}\left(\dot{x} i_{1} \dot{y} i_{2}\right)$ and tted those to a cosine function: $y=A \quad \cos \left(x \quad x_{0}\right)+B$. From the tted values of the amplitude $A$ and the 0 set B , we extracted the experim ental visibilities as $\mathrm{V}_{1}=$ $1: 04 \quad 0: 02 ; \mathrm{V}_{2}=0: 99 \quad 0: 01, \mathrm{~V}_{12}=0: 05 \quad 0: 01$ for the product state $j i$ and $V_{1}=0: 03 \quad 0: 01 ; V_{2}=0: 14 \quad 0: 01$, $V_{12}=0: 86 \quad 0: 02$ for the entangled state $j$ iby the de nitions of Eqs. (12) and (2 $\left.\mathbf{2}_{1}^{1}\right)$. A s theoretically expected, the product state $j$ i show s one-particle interference fringes, but alm ost no tw o-particle interference fringes, while the situation is reversed for the entangled state $j i$. It can also be seen that the discrepancies from the theory is


F IG . 5: Experim ental spectra of proton w the phase ${ }_{1}$ : (a) for the product state $j i$ and (b) for the entangled state ji.
larger for the entangled state $j i$ than for the product state $j \mathrm{i}$. T his is easily understood by realizing that the state preparation is $m$ ore com plicated for the entangled state.

## IV. "W H ICH-W AY" INFORMATION IN BIPARTITESYSTEMS

> A. P red ictab ility

For the sam e 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 ${ }_{z}^{(k)} j i$ :

$$
\begin{align*}
& P_{1}=j_{1} \jmath^{2}+j_{2} j^{2} j_{3} \jmath^{2} j_{4} \jmath^{2} \\
& P_{2}=j_{1} \jmath^{2} j_{2} j^{2}+j_{3} j^{2} j_{4} j^{2} ; \tag{32}
\end{align*}
$$

where ${ }_{z}^{(k)}$ is the $z$ com ponent of the P auli operator on qubit $k . P_{k}$ is thus the $m$ agnitude of the di erence betw een the probabilities that particle $k$ takes path $j 0 i_{k}$ or the other path $j 1 i_{k}$.

For the experim entalm easurem ent of the predictabil-
 tum state tom ography: a eld gradient pulse destroys
coherences and a readout pulse $\overline{2}^{k}{ }_{=2}$ converts $Z_{z}^{(k)}$ into ${ }_{x}^{(k)}$, which is recorded as the $F \mathbb{D}$. U pon Fourier transform ation, the integral ofboth lines yieldsh ${ }_{z}^{(k)}$ i, and its $m$ agnitude corresponds to the predictability $P_{k}$.

Figure ${ }^{1} \bar{\sigma}_{1}$ shows the $m$ easurem ent of the predictability $\mathrm{P}_{2}$ on ${ }^{13} \mathrm{CHCl}_{3}$ for tyo specic exam ples: the product state $j() i=p^{1}=\left(j 0 i_{1}+j i_{1}\right)$ $\cos _{\overline{2}}-\mathrm{O} i_{2} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{h}} \sin \overline{2}-j \mathrm{i}_{2}$ and the entangled state $j$ ( ) $i=$



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 $=0 ; \overline{2}$; .

> B . D istingu ish ab ility

In a bipartite system, the which-way inform ation for particle $k$ can be optim ized by rst perform ing a projective $m$ easurem ent on particle $j(j \notin k)$. For this $m$ easurem ent, we rst have to choose the optim al ancilla observable $\mathrm{W}_{j}^{\text {(opt) }}$. A ccording to Englert's quantitative analysis of the distinguishability [1] ], we start by w riting the quantum state $j i$ as the sum of two components corresponding to two paths of qubit $k$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i=a_{k+} j 0 i_{k} \dot{m}+i_{j}+a_{k} \text { jli } i_{k} \dot{m} \quad i_{j}: \tag{33}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{align*}
& \dot{j} n_{+} i_{j}=\frac{1}{a_{k+}} j 0 i_{j}+\frac{1+k}{a_{k+}} j 1 i_{j}  \tag{34}\\
& \dot{j n} \quad i_{j}=\frac{4+k}{a_{k}} j 0 i_{j}+\frac{4}{a_{k}} j 1 i_{j}
\end{align*}
$$

The coe cients $a_{k}$ are

$$
\begin{align*}
& a_{k+}=p \overline{j_{1} \mathfrak{j}^{2}+j_{1+k} \jmath^{2}}  \tag{35}\\
& a_{k}=
\end{align*}
$$

A suitable $m$ easurem ent is perform ed on qubit $j$ to $m$ ake qubit $k$ acquire the $m$ axim al \which-way" inform ation. To determ ine the m ost usefulancilla observable, we w rite it as $W_{j}=\widetilde{\delta} \quad(j)$. The probability that the ancilla observable nds eigenvalue di ers for the two com ponent states:

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
p_{+}()=a_{k+}^{2} h & j\left(j n^{2}+i_{j} r m+j_{j}\right) j & i  \tag{36}\\
p & ()=a_{k}^{2} h & j(j n \\
i_{j} h m & \left.j_{j}\right) j & i
\end{array} ;
$$

where is the corresponding eigenvector.
$T$ he distinguishability $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}$ for qubit k is obtained by $m$ axim izing the di erence of the $m$ easurem ent probabiltities for the two com ponents,

U sing the notation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { jू } \quad \text { irm } \quad j=m \sim \quad \sim \text {; } \tag{38}
\end{equation*}
$$

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

$$
\begin{equation*}
D_{k}=m a x \quad \widetilde{B} \quad a_{k+}^{2} m+\quad a_{k}^{2} m \quad 0: \tag{39}
\end{equation*}
$$

$C$ learly the $m$ axim um is reached if the two vectors $\widetilde{I}$ and $\mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{k}+}^{2} \mathrm{mt}+\quad \mathrm{a}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2} \mathrm{me}$ are parallel. Since $\tilde{b}$ has unit length, the distinguishability becom es

$$
\begin{align*}
D_{k} & =a_{k+}^{2} \mathrm{mt}_{+} a_{k}^{2} \mathrm{mq}  \tag{40}\\
& =12 a_{k+}^{2} a_{k}^{2}(1+\mathrm{mt}+\mathrm{mq}):
\end{align*}
$$

C om bining Eqs. ( $\left.2 \overline{0} 0_{1}^{\prime}\right)$ and ( $\left.4 \bar{d}\right)$, we obtain the com ple$m$ entarity relation (\$3), ie., $D_{k}^{2}+V_{k}^{2}=1$ for $k=1 ; 2$.

For the experim ental $m$ easurem ent, we rst have to perform a "m easurem ent" on the ancilla qubit $j$, using the optim alobservable $W_{j}=\tilde{\circ} \quad \tilde{j} . T$ his is done by applying a unitary transform ation $R$ to rotate the eigenbasis fj $i_{j} g$ of the observable $W{ }_{j}{ }^{\text {(opt) }}$ into the com putational basis $f j 0 i_{j} ; j i_{j} g\left[322_{1}^{\prime}\right]$. The subsequent eld gradient pulse destroys coherence of qubit j [ $\left.{ }^{3} 3_{1}^{\prime}\right]$, as well as qubit $k$ and joint coherences (= zero and double quantum coherences). A fter this ancilla $m$ easurem ent, the distinguishability $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}$ can be $m$ easured by a readout pulse, detection of the $F \mathbb{D}$, Fourier transform ation, and taking the sum of the $m$ agnitudes ofboth resonance lines.

Figure ${ }_{1} \overline{7}_{1}^{\prime}$ show s the observed distinguishability $D_{2}$ for the states $j$ ( )i and $j$ ( )i. From Eq. (B9ㄴㄱ, we nd the optim al observable $W_{1}^{(o p t)}$ is ${ }_{z}^{(1)}$ for $j() i$, and
 for $j$ ( )i. Therefore, the transform ation $R$ was realized by the NMR pulses $\overline{2}_{2}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ and $\left[\frac{]_{\frac{3}{2}}^{1}}{2}\right.$. As there is no entanglem ent in the state $j() i, D_{2}=P_{2}$, while for the entangled state $j$ ( )iwe nd $D_{2}>P_{2}$. The experim ental data also satisfy the relation $\mathrm{D}_{2}^{2}=\mathrm{P}_{2}^{2}+\mathrm{C}^{2}$ of Eq. $\left.{ }_{-1}{ }^{-1}\right)$.


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

## V. COMPLEMENTARITYRELATIONS FOR BIPARTITESYSTEMS

W ith the sam e experim ental schem e we now explore the com plem entarity relations forbipartite quantum system s . B etw een the single particle visibility $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}$ (see Eq. $\left(2_{1}^{\prime} \underline{1}^{\prime}\right)$ ), the two-particle visibility $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ (Eq. (2 $\left.\overline{2}_{1}^{\prime \prime}\right)$ ), and the predictability $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}$ (Eq. (323)), we can verify that the relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{V}_{12}^{2}+\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2} \quad 1 \quad(\mathrm{k}=1 ; 2) \tag{41}
\end{equation*}
$$

holds in a pure bipartite system for any experim ental setting and $m$ easurem ent basis.

If the initial state $j i$ has only real coe cients i, the inequality becom es an equality. In this case, the tw o-particle visibility $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ becom es equal to the concurrence $C, V_{12} C=2 j_{1} 4 \quad 23 j$. However, when the coe cients $i$ are arbitrary complex numbers, the tw o-particle visibility $V_{12}$ can be sm aller than the concurrenœe, $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ C.As a speci c exam ple consider $j i=$ $0: 3$ j00i $0: 2 e^{i \frac{3}{5}}-01 i+0: 8 e^{i \overline{25}}$ ᄀ10i+ $0: 4796 e^{i \frac{5}{12}} \mathfrak{j 1 1}$. U sing sym $m$ etric beam splitters and them easurem ent basis fjoi; 1 l ig), we nd $V_{12}=0: 1627$ and $C=0: 2110$, ie. $\mathrm{V}_{12}<\mathrm{C}$.

By the Schm idt decom position [ $\left.{ }^{[3} \overline{2}_{-1}^{1}\right]$, any pure state $j i$ can be transform ed into onew th realcoe cients by local unitary operations. Therefore, one can design a di erent experim ent using beam splitters that im plem ent the
 sym $m$ etric one $e^{i_{4}}{ }_{y}^{(k)}$. In this case, the single-particle transducers im plem ent the operation
instead of $U_{k}(k)$ in Eq. (1]). N ote that the singleparticle character $S_{k}$ (Eq. (lli)) is invariant under local
unitary transform ations though its constituents $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}$ and $P_{k}$ are not. $B y$ de ning the $m$ axim al visibility $V_{12}=$ $\max _{\mathrm{f}}^{\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{kg}} \mathrm{fV}_{12}(\mathrm{k} ; \mathrm{k}) \mathrm{g}$, we obtain $\mathrm{V}_{12} \quad \mathrm{C}$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{V}_{12}^{2}+\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=1 ; \quad(\mathrm{k}=1 ; 2): \tag{43}
\end{equation*}
$$

$T$ his show $s$ that the com plem entarity relation ( (q) in the equality form is ful lled for any pure bipartite system. A $n$ altemative $w$ ay is to keep the sym $m$ etric beam splitters and change the $m$ easurem ent basis. O ne can alw ays choose an optim al basis which consists of the eigenvectors of an observable $W=W_{1} \quad W_{2}$ that $m$ axim izes the visibility $\mathrm{V}_{12}$, i.e., $\mathrm{V}_{12}=\mathrm{max}_{\mathrm{fW}} \mathrm{gV}_{12}$ ( W ) g C. Being invariant under local unitary transform ations, this m axim al two-particle visibility $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ (= concurrence C) is a good $m$ easure of the bipartite property encoded in the pure state.

In a pure bipartite system, the com plem entarity relation (431), together w ith the identity $V_{12} \quad C$ and the de nition (7, 7 ) of the single particle character $S_{k} \circ$ ers a $m$ ethod for quantifying entanglem ent in term $s$ of the directly m easurable quantities, in this case visibilities, predictability and distinguishability. In this section, we experim entally explore these com plem entarity relations for the states

$$
\begin{align*}
j(1 ; 2) i= & P_{\frac{1}{2}}\left[j 0 i_{1} \quad \cos \frac{1}{2} j 0 i_{2}+\sin \frac{1}{2} j 1 i_{2}\right. \\
& +j i_{1} \quad \cos \frac{2}{2} j 0 i_{2}+\sin \frac{2}{2} j 1 i_{2} \tag{44}
\end{align*}
$$

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.

Tableit lists the theoretical expectations for the various quantities involved in the com plem entarity relation for this state. T he single particle character $S_{k}$ and the concurrence C ( the maxim al two-particle visibility $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ ) satisfy the duality relation of Eq. (43'). For the state $j(1 ; 2)$ i (Eq. (44 $\left.{ }_{2}^{\prime}\right)$ ), the $m$ axim al two-particle visibilIty $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ is obtained from the experim ental visibility $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ by setting the $m$ easurem ent basis $f \dot{x}_{1} y_{2}$ ig to the com putationalbasis $\mathrm{f} \times ; \mathrm{y}=0$ or 1 ig . T he predictabilities for the tw o particles are qualitatively di erent, $\mathrm{P}_{1} \not \mathrm{P}_{2}$, which results in $V_{1}^{2}+V_{12}^{2}=1$ whereas $V_{2}^{2}+V_{12}^{2} \quad 1 . T$ he special case w ith $1+{ }_{2}=$ was discussed in detail in Ref. $\left.{ }_{2}^{2} \overline{1}_{1}^{1}\right] ;$ in that case, both predictabilities vanish, $P_{1}=P_{2}=0$. H ow ever, $\mathrm{V}_{12}^{2}+\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=1$ and $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}+\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=1$ are still satis ed for $k=1$ or 2 .

To verify these relations, we used an experim entalprocedure sim ilar to that discussed in Section IIB. To prepare the state $j(1 ; 2) i$ from the pseudo-pure state 00 , we used the follow ing NM R pulse sequence:


W hen $\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & 2\end{array}\right)=2 \mathrm{~J}$ is negative, we generate the required evolution by inserting two pulses on one of the two qubits before and after the evolution period of $j_{1} \quad 2 j=2 J$ 。

W em easured the visibilities for the state $j(1 ; 2) i b y$ rst scanning 1 while xing 2 to $=2$, then repeated the experim ent with xed 1 and variable 2 . This provides the $m$ axim alprobabilities $\overline{\mathrm{p}}_{\mathrm{m} \text { ax; }}$ in ( $\dot{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{i}_{1} \dot{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{i}_{2}$ ) of the \corrected" joint probabilities, which occur at ( $1 ; 2$ ) = $\mathrm{n}+\frac{1}{2} ; \mathrm{m}+\frac{\overline{2}}{}$ for $\mathrm{j}^{(1 ; 2}$ ) i.

A s a speci c exam ple, we present the experim ental results for $j\left(1_{1} ; 2\right)$ i with $1+2=\frac{1}{2}$. The resulting interference fringes were closely sim ilar to those shown in Fig. $\bar{S}_{1}^{1} \cdot$. U sing the procedure described in Section IIIB, we extracted the relevant visibilities $V_{k}$ and $V_{12}$ from the experim ental data. The visibilities and the predictability were $m$ easured as a function of 1 varying from $=4$ to $3 \overline{\overline{\mathrm{p}}}{ }^{4}$ in steps of $=8$. The single-particle character $S_{k}=P \overline{V_{k}^{2}+P_{k}^{2}}$ and the two-particle visibility $V_{12}$ from these experim ents are displayed in F ig. 19, together w ith 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 am plitude $r=0: 98 \quad 0: 01$ for the data of Fig. .


F IG . 8: (C olor online) Experim ental veri cation of the com plem entarity relation $V_{12}^{2}+S_{k}^{2}=1$ in a pure tw o-qubit system : (a) for qubit 1 and (b) for qubit 2 . Solid curves represent the theoreticalcom plem entarity relation of single-particle character $S_{k}$ vensus tw o-particle visibility $V_{12}$. Experim ental results are indicated by circles.

For the quantitative $m$ easurem ent of the distinguishability $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}$, the optim al observable $\mathrm{W}_{j}^{(\text {opt })}$ for $j(1 ; 2) i$ is a spin operator parallel to $\widetilde{\widetilde{o}}=(\sin (=2) ; 0 ; \cos (=2))$ w ith $=\frac{1+2}{2} \quad \frac{1}{2}$ for $\mathrm{D}_{1}$, in agreem ent w ith Ref . [1] ${ }_{1}$ ], and $=\arctan \left(\cot \left(\frac{1+2}{2}\right)=\sin \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)\right)$ forD 2 , according to the analysis of section IV B. The transform ation
 $m$ easured values of the single particle visibilities $V_{k}$ and the distinguishabilities $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}$ to the theoretical com plem en: tarity relations (solid curves) $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}+\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=1$. The tted $=2$ values of the am plitude r are $0: 99 \quad 0: 01$ for the data in (45)


| P article k | C $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{k}} ; \begin{aligned} & \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}} \\ & \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}} \\ & \hline \end{aligned}$ | D k |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| 1 |  | $\cos \frac{1 \quad 2}{2} ; \cos \frac{1 \quad 2}{2}$ | $\cos \frac{1}{2}$ |
| 2 | $\sin \frac{2}{2}$ | $\cos \frac{1+2}{2} ; \quad \sin \frac{1+2}{2} \cos \frac{1}{2} 2$ | $9 \frac{\sin ^{2}\left(\frac{1+2}{2}\right) \cos ^{2} \frac{1}{2}}{1}$ |

TABLE I: The various quantities involved in the complem entarity relation for the fam ily of states $j(1 ; 2)$ in Eq. (44) .


F IG . 9: (C olor 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. ${ }^{1} \overline{1} \overline{\mathrm{O}}$, we com pare tw o independent w ays form easuring the concurrenœC, either through the tw o-particle visibility $\mathrm{V}_{12}$, or through the single-particle quantities, as $\overline{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}$. Both data sets are plotted against ${ }_{1}$, together $w$ ith the theoretical concurrence C. The $g-$ ure show s clearly that the tw o procedure give the sam e results, w ithin experim ental errors. A pparently, both $m$ ethods allow one to experim entally determ ine the entanglem ent of pure two-qubit states. At the sam e tim e, the data verify the com plem entarity relation (క) .


F IG. 10: (C olor online) M easured concurrenge from the ex-
perim ental values of $\mathrm{V}_{12}$ (denoted by 5) and $\frac{\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}}{\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}}$ (denoted, respectively, by and for $k=1$ and 2) verus 1. The solid curve represent the theoretical concurrence $C=\sin \left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & \overline{4}\end{array}\right)$.

In these experim ents, the $m$ axim al absolute errors for
the quantities $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}, \mathrm{V}_{12}$ and $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}$ were about $0: 1$. The error is prim arily due to the inhom ogenety of the radio frequency eld and the static $m$ agnetic eld, im perfect calibration of radio frequency pulses, and signal decay during the experim ents. A m axim al experim ental error about 6\% results for the veri cation of the com plem entarity relations. Ifwe take into account these im perfections, the $m$ easured data in our NM R experim ents agree well w ith the theory.

## V I. M U LT I-Q U B IT SY STEM S

To generalize the complem entarity relation $(\overline{5} \overline{1})$ to multi-qubit system $s$, we consider a pure state $j$ iwith n qubits $i ; j ; k ;::: ; m$. A ccording to the generalized concurrence for pairs of quantum _system $s$ of anbitrary dim ension by $R$ ungta et al. [35, '36], we calculate the bipartite concurrence $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{ij}:: \mathrm{m})}$ betw een qubit k and the system $w$ ith the rem aining $n \quad 1$ qubits ( $i j:: m$ ) in term $s$ of the $m$ arginaldensity operator $k$

In term $s$ of the single particle character $S_{k}$ (Eq. (7, II)), and using $\operatorname{Tr}{ }_{k}^{2}=\frac{1}{2} 1+S_{k}^{2}$, we obtain the com ple$m$ entarity relation

$$
\begin{equation*}
C_{k(i j:: m)}^{2}+S_{k}^{2}=1 \tag{47}
\end{equation*}
$$

$T$ his is a rst generalization of the tradeo between individual particle properties, quanti ed by $S_{k}$, and the bipartite entanglem ent $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{ij}:: \mathrm{m})}$ to m any particle system s . It im plies also the relation ${ }_{i=1}^{P^{n}} C_{k(i j:: m)}^{2}+S_{k}^{2}=n$ derived by Tessier

To characterize the pairw ise entanglem ents of qubit $k$ w ith the other qubits, we sum over the squares of the concurrences of all tw o-partite subsystem s involving qubit $k$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{2}^{(k)}={ }_{j \in k}^{X} C_{k j}^{2}: \tag{48}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here, the concurrence $C_{k j}$ is de ned in term $s$ of the $m$ arginal density operator $k j$ for the $k j$ subsystem, using the de nition of $C(k j)=m a x f 13$ ${ }_{4} ; 0 \mathrm{~g}$, where ${ }_{i}(i=1 ; 2 ; 3 ; 4)$ are the square roots of
the eigenvalues of $k j\left(y_{y}^{(k)}{ }_{y}^{(j)}\right){ }_{k j}\left(y_{y}^{(k)} y_{y}^{(j)}\right)$ in decreasing order $[2$

W e now specialize to pure three-qubit system s. H ere, it is possible to specify three-partite entanglem ent by the 3-tangle 3 [

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{3}=C_{k(i j)}^{2} \quad C_{k i}^{2} \quad C_{k j}^{2}: \tag{49}
\end{equation*}
$$

Combining Eqs $\left(4 \bar{U}_{-1}\right),(4 \bar{d})$, and $(4 \overline{-1})$, we nd a complem entarity betw een single-particle properties $S_{k}$, pairw ise entanglem ent ${ }_{2}^{(k)}$, and three-partite entanglem ent 3 , which is valid for each individual qubit:

$$
\begin{equation*}
3+2^{(k)}+S_{k}^{2}=1 ; \tag{50}
\end{equation*}
$$

For speci c exam ples, we have listed in Table $\overline{T I T}$ different three-qubit states and calculated the $1-, 2-$, and 3 -qubit quanti ers appearing in Eq. (5G). A s can be ver$i$ ed from the table, these states satisfy Eq. (501) in di erent ways. T he product states of the rst entry only have single particle character. A s discussed by D ur et al. [B3'in, the states listed in the second entry represent bipartite entanglem ent betw een the second and third quibit, while the rst qubit is in a product state w ith them. TheGHZ states are pure three-particle entangled states, while the W states exhibit no genuine three-particle entanglem ent, but tw o-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 (5d) to $m$ ore than three qubits. O $n$ a heuristic basis, we consider tw o types of pure $n$-qubit system s. O ne is a generalization of the GHZ states to $n$ qubits: $\mathrm{JGHz}_{\mathrm{n}} i=\mathrm{a}_{1} \mathrm{jOi}^{\mathrm{n}}+\mathrm{a}_{2} \mathrm{jli}{ }^{\mathrm{n}}$. This is a state w th pure n -w ay entanglem ent, i.e.,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{n}=4 \dot{j}_{1} \mathrm{a}_{2} \mathrm{f}^{\prime} ; \quad \quad{ }_{\mathrm{m}}{ }^{(\mathrm{k})}=0 \text { for } 1<\mathrm{m}<\mathrm{n} \\
& S_{k}^{2}=\dot{a}_{1} J^{2} \dot{\beta}_{2} \jmath^{2} ; \tag{51}
\end{align*}
$$

where ${ }_{\mathrm{m}}{ }^{(\mathrm{k})}$ denotes the pure m -tangle regarding qubit k . H ere, the $m$ tangle denotes $m$-w ay or $m$-party entangle$m$ ent that critically involves allm parties, which is di erent from the I-tangle in Ref. $[35$ duced $m$ easure of $m$ ulti-partite entanglem ent de ned by $C_{(n)}^{2}=\operatorname{Tr}(\sim)$ with a spin- ip operation $\sim y^{n} y^{n}$ by A. W ong and N. Christensen [3T1]. Currently, there is no general $w$ ay to $m$ easure this form of entanglem ent beyond three qubits.

Thew states of Table ${ }^{T I I} m$ ay also be generalized to $n$ qubits as 执 ${ }_{n}=a_{1} 100::: 0 i+a_{2}$ j010 :::0i+ $a_{3}$ j001:::0i+ ::: + + $a_{n} j 000::: 1 i$. These states exhibit the maxim al bipartite entanglem ents and no other $m$ way entanglem ents, i.e.,

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{k}^{2}=@ \dot{\mu}_{k} J^{2}{ }^{X} \dot{\mu}_{j} j^{2} A \tag{52}
\end{align*}
$$

In these tw o cases the com plem entarity relation generalizes to ${ }_{m=2}^{P^{n}}{ }_{m}^{(k)}+S_{k}^{2}=1$.
VII. CONCLUSIONS

Complem entarity is a universal relationship between properties of quantum objects. H ow ever, it behaves in di erent ways for di erent quantum ob jects. The purpose of this paper was to analyze the di erent com ple$m$ entarity relations that exist in two- and multi-qubit system $s$ and to illustrate some of them in a simple NMR system.

W e experim entally veri ed the com plem entarity relation betw een the single-particle and bipartite properties: $\mathrm{C}^{2}+\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=1$ in a pure two-qubit system. To deter$m$ ine the entanglem ent, we used either the two-particle visibillty $V_{12}$ or the distinguishability $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}$ and the predictability $P_{k}$. A ccordingly, tw o com plem entarity relations: $\mathrm{V}_{12}^{2}+\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=1$ and $\mathrm{D}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}+\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=1$ were tested for di erent states including $m$ axim ally entangled, separable, as w ellas partially entangled (interm ediate) states.

Furthem ore, the complem entarity $C^{2}+S_{k}^{2}=1$ between one- and two-particle character was generalized to system $s$ of $n$ qubits. The com plem entarity relation $C_{k(i j:: m)}^{2}+S_{k}^{2}=1$ holds for an arbitrary pure $n$-qubit state, which im plies a tradeo betw een the local singleparticle property ( $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}$ ) and the nonlocal bipartite entanglem ent betw een the particle and the re$m$ ainder of the system $\left(\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{k}(\mathrm{ij}:: m)}^{2}\right)$. M ore interesting, in a pure three-qubit system, the single-particle character $\left(\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}\right)$, 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 $m$ easured by the genuine tripartite entanglem ent ( 3) are com plem entary, i.e., $3+2_{2}^{(k)}+S_{k}^{2}=1$. H ow ever, the generalization of the sim ilar relationship to a largerqubit system requires the identi cation and quanti cation of $m$ ulti-partite entanglem ent for pure and $m$ ixed states beyond three-qubit system s that still rem ains an open question currently. A sim ilar relationship cannot be directly generalized to larger qubit system $s$. Som e speci c sam ples might be helpfiul to con jecture the relation ${ }_{m=2}^{\mathrm{P}^{\mathrm{l}}}{ }_{\mathrm{m}}^{(\mathrm{k})}+\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=1$ : the single-particle property (local) of a particle $m$ ight be com plem entary to all possible pure multi-particle properties (nonlocal) connected to this particle.

C om plem entarity and entanglem ent are tw o im portant phenom ena that characterize quantum $m$ echanics. From these observations, we conclude that entanglem ent in its various form $s$ is an im portant param eter for the di erent form s of com plem entarity relations in m ulti-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 | $\overline{(k)}$ | $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{k}}^{2}=\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{k}}{ }^{2}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{k}}{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| P roduct states | 0 | 0 | 1 |
| B ipartite entanglem ent $j_{r} \operatorname{sti}^{\prime}=j 0 i_{r}\left(a_{1} j 00 i+a_{2} j 1 i\right)_{s t}$ | 0 | $\begin{aligned} & 0 ;(k=r) \\ & 4 \dot{\beta}_{1} a_{2} J^{2} ;(k=s ; t) \end{aligned}$ | $\begin{aligned} & 1 ;(k=r) \\ & \left(\dot{a}_{1} j^{2} \quad \dot{\mathfrak{a}}_{2} j^{2}\right)^{2} ;(k=s ; t) \end{aligned}$ |
| W states <br> 盍 $i=a_{1} j 001 i+a_{2} j 010 i+a_{3}$ j100i | 0 |  | $\left(\dot{a}_{k} j^{2} \quad \sum_{j \neq k} \dot{j}_{j} j^{2}\right)^{2}$ |
| G H Z states $\text { jG H Z i }=a_{1} \text { j000i }+a_{2} \text { j111i }$ | $4 \dot{\beta}_{1} \mathrm{a}_{2} \mathrm{~J}^{2}$ | 0 | $\left(\dot{\mathfrak{a}}_{1} \jmath^{2} \quad \dot{\mathfrak{a}}_{2} \jmath^{2}\right)^{2}$ |

TA B LE II: Som e exam ples for the com plem entarity relation $3_{3}+2_{2}^{(k)}+S_{k}^{2}=1$ in a pure 3-qubit system.
quantum attributes. These results have also im plications on the connection betw een entanglem ent sharing and com plem entarity and $m$ aybe in tum provide a possible $w$ ay to study the entanglem ent in $m$ ulti-partite quantum system $s$ by com plem entarity. W e hope that these ndings $w$ ill.be useful for fiuture research into the nature of com plem entarity and entanglem ent.
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