

# Cavity-catalyzed deterministic generation of maximal entanglement between nonidentical atoms

Nguyen Ba An\*

*School of Computational Sciences, Korea Institute for Advanced Study,  
207-43 Cheongryangni 2-dong, Dongdaemun-gu, Seoul 130-722, Republic of Korea*

By exactly solving the underlying Schrödinger equation we show that one and the same resonant cavity can be used as a catalyst to maximally entangle atoms of two nonidentical groups. The generation scheme is realistic and advantageous in the sense that it is deterministic, efficient, scalable and immune from decoherence effects.

## 1. Introduction

Quantum entanglement, or simply entanglement for short, though known a long time ago [1], has recently become a key ingredient to perform in nonclassical ways various tasks of quantum information processing and quantum computing [2]. Not only two parties can be entangled with each other, entanglement exists also between many parties. The two best known genuine multipartite entangled states are the GHZ-states [3] and the W-states [4] which are inequivalent and exhibit qualitatively different behaviors (see, e.g. [5]). Since multipartite entangled states are necessarily prerequisite resources for quantum network communication and scalable quantum computers (see, e.g. [6]) their generation plays a crucial role. A good deal of generation schemes by diverse mechanisms (see, e.g. [7]) have been studied in detail so far. Here we are concerned with a cavity-based scheme to generate  $N$ -partite maximally entangled W-states of the form

$$|W_N\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} (|e_1 g_2 \dots g_N\rangle + |g_1 e_2 \dots g_N\rangle + \dots + |g_1 g_2 \dots e_N\rangle) \quad (1)$$

where  $|g_j\rangle$  and  $|e_j\rangle$  are the ground and the excited state of the  $j^{\text{th}}$  two-level atom. In dealing with atom-cavity interaction most theoretical schemes have assumed, for simplicity, identical atoms in the sense that each atom is coupled equally with the cavity [8, 9]. To achieve error-free results, synchronization is required that all the atoms be interacted simultaneously with the cavity: the atoms should be sent at the same time through different paths (i.e. they enter the cavity at different entrance points). As the cavity mode has a spatial profile [10] different atoms actually experience different couplings with the cavity. In this sense the experimented atoms are not invariant under atom exchange, or the same, they are nonidentical with respect to the coupling with the cavity. Just very recently such practical scenarios have been taken into account for  $N = 2$  nonidentical atoms [11] as well as for an arbitrary  $N$  atoms among which  $M = 1$  atom is nonidentical with all the remaining  $N - 1$  identical atoms [12]. This work carefully considers more general cases of partition of nonidentical atoms. In section 2 we explicitly prove that neither totally nonidentical atoms nor totally identical atoms can be maximally entangled by means of interaction with a resonant cavity. The fully symmetric multi-atom entanglement of the form (1) can however be generated if the atomic ensemble possesses a partial asymmetry. Section 3 deals with a bipartite partition when the atomic ensemble consists of two groups such that the coupling with the cavity is equal for atoms in the same group but unequal for atoms in different groups. The generation time is assessed in section 4. Section 5 is the conclusion.

## 2. Totally nonidentical atoms

Consider  $N$  two-level atoms interacting resonantly with a single-mode cavity field. In the interaction picture and rotating-wave approximation the Hamiltonian of the atom-field system reads

$$H = \sum_{j=1}^N f_j (a^+ S_j^- + S_j^+ a) \quad (2)$$

where  $a$  ( $a^+$ ) denotes the annihilation (creation) operator of the resonant single-mode field in the cavity,  $S_j^- = |g_j\rangle \langle e_j|$ ,  $S_j^+ = |e_j\rangle \langle g_j|$  and  $f_j$  measures the strength of the interaction between the  $j^{\text{th}}$  atom and the same field mode. The atoms are assumed totally nonidentical in the sense that  $f_j \neq f_{j'}$  for  $j \neq j'$ . The system dynamics governed by the Hamiltonian (2) conserves the so-called excitation number  $\mathcal{N}$  defined as the number of photons plus the number of

---

\*Electronic address: nbaan@kias.re.kr

excited atoms, i.e.  $\mathcal{N} = a^\dagger a + \sum_{j=1}^N |e_j\rangle \langle e_j|$ . We shall be interested in the subspace having  $\mathcal{N} = 1$ . In this subspace there are  $N+1$  basic states which can be chosen as  $|e_1 g_2 \dots g_N\rangle |0\rangle$ ,  $|g_1 e_2 \dots g_N\rangle |0\rangle$ , ...,  $|g_1 g_2 \dots e_N\rangle |0\rangle$  and  $|g_1 g_2 \dots g_N\rangle |1\rangle$ , where the latter ket denotes the photon number state. At any time  $t$  the combined atom-field state  $|\Psi(t)\rangle$  can be represented as a linear superposition of the  $N+1$  basic states as

$$|\Psi(t)\rangle = C_1(t) |e_1 g_2 \dots g_N\rangle |0\rangle + C_2(t) |g_1 e_2 \dots g_N\rangle |0\rangle \\ + \dots + C_N(t) |g_1 g_2 \dots e_N\rangle |0\rangle + C_{N+1}(t) |g_1 g_2 \dots g_N\rangle |1\rangle.$$

The differential equations for the coefficients  $C'_s(t)$  can be derived from the Schrödinger equation  $i \dot{|\Psi(t)\rangle} = H |\Psi(t)\rangle$ . As a result, we get

$$\left. \begin{aligned} i \dot{C}_1(t) &= f_1 C_{N+1}(t), \\ i \dot{C}_2(t) &= f_2 C_{N+1}(t), \\ \dots &= \dots \\ i \dot{C}_N(t) &= f_N C_{N+1}(t), \\ i \dot{C}_{N+1}(t) &= \sum_{j=1}^N f_j C_j(t) \end{aligned} \right\}. \quad (3)$$

The general solution of Eqs. (3) is

$$C_k(t) = \frac{f_k^2 \cos(\Omega t) + \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^N f_j^2}{\Omega^2} C_k(0) \\ + \frac{f_k [\cos(\Omega t) - 1]}{\Omega^2} \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^N f_j C_j(0) \\ - \frac{i f_k \sin(\Omega t)}{\Omega} C_{N+1}(0) \quad (4)$$

for  $k = 1, 2, \dots, N$  and

$$C_{N+1}(t) = -\frac{i \sin(\Omega t)}{\Omega} \sum_{j=1}^N f_j C_j(0) + \cos(\Omega t) C_{N+1}(0). \quad (5)$$

In Eqs. (4) and (5)  $\Omega = \sqrt{\sum_{j=1}^N f_j^2}$ . At time  $t = t' = \pi/\Omega$ , Eqs. (4) and (5) reduce to

$$C_k(t') = \frac{\Omega^2 - 2f_k^2}{\Omega^2} C_k(0) - \frac{2f_k}{\Omega^2} \sum_{j=1, j \neq k}^N f_j C_j(0), \quad (6)$$

$$C_{N+1}(t') = -C_{N+1}(0). \quad (7)$$

If the initial system is prepared in a state in which there are no photons and only one atom, say, the  $q^{\text{th}}$  atom with  $q \in [1, N]$ , is excited, then Eqs. (6) and (7) simplify to

$$C_q(t') = 1 - \frac{2f_q^2}{\Omega^2},$$

$$C_{p \neq q}(t') = -\frac{2f_p f_q}{\Omega^2},$$

$$C_{N+1}(t') = 0.$$

Since  $C_{N+1}(t') = 0$  the system at time  $t = t'$  becomes decoupled: the cavity returns back to its initial vacuum state but the  $N$  atoms turns out to be in the entangled state

$$|\mathcal{A}(t')\rangle = \left(1 - \frac{2f_q^2}{\Omega^2}\right) |\dots e_q \dots\rangle - \frac{2f_q}{\Omega^2} \sum_{p=1, p \neq q}^N f_p |\dots e_p \dots\rangle \quad (8)$$

where  $|\dots e_j \dots\rangle$  denotes a state in which only the  $j^{\text{th}}$  atom is excited while all the other  $N - 1$  atoms remain unexcited. From Eq. (8) it is transparent that the maximally entangled state (1) cannot be produced since the atoms are totally nonidentical: the weight coefficients of  $|\dots e_j \dots\rangle$  are all different from each other. It is worth noting also that even in the case of totally identical atoms, i.e.  $f_j = f \forall j$ , maximal entanglement does not arise because in this case the atoms would appear in the state

$$|\mathcal{A}'(t')\rangle = \left(1 - \frac{2}{N}\right) |\dots e_q \dots\rangle - \frac{2}{N} \sum_{p=1, p \neq q}^N |\dots e_p \dots\rangle$$

which is clearly entangled but not maximally.

### 3. Partially nonidentical atoms

In this section we shall show that the fully symmetric  $N$ -atom W-state (1) can be generated if the atomic ensemble possesses a partial asymmetry. We suppose that the  $N$  atoms consist of two nonidentical groups. In group 1 there are  $M_1$  ( $1 \leq M_1 < N$ ) identical atoms whereas the number of identical atoms in group 2 is  $M_2 = N - M_1$ . The asymmetry arises from the fact that each atom of group 1 interacts equally with the cavity mode with a coupling constant  $f_1$  while each atom of group 2 also interacts equally with the cavity mode but with a different coupling constant  $f_2 \neq f_1$ . Under such an asymmetric situation the differential equations for the coefficients  $C'_s(t)$  read

$$\left. \begin{aligned} i \dot{C}_m(t) &= f_1 C_{N+1}(t), \\ i \dot{C}_n(t) &= f_2 C_{N+1}(t), \\ i \dot{C}_{N+1}(t) &= M_1 f_1 C_m(t) + M_2 f_2 C_n(t) \end{aligned} \right\} \quad (9)$$

where  $m = 1, 2, \dots, M_1$  and  $n = M_1 + 1, M_1 + 2, \dots, N$ . The general solution of Eqs. (9) is

$$\begin{aligned} C_m(t) &= \frac{M_1 f_1^2 \cos(\omega t) + M_2 f_2^2}{\omega^2} C_m(0) \\ &\quad + \frac{M_2 f_1 f_2 [\cos(\omega t) - 1]}{\omega^2} C_n(0) \\ &\quad - \frac{i f_1 \sin(\omega t)}{\omega} C_{N+1}(0), \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_n(t) &= \frac{M_1 f_1 f_2 [\cos(\omega t) - 1]}{\omega^2} C_m(0) \\ &\quad + \frac{M_1 f_1^2 + M_2 f_2^2 \cos(\omega t)}{\omega^2} C_n(0) \\ &\quad - \frac{i f_2 \sin(\omega t)}{\omega} C_{N+1}(0), \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} C_{N+1}(t) &= -\frac{i M_1 f_1 \sin(\omega t)}{\omega} C_m(0) \\ &\quad - \frac{i M_2 f_2 \sin(\omega t)}{\omega} C_n(0) \\ &\quad + \cos(\omega t) C_{N+1}(0) \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

where  $\omega = \sqrt{M_1 f_1^2 + M_2 f_2^2}$ . At time  $t = \theta = \pi/\omega$  Eqs. (10), (11) and (12) reduce to

$$C_m(\theta) = \frac{M_2 f_2^2 - M_1 f_1^2}{\omega^2} C_m(0) - \frac{2 M_2 f_1 f_2}{\omega^2} C_n(0), \quad (13)$$

$$C_n(\theta) = -\frac{2 M_1 f_1 f_2}{\omega^2} C_m(0) + \frac{M_1 f_1^2 - M_2 f_2^2}{\omega^2} C_n(0), \quad (14)$$

$$C_{N+1}(\theta) = -C_{N+1}(0). \quad (15)$$

If the initial system were prepared in the state

$$\begin{aligned} |W_{M_1}^-\rangle &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{M_1}} (|e_1 g_2 \dots g_{M_1} g_{M_1+1} \dots g_N\rangle \\ &\quad + |g_1 e_2 \dots g_{M_1} g_{M_1+1} \dots g_N\rangle \\ &\quad + \dots + |g_1 g_2 \dots e_{M_1} g_{M_1+1} \dots g_N\rangle) \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

realized by setting the initial conditions as

$$\begin{aligned} C_1(0) &= C_2(0) = \dots = C_{M_1}(0) = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{M_1}}, \\ C_{M_1+1}(0) &= C_{M_1+2}(0) = \dots = C_N(0) = C_{N+1}(0) = 0, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

then Eqs. (13), (14) and (15) simplify to

$$C_m(\theta) = \frac{M_1 f_1^2 - M_2 f_2^2}{\omega^2 \sqrt{M_1}},$$

$$C_n(\theta) = \frac{2\sqrt{M_1} f_1 f_2}{\omega^2},$$

$$C_{N+1}(\theta) = 0$$

and the  $N$  atoms appear in the entangled state

$$|\mathcal{A}(\theta)\rangle = \frac{M_1 f_1^2 - M_2 f_2^2}{\omega^2 \sqrt{M_1}} \sum_{m=1}^{M_1} |\dots e_m \dots\rangle + \frac{2\sqrt{M_1} f_1 f_2}{\omega^2} \sum_{n=M_1+1}^N |\dots e_n \dots\rangle. \quad (18)$$

If the coupling constants are controlled so that their ratio  $r = f_1/f_2$  satisfies the following constraint

$$r = 1 + \sqrt{\frac{N}{M_1}} \quad (19)$$

then the state (18) becomes the desired  $N$ -atom W-state  $|W_N\rangle$ . As recognized from above, the overall process involves two steps: the first step prepares the initial state (16) and the second step generates the final state (1). For  $M_1 = 1$  the first step is trivial [11, 12] and the overall process can be looked upon as a one-step process. Yet, generally, for  $M_1 > 1$  preparation of the initial state (16) is nontrivial. On one hand, we could prepare that state by using another nonresonant cavity and following the probabilistic scheme described in [9]. More conveniently and more efficiently, on the other hand, we could use one and the same resonant cavity for doing both of the steps. Namely, in the first step we send through the empty resonant cavity  $M_1$  unexcited atoms of group 1 and one auxiliary atom in the excited state  $-|e\rangle$  whose coupling constant  $f$  with the cavity is chosen such that

$$f = f_1 \sqrt{M_1}. \quad (20)$$

Then at time  $t = \tau = \pi/f\sqrt{2}$  the cavity turns out to be empty again, the auxiliary atom jumps down to its ground state but the  $M_1$  interested atoms are readily transformed to the required ‘‘initial’’ state  $|W_{M_1}^-\rangle$ , Eq. (16). We note that the just-mentioned first step by using the resonant cavity is measurement-free and deterministic, in evident contrast with the non-deterministic scheme of [9] which uses a nonresonant cavity and needs a post-selection measurement. After the first step we send back the  $M_1$  atoms in state  $|W_{M_1}^-\rangle$  together with the  $M_2$  atoms, all in their ground states, to the same cavity to perform the second step.

#### 4. Discussion

To see how long the proposed scheme takes let us scale time in units of  $\pi/f_1$  for convenience. That is, we introduce dimensionless time as  $\tilde{t} = f_1 t/\pi$  with  $t$  the real time. Then, in terms of  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ , the (dimensionless) time needed to complete the first step is

$$\tilde{\tau} = \frac{f_1}{\pi} \tau = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2M_1}} \quad (21)$$




FIG. 1: Dimensionless total generation time  $T = \tilde{\tau} + \tilde{\theta}$  as a function of  $M_1$  (the number of atoms in group 1) and  $M_2$  (the number of atoms in group 2 nonidentical with group 1).

whereas the (dimensionless) time needed to complete the second step is

$$\tilde{\theta} = \frac{f_1}{\pi} \theta = \frac{\sqrt{M_1} + \sqrt{M_1 + M_2}}{\sqrt{2M_1 (M_1 + M_2 + \sqrt{M_1(M_1 + M_2)})}}. \quad (22)$$

Figure 1 plots the dependence of the total (dimensionless) generation time  $T = \tilde{\tau} + \tilde{\theta}$  on  $M_1$  and  $M_2$ . The figure shows that  $T$  decreases quickly as  $M_1$  (the number of atoms in group 1) increases but slightly as  $M_2$  (the number of atoms in group 2) increases.

We note that, alternative to the choice (17) of the initial condition, we could also set

$$\begin{aligned} C_1(0) &= C_2(0) = \dots = C_{M_1}(0) = C_{N+1}(0) = 0, \\ C_{M_1+1}(0) &= C_{M_1+2}(0) = \dots = C_N(0) = -1/\sqrt{M_2} \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

that correspond to the initial state  $|W_{M_2}^-\rangle = -(|g_1 \dots g_{M_1} e_{M_1+1} g_{M_1+2} \dots g_N\rangle + |g_1 \dots g_{M_1} g_{M_1+1} e_{M_1+2} \dots g_N\rangle + \dots + |g_1 \dots g_{M_1} g_{M_1+1} g_{M_1+2} \dots e_N\rangle) / \sqrt{M_2}$ . For the choice (23) we need just making an interchange between the sub-indices 1 and 2 in all the formulae (19) - (22) as well as in the figure. Comparing the two alternatives suggests the following strategy to achieve a faster generation time: if  $M_1 > M_2$  we choose the conditions (17), if  $M_1 < M_2$  we choose the conditions (23) and if  $M_1 = M_2$  either (17) or (23) is equally all-right. Anyway, in a right choice the proposed scheme is robust, taking a shorter time to entangle a larger number  $N$  of atoms. For large enough  $N$  the total entangling time may become shorter than both the atom and the photon decay times rendering the scheme immune from decoherence effects. Since the coupling constant depends on the distance between the central axis of the cavity and the atom position [10], the required ratios of coupling constants (19) and (20) can be experimentally achieved by appropriately controlling the entrance points through which the atoms enter the cavity. Furthermore, it is clear that at the beginning the cavity is set to the vacuum state. At time  $t = \tau$  when the “initial” state  $|W_{M_1}^-\rangle$  (or  $|W_{M_2}^-\rangle$ ) is prepared the cavity is automatically reset to the vacuum state, i.e. it is ready for the next step of generating the desired target state  $|W_N\rangle$ . At the end of the second step when the desired state  $|W_N\rangle$  is generated, the cavity is again reset to its vacuum state. Hence, one and the same cavity is used for both preparing the “initial” state  $|W_{M_{1,2}}^-\rangle$  (step 1) and producing the target state  $|W_N\rangle$  (step 2) and, after each step the cavity is automatically reset to its initial vacuum state, i.e. the cavity remains unchanged. In this sense, the cavity serves as a catalyst in the proposed scheme. Finally, our scheme would work similarly for scalable maximal entanglement of cold ions trapped inside a high-Q cavity within the Lamb-Dicke approximation. In the latter case the ion-cavity couplings can be controlled by localizing the ions in suitable positions with respect to the cavity field mode profile.

## 5. Conclusion

We have considered a realistic situation of atoms interacting with a cavity with different couplings. We have investigated in detail the case when one and the same cavity as a catalyst is used to generate  $N$ -partite W-states

where  $N = M_1 + M_2$  with  $M_1 \geq 1$  and  $M_2 \geq 1$  the numbers of atoms of two nonidentical groups. Our result covers that of  $M_1 = 1$  and  $M_2 \geq 1$  [11, 12] as a particular case. For  $M_1 > 1$  our scheme proceeds with two successive steps. In the first step an auxiliary atom with a properly chosen coupling constant is required to prepare the “initial” state  $|W_{M_1}^-\rangle$  or  $|W_{M_2}^-\rangle$ , depending on  $M_1 > M_2$  or  $M_2 > M_1$ . In the second step the desired target state  $|W_N\rangle$  is generated. Both steps are measurement-free and therefore the whole process, as a two-step process, is efficient and deterministic. The proposed scheme is also scalable with the total generation time that decreases with increasing  $N$ . This feature provides an advantage as to overcome the obstacle due to decoherence effects when a large number of atoms are to be entangled.

**Acknowledgments.** The author thanks KIAS Quantum Information Science group for support. This research was financed by a Grant (TRQCQ) from the Ministry of Science and Technology (MOST) of Korea and also by a KIAS R&D Fund No 6G014904.

- 
- [1] E. Schrödinger, *Naturwissenschaften* 23 (1935) 807;  
A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, N. Rosen, *Phys. Rev.* 47 (1935) 777.
- [2] C. Monroe, *Nature* (London) 416 (2002) 238.
- [3] D.M. Greenberger, M.A. Horne, A. Zeilinger, in *Bell’s Theorem, Quantum Theory and Conceptions of the Universe*, edited by M. Kafatos (Kluwer Academic, Dordrecht, The Netherlands, 1989), p.69.
- [4] W. Dur, G. Vidal, J.I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A* 62 (2000) 062314.
- [5] E.F. Galvao, B.M. Plenio, S. Virmani, *J. Phys. A* 33 (2000) 8809;  
A. Cabello, *Phys. Rev. A* 65 (2002) 032108;  
A. Sen, U. Sen, M. Wiesniak, D. Kaszlikowski, M. Zukowski, *Phys. Rev. A* 68 (2003) 062306.
- [6] A. Karlsson, M. Bourennane, *Phys. Rev. A* 58 (1998) 4394;  
V. Buzek, M. Hillery, *Phys. Rev. A* 62 (2000) 022303;  
P. van Loock, S.L. Braunstein, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 84 (2000) 3482;  
V.N. Gorbachev, A.I. Trubilko, A.I. Zhiliba, *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass.* 3 (2001) S25;  
X. Wang, *Phys. Rev. A* 64 (2001) 022302;  
B.S. Shi, A. Tomita, *Phys. Lett. A* 296 (2002) 161;  
J. Li, G.C. Guo, *Phys. Lett. A* 313 (2003) 397;  
J. Joo, Y.J. Park, S. Oh, J. Kim, *New J. Phys.* 5 (2003) 136;  
Nguyen Ba An, J. Kim, e-print quant-ph/0303149;  
Nguyen Ba An, *Phys. Rev. A* 68 (2003) 022321;  
Nguyen Ba An, *Phys. Rev. A* 69 (2004) 022315;  
Z.L. Cao, M. Yang, *Physica A: Stat. Theor. Phys.* 337 (2004) 132;  
H.Y. Dai, P.X. Chen, C.Z. Li, *Opt. Commun.* 231 (2004) 281;  
C.P. Yang, S.I. Chu, S. Han, *Phys. Rev. A* 70 (2004) 022329.  
Z.L. Cao, W. Song, *Physica A: Stat. Theor. Phys.* 347 (2005) 177.
- [7] X.B. Zou, K. Pahlke, W. Mathis, *Phys. Rev. A* 66 (2002) 044302;  
T. Yamamoto, K. Tamaki, M. Koashi, N. Imoto, *Phys. Rev. A* 66 (2002) 064301;  
X. Wang, M. Feng, B.C. Sanders, *Phys. Rev. A* 67 (2003) 022302;  
X.B. Zou, K. Pahlke, W. Mathis, *Phys. Rev. A* 69 (2003) 013811;  
Y. Li, T. Kobayashi, *Phys. Rev. A* 70 (2004) 014301;  
H. Mikami, Y. Li, T. Kobayashi, *Phys. Rev. A* 70 (2004) 052308;  
M. Eibl, N. Kiesel, M. Bourennane, C. Kurtsiefer, H. Weinfurter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 92 (2004) 077901;  
X.B. Zou, K. Pahlke, W. Mathis, *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass.* 7 (2005) 119.
- [8] S.B. Zheng, G.C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85 (2000) 2392.
- [9] G.P. Guo, C.F. Li, J. Li, G.C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. A* 65 (2002) 042102.
- [10] L.M. Duan, A. Kuzmich, H.J. Kimble, *Phys. Rev. A* 67 (2003) 032305.
- [11] L. Zhou, X.X. Yi, H.S. Song, Y.Q. Qu, *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass.* 6 (2004) 378;  
A. Olaya-Castro, N.F. Johnson, L. Quiroga, *Phys. Rev. A* 70 (2004) 020301 (R).
- [12] S.B. Zheng, *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass.* 7 (2005) 10;  
A. Olaya-Castro, N.F. Johnson, L. Quiroga, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 94 (2005) 110502.