Acta Phys.Hung.B 20/1 (2004) 000{000

Q U A N T U M E LE C T R O N IC S

# How to Extract Entanglement from a Piece of Solid or a Bunch of Neutrons

Marcelo O. Terra Cunha<sup>a</sup> and V latko Vedral

The School of Physics and Astronomy, University of Leeds, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK

Received 1 January 2004

A b stract. We review how to obtain spin entangled pairs of ferm ions from a Ferm igas. An experim ent with neutrons is proposed in order to get such pairs.

K eywords: Entanglem ent; N eutrons; Ferm iG as PACS: 03.67 M n,03.75 Ss,03.75 B e,28 20 -v

## 1. Introduction

Entanglement is a central aspect of modern discussions of quantum mechanics. Recognized in the early days[1], it was exclusively a matter of foundations form ore than half a century [2]. Its status changed with the birth of quantum information theory [3], when it become a resource to be understood [4] and utilized in tasks like teleportation [5] as well as in some algorithms of quantum computation [6, 7].

O ne natural task is to bok for entanglem ent sources. The most usual strategies are to manipulate individual qubits and to control their interactions in order to generate entanglem ent, or to post select a special part of a quantum state, using our know ledge of some property to create entanglem ent in other degrees of freedom. O ther tasks include the search for the consequences of entanglem ent for the properties of matter[8].

In this article we will revise a proposed strategy to obtain spin entangled ferm ion pairs from a degenerated Ferm i gas. We will address the natural di culties in applying such ideas to electronic Ferm i gases and propose the use of stored neutrons in order to experim entally investigate entanglem ent in Ferm i gases.

2. Pair entanglem ent in Ferm i gases

In this section we review two works, refs. [9, 10], which are the central contribution we presented in CEW QO. Details can be obtained in the cited references.

In Ref. [9] the conditional state of a localized pair of ferm ions from a degenerated Ferm igas was studied. Consider j<sub>0</sub> i as the ground state of the Ferm igas. In a second quantization notation, one has

$$j_{0}i = b_{s}^{Y}(p) \mathcal{D}i; \qquad (1)$$

where  $b_s^y$  (p) is the creation operator of one ferm ion of spin s and m om entum p, and the product is over all modes with m om entum sm aller than the Ferm im om entum  $p_f$ . If one considers the two body density operator (up to norm alization), conditioned to the detection of a pair of ferm ions at positions r and  $r^0$ , then [11]

7

where

$$s(r) = \int_{0}^{2} \frac{d^{3}p}{(2)^{3}} e^{ipr} b_{s}(p)$$
(3)

is the annihilation operator localized at r.

The operator (2) can be considered as a two qubit density operator (see Appendix of Ref. [10]) and application of Peres-Horodecki criterion [12] shows the existence of an entanglem ent distance: if two ferm ions are extracted from the Ferm i gas separated by less than this entanglem ent distance, then their spins are entangled. One physical point must be stressed: the position detection must be spin non-destructive for the scheme to make sense. One limiting case is very intuitive. If both ferm ions were detected at the same position, as they only have position and spin degrees of freedom, their spin state is necessarilly the singlet state J''#i J'''i, which is maxim ally entangled. In Ref. [10] it is shown how the increasing in the ferm ions separation corresponds to more mixing with a classically correlated state, which makes entanglem ent to vanish at and above this entanglem ent distance. Entanglem ent distance is essentially given by  $k_f^{-1}$ , where  $k_f$  is the Ferm i wavenum ber.

O ne step forward was given in Ref. [10] when the perfect localization condition was dropped out, and the notion of fuzzy m esurem ents was introduced. Fuzzy m easurem ents are characterized by a distribution D (r  $r^{(0)}$ ) and detection (annihilation) operators

$$s(r) = \frac{Z}{(2)^{3}} \frac{d^{3}r^{00}}{(2)^{3}} \frac{Z}{(2)^{3}} e^{ipr^{00}} D(r r^{00}) b_{s}(p) :$$
(4)

U sing this notion, entanglem ent was quanti ed and its dependence on the separation and on the broadening of gaussian detectors was studied (note that eq. (3) corresponds to the situation when D is a delta function). However, no pratical situation was devised.

It must be stressed that fizzy m easurem entsmust be seen as coherent detectors, in the sense that they have specic annihilation operators associated to them. They are not a simple bunch of incoherent localized detectors. M icroscopic detectors tend to be closer to fizzy m easurem ents, while m acroscopic detectors tend to add up incoherent signals.

## 3. Electronic Ferm i sea

The simplest ferm ions one can think about are electrons and the simplest situation for them to be con ned in a non-interacting Ferm i gas is the case of conduction electrons in a metal.

From a theoretic and abstract view point, it can be done. The di culty in proposing a real fuzzy m easurement for such a gas comes from the entanglement distance they have, of the order of a few angstrom s[13]. One should then be able to address a pair of conducting electrons as close as such a distance, without disturbing its spin state. This is not a simple direct task, and some other strategy needs to be devised in order to extract entanglement from the Pauli principle.

## 4. A proposal: N eutrons

For a con ned Ferm igas,  $k_f^3$  is proportional to the density of ferm ions[14]. So, the root of the di culties with conducting electrons is their high density. Neutrons can be used to create a Ferm i gas suitable for the extraction of spin entangled pairs. We will describe such a proposal in this section.

The experiment we will propose keeps some similarities with an interesting recently performed measurement of evidences for neutron antibunching [15]. In that experiment a beam of them al neutrons is monochromatized by a cristal. The beam then incides in a beam splitter and the coincidences on both outputs of the beam splitter are recorded as a function of the optical path di erence. A small deep is registered, which can be understood as a result of the fermionic antibunching (for each pair, the triplet spin component antibunches, while the singlet component bunches). The smallness of this deep can be interpreted as an indication that the vast majority of the recorded coincidences are accidental, in the sense that the two recorded neutrons were not really paired in the beam (in other words, they were independent), even when the optical paths agree. This is natural for a reasonably high ux of the order of 3000 neutrons per second.

The one and very rst di erence in the experiment we propose is the previous creation of a conned Fermigas. This is made to keep the situation the closest possible to the idealized Fermigas, where boundary conditions imply the discreteness of the single particle levels. Ultra-cold neutrons [16] are a good example of conned Fermigas, but other alternatives are also possible.

Now we want a physical way of realizing the detection operator (4). Note that the D distribution im ply a wavepacket-like detector. This can be approximated by a sequence of a slit and collim ators, where the emergent neutrons will have reasonably well de ned position and momentum. The details of the slit and collim ators will de ne the best model for D. A naive model is just a gaussian pro le.

Naturally, neutrons will be emitted by this \source" in a statistical way. The ux can be estimated as N rce, where N is the number of trapped neutrons (decrescent with time), r is the ratio between the area of the hole and the total area of the storing vessel, c is the rate of collisions of neutrons with the walls, and e 1 is an

e ciency coe cient related to loses in the collimation process or in the detection (also e ects of antibunching can be included in this factor). If one stores  $N = 10^5$ neutrons in a bottle of one litre [17], c can be avaliatted as c  $50 \text{ s}^{-1}$ . For a hole diam eter of less than 1 mm, one gets r  $10^{5}$ . As e depends on experimental details, one can say that roughly the ux will be of the order of few neutrons per second. The experiment intends to work with essentially simultaneously emitted neutrons. Such a concept depends on the de nition of a simultaneity time window. This has to do with both, fundam ental and practical aspects. From the rst point, the broadening in momentum distribution of the emitted neutron de nes a time scale which can be associated to its presence. From the other one, the response time and accuracy of the detectors play an important role. Suppose we allow a coincidence time of the order of 10  $\,^4\,$  s. This value is large compared to the usual neutron detectors. From the values above, one can consider to have a mean value of the order of 10  $^3$  neutrons per \pulse", which in plies a coincidence rate of the order of 10<sup>6</sup> per counting or 10<sup>2</sup> coincidences per second. These numbers sugest the experiment to be feasible, despite di cult. The vessel should be fulled and detections m ade through a time like one hour (som ething around 30 pairs of neutrons would be available). Then the preparation must be repeated and data recolected.

Up to this moment, we were not speci c of which experiment should be done. If one just want to prove entanglement, something like a Bell experiment is enough. For completeness, we suggest to make a tomography of the spin state of neutron pairs[18]. The procedure is detailed in the appendix. In any case, a beam splitter should be used to separate the neutrons and spin polarizing detectors must be used in the equal optical path condition for recording coincidences.

## 4.1.0 ther entanglem ent e ects on neutrons

W emustem phasize that it is not the rst time that one talks about entanglem ent on neutrons. There is a debate about som e experim ents on neutron scattering in which \anom abus" experim ental cross-section m ay [19] orm ay not[20] be caused by short time entanglem ent am ong nucleons. A lso violations of B ell inequalities were veried with neutrons[21] which must be considered as entanglem ent on neutrons. How ever, while in the rst case, the possibly entangled nucleons are subject to a strong environment which disentangles the system, and in the second experiment, the entanglem ent is between two degrees of freedom of the same neutron: momentum and spin; the experiment which we propose will be able to generate free ying spin entangled neutron pairs.

# 5.Conclusions

In this article we review how non-desctructive measurements can be used to extract entangled pairs of fermions from a Fermigas. We discuss the disculties in applying such ideas to conducting electrons in normalmetals. We then suggest an experiment with neutrons capable of exhibit such a behaviour. It can be seen as a practical advance: a possible new source of entangled particles; and as a foundational interesting step, testing novel properties of fundam ental constituents of m atter.

# Appendix: Quantum state tom ography

W e want to describe a simple two-qubit tom ographic procedure for neutron spins. W e will rst introduce a formalism in terms of expectation values of observables. Then we will convert it to neutron-countings since these are the available data.

The central idea can be understood for just one qubit. Denote by  $_0$  the 2 2 identity matrix and by  $_j$ , j = 1;2;3, the usual Paulim atrices (by convention, latin indices run from 1 to 3, while greek indices include 0). Note that f g is a basis for the (real) vector space of (2 2) H erm itian matrices. M oreover,  $_j$  are traceless matrices. So, any density operator can be written as

$$=\frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} x & y \\ x & z \\ y & z \end{bmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} x & y \\ y & z \\ y & z \end{bmatrix}$$
(5)

in a unique way. The three real numbers  $b_j$  form the so called B bch vector, and the positivity condition for implies that this vetor lies inside a unit sphere with respect to the usual Euclidean norm (the so called B bch sphere). Eq. (5) can be interpreted as a tom ographic decomposition when one realizes that

$$b_{j} = Trf_{j} g = h_{j}i;$$
(6)

which follows directly from the algebraic properties of Paulim atrices. This means that one only needs to measure three mean values to characterize a one qubit state.

In terms of particle counting, it means that for each j one needs to count two rates:  $n_{j+}$  and  $n_j$  and the tom ographic coeccient will be estimated by the ratio

$$b_{j} = \frac{n_{j+} \quad n_{j}}{n_{j+} + n_{j}} :$$
(7)

W henever possible, the best way is to use polarizing beam splitters (PBS) and two independent detectors, one in each output of the PBS.M easurements for di erent j values involve the rotation of the PBS and the inclusion of quarter wave plates. If the PBS is not balanced, Eq. (7) must be properly adapted.

For generalizing this to two qubits, consider the matrices S = .Again, the set fS g is a basis for the (real) vector space of (4 4) Herm itian matrices. In a more compact notation, one can write any density operator as

$$=\frac{1}{4} X \qquad (8)$$

with the coe cients given by

$$a = TrfS \quad g = hS \quad i; \tag{9}$$

which must now be interpreted. First of all,  $\text{TrfS}_{00}$  g = 1 and must not be obtained. The remaining 15 coe cients can be divided into three sets:  $a_{10}$  refers only to the rst neutron,  $a_{0j}$  to the second, while  $a_{1j}$  to correlations. Ideally, the rst two sets could be measured without paying atention to coincidences. However, in the experiment we have in m ind, we want to characterize the state of neutron pairs. So, it is necessary to use the second detector as a trigger for the relevant one.

As in the one qubit case, the mean values must be translated into detection rates, now with only coincidences being registered. The coe cients can now be estimated as

$$a_{ij} = \frac{n_{i+} n_{j+} n_{i+} n_j}{n_{i+} n_{j+} + n_{i+} n_j} + n_i n_{j+} + n_i n_j};$$
(10)

$$a_{i0} = \frac{n_{i+} n_{j+} + n_{i+} n_{j}}{n_{i+} n_{j+} + n_{i+} n_{j}} + n_{i} n_{j+} + n_{i} n_{j}};$$
(11)

$$a_{0j} = \frac{n_{i+} n_{j+} n_{i+} n_{j} + n_{i} n_{j+} n_{i} n_{j+}}{n_{i+} n_{j+} + n_{i+} n_{j} + n_{i} n_{j+} + n_{i} n_{j+}};$$
(12)

where each coe cient a  $_{i0}$  and  $a_{0j}$  will be estimated three times. Ideally these estimations should coincide. In practice they will coincide up to experimental errors and a statistical treatment can be used to reme them.

One important di culty we want to address is that the use of PBS for two neutrons can give rise to di culties in the registering of coincidences. In this case one will need to make independent measurements for each two complementar situations.

It is in portant to emphasize that, in a situation like the here proposed, where each outcom e takes a relatively long time, it can be interesting to consider better tom ographic strategies, like the one proposed in ref. [22].

#### A cknow ledgm ent(s)

The authors have the pleasure to thank the O rganizers of CEW QO for invitation and reception. D iscussions with other participants of the event contributed to the present work. -MOTC recognizes support from CNPq, PRPq-UFMG, and the M illenium Institute for Q uantum Inform ation (CNPq-Brazil). VV thanks Engineering and Physical Sciences R esearch C ouncil in UK for support.

## N otes

 a. Perm anent address: Departam ento de M atem atica, U niversidade Federal de M inas G erais, C aixa Postal 702 Belo H orizonte 30123-970, B razil;
 E-m ail: tcunha@m at.ufm g.br

## References

1. A. Einstein, B. Podolsky, and N. Rosen, Phys. Rev. 47 (1935) 777.

- 2. J.S.Bell, Speakable and unspeakable in quantum mechanics, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1987).
- 3. M A.Nielsen and IL.Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge Univesity Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- 4. M B. Plenio and S. Virm ani, arxiv quant-ph/0504163
- 5. C.H.Bennett, G.Brassard, C.Crepeau, R.Jozsa, A.Peres, and W.K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70 (1993) 1895.
- 6. P.W. Shor, Proceedings of the 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, Santa Fe, November 20{22, 1994, IEEE, 1994, p. 124 (D O I: 10.1109/SFC S.1994.365700).
- 7. L.K. Grover, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 325.
- 8. M.W iesniak, V.Vedral, and C.Brukner, New J.Phys. 7 (2005) 258; C. Brukner, V.Vedral, and A.Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. A 73 (2006) 012110.
- 9. V.Vedral, Cent. Eur. J. Phys. 2 (2003) 289.
- 10. D.Cavakanti, M.Franca Santos, M.O.Terra Cunha, C.Lunkes, and V. Vedral Phys. Rev. A 72 (2005) 062307.
- 11. C N. Yang, Rev. M od. Phys. 34 (1962) 694.
- 12. A. Peres, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77 (1996) 1413; M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A 223 (1996) 1.
- 13. N W .A shcroft and N D .M erm in, Solid State Physics (Holt, R inehart and W inston, New York, 1976).
- 14. One can repeat the claculation shown, e.g., ir ref. [13] only changing the Bom-von K arm an periodic boundary conditions by the vanishing of the single particle wave function outside the gas recipient. The only e ect is to add a factor 2 in the calculation.
- 15. M. Jannuzzi, A. O recchini, F. Sacchetti, P. Facchi, and S. Pascazio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 080402 (2006). See also S. Pascazio contribution to this proceedings volum e.
- 16. V K. Ignatovich, The Physics of Ultracold Neutrons (Oxford, 1990); R. Golub, D. Richardson, and S.K. Lam oreaux, Ultra-Cold Neutrons (A dam Hilger, Bristol, 1991).
- 17. A. Saunders et al, Phys. Lett. B 593 (2004) 55.
- 18. This would take roughly ten times more than a CHSH Bell inequality experiment, something that must be taken in account before performing data aquisition.
- 19. C A. Chatzidim itriou-D reism ann, T A. Redah, R M F. Stre er, and J. M ayers, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79 (1997) 2839; E B. Karlsson, T. Abdul-Redah, R M F. Stre er, B. H jorvarsson, J. M ayers, and C A. Chatzidim itriou-D reism ann, Phys. Rev. B 67 (2003) 184108; C A. Chatzidim itriou-D reism ann, M. Vos, C. K leiner, and T. Abdul-Redah, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91 (2003) 057403. See also C A. Chatzidim itriou-D reism ann contribution to this proceedings volum e.
- 20. D. Colognesi, Physica B 358 (2005) 114; H. Sugimoto, A. Okumura, and HiroyukiYuuki, Phys. Rev. B 73 (2006) 014305.

- 21. Y. Hasegawa, R. Loidl, G. Badurek, M. Baron, and H. Rauch, Nature 425 (2003) 45.
- 22. J.Rehacek, B.-G. Englert, and D.Kaszlikowski, Phys. Rev. A 70 (2004) 052321.