Quantum Optimal Control of Nuclear Spin Qudcimals in $^{87}\text{Sr}$
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We study the ability to implement unitary maps on states of the $I = 9/2$ nuclear spin in $^{87}\text{Sr}$, a $d = 10$ dimensional (qudecimal) Hilbert space, using quantum optimal control. Through a combination of nuclear spin-resonance and a tensor AC-Stark shift, by solely modulating the phase of a radio-frequency magnetic field, the system is quantum controllable. Alkaline earth atoms, such as $^{87}\text{Sr}$, have a very favorable figure-of-merit for such control due to the long lifetimes of the intercombination lines and the large hyperfine splitting in the excited states. We numerically study the quantum speed-limit, optimal parameters, and the fidelity of arbitrary state preparation and full SU(10) maps including the presence of decoherence due to optical pumping induced by the light-shifting laser. We also study the use of robust control to mitigate some dephasing due to inhomogeneities in the light shift. We find that with an rf-Rabi frequency of $\Omega_{rf}/2\pi = 2$ kHz and 1% inhomogeneity in the the light shift we can prepare an arbitrary Haar-random state in a time $T = 8\pi/\Omega_{rf} = 2$ ms with average fidelity $\langle F_\psi \rangle = 0.9996$, and an arbitrary Haar-random SU(10) map in a time $T = 42\pi/\Omega_{rf} = 10.5$ ms with average fidelity $\langle F_U \rangle = 0.9963$.

Ultracold ensembles of alkaline-earth atoms trapped in optical lattices or arrays of optical tweezers are a powerful platform for quantum information processing (QIP), including atomic clocks and sensors [1–5], simulators of many-body physics [6–11], and general purpose quantum computers [12–14]. The ability to optically manipulate coherence in single-atoms via ultranarrow optical resonances on the intercombination lines, together with the ability to create high-fidelity entangling interactions between atoms when they are excited to high-lying Rydberg states [14–16], provides tools that make this system highly controllable for such applications. In addition, fermionic species have nuclear spin. As the ground state is a closed shell, there is no electron angular momentum, and the nuclear spin with its weak magnetic moment is highly isolated from the environment. Such nuclear spins in alkaline-earth atoms are thus natural carriers of quantum information given their long coherence times and our ability to coherently control them with magnetic and optical fields. Nuclear spins are also seen as excellent carriers of quantum information in the solid state as demonstrated in pioneering experiments including in NV-centers [17] and dopants in silicon [18, 21].

Using magneto-optical fields to control qubits comprising an isolated pair of two nuclear-spin magnetic sublevels levels in $^{87}\text{Sr}$ was recently demonstrated [22]. The nuclear spin in this atomic species, however, is not a two-level system; the spin is $I = 9/2$ and there are $d = 2I + 1 = 10$ nuclear magnetic sublevels. Such qudits, here “qudecimals,” have potential advantage for QIP. First and foremost, one can encode a $D = d^{n_d} = 2^{n_2}$ dimensional Hilbert space associated with $n_2$ qudits in $n_d = n_2/\log_2 d$ qubits. While only a logarithmic saving, this is meaningful for the qudecimal ($\log_2 d = 3.32$), especially when trapping and control of each atom is at a premium. This savings extends to algorithmic efficiency, in that the number of elementary two-qubit gates necessary to implement a unitary map scales as $O(n_2^2D^2) = \mathcal{O}\left(n_2^2d^{2n_2}\right)$ [23]. Moreover, qudits offer new opportunities for quantum error correction [24]. One can protect against dephasing errors by encoding a qubit in a nuclear spin qudit [25]. In addition, fault-tolerant operation of a quantum computer may be more favorable based on qudit vs. qubit codes [26, 27].

While QIP with qudits has great potential, there are substantial hurdles. State preparation and a readout are more challenging for systems with $d > 2$. Moreover, quantum logic with qudits is more complex. Universal quantum logic with qubits can be achieved with a set of logic gates that include the unitary-generators of SU(2) on each qubit, plus one entangling gate between qubits pairwise. In the case of qudits, in addition to the entangling gate, we require unitary-generators of SU($d$) for each subsystem [22, 28, 30]. Unlike qubits, the Lie algebra of such gates are not the native Hamiltonians, and thus implementation of this generating set is not straightforward. Different approaches have been studied to implement SU($d$) gates [31–37]. One approach is to specify an arbitrary SU($d$) unitary matrix through a sequence of so-called Givens rotations acting between pairs of levels [30]. Alternatively, one can employ the tools of quantum optimal control to numerically search for a time-dependent waveform that achieves the desired SU($d$) unitary map when one has access to a Hamiltonian that makes the system universally “controllable” [37]. Optimal control is a powerful and flexible approach that does not require specific pairwise Givens rotations, can be high-fidelity and can be made robust to imperfections such as inhomogeneities through the tools of robust control [38].
Encoding qudits in the electronic ground state of cold atoms has been explored for species with one electron in the valence shell (neutral \[39\] and ionic \[40\]). In this case the hyperfine splitting provides additional tools for control based on microwave or two-photon Raman couplings, through which one can implement desired Givens rotations on a subspace that is least sensitive to magnetic field noise \[33\]. In addition, the combination of microwave and radio-frequency control, makes this system controllable \[41\]. In seminal work, the Jessen group used optimal control to demonstrate high-fidelity arbitrary SU(16) maps on the d = 16 dimensional Hilbert space associated with the hyperfine spin levels of ground-state cesium \[42\]. This flexible control has found potential application in studies of quantum simulation \[43\].

In this paper we build on the work of Jessen et al. to study implementation of SU(10) gates on the nuclear spin of \(^{87}\)Sr-based on quantum optimal control. Such a system may have long-term advantages compared to hyperfine states that couple electron and nuclear spins, in its strongly reduced sensitivity to to background magnetic fields and resilience against decoherence driven by photon scattering from optical tweezers or lattices \[12\] \[13\] \[14\]. Weak coupling to the environment, of course, comes with increased challenges of weak coupling to control fields. We will show, nonetheless, that with reasonable experimental parameters one can implement high-fidelity qudecimal logic, with low decoherence.

We consider open loop-control on Hilbert space of finite dimension d, governed by a Hamiltonian \(H[c(t)] = H_0 + \sum \alpha \{c_\alpha(t)H_\alpha\}\) where \(c(t) = \{c_\alpha(t)\}\) is the set of time-dependent classical control waveforms. The system is said to “controllable” if the set of Hamiltonians \(\{H_0, H_3\}\) are generators of the Lie algebra SU(d). Then \(\exists c(t)\) such that \(U[c,T] = \exp(-i \int_0^T H[c(t)] dt) = U_{\text{tar}}\) for any target unitary matrix \(U_{\text{tar}} = \text{SU}(d)\) in this space. The minimal time \(T\) for which this is possible is known as the “quantum speed limit” (QSL) \[45\].

One can achieve quantum controllability of the nuclear spin qudecimal through magneto-optical interactions. We combine magnetic spin resonance in the presence of an off-resonant laser field as depicted in Fig. 1. The Hamiltonian acting on the nuclear spin the \(^{5}S_{2}\) \(^{1}S_{0}\) ground state takes the form \(H = H_{\text{mag}} + H_{\text{LS}}\). Here \(H_{\text{mag}} = -\mu \cdot B(t)\) is the magnetic spin-resonance Hamiltonian, with \(\mu = g\mu_N I\) the nuclear magnetic dipole vector operator and \(B(t) = B_0 e_z + B_T \text{Re} \left[(e_x + i e_y)e^{-i(\omega_{rt} + \phi(t))}\right]\) the magnetic field consisting of a strong bias defining the quantization axis \(e_z\) and a transversely rotating rf-magnetic field with a time dependent phase \(\phi(t)\). Taken alone, the \(H_{\text{mag}}\) generates only SU(2) rotations of nuclear spin. To achieve full SU(d) control we add a light-shift Hamiltonian due to the AC-Stark effect, \(H_{\text{LS}} = -\alpha_{zz}(\omega_L)|E_0|^2/4\) where \(\alpha_{zz}(\omega_L)\) is the zz-component of atomic AC-polarizability tensor operator for a laser field at frequency \(\omega_L\) linearly-polarized along the quantization axis, \(E_\alpha(t) = e_\alpha \text{Re} (E_0 e^{-i\omega_L t})\). The form of \(\alpha_{zz}\) depends on the atomic structure and the detuning of the laser from atomic resonance. In particular, when the detuning is not large compared to the hyperfine splitting in the excited state, the polarizability has an irreducible rank-2 tensor component \(\alpha_{zz} = \alpha^{(2)} I_2^z\) (there also a trivial scalar term proportion to the identity \([46]\)). This quadratic spin twist together with the linear Larmor precession yields a set of control Hamiltonians \(\{I_x, I_y, I_2^z\}\) sufficient to generate the Lie algebra SU(2I + 1) for an arbitrary spin \(I\) \[17\]. Such control was first demonstrated in the alkali atom cesium, for the hyperfine spin \(F = 3\) in the electronic ground state, in order to generate nonclassical spin states in the \(d = 7\) dimensional Hilbert space \[39\].

Importantly, the size of tensor polarizability \(\alpha^{(2)}\) depends on the ratio of the excited state hyperfine splitting to the laser detuning \[40\], achieving its maximum when these are of the same order. Thus, to achieve high-fidelity control, one must tune sufficiently close to resonance, while avoiding photon scattering that leads to decoherence. Critically, in alkaline-earth atoms, the first excited \(^3P_1\) states have long lifetimes and large hyperfine splittings. This leads to a very favorable figure of merit for optimal control, as measured by the ratio of the characteristic tensor light shift to the photon scattering rate \(\gamma_\gamma, \kappa = \alpha^{(2)} |E_0|^2 / 4\gamma_\gamma\). For example, in \(^{87}\)Sr, the hyperfine splitting between the \(F = 7/2\) and \(F = 9/2\) levels in the singly-excited \(^5S_{1/2}\) state is \(\omega_{HF}/2\pi = 1130\) MHz, while the spontaneous emission linewidth is \(\Gamma/2\pi = 7.5\) kHz. With scattering averaged over all magnetic sublevels \[40\], we find that when we detune about halfway between these resonances, we obtain the maximum figure of merit \(\kappa = 6.8 \times 10^3\) (see Fig. 1). In contrast, \(\kappa = 18.6\) for \(F = 3\) hyperfine spin in the cesium ground state when the laser is tuned halfway between the \(F = 3\) and \(F = 4\) hyperfine levels in the excited \(^3P_{1/2}\) D1-resonance. This small figure of merit limited the fidelity to around 0.85 for the arbitrary state preparation. A factor of 364 increase in the figure of merit for alkaline earths shows the potential power of this approach to yield high-fidelity quantum optimal control of the nuclear spin qudit.

We consider control of the nuclear spin qudecimal with on-resonance rf fields on resonance with the Zeeman splitting, \(\Delta E_0 = |g_I\mu_N B_\parallel|\), where \(g_I\mu_N/h = -184\) Hz/Gauss in \(^{87}\)Sr \[48\]. In the rotating frame, the control Hamiltonian is

\[
H(t) = \Omega_{\text{rf}} \left( \cos[c(t)\pi]I_x + \sin[c(t)\pi]I_y \right) + \beta I_z^2
\]

where \(\Omega_{\text{rf}} = -g_I\mu_N B_\parallel\) is the rf-Rabi frequency and \(\beta = \alpha^{(2)} |E_0|^2/4\) is the strength of the tensor light shift (here and to follow \(\hbar = 1\)). Note, for a rotating rf-field, there is no rotating wave approximation, and this Hamiltonian is valid even when \(\Omega_{\text{rf}} \gtrsim \omega_L\). Here the single control
The number of parameters necessary for the control task; for state-maps \( n_{\text{min}} = 2d - 2 \) and for arbitrary SU\((d)\) maps \( n_{\text{min}} = d^2 - 1 \). In practice, we choose \( n \) to be larger than \( n_{\text{min}} \) which improves the fidelity landscape when \( T \) is close to the QSL. To numerically optimize \( F \) we use a variation of the well-known GRAPE algorithm [51].

For a fixed value of \( \Omega_{rf} \), the optimal choice of \( \beta \) and total time \( T \) are found empirically. Figures 2(a,b) show the infidelity, \( 1 - F \), for state preparation (unitary maps), when averaged over 20 Haar random target vectors (10 random unitary maps). As expected, when \( T \to \infty \) the infidelity is essentially zero. The QSL is highly dependent on the value of \( \beta \). As expected, the optimal choice is \( \beta \approx \Omega_{rf} \) as this provides the optimal mixing between Larmor precession and one-axis twisting. The characteristics of state preparation and unitary maps are similar in nature. The major difference between these two cases is that unitary mapping requires more time for the simple reason that unitary mapping has \( d^2 - 1 \) parameters compared to the \( 2d - 2 \) for the state preparation. The quantum speed limit at \( \beta = \Omega_{rf} \) is \( T_\ast \approx 1.5\pi/\Omega_{rf} \) for state preparation and \( T_\ast \approx 8\pi/\Omega_{rf} \) for SU\((10)\) unitary maps.

In principle, one can achieve arbitrarily high fidelity with increasing \( T \). In practice \( T \) is limited by the coherence time of the system. Here, the coherence time is fundamentally limited by decoherence arising from photon scattering and optical pumping due to the off-resonant light-shift laser. We model the effects of decoherence in the state preparation protocols using the Lindblad Master equation [44],

\[
\frac{d\rho[c,t]}{dt} = -i[H_{\text{eff}}[c], \rho[c,t]] + \Gamma \sum_q W_q \rho[c,t] W_q^\dagger
\]

\[
\equiv \mathcal{L}[c] \rho[c,t].
\]

where the jump operators for optical pumping between magnetic sublevels describing absorption followed by emission of a \( q \)-polarized photon are \( W_q \),

\[
W_q = \frac{\Omega/2}{\Delta_{FF'} + i\Gamma/2} (e_q^* \mathcal{D}_{FF'}^\dagger(\mathcal{L}_q \mathcal{D}_{FF'})^\dagger).
\]

Here \( \mathcal{D}_{FF'}^\dagger \) are the dimensionless dipole raising operators from ground state manifold \( F = I \) to the excited state manifold \( F' \), as defined in [44]. \( H_{\text{eff}}[c] = \bar{H}[c] - i\Gamma \sum_q W_q^\dagger W_q/2 \) is the nonHermitian control Hamiltonian, Eq. 4, now including absorption of the laser light.

For gates, we define a \( d^2 \times d^2 \) superoperator matrix acting on the density matrix. For the open quantum system, the superoperator describing the evolution of an arbitrary input state is the Completely Postive (CP)-map, \( \mathcal{E}[c,T] = T \left( \exp \{ \int_0^T \mathcal{L}[c(t')] dt' \} \right) \), where \( \mathcal{L} \) is the Lindbladian superoperator of the master equation, defined implicitly in Eq. 4.
FIG. 2: Fidelity of objectives found by optimal control as a function of the strength of AC-stark shift, β, and the total time $T$, in units of the rf-Rabi frequency $\Omega_{\text{rf}}$. Predictions based on closed-unitary evolution for state-maps (a) and SU(10) unitary-maps (b) averaged over 20 Haar-random target states and 10 Haar-random target SU(10) matrices, respectively. The control waveforms are piecewise constant, over times $\delta t = T/n$. For state maps we choose $n = 30$ time steps; the unitary maps we take $n = 150$. The bottom layer gives the similar figures in the presence of decoherence using the master equation, Eq. (4): state fidelity (c), Eq. (6), and process fidelity (d), Eq. (7).

We study the effect of decoherence on the control task by setting $c$ in the open quantum system dynamics to be the control solution found in closed-system optimization. The fidelities for state preparation and full SU(10) maps are, respectively,

$$\mathcal{F}_\psi[c, T] = \text{Tr}\{\rho_{\psi_{\text{tar}}}, \rho[c, T]\},$$

Eq. (6)

$$\mathcal{F}_U[c, T] = \text{Tr}\left\{\mathcal{E}_{U_{\text{tar}}}, \mathcal{E}[c, T]\right\}/d^2.$$

Eq. (7)

Here $\rho_{\psi_{\text{tar}}} = |\psi_{\text{tar}}\rangle \langle \psi_{\text{tar}}|$ is the target state and $\rho[c, T]$ is the solution to the master equation. $\mathcal{E}_{U_{\text{tar}}} = U_{\text{tar}}^{\dagger} \otimes U_{\text{tar}}$ is the CP-map corresponding to the target unitary gate and $\mathcal{E}[c, T]$ is the CP-map with decoherence. Eq. (7) is the “process fidelity,” a key quantity of interest in determining the thresholds for fault-tolerant quantum computation [52].

Numerical results are given in Fig. 2 for both state preparation and unitary mapping. In contrast to closed-system control, Fig. 2a and Fig. 2b show that there is an island where the infidelity is smallest. This reflects the tradeoff between coherent control and decoherence. There is an optimal total time of evolution $T$ than larger than the QSL but not too large when compared to the optical pumping time. In addition, the optimal choice of $\beta$ is now smaller than we found for the closed quantum system, as increased tensor-light shift is accompanied by increased photon scattering. Including decoherence, for the case of state preparation, we find the fidelity $\langle \mathcal{F}_\psi \rangle \approx 0.9998$. Here the island of high fidelity is large, occurring for $\beta < 1.2$. For the case of unitary mapping the island of lowest infidelity is smaller and occurs for $\beta < 0.7$ where the fidelity $\langle \mathcal{F}_U \rangle \approx 0.9986$. It should be remembered that these qudecimal maps act on a 10-dimensional Hilbert space. Thus a fair comparison of the effective fidelity acting on qubits is $\langle \mathcal{F} \rangle_{\text{qubit}} = \langle \mathcal{F} \rangle_{\text{qudecimal}}^{0.3}$. We consider here an uncertainty in the tensor light shift arising from the thermal velocity of the atoms. To perform robust control, we replace the control Hamiltonian $H[c] \rightarrow H'[c, \epsilon] = H[c] + i\epsilon I_z$, where $\epsilon$ is the variation in $\beta$ around the fiducial value, and define a new objective function as the average fidelity, $\langle \mathcal{F}[c, T] \rangle = \int d\epsilon p(\epsilon) \langle \mathcal{F}[c, T, \epsilon] \rangle$. While in principle one can design inhomogeneous control with detailed knowledge of the probability distribution $p(\epsilon)$, in practice, when the standard deviation of the distribution $\delta$ is sufficiently narrow, it is sufficient to simultaneously optimize at two points, and choose the objective function as

$$\langle \mathcal{F}[c, T] \rangle = \langle \mathcal{F}[c, T, \epsilon = +\delta] + \mathcal{F}[c, T, \epsilon = -\delta]\rangle/2.$$  

Eq. (8)

The numerical results of robust control are shown in Fig. 3 for an error of $\delta = 0.1\beta$ and $\beta = 0.1\Omega_{\text{rf}}$. We see that robust control outperforms the bare waveforms, even in presence of decoherence, but one does not reach the fidelity without any inhomogeneity due to optical pumping occurring over the extended time of the control pulses. For the parameters chosen here, we find that for state preparation one could achieve a fidelity of $\langle \mathcal{F}_\psi \rangle \approx 0.9996$ in a time $T = 8\pi/\Omega_{\text{rf}}$, and for unitary mapping one achieved a fidelity $\langle \mathcal{F}_U \rangle \approx 0.9963$ in a time $T = 42\pi/\Omega_{\text{rf}}$. For reasonable control, we consider a radio-frequency fields rotating at 20 kHz and Rabi frequency $\Omega_{\text{rf}}/2\pi = 2.0$ kHz, so that robust state control and unitary maps can be achieved on the order of 2 ms and 10.5 ms respectively.

We have shown that in the presence of fundamental decoherence and small inhomogeneities, quantum optimal control allows for the realization of high-fidelity arbitrary state maps and SU(10) qudecimal gates acting on nuclear spin in the ground state of $^{87}\text{Sr}$. Such control should find a variety of applications in QIP, including metrological enhancement with qudits [52], quantum simulation [43, 50], and universal quantum computation [7]. For the latter additional components are necessary. One must enable readout of all 10 magnetic sublevels though appropriate shelving and fluorescence protocols [57]. Most importantly, we must study the
implementation of entangling gates consistent with qudit logic. Advances in Rydberg-state control for alkaline earth atoms show great promise in this direction. Finally, while we have studied here two extremes of the control tasks, state preparation and SU(10) maps, optimal control allows for arbitrary partial isometries to encode a $d' < 10$ qudit in the qudecimal. For example one can encode a qubit in the logical states $|0\rangle = |m_I = 9/2\rangle$, $|1\rangle = |m_I = -9/2\rangle$ and potentially protect it from dephasing noise, analogous to a cat-code. The flexibility of arbitrary control provides avenues to explore the best approach to encoding and error mitigation.
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