Laser-free trapped-ion entangling gates with simultaneous insensitivity to qubit and motional decoherence
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The dominant error sources for state-of-the-art laser-free trapped-ion entangling gates are decoherence of the qubit state and motion. The effect of these decoherence mechanisms can be suppressed with additional control fields, or through other techniques that reduce gate speed. Here, we propose using a near-motional-frequency magnetic field gradient to make a laser-free gate that is simultaneously resilient to both types of decoherence, does not require additional control fields, and has a relatively smaller cost in gate speed.

Trapped ions are a promising platform for quantum simulations and universal quantum computation due to their long coherence times, inherent uniformity, and high gate fidelities [1–8]. The most common method for performing high-fidelity multi-qubit entangling gates, a requirement for universal quantum processors, relies on coupling the internal qubit “spin” states to collective motional degrees of freedom [1, 2, 8]. Geometric phase gates, which create entanglement through closed spin-dependent trajectories in motional phase space, are widely used because (in the Lamb-Dicke limit) they are first-order insensitive to ion temperature [10–12]. Geometric phase gates employing laser beams to create the required spin-motion coupling have been used to generate Bell states with fidelities \( \sim 0.999 [7,8] \), with the main source of error arising from off-resonant photon scattering [13]. Alternative laser-free schemes induce spin-motion coupling with static [14–20], near-qubit-frequency [21–23], or near-motional-frequency [21–26] magnetic field gradients. While laser-free schemes eliminate photon scattering errors and do not require stable, high-power lasers, they can be more susceptible to other noise sources due to their typically longer gate durations.

Qubit frequency shifts due to magnetic field noise or fluctuating microwave amplitudes are the primary sources of error in laser-free gates [20, 22]. Recent work has shown that these shifts may be reduced passively through careful trap design [23]. They can also be reduced actively by adding control fields to perform dynamical decoupling [18, 29, 32]; the best experimentally demonstrated Bell state fidelity using such a scheme is 0.997(1) [23]. Since laser-free geometric phase gates are typically slower than laser-based gates by an order of magnitude, the qubits spend more time entangled with the motional mode, and thus the gates are more sensitive to motional decoherence. Typically, this is the next most important source of gate error [18, 23, 26]. In the work reported here, we consider motional decoherence in three distinct regimes, depending on the timescale and nature of the decoherence: secular frequency shifts, motional heating, and motional dephasing.

In their original proposal, Sørenson and Mølmer pointed out that dividing a geometric phase gate into \( K \) loops decreases gate errors from heating and motional dephasing [11]. Separately, decoherence from secular frequency shifts can be suppressed with Walsh sequences [33], or with phase modulation of gate fields [34, 35]. These techniques increase the gate duration \( t_G \) in exchange for robustness. Polychromatic gates [36], geometric phase gates that are comprised of multiple simultaneously applied gate fields with optimized amplitudes, reduce the impact of all three types of motional decoherence and have a comparatively smaller trade-off in \( t_G \). This technique was recently demonstrated for both laser-based [37] and laser-free gates [20]. However, these gates remain sensitive to qubit frequency shifts, and their physical implementation also requires additional control fields, increasing the experimental complexity.

In this work, we propose a gate that provides simultaneous robustness to qubit frequency shifts and to motional decoherence without requiring additional control fields, offering a combination of increased fidelity and decreased experimental overhead. We consider a pair of microwave frequency fields, symmetrically detuned around the qubit transition frequency \( \omega_q \) by \( \pm \delta \), and a separate magnetic field gradient oscillating at \( \omega_g \), where \( \omega_g \) is approximately 1/3 of the frequency \( \omega_q \) of the shared collective mode of the motion, as shown in Fig. 1(a). Without considering noise, the dynamics of this system are governed by the following Hamiltonian, which considers two qubit ions and one shared motional mode [27]. In the interaction frame for the qubit and motional mode this is

\[
\hat{H}(t) = 2\hbar \Omega_p \hat{S}_z \cos(\delta t) + 2\hbar \Omega_g \cos(\omega_g t) \hat{S}_z \hat{a} e^{-i\omega_r t} + H.c.,
\]

(1)
where $\Omega_g$ is the magnetic field gradient Rabi frequency and $\Omega_{\mu}$ is the microwave Rabi frequency. Here, $\hat{a}(\hat{a}^\dagger)$ is a phonon annihilation(creation) operator, $\hat{S}_{\gamma}(x,y,z)$ is a multi-atom spin operator ($\hat{S}_{\gamma} = \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma,1} + \hat{\sigma}_{\gamma,2}$), and $\delta$ is the detuning of the microwaves from the qubit frequency. We have neglected fast-rotating terms (see Supplemental Material). The oscillating gradient at $\omega_g$, in combination with the detuned microwaves, can give rise to two spin-motion-coupling sideband interactions, occurring when $\delta = \omega_r \pm \omega_g$, respectively [28]. The proposed gate relies on this feature of the interaction, along with the fact that the bichromatic microwave pair combines to give an effective modulation of $\Omega_{\mu}$. This scheme requires a magnetic-field-sensitive qubit transition instead of the magnetic-field-insensitive “clock” transitions typically preferred for their long coherence times. We envision storing quantum information in a clock qubit and transferring the state populations to a field-sensitive qubit only during times when an entangling gate is being carried out. Alternatively, microwave fields can be applied to field-sensitive transitions to create dressed-state clock qubits [31].

Constraints of current experimental apparatuses limit the strength of $\Omega_g/2\pi$ to a few kHz, whereas $\Omega_{\mu}/2\pi$ can be in the MHz regime [28]. It is therefore convenient to analyze the system dynamics in a frame that eliminates the large size disparity between the terms. This can be done by transforming into the interaction picture with respect to the bichromatic microwaves [27, 32, 38, 39]:

$$\hat{H}(t) = \hat{U}(t)\hat{H}(t)\hat{U}(t) + i\hbar\hat{U}(t)\hat{U}(t)^\dagger,$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

where the frame transformation $\hat{U}(t)$, given by

$$\hat{U}(t) = \exp \left\{ -i\hat{S}_z \frac{\Omega_{\mu}}{\delta} \sin(\delta t) \right\}, \hspace{1cm} (3)$$

encapsulates the dynamics of the microwave pair (see Supplemental Material). In the time-dependent transformed basis of this “bichromatic” interaction picture, the system dynamics between times $t_i$ and $t_f$, given by the propagator $\hat{T}(t_i, t_f)$ of $\hat{H}(t)$, appear simplified. Crucially, however, if the microwave pair (as parameterized by $\Omega_{\mu}$) can be turned on and off in such a manner that $\hat{U}(t_i) = \hat{I}$ and $\hat{U}(t_f) = \hat{I}$, where $\hat{I}$ is the identity operator, then the state evolution given by $\hat{T}(t_i, t_f)$ applies to the lab frame basis as well as the transformed basis in the bichromatic interaction picture. This condition on $\hat{U}(t_i)$ and $\hat{U}(t_f)$ can be achieved by ramping the microwave pair on and off slowly with respect to $1/\delta$, or by choosing the gate duration $t_G$ (during which the microwave pair is on) such that $t_G\delta$ is an integer multiple of $2\pi$. Either method can be used, with realistic parameters, such that the fidelity of the final state in the lab frame basis and the interaction frame basis differ by less than $10^{-4}$. While the first method would be used in experiments, we use the second method in this paper (unless otherwise specified) because it is simpler for the numerical simulations. Making the above transformation on Eq. (1) gives [27]:

$$\hat{H}(t) = 2\hbar \Omega_g \cos(\omega_g t) \left\{ \hat{a}e^{-i\omega_r t} + \hat{a}^\dagger e^{i\omega_r t} \right\} \left\{ \hat{S}_z \left( \frac{4\Omega_{\mu}}{\delta} \right) + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{2n} \left( \frac{4\Omega_{\mu}}{\delta} \right) \cos(2n\delta t) \right\}, \hspace{1cm} (4)$$

By setting the conditions

$$4\delta = (\omega_r - \omega_g) - j\Delta,$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

$$8\delta = (\omega_r + \omega_g) - (j + 1)\Delta,$$

where $j$ is an integer, and $\Delta = 2\pi/t_G$ is on the order of $\Omega_g$, the terms $\propto J_4$ and $\propto J_8$ become slowly varying in time with respect to all other terms in the sum. They will thus make the dominant contribution to the system dynamics, while the other terms that appear in Eq. (4) are significantly off-resonant, with contributions scaling as $(\Omega_g/\delta)^2$, where we note that $\Omega_{\mu} \ll \delta$. In the laboratory frame, the conditions in Eq. (5) are equivalent to setting $\delta$ and $\omega_g$ to drive both the $\omega_r - \omega_g$ and $\omega_r + \omega_g$ sidebands simultaneously, as shown in Fig. (1)(c).

Keeping only these near-resonant terms gives:

$$\hat{H}(t) \approx \hbar \Omega_g \hat{S}_z \left\{ J_4 \left( \frac{4\Omega_{\mu}}{\delta} \right) \left( \hat{a}e^{-i\Delta t} + \hat{a}^\dagger e^{i\Delta t} \right) + J_8 \left( \frac{4\Omega_{\mu}}{\delta} \right) \left( \hat{a}e^{-i(j+1)\Delta t} + \hat{a}^\dagger e^{i(j+1)\Delta t} \right) \right\}, \hspace{1cm} (6)$$
which resembles the form of the motionaly robust polychromatic gates discussed in Refs. [20, 36, 37]. This will generate a gate with $K$ loops if we choose

$$\Delta = 4\Omega_g K^{1/2} \left\{ \frac{\left[J_4(4\Omega_g/\delta)\right]^2}{j} + \frac{\left[J_6(4\Omega_g/\delta)\right]^2}{j+1} \right\}^{1/2}. \quad (7)$$

Since $J_4(4\Omega_g/\delta)$ and $J_6(4\Omega_g/\delta)$ are independent functions, we may optimize the relative amplitudes of their effective tones by setting the value of $\Omega_g/\delta$. For example, when $j = 1$, we can engineer a gate that is robust to gate duration errors when $J_6(4\Omega_g/\delta)/J_4(4\Omega_g/\delta) = -1$ [37], or the motionaly robust gates of Refs. [20, 36] when $J_6(4\Omega_g/\delta)/J_4(4\Omega_g/\delta) = -2$ [36]. These gates are, unfortunately, still sensitive to qubit frequency shifts.

We can model the effects of time-dependent qubit frequency shifts by adding a term $\hat{H}_z(t) = (\hbar/\delta) \cos(\omega_z t) \hat{S}_z$ to the ideal Hamiltonian in Eq. (1). In the bichromatic interaction picture, keeping only near-resonant terms (assuming $\varepsilon, \omega_z \ll \delta$), $\hat{H}_{z,1}(t)$ can be written as:

$$\hat{H}_{z,1}(t) \simeq \frac{\hbar}{2} J_0 \left(\frac{4\Omega_g}{\delta}\right) \cos(\omega_z t) \hat{S}_z. \quad (8)$$

When the value of $4\Omega_g/\delta$ is set to one of the zeros of the $J_0$ Bessel function, the expression in Eq. (8) goes to zero and the qubit frequency shifts do not contribute to the dynamics. The off-resonant terms dropped from Eq. (8) all oscillate at integer multiples of $\delta$, such that in the typical case where $\varepsilon, \omega_z \ll \delta$, their effect averages to zero; we refer to this phenomenon as intrinsic dynamical decoupling (IDD) [27]. By tuning $\delta, \omega_g$, and $\omega_r$ so that Eqs. (5) are met for a particular value of $j$, and setting $4\Omega_g/\delta \simeq 8.65$, the third IDD point (i.e. the third zero of $J_0(4\Omega_g/\delta)$), we perform a gate such that $J_8(4\Omega_g/\delta)/J_4(4\Omega_g/\delta) \simeq -1.22$ (see Fig. 1(c)); we will refer to this as the IDD-$j$ gate. The phase space trajectory of an IDD-2 gate is shown in Fig. 1(b). Figure 1(b) also compares our new gate's trajectory to that of a single-tone $\sigma_z \sigma_z$ gate corresponding to the $J_2$ resonance performed at the first IDD point (here referred to as IDD-single) [27]. While the phase-space trajectories of IDD-single and IDD-1 gates are not completely centered on the origin, those of IDD-$j$ gates for $j \geq 2$ are, resulting in less time-averaged spin-motion entanglement, and consequently less impact of motional decoherence on gate fidelity. For all the calculations shown, we use experimentally relevant values of $\Omega_g/2\pi = 1$ kHz and $\omega_r/2\pi = 6.5$ MHz. Here $\omega_g/2\pi = 5$ MHz for the IDD-single gate; for the IDD-$j$ gates, $\omega_g$ is determined by solving Eqs. (5) and (7), giving $\omega_g \sim \omega_r/3$.

In addition to the intrinsic dynamical decoupling effect described above, the IDD-$j$ gates can also be made insensitive to static qubit frequency shifts. These gates produce an effective interaction of the form $\sigma_z \sigma_z$, such that qubit frequency shifts as shown in Eq. (8) commute with the gate operation. As a result, the effect of static shifts can be removed (when $\varepsilon \ll \delta$) by performing a $K = 2$ loop gate with a qubit $\pi$ rotation in between loops (a Walsh modulation of index 1) [33].

![FIG. 2. (a) Gate infidelity $1 - F$ versus symmetric qubit frequency offset $\varepsilon$ for IDD-single (black dashed) and IDD-2 (solid red) gates with a given gradient strength $\Omega_g$. Each simulated gate has two phase space loops with a global qubit $\pi$ rotation in between. (b) Gate infidelity $1 - F$ for the same gates versus the frequency $\omega_z$ of the qubit frequency shift, with $\varepsilon = \Omega_g/5$.](image-url)
In Figure 3(b), we plot Bell state infidelity for a variety of gates with Walsh modulation of index 3 or 4 (K = 8 and K = 16, respectively) to IDD-2 and IDD-3 gates with K = 1 or K = 6, plotted against a dimensionless motional offset $\nu/\Omega_g$ normalized by a dimensionless gate duration $t_G\Omega_g/2\pi$. All IDD gates fall on a similar curve, as do IDD-single gates for small values of $O(n\delta/t_G)$. Geometric phase shifts the secular frequency for integer $n$ appear in the bichromatic interaction picture as static error terms $\propto S_z$ (for even $n$) or $\propto S_y$ (for odd $n$) $[20, 37]$. Experimentally, qubit frequency fluctuations near $n\delta$ can arise from residual magnetic fields at $\omega_y$ from the currents generating the gradient. Choosing the $J_4$ and $J_6$ resonances to implement the gate makes $n$ even, and so the resulting errors are $\propto S_z$ and can be removed as described above (see Supplemental Material).

Gates with multiple blue and red sideband pairs, such as those presented in this work, have reduced sensitivity to motional frequency offsets. For example, an IDD-$j$ gate is a linear superposition of $a$ and $a+1$ loop IDD-single gate, each with amplitudes of opposite signs. A motional frequency offset $\nu$ shifts the secular frequency such that $\omega_r \rightarrow \omega_r + \nu$, resulting in a residual displacement in phase space at the end of the gate. With nonzero $\nu$, the superposed gates experience opposite displacements in phase space which coherently cancel each other. As shown in Fig. 3(a), this results in reduced sensitivity to $\nu$ $[20, 37]$. Fig. 3(b) shows that this coherent error cancellation can provide reduced sensitivity to $\nu$ by increasing either the number of loops $K$ or the order $j$ of the gate. The infidelity due to an offset $\nu$ will remain constant for an increased $\nu$ if $t_G$ is also increased proportionally; this remains true whether the increased $t_G$ is associated with more loops $K$ or larger values of $j$. In Figure 3(b), we plot Bell state infidelity for a variety of different gates versus the dimensionless motional frequency offset $\nu/\Omega_g$, normalized by the dimensionless gate duration $t_G\Omega_g/2\pi$. With this normalization, the different gates fall on approximately the same curve of sensitivity to motional frequency offsets. As the gate-time-normalized motional frequency offset becomes larger, the IDD-$j$ gates have higher fidelity than single tone gates following Walsh sequences, shown in Fig. 3(b) $[33]$. In Fig. 4, we show the increased robustness to heating and motional dephasing of the IDD-$j$ gates. We treat these decoherence mechanisms as Markovian, using a Lindblad formalism $[11]$. Note that for these calculations, we use Eq. (6) to calculate the infidelity; this gives the same motional decoherence effect as the full integration of Eq. (1) (see Supplemental Material). Geometric phase gates can be made less sensitive to motional heating by performing more phase space loops, with $1 - \mathcal{F}$ scaling $\propto 1/t_G$. Therefore, in order to make a relevant comparison to our polychromatic gates, Fig. 4(a) shows the infidelity due to a heating rate $\dot{\bar{\Gamma}} = \Gamma_g/\Omega_g/100\pi$, versus $2\pi/\Omega_g t_G$, for the IDD-single, IDD-1, and IDD-2 gates. Similarly, in Fig. 4(b) we compare the same set of gates for a motional dephasing rate of $\Gamma_d = \Omega_g/100\pi$. Both calculations in Fig. 4 show that, while better than the IDD-single, the IDD-1 gate is not as robust as the IDD-2; this can be understood because the IDD-1 trajectory is not centered on the origin of phase space. For $j > 2$, however, we find that there is not a significant improvement of $\mathcal{F}$ versus $t_G$ relative to $j = 2$. This is because the phase space trajectory of the IDD-2 gate is already centered on the origin, thus saturating improvement to the time-averaged spin-motion entanglement.

In this work, we have described a new type of trapped-
ion entangling gate that can be tuned to be simultaneously robust to motional decoherence and qubit frequency shifts, while requiring only two microwave magnetic fields and one near-motional-frequency magnetic field gradient to perform the gate operation. This design should enable higher gate fidelities for laser-free entangling gates without increasing gate duration or increasing the complexity of the required driving fields.
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Supplemental Material

LASER-FREE HAMILTONIAN

We consider a general Hamiltonian for laser-free gates between two trapped ions with identical qubit frequencies:

\[
\hat{H}_{\text{lab}}(t) = \frac{\hbar\omega_0}{2} \hat{S}_z + \hbar\omega_r \hat{a}\dagger\hat{a} + 2\hbar\Omega_g f(t) \hat{S}_j \left\{ \hat{a} + \hat{a}\dagger \right\} \\
+ 2\hbar\Omega_g \hat{S}_z \sum_n c_n \left\{ \cos(\omega_n t) \hat{a} + \hat{a}\dagger \right\} + \cos(\omega_0 - \delta_n t) \right\},
\]

(S1)

where \( i \in \{x, y\} \) and \( j \in \{x, y, z\} \). We define two-ion Pauli spin operators as \( \hat{S}_j = \hat{\sigma}_{y,1} + \hat{\sigma}_{y,2} \). We have taken \( z \) to be the qubit quantization axis and \( \omega_0 \) to be the qubit frequency. Here we have assumed an ion crystal whose internal states are coupled via a motional mode with frequency \( \omega_r \) and creation (annihilation) operators \( \hat{a}\dagger (\hat{a}) \). As they appear in this equation, \( \Omega_g \) and \( \Omega_r \) are Rabi frequencies. Here, \( c_n \) is the relative amplitude (order unity) of the \( n^{th} \) pair of equal amplitude fields, symmetrically detuned from the qubit frequency by \( \pm \delta_n \). The \( \Omega_g \) term describes the gradient induced coupling of the internal states to the motion. The time dependent function of the gradient, \( f(t) \), can be arbitrary; here, we take it to be constant or sinusoidally oscillating with a frequency of the same order of magnitude as \( \omega_r \).

We transform Eq. (S1) into the interaction picture with respect to the harmonic motion and qubit frequency terms, \( \hat{H}_I = \hbar\omega_0 \hat{S}_z/2 + \hbar\omega_r \hat{a}\dagger\hat{a} \). Furthermore, we make the rotating wave approximation to eliminate terms oscillating with frequencies near \( 2\omega_0 \). This gives the interaction Hamiltonian:

\[
\hat{H}(t) = 2\hbar\Omega_g \hat{S}_z \sum_n c_n \cos(\delta_n t) \\
+ 2\hbar\Omega_g f(t) \hat{S}_j \left\{ \hat{a} e^{-i\omega_r t} + \hat{a}\dagger e^{i\omega_r t} \right\},
\]

(S2)

which is Eq. (1) from the main text when \( i = x \) and \( j = z \). Note that when \( j \in \{x, y\} \), \( f(t) \) changes from Eq. (S1) to Eq. (S2) when frequencies near \( 2\omega_0 \) are dropped (see Ref. [27] for more details).

BICHROMATIC INTERACTION PICTURE

For completeness, we summarize an analysis of geometric phase gates for large microwave fields (\( \Omega_g \sim \omega_r \)) demonstrated originally in Ref. [27]. Assuming a Hamiltonian that takes the form of Eq. (1), representing a system with a bichromatic field pair and a (static or oscillatory) magnetic field gradient, we obtain:

\[
\hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}_r(t) + \hat{H}_g(t) \\
= 2\hbar\Omega_g \hat{S}_z \cos(\delta t) + 2\hbar\Omega_g f(t) \hat{S}_j \left\{ \hat{a} e^{-i\omega_r t} + \hat{a}\dagger e^{i\omega_r t} \right\},
\]

(S3)

where we have dropped the subscript of \( \delta \), since there is only one microwave pair. In order to exactly account for the dynamics caused by the larger of the two terms in this equation (the bichromatic field), we note that the time propagator for this field alone is exactly solvable:

\[
\hat{U}(t) = \exp \left( -2i\Omega_g \hat{S}_z \int_0^t dt' \cos(\delta t') \right) = \exp \left( -\frac{2i\Omega_g}{\delta} \sin(\delta t) \hat{S}_z \right).
\]

(S4)

We can then transform into the interaction picture with respect to the bichromatic microwave term:

\[
\hat{H}_I = \hat{U}_I^\dagger(t) \hat{H}_g(t) \hat{U}(t) \\
= 2\hbar\Omega_g \left\{ \hat{a} e^{-i\omega_r t} + \hat{a}\dagger e^{i\omega_r t} \right\} \right\} \hat{S}_j \hat{U}(t).
\]

(S5)

Applying the Jacobi-Anger expansion (see Ref. [27]),

\[
\hat{U}_I^\dagger(t) \hat{S}_j \hat{U}(t) = \left\{ \hat{S}_j \left[ J_0 \left( \frac{4\Omega_g}{\delta} \right) + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{2n} \left( \frac{4\Omega_g}{\delta} \right) \cos(2n\delta t) \right] \\
- 2\epsilon_{ijk} \hat{S}_k \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{2n-1} \left( \frac{4\Omega_g}{\delta} \right) \sin(2n-1\delta t) \right\},
\]

(S6)

giving

\[
\hat{H}_I(t) = 2\hbar\Omega_g f(t) \left\{ \hat{a} e^{-i\omega_r t} + \hat{a}\dagger e^{i\omega_r t} \right\} \left\{ \hat{S}_j \left[ J_0 \left( \frac{4\Omega_g}{\delta} \right) \\
+ 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{2n} \left( \frac{4\Omega_g}{\delta} \right) \cos(2n\delta t) \right] \\
- 2\epsilon_{ijk} \hat{S}_k \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{2n-1} \left( \frac{4\Omega_g}{\delta} \right) \sin(2n-1\delta t) \right\}.
\]

(S7)

This shows a series of resonances corresponding to \( \sigma_y \hat{\sigma}_z \) and \( \sigma_y \hat{\sigma}_x \) (Mølmer-Sørenson) gates when the sideband frequency is an even or odd integer multiple of \( \delta \), respectively.
POLychromatic Gates with multiple pairs of Microwaves

The gate presented in this work shows similar resilience to motional decoherence as the laser-free polychromatic gate successfully demonstrated by Webb et al. in Ref. [20], but it also has important advantages. In their experiment, Webb et al. implemented laser-free polychromatic gates by tuning two bichromatic microwave pairs close to the frequency of the sideband of a static gradient ($\omega_q = 0$). This scheme requires a total of 12 oscillating control fields plus a strong static magnetic field gradient [20], whereas the scheme presented here requires only three oscillating control fields, including a strong oscillating magnetic field gradient. Most importantly, however, the scheme of Ref. [20] produces unavoidable errors unless $\Omega_\mu/\omega_r \ll 1$, which limits the achievable gate speed, while our gate scheme has no such limitation on $\Omega_\mu$. We derive this result again using our interaction formalism.

The Hamiltonian for the multiple microwave pair system used in [20] is given by:

$$\hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}_{\mu,1}(t) + \hat{H}_{\mu,2} + \hat{H}_g(t)$$

$$= 2\hbar\Omega_\mu \hat{S}_x c_1 \cos(\delta_1 t) + 2\hbar\Omega_\mu \hat{S}_x c_2 \cos(\delta_2 t)$$

$$+ 2\hbar\Omega_y \hat{S}_z \left\{ \hat{a} e^{-i\omega_r t} + \hat{a}^\dagger e^{i\omega_r t} \right\}. \quad (S8)$$

We can account for the microwave dynamics exactly by going into the interaction picture with respect to both of these terms. This gives:

$$H_I(t) = \hat{U}^\dagger_1(t)\hat{U}_2(t)\hat{U}^\dagger_2(t)\hat{U}_1(t), \quad (S9)$$

where

$$U_j(t) = \exp \left\{ -\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^t dt' H_{\mu,j}(t') \right\}$$

$$= \exp \left\{ -\frac{4\Omega_\mu c_j}{\hbar} \sin(\delta_j t) \hat{S}_x \right\}. \quad (S10)$$

Focusing on the Pauli operators, and using Eq. (S9), twice, we obtain:

$$\hat{U}_1^\dagger(t)\hat{U}_2^\dagger(t)\hat{S}_x\hat{U}_2(t)\hat{U}_1(t) =$$

$$\hat{S}_z \left\{ J_0 \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_1}{\delta_1} \right) + 2 \sum_{n=1}^\infty J_{2n} \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_1}{\delta_1} \right) \cos(2n\delta_1 t) \right\}$$

$$\times \left[ J_0 \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_2}{\delta_2} \right) + 2 \sum_{n=1}^\infty J_{2n} \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_2}{\delta_2} \right) \cos(2n\delta_2 t) \right]$$

$$- 4 \sum_{n,n'=1}^\infty J_{2n-1} \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_1}{\delta_1} \right) J_{2n'-1} \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_2}{\delta_2} \right)$$

$$\times \sin[(2n-1)\delta_1 t] \sin[(2n'-1)\delta_2 t]$$

$$+ 2 \hat{S}_y \left\{ \sum_{n=1}^\infty J_{2n-1} \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_1}{\delta_1} \right) \sin(2n-1)\delta_1 t \right\}$$

$$\times \left[ J_0 \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_2}{\delta_2} \right) + 2 \sum_{n=1}^\infty J_{2n} \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_2}{\delta_2} \right) \cos(2n\delta_2 t) \right]$$

$$\times \left[ \sum_{n=1}^\infty J_{2n-1} \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_2}{\delta_2} \right) \sin((2n-1)\delta_2 t) \right]$$

$$\times \left[ J_0 \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_1}{\delta_1} \right) + 2 \sum_{n=1}^\infty J_{2n} \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu c_1}{\delta_1} \right) \cos(2n\delta_1 t) \right] \right\}.$$  \hspace{1cm} (S11)

This equation can be simplified for the case considered by Webb et al. [20], where $\delta_1 = \omega_{sr} - \Delta$, $\delta_2 = \omega_{sr} - 2\Delta$, and $\omega_{sr} = \omega_r$ or $\omega_{sr} = |\omega_r \pm \omega_j|$ for a static gradient or a near-motional-frequency gradient, respectively. Here $\Delta$ is of the same order as $\Omega_\mu$. Noting that $J_n(x) \to \left( \frac{x}{2} \right)^n / n!$ as $x \to 0$, and keeping only the terms that are first order in $\Omega_\mu/\omega_{sr}$, we obtain:

$$\hat{U}_1^\dagger(t)\hat{U}_2^\dagger(t)\hat{S}_x\hat{U}_2(t)\hat{U}_1(t)$$

$$\simeq \hat{S}_z + \frac{4\Omega_\mu}{\omega_{sr}} \hat{S}_y \left\{ c_1 \sin(|\omega_{sr} - \Delta| t) + c_2 \sin(|\omega_{sr} - 2\Delta| t) \right\}, \quad (S12)$$

which, if we assume a static gradient $\omega_{sr} = \omega_r$ and neglect the terms oscillating on the order of $\omega_r$, we get an interaction picture Hamiltonian:

$$\hat{H}_I(t) = \frac{4i\hbar\Omega_\mu \Omega_r}{\omega_r} \hat{S}_y \left\{ \hat{a}^\dagger (c_1 e^{i\Delta t} + c_2 e^{2i\Delta t}) \right.$$  

$$- \hat{a} (c_1 e^{-i\Delta t} + c_2 e^{-2i\Delta t}) \right\}, \quad (S13)$$

giving the form of a polychromatic gate [36]. This means that in the small microwave limit ($\Omega_\mu \ll \omega_r$) this is a valid technique for performing laser-free polychromatic gates.

If terms in Eq. (S11) that are higher-order in $\Omega_\mu/\omega_r$ contribute to the dynamics, the phase space trajectory becomes distorted. In particular, the appearance of
terms that oscillate at exactly \( \omega_r \), such as
\[
J_1 \left( \frac{4 \Omega_\mu c_2}{\omega_{sb}} \right) J_2 \left( \frac{4 \Omega_\mu c_1}{\omega_{sb}} \right) \sin(\omega_{sb} - 2\Delta t) \cos(2|\omega_{sb} - \Delta t|) \\
= J_1 \left( \frac{4 \Omega_\mu c_2}{\omega_{sb}} \right) J_2 \left( \frac{4 \Omega_\mu c_1}{\omega_{sb}} \right) \left\{ \sin(3\omega_{sb} - 4\Delta t) - \sin(\omega_{sb}t) \right\},
\]
(S14)

prevent the ions from returning to the origin and thus disentangling from their motion. Quantitatively, this occurs when \( J_1 \left( \frac{4 \Omega_\mu c_2}{\omega_{sb}} \right) J_2 \left( \frac{4 \Omega_\mu c_1}{\omega_{sb}} \right) \) is not negligible, suggesting that this implementation of laser-free polychromatic gates is limited to the small microwave regime. We show this effect in Fig. 5, where we simulate the trajectory of Eq. (S11) for a static gradient with \( \omega_{sb} = \omega_r \) and increasing values of \( \Omega_\mu \), with no added noise. We can see that for the \( \Omega_\mu /\omega_r \ll 1 \) regime, the phase space trajectory follows the two-tone trajectory described in Ref. [30] and \( \mathcal{F} \to 1 \). When \( \Omega_\mu /\omega_r \sim 1 \), however, the trajectory distorts and the gate fidelity decreases.

\[
\Omega_\mu /\omega_r = 0.01 \quad \Omega_\mu /\omega_r = 0.1 \quad \Omega_\mu /\omega_r = 0.2 \quad \Omega_\mu /\omega_r = 0.3
\]
\[
\mathcal{F} \approx 1 \quad \mathcal{F} \approx 0.96 \quad \mathcal{F} \approx 0.73 \quad \mathcal{F} \approx 0.57
\]

FIG. 5. Phase space trajectories and fidelities, \( \mathcal{F} \), calculated using Eq. (1), for increasing values of \( \Omega_\mu /\omega_r \), where \( \Omega_\mu \) is the microwave strength and \( \omega_r \) is the motional frequency. For an ideal system, when \( \Omega_\mu \sim \omega_r \), the phase space trajectory distorts and the value of \( \mathcal{F} \) decreases.

**DECOHERENCE DUE TO BATH COUPLING**

In this section, we show that for the system described in the paper, we can calculate the infidelities due to Markovian heating and motional dephasing by numerically calculating the (significantly less computationally intensive) master equation for \( \hat{H}_I \) (neglecting terms rotating near \( \omega_r \)) rather than the full Hamiltonian given by Eq. (1). This is because the unitary transformation given by Eq. (3), commutes with the Lindblad operators that represent heating and motional dephasing. The full master equation for the time evolution of the full Hamiltonian, Eq. (1), including heating and motional dephasing is:
\[
\dot{\rho}(t) = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}(t), \rho(t)] + \hat{n} \left\{ \hat{a}\rho(t)\hat{a}^\dagger + \hat{a}^\dagger\rho(t)\hat{a} \\
- \frac{1}{2}(\hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger + \hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger)\rho(t) - \frac{1}{2}\rho(t)(\hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger + \hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger) \right\} \\
+ \Gamma_d \left\{ \hat{a}\hat{a}\rho(t)\hat{a}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger\rho(t) - \frac{1}{2}\rho(t)(\hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger) \right\},
\]
(S15)

where \( \hat{n} \) is the heating rate of the system and \( \Gamma_d \) is the motional dephasing rate. Making the unitary transformation defined by Eq. (3), we can solve for the density matrix in the interaction picture:
\[
\dot{\rho}_I(t) = \hat{U}^\dagger(t)\rho(t)\hat{U}(t).
\]
(S16)

Since the above transformation commutes with both the heating and motional dephasing operators, the interaction picture master equation is simply:
\[
\dot{\rho}_I(t) = -\frac{i}{\hbar} [\hat{H}_I(t), \rho_I(t)] + \hat{n} \left\{ \hat{a}\rho_I(t)\hat{a}^\dagger + \hat{a}^\dagger\rho_I(t)\hat{a} \\
- \frac{1}{2}(\hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger + \hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger)\rho_I(t) - \frac{1}{2}\rho_I(t)(\hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger + \hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger) \right\} \\
+ \Gamma_d \left\{ \hat{a}\hat{a}\rho_I(t)\hat{a}^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}(\hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger\rho_I(t) - \frac{1}{2}\rho_I(t)(\hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger) \right\}.
\]
(S17)

The fast rotating terms in \( \hat{H}_I \) can be dropped with an effect scaling \( \propto (\Omega_g /\omega_r)^2 \). This is demonstrated by the full numerical Hamiltonian shown for the pure state systems in this work. Numerically integrating Eq. (11) allows us to calculate \( \rho_I(t_G) \), where \( t_G \) is the gate duration, while accurately including the effects of Markovian heating and motional dephasing. As with the pure state calculations, when \( \hat{U}(t_G) \to I, \rho_I(t_G) \to \rho(t_G) \), meaning that our reduced calculation gives the same answer as would performing the full numerical integration of Eq. (S15), as long as the pure state calculation is also valid.

**EFFECT OF HOMOGENOUS MAGNETIC FIELD OSCILLATING AT \( \omega_g \)**

Generating a gradient that oscillates at \( \omega_g \) near the motional frequency \( \omega_r \) typically leads to a residual magnetic field that also oscillates at \( \omega_g \). This can be mitigated through nulling the magnetic field along the axis of the ion crystal [22], but this would add significant experimental overhead.

We represent the Hamiltonian of this residual magnetic field as
\[
\hat{H}_z(t) = 2\hbar \Omega_z \cos(\omega_g t) \hat{S}_z
\]
(S18)

which adds to the full Hamiltonian, given by Eq. (1). To analyze this field’s effect on our gate we need to make the transformation given by Eq. (3). This gives:
\[
\hat{H}_{z,I}(t) = 2\hbar \Omega_z \cos(\omega_g t) \times
\left\{ \hat{S}_z \left[ J_0 \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu}{\delta} \right) + 2 \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{2n} \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu}{\delta} \right) \cos(2n\delta t) \right] \\
+ 2\hat{S}_y \sum_{n=1}^{\infty} J_{2n-1} \left( \frac{4\Omega_\mu}{\delta} \right) \sin(2n-1|\delta| t) \right\}.
\]
(S19)
Assuming $\Omega_z \ll \delta$, we can simplify this equation by dropping far-off-resonant terms. By solving Eq. (5), we find that:

$$\delta = \frac{\omega_g}{2} - \frac{\Delta}{4}. \quad (S20)$$

Keeping only the near-resonant terms gives:

$$\tilde{H}_{I,z}(t) \simeq 2\hbar \Omega_z J_2 \left( \frac{4\omega_g}{\delta} \right) \cos(\Delta t/2) \hat{S}_z. \quad (S21)$$

Since the residual term is $\propto \hat{S}_z$, it commutes with the gate and its effect at the end of a single-loop gate, $t_G = \frac{2\pi}{\Delta}$, can be described by a unitary operator given by:

$$\tilde{U}_z(t) = \exp \left( -\frac{i}{\hbar} \int_0^{t_G} dt' \tilde{H}_{I,z}(t') \right)$$
$$= \exp \left( -\frac{4i\Omega_z}{\Delta} J_2 \left( \frac{4\omega_g}{\delta} \right) \sin(\pi) \hat{S}_z \right)$$
$$= \tilde{I}. \quad (S22)$$

Thus, a residual homogenous magnetic field at $\omega_g$ (such that $\Omega_z \ll \delta$) does not impact the fidelity of the gate. For the gates described in this work, the $J_4$ and $J_8$ resonances were chosen specifically because the near-resonant ($\sim \omega_g$) contributions are $\propto \hat{S}_z$ (see Eq. (S19)). One could imagine a similar scheme using the $\omega_r \pm \omega_g$ sidebands, and the $J_2$ and $J_4$ resonances. This, however, results in an on-resonant term $\propto \hat{S}_x$ in $H_{I,z}$, as opposed to the term $\propto \hat{S}_z$ in the $J_4$, $J_8$ gate. Since this term does not commute with the gate, it would have to be nulled in order to not affect the gate, which would make the scheme significantly more difficult to perform.