

Simple operation sequences to couple and interchange quantum information between spin qubits of different kinds

Sebastian Mehl^{1,2,*} and David P. DiVincenzo^{1,2}

¹*JARA-Institute for Quantum Information, RWTH Aachen University, D-52056 Aachen, Germany*

²*Peter Grünberg Institute (PGI-2), Forschungszentrum Jülich, D-52425 Jülich, Germany*

(Dated: September 30, 2018)

Efficient operation sequences to couple and interchange quantum information between quantum dot spin qubits of different kinds are derived using exchange interactions. In the qubit encoding of a single-spin qubit, a singlet-triplet qubit, and an exchange-only (triple-dot) qubit, some of the single-qubit interactions remain on during the entangling operation; this greatly simplifies the operation sequences that construct entangling operations. In the ideal setup, the gate operations use the intra-qubit exchange interactions only once. The limitations of the entangling sequences are discussed, and it is shown how quantum information can be converted between different kinds of quantum dot spin qubits.

I. INTRODUCTION

Small arrays of singly occupied quantum dot (QD) qubits are now fabricated in GaAs and silicon with great reliability.^{1,2} These setups are of high interest for quantum computation because the electron spin can be used as a qubit.³ Besides the single-spin qubit encoding, also more advanced qubit encodings have been suggested. Most promising are the singlet-triplet qubit (STQ)⁴ and the exchange-only qubit.⁵ These qubits encode quantum information in the $s_z = 0$ spin subspace of a two-electron double QD (DQD) or in two of the eight possible spin configurations of a three-electron triple QD (TQD).

For all the described qubits, single-qubit gates have been realized with high fidelities. Electric^{6,7} or magnetic⁸⁻¹⁰ field pulses can nowadays control single spins with very high fidelities. High-fidelity gates for STQs are also possible when the electron configuration of the DQD is modified while the magnetic field across the DQD is inhomogeneous.¹¹ Experimentally, a preparation of the nuclear magnetic field^{12,13} or a micromagnet¹⁴ created such static magnetic field configurations. The three-electron TQD can be operated using exchange interactions alone;^{5,15,16} more optimal qubit control has been realized if some of the exchange interactions are not reduced to zero.^{17,18} Two-qubit gates have been proposed for all the qubit encodings using exchange couplings,^{3-5,19,20} while experiments have realized these gates only for single-spin qubits.²¹ STQs or exchange-only qubits can be coupled indirectly via their charge sector, e.g., using Coulomb interactions²² or couplings via cavity modes.^{17,23,24} These approaches have not been successful yet due to a high amount of dephasing that is caused by charge noise.²⁵⁻²⁸

The present study assumes that universal qubit control is possible for the encoded qubits, while two QDs from different qubits are exchange coupled. Operation sequences for entanglement generation and qubit conversion are derived between QD qubits of different kinds. The operation sequences profit from always-on single qubit Hamiltonians during the entanglement sequences,

as in earlier studies of TQDs.^{20,29} For STQs, the magnetic fields at the QDs should be prepared independently. Their values need to differ anyway to realize single-qubit control. For the exchange-only qubit, a linear TQD arrangement is considered. Here, the exchange couplings between the neighboring pairs of QDs remain always at similar magnitudes. Such setups have been used in a previous experiment,^{17,18} and can be realized if the occupation of the middle QD is made unfavorable by increasing its chemical potential compared to the outer QDs.^{17,18}

The main finding of this paper are explicit operation sequences to entangle QD qubits of different kinds. The always-on single-qubit couplings greatly simplify the operation sequences because they reduce the possibility of leakage from the computational subspace. Effective Hamiltonians and entangling sequences are derived; the setups only require two operation sequences to entangle a single-spin qubit and a STQ (or an exchange-only qubit and a STQ), or four operation sequences to entangle a single-spin qubit and an exchange-only qubit. It is shown how the entanglement sequences can be used to swap quantum information between the qubits, and the limitations of the operation sequences are discussed.

The simplicity of the entangling operations shows that a large lattice of QD qubits does not necessarily need to contain identical types of coded qubits (cf., e.g., the description of large scale quantum computation with STQs in Ref. [30]). One can easily convert and couple different QD qubits using the operation sequences derived in this paper. As a consequence, it is possible to use a qubit encoding just for the situation when it is most optimal. It is known that single-spin qubits have exceptionally long coherence times, which makes them an ideal quantum memory.^{8,31} Encoded spin qubits, like the STQ or the exchange-only qubit, can be employed in their orbital sector, which makes them more ideal for readout or for long-distance couplings.^{1,22} It is also possible to use the described operation sequences to couple QD spin qubits to other spin qubits, like, e.g., donor-bound spin qubits.³² The electron spin bound to a donor atom is a well-known qubit candidate with many impressive experiments of co-

herent spin control in recent years.^{8,33–35} Also tunnel couplings between donor-bound and gate-defined spin qubits were shown recently.^{36,37}

The organization of the paper is as follows. Sec. II introduces the mathematical descriptions of the single-spin qubit, the STQ, and the exchange-only qubit. Sec. III derives the operation sequences to entangle QD qubits of different qubit encodings. Sec. IV discusses the limitations of these operations and describes how quantum information is converted between different qubits. Finally, the results of the paper are summarized.

II. QUBIT DEFINITIONS

A. Single-spin qubit

A single spin defines a qubit using the states $|0\rangle = |\uparrow\rangle$ and $|1\rangle = |\downarrow\rangle$.³ Universal qubit control is realized when a magnetic field can be tilted to two different directions. The control mechanisms to manipulate spins are magnetic field pulses,^{9,38} moving spins in static magnetic fields with spin-orbit interactions,³⁹ and driving spins through areas of different magnetic fields.^{6,40,41} Without further discussing the exact mechanism, it is assumed here that the magnetic field direction can be rotated to the z and x directions to generate rotations around the z and x axes of the Bloch sphere. These single-qubit gates are labeled $Z_\phi = e^{-i2\pi\frac{\phi}{2}\sigma_z}$ and $X_\phi = e^{-i2\pi\frac{\phi}{2}\sigma_x}$, where $\sigma_z = |\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow| - |\downarrow\rangle\langle\downarrow|$ and $\sigma_x = |\uparrow\rangle\langle\downarrow| + |\downarrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|$ are the Pauli operators. The phase accumulation $\phi = \frac{E_z}{h}$ ($\phi = \frac{E_x}{h}$) is caused by the Zeeman energy $E_z = g\mu_B B_z$ ($E_x = g\mu_B B_x$) of the magnetic field in the z direction (x direction).⁴²

B. Singlet-triplet qubit

STQs are coded using the $s_z = 0$ spin subspace of a two-electron DQD.⁴ QD₁ and QD₂ label the individual QDs of the DQD. Ideally, the electrons are spatially separated, and each QD is occupied with one electron. The logical qubit states are defined by $|0\rangle = |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ and $|1\rangle = |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$, where the first entry labels the electron at QD₁, and the second entry labels the electron at QD₂. Single-qubit control is realized using a magnetic field gradient between the QDs, corresponding to energy differences $\frac{\Delta E_z}{2}(\sigma_{z,1} - \sigma_{z,2})$, with $\Delta E_z = (E_{z,1} - E_{z,2})/2$, and the exchange interaction between the QD electrons $\frac{J_{12}}{4}(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 - \mathbf{1})$. $\sigma_i = (\sigma_{x,i}, \sigma_{y,i}, \sigma_{z,i})$ is the vector of Pauli matrices at QD_i.

ΔE_z is usually static in experiments, but J_{12} can be tuned within subnanoseconds by controlling the tunnel coupling or the potential difference of the QDs.⁴³ The magnetic field gradient generates rotations around the z axis of the Bloch sphere $Z_\phi = e^{-i2\pi\frac{\phi}{4}(\sigma_{z,1} - \sigma_{z,2})}$, with $\phi = 2\Delta E_z/h$, and rotations around the x axis are caused

by the exchange interaction $X_\phi = e^{-i2\pi\frac{\phi}{4}(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 - \mathbf{1})}$, with $\phi = J_{12}/h$. To reduce the leakage probability, experiments are always done at global magnetic fields $\frac{E_z}{2}(\sigma_{z,1} + \sigma_{z,2})$, with $E_z = (E_{z,1} + E_{z,2})/2$, that lift the degeneracy between the leakage states $\{|\uparrow\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle\}$ and the computational subspace $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$.

C. Exchange-only qubit

The exchange-only qubit is coded using the $S = \frac{1}{2}$, $s_z = \frac{1}{2}$ subspace of three electrons.⁵ The following operations require the initialization to a subspace encoding.⁴⁴ In any case, applying strong, global external magnetic field eases controlled state initializations. The three singly-occupied QDs are labeled by QD₁, QD₂, and QD₃. The qubit states are defined by $|0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle)$ and $|1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle) - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$, with the spin labels $|\sigma_{\text{QD}_1}, \sigma_{\text{QD}_2}, \sigma_{\text{QD}_3}\rangle$. The sum of the exchange interactions $\frac{J}{4}[(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 - \mathbf{1}) + (\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_3 - \mathbf{1})]$, with $J = (J_{12} + J_{23})/2$, and their difference $\frac{\Delta J}{4}[(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 - \mathbf{1}) - (\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_3 - \mathbf{1})]$, with $\Delta J = (J_{12} - J_{23})/2$, provide universal control of the subspace $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. J causes a rotation around the z axis of the Bloch sphere $Z_\phi = e^{-i2\pi\frac{\phi}{4}[(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 - \mathbf{1}) + (\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_3 - \mathbf{1})]}$, with $\phi = J/h$, and ΔJ causes a rotation around the x axis $X_\phi = e^{-i2\pi\frac{\phi}{4\sqrt{3}}[(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 - \mathbf{1}) - (\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_3 - \mathbf{1})]}$, with $\phi = \sqrt{3}\Delta J/h$. In typical qubit manipulation protocols, J is constant and large, while ΔJ is rapidly driven around zero.^{17,18}

III. INTERFACES BETWEEN SPIN QUBITS

A. Single-spin qubit and singlet-triplet qubit

Fig. 1(a) shows a trio of singly-occupied QDs that encodes a single-spin qubit and a STQ. QD₁ defines the single-spin qubit, with the qubit levels $\{|0^L\rangle, |1^L\rangle\}$. QD₂ and QD₃ define the STQ, where the qubit levels are called $\{|0^R\rangle, |1^R\rangle\}$. A general Hamiltonian in this setup is

$$\mathcal{H}^A = \frac{J_{12}}{4}(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 - \mathbf{1}) + \frac{E_z}{2}(\sigma_{z,1} + \sigma_{z,2} + \sigma_{z,3}) \quad (1)$$

$$+ \frac{\tilde{E}_{z,2}}{2}\sigma_{z,2} + \frac{\tilde{E}_{z,3}}{2}\sigma_{z,3}.$$

QD₁ and QD₂ are coupled by the exchange coupling J_{12} that is described by the first term in Eq. (1). The second term describes the global magnetic field E_z , and the last two terms are the deviations of the local magnetic fields at QD₂ and QD₃ from E_z . To construct entangling operations, $\frac{E_z}{2}(\sigma_{z,1} + \sigma_{z,2} + \sigma_{z,3})$ and $\frac{\tilde{E}_{z,3}}{2}\sigma_{z,3}$ can be neglected because these terms commute with the remaining parts of Eq. (1), and they generate only irrelevant phases.




Figure 1. Entangling operation between a single-spin qubit and a STQ. (a) QD₁ defines a single-spin qubit with the qubit levels $\{0^L, 1^L\}$; QD₂ and QD₃ define a STQ with the qubit levels $\{0^R, 1^R\}$. A weak tunnel coupling between QD₁ and QD₂ couples the single-spin qubit and the STQ. (b) Sequence to create a CPHASE between a single-spin qubit (coded on QD₁) and a STQ (coded on QD₂ and QD₃). Z_ϕ^L and Z_ϕ^R are the phase gates of the qubits L and R. $\mathcal{U}_{\phi,\psi}^A$ is defined in Eq. (2).

The relevant time evolution is described by

$$\mathcal{U}_{\phi,\psi}^A = e^{-i2\pi[\frac{\phi}{4}(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 - 1) + \frac{\psi}{2}\sigma_{z,2}]}, \quad (2)$$

with $\phi = J_{12}/h$ and $\psi = \tilde{E}_{z,2}/h$.

Only the states in the subspace $\{|0^L 0^R\rangle, |0^L 1^R\rangle, |1^L 0^R\rangle, |1^L 1^R\rangle, |\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle, |\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle\}$ are coupled in Eq. (2). There is no evolution from computational states to leakage states for $\sqrt{\phi^2 + \psi^2} = \mathbb{Z}$. An entangling operation that is, up to local unitaries, equivalent to the CPHASE operation is realized for $\phi = \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$. One can use, e.g., $\mathcal{U}_{1/2, \sqrt{3}/2}^A$. A CPHASE in the basis $\{|0^L 0^R\rangle, |0^L 1^R\rangle, |1^L 0^R\rangle, |1^L 1^R\rangle\}$ is [see Fig. 1(b)]:

$$Z_{(1-\sqrt{3})/4}^L Z_{(1-3\sqrt{3})/4}^R \mathcal{U}_{1/2, \sqrt{3}/2}^A = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{2}} \text{CPHASE}. \quad (3)$$

B. Single-spin qubit and exchange-only qubit

Fig. 2(a) shows a quartet of singly-occupied QDs that encodes a single-spin qubit (QD₁; qubit states $\{|0^L\rangle, |1^L\rangle\}$) and an exchange-only qubit (QD₂-QD₄; qubit states $\{|0^R\rangle, |1^R\rangle\}$). A general interaction in this setup is

$$\mathcal{H}^B = \frac{J_{12}}{4} (\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 - 1) + \frac{E_z}{2} (\sigma_{z,1} + \sigma_{z,2} + \sigma_{z,3} + \sigma_{z,4}) + \frac{J}{4} [(\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_3 - 1) + (\sigma_3 \cdot \sigma_4 - 1)]. \quad (4)$$

The first term in Eq. (4) is the exchange coupling between QD₁ and QD₂. The second term is the global magnetic




Figure 2. Entangling operation between a single-spin qubit and an exchange-only qubit. (a) QD₁ defines a single-spin qubit with the qubit levels $\{0^L, 1^L\}$; QD₂-QD₄ define an exchange-only qubit with the qubit levels $\{0^R, 1^R\}$. A weak tunnel coupling between QD₁ and QD₂ couples the single-spin qubit and the exchange-only qubit. (b) Sequence to create a CPHASE between a single-spin qubit (coded on QD₁) and an exchange-only qubit (coded on QD₂-QD₄). Z_ϕ^L and Z_ϕ^R are the phase gates of the qubits L and R. \mathcal{U}_ϕ^B is defined in Eq. (7).

field, and the third term describes the exchange couplings of the exchange-only qubit.

$\frac{E_z}{2} (\sigma_{z,1} + \sigma_{z,2} + \sigma_{z,3} + \sigma_{z,4})$ commutes with the remaining parts of Eq. (4), and this term causes only an irrelevant time evolution of the single-spin qubit. The relevant time evolution through Eq. (4) is

$$\mathcal{U}_{\phi,\psi}^B = e^{-i2\pi\{\frac{\phi}{4}(\sigma_1 \cdot \sigma_2 - 1) + \frac{\psi}{4}[(\sigma_2 \cdot \sigma_3 - 1) + (\sigma_3 \cdot \sigma_4 - 1)]\}}, \quad (5)$$

with $\phi = J_{12}/h$ and $\psi = J/h$. There are exact entangling operations between a single-spin qubit and an exchange-only qubit that use Eq. (5). However, these sequences are complicated and involve many operation steps.⁴⁵

Simpler entangling operations can be constructed for $J \gg J_{12}$. The computational subspace is part of the four-spin subspaces $S = 0$, $s_z = 0$ and $S = 1$, $s_z = 1, 0$, which together have eight dimensions.⁴⁶ Because the Hamiltonian in Eq. (4) preserves the spin quantum numbers, it is sufficient to describe the time evolution only in the four-spin subspaces $S = 0$, $s_z = 0$ and $S = 1$, $s_z = 1, 0$ that are spanned by $\{|0^L 0^R\rangle, |0^L 1^R\rangle, |1^L 0^R\rangle, |l_1\rangle, |1^L 1^R\rangle, |l_2\rangle, |l_3\rangle, |l_4\rangle\}$, with $|l_1\rangle = |0^L\rangle|u_{-1/2}\rangle$, $|l_2\rangle = |0^L\rangle|v_{-1/2}\rangle$, $|l_3\rangle \propto |0^L\rangle|Q_{-1/2}\rangle - |1^L\rangle|Q_{1/2}\rangle$, and $|l_4\rangle \propto \sqrt{3}|1^L\rangle|Q_{3/2}\rangle - |0^L\rangle|Q_{1/2}\rangle$. The states $|u_{-1/2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle)$ and $|v_{-1/2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle) - \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}|\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ span the $S = \frac{1}{2}$, $s_z = -\frac{1}{2}$ spin subspace of three electrons; $|Q_{3/2}\rangle = |\uparrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$, $|Q_{1/2}\rangle \propto |\uparrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + |\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$, $|Q_{-1/2}\rangle \propto |\downarrow\downarrow\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + |\uparrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$, and $|Q_{-3/2}\rangle = |\downarrow\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$ are the $S = \frac{3}{2}$

span the $S = \frac{1}{2}$, $s_z = -\frac{1}{2}$ subspace of the spins at QD₂-QD₄ (using the definitions from Sec. III B). $m_3 = \sqrt{\frac{1}{2}}|T_-\rangle|Q_{3/2}\rangle - \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}|T_0\rangle|Q_{1/2}\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}|T_+\rangle|Q_{-1/2}\rangle$, $m_4 = \sqrt{\frac{2}{5}}|T_-\rangle|Q_{3/2}\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{15}}|T_0\rangle|Q_{1/2}\rangle - \sqrt{\frac{8}{15}}|T_+\rangle|Q_{-1/2}\rangle$, and $m_5 = |S\rangle|Q_{3/2}\rangle$ have different energies,

and therefore these states can be neglected. $|T_+\rangle = |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle$, $|T_0\rangle \propto |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$, $|T_-\rangle = |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle$, and $|S_0\rangle = |\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle$ are the usual triplet and singlet states at QD₁-QD₂. Projecting Eq. (9) to $\{|0^L0^R\rangle, |1^L0^R\rangle, |m_1\rangle, |0^L1^R\rangle, |1^L1^R\rangle, |m_2\rangle\}$ gives

$$\mathcal{H}^{C_1} \approx \left(\begin{array}{ccc|ccc} \frac{E_z - J - \tilde{E}_{z,2}}{2} - \frac{J_{23}}{4} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{J_{23}}{4\sqrt{3}} & & -\frac{J_{23}}{2\sqrt{3}} \\ 0 & \frac{E_z - J + \tilde{E}_{z,2}}{2} - \frac{J_{23}}{4} & 0 & & \frac{J_{23}}{4\sqrt{3}} & \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{E_z - J + \tilde{E}_{z,2}}{2} - \frac{J_{23}}{4} & \frac{J_{23}}{2\sqrt{3}} & & \frac{J_{23}}{4\sqrt{3}} \\ \hline -\frac{J_{23}}{4\sqrt{3}} & & \frac{J_{23}}{2\sqrt{3}} & \frac{E_z - 3J - \tilde{E}_{z,2}}{2} - \frac{5J_{23}}{12} & 0 & -\frac{J_{23}}{3} \\ & \frac{J_{23}}{4\sqrt{3}} & & 0 & \frac{E_z - 3J + \tilde{E}_{z,2}}{2} - \frac{J_{23}}{12} & 0 \\ -\frac{J_{23}}{2\sqrt{3}} & & \frac{J_{23}}{4\sqrt{3}} & -\frac{J_{23}}{3} & 0 & \frac{E_z - 3J + \tilde{E}_{z,2}}{2} - \frac{5J_{23}}{12} \end{array} \right). \quad (10)$$

Eq. (10) contains two subspaces of virtually identical energies, as marked by the borders in the matrix. All the terms that couple these subspaces can be neglected.

After neglecting the block off diagonal entries in Eq. (10), also the time evolutions of E_z and J factor because they commute with the remaining entries. The time evolution through $\frac{J}{4}[(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_4 - \mathbf{1}) + (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_4 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_5 - \mathbf{1})] \simeq \frac{J}{2}(|0^R\rangle\langle 0^R| - |1^R\rangle\langle 1^R|)$ causes only single-qubit time evolutions of the triple-QD qubit, and E_z causes global phase evolutions. The remaining time evolution is

$$\mathcal{U}_{\phi, \psi}^{C_1} \approx e^{-i2\pi(\phi m_1 + \frac{\psi}{2} m_2)}, \quad (11)$$

$$m_1 = -\text{diag} \left\{ \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \frac{1}{4}, \left(\begin{array}{ccc} \frac{5}{12} & 0 & \frac{1}{3} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{12} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{3} & 0 & \frac{5}{12} \end{array} \right) \right\},$$

$$m_2 = \text{diag} \{-1, 1, 1, -1, 1, 1\},$$

with $\phi = J_{23}/h$ and $\psi = \tilde{E}_{z,2}/h$.

Eq. (11) causes no leakage for $\frac{1}{3}\sqrt{4\phi^2 + 9\psi^2} = 2\mathbb{Z} + 1$, and an entangling operation is realized for $\frac{1}{6}(2\phi - 3\psi) = \mathbb{Z}$. Alternatively, it is also possible to use $\frac{1}{3}\sqrt{4\phi^2 + 9\psi^2} = 2\mathbb{Z}$ and $\frac{1}{6}(2\phi - 3\psi) = \mathbb{Z} + \frac{1}{2}$. E.g., the entangling operation $\mathcal{U}_{3/(2\sqrt{2}), 1/\sqrt{2}}^{C_1}$ gives a CPHASE in the basis $\{|0^L0^R\rangle, |0^L1^R\rangle, |1^L0^R\rangle, |1^L1^R\rangle\}$ using [see

Fig. 3(b)]:

$$\mathcal{U}_{1/\sqrt{2}}^L \mathcal{Z}_{(4+\sqrt{2})/8}^R \mathcal{U}_{3/(2\sqrt{2}), 1/\sqrt{2}}^{C_1} = e^{i\pi \frac{\sqrt{2}-3}{2}} \text{CPHASE}. \quad (12)$$

Note that in the construction of Eq. (12), it was assumed that J_{12} is turned to zero during the entangling operation. Small values of J_{12} can only be tolerated if they are much smaller than $\tilde{E}_{z,2}$. An alternative gate can be constructed for large J_{12} . In this case, Eq. (9) is modified to

$$\mathcal{H}^{C_2} = \frac{J_{12}}{4} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_1 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_2 - \mathbf{1}) + \frac{J}{4} [(\boldsymbol{\sigma}_3 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_4 - \mathbf{1}) + (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_4 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_5 - \mathbf{1})]$$

$$+ \frac{\Sigma E_z}{2} (\sigma_{z,1} + \sigma_{z,2}) + \frac{J_{23}}{4} (\boldsymbol{\sigma}_2 \cdot \boldsymbol{\sigma}_3 - \mathbf{1}) \quad (13)$$

$$+ \frac{E_z}{2} (\sigma_{z,1} + \sigma_{z,2} + \sigma_{z,3} + \sigma_{z,4} + \sigma_{z,5}).$$

Eq. (13) contains the exchange interactions J_{12} , J_{23} , and J . Additionally to a global magnetic field E_z , the sum of the magnetic field variations at QD₁ and QD₂ are important $\Sigma E_z = (\tilde{E}_{z,1} + \tilde{E}_{z,2})/2$. The magnetic field difference $\Delta E_z = (\tilde{E}_{z,1} - \tilde{E}_{z,2})/2$ can be neglected if it is much smaller than J_{12} . Using the equivalent arguments as before for $E_z, J_{12}, J \gg \Sigma E_z, J_{23}$, the qubit time evolution is restricted to the subspace $\{|T_00^R\rangle, |m_1\rangle, |T_01^R\rangle, |m_2\rangle, |S_00^R\rangle, |S_01^R\rangle\}$. Projecting Eq. (13) to this basis gives




Figure 4. Gate errors for the operation sequences of Eq. (8), Eq. (12), and Eq. (16). Only the operations $\mathcal{U}_{3/4}^B$, $\mathcal{U}_{3/(2\sqrt{2}),1/\sqrt{2}}^{C_1}$, and $\mathcal{U}_{3/\sqrt{2},1/(2\sqrt{2})}^{C_2}$ are analyzed. The gate errors are characterized by the deviation of the entanglement fidelity $F = \text{tr} \rho^{\text{RS}} \mathcal{U}_{\text{ideal}}^{-1} \mathcal{U}_{\text{real}} \rho^{\text{RS}} \mathcal{U}_{\text{real}}^{-1} \mathcal{U}_{\text{ideal}}$ from 1. $\rho^{\text{RS}} = |\text{RS}\rangle \langle \text{RS}|$ is the maximally entangled state of two identical subspaces R and S, e.g., $|\text{RS}\rangle \propto |0000\rangle + |0110\rangle + |1001\rangle + |1111\rangle$, and the time evolutions $\mathcal{U}_{\text{ideal}}$ and $\mathcal{U}_{\text{real}}$ act only on S while R remains unchanged. (a) For $\mathcal{U}_{3/4}^B$ (blue curve) and $\mathcal{U}_{3/(2\sqrt{2}),1/\sqrt{2}}^{C_1}$ (red curve) the exchange interaction of the exchange-only qubit J should be by more than one order of magnitude larger than J_{12} to reduce the gate error below 1%. (b) For $\mathcal{U}_{3/\sqrt{2},1/(2\sqrt{2})}^{C_2}$, J_{12} and J should be large. The gate errors increase for $J_{12} = 3J/2$, $J_{12} = J$, and $J_{12} = J/2$ (dashed lines) because of degeneracies in the level spectrum.

types. To entangle a single-spin qubit and an exchange-only qubit, a sequence of two inter-qubit exchange interactions is needed.

The advantage of exchange-based entangling operations is the controllability of the interaction mechanism. The exchange interaction depends on the tunnel coupling between distant QDs and their chemical potentials. It has been shown that exchange interactions can be tuned rapidly.⁴³ The limitations of the proposed entangling operations are similar to existing gate schemes.




Figure 5. Gate operations to interchange qubits using CPHASE gates. (a) The unconditioned SWAP operation requires three CPHASE gates together with Hadamard gates (H). (b) A simpler SWAP sequence can be realized if one of the qubits is initialized to a fixed state, e.g., $|0\rangle$. Then the SWAP operation with an arbitrary state $|\psi\rangle$ requires only two CPHASE gates.

Local magnetic⁴⁷ and electric field⁴⁸ fluctuations are present in semiconductors. Both mechanism cause low-frequency fluctuations of the QD parameters. It is possible to reduce the influence of low-frequency fluctuations by refocusing protocols,^{49,50} which can also be optimized numerically.⁵¹ Spin-orbit interactions are weak in typical QD materials like, e.g., GaAs or Si,^{1,2} and they should have minor influence on the proposed operation sequences.

The constructions of the entangling operations in Sec. III B and Sec. III C used a few approximations. It was assumed that the exchange interaction between the QDs of the STQ, or between the QDs of the exchange-only qubit are constantly turned on, while their magnitudes are much larger than the exchange interaction between the neighboring QDs of the different qubits. Fig. 4 show that about one order of magnitude difference in the interaction strength is sufficient to reduce the effective gate errors below 1%. These gate errors are sufficient for quantum computation with standard quantum error correction protocols.⁵²⁻⁵⁴

Besides entangling different kinds of spin qubits, it might also be useful to interchange quantum information between them. Fig. 5 shows operation sequences for SWAP operations that only rely on CPHASE and Hadamard gates (cf. Ref. [55]). An unconditioned SWAP is realized using three CPHASE gates; only two CPHASE gates are needed if the state of a qubit should be transferred to another qubit that is initially in $|0\rangle$.

Altogether, very efficient operation sequences have been constructed to couple and interconvert different kinds of spin qubits. These operation sequences can couple all the standard qubit encodings in one, two, and three singly occupied QDs. Only the established single-qubit manipulation protocols are needed that have been successfully realized for all the qubit encodings. Different qubits are coupled using exchange interactions that are well controlled experimentally. With the current efforts to build larger arrays of tunnel-coupled QDs,^{56,57} the proposed operation sequences can be tested directly. The interconversion of different spin qubits allows to use

all the advantages of the different QD setups in large arrays of QDs. E.g., it is known that few-electron qubits couple stronger to cavities^{17,23,24} or metallic gates,⁵⁸ while single-spin qubits have extremely long coherence times.^{8,31} Therefore the described operation sequences are another useful ingredient on the way towards quan-

tum computation with large QD networks.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We are grateful for support from the Alexander von Humboldt foundation.

-
- * s.mehl@fz-juelich.de
- ¹ R. Hanson, L. P. Kouwenhoven, J. R. Petta, S. Tarucha, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, "Spins in few-electron quantum dots," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **79**, 1217 (2007).
 - ² F. A. Zwanenburg, A. S. Dzurak, A. Morello, M. Y. Simmons, L. C. L. Hollenberg, G. Klimeck, S. Rogge, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, "Silicon quantum electronics," *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 961 (2013).
 - ³ D. Loss and D. P. DiVincenzo, "Quantum computation with quantum dots," *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 120 (1998).
 - ⁴ J. Levy, "Universal Quantum Computation with Spin-1/2 Pairs and Heisenberg Exchange," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **89**, 147902 (2002).
 - ⁵ D. P. DiVincenzo, D. Bacon, J. Kempe, G. Burkard, and K. B. Whaley, "Universal quantum computation with the exchange interaction," *Nature (London)* **408**, 339 (2000).
 - ⁶ E. Kawakami, P. Scarlino, D. R. Ward, F. R. Braakman, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, M. A. Eriksson, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, "Electrical control of a long-lived spin qubit in a Si/SiGe quantum dot," *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **9**, 666 (2014).
 - ⁷ P. Scarlino, E. Kawakami, D. R. Ward, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, M. A. Eriksson, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, "Second Harmonic Coherent Driving of a Spin Qubit in a Si/SiGe Quantum Dot," arXiv:1504.06436 [cond-mat.mes-hall] (2015).
 - ⁸ J. J. Pla, K. Y. Tan, J. P. Dehollain, W. H. Lim, J. J. L. Morton, D. N. Jamieson, A. S. Dzurak, and A. Morello, "A single-atom electron spin qubit in silicon," *Nature (London)* **489**, 541 (2012).
 - ⁹ M. Veldhorst, J. C. C. Hwang, C. H. Yang, A. W. Leenstra, B. de Ronde, J. P. Dehollain, J. T. Muhonen, F. E. Hudson, K. M. Itoh, A. Morello, and A. S. Dzurak, "An addressable quantum dot qubit with fault-tolerant control-fidelity," *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **9**, 981 (2014).
 - ¹⁰ M. Veldhorst, R. Ruskov, C. H. Yang, J. C. C. Hwang, F. E. Hudson, M. E. Flatté, C. Tahan, K. M. Itoh, A. Morello, and A. S. Dzurak, "Spin-orbit coupling and operation of multi-valley spin qubits," arXiv:1504.06436 [cond-mat.mes-hall] (2015).
 - ¹¹ R. Hanson and G. Burkard, "Universal Set of Quantum Gates for Double-Dot Spin Qubits with Fixed Interdot Coupling," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **98**, 050502 (2007).
 - ¹² S. Foletti, H. Bluhm, D. Mahalu, V. Umansky, and A. Yacoby, "Universal quantum control of two-electron spin quantum bits using dynamic nuclear polarization," *Nat. Phys.* **5**, 903 (2009).
 - ¹³ H. Bluhm, S. Foletti, D. Mahalu, V. Umansky, and A. Yacoby, "Enhancing the Coherence of a Spin Qubit by Operating it as a Feedback Loop That Controls its Nuclear Spin Bath," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 216803 (2010).
 - ¹⁴ X. Wu, D. R. Ward, J. R. Prance, D. Kim, J. K. Gamble, R. T. Mohr, Z. Shi, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, "Two-axis control of a singlet-triplet qubit with an integrated micromagnet," *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **111**, 11938 (2014).
 - ¹⁵ J. Medford, J. Beil, J. M. Taylor, S. D. Bartlett, A. C. Doherty, E. I. Rashba, D. P. DiVincenzo, H. Lu, A. C. Gossard, and C. M. Marcus, "Self-consistent measurement and state tomography of an exchange-only spin qubit," *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **8**, 654 (2013).
 - ¹⁶ K. Eng, T. D. Ladd, A. Smith, M. G. Borselli, A. A. Kisilev, B. H. Fong, K. S. Holabird, T. M. Hazard, B. Huang, P. W. Deelman, I. Milosavljevic, A. E. Schmitz, R. S. Ross, M. F. Gyure, and A. T. Hunter, "Isotopically enhanced triple-quantum-dot qubit," *Sci. Adv.* **1**, e1500214 (2015).
 - ¹⁷ J. M. Taylor, V. Srinivasa, and J. Medford, "Electrically Protected Resonant Exchange Qubits in Triple Quantum Dots," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 050502 (2013).
 - ¹⁸ J. Medford, J. Beil, J. M. Taylor, E. I. Rashba, H. Lu, A. C. Gossard, and C. M. Marcus, "Quantum-Dot-Based Resonant Exchange Qubit," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 050501 (2013).
 - ¹⁹ S. Mehl, H. Bluhm, and D. P. DiVincenzo, "Two-qubit couplings of singlet-triplet qubits mediated by one quantum state," *Phys. Rev. B* **90**, 045404 (2014).
 - ²⁰ A. C. Doherty and M. P. Wardrop, "Two-Qubit Gates for Resonant Exchange Qubits," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 050503 (2013).
 - ²¹ M. Veldhorst, C. H. Yang, J. C. C. Hwang, W. Huang, J. P. Dehollain, J. T. Muhonen, S. Simmons, A. Laucht, F. E. Hudson, K. M. Itoh, A. Morello, and A. S. Dzurak, "A Two Qubit Logic Gate in Silicon," arXiv:1411.5760 [cond-mat.mes-hall] (2014).
 - ²² J. M. Taylor, H.-A. Engel, W. Dür, A. Yacoby, C. M. Marcus, P. Zoller, and M. D. Lukin, "Fault-tolerant architecture for quantum computation using electrically controlled semiconductor spins," *Nat. Phys.* **1**, 177 (2005).
 - ²³ J. M. Taylor and M. D. Lukin, "Cavity quantum electrodynamics with semiconductor double-dot molecules on a chip," arXiv:cond-mat/0605144 [cond-mat.mes-hall] (2006).
 - ²⁴ G. Burkard and A. Imamoglu, "Ultra-long-distance interaction between spin qubits," *Phys. Rev. B* **74**, 041307 (2006).
 - ²⁵ M. D. Shulman, S. P. Harvey, J. M. Nichol, S. D. Bartlett, A. C. Doherty, V. Umansky, and A. Yacoby, "Suppressing qubit dephasing using real-time Hamiltonian estimation," *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 5156 (2014).
 - ²⁶ T. Frey, P. J. Leek, M. Beck, A. Blais, T. Ihn, K. Ensslin, and A. Wallraff, "Dipole Coupling of a Double Quantum Dot to a Microwave Resonator," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 046807 (2012).
 - ²⁷ K. D. Petersson, L. W. McFaul, M. D. Schroer, M. Jung,

- J. M. Taylor, A. A. Houck, and J. R. Petta, "Circuit quantum electrodynamics with a spin qubit," *Nature (London)* **490**, 380 (2012).
- ²⁸ H. Toida, T. Nakajima, and S. Komiyama, "Vacuum Rabi Splitting in a Semiconductor Circuit QED System," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 066802 (2013).
- ²⁹ Y. S. Weinstein and C. S. Hellberg, "Energetic suppression of decoherence in exchange-only quantum computation," *Phys. Rev. A* **72**, 022319 (2005).
- ³⁰ S. Mehl, H. Bluhm, and D. P. DiVincenzo, "Fault-tolerant quantum computation for singlet-triplet qubits with leakage errors," *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 085419 (2015).
- ³¹ G. Balasubramanian, P. Neumann, D. Twitchen, M. Markham, R. Kolesov, N. Mizuochi, J. Isoya, J. Achard, J. Beck, J. Tessler, V. Jacques P. R. Hemmer, F. Jelezko, and J. Wrachtrup, "Ultralong spin coherence time in isotopically engineered diamond," *Nature Mater.* **8**, 383 (2009).
- ³² B. E. Kane, "A silicon-based nuclear spin quantum computer," *Nature (London)* **393**, 133 (1998).
- ³³ J. T. Muhonen, J. P. Dehollain, A. Laucht, F. E. Hudson, T. Sekiguchi, K. M. Itoh, D. N. Jamieson, J. C. McCallum, A. S. Dzurak, and A. Morello, "Storing quantum information for 30 seconds in a nanoelectronic device," *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **9**, 986 (2014).
- ³⁴ J. P. Dehollain, J. T. Muhonen, K. Y. Tan, A. Saraiva, D. N. Jamieson, A. S. Dzurak, and A. Morello, "Single-Shot Readout and Relaxation of Singlet and Triplet States in Exchange-Coupled ^{31}P Electron Spins in Silicon," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 236801 (2014).
- ³⁵ J. T. Muhonen, A. Laucht, S. Simmons, J. P. Dehollain, R. Kalra, F. E. Hudson, S. Freer, K. M. Itoh, D. N. Jamieson, J. C. McCallum, A. S. Dzurak, and A. Morello, "Quantifying the quantum gate fidelity of single-atom spin qubits in silicon by randomized benchmarking," *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter* **27**, 154205 (2015).
- ³⁶ M. Urdampilleta, A. Chatterjee, C. C. Lo, T. Kobayashi, J. Mansir, S. Barraud, A. C. Betz, S. Rogge, M. F. Gonzalez-Zalba, and J. J. L. Morton, "Charge dynamics and spin blockade in a hybrid double quantum dot in silicon," arXiv:1503.01049 [cond-mat.mes-hall] (2015).
- ³⁷ R. H. Foote, D. R. Ward, J. R. Prance, J. K. Gamble, E. Nielsen, B. Thorgrimsson, D. E. Savage, A. L. Saraiva, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, "Transport through an impurity tunnel coupled to a Si/SiGe quantum dot," arXiv:1505.02132 [cond-mat.mes-hall] (2015).
- ³⁸ F. H. L. Koppens, C. Buizert, K.-J. Tielrooij, I. T. Vink, K. C. Nowack, T. Meunier, L. P. Kouwenhoven, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, "Driven coherent oscillations of a single electron spin in a quantum dot," *Nature (London)* **442**, 766 (2006).
- ³⁹ K. C. Nowack, F. H. L. Koppens, Y. V. Nazarov, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, "Coherent Control of a Single Electron Spin with Electric Fields," *Science* **318**, 1430 (2007).
- ⁴⁰ R. Brunner, Y.-S. Shin, T. Obata, M. Pioro-Ladrière, T. Kubo, K. Yoshida, T. Taniyama, Y. Tokura, and S. Tarucha, "Two-Qubit Gate of Combined Single-Spin Rotation and Interdot Spin Exchange in a Double Quantum Dot," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107**, 146801 (2011).
- ⁴¹ J. Yoneda, T. Otsuka, T. Nakajima, T. Takakura, T. Obata, M. Pioro-Ladrière, H. Lu, C. Palmstrøm, A. C. Gossard, and S. Tarucha, "Fast Electrical Control of Single Electron Spins in Quantum Dots with Vanishing Influence from Nuclear Spins," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 267601 (2014).
- ⁴² In contrast to Ref. [55], all the phase accumulations are given in multiples of 2π .
- ⁴³ J. R. Petta, A. C. Johnson, J. M. Taylor, E. A. Laird, A. Yacoby, M. D. Lukin, C. M. Marcus, M. P. Hanson, and A. C. Gossard, "Coherent Manipulation of Coupled Electron Spins in Semiconductor Quantum Dots," *Science* **309**, 2180 (2005).
- ⁴⁴ S. Mehl and D. P. DiVincenzo, "Noise analysis of qubits implemented in triple quantum dot systems in a Davies master equation approach," *Phys. Rev. B* **87**, 195309 (2013).
- ⁴⁵ I found operation sequences to create entangling operations with a numerical search algorithm, similar to the description in Ref. [19]. An operation sequence that is equivalent to a CPHASE is
- $$\mathcal{U}_{\phi_1, \phi_2}^B X_{\phi_3}^R \mathcal{U}_{\phi_1, \phi_2}^B Z_{1/2}^L X_{\phi_4}^R \mathcal{U}_{\phi_1, \phi_2}^B X_{\phi_3}^R \mathcal{U}_{\phi_1, \phi_2}^B,$$
- with $\phi_1 = 0.195613200942698$, $\phi_2 = 0.2178346646839128$, $\phi_3 = 0.7362256575556158$, and $\phi_4 = 0.735072280195903$.
- ⁴⁶ See the standard spin addition rules, e.g., in J. J. Sakurai and S. F. Tuan, *Modern Quantum Mechanics* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, 1994).
- ⁴⁷ G. Burkard, D. Loss, and D. P. DiVincenzo, "Coupled quantum dots as quantum gates," *Phys. Rev. B* **59**, 2070 (1999).
- ⁴⁸ X. Hu and S. Das Sarma, "Charge-Fluctuation-Induced Dephasing of Exchange-Coupled Spin Qubits," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 100501 (2006).
- ⁴⁹ H. Bluhm, S. Foletti, I. Neder, M. Rudner, D. Mahalu, V. Umansky, and A. Yacoby, "Dephasing time of GaAs electron-spin qubits coupled to a nuclear bath exceeding 200 μs ," *Nat. Phys.* **7**, 109 (2011).
- ⁵⁰ J. Medford, L. Cywinski, C. Barthel, C. M. Marcus, M. P. Hanson, and A. C. Gossard, "Scaling of Dynamical Decoupling for Spin Qubits," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 086802 (2012).
- ⁵¹ P. Cerfontaine, T. Botzem, D. P. DiVincenzo, and H. Bluhm, "High-Fidelity Single-Qubit Gates for Two-Electron Spin Qubits in GaAs," *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 150501 (2014).
- ⁵² A. G. Fowler, A. M. Stephens, and P. Groszkowski, "High-threshold universal quantum computation on the surface code," *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 052312 (2009).
- ⁵³ A. G. Fowler, M. Mariantoni, J. M. Martinis, and A. N. Cleland, "Surface codes: Towards practical large-scale quantum computation," *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 032324 (2012).
- ⁵⁴ N. C. Jones, R. Van Meter, A. G. Fowler, P. L. McMahon, J. Kim, T. D. Ladd, and Y. Yamamoto, "Layered Architecture for Quantum Computing," *Phys. Rev. X* **2**, 031007 (2012).
- ⁵⁵ M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- ⁵⁶ T. Takakura, A. Noiri, T. Obata, T. Otsuka, J. Yoneda, K. Yoshida, and S. Tarucha, "Single to quadruple quantum dots with tunable tunnel couplings," *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **104**, 113109 (2014).
- ⁵⁷ M. R. Delbecq, T. Nakajima, T. Otsuka, S. Amaha, J. D. Watson, M. J. Manfra, and S. Tarucha, "Full control of quadruple quantum dot circuit charge states in the single electron regime," *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **104**, 183111 (2014).
- ⁵⁸ L. Trifunovic, O. Dial, M. Trif, J. R. Wootton, R. Abebe, A. Yacoby, and D. Loss, "Long-Distance Spin-Spin Coupling via Floating Gates," *Phys. Rev. X* **2**, 011006 (2012).