

Holonomic quantum control with continuous variable systems

Victor V. Albert,¹ Chi Shu,^{1,2} Stefan Krastanov,¹ Chao Shen,¹ Ren-Bao Liu,³ Zhen-Biao Yang,^{1,4} Robert J. Schoelkopf,¹ Mazyar Mirrahimi,^{1,5} Michel H. Devoret,¹ and Liang Jiang¹

¹*Departments of Applied Physics and Physics, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, USA*

²*Department of Physics, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong, China*

³*Department of Physics & Centre for Quantum Coherence, The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China*

⁴*Department of Physics, Fuzhou University, Fuzhou, China*

⁵*INRIA Paris-Rocquencourt, Domaine de Voluceau, Le Chesnay Cedex, France*

(Dated: September 8, 2018)

Universal computation of a quantum system consisting of superpositions of well-separated coherent states of multiple harmonic oscillators can be achieved by three families of adiabatic holonomic gates. The first gate consists of moving a coherent state around a closed path in phase space, resulting in a relative Berry phase between that state and the other states. The second gate consists of “colliding” two coherent states of the same oscillator, resulting in coherent population transfer between them. The third gate is an effective controlled-phase gate on coherent states of two different oscillators. Such gates should be realizable via reservoir engineering of systems which support tunable nonlinearities, such as trapped ions and circuit QED.

PACS numbers: 03.65.Yz, 03.65.Vf, 42.50.Dv

Keywords: Lindblad master equation, decoherence free subspace, holonomy, reservoir engineering

Reservoir engineering schemes continue to reveal promising new directions in the search for potentially robust and readily realizable quantum memory platforms. Such schemes are often described by *Lindbladians* [1] possessing *decoherence-free subspaces* (DFSs) [2] or (more generally) *noiseless subsystems* (NSs) [3] – multidimensional spaces immune to the nonunitary effects of the Lindbladian and, potentially, to other error channels [4, 5]. On the other hand, *holonomic quantum computation* (HQC) [6] is a promising framework for achieving noise-resistant quantum computation [7]. In HQC, states undergo adiabatic closed-loop parallel transport in parameter space, acquiring Berry phases or matrices (also called non-Abelian holonomies or Wilson loops [8]) which can be combined to achieve universal computation.

It is natural to consider combining the above two concepts. After the initial proposals [9, 10], the idea of HQC on a DFS gained traction in Refs. [11, 51] and numerous investigations into HQC on DFSs [12] and NSs [13–15] followed. However, previous proposals perform HQC on DFS states constructed out of a finite-dimensional basis of atomic or *spin* states. There has been little investigation [16] of HQC on DFSs consisting of nontrivial oscillator states (e.g. coherent states [17, 18]). While this is likely due to a historically higher degree of control of spin systems, recent experimental progress in control of microwave cavities [19–21], trapped ions [22], and Rydberg atoms [23] suggests that oscillator-type systems are also within reach. In this Letter, we propose an oscillator HQC-on-DFS scheme using cat-codes.

Cat-codes are quantum memories for coherent-state quantum information processing [24] storing information in superpositions of well-separated coherent states which are evenly distributed around the origin of phase space. Cat-code quantum information can be protected from cavity dephasing via passive quantum error correction [25] using Lindbladian-




Figure 1. In the $d = 2$ cat-code, quantum information is encoded in the coherent states $|\alpha_0(0)\rangle \equiv |\alpha\rangle$ and $|\alpha_1(0)\rangle \equiv |-\alpha\rangle$. **(a)** Wigner function sketch of the state before (top) and after (bottom) a loop gate acting on $|\alpha\rangle$, depicting the path of $|\alpha\rangle$ during the gate (blue) and a shift in the fringes between $|\pm\alpha\rangle$. **(b)** Phase space diagram for the loop gate; $X = \frac{1}{2}(\hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger)$ and $P = -\frac{i}{2}(\hat{a} - \hat{a}^\dagger)$. The parameter $\alpha_1(t)$ is varied along a closed path (blue) of area A , after which the state $|\alpha\rangle$ gains a phase $\theta = 2A$ relative to $|\alpha\rangle$. **(c)** Effective Bloch sphere of the $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ qubit depicting the rotation caused by the $d = 2$ loop gate. Black arrow depicts initial state while red arrow is the state after application of the gate. The dotted blue arrow does not represent the path traveled since the states leave the logical space $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ during the gate. **(d-f)** Analogous descriptions of the collision gate, which consists of reducing α to 0, driving back to $\alpha \exp(i\phi)$, and rotating back to α .

based reservoir engineering [5]. In addition, such information

can be actively protected from photon loss events [5, 26–28]. While there exist plenty of methods to create and manipulate the necessary states [5, 26, 29–31] and while the gates can also be implemented using Hamiltonians, we consider reservoir engineering due to its protective features. Cat-codes differ from the well-known Gottesman-Kitaev-Preskill (GKP) encoding scheme [32] in both state structure and protection. GKP codes consist of superpositions of highly squeezed states and focus on protecting against small shifts in oscillator position and momentum. In contrast, cat codes protect against damping and dephasing errors, the dominant loss mechanisms for most cavity systems. While realistic GKP realization schemes remain scarce [33], cat-codes benefit from greater near-term experimental feasibility [21].

For simplicity, let us introduce our framework using a single oscillator (or mode). Consider the Lindbladian

$$\dot{\rho} = F\rho F^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{F^\dagger F, \rho\} \quad \text{with} \quad F = \sqrt{\kappa} \prod_{\nu=0}^{d-1} (\hat{a} - \alpha_\nu), \quad (1)$$

$[\hat{a}, \hat{a}^\dagger] = 1$, $\hat{n} \equiv \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a}$, $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}$, dimensionless $\alpha_\nu \in \mathbb{C}$, and ρ a density matrix. The $d = 1$ case [$F = \sqrt{\kappa}(\hat{a} - \alpha_0)$] reduces to the well-known driven damped harmonic oscillator ([34], Sec. 9.1) whose unique steady state is the coherent state $|\alpha_0\rangle$ (with $\hat{a}|\alpha_0\rangle = \alpha_0|\alpha_0\rangle$). Variants of the $d = 2$ case are manifest in driven 2-photon absorption ([35], Sec. 13.2.2), the degenerate parametric oscillator ([36], Eq. 12.10), and a laser-driven trapped ion ([37], Fig. 2d; see also [38]). A motivation for this work has been the recent realization of the $F = \sqrt{\kappa}(\hat{a}^2 - \alpha_0^2)$ process in circuit QED [20], following an earlier proposal to realize $F = \sqrt{\kappa}(\hat{a}^d - \alpha_0^d)$ with $d = 2, 4$ [5]. For arbitrary d and certain α_ν , a qudit steady state space is spanned by the d well-separated coherent states $|\alpha_\nu\rangle$ that are annihilated by F . The main conclusion of this work is that universal control of this qudit can be done via two simple gate families, *loop gates* and *collision gates*, that rely on adiabatic variation of the parameters $\alpha_\nu(t)$. Universal computation on multiple modes can then be achieved with the help of an entangling two-oscillator *infinity gate*. We first sketch the $d = 2$ case and extend to arbitrary d with $|\alpha_\nu\rangle$ arranged in a circle in phase space. The straightforward generalization to arbitrary arrangements of $|\alpha_\nu\rangle$ is presented in [39]. We then discuss gate errors and integration with cat-code error correction schemes [5, 28], concluding with a discussion of experimental implementation.

Single-qubit gates.—Let $d = 2$ and let α_0, α_1 depend on time in Eq. (1), so the steady-state space holds a qubit worth of information. The positions of the qubit’s two states $|\alpha_\nu(t)\rangle$ in phase space are each controlled by a tunable parameter. We let $\alpha_0(0) = -\alpha_1(0) \equiv \alpha$ (with α real unless stated otherwise). This system’s steady states $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ are the starting point of parameter space evolution for this section and the qubit defined by them (for large enough α) is shown in Fig. 1a.

The loop gate involves an adiabatic variation of $\alpha_1(t)$ through a closed path in phase space (see Fig. 1b). The state $|\alpha_1(t)\rangle$ will follow the path and, as long as the path is well

separated from $|\alpha_0(t)\rangle = |\alpha\rangle$, will pick up a phase $\theta = 2A$, with A being the area enclosed by the path [40]. It should be clear that initializing the qubit in $|\alpha\rangle$ will produce only an irrelevant *overall* phase upon application of the gate (similar to the $d = 1$ case). However, once the qubit is initialized in a superposition of the two coherent states with coefficients c_\pm , the gate will impart a *relative* phase:

$$c_+|\alpha\rangle + c_-|\alpha\rangle \longrightarrow c_+|\alpha\rangle + c_-e^{i\theta}|\alpha\rangle. \quad (2)$$

Hence, if we pick $|\alpha\rangle$ to be the x -axis of the $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ qubit Bloch sphere, this gate can be thought of as a rotation around that axis (depicted blue in Fig. 1c). Similarly, adiabatically traversing a closed and isolated path with the other state parameter $|\alpha_0(t)\rangle$ will induce a phase on $|\alpha\rangle$.

We now introduce the remaining Bloch sphere components of the cat-code qubit. For $\alpha = 0$, the $d = 2$ case retains its qubit steady-state space, which now consists of Fock states $|\mu\rangle$, $\mu = 0, 1$ (since $F = \sqrt{\kappa}\hat{a}^2$ annihilates both). One may have noticed that both states $|\pm\alpha\rangle$ go to $|0\rangle$ in the $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ limit and do not reproduce the $\alpha = 0$ steady state basis. This issue is resolved by introducing the cat state basis [41]

$$|\mu_\alpha\rangle \equiv \frac{e^{-\frac{1}{2}\alpha^2}}{\mathcal{N}_\mu} \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \frac{\alpha^{2n+\mu}}{\sqrt{(2n+\mu)!}} |2n+\mu\rangle \stackrel{\alpha \rightarrow \infty}{\sim} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|\alpha\rangle + (-)^\mu |\alpha\rangle) \quad (3)$$

with normalization $\mathcal{N}_\mu = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}[1 + (-)^\mu \exp(-2\alpha^2)]}$. As $\alpha \rightarrow 0$, $|\mu_\alpha\rangle \sim |\mu\rangle$ while for $\alpha \rightarrow \infty$, the cat states (exponentially) quickly become “macroscopic” superpositions of $|\pm\alpha\rangle$. This problem thus has *only two distinct parameter regimes*: one in which coherent states come together ($\alpha \ll 1$) and one in which they are well-separated ($\alpha \gg 1$, or more practically $\alpha \gtrsim 2$ for $d = 2$). Eq. (3) shows that (for large enough α) cat states and coherent states become conjugate z - and x -bases respectively, forming a qubit. We note that $\mu = 0, 1$ labels the respective ± 1 eigenspace of the parity operator $\exp(i\pi\hat{n})$; this photon parity is preserved during the collision gate.

We utilize the $\alpha \ll 1$ regime to perform rotations around the Bloch sphere z -axis (Fig. 1f), which effectively induce a collision and population transfer between $|\alpha\rangle$ and $|\alpha\rangle$. The procedure hinges on the following observation: applying a bosonic rotation $R_\phi \equiv \exp(i\phi\hat{n})$ to well-separated coherent or cat state superpositions *does not* induce state-dependent phases while applying R_ϕ to Fock state superpositions *does*. Only one tunable parameter $\alpha_0(t) = -\alpha_1(t)$ is necessary here, so $F = \sqrt{\kappa}[\hat{a}^2 - \alpha_0(t)^2]$ with $|\alpha_0(0)\rangle = \alpha$. The collision gate consists of reducing α to 0, driving back to $\alpha \exp(i\phi)$, and rotating back to α (Fig. 1e). The full gate is thus represented by $R_\phi^\dagger S_\phi S_0^\dagger$, with S_ϕ [42] denoting the nonunitary driving from 0 to $\alpha \exp(i\phi)$. Since

$$R_\phi^\dagger S_\phi S_0^\dagger = R_\phi^\dagger (R_\phi S_0 R_\phi^\dagger) S_0^\dagger = S_0 R_\phi^\dagger S_0^\dagger, \quad (4)$$

the collision gate is equivalent to reducing α , applying R_ϕ^\dagger on the steady-state basis $|\mu\rangle$, and driving back to α . The net result is thus a relative phase between the states $|\mu_\alpha\rangle$:

$$c_0|0_\alpha\rangle + c_1|1_\alpha\rangle \longrightarrow c_0|0_\alpha\rangle + c_1e^{-i\phi}|1_\alpha\rangle. \quad (5)$$

In the coherent state basis, this translates to a coherent population transfer between $|\pm\alpha\rangle$.




Figure 2. Sketch of the adiabatic paths of the components (a) $|\delta\alpha\rangle$ and (b) $|\delta^{-1}\alpha\rangle$ during the infinity gate.

Two-qubit gates.—Now let's add a second mode \hat{b} and introduce the entangling infinity gate for the 2-photon case. We now use two jump operators for Eq. (1),

$$F_I = (\hat{a} - \alpha)(\hat{a} + \delta\alpha) \quad \text{and} \quad F_{II} = (\hat{a}\hat{b} - \alpha^2)(\hat{a}\hat{b} + \delta\alpha^2). \quad (6)$$

We keep $\alpha > 0$ constant and vary $\delta(t)$ in a figure-eight or “ ∞ ” pattern (Fig. 2), starting and ending with $\delta = 1$. For $\delta = 1$, the four DFS basis elements $\{|\pm\alpha\rangle\} \otimes \{|\pm\alpha\rangle\}$ are annihilated by both F_I and F_{II} . For $\delta \neq 1$ and for sufficiently large α , the basis elements become $|\alpha, \alpha\rangle$, $|\alpha, -\delta\alpha\rangle$, $|\delta\alpha, \alpha\rangle$, and $|\delta\alpha, -\delta^{-1}\alpha\rangle$. Notice that the δ^{-1} makes sure that $F_{II}|\delta\alpha, -\delta^{-1}\alpha\rangle = 0$. This δ^{-1} allows the fourth state to gain a Berry phase distinct from the other three states. Since Berry phases of different modes add, we analyze the \hat{a}/\hat{b} -mode contributions individually. For any state which contains the $|\delta\alpha\rangle$ component (in either mode), the Berry phase gained for each of the two circles is proportional to their areas. Since the oppositely oriented circles have the same area (Fig. 2a), these phases will cancel. The Berry phase of the fourth state, which contains the component $|\delta^{-1}\alpha\rangle$, will be proportional to the total area enclosed by the path made by δ^{-1} . Inversion maps circles to circles, but the two inverted circles will now have *different* areas (Fig. 2b). Summing the Berry phases ψ_i gained upon traversal of the two circles $i \in \{1, 2\}$ yields an effective phase gate:

$$|-\alpha, -\alpha\rangle + |\text{rest}\rangle \longrightarrow e^{i(\psi_1 + \psi_2)} |-\alpha, -\alpha\rangle + |\text{rest}\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where $|\text{rest}\rangle$ is the unaffected superposition of the remaining components $\{|\alpha, \alpha\rangle, |\alpha, -\alpha\rangle, |-\alpha, \alpha\rangle\}$.

Single-qudit gates.—We now outline the system and its single-mode gates for arbitrary d . Here we let $\alpha_\nu(0) \equiv \alpha e_\nu$ with real non-negative α , $e_\nu \equiv \exp(i\frac{2\pi}{d}\nu)$, and $\nu = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$ (see Fig. 3a for $d = 3$). This choice of initial qudit configuration makes Eq. (1) invariant under the discrete rotation $\exp(i\frac{2\pi}{d}\hat{n})$ and is a bosonic analogue of a particle on a discrete ring [43]. Therefore, $\hat{n} \bmod d$ is a good quantum number and we can distinguish eigenspaces of $\exp(i\frac{2\pi}{d}\hat{n})$ by projections [44]

$$\Pi_\mu = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} |dn + \mu\rangle\langle dn + \mu| = \frac{1}{d} \sum_{\nu=0}^{d-1} \exp\left[i\frac{2\pi}{d}(\hat{n} - \mu)\nu\right] \quad (8)$$

with $\mu = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$. The corresponding cat-state basis generalizes Eq. (3) to

$$|\mu_\alpha\rangle \equiv \frac{\Pi_\mu|\alpha\rangle}{\sqrt{\langle\alpha|\Pi_\mu|\alpha\rangle}} \sim \begin{cases} |\mu\rangle & \alpha \rightarrow 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{\nu=0}^{d-1} e^{-i\frac{2\pi}{d}\mu\nu} |\alpha e_\nu\rangle & \alpha \rightarrow \infty. \end{cases} \quad (9b)$$

Since overlap between coherent states decays exponentially with α , the quantum Fourier transform between coherent states $|\alpha e_\nu\rangle$ and cat states $|\mu_\alpha\rangle$ in Eq. (9b) is valid in the well-separated regime, i.e., when $2\alpha \sin \frac{\pi}{d} \gg 1$ (satisfied when $|\langle\alpha|\alpha e_1\rangle|^2 \ll 1$). It should be clear that the more coherent states there are (larger d), the more one has to drive to resolve them (larger α). Also note the proper convergence to Fock states $|\mu\rangle$ as $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ in Eq. (9a).




Figure 3. (a) Three-fold symmetric configuration of steady states $|\alpha_\nu\rangle$ of Eq. (1) with $d = 3$ and depiction of a loop gate (θ) acting on $|\alpha_2\rangle$ and a collision gate (ϕ) between all states. (b) Arbitrary configuration of steady states for $d = 7$, depicting $|\alpha_0\rangle$ undergoing a loop gate and $|\alpha_1\rangle, |\alpha_2\rangle$ undergoing a displaced collision gate (see Supplementary Material).

Both gates generalize straightforwardly (see Fig. 3a for $d = 3$). The loop gate consists of adiabatic evolution of a specific $\alpha_\nu(t)$ around a closed path isolated from all other $\alpha_\nu(0)$. There are d such possible evolutions, each imparting a phase on its respective $|\alpha e_\nu\rangle$. The collision gate is performed as follows: starting with the $|\alpha e_\nu\rangle$ configuration for large enough α , tune α to zero (or close to zero), pump back to a different phase $\alpha \exp(i\phi)$, and rotate back to the initial configuration. Each $|\mu_\alpha\rangle$ will gain a phase proportional to its mean photon number, which behaves in the two parameter regimes as follows:

$$\langle\mu_\alpha|\hat{n}|\mu_\alpha\rangle = \begin{cases} \mu + O(\alpha^{2d}) & \alpha \rightarrow 0 \\ \alpha^2 + O(\alpha^2 e^{-c\alpha^2}) & \alpha \rightarrow \infty, \end{cases} \quad (10a) \quad (10b)$$

where $c = 1 - \cos \frac{2\pi}{d}$. Since a rotation imparts only a μ -independent (i.e. overall) phase in the well-separated regime [Eq. (10b)], the only μ -dependent (i.e. nontrivial) contribution of the symmetric collision gate path to the Berry matrix is at $\alpha = 0$. This gate therefore effectively applies the Berry matrix $\exp(-i\phi\hat{\chi})$ to the qudit, where $\hat{\chi} \equiv \sum_{\mu=0}^{d-1} \mu |\mu_\alpha\rangle\langle\mu_\alpha|$ is the discrete position operator of a particle on a discrete ring [43]. More generally, one does not have to tune α all the way to zero to achieve similar gates – e.g. being in the regime with $2\alpha \sin \frac{\pi}{d} \approx 1$ is sufficient. The two-mode infinity gate can

likewise be extended to the d -photon case and it is a simple exercise to prove universality [39].

Gate errors.— In the Lindbladian-dominated adiabatic limit [39], the role of the excitation gap is played by the *dissipation gap* – the eigenvalue of the Lindblad operator whose real part is closest (but not equal) to zero. Since our Lindbladians are infinite-dimensional, it is possible for the dissipation gap to approach zero for sufficiently large $|\alpha_\nu|$ (i.e., in the limit of an infinite-dimensional space). For the symmetric d -photon case however, this is not the case and the gap actually *increases* with α (verified numerically for $d \leq 10$). Having numerically verified the infinity-gate, we also see that the gap increases with α in the two-mode system (6). The gap can also be seen to increase by analyzing the excitation gap of the Hamiltonian $F^\dagger F$ (see Ref. [15], Sec. VIII.C).

Here we discuss the scaling of leading-order nonadiabatic errors, focusing on the single-mode gates for $d = 2, 3$.

Non-adiabatic corrections in Lindbladians are in general nonunitary, so their effect is manifest in the *impurity* of the final state (assuming a pure initial state). Extensive numerical simulations [45] show that the impurity can be fit to

$$\epsilon \equiv 1 - \text{Tr}\{\rho(T)^2\} \propto \frac{1}{\kappa T \alpha^p} \quad (11)$$

as $\alpha, T \rightarrow \infty$, where $\rho(T)$ is the state after completion of the gate, $\alpha \equiv |\alpha_\nu(0)|$ is the initial distance of all $|\alpha_\nu\rangle$ from the origin, $p > 0$ is gate-dependent, and κ is the overall rate of Eq. (1). One can see that $\epsilon \approx O(T^{-1})$, as expected for a nearly adiabatic process. Additionally, we report that $p \approx 1.8$ for $d = 2$ and $p \approx 3.9$ for $d = 3$ loop gates, respectively. For the $d = 2, 3$ collision gates, we observe that $p \approx 0$.

Photon loss errors.—We have determined that the above gates can be made compatible with a (photon number) parity-based scheme protecting against photon loss [5, 28]. In such a scheme, one encodes quantum information in a logical space spanned by even parity states (e.g. $|\alpha_\nu\rangle + |-\alpha_\nu\rangle$ with $\nu = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$, generalizing Sec. II.D.3 of [25]). Photon loss events can be detected by quantum non-demolition measurements of the parity operator $(-1)^{\hat{n}}$. In the case of fixed-parity cat-codes, errors due to photon loss events can be corrected immediately [28] or tracked in parallel with the computation [5]. By doubling the size d of the DFS of Lindbladian (1) to accommodate both even and odd parity logical spaces, we have determined a set of holonomic gates which are parity conserving and are universal on each parity subspace [39]. This allows for parity detection to be performed before/after HQC.

Implementation & conclusion.—We show how to achieve universal computation of an arbitrary configuration of multi-mode well-separated coherent states $|\alpha_\nu\rangle$ by adiabatic closed-loop variation of $\alpha_\nu(t)$. We construct Lindbladians which admit a decoherence-free subspace consisting of such states and whose jump operators consist of lowering operators of the modes. One can obtain the desired jump operators by nonlinearly coupling the multi-mode system to auxiliary modes $(\hat{c}, \hat{d}, \dots)$, which act as effective thermal reservoirs for the ac-

tive modes. For the case of one active mode \hat{a} , if one assumes a coupling of the form $\hat{a}\hat{c}^\dagger + H.c.$ and no thermal fluctuations in \hat{c} , one will obtain (in the Born-Markov approximation) a Lindbladian with jump operator \hat{a} . Therefore, a generalization of the coupling to $F\hat{c}^\dagger + H.c.$ will result in the desired single-mode Lindbladian (1) with jump operator F . Since F are polynomials in the lowering operators of the active modes, quartic and higher mode interactions need to be engineered. Such terms can be obtained by driving an atom in a harmonic trap with multiple lasers [37] or by coupling between a Josephson junction and a microwave cavity [5, 20]. We thus describe arguably the first approach to achieve holonomic quantum control of realistic continuous variable systems.

The authors thank S. M. Girvin, L. I. Glazman, N. Read, and Z. Leghtas for fruitful discussions. This work was supported by the ARO, AFOSR MURI, DARPA Quiness program, the Alfred P. Sloan Foundation, and the David and Lucile Packard Foundation. V.V.A. was supported by the NSF GRFP under Grant DGE-1122492. C.S. was supported by the Paul and May Chu Overseas Summer Research Travel Grant from HKUST and acknowledges support from Shengwang Du. R.-B. L. was supported by Hong Kong RGC/GRF Project 14303014. We thank the Yale High Performance Computing Center for use of their resources.

-
- [1] V. Gorini, A. Kossakowski, and E. C. G. Sudarshan, *J. Math. Phys.* **17**, 821 (1976); G. Lindblad, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **48**, 119 (1976).
 - [2] L.-M. Duan and G.-C. Guo, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 1953 (1997); P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 3306 (1997); D. A. Lidar, I. L. Chuang, and K. B. Whaley, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **81**, 2594 (1998).
 - [3] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and L. Viola, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **84**, 2525 (2000); P. Zanardi, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 012301 (2000); J. Kempe, D. Bacon, D. A. Lidar, and K. B. Whaley, *Phys. Rev. A* **63**, 042307 (2001).
 - [4] P. Zanardi and L. Campos Venuti, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 052324 (2015).
 - [5] M. Mirrahimi, Z. Leghtas, V. V. Albert, S. Touzard, R. J. Schoelkopf, L. Jiang, and M. H. Devoret, *New J. Phys.* **16**, 045014 (2014).
 - [6] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, *Phys. Lett. A* **264**, 94 (1999); J. Pachos, P. Zanardi, and M. Rasetti, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 010305 (1999); P. Zanardi, in *Quantum error correction*, edited by D. A. Lidar and T. A. Brun (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2013) Chap. 16.
 - [7] P. Solinas, P. Zanardi, and N. Zanghi, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 042316 (2004).
 - [8] F. Wilczek and A. Zee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 2111 (1984).
 - [9] P. Zanardi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 077901 (2001).
 - [10] J. K. Pachos and A. Beige, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 033817 (2004).
 - [11] L.-A. Wu, P. Zanardi, and D. A. Lidar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **95**, 130501 (2005).
 - [12] A. Carollo, G. Massimo Palma, A. Lozinski, M. F. Santos, and V. Vedral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 150403 (2006); X. D. Zhang, Q. Zhang, and Z. D. Wang, *Phys. Rev. A* **74**, 034302 (2006); Z.-q. Yin, F.-l. Li, and P. Peng, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 062311 (2007);

- S. Dasgupta and D. A. Lidar, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **40**, S127 (2007); X.-L. Feng, C. Wu, H. Sun, and C. H. Oh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 200501 (2009); S.-B. Zheng, *Phys. Rev. A* **85**, 052106 (2012); *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 062118 (2014).
- [13] O. Oreshkov, T. A. Brun, and D. A. Lidar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 070502 (2009); O. Oreshkov, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 090502 (2009).
- [14] O. Oreshkov and J. Calsamiglia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 050503 (2010).
- [15] V. V. Albert, B. Bradlyn, M. Fraas, and L. Jiang, [arXiv:1512.08079](https://arxiv.org/abs/1512.08079).
- [16] D. Lucarelli and T. Tarn, in *Proceedings of the 41st IEEE Conference on Decision and Control*, Vol. 1 (IEEE, 2002) p. 452.
- [17] A. Cacheffo, M. A. de Ponte, M. H. Y. Moussa, and A. S. M. de Castro, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **43**, 105503 (2010); G. D. M. Neto, A. Cacheffo, A. S. M. de Castro, M. A. de Ponte, and M. H. Y. Moussa, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **44**, 145502 (2011).
- [18] M. A. de Ponte, S. S. Mizrahi, and M. H. Y. Moussa, *Ann. Phys.* **322**, 2077 (2007); *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **41**, 215506 (2008); *Phys. Rev. A* **84**, 012331 (2011).
- [19] C. Sayrin, I. Dotsenko, X. Zhou, B. Peaudecerf, T. Rybarczyk, S. Gleyzes, P. Rouchon, M. Mirrahimi, H. Amini, M. Brune, J.-M. Raimond, and S. Haroche, *Nature* **477**, 73 (2011); G. Kirchmair, B. Vlastakis, Z. Leghtas, S. E. Nigg, H. Paik, E. Ginossar, M. Mirrahimi, L. Frunzio, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Nature* **495**, 205 (2013); B. Vlastakis, G. Kirchmair, Z. Leghtas, S. E. Nigg, L. Frunzio, S. M. Girvin, M. Mirrahimi, M. H. Devoret, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Science* **342**, 607 (2013); L. Sun, A. Petrenko, Z. Leghtas, B. Vlastakis, G. Kirchmair, K. M. Sliwa, A. Narla, M. Hatridge, S. Shankar, J. Blumoff, L. Frunzio, M. Mirrahimi, M. H. Devoret, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Nature* **511**, 444 (2014); R. W. Heeres, B. Vlastakis, E. Holland, S. Krastanov, V. V. Albert, L. Frunzio, L. Jiang, and R. J. Schoelkopf, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 137002 (2015).
- [20] Z. Leghtas, S. Touzard, I. M. Pop, A. Kou, B. Vlastakis, A. Petrenko, K. M. Sliwa, A. Narla, S. Shankar, M. J. Hatridge, M. Reagor, L. Frunzio, R. J. Schoelkopf, M. Mirrahimi, and M. H. Devoret, *Science* **347**, 853 (2015).
- [21] N. Ofek, A. Petrenko, R. Heeres, P. Reinhold, Z. Leghtas, B. Vlastakis, Y. Liu, L. Frunzio, S. M. Girvin, L. Jiang, M. Mirrahimi, M. H. Devoret, and R. J. Schoelkopf, [arXiv:1602.04768](https://arxiv.org/abs/1602.04768).
- [22] J. T. Barreiro, M. Müller, P. Schindler, D. Nigg, T. Monz, M. Chwalla, M. Hennrich, C. F. Roos, P. Zoller, and R. Blatt, *Nature* **470**, 486 (2011); P. Schindler, M. Müller, D. Nigg, J. T. Barreiro, E. A. Martinez, M. Hennrich, T. Monz, S. Diehl, P. Zoller, and R. Blatt, *Nat. Phys.* **9**, 361 (2013).
- [23] A. Signoles, A. Facon, D. Grosso, I. Dotsenko, S. Haroche, J.-M. Raimond, M. Brune, and S. Gleyzes, *Nat. Phys.* **10**, 715 (2014).
- [24] S. Haroche and J.-M. Raimond, *Exploring the Quantum: Atoms, Cavities, and Photons* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 2006); H. Jeong and T. C. Ralph, in *Quantum Information with Continuous Variables of Atoms and Light*, edited by N. J. Cerf, G. Leuchs, and E. S. Polzik (World Scientific, London, 2007) Chap. 9.
- [25] B. M. Terhal, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **87**, 307 (2015).
- [26] P. T. Cochrane, G. J. Milburn, and W. J. Munro, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 2631 (1999).
- [27] S. Glancy, H. M. Vasconcelos, and T. C. Ralph, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 022317 (2004).
- [28] Z. Leghtas, G. Kirchmair, B. Vlastakis, R. J. Schoelkopf, M. H. Devoret, and M. Mirrahimi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 120501 (2013).
- [29] H. Jeong and M. S. Kim, *Phys. Rev. A* **65**, 042305 (2002); T. C. Ralph, A. Gilchrist, G. J. Milburn, W. J. Munro, and S. Glancy, *Phys. Rev. A* **68**, 042319 (2003); A. Gilchrist, K. Nemoto, W. J. Munro, T. C. Ralph, S. Glancy, S. L. Braunstein, and G. J. Milburn, *J. Opt. B - Quantum S. O.* **6**, S828 (2004); A. Ourjoumtsev, R. Tualle-Brouri, J. Laurat, and P. Grangier, *Science* **312**, 83 (2006); M. Takeoka and M. Sasaki, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 064302 (2007); A. P. Lund, T. C. Ralph, and H. L. Haselgrove, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**, 030503 (2008); H. Takahashi, K. Wakui, S. Suzuki, M. Takeoka, K. Hayasaka, A. Furusawa, and M. Sasaki, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **101**, 233605 (2008).
- [30] W. J. Munro, G. J. Milburn, and B. C. Sanders, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 052108 (2000).
- [31] C. Arenz, C. Cormick, D. Vitali, and G. Morigi, *J. Phys. B: At. Mol. Opt. Phys.* **46**, 224001 (2013); M. J. Everitt, T. P. Spiller, G. J. Milburn, R. D. Wilson, and A. M. Zagoskin, *Frontiers in ICT* **1**, 1 (2014).
- [32] D. Gottesman, A. Kitaev, and J. Preskill, *Phys. Rev. A* **64**, 012310 (2001).
- [33] B. M. Terhal and D. Weigand, [arXiv:1506.05033](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.05033).
- [34] A. B. Klimov and S. M. Chumakov, *A Group-Theoretical Approach to Quantum Optics* (Wiley, Weinheim, 2009).
- [35] R. R. Puri, *Mathematical Methods of Quantum Optics* (Springer, Berlin/Heidelberg, 2001).
- [36] H. J. Carmichael, *Statistical Methods in Quantum Optics 2: Non-classical fields* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin/Heidelberg, 2008).
- [37] J. F. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **77**, 4728 (1996).
- [38] B. M. Garraway, P. L. Knight, and M. B. Plenio, *Phys. Scripta* **T76**, 152 (1998); A. R. R. Carvalho, P. Milman, R. L. de Matos Filho, and L. Davidovich, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**, 4988 (2001).
- [39] See Supplemental Material, which cites [46–55], at URL for an extension of the infinity gate to qudits, proof of universal computation, generalization to arbitrary $|\alpha_\nu\rangle$, a sketch of the derivation of the Berry matrices, and a way to integrate the gates with a photon loss error correction scheme.
- [40] S. Chaturvedi, M. S. Sriram, and V. Srinivasan, *J. Phys. A: Math. Gen.* **20**, L1071 (1987).
- [41] V. V. Dodonov, I. Malkin, and V. Man'ko, *Physica* **72**, 597 (1974).
- [42] When acting on states in the DFS, S_ϕ can be approximated by a path-ordered product of DFS projectors $P_\alpha = |0_\alpha\rangle\langle 0_\alpha| + |1_\alpha\rangle\langle 1_\alpha|$ with each projector incrementing α : $S_\phi \approx P_{\alpha^{i\phi}} \cdots P_{\frac{2}{M}\alpha^{i\phi}} P_{\frac{1}{M}\alpha^{i\phi}}$ for integer $M \gg 1$ [4]. Using Eq. (3), one can show that $P_{\alpha^{i\phi}} = R_\phi P_\alpha R_\phi^\dagger$ and prove Eq. (4).
- [43] A. Vourdas, *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **67**, 267 (2004).
- [44] V. V. Albert and L. Jiang, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 022118 (2014).
- [45] S. Krastanov, “Animations of cat-qudit gates: <http://dancingblobs.krastanov.org/>,” (2015).
- [46] E. B. Davies and H. Spohn, *Journal of Statistical Physics* **19**, 511 (1978); P. Thunstrom, J. Aberg, and E. Sjoqvist, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 022328 (2005); J. P. Pekola, V. Brosco, M. Möttönen, P. Solinas, and A. Shnirman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 030401 (2010).
- [47] S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 346 (1995).
- [48] J. E. Avron, M. Fraas, and G. M. Graf, *J. Stat. Phys.* **148**, 800 (2012).
- [49] M. S. Sarandy and D. A. Lidar, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 012331 (2005).
- [50] M. S. Sarandy and D. A. Lidar, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 062101 (2006).
- [51] A. Carollo, M. F. Santos, and V. Vedral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 020403 (2006).

- [52] J. E. Avron, M. Fraas, G. M. Graf, and O. Kenneth, *New J. Phys.* **13**, 053042 (2011); J. E. Avron, M. Fraas, G. M. Graf, and P. Grech, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **314**, 163 (2012).
- [53] L. Campos Venuti, T. Albash, D. A. Lidar, and P. Zanardi, [arXiv:1508.05558](https://arxiv.org/abs/1508.05558).
- [54] G. F. Xu, J. Zhang, D. M. Tong, E. Sjöqvist, and L. C. Kwek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 170501 (2012); S. L. Wu, L. C. Wang, and X. X. Yi, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45**, 405305 (2012); G. Xu and G. Long, *Sci. Rep.* **4**, 6814 (2014); Z.-T. Liang, Y.-X. Du, W. Huang, Z.-Y. Xue, and H. Yan, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 062312 (2014); V. A. Mousolou, C. M. Canali, and E. Sjöqvist, *New J. Phys.* **16**, 013029 (2014); P. V. Pyshkin, D.-w. Luo, J. Jing, J. Q. You, and L.-A. Wu, [arXiv:1507.00815](https://arxiv.org/abs/1507.00815); Z.-Y. Xue, J. Zhou, and Y. Hu, [arXiv:1601.07219](https://arxiv.org/abs/1601.07219).
- [55] J. Zhang, L.-C. Kwek, E. Sjöqvist, D. M. Tong, and P. Zanardi, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 042302 (2014).

Supplemental material: Universal holonomic quantum computing with cat-codes

Victor V. Albert,¹ Chi Shu,^{1,2} Stefan Krastanov,¹ Chao Shen,¹ Ren-Bao Liu,³ Zhen-Biao Yang,^{1,4}
Robert J. Schoelkopf,¹ Mazyar Mirrahimi,^{1,5} Michel H. Devoret,¹ and Liang Jiang¹

¹*Departments of Applied Physics and Physics, Yale University, New Haven, Connecticut, USA*

²*Department of Physics, The Hong Kong University of Science and Technology, Hong Kong, China*

³*Department of Physics & Centre for Quantum Coherence,*

The Chinese University of Hong Kong, Hong Kong, China

⁴*Department of Physics, Fuzhou University, Fuzhou, China*

⁵*INRIA Paris-Rocquencourt, Domaine de Voluceau, Le Chesnay Cedex, France*

(Dated: March 30, 2016)

Summary

In Sec. A, we provide a qudit extension of the two-qubit infinity gate described in the main text. In Sec. B, we prove universal quantum computation on the subspace spanned by coherent states lying on a circle in phase space using loop, collision, and infinity gates. In Sec. C, we relax the restriction of the coherent states lying on a circle and extend our gates to arbitrary configurations. In Sec. D, we make contact with the adiabatic theorem and Berry connections, revealing the Berry matrix for our gates. In Sec. E, we show how to implement gates of fixed photon number parity, allowing for photon loss errors to be corrected before/after the gates.

A. Two-qudit gates

Here we extend the two-mode ∞ gate to arbitrary d . The initial adiabatic path is the same, but an extra single mode loop gate is required afterwards to make the infinity gate a true controlled phase gate.

Similar to the single-mode gate extensions stated in the main text, we let $\alpha_\nu(0) \equiv \alpha e_\nu$ be the initial coherent state values for each mode [with real non-negative α , $e_\nu \equiv \exp(i\frac{2\pi}{d}\nu)$, and $\nu = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$]. The two-mode jump operators from Eq. (6) of the main text now generalize to

$$F_I = (\hat{a} - \delta\alpha_{d-1}) \prod_{\nu=0}^{d-2} (\hat{a} - \alpha_\nu) \quad \text{and} \quad F_{II} = (\hat{a}\hat{b} - \alpha\alpha_{d-1})(\hat{a}\hat{b} - \delta\alpha\alpha_{d-2}) \prod_{\nu=0}^{d-3} (\hat{a}\hat{b} - \alpha_\nu). \quad (1)$$

When $\delta = 1$, the d^2 DFS basis elements $\{|\alpha_\nu\rangle\} \otimes \{|\alpha_{\nu'}\rangle\}$ are annihilated by both F_I and F_{II} . For $\delta \neq 1$ and for sufficiently large α , the basis elements become $\{|\alpha_\nu, X\alpha_{\nu'}\rangle\}$ and $\{|\delta\alpha_{d-1}, X\alpha_{\nu'}\rangle\}$, where X follows from Tab. I. Upon adiabatic evolution of δ in an ∞ -shaped path, the Berry phase obtained from any $|\delta\alpha_\nu\rangle$ vanishes due to each of the two loops contributing an equal area with opposite sign. The Berry phase of the non-trivial terms, which contain the component $|\delta^{-1}\alpha_\nu\rangle$, per loop $i \in \{1, 2\}$ is now

$$\psi_i = 2\alpha^2 \int_i d^2\delta |\delta|^{-4}, \quad (2)$$

which can be calculated using the corresponding Berry connections $A_{|\delta|, \arg \delta} = i\langle \delta^{-1}\alpha | \partial_{|\delta|, \arg \delta} | \delta^{-1}\alpha \rangle$ (see Appx. D). This calculation is equivalent to the geometrical reasoning provided in the main text. At the end of the gate, the phase gained from adiabatic evolution of all d^2 DFS states is listed in Tab. II. We can see that all DFS states of the form $|\alpha_{d-1}, \alpha_\nu\rangle$ gain the phase $\psi_1 + \psi_2$, with exception of the last state $|\alpha_{d-1}, \alpha_{d-1}\rangle$. If we now apply a loop gate on the $|\alpha_{d-1}\rangle$ state of the first oscillator with a $-(\psi_1 + \psi_2)$ phase, the last state becomes the only one to gain a phase:

$$|\alpha_{d-1}, \alpha_{d-1}\rangle + |\text{rest}\rangle \longrightarrow e^{-i(\psi_1 + \psi_2)} |\alpha_{d-1}, \alpha_{d-1}\rangle + |\text{rest}\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $|\text{rest}\rangle$ is the unaffected superposition of the remaining components $\{|\alpha_\nu, \alpha_{\nu'}\rangle\}$.

B. Proof of universal computation

To prove universal computation of the three effective unitary gate families, we analyze their generators and show that various commutators of those generators provide a basis for the Lie algebra $\mathfrak{su}(d)$ [1]. The loop gates are generated by d coherent

mode b \ mode a	$ \alpha_0\rangle$	$ \alpha_1\rangle$...	$ \alpha_{d-3}\rangle$	$ \alpha_{d-2}\rangle$	$ \alpha_{d-1}\rangle$
$ \alpha_0\rangle$	1	1	...	1	δ	1
$ \alpha_1\rangle$	1	1	...	δ	1	1
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	\ddots	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
$ \alpha_{d-3}\rangle$	1	δ	...	1	1	1
$ \alpha_{d-2}\rangle$	δ	1	...	1	1	1
$ \delta\alpha_{d-1}\rangle$	δ^{-1}	δ^{-1}	...	δ^{-1}	δ^{-1}	1

Table I. Values of X for each state of mode b for all d^2 steady states of a Lindbladian with jump operators F_I and F_{II} from Eq. (1).

mode b \ mode a	$ \alpha_0\rangle$	$ \alpha_1\rangle$...	$ \alpha_{d-3}\rangle$	$ \alpha_{d-2}\rangle$	$ \alpha_{d-1}\rangle$
$ \alpha_0\rangle$	0	0	...	0	0	0
$ \alpha_1\rangle$	0	0	...	0	0	0
\vdots	\vdots	\vdots	...	\vdots	\vdots	\vdots
$ \alpha_{d-3}\rangle$	0	0	...	0	0	0
$ \alpha_{d-2}\rangle$	0	0	...	0	0	0
$ \alpha_{d-1}\rangle$	$\psi_1 + \psi_2$	$\psi_1 + \psi_2$...	$\psi_1 + \psi_2$	$\psi_1 + \psi_2$	0

Table II. Berry phase gained for each of the d^2 DFS states upon completion of the ∞ -gate.

state projections $\hat{\pi}_\nu \equiv |\alpha e_\nu\rangle\langle\alpha e_\nu|$ and can be commuted with $\hat{\chi}$ to generate $\mathfrak{su}(d)$ as follows. Superpositions of $\hat{\pi}_\nu$ provide $d - 1$ linearly independent traceless diagonal elements. The linearly independent off-diagonal coherent state transitions are provided by $\frac{1}{2}d(d - 1)$ elements

$$\hat{g}_{\nu\nu'} \equiv [\hat{\pi}_\nu, [\hat{\chi}, \hat{\pi}_{\nu'}]] = \frac{|\alpha e_\nu\rangle\langle\alpha e_{\nu'}|}{e^{-i\frac{2\pi}{d}(\nu-\nu')} - 1} + H.c. \quad (4)$$

along with the $\frac{1}{2}d(d - 1)$ elements $\frac{i}{2}[\hat{\pi}_\nu - \hat{\pi}_{\nu'}, \hat{g}_{\nu\nu'}]$ (both sets for $\nu \neq \nu'$). Together this makes $d^2 - 1$ elements, the dimension of $\mathfrak{su}(d)$. Adding in the qudit infinity gates from above then becomes sufficient for universal computation [2].




Figure 3 from main text. (a) Three-fold symmetric configuration of steady states $|\alpha_\nu\rangle$ of Eq. (1) with $d = 3$ and depiction of a loop gate (θ) acting on $|\alpha_2\rangle$ and a collision gate (ϕ) between all states. (b) Arbitrary configuration of steady states for $d = 7$, depicting $|\alpha_0\rangle$ undergoing a loop gate and $|\alpha_1\rangle, |\alpha_2\rangle$ (with “center of mass” γ and relative coordinate α) undergoing a displaced collision gate.

C. Generalization to arbitrary α_ν

Here we discuss generalized versions of the single-mode symmetric 2-photon and d -photon gates from the main text, breaking symmetry and allowing for arbitrary values of $|\alpha_\nu\rangle$ (as long as all states remain well-separated). Fig. 3 from the main text is reproduced for convenience.

Generalized loop gates can be performed via simultaneous variation of multiple $\alpha_\nu(t)$. The procedure is exactly the same as that described in the main text for the $d = 2$ loop gate. More interestingly, collision gates away from the origin between any two (or more) coherent states can also be performed. For example, the symmetric $d = 2$ collision gate, demonstrated with the collision at the origin in Fig. 1d (see main text), can be performed anywhere in phase space. If one picks two states $|\alpha_1(0)\rangle, |\alpha_2(0)\rangle$ (see Fig. 2b) and assumes that all other states are well-separated from them, a two-state collision gate is then a displaced version of the original collision gate from Fig. 1d. To better understand this, first let $\alpha_1 = \gamma + \alpha$ and $\alpha_2 = \gamma - \alpha$ with complex relative coordinate α and “center of mass” γ . Then, note that the displaced cat states become (up to a global phase)

$$D_\gamma|\mu_\alpha\rangle \xrightarrow{|\alpha| \geq 2} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\alpha_1\rangle + (-)^\mu e^{i\text{Im}\alpha_1\alpha_2^*} |\alpha_2\rangle),$$

where $\mu \in \{0, 1\}$ and D_γ is the displacement operator (with $D_\gamma|0\rangle = |\gamma\rangle$). The states $D_\gamma|\mu_\alpha\rangle$ provide a basis (valid for any α_1, α_2) for the steady states of the $d = 2$ case $F = \sqrt{k}(\hat{a} - \alpha_1)(\hat{a} - \alpha_2)$ from Eq. (1) of the main text, which reduces to $F = \sqrt{k}(\hat{a}^2 - \alpha^2)$ when $\gamma = 0$. The collision gate thus translates into varying the amplitude and phase of α in the path shown in Fig. 2b while keeping γ constant, producing the same net result as the original $d = 2$ collision gate and inducing transitions between $|\alpha_1(0)\rangle$ and $|\alpha_2(0)\rangle$. Naturally, such phase and collision gates allow for universal control for $|\alpha_\nu(0)\rangle$ at arbitrary locations in phase space (Fig. 2b), granted that $|\alpha_\nu(0)\rangle$ are well-separated from each other: $|\alpha_\nu(0) - \alpha_{\nu'}(0)| \geq 4$ for all $\nu, \nu' = 0, 1, \dots, d-1$.

D. Berry connections

The adiabatic theorem states that traversal of a closed loop in parameter space in the adiabatic limit (parallel transport) results in the application of a Berry matrix (more generally, a holonomy) on the initial state space, generalizing the Berry phase for non-degenerate systems. There are two adiabatic limits associated with Lindbladians: one governed by the steady states of the entire Lindbladian ([3], Sec. 6; see also [4–10]) and one governed by eigenstates of a Hamiltonian part [11]. We consider a DFS in the former limit. The Berry matrix imparted on a d -dimensional steady state subspace when time evolution is governed by a Lindbladian may not be equal to that imparted on the same subspace when time evolution is governed by a Hamiltonian. However, Ref. [6] showed that the Berry matrix of the Lindbladian-controlled DFS case [5] does indeed reduce to the ordinary $SU(d)$ Berry matrix for unitary systems [12]. Here we sketch another proof of this result, based on a more general derivation of the Berry matrix for generic steady state subspaces from Ref. [10]. We note that non-adiabatic HQC schemes on DFSs [13] and NSs [14] have also been proposed and that HQC (as well as general manipulations) on a DFS can alternatively be understood in terms of a generalized quantum Zeno effect [6, 15–18].

The Lindbladian Berry matrix, in general nonunitary, can be calculated via an ordered path integral of the Lindbladian Berry connections

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mu\mu';\sigma\sigma'}^\lambda = i\text{Tr}\{J_{\mu\mu'}^\dagger \partial_\lambda(|\sigma_\alpha\rangle\langle\sigma'_\alpha|)\}, \quad (5)$$

where $J_{\mu\mu'}$ is the conserved quantity [19] corresponding to $|\mu_\alpha\rangle\langle\mu'_\alpha|$ and $\partial_\lambda \equiv \frac{\partial}{\partial\lambda}$. The $J_{\mu\mu'}$ determine the initial Bloch vector of the cat qudit and are known in closed form only for $d = 2$ [15]. Interestingly, $J_{\mu\mu'}$ do not participate in parallel transport for either gate and Eq. (5) reduces to its closed system counterpart – a superposition of ordinary Berry connections between cat states. This reduction holds because $J_{\mu\mu'}$ do not “cross-talk,” i.e., $P_\alpha J_{\mu\mu'} P_\alpha^\perp = 0$ with $P_\alpha = \sum_{\mu=0}^{d-1} |\mu_\alpha\rangle\langle\mu_\alpha|$ the projection on the steady state subspace and $P_\alpha^\perp = 1 - P_\alpha$. This condition can be shown to imply that adiabatic parallel transport on the DFS is free from the nonunitary effects of the Lindbladian. We have shown the condition numerically for the example here; the exact proof is shown in Ref. [10]. In other words, one can verify that

$$\mathcal{A}_{\mu\mu';\sigma\sigma'}^\lambda = \delta_{\mu'\sigma'} A_{\mu\sigma}^\lambda + \delta_{\mu\sigma} A_{\mu'\sigma'}^\lambda \quad (6)$$

with $A_{\mu\sigma}^\lambda = i\langle\mu_\alpha|\partial_\lambda\sigma_\alpha\rangle$ the ordinary Berry connection [12].

The Berry connections A^λ reduce exactly to the gate generators $\hat{\chi}, \hat{\pi}_\nu$ from the main text. For example, the symmetric collision gate in Figs. 1c and 2a arises from changes in the magnitude and phase of α (here complex). Therefore, $\lambda \in \{|\alpha|, \arg \alpha \equiv \varphi\}$ and a simple calculation reveals $A_{\mu\mu'}^{|\alpha|} = 0$ and

$$A_{\mu\mu'}^\varphi = -\delta_{\mu\mu'} \langle\mu_\alpha|\hat{n}|\mu_\alpha\rangle \rightarrow \begin{cases} -\delta_{\mu\mu'}\mu & |\alpha| \rightarrow 0 \\ -\delta_{\mu\mu'}|\alpha|^2 & |\alpha| \rightarrow \infty. \end{cases} \quad (7a)$$

One can see that $A^\varphi \propto \hat{\chi}$ as $|\alpha| \rightarrow 0$, confirming that $\hat{\chi}$ indeed generates the effective operation induced by the collision gate.

E. Integration with photon loss error correction scheme

Here we discuss the parity conserving holonomic single-qubit gates; the infinity gate extends analogously. To add HQC capability to qudits protected from photon loss, we need to double the size of the DFS in order to accommodate both even and odd parity logical spaces. This is done by letting $\hat{a} - \alpha_\nu \rightarrow \hat{a}^2 - \alpha_\nu^2$ in Eq. (1) from the main text. The original $\{|\alpha_\nu\rangle\}$ basis (for sufficiently large and well-separated α_ν) becomes

$$|\alpha_\nu, p\rangle \sim \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\alpha_\nu\rangle + (-)^p |-\alpha_\nu\rangle), \quad (8)$$

where $p \in \{0, 1\} \pmod{2}$ indexes the logical space and $2d$ is the dimension of the new DFS. In order to extend HQC to these states, we need to show that both gate families act identically on both logical spaces p . The loop gate generalizes straightforwardly. Varying $\alpha_\nu(t)$ in a closed loop far away from all other α_ν produces the same geometric phase for both $|\pm\alpha_\nu\rangle$, so $|\alpha_\nu, p\rangle \rightarrow e^{i\theta} |\alpha_\nu, p\rangle$ with θ independent of p . To generalize the collision gate [for which we now set $\alpha_\nu \equiv \alpha \exp(i\frac{\pi}{d}\nu)$], we once again need a dual basis to properly take the $\alpha \rightarrow 0$ limit. This cat state basis $\{|\mu_\alpha, p\rangle \equiv |(2\mu + p)_\alpha\rangle\}$ is obtained by letting $\mu \rightarrow 2\mu + p$ and $d \rightarrow 2d$ in Eq. (9) from the main text and plugging in Eq. (8). In the two regimes of interest,

$$|\mu_\alpha, p\rangle \sim \begin{cases} |2\mu + p\rangle & \alpha \rightarrow 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{\nu=0}^{d-1} e^{-i\frac{\pi}{d}\nu(2\mu+p)} |\alpha e^{i\frac{\pi}{d}\nu}, p\rangle & \alpha \rightarrow \infty. \end{cases} \quad (9a)$$

$$(9b)$$

The phase gained during the $\alpha = 0$ rotation part of the collision gate is then $\langle \mu_\alpha, p | \hat{n} | \mu_\alpha, p \rangle \xrightarrow{\alpha \rightarrow 0} \phi(2\mu + p)$. Therefore, the collision gate also acts the same way on both logical spaces, up to an overall phase of $\exp(-i\phi p)$.

-
- [1] S. L. Braunstein and P. V. Loock, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **77** (2005).
[2] S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **75**, 346 (1995).
[3] J. E. Avron, M. Fraas, and G. M. Graf, *J. Stat. Phys.* **148**, 800 (2012).
[4] M. S. Sarandy and D. A. Lidar, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 012331 (2005).
[5] M. S. Sarandy and D. A. Lidar, *Phys. Rev. A* **73**, 062101 (2006).
[6] A. Carollo, M. F. Santos, and V. Vedral, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 020403 (2006).
[7] O. Oreshkov and J. Calsamiglia, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 050503 (2010).
[8] J. E. Avron, M. Fraas, G. M. Graf, and O. Kenneth, *New J. Phys.* **13**, 053042 (2011); J. E. Avron, M. Fraas, G. M. Graf, and P. Grech, *Commun. Math. Phys.* **314**, 163 (2012).
[9] L. C. Venuti, T. Albash, D. A. Lidar, and P. Zanardi, *Physical Review A* **93**, 032118 (2016).
[10] V. V. Albert, B. Bradlyn, M. Fraas, and L. Jiang, *arXiv:1512.08079*.
[11] E. B. Davies and H. Spohn, *J. Stat. Phys.* **19**, 511 (1978); P. Thunstrom, J. Aberg, and E. Sjöqvist, *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 022328 (2005); J. P. Pekola, V. Brosco, M. Möttönen, P. Solinas, and A. Shnirman, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 030401 (2010).
[12] F. Wilczek and A. Zee, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **52**, 2111 (1984).
[13] G. F. Xu, J. Zhang, D. M. Tong, E. Sjöqvist, and L. C. Kwek, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109**, 170501 (2012); S. L. Wu, L. C. Wang, and X. X. Yi, *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **45**, 405305 (2012); G. Xu and G. Long, *Sci. Rep.* **4**, 6814 (2014); Z.-T. Liang, Y.-X. Du, W. Huang, Z.-Y. Xue, and H. Yan, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 062312 (2014); V. A. Mousolou, C. M. Canali, and E. Sjöqvist, *New J. Phys.* **16**, 013029 (2014); P. V. Pyshkin, D.-w. Luo, J. Jing, J. Q. You, and L.-A. Wu, *arXiv:1507.00815*; Z.-Y. Xue, J. Zhou, and Y. Hu, *arXiv:1601.07219*.
[14] J. Zhang, L.-C. Kwek, E. Sjöqvist, D. M. Tong, and P. Zanardi, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 042302 (2014).
[15] M. Mirrahimi, Z. Leghtas, V. V. Albert, S. Touzard, R. J. Schoelkopf, L. Jiang, and M. H. Devoret, *New J. Phys.* **16**, 045014 (2014).
[16] A. Beige, D. Braun, B. Tregenna, and P. L. Knight, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **85**, 1762 (2000); D. Burgarth, P. Facchi, V. Giovannetti, H. Nakazato, S. Pascazio, and K. Yuasa, *Phys. Rev. A* **88**, 042107 (2013).
[17] P. Zanardi and L. Campos Venuti, *Phys. Rev. A* **91**, 052324 (2015).
[18] P. Facchi and S. Pascazio, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 080401 (2002); G. A. Paz-Silva, A. T. Rezakhani, J. M. Dominy, and D. A. Lidar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 080501 (2012).
[19] V. V. Albert and L. Jiang, *Phys. Rev. A* **89**, 022118 (2014).