Coupling superconducting ux qubits at optim alpoint via dynam ic decoupling with the quantum bus

Ying-Dan Wang, A. Kemp, and K. Semba

NTT Basic Research Laboratories, NTT Corporation, 3-1, Morinosato W akam iya, Atsugi-shi, Kanagawa 243-0198, Japan (D ated: M ay 29, 2019)

We propose a scheme with dc-control of nite bandwidth to implement two-qubit gate for superconducting ux qubits at the optim alpoint. We provide a detailed non-perturbative analysis on the dynamic evolution of the qubits interacting with a common quantum bus. An elective qubit-qubit coupling is induced while decoupling the quantum bus with proposed pulse sequences. The two-qubit gate is insensitive to the initial state of the quantum bus and applicable to non-perturbative coupling regime which enables rapid two-qubit operation. This scheme can be scaled up to multi-qubit coupling.

PACS num bers: 03.67 Lx,85.25 Hv,85.25 Cp

I. IN TRODUCTION

Superconducting Josephson junction (JJ) qubit (for a review, see $e.g.^{1,2,3,4}$) provides an arena to study the macroscopic quantum phenomenon and acts as a promising candidate towards quantum information processing. For the three basic types of superconducting qubit, namely charge qubit, ux qubit and phase qubit, single qubit coherent operations with high quality factor have been demonstrated in many laboratories^{5,6,7,8,9,10,11,12}. However, the best way to achieve controllable coupling and universal two-qubit gate are still open questions. A number of experim ental attem pts^{13,14,15,16,17,18,19,20,21,22,23,24,25,26,27,28} as well as theoretical proposals have been put forward^{29,30,31,32,33,34,35,36,37,38,39,40,41,42} according to the characteristics of each speci c circuit. In this paper, our discussion would be focused on coupling superconducting ux qubits^{43,44,45}.

The straightforward consideration to realize two-qubit entanglement is utilizing the xed inductive coupling between two ux qubits. With tunable single-qubit energy spacing, this xed coupling can be used to demonstrate two-qubit logic gate²⁶. However, tunable coupling is required to achieve universal quantum computing. At early stage, dc-pulse control is widely adopted in the tunable coupling proposals^{33,46}. Main disadvantage for this method is the ine ciency to work at the degeneracy point which is a low-decoherence sweet spot. At the optimal point, the natural inductive coupling is o -diagonal in the diagonal representation of the free Ham iltonian. Hence the coupling only has second-order e ect on the qubit dynam ic for the detuned qubits. A nother di culty related with dc control is the operation error related to the

nite rising-and-falling time of the dc-pulse. Recently, more attention is paid to coupling schemes with ac-pulse control^{25,34,35,36,37,40}. W hile most of the ac-control coupling schemes can work at the degeneracy point and no additional circuitry is needed^{34,40}, some of them require strong driving³⁴ or results in slow operation⁴⁰. Meanwhile, unwanted crosstalk is present due to always-on

coupling. The possible solution to the above problem s is the parametric coupling scheme with a tunable circuit acting as $coupler^{36}$. A third ux qubit has been demonstrated as a candidate for this $coupler^{25,37}$. How - ever incorporating additional nonlinear component to the circuit would increase the complexity of the circuit and m ight introduce additional noise.

In this paper, we propose a scalable coupling mechanism of ux qubits with four Josephson junctions in two loops (4JJ-2L). The coupling is induced by a com mon quantum bus, such as a LC resonator or a onedim ensional superconducting transm ission line resonator (TLR). The e ective coupling Ham iltonian is diagonal with the free Hamiltonian of single qubit at the optimal point. By tuning the dc-control line, a dynam ic quantum gate can be realized for superconducting ux qubits at the optim al point. This gate operation is insensitive to the initial state of the quantum bus. The on-and-o of the coupling can be switched by dc-pulse of nite bandwidth without introducing additional error. This protocol is based on the time evolution of a non-perturbative interaction Ham iltonian. Therefore it is applicable to "ultra strong coupling" regime, where the coupling strength is com parable to gubit free H am iltonian. Due to these advantages, this new proposal could be a prom ising alternative in experiments.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we rst review the 4JJ-2L qubit con guration which was rst proposed in Ref.^{43,44}. We also analyze in detail the energy spectrum of this 4-JJ qubit with respect of magnetic ux in the two loops respectively. In Sec. III, the setup of our coupling mechanism for this type of qubit is described and the system H am iltonian is derived. In Sec. IV, we present two di erent ways to realize the e ective two-qubit coupling and construct two-qubit logic gates. The characteristics of this coupling scheme based on experimental consideration are analyzed in Sec. V. The conclusion and remarks of this paper are given in Sec. VI.

II. FLUX QUBIT W ITH TUNABLE QUBIT GAP

A single ux qubit discussed in this paper is shown in Fig. (1). Each qubit is composed of four Josephson junctions in two loops: the main loop (lower loop) and the dc SQUD loop (upper loop). The main loop encloses three junctions: two identical junctions with Josephson energy E_{τ} and one shared with the dc SQ U ID loop with Josephson energy ${}_{0}^{(i)} E_{J}^{(i)}$ where ${}_{0}^{(i)}$ is the ratio of the Josephson energy between the rst two junctions and the third one (here and hereafter, the superscript (i) denotes the variables of the i-th qubit). The main loop form sa ux qubit whose energy eigenstates are the superpositions of the clockwise and the counterclockwise persistent current states 43,44. The 4-JJ ux qubit is di erent from the conventional design of a ux qubit due to the additional dc SQUD loop. The third junction of 3-JJ ux qubit is replaced by a dc SQUD in this 4-JJ design. Therefore the e ective Josephson energy of the third junction can be controlled by the magnetic $\begin{bmatrix} ux & d \\ d \end{bmatrix}$ threading the dc SQUID loop. Assuming the two junctions in the dc SQUID bop are identical, the e ective Josephson energy is ${}^{(i)}({}^{(i)}_{d})E_{J}^{(i)} 2_{0}^{(i)}\cos{}^{(i)}_{d} = {}_{0}E_{J}^{(i)}$ with ${}_{0}$ the ux quantum. This feature, as we show later, enables the qubit gap to be tunable. This increases the external controllability of the quantum circuit^{43,44}. The main loop and the dc SQUID loop of each qubit can be controlled by external on-site ux bias separately.

As shown in Fig. (1), the Josephson phase di erences of the four junctions in one qubit are denoted by ${\prime}_{1}^{(i)}$, ${\prime}_{2}^{(i)}$, ${\prime}_{3}^{(i)}$ and ${\prime}_{4}^{(i)}$ respectively. By de ning ${\prime}_{3}^{(i)}$, ${\prime}_{3}^{(i)}$ + ${\prime}_{4}^{(i)}$)=2, the total Josephson energy in



FIG.1: (Color online) The schem atics of a single qubit with four Josephson junctions (denoted by cross) connected in two superconducting bop. The upper bop forms a dc SQUID with two identical junctions while the lower bop encloses three junctions similar as the conventional 3-JJ ux qubit. Each bop can be controlled separately by external magnetic ux $d_{i}^{(i)}$ and $m_{i}^{(i)}$ respectively.

one qubit loop is $U_0^{(i)} = E_J^{(i)} \cos' \frac{i}{1} + E_J^{(i)} \cos' \frac{i}{2} + \frac{i}{2} \cos' \frac{i}{2}$, where we have used the uxoid quantization relation in the dc SQUID loop:

$$Y_{3}^{(i)}$$
 $Y_{4}^{(i)} = 2 \frac{d}{0}$: (1)

There are two other uxoid quantization relations for this circuit:

$${}^{(i)}_{1} + {}^{(i)}_{2} + {}^{(i)}_{3} = 2 \frac{m}{0};$$

$${}^{(i)}_{1} + {}^{(i)}_{2} + {}^{(i)}_{4} = 2 \frac{m}{0};$$

$$(2)$$

where $m_{m}^{(i)}$ the magnetic ux threading the main qubit loop. Adding up the two equations in (2), we get

$$\prime_{1}^{(i)} + \prime_{2}^{(i)} + \prime_{3}^{(i)} = 2 \frac{t}{0};$$
 (3)

where $t^{(i)}_{t} m^{(i)} + d^{(i)}_{d} = 2$ is the total magnetic ux threading the qubit loop. Then the total Josephson energy of the four junctions in the loop is

$$U_{0}^{(i)} = {}^{(i)} \left({}^{(i)}_{d} \right) E_{J}^{(i)} \cos 2 \frac{t}{t} {}^{(i)}_{0} {}^{(i)}_{1} + {}^{(i)}_{2} {}^{(i)}_{1} + {}^{(i)}_{2} {}^{(i)}_{1} + {}^{(i)}_{2} {}^{(i)}_{1} + {}^{(i)}_{2} {}^{(i)}_{2} :$$

$$(4)$$

It takes the same form as that of the 3-JJ ux qubit^{3,44} except that the ratio ⁽ⁱ⁾ is tunable. If the totalm agnetic ux $_{t}^{(i)}$ is close to half a ux quantum $_{0}=2$ and ⁽ⁱ⁾ > 0.5, the function U₀ $\prime_{1}^{(i)}$; $\prime_{2}^{(i)}$ represents a landscape with periodic double-well potentials.

W ith external ux bias, one can set the operation point in one double-well potential. The classical stable states of this potential correspond to the clockwise and the counter-clockwise persistent current states. By changing the ratio ⁽ⁱ⁾ between the Josephson energy of the third junction (through the dc SQ U D), the height of the tunneling barrier (hence the tunneling rate) between the two m inim a of each double-well is tunable. W hen ⁽ⁱ⁾ is set in appropriate range, coherent tunneling between the two wells of the potential is enabled while the tunneling between di erent potentials is highly suppressed.

Taking into account the electric energy stored in the four capacitors, we can get the full H am iltonian of this system. The energy spectrum of the circuit with ⁽ⁱ⁾ = 0.8 and $E_{J}^{(i)} = E_{C}^{(i)} = 35 \ (E_{C}^{(i)} = e^{2} = 2C \ denotes the C oulom b energy of the rst (second) junction of the i-th qubit and C is the junction capacitance) is shown in F ig. 2 as a function of the rescaled total magnetic ux f⁽ⁱ⁾ = <math>_{t}^{(i)} = _{0}$. In the vicinity of $_{t}^{(i)} = _{0} = 2$, the low est two energy levels are far away from other energy levels and form s a two-level subspace that can be used as the

ux qubit. The eigenstates of the ux qubit is a superposition of the clockwise and the counter-clockwise persistent current states. The 4-JJ ux qubit works the same as its 3-JJ prototype except that the barrier height of the double-well potential is tunable in situ. In the twolevel subspace, the free H am iltonian for the i-th qubit is written as

$$H^{(i)} = "^{(i)} (t^{(i)}) z^{(i)} + t^{(i)} (t^{(i)}) x^{(i)}$$
(5)

where "⁽ⁱ⁾ is the energy spacing of the two classical current states

$$\mathbf{u}^{(i)} \begin{pmatrix} (i) \\ t \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{f}^{(i)} \quad \mathbf{f}^{(i)} \\ \mathbf{f}$$

⁽ⁱ⁾ is the energy gap between the two states at the and degeneracy point $t_{t}^{(i)} =$ ₀=2,

⁽ⁱ⁾
$$\binom{(i)}{d}$$
 ⁽ⁱ⁾ $\binom{(i)}{d} = 2 \binom{(i)}{0} \cos(\frac{d}{0})$ (7)

(i) According to the tight-binding model, can be evaluated through WKB approximation 44 as $(!_a=2) \exp([4(1+2)E_T^{(i)}=E_C^{(i)}]^{1=2})$ (i) (i)

 $^{\rm (i)}\mbox{=}2$)) where $!_{\rm a}$ is the attempt frequency of escape in the potential well and $\cos^{(i)} = 0.5^{(i)}$ (the P lanck constant ~ is set to be 1). In Fig. 3, the energy gap (i) and its derivative d (i)=d (i) are shown in as a function of ⁽ⁱ⁾. The results are obtained from num erical calculation and analytical derivation based on WKB approximation.

III. THE COUPLED SYSTEM

A schematics to illustrate our coupling mechanism is shown in Fig. 4 with two di erent types of data bus, i.e.,



FIG.2: (Color on line) The energy spectrum of the lowest six energy levels of the superconducting loop with respect of the totalm agnetic ux ${}_{t}^{(i)}$. The energy is in the unit of E $_{J}$ while the magnetic ux is in the unit of $_0$. We take $E_{T} = E_{C}^{(i)} = 35$ and $^{(i)} = 0:8$.



(i) FIG. 3: (Color online) The energy gap of single qubit and its derivative d $^{(i)}=d^{(i)}$ as a function of $^{(i)}$ for (a) $E_{\rm J}^{~(i)}=\!\!E_{\rm C}^{~(i)}$ = 35 and (b) $E_{\rm J}^{~(i)}=\!\!E_{\rm C}^{~(i)}$ = 50 (for sim plicity, the superscript (i) is om itted in the gure. The solid line (red) is obtained from the exact diagonalization of the original 4-JJ qubit Hamiltonian while the dashed line (black) is obtained from the analytical solution of the tight-binding m odel with W KB approximation which is less e ective at low barrier reqime. The two method has The energy is in the unit of E_{J} .

LC resonator and 1D TLR. For sim plicity, we rst concentrate on coupling two qubits. The problem of scale-up will be discussed later. As we described in the previous section: Each qubit is composed of four Josephson junctions in two loops: them ain loop (the lower loop) and the dc SQUD bop (the upper one). The main bop and the dc SQ U D loop of each qubit can be controlled by externalon-site ux bias independently. The two qubits are placed in su cient distance so that the direct coupling can be e ectively neglected²⁵. The two qubits are both coupled with a comm on data bus such as the twisted LC resonator or 1D on-the-top TLR via mutual inductance.

Due to the mutual inductance with the resonator, the magnetic uses include the contribution both from the external applied ux and the resonator, i.e., $m^{(i)} =$ ${}^{(i)}_{m,e}$ + ${}^{(i)}_{m,b}$ and ${}^{(i)}_{d}$ = ${}^{(i)}_{d,e}$ + ${}^{(i)}_{d,b}$, where the subscript e(b) indicates the contribution from the external magnetic ux (the quantum data bus) respectively. Then the total magnetic ux t reads

$${}^{(i)}_{t} = {}^{(i)}_{m,e} + {}^{(i)}_{-2} + {}^{(i)}_{m,b} + {}^{(i)}_{-2} + {}^{(i)}_{m,b} + {}^{(i)}_{-2} ; \qquad (8)$$

The coupling between a single qubit and the data bus includes two parts: the coupling of the qubit with the dc SQ U ID loop via mutual inductance M $_{\rm d}^{\rm (i)}$ and the coupling of the qubit with the main loop via $M_{\,\rm m}^{\,\,(i)}$. The magnetic ux induced in the dc SQUID loop and the

t

where $! = (LC)^{1=2}$ is the plasm a frequency of resonator, L (C) the lum ped or distributed inductance (capacitance) of the resonator and a^{y} (a) the plasm on creation (annihilation) operator. W ith these denotations,

$$_{d,b}^{(i)} = f_{d}^{(i)} a + a^{Y}$$
 (13)

where

$$f_{d}^{(i)} M_{d}^{(i)} \frac{r}{2L}$$
: (14)

U sually the mutual inductance of the resonator and the qubit loop is about several pH to several tens of pH. For example, if we take $M_{d}^{(i)} = 10 \text{ pH}$, ! = 1 GHz and L = 100 pH, $f_{d}^{(i)} = _{0}$ 5:6 10^{4} 1. This means the magnetic ux contributed from the resonator is much sm aller than that from the external applied magnetic eld. To the rst order, the energy gap of a single qubit is modil ed by the resonator as

(i) (i)
$$e^{(i)} = \frac{d^{(i)}}{d^{(i)}} = e^{(i)} (a + a^{y})$$

(i) $(a + a^{y})$ (15)

The Ham iltonian for a single qubit linearly interacting with the data bus reads,

$$H^{(i)} = \mathbf{u}^{(i)} \stackrel{(i)}{}_{m \neq e} + \stackrel{(i)}{}_{d_{e}e} = 2 \quad \stackrel{(i)}{}_{z} + \stackrel{(i)}{}_{d_{e}e} \stackrel{(i)}{}_{x} \stackrel{(i)}{}_{d_{e}e} + g^{(i)} \stackrel{(i)}{}_{d_{e}e} \stackrel{(i)}{}_{x} a + a^{y}$$
(17)

with the coupling coe cient

(i)

$$g^{(i)} {}_{d,e}^{(i)} = \frac{d}{d}^{(i)}_{(i)} {}_{(i)=}^{(i)}_{e}^{(i)}$$
 (19)

Note that magnitude of the coupling $g^{(i)}$ increases with the mutual inductance M_{d(i)}. If $m_{;e}^{(i)} + d_{;e}^{(i)} = 2 = (n + 0.5)_0$ (where n = 0; 1; 2 is an arbitrary integer), qubit is biased at the degeneracy point and the system H am iltonian is written as

$$H = ! a^{Y}a + \sum_{i=1,2}^{(i)} {\binom{(i)}{d_{e}}} x^{(i)} + g^{(i)} {\binom{(i)}{d_{e}}} x^{(i)} + a^{Y}$$
(20)



FIG.4: (C olor online) The circuit design examples to implement the required coupling. Two 4-JJ ux qubits are coupled with each other through the inductive coupling with a resonator as data bus: (a) a twisted LC resonator and (b) a 1D superconducting transmission line resonator in a separate layer. The current of the data bus induces magnetic uxes in the upper loop ($\binom{(i)}{d,b}$) and in the lower loop ($\binom{(i)}{m,b}$) of each qubit. The directions of $\binom{(i)}{d,b}$ and $\binom{(i)}{m,b}$ are opposite.

qubit main loop are

respectively and I is the current in the resonator. For our purpose, the two magnetic ux satis es

$$d_{ab}^{(1)} = 2 d_{m,ab}^{(1)}$$
: (10)

This can be implemented by designing the mutual inductance

$$M_{d}^{(i)} = 2M_{m}^{(i)};$$
 (11)

The m inus in (10) is due to the special layout of the data bus so that the directions of the magnetic ux induced by the quantum bus in the upper loop and the lower loop are opposite. Inserting Eq. (10) into Eq. (8), we nd the total ux $_{t}^{(i)}$ is contributed only by the external applied magnetic ux as $_{t}^{(i)} = \frac{q}{q_{r}e} + \frac{(i)}{d_{r}e} = 2$. Since the $_{z}$ com – ponent of the qubit is coupled with $_{t}^{(i)}$, the resonator contributes a pure $_{x}$ coupling with no $_{z}$ com ponent. Therefore the qubit can always be biased at the optim al point $_{t}^{(i)} = _{0} = 2$.

For the quantized m ode of the resonator,

$$I = \frac{r}{\frac{!}{2L}} a + a^{y} : \qquad (12)$$

By tuning the external magnetic $ux \begin{pmatrix} (i) \\ d_{re} \end{pmatrix}$ in the dc SQUID bop to be n₀, $g^{(i)} \begin{pmatrix} (i) \\ d_{re} \end{pmatrix} = 0$, the qubit is decoupled from the resonator in the storder. The qubits act independently and single-qubit operation can be in plemented by biasing $q_{re}^{(i)}$ together with microw ave pulse.

In the above discussion, the condition Eq. (11) is assum ed. However it m ight not be precisely satis ed in practical case. Suppose there is a small deviation in the fabrication process that $M_{d}^{(i)} = 2(1 + M_{m}^{(i)}) (where$

1), the total magnetic ux $_{\rm t}^{\rm (i)}$ includes a small contribution from the resonator,

$${}_{t}^{(i)} = {}_{q,e}^{(i)} + \frac{d_{e}}{2} M_{m}^{(i)} I:$$
 (21)

This adds a term to the Hamiltonian Eq. (20): $g^{0(i)}_{z}^{(i)} a + a^{y}$ with $g^{0(i)} = M_{m}^{(i)} I_{p}^{p} \frac{p}{1-2L}$. However since the qubit is far-detuned (15.28 G H z and 1 GHz in the case we discussed), this last term is a fast-rotating one and has negligible contribution. In the following, we adopt Eq. (20) as the elective system Hamiltonian.

IV. THE STRATEGY TO ACHIEVE EFFECTIVE TW O-QUBIT INTERACTION

In this section, we discuss about how to achieve the two-qubit coupling in this composite system. The qubit only interact with each other indirectly through a com – m on quantum bus. In the dispersive limit, the operation time of two-qubit logic gate is limited by the small ratio g= ! where g is the qubit-bus coupling and ! the qubit-resonator detuning. In this case, the resonator is only virtually excited. In this paper we follow another way that the quantum bus carries real excitations. The elective two-qubit coupling is achieved by one or a series of speci c unitary evolutions of the resonator-qubit composite system. Similarm ethod has been discussed in quantum computing with therm al ion-trap^{48,49,50,51} and Josephson charge qubit⁵². The feature of the resonator.

If a dc-pulse is applied to $d_{,e}^{(i)}$ to shift it from n $_0$, the tim e evolution of the composite system is driven by the H am iltonian Eq. (20). The operators included in the interaction H am iltonian $((a + a^y) x^{(i)})$ and the free H am iltonian $(a + a^y, x^{(i)})$ may be enlarged by their commutator into a closed Lie algebra of nite dimension. Thus the exact solution of the time evolution can be decomposed into a product over exponentials of the generators⁵³. In the interaction picture, it reads

$$U_{I}(t) = e^{iD_{i}(t)} e^{iA_{i}(t)} e^{iA_{i}(t)} x_{1} x_{2}} 1$$

$$e^{iB_{i}(t)a_{x}^{(i)}} e^{iB_{i}(t)a_{x}^{y}} e^{iA_{i}(t)} A_{i}(t) x_{2}^{y} e^{iA_{i}(t)} e$$

where

$$\begin{array}{c} 8 \\ \gtrless \\ B_{i}(t) = \frac{g^{(i)}}{i!} e^{i!t} 1; \\ A(t) = \frac{2g^{(1)}g^{(2)}}{!} \frac{1}{i!} e^{i!t} 1; \\ D(t) = \frac{(g^{(1)})^{2} + (g^{(2)})^{2}}{!} \frac{1}{i!} e^{i!t} 1t; \end{array}$$

$$\begin{array}{c} (23) \\ \hline \end{array}$$

In the following discussion, we neglect the universal phase factor D (t). If the last factor of Eq. (22) can be e ectively canceled,

$$U_{I}(t) \exp[iC(t) iA(t)_{x1 x2}];$$
 (24)

which represents the time evolution which is e ectively governed by H am iltonian $x_1 x_2$. This can be done in two di erent ways as described below:

A. Single pulse operation

By controlling the pulse length, a two-qubit gate is realized with a single dc-pulse which shifts ${}^{(i)}_{d,e}$ from n $_0$ (Fig. 5 (a)). While the whole time evolution Eq. (22) is non-periodic, Eq. (23) shows that B_i(t) is a periodic function of time and it vanishes at T_n = 2n =!. At these times, the time evolution operator in the interaction picture reduces to

$$U_{I}(T_{n}) = \exp i \frac{4n g^{(1)}g^{(2)}}{!^{2}} x_{1} x_{2}$$
 : (25)

This is equivalent to a system of two coupled qubits with an interaction H am iltonian / $x_1 x_2$.

The minimum time to realize a rotation $U_{xx}() = \exp(i_{x1} x_2)$ is

$$T_{m in} \qquad T_{m_0} = 2m_0 = !$$
 (26)

with

$$m_0 = [n_0] = \frac{!^2}{4 q^{(1)}q^{(2)}}$$
; (27)

where [:::] represents the integer part of a number. Note that we can not achieve a two-qubit rotation precisely unless n_0 happens to be an integer so that $n_0 = m_0$. The error of one two-qubit gate is on the order of $4 g^{(1)}g^{(2)}=$!²



FIG. 5: (Color online) The schematics of the pulse sequence to realize two-qubit gate operation.

(about 1% using practical param eters). This operation error can be avoided using a double-pulse m ethod discussed below.

B. Double pulse operation

A lternatively a two-qubit logic operation can be constructed with two successive operations as shown in Fig.5(b).

Initially $d_{e}^{(i)}$ is biased at n $_{0}$. The rst dc-pulse shifts it to a certain $d_{e}^{(i)} \in$ n $_{0}$ for a duration t=2. The evolution operator (in the interaction picture) is $U_{I} \frac{t}{2}$. A fler time t=2, reverse the direction of the magnetic ux in the dc SQUID loop so that $d_{e}^{(i)}$ is changed into $d_{e}^{(i)}$ and $g^{0(i)} = g^{(i)}$. The system is then driven by a new H am iltonian H 0 = H $g^{(i)}$ for another t=2.

The dynam ics for the above two consecutive steps is

$$U_{tot}$$
 (t) = exp[iM (t) x1 x2]exp[iN (t)]; (28)

where

$$M (t) = \frac{2g^{(1)}g^{(2)}}{!} \frac{2}{!} \sin \frac{!t}{2} t;$$

$$N (t) = \frac{(g^{(1)})^2 + (g^{(2)})^2}{!} \frac{2}{!} \sin \frac{!t}{2} t: (29)$$

Therefore, the total time evolution is equivalent to the time evolution governed by two-qubit interaction (1)

 $\begin{array}{cc} {}^{(1)}_{x} & {}^{(2)}_{x} \end{array}$ together with a universal phase factor.

The time T to realize a rotation $U_{\rm xx}$ () in this way satis es the nonlinear equation

$$\frac{!\,\mathrm{T}}{2} \qquad \sin\frac{!\,\mathrm{T}}{2} = \frac{!^2}{4\mathrm{g}^{(1)}\mathrm{g}^{(2)}}: \tag{30}$$

In the case of $! g^{(i)}$, the solution is written as

T
$$\frac{!}{2g^{(1)}g^{(2)}}$$
: (31)

The two-qubit operation time is estimated using experim entalparameters. A ssuming M_d = 20 pH and L = 100 pH, one gets g⁽ⁱ⁾ = $c_d f_d = _0$ 36.02 MHz. As a cost of the low uctuation related to the dc SQUID loop, the coupling strength associated with the dc SQUID loop is weaker than that with the main loop. For example, to realize a U_{xx} $\frac{1}{2}$, the operation time is about 204 ns. It is smaller than the qubit coherence time at the operation al point. The operation time is proportional to L=M $_d^2$. Increasing the mutual inductance between the dc SQUID and the resonator reduces the operation time. It is worth to point out that the ratio g=! is not required to be small. Therefore there is no fundamental limit on the operation time time except the realizable coupling strength.

As discussed in Sec. III, arbitrary single qubit gate can be performed after switching o the qubit-bus interaction. Any non-trivial two-qubit gate can be built up with this xx coupling plus single qubit gates. For example, the C-phase gate can be constructed as (suppose we change representation so that $\sim_z = x$ and $\sim_x = z)^1$

R () =
$$U_z^{(1)}$$
 $\frac{1}{2}$ $U_z^{(2)}$ $\frac{1}{2}$ exp i $z^{(1)}_z z^{(2)}_z$ (32)

with Uz $^{(i)}_z$ () $exp\ i\ \sim_z^{(i)}$ = $exp\ i\ _x^{(i)}$. And the CNOT gate can be readily constructed with C-phase gate as

$$CNOT = H^{(2)}R()H^{(2)};$$
 (33)

where H denote the H adam and transform ation as H $^{(i)} = \exp i \frac{a}{x} + \frac{a}{z} = 2^{p} \overline{2}$.

W ith arbitrary single-qubit rotation and any non-trivial two-qubit rotation, universal quantum computing can be realized according to quantum network theorem 54 .

V. THE FEATURES OF THIS COUPLING PROTOCOL

In the previous section, we have presented the way to realize two-qubit coupling and logic gate with our proposed setup. In this section, the features of this coupling protocol are analyzed with emphasis on the experim ental implementation. The qubit-qubit e ective coupling commutes with the free Ham iltonian of the single qubit. This feature enables m any practical advantages:

(1) The main idea to implement a two-qubit operation from the exact evolution operator Eq. (22) is to cancel the part related with the degree of freedom of the resonator, so that the nal operation Eq. (24) represents a qubit-qubit operation without entanglement with resonator mode. Therefore the resonator mode does not transfer population with the qubit although the resonator mode mediates the qubit-qubit interaction. As a result, this two-qubit logic gate is insensitive to the initial state of the resonator⁴⁹. This feature is in portant for the experiment performed at nite temperature because the equilibrium state of the resonator is a mixed state. For example, there is 16% population at the excited state for a 1 G H z resonator at 30 m K.

(2) As we mentioned, our coupling protocol works at the low-decoherence optimal point where the qubit is robust to ux uctuation and has long decoherence time. This is in contrast to other coupling protocols with dc-pulse control^{33,46}. During the two-qubit operation, the control parameter is not the total magnetic

ux but rather a component in the dc SQUID bop. Therefore, the qubit can be biased at the optim alpoint

 $_{t}^{(i)}$ = (n + 1=2) $_{0}$ during two-qubit operation.

W hile the dc SQUID adds a second control to the circuit, it introduces extra decoherence. The uctuation of the ux threading the dc SQUID loop results in the

uctuation of the energy splitting and introduces decoherence to the qubit dynam ics. Suppose the magnetic

ux are perturbed by the same amount of uctuation as $t^{(i)} + t^{(i)} + t^{(i)} + t^{(i)} + t^{(i)} + t^{(i)} + t^{(i)}$ Therefore rst-order e ect of the uctuation of magnetic . Therefore the ux in the main loop and the sub-loop are $E_t^{(i)}$ ę(i) and $E_{d}^{(i)}$ G⁽ⁱ⁾ respectively, with $c^{(i)}$ @E ⁽ⁱ⁾=0 ⁽ⁱ⁾ and QE $^{(i)}=$ Q $_{\rm d}^{(i)}$, where E $^{(i)}$ is the energy level spaccd^(i) (i) (i) ing of the qubit, $E^{(i)} = "^2$. If a $qubt^9$ with $E_{J} = 259$ G H z, $E_{J} = E_{c} = 35$ and $2_{0} = 0$:8 is biased at t = 0=2 and $2 \cos(d=0) = 0.65$, we get (2)

$$c_d^{(L)} = 163 \text{ G H } z = _0$$
: (34)

However, if qubit is not biased at the optim algoint but close to the optim algoint, e.g. "=E = 0.5,

$$c_{t}^{(1)} = 1100 \text{ G H } z = 0$$
 (35)

where we assume $I_p = 500 \text{ nA}$. The in uence of the uctuation on the total magnetic ux is one order of magnitude larger than that on the dc SQUID loop. This suggests that although the dc SQUID loop introduces additional uctuation to the system, the decoherence comes from ux uctuation in dc SQUID is much less than that decoherence caused by shifting-away from the degeneracy point $t_{t}^{(i)} = 0=2$.

(3) A scalable qubit-qubit coupling scheme should allow the coupling to be switched on-and-o (i.e. tunable over several orders of magnitude). O therwise, additional compensation pulse is needed to correct the error in single-qubit operation. In our coupling protocol, as shown in Eq. (19), the external magnetic ux in the dc SQ U ID loop can be used to switch o the coupling by setting $d_{,e}^{(i)} = 2n \quad _0$. When the qubit is decoupled from the data bus, single qubit operation can be controlled by

 $_{q,e}^{(i)}$ independently.

O urprotocol does not require to change the am plitude of a dc pulse instantaneously. Finite rising and falling times of the controlling dc pulse will not induce additional error to the two qubit coupling. This is essentially due to the qubit-resonator interaction commutes with the free H am iltonian of the qubit at the optimal point. In the previous discussion, we assumed a constant $g^{(i)}$ for simplicity. In the real experiments, the modulation of the magnetic ux always includes nite rising time, i.e., $g^{(i)} = g^{(i)}$ (t). As long as $g^{(i)}$ is a slow-varying (com paring with e ^{i!t}) function of time t, the above discussion stillhold except that the length of the pulse, i.e. T should satisfy

C (T) $e^{i!T} g^{(i)}$ (T) $g^{(i)}$ (0) = 0 (36)

instead of T = 2n = !. The magnitude of the e ective two-qubit interaction, i.e., A (t) in Eq. (22) is modi ed as

A (T) =
$$\int_{0}^{2} \frac{dt}{!} f e^{i!t} (g^{(1)}(t) g^{(2)}(0) g^{(1)}(0) g^{(2)}(t))$$

2g^{(1)}(t) g^{(2)}(t)g: (37)

To realize a certain xx rotation $U = \exp i \begin{pmatrix} (1) & (2) \\ x & x \end{pmatrix}$ is to apply a pulse satisfy C (T) = 0 and A (T) = simultaneously. It is notable that the two conditions are only related to the integral over the whole pulse and thus robust to operation error. This conclusion is also applicable to the double-pulse m ethod.

(4) The evaluation is applicable to "ultra-strong coupling" regime where the coupling strength is even com parable to the free H am iltonian frequency as long as the approximation (15) is valid. Hence in principle, the twoqubit can be made as fast as single qubit operation.

VI. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSIONS

W e illustrate two possible ways to scale up the twoqubit system. In Fig. 6 (a), a nearest-neighbor coupled qubits are sketched. They form a transverse Ising chain which can be use to implement quantum state transfer^{55,56,57} and quantum information storage⁵². It is possible to extend this con guration to 2D Ising model. Fig. 6 (b) shows an example to realize selective coupling between multiple qubits by a single quantum bus (such as a transmission line resonator).

For nom inally same parameters, there is natural spread of the junctions critical currents. This coupling mechanism is robust to the di erence of $_{0}^{(1)}$ and $_{0}^{(2)}$ because the free H am iltonian commutes with the interaction H am iltonian. A s such, in the sam ple fabrication process, the requirements on hom ogeneity and reproducibility can be relaxed and meet with current production technology. The additional on-site control lines requires only one more layer.



FIG.6: (Coloronline) The schem atics to scale up the coupling system. (a) Each qubit is coupled with the nearest neighbors by the twisted LC resonators. (b) All qubits are interacting with a common TLR resonator on the top of the qubits array.

The qubit-resonator interaction commutes with the qubit free Ham iltonian. This feature enables quantum non-dem olition (QND) measurement on superconducting qubit biased at the optimal point⁵⁸. This QND measurement is realizable even in the ultra-strong coupling lim \pm^{59} .

A cknow ledgem ent

The authors are very grateful to S. Saito and H. Nakano for their suggestions on the experimental realiza-

- ¹ Y.Makhlin,G.Schoen, and A.Shnim an, Rev.M od.Phys. 73, 357 (2001).
- 2 J.Q.You and F.Nori, Phys.Today 58 (11), 42 (2005).
- ³ G.W endin and V. Shum eiko, in Handbook of Theoreticaland ComputationalNanotechnology (ASP,LosAngeles, 2006).
- $^4\,$ J.C larke and F.K.W ilhelm , N ature 453, 1031 (2008).
- ⁵ Y.Nakamura, Y.A.Pashkin, and J.S.Tsai, Nature (London) 398, 786 (1999).
- ⁶ D. Vion, A. Aassime, A. Cottet, P. Joyez, H. Pothier, C. Urbina, D. Esteve, and M. H. Devoret, Science 296, 886 (2002).
- ⁷ Y.Yu, S.Han, X.Chu, S.-I.Chu, and Z.W ang, Science 296,889 (2002).
- ⁸ J. M. Martinis, S. Nam, J. Aumentado, and C. Urbina, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 117901 (2002).
- ⁹ I.Chiorescu, Y.Nakamura, C.J.P.M.Harmans, and J.E. Mooij Science 299, 1869 (2003).
- ¹⁰ S. Saito, M. Thorwart, H. Tanaka, M. Ueda, H. Nakano, K. Sem ba, and H. Takayanagi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 037001 (2004).
- ¹¹ J. Johansson, S. Saito, T. M eno, H. Tanaka, H. Nakano, M. Ueda, K. Sem ba, and H. Takayanagi, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 127006 (2006).
- ¹² F. Deppe, M. Mariantoni, E. P. Menzel, A. Marx, S.Saito, K. Kakuyanagi, H. Tanaka, T. Meno, K. Semba, H. Takayanagi, E. Solano, and R. Gross, Nature Physics doi:10.2038/nphys1016 (2008).
- ¹³ Y.A.Pashkin, T.Yam am oto, O.A sta ev, Y.Nakam ura, D.V.Averin, and J.S.Tsai, Nature (London) 421, 823 (2003).
- ¹⁴ T.Yam am oto, Y.A.Pashkin, O.A sta ev, Y.Nakam ura, and J.S.Tsai, Nature (London) 425, 941 (2003).
- ¹⁵ A.J.Berkley, H.Xu, R.C.Ramaos, M.A.Gubrud, F.W. Strach, P.R.Johanson, J.R.Anderson, A.J.Dagt, C.J. Lob, and F.C.W ellstood, Science 368 (2003).
- ¹⁶ P.R. Johnson, F.W. Strauch, A.J.D ragt, R.C.Ramos, C.J.Lobb, J.R.Anderson, and F.C.W ellstood, Phys. Rev.B.67, 020509 (2003).
- ¹⁷ A. Izm alkov, M.G rajpar, E. Il'ichev, W. Th, H.G. Meyer, A.Y. Sm imov, and M.H.S. Am in, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 037003 (2004).
- ¹⁸ H.Xu, F.W. Strauch, S.K. Dutta, P.R. Johnson, R.C. Ramos, A.J.Berkley, H.Paik, J.R. Anderson, A.J.D ragt, C.J.Lobb, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 027003 (2005).
- ¹⁹ R. McDermott, R. W. Simmonds, M. Steen, K. B.

tions of this proposal.YDW also thank C.P.Sun,Yu-Xi Liu and FeiX ue for the fruitful discussions with them and J.Q.You for his assist on num erical calculation. This work is partially supported by the JSPS-KAKENHINO. 18201018 and MEXT-KAKENHINO. 18001002.

- Cooper, K. Cicak, K. D. Osborn, S. Oh, D. P. Pappas, and J. M. Martinis, Science 307, 1299 (2005).
- ²⁰ J.B.Majer, F.G.Paauw, A.J.t.Haar, C.J.P.Hamans, and J.E.Mooij Phys. Rev. Lett. 94, 090501 (2005).
- ²¹ B.L.P. burde, T.L.R obertson, P.A.R eichardt, T.H in e, S. Linzen, C.-E.Wu, and J.Clarke, Phys. Rev. B 72, 060506 (2005).
- ²² T.Hime, P.A.Reichardt, B.L.T.Plourde, T.L.Robertson, C.-E.Wu, A.V.Ustinov, and J.Clarke, Science 314 (2006).
- ²³ R.Harris, A.J.Berkley, M.W.Johnson, P.Bunyk, S.Govorkov, M.C.Thom, S.Uchaikin, A.B.W ilson, J.Chung, E.Holtham, et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 177001 (2007).
- ²⁴ S.H.W.v.d.Ploeg, A. Izm alkov, A.M. vander Brink, U.Huner, M.G rajcar, E. Il'ichev, H.-G. Meyer, and A.M. Zagoskin, Phys. Rev. Lett. 98, 057004 (2007).
- ²⁵ A.O. Niskanen, K. Harrabi, F. Yoshihara, Y. Nakamura, S. Lloyd, and J.S. Tsai, Science 316, 723 (2007).
- ²⁶ J.Plantenberg, P.C.d.Groot, C.J.P.M. Harmans, and J.E.Mooij, Nature 447, 836 (2007).
- ²⁷ M.A.Sillanpaa, J.I.Park, and R.W. Simmonds, Nature (London) 449, 438 (2007).
- ²⁸ 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. Wallra, et al., Nature (London) 449, 443 (2007).
- ²⁹ Y.Makhlin, G.Scohn, and A.Shnim an, Nature 398, 305 (1999).
- ³⁰ J.Q.You, J.S.Tsai, and F.Nori, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 197902 (2002).
- ³¹ D.V.Averin and C.Bruder, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 057003 (2003).
- ³² Y.D.W ang, Y.B.Gao, and C.P.Sun, Eur. J. Phys. B 40, 321 (2004).
- ³³ B.L.T.P. burde, J.Zhang, K.B.W haley, F.K.W ilhelm, T.L.Robertson, T.Hime, S.Linzen, P.A.Reichardt, C.-E.W u, and J.C. larke, Phys.Rev.B (R) 70, 140501 (2004).
- ³⁴ C.R igetti, A.B lais, and M.D evoret, Phys.Rev.Lett.94, 240502 (2005).
- ³⁵ Y.-x. Liu, L.F.Wei, J.S. Tsai, and F.Nori, Phys. Rev. Lett. 96, 067003 (2006).
- ³⁶ P.Bertet, C.J.P.M. Harmans, and J.E.Mooij Phys. Rev.B 73,064512 (2006).
- ³⁷ A.O.N iskanen, Y.N akam ura, and J.S.T sai, Phys. Rev. B 73, 094506 (2006).
- ³⁸ M.Grajcar, A.Izmalkov, S.H.W.v.d.Ploeg, S.Linzen,

T.Plecenik, W.Th, U.Hubner, E.Il'ichev, H.G.Meyer, A.Y.Smirnov, et al., Physical Review Letters 96, 047006 (2006).

- ³⁹ G.S.Paraoanu, Phys.Rev.B 74, 140504 (R) (2006).
- ⁴⁰ S.Ashhab, S.M atsuo, N.H atakenaka, and F.N ori, Phys. Rev. B 74, 184504 (2006); S.Ashhab, et al., ibid, 77, 014510 (2008)
- ⁴¹ A.Blais, J.Gambetta, A.Wallra, D.I.Schuster, S.M. Girvin, M.H.Devoret, and R.J.Schoelkopf, Phys. Rev. A 75, 032329 (2007).
- ⁴² H.Nakano, K.Kakuyanagi, M.Ueda, and K.Semba, App. Phys.Lett. 91, 032501 (2007).
- ⁴³ J.E.Mooij T.P.O rlando, L.Levitov, L.Tian, C.H.v.d. W al, and S.Lloyd, Science 285, 1036 (1999).
- ⁴⁴ T.P.O rlando, J.E.M ooij, L.Tian, C.H.v.d.W al, L.S. Levitov, S.Lloyd, and J.J.M azo, Phys. Rev. B 60, 15398 (1999).
- ⁴⁵ F.K.W illelm and K. Semba, in Physical Realization of Quantum Computing (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 2006).
- ⁴⁶ J.Q.You, Y.Nakamura, and F.Nori, Phys. Rev. B 71, 024532 (2005).
- ⁴⁷ R.Ruskov and A.N.Korotkov, Phys. Rev. B 67, 241305 (2003).

- ⁴⁸ G.M ilbum, quant-ph/9908037 (1999).
- ⁴⁹ A.S rensen and K.M Imer, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 1971 (1999).
- ⁵⁰ A.S rensen and K.M lm er, Phys. Rev. A 62, 022311 (2000).
- ⁵¹ X.G.Wang, A.S rensen, and K.M lm er, Phys.Rev.Lett. 86, 3907 (2001).
- ⁵² Y.D.W ang, Z.D.W ang, and C.P.Sun, Phys. Rev. B 72, 172507 (2005).
- ⁵³ J.W eiand E.Nom an, J.M ath. Phys. 4, 575 (1963).
- ⁵⁴ A. Barenco, C. H. Bennett, R. Cleve, D. P. D N incenzo, N. Margolus, P. Shor, T. Sleator, J. A. Smolin, and H. Weinfurter, Phys. Rev. A 52, 3457 (1995).
- ⁵⁵ S.Bose, Phys.Rev.Lett. 91, 207901 (2003).
- ⁵⁶ Z.Song and C.P.Sun, Low Tem p.P hys., Issue 8 31, 686 (2005).
- 57 Å.Lyakhov and C.Bruder, New J.Phys.7, 181 (2005).
- ⁵⁸ A.Blais, R.S.Huang, A.W allra, S.M.G irvin, and R. J.Schoelkopf, Phys. Rev. A 69, 062320 (2004).
- ⁵⁹ A. Lupascue, S. Saito, T. Picot, P. C. De G root, C. J. P. M. Harm ans Harm ans, and J.E. Mooij Nature Physics 3, 119 (2007).