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No-cloning theorem forbids perfect cloning of an unknown quantum state. A universal quantum cloning machine (UQCM), which can produce two copies of any input qubit with the optimal fidelity, is of fundamental interest and has applications in quantum information processing. Previous implementations of UQCMs either are probabilistic or do not constitute true cloning of individual qubits. We here report on the first deterministic experimental demonstration of the UQCM for genuinely individual qubits in a superconducting circuit, where five Xmon qubits are coupled to a bus resonator. The high controllability of the system dynamics, enabled by the frequency tunability of each qubit, allows for deterministic implementation of all gate operations necessary for approximately cloning an arbitrary input state. The measured fidelities of the clones are input-state-independent and close to the optimal value 5/6. We further confirm the existence of quantum entanglement among the two clones and the original qubits, which distinguishes a quantum cloning machine from a classical counterpart but has not been demonstrated yet.

In quantum computation and communication, information is carried by a collection of qubits, each of which can be in a superposition of the two basis vectors in a two-dimensional state space [1]. Quantum information processing is implemented by performing desired quantum mechanical transformations on the qubits, each of which corresponds to a unitary operator. If a unitary transformation leads to two ideal copies for each input basis vector of a qubit, the linearity associated with the unitary transformation prohibits a superposition of the two basis vectors to be perfectly cloned [2]. In other words, such a copying process leads to the entanglement between the two output qubits, which destroys the quantum coherence of each qubit when the other is traced out. This feature, discovered by Wooters and Zurek in 1982 and known as the no-cloning theorem, represents one of the fundamental differences between quantum information and classical information. In particular, it ensures the security of quantum cryptography schemes [3, 4].

Because of the impossibility of perfect quantum cloning, much attention has been paid to the possibility of producing copies close to the original states. In the seminal paper by Bužek and Hillery, a universal quantum cloning machine (UQCM) was proposed, which produces two identical approximate copies via controllably entangling them with the original qubit [5]. The output state of each of these two copy qubits has a fidelity of 5/6 to the input state, which is independent of the input state and was proven to be optimal [6, 7]. Besides fundamental interest, quantum cloning can be used to improve the performance of some quantum computational tasks [8], to distribute quantum information, and to realize minimal disturbance measurements [9]. The UQCM can be realized with a network composed of a sequence of quantum logic gates [10]. Such a quantum copying network has been reported in nuclear magnetic resonance systems [11, 12], but where the true cloning of individual quantum systems cannot be achieved due to the ensemble aspect. This cloning network has also been implemented in an optical system [13], however only a single photon was involved in the copying process; the polarization degree of freedom of the photon was copied onto one of its path degrees of freedom. Several optical experiments have been reported, where the state of a photon was copied onto another photon [14–20], but the cloning processes are probabilistic for lack of a deterministic two-qubit controlled gate between different photons in these experiments. We note that in all of these experiments, the genuine quantum behavior of the UQCM-controlled entanglement among the original qubit and the copy qubits—has not been demonstrated. In the context of cavity quantum electrodynamics (QED) with Rydberg atoms coupled to cavities, schemes have been proposed for approximately cloning the state of an atomic qubit [19, 20]; however, experimental implementations remain challenging.

We here adapt the scheme of Ref. [20] to a circuit QED system where five superconducting qubits are con-
trollably coupled to a resonator, implementing a deterministic UQCM, which can approximately copy any state of one qubit to other two qubits. The frequency tunability of individual qubits enables a high degree of control over the qubit-resonator couplings as well as over the resonator-mediated qubit-qubit couplings. With this flexibility, we are able to realize all gate operations required for approximately cloning the state of each qubit in a deterministic way, which is in distinct contrast with the previous implementations of the UQCM. We characterize the performance of the UQCM by quantum state tomography, finding for each input state the output state of each copy qubit is close to that produced by the perfect UQCM. We further perform a joint output state tomography for each copy qubit and the original qubit, demonstrating they are nonclassically entangled, which represents one of the most fundamental differences between quantum and classical cloning but has not been touched upon in previous experiments. The entanglement between the two copy qubits is also measured.

The sample used to perform the experiment involves five Xmon qubits [21], labeled from $Q_1$ to $Q_5$, which are almost symmetrically coupled to a central bus resonator, as sketched in the Supplemental Material [22]. The resonator has a fixed frequency of $\omega_r/2\pi = 5.588 \text{ GHz}$, while the frequencies of the qubits are individually adjustable, which enables us to tailor the system dynamics to accomplish the copying task. The Hamiltonian for the total system is

$$H = \hbar \omega_r a^\dagger a + \sum_{j=1}^{5} \omega_{q,j} |1_j\rangle \langle 1_j| + \sum_{j=1}^{5} g_j \left( a^\dagger S_j^- + a S_j^+ \right)$$

(1)

where $a^\dagger$ and $a$ are the photonic creation and annihilation operators for the resonator, respectively, $S_j^\pm = |1_j\rangle \langle 0_j| \pm |0_j\rangle \langle 1_j|$ are the flip operators for $Q_j$, with $|0_j\rangle$ and $|1_j\rangle$ being its ground and first excited states separated by an energy gap $\hbar \omega_{q,j}$, $g_j$ are the corresponding qubit-resonator coupling strengths, and $\hbar$ is the reduced Planck constant. In our sample these coupling strengths are almost identical, e.g., $g_j \approx g \approx 2\pi \times 20 \text{ MHz}$. The system parameters are detailed in the Supplemental Material [22]. The qubit frequency tunability makes the system dynamics programmable. When one or more qubits are tuned on resonance with the resonator, they will coherently exchange energy with the resonator [25], without being affected by other qubits that are far off-resonant with the resonator. On the other hand, when two or more qubits are detuned from the resonator by the same amount much larger than $g$, they are coupled by virtual photon exchange [26–36]. In our experiment, $Q_1$ acts as the original qubit whose state is to be cloned, and $Q_2$ and $Q_3$ are used as the copy qubits. $Q_4$ and $Q_5$, which are not used, will stay at the corresponding idle frequencies throughout the process and not be included in the description of the system state.

The experimental sequence for realizing the UQCM with our setup is shown in Fig. 1. The experiment starts with initializing the resonator to the vacuum state $|0_r\rangle$ and the qubits to their ground state $|0_10_20_3\rangle$ at their idle frequencies. These idle frequencies are highly detuned from the resonator frequency and off-resonant with each other, ensuring each qubit to be effectively decoupled from the resonator and other qubits when staying at its idle frequency. After the initialization, a suitable rotation is applied to $Q_1$ to prepare it in the state to be cloned

$$|\psi_m\rangle = \alpha |0_1\rangle + \beta |1_1\rangle,$$

(2)

where $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are complex numbers, satisfying $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. Prior to the copying operation, we have to prepare $Q_2$ and $Q_3$ in the entangled state $|\psi_{2,3}^+\rangle = (|1_20_3\rangle + |0_21_3\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. To prepare this state, we first transform $Q_2$ to the excited state $|1_2\rangle$ by a $\pi$ rotation $X_{2}$, and then tune $Q_2$ and $Q_3$ to the working frequency $\omega_w/2\pi = 5.44 \text{ GHz}$. With this setting, the resonator will not exchange photons with the qubits and remain in the ground state due to the large detuning, but can mediate energy swapping between the two qubits [26, 29]. After a duration of 57.5 ns, a $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ gate is realized, which evolves these two qubits to the state $(|1_20_3\rangle + e^{\text{i}\theta} |0_21_3\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, where $\theta = \pi/2 + \theta_d$, with $\theta_d$ being the extra dynamical phase accumulated during the frequency tuning process. To cancel the phase $\theta$, $Q_3$ is tuned to the frequency 5.311 GHz, where the rotation $R_{\theta} = e^{-\text{i}\theta |1_3\rangle\langle 1_3|}$ is realized after a duration of 30 ns.

After the production of $|\psi_{2,3}^+\rangle$, $Q_2$ and $Q_3$ are tuned on resonance with $Q_1$ at the working frequency, where

![FIG. 1: (Color online) Experimental sequence. Before the copying operation, all qubits are initialized to their ground state at the corresponding idle frequencies. The whole procedure can be divided into four steps: Preparation of the input state through a unitary rotation at the idle frequency, denoted as $U$; entanglement of $Q_2$ and $Q_3$ with Bell type, achieved by a $\pi$ rotation $X_{2}$ on $Q_2$, the $Q_2$-$Q_3$ $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ gate, and a small $Z$ pulse on $Q_3$ realizing a rotation $R_{\theta}$ for phase compensation; cloning of the input state onto $Q_2$ and $Q_3$, realized by resonator-induced couplings $C_{1,2,3}$ and $C_{2,3}$; output state tomography. $C_{1,2,3}$ is implemented by tuning $Q_2$ and $Q_3$ on resonance with $Q_1$ at the working frequency, while $C_{2,3}$ realized by tuning $Q_1$ back to its idle frequency, leaving $Q_2$ and $Q_3$ coupled to each other. Note that in our experiment, steps 1 and 2 are completed simultaneously for the sake of reducing qubits’ decoherence, see Supplemental Material for the details [22].](image-url)
these qubits are red-detuned from the resonator by the same amount \( \Delta = 2\pi \times 148 \text{ MHz} \). With this setting, the resonator does not exchange photons with the qubits due to the large detuning, but can mediate a coupling of strength \( \lambda = g^2/\Delta \) between any two of these qubits. The resonator will remain in the ground state during this process, and can be discarded in the description of the system dynamics. In the interaction picture, the state evolution of the qubits is governed by the effective Hamiltonian \[ H_e = -\lambda \sum_{j,k=1}^{3} S_{j}^+ S_{k}^- , \quad j \neq k . \] (3)

Under this Hamiltonian, \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \) symmetrically interact with \( Q_1 \) through exchange exchange, with the number of the total excitations being conserved. After an interaction time \( \tau = 2\pi/9\lambda \), these qubits evolve to the entangled state

\[
\alpha \left[ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} |11\rangle |02\rangle |03\rangle + \frac{1}{3} e^{-i\pi/3} |01\rangle |\psi_{3,2}^+\rangle \right] + \beta \left[ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} |01\rangle |12\rangle |13\rangle + \frac{1}{3} e^{-i\pi/3} |11\rangle |\psi_{3,2}^+\rangle \right]. \tag{4}
\]

Then \( Q_1 \) is tuned back to its idle frequency and decoupled from \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \), which remain at the working frequency and continue to interact with each other. The state components \(|02\rangle |03\rangle \) and \(|12\rangle |13\rangle \) are eigenstates of the two-qubit interaction Hamiltonian \( H_e = -\lambda (S_{2}^+ S_{3}^- + S_{3}^+ S_{2}^-) \) with the zero eigenvalue, while \(|\psi_{3,2}^+\rangle \) is an eigenstate of \( H_e \) with the eigenvalue of \(-\lambda\). As a result, this swapping interaction does not affect \(|02\rangle |03\rangle \) and \(|12\rangle |13\rangle \), but produces a phase shift \( \lambda \tau \) to \(|\psi_{3,2}^+\rangle \) with \( \tau \) being the interaction time. With the choice \( \tau = \pi/3\lambda \), this cancels the phase factor \( e^{-i\pi/3} \) associated with \(|\psi_{3,2}^+\rangle \), evolving the three qubits to \[ \alpha \left[ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} e^{i\phi} |11\rangle |02\rangle |03\rangle + \frac{1}{3} |01\rangle |\psi_{3,2}^+\rangle \right] \tag{5} + \beta \left[ \frac{\sqrt{2}}{3} |01\rangle |12\rangle |13\rangle + \frac{1}{3} e^{i\phi} |11\rangle |\psi_{3,2}^+\rangle \right] , \]

where the phase \( \phi \) is due to the frequency shift of \( Q_1 \) during the \( Q_2-Q_3 \) interaction, which does not affect the reduced density matrices for both \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \), each of which in the basis \(|0\rangle, |1\rangle \) is given by

\[
\left( \frac{5}{6} |\alpha|^2 + \frac{1}{6} |\beta|^2, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \alpha^* \beta, \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} \alpha \beta^*, \frac{1}{6} |\alpha|^2 + \frac{1}{6} |\beta|^2 \right). \tag{6}
\]

For the perfect UQCM, the fidelity of these two output copiers with respect to the input state \(|\psi_{\text{in}}\rangle \) is 5/6, irrespective of the probability amplitudes \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) associated with the components \(|0\rangle \) and \(|1\rangle \). We note that due to the existence of the direct but nonuniform qubit-qubit couplings in our device \[32-36\], each qubit is asymmetrically coupled to the other two qubits with the effective coupling strengths slightly smaller than \( \lambda \), and consequently, the optimal coupling times \( \tau \) and \( \tau' \) should deviate from the values for the ideal case, and are 40 ns and 71 ns, respectively.

We characterize the performance of the UQCM by preparing different input states \(|\{01\}, (|01\rangle - i |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}, (|01\rangle + |11\rangle)/\sqrt{2}, |11\rangle\rangle\), and measuring the corresponding output states of \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \) through quantum state tomography. The measured density matrices for the clones of the above-mentioned four input states are respectively displayed in Fig. 2(a)-(d), where the upper and lower panels denote the measured output density matrices of \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \), respectively. The fidelities of the output states of \( Q_2 \) (\( Q_3 \)) to these four ideal input states, defined as \( F = \langle \psi_{\text{in}} | \rho_{\text{out}} | \psi_{\text{in}} \rangle \), are respectively 0.832 \pm 0.002 (0.833 \pm 0.004), 0.788 \pm 0.005 (0.836 \pm 0.003), 0.802 \pm 0.003 (0.833 \pm 0.003), and 0.791 \pm 0.002 (0.833 \pm 0.003), where \( \rho_{\text{out}} \) denotes the measured density matrix for the corresponding output clone. Each of these fidelities is close to the optimal value 5/6, confirming the performance of the UQCM is independent of the input state. The slight difference between the output states of the two copy qubits is mainly due to direct qubit-qubit couplings. These nonuniform couplings also make the qualities of the output states slightly depend on the input state. Due to the slight deviation from the perfect UQCM the fidelities of certain output states can be slightly higher than the optimal value 5/6 of the UQCM.

To further examine the performance of the UQCM, we perform the quantum process tomography, achieved by preparing the above-mentioned four distinct input states, and measuring them and the corresponding output states of \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \) through quantum state tomography. The measured process matrices associated with the output states of \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \), \( \chi_{\text{meas}}^{(2)} \) and \( \chi_{\text{meas}}^{(3)} \), are respectively presented in Fig. 3(a) and (b), respectively. The fidelities of \( \chi_{\text{meas}}^{(2)} \) and \( \chi_{\text{meas}}^{(3)} \) with respect to the ideal cloning process \( \chi_{\text{id}} \), defined as \( F = Tr (\chi_{\text{meas}} \chi_{\text{id}}) \), are 0.698 \pm 0.003 and 0.740 \pm 0.003, respectively. These process fidelities are close to the result of the perfect UQCM, 0.75, demonstrating a good quantum control over the multiqubit-resonator system.

One distinct feature of the UQCM is that the information carried by the input state is spread over the two copy qubits and the original one via a controlled quantum entanglement \[14\]: at the output, the three qubits exhibit a three-particle entanglement, which was not characterized in previous experiments. When one copy qubit is traced out, there remains some entanglement between the other copy qubit and the original qubit. The degree of the remaining entanglement, quantified by concurrence \[37\], is 2/3 for an ideal UQCM, which is independent of the input state (see Supplemental Material...
We have demonstrated universal cloning of an arbitrary state of an individual qubit with a circuit QED setup, where all the quantum operations necessary for operation. With the experimental imperfections being considered, these results are in good agreement with theoretical predictions, demonstrating the close relation between quantum cloning and entanglement.

When the original qubit is traced out, the concurrence between the two copy qubits is 1/3 for the perfect UQCM, which is also input-state independent. To verify this entanglement, we perform the joint Q2-Q3 output state tomography. The reconstructed joint Q2-Q3 density matrices for the four input states are displayed in the Supplemental Material [22]. The Q2-Q3 concurrences associated with these four measured density matrices are 0.222 ± 0.025, 0.105 ± 0.022, 0.143 ± 0.022, and 0.202 ± 0.012, respectively. These results indicate that for the input superposition state the output Q2-Q3 entanglement is much more affected by the decoherence effect compared to the case with input |0⟩- or |1⟩-state. This can be interpreted as follows. For the latter case, the output Q2-Q3 state is a mixture of ψ2+3 and |0⟩ |0⟩ or |1⟩ |1⟩, and thus the entanglement is solely determined by the quality of ψ2+3. The Q2-Q3 coupling produces a dynamical decoupling effect for ψ2+3, partially protecting it from the dephasing noises (see Supplemental Material). On the other hand, for an input superposition state, the output Q2-Q3 state is a mixture of two components, each of which corresponds to a superposition of ψ2+3 and |0⟩ |0⟩ or |1⟩ |1⟩, which is not protected by the Q2-Q3 coupling. The existence of concurrence between any two of the three qubits confirm they are in a genuine three-particle entangled state, revealing the fundamental difference between a quantum cloning process and a classical one.

We have demonstrated universal cloning of an arbitrary state of an individual qubit with a circuit QED setup, where all the quantum operations necessary for
FIG. 4: (Color online) Measured $Q_1$-$Q_2$ and $Q_1$-$Q_3$ output density matrices for input states: (a) $|0⟩$; (b) $(|0⟩ - i|1⟩)/√2$; (c) $(|0⟩ + |1⟩)/√2$; (d) $|1⟩$. For clarity, a single-qubit z-axis rotation is numerically applied to cancel the phase of the extra phase accumulated due to the qubits’ frequency shift. The measured $Q_1$-$Q_2$ and $Q_1$-$Q_3$ output density matrices are displayed in the upper and lower panels, respectively. The black wire frames denote the corresponding density matrices produced by the perfect UQCM.

Constructing a UQCM network are mediated by a bus resonator that is connected to five Xmon qubits. We characterize the performance of the UQCM by quantum state tomography, confirming the universality of the copying process. We further measure the concurrence between each copy qubit and the original qubit as well as that between the two copy qubits, and verify the existence of true three-particle entanglement at the output, revealing the quantum nature of the implemented UQCM. Our results illustrate the potential of our device as a versatile quantum processor, where the resonator can be used to program quantum information procedures. This unique feature, together with the scalability of integrated circuit fabrication, makes it promising to build a large-scale solid-state platform for quantum computation as well as for quantum simulation.

This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11674060, No. 11874114, No. 11875108, No. 11934018 and No. 11904393), and the Strategic Priority Research Program of Chinese Academy of Sciences (Grant No. XDB28000000).

[22] See Supplemental Material at <url>, which includes Refs. [23,24] for characterization of quantum entanglement in the output state of an ideal UQMC, analysis of dynamical decoupling effect produced by $Q_2$-$Q_3$ coupling, device parameters and experimental setup, detailed experimental pulse sequences, and details on $Q_2$-$Q_3$ joint state tomography.
Supplemental Material for “Experimental demonstration of universal quantum cloning in a circuit”

Zhen-Biao Yang1, Pei-Rong Han1, Xin-Jie Huang1, Wen Ning1, Hekang Li2, Kai Xu2,3,* Dongning Zheng2,3, Heng Fan2,3,† and Shi-Biao Zheng1,‡
1.Fujian Key Laboratory of Quantum Information and Quantum Optics,
College of Physics and Information Engineering,
Fuzhou University, Fuzhou, Fujian 350108, China
2.Institute of Physics and Beijing National Laboratory for Condensed Matter Physics,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China and
3.CAS Center for Excellence in Topological Quantum Computation,
University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China
(Dated: September 10, 2019)

xxx

PACS numbers:

Contents

1. Quantum entanglement in the output state of an ideal UQMC 1

2. Dynamical decoupling effect produced by Q2–Q3 coupling 2

3. Device sketch, system parameters and experimental setup 2

4. Experimental pulse sequences 3

5. Q2–Q3 joint state tomography 4

References 5

1. QUANTUM ENTANGLEMENT IN THE OUTPUT STATE OF AN IDEAL UQMC

When one of the copy qubits is traced out, the joint density matrix for the other copy qubit and the original qubit at the output of the UQCM, in the basis \( \{ |0_k⟩, |0_1 k⟩, |1_1 k⟩, |1_1 0 k⟩ \} \) \((k = 2, 3)\) is given by

\[
\rho = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 \\
\frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 \\
\frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 \\
\frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 & \frac{1}{6} |α|^2 \\
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(S1)

The corresponding \( \tilde{ρ} \) matrix, defined as \( \tilde{ρ} = ρ(σ_g ⊗ σ_g)ρ^*(σ_g ⊗ σ_g) \), is

\[
\tilde{ρ} = \begin{pmatrix}
-\frac{1}{9} |αβ|^2 & \frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) & \frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) & \frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) \\
\frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) & -\frac{1}{9} |αβ|^2 & \frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) & \frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) \\
\frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) & \frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) & -\frac{1}{9} |αβ|^2 & \frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) \\
\frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) & \frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) & \frac{1}{2} |αβ^*|^2 (|α|^2 + |β|^2) & -\frac{1}{9} |αβ|^2 \\
\end{pmatrix}.
\]

(S2)

The four eigenvalues of \( \tilde{ρ} \) in the decreasing order are respectively \( λ_1 = 4/9 \) and \( λ_2 = λ_3 = λ_4 = 0 \). The corresponding concurrence [1], defined as \( C = \max\{\sqrt{λ_1} - \sqrt{λ_2} - \sqrt{λ_3} - \sqrt{λ_4}, 0\} \), is 2/3, which is independent of the input state.

After tracing over the original qubit, the joint density matrix of \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \) at the output of the UQCM, in the
basis \{ |0203\rangle, |0213\rangle, |1203\rangle, |1213\rangle \}, reads as

\[ \rho = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{2}{9} |\alpha|^2 & \frac{1}{9} \alpha^* \beta & \frac{1}{9} \alpha \beta^* & 0 \\
\frac{2}{9} \alpha^* \beta & \frac{1}{9} |\beta|^2 & \frac{1}{9} \beta \alpha^* & \frac{1}{9} \alpha \beta^* \\
\frac{2}{9} \alpha \beta^* & \frac{1}{9} \beta \alpha^* & \frac{1}{9} |\beta|^2 & \frac{1}{9} \alpha^* \beta \\
0 & \frac{1}{9} \alpha^* \beta & \frac{1}{9} |\alpha|^2 & \frac{2}{9} |\beta|^2
\end{pmatrix} \] (S3)

The matrix \( \tilde{\rho} \) is

\[ \tilde{\rho} = \begin{pmatrix}
\frac{2}{9} |\alpha\beta|^2 & \frac{1}{9} \alpha^* \beta \left(|\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2\right) & \frac{1}{9} \alpha \beta^* \left(|\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2\right) & \frac{1}{9} \alpha^* \beta \left(|\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2\right) \\
\frac{1}{9} \alpha^* \beta \left(|\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2\right) & \frac{1}{9} |\beta|^2 & \frac{1}{9} \beta \alpha^* & \frac{1}{9} \alpha \beta^* \\
\frac{1}{9} \alpha \beta^* \left(|\beta|^2 - |\alpha|^2\right) & \frac{1}{9} \beta \alpha^* & \frac{1}{9} |\beta|^2 & \frac{1}{9} \alpha^* \beta \\
\frac{1}{9} \alpha^* \beta \left(|\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2\right) & \frac{1}{9} \alpha \beta^* \left(|\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2\right) & \frac{1}{9} \alpha^* \beta \left(|\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2\right) & \frac{1}{9} |\beta|^2
\end{pmatrix} \] (S4)

the four eigenvalues of which in the decreasing order are respectively \( \lambda_1 = 1/9 \) and \( \lambda_2 = \lambda_3 = \lambda_4 = 0 \), corresponding to a concurrence of 1/3, which is also input-state-independent.

\[ \text{DYNAMICAL DECOUPLING EFFECT PRODUCED BY } Q_2-Q_3 \text{ COUPLING} \]

For simplicity, we consider the system comprised of \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \), which are coupled to each qubit with the coupling strength \( \lambda \). With the dephasing being included, the system Hamiltonian in the interaction picture is

\[ H = H_0 + H_1, \] (S5)

where

\[ H_0 = -\lambda \left( S_2^+ S_3^- + S_2^- S_3^+ \right), \] (S6)

\[ H_1 = \hbar K_2 |12\rangle \langle 12| + \hbar K_3 |13\rangle \langle 13|, \] (S7)

with \( K_2 \) and \( K_3 \) denoting the frequency fluctuations for \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \), respectively. To clearly show the dynamical decoupling effect, we express \( H_1 \) in the basis formed by the eigenstates \( \{ |0203\rangle, |0213\rangle, |1203\rangle, |1213\rangle \} \) of \( H_0 \),

\[ H_1 = \hbar \left( K_2 + K_3 \right) |\psi_{2,3}^+\rangle \langle \psi_{2,3}^-| + |\psi_{2,3}^-\rangle \langle \psi_{2,3}^+| \]

\[ + |\psi_{3,2}^-\rangle \langle \psi_{3,2}^+| + |\psi_{3,2}^+\rangle \langle \psi_{3,2}^-| \]

\[ + \hbar \left( K_2 + K_3 \right) |1213\rangle \langle 1213|, \] (S8)

where \( |\psi_{2,3}^\pm\rangle = (|1203\rangle \pm |0213\rangle) / \sqrt{2}. \) In addition to the energy shifts, the frequency fluctuations induce the transition between \( |\psi_{2,3}^+\rangle \) and \( |\psi_{2,3}^-\rangle \). Under the condition \( |K_j|, 1/T_j \ll \lambda \), where \( T_j \) represents the correlation time of the noise \( K_j (j = 1, 2, \text{this transition is suppressed owing to the large energy gap } (2\lambda) \) produced by the \( Q_2-Q_3 \) coupling, and \( H_1 \) can be approximately replaced by

The effective Hamiltonian [2]

\[ H_{eff} = \frac{\hbar}{2} \left( K_2 + K_3 \right) \left\{ 1 - \frac{(K_2 + K_3)}{\lambda} \right\} |\psi_{2,3}^+\rangle \langle \psi_{2,3}^-| \]

\[ + \left( 1 + \frac{(K_2 + K_3)}{\lambda} \right) |\psi_{2,3}^-\rangle \langle \psi_{2,3}^+| \]

\[ + \hbar \left( K_2 + K_3 \right) |1213\rangle \langle 1213|. \]

During the interval \([t_1, t_2]\), this Hamiltonian induces a phase factor \( e^{i\phi} \) to \( |\psi_{2,3}^+\rangle \) and a phase factor \( e^{i\phi^*} \) to \( |1213\rangle \), where \( \phi = -\frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \left( K_2 + K_3 \right) \left( 1 - \frac{(K_2 + K_3)}{\lambda} \right) dt \) and \( \phi^* = -\frac{1}{\hbar} \int_{t_1}^{t_2} \left( K_2 + K_3 \right) dt. \) When \( |\psi_{2,3}^+\rangle \) is not superposed with other components, it is not affected by the common phase factor \( e^{i\phi}. \) However, when \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \) are in a superposition of the two basis states \( |\psi_{2,3}^+\rangle \) and \( |0203\rangle \) \((|1213\rangle)\), \( H_{eff} \) induces a random relative phase shift \( \phi \) between these two basis states, which deteriorates quantum coherence between the two basis states. We note that \( |\psi_{2,3}^+\rangle \) is only dynamically decoupled from the slow dephasing noises; for frequency fluctuations with correlation times that are not much longer than the dynamical timescale \( 1/\lambda \), the resulting dephasing effects on \( |\psi_{2,3}^+\rangle \) cannot be well suppressed.

3. DEVICE SKETCH, SYSTEM PARAMETERS AND EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

The UQCM is demonstrated in a superconducting circuit consisting of five frequency-tunable Xmon qubits, labeled from \( Q_1 \) to \( Q_5 \), coupled to a resonator with a fixed frequency of \( \omega_r / 2 \pi = 5.588 \text{ GHz} \) [3, 4], as sketched in Fig. S1. \( Q_4 \) and \( Q_5 \) (not marked here), which are not used in the experiment, stay far off-resonant from the other three qubits and the resonator throughout the copying process. The parameters are detailed in TABLE S1. The qubit-resonator coupling strength \( g_j \) is measured and estimated through the vacuum Rabi oscillations. The qubits’ energy decaying time \( T_1 \), the Ram-
TABLE S1: Qubits characteristics. \( \omega_j/2\pi \) is the idle frequency of \( Q_j \) where single-qubit rotations and qubit state tomography are performed. \( g_j \) is the coupling strength between \( Q_j \) and the bus resonator. \( \lambda_{j,j+1} \) is the magnitude of crosstalk qubit-qubit coupling between \( Q_j \) and \( Q_{j+1} \) beyond that induced by the resonator. \( T_{1,j} \), \( T_{2,j} \), and \( T_{\text{SE},j} \) are the energy relaxation time, the Ramsey dephasing time (Gaussian decay), and the dephasing time (Gaussian decay) with spin-echo, respectively, all of them (those in parentheses) are measured at the idle (working) point of \( Q_j \). \( \kappa'_r \) represents the leakage rate of \( Q_j \)’s readout resonator \( R_j \). \( F_{0,j} \) (\( F_{1,j} \)) is the probability of correctly detecting \( Q_j \) in \([0]\) (\([1]\)) when it is prepared in \([0]\) (\([1]\)) state.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>( \omega_j/2\pi ) (GHz)</th>
<th>( g_j/2\pi ) (MHz)</th>
<th>( \lambda_{j,j+1}/2\pi ) (MHz)</th>
<th>( T_{1,j} ) (( \mu )s)</th>
<th>( T_{2,j} ) (( \mu )s)</th>
<th>( T_{\text{SE},j} ) (( \mu )s)</th>
<th>( 1/\kappa'_r ) (( \nu )s)</th>
<th>( F_{0,j} )</th>
<th>( F_{1,j} )</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>( Q_1 )</td>
<td>5.366</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>0.071</td>
<td>19.4(19.9)</td>
<td>0.6(0.7)</td>
<td>6.8(6.5)</td>
<td>315</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.943</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Q_2 )</td>
<td>5.229</td>
<td>20.8</td>
<td>0.567</td>
<td>31.3(18.1)</td>
<td>1.2(1.4)</td>
<td>7.1(7.0)</td>
<td>219</td>
<td>0.978</td>
<td>0.926</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>( Q_3 )</td>
<td>5.312</td>
<td>19.9</td>
<td>1.09</td>
<td>19.5(15.4)</td>
<td>1.8(1.8)</td>
<td>8.3(11.6)</td>
<td>203</td>
<td>0.967</td>
<td>0.910</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The whole electronics and wiring for the device control is separated into two parts: one at room temperature and the other in the dilution refrigerator, as shown in Fig. S1. Each qubit XY control is implemented through mixing the low-frequency signals produced by 2 Digital-to-Analog convertor (DAC) channels (I/Q) and a Microwave source (MS) whose carry frequency is 5.52 GHz; it realizes the fast qubit flipping at the nanosecond scale. Each qubit’s frequency control is implemented by the signals from two ways that are combined from a bias tee, one is directly produced by a DAC channel for the fast tuning of the qubit’s frequency, while the other is sent by a Direct-Current (DC) channel to reset the qubit’s frequency to specific operating point. The qubit readout control is achieved also by the sideband mixing of the signals of two independent DAC channels I/Q and a MS with the frequency of 6.67 GHz, thus it outputs a readout pulse with 3 tones that targets 3 qubits’ readout resonators. The output from the sample is amplified sequentially by the impedance-transformed Josephson parametric amplifier (JPA), high electron mobility transistor (HEMT) and room temperature amplifiers before being captured and demodulated by ADC. 4 cryogenic circulators with low insertion loss are placed between JPA and the device to allow the unidirectional-transmission of microwave signal which impedes the reflections and noise from the input entering into the device. The JPA is pumped by a MS with the frequency of 13.494 GHz, about twice the signal frequency through the pumping line, where the signal is filtered by a 13.1 GHz band-pass filter; the amplification band of the JPA is tunable with a DC bias applied to it. To reduce kinds of unwanted noises feeding into the signal lines, each signal from (to) DAC and Analog-to-Digital convertor (ADC) is filtered with a 7.5 GHz lowpass filter, each qubit Z pulse from DAC is filtered with a 500 MHz low-pass filter, and each DC signal is filtered with a 80 MHz low-pass filter at Mixing-Chamber (MC) stage and with a RC filter at 4K state. Moreover, some attenuators are also added to the signal lines at different temperature stages to further reduce the noises influencing the operation of the device.

4. EXPERIMENTAL PULSE SEQUENCES

The pulse sequence for UQCM is shown in Fig. S2, which is divided into 3 stages in time series. The first stage involves 2 steps for the implementation: the preparation of the state to be cloned for \( Q_1 \) and the preparation of the entangled state for the two copy qubits \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \). The experiment begins by applying a \( \pi \) rotation \( X_1 \) on \( Q_1 \) realized by a microwave pulse with a duration of 40 ns at its idle frequency. Then \( Q_2 \) and \( Q_3 \) are quickly biased with rectangular pulses from their respective idle frequencies (see Table S1) to the working frequency \( \omega_j/2\pi = 5.44 \) GHz, which is red-detuned from the resonator frequency by an amount of \( \Delta = 2\pi \times 148 \) MHz. Thus it fulfills a \( \sqrt{\text{SWAP}} \) gate and steers \( Q_2-Q_3 \) to the entangled state \( |\psi_{2,3}\rangle = |1_20_3\rangle + e^{i(\pi/2+\theta_d)}|0_21_3\rangle\rangle/\sqrt{2} \), with \( \theta_d \) being the dynamical phase accumulated during the frequency tuning process. A compensated Z-pulse is applied to \( Q_3 \) for 30 ns to eliminate the factor \( e^{i(\pi/2+\theta_d)} \) of such an entangled state \( |\psi_{2,3}\rangle \). Meanwhile, \( Q_1 \) is prepared to the initial state to be cloned by applying microwave pulses through its XY control line. The second stage launches by biasing each of the three qubits with a rectangular pulse to the working frequency \( \omega_j \), realizes the resonator-induced three-qubit coupling \( C_{1,2,3} \) for the preparation of the three-body state in Eq. (4) of the main text and the resonator-induced two-qubit coupling \( C_{2,3} \) for the neutralization of the phase factor \( e^{-i\pi/3} \) in such a three-body state. The processes \( C_{1,2,3} \) and \( C_{2,3} \) last for 40 ns and 71 ns, respectively. In the third stage, the qubit output state tomography is performed, where three kinds of tomographic pulses \( (I, X/2, Y/2) \) for each qubit are iterated for different experimental run. With this pulse sequence, the density matrices for each of the copy qubits
5. Q2-Q3 JOINT STATE TOMOGRAPHY

To characterize the quantum entanglement between the two copy qubits after the cloning operation, we perform joint output state tomography for Q2 and Q3. The Q2-Q3 joint output density matrices for the four input states $|0\rangle$, $|1\rangle - i|1\rangle$, $|0\rangle + |1\rangle$, and $|1\rangle$ are shown in Fig. S3(a)-(d), respectively. The measured matrix elements are denoted by two color bars, one for the real part and the other for the imaginary part, which are in well agreement with the corresponding results for a perfect UQCM (black wire frames). Note that for clarity, before the state tomography, a single-qubit z-axis rotation with a specific radian angle (Q1: -2.09848; Q2: -0.2288; Q3: -0.3344) is numerically applied to cancel the extra phase accumulated due to the qubits’ frequency shift, which does not change the entanglement.

$Q_2$ and $Q_3$ associated with the different input states

$\{ |0_2\rangle, (|0_2\rangle - i|1_2\rangle) / \sqrt{2}, (|0_2\rangle + |1_2\rangle) / \sqrt{2}, |1_2\rangle \}$

are reconstructed and displayed in Fig. 2(a)-(d) of the main text, respectively. While the joint $Q_1$-$Q_2$ and $Q_1$-$Q_3$ output density matrices associated with the four input states are reconstructed and displaced in Fig. 4(a)-(d) of the main text, respectively.

**FIG. S2:** Experimental pulse sequence. The sequence is divided into 3 stages which involves 4 steps: 1. the preparation of the state to be cloned for $Q_1$; 2. the preparation of the entangled state for $Q_2$ and $Q_3$; 3. resonator-induced couplings $C_{1,2,3}$ and $C_{2,3}$; and 4. quantum state tomography. In the first stage, a microwave $\pi$-pulse with a duration of $40\,\text{ns}$ is first applied on $Q_3$ to excite it to $|1_3\rangle$, then a rectangular pulse with a length of $57.5\,\text{ns}$ is applied on the qubit pair $Q_2$-$Q_3$ to tune them on resonance, realizing the $\sqrt{\text{SWAP}}$ gate which generates the entangled state $|1_2\rangle_{Q_2} + e^{i(\pi/2+\theta)}|0_2\rangle_{Q_2}|1_3\rangle_{Q_3}$/$\sqrt{2}$. A compensated rectangular pulse of a length of $30\,\text{ns}$ is then applied on $Q_3$ to cancel the phase factor $i$ and the dynamical phase $\theta$ accumulated during the frequency tuning process. The step 1 for the preparation of the input state to be cloned for $Q_1$ begins in the last $40\,\text{ns}$ or $20\,\text{ns}$ of the step 2, through a microwave pulse that terminates synchronously with the phase compensated pulse. In step 3, the resonator-induced coupling $C_{1,2,3}$ is started with a rectangular pulse applied on $Q_1$, $Q_2$, and $Q_3$, tuning them on resonance for about $40\,\text{ns}$; this is successively transformed to the coupling $C_{2,3}$ as the rectangular pulse on $Q_1$ is withdrawn at the moment thus remaining only $Q_2$ and $Q_3$ virtually coupling with the resonator, the duration is about $71\,\text{ns}$. Note that a single-qubit z-axis rotation is then numerically applied on each qubit to cancel the extra phase accumulated due to the qubits’ frequency shift during the process. The sequence of step 4 involves a tomographic pulse of a duration $40\,\text{ns}$ and a readout pulse of a duration of $1\,\mu\text{s}$ on each qubit. Thus the density matrix for each qubit and the joint density matrices for any two qubits can be reconstructed.
FIG. S3: (Color online) $Q_2$-$Q_3$ joint output density matrices for the four input states: (a) $|0\rangle_1$, (b) $(|0\rangle_1 - i|1\rangle_1)/\sqrt{2}$, (c) $(|0\rangle_1 + |1\rangle_1)/2$, (d) $|1\rangle_1$. Each matrix element is characterized by two color bars, one for the real part and the other for the imaginary part. The black wire frames denote the corresponding matrix elements of the ideal output states.