

# A photonic cluster state machine gun

Netanel H. Lindner<sup>1</sup> and Terry Rudolph<sup>2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, Technion—Israel Institute of Technology, 32000 Haifa, Israel*

<sup>2</sup>*Optics Section, Blackett Laboratory, Imperial College London, London SW7 2BZ, United Kingdom*

<sup>3</sup>*Institute for Mathematical Sciences, Imperial College London, London SW7 2BW, United Kingdom*

We present a method which can be used to convert certain single photon sources into devices capable of emitting large strings of photonic cluster state in a controlled and pulsed “on demand” manner. Such sources greatly alleviate the resources required to achieve linear optical quantum computation. Standard spin errors, such as dephasing, are shown to affect only 1 or 2 of the emitted photons at a time. This allows for the use of standard fault tolerance techniques, and shows that the machine gun can be fired for arbitrarily long times. Using realistic parameters for current quantum dot sources, we conclude high entangled-photon emission rates are achievable, with Pauli-error rates less than 0.2%. For quantum dot sources the method has the added advantage of circumventing the problematic issue of obtaining identical photons from independent, non-identical quantum dots.

PACS numbers: 03.67.-a, 03.67.Lx, 73.43.Nq

The primary challenge facing linear optical quantum computation is that of building suitable photon sources. The majority of effort has been directed at single photon sources. Four single photons can be used in an interferometer to produce a maximally entangled Bell pair of photons [1], and given a source of Bell pairs it is in principle possible to fuse them [2] into larger so-called *cluster states* [3]. These somewhat magical quantum states can be used for performing quantum computation via the simple procedure of making individual (single-qubit) measurements on the photons involved. Recently a promising new approach has been to produce Bell pairs directly [4, 5] via a radiative cascade in quantum dots. However, even an ideal such source would only reduce the overall resources required for a full optical quantum computation by a small factor.

In this Letter we will show that with current technology it is possible to manipulate certain single photon sources, in particular quantum dots, so as to generate a continuous stream of photons, each of which is entangled with the photons which both precede and follow it. Specifically, it is possible to use the source to emit long strings of (various varieties of) 1-dimensional cluster states. Using these strings, cluster states capable of running arbitrary quantum algorithms can be very efficiently generated by fusion. We analyze all error mechanisms and show that the error rates can be very low - close to fault tolerant thresholds for quantum computing - even if the source is operated for timescales much longer than the typical decoherence times. Our analysis of the emitted wavepackets allows us to design filtering techniques which can push these error rates even lower.

We begin with a highly idealized description of the proposal. Consider a source with a degenerate spin 1/2 ground state manifold. The basis  $|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle$  denotes the spin projection along the  $z$  axis. Furthermore, imagine that optical transitions at frequency  $\omega_0$  are possible *only* to

a doubly degenerate excited state manifold. The excited states  $|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle$  have  $J_z = \pm 3/2\hbar$ , thus only the (single photon) transitions  $|\uparrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |\uparrow\rangle$  and  $|\downarrow\rangle \leftrightarrow |\downarrow\rangle$  are allowed. Such transitions are well known to occur, for example, in quantum dots (QDs) which emit single photons via charged-exciton decay [6]. We only consider the emitted photons propagating along the  $z$  axis. Therefore, if the initial state of the source is  $|\uparrow\rangle$  ( $|\downarrow\rangle$ ), an excitation to the state  $|\uparrow\rangle$  ( $|\downarrow\rangle$ ) followed by radiative decay, results in the emission of a single right (left)-circularly polarized photon  $|R\rangle$  ( $|L\rangle$ ) and leaves the source in the state  $|\uparrow\rangle$  ( $|\downarrow\rangle$ ). Now, consider the initial state  $|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle$ , and a coherent excitation pulse with a linear polarization along the  $x$  direction. (The exciting pulse itself need not necessarily propagate along the  $z$  direction, which is useful for separation of the coherent and emitted light). Such a pulse couples equally to both transitions. Therefore, the processes described above happen in superposition, and the emitted photon will be entangled with the electron: the joint state of both systems would be the Bell pair  $|\uparrow, R\rangle + |\downarrow, L\rangle$ . Repeating such a procedure would produce GHZ-type entangled states, which are not useful for quantum computing, and for which disentangling the photons from the electron spin is difficult. Moreover, the GHZ state is highly vulnerable to decoherence. By contrast, the cluster states suffer none of these problems.

To see how to create cluster states, we now imagine that before the second excitation of the system, when the state of the spin and the first photon is  $|\uparrow\rangle|R_1\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle|L_1\rangle$ , the spin undergoes a  $\pi/2$ -rotation about the  $y$ -axis. Under this operation, described by  $\exp(-iY\pi/4) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} / \sqrt{2}$ , the state evolves to  $(|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle)|R_1\rangle + (-|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle)|L_1\rangle$ . A second pulse excitation, accompanied by a second photon emission, will now result in the two photons and the electron spin being in the state:

$$(|\uparrow\rangle|R_2\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle|L_2\rangle)|R_1\rangle + (-|\uparrow\rangle|R_2\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle|L_2\rangle)|L_1\rangle \quad (1)$$




FIG. 1: (Color online) A standard quantum circuit which is readily verified to output linear cluster state. For mapping to the cluster state machine gun, the top qubit line is the electron spin, the Hadamard gates are replaced by single qubit unitaries  $\exp(-i\pi Y/4)$  (requiring the careful tracking of certain phases), and the physical process of creating a photon with left/right circular polarization conditioned on the state of the electron spin becomes the controlled not gate which leaves the qubit (photon) in state  $|0\rangle$  (i.e.  $|R\rangle$ ) if the electron spin is in state  $|0\rangle$  (i.e.  $|\uparrow\rangle$ ), but otherwise flips it. Crucially, as depicted, a Pauli  $Y$  error on the spin localizes; i.e. it is equivalent to  $Y$  and  $Z$  errors on the next two photons produced.

In terms of abstract (logical) qubit encodings we will take  $|R\rangle \equiv |0\rangle, |L\rangle \equiv -|1\rangle$ . It can be readily verified that rotating the spin with another  $\pi/2$  rotation, now leaves the spin and two photons in the state:  $|000\rangle + |001\rangle + |010\rangle - |011\rangle + |100\rangle + |101\rangle - |110\rangle + |111\rangle$  which is exactly the 3 qubit linear cluster state. Repeating the process of excitation followed by  $\pi/2$  rotation, will produce a third photon such that the electron and three photons are in a 4-qubit linear cluster state. The procedure can, in principle, be repeated indefinitely, producing a continuous chain of photons in an entangled linear cluster state. Note that one advantage of producing a cluster state is that the electron can be readily disentangled from the string of entangled photons, for example by making a computational ( $|R\rangle, |L\rangle$ ) basis measurement on the most recently created photon. In fact, since in general the initial state of the spin will be mixed, such a detection of a photon in state  $|R\rangle(|L\rangle)$  polarization can also be used to project the spin to the  $|\uparrow\rangle(|\downarrow\rangle)$  state, and initializes the cluster state (either outcome is ok). It can be readily verified that the whole idealized procedure just described is equivalent to the qubit quantum circuit depicted in Fig. 1.

A very general analysis of how cluster states are generated by evolution of atoms in cavities undergoing general pumping and decay can be found in [7], and interesting cavity QED proposals can be found in [8]. We will primarily focus on a specific implementation of our proposal, namely photon emission from a quantum dot, via the process of creation and subsequent decay of a charged

exciton (trion). In practise the expressions we derive, such as the structure of the emitted photon wavepackets, can be easily applied to any systems which obey similar selection rules, and the imperfections we discuss are, for the most part, generic. The importance of the selection rules arises as follows. In semiconductor quantum dots, the  $J = 3/2, J_z = \pm 1/2$  states are naturally split off from the  $J = 3/2, J_z = \pm 3/2$  ones primarily due to confinement. They correspond to trions containing two electrons in the singlet state and a *light* hole or *heavy* hole respectively. We can consider only the *heavy* trions and neglect the mixing between them. In other systems, while the transitions to  $J_z = \pm 1/2$  may be energetically split off by an external field, or may simply have different couplings, generically they will still lead to imperfections equivalent to non-orthogonality of the emitted photons. Moreover processes in other systems tend to be slower, and temporally longer pulses may well also be required because of nearby energy levels. Although these problems can be remedied somewhat by applying proper filtration protocols to the output cluster state (at the expense of larger loss rates) we focus on quantum dots for which the suppression is essentially perfect, the processes are fast, and the energy levels well separated.

Although other options exist, we will consider from now on the situation where the  $\pi/2$  rotations on the spin are performed by placing the quantum dot in a constant magnetic field of strength  $B$  which is directed along the  $y$ -direction (i.e. in the plane of the dot). The spin precession at frequency  $\omega_B = g_e\mu B/\hbar$  in the  $z$ - $x$  plane therefore implements the desired rotation every  $T_{\text{cycle}} = \pi/2\omega_B$ . Suitably timed strobing of the dot by the excitation pulse, followed by the rapid exciton decay, will therefore enable the machine-gun-like generation of 1d cluster state described above.

There are several possible sources of imperfection with this idealized protocol, and we turn now to an analysis of them. The potential issues to be considered are as follows: (i) The non-zero lifetime of the trion  $\tau_{\text{decay}}$  means that the magnetic field causes precession of the electrons during the emission process. This leads to errors induced on the quantum circuit of Fig 1; these errors will be derived below, and we shall find that they can be understood as implementing an error model on the final output cluster state which takes the form of Pauli errors occurring with some independent probability on pairs of (photonic) qubits. (ii) Interaction of the electron spin with its environment results in a non-unitary evolution of the spin. This evolution consists of two parts: decoherence (in which we include both dephasing and spin flips) and spin relaxation. Decoherence is characterized by a  $T_2$  time. Fortunately we will see that both these processes also lead only to errors occurring independently on two (photonic) qubits at a time. Efficient cluster state quantum computation can proceed even if every qubit has a finite (though small) probability of undergoing some ran-

dom error [9]. This implies that the protocol's running time is not limited by  $T_2$ , while the errors are amenable to standard quantum error correction techniques for cluster states. Spin relaxation is characterized by a  $T_1$  time, and is a process which projects the spin to the ground state. In semiconductor quantum dots  $T_1$  times are extremely long  $T_1 \gg T_2 \gg \tau_{\text{decay}}$  [11]. Therefore, we shall not discuss the effects of this process further here. We point out, however, that it can be shown this process also leads to errors of a localized form, and so in principle is no obstacle to the continuous operation of the device even for times much longer than  $T_1$ . (iii) The last source of error is related to the issue of ensuring the photons are emitted into well-controlled spatial modes. In practise this technological issue of mode matching (say by placing the dot in a microcavity) results in some amount of photon loss error in the final state. Significant progress on this issue is being made for a variety of quantum dots [12]. Fortunately photonic cluster state computation can proceed even in the presence of very high (up to 50%) loss [10], and we will not consider this source of error further.

We now turn to detailed calculations of the error rate inflicted by imperfections (i) and (ii) discussed above. We first calculate the effect of a finite ratio of the trion decay time  $\tau_{\text{decay}}$  time to the spin precession time  $T_p$ . The Hamiltonian we consider is  $H = H_0 + H_B + V$ , where  $H_0 = \omega_0 P + H_{\text{EM}}$  (we denote  $P$  to be a projector on the trion manifold and  $H_{\text{EM}}$  is the free EM field Hamiltonian). The Zeeman interaction for the electron is  $H_B = g_e \mu_B \vec{S}_e \cdot \vec{B}$ , where  $\mu$  is the Bohr magneton, and  $g_e$  is the effective gyromagnetic ratio of the electron in the QD. For the low magnetic fields we are dealing with, we can assume  $g_h = 0$  for the heavy hole [13]. The interaction Hamiltonian with the photon field, is given in the rotating wave and dipole approximation by

$$V = \sum_k \left( V_{k,R} |\uparrow\rangle \langle \uparrow| a_{k,R}^\dagger + V_{k,L} |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow| a_{k,L}^\dagger + h.c. \right).$$

Here the (heavy) trion states are denoted by  $\uparrow, \downarrow$  respectively. We denote by  $\rho_n(\tau + t_n)$  the state of the system (the quantum dot and photons) at time  $\tau$  after the  $n^{\text{th}}$  excitation pulse,  $t_n = nT_{\text{cycle}}$ . By  $\rho_n(t_n^-)$  we mean the state of the system *just before* the  $n^{\text{th}}$  excitation pulse (we assume the excitation is instantaneous). Following the excitation, the trion state decays, emitting a photon and leaving an electron in the QD, the spin of which then precesses in the magnetic field. These lead to an evolution of the quantum state described by the following map

$$\rho(t_n + \tau) = U^\dagger(\tau) \left( G + F \right)^\dagger \rho(t_n^-) \left( G + F \right) U(\tau) \quad (2)$$

The unitary operator  $U = \exp(iY\omega_B\tau) \exp(iH_0\tau)$  describes the precession of the electron spin and the free

propagation of the photons. The generalized creation operators

$$G^\dagger = G_R^\dagger |\uparrow\rangle \langle \uparrow| + G_L^\dagger |\downarrow\rangle \langle \downarrow|, F^\dagger = F_R^\dagger |\downarrow\rangle \langle \uparrow| - F_L^\dagger |\uparrow\rangle \langle \downarrow|, \quad (3)$$

describe the excitation and decay process, adding a photon to the state. The trion states decay exponentially with  $\tau$ , therefore we have omitted them from Eq. (2) (which describes the state of the system at times greater than the trion decay time, *i.e.*  $\tau \gg \tau_{\text{decay}}$ ). Note that the photons created in each cycle are well separated from the ones created in the previous cycles (formally, this is taken into account by the free propagation of the photons).

Equation (3) describes a circuit isomorphic to the one described in Fig. 1. The operator  $G^\dagger$  corresponds to a correct application of a CNOT gate. This happens with an amplitude  $g(k)$ , which depends on the photon's energy  $k$ :  $\langle k\varepsilon | G_\varepsilon^\dagger | 0 \rangle \equiv g(k) = \frac{\sqrt{\Gamma/(2\pi)}(k-Z)}{(k-Z)^2 - (g_e\mu_B)^2/4}$ . Here  $|k\varepsilon\rangle = a_{k,\varepsilon}^\dagger |0\rangle$  and  $\varepsilon = L, R$ . The complex energy of the trion states is denoted by  $Z = \omega_0 - i\Gamma/2$ , where  $\tau_{\text{decay}} = 1/\Gamma$  is their lifetime. The operator  $F^\dagger$  corresponds to a CNOT gate followed by a  $Y$  error on the spin qubit. This errored gate is applied with amplitude  $f(k)$ , where  $\langle k\varepsilon | F_\varepsilon^\dagger | 0 \rangle \equiv f(k) = \frac{i\sqrt{\Gamma/(2\pi)}g_e\mu_B/2}{(k-Z)^2 - (g_e\mu_B)^2/4}$ .

For simplicity, let us for the moment treat the processes described by  $G^\dagger$  and  $F^\dagger$  as incoherent with each other. Then the resulting state is described by the circuit of Fig. 1 with a probability  $p_B = \|f\|^2 = \frac{(g_e\mu_B)^2}{2(g_e\mu_B)^2 + 2\Gamma^2}$ , that each CNOT gate is followed by  $Y$  error on the spin qubit. As noted in Fig. 1, a state with a  $Y$  error on the spin after generation of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  photon (*i.e.*, after the  $n^{\text{th}}$  CNOT), is equivalent to a state  $Y$  and a  $Z$  error on the  $n^{\text{th}} + 1$  and  $n^{\text{th}} + 2$  photons, with no error on the spin. Note that the error probability increases with magnetic field strength, because the spin can precess more during the lifetime of the trion [14]. Therefore it is advantageous to consider relatively low magnetic fields, for which  $g_e\mu_B \ll \Gamma$ . Although  $p_B$  turns out to be quite low for relevant experimental parameters (see below), it is possible to reduce it further by considering the amplitudes  $g(k)$  and  $f(k)$ . As  $g(k)$  is more localized around  $\omega_0$  then  $f(k)$  (inset of Fig. 2), selection of photons with energy  $|k - \omega_0| > \Delta$  yields lower probability of error at the expense of (heralded) loss. A unitary correction  $e^{iY\phi}$  with  $\sin\phi = \langle g|f\rangle/\langle g|g\rangle$  yields a substantial further improvement of the error rate, this is also depicted in Fig. 2.

We now turn to the issue of decoherence of the spin as a result of its interaction with the nuclei in the quantum dot [15]. Assuming Markovian dynamics [16], it is well known [17] that the resulting dephasing and spin flip dynamics are equivalent to the action of random Pauli operations  $X, Y, Z$  with some probabilities  $p_x, p_y, p_z$ . The probabilities  $p_x, p_z$  are suppressed due to the presence of the magnetic field [15], while  $p_y$  is characterized by  $T_2$ , the dephasing time. This can readily be shown to give




FIG. 2: (Color online) Contour plots showing the total probability of error, as a function of  $g_e\mu B/\Gamma$  and  $(\Gamma T_2)^{-1}$ . Dotted line is with no correction mechanisms, thick solid lines are for an easily implemented unitary correction, and dashed lines are for spectral filtering incurring 15% (heralded) loss. The inset is a plot of the good mode function  $g(k)$  (blue) and error mode function  $f(k)$  (red) at  $g_e\mu B/\Gamma = 0.15$ .

$p_y = \frac{1}{2}(1 - e^{-T_{\text{cycle}}/T_2})$  as the probability of a given spin error in 1 cycle. We already noted that a  $Y$  error on the spin becomes a pauli error on the next 2 photons. Similarly a  $Z$  error at the end of the  $n^{\text{th}}$  cycle is equivalent to a  $Z$  error on the  $n^{\text{th}}+1$  photon, as can be seen from Fig. 1 and the fact that the operator  $C_{\text{NOT}}(Z_{\text{spin}} \otimes I_{\text{photon}})$  and  $(I_{\text{spin}} \otimes Z_{\text{photon}})C_{\text{NOT}}$  have similar actions on the states  $|00\rangle$  and  $|10\rangle$ . As  $X = iZY$ , an  $X$  error again affects only the next two photons to be generated.

In Fig. 2 we plot the total probability of error on any given qubit,  $1 - (1 - p_B)(1 - p_y)$ , as a function of the two dimensionless parameters  $g_e\mu B/\Gamma$  and  $(\Gamma T_2)^{-1}$ . Although free induction decay  $T_2$  may be relatively short in low magnetic fields, using a spin echo pulse at half way along the cycle time can extend  $T_2$  considerably [15], and remove the dephasing caused by a wide distribution of nuclear (Overhauser) magnetic fields (often termed inhomogeneous broadening and characterized by a  $T_2^*$  time). To estimate an achievable error rate, we consider a decay time of  $1/\Gamma = 100$  ps, and a dephasing time of  $T_2 = 1$   $\mu$ s with the addition of the spin echo pulses (a lower bound of 3  $\mu$ s have been measured in high magnetic fields [18]). This gives  $(\Gamma T_2)^{-1} = 10^{-4}$ . From Fig. 2, one can deduce that a probability of error less than 0.2% can be achieved by applying a magnetic field of 15mT (we take  $g_e = 0.5$ ). We note that even without the spin echo pulses error rates of about 1% are achievable, which enables the production of considerable longer and higher quality optical cluster states than those produced by current methods.

So far we have worked under the assumption that the pulse excitations are timed to coincide with (integer multiples of)  $\pi/2$  rotations of the spin. In fact it can be advantageous to sometimes wait for a full  $\pi$  rotation to occur. This has the effect of emitting subsequent photons which are redundantly encoded [2]. Such encoding

is equivalent (after a single qubit Hadamard rotation) to having “leaves” sticking out of the linear cluster qubits, and fusing together such leaves gives a highly efficient method for producing 2-dimensional cluster states which are universal for quantum computing.

Lastly let us mention that for certain architectures, e.g. [8, 19], it may be advantageous to use the stationary matter qubits as the primary quantum computer, and the emitted photons as a vehicle for entangling these systems into cluster states. Clearly our proposal is easily turned into a highly efficient mechanism for doing so.

*Acknowledgments.* TR acknowledges the support of the EPSRC, the QIP-IRC, and the US Army Research Office. We acknowledge numerous useful conversations with S. Economou and D. Gershoni.

- 
- [1] Q. Zhang, *et. al*, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 062316 (2008)
  - [2] D. E. Browne and T. Rudolph Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 010501 (2005).
  - [3] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5188 (2001).
  - [4] N. Akopian *et. al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 130501 (2006), M. Stevenson *et. al.*, Nature **439**, 179 (2006), A. Gilchrist *et. al.*, Nature **445**, E4-E5.
  - [5] E. Meirum *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. A **77**, 062310 (2008), J. E. Avron *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 120501 (2008).
  - [6] M. Bayer *et. al.* Phys. Rev. B **65** 195315 (2002).
  - [7] C. Schoen *et al*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 110503 (2005).
  - [8] J. Metz *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 052307 (2007); C. Schoen *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. A **75**, 032311 (2007); A. Beige *et. al.*, J. Mod. Opt. **54**, 397 (2007).
  - [9] R. Raussendorf *et. al.*, Annals of Physics **321**, 2242 (2006); C. M. Dawson *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **96**, 020501 (2006); M. A. Nielsen and C. M. Dawson, eprint:quant-ph/0601066; Panos Aliferis and Debbie W. Leung, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 032308 (2006)
  - [10] M. Varnava *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 120501 (2006); *ibid*, Phys. Rev. Lett., **100**, 060502 (2008).
  - [11] M. Kroutvar *et. al.*, Nature **432**, 81 (2004).
  - [12] K. Hennessy *et. al.*, Nature **445**, 896 (2006).
  - [13] J. G. Tischler *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. B. **66**, 081310 R! 2002!
  - [14] S. E. Economou *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. B **71**, 195327 (2005).
  - [15] W. A. Coish and *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. B **70**, 195340 (2004); W. Yao *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. B. **74**, 195301 (2006); W. M. Witzel *et. al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **98**, 077601 (2007), L. Cywinski *et. al.* eprint: cond-mat/0809.0003.
  - [16] A Markovian assumption overestimates the single qubit error rate. Previous studies [15] suggest a non-Markovian decay profile. The resulting correlated errors can also be dealt with, as discussed in B. Terhal and G. Burkard, Phys. Rev. A. **71**, 012336 (2005).
  - [17] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
  - [18] A. Greilich *et al*, Science **313**, 341 (2006).
  - [19] Sean D. Barrett and Pieter Kok, Phys. Rev. A **71** 060310R (2005)