# Entanglement Creation Outside Light Cone

#### Shih-Yuin Lin 林世的

Department of Physics National Cheng Kung University

in collaboration with Bei-Lok Hu

# Outline

- I. Motivation
- II. The Model
- III. Concluding Remarks

Two HO separated in distance *d* in vacuum state of a massless scalar field [S-Y Lin and BL Hu, PRD79, 085020 (2009)]

EN



 $c_0 t = d$ , the "light cone"

Interaction is switched on at t=0.

Entanglement is created long after one detector enters the other's light cone (started at the initial moment).

Two double-quantum-dots separated in distance *R* in thermal EM field [D. Braun, PRA72, 062324 (2005)]



Interaction is switched on at t=0.

FIG. 1. Entanglement of formation *E* for two initially not entangled DQDs with d=10 nm coupled to the CMB at T=2.73 K as a function of  $\log_{10}(t_0/\tau)$  and  $\log_{10}(t/\tau)$ ,  $\tau=\beta\hbar$ . Black means perfect entanglement, E=1, white no entanglement E=0. Entanglement is created only for  $t/\tau \ge 10^{12}(t_0/\tau)^3$ .

$$t_0 = R/c_0$$

Entanglement is created deeply in the light cone, too.

Two initially separated two-level atoms are back-to-back, uniformly accelerated [B. Reznik, Found. Phys.33, 167 (2003)]



#### Entanglement can be created outside light cone !

 $\begin{aligned} x_A &= -L/2\cosh(2\tau/L), \qquad t_A = L/2\sinh(2\tau/l), \\ x_B &= L/2\cosh(2\tau'/L), \qquad t_B = L/2\sinh(2\tau'/L). \end{aligned}$ 

Two initially separated two-level atoms are back-to-back, uniformly accelerated [B. Reznik, Found. Phys.33, 167 (2003)]

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} 1-C & -\langle X_{AB} | 0 \rangle & 0 & 0 \\ -\langle 0 | X_{AB} \rangle & |X_{AB}|^2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & |E_A|^2 & \langle E_B | E_A \rangle \\ 0 & 0 & \langle E_A | E_B \rangle & |E_B|^2 \end{pmatrix}$$
the basis  $\{|i\rangle, |j\rangle\} = \{\downarrow\downarrow, \uparrow\uparrow, \downarrow\uparrow, \uparrow\downarrow\}$ 

$$|\langle 0 | X_{AB} \rangle|^2 > |E_A|^2 |E_B|^2 \quad : \text{Entangled}$$

$$\frac{\langle 0 | X_{AB} \rangle|^2 > |E_A|^2 |E_B|^2 \quad : \text{Entangled}}{|E_A|^2 = \int d\tau_A \int d\tau_B e^{i\Omega(\tau_A + \tau_B)} D^+(A, B)}$$

$$|E_A|^2 = \int d\tau_A \int d\tau'_A e^{-i\Omega(\tau'_A - \tau_A)} D^+(A', A)$$

$$\frac{|\langle 0 | X_{AB} \rangle|^2}{|E_A|^2} = \frac{e^{-\pi\Omega L/2} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} e^{-\pi\Omega L}}{\sum_{n=1}^{\infty} e^{-\pi\Omega L/2}} = e^{\pi\Omega L/2} \quad > 1 \text{ for all } L>0$$
!!

Two initially separated two-level atoms are back-to-back, uniformly accelerated [B. Reznik, Found. Phys.33, 167 (2003)]



Entanglement can be created outside light cone.

Shortcomings of the argument:

- Time-dependent perturbation theory: range of validity
- Comparing two infinities
- No time evolution

 Two Unruh-DeWitt detectors (HO) are back-to-back, uniformly accelerated in a massless scalar field:

$$Q_{A} @ z_{A}^{\mu} = (a^{-1} \sinh a\tau, a^{-1} \cosh a\tau, 0, 0)$$
$$Q_{B} @ z_{B}^{\mu} = (a^{-1} \sinh a\tau, -a^{-1} \cosh a\tau, 0, 0)$$

One never enters the other's light cone.

Initial state at  $\tau = \tau_0$  (Gaussian)

$$|\psi(0)\rangle = |Q_A, Q_B\rangle\rangle \otimes |0_M\rangle$$



Free detectors' ground states Minkowski vacuum

Action 
$$S = -\int d^4x \frac{1}{2} \partial_\mu \Phi \partial^\mu \Phi + \sum_{j=A,B} \left\{ \int d\tau_j \frac{1}{2} [(\partial_{\tau_j} Q_j)^2 - \Omega_0^2 Q_j^2] + \lambda_0 \int d^4x \Phi(x) \int d\tau_j Q_j(\tau_j) \delta^4(x^\mu - z_j^\mu(\tau_j)) \right\}$$

#### Sketch of calculation

• Evolution of operators  $Q_L$ ,  $P_L$ ,  $Q_R$ ,  $P_R$ ,  $\Phi$ ,  $\Pi$  in Heisenberg picture.

$$\hat{Q}_{i}(\tau_{i}) = \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2\Omega_{r}}} \sum_{i} \left[ q_{i}^{(j)}(\tau_{i}) \hat{a}_{j} + q_{i}^{(j)*}(\tau_{i}) \hat{a}_{j}^{\dagger} \right] + \int \frac{d^{3}k}{(2\pi)^{3}} \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2\omega}} \left[ q_{i}^{(+)}(\tau_{i},\mathbf{k}) \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}} + q_{i}^{(-)}(\tau_{i},\mathbf{k}) \hat{b}_{\mathbf{k}}^{\dagger} \right]$$
  
damped HO damped driven HO

Sandwiched by the initial state: 10 symmetric correlators as elements of the covariance matrix

$$V_{\mu\nu}(t) = \langle \mathcal{R}_{\mu}, \mathcal{R}_{\nu} \rangle \equiv \frac{1}{2} \langle (\mathcal{R}_{\mu}\mathcal{R}_{\nu} + \mathcal{R}_{\nu}\mathcal{R}_{\mu}) \rangle$$

• Partial Transposition:  $V^{PT} = \Lambda V \Lambda$ 

The quantity

$$\Sigma(t) \equiv \det \left[ \mathbf{V}^{PT} + i\frac{\hbar}{2}\mathbf{M} \right]$$
  
< 0 iff entangled [Simon 2000].



or logarithmic negativity  $E_{\mathcal{N}} \equiv \max\{0, -\log_2 2c_-\}$ 





#### More observations:

- 1. The detectors will be disentangled at late times.
- 2. It seems that the entanglement time is after the moment that the third party can have causal contact with both detectors

Covariance matrix of the detectors



Self correlators  $\langle Q_A^2 \rangle = \langle Q_B^2 \rangle$ ,  $\langle P_A^2 \rangle = \langle P_B^2 \rangle$  are always positive and "large",



while  $\langle P_A, Q_A \rangle$ ,  $\langle P_B, Q_B \rangle = (m_0/2)(d/d\tau)\langle Q^2 \rangle$  are oscillating in small amplitude.













Cross correlators oscillate with growing amplitude after t=0 for  $\tau_0 < 0$ . This could generate entanglement.

 $\langle Q_A, Q_B \rangle$  with  $\gamma = 0.01, \ \Omega = 1.3, \ a = 1, \ \hbar = 1, \ \tau_0 = -60.$ 



Cross correlators oscillate with growing amplitude after t=0 for  $\tau_0 < 0$ . This could generate entanglement.



If  $\tau_0=0$ ,  $\langle Q_A, Q_B \rangle$  has no Stage 1 or 2 and is always small.

No entanglement creation outside light cone if τ<sub>0</sub>=0
 - similar to [Lin, Hu 2009] and [Braun 2005].

Cross correlators oscillate with growing amplitude after t=0 for  $\tau_0 < 0$ . This could and could not generate entanglement.



No entanglement creation outside light cone if  $\tau_0=0$ 

Entanglement Dynamics depend on  $\tau_0$ : Non-Markovian.

In <u>strong-coupling</u> regime and <u>ultrahigh-acceleration</u> regime,

the self correlators always dominate over the cross correlators....



No entanglement creation.

#### **Summary**

For two initially separable, local-in-space quantum objects without direct interaction between them, a long-lifetime quantum entanglement between the two quantum objects could be generated by the environment before one object enters the other's light cone under some conditions (e.g. back-to-back accelerated uniformly with proper acceleration, natural frequency, coupling, and initial moment  $\tau_0$  in certain parameter range).



Entanglement created in this way will disappear in a finite time if the two detectors are sufficiently far from each other at late times.

Two ions separated by 1m

[Maunz, Olmschenk, Hayes, Matsukevich, Duan, Monroe, PRL102, 250502 (2009)]



FIG. 1 (color online). The experimental apparatus. Two  $^{171}$ Yb<sup>+</sup> ions are trapped in identically constructed ion traps separated by 1 m. A magnetic field B is applied perpendicular to the excitation and observation axes to define the quantization axis. About 2% of the emitted light from each ion is collected by an imaging system (OL) with numerical aperture of about 0.3 and coupled into single-mode fibers. Polarization control paddles

are used to adjust the fibers to maintain linear polarization. The output of these fibers is directed to interfere on a polarization-independent 50% beam splitter (BS). Polarizers (PBS) transmit only the  $\pi$ -polarized light from the ions. The photons are detected by single-photon counting photomultiplier tubes (PMT A and PMT B). Detection of the atomic state is done independently for the two traps with dedicated photomultiplier tubes (PMTs).

Two ions separated by 1m

[Maunz, Olmschenk, Hayes, Matsukevich, Duan, Monroe, PRL102, 250502 (2009)]



With measurement (on spontaneously emitted photons), entanglement between two atoms can be created after the third party have causal contact with both atoms, while the atoms could be outside the light cones of each other then.



# **III.** Concluding Remarks

### III. Concluding Remark (1)

 RDM truncated up to the 1st excited state contains <u>complete</u> information about the separability of two detectors.

$$\rho_{n_{A}n_{B},n'_{A}n'_{B}}^{R} \approx \begin{pmatrix} g & 0 & 0 & gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{A'B'} \\ 0 & gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{BB'} & gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{A'B} & 0 \\ 0 & gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{AB'} & gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{AA'} & 0 \\ gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{AB} & 0 & 0 & gK^{4} \left[ \mathcal{J}^{AB}\mathcal{J}^{A'B'} + \mathcal{J}^{AA'}\mathcal{J}^{BB'} + \mathcal{J}^{AB'}\mathcal{J}^{A'B} \right] \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 00 \\ 01 \\ 10 \\ 11 \end{pmatrix}$$

### III. Concluding Remark (1)

 RDM truncated up to the 1st excited state contains <u>complete</u> information about the separability of two detectors.

$$\rho_{n_{A}n_{B},n'_{A}n'_{B}}^{R} \approx \begin{pmatrix} g & 0 & 0 & gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{A'B'} \\ 0 & gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{BB'} gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{A'B} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{AB'} gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{AA'} & 0 & 0 \\ gK^{2}\mathcal{J}^{AB} & 0 & 0 & gK^{4} \begin{bmatrix} \mathcal{J}^{AB}\mathcal{J}^{A'B'} + \mathcal{J}^{AA'}\mathcal{J}^{BB'} + \mathcal{J}^{AB'}\mathcal{J}^{A'B} \end{bmatrix} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 00 \\ 01 \\ 10 \\ 11 \end{pmatrix}$$

Partially Transposed 
$$\rho_{n_A n_B, n'_A n'_B}^R$$
 has a negative eigenvalue if  

$$0 > \qquad \mathcal{J}^{AA'} \mathcal{J}^{BB'} - \mathcal{J}^{AB} \mathcal{J}^{A'B'} = \frac{\sum \Omega^2 \det(V + V_0)}{16\hbar^{10} \left[ \langle Q_A^2 \rangle \langle Q_B^2 \rangle - \langle Q_A, Q_B \rangle^2 \right]^2}$$
or  $0 > \rho_{00,00}^R \rho_{11,11}^R - \rho_{10,01}^R \rho_{01,10}^R$ 

 $\Sigma$  < 0 iff the two detectors are entangled !!

### III. Concluding Remark (2)

 A replacement of Wightman function in textbook actually changes the interpretation of the cutoff.

$$\begin{split} \rho_{10,10}^{R} &\approx \frac{\lambda_{0}^{2}}{2\hbar\Omega} \int_{\tau_{0}}^{\tau} ds \int_{\tau_{0}}^{\tau} ds' e^{-i\Omega(s-s')} D^{+} (z_{A}^{\mu}(s), z_{A}^{\nu}(s')) \\ \\ \text{Positive frequency} \\ \text{Wightman function} \end{split} \begin{array}{l} D^{+}(z_{j}^{\mu}, z_{j'}^{\nu}) &\equiv \langle 0_{M} \mid \phi(z_{j}^{\mu}) \phi(z_{j'}^{\nu}) \mid 0_{M} \rangle \\ &= \int \frac{\hbar d^{3}k}{(2\pi)^{3}2\omega} e^{-\omega\epsilon} e^{-i\omega(z_{j}^{0}-z_{j'}^{0})+i\mathbf{k}\cdot(\mathbf{z}_{j}-\mathbf{z}_{j'})} \\ &= \frac{\hbar/4\pi^{2}}{|\mathbf{z}_{j}-\mathbf{z}_{j'}|^{2} - \left(z_{j}^{0}-z_{j'}^{0}-i\epsilon\right)^{2}} \\ \\ z_{A}^{\mu} &= (a^{-1}\sinh a\tau, a^{-1}\cosh a\tau, 0, 0) \\ D^{+}(z_{A}^{\mu}(s), z_{A}^{\nu}(s')) &= \frac{\hbar/4\pi^{2}}{-\frac{4}{a^{2}}\sinh \frac{a}{2}\Delta\left(\sinh \frac{a}{2}\Delta - i\epsilon a\cosh aT\right) + \epsilon^{2}} \\ \end{array} \begin{array}{l} T &\equiv (s+s')/2 \\ \Delta &\equiv s-s' \\ \end{array}$$

### III. Concluding Remark (2)

 A replacement of Wightman function in textbook actually changes the interpretation of the cutoff.

$$\rho_{10,10}^R \approx \frac{\lambda_0^2}{2\hbar\Omega} \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} ds \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau} ds' e^{-i\Omega(s-s')} D^+ \left( z_A^{\mu}(s), z_A^{\nu}(s') \right)$$

 $D^+(z_A^{\mu}(s), z_A^{\nu}(s')) = \frac{\hbar/4\pi^2}{-\frac{4}{a^2}\sinh\frac{a}{2}\Delta\left(\sinh\frac{a}{2}\Delta - i\epsilon a\cosh aT\right) + \epsilon^2} \qquad \begin{array}{c} T \equiv (s+s')/2 \\ \Delta \equiv s-s' \end{array}$ 

In textbook this is replaced by (since  $\epsilon$  is extremely small)

 $D'^{+}(z_{A}^{\mu}(s), z_{A}^{\nu}(s')) = \frac{\hbar/4\pi^{2}}{-\frac{4}{a^{2}}\sinh^{2}\frac{a}{2}(\Delta - i\epsilon')}$ 

Alternatively, one can use the original  $D^+$  but put the <u>time-resolution of the</u> <u>detector</u> (physical cutoffs)

$$\rho_{10,10}^R \approx \frac{\lambda_0^2}{2\hbar\Omega} \int_{\tau_0}^{\tau+\epsilon_1} ds \int_{\tau_0+\epsilon_0}^{\tau} ds' e^{-i\Omega(s-s')} D^+ \left(z_A^{\mu}(s), z_A^{\nu}(s')\right)$$

### III. Concluding Remark (2)

 A replacement of Wightman function in textbook actually changes the interpretation of the cutoff.





# Thank you!