

Engineering Giant Nonlinearities in Quantum Nano-Systems

Kurt Jacobs^{1,2} and Andrew J. Landahl³

¹*Department of Physics, University of Massachusetts at Boston, Boston, MA 02125, USA*

²*Hearne Institute for Theoretical Physics, Louisiana State University, Baton Rouge, LA 70803, USA*

³*Center for Advanced Studies, Department of Physics and Astronomy,
University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, 87131, USA*

PACS numbers: 85.85.+j,85.35.Gv,03.65.Ta,45.80.+r

In the last few years there has been rapid progress in the construction and manipulation of nano-mechanical resonators and superconducting microwave oscillators. Both these varieties of oscillators can be combined with other electrical elements to form mesoscopic devices, and because of their very high frequencies, both have the potential to realize quantum behavior. If either variety could be built to exhibit nonlinearities that were strong in the quantum regime (so-called *giant* nonlinearities), then this would open up a host of potential applications. Here we show how to engineer these nonlinearities by coupling the oscillators perturbatively to low-dimensional auxiliary systems, which we call *perturbative connectors*. We show that this technique allows a large range of nonlinearities to be realized. For the important case of $\chi^{(3)}$ —the Kerr nonlinearity—we derive explicit connectors that can be readily implemented using simple superconducting elements.

The ability to engineer mesoscopic oscillators^{1,2,3,4,5} with giant nonlinearities⁶ has applications in information processing^{7,8,9}, simulating many-body systems^{10,11}, fundamental studies of the transition between quantum and classical dynamics^{12,13}, as well as other fundamental tests of quantum mechanics¹⁴. It can also be expected to lead to further applications in sensing and metrology^{15,16}. The ability to engineer nonlinear *interactions* between nano-oscillators will open the way to directly observing quantum behavior in nano-resonators^{17,18,19} and can be expected to have future applications in feedback control^{20,21}. Superconducting oscillators have no natural nonlinearities, and the mechanical nonlinearities that exist in nano-resonators are far too weak for these purposes¹⁵. The only method suggested to date for solving this problem requires active open-loop control of auxiliary systems on time scales that are fast compared to that of the desired nonlinear dynamics^{14,22}. The method described here is considerably simpler because it does not require active control.

It is well-known in the field of quantum optics that a low-dimensional system can generate an effective nonlinearity in a larger system. For example, a four-level atom with the right level structure, when detuned appropriately from a cavity mode, will create a $\chi^{(3)}$ nonlinearity for the cavity mode^{6,23}. Similarly, other nonlinear opti-

cal processes are generated by media containing atoms with specific level structures^{24,25}. Here we show that low-dimensional quantum systems are significantly more powerful than indicated by the examples considered in quantum optics: we show that by tailoring the Hamiltonians of low-dimensional systems one can 1) generate a specified nonlinearity in a target system, accurate to a desired order in the perturbation, and 2) construct probes that can extract information about nonlinear observables of a target system, also accurate to a desired order. Further, we show that there exist *many* different low-dimensional systems that will induce a given nonlinearity or nonlinear interaction, allowing one considerable freedom in selecting an auxiliary system for a given task. Because of this, one is able to find auxiliary systems, consisting of, e.g., two coupled qubits, that are straightforward to realize for nano-systems, both electrical and mechanical.

Recently Kempe, Kitaev and Regev²⁶ noted that a two-level system (a “qubit”), when perturbatively coupled to two or more target systems, will effectively couple the target systems together. They referred to a qubit used in this way as a “perturbation gadget”. This work, and its extension by Oliveira and Terhal²⁷, are the principal inspirations for the analysis here. To analyze the perturbation, Kempe *et al.* used the method of resolvents, as that was appropriate for the formal results they required. For our purposes, the standard formulation of time-independent perturbation theory suffices. In the following, we use a nano-mechanical resonator as our target system, but our results apply equally well to superconducting stripline resonators, optical cavities, and in fact *any* quantum system for which one wishes to generate dynamics that may be otherwise difficult to achieve.

I. THE 2D CONNECTOR

We review the single-qubit “edge subdivision gadget” of Oliveira and Terhal²⁷, a single qubit perturbatively coupled to two “target” systems. We then show how this “2D-connector” can be used to generate an effective Hamiltonian for, and nonlinear interaction with, a *single* target system. This introduces the techniques that enable the more powerful connectors introduced below.

In the configuration of Oliveira and Terhal, the qubit has Hamiltonian $H = (E_0/2)\sigma_z$, and is coupled to the




FIG. 1: Here we show a single Cooper-pair box (CPB) capacitively coupled to a nanomechanical resonator. The coupling is due to the capacitance between gates 1 and 2. The distance between the gates, and thus the capacitance, depends on the position of the center-of-mass of the resonator. The result is the linear interaction proportional to $\sigma_z x$, where σ_z is the Pauli spin- z operator for the CPB in the charge basis, and x is the position of the resonator.

two target systems via the weaker interactions $H_1^{\text{int}} = \mu\sigma_x A$ and $H_2^{\text{int}} = \mu\sigma_x B$, where A and B are operators of the respective target systems. The total Hamiltonian is thus

$$H = \frac{E_0}{2}\sigma_z + \mu\sigma_x(A + B) \quad (1)$$

This is of the form $H = H_0 + \lambda V$, with $H_0 = E_0\sigma_z/2$, $V = \sigma_x$ and $\lambda = \mu(A + B)$. Time-independent perturbation theory shows us how to find the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of H as power series expansions in the small parameter λ (the details of this theory are presented in the methods section, below). The fact that λ contains operators requires no modification to time-dependent perturbation theory, since these operators commute with all operators of the connector. To second order in $\varepsilon \equiv \lambda/E_0$, the lowest eigenvalue of the qubit under this perturbation is

$$E = -E_0 \left[\frac{1}{2} + \varepsilon^2(A^2 + 2AB + B^2) \right]. \quad (2)$$

If we prepare the qubit in the eigenstate corresponding to this eigenvalue, the qubit remains in this state and for all intents and purposes the Hamiltonian becomes

$$H_{\text{eff}} = E_0\varepsilon^2(A^2 + 2AB + B^2), \quad (3)$$

where we have denoted the small parameter as $\varepsilon \equiv \mu/E_0$. We have now created a Hamiltonian that connects the two target systems via the interaction AB , the purpose of this gadget. Generalizing this analysis to more than two systems is straightforward—the 2D connector generates pairwise interactions between each pair of systems. These interactions can be used, e.g., for performing parameter estimation surpassing the Heisenberg limit for metrology¹⁶.

Now consider a configuration in which the connector is coupled to a single resonator (the “target system”)

via the linear interaction $H_{\text{int}} = -\mu\sigma_z x$, as shown in Figure 1. We take the Josephson coupling energy to be large compared to the charging energy, so that $H_0 = (E_0/2)\sigma_x$. To second order in ε , the upper energy level is $E_1 = E_0[1/2 + \varepsilon^2 x^2]$, and the lower level is $E_2 = -E_1$. Defining the upper and lower eigenstates of the connector as $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$, respectively, and $\sigma'_x \equiv (1 - \varepsilon^2)\sigma_x - 2\varepsilon\sigma_z = |1\rangle\langle 1| - |2\rangle\langle 2|$, the effective Hamiltonian is

$$H_{\text{eff}} = E_0\sigma'_x + E_0\varepsilon^2\sigma'_x x^2. \quad (4)$$

We have now created an effective interaction proportional to $\sigma'_x x^2$. In general, an interaction proportional to AB , where A is a connector operator and B a nonlinear operator of the target system, allows us to measure B . This is achieved by monitoring an observable of the connector that does not commute with A , in the manner of the well-known von Neumann prescription^{28,29}. Thus the configuration above provides a simple way to continuously measure x^2 for a resonator, by continuously measuring the σ_z operator of the qubit. This is readily achieved using a superconducting resonator (separate from the target system) or single-electron transistor coupled to the qubit^{1,4}. It has recently been shown that a continuous measurement of x^2 will generate mesoscopic-superposition states of a resonator directly from a thermal state²². In that work an open-loop control protocol was proposed to engineer the required x^2 interaction; the technique here provides a much simpler method.

To use the qubit to generate an effective Hamiltonian for the resonator, one now places the qubit in the lower perturbed state, $|1\rangle$. The qubit remains in this state, and the resonator Hamiltonian picks up the extra term $H_{\text{eff}} = -E_0\varepsilon^2 x^2$. This extra term is not very interesting, as it merely adjusts the bare frequency of the resonator. Nevertheless, it is this method that will allow us to engineer nonlinearities using more sophisticated connectors.

II. THE 3D CONNECTOR

Consider the problem of engineering the nonlinearity x^3 . We cannot do this with a connector consisting of a single qubit: if we have a nonzero third-order term in the perturbation expansion of the qubit, we necessarily have a second-order nonlinearity, and this dominates the interaction. To generate x^3 we must obtain a perturbation expansion in which the first- and second-order terms vanish. Further, to generate x^3 with high fidelity, we should ideally remove the fourth-order term as well. It turns out that this can be achieved using a perturbative interaction with a qutrit, or 3D connector.

A generic 3D connector Hamiltonian is of the form $H = \tilde{H}_0 + \lambda\tilde{V}$, as was true for the 2D connector, except now \tilde{H}_0 and \tilde{V} are operators for a qutrit rather than a qubit. We use tildes to denote these operators for reasons that will become clear below. As above, we set $\lambda = \mu x$. Denoting the lowest energy levels of \tilde{H}_0 as $E_0^{(0)} < E_1^{(0)} < E_2^{(0)}$, and

defining the energy gaps as $\Delta \equiv E_1^{(0)} - E_0^{(0)}$ and $r\Delta \equiv E_2^{(0)} - E_1^{(0)}$, it turns out that there is a single condition for removing the second- and fourth-order terms in the expansion for E_1 , namely

$$|\tilde{V}_{21}|^2 = r|\tilde{V}_{01}|^2, \quad (5)$$

where \tilde{V}_{ij} denotes the matrix element $\langle E_i | \tilde{V} | E_j \rangle$ of \tilde{V} between the eigenstates of H having energies E_i and E_j . The lowest nonvanishing term in the expansion for the system's energy appears at third order and is

$$E_1^{(3)} = - \left(\frac{2}{r\Delta^2} \right) \text{Re} \left[\tilde{V}_{01} \tilde{V}_{12} \tilde{V}_{20} \right]. \quad (6)$$

Thus if we place the qutrit in the eigenstate of the center energy level, we obtain the Hamiltonian

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \Delta \left[-\chi \varepsilon^3 x^3 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^5) \right], \quad (7)$$

where $\varepsilon \equiv \mu/\Delta$ is the perturbation parameter, and we have defined $\chi \equiv 2\text{Re}[\tilde{V}_{01}\tilde{V}_{12}\tilde{V}_{20}]/r$. There is now one more trick to obtaining a practical connector. It is difficult, if not impossible, to build a physical circuit that provides an arbitrary interaction operator between a resonator and a second system, in our case the connector; it is much easier to engineer the Hamiltonian of the connector instead. Thus, having found the required operator \tilde{V} , we find the unitary transformation that diagonalizes it. If we call this unitary operator U , then we can specify the required 3D connector Hamiltonian as

$$H = H_0 + \mu V x \quad (8)$$

where V is diagonal (and thus very simple), and H_0 is the Hamiltonian we require for the connector, given by $H_0 = U^\dagger \text{Diag}(E_0, E_1, E_2) U$. Note that the conditions in Eqs. (5) and (6) give us great scope in choosing the interaction operator \tilde{V} . We have, for example, complete freedom to choose the diagonal elements of V .

It is the operators H_0 and V that specify the required connector, and that must be implemented physically. If we choose the connector to be a charged system, such as a quantum dot³⁰, polar molecule³¹ or Cooper-pair box (CPB), then the natural interaction is Vx , with V diagonal in the charge basis of the CPB, or the eigenbasis of the dot or polar molecule.

The problem of creating an x^3 nonlinearity has now been reduced to engineering the Hamiltonian, H_0 , of a mesoscopic three-level system. If the three-level system is a quantum dot or polar molecule, then the Hamiltonian can be completely tailored by coupling the three energy levels with lasers. In this case three lasers are required, each coupling one of the three transitions. This 3D connector serves mainly as an example analysis, however. When we consider 4D connectors in the next section, which can do everything a 3D connector can do, we can give explicit, and simple, configurations of two CPBs that realize the desired target Hamiltonians.

III. 4D CONNECTORS

It turns out that one cannot use a 3D connector to generate x^4 . This is because removing the second-order term in the perturbation expansion for a three-level system automatically removes the fourth-order term. Further, recall that we wish to generate not only nonlinearities for mesoscopic resonators but also nonlinear interactions with a connector that facilitate measurements of nonlinear observables. We cannot use the above construction to do this either, since it is only a single eigenstate of the connector that has the expansion to engineer x^3 . To extract information about x^3 via a connector, we need an *eigenspace* with the required expansion (a minimum of two eigenvalues). These problems can be solved with 4D connectors.

We now show how to engineer the nonlinearities x^3 and x^4 using a 4D connector. The latter is especially important because, as we show below, the same connector allows one to engineer $\chi^{(3)}$, which can be used to realize quantum gates^{8,9} and prepare mesoscopic-superposition states¹⁴. To create x^4 with high fidelity we must choose the elements of V to eliminate at least the second-, third-, and fifth-order terms in the perturbation expansion for a given eigenvalue. Choosing the energy levels of \tilde{H}_0 to be $E_n^{(0)} = n\Delta$, $n = 0, \dots, 3$, one can readily derive the conditions for eliminating the second- and third-order terms for E_1 . These are, respectively,

$$|\tilde{V}_{13}|^2 = 2(|\tilde{V}_{01}|^2 - |\tilde{V}_{12}|^2) \quad (9)$$

and

$$\text{Re} \left[2\tilde{V}_{10}\tilde{V}_{02}\tilde{V}_{21} + \tilde{V}_{10}\tilde{V}_{03}\tilde{V}_{31} - \tilde{V}_{12}\tilde{V}_{23}\tilde{V}_{31} \right] = 0 \quad (10)$$

Satisfying these two conditions conveniently removes the fifth-order term, and so together they are sufficient for obtaining x^4 , accurate to fifth order. Satisfying these two conditions leaves \tilde{V} with no less than ten free parameters that we can choose to satisfy additional conditions, such as limiting the magnitude of higher-order terms, and simplifying the Hamiltonian of the connector.

To find good connectors, we performed a numerical search over all \tilde{V} that satisfy the above two conditions, minimizing the distance from the resulting Hamiltonian, H_0 , to several Hamiltonians with relatively simple forms that we know already how to engineer for two qubits. This minimization is not difficult (we used Matlab's implementation of the Nelder-Mead (simplex) direct search³²). The optimization has many adequate minima; running it repeatedly with random initial conditions finds many good connectors. A nice example is the two-qubit Hamiltonian

$$H_0 = \Delta \left[a\sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(2)} + b\sigma_x^{(1)} + c\sigma_x^{(2)} + d\sigma_x^{(1)}\sigma_x^{(2)} \right] \quad (11)$$

where $a = d = 0.914$ and $b = c = 0.405$. This Hamiltonian can be engineered with two CPBs, using a method

described by Rigetti *et al.*³³. The required interaction with the target resonator is simple and straightforward to implement, and is

$$V = \mu \left[f\sigma_z^{(1)} + g\sigma_z^{(2)} \right] x, \quad (12)$$

where $f = -1.823$ and $g = -1.382$. Denoting the coefficients of the perturbation expansion for E_1 as $E_1^{(k)}$, where k is the power of x , this connector gives $E_1^{(1)} = E_1^{(3)} = E_1^{(5)} = E_1^{(7)} = 0$, $E_1^{(2)} = 2 \times 10^{-4}$, $E_1^{(4)} = -1$ and $E_1^{(6)} = -3.99$.

To create x^3 we eliminate the second- and fourth-order terms in the perturbation expansion for E_1 . Using a numerical search as above, we find that we can obtain simple connector Hamiltonians for this purpose, but not connectors that require only the simplest interaction, Eq. (12). Our search was not exhaustive, so it may be that 4D connectors exist for x^3 that can exploit this basic interaction. If not, one may need to consider a 3-qubit (8D) connector, but we will not pursue this further here. An example of a 4D connector Hamiltonian that generates x^3 is

$$H_0 = \Delta \left[a\sigma_x^{(1)} + b\sigma_x^{(2)} + c\sigma_x^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(2)} + d\sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_x^{(2)} \right], \quad (13)$$

with $a = -0.9855$, $b = 0.4875$, $c = -0.1105$ and $d = -0.1705$. The required interaction with the resonator is

$$V = \mu \left[f\sigma_z^{(1)} + g\sigma_z^{(2)} + h\sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(2)} \right] x \quad (14)$$

with $f = -1.5329$, $g = -1.1716$ and $h = 0.3613$. This connector gives the perturbation expansion $E_1^{(1)} \approx E_1^{(2)} \approx E_1^{(4)} = 2 \times 10^{-4}$, $E_1^{(3)} = -1.3$, $E_1^{(5)} = 5$ and $E_1^{(6)} = -2.5$.

As mentioned briefly above, engineering x^4 also allows us to engineer the nonlinearity $(a^\dagger a)^2$, otherwise known as $\chi^{(3)}$. The simplest way to do this is to ensure that the strength of the x^4 Hamiltonian generated by the connector is much smaller than the frequency of the resonator, ω . Moving into the interaction picture with respect to the free Hamiltonian of the resonator, and writing x as $(a + a^\dagger)/\sqrt{2}$, most of the terms in x^4 acquire high frequency factors, being integer powers of $e^{\pm i\omega t}$. These terms average to zero on the time-scale of the dynamics induced by the nonlinearity. As a result, if we write the nonlinearity as $H_4 = \kappa x^4 = (\kappa/4)(a + a^\dagger)^4$, then this becomes

$$H_4 = \frac{\kappa}{4}(a + a^\dagger)^4 \rightarrow \frac{3\kappa}{2}(a^\dagger a)^2 + \frac{3\kappa}{2}a^\dagger a, \quad \kappa \ll \omega.$$

We now show how to construct interactions between a connector and a target system to enable measurements of nonlinear observables of the target. We do this by choosing the Hamiltonian of the connector to selectively remove the *same* terms from the expansions for *two* of the eigenvalues, at the same time ensuring that the terms

we leave are *different* for these eigenvalues. This generates a specific nonlinear interaction operator between the system and the 2D degenerate subspace of the connector. This is precisely what is needed for the connector to serve as a nonlinear probe for the system.

We now construct the interaction x^4 using a 4D connector. Choosing the energy levels of \tilde{H}_0 as before, for each of these cases we first apply the relevant conditions, those presented above and in the methods section (Eqs. (9), (10), (29), and (30)), to the perturbation operator \tilde{V} and search over the remaining free elements of \tilde{V} for those that give a simple connector Hamiltonian H_0 . For the interaction x^4 , our results indicate that there is a essentially a single connector Hamiltonian with the desired properties. This is the very simple

$$H_0 = \frac{\Delta}{2} \left[\sigma_x^{(1)} + \sigma_x^{(2)} \right] \quad (15)$$

and the interaction operator is

$$V = \mu \left[f\sigma_z^{(1)} + g\sigma_z^{(2)} \right] x, \quad (16)$$

with $f = 1.682$ and $g = 1.189$. This connector eliminates all the terms in the perturbation expansion for the two eigenvalues E_1 and E_2 up to seventh order, except for the fourth and sixth order terms which are $E_1^{(4)} = -E_2^{(4)} = 1$ and $E_1^{(6)} = -E_2^{(6)} = -4.24$.

The effective interaction between the resonator and the subspace of the connector containing these eigenvalues is thus

$$H_{\text{eff}} = \Delta \left[\varepsilon^4 Z x^4 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^6) \right], \quad (17)$$

where $\varepsilon = \mu/\Delta$ as above. Here the effective interaction operator, Z , on the subspace of E_1 and E_2 , is $Z = |1\rangle\langle 1| - |2\rangle\langle 2|$, where $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$ are the eigenvectors corresponding respectively to E_1 and E_2 .

This interaction allows one to measure x^4 because it continuously writes information regarding x^4 into the subspace of E_1 and E_2 . We can continuously extract this information by measuring an operator of the connector that does not commute with Z on this subspace.

IV. REALISTIC DEVICES

To show that the method we have presented is practical, consider implementing a 4D connector using two Cooper-pair boxes (CPBs) in a realistic device. Typical energy gaps for CPBs are 100 MHz–10 GHz^{3,4}. If we scale the resonator's position so that $x = (a + a^\dagger)/\sqrt{2}$, then the interaction strength, μ , between a CPB and x for the resonator (either mechanical or superconducting), has an upper limit of about 10^8 s^{-1} , as discussed by Armour *et al.*³⁴. Consider engineering x^4 using the connector given in Eqs. (11) and (12). If we choose the energy scale for the two CPBs to be $\Delta/\hbar = 10^9 \text{ s}^{-1}$ and the interaction

strength to be $\mu/\hbar = 10^8 \text{ s}^{-1}$, then we can create the effective Hamiltonian for the resonator

$$H_{\text{eff}} = -\hbar\kappa \left[x^4 + \left(\frac{1}{25} \right) x^6 + \mathcal{O}(\varepsilon^8) \right]. \quad (18)$$

with $\kappa = 10^5 \text{ s}^{-1}$. This is a giant x^4 nonlinearity as advertised, albeit with a (relatively) small additional x^6 term. With a resonator frequency of 100 MHz, this x^4 term is to excellent approximation a $\chi^{(3)}$ (Kerr) nonlinearity, given by the Hamiltonian $H_{\text{eff}} = -(3/2)\hbar\kappa(a^\dagger a)^4$. As a measure of strength, this Kerr nonlinearity will create a mesoscopic-superposition of two coherent states, starting from an initial coherent state, in a time of $\tau = \pi/(3\kappa) = 10 \mu\text{s}^{14}$.

We can certainly reduce the relative size of the sixth-order correction if we wish by increasing Δ with respect to μ , which is quite practical. However, this will also reduce the strength of the x^4 nonlinearity. If we want to both increase the strength of the x^4 term and reduce the strength of the x^6 term, then we need to reduce the coefficient of the sixth-order term in the perturbation expansion. This can be done to a certain extent with a 4D connector, but our numerical search, while not exhaustive, indicates that there is a limit to how small one can make the sixth-order term with 2 qubits. We expect that using a connector with 3 qubits (thus 8D) will give one the freedom to eliminate the sixth-order term completely, although we will not explore this further here.

Our analysis suggests that the technique presented here, that of structuring the Hamiltonian of an auxiliary system perturbatively coupled to a target system, has tremendous as-yet-unexplored potential for engineering quantum mesoscopic systems. Exploring this potential will require answering a number of questions. One of these is the robustness of a given connector to small variations in its Hamiltonian—ideally one would like to construct connectors that perform their task well even if their construction varies. Further, the landscape that maps Hamiltonians to perturbation expansions is complex. Sophisticated methods for navigating this landscape, be they numerical or analytical, will need to be developed if the full power of perturbative connectors is to be realized.

V. METHODS

Time-independent perturbation theory allows one to compute the eigenvalues and eigenvectors of a Hamiltonian $H_0 + \lambda V$ as a power series in λ . If $|n\rangle$ and $E_n^{(0)}$ are the N (non-degenerate) eigenvectors and eigenvalues of H_0 , then the eigenvectors and eigenvalues of $(H_0 + \lambda V)$, which we denote by $|\psi_n\rangle$ and E_n , are given by the expansions

$$|\psi_n\rangle = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k |n^{(k)}\rangle \quad \text{and} \quad E_n = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \lambda^k E_n^{(k)}. \quad (19)$$

We will denote the elements of the vectors $|n^{(k)}\rangle$ in this expansion as $C_{mn}^{(k)}$, so that $|n^{(k)}\rangle = \sum_m C_{mn}^{(k)} |m\rangle$.

To develop perturbative connectors, we consider the situation in which H_0 and V are two operators of a given system (the connector) and λ contains one (or more) operators of other quantum system(s). Thus for the purposes of the perturbation expansion, λ may be treated as a real number with respect to H_0 and V . The terms in the expansions for E_n and $|\psi_n\rangle$ are determined by three recursion relations. These are

$$E_n^{(k)} = \sum_{m=1}^N V_{nm} C_{mn}^{(k-1)} - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} E_n^{(j)} C_{nn}^{(k-j)}, \quad (20)$$

$$C_{ln}^{(k)} = \sum_{m=1}^N \frac{V_{lm}}{\Delta_{ln}} C_{mn}^{(k-1)} - \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} \frac{E_n^{(j)}}{\Delta_{ln}} C_{ln}^{(k-j)}, \quad l \neq n \quad (21)$$

$$C_{nn}^{(k)} = -\frac{1}{2} \sum_{m=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^{k-1} C_{mn}^{(j)} C_{mn}^{(k-j)*} \quad (22)$$

with

$$C_{mn}^{(0)} = \delta_{mn} \quad (23)$$

$$C_{mn}^{(1)} = (1 - \delta_{mn}) \frac{V_{mn}}{\Delta_{mn}}, \quad (24)$$

and $\Delta_{ln} \equiv E_n^{(0)} - E_l^{(0)}$. One can choose all the $C_{nn}^{(k)}$ to be real. Solving the recursion relations for the energies $E_n^{(k)}$ up to fourth order and choosing the diagonal elements of V to be zero, gives

$$E_n^{(1)} = 0, \quad (25)$$

$$E_n^{(2)} = \sum_{m \neq n} \frac{|V_{mn}|^2}{\Delta_{mn}}, \quad (26)$$

$$E_n^{(3)} = \sum_{m, l \neq n} \frac{V_{nm} V_{ml} V_{ln}}{\Delta_{mn} \Delta_{ln}}, \quad (27)$$

$$E_n^{(4)} = \sum_{m, l, j \neq n} \frac{V_{nm} V_{ml} V_{lj} V_{jn}}{\Delta_{mn} \Delta_{ln} \Delta_{jn}} - \sum_{m, l \neq n} \frac{|V_{mn}|^2 |V_{ln}|^2}{\Delta_{mn} \Delta_{ln}^2} \quad (28)$$

The complexity of the terms grows rapidly after this; the expression for $E_n^{(5)}$ contains seven terms.

To design connectors that act as conduits of information, we need to tailor the perturbative expansions of two eigenvalues. Here we give some relations for this problem, which are used to obtain the connectors described above. We denote the elements of the connector operator V as $V_{nm} = A_{nm} e^{i\theta_{nm}}$, where A_{nm} and θ_{nm} are real-valued. Since V is Hermitian, we have $A_{nm} = A_{mn}$ and $\theta_{nm} = -\theta_{mn}$. For a 4D connector, the conditions for setting $E_1^{(2)} = E_2^{(2)} = 0$ are Eq. (9) and

$$|V_{02}|^2 = 2(|V_{23}|^2 - |V_{12}|^2), \quad (29)$$

The conditions for eliminating the third-order terms, $E_1^{(3)}$ and $E_2^{(3)}$, are Eq. (10) and

$$\text{Re} [2V_{21}V_{13}V_{32} - V_{20}V_{01}V_{12} + V_{20}V_{03}V_{32}] = 0. \quad (30)$$

The conditions for eliminating the fourth-order terms are much more complex, but simplify considerably if we set

$$\begin{aligned} 0 = & 2A_{12}^2 \left(A_{01}^2 - A_{12}^2 + A_{23}^2 - \frac{A_{03}^2}{4} \right) - \frac{5}{2} A_{01}^2 A_{23}^2 + A_{10} A_{02} A_{23} A_{31} \cos(\theta_{10} + \theta_{02} + \theta_{23} + \theta_{31}) \\ & + A_{12} A_{20} A_{03} A_{31} \cos(\theta_{12} + \theta_{20} + \theta_{03} + \theta_{31}) + A_{10} A_{03} A_{32} A_{21} \cos(\theta_{10} + \theta_{03} + \theta_{32} + \theta_{21}), \end{aligned} \quad (31)$$

where $A_{13} = \sqrt{2(A_{01}^2 - A_{12}^2)}$ and $A_{02} = \sqrt{2(A_{23}^2 - A_{12}^2)}$.

Acknowledgements: KJ was supported in part by The Hearne Institute for Theoretical Physics, The Army Research Office and the Intelligence Advanced Research Projects Activity. AJL was supported in part by the Center for Advanced Studies at the University of New

the second-order terms to zero. Once we satisfy Eqs. (9) and (29), it turns out that $E_1^{(4)} = -E_2^{(4)}$, and so there is a single condition for eliminating both of them. Writing $V_{mn} = A_{mn}e^{i\theta_{mn}}$, so that $A_{mn} = A_{nm}$ and $\theta_{mn} = -\theta_{nm}$, this condition is

Mexico and the National Science Foundation under contracts PHY-0555573, PHY-0653596, and CCF-0829944. Both KJ and AJL would like to acknowledge the QUEST workshop in Santa Fe that initiated the exchange of ideas leading to this work.

- ¹ LaHaye, M. D., Buu, O., Camarota, B., and Schwab, K. C. Approaching the quantum limit of a nanomechanical resonator. *Science* **304**, 74 (2004).
- ² Naik, A., *et al.*, Cooling a nanomechanical resonator with quantum back-action. *Nature* **443**, 193 (2006).
- ³ Majer, J., *et al.*, Coupling superconducting qubits via a cavity bus. *Nature* **449**, 443 (2007).
- ⁴ Houck, A. A., *et al.*, Generating single microwave photons in a circuit. *Nature* **449**, 328 (2007).
- ⁵ Regal, C. A., Teufel, J. D., and Lehnert, K. W. Measuring nanomechanical motion with a microwave cavity interferometer. *Nature Phys.* **4**, 555 (2008).
- ⁶ Schmidt, H. and Imamoglu, A. Giant Kerr nonlinearities obtained by electromagnetically induced transparency, *Opt. Lett.* **21** 1936 (1996).
- ⁷ Lloyd, S. and Braunstein, S. L. Quantum computation over continuous variables. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 1748 (1999).
- ⁸ Semiao, F. L. and Vidiella-Barranco, A. Effective cross-Kerr nonlinearity and robust phase gates with trapped ions. *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 064305 (2005).
- ⁹ Azuma, H. Quantum computation with Kerr-nonlinear photonic crystals. *J. Phys. D: Appl. Phys.* **41**, 025102 (2008).
- ¹⁰ Hartmann, M. J., Brandao, F. G., and Plenio, M. B. Strongly interacting polaritons in coupled arrays of cavities. *Nature Physics* **2**, 849 (2006).
- ¹¹ Hartmann, M. J. and Plenio, M. B. Strong photon nonlinearities and photonic Mott insulators. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 103601 (2007).
- ¹² Bhattacharya, T., Habib, S., and Jacobs, K. Continuous quantum measurement and the emergence of classical chaos. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 4852 (2000).
- ¹³ Habib, S., Jacobs, K., and Shizume, K. Emergence of chaos in quantum systems far from the classical limit. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 010403 (2006).

- ¹⁴ Jacobs, K. Engineering quantum states of a nano-resonator via a simple auxiliary system. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 117203 (2007).
- ¹⁵ Woolley, M. J., Milburn, G. J., and Caves, C. M. Non-linear quantum metrology using coupled nanomechanical resonators. *Eprint: arXiv:0804.4540* (2008).
- ¹⁶ Boixo, S., Flammia, S. T., Caves, C. M., and Geremia, J. Generalized limits for single-parameter quantum estimation. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 090401 (2007).
- ¹⁷ Martin, I. and Zurek, W. H. Measurement of energy eigenstates by a slow detector. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 120401 (2007).
- ¹⁸ Jacobs, K., Lougovski, P., and Blencowe, M. P. Continuous measurement of the energy eigenstates of a nanomechanical resonator without a nondemolition probe. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 147201 (2007).
- ¹⁹ Buks, E., Arbel-Segev, E., Zaitsev, S., Abdo, B., and Blencowe, M. P. Quantum nondemolition measurement of discrete Fock states of a nanomechanical resonator. *Europhysics Lett.* **81**, 10001 (2008).
- ²⁰ Wiseman, H. M. Adaptive phase measurements of optical modes: Going beyond the marginal Q distribution. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 4587 (1995).
- ²¹ Jacobs, K. and Lund, A. P. Feedback control of nonlinear quantum systems: A rule of thumb. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **99**, 020501 (2007).
- ²² Jacobs, K., Tian, L., and Finn, J. Engineering superposition states and tailored probes for nano-resonators via open-loop control. *Eprint: arXiv:0807.5132* (2008).
- ²³ Imamoglu, A., Schmidt, H., Woods, G., and Deutsch, M. Strongly interacting photons in a nonlinear cavity. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 1467 (1997).
- ²⁴ Tewari, S. P. and Agarwal, G. S. Control of phase matching

- and nonlinear generation in dense media by resonant fields, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **56**, 1811 (1986).
- ²⁵ Hakuta, K., Marmet, L. and Stoicheff, B. P. Electric-field-induced second-harmonic generation with reduced absorption in atomic hydrogen, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **66**, 596 (1991).
- ²⁶ Kempe, J., Kitaev, A., and Regev, O. The complexity of the local Hamiltonian problem. *SIAM J. Comput.* **35**, 1070 (2006).
- ²⁷ Oliveira, R., Terhal, B. M. The complexity of quantum spin systems on a two-dimensional square lattice. *Eprint: arXiv:quant-ph/0504050* (2005).
- ²⁸ v. Neumann, J. *Mathematical Foundations of Quantum Mechanics* (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1955).
- ²⁹ Jacobs, K., Jordan, A. N. and Irish, E. K. Energy Measurements and Preparation of Canonical Phase States of a Nanomechanical Resonator, *Europhys. Lett.* **82**, 18003 (2008).
- ³⁰ Srinivasan, K. and Painter, O. Linear and nonlinear optical spectroscopy of a strongly-coupled microdisk-quantum dot system. *Nature* **450**, 862 (2007).
- ³¹ Andre, A., *et al.*, A coherent all-electrical interface between polar molecules and mesoscopic superconducting resonators. *Nature Physics* **2**, 636 (2006).
- ³² Nelder, J. and Mead, R. Simplex method for function minimization. *Computer Journal* **7**, 308 (1965).
- ³³ Rigetti, C., Blais, A., and Devoret, M. Protocol for universal gates in optimally biased superconducting qubits. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **94**, 240502 (2005).
- ³⁴ Armour, A. D., Blencowe, M. P., and Schwab, K. C. Entanglement and decoherence of a micromechanical resonator via coupling to a Cooper-pair box, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 148301 (2002).