

## Experimental entanglement quantification and verification via uncertainty relations

Zhi-Wei Wang, Yun-Feng Huang,<sup>y</sup> Xi-Feng Ren, Yong-Sheng Zhang, and Guang-Can Guo  
 Key Laboratory of Quantum Information, University of Science and  
 Technology of China, CAS, Hefei 230026, People's Republic of China

We report on experimental studies on entanglement quantification and verification based on uncertainty relations for systems consisting of two qubits. The new proposed measure is shown to be invariant under local unitary transformations, by which entanglement quantification is implemented for two-qubit pure states. The nonlocal uncertainty relations for two-qubit pure states are also used for entanglement verification which serves as a basic proposition and promise to be a good choice for verification of multipartite entanglement.

PACS number(s): 03.67.Mn, 42.50.Dv, 42.65.Lm

Entanglement plays a key role in quantum information processing, such as quantum teleportation [1], efficient quantum computation [2] and entangled-assisted quantum cryptography [3]. Since more and more experimental realization of entanglement sources become available [4], it is necessary to develop efficient methods of testing the entanglement produced by these sources. Bell inequalities and entanglement witness [5], are the main tools to detect entanglement, but the construction of witnesses for entanglement detection and quantification of general states is still a highly nontrivial task [6, 7, 8]. Some other ways of direct detection of quantum entanglement has been proposed in Ref. [9, 10] and demonstrated by linear optics in Ref. [11, 12].

During the last few years, local uncertainty relations (LURs) have been suggested which use sums of variance of local observables to probe the existence of entanglement in  $N$ -level systems [13]. It is easy to implement experimentally, but unfortunately no known LUR can detect all entangled two-qubit states and, in general it do not give quantitative measure of entanglement. Khan and Howell [15] investigated the method for entangled photon pairs emitted from a down-conversion source. They perform entanglement verification using basic LURs inequalities and show these inequalities have more sensitivities than a Bell's measurement while each requiring less measurements than a Bell's measurement to obtain. But these LURs are not able to quantify entanglement except some special states. Samuelsson and Björk [16] introduce the general theory of LURs with improved characteristics and point out that the extended use of LURs requires that the behavior of them obey certain criteria, such as invariance under local unitary transformations (ILUT). In the following, Kothé and Björk [17] present a significantly improved measure for entanglement quantification of two-qubit system with the character of ILUT. A generalization of LUR theory, by considering nonlocal observables, can also be applied to entanglement verification for bipartite systems and for multipartite systems, they will have more applications [14].

For two systems  $A$  and  $B$ , one can choose two sets of observables  $\{\hat{A}_i\}$  and  $\{\hat{B}_i\}$ , acting on system  $A$  and  $B$ , respectively. The local variances are given by  $\sum_i \langle \hat{A}_i^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{A}_i \rangle^2$  and  $\sum_i \langle \hat{B}_i^2 \rangle - \langle \hat{B}_i \rangle^2$ , and similar for  $\{\hat{B}_i\}$ . The sum of the local variances  $\sum_i \langle \hat{A}_i^2 \rangle$  and  $\sum_i \langle \hat{B}_i^2 \rangle$ , will each have a minimum lower bound,  $U_A$  and  $U_B$ , respectively. The local uncertainty relation

$$\sum_i \langle \hat{A}_i^2 + \hat{B}_i^2 \rangle \geq U_A + U_B \quad (1)$$

holds for all mixtures of product states [13].

Define the covariance term as

$$C(\hat{A}_i; \hat{B}_i) = \langle \hat{A}_i \hat{B}_i \rangle - \langle \hat{A}_i \rangle \langle \hat{B}_i \rangle. \quad (2)$$

If the LUR is to reveal entanglement, at least one of the covariance terms in Eq. (2) has to be less than zero for entangled states.

In order to quantify entanglement of a state, the measure used must obey the criteria of ILUT. However, the single covariance can not satisfy this criteria. Kothé and Björk [17] propose a new measure

$$G = \sum_{i,j=1}^3 C^2(\hat{A}_i; \hat{B}_j) \quad (3)$$

<sup>E</sup>lectronic address: sdzww@mailustc.edu.cn

<sup>y</sup>Electronic address: hyf@ustc.edu.cn

which combines several covariances as a quantification of entanglement. It allows entanglement quantification of all pure states and a certain range of mixed states.  $G$  has the symmetry about the Pauli operators  $\sigma_i$  ( $i = 1; 2; 3$ ), therefore it has the potential probability of ILUT. ILUT also means that a shared spatial reference is no longer needed and will make it convenient for both theoretical and experimental investigation.

For pure states, it is shown that the value of  $G$  can be related to the well-known concurrence  $c$  [18] with the relation

$$G = c^2 (c^2 + 2). \quad (4)$$

$G > 0$  implies the state is entangled. Therefore, entanglement can be determined by measuring  $G$ . For mixed states, Eq. (4) does not hold. As a substitution, Ref. [17] gives a relation

$$c^2 (c^2 + 2) = G = 2c^2 + 1. \quad (5)$$

They explain the bounds of  $G$  but do not give strict algebraical proof. In general,  $G$  is an entanglement witness for mixed states.

The experiment set-up is shown in Fig. 1. A 0.59 mm thick  $\alpha$ -barium borate (BBO) crystal arranged in the Kwiat type configuration [19] is pumped by a 351.1 nm laser beam produced by an Ar<sup>+</sup> laser. Through the spontaneous parametric down-conversion (SPDC) process, a non-maximally entangled state  $a|H\rangle|H\rangle + b|V\rangle|V\rangle$  ( $H$  and  $V$  represent horizontal and vertical polarization of the photons respectively) is produced, where the real numbers  $a$  and  $b$  can be determined by the polarization of the pump beam and the normalization condition  $a^2 + b^2 = 1$ .

The measurement of  $C$  is easy to implement because

$$C(i; j) = h_i^A h_j^B i_i^A i_j^B i_i^A i_j^A i_j^B i_i^B \quad (6)$$

the value of  $C$  just needs combination of coincidence rates of proper projection measurements. We take  $C(1; 2)$  for example:

$$\begin{aligned} C(1; 2) &= h_1^A h_2^B i_1^A i_2^B i_1^A i_2^A i_2^B i_1^B = \\ &= h_j^+ R i_h^+ R j_j^- + L i_h^+ L j_j^- + R i_h^- R j_j^+ + L i_h^- L j_j^+ \\ &= h_j^+ + i_h^+ + j_j^- + j_j^- + i_h^- + j_j^+ + i_h^- + j_j^+ \\ &= h_j^+ R i_h^+ R j_j^- + R L i_h^+ R L j_j^- + L R i_h^- L R j_j^+ + L L i_h^- L L j_j^+ \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $j_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|H\rangle_i - |V\rangle_i)$  and  $R i_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|H\rangle_i + |V\rangle_i)$  ( $L i_i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|H\rangle_i - |V\rangle_i)$ ) are the eigenvectors of  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$ . Then according to Eq. (3), we need to measure the coincidence rates between every two bases of the set  $\{|H\rangle_i, |V\rangle_i, |j\rangle_i, |R i\rangle_i, |L i\rangle_i\}$  to obtain the value of  $G$ . The total number of measurements involved are 36. The number of the usual two-qubit tomography to reconstruct the density matrix is 16. The advantage of the measure  $G$  is that the entanglement can be directly obtained from the measurement. On the other hand, we can estimate the concurrence from the density matrix reconstructed from tomography.

In order to utilize  $G$  as the measure of entanglement, first it is necessary to demonstrate ILUT of  $G$  for two-qubit states. In experiment, we choose the pure state as  $|H\rangle|V\rangle - |V\rangle|H\rangle$ ,  $0.91|H\rangle|H\rangle + 0.41|V\rangle|V\rangle$ , and  $0.99|H\rangle|H\rangle + 0.12|V\rangle|V\rangle$ , respectively. For the second and third groups of data in Table I, two half wave plates (HWP) with the angles set to 45° and 0° respectively, are used as the local unitary transformation. For the other groups of data, a quarter wave plate (QWP) with the angle set to 45° is used as the local unitary transformation. From the first three groups of data in Table I, we can see  $G$  remains invariant under the transformation within the errors. To demonstrate ILUT of  $G$  for mixed states, we let entangled states  $a|H\rangle|H\rangle + b|V\rangle|V\rangle$  pass through two same phase-damping channels in  $|H\rangle|H\rangle, |H\rangle|V\rangle, |V\rangle|H\rangle, |V\rangle|V\rangle$  basis with the corresponding superoperators  $f_{1-p}^H, f_{p-1}^{g_A}$ ,  $f_{1-p}^V, f_{p-1}^{g_B}$  for the next two groups of data in Table I and two same phase-damping channels in  $|H\rangle|H\rangle, |V\rangle|V\rangle$  basis with the corresponding superoperators  $f_{1-p}^H, f_{p-3}^{g_A}$ ,  $f_{1-p}^V, f_{p-3}^{g_B}$  for the last groups of data where  $p$  is connected with the thickness of the quartz and the bandwidth of the interference filter [20]. From Table I, we can see the values of  $G$  are invariant under local unitary transformation within experimental errors for both pure and mixed states (for the better understanding of Table I, we list the typical data in Table II). Therefore,  $G$  can be used as measure of entanglement.

In the process of entanglement measurement of pure two-qubit states, we can obtain the values of  $G$  of the experiment-prepared states based on Eq. (3). On the other hand, we can obtain the values of concurrence  $c$  according to these pure states which are denoted by  $c_1$  in Fig. 2. We can also obtain the values of concurrence  $c$  according to the reconstructed density matrix which are shown in Fig. 2 represented with  $c_2$ . In Fig. 2(a), the prepared state is  $|\psi_0\rangle = \cos 2\theta |H\rangle|H\rangle + \sin 2\theta |V\rangle|V\rangle$ , where  $\theta$  (the horizontal axis) is the angle between the optical axis of the half wave plate (HWP) in pump light path and the vertical axis. The vertical axis denotes the values of  $G$  and  $c$ . We can see that the dots deriving from the experiment data agree with the theoretical curves of  $G$  and  $c$  plotted

G	G	G <sup>0</sup>	G <sup>0</sup>
2.841	0.034	2.836	0.034
1.376	0.022	1.419	0.024
0.084	0.006	0.083	0.006
2.831	0.018	2.859	0.018
2.303	0.016	2.324	0.016
0.606	0.009	0.598	0.008

TABLE I: Demonstration of the invariance of  $G$  under local unitary transformations.  $G^0$  denotes the values of  $G$  after the local transformation. The first three groups of data are corresponding to pure states, while the other three ones are for mixed states.

according to Eq. (3) and (4), respectively. However, the values of concurrence  $c$  obtained through the measurement of  $G$  are always higher than those obtained by tomography. This result indicates that the errors arising from the reconstruction in tomography have an unignorable impact on the experimental measurement of concurrence since the maximally entangled state produced has a visibility of 97.8%. Therefore, it is more accurate to adopt  $G$  as the measure of entanglement of pure states. We obtain similar results in Fig. 2(b) for another series of pure states  $\cos^2 \theta |H\rangle_i \sin^2 \theta |V\rangle_i$ .

$C(HH) = 26$	$C(HV) = 5005$	$C(HD) = 2162$	$C(HR) = 2477$	$C(VH) = 4881$	$C(VV) = 16$
$C(VD) = 2558$	$C(VR) = 2416$	$C(DH) = 2738$	$C(DV) = 2303$	$C(DD) = 106$	$C(DR) = 2957$
$C(RH) = 2359$	$C(RV) = 2446$	$C(RD) = 2040$	$C(RR) = 96$	$C(LH) = 2939$	$C(LV) = 2527$
$C(VL) = 2241$	$C(VL) = 2338$	$C(DL) = 4947$	$C(DL) = 2148$	$C(LH) = 2168$	$C(LV) = 2657$
$C(DL) = 4725$	$C(L) = 99$	$C(L) = 2611$	$C(L) = 2116$	$C(LH) = 2445$	$C(LV) = 2481$
$C(LD) = 2693$	$C(L) = 2243$	$C(LL) = 75$	$C(LR) = 4853$	$C(R) = 2796$	$C(RL) = 4727$
$C(HH) = 2427$	$C(HV) = 2734$	$C(HD) = 1256$	$C(HR) = 418$	$C(VH) = 2529$	$C(VV) = 2275$
$C(VD) = 3564$	$C(VR) = 4605$	$C(DH) = 2086$	$C(DV) = 3155$	$C(DD) = 469$	$C(DR) = 3774$
$C(RH) = 4781$	$C(RV) = 54$	$C(RD) = 1803$	$C(RR) = 2397$	$C(LH) = 3763$	$C(LV) = 4592$
$C(VL) = 1389$	$C(VL) = 283$	$C(DL) = 4727$	$C(DL) = 1376$	$C(LH) = 2723$	$C(LV) = 1995$
$C(DL) = 4378$	$C(L) = 365$	$C(L) = 3416$	$C(L) = 1276$	$C(LH) = 45$	$C(LV) = 4882$
$C(LD) = 2894$	$C(L) = 2046$	$C(LL) = 2362$	$C(LR) = 2552$	$C(R) = 2917$	$C(RL) = 2290$

Up to now, all our discussions are confined to local observables, but they have some disadvantages: LURs can only be constructed to characterize separable states and its generalization to multipartite and high-dimensional systems is not very clear. Ref. [14] generalizes LURs to multipartite and high-dimensional systems utilizing nonlocal observables, which can overcome these disadvantages. As a basic and important proposition, two uncertainty relations using nonlocal observables is considered: For an entangled state  $|j_1\rangle_i = a|j_1\rangle_i + b|j_2\rangle_i$  (for simplicity,  $a > b$ ), there exist  $M_i$  such that for  $j_1, i$ ,

$$K = \sum_i M_i^2 |j_1\rangle_i \langle j_1|_i = 0 \quad (8)$$

holds, while for separable states

$$K = \sum_i M_i^2 \geq 2a^2b^2 \quad (9)$$

is fulfilled. Here  $M_i = |j_1\rangle_i \langle j_1|_i$ ,  $j_1, i = 1, \dots, 4$ , and  $|j_2\rangle_i = a|j_1\rangle_i + b|j_2\rangle_i$ ,  $|j_3\rangle_i = a|j_1\rangle_i + b|j_2\rangle_i$ ,  $|j_4\rangle_i = b|j_1\rangle_i - a|j_2\rangle_i$ . So the violation of inequality (9) can be used for entanglement verification. It is also simple to implement in experiment. For experimental measurement of  $K$ , the operator  $M_i$  can be decomposed into local operators, i.e., written into a sum of projectors onto product vectors [7]. The key two terms  $|j_1\rangle_i \langle j_1|_i + |j_2\rangle_i \langle j_2|_i$  and  $|j_1\rangle_i \langle j_2|_i + |j_2\rangle_i \langle j_1|_i$  can be decomposed:

$$\langle \rho_{11} \rangle + \langle \rho_{00} \rangle = \langle \rho_{LR} \rangle + \langle \rho_{RL} \rangle + \langle \rho_{+} \rangle + \langle \rho_{-} \rangle + \langle \rho_{j} \rangle \quad (10)$$

and

$$\langle \rho_{10} \rangle + \langle \rho_{01} \rangle = \langle \rho_{+} \rangle + \langle \rho_{-} \rangle + \langle \rho_{j} \rangle \quad (11)$$

where  $I$  is the  $4 \times 4$  identity matrix. So  $K$  can be experimentally measured with two-photon coincidence. From Eqs. (8), (10) and (11), the number of measurement of  $K$  is 10 [21]. However, the number of measurement of  $K$  according to tomography is 16. So it is more convenient to use the nonlocal observables to verify entanglement. However, for nonlocal observables, they can not be measured directly and the local decomposition is needed compared with local observables.

To demonstrate entanglement verification using Eqs. (8) and (9), we choose the entangled state  $|\psi_0\rangle$  and two product states  $|\psi_1\rangle = |\psi_H\rangle$ ,  $|\psi_2\rangle = |\psi_V\rangle$ . By means of local decomposition of  $M_i$ , the values of  $K$  are measured for these states respectively. In Fig. 3,  $K_i$  ( $i = 0; 1; 2$ ) denotes the values of  $K$  for  $|\psi_i\rangle$ . In this Figure, all the points about  $K_1$  and  $K_2$  are above the curve representing the lower bound for inequality (9).  $K_0$  are well below this curve, approaching its theoretical value zero, which is a good indication of entanglement verification for pure states.

The basic idea to take one  $M_i$  as the projector onto the range of state space, and the other  $M_i$  as projectors onto the basis of the kernel, can also be generalized to other cases. For example, it can be generalized to verify entanglement of arbitrary bipartite  $N \times M$  system. For multipartite systems, the investigation of nonlocal observables can play an important role in verifying multipartite entangled states [14].

In a summary, we experimentally test ILUT of the new measure  $G$  for both pure and mixed states. By means of ILUT, we demonstrate entanglement quantification using  $G$  for pure states with the forms of  $\cos^2 |\psi_H\rangle + \sin^2 |\psi_V\rangle$  and  $\cos^2 |\psi_V\rangle + \sin^2 |\psi_H\rangle$ . Since any two-qubit pure states can be decomposed into these forms under Schmidt decomposition up to certain local unitary transformations, the method can be generalized to all two-qubit pure states. The measure can be generalized to high-dimensional systems which would keep the properties like ILUT and may be useful to detect and quantify entanglement. We also generalize to nonlocal observables which can overcome the disadvantages brought by LURs. Experimentally we demonstrate entanglement verification using nonlocal uncertainty relations Eq. (8) and inequality (9) for pure states, which can be subsequently generalized to arbitrary two-qubit pure states. The investigation of nonlocal observables can play an important role in verifying multipartite entangled states and distinguishing between different classes of true tripartite entanglement for qubits.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank D. Cavalcanti for helpful comment. This work was funded by the National Fundamental Research Program, National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 10674127 and 60121503), Innovation Funds from Chinese Academy of Sciences, and Program for New Century Excellent Talents in University.

- 
- [1] C. H. Bennett et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1895 (1993).
  - [2] C. H. Bennett and D. P. DiVincenzo, Nature (London) 404, 247 (2000).
  - [3] A. K. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 67, 661 (1991).
  - [4] A. Mair, A. Vaziri, G. Weihs, and A. Zeilinger, Nature (London) 412, 313 (2001); A. Vaziri, G. Weihs, and A. Zeilinger, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 240401 (2002); A. Las-Liñares, J. C. Howell, and Bouwmester, Nature (London) 412, 887 (2001); J. C. Howell et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 030401 (2002); E. Hagley et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 1 (1997).
  - [5] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Lett. A 223, 1 (1996); M. Lewenstein et al., Phys. Rev. A 62, 052310 (2000).
  - [6] F. G. S. L. Brandao, Phys. Rev. A 72, 022310 (2005); D. Cavalcanti and M. O. T. Cunha, Appl. Phys. Lett. 89, 084102 (2006); O. Gühne, M. Reimpell, and R. F. Werner, quant-ph/0607163; J. Eisert et al., quant-ph/0607167.
  - [7] O. Gühne et al., Phys. Rev. A 66, 062305 (2002).
  - [8] K. M. R. Audenaert and M. B. Plenio, New J. Phys. 8, 266 (2006).
  - [9] P. Horodecki and A. Ekert, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 127902 (2002); P. Horodecki, quant-ph/0111082; R. Filip, Phys. Rev. A 65, 062320 (2006).
  - [10] F. Mintert, M. Kus, and A. Buchleitner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 95, 260502 (2005).
  - [11] Z.-W. Wang et al., quant-ph/0607189.
  - [12] S. P. Walborn et al., Nature (London) 440, 1022 (2006).
  - [13] H. F. Hofmann and S. Takeuchi, Phys. Rev. A 68, 032103 (2003).

- [14] O. Gühne, Phys. Rev. Lett. 92, 117903 (2004).  
 [15] I. A. Khan and J. C. Howell, Phys. Rev. A 70, 062320 (2004).  
 [16] S. Samuelsson and G. Björk, Phys. Rev. A 73, 012319 (2006).  
 [17] C. Kothé and G. Björk, quant-ph/0608041.  
 [18] S. Hill and W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 78, 5022 (1997); W. K. Wootters, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 2245 (1998).  
 [19] A. G. White et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 3103 (1999).  
 [20] A. J. Berglund, quant-ph/0010001; Z.-W. Wang et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 220505 (2006).  
 [21] It includes the measurement of the total photon number.


FIG. 1. Experimental arrangement. The halfwave plate (HWP), quarterwave plate (QWP) and BBO crystal in the pump beam are used to prepare nonmaximally entangled states. In the mixed state preparation process, we use quartz plates as decoherence channel which can be rotated to introduce decoherence in a particular basis. The local transformation is realized using QWP with the angle between the optical axis and the vertical axis set to  $45^\circ$ . The local QWP and HWP, together with polarizing beam splitter (PBS) in each arm, enable analysis of the polarization correlations in any basis, which can be applied to tomographic measurement of the state and measurement of  $G$  and  $K$ . To detect the photon pairs, we use interference filter (bandwidth 4.62 nm), single-photon detectors and two-photon coincidence.

FIG. 2. Our experiment results for entanglement quantification. In Fig. (a) and (b), the prepared state is  $\cos^2 \theta |HH\rangle + \sin^2 \theta |VV\rangle$  and  $\cos^2 \theta |HV\rangle + \sin^2 \theta |VH\rangle$ , respectively. The curves of  $G$  and  $c_1$  are theoretical curves. The points denoted by  $c_2$  are obtained from the density matrix reconstructed by tomography. The horizontal axis is the angle between the optical axis of the halfwave plate in pump light path and the vertical axis.

FIG. 3. Demonstration of entanglement verification using nonlocal uncertainty relations.  $K_i$  ( $i = 0; 1; 2$ ) denote the values of  $K$  for  $j_i$ . The curve represents the lower bound for inequality (9). The definition of the horizontal axis is identical with that in Fig. 2.


TABLE I. Demonstration of the invariance of  $G$  under local unitary transformations.  $G^0$  denotes the values of  $G$  after the local transformation. The first three groups of data are corresponding to pure states, while the other three ones are for mixed states.

TABLE II. (a) The typical coincidence count rates for the first  $G$  in Table I. (b) The typical coincidence count rates for the first  $G^0$  in Table I.




**FIG. 1**


(a)



(b)



**FIG. 2**



**FIG 3**