

Holographic quantum computing

Karl Tordrup, Antonio Negretti, and Klaus Mølmer

Lundbeck Foundation Theoretical Center for Quantum System Research,
Department of Physics and Astronomy, University of Aarhus, DK-8000 Aarhus C, Denmark
(Dated: April 30, 2022)

We propose that a single mesoscopic ensemble of trapped polar molecules can support a "holographic quantum computer" with hundreds of qubits encoded in collective excitations with definite spatial phase variations. Each phase pattern is uniquely addressed by optical Raman processes with classical optical fields, while one- and two-qubit gates are accomplished by selectively transferring the individual qubit states to a stripline microwave cavity field and a Cooper pair box where controllable two-level unitary dynamics is governed by classical microwave fields.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 33.90.+h, 85.25.Cp, 42.70.Ln

In classical computer science holographic data storage is poised to provide the next generation in digital media[1, 2]. The defining characteristic of this method is that information is stored globally rather than on specific sites in a storage medium. In practice a signal laser beam containing the data is interfered with a reference beam in a photosensitive medium which records the interference pattern. Subsequent illumination with the reference beam causes refraction off the stored pattern thus reading out the original signal beam. By varying the direction of the signal beam large amounts of data can be superimposed on the same storage medium. Current investigations of quantum memory components include similar ideas for storage of optical information in ensembles of atoms[3, 4] or molecules[5]. Coherent mapping between matter and light has been successfully demonstrated in stopped light experiments where a coherent pulse is stored in a Bose Einstein condensate[6], however for single photon fields efficient storage and read out of qubit states is still very difficult[7].

In the quantum version of holographic storage one can envisage N atoms or molecules in a lattice initially all populating the same internal quantum state $|g\rangle$ [see Fig. 1(b)]. The quantum information in an incident weak field

$\Omega_1 e^{i\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{x}}$ is, by the assistance of a control field $\Omega_2(t) e^{i\vec{k}_2 \cdot \vec{x}}$ and the Hamiltonian

$$H_{\vec{q}} = \sum_{j=1}^N \Omega_1 e^{i\vec{k}_1 \cdot \vec{x}_j} |e\rangle_{jj} \langle g| + \Omega_2 e^{i\vec{k}_2 \cdot \vec{x}_j} |e\rangle_{jj} \langle f| + \text{h.c.}, \quad (1)$$

transferred onto a collective matter-light excitation which propagates slowly through the medium and is brought to a complete stop by turning off $\Omega_2(t)$. The Hamiltonian has a dark state, the so-called polariton[8], which maps the field content of Ω_1 into a collective population of the state $|f\rangle$. In order for this storage mechanism to work, it is necessary that the optical depth of the sample is large[8], which may indeed be the case for a sufficiently large sample of atoms or molecules.

The coupling in Eq. (1) can be used to map a single-photon state to the collective phase pattern state $|f, \vec{q}\rangle \equiv 1/\sqrt{N} \sum_j e^{i\vec{q} \cdot \vec{x}_j} |g_1 \dots f_j \dots g_N\rangle$, where $\vec{q} = \vec{k}_1 - \vec{k}_2$ is the wave number difference of the two fields. For an extended ensemble with a large number N of atoms or molecules, phase pattern states with sufficiently different wave numbers approximately fulfill the orthogonality relation

$$\langle f, \vec{q}_1 | f, \vec{q}_2 \rangle = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N e^{i(\vec{q}_2 - \vec{q}_1) \cdot \vec{x}_j} \approx \delta_{\vec{q}_1 \vec{q}_2}. \quad (2)$$

Such collective excitations can be used to simultaneously encode a large number of qubits by associating the logical state $|b_1 b_2 \dots b_K\rangle$ ($b_i = 0, 1$) with the collective state $\prod_i (a_{\vec{q}_i}^\dagger)^{b_i} |g_1 g_2 \dots g_N\rangle$, where $a_{\vec{q}_i}^\dagger = \sum_{j=1}^N e^{i\vec{q}_i \cdot \vec{x}_j} |f\rangle_{jj} \langle g|$. That is, the identification of K orthogonal (in the sense of Eq. (2)) wave vectors \vec{q}_i allows construction of a K qubit register. Addressing different qubits is then merely a question of applying laser beams from different directions to adhere to the phase matching condition, as illustrated in Fig. 1(a).

We shall present a proposal for a universal quantum computer, with bits stored in the way described above. The challenge lies in restricting the ensemble to states with at most one particle transferred to each phase pattern collective state, and in providing the interactions




FIG. 1: (Color online). (a) By varying the direction of a control field $\Omega_2(t) e^{i\vec{k}_2 \cdot \vec{x}}$, an incident single photon with wave vector \vec{k}_1 may be transferred to different collective storage modes with wave vector $\vec{q} = \vec{k}_1 - \vec{k}_2$. (b) The levels $|g\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ are coupled by a two photon process leaving no population in the electronically excited state $|e\rangle$.




FIG. 2: (Color online). (a) A stripline cavity field is coupled to a Cooper pair box and an ensemble of trapped polar molecules. (b) Level structure of a molecule with a $^2\Sigma_{1/2}$ electronic ground state and nuclear spin 1/2. Only levels in the rotational ground state ($K = 0$) are populated. The $F = 0$ hyperfine ground state $|g\rangle$ is coupled with a Raman process involving the cavity field and a microwave source to the $|F = 1, m_F = +1\rangle$ triplet state $|m\rangle$ via a $K = 1$ rotationally excited state. Two optical fields provide further coupling to the triplet $|F = 1, m_F = 0\rangle$ state $|f\rangle$ via an electronically excited state.

necessary to drive single-qubit and two-qubit gates. The physical system we shall consider is a sample of cold polar molecules, trapped at an antinode of the quantized electromagnetic field of a superconducting stripline resonator [see Fig. 2(a)] [9]. A Cooper pair box (CPB) is situated at an adjacent antinode and both the molecular ensemble and the CPB are strongly coupled to the cavity field. The Cooper pair box has non-equidistant energy levels and under illumination by a classical resonant microwave field, it can be treated as an effective controllable two-level system. By transferring the quantum state between the Cooper pair box and the molecules, we shall show how to perform the required operations for universal quantum computation.

First, we shall modify the level scheme presented in Fig. 1, and introduce an auxiliary state $|m\rangle$, indicated in Fig. 2(b). Rather than relying on the coupling of a single photon field in Eq. (1) we can exploit the collective enhancement of the molecule-field interaction to resonantly transfer a single quantum of excitation from the cavity field to a single collective excitation of the molecular ensemble [9]. The cavity one-photon state is thus transferred to the collective molecular state $|m, \vec{q} = \vec{0}\rangle$ with a vanishing phase variation across the ensemble (because it is transferred from the ground state by means of long wavelength microwave fields). The state amplitude in the collective excitation in $|m, \vec{0}\rangle$, can subsequently be

transferred to the collective state $|f, \vec{q}_i\rangle$ by a STIRAP process with classical optical fields [10]. By inverting the order of the fields in the STIRAP process, the state vector amplitude can be returned to $|m, \vec{0}\rangle$ at later times from which a transfer to the cavity field is possible.

Before discussing the various transfer processes and the coupling to the Cooper pair box, let us outline how one stores multiple qubits in the same molecular ensemble. Imagine that a single cavity qubit in the form of a superposition of zero and one photon states has been transferred to the corresponding superposition of the collective molecular ground state and the state $|f, \vec{q}_1\rangle$. We now wish to transfer a second photonic qubit to another wave vector pattern state $|f, \vec{q}_2\rangle$. Using the collectively enhanced molecule-field coupling, we may transfer the amplitude of the one-photon state to the $|m, \vec{0}\rangle$ state as above, but the subsequent coupling of $|m\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ with a wave vector \vec{q}_2 couples the already encoded excitation in $|f, \vec{q}_1\rangle$ back to $|m, \vec{q}_1 - \vec{q}_2\rangle$. Furthermore since the STIRAP process occurs in the "wrong order" for the latter coupling, the molecular excited state will also become populated in the process. This problem is solved if we initially apply an inverted STIRAP pulse with wave vector \vec{q}_2 , so that the first qubit is reliably transferred to the state $|m, \vec{q}_1 - \vec{q}_2\rangle$ while the second qubit remains in the cavity. Then we transfer the field excitation to the state $|m, \vec{0}\rangle$, and with a final STIRAP process with wave vector \vec{q}_2 , the two states are transferred to $|f, \vec{q}_1\rangle$ and $|f, \vec{q}_2\rangle$. Note that the collective enhancement of the coupling is crucial for this protocol to work. When we map the cavity state to the molecules, it is possible for the amplitude in the intermediate state $|m, \vec{q}_1 - \vec{q}_2\rangle$ to be converted into a field excitation in the cavity, but due to the phase variation across the sample this coupling is suppressed, while the field coupling to the zero wave vector state experiences the collective enhancement factor \sqrt{N} . To go beyond two qubits we simply apply the same steps, such that both storage and retrieval of a molecular qubit in state $|f, \vec{q}_i\rangle$ is preceded by shifting all $|f, \vec{q}_i\rangle$ qubit states "backwards" to $|m, \vec{q}_i - \vec{q}_j\rangle$. The collective enhancement ensures that only $|f, \vec{0}\rangle$ can be mapped to or from the cavity before all states are brought "forwards" back to $|f, \vec{q}_i\rangle$.

We now turn to the details of the physical proposal and the transfer processes. The stripline cavity field is characterized by a wavelength in the cm range, and by a transverse modal extent of only few microns in the vicinity of superconducting waveguide elements [9, 11]. The associated small mode volume implies a high electric field amplitude associated with just a single photon. The CPB consists of a superconducting island onto which quantized charge may tunnel through insulating barriers. The associated large dipole moment together with the large value of the single photon electric field makes it possible to couple the field resonantly to the Cooper pair box with a Rabi frequency much higher than the decay rates of the

cavity field and of the Cooper pair box excitation. When operated at cryogenic temperatures the CPB acts as an artificial two-level system, and the interaction of the CPB and the cavity is described by a Jaynes-Cummings type Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{CPB}} = g_c(\sigma^- c^\dagger + \sigma^+ c) + \delta_{\text{CPB}}(t)\sigma^+ \sigma^-, \quad (3)$$

where σ^+ (σ^-) is the CPB raising (lowering) operator, c^\dagger (c) the cavity field creation (annihilation) operator and $\delta_{\text{CPB}}(t) = \omega_{\text{CPB}}(t) - \omega_c$ is the tunable CPB detuning with respect to the cavity. This coherent coupling has been demonstrated in a number of experiments[11, 12]. The CPB acts as a controllable source of single excitations which can be transferred to the initially empty cavity by an adiabatic sweep of $\delta_{\text{CPB}}(t)$ across resonance[9, 13]. The photonic excitation can subsequently be transferred to any \vec{q}_i mode in the molecular ensemble for storage.

The cavity coupling to the molecules through a Raman transition [see Fig. 2(b)] involving the cavity field with coupling strength g and a classical microwave field $\Omega_{\text{MW}}(t)$ is collectively enhanced by the square root of the number of molecules. We describe the dynamics with the Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{M}} = g_{\text{eff}}(t)(c^\dagger |g\rangle \langle m, \vec{0}| + c |m, \vec{0}\rangle \langle g|) - \delta(t)c^\dagger c, \quad (4)$$

where the effective coupling strength $g_{\text{eff}}(t) = \Omega_{\text{MW}}(t)g\sqrt{N_0}/2\Delta$ and N_0 is the number of molecules in the ground state. We shall consider the case of $N \sim 10^5 - 10^6$ molecules and encode no more than few hundred qubits, hence we can neglect the depletion of the ground state and set $N_0 = N$ in the following.

A cavity photon can be mapped to a collective excitation of the state $|m\rangle$ by turning on the classical field $\Omega_{\text{MW}}(t)$, and by performing an adiabatic sweep of $\delta(t)$ in Eq. (4). As indicated previously we use the state $|m, \vec{0}\rangle$ only as an intermediate station, and we use the optical STIRAP process to connect to the final $|f, \vec{q}_i\rangle$. To perform a single qubit rotation, we use the same procedure to map the qubit to the cavity and transfer it to the CPB. Single qubit rotations can then be performed on the CPB using microwave pulses[14] before transferring the qubit back to the appropriate holographic storage mode in the molecular ensemble. Two-qubit gates can be realized by transferring one qubit to the CPB and another to the cavity. Starting at $\delta_{\text{CPB}}(t=0)/g_c \gg 1$, $\delta_{\text{CPB}}(t)$ is adiabatically tuned close to resonance and back to $\delta_{\text{CPB}}(T)/g_c \gg 1$, causing the combined CPB-cavity dressed states each to acquire nonlinear phases. By choosing the form of $\delta_{\text{CPB}}(t)$ appropriately it is possible to implement a fully entangling controlled phase gate[9, 13]. Using quantum optimal control theory[15, 16] we have found improved pulse shapes for performing the SWAP and conditional phase shift operations. The resulting pulse shapes, shown in Fig. 3, all achieve infidelities below the 10^{-4} level. We have investigated the robustness of these operations with




FIG. 3: (Color online). (a-b) $g_{\text{eff}}(t)$ and $\delta(t)$ in units of the maximum coupling strength implementing a SWAP operation between the cavity and molecular ensemble. $\delta(t)$ is an odd function of time in order to cancel the total dynamical phase acquired during two consecutive SWAP's from a molecular state to the cavity and back[13]. (c) Functional form of $\delta_{\text{CPB}}(t)$ implementing a SWAP between the cavity and CPB. The coupling g_c cannot be turned off so a sweep from negative to positive detuning transferring a cavity state to the CPB must be followed by the time reversed sweep to transfer the state back to the cavity. During the two SWAP processes the total phase amounts to $0 \bmod 2\pi$. (d) Functional form of $\delta_{\text{CPB}}(t)$ implementing a fully entangling conditional phase gate between a CPB and a cavity qubit.

respect to the experimental controls by applying a filter to suppress frequency components above a certain cutoff which resulted only in a minor reduction in performance. Applying the same frequency cutoff to $\delta_{\text{CPB}}(t)$ we have investigated the probability of parametric excitations beyond the lowest two levels of the CPB using a harmonic oscillator model. Simulations yield a total excitation probability during a single gate $\lesssim 5 \cdot 10^{-5}$.

We shall now address the coherence properties of the system. The decoherence time of the CPB when operated at the so called "sweet spot" is determined mainly by the dephasing time $T_2 \sim 1 \mu\text{s}$. By replacing the traditional Cooper pair box with a transmon design[17] the main decoherence channel becomes relaxation with $T_1 \sim 16 \mu\text{s}$. With feasible coupling strengths of up to $g_c \sim 2\pi \times 200\text{MHz}$ [14] thousands of operations can be carried out within the coherence time of the CPB. The stripline cavity can be manufactured with photon loss rates as low as $2\pi \times 5\text{kHz}$ [14]. This corresponds to a decay probability during a SWAP or conditional phase gate of the order 10^{-4} which does not significantly limit the proposal. In order to achieve long coherence times for the molecular ensemble qubits it is advantageous to employ spin states for the internal states $|g\rangle$, $|m\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ [5]. In a molecule such as CaF with a $^2\Sigma_{1/2}$ ground state coupled by the hyperfine interaction to a nuclear spin of $I = 1/2$

we can use the singlet $F = 0$ for $|g\rangle$ and the two $F = 1$ triplet states with $m_F = 1$ and $m_F = 0$ for $|m\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ respectively as illustrated in Fig. 2(b). Qubits encoded in spin states are protected from dipole-dipole interactions and the resulting coupling to the phonon spectrum. The decoherence rate due to higher order spin-flip processes scales as $1/(\Delta l)^6$, where Δl is the lattice spacing, which for reasonable values is below the 1 Hz level[5]. Similarly the single molecule dephasing rate of the hyperfine states should also be below the 1 Hz level. In order to satisfy the dipole selection rule, $\Delta m_F = 1$, one of the STIRAP lasers can be chosen circularly polarized and the other one linearly polarized. The circularly polarized beam with wave vector \vec{k}_1 is kept fixed while the linearly polarized beam with wavenumber k_2 is rotated in a plane to give different $\vec{q}_i = \vec{k}_1 - \vec{k}_{2,i}$. Since the molecules are excited with different spatial phase factors, and they are read according to these factors they must not move around freely, but must be trapped in an arrangement that provides localization to within the wavelength of the phase patterns. Two possibilities are optical lattices and self assembled dipolar crystals in electrostatic traps[5]. Since the trapping has to occur within a few μm from the superconductor, we do not have space for a full 3D optical lattice, but should rather think of a single or a few tubes with strong transversal confinement along the axis of the superconductor.

We must also secure that the interaction with the STIRAP laser fields does not excite the motion of the individual molecules in the traps. With trap frequencies in the 100 kHz range, which is achievable with optical lattices, we find from numerical simulations that the STIRAP transfer can be carried out with less than 10^{-3} excitation of the molecular motion. The demands on the trapping depth to ensure that vibrational motion is not excited are significantly reduced if the laser are made almost co-propagating, e.g., with one perpendicular to the trap axis, and the other one making an angle just big enough for the resulting phase patterns to be orthogonal in the sense of Eq. (2). For equidistant molecules along a trap axis of length L , this will be the case for angles of the incident field with respect to the normal, obeying $k_2 L \sin \theta_n = n \cdot 2\pi$, where k_2 is the wavenumber of the non-fixed STIRAP beam. For this geometry it is not possible to strictly uphold the dipole selection rule, so selective transfer must be accomplished by other means, e.g. by applying a magnetic field to lift the degeneracy of the $|m\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ states. Several hundred qubits can then be encoded with beams coming from within a fraction of a radian only.

In conclusion we have described a holographic quantum information system able to support hundreds of qubits and thousands of one- and two-qubit operations. The setup uses an array of polar molecules, but although

these molecules might be in principle individually addressable, the coupling of a single molecule to the quantized cavity field is too small to be useful for reliable transfer of quantum states. The phase pattern modes are not only globally addressable by wider laser beams, but are also much more strongly coupled due to the collective enhancement. The holographic storage is for the same reason not prone to the conventional independent qubit errors, since single molecule disturbances affect all qubits, but only very weakly[18]. New schemes must be developed, however, to protect or correct qubits while in transit in the CPB or cavity.

This work was supported by the European Commission through the Integrated Project FET/QIPC "SCALA".

-
- [1] M. Haw, Nature **422**, 556 (2003).
 - [2] D. Psaltis, Science **298**, 1359 (2002).
 - [3] J. F. Sherson, H. Krauter, R. K. Olsson, B. Julsgaard, K. Hammerer, I. Cirac, and E. S. Polzik, Nature **443**, 557 (2006).
 - [4] C. W. Chou, H. de Riedmatten, D. Felinto, S. V. Polyakov, S. J. van Enk, and H. J. Kimble, Nature **438**, 828 (2005).
 - [5] P. Rabl and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 042308 (2007).
 - [6] C. Liu, Z. Dutton, C. H. Behroozi, and L. V. Hau, Nature **409**, 490 (2001).
 - [7] T. Chanelière, D. N. Matsukevich, S. D. Jenkins, S.-Y. Lan, T. A. B. Kennedy, and A. Kuzmich, Nature **438**, 833 (2005).
 - [8] M. Fleischhauer and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5094 (2000).
 - [9] P. Rabl, D. DeMille, J. M. Doyle, M. D. Lukin, R. J. Schoelkopf, and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 033003 (2006).
 - [10] K. Bergmann, H. Theuer, and B. W. Shore, Rev. Mod. Phys. **70**, 1003 (1998).
 - [11] D. I. Schuster, A. A. Houck, J. A. Schreier, A. Wallraff, J. M. Gambetta, A. Blais, L. Frunzio, J. Majer, B. Johnson, M. H. Devoret, et al., Nature **445**, 515 (2007).
 - [12] A. Wallraff, D. I. Schuster, A. Blais, L. Frunzio, R.-S. Huang, J. Majer, S. Kumar, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, Nature **431**, 162 (2004).
 - [13] K. Tordrup and K. Mølmer, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 020301(R) (2008).
 - [14] A. Blais, J. Gambetta, A. Wallraff, D. I. Schuster, S. M. Girvin, M. H. Devoret, and R. J. Schoelkopf, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032329 (2007).
 - [15] S. Montangero, T. Calarco, and R. Fazio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 170501 (2007).
 - [16] P. Treutlein, T. W. Hänsch, J. Reichel, A. Negretti, M. A. Cirone, and T. Calarco, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 022312 (2006).
 - [17] J. Majer, J. M. Chow, J. M. Gambetta, J. Koch, B. R. Johnson, J. A. Schreier, L. Frunzio, D. I. Schuster, A. A. Houck, A. Wallraff, et al., Nature **449**, 443 (2007).
 - [18] E. Brion, L. H. Pedersen, M. Saffman, and K. Mølmer, arXiv:0710.1717.