

# Engineering Progressive Decoherence with Quantum Jumps in Charge Qubit

Y. D. Wang, Y. B. Gao, C. P. Sun<sup>a</sup>

*Institute of Theoretical Physics, the Chinese Academy of Science, Beijing, 100080, China*

For the Josephson junction charge qubits with macroscopically quantum natures, we propose a theoretical scheme to observe the loss of quantum coherence through coupling such qubit system to an engineered reservoir, the harmonic oscillator mode in the LC circuit formed by the inductor and the separated capacitors. Similar to the usual cavity QED system in form, this charge qubit system with engineered couplings shows the quantum jumps (C.P.Sun et al Fortschr. Phys. **43**, 585 (1995) )in a progressive decoherence process. Corresponding to two components of superposition of two charge states, the inductor evolves simultaneously towards two distinct quasi-classical states entangling with two states of the charge qubit. Then it induces the quantum decoherence for the induced squeezing macroscopically in the LC mode.

PACS number:03.65.-w,74.50.+r,03.67.Lx,85.25.Dq

It is well-known that the superposition of quantum states lies at the very heart of modern quantum theory. In an ideal situation the quantum coherence implied by this superposition results in various dramatic features in quantum mechanics [1]. However, the real systems are never isolated completely from the surrounding environment. The interaction with the environment (a reservoir ) or other external systems will lead to the entanglement between them, and then the randomness or the classicality of environment will wash out the phases of quantum world: there happens the transition from the quantum world to classical world [3].

This issue is directly related to quantum measurement problem where the coupling of the measured system with the measuring apparatus ( detector) will cause the reduction of superposition or wave packet collapse [4]. It should be emphasized that the coupling between the measured system and the detector can be controlled to satisfy one's need in measurement. This is quite different from the coupling with the environment, the detailed knowledge of which is usually unavailable. Actually in the past few years, the cavity QED system [5] and the laser cooled trapped ions [7] were utilized to demonstrate how to "engineer" the system-reservoir coupling so that the progressive decoherence can be observed with experimentally accessible technologies. In this letter, we show that, in the "qubit way"—a two level approximation [8–10], a solid system—the Josephson junction can also implement the engineered system-reservoir interaction to illustrate the detailed dynamics of quantum decoherence. In fact, in the most recent experiments of charge and flux qubit of Josephson junction, the much longer time Rabi oscillation with very large qubit quality factor  $Q_\phi = \tau_\phi \omega$  ( $2.5 \times 10^4$  for charge qubit [11] and  $2 \times 10^{15}$  for flux qubit [12],  $\tau_\phi$  is the decoherence time and  $\omega$  is the "Larmor precession frequency") is observed. These physical realizations of qubit offer us the possibility of manipulating the quantum states of the mesoscopic electrical circuit

and engineering the coupling between the qubit and the artificial environment. Most recently, the relaxation and dephasing that result from the control and the measurement setup itself in experiments have been discussed for the Josephson persistent-current qubits [13]. In this letter we will pay our attention to the charge qubit.

FIG. 1. A charge qubit of tunable coupling is connected with an inductor to  $L$ , and gate voltage  $V_g$  can be controlled to adjust the coupling of the Cooper pair with its engineered reservoir.

For implementing the engineered reservoir couplings, one choice is to connect the Josephson junction charge qubit to a LC-oscillator formed by adding an inductor with tunable inductance  $L$ . (see Fig. 1). Here, the charge qubit of tunable coupling is a complex Cooper pair box formed by a dc SQUID with two symmetric junction.  $C_J$  is the capacitor of tunnel junction,  $E_J$  the Josephson coupling energy,  $C_g$  the gate capacitor and  $V_g$  the control gate voltage. The Hamiltonian of the total system can be written down according to ref. [14] as

$$H = \frac{q^2}{2C} + \frac{\phi^2}{2L} + 4E_C(n - n_g)^2 - E_J(\phi_x) \cos(\theta - \eta'\phi) \quad (1)$$

where  $n$  is the number operator of excess Cooper-pair charges on the island, and  $\theta$  the phase of the superconductor order parameter,  $\phi$  the flux through the inductor,  $\phi_x$  the external flux and  $q$  the total charge accumulated on the gate capacitor. The others parameters are defined as  $C = \frac{C_J C_g}{C_J + C_g}$ ,  $\eta' = \frac{2\pi}{\phi_0} \frac{C}{C_J}$ ,  $E_C = \frac{e^2}{2(C_J + C_g)}$ ,  $n_g = \frac{C_g V_g}{2e}$ ,  $E_J(\phi_x) = 2E_J^0 \cos(\pi \frac{\phi_x}{\phi_0})$ , and  $\phi_0 = \frac{h}{2e}$  denotes the flux quanta.

To form a qubit or a two-level system, one need to tune the gate voltage  $V_g$  so that  $n_g$  is approximately a half-integer. In this case the charge eigen-states  $|0\rangle_c$  and  $|1\rangle_c$  are approximately degenerate and the other energy levels are far from these two states. In the case of weak coupling  $\frac{C}{C_J} \sqrt{\langle \phi^2 \rangle} \ll 1$ , one can keep  $\phi$  to the first order

and "isolate"  $|0\rangle_c$  and  $|1\rangle_c$  to implement a qubit system with Hamiltonian [14]

$$H = \hbar\omega a^\dagger a - \frac{1}{2}\hbar\omega_a\sigma_z + i(a - a^\dagger)\hbar g\sigma_y \quad (3)$$

with three crucial parameters  $\omega = \sqrt{\frac{1}{CL}}$ ,  $\omega_a = \frac{1}{\hbar}\sqrt{16E_c^2(1 - 2n_g)^2 + E_J^2}$ ,  $g = \frac{\pi E_J}{\phi_0 \hbar} \frac{C}{C_J} (\frac{\hbar^2 L}{4C})^{1/4}$ . Here, we have introduced the creation and annihilation operators,  $a^\dagger = \frac{1}{2}(\frac{4L}{\hbar^2 C})^{1/4}(q + i\sqrt{\frac{C}{L}}\phi)$  and  $a$ . The quasi-spin operators  $\sigma_z = |0\rangle\langle 0| - |1\rangle\langle 1|$ ,  $\sigma_y = -i(|1\rangle\langle 0| - |0\rangle\langle 1|)$  and  $\sigma_x = |1\rangle\langle 0| + |0\rangle\langle 1|$  are defined in the rotation representation with the bases  $|0\rangle = \cos\frac{\theta}{2}|0\rangle_c + \sin\frac{\theta}{2}|1\rangle_c$  and  $|1\rangle = -\sin\frac{\theta}{2}|0\rangle_c + \cos\frac{\theta}{2}|1\rangle_c$  for  $\tan\theta = E_J/[4E_c(1 - 2n_g)]$ . It is noticed that  $|0\rangle_c(|1\rangle_c)$  physically represents the state of no (one) excess cooper pair on the island.

The above model is quite similar to a cavity QED model without the rotation-wave-approximation (RWA), which usually describes the single mode cavity interaction with an off-resonance two-level atom [6]. In this cavity QED model, when the detuning between the cavity frequency and the  $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |1\rangle$  transition frequency is large enough to avoid any energy transfer between the atom and the cavity, the atoms in different states  $|1\rangle$  and  $|0\rangle$  will modify the phase of cavity field in different ways [5,15] and thus induce the quantum decoherence of atomic states superposition. We can consider these issues about decoherence in the present charge qubit system. The large detuning condition  $\gamma = \frac{g}{|\omega_a - \omega|} \ll 1$  is easily satisfied by taking proper parameters in experiments [8,9,14]. For example, we can take  $C_J \simeq 10^{-16}F$ ,  $C_g \simeq 10^{-16}F$ ,  $L \simeq 5 \times 10^{-6}H$ ,  $E_J \simeq 0.05K$ . In this case we estimate  $\omega_a \simeq 8.06 \times 10^{10}Hz$ ,  $\omega \simeq 4.47 \times 10^{10}Hz$ ,  $g \simeq 2.57 \times 10^9 Hz$ . Then we have  $\gamma = 7 \times 10^{-2} \ll 1$ , and we need not invoke the rotation wave approximation.

With the above consideration for the rational parameters in the experiment, we shall adiabatically eliminate coherence effect between  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$ . Then we obtain an effective Hamiltonian  $H_{eff} = H_1|1\rangle\langle 1| + H_0|0\rangle\langle 0|$ , which is diagonal with respect to  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$ , and the effective actions on the LC circuit from two qubit states  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  are

$$H_k = (\omega + \frac{2g^2}{\Delta})a^\dagger a + (-1)^k \frac{g^2}{\Delta}(a^2 - a^{\dagger 2}) + \varepsilon \quad (4)$$

for  $k = 0, 1$  respectively. Here,  $\Delta = \omega_a - \omega$ ,  $\varepsilon = \frac{g^2}{\Delta} - (-1)^k \frac{\omega_a}{2}$ . It is easy to see that  $H_{eff}$  is a typical dynamics Hamiltonian creating entanglement of the subsystems. In fact, starting from a factorized initial state  $|\psi(0)\rangle = (c_0|0\rangle + c_1|1\rangle) \otimes |s(0)\rangle$ , the total system driven by  $H_{eff}$  will evolve into an entanglement state

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = c_0|0\rangle \otimes |s_0(t)\rangle + c_1|1\rangle \otimes |s_1(t)\rangle \quad (5)$$

where  $|s_k(t)\rangle = \exp(-iH_k t)|s(0)\rangle$  ( $k = 0, 1$ ) and  $|s(0)\rangle$  is the initial state of the LC circuit. Therefore, a charge

state superposition in terms of  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  will cause the LC circuit state to evolve along the two directions  $|s_1(t)\rangle$  and  $|s_0(t)\rangle$ . The time evolution dominated by the conditional dynamics Hamiltonian  $H_{eff}$  means to implement an ideal pre-quantum measurement when the overlapping  $\langle s_1(t)|s_0(t)\rangle$  approaches zero [16]. Physically the pre-measurement implies a quantum decoherence of the subsystem formed by charge qubit. We consider the reduced density matrix of the charge qubit at time  $t$ . Its off-diagonal elements are determined by  $c_1 c_0^* \langle s_1(t)|s_0(t)\rangle$  and vanishes completely as the overlapping  $\langle s_1(t)|s_0(t)\rangle$  is zero. In this sense, the decoherence factor defined by  $D(t) = |\langle s_1(t)|s_0(t)\rangle|$  characterizes the extent of decoherence and the time-dependent behavior of  $D(t)$  means a progressive process of decoherence or a progressive decoherence. The very sharp peaks in  $D(t)$  curves may originate from the reversibility of the Schroedinger equation for few body system and we called them quantum jumps [4,15]

It is very interesting to observe that the component Hamiltonian  $H_1$  and  $H_0$  are of Hermitian quadratic form of creation and annihilation operators. Mathematically, they are the same as that to produce the degenerate parametric amplifier in nonlinear quantum optics with classical pump [17]. This fact tells us that the component Hamiltonian  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  can create different squeezing of the LC mode. Namely,  $H_0$  and  $H_1$  may drive the LC oscillation mode from the same coherent state  $|\alpha\rangle$  to evolve into two different squeezed states [18]. With this mathematical consideration, we can evaluate the time evolution of the total system and obtain the squeezing wave function at time  $t$

$$|s_k(t)\rangle = \exp[i(-1)^k \frac{\omega_a}{2} t] |\alpha, \mu_k(t), \nu_k(t)\rangle_{A_k} \quad (6)$$

of the LC circuit for  $\mu_k(t)[\nu_k(t)] = \frac{1}{2}(\sqrt{N_k} + [-] \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_k}}) \exp(+[-]i\Omega t)$ ,  $N_0 = \frac{1}{N_1} = \sqrt{\frac{\omega\Delta}{\omega\Delta + 4g^2}}$  and  $\Omega = \sqrt{\omega^2 + 4g^2\omega/\Delta}$ . Here, the squeezed coherent state  $|\alpha, \mu_k(t), \nu_k(t)\rangle_{A_k}$  is defined as in ref. [18] for a new set of boson operators  $A_k = \mu_k(t)a - \nu_k(t)a^\dagger$  (for  $k = 0, 1$ ).

The above calculation demonstrates that the off-resonance interaction between the LC circuit oscillator mode and the different charge qubit will result in a dynamic squeezing split of the quasi-classical state  $|\alpha\rangle$  of LC circuit. The two split components with different squeezing are represented by different squeezing states. Correspondingly, the decoherence factor characterizing quantum decoherence is

$$D(t) = G(t) \exp(\frac{-8g^4 \sin^2 \Omega t}{\Delta^2 \Omega^2 + 8g^4 \sin^2 \Omega t} |\alpha|^2) \quad (7)$$

where  $G(t) = \frac{\Delta\Omega}{\sqrt{\Delta^2 \Omega^2 + 8g^4 \sin^2 \Omega t}}$ . Considering  $\frac{g}{\Delta} \ll 1$  and  $\frac{g}{\Omega} \sim \frac{g}{\omega} \ll 1$ , we can simplify the above result as

$$D(t) = \exp(\frac{-8g^4 \sin^2 \Omega t}{\Delta^2 \Omega^2} |\alpha|^2) \quad (8)$$

The reversible decoherence phenomenon with quantum jumps illustrated in Fig.2 is quite typical. It was found even theoretically in reference [4,19] in 1993, and the possibility of implementing its observation in cavity QED experiment was also pointed out in ref. [15]. In 1997 it was also independently discussed [5] with another cavity QED setup, whose Hamiltonian is mathematically similar to that in our present investigation. As understood usually [16], the quantum decoherence reflects a complementarity effect since the LC mode plays a role of carrying away information about the phase of Josephson Junction qubit and the phase uncertainty appears when enough information of qubit is determined by the LC mode in a very classical state. The more exact information about the qubit phase we obtain the stronger influence will the LC mode exert on the qubit. This revival of decoherence or quantum jump substantially results from the fact that the reservoir is only of a single mode, and its profound origin is the reversibility of the time -evolution for the system of few degrees of freedom is reversible since governed by Schrödinger equation.

FIG. 2. The time-dependence of decoherence factor with different  $|\alpha| = 5$ (dot line),  $|\alpha| = 10$ (dash line),  $|\alpha| = 30$ (solid line). The larger  $|\alpha|$  means the more exact "detection" about this qubit or the one-mode reservoir is more classical. It leads to an evident vanishing of coherence.

In comparison with the case of atomic cavity QED, the advantage using Josephson charge qubit to test one-bit reservoir induced decoherence is due to the macroscopically quantum effect of superconductive system and the well-controlled nature of coupling to one-bit engineered reservoir. A direct way to observe the quantum jump effect of engineered quantum decoherence is to detect the current through the probe junction as in the schematics of Copper pair box in Fig.3. The box electrode is connected to an inductor L via the two junctions of SQUID. When the charge qubit is in the high level state  $|1\rangle_c$ , there are two electrons passing the probe junction. In fact, under a proper bias condition, the state decays into  $|0\rangle_c$  via two single-electron tunnelling through the probe junction.

FIG. 3. Schematic of Cooper pair box with probe junction. The additional voltage biased probe electrode of voltage  $V_b$  is attached to the box through a highly-resistive tunnel junction H for the detection of charge qubit state .

As usual, it is difficult to observe the two electrons via a single trial, but one can see an average effect of this tunnelling process. The current is proportional to the charging rate of the occupation probability  $P_c(t) = \text{Tr}(\rho|1\rangle_{cc}\langle 1|)$  of Cooper pair in  $|1\rangle_c$ . The corresponding current  $I(t) = \frac{\partial}{\partial t}(-2eP_c(t))$  is explicitly expressed for  $c_0 = c_1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$  as

$$I(t) \simeq e \sin \theta D(t) [\omega_a \sin \omega_a t + \frac{8g^4 |\alpha|^2}{\Delta^2 \Omega^2} \sin 2\Omega t \cos \omega_a t] \quad (9)$$

FIG. 4. The Rabi oscillation of the charge current. (a)with coupling to the LC oscillator ( $|\alpha| = 30$ ). (b) without coupling to the LC oscillator

where we have considered the approximation  $\omega_a, \omega \gg g$ . In Fig.4, we compare this result with the case without coupling to LC circuit. It can be seen that the current oscillates sinusoidally in both cases, but the coupling to external reservoir adds the periodical amplitude modulation as the direct manifestation of decoherence. Experimentally, one can use the ratio of envelop width and the fixed period to measure the extent of decoherence quantitatively.

In principle this quantum decoherence is macroscopically observable and it is expected to be implemented in the experiment of Josephson qubit in the near future. It is crucial for the above arguments to initially prepare the L-C mode in a coherent state. As usual the external sources can add the linear forces  $\propto q$  or  $\phi$ . They may force the L-C mode to evolve into a coherent state from a vacuum state. In practice, the initial state may easily be in a thermal equilibrium at finite temperature, but this state is described by a diagonal density matrix in the coherent-state representation ("Q-representation"). Thus, the quantum jump phenomenon predicted above can still be observed and the higher temperature can enhance the quantum jump. For the cavity QED case we have shown this enhancement effects by straightforward calculations [15]. The same calculations can be done here for the charge qubit.

A difficulty to realize this setup is to fabricate a nanometer-scale inductor with tunable inductance L. Another difficulty lies in the quantum dissipation of the inductor causing the energy relaxation and the additional decoherence simultaneously. The mechanism of this dissipation is due to the coupling of the inductor to the vacuum electromagnetic field. For the practical purpose, we shall include this dissipation effect in our future argument.

We finally remark that the relevant quantum measurement problem of Josephson Junction qubit has been considered theoretically by Averin [20]. He extends the concept of quantum non-demolition (QND) measurement to coherent Rabi oscillation of JJ qubit. The advantage of such QND measurement is that the observation of oscillation spectrum, in principle, avoids the detector induced decoherence. This suggested that a scheme combining flux and charge qubit may be used in our setup to detect the engineered quantum decoherence without "additional quantum decoherence".

*This work is supported by the NSF of China and the*

*knowledge Innovation Program (KIP) of the Chinese Academy of Science. It is also founded by the National Fundamental Research Program of China with No 001GB309310. We also sincerely thank D.L.Zhou for the useful discussions with him.*

fortsch Physik, **48**, 1055 (2002).

- 
- <sup>a</sup> E-mail : [suncp@itp.ac.cn](mailto:suncp@itp.ac.cn); web site: <http://www.itp.ac.cn/~suncp>
- [1] J. A. Wheeler and Z.H. Zurek, Quantum Theory of Measurement. (Princeton University Press, NJ, 1983).
  - [2] A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Legget, Physica A, **121**, 587(1983); E. Joos and H. D. Zeh, Z. Phys. B **59**, 223(1985).
  - [3] W. H. Zurek, Physics Today, ;Phys. Rev. D **24**, 1516 (1981); R. Onnes, Rev. Mod. Phys, **64**, 339 (1992).
  - [4] C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **48**, 878 (1993). C. P. Sun *et.al*, Fortschr. Phys. **43**, 585 (1995).
  - [5] M. Brune,*et.al*, Phys. Rev. Lett **77**, 4887 (1996); J. M. Raimond, M. Brune and S Haroche, Phys. Rev. Lett **79**, 1964 (1997).
  - [6] H.B.Zhu,C.P.Sun, Chinese Science (A) 2000.10 30(10) 928-933; Progresse in Chinese Science, 2000.60 10(8) 698-703 0
  - [7] C. J. Myatt, *et.al*, Nature, **403**, 269 (2000).
  - [8] A. Shnirman, G. Schön, Z. Hermon, Phys. Rev. Lett, **79**, 2371 (1997);Y. Makhlin, G. Schön, A. Shnirman, Nature, **398**, 305 (1999).
  - [9] Y. Nakamura, C. D. Chen, J. S. Tsai, Phys. Rev. Lett **79**, 2238 (1997); Y. Nakamura, Y.A. Pushkin, J. S. Tsai, Nature, **398**, 786 (1999).
  - [10] J. E. Mooij *et.al*, Science, **285**, 1036 (1999); C. H. Van der Wal, science **290**, 773 (2000); J. R. Friedman, Nature, **406**, 43 (2000).
  - [11] D. Vion, *et.al*, Science. **296**, 1886 (2002).
  - [12] Y. Yu, S. Han, X. Chu, S. I. Chu, Z. Wang, Science, **296**, 889 (2002); S. Yan, Y. YU, X. Chu, S. I. Chu. Z.wang, Science, **293**, 1457 (2001).
  - [13] Caspar H. van der Wal, F.K. Wilhelm, C.J.P.M. Harman, J.E. Mooij,LANL e-print ,cond-mat/0211664.
  - [14] Y. Makhlin, G. Schön, A. Shnirman, Rev. Mod. Phys **73**, 357 (2001).
  - [15] C. P. Sun, *et.al.*, Quantum Semiclassic Opt **9**, 119 (1997).
  - [16] P. Zhang, X. F. Liu, C. P. Sun, Phys. Rev. A **66**, 042104 (2002).
  - [17] M. O. Scully, M. S. Zubairy, Quantum Optics ( Cambridge University Press , England, 1997); D. F. Walls, G. J. Milburn, Quantum Optics ( Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1994).
  - [18] H. P. Yuen, Phys. Rev. A **13**, 2226 (1976); D. F. Walls, Nature, **324**, 210 (1981) ; C. M. Caves, Phys. Rev. D **23**, 1693 (1981).
  - [19] C. P. Sun, in Quantum Coherence and Decoherence. ed. by K. Fujikawa and Y. A. Ono, (Amsterdam; Elsevier Science Press, 1996).
  - [20] D. V. Averin, e-print LANL Cond/0202082 VI, 2002;



