

Entanglement is protected by acceleration-induced transparency in thermal field

Yongjie Pan^{1,2}, Baocheng Zhang^{1,*} and Qingyu Cai^{2,3,4†}

¹*School of Mathematics and Physics, China University of Geosciences, Wuhan 430074, China*

²*Center for Theoretical Physics, Hainan University, Haikou 570228, China*

³*School of Information and Communication Engineering, Hainan University, Haikou 570228, China and*

⁴*Peng Huanwu Center for Fundamental Theory, Hefei 230026, China*

The acceleration-induced transparency (AIT) effect has been suggested recently to amplify the transition probability of the two-level detector and offers a potential avenue for the experimental detection of the Unruh effect. In this paper, we explore the influence of the AIT effect on quantum entanglement between two detectors accelerated in a thermal field background, since the thermal background field cannot be avoided completely in any experiments. Interestingly, we find that although the background thermal field generally degrade the entanglement between the detectors, the AIT effect can effectively protect it.

I. INTRODUCTION

The Unruh effect predicts that an uniformly accelerated observer perceives the Minkowski vacuum as a thermal bath with temperature $T = a/2\pi$, where a denotes the proper acceleration [1]. This remarkable effect reveals profound connections between quantum field theory and general relativity, demonstrating the observer-dependent nature of quantum vacuum. Not only does it validate nontrivial aspects of quantum field theory in non-inertial frames, but also establishes a paradigmatic framework for studying black hole thermodynamics (e.g., Hawking radiation), thereby deepening our understanding of spacetime, gravity, and quantum theory. However, experimental verification remains challenging since achieving the required acceleration ($\sim 10^{20}$ m/s²) exceeds current technological capabilities. This makes the search for feasible indirect detection methods a central problem in contemporary research.

Recent studies suggest that acceleration-induced transparency (AIT) may provide a pathway to detect the acceleration-dependent response of the Unruh-DeWitt (UDW) detectors [2, 3]. For a detector undergoing non-uniform acceleration in a multi-particle field, the transition from ground to excited state receives two distinct contributions, the stimulated absorption (that is the energy exchange with field quanta proportional to particle number) and the Unruh contribution (that is the acceleration-driven excitation inherent to non-inertial motion). The AIT phenomenon occurs when the stimulated absorption is suppressed while the Unruh term gets amplified by a factor of $(\langle n \rangle + 1)$, where $\langle n \rangle$ represents the mean particle number in the field. Crucially, for sufficiently large $\langle n \rangle$, this amplification could render the detector's acceleration response experimentally measurable in the near future.

The influence of uniformly accelerated motion on quan-

tum entanglement has been extensively studied in various contexts. Notable examples include the Unruh effect [4–6] and anti-Unruh effects [7–9], as well as scenarios in curved spacetimes such as near Schwarzschild black holes [10, 11]. Overall, testing the Unruh effect through acceleration-induced changes in entanglement is still beyond the reach of current experimental technology. However, since entanglement is fragile, the degradation of entanglement due to acceleration or gravity is indeed worth studying, especially in the presence of a thermal background field. The AIT effect indicates that acceleration-induced physical effects can be amplified in a thermal field. This motivates our investigation into how entanglement between accelerated detectors is affected by AIT in a thermal background—whether it leads to more severe degradation or provides a certain degree of protection—is the main focus of our study. Our results reveal that AIT not only facilitates experimental detection of UDW detector responses but also protects entanglement between accelerated detectors.

For different field particle distributions, such as in squeezed states, coherent states, and thermal states, the amplification effect of field particles on UDW detector responses differs [12]. Moreover, the thermal effects from background fields and the Unruh effect appear to produce entirely different outcomes for quantum entanglement, with existing discussions for uniform acceleration cases [13, 14]. We therefore investigate entanglement evolution under uniform acceleration when AIT occurs. This is particularly relevant for thermal field states, where detector entanglement is influenced by two thermal effects: the Unruh-induced thermal effect, and the background thermal field effect. Both effects typically degrade entanglement. However, the emergence of AIT suppresses partial contributions from the thermal background, leading to qualitatively different entanglement dynamics.

This paper is organized as follows. First, in Sec. II, We have systematically reviewed the response of accelerated detectors interacting with multi-particle fields. In Sec. III, we investigated the AIT phenomenon for fields prepared in both number states and thermal states. Sec. IV presents our analysis of entanglement dynamics, demonstrating how the AIT mechanism can protect detector-

*Electronic address: zhangbaocheng@cug.edu.cn

†Electronic address: qycail@hainanu.edu.cn

detector entanglement. Furthermore, we examined the entanglement degradation caused by thermal effects in background fields. Finally, we present our conclusions in Sec. V. In this paper, we use units with $c = \hbar = k_B = 1$.

II. THE DETECTOR MODEL

The model of the UDW detector can be embodied by a pointlike two-level quantum system. Its interaction with the background field is expressed by the Hamiltonian [3, 15],

$$H_{int} = \lambda \chi(\tau) \hat{\mu}(\tau) \hat{\phi}(t(\tau), x(\tau)), \quad (1)$$

where λ is the coupling constant between the accelerated detector and the scalar field, $\hat{\mu}(\tau) = e^{i\Omega\tau} \hat{\sigma}_+ + e^{-i\Omega\tau} \hat{\sigma}_-$ represents the detector's monopole moment with σ_{\pm} being $SU(2)$ ladder operators. The detector possesses two distinct energy levels denoted by the ground $|g\rangle$ and excited $|e\rangle$ state, respectively, separated by an energy gap Ω in the detector's rest frame. $\hat{\phi}(t(\tau), x(\tau)) = \int dk \left(e^{-i\omega_k t + i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + e^{i\omega_k t - i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger \right)$ is the field operator in which $t(\tau)$, $x(\tau)$ represents the detector's trajectory. $\chi(\tau)$ is the switching function. In this paper, we set $\chi(\tau)$ to be equal to 1 without affecting our conclusions. Restricting attention to the weak-coupling regime, the transition amplitude for the process $|\psi_i\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_f\rangle$ is given as,

$$\mathcal{A}_{i \rightarrow f} = \int \langle \psi_f | \hat{H}_{int}(\tau) | \psi_i \rangle d\tau = \int dk \mathcal{A}_{i \rightarrow f}(\mathbf{k}), \quad (2)$$

$$\mathcal{A}_{i \rightarrow f}(\mathbf{k}) = \lambda \int d\tau \langle \psi_f | (e^{i\Omega\tau} \hat{\sigma}_+ + h.c.) (e^{-i\omega_k t + i\mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}} \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} + h.c.) | \psi_i \rangle, \quad (3)$$

where \mathbf{k} ($\omega_{\mathbf{k}}$) is the momentum (frequency) of a field quantum at the proper time τ . Note that in this paper, we only consider the massless scalar field with the relation, $\omega_{\mathbf{k}} = k$. Further, the amplitude can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}_{i \rightarrow f}(\mathbf{k}) &= \lambda [I_-(\Omega, \mathbf{k}) \langle \psi_f | \hat{\sigma}_+ \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}} | \psi_i \rangle + h.c.] \\ &+ \lambda [I_+(\Omega, \mathbf{k}) \langle \psi_f | \hat{\sigma}_+ \hat{a}_{\mathbf{k}}^\dagger | \psi_i \rangle + h.c.]. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Note that both rotating-wave terms (first line) and counter-rotating-wave terms (second line) contribute in general, weighted by I_{\pm} respectively,

$$I_{\pm}(\Omega, \mathbf{k}) = \int d\tau e^{i\Omega\tau \pm i k^\mu x_\mu(\tau)}, \quad (5)$$

where $k^\mu x_\mu(\tau) = \omega_{\mathbf{k}} t(\tau) - \mathbf{k} \cdot \mathbf{x}(\tau)$.

For a detector moving within a multi-particle field, the evolution of the total system state is governed by the time-evolution operator. To first-order perturbation theory, this operator expands as

$$U = I - i \int d\tau H_I(\tau) + O(\lambda^2). \quad (6)$$

In the interaction picture, this evolution is described by [12]

$$\begin{aligned} U|g\rangle|n_k\rangle &= |g\rangle|n_k\rangle - i\sqrt{n_k} I_- |e\rangle|n_k - 1\rangle \\ &- i\sqrt{n_k + 1} I_+ |e\rangle|n_k + 1\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (7a)$$

$$\begin{aligned} U|e\rangle|n_k\rangle &= |e\rangle|n_k\rangle - i\sqrt{n_k + 1} I_-^* |g\rangle|n_k + 1\rangle \\ &- i\sqrt{n_k} I_+^* |g\rangle|n_k - 1\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (7b)$$

where $|n_k\rangle$ is the Fock state of the field that indicates the presence of n photons in the k mode. In the Eqs. (7a) and (7b), the second and third terms on the right side represent the rotating-wave and counter-rotating-wave terms, respectively. For instance, the second term in Eq. (7a) signifies the absorption of energy by the detector from the field, causing a transition from the ground state to the excited state, commonly referred to as the stimulated absorption term [3]. The third term in Eq. (7a) accounts for the contribution of the Unruh effect, which arises from the accelerated motion of the detector within the photon field, known as the stimulated Unruh effect term. Equation (7b) can be interpreted in a similarly way.

From Eq. (7a), the transition probability from the ground state $|g\rangle$ to the excited state $|e\rangle$ is given by

$$P_{|g\rangle \rightarrow |e\rangle} = n_k |I_-(\Omega, \mathbf{k})|^2 + (n_k + 1) |I_+(\Omega, \mathbf{k})|^2, \quad (8)$$

where I_- corresponds to the stimulated absorption term and I_+ represents the Unruh effect contribution. When the detector undergoes uniform acceleration in the vacuum field ($n_k = 0$), its worldline follows

$$t(\tau) = a^{-1} \sinh(a\tau), \quad z(\tau) = a^{-1} \cosh(a\tau), \quad (9)$$

and the detector's transition probability becomes:

$$P_{|g\rangle \rightarrow |e\rangle} = \sum_k |I_{(+,k)}|^2. \quad (10)$$

Substituting the uniformly accelerated worldline of the detector into the transition amplitude in Eq. (5), we obtain

$$P_{|g\rangle \rightarrow |e\rangle} = \frac{2\pi}{\Omega a (e^{\Omega/k_B T_U} - 1)} \quad (11)$$

This corresponds to a Bose-Einstein distribution at a temperature $T_U = a/2\pi$. This implies that the conventional Unruh effect, which arises from a uniformly accelerating motion of the detector in vacuum, is equivalent to the detector being immersed in a thermal bath at a temperature of T_U .

III. ACCELERATION-INDUCED TRANSPARENCY

For fields containing particles, the field quanta amplify both the stimulated absorption term by a factor of $\langle n \rangle$

and the Unruh term by $(\langle n \rangle + 1)$. Concurrently, Barbara *et al.* [3] proposed the AIT phenomenon. AIT occurs under specific conditions where the stimulated absorption contribution to the transition probability becomes vanishingly small ($I_- \rightarrow 0$), while the Unruh term remains non-zero ($I_+ \neq 0$). Mathematically, this is characterized by the ratio $I_-/I_+ \rightarrow 0$. During AIT, only the Unruh term contributes to the detector's transition probability, amplified by $(\langle n \rangle + 1)$, which facilitates experimental detection of detector responses [3].

From the transition amplitude (5), the distinction between stimulated absorption and Unruh contributions primarily depends on the detector's worldline. Defining $\pi(\tau) = k^\mu x_\mu(\tau)$ as the phase function (where $\dot{\pi}(\tau) = \text{constant}$ represents inertial motion), we consider the standard scenario for the Unruh effect with the uniformly accelerated worldline in Eq. (9). Substituting this into the Unruh term coefficient (5) yields

$$I_+(\Omega, \mathbf{k}) = \frac{-i}{4a\pi\sqrt{\pi}} e^{-\frac{i}{a}} e^{i\frac{\Omega}{a} \ln(\frac{-i}{a})} \Gamma(-i\Omega/a), \quad (12)$$

where $\Gamma(z)$ denotes the complex gamma function [16, 17].

To realize the AIT effect, we choose a worldline with non-uniform acceleration

$$\dot{\pi}(\tau) := k \begin{cases} v_0 & \tau < 0 \\ v_0 + a_1\tau & \tau \in [0, T_1) \\ v_1 + a_2(\tau - T_1) & \tau \in [T_1, T_2) \\ v_2 & \tau \geq T_2 \end{cases}. \quad (13)$$

This worldline indicates: in the initial stage, the detector moves inertially with speed $s_0 = 1 - v_0$; then at time T_1 begins uniformly accelerated motion with acceleration a_1 until the speed changes to $s_1 = 1 - v_1$; subsequently undergoes another uniformly accelerated motion with different acceleration a_2 ; and finally moves inertially with speed $s_2 = 1 - v_2$.

For massless scalar fields, this phase function $\pi(\tau) = k^\mu x_\mu$ simplifies to $\pi(\tau) = k^0 (x^0(\tau) - \sum_i x^i(\tau))$. Compared with the calculation process of the Unruh effect, the most significant difference is that the acceleration is non-uniform and includes phases of inertial motion, where the acceleration process contains both deceleration and acceleration, ending with inertial motion.

Since the thermal background cannot be neglected in actual experiments, we consider AIT phenomenon for detectors moving in thermal fields which is expressed in terms of the Fock state basis as

$$\rho_k = \sum_{n_k} (1 - e^{-\beta\omega_k}) e^{-n_k\beta\omega_k} |n_k\rangle \langle n_k|, \quad (14)$$

where $\beta = 1/T$ is the inverse temperature of the background field. The expectation value of the average particle number operator in the thermal state is

$$\langle n_k \rangle = \text{Tr}(\rho_k n_k) = \frac{1}{e^{\beta\omega_k} - 1}. \quad (15)$$




FIG. 1: Acceleration-induced transparency in thermal fields. The parameter is set to $\beta = 0.1$, $v_0 = 1.041$, $v_1 = 1.070$, $T_1 = 9.74350$, $T_2 = 1305.413$.

The transition probability for a detector moving in the thermal field is calculated to be

$$P_{TS} = \frac{1}{e^{\beta\omega_k} - 1} |I_{(-,k)}|^2 + \left(\frac{1}{e^{\beta\omega_k} - 1} + 1 \right) |I_{(+,k)}|^2, \quad (16)$$

where the first term represents stimulated absorption while the second term corresponds to the Unruh contribution. For the AIT effect to occur in the thermal field, the stimulated absorption has to be suppressed, which can be ensured by a small amplitude $|I_-|$ seen from $\frac{\text{Abs term}}{\text{Unruh term}} = e^{-\beta\omega_k} \frac{|I_-|^2}{|I_+|^2}$.

After calculation, we obtain the transition amplitude for an accelerating detector in the thermal field, as shown in Fig. 1. It can be observed that the contribution from the stimulated absorption process becomes significantly smaller than that of the Unruh process at a specific energy gap where AIT effect occurs.

IV. ENTANGLEMENT

Now we consider the evolution of quantum entangled states between two detectors A and B along the worldlines which can lead to AIT. First, assume the detectors' initial state

$$|\phi\rangle = (\alpha|g\rangle|e\rangle + \beta|e\rangle|g\rangle), \quad (17)$$

where α and β are normalization coefficients satisfying $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. For fields prepared in the Fock states, the complete system's state evolution follows $U_A^* U_B^* |\phi\rangle \langle \phi| U_A U_B$, where the time evolution operators $U_i, i \in \{A, B\}$ are given by Eq. (6).

The initial entangled state from Eq. (17), moving along worldline (13) and interacting with the field (par-

ticles), evolves into

$$\rho_{out} = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{gggg}^{11} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{eeeg}^{41} \\ 0 & \rho_{gege}^{22} & \rho_{geeg}^{32} & 0 \\ 0 & \rho_{geeg}^{23} & \rho_{egeg}^{33} & 0 \\ \rho_{ggee}^{14} & 0 & 0 & \rho_{eeee}^{44} \end{pmatrix} \quad (18)$$

with the matrix basis $\{|gg\rangle, |ge\rangle, |eg\rangle, |ee\rangle\}$. And each element is obtained as follows

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_{gggg}^{11} &= \alpha^2(\langle n_B \rangle |I_{+,B}|^2 + (\langle n_B \rangle + 1) |I_{-,B}|^2) + \beta^2 \langle n_A \rangle |I_{+,A}|^2 + \beta^2 (\langle n_A \rangle + 1) |I_{-,A}|^2, \\ \rho_{eeeg}^{41} &= (2\langle n_B \rangle + 1) \alpha^* \beta I_{-,B} I_{+,B} + \beta^* \alpha (2\langle n_A \rangle + 1) I_{+,A} I_{-,A}, \\ \rho_{gege}^{22} &= \alpha^2 + \beta^2 |I_{+,A}|^2 \langle n_A \rangle (\langle n_B \rangle + 1) |I_{+,B}|^2 + \beta^2 |I_{-,A}|^2 \langle n_A \rangle \langle n_B \rangle |I_{+,B}|^2 \\ &\quad + \beta^2 |I_{-,A}|^2 (\langle n_A \rangle + 1) (\langle n_B \rangle + 1) |I_{+,B}|^2 + \beta^2 |I_{-,A}|^2 \langle n_B \rangle (\langle n_A \rangle + 1) |I_{-,B}|^2, \\ \rho_{egeg}^{32} &= \alpha^* \beta + \beta^* \alpha \langle n_A \rangle (\langle n_B \rangle + 1) I_{+,A} I_{+,B}^* I_{-,A} I_{-,B}^* + \beta^* \alpha \langle n_A \rangle \langle n_B \rangle I_{+,A} I_{-,B}^* I_{-,A} I_{+,B}^* \\ &\quad + \beta^* \alpha (\langle n_A \rangle + 1) (\langle n_B \rangle + 1) I_{-,A} I_{+,B}^* I_{+,A} I_{-,B}^* + \beta^* \alpha (\langle n_A \rangle + 1) \langle n_B \rangle I_{-,A} I_{-,B}^* I_{+,A} I_{+,B}^*, \\ \rho_{geeg}^{23} &= \alpha \beta^* + \beta \alpha^* \langle n_A \rangle (\langle n_B \rangle + 1) I_{+,A}^* I_{+,B} I_{-,A}^* I_{-,B} + \beta \alpha^* \langle n_A \rangle \langle n_B \rangle I_{+,A}^* I_{-,B} I_{-,A}^* I_{+,B} \\ &\quad + \beta \alpha^* (\langle n_A \rangle + 1) (\langle n_B \rangle + 1) I_{-,A}^* I_{+,B} I_{+,A}^* I_{-,B} + \beta \alpha^* (\langle n_A \rangle + 1) \langle n_B \rangle I_{-,A}^* I_{-,B} I_{+,A}^* I_{+,B}, \\ \rho_{egeg}^{33} &= \beta^2 + \alpha^2 |I_{-,A}|^2 \langle n_A \rangle (\langle n_B \rangle + 1) |I_{-,B}|^2 + \alpha^2 |I_{-,A}|^2 \langle n_A \rangle \langle n_B \rangle |I_{+,B}|^2 \\ &\quad + \alpha^2 |I_{+,A}|^2 (\langle n_A \rangle + 1) (\langle n_B \rangle + 1) |I_{-,B}|^2 + \alpha^2 |I_{+,A}|^2 (\langle n_A \rangle + 1) \langle n_B \rangle |I_{+,B}|^2, \\ \rho_{ggee}^{14} &= (2\langle n_B \rangle + 1) \alpha \beta^* I_{-,B}^* I_{+,B} + \beta \alpha^* (2\langle n_A \rangle + 1) I_{+,A}^* I_{-,A}, \\ \rho_{eeee}^{44} &= \beta^2 (\langle n_B \rangle |I_{-,B}|^2 + (\langle n_B \rangle + 1) |I_{+,B}|^2) + \alpha^2 (\langle n_A \rangle |I_{-,A}|^2 + (\langle n_A \rangle + 1) |I_{+,A}|^2). \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle n \rangle$ represents the expectation value of the particle number operator in the field state. Due to the characteristic “X” pattern formed by its non-zero matrix elements, this state is commonly referred to as an “X-state” [18, 19]. For notational simplicity, we have omitted the normalization factor $Tr(\rho_{out}) = \rho_{gggg}^{11} + \rho_{gege}^{22} + \rho_{egeg}^{33} + \rho_{eeee}^{44}$ here.

We use the concurrence [20] as the method of entanglement measure for the density operator ρ_{out} . The concurrence C of the matrix ρ_{out} can be calculated using the formula [21–23]

$$C = 2 * \text{Max}\{0, C_1, C_2\}, \quad (19)$$

where $C_1 = |\rho_{geeg}^{23}| - \sqrt{\rho_{gggg}^{11} \rho_{eeee}^{44}}$ and $C_2 = |\rho_{eeeg}^{41}| - \sqrt{\rho_{egeg}^{33} \rho_{gege}^{22}}$. Substituting the matrix elements from ρ_{out} , we have the concurrence of state (18).

For entangled states undergoing acceleration in thermal fields, the degradation of entanglement arises from both the thermal radiation of the background field and the Unruh effect. Figure 2 shows the residual entanglement after the state has been accelerated in the thermal field. It is evident that a portion of the entanglement is preserved at a specific energy level where the AIT effect occurs. This suggests that the AIT effect offers a degree of protection to entanglement, as the entanglement is almost completely destroyed at other energy levels due to enhanced detector transitions.

However, this kind of entanglement protection cannot be sustained at all temperatures. When the tempera-




FIG. 2: Entanglement behavior in thermal fields. The background field temperature $\beta = 0.3$ and the other parameters are the same as in Fig.1

ture of the background thermal field becomes sufficiently high, the entanglement is still destroyed, even if the conditions required for the AIT effect are satisfied. This is illustrated in Fig. 3, which clearly shows how the residual entanglement varies with the field temperature. As the temperature increases, the residual entanglement decreases monotonically and nearly vanishes beyond a critical temperature threshold.




FIG. 3: Residual entanglement as a function of background field temperature. The detector's energy gap is fixed at $\Omega = 0.00762$, and the other parameters are the same as in Fig.1

V. CONCLUSION

In this work, we investigate the entanglement dynamics of two initially entangled UDW detectors moving along specially chosen worldlines and analyze the respective contributions of the Unruh effect and thermal background fields. These special worldlines are associated with the AIT effect, whereby, for detectors with specific energy gaps, the stimulated absorption term becomes negligibly small and the induced excitation by the Unruh effect dominates, when the background field is

non-vacuum. In particular, we show that the AIT effect persists even in thermal background fields. When two entangled detectors move under AIT conditions, our results reveal that although the existence of field particles enhance the detectors' thermal response and leads to the complete loss of entanglement in general, quantum entanglement can still survive partially for detectors with specific energy levels required by the AIT effect. Furthermore, we examine the impact of the field temperature on entanglement and find that the residual entanglement enabled by the AIT effect decreases with increasing temperature and vanishes beyond a critical temperature threshold.

VI. ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant Nos. 12375057 and 12047502), and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities, China University of Geosciences (Wuhan).

VII. DATA AVAILABILITY

Data sharing is not applicable to this article as no datasets were generated or analyzed during the current study.

-
- [1] W. G. Unruh, Notes on black-hole evaporation, *Phys. Rev. D* **14**, 870 (1976).
 - [2] B. S. DeWitt, *Quantum gravity: the new synthesis*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1979).
 - [3] B. Šoda, V. Sudhir, and A. Kempf, Acceleration-induced effects in stimulated light-matter interactions, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **128**, 163603 (2022).
 - [4] L. C. B. Crispino, A. Higuchi, and G. E. A. Matsas, The Unruh effect and its applications, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **80**, 787 (2008).
 - [5] J. Wang and J. Jing, Multipartite entanglement of fermionic systems in noninertial frames, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 022314 (2011).
 - [6] B. Richter and Y. Omar, Degradation of entanglement between two accelerated parties: Bell states under the Unruh effect, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 022334 (2015).
 - [7] T. Li, B. Zhang, and L. You, Would quantum entanglement be increased by anti-Unruh effect?, *Phys. Rev. D* **97**, 045005 (2018).
 - [8] Y. Pan and B. Zhang, Influence of acceleration on multi-body entangled quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 062111 (2020).
 - [9] J. Yan, B. Zhang, and Q. Cai, Reveal the lost entanglement for accelerated atoms in the high-dimensional spacetime, *Sci. China-Phys. Mech. Astron.* **67**, 260411 (2024).
 - [10] I. Fuentes-Schuller and R. B. Mann, Alice falls into a black hole: entanglement in noninertial frames, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 120404 (2005).
 - [11] E. Martín-Martínez, L. J. Garay, and J. Leon, Unveiling quantum entanglement degradation near a Schwarzschild black hole, *Phys. Rev. D* **82**, 064006 (2010).
 - [12] Y. Pan and B. Zhang, Enhanced anti-Unruh effect by simulated light-matter interaction, *Phys. Rev. D* **107**, 085001 (2023).
 - [13] W. G. Brenna, R. B. Mann, and E. Martín-Martínez, Anti-Unruh Phenomena, *Phys. Lett. B* **757**, 307 (2016).
 - [14] Y. Pan and B. Zhang, Anti-Unruh effect in the thermal background, *Phys. Rev. D* **104**, 125014 (2021).
 - [15] N. D. Birrell and P. C. W. Davies, *Quantum fields in curved space*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 1984).
 - [16] A. Ahmadzadegan and A. Kempf, On the Unruh effect, trajectories and information, *Class. Quantum Grav.* **35**, 184002 (2018).
 - [17] F. Giacomini and A. Kempf, Second-quantized Unruh-DeWitt detectors and their quantum reference frame transformations, *Phys. Rev. D* **105**, 125001 (2022).
 - [18] R. Tanaś and Z. Ficek, Stationary two-atom entanglement induced by nonclassical two-photon correlations, *J. Opt. B* **6**, S610 (2004).
 - [19] M. Ali, A. R. P. Rau, and G. Alber, Quantum discord for two-qubit x states, *Phys. Rev. A* **81**, 042105 (2010).
 - [20] W. K. Wootters, Entanglement of Formation of an Ar-

- bitrary State of Two Qubits, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 2245 (1998).
- [21] R. Tanaś and Z. Ficek, Entangling two atoms via spontaneous emission, J. Opt. B **6**, S90 (2004).
- [22] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Evolution from entanglement to decoherence of bipartite mixed “x” states, arXiv: quant-ph/0503089 (2005).
- [23] T. Yu and J. H. Eberly, Sudden death of entanglement: classical noise effects, Opt. Commun. **264**, 393 (2006).