

# Non-Abelian phases, pumping, and quantum computation with Josephson junctions

Lara Faoro<sup>(1)</sup>, Jens Siewert<sup>(2,4)</sup>, and Rosario Fazio<sup>(3,4)</sup>

<sup>(1)</sup> *INFM & Institute for Scientific Interchange (ISI), Viale Settimo Severo 65, 10133 Torino, Italy*

<sup>(2)</sup> *Institut für Theoretische Physik, Universität Regensburg, 93040 Regensburg, Germany*

<sup>(3)</sup> *NEST-INFM & Scuola Normale Superiore, 56126 Pisa, Italy\**

<sup>(4)</sup> *Dipartimento di Metodologie Fisiche e Chimiche (DMFCI), Università di Catania, viale A. Doria 6, 95125 Catania, Italy*

## Abstract

Non-Abelian phases can be generated in certain networks of Josephson junctions. Here we explicitly construct such a device and show how it can be applied both for adiabatic pumping and as an implementation of a quantum computer.

If a quantum system is prepared in a superposition of two states, a physical observable associated with this system can exhibit oscillatory behavior depending on the relative phase of the two states. Interference can be induced during the dynamical evolution of the system, in this case we refer to the accumulated phase as the *dynamical* phase. Interference can also be of *geometrical* nature if the parameters of the Hamiltonian are varied cyclically [1]. After Berry's original work, considerable attention has been devoted to the interpretation, generalization, and detection of geometric phases [2]. An important generalization, relevant for the present work, is when the adiabatic cyclic evolution involves a degenerate eigenspace of the Hamiltonian. It has been shown by Wilczek and Zee [3] that in this case geometric

---

\*permanent address

phases acquire a non-Abelian structure. Originally investigated in Nuclear Quadrupole Resonance [4], more recently it was shown that non-Abelian phases occur in the manipulation of trapped ions by means of pulsed coherent excitations [5,6].

Apart from its fundamental importance, geometric interference has interesting applications in the field of quantum information processing [7] where quantum computers can be viewed as large-scale quantum interferometers [8]. Implementations of quantum computers so far include optical systems and liquid-state NMR [9] as well as solid-state devices based on superconductors [10] and on semiconductors [11]. In most of the proposed physical implementations of quantum computing devices the relative phases of the probability amplitudes are due to the coherent dynamics of the system and are controlled by switching on and off suitable terms of the many-qubit Hamiltonian. Recently it has been shown that quantum gates can be implemented by geometric means using Abelian [12–16] as well as non-Abelian [18,6] phases. This scheme is described as *geometric quantum computation*. Due to the rapid development of nanotechnologies with the consequent control of artificial two-level systems in solid-state devices [19,20], the realization of geometric interference in mesoscopic systems has become plausible.

The aim of this work is to show that non-Abelian phases can also appear in the quantum dynamics of Josephson networks [21]. Hereby we are following the spirit of the schemes described in Refs. [5,6]. There are various interesting aspects which emerge from this analysis. In addition to their possible detection, which is intriguing by itself, non-Abelian phases may be employed both in adiabatic charge pumping [24] and quantum computation. Some parts of our proposal are on purpose speculative. The adiabatic manipulation of degenerate subspaces and the degeneracy condition itself is a non-trivial issue for an artificially fabricated device, and requires further investigation. We believe, however, that the applications in pumping and computation are interesting new directions to pursue.

Our main focus is to realize the Hamiltonian used in Refs. [5,6] in nanofabricated superconducting circuits. This is indeed possible due to the great flexibility in design offered by Josephson circuits. The building block to generate non-Abelian phases is the network shown

in Fig.1. It consists of three superconducting islands (labeled by  $j=0,a,1$  in analogy with Ref. [6]) connected to a fourth one (labeled with ‘e’) by SQUIDs. A gate voltage is applied to each island via a gate capacitance. The device operates in the charging regime, that is the Josephson energies  $J_0, J_a, J_1$  of the junctions are much smaller than the charging energies  $E_C$  of an individual island and  $\tilde{E}_C$  of the entire setup. For temperatures  $T \ll J_j \ll \tilde{E}_C < E_C < \Delta$  only the two charge states corresponding to the presence of *zero* or *one* excess Cooper pair on each island become important ( $\Delta$  denotes the superconducting gap). We ignore quasiparticle tunneling since it is suppressed at low temperature. The gate charges  $n_{xj} = C_g V_{xj}/2e$  on each island can easily be tuned by changing the gate voltages. Conditions are arranged such that the number of charges is fixed with a total of one excess Cooper pair in the four-island setup. There are four charge states  $|j\rangle$  of the system corresponding to the position of the excess pair on island  $j$ .

By choosing the gate charges appropriately around  $n_{xj} = 1/2$ ,  $|j\rangle$  is the state with minimum charging energy ( $j = 0, a, 1$ ). If the system is in the state  $|e\rangle$  there is an extra charging energy  $\delta E_C$ . Thus we obtain the Hamiltonian in complete analogy with Refs. [5,6]

$$H = \delta E_C |e\rangle\langle e| + \frac{1}{2} [J_0 e^{-i\alpha_0} |e\rangle\langle 0| + J_a e^{-i\alpha_a} |e\rangle\langle a| + J_1 e^{-i\alpha_1} |e\rangle\langle 1| + \text{H.c.}] \quad (1)$$

where

$$J_j = J_j(\bar{\Phi}_j) = \sqrt{(J_{jr} - J_{jl})^2 + 4J_{jr}J_{jl} \cos^2(\pi\bar{\Phi}_j)} \quad , \quad (2)$$

$$\tan(\alpha_j) = \frac{J_{jr} - J_{jl}}{J_{jr} + J_{jl}} \tan(\pi\bar{\Phi}_j) \quad , \quad (3)$$

where  $\bar{\Phi}_j = \Phi_j/\Phi_0$  ( $j = 0, a, 1$ ) are the external magnetic fluxes in units of the flux quantum  $\Phi_0 = h/2e$  and  $J_{jl}, J_{jr}$  denote the Josephson energies of the left and right junction of each SQUID in Fig. 1. In the following we will refer to the fluxes  $\{\bar{\Phi}_0, \bar{\Phi}_a, \bar{\Phi}_1\}$  as *control* parameters and to their manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  as the *control manifold*. In general all the SQUIDs could be asymmetric, although it is not necessary for the purposes of our discussion.

The Hamiltonian defined in Eq.(1) has the following two degenerate eigenstates (not normalized) with zero-energy eigenvalue

$$\begin{aligned} |D_1\rangle &= -J_a e^{-i\alpha_a} |0\rangle + J_0 e^{-i\alpha_0} |a\rangle, \\ |D_2\rangle &= -J_1 e^{-i\alpha_1} \left( J_0 e^{i\alpha_0} |0\rangle + J_a e^{i\alpha_a} |a\rangle \right) + (J_0^2 + J_a^2) |1\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

By proper manipulation of the external magnetic fluxes it is possible to realize adiabatic pumping and quantum computation as we will discuss below.

Pumping - For this purpose it is sufficient to have only symmetric SQUIDS. In contrast to the well-known turnstiles for single electrons or Cooper pairs [22–24] (in which the gate potentials are modulated periodically), here charge is transported through the chain (say from island 0 to island 1) by means of a modulation of the Josephson couplings while keeping the gate voltages unchanged. The pumping cycle goes as follows. The system is initially prepared in the  $|0\rangle$  state (i.e. one Cooper pair on the ‘0’ island in Fig.1). Then a suitable loop in the manifold  $\mathcal{M}$  has to be performed in order to achieve the gate  $U = e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\sigma_y}$ . After one adiabatic cycle, the final state of the device is  $|1\rangle$ , i.e. one Cooper pair has been transported through the chain of islands.

The mechanism described here relies entirely on the geometric phases accumulated during the cycle and can be generalized to describe pumping of a single Cooper pair through  $N$  superconducting islands. In Fig.2 we show explicitly the closed loop which has to be performed in the  $(\bar{\Phi}_0, \bar{\Phi}_1)$ - plane at fixed  $\bar{\Phi}_a = 0$  in order to realize the pumping through the three islands.

The connection between pumping and geometric phases has been discussed by Pekola *et al.* [24]. The crucial difference is that here only the Josephson couplings have to be varied. During the cycle, exactly one Cooper pair is transported, in this sense there are no errors due to the spread of the wave function discussed in [24]. There are other drawbacks though, mostly related to the fact that the degenerate states are different from the ground state and relaxation processes may become important.

We mention that one can imagine to realize this pumping mechanism also in a setup of

semiconducting islands [25].

Quantum Computation, one qubit - The pumping process is nothing but one of the key elements to construct a quantum computing scheme using non-Abelian phases. Proceeding along the lines of Ref. [6], we point out the necessary ingredients and the differences which arise in the case of the Josephson junction setup. For the implementation, it is sufficient to provide explicit representations for the gates  $U_1 = e^{i\Sigma_1|1\rangle\langle 1|}$  and  $U_2 = e^{i\Sigma_2\sigma_y}$ , describing rotations of the qubit state about the  $z$  axis and the  $y$  axis, respectively. We note that only one asymmetric SQUID (as shown in Fig. 1) is required to implement the one-qubit operations.

The gate  $U_1$  is a phase shift for the state  $|1\rangle$  while the state  $|0\rangle$  remains decoupled, i.e.,  $J_0 \equiv 0$  during the operation. In the initial state we have  $J_1 = 0$ , so the eigenstates  $\{|D_1\rangle, |D_2\rangle\}$  correspond to the logical states  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ . The control parameters  $\bar{\Phi}_a, \bar{\Phi}_1$  evolve adiabatically along the closed loop  $C_1$  in the  $(\bar{\Phi}_a, \bar{\Phi}_1)$ -plane from  $\bar{\Phi}_1 = 1/2$  to  $\bar{\Phi}_1 = 1/2$ . By using the formula for holonomies one can show that this cyclic evolution produces the gate  $U_1$  with the phase  $\Sigma_1$  :

$$\Sigma_1 = \sigma_1 \oint_{\mathcal{S}(C_1)} d\bar{\Phi}_a d\bar{\Phi}_1 \frac{\sin(2\pi\bar{\Phi}_1)}{(J_1^2(\bar{\Phi}_1) + J_a^2(\bar{\Phi}_a))^2} \quad (5)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}(C_1)$  denotes the surface enclosed by the loop  $C_1$  in  $\mathcal{M}$  and  $\sigma_1 = 4\pi^2 J_1^2(0)(J_{al}^2 - J_{ar}^2)$ . Similarly we can consider a closed loop  $C_2$  in the  $(\bar{\Phi}_0, \bar{\Phi}_1)$ -plane at fixed  $\bar{\Phi}_a = 0$ , and let the control parameters  $\bar{\Phi}_0$  and  $\bar{\Phi}_1$  undergo a cyclic adiabatic evolution with starting and ending point  $\bar{\Phi}_0 = \bar{\Phi}_1 = 1/2$ . This operation yields the gate  $U_2$  with phase  $\Sigma_2$

$$\Sigma_2 = \sigma_2 \oint_{\mathcal{S}(C_2)} d\bar{\Phi}_1 d\bar{\Phi}_0 \frac{\sin(\pi\bar{\Phi}_0) \sin(\pi\bar{\Phi}_1)}{(J_a^2(0) + J^2(\bar{\Phi}_1) + J^2(\bar{\Phi}_0))^{3/2}} \quad (6)$$

where  $\mathcal{S}(C_2)$  denotes the surface enclosed by the loop  $C_2$  in  $\mathcal{M}$ , and  $\sigma_2 = 4\pi^2 J^2(J_{al} + J_{ar})$  where we have assumed  $J_0(0) = J_1(0) =: J$ . Obviously the pumping cycle discussed above is a special case of the gate  $U_2$  with  $\Sigma_2 = \pi/2$ .

Quantum Computation, two qubits - In order to obtain a universal set of operations we need to provide a two-qubit gate. It turns out that it is possible to implement a conditional

phase shift  $U_3 = e^{i\Sigma_3|11\rangle\langle 11|}$  by coupling the qubits via Josephson junctions. These junctions should be realized as symmetric SQUIDS such that the coupling can be switched off. The capacitive coupling due to these SQUIDS can be neglected if the capacitances of the junction are sufficiently small [26].

The implementation of the conditional phase shift  $U_3$  is analogous to the single-qubit phase shift  $U_1$ . That is, we need to find a subspace of the 16-dimensional space of two-qubit states  $\{|00\rangle, |01\rangle, \dots, |ee\rangle\}$  for which we can construct a Hamiltonian with the same structure as in Eq. (1). This subspace is given by the states  $\{|00\rangle, |11\rangle, |ea\rangle, |ee\rangle\}$ . Note that now we have to set  $\delta E_C = 0$  while this was not necessary in the one-qubit case. By coupling the ‘e’ island of each qubit with the ‘1’ island of the other (as shown in Fig.3) and by switching on the coupling  $J_a^{(2)}(\bar{\Phi}_a^{(2)})$  of the second qubit we obtain the Hamiltonian

$$H_{2\text{qubit}} = \frac{1}{2} \left[ J_a^{(2)} e^{-i\alpha_a^{(2)}} |ee\rangle\langle ea| + J_X |ee\rangle\langle 11| + \text{H.c.} \right] . \quad (7)$$

Here the matrix element  $J_X = J_X(\bar{\Phi}_4, \bar{\Phi}_5)$  is given by

$$J_X = -(1/2) J_{e1}(\bar{\Phi}_4) J_{1e}(\bar{\Phi}_5) \mu \quad (8)$$

where  $\mu = [1/\delta\tilde{E}_C^{+-} + 1/\delta\tilde{E}_C^{-+}]$ . Here  $\delta\tilde{E}_C^{+-}$  and  $\delta\tilde{E}_C^{-+}$  denote the charging energy difference between the initial and the intermediate state (see below). The coupling is of second order since the inter-qubit coupling junctions change the total number of pairs on each one-bit setup. Thus the coupling occurs via intermediate charge states which lie outside the Hilbert space of the two-qubit system. These are states, e.g., without excess Cooper pair on the first qubit and two excess pairs on the second qubit. In Eq. (8) we have abbreviated the charging energy difference between the corresponding state and the initial qubit state by  $\delta\tilde{E}_C^{-+}$ , and we have denoted the external magnetic fluxes in the coupling SQUIDS by  $\bar{\Phi}_4$  and  $\bar{\Phi}_5$ .

While  $J_X(\bar{\Phi}_4, \bar{\Phi}_5)$  is the only off-diagonal coupling of second order, there are also second-order corrections of the diagonal elements, i.e. of the energies of the two-qubit states. These corrections would lift the degeneracy and thus would hamper the geometric operation which

is based on the degeneracy of all states. It is therefore crucial that it is possible to compensate these corrections and to guarantee the degeneracy. It is easy to see that by adjusting the gate voltages the energy shifts can be canceled. Note that during the geometric operation the values of the Josephson couplings are changing and therefore also the energy shifts are not constant. Consequently their compensation by means of the gate voltages has to follow the evolution of the parameters.

Let us now show explicitly how the gate  $U_3$  can be achieved. To this aim, we consider a closed loop  $C_3$  in the  $(\bar{\Phi}_a^{(2)}, \bar{\Phi}_4)$ -plane at fixed  $\bar{\Phi}_5 = 0$ . If the control parameters  $\bar{\Phi}_4$  and  $\bar{\Phi}_a^{(2)}$  undergo a cyclic adiabatic evolution with starting and ending point  $\bar{\Phi}_4 = 1/2$ ,  $\bar{\Phi}_a^{(2)} = 0$ , the geometric phase obtained with this loop is

$$\Sigma_3 = \sigma_3 \oint_{S(C_3)} d\bar{\Phi}_a^{(2)} d\bar{\Phi}_4 \frac{\mu^2 \sin(2\pi\bar{\Phi}_4)}{\left((J_a^{(2)}(\bar{\Phi}_a^{(2)}))^2 + \mu^2 J^2 J_{e1}^2(\bar{\Phi}_4)\right)^2}$$

with  $\sigma_3 = 4\pi^2 J^4 (J_{al}^2 - J_{ar}^2)$  and  $J_{e1}(0) = J_{1e}(0) =: J$ . As we have mentioned in the introduction, some caution is required before regarding this scheme ready for implementation. In practice it will be difficult to achieve perfect degeneracy of all states. Thus the question is imposed to which extend incomplete degeneracy of the qubit states is permissible. Clearly, the adiabatic condition requires the inverse operation time  $\tau_{\text{op}}$  to be smaller than the minimum energy difference to the neighboring states:  $\tau_{\text{op}}^{-1} \ll \min \delta \tilde{E}_C, J_j, J_X$ . On the other hand, if the degeneracy is not complete and the deviation is of the order  $\epsilon$  one can show by modifying the derivation of Eq. (4) in Ref. [18] that for  $\epsilon \ll \tau_{\text{op}}^{-1}$  the holonomies can be realized to a sufficient accuracy. This inequality expresses the requirement that the operation time be still small enough in order to not resolve small level spacings of the order  $\epsilon$ .

There is another important constraint on  $\tau_{\text{op}}$ . As the degenerate states in Eq. (4) are different from the ground state of the system,  $\tau_{\text{op}}$  must not be too large in order to prevent inelastic relaxation. The main origin for such relaxation processes is the coupling to a low-impedance electromagnetic environment. We can estimate the relaxation rate by  $\Gamma_{\text{in}} \sim E(R_{\text{env}}/R_K)$  where  $R_K = h/e^2$  is the quantum resistance and  $E$  is on the order of the

Josephson energies  $E \sim J_J, J_X$ . Thus it is not difficult to satisfy the condition  $\tau_{\text{op}} < \Gamma_{\text{in}}^{-1}$  experimentally. In fact, it has been found recently that inelastic relaxation times in charge qubits can be made quite large and exceed by far the typical dephasing times due to background charge fluctuations [27,28].

Stimulating discussions with G. Falci, G.M. Palma, E. Paladino, M. Rasetti and P. Zanardi are gratefully acknowledged. We wish to thank M.-S. Choi for informing us of his results. This work has been supported by the EU (IST-FET SQUBIT) and by INFN-PRA-SSQI.



## REFERENCES

- [1] M.V. Berry, Proc. Roy. Soc. A **392**, 45 (1984).
- [2] *Geometric phases in physics*, A. Shapere and F. Wilczek, Eds. World Scientific, (Singapore, 1989).
- [3] F. Wilczek and A. Zee, Phys. Rev. Lett. **52**, 2111 (1984).
- [4] R. Tycko, Phys. Rev. Lett. **58**, 2281 (1987).
- [5] R.G. Unanyan, B.W. Shore, and K. Bergmann, Phys. Rev. A **59**, 2910 (1999).
- [6] L.-M. Duan, J.I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, Science **292**, 1695 (2001).
- [7] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Communication*, (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [8] A. Ekert and R. Jozsa, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 733-753 (1996).
- [9] D. DiVincenzo, Fortschr. Phys. **48**, 771 (2000)
- [10] Yu. Makhlin, G. Schön, and A. Shnirman Rev. Mod. Phys. **73**, 357 (2000).
- [11] G. Burkard, H.-A. Engel, and D. Loss, Fortschr. Phys. **48**, 965 (2000).
- [12] J. Jones, V. Vedral, A.K. Ekert, C. Castagnoli, Nature, **403**, 869 (2000).
- [13] G. Falci, R. Fazio, G.M. Palma, J. Siewert, and V. Vedral, Nature **403**, 869 (2000).
- [14] Wang Xiang-Bin and Matsumoto Keiji, Phys. Rev. Lett. **97**, 097901 (2001).
- [15] A. Blais, A.-M.S. Tremblay, quant-ph/0105006.
- [16] F.K. Wilhelm and J.E. Mooij, unpublished (2001).
- [17] R.S. Whitney and Y. Gefen, cond-mat/0107359.
- [18] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, Phys. Lett. A **264**, 94 (1999); J. Pachos, P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, Phys. Rev. A **61**, R10305 (2000).

- [19] T.H. Oosterkamp *et al.* Nature **395**, 873 (1998).
- [20] Y. Nakamura, Yu. Pashkin, and J.S. Tsai, Nature **398**, 786 (1999).
- [21] While completing this work we became aware of a similar proposal by M.-S. Choi, quant-ph/0111019.
- [22] H. Pothier *et al.*, Physica B **169**, 573 (1991).
- [23] L.J. Geerligs *et al.*, Z. Phys. B **85**, 349 (1991).
- [24] J.P. Pekola *et al.*, Phys. Rev. B **60**, R9931 (1999).
- [25] B.L. Altshuler and L.I. Glazman, Science **283**, 1864 (1999).
- [26] J. Siewert and R. Fazio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 257905 (2001).
- [27] Y. Nakamura, Yu.A. Pashkin, T. Yamamoto, J.S. Tsai, eprint cond-mat/0111402 (2001).
- [28] E. Paladino, L. Faoro, G. Falci, and R. Fazio, to be published




FIG. 1. Elementary Josephson network for the investigation of non-Abelian geometric phases. Note that an asymmetric SQUID cannot be switched off completely in accordance with Eq.(2). Since  $J_a = 0$  may be desirable for quantum computation the SQUID is designed such that this condition can be satisfied.




FIG. 2. Pumping cycle for 3 islands. Starting from  $P = (1/2, 1/2)$  and adiabatically following the drawn path, the gate  $U = e^{i\frac{\pi}{2}\sigma_y}$  can be achieved.




FIG. 3. Inter-qubit coupling for the implementation of the gate  $U_3$ .