Quantum simulation with superconducting qubits

Hans Mooij Kavli Institute of Nanoscience Delft University of Technology



KITP Santa Barbara - Workshop on Quantum Information Science November 4, 2009

- 1. introduction superconducting qubits
- 2. flux qubits
- 3. quantum simulation with quantum vortices and flux qubits

superconducting order parameter $\Psi = |\Psi| e^{i\varphi}$

$$\Phi_{o} = \frac{h}{2e} \qquad V = \frac{\Phi_{o}}{2\pi} \frac{\partial \varphi}{\partial t} \qquad \text{loop} \quad \sum_{i} \varphi_{i} = 2\pi \frac{\Phi}{\Phi_{o}} + 2\pi n$$

U

Josephson junction



$$E_J = \frac{\Phi_o}{2\pi} I_o$$
$$E_C \equiv \frac{4e^2}{2C}$$

$$U = E_C \left(\frac{Q}{2e}\right)^2 + E_J (1 - \cos\varphi)$$
$$I = \frac{dQ}{dt} + I_o \sin\varphi$$

circuit with Josephson junctions

 $\phi_1..\phi_n$ phase differences+constraints

 $U(\phi_i...\phi_n)$: potential energy

 $C_i(d\phi_i/dt)^2$ terms: kinetic energy

set of conjugate variables: Lagrangian, Hamiltonian quantization

set of islands with discrete numbers of Cooper pairs junctions provide off-diagonal coupling of charge states



quantum Cooper pair box: charge qubit

$$H = E_C (n - n_g)^2 - E_J \cos \varphi$$
$$\left[\hat{n}, \hat{\varphi}\right] = i$$
$$\hat{H} = E_C (\hat{n} - n_g)^2 - E_J \cos \hat{\varphi}$$

(classical Hamiltonian)



$$\begin{split} & \mathsf{E}_{\mathrm{C}}/\mathsf{E}_{\mathrm{J}} \!>\! >\! 1 \\ & \text{around } \mathsf{n}_{\mathrm{g}} \!=\! 0.5 \\ & \hat{H} \!=\! -\{E_{J}\sigma_{x} \!+\! E_{C}(n_{g} \!-\! 0.5)\sigma_{z}\}/2 \\ & \text{other levels extremely high} \end{split}$$

flux qubit $E_{J} >> E_{C}$



Phase Qubit

plasma oscillation of a current-biased single Josephson junction



Martinis group Santa Barbara





Synthesizing arbitrary quantum states in a superconducting resonator

Nature 459, 546 (2009)

Max Hofheinz¹, H. Wang¹, M. Ansmann¹, Radoslaw C. Bialczak¹, Erik Lucero¹, M. Neeley¹, A. D. O'Connell¹, D. Sank¹, J. Wenner¹, John M. Martinis¹ & A. N. Cleland¹



Violation of Bell's inequality in Josephson phase qubits

Nature **461**, 504 (2009)

Markus Ansmann¹, H. Wang¹, Radoslaw C. Bialczak¹, Max Hofheinz¹, Erik Lucero¹, M. Neeley¹, A. D. O'Connell¹, D. Sank¹, M. Weides¹, J. Wenner¹, A. N. Cleland¹ & John M. Martinis¹

Yale group: Schoelkopf, Girvin

transmon: Cooper pair box with strongly reduced E_C coupled to high Q harmonic oscillator



external capacitive shunt $E_{Jmax}/h= 18 \text{ GHz}$ $E_{Ceff}/h= 1.4 \text{ Ghz}$ $v_{pl} \sim 6 \text{ GHz}$



increasing E_1 leads to

- gradually decreasing anharmonicity

- exponentially decreasing dependence of δE on n_g

Koch et al. PRA 76, 042319 (2007), Schreier et al., PRB 77, 180502 (2008)

circuit quantum electrodynamics





Demonstration of two-qubit algorithms with a superconducting quantum processor

L. DiCarlo¹, J. M. Chow¹, J. M. Gambetta², Lev S. Bishop¹, B. R. Johnson¹, D. I. Schuster¹, J. Majer³, A. Blais⁴, L. Frunzio¹, S. M. Girvin¹ & R. J. Schoelkopf¹

Nature 460, 240 (2009)

sources of decoherence

driving circuits: gate, bias flux, microwave lines, measurement engineering design, calculation possible

microscopic defects 1/f noise due to many fluctuators

parasitic two-level systems with same energy splitting *smaller qubits, fewer defects*

dephasing times > 1 µs reached in most qubit types at optimal conditions

level separation 3-15 GHz, operation time 5-50 ns



Mooij et al. Science **285**, 1036 (1999), Orlando et al. PRB (1999) Van der Wal et al. Science **290** 1140 (2000)













F.G. Paauw et al. PRL **102**, 090501 (2009)

$$H = \frac{1}{2} (\varepsilon \sigma_z + \Delta \sigma_x)$$
$$\varepsilon = (\Phi / \Phi_o - 0.5) 2 \Phi_o I_p$$



controlled-NOT gate



Plantenberg et al. Nature 447,836 (2007)









A. Lupascu et al. Nature Physics 3, 119 (2007)



oscillator state $h \Leftrightarrow$ qubit ground state oscillator state $l \Leftrightarrow$ qubit excited state

Pieter de Groot - 2-qubit sample with bifurcative readout



cross-talk between readout systems < 0.1 %



tunable- α qubit coupled to low Q oscillator

Arkady Federov



vacuum Rabi oscillation around symmetry point

quantum vortices in 2D or quasi-1D array of Josephson junctions





vortex in 2D Josephson junction array: particle moving in 2D potential E_J mass determined by junction capacitance 1/E_c



PRL 77, 4257 (1996)

arXiv:cond-mat/0108266 (2001)

Quantum spin chains and Majorana states in arrays of coupled qubits

L. S. Levitov¹, T. P. Orlando², J. B. Majer³, J. E. Mooij³

(1) Physics Department and Center for Materials Science & Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Ave, Cambridge, MA 02139

(2) Electrical Engineering Department, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 77 Massachusetts Ave, Cambridge, MA 02139
 (3) Applied Physics and DIMES, Delft Technical University, P.O.Box 5046, 2600 GA Delft, the Netherlands



FIG. 2. 1D array of qubits coupled by shared Josephson junctions: a realization of the $\sigma_1^z \sigma_2^z$ interaction.



$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i=-\infty}^{\infty} t(\sigma_i^+ \sigma_{i+1}^- + \sigma_i^- \sigma_{i+1}^+) - (\Delta \sigma_i^x + h \sigma_i^z)$$



Quantum state transfer in arrays of flux qubits

A Lyakhov and C Bruder New J of Phys 7, 181 (2005)

chain of flux qubits: excitation at one end, readout at the other end







Floor Paauw, Delft

1D coupled chains of flux qubits





trapped vortex in junction array



2 degenerate states



4 degenerate states





6 charge variables

 $E_{C} >> E_{J}$



17 junctions (12-1) loop equations 6 phase variables $E_J >> E_C$

if vertical symmetry is assumed:
3 variables

trapped fluxoid: two positions central junction q times larger







1.5

10

1.0

0.5

0.0

0





quantum calculation (Jos Thijssen et al.)



q=1.3, m=5, symmetric case (3 degrees of freedom)

 $\uparrow \\ energy \quad current \ tilt \rightarrow$

square array with one trapped fluxoid



9 degrees of freedom



4 equivalent fluxoid positions



barrier as a function of central junction strength



barriers center junctions q times larger than other junctions





tilt induced by current

quantum calculation Jos Thijssen, 9 degrees of freedom

Quantum interference of vortices around charge, Aharonov-Casher

W.J. Elion, J.J. Wachters, L.L. Sohn, J.E. Mooij, PRL **71**, 2311 (1993)













 $I_x = 0, I_y = 0$

- \rightarrow .32 .95 .27 .57 .27 57 .99 .33 ≯ .38 .16 **X**.76 1.29 .95 .11 .63 1.30 .60 ~ .30 .33 .41 .60 .32 .76 ~ .46 .59 .38 .30 .16 27 38 .79 .79 .27 .11 .41







classical nearest neighbor interaction



+	+8.9	-1.0
	+2.1	-4.9

+	-1.0	+5.6
	-4.9	+3.2

1D chain

+		+		+		+		+
	+		+		+		+	

2D array

+		+		+
	+		+	
+		+		+
	+		+	
+		+		+
+	+	+	+	+
+ + +	+	+ +	+	+ +

1D chain







Berry phase

H(p1,p2)

make closed loop through parameter space

wave function picks up geometric phase and dynamical phase

retrace loop backwards to eliminate dynamical phase, but do something smart to double geometric phase

e-change on island charge?