### Universal Quantum Logic from Zeem an and Anisotropic Exchange Interactions

Lian-AoWu and DanielA.Lidar

Chem ical Physics Theory Group, Chem istry Department, University of Toronto,

80 St. George Str., Toronto, Ontario M 5S 3H 6, Canada

Some of the most promising proposals for scalable solid-state quantum computing, e.g., those using electron spins in quantum dots or donor electron or nuclear spins in Si, rely on a two-qubit quantum gate that is ideally generated by an isotropic exchange interaction. How ever, an anisotropic perturbation arising from spin-orbit coupling is inevitably present. Previous studies focused on removing the anisotropy. Here we introduce a new universal set of quantum logic gates that takes advantage of the anisotropic perturbation. The price is a constant but modest factor in additional pulses. The gain is a scheme that is compatible with the naturally available interactions in spin-based solid-state quantum computers.

PACS num bers: 03.67 Lx,03.65 Bz,03.65 Fd,05.30 Ch

I. INTRODUCTION

A fundamental notion in quantum computing (QC) is universality: a set of quantum logic gates (unitary transform ations) is said to be \universal for QC " if any unitary transform ation can be approximated to arbitrary accuracy by a quantum circuit involving only those gates [1]. M athem atically, this means the ability to e ciently generate a dense subgroup of the group of unitary operations on N qubits, U  $(2^N)$ . Physically, this is accom plished by carefully manipulating single qubit-external eld and (or only) qubit-qubit interactions, thus generating unitary gate operations. A universal-gate set that accom plishes this, m ay be continuous, discrete, or both. A well-known example is the set of all single-qubit gates plus a controlled-phase (CP) gate (that ips the phase of a target qubit depending on the state of a control qubit), but m any other universal sets are known [1]. An important example of a universal gate set, of relevance to us, is the set generated by controlling only isotropic Heisenberg exchange interactions. This set was shown [2] to be universal in the context of research on decoherence-free subspaces (DFSs) [3], and requires that a logical qubit be encoded into at least 3 physical qubits [4]. E cient gate sequences for universalQ C in this case were subsequently presented in R ef. [5]. These results assume that all qubits have equalenergies. How ever, this assumption may break down under magnetic eld and/or g-factor inhom ogeneity [6]. When the resulting Zeem an splitting is taken into account, it can be shown that the isotropic Heisenberg interaction is universal for QC using an encoding of one logical qubit into only two physical qubits, and e cient gate sequences have been found [7, 8]. We describe here a new universal gate set: that generated by the Zeem an splitting and the anisotropic Heisenberg interaction, dened more precisely below. This set is of particular im portance to spin-based solid-state approaches to quantum computing [9, 10], where anisotropy is inherently present [11].

### II. ZEEM AN AND EXCHANGE INTERACTIONS

A single spin  $S = (S^x; S^y; S^z)$  with magnetic moment <sub>B</sub> couples to a magnetic eld B (t) oriented along the z axis through the Zeem an splitting H am iltonian g <sub>B</sub> B (t)S<sup>z</sup>. This interaction can be spatially controlled by making B (t) inhom ogeneous [9], or by modulating the g-factor [10]. Conversely, inhom ogeneities and/or a non-uniform g-factor may be naturally present [6]. The Zeem an splitting rem oves the degeneracy of the two spin states and serves to de ne a physical qubit. Sw itching on the Zeem an term for the j<sup>th</sup> qubit causes a phase shift, i.e., it generates the single-qubit gate e<sup>i S<sub>j</sub><sup>z</sup></sup>, where

= 
$$dtg_BB(t)$$

7

is a controllable parameter (we use units where ~ = 1). E g., a useful gate is  $Z_j = iexp(i S_j^z)$ , which is a  $180^0$  rotation about the z axis. The typical switching time of the Zeem an splitting is fast: it is similar to that of the Heisenberg interaction (G H z), which is the interaction assumed to govern the operation of two-qubit gates in some of the spin-based approaches to quantum com – puting [9, 10]. These QC proposals, as well as schemes for universalQC using the Heisenberg interaction alone [2, 5] rely on this interaction being perfectly isotropic. However, in a crystal environment that lacks inversion symmetry, the actual interaction between spins i and j is

$$H_{ij}(t) = J(t) (S_i S_j + ~(t) S_i S_j + (t)^{(t)} S_i^{(t)}(t) S_j^{(t)};$$
(1)

where only the exchange parameter J (t) is directly controllable [11]. This means that the isotropic Heisenberg interaction J (t) $S_i$   $S_j$  itself is not independently tunable. The anisotropic part arises from spin-orbit coupling, as a relativistic correction. A swritten, the anisotropy parameters ~ and are dimensionless; in system s like coupled G aAs quantum dots j~j is of the order of a few percent, while the last term is of the order of 10<sup>4</sup> [11]. H<sub>ij</sub> (t) given in Eq. (1) is the most general anisotropic exchange interaction that is symmetric about a given axis, here  $\sim$ . Further corrections will be even smaller. The anisotropic perturbation has been considered a problem and strategies have been designed to cancel it. E g., it can be removed to rst order by shaped pulses [12], or cancelled in the absence of an external magnetic eld [13]. Instead of trying to cancel the anisotropy, we show here how to use it to our advantage in order to generate a universal gate set.

We rst focus on the case of time-independent ~ and , which should be dominant as discussed recently in Ref. [13]. The corrections arising from the timedependent anisotropic interaction are much weaker, sufciently so that they are below the threshold for fault tolerant quantum computation [13, 14]. Nevertheless, we also consider the time-dependent case below . Now, turning on the exchange term H<sub>ij</sub> (t) generates a unitary evolution

$$U_{ij}(') = \exp(iH_{ij}('))$$

through the Schrödinger equation, where H  $_{\rm ij}$  ( ) / ' and  $\rm Z$ 

is a second controllable param eter.

W e assume that we can only use the two parameters and ' to manipulate computational states and construct a universalgate set. D irect controlofH am iltonian terms that generate single-qubit rotations about the x and y axes causes device heating and other major technicalproblems, so that this type of control is best avoided [5, 7]. We thus refer to H<sub>ij</sub> and the Zeem an splitting as the \available H am iltonians". We now show that using controlonly over these available H am iltonians su ces to generate universal gate sets for a variety of orientations of the vector ~.

Following Ref. [11], the orientation of  $\sim$  is expressed in terms of the vector  $R_{ij}$  pointing from qubit i (e.g., the center of the i<sup>th</sup> quantum dot) to qubit j (Fig.1). We can always choose the direction of the magnetic eld as the z axis. Since  $R_{ij}$  is a vector in the plane the quantum dots are lying on, if the magnetic eld is applied parallel to  $\sim$ , it too should be in the plane of the dots (Fig.1a). A more com m on case is when the magnetic eld is perpendicular to the plane of the dots (Figs. 1b-d). We proceed to analyze each of these four cases.

## III. CASE 1: MAGNETIC FIELD PARALLEL TO $\sim$

We rst discuss the case in which the magnetic eld B is parallel to  $\sim$  (=  $e_z$ , Fig. 1a). In this (and only this) case it was shown in Ref. [13] that the e ect of the anisotropy may be made to cancel exactly. However, this approach requires precise alignment of B along



FIG.1: Geometries of magnetic eld B, relative position of quantum dots  $R_{ij}$ , and spin-orbit eld  $\tilde{}$ , considered in the text. Quantum dots are indicated by shaded circles.

~, and utilizes single-qubit S<sup>x</sup>;S<sup>y</sup> interactions for universality, which as discussed above, we seek to avoid here. Indeed, in the  $i\beta$  case, the available H am iltonians are not universal for QC because they have too much sym metry: H  $_{\rm ij}$  and the Zeem an splitting both com mute with  $S_1^z + S_2^z$ . There is a simple way to solve the problem : we encode a pair of physical qubit states into a logical qubit:  $\mathcal{D}_{L}i = j "ij # i and j l_{L}i = j # ij "i (see$ Refs. [7, 8, 15] for other cases where this encoding proved useful for universality). In this manner the rst logical qubit is given by physical qubits 1;2, the second by physical qubit 3;4, and so on. A calculation then shows that the encoded (denoted by a bar) single-qubit operations are:  $\overline{S_{i}^{x}} = S_{2i} S_{2i} S_{2i} S_{2i}^{z} S_{2i}^{z}$ \$21 1 \$21)z, and  $\overline{S_{i}^{z}} = (S_{2i-1}^{z} S_{2i}^{z})=2$ , where the subscript denotes the i<sup>th</sup> encoded qubit. These operators have the same commutation relations as the three components of spin angular m om entum [i.e., they generate su (2)]. Under our assumption of a controllable Zeem an splitting, we can switch  $\overline{S^z}$  on/o, and hence can perform arbitrary rotations about the z axis of the encoded qubit. W hile we do not have direct access to S<sup>x</sup>, the 3-step quantum circuit depicted in Fig. 2a yields this operation.

The ability to perform arbitrary rotations about the z and x axes su ces for perform ing arbitrary single qubit operations, through a standard Euler angle contruction [1]. To complete the universal gate set we also need a logic gate coupling di erent encoded qubits in a nontrivial manner, such as a CP gate. We have previously shown that the interaction  $S_{1}^{z}S_{2}^{z}$  between logical qubits 1 and 2, and which generates a CP gate between these qubits, is equivalent to the interaction  $S_{2}^{z}S_{3}^{z}$  between physical qubits 2 and 3 [15]. This can be implemented by the 4-step quantum circuit depicted in Fig. 2b. We note that this circuit also provides a way to cancel the anisotropic interaction by controlling the Zeem an split-



FIG. 2: Diagrams of circuits in plan enting logical operations in the ~jB case. Lines denote physical qubits, time ows from left to right. The 3-step circuit (a) implaments the transformation  $\overline{X}$  () exp((i  $\overline{S^{x}}_{1})U_{12}$  ( $\stackrel{P}{=}$   $1 + \stackrel{2}{}$ ) exp((i  $\overline{S^{z}}_{1})$ . Here is an arbitrary angle and = arctan is a time-independent constant [16]. The 4-step circuit (b) implements the transformation  $\overline{ZZ}$  () exp((i  $\overline{S^{z}}_{1}S^{z}_{2}) = U_{23}$  () $Z_{2}U_{23}$  () $Z_{2}$ , where =  $\frac{1}{2} = (1 + \stackrel{2}{})$ . The notation used in the diagrams is: U<sub>2</sub> () exp((i  $\overline{S}$ ), Z iexp((i  $S^{z}$ ).

ting (see also R ef. [13]). In addition, the encoded qubit is a D F S against collective dephasing errors [2], so an autom atic layer of error protection is built into these circuits.

### IV. CASE 2: MAGNETIC FIELD PERPENDICULAR TO PLANE OF DOTS

W enow analyze them ore comm on case where them agnetic eld is perpendicular to the x y plane the quantum dots are on. First we consider  $\sim = e_x$  (or  $e_y$ ), which can be along the direction  $\mathcal{R}_{12}$  from qubit 1 to qubit 2 (Fig. 1b). As shown in the previous case (of Fig. 1a), the isotropic Heisenberg interaction and Zeem an splitting become universal for QC by using an encoding. In contrast, as we now show, H ij together with the Zeem an splitting are universal without encoding. Since  $S^z$  is by our assumptions controllable, the problem for singlequbit rotations is to show how to generate  $S^{\times}$ . We will explicitly be using the anisotropic perturbation to this end, so the speed of the  $S^{x}$  gate will be on the order of a few percent of the S<sup>z</sup> gate. This is still reasonable since it is sim ilar to, or even better than, the relative strength of the two-spin interaction and the external radiofrequency magnetic elds in NMR [1].

To generate the S<sup>x</sup> gate we rst introduce a simple 3step quantum circuit, that will serve as a building block for other gates:

$$V = U_{12} \left( = \frac{p}{1+2} \right) Z_1 Z_2 U_{12} \left( = \frac{p}{1+2} \right);$$

(note that  $Z_1Z_2$  can be in plem ented in one parallel step). Contrary to its appearance, this gate is actually separable for qubits 1 and 2. This allows us to use it for creating single-qubit gates, e.g., the following 8-step circuit:

$$\exp(i4 S^{x}) = Z_1 V Z_1 V$$
:

Recall that = arctan and is xed (given) so that this circuit is discrete (only whole multiples of the angle 4 can be generated). A lternatively, the following 17-step circuit yields a continuous  $S^{x}$  gate [17]:

$$\exp(i S_1^x) = \exp(i S_1^z) V \exp(i S_1^z) V$$
$$Z_1 Z_2 V \exp(i S_1^z) V Z_1 Z_2 \exp(i S_1^z)$$

with = =2  $\arctan(\tan = 2\cos 2)$ , and  $\operatorname{continuous}$ angle =  $2\arccos(1 2\sin^2 = 2\sin^2 2)$ ,  $\operatorname{controlled}$  in terms of . However, j j is bounded because of . E.g., its maximum is approximately =12 if = 0.03: Therefore, in order to perform exactly a single-qubit S<sup>x</sup> gate with larger angle, one can rst use V to approximate the needed gate and then converge using the 17-step continuous gate.

To complete the discussion of universality we again need to generate a logic gate coupling qubits. Such a twoqubit operation can be obtained in term s of the following (not necessarily optimized) 55-step quantum circuit,

$$\begin{split} \exp(\text{ i } S_1^z S_2^z) &= \mathbb{Z}_2 \exp(\text{ i } (S_{1x} - S_{2x})) \mathbb{U}_{12} (') \mathbb{Z}_2 \\ &= \exp(\text{ i } S_2^x) \mathbb{U}_{12} (') \exp(\text{ i } - \frac{1}{2} (S_1^x - S_2^x)); \end{split}$$

where the arbitrary angle =  $2^{\prime} \frac{p}{1+2}$  is controlled in term s of the angle ' in H<sub>ij</sub>. This gate is therefore no longer slow. Note that  $e^{i} (S_1^x S_2^x)$  can be implemented as above by a 17-step quantum circuit. Further note that since any entangling gate is universal (together with single-qubit gates) [18], in practice one may be able to reduce our 55-step circuit, e.g., using geometric timeoptim al controlm ethods [19].

# V. CASE 3: GENERAL TIM E-INDEPENDENT CASE

The general ~? B case is where ~ =  $_x e_x + _y e_y$ , i.e., time-independent and somewhere in the x y plane (Fig. 1c). However, this case is equivalent up to a unitary rotation to the ~ =  $e_x$  case. Speci cally, the transformation  $e^{i!} (S_1^{z} + S_2^{z}) U_{12} (') e^{-i!} (S_1^{z} + S_2^{z}) (where ! = \arctan(y = x))$ , rotates ~ so that it becomes parallel to  $e_x$ . The treatment above then applies provided we everywhere replace by  $\frac{2}{x} + \frac{2}{y}$ .

It is noteworthy that in the present case of timeindependent  $\sim$ , sim ilarly to Ref. [5] where e cient gate sequences for the isotropic Heisenberg interaction were obtained, we did not employ the short-time approxim ation, i.e., made use only of nite time steps. In contrast to the num erically derived circuits of Ref. [5], our circuits are based on analytical results, and can be understood using elementary angular momentum theory [16, 17].

### VI. CASE 4:GENERAL TIM E-DEPENDENT CASE

F in ally, we also consider the general case with  $\sim$  and both time-dependent,  $\sim$  (t) in the x y plane (Fig. 1d). In contrast to the tim e-independent case, gates now have to be implemented using the short-time approximation:  $e^{A} t e^{B} t = e^{(A+B)} t + 0 (t^{2})$  for operators A and B that do not necessarily commute, and t 1. W hile this is less accurate than the exact circuits given above, it is nevertheless a valuable and common tool in discussions of universality [1, 2, 20]. The short-time evolution operator corresponding to H<sub>ii</sub> has the same form as before:  $U_{12}()$  with = J t, except that now J is an average value of the coupling constant in the time interval from 0 to t. A ssum ing that all tim e-dependent param eters do not vary appreciably within the short time t, a two-qubit CP gate is given by the repeated 4-step circuit.

exp( 
$$i S_1^z S_2^z$$
) (U<sub>12</sub> (=4n)Z<sub>1</sub>Z<sub>2</sub>U<sub>12</sub> (=4n)Z<sub>1</sub>)<sup>2n</sup>; (2)

where = n . The approximation improves with increasing n. Since =4n 1 we only need to know the detailed properties of the evolution operator around time zero. Next we must generate the single-qubit  $S^x$  gate. To do so we combine a short-time and a nite-time circuit. First,

$$e^{i (S_{1}^{z}S_{2}^{y} S_{1}^{y}S_{2}^{z})} (e^{i! (S_{1}^{z}+S_{2}^{z})}U_{12} ()Z_{1}Z_{2} U_{12} ()U_{12} ()Z_{1}Z_{2} U_{12} ()Z_{1}Z_{2} e^{i! (S_{1}^{z}+S_{2}^{z})})^{n}$$

where = n  $\frac{2}{x} + \frac{2}{y}$  and we have used the shorttime approximation. Then the single-qubit S<sup>x</sup> gate is given in terms of the following circuit:

$$e^{i S_{1}^{x}} = e^{i S_{1}^{z} S_{2}^{z}} e^{i (S_{1}^{z} S_{2}^{y} S_{1}^{y} S_{2}^{z})} Z_{2}$$
$$e^{i (S_{1}^{z} S_{2}^{y} S_{1}^{y} S_{2}^{z})} e^{i S_{1}^{z} S_{2}^{z}} Z_{2}:$$

This completes the generation of single-qubit gates, and thus proves universality of our available interactions in the time-dependent case.

### VII. MANAGING DECOHERENCE

A discussion of universal quantum computation is incomplete without a consideration of decoherence,

the process whereby quantum information is degraded through the interaction of qubits with their environm ent. In principle three of the majorm ethods for resisting decoherence, quantum error correcting codes [1, 4, 14], DFSs [2, 3, 4], and fast/strong \bang-bang" (BB) pulses [21] are compatible with our universality results. As mentioned above, in the case of  $\tilde{\phantom{a}}$  is we have used an encoding into a DFS that is autom atically resistant to collective dephasing errors. We have recently shown how, starting from a general (linear) system -bath coupling, to actively create the conditions for collective decoherence by applying BB pulses generated by the isotropic Heisenberg interaction [22]. In this case an encoding into a 3-or 4-qubit DFS is possible, which resists the remaining collective errors. Leakage errors (which would arise due to corrections to the short-time approximation invoked in BB theory) can likew ise be elim inated using only the isotropic Heisenberg interaction [23]. We conjecture that the same (creation of collective decoherence, leakage elim ination) should be possible using the available interactions we considered here. Even without encoding, the use of BB pulses should serve to signi cantly enhance the robustness of our circuits under decoherence.

W e further note that som e of our circuits already have a form of decoherence-resistance built into them. E g., the form of Eq. (2) is that of a parity-kick operation [21], which in plies that this circuit elim inates all H am iltonians (including system -bath) containing system operators which anti-commute with  $Z_1Z_2$  and  $Z_1$  or  $Z_2$ . In fact the same consideration shows that this circuit also elim inates the undesired anisotropic interaction in the m ore com plicated case in which the strength of the anisotropic interaction is not proportional to that of the H eisenberg interaction.

#### VIII. CONCLUSIONS

We have introduced a new set of universal Ham iltonians: the Zeem an splitting and anistropic Heisenberg interaction. This set is of direct relevance to quantum computing in solid state systems that rely on spinspin interactions [9, 10]. Until recently, most studies of such systems assumed an isotropic Heisenberg interaction, which, however, is an approximation due to spinorbit coupling and other perturbations [6, 11]. Instead of trying to cancel the resulting anisotropy [12, 13], we showed here how to advantageously use the anisotropy. W e analytically derived circuits which in plem ent universal quantum logic in a variety of geom etries of interest, for both time-independent and time-dependent perturbations. In the form er case, depending on geom etry and type of gate in plemented, these circuits come with an overhead of between 3 and at most 55 extra pulses. W e hope that the m ethods presented here will enhance the prospects of quantum information processing in those promising quantum computing proposals where the inherent anisotropy of the exchange interaction cannot be

ignored.

### A cknow ledgm ents

This material is based on research sponsored by the D effense Advanced Research Projects Agency under the QuIST program and managed by the Air Force Research Laboratory (AFOSR), under agreement F49620-

- M A. Nielsen and IL. Chuang, Quantum Computation and Quantum Information (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000).
- [2] D.Bacon, J.K em pe, D A.Lidar, and K B.W haley, Phys. Rev.Lett. 85, 1758 (2000); J.K em pe, D.Bacon, D A. Lidar, and K B.W haley, Phys. Rev. A 63, 042307 (2001).
- [3] P. Zanardi and M. Rasetti, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 3306 (1997); L.-M Duan and G.-C. Guo, Phys. Rev. A 57, 737 (1998); D A. Lidar, IL. Chuang, and K B.W haley, Phys. Rev. Lett. 81, 2594 (1998).
- [4] E.Knill, R.La amme, and L.Viola, Phys. Rev. Lett. 84, 2525 (2000).
- [5] D P.D iV incenzo, D.Bacon, J.K empe, G.Burkard, and K B.W haley, Nature 408, 339 (2000).
- [6] X.Hu, R.de Sousa, and S.Das Sam a, Phys. Rev. Lett. 86, 918 (2001).
- [7] D A. Lidar and L.-A. W u, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 017905 (2002); L.-A. W u and D A. Lidar, J. M ath. Phys. 43, 4506 (2002)
- [8] J.Levy, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 147902 (2002); S.C. Benjam in, Phys. Rev. A 64, 054303 (2001).
- [9] D. Loss and D.P. D.W. incenzo, Phys. Rev. A 57, 120 (1998); B.E. Kane, Nature 393, 133 (1998); J. Levy, Phys. Rev. A 64, 052306 (2001);
- [10] R. Vrijen, E. Yablonovitch, K. Wang, H. W. Jiang, A. Balandin, V. Roychowdhury, T. Mor, and D. D. Wincenzo, Phys. Rev. A 62, 012306 (2000).
- [11] K.V.Kavokin, Phys.Rev.B 64,075305 (2001).
- [12] N E. Bonesteel, D. Stepanenko, and D P. D Wincenzo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 87, 207901 (2001).
- [13] G. Burkard and D. Loss, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 047903

(2002).

[14] D. A haronov and M. Ben-Or, eprint quant-ph/9906129;
 J. Preskill, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A 454, 385 (1998); A M. Steane, eprint quant-ph/0207119.

01-1-0468 (to D A L.). The U.S.G overnment is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for G overnmental purposes notwithstanding any copyright notation

thereon. The view s and conclusions contained herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the o cialpolicies or endorsem ents,

either expressed or implied, of the Air Force Research

Laboratory or the U.S.G overnm ent.

- [15] L.-A. W u and D.A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. A 65, 042318 (2002).
- [16] In deriving this formula we neglected an overall phase factor  $e^{i (1+ 2)S_1^2 S_2^2}$  and employed the identity  $e^{i S^2} S^x e^{i S^2} = S^x \cos + S^y \sin$ , which we use repeatedly below.
- [17] Here we used the identity  $e^{i (S^{z} \cos 2 + S^{y} \sin 2)}$
- $e^{i (S^{z} \cos 2 \dots S^{y} \sin 2)} = e^{i (S^{x} \cos y \sin y)}$ , with angles as de ned in the text.
- [18] J.L.Dodd, M.A.Nielsen, M.J.Bremner, and R.T.Thew, Phys. Rev. A 65, 040301 (2002).
- [19] N.Khaneja, S.J.G lasser, and R.Brockett, Phys. Rev.A 65, 032301 (2002).
- [20] S.Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. 75, 346 (1995).
- [21] L. Viola and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. A 58, 2733 (1998);
  D. Vitali and P. Tom besi, Phys. Rev. A 59, 4178 (1999);
  P. Zanardi, Phys. Lett. A 258, 77 (1999); M S. Byrd and
  D A. Lidar, Quant. Inf. Proc. 1, 19 (2002).
- [22] L.-A.Wu and D.A.Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 207902 (2002).
- [23] J. Kempe, D. Bacon, D P. D iv incenzo, and K B. W haley, Quant. Inf. Comp.1, 33 (2001); M S. Byrd and D A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 047901 (2002); L.-A. W u, M S. Byrd, and D A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. 89, 127901 (2002).