arXiv:quant-ph/0009024v1 6 Sep 2000

Decoherence, pointer engineering and quantum state protection

A R R. Carvalho, P.M ilm an, R. L. de M atos Filho, and L. D avidovich

Instituto de F sica, Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro, Caixa Postal 68528, 21945-970 Rio de Janeiro, RJ, Brazil

(Septem ber 4, 2000)

W e present a proposal for protecting states against decoherence, based on the engineering of pointer states. W e apply this procedure to the vibrationalm otion of a trapped ion, and show how to protect qubits, squeezed states, approxim at phase eigenstates and superpositions of coherent states.

PACS number(s): 03.65 Bz, 42.50 Dv, 42.50 Vk, 89.70.+ c

It is well known that the interaction of a quantum system with its surrounding environm ent m ay lead to quantum entanglem ent between system and environm ent, and to an irreversible loss of information on the system. W hich set of states is less sensitive to entanglem ent depends on the concrete form of the interaction Ham iltonian between system and environment [1]. In the course of the interaction, the reduced density operator of the system becom es rapidly diagonal in this basis, transform ing any initial superposition of these states into a statisticalm ixture. On the other hand, if the system is initially in a pointer state, it will remain in a pure state during its tim e developm ent. The decoherence process by which coherent superpositions of pointer states get transform ed into statistical m ixtures is at the heart of the quantum theory of m easurem ent [2], and plays an essential role in the classical lim it of quantum mechanics [3].

Fighting decoherence has become a major chalenge in the last years, motivated by recent progress in the theory of quantum information processing, which relies on the possibility of preserving quantum coherence [4,5]. It is also of interest to high-precision frequency measurements in ion traps [6]. Several strategies have been devised. They include quantum error correction schemes [7], feedback in plementations [8,9], the realization of qbits in symmetric subspaces decoupled from the environment [10], and dynamical decoupling techniques [11].

In linear ion traps, by far the most important decoherence e ect is the one associated with the motional state [12,13]. In the present paper, we show that decoherence in the vibrational motion of a trapped ion can be suppressed by generating, through the techniques of \reservoir engineering" [14], arti cial reservoirs associated with properly chosen pointer observables, which have the states to be preserved as their eigenstates, and which dom inate over other dissipation processes. We exemplify this procedure by showing how to protect from decoherence several kinds of non-classical states.

Under the hypotheses of M arkovian dynamics, com plete positivity and initial decoupling between system and bath [15,16], a master equation describing the reduced dynamics of a system interacting with its enviroment can be written in the Lindblad form

$$\frac{d^{*}}{dt} = L^{*} \qquad \begin{array}{c} X \\ i = 2 \end{array} (i = 2) 2 \hat{c}_{i}^{*} \hat{c}_{i}^{*} \quad \hat{c}_{i}^{*} \hat{c}_{i}^{*} \quad \hat{c}_{i}^{*} \hat{c}_{i} \quad \hat{c}_{i}^{*} \hat{c}_{i} \quad ; (1)$$

where ^ is the reduced density operator of the system in the interaction picture, and we have neglected the unitary evolution term (i=h) \hat{H} ; ^]. The operators \hat{G} are closely related to the system operators present in the interaction Ham iltonian and i measures the strength of the system environ ent coupling. In this case, the pointer basis is given by the set of all the eigenstates of the operator \hat{c}_i . If all \hat{c}_i are Herm itian, their eigenstates are steady states of the master equation (1). If instead the c_i 's are not H erm itian, the states of the pointer basis will rem ain pure, but will not necessarily be steady states of (1). Note that steady states of (1) are not a ected by the environment [10]. Our strategy for the protection of a speci c quantum state against the environ ent consists in engineering, via adequate external driving of the system, a system -environ ent coupling, so that the net e ect is to add to the master equation (1) an extra term, thus getting

$$\frac{d^{*}}{dt} = L^{*} + (_{eng}=2) 2\hat{d}^{*}\hat{d}^{y} \hat{d}^{y} \hat{d}^{*} \hat{d}^{y} \hat{d}^{*} ; (2)$$

The operator \hat{d} is chosen so that the state one wants to protect is the only steady state of Eq. (2) without the environment term L^. For eng , the steady state of the new master equation (2) will be very close to the state to be protected (if the state is not unique, the term L^ could still induce transitions between the steady states). Besides, any state of the system will decay into the state chosen to be protected. Therefore, this is also a procedure for preparing quantum states in the presence of decoherence.

In the following we apply this method to the onedimensional motion of the center-of-mass of an ion conned in an electrom agnetic trap. The reservoir engineering process will be implemented by letting the ion interact with several laser beams of adequate frequencies and intensities, which are quasi-resonant to an electronic transition jli\$ jli of frequency !21.

For our purposes it is in portant to consider the ion to be in the regime of resolved sidebands, given by

; n, where is the electronic energy decay rate, is the ion vibrational frequency, and n is the (complex) Rabi frequency corresponding to laser n, tuned to the k-th red vibrational sideband of the ion. Under these conditions the interaction term corresponding to laser n, can be described, in the interaction picture, by [17]

$$\hat{\mathbf{H}}_{\text{int}}(\mathbf{t}) = \mathbf{hg} \left(\hat{\mathbf{A}}_{21} \hat{\mathbf{d}} + \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{12} \hat{\mathbf{d}}^{\text{y}} \right) \\ = \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{h}_{n} \left(\mathbf{i}_{n} \right)^{k} \hat{\mathbf{A}}_{21} \hat{\mathbf{f}}_{k} \left(\hat{\mathbf{a}}^{\text{y}} \hat{\mathbf{a}} \right) \hat{\mathbf{a}}^{k} + \mathbf{H} \boldsymbol{x};; \qquad (3)$$

where g is taken to be real and

$$\hat{f}_{k}(\hat{a}^{y}\hat{a}) = e^{2} \frac{\chi^{k}}{1 + 0} \frac{(1)^{1/2}}{1!(1+k)!} (\hat{a}^{y})^{1}\hat{a}^{1}$$
(4)

Here, the operators \hat{a} and \hat{A}_{21} are the annihilation operator of a quantum of the ionic vibrational motion and the electronic ip operator, respectively. The quantity $n = h(k_n \quad d) \neq 2M$ is the Lamb (D icke parameter with respect to the direction of vibration, xed by the unit vector u. M is the ion's mass and k_n is the wave vector of lazer n. It is assumed that 1 for any direction orthogonal to u, as it is the case in linear traps.

In the Born-M arkov limit, the time evolution of the vibronic density operator $^{\text{for the direction } u}$ (say x) is

$$\frac{d^{\wedge}}{dt} = \frac{i}{h} \hat{H}_{int}; ^{\wedge} + \frac{1}{2} 2\hat{A}_{12} \hat{A}_{21} \hat{A}_{22} ^{\wedge} \hat{A}_{22} + L^{\circ};$$
(5)

where the second term corresponds to spontaneous em ission with energy relaxation rate $% \mathcal{A}$, and

accounts for changes of the vibrational energy along the x direction due to spontaneous emission with angular distribution W (s). The last term of (5) describes the coupling of the center-of-m ass motion to the environment, and has the general form (1). How ever, the precise form of this dissipation term is not in portant for our purposes.

The matrix elements of (5) with respect to the electronic basis yield the equations

$$\hat{\gamma}_{11} = ig (\hat{d}^{Y} \hat{\gamma}_{21} \hat{\gamma}_{12} d) + \hat{\gamma}_{22} + L \hat{\gamma}_{11};$$
(7)

$$\hat{2}_{22} = ig (\hat{d}_{12} \quad \hat{2}_{1} d^{y}) \quad \hat{2}_{22} + L \hat{2}_{22}; \quad (8)$$

$$\hat{\gamma}_{12} = ig \hat{d}^{Y} \hat{\gamma}_{22} \quad \hat{\gamma}_{11} \hat{d}^{Y}) \quad \frac{1}{2} \hat{\gamma}_{12} + L \hat{\gamma}_{12}; \quad (9)$$

We assume now that the decay rate is by far the largest rate in the system . Under this condition, one can elim inate $^{12}_{12}$ adiabatically. Since L / , one gets:

12
 = (2ig=) $(\hat{d}^{y})_{22}$ \hat{d}^{11} (\hat{d}^{y}) [1 + 0 (=)] : (10)

Replacing (10) into (7) and (8), and adding up these two equations, we get, since the reduced density operator for the vibrational mode is given by $\gamma_v = \gamma_{11} + \gamma_{22}$, and neglecting the correction proportional to = in (10):

$$\hat{r}_{v} = \frac{2g^{2}h}{2\hat{d}_{11}\hat{d}^{y}} \hat{d}^{y}\hat{d}_{11} \hat{f}_{11}\hat{d}^{y}\hat{d}$$
(11)

+
$$2\hat{d}^{y} \hat{}_{22} \hat{d} \hat{d}^{y} \hat{}_{22} \hat{d}^{y} \hat{d}^{y}$$
 ($\hat{}_{22} \hat{}_{22} \hat{d} \hat{d}^{y}$ ($\hat{}_{22} \hat{}_{22} \hat{}_{22} \hat{d} \hat{d}^{y}$:

Under the conditions assumed here, the matrix elements of $^{2}_{22}$ are much smaller than those of $^{1}_{11}$. Indeed, replacing (10) in (8), and eliminating $^{2}_{22}$ from (8) adiabatically, one gets $^{2}_{22}$ O (g=)² $^{1}_{11}$. We can therefore safely neglect the terms dependent of $^{2}_{22}$ inside the brackets in (11) and at the same time replace $^{1}_{11}$ by $^{1}_{v}$. We veriled numerically that these are indeed excellent approximations. We get then, nally:

W e will base our considerations on this equation. The rst term on the r.h.s. has the form (1). This is the \engineered reservoir," with a decay constant $_{eng} = 4g^2 = .$

N eglecting term s of O (4) in the expansion of the second term on the r.h.s. of eq. (12), one can show that its contribution is (2 =5)(4g²=) v , that is, (2 2 =5) multiplied by the engineered-reservoir term. For 0.25, this yields a factor 1=40, a small correction, which is how ever fully taken into account in our num erical simulations. Therefore, the action of the engineered reservoir will be the dom inant one as long as eng

In recent experiments with trapped ions, random elds seem to play an important role in the decoherence process [13]. Their e ect may also be described by (1). We write the random eld as E (t) = $E^{(+)}(t) \exp((i t) + E^{(-)}(t) \exp((i t))$, and the interaction H am iltonian in the RWA as [13]: $\hat{H}^{-} = E^{(+)}(t)\hat{a}^{y} + E^{(-)}(t)\hat{a}$. Iterating the equation of motion for the density operator, and using that for steady elds [18] $hE^{(-)}(t)E^{(-)}(t^{0})i =$ $hE^{(+)}(t)E^{(+)}(t^{0})i = 0$, we get, in the M arkovian lim it $hE^{(+)}(t)E^{(-)}(t^{0})i = 2D$ (t $\hat{\Phi}$):

which corresponds to an in nite temperature thermal reservoir (by letting the thermal photon number N_T ! 1, and at the same time the dissipation rate ! 0, so that N_T remains constant). Both random elds and thermal reservoirs will be considered in our simulations.

In order to protect a state j i, we look for \hat{d} such that \hat{d} j i = j i w ith = 0, and m ake sure that j i is in fact the only steady state of (2) w ithout L^. Since eng , this yields a good approximation of the corresponding steady state of (2).

As a rst example, we consider the protection (and generation) of the class of states j i = $\prod_{n=0}^{N} c_n j_n i$, where jni is an energy eigenstate of the vibrational motion of the trapped ion and $c_n \in 0$. It is easy to see that the operator $\hat{d} = \hat{g}(\hat{n}) \hat{a} + \hat{h}(\hat{n})$ has j i as its only eigenstate with eigenvalue = 0, provided the eingenvalues of $\hat{g}(\hat{n})$ and $\hat{h}(\hat{n})$ full the constraints $g(m) = \frac{p^{h}(m)}{m+1}c_m = c_{m+1}$ (m = 0; ;N 1) and N is the rst zero of h(m). For this case, j i is the only steady state of (2).

Inspection of Eqs. (3) and (4) shows that the operator $\hat{g}(n)$ å can be engineered by driving the ion with N laser elds, tuned to the rst vibrational sideband of the ion. The values of the Rabi frequencies _n of the N lasers are given by the following system of N linear equations (m = 0; ;N 1):

$$X^{N} = \sum_{n=1}^{2} \sum_{m=n}^{N} \frac{X^{n}}{1! (1+1)!} \frac{(1)^{1}}{(m-1)!} \frac{m!}{(m-1)!} = \frac{\ln (m)}{m+1} \frac{C_{m}}{C_{m+1}};$$
(14)

where the Lam b {D icke parameters _n depend on the orientation of the laser elds with respect to the x-direction. The operator $\hat{h}(\hat{n})$ is constructed by driving the ion with two laser elds resonant with the electronic transition, one of them propagating orthogonal to the x-axis (say y-direction, with _y 1). The Rabi frequencies of these two lasers are related by _y = _xL_N ($\frac{2}{x}$), where L_N (x) is a Laguerre polynom ial of order N (_x should not be too large for the rst zero of h (m) to occur at m = N).

A n important representative of the class of states presented above is the \qubit" state j $i = c_0 j j i + c_1 j l i$. The discussion above implies that this state can be generated and protected against the action of an external reservoir with just three lasers, with Rabi frequencies satisfying the following condition:

$$\frac{x}{i_1} = \frac{c_1}{c_0}$$
 and $\frac{y}{i_1} = e^{-\frac{2}{c_2}} \frac{c_1}{c_0} \frac{1}{2} = \frac{1}{c_0}$ (15)

In this case, $eng = \frac{2}{1} = \frac{2}$ the corresponding reservoir to win over the environm ent reservoir, one needs 2 ${}_{1}^{2}$ = , but at the sam e tim e and 1. This requirem ents are satis ed ; 1 $4 \text{ M H z,} \quad 1 \quad 2 \text{ L}$ $2 \quad 1^2 = 1 \text{ L}$ if $2 M H z_{,} = 0 2_{,}$ 20 30 M H z, 40 kHz. Fig.1a displays as long as the delity $F(t) = Trf^{(0)}(t)g$, with the ion initially in the vibrational state $j = \frac{1}{2} (\mathcal{D}i + j\mathbf{l}i)$ [allour num erical simulations are obtained from eq. (5), and we always assum e the ion to be initially in the electronic ground state]. Both a therm al and a random eld reservoir have been considered. As can be seen, the system rapidly reaches a steady state with delity very close to unity (= 0.2).

One should remark that feedback procedures [9] do not protect states involving superpositions of Di and jli, since the loss of one photon by the state jli com pletely erases any phase information about the original state. Our procedure works how ever very well in this case.

O ther interesting example is the approximate phase state [19] j i = $(1=\frac{N+1}{N+1})^{N} \sum_{n=0}^{N} e^{in}$ jii, which can be generated and protected by N + 2 lasers. Fig. 1b displays the time evolution of the delity F (t), for the approximate phase state j i = $(1=2)^{N} \sum_{n=0}^{3} e^{in}$ jii ('s in the range 0:1 0:2).

A class of states which is specially fragile against the action of decoherence is the one form ed by m esoscopic superpositions of coherent states. Under action of an external reservoir, these states decay to a m ixture of coherent

states in a extrem ely short tim e, inversely proportional to the distance between the two states in phase space [3]. Our technique can also be applied to the Schrodinger $cat-like state [20] j_+ i = (j i + ij)$ i)= 2. Since j + i has no \hole" in its num ber distribution (which coincides with that for the coherent state j i), it can be approxim ated by one of the states j i discussed above. Consequently, one could, with the use of N + 2 lasers, generate $\sum_{n=0}^{N} c_n j_n i_n$ with the rst and protect the state j i = N coe cients c_n equal to the corresponding coe cients of j + i. One should notice, however, that it is possible in this case to nd directly a Lindblad operator \hat{d}_{i} which has the state j + i as its only eigenstate with zero eigenvalue: $\hat{d} = T \hat{a}T^{y} = e^{i \hat{n}} \hat{a} + i$. Here T is the unitary operator exp[i fi (fi 1)=2]exp(\hat{a} a), which yields j_+ i when applied to the vacuum . For this choice of \hat{d}_r we plot in Fig. 1c the delity F (t), for the initial state $j_+i = 0.2$). An open problem is how to engineer this operator with a nite number of laser beams.

Finally, we describe the protection of a squeezed state. We set $\hat{d} = \hat{a} + \hat{a}^y$, where $= \tanh r$ and r is the squeezing factor. The corresponding setup consists of two lasers along the direction of squeezing, resonant with the rst red (laser 1) and the rst blue (laser 2) sidebands, and with Rabi frequencies satisfying $_{2}=_{1}=$ [14]. The num erical simulation is shown for r = 0.6 in Fig. 1d, for a realistic set of parameters (= 0.05). Higher values of squeezing render our method less e ective, since the presence of higher photon num bers would lead to stronger dissipation by the \natural" reservoir.

In conclusion, we have suggested a method for protecting quantum states of the vibrationalm otion of a trapped ion against decoherence by generating articial reservoirs which have the states to be protected as pointer states. M ore general pointer states can be generated by applying unitary transform ations to the states and operators discussed here. Indeed, the transform ed states would still be the sole steady solutions of the master equation with the transform ed operators. This is precisely the mechanism which leads to the protection of the states j_+ i above, and also of squeezed states, since they are related by unitary transform ations to the vacuum, which is the only steady state for a zero-tem perature reservoir (for which $\hat{d} = \hat{a}$). As for possible sources of error in experimental in plem entations of our proposal, one should rem ark that ourm ethod is sensitive only to relative intensity and phase uctuations, since state selection is determ ined by ratios of R abi frequencies.

W e acknowledge the partial support of Conselho Nacional de Desenvolvimento Cient co e Tecnologico (CNPq), Fundaceo de Amparo a Pesquisa do Estado do Rio de Janeiro (FAPERJ), Fundaceo Universitaria Jose Bonifacio (FUJB), and Program a de Apoio a Nucleos de Excelência (PRONEX).

- W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D 24, 1516 (1981); 26, 1862 (1982); Physics Today 44, 36 (1991); W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 5181 (1999); D. G iulini et al., Decoherence and the Appearence of a Classical W orld in Quantum Theory (Springer Verlag, Berlin Heidelberg, 1996).
- [2] J. Von Neumann, Die Mathematische Grundlagen der Quantenmechanik (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1932); Quantum Theory and Measurement, edited by J.A.Wheeler and W.H.Zurek (Princeton Univ. Press, Princeton, 1983).
- [3] For the role of decoherence in the classical lim it of chaotic system s, see W H. Zurek and J.P. Paz, Phys. Rev. Lett. 72, 2508 (1994); for experim ental results on decoherence, see M. Brune et al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 4887 (1996), and C. J. M yatt et al, Nature 403, 269 (2000).
- [4] For reviews, see D.P. Di Vicenzo, Science 270, 255 (1995); A.Ekert and R.Josza, Rev.M od.Phys. 68, 733 (1996); J.Preskill, Physics Today 52, 24 (1999).
- [5] J.J.C irac and P.Zoller, Phys.Rev.Lett.74, 4091 (1995).
- [6] D.J.W ineland et al, Phys. Rev. A 46, R 6797 (1992);
 W.M.Itano, Phys. Rev. A 47, 3554 (1993); S.F. Huelga et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 3865 (1997); J. Steinbach and C.C. Genry, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 5528 (1998).
- [7] P.W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A 52, 2493 (1995); D. Gottesman, ibid.54, 1862 (1996); A. Ekert and C. M aochiavello, Phys. Rev. Lett. 77, 2585 (1996); A.R. Calderband et al, ibid. 78, 405 (1997);
- [8] H. M abuchi and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. 76, 3108 (1996).
- [9] D. V itali, P. Tom besi, and G. J.M ilbum Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 2442 (1997); Phys. Rev. A 57, 4930 (1998).
- [10] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 3306 (1997); D. A. Lidar, I. L. Chuang, and K. B. W haley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2594 (1998); D. Braun, PA. Braun, and F. Haake, Opt. Comm. 179, 195 (2000).
- [11] L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. 82, 2417 (1999); L. Viola and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. A 58, 2733 (1998).
- [12] D J.W ineland et al, JournalofR essaarch of the N ational Institute of Standards and Technology 103, 29 (1998).
- [13] D F.V. Jam es, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 317 (1998).
- [14] J.F.Poyatos, J.I.C irac, and P.Zoller, Phys.Rev.Lett. 77, 4728 (1996); form ethods of H am iltonian engineering, see R L.de M atos Filho and W .Vogel, Phys.Rev.A 58, R1661 (1998).
- [15] G.Lindblad, M ath. Phys. 48, 119 (1976).
- [16] R.A licki and K.Lendi, Quantum Dynam ical Sem igroups and Applications, in Lecture Notes in Physics (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1987), No. 286; P.Pechukas, Phys. Rev. Lett. 73, 1060 (1994); R.A licki, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 3020 (1995); P.Pechukas, ibid., 75, 3021 (1995).
- [17] W .Vogel and R.L. de M atos Filho, Phys. Rev. A 52, 4214 (1995).
- [18] Only second-order stationarity m ust be assumed. See L. M andel and E.W olf, Optical Coherence and Quantum Optics (Cambridge University Press, 1995), Sec. 31.3.
- [19] D.T. Pegg and S.M. Bamett, Europhys. Lett. 6, 483 (1988).
- [20] B.Yurke and B.Stoler, Phys. Rev. Lett. 57, 13 (1986).

FIG.1. Time evolution of the delity F (t) for several initial nonclassical states, in the presence of a therm al 2 = 3; and (d) vacuum squezed state with r = 0:6.

