Coupling Josephson qubits via a current-biased inform ation bus

LF.Wei,^{1,2} Yu-xiLiu,¹ and Franco Nori^{1,3}

¹Frontier Research System, The Institute of Physical and Chemical Research (RIKEN), Wako-shi, Saitama, 351-0198, Japan

²Institute of Quantum Optics and Quantum Information, Department of Physics,

Shanghai Jiaotong University, Shanghai 200030, P.R. China

³Center for Theoretical Physics, Physics Department, CSCS,

The University of M ichigan, Ann Arbor, M ichigan 48109–1120

(D ated: M arch 22, 2024)

Josephson qubits without direct interaction can be e ectively coupled by sequentially connecting them to an information bus: a current-biased large Josephson junction treated as an oscillator with adjustable frequency. The coupling between any qubit and the bus can be controlled by modulating the magnetic ux applied to that qubit. This tunable and selective coupling provides two-qubit entangled states for implementing elementary quantum logic operations, and for experimentally testing Bell's inequality.

PACS.74.50.+ r - P roxim ity e ects, weak links, tunneling phenom ena, and Josephson e ects. PACS.03.67 Lx - Quantum computation.

PACS.03.65 JJ d - Entanglement and quantum nonlocality (e.g. EPR paradox, Bell's inequalities, GHZ states, etc.).

Superconducting circuits with Josephson junctions offer one of the most promising candidates for realizing quantum computation [1, 2, 3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9, 10, 11, 12, 13, 14, 15, 16]. These superconducting qubits can be either charge- [2], ux- [3], m ixed- [4], current-biased Josephson-junction (CBJJ) qubits [5, 6], and others. Much attention is now devoted to realizing controlled couplings between superconducting qubits and implementing quantum logic operations (see, e.g., [7, 8, 9, 10, 11]). Two qubits, i and j, can be connected by a common inductor or capacitor, with Ising-(i) ^(j) (= x;y;orz). However, in type couplings general, (1) the capacitive coupling [8, 12] between qubits is not tunable (and thus adjusting the physical param eters for realizing two-qubit operation is not easy), and (2) a large inductance is required in [7] to achieve a reasonably high interaction strength and speed for twoqubit operations [10]. A Itematively, other schemes (see, e.g., [11, 13, 14]) use sequential interactions of individualqubits with an inform ation bus. These provide som e advantages: allow faster two-qubit operations, m ay possess longer decoherence times, and are scalable. These schemes are similar to the techniques used for trapped ions [17], where the ions are entangled by exciting and de-exciting quanta (data bus) of their shared collective vibrationalm odes.

C om pared to the externally-connected LC -resonator used in Ref. [13] and the cavity QED mode proposed in Ref. [14], a large (e.g., 10 m) CBJJ [6, 15] is more suitable as an information bus, because its eigenfrequency can be controlled by adjusting the applied bias current. In fact, such data bus to couple distant qubits has been proposed in [11]. However, there all non-resonant interactions between the qubits and the bus were ignored. This is problematic because these near-resonance interactions m ust be considered, otherwise, the desired coupling/decoupling between the chosen qubit and the bus cannot be im plemented because a perfect resonance condition is not always achievable. A lso, modulating the bias current to selectively couple di erent qubits changes the physical characteristics (e.g., eigenfrequency) of the bus, and thus may yield additional errors during the com - munication between qubits. Finally, an e ective method still lacks for refocusing the dynamical-phase shifts of the qubits to realize the desired quantum operations.

Here, we propose an e ective scheme for coupling any pair of superconducting qubits without direct interaction between them by letting these be sequentially connected to a large CBJJ that acts as a data bus. The qubit in Ref. [12] is a CBJJ, while here we consider charge qubits. Here, a large CBJJ acts only as the inform ation bus between the qubits. A lso, in contrast to Ref. [11], in the present circuit any chosen qubit can be coupled to and decouple from the bus by switching on and o its Josephson energy. The bias current applied to the bus is xed during the operations, and the dynam icalphase shifts of the qubits can be conveniently refocused by properly setting the free-evolution times of the bus. Therefore, an entanglem ent between distant qubits can be created in a controllable way for realizing quantum computation, and also for testing Bell's inequality. Its experimental realizability is also brie y discussed.

Model. Without loss of generality, we consider the simplest network sketched in Fig. 1. It can be easily modi ed to include arbitrary qubits. Each qubit consists of a gate electrode of capacitance C_g and a single-Cooper-pair box with two ultrasmall identical Josephson junctions of capacitance q_{I} and Josephson energy ", form ing a superconducting quantum interference device (SQUD) ring threaded by a ux and with a gate voltage V. The superconducting phase di erence across the kth qubit is represented by $_k$, k = 1;2. The large CBJJ has capacitance C_b, phase drop _b, Josephson energy E_{b} , and a bias current I_{b} . The qubit is assumed to work in the charge regime with $k_B T$ $\rm E_{C}$ ΕJ wherein quasi-particle tunnelling or excitations are e ec-




FIG. 1: A pair of SQUID-based charge qubits, located on the left of the dashed line, coupled to a large CBJJ on the right, which acts as an inform ation bus. The circuit is divided into two parts, the qubits and the bus. The dashed line only indicates a separation between these. The controllable gate voltage V_k (k = 1;2) and external ux $_k$ are used to manipulate the qubits and their interactions with the bus. The bus current remains xed during the operations.

tively suppressed. Here, k_B ; T; ; E_C , and E_J are the Boltzm ann constant, tem perature, superconducting gap, charging and Josephson coupling energies of the qubit, respectively. The present mechanism of quantum manipulation is signic cantly dierent from Refs. [7, 10, 11], although the circuits appear to be similar. The Ham iltonian for the circuit in Fig. 1 is

$$\hat{H} = \frac{X^{2}}{e^{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 4e^{2} & h & \eta_{g}^{(k)} \\ \frac{4e^{2}}{2C_{k}} & fh & \eta_{g}^{(k)} \\ + \frac{\hat{Q}_{b}^{2}}{2C_{b}} & E_{b} \cos^{2}_{b} & \frac{0}{2} \\ \frac{1}{2} & h & h \end{pmatrix} (1)$$

with $[\hat{k}; \hat{n}_k] = i$. Here, $\hat{Q}_b = 2 \hat{p}_{b} = 0$ is the operator of charges on the CBJJ and $[{}^{h}_{b}; p_{b}] = i \sim C_{J}^{(k)} =$ $2c_{J}^{(k)}, E_{J}^{(k)} = 2{"}_{J}^{(k)} \cos(k_{k} = 0), C_{k} = C_{g}^{(k)} + C_{J}^{(k)},$ $n_{g}^{(k)} = C_{g}^{(k)} V_{k} = (2e), \text{ and } C_{b} = C_{b} + \frac{P}{k=1}^{2} C_{J}^{(k)} C_{g}^{(k)} = C_{k}.$ $_0 = h = (2e)$ and n_k are the ux quantum and the excess num ber of C ooper pairs in the superconducting box of the kth qubit, respectively. W hen the applied gate voltage V_k is set near the degeneracy points (n_g^{(k)} = (l+ 1=2); l= 0;1;2; ...), then only the two low est-energy charge states, $\dot{\mathbf{n}}_k = 0\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{j}_k^*\mathbf{i}$ and $\dot{\mathbf{n}}_k = 1\mathbf{i} = \mathbf{j}_k^*\mathbf{i}$, play a role. The large CBJJ works in the phase regime and describes the motion of a \particle" with mass m = $C_b (_0=2)^2$ in a potential U ($_{\rm b}$) = $E_{\rm b}$ (cos $_{\rm b}$ + $I_{\rm b} _{\rm b}$ = $I_{\rm c}$) with $I_{\rm c}$ = 2 E_{b} = 0. For I_{b} < I_{c} , there exist a series of minima of U ($_{\rm b}$). Near these points, U ($_{\rm b}$) approximates a harmonic oscillator potential with characteristic frequency $8E_{c}^{(b)}E_{b} = -2$ 1 $(I_{b} = I_{c})^{2} = E_{c}^{(b)} = e^{2} = (2C_{b})$. $!_{b} =$ The approximate number of metastable quantum bound states [15] is N_s = 2^{3-4} E_b=E_c^(b) (1 J=I_c)⁵⁻⁴. For a low bias current, the dynam ics of the CBJJ can be safely

restricted [6] to the Hilbert space spanned by the two lowest states of this data bus: \mathcal{D}_{bi} and \mathcal{J}_{bi} .

The eigenenergy $\sim !_{LC}$ of the bus used in [7] is much higher than that of the qubits. Therefore, adiabatically elim inating such a bus yields a direct interbit coupling. However, the energy scale of our proposed data bus (i.e., 10 GHz [6], which is of the CBJJ oscillator) is $!_{\rm b}=2$ the same order of the Josephson energy (e.g., $E_J = h$ 13 GHz [2]). Therefore, the quanta in the present bus can be excited or de-excited when the qubit is operated. The Ham iltonian (1) clearly shows that the coupling between the chosen kth qubit and the bus can be turned on and [18], when the threaded ux_k di ers from or equals 0 to $(1^{0} + 1 = 2)_{0}$; $1^{0} = 0$; 1; 2; For simplicity, hereafter we let $l; l^0 = 0$. Two qubits can be indirectly coupled by independently interacting with the bus sequentially when exciting/de-exciting the vibrational quanta of the bus. Under the usual rotating-wave approximation, the dynamics for such a coupling mechanism can be described by the following e ective Ham iltonian

$$\hat{H}_{kb} = \hat{H}_{k} + \hat{H}_{b} + i_{k} + \hat{h}_{+}^{(k)} \hat{a}^{(k)} \hat{a}^{y}; \qquad (2)$$

$$\hat{H}_{k} = \frac{E_{J}^{(k)}}{2} \hat{r}_{z}^{(k)} - \frac{E_{C}^{(k)}}{2} \hat{r}_{x}^{(k)}; \quad \hat{H}_{b} = \sim !_{b} \quad \hat{n} + \frac{1}{2} ;$$

with
$$\hat{a} = \frac{q}{C_b!_b = \frac{1}{2}} + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{2}{2} + \frac{p}{2} + \frac{p}{2}$$

and $\hat{n} = \hat{a}^{y}\hat{a}$ being the Boson operators of the bus. Here, $E_{c}^{(k)} = \frac{2e^{2}}{p} (1 - 2n_{g}^{(k)}) = C_{k}, \quad k = k \cos(k = 0); \quad k = 0$ tors: ${}^{(k)}_{z} = \mathbf{j}_{k}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{h}_{k}\mathbf{j}$ $\mathbf{j}_{k}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{h}_{k}\mathbf{j}$ ${}^{(k)}_{+} = \mathbf{j}_{k}\mathbf{i}\mathbf{h}_{k}\mathbf{j}$ and $^{(k)} = \mathcal{D}_k \operatorname{ihl}_k \operatorname{jare de}$ ned in the subspace spanned by the logic states: $\mathcal{D}_k i = (j\#_k i + j''_k i) = 2$ and $\mathcal{J}_k i = 2$ $(j\#_k i j ''_k i) = \overline{2}$. Only the single-quantum transition process, approximated to st-order in [^]_b, is considered during the expansion of the cosine-term of the Ham iltonian $(1)_{d}$ as the uctuation of $_{b}$ is very weak. In fact, $C_g^{(k)}$ h h_b^2 i=C k . 10 2 1, for typical experim ental param eters [2, 6, 8]: C_b $6 \, \mathrm{pF}$, $!_{\mathrm{b}}=2$ 10 GHz, and $C_g^{(k)} = C_J^{(k)}$ 10². Once the bias current I_b is properly set up beforehand, various dynam ical evolutions can be induced by selecting the applied ux k and the gate voltage Vk. Considering two extrem e cases, the strongest coupling ($_{k}$ = 0) and the decoupling (k = 0=2), several typical realizable evolutions deduced from the Hamiltonian $q^{(2)}$ are given in table I. There, $\sim_{k} = "_{k} \sim !_{b}; "_{k} = [2"_{J}^{(k)}]^{2} + [E_{C}^{(k)}]^{2}.$

Q uantum gates. The physical characteristic (e.g., the eigenfrequency) of the bus in the present circuit does not need to be changed, once it is set up beforehand. It still undergoes a free evolution \hat{U}_0 (t) ruled by a non-zero \hat{H}_b during the operational delay, i.e., the time interval when the qubits do not evolve because their H am iltonians are tem porarily set to zero (when $_k = _0 = 2$; $V_k = e = C_g^{(k)}$).

Controllable Param eters	Evolutions
$V_k = e = C_g^{(k)}; k = 0 = 2$	Û₀ (t)
$V_k \in e=C_g^{(k)}; k = 0=2$	Û ₁ ^(k) (t)
$V_{k} = e = C_{g}^{(k)}; k = 0; \sim !_{b} = 2''_{J}^{(k)}$	Û ₂ ^(k) (t)
$V_k \in e=C_g^{(k)}; k = 0; 2_k n + 1 \sim k$	Û ₃ (t)

TABLE I: Typical settings of the controllable experimental parameters (V_k and _k) and the corresponding time evolutions $\hat{U}_{j}(t)$ of the qubit-bus system. Here, $C_{g}^{(k)}$ and $2"_{J}^{(k)}$ are the gate capacitance and the maximal Josephson energy of the kth SQUID based charge qubit. _k is the maximum strength of the coupling between the kth qubit with energy "_k and the bus of frequency !_b. The detuning between the qubit and the bus energies is ~ $_{k}$ = "_k ~ !_b. n = 0;1 is occupation number for the number state jni of the bus. The various time-evolution operators are: $\hat{U}_{0}(t), \hat{U}_{2}^{(k)} = A(t) \cos^{^{}}_{n} jk_{i} ihO_{k} j$ (sin $^{^{}}_{n}) \hat{a} = \frac{p_{c}^{(k)} \wedge _{k}^{(k)}}{n! + 1} jk_{k} ihI_{k} j + \hat{a}^{y} \sin^{^{}}_{n} = \hat{n}_{j} l_{k} ihO_{k} j + \cos^{^{}}_{n} jk_{k} ihO_{k} j = (k_{c}) l_{3}^{(k)} (t) = A(t) exp[it <math>_{k}^{2} [jl_{k} ihl_{k} j(n + 1) jk_{k} ihO_{k} j_{l}] = (k_{c}) l_{3}^{(k)} (t) = A(t) exp[it <math>_{k}^{2} [jl_{k} ihl_{k} j(n + 1) jk_{k} ihO_{k} j_{l}] = (k_{c}) l_{3}^{(k)} (t) = A(t) exp[it <math>_{k}^{2} [jl_{k} ihl_{k} j(n + 1) jk_{k} ihO_{k} j_{l}] = (k_{c}) l_{3}^{(k)} (t) = exp[it (Al_{b}^{2} + E_{J}^{(k)} \wedge _{z}^{(k)}) = (2 \cdot)], _{n}^{^{}} = 2 k t n + 1 = \cdot, and _{n}^{^{}} = 2 k t n = \cdot.$

Before and after the desired operations, the bus should remain in its ground state $\mathfrak{P}_{b}i$. In principle, the timeevolutions listed in table I are su cient to implement any desired operation for manipulating the quantum information stored in the present circuit. In fact, any single-qubit rotation, including the typical Hadam and gate: $\hat{H}_{g}^{(k)} = [\hat{\Gamma}_{z}^{(k)} + \hat{\Gamma}_{+}^{(k)} + \hat{\Gamma}_{z}^{(k)}] = \overline{2}$, on the kth qubit can be easily realized by selectively using $\hat{U}_{1}^{(k)}$ (t) and $\hat{U}_{3}^{(k)}$ (t). Any single-qubit operation is not in uenced by the free evolution of the bus during the time delay between successive operations.

In order to realize two-qubit gates, we must be able to couple distant qubits via their sequential interactions to the bus. We set the bias current I_b such that $\sim !_b = 2 "_J^{(1)}$ and then perform a three-step process. First, we couple the rst (control) qubit to the bus by switching o its applied ux 1 and produce the evolution $\hat{U}_2^{(1)}(t_1)$. A fier a duration t_1 determined by $\sin(2 t_1 = \sim) = 1$, the control qubit is decoupled from the bus. This process in plements the evolutions: $\hat{J}_b i \hat{J}_1 i$! $\hat{J}_b i \hat{J}_1 i$ and $\hat{J}_b i \hat{J}_1 i$! $\hat{J}_b i \hat{J}_1 i$. Next, we let the second (target) qubit work at a non-degenerate point ($V_2 \in e^{-C_g^{(2)}}$) and couple it to the bus by switching o its applied ux 2. A fier a duration t_2 determined by

$$\sin \frac{\frac{2}{2}t_2}{\frac{2}{2}} = \cos \frac{\mathbf{u}_2 t_2}{2^2} + \frac{\frac{2}{2}t_2}{2^{2}} = 1; \quad (3)$$

the target qubit is backed to its degenerate point (V₂ = $e=C_g^{(2)}$) and decoupled from the bus. This sequence of

operations generate the evolutions:

		e ⁱ Þ _b iÞ ₂ i; Þ _b i		
>	jl _b ij02i!	ie $i(+ !_b t_g)$ (cos ie $i(+ !_b t_g)$ (sin	₂jl₀ij0₂i+ si	n ₂ jl _b ijl ₂ i);
:	jl _b ijl2i!	ie $i(+ !_b t_g)$ (sin	2jl _b iβ2i α	os 2 jl _b ijl2i) ;

with = $\frac{1}{p_0} (1 + t_2 + 2) = 2 + \frac{2}{1} t_2 = (2^{-2} 2)$, and $t_g = \frac{p_0}{s=1} t_s + \frac{2}{s=1} s$. Finally, we couple again the control qubit to the bus and perform the evolution $\hat{U}_2^{(1)}(t_3)$ with $\sin(2 t_3 = -) = 1$, yielding evolutions: $\hat{D}_b i \hat{D}_1 i ! \hat{D}_b i \hat{D}_1 i$ and $\hat{J}_b i \hat{D}_1 i ! e^{-it_b t_3} \hat{D}_b i \hat{J}_1 i$. In practice, the free evolutions $\hat{U}_0(t_1)$ and $\hat{U}_0(t_2)$ exist during the time delays between the st (second) and second (third) pulses. If the delays are further set accurately such that the total duration t_g satis es the condition $\sin t_b t_g = 1$, then the above three-step process with two delays yields a quantum operation $\hat{U}(t_g) = \hat{U}_2^{(1)}(t_3)\hat{U}_0(t_2)\hat{U}_3^{(2)}(t_2)\hat{U}_0(t_1)\hat{U}_2^{(1)}(t_1) = \exp((t_1)\hat{D}_b j \hat{U}_d^{(12)}(t_2);$ with

$$\hat{U}_{d}^{(12)}(_{2}) = \begin{array}{c} 0 & & & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ B & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ C & 0 & 0 \cos_{2} & \sin_{2} \\ 0 & 0 & \sin_{2} & \cos_{2} \end{array}$$
(4)

being a universal two-qubit gate. Here, $\cos_2 = 2 {\tt u}_J^{(2)} = {\tt u}_2$. This gate can produce entanglement between qubits and also realize any quantum computation, accompanied by single-qubit rotations.

Testing Bell's inequality. Entanglement is a key ingredient for computational speedup in quantum com putation. Historically, Bell's inequalities were seen as an entanglem ent test: its violation im plies that entanglement must exist. For a two-qubit entangled state jei, the Clauser, Home, Shim ony and Holt (CHSH) form of Bell's inequality : f(j_ei) 2 is usually tested by experimentally measuring the CHSH function f(j $_{e}i$) = $\mathbf{E}(1; 2) + \mathbf{E}(\frac{0}{1}; 2) + \mathbf{E}(1; \frac{0}{2}) = \mathbf{E}(\frac{0}{1}; \frac{0}{2})$; Here, k are controllable classical variables and E (1; 2) is the correlation for the outcom es of separately projected measurements of two qubits. A num ber of experimental tests [20] of Bell's inequality have already been perform ed by using entangled photons and atom s. W e now show that a desired entangled state can be created in a repeatable way and thus Bell's inequality can also be tested experim entally by using this circuit.

We begin with an initial state $j_0 i = \mathcal{D}_b i \#_1 i \#_2 i = \mathcal{D}_b i$ $(\mathcal{D}_1 i + \mathcal{J}_1 i)$ $(\mathcal{D}_2 + \mathcal{J}_2 i) = 2$ with two qubits decoupled from the bus but working at their non-degenerate points (i.e., $V_k \in e=C_g^{(k)}$). A fler applying a H adam and gate $\hat{H_g}^{(2)}$ to the second qubit, the system evolves to the state $j_1 i = \mathcal{D}_b i$ $(\mathcal{D}_1 i + \mathcal{J}_1 i)$ $\mathcal{J}_2 i = 2$. The desired twoqubit entangled state is then generated as

 $j_{d}^{(12)}(_{1};_{2};_{2})i = \hat{U}_{1}^{(1)}(_{1})\hat{U}_{1}^{(2)}(_{2})\hat{U}_{d}^{(12)}(_{2})j_{1}i; (5)$ h i $w \text{ ith } \hat{U}_{1}^{(k)}(_{k}) = \exp i_{k} \gamma_{x}^{(k)} = 2; k = E_{C}^{(k)}t_{k} = \sim. \text{ The corresponding correlation function is } E(_{1};_{2};_{2}) =$

$$f(j_{d}^{(12)}(_{2})i) = \frac{p_{2}}{2} jsin_{2} (sin_{2} + 1)j;$$
(6)

It is easy to numerically check that Bell's inequality, f (j $_{d}^{(12)}$ ($_{2}$)i) 2, is violated when $E_{J}^{(2)} = E_{C}^{(2)} < 0.776$, which can be easily satisfied for this charge-qubit system.

Experimentally, the above procedure can be repeated many times at each of the four sets of angles and thus the correlation function $E(_1;_2;_2) = N_{sam e}(_1;_2)$ $N_{di}(_1;_2) \models N_{tot}$, with $N_{sam e}(_1;_2)$ $N_{di}(_1;_2) \models N_{tot}$, with $N_{sam e}(_1;_2)$ $N_{di}(_1;_2)$ being the number of events with two qubits being found in the same (di erent) logic states and $N_{tot} = N_{sam e}(_1;_2) + N_{di}(_1;_2)$ being the total experimental times for the same $_1$ and $_2$. Finally, Bell's inequality can be tested by calculating the experimental CH SH function: $f(j_d^{(12)}(_2)i) = f(_1;_2;_2) + E(_1;_2;_2) + E(_1;_2;_2) = E(_1;_2;_2)i$.

D iscussion. Two types of noise, uctuations of the applied gate voltage V_k and bias current I_b , must be considered in the present qubit-bus system. For simplicity, these two environmental noises are treated as two separate B oson baths with 0 hm ic spectral densities and assumed to be weakly coupled to the qubit and CBJJ, respectively. The H am iltonian of the kth qubit coupling to the bus, containing these uctuations, can be written as

$$\hat{H} = \hat{H}_{kb} + \frac{X X}{\sum_{j=1;2^{j} j} \sim !_{j} a_{!_{j}}^{y} a_{!_{j}}} \frac{eC_{g}^{(k)}}{C_{k}} c_{z}^{(k)} (\hat{R}_{1} + \hat{R}_{1}^{y})}$$

$$s \frac{\sum_{j=1;2^{j} j} a_{!_{j}}}{2\mathcal{C}_{b}!_{b}} a^{y} \hat{R}_{2} + a \hat{R}_{2}^{y}; \hat{R}_{j} = \frac{X}{\sum_{i,j} g_{!_{j}} a_{!_{j}}}; (7)$$

Here, $a_{!,j}$ is the B oson operator of the jth bath and $g_{!,j}$ its coupling strength. The relaxation and decoherence rates of our qubit-bus system can also be calculated by using the well established B loch-R ed eld form alism [16]. Under the usual secular approximation, the relaxation and

- [L] Y.Makhlin, G.Schon and A.Shnim an, Rev. Mod. Phys. 73, 357 (2001).
- Y.Nakamura, YuA.Pashkin, and J.S.Tsai, Nature 398, 786 (1999); K.W. Lehner et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 90, 027002 (2003).
- [3] JE. Mooij et al., Science 285, 1036 (1999); 290, 773 (2000); E. Il'ichev et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 097906 (2003).
- [4] D.Vion et al., Science 296, 886 (2002).
- [5] Y.Yu et al., Science 296, 889 (2002).
- [6] JM .M artinis et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 117901 (2002).
- [7] Y.Makhlin, G.Schon and A.Shnim an, Nature 398, 305 (1999).

decoherence rates are characterized [21] by two dimensionless coupling parameters, $v = (C_g^{(k)} = C_k)^2 R_v = R_K$ and $I = Re(Y_I) = (C_b!_b)$, which describe the couplings of the voltage uctuations to the qubit and the bias-current

uctuations to the bus, respectively. Here, $R_K = h=e^2$ 25:8 k is the quantum of resistance, R_V is the 0 hm ic resistor of the voltage, and $R \in (Y_I)$ is the dissipative part of the adm ittance of the current bias. If the qubit decouples from the bus, $_{\rm V}$ ($_{\rm I}$) characterizes the decoherence and relaxation of the qubit (bus). It has been estim ated in Ref. [1] that the dissipation for a single SQU ID -based charge qubit is su ciently weak ($_{\rm V}$ 10⁶), which allows, in principle, for 10⁶ coherent single-qubit manipulations. However, for a single CBJJ the dimensionless parameter I only reaches 10³ for typical experimen-100 , $G_{\!
m o}$ tal parameters [6]: $1=Re(Y_T)$ 6 pF, 10 GHz. This implies that the quantum co-!_b=2 herence of the present qubit-bus system is mainly lim ited by the bias-current uctuations. Fortunately, the in pedance of the above CBJJ can be engineered to be $1=\text{Re}(Y_{I})$ 560 k [6]. This lets I reach up to 10⁵ and allow about 10⁵ coherent m an ipulations of the qubit-bus system .

In sum m ary, we have proposed a scheme for coupling two SQUID-based charge qubits by sequentially using their interactions with a common large Josephson junction biased by a xed current. Each interaction is tunable by controlling the external ux applied to the chosen SQUID-based charge qubit. The proposed circuit allow sthe possibility of im plementing elementary quantum logic operations, including arbitrary single-qubit gates and universal two-qubit gates. The created two-qubit entangled states can be used to test Bell's inequality.

A cknow ledgm ents

W e acknow ledge useful discussions with D rs. JQ.You, JS.Tsai, and X.Hu, and the support of the USNSA and ARDA under AFOSR contract No. F49620-02-1-0334, and the NSF grant No. EIA-0130383.

- [B] YuA. Pashkin et al., Nature 421, 823 (2003); T. Yam am oto et al., Nature 425, 941 (2003).
- [9] D. V. Averin and C. Bruder, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 057003 (2003).
- [10] JQ. You, J.S. Tsai, and F. Nori, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 197902 (2002); Phys. Rev. B 68, 024510 (2003).
- [11] A.Blais, A.M. van den Brink, and A.M. Zagoskin, Phys. Rev.Lett. 90, 127901 (2003).
- [12] A J. Berkley et al., Science 300, 1548 (2003); F W. Strauch et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 167005 (2003).
- [13] F.Plastina and G.Falci, Phys. Rev. B 67, 224514 (2003).
- [14] S.L. Zhu, Z.D. W ang, and K. Yang, Phys. Rev. A 68, 034303 (2003); C.-P. Yang and S.-IChu, ibid. 67, 042311

(2003); J.Q. You and F.Nori, Phys.Rev.B 68, 064509 (2003).

- [15] J. Clarke et al., Science 239, 992 (1988); J.M. Martinis, M.H. Devoret, and J. Clarke, Phys. Rev. B 35, 4682 (1987).
- [16] M. Storcz and F.K.W ilhelm, Phys. Rev. A 67, 042319 (2003); E.Paladino et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 228304 (2002); U.W eiss, Quantum Dissipative systems, 2nd ed. (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 1999).
- [17] J.I.C irac and P.Zoller, Phys.Rev.Lett.74,4091 (1995); LF.Wei, S.Y.Liu, and X.L.Lei, Phys.Rev.A 65, 062316 (2002); Opt.Comm.208,131 (2002).
- [18] Indeed, such a possibility requires that the Josephson energies of two junctions in a SQUID-loop to be equal or have a very small relative di erence j "J="J jin their coupling energies. Experimentally [19], this has been reached with j "J="J j 1%. This implies that another interaction term H J" sin (k= 0) sin k C_g^(k) = C_k, due to the di erent critical currents of the two junctions, can be safely neglected and thus the system can be described by the H am iltonian (1).
- [19] See, e.g., R. Rouse, S. Han, and J.E. Lukens, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 1614 (1995).
- [20] M A.Rowe et al, Nature 409, 791 (2001); G.W eihs et

al, Phys.Rev.Lett. 81, 5039 (1998).

[21] Only a few lower-energy eigenstates of \hat{H}_{kb} , i.e., the ground state $j_{gi} = j_k; 0_b i$ and the rst doublet, jui= $\cos_k j + k; 0_b i$ isin $k j k; 1_b i$ and $jvi = isin_k j + k; 0_b i + cos_k j_k; 1_b i, are$ involved in our calculations. Their corresponding eigenvalues are $\sim !_{q}$, $\sim !_{u}$, and $\sim !_{v}$, respectively. Here, $j_k i$ ($j_b i; j_b i$) are the eigenstates of $\hat{H_k}$ ($\hat{H_b}$), and $\cos_{k} = \frac{r}{(k-k)} = (2k); \quad k = \frac{r}{k} + 4k; \quad k = \frac{r}{k} - \frac{k}{k}.$ This simplies the calculation of the rates of decoherence and relaxation. For example, the decoherence rate of the superposition of states jui and jvi can be estimated as uv = v Av + I AI, with $A_V = B_1 \sin^2 k + B_2 \cos^2 k$; $A_I = ug \sin^2$ _k + $v_{q} \cos^{2} k_{h} B_{1} = 4 \cos^{2} (2 k_{h}) (2k_{B} T) = +2 v_{u} \sin^{2} (2 k_{h}),$ and $B_2 = ug \cos^2 k + vg \sin^2 k$. Also, ug = $!_{ug} \operatorname{coth} [~!_{ug} = (2k_bT)], v_g = !_{vg} \operatorname{coth} [~!_{vg} = (2k_bT)],$ $_{\rm vu}$ = ! $_{\rm vu}$ coth [~ ! $_{\rm vu}$ =(2k_bT)] and $!_{vu} = !_v !_u$, etc. Specically, for the decoupling case with $\sin_k = 0$, the qubit and bus independently dephase with the rate + $_{\rm V}$ f4 sin² $_{\rm k}$ 2k_B T =~ + $!_{+} \cos^{2}_{k} \coth [\sim !_{+} = (2k_{b}T)]g$ and 10 $_{I}!_{b}$ coth [~!_b=(2k_B T)].