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We introduce CircuitQ, an open-source toolbox for the analysis of superconducting circuits implemented in Python. It features the automated construction of a symbolic Hamiltonian of the input circuit, as well as a dynamic numerical representation of this Hamiltonian with a variable basis choice. Additional features include the estimation of the $T_1$ lifetimes of the circuit states under various noise mechanisms. We review previously established circuit quantization methods and formulate them in a way that facilitates the software implementation. The toolbox is then showcased by applying it to practically relevant qubit circuits and comparing it to specialized circuit solvers. Our circuit quantization is both applicable to circuit inputs from a large design space and the software is open-sourced. We thereby add an important toolbox for the design of new quantum circuits for quantum information processing applications.

I. INTRODUCTION

Superconducting circuits are emerging as one of the most versatile and promising platforms in the development of chip-based quantum processors [1,2]. The development of cutting-edge qubit designs is currently driven by the effort to realize quantum computers with long coherence times, and at the same time, high-fidelity control and readout, all in a scalable design [3]. Combining these requirements is a grand challenge for quantum hardware design. Thus, continuous effort is invested into the study of new and improved qubit circuits for quantum information processing applications [3,7].

A major part of the analysis of superconducting circuits is the construction of a quantum model to describe the system theoretically. Such a model is obtained by using general methods to construct the corresponding Hamiltonian [8–10]. In order to analyse the quantum properties of superconducting circuits, a numerical implementation of the algebraic description is needed.

For this purpose, open source software has been developed to analyze superconducting circuits. The library scQubits [11], for example, provides a user with the possibility to simulate qubits from a specific set of circuits. Gely et al. developed QuCAT [12], which offers a more general circuit input, as it permits a combination of Josephson junctions, inductances, capacitances and resonators. The quantization is performed in the basis of normal modes, which is suitable for weakly anharmonic systems. Another useful toolbox is provided by the SuperQuantPackage [13], which includes an algorithm to provide the user with a numerical representation of the Hamiltonian for a given input circuit. It performs a coordinate transformation prior to quantization. While such software packages have been proven to be useful for specific circuit design tasks, we expand on prior work by presenting a toolbox that works for a generic variety of circuits, provides the user with a symbolic and numerical Hamiltonian and includes a measure for several $T_1$ contributions.

In this work, we provide a structured review of the superconducting circuit quantization procedure implemented in the software toolbox CircuitQ. This provides an insight into the software implementation, but also serves as a more general review of the quantization process of superconducting circuits by constructing the Hamiltonian in a symbolic and numerical form. CircuitQ is written in Python and can be used to analyze superconducting circuits that are a user-defined combination of Josephson junctions, linear inductances, and capacitances. It takes the circuit and optionally the circuit component parameters as an input and returns the quantum physical properties of the circuit, particularly the corresponding Hamiltonian in symbolic and numerical form. Depending on the shape of the potential, CircuitQ can dynamically perform the numerical implementation in the charge basis, the flux basis, or in a mixture of both. Therefore, it provides a toolbox for circuits comprising different parameter regimes. The interface offers the possibility for a general circuit input. A variety of features and degrees of freedom can be adjusted by the user, such as the circuit composition, the component parameters, ground nodes, offset charges, and loop fluxes. In order to analyze the circuit in view of noisy environments, we implemented an estimation of the $T_1$ lifetime of an eigenstate by considering three different relaxation
FIG. 1. Overview of the functionality of CircuitQ for three exemplary circuits, as discussed in Sec. IV. The general procedure to analyse a superconducting circuit (top row) is to interpret it as a graph whose edges correspond to the circuit elements (middle row). The graph serves as the input of the toolbox, and a symbolic and a numerical Hamiltonian are constructed from it. The potential and eigenspectrum of the Hamiltonian are shown in the bottom row. The symbolic Hamiltonians and parameter values can be found in Sec. IV and the code to generate these instances is listed in Appendix A. (a) Transmon circuit. The last row depicts the absolute value squared of the lowest five eigenstates as a function of the flux variable $\Phi_1$. Each wave function is offset by its corresponding eigenvalues. The potential of the Hamiltonian is shown as a black line. (b) Fluxonium circuit. The eigenstates and potential are shown in the same fashion as in (a). (c) Persistent-current flux qubit circuit. Due to the additional node, the problem becomes two-dimensional. We show an overlap of two contour plots, where one depicts the absolute value squared of the lowest eigenstate and the other visualizes the potential.

mechanisms. Finally, we showcase the software by comparing its accuracy to specialized circuit solvers for several prominent qubit circuits.

We provide community access to CircuitQ by making the code and documentation publicly available on GitHub [14].

The article is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we present the procedure to generate the symbolic Hamiltonian from a given input circuit. Subsequently, the numerical implementation of the Hamiltonian and features of the toolbox are presented in Sec. III. Lastly, applications of the toolbox to practically relevant circuit examples are provided in Sec. IV.

II. FROM THE CIRCUIT TO THE SYMBOLIC HAMILTONIAN

The first step in the analysis of the quantum properties of a superconducting circuit is the construction of the circuit Hamiltonian. Our software implementation automates the process to derive the symbolic Hamiltonian. A multitude of techniques for circuit quantization has been developed, including several based on the method of nodes [8-10, 15], black box quantization [16, 17] and others [18-19]. Here we follow the method of nodes-based approach, which is generally applicable to any superconducting circuit that includes capacitances, inductances, and Josephson junctions, given the realistic condition that spurious capacitances exist between all circuit nodes.

The starting point of circuit quantization is a circuit
They are denoted as the node charge \( a \) specific path from the node to ground, respectively.

Capacitances connected to the node and the flux along edges. The nodes are then home to the conjugate charge

can be seen as a graph with the circuit elements on its graph in Fig. 2. The choice of spanning tree is equivalent to setting a gauge and therefore does not change the Hamiltonian, which is the sum of linear inductive and

In order to determine the contribution of an inductive circuit element to the Hamiltonian, one needs to evaluate the flux difference across the respective edge. An inductive loop made up of inductances and junctions can encircle a static flux, and the boundary condition has to be fulfilled that all the fluxes around a loop sum to an integer multiple of the flux quantum \( \Phi_0 \). We highlight one such loop in orange in Fig. 2. The static flux enters the circuit Hamiltonian by being added to the flux difference across an inductive element between two of the nodes that are part of the loop.

In CircuitQ, the automated evaluation of flux differences is started by defining the set of purely inductive edges \( \mathcal{L} \) and splitting it into the subset \( \mathcal{S} \) that is in parallel to spanning tree edges and into the remaining edges \( \mathcal{B} = \mathcal{L} - \mathcal{S} \). As we allow for multiple parallel inductive elements between two nodes, a restriction needs to be introduced that only the first parallel inductive edge is added to \( \mathcal{S} \). The routine then iteratively steps through the edges in \( \mathcal{B} \). If the current edge does not close an inductive loop, we add it to a subset \( \mathcal{B}_c \subseteq \mathcal{B} \) and do not assign an external flux to it. In case it does close an inductive loop, we add it to \( \mathcal{B}_c \subseteq \mathcal{B} \) and do assign an external flux to it. Using the fluxoid quantization condition, the directionality of the spanning tree edges can be chosen such that we obtain the following relation for the edge flux \( \Phi_{e_{ij}} \) of the \( n \)-th inductive edge \( e_{ij} \) between nodes \( i \) and \( j \):

\[
\Phi_{e_{ij}} = \begin{cases} 
\Phi_j - \Phi_i & \text{for } e_{ij} \in \mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{B}_o \\
\Phi_j - \Phi_i + \tilde{\Phi}_{ij} & \text{for } e_{ij} \in \mathcal{B}_c 
\end{cases} ,
\tag{1}
\]

For the circuit in Fig. 2, this procedure identifies the loop flux \( \tilde{\Phi}_{120} \) and applies it to the flux difference between nodes 1 and 2.

We note that the loop fluxes are degrees of freedom that can be used to tune the circuit properties. At the same time, they open a path for undesired fluctuations from the environment to couple to the circuit. CircuitQ determines a set of loop fluxes automatically when initializing an instance for a given circuit. These fluxes are treated as conventional circuit parameters whose numerical values can be specified by the user.

Given the relationship between branch and node fluxes, we can explicitly state the inductive potential of the Hamiltonian. In this work, we follow common practice and route the spanning tree through capacitive circuit elements only. Since each node pair is connected by spurious capacitances, a spanning tree can always be defined in such a way. For the implementation, CircuitQ makes use of the spanning tree functionality of the NetworkX package.

In this work, we follow common practice and route the spanning tree through capacitive circuit elements only. Since each node pair is connected by spurious capacitances, a spanning tree can always be defined in such a way. For the implementation, CircuitQ makes use of the spanning tree functionality of the NetworkX package.
Josephson potentials:

\[
U_{\text{ind}}(\Phi) = \sum_{i \leq j \in S_U \cup B_u} \sum_{n=0}^{N_i^j} \frac{\left(\epsilon_{eijn}(\Phi)\right)^2}{2L_{ijn}} + \sum_{i \leq j \in S_D \cup B_d} \sum_{n=0}^{N_i^j} E_{eijn} \cos \left(\frac{\Phi_{eijn}(\Phi)}{\Phi_0}\right),
\]

where \(N_{ij}^j\) is the number of linear inductors between node \(i\) and \(j\) and \(N_{ij}^j\) is the number of Josephson junctions. Our formulation of the potential expands upon prior work on general circuit quantization formulations in that it allows for multiple parallel inductive elements per node pair. While this is relevant for Josephson junctions, for example in modelling the split-junction transmon, multiple parallel linear inductors are of limited practical relevance for quantum information processing applications because they lead to sensitivity of the circuit energy to static flux offsets.

The kinetic energy \(T_{\text{cap}}\) of the Hamiltonian is given by the capacitive energy of the circuit. In general, \(T_{\text{cap}}\) takes the form

\[
T_{\text{cap}}(\tilde{Q}) = \frac{1}{2} \tilde{Q}^{-1} C^{-1} \tilde{Q}.
\]

Here, \(C\) is the node capacitance matrix, which contains the sum of all capacitances connected to a node as the respective diagonal entry and the negative capacitance between two nodes on the off-diagonals. The form of the kinetic energy arises in the Legendre transformation of the circuit Lagrangian. Charge offsets on a node are taken into account by directly adding the offset to the respective charge operator.

The circuit Hamiltonian in terms of the conjugate coordinates \(\Phi\) and \(\tilde{Q}\) is given by the sum of the kinetic and potential terms:

\[
H(\Phi, \tilde{Q}) = T_{\text{cap}}(\tilde{Q}) + U_{\text{ind}}(\Phi).
\]

In CircuitQ, it is returned as a symbolic SymPy object. The resulting Hamiltonian which is constructed by CircuitQ for the exemplary circuit in Fig. 2 can be found in Appendix D. Generating the Hamiltonian in a symbolic form is the first step towards the automated description of a circuit. The second step is to express the Hamiltonian numerically.

### III. FROM THE SYMBOLIC HAMILTONIAN TO IT’S NUMERICAL IMPLEMENTATION

The numerical implementation of the symbolic Hamiltonian is crucial for the analysis of the quantum properties of the input circuit. In this section, we first present important steps of the automated numerical implementation that is part of the toolbox. Subsequently, we describe numerical analysis tools that are implemented in CircuitQ.

![Figure 3. Summary of the estimated T1 times for the three circuits shown in Fig. 1. T1_tot denotes the total T1 times, which is made up from the contributions of quasiparticle tunneling T1_quasipart, charge noise T1_charge and flux noise T1_flux. The chosen parameter values are equal those in Fig. 1. There is no flux noise contribution to the transmon as we consider the fixed-frequency transmon circuit here. The flux noise contributions to the T1 time for the other two qubits is beyond the chosen limit of the plot.](image-url)
1. Flux Basis

To implement a node variable in the flux basis, we confine the numerical flux values to a finite grid \([-\Phi_{\text{max}}, -\Phi_{\text{max}} + \delta, \ldots, \Phi_{\text{max}}]\) with grid spacing \(\delta\). The grid length can be decided by the user or is set to a default value otherwise. Consequently, we can assign a diagonal matrix to the flux variable:

\[
\Phi \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix}
-\Phi_{\text{max}} & \\
-\Phi_{\text{max}} + \delta & \\
\vdots & \\
\Phi_{\text{max}} & 
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (6)

As the conjugate momentum of the flux, the charge can be associated with the derivative with respect to \(\Phi\): \(q = -i\hbar \partial_\Phi\). To implement the derivative as a Hermitian operator, we use the finite-difference method:

\[
q \rightarrow -\frac{i\hbar}{2\delta} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots \\ -1 & 0 
\end{pmatrix},
\] (7)

\[
q^2 \rightarrow -\frac{\hbar^2}{\delta^2} \begin{pmatrix} -2 & 1 \\ 1 & -2 & 1 \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots \\ 1 & -2 
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (8)

To generate Hermitian matrices, we have chosen a different discretization for the first and second derivative. CircuitQ is capable of working with charge and flux offset, where the flux offsets \(\Phi\) are associated with loop fluxes and charge offsets \(q\) with node charges. They are implemented by multiplying them with the identity matrix:

\[
\Phi \rightarrow \Phi \cdot \mathbb{I}, \quad q \rightarrow q \cdot \mathbb{I}.
\] (9)

A Hilbert space is assigned to every node which is not set to ground. To get a numerical description of the full Hamiltonian, these subspaces are combined into a composite space using the tensor product by substituting

\[
\Phi_i \rightarrow \mathbb{I} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \Phi_i \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \cdots
\] (10)

\[
q_i \rightarrow \mathbb{I} \otimes \cdots \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes q_i \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \cdots.
\] (11)

Here, the variable corresponding to node \(i\) is implemented by placing the respective matrix at the \(i\)-th position of the composite space.

2. Charge Basis

Similar to the flux basis, we restrict the charge variables to a finite grid when using the charge basis. The grid is limited by a cutoff number of Cooper pairs \(n_{\text{cutoff}}\) which leads to the charge grid \(2e[-n_{\text{cutoff}}, \ldots, n_{\text{cutoff}}]=[-q_{\text{cutoff}}, \ldots, q_{\text{cutoff}}]\). In this setting, we can express the charge variable as a diagonal matrix:

\[
q \rightarrow 2e \begin{pmatrix} -n_{\text{cutoff}} & 0 & \cdots \\ 0 & -n_{\text{cutoff}} + 1 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ -n_{\text{cutoff}} & \cdots & \cdots & -1 & 0 
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (12)

Flux variables that correspond to periodic nodes appear exclusively in the arguments of the cosine terms in the Hamiltonian. We can then use the decomposition of the cosine into complex exponentials to represent these terms numerically. These exponential of a flux operator describes the tunneling process of a Cooper pair through a Josephson junction, and it can be described as a jump operator in the charge basis:

\[
e^{i\Phi} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \cdots \\ 1 & 0 & \cdots \\ \vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots \\ 1 & \cdots & \cdots & 0 
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (13)

The composite space has to be considered if there are multiple flux variables in the argument of the cosine. In this case, we again make use of the tensor product:

\[
e^{i(\Phi_i - \Phi_j)} \rightarrow \mathbb{I} \otimes \cdots \otimes e^{i\Phi_i} \otimes \cdots \otimes e^{i\Phi_j} \otimes \mathbb{I} \otimes \cdots
\] (14)

As before, the position \(i\) and \(j\) correspond to the flux variables of node \(i\) and \(j\). The full cosine function can thus be implemented as

\[
\cos(\Phi_i - \Phi_j) \rightarrow \frac{1}{2} \left( e^{i(\Phi_i - \Phi_j)} + e^{i(\Phi_i - \Phi_j)^\dagger} \right).
\] (15)

To account for a flux offset \(\tilde{\Phi}\), the cosine function in Eq. 15 can be multiplied by the complex scalar \(e^{-\tilde{\Phi}}\).

The numerical Hamiltonian is generated by using the lambdify function of SymPy with the parameters and matrices that have been described in this section as an input. The final implementation is returned as a sparse matrix in scipy format [23]. It can be helpful to visualize the eigenstates as a function of the flux variable although an implementation in the charge basis has been used. For this purpose, CircuitQ provides a method which transforms the eigenvectors from the charge to the flux basis.

B. Features for circuit analysis

Since CircuitQ constructs a numerical implementation of the circuit Hamiltonian, it can be used as a tool for the analysis of the quantum properties of superconducting circuits. This includes the energy spectrum of the
Hamiltonian and relaxation times of the energy eigenstates.

To calculate the energy spectrum of the numerical Hamiltonian, the toolbox provides a method that returns the lowest eigenstates and eigenenergies of the numerical Hamiltonian matrix. We use the SciPy library for the (partial) diagonalization, which in turn makes use of efficient ARPACK routines [30]. With this functionality, the toolbox can be used to investigate how a change of parameter values – for example an external flux – or a change in the circuit composition effects the energy spectrum.

For the description of the superconducting circuit as a qubit, we associate the lowest two energy levels that have a nonvanishing energy difference with the qubit states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ by default. However, it is possible to declare a different state as the excited qubit state manually. The corresponding energy levels should not be degenerate. To operate a circuit as a qubit, a high degree of anharmonicity of its spectrum is desired. CircuitQ provides a method which gives an estimate of the harmonicity of the spectrum in a quantified form.

In order to determine the performance of the circuit as a qubit, it is crucial to study its sensitivity to various noise sources. The qubit can decay to its ground state as a result of its interactions with the environment. The sensitivity to this relaxation process is quantified by the $T_1$ time. Table I provides an overview of the noise contributions that can be estimated by using CircuitQ. We included relaxation due to quasiparticle tunneling as well as charge and flux noise. Equation 16 may alternatively be given by the matrix element of the sine operator $\sin(\phi_j/2)$. The action of this operator on the excited state results in the excited state shifted by one elementary charge. We included this relation directly in the respective $T_1$ time relation by introducing the offset charge.

The focus of this toolbox is on pure qubit design without considering qubit control such as state preparation. Therefore, we do not consider noise due to the Purcell effect for now. We also do not include pure dephasing mechanisms explicitly, which stem from fluctuations in offset charge or offset flux and can be computed from the respective dispersion. Fig. 5 gives an overview of the $T_1$ contributions that are estimated by the toolbox for the exemplary circuits which are shown in Fig. 4.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Contribution</th>
<th>Formula</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Quasiparticle tunneling [24]</td>
<td>$T_1 = \left( \sum_j</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Charge noise [25]</td>
<td>$T_1 = \left( \sum_i \frac{S_Q(\omega_q)}{\hbar^2}</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Flux noise [25]</td>
<td>$T_1 = \left( \sum_i \frac{S_{Q}(\omega_q)}{\hbar^2}</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I. Overview of the noise contributions to $T_1$ which are implemented in CircuitQ. The second column lists the formulas used as the basis of the noise estimation. Here, $|g\rangle$ and $|e\rangle$ label the qubit ground and excited state. In equation 16, this notation is extended by the offset charge $\tilde{q}_j$ at node $j$ (see the main text for an explanation). The qubit’s angular frequency is labeled by $\omega_q$. Other symbols are described in the third column.

IV. DEMONSTRATION AND BENCHMARK

To demonstrate the capabilities of CircuitQ, we use three well known circuits from the literature, i.e., the fixed-frequency transmon [31], the fluxonium [32] and the persistent-current flux qubit [33]. These examples are ini-
tialized with the corresponding input graph, from which CircuitQ computes the symbolic and numerical Hamiltonian. The latter can be diagonalized to analyze the spectrum and eigenstates of the system. Fig. 4 gives an overview of this procedure. In Appendix A, the corresponding code samples are provided to initialize these instances.

The symbolic Hamiltonian that is generated for the transmon by the toolbox is

\[ H = -E_{J010} \cos \left( \frac{\Phi_1}{\Phi_0} \right) + \frac{(q_1 + \tilde{q}_1)^2}{2C_{01}}. \]  

(19)

Here, \( \Phi_1 \) and \( q_1 \) are the flux and charge variables of node 1, and \( \tilde{q}_1 \) is a charge offset that can be introduced upon initialization (see Appendix A). We associate \( E_{J010} \) with the Josephson energy of the 0-th junction between node 0 and 1, which is shunted by the capacitance \( C_{01} \). The flux quantum \( \Phi_0 = \frac{\hbar}{e} \) will be displayed as \( \Phi_0 \) in the toolbox, to distinguish it from the node flux of a potential node 0. Since the principles of this notation are also applicable for the following examples, we will not define the symbols in the following equations separately. The numerical values for the corresponding spectrum plot in Fig. 4, which shows the lowest eigenstates of the weakly anharmonic cosine-potential, are chosen to be \( C_{01} = 0.1 \) pF and \( E_{J010} \approx 40 \) µeV. For the fluxonium qubit, the toolbox determines the symbolic Hamiltonian

\[ H = -E_{J010} \cos \left( \frac{\Phi_1}{\Phi_0} \right) + \frac{(\Phi_1 + \tilde{\Phi}_{010})^2}{2L_{010}} + \frac{q_1^2}{2C_{01}}. \]  

(20)

where \( \tilde{\Phi}_{010} \) labels the offset flux of the inductive loop. An excerpt of the spectrum of this Hamiltonian is shown in Fig. 4 with \( C_{01} = 10 \) fF, \( L_{010} = 0.5 \) µH, \( E_{J010} \approx 20 \) µeV and \( \Phi_{010} = \pi \Phi_0 \). It shows the typical low-lying 0 and 1 states that are localized in the wells, with higher plasma states several GHz above.

Finally, the persistent-current flux qubit Hamiltonian constructed by the toolbox can be written as

\[ H = -E_{J010} \cos \left( \frac{\Phi_1}{\Phi_0} \right) - E_{J020} \cos \left( \frac{\Phi_2}{\Phi_0} \right) \]

\[ - E_{J120} \cos \left( \frac{\Phi_2 - \Phi_1 + \tilde{\Phi}_{120}}{\Phi_0} \right) \]

\[ + \frac{q_1^2 (C_{02} + C_{12}) + 2q_1q_2C_{12} + q_2^2 (C_{01} + C_{12})}{2 (C_{01}C_{02} + C_{01}C_{12} + C_{02}C_{12})}. \]  

(21)

We depict the ground state of this Hamiltonian in Fig. 4 for \( \alpha = 0.7 \), \( C_{01} = C_{02} = C_{12} = 50 \) fF, \( E_{J010} = E_{J020} = E_{J120} \approx 40 \) µeV and \( \Phi_{020} = \pi \Phi_0 \). The ground state is localized in the double well potential, which is repeated periodically throughout the chosen flux grid. As for the transmon circuit, due to the periodicity of the potential, the Hamiltonian is implemented in the charge basis. For Fig. 4, we use the transformation method of the toolbox to visualize the eigenstates still in the flux basis.

In order to test the software and to check the accuracy of our numerical implementation, we perform benchmark tests for a variety of circuits. In addition to the three exemplary circuits, which have been previously discussed in this section, we complete the benchmark by adding the 0-π-Qubit [34], the 4-body-coupler which is referred to as Circuit C in reference [35] and a circuit containing a transmon capacitively coupled to a resonator, to the
list of test circuits. The latter circuit is called QuCAT circuit here, as a similar version is discussed in the corresponding reference [12]. The code to construct those instances can be found in Appendix [9]. We use existing software implementations to calculate the spectrum of those test circuits as a benchmark and compare the results of CircuitQ to it. As a reference we used the toolbox scQubits [11] for the transmon, fluxonium, 0-π-qubit, and persistent-current flux qubit circuit. The QuCAT circuit has been compared to it’s implementation in the QuCAT toolbox [12]. The 4-body-coupler has been tested against a direct and individualised software implementation. As the test outcome depends on the size of the numerical matrices which represent the charge and flux variables, we vary the dimension of those matrices. The result is shown in Fig. 4. CircuitQ automatically implements the transmon and flux qubit in the charge basis, and the fluxonium, 0-π-qubit and 4-body-coupler in the flux basis. The QuCAT circuit is implemented in a mixture of both bases. For the transmon, fluxonium and flux qubit as well as for the QuCAT circuit, we find a good agreement between CircuitQ and the benchmark implementation. However, we observe larger deviations for the 4-body-coupler and the 0-π-qubit, which are more complex circuits, even for large numerical matrices. For some circuits, a quantization of the node variables is not the most natural choice, as characteristic modes of the system might be a combination of several node variables. To get a more natural quantization, a coordinate transformation of the node variables can be performed prior to quantization. Therefore, the deviation for the 4-body-coupler and the 0-π-qubit can be attributed to the lack of an appropriate coordinate transformation.

V. CONCLUSION

We presented the core functionalities of CircuitQ. With the ability to derive a symbolic and numerical Hamiltonian from a superconducting circuit in an automated way, CircuitQ can serve as a toolbox for the community to analyze superconducting circuits. The input circuit can be a general superconducting circuit that combines Josephson junctions, linear inductances, and capacitances.

While the toolbox is currently limited to the computation of few-node circuits, future work will address the optimization of speed and scalability. A key feature of CircuitQ is its dynamic implementation in the charge and flux basis. At the moment, the variables that are quantized are always the node variables of the circuit graph. For some circuits, it is crucial to perform a variable transformation prior to quantization. Adding a suitable transformation will be an important development step towards the goal of increasing the calculation speed. Another improvement can be made by implementing hierarchical diagonalization such as discussed in reference [10]. In addition, the toolbox is written in a modular fashion that allows for extensions towards time-dependent simulations.

Thanks to the general functionality, the possibility to include charge and flux offsets as well as the the incorporation of noise estimates, CircuitQ can serve as a versatile tool for the design of superconducting qubits. Adding more noise channels, especially estimates for the $T_2$ time, would be an important future addition to the software.
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Appendix A: Code samples for illustrative circuits in figure 1

In the following subsections, we present the code that generates the three instances which are displayed in Fig. 1 and which are discussed in Sec IV.

1. Transmon

```
import circuitq as cq
import networkx as nx

graph = nx.MultiGraph()
graph.add_edge(0,1, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(0,1, element = 'J')
circuit = cq.CircuitQ(graph, offset_nodes=[1])

# Numerical implementation and diagonalisation
h_num = circuit.get_numerical_hamiltonian(400, grid_length=np.pi*circuit.phi_0)
eigv, eigs = circuit.get_eigensystem()

# Conversion for the plot
circuit.transform_charge_to_flux()
eigs = circuit.estates_in_phi_basis
```

2. Fluxonium

```
import circuitq as cq
import networkx as nx

graph = nx.MultiGraph()
graph.add_edge(0,1, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(0,1, element = 'J')
graph.add_edge(0,1, element = 'L')
circuit = cq.CircuitQ(graph)

EJ = circuit.c_v['E']*0.5
L = circuit.c_v['L']*5
C = circuit.c_v['C']*0.1
phi_ext = np.pi*circuit.phi_0
h_num = circuit.get_numerical_hamiltonian(400, parameter_values=[C, EJ, L, phi_ext])
eigv, eigs = circuit.get_eigensystem()

# Conversion for the plot
circuit.transform_charge_to_flux()
eigs = circuit.estates_in_phi_basis
```

3. Persistent-current flux qubit

```
import circuitq as cq
import networkx as nx

graph = nx.MultiGraph()
graph.add_edge(0,1, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(0,1, element = 'J')
graph.add_edge(1,2, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(1,2, element = 'J')
graph.add_edge(0,2, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(0,2, element = 'J')
circuit = cq.CircuitQ(graph)

dim = 51
EJ = 1*circuit.c_v['E']
alpha = 0.7
C = circuit.c_v['C']*0.5
phi_ext = np.pi*circuit.phi_0
h_num = circuit.get_numerical_hamiltonian(dim, parameter_values=[C, EJ, alpha*EJ, phi_ext])
eigv, eigs = circuit.get_eigensystem()

# Conversion for the plot
circuit.transform_charge_to_flux()
eigs = circuit.estates_in_phi_basis
```

Appendix B: Code sample for exemplary circuit in Fig. 2

The following code demonstrates the initialization of the circuit in Fig. 2.

```
import circuitq as cq
import networkx as nx

graph = nx.MultiGraph()
graph.add_edge(0,1, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(0,2, element = 'J')
graph.add_edge(0,2, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(1,2, element = 'L')
graph.add_edge(1,2, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(1,3, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(1,3, element = 'L')
graph.add_edge(2,3, element = 'L')
graph.add_edge(2,3, element = 'C')
circuit = cq.CircuitQ(graph)
```

Appendix C: Code sample for additional benchmark circuits

In the following, we present the generation of the numerical Hamiltonian for the additional benchmark circuits in figure 4 which have not been given in Appendix A yet, for an arbitrary subsystem matrix dimension \( d \).

1. 0-π-Qubit

```
import circuitq as cq
import networkx as nx

graph = nx.MultiGraph()
```

```circuit
graph.add_edge(1,2, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(1,2, element = 'J')
graph.add_edge(1,2, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(3,4, element = 'J')
graph.add_edge(3,4, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(4,1, element = 'L')
graph.add_edge(1,3, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(2,4, element = 'C')
```
2. 4-Body-Coupler

```python
import circuitq as cq
import networkx as nx
import numpy as np

graph = nx.MultiGraph()
graph.add_edge(0,2, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(0,2, element = 'J')
graph.add_edge(2,3, element = 'L')
graph.add_edge(2,3, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(0,3, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(0,3, element = 'J')
graph.add_edge(2,1, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(2,1, element = 'J')
graph.add_edge(1,3, element = 'L')
graph.add_edge(1,3, element = 'C')

L13 = 289.395 # in pH
L23 = 120.416 # in pH
lj12 = 3.75498 # in um
lj22 = 0.395517 # in um
lj33 = 0.373288 # in um
Jc = 5e-6 # critical current density in A/um^2
wJ = 0.2 # junction width in um
Sc = 60e-15 # specific capacitance in F/um^2
Phi0 = 2.06783385 * 10 ** ( -15) # flux quantum

C = cq.CircuitQ(graph, ground_nodes=[0])
C.get_numerical_hamiltonian(d,
    parameter_values=[4.455 * 1e-15 + Sc * wJ * lj22,
    70.556 * 1e-15 + Sc * wJ * lj33,
    Sc * wJ * lj12,
    16.832 * 1e-15,
    85.677 * 1e-15,
    Ej22, Ej33, Ej12, L23, L13,
    0.5 * C.phi_0,
    0.02 * C.phi_0]
)
```

3. QuCAT circuit

```python
import circuitq as cq
import networkx as nx
import numpy as np

graph = nx.MultiGraph()
graph.add_edge(0,1, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(0,1, element = 'J')
graph.add_edge(0,2, element = 'C')
graph.add_edge(0,2, element = 'L')
graph.add_edge(1,2, element = 'C')

circuit = cq.CircuitQ(graph, ground_nodes=[0])
circuit.get_numerical_hamiltonian(d,
    grid_length=np.pi*C.circuit.phi_0,
    parameter_values=[100e-15,100e-15,
        (C.circuit.phi_0**2)/8e-9,
        1e-15,((C.circuit.phi_0**2)/8e-9
)
)
```

Appendix D: Symbolic Hamiltonian for circuit in Fig. 2

CircuitQ provides the symbolic Hamiltonian given in Eq. D1 for the exemplary circuit in Fig. 2. For a better readability, the flux quantum \( \Phi_0 \) is given as a symbol, however it's numerical value would be displayed in the software implementation. The parasitic capacitances within the first kinetic part of the Hamiltonian are labelled by a \( p \) in the index.
\[ H = \left( C_{01}C_{02}C_{13} + C_{01}C_{02}C_{p23} + C_{01}C_{13}C_{p12} + C_{01}C_{13}C_{p23} ight. \\
+ C_{01}C_{p12}C_{p23} + C_{02}C_{13}C_{p12} + C_{02}C_{13}C_{p23} + C_{02}C_{p12}C_{p23})^{-1} \cdot \left( q_1 \left( C_{02}C_{13} + C_{02}C_{p23} + C_{13}C_{p12} + C_{13}C_{p23} + C_{p12}C_{p23} \right. \\
+ q_2 \left( C_{13}C_{p12} + C_{13}C_{p23} + C_{p12}C_{p23} \right) \\
+ q_3 \left( C_{02}C_{13} + C_{13}C_{p12} + C_{13}C_{p23} + C_{p12}C_{p23} \right) \right) \\
+ q_2 \left( q_1 \left( C_{13}C_{p12} + C_{13}C_{p23} + C_{p12}C_{p23} \right) \\
+ q_2 \left( C_{01}C_{13} + C_{01}C_{p23} + C_{13}C_{p12} + C_{13}C_{p23} + C_{p12}C_{p23} \right) \\
+ q_3 \left( C_{01}C_{p23} + C_{13}C_{p12} + C_{13}C_{p23} + C_{p12}C_{p23} \right) \right) \\
+ q_3 \left( q_1 \left( C_{02}C_{13} + C_{13}C_{p12} + C_{13}C_{p23} + C_{p12}C_{p23} \right) \\
+ q_2 \left( C_{01}C_{p23} + C_{13}C_{p12} + C_{13}C_{p23} + C_{p12}C_{p23} \right) \\
+ q_3 \left( C_{01}C_{p23} + C_{13}C_{p12} + C_{13}C_{p23} + C_{p12}C_{p23} \right) \right) \right) \\
- E_{J020} \cos \left( \frac{\Phi_2}{\Phi_0} \right) - E_{J130} \cos \left( \frac{\Phi_1 - \Phi_3}{\Phi_0} \right) \\
+ \left( \frac{\Phi_3 - \Phi_2 + \tilde{\Phi}_{230}}{2L_{230}} \right)^2 + \left( \frac{\Phi_2 - \Phi_1}{2L_{120}} \right)^2 \] (D1)