

This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

Squeezing of spin-1 quantum states via a one-axis twisting Hamiltonian

Tuguldur Kh. Begzjav and Girish S. Agarwal

Phys. Rev. A **104**, 023706 — Published 11 August 2021

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.104.023706](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.104.023706)

Squeezing of spin-1 quantum states via one-axis twisting Hamiltonian

Tuguldur Kh. Begzjav^{1,2} and Girish S. Agarwal³

¹*Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering, Departments of Physics and Astronomy,
Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, USA*

²*Department of Physics, National University of Mongolia, Ulaanbaatar, 14200, Mongolia*

³*Institute for Quantum Science and Engineering,
Departments of Biological and Agricultural Engineering and Physics and Astronomy,
Texas A&M University, College Station, Texas 77843, USA*

(Dated: July 27, 2021)

Squeezing of quantum states is of great interest due to its application in high-precision measurement that can exceed standard quantum noise-limit described by Heisenberg uncertainty relations. Here, we study the squeezing of quantum systems with $SU(3)$ symmetry via one-axis twisting Hamiltonian and examine the intriguing connections between the squeezing of spin-1/2 and spin-1 systems. There are seven subalgebras of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ Lie algebra. All these subalgebras are identical with $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ Lie algebra but not all of them have the same anti-commutation relations as $\mathfrak{su}(2)$. Interestingly, squeezing parameters corresponding to spin-1 subalgebras depend not only on structure constants but also on anti-commutation relations of the subalgebras. New results are reported for the subalgebras with vanishing anti-commutators and nematic squeezing, while in other cases our first principle calculation recovers known results.

I. INTRODUCTION

Squeezed states are the states with reduced quantum fluctuations below the standard quantum limit of fluctuations characterized by the coherent state. Generally, the squeezed states are achieved by applying a second-order nonlinear Hamiltonian on the coherent state with minimum uncertainty fluctuations, as a consequence redistribution of equal shared quantum fluctuations within two quadratures develops reduced quantum noise lower than the standard quantum limit. The importance of the squeezed states can be justified by their wide range of applications; for example high-precision spectroscopic [1–6] and interferometric measurements [7–10] (e.g. gravitational waves), atomic clocks [11–13], and quantum information processing [14].

The first experimental demonstration of squeezed states is carried out in an electromagnetic field in an optical cavity by non-degenerate four-wave mixing [15] and later squeezed quantum states are demonstrated also in cold atomic ensembles that resemble spin-1/2 system by various methods such as quantum state transfer, direct interaction of pseudo-spins, multiple passes of light and so forth [16–21]. Since then spin squeezing was used extensively in other contexts like Bose-Einstein condensates [22] and polarization optics [23]. So far all these applications required only the squeezed states with $SU(2)$ symmetry. The spin-1 squeezed states [24–30] are needed in the context of the three-component Bose-Einstein condensates [31–36] and quantum description of the focused electromagnetic fields [23, 37–40] which are described by $SU(3)$ Lie group. In the context of atomic vapors, the $SU(3)$ symmetry has been realized in the experiment done by E. J. Davis et al. [41] which produces ferromagnetic-like interactions between spin-1 atoms. It is clear from these recent developments that $SU(3)$ symmetry is starting to become important in optical physics

starting from multicomponent Bose-Einstein condensates to the quantum states of focused electromagnetic fields. It is expected that it would become more and more relevant in future investigations.

For spin-1, there are eight Hermitian, traceless and orthonormal operators analogous to Pauli matrices for spin-1/2. Three of them are just spin operators whereas the last five operators are quadrupole operators. They form $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ Lie algebra. Then the convenient way to study of squeezing of spin-1 turns out to be the investigation of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ subalgebras of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ Lie algebra. Great progress in this research has been made by Yukawa and et al. [26, 29]. They classify subalgebras into two types, namely type-1 and type-2 according to the absolute value of the structure constants of the subalgebras, and predict squeezing parameters for type-1 and type-2 subalgebras based on the formal structure of subalgebras especially on the commutation relations i.e., structure constants.

In this paper, we study squeezed collective states of isolated N spin-1 systems produced by the action of one-axis twisting Hamiltonian on a coherent state. The idea of squeezed states is based on constructing states for which uncertainties in certain physical variables are lower than those for coherent states where the Heisenberg uncertainty relation is crucial. This involves a set of operators which are closed under commutation relations. Thus among the elements of the $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ algebra, we look for sets of operators which satisfy this property. Our procedure is similar to what is the standard in the field of squeezed states.

We investigate the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ subalgebras of the $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ Lie algebra and identify two types of the subalgebras: type-1 and type-2. This classification is based on anti-commutation relations that make difference between spin squeezed states of the identified types of subalgebras. Accidentally, our identified types of subalgebras exactly coincide with the types of subalgebras obtained by

E. Yukawa, M. Ueda, and K. Nemoto in Ref. [26]. However, we concentrate here on the anti-commutation relations of the subalgebras rather than structure constants, and our primary concern here is to obtain the squeezing parameters by first-principle calculations, namely rigorous calculation of the squeezing parameters using individual spin operators instead of the collective operators. As a result of the first-principle calculations, in some cases, we prove that misleading results about the squeezing parameters can be obtained when the similarities between the algebra of spin-1/2 and subalgebra of spin-1 are taken into consideration without rigorous calculations.

This paper is organized as follows: In Sec. II, we examine the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ subalgebras of the $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ Lie algebra. In the subsequent Sec. III and IV, we consider the squeezed states produced by applying one-axis twisting Hamiltonian on the coherent and nematic states, respectively. Then, in Sec. V, we examine the squeezed states in a specific case, namely for two spin-1 particles. In the final section VI, we summarize our work. At the end of this paper, Appendix A is briefly reviewed the squeezing of spin-1/2 to compare it with spin-1.

II. SUBALGEBRAS OF $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ LIE ALGEBRA

Spin-1 system is three-level quantum system determined by spin quantum number $s = 1$. Spin operator $\hat{s}_z$ along z -direction has three distinct eigenvalues $+1$, 0 , and -1 and the corresponding eigenstates are denoted by $|1\rangle$, $|0\rangle$, and $|-1\rangle$ forming three-dimensional spin space. The dynamics of the spin-1 system is rotation in the spin space and represented by the unitary operators in the form of $e^{-i\phi g}$ where g is the group algebra element of the $\mathfrak{su}(3)$, and ϕ is rotation angle. The group algebra element g can be uniquely determined by linear superposition of eight independent, Hermitian and traceless generators; more physical choice of these generators are three spin-1 operators $\hat{s}_x$, $\hat{s}_y$, $\hat{s}_z$ that obey commutation relation $[\hat{s}_i, \hat{s}_j] = i\epsilon_{ijk}\hat{s}_k$ where ϵ_{ijk} is Levi-Civita tensor, and five quadrupole operators $\hat{q}_{3z^2-r^2}$, $\hat{q}_{x^2-y^2}$, $\hat{q}_{xy}$, $\hat{q}_{xz}$ and $\hat{q}_{yz}$ given by

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{q}_{x^2-y^2} &= \hat{s}_x^2 - \hat{s}_y^2, & \hat{q}_{3z^2-r^2} &= 3\hat{s}_z^2 - 2\hat{I}, \\ \hat{q}_{xy} &= \{\hat{s}_x, \hat{s}_y\}, & \hat{q}_{xz} &= \{\hat{s}_x, \hat{s}_z\}, \\ \hat{q}_{yz} &= \{\hat{s}_y, \hat{s}_z\},\end{aligned}\quad (1)$$

where the curly brackets denote anti-commutator and $\hat{I}$ is the unit operator.

There are seven subalgebras of the $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ as listed below

[26, 34]

1. $\hat{s}_x, \hat{s}_y, \hat{s}_z$;
 2. $\hat{s}_x, \hat{q}_{xy}, \hat{q}_{xz}$;
 3. $\hat{s}_y, \hat{q}_{yz}, \hat{q}_{xy}$;
 4. $\hat{s}_z, \hat{q}_{xz}, \hat{q}_{yz}$;
 5. $\hat{s}_x, \hat{q}_{yz}, \hat{q}_+$;
 6. $\hat{s}_y, \hat{q}_{xz}, \hat{q}_-$;
 7. $\hat{s}_z, \hat{q}_{x^2-y^2}, \hat{q}_{xy}$,
- (2)

where $\hat{q}_\pm = (\hat{q}_{x^2-y^2} \pm \hat{q}_{3z^2-r^2})/2$. These 7 subalgebras are all three-dimensional and satisfy three properties of a Lie algebra, namely (i) operators form a linear vector space (ii) operators are closed under the commutation relations (iii) operators satisfy the Jacobi identity. The explicit form of commutation relations are in the form of

$$[\hat{A}_i, \hat{A}_j] = i\epsilon_{ijk}\hat{A}_k \quad (3)$$

for the first four subalgebras and

$$[\hat{A}_i, \hat{A}_j] = 2i\epsilon_{ijk}\hat{A}_k \quad (4)$$

for the last three subalgebras [26], and here the operators $\hat{A}_i$ stand for a triad of operators of the subalgebras. It should be noted that the seven algebras are not independent, however, the independence is not necessary to construct the squeezed states. The construction of squeezed states is guided by the Heisenberg uncertainty relations and thus Eqs. (3,4) are important. Further our construction of $SU(3)$ squeezed states does not exhaust all possible squeezed states for such systems.

Anti-commutators are given in Table I. Notice that there are two types of the subalgebras namely type-1: the first four subalgebras that have non-zero anti-commutators and type-2: last three subalgebras that have vanishing anti-commutators. For the type-1, anti-commutators shown in Table I can be compactly written as

$$\begin{aligned}\{\hat{s}_i, \hat{s}_j\} &= \hat{q}_{ij}, & \{\hat{s}_i, \hat{q}_{ij}\} &= \hat{s}_j, \\ \{\hat{q}_{ij}, \hat{q}_{jk}\} &= -\hat{q}_{ik},\end{aligned}\quad (5)$$

where i, j take values x, y , and z .

For the system composed of many spin-1 particles, collective spin and quadrupole operators are defined as the sum of all individual spin and quadrupole operators. They are given as follow

$$\begin{aligned}\hat{S}_i &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \hat{s}_{i\alpha}, & \hat{Q}_{ij} &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \hat{q}_{ij\alpha}, & \hat{Q}_\pm &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \hat{q}_{\pm\alpha}, \\ \hat{Q}_{x^2-y^2} &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \hat{q}_{x^2-y^2, \alpha}, & \text{and } \hat{Q}_{3z^2-r^2} &= \sum_{\alpha=1}^N \hat{q}_{3z^2-r^2, \alpha}\end{aligned}\quad (6)$$

where N stands for the number of the spin-1 particles. For notation, the uppercase operators stand for collective

TABLE I. Anti-commutation relations of spin-1 operators for the $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ subalgebras given by Eq. (2)

Sub-algebras	Anti-commutation relations
Type-1	
1	$\{\hat{s}_x, \hat{s}_y\} = \hat{q}_{xy}, \{\hat{s}_x, \hat{s}_z\} = \hat{q}_{xz}, \{\hat{s}_y, \hat{s}_z\} = \hat{q}_{yz}$
2	$\{\hat{s}_x, \hat{q}_{xy}\} = \hat{s}_y, \{\hat{s}_x, \hat{q}_{xz}\} = \hat{s}_z, \{\hat{q}_{xy}, \hat{q}_{xz}\} = -\hat{q}_{yz}$
3	$\{\hat{s}_y, \hat{q}_{xy}\} = \hat{s}_x, \{\hat{s}_y, \hat{q}_{yz}\} = \hat{s}_z, \{\hat{q}_{xy}, \hat{q}_{yz}\} = -\hat{q}_{xz}$
4	$\{\hat{s}_z, \hat{q}_{xz}\} = \hat{s}_x, \{\hat{s}_z, \hat{q}_{yz}\} = \hat{s}_y, \{\hat{q}_{xz}, \hat{q}_{yz}\} = -\hat{q}_{xy}$
Type-2	
5	$\{\hat{s}_x, \hat{q}_{yz}\} = 0, \{\hat{s}_x, \hat{q}_+\} = 0, \{\hat{q}_{yz}, \hat{q}_+\} = 0$
6	$\{\hat{s}_y, \hat{q}_{xz}\} = 0, \{\hat{s}_y, \hat{q}_-\} = 0, \{\hat{q}_{xz}, \hat{q}_-\} = 0$
7	$\{\hat{s}_z, \hat{q}_{x^2-y^2}\} = 0, \{\hat{s}_z, \hat{q}_{xy}\} = 0, \{\hat{q}_{x^2-y^2}, \hat{q}_{xy}\} = 0$

spin operators whereas the lowercase operators stand for single spin operators, for example $\hat{s}_{x\alpha}$ denotes x component of the α th spin operator. This notation is used throughout this paper.

Finally, it is worth mentioning that our classification of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ Lie algebra based on anti-commutation relations accidentally coincide with the classification provided in Ref. [26].

In next two sections, we discuss the spin as well as nematic squeezing of the specifically chosen initial states via one-axis twisting Hamiltonian where we find very interesting results; see Fig. 1 especially the black curve. For the general initial states, the question is very much open even in the context of spin-half systems. Some answers are known for states obtained by rotation of say lowest state. The spin-1 space is much richer and rotations form only a small subgroup.

III. SPIN SQUEEZING OF $|0, 0, N\rangle$ STATE VIA ONE-AXIS TWISTING HAMILTONIAN

In this section, we focus on squeezing parameters of the various types of the spin-1 squeezed states produced by applying one-axis twisting Hamiltonian on the coherent spin state $|0, 0, N\rangle$. Note that any state in which all spins are aligned in the same direction would be referred to as a coherent state. Here the notation $|N_1, N_0, N_{-1}\rangle$ means N_1, N_0 and N_{-1} spin-1 particles are in the levels $|1\rangle, |0\rangle$, and $|-1\rangle$, respectively. We use the squeezing parameter defined in Ref. [42] throughout this paper. Details of the squeezing parameter is given in Appendix A (also see our Eqs. (10), (20) and (23)).

A. Type-2 spin squeezing

First, we consider the squeezed state with respect to the type-2 subalgebras since it has not been considered as yet in literature. There are strong similarities between spin-1/2 algebra and type-2 subalgebras, specifically, they have not only the similar commutation relations of quadrature operators but also the same anti-commutation relations. Based on this similarities, one can easily conclude the same squeezing parameters for both cases. However, we will reveal here that the squeezing parameter for type-2 spin squeezing is not identical to that of spin-1/2 regardless of their algebraic similarities.

It is sufficient to analyze any of the three subalgebras of type-2 since all squeezing features of the three subalgebras of this type are identical to each other. Therefore, as an example we examine subalgebra 5 (see Table. II) in which $\hat{S}_x$ and $\hat{Q}_{yz}$ are quadrature operators orthogonal to mean spin direction. The well-known Heisenberg uncertainty relation $\langle \Delta \hat{S}_x^2 \rangle \langle \Delta \hat{Q}_{yz}^2 \rangle \geq 4 \langle \hat{Q}_+ \rangle^2 / 4 = N^2 / 4$ leads to the standard quantum limit $N/2$.

The one-axis twisting Hamiltonian is given by $\hat{H}_2 = \chi \hat{S}_x^2$, where χ stands for coupling constant and the label 2 means the type-2 subalgebras. Time dynamics is governed by unitary operator $\hat{U}_2(\theta) = \exp(-i\theta \hat{S}_x^2 / 2)$ with $\theta = 2\chi t$. To obtain the time dynamics of the individual spin operator $\hat{q}_{yz1}$, we calculate the following nested commutation relations

$$\begin{aligned}
[\hat{S}_x^2, \hat{q}_{yz1}] &= 2i\{\hat{s}_{x1}, \hat{q}_{+1}\} + 4i\hat{K}_2\hat{q}_{+1} \\
&= 4i\hat{K}_2\hat{q}_{+1}, \\
[\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, \hat{q}_{yz1}]] &= 8\hat{K}_2\{\hat{s}_{x1}, \hat{q}_{yz1}\} + 16\hat{K}_2^2\hat{q}_{yz1} \\
&= 16\hat{K}_2^2\hat{q}_{yz1}, \\
[\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, \hat{q}_{yz1}]]] &= 32i\hat{K}_2^3\{\hat{s}_{x1}, \hat{q}_{+1}\} + 64i\hat{K}_2^3\hat{q}_{+1} \\
&= 64i\hat{K}_2^3\hat{q}_{+1}, \\
[\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, \hat{q}_{yz1}]]]] &= 128\hat{K}_2^4\{\hat{s}_{x1}, \hat{q}_{yz1}\} + 256\hat{K}_2^4\hat{q}_{yz1} \\
&= 256\hat{K}_2^4\hat{q}_{yz1}, \tag{7}
\end{aligned}$$

and so on. Here, $\hat{K}_2 = \sum_{\alpha=2}^N \hat{s}_{x\alpha}$. The nested commutation relations Eqs. (7) are simple as Eqs. (A4) since the anti-commutators vanish $\{\hat{s}_{x1}, \hat{q}_{+1}\} = \{\hat{s}_{x1}, \hat{q}_{yz1}\} = 0$ as spin-1/2. Furthermore, the time dynamics is obtained as

$$\hat{U}_2^\dagger \hat{q}_{yz1} \hat{U}_2 = \hat{q}_{yz1} \cos(2\theta \hat{K}_2) - \hat{q}_{+1} \sin(2\theta \hat{K}_2). \tag{8}$$

This expression looks similar to Eq. (A5) for spin-1/2 given in Appendix A, and the only difference is the double scaling of variable θ . However, the expectation values

$$\begin{aligned}
\langle \hat{Q}_{yz}^2 \rangle &= \frac{N}{2} + \frac{N(N-1)}{8} (1 - \cos^{2N-4} 2\theta), \\
\langle \hat{Q}_{yz} \hat{S}_x \rangle &= \langle \hat{S}_x \hat{Q}_{yz} \rangle^* = -i \frac{N}{2} \cos^{2N-2} \theta \\
&\quad + \frac{N(N-1)}{4} \sin(2\theta) \cos^{2N-4} \theta \tag{9}
\end{aligned}$$

looks different from that for spin-1/2 given by Eq. (A6). Using Eq. (A2) along with the Eqs. (9) and $\langle \hat{S}_x^2 \rangle = N/2$ we obtain the following squeezing parameter (details of the squeezing parameter is given in Appendix A)

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_2^2(N, \theta) &= \frac{\text{var}(\hat{S}_x, \hat{Q}_{yz})}{N/2} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{8}(N-1) \\ &\times \left[\sqrt{(1 - \cos^{2N-4}(2\theta))^2 + 16 \sin^2(2\theta) \cos^{4N-8}(\theta)} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (1 - \cos^{2N-4}(2\theta)) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

This squeezing parameter is a result of our first-principle calculations, and it is exact expression. Furthermore, it is interesting to study the asymptotic behavior of the minimum attainable squeezing parameter and compare it to other cases. For small θ and large N , we approximate the squeezing parameter $\xi_2^2(N, \theta)$ as

$$\xi_2^2(N, \theta) \simeq \frac{1}{16\alpha^2} + \frac{128}{3}\beta^2, \quad (11)$$

where $\alpha = N\theta/4$ and $\beta = N\theta^2/8$ as introduced in Ref. [42]. This approximate squeezing parameter has a minimum value given by

$$\xi_{2,min}^2(N) \simeq \left(\frac{9}{2}\right)^{1/3} N^{-2/3} \quad (12)$$

at $\theta_0 = (3/4)^{1/6} N^{-2/3}$. To compare the minimum squeezing parameter to other cases, see Fig. 1.

Finally, according to the squeezing parameter Eq. (10), there are no clear relationships between $\xi_{\text{su}(2)}^2$ defined in Appendix A and ξ_2^2 which implies that the similarities of $\text{su}(2)$ and type-2 subalgebras of $\text{su}(3)$ are deceptive in terms of quantum squeezing. Accordingly, it is inappropriate to analyze the squeezing features just based on the algebraic similarities.

B. Type-1 spin squeezing

In the preceding case, we show that the squeezing properties of the spin-1 subalgebras are not necessary to behave in accordance with their algebraic structures. For this reason, it is worth to calculate the squeezing parameter explicitly for type-1 subalgebras, and we present this calculations here.

The case of the interest is the type-1 spin squeezing of $|0, 0, N\rangle$ coherent state of N spin-1 systems via one-axis twisting Hamiltonian. As shown in Table II, the subalgebras 1 and 4 have non-zero expectation values for the state $|0, 0, N\rangle$. Therefore, we first consider the subalgebra 1, namely $(\hat{S}_x, \hat{S}_y, \hat{S}_z)$. The Hamiltonian $\hat{H}_1 = \chi \hat{S}_x^2$, where the label 1 stands for type-1, leads to time dynamics governed by the unitary operator $\hat{U}_1(\theta) = \exp(-i\theta \hat{S}_x^2/2)$, and squeezing quadratures

TABLE II. Expectation values of the collective operators in the state $|0, 0, N\rangle$.

Subalgebras	Expectation values
Type-1	
$\hat{S}_x, \hat{S}_y, \hat{S}_z$	$\langle \hat{S}_x \rangle = \langle \hat{S}_y \rangle = 0, \langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = -N$
$\hat{S}_x, \hat{Q}_{xy}, \hat{Q}_{xz}$	$\langle \hat{S}_x \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{xy} \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{xz} \rangle = 0$
$\hat{S}_y, \hat{Q}_{yz}, \hat{Q}_{xy}$	$\langle \hat{S}_y \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{yz} \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{xy} \rangle = 0$
$\hat{S}_z, \hat{Q}_{xz}, \hat{Q}_{yz}$	$\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = -N, \langle \hat{Q}_{xz} \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{yz} \rangle = 0$
Type-2	
$\hat{S}_x, \hat{Q}_{yz}, \hat{Q}_+$	$\langle \hat{S}_x \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{yz} \rangle = 0, \langle \hat{Q}_+ \rangle = N/2$
$\hat{S}_y, \hat{Q}_{xz}, \hat{Q}_-$	$\langle \hat{S}_y \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{xz} \rangle = 0, \langle \hat{Q}_- \rangle = -N/2$
$\hat{S}_z, \hat{Q}_{x^2-y^2}, \hat{Q}_{xy}$	$\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = -N, \langle \hat{Q}_{x^2-y^2} \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{xy} \rangle = 0$




FIG. 1. For large N , there is a linear dependence between the minimum attainable squeezing parameters and $N^{-2/3}$. This dependence is depicted by (i) solid yellow line for spin-1/2, (ii) solid black line for type-1 squeezing of coherent state $|0, 0, N\rangle$, (iii) red dashed line for type-2 squeezing of coherent state $|0, 0, N\rangle$, and (iv) blue dash-dotted line for type-2 squeezing of nematic state $|0, N, 0\rangle$. Numerically calculated exact values are plotted by rectangles, circles, triangles, and dots.

are S_x and S_y . Since $\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = -N$ (see Table II) the corresponding Heisenberg uncertainty relation is given by $\langle \Delta \hat{S}_x^2 \rangle \langle \Delta \hat{S}_y^2 \rangle \geq N^2/4$, and as a result, the standard quantum limit is obtained as $N/2$.

For the subalgebra 1, the physics of the squeezing can be revealed by the clear connection between spin-1/2 and spin-1 particles i.e. spin addition rule. In order to see

this, we start with two spin-1/2 particles. Then, the squeezed state is described as

$$|\psi\rangle = e^{-i\theta(\hat{s}_{x1}^{(1/2)} \otimes \hat{s}_{x2}^{(1/2)})^2/2} |g\rangle_1 \otimes |g\rangle_2 \quad (13)$$

where $|g\rangle$ is the ground state of the spin-1/2. Here, the operators $\hat{s}_{x1}^{(1/2)}$ and $\hat{s}_{x2}^{(1/2)}$ are x components of individual spin operators of two spin-1/2 and they described in the Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}_1^{(1/2)}$ and $\mathcal{H}_2^{(1/2)}$ where $\mathcal{H}_i^{(1/2)}$ is Hilbert space of i th spin-1/2. Now the total Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1^{(1/2)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^{(1/2)}$ can be decomposed as a direct sum of irreducible subalgebras as follows

$$\mathcal{H}_1^{(1/2)} \otimes \mathcal{H}_2^{(1/2)} = \mathcal{H}^{(1)} \oplus \mathcal{H}^{(0)}, \quad (14)$$

where $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$ and $\mathcal{H}^{(0)}$ are Hilbert spaces for spin-1 and spin-0, respectively. This implies that the space of two spin-1/2 particles is identical to the direct sum of spaces for spin-1 and spin-0 particles. As long as, the state $|g\rangle_1 \otimes |g\rangle_2$ belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$, the squeezed state Eq. (13) can be written as

$$|\psi\rangle = e^{-i\theta\hat{s}_x^2/2} |-1\rangle, \quad (15)$$

where $\hat{s}_x = \hat{s}_{x1}^{(1/2)} + \hat{s}_{x2}^{(1/2)}$ is x component of a total spin-1 operator that belongs to $\mathcal{H}^{(1)}$, and $|-1\rangle$ denotes $|g\rangle_1 \otimes |g\rangle_2$. Furthermore, Eq. (15) implies that the degree of squeezing of a spin-1 particle is equivalent to that of two spin-1/2 particles when the type-1 subalgebra $(\hat{s}_x, \hat{s}_y, \hat{s}_z)$ is considered. In general, the squeezing parameter of N spin-1 is the same as the squeezing parameter of $2N$ spin-1/2 particles. This argument is first given in Ref. [26] based on the same structure constants of $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ algebra for spin-1/2 and type-1 subalgebras for spin-1.

Now, we aim to give an explicit calculation of the squeezing parameter of N spin-1 system and prove that it is the same as the squeezing parameter of $2N$ spin-1/2 particles. For this purpose, we consider the 4th subalgebra $(\hat{s}_z, \hat{q}_{xz}, \hat{q}_{yz})$ and time evolution operator $\hat{U}'_1(\theta) = \exp(-i\theta\hat{Q}_{xz}^2/2)$ corresponding to the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}'_1 = \chi\hat{Q}_{xz}^2$. Here, it is worth mentioning that any subalgebra which belongs to type-1 can represent spin-1 squeezing on an equal footing. The first step of our calculation is to determine the following commutators

$$[\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, \hat{q}_{yz1}] = i \underbrace{\{\hat{q}_{xz1}, \hat{s}_{z1}\}}_{\neq 0} + 2i\hat{K}'_1\hat{s}_{z1} = i\hat{s}_{x1} + 2i\hat{K}'_1\hat{s}_{z1},$$

$$[\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, [\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, \hat{q}_{yz1}]] = (1 + 4\hat{K}'_1{}^2)\hat{q}_{yz1} - 4\hat{K}'_1\hat{q}_{xy1},$$

$$[\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, [\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, [\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, \hat{q}_{yz1}]]] = i(1 + 12\hat{K}'_1{}^2)\hat{s}_{x1} + i(6\hat{K}'_1 + 8\hat{K}'_1{}^3)\hat{s}_{z1},$$

$$[\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, [\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, [\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, [\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, \hat{q}_{yz1}]]]] = (1 + 24\hat{K}'_1{}^2 + 16\hat{K}'_1{}^4)\hat{q}_{yz1} - (8\hat{K}'_1 + 32\hat{K}'_1{}^3)\hat{q}_{xy1}, \quad (16)$$

and so on. Here, $\hat{K}'_1 = \sum_{\alpha=2}^N \hat{q}_{xz\alpha}$. In Eqs. (16), due to non-vanishing anti-commutators between $\hat{q}_{xz}$ and each of operators $\hat{s}_{z1}$, $\hat{s}_{x1}$, $\hat{q}_{yz1}$, and $\hat{q}_{xy1}$, the number of terms on the right-hand side increases as the number of nested commutators grows. In general, the nested commutators are given by

$$\underbrace{[\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, [\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, \dots [\hat{Q}_{xz}^2, \hat{q}_{yz1}]]]}_{n \text{ times}} = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} \left[(1 + 2\hat{K}'_1)^n + (1 - 2\hat{K}'_1)^n \right] \hat{q}_{yz1} - \frac{1}{2} \left[(1 + 2\hat{K}'_1)^n - (1 - 2\hat{K}'_1)^n \right] \hat{q}_{xy1}, & \text{when } n \text{ is even} \\ \frac{i}{2} \left[(1 + 2\hat{K}'_1)^n + (1 - 2\hat{K}'_1)^n \right] \hat{s}_{x1} + \frac{i}{2} \left[(1 + 2\hat{K}'_1)^n - (1 - 2\hat{K}'_1)^n \right] \hat{s}_{z1}, & \text{when } n \text{ is odd.} \end{cases} \quad (17)$$

This is a complicated pattern as opposed to the Eq. (A4) for spin-1/2, and fortunately, we obtain simple enough equation for the time evolution of $\hat{q}_{yz1}$ as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{U}'_1{}^\dagger \hat{q}_{yz1} \hat{U}'_1 &= \\ \hat{q}_{yz1} \cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \cos(\theta\hat{K}'_1) + \hat{q}_{xy1} \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \sin(\theta\hat{K}'_1) \\ - \hat{s}_{x1} \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \cos(\theta\hat{K}'_1) - \hat{s}_{z1} \cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \sin(\theta\hat{K}'_1). \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

Using this time dynamics, the required expectation val-

ues can be calculated. The calculation is much cumbersome but it is straightforward. The results are as follow

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{Q}_{yz}^2 \rangle &= \frac{N}{2} + \frac{2N(2N-1)}{8} (1 - \cos^{2N-2} \theta), \\ \langle \hat{Q}_{yz} \hat{Q}_{xz} \rangle &= \langle \hat{Q}_{xz} \hat{Q}_{yz} \rangle^* = i \frac{N}{2} \cos^{2N-1} \frac{\theta}{2} \\ &\quad + \frac{2N(2N-1)}{4} \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \cos^{2N-2} \frac{\theta}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

With the help of Eqs. (19) and $\langle \hat{Q}_{xz}^2 \rangle = N/2$, we obtain

the squeezing parameter as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_1^2(N, \theta) &= \frac{\text{var}(\hat{Q}_{xz}, \hat{Q}_{yz})}{N/2} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{4}(2N - 1) \\ &\quad \times \left[\sqrt{(1 - \cos^{2N-2} \theta)^2 + 16 \sin^2 \left(\frac{\theta}{2} \right) \cos^{4N-4} \frac{\theta}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (1 - \cos^{2N-2} \theta) \right].\end{aligned}\quad (20)$$

This expression implies $\xi_1^2(N, \theta) = \xi_{\text{su}(2)}^2(2N, \theta)$ and it verifies that the statement “squeezing parameters of N spin-1 particles and $2N$ spin-1/2 particles are equal in magnitude”.

In the case of large N , an asymptotic form of the minimum attainable squeezing parameter can be found by simply replacing N in Eq. (A8) by $2N$ and it yields

$$\xi_{1,\min}^2(N) \simeq \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{9}{4} \right)^{1/3} N^{-2/3}. \quad (21)$$

It implies that N spin-1 systems provide approximately 1.58 times stronger squeezing compared with the same number of spin-1/2 particles. The asymptotic form, as well as numerical exact value of the minimum squeezing parameter, are illustrated in Fig. 1.

IV. NEMATIC SQUEEZING OF $|0, N, 0\rangle$ STATE VIA ONE-AXIS TWISTING HAMILTONIAN

Nematic states of spin-1 with zero spin average $\langle \hat{S} \rangle = 0$ are of great interest and these states do not have spin-1/2 counterparts. For the nematic state $|0, N, 0\rangle$, only two from seven subalgebras have non-zero expectation values (see Table. III). These are the subalgebras 5 and 6 of type-2 (see Eq. (2)). The squeezing of these subalgebras is successfully realized in a Bose-Einstein condensate via nonlinear collisions [34].

Here, we consider the subalgebra 5 as an example, and the non-zero expectation value is $\langle \hat{Q}_+ \rangle = -N$. This leads to the uncertainty relation $\langle \Delta \hat{S}_x^2 \rangle \langle \Delta \hat{Q}_{yz}^2 \rangle \geq N^2$ and standard quantum limit N . The corresponding one-axis twisting Hamiltonian is given by $\hat{H}_n = \chi \hat{S}_x^2$, and time evolution unitary operator is written as $\hat{U}_n(\theta) = e^{-i\theta \hat{S}_x^2/2}$. Here, the label n stands for the nematic squeezing. The time evolution of the operator $\hat{Q}_{yz1}$ is already given in the previous section by Eq. (8). The expectation values required for calculation of the squeezing parameter

TABLE III. Expectation values of the collective operators in the nematic state $|0, N, 0\rangle$.

Subalgebras	Expectation values
Type-1	
$\hat{S}_x, \hat{S}_y, \hat{S}_z$	$\langle \hat{S}_x \rangle = \langle \hat{S}_y \rangle = \langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = 0$
$\hat{S}_x, \hat{Q}_{xy}, \hat{Q}_{xz}$	$\langle \hat{S}_x \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{xy} \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{xz} \rangle = 0$
$\hat{S}_y, \hat{Q}_{yz}, \hat{Q}_{xy}$	$\langle \hat{S}_y \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{yz} \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{xy} \rangle = 0$
$\hat{S}_z, \hat{Q}_{xz}, \hat{Q}_{yz}$	$\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{xz} \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{yz} \rangle = 0$
Type-2	
$\hat{S}_x, \hat{Q}_{yz}, \hat{Q}_+$	$\langle \hat{S}_x \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{yz} \rangle = 0, \langle \hat{Q}_+ \rangle = -N$
$\hat{S}_y, \hat{Q}_{xz}, \hat{Q}_-$	$\langle \hat{S}_y \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{xz} \rangle = 0, \langle \hat{Q}_- \rangle = N$
$\hat{S}_z, \hat{Q}_{x^2-y^2}, \hat{Q}_{xy}$	$\langle \hat{S}_z \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{x^2-y^2} \rangle = \langle \hat{Q}_{xy} \rangle = 0$

are as follows

$$\begin{aligned}\langle \hat{S}_x^2 \rangle &= N, \\ \langle \hat{Q}_{yz}^2 \rangle &= N + \frac{N(N-1)}{2} (1 - \cos^{N-2}(4\theta)), \\ \langle \hat{Q}_{yz} \hat{S}_x \rangle &= \langle \hat{S}_x \hat{Q}_{yz} \rangle^* = iN \cos^{N-1}(2\theta) \\ &\quad + N(N-1) \sin(2\theta) \cos^{N-2}(2\theta),\end{aligned}\quad (22)$$

and the squeezing parameter is obtained as

$$\begin{aligned}\xi_n^2(N, \theta) &= \frac{\text{var}(\hat{S}_x, \hat{Q}_{yz})}{N} \\ &= 1 - \frac{1}{4}(N - 1) \\ &\quad \times \left[\sqrt{(1 - \cos^{N-2} 4\theta)^2 + 16 \sin^2 2\theta \cos^{2N-4} 2\theta} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (1 - \cos^{N-2} 4\theta) \right].\end{aligned}\quad (23)$$

The fascinating outcome of Eqs. (23) is that the squeezing parameters of squeezed nematic states of N spin-1 particles are identical to the squeezing parameter of the same number of spin-1/2 except scaling factor 4 along the time axis. The difference in the scaling of time axis t is due to doubled absolute values of the structure constants in Eq. (4). Since the difference is only in the scaling, the minimum values of the squeezing parameters $\xi_n^2(N, \theta)$ are the same as $\xi_{\text{su}(2),\min}^2$ for spin-1/2 given by Eq. (A8). The numerically calculated minimum squeezing parameter is plotted in Fig. 1 by black round dots.

V. EXPLICIT FORM OF SQUEEZED STATES FOR $N = 2$

In general, an explicit form of the squeezed states are much complicated and analytically impossible to obtain.




FIG. 2. The squeezing parameters of two spin-1 particles as a function of θ . The minimum attainable values are depicted by rectangles.

But, it is simple enough for two spin-1 particles. In what follows, we analyze the various types of the squeezed states for $N = 2$.

A. Type-2 squeezing of the state $|0,0,2\rangle$

Using matrix representation we obtain the squeezed state for $N = 2$ as follows

$$e^{-i\theta\hat{S}_x^2/2}|-1,-1\rangle = \alpha_1(\theta)|1,1\rangle - \beta(\theta)|1,-1\rangle - 2\beta(\theta)|0,0\rangle - \beta(\theta)|-1,1\rangle + \alpha_2(\theta)|-1,-1\rangle, \quad (24)$$

where we introduce the following functions of θ

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_1(\theta) &= \left(e^{-i\theta} \frac{3}{4} \cos \theta - \frac{1}{4} e^{-2i\theta} - \frac{1}{2} e^{-i\theta/2} \right), \\ \alpha_2(\theta) &= \left(e^{-i\theta} \frac{3}{4} \cos \theta - \frac{1}{4} e^{-2i\theta} + \frac{1}{2} e^{-i\theta/2} \right), \\ \beta(\theta) &= \frac{i}{4} e^{-i\theta} \sin \theta. \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

Here, the notation $|0,0,2\rangle = |-1\rangle \otimes |-1\rangle = |-1,-1\rangle$ is introduced. For the current case, the squeezing parameter Eq. (10) reads as

$$\xi_2^2(2, \theta) = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sin 2\theta \quad (26)$$

This is a quite simple function (see Fig. 2), and it has the minimum value $\xi_{2,min}^2(2) = 1/2$ at the point $\theta_{min} = \pi/4$. At the minimum point, the squeezed state takes the form as

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_2\rangle = e^{-i\pi\hat{S}_x^2/8}|-1,-1\rangle &= \alpha_1(\pi/4)|1,1\rangle - \beta(\pi/4)|1,-1\rangle \\ &\quad - 2\beta(\pi/4)|0,0\rangle - \beta(\pi/4)|-1,1\rangle \\ &\quad + \alpha_2(\pi/4)|-1,-1\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

This state is obviously entangled, and we quantify the entanglement by Von Neumann entropy defined as $S = -\text{Tr}[\rho_1 \log(\rho_1)]$, where ρ_1 is density matrix of the first spin-1 particle and $\text{Tr}()$ stands for trace over the first particle. We obtain the approximate value of S as 0.4135. In comparison to other cases, the squeezed state $|\psi_2\rangle$ is less entangled and squeezed, and this is illustrated by red rectangle in Fig. 2.

B. Type-1 squeezing of the state $|0,0,2\rangle$

In the case of type-1 squeezing of the coherent state $|0,0,2\rangle$, we obtain the following squeezed state

$$e^{-i\theta\hat{Q}_{xz}^2/2}|-1,-1\rangle = \alpha_1(\theta)|1,1\rangle + \beta(\theta)|1,-1\rangle - 2\beta(\theta)|0,0\rangle + \beta(\theta)|-1,1\rangle + \alpha_2(\theta)|-1,-1\rangle \quad (28)$$

with $\alpha_1(\theta)$, $\alpha_2(\theta)$ and $\beta(\theta)$ functions given by Eqs. (25). The corresponding squeezing parameter is derived from Eq. (20) as follows

$$\xi_1^2(2, \theta) = 1 - \frac{3}{4}(1 - \cos^2 \theta) \left(\sqrt{\frac{3 - \cos \theta}{1 - \cos \theta}} - 1 \right), \quad (29)$$

and it has minimum value

$$\xi_{1,min}^2(2) \simeq 0.302484 \quad (30)$$

at $\theta_{min} \simeq 0.98304 = 0.312911\pi$. The Von Neumann entropy of the squeezed state Eq. (29) at θ_{min} is obtained as $S \simeq 0.537$.

C. Type-2 squeezing of the state $|0,2,0\rangle$

For the nematic state $|0,2,0\rangle$, the squeezed state is given by

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\theta\hat{S}_x^2/2}|0,0\rangle &= -2\beta(\theta) \left(|1,1\rangle + |1,-1\rangle + 2i \cot \theta |0,0\rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |-1,1\rangle + |-1,-1\rangle \right), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

which is clearly entangled. Equation (23) yields the following simple expression for $N = 2$

$$\xi_n^2(2, \theta) = 1 - \sin(2\theta), \quad (32)$$

and it has vanishing minimum value $\xi_{n,min}^2(2) = 0$ at $\theta_{min} = \pi/4$ (see Fig. 2). The Von Neumann entropy of the squeezed state

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-i\pi\hat{S}_x^2/8}|0,0\rangle &= -\frac{1+i}{4} \left(|1,1\rangle + |1,-1\rangle + 2i|0,0\rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. + |-1,1\rangle + |-1,-1\rangle \right) \end{aligned} \quad (33)$$

at θ_{min} is calculated as $S \simeq 0.6931$ which implies the state Eq. (33) is the most entangled state in comparison to other considered cases. This argument is also justified by the vanishing squeezing parameter depicted by blue rectangle in Fig. 2.

TABLE IV. Relationships between squeezing parameters of spin-1 and spin-1/2 states.

Types of the subalgebras	spin state $ 0, 0, N\rangle$	nematic state $ 0, N, 0\rangle$
Type-1	$\xi_1^2(N, \theta) = \xi_{\text{su}(2)}^2(2N, \theta)$ $\xi_{1,\min}^2(N) \simeq (1/2)(9/4)^{1/3} N^{-2/3}$	-
Type-2	$\xi_2^2(N, \theta)$, no relationships with $\xi_{\text{su}(2)}^2(N, \theta)$ $\xi_{2,\min}^2(N) \simeq (9/2)^{1/3} N^{-2/3}$	$\xi_n^2(N, \theta) = \xi_{\text{su}(2)}^2(N, 4\theta)$ $\xi_{n,\min}^2(N) \simeq (1/2)9^{1/3} N^{-2/3}$ This is actually the asymptotic value of minimum squeezing parameter for spin-1/2.

VI. CONCLUSIONS

We identify seven subalgebras of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ algebra that are identical with $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ algebra in terms of the commutation relations but four of them (type-1 subalgebras) are different than $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ spin operators due to their non-vanishing anti-commutation relations. The other three subalgebras called type-2 have vanishing anti-commutation relations similar to $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ algebra.

Furthermore, we consider three different instances of squeezing of spin-1 states and do first-principle calculations of squeezing parameters in each instance. In what follows, we present the results of our calculations (see Table. IV).

1. Type-1 squeezed states generated by applying one-axis twisting Hamiltonian on the coherent state $|0, 0, N\rangle$. In this case, we demonstrated the equivalence of squeezing parameters of N spin-1 and $2N$ spin-1/2 particles with the use of first-principle calculations. This result is previously predicted in Ref. [26].
2. Type-2 squeezed states generated by applying one-axis twisting Hamiltonian on the coherent state $|0, 0, N\rangle$. Type-2 subalgebra of $\mathfrak{su}(3)$ and $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ algebra share not only similar commutation relations but also anti-commutation relations. But these similarities are misleading because there are no relationships between the squeezing parameters associated with these two algebras. This result is also proved by rigorous calculations.
3. Type-2 squeezed states generated by applying one-axis twisting Hamiltonian on the nematic state $|0, N, 0\rangle$. In this instance, the squeezing parameter is obtained as $\xi_n^2(N, \theta) = \xi_{\text{su}(2)}^2(N, 4\theta)$ which implies that the same number of spin-1 and spin-1/2 particles exhibit the same squeezing properties.

Then, we consider the asymptotic behavior of the squeezing parameters when $N \rightarrow \infty$. The results are summarized in Table. IV and plotted in Fig. 1. As shown in Fig. 1, the asymptotic results are in agreement with the numerical results, and type-1 spin squeezing of the coherent state $|0, 0, N\rangle$ can achieve stronger squeezing than

spin-1/2 when the same number of spin-1 and spin-1/2 particles are considered. However, for type-2 squeezing of the state $|0, 0, N\rangle$ exhibits weaker squeezing compared to spin-1/2. Another situation is the squeezing of the nematic state $|0, N, 0\rangle$. In this case, the minimum attainable squeezing parameter is the same as that of spin-1/2. It is worth mentioning that all results presented in this work are the direct outcome of rigorous first-principle calculations.

Finally, we also examine the specific case $N = 2$ and calculate an explicit form of the squeezed states. The numerical values of the obtained Von Neumann entropy verify the close relation between squeezing and entanglement.

We conclude by mentioning future investigations on spin one squeezing – (a) to go beyond single twisted squeezed states; (b) to study input states other than the coherent states $|0, 0, N\rangle$; $|0, N, 0\rangle$; (c) the decoherence of spin-1 squeezed states under environmental perturbations, the techniques for the latter exist [43].

Appendix A: Squeezing of spin-1/2 states

Squeezing parameters that quantify the spin squeezed states have been studied much extensively in the case of spin-1/2 particles due to its simplicity. There are several squeezing parameters are introduced in literature, and the most popular definition has been given by Kitagawa and Ueda in 1993 [42]. They first define mean spin direction as $\mathbf{n} = \langle \hat{S} \rangle / |\langle \hat{S} \rangle|$, where $\hat{S}$ is a collective spin operator of spin-1/2, and then introduce squeezing parameter as a ratio of the minimum variance of quadratures in the plane perpendicular to the mean spin direction to the standard quantum limit characterized by spin coherent state. Then the squeezing parameter is given as

$$\xi_{\text{su}(2)}^2 = \frac{\text{var}(\hat{S}_{\perp 1}, \hat{S}_{\perp 2})}{N/4}, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $\text{var}(\hat{S}_{\perp 1}, \hat{S}_{\perp 2})$ stands for the minimum variance of two spin quadratures $\hat{S}_{\perp 1}$ and $\hat{S}_{\perp 2}$ in the plane perpendicular to the mean spin direction. In literature, there are two methods to calculate the squeezing parameter

Eq. (A1). First, the method used in the seminal paper by M. Kitagawa and M. Ueda [42] where two spin quadratures are rotated around mean spin direction and afterwards one of the variances is minimized by setting proper rotation angle. This method is based on the collective spin state $|S, M\rangle$ with S being total spin and M being z component of total spin [42, 44]. Second, the method where the minimum and maximum variances are found by means of eigenvalues. This method is based on the number state $|N_+, N_-\rangle$ where N_+ and N_- are populations of excited and ground states of spin-1/2 [45]. The explicit form of the minimum variance found by the second method is as follows

$$\text{var}(\hat{S}_{\perp 1}, \hat{S}_{\perp 2}) = \frac{1}{2} \left[\left\langle \hat{S}_{\perp 1}^2 + \hat{S}_{\perp 2}^2 \right\rangle - \sqrt{\left\langle \hat{S}_{\perp 1}^2 - \hat{S}_{\perp 2}^2 \right\rangle^2 + 2 \left\langle \hat{S}_{\perp 1} \hat{S}_{\perp 2} + \hat{S}_{\perp 2} \hat{S}_{\perp 1} \right\rangle^2} \right]. \quad (\text{A2})$$

By calculating the expectation values in Eq. (A2) for a given initial state one can obtain the squeezing parameter $\xi_{\text{su}(2)}^2$ in explicit form.

As an example, we present here calculations of the squeezing parameter of the squeezed state produced by applying one-axis twisting Hamiltonian $\hat{H} = \chi \hat{S}_x^2$ on coherent spin state $|0, N\rangle$. In this example, spin quadratures are $\hat{S}_{\perp 1} = \hat{S}_x$ and $\hat{S}_{\perp 2} = \hat{S}_y$. We follow the second method given in Ref. [45] since it enables us to understand how the squeezing parameter depends on the corresponding Lie group structure and anticommutation relations. The unitary time-evolution operator at time t becomes $\hat{U}(\theta) = \exp(-i\theta \hat{S}_x^2/2)$ where $\theta = 2\chi t$. Since the operator $\hat{S}_x$ commute with $\hat{U}(\theta)$, it does not depend on time. Therefore, its expectation value is written as

$$\langle \hat{S}_x^2 \rangle = \frac{N}{4}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

However, $\hat{S}_y$ depends on time. To calculate its time dependence, the following commutation relations are calculated

$$\begin{aligned} [\hat{S}_x^2, \hat{S}_{y1}] &= i\{\hat{S}_{x1}, \hat{S}_{z1}\} + 2i\hat{K}\hat{S}_{z1} = 2i\hat{K}\hat{S}_{z1}, \\ [\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, \hat{S}_{y1}]] &= 2\hat{K}\{\hat{S}_{x1}, \hat{S}_{y1}\} + 4\hat{K}^2\hat{S}_{y1} \\ &= 4\hat{K}^2\hat{S}_{y1}, \\ [\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, \hat{S}_{y1}]]] &= 4i\hat{K}^2\{\hat{S}_{x1}, \hat{S}_{z1}\} + 8i\hat{K}^3\hat{S}_{z1} \\ &= 8i\hat{K}^3\hat{S}_{z1}, \\ [\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, [\hat{S}_x^2, \hat{S}_{y1}]]]] &= 8\hat{K}^3\{\hat{S}_{x1}, \hat{S}_{y1}\} + 16\hat{K}^4\hat{S}_{y1} \\ &= 16\hat{K}^4\hat{S}_{y1}, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A4})$$

and so on. Here, $\hat{K} = \sum_{\alpha=2}^N \hat{S}_{x\alpha}$. Moreover, in Eq. A4 we exploit vanishing anti-commutation relations between

single spin-1/2 operators $\hat{s}_{x1}$, $\hat{s}_{y1}$ and $\hat{s}_{z1}$. This vanishing anti-commutators much simplify Eqs. (A4) in contrast to the analogous equation for spin-1 in Sec. IIIB. With the help of the commutation relations, we obtain the following time evolution for the operator $\hat{s}_{y1}$

$$\hat{U}^\dagger(\theta) \hat{s}_{y1} \hat{U}(\theta) = \hat{s}_{y1} \cos(\theta \hat{K}) - \hat{s}_{z1} \sin(\theta \hat{K}). \quad (\text{A5})$$

This time dependence of the operator $\hat{s}_{y1}$ gives the expectation values for the operators $\hat{S}_y^2$ and $\hat{S}_y \hat{S}_x$ as follow

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \hat{S}_y^2 \rangle &= \frac{N}{4} + \frac{N(N-1)}{8} (1 - \cos^{N-2} \theta), \\ \langle \hat{S}_y \hat{S}_x \rangle &= \langle \hat{S}_x \hat{S}_y \rangle^* = i \frac{N}{4} \cos^{N-1} \frac{\theta}{2} \\ &\quad + \frac{N(N-1)}{4} \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \cos^{N-2} \frac{\theta}{2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A6})$$

Plugging Eqs. (A3) and (A6) into Eq. (A2) we obtain the squeezing parameter $\xi_{\text{su}(2)}^2$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_{\text{su}(2)}^2(N, \theta) &= 1 - \frac{1}{4}(N-1) \\ &\quad \times \left[\sqrt{(1 - \cos^{N-2} \theta)^2 + 16 \sin^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \cos^{2N-4} \frac{\theta}{2}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - (1 - \cos^{N-2} \theta) \right], \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A7})$$

and it can be found in Ref. [45]. In the case of spin-1/2, the minimum attainable value of the squeezing parameter $\xi_{\text{su}(2)}^2$ for large N is given in Ref. [42] as

$$\xi_{\text{su}(2), \text{min}}^2(N) \simeq \frac{9^{1/3}}{2} N^{-2/3}. \quad (\text{A8})$$

This asymptotic behavior is depicted in Fig. 1 by yellow solid line whereas exact values obtained from Eq. (A7) are plotted by square boxes.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank the Robert A. Welch Foundation (Grant No. A-1261 and No. A-1547), and the AFOSR award (No FA9550-20-1-0366) for financial support. The research has also received funding from the National University of Mongolia under grant agreement P2020-3967. TKB thanks M. O. Scully for many years of advice and support through the Herman F. Heep and Minnie Belle Heep Texas A&M University Endowed Fund held/administered by the Texas A&M Foundation.

-
- [1] D. J. Wineland, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, F. L. Moore, and D. J. Heinzen, *Phys. Rev. A* **46**, R6797 (1992).
 - [2] D. J. Wineland, J. J. Bollinger, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Heinzen, *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, 67 (1994).
 - [3] G. S. Agarwal and M. O. Scully, *Phys. Rev. A* **53**, 467 (1996).
 - [4] D. Ulam-Orgikh and M. Kitagawa, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 052106 (2001).
 - [5] K. Qu and G. S. Agarwal, *Opt. Lett.* **38**, 2563 (2013).
 - [6] W. Wasilewski, K. Jensen, H. Krauter, J. J. Renema, M. V. Balabas, and E. S. Polzik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 133601 (2010).
 - [7] C. M. Caves, *Phys. Rev. D* **23**, 1693 (1981).
 - [8] L. Barsotti, J. Harms, and R. Schnabel, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **82**, 016905 (2018).
 - [9] M. Tse and et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* (2019).
 - [10] F. Acernese and et al., *Phys. Rev. Lett.* (2019).
 - [11] J. Appel, P. J. Windpassinger, D. Oblak, U. B. Hoff, N. Kjærgaard, and E. S. Polzik, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **106**, 10960 (2009).
 - [12] M. H. Schleier-Smith, I. D. Leroux, and V. Vuletić, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 073604 (2010).
 - [13] I. Kruse, K. Lange, J. Peise, B. Lücke, L. Pezze, J. Arlt, W. Ertmer, C. Lisdat, L. Santos, A. Smerzi, *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 143004 (2016).
 - [14] D. Gottesman and J. Preskill, “Quantum information with continuous variables,” (Springer, Dordrecht, 2003) Chap. Secure Quantum Key Distribution using Squeezed States, pp. 317–356.
 - [15] R. E. Slusher, L. W. Hollberg, B. Yurke, J. C. Mertz, and J. F. Valley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **55**, 2409 (1985).
 - [16] A. Kuzmich, K. Mølmer, and E. S. Polzik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 4782 (1997).
 - [17] J. Hald, J. L. Sørensen, C. Schori, and E. S. Polzik, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 1319 (1999).
 - [18] A. Sørensen and K. Mølmer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 2274 (1999).
 - [19] K. Hammerer, K. Mølmer, E. S. Polzik, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 044304 (2004).
 - [20] I. D. Leroux, M. H. Schleier-Smith, and V. Vuletić, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104**, 073602 (2010).
 - [21] O. Hosten, N. J. Engelsen, R. Krishnakumar, and M. A. Kasevich, *Nature* **529**, 505 (2016).
 - [22] L. Pezzè, A. Smerzi, M. K. Oberthaler, R. Schmied, and P. Treutlein, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **90**, 035005 (2018).
 - [23] A. Z. Goldberg, P. De La Hoz, G. Björk, A. B. Klimov, M. Grassl, G. Leuchs, and L. L. Sánchez-Soto, *Adv. Opt. Photonics* **13**, 1 (2021).
 - [24] G. Vitagliano, P. Hyllus, I. L. Egusquiza, and G. Tóth, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 240502 (2011).
 - [25] G. Colangelo, R. J. Sewell, N. Behbood, F. M. Ciurana, G. Triginer, and M. W. Mitchell, *New J. Phys.* **15**, 103007 (2013).
 - [26] E. Yukawa, M. Ueda, and K. Nemoto, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 033629 (2013).
 - [27] G. Vitagliano, I. Apellaniz, I. L. Egusquiza, and G. Tóth, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 032307 (2014).
 - [28] Y. Huang, H.-N. Xiong, Z. Sun, and X. Wang, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 023622 (2015).
 - [29] E. Yukawa and K. Nemoto, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **49**, 255301 (2016).
 - [30] D. Kajtoch and E. Witkowska, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 023627 (2016).
 - [31] C. Orzel, A. K. Tuchman, M. L. Fenselau, M. Yasuda, and M. A. Kasevich, *Science* **291**, 2386 (2001).
 - [32] C. Gross, T. Zibold, E. Nicklas, J. Estève, and M. K. Oberthaler, *Nature* **464**, 1165 (2010).
 - [33] M. F. Riedel, P. Böhi, Y. Li, T. W. Hänsch, A. Sinatra, and P. Treutlein, *Nature* **464**, 1170 (2010).
 - [34] C. D. Hamley, C. S. Gerving, T. M. Hoang, E. M. Bookjans, and M. S. Chapman, *Nat. Phys.* **8**, 305 (2012).
 - [35] Y. Huang, H.-N. Xiong, Y. Yang, Z.-D. Hu, and Z. Xi, *Sci. Rep.* **7**, 43159 (2017).
 - [36] Y.-Q. Zou, L.-N. Wu, Q. Liu, X.-Y. Luo, S.-F. Guo, J.-H. Cao, M. K. Tey, and L. You, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U. S. A.* **115**, 6381 (2018).
 - [37] R. Barakat, *Opt. Commun.* **23**, 147 (1977).
 - [38] M. R. Dennis, *J. Opt. A: Pure Appl. Opt.* **6**, S26 (2004).
 - [39] B. Christian, *Fundamentals of Polarized Light: A Statistical Optics Approach* (Johh Wiley & Sons, INC., 1998).
 - [40] J. J. Gil, A. T. Friberg, A. Norrman, and T. Setälä, *New J. Phys.* (2021).
 - [41] E. J. Davis, G. Bentsen, L. Homeier, T. Li, and M. H. Schleier-Smith, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 010405 (2019).
 - [42] M. Kitagawa and M. Ueda, *Phys. Rev. A* **47**, 5138 (1993).
 - [43] G. S. Agarwal, “Quantum optics,” (Cambridge University Press, 2013) Chap. Decoherence and Disentanglement in two-level systems, pp. 370–384.
 - [44] G. S. Agarwal, “Quantum optics,” (Cambridge University Press, 2013) Chap. Quantum coherence, interference, and squeezing in two-level systems, pp. 242–266.
 - [45] J. Ma, X. Wang, C. Sun, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rep.* **509**, 89 (2011).