

j is the coupling constant between two qubits, which is determined approximately by $M I_{p1} I_{p2}$. If the external flux is equally applied ($h_1 = h_2 = h$) and the two qubits are assumed to be identical ($\phi_1 = \phi_2 = \phi$), we can simplify the Hamiltonian as

$$H_S = h \frac{z}{1} + \frac{x}{1} + h \frac{z}{2} + \frac{z}{2} + j \frac{z}{1} \frac{z}{2};$$

By comparing energy eigenstates of the H_S and Fig. 1(b) near the degeneracy point, we find that this approximated Hamiltonian H_S reproduces well the result of the original two-flux-qubit Hamiltonian with $j = 1.78 \text{ GHz}$ and $\phi = 2.07 \text{ GHz}$. Therefore, hereafter we analyze the decoherence in our coupled flux-qubit system with this H_S . In terms of the original flux-qubit system, $\frac{z}{1}$ corresponds to the flux the qubit 1 has, and $\frac{x}{1}$ to the charge polarization in the junction of the qubit. At the degeneracy point $h = 0$, we can obtain eigenvalues and eigenstates[7],

$$\begin{aligned} E_0 &= \frac{p}{j^2 + 4} \frac{z}{2}; \quad j_{0i} = j_{11}^2 i + j_{\#1}^2 i \\ &\quad \left(\frac{j + \frac{p}{j^2 + 4}}{2} \right) (j_{11}^2 i + j_{\#1}^2 i); \\ E_1 &= j; \quad j_{1i} = j_{11}^2 i - j_{\#1}^2 i; \\ E_2 &= j; \quad j_{2i} = j_{11}^2 i - j_{\#1}^2 i; \\ E_3 &= \frac{p}{j^2 + 4} \frac{z}{2}; \quad j_{3i} = j_{11}^2 i + j_{\#1}^2 i \\ &\quad \left(\frac{j - \frac{p}{j^2 + 4}}{2} \right) (j_{11}^2 i + j_{\#1}^2 i); \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

Here, a remarkable fact is that all the eigenstates of the two-qubit Hamiltonian at the degeneracy point are strongly entangled ones. Adopting a state composed of these entangled states as an initial state, we will discuss the time evolution of the density operator and some quantities.

III. PHYSICAL MODEL OF DECOHERENCE AND QUANTUM MASTER EQUATION

In order to take into account decoherence, we consider the total system as the sum of the qubit system and the environment. The total Hamiltonian is $H_{TOT} = H_S + H_E + H_{INT}$, where H_S , H_E , and H_{INT} , are the Hamiltonian of the qubit system, the environment, and the interaction between them, respectively. We showed already H_S and the components of environment and interaction are described as follows; $H_E = \sum_n \hbar \omega_n a_n^\dagger a_n$, $H_{INT} = \sum_k x_k a_k (a_k + a_k^\dagger)$. We regard the environment as a boson bath. a_k , a_k^\dagger are the annihilation and the creation operators of the environmental mode k . x_k is the strength of the coupling in each mode. x means a physical quantity of the qubit system that is coupled to the environment. Assuming that the system-environment coupling is small enough, we can treat H_{INT} as a perturbative term so that we acquire a quantum master equation

[9],

$$\begin{aligned} \dot{\rho}_S &= \frac{1}{\hbar} \int_0^t dt_1 \left(\rho_S(t_1) [x; [x(t_1); \rho_S]] \right. \\ &\quad \left. - [x(t_1) [x; \rho_S(t_1); \rho_S]] \right); \end{aligned}$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} \rho_S(t) &= \int_0^t d! \cos[!t] \coth\left[\frac{!}{2k_B T}\right] J(!); \\ \rho_S(t) &= \int_0^t d! \sin[!t] J(!); \end{aligned}$$

k_B is the Boltzmann constant and T is the absolute temperature. We adopt the spectral density $J(!) = g \frac{! a^2}{a^2 + !^2}$. Here a is the cutoff frequency and we set $a = 5$.

IV. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. decoherence via flux degree

First, we assume that the interaction between the system and the environment is caused only through the total flux of qubits; then we take $x = \frac{z}{1} + \frac{z}{2}$. This is a reasonable situation because we can expect that the system suffers decoherence due to the coupling to the detector like a SQUID and the fluctuation of the external flux, both of which are related to small flux generated by the persistent currents flowing in qubits. Now, we consider a superposition state composed of the first and second excited states $j_{12}(0)i = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(j_{11}^2 i + j_{21}^2 i)$ at the degeneracy point ($h = 0$) as the initial state. We can analytically calculate the time evolutions of expectation values $\langle h_{11}^2 i \rangle$, $\langle h_{21}^2 i \rangle$, $\langle h_{11}^2 i \rangle$ and $\langle h_{21}^2 i \rangle$ when there is no decoherence. Provided that it is possible to set independent probes which can detect both flux and charge on each of qubits, we can measure expectation values $\langle h_{11}^2 i \rangle$, $\langle h_{21}^2 i \rangle$, $\langle h_{11}^2 i \rangle$ and $\langle h_{21}^2 i \rangle$ independently. $j_{12}(t)i$ and the time evolutions of observables at $h = 0$ are obtained as follows;

$$\begin{aligned} j_{12}(t)i &= \cos[jt] j_{\#1}^2 x_{21}^2 i + i \sin[jt] j_{x1}^2 \#_{x2} i; \quad (3) \\ \langle h_{12}(t) j_{11}^2 j_{12}(t) i \rangle &= 0; \\ \langle h_{12}(t) j_{21}^2 j_{12}(t) i \rangle &= 0; \\ \langle h_{12}(t) j_{11}^2 j_{12}(t) i \rangle &= \cos[2jt]; \\ \langle h_{12}(t) j_{21}^2 j_{12}(t) i \rangle &= \cos[2jt]; \end{aligned}$$

Here $j_{x1}^2 i = j_{11}^2 i + j_{\#1}^2 i$, $j_{\#x1}^2 i = j_{11}^2 i + j_{\#1}^2 i$ ($i = 1, 2$). This shows that this coherent oscillation is impossible to detect through the flux, but there is a possibility to detect through the charge. We will show the result of the numerical calculation in the presence of decoherence, which is obtained by solving the quantum master equation with the above initial state. As we have expected in the analytical calculation, we realize that expectation values $\langle h_{11}^2 i \rangle$ and $\langle h_{21}^2 i \rangle$ obtained in numerical

calculations are always zero. The most interesting feature of this example is that the expectation value of the physical quantity which interacts with the environment $\langle h_1^z + h_2^z \rangle$ is zero. Although we would speculate that there is no coupling between qubits and the environment, this turns out not true according to the calculation results. Figure 2 (a) shows the oscillations of $\langle h_1^x \rangle$ and $\langle h_2^x \rangle$. We




FIG. 2: (a) Time evolution of expectation values $\langle h_1^x \rangle$ and $\langle h_2^x \rangle$ in the presence of decoherence. (b) Time evolution of the eigenvalues p_i ($i = 1; 2; 3; 4$) of the density operator. ($\hbar = 0$, $j = 1/8$, $\alpha = 2.07$, $g = 1$) Time is normalized by τ . The initial state is $|j_{12}(0)\rangle$. Decoherence is caused through $x = \frac{z}{1} + \frac{z}{2}$.

nd that their amplitudes are obviously suffering decoherence. Time evolution of eigenvalues of the density operator in Fig. 2 (b) helps us realize that a pure state is rapidly changing into a mixed state due to decoherence because the emergence of the finite second and later eigenvalues means the system becomes a mixed state. Therefore, we can make sure that, even if the expectation value of the interacting quantity between system and environment is always zero, there exists certain effect of decoherence.

Next, we discuss when the initial state is the superposition state $|j_{01}(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j_{01}\rangle + |j_{11}\rangle)$ of the ground and the first excited states. Figure 3 (a) shows oscillations of the flux induced at the qubit1 and qubit2, and these oscillations suggest that the possibility to detect the fluxes $\langle h_1^z \rangle$, $\langle h_2^z \rangle$ separately by setting an independent SQUIDS over each of the qubits. Figure 3 (a) also shows that amplitudes of oscillations hardly decay and it seems that the oscillations are hardly affected by decoherence. This suggests that it could be possible to realize coherent oscillation which is robust against the




FIG. 3: (a) Time evolution of expectation values $\langle h_1^z \rangle$ and $\langle h_2^z \rangle$ with decoherence via $x = \frac{z}{1} + \frac{z}{2}$. (b) Time evolution of eigenvalues of the density operator. The initial state is $|j_{01}(0)\rangle$.

tions of the flux induced at the qubit1 and qubit2, and these oscillations suggest that the possibility to detect the fluxes $\langle h_1^z \rangle$, $\langle h_2^z \rangle$ separately by setting an independent SQUIDS over each of the qubits. Figure 3 (a) also shows that amplitudes of oscillations hardly decay and it seems that the oscillations are hardly affected by decoherence. This suggests that it could be possible to realize coherent oscillation which is robust against the

decoherence via $x = \frac{z}{1} + \frac{z}{2}$. We can again observe the expectation value of the coupling between the qubit system and the environment is always zero ($\langle h_1^z + h_2^z \rangle = 0$). From the above two examples, surely we can make coherent oscillations where $\langle H_{INT} \rangle = \langle h_1^x \rangle_k \langle h_2^x \rangle_k (a_k + a_k^\dagger) = 0$ by using initial states which is composed by entangled energy eigenstates. However, one is strongly affected by decoherence and the other is not. Then, we are interested in considering how quantum fluctuations of the coupling x may become the source of decoherence [8]. In fact, the calculations obtaining Figs. 2 and 3 also give the finite quantum fluctuations

$$\begin{aligned} \overline{p} \frac{\langle h_{12}(t) \rangle \langle x^2 \rangle_{12}(t)}{\langle h_{01}(t) \rangle \langle x^2 \rangle_{01}(t)} &= 1.4; \\ \overline{p} \frac{\langle h_{12}(t) \rangle \langle x^2 \rangle_{12}(t)}{\langle h_{01}(t) \rangle \langle x^2 \rangle_{01}(t)} &= 0.75; \end{aligned}$$

where $\langle x^2 \rangle = \langle h_1^z \rangle^2$. It looks like that the quantum fluctuations of the coupling x and resulting magnitude of decoherence are determined by the curvatures of energy dispersions in Fig. 1 (b) around the degeneracy point $f = 0.5$. The quantum fluctuation of $x = \frac{z}{1} + \frac{z}{2}$ qualitatively corresponds to the quantum fluctuation of an applied flux in the horizontal axis of Fig. 1 (b). In fact, by a perturbation calculation under the condition $\langle h_1^z \rangle = \langle h_2^z \rangle = \langle j_1 \rangle$, the energy dispersion of an eigenstate $|j_i\rangle$ in the vicinity of the degeneracy point is given by

$$E_i = E_i^0 + \hbar^2 \sum_{j \neq i} \frac{\langle h_1^z \rangle_j \langle h_2^z \rangle_j + \langle j_1 \rangle_j \langle j_2 \rangle_j}{E_j^0 - E_i^0};$$

where E_i^0 and $|j_0\rangle$ are the eigenenergy and eigenstate at the degeneracy point. So, the curvature $\frac{\partial^2 E_i}{\partial \hbar^2}$ ($i = 0; 1; 2$) is approximately proportional to

$$\sum_j \frac{\langle h_1^z \rangle_j \langle h_2^z \rangle_j + \langle j_1 \rangle_j \langle j_2 \rangle_j}{E_j^0 - E_i^0};$$

that is the quantum fluctuation of $\frac{z}{1} + \frac{z}{2}$. As a result, we have reached a conclusion that the decoherence at the degeneracy point depends on the curvature of the energy dispersion around the degeneracy point.

Now we discuss the concurrence which is defined as $C(t) = \frac{1}{2} \left(1 - \sqrt{p_1^2 + p_2^2 + p_3^2 + p_4^2} \right)$ where p_i ($i = 1; 2; 3; 4$) is the i th eigenvalue of $\rho(t) = \frac{1}{4} \langle h_1^z \rangle \langle h_2^z \rangle + \frac{1}{4} \langle j_1 \rangle \langle j_2 \rangle$. This is a very important measure because the concurrence tells us how the two qubits keep entanglement which provide us the possibility to implement quantum parallelism calculations. Figure 4 shows the time evolution of the concurrence. When compared with the decays of the corresponding coherent oscillations in Figs. 2 (a) and 4 (a), we can find that the entanglement decays more rapidly than the observables $\langle h_1^x \rangle$ and $\langle h_2^x \rangle$ in the presence of decoherence.

B. decoherence via charge degree

Next, we suppose that the interaction between the system and the environment is only through the total charge




FIG. 4: (a) Time evolution of the concurrence with the initial state $|j_{12}(0)\rangle$. (b) Time evolution of the concurrence with the initial state $|j_{01}(0)\rangle$.

freedom the qubits have; $x = \frac{x}{1} + \frac{x}{2}$. For example, this type of interaction might appear in the presence of residual charges near the qubit junctions. When the initial state is $|j_{12}(0)\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j_{11}\rangle + |j_{21}\rangle)$, as we have analytically calculated, we have already known h_{11}^x and h_{21}^x are always zero and $h_{12}(t)j_{11}^x j_{12}(t)$ and $h_{12}(t)j_{21}^x j_{12}(t)$ oscillate sinusoidally. The numerical calculation of the time evolution gives the behavior of the expectation values, shown in Fig. 5(a). We can see h_{11}^x and h_{21}^x amazingly keep oscillating without any reduction of the amplitudes, and we have confirmed that the pure state is kept perfectly. We find this is because the two basis states $|j_{11}\rangle$ and $|j_{21}\rangle$ composing the initial state $|j_{12}(0)\rangle$ construct a Decoherence Free Subspace (DFS) [10] for the coupling between the two qubit system and the environment via $x = \frac{x}{1} + \frac{x}{2}$ [10,11]. In other words, $|j_{11}\rangle$ and $|j_{21}\rangle$ are the degenerate eigenstates of x . Therefore, we can suggest that it is possible to design a single quantum bit which does not form entanglement with the environment through the charge degree of freedom for a superposition state of $|j_{11}\rangle$ and $|j_{21}\rangle$. This is an example of a suppression of decoherence by introducing a redundant qubit and a qubit-qubit interaction, like quantum error

correction codes[12]. Figure 5(b) represents time evolution of the concurrence and we can make sure that the entanglement never deteriorates because of the suppression of decoherence in the DFS.




FIG. 5: (a) Time evolution of the expectation values h_{11}^x , h_{21}^x . (b) Time evolution of concurrence. The initial state is $|j_{12}(0)\rangle$. Decoherence is caused through $x = \frac{x}{1} + \frac{x}{2}$.

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In summary, we analyzed the time evolution of an inductively coupled two qubit system in the presence of environment. We confirmed the importance of quantum fluctuations of the observable coupled to the environment. We also found two basis states constructing a DFS for charge fluctuations.

Acknowledgements

We thank F. Wilhelm for valuable discussions. We also acknowledge K. Semba, S. Saito, H. Tanaka, F. Deppe and J. Johansson for their comments from the viewpoint of experiments. M. Ueda should be acknowledged for his helpful advices.

- ¹ Y. Makhlin, G. Schon and A. Shnirman, Rev. Mod. Phys. 357, 73, (2001), and references therein.
- ² J. E. Mooij, T. P. Orlando, L. Levitov, Lin. Tian, Casper H. van der Wal, Seth Lloyd, Science 285, 1036 (2003).
- ³ C. H. van der Wal, A. C. J. ter Haar, F. K. Wilhelm, R. N. Schouten, C. J. P. M. Hamers, T. P. Orlando, Seth. Lloyd, J. E. Mooij, Science 290, 773 (2000).
- ⁴ I. Chiorescu, Y. Nakamura, C. J. P. M. Hamers, and J. E. Mooij, Science 299, 1869 (2003).
- ⁵ H. Tanaka et al., cond-mat/0407299.
- ⁶ T. Kutsuzawa et al., submitted to Appl. Phys. Lett.
- ⁷ J. B. Majer, F. G. Paauw, A. C. ter Haar, C. J. P. M. Hamers, and J. E. Mooij, cond-mat/0308192.
- ⁸ J. Q. You, Y. Nakamura, and Franco. Nori, cond-

mat/0309491.

- ⁹ J. P. Paz and W. H. Zurek, p. 536 in Coherent atomic matter waves', edited by P. Kaiser et al., (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001).
- ¹⁰ D. A. Lidar and K. B. Whaley, p. 83 in Irreversible Quantum Dynamics', edited by F. Benatti, R. F.loreani, (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2003).
- ¹¹ A similar DFS was discovered in a charge-coupled two qubits. M. J. Storz et al., cond-mat/0407780.
- ¹² H. Nakano and H. Takayanagi, p. 28 in Proc. of ISQM - Tokyo'01, edited by Y. A. Ono and K. Fujikawa (World Scientific, Singapore, 2002).