Suppression of Qubit Crosstalk in a Tunable Coupling Superconducting Circuit
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We report the suppression of static ZZ crosstalk in a two-qubit, two-coupler superconducting circuit, where the ZZ interaction between the two qubits can be tuned to near zero. Characterization of qubit crosstalk is performed using randomized benchmarking and a two-qubit iSWAP gate is implemented using parametric modulation. We observe the dependence of single-qubit gate fidelity on ZZ interaction strength and identify effective thermalization of the tunable coupler as a crucial prerequisite for high fidelity two-qubit gates.
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Circuit quantum electrodynamics (cQED) [1], which uses superconducting circuits as its building blocks, has become a promising candidate and testbed for implementing quantum computation. Remarkable research progress has been made to integrate more qubits, resonators and other elements in a circuit in order to build increasingly computationally powerful devices [2, 3]. As the number of circuit elements and control signals scales up in a cQED device, undesired responses to external controls and unwanted interactions between subsystems lead to crosstalk that must be carefully calibrated and eliminated to ensure proper device performance [4, 5]. The trade-off between strong qubit-qubit interaction (for fast gates) and low crosstalk poses constraints on the device design and pulse schemes [6, 7].

In a cQED system where multiple transmon qubits [8] are coupled via bus cavities [9], the couplings between their higher energy levels give rise to cross-Kerr interactions that can be described by \( \zeta a_i^\dagger a_i a_j^\dagger a_j \) [10], where \( a (a^\dagger) \) is the annihilation (creation) operator for the qubit modes, and \( \zeta \) corresponds to the frequency shift of qubit \( i \) depending on the state of qubit \( j \) (and vice versa). This type of static ZZ crosstalk causes dephasing in the qubits and degrades device performance if \( \zeta \) is comparable to the qubit decoherence rate. In particular, it limits the fidelity of XX-type parity measurements in common quantum error correction schemes [11] and the lifetime of logical qubits containing XX-type stabilizers [4]. Theoretical and experimental studies have shown that ZZ crosstalk has become the limiting factor for gate fidelity as qubit coherence times keep improving in state-of-the-art devices [12].

In this work, we utilize quantum interference in a tunable coupling device to demonstrate the suppression of static ZZ crosstalk. By introducing a tunable coupler in addition to the bus cavity, we show that \( \zeta \) can be tuned to zero and that an efficient two-qubit gate can be implemented when \( \zeta \approx 0 \). By suppressing the always-on ZZ interaction, we achieve low qubit-qubit crosstalk, which is verified by simultaneous randomized benchmarking (RB). Recently, a theoretical architecture similar to our work has been independently proposed in [13] for achieving zero qubit-qubit dipole coupling through quantum interference.

The tunability of the two-qubit coupling strength enables us to implement an iSWAP gate using parametric modulation. Parametrically activated entangling gates have been widely employed in superconducting circuits [14–19]. However, in previous theoretical studies, the tunable coupler has always been assumed to be in the ground state during an iSWAP gate. In this work, we experimentally observe the degradation of an iSWAP gate due to poor thermalization of the coupler. We verify our findings with theoretical simulations of the dependence of iSWAP gate fidelity on the coupler temperature.

The device, shown in Fig. 1, consists of two computational qubits (Q1, Q2) coupled via a coupler qubit (C−) and a bus cavity (C+). The Hamiltonian for the device is

\[
H/\hbar = \sum_{i=1,2,\pm} \left( \omega_i a_i^\dagger a_i - \frac{\alpha_i}{2} a_i^\dagger a_i^\dagger a_i a_i \right) + \sum_{i=1,2} \sum_{j=\pm} g_{ij} (a_i^\dagger a_j + a_i a_j^\dagger),
\]

where the subscripts 1, 2, −, + correspond to the aforementioned elements, \( \omega_i \) and \( \alpha_i \) are their frequencies and anharmonicities, and the \( g_{ij} \) are the coupling rates between them. The computational qubits are fixed-frequency transmons with \( \omega_1/2\pi = 4.973 (5.163) \) GHz, and the bus cavity has resonance frequency of \( \omega_+ /2\pi = 7.036 \) GHz and \( \alpha_+ = 0 \). The coupler qubit frequency \( \omega_- \) can be tuned via a flux bias line.

The device is operated in the dispersive regime, where \( |\omega_i - \omega_j| \gg g_{ij} \), to minimize population leakage into the coupler qubit during gate operations and decoherence induced by flux noise in the coupler qubit [14]. In this regime, \( \zeta \) can be calculated using standard perturbation theory, and the analysis (See supplementary materials for details) shows that the criterion for zero \( \zeta \) and high qubit-qubit coupling strength is that the bus cavity (coupler qubit) be above (below) both qubits in frequency and...
one qubit be in the straddling regime of the other, i.e.

\[ \omega_- < \omega_{1,2} < \omega_+, \quad |\omega_1 - \omega_2| < \alpha_{1,2}. \]  

(2)

Tunability of \( \zeta \) is realized by adjusting the frequency of the coupler qubit (\( \omega_-(\Phi) = \omega_\text{max} \sqrt{\cos(\pi \Phi/\Phi_0)} \)), where \( \Phi_0 \) is the flux quantum) by tuning magnetic flux bias \( \Phi \). Zero \( \zeta \) can be achieved when there is destructive interference between ZZ interactions caused by the bus cavity and the coupler qubit.

We perform two-tone spectroscopy on both computational qubits while tuning the frequency of the coupler qubit via external magnetic field, and the result is shown in Fig. 2(a). When the coupler is brought into resonance with either qubit, an avoided crossing is observed and the corresponding coupling rate \( g_{1-} \) can be extracted by fitting the data to the eigenenergies of Eqn. (1) (See supplementary materials for the obtained parameter values).

The frequency shift of qubit 1 when the state of qubit 2 changes from ground to excited corresponds to the quantity \( \zeta = \omega_{11} - \omega_{10} - \omega_{01} \), which represents the ZZ coupling strength between the two qubits. \( \zeta \) is measured via a cross Ramsey measurement which involves measuring the qubit frequency with a Ramsey experiment while initializing the other qubit in either ground or excited state [see inset of Fig. 2(b) for the pulse sequence]. The dependence of \( \zeta \) on the coupler frequency \( \omega_-(\Phi) \) is mapped out in Fig. 2(b) via cross Ramsey measurements on qubit 1. Based on the criterion in Eqn. (2), we tune the frequency of the coupler qubit to be below those of both qubits and observe that \( \zeta \) crosses zero at \( \omega_-(\omega_1)/2 \pi = -1.47 \) and \( -0.75 \) GHz. The theoretical curve in Fig. 2(b) is calculated from the numerical diagonalization of the Hamiltonian in Eqn. (1) using the parameters obtained from fitting the spectroscopy data. The error bars correspond to the fitting error of the Ramsey data. Although the uncertainty in \( \zeta \) is relativley large, primarily due to the short \( T_2 \) of the qubit, we show clear evidence of the tunability and sign change of \( \zeta \) in agreement with theory. Cross Ramsey measurements on qubit 2 show similar values of \( \zeta \) but with larger uncertainty.

To further characterize the effect of \( \zeta \) on qubit crosstalk, we utilize the simultaneous RB protocol, where the difference in gate fidelity between individual (\( F_I \)) and simultaneous (\( F_S \)) RB provides a figure of merit for addressability and crosstalk [6]. The pulses used for single-qubit gates have Gaussian envelopes truncated at 4\( \sigma \) in total, with \( \sigma = 6.4 \) ns. Derivative removal via adiabatic gate (DRAG) [20, 21] is used for pulse correction reducing phase error and leakage to higher transmon levels. As shown in Fig. 3, the average gate fidelity, obtained from an exponential fit, for individual RB is \( F_I > 99.8\% \) for the primary gate set \{I, \( X_{\pi/2}, Y_{\pi/2}, X_{\pi}, Y_{\pi} \)\} for both qubits, which is close to the coherence-limited fidelity of 99.84\% estimated from the device parameters \( T_1 = [15.2 \, \mu s, \, 12.1 \, \mu s] \) and \( T_2 = [4.2 \, \mu s, \, 4 \, \mu s] \). The individual RB fidelity is not affected by the magnitude of \( \zeta \) whereas the gate fidelity from simultaneous RB decreases with increasing \( \zeta \). When \( \zeta > 2 \) kHz, \( F_I - F_S \) is less than 0.01\%, indicating that crosstalk is suppressed to a level below the gate error for this device. By contrast, when \( \zeta > 2 \) kHz the gate error increases by an order of magnitude, and ZZ crosstalk becomes the dominant source of gate error. We find good agreement between these results and numerical calculation using a Kraus map model for RB (See supplementary materials).

To realize a universal quantum gate set, we implement a two-qubit entangling gate using parametric modulation of the coupler qubit [14]. When the magnetic flux threading the SQUID loop of the coupler qubit is modulated around \( \Phi = \Theta \) at frequency \( \omega_\Phi = \omega_2 - \omega_1 \), phase \( \phi \) and amplitude \( \delta \), i.e. \( \Phi(t) = \Theta + \delta \cos(\omega_\Phi t + \phi) \), the ef-
FIG. 2. Calibration of tunable $\zeta$ device. (a) Spectroscopy of qubits and coupler. Red dashed lines are fit to the eigenenergies of Eqn. (1). Black dashed lines correspond to $\omega_i + g_{ij}^2/\Delta_{ij}$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $\omega_{\pm}(\Phi)$. (b) ZZ interaction strength $\zeta$ as a function of coupler frequency $\omega_{\pm}$. The value of $\zeta$ (blue points) is obtained by cross Ramsey calibration, where the frequency of qubit 1 is measured with and without a $\pi$ pulse to qubit 2 in the start of the experiment. Inset shows the pulse scheme and red line is the theoretical result from numerically diagonalizing Eqn. (1) using the fitted parameters.

Effective exchange coupling between the two qubits in their rotating frame is

$$H_{\text{int}}/\hbar = \frac{\delta}{2} \frac{\partial J}{\partial \Phi} \left( a_1^\dagger a_2 e^{-i\phi} + a_1 a_2^\dagger e^{i\phi} \right),$$  

(3)

where

$$J = \sum_{j=\pm} g_{1j} g_{2j} \left( \frac{1}{\omega_1 - \omega_j} + \frac{1}{\omega_2 - \omega_j} \right),$$  

(4)

is the rate for the effective exchange coupling mediated by couplers. The parametric modulation brings the computational qubits effectively into resonance and can be used to implement an iSWAP gate. Importantly, the effective coupling strength depends on the derivative of $J$ with respect to $\Phi$, and in this device, despite small $\zeta$, $\delta \cdot \partial J/\partial \Phi$ can be tuned from zero to a few MHz for moderate modulation amplitude $\delta$. An efficient two-qubit gate can therefore be implemented while ZZ crosstalk is suppressed.

Starting in the computational state $|10\rangle$, we apply flux modulation to the coupler for varying durations, followed by measurement of the qubit populations. The modulation frequency is fixed at the detuning of the two qubits (i.e. $\omega_0 = \tilde{\omega}_2 - \tilde{\omega}_1$, where $\tilde{\omega}_{1,2}$ are the qubit frequencies in the presence of flux modulation). The DC flux bias $\Theta$ is chosen to ensure low ZZ crosstalk based on ZZ calibration and simultaneous RB characterization. The result is shown in Fig. 4, where flux modulation for a duration of 90 ns leads to maximum population exchange between states $|10\rangle$ and $|01\rangle$.

In the experiment we find a noticeable amount of thermal population in the coupler qubit, evidenced by a splitting of frequency in both qubits' spectrum near the avoided crossing with the coupler qubit. The thermally dressed frequency for qubit 1 can be seen in the measured spectroscopy, and comparison between numerical simulation and measured data results in estimated effective coupler temperature of $\sim 90$ mK (See supplementary ma-
In conclusion, we demonstrate a way to achieve truly zero ZZ crosstalk by utilizing quantum interference in a tunable coupler device. This device allows us to operate in an optimal configuration to suppress qubit crosstalk, and the tunable ZZ interaction strength provides a useful tool to study the impact of crosstalk in cQED systems. We also identify thermal population in the tunable coupler as the factor that limits parametric iSWAP gate fidelity.
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I. DEVICE PARAMETERS

The coupler frequency in a full flux quantum is measured using two-tone spectroscopy and the bus cavity frequency is measured by monitoring the ac Stark shift of either qubit while sweeping the frequency of a cavity populating tone. The coupling parameters are obtained by fitting the spectroscopy data.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Symbol</th>
<th>Value</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Qubit 1 frequency</td>
<td>$\omega_1/2\pi$</td>
<td>4.973 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubit 1 anharmonicity</td>
<td>$\alpha_1/2\pi$</td>
<td>400 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubit 1 relaxation time</td>
<td>$T_1^{(1)}$</td>
<td>15.2 $\mu$s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubit 1 coherence time</td>
<td>$T_{2E}^{(1)}$</td>
<td>4.2 $\mu$s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubit 2 frequency</td>
<td>$\omega_2/2\pi$</td>
<td>5.163 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubit 2 anharmonicity</td>
<td>$\alpha_2/2\pi$</td>
<td>400 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubit 2 relaxation time</td>
<td>$T_1^{(2)}$</td>
<td>12.1 $\mu$s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Qubit 2 coherence time</td>
<td>$T_{2E}^{(2)}$</td>
<td>4.0 $\mu$s</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bus cavity frequency</td>
<td>$\omega_+/2\pi$</td>
<td>7.036 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum coupler frequency</td>
<td>$\omega_{\max}/2\pi$</td>
<td>7.18 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coupler anharmonicity</td>
<td>$\alpha_-/2\pi$</td>
<td>750 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Qubit 1, bus cavity) coupling</td>
<td>$g_{1+}/2\pi$</td>
<td>135 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Qubit 2, bus cavity) coupling</td>
<td>$g_{2+}/2\pi$</td>
<td>135 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Qubit 1, coupler) coupling</td>
<td>$g_{1-}/2\pi$</td>
<td>95 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Qubit 2, coupler) coupling</td>
<td>$g_{2-}/2\pi$</td>
<td>95 MHz</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

II. RB SIMULATIONS

For the simulation of RB sequences, we follow the protocol used in [S1]. For ease of reading, we describe the protocol here using the same notation as that used in [S1]. The accrued error is measured by tracking the density matrix as we go through the sequence of gates after starting in the ground state. For each gate in the RB sequence, we first apply an ideal gate unitary transformation, followed by a $ZZ$ unitary transformation and a density matrix map to account for decoherence. The maps used are

\[
\Lambda_{\text{gate}}[\rho] = U_g \cdot \rho \cdot U_g^\dagger, \quad (S1)
\]

\[
\Lambda_{\text{ZZ}}[\rho] = U_{ZZ} \cdot \rho \cdot U_{ZZ}^\dagger, \quad (S2)
\]

\[
\Lambda_{T_1, T_2}[\rho] = \frac{1}{2} e^{-t/T_2} Z \cdot \rho \cdot Z + \frac{1}{2} e^{-t/T_2} \rho + \frac{1}{2} e^{-t/T_1} (0\langle 1 | \cdot \rho \cdot | 1 \rangle (0) - (1 - e^{-t/T_1}) | 1 \rangle (1) \cdot \rho \cdot | 1 \rangle (1)), \quad (S3)
\]
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where $Z$ is the Pauli-Z operator.

The update to the density matrix after each gate can be expressed as follows

$$
\rho_{t+1} = \Lambda_{T_1, T_2, Q_1} \circ \Lambda_{T_1, T_2, Q_2} \circ \Lambda_{ZZ} \circ \Lambda_{\text{gate}, Q_1} \circ \Lambda_{\text{gate}, Q_2} [\rho_t].
$$  \hfill (S4)

The gate duration used for simulation is 22 ns and the coherence values used are $T_1 = [15.2 \mu s, 12.1 \mu s]$ and $T_2 = [4.2 \mu s, 4 \mu s]$. The measured fidelity matches with the simulation results.

![Graph](image)

**FIG. S1.** Kraus map model based simulation of simultaneous randomized benchmarking schemes gives fidelity of $F_S = 99.8\%$ for $\zeta = 0$ and $F_S = 98.5\%$ for $\zeta = 2\pi \times 2.26$ MHz. This matches well with the experimental results shown in the main text.

### III. $\zeta$ Calculation

We start from the Hamiltonian in Eqn.(1) in the main text,

$$
H = H_0 + V = \sum_{i=1,2,\pm} \hbar \left( \omega_i a_i^\dagger a_i - \frac{\alpha_i}{2} a_i^\dagger a_i a_i a_i^\dagger \right) + \sum_{i=1,2} \hbar g_{ij} (a_j^\dagger a_j + a_j a_j^\dagger).
$$  \hfill (S5)

and denote the eigenstates and eigenfrequencies by $|n_1 n_2 n_+ n_-\rangle$ and $\omega_{n_1 n_2 n_+ n_-}$. The detunings $\Delta_{ij}$ are the differences between unperturbed, single-excitation energy levels, e.g., $\Delta_{1+} = \omega_{1000}^{(0)} - \omega_{0010}^{(0)}$, etc. The ZZ coupling rate $\zeta$ between qubit 1 and 2 (assuming the couplers are in their ground states) is given by

$$
\zeta = \omega_{1100} - \omega_{1000} - \omega_{0100} \quad (\omega_{0000} = 0 \text{ for all orders}).
$$  \hfill (S6)

We use fourth order perturbation theory outlined in [S2], and the expression for $\zeta$ is

$$
\zeta = \frac{g_1^2 + g_2^2}{\Delta_{1+} + \Delta_{2+} + \alpha_+} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{1+}} + \frac{1}{\Delta_{2+}} \right)^2 + \frac{2g_1^2 g_2^2}{\Delta_{1-} + \Delta_{2-} + \alpha_-} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{1-}} + \frac{1}{\Delta_{2-}} \right)^2
$$

\[+
\left( \frac{g_1 + g_2}{\Delta_{1+}} + \frac{g_1 - g_2}{\Delta_{1-}} \right)^2 \frac{2}{\Delta_{12} + \alpha_2 - \Delta_{12}} - \frac{1}{\Delta_{12}} \]

\[+
\left( \frac{g_1 + g_2}{\Delta_{2+}} + \frac{g_1 - g_2}{\Delta_{2-}} \right)^2 \frac{2}{\Delta_{21} + \alpha_1 - \Delta_{21}} \]

\[+
\left( \frac{g_1 + g_2}{\Delta_{1+}} - \frac{g_1 - g_2}{\Delta_{1-}} \right)^2 \frac{2}{\Delta_{12} + \alpha_2 - \Delta_{12}} - \frac{1}{\Delta_{12}} \]

\[+
\left( \frac{g_1 + g_2}{\Delta_{2+}} - \frac{g_1 - g_2}{\Delta_{2-}} \right)^2 \frac{2}{\Delta_{21} + \alpha_1 - \Delta_{21}} \]

\[+
\left( \frac{g_1 + g_2}{\Delta_{1+}} + \frac{g_1 - g_2}{\Delta_{2+}} \right)^2 \frac{2}{\Delta_{12} + \alpha_2 - \Delta_{12}} - \frac{1}{\Delta_{12}} \]

\[+
\left( \frac{g_1 + g_2}{\Delta_{2+}} + \frac{g_1 - g_2}{\Delta_{2-}} \right)^2 \frac{2}{\Delta_{21} + \alpha_1 - \Delta_{21}} \]

\[+
\left( \frac{g_1 + g_2}{\Delta_{1+}} - \frac{g_1 - g_2}{\Delta_{2+}} \right)^2 \frac{2}{\Delta_{12} + \alpha_2 - \Delta_{12}} - \frac{1}{\Delta_{12}} \]

\[+
\left( \frac{g_1 + g_2}{\Delta_{2+}} - \frac{g_1 - g_2}{\Delta_{2-}} \right)^2 \frac{2}{\Delta_{21} + \alpha_1 - \Delta_{21}} \]  \hfill (S7)
TABLE S2. Parameter configurations for ZZ coupling rate calculation in Fig. S2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Figure</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Parameters (2\pi\cdot MHz)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(a)</td>
<td>Qubits far apart, one coupler in between.</td>
<td>$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 350$, $\alpha_- = 750$, $\Delta_{12} = 1500$, $g_{1-} = g_{2-} = 140$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(b)</td>
<td>Qubits in straddling regime, one coupler above, one coupler below.</td>
<td>$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 350$, $\alpha_+ = 750$, $\alpha_- = 0$, $\Delta_{12} = 250$, $\Delta_{+2} = 1800$, $g_{1+} = g_{2+} = 160$, $g_{1-} = g_{2-} = 140$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(c)</td>
<td>Qubits in straddling regime, one coupler above.</td>
<td>$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 350$, $\alpha_+ = 750$, $\Delta_{12} = 250$, $g_{1+} = g_{2+} = 120$.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(d)</td>
<td>Qubits out of straddling regime, one coupler above, one coupler below.</td>
<td>$\alpha_1 = \alpha_2 = 350$, $\alpha_- = 750$, $\alpha_+ = 0$, $\Delta_{12} = 450$, $\Delta_{+2} = 1800$, $g_{1+} = g_{2+} = 160$, $g_{1-} = g_{2-} = 140$.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

FIG. S2. ZZ coupling rate calculated from perturbation theory (blue) and numerical diagonalization (red). (a) Qubit frequencies are far apart with one coupler in between. (b) Qubits are in straddling regime, with one coupler above and one below the qubits in frequency. (c) The qubits are in straddling regime with one coupler above the qubit frequencies. (d) Qubits are out of straddling regime with one coupler above and one coupler below the qubits in frequency. The parameters used for each configuration are listed in Table S2.

To show the possibility of zero ZZ interaction, we calculate $\zeta$ for different parameter configurations using Eqns. (S7) and (S6), and the results are shown in the Fig. S2. The parameter configurations for each plot are listed in Table S2.

From Fig. S2 we find that there are several configurations that result in zero $\zeta$. We choose the configuration in (b) because the two qubits are close to each other in frequency and have stronger interaction strength compared to (a), which can potentially lead to fast two qubit gates in addition to zero $\zeta$. In configuration (c) zero $\zeta$ happens at relatively small detuning $\Delta_-/2\pi = 634$ MHz, which increases the susceptibility of the qubits to flux noise in the coupler.
IV. THERMAL POPULATION OF COUPLER QUBIT

The thermally dressed frequency for qubit 1 ($\omega_{1010} - \omega_{0010}$) can be seen in the measured two-tone spectroscopy, as is shown in Fig. S3(a). We fit the signal corresponding to the thermally dressed qubit 1 at the avoided crossing with the Boltzmann distribution to obtain thermal population of the tunable coupler. We estimate the thermal population in the coupler to be about $\sim 10\%$. Figure S3(b) shows the numerical simulation [S3], and comparison with measured data results in an estimated effective coupler temperature of $\sim 90$ mK. The thermal excitation in the coupler changes the detuning $\bar{\omega}_1 - \bar{\omega}_2$ and leaves behind a fraction of $\sim 10\%$ qubit population during the iSWAP operation, as can be seen in Fig. 4 of the main text.

![Measured two-tone spectroscopy and numerical simulation](image)

FIG. S3. Thermal population of coupler qubit. (a) Measured two-tone spectroscopy for qubit 1 shows splitting (indicated by arrows) due to the thermal population in the coupler qubit. (b) Numerical simulation shows the thermally dressed qubit frequency $\omega_{1010} - \omega_{0010}$. For this simulation, the thermal population in the first excited state is set to 0.11, corresponding to an effective temperature of 91 mK (for a 4 GHz frequency of the coupler qubit). The colormaps in both figures are saturated to better visualize thermally dressed frequencies.

V. SIMULATION OF iSWAP FIDELITY VS TEMPERATURE

From second order perturbation theory, we have the following effective iSWAP coupling strengths for different states of the tunable coupler –

(Tunable coupler population = 0)

$$J_0 = \frac{1}{2} \left[ g_{1+}g_{2+} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{1+}} + \frac{1}{\Delta_{2+}} \right) + g_{1-}g_{2-} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{1-}} + \frac{1}{\Delta_{2-}} \right) \right],$$

$$\partial J_0/\partial \Phi = \frac{1}{2} \left[ g_{1-}g_{2-} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{1-}} + \frac{1}{\Delta_{2-}} \right) \right] \partial \omega_-/\partial \Phi. \quad (S8)$$

(Tunable coupler population = 1)

$$J_1 = \frac{1}{2} \left[ g_{1+}g_{2+} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{1+}} + \frac{1}{\Delta_{2+}} \right) + 2g_{1-}g_{2-} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{1-} + \alpha_-} + \frac{1}{\Delta_{2-} + \alpha_-} \right) - g_{1-}g_{2-} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{1-}} + \frac{1}{\Delta_{2-}} \right) \right],$$

$$\partial J_1/\partial \Phi = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 2g_{1-}g_{2-} \left( \frac{1}{(\Delta_{1-} + \alpha_-)^2} + \frac{1}{(\Delta_{2-} + \alpha_-)^2} \right) - g_{1-}g_{2-} \left( \frac{1}{\Delta_{1-}} + \frac{1}{\Delta_{2-}} \right) \right] \partial \omega_-/\partial \Phi. \quad (S9)$$

As seen from the last two terms in Eqn. (S9), the effective iSWAP strength is decreased for excited coupler due to destructive interference. For our device parameters, we have $|\partial J_0/\partial \Phi|/\partial J_1/\partial \Phi| = 3.2$. Note that the resonance condition for an iSWAP gate is independent of the coupler population. Since we calibrate the duration of flux modulation to get
an iSWAP gate for the coupler in ground state, we model the unitary for the excited coupler as a partial iSWAP gate. In the simulation of iSWAP gate fidelity (for a 90 ns long gate) with finite temperature, we use the following map

\[ \Lambda_{FM}[\rho] = (1 - p) \ U_{iSWAP} \cdot \rho \cdot U_{iSWAP}^\dagger + \ p \ \ U_{FM,1} \cdot \rho \cdot U_{FM,1}^\dagger, \] (S10)

where \( p \) is the thermal population in the tunable coupler qubit and \( U_{FM,1} \) is the effective unitary due to flux modulation with the coupler qubit excited,

\[ U_{FM,1} = U_{iSWAP}^{1/3}. \]

The update to the density matrix due to the flux modulation for an iSWAP gate can be expressed as follows

\[ \rho_f = \Lambda_{T_1,T_2,Q1} \circ \Lambda_{T_1,T_2,Q2} \circ \Lambda_{FM}[\rho_0]. \] (S11)

We average iSWAP fidelity obtained by flux modulation over 16 different density matrices which form a good basis for two qubit process tomography \([S4]\).
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