Coupled vertical double quantum dots at single-hole occupancy

Alexander S. Ivlev,^{1, a)} Hanifa Tidjani,^{1, a)} Stefan D. Oosterhout,² Amir Sammak,² Giordano Scappucci,¹ and Menno Veldhorst¹

¹⁾QuTech and Kavli Institute of Nanoscience, Delft University of Technology, PO Box 5046, 2600 GA Delft, The Netherlands

²⁾QuTech and Netherlands Organisation for Applied Scientific Research (TNO), Delft, The Netherlands

(*Authors to whom the correspondence should be addressed: A.S.Ivlev, a.s.ivlev@tudelft.nl; M.Veldhorst, m.veldhorst@tudelft.nl)

(Dated: 15 January 2023)

Gate-defined quantum dots define an attractive platform for quantum computation and have been used to confine individual charges in a planar array. Here, we demonstrate control over vertical double quantum dots confined in a strained germanium double quantum well. We sense individual charge transitions with a single-hole transistor. The vertical separation between the quantum wells provides a sufficient difference in capacitive coupling to distinguish quantum dots located in the top and bottom quantum well. Tuning the vertical double quantum dot to the (1,1) charge state confines a single hole in each quantum well beneath a single plunger gate. By simultaneously accumulating holes under two neighbouring plunger gates, we are able to tune to the (1,1,1,1) charge state. These results motivate quantum dot systems that exploit the third dimension, creating opportunities for quantum simulation and quantum computing.

Attaining control over individual charges in silicon^{1–3} and germanium^{4–6} constituted a necessary prerequisite to enable quantum computation with gate-defined quantum dots^{7,8}. Planar quantum dot systems have progressed significantly, supporting high-fidelity single and two-qubit logic, multiqubit logic, rudimentary error correction, and control over a 16 quantum dot array^{9–17}. The development of a double germanium quantum well heterostructure¹⁸ has enabled the realisation of a vertically coupled double quantum dot¹⁹, by taking advantage of the third dimension. Gaining control over single charges confined in quantum dots in multilayer systems may become a key asset in obtaining high connectivity in large quantum dot arrays¹⁹. In the near term, single-charge control in bilayer quantum dot systems may enable the realization of small-scale quantum simulators of magnetic phases in correlated spin systems²⁰.

Here, we demonstrate a vertical double quantum dot formed under a single plunger gate and tuned to single-hole occupancy. The occupancy is detected by charge sensing with a single-hole transistor. Using a second plunger gate, the system is extended to a vertical $2x^2$ quantum dot array in the x-z plane parallel to the (100) heterostructure growth direction, filled down to the (1, 1, 1, 1) hole occupation. In comparison, achieving such a charge configuration in planar systems is non-trivial and have been demonstrated only recently in planar germanium²¹ and silicon²².

Fig. 1a depicts a schematic of the Ge/SiGe heterostructure, grown by reduced pressure chemical vapor deposition as detailed in Tosato et al.¹⁸. The heterostructure features two strained Ge quantum wells with thicknesses of 16 nm and 10 nm embedded in strain-relaxed Si_{0.2}Ge_{0.8}. The separation between the quantum wells is 4 nm and the separation of the top quantum well from the semiconductor-dielectric interface is 55 nm, in line with current heterostructures²³ hosting spin qubit devices. Ti/Pd metallic gates (Fig. 1b) are fabricated in two layers and separated by Al₂O₃, to electrostatically confine holes in the quantum wells (for further details on fabrication see¹⁹). Four plunger gates are patterned, with the left-most plunger gate SL_P forming a charge sensor and the right-most acting only as a reservoir in this experiment. The barrier gates SL_N(S) control the tunnelling between the charge sensor and the ohmic contacts. We define quantum dots localised in the two quantum wells using plunger gates P_L and P_R, and barrier gates B_L, B_C and B_R. Additionally, screening gates SC_L and SC_R provide further fine-tuning and prevent the formation of unwanted quantum dots. Barrier gates B_L and B_R also control the loading of charge carriers from the reservoirs to the quantum dots.

To facilitate charge sensing, a 100 µV bias is applied across the ohmic contacts S and D. The current signal through the sensor is determined by two-terminal DC measurements using low impedance lines and resulting in an integration time in the order of $100 \,\mu s$. We calibrate the gate voltages to observe well-defined Coulomb peaks corresponding to the transport of holes through the single hole transistor (SL_P), as seen in Fig. 1c. At the edge of a Coulomb peak, the source-drain current is highly sensitive to the electrostatic environment and in particular to the charge occupation of any quantum dots under plunger gates PL and PR, similar to charge sensors in single quantum well systems. During all following measurements the voltage on SL_P is tuned such that it maintains a high sensitivity to the studied charge states. Previous works have observed that the transport signal through a single-hole transistor may be diminished in a double quantum dot regime¹⁹. therefore we carefully tune the sensor to obtain regular and well-defined Coulomb peaks. We speculate that in this regime only one quantum well is contributing to transport through the charge sensor (see Supplementary II).

The charge sensor SL_P effectively detects the charge state beneath the plunger P_L . We begin by accumulating under P_L , while keeping P_R depleted, in order to avoid a

^{a)}These authors contributed equally



FIG. 1. Double quantum well heterostructure and top gate layout. a Schematic of the double quantum well heterostructure with the numbers indicating the targeted layer thickness. The yellow layer denotes the native SiOx. b False coloured SEM of a device nominally identical to the one used in this experiment. The left-most plunger gate acts as a charge sensor and the two central plunger gates and surrounding barrier gates confine individual holes under $P_{L,R}$. The remaining right side of the device forms a hole-reservoir. c Typical Coulomb oscillations of the single-hole transistor formed underneath the plunger gate SL_P, at a typical source-drain bias of 100 μ V.

lateral double quantum dot signature. Using PL and BC, we tune to a double dot regime under PL, and control the occupation of the two quantum dots QD_{L1} and QD_{L2} . Given their strong coupling to P_L, it is likely the dots are positioned underneath PL. To achieve orthogonal control of the charge occupation in the quantum dots we construct a virtual gate matrix which couples QD_{L1} to vP_L, and QD_{L2} to vB_C. This is enabled by a difference in the lever arm ratio $\alpha_{L1,BC}/\alpha_{L1,PL} < \alpha_{L2,BC}/\alpha_{L2,PL}$, where $\alpha_{D,G}$ is the lever arm between gates G and quantum dot D. As a result, we can construct virtual gates vPL and vBC (Fig. 2) to obtain independent control of the loading onto each quantum dot, down to the single hole regime. The linearly defined virtual gate space is effective in a small voltage regime but is insufficient to virtualise subsequent transitions of the double quantum dot under P_L (Fig. 2a). In particular, the transitions of QD_{L2} have a strongly varying lever arm across consecutive occupations. This difference between the quantum dots can be explained by a weaker in-plane confinement of QD_{L2}, which is consistent with it being located in the bottom quantum well.

To establish that each quantum dot is indeed located in a distinct quantum well, we qualitatively estimate the location of both quantum dots. This is done by extracting the lever arm ratios of the surrounding gates to each quantum dot from the charge stability diagrams, similar to the method used by Tidjani et al.¹⁹. We find that the two quantum dots have approximately equal coupling to the two surrounding barrier gates B_L and B_C. In particular we determine $\alpha_{L1,BC}/\alpha_{L1,PL} \approx \alpha_{L1,BL}/\alpha_{L1,PL} \approx 1.0$ and $\alpha_{L2,BC}/\alpha_{L2,PL} \approx \alpha_{L2,BL}/\alpha_{L2,PL} \approx 1.6$ (see Supplementary III) for the corresponding charge stability diagrams). These lever arms indicate that both quantum dots are equidistant in position between B_L and B_C . We note that B_L and B_C have similar shape and are fabricated in the same layer and we therefore ignore geometric effects. On the other hand $\alpha_{L1,SC_L}/\alpha_{L1,PL} \approx \alpha_{L2,SC_L}/\alpha_{L2,PL} \approx 0.4$, indicates that neither quantum dot is significantly closer to SC_L.

Together these findings suggest that the quantum dots are vertically stacked beneath plunger gate P_L . Since the quantum dots are well-defined with a distinct interdot transition and charge signal to the sensor, we conclude that they are separated in the z-direction, with each quantum well confining one quantum dot. We assign QD_{L2} to the bottom quantum well as its relative coupling to the barrier gates is larger than that of QD_{L1} , which has a stronger in-plane confinement¹⁹. Moreover, an interdot transition $(N_{L1}, N_{L2} + 1) \rightarrow (N_{L1} + 1, N_{L2})$ is induced by applying an increasingly negative P_L voltage, indicating that QD_{L1} is located closer to P_L . The vertically coupled double quantum dot is visualised in Fig. 2b.

Our conclusions are further supported by our finding of comparable results for the two quantum dots QD_{R1} and QD_{R2} under P_R , which we also tune to the (1,1) regime and where we similarly argue that each quantum dot is located in a different quantum well underneath P_R (Supplementary IV). This reproducibility bodes well for future efforts in operating larger arrays.

The observation of a distinct (1,0) - (0,1) interdot transition line in the right panel of Fig. 2a indicates a distinct capacitative coupling between each quantum dot and SL_P. This distinct capacitive coupling is encouraging, since the current heterostructure has a modest inter-layer separation, suggesting potential for further enhancement. The current ability to distinguish in which quantum well a charge is located is holds promise for vertical Pauli spin-blockade (PSB) readout. This gives perspective for the integration of a readout ancilla that can be used for PSB directly underneath or above a data qubit. This distinguishability furthermore allows to better study the inter-layer tunnel coupling itself. The control over the coupling between the quantum wells may be limited and largely predefined by their separation. Nonetheless, controlling the quantum dot occupation may serve as means to discretely



FIG. 2. Single-hole occupancy in a vertical double quantum dot. a. The left panel shows the charge-stability diagram of a double quantum dot formed underneath plunger gate P_L measured by charge sensing. The occupation (N_{L1} , N_{L2}) for quantum dots QD_{L1} and QD_{L2} is noted in each region and is controlled by the gate voltages on P_L and B_C , which are applied as virtual gates $vP_L=P_L-0.55B_C-0.2SL_P$ and $vB_C=-0.9P_L+B_C-0.18SL_P$ to maintain visibility of the charge sensor. In the right panel we focus on the (1,0)-(0,1) transition. The charge sensor is optimized to distinguish the interdot transition. Here the virtual gate definition is set to $vP_L=P_L-0.58B_C-0.18SL_P$ and $vB_C=-0.14SL_P$. The gate voltages at the center of the right panel are $P_L=-1381$ mV and $B_C=-183$ mV. b. Schematic depicting the double occupation under P_L while P_R is kept below the accumulation voltage.

change the tunnel coupling due to the varying wavefunction densities of different orbitals. The appreciable difference in the lever arms of the gates to the quantum dots furthermore suggests gate-based tunability of the inter-layer tunnel coupling and exchange interaction. An applied gate voltage could shift the quantum dots relative to one another, allowing to decrease their overlap and reducing the tunnel coupling. Alternatively, the gate voltage could influence the penetration of the wavefunction into the SiGe barrier. However, a more systematic study is needed to understand to which extent the charge occupation and tunnel couplings can be tuned independently *in situ*.

Having established individual control over the double quantum dots underneath each plunger gate, we now focus on simultaneous control over the hole occupation under both plungers to demonstrate a 2x2 array in the x-z plane. Starting in the few hole regime under P_R , we maintain the (1,1) P_R occupation and tune the system towards the voltage regime in which both quantum dots under PL become occupied with a single hole. The left (right) panel of Fig. 3a demonstrates the charge-stability diagram of vP_{L(R)} vs vB_C. In each diagram one can distinguish the double quantum dot under its corresponding plunger gate, as well as additional transitions corresponding to the double quantum dot under the other plunger gate. In this figure, the upper and lower quantum dots are not virtualised with respect to each other as with in Fig. 2a. in order to obtain a four quantum dot charge stability diagram while only varying two plunger gates. In the middle of the measurement range, the vertical 2x2 array is in the (1,1,1,1) charge occupation, depicted in Fig. 3b. In this regime, it becomes more challenging to distinguish individual transitions from each quantum dot due to the noticeably increased interlayer tunnel coupling between QD_{L1} and QD_{L2} (see Supplementary V for an analysis of the capacitive and tunnel couplings). This increased coupling

is thought to result from the central barrier voltage being increased to $B_C=13$ mV, compared to $B_C=-182$ mV in Fig. 2, which increases the in-plane confinement. Increasing B_C was necessary to achieve the desired (1,1,1,1) charge state. This high B_C voltage moreover reduces the intralayer capacitive and tunnel coupling, consistent with the observed small interdot transitions between the P_L and P_R quantum dots (see Supplementary V).

In conclusion, we have established single-hole charge control over quantum dots in a double quantum well. A significant challenge remains in obtaining control over the interdot coupling and in particular when the coupling is interlayer, since the gates controlling the occupation also control the coupling. Despite this, we have shown that even in a strongly coupled system, charge sensing and orthogonal control of quantum dots in each quantum well is possible, through the construction of virtual gate matrices. Furthermore, we have demonstrated a 2x2 quantum dot array oriented perpendicular to the quantum well plane, and tuned to the (1,1,1,1) charge state. Small extensions in the system size, such as a 2x2x2quantum dot array, may allow the study of intriguing physics arising in bilayer Hubbard models²⁰. Moreover, the ability to control single charges in multilayer systems may facilitate high-connectivity semiconductor quantum processors.

SUPPLEMENTARY MATERIAL

In the supplementary material (included below) we give details on the experimental setup and the regime the charge sensor is in. We also provide data allowing to triangulate the vertical double quantum dots under P_L as well as P_R . Finally we analyse several anti-crossings of the charge stability diagrams to give a crude assessment of the capacitive and tunnel



FIG. 3. **Single-hole occupancy in two coupled vertical double quantum dots. a.** The left panel shows the charge-stability diagram with individual transitions of the double quantum dot underneath P_L , where dark (light) dashed green lines correspond to reservoir transitions of $QD_{L1(2)}$, serving as a guide to the eye. In addition, the blue dotted transitions correspond to the double quantum dot under P_R . We note that the individual quantum dots are poorly distinguishable due to the small lever arm differences between P_L and the quantum dots underneath P_R . The occupation of the top (bottom) quantum well under $P_L N_{L1(2)}$ is indicated in the different regions. The right panel similarly shows the charge-stability diagram with individual transitions of the double quantum dot underneath P_R , with the transition to $QD_{R1(2)}$ indicated with dark (light) blue. The transitions corresponding to the double quantum dot under P_L are indicated with a dotted green line. Again the occupation of the top (bottom) quantum wells under P_R is indicated with $N_{R1(2)}$. In both subfigures the virtual gate voltages are $\tilde{v}P_L = P_L - 0.2P_R - 0.17SL$ and $\tilde{v}B_C = B_C - 0.22SL$ and $\tilde{v}P_R = P_R - 0.4P_L - 0.5B_C - 0.075SL$. To capture multiple transitions of the sensor in the right panel of **a**, the signal is averaged over multiple data sets at different sensor voltages SL_P . The stars correspond to the same voltage values and gives the location of the (1,1,1,1) charge state. **b**. Schematic depicting the 2x2 array. The colours match the transitions in **a**.

couplings between the quantum dots.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Sander de Snoo for software development and Alberto Tosato and Corentin Déprez for useful discussions.

DATA AVAILABILITY

The code, analysis, and raw data supporting the findings of this study are openly available in a Zenodo repository: https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.10513179

FUNDING

We acknowledge support through a Dutch Research Council (NWO) Domain Science (ENW) grant and a European Research Council (ERC) Starting Grant QUIST (850641).

COMPETING INTERESTS

At the time of publication A.S. is employed by Equal1 Laboratories (The Netherlands) B.V. The remaining authors declare no competing interest.

I. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

The measurements were performed in a Bluefors LD400 dilution refrigerator, with a nominal base temperature of 10 mK. The gate voltage was applied using Qblox QCM AWG modules, with 6 dB attenuation at the 50 K and 4 K plates. The DC current through the charge sensor was measured using a Keithley DMM 6500 digital multimeter.

II. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: CHARGE SENSOR TUNING

Optimal operation of the charge sensor occurs when the Coulomb peaks are well defined. In a bilayer device this may be complicated by the possible existence of an interacting double quantum dot beneath the charge sensor. To avoid this we tune to a regime where only one of the quantum wells contributes to transport as indicated by the signature of a single quantum dot (dashed line in Fig. S4).



FIG. S4. Charge stability diagram of charge sensor. The current through the charge sensor is measured as function of SL_N and SL_P . The linecut in Fig. 1c of the main manuscript is taken at the dashed vertical line.

III. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: LEVER ARMS FOR DOUBLE QUANTUM DOT UNDER P1

We triangulate the position of the double quantum dots most strongly coupled to P_L, whose charge stability diagram is in Fig. 2 of the main text. This is obtained from the lever arms ratios $\alpha_{d,G_1}/\alpha_{d,G_2}$ where $\alpha_{d,G}$ is the lever arm between gates *G* and dot *d*. These lever arm ratios are extracted from the slopes of the transition lines in the charge stability diagrams (Fig. S5). While subsequent reservoir transitions have different lever arms, in our analysis we only consider the reservoir transitions corresponding to the loading into the (1,1) state. To determine the lever arm ratio $\alpha_{d,P_L}/\alpha_{d,SC_L}$ for any quantum dot *d* we combine the lever arms $\alpha_{d,B_C}/\alpha_{d,SC_L}$ and $\alpha_{d,P_L}/\alpha_{d,B_C}$. We justify this approach based on the very similar slopes for the reservoir transitions in the charge stability diagram of P_L and SC_L, which doesn't allow us to directly identify a slope $\alpha_{d,P_L}/\alpha_{d,SC_L}$ with a particular quantum dot *d*.

The extracted lever arm ratios are summarized in table S1. From the observation that each quantum dot couples similarly to the barrier gates on either side, and neither quantum dot couples dominantly to the screening gate SC_L , we conclude that the quantum dots are centred around the same point in the x-y plane. Given that the quantum dots are sufficiently distinct and



FIG. S5. Charge stability diagrams of the double quantum dot under P_L . We extract the slopes corresponding to the loading of quantum dot $L_{1(2)}$ indicated in the dark (light) green to retrieve the lever arm ratios of the gates to the quantum dots. These are the reservoir transitions corresponding to the loading onto the (1,1). During these measurements the virtual gates are defined to maintain high charge sensor visibility: $vP_L=P_L-0.06SL_P$, $vSC_L=SC_L-0.1SL_P, vB_L=B_L-0.4SL_P$ and $vB_C = B_C-0.04SL_P$. Note that the virtualisation here is different from the figures in the main text. The gate voltage values at the centre of these datasets are $P_L = -1331 \text{ mV}$, $B_C = -203 \text{ mV}$, $SC_L = -36 \text{ mV}$ and $B_L = -139 \text{ mV}$.

TABLE S1. Lever arm ratios for the quantum dots under P_L . The lever arm ratios for quantum dot $L_{1(2)}$ are extracted from the slope of the dark (light) green line in the corresponding charge stability diagrams in Fig. S5. The compensation on the charge sensor SL_P has been neglected in this analysis. $\alpha_{SC_L}/\alpha_{P_L}$ is calculated by combining the other ratios, since the transitions of the individual quantum dots could not be distinguished from this data set. An error of 3mV is assumed when determining the slope.

QD	$\alpha_{B_L}/\alpha_{P_L}$	$\alpha_{B_C}/\alpha_{P_L}$	$\alpha_{B_L}/\alpha_{SC_L}$	$\alpha_{B_C}/\alpha_{SC_L}$	$\alpha_{SC_L}/\alpha_{P_L}$
L1	0.97 ± 0.08	1.04 ± 0.09	2.45 ± 0.19	2.45 ± 0.20	0.41 ± 0.04
L2	1.57 ± 0.15	1.59 ± 0.17	3.48 ± 0.38	3.74 ± 0.55	0.44 ± 0.05

don't effectively merge into a single quantum dot, they are understood to be in distinct quantum wells, with quantum dot $L_{1(2)}$ being in the top (bottom) well for the reasons outlined in the main text.

We note that in this analysis the compensation on the charge sensor SL_P is neglected, which we warrant through its minor effect on the quantum dot compared to the plunger and barrier gates.



FIG. S6. A double quantum dot under P_R in the few hole regime. Two overlapping data sets demonstrate multiple transitions of distinct quantum dots that are coupled to plunger gate P_2 . The occupation (N_{R1} , N_{R2}) is denoted in the different charge regions. Here $vP_R = P_R$ -0.055SL_P and vSC_R = SC_R-0.075SL_P. We attribute the charge transition crossing the y-axis at about -120 mV to a spurious dot near SC_R. Note that the virtualisation here is different from the figures in the main text. The gate voltage values at the centre of these data sets are given by $P_R = -791 \text{ mV}$ and SC_R = -75 mV. The two data-sets that are used are averaged at the points of overlap. The dashed lines are added to guide the eye.

IV. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: DOUBLE QUANTUM DOT UNDER PR

We demonstrate the formation of the double quantum dots under P_R and triangulate their position as we have done in supplementary III. For these measurements, the charge sensor on the left side of the device is used. The increased distance between the P_R and the sensor results in the weaker signal in Fig. S6 compared to Fig. 2 of the main text. Still, we distinguish two distinct transitions lines, each attributed to a different dot. The lack of further transitions in the (0,0) region shows that indeed the single-hole regime is reached. Plunger gate P_L is depleted such that no dots underneath it are occupied.

We further triangulate the exact positions of the double dots by determining the lever arm ratios of the surrounding gates to these quantum dots (fig. S7) and summarize the values in Table S2). The reservoir transitions used for extracting the lever arms have been denoted with blue and cyan dashed lines in Fig. S7, as these transitions can be consistently identified across the different charge stability diagrams. We see that the lever arm ratios are not as homogeneous as was found for the quantum dots under P_L , as in particular quantum dot QD_{R2} seem to be coupled more with B_R than B_C . Still neither quantum dot couples particularly weakly or strongly to any surrounding gate, and therefore they are unlikely to be spurious dots underneath any particular gate, as that would result in strong coupling to that gate and low coupling to a further-positioned gate. Based on the studied reservoir transitions alone we can not decisively argue that the two quantum dots must be located in different quantum wells. In particular, based on the given lever arm ratios (tab. S7), an alternative interpretation would be that both quantum dots are located in the same quantum well, both between barrier gates B_C and B_R, but with QD_{R2} closer towards SC_R than QD_{R1}. However, this interpretation suggests that an increasingly negative voltage on SCR would be able to transfer a hole from QDR1 into QD_{R2} . Yet the (0,1)-(1,0) interdot transition (white dashed line in fig. S7) suggests that an increasingly negative voltage on SC_R (B_C, B_R or P_R) would localise the single hole into QD_{R1}. This would suggest that $\alpha_{R1,G} > \alpha_{R2,G}$ with G being SC_R, B_C, B_R or P_R which, together with the lever arm ratio in table S2, conflicts with any configuration of in-plane double quantum dots. Hence we conclude that the two quantum dots are located in different quantum wells. More precisely, by a similar reasoning as for the double quantum dots under P_L we suggest that $QD_{R1(2)}$ is located in the top (bottom) quantum well (see Fig. S6b for a schematic).



FIG. S7. Charge Stability Diagrams of the double dot under P_R . We extract the slopes corresponding to the loading of quantum dot $QD_{R1(2)}$ indicated in the dark (light) blue to retrieve the lever arm ratios between the gates and the quantum dots. The black dashed lines indicate points of equal voltage across the different CSDs. The white line connects the two triple points at the (0,1)-(1,0) interdot transition, whenever these are distinguishable. The CSD with B_R was taken using a slower scan due to the limited bandwidth of the DC-line connected to B_R . In that CSD the latching effect becomes pronounced as B_R is more positive, as the quantum dots are loaded from the right reservoir. Across this data, the virtual gates are defined such that the sensor-voltage is compensated as such: $vP_R = P_R-0.055SL_P$, $vSC_R=SC_R-0.075SL_P$, $vB_C=B_C-0.2SL_P$, $vP_L=P_L-0.1SL_P$ and $vB_R=B_R-0.045SL_P$. The exception to this is CSD subfigure **a** which has $vP_R=P_R-0.05SL_P$. Note that the virtualisation here is different from the figures in the main text. The gate voltage values at the centre of these datasets are given by $P_R = -798 \text{ mV}$, $P_L = -315 \text{ mV}$, $B_C = 56 \text{ mV}$, $SC_R = -144 \text{ mV}$ and $B_R = -143 \text{ mV}$.

TABLE S2. Lever arm ratios for the quantum dots under P_R . Similar to table S1 the lever arm ratios for quantum dot $QD_{R1(2)}$ are extracted from the slope of the dark (light) blue line in the corresponding charge stability diagrams in Fig. S7. The compensation on the charge sensor SL_P has been neglected in this analysis. An error of 3 mV is assumed when determining the slope.

QD	$\alpha_{B_R}/\alpha_{P_R}$	$\alpha_{B_C}/\alpha_{P_R}$	$\alpha_{P_L}/\alpha_{P_R}$	$\alpha_{SC_R}/\alpha_{P_R}$
R1	1.07 ± 0.16	0.89 ± 0.07	0.23 ± 0.03	0.51 ± 0.05
R2	1.44 ± 0.13	1.02 ± 0.06	0.27 ± 0.04	0.69 ± 0.05

V. SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION: ANALYSIS OF CAPACITIVE AND TUNNEL COUPLING

The focus of this work is on the establishment of few-hole occupation in bilayer quantum dot arrays. However, the capacitive

TABLE S3. Extracted vertical tunnel and capacitive couplings. Based on model S1 fitted to the different anti-crossings N_{AC} in Fig. S8 we extract the tunnel and capacitive couplings in the vertical direction. To extract the energies we assume a lever arm $\alpha_{QD1,P} = 0.09 \text{ eV/V}$ between the plunger gate and the quantum dot in the top well. The transitions corresponding to the steeper slopes are assumed to correspond to the quantum dot in the upper quantum well, as justified in the main text. To account for the virtualisation factors, tables S1 and S2 are used. The uncertainties are standard deviations based on the first-order derivative near the optimum of the least-square optimizer.

N _{AC}	1	2	3	4	5	6
t_c (GHz)	10 ± 18	21 ± 6	10 ± 7	83 ± 22	11 ± 5	5 ± 6
E_m (GHz)	100 ± 18	280 ± 40	116 ± 30	293 ± 102	331 ± 34	260 ± 30

and tunnel coupling between neighbouring quantum dots are important parameters for charge and spin-manipulation^{24,25}. While further investigations are needed to reliably extract and predict the tunability of the tunnel coupling in bilayer systems, here we provide a crude assessment of the observed couplings in the present experiments.

We use the measured charge stability diagrams to evaluate these parameters through the bending of the charge transition lines. We detect the individual charge transitions using built-in scipy²⁶ and scikit²⁷ functions, the code for which are available together with the raw data on Zenodo. The voltage values (V_x, V_y) of these transitions are fitted to a two-level model^{24,25,28,29}:

$$V_{y} = \begin{bmatrix} a_{1}(V_{x} - x_{0}) + y_{0} + (-)E_{m}/2 & t_{c} \\ t_{c} & -a_{2}(V_{x} - x_{0}) + y_{0} + (-)E_{m}/2 \end{bmatrix}$$
(S1)

where the positive (negative) eigenvalues of this matrix give the upper (lower) branch of the charge anti-crossing, with capacitive coupling of E_m , tunnel coupling t_c , $a_{1,2}$ determining the lever arm ratio to the different quantum dots, and x_0, y_0 the offsets in voltage space. We note that this model assumes a constant lever-arm between the gates and both quantum dots across the voltage space which seems sufficient for the charge transitions we analyse.

To estimate the capacitive and tunnel couplings we assume the lever arm $\alpha_{QD_1,P} \approx 0.09 \text{ eV/V}$ between the plunger gates and the quantum dot in the top quantum well³⁰. This lever arm has been experimentally determined in a monolayer device with a similar plunger gate size whose quantum well is at the same depth as the top quantum well in this study. While the lever arm might deviate in our bilayer design, we believe that any corrections will be comparatively small, as confirmed by a 2D Schrödinger-Possion simulations predicting a similar lever arm of $\alpha \approx 0.12^{19}$. We will further validate this lever arm by using it to extract the charging energy of the top quantum dots and compare that with the charging energy $E_C = 619$ GHz of the earlier monolayer work³⁰.

The tunnel coupling and capacitive coupling are extracted based on the fits displayed in Fig. S8, together with the knowledge of the lever arm ratios from tables S1 and S2. The results can be found in table S3. With the exception of the vertical tunnel coupling of the left double quantum dot pair in the (1,1,1,1) regime, the extracted tunnel couplings are comparable to the targeted tunnel coupling of 16 GHz at this quantum well separation¹⁹. When both double quantum dots are occupied, we note a significant increase in the vertical capacitive coupling as well as an increase of the tunnel coupling for the left double quantum dot. This is explained by an increased in-plane confinement due to the barrier gate voltage B_C from $-182 \,\text{mV}$ in Fig. S8a to 13 mV in Fig. S8c,d. It should however be stressed that the uncertainty of the fit is considerable, and to draw precise conclusions future investigation is needed to collect data on the tunability of these couplings over a larger voltage space.

Additionally, the lateral couplings between the two double quantum dots have been analysed around the (1,1,1,1) charge state. As before, the two-level model (eq. S1) has been fitted to the charge transitions, with the resulting fits found in Fig. S9, with the extracted couplings in table S4. For these lateral transitions, it is not well determined between which quantum dot the coupling occurs, since at some transition the vertical double quantum dots hybridize. For simplicity, we again assume a lever arm of $\alpha = 0.09 \text{ eV/V}$. Clearly, there is a diminished but non-zero capacitive coupling. This decrease in lateral capacitive coupling is to be expected given the larger distance between the quantum dots, as well as the planar configuration. The tunnel coupling seems to be diminished as well but to a lesser extent. Due to the uncertainty of the method, the results are not conclusive. In future work, one might consider performing photon-assisted tunnelling to determine it directly²⁵. In general, we note that typically the lateral tunnel coupling will not decrease with the same order as the capacitive coupling since the tunnel barrier of the SiGe buffer is of a different magnitude than the in-plane confinement, and the tunnel coupling depends exponentially on the barrier height and width.



FIG. S8. Fitted charge stability diagrams to extract the vertical tunnel and capacitive couplings. The charge stability diagrams are the same as the ones used in earlier figures, with $\mathbf{a}(\mathbf{b})$ showing the single hole regime of $QD_{L(R)}$ and $\mathbf{c}(\mathbf{d})$ showing the single hole regime of the coupled vertical double quantum dot pair, focusing on $QD_{L(R)}$. Note that the virtualisation of the plunger and barrier gates is different across the regimes with $\tilde{v}P_L = P_L - 0.5B_C - 0.2SL_P$, $\tilde{v}B_C = 0.9P_L + B_C - 0.18SL_P$, $\tilde{v}P_R = P_R - 0.055SL_P$, $\tilde{v}SC_R = SC_R - 0.075SL_P$, $\tilde{v}P_L = P_L - 0.2P_R - 0.17SL_P$, $\tilde{v}B_C = B_C - 0.22SL_P$, $\tilde{v}P_R = P_R - 0.4P_L - 0.5B_C - 0.075SL_P$. The dashed lines are fits of the charge transitions according to eigenvalues of the model in equation S1. Based on the lever arm $\alpha_{QD_1,P} = 0.09 \text{ eV}/\text{V}$ we extract a charging energy of the top quantum dot in subfigure **a.** of $E_C \approx 416 \pm 10$ GHz, in **b.** of $E_C \approx 718 \pm 22$ GHz, in **c.** of $E_C \approx 699 \pm 20$ GHz and in **d.** of $E_C \approx 583 \pm 8$ GHz, where the uncertainties are based on a measurement uncertainty of 1mV. We note that this is comparable with single quantum well devices with a similar depth of the quantum well and comparable gate geometry³⁰, which had $E_C \approx 619$ GHz.

TABLE S4. Extracted lateral tunnel and capacitive couplings. Based on model S1 fitted to the different anti-crossings N_{AC} in Fig. S9 we extract the tunnel and capacitive couplings in the lateral and possibly diagonal direction. To extract the energies we assume a lever arm $\alpha = 0.09 \text{ eV/V}$ between the plunger gate and the quantum dot underneath it, independent of the quantum well. To account for virtualisation, tables S1 and S2 are used. The uncertainties are standard deviations based on the first-order derivative near the optimum of the least-square optimizer. Note that because for N_{AC} the estimated t_c approaches 0, the first derivative of the optimizer blows up, here E_m is taken as the standard deviation.

N _{AC}	7	8	9	10
t_c (GHz)	4 ± 4	2 ± 6	$0\pm E_m$	4 ± 3
E_m (GHz)	33 ± 3	25 ± 3	23 ± 2	28 ± 2



FIG. S9. Fitted charge stability diagrams to extract the lateral tunnel and capacitive couplings. The data is a higher-resolution scan of the right panel in Fig. 3a of the main text. Dashed lines correspond to fits of the four indicated anti-crossings. We note that charge state between the anti-crossings corresponds to the (1,1,1,1) regime.

- ¹S. J. Angus, A. J. Ferguson, A. S. Dzurak, and R. G. Clark, "Gate-defined quantum dots in intrinsic silicon," Nano Letters 7, 2051–2055 (2007).
- ²C. B. Simmons, M. Thalakulam, N. Shaji, L. J. Klein, H. Qin, R. H. Blick, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, "Singleelectron quantum dot in Si/SiGe with integrated charge sensing," Applied Physics Letters **91**, 213103 (2007).
- ³F. A. Zwanenburg, A. S. Dzurak, A. Morello, M. Y. Simmons, L. C. L. Hollenberg, G. Klimeck, S. Rogge, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, "Silicon quantum electronics," Rev. Mod. Phys. **85**, 961–1019 (2013).
- ⁴N. W. Hendrickx, D. P. Franke, A. Sammak, M. Kouwenhoven, D. Sabbagh, L. Yeoh, R. Li, M. L. V. Tagliaferri, M. Virgilio, G. Capellini, G. Scappucci, and M. Veldhorst, "Gate-controlled quantum dots and superconductivity in planar germanium," Nature Communications 9, 2835 (2018).
- ⁵W. I. L. Lawrie, H. G. J. Eenink, N. W. Hendrickx, J. M. Boter, L. Petit, S. V. Amitonov, M. Lodari, B. Paquelet Wuetz, C. Volk, S. G. J. Philips, G. Droulers, N. Kalhor, F. van Riggelen, D. Brousse, A. Sammak, L. M. K. Vandersypen, G. Scappucci, and M. Veldhorst, "Quantum dot arrays in silicon and germanium," Applied Physics Letters **116**, 080501 (2020).
- ⁶G. Scappucci, C. Kloeffel, F. A. Zwanenburg, D. Loss, M. Myronov, J.-J. Zhang, S. De Franceschi, G. Katsaros, and M. Veldhorst, "The germanium quantum information route," Nature Reviews Materials **6**, 926–943 (2021).
- ⁷D. Loss and D. P. DiVincenzo, "Quantum computation with quantum dots," Phys. Rev. A 57, 120–126 (1998).
- ⁸G. Burkard, T. D. Ladd, A. Pan, J. M. Nichol, and J. R. Petta, "Semiconductor spin qubits," Rev. Mod. Phys. 95, 025003 (2023).
- ⁹J. Yoneda, K. Takeda, T. Otsuka, T. Nakajima, M. R. Delbecq, G. Allison, T. Honda, T. Kodera, S. Oda, Y. Hoshi, N. Usami, K. M. Itoh, and S. Tarucha, "A quantum-dot spin qubit with coherence limited by charge noise and fidelity higher than 99.9%," Nature Nanotechnology 13, 102–106 (2018).
- ¹⁰W. I. L. Lawrie, M. Rimbach-Russ, F. v. Riggelen, N. W. Hendrickx, S. L. d. Snoo, A. Sammak, G. Scappucci, J. Helsen, and M. Veldhorst, "Simultaneous single-qubit driving of semiconductor spin qubits at the fault-tolerant threshold," Nature Communications 14, 3617 (2023).
- ¹¹N. W. Hendrickx, W. I. L. Lawrie, M. Russ, F. van Riggelen, S. L. de Snoo, R. N. Schouten, A. Sammak, G. Scappucci, and M. Veldhorst, "A four-qubit germanium quantum processor," Nature 591, 580–585 (2021).
- ¹²S. G. J. Philips, M. T. Mądzik, S. V. Amitonov, S. L. de Snoo, M. Russ, N. Kalhor, C. Volk, W. I. L. Lawrie, D. Brousse, L. Tryputen, B. P. Wuetz, A. Sammak, M. Veldhorst, G. Scappucci, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, "Universal control of a six-qubit quantum processor in silicon," Nature 609, 919–924 (2022).
- ¹³X. Xue, M. Russ, N. Samkharadze, B. Undseth, A. Sammak, G. Scappucci, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, "Quantum logic with spin qubits crossing the surface code threshold," Nature 601, 343–347 (2022).
- ¹⁴A. Noiri, K. Takeda, T. Nakajima, T. Kobayashi, A. Sammak, G. Scappucci, and S. Tarucha, "Fast universal quantum gate above the fault-tolerance threshold in silicon," Nature **601**, 338–342 (2022).
- ¹⁵K. Takeda, A. Noiri, T. Nakajima, T. Kobayashi, and S. Tarucha, "Quantum error correction with silicon spin qubits," Nature 608, 682–686 (2022).
- ¹⁶F. van Riggelen, W. I. L. Lawrie, M. Russ, N. W. Hendrickx, A. Sammak, M. Rispler, B. M. Terhal, G. Scappucci, and M. Veldhorst, "Phase flip code with semiconductor spin qubits," npj Quantum Information 8, 124 (2022).
- ¹⁷F. Borsoi, N. W. Hendrickx, V. John, M. Meyer, S. Motz, F. van Riggelen, A. Sammak, S. L. de Snoo, G. Scappucci, and M. Veldhorst, "Shared control of a 16 semiconductor quantum dot crossbar array," Nature Nanotechnology (2023), 10.1038/s41565-023-01491-3.
- ¹⁸A. Tosato, B. Ferrari, A. Sammak, A. R. Hamilton, M. Veldhorst, M. Virgilio, and G. Scappucci, "A high-mobility hole bilayer in a germanium double quantum well," Advanced Quantum Technologies 5, 2100167 (2022).
- ¹⁹H. Tidjani, A. Tosato, A. Ivlev, C. Déprez, S. Öosterhout, L. Stehouwer, A. Sammak, G. Scappucci, and M. Veldhorst, "Vertical gate-defined double quantum dot in a strained germanium double quantum well," Phys. Rev. Appl. 20, 054035 (2023).
- ²⁰D. Buterakos and S. Das Sarma, "Magnetic phases of bilayer quantum-dot hubbard model plaquettes," Phys. Rev. B 108, 235301 (2023).
- ²¹F. van Riggelen, N. W. Hendrickx, W. I. L. Lawrie, M. Russ, A. Sammak, G. Scappucci, and M. Veldhorst, "A two-dimensional array of single-hole quantum dots," Applied Physics Letters **118**, 044002 (2021).
- ²²F. K. Unseld, M. Meyer, M. T. Mądzik, F. Borsoi, S. L. de Snoo, S. V. Amitonov, A. Sammak, G. Scappucci, M. Veldhorst, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, "A 2D quantum dot array in planar 28Si/SiGe," Applied Physics Letters **123**, 084002 (2023).
- ²³M. Lodari, N. W. Hendrickx, W. I. L. Lawrie, T.-K. Hsiao, L. M. K. Vandersypen, A. Sammak, M. Veldhorst, and G. Scappucci, "Low percolation density and charge noise with holes in germanium," Materials for Quantum Technology 1, 011002 (2021).
- ²⁴R. Hanson, L. P. Kouwenhoven, J. R. Petta, S. Tarucha, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, "Spins in few-electron quantum dots," Rev. Mod. Phys. **79**, 1217–1265 (2007).
- ²⁵W. G. van der Wiel, S. De Franceschi, J. M. Elzerman, T. Fujisawa, S. Tarucha, and L. P. Kouwenhoven, "Electron transport through double quantum dots," Rev. Mod. Phys. 75, 1–22 (2002).
- ²⁶P. Virtanen, R. Gommers, T. E. Oliphant, M. Haberland, T. Reddy, D. Cournapeau, E. Burovski, P. Peterson, W. Weckesser, J. Bright, S. J. van der Walt, M. Brett, J. Wilson, K. J. Millman, N. Mayorov, A. R. J. Nelson, E. Jones, R. Kern, E. Larson, C. J. Carey, İ. Polat, Y. Feng, E. W. Moore, J. VanderPlas, D. Laxalde, J. Perktold, R. Cimrman, I. Henriksen, E. A. Quintero, C. R. Harris, A. M. Archibald, A. H. Ribeiro, F. Pedregosa, P. van Mulbregt, and SciPy 1.0 Contributors, "SciPy 1.0: Fundamental Algorithms for Scientific Computing in Python," Nature Methods 17, 261–272 (2020).
- ²⁷F. Pedregosa, G. Varoquaux, A. Gramfort, V. Michel, B. Thirion, O. Grisel, M. Blondel, P. Prettenhofer, R. Weiss, V. Dubourg, *et al.*, "Scikit-learn: Machine learning in python," Journal of machine learning research **12**, 2825–2830 (2011).
- ²⁸A. K. Hüttel, S. Ludwig, H. Lorenz, K. Eberl, and J. P. Kotthaus, "Direct control of the tunnel splitting in a one-electron double quantum dot," Phys. Rev. B 72, 081310 (2005).
- ²⁹M. Pioro-Ladrière, M. R. Abolfath, P. Zawadzki, J. Lapointe, S. A. Studenikin, A. S. Sachrajda, and P. Hawrylak, "Charge sensing of an artificial H₂⁺ molecule in lateral quantum dots," Phys. Rev. B **72**, 125307 (2005).
- ³⁰V. John, F. Borsoi, Z. György, C.-A. Wang, G. Széchenyi, F. van Riggelen-Doelman, W. I. L. Lawrie, N. W. Hendrickx, A. Sammak, G. Scappucci, A. Pályi, and M. Veldhorst, "Bichromatic rabi control of semiconductor qubits," Phys. Rev. Lett. **132**, 067001 (2024).