Self-correcting GKP qubit and gates in a driven-dissipative circuit

Frederik Nathan,^{1,2} Liam O'Brien,² Kyungjoo Noh,³ Matthew H.

Matheny,³ Arne L. Grimsmo,³ Liang Jiang,^{3,4} and Gil Refael^{2,3}

¹Center for Quantum Devices and NNF Quantum Computing Programme,

Niels Bohr Institute, University of Copenhagen, 2100 Copenhagen, Denmark

²Department of Physics and Institute for Quantum Information and Matter,

California Institute of Technology, Pasadena, CA 91125, USA

³AWS Center for Quantum Computing, Pasadena, CA, 91125, USA

⁴Pritzker School of Molecular Engineering, The University of Chicago, Chicago, Illinois 60637, USA

We propose a circuit architecture for a dissipatively error-corrected GKP qubit. The device consists of a high-impedance LC circuit coupled to a Josephson junction and a resistor via a controllable switch. When the switch is activated via a particular family of stepwise protocols, the resistor absorbs all noise-induced entropy, resulting in dissipative error correction of both phase and amplitude errors. This leads to an exponential increase of qubit lifetime, reaching beyond 10ms in simulations with near-feasible parameters. We show that the lifetime remains exponentially long in the presence of extrinsic noise and device/control imperfections (e.g., due to parasitics and finite control bandwidth) under specific thresholds. In this regime, lifetime is likely only limited by phase slips and quasiparticle tunneling. We show that the qubit can be read out and initialized via measurement of the supercurrent in the Josephson junction. We finally show that the qubit supports native self-correcting single-qubit Clifford gates, where dissipative error-correction of control noise leads to exponential suppression of gate infidelity.

Quantum error correction is crucial for quantum computing, due to the inevitability of noise from, e.g., uncontrolled degrees of freedom, imperfect control, or fluctuations of device parameters [1–7]. Many approachessuch as surface codes—rely on *active correction*, which eliminate noise-induced entropy via readout/feedback [6-8]. Requirements for rapid readout, extensive control, and complex device architectures, make the scalability of these approaches a significant challenge [7, 9, 10]. On the other hand, classical bits are often intrinsically stable due to dissipation [11, 12]: in a magnetic hard-disk, e.g., noise-induced magnetic fluctuations are damped dissipatively before they accumulate to generate bit flips, leading to extreme robustness. Similarly harnessing dissipation for quantum error correction is a challenging, but desirable, goal [13–25].

In this work, we propose an architecture for a dissipatively error-corrected qubit, based on a simple circuit device, shown in Fig. 1(a). The device consists of an LC resonator with impedance close to $h/2e^2 \approx 12.91 \,\mathrm{k\Omega}$, connected to a Josephson junction and a dissipative element through a controllable switch. Quantum information is encoded via a thermal mixture of generalized Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill (GKP) states [26] [see Fig. 1(b)], and can be accessed and initialized via the Josephson junction supercurrent. When the Josephson energy is larger than resistor temperature and LC frequency, the stepwise switch activation protocol in Fig. 1(c) drives the device into a regime of *dissipative error correction*, where noise-induced fluctuations are damped dissipatively without affecting the encoded information. This causes an exponential increase of this coherence time that extends well beyond 10ms in our simulations with near-feasible parameters—even with extrinsic noise present.

The dissipative stabilization protocol corrects both

phase and amplidue errors: each driving period of the switch protocol cyclically permutes the 3 logical Pauli operators, implying phase and amplitude erros appear on equal footting in the device, i.e., $T_1 = T_2$ (see below for details).

To illustrate the potential of the dissipative error correction protocol, in Fig. 1(d) we show representative trajectories of the device with charge noise present, for 3 different values of the resulting loss rate, Γ ; see Eq. (14)]. The data are obtained using simulations with the universal Lindblad equation (ULE) [27]—see caption for parameters. Evidently, coherence time increases dramatically with Γ . Further analysis reveals a clear exponential scaling of coherence time with Γ [Fig. 1(e)], that can extend beyond 10ms. In an upcoming work, we provide analytical support for the observed exponential scaling of lifetime [28].

Interestingly, our qubit supports a native set of Clifford gates, implemented via control of the switch. The resistor dissipatively corrects fluctuations induced by signal imperfections, making the gates exponentially robust against control noise. We show that a different encoding results in a native self-correcting T gate by a similar mechanism [29]. In this way, our device can be viewed as an *integrated, self-corrected quantum processor*, featuring both dissipatively-corrected memory and gates.

Due to its self-correcting properties, our qubit has finite tolerance for device imperfections, including finite switch control resolution (estimated at ~ 100Gs/s [10 ps] for 1GHz resonators), finite quality factor (~ 200), deviations of device inductance and capacitance from targeted values (~ 1-10%), and finite temperatures (up to a third of the Josephson energy)—see Table I for more details.

Our qubit dissipatively corrects errors induced by



FIG. 1. We propose a protocol for realizing a self-correcting GKP qubit in a driven circuit-QED device, shown in (a). (b) Quantum information is encoded in the parity of LC flux, φ , via thermal mixtures of GKP states: red/orange and green/blue indicate possible logical states in the flux potential (black). We show that dissipative error correction emerges when the LC impedance is close to $h/2e^2$ and the switch is modulated as in (c), with $z_{\rm s} \in \mathbb{Z}$ and $\tau_{\rm LC}$ denoting the LC period: (d) The GKP stabilizers S_1 and S_2 (purple, orange) and logical operators $\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z$ (red, blue, green) exhibit a dramatically rise of stability as the resistor-induced loss-rate, Γ , is increased. Plots show single Universal Lindblad equation trajectories with extrinsic charge noise present at strength $10^{-12} e^2/\text{Hz}$, starting from a random high-energy state, with $L = 10 \,\mu\text{H}, C = 60 \,\text{fF}, z_{\text{s}} = 2, E_J/h = 200 \,\text{GHz},$ and $T = 40 \,\mathrm{mK}$. (e) The qubit lifetime for the parameters in (d) scales exponentially with Γ , approaching timescales of $\sim 1 \,\mathrm{s}$ for $\Gamma \gtrsim 1 \,\mathrm{GHz}$. Data points were obtained via averaging over 50-100 trajectories with error bars indicating 95% confidence interval from bootstrap resampling.

finite-order polynomials of charge and flux, such as charge/flux noise or photon loss, while phase-space *non-local* noise, such as quasiparticle poisoning or phase slips, cause logical Pauli errors. Since these events can be rare and controllable [30] and result in Pauli errors, we expect that these noise sources are amenable to active error correction schemes with current technology.

Significant effort has been focused on realizing GKP states in circuit-QED devices, either through readout/feedback [20, 25, 31–34], or autonomous control [35]. There have also been proposals for deterministic protocols generating GKP states through coherent driving protocols [36, 37] or circuits featuring gyrators [38]. Recently, related proposals have been put forward for dissipatively stabilizing GKP states through bath engineering via frequency combs [25] and qubit resets [35]. A key advantage of our proposal is that it realizes dissipative error correction with *generic* thermodynamic baths, through a stepwise switch activation protocol with tolerances for finite bandwidth and control noise, offering a complementary approach with potentially simpler realizations. Our qubit also supports native protected, or self-correcting, single-qubit Clifford gates, potentially simplifying its in-



FIG. 2. Crenellation function used for protected continuousvariable encoding of quantum information via Eqs. (1).

tegration in a quantum processor.

Achieving an efficient Josephson coupler with control resolution ~ 100 Gs/s is a key technological challenge for our device. We speculate that such a device can be realized with a gated superconductor-semiconductor-superconductor junctions [39], high-fidelity controlled SQUIDS, or leveraging the AC Josephson effect. Control resolution in the required 100 Gs/s range has been achieved in the telecommunications industry [40], while control resolutions of 25 Gs/s were recently achieved in a circuit-QED context [41].

Realizing the switch above may carry a significant reward, by enabling a self-correcting quantum information processor with exponentially-scaling fidelity in the presence of noise, control, and device imperfections. By not relying on active error correction to achieve exponential robustness, such a device potentially provides an alternative route to useful-scale quantum computing with a very promising scalability potential.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: in Sec. I we describe how we encode a GKP qubit in an LC resonator; in Sec. II, we introduce the device realizing a dissipatively corrected this GKP qubit and discuss its basic operating principles. In Sec. III, we analyze the dynamics of the device in detail. In Sec. IV, we demonstrate the presence of native, dissipatively-corrected single-qubit Clifford gates in the device, and discuss a scheme for generating dissipatively-corrected T gates by a similar mechanism via a different encoding. In Sec. V, we discuss implementations readout/initialization. In Sec. VI we summarize the device criteria, and estimate relevant operation timescales and noise tolerances, summarized in Table I. Sec. VII provides data from numerical simulations of the device. We conclude with a discussion in Sec. VIII.

I. ENCODING OF QUANTUM INFORMATION

Our qubit is encoded in thermal mixtures of GKP states in an LC resonator [26]. In terms of the resonator flux φ and charge q, the GKP states have their Wigner function support confined near integer multiples of φ/φ_0 and q/e, where e denotes the electron charge, and $\varphi_0 = h/2e$ the flux quantum. The multiple parities define the σ_z and σ_x logical operators, respectively, via

$$\sigma_z = \Xi(\varphi/\varphi_0), \quad \sigma_x = \Xi(q/e), \quad \sigma_y = -i\sigma_z\sigma_x.$$
 (1)

where $\Xi(x) \equiv \operatorname{sgn} \cos(\pi x)$ denotes the *crenellation func*tion (see Fig. 2), which takes value 1 when the closest integer to x is even and value -1 if the closed integer to x is odd [42]. Since $\Xi(x) = -\Xi(x+1)$, the 3 operators above satisfy the Pauli anticommutation relations

$$\{\sigma_i, \sigma_j\} = 2\delta_{ij},\tag{2}$$

and hence form a valid qubit observable. We can encode a ν -dimensional qudit in an analogous fashion; see Sec. IV A for an example. The modular encoding in Eq. (1) allows *thermally mixed* physical states to encode *pure* logical states. This key feature underlies the exponential stability of our qubit.

GKP-encoded information is protected against sufficiently weak noise induced by finite-order polynomials of φ and q, such as charge/flux noise and photon loss-here termed *local noise*. The protection emerges because local noise generates a continuous flow of the system's Wigner function. The logical operators $\{\sigma_i\}$ are unaffected by this flow as long as the system's Wigner function support does not leak across the domain boundaries located at $\varphi = (n_1 + 1/2)\varphi_0$ and $q = (n_2 + 1/2)e$ for integers n_1 and n_2 . Hence, the encoded information is protected as long as the phase-space support of the system remains confined in the span of high-eigenvalue eigenstates of the two *GKP stabilizers*

$$S_1 = \cos\left(2\pi\varphi/\varphi_0\right), \quad S_2 = \cos(2\pi q/e). \tag{3}$$

Henceforth we refer to the mutual high-eigenvalue subspace of S_1 and S_2 as the *code subspace*, and to states within the code subspace as (generalized) GKP states.

In circuit-QED, GKP states can be realized as phasecoherent superpositions of states confined deep within the wells of a Josephson potential. To ensure $\langle S_2 \rangle \approx 1$, a GKP state's restriction to a single well must be approximately identical for nearby wells, up to a well-parity dependent relative amplitude, which encodes the quantum information [43]. The logical states of the qubit, $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, correspond to GKP states with full support in even and odd wells, respectively.

II. SELF-CORRECTING GKP QUBIT

Here we show that GKP states can be dissipatively generated and stabilized in a circuit-QED device. The device is shown in Fig. 1(a), and consists of an LC resonator connected via a switch to a Josephson junction and, capacitively, to a generic dissipative element. Here the dissipative element can, e.g., be a resistor or a transmission line connected to an external reservoir; for simplicity we refer to it as a resistor below. The resulting circuit is described by

$$H(t) = \frac{\varphi^2}{2L} + \frac{q^2}{2C} - w_{\rm s}(t) \left[E_J \cos\left(\frac{2\pi\varphi}{\varphi_0}\right) + \frac{qQ_{\rm R}}{C_R} \right] + H_{\rm R},\tag{4}$$

where L and C denote the inductance and capacitance of the LC circuit, E_J the Josephson energy of the junction, while $w_{\rm s}(t)$ defines the time-dependence of the switch. Additionally, $H_{\rm R}$ denotes the resistor Hamiltonian, C_R the coupler capacitance, and $Q_{\rm R}$ denotes the fluctuating charge on the resistor-side of the coupler.

A. Overview of protocol

To see how the device described by Eq. (4) stabilizes GKP states, first note that activating the switch (setting $w_s = 1$) causes the system to dissipatively relax in the cosine wells from the Josephson potential, confining it in the high-eigenvalue subspace of S_1 . We can stabilize S_2 by subsequently *deactivating* the switch for a quarter of the LC oscillation cycle, $\tau_{\rm LC}/4$. In this deactivated interval, the Hamiltonian generates a $\pi/2$ rotation of phase space, interchanging φ and q, up to a sign and a rescaling defined by the resonator impedance, $\sqrt{L/C}$. Setting

$$\sqrt{\frac{L}{C}} \approx \frac{h}{2e^2},\tag{5}$$

ensures that φ/φ_0 is mapped to q/e and vice versa (up to a sign) [44], leading to an effective interchange of S_1 and S_2 [see Eq. (3)]. Hence that $\langle S_2 \rangle \approx 1$ at the end of the deactivated segment. Reactivating the switch will again relax the system to the high-eigenvalue subspace of S_1 . The system will then be confined in the code subspace provided that $\langle S_2 \rangle$ retains its near-unit value during the second switch-activated interval. As a key result of our work, we show below that $\langle S_2 \rangle \approx 1$ at the end of the second activated interval, if it has duration $\frac{z_{\pi}}{2\pi}\tau_{\rm LC}$ for $z_{\rm s} \in \mathbb{Z}$.

The above analysis implies that the system is stabilized in the GKP code subspace by two cycles of the switch protocol

$$w_{\rm s}(t) \approx \begin{cases} 1, & 0 \leq t < \tau_{\rm s} \\ 0, & \tau_{\rm s} \leq t < \tau_{\rm s} + \frac{1}{4}\tau_{\rm LC} \end{cases} \quad \tau_{\rm s} = \frac{z_{\rm s}}{2\pi}\tau_{\rm LC} \,, \quad (6)$$

Below, we refer to the two ($w_s = 1$ and $w_s = 0$) segments above as the *free* and *stabilizer* segments, respectively.

In Sec. III we explain in detail why $\langle S_2 \rangle \approx 1$ after the second (and all subsequent) stabilizer segments. We provide a heuristic summary here: firstly, the resistor can only very slowly dephase the well index (i.e., flux) of the system, due to its capacitative coupling. As a result, inter-well coherence persists during the stabilizer segment up to small deviations. These deviations from coherence are mapped to flux displacements by the subsequent free segment, and, after that, dissipatively corrected during the following stabilizer segment. While the superposition components of different wells remain effectively phase-coherent, they do acquire deterministic relative phase factors, due to their different inductance energies [see Fig. 4(a)]. At the beginning of the stabilizer



FIG. 3. Schematic illustration of dissipative quantum error correction. (a) Quantum information is encoded in the well parity of the Josephson potential. (b) noise-induced fluctuations in the potential can potentially cause a bit-flip error if accumulating to generate a spill-over between wells. (c) With active error correction, noise-induced entropy is removed via readout/control: a detector monitors for fluctuations and counter-steers against any with appropriate control signals (purple). (d) With *dissipative error correction*, noise-induced entropy is absorbed by thermodynamic reservoirs. Our device achieves this by letting a resistor relax the system towards the center of the Josephson wells, while maintaining coherence. Intermittent segments of free LC evolution interchanges σ_r and σ_z , allowing our protocol to employ this relaxation to correct both phase and bit-flip errors. This causes complete dissipative stabilization.

segment, the buildup of these phase factors cause the expectation value of S_2 (which translates the wavefunction by ± 2 wells) to decay to zero. However, the inductance energies for distinct wells are all squared-integer multiples of $\varepsilon_L = \varphi_0^2/2L$. Phase factors of wells with the same parity (whose inductance energies are congruent modulo $4\varepsilon_L$) align at times $t = 2\pi\hbar z/4\varepsilon_L$ for each integer z. The impedance condition in Eq. (5) fixes $4\varepsilon_L/\hbar = 1/\tau_{\rm LC}$. Thus, S_2 revives for $t = z\tau_{\rm LC}/2\pi$. This revival mechanism is clearly demonstrated in numerical simulations, see Fig. 6(c).

B. Dissipative error correction

Continued operation of our protocol can be viewed as a realization of dissipative error correction, where noiseinduced entropy is absorbed by a thermal bath, rather than a readout/control apparatus (see Fig. 3): To see this, first note from the discussion above that our protocol effectively resets any state into the code subspace every two cycles. Secondly, recall from Sec. I that local noise only generates logical errors if causing the system's phase-space support to leak through the domain boundaries at $\varphi = (n_1 + 1/2)\varphi_0$ and $q = (n_2 + 1/2)e$ for $n_1, n_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$ [see Eq. (1)]. Logical errors can only occur if noise-induced leakage occurs within two cycles when starting from a stabilized state. For noise weaker tan this threshold, we expect exponential suppression of logical error rates.

Importantly, dissipative error correction makes the device resilient to parameter mistargeting (e.g., from parasitics) and to control noise (e.g., from imperfect operation of the switch). The deviations of impedance or control signal can be viewed as noise on par with other extrinsic noise sources; the deviations they cause are dissipatively corrected if below a certain threshold. We estimate the tolerance for these deviations in Sec. VI (see Tab. I), and provide analytic estimates for the induced error rates in a separate work [28]. In particular, this stability means that the native gates described in Sec. IV are self-correcting with exponential suppression of infidelity due to control-noise.

The dissipative error correction described above fails to correct noise from infinite-order polynomials of φ and q, which act nonlocally in phase space. Particularly relevant are quasiparticle poisoning, phase slips, and uncontrolled cooper pair tunneling, which translate q or φ by integer multiples of e or φ_0 , and hence act nonlocally in phase space. For instance, a quasiparticle tunneling into the device at time t during the free segment results in a phase space translation of the final state at the end of the segment given by $(\Delta \varphi, \Delta q) =$ $(\varphi_0 \sin(2\pi f_{\rm LC}t), e\cos(2\pi f_{\rm LC}t));$ this can hence take the system away from the protected code subspace, thereby scrambling the logical information. We hence expect the timescales for uncontrolled cooper pair tunneling, phase slips, and quasiparticle poisoning to provide upper limits on the qubit lifetime. Mitigating these noise sources is thus crucial to achieve significant lifetime enhancement.

III. DEVICE ANALYSIS: COHERENCE-PRESERVING RELAXATION

Here we analyze the dissipative stabilizatin protocol in further detail. In particular, we demonstrate the revival of S_2 during the stabilizer segment—a nontrivial feature crucial for the operation of the protocol.

A. Resistor model

We model the resistor as a Gaussian bath at temperature T, such that the fluctuating charge on the resistorside of the capacitive coupler, $Q_{\rm R}$, is fully parameterized via its power spectral density, $J(\omega)$:

$$\langle Q_{\rm R}^{\dagger}(\omega)Q_{\rm R}(\omega')\rangle_{\rm B} = J(\omega)\delta(\omega-\omega').$$
 (7)

Temperature is encoded in $J(\omega)$ via the detailed-balance condition $J(-\omega) = J(\omega)e^{-\hbar\omega/k_{\rm B}T}$. While any bath can in principle be used, for concreteness, our simulations consider an Ohmic bath where

$$J(\omega) = g^2 \frac{\omega e^{-\frac{\omega^2}{2\Lambda^2}}}{1 - e^{-\beta\omega\hbar}}.$$
(8)



FIG. 4. (a) Basis of approximate low-energy eigenstates of the stabilizer Hamiltonian $H_{\rm s}$, used to analyze the stabilization dynamics in Sec. III (see text for details). The basis state $|m,\mu\rangle$ denotes the μ th harmonic oscillator eigenstate with characteristic width $\varphi_0 \lambda$, centered at $m\varphi_0$, where $\lambda = (h f_{\rm LC} / 4\pi^3 E_J)^{1/4}$. To leading order in λ , their corresponding energy levels under H_s are uniformly spaced by $\varepsilon_0 = \lambda^2 E_J$ for each *m*, with zero-point energy $m^2 \varepsilon_L$, where $\varepsilon_L = \varphi_0^2/2L$. (b) A typical GKP state generated by our protocol (red), corresponding to a logical state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$, and its evolution under the free segment, $U_{\rm LC}$ (blue). The state is a coherent superposition of all states $\{|m, 0\rangle\}$, weighted by an envelope function (dashed line). The free segment effectively maps the Fourier transform of the well wavefunction to the envelope and vice versa, up to a sign and a scaling determined by the LC impedance $\sqrt{L/C} \approx h/2e^2$. This fixes the width of the envelope to be $\varphi_0/\pi\lambda$ (see Appendix D).

Here Λ is a high-frequency cutoff, and g is an effective noise strength of $Q_{\rm R}$.

We model the dissipative dynamics of the system via the universal Lindblad equation (ULE), which is accurate when the effective relaxation rate in the Josephson wells, Γ [see Eq. (14)], is small relative to the inverse bath correlation time ($\sim k_{\rm B}T/h$ for Ohmic baths) [27, 45]. With the ULE approximation, a derivation detailed in Appendix A shows that the density matrix in the stabilizer segment, ρ , evolves according to

$$\partial_t \rho = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [H_{\rm s}, \rho] + \ell \rho \ell^{\dagger} - \frac{1}{2} \{ \ell^{\dagger} \ell, \rho \}, \qquad (9)$$

where

$$H_{\rm s} \equiv \frac{\varphi^2}{2L} + \frac{q^2}{2C} - E_J \cos(2\pi\varphi/\varphi_0) \tag{10}$$

denotes the non-dissipative part of the circuit Hamiltonian with $w_{\rm s} = 1$, $\ell = |\psi_m\rangle\langle\psi_n|(\hbar C_{\rm R})^{-1}\sqrt{2\pi J(E_n - E_m)}\langle\psi_m|q|\psi_n\rangle$ denotes the ULE jump operator, and $\{E_n\}$ and $\{|\psi_n\rangle\}$ denote the energies and eigenstates of H_s .

B. Stabilization dynamics

We now analyze the dynamics of the system in the stabilizer segment, using Eq. (9). To this end, we express ρ in terms of the eigenstates of the effective Harmonic oscillators formed by the wells of the cosine potential. To be specific, we use the basis $\{|m, \mu\rangle\}$, where $|m, \mu\rangle$ is the μ th eigenstate of a Harmonic oscillator centered at $\varphi = m\varphi_0$, with vacuum fluctuation width $\delta\varphi$ [46], where

$$\delta \varphi = \lambda \varphi_0 \quad \text{and} \quad \lambda \equiv \left(\frac{h f_{\text{LC}}}{4\pi^3 E_J}\right)^{1/4}$$
(11)

where $f_{\rm LC} \equiv 1/2\pi\sqrt{LC}$ denotes the bare LC frequency. The dimensionless number λ defines the squeezing parameter for GKP states in our device [See Fig. 4 (a)], and serves as a small parameter in our analysis: stabilization of GKP states requires $\lambda \ll 1/2$.

In the subspace of states $\{|m,\mu\rangle\}$ with $\mu \ll 1/4\lambda^2$, the cosine wells of H_s effectively decouple such that

$$H_{\rm s}|m,\mu\rangle = |m\rangle \otimes \left[H_0 + m^2 \varepsilon_L\right]|\mu\rangle + \mathcal{O}\left(hf_{\rm LC}\lambda^4\right).$$
(12)

Here we introduced the tensor product notation $|m, \mu\rangle = |m\rangle \otimes |\mu\rangle$, $\varepsilon_L \equiv \varphi_0^2/2L$, and H_0 is the same operator for each μ (see Appendix B for derivation). More concretely, $H_0 = \varepsilon_0 a_2^{\dagger} a_2 + \mathcal{O}(\lambda \varepsilon_0)$, where $\varepsilon_0 \equiv \sqrt{4E_J e^2/C} = \sqrt{4\pi h f_{\rm LC} E_J}$ denotes the excitation energy in the cosine wells and a_2 denotes the well annihilation operator: $a_2 |m, \mu\rangle = \sqrt{\mu} |m, \mu - 1\rangle [47].$

Like the Hamiltonian, the jump operator ℓ only acts on the level index μ to leading order in λ ; namely, in Appendix B, we show

$$\ell |m,\mu\rangle = |m\rangle \otimes \ell_0 |\mu\rangle + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\Gamma}\lambda^4), \tag{13}$$

where ℓ_0 is the same operator for each μ , and is given by $\ell_0 = \sqrt{\Gamma n_{\rm B}(\varepsilon_0)} (a_2 + e^{-\frac{\beta \varepsilon_0}{2}} a_2^{\dagger}) + \mathcal{O}(\sqrt{\Gamma n_{\rm B}(\varepsilon_0\beta)}\lambda)$, where $n_{\rm B}(\varepsilon) = (e^{-\varepsilon/k_{\rm B}T} - 1)^{-1}$ denotes the Bose-Einstein distribution at temperature T, and

$$\Gamma = \frac{e^2}{\pi n_{\rm B}(\varepsilon_0)\hbar^2 \lambda^2 C_{\rm R}^2} J(\varepsilon_0/\hbar).$$
(14)

This defines a characteristic rate for intra-well relaxation. We provide explicit expressions for the subleading corrections to $H_{\rm s}$ and ℓ in Appendix B.

Evidently, ℓ generates intra-well relaxation with rate Γ , and only acts on the level index μ , up to a subleading correction of order $\lambda^4 \sqrt{\Gamma}$. The latter fact implies that the resistor can only dephase the well index on timescales longer than $1/(\lambda^4\Gamma)$. Crucially, inter-well coherence is thus maintained on the timescale for intra-well relaxation.

C. Stabilizer revival trick

We now demonstrate the revival of S_2 in the stabilizer segment, which underlies the operation principle of the dissiative stabilization protocol. To this end, we express $\rho(t)$ in the basis $\{|m, \mu\rangle\}$ via [48]

$$\rho(t) = \sum_{mn} |m\rangle \langle n| \otimes \rho_{m,n}(t).$$
(15)

The components $\{\rho_{m,n}(t)\}$ determine $\langle S_2(t) \rangle$ through

$$\langle S_2(t) \rangle = \sum_m \operatorname{Re} \left(\operatorname{Tr}[\rho_{m,m+2}(t)] \right) \,. \tag{16}$$

This follows since $S_2|m\rangle \otimes |\mu\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|m+2\rangle \otimes |\mu\rangle + |m-2\rangle \otimes |\mu\rangle).$

At the onset of the second stabilizer segment—t = 0below—the system is confined in the high-eigenvalue subspace of S_2 (c.f. Sec. II A), implying $\rho_{m,m+2}(0) \approx \rho_{m,m}(0)$. Using Eqs. (12) and (13), along with the tracepreserving properties of Lindbladians, we moreover find

$$\operatorname{Tr}[\rho_{mn}(t)] = e^{-i(m^2 - n^2)\frac{\varepsilon_L t}{\hbar}} \operatorname{Tr}[\rho_{mn}(0)] + \mathcal{O}(\lambda^4 [f_{\mathrm{LC}} + \Gamma]t).$$
(17)

The correction is generated by the residual corrections to H_s and L in Eqs. (12) and (13), i.e., from the deterministic deviations of state trajectories in different wells generated by the correction to H_s , and from the weak inter-well dephasing generated by the correction to ℓ .

Combining Eq. (16) with $\rho_{m,m+2}(0) \approx \rho_{m,m}(0)$ shows that $\langle S_2(t) \rangle$ initially decays to zero due the buildup of the phases $\{4\varepsilon_L(m^2 - n^2)t/\hbar\}$. However, since $(m^2 - [m+2]^2) \in 4\mathbb{Z}$, the phase factors align when $t = z \frac{\hbar\pi}{4\varepsilon_L}$ for integer z, causing $\langle S_2 \rangle$ to revive:

$$\left\langle S_2\left(\frac{z\hbar\pi}{4\varepsilon_L}\right)\right\rangle = \left\langle S_2(0)\right\rangle + \mathcal{O}\left(z\lambda^4(1+\Gamma\tau_{\rm LC})\right).$$
 (18)

The impedance criterion $\sqrt{L/C} = h/2e^2$ fixes $\varepsilon_L = \pi h f_{\rm LC}/2$; hence the phase factor alignment occurs when $t = \frac{z}{2\pi} \tau_{\rm LC}$, i.e., at the end of the stabilizer segment. The revival of S_2 is evidenced in numerical simulations [see Fig. 6(c)]. Similar arguments shows that $\langle S_2^k(\tau_{\rm s}) \rangle \approx 1$ for k > 1, implying that the system is confined in the high-eigenvalue subspace of S_2 at the end of the second stabilizer segment.

The results above implies that the system is confined within the mutual high-eigenvalue subspaces of S_1 and S_2 at the end of the second stabilizer segment, and for all subsequent driving cycles. This demonstrates that the device and protocol in Fig. 1(a,c) [Eqs. (4), (6)] dissipatively generates and error corrects GKP states.

IV. SELF-CORRECTING NATIVE GATES

Here we show that the qubit supports self-correcting native S and Hadamard (H) gates, which can be applied

through appropriate control of the switch signal $w_s(t)$. These form a complete set of single-qubit Clifford gates.

The Hadamard gate is generated by each free segment, since this part of the protocol interchanges σ_x and σ_z [see Sec. II A and Eq. (1)].

The S gate is generated by the accumulating relative phase-factors between different wells in the Josephson potential, due to their distinct inductance energies; see discussion below Eq. (6). First, note that the inductance energy of well n is given by $n^2 \varepsilon_L$, implying that inductance energeis of even and odd wells differ by ε_L modulo $4\varepsilon_L$. States in odd wells therefore acquire a phase factor $e^{-i\varepsilon_L z_s \tau_{\rm LC}/2\pi\hbar} = e^{-i\pi z_s/2}$ relative to their counterparts in even wells under a stabilizer segment of duration $z_s \tau_{\rm LC}/2\pi$. This is equivalent to the action of $z_s S$ gates.

Arbitrary single-qubit Clifford control can be implemented through appropriate interspersing of stabilizer and free segment [i.e., not necessarily ordering them in an alternating pattern in Fig. 1(c)]. As described in Sec. II B, control noise from these gates dissipatively error corrected, which leads to exponential suppression of gate infidelity.

The above results imply that odd z_s causes the protocol to cyclically permute σ_x , σ_y , and σ_z —possibly with an alternating sign. In this sense, our device can be viewed as a dissipative phase-locked oscillator, or Floquet time crystal [49–56], whose emergent periodicity is controlled by $z_s \mod 4$. Choosing z_s odd causes the 3 logical operators of the qubit to appear on equal footing, implying that phase an amplitude errors is treated symmetrically, and $T_1 = T_2$.

A. Protected T gate in quasi-modular encoding

Interestingly, the same mechanism that leads to the native, protected S gatecan be used to stabilize a native magic T gate, $e^{-i\pi\sigma_z/8}$ when using an alternative implementation of the qubit, with $\sqrt{L/C} = h/e^2$ and a different encoding [29].

The self-correcting T gate emerges for a qubit encoded with the quasi-modular logical operators $\bar{\boldsymbol{\sigma}} = (\bar{\sigma}_x, \bar{\sigma}_y, \bar{\sigma}_z)$, where

$$\bar{\sigma}_z = \Xi(\varphi/\varphi_0), \quad \bar{\sigma}_x = \Xi(q/2e)e^{-i\frac{q}{4e}}II_{\rm w}, \quad \bar{\sigma}_y = -i\bar{\sigma}_z\bar{\sigma}_x.$$
(19)

here $\Xi(x)$ denotes the crenellation function (see Fig. 2), Iis the phase space inversion operator that maps (φ, q) to $-(\varphi, q)$, while $I_{\rm w} = e^{-i\pi a_2^{\dagger} a_2}$ is the well inversion operator, that maps $|m, \mu\rangle$ to $(-1)^{\mu}|m, \mu\rangle$, with a_2 and $\{|m, \mu\rangle\}$ denoting the well annihilation operator and basis states described in Sec. III [see also Fig. 4]. The logical operators above satisfy the Pauli algebra $\{\bar{\sigma}_i, \bar{\sigma}_j\} = \delta_{ij}$ when acting on stabilized states, and hence form a valid qubit observable; this can, e.g., be seen when noting that $\bar{\sigma}_x|m,\mu\rangle = |1-m,\mu\rangle$ and $\bar{\sigma}_z|m,\mu\rangle = (-1)^m|m,\mu\rangle$.

With the above encoding, the code subspace is spanned by 4 families of states, with support near $\varphi \pmod{4\varphi_0} \approx$ $\zeta \varphi_0$ for $\zeta = 0, 1, 2$, or 3, respectively. The computational spaces splits up into two sectors: logical operators do not couple states with $\zeta \in \{0, 1\}$ to states with $\zeta \in \{2, 3\}$. We use the first sector as the computational space for the system, with $\zeta = 0, 1$ resulting in eigenvalues 1 and -1 of σ_z . States with $\zeta = 2, 3$ can be considered non-computational.

The logical operators $\{\bar{\sigma}_i\}$ have stabilizers S_1 and $\bar{S}_2 = \cos(4\pi q/e)$. The quasi-modular encoding above can be thus dissipatively stabilized by the device and protocol in Sec. II A by setting $\sqrt{L/C} = h/e^2$. The revival of \bar{S}_2 in the stabilizer segment is again ensured by picking the stabilizer segment duration to be an integer multiple of $\tau_{\rm LC}/2\pi$, $z_{\rm s}$ [57]

To see how the T gate emerges, note that the $|\zeta\rangle$ logical state (for $\zeta \in \{0, 1\}$) has support in wells where $m \mod 4 = \zeta$. Since $m \mod 4 = \zeta$ implies $m^2 \mod 8 = \zeta$ for $\zeta \in \{0, 1\}$, the $|\zeta\rangle$ logical state of the qubit thus acquires a phase factor $e^{-i\pi\zeta/4}$ during the stabilizer segment. A stabilizer segment with $z_{\rm s} \in 8\mathbb{Z} + 1$ hence generates a T gate [58].

Unlike the modular encoding in Eq. (1), the quasimodular encoding above does not appear to support a native, protected Hadamard gate, and hence also not universal gates. We speculate that the protocol above could still be leveraged to provide a high-fidelity magic factory in a quantum information processor, by generating magic states with exponentially-suppressed infidelity. The protocol could thus provide a valuable resource in a quantum information processing architecture, if logical states with the quasi-modular-encoding above could be transported to a qubit with a different encoding (e.g., the modular encoding in Sec. I that we consider in the rest of the paper).

V. READOUT AND INITIALIZATION

Here we propose a readout protocol which performs a measurement of σ_z via the supercurrent in the Josephson junction. The protocol can also be used for initialization in the logical state with $\langle \sigma_x \rangle = 1$.

The protocol consists of the following sequence:

- 1. Set $w_{\rm s} = 1$ for a duration $\tau_{\rm LC}/4\pi$
- 2. set $w_{\rm s} = 0$ for a duration $\tau_{\rm LC}/4$
- 3. Set $w_{\rm s} = 1$ and measure the squared supercurrent in the Josephson junction, $I^2 = (2eE_J/\hbar)^2 \sin^2(2\pi\varphi/\varphi_0)$. This can, e.g., be detected the frequency shift of an adjacent transmon due to the magnetic field induced by the supercurrent [59, 60]. In this interval, the relaxation time Γ^{-1} (controlled through $C_{\rm R}$) must be longer than the detection time of the device.
- 4. If the average squared supercurrent is larger than $I_c^2/4$, the system was in a $|1\rangle$ logical state ($\langle \sigma_x \rangle =$



FIG. 5. Evolution of logical states during stabilizer segment, when $w_{\rm s} = 1$, using the parameters from example 2 of Table I, assuming no dissipation and noise. (a) Evolution of charge probability distribution p(q) during the stabilizer segment for a logical $|1\rangle$ -state. (b) Wigner function of the system at t = 0 and (c) at $t = \tau_{\rm LC}/(8\pi)$. Yellow arrows indicate correspondence to peaks in panel (a), and purple arrows indicate shear-drift of peaks in Wigner function. (d) Evolution of charge probability distribution for a logical $|0\rangle$ -state. (e) Evolution of stabilizers during the stabilizer segment for the $|0\rangle$ (red) and $|1\rangle$ state (blue).

-1) at the onset of the readout protocol. If not, the system was in a $|0\rangle$ logical state at the onset.

5. (For initialization): Set $w_{\rm s} = 0$ again after a duration $z_{\rm readout}/(2\pi f_{\rm LC})$ where $z_{\rm readout}$ is an integer large enough to ensure successful measurement of the supercurrent. If no supercurrent is detected, the system is initialized in a logical state with $\langle \sigma_x \rangle = 1$ at the end of the protocol. If not, run the ordinary stabilization protocol for a few cycles, and repeat the steps above.

The readout protocol exploits a characteristic peak structure that emerges in the charge probability distribution $p(q) \equiv \langle q | \rho | q \rangle$ for GKP states during the stabilizer segment. At times $t = a\tau_{\rm LC}/(2\pi b)$ for $a, b \in \mathbb{Z}$, p(q) consists of regularly-spaced peaks located at q = ez/b for $z \in \mathbb{Z}$. For even b, a logical $|s\rangle$ state (i.e., any state with σ_z -eigenvalue $(-1)^s$) will moreover result in p(q) being peaked at multiples of e/b wih parity s. This structure is evident in Fig. 5(ac), where we plot the evolution of p(q, t) during the stabilizer segment starting from two different logical states with σ_z eigenvalue -1 (a) and 1 (c)[61]. The structure emerges due to a shear-drift of

the peaks of the system's Wigner function, $W(\varphi, q)$ during the stabilizer segment. At time t, all peaks located at flux $\varphi = n\varphi_0$ have shifted in the q-direction by an amount $2\pi nef_{\rm LC}t/2$. This causes distinct Wigner function peaks to align in the φ direction for rational $2\pi f_{\rm LC}t$, leading to emergence of peaks in the charge probability distribution, $p(q) = \int d\varphi W(\varphi, q)$, as illustrated in Fig. 5(a-c). This mechanism is discussed in further detail in Appendix C.

The readout protocol exploits the peak structure as follows: Step 1 of the protocol evolves the system with the LC Hamiltonian until time $t = \tau_{\rm LC}/4\pi$, where the charge probability distribution for a logical $|s\rangle$ state is peaked at q = (z + s/2)e for integer z. Step 2 maps q/eto $-\varphi/\varphi_0$, implying that the resulting state is confined to $\varphi = (z + s/2)\varphi_0$. If the system is in a $|1\rangle$ logical state, the physical state will hence have its φ -support near the maxima of the Josephson potential. During step 3, the system will thus decay to the ground state of the Josephson potential, leading to a detectable supercurrent signal. On the other hand, for a $|0\rangle$ logical state, the system will be deep in the wells of the Josephson potential at the onset of step 3, and no supercurrent will be detected.

The protocol above can be used for initialization: by starting from a random initial state, a few cycles of the stabilization protocol first drives the system into the code subspace. Subsequently, the readout protocol is applied. If no supercurrent was detected, the system is known to have even support in all wells after the readout protocol, i.e., to be in a logical $|X\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ state. If a nonzero supercurrent is detected, the system is in an undetermined state (since the relaxation into the wells will cause the measured $|1\rangle$ state to be destroyed, and replaced by a mixed logical state). In that case, the stabilization/readout protocol is repeated, until no supercurrent is detected.

Importantly, noise from the readout apparatus does not affect the stability of the qubit during its normal operation. Specifically, the squared supercurrent $I^2 = (2eE_J/\hbar)^2 \sin^2(2\pi\varphi/\varphi_0)$ is a stabilizer of the qubit; noise coupled to it hence cannot decohere the encoded information. Indeed, the supercurrent readout can work as a syndrome detector, if switched on during the normal operation of the qubit.

VI. DEVICE REQUIREMENTS, NOISE THRESHOLDS, AND OPERATION TIMESCALES

Here we estimate the parameter requirements for the qubit, thresholds for charge and flux noise, and the characteristic operation timescales. We expect coherence time to be in the exponential-scaling regime below the thresholds we list here. Our estimates are listed in Table I for 3 different parameter scenarios that we expect to be achievable now or in the near-future.

Parameters			
L	$1\mu H$	$10 \mu H$	$100 \mu H$
C	$6\mathrm{fF}$	$60\mathrm{fF}$	$600\mathrm{fF}$
E_J/h	$200\mathrm{GHz}$	$200\mathrm{GHz}$	$200\mathrm{GHz}$
Г	$2\mathrm{GHz}$	$0.5\mathrm{GHz}$	$0.1\mathrm{GHz}$
$ au_{ m s}$	$21\tau_{\rm LC}/2\pi$	$8 au_{ m LC}/2\pi$	$4 au_{ m LC}/2\pi$
$f_{ m LC}$	$2.1\mathrm{GHz}$	$.21\mathrm{GHz}$	$.021\mathrm{GHz}$
λ	0.1	0.05	0.03
Device requriements			
Control resolution	$170 \ \mathrm{Gs/s}$	$30 \ \mathrm{Gs/s}$	6 Gs/s
LC Quality factor	220	2000	20000
Temperature	$2\mathrm{K}$	$2.5\mathrm{K}$	$3\mathrm{K}$
Accuracy of L/C	8%	4%	2%
Noise thresholds			
Charge noise	$2 \times 10^{-12} \frac{e^2}{\text{Hz}}$	$2 \times 10^{-11} \frac{e^2}{\text{Hz}}$	$2 \times 10^{-10} \frac{e^2}{\text{Hz}}$
Flux noise	$2 \times 10^{-13} \frac{\varphi_0^2}{\text{Hz}}$	$5 \times 10^{-12} \frac{\varphi_0^2}{\text{Hz}}$	$8 \times 10^{-11} \frac{\varphi_0^2}{\text{Hz}}$
Operation timescales			
Protocol cycle	$1.7\mathrm{ns}$	$7.4\mathrm{ns}$	$19\mathrm{ns}$
H Gate	$0.12\mathrm{ns}$	$1.2\mathrm{ns}$	$12\mathrm{ns}$
S Gate	$0.08\mathrm{ns}$	$0.8\mathrm{ns}$	$7.6\mathrm{ns}$
Readout	$75\mathrm{ns}$	$76\mathrm{ns}$	$79\mathrm{ns}$
Initialization	$300\mathrm{ns}$	$322\mathrm{ns}$	$530\mathrm{ns}$

TABLE I. Device requirements, noise thresholds and operation timescales for 3 parameter scenarios; see Sec. VI for details. Parameters L, C, E_J, Γ , and τ_s denote the inductance, capacitance, and Josephson energy, resistor-induced loss rate, and stabilizer segment duration, respectively, while $f_{\rm LC}$ and λ denote the derived LC frequency and GKP squeezing parameters. The charge and flux noise thresholds denote the estimate maximal tolerated power-spectral density for a white-noise charge or flux signal. For noise tolerances and device requirements below the listed thresholds, we expect the qubit lifetime to remain exponentially long.

A. Device requirements

We first consider the requirements for the device parameters: L, C, E_J, T , along with control resolution f_c , and LC quality factor Q.

As described in Secs. II A, our qubit operates in the regime where the LC impedance $\sqrt{L/C}$ approximately matches $h/2e^2 \approx 12.91 \text{ k}\Omega$. In terms of the LC frequency, $f_{\rm LC} = 1/2\pi\sqrt{LC}$, we thus require

$$L \approx \frac{2.053\,\mu\text{H}}{f_{\rm LC}\,[\text{GHz}]} \quad C \approx \frac{12.32\,\text{fF}}{f_{\rm LC}\,[\text{GHz}]} \tag{20}$$

Below, we estimate the tolerance for deviations of L and C from these targeted values to be up to ~ 10%, depending on the value $hf_{\rm LC}/E_J$ [see Eq. (25)].

We next estimate the requirements for the Josephson energy. We obtain the condition by requiring that the (Gaussian) ground state in the Josephson wells, which is stabilized by our protocol at low temperatures, is wellconfined inside the well. To be more concrete, we require that the domain boundaries of the logical operators at odd half-integer multiples of φ_0 is beyond 4 standard deviations of the well ground state, $\delta\varphi_0$. We recall from Sec. III that $\delta\varphi = \lambda\varphi_0$, where

$$\lambda = \left(\frac{hf_{\rm LC}}{4\pi^3 E_J}\right)^{1/4} \approx 0.300 \left(\frac{hf_{\rm LC}}{E_J}\right)^{1/4} \qquad (21)$$

denotes the GKP squeezing parameter. Our requirement above thus implies $\lambda \leq 1/8$, which leads to condition on the Josephson energy:

$$E_J/h \gtrsim 30 f_{\rm LC}$$
. (Josephson energy) (22)

To infer a condition on the temperature T, we note that the steady-state inside each well in the stabilizer segment is approximately a temperature-T thermal state of a Harmonic oscillator with vacuum fluctuation with $\delta \varphi = \lambda \varphi_0$ and excitation energy $\varepsilon_0 = \sqrt{4e^2 E_J/C}$ (see Sec. III). The flux probability distribution of such a state is a Gaussian with standard deviation $\delta \varphi_{\rm th} = \sqrt{\coth(\varepsilon_0/2k_{\rm B}T)}\lambda\varphi_0$. Analogous to our condition on the Josephson energy, we estimate a condition for T by requiring that $4\delta \varphi_{\rm th} \leq \varphi_0/2$. Using that $\coth(x) \approx \sqrt{1 + x^{-2}}$ and $\varepsilon_0 = 4\pi^2\lambda^2$, our condition thus becomes

$$T \lesssim 0.3 E_J / k_{\rm B} \sqrt{1 - (8\lambda)^2}$$
. (Temperature) (23)

We next estimate the threshold for control resolution of the switch [62], parameterized via the effective sampling rate of $w_s(t)$, f_c , we assume finite f_c causes the boundary between each free segment to be shifted by a random time step δt , of order $1/2f_c$. This causes the free segment to effectively mistarget the $\pi/2$ rotation of phase space by an angle $\sim \delta \theta = 2\pi \delta t$. We estimate the f_c threshold by requiring that, in phase-space symmetric units where $e = \varphi_0 = 1$, the phase space displacement generated by the rotation $\delta \theta$ is smaller than 1/2, within 4 standard deviations of the system's low-temperature Wigner function envelope, κ : $4\kappa\delta\theta \leq 1/2$. In Appendix D, we estimate the system's low-temperature Wigner function envelope to be a Gaussian with standard deviation $\kappa = 1/\pi\lambda$ (see also Fig. 4), leading to the condition

$$f_{\rm c} \lesssim \frac{8}{\lambda} f_{\rm LC}.$$
 (Control resolution) (24)

Since we require $\lambda \leq 1/8$, we hence need a control resolution of at least $\sim 64 f_{\rm LC}$

Next, we consider the tolerance for mistargeting the impedance. A deviation of the impedance leads to a squeezing of the Wigner function over a free segment by the factor $(\sqrt{L/C}/\mathcal{Z}_0 - 1)$, where $\mathcal{Z}_0 \equiv h/2e^2$ denotes twice the quantum resistance. Analogously to our condition for control resolution, we require the induced displacement to be smaller than 1/2 within 4κ from the origin (in units with $\varphi_0 = e = 1$): $4\kappa |\sqrt{L/C}/\mathcal{Z}_0 - 1| \leq 1/2$. This leads to

$$\left|\frac{\sqrt{L/C}}{\mathcal{Z}_0} - 1\right| \lesssim 0.4\lambda. \tag{25}$$

Since $\lambda \leq 1/8$, the deviation threshold can thus at most be 5%. Because of the square-root above, the tolerance for relative deviations of L and C is 0.8λ , and thus up to $\sim 10\%$, as we quoted below Eq. (25) above.

We finally consider the consequences of a finite Qfactor of the LC resonator caused by uncontrolled capacitative coupling to its surrounding environment—i.e., photon loss. During the stabilizer segment, a capacitative coupling to an external environment is beneficial; indeed such a coupling is leveraged by our dissipative stabilization protocol. During the free segment, the capacitive coupling on the other hand results in a uniform loss rate of photons from the LC resonator, at the rate $\gamma = 2\pi/Q\tau_{\rm LC}$, where Q is the corresponding quality factor and $\tau_{\rm LC}$ the LC oscillation period [63]. Photon loss generates simultaneous uniform diffusion and shrinkage of phase space, with diffusion constant $\gamma \coth(h f_{\rm LC}/2k_{\rm B}T)$ and shrinkage rate γ [64]; here and below we work in units where $\varphi_0 = e = 1$. At the end of the free segment (i.e., after a duration $\tau_{\rm LC}/4$), photon loss has thus shrunk phase space by a factor $\approx (1 - \gamma \tau_{\rm LC}/4)$, and diffused it with a diffusion kernel of width $\Delta = \sqrt{\gamma \coth(h f_{\rm LC}/2k_{\rm B}T)\tau_{\rm LC}/4}$. To obtain a condition on Q, we require that the domain boundaries of the logical operators at $\pm 1/2$ is beyond 4 standard deviations of the diffusion kernel, and that shrinkage-induced phase-space displacement is below 1/2 within 4κ from the phase space origin. Using $Q = 2\pi/\gamma \tau_{\rm LC}$, this leads to the conditions

$$Q \ge \max\left(100 \coth\left(\frac{hf_{\rm LC}}{2k_{\rm B}T}\right), \frac{4}{\lambda}\right) \quad (\text{Quality factor})$$
(26)

Note that the requirement on the Q factor can be relatively mild: for $f_{\rm LC} \sim \text{GHz}$, $T \sim 100 \text{ mK}$, and $\lambda \sim 1/8$, the Q factor threshold is ~ 240 .

B. Noise thresholds

We finally estimate the qubit's tolerance for flux and charge noise.

We model charge noise as a fluctuating charge $\xi(t)$ capacitively coupled to the circuit through $H_q(t) =$ $\xi(t)q/C$. For simplicity, we assume $\xi(t)$ a white-noise signal, with uniform power spectral density $\gamma_q/2\pi$, such that $\langle \xi(t)\xi(t') \rangle = \gamma_q \delta(t-t')$ (we analyze generic noise spectra in a separate work [28]). On its own, $H_q(t)$ generates Brownian motion of the flux, φ , with diffusion constant $D_q = \gamma_q/C^2$ [63]. Within the stabilizer segment, dissipation from the resistor counteracts the diffusion, driving φ towards the minima of the flux potential, $\varphi = n\varphi_0$. We expect the qubit to remain stable in the stabilizer segment if the effective diffusion length within the resistorinduced relaxation time Γ^{-1} is much smaller than $\varphi_0/2$, i.e., if $D_q \ll \Gamma \varphi_0^2$.

Within the free segment, $H_q(t)$ generates diffusion in phase space along the direction $(\varphi_0 \cos(2\pi f_{\rm LC}t), e\sin(2\pi f_{\rm LC}t))$ with normalized diffusion constant D_q in units where $e = \varphi_0 = 1$. As a result, $H_q(t)$ generates (correlated) flux and charge displacements with variances both given by $D\tau_{\rm LC}/8$ in the free segment. We again require these displacements remain below 1/2 within 4 standard deviations of the diffusion kernel. Using $C = \frac{e}{2\pi\varphi_0 h f_{\rm LC}}$. This leads to the condition [65]

$$\gamma_q \lesssim \frac{e^2}{320 f_{\rm LC}}$$
. (Charge noise) (27)

For noise strength γ_q below this threshold—and likely even above—our protocol resets noise-induced fluctuations before they accumulate to induce a logical error. We thus expect the qubit lifetime remains exponentially long.

We finally consider flux noise, which we model as a fluctuating flux $\xi_{\varphi}(t)$ coupled to the system through $H_{\varphi} = \xi_{\varphi}(t)\varphi/L$, where ξ_{φ} has uniform power spectral density: $\langle \xi_{\varphi}(t)\xi_{\varphi}(t')\rangle = \gamma_{\varphi}\delta(t-t')$. On its own, this term generates random diffusion of the charge, and causes a phase space displacement during the free segment, $(\Delta\varphi, \Delta q)$. Since no mechanism counteracts charge diffusion during the stabilizer segment, flux noise also generates a charge displacement in the stabilizer segment with diffusion constant $D_{\varphi} = \gamma_{\varphi}/L^2$. This displacement is only corrected in the following cycle, where it has been mapped to a flux displacement. Combining the diffusion during the stabilizer and free segment, an analysis similar to the one performed for charge noise results in the criterion

$$\gamma_{\varphi} \lesssim \frac{1}{320 + 80\tau_{\rm s} f_{\rm LC}} \frac{\varphi_0^2}{f_{\rm LC}}.$$
 (Flux noise) (28)

This sets the system's tolerance for flux noise.

C. Operation timescales

We finally estimate the relevant operation timescales for the qubit, including, gate, readout, initialization, and coherence times.

We estimate the readout and initialization times using the native protocol described in Sec. V, assuming the squared supercurrent of the Josephson junction can be detected within ~ 75 ns with a Josephson-device based magnetometer [59, 60]. The detection time is estimated assuming the magnetometer is located $5 \,\mu m$ from the Josephson junction, and has a sensitivity of ~ 10 pT/ $\sqrt{\text{Hz}}$, as has been realized recently [59, 60]. The initialization time is estimated assuming a 50% probability for successful initialization at each attempt (see Sec. V), implying that an average of 4 attempts are required to initialize the qubit.

The gate times are estimated using the native gates of the qubit, described in Sec. IV: the S gate $e^{-i\pi\sigma_z/4}$ is generated by a stabilizer segment with duration $1/(2\pi f_{\rm LC})$, while the Hadamard gate is generated by an free segment, with duration $1/(4f_{\rm LC})$. See Sec. IV for further discussion of the gates.

VII. NUMERICAL RESULTS

Here we demonstrate the emergence of dissipative error correction in simulations of the qubit. To demonstrate the robustness of the qubit to extrinsic noise, we also include charge noise in our simulations.

We model the system via the master equation

$$\partial_t \rho = \left(\mathcal{L}_{\rm s}(t) + \mathcal{L}_{\rm noise}(t) \right) [\rho], \tag{29}$$

where $\mathcal{L}_s(t)$ and $\mathcal{L}_{\text{noise}}(t)$ are the time-evolution generators (Liouvillians) of the stabilizer protocol and the noise, respectively. The Liouvillian of the stabilizer protocol was obtained in Eq. (9),

$$\mathcal{L}_{\rm s}(t)[\rho] = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H_{\rm S}(t),\rho] + w_{\rm s}(t)\left[\ell\rho\ell - \frac{1}{2}\{\ell^{\dagger}\ell,\rho\}\right].$$
(30)

Here $H_{\rm S}(t) = q^2/2C + \varphi^2/2L - w_{\rm s}(t)E_J\cos(2\pi\varphi/\varphi_0)$ denotes the system Hamiltonian, and $\ell \equiv (\hbar C_{\rm R})^{-1} \sum_{mn} |\psi_m\rangle \langle \psi_n| \sqrt{2\pi\gamma J([E_n - E_m]/\hbar)} \langle \psi_m| q |\psi_n\rangle$ denotes the ULE jump operator for the system with the switch activated, with $|\psi_n\rangle$ and E_n denoting the energies and eigenstates of $H_{\rm s} \equiv -q^2/2C + \varphi^2/2L - E_J\cos(2\pi\varphi/\varphi_0)$.

We model the resistor as an Ohmic bath at temperature $T = 1/k_{\rm B}\beta$, with power spectral density $J(\omega) = g^2 \omega (1 - e^{-\beta \hbar \omega})^{-1}$. Note that the resistor parameters only enter in Eq. (29) through the dimensionless ratio $eg/\hbar C_R$, which defines an effective conductance relative to the quantum conductance. The loss rate fixes this ratio via Eq. (14):

$$\hbar\Gamma = 4\pi \left(\frac{eg}{\hbar C_{\rm R}}\right)^2 E_J,\tag{31}$$

where we used $\varepsilon_0 = 4\pi^2 \lambda^2 E_J$.

We model charge noise as in Sec. VIB, through

$$\mathcal{L}_{\text{noise}}[\rho] = -i \frac{\xi_q(t)}{\hbar C} [q, \rho], \qquad (32)$$

where $\xi_q(t)$ is a white-noise signal satisfying $\langle \xi(t)\xi(t')\rangle = \gamma_q \delta(t-t')$, with γ_q defining the charge noise strength. We initially set the charge noise strength to $\gamma_q = 10^{-12} e^2/\text{Hz}$.

We numerically solve Eq. (29) with the parameters L, C, E_J, Γ and T from example 2 in Tab. I, using the Stochastic Schrodinger equation (SSE) [66, 67]. In our simulations, we compute ℓ through exact diagonalization. Our simulations are thus agnostic to the analysis in Secs. II A-III, thereby serving as an independent check of its conclusions.



FIG. 6. Numerical simulations of GKP state stabilization (see Sec. VII A for details). (a) Evolution of flux probability distribution over 3 cycles resulting obtained for a single SSE trajectory and starting from a random initial state. (b) Wigner function of the final state and (c) evolution of stabilizers 1 (purple) and 2 (orange) for the trajectory depicted in panel (a). shaded regions indicate stabilizer segments. Note that $\langle S_2 \rangle$ is only required to take value near 1 at the end of each stabilizer segment for GKP states to be stabilized. (d) Mean value of stabilizers at the end of each stabilizer segment for the first 12 cycles, averaged over 100 trajectories.

A. Stabilization of GKP states

To verify that the protocol stabilizes GKP states, we initialized the system in a random high-energy state far outside the code subspace [68], and computed the resulting evolution under the protocol via the SSE. Fig. 6(a)shows the evolution of the flux probability density for a representative SSE trajectory from this simulation. The single trajectory approaches the center of the wells of the Josephson potential (integer multiples of φ_0) in each stabilizer segment, while retaining support in different wells—reflecting maintenance of inter-well coherence, consistent with our discussion in Sec. III. After 3 protocol cycles, the Wigner function of the trajectory has the characteristic GKP grid structure [Fig. 6(b)], indicating successful convergence to the code subspace. Indeed, the expectation values of the two stabilizers have relaxed to near-unity after 2 cycles [Fig. 6(c)]. Sampling over 100 SSE trajectories, we confirm that stabilization of GKP states is achieved within 2-3 cycles of the protocol $(\sim 8 \,\mathrm{ns})$ [Fig. 6(d)].

B. Dissipative error correction

To confirm that the system remains stabilized after the initial convergence to the code subspace, we compute the evolution of the system for many subsequent cycles, after initializing the system in a randomly selected computational state[69] In Fig. 7 we show the resulting evolution



FIG. 7. Coherence properties of the qubit. (a,b) Evolution of logical operators in the absence (a) and presence (b) of coupling to the resistor, averaged over 200 SSE trajectories starting from a randomly chosen logical state (see main text). (c,d) Logarithm of logical state purity, $\log ||\boldsymbol{\sigma}||^2$, versus time, in the absence (c) and presence (d) of coupling to the resistor—note different axis scales in panels (c) and (d). Dashed lines indicate fits used to estimate qubit lifetimes. Data in panel (d) are obtained by time coarse-graining evolution of $||\boldsymbol{\sigma}||^2$ over 400 driving periods before taking the logarithm. Shaded regions, where visible, indicate standard error of the mean in panels (a,b), and standard deviation from bootstrap resampling of SSE trajectories in panels (c,d). In all cases, we use the parameter set from example 2 in Table I

of logical operators for $\Gamma = 0$ and $\Gamma = 1 \text{ GHz}$, averaged over 200 trajectories. Whereas the logical operator expectation values quickly decay in the absence of the resistor, for $\Gamma = 1 \text{ GHz}$, the logical operators remain stationary over the entire window we simulate.

To further illustrate the role of dissipation for stabilization, in Fig. 1(d) we show the stabilizers and logical operator evolution for representative SSE trajectories at 3 values of Γ . Evidently, increasing Γ causes the fluctuations of the stabilizers away from unity to decrease, and the logical operator trajectories to become stationary, implying stabilization of encoded information. Note that the logical operators for $\Gamma = 1 \text{ GHz}$ remains stationary in the presence of significant thermal fluctuations of the stabilizers, and hence also the state. This demonstrates that the encoded information is successfully decoupled from the thermal noise from the resistor. Interestingly, it is also possible to distinguish individual logical error events for $\Gamma = 0.25 \text{ GHz}$ in Fig. 1(f): here stabilizers only reach negative values at a few instances, where rare (but significant) noise-induced fluctuations takes the system over the energy barrier that protects the qubit. Indeed, the logical operator remains near-stationary between these instances, but changes abruptly at instances where the stabilizers obtain negative values.

We estimate the qubit lifetime via the decay of the logical state purity, $\|\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle\|^2$. Fig. 7(c) shows the stroboscopic evolution of $\log \|\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle\|^2$ for $\Gamma = 0$. The purity

remains near-unity for a brief initial period of little decay, which we expect is due to the finite time required for the system's phase space support to reach the domain boundaries of the logical operators. Beyond this point, the data shows a clear linear trend consistent with exponential decay of the purity. From a linear fit [dashed line in Fig. 7(c)], we estimate a lifetime of 63^{+19}_{-9} ns, with errors indicating 95% confidence interval from bootstrap resampling of SSE trajectories.

In Fig. 7(d), we show the evolution of $\log ||\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle||^2$) for $\Gamma = 1$ GHz [note the different x- and y-scale compared to panel (c)][70]. The logarithm of the purity exhibits a clear linear decrease after an initial period of ~ 150 μ s where the information is near-stationary [71] From a linear fit of the data after the onset of exponential decay [dashed line in Fig. 7(d)] [72], we estimate a lifetime of $1.8^{+9.9}_{-1.1}$ s (where the errors are the 95% confidence interval from bootstrap resampling). While there is significant uncertainty in our estimate of the lifetime, it is clear that the presence of the resistor enhances the timescales over which quantum information is preserved up to macroscopic timescales.

To investigate the scaling of qubit lifetime with the dissipation strength, in Fig. 1(f), we show the evolution of the obtained coherence times as a function of system-resistor coupling (parameterized via Γ) for the device parameters from column 2 of Table I. The data reveal a clear exponential trend that continues beyond the 1 ms range for $\Gamma \gtrsim 0.6$, GHz, indicating a potential for significant qubit stability against phase-space local noise.

C. Readout

We finally simulated the readout protocol from Sec. V. We generated characteristic $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ logical states of the protocol by evolving initial states with support in only even and only odd wells of the cosine potential, respectively, for 18 cycles. We then simulated the evolution of the system during the readout protocol from Sec. V. During step 3 of the protocol, we decreased the effective resistor conductance to $ge/C_{\rm R}\hbar = 0.00016$, in order to extend the relaxation time of the supercurrent signal to the ~ 100ns range, where it can possibly be detected (see Sec. V and Sec. VI. In the simulation, we used the charge noise strength $\gamma_q = 0.1 \times 10^{-13} e^2/{\rm Hz}$, because the smaller value of $\kappa e/C_{\rm R}\hbar$ leads to a lower tolerance for charge noise.

In Fig. 8(a) we show the flux probability density, $\langle \phi | \rho | \phi \rangle$, at the onset of step 3 of the protocol, for the two different initializations, averaged over 50 SSE trajectories. As described in Sec. V, the distributions resulting from the two logical states are confined near integer and half-integer multiples of φ_0 , respectively. In Fig. 8(b), we show the evolution of the squared supercurrent during step 3, with t = 0 the onset of the readout protocol. Evidently the two different logical states result in very different supercurrent signals, that could be detected by



FIG. 8. Numerical Simulations of the readout protocol described in Sec. V. (a) Flux probability density, $\langle \varphi | \rho | \varphi \rangle$, at the onset of step 3 of the protocol, immediately before the measurement of squared supercurrent, starting from a logical state produced by the protocol with σ_z expectation value 0 (red) and 1 (blue). (b) Evolution of squared supercurrent during step 3 of the protocol (supercurrent measurement), for the two initializations.

a readout device. This demonstrates the feasibility of the protocol.

VIII. DISCUSSION

Here we showed that the circuit-QED device and protocol in Fig. 1(a,b) can dissipatively generate GKP states within few cycles. Under continued operation, the device realizes dissipative error correction, where entropy induced by local noise (e.g., from flux, charge, or control noise) is removed dissipatively without affecting encoded logical information. Our simulations indicate that this dissipative error correction leads to exponential lifetime increase, possibly extending to macroscopic timescales even in the presence of external noise. In a separate upcoming work, we present analytic expressions for the lifetime that further support its exponential scaling.

Intriguingly, the qubit supports a set of native, rapidlyoperated, and self-correcting single-qubit Clifford gates, whose infidelity we expect will be exponentially suppressed. Also enhancing its appeal, our device supports a native readout/initialization protocol via the Josephson junction supercurrent. In this sense, our device can be viewed as an integrated self-correcting quantum information processor. For realizations with 1 μ H inductors and $\sim h \times 100$ GHz Josephson energies (requiring signal resolution of ~ 150 Gs/s), the gate times are of order 1 ns, while we estimate readout and initialization times to be of order 75 ns and 300 ns, respectively. In this regime, we expect coherence time can reach > 100 ms in the presence of finite control, charge, and flux, noise.

An interesting future direction is to explore whether the device supports a universal set of native, selfcorrecting gates, by exploring realizations of selfcorrecting multi-qubit and magic gates. Particularly interesting, our platform supports a self-correcting native magic (T) gate with the quasimodular encoding described in Sec. IV A. We speculate that this mechanism can be leveraged as a resource for protected magic gate generation—i.e., a magic factory—in a future quantum information processing architecture [29].

We expect qubit lifetime to be limited by phase-space nonlocal noise, including quasiparticle poisoning, phase slips, and spurious cooper pair tunneling from imperfect deactivation of the switch. Recent advances in understanding the origin of quasiparticle poisoning, and mitigating its effects [30, 73], could mean that the timescales for these events could be significantly above the threshold where potential concatenated active error correction protocols can efficiently operate with current technology.

The main experimental challenges we foresee for our device is the requirement of high-impedance LCresonators, and a rapidly-acting switch that completely blocks (or exponentially suppresses) cooper pair tunneling through the Josephson junction. The tradeoff between the requirements of circuit inductance and switch operation time is evidenced in Table I: for currently achievable inductances of order $L \sim 1 - 10 \mu H$, the switch has to exponentially suppress the rate of cooper pair tunneling at control resolutions of 10 - 200 Gs/s (depending on acheived inductance). This inevitably requires development of new circuit elements. Such elements can possibly build on existing technology: for reference, technology supporting control resolutions of 100 Gs/s have been developed in the telecommunications industry [40], and control resolutions of ~ 25 Gs/s has been employed in circuit-QED contexts. We speculate that a rapidlyacting switch can be achieved with gate-tuned Josephson junctions, which currently can achieve suppression of Josephson coupling by many orders of magnitude on the ns timescale and possibly below [39]. Alternative approaches could involve accurately-controlled SQUID elements, resistively-shunted Josephson junctions [25], or voltage-control that leverages the AC Josephson effect.

Realizing the technologies above will have significant

impact by enabling a physical qubit with exponentiallyscaling lifetime, which does not require active error correction for stabilization. Due to these advantages, we expect the devise presented here offers a promising alternative route to scalable quantum computation, by bypassing major scalability challenges for approaches purely based on active error correction.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We gratefully acknowledge useful discussions with Philippe Campagne-Ibarcq, Max Geier, Lev Arcady-Sellem, Jacob Hastrup, Karsten Flensberg, and Jonathan Conrad. F.N. was supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences under award DE-SC0019166, the Simons Foundation under award 623768, and the Carlsberg Foundation, grant CF22-0727. G.R. is grateful for support from the Simons Foundation as well as support from the NSF DMR Grant number 1839271, and from the IQIM, an NSF Physics Frontiers Center. L.J. acknowledges support from the ARO(W911NF-23-1-0077), ARO MURI (W911NF-21-1-0325), AFOSR MURI (FA9550-19-1-0399, FA9550-21-1-0209, FA9550-23-1-0338), DARPA (HR0011-24-9-0359, HR0011-24-9-0361), NSF (OMA-1936118, ERC-1941583, OMA-2137642, OSI-2326767, CCF-2312755), Packard Foundation (2020-71479). This work was performed in part at Aspen Center for Physics, which is supported by National Science Foundation grant PHY-1607611. The computations presented here were, in part, conducted in the Resnick High Performance Computing Center, a facility supported by Resnick Sustainability Institute at the California Institute of Technology.

- P. W. Shor, Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory, Phys. Rev. A 52, R2493 (1995).
- [2] A. R. Calderbank and P. W. Shor, Good quantum errorcorrecting codes exist, Phys. Rev. A 54, 1098 (1996).
- [3] A. M. Steane, Error correcting codes in quantum theory, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 793 (1996).
- [4] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and W. H. Zurek, Resilient quantum computation, Science 279, 342 (1998).
- [5] R. Raussendorf and J. Harrington, Fault-tolerant quantum computation with high threshold in two dimensions, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 190504 (2007).
- [6] A. G. Fowler, M. Mariantoni, J. M. Martinis, and A. N. Cleland, Surface codes: Towards practical large-scale quantum computation, Phys. Rev. A 86, 032324 (2012).
- [7] R. Acharya and others (Google Quantum AI), Suppressing quantum errors by scaling a surface code logical qubit, Nature 614, 676 (2023).
- [8] B. M. Terhal, Quantum error correction for quantum memories, Rev. Mod. Phys. 87, 307 (2015).

- [9] J. Preskill, Quantum Computing in the NISQ era and beyond, Quantum 2, 79 (2018).
- [10] S. J. Pauka, K. Das, R. Kalra, A. Moini, Y. Yang, M. Trainer, A. Bousquet, C. Cantaloube, N. Dick, G. C. Gardner, M. J. Manfra, and D. J. Reilly, A cryogenic interface for controlling many qubits (2019), arXiv:1912.01299 [quant-ph].
- [11] S. Bravyi and B. Terhal, A no-go theorem for a twodimensional self-correcting quantum memory based on stabilizer codes, New Journal of Physics 11, 043029 (2009).
- [12] H. Bombin, R. W. Chhajlany, M. Horodecki, and M. A. Martin-Delgado, Self-correcting quantum computers, New Journal of Physics 15, 055023 (2013), publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [13] J. P. Barnes and W. S. Warren, Automatic quantum error correction, Phys. Rev. Lett. 85, 856 (2000).
- [14] B. Kraus, H. P. Büchler, S. Diehl, A. Kantian, A. Micheli, and P. Zoller, Preparation of entangled states by quantum markov processes, Phys. Rev. A 78, 042307 (2008).

- [15] F. Verstraete, M. M. Wolf, and J. Ignacio Cirac, Quantum computation and quantum-state engineering driven by dissipation, Nature Physics 5, 633 (2009).
- [16] Z. Leghtas, G. Kirchmair, B. Vlastakis, R. J. Schoelkopf, M. H. Devoret, and M. Mirrahimi, Hardware-efficient autonomous quantum memory protection, Phys. Rev. Lett. 111, 120501 (2013).
- [17] F. Reiter, A. S. Sørensen, P. Zoller, and C. A. Muschik, Dissipative quantum error correction and application to quantum sensing with trapped ions, Nature Communications 8, 1822 (2017).
- [18] S. Touzard, A. Grimm, Z. Leghtas, S. O. Mundhada, P. Reinhold, C. Axline, M. Reagor, K. Chou, J. Blumoff, K. M. Sliwa, S. Shankar, L. Frunzio, R. J. Schoelkopf, M. Mirrahimi, and M. H. Devoret, Coherent oscillations inside a quantum manifold stabilized by dissipation, Phys. Rev. X 8, 021005 (2018).
- [19] B. de Neeve, T. L. Nguyen, T. Behrle, and J. Home, Error correction of a logical grid state qubit by dissipative pumping (2020).
- [20] C. Flühmann, T. L. Nguyen, M. Marinelli, V. Negnevitsky, K. Mehta, and J. P. Home, Encoding a qubit in a trapped-ion mechanical oscillator, Nature 566, 513 (2019).
- [21] D. R. Pérez and E. Kapit, Improved autonomous error correction using variable dissipation in small logical qubit architectures, Quantum Science and Technology 6, 015006 (2020), publisher: IOP Publishing.
- [22] P. M. Harrington, E. Mueller, and K. Murch, Engineered Dissipation for Quantum Information Science (2022), arXiv:2202.05280 [cond-mat, physics:physics, physics:quant-ph].
- [23] A. Grimm, N. E. Frattini, S. Puri, S. O. Mundhada, S. Touzard, M. Mirrahimi, S. M. Girvin, S. Shankar, and M. H. Devoret, Stabilization and operation of a Kerr-cat qubit, Nature 584, 205 (2020), number: 7820 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [24] A. Gyenis, A. Di Paolo, J. Koch, A. Blais, A. A. Houck, and D. I. Schuster, Moving beyond the Transmon: Noise-Protected Superconducting Quantum Circuits, PRX Quantum 2, 030101 (2021).
- [25] L.-A. Sellem, A. Sarlette, Z. Leghtas, M. Mirrahimi, P. Rouchon, and P. Campagne-Ibarcq, A gkp qubit protected by dissipation in a high-impedance superconducting circuit driven by a microwave frequency comb (2023), arXiv:2304.01425 [quant-ph].
- [26] D. Gottesman, A. Kitaev, and J. Preskill, Encoding a qubit in an oscillator, Phys. Rev. A 64, 012310 (2001).
- [27] F. Nathan and M. S. Rudner, Universal Lindblad equation for open quantum systems, Phys. Rev. B 102, 115109 (2020).
- [28] L. OBrien, G. Refael, and F. Nathan, To appear.
- [29] Note that our protocol does not directly generate a magic H state by projecting the LC oscillator vacuum state into the code subspace, as proposed in Ref. [74], since the nontrivial evolution towards the code subspace generated during by our stabilization protocol is inequivalent to a projection.
- [30] M. Aghaee and others (Microsoft Azure Quantum), Interferometric single-shot parity measurement in an inas-al hybrid device (2024), arXiv:2401.09549 [cond-mat.meshall].

- [31] P. Campagne-Ibarcq, A. Eickbusch, S. Touzard, E. Zalys-Geller, N. E. Frattini, V. V. Sivak, P. Reinhold, S. Puri, S. Shankar, R. J. Schoelkopf, L. Frunzio, M. Mirrahimi, and M. H. Devoret, Quantum error correction of a qubit encoded in grid states of an oscillator, Nature 584, 368 (2020), number: 7821 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [32] T. B. J. P. H. Brennan de Neeve, Thanh-Long Nguyen, Error correction of a logical grid state qubit by dissipative pumping, Nature Physics 18, 296–300 (2022).
- [33] A. Eickbusch, V. Sivak, A. Z. Ding, S. S. Elder, S. R. Jha, J. Venkatraman, B. Royer, S. M. Girvin, R. J. Schoelkopf, and M. H. Devoret, Fast universal control of an oscillator with weak dispersive coupling to a qubit, Nature Physics 18, 1464–1469 (2022).
- [34] V. V. Sivak, A. Eickbusch, B. Royer, S. Singh, I. Tsioutsios, S. Ganjam, A. Miano, B. L. Brock, A. Z. Ding, L. Frunzio, S. M. Girvin, R. J. Schoelkopf, and M. H. Devoret, Real-time quantum error correction beyond breakeven, Nature **616**, 50–55 (2023).
- [35] D. Lachance-Quirion, M.-A. Lemonde, J. O. Simoneau, L. St-Jean, P. Lemieux, S. Turcotte, W. Wright, A. Lacroix, J. Fréchette-Viens, R. Shillito, F. Hopfmueller, M. Tremblay, N. E. Frattini, J. C. Lemyre, and P. St-Jean, Autonomous quantum error correction of gottesman-kitaev-preskill states (2023), arXiv:2310.11400 [quant-ph].
- [36] X. C. Kolesnikow, R. W. Bomantara, A. C. Doherty, and A. L. Grimsmo, Gottesman-kitaev-preskill state preparation using periodic driving (2023), arXiv:2303.03541 [quant-ph].
- [37] J. Conrad, Twirling and hamiltonian engineering via dynamical decoupling for gottesman-kitaev-preskill quantum computing, Phys. Rev. A 103, 022404 (2021).
- [38] M. Rymarz, S. Bosco, A. Ciani, and D. P. DiVincenzo, Hardware-encoding grid states in a nonreciprocal superconducting circuit, Phys. Rev. X 11, 011032 (2021).
- [39] L. Casparis, M. R. Connolly, M. Kjaergaard, N. J. Pearson, A. Kringhøj, T. W. Larsen, F. Kuemmeth, T. Wang, C. Thomas, S. Gronin, G. C. Gardner, M. J. Manfra, C. M. Marcus, and K. D. Petersson, Superconducting gatemon qubit based on a proximitized two-dimensional electron gas, Nature Nanotechnology 13, 915 (2018), number: 10 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [40] M. Collisi and M. Möller, A 120 gs/s 2:1 analog multiplexer with high linearity in sige-bicmos technology, in 2020 IEEE BiCMOS and Compound Semiconductor Integrated Circuits and Technology Symposium (BCICTS) (2020) pp. 1–4.
- [41] Z. Li, P. Liu, P. Zhao, Z. Mi, H. Xu, X. Liang, T. Su, W. Sun, G. Xue, J.-N. Zhang, W. Liu, Y. Jin, and H. Yu, Error per single-qubit gate below 10⁻⁴ in a superconducting qubit, npj Quantum Information 9, 1 (2023), publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [42] G. Pantaleoni, B. Q. Baragiola, and N. C. Menicucci, Modular bosonic subsystem codes, Phys. Rev. Lett. 125, 040501 (2020).
- [43] For a ν -dimensional qudit with $\nu > 2$, the relative amplitude depends on well index modulo ν , rather than its parity.
- [44] More generally, for a ν -dimensional qudit encoding (see text below Eq. (1)) we require $\sqrt{\frac{L}{C}} = \nu h/4e^2$.

- [45] F. Nathan and M. S. Rudner, High accuracy steady states obtained from the universal lindblad equation (2022), arXiv:2206.02917 [cond-mat.mes-hall].
- [46] Specifically, we define $|m,\mu\rangle$ to be the state with wavefunctin $\langle \varphi | m, \mu \rangle = e^{-\frac{\varphi^2}{2\delta\varphi^2}} H_{\mu} (\varphi/\delta\varphi) (2^{\mu}\mu! 2\pi\lambda\sqrt{\pi})^{-1/2}$,

with $H_{\mu}(x)$ denoting the μ th Hermite polynomial.

- [47] The well annihilation operator a_2 may, e.g., be explicitly defined as $a_2 \equiv \sqrt{\frac{\pi}{2}} (\frac{1}{\lambda \varphi_0} \bar{\varphi} + i \frac{\lambda}{e} \bar{q})$, with $\bar{\varphi} \equiv \varphi \mod \varphi_0$, with the branch cut of the modulo operation set at $\varphi_0/2$.
- [48] Formally, ρ_{mn} is defined such that $\rho(t) = \sum_{m,n,\mu,\mu} |m,\mu\rangle\langle n,\mu|\langle\mu|\rho_{mn}(t)|\mu\rangle$; this decomposition is uniquely defined if the level indices a and b are truncated at some finite cutoff.
- [49] M. Holthaus and M. E. Flatté, Subharmonic generation in quantum systems, Physics Letters A 187, 151 (1994).
- [50] K. Sacha, Modeling spontaneous breaking of timetranslation symmetry, Phys. Rev. A 91, 033617 (2015).
- [51] V. Khemani, A. Lazarides, R. Moessner, and S. L. Sondhi, Phase structure of driven quantum systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. **116**, 250401 (2016).
- [52] D. V. Else, B. Bauer, and C. Nayak, Floquet time crystals, Phys. Rev. Lett. **117**, 090402 (2016).
- [53] Y. Zhang, J. Gosner, S. M. Girvin, J. Ankerhold, and M. I. Dykman, Time-translation-symmetry breaking in a driven oscillator: From the quantum coherent to the incoherent regime, Phys. Rev. A 96, 052124 (2017).
- [54] Z. Gong, R. Hamazaki, and M. Ueda, Discrete timecrystalline order in cavity and circuit qed systems, Phys. Rev. Lett. **120**, 040404 (2018).
- [55] N. Lörch, Y. Zhang, C. Bruder, and M. I. Dykman, Quantum state preparation for coupled period tripling oscillators, Phys. Rev. Res. 1, 023023 (2019).
- [56] F. Nathan, G. Refael, M. S. Rudner, and I. Martin, Quantum frequency locking and downconversion in a driven qubit-cavity system, Phys. Rev. Res. 2, 043411 (2020).
- [57] To see this note that the inductance energy is given by $\varepsilon_L = \pi h f_{\rm LC}/4$, implying that states in well *m* acquire a relative phase factor $e^{-iz_{\rm s}\pi m^2/4}$ after the stabilizer segment. Since $(n+4)^2 n^2 \in 8\mathbb{Z}$, revival of \bar{S} is ensured for each integer choice of $z_{\rm s}$.
- [58] This T gate is the hermitian conjugate of the usual definition of the T gate, which would have -1-eigenstates of σ_z acquire a phase of \sqrt{i} .
- [59] S. Danilin, A. V. Lebedev, A. Vepsäläinen, G. B. Lesovik, G. Blatter, and G. S. Paraoanu, Quantum-enhanced magnetometry by phase estimation algorithms with a single artificial atom, npj Quantum Information 4, 29 (2018).
- [60] R. P. Budoyo, K. Kakuyanagi, H. Toida, Y. Matsuzaki, and S. Saito, Electron spin resonance with up to 20 spin sensitivity measured using a superconducting flux qubit, Applied Physics Letters **116**, 194001 (2020).
- [61] The initial state consisted of well-ground states with a Gaussian envelope, $|s\rangle \propto \sum_{k} e^{-8\pi^2\lambda^2k^2} |2k + s, 0\rangle$. [62] The switch must be completely turned off during the
- [62] The switch must be completely turned off during the free segment, to avoid spurious tunneling of cooper pairs, which can lead to irrecoverable logical errors. Hence we expect our qubit is only resilient to switch mistiming, while imperfect switch deactivation may cause logical errors.
- [63] C. Gardiner and P. Zoller, *Quantum Noise* (Springer-Verlag Berlin Heidelberg, 2004).

- [64] A. Isar, W. Scheid, and A. Sandulescu, Quasiprobability distributions for open quantum systems within the Lindblad theory, Journal of Mathematical Physics **32**, 2128 (1991).
- [65] The inverse scaling with $f_{\rm LC}$ arises due to the parametrization we use for charge noise: the coupling between system and charge noise is proportional to C^{-2} while $C \propto f_{\rm LC}^{-1}$, due to Eq. (5) fixing the resonator impedance. The charge noise-induced diffusion rate thus scales with $f_{\rm LC}^2$ for fixed γ_q , while the tolerance for diffusion rate scales with $f_{\rm LC}^{-1}$. As a result, smaller $f_{\rm LC}$ leads to more stability with our parametrization.
- [66] J. Dalibard, Y. Castin, and K. Mølmer, Wave-function approach to dissipative processes in quantum optics, Phys. Rev. Lett. 68, 580 (1992).
- [67] H. Carmichael, An open systems approach to quantum optics (Springer, 1993).
- [68] Specifically, we initialize the system in the state $|\psi_0\rangle = \sum_{n=-45}^{45} \sum_{k=0}^{35} c_{nk} |n,k\rangle$ with $|n,k\rangle$ the basis states described in Sec. III, and $\{c_{nk}\}$ random complex numbers with zero mean and identical variances.
- [69] Specifically, the system was initilized in the state $\cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|\psi_0\rangle + \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)e^{i\varphi}|\psi_1\rangle$, where $|\psi_s\rangle = \mathcal{N}\sum_k e^{-(2k+s)^2\pi^2\lambda^2/4}|2k+s,0\rangle$, with \mathcal{N} a normalization constant and $(\theta,\phi) = (1.93,1.62)$ chosen randomly on the unit sphere. The state above is well confined in the code subspace, and corresponds to the logical state $\cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)|0\rangle + \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right)e^{i\varphi}|1\rangle$.
- [70] Due to the long qubit lifetime in this regime, the level of decay we can resolve on simulated timescale is very small, and thus subject to significant statistical fluctuations between SSE trajectories. To overcome this, we show time coarse-grained data, obtained by time-averaging the purity over 400 driving periods. We also use the time-coarse grained data for our fit. We have confirmed that the lifetime fit varies little with the chosen window length, while the quality of the linear fit increases with n.
- [71] We speculate that the near-stationary interval arises from a small effective Lieb-Robinson velocity in phase space, which implies it takes a long time for exponential tails of the phase-space support of the state to spread to the domain boundaries of the logical operators.
- [72] The values of $\log \|\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle \|^2$ shown in Fig. 7(d) are very small, and hence the logarithm can be well approximated by its first order Taylor series over this range of values. Thus, $\log \|\langle \boldsymbol{\sigma} \rangle \|^2$ being linear over this range is not conclusive evidence that the purity decays exponentially in time; nonetheless, the inverse slope still defines a meaningful lifetime for the qubit.
- [73] M. McEwen, K. C. Miao, J. Atalaya, A. Bilmes, A. Crook, J. Bovaird, J. M. Kreikebaum, N. Zobrist, E. Jeffrey, B. Ying, A. Bengtsson, H.-S. Chang, A. Dunsworth, J. Kelly, Y. Zhang, E. Forati, R. Acharya, J. Iveland, W. Liu, S. Kim, B. Burkett, A. Megrant, Y. Chen, C. Neill, D. Sank, M. Devoret, and A. Opremcak, Resisting high-energy impact events through gap engineering in superconducting qubit arrays (2024), arXiv:2402.15644 [quant-ph].
- [74] B. Q. Baragiola, G. Pantaleoni, R. N. Alexander, A. Karanjai, and N. C. Menicucci, All-gaussian universality and fault tolerance with the gottesman-kitaev-preskill code, Phys. Rev. Lett. **123**, 200502 (2019).

- [75] G. Kiršanskas, M. Franckié, and A. Wacker, Phenomenological position and energy resolving Lindblad approach to quantum kinetics, Phys. Rev. B 97, 035432 (2018).
- [76] F. Nathan, Topological Phenomena in Periodically Driven Systems, Ph.D. thesis, University of Copenhagen (2018).
- [77] F. Nathan, I. Martin, and G. Refael, Topological frequency conversion in a driven dissipative quantum cavity, Physical Review B 99, 094311 (2019).
- [78] E. Kleinherbers, N. Szpak, J. König, and R. Schützhold, Relaxation dynamics in a Hubbard dimer coupled to fermionic baths: Phenomenological description and its microscopic foundation, Phys. Rev. B 101, 125131 (2020).
- [79] D. Davidović, Geometric-arithmetic master equation in large and fast open quantum systems, Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical 55, 455301 (2022).
- [80] The master equation as also hypothesized or heuristically obtained for special cases in Refs. [75–79]).
- [81] The ULE also features a renormalization of the Hamiltonian (a Lamb shift). We neglect the Lamb shift here, since it gives a subleading contribution to the Hamiltonian, which does not affect the qualitative behavior of the system, due to the perturbative robustness of dissipative error correction.
- [82] T. Dittrich, P. Hänggi, G.-L. Ingold, B. Kramer, G. Schön, and W. Zwerger, *Quantum Transport and Dis*sipation (Wiley, 1998).
- [83] W. Kohn, Periodic Thermodynamics, Journal of Statistical Physics 103, 417 (2001).
- [84] K. I. Seetharam, C.-E. Bardyn, N. H. Lindner, M. S. Rudner, and G. Refael, Controlled Population of Floquet-Bloch States via Coupling to Bose and Fermi Baths, Physical Review X 5, 041050 (2015), publisher: American Physical Society.

Appendix A: Lindblad equation for the system

Here we describe how we model the dissipative dynamics of the system via the universal Lindblad equation (ULE) from Ref. [27] [80].

To recap, we seek to obtain a master equation for the system described by the Hamiltonian

$$H_{\rm SB}(t) = H_{\rm S}(t) + H_{\rm int}(t) + H_{\rm B} \tag{A1}$$

where

$$H_{\rm S}(t) = \frac{q^2}{2C} + \left(\frac{\varphi_0}{2\pi}\right)^2 \frac{\phi^2}{2L} + f(t)E_J \cos(2\pi\varphi/\varphi_0), \quad (A2)$$

and $H_{\rm B}$ describes a fermionic bath (see below). In the case of capacitive coupling, the system-bath coupling takes the forms

$$H_{\rm int}(t) = w_{\rm s}(t) \frac{qQ_{\rm R}}{C_{\rm R}} \tag{A3}$$

Here $Q_{\rm r}$ denotes the charge on the bath-side of the capacitive coupler, and γ is an energy scale parameterizing the coupling strength. Note that γ is redundant, and can be absorbed into $Q_{\rm R}$.

According to the derivation in Ref. [27], in the limit where the effective system-bath coupling is weak relative to the inverse characteristic correlation time of the bath (see Sec. A 1 below for explicit conditions) [81], the system is described by the time-dependent Lindblad equation

$$\partial_t \rho(t) = -i[H_{\rm S}(t), \rho(t)] \tag{A4}$$

+
$$\ell(t)\rho(t)\ell^{\dagger}(t) - \frac{1}{2}\{\ell^{\dagger}(t)\ell(t),\rho(t)\}$$
 (A5)

where we neglected the Lamb shift, which generates a weak renormalization of the Hamiltonian. The ULE jump operator $\ell(t)$ is given by

$$\ell(t) = \frac{1}{\hbar C_{\rm R}} \int dt g(t-s) U(t,s) q(s) U(s,t).$$
 (A6)

Here $U(t,s) \equiv \mathcal{T}e^{-i\int_s^t dt' H_S(t')}$ is the unitary evolution operator generated by $H_S(t)$, and $g(t) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2\pi}}\int d\omega \sqrt{J(\omega)}$, where $J(\omega) = \frac{1}{2\pi}\int dt e^{i\omega t} \langle Q_R(t)Q_R(0)\rangle$ denotes the power-spectral density of Q_R .

1. Conditions for validity

We now discuss the conditions for validity of the master equation for the system. The formal error bounds identified in Ref. [27] are controlled by a time-scale, $\tau_{\rm B}$, and a rate $\Gamma_{\rm B}$ and $\Gamma_{\rm B}$, where

$$\tau_{\rm B} = \frac{\int dt |g(t)t|}{\int dt |g(t)|}, \quad \Gamma_{\rm B} = 4\gamma \left[\int dt |g(t)|\right]^2 \tag{A7}$$

The rate $\Gamma_{\rm B}$ is rigorously proven to bound the rate of bath-induced evolution [27], without any approximations: $\|\partial_t \rho + i[H_{\rm S}, \rho]\| \leq \Gamma_{\rm B}/2$. The timescale $\tau_{\rm B}$ defines a correlation time for the bath.

The ULE is shown to be accurate in the limit where

$$\Gamma_{\rm B}\tau_{\rm B}\ll 1.$$
 (A8)

Specifically, Ref. [27] shows that Eq. (A5) describes the evolution of the system in a weakly memory-dressed frame, which is obtained through a near-identity linear transformation (Defined in Refs· [27, 45]). The dressing is weak in the sense that the density matrix that results from the transformation, ρ' , differs from the true density matrix ρ by a correction bounded by $\Gamma_{\rm B} \tau_{\rm B}$ at all times: $\|\rho'(t) - \rho(t)\| \leq \Gamma_{\rm B} \tau_{\rm B}$. Note in particular, that that $\|\ell(t)\|_0 \leq \sqrt{\Gamma_{\rm B}}/2$ regardless of the time-dependence of the Hamiltonian, where $\|\cdot\|_0$ denotes the spectral norm.

Ref. [27] demonstrated that ρ' evolves according to Eq.(A5), up to a correction bounded by $\Gamma_{\rm B}^2 \tau_{\rm B}$, which hence is subleading in the small parameter of the problem, $\Gamma_{\rm B} \tau_{\rm B}$. The rigorous error bound is expected to be rather loose in many cases, and hence is probably not a necessary condition for Eq. (A5) to be valid. Rather, heuristic considerations about the relationship between the effective loss rate $\Gamma_{\text{eff}} = \|\ell^{\dagger}\ell\rho\|$ and the energy-resolved correlation time of the bath $\tau_{\text{eff}}(\omega) = \partial_{\omega} \log(J(\omega))$ within the spectral range of the system, likely is a better proxy for determining whether Eq. (A5) is a good approximation.

2. Quasistatic approximation

Here we discuss how the right-hand side of Eq. (A5) can be approximated by the piece-wise constant Liouvillian we consider in the main text. We focus on the case with direct coupling first, and discuss the capacitativecoupling case in the end.

While the time-dependent jump operators generally would make Eq. (A5) cumbersome to solve, the step-wise protocol we consider allows for a significant simplification.

The time-dependence of the jump operators arises when the time-dependence of the system Hamiltonian and system-bath coupling is significant on the timescale for bath correlations, $\tau_{\rm B}$. In this case, the bath does not have time to adiabatically adjust to the time-dependence of the system, causing driving-assisted incoherent processes, that can even heat the system when the bath is at zero temperature [82–84]. In this way, we can view the time-dependence of the jump operators as a noise source, arising from driving-assisted incoherent processes.

Note that, for the step-wise driving protocol we consider, $\ell(t)$ is effectively constant for $|t - t_i| \gtrsim \tau_B$, where $\{t_i\}$ denote the instances where $\partial_t f(t) \neq 0$ (i.e., at the instances where the switch is turned on or off). Within these intervals, in the bulk of the LC or stabilizer segment, $\ell(t)$ is time-independent in the respective intervals:

$$\ell(t) = w_{\rm s}(t)\bar{\ell} \quad \text{for} \quad |t - t_i| \gg \tau_{\rm B},$$
 (A9)

where $\bar{\ell} = \frac{1}{C_{\rm R}} \int dt g(-t) e^{iH_{\rm s}t} q e^{-iH_{\rm s}t}$. Expressing $H_{\rm s}$ in terms of its energies and eigenstates, $H_{\rm s} = \sum_{n} |\psi_n\rangle \langle \psi_n | E_n$ yields

$$\bar{\ell} = \frac{1}{\hbar C_{\rm R}} \sum_{mn} \sqrt{2\pi J(\omega_n - \omega_m)} |\psi_m\rangle \langle\psi_m|q|\psi_n\rangle \langle\psi_n|,\tag{A10}$$

with $\omega_n = E_n/\hbar$.

Next, we consider the evolution within the intervals $|t - t_i| \lesssim \tau_{\rm B}$. The action of the dissipator in this timeinterval is bounded by $\Gamma_{\rm B}\tau_{\rm B}$, which is the small parameter of our treatment; in a SSE algorithm, $\Gamma_{\rm B}\tau_{\rm B}$ would bound the probability of observing a quantum jump in this interval. Since the jump operator can be approximated by a sum of nested commutators of $H_{\rm S}(t)$ with X, it is a finite polynomial in ϕ and q and $\cos(\phi)$, and hence generates a small-displacement flow in phase-space, the noise induced expected to be correctible [28]. Hence, setting $\ell(t) = \bar{\ell}$ within the stabilizer segment and $\ell(t) = 0$ in the free segment thus effectively induces a weak local noise channel that we expect to be correctible. Hence, we can set $\ell(t) = w_{\rm s}(t)\bar{\ell}$ throughout the protocol at the cost of introducing a weak-correctible noise channel, which can be treated on par with other noise sources in the system.

Appendix B: Perturbative expansion of Hamiltonian and jump operator

Here we derive the perturbative expansion of the Hamiltonian and jump operators discussed in Sec. III. To recap, we consider the Hamiltonian of the system during the stabilizer segment

$$H_{\rm s} = \frac{q^2}{2C} + \frac{\varphi^2}{2L} - E_J \cos(2\pi\varphi/\varphi_0). \tag{B1}$$

Our goal is to find the action of H_s on the state $|m, \mu\rangle$, defined as the μ th eigenstate of a Harmonic oscillator with vacuum fluctuation length $\delta\varphi$, centered at $\varphi = rm\varphi_0$:

$$m,\mu\rangle = \int d\varphi \,\psi_{\mu}(\varphi - rm\varphi_0)|\varphi\rangle,$$
 (B2)

where

$$\psi_{\mu}(\varphi) \equiv \frac{e^{-\frac{\varphi^2}{2\delta\varphi^2}} H_{\mu}\left(\varphi/\delta\varphi\right)}{\sqrt{2^{\mu}\mu!\delta\varphi\sqrt{\pi}}} \tag{B3}$$

We pick the center $rm\varphi_0$ and width $\delta\varphi$ to match the center and vacuum fluctuation width of the wells of the potential in $H_{\rm s}$; since the potential from the inductor slightly renormalizes of the center and curvature of the cosine wells, the actual centers will be offset from integer multiples φ_0 , and their curvature be slightly larger than $\frac{4\pi^2 E_J}{\varphi_0^2}$; for this reason, we consider $\delta\varphi$ and r free parameters for now—we will fix their values later, based on our analysis below [Eqs. (B11)-(B12)]. We moreover introduce the dimensionless variable λ to parameterize $\delta\varphi$ in terms of φ_0 through

$$\delta \varphi = \lambda \varphi_0 \tag{B4}$$

To analyze the Hamiltonian, we introduce the annihilation operator of the nth well through

$$a_m \equiv \sum_{\mu} \sqrt{\mu} |n, \mu - 1\rangle \langle n, \mu|.$$
 (B5)

Introducing the dimensionless quadratures of the oscillator, $x_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(a_m + a_m^{\dagger})$ and $p_m = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}i}(a_m - a_m^{\dagger})$, we find

$$q = \frac{e}{\pi\lambda}p_m, \quad \varphi = \lambda\varphi_0 x_m + mr\varphi_0. \tag{B6}$$

where we used $\varphi_0 = h/2e$. Using $C = \frac{2e^2}{\pi\nu\hbar 2\pi f_{\rm LC}}$, and $L = \frac{\nu\varphi_0^2}{2\pi\hbar 2\pi f_{\rm LC}}$, we can express $H_{\rm s}$ in terms of x_m and p_m as follows:

$$H_{\rm s} = \frac{\nu h f_{\rm LC}}{4\pi\lambda^2} p_m^2 + \frac{h f_{\rm LC}}{4\pi\nu} (2\pi\lambda x_m + 2\pi m r)^2 - E_J \cos(2\pi\lambda x_m + 2\pi r m). \tag{B7}$$

Our next step is to separate out the *n*-independent part of H_s . To this end, we exploit $\cos(x) = \cos(x + 2\pi)$ to extract the quadratic part of the Hamiltonian:

$$H_{\rm s} = h_m + V_m,\tag{B8}$$

where h_m is purely quadratic:

$$h_m \equiv \frac{\nu h f_{\rm LC}}{4\pi\lambda^2} p_m^2 + \frac{h f_{\rm LC}}{4\pi\nu} (2\pi\lambda x_m + 2\pi rm)^2 + \frac{E_J}{2} (2\pi\lambda x_m - 2\pi\delta m)^2, \tag{B9}$$

with $\delta \equiv 1 - r$,

$$V_m = -E_J \cos(2\pi\lambda x_m - 2\pi\delta m) - \frac{E_J}{2} \left(2\pi\lambda x_m - 2\pi\delta m\right)^2.$$
(B10)

We wish to pick $2\pi\lambda$ and r such that h_m is the same for each well (up to a constant shift). In order to do this, we first expand the parenthesis, obtaining

$$h_m = \frac{\nu h f_{\rm LC}}{4\pi\lambda^2} p^2 + 4\pi\lambda^2 \left(\frac{h f_{\rm LC}}{2\pi\nu} + E_J\right) x_m^2 + \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2\pi h f_{\rm LC} r^2}{\nu} + 4\pi^2 \delta^2 E_J\right) m^2 + 2\pi\lambda \left(\frac{r h f_{\rm LC}}{\nu} - 2\pi\delta E_J\right) m x_m.$$

We see that h_m is the same for each m, if we pick r such that the parenthesis in front of the cross terms mx_m cancel out. Using $\delta = 1 - r$, we see that this is achieved if

$$r = \frac{E_J}{E_J + h f_{\rm LC}/2\pi\nu},\tag{B11}$$

We fix λ such that the coefficients in front of x^2 and p^2 are the same. This is achieved if

$$\lambda = \left[\frac{\nu h f_{\rm LC}}{4\pi^2 \frac{h f_{\rm LC}}{\nu} + 8\pi^3 E_J}\right]^{1/4} \tag{B12}$$

With the choice of r in Eq. (B11), the parenthesis in front of m^2 in Eq. (B11) finally simplifies to $\pi h f_{\rm LC} r/2\nu$ (this can be shown using $\delta/r = -h f_{\rm LC}/2\pi\nu E_J$) With the choices above, and defining $\varepsilon_0 = \nu h f_{\rm LC}/2\pi\lambda^2$, we hence obtain the simplified expression

$$h_m = \frac{\varepsilon_0}{2} (x_m^2 + p_m^2) + \frac{\pi r h f_{\rm LC}}{\nu} m^2.$$
(B13)

which is independent of m (up to a constant shift), as we wanted.

Our next step is to analyze the nonlinear correction V_m . We first Taylor expand V_m in $2\pi\delta n$, obtaining $V_m = V_0 + \delta V_m$, where

$$\delta V_m \equiv \sum_{z=1}^{\infty} V^{(z)} \frac{(2\pi\delta m)^z}{z!}.$$
 (B14)

Note that for $z \geq 2$, $V^{(z)} \sim E_J$, while $V^{(1)} = -E_J[\sin(2\pi\lambda x_m) - 2\pi\lambda x_m]$. Moreover, since $\delta = 4\pi^2\lambda^4/\nu^2$, we conclude, to leading order,

$$\delta V_m \sim \frac{32\pi^6}{3\nu^2} E_J \lambda^7 x_m^3. \tag{B15}$$

Noting that $\|\hat{x}^3|m,\mu\rangle\| \sim \mu^{3/2}$, we conclude

$$\|\delta V_m |m,\mu\rangle\| \sim \varepsilon_0 32\pi^5 \lambda^5 \mu^{3/2} \,, \tag{B16}$$

In the low temperature limit, the system is confined to regions where $E_J(1 - \cos 2\pi\lambda x) \lesssim k_{\rm B}T$, implying $\mu \sim k_{\rm B}T/4\pi^2\lambda^2 E_J \sim k_{\rm B}T/\varepsilon_0$.

To summarize, we have

$$H_{\rm s}|m,\mu\rangle = \left(H_0 + \frac{\pi r}{\nu}m^2 + \delta V_m\right)|m,\mu\rangle,\qquad(B17)$$

where

$$H_{0} = \frac{\nu h f_{\rm LC}}{2\pi\lambda^{2}} p^{2} + \frac{h f_{\rm LC}\pi\lambda^{2} x_{m}^{2}}{2\nu} + E_{J}\cos(2\pi\lambda x_{m}),$$
(B18)

and δV_m obeying (B15). This establishes the result we wished to prove.

1. Perturbative expansion of jump operator

We next consider the action of the jump operator on $|m, \mu\rangle$. To this end, we rewrite the jump operator as

$$\ell = \frac{1}{\hbar C_{\rm R}} \int d\omega g(\omega) \mathcal{G}(\omega)[q]$$
(B19)

where $g(\omega) = \sqrt{J(\omega)/2\pi}$, $\mathcal{G}(\omega) \equiv \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt e^{i\omega t - i\hat{H}t}$ denotes the Greens function (i.e., the Fourier transform of the time-evolution superoperator) of the system, and $\hat{H} = [H_{\rm s}, \cdot]$ denotes the commutator with $H_{\rm s}$. For our purpose it is convenient to express G as $\mathcal{G}(\omega) = \lim_{\eta \to 0^+} i[G(\omega + i\eta) - G(\omega - i\eta)]$, where

$$G(\omega) \equiv \frac{1}{\omega - \hat{H}}.$$
 (B20)

In this form, perturbation theory can be conveniently expressed as a geometric series for the Green's functions.

We first write $\hat{H} = \hat{H}_0 + \delta \hat{V}_m$ where $\delta V_m \sim \mu^{3/2} 2\pi \lambda^5 E_J$ is the residual nonlinear correction which we found above. This will be our perturbation. Expanding $G(\omega)$ in powers of $\delta \hat{V}_m$, we find

$$\mathcal{G}(\omega) = \sum_{z=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{G}_z(\omega), \qquad (B21)$$

where $\mathcal{G}_z(\omega) = i[G_z(\omega + i0^+) - G_z(\omega - i0^+)]$ with

$$G_z(\omega) = \left[\frac{1}{\omega - \hat{H}_0}\delta \hat{V}_m\right]^z \frac{1}{\omega - \hat{H}_0}$$
(B22)

Hence we can perturbatively expand the jump operator as

$$\ell = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \ell_z, \quad \ell_z = \frac{1}{\hbar C_{\rm R}} \int d\omega g(\omega) \mathcal{G}_z(\omega)[q].$$
(B23)

Note that the leading-order term of ℓ , ℓ_0 , is independent of the well index: I.e.,

$$\ell_0 |m,\mu\rangle = |m\rangle \otimes \ell_0 |\mu\rangle \tag{B24}$$

We can find ℓ_0 from the eigenstates and energies of H_0 , $\{|\psi_n\rangle\}$ and $\{E_n\}$ as follows:

$$\ell_0 = \frac{2\pi}{\hbar C_{\rm R}} \sum_{ba} g(E_b - E_a) |\psi_a\rangle \langle\psi_b| \langle\psi_a|q|\psi_b\rangle \qquad (B25)$$

While it is possible to find ℓ_0 numerically, for small k (in the bottom of the wells), $|\psi_{\mu}\rangle \approx |m,\mu\rangle$, and $E_{\mu} \approx \mu \varepsilon_0$.

Then, since $q = \frac{e}{\sqrt{2\pi\lambda i}}(a_m - a_m^{\dagger})$, we find

$$\ell_0 \approx \frac{2^{3/2} \pi e}{i \lambda h C_{\rm R}} [g(\varepsilon_0) a_m - g(-\varepsilon_0) a_m^{\dagger}] \tag{B26}$$

Next, we use $g(-E) = e^{-\beta E/2}g(E)$, and introduce

$$\Gamma = \frac{4\pi J(\varepsilon_0)e^2}{h^2\lambda^2 C_{\rm R}^2 n_{\rm B}(\varepsilon_0)},\tag{B27}$$

where $n_{\rm B}(\varepsilon) = 1/(e^{-\beta\varepsilon} - 1)$ denotes the Bose-Einstein distribution. In terms of these quantities, we find (up to an unimportant global phase)

$$\ell_0 \approx \sqrt{n_{\rm B}(\varepsilon_0)\Gamma}[a_m - e^{-\beta\varepsilon_0/2}a_m^{\dagger}].$$
 (B28)

This is the result we quoted in the main text.

Let us now consider the first subleading order, arising from $G_1(\omega)$. Since we work to first subleading order in λ , we can set

$$\delta \hat{V}_m \sim \frac{8\pi^4 \delta \lambda^3 E_J m}{3} x_m^3 \tag{B29}$$

in our analysis below.

We now recall that $q = \frac{e}{\pi\lambda}p_m = \frac{e}{i\sqrt{2}\pi\lambda}(a_m - a_m^{\dagger})$. We can also use $\hat{H}_0\hat{a} = -\varepsilon_0 a_m$ to leading order, such that $\frac{1}{\omega - \hat{H}}[a_m] = \frac{a_m}{\omega + \varepsilon_0}$. Then

$$G_1(\omega)[a_m] = \frac{8\pi^4 \delta \lambda^3 E_J m}{3(\omega + \varepsilon_0)} \frac{1}{\omega - \hat{H}} [x_m^3, a_m] \qquad (B30)$$

Using $x_m^3 = 2^{-3/2}(a_m + a_m^{\dagger})^3$, we find $[x_m^3, a_m] = -\frac{3}{\sqrt{2}}x_m^2$, implying

$$[x_m^3, a_m] = -\frac{3}{2^{3/2}}(a_m a_m + a_m^{\dagger} a_m^{\dagger} + 2a_m^{\dagger} a_m + 1).$$
(B31)

Inserting this in Eq. (B30) and using $\hat{H}[a_m a_m] = -2\varepsilon_0 a_n a_n$, $H[a_m^{\dagger} a_m] = 0$, $\hat{H}[a_m^{\dagger} a_m^{\dagger}] = 2\varepsilon_0 a_m^{\dagger} a_m^{\dagger}$, we obtain

$$G_1(\omega)[a_m] = \frac{-\delta 2^{3/2} \pi^4 \lambda^3 E_J m}{(\omega + \varepsilon_0)} \left[\frac{a_m a_m}{\omega + 2\varepsilon_0} + \frac{a_m^{\dagger} a_m^{\dagger}}{\omega - 2\varepsilon_0} + \frac{2a_m^{\dagger} a_m + 1}{\omega} \right]$$
(B32)

Likewise, using $[x_m^3, a_m^{\dagger}] = \frac{3}{\sqrt{2}} x_m^2$ and $\hat{H}[a_m^{\dagger}] = \varepsilon_0 a_m^{\dagger}$, we find

$$G_1(\omega)[a_m^{\dagger}] = \frac{\pi^4 2^{3/2} \delta \lambda^3 E_J m}{(\omega - \varepsilon_0)} \left[\frac{a_m a_m}{\omega + 2\varepsilon_0} + \frac{a_m^{\dagger} a_m^{\dagger}}{\omega - 2\varepsilon_0} + \frac{2a_m^{\dagger} a_m + 1}{\omega} \right]$$
(B33)

Combining the above results with $q = \frac{e}{\sqrt{2\pi\lambda i}} [a_m - a_m^{\dagger}]$ hence yields

$$G_1(\omega)[q] = \frac{4\pi^3 e \omega \delta \lambda^2 E_J m}{i(\varepsilon_0^2 - \omega^2)} \left[\frac{a_m a_m}{\omega + 2\varepsilon_0} + \frac{a_m^{\dagger} a_m^{\dagger}}{\omega - 2\varepsilon_0} + \frac{2a_m^{\dagger} a_m + 1}{\omega} \right]$$
(B34)

This implies

$$\mathcal{G}_1(\omega)[q] = -2\pi^2 i e \delta \lambda^2 E_J n \left[a_m a_m f_2(\omega) + a_m^\dagger a_m^\dagger f_{-2}(\omega) + (2a_m^\dagger a_m + 1) f_0(\omega) \right]$$
(B35)

where

$$f_n(\omega) \equiv 2i \lim_{\eta \to 0^+} \Im\left[\frac{\omega + i\eta}{(\varepsilon_0^2 - [\omega + i\eta]^2)(\omega + i\eta + n\varepsilon_0)}\right]$$
(B36)

Inserting this into the expression for ℓ_1 we hence obtain

$$\ell_1 = \frac{8\pi^3 e \delta \lambda^2 E_J m}{\hbar C_{\rm R}} \left(a_m a_m c_2 + a_m^{\dagger} a_m^{\dagger} c_{-2} + [2a_m^{\dagger} a_m + 1]c_0 \right)$$
(B37)

where

$$c_n \equiv \int d\omega \frac{1}{2i} g(\omega) f_n(\omega).$$
 (B38)

We see that

$$c_n = \Im \left[\int d\omega \frac{\omega + i\eta}{([\omega + i\eta]^2 - \varepsilon_0^2)} \frac{g(\omega)}{[\omega + i\eta] + n\varepsilon_0} \right] \quad (B39)$$

In the $\eta \to 0$ limit, the imaginary part of the integrand is only nonvanishing in the neighborhood of 3 distinct values of ω : $\omega = \pm \varepsilon_0$ and $\omega = -n\varepsilon_0$ (where we recall *n* takes value either 0, 2, or -2). Summing the contributions from these three neighborhoods results in

$$c_n = \frac{2\pi\varepsilon_0}{2\varepsilon_0} \frac{g(\varepsilon_0)}{\varepsilon_0 + n\varepsilon_0} + \frac{-2\pi\varepsilon_0}{-2\varepsilon_0} \frac{g(-\varepsilon_0)}{-\varepsilon_0 + n\varepsilon_0} - \frac{2\pi n\varepsilon_0 g(-n\varepsilon_0)}{[n^2 - 1]\varepsilon_0^2}$$
(B40)

Which can be simplified to

$$c_n = \frac{\pi}{\varepsilon_0} \left(\frac{g(\varepsilon_0)}{n+1} + \frac{g(-\varepsilon_0)}{n-1} - \frac{2g(-n\varepsilon_0)}{n-1/n} \right)$$
(B41)

Eqs. (B37) and (B41) together provide the leading order correction to the jump operator.

To estimate its scale, we note that $\Gamma = \frac{2\pi e^2}{\lambda^2 h^2 C_{\rm R}^2} g(\varepsilon_0)^2$. Note that $c_n \lesssim \pi g(\varepsilon_0)/\varepsilon_0 \sim \sqrt{\Gamma} \lambda h C_{\rm R}/e\varepsilon_0$, and $\delta =$ $4\pi^2\lambda^4/\nu^2$, and $4\pi^2\lambda^2 E_J \sim \varepsilon_0$. Inserting these relations, we find

$$\|\ell_1|m,\mu\rangle\| \sim 32\pi^5\lambda^5 m\mu\sqrt{\Gamma} \tag{B42}$$

This concludes this Appendix.

Appendix C: Emergence of peak structure in the charge probability distribution

Here, we demonstrate how the characteristic fractal peak structure of the charge probability distribution in Fig. 5 emerges—leveraged in the readout protocol discussed in Sec. V.

When dissipatively stabilized, the system will be in a thermal mixture of coherent superposition of high-energy well states. We consider the evolution of one of such superpositions: $|\psi(0)\rangle = \sum_{m} c_{m\mu}|m,\mu\rangle$; here $c_{m\mu}$ is nonzero only for even or odd m when the system is in an +1 or -1 eigenstate of σ_z , respectively. Since the system is dissipatively stabilized, $\langle S_2 \rangle \approx 1$, and the superposition is phase-coherent: $c_{m\mu} \approx c_{m+2,\mu}$. After evolution with H_s for a time t, the state of the system is hence given by $e^{-iH_s t}|\psi(0)\rangle \approx \sum_m c_{m\mu}e^{-i[m^2\varepsilon_L+\mu\varepsilon_0]t/\hbar}|m,\mu\rangle$ [See Eq. (12) of the main text].

To obtain charge probability distribution, we consider the evolution of the Wigner function of the system, $W(\varphi, q, t) \equiv \frac{1}{\pi\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varphi' \langle \varphi + \varphi' | \rho(t) | \varphi - \varphi' \rangle e^{2iq\varphi/\hbar}$, from which we may obtain the charge probability distribution through $p(q, t) = \int d\varphi W(\varphi, q, t)$. A straightforward derivation shows that

$$W(\varphi, q, t) = \sum_{kl} c_{m\mu}^* c_{n\eta} e^{\pi i \frac{q(m-n)}{e} + i[\varepsilon_L(m^2 - n^2) + \varepsilon_0(\mu - \eta)]t/\hbar} w_{\mu\eta} \left(\frac{\varphi - \varphi_0(k+l)}{2}, q\right)$$
(C1)

where $w_{\mu\eta}(\phi, q)$ is the cross-term Wigner function of eigenstates μ and η of the Harmonic oscillator corresponding to the central well:

$$w_{\mu\eta}(\varphi,q) = \frac{1}{\pi\hbar} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} d\varphi \,\psi_{\mu}^*(\varphi + \varphi')\psi_{\eta}(\varphi - \varphi')e^{2iq\varphi'/\hbar}.$$
(C2)

Introducing l = m + n, such that $(m^2 - n^2) = l(l - 2n)$, along with $\varepsilon_L = \pi \hbar 2\pi f_{\rm LC}/2$, we find

$$W(\varphi, q, t) = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} e^{-i\varepsilon_0(\mu - \eta)t/\hbar} w_{\mu\eta}(\varphi - l\varphi_0/2, q) f_l^{\mu\eta} \left(q - le \frac{2\pi f_{\rm LC} t}{2} \right), \quad f_l^{\mu\eta}(q) \equiv \sum_n c_{l-n,\mu}^* c_{n,\eta} e^{-\pi i q(l-2n)/e}.$$
(C3)

Since $c_n \approx c_{n+2}$, each $f_n(q)$ is sharply peaked around

 $q \approx ze$ for $z \in \mathbb{Z}$; i.e., each $f_n(q)$ is a nascent Dirac

comb with periodicity e. Since c_l is only nonzero when $l = s \mod 2$, the sign of the peaks alternate based on the parity of n. Since $w_{\mu\eta}(\phi, q)$ is sharply peaked around $\phi = 0, W(\phi, q, 0)$ has its support confined as peaks near $(\varphi, q) = (n_1\varphi_0, n_2e)$ for integer n_1, n_2 , with corresponding sign $(-1)^{(s+n_1)n_2}$. This grid structure is clearly visible in Fig. 5(b) of the main text, where we plot the Wigner function numerically obtained for the system in panel (a) at t = 0. As t increases, Eq. (C3) the column of peaks where $\varphi = \varphi_0 n_1$ shifts in the positive q-direction with velocity $\pi n_1 e f_{\rm LC}$.

When $t = \frac{a}{b} \frac{\tau_{\rm LC}}{2\pi}$ for integers a, b, peaks from columns where $an_1 \sim c \pmod{b}$ align at values q/e = c/2b. Thus, the charge probability distribution, $p(q,t) = \int d\varphi W(\varphi, q, t)$, has its support confined around values q = ec/2b for each integer c. However, due to the alternating sign of peaks in columns where n_1 and s have opposite parities, the peaks of the Wigner function will only interfere constructively at values of c with parity s, provided b is even. This interference is in indicated with the dashed arrows in Fig. 5(a) at $t = \tau_{\rm LC}/8\pi$. Consequently, p(q, t) consists of peaks centered at values q/e = (2n + s)/b where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Appendix D: Wigner function envelope

We obtain the low-temperature Wigner function envelope using the results of Appendix C.

First, we note that the low-temperature limit implies that the system is relaxed to well ground states at the onset of the stabilizer segment: $|\psi(0)\rangle \approx \sum_n d_n |n, 0\rangle$. The Wigner function can then be found from Eq. (C3)

$$W(\varphi,q) = \sum_{l \in \mathbb{Z}} w_{00}(\varphi - l\varphi_0/2, q) \sum_n d_{l-n}^* d_n \, e^{-\pi i q(l-2n)/e}$$
(D1)

with $w_{00}(\varphi, q)$ the Wigner function of the well-ground state. The sum $\sum_n d_{l-n}d_{n0} e^{-\pi i q(l-2n)/e}$ is by construction 2*e*-periodic in *q*, and thus $w_{00}(\varphi, q)$ defines the *q* envelope of the Wigner function. We note that $w_{00}(\varphi, q)$ is the Wigner function of a well ground state with vacuum fluctuation width $\lambda\varphi_0$ in the flux quadrature, and thereby vacuum fluctuation width $\hbar/\lambda\varphi_0 = e/\pi\lambda$ in the charge quadrature. Thus

$$w_{00}(\varphi,q) = \frac{1}{h} e^{-\frac{\varphi^2}{2\varphi_0^2 \lambda^2} - \frac{q^2 \pi^2 \lambda^2}{2e^2}}$$
(D2)

Hence the envelope of the Wigner function in the charge quadrature is a Gaussian with characteristic width $e/\pi\lambda$.

Similar arguments, based on the peak structure of the wavefunction in the charge quadrature, show that the envelope of the Wigner function decays with φ as a Gaussian with characteristic width $\varphi_0/\sqrt{2\pi\lambda}$.