Technical challenges and realizations of quantum qubits: the example of superconducting charge qubits

 $\bullet \bullet \bullet$

Author: Arthur Vesperini

University of Siena



The Sycamore processor [F. Arute et al, 2019]

The challenges

- Scalability
- Protected from decoherence (large relaxation time T_1 and dephasing time T_2)
- Protected from noise
- Implementation of single-qubit and two-qubit quantum gates
- Measurement apparatus

 $\hat{H}=Q^2/2C+\Phi^2/2L$



 $\hat{H}=Q^2/2C+\Phi^2/2L$





[D.Bernal et al. , 2020]

Superconducting qubits: the Cooper Pair Box (CPB) $\hat{H}=E_C(\hat{n}-n_q)^2-E_J\cos(\hat{arphi})$



$$\hat{Q}=(2e)^2(\hat{n}-n_g)^2$$





Superconducting qubits: the Cooper Pair Box (CPB)

$$\hat{H} = -E_J \sum_n \left(|n+1\rangle \langle n| + |n\rangle \langle n+1| \right)$$

 $+E_C \sum_n (n-n_g)^2 |n\rangle \langle n|$
 $E_C = (2e)^2/2C_\Sigma$
 $n_g = C_g V_g/2e$

Superconducting qubits: the Cooper Pair Box (CPB)
$$\hat{H}=-E_J\sum_n\left(|n+1
angle\langle n|+|n
angle\langle n+1|
ight)+E_C\sum_n(n-n_g)^2|n
angle\langle n|$$

To obtain a qubit: tuning of E_c and n_g to maximize anharmonicity $\alpha = \Delta E_{12} - \Delta E_{01}$



[J.Koch et al. , 2007]

 $egin{aligned} E_J &\sim constant\ E_C &= (2e)^2/2C_\Sigma\ n_g &= C_g V_g/2e \end{aligned}$

$$egin{aligned} \hat{H} &= -E_J \left(|1
angle \langle 0| + |0
angle \langle 1|
ight) \ &+ E_C \left(n_g^2 |0
angle \langle 0| - (1-n_g)^2 |1
angle \langle 1|
ight) \end{aligned}$$

$\hat{H} = K(n_g)\mathbb{I} - E_c(n_g-1/2)\sigma_z + E_J\sigma_x/2$

$$\hat{H} = K(n_g)\mathbb{I} - E_c(n_g-1/2)\sigma_z + E_J\sigma_x/2$$

n_g can be used as a control to change the nature of H, henceforth implementing single-qubit quantum gates:

$$\hat{H} = K(n_g)\mathbb{I} - E_c(n_g-1/2)\sigma_z + E_J\sigma_x/2$$

n_g can be used as a control to change the nature of H, henceforth implementing single-qubit quantum gates:

- adiabatic change (e.g. from $n_g=0$ to $n_g=\frac{1}{2}$ to obtain |+>)

$$\hat{H} = K(n_g)\mathbb{I} - E_c(n_g-1/2)\sigma_z + E_J\sigma_x/2$$

n_g can be used as a control to change the nature of H, henceforth implementing single-qubit quantum gates:

- adiabatic change (e.g. from $n_g=0$ to $n_g=\frac{1}{2}$ to obtain |+>)
- fast change of n_g leads to Rabi-like dynamics; then we control the onset time t to obtain the desired state.

Problem: sensitivity to charge noise, affecting the value of n_g , inducing small dephasing time T_2 .



In the transmon regime, E_{I}/E_{j} is tuned so that E(n dispersion becomes negligible, and some hanarmonicity is preserved. n_g becomes irrelevant.

[J.Koch et al. , 2007]



In practice, E_C is tuned by increasing total capacitance.

[T. Roth et al. , 2021]



[T. Roth et al. , 2021]

In practice, E_C is tuned by increasing total capacitance.

New problem is the weak anharmonicity: risks of leakage. Pulse shaping allows fast transitions with fine frequency control.

The transmon qubits can be coupled (entangled), through a resonator, which is expressed by a Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_r + \sum_{j=1,2} \hat{H}_j + \sum_{j=1,2} g(a^{\dagger}\sigma_j^- + a\sigma_j^+)$$

The transmon coupled to a circuit resonator can be expressed, after some manipulations, by a (approximated) Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian:

$$egin{aligned} \hat{H} &= (\omega_r - \chi |1
angle \langle 1| + \chi |0
angle \langle 0|) a^\dagger a \ &+ (\omega_1 + \chi) \sigma_z \end{aligned}$$

The transmon coupled to a circuit resonator can be expressed, after some manipulations, by a (approximated) Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian:

$$egin{aligned} \hat{H} &= (\omega_r - \chi |1
angle \langle 1| + \chi |0
angle \langle 0|) a^\dagger a \ &+ (\omega_1 + \chi) \sigma_z \end{aligned}$$

The resonator frequency depends on the transmon state; it is then measured by microwave spectroscopy.

Superconducting qubits: advantages

- Easy to embed into a larger circuit
- 1D junctions effectively smaller than 3D cavity
- Easy control transition frequencies: protection from thermal noise
- Macroscopic quantum state with high coupling strength
- Straightforward measurement

- Arute, Frank, Kunal Arya, Ryan Babbush, Dave Bacon, Joseph C. Bardin, Rami Barends, Rupak Biswas, et al. 'Quantum Supremacy Using a Programmable Superconducting Processor'. *Nature* 574, no. 7779 (24 October 2019): 505–10. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-1666-5</u>.
- Bernal, David E., Sridhar Tayur, and Davide Venturelli. 'Quantum Integer Programming (QuIP) 47-779: Lecture Notes'. arXiv, 11 January 2021. <u>http://arxiv.org/abs/2012.11382</u>.
- Hanneke, D., J. P. Home, J. D. Jost, J. M. Amini, D. Leibfried, and D. J. Wineland. 'Realization of a Programmable Two-Qubit Quantum Processor'. *Nature Physics* 6, no. 1 (January 2010): 13–16. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/nphys1453</u>.
- Koch, Jens, Terri M. Yu, Jay Gambetta, A. A. Houck, D. I. Schuster, J. Majer, Alexandre Blais, M. H. Devoret, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf. 'Charge-Insensitive Qubit Design Derived from the Cooper Pair Box'. *Physical Review A* 76, no. 4 (12 October 2007): 042319. <u>https://doi.org/10.1103</u> /PhysRevA.76.042319.
- Langford, Nathan K. 'Circuit QED Lecture Notes'. arXiv, 7 October 2013. <u>http://arxiv.org</u> /abs/1310.1897.
- Nakamura, Y., Yu. A. Pashkin, and J. S. Tsai. 'Coherent Control of Macroscopic Quantum States in a Single-Cooper-Pair Box'. *Nature* 398, no. 6730 (April 1999): 786–88. <u>https://doi.org/10.1038/19718</u>.
 Roth, Thomas E., Ruichao Ma, and Weng C. Chew. 'An Introduction to the Transmon Qubit for Electromagnetic Engineers'. arXiv, 21 June 2021. <u>http://arxiv.org/abs/2106.11352</u>.

Thank you.