Counterdiabatic holonomic gates using off-resonant-driven Rydberg atoms
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Geometric phase is insensitive to certain local disturbances due to the global properties accumulated through a closed loop in the parameter space. It can be utilized to realize high-fidelity logic gates for geometric quantum computing. Moreover, in the degenerate subspace, non-Abelian geometric phase leads to quantum holonomic gates. In this work, we propose a novel scheme for holonomic gates using Rydberg atoms under the detuning-controllable drivings, which can be considerably improved by the counterdiabatic method. In particular, we introduce a controllable variable, the detuning between the driving frequency and the atomic energy spacing, to modify the traditional scheme for holonomic gates. Subsequently, we can have two instantaneous eigenstates with opposite eigenvalues constituting a closed loop in the parameter space. The accumulated dynamical phase is exactly cancelled when the loop is completed, which is out of the parallel-transport restriction. The counterdiabatic term in our proposal can be used to enhance the speed and the fidelity of holonomic transformation, rendering revisions in both amplitudes and phases of the driving fields. Then in a shorter time we can realize a universal set of single-qubit gates and nontrivial double-qubit gates within the Rydberg blockade regime. We also estimate the gate fidelity under both dephasing and dissipation processes. In addition, beyond the Rydberg blockade regime, we propose an alternative realization for the double-qubit gates, in which a qubit (two-level system) is used to mediate two detuning-driven three-level Rydberg atoms.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum computing is believed to be more superior than its classical counterpart in solving certain problems, such as factoring large integers [1] and searching unsorted databases [2]. In order to implement quantum computing, it is prerequisite to have a universal set of single-qubit gates and a nontrivial double-qubit gate with a high fidelity. Nevertheless, reliable and robust quantum gates are always hard to be realized, because any quantum system or platform is affected inevitably by the errors arising from inaccurate control and external environments. The quantum gates based on the geometrical phase [3] are robust against control errors, since geometrical phase is only determined by the global properties of the transformation paths and independent of the transformation details [4–7].

Many schemes for holonomic quantum computing have been proposed [8–12] by taking advantages of the geometrical phase under the adiabatic passage. However, a quantum system usually takes a long time to complete the required loop in the parameter space when it undergoes an adiabatic evolution. A long time of evolution is harmful to the robustness of the adiabatic holonomic quantum computing, because it will gradually reduce the execution efficiency and amplify the decoherence. It is obviously negative to achieve high-fidelity quantum gates.

Therefore it is required to shorten the evolution time while retaining the adiabatic passage [13] or maintaining the quantum system as the desired instantaneous eigenstates at the two ends of the evolution. Plenty of superadiabatic approaches [14–18] have been proposed to dynamical systems, such as counterdiabatic driving (CD) method, i.e., the transitionless quantum driving [14, 19–21], to adiabaticity using Lewis-Riesenfeld invariant [22–24], dressed-state-based inverse engineering [25] and noise-induced adiabaticity [26–28], to name a few. The counterdiabatic driving method was proposed in the first decade of this century, which is useful for both theoretical proposals and practical applications. The formulation of CD is to add an ancillary Hamiltonian, named the counterdiabatic term, to the original Hamiltonian. Namely, if the original time-dependent Hamiltonian $H(t)$ is formally expressed in the spectral representation as $H(t) = \sum_n E_n(t)|n(t)\rangle\langle n(t)|$, then the counterdiabatic term can be written as [19–21]

$$H_{\text{CD}}(t) = i \sum_n (1 - |n(t)\rangle\langle n(t)|) |\dot{n}(t)\rangle\langle n(t)|,$$

where $E_n(t)$’s and $|n(t)\rangle$’s are respectively the instantaneous eigenvalues and eigenstates, and $|\dot{n}(t)\rangle$’s are the derivative of the instantaneous eigenstates with respect to time.

Many experimental platforms are devoted to the adiabatic holonomic quantum computing, including the Rydberg atoms [29–31], the trapped ions [32], nuclear magnetic resonance [33, 34], superconducting circuits [35, 36], and nitrogen-vacancy centers in diamond [37, 38]. A Rydberg atom is an ordinary atom where one of its electrons, usually the valence electron in an alkali atom, is excited to a state of very high principal quantum number, i.e., a Rydberg state. Neutral atoms in highly excited and long-lived Rydberg states are also considered as ideal architectures for quantum computation for they can be used as well-defined two-level or three-level sys-
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tems. The Rydberg-mediated interaction between high-
lying Rydberg states arising from dipole-dipole bond [39]
or van der Waals forces can lead to the Rydberg block-
ade phenomenon [40–42]. When the Rydberg-mediated
interaction is much stronger than the intensity of the
driving pulses on the atoms, this blockade would prevent
the simultaneous excitation of the neighboring Rydberg
atoms [31], which can be used to implement nontrivial
double-qubit gates [31, 43, 44]. Also in the Rydberg
blockade regime, the system is naturally robust against
certain control errors [45, 46].

In this work, we propose a novel scheme of superadi-
abatic holonomic gates based on Rydberg atoms via the
counterdiabatic method, which combines the robustness
of adiabatic geometrical transformation with the merits
of Rydberg atoms under driving. It thereby provides
a promising way to realize high-fidelity quantum holo-
monic computing. Comparing to the traditional schemes
for holonomic gates, our scheme applies the controllable
detuning between the driving frequency and the atomic
level-splitting as an additional variable to cancel the dy-
namical phase accumulated during the whole closed path
in the parameter space. It goes beyond the requirement
of the parallel-transport.

The rest of the work is so arranged as follows. Sec-
tion II is devoted to establish a universal set of single-
qubit gates based on a three-level Rydberg atom. In our
proposal, the phase difference between the complex Rabi
frequencies of the two driving lasers determines the type
of a quantum gate. CD method is then implemented to
improve the adiabaticity of the holonomic transformation
as well as the gate efficiency and fidelity. We also analy-
sis the average transformation-fidelity over initial states
under decoherence. In Sec. III, similar discussion is ex-
tended to the nontrivial double-qubit gates founded on
two two-level Rydberg atoms. In Sec. IV, we propose an
alternative scheme for the double-qubit gates, in which
a two-level system couples simultaneously to two three-
level Rydberg atoms. We conclude our work in Sec. V.

II. UNIVERSAL SINGLE-QUBIT GATES

Consider a three-level Rydberg atom consisted of a
stable ground state $|0\rangle$, an intermediate state $|1\rangle$, and
a highly excited Rydberg state $|2\rangle$. $|0\rangle$ is coupled to $|1\rangle$
by an off-resonant laser with Rabi frequency $\Omega_1$. States
$|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$ are driven by another off-resonant laser with Rabi
frequency $\Omega_2$ (see the diagram in Fig. 1). In the
unit of $\hbar \equiv 1$, the system Hamiltonian can be expressed
by [47]:

$$
H_0(t) = \omega_1 \langle 1 | 1 \rangle + \omega_2 \langle 2 | 2 \rangle + [\Omega_1(t) e^{i\xi_1(t)} | 1 \rangle + \Omega_2(t) e^{-i\xi_2(t)} | 2 \rangle | 1 \rangle + \text{h.c.}].
$$

Here the energy of level $|0\rangle$ is assumed as $\omega_0 = 0$ with no
loss of generality and $\xi_n(t) \equiv \int_0^t ds \xi_n(s)$, $n = 1, 2$. $\omega_n$ is
the energy of level $|n\rangle$. $\Omega_n(t)$ and $\xi_n(t)$ are respectively
the complex time-dependent Rabi frequency and the real
time-dependent driving frequency corresponding to the
driving term between $|n \rangle$ and $|n+1\rangle$. $\xi_1(t)$ and $\xi_2(t)$ satisfy the
condition that $\xi_1(t) + \xi_2(t) = \omega_2$.

Turn to the rotating frame with respect to $U_0(t) = \exp\{i\xi_1(t) | 1 \rangle \langle 1 | + i \xi_2(t) | 2 \rangle \langle 2 | \}$, the above Hamil-
tonian (2) can be rewritten as:

$$
H(t) = U_0(t) H_0(t) U_0^\dagger(t) - iU_0(t) \dot{U}_0^\dagger(t) = [\Omega_1(t) | 0 \rangle \langle 1 | + \Omega_2(t) | 2 \rangle \langle 1 | + \text{h.c.} - 2\Delta(t) | 1 \rangle \langle 1 |. \quad (3)
$$

where $2\Delta(t) \equiv \xi_1(t) - \omega_1$. The two complex Rabi
frequencies can be parameterized as

$$
\begin{align*}
\Omega_1(t) &= \Omega(t) \sin(\theta/2)e^{-i\phi}, \\
\Omega_2(t) &= \Omega(t) \cos(\theta/2)e^{-i\phi+i\psi},
\end{align*}
$$

with $\Omega(t)$ being real. Thus the Hamiltonian becomes

$$
H(t) = \Omega(t) \left[ \sin(\theta/2)e^{-i\phi} | 0 \rangle \langle 1 | + \cos(\theta/2)e^{-i\phi+i\psi} | 2 \rangle \langle 1 | + \text{h.c.} - 2\Delta(t) | 1 \rangle \langle 1 |. \quad (5)
$$

In a frame spanned by a new orthonormal set
\{ $| b \rangle, | 1 \rangle, | d \rangle \}$, where the bright and dark states are
respectively defined by

$$
\begin{align*}
| b \rangle &= \sin(\theta/2) | 0 \rangle + \cos(\theta/2) e^{i\psi} | 2 \rangle, \\
| d \rangle &= \cos(\theta/2) | 0 \rangle - \sin(\theta/2) e^{i\psi} | 2 \rangle,
\end{align*}
$$

one can express the Hamiltonian (5) as

$$
H(t) = \Omega(t) \left[ e^{-i\phi} | b \rangle \langle 1 | + \text{h.c.} - 2\Delta(t) | 1 \rangle \langle 1 |. \quad (7)
$$

It is clear that $| d \rangle$ is decoupled from $| b \rangle$ and $| 1 \rangle$, which
means that $| d \rangle$ remains unchanged during the system
transformation. So the Hamiltonian (7) can be effec-
tively expressed in the standard two-state space spanned
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The instantaneous eigenstates and eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian \( \Omega(t) \) can be further parameterized by \( \Omega(t) = E(t) \sin \varphi(t) \) and \( \Delta(t) = E(t) \cos \varphi(t) \), respectively. Then the instantaneous eigenstates and eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian (8) can be written as

\[
|E_+(t)\rangle = \cos[\varphi(t)/2]|b\rangle + \sin[\varphi(t)/2]e^{i\varphi}|1\rangle,
|E_-(t)\rangle = -\sin[\varphi(t)/2]e^{-i\varphi}|b\rangle + \cos[\varphi(t)/2]|1\rangle,
\]

and \( E_{\pm}(t) = \pm E(t) \), respectively.

The quantum system is supposed to evolve from \( t = 0 \) to \( t = T \). Our holonomic process is actually designed as a concatenation circle consisted of two piece-wisely adiabatic passages, \( 0 \to t_f \) and \( t_f \to T \) with \( t_f = T/2 \), to achieve the evolution from \( |b\rangle \) at \( t = 0 \) to \( e^{i(\beta+\eta)}|b\rangle \) at \( t = T \), where \( \beta \) and \( \eta \) are respectively the accumulated dynamical and geometrical phases. In particular, the system can evolve as \( |E_+(t)\rangle \) during the first-half period \( t \in [0,t_f] \) and is then relayed by \( |E_-(t)\rangle \) during the second-half part \( t \in [t_f,T] \). The parameter \( \phi \) from Eq. (4) is set as \( \phi_1 \) during the first-half part and \( \phi_2 \) during the second-half part of evolution, where \( \phi_1 \) and \( \phi_2 \) are controllable constants. Due to the fact that \( E_+(t) = -E_-(t) = E(t) \), we have

\[
\beta = -\left[ \int_0^{t_f} dt E_+(t) + \int_{t_f}^T dt E_-(t) \right] = 0.
\]

Then the accumulated dynamical phase exactly vanishes when completing the whole loop, which can then be safely ignored in the following discussions. With respect to the whole holonomic transformation, to allow the evolution process determined by the adiabatic theorem

\[
|E_{\pm}(0)\rangle = |b\rangle \to |E_+(t_f - 0^+)\rangle = e^{i\varphi_1}|1\rangle,
\]

the time-dependent parameter \( \varphi(t) \) should be conditioned by \( \varphi(0) = \varphi(t_f - 0^+) = \pi \), \( \varphi(t_f) = 0 \), and \( \varphi(T) = \pi \), where \( \eta = \pi + \phi_1 - \phi_2 \). Note one can design a similar two-stage transformation as above by swapping \( |E_+(t)\rangle \) and \( |E_-(t)\rangle \) with a proper function \( \varphi(t) \).

Therefore throughout the whole evolution \( [0,T] \), the geometrical phase is found to be \( \eta = \pi + \phi_1 - \phi_2 \) and the bright state \( |b\rangle \) turns to be \( e^{i\eta}|b\rangle \). It is known that the dark state remains invariant with time. Thus one can obtain a unitary transformation operator in the subspace spanned by \( \{|d\rangle, |b\rangle\} \):

\[
U = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\eta} \end{bmatrix} \approx e^{-\frac{i\eta}{2}(|d\rangle\langle d|-|b\rangle\langle b|)}.
\]

Thus in the computational subspace spanned by \( \{|0\rangle, |2\rangle\} \), we will obtain a universal gate operation for the one-qubit system:

\[
U = \begin{bmatrix} \cos \frac{\eta}{2} - i\sin \frac{\eta}{2} \cos \theta & i\sin \frac{\eta}{2} \sin \theta e^{-i\varphi} \\ i\sin \frac{\eta}{2} \sin \theta e^{i\varphi} & \cos \frac{\eta}{2} + i\sin \frac{\eta}{2} \cos \theta \end{bmatrix} = \exp\left(\frac{i\eta}{2} \vec{n} \cdot \vec{\sigma}\right),
\]

where \( \vec{\sigma} \) is a vector of Pauli matrices. On the Bloch sphere, this operation can rotate an arbitrary unit vector around the axis \( \vec{n} = (\sin \theta \cos \psi, \sin \theta \sin \psi, -\cos \theta) \) by an angle \( \eta \) in the clockwise direction, where \( \theta \) and \( \psi \) are parameterized by the two Rabi frequencies in Eq. (4) and \( \eta \) is the geometrical phase determined by \( \phi_1 - \phi_2 \) as in Eq. (11). A combination of \( \theta \) (measuring the relative strengths of the two driving fields) \( \psi \) (the phase difference between the two driving fields) and \( \phi_1 - \phi_2 \) (a phase as a controllable constant) corresponds to a specific single-qubit gate. For example, one can set \( \theta = \pi \), and \( \phi_1 = \phi_2 \) to obtain the \( \sigma_z \) gate up to a global phase.

To ensure the transitionless evolution during the adiabatic passage while shortening the period of the loop presented in Eq. (11), we use the counterdiabatic method by adding an ancillary term \( H_{CD}(t) \) into the original Hamiltonian (3). According to Eq. (1), the counterdiabatic term can be expressed by

\[
H_{CD}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i\Lambda(t)e^{-i\varphi} \\ i\Lambda(t)e^{i\varphi} & 0 \end{bmatrix},
\]

where \( \Lambda(t) = [\hat{\Omega}(t)\Delta(t) - \Omega(t)\dot{\Delta}(t)]/[2E^2(t)] \). Then we obtain a modified Hamiltonian \( H'(t) = H(t) + H_{CD}(t) \), which guarantees the quantum system exactly moving along certain eigenstates provided in Eq. (9) [Note now the eigenvalues \( E_{\pm}(t) \) are modified accordingly but they are irrelevant to both dynamical and geometrical phases]. In particular, now the amplitudes and phases of the two driving fields become

\[
\Omega_1(t) \to \Omega'_1(t) = [\Omega(t) - i\Lambda(t)]\sin(\theta/2)e^{-i\varphi},
\]

\[
\Omega_2(t) \to \Omega'_2(t) = [\Omega(t) - i\Lambda(t)]\cos(\theta/2)e^{-i\varphi+i\psi},
\]

respectively. Then one can repeat the parametric routine from Eq. (4) to Eq. (13) to establish a set of more efficient (We will show this shortly.) quantum gates by using the modified Rabi frequencies in Eq. (15).

To measure the performance of the single-qubit gates, we introduce a concept of average effective fidelity \( F \), which is defined by [44]:

\[
F(t) = \frac{1}{4\pi^2} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} d\alpha_1 d\alpha_2 \|\langle \Psi(t)|U(t)|\Psi(0)\rangle\|^2.
\]

Here the average means the sampling from the computational subspace, i.e., the initial states of the system are expressed by \( |\Psi(0)\rangle = \cos(\alpha_1)|0\rangle + \sin(\alpha_1)e^{i\alpha_2}|2\rangle \) with \( \alpha_1, \alpha_2 \in [0,2\pi] \). \( U(t) \) is the evolution operator directly obtained from the Hamiltonian (8) with the designed Rabi frequencies \( \Omega_1(t) \) and \( \Omega_2(t) \) in Eq. (4) or the effective Rabi frequencies \( \Omega'_1(t) \) and \( \Omega'_2(t) \) in Eq. (15).
of the ancillary Hamiltonian (14), high fidelity \( F \geq 0.99 \) can be met with a much reduced transformation time about \( ET \approx 2 \). In the inset of Fig. 2, the final average fidelity of the \( \sigma_z \) gate (orange dashed-dotted line with circle sign) and the \( \pi/8 \) gate (purple dotted line with circle sign) follow almost the same dynamics. They are a little bit higher than the fidelities of the other two gates. All of them are greater than 0.99 after \( ET \approx 2 \).

FIG. 3. (Color online) The dynamics of the average fidelity with a fixed running time \( ET = 6 \) with (blue solid line) and without CD (red dashed line) terms. (a) for the \( \sigma_x \) gate, (b) for the \( \sigma_y \) gate, (c) for the \( \sigma_z \) gate, (d) for the \( \pi/8 \)-phase gate.

The effect of the counterdiabatic approach can also be observed from the microscopic evolution of the quantum system. In Fig. 3, we plot the average-fidelity dynamics of the single-qubit gates under a fixed holonomic transformation period \( ET = 6 \). The behaviors of the fidelity dynamics are found to be nearly irrespective to the type of the quantum gate. However, the dynamics upon application of the CD method is quite significant. It will enhance the final fidelity from about 0.85 to unity in a stable way.

In the open-quantum-system scenario, the fidelity of the holonomic transformation is subject to the external decoherence resources. Here we take account both the dephasing and dissipation processes into consideration. In the weak-coupling regime, we apply the following Lindblad master equation [48]:

\[
\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -i[H'(t), \rho] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j \in \{0, 2\}} \left[ \Gamma_j^- L (\sigma_j^-) + \Gamma_j^+ L (\sigma_j^+) \right],
\]

where \( \rho \) is the density matrix of the interested system, \( H'(t) = H(t) + H_{CD}(t) \) is the CD-modified Hamiltonian [see Eqs. (8) and (14)] and \( L(A) \equiv 2A \rho A^\dagger - A^\dagger A \rho - \rho A^\dagger A \) is the Lindbladian superoperation for the system operator \( A \). Here \( \sigma^-_j \equiv |0\rangle\langle 1| \), \( \sigma^+_j \equiv |1\rangle\langle 2| \), \( \sigma_z \equiv |1\rangle\langle 1| - |0\rangle\langle 0| \) and \( \sigma_x \equiv |2\rangle\langle 2| - |1\rangle\langle 1| \). For simplicity, we assume \( \Gamma_0^- = \Gamma_2^- = \gamma_- \) and \( \Gamma_0^+ = \Gamma_2^+ = \gamma_+ \). Here the system is supposed to be prepared at \( |0\rangle \). Ideally the system becomes \( |0\rangle \) by the operation of the \( \sigma_z \) gate or \( |2\rangle \) by the

\[
|\Psi_f\rangle \equiv U|\Psi(0)\rangle \]

is the target state after performing the single-qubit gate \( U \) in Eq. (13) on \( |\Psi(0)\rangle \). In this work, we set [18] \( E(t) = 1 \) and

\[
\varphi(t) = \begin{cases} 
\frac{3\pi t^2}{t_f^2} - \frac{2\pi t^3}{t_f^3} \quad (0 \leq t < t_f) \\
\frac{3\pi (t - t_f)^2}{t_f^2} - \frac{2\pi(t - t_f)^3}{t_f^3} \quad (t_f \leq t \leq 2t_f = T)
\end{cases}
\]

In the following we will check the effect of our scheme with or without CD terms for four types of single-qubit gates by calculating the average fidelity dynamics of these gates until a fixed running time \( T \) and their final average fidelity versus \( T \). According to Eq. (13), when \( \theta = \pi \) and \( \phi_1 = \phi_2 \), we have the \( \sigma_z \) gate; when \( \theta = \pi/2 \), \( \phi_1 = \phi_2 \) and \( \psi = 0 \), we have the \( \sigma_x \) gate; when \( \theta = \pi/2 \), \( \phi_1 = \phi_2 \), and \( \psi = \pi/2 \), we have the \( \sigma_y \) gate; and when \( \theta = 0 \) and \( \phi_1 - \phi_2 = -3\pi/4 \), we have the \( \pi/8 \)-phase gate or called \( T \)-gate.

In Fig. 2, we plot the final fidelity \( F(T) \) of the four specific single-qubit gates with or without the counterdiabatic terms in the Hamiltonian. Under the original Hamiltonian (8), the fidelities of all the four gates (\( \sigma_x \), \( \sigma_y \), \( \sigma_z \), \( \pi/8 \)-phase) follow quite similar behaviors. They first lower to some extend and then bounce back until to almost unity at the same cyclic time \( T \). After about \( ET = 7 \), they will experience a decline with a much reduced amplitude. Then they are enhanced by a longer \( T \) again until maintained as almost unity after \( ET \approx 17 \). It is found that the final average fidelity for all the gates will attain \( F \geq 0.99 \) when \( ET \geq 15 \). While with the help of the diabatic terms in the Hamiltonian. Under the original specific single-qubit gates with or without the counterdiabatic terms again until maintained as almost unity after
operation of the $\sigma_x$ gate. Accordingly in the presence of the decoherence, we investigate the fidelity defined as $F(T) = \langle 0 | \rho(T) | 0 \rangle$ for the $\sigma_z$ gate or $F(T) = \langle 2 | \rho(T) | 2 \rangle$ for the $\sigma_x$ gate, where $\rho(T)$ represents the time-evolved density operator $\rho(t)$ at the final running time $T$.

The combined effect of both dissipation and dephasing under the same amplitude of decay rates $\gamma$ indicates the parameter space for the $\sigma_x$ gate or $\sigma_z$ gate, where $\rho(T)$ represents the time-evolved density operator $\rho(t)$ at the final running time $T$.

In Fig. 4, we switch on the two decoherence processes in turn for two particular single-qubit gates ($\sigma_z$ and $\sigma_x$). The open system now follows the counterdiabatic-holonomic transformation while going through a quantum (dissipation or dephasing) channel. We set the cyclic evolution time is fixed as $ET = 14$. In all the four situations, the fidelity decays linearly with the increasing decay rate. For either gate, the fidelity decay induced by dissipation is quicker than that induced by dephasing under the same amplitude of decay rates $\gamma$. For either decoherence channel, the $\sigma_z$ gate is more robust than the $\sigma_x$ gate. We then demonstrate in Fig. 5 the combined effect of both dissipation and dephasing on the $\sigma_z$ gate. It is shown that the effect on the transformation fidelity by the dephasing noise is about one quarter of that by the dissipation noise in terms of the fidelity decline. The left-bottom triangle area in Fig. 5 indicates the parameter space for maintaining the $\sigma_z$ gate with $F(T) \geq 0.99$.

### III. Nontrivial Double-Qubit Gates in the Rydberg Blockade Regime

To realize a complete set of gate operations in any circuit model for quantum computing, one needs at least one nontrivial two-qubit gate besides the universal set of one-qubit gates. We now demonstrate how to construct nontrivial two-qubit gates by using the Rydberg-mediated interaction, whose fidelity and efficiency can also be improved by the counterdiabatic driving method. Consider two identical two-level Rydberg atoms with energy splitting $\omega$. As shown in Fig. 6, the high-lying Rydberg states of the atoms are coupled by the Rydberg-mediated interaction $V|ee\rangle\langle ee|$. Either atom is under an off-resonant and time-dependent driving $\Omega_n(t) \exp[i \int_0^t ds \xi(s)] |g\rangle_n(e) + h.c., n = 1, 2$, with Rabi frequencies $\Omega_n(t)$ parameterized by Eq. (4) and detuning $2\Delta(t) = \xi(t) - \omega$. Similar to Eq. (3), the total system Hamiltonian in the rotating frame with respect to $U_0(t) = \exp[i \int_0^t ds \xi(s) |\langle e_1| + |e_2\rangle|_2]$ can be written as [31]

$$H(t) = H_1(t) \otimes I_2 + I_1 \otimes H_2(t) + V|ee\rangle\langle ee|,$$

where the single-atom Hamiltonian describes the interaction between the $n$th Rydberg atom and the laser, $n = 1, 2$,

$$H_n(t) = \Omega_n(t)|g\rangle_n(e) + \Omega_n^*(t)|e\rangle_n(g) - 2\Delta(t)|e\rangle_n(e),$$

and $I_n$ denotes the identity operator acting on the $n$th Rydberg atom. In the Hilbert space spanned by
\[
\{\ket{gg}, \ket{ge}, \ket{eg}, \ket{ee}\}, \text{ the total Hamiltonian } H(t) \text{ can be expressed by }
\]
\[
H(t) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \Omega_2(t) & \Omega_1(t) & 0 \\
\Omega_2^*(t) & -2\Delta(t) & 0 & \Omega_1(t) \\
0 & \Omega_2(t) & 0 & -2\Delta(t) \\
0 & 0 & \Omega_2^*(t) & -4\Delta(t) + V
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Then a further unitary transformation with respect to \(U_1(t) = \exp(iVt\ket{ee}\bra{ee})\) yields:
\[
H(t) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \Omega_2(t) & \Omega_1(t) & 0 \\
\Omega_2^*(t) & -2\Delta(t) & 0 & \Omega_1(t)e^{-iVt} \\
0 & \Omega_2^*(t)e^{iVt} & 0 & -2\Delta(t) \\
0 & 0 & \Omega_2(t)e^{iVt} & -4\Delta(t)
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

It is now appropriate to apply a rotating-wave approximation to \(H(t)\) (22) when the Rydberg-mediated interaction strength \(V\) is much greater than the magnitudes of \(\Omega_1(t), \Omega_2(t), \Delta(t)\). In this case, the fast oscillating terms (with \(e^{\pm iVt}\)) can be regarded as zero in a moderate time-scale. Then the effective Hamiltonian can simply be expressed in the subspace spanned by \(\{\ket{gg}, \ket{ge}, \ket{eg}\}\), which is now decoupled from the rest base \(\ket{ee}\),
\[
H_{\text{eff}}(t) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & \Omega_2(t) & \Omega_1(t) \\
\Omega_2^*(t) & -2\Delta(t) & 0 \\
0 & \Omega_2^*(t) & -2\Delta(t)
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

This is so-called interaction-induced Rydberg blockade, meaning the simultaneous excitation of two atoms from their ground states to the Rydberg states is inhibited. In this case, the effective Hamiltonian (23) is similar to the Hamiltonian (3) for the single-qubit gate. The Rabi frequencies of laser pulses can still be parameterized as in Eq. (4). With the same procedure as in section II but in the subspace spanned by \(\{\ket{gg}, \ket{b} \equiv \sin(\theta/2)\ket{eg} + \cos(\theta/2)e^{i\varphi}\ket{ge}\}\), the effective Hamiltonian reads
\[
H_{\text{eff}}(t) = \begin{bmatrix}
\Delta(t) & \Omega_1(t)e^{-i\varphi} \\
\Omega_1^*(t) & -\Delta(t)
\end{bmatrix}.
\]

Clearly we have a new dark state \(\ket{d} \equiv \cos(\theta/2)\ket{eg} - \sin(\theta/2)e^{i\varphi}\ket{ge}\), which is decoupled from both \(\ket{gg}\) and \(\ket{b}\) and remains invariant with time. Thus the instantaneous eigenstates of Eq. (24) can be immediately obtained from Eq. (9) by changing the bases:
\[
|E_+(t)\rangle = \cos[\varphi(t)/2]|b\rangle + \sin[\varphi(t)/2]e^{i\varphi}\ket{gg},
\]
\[
|E_-(t)\rangle = -\sin[\varphi(t)/2]e^{-i\varphi}|b\rangle + \cos[\varphi(t)/2]\ket{gg}.
\]

Formally their corresponding eigenvalues are \(E_+(t) = E(t) = -E_-(t)\), where \(E(t) \equiv \sqrt{\Omega^2(t) + \Delta^2(t)}\) and \(\tan \varphi(t) = \Omega(t)/\Delta(t)\).

We can still perform a concatenation holonomic circle consisted of two piece-wisely adiabatic passages similar to the single-qubit gate in section II. However, there is a dramatic difference between the eigenstates in Eq. (25) for the current two-qubit gate and those in Eq. (9) for the single-qubit gate. In Eq. (9), only one of the two bases constituting either \(|E_+(t)\rangle\) or \(|E_-(t)\rangle\), i.e., \(|b\rangle\), lives in the computational subspace while another one, i.e., \(|1\rangle\) does not. In contrast, both bases for the eigenstates in Eq. (25) live in the computational subspace. So that for the two-qubit gates, both eigenstates would take part in the two stages of adiabatic passages. To have an exactly vanishing dynamical phase while completing the loop as in Eq. (10), the two stages are still built up by cutting the whole holonomic transformation into half and half, i.e., \(t_f = T/2\). Conditioned by \(\varphi(0) = 0, \varphi(t_f - 0^+) = \pi, \varphi(T) = \pi\), \(\phi(t)\) is still chosen as the function in Eq. (17), the two stages of the holonomic transformation read
\[
|E_+(0)\rangle = |b\rangle \rightarrow |E_+(t_f - 0^+)\rangle = e^{i\pi/2}|gg\rangle,
\]
\[
e^{i\varphi_1}|gg\rangle = e^{i\varphi_1}|E_-(t_f)\rangle \rightarrow e^{i\varphi_1}|E_-(T)\rangle = e^{i\pi}|b\rangle,
\]
and simultaneously
\[
|E_-(0)\rangle = |gg\rangle \rightarrow |E_- (t_f - 0^+)\rangle = e^{i(\pi - \phi_1)}|b\rangle,
\]
\[
e^{i(\pi - \phi_1)}|b\rangle = e^{i(\pi - \phi_1)}|E_+(t_f)\rangle \rightarrow e^{i(\pi - \phi_1)}|E_+(T)\rangle = e^{i\pi}|gg\rangle.
\]
Here \(\eta_{\pm} \equiv \pm(\pi + \phi_1 - \phi_2)\), where \(\phi_1\) and \(\phi_2\) are respectively the constant value of \(\phi\) in the first-half and the second-half part of the evolution. Importantly, it is sure that the whole cyclic transformation is geometric and the geometrical phases accumulated from initial states \(|b\rangle\) and \(|gg\rangle\) are \(\eta_+\) and \(\eta_-\), respectively. And obviously the dark state \(|d\rangle\) and the double-exciton state \(|ee\rangle\) will not participate in the evolution. Thus we can have a transformation operation in the space spanned by \(\{|gg\rangle, |d\rangle, |b\rangle, |ee\rangle\}\):
\[
U = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & e^{i\eta_+} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
In the computational space spanned by \(\{|gg\rangle, |ge\rangle, |eg\rangle, |ee\rangle\}\), it reads,
\[
U = \begin{bmatrix}
e^{i\eta_-} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & e^{i\pi/2} + e^{i\eta_+} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & e^{i\pi/2} & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}.
\]
This is a nontrivial double-qubit gate whose type is determined by the combination of parameters $\theta$, $\psi$ and $\phi_1 - \phi_2$. For example, when $\psi = 0$, $\phi_1 = \phi_2$, $\theta = \pi/2$, we can have a SWAP-like gate similar up to an extra phase for the base $|ee\rangle$:

$$U \simeq \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$  \hfill (30)

In the current scheme for the two-qubit gate, the counterdiabatic driving terms could be formulated in almost exactly the same way as Eq. (14) for the one-qubit gate. Nevertheless now the ancillary Hamiltonian $H_{CD}(t)$ is written in the bases of $\{|b\rangle, |gg\rangle\}$. Still the Rabi frequencies $\Omega_1(t)$ and $\Omega_2(t)$ become respectively exactly $\Omega_1'(t)$ and $\Omega_2'(t)$ in Eq. (15).

Employing the same definition as in Eq. (16), we can perform the counterdiabatic driving terms with or without CD method by calculating the final average fidelity with certain running time $T$ and the average fidelity dynamics. In this section, the initial state of the system can be generally written as $|\Psi(0)\rangle = \cos \alpha_1|gg\rangle + \sin \alpha_1 \cos \alpha_2 e^{i\alpha_3}|ge\rangle + \sin \alpha_1 \sin \alpha_2 e^{i\alpha_4}|eg\rangle$ with $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3, \alpha_4\} \in [0, 2\pi]$. Here the parameter $E(t)$ is again set as 1.

In Fig. 7, we plot the final average fidelity of the double-qubit gates with or without the counterdiabatic terms under different parameter $\theta$. For $\theta = \pi/2$, the blue solid line and the red dashed line represent the fidelity obtained with and without the counterdiabatic term, respectively. For $\theta = \pi$, the yellow dotted line and the purple dash-dotted line represent the fidelity obtained with and without the counterdiabatic term, respectively. The other parameters are chosen as $\psi = 0$, $\phi_1 = \phi_2$, and $V = 100E$.

![FIG. 7. (Color online) The effect of holonomic transformation time $T$ on the final average fidelity $F(T)$ of the double-qubit gates under different parameter $\theta$. For $\theta = \pi/2$, the blue solid line and the red dashed line represent the fidelity obtained with and without the counterdiabatic term, respectively. For $\theta = \pi$, the yellow dotted line and the purple dash-dotted line represent the fidelity obtained with and without the counterdiabatic term, respectively. The other parameters are chosen as $\psi = 0$, $\phi_1 = \phi_2$, and $V = 100E$.](image)

The effect of the counterdiabatic method can also be measured by the fidelity dynamics of the quantum systems. In Fig. 8, we plot the average-fidelity dynamics of the double-qubit gates under a fixed holonomic transformation cyclic time $ET = 20$ for $\theta = \pi/2$ and $\theta = \pi$.

![FIG. 8. (Color online) The dynamics of the average fidelity with a fixed cyclic time $ET = 20$. For $\theta = \pi/2$, the blue solid line and the red dashed line represent the average fidelity dynamics with and without counterdiabatic terms, respectively. For $\theta = \pi$, the yellow dotted line the purple dash-dotted line represent the average fidelity dynamics with and without counterdiabatic terms, respectively. The other parameters are parameterized as $\psi = 0$, $\phi_1 = \phi_2$, $V = 100E$.](image)
about the combined effect of both dissipation and dephasing on the double-qubit gate, we make sure that the system enters the Rydberg-blockage regime and then realize a high-fidelity double-qubit gate. Our proposal is practical in experiments. For example, in Ref. [39], the magnitudes of $E$ is about $5\pi$ MHz and the interaction can be taken up to $V \sim 200 \pi$ MHz.

The effect of Rydberg-mediated coupling-strength $V$ is also measured by the final average fidelity and the average fidelity dynamics when we use the CD approach. These results are shown in Fig. 9. In Fig. 9(a), we plot the effect of $V$ on the final average fidelity under different $\theta$. We have a fixed cyclic time $ET = 20$. It is found that the final average fidelity for $\theta = \pi/3, \pi/2, \pi$ and $3\pi/2$ will achieve $F(T) \approx 1$ when $V \geq 5E$. While under $\theta = \pi$, a nearly unity fidelity appears when $V \geq 30E$. A smaller $V$ gives rise to a much lower fidelity with fluctuations for all the cases. In Fig. 9(b), We plot the average fidelity dynamics under $V = 10E$ or $V = 100E$ when the cyclic time is still set as $ET = 20$. It is shown that for $\theta = \pi/2$, there is no apparent difference between a weak coupling strength with $V = 10E$ and a strong one with $V = 100E$. However, for $\theta = \pi$, the increment of $V$ from $10E$ to $100E$ yields the enhancement of the final fidelity from almost 0.9 to 1 at the final moment. Thus a strong interaction (about thirty times larger than the amplitude of driving fields) between the two Rydberg atoms would make sure that the system enters the Rydberg-blockage regime and then realize a high-fidelity double-qubit gate.

Now we consider the effect of the system decoherence on the final fidelity after performing the CD method. The decoherence including both energy dissipation and dephasing can be described by the following quantum master equation

$$\frac{\partial \rho}{\partial t} = -i[H(t), \rho] + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{n \in \{1,2\}} [\Gamma_n^- L(\sigma_n^-) + \Gamma_n^+ L(\sigma_n^+)].$$ (31)

Here $H(t)$ can be immediately obtained by inputting Eq. (15) to the Hamiltonian (21) in the rotating frame, and in the Lindbladian superoperator $L(A)$, $\sigma_n^- \equiv |g\rangle_n \langle e|$ and $\sigma_n^+ \equiv |e\rangle_n \langle g|$ $\gamma_n$, $n = 1, 2$. We assume these two atoms are in the common environments with the same decay rates, namely, $\Gamma_1^- = \Gamma_2^- = \gamma_-$ and $\Gamma_1^+ = \Gamma_2^+ = \gamma_+$. The effect of the dissipation by the rate $\gamma_-$ and the dephasing by the rate $\gamma_+$ of the system on the final fidelity of the two-qubit gate is plotted in Fig. 10. In this case, the running time is set as $ET = 20$ and the phase parameters are set as $\theta = \pi/2, \phi_1 = \phi_2$ and $\psi = \pi/2$. At the initial moment, the atomic system is in the ground state, $|gg\rangle$. Then the fidelity $F(T)$ is defined as $F(T) = \langle gg|\rho(T)|gg\rangle$, where $\rho(T)$ represents the density operator $\rho$ at the final moment. In Fig. 10 about the combined effect of both dissipation and dephasing on the double-qubit gate, it is found that the fidelity is insensitive to the dissipation noise indicated by $\gamma_+$ with a fixed dephasing noise indicated by $\gamma_-$. Under the condition of the same magnitudes of decay rates, the dissipation noise leads to about five times as the dephasing noise does with respect to the fidelity decline. The left-bottom triangle area indicates the parameter space for maintaining the double-qubit gate with high-fidelity $F(T) \approx 0.95$. Obviously the double-qubit
gate is more fragile to the external noise than the single-qubit gate (see Fig. 5).

**IV. NONTRIVIAL DOUBLE-QUBIT GATES BEYOND THE RYDBERG BLOCKADE REGIME**

The last section is devoted to a realization of nontrivial double-qubit gates under off-resonant driving-fields. Yet it is still working in the Rydberg blockade regime as in the previous literatures, which means that in practice the distance between the two Rydberg atoms has to be small enough to achieve a sufficiently strong coupling $V$. And the double-exciton base $|ee\rangle$ is actually then excluded from the designed procedure. However, in this section we propose an alternative scheme using a qubit (two-level system) to bridge the two detuning-driven three-level Rydberg atoms and then relieve the prerequisite of sticking to the Rydberg blockade regime.

Consider two identical three-level Rydberg atoms. Both of them are coupled with a two-level atom consisting of a ground state $|\text{g}\rangle$ and a high-energy state $|\text{e}\rangle$, as shown in Fig. 11. For either three-level atom, the stable ground state $|0\rangle$ and the intermediate state $|1\rangle$ are coupled to the qubit with a coupling strength $g_n$, and the intermediate state $|1\rangle$ is coupled to the Rydberg state $|2\rangle$ by an off-resonant driving fields with Rabi frequency $\Omega_n$, $n = 1, 2$. $2\Delta$ is the detuning between the driving frequency and the energy splitting between states $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$.

![Diagram of two identical three-level Rydberg atoms coupled simultaneously to a two-level system](image)

**FIG. 11.** (Color online) Diagram for two identical three-level Rydberg atoms coupled simultaneously to a two-level system (qubit). For either three-level atom, the stable ground state $|0\rangle$ and the intermediate state $|1\rangle$ are coupled to the qubit with a coupling strength $g_n$, and the intermediate state $|1\rangle$ is coupled to the Rydberg state $|2\rangle$ by an off-resonant driving fields with Rabi frequency $\Omega_n$, $n = 1, 2$. $2\Delta$ is the detuning between the driving frequency and the energy splitting between states $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$.

In the case that the intensities of the atom-atom coupling are significantly larger than that of the atom-laser coupling, namely, $g_{l,2} \gg \Omega_{1,2}(t)$ and the level spacing of the qubit system is far-off-resonant from all the other level spacings in the whole system, one can construct a double-qubit gate in a computational space spanned by $\{|00\rangle, |02\rangle, |20\rangle, |22\rangle\}$ as a subspace of the two three-level Rydberg atoms (Strictly the computational space is spanned by $\{|00\rangle, |02\rangle, |20\rangle, |22\rangle\}$, where the qubit state $|g\rangle$ can be factored out. The details can be found in appendix A). It is obvious that the evolution of the state $|00\rangle$ due to the fact that it is decoupled from the total system Hamiltonian (32). Also the evolution of the state $|22\rangle$ is found to be irrelevant under the condition $g_{l,2} \gg \Omega_{1,2}(t)$. The effective Hamiltonian is found to be written in a subspace spanned by $\{ |02\rangle, |\varphi_0\rangle \equiv (g_{l}|10\rangle - g_2|01\rangle)/G, |20\rangle \}$, where $G = \sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}$ [see the analysis from Eq. (A1) to Eq. (A8) in appendix A]:

$$H_{\text{eff}}(t) = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -\Omega_2(t)g_1/G & 0 \\ -\Omega_2(t)g_1/G & 0 & -2\Delta(t) \\ 0 & -2\Delta(t) & 0 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \varphi_0(t) \\ \varphi_0(t) \\ G \end{bmatrix}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

It is not hard to see the effective Hamiltonian (33) is of exactly the same form as the Hamiltonian (3) for the single-qubit gate. Thus similar to Eq. (4), the elements can be parameterized as

$$-\Omega_2(t)g_1/G = \Omega(t)\sin(\theta/2)e^{-i\varphi},$$

$$\Omega_1(t)g_2/G = \Omega(t)\cos(\theta/2)e^{-i\varphi + i\psi},$$ \hspace{1cm} (34)

with $\Omega(t)$ being real. Then in the frame spanned by $\{|b\rangle, |\varphi_0\rangle, |d\rangle\}$, where $|b\rangle$ and $|d\rangle$ are respectively the
bright and dark states in this system and defined by mapping $|0\rangle \rightarrow |02g⟩$ and $|2\rangle \rightarrow |20g⟩$ in Eq. (6), the Hamiltonian (33) can be further expressed by

$$H(t) = \Omega(t) (e^{-i\phi}|b⟩⟨\phi_0| + h.c.) - 2\Delta(t)|\phi_0⟩⟨\phi_0|. \quad (35)$$

Repeating the procedure from Eq. (7) to Eq. (12) while mapping $|1⟩$ and $|b⟩$ in Sec. II to $|\psi_0⟩$ and the new bright state $|b⟩$, respectively, one can get a transformation operator in the same form as in Eq. (12) yet in the new defined bases $\{|b⟩, |d⟩\}$. Plus the unchanged bases $|00g⟩$ and $|22g⟩$, one can obtain a nontrivial double-qubit operator in the space spanned by $\{|00g⟩, |d⟩, |b⟩, |22g⟩\}$:

$$U = \begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \cos^{2}(\frac{\theta}{2}) + e^{i\eta}\sin^{2}(\frac{\theta}{2}) & 0 & 0 \\
0 & \frac{\sin^{2}(\eta) + e^{i\eta}}{e^{i\eta} - 1}e^{i\eta} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix}, \quad (36)$$

where $\eta = \pi + \phi_1 - \phi_2$, and $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$ are respectively the parameters set in first-half and second-half part of evolution. Factoring out the common state $|g⟩$, this gate is expressed by

$$\begin{bmatrix}
\sin^{2}(\frac{\theta}{2})e^{i\eta} - 1 & e^{i\eta} & 0 & 0 \\
\frac{\sin^{2}(\frac{\theta}{2})e^{i\eta}}{e^{i\eta} - 1} & e^{i\eta} & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1
\end{bmatrix} \quad (37)$$

in the subspace spanned by $\{|00⟩, |02⟩, |20⟩, |22⟩\}$. A special combination of $\theta$, $\psi$, and $\eta$ gives rise to a special double-qubit gate. For example, one can obtain a SWAP gate by letting $\theta = 3\pi/2$, $\phi_1 = \phi_2$, and $\psi = 0$.

We can also apply the counteradiabatic method by adding the ancillary Hamiltonian $H_{CD}(t)$ into the origin Hamiltonian (32) to significantly reduce the running time for the desired adiabatic passages. It is straightforwardly to find that in the space $\{|02g⟩, |\phi_0⟩, |20g⟩\}$, the counteradiabatic term has the same form as in Eq. (14). In particular, now the amplitudes and phases of the two driving fields become

$$\begin{align*}
\Omega_1(t) & \rightarrow \Omega'_1(t) = -\frac{G}{g_1}[\Omega(t) - i\Lambda(t)]\cos(\theta/2)e^{-i\phi + i\psi}, \\
\Omega_2(t) & \rightarrow \Omega'_2(t) = \frac{G}{g_2}[\Omega(t) - i\Lambda(t)]\sin(\theta/2)e^{-i\phi}
\end{align*} \quad (38)$$

where the parameters $\Lambda(t)$ and $E(t)$ share the same definitions as those in the single-qubit-gate case of Sec. II.

We take the SWAP gate as an example to measure the effect from the CD method and demonstrate the performance of double-qubit gates. The initial state is assumed as $|\Psi(0)⟩ = \cos\alpha_1|20g⟩ + \sin\alpha_1e^{i\alpha_2}|02g⟩$ with $\{\alpha_1, \alpha_2\} \in [0, 2\pi]$. The average fidelity we are interested is defined in Eq. (16). The parameter $E(t)$ is set as 1, the coupling strengths are $g_1 = g_2 = 100$, and $\varphi(t)$ is also chosen as in Eq. (17).

In Fig. 12, the effect from the CD terms can be observed by either the final fidelity under different running time $T$ or the fidelity dynamics during the holonomic path with a fixed $T$. It is shown that the CD terms render the final fidelity quickly attains unity in less than $ET = 1$. In contrast, without the CD terms, the fidelity experiences significant fluctuations and pseudo-periodically attains unity although the amplitude of the fluctuation shrinks with increasing $T$. And the first time that the fidelity becomes nearly unity is about $ET = 16$.

In the inset of Fig. 12, we examine the dynamics of the double-qubit gates under a fixed holonomic transformation period $ET = 20$. The CD approach enhances the final fidelity from about 0.8 to nearly unity and significantly reduces the fluctuations during the time evolution. Therefore the CD approach still plays an important role in obtaining stable and high-fidelity double-qubit gates.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

In summary, we have proposed a general scheme to realize a set of universal superadiabatic quantum holonomic gates via the off-resonant-driven Rydberg atoms. That can be impressively improved by the counteradiabatic method, i.e., the transitionless driving scheme, in terms of the running time as well as the stability of the gates. The computational spaces of these gates, including a universal set of single-qubit gates and two schemes of nontrivial double-qubit gates, are encoded in the stable ground state and the long-lived Rydberg states. In particular, for the single-qubit gates, we design a double-piecewise (super)adiabatic passages by two detuning driving fields and their phase difference [18]. The two instantaneous eigenstates are individually employed in either one of the two evolution-stages to cancel the accumulated dynamical phase when completing the whole loop. In the first scheme for the nontrivial double-qubit gate that works in the traditional Rydberg blockade regime [42, 44], we employ a similar double-piecewise (super)adiabatic passages yet of both instantaneous eigenstates simultaneously to avoid the parallel transport condition. In the second scheme for the double-qubit gate that is out of the Rydberg blockade regime, we employ a two-level system to mediate two Rydberg atoms under detuning driving.

Comparing to the previous works [18, 31, 40], our
scheme has four distinguished features: (i) The timedependent detuning between the driving frequencies and the atomic level-spacing is introduced as a controllable variable to avoid the requirement of parallel transport with respect to the vanishing dynamical phase. (ii) The phase difference between the Rabi frequencies is used to realize an arbitrary single-qubit gate through merely a single-loop of the parametric space, which reduces the exposure time of the quantum device to the error sources. (iii) In the nontrivial double-qubit gates using the Rydberg blockade phenomena, the two instantaneous eigenstates individually started from the ground state (=0) and the bright state (=1) are simultaneously evolving under the effective Hamiltonian, which provides a novel holonomic adiabatic procedure. (iv) In the scheme for the double-qubit gates beyond the Rydberg blockade regime, a qubit system replaces the conventionally used light-field to mediate the two detuning-driven three-level Rydberg atoms, which enriches the implementation of double-qubit gates.

Our scheme is built up on the features of superadiabatic holonomic gates and the merits of Rydberg atoms, and thereby provides a promising approach to the high-fidelity quantum holonomic computing. This approach can be properly extended to other physical systems with similar energy structure, such as transmons [48] in the superconducting circuit.
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Appendix A: The effective Hamiltonian for the double-qubit gates in Sec. IV

This appendix is devoted to obtaining the effective Hamiltonian (33) in the computational subspace \{00g, 02g, 20g, 22g\} = \{00, 02, 20, 22\} \& g\} from the original Hamiltonian (32) in the main text. First, the amplitude of an arbitrary initial state on the basis \{00g\} will not change with time due to the fact that \(H(t)\{00g\} = 0\) by Eq. (32). Second, if the initial state is an arbitrary superposed state of \{02g\} and \{20g\}, then the system will evolve in the subspace spanned by \{00g, 10g, 01g, 20g, 02g\}. In this subspace, the total Hamiltonian (32) can be expressed by

\[
H(t) = \begin{bmatrix}
0 & g_1 & g_2 & 0 & 0 \\
g_1 & -2\Delta(t) & 0 & \Omega_1(t) & 0 \\
g_2 & 0 & -2\Delta(t) & 0 & \Omega_2(t) \\
0 & \Omega_1(t) & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & \Omega_2(t) & 0 & 0
\end{bmatrix}.
\] (A1)

The Hamiltonian (A1) can be simplified by using the eigenstates of \(H_1\) in Eq. (32), which read [in the very subspace of Eq. (A1)]

\[
|\varphi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{G}(g_2|10g\rangle - g_1|01g\rangle),
\]

\[
|\varphi_\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2G}}(g_1|10g\rangle + g_2|01g\rangle \pm G|00\rangle).
\] (A2)

The eigenvalues for \(|\varphi_0\rangle\), \(|\varphi_+\rangle\), and \(|\varphi_-\rangle\) are 0, G, and \(-G\), respectively, where \(G = \sqrt{g_1^2 + g_2^2}\). Thus we have

\[
H_1 = G(|\varphi_+\rangle\langle\varphi_+| - |\varphi_-\rangle\langle\varphi_-|),
\] (A3)

and

\[
|10g\rangle = \frac{1}{G}\left(g_2|\varphi_0\rangle + \frac{g_1}{\sqrt{2}}|\varphi_+\rangle + \frac{g_2}{\sqrt{2}}|\varphi_-\rangle\right),
\]

\[
|01g\rangle = \frac{1}{G}\left(-g_1|\varphi_0\rangle + \frac{g_2}{\sqrt{2}}|\varphi_+\rangle + \frac{g_2}{\sqrt{2}}|\varphi_-\rangle\right).
\] (A4)

In the same subspace as Eq. (A1), the Hamiltonian \(H_2(t)\) of Eq. (32) can be written as

\[
H_2(t) = (\Omega_1|20g\rangle\langle10g| + \Omega_2|02g\rangle\langle01g| + h.c.)
- 2\Delta|10g\rangle\langle10g| - 2\Delta|01g\rangle\langle01g|.
\] (A5)

Using Eq. (A2), \(H_2(t)\) is rewritten as

\[
H_2(t) = \frac{1}{G}\left(\Omega_1g_2|20g\rangle\langle\varphi_0| - \Omega_2g_1|02g\rangle\langle\varphi_0|
+ \frac{\Omega_1g_1}{\sqrt{2}}|20g\rangle\langle\varphi_+| + \frac{\Omega_1g_1}{\sqrt{2}}|20g\rangle\langle\varphi_+|
+ \frac{\Omega_2g_2}{\sqrt{2}}|02g\rangle\langle\varphi_-| + \frac{\Omega_2g_2}{\sqrt{2}}|02g\rangle\langle\varphi_-| + h.c.
- 2\Delta|\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_0| - \Delta|\varphi_+\rangle\langle\varphi_+| - \Delta|\varphi_-\rangle\langle\varphi_-|
- \Delta|\varphi_+\rangle\langle\varphi_-| - \Delta|\varphi_-\rangle\langle\varphi_+|\right)
- \Delta|\varphi_+\rangle\langle\varphi_-| - \Delta|\varphi_-\rangle\langle\varphi_+|.
\] (A6)

Then in the rotating frame with respect to \(U_0 = e^{-iH_1t}\), the Hamiltonian (A1) becomes

\[
H(t) = U_0(t)H(t)U_0^\dagger(t) - iU_0(t)\dot{U}_0^\dagger(t)
= \frac{\Omega_1g_2}{G}|20g\rangle\langle\varphi_0| - \frac{\Omega_2g_1}{G}|02g\rangle\langle\varphi_0|
+ \frac{\Omega_1g_1}{\sqrt{2G}}|20g\rangle\langle\varphi_+|e^{iGt} + \frac{\Omega_1g_1}{\sqrt{2G}}|20g\rangle\langle\varphi_+|e^{iGt}
+ \frac{\Omega_2g_2}{\sqrt{2G}}|02g\rangle\langle\varphi_-|e^{-iGt} + \frac{\Omega_2g_2}{\sqrt{2G}}|02g\rangle\langle\varphi_-|e^{-iGt} + h.c.
- 2\Delta|\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_0| - \Delta|\varphi_+\rangle\langle\varphi_+| - \Delta|\varphi_-\rangle\langle\varphi_-|e^{2Gt}
- \Delta|\varphi_+\rangle\langle\varphi_-|e^{-2Gt} - \Delta|\varphi_-\rangle\langle\varphi_+|e^{2Gt}.
\] (A7)

When \(g_{1,2} \gg \Omega_{1,2}\), namely, \(G \gg \Omega_{1,2}\), the terms involving \(e^{\pm iGt}\) or \(e^{\pm 2iGt}\) can be omitted by the rotating frame approximation. So that in the subspace \{|02g⟩, |ϕ₀⟩, |20g⟩⟩\}, the effective Hamiltonian can be written as

\[
H_{eff}(t) = \frac{1}{G}(\Omega_1g_2|20g\rangle\langle\varphi_0| - \Omega_2g_1|02g\rangle\langle\varphi_0| + h.c.)
- 2\Delta|\varphi_0\rangle\langle\varphi_0|,
\] (A8)
which is Eq. (33) in the main text. One can check that both $|00g\rangle$ and $|22g\rangle$ are dark states of Eq. (A8) in nature and $|\phi_0\rangle$ serves as an ancillary state to the computational space \{00, 02, 20, 22\}.

However, we need to check the case when the initial state is $|22g\rangle$ since in the whole Hilbert space $H(t)|22g\rangle \neq 0$ due to the full Hamiltonian (32). Actually in this case, the quantum system will evolve in the subspace spanned by \{01e, 02e, 10e, 11g, 12g, 20e, 21g, 22g\}. In this subspace, the eigenstates and eigenvalues of the Hamiltonian $H_1$ are found to be

$$|\phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{G} (g_1|10e\rangle - g_2|01e\rangle),$$

$$|\phi_\pm\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2G}} (g_1|01e\rangle + g_2|10e\rangle \pm G|11g\rangle),$$

and 0 and $\pm G$, respectively. Then we repeat the procedure from Eq. (A4) to Eq. (A8). It turns out that the effective Hamiltonian in the subspace spanned by the new eigenstates of Eq. (A9) reads,

$$H_{eff}(t) = \frac{1}{G} (\Omega_1 g_1 \langle 20| \langle 00| - \Omega_2 g_2 \langle 02| \langle 00| + h.c.)$$

$$- 2\Delta |\phi_0\rangle \langle \phi_0|,$$

(A10)

under the condition that $G \gg \Omega_{1,2}(t)$. It is obvious that the state $|22g\rangle$ is decoupled from both effective Hamiltonians (A8) and (A10), so that it will remain invariant with the time evolution of the system. This result is consistent to that in the main text.

Note although the Hamiltonian (A10) indicates intuitively that the subspace \{00e, 02e, 20e, 22e\} = \{00, 02, 20, 22\} $\otimes |e\rangle$ could be used as another computational subspace, yet the excited state $|e\rangle$ for the qubit is usually little populated. Thus normally we utilize the low-energy effective Hamiltonian (A8) in consideration of the stability of the holonomic gates.