Path–phase duality with intraparticle translational–internal entanglement
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Abstract. The aim of this paper is to revisit the implications of complementarity when we inject into a Mach Zehnder interferometer particles with internal structure, prepared in special translational–internal entangled (TIE) intraparticle states. This correlation causes the path distinguishability to be interferometric phase-dependent in contrast to the standard case, where distinguishability depends on some external parameters (not interferometric phase). We show that such a TIE state permits us to detect small phase shifts along with almost perfect path distinguishability, beyond the constraints imposed by complementarity on simultaneous which-way and which-phase measurements for cases when distinguishability is uncoupled to interferometric phase.
1. Introduction

Wave–particle duality is one of the basic features of quantum mechanics: particles sent through an interferometer can produce wave-like interference fringes, but once we try to find which path the particle has taken, the fringes disappear [1]–[4]. A more detailed analysis has identified the complementarity relating our knowledge of the particle’s path and the fringe visibility [5]. The simplest complementarity relation can be expressed in the following form [5]–[12], which has been experimentally verified [8]:

\[ D^2 + V^2 \leq 1, \]  

(1)

where \( D \) is the path distinguishability, and \( V \) is the fringe visibility. Relation (1) was derived under the assumption that \( D \) is independent of the interferometric phase. This is what we have in mind when referring to the ‘standard’ case, scheme, etc.

In standard schemes, which-path (henceforth which-way (WW)) information is obtainable either if the alternative paths have \( a \) priori unequal detection probabilities [5] or if a WW detector of finite efficiency is placed along the paths [6, 7]. Clearly, these options may be combined.

Now suppose the phase difference between the alternative paths is allowed to assume only two possible values, \( \phi_0 \pm |\delta \phi| \). The joint probability of correct WW and which-phase (WP) guesses is constrained by (1) for any detector efficiency and phase difference, \( \delta \phi \) in a Mach–Zehnder interferometer (MZI).

The aim of this paper is to show that the standard constraints on this specific task can be avoided if we inject into the MZI particles with internal structure, prepared in special translational–internal entangled (TIE) states introduced in [13, 14] (section 3). Namely, a TIE state permits us to detect small phase shifts along with almost perfect path distinguishability, beyond the standard constraints on simultaneous WW and WP information (sections 2.1 and 2.2,
compared to section 4). We stress that entanglement in a TIE state refers to *intraparticle* correlations of inseparable degrees of freedom, rather than to interparticle entanglement, so that Bell inequalities or non-locality plays no role here.

In section 5 we motivate and introduce a new relation between phase sensitivity of the interference pattern and the path distinguishability, which brings out the merits of TIE. For particles without internal structure, this relation is in agreement with (1), but for particles prepared in TIE states it allows for much higher simultaneous accuracy of path and phase guesses (section 6). These results are discussed in section 7.

2. Standard complementarity in a MZI

The likelihood $P_{WW}$ of guessing correctly the outcome of a WW measurement (assuming the optimal strategy) may be related to $D$, the ‘distinguishability’ or ‘detection efficiency’ of the detector states [7], via:

$$P_{WW} = \frac{1 + D}{2}. \quad (2a)$$

The fringe visibility is recorded by scanning the detection probabilities at the two MZI output detectors denoted, e.g., by $+$ and $-$, across the range of possible phase differences $\phi$:

$$P_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2}(1 \pm V \cos \phi). \quad (2b)$$

The fringe visibility, $V$, can be similarly related to a WP [10] probability for correctly guessing the output phase to be $\phi_1$ or $\phi_2$. For two orthogonal output states, labelled by $\phi_1 = 0, \phi_2 = \pi$,

$$(P_{WP})_{\max} = \frac{1 + V}{2}. \quad (2c)$$

The probabilities $P_{WW}$ and $(P_{WP})_{\max}$ obey the following inequality inferred from (1):

$$(2P_{WW} - 1)^2 + [2 (P_{WP})_{\max} - 1]^2 \leq 1. \quad (3)$$

A particle propagating in a standard MZI, arriving at the beam merger, having interacted with a WW detector, is in an entangled state with it:

$$|\Psi_{st}\rangle = a_1|A\rangle|d_A\rangle + a_2|B\rangle|d_B\rangle, \quad (4a)$$

where $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$ are the path states and $|d_A\rangle$ and $|d_B\rangle$ are the corresponding detector states (for simplicity, it is assumed that the detector is initially in a pure state). We will be particularly interested in the case where $|a_1|^2 = |a_2|^2 = 1/2$, obtainable for balanced (50%:50%) beam splitters, so that the *a priori* visibility [7] is 1, and is reduced only by the presence of the detector. Under these assumptions, the complementary measures $D$ and $V$ can be expressed in
Figure 1. Standard MZI scheme (with WW detector coupled to the arms) and output detectors + and −. BS1 and BS2 are balanced (50%:50%) beam splitters. Path difference $L_0$ may deviate by $\pm|\delta L| = (\delta L_A - \delta L_B)$ (see section 2.1).

terms of the overlap of the alternative detector states [7]:

$$D = (1 - |\langle d_A|d_B\rangle|)^{1/2},$$

$$V = |\langle d_A|d_B\rangle|.$$  \hfill (4b,c)

2.1. Complementarity for discrete WP and WW outcomes

Now consider the case where the length of one of the interferometer arms can assume two discrete values, changing the path difference by $+|\delta L|$ or $-|\delta L|$ (figure 1). Since we are interested in some special path differences, the two arms are in general not equally long. We would like to quantify the trade-off between the WW probability as defined above, and the WP probability of distinguishing between the two possible path or phase differences. We now assume the input state to be a plane wave $e^{ikx}$ (as an approximation to a realistic input—see section 3). Let $L_{A,B}$ denote the lengths of the two interferometer arms, and let the two possible path length differences be $L_{AB} = L_A - L_B = L_0 \pm |\delta L|.$

If the corresponding phase difference is not an odd multiple of $\pi/2$ ($kL_0 = n\pi/2$, but $k\delta L \neq n'\pi/2$, $n$ and $n'$ being odd integers), the results (2c) and (3) are modified. Namely, the probabilities for detection at the two output ports (in figure 1) are now, respectively:

$$P_{\pm} = \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{V}{2} \cos[k (L_0 + \delta L)].$$  \hfill (5a)

Without loss of generality, let us assume that for positive $\delta L$, $P_+ > P_-$. Then the probability of guessing correctly the sign of the phase $\pm|\delta \phi| = \pm k|\delta L|$ is maximized if we associate detection
at port + (or −) with the path-difference change $|\delta L|$ (or $-|\delta L|$). Hence

$$P_{WP}(\delta L) = P_+ = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{V}{2} \sin k|\delta L|$$

which differs from $(P_{WP})_{\text{max}}$ in (2c). The duality relation, as inferred from (1), now takes the form

$$(2P_{WW} - 1)^2 + \left(\frac{2P_{WP}(\delta L) - 1}{\sin k|\delta L|}\right)^2 \leq 1. 
\quad (6)$$

This differs from inequality (3). When $k\delta L = 0$, inequality (6) implies $P_{WP} = \frac{1}{2}$.

We may always (formally) parametrize the detector efficiency (4b) as

$$D = |\cos \alpha|. 
\quad (7a)$$

If the detector efficiency is very close to 1, i.e. $\alpha \ll 1$,

$$P_{WW} \simeq 1 - \frac{\alpha^2}{4}, 
\quad (7b)$$

and $k|\delta L| \ll 1$, then inequality (6) may be written as:

$$P_{WP} \lesssim \frac{1}{2} \left[1 + |\alpha| \sin (k|\delta L|)\right] \simeq \frac{1}{2} \left(1 + k|\alpha \delta L|\right). 
\quad (8)$$

Let us stress that (8) was derived under ‘standard’ assumptions, i.e. $D$ is independent of $\phi = kL_{AB}$.

2.2. Generalization to polychromatic wavepackets

We may generalize these considerations to the case that a \textit{polychromatic wavepacket} is used as the input state of the MZI (right before impinging on beam splitter (BS1)):

$$\langle x|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{N} c_j e^{i(k_j x - \omega_j t)} \equiv f(x, t). 
\quad (9a)$$

Inside the MZI (right before beam merger (BS2)), the \textit{combined state} of the system+detector is then:

$$|\Psi_2(t)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left( f(L_A, t)|A\rangle|d_A\rangle + f(L_B, t)|B\rangle|d_B\rangle \right). 
\quad (9b)$$

For sufficiently long detection times, upon averaging out terms oscillating as $e^{i(\omega_j - \omega_j^\prime)t}$, we then find, instead of (5a), the time-averaged detection probabilities

$$\langle P_{\pm}\rangle_T = \frac{1}{2} \left\{ 1 \pm \tilde{V} \sum_{j=1}^{N} |c_j|^2 \cos (k_j L_{AB} + \theta_0) \right\}, 
\quad (9c)$$

where we have defined (cf equation (4c))

$$\tilde{V} = |\langle d_A|d_B\rangle| = \sqrt{1 - D^2}. 
\quad (9d)$$

The actual visibility, $V$, is less than or equal to $\tilde{V}$. Hence, duality as expressed by (3) or (6) is perfectly adequate for polychromatic wavepackets. This will be contrasted below with the results for TIE states.
Figure 2. Scheme for state (10a) preparation and its passage through an interferometer. The upper part shows the energy dependence on position. An atom is initially prepared in a superposition of spin-up and spin-down states. Upon entering the magnetic-field region, the potential energy of the atom is split depending on the spin state: spin-down atoms are slowed down whereas spin-up atoms are accelerated. The lower part shows the interferometer where the paths are realized by atomic waveguides, e.g. red-detuned optical beams. The initial wavepacket is split into two components moving with two different speeds inside the magnetic-field region, whereas their speeds before and after this region are equal. The wavepacket width must be sufficiently large for these two components to overlap after leaving the interferometer.

3. TIE states in MZI

Consider spin-1/2 particles (or their analogues: two-level atoms) of mass $M$ that are prepared in the entangled input state

$$|\psi_{\text{input}}\rangle = c_1|k_1\rangle|1\rangle + c_2|k_2\rangle|2\rangle.$$  \hfill (10a)

Here the internal states $|1\rangle$, $|2\rangle$ correspond to the internal energy levels $\epsilon_1$, $\epsilon_2$ and $\hbar k_1$, $\hbar k_2$ are $x$-oriented momenta, constrained by the total energy of state (10a):

$$E = \frac{\hbar^2 k_1^2}{2M} + \epsilon_1 = \frac{\hbar^2 k_2^2}{2M} + \epsilon_2.$$  \hfill (10b)

Condition (10b) ensures that no time-oscillations are associated with a superposition of $|k_1\rangle|1\rangle$ and $|k_2\rangle|2\rangle$. Such a state can be created, e.g., using the longitudinal Stern Gerlach effect (see figure 2). To this end, cold atoms are prepared in a superposition of two spin states, $c_1|1\rangle + c_2|2\rangle$. The states $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$ correspond to two orthogonal spin orientations along the $z$-axis. The atoms then enter a region with $z$-aligned magnetic field where they can move along two alternative $x$-oriented paths forming the MZI. The atoms are confined to one-dimensional motion along those paths by atomic waveguides: narrow beams of light red-detuned from an atomic transition [12]. Similar elements form the beam splitter and merger. The magnetic field gradient accelerates or decelerates atoms whose spin is parallel or antiparallel to the field, respectively. By adjusting the field intensity and the initial speed of the atoms we can control the ratio between the momenta $\hbar k_1$ and $\hbar k_2$. Since the potential is conservative, the solution of the Schroedinger equation is time-independent and the spin precession about the $z$-axis is locked to the motion along the $x$-axis.
Thus, the spin orientation is uniquely determined by the position, i.e. at a distance $x$ from the point of entrance into the magnetic field the internal state of the atom is

$$|\psi(x)\rangle = c_1 \exp(ik_1x)|1\rangle + c_2 \exp(ik_2x)|2\rangle. \quad (10c)$$

When the atoms leave the magnetic-field region, the gradient slows down the fast atoms and accelerates the slow atoms, so that their final speed is equal to the initial one. As the spin stops precessing in the field-free zone, a measurement of the spin orientation in this zone can give us information about the distance the atom has travelled in the magnetic-field region.

Equation (10a) is a plane-wave idealization of realistic wavepackets whose spatial width $\Delta x$ is the inverse of the momentum spread, $\Delta x \Delta k \approx 1$. In the magnetic field, the wavepacket is split into fast- and slow-moving components whose overlap is gradually diminishing. If the spin state is to be used for measurement of the distance travelled by the atom, $\Delta x$ must be sufficiently large, so that the two components substantially overlap after leaving the magnetic field.

An alternative realization of atomic TIE states and their propagation in a MZI may be based on elements of the scheme in [8]: atomic Bragg reflection, beam splitting and momentum entanglement with hyperfine levels by standing wave laser beams.

The effect of spin rotation in (10c) is similar to the photon polarization rotation along the different interfering paths in [15], where the Faraday effect was used as a ‘quantum clock’ for measuring traversal times of photons.

4. WW and WP measurements for TIE

Particles prepared in state (10a) exhibit unusual behaviour in a MZI (figure 3). The incoming wavepacket is split at a balanced (50%:50%) input beam splitter (BS1) into two beams that propagate along either of the two arms of length $L_A$ or $L_B$, then recombine at the 50%:50% beam merger BS2. It follows from equation (10c) that the spin degree of freedom can serve as a peculiar WW detector, since the distance $x$ traversed by the atom is encoded in the spin. Suppose that we know the path lengths $L_A$, $L_B$. We can then guess the path taken by the atom if we project the atomic internal state on an optimally (with respect to WW measurements) chosen pair of orthogonal spin states, namely

$$|\tilde{\psi}_{A,B}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle \pm \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \exp\left[i\left(\frac{(k_2 - k_1)(L_A + L_B)}{2} + \arg(c_1^*c_2)\right)\right]|2\rangle. \quad (11)$$

In practice, since the exact values of $L_A$ and $L_B$ are assumed to be unknown to the measuring party, they can use a similar suboptimal measurement basis (defined in terms of $L_{A0}$ and $L_{B0}$, known to them):

$$|\tilde{\psi}_{A,B}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle \pm \frac{i}{\sqrt{2}} \exp\left[i\left(\frac{(k_2 - k_1)(L_{A0} + L_{B0})}{2} + \arg(c_1^*c_2)\right)\right]|2\rangle, \quad (12a)$$

where $c_1$, $c_2$ are defined in (10c).

The internal states of atoms arriving at the beam merger from path $A$ or $B$ are

$$|\psi_A\rangle = c_1 \exp(ik_1L_A)|1\rangle + c_2 \exp(ik_2L_A)|2\rangle,$$

$$|\psi_B\rangle = c_1 \exp(ik_1L_B)|1\rangle + c_2 \exp(ik_2L_B)|2\rangle, \quad (12b)$$

respectively. Both detectors +, − further distinguish between states $|\tilde{\psi}_A\rangle$, $|\tilde{\psi}_B\rangle$ (see figure 3). If we detect (regardless by which detector) $|\tilde{\psi}_A\rangle$ ($|\tilde{\psi}_B\rangle$) outside BS2, we can guess that the atom
Figure 3. A particle in the state (10a) in a MZI. It traverses the interferometer from BS1 to BS2 via paths A and B, whose length difference $L_A$, $L_B$ is changed by $\delta L_A$, $\delta L_B$, respectively. Both output detectors + and − discriminate internal states $|\tilde{\psi}_A\rangle$ and $|\tilde{\psi}_B\rangle$ (equation (12a)) (compare with figure 1).

has followed path A (B, respectively). For the antisymmetric case, where $\delta L_B = -\delta L_A \equiv \delta L/2$ (see e.g. [13]), the correct-guess probability is given by

$$P_{WW} = |\langle \tilde{\psi}_A | \psi_A \rangle|^2 = |\langle \tilde{\psi}_B | \psi_B \rangle|^2 \equiv (1 + D)/2. \quad (13a)$$

It follows from equations (12) that

$$D = 2\sqrt{p_1 p_2} \left| \sin \left( \frac{k_2 - k_1}{2} \right) \right| \left( (L_{AB})_0 + \delta L \right) = 2\sqrt{p_1 p_2} \left| \sin \left( \frac{k_2 - k_1}{2} L_{AB} \right) \right|. \quad (13b)$$

with $p_1 = |c_1|^2$, $p_2 = |c_2|^2$ and $(L_{AB})_0 \equiv L_0 - L_{B0}, L_{AB} \equiv L_A - L_B$. Hence, in contrast to the standard expression (2a), equations (13) imply that path distinguishability oscillates with $L_{AB}$ for TIE states. This is, in fact, the key reason of all interesting effects described below.

We find that $D$ in equation (13b) is the same as that in equation (4c) if we set $|d_{A,B}\rangle$ to be $|\psi_{A,B}\rangle$:

$$D = \sqrt{1 - |\langle \psi_B | \psi_A \rangle|^2}. \quad (14)$$

The interference pattern recorded by output detectors (+ and −) is

$$P_{\pm}(L_{AB}) = p_1 P_{1\pm}(L_{AB}) + p_2 P_{2\pm}(L_{AB}), \quad (15a)$$

$$P_{1\pm}(L_{AB}) = \frac{1}{2} (1 \pm \cos k_1 L_{AB}), \quad (15b)$$

$$P_{2\pm}(L_{AB}) = \frac{1}{2} (1 \pm \cos k_2 L_{AB}), \quad (15c)$$
where \( P_{1,2\pm} \) are probabilities of hitting a detector by a particle in state 1 or 2, respectively. As seen from figure 4, this overall non-sinusoidal interference pattern oscillates between \( P_+ = 0 \) and \( P_+ = 1 \) (and likewise for \( P_- \)) for TIE states. If \( k_2 \gg k_1 \), then \( P_{1\pm} \) and \( P_{2\pm} \) are slow-changing and fast-changing, respectively, distinctly from standard states (with \( k_1 = k_2 \)).

If \( |k_2 - k_1| \ll k_{1,2} \), the amount of WW information in the internal states (12b) changes slowly with respect to the interference fringe pattern so that we can observe smooth transitions between high-fringe contrast, but low path distinguishability, and those of almost no fringe contrast but high path distinguishability, as predicted by (1). Conversely, if \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 \) are very different, the WW information varies faster than the fringe spacing of the interference pattern which is then, in general, non-sinusoidal.

Let us assume \( k_2 = 3k_1 \), \( L_{AB} = L_0 \pm |\delta L| \), where \( k_1L_0 = \frac{\pi}{2} \) and \( |\delta L| \ll |L_0| \), the sign of \( \delta L \) being unknown to us. Then, analogously to the standard WW and WP probabilities in section 2, we get from equations (13) and (15a):

\[
P_{WW} = 1 - \left( \frac{k_1|\delta L|}{4} \right)^2, \quad (16a)
\]

\[
P_{WP} = P_+ (|\delta L|) = P_- (-|\delta L|) \simeq \frac{1}{2} \left( 1 + |k_1||\delta L| \right). \quad (16b)
\]

The linear dependence of \( P_{WP} \) on \(|k_1|\delta L|\) must be contrasted with the weaker dependence of its standard counterpart equation (8) on \(|k|\alpha|\delta L|\) (see figure 4). This shows that inequality (6), or equivalently (8), which holds in cases when \( D \neq D(L_{AB}) \), cannot be directly applied to the TIE states. Namely, TIE states allow for better trade-off between \( P_{WW} \) and \( P_{WP} \). This remarkable result is operationally unambiguous and definition-free.
5. Complementarity for TIE

5.1. Do TIE states obey standard complementarity?

Here we show that inequality (6) (or its equivalent (8)) is strongly violated by TIE states, while complementarity in the sense of equation (1) still holds.

The state of our particle before reaching the beam merger is (using the notation of equation (12b)):

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ |\psi_A\rangle |A\rangle + e^{i\theta} |\psi_B\rangle |B\rangle \right],$$

if we allow for an additional phase, $\theta$, independent of $L_{AB}$, between the two arms. The probability of the particle to be detected at either output port, $P_\pm$, is then given by:

$$P_\pm = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 \pm V(L_{AB}) \cos(\theta + \theta_0) \right],$$

where $\theta_0 = \arg\{|\langle\psi_B|\psi_A\rangle\}$ and

$$V(L_{AB}) = |\langle\psi_A|\psi_B\rangle|$$

is the visibility obtained upon scanning $\theta$, with $L_{AB}$ fixed. Comparing equation (18a) with equation (14), we find that this visibility with respect to $\theta$ is just $\sqrt{1 - D^2}$. Thus we regain the standard complementarity in the sense of inequality (1) (with an equality sign).

This $V$ coincides with the purity of the reduced density matrix obtained upon tracing out the spin degree of freedom, which has the following form in the $\{|A\rangle, |B\rangle\}$ basis:

$$\rho = \frac{1}{2} \left( \frac{1}{\langle\psi_A|\psi_B\rangle} e^{-i\theta} \langle\psi_B|\psi_A\rangle e^{i\theta} \right).$$

Namely, it is a partially coherent superposition of $|A\rangle$ and $|B\rangle$ whose coherence (or purity) is measured by $V$, the magnitude of the off-diagonal terms. This identity between purity and visibility can be seen upon writing $P_\pm$ in terms of (19).

Clearly, this $V$, although still complementary to $D$, does not represent the fringe contrast of the $L_{AB}$-dependent TIE interference pattern (15a). Hence, TIE requires different complementary measures characterizing (15a).

How can we implement equation (17) based on the set-up of figure 2? We can add a magnetic field-free zone before the atom enters BS2. Let us denote the final states at the end of the magnetic-field region by $|\psi_A\rangle$, $|\psi_B\rangle$, respectively. After entering field-free zone, both spin states have the same potential energy, hence the same wavenumber $k$. The phase difference acquired by the interfering atom right before BS2 is then $\theta = k L_{AB}$. Here $L_{AB}$ is the length difference of the arms in the field-free zone, and is independent of $L_{AB}$ accumulated in the magnetic-field region. In such a modified set-up, the overall state right before BS2 is given by equation (17).

5.2. TIE-state complementarity for discrete WP and WW measurements

We need to introduce complementary measures adequate for the TIE interference pattern (15a). As shown in section 4, TIE states allow better trade-off between discrete WP and WW measurements.
Figure 5. The upper bounds of $S-D$ dependence for $\kappa = 1$ of equation (20) (dashed blue) and for $\kappa = 3$ (red) and $\kappa \gg 1$ of equation (23) (dash-dotted green).

than standard schemes obeying the duality relation (6)–(8). How can this trade-off be expressed in terms of complementary measures?

We propose a quantity directly related to the phase shift measurements via interference fringes, namely, the steepness of the fringe pattern, which we call the sensitivity, proportional to the derivative of $P_\pm$, the measured detection probability with respect to the interferometric phase. For standard sinusoidal interference patterns, the intensity, sensitivity and visibility are simply related by $P_\pm = \frac{1}{2} \pm \frac{V}{2} \cos \phi$, and $S = 2|dP_\pm/d\phi| = V|\sin \phi|$. Thus, for monochromatic waves it follows from (1) that the sensitivity satisfies

$$S^2 + D^2 \leq 1. \quad (20)$$

If we measure small length variations using polychromatic waves, it is appropriate to relate the phase changes to the shortest wavelength used, so that we can define the sensitivity as

$$S = \frac{2}{k_{\text{max}}} \left| \frac{dP_\pm}{dL_{AB}} \right|. \quad (21)$$

If we turn to the state (10a) with $k_2 = 3k_1$, we find that the sensitivity is $S = \left| \frac{p_2}{2} \sin k_1 L_{AB} + p_1 \sin 3k_1 L_{AB} \right|$. At the points of highest path distinguishability, $L_{AB} = (2n + 1)\pi/2k_1$, the sensitivity is $S = |1 - 4p_1/3|$. The distinguishability at these points is $D = 2\sqrt{p_1(1 - p_1)}$. By eliminating $p_1$, we find the relation between $S$ and $D$ in the form of an ellipse equation (see figure 5)

$$\left( \frac{S - (1/3)}{2/3} \right)^2 + D^2 \leq 1. \quad (22)$$

This relation, derived for cases when $D = D(L_{AB})$, allows for higher $D$ at a given $S$, and vice versa, than the complementarity relation (20) valid in cases $D \neq D(L_{AB})$. This relation can be
generalized to other ratios between \( k_1 \) and \( k_2 = \kappa k_1 \), resulting in
\[
\left( \frac{S - (\kappa - 1)/2\kappa}{(\kappa + 1)/2\kappa} \right)^2 + D^2 \leq 1, \tag{23}
\]
which in the limit \( \kappa \to \infty \) tends to
\[
\left( \frac{S - (1/2)}{1/2} \right)^2 + D^2 \leq 1. \tag{24}
\]
Inequality (23) describes the relation between maximum \( S \) at the point where \( D(L_{AB}) \) is maximum. The area enclosed by the ellipse (23) grows with \( \kappa \), progressively exceeding the area within the circle (20). The surplus area (i.e. the difference between the TIE ellipse area and the standard-complementarity circle area) reflects the additional path and phase information provided by the TIE state (10a) compared to unentangled states (i.e. for states when all internal states acquire the same interferometric phase).

6. WP and WW accuracy bounds

6.1. WW and WP accuracy under shot-noise fluctuations

We may now compare the bounds on WW and WP accuracy obtainable for TIE cases and cases when \( D \neq D(L_{AB}) \), so as to determine small changes \( \delta L \) of \( L_{AB} \).

We assume that for path lengths \( L_{A0} \) and \( L_{B0} \) the probability of an atom hitting each detector is 1/2, and we have maximum distinguishability \( D = 1 \) and sensitivity \( S = (\kappa - 1)/(2\kappa) \) (i.e. we assume \( p_1 = 1/2 \)). How many atoms \( N_{in} \) entering the interferometer are needed to determine \( \delta L \)? We must ensure that the change of statistics at each detector, \( \delta N = N_{in} \frac{\partial P}{\partial L} \delta L = N_{in} \frac{k_{\max} \delta L}{2} S \) is sufficiently bigger than the shot noise fluctuation of the number of atoms hitting each detector, \( \Delta N = \sqrt{N_{in}} \), i.e.
\[
N_{in} > \frac{1}{(k_{\max} \delta L S)^2}. \tag{25}
\]
How many among these atoms will have their path inferred incorrectly? This number is closely related to distinguishability, namely \( N_{\text{wrong}} = \frac{1-D}{2} N_{in} \). Since the path length difference has been shifted by \( \delta L \), \( D \) is no longer equal to unity, but rather \( D \approx 1 - \frac{\Delta k^2 \delta L^2}{8} \). This means that the number of atoms with incorrectly inferred path is
\[
N_{\text{wrong}} > \frac{\Delta k^2}{16 k_{\max}^2 S^2} \approx \frac{1}{4}, \tag{26}
\]
where we have used the TIE result (23) with \( \Delta k = \frac{\kappa - 1}{\kappa} k_{\max} \).

This result can be compared to what we would find in interference experiments without TIE with imperfect path detection. While the necessary number of input atoms is still given by (25),
the number of atoms with incorrectly determined path is found from (20), yielding

$$N_{\text{wrong}} = \frac{1 - D}{2} N_{\text{in}} > \frac{1 - \sqrt{1 - S^2}}{2} \frac{1}{(k_{\text{max}} \delta L S)^2} \geq \frac{1}{4k_{\text{max}}^2 \delta L^2}.$$  \hfill (27)

We now witness the tremendous accuracy edge of TIE over the case in which $D \neq D(L_{AB})$: according to (25) we would need 90 000 atoms to be sent through the interferometer to detect a small length change, e.g. $k_{\text{max}} \delta L \approx 0.01$ in the TIE scheme with $k_2 = 3k_1$ and $S = 1/3$. Yet among these atoms, according to (26), *less than one* atom on average will have the path determined incorrectly as opposed to *thousands* in the standard case (27). Namely, for the same length change to be detected with high distinguishability $D \geq 0.9$, one would need at least 53 000 input atoms in the standard case, out of which we would guess the path incorrectly for about 2600 atoms. The number of input atoms would have to increase to infinity if we wish to attain the lowest number of wrong guesses limited by (27), i.e. $N_{\text{wrong}} = 2500$.

6.2. How to verify our guesses?

A question arises: how to verify the path of the TIE particle we have inferred from internal-state measurements (cf (12) and (13))? This can be done by modifying the set-up, i.e. occasionally blocking one of the paths, so that if the detector measures internal state $\tilde{\psi}_A$ or $\tilde{\psi}_B$, we know the path of the particle. One can conceive of various ‘games’ in which one of the parties chooses in certain trials the length shift of the interferometer arms to be $+|\delta L|$ or $-|\delta L|$, and in other trials selects the atomic path by blocking the other one. After all trials have been performed, the rival ‘guessing party’ is asked to determine the length shift and guess which paths the atoms took in the selected subensemble of trials [13]. The use of TIE states will give the ‘guessing party’ a clear edge over someone using non-TIE states in similar games.

7. Conclusions

We have discussed an interferometric scheme employing particles represented by bichromatic waves, whose translational degree of freedom (wavevector) is entangled with the internal degree of freedom (spin): TIE states. One can then use the internal (spin) state to infer the WW information. The amount of WW information varies with the interferometer phase, which brings about unusual results. The usual definition of visibility is not suitable for quantification of wave–particle duality for such entangled states.

Specifically, the cardinal feature of TIE states is that they make the path distinguishability $D$ dependent on the arms-length difference $L_{AB}$ and thus on the corresponding phase difference, unlike the standard scenario. This dependence brings about intriguing results. In section 5 we have shown that while the complementarity in the sense of equation (1) still holds, inequality (6) constraining discrete path and phase guesses can be violated by TIE states. We have stressed that the visibility entering equation (1) pertains, in the case of TIE states, to the *purity* of the detected states, rather than to the contrast of the interference pattern they create as $L_{AB}$ is varied. Hence we need *alternative* complementary measures suitable for TIE interference.

Our ability to combine guessing of an unknown sign of the phase (length) difference $\delta L$ (WP guessing) with near-certain WW guessing, has been found to be *far superior* for TIE compared to the standard case when $D$ is independent of $L_{AB}$. This may be demonstrated either as the violation
of inequality (6) constraining $P_{WW}$ and $P_{WP}$, or as violation of inequality (20) constraining the sensitivity $S$ and $D$. The operational significance of these violations is embodied by the drastically different accuracy limits on the number of wrong path guesses for TIE (equation 26) and the standard case (equation 27). We stress that none of these unusual properties arise for unentangled polychromatic waves (equation (9a)), which behave quite standardly.

Although the proposed realization of TIE is challenging, it is within the realm of current possibilities of cold atom manipulation and interferometry. We believe that the novel aspects of quantum interferometry associated with TIE warrant this experimental endeavour.
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