

Suppressing spurious transitions using spectrally balanced pulse

Ruixia Wang,^{1,*} Yaqing Feng,¹ Yujia Zhang,^{1,2,3} Jiayu Ding,¹ Boxi Li,^{4,5} Felix Motzoi,^{4,5} Yang Gao,^{1,2,3} Huikai Xu,¹ Zhen Yang,¹ Wuerkaixi Nuerbolati,¹ Haifeng Yu,¹ Weijie Sun,^{1,†} and Fei Yan^{1,‡}

¹*Beijing Academy of Quantum Information Sciences, Beijing 100193, China*

²*Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing 100190, China*

³*University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 101408, China*

⁴*Forschungszentrum Jülich, Institute of Quantum Control (PGI-8), D-52425 Jülich, Germany*

⁵*Institute for Theoretical Physics, University of Cologne, D-50937 Cologne, Germany*

Achieving precise control over quantum systems presents a significant challenge, especially in many-body setups, where residual couplings and unintended transitions undermine the accuracy of quantum operations. In superconducting qubits, parasitic interactions—both between distant qubits and with spurious two-level systems—can severely limit the performance of quantum gates. In this work, we introduce a pulse-shaping technique that uses spectrally balanced microwave pulses to suppress undesired transitions. Experimental results demonstrate an order-of-magnitude reduction in spurious excitations between weakly detuned qubits, as well as a substantial decrease in single-qubit gate errors caused by a strongly coupled two-level defect over a broad frequency range. Our method provides a simple yet powerful solution to mitigate adverse effects from parasitic couplings, enhancing the fidelity of quantum operations and expanding feasible frequency allocations for large-scale quantum devices.

Introduction — Quantum information processing technologies have made significant progress, achieving coherent control over systems with about 100 qubits [1–6]. In superconducting quantum processors, qubit-qubit interactions are typically mediated by engineered coupling elements, such as coplanar capacitors. However, due to the long-range nature of electromagnetic interactions and design constraints, parasitic or residual couplings can exist between qubits that are intended to be uncoupled. These parasitic interactions, known as quantum crosstalk [7], pose a challenge to the execution of independent operations, as they can interfere with transitions close in frequency. This phenomenon degrades the performance of quantum operations, limiting the scalability of quantum computing systems.

Compounding this issue is the presence of uncontrolled microscopic degrees of freedom, often referred to as two-level defects or two-level systems (TLS), which are ubiquitous in many quantum platforms [8]. When frequencies of TLSs come close to those of the qubits, they can significantly interfere with qubit operations. Excitations into a long-lived TLS can be particularly harmful as they can accumulate over time and deteriorate subsequent operations, causing correlated or non-Markovian errors [9]. Without reset capability, this may be a potential threat to quantum error correction [10]. Moving the qubit frequency away from these TLSs can reduce their impact. However, this approach is not directly available for fixed-frequency qubits. Even for tunable qubits, the available frequency options are often severely constrained by the presence of multiple TLSs, complicating the calibration of large-scale processors [11].

Various techniques have been developed to address these challenges [12–15]. The Derivative Removal by Adiabatic Gate (DRAG) method [16–18], in particular, was a pulse shaping technique designed to suppress leakage transitions to higher energy states during single-qubit operations. By adding the derivative of the original pulse envelope to the quadrature component, DRAG removes unwanted diabatic leakage transitions, which, in the weak drive regime, show up as a spectral hole at a frequency determined by the prefactor of the derivative. The versatility of DRAG has been investigated in a variety of scenarios, including three-level lambda systems [19], cross-resonance gates [20–22], and frequency-crowded multi-level systems [23]. However, traditional DRAG corrections face challenges when dealing with weakly detuned transitions, as they struggle to effectively remove spectral components close to the target transition [21].

In this work, we propose and experimentally demonstrate a robust approach to mitigating undesired transitions caused by quantum crosstalk during single-qubit operations. Unlike conventional DRAG techniques, our method employs the dual-DRAG protocol, which creates symmetric spectral holes around the target transition frequency. This approach significantly reduces off-resonance effects during pulses and enables the pulse calibration to suppress unwanted transitions that are only slightly detuned. Residual off-resonance effects are further corrected using compensatory virtual-Z (VZ) gates. Experimental results validate the technique, demonstrating an order-of-magnitude suppression of crosstalk-induced excitations between two superconducting qubits detuned by approximately 40 MHz with a 25-ns pulse across various coupling strengths. Furthermore, we show its effectiveness in reducing excitations from a strongly coupled TLS and enhancing single-qubit gate fidelity across a broad frequency range, extending down to 20 MHz.

Quantum crosstalk — Parasitic couplings are a com-

* wangrx@baqis.ac.cn

† sunwj@baqis.ac.cn

‡ yanfei@baqis.ac.cn




FIG. 1. (a) Schematic diagram illustrating the unintended coupling (g) that can occur between two qubits or between a qubit and a spurious TLS. (b) Energy level diagram for the combined system of Q_0 and Q_1 (or TLS). Due to state dressing, driving Q_0 with an amplitude Ω also cross-drives Q_1 with a reduced amplitude of $\pm g\Omega/\Delta_0$ in the weak coupling limit ($g \ll |\Delta_0|$). Cross-driving can induce unwanted transitions in Q_1 when using a pulse with finite width. (c) Time-domain pulse profiles and (d) their normalized Fourier spectra for a 25-ns pulse, showing its original sine-to-the-fourth-power form ($\Omega^{(0)}$), the first-order DRAG-corrected pulse ($\Omega^{(1)}$), and the spectrally balanced pulse with dual-DRAG corrections ($\Omega^{(2)}$). Note that, in the time domain, the real part of $\Omega^{(0)}$ overlaps with that of $\Omega^{(1)}$, while the imaginary part of $\Omega^{(0)}$ overlaps with that of $\Omega^{(2)}$. The vertical dashed lines in (d) indicate the corresponding peak positions. In this case, the frequency to block is assumed to be $\Delta/2\pi = 40$ MHz.

mon challenge in practical quantum hardware, often arising between qubits that are not intentionally connected. For example, in solid-state devices like superconducting quantum processors, qubits are typically designed for nearest-neighbor connections. However, the long-range nature of electromagnetic interactions can lead to unintended couplings between physically distant qubits, as shown in Fig. 1(a). These interactions can also occur through shared modes, such as chip or box modes. Additionally, unwanted couplings can exist between qubits and spurious quantum systems in the environment, such as TLSs. These uncontrollable systems present a major obstacle in the development and calibration of state-of-the-art quantum hardware.

Consider a parasitic exchange-type coupling g between Q_0 and Q_1 (or a TLS). Due to the hybridization of the $|ge\rangle$ and $|eg\rangle$ states, driving one qubit inevitably induces a cross-driving effect on the other qubit or TLS, but with a reduced amplitude of $g\Omega/\Delta_0$, where Ω is the original drive amplitude applied to Q_0 , and $\Delta_0 = \omega_{ge} - \omega_{eg}$ is the detuning between the unwanted and target transitions, as illustrated in Fig. 1(b). Natural spectral broadening caused by finite pulse widths can lead to unwanted transitions, such as $|gg\rangle \leftrightarrow |ge\rangle$, which degrade the performance of quantum operations. This crosstalk phe-

nomenon is inherently quantum mechanical; the crosstalk Hamiltonian is of the ZX type, exhibiting opposite signs depending on the state of Q_0 . This contrasts with classical signal crosstalk, where the Hamiltonian is of the IX type. As a result, quantum crosstalk cannot be simply corrected by applying a cancellation signal [24].

Interestingly, this quantum crosstalk effect can also be harnessed for beneficial purposes. For instance, the cross-resonance effect, which is achieved by intentionally driving at the resonant frequency of Q_1 , is employed in generating a type of two-qubit entangling gate, the cross-resonance gate [25–27].

Dual-DRAG — A straightforward solution to suppress an unwanted transition is to remove the spectral components at that transition frequency. A famous example is the DRAG method, which was initially proposed to address leakage transitions to higher energy states in weakly anharmonic systems, such as transmon qubits.

In the DRAG framework, a first-order derivative of the original pulse envelope (which can be complex) is added as a quadrature component. The amplitude factor of the derivative pulse is expressed as $1/\Delta$, where Δ is the DRAG parameter in units of angular frequency. An example is illustrated in Fig. 1(c). From a frequency-domain perspective, this DRAG correction creates a spectral hole at a frequency Δ relative to the drive frequency ω_0 , as depicted in Fig. 1(d). When Δ is set equal to the qubit anharmonicity α , it effectively reduces spectral components near the qubit’s $|e\rangle$ - $|f\rangle$ transition frequency—typically 200-300 MHz below the $|g\rangle$ - $|e\rangle$ transition for transmon qubits—thereby suppressing leakage transitions. This technique has also been applied in cross-resonance gates to mitigate off-resonance errors [21] or parasitic transitions [22].

Avoiding weakly detuned transitions during single-qubit operations, which are only a few tens of MHz away, has proven to be challenging [21]. For instance, consider a 25-ns pulse, as shown in Fig. 1(c,d). While a single DRAG correction generates a spectral hole at the frequency defined by Δ , it also shifts the spectral weight to the opposite side. As shown by the example in Fig. 1(d), it leads to an average drive frequency that is about 30 MHz lower than the original drive frequency ω_0 given the frequency to block at $\Delta/2\pi = 40$ MHz. This effect may be partially mitigated by introducing a constant drive frequency detuning η during the pulse [18], i.e. modulating the nominal drive frequency from ω_0 to $\omega_0 + \eta$. However, when the DRAG-induced off-resonance effect is this large, the perturbative treatment in the DRAG theory breaks down. Often, calibrating a high-fidelity gate under such strong drive-induced detuning is experimentally infeasible.

To address this issue, we adopt the recursive DRAG scheme, where DRAG corrections are applied sequentially according to

$$\Omega^{(n)} = \Omega^{(n-1)} - i \frac{\dot{\Omega}^{(n-1)}}{\Delta_n}, \quad (1)$$




FIG. 2. (a) Calibrating the pulse amplitude of the R gate ($t_g = 25$ ns) which drives the qubit from its ground state to an equator state, as indicated by the arrow. The drive detuning is set at $\eta/2\pi = 23$ MHz. The inset plots are the circuit and a sketch of the state evolution on the Bloch sphere. (b) Calibrating the compensating virtual-Z phase after the R gate, which yields an \sqrt{X} gate. By applying the combination twice, the qubit is rotated from the ground state to the excited state, as indicated by the arrow. The inset is the circuit. (c) Experimental results (top panel) showing the calibrated drive amplitude and virtual-Z phase for different drive detunings, compared with numerical simulations (bottom panel). (d) Measured error per Clifford (EPC) from randomized benchmarking using pulses with virtual-Z compensation (blue) for different drive detunings. Results using detuning compensation (without the appended virtual-Z phase, shown in red) are also included for comparison.

using a set of DRAG parameters $\{\Delta_1, \Delta_2, \dots, \Delta_n\}$ [22, 28]. Here, $\Omega^{(0)}$ represents the original pulse shape without DRAG. The final pulse $\Omega^{(n)}$ generates multiple spectral holes at the specified frequencies. By two successive DRAG applications at $\pm\Delta$, we obtain a pulse envelope that involves a second derivative,

$$\Omega^{(2)} = \Omega^{(0)} + \frac{\ddot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{\Delta^2}. \quad (2)$$

As shown in Fig. 1(d), the spectrum $\hat{\Omega}^{(2)}(\omega)$ remains centered at ω_0 , while spectral components at $\omega_0 \pm \Delta$ are eliminated. This dual-DRAG application at mirrored frequencies suppresses weakly detuned transitions and significantly reduces drive-induced off-resonance (see the Supplementary Materials [29] for additional details). For the example presented, we choose the original pulse shape to be a sine raised to the fourth power. This ensures that the first three derivatives vanish at the pulse's beginning and end, thereby avoiding sharp edges or the need for truncation.

Correcting off-resonance error using virtual-Z compensation — Although the dual-DRAG method substantially reduces the deviation of spectral weighting, system nonidealities such as the presence of higher energy levels and pulse distortions can lead to residual off-resonance effects. To address this, we adopt a post-correction approach that compensates for the overall effect of an off-resonant pulse by appending a VZ gate. We validate this

protocol on a device similar to that described in Ref. [30] (see Supplementary Materials [29] for more information). For all experiments in this work unless specified otherwise, we constantly apply one DRAG correction at the qubit anharmonicity $\alpha/2\pi \approx -190$ MHz to prohibit leakage transition to the $|f\rangle$ state.

Throughout our work, we employ the U3 decomposition rule to synthesize arbitrary single-qubit operations using two \sqrt{X} gates interspersed with VZ gates [31]. Consequently, it suffices to calibrate only the \sqrt{X} gate. It can be shown that any rotation R, which maps the qubit from its ground state to the equator (XY plane) of the Bloch sphere, is equivalent to a $\frac{\pi}{2}$ rotation around an axis in the XY plane when combined with a virtual Z or phase rotation (see Supplementary Materials [29] and Ref. [31]). Importantly, since single-qubit gates depend only on relative phase, a $\frac{\pi}{2}$ gate of arbitrary phase can serve as \sqrt{X} . Thus, calibrating such an R operation enables the synthesis of any single-qubit gate with the aid of VZ gates.

To calibrate the R gate for a given pulse shape, duration, carrier frequency, and DRAG parameters, we scan the drive amplitude until the excited-state population of the qubit (initialized in its ground state) reaches 0.5 (Fig. 2(a)). By concatenating two R gates with interspersed VZ gates, we then determine the VZ phases required to achieve maximal excitation Fig. 2(b). Based on these initial values, we then fine-tune these parameters using standard pulse train techniques (see supplementary Materials [29] for details). Figure 2(c) shows experimental results for the calibrated parameters Ω (drive amplitude) and ϕ (VZ phase) under intentional drive detunings, which align closely with numerical simulations. Using these VZ-compensated \sqrt{X} gates, we perform randomized benchmarking (RB) [32]. The extracted errors per Clifford (EPC), shown in Fig. 2(d), demonstrate consistent performance across a broad detuning range of over ± 20 MHz. Compared to detuning compensation during pulses, the VZ compensation approach is better suited to handle more general and complex scenarios. In practice, when off-resonance effects are strong, balancing the correction of off-resonance errors while avoiding spurious transitions becomes challenging. Our method addresses this challenge effectively.

Suppressing spurious transitions between qubits — Next, we validate the effectiveness of the dual-DRAG method in suppressing unwanted transitions due to quantum crosstalk. Our investigation is performed on two transmon qubits on the same device. Between them is a tunable coupler—another transmon qubit—which adjusts the effective qubit-qubit coupling strength g via the coupler frequency ω_c (Fig. 3(a)). The qubit frequencies are tunable; their detuning is fixed at $\Delta_0/2\pi = 45$ MHz. At first, we set $g/2\pi = 1$ MHz.

For efficient detection of weak transitions ($g\Omega/\Delta_0 < \Delta_0$), we employ a similar pulse sequence adopted for calibrating the classical microwave crosstalk [33] (Fig. 3(b)). An even number ($2N$) of X gates are applied to the con-




FIG. 3. (a) Experimental setup consisting of two transmon qubits and a tunable coupler, which is also a transmon qubit. The coupler is used to modulate the effective coupling strength between the qubits by adjusting its frequency. (b) Pulse sequence designed for detecting spurious transitions in a nearby qubit during single-qubit gate operations. Repeated π gates, each consisting of two $\pi/2$ pulses and spaced by a waiting time τ , are applied to Q_0 . (c) Measured excited-state populations of Q_0 (top panel) and Q_1 (bottom panel) using the detection sequence, as a function of the waiting time τ . Results are shown with and without dual-DRAG. Both cases include DRAG correction at the leakage transition to the second excited state $|2\rangle$. The number of π gate pairs is $N = 50$. Here, $g/2\pi = 1.0$ MHz, $\Delta_0/2\pi = 45$ MHz, and $t_g = 25$ ns. (d) Randomized benchmarking results for Q_0 , comparing cases with and without dual-DRAG. (e) Simultaneously monitored excited-state populations of Q_1 . The excitation rates per Clifford gate (ExPC) are 8.4×10^{-6} with dual-DRAG and 1.6×10^{-4} without dual-DRAG. (f) Error per Clifford for different coupling strengths, with a fixed detuning of $\Delta_0/2\pi = 45$ MHz. (g) Excitation per Clifford for varying coupling strengths. The solid lines are the simulated ExPC averaged over 24 single-qubit Cliffords implemented with the U3 decomposition. The excitation rates are proportional to g^2 (see Supplementary Materials [29] for details).

trol qubit Q_0 , keeping it in the ground state. Due to non-zero coupling, the spectator qubit Q_1 is coherently excited by these pulses. A uniform waiting time τ is added after each π gate, during which the wavefunction amplitude of Q_1 's excited state (e.g., $|ge\rangle$) accumulates a

relative phase $e^{-i\Delta_0\tau}$. At specific τ , the transition amplitudes interfere constructively, amplifying Q_1 's excitation.

Figure 3(c) shows the measured total populations of all excited states (P_i^e , $i = 0, 1$), including $|e\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$, for both qubits as a function of τ . Without dual-DRAG correction, strong periodic peaks appear on both qubits at intervals of ~ 22.2 ns, matching $2\pi/\Delta_0$ and confirming our expectation. Since X gates are applied in pairs, transitions to the excited state of Q_1 — whether through $|gg\rangle \rightarrow |ge\rangle$ or $|eg\rangle \rightarrow |ee\rangle$ — result in the $|ee\rangle$ state in the end. Additionally, smaller secondary peaks on Q_1 , halfway between primary peaks and sharing the same periodicity, are attributed to residual IX interaction arising from both quantum and classical crosstalk [29].

We repeat measurements with dual-DRAG correction at $\pm\Delta$. The parameter Δ is initially set to Δ_0 and fine-tuned by minimizing excitation peaks. Using three DRAG parameters $\{\alpha, \Delta, -\Delta\}$, all prominent excitation peaks vanish (Fig. 3(c)), demonstrating effective suppression. Randomized benchmarking on Q_0 (Fig. 3(d,e)) shows a slight error reduction (error per Clifford: $1.60 \times 10^{-3} \rightarrow 1.42 \times 10^{-3}$). Simultaneously, Q_1 's excitation rate per Clifford (ExPC) drops by an order of magnitude from $(1.6 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-4}$ to $(0.8 \pm 0.3) \times 10^{-5}$. Although the effect in EPC does not seem to be significant, the induced correlated excitations, in particular between distant qubits, complicate the error model and may severely affect error correction codes.

We further test the method across coupling strengths using the tunable coupler. The improvement in gate error rates using dual-DRAG becomes more pronounced at larger g (Fig. 3(f)). This trend aligns with the measured spurious excitation rates, which scale quadratically with g as expected from the cross-driving amplitude that scales with g/Δ_0 . At large g , these spurious excitations dominate the gate errors, yet dual-DRAG consistently suppresses them by an order of magnitude across the whole range (Fig. 3(g)). These results demonstrate the effectiveness of spectrally balanced DRAG in suppressing weakly detuned transitions and enhancing gate fidelities.

Applications to the qubit-TLS system — We extend our method to suppress spurious transitions in systems where Q_0 is coupled to a parasitic TLS. Such TLSs with long relaxation times are particularly problematic, as their unintended excitations can accumulate over time and persistently degrade subsequent gate operations. The specific TLS studied here exhibits a strong coupling ($g/2\pi = 5$ MHz) to a transmon qubit, as evidenced by the avoided crossing in the measured qubit spectrum shown in Fig. 4(a).

To characterize the dependence on detuning of our method, we calibrate the \sqrt{X} gate at varying qubit-TLS detunings Δ_0 using the same protocol developed for coupled qubits. Figure 4(b) shows RB results comparing dual-DRAG corrections (applied at $\pm\Delta$) to uncorrected pulses across $20 \text{ MHz} \leq \Delta_0/2\pi \leq 85 \text{ MHz}$. For $\Delta_0/2\pi < 20$ MHz, spectral overlap between the drive frequency and the TLS transition hinders the convergence of




FIG. 4. (a) Spectroscopy of a tunable transmon qubit coupled to a spurious TLS, showing an avoided crossing of approximately 10 MHz. The horizontal axis represents the voltage of the flux bias pulse applied to the coupler qubit. (b) Error per Clifford of the qubit as a function of detuning between the qubit and the TLS. Here $t_g = 25$ ns. (c) Excitation per Clifford of the TLS for different gate times at $\Delta_0/2\pi = 42$ MHz. The solid lines are twice the simulated \sqrt{X} gate errors. (d) Excitation per Clifford of the TLS for varying detunings. The solid lines are twice the simulated \sqrt{X} gate errors.

parameters during calibration, and the dual-DRAG correction overcuts the spectral components around the target frequency, making the drive ineffective. At $\Delta_0/2\pi > 85$ MHz, TLS-induced gate errors diminish to a negligible level.

We further quantify TLS excitation rates across gate time t_g and detuning Δ_0 (Fig. 4(c,d)). To measure TLS excitations, we: (1) reset the qubit to its ground state post-RB, (2) apply an iSWAP gate to transfer TLS excitations to the qubit, and (3) perform qubit readout. In 20 ns $\leq t_g \leq 50$ ns, dual-DRAG reduces TLS excitation rates by an order of magnitude compared to uncorrected pulses. Numerical simulations of single-pulse dy-

namics reproduce the observed decreasing trend, though deviations may arise from interference between pulses and spectral smoothing due to the presence of dephasing noise.

The measured excitation rates for 20 MHz $\leq \Delta_0/2\pi \leq 85$ MHz show a comparable improvement from the use of dual-DRAG. The rapidly enhanced suppression with increasing Δ_0 results from the diminishing spectral weight at larger Δ_0 , and the reduced cross-drive amplitude that scales with g/Δ_0 .

Discussion — We have demonstrated a spectrally balanced pulse-shaping technique that suppresses spurious transitions in superconducting qubits. Our method reduces crosstalk errors by an order of magnitude and mitigates single-qubit gate errors from strongly coupled TLS. By engineering symmetric spectral holes, it effectively suppresses weakly detuned transitions by mitigating the off-resonance effect during pulses. The technique integrates seamlessly with virtual-Z gates, further improving gate fidelity.

This approach directly addresses key scalability challenges in a frequency-crowded quantum processor: parasitic qubit couplings and TLS-induced errors, both of which limit frequency allocation. By mitigating these effects, our work can enhance frequency planning flexibility and provide a framework for modeling microwave gate errors in complex environments. The hardware-agnostic nature of the dual-DRAG protocol makes it broadly applicable to other quantum architectures, including quantum dots, NV centers, and trapped ions, positioning it as a versatile tool for high-fidelity quantum control.

Note added. — During the preparation of this manuscript, we became aware of a concurrent work [34] that independently develops a related pulse-shaping technique using symmetrically filtered spectra to address classical crosstalk.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors would like to thank Yasunobu Nakamura and Peng Zhao for fruitful discussions. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grants No. 12404558, No. 12322413, No. 92365206, and No. 92476206), Innovation Program for Quantum Science and Technology (Grants No.2021ZD0301802).

[1] Y. Kim, A. Eddins, S. Anand, K. X. Wei, E. Van Den Berg, S. Rosenblatt, H. Nayfeh, Y. Wu, M. Zaletel, K. Temme, and A. Kandala, Evidence for the utility of quantum computing before fault tolerance, *Nature* **618**, 500 (2023).
 [2] R. Acharya, D. A. Abanin, L. Aghababaie-Beni, I. Aleiner, T. I. Andersen, M. Ansmann, F. Arute, K. Arya, A. Asfaw, N. Astrakhantsev, J. Atalaya,

R. Babbush, D. Bacon, B. Ballard, J. C. Bardin, J. Bausch, A. Bengtsson, A. Bilmes, S. Blackwell, S. Boixo, G. Bortoli, A. Bourassa, J. Bovaird, L. Brill, M. Broughton, D. A. Browne, B. Buchea, B. B. Buckley, D. A. Buell, T. Burger, B. Burkett, N. Bushnell, A. Cabrera, J. Campero, H.-S. Chang, Y. Chen, Z. Chen, B. Chiaro, D. Chik, C. Chou, J. Claes, A. Y. Cleland, J. Cogan, R. Collins, P. Conner, W. Courtney, A. L.

- Crook, B. Curtin, S. Das, A. Davies, L. De Lorenzo, D. M. Debroy, S. Demura, M. Devoret, A. Di Paolo, P. Donohoe, I. Drozdov, A. Dunsworth, C. Earle, T. Edlich, A. Eickbusch, A. M. Elbag, M. Elzouka, C. Erickson, L. Faoro, E. Farhi, V. S. Ferreira, L. F. Burgos, E. Forati, A. G. Fowler, B. Foxen, S. Ganjam, G. Garcia, R. Gasca, E. Genois, W. Giang, C. Gidney, D. Gilboa, R. Gosula, A. G. Dau, D. Graumann, A. Greene, J. A. Gross, S. Habegger, J. Hall, M. C. Hamilton, M. Hansen, M. P. Harrigan, S. D. Harrington, F. J. H. Heras, S. Heslin, P. Heu, O. Higgott, G. Hill, J. Hilton, G. Holland, S. Hong, H.-Y. Huang, A. Huff, W. J. Huggins, L. B. Ioffe, S. V. Isakov, J. Iveland, E. Jeffrey, Z. Jiang, C. Jones, S. Jordan, C. Joshi, P. Juhas, D. Kafri, H. Kang, A. H. Karamlou, K. Kechedzhi, J. Kelly, T. Khairi, T. Khattar, M. Khezri, S. Kim, P. V. Klimov, A. R. Klots, B. Kobrin, P. Kohli, A. N. Korotkov, F. Kostritsa, R. Kothari, B. Kozlovskii, J. M. Kreikebaum, V. D. Kurilovich, N. Lacroix, D. Landhuis, T. Lange-Dei, B. W. Langley, P. Laptev, K.-M. Lau, L. Le Guevel, J. Ledford, J. Lee, K. Lee, Y. D. Lensky, S. Leon, B. J. Lester, W. Y. Li, Y. Li, A. T. Lill, W. Liu, W. P. Livingston, A. Locharla, E. Lucero, D. Lundahl, A. Lunt, S. Madhuk, F. D. Malone, A. Maloney, S. Mandrà, J. Manyika, L. S. Martin, O. Martin, S. Martin, C. Maxfield, J. R. McClean, M. McEwen, S. Meeks, A. Megrant, X. Mi, K. C. Miao, A. Mieszala, R. Molavi, S. Molina, S. Montazeri, A. Morvan, R. Movassagh, W. Mruczkiewicz, O. Naaman, M. Neeley, C. Neill, A. Nersisyan, H. Neven, M. Newman, J. H. Ng, A. Nguyen, M. Nguyen, C.-H. Ni, M. Y. Niu, T. E. O'Brien, W. D. Oliver, A. Opremcak, K. Ottosson, A. Petukhov, A. Pizzuto, J. Platt, R. Potter, O. Pritchard, L. P. Pryadko, C. Quintana, G. Ramachandran, M. J. Reagor, J. Redding, D. M. Rhodes, G. Roberts, E. Rosenberg, E. Rosenfeld, P. Roushan, N. C. Rubin, N. Saei, D. Sank, K. Sankaragomathi, K. J. Satzinger, H. F. Schurkus, C. Schuster, A. W. Senior, M. J. Shearn, A. Shorter, N. Shutty, V. Shvarts, S. Singh, V. Sivak, J. Skrzuzny, S. Small, V. Smelyanskiy, W. C. Smith, R. D. Somma, S. Springer, G. Sterling, D. Strain, J. Suchard, A. Szasz, A. Szein, D. Thor, A. Torres, M. M. Torunbalci, A. Vaishnav, J. Vargas, S. Vdovichev, G. Vidal, B. Villalonga, C. V. Heidweiller, S. Waltman, S. X. Wang, B. Ware, K. Weber, T. Weidel, T. White, K. Wong, B. W. K. Woo, C. Xing, Z. J. Yao, P. Yeh, B. Ying, J. Yoo, N. Yosri, G. Young, A. Zalcman, Y. Zhang, N. Zhu, and N. Zobrist, Quantum error correction below the surface code threshold, *Nature*, **1** (2024), publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [3] S. Cao, B. Wu, F. Chen, M. Gong, Y. Wu, Y. Ye, C. Zha, H. Qian, C. Ying, S. Guo, Q. Zhu, H.-L. Huang, Y. Zhao, S. Li, S. Wang, J. Yu, D. Fan, D. Wu, H. Su, H. Deng, H. Rong, Y. Li, K. Zhang, T.-H. Chung, F. Liang, J. Lin, Y. Xu, L. Sun, C. Guo, N. Li, Y.-H. Huo, C.-Z. Peng, C.-Y. Lu, X. Yuan, X. Zhu, and J.-W. Pan, Generation of genuine entanglement up to 51 superconducting qubits, *Nature* **619**, 738 (2023).
- [4] S. Xu, Z.-Z. Sun, K. Wang, L. Xiang, Z. Bao, Z. Zhu, F. Shen, Z. Song, P. Zhang, W. Ren, X. Zhang, H. Dong, J. Deng, J. Chen, Y. Wu, Z. Tan, Y. Gao, F. Jin, X. Zhu, C. Zhang, N. Wang, Y. Zou, J. Zhong, A. Zhang, W. Li, W. Jiang, L.-W. Yu, Y. Yao, Z. Wang, H. Li, Q. Guo, C. Song, H. Wang, and D.-L. Deng, Digital simulation of projective non-abelian anyons with 68 superconducting qubits, *Chinese Physics Letters* **40**, 060301 (2023).
- [5] M. Iqbal, N. Tantivasadakarn, R. Verresen, S. L. Campbell, J. M. Dreiling, C. Figgatt, J. P. Gaebler, J. Johansen, M. Mills, S. A. Moses, J. M. Pino, A. Ransford, M. Rowe, P. Siegfried, R. P. Stutz, M. Foss-Feig, A. Vishwanath, and H. Dreyer, Non-abelian topological order and anyons on a trapped-ion processor, *Nature* **626**, 505 (2024), publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [6] D. Bluvstein, S. J. Evered, A. A. Geim, S. H. Li, H. Zhou, T. Manovitz, S. Ebadi, M. Cain, M. Kalinowski, D. Hangleiter, J. P. Bonilla Ataides, N. Maskara, I. Cong, X. Gao, P. Sales Rodriguez, T. Karolyshyn, G. Semeghini, M. J. Gullans, M. Greiner, V. Vuletić, and M. D. Lukin, Logical quantum processor based on reconfigurable atom arrays, *Nature* **626**, 58 (2024).
- [7] M. Sarovar, T. Proctor, K. Rudinger, K. Young, E. Nielsen, and R. Blume-Kohout, Detecting crosstalk errors in quantum information processors, *Quantum* **4**, 321 (2020).
- [8] C. Müller, J. H. Cole, and J. Lisenfeld, Towards understanding two-level-systems in amorphous solids: insights from quantum circuits, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **82**, 124501 (2019).
- [9] M. Y. Niu, V. Smelyanskiy, P. Klimov, S. Boixo, R. Barends, J. Kelly, Y. Chen, K. Arya, B. Burkett, D. Bacon, *et al.*, Learning non-markovian quantum noise from moiré-enhanced swap spectroscopy with deep evolutionary algorithm, arXiv preprint arXiv:1912.04368 (2019).
- [10] J. Ghosh, A. G. Fowler, J. M. Martinis, and M. R. Geller, Understanding the effects of leakage in superconducting quantum-error-detection circuits, *Physical Review A* **88**, 062329 (2013), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [11] P. V. Klimov, A. Bengtsson, C. Quintana, A. Bourassa, S. Hong, A. Dunsworth, K. J. Satzinger, W. P. Livingston, V. Sivak, M. Y. Niu, T. I. Andersen, Y. Zhang, D. Chik, Z. Chen, C. Neill, C. Erickson, A. Grajales Dau, A. Megrant, P. Roushan, A. N. Korotkov, J. Kelly, V. Smelyanskiy, Y. Chen, and H. Neven, Optimizing quantum gates towards the scale of logical qubits, *Nature Communications* **15**, 2442 (2024), publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [12] J. Bylander, S. Gustavsson, F. Yan, F. Yoshihara, K. Harrabi, G. Fitch, D. G. Cory, Y. Nakamura, J.-S. Tsai, and W. D. Oliver, Noise spectroscopy through dynamical decoupling with a superconducting flux qubit, *Nature Physics* **7**, 565 (2011), number: 7 Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- [13] Y. Ding, P. Gokhale, S. F. Lin, R. Rines, T. Propson, and F. T. Chong, Systematic crosstalk mitigation for superconducting qubits via frequency-aware compilation, in *2020 53rd Annual IEEE/ACM International Symposium on Microarchitecture (MICRO)* (IEEE, 2020) pp. 201–214.
- [14] P. Murali, D. C. McKay, M. Martonosi, and A. Javadi-Abhari, Software mitigation of crosstalk on noisy intermediate-scale quantum computers, in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems* (2020) pp. 1001–1016.
- [15] P. Zhao, Mitigation of quantum crosstalk in cross-resonance-based qubit architectures, *Physical Review Applied* **20**, 054033 (2023).

- [16] F. Motzoi, J. M. Gambetta, P. Rebentrost, and F. K. Wilhelm, Simple pulses for elimination of leakage in weakly nonlinear qubits, *Physical Review Letters* **103**, 110501 (2009).
- [17] J. M. Gambetta, F. Motzoi, S. Merkel, and F. K. Wilhelm, Analytic control methods for high-fidelity unitary operations in a weakly nonlinear oscillator, *Physical Review A—Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics* **83**, 012308 (2011).
- [18] Z. Chen, J. Kelly, C. Quintana, R. Barends, B. Campbell, Y. Chen, B. Chiaro, A. Dunsworth, A. G. Fowler, E. Lucero, E. Jeffrey, A. Megrant, J. Mutus, M. Neeley, C. Neill, P. J. J. O’Malley, P. Roushan, D. Sank, A. Vainsencher, J. Wenner, T. C. White, A. N. Korotkov, and J. M. Martinis, Measuring and suppressing quantum state leakage in a superconducting qubit, *Physical Review Letters* **116**, 020501 (2016).
- [19] A. Vezvaei, E. Takou, P. Hilaire, M. F. Doty, and S. E. Economou, Avoiding leakage and errors caused by unwanted transitions in lambda systems, *PRX Quantum* **4**, 030312 (2023).
- [20] M. Malekakhlagh and E. Magesan, Mitigating off-resonant error in the cross-resonance gate, *Physical Review A* **105**, 012602 (2022).
- [21] K. X. Wei, E. Pritchett, D. M. Zajac, D. C. McKay, and S. Merkel, Characterizing non-markovian off-resonant errors in quantum gates, *Physical Review Applied* **21**, 024018 (2024).
- [22] B. Li, T. Calarco, and F. Motzoi, Experimental error suppression in cross-resonance gates via multi-derivative pulse shaping, *npj Quantum Information* **10**, 66 (2024).
- [23] L. Theis, F. Motzoi, and F. Wilhelm, Simultaneous gates in frequency-crowded multilevel systems using fast, robust, analytic control shapes, *Physical Review A* **93**, 012324 (2016).
- [24] W. Nuerbolati, Z. Han, J. Chu, Y. Zhou, X. Tan, Y. Yu, S. Liu, and F. Yan, Canceling microwave crosstalk with fixed-frequency qubits, *Applied Physics Letters* **120** (2022).
- [25] C. Rigetti and M. Devoret, Fully microwave-tunable universal gates in superconducting qubits with linear couplings and fixed transition frequencies, *Physical Review B—Condensed Matter and Materials Physics* **81**, 134507 (2010).
- [26] P. De Groot, J. Lisenfeld, R. Schouten, S. Ashhab, A. Lupascu, C. Harmans, and J. Mooij, Selective darkening of degenerate transitions demonstrated with two superconducting quantum bits, *Nature Physics* **6**, 763 (2010).
- [27] V. Tripathi, M. Khezri, and A. N. Korotkov, Operation and intrinsic error budget of a two-qubit cross-resonance gate, *Physical Review A* **100**, 012301 (2019).
- [28] F. Motzoi and F. K. Wilhelm, Improving frequency selection of driven pulses using derivative-based transition suppression, *Physical Review A—Atomic, Molecular, and Optical Physics* **88**, 062318 (2013).
- [29] Supplementary Material.
- [30] Z. Chen, W. Liu, Y. Ma, W. Sun, R. Wang, H. Wang, H. Xu, G. Xue, H. Yan, Z. Yang, J. Ding, Y. Gao, F. Li, Y. Zhang, Z. Zhang, Y. Jin, H. Yu, J. Chen, and F. Yan, Efficient implementation of arbitrary two-qubit gates via unified control, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2502.03612* (2025).
- [31] D. C. McKay, C. J. Wood, S. Sheldon, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, Efficient z gates for quantum computing, *Physical Review A* **96**, 022330 (2017).
- [32] E. Magesan, J. M. Gambetta, and J. Emerson, Scalable and Robust Randomized Benchmarking of Quantum Processes, *Physical Review Letters* **106**, 180504 (2011), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [33] R. Acharya, I. Aleiner, R. Allen, T. I. Andersen, M. Ansmann, F. Arute, K. Arya, A. Asfaw, J. Atalaya, R. Babush, D. Bacon, J. C. Bardin, J. Basso, A. Bengtsson, S. Boixo, G. Bortoli, A. Bourassa, J. Bovaird, L. Brill, M. Broughton, B. B. Buckley, D. A. Buell, T. Burger, B. Burkett, N. Bushnell, Y. Chen, Z. Chen, B. Chiaro, J. Cogan, R. Collins, P. Conner, W. Courtney, A. L. Crook, B. Curtin, D. M. Debroy, A. Del Toro Barba, S. Demura, A. Dunsworth, D. Eppens, C. Erickson, L. Faoro, E. Farhi, R. Fatemi, L. Flores Burgos, E. Forati, A. G. Fowler, B. Foxen, W. Giang, C. Gidney, D. Gilboa, M. Giustina, A. Grajales Dau, J. A. Gross, S. Habegger, M. C. Hamilton, M. P. Harrigan, S. D. Harrington, O. Higgott, J. Hilton, M. Hoffmann, S. Hong, T. Huang, A. Huff, W. J. Huggins, L. B. Ioffe, S. V. Isakov, J. Iveland, E. Jeffrey, Z. Jiang, C. Jones, P. Juhas, D. Kafri, K. Kechedzhi, J. Kelly, T. Khattar, M. Khezri, M. Kieferová, S. Kim, A. Kitaev, P. V. Klimov, A. R. Klots, A. N. Korotkov, F. Kostritsa, J. M. Kreikebaum, D. Landhuis, P. Laptev, K.-M. Lau, L. Laws, J. Lee, K. Lee, B. J. Lester, A. Lill, W. Liu, A. Locharla, E. Lucero, F. D. Malone, J. Marshall, O. Martin, J. R. McClean, T. McCourt, M. McEwen, A. Megrant, B. Meurer Costa, X. Mi, K. C. Miao, M. Mohseni, S. Montazeri, A. Morvan, E. Mount, W. Mruczkiewicz, O. Naaman, M. Neeley, C. Neill, A. Nersisyan, H. Neven, M. Newman, J. H. Ng, A. Nguyen, M. Nguyen, M. Y. Niu, T. E. O’Brien, A. Opremcak, J. Platt, A. Petukhov, R. Potter, L. P. Pryadko, C. Quintana, P. Roushan, N. C. Rubin, N. Saei, D. Sank, K. Sankaragomathi, K. J. Satzinger, H. F. Schurkus, C. Schuster, M. J. Shearn, A. Shorter, V. Shvarts, J. Skrzynny, V. Smelyanskiy, W. C. Smith, G. Sterling, D. Strain, M. Szalay, A. Torres, G. Vidal, B. Villalonga, C. Vollgraf Heidweiller, T. White, C. Xing, Z. J. Yao, P. Yeh, J. Yoo, G. Young, A. Zalcman, Y. Zhang, and N. Zhu, Suppressing quantum errors by scaling a surface code logical qubit, *Nature* **614**, 676 (2023).
- [34] R. Matsuda, R. Ohira, T. Sumida, H. Shiomi, A. Machino, S. Morisaka, K. Koike, T. Miyoshi, Y. Kurimoto, Y. Sugita, Y. Ito, Y. Suzuki, P. A. Spring, S. Wang, S. Tamate, Y. Tabuchi, Y. Nakamura, K. Ogawa, and M. Negoro, Selective excitation of superconducting qubits with a shared control line through pulse shaping, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2501.10710* (2025).

Supplementary Materials for “Suppressing spurious transitions using spectrally balanced pulse”

I. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

The superconducting quantum processor used in this study and the experimental setup closely mirror those described in Ref. [30]. Qubits Q_0 and Q_1 are frequency-tunable transmon qubits, coupled through a tunable coupler. The coupling strength between the qubits can be adjusted by tuning the coupler’s frequency. Qubit Q_0 is also employed in the TLS experiment and is coupled to the relevant TLS. Table I lists the maximum (ω^{\max}) and typical operating (ω^{idle}) frequencies of the qubits and the TLS $|0\rangle \rightarrow |1\rangle$ transition, as well as the anharmonicities of the qubits. Additionally, it provides the T_1 relaxation times measured at both maximum and operating frequencies, and the T_2 times obtained via Ramsey interferometry at those frequencies.

	Q_0	Q_1	TLS
$\omega^{\max}/2\pi$ (GHz)	3.91	3.76	3.84
$\omega^{\text{idle}}/2\pi$ (GHz)	3.76	3.72	3.84
$\alpha/2\pi$ (MHz)	-194.6	-193.2	–
T_1^{\max} (μs)	78.6	72.6	–
T_1^{idle} (μs)	78.1	76.8	14.32
T_{2R}^{\max} (μs)	37.3	22.2	–
T_{2R}^{idle} (μs)	1.1	5.5	–

TABLE I. Parameters describing the two qubits and qubit-TLS system studied in our experiment.

II. THEORETICAL MODEL

The Hamiltonian for the two-qubit system is ($\hbar = 1$)

$$\begin{aligned}
 H &= H_0 + H_D, \\
 H_0 &= \sum_{i=0,1} (\omega_i a_i^\dagger a_i + \frac{\alpha_i}{2} a_i^\dagger a_i^\dagger a_i a_i) + g(a_0^\dagger a_1 + H.c.), \\
 H_D &= \Omega(t)(a_0^\dagger + a_0).
 \end{aligned} \tag{3}$$

H_0 is the drift Hamiltonian, with a constant coupling strength g between the two qubits, while H_D is the driving Hamiltonian, representing the single-qubit operation on Q_0 . In the absence of a driving pulse, the dressed states of the Hamiltonian H_0 are denoted as $|ij\rangle$, where the eigenfrequencies are given by Λ_{ij} ($i, j = g, e$). The driving frequency applied to Q_0 is set to Λ_{eg} . In the dressed state basis $|gg\rangle, |ge\rangle, |eg\rangle, |ee\rangle$, and using the rotating wave approximation along with the first-order approximation, we have

$$H_r = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \frac{\Omega g}{2\Delta_0} & \frac{\Omega}{2} & 0 \\ \frac{\Omega g}{2\Delta_0} & \delta + \Delta_0 & 0 & \frac{\Omega}{2} \\ \frac{\Omega}{2} & 0 & \delta & -\frac{\Omega g}{2\Delta_0} \\ 0 & \frac{\Omega}{2} & -\frac{\Omega g}{2\Delta_0} & 2\delta + \Delta_0 \end{bmatrix}, \tag{4}$$

where $\Delta_0 = \Lambda_{ge} - \Lambda_{eg}$, $\delta = \Lambda_{eg} - \omega_d$ and ω_d is the driving frequency.

For simplicity, in the Hamiltonian model and DRAG correction analysis (Section V), we only consider the ideal two-level system. But for the transmon qubits, impacted by the higher energy levels, the Hamiltonian of the quantum crosstalk has ZX and IX components [27]. So that, in Section IV, we give the analysis for both ZX and IX interactions.

III. CALIBRATION OF \sqrt{X} GATE WITH VZ COMPENSATION

A. Demonstration of the decomposition of a $\frac{\pi}{2}$ gate

The single-qubit operation that rotates an initial state $|g\rangle$ to the equator of the Bloch sphere can be expressed as:

$$R = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{\pi}{4} & -ie^{i\lambda} \sin \frac{\pi}{4} \\ -ie^{i\theta} \sin \frac{\pi}{4} & e^{i(\lambda+\theta)} \cos \frac{\pi}{4} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (5)$$

A rotation gate around the Z-axis with a rotation angle of $\lambda + \theta$ can be expressed as:

$$R_z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i(\lambda+\theta)} \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

Applying R and R_z in sequence, we obtain:

$$\begin{aligned} R_z R &= \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{\pi}{4} & -ie^{i\lambda} \sin \frac{\pi}{4} \\ -ie^{-i\lambda} \sin \frac{\pi}{4} & \cos \frac{\pi}{4} \end{bmatrix} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -ie^{i\lambda} \\ -ie^{-i\lambda} & 1 \end{bmatrix} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

The matrix representation of the operation $e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}(\cos \Phi \sigma_x + \sin \Phi \sigma_y)}$ is

$$R_\Phi\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -ie^{-i\Phi} \\ -ie^{i\Phi} & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

The equations (7) and (8) are equivalent as long as we set $\lambda = \Phi$. Thus, the arbitrary single-qubit operation $e^{-i\frac{\pi}{4}(\cos \Phi \sigma_x + \sin \Phi \sigma_y)}$, which we denote as $R_\Phi\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)$, can be decomposed into two operations: R and R_z . In this case, $R_\Phi\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\right)$ is simply a $\frac{\pi}{2}$ gate.

B. General flow for the calibration of \sqrt{X} gate

In the experiment, the \sqrt{X} gate is calibrated using the following processes.

1. Prepare the qubit in the initial state $|g\rangle$, apply the gate to be calibrated, and scan the driving power. The power value corresponding to the final state being $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|g\rangle + |e\rangle)$ is taken as the initial driving amplitude Ω_0 .
2. Prepare the qubit in the initial state $|g\rangle$, and implement two gates to be calibrated, with a VZ compensation in between, having an angle ϕ . Scan the value of ϕ , and take the value that corresponds to the maximum probability of the final state being in $|e\rangle$ as the initial angle ϕ_0 for the VZ compensation. Take Ω_0 and ϕ_0 as the initial driving amplitude and VZ compensation. Repeat steps 3 and 4 with increasing values of n until reaching the maximum value of n before decoherence occurs.
3. Prepare the initial state in $|g\rangle$, apply $4n + 2$ gates to be calibrated, and scan the driving amplitude. Take the value of the driving amplitude that corresponds to the maximum of P^e as the updated Ω .
4. Prepare the initial state in $|g\rangle$, apply 2 gates to be calibrated, followed by 2 conjugate gates of the gate to be calibrated, and repeat this process n times. Scan the value of ϕ and take the value that corresponds to the maximum of P^g as the updated ϕ .

C. Calibration of \sqrt{X} gate with dual-DRAG

We calibrate the \sqrt{X} gate using dual-DRAG to achieve optimal suppression performance. First, we choose typical initial values for the driving amplitude Ω , VZ compensation ϕ , and the DRAG parameters $\{\alpha, \Delta, -\Delta\}$.

Second, we scan the DRAG point Δ to find the optimal value using two calibration circuits. The first circuit is the pulse train shown in Fig. 3(b) of the main text. By measuring the spurious excitations around one of the strong peaks, we scan the Δ value around the predicted value, Δ_0 . The minimum value of P_1^e corresponds to the optimal Δ , as shown in Fig. 5. We also apply the second circuit in another case. In this case, we implement the RB circuit on qubit Q_0 with 300 cycles, and measure the population P^e of Q_1 at the end of the RB sequence (for qubit-TLS system, we will measure the qubit after the qubit reset gate and qubit-TLS iSWAP gate). By scanning the value of Δ , the minimum measured population corresponds to the optimal value of Δ , another case using this calibration method is shown in Fig. 6.

Third, using the optimal DRAG set $\{\alpha, \Delta, -\Delta\}$, we calibrate the \sqrt{X} gate following the calibration flow outlined in Sec. III B.




FIG. 5. Calibration processes with the pulse train method. Measured P^e of Q_1 using the same detection circuit as in Fig. 3(b) of the main text, but with dual-DRAG, plotted against the waiting time τ and the spectral hole-related detuning Δ . The white dashed line indicates the optimized Δ value used for subsequent experiments.




FIG. 6. Calibration processes with the RB circuit. Measured P^e of the qubit using dual-DRAG with the RB sequence, setting the number of Cliffords to 300, plotted against the spectral hole-related detuning Δ . The black dashed line indicates the optimized Δ value used for subsequent experiments.

IV. EXPLANATIONS FOR THE DETECTED PEAKS

In the experiments for the detection of the spurious transitions, we observed two different groups of peaks with different locations and heights. In this section, we would like to give the detailed analysis for the mechanism of the peaks.

A. ZX crosstalk

The unitary matrix for the X operation on the left qubit with ZX crosstalk can be written as

$$U_X^{(ZX)} \approx \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -iA & -i & iB \\ -iA & 0 & -iB & -iC \\ -i & -iB & 0 & iA \\ iB & -iC & iA & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad (9)$$

with the approximation of $|g/\Delta_0| \ll 1$, where $A = \frac{\Omega^2 g}{-2\Delta_0(\Delta_0^2 - \Omega^2)} + \frac{\Omega^2 g}{-2\Delta_0(\Delta_0^2 - \Omega^2)} e^{-i\Delta_0 T_g}$, $B = \frac{\Omega g}{-2(\Delta_0^2 - \Omega^2)} + \frac{\Omega g}{-2(\Delta_0^2 - \Omega^2)} e^{-i\Delta_0 T_g}$, $C = e^{-i\Delta_0 T_g}$, T_g is the gate time. Here we assume that, the driving pulse is a square pulse with a real and constant amplitude Ω and a driving frequency equal to Λ_{eg} . We do not distinguish the difference

of the frequency detuning between the bare states $\omega_e - \omega_g$ and dressed states $\Lambda_{ge} - \Lambda_{eg}$. The unitary matrix for the buffer process with the buffer time T_b can be written as

$$U_{bf} \approx \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\Delta_0 T_b} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-i\Delta_0 T_b} \end{bmatrix} \quad (10)$$

with the approximation of $|g/\Delta_0| \ll 1$.

Then we can calculate the unitary matrix elements for the sequence of the operations as with the approximation of $|A|, |B| \ll 1$

$$\begin{aligned} |[U_{bf}U_X^{(ZX)}U_{bf}U_X^{(ZX)}]_{[gg \rightarrow ge]}^{n(n \geq 1)}| &\approx |-Be^{-i\Delta_0 T_b}[1 - e^{-i\Delta_0(T_g+T_b)}][1 + e^{-i2\Delta_0(T_g+T_b)} + e^{-i4\Delta_0(T_g+T_b)} + \dots]| \\ &= |B'e^{-i\Delta_0 T_b}(1 + e^{-i\Delta_0 T_g})(1 - e^{-i\theta})| \left| \frac{\sin n\theta}{\sin \theta} \right|, \\ |[U_{bf}U_X^{(ZX)}U_{bf}U_X^{(ZX)}]_{[gg \rightarrow ee]}^{n(n \geq 1)}| &\approx |-Ae^{-i\Delta_0 T_b}[1 - e^{-i\Delta_0(T_b+T_g)}][1 + e^{-i2\Delta_0(T_g+T_b)} + e^{-i4\Delta_0(T_g+T_b)} + \dots]| \\ &= |A'e^{-i\Delta_0 T_b}(1 + e^{-i\Delta_0 T_g})(1 - e^{-i\theta})| \left| \frac{\sin n\theta}{\sin \theta} \right|, \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

where $A' = \frac{\Omega^2 g}{-2\Delta_0(\Delta_0^2 - \Omega^2)}$, $B' = \frac{\Omega g}{-2(\Delta_0^2 - \Omega^2)}$, $\theta = \Delta_0(T_g + T_b)$. The results show that, when $\theta = m\pi$ ($m \in N$), the term of $|\frac{\sin n\theta}{\sin \theta}|$ is in the peak value. However, when $\theta = 2k\pi$ ($k \in N$), there is $1 - e^{-i\theta} = 0$, then only when $\theta = (2k + 1)\pi$, we can detect the peaks in the states $|ge\rangle$ and $|ee\rangle$. The buffer time between two adjacent peaks is $\Delta T_b = |2\pi/\Delta_0|$. We can also know that, for our sequence, when the initial state is $|gg\rangle$, the peaks of $|ee\rangle$ represents the interaction of the first-order process between $|gg\rangle$ and $|ge\rangle$ or $|ge\rangle$ and $|ee\rangle$, while the peaks of $|ge\rangle$ indicates the second-order interaction between $|gg\rangle$ and $|ee\rangle$ or $|ge\rangle$ and $|eg\rangle$.

B. IX crosstalk

The unitary matrix for the X operation on the left qubit with IX can be written as

$$U_X^{(IX)} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & -i & iD \\ 0 & 0 & iD & -iC \\ -i & iD & 0 & 0 \\ iD & -iC & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (12)$$

with the approximation of $|g/\Delta_0| \ll 1$ and the assumption of a constant driving amplitude, where $D = \nu(1 - e^{-i\Delta_0 T_g})$, $C = e^{-i\Delta_0 T_g}$. ν is a constant, the value of which depends on the strength for both of the quantum crosstalk induced IX interaction and the microwave crosstalk. with the approximation of $|D| \ll 1$, the calculated unitary matrix elements for the sequence of the detection circuit are

$$\begin{aligned} |[U_{bf}U_X^{(IX)}U_{bf}U_X^{(IX)}]_{[gg \rightarrow ge]}^{n(n \geq 1)}| &\approx |D(1 + e^{-i\Delta_0(T_b+T_g)})[1 + e^{-i2\Delta_0(T_b+T_g)} + e^{-i4\Delta_0(T_b+T_g)} + \dots]| \\ &= |\nu(1 - e^{-i\Delta_0 T_g})(1 + e^{-i\theta})| \left| \frac{\sin n\theta}{\sin \theta} \right| \\ |[U_{bf}U_X^{(IX)}U_{bf}U_X^{(IX)}]_{[gg \rightarrow ee]}^{n(n \geq 1)}| &\approx 0 \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

Compared with the case of ZX interaction, we can get that, the buffer time between two adjacent peaks is also $\Delta T_b = |2\pi/\Delta_0|$, but only when $\theta = 2k\pi$, the peaks in the states $|ge\rangle$ can be detected. So that, the peaks induced by IX interaction are always resides in the middle of the two peaks induced by the ZX interaction.

V. ANALYSIS FOR DRAG CORRECTIONS

In this section, we would like to give the analysis for the difference between the traditional DRAG with constant detuning and the spectrally balanced DRAG corrections. For the traditional DRAG, the adiabatic transformation is

$$V_c = \exp[-iS_c(\frac{g}{\Delta_0}\sigma_y^{gg-ge} + \sigma_y^{gg-eg} + \sigma_y^{ge-ee} - \frac{g}{\Delta_0}\sigma_y^{eg-ee})], \quad (14)$$

where $\sigma_y^{j-k} = -i|j\rangle\langle k| + i|k\rangle\langle j|$. Then we can get the results of the first order correction with

$$\begin{aligned} S_c &= \frac{\Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta}, \\ \Omega^{(1)} &= \Omega^{(0)} - i\frac{\dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{\Delta}. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The adiabatic transformation is $H^V = VH_rV^\dagger + i\dot{V}V^\dagger$, the effective Hamiltonian with the driving pulse $\Omega^{(1)}$ is

$$H^V \approx \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\eta[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{4\Delta_0^2} - \frac{[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{2\Delta_0} & -\frac{\eta g\Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta_0^2} - \frac{g[\Omega^{(0)}]^3}{4\Delta_0^3} & -\frac{\eta\Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta_0} - \frac{[\Omega^{(0)}]^3}{4\Delta_0^2} + \frac{\Omega^{(0)}}{2} & -\frac{g[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{4\Delta_0^2} \\ -\frac{\eta g\Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta_0^2} - \frac{g[\Omega^{(0)}]^3}{4\Delta_0^3} & \frac{\eta[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{4\Delta_0^2} + \eta - \frac{[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{2\Delta_0} + \Delta_0 & -\frac{\eta g[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{2\Delta_0^3} + \frac{3g[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{4\Delta_0^2} & -\frac{\eta\Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta_0} - \frac{[\Omega^{(0)}]^3}{4\Delta_0^2} + \frac{\Omega^{(0)}}{2} \\ -\frac{\eta\Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta_0} - \frac{[\Omega^{(0)}]^3}{4\Delta_0^2} + \frac{\Omega^{(0)}}{2} & -\frac{\eta g[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{2\Delta_0^3} + \frac{3g[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{4\Delta_0^2} & -\frac{\eta[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{4\Delta_0^2} + \eta + \frac{[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{2\Delta_0} & \frac{\eta g\Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta_0^2} + \frac{g[\Omega^{(0)}]^3}{4\Delta_0^3} \\ -\frac{g[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{4\Delta_0^2} & -\frac{\delta\Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta_0} - \frac{[\Omega^{(0)}]^3}{4\Delta_0^2} + \frac{\Omega^{(0)}}{2} & \frac{\eta g\Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta_0^2} + \frac{g[\Omega^{(0)}]^3}{4\Delta_0^3} & -\frac{\eta[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{4\Delta_0^2} + 2\eta + \frac{[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{2\Delta_0} + \Delta_0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Because there is $g/\Delta_0 \ll 1$, we discard the items with the power of g/Δ_0 higher than 1. In our problem, the value of $\Omega^{(0)}$ is not far less than Δ_0 , then the term with $\frac{\Omega^{(0)}}{\Delta_0}$ cannot be discarded simply. From $H^V[1, 1]$ and $H^V[3, 3]$, we can get the value of the detuning correction η as

$$\eta = -\frac{[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{\Delta_0(1 - [\Omega^{(0)}]^2/2\Delta_0^2)} \quad (16)$$

According to the experimental and numerical simulation results, the maximum amplitude of the driving pulse is about 30 MHz, then we assume the maximum value of $\Omega^{(0)}/\Delta_0 \approx 3/4$, the detuning is about $-1.39[\Omega^{(0)}]^2/\Delta_0$. The item related to the first-order quantum crosstalk is $H^V[1, 2] = -0.89[\Omega^{(0)}]^3g/2\Delta_0^3$ and $H^V[4, 3] = -H^V[1, 2]$, compared with the original item in $H_r[1, 2]$, there is $H^V[1, 2]/H_r[1, 2] = 0.89[\Omega^{(0)}]^2/\Delta_0^2 \approx 0.5$, which is not far less than 1. That is the reason for the loss of efficacy of the traditional DRAG correction. There is one thing to note, even without considering the phase correction and setting $\eta = 0$, the value of $H^V[1, 2]/H_r[1, 2]$ about 0.28, the suppression for the crosstalk induced transitions is still limited.

For the spectrally balanced DRAG corrections, there is

$$V_b = \exp[-iS_{b1}(\frac{g}{\Delta_0}\sigma_y^{gg-ge} - \frac{g}{\Delta_0}\sigma_y^{eg-ee}) - iS_{b2}(\frac{g}{\Delta_0}\sigma_x^{gg-ge} - \frac{g}{\Delta_0}\sigma_x^{eg-ee})], \quad (17)$$

where $\sigma_x^{j-k} = |j\rangle\langle k| + |k\rangle\langle j|$. Then we can get the results of the first and second order corrections with

$$\begin{aligned} S_{b1} &= \frac{\Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta}, \\ S_{b2} &= -\frac{\dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^2}, \\ \Omega^{(2)} &= \Omega^{(0)} + \frac{\ddot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{\Delta^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

After the adiabatic transformation, there are

$$H^V \approx \begin{bmatrix} A & B \\ C & D \end{bmatrix}, \quad (19)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} A &\approx \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\frac{\eta g \Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta^2} + \frac{i\eta g \dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^3} \\ -\frac{\eta g \Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta^2} - \frac{i\eta g \dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^3} & \Delta + \eta \end{bmatrix}, \\ B &\approx \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^2} + \frac{\Omega^{(0)}}{2} & \frac{i g \Omega^{(0)} \dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^3} - \frac{g[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{2\Delta^2} \\ \frac{i g \Omega^{(0)} \dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^3} + \frac{g[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{2\Delta^2} & \frac{\dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^2} + \frac{\Omega^{(0)}}{2} \end{bmatrix}, \\ C &\approx \begin{bmatrix} \frac{\dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^2} + \frac{\Omega^{(0)}}{2} & -\frac{i g \Omega^{(0)} \dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^3} + \frac{g[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{2\Delta^2} \\ -\frac{i g \Omega^{(0)} \dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^3} - \frac{g[\Omega^{(0)}]^2}{2\Delta^2} & \frac{\dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^2} + \frac{\Omega^{(0)}}{2} \end{bmatrix}, \\ D &\approx \begin{bmatrix} \eta & \frac{\eta g \Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta^2} - \frac{i\eta g \dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^3} \\ \frac{\eta g \Omega^{(0)}}{2\Delta^2} + \frac{i\eta g \dot{\Omega}^{(0)}}{2\Delta^3} & \Delta + 2\eta \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

Here, we also discard the items with the power of g/Δ_0 higher than 1. In this case, from $H^V[1, 1]$ and $H^V[3, 3]$, we can get the value of detuning with $\eta = 0$. So that, without considering the higher order of g/Δ_0 , the items related to the quantum crosstalk are zero.

VI. FITTING FUNCTION FOR THE EXCITATION RATE

From the equations (9) and (12), we can take the exciting operation on the spectator qubit as a small rotation along the σ_x axis with $0 < \gamma_e \ll 1$ and

$$R_x(\gamma_e) = \begin{bmatrix} \sqrt{1-\gamma_e} & -i\sqrt{\gamma_e} \\ -i\sqrt{\gamma_e} & \sqrt{1-\gamma_e} \end{bmatrix}, \quad (21)$$

To extract the excitation rate γ_e , we assume the qubit goes through a series of channels: $\rho_f = \prod_i O_i(\rho_0)$, where $O_i = C_\Gamma \bar{C}_i$, C_Γ is an amplitude damping channel with the damping rate Γ , and $\bar{C}_i = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{j=1}^n R_z(\alpha_{ij}) R_x(\gamma_e) R_z(\beta_{ij})$. R_z is the single-qubit rotating gate around the σ_z axis with the angle α and β , which is chosen randomly and when $n \rightarrow +\infty$, there are

$$\bar{C}_i = \frac{1}{2\pi} \int_{\phi=0}^{2\pi} e^{iH(\phi)\theta} d\phi, \quad (22)$$

$$H(\phi) = \cos \phi \sigma_x + \sin \phi \sigma_y,$$

with $\gamma_e = \sin^2 \theta$. Then there is

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{C}_i(\rho) &= \cos^2 \theta \rho + \frac{1}{2} \sin^2 \theta (\sigma_x \rho \sigma_x + \sigma_y \rho \sigma_y) \\ &= (1 - \gamma_e) \rho + \frac{1}{2} \gamma_e (\sigma_x \rho \sigma_x + \sigma_y \rho \sigma_y) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Initially, there is

$$\rho_0 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, \quad (24)$$

After the first channel \bar{C}_1 , the density matrix becomes

$$\rho_{0z} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \gamma_e & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_e \end{bmatrix}, \quad (25)$$

And then after the amplitude damping channel, the density matrix is

$$\rho_1 = E_1 \rho_{0z} E_1^\dagger + E_2 \rho_{0z} E_2^\dagger, \quad (26)$$

where

$$E_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1-\Gamma} \end{bmatrix}, E_2 = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{\Gamma} \\ 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (27)$$

Then there is

$$\rho_1 = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - \gamma_e + \gamma_e \Gamma & 0 \\ 0 & \gamma_e (1 - \Gamma) \end{bmatrix}. \quad (28)$$

We assume that, for ρ_{m-1} , there is

$$\rho_{m-1} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 - p_1(m-1) & 0 \\ 0 & p_1(m-1) \end{bmatrix}, \quad (29)$$

where $p_1(m-1)$ is the population on the excited state after $m-1$ Clifford gates. We can get the population of the excited state in ρ_m as

$$\begin{aligned} p_1(m) &= r_e - r_e \Gamma + (1 - \Gamma - 2r_e + 2r_e \Gamma) p_1(m-1) \\ &= (r_e - r_e \Gamma) \frac{1 - q^m}{1 - q} \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

for $m = 1, 2, 3, \dots$, $p_1(0) = 0$ and $q = 1 - \Gamma - 2r_e + 2r_e \Gamma$.

VII. EXPLANATION OF THE INTER-PULSE INTERFERENCE EFFECTS

The ExPC as a function of gate time t_g shows an oscillatory behavior in Fig. 4(c) of the main text. This phenomenon can be explained by the inter-pulse interference effect. As shown in Fig. 7, the red line represents twice the simulated excitation rate of the \sqrt{X} gate over gate time, the orange line shows the results from a single U3 gate, and the blue line corresponds to the result from three U3 gates. As the pulse duration increases, the decreasing trend of ExPC for three U3 gates is not monotonic, and oscillations appear, which are attributed to the interference effects between the different pulses. In an RB circuit, which consists of hundreds of U3 gates, the fitted excitation rate is influenced by these inter-pulse interference effects. The practical excitation rate lies within the oscillation range, as shown by the comparison among the simulated ExPCs for \sqrt{X} , U3, and $U3 \times 3$ in Fig. 7.

VIII. COMPARISON OF DIFFERENT DRAG SETS

To compare the suppression of spurious transitions with different DRAG sets, we present the experimental results for RB and pulse train with four different DRAG sets, as shown in Fig. 8. The ExPC is significantly reduced with the recursive DRAG scheme, and the best suppression occurs with the optimized dual-DRAG, using the DRAG set $\{\alpha, \Delta_{\text{opt}}, -\Delta_{\text{opt}}\}$, as shown in Fig. 8(b). The significant suppression is further confirmed in Fig. 8(c). The irregular lines in the top panel may be attributed to noise in the system.

IX. DEPENDENCE OF EXPC OVER COUPLING STRENGTH

To verify the functional relationship between the ExPC and the coupling strength g , we fit the simulated ExPC shown in Fig. 3(g) of the main text using the fitting function $f(x) = ax^2$. The results are shown in Fig. 9. The excitation rates are found to be proportional to g^2 . The fitting parameters are $a_{w/} = 2.6 \times 10^{-5}$ and $a_{w/o} = 3.0 \times 10^{-4}$ with and without dual-DRAG, respectively.




FIG. 7. Simulated excitation rates as a function of gate time for single-qubit operations with the DRAG set $\{\alpha\}$. The green line represents the experimental results. The red line shows twice the excitation rate of the \sqrt{X} gate. The orange line represents the average ExPC from 24 Clifford gates compiled with the U3 scheme. The blue line shows one-third of the excitation rate of averaged single-qubit operations, each consisting of three U3 gates. The average value is computed from 10 random operations.




FIG. 8. (a) Randomized benchmarking results for Q_0 , comparing different DRAG sets. (b) Simultaneously monitored excited-state populations of Q_1 . The ExPC values for the DRAG sets $\{\alpha\}$, $\{\alpha, \Delta_0\}$, $\{\alpha, \Delta_0, -\Delta_0\}$, and $\{\alpha, \Delta_{\text{opt}}, -\Delta_{\text{opt}}\}$ are $(2.7 \pm 0.2) \times 10^{-4}$, $(6.6 \pm 1.0) \times 10^{-5}$, $(4.2 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-5}$, and $(3.2 \pm 1.2) \times 10^{-5}$, respectively. (c) Measured excited-state populations of Q_0 (top panel) and Q_1 (bottom panel), using the detection sequence shown in Fig. 3(b) of the main text, as a function of the waiting time τ . Results are shown for different DRAG sets. All cases include DRAG correction for the leakage transition to the second excited state $|2\rangle$. The number of π gate pairs is $N = 50$. Here, $g/2\pi = 0.8$ MHz, $\Delta_0/2\pi = 42.5$ MHz, and $t_g = 24$ ns.

X. SUPPRESSION OF THE SPURIOUS TRANSITIONS

In Fig. 10, we present the experimental results for TLS excitation rates as a function of gate time (t_g) with the detuning $\Delta_0/2\pi = 60$ MHz, using the circuit shown in Fig. 4(c) of the main text. Similar to the results presented in the main text, we observe that for gate times in the range $20 \text{ ns} \leq t_g \leq 50 \text{ ns}$, dual-DRAG reduces TLS excitation rates by an order of magnitude compared to uncorrected pulses. Numerical simulations of single-pulse dynamics successfully reproduce the observed decreasing trend.

XI. LEAKAGE SUPPRESSION WITH RECURSIVE DRAG

Having successfully suppressed spurious transitions using the spectrally balanced DRAG pulse, we now turn our attention to the leakage error on Q_0 and talk about the suppression of more than one transitions with multiple DRAG




FIG. 9. (a) Fitting of the ExPC as a function of coupling strength g using the fitting function $f(x) = ax^2$. The simulated ExPC values are averaged over 24 single-qubit Cliffords implemented with the U3 decomposition. The results with and without dual-DRAG are represented by blue dots and green squares, respectively, with the corresponding fitting results shown as red and orange solid lines.




FIG. 10. Excitation per Clifford of the TLS for different gate times at $\Delta_0/2\pi = 60$ MHz. The solid lines represent twice the simulated \sqrt{X} gate errors.

corrections. Compared with the conventional DRAG application on the leakage error with the DRAG set of $\{\alpha\}$, when applying the DRAG correction with the set of $\{\Delta, -\Delta\}$, the leakage to the excited states of Q_0 experiences a sudden increase, as observed by the prominent peaks in FIG. 11(a) with red data line. This increase attributed to the amplification of the driving strength at the frequency of $\omega_{fg} - \omega_{eg}$ due to the DRAG action on $\{\Delta, -\Delta\}$, as illustrated in FIG. 11(b). To solve this problem, we introduce the third DRAG correction with the DRAG set of $\{\alpha, \Delta, -\Delta\}$, then the leakage associated with the first-order process is significantly suppressed. While there is still some residual leakage error related to the second-order process on Q_0 (see minor peaks in FIG. 11 with green line), but it is faint enough to be negligible. These results underscore that a driving pulse with multiple DRAG corrections can effectively achieve suppressions on both leakage and spurious transitions.




FIG. 11. Suppression of more than one transitions with multiple DRAG corrections. (a) Measured sum of the excited states with Q_0 when running the detection circuit with three different DRAG sets. (b) Frequency spectrum features of the driving pulses corresponding to different DRAG sets.