The review on the entanglement quantum by an example

Jafari Matehkolaee[1], Mehdi[2], Gholami, Somayeh[2]
[1] Sama technical and vocational training college, Islamic Azad University, Sari Branch, Sari, Iran.
[2] Department of Physics Science and Research branch, Islamic Azad University, Fars.

E-mail: mehdisaraviaria@yahoo.com

(Received 24 May 2012, accepted 29 August 2012)

Abstract

We introduce and review the entanglement quantum. We will not attempt an in depth look at this approach as it would be impossible to treat it in such a short review. The emphasis is on understanding the meaning of the entanglement quantum. In this paper we showed the conception of entanglement by an example. Via this example we have clearly another conception such as pure state, mixed state and density matrix. Our motivation of this paper is to enable beginning students to start exploring the vast literature on this matter.

Keywords: Entanglement quantum – pure state – mixed state – density matrix.

Resumen

Introducimos y revisamos el entrelazamiento cuántico. No intentaremos mirar a fondo a este planteamiento, ya que sería imposible de tratar la información como una breve enseñanza. El énfasis está en entender el significado del entrelazamiento cuántico. En este trabajo se presenta la concepción de entrelazamiento como un ejemplo. Por medio de este ejemplo tenemos claramente otras concepciones tales como estado de pureza, estado mixto y de la matriz densidad. Nuestra motivación de este estudio es permitir a los estudiantes principiantes empezar a explorar la vasta literatura en esta materia.

Palabras clave: Entrelazamiento cuántico– estado puro – estado mixto – matriz de densidad.

PACS: 03.65.Ta, 03.65.Ca, 03.65.Db **ISSN 1870-9095**

I. INTRODUCTION

Entanglement was first used by Einstein, Podolski and Rosen (EPR) [1] to illustrate the conceptual differences between quantum and classical physics. In their seminal paper published in 1935, EPR argued that quantum mechanics is not a complete theory of nature, *i.e*. it does not include a full description of the physical reality, by presenting an example of an entangled quantum state to which it was not possible to ascribe definite element of reality. EPR defined an element of reality as a physical property, the value of which can be predicted with certainty before the actual property measurement. This condition is straightforwardly obeyed in the context of classical physics, but not in the context of quantum mechanics. The predictive Power of quantum mechanics is limited to, given a quantum state and an observable, the probabilities of the different measurement outcomes. This feature led EPR to deem quantum mechanics as incomplete. The incompleteness of quantum mechanics, as understood by EPR, was to plague physics for decades.

Entanglement too has proved to be a physical resource capable of revolutionizing the theories of computation and information. Within quantum information science, the logical unit of information is the qubit, a two – level quantum system. The qubit differs from the bit in that is can be any superposition of 0 and 1. In particular, a set of qubits can be in an entangled state. The possibility of exploiting these quantum correlations between qubits, for realizing computations faster than it would be possible classically, was first realized by Deutsch in 1985 [2].

II. CONCEPTION OF ENTANGLEMENT

We explain entanglement by below example. Two brothers and sisters named Ario (instead of Bob) and Utab (instead of Alis) are outside of earth into a ship. They are going to travel to Iran and United State. They know difference of time of these two countries is about 12 hours. That means if it is day time in Iran, that is night in United State and vice versa. We introduce dependent state ket to this system

$$|\psi\rangle = |\text{Iran day, USA night}\rangle - |\text{Iran night, USA day}\rangle \quad (1)$$

First Ario wants to go to Iran. It's probably clear if he faces to day time it will be $\frac{1}{2}$. Ario goes to Iran and gives message to Utab |Here is day>. At this moment Utab will get it's night in United state and gives message |Here is night>. We call non-local sharing to This correlation. It's thoroughly clear that Ario

Can't change night. So, it's impossible increasing or create entanglement [3].

Now imagine another situation. Before Ario goes to Iran Utab goes to United State. Also he faces to probably of $\frac{1}{2}$ to day time.

Now Ario is going to Iran, the probably that he face today time is equal to zero and face to night time is equal to one. So the probably of measurement on United state is effected on the probably measurement of Iran. We call entangle state to relation (1).

III. ENTANGLED STATE BY THE SYMMETRY SYMMETRY

The system consist of two qubite. Those which have symmetry in arrangement of qubite are certainly entangled and those haven't Symmetry aren't entangled.

Consider for example

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |01\rangle). \qquad (2)$$

We can write

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |01\rangle) = |0\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle). \qquad (3)$$

Then mixed state $|\psi\rangle$ is written like two separated qubites. Therefore $|\psi\rangle$ isn't intangled. As first qubite is ($|0\rangle$, $|0\rangle$) and second qubite is ($|0\rangle$, $|1\rangle$) because they haven't symmetry aren't entangled. Pay attention to another example

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle). \qquad (4)$$

First qubite is ($|0\rangle$, $|1\rangle$) and second one is ($|1\rangle$, $|0\rangle$). As seen state of (4) is not factorizable so it's entangled state.

Conseqently whenever there is a symmetry among two qubites, that's entangled and very intresting matter is that without calculating can be reached to this result.

IV. PURE STATE AND MIXED STATE:

Whenever we know the physical state of an object, the object is said to be in a pure state. Suppose that the electron is in a pure state entering the apparatus, *i.e.* it's state is known to be

$$\psi = C_1\alpha + C_2\beta. \qquad (5)$$

Where, for simplicity, we disregard the x, y, z degrees of freedom and concentrate on the spin. Then, if the detector haz been switched on, but before we look inside the black box, the electron exiting the detector must be either in state α, with probability $|C_1|^2$ or else in state β, with probability $|C_2|^2$.

This is an example of a mixed state or mixture. In general, if the state of an object is not know with certainly, but it is known that the object is in one of a number of possible state, together with probability of being in each state, then the object is said to be in a mixed state.

Ario, who was set up this experiment, has left the lab for the day. Utab, knowing Arios forgetful nature, goes to check that the detector inside the black box has been switched off, thereby is conserving the very expensive electronics inside. To her consternation, she discovers that the box has already been locked by the janitor, who has the only key. Can she tell, without opening the box, whether the detector inside the box is on of off?

It is always possible to distinguish between a pure state and a mixture. Suppose Utab measures, on the beam of electrons emerging from the box, the value of the observable O. If the detector is switched off, then the particles emerging from the detector remaining the initial state ψ, so that

$$\langle O \rangle_{pure} = \langle\psi|O|\psi\rangle = |c_1|^2\langle\alpha|O|\alpha\rangle + |c_2|^2\langle\beta|O|\beta\rangle + C_1{}^*C_2\langle\alpha|O|\beta\rangle + C_2{}^*C_1\langle\beta|O|\alpha\rangle, \qquad (6)$$

$\langle O \rangle_{mix}$= Prob. to find spin up × <α |O |α> + Prob. to find spin

down × = $\langle\beta| O |\beta\rangle = |C_1|^2\langle\alpha |O |\alpha\rangle + |C_2|^2\langle\beta| O |\beta\rangle$. (7)

The difference between the pure and mixed state result is called

The interference term

$$\langle O \rangle_{int} = \langle O \rangle_{pure} - \langle O \rangle_{mix} = C_1{}^*C_2\langle\alpha|O|\beta\rangle + C_2{}^*C_1\langle\beta|O|\alpha\rangle \qquad (8)$$

V. DENSITY MATRIX

In modern quantum mechanics, the density matrix or density operator is an essential tool for describing any quantum system.

A density matrix holds almost all the information about the observables of a system.

In the Diract notation for quantom mechanics, it is natural to think of ket vectors as position of quantom mechanical states in a Hilbert space and that bra vectors are a method of defining a basis in which to view the Hilbert space of states. When the density operator acts on the state vector (ket) of a system it gives us an eigenstate of the system.

In a system with a state vector, we can define the density operatore for the system by the outer product ρ (t) =|ψ, t> <ψ, t|.

With ψ as the time-dependent wave function describing the system, we may notice the explicit time dependence of the operator. It is clear that any 1system may evolve in time, as the density operator contains information about the observables of a system it will be of the density operator– such equations are known as the master Equations of the system.

A density matrix or density operator for the ensemble of |ψ> is defined as $\rho = \Sigma_A\, |\psi_A> p_A <\psi_A|$. Such that

(1) Tr(ρ)=1, for

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho) = \Sigma_n <n\,|\rho|\,n> = \Sigma_n <n\,|\,\Sigma_A\{|\psi_A>P_A<\psi_A|\}\,|n> = \Sigma_n \Sigma_A <n\,|\psi_A>P_A <\psi_A\,|\,n> = \Sigma_A\, P_A <\psi_A|\,\psi_A> = \Sigma_A\, P_A = 1. \quad (9)$$

The final equality follows by imposing the normalization condition $<\psi_A\,|\psi_A> = 1$

(2) ρ is positive semi-definite for any state |A>, <A |ρ| A> $=\Sigma_A P_A\, |<A|\psi_A>|^2 \geq 0$

(3) If the ensemble of $|\psi_A>$ has only one member, then
$\rho = |\psi_A> <\psi_A|$

is a pure state, with p being the probabilitistic weight of the th state. Noting that the density matrix ρ is Hermitian, it can always
be written as $\rho = \Sigma_i\, \lambda_i\ |i> <i|$

Where λ are the eigen values of the density matrix and the |i> are number states. This describes a coherent quantum superposition of pure states. The fact that ρ is Hermitian ensures that the eigen values are real and, hence, that the above statement is physically meaningful. The diagonalized matrix can then be given the standard interpretation with each eigen value being associated with the probability amplitude of the state with which it is linked (note that all the probabilities add up to1 and Tr {ρ} = 1).

Importantly, when a measurement of a quantum system described by a density matrix ρ is performed, the expectation value of the observable is <Â> = Tr (Âρ).

Indeed, as we expect to place a probabilistic physical interpretation on the density matrix, the following is also true

$$\mathrm{Tr}\,\{\rho^2\} \leq 1.$$

With equality only for a pure state. The expectation value of a quantum-mechanical operator is given by probabilistic average over the specific likelihood of the allowed states (p(a)). Hence,

$$<\hat{O}> = \Sigma_A\, p_A <\psi_A\,|\,(\hat{O})\,|\,\psi_A>$$

Here, we can define the density operator to be $\rho = \Sigma_A\, P_A\, |\psi_A> < \psi_A|$ Thus $\mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho^2) = \Sigma_{A,B}\ P_A P_B\ |<\psi_A\,|\,\psi_B>|^2$ and since $|<\psi_A\,|\psi_B>|^2 \leq 1$ and $\Sigma_B\, P_B = 1$ implying that $\Sigma_B\, P_B\, |<\psi_A\,|\,\psi_B>|^2 \leq 1$, then $\mathrm{Tr}\,(\rho)^2 \leq \Sigma_A\, P_A = 1$.

VI. CONTINUE OF DISCUSSION:

Suppose that we have two particles with spin of $\frac{1}{2}$ and state of them

$$|\psi>_{AB} = a\,|11> + b\,|10> + c\,|01> + d\,|00>. \quad (10)$$

We ask what's state of A?

That's right that both of them are in one specified state, but cannot attribute specified state vector to A particle. In this case and all similar cases our quantum system is part of one bigger system and it's state is defined by one density matrix. Generally assume that one system is consisted on two parts A and B. According to principles quantum system is attributed to this system Hilbert space $H = H_A \otimes H_B$.



FIGURE 1. This figure contain of two parts A and B. We ask what is state of A?.

State of A to be obtain by the trace of general density matrix of AB.

$$\rho_A = tr_B\,(|\psi><\psi|).$$

Come back to our first example:

Ario and Utab know out of earth if Iran is day it's night in united state and vice versa.

That means:

$$|\psi> = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\,(|\text{Iran day, USA night}> - |\text{Iran night, USA day}>) \quad (11)$$

We know (11) is a pure state. Indeed they have enough information about whole system. But not only they don't know if it's day in Iran or night and but also for United state either. The density matrix of them information is

ρ = (|Iran day, USA night> −|Iran night, USA day>) (<USA night, Iran day| −<USA day, Iran night|) = |Iran day, USA night> <USA night, Iran day| −|Iran day, USA night> <USA day, Iran night| −|Iran night, USA day> <USA night, Iran day| + |Iran night, USA day> <USA day, Iran night|. (12)

Up to now their information was about whole systems, now they want to say their information about part of system. For examples about measurement of Iran

$$\rho_{Iran} = \frac{1}{2}\,|\text{Iran day}> <\text{Iran day}| + \frac{1}{2}\,|\text{Iran night}> <\text{Iran night}|. \quad (13)$$

His (her) information about Iran (part of system) is not exact. He (she) knows its probably day time in Iran 50% and 50% night there. This is just observer's information but it's not done any measurement yet. Now, measurement is doing

$$\rho_{Iran}\,|\text{Iran day}> = \frac{1}{2}\,|\text{Iran day}>, \quad (14)$$

$$\rho_{Iran}\,|\text{Iran night}> = \frac{1}{2}\,|\text{Iran night}>. \quad (15)$$

Information about whole is more careful from detail. To exact information about details, Ario goes to Iran and Utab to United state information which are exchanged by them will be entangled.

VII. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper we showed that the conception of entanglement by the especially example. According to our opinion to read this paper enable for student is effective.

REFERENCES

[1] Podolsky, B., Einstein, A. and Rosen, N., *Can quantum-mechanical description of physical reality be considered complete?*, Physical Review **47**,777-780 (1935).
[2] Grangier, P., Aspect, A. and Roger, G., *Experimental realization of Einstein Podolsky-Rosen-Bohm gedanken experiment: A new violation of bell's inequalities*, Physical Review Letters **49**, 91–94 (1982).
[3] Poposcu, S. and *et al*, *Thermodynamics and the measure of entanglement*, quant-ph/9610044v2, (1997).