# T im e evolution and decoherence of entangled states realized in coupled superconducting ux qubits

Takuya Mouri<sup>1,2</sup>, Hayato Nakano<sup>2,3</sup>, and Hideaki Takayanagi<sup>1,2,3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>D epartm ent of Physics, Tokyo University of Science, Tokyo 162-8601, Japan

<sup>2</sup>CREST, Japan Science Technology Agency, Saitam a 332-0012, Japan

<sup>3</sup>NTT Basic Research Laboratories, NTT Corporation, Kanagawa 243-0198, Japan

(Dated: April 14, 2024)

We study theoretically how decoherence a ects superposition states composed of entangled states in inductively coupled two superconducting ux-qubits. We discover that the quantum uctuation of an observable in a coupled ux-qubit system plays a crucial role in decoherence when the expectation value of the observable is zero. This exam pli es that decoherence can be also induced through a quantum mechanically higher-order e ect. We also nd that there exists a decoherence free subspace for the environm ent coupled via a charge degree of freedom of the qubit system.

PACS num bers: 03.67 Lx, 74.50.+ r, 85.25.Cp

#### I. IN TRODUCTION

Josephson-junction circuits behave quantum mechanically, if they are su ciently decoupled from their environment. However, in reality, since a macroscopic quantum state is di cult to be decoupled from their environment com pletely, a quantum mechanical superposition state su ers decoherence. This is one of the central problem s that must be solved before these circuits can be used for quantum information processing [1]. In order to minimize decoherence on quantum states, it is very important to search what is the dom inant source of decoherence and how sensitively qubits feel the e ect of environment. In this paper, we theoretically present that the quantum uctuation of an observable in a coupled ux-qubit plays a crucial role in decoherence, even if the expectation value of the obseravable is always zero. We also report that we can extract a decoherence-free single-qubit basis from an inductively coupled ux-qubit system .

## II. IN DUCTIVELY COUPLED TW O FLUX QUBIT SYSTEM

A m ong qubits based on Josephson-junction circuits, a ux qubit was realized as a superconducting ring with three Josephson-junctions[2,3] and coherent oscillations were demonstrated [4,5,6]. We discuss decoherence appearing in the dynam ics of an inductively coupled two superconducting ux-qubits in Fig. 1(a) [7,8]. Four of Josephson-junctions have the Josephson energy  $E_J$  and capacitance C. The remaining two have  $E_J$  and C, where = 0:75 is a constant. The H am iltonian of the system is given by

$$H = \frac{C}{2} \frac{h}{2e} \sum_{-L_{1}}^{2} + \sum_{-R_{1}}^{2} + \sum_{-L_{2}}^{2} + \sum_{-R_{2}}^{2} + (\sum_{-L_{3}}^{2} + \sum_{-R_{3}}^{2})$$

$$E_{J} (\cos[_{L_{1}}] + \cos[_{R_{1}}] + \cos[_{L_{2}}] + \cos[_{R_{2}}](1 + (\cos[_{L_{3}}] + \cos[_{R_{3}}])) + \frac{1}{2M} \frac{h}{2e} \sum_{-M}^{2} \frac{2}{M};$$

where \_i (i= L1;R1;L2;R2;L3;R3;M) is the phase difference across each junction or the inductance. By calculating the H am iltonian with parameters  $E_J = 100G H z$ ,  $E_C = \frac{(2e)^2}{2C} = 8G H z$ , = 0.75,  $M = \frac{1}{20E_J} (\frac{h}{2e})^2$ , we can obtain the energy dispersion shown in Fig. 1 (b) and we call the point at f = 0.5 as the \degeneracy point".




FIG.1: (a)E ective circuit of inductively coupled two ux qubits. Two superconducting closed loops correspond to two ux qubits. A qubit has three Josephson junctions. An extenal ux  $_1$  or  $_2$  is penetrating through each qubit loop. Q ubits are coupled to each other through the mutual inductance M. (b)Energy dispersions obtained when identical external uxes are applied to the qubits,  $f = _1 = _0 = _2 = _0$  ( $_0 = h=2e$ ).

We can approximate the Hamiltonian for the two-qubit system using Paulimatrices  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,  $\frac{1}{2}$ ,

 $H_{S} = h_{1} \frac{z}{1} + \frac{x}{1} + h_{2} \frac{z}{2} + \frac{x}{2} + \frac{z}{1} \frac{z}{1} \frac{z}{2}$ :

Here, subscripts 1 and 2 indicate the left and right qubits, respectively. The basis of the two-qubit state are  $j\#_1\#_2i,j\#_1"_2i,j"_1\#_2i$  and  $j"_1"_2i$ , where  $j"_ii$  corresponds to the state where the persistent current ow s counterclockw ise and  $j\#_ii$  to the clockw ise state around the loop of the qubit i(i = 1;2).  $h_i(i = 1;2)$  is the parameter that depends on the external  $ux_i$  for the qubit  $i, and h_i = I_{pi}(i = \frac{0}{2}) = I_{pi} 0$  ( $f_i = \frac{1}{2}$ ), where  $I_{pi}(i = 1;2)$  is the absolute value of the persistent current in the each qubit determ ined by  $E_J$  and 0 = h=2e is the  $ux_i$  quantum. i(i = 1;2) is the tunneling matrix element each qubit has, which is the order of  $P_{E_C E_J}e^{P_{E_J}E_C}$ .

j is the coupling constant between two qubits, which is determ ined approximately by M  $I_{p1}I_{p2}$ . If the external ux is equally applied  $(h_1 = h_2 = h)$  and the two qubits are assumed to be identical  $(_1 = _2 = )$ , we can simplify the Ham iltonian as

$$H_{S} = h_{1}^{z} + h_{1}^{x} + h_{2}^{z} + j_{1}^{z} + j_{1}^{z}$$

By comparing energy eigenstates of the H<sub>s</sub> and Fig. 1 (b) near the degeneracy point, we nd that this approximated H am iltonian H<sub>s</sub> reproduces well the result of the original two ux-qubit H am iltonian with j = 1.78G Hz and = 2.07G Hz. Therefore, hereafter we analyze the decoherence in our coupled ux-qubit system with this H<sub>s</sub>. In terms of the original ux-qubit system,  $\sum_{i}^{z}$  corresponds to the ux the qubit i has, and  $\sum_{i}^{x}$  to the charge polarization in the junction of the qubit. At the degeneracy point h = 0, we can obtain eigenvalues and eigenstates[7],

$$E_{0} = \frac{p}{j^{2} + 4} \frac{2}{j^{2}}; \quad j_{0}i = j''_{1}''_{2}i + j\#_{1}\#_{2}i$$

$$\frac{j + p}{j^{2} + 4} \frac{2}{j^{2}}; \quad j_{1}i = j''_{1}\#_{2}i + j\#_{1}''_{2}i);$$

$$E_{1} = j; \quad j_{1}i = j''_{1}\#_{2}i \quad j\#_{1}''_{2}i;$$

$$E_{3} = \frac{p}{j^{2} + 4} \frac{2}{j^{2}}; \quad j_{2}i = j''_{1}''_{2}i + j\#_{1}\#_{2}i;$$

$$\frac{j}{j^{2} + 4} \frac{2}{j^{2}}; \quad j_{3}i = j''_{1}''_{2}i + j\#_{1}\#_{2}i \quad (2)$$

$$\frac{j}{j^{2} + 4} \frac{2}{j^{2}}; \quad j_{3}i = j''_{1}\#_{2}i + j\#_{1}''_{2}i):$$

Here, a remarkable fact is that all the eigenstates of the two-qubit Ham iltonian at the degeneracy point are strongly entangled ones. A dopting a state composed of these entangled states as an initial state, we will discuss the time evolution of the density operator and som e 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 environm ent. The total H am iltonian is H  $_{\rm TOT}$  =  $\rm H_{S}$  +  $\rm H_{E}$  +  $\rm H_{IN\,T}$  , where  $\rm H_{S}$  ,  $\rm H_{E}$  , and  $\rm H_{IN\,T}$  , are the Ham iltonian of the qubit system, the environment, and the interaction between them, respectively. We showed already H<sub>S</sub> and the components of environgment and interaction are described as follows; H  $_{\rm E}$  =  $_{n} h \, ! \, _{n} \, a_{n}^{\rm Y} a_{n}$  ,  $H_{INT} = x_{k} (a_k + a_k^{y})$ . We regard the environment as a boson bath.  $a_k$ ,  $a_k^y$  are the annihilation and the creation operators of the environmental mode k.  $_k$  is the strength of the coupling in each m ode. x m eans a physical quantity of the qubit system that is coupled to the environm ent. A ssum ing that the system -environm ent coupling is small enough, we can treat H  $_{\rm INT}$  as a perturbative term so that we acquire a quantum master equation [9],

$$s = \frac{1}{h} \int_{0}^{Z_{t}} dt_{1} ((t_{1})[x; [x(t_{1}); s]])$$
  
i (t\_{1})[x; fx(t\_{1}); sg]);

where

$$(t) = \int_{0}^{Z_{1}} d! \cos[!t] \operatorname{oth} \left[\frac{!}{2k_{B}T}\right] J(!);$$

$$\int_{0}^{Z_{1}} d! \sin[!t] J(!):$$

 $k_B$  is the Boltzm an constant and T is the absolute tem – perature. W e adopt the spectral density J (!) =  $g \frac{1 a^2}{a^2 + 1^2}$ . Here a is the cut o frequency and we set a = 5.

## $\ensuremath{\operatorname{IV}}$ . RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

#### A. decoherence via ux degree

First, we assume that the interaction between the system and the environm ent is caused only through the total ux of qubits; then we take  $x = \frac{z}{1} + \frac{z}{2}$ . This is a reasonable situation because we can expect that the system su ers decoherence due to the coupling to the detector like a SQUD and the uctuation of the external  $ux_{r}$ both of which are related to small ux generated by the persistent currents owing in qubits. Now, we consider a superposition state composed of the rst and second excited states  $j_{12}(0)i = \frac{p^2}{p^2}(j_1i+j_2i)$  at the degeneracy point (h = 0) as the initial state. W e can analytically calculate the time evolutions of expectation values  $h_{1}^{z}i$ ,  $h_{2}^{z}i$ ,  $h_{1}^{x}i$  and  $h_{2}^{x}i$  when there is no decoherence. Provided that it is possible to set independent probes which can detect both ux and charge on each of qubits, we can measure expectation values  $h_1^z i_1 h_2^z i_2 h_1^x i_1$  and h  $\frac{x}{2}$  i independently. j  $\frac{12}{12}$  (t) i and the time evolutions of observables at h = 0 are obtained as follow s;

$$j_{12}(t)i = \cos[jt]j \#_{x1} \#_{x2}i + isin[jt]j \#_{x1} \#_{x2}i;$$
(3)  

$$h_{12}(t)j_{1}^{z}j_{12}(t)i = 0;$$
  

$$h_{12}(t)j_{2}^{z}j_{12}(t)i = 0;$$
  

$$h_{12}(t)j_{1}^{x}j_{12}(t)i = \cos[2jt];$$
  

$$h_{12}(t)j_{2}^{x}j_{12}(t)i = \cos[2jt]:$$

Here  $j "_{xi}i = j "_{i}i + j \#_{i}i$ ,  $j \#_{xi}i = j "_{i}i + j \#_{i}i$ (i = 1;2). This shows that this coherent oscillation is impossible to detect through the ux, but there is a possiblity 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 h  $_{2}^{2}i$  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  $h_1^z + \frac{z}{2}i$  is zero. A linear 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  $h_1^zi$  and  $h_2^zi$ . We




FIG. 2: (a)T in e evolution of expectation values  $h_1^x$ i and  $h_2^x$ i in the presence of decoherence. (b)T in e evolution of the eigenvalues  $p_i$  (i = 1;2;3;4) of the density operator. (h = 0, j = 1:78, = 2:07, g = 1) T in e is normalized by . The initial state is j<sub>12</sub> (0)i. D ecoherence is caused through x =  $\frac{z}{1} + \frac{z}{2}$ .

nd that thier am plitudes are obviously su ering decoherence. T im e evolution of eigenvalues of the density operator in F ig. 2 (b) helps us realize that a pure state is rapidly changing into a m ixed state due to decoherence because the em ergence of the nite second and later eigenvalues m eans the system becom es a m ixed state. Therefore, we can m ake sure that, even if the expectation value of the interacting quantity between system and environm ent is always zero, there exists certain e ect of decoherence.

Next, we discuss when the initial state is the superposition state  $j_{01}(0)i = \frac{p^2}{2}(j_0i + j_1i)$  of the ground and the rst excited states. Figure 3(a) shows oscilla-




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

tions of the ux induced at the qubit1 and qubit2, and these oscillations suggest that the possibility to detect the uxes  $h_1^z$ i,  $h_2^z$ i separately by setting an independent SQUID s over each of the qubits. Figure 3(a) also shows that am plitudes of oscillations hardly decay and it seems that the oscillations are hardly a ected 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 environm ent is always zero (h $_1^z + \frac{z}{2}i=0$ ). From the above two examples, surely, we can make coherent oscillations where hH  $_{\rm IN\,T}i=hxi$   $_{\rm k}$  ( $a_{\rm k} + a_{\rm k}^{\rm Y}$ ) = 0 by using initial states which is composed by entangled energy eigenstates. However, one is strongly a ected by decoherence and the other is not. Then, we are interested in considering how quantum uctuations of the coupling x m ay become the source of decoherence[8]. In fact, the calculations obtaining Figs. 2 and 3 also give the nite quantum uctuations

$$p \frac{p}{h_{12}(t)jx^2j_{12}(t)i} 1:4;$$

$$p \frac{p}{h_{01}(t)jx^2j_{01}(t)i} 0:75;$$

where  $x^2 \ x^2 \ hx^2$ . It books like that the quantum uctuations of the coupling x and resulting m agnitude of decoherence are determined by the curvatures of energy dispersions in Fig. 1(b) around the degeneracy point f = 0.5. The quantum uctuation of  $x = \frac{z}{1} + \frac{z}{2}$  qualitatively corresponds to the quantum uctuation of an applied ux in the horizontal axis of Fig. 1(b). In fact, by a perturbation calculation under the condition hj j jjjj the energy dispersion of an eigenstate jii in the vicinity of the degeneracy point is given by

$$E_{i} E_{i}^{0} h^{2} \prod_{j \in i}^{X} \frac{hi0j_{1}^{z} + \frac{z}{2}jj0ihj0j_{1}^{z} + \frac{z}{2}jj0i}{E_{j}^{0} E_{i}^{0}};$$

where  $E_{i}^{0}$  and juliare the eigenenergy and eigenstate at the degeneracy point. So, the curvature  $\frac{\theta^{2}E_{i}}{\theta h^{2}}$  (i = 0;1;2) is approximately proportional to

hi0j
$$_1^z$$
 +  $_2^z$ jj0ihj0j $_1^z$  +  $_2^z$ jj0i;

that is the quantum uctuation 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 de ned as  $P_{p_{4}}^{1}$  where i (i = 1;2;3;4) is the C (t) = 2 3 1  $_{i}\dot{p}_{i}\dot{j}_{1}^{2}\dot{p}_{i}\dot{j}_{1}^{2}\dot{j}_{2}\dot{j}_{i}\dot{i}\dot{j}_{.}^{2}$  This is ith eigenvalue of (t) a very important measure because the concurrence tells us how the two qubits keep entanglem ent which provide us the possiblity to implement quantum parallelism calculations. Figure 4 shows the time evolution of the concurrence. W hen com pared with the decays of the corresponding coherent oscillations in Figs. 2 (a) and 4 (a), we can nd that the entanglem ent decays m ore rapidly than the observables h  $\frac{x}{1}$  i and h  $\frac{x}{2}$  in the presence of decoherence.

#### B. decoherence via charge degree

N ext, we suppose that the interaction between the system and the environm ent is only through the total charge




FIG.4: (a)T in e evolution of the concurrence with the initial state j  $_{12}$  (0)i. (b)T in e evolution of the concurrence with the initial state j  $_{01}$  (0)i.

freedom the qubits have;  $x = \frac{x}{1} + \frac{x}{2}$ . For example, this type of interaction m ight appear in the presence of residual charges near the qubit junctions. W hen the initial state is  $j_{12}(0)i = \frac{p^2}{2}(j_1i + j_2i)$ , as we have analytically calculated, we have already known h <sup>z</sup><sub>1</sub> i and h <sup>z</sup><sub>2</sub> i are always zero and h  $_{12}$  (t) j $_1^x$  j $_{12}$  (t) i and h  $_{12}$  (t) j $_2^x$  j $_{12}$  (t) i oscillate sinusoidally. The num erical calculation of the tim e evolution gives the behavior of the expectation values, shown in Fig. 5(a). We can see  $h_1^x$  i and  $h_2^x$  i am azingly keep oscillating without any reduction of the amplitudes, and we have con med that the pure state is kept perfectly. We nd this is because the two basis states  $j_1$  i and  $j_2$  i composing the initial state  $j_{12}$  (0) i construct a D ecoherence 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<sub>1</sub> i and  $j_2 i$  are the degenerate eigenstates of x. Therefore, we can suggest that it is possible to design a single quantum bit which does not form entanglem ent with the environm ent through the charge degree of freedom for a superposition state of  $j_1$  i and  $j_2$  i. This is an example of a suppression of decoherence by introducing a redundant qubit and a qubit-qubit interaction, like quantum error

- <sup>1</sup> Y.Makhlin, G.Schon and A.Shnim an, Rev.Mod.Phys. 357, 73, (2001), and references therein.
- <sup>2</sup> J.E.Mooij T.P.O rlando, L.Levitov, Lin.Tian, Casper H.van derWal, Seth Lloyd, Science 285, 1036 (2003).
- <sup>3</sup> C.H.van der Wal, A.C.J.ter Haar, F.K.W ilhelm, R. N.Schouten, C.J.P.M.Harmans, T.P.Orlando, Seth. Lloyd, J.E.Mooij, Science 290, 773 (2000).
- <sup>4</sup> I. Chiorescu, Y. Nakamura, C. J. P. M. Harmans, and J. E. Mooij, Science 299, 1869 (2003).
- $^5\,$  H . Tanaka et al., cond-m at/0407299.
- $^{\rm 6}\,$  T .K utsuzawa et al., subm itted to Appl.Phys.Lett.
- <sup>7</sup> J.B.Majer, F.G.Paauw, A.C. ter Haar, C.J.P.M. Harmans, and J.E.Mooij cond-mat/0308192.
- <sup>8</sup> J. Q. You, Y. Nakamura, and Franco. Nori, cond-

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




FIG. 5: (a)T in e evolution of the expectation values  $h_1^x i_r$ ,  $h_2^x i_r$  (b)T in e evolution of concurrence. The initial state is  $j_{12}$  (0)i. D ecoherence is caused through  $x = \frac{x}{1} + \frac{x}{2}$ .

V. SUMMARY AND CONCLUSION

In sum m ary, we analyzed the tim e evolution of an inductively coupled ux qubit system in the presence of environm ent. W e con m ed the importance of quantum uctuations of the observable coupled to the environm ent. W e also found two basis states constructing a DFS for charge uctuations.

### A cknow ledgem ents

W e thank F.W ilhelm for valuable discussions. W e also acknow ledge K. Sem ba, S. Saito, H. Tanaka, F. Deppe and J. Johansson for their comments from the view point of experiments. M. U eda should be acknow ledged for his helpful advices.

m at/0309491.

- <sup>9</sup> J.P.Paz and W.H.Zurek, p.536 ineC oherent atom ic m atter waves', edited by P.Kaiser et al., (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2001).
- <sup>10</sup> D. A. Lidar and K. B. W haley, p. 83 ineInveversible Quantum Dynamics', edited by F. Benatti, R. Floreanini, (Springer-Verlag, Berin, 2003).
- <sup>11</sup> A similar DFS was discovered in a charge-coupled ux qubits. M J. Storcz et al., cond-m at/0407780.
- <sup>12</sup> H. Nakano and H. Takayanagi, p. 28 in Proc. of ISQM -Tokyo'01, edited by Y. A. Ono and K. Fujikawa (W orld Scienti c, Singapore, 2002).