

# Quantum teleportation in superconducting charge qubits

R. M. Gomes, W. B. Cardoso, A. T. Avelar,\* and B. Baseia

*Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal de Goiás, 74.001-970, Goiânia (GO), Brazil*

In this paper we propose a scheme to implement a quantum teleportation based on the current experimental design [Nature (London) **431**, **162** (2004); *ibid* **445**, 515 (2007)] in which superconducting charge qubits are capacitively coupled to a single high-Q superconducting coplanar resonator. As advantage of this architecture, it permits the use of multiqubit gates between non-nearest qubits and the realization of parallel gates. We consider the case of two qubits inside the resonator, where the teleportation is accomplished.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Mn Entanglement production, characterization, and manipulation – 03.67.Hk Quantum communication – 03.67.-a Quantum information

Josephson junctions composing superconducting circuits are currently considered the most experimentally advanced solid state qubits [1]. The quantum behavior of these circuits have been tested at the level of a single qubit [2, 3, 4, 5, 6] and also for a pair of qubits [7, 8, 9, 10, 11]. The first quantitative experimental study of an entangled pair of coupled superconducting qubits was recently reported [12]. One of the possible applications of them concerns the quantum memory for superconducting qubits [26]. This system has great interest in fundamentals of quantum mechanics, quantum states engineering, and has also been proposed as a candidate for use in quantum information processing [13, 14, 15], quantum cryptography [16], quantum computer [17], and quantum teleportation [18].

For the implementation of quantum computer and teleportation the main ingredient is the conditional quantum dynamics, in which the coherent evolution of a subsystem depends on the state of another one and a measurement made upon one of them not only gives information about the other, but also provides its manipulation. Schemes in cavity-QED have also been proposed for realizing quantum logic gates [19] and teleportation [20]. Quantum logic gates have been demonstrated in cavity QED [22], ion trap [23], and NMR [24] experiments. The ion trap is also a good system for quantum information processing [21]. On the other hand, quantum teleportation has been demonstrated using optical systems [25] and NMR [7]. In our case we will use the circuit quantum electrodynamics architecture [27], in which two superconducting charge qubits, the Cooper pair boxes (CPBs), are strongly coupled to a coplanar transmission line resonator.

The description of a typical Cooper pair box (CPB) is detailed in [31]; accordingly, it consists of a several micrometre long and submicrometre wide superconducting island which is coupled via two submicrometre size Josephson tunnel junctions to a much larger superconducting reservoir, constructed in the gap between the centre conductor and the ground plane of the resonator, at an antinode of the field [31]. The overall energy scales of these terms, the charging energy  $E_C$  and the Josephson energy  $E_{J,max}$ , are readily engineered in fabrication by the choice of the total box capacitance and resistance respectively, subsequently tuned by electrical means. A gate voltage  $V_g$  applied to the input port (see [31]) induces a gate charge  $n_g = V_g C_g^*/e$  that controls the electrostatic energy

$E_{el}$ , where  $C_g^*$  is the effective capacitance between the input port of the resonator and the island of the CPB. A flux bias  $\Phi_b = \Phi/\Phi_0$  controls  $E_J$  via the application, with an external coil, to the loop of the box. When concerned with the case of two qubits they are usually fabricated at the two ends of the resonator, sufficiently far apart that the direct qubit-qubit capacitance is negligible [32]. An advantage of placing the qubits at the ends of the resonator is the finite capacitive coupling between each qubit and the input or output port of the resonator. This can be used to independently  $dc$  bias the qubits at their charge degeneracy point. The size of the direct capacitance must be chosen in such a way as to limit energy relaxation and dephasing due to noise at the input-output ports. Some of the noise is however still filtered by the high-Q resonator [34]. We note that recent design advances have also raised the possibility of eliminating the need for  $dc$  bias altogether [35].

In this paper we propose a scheme to implement a quantum teleportation in which two superconducting charge qubits are capacitively coupled to a single high-Q superconducting coplanar resonator. The qubits in the circuit QED architecture are constituted by split-junction Cooper pair boxes [2]. These devices can be modeled as two-level systems with the Hamiltonian [33]

$$H_a = -\frac{1}{2} (E_{el}\sigma_z + E_J\sigma_x), \quad (1)$$

where  $E_{el}$  is the electrostatic energy and  $E_J$  is the Josephson coupling energy. The Pauli matrices  $\sigma_z$  and  $\sigma_x$  are in the charge basis; that is, the basis states correspond to either zero or one excess Cooper-pair charges on the island. These CPBs can be viewed as artificial atoms with large dipole moments, and in circuit QED they are coupled to microwave frequency photons in a quasi-one-dimensional transmission line cavity (a coplanar waveguide resonator) by an electric dipole interaction [31]. This apparatus has a number of *in situ* tunable parameters, including  $E_{el}$  and  $E_J$ , and a choice can be made [34] in such a way that the combined Hamiltonian for qubit and transmission line cavity is the well-known Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian

$$H_{JC} = \hbar \left( \omega_r a^\dagger a + \frac{1}{2} \right) + \frac{\hbar\omega_a}{2} \sigma_z + \hbar\lambda (a^\dagger \sigma_- + a \sigma_+), \quad (2)$$

where  $a$  ( $a^\dagger$ ) is the annihilation (creation) operator for the cavity mode,  $\omega_r$  is the cavity resonance frequency,  $\omega_a$  is the energy splitting of the qubit, and  $\lambda$  is the coupling strength. Of course, the qubit energy splitting  $\omega_a$  is a function of the Cooper-pair box parameters  $E_{el}$  and  $E_J$  [34]. For typical values of the parameters in this Hamiltonian see Refs. [31, 34]. It should be noted here that there has been a basis change between Eqs. (1) and (2). In essence, we have swapped the  $x$  and  $z$  axes of Eq. (1), and the computational basis for our qubit has become the Josephson basis of the CPB. This choice of basis, which corresponds to operating the CPB in what is called the *charge degeneracy point* ( $E_{el} \sim 0$ ), has a number of advantages: the first of them being that the computational basis states become first-order insensitive to dephasing from offset charge noise. In fact, a CPB is only effective as a robust qubit at this operating point.

Single qubit gates are realized by pulses of microwaves on the input port of the resonator. Depending on the frequency, phase, and amplitude of the drive, different logical operations can be realized. External driving of the resonator can be described by the Hamiltonian [27]

$$H_D = \sum_k [\epsilon_k(t) a^\dagger e^{-i\omega_{dk}} + \epsilon_k^*(t) a e^{i\omega_{dk}}], \quad (3)$$

where  $\epsilon_k(t)$  is the amplitude and  $\omega_{dk}$  the frequency of the  $k$ -th external drive. In this scenario, quantum fluctuations in the drive are very small with respect to the drive amplitude and the drive can be considered, for all practical purposes, as a classical field. In the case where the drive amplitude  $\epsilon$  (single drive) is independent of time, and by moving to a frame rotating at the frequency  $\omega_d$  for both the qubit and the field operators, we get the displaced Hamiltonian [27],

$$\tilde{H} = \Delta_r a^\dagger a + \frac{\Delta_a}{2} \sigma_z - g (a^\dagger \sigma_- + a \sigma_+) + \frac{\Omega_R}{2} \sigma_x, \quad (4)$$

In the foregoing equation  $\Delta_r = \omega_r - \omega_d$  stands for the detuning of the cavity and the drive,  $\Delta_a = \omega_a - \omega_d$  is the same with respect with qubit transition frequency and the drive, and  $\Omega_R = 2\epsilon g/\Delta_r$  is the Rabi frequency. Changing  $\Delta_a$ ,  $\Omega_R$  and the phase of the drive can be used to rotate the qubit around any axis on the Bloch sphere [38]. In the dispersive regime where  $\Delta = \omega_a - \omega_r$  is much bigger than the coupling  $\lambda$ , we can write the following approximated Hamiltonian [27]

$$H_x \approx \Delta_r a^\dagger a + \frac{\tilde{\Delta}_a}{2} \sigma_z + \frac{\Omega_R}{2} \sigma_x, \quad (5)$$

where we have defined  $\chi = g^2/\Delta$  and  $\tilde{\Delta}_a = \tilde{\omega}_a - \omega_d$  with  $\tilde{\omega}_a = \omega_a + \chi$ .

Rotations about the  $z$  axis were produced from current pulses on the qubit bias line that adiabatically change the qubit frequency, leading to phase accumulation between the  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  states of the qubit [28]. Rotations about any axis in the  $xy$  plane were produced by microwave pulses resonant with the qubit transition frequency. They selectively address only the qubit energy levels, because transitions to higher-lying energy

levels are off-resonance due to anharmonicities of the potential and the shaping of the pulses [29]. The phase of the microwave pulses defines the rotation axis in the  $xy$  plane. The rotation angle is controlled by the pulse duration and amplitude.

In the situation where many qubits are fabricated with different transition frequencies in the resonator, the qubits can be individually addressed by tuning the frequency of the drive accordingly. It should therefore be possible to individually control several qubits in the circuit QED architecture. Assume the qubit 1 initially in the superposition state

$$|\phi\rangle_1 = C_0 |\downarrow\rangle_1 + C_1 |\uparrow\rangle_1, \quad (6)$$

where  $C_0$  and  $C_1$  are unknown coefficients. The resonator  $R$  and the qubit 2 (receiver of teleported state) are prepared in the entangled state  $(|0\rangle_R |\uparrow\rangle_2 - i|1\rangle_R |\downarrow\rangle_2)/\sqrt{2}$ . We assume one qubit coupled with the resonator, the other uncoupled. Thus, the interaction described by the Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian in Eq. (2) creates the nonlocal channel.

The state for the whole system can be written in the form

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle = & \frac{1}{2} \left[ |\Psi^{(+)}\rangle_{1R} (C_0 |\downarrow\rangle_2 + C_1 |\uparrow\rangle_2) \right. \\ & + |\Psi^{(-)}\rangle_{1R} (C_0 |\downarrow\rangle_2 - C_1 |\uparrow\rangle_2) \\ & + |\Phi^{(+)}\rangle_{1R} (C_0 |\uparrow\rangle_2 + C_1 |\downarrow\rangle_2) \\ & \left. + |\Phi^{(-)}\rangle_{1R} (C_0 |\uparrow\rangle_2 - C_1 |\downarrow\rangle_2) \right] \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where  $|\Psi^{(\pm)}\rangle_{1R}$  and  $|\Phi^{(\pm)}\rangle_{1R}$  are the Bell states [30]

$$|\Psi^{(\pm)}\rangle_{1R} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (-i |\downarrow\rangle_1 |1\rangle_R \pm |\uparrow\rangle_1 |0\rangle_R), \quad (8)$$

$$|\Phi^{(\pm)}\rangle_{1R} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\downarrow\rangle_1 |0\rangle_R \pm i |\uparrow\rangle_1 |1\rangle_R). \quad (9)$$

The outcome of the joint measurement on the qubit 1 and the resonator  $R$  is transmitted to the receiver, who can apply an appropriate rotation to qubit 2 to reconstruct the initial state of qubit 1. The measurement of the entanglement of the qubit-resonator system can be done through state tomography [12]. The multiqubit states teleportation, such as GHZ, W, and other entangled qubits, can also be implemented in superconducting circuits in the same way proposed in this paper.

In conclusion, we proposed a theoretical scheme to implement a quantum teleportation based on the current experimental design [31, 35] in which superconducting charge qubits are capacitively coupled to a single high-Q superconducting coplanar resonator. In this system the resonator frequency  $\omega_r/2\pi$  is assumed in the interval 5 - 10 GHz. The qubit transition frequencies were chosen as belonging to the interval 5 - 15 GHz, tunable via a flux through the qubit loop. In the circuit both qubits are affected by the externally applied field, but the effect on each qubit depends on the area of the qubit's loop. Coupling strengths  $g/2\pi$  between 5.8 and 100 MHz have been realized experimentally and couplings up

to 200 MHz should be feasible [31, 35]. Rabi frequencies of 50 MHz were obtained with a sample of moderate coupling strength  $g/2\pi = 17$  MHz and an improvement by at least a factor of 2 is realistic [2]. The cavity damping rate is chosen at fabrication time by tuning the coupling capacitance between the resonator center line and its input and output ports. Quality factors up to  $Q \sim 10^6$  have been reported for undercoupled resonators [36, 37], corresponding to a low damping rate  $\kappa/2\pi = \omega_r/2Q \sim 5$  KHz for a  $\omega_r/2\pi = 5$  GHz resonator. This results in a long photon lifetime  $1/\kappa$  of 31  $\mu s$ . To allow for fast measurement, the coupled quality factor can also be reduced by two or more orders of magnitude. Relaxation and dephasing of a qubit of this system were measured in Ref. [2], where  $T_1 = 7.3 \mu s$  and  $T_2 = 500 ns$  were reported. These yield  $\gamma_1/2\pi = 0.02$  MHz and  $\gamma_\phi/2\pi = (\gamma_2 - \gamma_1/2)/2\pi = 0.31$  MHz. In the limit where  $\Delta_r$  is large compared with the resonator half-width  $\kappa/2$ , the average photon number in the resonator can be written as  $\bar{n} \approx (\epsilon/\Delta_r)^2$ . In this case, the Rabi frequency takes the simple form  $\Omega_R \approx 2g\sqrt{\bar{n}}$ , as expected from the Jaynes-Cummings model.

The Cooper pair box is especially well suited for cavity QED because of its large effective electric dipole moment  $d$ , which can be  $10^4$  times larger than in alkali atoms and ten times larger in typical Rydberg atoms [31]. Besides the advantage of implementing teleportation with the present devices, in comparison with the cavity QED, coming from the easily reproducible architecture, the efficiency, and low loss, another great advantage of using CPBs comes from the velocity of the teleportation process, very important for quantum computation and information, in view, e.g., of the unavoidable presence of decoherence effects.

We thank the CAPES (RMG), CNPq (BB), and Funape (WBC, ATA, BB), Brazilian Agencies, for partially supporting this work.

---

\* Electronic address: ardiley@if.ufg.br

- [1] G. Wendin and V. S. Shumeiko, *Handbook of Theoretical and Computational Nanotechnology*, edited by M. Rieth and W. Schommers (American Scientific, California, 2006).
- [2] A. Wallraff, D. I. Schuster, A. Blais, L. Frunzio, J. Majer, M. H. Devoret, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 060501 (2005).
- [3] I. Chiorescu, Y. Nakamura, C. Harmans, and J. Mooij, *Science* **299**, 1869 (2003).
- [4] D. Vion, A. Aassime, A. Cottet, P. Joyez, H. Pothier, C. Urbina, D. Esteve, and M. Devoret, *Science* **296**, 886 (2002).
- [5] J. M. Martinis, S. Nam, J. Aumentado, and C. Urbina, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 117901 (2002).
- [6] Y. Nakamura, Y. Pashkin, and J. Tsai, *Nature (London)* **398**, 786 (1999).
- [7] R. McDermott, R. W. Simmonds, M. Steffen, K. B. Cooper, K. Cicak, K. D. Osborn, S. Oh, D. P. Pappas, and J. M. Martinis, *Science* **307**, 1299 (2005).
- [8] J. B. Majer, F. G. Paauw, A. C. J. terHaar, C. J. P. M. Harmans, and J. E. Mooij, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 090501 (2005).
- [9] T. Yamamoto, Y. A. Pashkin, O. Astafiev, Y. Nakamura, and J. Tsai, *Nature (London)* **425**, 941 (2003).
- [10] A. J. Berkley, H. Xu, R. C. Ramos, M. A. Gubrud, F. W. Strauch, P. R. Johnson, J. R. Anderson, A. J. Dragt, C. J. Lobb, and F. C. Wellstood, *Science* **300**, 1548 (2003).
- [11] Y. A. Pashkin, T. Yamamoto, O. Astafiev, Y. Nakamura, D. Averin, and J. Tsai, *Nature (London)* **421**, 823 (2003).
- [12] M. Steffen, M. Ansmann, R. C. Bialczak, N. Katz, E. Lucero, R. McDermott, M. Neeley, E. M. Weig, A. N. Cleland, and J. M. Martinis, *Science* **313**, 1423 (2006).
- [13] H. Mabuchi and A. Doherty, *Science* **298**, 1372 (2002).
- [14] C. J. Hood, T. W. Lynn, A. C. Doherty, A. S. Parkins, and H. J. Kimble, *Science* **287**, 1447 (2000).
- [15] J. Raimond, M. Brune, and S. Haroche, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 565 (2001).
- [16] A. K. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 661 (1991).
- [17] D. Deutsch and R. Jozsa, *Proc. R. Soc. London A* **439**, 553 (1992).
- [18] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crepeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, and W. Wootters, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **70**, 1895 (1993).
- [19] A. Barenco, D. Deutsch, and A. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4083 (1995); T. Sleator and H. Weinfurter, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4087 (1995); P. Domokos, J. M. Raimond, M. Brune, and S. Haroche, *Phys. Rev. A* **52**, 3554 (1995); T. Pellizzari, S. A. Gardiner, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 3788 (1995).
- [20] L. Davidovich, N. Zagury, M. Brune, J. M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, R895 (1994); J. I. Cirac and A. S. Parkins, *Phys. Rev. A* **50**, R4441 (1994); M. H. Y. Moussa, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 4661 (1996); S. B. Zheng and G. C. Guo, *Phys. Lett. A* **232**, 171 (1997).
- [21] J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4091 (1995); C. Monroe, D. Leibfried, B. E. King, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, *Phys. Rev. A* **55**, R2489 (1997).
- [22] Q. A. Turchette, C. J. Hood, W. Lange, H. Mabuchi, and H. J. Kimble, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4710 (1995); A. Rauschenbeutel, G. Nogues, S. Osnaghi, P. Bertet, M. Brune, J. M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **83**, 5166 (1999).
- [23] C. Monroe, D. M. Meekhof, B. E. King, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4714 (1995).
- [24] N. A. Gershenfeld and I. L. Chuang, *Science* **275**, 350 (1997); D. G. Cory, A. F. Fahmy, and T. F. Havel, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A.* **94**, 1634 (1997); J. A. Jones, M. Mosca, and R. H. Hansen, *Nature (London)* **393**, 344 (1998).
- [25] D. Bouwmeester, J.-W. Pan, K. Mattle, M. Eible, H. Weinfurter, and A. Zeilinger, *Nature (London)* **390**, 575 (1997); D. Boschi, S. Branca, F. D. Martini, L. Hardy, and S. Popescu, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **80**, 1121 (1998); A. Furusawa, J. L. Sørensen, S. L. Braunstein, C. A. Fuchs, H. J. Kimble, and E. S. Polzik, *Science* **282**, 706 (1998).
- [26] Emily J. Pritchett and Michael R. Geller, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 010301(R) (2005).
- [27] 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).
- [28] M. Steffen *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 050502 (2006).
- [29] M. Steffen, J. M. Martinis, I. L. Chuang, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 224518 (2003).
- [30] S. L. Braunstein, A. Mann, and M. Revzen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 3259 (1992).
- [31] A. Wallraff, D. I. Schuster, A. Blais, L. Frunzio, R.-S. Huang, J. Majer, S. Kumar, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Nature (London)* **431**, 162 (2004).
- [32] O. Gywat, F. Meier, D. Loss, and D. D. Awschalom, *Phys. Rev.*

- B **73**, 125336 (2006).
- [33] Y. Makhlin, G. Schon, and A. Shnirman, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **73**, 357 (2001).
- [34] A. Blais, R. S. Huang, A. Wallraff, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 062320 (2004).
- [35] 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, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Nature (London)* **445**, 515 (2007).
- [36] L. Frunzio, A. Wallraff, D. I. Schuster, J. Majer, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *IEEE Trans. Appl. Supercond.* **15**, 860 (2005).
- [37] P. K. Day, H. G. LeDuc, B. A. Mazin, A. Vayonakis, and J. Zmuidzinas, *Nature (London)* **425**, 817 (2003).
- [38] E. Collin, G. Ithier, A. Aassime, P. Joyez, D. Vion, and D. Esteve, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 157005 (2004).