# Entanglement between masses as a probe of the quantumness of gravity

Mauro Paternostro Queen's University Belfast Workshop Quantum Foundations. The physics of "what happens" and the measurement problem Frascati, 25 May 2017



# The resolution of frustration (and the fun that comes from it)

Mauro Paternostro Queen's University Belfast Workshop Quantum Foundations. The physics of "what happens" and the measurement problem Frascati, 25 May 2017





#### Quantum internet?



H. J. Kimble, Nature 453, 1023 (2008)



## Choose what you like!





## Choose what you like!







#### Long-term frustration



#### Separable states can be used to distribute entanglement

T. S. Cubitt,<sup>1</sup> F. Verstraete,<sup>1</sup> W. Dür,<sup>2</sup> and J.I. Cirac<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Max Plank Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann Str. 1, D-85748 Garching, Germany <sup>2</sup>Sektion Physik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Theresienstr. 37, D-80333 München, Germany (Dated: February 21, 2003)

We show that no entanglement is necessary to distribute entanglement; that is, two distant particles can be entangled by sending a third particle that is never entangled with the other two. Similarly, two particles can become entangled by continuous interaction with a highly mixed mediating particle that never itself becomes entangled. We also consider analogous properties of completely positive maps, in which the composition of two separable maps can create entanglement.



T. S. Cubitt, F. Verstraete, W. Duer, and J. I. Cirac, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 037902 (2003)



# QUB-NUS-IQC collaboration



## Kavan ModiTomasz Paterek(Oxford&NUS)(NTU)

#### Separable states can be used to distribute entanglement

T. S. Cubitt,<sup>1</sup> F. Verstraete,<sup>1</sup> W. Dür,<sup>2</sup> and J.I. Cirac<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Max Plank Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann Str. 1, D-85748 Garching, Germany <sup>2</sup>Sektion Physik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Theresienstr. 37, D-80333 München, Germany (Dated: February 21, 2003)

We show that no entanglement is necessary to distribute entanglement; that is, two distant particles can be entangled by sending a third particle that is never entangled with the other two. Similarly, two particles can become entangled by continuous interaction with a highly mixed mediating particle that never itself becomes entangled. We also consider analogous properties of completely positive maps, in which the composition of two separable maps can create entanglement.







Marco Piani (IQÇ)

#### Separable states can be used to distribute entanglement

T. S. Cubitt,<sup>1</sup> F. Verstraete,<sup>1</sup> W. Dür,<sup>2</sup> and J.I. Cirac<sup>1</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Max Plank Institut für Quantenoptik, Hans-Kopfermann Str. 1, D-85748 Garching, Germany <sup>2</sup>Sektion Physik, Ludwig-Maximilians-Universität München, Theresienstr. 37, D-80333 München, Germany (Dated: February 21, 2003)

We show that no entanglement is necessary to distribute entanglement; that is, two distant particles can be entangled by sending a third particle that is never entangled with the other two. Similarly, two particles can become entangled by continuous interaction with a highly mixed mediating particle that never itself becomes entangled. We also consider analogous properties of completely positive maps, in which the composition of two separable maps can create entanglement.



# QUB-NUS-IQC collaboration

Contraction Contra



#### Quantum Discord Workshop 2012 9-13 January 2012 . Singapore



Talk: "distributing entanglement through separable states"

Tomasz Paterek (NTU)

Alex Streltsov (Dusseldorf) : "We have the same results.."





#### **Quantum Cost for Sending Entanglement**

Alexander Streltsov,\* Hermann Kampermann, and Dagmar Bruß Institut für Theoretische Physik III, Heinrich-Heine-Universität Düsseldorf, D-40225 Düsseldorf, Germany (Received 20 March 2012; published 18 June 2012)

#### **Quantum Discord Bounds the Amount of Distributed Entanglement**

T. K. Chuan,<sup>1</sup> J. Maillard,<sup>2</sup> K. Modi,<sup>3,1</sup> T. Paterek,<sup>1,4,\*</sup> M. Paternostro,<sup>5</sup> and M. Piani<sup>6,†</sup>
<sup>1</sup>Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, 117543 Singapore
<sup>2</sup>Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London, Prince Consort Road, London SW7 2BZ, United Kingdom
<sup>3</sup>Department of Physics, University of Oxford, Clarendon Laboratory, Oxford, OX1 3PU, United Kingdom
<sup>4</sup>Division of Physics and Applied Physics, School of Physical and Mathematical Sciences, Nanyang Technological University, Singapore
<sup>5</sup>Centre for Theoretical Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics, School of Mathematics and Physics, Queen's University, Belfast BT7 1NN, United Kingdom
<sup>6</sup>Institute for Quantum Computing and Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Waterloo, 200 University Avenue West, Waterloo, Ontario N2L 3G1, Canada (Received 1 April 2012; published 16 August 2012)

#### **Using Separable Bell-Diagonal States to Distribute Entanglement**

Alastair Kay

Centre for Quantum Technologies, National University of Singapore, 3 Science Drive 2, Singapore 117543, Singapore and Keble College, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PG, United Kingdom (Received 10 April 2012; published 21 August 2012)



## Principia discordiae



K. Modí, A. Brodutch, H. Cable, T. Paterek, and V. Vedral, Rev. Mod. Phys. 84, 1655 (2012)



Separable=classical?

 $\varrho = |+\rangle_A \langle +|\otimes|0\rangle_B \langle 0|+|1\rangle_A \langle 1|\otimes|1\rangle_B \langle 1|$  $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle+|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ 

Two non-orthogonal states are not perfectly distinguishable A projective measurement still perturbs the state The eigenstates of the density matrix could well be superpositions (even entangled, although this is not the case here..)

In general, separable states do not have classical nature



#### A new classification

**Definition 1.** A bipartite state  $\rho$  is: (i) separable [20] if it can be written as  $\sum_i p_k \sigma_k^A \otimes \sigma_k^B$ , where  $p_k$  is a probability distribution and each  $\sigma_k^X$  is a quantum state, and entangled if non-separable; (ii) classical-quantum (CQ) if it can be written as  $\sum_i p_i |i\rangle \langle i| \otimes \sigma_i^B$ , where  $\{|i\rangle\}$  is an orthonormal set,  $\{p_i\}$  is a probability distribution and  $\sigma_i^B$  are quantum states; (iii) classical-classical (CC), or (strictly) classically correlated [3, 5], if there are two orthonormal sets  $\{|i\rangle\}$  and  $\{|j\rangle\}$  such that  $\rho =$  $\sum_{ij} p_{ij} |i\rangle \langle i| \otimes |j\rangle \langle j|$ , with  $p_{ij}$  a joint probability distribution for the indexes (i, j).

M. Piani, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 100, 090502 (2008)



## Classical picture

I(A:B) = H(A) + H(B) - H(A,B)J(A:B) = H(A) - H(A|B)J(B:A) = H(B) - H(B|A)I(A:B) = J(A:B) = J(B:A)(Bayes)



#### Quantum pícture

Measurement

D = Total correlations - Total amount of classical (quantum+classical) correlations classical ≠ separable The set of zero-discord states is zero-measure H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 017901 (2001)



### Take-home message

The entanglement-gain in a quantum communication protocol is bound by the degree of pre-available quantum discord



T. K. Chuan, J. Maillard, K. Modí, T. Paterek, M. Paternostro, and M. Píaní, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 070501 (2012)



## Goal 1: discord is key



# $\begin{aligned} Natural..\\ \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{final}} - \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{initial}} \leq \mathcal{I}_{\mathrm{comm}} \end{aligned}$

Expected...  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{final}} - \mathcal{E}_{\text{in}} \leq \mathcal{E}_{\text{comm}}$ 

#### True...

Theorem 1.—For any tripartite state  $\rho = \rho_{ABC}$  it holds  $|\mathcal{E}_{A:CB}(\rho) - \mathcal{E}_{AC:B}(\rho)| \leq \mathcal{D}_{AB|C}(\rho)$ 



**Lemma 1.** Given  $\rho = \rho_{ABC}$ , consider  $\Pi_C^*$ , the optimal projective measurement on C for the sake of  $\mathcal{D}_{AB|C}(\rho)$ . Let  $p_i$  be the probability of outcome i for such a measurement, and  $\rho_{AB}^i$  be the corresponding conditional states of AB; i.e.,  $\Pi_C^*(\rho_{ABC}) = \sum_i p_i \rho_{AB}^i \otimes |i\rangle \langle i|_C$ . Then  $\mathcal{E}_{A:CB}(\rho) \leq \mathcal{D}_{AB|C}(\rho) + \sum_{i} p_{i} \mathcal{E}_{A:B}(\rho_{AB}^{i})$  $= \mathcal{D}_{AB|C}(\rho) + \mathcal{E}_{A:CB}[\Pi_{C}^{*}(\rho)]$  $= \mathcal{D}_{AB|C}(\rho) + \mathcal{E}_{AC:B}[\Pi_{C}^{*}(\rho)].$ 

K., M., & P. Horodecki, and J. Oppenheim, Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 200501 (2005)

**Theorem 1.** For any tripartite state  $\rho = \rho_{ABC}$  it holds  $|\mathcal{E}_{A:CB}(\rho) - \mathcal{E}_{AC:B}(\rho)| \leq \mathcal{D}_{AE|C}(\rho).$ 

 $\begin{aligned} \textit{Proof.-} \mathcal{E}_{A:CB}(\rho) &\leq \mathcal{D}_{AB|C}(\rho) + \mathcal{E}_{AC:B}(\Pi_{C}^{*}(\rho)) \\ &\leq \mathcal{D}_{AB|C}(\rho) + \mathcal{E}_{AC:B}(\rho) \end{aligned}$ 

finally, invert the role of A and B

T.K. Chuan, J. Maillard, K. Modí, T. Paterek, M. Paternostro, and M. Píaní, Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 070501 (2012)



Bob

Bob

Entanglement distribution via separable states



Using Theorem 1:  $\mathcal{E}_{A:CB}(\beta) \leq \mathcal{E}_{AC:B}(\alpha) + \mathcal{D}_{AB|C}(\beta)$ 

Suppose  $\mathcal{D}_{AB|C}(\beta) = 0 \Rightarrow \beta = \sum_{i} p_{i} \rho_{AB}^{i} \otimes |i\rangle \langle i|_{C}$  $\begin{aligned} & \text{impossible to distribute entanglement via} \\ & \text{E}_{A:CB}(\beta) \leq \mathcal{E}_{AC:B}(\alpha) \end{aligned}$ 



## The resolution of frustration

General (Cubitt et al.) framework: what we want





 Swap B and C & consider that discord is nonincreasing under operations on the unmeasured party
 Use Theorem 1

 $\mathcal{E}_{A:CB}(\beta) \leq \mathcal{E}_{AB:C}(\beta) + \mathcal{D}_{AC|B}(\alpha)$ 

3) If condition holds, then  $\mathcal{E}_{A:CB}(\beta) \leq \mathcal{D}_{AC|B}(\alpha)$ 4) For C initially uncorrelated with A&B  $\mathcal{E}_{A:CB}(\beta) \leq \mathcal{D}_{A'|B}(\alpha)$ 

Precisely what Cubitt et al. had .....



# An experimental test





A. Fedrízzí, M. Zuppardo, G. Gillett, M. Broome, M. de Almeída, M. Paternostro, A. White, and T. Paterek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 230504 (2013)



#### Instrumental result

The entanglement-gain in a quantum communication protocol is bound by the degree of pre-available quantum discord



For any tripartite state  $\rho = \rho_{ABC}$  it holds  $|E_{A:BC}(t) - E_{AC:B}(t)| \leq D_{AB|C}(t)$ 

TK Chuan, J Maillard, K Modí, T Paterek, MP, and M Píaní, Phys Rev Lett 109, 070501 (2012)



### The dynamical setting

First assume that $E_{AC:B}(0) - E_{A:BC}(0) \leq D_{AB|C}(0),$  $[H_{AC}, H_{BC}] = 0$  $E'_{A:BC} - E'_{AC:B} \leq D'_{AB|C}$  (after  $H_{AC}$ ) $\tau$  is the final time of the experimentT. Krisnanda, M. Zuppardo, MP, T. Paterek, arXiv:1607.01140

HAC

HBC



#### The general setting

$$\begin{split} E'_{AC:B} &= E_{AC:B}(0) - E_{A:BC}(0) \le D_{AB|C}(0), \\ E'_{A:BC} - E'_{AC:B} \le D'_{AB|C} (after H_{AC}) \\ & || \\ E_{A:BC}(\tau) \end{split}$$

 $E_{A:BC}(\tau) - E_{A:BC}(0) \le D_{AB|C}(0) + D'_{AB|C}(0)$ 

Entanglement gain in partition A : BC mediated by C Non-classicality of C entails an entanglement gain

T. Krisnanda, M. Zuppardo, MP, T. Paterek, arXiv:1607.01140



 $[H_{AC}, H_{BC}] \neq 0 \qquad U = \lim_{n \to \infty} \left( e^{-iH_{BC}\Delta t} e^{-iH_{AC}\Delta t} \right)^n$  $\Delta t = \tau/n \to 0. \qquad E_{A:BC}(\Delta t) - E_{A:BC}(0) \leq D_{AB|C}(0) + D'_{AB|C}$ T. Krisnanda, M. Zuppardo, MP, T. Paterek, arXiv:1607.01140



Can "C" be classical and exploitable?

Can entanglement be increased by interacting with an always classical C?

**Theorem.** For a three party system with Hamiltonian  $H_{AC} + H_{BC}$ , entanglement  $E_{A:BC}$  is constant if discord  $D_{AB|C} = 0$  at all times.

Perfect position to study the non-classical nature of C from the observation of A&B only!

Entanglement gain is a good candidate...





T. Krisnanda, M. Zuppardo, MP, T. Paterek, arXiv:1607.01140



#### The Belfast crew







#### For Hendrik

