

## Communicating Josephson Qubits

F. Plastina<sup>1</sup> and G. Falci<sup>2</sup><sup>(1)</sup> NEST-INFM & Scuola Normale Superiore, I-56127 Pisa, Italy<sup>(2)</sup> NEST-INFM & Dipartimento di Metodologie Fisiche e Chimiche (DMFCI),  
Università di Catania, viale A. Doria 6, I-95125 Catania, Italy

(Dated: February 6, 2022)

We propose a scheme to implement a quantum information transfer protocol with a superconducting circuit and Josephson charge qubits. The information exchange is mediated by an L-C resonator used as a data bus. The main decoherence sources are analyzed in detail.

PACS numbers: 74.50.+r, 03.67.Hk, 73.23.Hk

One of the main purposes of quantum information processing is the faithful transmission of quantum states between distant parties, eventually exploiting entanglement among subsystems. Examples include quantum teleportation<sup>1</sup> and dense coding<sup>2</sup>, both of them demonstrated using entangled photon pairs<sup>3</sup>, with the ultimate aim of performing quantum cryptography<sup>4</sup>.

Until now, however, much of the work has been done within the realm of quantum optics<sup>5</sup> and very little efforts have been devoted to describe and implement these phenomena with solid state devices. On the other hand, nano-electronic devices have been proposed as candidates for quantum computer implementation<sup>6,7,8,9</sup> since they are easily embedded in electronic circuits and scaled up to contain a large number of qubits. In particular, superconducting Josephson junction circuits, whose fabrication is now performed with well established lithographic methods, combine the intrinsic stability of the superconducting phase with the possibility of controlling the circuit dynamics through manipulations of the applied voltages or magnetic fluxes<sup>10</sup>. Direct experimental evidence that a single-Cooper-pair box can be used as a controllable coherent two level system has been provided by Nakamura et al.<sup>11</sup>.

Either the charge on the island or the phase differences at junction can be used to store and manipulate quantum information<sup>12</sup>, the two regimes being characterized by dominating charging and Josephson energies, respectively. Here, we concentrate on the charge regime and propose a set-up that allows quantum information transfer and entanglement generation between two Josephson qubits. The circuit is designed so that interaction between the two subsystems is mediated by an L-C resonator, see Fig. 1, playing the role of a data bus. The spirit of the proposal is very similar to the Cirac-Zoller scheme for trapped ion qubit<sup>13</sup>. As will be shown below, this set-up is flexible enough to allow for quantum information transfer from one qubit to another and for the generation of Bell states. Furthermore, the circuit can be generalized to include more qubits and we give the necessary prescriptions to implement a universal set of quantum gates.

The coupling of a single charge qubit to a large Josephson junction (which may implement the resonator) has been recently exploited to perform on chip quan-

tum state measurements<sup>15</sup>, and to prepare a mesoscopic Schrodinger cat state<sup>16</sup>. We consider here a similar coupling, but replace the single junction with a SQUID to achieve a tuning of the Josephson energy<sup>7</sup>, which allows to operate in both the dispersive and the resonant coupling regimes, as required by the protocols described below.

We first analyze the model for a single qubit coupled to the resonator. Letting  $\phi_J$  be the effective phase for the SQUID<sup>12</sup>,  $\phi_r$  the phase difference across the resonator capacitance, and  $Q$  and  $P$  their conjugated charges, the system Hamiltonian reads ( $\hbar = 1$ )

$$H = \frac{Q^2}{2C_q} + qV_gQ + E_J(\phi_J) \cos(2e\phi_J) + \frac{PQ}{C_k} + \frac{P^2}{2C_p} + \frac{\phi_r^2}{2L} + pV_gP \quad (1)$$

where the capacitances are given by (see Fig. 1)  $C_q = C_g + C_J + (C_c^{-1} + C_r^{-1})^{-1}$ ,  $C_p = C_r + [C_c^{-1} + (C_c + C_J)^{-1}]^{-1}$ ,  $C_k = C_q(C_c + C_r) = C_c$ , and with attenuation parameters  $q = C_g/C_q$  and  $p = C_g/C_k$ . The relevant energy scales are the charging energy,  $E_{ch} = 2e^2/C_q$ , the resonator frequency  $\omega_r = (LC_p)^{-1/2}$ , and the effective Josephson coupling of the SQUID,  $E_J(\phi_J) = E_{J0} \cos(2e\phi_J)$ , tunable via an external magnetic flux  $\phi_J$ .

We consider the charge regime ( $E_{ch} \gg E_J$ ), where only the two lowest charge states ( $Q = 0; 2e$ ) of the small island come into play, allowing to employ it as a qubit. The electrostatic splitting between these two states is determined by the gate voltage  $V_g$ , which we fix by setting  $Q_g = C_g V_g = e$ . This choice is crucial for what follows, as we will show that decoherence effects are strongly quenched at this working point. The eigenstates of the qubit Hamiltonian,  $|j_i\rangle = (|0\rangle + i|2\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ , are then used as logical basis states.

If the qubit and the oscillator are tuned near resonance,  $\omega_r \approx E_J$ , the system described by Eq. (1) implements the Jaynes-Cummings Hamiltonian<sup>17</sup>

$$H_{JC} = \frac{E_J}{2} z^\dagger z + \omega_r a^\dagger a + ig(z^\dagger + z)(a^\dagger + a) \quad (2)$$

where  $z = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(j_+ - j_-)$ ,  $j_\pm = (j_\pm^\dagger)^\dagger = j_\mp^\dagger$  and  $g = \frac{E_J}{2} \frac{1}{C_k} e^{-2\phi_r/C_p}$ . To obtain Eq. (2), we introduced the usual ladder operators for the resonator and

performed the Rotating Wave Approximation (RWA), assuming the coupling to be almost resonant and weak,  $E_j \approx E_r \approx E_j + \hbar\omega_r$  and  $g \approx \hbar\omega_r/2$ . This Hamiltonian generates Rabi oscillations between the states  $|j; n_r\rangle$  and  $|j; n_r + 1\rangle$  at the frequency  $2R_{n_r} = \hbar\omega_r \sqrt{1 + 4g^2/(n_r + 1)}$ . We will need to take into account only oscillator states with at most  $n_r = 1$ . Exploiting the external flux dependence of  $E_j$ , it is possible to switch between nearly resonant ( $\omega_r \approx \omega_j$ ) and dispersive regime ( $\omega_r \gg \omega_j$ ). In the latter case, the time evolution is effectively generated by

$$H_{\text{int}}^{\text{eff}} = \frac{g^2}{\omega_r} a a^\dagger j^\dagger i \hbar + j^\dagger a^\dagger a j i \hbar : \quad (3)$$

The resonant coupling allows to accomplish a quantum state transfer, whereas switching between the two regimes is required to perform a two-qubit gate. If  $\omega_r$  and  $E_j$  are very different from one another, the coupling is effectively switched off and the qubit evolves independently from the resonator.

As suggested by<sup>15,16</sup>, a large current biased Josephson junction can be used as a resonator. For bias current  $I$  well below the critical value  $I_c$ , the phase  $\phi_r$  of the large junction is trapped in one of the minima of the tilted washboard potential, so that the system approximately behaves harmonically with  $\omega_r$  determined by the current. This dependence of  $\omega_r$  on  $I$ , gives a second (and independent) mechanism to move to the resonant regime<sup>18</sup>.

We consider, now, the two-qubit set-up of Fig. 1, and take for simplicity  $C_c = C_q$ , so that the direct electrostatic interaction between the two qubits ( $C_c^2 = C_q^2$ ) can be neglected and they only interact through the resonator via  $H_{JC}$  (in fact,  $C_p$ , the  $C_q$ 's and  $g$  are slightly modified, but the changes are negligible for small  $C_c$ ). To illustrate the use of the oscillator as a data bus, we show how the quantum state of qubit a can be transferred to b. Let us suppose that the three subsystems are initialized independently with qubit b in  $|j\rangle$  and the resonator in its ground state:

$$|j; 0\rangle_i = (c_+ |j+1\rangle + c_- |j-1\rangle) |j\rangle_i |0\rangle_i : \quad (4)$$

In the first step, the state of qubit a is transferred to the data bus by resonantly coupling them for a time  $\tau = \pi/2g$ . This leads to the state  $|j; i\rangle = |j\rangle_i |i\rangle_i + (c_+ |j+1\rangle + c_- |j-1\rangle) |j\rangle_i$ : We then de-couple qubit a and perform the same operation on qubit b. Then, the system is led to

$$|j; 2\rangle_i = |j\rangle_i (c_+ |j+1\rangle + c_- |j-1\rangle) |j\rangle_i \quad (5)$$

Thus, the state of one qubit has been transferred to the other one by exploiting the intermediary action of the resonator.

In a similar way, a maximally entangled singlet state can be obtained by adapting a protocol already realized with atoms and cavity<sup>19</sup>. The underlying idea is very simple: first to entangle a and r, and then swap the entanglement by just "exchanging" the states of the

oscillator and qubit b. With the system prepared in  $|j\rangle_i |j\rangle_i |0\rangle_i$ , we first let island a and the resonator to interact resonantly for a time  $\tau = \pi/2g$  and then allow for the same coupling (but lasting a time  $\tau$ ) to be experienced by island b. This procedure gives rise to the EPR state  $1/\sqrt{2} (|j+1\rangle_i |j\rangle_i + |j\rangle_i |j+1\rangle_i) |0\rangle_i$ . Note that, although the oscillator is left in the ground state after the operations, it actively mediates between the qubits. From the physical point of view, this is the main difference with respect to the scheme of Shnirman et al.<sup>17</sup>, where the oscillator is only virtually excited. As a consequence, when evaluating dephasing effects, the oscillator needs to be included explicitly (as we will do below).

Besides quantum state transfer and entanglement generation, the set-up allows to implement a universal set of quantum logic gates. Indeed, single-qubit rotations can be obtained by applying AC voltage pulses on the qubit gate electrode. Furthermore, a two-qubit gate (equivalent to the control phase up to a one-qubit operation) can be accomplished through the following four steps i) couple qubit a to the oscillator in the dispersive regime for a time  $t_1$  (with b de-coupled and the resonator initially prepared in  $|0\rangle_i$ ). This leaves the state  $|j\rangle_i$  unaffected, while appending the phase factor  $e^{-i\phi}$  to  $|j+1\rangle_i$ , with  $\phi = g^2 t_1$ ; ii) transfer the state of a to the oscillator as in the previous protocol (i.e. let the two systems interact for a time  $\tau$ ); iii) qubit a being de-coupled, let r and b interact in the dispersive regime, again for time  $t_1$ ; iv) transfer back the state of the oscillator to qubit a [same operation as in the step ii)]. The resulting gate is represented in the base  $|j\rangle_i |j\rangle_i$  as

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{-i\phi} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & e^{-i\phi} \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} |j\rangle_i |j\rangle_i \\ |j+1\rangle_i |j\rangle_i \\ |j\rangle_i |j+1\rangle_i \\ |j+1\rangle_i |j+1\rangle_i \end{pmatrix} : \quad (6)$$

The treatment given so far has to be extended to account for unwanted decoherence effects, whose major sources are electromagnetic fluctuations of the circuit and noise originating from bistable charged impurities located close to the islands. To estimate the time scales for relaxation and decoherence during operations, we focus on the single-qubit plus resonator scheme<sup>20</sup>, depicted in Fig. 2.

We first consider noise due to circuit impedances, modeled as harmonic oscillators reservoirs. Their effect on the system can be described via the hamiltonian<sup>12,21</sup>

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^N \hbar \omega_i a_i^\dagger a_i + \hbar \sum_{i=1}^N g_i (a_i^\dagger + a_i) \hat{K} + B(Q; P; \phi_r) \quad (7)$$

Each  $H^{\text{env}}$  describes a set of harmonic oscillators. The coupling term contains the operators  $\hat{K}$  acting on the system, and collective environment operators  $\hat{E}$ , whose fluctuations determine decoherence. The counter-term  $B(Q; P; \phi_r)$  enters only the proper determination of energy shifts and will be disregarded from now on.

The explicit form of  $\hat{K}$  and  $\hat{E}$  can be obtained by standard circuit analysis and by imposing that classical

voltage and current fluctuations are reproduced in the proper limit<sup>12,23</sup>. This gives<sup>24</sup>  $\hat{K}_1 = \hat{q}Q + \hat{p}P$  and  $\hat{K}_2 = \hat{r}$ , and allows to identify the fluctuation spectra  $S(\omega)$  of the environment operators  $\hat{E}$  (i.e. the Fourier transforms of their symmetric equilibrium correlation functions) as

$$S_1(\omega) = \omega \operatorname{Re} \frac{Z_1(\omega)}{1 + i\omega Z_1(\omega)C_{\text{eff}}(\omega)} \coth \frac{\omega}{2}$$

$$S_2(\omega) = \omega \operatorname{Re} [Z_2(\omega)]^{-1} \coth \frac{\omega}{2}$$

with  $C_{\text{eff}}(\omega) = C_g$ .

We now evaluate the effect of  $H$  on the eigenstates of  $H_{JC}$  supposing a weak coupling with the environment (the attenuation parameters  $\gamma_q$  and  $\gamma_p$  and the impedances can be chosen to fulfill this condition). The spectrum of  $H_{JC}$  is made up of a ground state,  $|j\rangle = |0\rangle$ , and a series of dressed doublets,

$$|j(n_r)\rangle = \cos n_r \theta |j\rangle + n_r i + i \sin n_r \theta |j\rangle + n_r + 1 i$$

$$|j(n_r)\rangle = i \sin n_r \theta |j\rangle + n_r i + \cos n_r \theta |j\rangle + n_r + 1 i$$

with eigenenergies  $(n_r + 1/2)\omega_r - R_{n_r}$ , and where  $\tan 2n_r \theta = 2g\sqrt{n_r + 1}$ . Only  $|j\rangle$  and the first doublet,  $|j,1\rangle, |j,0\rangle$ , are involved in the coherent operations described so far. In the secular approximation<sup>22</sup>, relaxation and dephasing rates in this subspace can be expressed in terms of the quantities

$$\Gamma_{if}(\omega) = 2 \operatorname{Im} \langle j | \hat{K} | j \rangle S(\omega) : \quad (8)$$

For instance, the dynamics of the populations is governed by a master equation with transition rates given by  $\Gamma_{if} = [1 + \exp(-\beta\hbar\omega)]^{-1} \Gamma_{if}(\omega)$ , the standard Golden Rule result.

If  $Z_2$  represents a resistor, the contributions of the second bath become  $\gamma_p = 1/(Z_2 C_p)$  (see table I), and simply reflect the finite quality factor of the resonator. On the other hand,  $Z_1$  affects both the qubit and the oscillator, thus perturbing the overall system through two interfering channels. As a result, the relaxation rate for  $|j,1\rangle$  is reduced if  $\gamma_p = \gamma_q$  for  $\theta = 0$ . Even if this condition is not met, one of the eigenstates can be made more stable by choosing an optimum<sup>24</sup>.

	$ j\rangle =  j,1\rangle$	$ j\rangle =  j,0\rangle$	$ j\rangle =  j,1\rangle$
$\gamma = 1$	$\gamma_q$	$\gamma_q \cos^2 \theta + \gamma_p \sin^2 \theta$	$i\gamma_q \sin \theta \cos \theta + \gamma_p \cos \theta \sin \theta$
$\gamma = 2$	0	$i(2\gamma_q)^{-1} \sin \theta$	$(2\gamma_q)^{-1} \cos \theta$
$\gamma = 3$	$\gamma_q^{-1}$	$\gamma_q^{-1} \cos^2 \theta + \gamma_k^{-1} \sin^2 \theta$	$i(\gamma_q^{-1} \sin \theta \cos \theta + \gamma_k^{-1} \cos \theta \sin \theta)$

TABLE I: Relevant matrix elements  $\langle j | \hat{K} | j \rangle$  of the coupling operators with the electromagnetic ( $\gamma = 1; 2$ ) and the 1=f ( $\gamma = 3$ ) environments. Diagonal elements are equal, e.g.  $\langle j | \hat{K}_1 | j,1\rangle = \langle j | \hat{K}_1 | j,0\rangle = \langle j | \hat{K}_1 | j,1\rangle = \gamma_q$ . Matrix elements  $\langle j | \hat{K} | j \rangle$  vanish. Here  $c = \cos \theta$ ,  $s = \sin \theta$  and  $\gamma_k = \gamma_p / \epsilon^2$ .

Two important consequences come from the structure of the matrices  $\langle j | \hat{K} | j \rangle$  reported in table I. First,

all matrix elements between the states of the doublet vanish, implying that the relatively small frequency  $\omega_{ab}$  never comes directly into play in the rates. As a consequence, coherence is well preserved in the usual temperature regime of operation,  $g < T \ll E_J$ . A second, crucial property is that each matrix  $\langle j | \hat{K} | j \rangle$  has equal diagonal elements. This implies that the dephasing rates,  $\Gamma_{ij}$ , for the off-diagonal entries  $\langle ij |$  of the reduced density matrix, do not contain "adiabatic" terms, and, therefore, are independent of the zero frequency spectra. Both properties of the  $\hat{K}$ 's directly result from the choice  $Q_g = e$ . In a sense, the gate charge can be seen as a knob which allows to operate at this "optimal" point, where low frequency noise does not dephase the system. At the temperatures of interest the largest dephasing rate is

$$\Gamma_{ab} = \frac{1}{2} (\gamma_a \gamma_g + \gamma_b \gamma_g) \frac{1}{2} X [\gamma_{ag}(\omega_{ag}) + \gamma_{bg}(\omega_{bg})] \quad (9)$$

The quenched sensitivity to low frequency fluctuations is crucial in the analysis of dephasing due to charged impurities lying close to the island, responsible for 1=f noise.

Dephasing due to fluctuating impurities is believed to be the most relevant problem in Josephson devices operating in the charge regime. In general, for such an environment of fluctuators with a wide range of switching rates, correlation times are too long for a master equation approach to be always valid. Indeed, due to their discrete character<sup>25</sup>, slower fluctuators contribute to decoherence in a distinctive manner, particularly marked when adiabatic terms enter the dephasing rates. However, as shown above, dephasing due to small frequency fluctuations is minimized at  $Q_g = e$ . In this case an estimate of the order of magnitude of the effect can be obtained if the coupling with the environment is treated to second order<sup>26</sup>, which is equivalent to mimic the effect of fluctuating impurities with a suitable oscillator environment. Then, Eqs. (8,9) are still valid, and the term describing 1=f noise contains

$$S_3(\omega) = S_Q(\omega) = \frac{A \epsilon^2}{\omega} \quad (10)$$

where  $S_Q(\omega)$  is the power spectrum of the charge fluctuations in the island, whose amplitude can be inferred from independent measurements<sup>27</sup>.

We now give some estimates of the relevant parameters of the setup, and show that state transfer and entanglement generation can be obtained with devices and circuits which are routinely fabricated. For instance, we can take a large Josephson junction as a resonator, with  $C_r = 1 \text{ pF}$ ,  $\omega_r \approx 37 \text{ eV}$ . A low-temperature sub-gap resistance  $R_2 > 600 \text{ K}$  (here modeled by the parallel impedance) can be achieved with Nb-based junctions, which yields a quality factor  $\omega_r R_2 C_r > 4 \times 10^4$ . For the box we take  $E_J = 40 \text{ eV}$  (eventually reduced by an external flux),  $C_J = 0.5 \text{ fF}$ ,  $C_g = 20 \text{ aF}$  and

$R_1 = 50 \text{ } \Omega$ . Furthermore, by taking  $C_c = 50 \text{ aF}$ , we obtain  $g' = 0.5 \text{ GHz}$  which allows operations on a time scale  $< 2 \text{ ns}$ . With this choice, the box charging energy is  $\approx 0.6 \text{ meV}$ , so it operates in the charging regime. Moreover we have  $g \gg \Gamma_r$  which ensures that the RWA is valid, and, as we will see,  $g$  is much larger than the environment induced level broadening, which guarantees the correctness of the secular approximation leading to equations (8,9). These parameters lead to the following estimates of the dephasing times due to circuit fluctuations,  $\tau_1 \approx 1 \text{ s}$  and  $\tau_2 \approx 120 \text{ s}$ . For background charge noise,  $A = 10^{-7}$  in equation (10)

gives  $\tau_3 \approx 1 \text{ s}$ . The resulting overall dephasing time is  $\tau = 1/\tau_{\text{ab}} \approx 376 \text{ ns}$ , allowing for the two communication protocols. To achieve the two-bit gate, a somewhat larger dephasing time is required, which can be obtained within the present technology by improving the quality factor of the resonator.

We thank B. Ruggiero, O. Buisson, M. G. Overmalle, Yu. Makhlin, E. Paladino, G. M. Palma and R. Fazio, F. Hekking for many helpful discussions. This work has been supported by EU under IST-FET contracts EQUIP and SUBIT, by INFM under contract PRA-SSQI, and by MIUR under contract 2001028294.

- <sup>1</sup> C. H. Bennett et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 70, 1895 (1993).
- <sup>2</sup> C. H. Bennett and S. J. Wiesner, Phys. Rev. Lett. 69, 2881 (1992).
- <sup>3</sup> K. Mattle et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 4656 (1996); D. Bouwmeester et al, Nature 390, 575 (1997); D. Boschi et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 1121 (1998).
- <sup>4</sup> C. H. Bennett and P. Shor, Science 284, 747 (1999).
- <sup>5</sup> L. M. Duane et al, Nature 414, 413 (2001).
- <sup>6</sup> D. Loss and D. P. DiVincenzo, Phys. Rev. A 57, 120 (1998); D. Loss and E. Sukhorukov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 1035 (2000).
- <sup>7</sup> A. Shnirman et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 2371 (1997); D. A. Averin, Sol. State Comm. 105 659 (1998); Yu. Makhlin et al, Nature, 398, 305 (1999).
- <sup>8</sup> J. E. Mooij et al, Science 285, 1036 (1999); L. B. Ioannidis et al, Nature 398, 679 (1999).
- <sup>9</sup> F. P. Laustina et al, Phys. Rev. B 64, 113306 (2001).
- <sup>10</sup> V. Bouchiat et al, Physica Scripta T 76, 165 (1998).
- <sup>11</sup> Y. Nakamura et al, Nature 398, 786 (1999).
- <sup>12</sup> Y. Makhlin et al, Rev. Mod. Phys. 73, 357 (2001).
- <sup>13</sup> J. I. Cirac et al, Science 272, 1207 (1996).
- <sup>14</sup> Macroscopic Quantum Coherence and Quantum Computing, edited by D. V. Averin, B. Ruggiero and P. Silvestrini (Kluwer, New York, 2001).
- <sup>15</sup> O. Buisson and F. W. J. Hekking, in Ref.<sup>14</sup>, pag. 137; D. Vion et al, Science, 296, 886 (2002).
- <sup>16</sup> F. Marquardt and V. Buder, Phys. Rev. B 63, 054514 (2001).
- <sup>17</sup> E. T. Jaynes and F. W. Cummings, Proc. IEEE 51, 89 (1963).
- <sup>18</sup> Since  $I$  cannot become so large, one necessarily has to change  $E_J(\phi)$  to decouple the qubit.
- <sup>19</sup> E. Hagley et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 1 (1997).
- <sup>20</sup> M. G. Overmalle et al, Chem. Phys. 268, 273 (2001).
- <sup>21</sup> A. O. Caldeira and A. J. Leggett, Ann. Phys. (N.Y.) 149, 374 (1983); U. Weiss Quantum Dissipative Systems, World Scientific (Singapore, 1999).
- <sup>22</sup> C. Cohen-Tannoudji, J. Dupont-Roc and G. Grynberg,

Atom-Photon Interaction (John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1992).

<sup>23</sup> J. Sievert et al, Europhys. Lett. 38, 365 (1997).

<sup>24</sup> G. Falci, F. Pastina, in preparation.

<sup>25</sup> E. Paladino et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 228304 (2002).

<sup>26</sup> E. Paladino et al, in Ref.<sup>14</sup>, pag. 359; A. Cottet et al, ibidem, pag. 111.

<sup>27</sup> A. B. Zorin et al, Phys. Rev. B 53, 13682 (1996); M. C. Over-




FIG. 1: Schematics of the superconducting circuit with two qubits coupled via the resonator.




FIG. 2: One qubit coupled to the resonator in the presence of the decohering reservoirs (the third of which represents a bath of fluctuating charge impurities).

ington et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84 5192 (2000); Y. Nakamura, et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 047901 (2002).