Connection between the Geometric phase and the Bures distance for entangled states
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Abstract

Correlation relations for the spin measurements on a pair of entangled particles scattered by the two separate arms of the interferometers in hybrid setups of different types are investigated. Concepts of concurrence, entanglement of formation, quantum fidelity, Bures distance are used to clarify how the geometric phase affects the initial bipartite state.
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1 Introduction

In classical and quantum physics, the geometric phase is a unifying and innovative concept, and it appears as an additional phase factor due to the geometric and topological properties of the Hamiltonian parameter space for various
driven systems. The geometric phase was first studied by Pancharatnam, Longuet-Higgins et al. and later generalized by Berry in 1984. Geometric and topological phases play a considerable role in physics and a vast literature exist today covering many plausible applications in different fields including quantum optics, quantum computing, topological insulators, optical lattices, carbon nano tubes, metallic rings, quantum dots, etc. [1–22]. On the other hand, entanglement is another striking aspect of quantum mechanics and its dates back to the article published by Schrödinger in 1926 [23], its deep meaning was exhibited later by Einstein et.al. [24] and also by Bell [25].

In this study, Clauser-Horne-Shimony-Holt (CHSH) inequality [26] for certain choices of spin measurements is discussed in a hybrid AC-EPR setup and then various entanglement measures such as concurrence ($C$), entanglement of formation ($EoF$) are examined [27–30] in connection with the quantum states acquiring geometric and topological phases. At the same time, in order to better understand the possible role of geometric phase as an indicator of the entanglement concepts such as quantum fidelity ($F$) and Bures distance ($D_B$) are utilized. The study of topological phases for entangled states has gained notable interest recently and it has been considered as a useful resource to analyze the quantum information processing. From this perspective, in this work, quantum correlations are briefly discussed for entangled particles in hybrid Aharonov-Bohm (AB), Aharonov-Casher (AC), He-McKellar-Wilkens (HMW), Dual Aharonov-Bohm (DAB) [13] type Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen (EPR) setups.
2 An Examplary Model: Entangled State in a Hybrid AC-EPR Setup

In order to investigate the quantum spin correlations related to the Aharonov-Casher effect performed with an entangled spin pairs a hybrid AC-EPR experimental setup with two electric line charges provides a useful and practical configuration (see Fig. 1). Consider a pair of entangled spin-$\frac{1}{2}$ neutral particles produced in a spin singlet state by the source at the center.

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[|\uparrow\rangle_L \otimes |\downarrow\rangle_R - |\downarrow\rangle_L \otimes |\uparrow\rangle_R]$$ (1)

Thus we are considering a gedanken experiment with two magnetic dipoles (neutrons) from a single source, one to the right, one to the left, and are under the influence of two different line electric charges ($\lambda_1, \lambda_2$).

![Fig. 1 A hybrid AC-EPR setup. To investigate the result of the measurement of the spin components of the particles going left and right, one can define projection operators along arbitrary vectors $\alpha, \alpha'$, $\beta$ and $\beta'$. Along these vectors the expectation values of joint measurements necessary for the CHSH inequality are calculated.](image)

Our goal is to discuss the possible results of the spin measurements in various directions and to find the correlation functions associated with the joint probabilities; and furthermore we will investigate the CHSH violation,
calculate the concurrence ($C$), entanglement of formation ($EoF$) and quantum fidelity ($F$), Bures distance ($D_B$) step by step.

The initial singlet state in (1) will gain an AC phase as follows,

$$|\psi(t')\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[e^{-i\mu \lambda_1}|\uparrow\rangle_L \otimes e^{i\mu \lambda_2}|\downarrow\rangle_R - e^{i\mu \lambda_1}|\downarrow\rangle_L \otimes e^{-i\mu \lambda_2}|\uparrow\rangle_R\right]$$  (2)

This equation can be written more simply,

$$|\psi(t')\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left[e^{-i\mu(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}|\uparrow\rangle_L |\downarrow\rangle_R - e^{i\mu(\lambda_1-\lambda_2)}|\downarrow\rangle_L |\uparrow\rangle_R\right]$$  (3)

If one defines $\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 = \lambda_E$, then above equation becomes,

$$|\psi(t')\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\mu \lambda_E}|\uparrow\rangle_L |\downarrow\rangle_R - e^{2i\mu \lambda_E}|\downarrow\rangle_L |\uparrow\rangle_R$$  (4)

The total phase factor can obviously be removed as it will not be included in the expectation value calculation, and the final spin wave function will be the following,

$$|\psi(t')\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\uparrow\rangle_L |\downarrow\rangle_R - e^{2i\mu \lambda_E}|\downarrow\rangle_L |\uparrow\rangle_R$$  (5)

The quantum correlations can be examined by measuring the spin components of the particles moving to the right and left, along the directions as in the usual Bell tests. The correlation function for the CHSH inequality associated with the angles ($\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta'$) for the spin measurements shown in Figure 1
can be found to be as:

\[ S(\alpha, \beta, \alpha', \beta', \delta_{AC}) = |E(\alpha, \beta) - E(\alpha, \beta')| + |E(\alpha', \beta) + E(\alpha', \beta')| \]
\[ = | - \cos \alpha \cos \beta - \sin \alpha \sin \beta \cos(2\mu \lambda_E) + \cos \alpha \cos \alpha' + \sin \alpha \sin \alpha' \cos(2\mu \lambda_E) | \]
\[ + | - \cos \alpha' \cos \beta' - \sin \alpha' \sin \beta' \cos(2\mu \lambda_E) + \cos \beta \cos \beta' + \sin \beta \sin \beta' \cos(2\mu \lambda_E) | \leq 2 \]  \hspace{1cm} (6)

Here \( E(\alpha, \beta) \)'s are expectation values of the joint spin measurements defined as, \( E(\alpha, \beta) = |\langle \psi(t')|[P_+^l (\alpha) - P_-^l (\alpha)] \otimes [P_+^r (\beta) - P_-^r (\beta)]|\psi(t')\rangle| \) and \( P_\pm^l (\alpha) \) being the spin projection operator along the angle \( \pm (\alpha) \), etc. (see ref. [31]).

It is easily seen that the CHSH inequality is violated by quantum mechanics, if the appropriate angles are chosen for the \( S \) function. At this point, one notes that Bell-type inequalities have a generalized upper violation limit called Tsirelson limit \( (|\langle E \rangle|_{QM_{correlations}} \leq 2\sqrt{2}) \) [32], and for appropriate choices of relevant angles below, one obtains:

\[ S(0, \frac{\pi}{4}, \frac{3\pi}{4}, \frac{\pi}{2}, \delta_{AC}) = \sqrt{2} + \sqrt{2} |\cos(2\mu \lambda_E)| \]  \hspace{1cm} (7)

This result reveals the clear dependence of the CHSH correlation function \( S \) on the geometric AC phase \( 2\mu \lambda_E \).

### 3 Related Entanglement Measures

Now in order to discuss the entanglement measures in connection with the Bell-type correlations for the entangled states we continue to examine the above mentioned hybrid AC-EPR setup with two line electric charges. Firstly, let us calculate concurrence. One needs to write a more suitable version of the wave
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function, namely $|\tilde{\psi}(t')\rangle$, according to the definition given in [28],

$$|\tilde{\psi}(t')\rangle = \sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y |\psi^*\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle - e^{-2i\mu\lambda E} |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle]$$ (8)

Pauli spin matrices here will spin flip the complex conjugate of the wave function, thus the concurrence becomes,

$$C(|\psi(t')\rangle) = \frac{1}{2} \left| \langle\uparrow\downarrow| - e^{-2i\mu\lambda E} \langle\downarrow\uparrow| |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle - e^{-2i\mu\lambda E} |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle \right|$$ (9)

If we arrange the above result, and performs simple inner products the concurrence is found as

$$C(|\psi(t')\rangle) = |-e^{-2i\mu\lambda E}| = 1$$ (10)

Thus, the entanglement of formation, $EoF$, is defined via the concurrence value and the function $h(x) = -x \log_2 x - (1 - x) \log_2 (1 - x)$ (see ref. [28]). If we use the above result in the $EoF$ calculation (10) we get

$$EoF = h \left( \frac{1 + \sqrt{1 - C^2(\rho)}}{2} \right) = h \left( \frac{1}{2} \right) = 1$$ (11)

In the case when both states ($|\psi(t)\rangle$ and $|\psi(t')\rangle$) are pure states then quantum fidelity can be calculated as an overlap of states,

$$F = |\langle\psi(t)|\psi(t')\rangle| = \frac{1}{2} \left| \langle\uparrow\downarrow|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - e^{2i\mu\lambda E} \langle\downarrow\uparrow|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle - \langle\downarrow\uparrow|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + e^{2i\mu\lambda E} \langle\uparrow\downarrow|\downarrow\uparrow\rangle \right|$$ (12)
Thus quantum fidelity for a process of hybrid AC-EPR scattering with spin entangled initial state turns out to be

\[ F = \frac{1}{2} |1 + e^{2i\mu\lambda E}| = |\cos(\mu\lambda E)| \]

(13)

Furthermore, the Bures distance is given as \( D_B = \sqrt{2(1 - F)} \) (see ref.[33]), so \( D_B \) between initial and final entangled states in a hybrid AC-EPR setup can be found as

\[ D_B(AC) = \sqrt{2 - 2|\cos(\mu\lambda E)|} \]

(14)

The state in (1) is a pure entangled state of two qubits, so by Gisin’s theorem [34], it violates the CHSH inequality and our result in (7) confirms that prediction. Also by the equations (10), (11) and (13); one observes that the geometric phase has no effects on the concurrence and entanglement of formation, but on the contrary it has an explicit appearance in the quantum fidelity expression and the latter ranges between 0 \( \leq F \leq 1 \). Also \( |\psi(t)\rangle \) and \( |\psi(t')\rangle \) which are connected via an AC phase as in (5) and the non-zero Bures distance between them is given by the equation (14).

In this context, AB, HMW, DAB type experimental hybrid setups can be designed similar to the hybrid AC-EPR setup and analogous calculations can be repeated for them. Thus, the summarized results, including a generalized version of the geometric Berry phase, can be obtained as written in Table 1.

This summary table and Figure 2 shows us that, AB and DAB phase information does not appear in the results of the measurements in the experimental setups to be made with entangled particles. However, the situation is different for AC, HMW and Berry phases. For these processes, geometric phase information appears in the joint spin measurements. Thus, it seems possible
Table 1: Summary of Aharonov-Bohm (AB), Aharonov-Casher (AC), He-McKellar-Wilkens (HMW), Berry and Dual Aharonov-Bohm (DAB) phases gained by entangled states and the values of Concurrence (C), Entanglement of Formation (EoF), Quantum Fidelity (F), Bures Distance ($D_B$). Here $\mu$ is magnetic dipole, $\lambda_E$ is electric charge density, $d$ is electric dipole, $\lambda_B$ is magnetic charge density, $\gamma$ is Berry phase and $g$ is magnetic charge.

| Phase | $|\psi(t)|^{1,3}$ | $|\psi(t')|^2$ | C | EoF | F | $D_B$ |
|-------|-----------------|----------------|---|-----|---|-------|
| AB    | $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-i\phi_B} [\left|\uparrow\right>_L \left|\downarrow\right>_R - \left|\downarrow\right>_L \left|\uparrow\right>_R]$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |
| AC    | $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\left|\uparrow\right>_L \left|\downarrow\right>_R - e^{2i\mu\lambda_E} \left|\downarrow\right>_L \left|\uparrow\right>_R]$ | 1 | 1 | $|\cos(\mu\lambda_E)|$ | $\sqrt{2} - 2|\cos(\mu\lambda_E)|$ |
| HMW   | $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\left|\uparrow\right>_L \left|\downarrow\right>_R - e^{2id\lambda_B} \left|\downarrow\right>_L \left|\uparrow\right>_R]$ | 1 | 1 | $|\cos(d\lambda_B)|$ | $\sqrt{2} - 2|\cos(d\lambda_B)|$ |
| Berry | $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} [\left|\uparrow\right>_L \left|\downarrow\right>_R - e^{2i\gamma} \left|\downarrow\right>_L \left|\uparrow\right>_R]$ | 1 | 1 | $|\cos(\gamma)|$ | $\sqrt{2} - 2|\cos(\gamma)|$ |
| DAB   | $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} e^{-ig\phi_E} [\left|\uparrow\right>_L \left|\downarrow\right>_R - \left|\downarrow\right>_L \left|\uparrow\right>_R]$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 0 |

1. Initial State Vector at $t$
2. Final State Vector at $t'$
3. The entangled state at time $t$ for all five cases
to carry information over the phase in the process. It is thought that investigation of the entanglement properties via the geometric phase will provide a better understanding of the nature of entanglement and its role in quantum technologies [35–37].

Fig. 2  Counter plots of (a) Fidelity and (b) Bures distance for AC-EPR and HMW-EPR Hybrid Setups. The white areas are the regions associated with the figure show that information can be carried with the geometric phase, and the dark areas are the places where there is no information about the geometric phase. In this context, since there is no geometric phase information in AB and DAB type hybrid experimental setups, no figures are included here. In the Berry case only a pure cosine graph is relevant. It should be noted that each product $\mu \lambda_E$ and $d \lambda_B$ is an angle. Therefore, $\mu$, $d$, $\lambda_E$ and $\lambda_B$ values should also be considered as variables.
4 Conclusion

Quantum computers are analog machines, which are expected to become a part of our lives in the near future. Although the codes to be run in the quantum computer are applied on various quantum gates, they are actually represented by real variables. Applying a quantum gate to a qubit means subjecting it to a wave from an indiscriminate wave generator. All properties of this wave, such as amplitude and frequency, are real-valued variables. Errors may occur from time to time in these variables. These errors are different from those caused by the interaction of the qubit with the environment. Even if a required quantum gate is prepared and applied perfectly, however exactly the desired quantum state may not be achieved. In fact, this is where quantum fidelity comes into play. Fidelity is a link between regular digital needs and quantum hardware. A quantum state will be less entangled the closer it is to the set of separable states, or more entangled the farther it is [38]. With fidelity calculations, one finds a way to track how well real circuits produced by a quantum computer fit the original state. Mathematically, it provides guidance on the degree between quantum states [39], and there are several benefits for making such a comparison. As a result fidelity has become one of the most widely used quantities to measure the degree of similarity between quantum states.

Besides, Bures distance describes the infinitesimal distance between the density matrices describing the quantum states, and this approach is a generalization of the Fisher distance. If it is limited to pure states only, it gives similar results as the Fubini–Study distance [40–44]. These distances can be used as a function of distance, metric. The Fisher metric is a Riemann metric that can be defined on a smooth statistical manifold. It is generally used to calculate the difference in information between measurements.
In this regard, statistical distances such as the Bures distance are determined by the size of the statistical fluctuations that occur in the measurements made to distinguish between the initial state and the evolved state. These statistical fluctuations raise the interesting possibility that quantum mechanics may be partially responsible for the Hilbert-space structure, so Bures distance is thought to be a link between statistics and geometry. Almost, by counting the number of intermediate states, the distance between states can be found [45].

Nevertheless, quantum logic gate operations can also be implemented with geometric phase. When a quantum system is in a cyclic evolution, it acquires a geometric phase determined by the path in which the system moves. Geometric phases are useful for combatting errors in quantum gate operations and can help quantum error correction codes reach below the error threshold. There are many studies examining how geometric phases can be used to better analyze entangled systems and process quantum information [46–48].

Since the geometric phase is not dependent on time and energy like the dynamic phase, but is connected to the closed path, it is not affected by changes such as noise distortions. Therefore, it can also be used for quantum logic gate applications [49, 50]. Obviously one of the main questions here is the entanglement content of the measured state, so after a physical process providing a geometric phase the different measures of entanglement are calculated for this purpose.

Otherwise, as is well known interferometers of different types, such as Mach–Zehnder, Hanbury Brown and Twiss, etc. are effectively used to study counter intuitive predictions of quantum mechanics [51–54]. In such works, one observes that the probability calculations based on the correlations between the number of particle counts at detectors have interesting similarities with
the probabilities via spin measurements of the particles in certain directions as used in the present work.

**Declarations**

The authors did not receive support from any organization for the submitted work. The authors have no relevant financial or non-financial interests to disclose. The authors declare that they have no known competing financial interests or personal relationships that could have appeared to influence the work reported in this paper.

**References**

[1] Ehrenberg, W., Siday, R.E.: The Refractive Index in Electron Optics and the Principles of Dynamics. Proceedings of the Physical Society. Section B 62(1), 8–21 (1949)

[2] Kato, T.: On the adiabatic theorem of quantum mechanics. Journal of the Physical Society of Japan 5(6), 435–439 (1950)

[3] Pancharatnam, S.: Generalized theory of interference, and its applications. Proceedings of the Indian Academy of Sciences - Section A 44(5), 247–262 (1956)

[4] Longuet-Higgins, H.C., Öpik, U., Pryce, M.H.L., Sack, R.: Studies of the Jahn-Teller effect. II. The dynamical problem. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences 244(1236), 1–16 (1958)

[5] Aharonov, Y., Bohm, D.: Significance of Electromagnetic Potentials in the Quantum Theory. Physical Review 115(3), 485 (1959)
[6] Berry, M.V.: Quantal phase factors accompanying adiabatic changes. Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. A. Mathematical and Physical Sciences 392(1802), 45–57 (1984)

[7] Aharonov, Y., Casher, A.: Topological Quantum Effects for Neutral Particles. Physical Review Letters 53(4), 319 (1984)

[8] Cimmino, A., Opat, G., Klein, A., Kaiser, H., Werner, S., Arif, M., Clothier, R.: Observation of the topological Aharonov-Casher phase shift by neutron interferometry. Physical review letters 63(4), 380 (1989)

[9] Zeilinger, A., Gähler, R., Horne, M.A.: On the topological nature of the Aharonov-Casher effect. Physics Letters A 154(3-4), 93–95 (1991)

[10] Anandan, J.: A geometric approach to quantum mechanics. Foundations of Physics 21(11), 1265–1284 (1991)

[11] He, X.-G., McKellar, B.H.J.: Topological phase due to electric dipole moment and magnetic monopole interaction. Phys. Rev. A 47, 3424–3425 (1993)

[12] Wilkens, M.: Quantum phase of a moving dipole. Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 5–8 (1994)

[13] Dowling, J.P., Williams, C.P., Franson, J.D.: Maxwell Duality, Lorentz Invariance, and Topological Phase. Phys. Rev. Lett. 83, 2486–2489 (1999)

[14] Sponar, S., Klepp, J., Loidl, R., Filipp, S., Durstberger-Rennhofer, K., Berthmann, R., Badurek, G., Rauch, H., Hasegawa, Y.: Geometric phase in entangled systems: A single-neutron interferometer experiment. Physical Review A 81(4), 042113 (2010)
[15] Sponar, S., Klepp, J., Durstberger-Rennhofer, K., Loidl, R., Filipp, S., Lettner, M., Bertlmann, R., Badurek, G., Rauch, H., Hasegawa, Y.: New aspects of geometric phases in experiments with polarized neutrons. Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical 43(35), 354015 (2010)

[16] Lepoutre, S., Gauguet, A., Trénec, G., Büchner, M., Vigué, J.: He-McKellar-Wilkens Topological Phase in Atom Interferometry. Physical Review Letters 109(12), 120404 (2012)

[17] Werner, S.: Observation of Berry’s Geometric Phase by Neutron Interferometry. Foundations of Physics 42(1), 122–139 (2012)

[18] Gillot, J., Lepoutre, S., Gauguet, A., Büchner, M., Vigué, J.: Measurement of the He-McKellar-Wilkens Topological Phase by Atom Interferometry and Test of Its Independence with Atom Velocity. Physical Review Letters 111(3), 030401 (2013)

[19] Rangani Jahromi, H., Amniat-Talab, M.: Geometric phase, entanglement, and quantum Fisher information near the saturation point. Annals of Physics 355, 299–312 (2015)

[20] Barboza, P.M.T., Bakke, K.: On a relation of the angular frequency to the Aharonov–Casher geometric phase in a quantum dot. Annals of Physics 372, 457–467 (2016)

[21] Cohen, E., Larocque, H., Bouchard, F., Nejadsattari, F., Gefen, Y., Karimi, E.: Geometric phase from Aharonov–Bohm to Pancharatnam–Berry and beyond. Nature Reviews Physics 1(7), 437–449 (2019)

[22] Jisha, C.P., Nolte, S., Alberucci, A.: Geometric Phase in Optics: From
Wavefront Manipulation to Waveguiding. Laser & Photonics Reviews 15(10), 2100003 (2021)

[23] Schrödinger, E.: Quantisierung als Eigenwertproblem. IV. Annalen der Physik 81, 437–449 (1926)

[24] Einstein, A., Podolsky, B., Rosen, N.: Can Quantum-Mechanical Description of Physical Reality Be Considered Complete? Physical review 47(10), 777 (1935)

[25] Bell, J.S.: On the Einstein Podolsky Rosen paradox. Physics Physique Fizika 1(3), 195 (1964)

[26] Clauser, J.F., Horne, M.A., Shimony, A., Holt, R.A.: Proposed Experiment to Test Local Hidden-Variable Theories. Physical Review Letters 23(15), 880 (1969)

[27] Bennett, C.H., DiVincenzo, D.P., Smolin, J.A., Wootters, W.K.: Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction. Physical Review A 54(5), 3824 (1996)

[28] Wootters, W.K.: Entanglement of Formation of an Arbitrary State of Two Qubits. Physical Review Letters 80(10), 2245 (1998)

[29] Werner, R.F.: Entanglement Measures, Encyclopedia of Mathematical Physics, 233–236 (2006)

[30] Plenio, M.B., Virmani, S.: An Introduction to Entanglement Measures. Quantum Info. Comput. 7(1), 1–51 (2007)

[31] Cildiroglu, H.O., Yilmazer, A.U.: Investigation of the Aharonov-Bohm and Aharonov-Casher topological phases for quantum entangled states.
Connection between the Geometric phase and the Bures distance for entangled states

Physics Letters A 420, 127753 (2021)

[32] Cirel’son, B.S.: Quantum generalizations of Bell’s inequality. Letters in Mathematical Physics 4(2), 93–100 (1980)

[33] Yuan, H., Fung, C.-H.F.: Quantum parameter estimation with general dynamics. npj Quantum Information 3(14), 1–6 (2017)

[34] Gisin, N.: Bell’s inequality holds for all non-product states. Physics Letters A 154(5), 201–202 (1991)

[35] Sandhya, S., Banerjee, S.: Geometric phase: an indicator of entanglement. The European Physical Journal D 66(6), 168 (2012)

[36] Ezratty, O.: Understanding Quantum Technologies (2021)

[37] Wong, T.: Introduction to classical and quantum computing (2022)

[38] Liang, Y.-C., Yeh, Y.-H., Mendonça, P.E., Teh, R.Y., Reid, M.D., Drummond, P.D.: Quantum fidelity measures for mixed states. Reports on Progress in Physics 82(7), 076001 (2019)

[39] Kozlowski, W., Wehner, S., Meter, R.V., Rijksman, B., Cacciapuoti, A.S., Caleffi, M., Nagayama, S.: Architectural Principles for a Quantum Internet. Internet-Draft draft-irtf-qirg-principles-10, Internet Engineering Task Force (Feb 2022). Work in Progress

[40] Jozsa, R.: Fidelity for Mixed Quantum States. Journal of Modern Optics 41(12), 2315–2323 (1994)

[41] Hübner, M.: Explicit computation of the Bures distance for density matrices. Physics Letters A 163(4), 239–242 (1992)
Connection between the Geometric phase and the Bures distance for entangled states

[42] Bures, D.: An Extension of Kakutani’s Theorem on Infinite Product Measures to the Tensor Product of Semifinite $w^*$-Algebras. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society 135, 199–212 (1969)

[43] Helstrom, C.W.: Minimum mean-squared error of estimates in quantum statistics. Physics Letters A 25(2), 101–102 (1967)

[44] Facchi, P., Kulkarni, R., Man’ko, V., Marmo, G., Sudarshan, E., Ventriglia, F.: Classical and quantum Fisher information in the geometrical formulation of quantum mechanics. Physics Letters A 374(48), 4801–4803 (2010)

[45] Wootters, W.K.: Statistical distance and Hilbert space. Physical Review D 23(2), 357 (1981)

[46] Vedral, V.: Geometric phases and topological quantum computation. International Journal of Quantum Information 01(01), 1–23 (2003)

[47] Sjöqvist, E.: Geometric phases in quantum information. International Journal of Quantum Chemistry 115(19), 1311–1326 (2015)

[48] Thomas, J.: Geometric phase in quantum computation. PhD thesis, George Mason University (2016)

[49] Song, C., Zheng, S.-B., Zhang, P., Xu, K., Zhang, L., Guo, Q., Liu, W., Xu, D., Deng, H., Huang, K., Zheng, D., Zhu, X., Wang, H.: Continuous-variable geometric phase and its manipulation for quantum computation in a superconducting circuit. Nature Communications 8(1), 1061 (2017)

[50] Ji, L.-N., Ding, C.-Y., Chen, T., Xue, Z.-Y.: Noncyclic geometric quantum gates with smooth paths via invariant-based shortcuts. Advanced
Connection between the Geometric phase and the Bures distance for entangled states

Quantum Technologies 4(6), 2100019 (2021)

[51] Zeilinger, A.: General properties of lossless beam splitters in interferometry. American Journal of Physics 49(9), 882–883 (1981)

[52] Grangier, P., Roger, G., Aspect, A.: Experimental evidence for a photon anticorrelation effect on a beam splitter: A new light on single-photon interferences. Europhysics Letters (EPL) 1(4), 173–179 (1986)

[53] Silverman, M.P.: Two-solenoid Aharonov-Bohm experiment with correlated particles. Physics Letters A 148(3), 154–157 (1990)

[54] Silverman, M.P.: Quantum Superposition, pp. 111–135. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg (2008)