

Auxiliary-level-assisted operations with charge qubits in semiconductors

L. A. Openov

Moscow Engineering Physics Institute (State University), 115409 Moscow, Russia

PACS Numbers: 85.35.p, 03.67.Lx, 73.20.Hb

ABSTRACT

We present a new scheme for rotations of a charge qubit associated with a singly ionized pair of donor atoms in a semiconductor host. The logical states of such a qubit proposed recently by Hollenberg et al. are defined by the lowest two energy states of the remaining valence electron localized around one or another donor. We show that an electron located initially at one donor site can be transferred to another donor site via an auxiliary molecular level formed upon the hybridization of the excited states of two donors. The electron transfer is driven by a single resonant microwave pulse in the case that the energies of the lowest donor states coincide or two resonant pulses in the case that they differ from each other. Depending on the pulse parameters, various one-qubit operations, including the phase gate, the NOT gate, and the Hadamard gate, can be realized in short times. Decoherence of an electron due to the interaction with acoustic phonons is analyzed and shown to be weak enough for coherent qubit manipulation being possible, at least in the proof-of-principle experiments on one-qubit devices.

1. INTRODUCTION

Solid-state systems are of great interest in the search for a scalable quantum computer technology. Several schemes for solid-state quantum information processing have been proposed [1, 2, 3]. For example, the coherent control of superconducting qubits [4] and their coupling [5] have been demonstrated, the qubits being encoded in the states of a Cooper-pair box. One promising area of current investigation is concerned with the semiconductor-based devices. In the Kane proposal [6], the qubits are defined by long-lived nuclear spins of phosphorous dopants in a silicon host. They are manipulated by external surface gates and RF magnetic fields. While long coherence times of nuclear spins make the Kane scheme very promising, the single-spin measurement remains a significant challenge [7]. This also concerns an alternative SiP architecture that uses electron spin states as qubits [8].

Along with spin-based qubits, the charged-based qubits in semiconductors are currently discussed as well. The logical states of a charge semiconductor qubit may be formed by, e. g., the ground and excited states of the electron in the single quantum dot [1] or the spatially separated states of the electron in two different quantum dots [9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. In spite of the fact that decoherence of the charge-based qubits is rather strong [14, 15], the charge qubits are nevertheless believed to be realizable at the present technological level due to their short operation times [16]. One of the obstacles to the practical realization of scalable quantum computation in the system of quantum dots is that it is extremely difficult, if at all, to manufacture a set of quantum dots with identical or at least predetermined characteristics each. This complicates the issue, introducing the errors into the operations with qubits [17] and generating a need for numerous ancillary

corrective gates. In this respect, it would be more reasonable to make use of natural atoms (instead of "artificial" ones) as the localization centers for the electrons carrying the quantum information. Recent advances in manipulation with single atoms on the solid surface [18] and atomically precise placement of single dopants in semiconductors [19, 20] make possible the construction of rather complex solid-state atomic architectures.

Recently, Hollenberg et al. proposed a two-atom charge-qubit scheme [16] and reported the first results on its fabrication and characterization [20] for the case of phosphorous dopants in silicon. In that scheme, the buried donor charge qubit consists of two dopant atoms ~ 50 nm apart in a semiconductor host. One of the donors is singly ionized. The logical states are formed by the lowest two energy states of the remaining valence electron localized at the left or the right donor, $|0\rangle_i = |L\rangle_i$ and $|1\rangle_i = |R\rangle_i$, see Fig. 1. The qubit is controlled by the surface electrodes through adiabatic variations of the donor potentials. Initialization and readout of the qubit are facilitated by a single electron transistor. The coupling of such qubits via the Coulomb interaction allows, in principle, to realize the conditional two-qubit gates [16].

It was shown in Ref. [16] that although the coherence time $\tau_{\text{coh}} \sim 1$ ns for charge-based qubits is much shorter than for their spin-based counterparts, the corresponding gate operations times are also shorter, of order $\tau_{\text{op}} \sim 50$ ps. Note, however, that the ratio of $\tau_{\text{op}}/\tau_{\text{coh}} \sim 10^{-1}$ seems to be insufficiently small for the fault-tolerant scalable quantum computation being possible [21]. Here we propose an alternative scheme for operations with buried donor charge qubits, instead of applying biases to the surface gates. Our scheme is based on the effect of electron transfer between the lowest states localized at different donors upon the influence of a resonant pulse [9] or two resonant pulses [22].

Such a transfer occurs via an excited molecular level of the double-donor system and allows for implementation of different one-qubit rotations. The operation times can be made orders of magnitude shorter than in the original proposal [16].

The paper is organized as follows. In Section II, we describe a three-level model for the resonant electron transfer between the donors and briefly discuss the relevant one-electron states of a P_2^+ molecular ion in Si. Next we present the analytical solution for the unitary electron evolution under the influence of microwave pulses. In Section III, we show that in the P_2^+ Si system it is possible to realize various one-qubit operations, including the NOT gate, the phase gate, and the Hadamard transformation. Decoherence due to the electron interaction with acoustic phonons is studied in Section IV. Discussion of the results is given in Section V.

II. MODEL FOR THE RESONANT ELECTRON TRANSFER

We consider a singly ionized pair of phosphorous atoms embedded in silicon. The remaining valence electron is described by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_0 = \sum_n E_n |j_n\rangle \langle j_n|; \quad (1)$$

where E_n and $|j_n\rangle$ are, respectively, the one-electron eigenenergies and eigenstates of the molecular ion P_2^+ Si. In general, to calculate the energy spectrum and the wave functions $|j_n\rangle$ of the single-electron/double-donor system beneath the surface, one should account for the conduction-band anisotropy, the inter-valley terms, the surface effects, the potentials induced in the substrate by the gate voltages, etc. This necessarily requires numerical calculations, see, e. g. Ref. [23]. We note that although the conduction-band edge of bulk Si has six degenerate minima, it has been shown both experimentally [24]

and theoretically [25] that substitutional impurities break the translational symmetry of the crystal lattice, thus lifting the degeneracy. The spacing between the energy levels in the ground-state and excited-states multiplets may be further increased through appropriate choice of the gate potentials. Anyway, to quantify the structure of the $P_2^+ \text{:Si}$ energy spectrum and wave functions, one should make sophisticated numerical calculations for a specific donor configuration. In this paper, however, we restrict ourselves to a semiquantitative consideration based on an isotropic effective mass approximation [26] that allows for an explicit analytical solution. Then the problem reduces to that for the hydrogen-like molecular ion with the effective Bohr radius $a_B \approx 3 \text{ nm}$ and the effective Hartree unit of energy $E^* = e^2/\epsilon a_B \approx 40 \text{ meV}$, where $\epsilon = 11.7$ is the dielectric constant for silicon [27]. The energy spectrum of the H_2^+ ion for different atomic separations is known with high accuracy [28].

We approximate the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_0 in Eq. (1) by the reduced three-level Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_r = E_1 |j_1\rangle\langle j_1| + E_2 |j_2\rangle\langle j_2| + E_{TR} |j_{TR}\rangle\langle j_{TR}|; \quad (2)$$

where $|j_1\rangle$ and $|j_2\rangle$ are the lowest molecular states, $1s_g$ and $2p_u$, whose wave functions are, respectively, symmetric and antisymmetric about the midpoint of the line joining the two donors, see Fig. 2, and $|j_{TR}\rangle$ is one of the excited molecular states discussed below. It is convenient to go from the states $|j_1\rangle$ and $|j_2\rangle$ delocalized over the $P_2^+ \text{:Si}$ ion to the states $|\mathcal{L}\rangle = (|j_1\rangle + |j_2\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $|\mathcal{R}\rangle = (|j_1\rangle - |j_2\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ localized at the left and the right donor, respectively. For donor separations $R \gg a_B$, the wave functions $\langle r|\mathcal{L}\rangle$ and $\langle r|\mathcal{R}\rangle$ are almost indistinguishable from the one-electron $1s$ -orbitals of the corresponding donor atoms.

The states $|\mathcal{L}\rangle$ and $|\mathcal{R}\rangle$ form the qubit logical states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, respectively. These

states are well defined if the thermal energy $k_B T$ is much lower than the differences $E_{31} = E_3 - E_1$ and $E_{32} = E_3 - E_2$ between the energy E_3 of the excited molecular state $|j_3\rangle$ and the energies E_1 and E_2 , respectively. At $R \gg a_B$ one has $E_1 - E_2 = E = 2$ and $E_3 - E = 8$, so that $E_{31} - E_{32} = 3E = 8 - 15 \text{ meV}$. Since the states $|j_L\rangle$ and $|j_R\rangle$ are not the exact eigenstates of the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_r , in the absence of external fields the initial qubit state $|j(0)\rangle = |j_L\rangle + |j_R\rangle$ will evolve with time as

$$|j(t)\rangle = e^{-i\hat{H}_r t/\hbar} |j(0)\rangle = e^{-iE_1 t/\hbar} |j(0)\rangle + i \left(\frac{E_{21}}{E_{21} - E_1} \right) e^{-iE_{21} t/2\hbar} \sin(E_{21} t/2\hbar) |j_L\rangle - |j_R\rangle; \quad (3)$$

where $E_{21} = E_2 - E_1$. Note that at $t \ll t_0 = \hbar/E_{21}$ the initial qubit state remains almost unchanged (not counting the common phase). Since at $x = R = a_B \gg 1$, the value of E_{21} is exponentially small [29, 30],

$$\frac{E_{21}}{E} = 4x e^{-x-1} \left(1 + \frac{1}{2x} + O\left(\frac{1}{x^2}\right) \right); \quad (4)$$

the period $t_0 = \hbar/E_{21}$ it takes for the qubit state to change is rather long, $t_0 > 1$ ns at $R > 60 \text{ nm}$. In what follows we shall consider the processes taking place in time intervals much shorter than t_0 and hence ignore the off-diagonal term $[(E_{21}=2) |j_L\rangle \langle j_R| + \text{h.c.}]$ in \hat{H}_r that gives rise to the electron tunneling $|j_L\rangle \leftrightarrow |j_R\rangle$. Then the Hamiltonian (2) takes the form

$$\hat{H}_r = \frac{E_1 + E_2}{2} |j_L\rangle \langle j_L| + |j_R\rangle \langle j_R| + E_{TR} |j_{TR}\rangle \langle j_{TR}|; \quad (5)$$

where $(E_1 + E_2)/2 = E_L = E_R$ at $R \gg a_B$. In the general case that the qubit is biased by the gate voltages, the energies E_L and E_R of the lowest states localized, respectively, at the left and the right donor differ from each other. In this case, the localized states are all the more good approximations to the energy eigenstates, and the Hamiltonian \hat{H}_r

reads

$$\hat{H}_r = E_L |L\rangle\langle L| + E_R |R\rangle\langle R| + E_{TR} |T_R\rangle\langle T_R| ; \quad (6)$$

Now let the buried donor charge qubit interact with an external electromagnetic field $E(t)$. Then the Hamiltonian becomes

$$\hat{H}(t) = \hat{H}_r + \hat{V}(t) ; \quad (7)$$

where the interaction term $\hat{V}(t)$ is

$$\hat{V}(t) = E(t) d_L |T_R\rangle\langle L| + d_R |T_R\rangle\langle R| + \text{h.c.} ; \quad (8)$$

with $d_L = \langle T_R | \hat{e} r | L \rangle$ and $d_R = \langle T_R | \hat{e} r | R \rangle$ being the electric dipole moments for the transitions $|L; R\rangle \rightarrow |T_R\rangle$ between, respectively, the localized states $|L\rangle$ and $|R\rangle$ and one of the excited molecular states $|T_R\rangle$ delocalized over the double-donor system. For definiteness, we choose this state to be the third one-electron state $|j_3\rangle$ of the molecular ion P_2^+ Si. At $E_L = E_R$ and $R = a_B > 6$, this is the $3d_g$ state whose wave function $\langle r | j_3 \rangle$ is symmetric about the midpoint of the line joining the two donors and has its maximum at the donor locations [31], see Fig. 2. If the donors are arranged along the x-axis, the state $|j_3\rangle$ is formed upon the hybridization of $|2S_{i_{L,R}}\rangle$ and $|2P_{x i_{L,R}}\rangle$ atomic states of the donors, and $\langle r | j_3 \rangle$ in the vicinity of the left/right donor equals to $[\langle r | 2S_{i_{L,R}} \rangle - \langle r | 2P_{x i_{L,R}} \rangle]/2$ at $R \gg a_B$. Note that for such a choice of the state $|j_3\rangle$, the electric field should have a nonzero x-component in order that $d_{L,R} \neq 0$.

We consider two cases: (a) $E_L = E_R = E_1$ and (b) $E_L \neq E_R$, the desired value of the difference $E_R - E_L$ being discussed below. In the case (a), we suppose $E(t)$ to oscillate at a frequency $\omega = (E_{TR} - E_{L,R})/\hbar$,

$$E(t) = E_0(t) \cos(\omega t) ; \quad (9)$$

where $E_0(t)$ is the slowly varying envelope of the field. Making use of the resonant approximation [32], i. e., omitting the rapidly oscillating terms with the frequencies $(\omega + E_{TR} = \hbar \omega_{L,R} = \hbar)$ from the Hamiltonian, we have

$$\hat{V}(t) = \frac{1}{2} e^{i\omega t} \left[\chi_L(t) j_{TR} \hat{L} j + \chi_R(t) j_{TR} \hat{R} j + \text{h.c.} \right]; \quad (10)$$

where $\chi_{L,R}(t) = E_0(t) d_{L,R}$. In the case (b), the field $E(t)$ has two components oscillating at frequencies $\omega_L = (\omega_{TR} - \omega_L) = \hbar$ and $\omega_R = (\omega_{TR} - \omega_R) = \hbar$,

$$E(t) = E_{01}(t) \cos(\omega_L t) + E_{02}(t) \cos(\omega_R t + \phi); \quad (11)$$

where ϕ is the phase shift between the two components. In the resonant approximation [32] one has

$$\hat{V}(t) = \frac{1}{2} e^{i\omega_L t} \left[\chi_L(t) j_{TR} \hat{L} j + \text{h.c.} \right] + \frac{1}{2} e^{i\omega_R t + i\phi} \left[\chi_R(t) j_{TR} \hat{R} j + \text{h.c.} \right]; \quad (12)$$

where $\chi_{L,R}(t) = E_{01,2}(t) d_{L,R}$. In this paper, we restrict ourselves to the rectangular pulse shape, so that $E_0(t)$ in Eq. (9) and both $E_{01}(t)$ and $E_{02}(t)$ in Eq. (11) are constant at $0 < t < t_{op}$ and zero elsewhere.

It is straightforward to solve the non-stationary Schrodinger equation for the state vector $j(t)i$,

$$i\hbar \frac{\partial j(t)i}{\partial t} = \hat{H}(t) j(t)i; \quad (13)$$

with the Hamiltonian $\hat{H}(t)$ in Eq. (7) given by Eqs. (5) and (10) in the case (a) or (6) and (12) in the case (b), and to find the coefficients $C_L(t)$, $C_R(t)$, and $C_{TR}(t)$ in the expansion of $j(t)i$ in terms of the states $L i$, $R i$, and $j_{TR} i$,

$$j(t)i = C_L(t) e^{iE_L t = \hbar} L i + C_R(t) e^{iE_R t = \hbar} R i + C_{TR}(t) e^{iE_{TR} t = \hbar} j_{TR} i; \quad (14)$$

provided that $j(0)|i\rangle = j_L|i\rangle + j_R|R\rangle$, where $j_L^2 + j_R^2 = 1$. In the case (a) we have

$$\begin{aligned} C_L(t) &= \cos\left(\frac{2j_L j_R}{j_L^2 + j_R^2} \sin^2(t)\right) - \frac{2j_L j_R}{j_L^2 + j_R^2} \sin^2(t); \\ C_R(t) &= \frac{2j_L j_R}{j_L^2 + j_R^2} \sin^2(t) + \cos\left(\frac{2j_L j_R}{j_L^2 + j_R^2} \sin^2(t)\right); \\ C_{TR}(t) &= i\frac{j_L - j_R}{j_L^2 + j_R^2} \sin(2t); \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where

$$= \frac{q \frac{j_L j_R}{j_L^2 + j_R^2}}{4h}; \quad (16)$$

In the case (b), the coefficients $C_L(t)$, $C_R(t)$, and $C_{TR}(t)$ are also given by Eqs. (15) and (16) with the only exception that j_R should be replaced by $j_R e^{-i}$. From Eqs. (15) and (16) one can see that at $t = t_{op} = k\pi/2$ (hereafter k is a positive integer) the coefficient C_{TR} vanishes, so that the state vector $j(t)|i\rangle$ remains in the qubit subspace $\{j_L|i\rangle, j_R|R\rangle\}$ and $j_L^2(t_{op}) + j_R^2(t_{op}) = 1$. In particular, if $C_L(0) = 1$ and $C_R(0) = 0$, then $C_L(t_{op}) = 0$ and $C_R(t_{op}) = 1$ at $t_L = t_R$ and odd k , i. e., there is a complete population transfer $j_L|i\rangle \rightarrow j_R|R\rangle$, see Ref. [9]. So, the auxiliary excited state $j_{TR}|i\rangle$ plays the role of the "transport" state, in that it assists the qubit evolution by means of the electron transfer between the states $j_L|i\rangle$ and $j_R|R\rangle$ as the pulse is on but remains unpopulated after the pulse is over.

III. QUBIT ROTATIONS

In this Section we show that the auxiliary-state-assisted electron transfer between the two donors allows for various qubit rotations. In the case (a) that the two donors in the molecular ion P_2^+ are equivalent, i. e., $E_L = E_R$ and $j_L = j_R$, the qubit state $j(t)|i\rangle$

at the operation time ϕ_{op} remains unchanged,

$$j(\phi_{op})i = e^{iE_L \phi_{op} = \hbar} j(0)i; \quad (17)$$

if $\phi_{op} = k\pi$, or changes into

$$j(\phi_{op})i = e^{iE_L \phi_{op} = \hbar} j(0)i + R i; \quad (18)$$

if $\phi_{op} = (2k+1)\pi/2$ and $E_L = E_R$, see Eqs. (14) and (15). The latter corresponds to the quantum NOT operation.

The case (b) seems to be more realistic because of the different local atomic surroundings of the donors in the pair due to both the uncontrollable damage of the host upon ion implantation and the probabilistic variations in the path taken through the substrate by each implanted ion [20]. Besides, the surface gates can be used to intentionally tune E_L and E_R to the predetermined values. Moreover, one can change the values of E_L and E_R separately through the changes in the electric field amplitudes E_{01} and E_{02} . It follows from Eqs. (14) and (15) that the relative phase shift operation is implemented at $\phi_{op} = k\pi$,

$$j(\phi_{op})i = e^{iE_L \phi_{op} = \hbar} j(0)i + e^{i(E_R - E_L) \phi_{op} = \hbar} R i; \quad (19)$$

while the value of $\phi_{op} = (2k+1)\pi/2$ corresponds to realization of the quantum NOT operation,

$$j(\phi_{op})i = e^{iE_L \phi_{op} = \hbar} j(0)i + R i; \quad (20)$$

if $E_L = E_R$ and $\phi_{op} = n\pi + (E_R - E_L) \phi_{op} = 2\hbar$ (hereafter n is an integer), or to the Hadamard transformation,

$$j(\phi_{op})i = e^{iE_L \phi_{op} = \hbar} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} j(0)i + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} R i \right); \quad (21)$$

if $(E_R - E_L)_{op} = \hbar = 2 \mu_B$ (where μ_B is a positive integer). Here the plus sign corresponds to the values of $n = 2 \mu_B$ and $L = \mu_B \left(\frac{p}{2} - 1 \right)$ or $n = (2\mu_B + 1)$ and $L = \mu_B \left(\frac{p}{2} - 1 \right)$, and the minus sign corresponds to the values of $n = 2 \mu_B$ and $L = \mu_B \left(\frac{p}{2} + 1 \right)$ or $n = (2\mu_B + 1)$ and $L = \mu_B \left(\frac{p}{2} + 1 \right)$.

So, various one-qubit operations can be implemented on the buried donor charge qubit through appropriate choices of the pulse frequency, phase, amplitude, and duration. Let us estimate the value of the operation time $t_{op} = \hbar / |J_{L,R}| = \hbar / e a_B E_0$, see Section II. For the field amplitude $E_0 = 1 \text{ V/cm}$ one has $t_{op} = 1 \text{ ns}$. Increase in the pulse intensity will cause the value of t_{op} to decrease down to the picosecond time scale, so that the value of t_{op} can be made orders of magnitude shorter than the period t_0 it takes for the qubit state to change due to the direct electron tunneling $|j_L\rangle \leftrightarrow |j_R\rangle$, see Section II, as well as the operation times in the case that the qubit is manipulated by adiabatically varying the potentials of the surface gates [16]. Note that in the case (b) the energies E_L and E_R should be sufficiently different from each other in order all these operations could be implemented in short times to avoid decoherence, as discussed below. For example, at $t_{op} = 1 \text{ ps}$ one should have $E_R - E_L = 3 \text{ meV}$.

IV. DECOHERENCE EFFECTS

The uncontrolled interaction of the quantum system with its environment leads to entanglement between the states of the system and the environmental degrees of freedom. This disturbs the unitary evolution of the system and results in the loss of coherence. There are various sources of decoherence in solids. For the charge qubit considered in this paper, the decoherence due to the phonon emission/absorption processes was studied in

Refs. [16, 26] and found to be much weaker than the decoherence due to both Nyquist-Johnson voltage fluctuations in the surface electrodes and $1/f$ noise from the background charge fluctuations. Note, however, that there are two mechanisms of the phonon-induced decoherence which are caused by either the energy relaxation processes or the virtual-phonon dephasing processes. Which one of those mechanisms is dominant, depends on the specific parameters of the quantum system and its environment, as well as on the operation times. Here we show that the dephasing processes play a decisive role in limiting the fault tolerance of the buried donor charge qubit. For simplicity, we consider the qubit at zero temperature and assume isotropic acoustic phonons with the linear dispersion law, $\hbar\omega_q = sq$, where s is the speed of sound.

First we recall some general concepts concerning the transition probability for an electron moving in the time-dependent potential. If an electron, being initially in the state $|i\rangle$ of the discrete energy spectrum, interacts with the harmonic field

$$\hat{V}(t) = \hat{F}e^{-i\omega t} + \hat{F}^+e^{i\omega t}; \quad (22)$$

then the probability amplitude to find it in the state $|f\rangle$ at a time t is given by the following expression that results from the first-order perturbation theory [33],

$$a_{i \rightarrow f}(\omega; t) = F_{fi} \frac{e^{i(\omega_{if} + \omega)t} - 1}{i(\omega_{if} + \omega)} + F_{if} \frac{e^{i(\omega_{if} - \omega)t} - 1}{i(\omega_{if} - \omega)}; \quad (23)$$

where $\omega_{if} = (E_i - E_f)/\hbar$. The common approach is to ignore the first term in Eq. (23) and make use of the expression

$$\lim_{t \rightarrow \infty} \frac{\sin^2(\omega t/2)}{t^2} = \pi \delta(\omega); \quad (24)$$

thus arriving at the so called Fermi golden rule for the transition probability,

$$W_{i \rightarrow f}(\omega; t) = \langle \hat{P}_{i \rightarrow f}(\omega; t) \rangle = \mathcal{F}_{if} \int \frac{4 \sin^2 \frac{\omega_{if} - \omega}{2} t}{(\omega_{if} - \omega)^2} = \frac{2}{h} \mathcal{F}_{if} \int (\hbar \omega_{if} - \hbar \omega) t = \mathcal{F}_{if}(\omega) t; \quad (25)$$

where $\mathcal{F}_{if}(\omega)$ is the time-independent transition rate. The δ -function reflects the energy conservation, $\hbar \omega_{if} = \hbar \omega$, for such a transition.

Electron-phonon coupling in condensed systems is described by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{el-ph} = \sum_q (\hat{c}^\dagger(q) \hat{c}(q) \hat{b}_q^\dagger + \hat{b}_{-q}^\dagger); \quad (26)$$

where \hat{b}_q^\dagger and \hat{b}_q are, respectively, the operators of creation and annihilation of a phonon with the wave vector q , $\hat{c}^\dagger(q) = \int d^3r e^{iqr} \hat{c}^\dagger(r)$ is the Fourier transform of the electron density operator $\hat{c}^\dagger(r) = \sum_{m,n} \psi_m^\dagger(r) \psi_n(r) \delta_{mn}$, and $\hat{c}(q)$ is the microscopic electron-phonon interaction matrix element that can be expressed in terms of the deformation potential D and the density of the crystal as

$$\hat{c}(q) = qD \frac{\hbar}{2 \omega_q} \epsilon^{1=2}; \quad (27)$$

with ϵ being the normalizing volume. If the harmonic field (22) is associated with a deformation phonon having the frequency ω_q , then, taking into account that the deformation fields produced by the phonons with different wave vectors are not correlated, one has for the total transition rate [34, 35]

$$\mathcal{F}_{if}(\omega) = \frac{2}{h} \sum_q \mathcal{F}_{if}(q) \int (\hbar \omega_{if} - \hbar \omega_q); \quad (28)$$

where

$$\mathcal{F}_{if}(q) = \langle \hat{c}^\dagger(q) \hat{c}(q) \rangle e^{iqr} \hat{c}^\dagger(r); \quad (29)$$

And decoherence during adiabatic variations of the surface gate potentials

In the case that the buried donor charge qubit is controlled by the surface gates [16], so that the state vector $|j\rangle(t)$ remains in the qubit subspace $\{|L\rangle; |R\rangle\}$ during the operation, and the overlap $\langle L | R \rangle$ is negligibly small, the Hamiltonian (26) can be written in the spin-boson form [36],

$$\hat{H}_{\text{el-ph}} = \hat{\sigma}_z \sum_{\mathbf{q}} g(\mathbf{q}) \hat{b}_{\mathbf{q}}^{\dagger} + \hat{b}_{\mathbf{q}}^{\dagger} ; \quad (30)$$

where $\hat{\sigma}_z = |L\rangle\langle L| - |R\rangle\langle R|$ and

$$g(\mathbf{q}) = \frac{(\mathbf{q})^h}{2} \langle L | e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} | L \rangle - \langle R | e^{i\mathbf{q}\cdot\mathbf{r}} | R \rangle : \quad (31)$$

Since $\langle R | L \rangle = (a_B)^3)^{-1/2} \exp(-|\mathbf{r} - \mathbf{r}_{L,R}|/a_B)$ for 1s-orbitals, where $\mathbf{r}_{L,R}$ are the donor coordinates, one has [14]

$$g(\mathbf{q}) = i(\mathbf{q}) \frac{\sin(q_x R/2)}{[1 + (qa_B)^2/4]^2} ; \quad (32)$$

where q_x is the component of the phonon wave vector along the line joining the two donors, and we chose the origin of the coordinates in between the donors, so that $\mathbf{r}_{L,R} = (R/2)\mathbf{e}_x$.

Fedichkin and Fedorov [14] have shown that at $T = 0$ decoherence upon implementing the phase operation emerges as pure dephasing, the electron density matrix being given by the general expression [37, 38],

$$\rho_{RL}(0) e^{B^2(t) - i(E_R - E_L)t/\hbar} \rho_{LR}(0) e^{B^2(t) + i(E_R - E_L)t/\hbar} ; \quad (33)$$

with the spectral function

$$B^2(t) = \frac{8}{\hbar^2} \sum_{\mathbf{q}} \frac{g(\mathbf{q})^2}{q^2} \sin^2 \frac{q t}{2} ; \quad (34)$$

There is no relaxation in this case since in order the phase operation could be implemented, the energies E_L and E_R should be sufficiently different from each other [14], so that the

basis $\{ |i\rangle; |R\rangle \}$ coincides with the energy basis of the electron in the double donor system, and the electron term (6) commutes with the interaction term (30) in the Hamiltonian. As a result, the diagonal elements of the density matrix remain unchanged. On the other hand, decoherence upon implementing the quantum NOT operation (where $E_L = E_R$ and the energy basis of the electron is formed by the states $|j_{1,2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|L\rangle \pm |R\rangle)$, see Section II) was suggested to be caused by relaxation [14], so that both off-diagonal and diagonal elements of the density matrix decrease exponentially with time, the relaxation rate $\gamma_{2 \rightarrow 1}$ being [14, 26], see Eq. (28),

$$\gamma_{2 \rightarrow 1} = \frac{D^2}{4 \hbar^2} \frac{q_{21}^3}{[1 + (q_{21} a_B)^2]^4} \left(1 - \frac{\sin(q_{21} R)}{q_{21} R} \right); \quad (35)$$

where $q_{21} = |E_{21}|/\hbar v$, see Eq. (4).

Note, however, that the approximation (25) for $W_{i \rightarrow f}(|i\rangle; t)$ and, accordingly, the equation (28) for $\rho_{i \rightarrow f}$ are valid provided the time t is sufficiently long, see Eq. (24). To quantify the applicability of this approximation, let us analyze the more general expression for $W_{i \rightarrow f}(t)$ that follows from Eq. (25),

$$W_{i \rightarrow f}(t) = \frac{4}{\hbar^2} \sum_q \mathcal{F}_{if}(q)^2 \frac{\sin^2\left(\frac{q_{if} - q}{2} t\right)}{(q_{if} - q)^2}; \quad (36)$$

One can roughly distinguish two phonon contributions to $W_{i \rightarrow f}(t)$, one being from the "resonant component", i.e., from the δ -function-like peak of $\sin^2\left(\frac{q_{if} - q}{2} t\right) = (q_{if} - q)^2$ as a function of q at $q = q_{if} = |E_{if}|/\hbar v$, with the height $t^2/4$ and the width $\Delta q = 1/t$, and another from the remaining "non-resonant background" of the phonon spectrum. The former can be estimated as

$$W_{i \rightarrow f}^{(1)}(t) = \frac{q_{if}^2}{\hbar^2 v} \mathcal{F}_{if}(q_{if})^2 t; \quad (37)$$

and the latter as

$$W_{i \rightarrow f}^{(2)}(t) = \frac{q}{h^2 s^2} F_{if}(q_{\text{max}})^2 \quad (38)$$

at $q_{if} \ll q_{\text{max}}$ and

$$W_{i \rightarrow f}^{(2)}(t) = \frac{q}{h^2 s^2} \frac{q_{\text{max}}^2}{q_{if}} F_{if}(q_{\text{max}})^2 \quad (39)$$

at $q_{if} \gg q_{\text{max}}$, where q_{max} is the wave vector at which the function $F_{if}(q)^2$ has a maximum, and q is a characteristic width of $F_{if}(q)^2$ in the maximum. The specific values of q , q_{max} , and $F_{if}(q_{\text{max}})$ depend on the specific type of wave functions ψ_i and ψ_f in the matrix element $\langle \psi_f | e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r}} | \psi_i \rangle$. Now if, e. g., $q_{if} \ll q_{\text{max}}$ and we are interested in the transition probability $W_{i \rightarrow f}(t)$ at a moment of time t such that $s q_{if}^2 F_{if}(q_{if})^2 t \ll q F_{if}(q_{\text{max}})^2$, then $W_{i \rightarrow f}^{(1)}(t) \ll W_{i \rightarrow f}^{(2)}(t)$, and hence the Fermi golden rule appears to be broken [39, 40]. This is due to violation of the energy conservation at short times [33].

An inspection of the phonon-induced transitions between the states $|j_{1,2}\rangle = |\bar{j}_1, j_2\rangle$ of the double donor system with $E_L = E_R$ and the donor separation $R \gg a_B$ (these transitions are relevant for decoherence during the implementation of the NOT operation [14]) provides an illustrative example of the departure from the Fermi golden rule. In this case $\langle j_{1,2} | e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r}} | j_{1,2} \rangle = \langle \bar{j}_1, j_2 | e^{i\mathbf{q} \cdot \mathbf{r}} | \bar{j}_1, j_2 \rangle$, so that $F_{21}(q) = g(q)$, see Eq. (32), and the resonant component of the transition probability is $W_{2 \rightarrow 1}^{(1)}(t) = q_{21}^3 D^2 t = h s^2$, in accordance with the value of the relaxation rate $\gamma_{2 \rightarrow 1}$ given by Eq. (35). Since the value of $q_{21} = E_{21}/h s$ decreases exponentially with R , see Eq. (4), the value of $\gamma_{2 \rightarrow 1}$ decreases exponentially as well, going below 10^3 s^{-1} at $R = a_B > 10$, see Fig. 5 in Ref. [26]. On the other hand, since $q_{21} \ll q_{\text{max}} = 1/a_B$, we have $W_{2 \rightarrow 1}^{(2)}(t) = D^2 t = h s^3 (a_B)^2$ from Eq. (38). More accurate calculations result in $W_{2 \rightarrow 1}^{(2)}(t) = B^2(t) t$, see Eq. (34). If the operation time τ_{op} is long compared to the phonon transit time, $a_B/v_s \approx 0.3 \text{ ps}$ for

$P_2^+ \text{Si}$), one has from Eq. (34), see Ref. [14],

$$B^2(\omega_p) = \frac{D^2}{3^2 \hbar s^3 (a_B)^2}; \quad (40)$$

so that the spectral function (34) appears to be a material constant, being about $6 \cdot 10^3$ for the phosphorous donors in silicon [14], where $D = 3.3 \text{ eV}$, $s = 9 \cdot 10^5 \text{ cm/s}$, and $\rho = 2.33 \text{ g/cm}^3$. Hence, $W_{2 \rightarrow 1}^{(2)}(t) \gg W_{2 \rightarrow 1}^{(1)}(t)$ at $R = a_B = 10$ and $t \ll \tau = 3 \cdot 10^6 \text{ s}$, the time τ being exponentially longer for larger values of $R = a_B$, and in any case longer than the operation time ω_p , see Section III.

So, contrary to suggestions [14, 26] that phonon-induced decoherence in the case of the NOT operation is determined by the value of the relaxation rate $\gamma_{2 \rightarrow 1}$ given by Eq. (35), we see that at sufficiently short operation times, decoherence in the cases of both phase and NOT operations is determined by the same spectral function $B^2(t)$, see Eq. (34). The distinction between the two cases is that the diagonal elements of the density matrix remain unchanged in the case of the phase operation since there is no relaxation, while they decay exponentially (along with the off-diagonal matrix elements) in the case of the NOT operation [14].

B. Decoherence during the auxiliary-state-assisted operations

Since the excited "transport" level $|T_R\rangle$ becomes temporarily populated during the resonant-pulse operations on the $P_2^+ \text{Si}$ qubit, the phonon-induced electron transitions $|T_R\rangle \leftrightarrow |L_R\rangle$ and $|T_R\rangle \leftrightarrow |j_{1,2}\rangle$ can have a detrimental effect on the qubit evolution, along with the transitions $|L\rangle \leftrightarrow |R\rangle$ and $|j_{11}\rangle \leftrightarrow |j_{21}\rangle$ studied above. Let us clarify what type of the phonon-induced electron transitions ("resonant" or "non-resonant") is dominant in this case and estimate the transition probability. We follow the line of reasoning

outlined above and start with calculations of the matrix elements $\langle \mathbf{R} | \mathbf{j}^{iqr} | \mathbf{L} ; \mathbf{R} \rangle$. For our choices of the "transport" state $|\mathbf{T}\rangle = |j_3\rangle$ and the double donor orientation, see Section II, at $R \gg a_B$ one has $\langle \mathbf{T} | \mathbf{R} \rangle = [\langle \mathbf{S} | \mathbf{i}_L \rangle \langle \mathbf{P}_x | \mathbf{i}_L \rangle + \langle \mathbf{S} | \mathbf{i}_R \rangle \langle \mathbf{P}_x | \mathbf{i}_R \rangle] = 2$, where $\langle \mathbf{S} | \mathbf{i}_{L,R} \rangle = (8/a_B^3)^{1/2} (1 - \mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{L,R}/2a_B) \exp(-\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{L,R}/2a_B)$ and $\langle \mathbf{P}_x | \mathbf{i}_{L,R} \rangle = (32/a_B^5)^{1/2} (x - x_{L,R}) \exp(-\mathbf{j} \cdot \mathbf{r}_{L,R}/2a_B)$. Neglecting the exponentially small overlap between the localized atomic-like orbitals centered at different donors, we have

$$\langle \mathbf{R} | \mathbf{j}^{iqr} | \mathbf{L} ; \mathbf{R} \rangle = 2 \frac{p - (qa_B)^2}{2} \frac{i_2^3 (qa_B)}{i_3} e^{-iq_R R} : \quad (41)$$

Since, depending on the relative values of E_L and E_R , the lowest energy eigenstates of P_2^+ are either $|\mathbf{L}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{R}\rangle$ (if $E_L \neq E_R$) or $|\mathbf{1}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{2}\rangle$ (if $E_L = E_R$), in order to find the probability $W_{TR}(t)$ of electron escape from the "transport" state at $T = 0$, one should add up the probabilities of, respectively, $|\mathbf{T}\rangle \rightarrow |\mathbf{L}\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{T}\rangle \rightarrow |\mathbf{R}\rangle$ or $|\mathbf{T}\rangle \rightarrow |\mathbf{j}_1\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{T}\rangle \rightarrow |\mathbf{j}_2\rangle$ electron transitions. If the value of $E_R - E_L$ is much less than the difference between E_{TR} and $E_{L,R}$, then in both cases we have the same result, so that $W_{TR}(t)$ is given by Eq. (36), where now $\Delta E_{31} = \hbar^2 3E = 8\hbar^2$ does not depend on R at $R \gg a_B$, and

$$F_{if}(q)^2 = 16 \frac{(qa_B)^4 + \frac{9}{4} (qa_B)^2}{i_6} j(q)^2 : \quad (42)$$

Taking into account that $q_{if} a_B = \Delta E_{31} / \hbar^2 = 8$ for $R \gg a_B$, it is straightforward to derive from Eq. (36) the following expressions for the probabilities of the "resonant" and "non-resonant" transitions, respectively,

$$W_{TR}^{(1)}(t) = \frac{8D^2}{\hbar^2 (a_B)^3} (q_{if} a_B)^5 \frac{i_4^3 + (q_{if} a_B)^2}{i_6} t \quad (43)$$

and

$$W_{TR}^{(2)}(t) = \frac{176D^2}{3645 \hbar^2 (a_B)^2 (q_{if} a_B)^2} : \quad (44)$$

It follows from Eqs. (43) and (44) that $W_{TR}^{(1)}(t) = \tau_{TR} t$, where $\tau_{TR} = 3 \cdot 10^5 s^{-1}$, and $W_{TR}^{(2)}(t) = 10^{-5}$, so that the "resonant" transitions are dominant at $t > 0.3$ ps.

Now let us check what states out of those involved in the auxiliary-state-assisted qubit evolution are most sensitive to phonon-induced decoherence. As we have seen above, decoherence of the low-energy states $|Li\rangle$ and $|Ri\rangle$ (or $|j_{1i}\rangle$ and $|j_{2i}\rangle$) is quantified by the error rate [14], i. e., the error generated during the operation time, $D(t) = B^2(t) = 3 \cdot 10^3$. This value is greater than $W_{TR}^{(2)}(t)$ but less than $W_{TR}^{(1)}(t)$ at $t > 10^{-10}$ s, where the processes of the spontaneous phonon emission by an electron temporarily occupying the "transport" level become prevailing. So, at $\tau_{op} < 100$ ps, the error rate does not exceed the value of $D(\tau_{op}) = 3 \cdot 10^3$.

V. DISCUSSION

Fast auxiliary-state-assisted evolution of the double-donor charge qubit driven by the resonant electromagnetic field allows for implementation of various one-qubit rotations in very short operation times $\tau_{op} < 100$ ps, thus minimizing the unwanted decoherence effects. At such times, the error rate due to acoustic phonons is $D(\tau_{op}) = 3 \cdot 10^3$ at $T = 0$. At finite temperatures, such that $k_B T > \hbar \omega_0$, where $\hbar \omega_0 = \hbar s a_B = 2$ meV for dephasing processes and "non-resonant" emission/absorption transitions, and $\hbar \omega_0 = E_i - E_f$ for the "resonant" $|j_{ii}\rangle \leftrightarrow |j_{fi}\rangle$ transitions, the error rate increases by a factor of $k_B T / \hbar \omega_0$.

The most strong increase in the error rate at $T \neq 0$ occurs if the two donors in the molecular ion P_2^+Si are equivalent since in this case the energies E_L and E_R of the lowest localized states $|Li\rangle$ and $|Ri\rangle$ are equal to each other, and the difference $E_2 - E_1$ between the eigenenergies of the two lowest delocalized molecular states $|j_{1i}\rangle$ and $|j_{2i}\rangle$ is exponentially

small at large donor separations, e. g., $E_2 - E_1 = 10^{-6}$ meV at $R = 60$ nm, see Eq. (4). To weaken decoherence, it would be reasonable to make use of the surface gates in order to increase the difference $E_R - E_L$ up to $E_R - E_L = 1$ meV so that the energy basis of the electron be formed by the states $|L\rangle$ and $|R\rangle$ instead of the states $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$. In this case, the electromagnetic field should have two components driving the electron transitions $|L\rangle \leftrightarrow |TR\rangle$ and $|R\rangle \leftrightarrow |TR\rangle$ between the states $|L;R\rangle$ and the auxiliary "transport" state $|TR\rangle$.

At $T \neq 0$, the processes of the phonon absorption by an electron temporarily occupying the "transport" state also contribute to decoherence. For our choice of the "transport" state, $|TR\rangle = |3\rangle$, the state nearest to it in energy is the state $|4\rangle$. In the case that the two donors are equivalent and $R = a_B > 15$, this is the $4f_u$ state $|4\rangle = [2S_{i_L} - 2P_{x i_L} - 2S_{i_R} - 2P_{x i_R}]/2$ whose wave function ψ_{4i} is antisymmetric about the midpoint of the line joining the two donors [31]. At $x = R = a_B \gg 1$ the energy separation [30] $E_4 - E_3 = E(x^3=4) \exp(-x^2/2) [1 + O(1/x)]$ is small but greatly exceeds the value of $E_2 - E_1$, e. g., $E_4 - E_3 = 0.3$ meV at $R = 60$ nm. The donor asymmetry in the presence of the gate potentials will result in a further increase in $E_4 - E_3$, so that the phonon absorption processes will not contribute much to decoherence at sufficiently low temperatures $T < 10$ K.

Thus, the error rate due to phonon-induced decoherence is $D_{(op)} = 3 \cdot 10^3$ at $\tau_{op} < 100$ ps and $T < 10$ K. This value should be compared to the error rates due to other sources of decoherence. The lowest bounds for the decoherence times associated with the Johnson noise from the gates and the environmental charge fluctuations are [16, 20, 26], respectively, 1 s and 1 ns, so that the corresponding error rates [14] $D_{(op)} =$

$1 - \exp(-\tau_{\text{op}}/\tau_{\text{ph}})$ do not exceed that due to phonons at $\tau_{\text{op}} < (1 - 10)$ ps. Hence, the performance of the buried donor charge qubit appears to be limited primarily by the electron-phonon interaction. In this paper, we concentrated on the phosphorous donors in silicon. Since the spectral function (34) that ultimately determines the error rate for one-qubit operations is a material constant, it would be worthwhile to search for other materials and/or doping elements for the buried donor charge qubit, in order to weaken the decoherence effects.

Although we restricted ourselves to rectangular shapes of the resonant pulses, our consideration can be generalized to other pulse shapes [41]. The results obtained can be also applied to quantum-dot structures and Josephson three-level gates [41, 42, 43, 44]. Finally, once a fundamental possibility of the auxiliary-state-assisted operations has been demonstrated, it is straightforward to organize the coupling of P_2^+ Si qubits for conditional quantum operations [16, 20].

In summary, we have proposed a scheme for fast rotations of the buried donor charge qubit through an auxiliary-state-assisted electron evolution under the influence of resonant microwave pulses. This scheme allows for implementation of one-qubit operations in times as short as $\tau_{\text{op}} \sim 1$ ps. By the example of the P_2^+ Si qubit, we have shown that dephasing and "non-resonant" relaxation due to acoustic phonons are the main sources of decoherence. The error rate at $T < 10$ K and operation times $\tau_{\text{op}} = (1 - 10)$ ps is about 3×10^{-3} , i. e., greater than the fault-tolerance threshold for quantum computation but sufficiently low to investigate the small-scale devices and thus to demonstrate the experimental feasibility of the scheme.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

Discussions with A. V. Tsukanov, L. Fedichkin, and M. S. Litsarev are gratefully acknowledged.

References

- [1] A. Barenco, D. Deutsch, A. Ekert, and R. Jozsa, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4083 (1995).
- [2] A. Shnirman, G. Schon, and Z. Hermon, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 2371 (1997).
- [3] D. Loss and D. P. DiVincenzo, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 120 (1998).
- [4] Y. Nakamura, Yu. A. Pashkin, and J. S. Tsai, *Nature* **398**, 786 (1999).
- [5] Yu. A. Pashkin, T. Yamamoto, O. Astaev, Y. Nakamura, D. V. Averin, and J. S. Tsai, *Nature* **421**, 823 (2003).
- [6] B. E. Kane, *Nature* **393**, 133 (1998).
- [7] B. E. Kane, N. S. M cAlpine, A. S. Durak, R. G. Clark, G. J. Milburn, He Bi Sun, and H. Wiseman, *Phys. Rev. B* **61**, 2961 (2000).
- [8] R. Vrijen, E. Yablonovitch, K. Wang, H. W. Jiang, A. Balandin, V. Roychowdhury, T. Mor, and D. DiVincenzo, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 012306 (2000).
- [9] L. A. Openov, *Phys. Rev. B* **60**, 8798 (1999); cond-mat/9906390.
- [10] L. Fedichkin, M. Yanchenko, and K. A. Valiev, *Nanotechnology* **11**, 387 (2000).
- [11] T. Tanamoto, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 022305 (2000).
- [12] J. H. Oh, D. Ahn, and S. W. Hwang, *Phys. Rev. A* **62**, 052306 (2000).

- [13] T. Hayashi, T. Fujisawa, H. D. Cheong, Y. H. Jeong, and Y. Hirayama, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 226804 (2003).
- [14] L. Fedichkin and A. Fedorov, Phys. Rev. A 69, 032311 (2004).
- [15] J. R. Petta, A. C. Johnson, C. M. Marcus, M. P. Hanson, and A. C. Gossard, e-print cond-mat/0408139.
- [16] L. C. L. Hollenberg, A. S. Dzurak, C. Wellard, A. R. Hamilton, D. J. Reilly, G. J. Milburn, and R. G. Clark, Phys. Rev. B 69, 113301 (2004).
- [17] A. V. Tukanov and L. A. Openov, Fiz. Tekh. Poluprovodn. (St. Petersburg) 38, 94 (2004) [Semiconductors 38, 91 (2004)].
- [18] D. M. Eigler and E. K. Schweizer, Nature 344, 524 (1990).
- [19] S. R. Schofield, N. J. Curson, M. Y. Simmons, F. J. Rue, T. Hallam, L. Oberbeck, and R. G. Clark, Phys. Rev. Lett. 91, 136104 (2003).
- [20] A. S. Dzurak, L. C. L. Hollenberg, D. N. Jamieson, F. E. Stanley, C. Yang, T. M. Buhler, V. Chan, D. J. Reilly, C. Wellard, A. R. Hamilton, C. I. Pakes, A. G. Ferguson, E. Gauja, S. Prawer, G. J. Milburn, and R. G. Clark, e-print cond-mat/0306265.
- [21] D. P. DiVincenzo, Fortschr. Phys. 48, 771 (2000).
- [22] L. A. Openov and A. V. Tukanov, Pis'ma Zh. Eksp. Teor. Fiz. 80, 572 (2004) [JETP Letters 80, 503 (2004)]; cond-mat/0411010; L. A. Openov, Phys. Rev. B 70, 233313 (2004); cond-mat/0411605.

- [23] L.M. Kettle, H.-S. Goan, S.C. Smith, C.J. Wellard, L.C.L. Hollenberg, and C.I. Pakes, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 075317 (2003).
- [24] R.L. Aggarwal, *Solid State Commun.* **2**, 163 (1964).
- [25] A. Baldereschi, *Phys. Rev. B* **1**, 4673 (1970).
- [26] S.D. Barrett and G.J. Milburn, *Phys. Rev. B* **68**, 155307 (2003).
- [27] Note that the isotropic effective mass approximation gives for the ground state energy of a single phosphorous donor in silicon the value $E = E_{\infty} - 20 \text{ meV}$ which is about half of the experimentally observed value $E = 45.5 \text{ meV}$, see, e.g., S.T. Pantelides and C.T. Sah, *Phys. Rev. B* **10**, 621 (1974).
- [28] D.R. Bates and R.H.G. Reid, *Adv. At. Mol. Phys.* **4**, 13 (1968).
- [29] N. Bardsley, T. Holstein, B.R. Junker, and S. Sinha, *Phys. Rev. A* **11**, 1911 (1975).
- [30] T.C. Scott, A. Dalgarno, and J.D. Morgan, III, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **67**, 1419 (1991).
- [31] S. Fudzinaga, *Molecular orbitals method* (Mir, Moscow, 1983), Translated from Japanese.
- [32] The resonant approximation is valid if the absolute value of the detuning from resonance, $\hbar = \hbar! (E_{\text{TR}} - E_{L,R})$, is small compared to the spacing between the energy E_{TR} of the state $|j_{\text{TR}}\rangle$ and the energy E^0 of the state $|j^0\rangle$ nearest to $|j_{\text{TR}}\rangle$. In the case that there are two components in $E(t)$, the absolute values of both $\hbar_L = \hbar!_L (E_{\text{TR}} - E_L)$ and $\hbar_R = \hbar!_R (E_{\text{TR}} - E_R)$ should be small compared to $|E^0 - E_{\text{TR}}|$.

- [33] L.D. Landau and E.M. Lifshitz, Quantum Mechanics, 3rd ed. (Nauka, Moscow, 1974). Chapter "Perturbation theory". Note that Eq. (23) is applicable for as long as $|\dot{a}_{if}(\omega; t)| < 1$.
- [34] U. Bockelmann and G. Bastard, Phys. Rev. B 42, 8947 (1990).
- [35] Note that at $T = 0$, there are no phonons in the sample, and hence only the second term in Eq. (22) is relevant for the electron-phonon interaction since the initial and final phonon states, $|j_{ph}\rangle$ and $\langle f_{ph}|$, are, respectively, the states $|0\rangle_{ph} e^{iE_0 t}$ and $\langle 1_q| e^{i(E_0 + \hbar\omega_q)t}$, where $E_0 = \frac{p^2}{2m}$ ($\hbar\omega_q = 2$), so that $\langle f_{ph} | \hat{H}_{ph}^+ | j_{ph} \rangle = e^{i\omega_q t}$.
- [36] T. Brandes and T. Vorrath, Phys. Rev. B 66, 075341 (2002).
- [37] N.G. van Kampen, J. Stat. Phys. 78, 299 (1995).
- [38] D. Mozysky and V. Privman, J. Stat. Phys. 91, 787 (1998).
- [39] F.-S. Liu, K.-D. Peng, and W.-F. Chen, Int. J. Theor. Phys. 40, 2037 (2001).
- [40] L.A. Openov, Phys. Rev. Lett. 93, 158901 (2004); cond-mat/0410106.
- [41] E. Paspalakis, Z. Kis, E. Voutsinas, and A.F. Terzis, Phys. Rev. B 69, 155316 (2004).
- [42] Z. Kis and E. Paspalakis, Phys. Rev. B 69, 024510 (2004).
- [43] C.-P. Yang, S.-I. Chu, and S. Han, Phys. Rev. A 67, 042311 (2003).
- [44] M.H.S. Amin, A.Yu. Smirnov, and A.M. van den Brink, Phys. Rev. B 67, 100508 (2003).




Fig. 1. The logical states $|L\rangle$ and $|R\rangle$ of the buried donor charge qubit.




Fig. 2a.

Fig. 2. One-electron wave functions of the two lowest states, $1s_g$ (a) and $2p_u$ (b), and the excited state $3d_g$ (c) of the molecular ion P_2^+Si in the isotropic effective mass approximation. The coordinate X is along the line joining the two donors. The donor separation is $R = 20a_B$. The symmetric and antisymmetric linear superpositions of $1s_g$ and $2p_u$ states correspond to $1s$ atomic states $|L\rangle$ and $|R\rangle$ localized at the left and the right donor, respectively. They form the qubit logical states $|0\rangle = |L\rangle$ and $|1\rangle = |R\rangle$. The excited state $3d_g$ is an auxiliary ("transport") state needed to transfer an electron between $|L\rangle$ and $|R\rangle$ states upon the influence of the external electromagnetic field.




Fig. 2b.




Fig. 2c.