

A spin-fermion model for solid-state quantum decoherence

Roman M. Lutchyn,^{1,2} Lukasz Cywiński,¹ Cody P. Nave,¹ and S. Das Sarma^{1,2}

¹Condensed Matter Theory Center, Department of Physics,
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-4111, USA

²Joint Quantum Institute, Department of Physics,
University of Maryland, College Park, MD 20742-4111, USA

(Dated: February 6, 2020)

We introduce a new theoretical model for quantum decoherence by studying the transverse dynamics of a single qubit interacting with a fermionic bath. We show that the qubit evolution under various pulse sequences can be mapped onto Keldysh path integrals. Our approach allows a simple diagrammatic treatment of different bath excitation processes contributing to qubit decoherence. We apply this theory to the evolution of the qubit coupled to the Andreev fluctuator bath in the context of widely studied superconducting qubits. We show that charge fluctuations within Andreev-fluctuator model lead to $1/f$ noise spectrum at low frequencies.

The loss of coherence of a quantum two-level system (quantum bit) is caused by its unavoidable coupling to the surrounding environment. For solid-state qubits, the decoherence process can be quite fast due to coupling to a large number of internal degrees of freedom. Our understanding of quantum decoherence and methods for its suppression in a realistic solid-state environment is mainly confined to the cases of a qubit interacting with bosonic [1, 2, 3] and nuclear spin baths [4, 5, 6], the so-called (and extensively studied) spin-boson and spin-bath models, respectively. A less well understood, but very relevant case for solid-state quantum architecture is that of a qubit coupled to a fermionic bath [7, 8], which dramatically differs from the previous examples. In this Letter we study quantum decoherence in the context of a superconducting charge qubit [9] interacting with the non-trivial bath of Andreev fluctuators [10, 11, 12]. This problem is a paradigmatic spin-fermion decoherence problem and applies to many situations involving the quantum coupling of a qubit (“spin”) to a general fermionic environment. Using a many-body Keldysh path integral approach, we obtain a quantum-mechanical description of the qubit evolution under pulse sequences aimed at prolonging the coherence of the system.

The transverse dynamics of a qubit interacting with its environment is determined by the following Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \frac{E}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z + \hat{\sigma}_z\hat{V} + \hat{H}_B. \quad (1)$$

Here the environment is represented by a fermionic bath \hat{H}_B , and the qubit is coupled to the environment through the density fluctuation operator:

$$\hat{V} = \sum_{l\sigma} v_l (c_{l\sigma}^\dagger c_{l\sigma} - n_{l\sigma}). \quad (2)$$

This model corresponds precisely to the coupling of superconducting charge qubit to the density fluctuations on the impurities in the substrate. Here $c_{l\sigma}$ and $c_{l\sigma}^\dagger$ are the fermionic annihilation and creation operators, v_l and

n_l are, respectively, the strength of the coupling and average occupation of l -th impurity, *i.e.* $n_{l\sigma} = \langle c_{l\sigma}^\dagger c_{l\sigma} \rangle$. Equations (1) and (2) define our spin-fermion model.

We study the evolution of the qubit in contact with a fermionic bath assuming the qubit energy relaxation time T_1 to be much longer than the quantum dephasing time T_2 . Qubit decoherence, *i.e.* dephasing, under the influence of the environment is given by the off-diagonal matrix elements of the reduced density matrix ($\hbar = 1$)

$$\rho_{+-}(t) = \rho_{+-}(0)e^{iEt}W(t). \quad (3)$$

Here $W(t)$ is the decoherence function defined as

$$W(t) = \left\langle e^{i(\hat{H}_B - \hat{V})t} e^{-i(\hat{H}_B + \hat{V})t} \right\rangle \quad (4)$$

with the brackets representing the average with respect to the bath Hamiltonian \hat{H}_B . In addition to the free evolution of the qubit (free induction decay), one is often interested in the dynamics of the system subject to external π -pulses [2, 13, 14, 15] which could, in principle, prolong or restore quantum coherence. The evolution of the qubit under various pulse sequences can be written as

$$W_n(t) = \left\langle \left(\hat{U}_-^{(n)}(t) \right)^\dagger \hat{U}_+^{(n)}(t) \right\rangle \quad (5)$$

with n being the number of applied pulses. The evolution operators $\hat{U}_\pm^{(n)}(t)$ are given by

$$\hat{U}_+^{(n)}(t) = e^{-i(\hat{H}_B + \hat{V})\tau_{n+1}} e^{-i(\hat{H}_B - \hat{V})\tau_n} \dots e^{-i(\hat{H}_B + (-1)^n \hat{V})\tau_1} \quad (6)$$

$$\hat{U}_-^{(n)}(t) = e^{-i(\hat{H}_B - \hat{V})\tau_{n+1}} e^{-i(\hat{H}_B + \hat{V})\tau_n} \dots e^{-i(\hat{H}_B - (-1)^n \hat{V})\tau_1},$$

where τ_i are time delays between π pulses, and $t = \sum_{i=1}^{n+1} \tau_i$. One can see that the well-known Hahn spin echo sequence (SE), for example, corresponds to $n = 1$.

Unlike in the spin-boson model, where the evaluation of $\hat{U}_\pm^{(n)}(t)$ is straightforward because the interaction is

linear in bosonic operators, allowing a simple diagonalization by a canonical transformation, the calculation of the evolution operators using the same technique in the spin-fermion model is cumbersome. However, one can

$$W_n(t) = \left\langle \mathcal{T}_C \exp \left[-i \int_C \tilde{V}_C(t') f_n(t') dt' \right] \right\rangle = \frac{1}{Z_B} \int \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi}_l \mathcal{D}\psi_l \exp \left(i S_B[\bar{\psi}, \psi] - i \int_C dt' \sum_{l\sigma} v_l(t') f_n(t') [\bar{\psi}_{l\sigma}(t') \psi_{l\sigma}(t') - n_l] \right). \quad (7)$$

Here, the function $f_n(t)$ encodes a particular sequence, see Fig. 1b and Ref. [20]. The coupling Hamiltonian is $\tilde{V}_C(t) = e^{i\hat{H}_B t} \hat{V}_C(t) e^{-i\hat{H}_B t}$ with $\hat{V}_C(t)$ being defined on the upper/lower branches of the Keldysh contour as $\hat{V}_C(t) = \pm \hat{V}(t)$, see Fig. 1a. The normalization constant is defined as the functional integral with $\hat{V}(t) = 0$.

In order to evaluate the functional integral (7), one needs to specify the bath Hamiltonian. Here we consider a non-trivial bath of Andreev fluctuators [10, 11, 12], which describes the fluctuations of the occupation of impurities close to insulator/superconductor interface due to Andreev processes. This model takes into account coherent processes of creation (destruction) of the Cooper pair in the superconductor by correlated tunneling of two electrons from (to) different impurity sites in the insulator [11]. In the limit when the superconducting gap energy Δ is the largest relevant energy scale in the problem ($T, E, \varepsilon_j, \ll \Delta$), the effective Hamiltonian for the Andreev fluctuator bath is given by

$$\hat{H}_B = \sum_{l\sigma} \varepsilon_l c_{l\sigma}^\dagger c_{l\sigma} + U \sum_l \hat{n}_{l\uparrow} \hat{n}_{l\downarrow} + \sum_{l \neq j} \left[A_{lj}^* c_{l\uparrow}^\dagger c_{j\downarrow}^\dagger + \text{H. c.} \right]. \quad (8)$$

Here, ε_l and U are the energy of a localized electron on l -th impurity (measured with respect to the Fermi energy ε_F of the conduction electrons) and repulsive on-site interaction (assumed to be large enough to prevent double occupation of the sites), respectively. The matrix elements A_{lj} , in the limit of low transparency barrier between the insulator and superconductor, are given by

$$A_{lj} \approx A_0 \frac{\sin(p_F |\mathbf{r}_l - \mathbf{r}_j|)}{p_F |\mathbf{r}_l - \mathbf{r}_j|} e^{-|\mathbf{r}_l - \mathbf{r}_j|/\pi\xi}. \quad (9)$$

Here p_F is the Fermi momentum, ξ is the coherence length in a clean superconductor. The amplitude $A_0 = 2\pi^2 d^2 a N(0) T_0^2$ is determined by the tunneling matrix element between the insulator and superconductor T_0 , the normal density of states in the metal $N(0) = mp_F/\pi^2$, the localization length under the barrier d and the size of the impurity wavefunction a [11].

Given the Hamiltonian (8), the action for the bath on

show that the evaluation of the function $W_n(t)$ can be reduced to the calculation of the functional integral with the Grassmann fields $\bar{\psi}_l$ and ψ_l defined on the Keldysh contour [8, 16, 17, 18]:

the Keldysh contour can be written as

$$S_B[\bar{\psi}, \psi] = \sum_{lj} \int_C dt' \sum_{\sigma} \delta_{lj} \bar{\psi}_{l\sigma}(t') (i\partial_{t'} - \varepsilon_l - U n_{l,-\sigma}) \psi_{l\sigma}(t') + A_{lj}^* \bar{\psi}_{l\uparrow}(t') \bar{\psi}_{j\downarrow}(t') + A_{lj} \psi_{j\downarrow}(t') \psi_{l\uparrow}(t'). \quad (10)$$

Here we used mean-field approximation for the Anderson impurity model assuming that Kondo temperature T_K is smaller than the superconducting gap Δ [12, 19]. The occupation probabilities $n_{l\sigma}$ are obtained self-consistently, see Ref.[19] for details. Performing Keldysh rotation [16, 17], one can calculate the full Green's function $\hat{\mathbf{G}}_{ll\sigma}(t, t')$ for the bath

$$\hat{\mathbf{G}}_{ll\sigma}^{-1}(t, t') = \hat{G}_{ll\sigma}^{-1}(t, t') - \hat{\Sigma}_{ll\sigma}(t, t'). \quad (11)$$

Here $\hat{G}_{ll\sigma}^{-1}(t, t')$ is the bare Green's function, see Eq. (10), and the self energy $\hat{\Sigma}_{ll\sigma}(t, t')$ is calculated in the Born approximation, see Fig. 2, giving

$$\hat{\Sigma}_{ll\sigma}(t, t') = \begin{pmatrix} \Sigma_{ll\sigma}^R(t, t') & \Sigma_{ll\sigma}^K(t, t') \\ 0 & \Sigma_{ll\sigma}^A(t, t') \end{pmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

where the matrix elements are

$$\Sigma_{ll\sigma}^{A/R}(t, t') = \sum_{j \neq l} |A_{lj}|^2 G_{jj, -\sigma}^{R/A}(t', t), \quad (13)$$

$$\Sigma_{ll\sigma}^K(t, t') = \sum_{j \neq l} |A_{lj}|^2 G_{jj, -\sigma}^K(t', t). \quad (14)$$




FIG. 1: a) Dependence of $\hat{V}_C(t)$ on time along the Keldysh contour. b) The plot of the function $f_n(t)$ for Spin Echo sequence ($n = 1$).

In Eqs. (13) and (14) we have neglected the off-diagonal terms in the impurity indices, i.e. $\Sigma_{lj\sigma} \approx \delta_{lj}\Sigma_{ll\sigma}$. Since the amplitude A_{lj} oscillates on the length scale of p_F^{-1} , the contribution of these off-diagonal terms to the self-

energy is small.

Using the above results, the action for the bath can be written in terms of the full Green's function $\mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}(t, t')$. Then, the decoherence function becomes

$$W_n(t) \equiv \exp[-\chi_n(t)] = \frac{1}{Z_B} \int \mathcal{D}\bar{\psi} \mathcal{D}\psi \quad (15)$$

$$\times \exp \left[i \sum_{l\sigma} \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt_1 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} dt_2 \left(\sum_{a,b=1}^2 \bar{\psi}_{l\sigma}^{(a)}(t_1) \left[\hat{\mathbf{G}}_{ll\sigma}^{-1}(t_1, t_2) \right]_{ab} \psi_{l\sigma}^{(b)}(t_2) - 2\delta(t_1 - t_2) v_l f^{(n)}(t_1) [\rho_{l\sigma}(t_1) - n_{l\sigma}] \right) \right].$$

Here, $\rho_{l\sigma}(t)$ corresponds to fermion density operator $\rho_{l\sigma}(t) = \frac{1}{2} [\bar{\psi}_{l\sigma}^{(1)}(t)\psi_{l\sigma}^{(2)}(t) + \bar{\psi}_{l\sigma}^{(2)}(t)\psi_{l\sigma}^{(1)}(t)]$; the fields $\psi^{(1)}(t)$ and $\psi^{(2)}(t)$ are given by the appropriate superposition of the fermionic fields on the upper and lower parts of the Keldysh contour, see Ref. [16]. After performing functional integral over fermionic fields and expanding to second order in v_l , one finds

$$\chi_n(t) = \sum_{l\sigma} v_l^2 \int_0^t \int_0^t dt_1 dt_2 f_n(t_1) f_n(t_2) [\mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^A(t_1, t_2) \mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^R(t_2, t_1) + \mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^R(t_1, t_2) \mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^A(t_2, t_1) + \mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^K(t_1, t_2) \mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^K(t_2, t_1)], \quad (16)$$

Equation (16) holds whenever the short-time expansion

is valid. The long-time asymptote can be obtained by resumming the whole series [8].

By introducing the Fourier transform of the Green's functions, Eq. (16) can be formally recast as

$$\chi_n(t) = \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\omega}{2\pi} \frac{F_n(\omega t)}{\omega^2} S_Q(\omega), \quad (17)$$

where $F_n(\omega t)$ is a sequence-specific filter function defined in Ref. [20] (for free induction decay $F_0(\omega t) = 2 \sin^2[\omega t/2]$ whereas for spin echo $F_1(\omega t) = 8 \sin^4[\omega t/4]$). The spectral density of quantum noise $S_Q(\omega)$ in the spin-fermion problem is given by

$$S_Q(\omega) = \sum_{l\sigma} v_l^2 \int_{-\infty}^{\infty} \frac{d\Omega}{2\pi} \left[\mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^A\left(\Omega + \frac{\omega}{2}\right) \mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^R\left(\Omega - \frac{\omega}{2}\right) + \mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^R\left(\Omega + \frac{\omega}{2}\right) \mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^A\left(\Omega - \frac{\omega}{2}\right) + \mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^K\left(\Omega + \frac{\omega}{2}\right) \mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^K\left(\Omega - \frac{\omega}{2}\right) \right]. \quad (18)$$

In the frequency domain, the full Green's functions are

$$\mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^{A/R}(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega - \varepsilon_l - U n_{l,-\sigma} - \Sigma_{ll\sigma}^{A/R}(\omega)},$$

$$\mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^K(\omega) = \tanh\left(\frac{\omega}{2T}\right) [\mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^R(\omega) - \mathbf{G}_{ll\sigma}^A(\omega)], \quad (19)$$

where the self energy $\Sigma_{ll\sigma}^{A/R}(\omega)$ is defined as

$$\Sigma_{ll\sigma}^{A/R}(\omega) = \sum_{j \neq l} \frac{|A_{lj}|^2}{\omega + \varepsilon_j + U n_{j\sigma} \mp i\delta}. \quad (20)$$

In general, the solution for $S_Q(\omega)$ with many Andreev fluctuators, can be obtained numerically by randomly generating the energies ε_l , and positions \mathbf{r}_l of the impurities at the insulator/superconductor interface. The numerically obtained spectral density of noise $S_Q(\omega)$ for

50 fluctuators is shown in Fig. 3. At low frequencies the noise power spectrum has $1/f$ dependence.

For ω and A_0 much smaller than the typical impurity level spacing $\delta\varepsilon$ and temperature T , the analytical solu-




FIG. 2: (color online). Dyson's equation for the retarded Green's function \mathbf{G}^R . Here we have adopted the convention of Ref. [17]. The advanced and Keldysh Green's functions are obtained analogously resulting in Eq. (12).




FIG. 3: (color online). Log-log plot of the noise spectral density $S_Q(\omega)$ for Andreev fluctuator model. The plot is obtained by randomly generating the positions $\mathbf{r}_l \in [-5, 5]\xi$ and energies $\varepsilon_l \in [-1, 1]K$ of 50 impurity sites and then, numerically integrating Eq. (18). (Here we assumed that the sites are occupied with equal number of spin up and spin down, $v_i = v$ for simplicity, and used $p_F^{-1} = 10^{-2}\xi$, $A_0 = 0.1K$ and $T = 0.1K$.) The dashed (blue) and dot-dashed (black) lines, shown for comparison, correspond to $1/f$ and $1/f^{1.3}$ noise spectra.

tion for the spectral density of noise (18) is given by

$$S_Q(\omega) \approx \sum_{l\sigma} 4v_l^2 \left[1 - \tanh^2 \left(\frac{\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l\sigma}}{2T} \right) \right] \frac{\gamma_{l\sigma}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l\sigma})}{\omega^2 + 4\gamma_{l\sigma}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l\sigma})^2}, \quad (21)$$

where $\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l\sigma} = \varepsilon_l + U n_{l,-\sigma}$ and $\gamma_{l\sigma}(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l\sigma}) = \text{Im} \Sigma_{ll\sigma}^A(\tilde{\varepsilon}_{l\sigma})$ is the broadening of the impurity energy levels due to Andreev processes. This broadening corresponds to the fluctuations of the impurity occupations changing the electrostatic environment of the qubit, and thus causing dephasing. From Eq. (21), one can see that $S_Q(\omega)$ is given by a sum of Lorentzians with different widths, which under proper distribution of γ_l gives rise to a $1/f$ noise spectrum. Note that unlike in the theory of $1/f$ charge noise produced by fluctuating two level systems (TLS) in the substrate with log-uniform distribution in the tunnel splitting [21], the emergence of the $1/f$ noise within Andreev fluctuator model has a qualitatively different geometrical origin due to the exponential dependence of the rate γ_l on the distance between different impurity sites, see Eq. (9). Given that the charge density fluctuations via Andreev processes involve two impurities with energies of the order of T , the probability to find two such impurities is proportional to $(T/D)^2$ with D being the impurity energy bandwidth, and thus, the spectral density of noise $S_Q(\omega)$ at low frequencies is proportional to T^2 as seen experimentally [22].

At high frequencies $\omega \gg \delta\varepsilon, T$, the spectral density $S_Q(\omega)$ has resonances corresponding to the virtual processes of correlated two-electron tunneling from (to) the impurity sites in the insulator. These resonances, describing manifestly quantum-mechanical processes, can

be seen in Fig. 3 at high frequencies. Their contribution to the decoherence of the qubit is suppressed by a factor $F_n(\omega t)/\omega^2$, see Eq. (17). However, going beyond the pure dephasing model, $T_1 \gg T_2$, considered here, one can show that correlated two-electron tunneling processes contribute to the energy relaxation of the qubit [10].

Using the above results calculated for the Andreev fluctuator bath, we now discuss the effect of pulse sequences. The qubit decoherence under a pulse sequence is given by Eqs. (15) and (17), which show that the noise contribution is modulated by a filter function $F_n(\omega t)$. Thus, to the second order in v_i we obtain results analogous to the case of a qubit coupled to the spin-boson bath or classical noise [2, 20]. Consequently, the analysis of the suppression of decoherence due to various pulse sequences [20] applies to the case of the quantum bath considered here, given that the time expansion is valid.

Conclusion. We consider spin-fermion model for quantum decoherence in solid-state qubits. We map the evolution of the qubit interacting with the fermionic environment, possibly subject to various π -pulse sequences, onto the Keldysh path integral. In the short-time limit, we derive the expression for the decoherence of the qubit determined by the noise spectral density due to quantum fluctuations of the bath. For a non-trivial model of the bath, the Andreev fluctuator model, we show that the spectral density has $1/f$ dependence at low frequencies. Our results provide a possible explanation for the source of the $1/f$ noise seen in charge qubits [22].

Acknowledgements We thank A. Kamenev, J. Koch, Y. Nakamura, E. Rossi, F. Wellstood and N. Zimmerman for stimulating discussions. This work was supported by the LPS-NSA-CMTC grant and by a fellowship from the Joint Quantum Institute (RL).

-
- [1] A. J. Leggett *et al.*, Rev. Mod. Phys. **59**, 1 (1987).
 - [2] G. S. Uhrig, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 100504 (2007).
 - [3] Y. Makhlin and A. Shnirman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **92**, 178301 (2004).
 - [4] A. V. Khaetskii, D. Loss, and L. Glazman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 186802 (2002).
 - [5] W. M. Witzel and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 035322 (2006).
 - [6] S. K. Saikin, W. Yao, and L. J. Sham, Phys. Rev. B **75**, 125314 (2007).
 - [7] L.-D. Chang and S. Chakravarty, Phys. Rev. B **31**, 154 (1985)
 - [8] A. Grishin, I. V. Yurkevich, and I. V. Lerner, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 060509(R) (2005); cond-mat/0608445 (2006)
 - [9] Y. Makhlin, G. Schön, and A. Shnirman, Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 357 (2001).
 - [10] L. Faoro *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 046805 (2005).
 - [11] V. I. Kozub *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 107004 (2006).
 - [12] L. Faoro and L. B. Ioffe, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 047001 (2006)
 - [13] L. Viola and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. A **58**, 2733 (1998).

- [14] K. Khodjasteh and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 180501 (2005).
- [15] B. Lee, W. M. Witzel, and S. Das Sarma, arXiv:0710.1416 (2007).
- [16] A. Kamenev, in *Nanophysics: Coherence and Transport*, edited by H. Bouchiat (Elsevier, 2005), pp. 177–246, (cond-mat/0210284).
- [17] J. Rammer, *Quantum Field Theory of Non-equilibrium States* (Cambridge University Press, 2007).
- [18] L. S. Levitov, in *New Directions in Mesoscopic Physics (Towards Nanoscience)*, edited by R. Fazio (Kluwer, Dordrecht, 2003), (cond-mat/0210284).
- [19] Y. Avishai, A. Golub and A. D. Zaikin, Europhys. Lett. **54**, 640 (2001)
- [20] Ł. Cywiński *et al.*, arXiv:0712.2225 (2007).
- [21] A. Shnirman *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **94**, 127002 (2005).
- [22] O. Astafiev *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 267007 (2004); Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 137001 (2006)