Quantum Time-evolution in Qubit Readout Process with a Josephson Bifurcation Amplier

Hayato Nakano, Shiro Saito, and Kouichi Semba NTT Basic Research Laboratories, NTT Corporation Atsugi-shi, Kanagawa 243-0198, Japan

H ideaki Takayanagi International Center for Materials Nanoarchitectonics, NIMS Tsukuba, Ibaraki 305-0003, Japan (Dated: February 20, 2024)

We analyzed the Josephson bifurcation am plier (JBA) readout process of a superconducting qubit quantum mechanically. This was achieved by employing numerical analyses of the dynamics of the density operator of a driven nonlinear oscillator and a qubit coupled system during the measurement process. In purely quantum cases, the wavefunction of the JBA is trapped in a quasienergy-state, and bifurcation is impossible. Introducing decoherence enables us to reproduce the bifurcation with a nite hysteresis. Moreover, we discuss in detail the dynamics involved when a qubit is initially in a superposition state. We have observed the qubit-probe (JBA) entangled state and it is divided into two separable states at the moment of the JBA transition begins. This corresponds to \projection". To readout the measurement result, however, we must wait until the two JBA states are macroscopically well separated. The waiting time is determined by the strength of the decoherence in the JBA.

PACS num bers: 85.25.Cp, 05.45.-a, 85.25.Am, 03.65.Yz, 42.50 Lc,

The readout of superconducting qubit states with the Josephson bifurcation ampli er (JBA) technique provides non-destructive and high visibility readout. Therefore, now it is widely and successfully used in actual experiments [1]. Mathematically, a JBA is described as a driven Du ng oscillator [2]. It enhances a smalldi erence in operation conditions by utilizing the bifurcation phenom enon. Under an appropriate driving force, a classical nonlinear oscillator becom es bistable [2]. O ne stable state has a sm all am plitude (low -am plitude state), and the other has a larger am plitude (high-am plitude state). The critical driving force f_c or the critical detuning c for the transition between these two states is very sensitive to sm all changes in the operational param eters of the oscillator. For example, when we increase or decrease the driving force continuously, the amplitude of the oscillation behaves hysteretically as shown in Fig. 1. W hen using a JBA as a qubit state readout probe, the JBA detects a sm all change depending on the qubit state. How ever, the quantum -m echanical behavior of the JBA readout process has not been established theoretically. This is because the bifurcation phenom enon can be discussed only for classical oscillators, and is in possible from the view point of pure quantum mechanics for an isolated system [3]. A classical analysis gives no information on entanglem ent between the qubit and the probe (JBA) or the decoherence in the composite system, although all the quantum properties (projection, measurement backaction, etc.) in the readout are contained in such infor-



FIG. 1: Hysteretic behavior of the oscillation amplitude a(t) of a JBA as a function of the driving amplitude f(t) (schematic).

mation. A quantum mechanical analysis is indispensable if we are to understand the readout process.

In this letter, we analyze the quantum -m echanical time evolution of a JBA, and clarify how a bifurcation appears in an actual situation. Moreover, we investigate what happens during the process of the qubit state readout with a JBA by analyzing dynam ics of the qubit-JBA com posite system.

In a highly quantum -m echanical JBA case, tunneling between classically stable states destroys the criticality in a classical oscillator. This type of phenom enon has been precisely discussed in [3] and in references therein. that the charging energy of the JBA ($2e^2=C$, where C is the e ective capacitance in the JBA circuit) is comparable to the energy barrier (the nonlinearity introduced below) between two stable states, and decoherecne is negligibly sm all. Howevr, actual JBA measurements are made with more classical conditions. Rigo et al. [4] investigated such an oscillator with a sem i-classical trajectory analysis. In order to obtain quantum information more directly, here, we analyze the time evolution of a JBA

E lectronic address: nakano@ willbrl.ntt.co.jp

and a qubit during the readout process.

A JBA can be modeled as an anhorm onic oscillator in a rotating fram e approximation with a Hamiltonian;

$$H_J = (!)n_a + n_a^2 \frac{1}{2}f(a^y + a)$$
 (1)

where, $a^y(a)$ is the creation (annihilation) operator of the Josephson plasm a oscillation. $n_a = a^y a$, and is the linear resonant frequency of the JBA oscillator. ! is the driving frequency, which is slightly smaller than by the detuning !. f is the driving strength, and (> 0) is the nonlinearity. In a classical approxim ation, this model shows the bifurcation in an appropriate parameter region. How ever, for a quantum -m echanical junction with $[a;a^y] = 1$, the transition from $[G i_J (low$ $am plitude state) to <math>[E i_J (high-am plitude state) or, from$ $<math>[E i_J to [G i_J is im possible.$

The quasienergy-states (eigenstates of the H am iltonian Eq. (1) in the rotating approximation) are easily calculated and it is found that eigenstates never cross when the driving strength f is changed adiabatically. This means that if the JBA is initially in the ground state without driving, it never moves to the high-am plitude resonant state even if we increase the driving eld because the JBA state only moves along the initial quasienergy-state and never jumps to the quasienergy-state which the high-am plitude resonant state belongs.

Therefore, we expect that when a transition between quasienergy-states is caused by perturbation from outside the system the bifurcation phenomenon is reproduced. This is the case when decoherence is introduced into the present m odel. Here, we only take into account of the decoherence caused by a bath coupled to the JBA because decoherence that directly attacks the qubit is not limited to the readout process. Even for this m odel, indirect decoherence via the JBA occurs in the qubit.

For example, we introduce linear loss in the oscillator (JBA). The time evolution of the system (qubit-JBA) is governed by a Liouville equation:

$$\frac{d}{dt} = \frac{1}{i} [;H] + \frac{1}{2} (2a a^{y} a^{y} a a^{y} a); \quad (2)$$

where is the density operator of the system, and is the relaxation rate due to the linear loss in the JBA. The Q-value is given by = .

First, we show a numerical example of JBA dynamics without a qubit in Figs. 2 and 3. Here, the parameters used are = 0.007, = 8 10⁵, Q = 2500, and f is operated as 0! 0.025 ! 0. These parameters are similar to those used in actual experiments [1]. However, and are a factor of 10^2 times smaller than real cases in order to emphasize quantum ness and discuss the in u-ences of decoherence. Even if we use di erent parameters we obtain qualitatively same behaviors for a JBA with similar = ratio value.

Figure 3(a) approximately corresponds to the square of the JBA amplitude shown in Fig. 1. So, we can see



FIG. 2: (Color online) The trajectory of the quantum expectation value $(h\frac{a^{\gamma}+a}{2}i;h\frac{a^{\gamma}}{2i}i)$ of the oscillator (com plex) am plitude when the driving force f is operated as shown in Fig. 1. The starting point is \mathcal{F} i_J without driving, and the right convergence point is \mathcal{F} i_J.



FIG.3: (Color online) T in e variations of som e quantum expectation values when the driving force f is operated as show n in Fig. 1. (a) N um ber of bosons excited in JBA. (b) Purity of the JBA. (c) Fluctuation in JBA amplitude.

that our calculation with decoherence reproduces the bifurcation phenomenon well. We nd that the critical driving f_c is approximately 0.011. Once the driving exceeds this f_c , the behaviors of the JBA is the same not depending on the maximum (f = 0.025 for Fig. 3) driving strength. Moreover, our calculation provides a bt of quantum -mechanical information about the JBA transition. Figure 3 (b) show sthetime variation of the purity of the JBA state. Increasing the driving force f, we found that the purity decreases abruptly (t = _a). This corresponds to the beginning of the transition from $\int G i_J$ to $\not E i_J$ of the JBA. This is a manifestation of the fact that the transition needs an intense emission/absorption of energy to/from an external energy bath. This energy transfer is incoherent. A fler the rapid decrease, the purity recovers to some extent and the JBA approaches to the classically stable state $\not E i_J$ (t = $_b$). Since $\not E i_J$ is a meta-stable state (stationary point of the classical H am iltonian), dragging JBA into the state by decoherence (linear loss) leads to the recovery of the purity. How – ever, the purity does not reach unity because it is not a true ground state. The uctuation in the JBA amplitude is plotted in Fig. 3 (c). We can see a divergence of the

uctuation at the moment of the rapid decrease in the purity (t = $_{\rm b}$). This suggests that this JBA transition between JG i_J and JE i_J is one of a phase transitions in bosonic system s with many degrees of freedom.

Now we discuss the criterion of decoherence that determ ines whether a bifurcation is observed or not. From the above analyses we know that there is no critical value. W hen the decoherence is very small (<), the speed of the transfer from $\int G i_J$ to $f \pm i_J$ becomes exponentially slower as (schem atically) exp[=], where is a numerical factor of the order of unity.

Inform ation about the qubit state is transferred to the probe (JBA) through the form ation of an entanglem ent between the qubit and the probe. W hat we actually observe is the m acroscopic state of the JBA, and m erely postulate the qubit state. Therefore, the processby which the entanglem ent is form ed and split into separable states due to decoherence (\projection") is very in portant for understanding the readout process [5].

The qubit-JBA composite system is approximately expressed by the Hamiltonian

$$H = H_J + k_z n_a + H_q; \quad H_q = \frac{1}{2} ("_z + ..., x)$$
 (3)

where H_q is the Pauli operator representation of the qubit. k is the interaction constant between the qubit and the JBA. The qubit state $(_z)$ slightly changes the e ective detuning $+ k_z$, resulting in a change in the critical value f_c . By detecting the change in f_c , we can distinguish the qubit state, i.e., whether $_z$ is 1 or -1. For a ux qubit, the eigenstates of $_z$ are the two ux states. is the bias provided by an external applied magnetic eld, and corresponds to the tunneling energy between

two ux states. For the qubit-JBA coupled system, we carried out cal-

culations sim ilar to those w ithout a qubit shown above. The qubit readout process is well understood by em ploying know ledge of the quantum behavior in the time evolution of the JBA w ithout a qubit that we have already discussed.

We show a numerical example of the dynamics during the qubit readout process in Fig. 4. JBA parameters are the same as for the above example. The initial state is a separable state; $(\frac{p_1}{2}j_{2}i_{q} + \frac{p_1}{2}j_{2}i_{q})$ jG i_J, that is, the qubit is in a superposition. Here, $j_{2}i_{q}$ and $j_{2}i_{q}$ are the ground and excited states of the qubit, respectively. Qubit parameters are = 0.2 , = = 1=2. The coupling between the qubit and the JBA is set at k = 0.001 . The driving force f is increased from 0 to 0.012 (slightly larger than $f_{\rm c}$ of the JBA) and maintained. This parameter set gives a typical behavior of successful qubit readout.

The Q-representations of the JBA state $Tr_q[]$ are shown in Fig. 4, where is the density operator of the qubit-JBA coupled system, and $Tr_q[$] denotes taking partial trace about qubit degrees of freedom. In the readout we can distinguish two peaks appearing in Fig. 4 (d), which is the nal stage of the readout. These peaks constitute an incoherent m ixture, so they correspond to two possibilities in the measurem ent result.

To discuss the entanglem ent between the JBA and the qubit, we adopt E $\operatorname{Tr}^2 \operatorname{Tr} (\operatorname{Tr}_q[])^2$, as a meah is sure of the entanglem ent. The reduction in Tr $(\operatorname{Tr}_q[])^2$ is the purity decrease in the reduced density operator of the JBA, that contains the decrease due to both decoherence and the entanglem ent form ation. The reduction in Tr 2 of the total system corresponds to the decrease due to decoherence. Therefore, E de ned above shows the strength of entanglem ent.

The time variation of the entanglement measure E is shown in Fig. 5. This process can be schematically expressed as

$$\begin{array}{ll} (0) = jG \, i_{JJ} hG \, j & \left(\frac{1}{p_2} jg i_q + \frac{1}{p_2} je i_q \right) \left(\frac{1}{p_2} hg j + \frac{1}{p_2} he j \right) \\ ! & (1) = \frac{1}{2} (jG \, i_J je i_q + jG^0 i_J jg i_q) (JhG \, j_l he j + JhG^0 j_l hg j) \\ ! & (2) = \frac{1}{2} jG \, i_J je i_{qJ} hG \, j_l he j + \frac{1}{2} jG^0 i_J jg i_{qJ} hG^0 j_l hg j \\ ! & (3) = \frac{1}{2} jG \, i_J je i_{qJ} hG \, j_l he j + \frac{1}{2} jE \, i_J jg i_{qJ} hE \, j_l hg j; \end{array}$$

Entanglement formation and \projection" correspond to the second (t = 1) and third (t = 2) lines of Eq. (4), respectively. At this moment (2), however, it is in – possible to obtain any information about the qubit from the observed probe (JBA) state because $jG^{0}i$ closely resembles jGi in a classical mechanical sense (Fig. 4(b)) although quantum mechanically $_{J}HG^{0}jGi_{J}$ 0, namely, these two states are orthogonal. When we increase the driving force, one JBA state $jG^{0}i_{J}$ m oves to jEi_{J} . In contrast, the other jGi_{J} does not move signi cantly. (see, Figs. 4(c),(d)) Then (3), we can easily distinguish jEi_{J} or jGi_{J} . This leads to a good postulation of the qubit state jgi_{q} or jei_{q} , which brings us to the end of the readout.

The measure E is su ciently quantitative for us to discuss the time variation of the entanglement but it does not show the absolute strength of the entanglement. To estimate the absolute strength we can calculate the entanglement of formation for every eigenstate consisting the total system density operator (t). For example, the time variation of the value of the most dominant eigenstate is quantitatively proportional to the behavior of E. How ever, it almost becomes unity when it reaches its maximum. The values for less dominant states also



FIG. 4: (C olor online) T in e-evolution of JBA during readout. The gures show Q-representations of the JBA oscillator states $Tr_q[]$ (in the rotating fram e). (a) Beginning of the readout. The state of the total system is (schem atically) $= j_0 ih_0 j$ with $j_0 i = 1 = 2 (j j i_q + j e i_q)$ (G i_J . (b) Starting the transition. Entanglement formation and projection are carried out during this period. (c) D uring the transition. Entanglement has already been destroyed. (d) The entire system has become a mixture of classically correlated states.

alm ost reaches unity. This means that the correlation between the qubit and JBA state becomes alm ost perfect via the interaction between them. As a result an ideal JBA readout exhibits 100% visibility if the qubit relaxation discussed below is negligible.



FIG. 5: (Color on line) T in e variation of the entanglement between the JBA and the qubit. $_{i}$ (i = 1;2;3) corresponds to those in Eq. 4, that is , $_{1}$: entanglement formation, $_{2}$: projection, $_{3}$: end of the readout.

The backaction on the qubit caused by the measurement is induced as a result of the non-commutation relation between the qubit Ham iltonian and the interaction Hamiltonian. W hen the qubit gap is much sm aller than other energies, the interaction commutes H_a. Therefore, the JBA readout causes only pure dephasing on the qubit. This does not pollute the m easurem ent result because the measurement itself requires the projection onto the $_z$ basis. This is simply the condition of the \non-dem olition m easurem ent". However, when is not negligible compared with , the measurement simultaneously causes qubit relaxation. The non-commuting part induces coherent transition between jgiq and jeiq in the qubit. This coherent transition itself is not hurm ful, but when such a transition is accompanied by decoherence (linear loss), stochastic energy relaxation in the qubit accumulate and a nite error remains. In fact, in the num erical example shown above, the average h $_{z}i$ of the qubit deviates slightly (0.1%) from the initial value 0 because of qubit relaxation. Stronger decoherence causes larger deform ation in the readout result although it is often much smaller than the deform ation caused by other factors not discussed here, such as qubit relaxation as a reslut of decoherence directly attacking the qubit, even if we use 10^2 times strong decoherence of JBA as in actual experim ents.

As described above, the state of the total system is already divided into separable states $j \epsilon_i q_j \beta i_J$ and $j p i_q \beta 0 i_J$ just after the transition $j \beta 0 i_J$! $j \epsilon_J$ starts. Therefore, \projection" itself is successful even if the transition takes much longer in the absence of su ciently strong decoherence (here, linear loss). How ever, we cannot distinguish $j \epsilon_J$ and $j \epsilon_J$ until the transition nishes. Then, the readout fails unless we can wait and maintain the JBA state until the transition is complete.

In summary, we analyzed the quantum dynamics of the density operator of a system composed of a qubit and a JBA as the probe of the qubit state readout. From the analysis results, we have succeeded in extracting the essential feature of the JBA readout process of a superconducting qubit.

We thank M. Devoret and H. Mabuchi for fruitful discussions. This work received support from KAK-ENHI(18001002, 18201018).

- [1] I. Siddiqi et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, .207002 (2004); I.
 Siddiqi et al, ibid. 94, 027005 (2005), A. Lupascu et al,
 ibid. 96, 127003 (2006); I. Siddiqi et al, Phys. Rev. B 73,
 054510 (2006); A. Lupascu et al, Nature Physics 3, 119
 (2007); N. Boulant et al, Phys. Rev. B 76, 014525 (2007).
- [2] W .Jordan and P.Sm ith, Nonlinear Ordinary Dierential Equations', third ed. (Oxford Univ. Press, 1999).
- [3] M .I.D ykm an and M .V .Fistul, Phys.Rev.B 71, 140508

(R) (2005); M. I. Dykman, Phys. Rev. E 75, 011101 (2007); V. Peano and M. Thorwart, Chem. Phys. 322, 135 (2006); V. Peano and M. Thorwart, New J. Phys. 8, 21 (2006).

- [4] M.Rigo et al, Phys. Rev. A 55, 1665 (1997).
- [5] Y. M akhlin, A. Shnim an and G. Schon, Rev. M od. Phys., 73, 357 (2001).