

Efficient quantum circuits for one-way quantum computing

Tetsufumi Tanamoto,¹ Yu-xi Liu,^{2,3} Xuedong Hu,⁴ and Franco Nori^{2,3,5}

¹Corporate R & D center, Toshiba Corporation, Saiwai-ku, Kawasaki 212-8582, Japan

²Frontier Research System, The Institute of Physical and Chemical Research (RIKEN), Wako-shi, Saitama 351-0198, Japan

³CREST, Japan Science and Technology Agency (JST), Kawaguchi, Saitama 332-0012, Japan

⁴Department of Physics, University at Buffalo, SUNY, Buffalo, New York 14260-1500, USA

⁵Physics Department, MCTP, The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan 48109-1040, USA

(Dated: November 3, 2018)

While Ising-type interactions are ideal for implementing controlled phase flip gates in one-way quantum computing, natural interactions between solid-state qubits are most often described by either the XY or the Heisenberg models. We show an efficient way of generating cluster states directly using either the iSWAP gate for the XY model, or the $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ gate for the Heisenberg model. Our approach thus makes one-way quantum computing more feasible for solid-state devices.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 03.67.Mn, 73.21.La

One- and two-qubit gate operations are essential ingredients for quantum information processing. Significant theoretical and experimental efforts have been devoted to study how qubits interact with external perturbations and between themselves (see, e.g., [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6]). Many solid-state qubits have inter-qubit interactions described by various kinds of exchange Hamiltonians: XY [2, 3], XXZ, or the isotropic Heisenberg exchange model [4, 5, 6], *rather than* the Ising model [1] (e.g., Table 1). For Ising interactions, two-qubit gates such as the controlled NOT (CNOT) and controlled phase flip (CPF) are obtained by turning-on the spin-spin interaction just *once*. For non-Ising interactions, these two-qubit gates are more difficult to implement: both CNOT and CPF gates require turning-on the two-qubit interaction *at least twice*, in addition to several single-qubit gates [8, 9].

In recent years there has been steady progress towards the tunable coupling of flux [10] and spin qubits [5, 11]. However, in general, qubit interactions are still difficult to control precisely. Furthermore, turning-on inter-qubit interactions can open new decoherence channels. For instance, the Heisenberg exchange interaction between electrons is electrostatic in nature. Turning it on makes the spin system vulnerable to charge fluctuations in the environment [12]. In order to improve the reliability of a solid state quantum circuit, it is generally desirable to have as few inter-qubit interaction operations as possible. In other words, universal quantum gates should minimize the number of two-qubit operations.

One-way quantum computing is a novel measurement-based approach [13, 14, 15], which starts with the creation of a highly entangled cluster state using CPF gates for Ising interactions. However, for the XY, XXZ, and the Heisenberg exchange interactions, each CNOT or CPF gate consists of at least *two* iSWAP or $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ gates (as opposed to one for Ising interactions). Here we tailor one-way quantum computing to the inter-qubit interactions actually present in solid state nanostructures. In particular, we show that the relatively cumbersome and expen-

sive CPF and CNOT gates can be replaced by a *single-application* of an iSWAP (XY model), $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ (Heisenberg model), or generalized $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ gate (XXZ model), without additional overheads. This change of the underlying two-qubit gate in the quantum circuit allows much simpler, faster, and more robust computations. In addition, we demonstrate that iSWAP gates are particularly useful in the construction of large cluster states. We also show that a measurement, combined with either the XY or the XXZ interaction, can further improve gate efficiencies in solid state quantum computation. Our approach is reminiscent of recent theoretical studies in photonic qubits [16], where polarization beam splitters, with post-selection by photon detection (i.e., measurement), have been shown to generate cluster states efficiently without using true CNOT gates.

$(J, J^z; t)$ -gate.— The XY, XXZ, and Heisenberg models are described by the Hamiltonian $H = \sum_{i<j} H^{(ij)}$ with

$$H^{(ij)} = J_{ij}(\sigma_i^x \sigma_j^x + \sigma_i^y \sigma_j^y) + J_{ij}^z \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z, \quad (1)$$

where σ_i^α ($\alpha = x, y, z$) are the Pauli matrices acting on the i -th qubit with qubit basis $|0\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle$ and $|1\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle$. For simplicity we take $J = J_{ij}$ and $J^z = J_{ij}^z$. The XY model then corresponds to $J^z = 0$, and the Heisenberg model to $J^z = J$. In the case of two qubits, $H^{(12)} = J(\sigma_1^x \sigma_2^x + \sigma_1^y \sigma_2^y) + J^z \sigma_1^z \sigma_2^z$ leads to a two-qubit evolution described by $U^{(12)}(t) = e^{-itH^{(12)}}$ ($\hbar = 1$), so that

$$|01\rangle \rightarrow A|01\rangle + iB|10\rangle, \quad |10\rangle \rightarrow A|10\rangle + iB|01\rangle, \quad (2)$$

with $A \equiv e^{-2iJ^z t} \cos 2Jt$ and $B \equiv e^{-2iJ^z t} \sin 2Jt$, while $|00\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$ are unchanged (an overall phase factor $e^{iJ^z t}$ has been omitted). Hereafter, we call this very general operation of turning-on $H^{(12)}$ for a time period t , the $(J, J^z; t)$ -gate. The iSWAP gate is obtained when $J^z = 0$ and $t = \tau_{\text{iSWAP}} = \pi/(4J)$, and the $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ gate is obtained when $J = J^z$ and $t = \tau_{\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}} = \pi/(8J)$. The conventional CNOT or CPF

TABLE 1. Examples of inter-qubit interactions

Two-qubit interaction	Qubit system
Ising	charge [1]
XY	flux [2, 10], charge-flux [2], phase [2], {charge [2], flux [2], spin [3]} in cavity
XXZ	electrons on helium [7]
Heisenberg	spin [4], donor atom [6]

gate requires two iSWAP gates for the XY model [8] or two $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ gates for the Heisenberg model [4, 8, 9], plus additional single-qubit rotations. For example, the XY-model CNOT gate is usually described by $U_{\text{cnot}}^{(12)} = e^{i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_1^z} e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_2^x} e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_2^z} [\text{iswap}]_{12} e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_1^x} [\text{iswap}]_{12} e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_2^z}$ [8], where $[\text{iswap}]_{12} \equiv U^{(12)}(\tau_{\text{iswap}})$.

Generation of cluster states using $(J, J^z; t)$ -gates.— Cluster states [13] are generated by a two-body evolution of the form $S_{ij} \equiv (1 + \sigma_i^z + \sigma_j^z - \sigma_i^z \sigma_j^z)$ acting on a product state $\Pi_i |+\rangle_i$, where $|\pm\rangle_i = (|0\rangle_i \pm |1\rangle_i)/\sqrt{2}$. The difficulty of applying this approach to natural non-Ising spin models is that neighboring interactions generally do *not* commute: $[H^{(i,i-1)}, H^{(i,i+1)}] \neq 0$, so that $\exp(-iHt) \neq \Pi_{ij} \exp[-iH^{(ij)}t]$. In order to create cluster states using these non-Ising spin interactions, *pairwise* bonding between qubits are needed [17]. Specifically, for a d -dimensional (d -D) qubit array, cluster states are generated in $2d$ steps. First, two-qubit cluster states are created by performing CPF operations between pairs of nearest-neighbor qubits. These qubit pairs are then connected to each other via another set of CPF operations, and a 1-D chain cluster state is generated. Afterwards, two chains are connected resulting in a ladder structure. Two ladder cluster states can then be connected into 2-D cluster states, and so on.

Can we further streamline this process of cluster state generation? An important step in optimizing a quantum circuit for a particular type of interaction is to identify the fastest route to a desired entanglement. When we closely inspect the various spin interactions, we find that CNOT/CPF gates are generally not the best two-qubit gates to generate cluster states (except in the case of Ising interactions). Instead, a more efficient approach is to replace the CPF gate [in the generation of pair cluster states (the first step above)] by a single application of the $(J, J^z; t)$ -gate in the general XXZ model, together with single-qubit rotations. The initial two-qubit state here needs to be $(|0\rangle_1 + e^{i\theta_1}|1\rangle_1)(|0\rangle_2 + e^{i\theta_2}|1\rangle_2)$, with $\theta_2 - \theta_1 = \pi$ or 0. If $\theta_2 - \theta_1 = \pi$, the duration of the $(J, J^z; t)$ -gate is $t = \pi/[4(J + J^z)]$; if $\theta_2 - \theta_1 = 0$, $t = (\pi/4 + m_s\pi/2)/(J - J^z)$, where m_s is an arbitrary integer. After appropriate single-qubit rotations, a two-qubit cluster state $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^C \equiv (|0\rangle_1|+\rangle_2 + |1\rangle_1|-\rangle_2)$ is generated (for simplicity, we omit normalization coefficients). For isotropic Heisenberg exchange interactions, where the $(J, J^z; t)$ -gate takes the form of $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$,

we need to prepare the initial state $|+\rangle_1|-\rangle_2$. Applying $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ then leads to $[\sqrt{\text{swap}}]_{12}|+\rangle_1|-\rangle_2 = |0\rangle_1\{|0\rangle_2 + i|1\rangle_2\} - i|1\rangle_1\{|0\rangle_2 - i|1\rangle_2\}$. After two single-qubit rotations, $\exp[i\pi(\sigma_2^z - \sigma_1^z)/4]$, $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^C$ is obtained. For XY interactions, the pulse sequence is even simpler: A cluster state $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^C$ of two qubits is simply created by applying the iSWAP gate $[\text{iswap}]_{12}|-\rangle_{y1}|-\rangle_{y2}$, where $|-\rangle_{yi} \equiv (|0\rangle_i - i|1\rangle_i)/\sqrt{2}$ is an eigenstate of σ^y .

Our new approach here can save more than half the time over the conventional method during the first step of cluster state generation. For example, when using the two-qubit spin Hamiltonian [9] $H_s^{(ij)} = J\vec{\sigma}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_j + (\vec{B}_i \cdot \vec{\sigma}_i + \vec{B}_j \cdot \vec{\sigma}_j)/2$, with $|\vec{B}_i|/2 = J$ for simplicity, a time $t_{\text{cpf}} = \pi/J$ is needed for generating a two-qubit cluster state including single-qubit rotations, using the conventional method. However, using our new method, it takes $\tau_{\sqrt{\text{swap}}} + \pi/(4J) = (3/8)(\pi/J)$, which amounts to a ~ 2.7 *speed-up* in time for generating a two-qubit cluster state. For spin qubits [5] based on quantum dots, with $J \sim 50$ μeV , the time required for generating a two-qubit cluster state would be ~ 15 psec. For a flux qubit [2] in the rotating frame, the Hamiltonian is $\tilde{H}_{\text{fq}} = H_0 + H_{xy}$, where $H_0 = \sum_{i=1}^2 (\Omega^R/2)(\sigma_i^x \cos \phi_i + \sigma_i^y \sin \phi_i)$, $H_{xy} = J(\sigma_1^x \sigma_2^x + \sigma_1^y \sigma_2^y)$, and Ω^R is the half-amplitude of the applied classical field. The time required to generate a two-qubit cluster state previously [18] was $t_{\text{cs}}^{\text{old}} = (11\pi)/(4\Omega^R) + \pi/(4J) \sim 18$ ns ($\Omega^R \sim J \sim 0.5$ GHz). In the method proposed here, we just need $t_{\text{cs}}^{\text{new}} = \tau_{\text{iswap}} \sim 1.57$ ns, which is *over one order of magnitude faster*.

The reduction in the number of quantum gates naturally increases the robustness of cluster state generation. Consider a simple case where there are phase errors in each of the one- and two-qubit gates, such that $\theta \rightarrow \theta + \delta_\theta$ and $Jt \rightarrow Jt + \delta_J$ respectively ($\delta_\theta, \delta_J \ll 1$). The resulting two-qubit state, denoted by $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^{C(\text{error})}$, is then slightly different from the target two-qubit cluster state. The *fidelity* of this state, if generated by a single $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ with single-qubit rotations starting from $|+\rangle_1|-\rangle_2$, is given by $|\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle_{12}^{C(\text{error})}|^2 \sim 1 - 2\delta_\theta^2 - 4\delta_J^2$, which is higher than the one achieved by the conventional CPF gate in Refs. [8, 9], where $|\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle_{12}^{C(\text{error})}|^2 \sim 1 - 2.5\delta_\theta^2 - 4\delta_J^2$. When an iSWAP gate is used, starting from $|-\rangle_{y1}|-\rangle_{y2}$, the fidelity for two-qubit cluster state generation is $(1 + \cos 2\delta_J)/2 \sim (1 - \delta_J^2)$, which improves greatly over the previous result [18] of $1 - 4\delta_J^2 - (1 - \sin^2(\pi/8))\delta_\theta^2$. For example, the fidelity increases from 0.84 (0.95) to 0.96 (0.99) for 20 % (10%) errors in δ_θ and δ_J .

Generation of larger cluster states with iSWAP gates.— The iSWAP gate is not just an efficient substitute in the generation of pair cluster states. It can also simplify the generation of larger cluster states. Consider the case of generating a three-qubit cluster state. Starting with qubits ‘1’ and ‘2’ already in a cluster state, applying an iSWAP gate between qubits ‘2’ and ‘3’ leads




FIG. 1: Illustration of how to generate cluster states with iSWAP gates. Each circle represents a qubit. Each solid line represents a bond by cluster states. (a) A three-qubit cluster state from a two-qubit cluster state. (b) Creation of a chain cluster state. The first step is to create separated two-qubit cluster states. The second step is to apply an iSWAP gate between the 3 two-qubit cluster states. (c) Two chain cluster states produced in (b) are vertically connected by iSWAPs, thus producing a ladder cluster states. Afterwards, several of these can be connected to produce 2-D cluster states.

to

$$[\text{iswap}]_{23}|\Psi\rangle_{12}^C|+\rangle_3 = |+\rangle_1|0\rangle_3[|0\rangle_2 + i|1\rangle_2] + i|-\rangle_1|1\rangle_3[|0\rangle_2 - i|1\rangle_2]. \quad (3)$$

Additional transformations $|0\rangle_j \rightarrow |0\rangle_j, i|1\rangle_j \rightarrow |1\rangle_j$ ($-\pi/2$ rotation around the z axis, $P \equiv \text{diag}(1, -i)$) for $j = 2, 3$ then lead to the “twisted” cluster state shown in Fig. 1(a), which is different from the conventional three-qubit cluster state $|\Psi\rangle_{123}^C = |+\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|+\rangle_3 + |-\rangle_1|1\rangle_2|-\rangle_3$ by an exchange of the indices of qubits ‘2’ and ‘3’. This simple example suggests that iSWAP gates can be used to expand cluster states even after the second step mentioned in the previous section. Using the iSWAP gate with only P , two-qubit cluster states can be connected to make a large cluster chain as shown in Fig. 1(b). Moreover, cluster states in higher dimensions can be generated in steps, as shown in Fig. 1(c).

The iSWAP gate is particularly powerful [but not the $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ and the general $(J, J^z; t)$ -gates] in the cluster state generation and manipulation. This fact can be understood and illustrated by applying a $(J, J^z; t)$ -gate between a pair of qubits that are in a pair cluster state $|\Psi\rangle_{12}^C$ and a third qubit in an arbitrary superposition state $a_3|0\rangle_3 + b_3|1\rangle_3$, in an attempt to generate a three-qubit cluster state $|\Psi\rangle_{123}^C = |+\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|+\rangle_3 + |-\rangle_1|1\rangle_2|-\rangle_3$. To maintain the right number of basis states in the three-qubit superposition state, we need $A = 0$ in Eq. (2). This also leaves us with $B = \pm 1$, which allows the factorization of the three-qubit state as in the three-qubit cluster state. But the conditions above correspond exactly to an

iSWAP gate. A general $(J, J^z; t)$ -gate or a $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ gate would have created additional terms so that additional steps are needed to clean up the state. In other words, the iSWAP gate combines both the power to entangle and the advantage of simplicity. Because the iSWAP gate is decomposed into a product of a CNOT and a SWAP gates [8], it is *fault-tolerant* as well [19]. Thus, we can say that cluster states in the XY model are constructed by *fault-tolerant* operations iSWAP and rotation P .

The replacement of CNOT gates by iSWAP gates has very broad implications in the context of the general manipulation of quantum information, going well beyond one-way quantum computing and the generation of cluster states. For example, it can be used for quantum error-corrections. For an arbitrary qubit state, $|\psi\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$, the three-bit-flip state $a|000\rangle + b|111\rangle$ is conventionally obtained by two CNOT gates: $[\text{cnot}]_{12}[\text{cnot}]_{13}|\psi\rangle_1|0\rangle_2|0\rangle_3$. Using iSWAP, this state can instead be generated by $e^{i(\sigma_1^x + \sigma_2^x)\pi/4}[\text{iswap}]_{23}[\text{iswap}]_{12}|\psi\rangle_1|+\rangle_2|+\rangle_3$, which again reduces the complexity of the quantum circuit.

In short, we have shown that we can efficiently create pair cluster states by directly using the $(J, J^z; t)$ -gates (specially the iSWAP or $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ gates when the interaction is of XY or isotropic Heisenberg type) based on naturally existing interactions. Furthermore, all CNOT gates can be replaced by iSWAP gates for cluster state generation and other broader applications.

Cluster fusion using iSWAP gates.— In general, Ising interaction is the most convenient interaction for one-way quantum computing because it generates CPF gates directly, while the isotropic Heisenberg interaction is the most cumbersome. The XY interaction and the associate iSWAP gate are almost equivalent to the Ising interaction and the CNOT gate, so that the iSWAP can be used to replace CNOT gates without incurring large costs in computational resources. The power of the iSWAP gate can be further enhanced in one-way quantum computing when combined with measurements. As an example, we show that a large $(M + N - 1)$ -qubit cluster chain can be created by joining two initially-separated M -qubit and N -qubit cluster chains (M and N are arbitrary integers) using one iSWAP gate and measurement, similar to the idea of “qubit fusion” described in Ref. [16].

Consider two initially-separated qubit chains that are in cluster states, $|\Psi_L\rangle = \cdots S_{12}S_{23}|+\rangle_1|+\rangle_2|+\rangle_3$ and $|\Psi_R\rangle = S_{45}S_{56}|+\rangle_4|+\rangle_5|+\rangle_6 \cdots$. We connect the end of the first chain and the beginning of the second chain by applying an iSWAP between qubits ‘3’ and ‘4’ (Fig. 2). The resulting state is $[\text{iswap}]_{34}|\Psi_L\rangle|\Psi_R\rangle = \cdots S_{12}S_{56}(2|\Theta\rangle)|+\rangle_1|+\rangle_6 \cdots$, where $|\Theta\rangle = [\text{iswap}]_{34}|\Psi\rangle_{23}^C|\Psi\rangle_{45}^C$. Next we carry out a σ^x measurement on qubit ‘3’ (or qubit ‘4’), so that

$$|\Theta\rangle \rightarrow |+\rangle_2|0\rangle_4[(1 + (-1)^{s_3}i)|0\rangle_5 + (1 - (-1)^{s_3}i)|1\rangle_5] + |-\rangle_2|1\rangle_4[(i + (-1)^{s_3})|0\rangle_5 + (i - (-1)^{s_3})|1\rangle_5]. \quad (4)$$




FIG. 2: Connecting two half-infinite cluster states via an iSWAP gate and measurement. After applying an iSWAP gate between qubit ‘3’ and ‘4’, qubit ‘3’ is measured on the σ^x basis following appropriate rotations in qubit ‘4’ and ‘5’. Qubit ‘3’ is discarded after the measurement.

Here $s_3 = 0$ or 1 is the result of the measurement. After applying a rotation $e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_5^z}[e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\sigma_5^x}]^{s_3}$, we obtain a $(M + N - 1)$ -qubit cluster state $\cdots S_{24}S_{45}|+\rangle_2|+\rangle_4|+\rangle_5 \cdots = \cdots \{|+\rangle_2|0\rangle_4|+\rangle_5 + |-\rangle_2|1\rangle_4|-\rangle_5\} \cdots$. The fidelity of this cluster fusion, in the presence of pulse errors δ_θ and δ_J , is $\sim 1 - \delta_\theta^2(1 + s_3) - 2\delta_J^2$. Compared with a previous generation method [18] for flux qubits, the fidelity is now improved when $\delta_\theta \lesssim \sqrt{2}\delta_J$.

Connection between distant qubits.— Last but not least, $(J, J^z; t)$ -gates can generate a cluster state for two distant qubits when combined with measurements. Consider a chain of $2N$ qubits in a product of pair-wise cluster states $\prod_{j=1}^N |\Psi\rangle_{2j-1, 2j}^C$. A two-qubit cluster state $|\Psi\rangle_{1, 2N}^C$ is efficiently obtained as follows: (1) Apply $(J, J^z; t_1)$ -gates between qubits ‘ l ’ and ‘ $l+1$ ’ ($l = 2, 4, \dots$) that belong to neighboring two-qubit cluster states (t_1 is determined below); (2) Perform σ^x -measurements on all intermediate qubits $2, 3, \dots, 2N-1$. After these two steps, the $2N$ -qubit state becomes $\{u_+|+\rangle_1 + v_-|-\rangle_1\}|0\rangle_{2N} + \{u_-|+\rangle_1 + v_+|-\rangle_1\}|1\rangle_{2N}$, with $\begin{pmatrix} u_+ & u_- \\ v_- & v_+ \end{pmatrix} = \prod_{j=1}^{N-1} \begin{pmatrix} u_{j+} & u_{j-} \\ v_{j-} & v_{j+} \end{pmatrix}$, $v_{j\pm} = \mp(-1)^{s_{2j}+s_{2j+1}}u_{j\mp}$ and $u_{j\pm} = 1 \pm (-1)^{s_{2j}} \exp 2i((-1)^{s_{2j}+s_{2j+1}}J - J^z)t_1$, where s_{2j} and s_{2j+1} are measurement outcomes ($s_{2j}, s_{2j+1} = \{0, 1\}$). The unitarity of this transformation dictates that $\cos 2((-1)^{s_{2j}+s_{2j+1}}J - J^z)t_1 = 0$ (this condition is generally not satisfied by the uniform Heisenberg model ($J = J^z$)); (3) Finally, depending on the measurement outcome, rotate qubit ‘1’ appropriately, and we obtain $|\Psi\rangle_{1, 2N}^C$.

Discussions.— An essential ingredient of our study is to identify the exact effects of two-qubit interactions in solid-state one-way quantum computing. Instead of overcoming difficulties in gate operations through encoding in logical qubits [7, 20], we here focus on optimizing the gate capabilities of naturally existing interactions and build quantum circuits accordingly. Our approach leads to significantly simplified quantum circuits compared to conventional ones built around CNOT/CPF gates, resulting in faster and more robust gates. Such simplicity should also be useful in the fight against decoherence, especially when combined with known approaches such as dynamic

decoupling [20]. We also observe that, as the isotropy in the interaction decreases from the Heisenberg model to the Ising model, through the XXZ and XY models, the generation of cluster states becomes more efficient as the required number of steps decreases.

Conclusions.— We have shown that $(J, J^z; t)$ -gates based on known interactions in solid state qubits (such as iSWAP gates for the XY interactions and $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ gates for the isotropic Heisenberg exchange interaction) allows significantly more efficient quantum circuits for one-way quantum computing. The gains in circuit efficiency and robustness make solid state qubits more feasible. The success of the present approach depends strongly on the interaction anisotropy, described by J and J^z . In particular, the iSWAP gate ($J^z = 0$) is especially attractive for its simplicity and its ability to entangle, so that it can replace the more widely used CNOT/CPF gates in a broad spectrum of applications ranging from one-way quantum computing to quantum error correction.

FN and XH are supported in part by the NSA, LPS, ARO, and NSF. We thank K. Maruyama for remarks.

-
- [1] T. Yamamoto *et al.*, Nature (London) **425**, 941 (2003).
 - [2] J.Q. You and F. Nori, Phys. Today **58** (11), 42 (2005).
 - [3] A. Imamoglu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **83**, 4204 (1999).
 - [4] D. Loss and D.P. DiVincenzo, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 120 (1998).
 - [5] J.R. Petta *et al.*, Science **309**, 2180 (2005).
 - [6] B.E. Kane, Nature (London) **393**, 133 (1998).
 - [7] D.A. Lidar and L.A. Wu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 017905 (2001).
 - [8] N. Schuch and J. Siewert, Phys. Rev. A **67**, 032301 (2003).
 - [9] G. Burkard *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **60**, 11404 (1999).
 - [10] M. Grajcar *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 172505 (2006); Y.X. Liu *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 067003 (2006); T. Yamamoto *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **77**, 064505 (2008).
 - [11] L.A. Wu and D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 30501 (2004).
 - [12] X. Hu and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 100501 (2006).
 - [13] H.J. Briegel and R. Raussendorf, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 910, 5188 (2001); R. Raussendorf, D.E. Browne and H.J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 022312 (2003); M.V. Nest *et al.*, New J. Phys. **9** 204 (2007); M. Hein *et al.*, quant-ph/0602096.
 - [14] M.A. Nielsen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 040503 (2004); C.M. Dawson *et al.*, *ibid.* **96**, 020501 (2006).
 - [15] P. Walther *et al.*, Nature (London) **434**, 169 (2005).
 - [16] D.E. Browne and T. Rudolph, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 010501 (2005); T.P. Bodiya and L.M. Duan, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 143601 (2006).
 - [17] Y.S. Weinstein, C.S. Hellberg, and J. Levy, Phys. Rev. A **72**, 020304 (2005); M. Borhani and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 034308 (2005).
 - [18] T. Tanamoto *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 230501 (2006); J.Q. You *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 052319 (2007); X.B. Wang, J.Q. You, and F. Nori, quant-ph/0608205.
 - [19] D. Gottesman, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 127 (1998).
 - [20] L. Viola and E. Knill, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 37901 (2003).