

Graphene Josephson Qubit

Colin Benjamin and Jiannis K. Pachos

*Quantum Information Group, School of Physics and Astronomy,
University of Leeds, Woodhouse Lane, Leeds LS2 9JT, UK.*

(Dated: October 30, 2019)

We propose to combine the advantages of graphene, such as easy tunability and long coherence times, with Josephson physics to manufacture qubits. These qubits are built around a 0 and π junction and are controlled by external flux. We show that ferromagnets are not required for realizing π junction in graphene, thus considerably simplifying its physical implementation. We demonstrate that one qubit gates, such as arbitrary phase rotations and the exchange gate, σ_x , can be implemented in much shorter times than the decoherence time of the system. This novel proposal for a graphene qubit obviates the control deficiencies of normal Josephson qubits, while adding the versatility of graphene.

PACS numbers: **72.70.+m, 73.23.-b, 74.45.+c, 03.65.Ud**

Josephson physics inspired solid state qubits have been in vogue for some years [1]. The reason is the inherent advantages of large scale integration and flexibility of layout over other qubit proposals like ion traps, nuclear spins and photons. Typically Josephson junction qubits employ ferromagnetic elements or high- T_c materials, which have small coherence lengths, making experimental implementation and, more so, mass production difficult. On the other hand ferromagnetism and superconductivity are antithetical in nature. Thus, it is desirable to build Josephson qubits which do not rely on ferromagnetic elements [2]. In this work we create a Josephson qubit based




FIG. 1: An overview of the set-up. Two semicircular superconducting graphene strips (Gs) with normal graphene layers on top and bottom enclosing a magnetic flux, Φ . By the application of suitable gate voltages to the normal graphene strip the junctions are tuned to either $\phi = 0$ or π phase shift.

on graphene. The physical system consists of a graphene substrate with superconducting correlations induced in sections via the proximity effect [3, 4]. It comprises of two Josephson junctions (distinguished by their ground states, one at a phase difference $\phi = 0$ and the other at $\phi = \pi$), arranged as in Fig. 1. The total energy of the system is controlled by the flux, Φ , that passes through the ring. The reversal of super-current in a Josephson device, where the free energy has global minima at phase difference $\phi = \pi$ is referred to as π shift and the corresponding Josephson junction is termed a π junction. This

is in contrast to a 0 junction wherein the free energy has a global minimum at phase difference $\phi = 0$ [6]. To be able to encode a qubit we have to construct a π junction and integrate it with the rest of our device (the 0 junction). A π junction is needed to create a doubly degenerate ground state, where a qubit is encoded. Here we demonstrate that a π junction can be identified in our system without the need of any ferromagnetic elements. We further show that a complete set of single qubit gates can be efficiently implemented with gate times much smaller than the decoherence time, demonstrating that our proposal is promising for quantum computation. Apart from a proposal on graphene based spin qubits [5] this is the only work that takes advantage of the unique properties of graphene for manufacturing qubits.

In Fig. 2, we show our graphene π junction set-up. Previously a π -shift has been predicted [7] using ferromagnetic correlations in graphene. Here we demonstrate that ferromagnetic correlations are unnecessary for making a π -junction in graphene, thus greatly simplifying its experimental implementation. To calculate the Josephson current and show it reverses its sign as function of the Fermi energy or the length of the normal graphene layer, we use the approach of Furusaki-Tsukada [8]. This approach relates the dc Josephson current to the scattering amplitudes for electron- and hole-like quasiparticles. We apply it to the type 1 and type 2 processes of the junction described in Fig. 2 using detailed balancing between reflection and transmission amplitudes. The kinematics of quasiparticles in graphene is described by the Dirac-Bogoliubov-de Gennes equation, which assumes the form

$$\begin{pmatrix} \hat{H} - E_F \hat{I} & \Delta \hat{I} \\ \Delta^\dagger \hat{I} & E_F \hat{I} - \hat{T} \hat{H} \hat{T}^{-1} \end{pmatrix} \Psi = E \Psi, \quad (1)$$

where E is the excitation energy, Δ is the superconducting gap of a s-wave superconductor, Ψ is the wavefunction and $\hat{\cdot}$ represents 4×4 matrices. In the above equation

$$\hat{H} = \begin{pmatrix} H_+ & 0 \\ 0 & H_- \end{pmatrix}, \quad H_\pm = -i\hbar v_F (\sigma_x \partial_x \pm \sigma_y \partial_y) + U. \quad (2)$$

Here \hbar, v_F (set equal to unity hence forth) are the Planck's constant and the energy independent Fermi velocity for graphene, while the σ 's denote Pauli matrices that operate on the sublattices A and B . The electrostatic potential U can be adjusted independently via a gate voltage or doping. We assume $U = 0$, in the normal region, while $U = -U_0$ in the superconducting graphene. The subscripts of Hamiltonian \pm refer to the Fermi points K_+ and K_- in the Brillouin zone. $T = -\tau_y \otimes \sigma_y C$, (C being complex conjugation) is the time reversal operator, with τ being Pauli matrices that operate on the \pm space and \hat{I} is the identity matrix.




FIG. 2: The Furusaki-Tsukada approach and the processes involved. Top: θ_S^e is the angle of incidence of electron-like quasiparticle, while $-\theta_S^e$ is the angle of its reflection. Hole-like quasiparticle are Andreev reflected at angle θ_S^h . In the normal region electron and holes are transmitted and incident with angles θ and θ^A . Bottom: In type 1 process an electron-like quasiparticle is incident from the left, while in type 2 process a hole-like quasiparticle is incident from the left. a_1, b_1, c_1 and d_1 are amplitudes of hole-like quasiparticle, while a_2, b_2, c_2 and d_2 are scattering amplitudes for electron-like quasiparticles.

Let us consider an incident electron-like quasiparticle from the left superconductor with pairing gap $\Delta e^{i\phi_1}$ ($x < 0$) and energy E . For a right moving electron-like quasiparticle with an incident angle θ the eigenvector and corresponding momentum read $\Psi_{S_{1+}}^e = [u, ue^{i\theta^+}, v, ve^{i\theta^+}]^T e^{iq^e \cos \theta^+ x}$, $q^e = (E_F + U_0 + \sqrt{E^2 - \Delta^2})$. A left moving electron-like quasiparticle is described by the substitution $\theta \rightarrow \pi - \theta$. If Andreev-reflection takes place, a left moving hole-like quasiparticle is generated with energy E , angle of reflection θ^- and its corresponding wavefunction is given by $\Psi_{S_{1-}}^h = [v, ve^{-i\theta^-}, u, ue^{-i\theta^-}]^T e^{-iq^h \cos \theta^- x}$, $q^h = (E_F + U_0 - \sqrt{E^2 - \Delta^2})$. The superscript e (h) denotes an

electron-like (hole-like) excitation. Since translational invariance in the y -direction holds the corresponding component of momentum is conserved. This condition allows for the determination of the Andreev reflection angle θ_A through $q^h \sin(\theta^-) = q^e \sin(\theta^+)$. There is no Andreev reflection and consequently no sub-gap conductance for angles of incidence above the critical angle $\theta_c = \sin^{-1}(|q^h|/q^e)$. The coherence factors are given by $u = \sqrt{(1 + \sqrt{1 - \Delta^2/E^2})/2}$, $v = \sqrt{(1 - \sqrt{1 - \Delta^2/E^2})/2}$. We have also defined $\theta^+ = \theta_S^e$, $\theta^- = \pi - \theta_S^h$, where the angles are defined in Fig. 2.

In the normal region the eigenvector and corresponding momentum of a right moving electron with an incident angle θ read

$$\psi_+^e = [1, e^{i\theta}, 0, 0]^T e^{ip^e \cos \theta x}, \quad p^e = (E + E_F). \quad (3)$$

A left moving electron is described by the substitution $\theta \rightarrow \pi - \theta$. If Andreev-reflection takes place, a left moving hole is generated with energy E , angle of reflection θ_A and its corresponding wavefunction is given by

$$\psi_-^h = [0, 0, 1, e^{-i\theta_A}]^T e^{-ip^h \cos \theta_A x}, \quad p^h = (E - E_F). \quad (4)$$

The transmission angles θ_S^α for the electron-like and hole-like quasiparticles are given by $q^\alpha \sin \theta_S^\alpha = p^e \sin \theta$, $\alpha = e, h$.

The full wavefunction in the type 1 scenario can be written as below for the various regions

$$\begin{aligned} \psi_{S_1} &= \Psi_{S_{1+}}^e + b_1 \Psi_{S_{1-}}^e + a_1 \Psi_{S_{1-}}^h, \quad x < 0, \\ \psi_N &= p\psi_+^e + q\psi_-^e + m\psi_+^h + n\psi_-^h, \quad 0 < x < d, \\ \psi_{S_2} &= c_1 \Psi_{S_{2+}}^e + d_1 \Psi_{S_{2+}}^h, \quad x > d. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Matching the wavefunctions at the interfaces one can solve for the amplitudes of reflection a_1, b_1, c_1 and d_1 . Similarly, one can write the wavefunctions in case of type 2 scenario and calculate the amplitudes a_2, b_2, c_2 , and d_2 . The detailed balance for the amplitudes are verified as follows

$$\begin{aligned} C a_1(\phi, E) &= C' a_2(-\phi, E), \\ b_i(\phi, E) &= b_i(-\phi, E) (i = 1, 2), \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

with $C = \sqrt{\frac{\cos \theta_S^h}{\cos \theta_S^e}}$ and $C' = \sqrt{\frac{\cos \theta_S^e}{\cos \theta_S^h}}$. Following the procedure established in Ref. [8] and employing analytic continuation $E \rightarrow iw_n$ the dc Josephson current is given by

$$\begin{aligned} I(\phi) &= \frac{e\Delta}{2\beta\hbar\Omega_n} \sum_{w_n} \int_{-\pi/2}^{\pi/2} (C + C') \left[\frac{a_1(\phi, iw_n)}{C} \right. \\ &\quad \left. - \frac{a_2(\phi, iw_n)}{C'} \right] \cos(\theta_S^e) d\theta_S^e, \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

where $\beta = 1/k_B T$, $\Omega_n = \sqrt{w_n^2 + \Delta^2}$ and $w_n = \pi k_B T (2n + 1)$, $n = 0, \pm 1, \pm 2, \dots$. The above equation

has a simple physical interpretation [8]. Andreev reflection is equivalent to the breaking up or creation of a Cooper pair. The scattering amplitude a_1 describes the process in which an electron-like quasiparticle coming from the left superconducting graphene strip ($x < 0$) is reflected as a hole-like quasiparticle. The amplitude a_2 corresponds to the reverse process in which a hole-like quasiparticle is reflected as an electron-like quasiparticle. This implies that a_1 and a_2 correspond to the passage of a Cooper pair to the left and right respectively, hence, the dc Josephson current is proportional to $a_1 - a_2$. Further, the dc Josephson current is an odd function of the phase difference, ϕ , as seen by the detailed balance condition $a_2(\phi, iw_n)/C = a_1(-\phi, iw_n)/C'$. To calculate the Josephson current one thus takes the difference between the amplitudes a_1 and a_2 and then sums over the energies. In this method we account for all the energies, unlike Refs. [4, 7], where only the bound state contribution is taken into account. The free energy of the Josephson junction can be calculated as

$$F(\phi) = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_0^\phi I(\phi') d\phi'. \quad (8)$$

Now we illustrate the results for the Josephson current as function of the width of the normal graphene interlude as well as the phase difference across the two superconducting graphene strips. The calculations are performed by treating Eqs. (7) and (8) numerically and the derived results hold for the $T \rightarrow 0$ temperature limit. Fig. 3(a) shows the Josephson current as function of the width of the normal graphene strip for different values of the Fermi energy. Note that Fermi energy is easily controllable in graphene. The plot shows that for small values of Fermi energy the Josephson current changes sign especially in the parameter regime $1.5 < d < 2.5$, implying a π shift. One important fact to note is that for increased d the current decreases, which is in agreement with past Josephson works. Fig. 3(b) shows the current-phase relation for two different values of the Fermi energy. It again confirms the earlier indication of π shift. The reason why we see a π -shift in a system identical to that considered in Refs. [4] is because in our work we do not limit ourselves only to energies within the superconducting gap, but properly consider the entire energy spectrum both bound as well as continuum. This continuum current (not plotted here) flows against the direction of the bound state current. Specifically, in some parameter regime this continuum contribution can dominate and is the reason for the change in direction of the Josephson current [6]. Finally, to establish beyond doubt that as function of Fermi energy one generates a π junction we plot the free energy in Fig. 4(a). The plot shows that as one changes the Fermi energy via a gate voltage one changes the ground state of the junction from 0 to π .

As shown in Fig. 4, the free energy, F , has a minimum at $\phi = \pi$ (for the π junction case) and the variation




FIG. 3: (a) Current (in units of $e\Delta/\hbar$) versus width of normal graphene strip, d (in units of $\hbar v_F/\Delta$), at phase difference $\phi = \pi/2$ and $U_0 = 0$ for different values of E_F (in units of Δ). (b) Current versus phase, where the width of normal graphene strip is $d = 2.0$ and the other parameters are indicated in figure.




FIG. 4: (a) Free energy of $G_S - G_N - G_S$ junction versus phase difference for different Fermi energies with 0 junction ($E_F = 100$ red dashed line) and π junction ($E_F = 0.01$ black solid line) and width of normal graphene strip $d = 2$. (b) The approximate forms for the 0 and π junction energies are in good agreement with the real free energies and are used in analyzing the graphene Josephson qubit.

of F with ϕ is strongly dependent on the width d and the Fermi energy. In this parameter regime the free energy can be approximated as $F \sim -E_\pi[\cos(\phi_\pi + \pi) + 1]$, with E_π being the Josephson coupling constant. In Fig. 1, the 0 junction and the π junction have Josephson energies $U_0 = -E_0[|\cos(\phi_0/2 + \pi)| - 1]$ and $U_\pi = -E_\pi[\cos(\phi_\pi + \pi) + 1]$ plotted in Fig. 4(b). The superconducting phase difference is ϕ_0 for the 0 junction and ϕ_π for the π junction. The total flux in the ring Φ satisfies $\phi_\pi - \phi_0 = 2\pi\Phi/\Phi_0 - 2\pi l$, where Φ_0 is the flux quantum and l is an integer.

Here we show that single qubit gates can be efficiently implemented in graphene based Josephson qubits. In Ref. [11] the authors demonstrate a qubit with a π (SFS) junction and a 0 (SNS) junction coupled into a ring. The qubit dynamics are controlled by an external flux. In our

work too we predict that our graphene based system, which does not need any ferromagnetic element, could also be prepared similarly in order to implement a qubit. The full hamiltonian of the graphene ring system (Fig. 1) is given by $H = K + U_{tot}$ with $U_{tot} = U_0 + U_\pi + U_L$, where $U_L = (\Phi - \Phi_{ext})^2/2L_S$ is the magnetic energy stored in the ring and K is the flux independent kinetic energy.

We next minimize the hamiltonian with respect to flux and obtain $\Phi(\phi_0) = -\beta\Phi_0\sin(\phi_\pi) + \Phi_{ext}$, with $\beta = 2\pi E_\pi L_S/\Phi_0^2$. Substituting this equation in the expression for U_{tot} , we have:

$$U_{tot}/E_\pi = -\alpha[|\cos(\phi_\pi/2 - \pi\Phi/\Phi_0 + \pi)| - 1] - [\cos(\phi_\pi + \pi) + 1] + \pi\beta\sin^2(\phi_\pi + \pi). \quad (9)$$

with $\alpha = E_\pi/E_0$. For typical values mentioned in Fig. 5, we plot Eq. (9).




FIG. 5: (a) Normalized energy, U_{tot}/E_π , as function of ϕ_π for no external magnetic flux. (b) In presence of an external magnetic field with $\alpha = 2.5$.

We observe that the energy has double minima located approximately at $\phi_\pi \sim \pi/2$ ($|0\rangle$ state) and $3\pi/2$ ($|1\rangle$ state) which form the basis of the qubit. For single layer graphene with junction area [12] $0.8 \times 10^{-12} \mu m^2$ and depth $1nm$, the electrostatic energy E_c is $2.5 \times 10^{-24} J$, while E_0 the junction energy for the zero junction is around $100E_c$. Thus for $\alpha = 3.0$, we have ΔE , the energy gap, between the ground and first excited state $\Delta E/h = 300GHz$. The basic phase gate with $\phi = \Delta E \Delta t/h = \pi$ could be implemented with gate time Δt given by 3 femto-seconds. This is much less than the electronic decoherence time in few layer graphene structures, which is 10^{-10} seconds [13].

Another important gate realization with graphene Josephson qubit is the exchange gate. We will show how to implement an exchange gate σ_x acting on the qubit states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. This is realized by a tunnelling transition between the potential minima that encode these qubit states. Assuming the coupling potential is deep enough we approximate the qubit states by Gaussians centered at the minima of U_{tot} . By varying α (or E_c) one can induce tunnelling between the two minima in a

controlled way. The exchange coupling of our system is calculated as

$$J = \int d\phi_\pi \Psi^*(\phi_\pi - \phi_{|0\rangle}) \left(-4E_c \frac{d^2}{d\phi_\pi^2} + U_{tot} \right) \Psi(\phi_\pi - \phi_{|1\rangle}). \quad (10)$$

In Fig. 6 we plot the exchange coupling versus the normalized Josephson energy for various values of the electrostatic energy, E_c . We see that for large α no tunnelling occurs, while for $\alpha \sim 2.0$ we obtain $J \sim 0.2E_\pi$ (for $E_c = 0.25$) and, thus, the σ_x gate can be implemented in $\Delta t = 1.6 \times 10^{-12}$ seconds.




FIG. 6: Exchange coupling J (in units of E_π) as function of α for different values of E_c . Here E_c is multiplied by $1.5 \times 10^{-24} J$.

To conclude we have shown a novel implementation of a Josephson qubit using graphene as a test bed. It was also shown that a ferromagnetic graphene layer is unnecessary to create a π -shift, a completely novel result. This is unique to graphene since normal metals sandwiched between two s-wave superconductors do not show this effect at equilibrium. Future proposals to make CNOT or other two-qubit gate designs could also be envisaged using the above architecture. *Acknowledgements-* This work was supported by the EU grants EMALI and SCALA, EP-SRC and the Royal Society.

-
- [1] J. Q. You and F. Nori, Physics Today, p. 42, November (2005).
 - [2] J. Flouquet and A. Buzdin, Physics World January 2002.
 - [3] P. Buset, A. Levy Yeyati, and A. Martin-Rodero Phys. Rev. B **77**, 205425 (2008).
 - [4] M. Maiti and K. Sengupta, Phys. Rev. B **76**, 054513 (2007); M. Titov and C. W. J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. B **74**, 041401 (2006).
 - [5] B. Trauzettel, D. V. Bulaev, D. Loss and G. Burkard, Nature Physics, **3**, 192 (2007).
 - [6] C. Benjamin, T. Jonckheere, A. Zazunov and T. Martin, Eur. Phys. J. B **57**, 279 (2007).
 - [7] J. Linder, T. Yokoyama, D. Huertas-Hernando and A. Sudbø, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 187004 (2008).

- [8] A. Furusaki and M. Tsukada, Solid State Comm. **78**, 299 (1991); A. Furusaki, H. Takayanagi and M. Tsukada, Phys. Rev. B **45**, 10563 (1992).
- [9] C. W. J. Beenakker, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 067007 (2006).
- [10] J. Linder and A. Sudbo, Phys. Rev. Lett. **99**, 147001 (2007); S. Bhattacharjee and K. Sengupta, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 217001 (2006).
- [11] T. Yamashita, K. Tanikawa, S. Takahashi and S. Maekawa, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 097001 (2005).
- [12] H. B. Heersche, *et. al.*, Nature **446**, 56 (2007).
- [13] R. V.Gorbachev, *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 176805 (2007).