

**Spin squeezing under non-Markovian channels by the hierarchy equation method**Xiaolei Yin,<sup>1,2</sup> Jian Ma,<sup>1,2</sup> Xiaoguang Wang,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> and Franco Nori<sup>1,3</sup><sup>1</sup>*Advanced Science Institute, RIKEN, Wako-shi, Saitama 351-0198, Japan*<sup>2</sup>*Zhejiang Institute of Modern Physics, Department of Physics, Zhejiang University, Hangzhou 310027, China*<sup>3</sup>*Physics Department, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1040, USA*

(Received 31 March 2012; published 11 July 2012)

We study the decoherence of spin squeezing under non-Markovian channels and consider an ensemble of  $N$  independent spin-1/2 particles with exchange symmetry. Each spin interacts with its own bath, and the baths are independent and identical. For this kind of open system, the spin squeezing under decoherence can be investigated from the dynamics of the local expectations. The reduced dynamics is obtained by the exact hierarchy equation method. The numerical results show that the spin squeezing may display both sudden and asymptotic vanishing; however, the revival phenomenon does not happen. In contrast, the concurrence shows multiple sudden vanishing and revival phenomena.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.86.012308](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.86.012308)

PACS number(s): 03.67.Bg, 03.67.Mn, 03.65.Ud, 03.65.Yz

**I. INTRODUCTION**

Spin squeezing has attracted much attention for decades [1–8]. An important application of spin squeezing is to detect quantum entanglement [9–11]. As a multipartite entanglement witness, spin squeezing is relatively easy to generate and measure [2,12–14]. Many efforts have been devoted to finding relations between spin squeezing and entanglement [1–7,15–17]. Another application of spin squeezing is to improve the precision of measurements. For example, spin squeezing plays an important role in making more precise atomic clocks [2,6,18,19] and gravitational-wave interferometers [20–22] and so on.

Spin-squeezed states are useful resources for quantum information processing. However, in practice, decoherence is inevitable and harmful to spin squeezing and entanglement [23–29]. Generally, when the system-bath coupling strength is weak enough, the decoherence is studied by using the master equation method, which is derived by employing the Born approximation [23,24]. In addition, the Markov approximation can be applied if the time scale of the bath is much shorter than that of the system. To overcome the above approximations, a set of hierarchical equations were established by Tanimura *et al.* [30–36]. It provides an exact way to obtain the reduced dynamics of the system [37–49]. However, for numerical reasons, it is hard to treat systems with a large number of particles straightforwardly. Here, we show that, for the open system we consider, we can reduce the multiparticle dynamics into a two-particle one, and then we efficiently use the hierarchy equation method to make numerical calculations.

As we know, spin squeezing is a multipartite entanglement witness. Reference [50] has shown that for a many-particle system with exchange symmetry, the spin-squeezing parameters of the total system can be expressed in terms of local expectations and correlations. Here, we consider such an ensemble of  $N$  independent spin-1/2 particles. Each particle interacts with its own bath, and the baths are independent and identical. Thus,

the exchange symmetry is not affected by the decoherence, and the spin-squeezing parameters of the open system can also be expressed by the dynamics of the local expectations and correlations. For the system under consideration, we find that the dynamics of any two particles is governed only by the local Hamiltonian of the two particles and their baths. Then, we use the hierarchy equation method to calculate the dynamics of the local expectations and correlations. Reference [50] has also shown that the spin squeezing has close relations with pairwise entanglement if the state of the collective spin system lies in the  $J = N/2$  sector, where  $J$  is the collective angular momentum of the system. Therefore, since the state of the system will not lie in the  $J = N/2$  sector any longer under decoherence, the ability of spin squeezing in detecting pairwise entanglement needs to be further studied and clarified.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we introduce the Hamiltonian and the initial state of the open system. The definition of the spin-squeezing parameters is given in Sec. III, and we also discuss the symmetry of the system and reduce the multiqubit dynamics into the two-qubit one. In Sec. IV, we introduce the hierarchy method and give an alternative form of the hierarchy equation. We numerically calculate spin-squeezing parameters and the rescaled concurrence of the open system under decoherence and compare their behaviors in Sec. V. Finally, a summary is given in Sec. VI.

**II. HAMILTONIAN AND INITIAL STATE**

The spin-boson model is one of the most important theoretical models in the study of dissipation and decoherence in quantum systems [51–53]. The model is composed of a two-level system and a bath of harmonic oscillators. Although the model is simple, it is fundamental and useful in the study of physics of open quantum systems. Here, we consider a generalized spin-boson model, which contains an ensemble of  $N$  independent spin-1/2 particles with exchange symmetry, and each particle interacts with its own bosonic bath. The  $N$  baths are independent and identical. The Hamiltonian of the

\*xgwang@zimp.zju.edu.cn

total system is ( $\hbar = 1$ )

$$H = H_S + H_B + H_{SB} \\ = \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \frac{\omega_0}{2} \sigma_{\alpha z} + \sum_k \omega_k b_k^\dagger b_k + \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \sum_k g_{\alpha k} \sigma_{\alpha x} (b_k^\dagger + b_k), \quad (1)$$

where the first term is the Hamiltonian of the system with  $\sigma_{k\alpha}$  ( $\alpha = x, y, z$ ) being the Pauli matrices for the  $k$ th spin and  $\omega_0$  being the frequency for all qubits. The second term describes the bosonic bath, where  $b_k$  and  $b_k^\dagger$  are the creation and annihilation operators of the  $k$ th mode with frequency  $\omega_k$ . The system-bath coupling is characterized by the third term, with  $g_{\alpha k}$  being the coupling strength for qubit  $\alpha$ . Here, we study  $N$  independent baths, i.e., the bath can be divided into  $N$  parts, and  $g_{\alpha k}$  is only nonzero when mode  $k$  belongs to the  $\alpha$ th part.

The initial state of the total system is set to be a product state,

$$\rho_T(0) = \rho_S(0) \otimes \rho_B(0), \quad (2)$$

in which the system and bath are uncorrelated. The bath is in a thermal state,

$$\rho_B(0) = \prod_k \frac{\exp(-\beta \omega_k b_k^\dagger b_k)}{Z_k}, \quad (3)$$

with the inverse temperature  $\beta = 1/(k_B T)$  and partition function  $Z_k = \text{Tr} \exp(-\beta \omega_k b_k^\dagger b_k)$  for mode  $k$ , and in this paper we take  $k_B = 1$ . For  $\rho_S(0) = |\Psi(0)\rangle\langle\Psi(0)|$ , we choose a standard one-axis twisted state [1],

$$|\Psi(0)\rangle = e^{-i\theta J_x^2/2} |1 \dots 1\rangle, \quad (4)$$

with

$$J_\alpha = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^N \sigma_{k\alpha} \quad (5)$$

being the total angular momentum operators and  $|1 \dots 1\rangle$  being the ground state of  $J_z$ . This state is prepared by the one-axis twisted Hamiltonian  $H = \chi J_x^2$ , with the coupling constant  $\chi$  and  $\theta = 2\chi t$  being the twist angle. For our case, the system of  $N$  spin-1/2 behaves like an effective large spin  $N/2$ .

### III. SPIN SQUEEZING AND REDUCING THE MULTIQUBIT DYNAMICS INTO A TWO-QUBIT ONE

In this section, we give the definitions of two spin-squeezing parameters. By discussing the symmetry of the open system under consideration, we know that the spin squeezing can be expressed by the local expectations and correlations. Since we can reduce the multiqubit dynamics into a two-qubit one, the spin squeezing can then be calculated by the dynamics of the local expectations and correlations.

#### A. Spin-squeezing definitions

There are various measures of spin squeezing related to various inequality criteria [1–3,5,8], and we consider two of

them as follows:

$$\xi_{\text{KU}}^2 = \frac{4(\Delta J_\perp)_{\text{min}}^2}{N}, \quad (6)$$

$$\xi_{\text{T}}^2 = \frac{\lambda_{\text{min}}}{\langle \bar{J}^2 \rangle - \frac{N}{2}}. \quad (7)$$

Here, the minimization in the first equation is over all directions denoted by  $\perp$ , which are perpendicular to the mean spin direction  $\langle \bar{J} \rangle / |\langle \bar{J} \rangle|$ .  $\lambda_{\text{min}}$  in the second equation is the minimal eigenvalue of the matrix

$$\Gamma = (N-1)\gamma + \mathbf{C}, \quad (8)$$

where

$$\gamma_{kl} = \mathbf{C}_{kl} - \langle J_k \rangle \langle J_l \rangle, \quad k, l \in \{x, y, z\}, \quad (9)$$

is the covariance matrix and

$$\mathbf{C}_{kl} = \frac{1}{2} \langle J_l J_k + J_k J_l \rangle \quad (10)$$

is the global correlation matrix. The parameter  $\xi_{\text{KU}}^2$  was defined by Kitagawa and Ueda [1], and  $\xi_{\text{T}}^2$  was defined by Tóth *et al.* [5]. If  $\xi_{\text{T}}^2 < 1$ , spin squeezing occurs, and we can safely say that the multipartite state is entangled [5,8].

From the definitions, we know that the spin-squeezing parameters are based on the expectations and correlations of the collective operators. For the limitation of the hierarchy equation method, it is hard to calculate the decoherence of a many-particle system straightforwardly.

#### B. Simplification of the spin-squeezing parameters

Since the baths are independent and identical, the exchange symmetry is not affected by decoherence. Therefore, the global expectations or correlations of collective operators can be written as [50]

$$\langle J_\alpha \rangle = \frac{N}{2} \langle \sigma_{1\alpha} \rangle, \quad (11)$$

$$\langle J_\alpha^2 \rangle = \frac{N}{4} + \frac{N(N-1)}{4} \langle \sigma_{1\alpha} \sigma_{2\alpha} \rangle, \quad (12)$$

$$\langle [J_\alpha, J_\beta]_+ \rangle = \frac{N(N-1)}{4} \langle [\sigma_{1\alpha}, \sigma_{2\beta}]_+ \rangle, (\alpha \neq \beta), \quad (13)$$

which only depend on the expectation values of the local Pauli operators, e.g.,  $\langle \sigma_{1\alpha} \sigma_{2\beta} \rangle$  and  $\langle \sigma_{1\alpha} \rangle$ .

The initial one-axis twisted state we use here has a parity symmetry leading to  $\langle J_x \rangle = \langle J_y \rangle = 0$ , namely, the mean-spin direction is along the  $z$  axis. Moreover, the mean-spin direction does not change during decoherence. The proof is given as follows.

The Hamiltonian (1) displays only one symmetry, i.e., the parity symmetry. The parity operator is given by

$$\Pi = \Pi_1 \otimes \Pi_2 \\ = (-1)^{\mathcal{N}} \otimes (-1)^{\sum_k a_k^\dagger a_k} \\ = (-1)^{\mathcal{N} + \sum_k a_k^\dagger a_k}, \quad (14)$$

where  $\mathcal{N} = J_z + N/2$  describes the numbers of excitations of up spins. Obviously, we have

$$\Pi H \Pi = H, \quad (15)$$

$$\Pi_1 \rho_S(0) \Pi_1 = \rho_S(0), \quad (16)$$

$$\Pi_2 \rho_B(0) \Pi_2 = \rho_B(0), \quad (17)$$

$$\Pi \rho_T(0) \Pi = \rho_T(0); \quad (18)$$

namely, the Hamiltonian and the initial state have a fixed parity. Since the exchange symmetry leads to  $\langle J_x \rangle = N \langle \sigma_{1x} \rangle / 2$ , we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \sigma_{1x} \rangle &= \text{Tr}[\sigma_{1x} U(t) \rho_T(0) U^\dagger(t)] \\ &= \text{Tr}\{\sigma_{1x} \Pi [\Pi U(t) \Pi] [\Pi \rho_T(0) \Pi] [\Pi U^\dagger(t) \Pi] \Pi\} \\ &= \text{Tr}[\sigma_{1x} \Pi U(t) \rho_T(0) U^\dagger(t) \Pi] \\ &= \text{Tr}[\Pi \sigma_{1x} \Pi U(t) \rho_T(0) U^\dagger(t)] \\ &= -\langle \sigma_{1x} \rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

which leads to  $\langle J_x \rangle = 0$ . Similarly,  $\langle J_y \rangle = \langle J_y J_z \rangle = \langle J_x J_z \rangle = 0$  can be proved. Therefore, during the evolution the mean spin direction is always along the  $z$  axis. In this case, the spin-squeezing parameters reduce to [7,28]

$$\xi_{\text{KU}}^2 = 1 + 2(N-1)(\langle \sigma_{1+} \sigma_{2-} \rangle - |\langle \sigma_{1-} \sigma_{2-} \rangle|), \quad (20)$$

$$\xi_{\text{T}}^2 = \frac{\min\{\xi_{\text{KU}}^2, S^2\}}{(1-1/N)(\vec{\sigma}_1 \cdot \vec{\sigma}_2) + 1/N}, \quad (21)$$

where

$$S^2 = 1 + (N-1)(\langle \sigma_{1z} \sigma_{2z} \rangle - \langle \sigma_{1z} \rangle \langle \sigma_{2z} \rangle). \quad (22)$$

For convenience, hereafter we use

$$\zeta_k^2 = \max(0, 1 - \xi_k^2), \quad k \in \{\text{KU}, \text{T}\} \quad (23)$$

to characterize spin squeezing. With the above definition, spin squeezing occurs when  $\zeta_k^2 > 0$ .

Now we only need to calculate the dynamics of the local expectations and correlations of the spins, and the spin-squeezing parameters are greatly simplified. Furthermore, we will prove that the reduced dynamics is only governed by the Hamiltonian of the two particles and their baths.

### C. Reducing the multiqubit dynamics into a two-qubit one

Now we prove that we can reduce the multiqubit dynamics into a two-qubit one. Generally, we consider a system written as follows:

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^N H^{(i)}, \quad H^{(i)} = H_S^{(i)} + H_B^{(i)} + H_{SB}^{(i)}. \quad (24)$$

$H_S^{(i)}$  and  $H_B^{(i)}$  represent the Hamiltonian of a single particle and its bath, respectively, and their couplings are expressed by  $H_{SB}^{(i)}$ . Obviously, each of the particles interacts with its own bath. The particles do not interact with each other, and the baths are independent. Equation (1) belongs to this case.

The time-evolution operator of the total system can be written as

$$U(t) = e^{-iHt} = \prod_i e^{-iH_i t} = \prod_i u_i(t), \quad (25)$$

where  $u_i(t) = e^{-iH_i t}$ . Then, the total density matrix at time  $t$  is given by

$$\rho_T(t) = U(t) \rho_T(0) U^\dagger(t), \quad (26)$$

which can be formally written as

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_T(t) &= U(t) \rho_T(0) U^\dagger(t) \\ &= \prod_i u_i(t) \rho_T(0) \prod_i u_i^\dagger(t). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Here we assume that the initial state is a product state written as

$$\rho_T(0) = \rho_S(0) \otimes \rho_B(0). \quad (28)$$

By tracing out the baths and  $N-2$  particles of the system, we obtain the reduced density matrix of any two particles:

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_S^{12}(t) &= \text{Tr}_{\{B_{1,2}\}} \left[ \text{Tr}_{\{S_{3\dots N} B_{3\dots N}\}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^N u_i(t) \rho_T(0) \prod_{i=1}^N u_i^\dagger(t) \right) \right] \\ &= \text{Tr}_{\{B_{1,2}\}} \left[ \text{Tr}_{\{S_{3\dots N} B_{3\dots N}\}} \left( \prod_{i=1}^2 u_i(t) \rho_T(0) \prod_{i=1}^2 u_i^\dagger(t) \right) \right] \\ &= \text{Tr}_{\{B_{1,2}\}} \left[ \prod_{i=1}^2 u_i(t) [\rho_S^{12}(0) \otimes \rho_B^{12}(0)] \prod_{i=1}^2 u_i^\dagger(t) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where the second equality follows from the fact that

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Tr}_2[(A_1 \otimes A_2) \rho_{12}(B_1 \otimes B_2)] \\ = \text{Tr}_2[A_1 \otimes (B_2 A_2) \rho_{12}(B_1 \otimes I_2)], \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

and the last equality is obtained by substituting the initial product state (28).  $\rho_S^{12}(0) = \text{Tr}_{\{S_{3\dots N}\}} \rho_S(0)$  and  $\rho_B^{12}(0) = \text{Tr}_{\{B_{3\dots N}\}} \rho_B(0)$  in the equation are the reduced density matrices of the initial state for the system and bath, respectively.

Equation (29) indicates that the evolution of any two particles is governed only by the local Hamiltonian of the two particles and their baths [54]. It is noted that we can reach this conclusion even when the initial states of the system or the baths are entangled states. Therefore, the multiqubit dynamics reduces to a two-qubit one. Then we use the hierarchy equation method to calculate the reduced dynamics the system, and the dynamics of the local expectations and correlations in Eqs. (20)–(22) can also be obtained.

Here we emphasize that the reducing process is obtained without using exchange symmetry, which means that the particles are not necessarily identical, and neither are the baths. Also, the proof can be easily extended to any finite number of particles.

## IV. HIERARCHY EQUATIONS AND INITIAL TWO-QUBIT REDUCED DENSITY MATRIX

To start with the numerical calculations, we introduce the hierarchy equation method [36,37] and discuss the spin-squeezing parameters of the initial state in this section. For comparison, the definition of a rescaled concurrence is also given.

### A. Hierarchy equations

We choose the Drude-Lorentz spectrum,

$$J(\omega) = \frac{2}{\pi} \frac{\omega \lambda \gamma}{\omega^2 + \gamma^2}, \quad (31)$$

where  $\gamma$  represents the width of the spectral distribution of the bath mode and  $\lambda$  can be viewed as the system-bath coupling strength. The bath correlation function for the bath operator

$$B_\alpha(t) = \sum_k g_{\alpha k} (b_k^\dagger e^{i\omega_k t} + b_k e^{-i\omega_k t}) \quad (32)$$

is given by [37]

$$\langle B_\alpha(t) B_\alpha(\tau) \rangle = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} c_n e^{-v_n |t-\tau|}, \quad (33)$$

where

$$v_n = \frac{2\pi n}{\beta} (1 - \delta_{n0}) + \gamma \delta_{n0} \quad (34)$$

is the  $k$ th Matsubara frequency and

$$c_n = \frac{4\lambda\gamma}{\beta} \frac{v_n}{v_n^2 - \gamma^2} (1 - \delta_{n0}) + \lambda\gamma \left[ \cot\left(\frac{\beta\gamma}{2}\right) - i \right] \delta_{n0} \quad (35)$$

are the expansion coefficients.

With the Drude-Lorentz spectrum, the hierarchy equations become

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_{\vec{n}} = & -[iH_S^\times + (\vec{n}_1 + \vec{n}_2) \cdot \vec{v}] \rho_{\vec{n}} \\ & - \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \sum_{k=0}^M \left( \frac{2\lambda}{\beta\gamma} - i\lambda - \sum_{k=0}^M \frac{c_k}{v_k} \right) V_\alpha^\times V_\alpha^\times \rho_{\vec{n}} \\ & - i \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \sum_{k=0}^M n_{\alpha k} (c_k V_\alpha \rho_{\vec{n} - \vec{e}_{\alpha k}} - c_k^* \rho_{\vec{n} - \vec{e}_{\alpha k}} V_\alpha) \\ & - i \sum_{\alpha=1}^2 \sum_{k=0}^M V_\alpha^\times \rho_{\vec{n} + \vec{e}_{\alpha k}}, \end{aligned} \quad (36)$$

where

$$\vec{n} = (\vec{n}_1, \vec{n}_2) = (n_{10}, \dots, n_{1M}, n_{20}, \dots, n_{2M}) \quad (37)$$

is a  $2(M+1)$ -dimensional vector, a concatenation of two  $(M+1)$ -dimensional vectors  $\vec{n}_1$  and  $\vec{n}_2$ . The vectors  $\vec{v} = (v_0, \dots, v_M)$  and  $\vec{e}_{\alpha k}$  are defined as  $2(M+1)$ -dimensional vectors with only 1 in the  $\alpha k$  place and 0's in other places. Note that this equation is slightly different and essentially the same as that given in Ref. [37].

### B. Initial two-qubit reduced density matrix

To solve Eq. (36), we need to know the initial state. Since the mean spin of the initial state (4) is along the  $z$  direction, the two-qubit reduced density matrix can be written in a block-diagonal form [7]:

$$\rho_{12} = \begin{pmatrix} v_+ & u^* \\ u & v_- \end{pmatrix} \oplus \begin{pmatrix} w & y \\ y & w \end{pmatrix} \quad (38)$$

in the basis  $\{|00\rangle, |11\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle\}$ , where

$$v_\pm = (1 \pm 2\langle\sigma_{1z}\rangle + \langle\sigma_{1z}\sigma_{2z}\rangle)/4, \quad (39)$$

$$w = (1 - \langle\sigma_{1z}\sigma_{2z}\rangle)/4, \quad (40)$$

$$u = \langle\sigma_{1-}\sigma_{2-}\rangle, \quad (41)$$

$$y = \langle\sigma_{1+}\sigma_{2-}\rangle. \quad (42)$$

We notice that if  $\langle\sigma_{1+}\sigma_{2-}\rangle$ ,  $\langle\sigma_{1-}\sigma_{2-}\rangle$ ,  $\langle\sigma_{1z}\rangle$ , and  $\langle\sigma_{1z}\sigma_{2z}\rangle$  are known, the density matrix is determined. For the one-axis twisted state, we have [7]

$$\langle\sigma_z\rangle = -\cos^{N-1}\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right), \quad (43)$$

$$\langle\sigma_{1z}\sigma_{2z}\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(1 + \cos^{N-2}\theta), \quad (44)$$

$$\langle\sigma_{1+}\sigma_{2-}\rangle = \frac{1}{8}(1 - \cos^{N-2}\theta), \quad (45)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle\sigma_{1-}\sigma_{2-}\rangle = & -\frac{1}{8}(1 - \cos^{N-2}\theta) \\ & - \frac{i}{2} \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \cos^{N-2}\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right). \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

Employing the equations above, we obtain the initial two-qubit reduced density matrix in Eq. (38). Then we use Eq. (36) to calculate the dynamics of the reduced density matrix numerically.

Meanwhile, we can also use Eqs. (43)–(46) to discuss the spin-squeezing parameters for the initial state. For the initial state (4), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \zeta_{\text{KU}}^2(0) = \zeta_{\text{T}}^2(0) = & \frac{1}{4} \left\{ \left[ (1 - \cos^{N-2}\theta)^2 + 16 \sin^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \right. \right. \\ & \left. \left. \times \cos^{2N-4}\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \right]^{1/2} - 1 + \cos^{N-2}\theta \right\}, \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

which implies that the two spin-squeezing parameters for the initial state coincide.

It is known that spin squeezing has close relations with concurrence if the state of the collective spin system lies in the  $J = N/2$  sector [50], such as the initial state of the system. During the decoherence, the state of the system does not lie in the  $J = N/2$  sector any longer. It is necessary to compare the behaviors of spin squeezing and pairwise entanglement.

The concurrence is defined as [55]

$$C = \max(0, \lambda_1 - \lambda_2 - \lambda_3 - \lambda_4), \quad (48)$$

where  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \lambda_3 \geq \lambda_4$  are the square roots of eigenvalues of  $\tilde{\rho}\rho$ . Here  $\rho$  is the reduced density matrix of the system, and

$$\tilde{\rho} = (\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y) \rho^* (\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y), \quad (49)$$

where  $\rho^*$  is the conjugate of  $\rho$ .

For the reduced density matrix of (38), the concurrence is given by [56]

$$C = 2 \max\{0, |u| - w, y - \sqrt{v_+ v_-}\}. \quad (50)$$

Therefore, we can also obtain the concurrence of the initial state by employing Eqs. (39)–(46).

For convenience, here we use a rescaled concurrence

$$C_r = (N-1)C, \quad (51)$$

and thus  $C_r(0) = \zeta_{\text{KU}}^2(0) = \zeta_{\text{T}}^2(0)$ . Then we know that the two spin-squeezing parameters and the rescaled concurrence are the same for the initial state.

**V. SPIN SQUEEZING AND CONCURRENCE UNDER DECOHERENCE**

The initial one-axis twisted state considered in this work is a symmetric state which can be expressed as a superposition of symmetric Dicke states. In other words, the  $N$  qubits behave effectively like a large spin  $N/2$ . After decoherence, not only will the symmetric Dicke states be populated but also states with lower symmetry. Therefore, it is not sufficient to describe the system with only an  $(N + 1)$ -dimensional space. However, the exchange symmetry is not affected by the decoherence. In other words, a state with exchange symmetry does not necessarily belong to the maximally symmetric space [57]. Now by employing the hierarchy equation method, we calculate the spin-squeezing parameters and the rescaled concurrence under decoherence and compare their behaviors.

As an example, we set the initial state given in Eq. (47) with  $\theta = \pi/10$ . The parameters of the Drude-Lorentz spectrum in Eq. (31) are chosen to be  $\lambda = 0.03\omega_0$  and  $\gamma = 0.15\omega_0$ . In this section, we study the effects of the particle number  $N$  and bath temperature  $T$  on the dynamics of spin squeezing and concurrence.

Figures 1(a) and 1(b) show the time evolution of  $\zeta_{\text{KU}}^2$ ,  $\zeta_{\text{T}}^2$ , and  $C_r$  with two different particle numbers,  $N = 10$  and  $N = 20$ . The inverse temperature is set to  $\beta = 4/\omega_0$ . Figures 1(a) and 1(b) show that the decay rate of  $C_r$  increases with  $N$ . Although the rescaled concurrence of the initial state for  $N = 20$  is larger than that for  $N = 10$ , it vanishes earlier. Also, the revival, after a sudden vanishing, becomes weaker with increasing  $N$ . Both  $\zeta_{\text{KU}}^2$  and  $\zeta_{\text{T}}^2$  decay in an oscillatory way. We observe that  $\zeta_{\text{T}}^2$  vanishes suddenly, while, interestingly,  $\zeta_{\text{KU}}^2$  decays to zero asymptotically ( $t \rightarrow \infty$ ), as shown in the insets. Comparing Figs. 1(a) and 1(b), we find that for spin squeezing, the vanishing time changes little with increasing  $N$ .

Now we focus on the effects of the bath temperature on the dynamics of spin squeezing and rescaled concurrence, which




FIG. 1. (Color online) Time evolution of the spin-squeezing parameters  $\zeta_{\text{KU}}^2$  and  $\zeta_{\text{T}}^2$  and the rescaled concurrence  $C_r$  as a function of dimensionless quantity  $\omega_0 t$  for (a)  $N = 10$  and (b)  $N = 20$ . The inverse temperature is taken as  $\beta = 4/\omega_0$ . The insets show the magnifications in the region where  $\zeta_{\text{KU}}^2$  nearly vanishes. The horizontal x axes are logarithmic, but the inset x axes are linear.




FIG. 2. (Color online) Time evolution of the rescaled concurrence as a function of dimensionless quantity  $\omega_0 t$  for different values of the inverse temperature  $\beta$ . Here, we choose  $N = 10$ .

are shown by Figs. 2–4. These figures are plotted with a fixed particle number  $N = 10$  and different temperature  $T$ . Here we choose the inverse temperature  $\beta = 4/\omega_0, 3/\omega_0, 2.5/\omega_0, 2/\omega_0$ , and we particularly take  $\beta = 0.5/\omega_0$  for  $\zeta_{\text{KU}}^2$ . First, let us discuss the time evolutions of  $C_r$ , which are shown in Fig. 2. As expected,  $C_r$  is suppressed with increasing temperature. When we choose a low temperature, such as  $\beta = 4/\omega_0$ ,  $C_r$  decays with multiple revivals. When the temperature increases, the revivals become weaker.  $C_r$  even vanishes completely without revival when  $\beta = 1/\omega_0$ .

The spin squeezing is also suppressed with increasing  $T$ . As shown in Fig. 3,  $\zeta_{\text{KU}}^2$  decays without sudden vanishing and approaches zero asymptotically ( $t \rightarrow \infty$ ) when temperature is not high enough, which is shown in the inset. Interestingly, when the temperature reaches  $\beta = 0.5/\omega_0$ ,  $\zeta_{\text{KU}}^2$  decays to zero quickly and suddenly without revival. The behavior is quite different from  $C_r$ . However,  $\zeta_{\text{T}}^2$  decays and suddenly vanishes even with low temperature, as shown in Fig. 4, which is similar to  $C_r$ .

From the comparison, although they have close relations, we find that spin squeezing is not a satisfactory indicator of




FIG. 3. (Color online) Time evolution of the spin-squeezing parameter  $\zeta_{\text{KU}}^2$  as a function of dimensionless quantity  $\omega_0 t$  for different values of  $\beta$ , with  $N = 10$ . The inset shows the magnification in the region where  $t$  is large.




FIG. 4. (Color online) Time evolution of the spin-squeezing parameter  $\zeta_T^2$  as a function of dimensionless quantity  $\omega_0 t$  for different values of  $\beta$ , with  $N = 10$ .

pairwise entanglement under decoherence for the open system. Also, it is noted that instead of decreasing monotonically, the spin squeezing and concurrence both decay with oscillations. There is a theorem that entanglement does not increase under local operations and classical communication (LOCC). However, the oscillations of the concurrence do not violate the theorem. Actually, only the process from  $t_0(t_0 = 0) \rightarrow t(t > 0)$  is an LOCC, while the process from an intermediate time  $t'(t' > 0)$  to  $t(t > t')$  is not an LOCC. As we know, a process is called an LOCC only if it can be expressed as [58]

$$\rho \rightarrow \sum_{\mu} K_{\mu} \rho K_{\mu}^{\dagger}, \quad (52)$$

where  $K_{\mu} = \otimes_{i=1}^N l_{\mu}^i$  are the Kraus operators and  $l_{\mu}^i$  is a local operation on particle  $i$ , with  $\sum_{\mu} l_{\mu}^i \dagger l_{\mu}^i \leq 1$ . It is evident that, if the dynamics of an open system can be expressed as Eq. (52), the system and bath should be initially separated. Obviously, the process from  $t_0 \rightarrow t$  in our work is an LOCC since Eq. (2) is a product state. As we can see from Figs. 1 and 2, the concurrence at  $t(t > 0)$  is less than that at  $t_0$ , which implies that

the theorem is not violated. However, since our method does not involve the Born-Markov approximation, the system and bath are correlated during the evolution. Therefore, in general, a process from  $t' \rightarrow t$  cannot be expressed as Eq. (52), and it is not an LOCC. Detailed discussions are given in [54,59].

## VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we consider an ensemble of  $N$  spin-1/2 particles interacting with identical independent bosonic heat baths. The one-axis twisted state is chosen to be the initial state. The mean spin direction of the initial state is along the  $z$  axis, and it does not change during the decoherence dynamics. For the open system we consider, we proved that the multiqubit dynamics can be reduced into a two-qubit one. Then we use the hierarchy equation method to study the spin squeezing and concurrence under decoherence. This is an exact method without using rotating-wave and Born-Markov approximations.

From the numerical results, we find that the decay rate of the rescaled concurrence increases with the particle number  $N$  as well as the bath temperature  $T$ , and the revivals become weaker over time. For the spin squeezing, it is suppressed with increasing temperature, as expected, while the vanishing time changes little with  $N$ . The spin-squeezing parameter  $\zeta_{\text{KU}}^2$  vanishes asymptotically with low bath temperature and disappears suddenly when bath temperature is high enough. Interestingly,  $\zeta_T^2$  vanishes suddenly even when bath temperature is low, which is similar to  $C_r$ .

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors thank Z. W. Zhou for valuable discussions. X. Wang acknowledges support from the NFRPC through Grant No. 2012CB921602 and the NSFC through Grants No. 11025527 and No. 10935010. F. Nori acknowledges partial support from the LPS, NSA, ARO, NSF Grant No. 0726909, JSPS-RFBR Contract No. 09-02-92114, Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research (S), MEXT Kakenhi on Quantum Cybernetics, and the JSPS through its FIRST program.

- 
- [1] M. Kitagawa and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 5138 (1993).
  - [2] D. J. Wineland, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Heinzen, *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, 67 (1994).
  - [3] A. Sørensen, L.-M. Duan, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, *Nature (London)* **409**, 63 (2001).
  - [4] G. Tóth, C. Knapp, O. Gühne, and H. J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 250405 (2007).
  - [5] G. Tóth, C. Knapp, O. Gühne, and H. J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 042334 (2009).
  - [6] A. Sørensen and K. Mølmer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 2274 (1999).
  - [7] X. Wang and B. C. Sanders, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 012101 (2003).
  - [8] J. Ma, X. Wang, C. P. Sun, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rep.* **509**, 89 (2011).
  - [9] O. Gühne and G. Tóth, *Phys. Rep.* **474**, 1 (2009).
  - [10] L. Amico, R. Fazio, A. Osterloh, and V. Vedral, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 517 (2008).
  - [11] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **81**, 865 (2009).
  - [12] C. Genes, P. R. Berman, and A. G. Rojo, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 043809 (2003).
  - [13] T. Fernholz, H. Krauter, K. Jensen, J. F. Sherson, A. S. Sørensen, and E. S. Polzik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 073601 (2008).
  - [14] T. Takano, M. Fuyama, R. Namiki, and Y. Takahashi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 033601 (2009).
  - [15] D. Ulam-Orgikh and M. Kitagawa, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 052106 (2001).
  - [16] X. Wang, *Phys. Lett. A* **331**, 164 (2004).
  - [17] X. Yin, X. Wang, J. Ma, and X. Wang, *J. Phys. B* **44**, 015501 (2011).
  - [18] A. Andre, A. S. Sørensen, and M. D. Lukin, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 230801 (2004).

- [19] D. Meiser, J. Ye, and M. J. Holland, *New J. Phys.* **10**, 073014 (2008).
- [20] D. F. Walls and P. Zoller, *Phys. Lett. A* **85**, 118 (1981).
- [21] J. A. Dunningham and K. Burnett, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 033601 (2004).
- [22] K. Goda, O. Miyakawa, E. E. Mikhailov, S. Saraf, R. Adhikari, K. McKenzie, R. Ward, S. Vass, A. J. Weinstein, and N. Mavalvala, *Nat. Phys.* **4**, 472 (2008).
- [23] H.-P. Breuer and F. Petruccione, *The Theory of Open Quantum Systems* (Oxford University Press, New York, 2002).
- [24] C. W. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise*, 2nd ed. (Springer, Berlin, 2000).
- [25] C. Simon and J. Kempe, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 052327 (2002).
- [26] W. Dür and H.-J. Briegel, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 180403 (2004).
- [27] A. R. R. Carvalho, F. Mintert, and A. Buchleitner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 230501 (2004).
- [28] X. Wang, A. Miranowicz, Y. X. Liu, C. P. Sun, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 022106 (2010).
- [29] Z. Sun, *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 052307 (2011).
- [30] Y. Tanimura and R. Kubo, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **58**, 101 (1989).
- [31] Y. Tanimura, *Phys. Rev. A* **41**, 6676 (1990).
- [32] Y. Tanimura and P. G. Wolynes, *Phys. Rev. A* **43**, 4131 (1991).
- [33] A. Ishizaki and Y. Tanimura, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **74**, 3131 (2005).
- [34] A. Ishizaki and Y. Tanimura, *J. Chem. Phys.* **125**, 084501 (2006).
- [35] A. Ishizaki and Y. Tanimura, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **111**, 9269 (2007).
- [36] Y. Tanimura, *J. Phys. Soc. Jpn.* **75**, 082001 (2006).
- [37] A. G. Dijkstra and Y. Tanimura, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 250401 (2010).
- [38] H.-T. Wang, C.-F. Li, Y. Zou, R.-C. Ge, and G.-C. Guo, *Phys. A* **390**, 3183 (2011).
- [39] J. Ma, Z. Sun, X. Wang, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 062323 (2012).
- [40] R.-X. Xu, P. Cui, X. Q. Li, Y. Mo, and Y. J. Yan, *J. Chem. Phys.* **122**, 041103 (2004).
- [41] R.-X. Xu and Y. J. Yan, *Phys. Rev. E* **75**, 031107 (2007).
- [42] J. Xu, R.-X. Xu, and Y. J. Yan, *New J. Phys.* **11**, 105037 (2009).
- [43] L. Chen, R. Zheng, Q. Shi, and Y. J. Yan, *J. Chem. Phys.* **131**, 094502 (2009).
- [44] Y. Yan, F. Yang, Y. Liu, and J. Shao, *Chem. Phys. Lett.* **395**, 216 (2004).
- [45] Y. Zhou, Y. Yan, and J. Shao, *Europhys. Lett.* **72**, 334 (2005).
- [46] H. Li, J. Shao, and S. Wang, *Phys. Rev. E* **84**, 051112 (2011).
- [47] A. Ishizaki and G. R. Fleming, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **106**, 17255 (2009).
- [48] M. Sarovar, A. Ishizaki, G. R. Fleming, and K. B. Whaley, *Nat. Phys.* **6**, 462 (2010).
- [49] J. Strümpfer and K. Schulten, *J. Chem. Phys.* **131**, 225101 (2009); **134**, 095102 (2011).
- [50] X. Wang and K. Mølmer, *Eur. Phys. J. D* **18**, 385 (2002).
- [51] A. J. Leggett, S. Chakravarty, A. T. Dorsey, M. P. A. Fisher, A. Garg, and W. Zwerger, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **59**, 1 (1987).
- [52] U. Weiss, *Quantum Dissipative System* (World Scientific, Singapore, 1999).
- [53] A. W. Chin, *Phys. Rev. B* **76**, 201307(R) (2007).
- [54] B. Bellomo, R. Lo Franco, and G. Compagno, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 160502 (2007); *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 032342 (2008).
- [55] W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 2245 (1998).
- [56] V. Coffman, J. Kundu, and W. K. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 052306 (2000).
- [57] J. Wesenberg and K. Mølmer, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 062304 (2002).
- [58] M. B. Plenio and S. Virmani, *Quantum Inf. Comput.* **7**, 1 (2007).
- [59] J. Dajka, M. Mierzejewski, and J. Łuczka, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 042316 (2008).