Cavity-QED of a quantum metamaterial with tunable disorder
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We explore experimentally a quantum metamaterial based on a superconducting chip with 25 frequency-tunable transmon qubits coupled to a common coplanar resonator. The collective bright and dark modes are probed via the microwave response, i.e., by measuring the transmission amplitude of an external microwave signal. All qubits have individual control and readout lines. Their frequency tunability allows to change the number $N$ of resonantly coupled qubits and also to introduce a disorder in their excitation frequencies with preassigned distributions. While increasing $N$, we demonstrate the expected $N^{1/2}$ scaling law for the energy gap (Rabi splitting) between bright modes around the cavity frequency. By introducing a controllable disorder and averaging the transmission amplitude over a large number of realizations, we demonstrate a decay of mesoscopic fluctuations which mimics an approach towards the thermodynamic limit. The collective bright states survive in the presence of disorder when the strength of individual qubit coupling to the cavity dominates over the disorder strength.

\textit{Introduction.}—During last years, superconducting qubits have shown remarkable progress in realizations of scalable quantum computing devices \cite{1} as well as in fundamental studies of circuit quantum electrodynamics (QED) \cite{2}. Quantum circuits based on superconducting qubits allow for testing fermion models \cite{3}, geometric phases \cite{4}, weak localization \cite{5}, topologically ordered states \cite{6–8}, and beyond. Various phenomena related to photonic transport and photon-photon interaction can be observed even for a circuit with a single qubit. They appear when microwave photons are transmitted through a qubit circuit which plays a role of a nonlinear oscillator. Examples are photon blockade \cite{9, 10}, transfer of thermalized photons and measurement of their bunching \cite{11}, probing of transmitted photons statistics \cite{12–14}, and multi-photon transitions \cite{15}.

Multi-qubit circuits find their applications in quantum metamaterials \cite{16}, which are examples of artificial quantum matter with tunable properties. The dynamics of such metamaterials is governed by quantum-optical models, such as Dicke \cite{17–19} or Bose-Hubbard \cite{20–22} models, which capture the physics of coupled photonic modes and qubit degrees of freedom.

The major technical challenge for fabrication of multi-qubit metamaterials is in making the energy level separations $\hbar \epsilon_j$ of many non-identical qubits as similar as possible. This is required for observing, e.g., a coherent response of the metamaterial and collective bright modes of the system. It has been argued \cite{16, 23, 24} but not yet proved that, for non-tunable qubits, this problem can be overcome by engineering large enough qubit coupling strength $g$ to the cavity, similar to the way of overcoming the effects of inhomogeneous broadening in lasers made of natural atoms. Coherent response of a metamaterial can be expected if the spread in $\epsilon_j$ becomes smaller than $g$. The individual qubit frequencies $\epsilon_j$ can be individually controlled by applying local fields to qubits, which, obviously, becomes more and more technically difficult when increasing the number of qubits in a metamaterial.

Multi-qubit metamaterials represent a mesoscopic limit of naturally occurring ensembles consisting of nominally identical atoms or spins. Here, however, the fluctuations are different for each atom and lead to the resonance line broadening in the presence of fluctuating local fields and interactions between atoms. The homogeneously broadened emission (lifetime-limited) line has a Lorentzian profile, while the inhomogeneously broadened emission will have a Gaussian profile. While fluctuations in the thermodynamic limit corresponding to a very large number of emitters are well understood and studied in solid-state and molecular spectroscopy, the mesoscopic limit of a countable (not too large) number of emitters is very difficult to explore with natural atoms or spins. Qubit metamaterials may be suitable to fill this knowledge gap. One of the prominent examples is a spin ensemble coupled to a cavity and described by the Tavis-
Cummings model \cite{25}. Here, qubits with individual frequency control can be used to introduce a tunable static or dynamic disorder.

In this work, we report on experimental realization of a multi-qubit platform that allows to simulate disorder effects in quantum metamaterials. We have designed and fabricated the superconducting chip based on an array of 25 transmon \cite{26} qubits coupled to a common coplanar resonator. The excitation frequency of every qubit is individually tunable in GHz range. Hence, arbitrary disorder realizations can be easily implemented and studied in this setting.

Theoretical background.—We address to low excitation regime, where rotating-wave approximation is valid and the Dicke model for \( N \) qubits is reduced to the Tavis-Cummings model. For particular qubit frequencies \( \epsilon_j \), qubit-cavity couplings \( g_j \), and the cavity mode with the frequency \( \nu_c \), the Tavis-Cummings model reads as

\[
\hat{H} = \nu_c \hat{a} \hat{a}^\dagger + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \epsilon_j \hat{\sigma}_j^+ \hat{\sigma}_j^- + \sum_{j=1}^{N} g_j (\hat{\sigma}_j^+ \hat{a} + \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{\sigma}_j^-). \tag{1}
\]

Here, \( \hat{a}^\dagger \) and \( \hat{a} \) are the photon creation and annihilation operators, \( \hat{\sigma}_j^+ \) and \( \hat{\sigma}_j^- \) are raising and lowering Pauli operators acting upon \( j \)-th two-level system. In the low energy limit, this Hamiltonian can be represented as a \( N+1 \)-dimensional matrix \( \mathcal{H}_{i,j} = \langle \psi_i | \hat{H} | \psi_j \rangle \) after the projection of \( \hat{H} \) on a single excitation basis, \( \{ |\psi_i\rangle \}_{i=1}^{N+1} = \{ \hat{a}^\dagger |g.s.;\rangle; \hat{\sigma}_1^+ |g.s.;\rangle; ..., \hat{\sigma}_N^+ |g.s.;\rangle \} \).

The respective Green function matrix that takes into account a dissipation to an environment, is \( G(\omega) = (\omega \mathcal{I} + i\mathcal{D} - \hat{H})^{-1} \).

Here, \( \mathcal{I} = \delta_{i,j} \) is the identity matrix in the basis \( \{ |\psi_i\rangle \}_{i=1}^{N+1} \) and the matrix \( \mathcal{D} = \text{diag}[\kappa, \Gamma_1, ..., \Gamma_N] \) is determined by the loss rate in the resonator, \( \kappa \), and the relaxation from the excited to the ground state in qubits, \( \Gamma_j \). It can be written through the Green functions of decoupled resonator and qubits \cite{27}, \( G_{\text{ph}}(\omega) = (\omega + i\kappa - \nu_c)^{-1} \) and \( G_{\text{q}}(\omega) = (\omega + i\Gamma_j - \epsilon_j)^{-1} \), respectively, as \( G(\omega) = \begin{bmatrix} G_{\text{ph}}^{-1}(\omega) - g^T & -g \\ -g & G_{\text{q}}^{-1}(\omega) \end{bmatrix} \). Here the \( N \)-dimensional matrix \( G_{\text{q}}(\omega) = \delta_{i,j} G_{\text{q}}(\omega) \) and the vector \( g = (g_1; g_2; ...; g_N)^T \) with all coupling constants are introduced. Photonic propagator \( G_{\text{ph}}(\omega) \equiv [G(\omega)]_{1,1} \) is found after an expansion of \( G \) by the non-diagonal part and resummation of the first diagonal element. The result is

\[
G_{\text{ph}}(\omega) = \frac{1}{G_{\text{ph}}^{-1}(\omega) - g^T G_{\text{q}}(\omega) g}, \tag{2}
\]

The term \( g^T G_{\text{q}}(\omega) g = \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{g_j^2}{\omega + i\Gamma_j - \epsilon_j} \) takes into account the diagonal disorder in \( \epsilon_j \) and non-diagonal disorder in \( g_j \).

Resolving the equation \( G_{\text{ph}}^{-1}(\omega) = 0 \) with respect to \( \omega \) in the absence of the disorder, \( \epsilon_j = \epsilon \), one finds that the frequencies of bright collective modes are \( \nu_{\pm} = \frac{1}{\pi} \left( \nu_c + \epsilon \pm \sqrt{(\nu_c - \epsilon)^2 + 4 |g|^2} \right) \). If \( g_i \) is \( g \) and resonant condition holds, \( \epsilon_j = \nu_c \), then one finds a well-known scaling of the energy gap with \( N \) in the Tavis-Cummings model, \( \omega_- - \omega_+ = 2gN/\sqrt{N} \). The initial task in this work is thus to demonstrate this scaling law \( N^{1/2} \). It becomes possible by means of subsequent increase of qubit number tuned into the resonance with the photon mode.

The main aim of this work is to study an ensemble of qubits with tunable disorder. We set our goals to demonstrate the effect of self-averaging in transmission amplitudes of disordered ensemble and to observe mesoscopic fluctuations which decrease with \( N \). As long as the diagonal disorder is fully controllable, we set the resonant condition between the resonator mode and all qubits on the average as \( \nu_c = \langle \epsilon_j \rangle \). The probability density to find the \( j \)-th qubit in a frequency range \( [\epsilon; \epsilon + d\epsilon] \) is simulated by a flat function \( p(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2\theta(\Delta/2 - |\epsilon - \nu_c|)} \) which is symmetric near \( \epsilon = \nu_c \) and has a controllable spread \( \Delta \).

To explore the mesoscopic effects in the qubit metamaterial, we collect data for the transmission coefficient \( S_{21} \) of the microwave probe signal sent at the cavity bare frequency \( \omega = \nu_c \). As follows from in-out theory where a matching of reflected and transmitted waves is performed, the transmission coefficient is related to the Green function (2) as follows, \( S_{21} = \sqrt{\gamma_{\text{in}} \gamma_{\text{out}}} G_{\text{ph}}(\nu_c) \). Here, \( \gamma_{\text{in}} \) and \( \gamma_{\text{out}} \) are radiation rates from the resonator into in- and out-waveguides.

Let us analyze \( S_{21} \) where the averaging is based on a large number of diagonal disorder realizations with the probability density \( p(\epsilon) \). We consider first the limit of large \( N \) where, similarly to the thermodynamic limit, fluctuations are suppressed and self-averaging can be applied. Namely, the sum from (2) is replaced by the integral with \( p(\epsilon) \) which is the density of states analogue.

One finds \( g^T G_{\text{q}}(\omega) g = \gamma g^2 N/\Delta \) and, consequently, the transmission coefficient is

\[
\langle S_{21} \rangle = \sqrt{\gamma_{\text{in}} \gamma_{\text{out}}} \frac{-i}{\kappa + \pi g^2 N/\Delta}. \tag{3}
\]

The detailed derivation is presented in \cite{27}. Mesoscopic fluctuations \( \Delta S_{21} \equiv S_{21} - \langle S_{21} \rangle \), which are considered as a random value corresponding to a particular disorder realization, appear at finite \( N \). They are found as follows in the leading order by the finite \( N \)

\[
\langle |\Delta S_{21}|^2 \rangle = \gamma_{\text{in}} \gamma_{\text{out}} \frac{\pi N g^4}{2\Gamma \Delta (\kappa + \pi g^2 N/\Delta)^4}. \tag{4}
\]

One sees that the average decays as \( \langle S_{21} \rangle \propto N^{-1} \) while fluctuations as \( \propto N^{-3} \) at large \( N \) limit. In our experiment, we use these results (3, 4) to fit the measured data.

Quantum circuit and measurement setup.—Here we present first our experimental setting which involves 25
superconducting transmon qubits. A particular qubit, measurement scheme, and equivalent circuit are shown in Figs. 1 (a-d), respectively. Qubits are capacitively coupled to a common cavity realized as a \(\lambda/2\) coplanar waveguide resonator (panel (a), brown color). The cavity is terminated with the input transmission line (cyan color). A transmon qubit (panel (b)), at one of its ends, involves a short segment running close to the common cavity conductor (brown color). This results in a strong capacitive qubit-cavity coupling. At the other end, the transmon is connected to an individual flux bias line (blue color) that allows to tune the excitation frequency of a particular qubit. There are 25 individual control lines in total; they are implemented as asymmetric SQUIDs connected to a multi-channel DC source. Fabrication steps of the device are described in [27]. Each of the qubit is capacitively coupled to an individual readout resonator (panel (b), green color). These resonators have different lengths and frequencies and operate in a dispersive regime. This allows us to address each of the qubits individually through this feed line using frequency multiplexing, perform two-tone spectroscopy of qubits, and perform calibration of the frequency controls [27].

The common cavity is connected to its own microwave feedline in a butt-port geometry. Readout resonators are notch-port coupled to a common cavity and are connected to the output line (magenta color in the circuit shown in panel (d)).

We perform measurements of the reflection and transmission amplitudes, \(S_{11}\) and \(S_{21}\), with the use of a microwave circulator and a switch. In \(S_{11}\) measurements, the incident signal is sent to the common cavity and reflected back. In \(S_{21}\) measurements, the incident signal excites qubit modes and leaves the chip through the individual resonators coupled to qubits.

The measurement scheme is shown in Fig. 1 (c). The microwave drive tone, sent from the vector network analyzer (VNA), is attenuated by 50 dB before entering the chip. After passing through the chip, the signal is amplified and measured by the VNA, yielding the complex transmission amplitude \(S_{21}\). Due to long attenuation and amplification chains, \(S_{21}\) is not calibrated. Thus, the data are presented relative to an arbitrary level hereafter.

The spectroscopy data for \(S_{21}\), where frequencies of resonant qubits, \(\epsilon = \epsilon_j\), and probe signal, \(f_p\), vary, are shown in Figs 2 (a-d). Here, we present results for \(N = 4, 7, 16, 21\) resonant qubits. These measurements are performed using the specific calibration procedure [27]. Bright anticrossings marked by black dashed curves are the energies of Rabi collective modes \(\nu_k\). Yellow and red dashed lines are bare frequencies of the cavity and resonant qubits. The increase of the gap with \(N\) indicates for a bright-state coherence between qubit array and photon mode.

**Vacuum Rabi splitting.**—The first important result of this work is the demonstration of \(N^{1/2}\)-scaling in the Rabi splitting, \(g_{\text{Rabi}}\), as a function of \(N\), which is the number of qubits tuned into the resonance with the cavity. In Fig. 2 (d) the dependence of \(g_{\text{Rabi}}(N)\), where \(N\) changes from 3 to 23, is demonstrated. The theoretical dependence \(g_{\text{Rabi}} = 2g\sqrt{N}\) (solid curve) shows good agreement with the experimental data (dots). There is a single fitting parameter, qubit-cavity coupling \(g\), which is found to be 45 MHz. We note that previously, to our knowledge, the \(N^{1/2}\)-scaling in the Rabi splitting between two bright states has been observed with ensembles of up to 6 tunable qubits [28]. Here, in spite of rising complexity of the measurement setup, we were able to bring into the collective bright states an ensemble of almost 4 times larger number of tunable qubits.

**Transmission in a disordered metamaterial.**—The most relevant result of this work is measurements of \(S_{21}\) in a mesoscopic metamaterial with large but finite number of qubits \(N\) and tunable disorder in their fundamental transition frequencies. Here, fluctuations are induced by the diagonal disorder in \(\epsilon_j\). The disorder results in the appearance of dark states near the resonator frequency \(\nu_c\) which shift randomly the amplitude and phase of \(S_{21}\).

Before we analyze fluctuations, we present transmis-
Transmission coefficient $|S_{21}|$ (a.u.)

FIG. 2: Spectrum of collective bright (Rabi) modes. (a)-(d) Reflection amplitude $|S_{21}|$ measured for different numbers of tunable qubits ($N = 4, 7, 16, 21$). Black dashed lines are $\nu_\pm$, energies of Rabi satellites predicted by the Tavis-Cummings model. Yellow dashed lines stand for bare cavity mode frequency $\nu_c$. Red dashed lines are bare frequencies of tunable qubits. (e) $N^{1/2}$ scaling of Rabi splittings $g_{\text{Rabi}}$ for $N = 3, \ldots, 23$ qubits tuned into the resonance with the cavity.

FIG. 3: Microwave spectroscopy of disordered metamaterial with 17 qubits. The data for transmission coefficient $|S_{21}|$ is presented. Average qubit frequency is tuned into the resonance with the cavity, $\langle \epsilon \rangle = \nu_c$. Panels (a)-(g) corresponds to different spreads $\Delta$ in qubit frequencies. Different realisations of random frequency offsets are shown in different colors (green, blue, red). Black solid lines denote bare qubit frequencies. Orange dashed lines show the common resonator frequency.

in each panel (green, red and blue); they correspond to three particular realizations of disordered $\{\epsilon_j\}_{j=1}^N$ (black lines indicate qubit frequencies in each curve). Frequencies $\{\epsilon_j\}_{j=1}^N$ are chosen such that they have a particular spread, i.e. $\langle \epsilon_j^2 \rangle - \langle \epsilon_j \rangle^2 = \Delta^2$. Orange dashed line corresponds to the resonator frequency $\nu_c = 5.755$ GHz. Large side peaks on green curves are due to individual qubit readout resonators.

Mesoscopic fluctuations. — Let us address the average...
values of $\langle |S_{21}| \rangle$ and $\langle |\Delta S_{21}|^2 \rangle$ in the presence of disorder. Hereafter, the probe signal is tuned to the cavity mode frequency, $f_p = \nu_c = \langle \epsilon \rangle$, hence, Eqs. (3) and (4) are applicable. The measurement results for $\langle |S_{21}| \rangle$ and $\langle |\Delta S_{21}|^2 \rangle$ are shown in Figs. 4 (a) and (b), respectively. All points are obtained from averaging over 1000 disorder realizations. Different colors correspond to different values of $\Delta$. Here we present the data for $\langle |S_{21}| \rangle$ and $\langle |\Delta S_{21}|^2 \rangle$ as a function of $N/\Delta$ for all spreads and $N$. It is clearly seen that points from all sets of $N$, $\Delta$-parameters (colored dots) reside very close to theoretically predicted dependence (black curve). The experimental data are fitted by the formulas given by Eqs. (3) and (4) to which, however, constant shifts $c_1$ and $c_2$ are added, $\langle |\Delta S_{21}| \rangle c_1$ and $\langle |\Delta S_{21}|^2 \rangle + c_2$. These shifts are phenomenological corrections that take into account shunting of the circuit probe signal by the parasitic environmental transmission signal, which we could not avoid in our measurements.

According to Eq. (3), there should be a linear dependence between the inverted transmission $1/\langle |S_{21}| \rangle$ and the ratio $N/\Delta$, up to a constant shift. We plot the data in Fig. 5 in these coordinates for all tested spreads $\Delta$ and numbers $N$. The raw data are plotted in the panel (a) and, on a qualitative level, show linear dependence. The dispersion in these data around linear dependence can be due to various reasons as, e.g., specific realizations of flat distribution, calibration of qubit frequencies, interference between the cavity and background transmission (Fano resonance), and thermal noise. A data processing procedure which takes into account some of these factors to adjust $\Delta$ is proposed in [27]. A very good agreement between the processed data and predicted analytical linear dependence (black line) is demonstrated in the panel (b) of Fig. 5. This is one more key result of our work.

**Conclusion.**—We have studied experimentally an array of 25 tunable transmon qubits coupled to the common resonator. The tunability of qubits allowed us to simulate a diagonal disorder with a preassigned distributions. First, we have probed the collective modes of the qubit arrays by measuring the transmission amplitude of an external microwave signal. By tuning qubits one by one to the resonator frequency, we have observed $N^{1/2}$-scaling law for the Rabi splitting as predicted by the Tavis-Cummings model. Our most interesting new result is measurements of the microwave transmission through the qubit metamaterial in a presence of synthesised disorder in qubit frequencies. We observed mesoscopic fluctuations emerging due to dark states which are very sensitive to disorder in qubit frequencies and their number in the ensemble. We observed a decay of the averaged transmission amplitude with increasing the qubit number $N$ and decreasing the amplitude of the disorder. At the same time, averaged fluctuations decrease with increasing $N$. Thus, in the presence of disorder, adding more and more qubits promotes the collective bright state. Our technique thus provides an on-chip quantum simulator of a crossover between mesoscopic to thermodynamic limits in the Tavis-Cummings model.
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A. Definitions and assumptions

In these Supplementary materials, we study fluctuations of the transmission coefficient $S_{21}(\omega)$ acquired by the probe signal at the frequency $\omega$. The transmission coefficient is a complex valued function related to the photon mode Green function $G_{\text{ph}}(\omega)$ as

$$S_{21}(\omega) = \sqrt{\gamma_{\text{in}} \gamma_{\text{out}}} G_{\text{ph}}(\omega). \quad (S1)$$

Here, loss rates $\gamma_{\text{in}}$ and $\gamma_{\text{out}}$ determine radiation from the resonator into in- and out-waveguides, respectively. Our goal is to calculate fluctuations of $S_{21}(\omega)$ averaged by different disorder realizations in qubit excitation frequencies.

Our calculations are based on following assumptions:

1. The probe signal is small such the average photon number in the resonator is much smaller than one. This assumption allows to reduce the Hilbert space to that of a single excitation (either one photon or one qubit is excited). Also, this allows to use Tavis-Cummings model in rotating wave approximation.

2. In analytical calculations, we assume that probe frequency $\omega$ is tuned into a resonance with bare frequency of the resonator mode, i.e., $\omega = \nu_{c}$. This allows us to find compact expressions.

3. We assume the resonant condition between the resonator mode and all qubits on average as $\nu_{c} = \epsilon_{j}$ where $\epsilon_{j} = \langle \epsilon_{j} \rangle$ is the averaged by the realizations frequency of $j$-th qubit ($j \in [1, N]$).

4. We assume that disorder distribution functions are identical for all of the qubits. We suppose that their dispersions $\Delta_{j} = \sqrt{\langle \epsilon_{j}^{2} \rangle - \langle \epsilon_{j} \rangle^{2}}$ are identical, i.e., $\Delta_{j} = \Delta$.

5. The disorder parameter $\Delta$ is supposed to be known. Also, we know resonator’s loss rate, $\kappa$, qubits’ loss rates $\Gamma_{j} = \Gamma$, and identical coupling constants $g_{j} = g$ between $j$-th qubit and the resonator.

6. The distribution probability $p(\delta \epsilon_{j})$ for random qubit detunings $\delta \epsilon_{j} = \epsilon_{j} - \langle \epsilon_{j} \rangle$ is flat

$$p(\delta \epsilon_{j}) = \frac{1}{\Delta} \theta(\Delta/2 - |\delta \epsilon_{j}|). \quad (S2)$$

Here $\delta \epsilon_{j} \in [-\Delta/2; \Delta/2]$ and $p(\delta \epsilon_{j})$ is normalized to unity.
B. Calculation of the photon's Green function

The Tavis-Cummings model (for a particular realization of qubit frequencies $\epsilon_j$ and different couplings $g_j$) reads as

$$\hat{H} = \nu_c \hat{a}^{\dagger} \hat{a} + \sum_{j=1}^{N} \epsilon_j \hat{\sigma}_j^+ \hat{\sigma}_j^- + \sum_{j=1}^{N} g_j (\hat{\sigma}_j^+ \hat{a} + \hat{a}^{\dagger} \hat{\sigma}_j^-).$$  \hspace{1cm} (S3)

Here, $\hat{a}^{\dagger}$ and $\hat{a}$ are the photon creation and annihilation operators, $\hat{\sigma}_j^+$ and $\hat{\sigma}_j^-$ are raising and lowering operators acting upon $j$-th qubit. This Hamiltonian can be represented as $N + 1$-dimensional matrix $\mathcal{H}_{i,j} = \langle \psi_i | \hat{H} | \psi_j \rangle$ after the projection of $\hat{H}$ on a single excitation basis, $\{|\psi_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^{N+1} = \{\hat{a}^{\dagger} | g.s. \}; \hat{\sigma}_1^+ | g.s. \}; \ldots; \hat{\sigma}_N^+ | g.s. \}$:

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{bmatrix} \nu_c & \mathbf{g}^T \\ \mathbf{g} & h_{\text{ph}} \end{bmatrix}. \hspace{1cm} (S4)$$

Here we introduced $N$-dimensional vector $\mathbf{g} = (g_1; g_2; \ldots; g_N)^T$ and diagonal matrix for qubit ensemble $h_{q,i,j} = \delta_{i,j} \epsilon_j$. The respective Green function is

$$\mathcal{G}(\omega) = \begin{bmatrix} G^{-1}_{\text{ph}}(\omega) & -\mathbf{g}^T \\ -\mathbf{g} & G^{-1}_{q}(\omega) \end{bmatrix}^{-1}. \hspace{1cm} (S5)$$

It that takes into account loss rates, can be written through the bare Green functions of the lumped resonator and qubit modes, $G_{\text{ph}}$ and $G_q$, respectively. They read as follows. The resonator’ Green function is

$$G_{\text{ph}}(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega + i\kappa - \nu_c}. \hspace{1cm} (S6)$$

Qubits modes are encoded by the diagonal matrix $G_q$, its elements are $G_{q,i,j} = \delta_{i,j} G_{q,j}$. They read

$$G_{q,j}(\omega) = \frac{1}{\omega + i\Gamma - \epsilon_j}, \hspace{0.5cm} j \in [1, N]. \hspace{1cm} (S7)$$

The inverse matrix $\mathcal{G}^{-1}$ (S5) has non-zero elements on the diagonal, and on the upper row and left column determined by $\mathbf{g}^T$ and $\mathbf{g}$, while other elements are equal to zero. The first diagonal element of $[\mathcal{G}(\omega)]_{1,1}$ corresponds to photon Green function in the hybrid system, written $G_{\text{ph},r}(\omega)$. It is found after an expansion by the non-diagonal $\mathbf{g}^T$ and $\mathbf{g}$ in (S5) and following resummation of even order terms. The result is

$$G_{\text{ph}}(\omega) = \frac{1}{G_{\text{ph}}^{-1}(\omega) - \mathbf{g}^T G_q(\omega) \mathbf{g}}. \hspace{1cm} (S8)$$

It takes into account disorders in qubit frequencies and in couplings through the product in the denominator

$$\mathbf{g}^T G_q(\omega) \mathbf{g} = \sum_{j=1}^{N} g_j^2 G_{q,j}(\omega). \hspace{1cm} (S9)$$

C. Mesoscopic fluctuations of $S_{21}$

We consider complex valued $S_{21}$ from (S1) at zero detuning (i.e. we probe a response at the bare resonator frequency $\nu_c$). It is related to Green function $G_{\text{ph},r}(\omega_r)$ and reads:

$$S_{21}(\omega = \nu_c) = \sqrt{\gamma_{\text{in}} \gamma_{\text{out}}} \left[ g^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} \delta \epsilon_j \left( \kappa + g^2 \Gamma \right)^2 \left( \delta \epsilon_j \right)^2 \Gamma^2 \right]^{-1}. \hspace{1cm} (S10)$$

Let us analyze the disorder effects starting from a formal limit of infinitely large $N$. Then, the mesoscopic corrections due to $1/N$ with finite $N$ are be calculated.
There is a self-averaging in the limit of large enough \( N \), namely, the sums in (S10) are treated as integrals over continuous variable \( \epsilon \in [-\frac{\Delta}{2}; \frac{\Delta}{2}] \) with \( p(\epsilon) \) from (S2). This gives:

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\delta \epsilon_j}{(\delta \epsilon_j)^2 + \Gamma^2} = N \int p(\epsilon) \frac{\epsilon d\epsilon}{\epsilon^2 + \Gamma^2} = 0 ,
\]

\[
\sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{1}{(\delta \epsilon_j)^2 + \Gamma^2} = N \int p(\epsilon) \frac{d\epsilon}{\epsilon^2 + \Gamma^2} = \frac{\pi N}{\Delta \Gamma} .
\]

(Here, we assumed \( \Delta \gg \Gamma \) and calculated the integrals in infinite limits.) Thus, after this integrations, we find the averaged \( \langle S_{21} \rangle \):

\[
\langle S_{21} \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_{\text{in}} \gamma_{\text{out}}}{\kappa + \pi g^2 N/\Delta}} .
\]

Now we address the mesoscopic correction to this result due to random variable given by the first sum, \( g^2 \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\delta \epsilon_j}{(\delta \epsilon_j)^2 + \Gamma^2} \), in the square brackets of (S10). We expand \( S_{21} \) by the first order in this random valued sum:

\[
S_{21} \approx \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_{\text{in}} \gamma_{\text{out}}}{\kappa + \pi g^2 N/\Delta}} \left( 1 + \frac{i g^2}{\kappa + \pi g^2 N/\Delta} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\delta \epsilon_j}{(\delta \epsilon_j)^2 + \Gamma^2} \right) .
\]

According to (S13) and (S14), we find random deviation \( \delta S_{21} \) from averaged value \( \langle S_{21} \rangle \) for a particular realization of values \( \epsilon_j \) (we still work with complex valued quantity):

\[
\delta S_{21} = S_{21} - \langle S_{21} \rangle = e^{i \varphi_0} \sqrt{\frac{\gamma_{\text{in}} \gamma_{\text{out}}}{\kappa + \pi g^2 N/\Delta}} \frac{g^2}{\kappa + \pi g^2 N/\Delta} \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\delta \epsilon_j}{(\delta \epsilon_j)^2 + \Gamma^2} .
\]

At this step we find its absolute squared and averaged value

\[
\langle |\delta S_{21}|^2 \rangle = \frac{g^4}{(\kappa + \pi g^2 N/\Delta)^4} \left( \sum_{i, j=1}^{N} \frac{\delta \epsilon_i \delta \epsilon_j}{((\delta \epsilon_i)^2 + \Gamma^2)((\delta \epsilon_j)^2 + \Gamma^2)} \right) .
\]

The cross terms with \( i \neq j \) in the average (S16) cancel out. Hence,

\[
\left( \sum_{i, j=1}^{N} \frac{\delta \epsilon_i \delta \epsilon_j}{((\delta \epsilon_i)^2 + \Gamma^2)((\delta \epsilon_j)^2 + \Gamma^2)} \right) = \left( \sum_{j=1}^{N} \frac{\delta \epsilon_j^2}{((\delta \epsilon_j)^2 + \Gamma^2)^2} \right) = N \int p(\epsilon) \frac{\epsilon^2 d\epsilon}{(\epsilon^2 + \Gamma^2)^2} = \frac{\pi N}{2\Gamma \Delta} .
\]

(We note, that \( \langle |\delta S_{21}|^2 \rangle \) decays faster than \( \langle S_{21} \rangle \) at large \( N \) that means the expansion in (S14) is a controllable approximation.) Finally, we find relative mesoscopic fluctuations of \( S_{21} \), combining (S13), (S16) and (S17), which reads:

\[
\sqrt{\frac{\langle |\delta S_{21}|^2 \rangle}{\langle S_{21} \rangle}} = \frac{g^2}{\kappa + \pi g^2 N/\Delta} \sqrt{\frac{\pi N}{2\Gamma \Delta}} .
\]

We note that if one assumes that the resonator’s relaxation is small, \( \kappa \ll g^2 N/\Delta \), we find the following scaling where \( g \) does not appear:

\[
\sqrt{\frac{\langle |\delta S_{21}|^2 \rangle}{\langle S_{21} \rangle}} \approx \frac{1}{N} \frac{\Delta}{2\pi \Gamma} .
\]

However, experimental observation of this scaling requires large \( N \) and small \( \kappa \) which are not realized in our device.
D. Sample fabrication

To fabricate the superconducting chip based on the array of 25 transmon qubits coupled to a common coplanar resonator we use the three-stage process. The process includes following stages: I) epitaxial Al base layer deposition using two-step SCULL process \[S1\] and Al patterning with laser direct lithography (including transmon capacitor ground plane, waveguides, resonators and flux bias lines); II) double-angle evaporation of Josephson junctions followed by lift-off; III) resist-based low impedance crossover fabrication. SEM images of metamaterial and enlarged fragment of a Josephson junction SQUID are shown in Fig. S1.

The fabrication process starts with multi-step wet chemical cleaning of a high-resistivity intrinsic silicon sample \((\rho > 10000 \ \Omega \cdot cm, \ 525 \ \mu m \ \text{thick})\) in a Piranha solution \((1:4)\) followed by native oxide removal in HF \((1:50)\) for 120 seconds. Immediately after a 100 nm thick epitaxial Al base layer is deposited with UHV e-beam evaporation SCULL technique \[S1\] followed by its direct laser lithography patterning and dry etching in BCl\(_3/\text{Cl}2\)-based gasses. Than a two-layer e-beam resists stack \((300 \ \text{nm thick PMMA e-beam resist on top of a 500 nm thick MMA copolymer})\) is spin coated followed by 50 kV e-beam exposure. After development and oxygen plasma treatment, we performed UHV e-beam shadow evaporation of Al-AlOx-Al Josephson junctions \((62^\circ/0^\circ, \ 25/45 \ \text{nm})\). Low impedance free-standing crossovers are fabricated by means of a four-step \[S2\] process: (I) crossovers pads laser lithography, (II) 300 nm thick Al film e-beam deposition, (III) crossovers topology laser lithography; (IV) BCl\(_3/\text{Cl}2\)-based dry plasma etching. Finally, we stripped both resist layers in an NMP-based solvent.

E. Calibration

Spectroscopic measurements have been performed to determine device parameters such as Josephson energies of SQUID junctions, capacitive energies, coupling between qubits and common cavity, qubits and individual resonators, mutual inductance between coils and qubits, frequencies of resonators, flux biases of the SQUIDs. The measurements were performed first in wide range and high power to find the ranges of qubits and cavities frequencies, then they were repeated with lower power and narrow frequency ranges. The typical results of these measurements are presented in Fig. S2 (a), (b), (d), (e).

For each flux configuration, the maximum response of two-tone spectroscopy is taken as qubit frequency, minimum response of singletone – resonator frequency. Outlier points are dropped, after we extract device parameters by fitting data with Tavis-Cummings model:

\[
\hat{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_{\text{ind}} \hat{a}_{\text{ind}}^{\dagger} \hat{a}_{\text{ind}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} f_{\text{com}} \hat{a}_{\text{com}}^{\dagger} \hat{a}_{\text{com}} + \sum_{i=1}^{N} g_{\text{ind}} \sqrt{f_{\text{ind}} f_{\text{q}} (\hat{a}_{\text{ind}}^{\dagger} + \hat{a}_{\text{ind}}) (\hat{a}^{\dagger} + \hat{a}^{-} +)} + \]

FIG. S1: (a): SEM image of a twenty five qubits array (b): SEM image of a Josephson junction SQUID with low impedance crossover.
FIG. S2: Typical spectra used to calibration and fitting residuals. (a): Singletone spectroscopy of individual resonator. (b): Adaptive two-tone spectroscopy. (c): Check accuracy of setting qubits into desired frequency. (d): Singletone spectroscopy of common cavity. (e): Two-tone spectroscopy tuning voltage of coil connected to another qubit. (f): Distributions of residuals from two-tone spectra used for calibration or check frequencies. Solid black line was calculated from dispersion and average of distribution. (a)-(e) Red solid lines were calculated using Tavis-Cummings model, black dots is data used for fitting task.

$$+$

$$\sum_{i=1}^{N} g_{com}^i \sqrt{f_{com} f_{q}^i (\hat{a}_{com}^+ + \hat{a}_{com}) (\hat{a}_{q}^{i+} + \hat{a}_{q}^{i-})}$$

(S20)

where indexes $com$, $ind$, $q$ corresponds to common, individual resonators, qubit, $i$ is number of qubit, $f$ is frequency, $a$ and $a^\dagger$ is annihilation and creation operators. The hamiltonian was limited by the first excited level.

For the dependence of bare transmon frequency on SQUID flux we use formula.

$$f(\phi) = \sqrt{8E_C((E_{J1} + E_{J2})^2 \cos^2 \phi + (E_{J1} - E_{J2})^2 \sin^2 \phi)^\frac{1}{4}} - E_C,$$

(S21)

where $E_{J1}$ and $E_{J2}$ are Josephson energies of the DC SQUIDs’ junctions, $E_C$ is the transmon charging energy, $\phi = \frac{2\pi \phi_0}{\Phi_0}$ is dimensionless magnetic flux through the SQUID. We assume linear dependence of SQUID fluxes on DC voltage applied to the coils.

$$\phi_i = \sum_j L_{ij} V_j + \phi_0^i,$$

(S22)

where index $i$ corresponds to qubit number, $j$ to coil number, $\phi_0^i$ is frozen dimensionless magnetic flux through the SQUID.

The effective frequency of a specific transmon was chosen as the frequency of mode with the largest participation in this transmon. The fitting was performed with a least-squares cost function. The distribution of residuals is shown on Fig. S2 f (black bar). The root mean square error is 20 MHz.

Setting transmon to some frequency we consider its interaction with individual resonator. So, to set transmon frequencies to the desired values we find corresponding bare qubit frequency using coupled linear oscillator model

$$f = \frac{f_s + f_r}{2} \pm \frac{\sqrt{(f_s - f_r)^2 + 4gf_s f_r}}{2},$$

where $f_s$, $f_r$ and $f_c$ corresponds to frequency of coupled system, qubit and resonator, $g$ - coupling constant. Then fluxes were calculated using formula and then solved the linear system of equations.

To evaluate control frequency accuracy independently we perform two-tone spectroscopy measurement setting all qubits to equal desired frequency and then tuning one of them in some range, while other are persisted in their position. Typical result of this measurements and distribution of residuals (red bar) are shown on Fig. S2 (c) and (f), correspondingly. The root mean square error is also equal to 20 MHz and this let us consider this value as accuracy of setting transmon frequencies.
F. Processing of experimental data

Average transmission amplitudes for different spreads $\Delta$ are shown in Fig. S3. It follows from the theory, that on complex plane we should have straight lines tending to zero with increasing number of qubits in the array $N$ for each value of $\Delta$. It is seen from the Fig. S3, that experimental curves are close to straight lines but tend to the same nonzero value. As it mentioned in the main text one reason of such behaviour is the appearance of Fano resonance. In our post processing we had to introduce phenomenological corrections to eliminate this parasitic effect. Corrections are selected the same for all curves. A typical example of such processing is shown in Fig. S3 (b), where you can see the dependence of the absolute value of the transmission signal on the number of resonant qubits for the initial data and for the data after elimination the Fano resonance influence.

An additional processing step was made to take into account the difference between the real distribution and the random flat distribution due to calibration errors Fig. S2 (f). These errors prevent us from using a simple analytical calculation of the integral $S_{12}$. For comparison the analytical and numerical solution of this integral for different spreads $\Delta$ is shown in Fig. S3 (c). A significant discrepancy is observed at small values of $\Delta$. For subsequent calculations presented in the main text we used a numerical approach, in order to determine the effective width of distribution.

The influence of these errors is shown in Fig. 5, where presented inverted averaged transmission coefficient $|1/\langle S_{21} \rangle|$ for initial $\Delta$ (a) and corrected (b). The raw data is well fitted by different lines for each width of distribution, while processed data - by one line.

![FIG. S3: Processing of experimental data. (a) - average of transmission amplitude on complex plane from the number of resonant qubits for different distribution spreads $\Delta$. (b) - dependence of the absolute value of average transmission amplitude on $N$ for initial experimental data and after elimination the Fano resonance, (c) - the integral $\langle S_{12} \rangle$ value dependence on the random distribution spread calculated analytically and numerically to account for calibration errors.](image)
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