

# Phase factors of periodically driven two-level systems

Marcela Muniz Gontijo and João C. A. Barata

*Department of Mathematical Physics, University of São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil*

Using a perturbative solution for a periodically driven two-level quantum system, we show how to obtain phase factors for both a two-level quantum system and two two-level quantum systems non-interacting and interacting. The method is easily implemented by numerical routines and presents the advantage of being stable for long-time periods. We furthermore explore the possibility of implementing a quantum phase gate using the perturbative solution.

## INTRODUCTION

The study of geometric phases has attracted significant interest since it was shown that they could be used to process quantum information [18] and, due to its geometric properties, they present an inherent resilience to fluctuation errors in the control parameters. The experimental implementations of geometric phase in the context of quantum computation, sometimes referred to as geometric quantum computation (GQC), has been fruitful [1, 13]. Nevertheless, to obtain the expression for the geometric phase acquired by a two-level quantum system, many works implement the rotating wave approximation (RWA) [10, 13, 15]. As every approximation, the RWA has its realm of validity and applicability that has been extensively studied [7, 8, 11, 16, 17].

In this work, we consider the evolution of a two-level quantum system driven by periodic fields. Instead of the RWA, we use the solution of the Schrödinger equation obtained in [3, 4] (see also [2, 5, 6, 12]) to compute the total, dynamical and geometric phase for a two-level quantum system and two two-level quantum systems. Since the solution used is uniformly convergent in time, the expressions for the phases present a robustness when long-time periods are considered. We first make a brief overview of the perturbative method developed in [3, 4]. The phases of a two-level quantum system are then obtained using the perturbative expansion. The discussion is extended to two two-level quantum systems, non-interacting and interacting. In each case, we present the expressions for calculating each phase factor. Finally, we obtain the phase factors for the composite two two-level quantum system with a delta interaction. We show that for a specific choice of parameters, it is possible to build a phase shift gate.

## DESCRIPTION OF THE MODEL AND METHODS

Let us start by considering a system with the following Hamiltonian:

$$H_1(t) = \epsilon\sigma_3 - f(t)\sigma_1, \quad (1)$$

where  $\epsilon$  is a real constant and  $f(t)$  is a periodic function of time with frequency  $\omega > 0$ . Let us consider a rotation

of  $\pi/2$  around the  $y$ -axis, denoted by  $R_y(\pi/2)$ , and the Schrödinger equation on this new rotated frame is given by

$$i\frac{d}{dt}\psi_2(t) = H_2(t)\psi_2(t), \quad (2)$$

where

$$\psi_2(t) = R_y(\pi/2)\psi(t) = \exp(-i\pi\sigma_2/4)\psi(t) \quad (3)$$

and

$$H_2(t) = \epsilon\sigma_1 + f(t)\sigma_3. \quad (4)$$

The Hamiltonian (1) can be interpreted as describing a system with a Hamiltonian independent of time  $\epsilon\sigma_3$  subjected to a time-dependent perturbation  $-f(t)\sigma_1$ . The later is responsible for transitions between the two states of the system.

The method developed in [3] and [4] is valid for small  $\epsilon$  and periodic  $f$ . The quasi-periodic case was analysed in [12]. It consists in writing a perturbative expansion in  $\epsilon$  for the time evolution operator. This method has proven to have the following advantages: the series expansion are uniformly convergent in time, the expression obtained for the time evolution operator is given in terms of series and so are easily implementable in numerical calculations and they can be employed for any periodic function. The uniform convergence is of great importance, since it means the results lead to stable numerical calculations and therefore allows the study of long-time behaviour of the observable quantities of the system.

It was shown in [3] that the time evolution operator  $U(t)$  for the system described by (4) can be written as

$$U(t) = \begin{pmatrix} R(t)(1 + ig_0S(t)) & -i\epsilon R(t)S(t) \\ -i\epsilon \overline{R(t)}S(t) & \overline{R(t)}(1 - i\overline{g_0}S(t)) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

where  $R(t)$  and  $S(t)$  are given by

$$R(t) = e^{-i\Omega t} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} R_m e^{im\omega t} \quad (6)$$

and

$$S(t) = \sigma_0 + e^{2i\Omega t} \sum_{m \in \mathbb{Z}} S_m e^{im\omega t}. \quad (7)$$

$R_m$  and  $S_m$  are coefficients of the Fourier expansion of  $R(t)$  and  $S(t)$ , respectively. Together with the Rabi frequency  $\Omega$  and the constants  $g_0$  and  $\sigma_0$ , they can all be obtained from rather complex but convergent power series expansions in  $\epsilon$ , involving the Fourier coefficients of  $f$  and its frequency  $\omega$ . See [4] as well as [2, 3, 5, 6] for explicit formulas and examples. Sometimes we will refer to the matrix elements of  $U(t)$ , for example,  $U_{11}(t) = R(t)(1 + ig_0S(t))$  and  $U_{12}(t) = -i\epsilon R(t)S(t)$ .

As done in [4], we implemented numerically the method developed there for a perturbation of the form

$$f(t) = F_0 + A \cos(\omega t), \quad (8)$$

where  $F_0$  is a real number,  $A$  and  $\omega$  is the amplitude and the frequency of the periodic perturbation, respectively.

Following the directions of the original paper, the method was applied to several values of  $\omega$  and  $\epsilon$ , the former ranging from 1.0 to 10.0 and the later from 0.01 to 0.40. For all these values, the unitarity test was sufficiently satisfactory, since the error is bounded by  $3 \times 10^{-3}$  in one specific case (for  $\omega = 1.0$  and  $\epsilon = 0.40$ ), but for most cases, is bounded by  $10^{-5}$  or even  $10^{-10}$ .

### TOTAL, DYNAMICAL AND GEOMETRIC PHASES

We now show the calculations of the total, dynamical and geometric phases for the two-level system considered. The total phase of the system is simply given by

$$\phi_{tot}(t) = \arg\langle\psi(0), \psi(t)\rangle, \quad (9)$$

and the dynamical phase  $\alpha_{dyn}$  is given by

$$\alpha_{dyn}(t) = i \int_0^t \langle\psi(t'), \dot{\psi}(t')\rangle dt', \quad (10)$$

where  $\psi(0)$  and  $\psi(t)$  are the state vectors of the system at the initial instant of time and for an instant of time  $t$ , respectively. The dot indicates derivation relative to time. The geometric phase  $\gamma_{geo}$  is simply the difference between the total and dynamical phases:

$$\gamma_{geo}(t) = \phi_{tot}(t) - \alpha_{dyn}(t). \quad (11)$$

We note that the phase factors are functions of time, since they are defined by the evolution of the state vector  $\psi(t)$ .

When performing the following calculations, we shall consider the state vector correspondent to the rotated Hamiltonian given by (3). The resulting expressions become

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{tot}(t) = \arg\{ & \text{Re } U_{11}(t) + i(-2 \text{Re}(\bar{\alpha}\beta) \text{Im } U_{11}(t) \\ & + 2 \text{Im}(\bar{\alpha}\beta) \text{Re } U_{12}(t) + (2|\alpha|^2 - 1) \text{Im } U_{12}(t))\} \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{dyn}(t) = & |\alpha|^2 \left( -\text{Im} \int_0^t a_{11}(t') dt' + i \text{Re} \int_0^t a_{12}(t') dt' \right) \\ & - 2i \text{Re}(\bar{\alpha}\beta) \text{Re} \int_0^t a_{11}(t') dt' - 2i \text{Im}(\bar{\alpha}\beta) \text{Im} \int_0^t a_{12}(t') dt' \\ & + |\beta|^2 \left( -\text{Im} \int_0^t a_{11}(t') dt' - i \text{Re} \int_0^t a_{12}(t') dt' \right), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where  $a_{11}(t)$  and  $a_{12}(t)$  are matrix elements of the product of  $U^*(t)$  and  $\dot{U}(t)$ :

$$U^*(t)\dot{U}(t) = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11}(t) & a_{12}(t) \\ -\bar{a}_{12}(t) & \bar{a}_{11}(t) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (14)$$

The expression for the dynamical phase involves integrations over time of the expansions. Although there are lots of integration routines, using them in the highly oscillatory functions that constitute the expansions often results in a large error due to the routine. Thus, the integrations were carried out analytically term by term in the Fourier expansions and then implemented numerically.

The previous expressions determine the total and dynamical phase for the system for any instant of time. Next, it is necessary to define the instant of time that is physically meaningful to the calculations of the phase acquired by the system. One could argue that the appropriate instant of time would be the ‘‘natural’’ frequency of the system, characterised by the Rabi frequency  $\Omega$ . But we must recollect the nature of the geometric phase, that is, the phase acquired over the course of the evolution of the system resulted from the geometrical properties of the parameter space of the Hamiltonian. In our case, the parameter space is two-dimensional, with each dimension associated to the parameters  $A$  and  $\omega$  in (8). So, if we consider a cyclic evolution on the parameter space and a fixed amplitude  $A$  of the external field, the relevant instant of time is precisely

$$t_\omega = \frac{2\pi}{\omega}. \quad (15)$$

Therefore, the expressions (12), (13) and (11) for the respective total phase, dynamical phase and geometric phase of the system are taken at  $t_\omega$ . Next, we present some results of our calculations for the phase factors of the system as graphical representations. Without loss of generality, we considered the initial state vector to be  $\psi(0) = |0\rangle$ , that is, the state vector is initially aligned with the  $z$ -axis. The calculations were performed for values of  $\epsilon$  ranging from 0.01 to 0.40 with steps of 0.01; and values of  $\omega$  ranging from 1.0 to 10.0 with steps of 0.5.

As previously stated, the numerical implementation of the total phase was easily accomplished. We note

that since the total phase is defined as an argument, there was no need to test if the numerical function had relevant imaginary parts due to built-in machine errors. Figure 1a shows the relation between the values of the total phase and the parameter  $\epsilon$  and Figure 2 presents a three-dimensional representation of the total phase as a function of  $\omega$  and  $\epsilon$ . We can see that the absolute value of the total phase is proportional to the value of  $\epsilon$ . According to the interpretation of (1) in which  $\epsilon$  is the energy gap between the two eigenstates of  $\sigma_3$ , we can say that the total phase is proportional to this gap. Moreover, we note that as the value of  $\omega$  increases, the rate in which the total phase increases with  $\epsilon$  decreases. In other words, the value of  $\omega$  modulates the curve  $\phi_{tot} \times \epsilon$ . Figure 1b shows graphs of the total phase as a function of  $\omega$  with fixed values of  $\epsilon$ . The same behaviour observed in Figure 1a is present in Figure 1b, but in this case, the value of  $\epsilon$  modulates the curve  $\phi_{tot} \times \omega$  in the following way: as  $\epsilon$  increases, the curve gets more accentuated. It is also notable that for  $\omega$  around 2.0, the absolute value of the total phase is maximised.




Figure 1: Total phase plotted as a function of  $\epsilon$  and  $\omega$ .

The numerical implementation of the dynamical phase is not as straightforward as that of the total phase, since it involves several integrations over time (equation (13)). These integrations, as we said before, were done analytically and then numerically implemented. The dynamical phase is expected to be real, but the expansions in our implementation are truncated, so we tested if the imaginary part of the dynamical phase had relevant contributions. The imaginary parts equal zero within the machine accuracy. The relation between the dynamical phase and the values of  $\omega$  has a particular behaviour: for  $\omega = 1.0, 1.5, 2.0, 2.5$  the curve  $\alpha_{dyn} \times \epsilon$  resembles a parabola and for higher values the curve resembles a linear function. Figure 3a shows the dynamical phase as a function of  $\epsilon$  for some fixed values of  $\omega$ . Figure 3b shows the curve  $\alpha_{dyn} \times \omega$  for some values of  $\epsilon$ . We can see that, similar to Figure 1b,  $\epsilon$  seems to modulate the curve and there is a value of  $\omega$  that maximises  $\alpha_{dyn}$ , but this value shifts according to the value of  $\epsilon$ . Fig-




Figure 2: Graphical representation of the total phase  $\phi_{tot}$  as a function of  $\omega$  and  $\epsilon$ .

ure 4 shows a three-dimensional representation of the dynamical phase as a function of  $\omega$  and  $\epsilon$ .




Figure 3: Dynamical phase plotted as a function of  $\epsilon$  and  $\omega$ .

A similar behaviour of the total phase is observed for the geometric phase in Figures 5a and (5b): the absolute value of the geometric phase increases as  $\epsilon$  increases, the curve  $\gamma_{geo} \times \omega$  is modulated by  $\epsilon$  and it presents a value of  $\omega$  that maximises the absolute value of the geometric phase. Figure 6 shows the graphical representation of the geometric phase as a function of  $\omega$  and  $\epsilon$ .

We next consider two two-level quantum systems with individual Hamiltonians given by (1). When considering that the two systems do not interact with each other, the phase factors obtained for the composite system are simply the algebraic sum of the individual phase factors. In order to explore how the phase factors of the composite system change when interactions are taken into account, we considered an interaction given by

$$H'(t) = \kappa v(t) \sigma_3^{(a)} \otimes \sigma_3^{(b)}, \quad (16)$$





Figure 4: Graphical representation of the dynamical phase  $\alpha_{dyn}$  as a function of  $\omega$  and  $\epsilon$ .



(a) Geometric phase  $\gamma_{geo}(t_\omega)$  as a function of  $\epsilon$  for fixed  $\omega = 2.0$  (full line), 5.0 (dashed line) and 10.0 (dotted line).  
 (b) Geometric phase  $\gamma_{geo}(t_\omega)$  as a function of  $\omega$  for fixed  $\epsilon = 0.01$  (full line), 0.10 (dashed line) and 0.40 (dotted line).

Figure 5: Geometric phase plotted as a function of  $\epsilon$  and  $\omega$ .




Figure 6: Graphical representation of the geometric phase  $\gamma_{geo}$  as a function of  $\omega$  and  $\epsilon$ .

where  $\kappa$  is a real constant and  $v(t)$  is a real function of time. The corresponding Hamiltonian in the rotated frame is given by

$$\begin{aligned} H_2'(t) &= R_y(\pi/2) \kappa v(t) \sigma_3^{(a)} \otimes \sigma_3^{(b)} R_y^*(\pi/2) \\ &= \kappa v(t) \sigma_1^{(a)} \otimes \sigma_1^{(b)}, \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

where  $\epsilon_a$  and  $\epsilon_b$  are the respective constants of the individual systems and  $f_a(t)$  and  $f_b(t)$  are the external fields applied to each subsystem. The Hamiltonian of the composite system is

$$H_2(t) = \begin{pmatrix} f_a(t)+f_b(t) & \epsilon_b & \epsilon_a & \kappa v(t) \\ \epsilon_b & f_a(t)-f_b(t) & \kappa v(t) & \epsilon_a \\ \epsilon_a & \kappa v(t) & -f_a(t)+f_b(t) & \epsilon_b \\ \kappa v(t) & \epsilon_a(t) & \epsilon_b & -f_a(t)-f_b(t) \end{pmatrix} \quad (18)$$

In order to obtain the phase factors for the composite system, we consider the interaction picture. We will denote the state vector in this picture by  $\psi_I(t)$  and it relates to the state vector in the Schrödinger picture by the unitary transformation

$$\psi_I(t) = U^*(t)\psi(t), \quad (19)$$

where  $U(t)$  is the time evolution operator. In the interaction picture, the time evolution operator  $U_I(t)$  is given by the Dyson series

$$U_I(t) = \mathbb{1} + \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} (-i)^n \int_0^t V_I(t_1) dt_1 \dots \int_0^{t_{n-1}} V_I(t_n) dt_n. \quad (20)$$

where  $V_I(t)$  is the interaction Hamiltonian in the interaction picture given by

$$V_I(t) = \kappa v(t) \begin{pmatrix} V_{11}(t) & V_{12}(t) \\ \bar{V}_{12}(t) & -V_{11}(t) \end{pmatrix}^{(a)} \otimes \begin{pmatrix} V_{11}(t) & V_{12}(t) \\ \bar{V}_{12}(t) & -V_{11}(t) \end{pmatrix}^{(b)}, \quad (21)$$

with

$$V_{11}(t) = -\bar{U}_{11}(t)\bar{U}_{12}(t) - U_{11}(t)U_{12}(t), \quad (22)$$

$$V_{12}(t) = \bar{U}_{11}(t)^2 - U_{12}(t)^2. \quad (23)$$

The time evolution operator in the interaction picture given by the Dyson expansion in (20), considering the expression for the operator  $V_I(t)$  in (21), is

$$\begin{aligned} U_I(t) &= \mathbb{1} - i\kappa \int_0^t (U_a^*(t')\sigma_1^{(a)}U_a(t')) \\ &\quad \otimes ((U_b^*(t')\sigma_1^{(b)}U_b(t')) dt' + \mathcal{O}(\kappa^2). \end{aligned}$$

We shall consider the Dyson expansion up to first order. The matrix form of the time evolution operator in the interaction picture, in first order, is given by

$$U_I(t) = \mathbb{1}_4 - i\kappa V^{(1)}(t), \quad (24)$$

where  $\mathbb{1}_4$  is the identity operator acting on a four-dimensional Hilbert space and

$$V^{(1)}(t) = \int_0^t v(t') \begin{pmatrix} V_{11}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & V_{11}^{(a)} V_{12}^{(b)} & V_{12}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & V_{12}^{(a)} V_{12}^{(b)} \\ V_{11}^{(a)} \bar{V}_{12}^{(b)} & -V_{11}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & V_{12}^{(a)} \bar{V}_{12}^{(b)} & -V_{12}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} \\ \bar{V}_{12}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & \bar{V}_{12}^{(a)} V_{12}^{(b)} & -V_{11}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & -V_{11}^{(a)} V_{12}^{(b)} \\ \bar{V}_{12}^{(a)} \bar{V}_{12}^{(b)} & -\bar{V}_{12}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & -V_{11}^{(a)} \bar{V}_{12}^{(b)} & V_{11}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} \end{pmatrix} dt' \quad (25)$$

We omitted the time-dependency of the expressions for  $V_{11}(t)$  and  $V_{12}(t)$  given by equations (22) and (23), respectively. The operator  $V^{(1)}(t)$  will be useful for evaluating the expressions for the phase factors of the composite system. Also, we must note that  $V^{(1)}(t)$  is a self-adjoint operator, since  $v(t)$  is a real function of  $t$  and the matrix operator in the integrand on the right hand side of (25) is self-adjoint.

The total phase factor for the composite system is

$$\begin{aligned} \phi_{tot}(t) &= \arg \langle \psi_2(0), \psi_2(t) \rangle \\ &= \arg \left\{ \langle \psi_2^{(a)}(0), U_a(t) \psi_2^{(a)}(0) \rangle \langle \psi_2^{(b)}(0), U_b(t) \psi_2^{(b)}(0) \rangle \right. \\ &\quad \left. - i\kappa \langle \psi_2(0), U(t) V^{(1)}(t) \psi_2(0) \rangle \right\}. \quad (26) \end{aligned}$$

Note that for  $\kappa = 0$  the expression above reduces itself to the total phase of two non-interacting systems.

Using (10) for the dynamical phase and the expansion in  $\kappa$  for the time evolution operator in the interaction picture, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{dyn}(t) &= i \int_0^t \langle \psi_2(t'), \dot{\psi}_2(t') \rangle dt' \\ &= i \int_0^t \langle \psi_2(0), U^*(t') \dot{U}(t') \psi_2(0) \rangle dt' \\ &\quad + \kappa \int_0^t \langle \psi_2(0), U^*(t') U(t') V^{(1)}(t') \psi_2(0) \rangle dt' \\ &\quad + \kappa \int_0^t \langle \psi_2(0), U^*(t') \dot{U}(t') \dot{V}^{(1)}(t') \psi_2(0) \rangle dt' \\ &\quad - \kappa \int_0^t \langle \psi_2(0), V^{(1)}(t')^* U^*(t') \dot{U}(t') \rangle dt' + \mathcal{O}(\kappa^2), \end{aligned}$$

since  $U(t)$  is unitary, the identity  $U^*(t) \dot{U}(t) = -\dot{U}^*(t) U(t)$  holds and the third term on the right hand side of the expression above can be rewritten as the complex conjugate of the second term. Hence, the dynamical phase up to first order in  $\kappa$  is given by

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha_{dyn}(t) &= \alpha_{dyn}^{(0)}(t) \\ &\quad + 2\kappa \operatorname{Re} \int_0^t \langle \psi_2(0), U^*(t') \dot{U}(t') V^{(1)}(t') \psi_2(0) \rangle dt' \\ &\quad + \kappa \int_0^t \langle \psi_2(0), \dot{V}^{(1)}(t') \psi_2(0) \rangle dt' + \mathcal{O}(\kappa^2), \quad (27) \end{aligned}$$

where the  $\alpha_{dyn}^{(0)}(t)$  is exactly the expression for the dynamical phase for two non-interacting two-level systems.

Also, the third term on the right hand side of (27) is the integral over time of the expectation value of the self-adjoint operator  $V^{(1)}(t)$ . Therefore, this term is also real and so is the expression for the dynamical phase. The geometric phase for the composite system is still given by the difference between the total phase and the dynamical phase.

Now, let us consider the case in which the interaction is given by

$$v(t) = \delta(t - t_0), \quad (28)$$

where  $t_0$  is any instant of time. The time evolution operator in the interaction picture, according to (24) and (25), is

$$U_I(t) = \mathbb{1}_4 - i\kappa \begin{pmatrix} V_{11}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & V_{11}^{(a)} V_{12}^{(b)} & V_{12}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & V_{12}^{(a)} V_{12}^{(b)} \\ V_{11}^{(a)} \bar{V}_{12}^{(b)} & -V_{11}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & V_{12}^{(a)} \bar{V}_{12}^{(b)} & -V_{12}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} \\ \bar{V}_{12}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & \bar{V}_{12}^{(a)} V_{12}^{(b)} & -V_{11}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & -V_{11}^{(a)} V_{12}^{(b)} \\ \bar{V}_{12}^{(a)} \bar{V}_{12}^{(b)} & -\bar{V}_{12}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} & -V_{11}^{(a)} \bar{V}_{12}^{(b)} & V_{11}^{(a)} V_{11}^{(b)} \end{pmatrix}_{t=t_0}, \quad (29)$$

where the time dependency of  $V_{11}(t)$  and  $V_{12}(t)$  are respectively given by (22) and (23). The time dependency in the second term on the right hand side was omitted, but we assume that  $0 < t_0 < t$  and so, both  $V_{11}(t)$  and  $V_{12}(t)$  are calculated for  $t_0$ , as is indicated by the subscript on the matrix on the right hand side of (29).

Up to first order in  $\kappa$ , the time evolution operator in (29) is constant in time. Thus, the third term of the expression for the dynamical phase in (27), that involves the time derivative of  $V^{(1)}(t)$ , is null. We implemented in our code routines that calculate the phase factors for the interaction given by (28). To investigate the relation between the phase factors and the constant  $\kappa$ , we considered a system composed of two commensurable subsystems with fixed  $\omega_a$ ,  $\omega_b$ ,  $\epsilon_a$  and  $\epsilon_b$ , a fixed  $t_0$  that characterises the delta interaction and we varied  $\kappa$  from 0 to 0.2, with steps of 0.01. Considering this set of parameters, the code calculates the phase factors for each of the computational basis states ( $|00\rangle$ ,  $|01\rangle$ ,  $|10\rangle$  and  $|11\rangle$ ). Figure 7 shows the results for the initial state  $|00\rangle$  and  $\omega_q = 1.0$ ,  $\omega_b = 2.0$ ,  $\epsilon_a = \epsilon_b = 0.01$  and  $t_0 = 0.5$ . The results are similar for others sets of parameters. We note that since our approximation of the Dyson expansion (equation (20)) is only up to first order, the dependency of the phase factors on  $\kappa$  is linear. The parameter  $\kappa$  is not, as one could imagine, a parameter of the control space of the system. It simply modulates the interaction between the subsystems and can be thought of as an structural constant.

Figure 8 shows the dependency of the phase factors on the instant of time  $t_0$  of the interaction for the initial state  $|00\rangle$ . The presented relation between the phase factors and  $t_0$  is similar for the others states of the computational basis and for different sets of parameters. We note that there is a value of  $t_0$  that maximises the abso-




Figure 7: Plots of the phase factors for the initial state  $|00\rangle$  as functions of the parameter  $\kappa$ . The thick line represents the value of the phase factors for a system with non-interacting subsystems. The dashed line represents the interaction given by (28). We considered subsystems with  $\omega_a = 1.0$ ,  $\omega_b = 2.0$ ,  $\epsilon_a = \epsilon_b = 0.01$  and  $t_0 = 0.5$ .

lute value of the geometric phase, but we cannot state that this is a global maximum.




Figure 8: Plots of the phase factors for the initial state  $|00\rangle$  as functions of the instant of time of the interaction  $t_0$ . The thick line represents the value of the phase factors for a system with non-interacting subsystems. The dashed line represents the interaction given by (28). We considered subsystems with  $\omega_a = 1.0$ ,  $\omega_b = 2.0$ ,  $\epsilon_a = \epsilon_b = 0.01$  and  $\kappa = 0.1$ . The time is measured in unites of  $2\pi/\omega$ .

## FURTHER RESULTS

Using the results obtained so far for two two-level quantum systems, we may investigate once again the appropriate instant of time to calculate the phase factors. Following the same prerogative, that the instant to be considered corresponds to the time interval in which the system undergoes a cyclic evolution, we consider the probability of transition for the composite system:

$$P(t) = |\langle \psi(0), U(t)\psi(0) \rangle|^2.$$

Figure 9 shows  $P(t)$  as a function of time. We observe that the system returns to its initial state after a time  $T_\Omega \cong 456t_\omega$ , where  $t_\omega = 2\pi/\omega$ .  $T_\Omega$  is also obtained through  $T_\Omega = 2\pi/\Omega$ , where  $\Omega$  is the Rabi frequency and is calculated numerically. We considered a system with  $\omega_a = 1.0$ ,  $\omega_b = 2.0$ ,  $\epsilon_a = \epsilon_b = 0.01$ . The constants that determine the interaction are  $\kappa = 0.1$  and  $t_0 = 0.5 = 0.16t_\omega$ . For this values, the correspondent Rabi frequency is  $\Omega = 0.0022$ , resulting in  $T_\Omega \cong 456t_\omega$ , as observed in Figure 9.




Figure 9: Probability of the system remaining in its initial state. Starting from the graph in the left column and first row, in clockwise order the graphs correspond to the initial states  $|00\rangle$ ,  $|01\rangle$ ,  $|10\rangle$  and  $|11\rangle$ . The full line corresponds to non-interacting subsystems and the dashed line corresponds to an interaction of the form (28). The time is measured in unites of  $t_\omega = 2\pi/\omega$ . The relevant constants of the systems are  $\omega_a = 1.0$ ,  $\omega_b = 2.0$ ,  $\epsilon_a = \epsilon_b = 0.01$ ,  $\kappa = 0.1$  and  $t_0 = .16t_\omega$ .

	$\omega_b = 1.0$		$\omega_b = 5.0$		$\omega_b = 8.0$	
	$\phi_{tot}^{(0)}$	$\phi_{tot}^{(\delta)}$	$\phi_{tot}^{(0)}$	$\phi_{tot}^{(\delta)}$	$\phi_{tot}^{(0)}$	$\phi_{tot}^{(\delta)}$
$ 00\rangle$	0.027	-0.116	-1.816	-1.878	-2.491	-2.552
$ 01\rangle$	0.000	0.151	1.843	1.898	2.518	2.570
$ 10\rangle$	0.000	0.151	-1.843	1.790	-2.518	-2.466
$ 00\rangle$	-0.027	-0.116	1.816	1.752	2.491	2.429

Table I: Values of the total phase  $\phi_{tot}$  for each state of the computational basis, considering different values of  $\omega_b$  and fixed  $\omega_a = 1.0$ . The subscript  $\phi_{tot}^{(0)}$  and  $\phi_{tot}^{(\delta)}$  indicate systems with no interaction and interaction given by a delta function, respectively.

Once we determined the period that the system takes to return to its initial state ( $T_\Omega$ ), we can calculate the total phase factor of the composite system.

Table I shows values of the total phase for a set of  $\omega_a$  and  $\omega_b$  values. We note that when  $\omega_a = \omega_b$ , we can write the following transformation:

$$B(\phi) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\phi} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-i\phi} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (30)$$

where  $\phi$  is the total phase associated with the basis state  $|00\rangle$ . This transformation implements a conditional evolution of the basis states, we can say that (30) is a conditional phase gate in the sense that the state of one system influences the state of the other, although it does present the usual symmetric form of controlled phase shift gates. This gate is not purely geometrical, since the total phase factor involves both the dynamical and

geometric phases. When  $\omega_a \neq \omega_b$ , the transformation on the basis state can no longer be represented by (30), as can be seen in Table I.

## CONCLUSIONS

The main contribution of this work is the implementation of the method developed in [3] and [4] to obtain phase factors for a two-level quantum system and two two-level quantum systems interacting and non-interacting. Since this method presents a solution stable for long-time periods, the resulting phase factors also present this property.

The implementation of a quantum gate, when RWA is considered [10, 15] is valid for an adiabatic evolution and, in the context of two two-level systems interacting, only one is subjected to an external time-dependent field. In our case, both systems are subjected to an external periodic field and neither the adiabatic approximation nor the rotating wave approximation are necessary. Using the results for phase factors we were able to implement a controlled phase shift gate. The resulting gate is not purely geometrical and removing the dynamical contribution to the overall phase is not a straightforward task. One possibility is finding a Hamiltonian that cancels the dynamical phase of the system along a cyclic trajectory. Nevertheless, our work can be extended in many ways. For example, the time evolution operator obtained for a two-level quantum system could be used in the calculation of geometric phases in open quantum systems under the Quantum Jump Approach [9]. Or, for non-unitary evolutions in the context of interferometry, it is even possible to combine the method developed in [14] with our work to obtain a time evolution operator for a system subjected to a time-dependent perturbation and derive the corresponding phase factors.

---

[1] J. Anandan, J. Christian, and K. Wanelik. Geometric phases in physics. *American Journal of Physics*, 65:180, 1997.

[2] J. C. A Barata. On formal quasi-periodic solutions of

the schrödinger equation for a two-level system with a hamiltonian depending quasi-periodically on time. *Rev. Math. Phys.*, 12(1):25–64, 2000.

- [3] J. C. A. Barata. Converging perturbative solutions of the Schrödinger equation for a two-level system with a hamiltonian depending periodically on time. *Annales Henri Poincaré*, 2:963–1005, 2001.
- [4] J. C. A. Barata and D. A. Cortez. Time evolution of two-level systems driven by periodic fields. *Phys. Lett. A*, 301:350–360, 2002.
- [5] J. C. A. Barata and D. A. Cortez. Perturbative analysis of dynamical localisation. *J. Math. Phys.*, 44(5):1937–1960, 2003.
- [6] J. C. A Barata and W. F. Wreszinski. Strong-coupling theory of two-level atoms in periodic fields. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 84(10):2112–2115, 2000.
- [7] F. Bloch and A. Siegert. Magnetic resonance for nonrotating fields. *Phys. Rev.*, 57:522–527, Mar 1940.
- [8] D. Bonacci. Rabi spectra - a simple tool for analyzing the limitations of RWA in modelling of the selective population transfer in many-level quantum systems. *eprint arXiv:quant-ph/0309126*, September 2003.
- [9] A. Carollo, I. Fuentes-Garidi, M. França Santos, and V. Vedral. Geometric phase in open systems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 90(16):160402, 2003.
- [10] A. Ekert, M. Ericsson, P. Hayden, H. Inamori, J. A. Jones, D. K. L. Oi, and V. Vedral. Geometric quantum computation. *J. Mod. Opt.*, 47(14,15):2501–2513, 2000.
- [11] Marco Frasca. A modern review of the two-level approximation. *Annals of Physics*, 306(2):193–208, 2003.
- [12] Daniel A. Cortez Guido Gentile and João. C. A. Barata. Stability for quasi-periodically perturbed hill’s equations. *Commun. Math. Phys.*, 260:403–443, 2005.
- [13] J. A. Jones, V. Vedral, A. Ekert, and G. Castagnoli. Geometric quantum computation using nuclear magnetic resonance. *Nature*, 403:869–871, 2000.
- [14] J. G. Peixoto de Faria, A. F. R. Toledo Piza, and M. C. Nemes. Phases of quantum states in completely positive non-unitary evolutions. *Europhysics Lett.*, 62(6):782–788, 2003.
- [15] E. Sjöqvist, A. K. Pati, A. Ekert, J. S. Anadan, M. Ericsson, D. K. L. Oi, and V. Vedral. Geometric phases for mixed states in interferometry. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 85(14):2845, 2000.
- [16] J. Spiegelberg and E. Sjöqvist. Validity of the rotating-wave approximation in nonadiabatic holonomic quantum computation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 88:054301, 2013.
- [17] A. F. Stevenson. On the theory of the magnetic resonance method of determining nuclear moments. *Phys. Rev.*, 58:1061–1067, Dec 1940.
- [18] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti. Holonomic quantum computation. *Phys. Lett. A*, 264:94–99, 1999.