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## P art I

## Q uantum Computation: D ecoherence and C ontrol

## C hapter 1

## Phoilosonom icon

wherein we gently em bark on an inquiry into the com putational depths of the physical universe and discover the fragile structure of inform ation $w$ ith quantum foundations

### 1.1 P rologue

O ur generous universe com es equipped with the ability to com pute ${ }^{1}$. By the use of appropriate physical system s algorithm ic tasks can be executed w ith repeatable results which in tum allow for the developm ent of our system $s$ of $m$ athem atics and physics consistent w ith this repeatability. In physics, determ ination of the allowable $m$ anipulations of a physical system is of central im portance. C om puter science, on the other hand, has arisen in order to quantify what resources are needed in order to perform a certain algorithm ic function. For com puter science to be applicable to the real w orld the quanti cation of resources needed to perform a certain algorithm ic function should be delim ited by what physics has determ ined to be allowable manipulations. Thus we arrive at the realization that because inform ation is physical, our understanding of com puter science should be built on prim itives which respect our understanding of the law s of physics. Terse in expression, ghostly trivial in its conceptual underpinnings, this $m$ antra that,
\Inform ation is physical"' [130]
nonetheless has deep consequences for both the physicist exam ining how nature behaves and the com puter scientist attem pting to understand the pow er and lim itations of real world execution of algorithm ic tasks. This very thesis, an ever-grow ing body of scienti c literature, and an equally expanding com munity of scientists (rainbow in its com position of physicists, $m$ athem aticians, and com puter scientists), are but a

[^0]sm all testam ent to the usefulness, practical and abstract, of this one sm all idea. \Inform ation is physical", we thus shout, and in this thesis we explore, the consequences of this sm all idea in our large and generous universe.

### 1.2 A rgum ent via the inevitability of technology

It is only through the bright light ofhindsight that we can appreciate the grandeur of scienti c achievem ent during the tw entieth century. Unlike any previous historical era, this scienti c century has erected profound disciplines from a seem ing vacuum of prior consideration, pushing novel technologies and new understandings in directions inconceivable only a few years prior. A $m$ ong the tw o $m$ ost far reaching $m$ ovem ents of the twentieth century's scienti c sym phony have been the com position of the quantum theory of nature and the rising crescendo of the com puter revolution. To rst approxim ation these two elds appear in independent coexistence. To m aster the art of com puter program $m$ ing, know ledge of quantum theory is not prerequisite. Likew ise, to leam contem porary physical theory, understanding ofm odem com putational theory is not necessary.

The illusion of separation betw een com puter science and m odem physical theory, how ever, fades quickly as one's focus on details sharpens. O n one hand, com prehension ofm odem physical theory does not require com putation, but our understanding of the physical w orld is sharpened, if not progressed, by the use of com puters in the sim ulation of physical system s . W hole realm s of physics w ould be inaccessible w ere it not for the use of com puters to perform calculations im possible on a hum an scale but possible w th the calculational capabilities ofm odem com puters. F ields like physical chem istry and lattioe quantum eld theory now depend on the use of com putational power to such a degree that a grow ing view am ong theoretical physicists is to play the cynic and declare they are \com puter program $m$ ers not physicists" ${ }^{2}$.

The reverse implication between the two elds also occurs because com puters are physical devices such that quantum theory is essential to understanding their physical operation. The m odem quantum theory of these devices presents our best understanding of the physics behind the com puter revolution. T hus, while there is nothing which is essentially quantum $m$ echanical about the algorithm ic operation of today's com puters, our understanding of the $m$ echanism $s$ behind the com puter ardhitecture is deeply rooted in the quantum theory of the solid-state.

H ow far can the two way relationship between com puter science and quantum theory be pressed? The forw ard im plication asks the question \what can com puter science tell us about quantum theory?" [80] This thesis will not concem itself with this question, and indeed it appears that very little progress has been $m$ ade along this line of inquiry (see, how ever $[158,203]$ ).

[^1]

Figure 1.1: Physics and com puter science entangled

The reverse im plication posses a di erent query: \what can quantum theory tell us about com puter science?" O ne im portant di erence betw een this im plication and its inverse lies in the seem ing inevitability of the relevance of this question. This inevitability arises from tw o di erent directions. In 1965 G ordon M oore notioed that the com putational pow er of a com puter doubled approxim ately every two years [149]. A m ore physical statem ent of this principle is that the num ber of atom 's needed to represent one bit of inform ation $w$ ill halve approxim ately every two years. Since M oore's 1965 observation, M oore's law has continued to hold and been the barom eter of astounding technological progress in com puter hardw are. A s M oore's law m oves into its fortieth year of success, how ever, a new barrier has arisen on the not so distant horizon. If M oore's law continues to hold, around the year 2015 M oore's law predicts that the size of the com putational devices constructed w ill reach a scale where quantum e ects will begin to play a dom inant operational role. O ne view of progress $m$ aintains that this $w i l l$ be the essential lim it to our current solid-state com puter architectures: quantum e ects becom ing dom inant im plies that no m ore com putational power can be squeezed out of the system. On the other hand, it is unclear how a com puter operating at this quantum lim it will behave. T he argum ent of technological inevitability leads us to believe that com puters operating into the quantum regim ew illbe built. Thus it seem s technologically relevant to consider how com puters operating w ith quantum e ects dom inating willbehave. Q uantum theory can tell us som ething about how real com puters of the future $w$ ill function.

A second reason for con dence in the inevitability of the role quantum theory can play in com puter science builds from a long line of experim ental progress in controlof quantum system s. In particular, elds like cavity quantum electrodynam ics[23], ion and neutral atom trapping [205], and certain areas of quantum optics[90, 169, 207], have $m$ ade considerable progress in dem onstration of the controlof fully quantum degrees of freedom. These extrem ely sensitive experim ental successes point to a tim e in which controlover m ultiple interacting quantum system swillbecom e possible. From the com puter science prospective, such quantum controlw ill represent com putational devices operating in a quantum regim e. A gain technological progress leads us to believe that quantum control will be pressed further and further until at least sm all scale com putationalquantum devices are constructed.

Inevitably, we are thus led to assum e that the relevance of quantum theory to com putational device will grow largerw ith tim e. W hat, then, are the consequences of this seem ingly inevitable crash between the twentieth centuriesm ost proli co spring, quantum theory and $m$ odem com putation?

### 1.3 T he rise of the quantum algorithm

O ne m ust solem ly a mone's allegiance to the Q uantum G od before one $m$ ay be adm itted to the physics clan.
\{C arver A. M ead, C ollective E lectrodynam ics [145]
In the early 1980's B enio $[17,18,19]$ and Feynm an $[80,81]$ began to consider com puters whose algorithm ic operation was fully quantum mechanical. Benio appears to have been $m$ otivated tow ards such quantum com puters via the requirem ent that description ofquantum theory should be self-consistently described by $m$ achines operating according to quantum theory. Feynm an, on the other hand, had a long standing interest in the physical lim its of com putation [79] which apparently led him tow ards considering com puters w ith quantum com ponents[82]. H ow ever, while Feynm an [80], and earlier $M$ anin [143], clearly understood that sim ulating quantum system $s$ was in som e form a di cult task, it took the ground breaking work of D eutsch [56] and D eutsch and Jozsa [59] to realize that com puters built on quantum principles could perform com putationaltasks in an intrinsically $m$ ore e cient $m$ anner than could classicalcom puters. W hat these latter authors show ed was that there w ere circum stances under which inform ation in a quantum setting $m$ anipulated by a quantum com puter had a di erent productivity than equivalent classical inform ation $m$ anipulated by a classical com puter. H ere, then, was the rst interesting answer to the query \what can quantum physics tellusabout com puter science?" The quanti cation of resources which is them ain thrust of com puter science was show $n$ to be di erentwhen operating in the quantum regim e.

The work ofD eutsch and Jozsa was followed up by a progression of work dem onstrating increasingly powerfulapplications of the idea of quantum com putation. The oracle problem D eutsch and Jozsa investigated (and subsequent results by Berthiaum e and B rassard [26, 27]) w as one in which the am ount of resources needed in order to perform the com putation on a quantum com puter was exponentially less than a sim ilar exact com putation perform ed on a classical com puter. H ow ever, a probabilistic classical com puter could solve the problem D eutsch and Jozsa posed w ith sim ilar use of resources if the problem output of the algorithm could be wrong with som e vanishingly sm all probability. Thus the work of D eutsch and Jozsa alone did not dem onstrate a clear separation between classical and quantum com putation.

O vercom ing the exactness requirem ent ofD eutsch and Jozsa, B emstein and Vazirani [24] put forth algorithm swich showed a true supenpolynom ial resource gap between quantum and classical com putation in 1993. This was followed closely by the work of Sim on [176] who posed a problem which required exponentially m ore resources to solve on a classical com puter than on a quantum computer. In 1994, follow ing Sim on's lead, Shor[173] rem arkably dem onstrated that quantum com puters could factor num bers and com pute a discrete logarithm e ciently. M uch work in com plexity theory has gone into attem pting to develop e cient classical algorithm sfor these tw o problem s and it is w idely believed that such e cient solution on a classical com puter is im possible[167]. In fact, con dence in the di culty of these two problem $s$ form $s$ the basis for the $m$ ost widely used public key cryptography system s[164]. Further evidenœ for the power of quantum com puters over classical com puters was unveiled when $G$ rover [99, 100] dem onstrated that quantum com puters could search unordered lists quadratically faster than classical com puters.

By 1996, a clear separation in productivity between the algorithm ic m anipulation of quantum inform ation and classical inform ation had been established. Further progress $[30,113]$ dem onstrated [105] that D eutsch-Jozsa, B emstein-V azirani, Sim on, and Shor's algorithm s were all related to a single problem known as the hidden subgroup problem. Separate from these Shor-type algorithm S , research also broadened [31, 32] and quanti ed [20] the algorithm developed by G rover.

A third line of research has show $n$ how to use a quantum com puter to e ciently sim ulate quantum system $s[1,29,138,181,204,209]$. W hile there is no general proof that quantum system $s$ are hard to sim ulate on classical com puters, the vast industry of physicists who have attem pted to provide such e cient sim ulations have all failed. Building a quantum com puter would profoundly change the com plexity of the quantum m odels studied by physicists.

The discovery that quantum algorithm s can outperform their classicalbrethren is a result which should be fundam entally shocking to all studied com puter scientists. The com putational com plexity classes of yesteryear have ethereal foundations: the true foundations lie in a quantum setting. Further shock should also occur to those who use public key cryptosystem s based on factoring and discrete logarithm s: the future building of a quantum com puter willallow your encrypted $m$ essages to be read!

Like any infant discovery, however, the true power behind quantum com putation is currently unclear. P ast ventures by hum anity in brandishing the skill of foresight \{
\I think there is a world $m$ arket for $m$ aybe ve com puters." - Thom as W atson, chairm an of $\mathbb{B M}, 1943$
\{give us the con dence and optim ism to believe that the eld ofquantum algorithm s is only beginning to bloom .

### 1.4 C ontrol and the quantum com puter

W hile the algorithm ic speedup prom ised by quantum com puters was being developed, much work was done de ning and understanding the basic question: what exactly is a quantum com puter?

A sem inal step in m odem com puter science was taken when Turing de ned the class of functions now known as recursive or com putable functions[189]. T he C hurchTuring thesis $[189,46,45]$ con jectures that th is class of functions corresponds precisely to what can be com puted by an algorithm ic $m$ ethod in the real world. Thus the C hurch-Turing thesis provides a fundam entalgrounding upon which $m$ odem theoreticalcom puter science is built: everything that is naturally com putable by an algorithm is precisely the class of recursive functions. C om puter scientists are thus assured of job security by basing their studies on the class of recursive functions. Furtherm ore it was found that a certain class of com puters, universal com puters [189], could be used to e ciently com pute a recursive fiunction. Thus, under the $C$ hurch-Turing thesis and universality results, a com puter scientist concemed with com putation could be $m$ yopic to all $m$ odels of com putation sans a universal com puter. Of particular im portance to com puter science is that the Church-Turing thesis and universality results allow for the developm ent of a quanti cation [49, 108] of the com putational resouroes needed to perform a certain algorithm ic task which is essentially robust to the basic $m$ odel of com putation used to perform the task. M odem com putational com plexity [156] theory is a house buitt upon a fram e of universal com puters whose structural integrity is encoded in the robustness claim ed by the C hurdh-Turing thesis.

The Church-Turing thesis, however, is not a $m$ athem atical proof, how ever, but an em pirical statem ent whose validity has withstood over seventy years of testing. The advent of quantum com putation, how ever, has brought the validity of the com putational com plexity $m$ odels founded upon the Church-Turing thesis into question and in fact the very basis of com putation which is now clain ed to be fundam ental in com puter science has taken a severe detour into the quantum realm. Early research in quantum com putation generalized classicalm odels of com puting, the Turing $m$ achine and the circuit $m$ odel, into their quantum $m$ echanicalanalogies. The quantum equivalent ofa Turing $m$ achine was rst considered by Benio [17,18,19]. D eutsch [56] and Yao [208] further developed quantum Turing $m$ achines. The quantum equivalent of
classical circuits w as introduced by D eutsch 57] and this quantum circuit m odel (w ith certain uniform ity constraints) was shown to be equivalent to the quantum Turing $m$ achine by Yao [208].

In the sim plest quantum circuit m odela sequence of quantum gates (unitary evolution) is applied (perhaps in parallel) to an array of quantum mechanical tw o-level system $s$ (qubits) $w$ ith an appropriate initialization and readout of the quantum infor$m$ ation. O ne of the rst results in quantum com putation was the dem onstration that certain sets of quantum gates acting on such an array are universal in the sense that any unitary evolution on the array could be perform ed by an appropriate sequence of such gates. Follow ing early results which required three-body interactions[57] between quantum systems it was subsequently realized that two-body interactions[61] were su cient to perform universal quantum computation in the quantum circuit m odel.

Because quantum interactions are intrinsically analog in nature (interaction tim es and coupling strengths are realnum bers) the correct description of universalquantum circuits requires som e notion of approxim ation [117, 118]. This is sim ilar to the situation w ith probabilistic classical com puters. At rst glance it appears that the analog nature of probabilities $m$ ay cause unw arranted pow er due to in nite accuracy in such classical probabilistic com puters. M odels which contain bounded accuracy in their transition probabilities, the realw orld equivalent to a classical probabilistic $m$ achine, how ever, can be shown to form a robust com putational class. Sim ilarly, quantum circuits $m$ ust be cast $w$ thin the fram ew ork of nite accuracy. In partioular, discrete sets of quantum gates im plem ented with a nite accuracy are the realbuilding blocks of a quantum circuit. Luckily such discrete sets were show $n$ to be able to approxim ate any exact quantum circuit to w thin an accuracy (de ned on som e suitable distance $m$ easure) w ith only $\log ^{c}\left({ }^{1}\right)$ com putational overhead [112, 177]. T his in tum allow $s$ for the establishm ent of robust com putational com plexity classes w ithin the context of such discrete gate universal quantum com puters.

The universality results in the quantum circuit model show that given su cient control over quantum system $s$ there is a robust class of com putations based on the quantum circuit model. Thus su cient quantum control implies quantum com putation. But what of the validity of the quantum circuit $m$ odel as a real description of quantum system s? Q uantum circuits clearly map to quantum system s , but how realistic are the assum ptions that go into the quantum circuit $m$ odel?

### 1.5 T he decoherence roadb lock

Unfortunately, the description adopted in the quantum circuit m odel does not correspond to the realw orld in a particularly nasty detail. The quantum circuitm odel describes a quantum com puter as a closed quantum system. The whole form alism of a quantum circuit assum es that there is a system which executes the circuit but is
com pletely isolated from the rest of the universe. In the real world, how ever, there are no know $n m$ echanism s for truly isolating a quantum system from its environm ent. Realquantum system $s$ are open quantum system $s$. O pen quantum system scouple to their environm ent and destroy the quantum inform ation in the system through the process known as decoherence[92]. W hen exam ining the sim ple evolution of a single quantum system this system environm ent coupling appears to cause errors on the quantum system 's evolution. The picture of a quantum circuit where only desired unitary evolution occurs is thus naive.

D ecoherence, then, is a direct attack on the physical viability of quantum com puters in the real world $[101,129,190]$. Because quantum inform ation is not easily isolated from its environm ent, physics dictates that the quantum in form ation $w$ ill lose $m$ any of the properties that $m$ ake the inform ation quantum and not classical. In fact, $m$ uch ofthe infam ous transition from quantum to classicalphysics hasbeen attributed to the role of decoherence in physical system $s[222,223,224]$. Thus to the question \what $m$ akes a com puter classical and not quantum ?" the answer \decoherence" follow s. W hile the algorithm ic speedup prom ised by quantum com puters viewed as a closed system is a profound observation, it is all for naught if this decoherence problem cannot be overcom e.

There is an analogy here with classical com puters operating in noisy environ$m$ ents. For exam ple, conventional com puters exposed to hard radiation of space will not function properly due to the errors caused on the com puter hardw are by the radiation. At rst glance it would appear that a classical com puter operating in such an environm ent would be useless. O ne $m$ istake in the calculating the trajectory of a satellite can $m$ ean the com plete destruction of the satellite! Besides the obvious practice ofm aking the com puter hardw are resilient to the radiation, perhaps surprisingly, there is another $m$ ethod for overcom ing this problem known a \fault-tolerant" com putation. Fault-tolerant com putation is intim ately related to the idea of error correcting codes. In classicalerror correcting codes, in form ation transm itted through a noisy channel is $m$ ade $m$ ore resistant to the noise by $m$ aking the inform ation redundant. This basic idea, that redundancy can protect inform ation, was extend by von $N$ eum ann [200] to provide a $m$ ethod for perform ing com putations in the presence of noisy environm ents and im perfect operations. T hus the question that em erged around 1996 was does there exists a theory of fault-tolerant quantum com putation?

The rst step tow ards solving the decoherence problem was taken in 1995 when Shor[174] (and independently Steane [182]) discovered a quantum analogue of classical error correcting codes. Shor discovered that by encoding quantum inform ation, this inform ation could becom e $m$ ore resistant to interaction $w$ ith its environm ent. Follow ing this rem arkable discovery a rigorous theory of quantum error correction was developed $[21,38,37,78,120]$. M any di erent quantum error correcting codes $[41,94,119,128,132,162,183,185$ ] were discovered and this further led to a theory of fault-tolerant quantum com putation $[3,96,115,124,161,175]$. Fully fault-tolerant quantum com putation describes $m$ ethods for dealing $w$ ith system environm ent cou-
pling as well as dealing with faulty control of the quantum com puter. O f particular signi cance was the discovery of the threshold theorem for fault-tolerant quantum com putation [3, 95, 112, 124, 161]. T he threshold theorem states that if the decoherence interactions are of a certain form and are w eaker than the controlling interactions by a certain ratio, quantum com putation to any desired precision can be achieved. The threshold theorem for fault-tolerance thus declares a nal solution to the question of whether there are theoretical lim its to the construction of robust quantum com puters.

### 1.6 Q uantum Gem in i: decoherence and control

T he study of inform ation in a quantum setting is beginning to describe an am azingly rich com putational universe. In this brief introduction we have leamed that quantum algorithm $s$ can perform astounding com putational feats. $Q$ uantum control can be used to perform these algorithm s , while decoherence can be overcom e by this sam e quantum control. In spite of these discoveries, the inevitability of quantum technology rem ains unclear. Exactly what physical system s w ill be used to build a quantum com puter? T here have been a plethora of proposed physical system s for quantum com putation and a few of these have even $m$ oved from the draw ing board to sm all scale im plem entation [188, 148, 43, 152]. Just as vacuum tubes of the past have been replaced by the silicon wafers of today, the hardw are of future quantum com puters, how ever, is currently far from certain.

G iven the state of ignorance as to the suitability of di erent physical system sfor quantum com putation, it is im portant to provide theoretical groundw ork tow ards understanding what does and does not $m$ ake a good quantum com puter. This im plies understanding the delicate dance between quantum com putation's tw in considerations: decoherence and control.

In $G$ reek $m$ ythology, C astor and Pollux were tw ins bom to the sam e m other but w ith di erent fathers. Polhux's father was a god while the C astor's father was a m ere m ortal. Thus Pollux was im m ortal while C astor was m ortal. W hen C astor died on the battle eld his brother was so stricken with grief that he pleaded with Zeus to either send him to the sam e fate or restore his brother to life. Zeus was touched by the brotherly love and allowed C astor to spend altemating days on O lym pus w ith the gods and in the $m$ ortal w orld below the Earth, H ades. D ue to their exem plary exam ple ofbrotherly love the star constellation $G$ em iniw as placed in the heavens by Zeus in honor of these tw ins.

In this thesis we venture forth towards understanding a m odem day quantum G em ini $Q$ uantum control, our Pollux, is the pow erfulnear-im m ortalm aster of quantum com putation. D ecoherence, our $C$ astor, pulls quantum com putation down into the $m$ ortal real w orld. Su cient quantum control helps pull decoherence aw ay from realw orld di culty and restores the glory of quantum com putation. \D e ne, clarify,
and broaden his brotherly relationship between decoherence and quantum control", we thus beseech and in this thesis we explore, \and som eday quantum com puters will $m$ ove from $m y$ th to reality !"

### 1.7 Thesis outline

This thesis is divided into three $m$ ain parts. In part I of the thesis we introduce the basic notions of decoherence, control and universality in a quantum com puter. C hapter 2 discusses the basic form alism ofquantum operators for describing decoherence and presents a non-standard derivation of a sem igroup $m$ aster equation through the operator-sum representation. Chapter 3 then introduces the notion of control of a quantum system. N ecessary and su cient conditions for interactions which can be used for control which does not cause decoherence are presented. T he Lie algebraic structure of control is then discussed along w ith the im portant issue of approxim ation in quantum control. Chapter 4 shifts focus tow ards universal quantum com putation w ith a special em phasis on the subsystem s nature of universal quantum com puters. The notion ofencoded universality is introduced w ith an em phasis on the Lie algebraic structure of such encodings. A criteria for universal quantum com putation is derived which is useful for deciding when even encoding cannot tum a set of interactions into a universal set of interactions.

In part II of this thesis we tum to the theory of decoherence-free subspaces and decoherence-free subsystem s. W e begin in C hapter 5 by deriving necessary and su cient conditions for the existence of decoherence-free subspaces and their generalization decoherence-free subsystem s. The role of the O SR algebra is stressed as a funda$m$ entalm ethod for understanding both decoherence-free subspaces and decoherencefree subsystem s . The com $m$ utant ofthe O SR algebra is also identi ed as an im portant characterizer of decoherence-free system s. D ecoherence-free subsystem conditions in the $m$ aster equation are introduced and the reason why such conditions are currently only necessary are discussed. F inally the connection betw een sym $m$ etrization schem es and decoherence-free subsystem $s$ is discussed. In C hapter 6 we discuss the stability of decoherence-free system $s$ to perturbations. $W$ e show that perturbing interactions do not destroy the decoherence-free properties. Chapter 7 discusses $m$ any of the issues which generically arise when using a decoherence-fire subsystem for quantum com putation. In C hapter 8 we introduce an im portant $m$ odelof decoherence which supports decoherence-free subsystem $s$, the collective decoherence model. M aster equations are derived for both collective dephasing and for collective am plitude dam ping in order to better ilhustrate the conditions under which collective decoherence occurs. T he notion ofw eak and strong collective decoherence is introduced and the decoherence-fiee subsystem s for both of these cases is introduced. In C hapter 9 we discuss universal quantum computation on the weak and strong collective decoherence decoherencefree subsystem s. The use of only the exchange interaction for quantum com puting
is discovered and issues of the explicit use of collective decoherence decoherence-free subsystem s for quantum com putation are discussed. In C hapter 10 we discuss universalquantum com putation on an experim entally realized decoherence-free subspace in ion traps. Explicit control sequences are identi ed for such com putation. C hapter 11 then discusses how solid state proposals for quantum com putation can be sim plied and im proved by the use of encoded universality w ith the exchange interaction. Finally in Chapter 12 we discuss decoherence-firee subspaces in atom ic system s .

In part III of this thesis we tum to $m$ ethods for building a quantum computer which rely on techniques of robustness due to the energetics of the decoherence process. In C hapter 15 we describe the e ect of supercoherence where quantum inform ation is protected at low environm ent tem peratures. A supercoherent system which allow sfor universal quantum com putation is derived and presented in the context of a solid-state im plem entation of a quantum com puter. W e then present a spin ladder in Chapter 16 which has $m$ any of the properties of supercoherence as well as new error correcting properties. In C hapter 17 this is taken one step further and a system with a ground state which is a quantum error correcting is discussed. This is the rst exam ple of such a quantum error correcting ground state which is fully quantum $m$ echanicaland which does not require unreasonable physical resources. F inally in Chapter 18 we discuss the possibility of naturally fault-tolerant quantum computation. A nalogies w th the classical robustness of inform ation are discussed and a general fram ew ork for future natural fault-tolerant quantum com putation is provided.

## C hapter 2

## The $P$ ain of Isolating $Q$ uantum In form ation: D ecoherence

so its quantum com puters we want
w ith com putational power we can aunt
well there's a price which we'll have to pay
because quantum coherences rejoice in decay
In this chapter we introduce the basic theory of quantum operations for studying decoherence. $W$ e begin by giving a sim ple exam ple of how decoherence can destroy quantum inform ation. We then introduce decoherence in an abstract form alism known as the operator-sum representation ( $O S R$ ). Shortcom ings of this form alism are illum inated. W e then discuss the physically m otivated approxim ations of the operator-sum representation know $n$ as $m$ aster equations. A $m$ ystery in decoherence rates calculated in the operator-sum representations is presented and solved.

### 2.1 The degradation of quantum in form ation

$Q$ uantum com putation would be a $m$ atter of the controlof quantum system $s$ (not itself a com pletely trivial sub ject) were it not for the fact that quantum system s are open system s . The degradation of quantum inform ation due to the coupling of the system containing the quantum inform ation to the environm ent is called decoherence ${ }^{1}$. Let us begin our understanding of the degradation of quantum inform ation by exam ining a sim ple exam ple.

[^2]Suppose we are given a system of consisting a single qubit and an environm ent consisting of another qubit. The H ilbert space of this com bined system and environ$m$ ent is $H=H_{S} \quad H_{E} \quad C^{2} \quad C^{2}$. Further suppose that there is a coupling betw een the system and the environm ent given by the H am ittonian $\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{z} \quad \mathrm{z}$ where is a xed coupling constant.

We wish to encode on the system a qubit of quantum inform ation, $j i=j 0 i+$ jli. If $=0$ we could create the state $j i$ and the state of the system would rem ain $j$ i for all tim es after its creation: the quantum inform ation would be preserved. If how ever $\Leftrightarrow 0$, there is a coupling betw een the system and the environm ent given by the evolution operator

$$
U(t)=\exp \left[\begin{array}{lll}
i t_{z} & z \tag{2.1}
\end{array}\right]=\cos (t) I \quad i \sin (t)_{z} \quad z:
$$

Suppose that the environment is initially in the state $j+i=\frac{1}{\overline{2}}$ (j0i+ $j 1 i$ ), so that initially the state of the system plus environm ent is $j i \quad j+i$. At a tim et latter, the state of the system plus environm ent w ill be

$$
\begin{equation*}
j(t) i=\cos (t) j i \quad j+i \quad i \sin (t)(z j \text { i) } j \quad i ; \tag{22}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $j \quad i=P_{\overline{1}}^{1}(j 0 i \quad j i)$. The density $m$ atrix of the system at timet is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& =\quad \begin{array}{ll}
j \jmath & \cos (2 t) \\
\cos (2 t) & j 3
\end{array}: \tag{2.3}
\end{align*}
$$

Here $T r_{\mathrm{E}}$ [ ] represents tracing over the environm ent. The residual di erence betw een this density $m$ atrix and the initialdensity $m$ atrix is

W e here see that as tim e evolves, the o diagonal elem ents of the density matrix oscillate in tim e. We thus say that the \coherence" betw een the j0i and jli states is being m anipulated. N ote that a tim $\mathrm{e} t=-\mathrm{k}$, where k is an integer, the quantum inform ation in the system is una ected, $=0$. System-environm ent coupling alone is not enough to degrade the quantum inform ation. In addition to the coupling, an assum ption about the inaccessiblity of the environm ental degrees of freedom m ust be $m$ ade in order for decoherence to occur. Suppose, for exam ple, that at tim e $t_{0}=\overline{4}$ the coupling between the system and the environm ent is tumed o and the state of the environm ent is $m$ ade inaccessible to experim ent. At this time the diagonal elem ents of the density $m$ atrix in the j0i; jli basis com pletely vanish. Since the environm ental degrees of freedom are now, by assum ption, assum ed to be inaccessible, the quantum inform ation in the system hasbeen degraded. A s described in A ppendix
A.5, the trace norm betw een two density $m$ atrioes is a good m easure of the absolute distinguishability of the density $m$ atriges. For this exam ple we calculate that

$$
D\left(\begin{array}{ll}
(0) ; & (t))=\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Tr} j \quad j=j \text { j jil } \quad \cos (2 \quad t) j: ~ \tag{2.5}
\end{array}\right.
$$

The best $m$ easurem ent to distinguish the initial state from the decohered state at tim e t w ill produce m easurem ents probabilities whose absolute di erence will di er by $j$ j j $j$ cos $(2 \quad t) j$. If one is thinking about using this qubit for som e sort of com putation, then we see that the com putation will err w ith a probability of at least this value.
$T$ his sim ple exam ple ofdecoherence serves to illustrate the basic idea that coupling betw een the system and environm ent can lead to degradation ofquantum inform ation.

### 2.2 Quantum operations

In this section we describe a basic form alism for understanding open quantum system s . In particular we seek to understand the evolution of a system when it is coupled to an environm ent as seen from the perspective of the system alone.

### 2.2.1 D erivation

C onsider the dynam ics of a system $S$ together $w$ ith the rest of the universe which we will call the environm ent $\mathrm{E} . \mathrm{W}$ e will assum e that the system S represents full degrees of freedom separate from those of the environm ent $E$. The state space of the system plus environm ent then occupies a Hibert space which is the tensor product of the system and environm ent H ibert spaces, $H \quad H_{S} \quad H_{E}$.
$N$ ote that this is not the m ost general de nition of a system \{it is possible that the system we are interested in does not have support over a full degree of freedom. $T$ his is the case, for exam ple, when one is interested in a lim ited num ber of levels of a m ulti-level atom. In this situation, probability can \leak" in or out of the system from or to the rest of the degree of freedom. W e will develop our form alism for the situation where the system is a full degree of freedom but note where results can be extended to this m ore general de nition of a system.

The evolution of the system $S$ plus environm ent $E$ (which together do from a closed system by postulate) is unitary w ith a H am iltonian given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{S}} \quad \mathrm{E}+\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{S}} \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{E}}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SE}} ; \tag{2.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $H_{S}$ acts on the system degrees of freedom $S, H_{E}$ acts on the environm entaldegrees of freedom and $H_{\text {se }}$ couples these degrees of freedom. The evolution of the system and environm ent is then govemed by the evolution operator $U(t)=\exp [i H t]$. $W$ hen the coupling between the system and the environm ent is zero, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SE}}=0$, the
evolution of the system plus environm ent are separately unitary $U(t)=\exp [i H t]=$ $U_{S}(t) \quad U_{E}(t) w$ ith $U_{S}(t)=\exp \left[i H_{S} t\right]$ and $U_{E}(t)=\exp \left[i H_{E} t\right]$. From the perspective of the system alone, the evolution is therefore strictly unitary independent of the possibly entangled initial state of the system and environm ent:

$$
S_{S}(t)=T r_{E}^{h} U(t) \quad(0) U^{y}(t)^{i}=U_{S}(t) S_{S}(0) U_{S}^{y}(t):
$$

If this were not true, it w ould allow for superhum inalm anipulation ofdistant system s .
$W$ hen, however, $H_{S E} \in$, the evolution of the system and the bath is more com plicated. Let us rst exam ine the situation when the system and the bath are initially in a tensor products state $(0)=\mathrm{s}(0) \quad \mathrm{E}(0)$. From the perspective of the system the evolution is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
s_{s}(t)=\operatorname{Tr}_{E}{ }^{h} U(t)_{s}(0) \quad E_{E}(0) U^{y}(t)^{i}: \tag{2.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

The initial state of the environm ent can be written in term sof its spectral decom position $E_{E}(0)=P^{P} \quad \mathrm{j}$ ih jwhere $j$ i $2 \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{E}}$ is a complete orthogonal basis for the environm ent which diagonalizes ${ }_{E}(0), 0 \quad p \quad 1$, and ${ }^{P} \quad p=1$. Expanding the trace and using the spectral decom position of the environm ent we nd that

$$
\begin{equation*}
s(t)={ }_{x}^{x} h \text { jJ (t) } s(0) p j \text { in } j^{y}(t) j i \text {; } \tag{2.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
s(t)={ }_{i}^{x} A_{i}(t) s(0) A_{i}^{y}(t) ; \tag{2.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i=(;)}(t)={ }^{p} \overline{p h} j J(t) j i: \tag{2.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

$T$ he requirem ent that $U(t)$ is unitary im plies that

$$
\begin{align*}
& X \quad A_{i}^{Y}(t) A_{i}(t)=I: \tag{2.12}
\end{align*}
$$

Eq. (2.10) together w ith the nom alization condition Eq. (2.12) form the tracepreserving operator-sum representation (OSR). N otice that the exact form of the O SR operators depends on the basis $j i$ (not the $j i$ basis which is determ ined by the spectral decom position). The evolution does not depend on this basis expansion, but the exact form of the operators $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{t})$ does depend on this basis choige. W ew ill retum to this freedom

In fact it can be show $n$ [126] that the $m$ ost general evolution of a density $m$ atrix, $(t)=L(t)[(0)]$ satisfying the requirem ents

1. The $m$ ap $L(t)$ takes density $m$ atrioes to density $m$ atrioes.
2. The $m a p L(t)$ is a linear $m a p$.
3. Them ap L ( $t$ ) is com pletely positive. A com pletely positive $m$ ap takes positive operators to positive operators when acting as identity on an auxiliary space I $L(t) \mathbb{A}] 0$ forA 0 , w th I the identity operator on any addition $H$ ilbert space.
$m$ ust have the form of the OSR. Every possible OSR has a description in term s of the action of a unitary operator on a larger H ilbert space. This allow s us to favor the $m$ ore concrete derivation of the $O S R$ from the physical perspective of unitary evolution traced over the environm ent as opposed to the m ore axiom atic approach.


Figure 2.1: D iagram of the operator sum representation

### 2.2.2 F ixed basis O SR

A tool which we will nd usefiul later in our derivation of $m$ aster equations is the xed basis form of the OSR [42, 10]. Suppose we choose a xed basis (see Appendix A 3) for expanding each of the operators $A_{i}(t)$ in the $O S R$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i}(t)={ }^{x} \quad b_{i}(t) F: \tag{2.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The OSR can then be written as

$$
\begin{equation*}
(t)={ }_{{ }_{i}^{x}}^{A_{i}(t)} \quad(0) A_{i}^{y}(t)={ }_{i}^{x} b_{i}(t) b_{i}(t) F \quad(0) F^{y}={ }^{x} \quad \text { (t)F } \quad(0) F \quad ; \tag{2.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
={ }_{i}^{x} b_{i}(t) b_{i}(t): \tag{2.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

Eq. (2.14) is the xed basis or chi representation of the O SR.N orm alization requires that

$$
{ }_{i}^{x} b_{i} b_{i} F^{y} F=F^{X} \quad F^{y} F=I:
$$

Taking the trace of this equation we nd that

$$
\begin{equation*}
x \quad=d: \tag{2.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

The ( $t$ ) $m$ atrix is a positive hem itian $m$ atrix which speci es the $O S R$ in a given basis.

Separating out the identity com ponents ofEq. (2.14) and Eq. (2.16) we obtain
$(t)=00(t)$
$(0)+\quad 0(t) F$
$(0)+0$
(t) $\quad(0) F^{Y^{i}}+{ }_{\text {; }}^{X}$
(t) F
(0) $\mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{y}}$ :
and

$$
\begin{equation*}
00(t) I+\underbrace{X h}_{\epsilon 0} 0(t) F+0(t) F^{Y^{i}}+\underbrace{X}_{; \epsilon=0} \quad \text { (t) } F^{y} F=I: \tag{2.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

M ultiplying the second of these equations by $\frac{1}{2}$ (0) from both the left and right, and substituting into the evolution equation, we obtain
(t)
$(0)=i[S(t)$;
(0)] $+\frac{1}{2} \underset{\sim}{x}$
(t) F ; (0) $\mathrm{F}^{Y^{i}}+\mathrm{h}$
(0) $; \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{Y}^{\mathrm{i}}}$;
where

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(t)=\frac{i}{2}_{\notin 0} \quad 0(t) F \quad 0 \quad(t) F^{y}: \tag{221}
\end{equation*}
$$

This version of the xed basis $O S R$ will be useful in deriving $m$ aster equations. It is also convenient because any positive
( $t$ ) m atrix whose trace is d corresponds to an $O S R$.

### 2.2.3 Exam ple O SR

A s an example of the OSR consider the process described in Section 2.1. The system -environm ent evolution operator is given by Eq. (2.1) and the intitial density $m$ atrix of the environm ent is ${ }_{E}(0)=j+i h t j$. In the derivation of the $O S R$ there are two term s,

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
A_{1}(t)=h+\dot{i}(\cos (t) I & i \sin (t)_{z} & z) j+i_{E}=\cos (t) I ; \\
A_{2}(t)=h \dot{i}(\cos (t) I & i \sin (t)_{z} & \left.z_{z}\right) j+i_{E}=i \sin (t)_{z}: \tag{222}
\end{array}
$$

$N$ ote that $A_{1}^{Y}(t) A_{1}(t)+A_{2}^{y}(t) A_{2}(t)=I$ as required by unitarity. $T$ he evolution of the intitial density $m$ atrix ( 0 ) is thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
(t)=\cos ^{2}(t) \quad(0)+\sin ^{2}(t) \quad z \quad(0) z ; \tag{223}
\end{equation*}
$$

which agrees w ith Eq. (2.3) derived above.
Suppose that instead of the environm ent being in the initial state $j+i n t j$ it is in the state $j 0 i h 0 j$. In this case, if we us the basis $j+i, j$ i to calculate the OSR we nd that

$$
\begin{array}{llll}
A_{1}(t)=h+i & (\cos (t) I & i \sin (t)_{z} & z) j 0 i_{E}=p_{\overline{2}}^{1}(\cos (t) I \\
\left.i \sin (t)_{z}\right) ;  \tag{224}\\
A_{2}(t)=h i \cos (t) I & i \sin (t)_{z} & \left.z_{z}\right) j 0 i_{E}=A_{1}(t): & (2.24
\end{array}
$$

If we instead use the basis j0i, jli to calculate the O SR, we nd that

$$
\begin{array}{rlll}
\tilde{A}_{1}(t) & =h 0 i(\cos (t) I & i \sin (t)_{z} & z) j 0 i_{ \pm}=(\cos (t) I \\
\left.\widetilde{A}_{2}(t)=h 1 \sin (t)_{z}\right) ; \tag{225}
\end{array}
$$

There are two interesting facts about this case. First, we see how using a di erent basis for caloulating the O SR gives di erent operators but the sam e evolution:

$$
\begin{equation*}
(t)=A_{1}(t) \quad(0) A_{1}^{Y}(t)+A_{2}(t) \quad(0) A_{2}^{Y}(t)=\widetilde{A}_{1}(t) \quad(0) \widetilde{A}_{1}^{Y}(t): \tag{226}
\end{equation*}
$$

Second the evolution of the system is unitary, $\mathbb{A}_{1}^{Y} \mathcal{A}_{1}=I$. Besides dem onstrating the non-uniqueness of the $O S R$, this exam ple serves to bring up an interesting question: under what conditions is the evolution of the O SR correspond to unitary evolution? Since this question presages future work we will address this question in the next subsection.

### 2.2.4 OSR and unitary evolution

The question we pose is under what conditions does

$$
{ }^{X} A_{i} A_{i}^{y}=U \quad U^{y} ;
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
U^{Y_{U}}={ }_{i}^{X} A_{i}^{y_{i} A_{i}}=I ; \tag{228}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all. $W$ e claim that an $i$ condition for this to hold is $A_{i}=C_{i}(t) U$ with ${ }^{P}{ }_{i} \dot{J}_{i}{ }^{j}=$ 1[76, 135].

The forward implication is trivial. $C$ learly if $A_{i}=C_{i} U$ with ${ }^{P}{ }_{i} \dot{J}_{i}{ }^{j} \rho=1$ then Eq. (2 27) and Eq. (2 28) both hold.

To prove the inverse, assum e Eq. (2 27) and Eq. (2 28) both hold. It is useful to rew rite Eq. (2.27) as

$$
{ }^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{A}}} \mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{U}=\text {; }
$$

and then de ne $\mathbb{A}_{i}=U^{Y} A_{i}$ so that this becom es

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{i}^{X} \widetilde{A}_{i} \widetilde{A}_{i}^{Y}=: \tag{2.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since this equation must hold for all it must hold for a particular choige of = $j$ ih $j$. This im mediately leads to

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { x } \nrightarrow 2 \overbrace{i} j i f=1:  \tag{2.31}\\
& \text { i }
\end{align*}
$$

For a given $\widehat{A}_{i}$, the state $\widehat{A}_{i} j$ i can be split into two components $\widehat{A}_{i} j$ i $=c_{i} j$ i+ $C_{i}^{?} j$ ? i where $j$ ? $i$ is a vector penpendicular to $j$ i. Eq. (2.31) then implies

$$
\text { x } \quad \dot{\mathcal{M}}_{i}^{2}{ }^{2}=1:
$$

The norm alization condition Eq. (2 28) can be recast as

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{i}^{X} \mathbb{A}_{i}^{Y} \widetilde{A}_{i}=I ; \tag{2.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

which im plies

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }^{x} \quad \dot{\zeta}_{i} \mathcal{J}+\dot{\mathcal{L}}_{i}^{?} \tilde{J}=1: \tag{2.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

Together with Eq. (2.32) this implies that ${ }^{P}{ }_{i} \dot{\mathcal{C}}_{i}^{?} \mathcal{J}=0$ such that $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{i}}^{?}=0$ for all i . Thus $j i$ is an eigenstate ofallof the $\mathbb{A}_{i}, \mathbb{A}_{i} j i=c_{i} j i T h i s m u s t h o l d ~ f o r a l l p o s s i b l e$ $j$ i in the Hibert space the $O S R$ operates on and therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\widehat{A}_{i}=c_{i} I\right) \quad A_{i}=c_{i} U: \tag{2.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

Eq. (2.28) then implies ${ }^{\mathrm{P}}{ }_{\mathrm{i}} \dot{\mathrm{J}}_{\mathrm{i}}{ }^{\jmath}=1$.

### 2.2.5 Lim its of the O SR

The OSR is fairly satisfying in term s of describing the evolution of a system coupled to an environm ent. The initial state of the environm ent together with a description of the unitary evolution operator on the system and environm ent allows for a description of the evolution of allpossible system density operators in a com pact form. Them ost troublesom e assum ption in this derivation is, perhaps, the assum ption that the system and the environm ent are initially in a tensor product state $(0)=$ $S^{(0)} E^{(0)}$.

D o there exist situations in whid interaction betw een the system and the environ$m$ ent cannot be expressed in the OSR ? C onsider the situation where the system and environm ent are each single qubits and the intial joint state is $j_{1} i=p_{\overline{2}}^{1}(j 00 i+j 11 i)$ or $j_{2} i=p^{1} \overline{\overline{2}}(j+0 i+j 1 i)$. Suppose the system and environm ent then evolve according to the unitary evolution $U=I \quad j 0 i h 0 j+x \quad j 1 i h 1 j$. In som e sense, the state of the environm ent is the sam e in both of these situations: the density $m$ atrioes of the environm ent for both $j_{1} i$ and $j_{2} i$ are both $\frac{1}{2} I$. Further, the density $m$ atrioes of the system for both $j_{1} i$ and $j{ }_{2} i$ are also both $\frac{1}{2} I$. A fter evolution according to $U$, how ever, the state of the system is di erent for these two cases di er

Thus we see that the same density $m$ atrix has evolved into two di erent density $m$ atrices $w$ hen the environm ent's density $m$ atrices $w$ as identical. $T$ hus it is clear that there is no hope in deriving an O SR which depends solely on the initialdensity m atrix of the environm ent and the system -environm ent unitary evolution. In particular the entangled nature (see Appendix A 2 for de nition) of the system and environm ent leads to situations w here the O SR fails.

T he initialcondition oftensor product states for the system and environm ent is an assum ption that the system and the environm ent are initially uncorrelated. Further we have shown how when the system and the environm ent start an entangled state an OSR depending only on the environm ental density $m$ atrix and the fill evolution is im possible. Let us now show that even when the system and the environm ent are classically correlated there are problem $s$ in the derivation of the O SR. Suppose that the initial state of the system plus environm ent can be w rilten in the separable form (see A ppendix A 2 for de nition)

$$
\begin{equation*}
(0)=^{X} \quad q \quad s^{(0)} \quad \text { e } \quad(0) ; \tag{2.37}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ ith $0<q \quad 1$ and ${ }^{P} \quad q=1$ and $S^{(0), E_{P}(0) \text { valid density } m \text { atrioes. The }}$ initialsystem density matrix is $s(0)=\operatorname{Tr}[(0)]=P \quad q \quad s \quad(0)$. Each environm ental density $m$ atrix has a spectraldecom position (perhaps over di erent environm ent basis states) : $\mathrm{E}(0)=\mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{j}$ ih $j$. The evolution of the system is then

$$
\begin{equation*}
s(t)={ }_{;}^{x} \text { h JJ (t) s (0)qP j ih } J^{y}(t) j i: \tag{2.38}
\end{equation*}
$$

$T$ his can be $w$ ritten in the form

$$
{ }_{s}(t)=\begin{gather*}
X  \tag{2.39}\\
i=(;)
\end{gather*} A_{i ;} \text { (t) } q \text { s (0)A } \underset{i ;}{y}(t) ;
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i=(;) ;}(t)=\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{P}} \mathrm{jJ}(\mathrm{t}) j i_{i} \tag{2.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

and unitarity requires

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{i}^{X} A_{i ;}^{y}(t) A_{i ;}(t)=I: \tag{2.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

Unless the basis used for each spectraldecom position of the bath is the sam eji=ji and the spectral coe cients are the sam ep $=\mathrm{p}$, the evolution of the system cannot be expressed as in the OSR form Eq. (2.10).

### 2.3 M aster equations

W hile the $O S R$ is a convenient form alism for discussing the coupling betw een the system and the bath under appropriate initial conditions, it is often too cum bersom e
to be used for calculations on realphysical system. O ne im portant reason for this fact is that the environm ent of real physical system $s$ are often large com plex subsystem $s$ whose evolution is di cult to m odel. The sim plicity of the system is oflittle help when dealing $w$ ith open quantum system $s$ which require an understanding ofenvironm ental degrees of freedom. Despite this di culty, a surprisingly large class of decohering dynam ics has been adequately described by physically derived evolution equations.

A closed quantum system evolves according to the Liouville equation of m otion

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{@ \quad(t)}{@ t}=i \mathbb{H} ; \quad(t)\right] ; \tag{2.42}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have chosen a static H am iltonian H for sim plicity. O ftentim es it is possible to derive an approxim ate evolution equation for an open quantum system which corresponds to an extra term in this evolution equation:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{@(t)}{@ t}=i \mathbb{H} ;(t)\right]+L[(t)]: \tag{2.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

A large class of these approxim ate evolution equations correspond to sem igroup $m$ aster equations. If we let $(t)=(t)[(0)]$ denote the param eterized $m$ ap of the initial density $m$ atrix to the density $m$ atrix at tim $e t$, we de ne a sem igroup $m$ aster equation as a map ( $t$ ) which satis es

1. ( $t$ ) is a com pletely positive linearm ap continuous in $t$ (see Section 22.1 for the de nition of com plete positivity).
2. (t) is M arkovian: (t)
$(s)=(s+t)$.
3. The initial state of the system and environm ent are in a tensor product state.

G orini, K ossakow ski, and Sudarshan [93] and Lindblad [139] have show $n$ that any $m$ ap
(t) which satis es these requirem ents has an evolution which is generated by the sem igroup $m$ aster equation (SM E)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\frac{@(t)}{@ t}=i \mathbb{H} ; \quad(t)\right]+\frac{1}{2}^{X} \text { a } \stackrel{h}{F} \quad(t) ; F^{Y^{i}}+\mathbb{F}^{h} ; \quad(t) F^{y^{i}} \text {; } \tag{2.44}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $F$ are a com plete basis for the operators on the $H$ ilbert space which inhabits and $a$ is a positive herm itian $m$ atrix.

### 2.3.1 D iscrete coarse graining derivation of the SM E

W e now show that explicit use of a discrete coarse-graining over tim e can lead naturally from the OSR evolution equation, Eq. (220) to the SM E, Eq. (2 3) [10]. A
useful form of the xed basis O SR Eq. (220) is found by taking the derivative of Eq. (220) w ith respect to tim e

The coarse graining of the evolution $w$ ill be done $w$ ith respect to a time. This tim e-scale, we will eventually discover, is related to a environm ent \m em ory" tim e scale. C oarse graining over corresponds to

$$
\begin{equation*}
j=(j) ; \quad ; j=\quad(j) ; \quad j 2 N: \tag{2.46}
\end{equation*}
$$

Further, rew riting the QSR Eq. (220) as $\quad(t)=\quad(t) \quad(0)$ and de ning $\mathbb{L}(t)$ through $(t)=T \exp { }_{0}^{n_{R_{t}}} \Psi(s) d s$ we nd that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{@ \quad(t)}{@ t}=\Psi(t)[(t)]: \tag{2.47}
\end{equation*}
$$



$$
\begin{equation*}
{\underset{0}{t}}_{Z_{t}(s) d s}=\mathbb{X}_{j=0}^{1} \mathbb{L}_{j}: \tag{2.48}
\end{equation*}
$$

N ext we will m ake the assum ption that on the tim e scale of the environm ent , the evolution generators $\mathbb{L}(\mathrm{t})$ commute in the \average" sense that $\mathbb{I}_{j} ; \mathbb{I}_{k}=0 ; 8 j ; \mathrm{k}$. Physically, we im agine this operation as arising from the \resetting" of the environ$m$ ent density operator over the tim e-scale. U nder this assum ption, the evolution of the system is M arkovian when $t$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
(t)={\underset{j=0}{h Y} \exp ^{h} L_{j}^{i}: ~}_{i} \text { : } \tag{2.49}
\end{equation*}
$$

U nder the discretization of the evolution, this product form of the evolution im plies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{j+1}=\exp ^{h} \mathbb{L}_{j}^{i}\left[{ }_{j}\right]: \tag{2.50}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the lim it of twe expand this exponential, to nd that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\xrightarrow{j+1} \quad j=\mathbb{I}_{j}\left[{ }_{j}\right]: \tag{2.51}
\end{equation*}
$$

This equation is sim ply a discretization of Eq. (2.47) under the assum ption that , where is the tim e-scale of change for the system density $m$ atrix. N otice in particular that the RHS of Eq. (2.51) contains the average value of $4(t)$ over the
interval. From the O SR evolution equation Eq. (2.45), we know the explicit form of $\mathbb{L}(t)$ over the rst interval from 0 to..$D$ iscretizing over this intervalwe nd that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \Psi_{0}\left[\begin{array}{l}
0
\end{array}\right] \tag{2.52}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{hXi} \underline{-}_{0}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{X}(\mathrm{~s}) \mathrm{ds}: \tag{2.53}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, in the sense of the coarse graining above we have arrived at an explicit form for $\mathbb{I}_{0}$.

C onsider the evolution beyond this rst interval. Deriving an explicit form for $I_{1}$ and for higher term $s$ is now im possible because Eq. (2.45) gives the evolution in term s of (0). H ow ever, since we have $m$ ade the assum ption that the environm ent \resets" over the tim e-scale , we expect the environm ent to interact w ith the system in the sam em anner over every -length coarse-grained interval. This is equivalent to assum ing that $\Psi_{i}=\Psi_{0} ; 8 i$ (which of course is the $m$ ost trivial way of satisfying the M arkovian evolution condition $\left.\llbracket_{i} ; \mathbb{\Psi}_{j}\right]=0 ; 8 i ; j$ ). Then, using Eq. (2.51), one is led to the form of the sem igroup equation ofm otion,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.\frac{@(t)}{@ t}=i\left[\frac{@ S(t)^{+}}{@ t} ;(t)\right]+\frac{1}{2}^{x^{*}} ;{\frac{@(t)^{+}}{@ t}}_{\mathbb{E}} ;(t) F^{\mathrm{y}}\right]+\mathbb{E} \quad(t) ; \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{y}}\right]: \tag{2.54}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e can write this equation of $m$ otion in an altemative form which distinguishes between the system and environm ent contributions to the evolution. Since Eq. (2.45) is linear in the ( $t$ ) matrix, one can calculate ${ }^{(0)}(t)$ for the isolated system and hence de ne the new term swhid com eabout from the coupling of the system to the environm ent:

$$
\begin{equation*}
(t)={ }^{(0)}(t)+{ }^{(1)}(t): \tag{2.55}
\end{equation*}
$$

The term swhich correspond to the isolated system will therefore produce a nom al
iH ; ( t ] ] Liouville term in Eq. (2.54). Thus Eq. (2.54) can be rew ritten as
$\left.\left.\frac{@(t)}{@ t}=i H+\frac{{ }^{*} @ S^{(1)}(t)^{+}}{@ t} ;(t)^{\#}+\frac{1}{2} x^{*}{ }^{*} \frac{@(1)(t)^{+}}{@ t} \mathbb{F} ;(t) F^{y}\right]+\mathbb{F} \quad(t) ; F^{y}\right]$
which with the identi cation of $\frac{D(t)^{E}}{\text { Qt }}$ with a is equivalent to Eq. (2.3), except for the presence of the second term derived from $\frac{\mathrm{QS}^{(1)}(t)}{\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{E}}}$ in the Liouvillian. This second term induces unitary dynam ics on the system, $\frac{\mathrm{QS}^{(1)}(\mathrm{t})}{\mathrm{Et}}$, is referred to as the Lamb shift. This term explicitly describes an unitary e ect which the environm ent has on the system. It is often im plicitly assum ed to be present in Eq. (2 3).

W e have shown how coarse-graining the evolution over the environm ent tim escale allow s one to understand the connection betw een the OSR and the sem igroup evolution. T he assum ptions which went into this derivation are explicitly

1. The tim e-scale for the evolution of the system density $m$ atrix is $m u c h ~ l a r g e r ~$ than the tim e-scale for the resetting of the environm ent ( ).
2. The evolution of the system should be $M$ arkovian ( $\left.\left.\mathbb{H}_{i} ; \mathbb{\Psi}_{j}\right]=0 ; 8 i ; j\right)$
3. The environm ent resets to the sam e state so that the system evolution is the sam e over every coarse graining ( $\Psi_{i}=\Psi_{0} ; 8 i$ ).
4. T he system and the environm ent start in a tensor product state.

The im portance of Eq. (2.45) lies in the fact that it allow s one to pinpoint the exact point at which the assum ption of $M$ arkovian dynam ics are $m$ ade and further, due to the general likeness of its form to the SM E, provides an easily translatable connection when going from the non $M$ arkovian $O$ SR to the M arkovian SM E. N otice also that the assum ption of $M$ arkovian dynam ics introduces an arrow of tim e in the evolution of the system through the ordering of the environm ental states: the system evolves through tim $e$ in the direction of each successive resetting of the environm ent.

A detailed study of this coarse graining procedure on a speci c m odel has been carried out in [136] where the authors exam ine the application of this procedure to a spin-boson model. Am azingly at low order in perturbation theory the coarse grain procedure described above provides an accurate description of the open system dynam ics.

The use of $M$ arkovian $m$ aster equations in physics has a long and storied history. From the early study of phenom enologicalm odels [28,202], to $m$ ore rigorous derivations [125,52,53,139], and the saturation ofm aster equations in the quantum optics com $m$ unity [39], $m$ aster equations are a usefultool for $m$ odeling the behavior ofm any di erent physical system s. It has even been suggested that instead of an approxi$m$ ation of the full unitary dynam ics, the SM E is a fundam ental evolution equation for nature (for a good discussion of this $m$ atter, and why it fails to solve the $\backslash \mathrm{m}$ easurem ent problem ", see [92]). W hat we have provided in this section is a di erent $m$ anner of understanding how the SM E can arise as an approxim ate evolution of a system. Eq. (2.20) and Eq. (2.45) provide an path between the exact OSR and the approxim ate SM E via our speci c coarse graining procedure.

### 2.3.2 R esolving a mystery in decoherence rates

D ecoherence rates

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{n}={ }^{n} \operatorname{Tr}^{h} \quad(0)^{(n)}(0)^{i 0} \frac{1}{n} \text {; } \tag{2.57}
\end{equation*}
$$

（see A ppendix A． 6 for the m otivation behind this de nition）can be used to under－ stand the tim e scales of a decoherence process．Interestingly，under the SM E，rst order decoherence rates $\left(1={ }_{1}\right)$ are nite while in the OSR these decoherence rates vanish．

O ne can see the vanishing of the rst order decoherence rate in the O SR by directly substituting in the pre－O SR H am iltonian dynam ics and using the cyclical nature of the trace operation，

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{1}{1} & =\operatorname{Tr}_{S}{ }_{S}(0) \frac{@}{@ t} \operatorname{Tr}_{E} U_{S E}(t){ }_{S}(0) \quad{ }_{E}(0) U_{S E}^{Y}(t)^{i}{ }^{!}{ }^{t=0} \\
& =\operatorname{Tr}_{S}\left[{ }_{S}(0) T r_{E}\left[i H_{S B} S_{S}(0)+i_{S}(0) H_{S B}\right]\right]=0: \tag{2.58}
\end{align*}
$$

The only possible $m$ anner in which this vanishing of this trace could not occur would be to play som e tricks $w$ th $\lim$ its of in nite $m$ atrices．

H ow ever，in the SME，the rst order decoherence rate does not vanish．Explicitly， in the SME，we nd that（in the absence of a system evolution $H_{s}=0$ ），

$$
\begin{align*}
& 20 \\
& \left.\left.\frac{1}{1}=\operatorname{Tr}_{\mathrm{S}}{ }^{4}{ }_{\mathrm{S}}(0) @ \frac{1}{2}{ }_{\mathrm{X}}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{f}_{0} \mathbb{F} \quad(0) ; \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{y}}\right]+\mathbb{E} ;(0) \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{y}}\right] \mathrm{A} 5 ; \tag{2.59}
\end{align*}
$$

which in general does not vanish（see for exam ple［211，219］）．
N ow lets present a bit（or m ore precisely a qubit！）of a paradox．C onsider the often quoted exam ple of phase dam ping of a qubit．In this case，弌 w ould appear that there is a nite rst order decoherence rate．Yet，phase dam ping of a qubit is often presented w thin the OSR $[42,120,153]$ ，which，as we have just shown above，would predict zero rst order decoherence rates for any non－singular $H$ am iltonian．In this exam ple，the O SR operators are given by［42］

$$
A_{0}(t)=\begin{align*}
& 1  \tag{2.60}\\
& 0
\end{align*} e^{t} \quad ; \quad \text { and } A_{1}(t)=0 \quad p \frac{0}{1 e^{2 t}} ;
$$

and a sim ple calculation using these operators yields a m inim um rst order decoher－ ence rate of $1={ }_{1}=2$ ．H ow can this be？In particular we know that every $O$ SR corresponds to some H am iltonian dynam ics on a larger H ilbert space and we have previously showed that rst order decoherence rates vanish in the OSR．Yet，here is an exam ple of an $O S R$ where the rst order decoherence rate does not vanish！

W e can resolve this apparent paradox by exam ining the coarse graining procedure used to derive the SME from the O SR ．

U sing Eq．（2．45）the rst order decoherence rate in the O SR becom es

$$
\begin{align*}
& \frac{1}{1}=\operatorname{iTr}_{2}^{"}(0) \frac{@ S(t)}{@ t}_{t=0}^{!} ;(0)  \tag{2.61}\\
& \left.\left.+\operatorname{Tr}^{2} \frac{1}{2}{ }_{; 母 1}^{\mathrm{X}} \frac{@(\mathrm{t})^{!^{t=0}}}{\mathrm{C}=0} \mathbb{F} ;(0) \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{y}}\right]+\mathbb{F} \quad(0) ; \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{y}}\right]^{5}:
\end{align*}
$$

U sing the decom position of the O SR operators, Eq. (2.11), and know ing that U (0) = $I_{s} \quad \bar{F}$, we nd that $A_{i}(0)=P^{-} I_{i ;}$; ). Thus, since the $F$ 's form a linearly independent basis, it follow $s$, using Eq. (2.13), that the expansion coe cients m ust be

$$
\begin{equation*}
b_{i}(0)=0_{0}^{p} \bar{d}_{i ;(;)}: \tag{2.62}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $d$ is dim ension of the system H ilbert space. By direct evaluation,
which implies the vanishing (as long as $\frac{\left.Q_{h} b_{1} ;\right)_{i}(t)}{\varrho_{i}} \mathrm{t}=0$ rem ains nite) in Eq. (2.62) of every term except $\operatorname{Tr}$ (0) $\frac{\varrho S(t)}{\varrho t} \quad t=0$; (0). However, this in tum vanishes by cyclic perm utation of the trace. Thus we se as clam ed, that the OSR rst order decoherence rate vanishes.

W e can now use our coarse graining derivation of the SM E to understand how rst order decoherence rates appear in the SM E. Exam ination of our derivation of the SM E, Eqs. (2.54) and (2.56), now shows how non-zero rst order decoherence rates can arise when the evolution is considered to be $M$ arkovian. In the derivation of the sem igroup equation in the $M$ arkovian lim it we $m$ ade the assum ption that the $m$ atrices $\frac{\varrho(t)}{\varrho t}{ }_{t=0}$ can be identi ed w ith the constantm atrices a of the sem igroup equation, Eq. (2.3). H ow ever, when this is done, the matrix elem ents $\frac{\varrho_{\mathrm{et}}^{(t)}}{\mathrm{et}}$ in Eq. (2.62) are replaced by their tim e-averaged values, forwhich the relation Eq.(2.63) no longer applies. H ence, in general, the rst order decoherence rates are necessarily not zero when the M ankovian coarse-graining is applied. For nite totalH am iltonian $H_{S B}$, non-zero rst order rates are therefore seen to be an artifact of the $M$ arkovian assum ption, and their appearance em phasizes the delicate nature of the transition to the M arkovian regin e.

W e have seen how the rst order decoherence rate can not vanish in the transition from the OSR to the SME, but we are still left w th the paradox of a rst order decoherence rate in the $O S R$ for the phase dam ping exam ple. To resolve this dichotom $y$, we consider how the above phase dam ping O SR operators are generated from the unitary dynam ics of a qubit system $S$ and a qubit bath $B$. The evolution operator
(where the rst qubit represents the bath ( $j$ " $i ; j \# i$ ) and the second represents the system ( $\mathbf{j} \mathrm{Oi} ; \mathrm{jli}$ ) as denoted in the colum ns above) w ith the bath initially in the state j\#i, im m ediately gives the O SR operators of Eq. (2.60). It is easy to calculate the Ham iltonian which generates this evolution, (using $\left.H_{S B}(t)=i h \frac{d U(t)}{d t} U^{y}(t)\right)$ :

$$
\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}}(\mathrm{t})=\begin{array}{ccccll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1  \tag{2.65}\\
\frac{B}{B} & 0 & 0 & 0 & g(t) \stackrel{C}{C} \\
\mathrm{~B} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \mathrm{~A} \\
& 0 & g(t) & 0 & 0
\end{array}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
g(t)=i h p \frac{e^{t}}{1 e^{2} t}: \tag{2.66}
\end{equation*}
$$

H ow ever, we see that as $t!0, g(t)!1$. Thus, in this simple exam ple, we nd that at $t=0$, the $H$ am iltonian becom es singular. This ilhustrates our claim that rst order decoherence rates in the O SR are the result of an in nite H am iltonian, and do not contradict the general $O \mathrm{SR}$ result of zero rates for nite H am iltonians.

### 2.3.3 D iagonal form of the SM E

In the SM E, Eq. (2.3), we have selected used a speci c full basis F. This choide of basis is, of course, arbitrary. A di erent basis, G could have been selected and this new basis $w$ ill be related to the old basis via

$$
\begin{equation*}
F={ }_{\notin 0}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{~g} G \tag{2.67}
\end{equation*}
$$

for 0 . If we require the new basis to $m$ aintain the trace inner product, then


Thinking about $g$ as a $m$ atrix, this im plies that $g$ is a unitary $m$ atrix.
The non $H$ am iltonian generator of the SM E, Eq. (2.3) is de ned as

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.L[]=\frac{1}{2} \underset{;}{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{a} \quad \mathbb{F} \quad ; \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{Y}}\right]+\mathbb{F} ; \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{Y}}\right]: \tag{2.69}
\end{equation*}
$$

T he change ofbasis, Eq. (2.67), transform s this generator to

$$
\begin{equation*}
L[]=\frac{1}{2} \underset{; ; \neq 0}{\mathrm{X}} \quad \mathrm{a} \quad \mathrm{~g} \quad \mathrm{~g} \quad\left[\mathrm{G} \quad ; \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{Y}}\right]+\left[\mathrm{G}^{;} ; \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{Y}}\right]: \tag{2.70}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is a new generator for a SM E

$$
\begin{equation*}
L[]=\frac{1}{2}_{; \in 0}^{X} \quad a^{0} \quad\left[G \quad ; G^{y}\right]+\left[G \quad ; \quad G^{y}\right] ; \tag{2.71}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
a^{0}=\sum_{; \hbar=0}^{x} a g \quad g: \tag{2.72}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since $g$ can be any unitary $m$ atrix, and $a$ is a hem itian $m$ atrix, we can choose $g$ such that this $m$ atrix diagonalizes $a^{0}$. In this case, the generator of the $S M E$ is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
L[]=\frac{1}{2}_{\notin 0}^{X} \quad a \quad\left[G \quad ; G^{\mathrm{Y}}\right]+\left[G \quad ; \quad G^{\mathrm{y}}\right] ; \tag{2.73}
\end{equation*}
$$

which we can rescale such that the SM E becom es

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.\left.\frac{@ \quad(t)}{@ t}=i \mathbb{H} ; \quad(t)\right]+\frac{1}{2}_{60}^{x} \mathbb{\mathbb { L }} \quad(t) ; L^{y}\right]+\mathbb{L} ; \quad(t) L^{y}\right]: \tag{2.74}
\end{equation*}
$$

The operators L are called the Lindblad operators after [139] and this form of the SM $E$ is called the Lindblad diagonal form .

### 2.4 D ecoherence

In the previous two sections we have developed form alism s for understanding the coupling of a system to its environm ent. A long the way we have encountered assum ptions which allow ed us to $m$ ake form al progress in $m$ odeling the decoherence. M uch of the justi cation for the form alism s of the OSR and SM E m ust com e from the em pirical evidence in favor of these descriptions. B arring this justi cation, one $m$ ust resort back to the fully $H$ am iltonian description of the system plus environm ent in order to m ake progress in understanding a particular decoherence process. T hus, while the decoherence form alism s of the OSR and SM E allow a nice description of decoherence, there is $m u c h$ to be said for thinking about decoherence from a purely Ham iltonian system plus environm ent view point. In this thesis we will have the chance to work w th all three of these approaches, the O SR, the SM E, and the full H am iltonian form ulation of decoherence.

## Chapter 3

## Quantum Control

Two questions:

1. W hat does it mean to control the evolution of a quantum system?
2. G iven som e control, what can be done?

In this chapter, we introduce the notion of control of a quantum system. The role of control which does not cause decoherence is em phasized. Various form alism s are developed to understand when such non-decohering control is possible. This form alism is then applied to the case of control of a qubit when coupled via a JaynesC um mings H am iltonian to a coherent state of the electrom agnetic eld. Finally, work regarding what can be done w ith a given am ount of control is review ed with the role of the Lie algebraic structure being em phasized.

### 3.1 C ontrol and m easurem ent

Suppose one is given a quantum system $S$ and some $m$ eans of controlling this system. By a quantum system $S$, we m ean a system which experim ent has showed can produce e ects whose description obeys quantum $m$ echanics or at least som e sem i-classical quantum principles. In general, it seem s that there are two form $s$ of interactions which an extemal system can in uence on a quantum system : control and $m$ easurem ent.

In control one $m$ anipulates a controlling apparatus whose state controls the unitary evolution of the system. In order for this $m$ anipulation to be a valid quantum control, the evolution of the system should not becom e entangled w ith the controlling apparatus. A nother way of stating this is that the act of control should not induce decoherence on the system.

In contrast to control, in $m$ easurem ent a $m$ easuring apparatus interacts $w$ ith the system in such a way that the state of the $m$ easuring apparatus becom es entangled or correlated in such a way that the state of the apparatus provides inform ation about the system .

### 3.2 C onditions for control

Let us try to quantify exactly what is $m$ eant for a control $m$ echanism to be a good controlm echanism which does not cause decoherence on the system. W e will $m$ odel the problem in a $m$ anner which we think reasonably captures a large num ber of experim entalm ethods for classical control of quantum system s .

Suppose we are given a quantum system $S$ and an apparatus A. Wewill assum e that there is some constant coupling Ham iltonian between the system $S$ and the apparatus A, $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SA}}$. There are two ob jections to this assum ption. The rst ob jection claim s that this is not a good assum ption because it is possible to take an apparatus and rem ove it across the room such that the apparatus no longer interacts $w$ ith the system. T he resolution of this ob jection is tw o-fold. F irst of all it seem $s$ to alw ays be possible to m odel the rem oval of apparatus from interaction within the H am iltonian $H_{S A}$ and the apparatus evolution $I_{S} \quad H_{A}$. The reason for this is our fundam ental belief that quantum mechanics is obeyed by all physical law $s$. T hus once we have de ned our system, there can only be Ham iltonian coupling to an outside quantum system. The second reason this ob jection is not well founded is the experim ental reality that alm ost allcontrol of quantum system s som e com ponent of the apparatus in contact $w$ ith the system. Thus, for exam $p l e$, if one is $m$ anipulating the electronic state of an atom w ith a laser, the atom is in constant contact $w$ ith the electrom agnetic $m$ ode which $w$ ill.be used for control. The second ob jection to the $m$ odel of a constant $H_{S A}$ is that it disallows a possibly time dependent $H_{S A}$. M uch of what we will derive can easily be extended to the case of a tim e dependent Ham iltonian and our assum ption of tim e-independence in this respect is merely a convenience in order to sim plify our discussion. W e thus start from a full system apparatus evolution H am iltonian of

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{S}} \quad \mathrm{~F}+\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{S}} \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SA}} ; \tag{3.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ ith the corresponding unitary evolution of $U_{S A}(t)=\exp [i H t]$.

### 3.2.1 O rthogonalpure state stationary control

W hen su cient is easy, necessary is alm ost always di cult.
G iven the assum ption of a constant system -apparatus coupling, let us exam ine a sim ple generalm odel for classical control.

D e nition 3.2.1 (O rthogonalpure state stationary control) Suppose we are given an orthogonal set A of pure states jai of the apparatus A. O rthogonal pure state stationary control is then de ned as the situation where for every input jai into the apparatus (de ned as the situation where the density $m$ atrix of the system plus apparatus is $s$ (0) jaihaj) the evolution of the system is unitary with som e generating H am iltonian $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ and the state of the apparatus is jai at alltim es during the evolution.

The condition of orthogonalpure state stationary control is therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{S A}(t)\left({ }_{s}(0) \text { jaihaj) } U_{S A}^{Y}(t)=U_{a}(t) S_{s}(0) U_{a}^{Y}(t) \text { jaihaj } 8 t ; 8 \text { a } 2\right. \text { A ; } \tag{32}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $U_{a}(t)=\exp \left[\mathrm{iH}_{\mathrm{a}} t\right]$. The question we now seek to answer is whether there is a succinct $m$ ethod for determ ining whether a given $H$ am iltonian $H$ can be used to perform orthogonalpure state stationary control?

Let us begin by expressing the system -apparatus evolution as an expansion over the system tensor apparatus operators. In particular we w ill choose a com plete her$m$ itian basis $F$ (see A ppendix A 3) for the expansion over the system com ponent of H am iltonian

$$
\begin{equation*}
H={ }^{X} F \quad A=I_{S} \quad H_{A}+{ }_{60}^{X} \quad A \text {; } \tag{3.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have conveniently expanded out the identity com ponent of this expansion. Herm iticity of the Ham iltonian implies that the A operators can be chosen to be Hem itian as well. Then, a su cient condition for pure state stationary control to hold is
for all di. W e can check that this is su cient by direct evaluation

which we can easily see by using the Taylor expansion of the exponential, evaluating the apparatus operators and regrouping. Thus if Eq. (3.4) holds then the evolution is that of orthogonal pure state stationary controlw the controlled H am ittonians $H_{a}={ }_{a} I_{S}+{ }_{\xi 0} C ;{ }_{a} \mathrm{~F}$.

Let us now show that Eq. (3.4) is also a necessary condition for orthogonalpure state stationary control. D i erentiating the orthogonal pure state stationary control condition, Eq. (32), w ith respect to tim e $t$ and evaluating this equation at $t=0$ we nd that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\mathbb{H}_{\mathrm{SA}} ; \mathrm{s}_{\mathrm{s}}(0) \quad \text { jaihaj] }=\mathbb{H}_{\mathrm{a}} ; \mathrm{s}(0)\right] \text { jaihaj: } \tag{3.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Expanding

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.{ }_{s}(0)\right)^{X} \quad F=\frac{1}{d} I+{ }_{60}^{X} \quad F ; \tag{3.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

and tracing over the system we nd that this im plies
x

This must hold for all $\mathrm{s}(0)$. The, 0 form a convex set in the vector space $\mathbb{R}^{d^{2}} \quad{ }^{1}$ where $d$ is the dim ension of the system $H$ ilbert space. This convex set contains the origin (which corresponds to $s(0)=\frac{1}{d} I$ ) and an open ball of dim ension $d^{2} \quad 1$ around the origin [225]. This in tum im plies that each of the term $s$ in the expansion of Eq. (3.8) m ust vanish separately

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { A ; jihaj] }=0 \\
& \left.\mathbb{H}_{\mathrm{A}} ; \text {; } \dot{\text { aiha }}\right]=0: \tag{3.9}
\end{align*}
$$

This in tum directly im plies our claim ed condition Eq. (3.4) and $m$ ust hold for all jai

### 3.2.2 C om m uting m ixed state stationary control

In orthogonal pure state stationary control, we assum ed that the system was in one of an orthogonalset ofstates ji. O ur choige of the orthogonalinput state jai was $m$ ade in order to satisfy in a nebulous $m$ anner som e requirem ent that our apparatus is a classical control devioe. A m ore satisfying requirem ent would be to loosen our apparatus to start in a m ixed state. In this case, the m ore appropriate choioe of classicality is that the di erent possible controlling $m$ ixed states com $m$ ute (see [15] for a good $m$ otivation for this choige). Thus we de ne:

Demition 3.2.2 (C om m uting mixed state stationary control) Suppose we are given a commuting set $M$ of $m$ ixed-states a of the apparatus A. Commuting $m$ ixed state stationary control is then de ned as the situation where for every input a into the apparatus (de ned as the situation where the density $m$ atrix of the system plus apparatus is ${ }_{s}(0) \quad{ }_{a}$ ) the evolution of the system is unitary with som e generating H am iltonian $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ and the state of the apparatus is a at all tim es during the evolution. $T$ he condition of com $m$ uting $m$ ixed state stationary control is therefore

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{S A}(t)\left({ }_{s}(0) \quad a\right) U_{S A}^{Y}(t)=U_{a}(t) s_{s}(0) U_{a}^{Y}(t) \quad a \quad 8 t ; 8{ }_{a} 2 M: \tag{3.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

We claim that a necessary and su cient condition for com $m$ uting $m$ ixed state stationary control is

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{A} a=\mathrm{C} ; \mathrm{a}  \tag{3.11}\\
& \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{a} a ; \tag{3.12}
\end{align*}
$$

for all of the commuting ${ }_{a}$. N ote that the orthogonal pure state stationary control condition is contained within this condition.

W eprove this claim via the tim ehonored tradition ofusing puri cation to $m$ ap this onto the problem we already know how to solve：the orthogonalpure state stationary control condition．

Let us introduce an auxiliary system $R$ such that the puri cations of the com $m$ ut－ ing a are orthogonal：

$$
\begin{equation*}
a=T r_{R}[j \text { jhha }] ; \tag{3.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the jai are orthogonal．It is always possible to perform such an orthogonal puri cation when the a commute but not possible always possible when they do not com $m$ ute）．The com $m$ uting $m$ ixed state stationary control condition Eq．（3．10） then becom es

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{S A}(t) \quad E\left({ }_{S}(0) \text { áihaj) } U_{S A}^{Y}(t) \quad E=U_{a}(t) S_{S}(0) U_{a}^{Y}(t) \text { jaihaj } 8 t ; a ;\right. \tag{3.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

which we can express as

$$
\begin{equation*}
U_{S A R}(t)\left({ }_{S}(0) \quad \dot{\beta} i h a j\right) U_{S A R}^{Y}(t)=U_{a}(t) S_{s}(0) U_{a}^{Y}(t) \text { jaihaj 8t;a; } \tag{3.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w h e r e U_{S A R}(t)=\exp [$ iH It］．A necessary and su cient condition for this is just the orthogonal pure state stationary control conditions from above $w$ ith an identity tensored onto the operators

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { A 末白i = c;aji } \\
& \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}} \text { 玉㐫i }=\text { a јi: } \tag{3.16}
\end{align*}
$$

Form ing the operators A 末 jaihajand $H_{A}$ 末 jaihajand tracing over $R$ we then arrive at the clam ed necessary and su cient conditions Eq．（3．11）and Eq．（3．12） holding for all of the commuting $a$ ．

## 3．2．3 N on－stationary control and throw ing the sw itch

Throughout our derivation of the control equations we have required that the input and the output of apparatus rem ain the sam e．T hus the adjective \stationary＂ was appended to all of our derivations of control．In general，it seem s likely that a $m$ ore generalcondition allow s no entanglem ent betw een the system and the apparatus but allow s the state of the apparatus to change．$W$ hat we are not talking about here is the situation where the apparatus and the system are entangled at som e m idw ay point and then at som e nal tim e the state is no longer entangled．This latter case is an exam ple of quantum control via a quantum apparatus because $m$ aintenance of the quantum nature of the apparatus is necessary in order to perform the operation w ithout decoherence on the system ．

O ne of the potentialproblem sw ith non－stationary control is the fact that observa－ tion of the apparatus as the state changes can lead to entanglem ent of the apparatus with an extemal observer which then induces decoherence on the system．K now ing
the state of the apparatus will provides inform ation about how far along a certain evolution on the system has progressed and when di erent observations are $m$ ade at di erent tim es, decoherence can result. It is an interesting open question, then, to understand non-stationary control of quantum system.

A long sim ilar lines of thought, the $m$ odel we have presented for control assum es that there is a $m$ anner in which the state of the apparatus can be rapidly changed between the di erent controlling states ${ }_{a}$. T he reason rapid control is needed in this m odel is that if the state of the apparatus gets caught in either a supenposition or m ixture of two controlling H am iltonians which produce di erent evolution this will cause decoherence from the perspective of the system. T hus the m odelwe present is one in which the state of the apparatus can be e ciently $m$ anipulated on tim e scales shorter than the tim e scale of the controlled dynam ics on the quantum system.

### 3.3 C ontrol exam ples

H ere we exam ine two sim ple control exam ples. O ne of these allow s control while the other does not allow for control. In both exam ples the system s S and the apparatus A are single qubits.

The rst exam ple is a trivial exam ple where pure state stationary control is possible. C onsider the system -apparatus H am iltonian

$$
H=\left(\begin{array}{llll}
z & I+ & z & z \tag{3.17}
\end{array}\right):
$$

The $\mathrm{f}^{\frac{1}{2}}$ are a good xed operator basis for the system H ilbert space, we therefore nd in the xed-basis expansion Eq. (3.3) that

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}} & =\mathrm{p} \frac{\mathrm{z}}{2 \mathrm{I}}  \tag{3.18}\\
\mathrm{~A}_{\mathrm{z}} & =\mathrm{P} \frac{2}{2}: \\
\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{x}} & =
\end{align*}
$$

C learly the eigenstates of $z, j 0 i$ and 11 i, satisfy the orthogonalpure state stationary control conditions Eq. (3.4). In particular we se that if the apparatus is in the state jOi , then the evolution of the system is according to the H am ittonian $\mathrm{H}{ }_{0}=$
$\left(z^{+} x+I\right)$. If, on the other hand, the apparatus is in the state $j l i$, then the evolution is govemed by the H am iltonian $\mathrm{H}_{1}=\left(\mathrm{z}_{\mathrm{x}}+\mathrm{I}\right)$.

N ext we present an exam ple of a system -apparatus $H$ am iltonian which does not allow for control. C onsider the system -apparatus H am iltonian

$$
H=\left(\begin{array}{ccccc}
z & I+ & x & x+I & z \tag{3.19}
\end{array}\right):
$$

A gain, using the $\frac{1}{\overline{2}} z$ as the $x e d$-basis for the system one nds the term $s$ in expansion Eq. (3.3),

$$
\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{A}}=\mathrm{z}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& A_{z}=P_{\overline{2}}  \tag{320}\\
& A_{x}=\overline{2}_{x}:
\end{align*}
$$

There are no states which are the eigenstates of all three of these operators (this w ould
 pure state stationary control conditions Eq. (3.4).

### 3.4 C ontrolw ith coherent states

A s a m ore physically relevant application of the orthogonal pure state stationary control condition, let us consider the control of a two level system via coupling to a boson eld $m$ ode. $W$ e assum $e$ that the system is a qubit and the apparatus is a boson eld $m$ ode $w$ th creation and annihilation operators $\mathrm{a}^{\mathrm{y}}$ and a respectively. W e will consider the evolution of the system and apparatus as dom inated by the post-rotating wave approxim ation Jaynes-C um $m$ ing $H$ am iltonian exactly at resonanœe[104],

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=g \quad a^{y}+g+a \text {; } \tag{321}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\quad=x_{y}$. U sing the $\mathrm{p}_{\overline{2}}^{1}$ as a basis for the system operators, we obtain the expansion

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=x \quad(g a z+g a)+y \quad i(g a ̆+g a): \tag{322}
\end{equation*}
$$

The issue of whether this H am iltonian can be used for stationary control is therefore reduced to whether the operators

$$
\begin{align*}
& A_{x}=p^{2} g a^{y}+g a \\
& A_{y}=i^{2}\left(g a^{y}+g a\right) \tag{323}
\end{align*}
$$

have sim ultaneous eigenstates. First we will show why these operators do not have sim ultaneous eigenstates but then we will show how in a certain lim it these operators can have a approxim ate sim ultaneous eigenstates.

Suppose that $A_{x}$ and $A_{y}$ had a simultaneous eigenstate $j$ i with eigenvalue $a_{x}$ and $a_{y}$ respectively. Since $A_{x}$ and $A_{y}$ are both $H$ erm itian, $a_{x}$ and $a_{y}$ are both real The com $m$ utator between $A_{x}$ and $A_{y}$ is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left[A_{x} ; A_{y}\right]=4 i \dot{g} j^{h} a ; a^{y^{i}}=4 i \dot{g} j I: \tag{324}
\end{equation*}
$$

The fact that $j i$ is a sim ultaneous eigenstate of the $A_{x}$ and $A_{y}$ operator im plies

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.h j A_{x} ; A_{y}\right] j i=a_{x} a_{y} \quad a_{y} a_{x}=0: \tag{325}
\end{equation*}
$$

H ow ever on the right hand side of Eq. (324) we nd the $h(4 i j 23 I) j i=4 i j g j$. $T$ his is a contradiction and therefore $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{x}}$ and $\mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{y}}$ cannot have sim ultaneous eigenstates.

Thus the Jaynes-C um mings H am ittonian Eq. (3 21) cannot be used for orthogonal pure state stationary control.

Let us show, how ever, despite the fact that the Jaynes-C um mings $H$ am iltonian cannot be used for exact control, that $w$ ith a suitable approxim ation the JaynesCum $m$ ings $H$ am iltonian can indeed be used for control.

The coherent state $j$ iwhere $2 \mathbb{C}$ is de ned in term $s$ of the number states jni as[169]

$$
j i=e^{\frac{j j^{2} x^{2}}{2}} p_{n=0}^{n} \frac{n!n i: ~}{n!}
$$

and is an eigenstate of the annihilation operator $a j i=j i$. If the bosonic eld we are considering is an electrom agnetic eld, then lasers produce coherent states $w$ ith very high delity.

W e next nd that

D e ning the nom alized state

$$
\begin{align*}
& j i=q^{\frac{1}{n=0} \frac{(n+1)\left(j j^{n}\right)^{n}}{n!}} n=0 x^{x^{A}} \frac{P \overline{n+1} n}{P^{n!}} j n+1 i \\
& ={\frac{e^{j \xi=2}}{1+j \jmath^{2}}}_{n=0}^{x^{1}} \frac{P \overline{P^{+1}}}{\overline{n!}} j n+1 i:
\end{align*}
$$

W e nd that

$$
\begin{align*}
& =P^{2} g \quad j i+g \overline{1+j \jmath} j \quad i:
\end{align*}
$$

N ow $j \quad i$ is nearly $j i$ for large $j j$

In particular we nd that

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{x} j i \quad{ }^{P} \overline{2}(g+g) j i ; \tag{3.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

for j j 1. Sim ilarly it can be shown that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.A_{y} j i \quad{ }^{P} \overline{2 i}_{(g} \quad g \quad\right) j i_{i} \tag{3.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

for $j \quad{ }^{1}$. $p^{T}$ hus we have show $p$ that $j i$ is nearly an eigenstate of $A_{x}$ and $A_{y} w$ th eigenvalues ${ }^{\rho} \overline{2}(g+g)$ and $\left.{ }^{\mathrm{P}} \overline{2}_{i(g} \quad \mathrm{g}\right)$ respectively.
$W$ e have therefore show $n$ that a system interacting $w$ ith an apparatus $w$ hich is in the coherent state $j$ i will, to a high degree of approxim ation, produce an evolution on the system when $j \mathrm{j} 1$.

### 3.5 T he unitary control question

W e have exam ined the conditions under which control of a quantum system is possible. N ow suppose that one is given som e controlover a quantum system. In this section we address the issue of what can be done given the ability to exercise som e speci ed control. For discussions in this section, we assum e ideal control conditions (no decoherence, perfect control of the controlling apparatus and related couplings). In the section follow ing this one we deal with the issue of approxim ation $w$ ithin the issue of control although we will touch on the subject brie $y$ in this section. A nother shortcom ing of our discussion is the fact that we ignore the e ect which $m$ easurem ents can have for controlling a system evolution. T hus what we are really asking is a question of unitary control.

The $m$ ost generic $m$ anner of posing the question of control is to assum e that a set of unitary evolutions $U_{i} 2 \mathrm{U}$ can be enacted on the system via som e controlling apparatus. Given the ability to perform each of these evolutions $U_{i}$ a sequence of control can then be enacted like

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}} \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}} \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{3}} \quad \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{p}} \text { Uwhere } \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{k}} 2 \mathrm{U}: \tag{3.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e will call such an evolution a control sequence.

### 3.5.1 D ensely lled group

It $m$ ight seem obvious that the control sequences form a group, but it tums out this is not true in an exact sense. The reason for this is that the controlsequences are
nitely generated. Let us dem onstrate a trivial exam ple of a control sequence which does not form a group. Suppose there is only one $U_{1} 2 \mathrm{U}$ which acts on a single qubit as $U_{1}=j 0 i h 0 j+e^{i} j$ ihl $j$ for some 2 R . Then the control sequences we can generate are $U_{1}^{p}=j 0 i h 0 j+e^{i p} j$ ihh1 jor $p 2 \mathrm{~N}^{+}$. In order for $U_{1}$ to have an inverse (and hence form a group) there $m$ ust exist a $p$ such that $U_{1}^{p}=I$ or $\exp [i p]=1$. $T$ he only way in which this can be true for a nitep is for to be a rationalnumber. $T$ hus the control sequences do not always exactly form a group.

H ow ever it is easy to see that to som e degree of approxim ation ${ }_{P}$ the control sequences do form a group. $W$ riting a given $U_{i}$ in the diagonal form $e^{i} j$ ih jwe see that for a given $e^{i} p, p 2 \mathbb{N}^{+}$are reachable by repeated application of $U_{i}$ For a given, either $e^{i} p=1$ for some nite por $e^{i} p$ densely $\quad l s e^{i x} ; 8 \times 2 \mathbb{R}$ and as
such densely lls the neighborhood around $e^{i x}=1$. Thus there alw ays exists a nite $p$ such that $U_{i}^{p}$ I where the approxim ation is in the sense of deviation from each $e^{i}$ p from 1. T hus we see that all control sequences densely lla group: every group elem ent can be arbitrarily accurately approxim ated by som e control sequence.
$T$ he question of what can be generated by a control sequence is therefore generally answ ered w ith a group, w ith the understanding that this answ er hinges on the densely
lling structure of the control sequences.

### 3.5.2 H am ilton ian control

In $m$ ost experim ental control of a quantum system, instead of being given a set of $U_{i} 2$ U which can be im plem ented, one usually encounters the situation where evolution according to som e set of H am iltonians $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}} 2 \mathrm{O}$ can be achieved. W e will $m$ ake the assum ption that the achievable control for such a set of $H$ am iltonians is given by all evolutions of the form $\exp \left[\mathrm{iH}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{t}\right] 8 \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}} 2 \mathrm{O} ; 8 \mathrm{t} 2 \mathbb{R}^{+}$. This is an ideal assum ption whose validity in the realworld is lacking due to (1) in nite precision in $t$ and (2) inability to perform extrem ely fast tuming on and o of a H am iltonian. Problem (1) is true for any control sequence and is addressed in the next section. P roblem (2), how ever, also doesn't pose a huge problem because repeated application of $\exp \left[\quad \mathrm{iH}_{i} \mathrm{t}_{0}\right]$ for a xed $\mathrm{t}_{0}$ can be used to densely ll the torus of all $\exp [\mathrm{iH} i t]$. Thus it is a generally good assum ption that control of a quantum system will allow for the im plem entation of given $\exp [i H i t]$ for all real values of $t$. $W$ e call this case of control H am iltonian control. In H am iltonian control, one asks the question what can be achieved via a H am iltonian control sequence

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{i H_{i_{1}} t_{1}} e^{i H_{i_{2}} t_{2}} \quad i H_{i s e}^{t_{p}} \quad \text { where } H_{i_{k}} 20 ; t_{i} 2 \mathbb{R}^{+} \text {: } \tag{3.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 3.5.3 Lie structure of H am iltonian control

L loyd [140] and D eutsch, B arenco, and Ekert [58], building on work hinted at by D iV incenzo [61], were the rst to raise and answer the question of what can be done w ith H am iltonian controlw ithin the context of quantum com putation. W e have seen in the previous section how controlsequences form a group. In the case of f am iltonian control, the group which is generated is a Lie group. In particular, the H am iltonian control sequences Eq. (3.34) generate a continuously param eterized group with nice sm oothness and continuity properties over the param eterization.

W hen we refer to the Lie group structure of the $H$ am iltonian control sequences, we are just referring to the abstract group multiplication law between elem ents of the $H$ am iltonian control sequences $g() g()=g()$ where ; ; are the param eters of the group elem ents $g() ; g() ; g()$. O ur H am ittonian control sequences, how ever, have an explicit representation as unitary linear operators on a H ibert space H , $g()$. This explicit representation is called a unitary representation of the Lie group.

A representation of a Lie group is said to the reducible if it has an invariant proper subspace, by which we $m$ ean that the action of any group elem ent $g()$ on a vector in the subspace rem ains in the subspace. A representation which is not reducible is irreducible. A ll of the Lie groups generated by Eq. (3.34) are com pletely reducible Lie groups. This $m$ eans that the representations we dealw ith can alw ays be w ritten as the direct product of irreducible representations (irreps),

$$
\begin{equation*}
g()=g_{1}() \quad g() \quad k() ; g \tag{3.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

where each $g_{i}()$ is an irrep param eterized by .
D ecom posing the action of the H am iltonian control sequences into com pletely reducible form tells us a lot about what can be done w th such sequences. It doesn't give use direct access to what sort of com putation (som ething we haven't even introduced, but the $m$ eaning should be clear) can be perform ed on the quantum system because we haven't de ned an input, output relationship on the system. On the other hand, specifying the com pletely reducible form of a Lie group describes exactly the lim its of what can be done w ith a given $H$ am iltonian control sequence. T he com pletely reducible form of a given $H$ am iltonian controlsequence succinctly describes all possible unitary actions which can be perform ed on a controlled system.

Lets also point out how just know ing which Lie group one is dealing with is not enough to pin down what can be done with a given $H$ am iltonian control sequence. O ne needs to also know which dim ensional representation one is dealing with. The easiest exam ple for illustrating this is to exam ine the one-dim ensional representation ofsu (2)

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{1}(1 ; 2 ; 3)=[1] ; \tag{3.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

and com pare this to the two-dim ensional representation of SU (2),

$$
\begin{equation*}
g_{2}(1 ; 2 ; 3)=\exp [\text { i~ ~]; } \tag{3.37}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\sim\left({ }_{1} ;{ }_{2} ;{ }_{3}\right)$ is the vector of the two-dim ensional P aulim atrioes. $C$ learly the action of these two operators are very di erent. O ne does absolutely nothing, while the otherm anipulates a two-dim ensionalquantum system in a non-trivialm anner. Thus just know ing what Lie group one has controlover is not enough \{ in form ation about which irrep is also needed.

Every Lie group has a corresponding Lie algebra which we can use to good e ect to understand what can be done with a given $H$ am iltonian control sequence. $G$ iven the ability to enact the H am iltonians $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}} 2 \mathrm{O}$, every H am iltonian which can be generated from these H am iltonians via the follow ing two actions can be physically enacted:

1. Real linear com bination of elem ents: $\mathrm{aH}+\mathrm{bH} \quad$ where $a ; b 2 \mathbb{R}$.
2. Lie commutation of elem ents: i[H ; H ].

The reason H am iltonian control sequences with H am iltonians generated by this set of operators are reachable follow from the two identities


In fact, we know from the fam ous theorem of $L$ ie that the reachable operators are exactly those which can generated via these tw o processes. Thus the Lie algebra generated by the iH describes the H am iltonians which can be enacted by a H am iltonian control sequence.

A gain, just know ing the Lie algebraic structure of the H am iltonians, how ever, does not tell everything about the Lie group generated by the H am iltonians. H ere there is an even further com plication in that isom onphic Lie algebras $m$ ay correspond to di erent Lie groups. Thus the abstract speci cation of the Lie algebra is not enough to understand what can be done with a H am iltonian control sequence. In spite of this fact, which just $m$ eans that we can't look at the abstract nature of the Lie algebra and jum $p$ to conclusions, if we com pletely reduce a Lie algebra this w ill tell us everything about what can be done with a given Ham iltonian control sequence.

### 3.6 C ontrol and approxim ation

An im portant notion in controlofquantum system $s$ is how badly executed operations in uence the outcom e of a controlsequence. Bemstein and Vazirani[25] w ere the rst to discuss how a sequence of poorly approxim ated quantum operations in uence the outcom e of a particular control sequence. We follow the discussion of $N$ ielsen and C huang [153] on the issue of approxim ating control sequences.

### 3.6.1 A pproxim ate unitary evolution

Suppose we start a quantum system in the state $j$ i and then execute a single unitary evolution $U$ on the system and then perform a m easurem ent with POVM elem ents M (se Appendix A.4). H ow do the probabilities of these m easurem ents di er if instead of enacting $U$, the evolution operator $V$ was executed? O utcom e
occurs w th probability h fJ ${ }^{Y} M \quad U$ j i if $U$ is executed but occurs w ith probability $h$ jV ${ }^{Y} M \mathrm{~V}$ ji if $V$ is executed. The absolute value of the di erence in these probabilities is

$$
\begin{align*}
P & =h J^{Y} M \text { U } i \quad h J^{Y} M V j i \\
& =h J^{Y} M \text { ji+h } M \quad V j i ; \tag{3.39}
\end{align*}
$$

where ji=(U V)ji.U sing Cauchy-Schwarz we nd that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{P} \quad \mathrm{~h} j \mathrm{~J}^{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{M} j \mathrm{j}+\mathrm{H} \mathrm{M} \mathrm{Vjij} \\
& 2 \mathrm{kj} j \mathrm{k} \\
& \mathrm{2E}(\mathrm{U} ; \mathrm{V}) ; \tag{3.40}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{U} ; \mathrm{V}) \quad \operatorname{maxk}_{j \mathrm{i}}(\mathrm{U} \quad \mathrm{~V}) j \mathrm{j} \mathrm{k}: \tag{3.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore E ( $\mathrm{U} ; \mathrm{V}$ ) gives a quanti cation of how di erent a m easurem ent outcom e can be if the two di erent evolutions $U$ or $V$ are executed. W ew ill thus calle (U ; $V$ ) the error betw een the evolutions $U$ and $V$.

An important class of error which can occur in an evolution occur when the variation of the controlled H am iltonian is negligible while there are problem executing the evolution for a precise tim et. In this case the error is

$$
\begin{aligned}
& E(\exp [i H t] ; \exp [i H(t+t)])=\max _{j \mathrm{i}}(\exp [i H t] \exp [i H(t+\quad t)]) j i k
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& =1 \quad \exp \quad i \max _{j i} k H j i k \quad t: \tag{3.42}
\end{align*}
$$

For sm all $t$, the error is thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
E(\exp [i H t] ; \exp [i H(t+\quad t)]) \quad \operatorname{tm}_{j i} \operatorname{jex} j \text { ik: } \tag{3.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

Suppose we are attem pting to execute a control sequence $U_{i_{1}} U_{i_{2}} \quad i_{p}$. D ue to inaccuracies, how ever, the control sequence $\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}} \quad \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{p}}$ whas enacted. The error between these two control sequences is then

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}} \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}} \quad \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{p}} ; \mathbb{W}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}} \quad \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{p}}\right): \mathbb{V} \tag{3.44}
\end{equation*}
$$

It tums out that the error caused by such a sequence is at m ost the sum of the errors of the individual operations

This can be proved via induction. For $p=2$, we can use the triangle inequality to show that

$$
\begin{align*}
& E\left(U_{i_{1}} U_{i_{2}} ; \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}}\right)=k\left(\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}} \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}} \quad \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}}\right) j \mathrm{j} k \\
& =k\left(\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}} \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}} \quad \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}} \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}}\right) j i+\left(\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}} \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}} \quad \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}}\right) j \mathrm{j} k \\
& k\left(U_{i_{2}} \quad V_{i_{2}}\right) U_{i_{1}} j i k+k V_{i_{2}}\left(U_{i_{1}} \quad V_{i_{1}}\right) j i k \\
& \mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{1}} ; \mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}}\right)+\mathrm{E}\left(\mathrm{U}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}} ; \mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{i}_{2}}\right): \tag{3.46}
\end{align*}
$$

The general case for $p>2$ then quidkly follow sfrom induction.
Thus we have seen how E (U;V) quanti es the notion of how close two unitary operators are in term $s$ of di erence in $m$ easurem ent outcom es follow ing the di erent unitary operators. Further for a sequence of unitary evolutions, the total error is bounded by the sum of the individual errors. This latter property w ill be im portant when we discuss the relationship between probabilities and com putation.

### 3.6.2 A pproxim ate O SR evolution

Is there an equivalent de nition of an error distance betw een two O SR evolutions $f A_{i} g$ and $f B_{i} g$ ? As above, we can exam ine the absolute di erence in a POVM outcom em easurem ent probability given the input state $j$ i, but now after the OSR evolutions via O SR operators $£ A_{i} g$ and $f B{ }_{i} 9$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& P={ }^{x} A_{i} j \text { in } A_{i}{ }_{i}^{Y} M \quad{ }^{x} B_{i} j \text { in } B B_{i}^{y} M \\
& =x^{x^{i}} h \quad j A_{i}^{y} M \quad A_{i} \quad B_{i}^{y} M \quad B_{i} j i \\
& =x_{i}^{x^{i}} h_{j A_{i}^{y} M}^{j} j_{i} i+h{ }_{i} M \quad B_{i} j i ; \tag{3.47}
\end{align*}
$$

where $j{ }_{i} i=\left(\begin{array}{ll}A_{i} & B_{i}\end{array}\right) j$ i. Cauchy-Schwarz then im plies

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { i } \tag{3.48}
\end{align*}
$$

W e can now use the trick of recalling that the O SR com es from unitary evolution on a larger space. If the environm ent starts in the state j0i and the O SR operators $\mathrm{fA}_{\mathrm{i}} 9$ and $f B{ }_{i} g$ come from the unitary evolution $U_{A}$ and $U_{B}$ respectively, we nd that

where we de ne the error betw een the two O SR evolutions $f A_{i} g$ and $f B{ }_{i} g$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
E\left(f A_{i} g ; f B_{i} g\right)=\max _{j i} \mathrm{ax}_{i}^{X}\left(A_{i} \quad B_{i}\right) j i k: \tag{3.50}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus we see that O SR evolutions have a sim ilar notion of error to those of unitary evolution.

### 3.7 C ontrol

In this chapter we have seen how to de ne what is and what is not good control. W e have begun to explored what can be done w ith this control and understood how approxim ate control can be given a quantitative basis. Later in this thesis we will discuss the use of control sequences for quantum com putation. O ftentim es it will be usefiul to work in the perfect controlarena even though the validity of this assum ption is certainly not realized in experim ent.

C onsider this state of a airs from the perspective of the status of classical com puters in the 1940's. At that time it was unclear that $m$ achines could reliably execute com putations, and indeed early com puters were prone to breaking down. Even today, hardware errors in com puters can occur but the probability of such errors occurring is extrem ely sm all (due in part to the largess of A vogadro's num ber, see C hapter 18). The $m$ yth of perfect control for classical com puters is a good but only approxim ate truth. The question for quantum com putation, of course, is whether it will ever be possible to achieve the low probability of failure for a given control. O fparticular note in this quest is the dem onstration of fault-tolerant quantum com putation $[3,96,115,124,161,175]$ w here, even $w$ ith im perfect control, nearly perfect control is achievable w ithout a drastic increase in resouroes. On the other hand, there is no good reason to believe that there do not exist system swion are naturally fault-tolerant (see C hapter 18). The issues of control we have raised in this chapter then, are the central language which w ill m otivate our quest for reliable quantum com putation.

## C hapter 4

## U niversal Q uantum Computation

> \M echanical process' is supposed to be a m etaphor, A lan... "
\{ N iel Stephenson, C ryptonom icon [186]

In the previous two chapters we have seen how to understand the evolution, both desired (in the form of controllable evolution) and undesired (in the form of decoherence) of a quantum system. In this chapter we address the issue of how to put the controllable evolution to use to perform quantum com putation. W e begin with a discussion of the notion of quantum subsystem s . The fundam ental localizable subsystem s of m odem physical theories then allow us to de ne and $m$ ake a case for the quantum circuit $m$ odel as a valid $m$ odel of quantum com putation. The notion of a universal gate set is then introduced and two im portant lem $m$ as are presented which sim plify the identi cation of universal gate sets. The $m$ ost com $m$ only cited universal gate set is then show n to be universal. In order to put the eld of quantum com putational com plexity on solid footing, the K itaev-Solovay theorem is presented and the connection betw een discrete and H am iltonian control is discussed. W e then present an exam ple of a gate set which is not fully universal. This leads to a discussion of the concept of encoded universality wherein one uses the fungible nature of quantum inform ation to $m$ ake a gate set universal. A $n$ exam ple of an encoded universal gate set is presented. An open question about the relationship of representation theory of $L$ ie algebras to quantum computation is presented and a discussion of di erent dim ensional irreducible representations of $S$ (2) is show n to give a broad leew ay into the question ofw hat is a qubit. F inally, the grow th function of a Lie algebra is de ned and shown to be a powerful toolin show ing when a gate set is not universal.

### 4.1 Quantum subsystem s

In our discussion of decoherence we divided the universe up into a system and an environm ent. W em ade the assum ption that this division was such that the $H$ ilbert space factorized as $\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{s}} \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{E}}$. This was an assum ption that the universe could be divided up into subsystem s: the system (perhaps a poorly planned nom enclature in hindsight!) and the environm ent. Sim ilarly when we discussed decoherence-fiee control we had the two subsystem s , the system and the apparatus. W hat dictates the subsystem structure of quantum system s?

Let us rst exam ine the notion of subsystem $s$ from an abstract $m$ athem atical point of view. The sim plest concept of a subsystem s structure is the one which we m ost frequently encounter in nature: full tensor product subsystem s . T hese are subsystem $s$ in which the full H ilbert space $H$ can be divided up into a tensor product of $n$ subsystem $S, H={\underset{i}{i=1}}_{n} H_{i}$ where each $H_{i}$ is a $H$ ilbert space corresponding to $a$ subsystem . N ote, how ever, that this is not the m ost generic notion of a subsystem . In particular it is possible that there are subspace tensor product subsystem s. T his $m$ eans that instead of the full tensor product structure there is $a_{N}$ tensor product structure over restricted subspaces of the H ilbert space $H={ }_{j=1}^{p_{j}} \underset{i=1}{N_{p}} H_{i j}$. Here $j$ labels a subspace of the global H ibert space $H$ and $i$ labels the ith subsystem over th is subspace. $W$ e thus see that the $m$ ost general notion of a subsystem $s$ is one which act w thin di erent subspaces of the global H ilbert space H. N ote that one could take one of the $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ij}} \mathrm{H}$ ilbert space and further decom pose this H ilbert space into a subsystem structure. If this is done, how ever, one can alw ays express this subsystem structure as in the subspace tensor product structure. T hus the subspace tensor product structure is the $m$ ost general subspace tensor product structure possible.

Of course from a mathem atical point of view, we can alw ays view any global H ilbert space H as having any subsystem structure (full tensor product or subspace tensor product) we desire. W hat is needed in order to $m$ ake progress in understanding subsystem $s$ is to ask how physics dictates a subsystem structure. In particular, the notion of subsystem $s$ is a em pirically derived concept. The basic postulates of quantum system s do not dictate the subsystem structure of quantum system s .

H ow, then, does the notion of subsystem s arise in quantum system s? Subsystem s arise due to the em pirically $m$ otivated physical theories which we paste onto the basic postulates ofquantum system s. T he physical theories provide H am iltonians $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ w hidh dictate the evolution ofquantum system sand them anner in which these H am iltonians act on the system provide the notion of subsystem s. Of particular signi cance is the realization that currently all em pirically veri ed fundam ental physical theories carry w ith them the requirem ent of locality. T he notion of locality establishes a causalstructure on the evolution ofquantum system sin spacetim e: the H am iltonians of these theories establish a subsystem structure corresponding to the idea of local subsystem s. The basic postulate of locality thus leads to physical theories which contain localizable subsystem s.

The fundam ental physical theories thus provided a fundam ental subsystem structure on a quantum system. This can be separated from an induced subsystem structure which takes the fundam ental subsystem structure and builds up subsystem s from the fiundam ental physical subsystem s . For exam ple, the notion of individual atom ic system $s$ as a being separate subsystem $s$ is an induced subsystem structure arising from them ore findam entalphysical subsystem structure ofquantum electrodynam ics (and to a lesser degree the quantum theories of the weak and strong foroes). It is a basic con jecture ofm odem physics that

C on jecture 4.1.1 A llem piricalinduced subsystem s arise from localizable fundam ental subsystem s.

Since induced subsystem s are derived from fundam ental subsystem s , we are therefore $m$ otivated to consider fundam ental localizable subsystem $s$ as the basic notion of quantum subsystem s.

Let us be m ore concrete in our description of what wem ean by localizable subsystem s . In particular we w ill not address the issue ofw hat does or does not constitute a localizable subsystem but instead we will present a m odel of a localizable subsystem which we claim captures the notion of locality in $m$ ost $m$ odem theories. Suppose we are given a d dim ensional hypercubic lattioe with vertioes V and edges E . We associate w ith each of the vertioes $v 2 \mathrm{~V}$ in this lattice a subsystem $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{v}}$ such that the global H ibert space factors w ith a full tensor product $H={ }_{v 2 v} H_{v}$. Local physical theories produce nonvanishing $H$ am iltonians only when the $H$ am iltonians act as single-body interactions on individual subsystem ( $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{i}}}$ on a given vertioes $\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{H}$ ilbert space $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{i}}}$ tensored w ith identity on all other subsystem s) or betw een individual subsystem $s$ which are neighbors ( $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{i}}, \mathrm{v}_{j}}$ acting nontrivially on the com bined H ilbert space $H_{v_{i}} \quad H_{v_{j}}$ where $v_{i}$ and $v_{j}$ are neighbors on the hypercubic lattice tensored $w$ ith identity on all other subsystem ). W e claim that this $m$ odel of local subsystem $s$ can be used as the basis for allm odem quantum physical theories. O fcourse in modem eld theory, the subsystem structure is really over a continuum of subsystem $s$, so what we are really claim ing is that the continuum model of quantum eld theory can be well approxim ated by our basic $m$ odel.

Further, asw e have em phasized, the localsubsystem structure ofquantum system s is really an em piricalquestion for physical theories within the fram ew ork of quantum principles. O fspecial note on this sub ject is the collected w ork of K itaev, Freedm an, and cow orkers $[33,86,83,87,84,116]$ who have exam ined di erent physical theories of nature in term s of their local subsystem structure. For instance, these w orkers have described how som em odem topological eld theories can be cast within a local subsystem structure. T he vigilant theorist, therefore, should take an interest in new theories ofnature which do not appear to provide a local subsystem structure\{ if these theories tum out to have an em piricalbasis and a non-local subsystem structure, the basis of quantum com putation which local subsystem s provide $m$ ay need updating!

W e have introduced the notion of subsystem s here because our future w ork in this thesis w ill deal w ith induced subsystem s of a nontrivial nature. A crucial role of a quantum com puter will be the ability to sim ulate the fundam ental local subsystem structure w ith this induced subsystem structure. This is the $m$ otivation which $m$ akes this section fiundam entally im portant to the understanding of what $m$ akes a quantum com puter.

### 4.2 The quantum circuit model

W ewill now introduce the quantum circuit modelofquantum computation. This $m$ odelwas rst introduced by $D$ eutsch [57] w ith $m$ ore rigorous theory being presented by Yao [208].

W e know from the previous section that m odem physical theories are well described by localizable quantum subsystem s. W e would like to build a m odel of quantum com putation which, in the spirit of a m odem day C hurch-Turing thesis, provides a good $m$ odel for what can be com puted using quantum system $s$ in the real world. For concreteness we w ill introduce the qubit quantum circuit m odeland then describe how this $m$ odel ts in $w$ th the $m$ ore general notion of a quantum com puter.

The qubit quantum circuit $m$ odelon $n$ qubits is built of a collection of $n$ tw o state system s. G iven n qubits, the subsystem structure of this system is $H=\underset{\mathrm{N}=1}{\mathrm{~N}} \mathbb{C}^{2} . \mathrm{W}$ e endow the qubits with a com putationalbasis j0i and jliwhich are the 1 eigenstates of $z$. The input to the quantum circuit is a basis vector $\neq i_{i}=\mu_{1} i \ddot{\mu}_{2} i \quad n i$ winere each qubit is in a particular basis state j0i or jil. The input represents a prepared state upon which the quantum computation will act. The evolution of the system once the input has been prepared is then described by a series of local control operators known as local quantum gates. A quantum gate acting on $k$ qubits is a unitary $2^{k} \quad 2$ evolution $m$ atrix which describes the e ect of som e evolution on the prescribed k qubits. W ew illassum e that the quantum gates whose evolution we can im plem ent are all two or one qubit gates, but we will allow parallel operation of such gates (see [2] for our $m$ otivation for allow ing parallel operators). W e also restrict our quantum com puter to have som e realistic localized subsystem structure and only allow operators which operate nontrivially betw een local subsystem s. A quantum circuit is then a speci cation of the gates which will operate upon the quantum system. U pon execution of the evolution the qubits are $m$ easured in the com putational basis and the output will then be a com putationalbasis output state $\bar{j} i$. The outcom e of the circuit will, in general, be probabilistic.

The qubit quantum circuit $m$ odel is clearly a restricted class of a much larger class which we will label the subsystem s quantum circuit m odel. In the subsystem s guantum circuit $m$ odel, one is given a system with som e subsystem structure $H=$
$\underset{i=1}{n} H_{i}$ (if it is not a full tensor product structure, then we willexam ine a full tensor product structure over som e subspace of a subspace tensor product). P reparation
now corresponds to preparing an input state which for each of the subsystem s . T he quantum gates now correspond to operators on the subsystem $s$ and between local subsystem $s$. Finally, $m$ easurem ent is now a com plete projective $m$ easurem ent on each of the subsystem. In further discussion, we will refer to the subsystem s quantum circuit $m$ odel as the quantum circuit $m$ odel unless needed.

A quantum circuit is a speci cation of the gates which will perform a quantum com putation on the input which results in an output with som e probability. In this de nition, it w illtum out (see below) that every possible m anipulation of an input to an output is a quantum circuit. For a xed $n$, then, it is possible to construct every possible quantum circuit. H ow ever, the notion of sim ply being a quantum circuit is not enough to capture the notion of an algorithm : algorithm s tell us how to work $w$ th inputs of varying length in a uniform $m$ anner. In particular there should be som em ethod for constructing a quantum circuit corresponding to som e algorithm for all possible input sizes.

To resolve this inadequacy of the quantum circuit model we m ust introduce the notion of uniform quantum circuit fam ilies. A quantum circuit fam ily is a set of circuits C whose elem ents are circuits $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{m}}$ indexed by a labelm which describes the num ber of input bits into the given circuit. E ach of these circuits can be augm ented by any num ber ofextra work bits and the output $m$ ay also have any num ber of extra output bits (ie. possible output greater than $m$ bits). On an input string $7 i$ with $m$ qubits, the circuit labeled by $m$ produces an output $C_{m}$ (7ii). W e require that the circuits in $C$ be consistent in that $C_{m}\left(j 0 i \quad\right.$ 前) $=C_{n}$ ( 7 i $)$ where $m>n$ and $i$ is an $n$ bit input. Furthem ore we $m$ ust require that there is som e procedure for constructing the circuit for a given input ïi. W e say that a circuit fam ily $C$ is uniform is there is a (classical) Turing $m$ achine which, given the input i generates a description of the circuit $\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{m}}$ which will act on the input 7 ij . W e will not delve into the de nition of a classical Turing $m$ achine $\{$ for our purposes we can just substitute our intuitive notion of a m odem classical com puter (which is a Turing $m$ achine (alm ost: today's com puters do not have unlm ted $m$ em ory !)).
$W$ e have thus seen that the notion of a quantum algorithm can be recast into the notion of uniform quantum circuit fam ilies. The quantum circuit $m$ odel itself consisted of three $m$ a jor procedures: preparation, evolution due to quantum gates, and $m$ easurem ent. The quantum circuit $m$ odel was also endowed with a speci c subsystem structure and certain localized lim its on the actions whid could be perform ed on this subsystem structure. In order to $m$ ake the quantum circuit $m$ odel correspond to som e notion of an algorithm ic task we have had to introduce the notion of uniform quantum circuit fam ilies. The qubit quantum circuit $m$ odel $w$ ith uniform quantum circuit fam ilies is a speci c realization of what is $m$ eant to carry out an algorithm on a quantum system.

### 4.3 U niversality

In the previous section we have de ned a quantum algorithm as a quantum circuit fam ily acting on a qubit quantum circuit $m$ odel. The circuit fam ily $C$ will contain an algorithm for constructing a given circuit $C_{m}$ for input on $m$ bits. $T$ he output of the classical algorithm describing as speci c $C_{m}$ for a given input fili will contain a set of instructions $I$ (i) for building the circuit $C_{m}$. In particular these instructions I (i) w ill describe what gates should be im plem ented, how they should be im plem ented (between which qubits), and the order in which the gates should be executed. The execution of a speci c circuit fam ily $C$ requires that certain speci c quantum gates are executed in the fashion described by the instructions I (i). Thus it would seem that di erent circuit fam ilies $m$ ight require di erent possible quantum gates. T his would be a torrid state of a airs for quantum com putation if every quantum circuit fam ily required a com plete reengineering of the quantum hardw are.

W e would thus like to ask the question of whether there exist som e set of ele$m$ entary quantum gates which can be used to build our algorithm s such that once we have access to this set of gates, we can in principle build up any quantum circuit desired. A ctually what we want is a little less restrictive because, as we discussed in Chapter 3, we m ust deal w ith som e sort of approxim ate evolution. We want to ask if there is a set of gates which we can use to approxim ate any quantum circuit. An im portant note in this de nition is that because the quantum circuit description com ing from a classical com puter is nite, the set of quantum gates we will use must also be nite.

Let us therefore begin by $m$ aking the follow ing de nition:
De nition 4.3.1 ( n -qubit universal gate set) A set of quantum gates G acting on a qubit quantum circuit $m$ odel with $n$ qubits is de ned to be a n-qubit universal gate set if, for any > 0 a sequence of gates from this set $G$ can be used to approxim ate any unitary evolution on alln qubits to accuracy (if $G$ represents the evolution due to a sequence of such gates then we require $\mathrm{E}(\mathrm{U} ; \mathrm{G})$ < where E is de ned as in Section 3.6.1).

W e can loosen this de nition a bit if we allow som e nite num ber of ancilla qubits to be acted upon:

De nition 4.3.2 ( $n$-qubit universal gate set augm ented by $m$ ancilla qubits) A set of quantum gates $G$ acting on a qubit quantum circuit $m$ odel with $n+m$ qubits is de ned to be a n-qubit universal gate set augm ented by $m$ ancilla qubits if, for any
$>0$ a sequence of gates from this set $G$ can be used to approxim ate any unitary evolution on $n$ qubits to accuracy .

Furtherwe can extend the notion of a universal set ofquantum gates to the subsystem quantum circuit $m$ odel via sim ply substituting subsystem quantum circuit model for
qubit quantum circuit $m$ odel. $W$ e then say that a set of gates is a n-subsystem universal gate set.

The rst to dem onstrate a universal set of gates was D eutsch [57] in 1989. The universal gate set obtained by D eutsch, how ever, consisted of operators on three qubits. The three-body interactions necessary to produce such a gate, how ever, are extrem ely di cult if not im possible to experim entally realize. D iV incenzo was the rst to dem onstrate a universal set of gates whidh required only tw o-body interactions[61]. Perhaps the $m$ ost $w$ idely cited universal gate set consists of the controlled-not com bined with a nitely generated group dense in single qubit rotations[13].

A nother im portant result states that a generic gate together with the ability to perm ute qubits is universal[58, 140]. H ere generic is the rather lim ited notion of a gate w ith no inherit sym m etry draw n from the space of allpossible gates. W hile this result is of great existential value, as it allow smaintains that generically universally is not hard to achieve, in practioe this result has few applications. The reason for this is that physical interactions tend to have sym $m$ etries in their interactions. Such symm etries con ne the given Ham iltonian to a lower dim ensional space than the full space of all operators on a given space. Nature, in general, does not uphold a $m$ athem atician's generic.

Below we assem ble a list of im portant universal gate sets.

### 4.3.1 The inductive subsystem lem ma

Before proceeding, it is usefiul to introduce the follow ing tools for universality proofs.

Lem mat 4.3.1 [4] Suppose one is given two sets $\mathrm{O}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{O}_{2}$ of operators which densely actas $S U\left(d_{A}\right)$ and $S U\left(d_{B}\right)$ on two subspaces $H_{A}$ (dim ension $d_{A}$ ) and $H_{B}$ (dim ension $d_{B}$ ) of a larger $H$ ibert space $H$. If $H_{A}$ and $H_{B}$ are not disjoint then the set of operators which can be achieved by com bining these operators is SU (d) acting on the union of these $H$ ibert spaces $H_{A}\left[H_{B}\right.$ (dim ension d)

Proof: See [4].
Follow ing this lem m a, the inductive subsystem lem m a follow s
Lem ma 4.3.2 Suppose one is given a Hibert space H with a subsystem structure $H={\underset{i}{i=1}}_{\mathrm{n}}^{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$, each subsystem $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ of dim ension $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{i}}$. We say that two subsystem $\mathrm{s} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}}$ and $H_{b}$ of dim ensions $d_{a}$ and $d_{b}$ are com putationally connected if operators on the com bined H ilbert space $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{a}} \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{b}}$ densely generate $\mathrm{SU}\left(\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{a}} \mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{b}}\right)$. Let G be the graph of com putationally connected subsystem s for a given gate set. If this graph is connected, then the gate set can densely generate $\operatorname{SU}\left(\underset{i=1}{\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{n}}} \mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{i}}\right)$.

Proof: Follow s sim ply from induction using Lem m a 4.3.1.

### 4.3.2 U niversal gate set exam ple

As a quick exam ple of a universal gate set, we give here the exam ple of the controlled-not ${ }^{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{X}$ plus nitely generated dense single qubit gates[13].

By postulate, this gate set generates any single qubit operation to any desired accuracy. In particular it generates an approxim ation to a single qubit x rotation near identity, exp $\left[\begin{array}{ll}i & \mathrm{x}\end{array}\right]$. Sandw iching this operation in between tw o controlled not operators, we nd that on two qubits

$$
{ }^{c} X \exp \left[\begin{array}{lll}
i & x & I f  \tag{4.1}\\
X & =\exp \left[\begin{array}{lll}
i & x & x
\end{array}\right]: ~
\end{array}\right.
$$

W e recall (see A ppendix A.7) that elem ents of the single qubit P auli norm alizer act as an autom orphism on the single qubit Pauli operators. This im plies that there are single qubit operators which when conjugated about x x produce the Pauli operators . Thus our gate set can produce

$$
N_{1}^{y} \quad N_{2}^{y} \exp \left[\begin{array}{lllll}
i & x & x \tag{42}
\end{array}\right] N_{1} \quad N_{2}=\exp [i \quad] ;
$$

where $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{i}}$ are elem ents of the single qubit P aulinorm alizer. W e have therefore show n that the gate set can produce, to a given accuracy any in nitesim al generator of the

SU (4) over two qubits:


Because we have the in nitesim al generators of $S$ (4), we can therefore produce any gate in the $S U$ (4) oftwo qubits: we have show $n$ how to produce all tw o qubit unitary gates.

Next we can use Lemma 4.32. Because we can generate SU (4) between local qubits, we can therefore produce any $S U\left(2^{n}\right)$ on $n$ qubits. Thus we have show $n$ how the controlled not plus local single qubit gates can be used to enact any possible quantum circuit.

### 4.3.3 The K itaev-Solovay theorem

W e have de ned a universal gate set such that any quantum circuit can be constructed to any desired accuracy from this gate set. N ow, suppose one is given a quantum circuit fam ily. T he circuits in this circuit fam ily will com ew ith descriptions of the quantum gates to be executed in the quantum algorithm. There are $m$ any w ays to place the cost on im plem enting such a circuit: the breadth of the circuit, the depth of the circuit, the total num ber of gates used, etc. T he eld of quantum com putational com plexity $[24,25,26]$ seeks to understand how these resources grow for di erent quantum algorithm s . T he cost function which is perhaps m ost im portant is the depth of the circuit. This depth corresponds in som e fashion to the total running tim e of the circuit. In view of the universality results for quantum circuits, it would be nice to know that di erent universal gate sets do not lead to radically di erent assessm ents of the com plexity of di erent circuits.

That this is ostensibly true is guaranteed by a theorem due to K 止aev [112] and independently Solovay [177, 178].

Theorem 4.3.1 (SolovayK itaev) Let G be a nite set of quantum gates which contains each gate's inverse and which densely generates $S U(d)$. For $>0$, there is sequence of gates of length 1 which is within of every elem ent of $S U$ (d) (using trace distance, Section 3.6.1) where $1=0 \quad \log ^{c} \underline{1}$ where c is some xed constant which depends on d.

Proof: See [153]. It is interesting to note the connections between this theorem and the study of \geom etric group theory" [55].

The Solovay-K itaev theorem indicates that a universal set of quantum gates can be used to approxim ate another universal set of gates with only a polylogarithm ic overhead in the depth of the circuit. C onsider two sets of gates $G_{1}$ and $G_{2}$. Because
each of these gate sets are universal, every gate in $G_{1}$ can be approxim ated by a sequence ofgates in $G_{2}$ and vice versa. The content of the Solovay $K$ itaev theorem tells us the sequence of gates from one set used to approxim ate a gate from the other set requires $O l^{\circ} g^{c} \stackrel{1}{l}$ gates. Thus the depth di erence betw een circuits constructed w ith di erent universal sets of gates to an accuracy is only $0 \log ^{\mathrm{C}} \stackrel{1}{ }$.

### 4.3.4 D iscrete versus H am ilton ian control

In Chapter 3 we introduce the notion of a H am iltonian control sequence given a set O of im plem entable H am iltonians

$$
\begin{equation*}
e^{i H_{i_{1}} t_{1}} e^{i H_{i_{2}} t_{2}} \quad{ }^{\text {iH }} H_{i_{1}} e^{t_{p}} \quad \text { where } H_{i_{k}} 20 ; t_{i} 2 \mathbb{R}^{+}: \tag{4.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

H ow do H am iltonian control sequences, which we are m ost likely to encounter in real quantum control situations, $m$ esh $w$ ith the idea of universal quantum gate sets?

U niversal sets of quantum gates are a nite set of gates which can be im plem ented w ith a œertain accuracy while $H$ am iltonian controlsequences are a continuum of gates which can be im plem ented w ith a certain accuracy. In practice, one w ould take the set of H am iltonian control sequences and $m$ ake these operators a discrete set in order to use the controlsequence as a universal set ofgates. T here is a sim pli cation, how ever, in describing the universality properties of H am iltonian control sequences w hidh often $m$ akes determ ining their universality properties sim ple. $G$ iven a subsystem structure and a H am iltonian control sequence, the universality properties follow directly from analysis of the Lie algebra generated by the control H am iltonians.

Representation theory of the Lie algebra for a set of control H am iltonian O describes exactly what can be done with a H am ittonian control sequence. C om bined w ith a description of the accuracy w ith which a given Ham iltonian control sequence can be im plem ented, this inform ation describes how every elem ent of a Lie group corresponding to the Lie algebra can be obtain to within some accuracy given a Ham iltonian control sequence. It is im portant to realize that just understanding what can be done w ith som e given control is insu cient for resolving questions about universality. A $m$ apping from the quantum system to a subsystem $s$ quantum circuit $m$ odel $m$ ust also be $m$ ade. A nalysis of Lie algebra alone does not give a com plete understanding of universality properties.

### 4.3.5 Exam ple use of Lie algebraic structure

Suppose we are given a linear array of $n$ qubits where $n$ is odd. Each individual qubit has an energy $H_{0}={\underset{i}{i=1}}_{\mathrm{n}}^{z_{2}^{(i)}}$ whidh is alw ays present and we have no control of the energy spacing . Between neighboring qubits there is an interaction $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}=$
 H am iltonians we can achieve is $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{H}_{0}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{i}}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{0}$.

Let us describe the Lie algebra achievable w ith these interactions. C learly we can start w ith $H_{0}=$ andrri as our interactions because the rst is given up to scaling and the second can be obtain via subtracting this rst from $H_{i}$. Taking the com $m$ utator yields

Taking the com mutator of this operation $w$ ith $H_{0}$ or $\tilde{H}_{i} y$ ields

Because $n$ is odd, the last of these com $m$ utators im plies that ${ }_{z}^{(i)}$ is in the Lie algebra generated by $O$. At this point it is clear that the Lie algebra generated by $O$ is the


Suppose we wanted to use these interactions for a quantum circuit m odel on alln qubits, ie. w ith subsystem structure ${ }_{\mathrm{N}}^{\mathrm{n}=1} \mathbb{C}^{2} . W$ e can show that this is not possible, i.e. that it is not possible to generate $S U\left(2^{n}\right) w$ th the operators in $0^{0}$.

C onsider the elem ents of the Lie algebra generated by $\mathrm{O}^{\circ}$. A 11 of these elem ents $w$ illbe linear com binations of com $m$ utators of the generators in $O^{0}$. $W$ ew illnow show that the parity, de ned as the eigenvalue of ${ }^{N_{i=1}^{n}} \quad z_{z}^{(i)}$, cannot be changed by the any elem ent in the ${ }_{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{i}$ ie algebra generated by $\mathrm{O}^{\circ}$. F irst note that all of the elem ents of $\mathrm{O}^{0}$

 of the Lie algebra generated by $0^{0}$. Since ${ }_{i=1}^{n}{\underset{z}{(i)}}_{(i)}$ om $m$ utes with allof the elem ents of the Lie algebra generated by $O^{0}$ there are elem ents of $S U\left(2^{n}\right)$ which are not in this Lie algebra.

In this exam ple we have shown how a speci c controlm echanism fails to be fully universal. It is im possible to use the controlof local ${\underset{x}{(i)}}_{x_{x}^{(i+1)}}$ w ith each qubit having a constant energy to produce every unitary evolution on $n$ qubits.

### 4.4 Encoded universality

### 4.4.1 T he fungible nature of quantum inform ation

A $n$ im portant property of classical inform ation which carries over to the quantum regim $e$ is the fiungible nature of inform ation [8]. A resource is fungible if interchanging it $w$ th another resource does not destroy the value of the resource. W hether we represent a classicalbit by the presence or absence of a chad on a punch-card [191] or in the orientation of a billion electron spins, the intrinsic value of the inform ation (the value of the bit) is untouched. Inform ation does not depend upon the $m$ edium
in which it is represented. The fungible nature of inform ation has been key to the exponential grow th of the com puter revolution. T he fact that it does not $m$ atter that the inform ation is being con ned to sm aller and sm aller com ponents on silicon chips has been central to the continuing success ofM oore's law [149]. So, too, goes quantum inform ation: the plethora of experim entally proposed system sfrom which a quantum com puter could be built is $m$ ade possible by the fiungibility of quantum inform ation. W hether we store quantum inform ation in the electronic levels of an atom ic system or in the spin of a single electron im purity in a solid-state system, the inform ation is still quantum and can be used for the basis of building a quantum com puter.

O ne central aspect of the fungible nature of quantum inform ation is that the inform ation can be encoded in som e highly non-trivialm anner. Of course when we represent a qubit in the spin of an electron or in the hyper ne levels of a ion, we are essentially encoding the qubit into a given H ibert space. H ow ever, it is im portant that this notion can be considerably extended. In particular, given m ultiple quantum subsystem, quantum inform ation can be stored in highly entangled states between these subsystem s. The fact that quantum inform ation can be encoded is essential to the developm ent of the theory of quantum error correcting codes. By choosing a particular encoding of the quantum inform ation, quantum error correcting codes provide a $m$ ethod for identifying and correcting the e ect of quantum errors on the code. In part II of this thesis, we will explore how certain encodings of quantum inform ation can be used to perfectly isolate the quantum inform ation from particular form s of decoherence.

The fiungible nature ofquantum inform ation is a w aming sign on the path tow ards building a quantum com puter. W hile a gaggle of labs quest to develop a particular system for quantum computation, the fungible nature of quantum inform ation tells us that a successfiul architecture for quantum com puting $m$ ay look nothing like the currently envisioned system. B ecause inform ation can be encoded, it is unclear exactly where we will store the inform ation that $m$ akes up a future quantum computer. An optim istic view point of the fungible nature of quantum inform ation, then, tells us that the quest for physical system $s$ which can quantum com pute is far from a closed deal. W e w ill retum to this issue in C hapter 18.

### 4.4.2 Encoded universality constructions

Encoding of quantum inform ation can also be of use in the construction of universal gate sets[8]. T here are two com plem entary ways of looking at this problem. On the one hand, because quantum inform ation can be encoded, œertain interactions which were not universal over the entire $H$ ilbert space can be $m$ ade universal on a particular encoded space. At the other end of the spectrum, it is com $m$ on in quantum com puting to develop a particular encoding (for error correction, due to physical constraints, etc.) and then to ask: what $m$ anipulations are needed to com pute on such an encoded space. O fcourse, these view points are com plem entary to each other.

In this section, we will discuss the rst of these view points: how encoding can make gate sets universal over an encoding.

Suppose one is given a gate set G. A s we have previously argued, the universal properties of this gate set is really a question of the relation of this gate set to representations of Lie groups. In fact the notion of an irreducible representation directly contains our notion of encoded universality. T hus the idea of encoded universality is nothing $m$ ore than the observation that the power of a set of gates is described by the irreducible representations and these irreducible representations $m$ ay act on som e encoded space. $W$ e refer to a set of gates which acts on som e encoded subsystem structure in a universalm anner as a universal set of gates on a quantum circuit m odel w ith encoded subsystem s.
$N$ otice that the notion of encoded universality changes the rules not only for the $m$ anipulation of the quantum inform ation, but also for the preparation and $m$ easure$m$ ent procedures of a quantum circuit $m$ odelw ith encoded subsystem s. O fparticular im portance here it to note that the preparation procedure should not be overly ine cient. W e will retum to these questions when we address a speci c exam ple in Chapter 9.

Let us de ne what is needed in order to present an encoded universality quantum circuit $m$ odel which can be used to construct uniform quantum circuit fam ilies:

A particular subsystem structure on the H ilbert space m ust be described which $m$ aps onto a subsystem structure of an unencoded quantum circuit model. This is perhaps the most stringent of the requirem ents for an encoded quantum com puter. W ithout a subsystem s structure, uniform ity cannot be enforoed and the very nature of a scalable architecture is violated.

T he abilly to prepare the subsystem s into a particular initialstate. H ere there is $m$ ore leew ay. It is, even for the standard quantum circuit $m$ odel, never necessary to obtain perfect preparation. An im portant issue for encoded universality constructions is the fact that it is possible for quantum inform ation to \leak" out of the encoded subsystem .

O perationswhich act in a universalm anner on the encoded subsystem structure.
The ability to extract inform ation from the encoded subsystem s. A gain, perfect $m$ easurem ent is not necessary. The ability to extract even a little bit of inform ation is often su cient for quantum com putation.

A particularly interesting class of encoded universality constructions are what we w ill term few subsystem s encoded universalily. W hile in practioe, given a gate set, G one can analyze the action of this gate set on ever larger num bers of qubits, the uniform ity condition of the quantum circuit modelputs a condition on the encoding such that there should be a som em ap onto a subsystem structure which grow s proportional to the num ber of qubits added. T hus the typicalm anner in which enooded
universality w illbe used is to take a constant num ber of subsystem s and the encode a basic subsystem into this constant num ber of subsystem $s$. For exam ple one $m$ ay nd that taking triads of qubits allows for an encoded qubit which can be robustly m anipulated (prepared, $m$ easured, unitarily controlled). Then one proceeds to take the encoded subsystem s , m ap it onto a quantum subsystem circuit m odeland (hopefully) show universality on this encoded subsystem structure.

### 4.4.3 Few subsystem sencoded universality exam ple

Suppose one is given a spin chain of $n$ qubits with interactions as shown in $F$ igure 4.1 below. In particular assum e that the H am iltonians which can be enacted on this spin chain com e from the set

To see that fulluniversality on alln qubits (the ability to im plem ent SU $\left(2^{\mathrm{n}}\right)$ on the


Figure 4.1: Exam ple encoded universality spin chain
system ) is not possible, note that ${ }_{\mathrm{Q}_{\mathrm{i}=1}}{ }_{\mathrm{z}}^{\text {(i) }}$ comm utes w ith all of the elem ents of S and thus, via the sam e argum ent of Section 4.3.5, the Lie algebra generated by these H am iltonians is not the full $\mathrm{SU}\left(2^{\mathrm{n}}\right)$.

Let us exam ine the action of the H am iltonians listed above on pairs of qubits. N otice that these have the follow ing Lie algebraic structure

The rst of these commutation relations indicates an SU (2) structure for these

abelian subalgebra over these two qubits. In particular we note that over the subspace with basis states $j 00 i$ and 711 (for the $i$ and $i+1$ th qubit), the operators
 space, while ${\underset{z}{(i)}{\underset{z}{(i+1)}}^{(1)} \text { acts as identity on this subspace. Thus we can use these }}_{\text {a }}$ operators to enact SU (2) on the encoded subspace spanned by the logical qubits $j j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}=j 00 \mathrm{i}$ and $j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{j} 1 \mathrm{i}$. A lso note that the subspace $j 01 \mathrm{i}$ and $j 10 \mathrm{i}$ is not acted upon by these operators in a non-com $m$ uting $m$ anner and hence over these operators cannot be used as a qubit.

H aving show $n$ that there is an encoding over tw o qubits forw hich the operators in S act aSSU (2), we then hope to extend this encoding to a fullquantum circuitm odel. In particular we take our encoded qubits (the subsystem s) to be tw o physical qubits w ith the encoding of $j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}=j 00 \mathrm{i}$ and $j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}=j 11 \mathrm{i}$. W e have already show $n$ that any single qubit operation is possible on this encoded space and thus it is su cient to show that we can im plem ent a non-trivialtw o body encoded operation between the qubits in order to produce a encoded universal quantum circuit. If we take the encoding between the 1st and 2nd, 3rd and 4th, etc. qubits then the operation ${ }_{z}^{(2 k)}{ }_{z}^{(2 k+1)}$ w th $1 \mathrm{k} \mathrm{n}=2$ provides this coupling. In particular note that

| ${ }_{z}^{(2 k)}$ | ${ }_{z}^{(2 k+1)} j_{0} i j 0_{L} i$ | ${ }_{2}{ }^{2 \mathrm{k}}$ ) | joijoi |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| ${ }_{z}^{(2 k)}$ | ${ }_{z}^{(2 k+1)}{ }^{2 k} \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i} \mathcal{H}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}$ | ${ }_{z}^{(2 k)}$ | ${ }_{z}^{(2 k+1)} j 00 i j 1 i=$ | j00ij11 |
| ${ }_{z}^{(2 k)}$ | ${ }_{z}^{(2 k+1)}{ }^{1} \mathcal{1}_{L} i j j_{L} i$ | $\begin{equation*} (2 \mathrm{k}) \tag{4.9} \end{equation*}$ | ${ }^{\text {1) }}$ 71ij00i= | j1ijo |
| (2k) | ${ }_{z}^{(2 k+1)} \mathcal{1}_{L} i \mathcal{j}_{L} i$ | (2k) | j11 111 | 211ij |

Thus we see that this operation acts like an encoded $\quad$ z $\quad$ z between encoded qubits. W hen this operation is enacted as a $H$ am iltonian, com bined w ith single encoded qubit operators this allow sfor universal control of the encoded qubits.

In this exam ple we have seen how pairing the qubits together we can obtain an encoding such that there is a mapping from encoded two-qubit states to encoded qubits and universalquantum com putation can be obtained on this encoding.

### 4.5 W hat to do w ith the strange irreducible representations

In constructing encoded universal gate sets from H am iltonian control sequences, one can perform an analysis of the Lie algebra structure H am iltonians to get a hold of how these H am iltonians can be used for encoded universality. Luckily the analysis of the Lie algebras we will deal with on a quantum com puter have long ago been identi ed and classi ed! W e w ill not deal w ith this issue here but instead refer the reader to the standard texts of C omw ell[50] and G eorgi[91].

H ow ever, we would like to bring up tw o points related to representation theory of

Lie algebras which are im portant but have not received extensive discussion in the quantum com puting literature.

### 4.5.1 W hat to do w ith Lie A lgebra X ?

A ll of the universality constructions to date have shown how a suitable $S U(k)$ can be executed on a given circuit $m$ odel. But there is $m$ ore under the sun than the Lie group SU (k)! In partioular there are other Lie groups w ith di ering Lie algebras which, in theory, can arise or be sim ulated on a quantum system. A $n$ interesting open question is if these Lie algebras have anything to do with quantum com puting.

O pen $Q$ uestion 4.5.1 D o Lie algebras other than $s u(k)$ play any role in the realm of quantum computing?

A $n$ im portant point in this discussion is that there are only four in nite fam ilies ofL ie algebras in the classi cation schem e ( $A_{n}, B_{n}, C_{n}$, and $D_{n}$ in the standard notation.) $T$ hese w ould appear to be the Lie algebras which are $m$ ost likely to support som e sort of com putation because they satisfy the requirem ent of allow ing for the notion of the power of the com puter grow ing w ith the num ber of subsystem $s$ added.

### 4.5.2 W hat is a qubit?

The notion of encoded universality also raises som e particularly interesting questions. O ne particular issue which has been raised in the literature is the notion of \w hat is a qubit?" V iola, K nill, and La am m e [193] present m odels ofqubits encoded into di erent spaces. These authors rightly take an operational view of a qubit. A qubit is de ned by how one can access the inform ation in the qubit: both in control and in $m$ easurem ent of the qubit. Unfortunately the authors only present qubits where they have operators which act on the qubits which satisfy both the com $m$ utation and anti-com $m$ utation relations of the standard $P$ aulim atrioes:

$$
\begin{align*}
{[;] } & =2 i \\
\mathrm{f} ; \mathrm{g} & =2 \mathrm{I}: \tag{4.10}
\end{align*}
$$

This, how ever, is a lim ited notion of a qubit from the point of view of the representation theory of quantum inform ation. To see this, consider three di erent irreps of SU (2) : i.e. the Lie algebra which satis es the com mutation relations above, but not necessarily the anti-com $m$ utation relations. The rst representation is the onedim ensional irreducible representation. In this representation, the SU (2) operators all act as 0

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{x}^{[1]}=[0] ; \quad{ }_{y}^{[1]}=[0] ; \quad{ }_{z}^{[1]}=[0]: \tag{4.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

T he second representation is the two-dim ensional irreducible representation:

F inally we exam ine the three-dim ensional irreducible representation
$C$ learly the one-dim ensional irrep ofSU (2) is useless. This irrep can, in no $m$ anner, be considered a qubit. A nd, of course, the two-dim ensional irrep of SU (2) is what we nom ally think of as a qubit. But what about the three-dim ensional irrep? Let us show that any $m$ anipulation of the two-dim ensional irrep can be $m$ im idked by the three-dim ensional irrep. Let jai, jpi, and jci denote the vectors upon which the threedim ension irrep acts and j0i, jli denote the vectors upon with the two-dim ensional irrep acts.

In the two-dim ensional irrep, a state of the system can be w ritten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }^{[2]}(\mathrm{A})=\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{I}+\mathrm{A} \sim^{[2]}: \tag{4.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us map the state of the two-dim ensional irrep described by if to the threedim ensional state

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }^{[3]}(\mathrm{A})=\frac{1}{3} I+\frac{1}{6} \mathrm{~K} \quad \sim^{[B]}: \tag{4.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

$N$ otioe that a pure state in the two-dim ensional irrep is not $m$ apped onto a pure state in the three-dim ensional irrep.

A $n$ observable on the two-dim ensional irrep is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}^{[2]}\left(\mathrm{m}_{0} ; \mathrm{mq}\right)=\mathrm{m}_{0} I+\mathrm{mt} \quad[2]: \tag{4.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

The expectation of this observable is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Tr}^{h}{ }^{[2]}(\mathrm{m}) \mathrm{H}\left(\mathrm{~m}_{0} ; \mathrm{Rr}^{1}\right)^{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{m}_{0}+\mathrm{mq} \quad \mathrm{P}: \tag{4.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

For the three dim ensional irrep we can de ne the equivalent observable

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}^{[3]}\left(\mathrm{m}_{0} ; \mathrm{rrt}\right)=\mathrm{m}_{0} I+\frac{3}{4} \mathrm{~m}^{\mathrm{mt}} \sim ; \tag{4.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

such that the expectation value of this observable is identical

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Tr}^{\mathrm{h}}{ }^{[3]}{ }_{(\mathrm{P})} \mathrm{H}^{[3]}\left(\mathrm{m}_{0} ; \mathrm{mT}\right)^{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{m}_{0}+\mathrm{FT} \quad \mathrm{~A}: \tag{4.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

$F$ inally note that evolution on the two-dim ensional irrep

$$
\begin{equation*}
U^{[2]}(\forall ; t)=\exp ^{\mathrm{h}} \text { itw } \sim^{[2]^{i}} \text {; } \tag{420}
\end{equation*}
$$

can be directly $m$ apped onto evolution of the three-dim ensional irrep

$$
\begin{equation*}
U^{[3]}(\forall ; t)=\exp ^{h} \text { itw } \sim^{[B]^{i}} ; \tag{421}
\end{equation*}
$$

such that the evolution of the density $m$ atrix has the sam e ect

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.U^{[2]}(\forall ; t)\right)^{[2]}(\mathrm{A}) \mathrm{U}^{[2] y}(\forall ; t)={ }^{[2]}\left(\mathrm{A}^{0}\right) \\
& U^{[3]}(\forall ; t){ }^{[3]}(\mathrm{A}) \mathrm{U}^{[3] y}(\forall ; t)={ }^{[B]}\left(\mathrm{A}^{0}\right): \tag{422}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus we have seen that there is a $m$ apping between density $m$ atrices, observables, and evolutions of the two and three-dim ensional irreps which perfectly preserves the structure of a qubit. In general d > 1 dim ensional irreps of SU (2) can be used in a sim ilar $m$ anner to construct a valid qubit. A qubit is m ore than just the twodim ensional irreducible representations of SU (2)!

### 4.6 Subsystem grow th of a Lie algebra and quantum com putation

A s im portant as the question of when a given H am iltonian control sequence has universal control is the negative of this question. H ere we present a useful criteria for detecting Lie algebras which are not universal.

Suppose one is given a set of H am iltonians $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}$ which can be im plem ented in a $H$ am iltonian control sequence on $n$ subsystem $s$. Let $L_{n}$ denote the $L$ ie algebra which can be generated by $S_{n}$ and let $g(n)$ denote the number of linearly independent operators in $L_{n}$. We call $g(n)$ the subsystem $s$ grow th function.

Theorem 4.6.1 A grow th function $g(n)$ which is polynom ialin $n$ is not universalon a quantum circuit model.

Proof: The basic idea behind this theorem is to note that a quantum circuit $m$ odel on $n$ subsystems has a state space which grows exponentially in $n$ and therefore perform ing unitary operators on this space is equivalent to generating elem ents of an exponentially grow ing Lie algebra.

Retum now to the exam ple presented in Section 4.3 .5 where we exam ined the power of H am iltonian control sequences generated by H am iltonians in the set

$$
\begin{equation*}
0^{0}=f \underset{z}{(i)} ; \underset{x}{(i)} \underset{x}{(i+1)} g \text { : } \tag{423}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e will now show that, even with the help of encoding, this set of H am iltonians is not universal.
 $W$ e claim that the operators in the $L$ ie algebra generated by $0^{0}$ are all linear com binations of the form $M_{j k}$; plus the single qubit ${ }_{z}^{(i)}$. $N$ otice that this is true for $n=2$. W e will prove the result by induction. F irst we note that because our generators are $m$ ade up ofP aulioperators, we need not w orry about linear com binations ofoperators, but only need to worry about the operators which can be generated by com m utation. Let $\mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{n}}$ denote the Lie algebra on n qubits generated by taking com $m$ utators in $\mathrm{O}^{0}$. For exam ple $\mathrm{L}_{2}=\mathrm{fM}{ }_{12 ; \mathrm{x} ; \mathrm{x}} ; \mathrm{M}_{12 ; \mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{y}} ; \mathrm{M}_{12 ; \mathrm{y} ; \mathrm{x}} ; \mathrm{M}_{12 ; \mathrm{y} ; \mathrm{y}} ;{ }_{2}^{(1)} ;{ }_{2}^{(2)} \mathrm{g}$ as claim ed above. A s-

 em ents in $L_{n}$ : the only elem ents which ${\underset{z}{\text { (i) }}}^{\text {do not commute } w \text { ith are } \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{ik}} \text {; ; and }}$ $\mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{ki} ;}$; and this commutation only serves to ip the value of or . Finally, note that taking the com $m$ utator betw een elem ents of $L_{n}$ and ${\underset{x}{(i)}}_{x_{x}^{(i+1)}}$ can only generate elem ents in $L_{n+1}$. To see this, rst note that the only nontrivial com mutators are those which occur w ith the ${\underset{z}{2}}_{(i)}^{(i)}$ operators, which just produce elem ents in $\mathrm{L}_{2}$.
 are one qubit larger or sm aller. Thus we have proved that the Lie algebra generated by elem ents of $0^{0}$ are spanned by the set of linearly independent operators in

 operators. Thus the grow th function for this Lie algebra is $g(n)=n+4 \frac{n(n 1)}{2}=$ $2 n^{2} \quad n$. This grow th function is polynom ial in $n$ and thus via $T$ heorem 4.6.1 this set of operator is not universal.

### 4.7 U niversal quantum com putation

U niversality is one of the $m$ ost powerfiul concepts to arise from the theoretical study of com puter science. In this chapter we have dealt $w$ th the ideal conditions needed for universal quantum com putation. This idealm odel presents an abstract connection to the question of exactly what is a quantum com puter. Real world realization of a universal quantum com puter, how ever, m ust deal with decoherence, faulty operations, faulty preparation, and faulty m easurem ents. Luckily the theory of fault-tolerant quantum com putation has been developed which deals directly w ith these issues $3,96,115,124,161,175]$ and a theorem which basically states that if these problem s are not too severe, the idealm odel can nearly ideally be obtained [3, 95, 112, 124, 161].

IfA lan Turing were to retum from the dead and see them odem classicalcom puter, he would surely be shocked by the technological progress achieved in the past fly years. H ow ever, if one explained to Turing how the m odem com puter works, he would surely recognize the $m$ anner in which the $m$ odem com puter attains universal com putation (no slouch, that Turing: he could w ork in a base-32 notation that others
had to convert to decim al to understand!) O ne of the $m$ ain $m$ otivations for studying the theory of universal quantum com putation is simply the realization that we do not know exactly what a future quantum com puter will look like, but we have som e notion of what is required in order to obtain universality. The unknowable future, then, has already given way to novelproposals for quantum com putation, and, in the end, $m$ ay present the ultim ate road towards building a quantum com puter.

| G ate set | R eference |
| :---: | :---: |
| and $P$ em utations | D eutsch, 1989 [57] |
|  | D iv incenzo, 1995 [61] |
| A ny single $P_{j 0 i} \quad I+P_{j i i} \quad \dot{e}^{i=1} i^{i}$, and $P$ erm utations | B arenco, 1995 [12] |
| A $m$ ost any single tw o-qubit gate, and Pem utations | D eutsch et.al, 1995 [58] <br> L loyd, 1995 [140] |
| ${ }^{\mathrm{C}} \mathrm{X} \quad \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{j} 0 \mathrm{i}} \quad \mathrm{I}+\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{j} 1 \mathrm{i}} \quad{ }_{\mathrm{x}}$, and any gate set which densely generates single qubit gates | B arenco et.al, 1995 [13] |
| H, P, ${ }^{\text {c }} \mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Q}$ ( $=2$ ) | Shor, 1996 [175] |
| $P,{ }^{C} X,{ }^{C} P \quad P_{j 00 i}+P_{j 01 i}+P_{j 10 i}+i P_{j 11 i},$ <br> and the ability to prepare $j \quad i=p^{1} \overline{\overline{2}}$ ( $\mathrm{j} i \mathrm{i} \quad \mathrm{jli}$ ) | K nill et.al, 1998 [123] |
| H, P, ${ }^{C} \mathrm{X},{ }^{\text {c }} \mathrm{P}$ | K nill et.al, 1998 [123] |
| H, P, ${ }^{C} X$, and the ability to prepare $j=8 i=\cos (=8) j 0 i+\sin (=8) j 1 i$ | K nill et.al, 1998 [123, 124] |
| ${ }^{c} \mathrm{X}, \mathrm{Q}(=2)$, plus the ability to measure i, i2 fx;y;zg | G ottesm an, 1998 [96] |
| Single qubit operations, B ellm easurem ents, and G H Z states | G ottesm an and C huang [97] |
| $\exp \left[\begin{array}{llll}\text { i } & \text { i } & \text { i }\end{array}\right]$ | $\begin{gathered} \text { B acon et.al, } 2000 \text { [9] } \\ \text { K em pe et.al, } 2001 \text { [109] } \\ \hline \end{gathered}$ |
| x x ${ }^{+} \mathrm{y}$ y between qubits | K em pe, 2001 [109] w u and Lidar, 2001 [206] |
| Linear optics elem ents, single photon souroes, single photon detectors | K nill, La amme, and M ibum, 2001 [121] |
| E ntangled cluster state and single m easurem ents | R aussendorf and B riegel, 2001 [163] |

Table 4.1: U niversal gate constructions
U niversalsets of gates. $M$ any of these gates are elem ents in the norm alizer of the $P$ auli group (see Appendix A.7). , and $i$ are irrationalmultiples of $. P_{j i}=j$ ih jnot to be confused with $P=j 0 i h 0 j+i j i h 1 j$. Pem utations $m$ eans the ability to perm ute the $w$ ires of the qubits.

## P art II

## D ecoherenceFree Q uantum C om putation

## C hapter 5

## D ecoherence- F ree C onditions

wherein the dem ons of decoherence are rst shown the door and the door is described by necessary and su cient conditions

In this chapter we introduce the basic conditions for decoherence-free subspaces and decoherence-fiee subsystem $s$. W e begin with a sim ple classical exam ple of a subsystem which withstands a classical error process. The fundam ental algebraic theorem of decoherence is then derived and the concept of the OSR algebra is dened. D ecoherence-fire subspaces are then introduced and an i condition for such subspaces is derived. A sim ple exam ple of a decoherence-free subspace is presented and how to handle system speci c evolution is discussed. D ecoherence-free subsystem s are then de ned and w th the help of a basic theorem of the representation theory of com plex associative $y$-closed algebras and an i condition for such subsystem $s$ is derived. An exam ple of a decoherence-fire subsystem is exam ined and the role of the a nontrivial com m utant is introduced. Finally decoherence-free conditions form aster equations are presented.

### 5.1 P rotecting in form ation by encoding

T w o parties, A lige and B ob, w ish to com m unicate an im portant m essage. At their disposal is a classical com $m$ unication channel. A lice and B ob can send two classical bits at a tim e down this channel. Unfortunately this classical channel has a devilish $m$ anner of distorting the inform ation sent dow $n$ the channel. $W$ hen the parties send their tw o bits dow $n$ the channel, there is a noise process in the channelwhich will ip the value of both bits. Thus if A lice sends 00 dow $n$ the line, B ob w ill either receive the undisturbed 00 or the ipped 11. If A lioe sends 01 through the channel, B ob w ill either receive the undisturbed 01 or the ipped 10. C learly, if A lioe and B ob w ish to com $m$ unicate using the full capacity of the classical channel ( $m$ eaning each using both bits of the classical channel) they will fail.

Let ( $\mathrm{x}_{1} ; \mathrm{x}_{2}$ ) denote the classical bits sent dow n two bit channel. All of the infor$m$ ation which is in the pair $\left(x_{1} ; x_{2}\right)$ is also in the pair $\left(x_{1} \quad x_{2} ; x_{2}\right)$ where is the exclusive-or of the two bits ( $\mathrm{x}_{1} \quad \mathrm{x}_{2}=\mathrm{x}_{1}+\mathrm{x}_{2} \bmod 2$ ). To se this, smply note that this is a map which is one-to-one: $00!00,01!11,10!10,11!01$. The pair ( $x_{1} \quad x_{2} ; x_{2}$ ) is a particular encoding of the classical inform ation. W hat is interesting to $A$ lice and $B$ ob about this encoding is that the rst bit $\mathrm{x}_{1} \quad \mathrm{x}_{2}$ is unchanged by the error process of the channel. If the channel does not act on the bits, then of course nothing happens to $x_{1} \quad x_{2}$. If the channel ips both of the bits, then $x_{1} \quad x_{2}!x_{1} \quad x_{2}=x_{1} \quad x_{2}$ where $x$ indicates the negation operation and we have used the fact that the exclusive-or of two negated bits is the same as the exclusive-or of the unnegated bits. O $n$ the other hand the second bit in the encoding $\mathrm{x}_{2}$ is unprotected from the action of the channel.

A lige and Bob can thus use this noisy channel to com $m$ unicate $w$ ith perfect delity by using the encoding ( $\mathrm{x}_{1} \quad \mathrm{x}_{2} ; \mathrm{x}_{2}$ ). If A lice wants to send an encoded bit dow $n$ the channel, she encodes her bit into the parity of the two bits (choosing either of the two possible ( $\mathrm{x}_{1} ; \mathrm{x}_{2}$ ) for a given choice of parity) and sends these two bits to Bob. The channel cannot change the parity of the two bits and thus Bob can decode the bit which A lice encoded by exam ining the parity of two bits he receives.
$T$ here are tw o $m$ orals from this sim ple exam ple. The rstm oralis that inform ation can be protected from disturbance via an appropriate encoding. The second moral com es from the observation that the reason an appropriate encoding exists which perfectly protects the inform ation is due to a sym $m$ etry of the noise process. In particular the errors which the channel induce on the two bits are identical on each individual bit. This is the sym $m$ etry of the error process which allow sfor encoding into parity which perfectly preserves the inform ation.

The above exam ple dem onstrates how classical inform ation can be perfectly protected from noise via an appropriate encoding of the inform ation. In this part of the thesis we w illbe exam ining sim ilar constructions, but now in the context of quantum inform ation.

### 5.2 The O SR A lgebra

Consider the evolution of a system $S$ and an environm ent $E w$ ith joint $H$ ibert space $H=H_{S} \quad H_{E}$ which evolves according to som e $H$ am iltonian $H$. C onsider the expansion of the H am iltonian into system and environm ent operators

$$
\begin{equation*}
H={ }_{=0}^{x^{A}} S \quad B \text {; } \tag{5.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

 possible. The expansion, on the other hand is not unique. W e w ill place the require$m$ ent on this expansion that the $B$ are a com plete xed basis which are linearly
independent, herm itian and have an inner product $\operatorname{Tr} \mathrm{B}^{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{B}=$. Such a basis can alw ays be chosen over the environm ent Hilbert space (see A ppendix A.3). We will often refer to the $S$ as the system operators and the $B$ as the environm ent operators.

Let us recall that evolution of the system plus environm ent which initially starts in a tensor product state $(0)=S_{S}(0) \quad E_{E}(0)$ is given by the $O S R$ evolution

$$
\begin{equation*}
(t)=\int_{i}^{X} A_{i}(t) S_{s}(0) A_{i}^{y}(t): \tag{52}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e now claim that a basis for the $O S R$ operators $A_{i}(t)$ corresponding to the $H$ am irtonian H in Eq. (5.1) is given by the com plex associative algebra A generated by the $S$ plus the identity operator I.

De nition 5.2.1 (C om plex associative algebra) [122, 131] The com plex associative algebra A generated by the set of operators $S$ is the set of operators which can be constructed from the operators $S$ via the processes of linear com bination over $\mathbb{C}$ and sim ple operator m ultiplication.

W e claim that
Lem m a 5.2.1 [122] C onsider the evolution of a system plus environm ent due to a Ham iltonian H with expansion Eq. (5.1). The OSR operators $A_{i}(t)$ corresponding to evolution due to $H$ are elem ents of the com plex associative algebra A generated by the $S$ in Eq. (5.1) plus identity I.

Proof: The Taylor expansion of the full system-environm ent evolution operator is given by

A xed basis form over the environm ent of the evolution operator can be obtained by expanding

$$
\begin{align*}
& b\left(1 ;::: ; n^{n}\right)=\operatorname{Tr}^{y}\left(B_{1}\right) B ; \tag{5.4}
\end{align*}
$$

such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
U(t)=x_{n=0}^{X^{A}} \frac{\left(\text { it }^{n}\right)^{2}}{n!} 4_{1=0}^{X^{A}} \quad x_{n=0}^{X^{A}}\left(S_{1} \quad{ }_{n}\right) S_{=0}^{X^{A}} b\left({ }_{1} ;::: ; n_{n}\right) B^{5}: \tag{5.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

U sing the de nition ${ }_{P}$ f the OSR operators, Eq. (2.11) we nd that for an intial evolution of $E(0)={ }^{P} \quad \mathrm{pj}$ ih $j$

$$
\begin{align*}
& =P^{p} \bar{n}_{n=0}^{x^{A}=0} \quad x_{n=0}^{x^{A}} x^{x^{A}} \frac{\left(\text { it }^{n}\right.}{n!} b\left(1 ;::: ; n_{n}\right) B ; \quad\left(S_{1} \quad n_{n}\right) ; S \tag{5.6}
\end{align*}
$$

where $B ;=h \notin j$ i. Thus we see that each $O S R$ operator $A_{i}$ is a com plex linear com bination of products of the $S$ 's plus identity Ifor $n=0$. Thus the $A_{i}$ are elem ents of the com plex associative algebra A generated by the $S$ plus identity I as claím ed.

Suppose we are given a com plex associative algebra A generated by the elem ents $S$ plus identity I. Let $F^{A}$; $=1::: B$ denote a com plete basis for the operators in this algebra which has an identical span as the elem ents of A. Then we can expand the elem ents of A as

$$
\begin{align*}
& S_{1} \quad f_{n} S\left(1 ;::: i_{n}\right) F^{A} \\
& S\left(1 ;::: ;_{n}\right)=\operatorname{Tr}^{\frac{1}{h}} F^{\text {Ay }}\left(S_{1}{ }_{n}\right)^{i} S \text { : } \tag{5.7}
\end{align*}
$$

Expanding Eq. (5.6) in term s ofF ${ }^{\mathrm{A}}$,

$$
\begin{align*}
& =X_{=0}^{X B} a F^{A} ; \tag{5.8}
\end{align*}
$$

where

For general initial environm ent initial conditions, we can use this expression to show that there are evolutions such that a is non-vanishing for som etim et>0.C onsider the $k$ th derivative of $a$ with respect to tim e evaluated at $t=0$,

For general environm ental initial conditions, we can choose an initial environm ental condition and basis $j$ isuch that ${ }^{\mathrm{P}} \overline{\mathrm{P}} \mathrm{B} ; 母 0$ forany. Further, $\mathrm{b}\left({ }_{1} ;::: ;{ }_{k}\right) \neq 0$
for at least one for any $1 ;::: ;{ }_{n}$. F inally, because the $F^{A}$ have an identical span to the com plex associative algebra generated by the $S$ plus identity $I$, there $m$ ust exist
 for som et> 0 for every .

Together w ith Lem ma 52.1 this im plies an extrem ely im portant theorem in the study of decoherence. Let us rst de ne the OSR algebra

De nition 5.2.2 (O SR algebra) The O SR algebra is the com plex associative algebra generated by (i) the $S$ operators in the expansion of a system -environm ent H am iltonian $H={ }^{P}{ }_{=0} S \quad B$ where the $B$ are linearly independent operators and (ii) the identity I.

Theorem 5.2.1 (Fundam ental algebraic theorem of decoherence) ${\underset{P}{122]}}_{A}$ Suppose a system and environm ent evolve according to the $H$ am ittonian $H={ }^{P}{ }_{A}^{A}{ }_{0} S \quad B$ where the B are linearly independent. The OSR evolution operators $A_{i}(t)$ are in the O SR algebra and the span of the $A_{i}(t)$ for generic environm ent initial conditions is identical to the OSR algebra.

The signi cance of this theorem is that it reduces the study of system evolution w ith generic environm ent initial conditions to the study of the algebraic structure of the corresponding OSR algebra. Thus if one wishes to understand the e ects and O SR operator can have, it is enough to exam ine the span of the system operators of a system -environm ent expansion of the H am iltonian. It provides an i connection between the O SR operators and the O SR algebra under generic environm ental initial conditions.

### 5.3 D ecoherence-free subspaces

In the exam ple from the rst section of this chapter we saw that inform ation could be protected from an environm ent via a suitable encoding of the inform ation. In this section we present the rst disoovered and sim plest condition under which sim ilar protection can be endowed to a quantum system.

C onsider a system $S$ w ith $H$ ibert space $H_{S}$ which evolves according to some joint H am iltonian $\mathrm{H}={ }^{\mathrm{P}}{ }_{\mathrm{A}}^{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{O}_{0} \mathrm{~S} \quad \mathrm{~B}$ with linearly independent environm ent operators B . Corresponding to this evolution and given an environm ental initial condition there are a set of OSR operators $A_{i}(t)$ for the evolution of the system. We say that a system density $m$ atrix $s$ is invariant under the $O S R$ operators $A_{i}(t)$ if

$$
{ }_{i}^{X} A_{i}(t){ }_{s} A_{i}^{Y}(t)=s_{s}:
$$

$C$ learly an invariant density $m$ atrix does not evolve even though the system and environm ent $m$ ay have som e non-trivial coupling.

D e nition 5.3.1 (D ecoherence-free subspace) A subspace $S$ of a system's H ibert space $H_{S}$ is called a decoherence-free subspace (DFS) with respect to a system environm ent coupling if every pure state from this subspace is invariant under the corresponding $O$ SR evolution for any possible environm ent initial condition :

X

A decoherence-free subspace is a perfect quantum $m$ em ory. T he fungible nature of quantum inform ation tells us that quantum inform ation encoded into a subspace has the same fundam ental value as any other representation of quantum inform ation. T hus while the fundam ental value of the quantum inform ation is unchanged by encoding into a D FS, an im portant property of the way in which this inform ation interacts w ith its environm ent is changed by encoding into a DFS.

W hile we have de ned a DFS in term s of invariant pure states, m ixed states fall nigely w thin the protection of a D FS as well. In particular a m ixed state which has support only over a the pure states of a DFS will be also be invariant and hence protected from decoherence.

### 5.3.1 D ecoherence-free subspace condition

Let us describe a necessary and su cient condition for the existence of a DFS given a speci c system -environm ent coupling as in Eq. (5.1).

T heorem 5.3.1 (D ecoherence-free subspace H am ittonian criteria) [216] A subspace $S$ is a DFS i the system operators $S$ act proportional to identity on the subspace:

$$
\begin{equation*}
S \text { j} i=c \text { j} i 1 ~ 8 \grave{j} i 2 S: \tag{5.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

P roof: First we prove su ciency. Suppose $S$ ji $=c$ jii. D ue to the fundam ental algebraic theorem of decoherence, all OSR operators are elem ents of the com plex associative algebra generated by $S$. Thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i}(t) \ddot{j} i=C_{i}(t) \ddot{j} i ; \tag{5.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $c_{i}$ is som e com plex constant which is a com plex com bination of the $c$ 's. Therefore

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { i i }
\end{aligned}
$$

The norm alization condition ${ }^{P}{ }_{i} A_{i}^{y}(t) A_{i}(t)=I$ implies ${ }^{P}{ }_{i} \dot{J}_{i}(t) \jmath=1$. Thus if $S$ j$i=c$ ji for all ji in a subspace $S$, the $S$ is a DFS. N ext we prove necessity. For every $A_{i}(t)$ acting on a state $\bar{j} i$, we can separate the resulting state into a
 which depends on $A_{i}(t)$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i}(t) \dot{\jmath} i=a_{i}(t) \ddot{j} i+b_{i}(t) \dot{j}_{?} \text { (i) } i: \tag{5.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

The invariant condition on j̈i, Eq. (5.11)

$$
{ }_{i}^{x} \quad\left(a_{i}(t) \ddot{j} i+b_{i}(t) \ddot{j}:(i) i\right)\left(h j \dot{j}_{i}(t)+h j_{!} \text {(i) } b_{i}(t)\right)=\ddot{j} i h j \dot{j}
$$

or

$$
\left.x \quad \dot{\mathcal{A}}_{\mathrm{i}}(t)\right)^{2}=1:
$$

i

The OSR norm alization condition ${ }^{P}{ }_{i} A_{i}^{Y}(t) A_{i}(t)=I$ im plies
x

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{\mathfrak{a}}_{i}(t) \hat{\jmath}+p_{p_{i}}(t) \mathcal{f}=1: \tag{5.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus ${ }^{P}{ }_{i} j_{i}(t){ }^{\jmath}=0$ which implies $b_{i}(t)=0$ for all $i$ and $t$. $T$ hus we see that $A_{i}(t) j i=a_{i}(t) j i 1 . W$ e can now invoke the fundam ental algebraic theorem of decoherence. The span of the $A_{i}(t)$ for generic environm ental intitial conditions is identicalto the com plex associative algebra generated by the $S . T$ hus $A_{i}(t) j i=a_{i}(t) j i$


W e have seen how the condition Eq. (5.13) is an i condition for the existence of a DFS. Stated succinctly, a DFS is the degenerate com m on eigenspace of the S system operators. Perhaps the m ost im portant aspect of the D FS criteria is to notioe how degeneracy is essential to the de nition. A system -environm ent coupling which is degenerate cannot distinguish betw een the degenerate states.

### 5.3.2 Exam ple decoherence-free subspace

Let us exam ine a particularly sim ple exam ple of decoherence-free subspace. Suppose tw o qubits are coupled to a harm onic oscillator environm ent via the H am iltonian

$$
H=g\left(\begin{array}{llll}
z & I+I & z \tag{520}
\end{array}\right) \quad a+a^{y} ;
$$

where a $\left(a^{\mathrm{y}}\right)$ is the destruction (creation) operator for the harm onic oscillator. The O SR algebra is then the com plex associative algebra generated by the operators I and ( $z \quad I+I \quad z$ ). The second of these operators has eigenstates j00i, j01i, j10i, $j 11$ w th eigenvalues $2,0,0$, and 2 respectively. Thus there is a subspaces spanned by j01i and j10iwhich satis es the DFS condition Eq. (5.13). W e can now directly see how superpositions of these two basis states do not decohere

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp [\text { iH } t]\left(j 01 i+\text { j10i) } j_{\text {env }} i=(j 01 i+j 10 i) \quad j_{\text {env }} i ;\right. \tag{521}
\end{equation*}
$$

because z I + I z annihilates each basis state j01i and j10i. In general the H am iltonian operatorw ill not annihilate the states, but will act as a constant on the states. This im plies that a global phase to the subspace will be applied. H ow ever a global phase does not cause decoherence on the system .

### 5.3.3 System H am iltonian and the D FS

W e have de ned a decoherence-free subspace as a subspace for whidh the O SR evolution produces no evolution of the quantum inform ation stored in the subspace. C learly such a subspace would be useless for quantum com putation because the inform ation stored in the subspace does not evolve!

A system -environm ent H am iltonian can be expanded asH $=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{S}} \quad \mathrm{I}+\mathrm{I} \quad \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{E}}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{se}}$ where the all of the nontrivial coupling betw een the system and the environm ent is included in the $H_{S E}$ term. Fortim e independent $H$ am iltonians, all of the decoherence for general environm ental initial conditions com es from the $H_{\text {SE }}$ coupling. T hus the decoherence-fiee subspace condition should be applied to an expansion of the $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SE}}$. The unitary evolution $w$ ill then be due to $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{S}}$. This evolution should preserve the DFS. By this we mean that the evolution due to $H_{s}$ should not take states with support over the subspace to states w ith support outside of the subspace.

D e nition 5.3.2 (Subspace preserving $H$ am iltonian) A $H$ am iltonian $H$ preserves a
 expanded such that the states $\ddot{j} i$ which are entirely within the subspace $S$ or entirely outside of the subspace $S$.

N otige that because the spectral decom position is not unique when there is a degeneracy of the system H am iltonian, the subspace preserving condition m ust be de ned in term $s$ of if the spectral decom position can be $m$ ade such that the subspace is preserved.

If a system $H$ am iltonian $H_{s}$ preserves a subspace and that subspace is a D F S w ith respect to the system -environm ent coupling $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SE}}$, then the evolution of the D FS w ill be entirely unitary. W ew ill refer to a DFS which evolves unitarily by the term DFS unless a distinction is needed and then we will refer to a unitarily evolving D FS.

A nother way in which the presence of a system $H$ am iltonian can be dealt w ith is to work in the interaction picture. In the interaction picture, the evolution of a system due to the H am iltonian $\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{H}_{0}+\mathrm{V}$ is recast into exam ining the evolution of $\sim(t)=U{ }_{0}^{Y}(t) \quad(t) U_{0}(t)$ where $U_{0}(t)=\exp \left[\quad i H_{0} t\right]$. The evolution of $\sim(t)$ is given Schrodinger equation evolution under the interaction $H$ am iltonian $V(t)=$ $\mathrm{U}{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{Y}}(\mathrm{t}) \mathrm{V} \mathrm{U}_{0}(\mathrm{t})$. If $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ consists only of separate system and environm ent evolution (i.e. no system -environm ent coupling) then a state $j$ i which is invariant with respect to $V$ (t) will evolve unitarily. To see this sim ply note that if a state is invariant in the interaction picture, then $\quad(t)=j$ ih $j) \quad(t)=U U_{0}^{S}(t) j$ ih $j J_{0}^{S}(t){ }^{Y}$ where $U{ }_{0}^{S}(t)$ represents the system evolution operator alone.

### 5.3.4 D ecoherence-free subspaces and quantum error correction

The theory of quantum error correction (see, for exam ple, [120, 96, 153]) provides a $m$ ethod of preserving quantum coherence by actively $m$ anipulating the quantum inform ation. In this theory, one can show that certain encodings of quantum infor$m$ ation can be arranged such certain error processes can be detected and corrected on this encoding without destroying the coherence between the encoded quantum inform ation. Suppose E are a set of error operators which act on a given system . These errors are usually taken from an expansion of the OSR algebra, but are not necessarily a com plete basis for the O SR algebra. T hese errors usually represent \the largest" com ponent of the OSR operators often on som e short tim e expansion of the O SR operators.

A necessary and su cient condition for there to exist a subspace which can detect and correct these errors is given by $[21,120]$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { hiÆ }{ }^{y} E \quad \ddot{j} i=C \quad{ }_{i j} ; \tag{522}
\end{equation*}
$$

for the basis states $\ddot{\mu} i$ and $\ddot{j} i$ in the subspace and for all errors $E$ and $E$. The intuition behind this criteria is that the errors should take the basis states to distinguishable subspaces so that these errors can be diagnosed and then corrected.

H ow do DF subspaces $t$ in $w$ th the theory of quantum error correction? If we identify the error operators E w ith the OSR algebra, then the DF subspace characterizing Theorem 5.3.1, im plies that a DF subspace necessarily satis es the condition
where $\ddot{\text { il }}$ and jij are both in the D F subspace. Since c c is a rank one matrix, it is possible to choose a basis for the error operators $E$ such that hiJ ${ }^{Y} E \quad \mathrm{j} i=C_{i j}$. In the theory of quantum error correcting codes, the rank of the C matrix in Eq. (522) is known as the degeneracy of the code[96]. Thus we are lead to the characterization [135, 75]

Lem mas.3.1 A decoherence free subspace $S$ from some OSR algebra is a fully degenerate quantum error correcting code for all elem ents of the OSR algebra.

For more discussion of the relationship between quantum error correction and decoherence-free subspaces the reader is referred to [135, 75].

### 5.4 D ecoherence-free subsystem s

In the previous section we have seen how inform ation can be encoded into a subspace of the system 's H ibert space such that the inform ation does not decohere. For
constructing a quantum com puter, how ever, this condition is not the most general condition under which quantum inform ation can be stored in a decoherence-freem anner. The basic reason for this is that quantum inform ation is stored $m$ ost generally in subsystem $s$ and not necessarily subspaces.

To de ne a decoherence-free subsystem, we must rst de ne an operation which we will call the subsystem trace operator.
${\underset{L}{L}}_{\mathrm{D}}^{\mathrm{p}} \mathrm{e} \underset{\mathrm{N}}{\mathrm{N}} \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{p}}}^{\text {ition }}$ 5.4.1 Suppose a H ibert space H has a general subsystem structure $\mathrm{H}=$ $\underset{j=1}{p} \quad \underset{i=1}{n_{p}} H_{i j}$. Let $\mathrm{j}^{(j)} \mathrm{i}$ denote a basis for the subspace de ned by $j$ in this expansion. $\mathrm{k}^{(j)} \mathrm{i}$ is in the H ibert space ${\underset{\mathrm{N}}{\mathrm{n}=1}}_{\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{p}}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ and a basis over this tensor product structure is given by $\mathrm{j}_{1}^{(j)} \mathrm{i} \quad j_{2}^{(j)} i \quad{\underset{n}{(j)}}_{n_{j}}^{(j)}$.jow e de ne the subsystem trace operator over the subsystem $H_{i j}$ as

$$
\begin{equation*}
T r_{i j}[0]={\underset{k_{i}^{(j)}}{x} h k_{i}^{(j)} j \emptyset j_{i}^{(j)} i: ~}_{i} \tag{524}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e say that inform ation i has been encoded into a subsystem $H_{i j}$ when the density $m$ atrix of the full H ilbert space satis es

Let us de ne the above operator as the ij subsystem extractor,

This allows us to de ne what it $m$ eans to be decoherence-free when inform ation is encoded into a subsystem.

De nition 5.4.2 (D ecoherence-free subsystem (D FS ) ) G iven a system H ibert space with a general subsystem decom position $H=\underset{j=1}{\mathrm{~L}_{1}} \underset{\mathrm{i}=1}{\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{p}}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ij}}$. A subsystem $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ is said to be a decoherence-free subsystem (D F S) w ith respect to a system-environm ent coupling if every pure state encoded into this subsystem is invariant $w$ ith respect to this subsystem under the corresponding O SR evolution for any possible environm ent initialcondition. If denotes the situation where the pure state $j$ i has been encoded in the $H_{i j}$ subsystem, then this condition is equivalent to
${ }_{i j}{ }_{k}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{A}_{\mathrm{k}}(\mathrm{t}) \quad A_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{y}}(\mathrm{t})=\mathrm{j}$ ih $j:$

W e use the abbreviation D FS for both decoherence-free subspaces and decoherencefree subsystem s . We can see from the above de nition of a decoherence-firee subsystem, decoherence-free subspaces are exam ples of decoherence-free subsystem s. In particular decoherence-free subspaces occur when the $m$ atrix algebra $M_{d_{J}}$ is one di$m$ ensional $d_{J}=1$ and hence all of the operators act as a constant on a subspac.

Unless we need to distinguish between the subsystem and subspace de nitions, we w ill refer to both as D FSs.

W hat is the di erence between storing inform ation in a subspace and storing inform ation in a subsystem ? This question often leads to confusion, so let us address this by exam ining an ilhum inating exam ple. C onsider encoding a single qubit of inform ation into a two qubit system. O ne particular way to encode a qubit into the four dim ensional H ibert space of two qubits is to encode the inform ation into a subspace spanned by two orthogonal states. Thus for instance we can encode the inform ation of a qubit j0i+ jlias j01i+ j10i:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { joi }+ \text { jli! j01i+ j10i: } \tag{528}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e then say that the inform ation has been encoded into a subspace of the two qubit H ilbert space. Suppose we sim ply encode the inform ation into the rst qubit of the two qubits. It doesn't m atter, then, what the state of the second qubit is
jOi+ jil! ( joit jli) ji:
$N$ otioe that this $m$ ap is a one-to $m$ any $m$ apping from the quantum inform ation in one qubit to a two qubit H ibert space. For a particularm apping to a $j$ i, the mapping is the sam e as the $m$ apping from a qubit to a subspace of the tw o qubit $H$ ilbert space.

### 5.4.1 Representation theory for the O SR algebra

$\backslash T$ he universe is an enom ous direct product of representations of sym m etry groups."
\{Steve W einberg (as quoted in [89])
W e now present a theorem which exactly delineates where quantum inform ation can be stored decoherence-free in a quantum system. First we note that the OSR algebra is a $y$-closed algebra. A y-closed algebra is an algebra that satis es the requirem ent that if $S$ is the algebra, then $S^{y}$ is also in the algebra. For the O SR algebra, this follows from the herm iticity of the system -environm ent $H$ am iltonian.

The theorem we want is a basic theorem from representation theory of com plex associative algebras which are y -closed (see, for exam ple, [131])

Theorem 5.4.1 (B asic representation theorem of $y$-closed com plex associative algebras) Let A be a com plex associate algebra which is $y$-closed acting on a H ibert space H and which contains the identity operator. In generalA w illbe a reducible subalgebra of the full algebra over $H$. In particular the algebra $A$ is isom orphic to a direct sum of fullm atrix algebras

$$
\begin{equation*}
A={ }_{J 2 J}^{M} I_{n_{J}} \quad M_{G J}: \tag{5.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $I_{d}$ is the d dim ensionalidentity algebra (which just consists of the d dim ensional identity operator) and $M_{d}$ is the d dim ensional com plex associative algebra corresponding to all general linear operators on the d dim ensional space.
$J$ is a set describing the di erent irreducible representations and $n_{J}$ is referred to as the degeneracy of the Jth irreducible representation (irrep). This theorem implies that there is a basis such that the operation ofevery operators in a y-closed com plex associative algebra acts on the H ilbert space as

$$
\begin{equation*}
S={ }_{J 2 J}^{M} I_{n_{J}} \quad S_{d_{J}} ; \tag{5.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $S_{d_{J}}$ is a $d_{J}$ dim ensionaloperator and $I_{n_{J}}$ is the $n_{J}$ dim ensionalidentity operator. Because $M_{d}$ is the d dim ensional com plex associative algebra corresponding to all general linear operators on a d dim ensional space, the $S_{d_{J}}$ span the entire space of $d_{J}$ dim ensional operators.

C orresponding to the decom position in Eq. (5.31) we can construct a basis which w ill sim plify our notation considerably. Let jJ; ;m i denote the basis where $J$ labels the subspace of the irrep, labels the degenerate com ponent of the decom position and $m$ labels the com ponent of the com position which is acted upon non-trivially by the irrep. This basis im plies that the decom position Eq. (5.31) can be w ritten as

A nother usefiuloperator to de ne is the operator which perform s the subsystem trace over the $m$ atrix algebra com ponent of a given irrep. De ne

$$
\begin{equation*}
J[0]={\underset{m}{x} h J ; m j 0 j J ; m i ; ~}_{x} \tag{5.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we im plicitly use the subsystem structure for a given $J$, jJ; ;mi=jJ;minim in this sum.

The basic representation theorem of com plex associative $y$-closed algebras describes a subsystem structure which we previously identi ed as a subspace tensor product structure. G iven a J 2 J for an algebra A there is a subspace over which the operators act. O ne $m$ anner in whid quantum inform ation can be encoded w ith respect to the algebra $A$ is to encode the inform ation into the subspace for a given $J$. Inform ation encoded in this $m$ anner is acted upon non-trivially by the operators in the algebra $A$. O ver the subspace for a given $J$, there is a tw o-fold tensor product structure. Inform ation which is encoded into the subspace corresponding to a particular $J$ can then be encoded such that it respects this tensor product structure. Thus inform ation in the subspace can be encoded into the degenerate degrees of freedom corresponding to the $I_{n_{J}}$ algebra or the inform ation can be encoded into the degrees
of freedom corresponding to the $M_{d_{J}}$ algebra. W e say that inform ation has been encoded into the degeneracy of the $J$ th irrep if that inform ation has support only over the degrees of freedom of the $I_{n_{J}}$ algebra. $N$ otice that because we are encoding into a subsystem, for a given $J$ inform ation which is encoded into the degeneracy will be accom panied by inform ation encoded into the degrees of freedom of the $M_{d_{J}}$ algebra.

### 5.4.2 D ecoherence-free subsystem condition

The basic representation theorem of com plex associative algebras com bined with the fundam ental algebraic theorem of decoherence together form an excellent i description of decoherence on a quantum system. G iven an OSR algebra generated by the system operators $S$, we can decom pose this algebra as in Eq. (5.31). This in tum im plies that we can represent the O SR operators as

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i}(t)={ }_{J 2 J}^{M} I_{n_{J}} \quad\left(A_{d_{J}}\right)_{i}(t) ; \tag{5.34}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\left(\mathbb{A}_{d_{J}}\right)_{i}(t)$ are $d_{J}$ dim ensional OSR operators. The span of the $\left(\mathbb{A}_{d_{J}}\right)_{i}(t)$ are the entire space of all $d_{J}$ linear operators and the $\left(A A_{d}\right)_{i}(t)$ are them selves valid O SR operators which satisfy the com pleteness relation ${ }_{i}\left(\mathbb{A}_{d_{J}}\right)_{i}^{y}(t)\left(\mathbb{A}_{d_{J}}\right)_{i}(t)=I_{d_{J}}$.

Theorem 5.4.2 (D ecoherence-free subsystem Ham ittonian criteria) [122] A subsystem is a decoherence-fire subsystem i this subsystem is encoded in the degeneracy of single irrep $J$ from the OSR algebra $A={ }^{L}{ }_{\mathrm{J} 2 \mathrm{~J}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{n}_{J}} \quad \mathrm{Md}_{\mathrm{J}}$.

Proof: First, su ciency. Suppose that the pure state $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{J}} \mathrm{i}$ is encoded into the degeneracy of a single irrep $J$ of the $O S R$ algebra $A={ }_{J 2 J} I_{n_{J}} \quad M_{H_{J}}$. This means that
where $d_{J}$ is any arbitrary $d_{J}$ dim ensionaldensity $m$ atrix and $0_{d}$ is the $d$ dim ensional zero m atrix. W e w ill represent this state as

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\text { 并ihjjj do } \tag{5.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ here the support of the density $m$ atrix is taken to be only over the $J$ irrep. The OSR operators then act on the this states as

Thus we see that the pure state ji encoded into the degeneracy of the algebra is invariant w ith respect to the subsystem. N ext we prove necessity. N otioe that the decoherence-fire subsystem can be thought of as a decoherence-fire subspace after a certain subsystem reduction has been perform ed. We can thus use the necessary com ponent of the decoherence-free subspace condition after we trace over the appropriate subsystem. Suppose the in form ation was encoded into a subsystem which does not correspond to the degeneracy of a given irrep J in Eq. (5.34). T his inform ation w ill not be acted upon proportional to identity because (i) a com ponent of the inform ation is encoded into the $M_{d_{j}}$ algebras, (ii) a com ponent of the inform ation is encoded into di erent irreps labeled by $J$, or (iii) both (i) and (ii). In case (i), the inform ation $w$ ill be acted upon nontrivially over the subsystem because the $M_{d_{J}}$ are the fullm atrix algebra over such a space. In case (ii), the inform ation will be acted upon by di ering algebras. This allow sfor di ering global factors betw een the O SR operators. F inally, in case (iii) the inform ation is infected by both of these problem s. The decoherence-free subspace i condition then im plies that the inform ation $m$ ust be encoded into the degeneracy of the a single irrep of the O SR algebra.

### 5.4.3 The com m utant of the O SR algebra and D F S s

G iven an O SR algebra A, how does one know whether there is a degeneracy over which inform ation can be encoded in a degenerate $m$ anner? T he easiest way to exam ine this question is to exam ine the com $m$ utant of the $O S R$ algebra. The com $m$ utant of an algebra $A$ is denoted by $A^{0}$ and is the set of all operators which com $m$ ute w ith all of the elem ents of A. The com $m$ utant of the com $m$ utant of an algebra is itself the algebra $\left(A^{0}\right)^{0}=A$. If the algebra $A$ is reducible to the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=\sum_{J 2 J}^{M} I_{n_{J}} \quad M_{G_{J}} ; \tag{5,38}
\end{equation*}
$$

as in Eq. (5.30), then the com m utant of the algebra is reducible to the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{0}={\underset{J 2 J}{M} M_{n_{J}} \quad I_{d_{J}}:, ~}_{\text {: }} \tag{5.39}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus the existence of a non-trivial com m utant of the O SR algebra im plies the existence of a DFS for the OSR algebra.

### 5.4.4 Exam ple decoherence-free subsystem

H ere we consider a sim ple exam ple of a decoherence-free subsystem. This exam ple is not $m$ otivated physically (we will retum to physically m otivated exam ples later) but serves as a good ilhustration of a decoherence-free subsystem. C onsider a three qubit system coupled to a bath via the H am iltonian

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=x \quad x \quad x \quad B_{x}+\quad z \quad z \quad z \quad B_{z} ; \tag{5.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

where B are linearly independent bath operators. The OSR algebra A for this Ham iltonian is generated by the set of operators fI ; $\mathrm{x} \quad \mathrm{x} \quad \mathrm{x}$; $\quad \mathrm{z} \quad \mathrm{z} \quad{ }_{\mathrm{z}} \mathrm{g}$. C losing this algebra A we see that the O SR algebra A is spanned by the operators fI; x x xi y y y; z z zg.

A com plete set of com $m$ uting observables for the three qubit system is given by the operators $Z_{12}=z \quad z \quad I, Z_{23}=I \quad z \quad z$, and $Z_{123}=z \quad z \quad z \cdot D e n e$ the basis labeled by the eigenvalues of these operators via $\dot{j}_{12} ; z_{23} ; z_{123} i$. Expressing these basis states in term $s$ of the standard com putationalbasis we nd that

$$
\begin{align*}
& j+1 ;+1 ;+1 i=j 000 i ; j+1 ;+1 ; \quad 1 i=j 11 i ; j+1 ; 1 ;+1 i=j 10 i ; \\
& j+1 ; 1 ; \quad 1 i=j 001 i ; j 1 ;+1 ;+1 i=j 011 i ; j 1 ;+1 ; \quad 1 i=j 100 i \\
& j \quad 1 ; 1 ;+1 i=j 101 i ; \quad j \quad 1 ; \quad 1 ; \quad 1 i=j 010 i: \tag{5.41}
\end{align*}
$$

$N$ ext notice how the operators in the O SR algebra A only a ect the $z_{123}$ index:

$$
\begin{align*}
& z \quad z \quad z \dot{\bar{k}}_{12} ; z_{23} ; z_{123} \dot{i}=z_{123} \dot{\underline{z}}_{12} ; z_{23} ; z_{123} \dot{i} \\
& \times \quad \times \quad \times \dot{\mathcal{Z}}_{12} ; z_{23} ; z_{123} i=\dot{\mathcal{K}}_{12} ; z_{23} ; z_{23} i \tag{5.42}
\end{align*}
$$

i.e. we could have w ritten this such that only the $\mathrm{z}_{123}$ subsystem is a ected

$$
\begin{equation*}
\dot{\mathfrak{j}}_{12} ; z_{23} ; z_{123} i=\dot{\jmath}_{12} ; z_{23} \dot{i} \quad \text { O } \dot{z}_{123} \dot{i}: \tag{5.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus two qubits of inform ation can be stored in $z_{12}$ and $z_{23}$ which will not decohere under the coupling H am iltonian Eq. (5.40). N otioe how the O SR algebra can and does a ect the $z_{123}$ quantum num ber, but this coupling does not destroy the inform ation in the quantum num bers $z_{12}$ and $z_{23}$. This is the essential com ponent of a decoherencefree subsystem which di ers from a decoherence-free subspace. In the subspace case, the inform ation in an subspace does not evolve while in the subsystem case, degrees of freedom other than those of the subsystem evolve. In term s of the OSR algebra A we see that the algebra is reducible to the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=I_{4} \quad M: \tag{5.44}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e also could have seen that inform ation can be encoded into a D FS by exam ining the com $m$ utant of the O SR algebra. The com $m$ utant of the O SR algebra is generated
 generated this set of operators is a tw o-fold degenerate 4 dim ensionalm atrix algebra:

$$
\begin{equation*}
A^{0}=M_{4} \quad I_{2}: \tag{5.45}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 5.5 M aster equation decoherence-free conditions

W e recall that the diagonal form of the sem igroup $m$ aster equation (SM E) is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.\left.\frac{@ \quad(t)}{@ t}=i \mathbb{H} ; \quad(t)\right]+\frac{1}{2}_{60}^{x} \quad \mathbb{L} \quad(t) ; L^{y}\right]+\mathbb{L} ; \quad(t) L^{y}\right] ; \tag{5.46}
\end{equation*}
$$

where the $L$ are the $L$ indblad operators. H ere we present conditions for decoherencefree evolution for the SM E.W ew ill ignore the evolution due to the system H am iltonian (see Section 5.3.3), $\mathrm{H}=0$.

Theorem 5.5.1 (D ecoherence-free subspace master equation criteria) [211, 137] A subspace $S$ of the system $H$ ibert space $H_{s}$ is a decoherence-free subspace when evolving due to a sem igroup $m$ aster equation $i$ the $L$ indblad operators allsatisfy $L$ ji $i=c$ ji for every ग̈i 2 S .

Proof: Su ciency follows via the fact that if $L$ गji $=\ddot{j} i$, then $\mathbb{L} ; \vec{j} i h j j]=0$. Thus if the in itial state is $\ddot{j} i h j j$ j then the decoherence term vanishes:

Thus $\frac{\varrho(t)}{\varrho t}=0$ and the state is a DFS. To show the necessity of this condition, note that $\frac{\varrho(t)}{\varrho t}=0 \mathrm{implies}$ that

If each $L$ acts on the states $\bar{j} i$ as $L=a \operatorname{ji} i+b$ j ? ( )i, then this implies

$$
\begin{equation*}
x_{60}^{x} \rho=0 \text {; } \tag{5.49}
\end{equation*}
$$

and hence each $\mathrm{b}=0$. Thus the condition is also necessary.
For subsystem $s$, the situation, unfortunately is not quite as easy. $F$ irst let us de ne the SM E algebra

De nition 5.5.1 (SM E algebra) Suppose one is given a sem igroup $m$ aster equation with diagonal Lindblad operators L. The SM E algebra is the complex associative algebra generated by the $L$ indblad operators $L$, their adjoints $L^{y}$ and identity I.

H aving de ned the SM E algebra, we can present a su cient condition fordecoherencefree evolution under the SM E.

Theorem 5.5.2 (D ecoherence-free subsystem sem igroup master equation criteria) A su cient criteria for the existence of a decoherence-free subsystem under the evolution of a sem igroup $m$ aster equation is that the subsystem is acted upon as identity by the corresponding SM E algebra.

P roof: The Lindblad operators and their adjoints along with the identily act as the reducible com plex associative algebra such that we can express these operators as

If we encode into the degeneracy of irrep $J$, then the initial density $m$ atrix of the system willbe
such that $\mathrm{J}[\mathrm{]}=\mathrm{j} \mathrm{j} i h j j$. It is then easy to check that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.\frac{@ J[(t)]}{@ t}=J \frac{" @(t)^{\#}}{@ t}={ }_{J}^{4} \frac{1}{2}_{60}^{2} \quad \llbracket \quad(t) ; L^{y}\right]+\mathbb{L} ; \quad(t) L^{y}\right]^{5}=0: \tag{5.52}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us also give an exam ple ofw hy the above condition cannot be also a necessary condition [109]. Suppose we are given a single qubit which is sub jected to a sem igroup $m$ aster equation $w$ ith only one non-zero $L_{1}=\quad=\left(\begin{array}{ll}x & i_{y}\end{array}\right)$. This situation corresponds to a single tw o-level system sub ject to spontaneous decay. C learly there is a stationary state of the system j0i which does not evolve. H ow ever, if one exam ine the algebra generated by $\mathrm{L}_{1}, \mathrm{~L}_{1}^{y}$ and I , one can easily see that any linear operator over the two-qubits can be found in this algebra. T hen according to the above criteria, there w ould be no states which do not evolve. B ut this is a contradiction to our earlier observation. Thus the condition is su cient but not necessarily necessary. Only in the subspace regim e does the above condition becom e necessary and su cient.
$W$ hy did the condition we used in the OSR fail for the SME? The m ain reason for this is that the SM E represents evolution which is a sem igroup (a group without the requirem ent that every elem ent have an inverse). W hat is needed in order to obtain a necessary and su cient condition is representation theory for sem igroups. W e will not delve into this sub ject but in the nite dim ensional case there should be no di culty applying representation theory of sem igroups to the decoherence-free problem.

### 5.6 Inducing decoherence-free conditions

A nal topic which we would like to address is the issue of inducing or sym $m$ etrizing the evolution of a system such that the system -environm ent coupling exhibits a certain sym $m$ etry which supports a decoherence-free condition. V iola and

Lloyd [196, 197] were the rst to suggest that it $m$ ight be possible to use ultra-fast system evolution to reduce decoherence in the context of quantum com putation (see also [74, 77, 199]). V iola, Lloyd, and K nill [198, 194] and independently Zanardi $[213,212,218]$ then developed the $m$ athem atical theory behind these sym $m$ etrization schem es and dem onstrated how universal quantum com putation could also be perform ed on these system s . W ith the sem inal paper of K nill, $L$ La am m e , and $V$ iola [122] which introduced the notion of decoherence-free subsystem $s$, it was quidkly realized by V iola, K nill, and Lloyd [195] and by Zanardi[214] that there is an intim ate relationship between the ideas of sym $m$ etrized evolutions and decoherence-firee subsystem $s$. It is this relationship which we will now brie y described.

Suppose that one has the ability to perform ultra-fast gates and their inverses on a system from som e the unitary representation of some nite group $G$. Let $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{g}}$ be represent of the elem ent $g$ of this group. If one applies the operation $\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{g}}$, then allow s the system to evolve according to som e H am iltonian H , and nally applies the operation $G \underset{g}{\mathrm{~g}}$, the resulting operation is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{g}}^{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{iH} \mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{g}}=e^{\mathrm{itG}_{\mathrm{g}}^{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{Hg}} ; ~} \tag{5.53}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that the system e ectively evolves according to the $H$ am iltonian $H$ eff $=G{ }_{g}{ }^{Y} H G_{g}$. Suppose that all elem ents of the groups are applied in this fashion to an evolution due to som e $H$ am iltonian $H$. The evolution is then approxim ately

$$
\begin{equation*}
G_{g_{1}}^{Y} e^{\text {iH } t^{t}} G_{g_{1}} G_{g_{2}}^{Y} e^{\text {iH }}{ }^{t} G_{g_{2}} \quad{ }_{g_{p}}^{Y} e G^{i H} G_{g_{p}} \quad e^{i H_{\text {eff } f} j \sigma j t} ; \tag{5.54}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $j G j$ is the order of the group $G$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{e f f}=\frac{1}{j G}{ }_{\mathrm{g} 2 \mathrm{G}}^{\mathrm{X}} \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{g}}^{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{H} \mathrm{G}_{\mathrm{g}} \text { : } \tag{5.55}
\end{equation*}
$$

De ne the G-sym m etrizing operator

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{G}[X]=\frac{1}{J_{G} j_{g 2 G}}{ }^{X}{ }_{g}^{Y} X G_{g}: \tag{5.56}
\end{equation*}
$$

$N$ otice that $\left.P i_{G} \mathbb{X}\right]$ com $m$ utes $w$ ith all of the elem ent of $G$

De ne $\mathbb{C} G$ as the com plex associative algebra generated by elem ents of the group $G$. $W$ e call this algebra the group algebra. This algebra is reducible, $\mathbb{C G}={ }^{L}{ }_{\mathrm{J} 2 \mathrm{~J}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{J}}}$ $M_{d_{J}}$. O perators acted on by $\left.{ }_{G},{ }_{G} \mathbb{X}\right]$ are all in the commutant $\mathbb{C} G^{0}$ of the group algebra. This algebra is reducible to the form $\mathbb{C} G={ }_{J 2 J} M_{n_{J}} \quad I_{d_{J}}$.

Suppose the $G$-sym $m$ etrizing procedure is applied to the system com ponent of a system -environm ent coupling $H_{S B}={ }^{P} \quad S \quad B . T$ hen if this procedure is applied fast enough [196], the evolution of the system and environm ent will be govemed by the e ective H am iltonian

$$
\left.{ }_{G}\left[\mathbb{H}_{S B}\right]\right]^{x} \quad{ }_{G}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
{[S} & ] & B \tag{5.58}
\end{array}\right.
$$

O ne can now apply the decoherence-fiee conditions to the sym $m$ etrized system operators

$$
\begin{equation*}
S ; \text { eff }=\frac{1}{j G} j_{g 2 G}^{X}{ }_{g}^{y} S G_{g}: \tag{5.59}
\end{equation*}
$$

A s we described above, the $S$;eff can be reduced because they are in the com $m$ utant of the group algebra. M ore generally, if the $S$ for a com plete basis for the filllm atrix algebra of the system 's H ilbert space, then the $S$;eff $w$ ill exactly realize the entire com $m$ utant $\mathbb{C} G^{0}$ of the group algebra $\mathbb{C G}$.

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{\text {;eff }}={ }^{M} S_{J 2 J} \mathrm{n}_{J} \quad \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{J}} ; \tag{5.60}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $S ; n_{J}$ are $n_{J}$ dim ensional operators which act on the degeneracy of the $J$ th irrep.

Thus we see that there is an intim ate connection between the sym $m$ etrization procedure described above and decoherence-free condition. By sym m etrizing the evolution, a sym metry in the system-environm ent coupling can be induced and a decoherence-free subspace or subsystem can be used to store protected quantum inform ation.

### 5.7 A brief history of decoherence-free conditions

D ecoherence-free subspaces are som ew hat related to pointer bases[222, 223]. In particular decoherence-free subspaces can be thought of as degenerate pointer basis: the kind of pointer basis which would cause ts for the $m$ easurem ent problem interpretation usually attached to environm ent-induced pointer basis selection. A lso related are the D icke states ofoptics [60]. B oth of these exam ple, how ever, degeneracy was nothing $m$ ore than a theoretical hindrance.

The rst indication of states which are resistant to decoherence as applied to quantum com putation was the work of Palm a, Suom inen, and Ekert[155] as well as the work of Chuang and Yam am oto [44,51]. These authors $m$ ade observations of speci c dephasing based D F subspaces and noted the consequences of these states for quantum com putation.

W ork on concrete realizations of $F$ subspaces was presented in a series of papers by D uan and $\mathrm{Guo}[67,68,215,69,70,71,72,73,76]$. These authors derived di erent
physical conditions under which D F subspaces could exist. M ost of this work was presented in the context of sem igroup $m$ aster equations and focused solely on the theory the existence of such subspaces for speci c exam ples.

The rst work to $m$ athem atically put dow $n$ the DF subspace condition were the sem inal papers of $Z$ anardi and $R$ asetti[216, 210, 217]. In these papers Zanardi and $R$ asetti put forth the Ham iltonian i criteria for the existence of a DF subspace. Zanardiand R ossialso developed proposals for physical realization ofD $F$ subspaces in quantum dots[219,220]. The sem igroup $m$ aster equation i criteria for D F subspaces was then derived by Zanardi[211] and by Lidar, C huang, and W haley [137].

D eveloping, at rst independently from D F conditions, V iola and L loyd presented the notion that sym $m$ etrization could be used to avoid decoherence[196, 197, 198, 194]. D uan and G uo also exam ined pulsed control of decoherence[74, 77]. Zanardi developed the generalm athem atical theory of such sym m etrization [213]. B oth V iola, Lloyd and K nill[195] along w ith Zanardi[212] also presented $m$ ethods for perform ing com putation on such sym $m$ etrized evolutions.

In an im portant generalization of the D F subspace notion, the w ork on dynam ical induced symm etrization led K nill, La amme, and V iola to introduce the notion of D F subsystem s[122]. D F subsystem s were also derived, independently, by de Filipo. $T$ his was the rst derivation of the DF subsystem criteria. Zanardi[214, 218] and V iola, K nill, and La am m e[195] then discussed the dynam icalgeneration of coherence preserving evolutions and the general theory of D F subsystem s.

### 5.8 D ecoherence-free conditions

D F subspaces and their generalization D F subsystem so er a m ethod for avoiding speci c sym $m$ etric decoherence $m$ echanism. In the next few chapters we explore the stability ofD FSs and how DFSs $t$ in $w$ th the notion of a quantum com puterbefore tuming to a concrete physical realization of a D FS. It should be m entioned, how ever, that a recent experim ent $[111,110]$ using ion traps has dem onstrated the existence of a D F subspace. Thus this work is not just a matter of wishful theorizing: there is experim entalevidence that the notion ofD FSSw illplay an im portant role in a future quantum computer.

## C hapter 6

## Stability of D ecoherenceFree System s

D oes poking and prodding decoherence-fire system s rem ove the free from decoherence-free?

In this chapter we address the issue of the stability of decoherence-free system s to additional perturbing decoherence processes. W e rst give a sim ple exam ple of the stability of a decoherence-free subspace. T he stability of a D FS w ith respect to a mem ory delity is treated within both the OSR and SME. If the strength of the perturbation is, the decoherencerates to all orders are shown to vary as $O\left({ }^{2}\right)$. $F$ inally, the issue of the dynam ical stability of a D FS is addressed.

### 6.1 Stability exam ple for a decoherence-free subspace

Suppose one has a decoherence-free subsystem corresponding to som e system environm ent coupling. This coupling $m$ ay be extrem ely strong and thus it is not unreasonable to think that a perturbing non-decoherence-free supporting interaction could couple w th this strong evolution yielding a decoherence-free subsystem which is highly unstable. In this chapter we will concem ourselves with understanding the stability of such a situation. Before we proceed to the $m$ athem atically $m$ essy calculation, how ever, it is useful to present the sim plest exam ple of such stability. This analysis was rst presented by Lidar, C huang and $W$ haley in [137].

C onsider the addition of a perturbing interaction to that of a DFS supporting evolution in the SME:

$$
\left.\left.\frac{@(t)}{@ t}={ }^{X} \text { a } \quad \mathbb{F} ; \quad(t) F^{Y}\right]+\mathbb{F} \quad(t) ; F^{Y}\right]
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& +a^{0}\left[G ;(t) F^{Y}\right]+[G \\
& +a^{\infty}\left[\mathbb{F} ;(t) ; G^{Y}\right]+\mathbb{F}  \tag{6.1}\\
& \left.(t) ; G^{\mathrm{Y}}\right]:
\end{align*}
$$

W e are interested here in the rst-order decoherence rate (see A ppendix A.6)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{1}=\operatorname{Tr} \quad(0) \frac{@}{@ t}(0)^{\#}: \tag{62}
\end{equation*}
$$

If we encoded into a DF subspaces, $(0)=j$ ih $j$ then $F \quad(0)=(0) F=$ C (0) where we have $m$ ade the sim plifying assum ption that $F$ is herm itian and is a basis w ith the sam e algebraic structure as that of the Lindblad operators and their adjoints (the SM E algebra). This in tum im plies that

$$
\operatorname{Tr}^{h} \quad(0)\left[G \quad ; \quad(0) F^{y}\right]+\left[G \quad(0) ; F^{y}\right]^{i}=0 \text {; }
$$

by using the cyclical property of the trace. This holds for the other perturbing term as well. Thus we se that the rst-order decoherence rate vanishes to order under a
strong perturbation. In the follow ing sections we expand this result to higher orders and work in both the OSR and the SM E. Furtherm ore we also generalize this result to the subsystem s situation. This extends the subspace analysis originally presented in [10].

### 6.2 Stability under the operator-sum representation

C onsider the addition to a D FS supporting Ham iltonian of new perturbing term s in the interaction $H$ am iltonian: $H_{S B}^{0}=H_{S B}+H_{I}^{0}$. The new fullevolution operator is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
U^{0}(t) & =\exp \left[i H_{S B}^{0} t\right]=X^{X^{B}} \frac{(i t)^{n}}{n!}\left(H_{S B}+H_{I}^{0}\right)^{n} \\
& =U(t)+\sum_{k=1}^{X^{B}} k_{n=k}^{X^{B}} \frac{(i t)^{n}}{n!} f_{n}^{(k)}\left(H_{S B} ; H_{I}^{0}\right) ; \tag{6.4}
\end{align*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{f}_{1}^{(1)}\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}} ; \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0}\right)=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0} \\
& \mathrm{f}_{2}^{(1)}\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}} ; \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0}\right)=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}} \\
& \mathrm{f}_{3}^{(1)}\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}} ; \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0}\right)=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}}^{2} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}}^{2} \\
& \mathrm{f}_{2}^{(2)}\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}} ; \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0}\right)=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{02} \\
& \mathrm{f}_{3}^{(2)}\left(\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}} ; \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0}\right)=\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{02}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0}+\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{02} \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{SB}} ; \tag{6.5}
\end{align*}
$$

etc. $H$ ere $U(t)=\exp \left[i H_{S B} t\right]$ is the unperturbed evolution operator. In this chapter we will concem ourselves w ith the correction due of the evolution to rst order in the perturbing param eter :

$$
\begin{equation*}
U^{0}(t)=U(t)+X_{n=1}^{X^{1}} \frac{(i t)^{p}}{n!} f_{n}^{(1)}\left(H_{S B} ; H_{I}^{0}\right)+O\left({ }^{2}\right): \tag{6.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

C orresponding to this evolution operator are the O SR operators

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i=(;)}^{0}(t)=A_{i}(t)+p_{p}^{P_{n=1}^{A}} \frac{(i t)^{n}}{n!} h \dot{f}_{n}^{(1)}\left(H_{S B} ; H_{I}^{0}\right) j i+O\left(^{2}\right): \tag{6.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

Expand the unperturbed O SR operators and the perturbing term sabout di erent xed basis (see Section 22.2) F and G :

$$
\begin{aligned}
& A_{i}(t)={ }^{X} \quad b_{i}(t) F
\end{aligned}
$$

such that the evolution operator to rst order in is

$$
\begin{equation*}
A_{i}^{0}(t)={ }^{X} b_{i}(t) F+G(t) G+O\left({ }^{2}\right): \tag{6.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

The evolution due to this O SR is thus

$$
\begin{equation*}
(t)={ }^{X} \quad{ }^{f f}(t) F \quad(0) F^{y}+\quad{ }^{f g} F \quad(0) G^{y}+\quad{ }^{g f} G \quad(0) F^{y}+O\left({ }^{2}\right) ; \tag{6.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ${ }^{f f}={ }^{P}{ }_{i} b_{i} b_{i},{ }^{f g}={ }^{P}{ }_{i} b_{i} C_{i}$, and ${ }^{g f}={ }^{P}{ }_{i} C_{i} b_{i}$. The norm alization condition is

$$
\mathrm{X} \quad{ }^{\mathrm{ff}} \mathrm{~F}^{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{~F}+{ }^{\mathrm{fg}} \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{~F}+{ }_{\mathrm{gf}} \mathrm{~F}^{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{G}+\mathrm{O}\left({ }^{2}\right)=\mathrm{I}:
$$

As in Section 2.22 we can separate out the identity com ponents of the evolution and norm alization conditions and obtain

$$
\begin{aligned}
(t) \quad(0)= & i^{\mathrm{h}} \mathrm{~S}^{\mathrm{ff}}(\mathrm{t})+\mathrm{S}^{f g}(\mathrm{t})+\mathrm{S}^{\mathrm{ff}}(\mathrm{t}) ;(0)^{i} \\
& +\mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{ff}}(\mathrm{t})[(0)]+\mathrm{L}^{f g}(\mathrm{t})[(0)]+\mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{gf}}(\mathrm{t})[(0)]+\mathrm{O}\left({ }^{2}\right) ;(6.12)
\end{aligned}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& S^{f f}(t)=\frac{i}{2}{ }_{\neq 0}^{\mathrm{f}}{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{ff}}(\mathrm{t}) \mathrm{F} \quad{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{ff}}(\mathrm{t}) \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{Y}} \\
& S^{f g}(t)=\frac{i x}{2} \underset{f_{0}}{\mathrm{fg}}{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{f}}(\mathrm{t}) \mathrm{F} \quad{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{fg}}(\mathrm{t}) \mathrm{G}^{\mathrm{y}} \\
& S^{g f}(t)=\frac{i}{2}_{\neq 0}^{\mathrm{X}}{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{gf}}(\mathrm{t}) \mathrm{G} \quad{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{gf}}(\mathrm{t}) \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{y}} \text {; } \tag{6.13}
\end{align*}
$$

and

Suppose that quantum inform ation $\mathrm{ji} i$ is encoded into the degeneracy of the $J$ th irrep of the OSR algebra of the unperturbed OSR evolution: $\quad \mathrm{J}[(0)]=$ jihijj or
$(0)=$ 并ihjj $d_{j}$ The pth order decoherence rate $p$ for this evolution is given by (see A ppendix A.6)

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{p}^{!p}=\operatorname{Tr}^{h} J[(0)]_{J}^{h}{ }^{(p)}(0)^{\text {ii }}=h j j J^{h}(0)(0)^{i} \ddot{\partial} i ; \tag{6.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ${ }^{(p)}(0)$ is the pth tim e derivative of the evolved density $m$ atrix $\quad(t)$ evaluated at $t=0$. Recall that

$$
\begin{equation*}
J[X]={\underset{m}{X} h J ; m \text { X } j J ; m i ; ~}_{\text {i }} \tag{6.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

transform s an operator X on the fullH ilbert space to an operator which acts only on the degeneracy of the Jth irrep. N ow , explicitly, we can calculate that

$$
\begin{align*}
& { }^{(p)}(0)=h^{\text {i }}{ }^{f f(p)}(0)+S^{f g(p)}(0)+S^{g f(p)}(0) ;(0)^{i} \\
& +\mathrm{L}^{f f(0)}(0)[(0)]+\mathrm{L}^{f g(0)}(0)[(0)]+\mathrm{L}^{\mathrm{gf}(0)}(0)[(0)]+\mathrm{O}\left(^{2}\right):(0 \tag{6.17}
\end{align*}
$$

U sing this expression we can evaluate the contribution of each term to pth order decoherence rate. F irst we nd that

$$
\begin{align*}
& +i h j j{ }_{m}^{X} h J ; m j_{n_{J}} \quad \text { d } S^{f f(p)}(0)+S^{f g(p)}(0)+S^{g f(p)}(0) \quad j J ; m i j i \\
& =0 \text {; } \tag{6.18}
\end{align*}
$$

where we have used the fact

$$
{ }_{J}\left[\begin{array}{ll}
\left(I_{n_{J}}\right. & \left.X_{d_{J}}\right) Y
\end{array}\right]=\quad J\left[\begin{array}{lll}
Y & \left(I_{n_{J}}\right. & \left.X_{d_{J}}\right) \tag{6.19}
\end{array}\right]:
$$

N ext, because the unperturbed evolution is a DFS,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{hjj}_{J}{ }^{h} L^{f f(p)}(t)[(0)]^{i} \ddot{j} i=0 \text { : } \tag{620}
\end{equation*}
$$

To show that the nal two traces vanish, we recall that basic representation theory of com plex associative algebras tells us that the expansion operators $F$ can be taken to have the sam e reducible structure as the O SR algebra

$$
\begin{equation*}
F={ }_{K 2 J}^{M} I_{n_{K}} \quad\left(F_{d_{K}}\right): \tag{621}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus we nd that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { (0) } G^{Y}{ }_{K 2 J}^{M} I_{n_{K}} \quad\left(F_{d_{K}}\right) A 5 \text {; } \tag{622}
\end{align*}
$$

and using the fact that J pulls out only the Jth irrep,

F inally, using the cyclic property of $\quad$, Eq. (6.19), this im plies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{hjj}_{J} \mathrm{~L}^{\mathrm{fg}}{ }^{\mathrm{h}}(0)(0)^{\mathrm{ii}} \mathrm{j} i=0 \text { : } \tag{624}
\end{equation*}
$$

A sim ilar calculation nds that

$$
\begin{equation*}
h j j_{J} L^{h f}{ }^{h} \quad(0) \quad 0^{\text {ii }} \quad \ddot{j} i=0 \text { : } \tag{625}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus, we have shown that, to rst order in , the decoherence rates of a DFS on the OSR for a perturbing interaction of strength vanishes

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{p}^{!p}=0+O\left({ }^{2}\right): \tag{626}
\end{equation*}
$$

This result im plies that perturbing interactions can indeed be treated as perturbing. A priorione can w orry that a strong D FS supporting interaction could producee ects that scale like $g$ where $g$ is the coupling strength of the unperturbed interaction.

The above calculation shows that one must go to order ${ }^{2}$ before such interactions can destroy the decoherence-free nature of the DFS.

F inally we note that we have worked with a pure input state jihjj. N otice, how ever, that a m ixed state which evolves according to the O SR can be thought of as a convex com bination of the pure state evolutions

This im plies that the above perturbative analysis carries over to the initial mixed state case.

### 6.3 Stability under the sem igroup m aster equation

C onsider in addition to a D FS supporting SM E

$$
\begin{align*}
\frac{@(t)}{@ t} & =L_{F ; F}[(t)] \\
L_{F} ; F[(t)] & =\frac{1}{2}^{X} a \stackrel{h}{\mathrm{X}} ; \quad(\mathrm{t}) ; \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{Y}^{i}}+\mathrm{h} ; \quad(\mathrm{F}) \mathrm{F}^{\mathrm{Y}} ; \tag{628}
\end{align*}
$$

and additional perturbing term

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{@(t)}{@ t}=L[(t)]=L_{F ; F}[(t)]+L_{F} ; G[(t)]+L_{G ; F}[(t)] ; \tag{629}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& L_{G: E}[(t)]=\overline{2}^{X} ;{ }^{\mathrm{C}}{ }^{\mathrm{h}}  \tag{6.30}\\
& (t) ; F^{Y}{ }^{i}+G \quad ; \quad(t) F^{Y^{i}} \text { : }
\end{align*}
$$

The p tim e derivative of $(t)$ evaluated at $t=0$ is then given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }^{(p)}(0)=L^{(p)}{ }^{1)}[(0)] ; \tag{6.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

N ow suppose that quantum inform ation $\bar{j} i$ is encoded into the degeneracy of the Jth irrep of the SM E algebra: (0) = jihijj $d_{J}(0)$. The decoherence rates are then, as in the previous section, given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{p}^{!p}=h j j_{J}^{h}{ }^{(0)}(0)^{i} \ddot{j} i=h j j{ }_{J} L^{(p)}{ }^{1)}[(0)]^{i} \ddot{j} i: \tag{6.33}
\end{equation*}
$$



 SM E algebra:

$$
\begin{equation*}
F={ }_{K 2 J}^{M} I_{n_{k}} \quad\left(F_{d_{J}}\right): \tag{6.35}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is useful here to notige that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.h j j \operatorname{J} \mathbb{X}] \underset{j}{j} i={ }_{m}^{X} \operatorname{Tr} \mathbb{P}_{J i j ; m} X P_{J ; j, m}\right] ; \tag{6.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $P_{j ; j m}=$ jihhjj $_{j} j ; m$ ihJ;m j. Because we can choose $F$ to be herm itian, $\mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{Jijmm}} \mathrm{F}=\mathrm{F} \mathrm{P}_{\mathrm{J} ; j, \mathrm{~m}}$ so that

N ow

$$
\begin{align*}
& d_{J}(0) G^{Y} \quad G^{Y} F \quad \text { jihhjj } \quad d_{J}(0) \\
& \text { \#̈ihjj } d_{J}(0) G^{y} F^{1} P_{J i j m} \text { : } \tag{6.38}
\end{align*}
$$

The ${ }_{m} P_{J ; j, m} \quad J_{i j m P} P$ is essentially a trace operator over $m$ and since only $G^{y}$ acts non-trivially over the decom position, we see that we can cycle the operators such that this term vanishes

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \text { m }
\end{aligned}
$$

A sim ilar conclusion holds for the $L_{F}$; $G$ term .
Thus we se that, as is the case for the OSR, in the SM E

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{p}^{!p}=0+O\left({ }^{2}\right): \tag{6.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

### 6.4 D ynam ical stability

The results derived in the previous Section im ply that D F Ss are robust to sm all perturbations when the DFS is operating as a quantum $m$ em ory. In order to address what happens when perturbations are $m$ ade on the system as it evolves according to som e desired quantum computation, we have to rst de ne an analog of the m ixedstate $m$ em ory delity for an evolving system. This is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{d}}(\mathrm{t})=\operatorname{Tr}[\mathrm{U} \text { ( } \mathrm{t}) \quad(\mathrm{t})\right] ; ; \tag{6.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ${ }_{u}(t)$ is the desired unitary evolution,

$$
\begin{equation*}
U(t)=U_{S}(t) \quad(0) U_{S}^{Y}(t) ; \text { with } U_{S}(t)=\exp \left[\quad i H_{S} t\right]: \tag{6.42}
\end{equation*}
$$

Here $H_{s}$ is the system $H$ am iltonian. This dynam ical delity is a good measure of the di erence between the desired evolution of the system and the actual, noisy evolution. Thus, $0 \quad F_{d}(t) \quad 1$, with $F_{d}(t)=1$ if and only if the evolution is perfect, ie., ( $t$ ) $=u_{u}(t)$. The decoherence rates for the dynam ical delity are de ned in the sam em anner as for the $m$ em ory delity:

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{d}(t)={ }^{x} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{t^{n}}{n}: \frac{1}{n}={ }^{n} \operatorname{Tr}\left[f_{U}(t)(t) g^{(n)}\right]^{O_{1=n}}: \tag{6.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

In [10], 辻 was shown that $\frac{1}{1}=0$ for both the OSR and the SM E. T he interested reader is referred to this article for $m$ ore inform ation on this result.

### 6.5 Stability

W e assem ble in Table 6.1 all of the perturbation results
$T$ he rst indications of the stability of D F subspace can be found in the num erical sim ulations done by Zanardiin [211]. Lidar, C huang, and W haley [137] then presented the generalm em ory stability condition of $\frac{1}{1}=0$ in the context ofD $F$ subspaces. The generalm em ory stability results to allorders in tim e forD $F$ subspaces w ere derived by B acon, Lidar, and W haley in [10]. In this chapter, we have broadened these stability results from the arena ofD $F$ subspaces to $D F$ subsystem $s$.

The stability ofD F Ss to perturbations is a particularly nice result for using D F Ss as a stable quantum m em ory. It is unlikely that absolutely perfect $D \mathrm{~F}$ conditions w ill

|  | SM E | O SR |
| :---: | :---: | :---: |
| G eneral | $1=1 ¢ 0$ | $1=1=0$ |
|  | $1={ }_{n} \in 0, \mathrm{n} \quad 2$ | $1={ }_{n} \not 0, \mathrm{n} \quad 2$ |
| DFSS | $1={ }_{n}=0$ | $1={ }_{n}=0$ |
| mem ory delity for -perturbed DFSs | $1={ }_{n}=0+0\left({ }^{2}\right)$ | $1={ }_{n}=0+O\left({ }^{2}\right)$ |
| dynam ical delity for -perturbed D F subspaces | $\begin{gathered} 1={ }_{1}=0 \\ 1=\begin{array}{c} n \\ n \end{array}, n \end{gathered}$ |  |

Table 6.1: P erturbed decoherence-rates
exist in nature and therefore it is im portant to understand how perturbing interactions change the DF nature of the system. The above perturbation results indicate that one can treat perturbing interactions on a DFS as independent of the DF condition. This will later tum out to be an im portant issue when one thinks about how to use DFSS w thin the context of fault-tolerant quantum error correction.

## C hapter 7

## D ecoherence $\mp$ ree Subsystem $s$ and the $Q$ uantum $C$ om puter

To com pute or not to com pute, that is the question.
In this chapter we address the issue the relationship betw een D FSs and quantum computation. We begin by describing how DFSs can be used in a concatenated $m$ anner and how this ts in $w$ the idea of fault-tolerant quantum com putation. A particularly im portant aspect ofD F Ss necessary for theiruse in quantum com putation is the ability to perform universal quantum com putation on the encoded inform ation. The special, but not unique, role of the com m utant of the O SR or SM E algebra for universalquantum com putation is outlined. The issue ofm easurem ent on a DFS and leakage errors is also introduced with application to $m$ ore concrete $m$ odels put o until the follow ing chapters.

### 7.1 Q uantum computation and decoherence-free subspaces

In the previous two chapters we have introduced the notion of decoherence-free subsystem and exam ined the stability of such DFSs to perturbing interactions. We have seen that it is possible to perform an encoding of quantum inform ation such that the inform ation is protected from a certain source of decoherence. Let us now discuss how such decoherence-free subsystem s can be put to use tow ards building a quantum com puter.

O ne of the com $m$ on $m$ isconceptions about decoherence-free subsystem $s$ is that they were intended as an ultim ate solution tow ards building a quantum com puter. $T$ here are two $m$ ain reasons why such a future is highly unlikely to unfold.

The rst reason why DFSs are not the ultim ate solution arises from the fact that the sym $m$ etries necessary for $m$ aintaining a decoherence-free condition $w$ ill alm ost
certainly not be perfectly realized in the physical world. Encoding into a DFSs, should be thought of in the context of elim inating a particular decoherence $m$ echanism. This decoherence $m$ echanism $m$ ay be the dom inant $m$ echanism or it $m$ ay be on equal footing w ith other non-DFS supporting decoherence $m$ echanism $s$. This is not to deem phasize the im portance of D F Ss tow ards building a quantum com puter: elim ination of a particular decoherence $m$ echanism should not be brushed under the nug and dism issed.

The second reason why D FSs are not the ultim ate solution to building a quantum com puter is because the concept of a decoherence-free subsystem does nothing to address the issue of fault-tolerant quantum com putation. Suppose one has, $m$ iraculously, found a system whose only decoherence m echanism supports a DFS and it is possible to encode and $m$ ake suitable $m$ easurem ents on the D FS. In order to use such DFSs for quantum com putation, one m ust be able to perform operations on the DFS which $m$ anipulate the quantum inform ation. These operations $w i l l m$ ost likely be faulty: it will not be possible to perfectly execute an operation on the D FS perhaps. The condition of being decoherence-firee says nothing about the faulty operation of gates on the encoded D FS.

So, in general, the theory of D F Ss m ust be cast w ithin the broader quest tow ards building a quantum com puter. Them ost likely usefulness of the $D F$ idea in quantum com putation is to work alongside the theory of fault-tolerant quantum error correction. The theory of fault-tolerant quantum com putation $[3,96,115,124,161,175]$ describes how faulty operations and decoherence, if the e ects ofboth are su ciently weak and su ciently non-pathological, can be used to perform quantum com putation to any desired accuracy w th only a polynom ial slow down in the quantum com putation. The idea of putting D F Ss to work in quantum com putation is the elim ination of a particular decoherence $m$ echanism such that the threshold for fault-tolerant quantum com putation can be achieved. This philosophy is perhaps best sum $m$ arized by the saying \use sym $m$ etry rst!" im plying that sym $m$ etries in the system -environm ent coupling should be used to rst elim inate bothersom e decoherence $m$ echanism sbefore quantum error correction is then applied to build a reliable quantum com puter.

### 7.2 D FSs for quantum computation

To build a quantum com puter, we must $m$ ake a $m$ apping to the quantum subsystem circuit $m$ odel. The $m$ ost straightforward $m$ anner of achieving this goal in the context of DFSs is to take individual DFSs as the subsystem s of the quantum subsystem circuit model. The idea is som ething like that depicted in Figure 7.1. Inform ation in physical subsystem s is encoded into a DFS which may span several physical subsystem $s$. These encoded subsystem s then will.becom e the building blocks of the quantum subsystem circuit $m$ odel. $V$ iew ed from the lens of coding theory what we are doing is using the D FSs as a code from which the quantum subsystem s circuit


Figure 7.1: Decoherence-free subspace and the quantum circuit m odel
m odel is constructed.
Suppose one has tw o O SR $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{L}}$ or SM E algebras A and B which have representations $A={ }^{L}{ }_{J 2 J} I_{n_{J}} \quad M_{J}$ and $B={ }^{L}{ }_{K 2 K} I_{n_{K}} \quad M_{Q_{K}} . N$ ow suppose that these two algebra act on two separate subsystem s of a $H$ ibert space $H=H_{A} \quad H_{B}$. The algebra on this con joined space then acts as A B. U sing the reducible representation of each algebra we nd that

where we have used the fact that the tensor product of tw o fullm atrix algebras is the fullm atrix algebra on the tensor product state $M_{d_{1}} \quad M_{d_{2}}=M_{d_{1} d_{2}}$. This result im plies that if we store build a quantum subsystem circuit out of subsystem $s$ which are each individually D F Ss, then the con joined subsystem swill still be D F . This, how ever, w ill not alw ays be the situation. D ue to the particular sym m etry involved in a DFS, it $m$ ay be possible that con joining two DFSs produces an OSR or SM E algebra which is larger than the sim ple tensor product structure of the above decom position.

Here it should be pointed out that, $m$ uch like the case of the quantum subsystem $s$
circuit $m$ odel itself, there is some arbitrariness in the how we m ap from a DFS to the quantum subsystem circuit $m$ odel. In the above description, and as depicted in $F$ igure 7.1 each encoded subsystem is in one-to-one correspondence $w$ th a set of physical qubits. The tensor product between these sets of physical qubits then becom es the tensor product betw een the encoded subsystem $s$ in the quantum circuit m odel. This m odel, of course, is not the m ost general. W ew ill, how ever concentrate on this $m$ odel as it appears to be the $m$ ost physically relevant $m$ odel.

D FS encoded subsystem s will be used in the quantum subsystem circuit model to perform fault-tolerant quantum com putation. P lacing quantum inform ation into a DFS presents extra challenges for the theory of fault-tolerant quantum com putation. Let us enum erate the ways in which a DFS ts in with the standard $m$ odel of faulttolerant quantum com putation.

1. P reparation. There should be som em anner to create states $w$ ith support over a DFS with a certain delity of preparation. In the theory of fault-tolerant quantum error correction there are often cases where preparation of a particular state is desired. Speci c D FS m odels then will require these special preparation steps.
2. M easurem ent. C losely tied w ith the issue of preparation, it should be possible to extract inform ation via a m easurem ent which $m$ akes som e distinction between di erent encoded inform ation. O f course it would be highly desirable to perform any possible $m$ easurem ent, but $m$ uch of the theory of fault-tolerant quantum com putation can be adapted to $m$ odels where only $m$ inim al inform ation extraction is possible. W ew ill address this issue in Section 7.4.
3. U niversality. A set of interactionsm ust be possible which act on the inform ation encoded in the DFS. If the D F condition is to $m$ aintained there is an im portant restriction here that does not appear in norm al quantum com putation: the interactions should alw ays act w ithin the protected subsystem. This issue is addressed in Section 7.3.
4. N oise m odels. The threshold theorem for fault-tolerant quantum com putation deals $w$ th noise $m$ odels of a speci c form. Thism eans that the perturbing noise (i.e. non-decoherence-free) on DFSs should $t w i$ ithin these noise models. Of non-trivial signi cance in this context is the problem that inform ation which has been encoded can leak out of the encoding. A particularly usefultechnique for attacking leakage in the context of error correction is given in Section 7.5

### 7.3 The com m utant and universal quantum com putation

U sing D FSs to construct a quantum subsystem scircuit m odel one m ust be able to perform com putation on the encoded subsystem S . In a given physical setup where one is attem pting to couple or act on single subsystem $s$, there will be a given O SR or SM E algebra A which is relevant when the evolution on the encoded subsystem is being acted upon. The operation which is enacted on the encoded subsystem $m$ ay be on a single encoded subsystem or betw een multiple subsystem $s$, but in both cases, there will be a relevant OSR or SM E algebra A describing the DFS. In partioular because leaving a DFS m ay be disastrous to the encoded quantum inform ation, we require that the evolution of the system never cause inform ation in the D FS to leak out of the DFS.W hat are the necessary and su cient conditions for a $H$ am iltonian dynam ics H to $m$ aintain the DF condition?
$W$ e recall that every algebra $A$ has a com $m$ utant $A^{0}$ which is the set ofalloperators which comm ute $w$ ith the elem ents of the algebra A. These operators have a dual reducible structure (recall Section 5.4.3)

$$
\begin{align*}
& A={ }^{M} I_{n_{J}} \quad M{ }_{\text {GJ }} \\
& A^{0}={ }_{\mathrm{M} 2 \mathrm{~J}}^{\mathrm{J} 2 \mathrm{~J}} \mathrm{M}_{\mathrm{n}_{J}} \quad \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{d}_{J}}: \tag{72}
\end{align*}
$$

In particular we that elem ents of the com mutant act to preserve the reducible structure of the algebra A. This leads us the follow ing su cient condition for a H am iltonian H to act only on inform ation encoded in a particular irrep.
Lem $m$ a 7.3.1 Suppose one is given an OSR or SM E algebra $A={ }_{\mathrm{L} 2 \mathrm{~J}} I_{\mathrm{n}_{J}} \quad M_{G_{J}}$ and inform ation has been encoded into the degeneracy of the $K$ th irrep. A $H$ am iltonian $H$ which com $m$ utes $w$ ith all of the elem ents of $A$ will act on this encoded inform ation and will not take this encoded in form ation out of the $K$ th irrep.

Proof: Trivial application of the idea of the commutant of the algebra A. If $H$ com $m$ utes w ith $A$, then it is in $A^{0}$ and therefore has the decom position described in Eq. (72) which preserves the inform ation encoded into the degeneracy.

### 7.3.1 Exam ple of the com m utant condition

Recall in Section 5.4.4 we found that the O SR algebra A spanned by fI; $\mathrm{x} \quad \mathrm{x}$ xi y y yi z z $\quad$ g supported a four dim ensionald FS. The com m utant of the OSR algebra A is generated by the operators $f \quad z \quad z \quad I ; I \quad z \quad z_{z} \quad$; $x \quad \mathrm{I} ; \quad$; $\mathrm{I} \quad \mathrm{x}$; Ig. Let us discuss how this com $m$ utant can be used to enact interactions on the DFS.

The D FS corresponding to $A$ is four dim ensional. $W$ e can therefore think of this subsystem as com posed of two qubits. The splitting of the space into two qubits is, as alw ays, arbitrary in where we place the tensor product structure. W e recall that a com plete set of commuting observables for the three qubit $H$ ibert space of this DFS is given by $Z_{12}=z \quad z \quad I, Z_{23}=I \quad z \quad z$, and $Z_{123}=\quad z \quad z \quad z$ $w$ ith a corresponding basis $\mathrm{z}_{12} ; \mathrm{z}_{23} ; \mathrm{z}_{123}$ i. The DFS inform ation is encoded into the subsystem spanned by the $\dot{z}_{12} ; z_{23} i$. W ew illtake our two qubits to be the $\dot{j}_{12} i \quad \dot{J}_{23} i$ subsystem structure. $W$ e therefore see that the operation $Z_{12}$ acts non-trivially on this encoded inform ation

$$
\begin{align*}
& z_{12} j+1 ; z_{23} ; z_{123} i=+j+1 ; z_{23} ; z_{123} i \\
& z_{12} j \quad 1 ; z_{3} ; z_{123} i=j \quad 1 ; z_{3} ; z_{123} i: \tag{7.3}
\end{align*}
$$

Sim ilarly for $Z_{23}$ acts only on the $z_{23}$ com ponent of $\dot{z}_{12} ; z_{23} ; z_{123} i$. $T$ he $Z_{12}$ and $Z_{23}$ act as an encoded $z$ on each of the encoded qubits. Sim ilarly we nd that

$$
\begin{align*}
& I \quad x \quad x j+1 ; z_{23} ; z_{123} i=j \quad 1 ; z_{3} ; z_{123} i \\
& I \quad x \quad x j \quad 1 ; z_{3} ; z_{123} i=j+1 ; z_{23} ; z_{123} \dot{i} ; \tag{7.4}
\end{align*}
$$

such that this operator acts as an encoded $x$ on the $\dot{j}_{12} i q u b i t$.
W hat should now be clear this that these operators which are in the com m utant of A act as single qubit P auli operators on the encoded subsystem s. Let us denote the two qubits via $a$ and $b$. Then the encoded operators on the these subsystem s are enacted by the encoded Pauli operators

Thus if one $w$ ishes to perform a single qubit rotation on the qubit $a$, one can use a H am iltonian of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
H^{(a)}=\mathrm{n} \quad \sim^{(a)}=n_{x} I \quad x \quad x+n_{y} \quad z \quad y \quad x+n_{z} \quad z \quad z \quad I: \tag{7.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Sim ilarly we can construct the operators which act between qubits a and b. For example the operator which acts as $\mathrm{x} \quad \mathrm{x}$ on the encoded qubits is given by

This operator and all the other sim ilar two qubit operators is, like the ${ }^{(a ; b) \text {, in the }}$ com mutant of A.

Thus we see how exam ining the commutant of an algebra A can allow us to nd operators which perform interactions on the encoded subsystem.

### 7.3.2 W hy the com m utant condition is su cientbut not necessary

W hile Lem m a 7.3 .1 describes a su cient condition for a $H$ am iltonian to preserve the inform ation encoded into a DFS subsystem, the condition is not necessary. To se this, one recalls that inform ation will.be stored in a particular $\mathrm{J}^{0} 2 \mathrm{~J}$ irrep of the algebra $A={ }_{\text {J2J }} I_{n_{J}} \quad M_{G_{J}}$. Inform ation which has been encoded into the degeneracy of a particular single $J^{0}$ irrep is una ected by what happens in the other irreps. E le$m$ ents which com $m$ ute $w$ th operators in A preserve every $J$ irrep. Inform ation which is encoded in a particular single degeneracy can be acted upon by operators which are not in the com $m$ utant of A and which still preserve the D F encoded inform ation.

U sing the criteria that a $H$ am iltonian com $m$ ute $w$ th the $O S R$ or SM E algebra, then, is not a necessary condition for preserving inform ation encoded into the corresponding DFS.W ewill nd, how ever, that while the criteria is not necessary it is often su cient for our needs.

### 7.3.3 R epresentation theory and the com m utant

A further area which often causes confusion in describing com putation on a D FS is the di erence betw een a com plex associate algebra and a Lie algebra. Suppose one is given the ability to enact a set of $H$ am iltonians which generate the com m utant of the OSR or SM E algebra A for a œertain DFS. The ability to enact the Herm itian generators of the com $m$ utant is not enough to guarantee that every operation on the encoded D FS can be enacted. The reason for this is that the generators we have specied are generators in the sense of a com plex associative algebra ( $m$ ultiplication, linear com bination) and not in the sense of a Lie algebra (Lie bracket, linear com bination).

Let us given an illustrative exam ple of this situation to clarify the problem. Suppose we are given the ability to enact a three-dim ensional irrep of the Lie algebra su (2),

It is easy to check that the com plex associative algebra generated by multiplication and linear com bination is the entire space of linear operators on the three-dim ensional space. H ow ever, the Lie algebra generated by these operators is just the three operators ${ }^{[3]}$ which do not span the space of linear operators on the three-dim ensional space. E lem ents like ${ }_{x}^{[3]}{ }^{2}$ are in the com plex associative algebra generated by the
${ }^{[3]}$, but are not in the Lie algebra generated by the ${ }^{[3]}$.
The correct w ay to state Lem m a 7.3.1 in tem s of the generators of a Lie algebra is then

Lem ma 7.3.2 Suppose one is given an OSR or SME algebra $A={ }^{L}{ }_{\text {J2J }} I_{n_{J}} \quad M_{d_{J}}$ and inform ation has been encoded into the degeneracy of the $K$ th irrep. A set of Ham iltonians $S$ each of which com $m$ utes with all of the elem ents of $A$ will act on this encoded inform ation w ithout taking this encoded inform ation out of the $K$ th irrep. Furtherm ore this set of H am iltonians $S$ will generate a Lie algebra $L$ which has a reducible structure of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{L}={ }_{J 2 J}^{\mathrm{M}} \mathrm{~L}_{\mathrm{n}_{J}} \quad I_{\mathrm{d}_{J}} ; \tag{7.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $L_{n_{J}}$ is a (perhaps further reducible) $n_{J}$ dim ensionalLie algebra and $I_{d_{J}}$ represents the identity action on a $d_{J}$ dim ensional space.

### 7.3.4 Existential universality on a D F S

It is im portant to realize that universal sets of gates alw ays exist for any given subsystem structure $m$ apped onto a quantum circuit $m$ odel[140, 212]. This is to say that it is alw ays possible to construct a given set of interactions betw een subsystem s. H ow ever, for a speci c DFS, there are im portant lim itations which prevent this existential result from holding any weight. In particular, the set of operators which can be enacted on the D FS often is from a lim ted set of physically viable operators. In $m$ ost system $s, m$ ore that two-body interactions $w$ ill be very di cult to enact on the system. T hus existentially there are alw ays universal gate sets, but under m ost conditions, these existential results are not of use.

Suppose, for exam ple, that one has encoded on qubit of inform ation into 5 physical qubits in term sof the basis states $j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}=j 00000 i$ and $j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{j} 11111 \mathrm{i}$. C learly there is a single qubit encoded $z$ betw een these qubits which is given by $j 0_{\mathrm{L}}$ ih0 $0_{\mathrm{L}} j \quad j_{\mathrm{L}}$ ih1 $\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{j}=$ j00000ih00000j j11111ih11111j. N otioe how ever, that this is a ve-qubit interaction which we would not expect to be easily im plem entable on a system. On the other hand, one can also see that a single Pauli $z$ acting on a single qubit of this encoding produces an encoded $\quad z_{z}: \quad{ }_{z}^{(1)} j 00000 i=j 00000 i$ and $\quad{ }_{z}^{(1)} \mathfrak{j 1 1 1 1 1 i}=\quad$ j11111i.

### 7.4 M easurem ent on D FSs for quantum computation

Suppose we are trying to extract inform ation via a m easurem ent which has been encoded into the degeneracy of the $J^{0}$ th irrep of som e O SR or SM E algebra A. C learly the $m$ easurem ent of an operator which is this $O$ SR will not yield any inform ation about the inform ation encoded into the degeneracy. This is because these operators all act as identity on the encoded inform ation and $m$ easuring identity gives no inform ation about the encoded inform ation.

Suppose we wish the $m$ easurem ent operators to preserve the DFS structure of the encoded inform ation. In this case, the nontrivial elem ents of the com $m$ utant of A provide operators which preserve the D FS structure and retum inform ation about the encoded inform ation.

Lem m a 7.4.1 LetM be a hem itian observable which is a $m$ em ber of the com $m$ utant of the OSR or SME algebra A. Inform ation which has been encoded into a irrep of the algebra A will rem ain in the irrep after a m easurem ent of $M$.

The issue ofm easurem ents, how ever, is again far from contained w ithin elem ents of the com $m$ utant only. Just like in the unitary $m$ anipulation ofD $F$ encoded inform ation, there are $m$ easurem ents which are not in the com $m$ utant which still preserve the encoded inform ation.

### 7.5 M aking leakage into noise

Finally we would like to address the issue of noise models on a DFS. In the standard theory of error correction, one works w ith operators E which are called the errors, and represent the action of $m$ a jor com ponent of the OSR algebra on system evolution.

An im portant form of noise on a DFS is a leakage error[135]. If we encode inform ation into the $J^{0}$ th irrep of som e algebra $A$, then we can classify three types of errors.

1. E rrors which act on the DFS inform ation but preserve the subsystem structure. $T$ hese errors act on the $J^{0}$ th irrep in a non-trivial $m$ anner. If we are using a given D FS for fault-tolerant error correction, these errons will be the standard errors which the fault-tolerant error correction serves to x .
2. E rrorw hich preserve the D F S inform ation but act nontrivially otherw ise. $T$ hese are errors like those generated by the O SR algebra A.
3. E rrors which do not preserve the D F S inform ation. T hese errors take inform ation in a subsystem and leak the inform ation to outside of the subsystem. For exam ple inform ation in the $J^{0}$ th irrep $m$ ay be $m$ oved to the $J^{00}$ th irrep.

If the subsystem structure of the algebra A corresponds to


Then the errors detailed above correspond to operators with nonvanishing elem ent in the follow ing locations


Of these errors, those in 3 are the $m$ ost troublesom e in the use of a D FS concatenated w ithin a fault-tolerant quantum error correction procedure. These \leakage" errors, how ever, do not pose a fundam entalproblem for the theory of fault-tolerant quantum com putation [161,96]. A particularly nice technique for dealw ith leakage errors is to sim ply $m$ ake these errors type $1 / 2$ errors. To do this one $m$ akes a $m$ easurem ent which distinguishes between states in the DFS and states outside of the DFS and then depending on the outcom e takes states outside of the DFS back into states in the DF.S.T hus it is possible to convert errors which leak out of the subsystem and make these errors which occur on the subsystem. For a speci c exam ple of this technique applied to a D FS/quantum error correction schem e see [135].

### 7.6 D ecoherence-free subsystem $s$ as com ponents of a quantum com puter

The purpose of this chapter was to address som e of the issues which occur when attem pting to use DFSs in conjunction w ith the theory of fault-tolerant quantum com putation. There are no fundam ental di culties in such a m elding of D FSs and fault-tolerant quantum com putation. M uch like in the theory of fault-tolerant quantum com putation, how ever, speci c application to a speci c physical system which supports a D FS poses di erent challenges in m elding DFSS with fault-tolerance. In the next few chapters we will have the opportunity to exam ine a speci c physically relevant m odel of a D FS and thus the results in this chapter w illbe directly addressed for this physicalm odel.

## C hapter 8

## C ollective D ecoherence

W here not being able to distinguish subsystem $s$ is a sym $m$ etry
In this chapter we introduce an im portant physical m odel of decoherence which supports decoherence-fire evolution: collective decoherence. This m odel is, in som e sense, a generic $m$ odel and dem onstrates an im portant sym $m$ etry whidh can be realized in suitable natural quantum system s. D ue to the physical relevance of this m odel, it will be the sub ject of this thesis in the follow ing four chapters. W e begin w ith a non-rigorous discussion of the conditions which lead to collective decoherence. $W$ e then tum to the exam ple of collective dephasing and present $m$ odels of this decoherence process in the H am iltonian and m aster equation form ulations. Speci c conditions for collective dephasing are derived. We then discuss collective am plitude dam ping and the conditions under which such a process occurs. Finally, we categorize the three di erent types of collective decoherence as w eak collective decoherence, strong collective decoherence, and collective am plitude dam ping. T he D FS structure of each of these $m$ odels is then given.

### 8.1 C ollective coupling to an environm ent

C onsider two physical qubits which are situated in close proxim ity to each other. W hen we think about the environm ent of these qubits, we are generally thinking about the environm ent as the rest of the universe. Thus even when the qubits are not in close proxim ity, the entity of the environm ent is really the sam e for each qubit. H owever, as the qubits are brought from close proxim ity to large separation, the environm ents w ith which each qubit m ost strongly acts separate out into two local environm ents for each qubit. Physical assum ptions then usually allow us to consider each qubit as coupling strongly to a local environm ent and weakly or vanishingly to the other qubits' environm ent. C onversely, when the two qubits are situated close together, the environm ent which each qubit interacts with is essentially the same environm ent.

In m ost physical situations it is im possible to put two physical qubits on top of each other\{especially w ithout these qubits interacting with each other\{but let us im agine for the $m$ om ent that this is possible. In the lim it of qubits on top of each other and not interacting, we expect each qubit to couple to the environm ent in an identical m anner. N ow suppose we increase the physical separation betw een these qubits. C learly the identical $m$ anner in which the qubits couple to the system will now no longer be identical. The coupling to the sam e environm ent, how ever, for sm all enough separation, should stillbe them ain $m$ echanism ofdecoherence for these closely spaced qubits. This is exactly analogous to the reasoning behind distant qubits having separate local environm ents. W e will refer to the situation where each qubit couples in an identical $m$ anner to individual quantum subsystem $s$ as the case of collective decoherence.

A nother way to $m$ etaphorically codify the idea of collective coupling is to think about decoherence as a spying process on the system. D ecoherence is the process through which the environm ent becom es entangled with the system and som e of the quantum inform ation of the system is transferred to a joint system -environm ent state. $V$ iewed in this $m$ anner, the decoherence process is the $m$ anner in which the environm ent observer the system . N ow consider the case of tw o closely spaced qubits which are being observed by an environm ent. Since the qubits are closely spaced, the environm ent $m$ ay not be able to distinguish betw een each of the qubits when the environm ent observers (interacts) w ith the two qubits. The inability of the environ$m$ ent to distinguish two or $m$ ore closely spaced physical qubits is exactly the case of collective decoherence.

### 8.2 C ollective dephasing

C onsider the evolution of a system of $n$ qubit coupled to an environm ent. T hese qubits have a natural energy levels and the process of dephasing is the $m$ echanism through which the populations of these levels do not change but the coherence between the levels do change. This setup is m ost generally characterized by a system environm ent $H$ am iltonian of the form

where $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{E}}$ is som e environm ent H am iltonian. If these energy levels are identical then $!_{i}=!$. The case of collective dephasing corresponds to the situation when $B_{i}=B$ and the energy levels are identical. This then corresponds to the $H$ am iltonian

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=2!S_{z}+H_{E}+S_{z} \quad 2 B ; \tag{82}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have de ned

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{z}={ }^{x} \quad{ }_{z}^{(i)}: \tag{8.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

In the collective dephasing setup, the O SR algebra willbe generated by I and $S_{z}$ (and thus consists of all higher pow ers of $S_{z}$.) W ew ill discuss the D FSs generated by the collective dephasing model in Section 8.5 .

Let us introduce a less generic m odel of the dephasing of qubits which we can use to $m$ ake argum ents about the situations under which collective decoherence in the form ofdephasing should occur. C onsider a system ofn identicalqubits $H_{S}=\underset{i=1}{N} \mathbb{C}^{2}$ coupled to a quantized eld expressed as a set of harm onic oscillator m odes which are the environm ent $H_{E}={ }_{k} H_{K}$ via the $H$ am iltonian
where $a_{k}\left(a_{k}^{y}\right)$ is the anninilation (creation) operator for the $k$ th $m$ ode. The coupling constant $g_{i k} w i l l$, in general, depend on the location of the ith system. In $m$ any situations it m ay be possible to m ake approxim ations directly on the coupling constants $g_{i k}$. The situation corresponding to collective dephasing is then when the coupling between the system and the environm ent is identical for each qubit $g_{i k}=g_{k}$. In this case the H am iltonian is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=2!{ }_{0} S_{z}+{ }_{k}^{X}!_{k} a_{k}^{y} a_{k}+2 S_{z}{ }_{k}^{X} \quad g_{k} a_{k}+g_{k} a_{k}^{y}: \tag{8.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

To give an idea of when $g_{k i}=g_{k}$ we recall that the spatial dependence of $g_{k i}$ is given by a norm alm ode expansion of the eld. Thus $g_{k i}=g_{k}\left(r_{i}\right)$ where $r_{i}$ is the location of the ith qubit and $g_{k}(r)$ describes the spatial variation of the $k$ th $m$ ode. The condition of $g_{k i}=g_{k}$ then corresponds to $g_{k}\left(r_{i}\right)=g_{k}\left(r_{j}\right)$ for all $i$ and $j$. In other words, when the spacing betw een the qubits is sm allenough that the norm alm ode $k$ does not vary signi cantly over the positions of these qubits, collective dephasing will dom inate. If the norm alm ode, for exam ple, is a plane wave $g_{k i}=g_{k} e^{i K}{ }^{i k}$ and the spacing betw een the qubits is much less than the wavelength of this plane wave, $\widetilde{K} \quad f(x) \quad$, then $e^{\mathrm{ik} \mathrm{i}^{k}} \quad \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{jk}}{ }^{j \pi}$ or $g_{k i} \quad \mathscr{G}$.

### 8.2.1 M aster equation collective dephasing

In order to obtain the collective dephasing regim $e$, it is necessary that there be a reason why $m$ odes which distinguish betw een di erent qubits contribute little to the dynam ics of the system -environm ent evolution. In order to clarify the role of this assum ption, we present a derivation ofa sem igroup $m$ aster equation forthis $H$ am iltonian which can help clarify under what conditions this assum ption is a good assum ption. $T$ his is the sem igroup $m$ aster equation form ulation of collective dephasing $[155,69]$.

The rst step in the derivation of the $m_{P}$ aster equation is to $m$ ove into the interac-
 $T$ hen the interaction picture H am iltonian is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{I}^{0}(t)={\underset{i k}{X} \quad{ }_{z}^{(i)} g_{i k} a_{k} e^{i!{ }_{k} t}+g_{k 1} a_{k}^{y} e^{i!_{k} t}: ~}_{\text {in }} \text { : } \tag{8.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

 of each qubit w illbe una ected by the evolution due to this $H$ am iltonian. U nder the approxim ation, the general form of a $m$ aster equation is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\left.\left.\frac{\varrho}{@ t}=\quad i T €\left(\mathbb{H}_{I}^{0}(t) ; \quad E(0)\right]\right) \quad{ }_{0}^{\mathrm{Z}} \mathrm{Tr}_{\mathrm{E}}\left(\mathbb{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0}(\mathrm{t}) ; \mathbb{H}_{\mathrm{I}}^{0}() ; \quad \quad \mathrm{E}(0)\right]\right] d\right): \tag{8.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

We will make the assumption that the environm ent is in therm al equilibrium at tem perature $T$ ( $w$ e set $k_{B}=1,=\frac{1}{T}$ ). $W$ hen we $m$ ake this assum ption we $w$ ill refer to the environm ent as the bath. T he bath density $m$ atrix is thus given by [90]

$$
\begin{equation*}
E(0)=\frac{1}{\operatorname{Tr}\left[\exp \left(H_{B}\right)\right]} \exp \left(\quad H_{B}\right)=0_{k}^{z} d_{k}^{2} \frac{1}{h N!_{k} i} \exp \quad \frac{j!_{k} j^{!}}{h N!_{k} i} j_{k} i h_{k} i \text { j } \tag{8.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

$w$ here $h N!_{k} i$ is the $m$ ean occupation num ber for $m$ ode $k$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{hN}_{!_{k}} \mathrm{i}=\frac{1}{\exp \left(!_{k}\right)} 1^{\prime} \tag{8.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and $j_{k i} i$ is a coherent state for the $k$ th $m$ ode.
The rst term in the master equation, Eq. (8.7), is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { 订€ ( } \mathbb{H}_{I}^{0}(t) \text {; } \tag{8.10}
\end{align*}
$$

where ho $i_{E}=\operatorname{Tr}\left(O_{E}(0)\right)$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{i k}=g_{i k} a_{k} e^{i!k t}+g_{i k} a_{k}^{y} e^{i!k_{k} t^{E}}: \tag{8.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

$T$ his term vanishes identically for a bath in equilibrium $i k=0$.
The second term in the $m$ aster equation, Eq. (8.7), is given by
where

$$
\begin{align*}
& { }_{i j k k^{0}}^{(1)}=Z^{Z}{ }^{0}{ }_{t D} g_{i k} a_{k} e^{i!k_{k} t}+g_{i k} a_{k}^{y} e^{i!k_{k} t} \quad g_{j k 0} 0 a_{k} 0 e^{i!k_{k} 0}+g_{j k} 00_{k}^{y} 0 e^{i!k_{k} 0}{ }_{E}^{E} d \\
& \underset{i j k k 0}{(2)}=g_{j k 0} a_{k} 0 e^{i!k^{0}}+g_{j k 0} a_{k}^{y} 0 e^{i!!_{k} 0} \quad g_{i k} a_{k} e^{i!!_{k} t}+g_{j k} a_{k}^{y} e^{i!k_{k} t} d: \tag{8.13}
\end{align*}
$$

U sing the therm alequilibrium density $m$ atrix it is easy to calculate that

The evolution is therefore given by

This dephasing $m$ aster equation show $s$ how the coe cient $m$ atrix ij contains infor$m$ ation about the correlation of decoherence betw een di erent qubits.

There are two im portant lim its to Eq. (8.15). In the rst lim it, $\mathrm{ij}_{\mathrm{ij}}=\mathrm{ij} \mathrm{i}$. In this case the $m$ aster equation can be written as a sum of two $L$ indblad operators on each qubit

This is the case of independent dephasing. Each qubit evolves independent of the evolution of the other qubit. The other im portant lim it is when ij is constant, ${ }_{i j}==4$. In this case the $m$ aster equation contains just one Lindblad operator which acts on allqubits

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{@}{@ t}={ }_{i}^{x} \quad\left(\left[S_{z} ; S_{z}\right]+\left[S_{z} ; S_{z}\right]\right): \tag{8.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

This is the case of collective dephasing.
In the continuum $m$ odel $w$ here the $e_{R}$ bath corresponds to som e quantized eld, we can $m$ ake the substitution ${ }^{\mathrm{P}}{ }_{k}!\frac{\mathrm{V}_{r}}{(2)^{r}} \mathrm{~d}^{\mathrm{r}} \mathrm{k}$ where r is the dimension of the eld. We $w$ ill exam ine the case of $r=1$. The other dim ensional cases follow sim ilar lines of investigation.
$W$ e assum $e$ the coe cients $g_{k i}$ have a spatial relationship $g_{k i}=g(k) e^{i k r_{i}}$ where $r_{i}$ is the position of the ith qubit. Then if the quantized region is length $L$,

W e would like to see what conditions the length scale at which the approxim ation $\mathrm{ij}_{\mathrm{ij}}=$ occurs. M oving into the frequency domain, we nd that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.i j=L^{z} d!\frac{d k}{d!} \frac{\dot{j}(!))^{\mathcal{J}}}{!} \sin \llbracket k(!)\left(r_{j} \quad r_{i}\right) \quad!t\right]\left(2 h N_{!} i+1\right) ; \tag{8.19}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have dropped the super uous $k$ index on $!_{k}$. D e ne the envelope fiunction $f(!)=\frac{d k}{d!} \frac{j(!) f}{!}(2 \mathrm{hN}!i+1)$ such that $\left.i j^{i j} \underline{L}^{\mathrm{R}} d!f(!) \sin \mathfrak{k}(!)\left(r_{j} \quad r_{i}\right) \quad!t\right]$. The function $f(!)$ determ ines which ! m odes contribute $m$ axim ally to this integral. $W e$ can split $f(!)$ into two contributions

$$
\begin{align*}
f(!) & =f_{\mathrm{T}}(!)+f_{\mathrm{V}}(!) \\
\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{T}}(!) & =2 \frac{\mathrm{dk}}{\mathrm{~d}!} \frac{\dot{g}(!))^{\mathcal{J}}}{!} \mathrm{hN}!i \\
\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{V}}(!) & =\frac{\mathrm{dk}}{\mathrm{~d}!} \frac{\dot{g}(!)^{\mathcal{J}}}{!}: \tag{820}
\end{align*}
$$

$f_{T}(!)$ represents the them alcontribution to $f(!)$ while $f_{V}(!)$ com es from the vacuum uctuation contribution to $f(!)$. The them alcontribution to the $f(!)$ has a natural cuto frequency given by the them al frequency

$$
\begin{equation*}
f_{T}(!)=2 \frac{d k}{d!} \frac{\dot{g}(!))^{?}}{!} \frac{1}{e!}: \tag{821}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus for ! $T, f_{T}(!)$ is exponentially suppressed. A ssum ing a linear dispersion relation $\frac{d k}{d!}=c$, if the qubits are spaced such that $j_{i} \quad r_{j} j \quad \frac{c}{T}$, then the integral is not exponentially suppressed in the region where $\left(\begin{array}{rll}r_{i} & r_{j}\end{array}\right) \mathrm{k} \quad 0$. Thus, if the qubits are spaced closer than the them al spacing $h_{T}=\frac{c}{T}$, the them al contribution to $f(!)$ $w$ ill contribute $i j=T$ independent of $i$ and $j$. For a given tem perature, there is a spectrum of bath $m$ odes which are occupied. The tem perature then determ ines the longest w avelength which has non-negligible occupation and this w avelength then determ ines the spacing needed in order to achieve collective dephasing.
$T$ he vacuum contribution to $f(!)$ how ever, does not have such an exponential suppression except as given by the eld theory which provides a coupling constant w ith a cuto frequency $g(!) /!^{n} e^{\frac{1}{!_{c}}}$. If the bath eld is a phonon eld, the naturalcut-o can be identi ed w ith the D ebye frequency. In this case an identical argum ent to the them al case gives a characteristic vacuum spacing $l_{v}=\frac{c}{!_{c}} \cdot Q$ ubits spaced closed that this vacuum spacing will dephase collectively due to the vacuum contribution $f_{V}(!)$.

### 8.3 C ollective am plitude dam ping

In the previous section we investigated the situation where no population transfer occurred on the system 's qubits but the phase of the qubits state was a ected. Let us now exam ine the situation where population transfer does occur.

C onsider the situation of $n$ qubits coupled to a radiation eld. In the interaction picture and under the rotating wave approxim ation, the $H$ am iltonian for this system plus environm ent is given by
where $=x \quad i_{y}$ and $!_{0}$ is the energy spacing of each qubit. U nder the assum $p$ tion of $\mathbb{K}$ (x

$$
\left.H_{I}(t)=\begin{array}{ll}
x^{n} x & h  \tag{823}\\
g_{\hat{k}} e^{i} e^{i(!}!_{k} & \left.!_{0}\right) t
\end{array}+a_{k}+g_{k} e^{i\left(!!_{k}\right.} \quad!_{0}\right) t \quad a_{k}^{y_{k}^{i}} ;
$$

where $g_{\mathbb{K}}=e^{i K}{ }^{15} g_{\hat{K}}$. N otioe that the system operators couple collectively to the bath
where

$$
S=\frac{1}{2}_{i}^{x}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
x & \left.i_{y}\right): \tag{825}
\end{array}\right.
$$

 therefore generated by I and S . W e w ill later retum to this situation, which we w ill label strong collective decoherence.

### 8.3.1 $M$ aster equation collective am plitude dam ping

Let us exam ine the evolution due to the pre-approxim ated (except the rotatingwave approxim ation) H am iltonian Eq. (8 22) [69]. U sing them aster equation Eq. (8.7) and the assum ption that the environm ent $m$ odes are all in the vacuum state, we can easily obtain the $m$ aster equation in the interaction picture as
where

In the continuum lim 五, them ain contribution to these term soccur at $!_{\mathrm{k}}=!_{0}$. Thus in order to attain a collective regin $e$, the requirem ent is that

$$
\mathbb{K}_{0} \quad\left(\begin{array}{ll}
(x) & x_{j} \tag{828}
\end{array}\right) \quad 1 ;
$$

where $\widetilde{K}_{0}$ is the wavenum ber where $!_{\tilde{K}_{0}}=!_{0}$. D ue to the resonance condition, the conditions for collective am plitude dam ping are much easier to describe than those of collective dephasing. The $m$ ain pathway for am plitude dam ping is exchange of ! 0 energy w th the bath and therefore this dom inant pathw ay provides the condition for collective am plitude dam ping.

In the collective regim e , the m aster equation reduces to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{@}{@ t}=i[S S ;]+\left(\left[S \quad ; S_{+}\right]+\left[S ; S_{+}\right]\right) ; \tag{829}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $S$ are de ned as in Eq. (825). N otioe that the Lindblad operator $S$ here does not include an equivalent $S^{y}=S_{+}$Lindblad operator. The case of collective am plitude dam ping, then, is a case where the SM E algebra $m$ ay give di ering DFS structures than the actualD FS for the $m$ aster equation.

In both collective dephasing and collective am plitude dam ping, the fundam ental requirem ent to enter into these regim es is that the spacing of the qubits be su ciently sm all that the im portant wavelengths of the interacting baths cannot distinguish the qubits. T here are other natural situations w here collective decoherence w illdom inate. For exam ple if both qubits are coupled to another quantum system extemal to the two qubits, the wavelength criteria need not be $m$ et, but only the fact that the two qubits couple identically to the states of the other system is needed. The m odels we have presented in Sections 8.2 and 8.3 are m eant to serve as guides to nding system $s$ where collective decoherence is exhibited.

### 8.4 C ollective decoheren ce

In the last tw o sections we have exam ined $m$ odels which exhibit collective coupling of a system to the environm ent. There are three relevant arenas for this collective coupling which we w ill label weak collective decoherence, strong collective decoherence, and collective am plitude dam ping. For com pleteness, we recall our de nition of the collective operators on $n$ qubit,

$$
\begin{equation*}
S=X_{i=1}^{X^{n}} \frac{1}{2} \text { (i) }: \tag{8.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

where 2 fx;y;z;+; g. W hen we need to refer to the collective operators on a speci c number of qubits, we will do this $w$ ith a superscript $S^{[n]}$ is the collective operator on $n$ qubits

$$
\begin{equation*}
S^{[n]}={ }_{i=1}^{X^{n}} \frac{1}{2}{ }^{\text {(i) }}: \tag{8.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

These operators form a representation of the Lie algebra $s u(2), m$ eaning they satisfy the com $m$ utation relations

$$
\begin{equation*}
[S \text {;S }]=\text { i ; ; } S \quad ; \quad 2 \text { fx;y;zg: } \tag{8.32}
\end{equation*}
$$

The three cases of collective decoherence are then speci ed by
D e nition 8.4.1 (W eak collective decoherence) $W$ hen the O SR or SM E algebra consists of only a single ${ }^{P}$ n $S \quad\left(n \quad 2 \mathbb{R}, n_{x}^{2}+n_{y}^{2}+n_{z}^{2}=1\right)$ and identity we call this decoherence $m$ echan ism weak collective decoherence. Single qubit rotations are alw ays possible which take this operator to the operator $S_{z}$. W ewillassum e that this has been done and thus weak collective decoherence for our purposes will be when the O SR or SM E algebra consists only of $S_{z}$ and I.

De nition 8.4.2 (Strong collective decoherence) W hen the OSR or SM E algebra contains all $S$, 2 fx;y;zg and the identity we call this decoherence mechanism strong collective decoherence.

D e nition 8.4.3 (C ollective am plitude dam ping) W hen the SME contains only the Lindblad operator $S$ and a Ham iltonian term $S_{+} S$, we call this decoherence $m$ echanism collective am plitude dam ping. N otice that collective am plitude dam ping when extended to the full SM E algebra is strong collective decoherence.

### 8.5 W eak collective decoherence D F S s

In weak collective decoherence on $n$ qubits, the only nontrivial error operator is $S_{z}$. This error operator thus form s an abelian algebra A w th elem ents spanned by the set $\mathrm{fS}_{z}^{0} ; \mathrm{S}_{z}^{1} ; \mathrm{S}_{z}^{2} ;::: \mathrm{S}_{z}^{n} \mathrm{~g}$. D ue to the fact that $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{z}}$ is hem itian, there is not di erence between the DFSs in the H am iltonian/O SR treatm ent and the SM E treatm ent. In the rst case (OSR) $S_{z} w$ ill.be the system operator and in the second case (SM E) $S_{z}$ w ill be the sole Lindblad operator. Furthem ore, because the algebra for the weak collective decoherence is abelian, the DF structure will be that of D F subspaces. This is because abelian algebras all have irreps which are one-dim ensional and onedim ensional irreps sim ply correspond to D F subspaces (note that the converse is does not hold. There can be D F subspaces when the algebra is non-abelian. T he algebra w ill.be abelian over the subspaces, but over the entire space it can be non-abelian.)

The easiest way to understand the weak collective decoherence DFS is to work in the basis where $S$ is diagonalized. This basis is just the standard com putational


Let $H$ (i) denote the $H$ am $m$ ing length of num ber $i$ in binary: $H$ (i) is the num ber of 1 's in the binary expression of $i$. Then this is just

$$
S_{z} \ddot{\mathrm{zi}}=\frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{lll}
\mathrm{n} & 2 \mathrm{H} & \text { (i) }) \tag{8.34}
\end{array}\right)
$$

N otioe that for a given H am m ing distance $H$ (i), the action of $S_{z}$ on all states $w$ ith this Ham ming distance (i) is identical. TheD F subspace criteria is the $S_{z} j i=c j$ ifor each of the states $j i$ in the subspace. Thus in our case we see that the D F subspaces correspond to states $w$ ith equal $H$ am $m$ ing w eight.

D e nition 8.5.1 (W eak collective decoherence D F subspac D F $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{H})$ ) W eak collective decoherence on $n$ qubits supports $D F$ subspaces labeled by the integer $0 \quad h \quad n$, $D F S_{n}(h)$. DF $S_{n}(h)$ is spanned by basis states in the com putational basis $\ddot{\mu} i$ which have $H$ am $m$ ing weight $H$ (i) equal to $h$.

This result follow s directly from the D F subspace H am iltonian and sem igroup master equation criteria.

The dim ension of a given $D F S_{n}(h)$ is given by the num ber of ways a $n$ bit num ber can be w ritten which has a H am m ing distance $h$. This is given by

$$
\operatorname{dim}\left(\mathbb{D} S_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{~h})\right)=\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{h}}=\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{n}  \tag{8.35}\\
& \mathrm{~h}
\end{align*}:
$$

The largest DFS for a xed number of qubits then corresponds to the case when $\mathrm{h}=\frac{\mathrm{n}}{2}$ when n is even, or $\mathrm{h}=\frac{\mathrm{n} 1}{2}$ when n is odd.

### 8.5.1 The weak D F S basis

A complete set of commuting observables for the weak collective decoherence DFS on $n$ qubits is given by the set of operators $f S_{z}^{[1]} ; S_{z}^{[2]} ; S_{z}^{[3]} ;::: ; S_{z}^{[n]} g$ [109]. The corresponding basis is then denoted by $\hbar_{z}^{[1]} ; S_{z}^{[2]} ;::: ; S_{z}^{[n]} i$. This basis is especially nice because it allows a for a graphical representation of the D FSS and their basis states. W e will call this basis the weak D FS basis. In F igure 8.1, the horizontal axis $m$ arks the num ber of qubits and the vertical axis $m$ easures the eigenvalue of $S_{z}$. Each state in the basis $j_{z}^{[1]} ; S_{z}^{[2]} ;::: ; S_{z}^{[n]} i$ corresponds to a path from the origin to the given DFS in which only connections which act from left to right are allowed.

A simple example will help explain our notation. For $n=3$, there are 4 DF subspaces. These correspond to H am m ing distances $\mathrm{h}=0, \mathrm{~h}=1, \mathrm{~h}=2$, and $\mathrm{h}=3$. $T$ he basis states for these D FSs in the standard com putationalbasis are

$$
\begin{align*}
& \stackrel{8}{\gtrless} j 001 i \\
& \mathrm{DFS}_{3}(0)=\text { fjo00i; } \mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)=\xrightarrow{\text { j010i } ;} \begin{array}{l}
\text { j100i }
\end{array} \\
& \stackrel{8}{\gtrless} \mathrm{j} 10 \mathrm{i} \\
& \mathrm{DFS}_{3}(2)=\underset{\substack{\mathrm{j} \\
\mathrm{j} 101 \mathrm{i}}}{\mathrm{j} 101 \mathrm{i}} ; \mathrm{DFS}_{3}(3)=\mathrm{fj} 11 \mathrm{i} \tag{8.36}
\end{align*}
$$



Figure 8.1: W eak collective decoherence D FS graphical depiction

In the weak D FS basis, these states would be denoted by

$$
\begin{align*}
& j 000 i=j_{z}^{[1]}=\frac{1}{2} ; S_{z}^{[2]}=1 ; S_{z}^{[3]}=\frac{3}{2} i \\
& j 001 i=j S_{z}^{[1]}=\frac{1}{2} ; S_{z}^{[2]}=1 ; S_{z}^{[3]}=\frac{1}{2} i \\
& j 010 i=j S_{z}^{[1]}=\frac{1}{2} ; S_{z}^{[2]}=0 ; S_{z}^{[3]}=\frac{1}{2} i \\
& j 100 i=j S_{z}^{[1]}=\frac{1}{2} ; S_{z}^{[2]}=0 ; S_{z}^{[3]}=\frac{1}{2} i \\
& j 011 i=S_{z}^{[1]}=\frac{1}{2} ; S_{z}^{[2]}=0 ; S_{z}^{[3]}=\frac{1}{2} i \\
& \text { j101i }=j_{z}^{[1]}=\frac{1}{2} ; S_{z}^{[2]}=0 ; S_{z}^{[3]}=\frac{1}{2} i \\
& \text { j110i }=j_{z}^{[1]}=\frac{1}{2} ; S_{z}^{[2]}=1 ; S_{z}^{[3]}=\frac{1}{2} i \\
& \text { j111i }=S_{z}^{[1]}=\frac{1}{2} ; S_{z}^{[2]}=1 ; S_{z}^{[3]}=\frac{3}{2} i: \tag{8.37}
\end{align*}
$$

A qutrit of inform ation, for exam ple, can encoded into the $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$

$$
\begin{align*}
j i= & j 001 i+j 010 i+j 00 i \\
= & j S_{z}^{[1]}=\frac{1}{2} ; S_{z}^{[2]}=1 ; S_{z}^{[3]}=\frac{1}{2} i+\quad j S_{z}^{[1]}=\frac{1}{2} ; S_{z}^{[2]}=0 ; S_{z}^{[3]}=\frac{1}{2} i \\
& +j S_{z}^{[1]}=\frac{1}{2} ; S_{z}^{[2]}=0 ; S_{z}^{[3]}=\frac{1}{2} i ; \tag{8.38}
\end{align*}
$$

and $S_{z}^{[3]}$ acts on $j$ i as a scalar $S_{z}^{[3]} j i=\frac{1}{2} j i$.
$F$ inally in Table 8.1 we assem ble the dim ension of the weak collective decoherence DFS. N otice that these num bers are just Pascal's triangles. It is easy then to see the connection between the num ber of paths in Figure 8.1 and the degeneracy in Eq. (8.35)

| $\mathrm{h}=6$ |  |  |  |  |  |  |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $\mathrm{~h}=5$ |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| $\mathrm{~h}=4$ |  |  |  | 1 | 5 | 15 |
| $\mathrm{~h}=3$ |  |  | 1 | 4 | 10 | 20 |
| $\mathrm{~h}=2$ |  | 1 | 3 | 6 | 10 | 15 |
| $\mathrm{~h}=1$ | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 | 6 |
| $\mathrm{~h}=0$ | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 | 1 |
|  | $\mathrm{n}=1$ | $\mathrm{n}=2$ | $\mathrm{n}=3$ | $\mathrm{n}=4$ | $\mathrm{n}=5$ | $\mathrm{n}=6$ |

Table 8.1: W eak collective decoherence D FS dim ensions, given by the degeneracy $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{h}}$

### 8.6 Strong collective decoherence D FSs

Strong collective decoherence on $n$ qubits is characterized by the action of the three operators $S_{x}^{[n]}, S_{y}^{[n]}$, and $S_{z}^{[n]}$. T hese operators act as the Lie algebra su (2) and this will help us to characterize the D F Ss arising from these operators. In particular, the rules of addition of angularm om entum allow us to com pletely understand the irreps of the $S^{[n]}$. In particular we think of the com putational basis states $j 0 i$ and $j 1 i$ as spin $-1=2$ particles under the $m$ apping j0i! $j J=\frac{1}{2} ; m=\frac{1}{2} i$ and $j 1 i!j J=\frac{1}{2} ; m=\frac{1}{2} i$.

The operators $S^{[n]}$ do not commute w th each other and thus they cannot be sim ultaneously diagonalized. Follow ing standard addition of angular mom entum, we nd that the operators

$$
\begin{equation*}
S^{[n]}{ }^{2}=S_{x}^{[n]}{ }^{2}+S_{y}^{[n]}{ }^{2}+S_{z}^{[n]}{ }^{2} \text { and } S_{z}^{[n]} \tag{8.39}
\end{equation*}
$$

do com $m$ ute. These two operators do not form a com plete basis for the entire H ilbert space. Thus for given eigenvalues of these two operators we m ust assign a degeneracy
index which com pletes the basis. By sim ultaneously diagonalizing these tw o operators we have a basis jJ; ;m i which are a representation of su (2),

$$
\begin{align*}
S^{[n]}{ }^{2} j J ; ~ ; m i & =J(J+1) j 丁 ; ~ ; m i \\
S_{z}^{[n]} j J ; ~ ; m i & =m j \boldsymbol{j} ; \quad ; \mathrm{mi}: \tag{8.40}
\end{align*}
$$

Here, $0(1=2) \quad J \quad n=2$ and $J \quad m \quad J$ and labels the degeneracy $m$ entioned above. In analogy with the addition of angular $m$ om entum, we $w$ ill of think of the qubits as spin $-1=2$ particles. $J$ then represents the total angular $m$ om entum of the particles and $m$ labels the projection of the angular $m$ om entum along the $z$-axis. It is im portant to realize that the qubit does not necessarily correspond to a spin-1=2 particle in the physical system. H ow ever, using the language of angular m om entum and addition of spin $-1=2$ particles $w i l l$ sim plify our nom enclature signi cantly. U sing these basic observations, we can $m$ ove on to study the irreps of the algebra A for strong collective decoherence.

The algebra A generated from $S_{x}^{[n]}, S_{y}^{[n]}$, and $S_{z}^{[n]}$ plus identity I can be decom posed as

$$
\begin{equation*}
A=M_{J=0(1=2)}^{M^{=2}} I_{n_{J}} \quad M_{Z J+1} ; \tag{8.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $J$ labels the total angular $m$ om entum of a particular irrep (and hence the 0 or $1=2$ depending on whether $n$ is even or odd, respectively), $M_{d}$ is the algebra of all linear operators on a d dim ensional space, and $I_{d}$ is the algebra consisting only of the identity operator $I$. $n_{J}$ is then the degeneracy of the $J$ th irrep and $d_{J}=2 J+1$ is dim ension of the Jth irrep. The degeneracy of the Jth irrep is given by [142]

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.n_{J}=\frac{(2 J+1) n!}{(n=2+J+1)!(n=2} \quad J\right)! \tag{8.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

C orresponding to the decom position Eq. (8.41) the action of the $S$ 's act as

$$
\begin{equation*}
S=M_{J=0(1=2)}^{\mathrm{M}^{2}} \mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{n}} \quad \mathrm{~S}(2 J+1) \tag{8.43}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $S(2 J+1)$ is the $2 J+1$ dim ensional representation of su (2). C orresponding to this representation is a basis $j J ; ~ m i w h i c h ~ i s ~ a c t e d ~ u p o n ~ a s ~ S ~ j J ; ~ ; m i=j J ; ~ i ~$ S $(2 J+1)$ jn i. N otice that this action depends on which $j J i$ is acted upon, but is independent of the degeneracy index .

Demition 8.6.1 (Strong collective decoherence D F subsystem D F $S_{n}$ (J)) Strong collective decoherence on $n$ qubits supports D F S labeled by the integer $0(1=2) \quad J \quad n=2$, $D F S_{n}(J) . D F S_{n}(J)$ in general has a subsystem structure. The states in DFS $S_{n}(J)$ are
all eigenstates of $S^{[n]}{ }^{2}$ with eigenvalue $J(J+1)$ ．The action of the collective deco－ herence operators $S^{[n]}$ act as representations of $s u(2)$ on the eigenstates of $S_{z}^{[n]}$ for a particular totalangular m om entum J．F inally，the DFS is realized by the degeneracy of the $J$ th irrep．

The strong collective decoherence DFS，then has inform ation which is encoded into the degeneracy for a particular irrep label by the total angular m om entum J． In addition of angular $m$ om entum，one takes two spin－J and spin $J^{0}$ representations of su（2）adds them together to form spin $K$ representation of $s u(2)$ ．For the strong collective decoherence DFS，we perform this addition of angular $m$ om entum $w$ ith spin $-1=2$ particles．Thus the degeneracy for a given $J$ is given by the di erent ways in which $n$ qubits can be added together under the law s of angular mom entum addition such that the total angularm om entum is J ．

It is usefulto present the rst few $D F S_{n}(J)$ states in order to gain some intuition for what is going on here．DFS $\mathrm{S}_{1}(\mathrm{~J})$ consists of only one D FS，DFS $\mathrm{S}_{1}(1=2)$

$$
\mathrm{DFS}_{1}(1=2)=\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{j} J=\frac{1}{2} ;=1 ; \mathrm{m}=\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{i}=j 0 \mathrm{i}  \tag{8.44}\\
& \mathrm{jJ}=\frac{1}{2} ;=1 ; \mathrm{m}=\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{i}=7 \mathrm{Hi}
\end{align*}
$$

DFS $S_{2}(J)$ now consists of two DFSs，DFS $S_{2}(1)$ and $D F S_{2}(0)$ ，

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \stackrel{8}{\gtrless} j J=1 ;=1 ; m=1 i=j 00 i
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& j J=1 ;=1 ; m=1 i=j 1 i \\
& D F S_{2}(0)=f j=0 ;=1 ; m=1 i=P_{\frac{1}{2}}^{1}(j 01 i \quad j 10 i): \tag{8.45}
\end{align*}
$$

H ere we see that the DFSs for $\mathrm{n}=2$ simply correspond to the singlet and triplet spaces．Up to this point，how ever，there is no degeneracy（ $=1$ for allDFSs）．For $\mathrm{n}=3$ how ever，this changes．At $\mathrm{n}=2$ we saw that we had a singlet and a triplet． $W$ hen we add a spin $-1=2$ particle to these states we can produce $a=1=2$ by either adding to the singlet or subtracting from the triplet．Thus we see that there is a degeneracy in the DFS corresponding to $J=1=2$ ，

$$
\begin{align*}
& { }^{8} \mathrm{j} J=\frac{3}{2} ; \quad=1 ; \mathrm{m}=\frac{3}{2} \mathrm{i}=j 000 \\
& \operatorname{DFS}_{3}(3=2)= \\
& \text { 多 } \\
& \begin{array}{l}
8 \\
\text { 多 }
\end{array} \\
& \text { DFS } \mathrm{S}_{3}(1=2)=  \tag{8.46}\\
& \begin{array}{l}
j=\frac{1}{2} ;=1 ; m=\frac{1}{2} i=p^{1} \overline{3}(j 001 i+j 010 i+j 100 i) \\
j J=\frac{1}{2} ;=1 ; m=\frac{1}{2} i=\frac{3}{3}(j 110 i+j 101 i+j 011 i) \\
j J=\frac{3}{2} ;=1 ; m=\frac{3}{2} i=j 11 i
\end{array} \\
& j \mathrm{j}=\frac{3}{2} ;=1 ; \mathrm{m}=\frac{3}{2} \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{j} 111 \mathrm{i} \\
& j 丁=\frac{1}{2} ;=1 ; m=\frac{1}{2} i=\frac{1}{2}(j 010 i \quad \text { j100i }) \\
& j 丁=\frac{1}{2} ; \quad=1 ; m=\frac{1}{2} i=\frac{p}{2}(j 011 i \quad \text { j101i }) \\
& j 丁=\frac{1}{2} ; \quad 2 ; m=\frac{1}{2} i=q^{1} \frac{1}{\overline{6}}(2 j 001 i+j 010 i+j 100 i) \\
& j J=\frac{1}{2} ; \quad 2 ; m=\frac{1}{2} i=\frac{1}{\overline{6}}(2 j 10 i \quad \text { j101i } \quad \text { j011i })
\end{align*}
$$

The states w ith $=1$ were obtained by taking a singlet and adding a single spin-1=2 and the states $w$ ith $=2$ were obtained by taking a triplet and subtracting a single spin $-1=2$. Thus we see that for $n=3$, we can encoded one qubit of inform ation into the degeneracy index .

### 8.6.1 The strong D F S basis

The DFS corresponding to di erent $J$ values for a given $n$ can be computed using standard $m$ ethods for the addition of angular $m$ om entum [98]. This can best be illustrated by exam ining a fullbasis for the entire $H$ ilbert space. T he set of operators

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{f}\left(\mathrm{~S}^{[1]}\right)^{2} ;\left(\mathrm{S}^{[2]}\right)^{2} ;::: ;\left(\mathrm{S}^{[n]}\right)^{2} ; \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{z}}^{[\mathrm{n}]} \mathrm{g} \tag{8.47}
\end{equation*}
$$

form $s$ a complete set of commuting observables for the $H$ ilbert space of $n$ qubits, $\mathbb{C}^{2 n}$ [109]. C orresponding to this set of observables is a basis which we w ill label as

$$
\begin{equation*}
j_{1} ; J_{2} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 1 ; J_{n} ; m \text { i: } \tag{8.48}
\end{equation*}
$$

This basis is acted upon by the com plete set of com $m$ uting observables in Eq. (8.47) as

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(S^{[k]}\right)^{2}{ }^{2} J_{1} ; J_{2} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 1 ; J_{n} ; m i=J_{k}\left(J_{k}+1\right) \mathrm{j}_{1} ; J_{2} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 1 ; J_{n} ; m i \tag{8.49}
\end{align*}
$$

W e call this basis the strong D F S basis. W ew ill alw ays assum e that the $J_{1} ; J_{2} ;::: ; J_{n}$ and $m$ are consistent $w$ th the law s of the addition of angular $m$ om entum.

O ne can understand this basis by thinking of the addition of angular m om entum in a piecew ise fashion. We start $w$ th a spin $-1=2$ particle. Adding another qubit which is just a spin $-1=2$ particle, we can then create a spin-1 or a spin-0 particle. If we proceed in this $m$ anner, for $k$ qubits we $m$ ay have a spin- particle and adding another qubit allows for the creation of spin $J+1=2$ or spin $J \quad 1=2$ (if $J \quad 1=2$ is positive) particles. This graphical addition of angular $m$ om entum can be easily visualized as in $F$ igure 82 below. The horizontal axis of $F$ igure 82 is the num ber of qubits $n$ and the verticalaxis is the totalangularm om entum $J$ obtained by sum $m$ ing angular $m$ om enta of $n$ spin-1=2 particles. Each state in a DFS is represented by a pathway from the origin always moving from left to right.

Thuswe nd that the degeneracy is labeled by the set of pathw ays via which one can piecew ise construct a given $J$ dim ensional representation of su (2). Sym bolically we might express this as $j J ; ~ ; \mathrm{mi}=j J ;\left(\mathrm{J}_{1} ; \mathrm{J}_{2} ;::: ; \mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{n}}{ }_{1}\right) ; \mathrm{m}$ i. W hen we are talking about a particular n qubit DFS we will often use the notation $j_{n}$; ; m i to $m$ esh w ith the strong D FS basis.
$F$ inally we include in $T$ able 82 the degeneracy of the $J$ th irreducible representation forn qubits. The entries of this table are obtained just as in P ascal's triangle, except half of the triangle is $m$ issing because negative angular $m$ om entum $J$ is not allowed. The entries are exactly those in Eq. (8.42).


Figure 8 2: Strong collective decoherence D F S graphical depiction

### 8.7 C ollective am plitude dam ping D F subspaces

F inally let us consider the D F S s for collective am plitude dam ping [70]. O n n qubits, collective am plitude dam ping consists of a H am iltonian evolution $S_{+}^{[n]} S^{[n]}$ and a collective annihilation Lindblad operator $S^{[n]}$. U sing the $j J$; ;mibasis from Section 8.6 the action ofboth of these operators can be evaluated:

$$
\begin{align*}
& S^{[n]}{ }_{j} J_{n} ; ~ ; m i={ }^{q} \overline{\left(J_{n}+m\right)\left(J_{n} \quad m+1\right)} j_{i} ; ~ ; m \quad 1 i \\
& S_{+}^{[n]} S^{[n]} j_{n} ; ~ ; m i=\left(J_{n}+m\right)\left(J_{n} \quad m+1\right) j \text { ji ; } m i: \tag{8.50}
\end{align*}
$$

A s m entioned previously, if we extend these operators to form a y-closed com plex associative algebra, we obtain exactly the case of strong collective decoherence. T hus it is clear that inform ation encoded into the degeneracy of the strong collective decoherence D FS can be used to store inform ation in the collective am plitude dam ping case. H ow ever we recall that the condition we used to show the strong collective decoherence DFS was a su cient but not necessary condition for the existence of a DFS.

H ere, then we will exam ine the D F subspaces of collective am plitude dam ping where we have a criteria which is both necessary and su cient. The DF subspace condition is that the Lindblad operators act as identity on the states in the DF subspace. In the case of the collective am plitude dam ping the Lindblad operator is only $S^{[m]}$. From equation Eq. (8.50), the only states for which this holds true are the

| $J=3$ |  |  |  |  |  | 1 |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| $J=\frac{5}{2}$ |  |  |  |  | 1 |  |
| $J=2$ |  |  |  | 1 |  | 5 |
| $J=\frac{3}{2}$ |  |  | 1 |  | 4 |  |
| $J=1$ |  | 1 |  | 3 |  | 9 |
| $J=\frac{1}{2}$ | 1 |  | 2 |  | 5 |  |
| $J=0$ |  | 1 |  | 2 |  | 5 |
|  | $n=1$ | $n=2$ | $n=3$ | $n=4$ | $n=5$ | $n=6$ |

Table 8 2: Strong collective decoherence D FS dim ensions, given by the degeneracy $n_{J}$
states $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{n}} ; ~ ; \mathrm{m}=\mathrm{W}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{i}$. In particular we see that

$$
\begin{equation*}
S^{[n]} j J_{n} ; ; m=W_{n} i=0: \tag{8.51}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furtherm ore, the H am iltonian term $S_{+}^{[n]} S^{[n]}$ preserves this subspace

$$
\begin{equation*}
S_{+}^{[n]} S^{[n]} j_{\mathrm{n}} ; \quad ; \mathrm{m}=\mathrm{w}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{i}=0: \tag{8.52}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thuswe nd that
De nition 8.7.1 (C ollective am plitude dam ping D F subspace D F $S_{n}$ ) C ollective am plitude dam ping, in addition to supporting the D F subsystem of strong collective decoherence, supports a DF subspace. The elem ents of this subspace are the states annihilated by the $S^{[n]}$ operator. These states have a projection of the total angular m om entum along the z -axis which is negative the total angular m om entum of the state.

Below we list the elem ents of the collective am plitude dam ping D F S for betw een 1 and 3 qubits

$$
\begin{align*}
& D F S_{1}={ }_{( }^{\mathrm{f} j \mathrm{ji}} \\
& D E S_{2}=j 00 i \\
& { }^{1} \frac{1}{2}-j 01 i \quad \text { j10i } \\
& \text { 立 } \frac{1}{\overline{6}}(2 j 001 i+j 010 i+j 100 i) \tag{8.53}
\end{align*}
$$

From this list we nd that we can encode a single qubit of inform ation into two physical qubits.

T he dim ension of the collective am plitude dam ping D $F$ subspace is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{c}}=\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{b} \frac{\mathrm{n}}{2} \mathrm{c}}^{!} \tag{8.54}
\end{equation*}
$$

which can be found by sum $m$ ing the degeneracy of the appropriate strong collective decoherence D FSs $n_{J}$.

Since we will not work with universality or quantum com puting structures on the collective am plitude dam ping D F subspace, we will not construct a nice basis for this DFS.

### 8.8 C ollective decoheren ce

In this chapterw e have seen how collective coupling ofa system to a bath can occur under reasonably generic conditions. In latter chapters we will encounter physical system s which explicitly realize this regin $e$. The value of the collective decoherence model, of course, is lim ited by how realistic collective coupling is as a source of decoherence.

## C hapter 9

## U niversality on C ollective D ecoherence D ecoherence-Free Subsystem s


#### Abstract

Is it possible to com pute on collective decoherence decoherence-fire subsystem s or are these decoherence-fiee subsystem s useless for quantum computation?


In this chapter we discuss how to use the weak and strong collective decoherence DFSs for quantum computation. The rst issue we address is understanding how to perform universal quantum com putation on the weak and strong DFS.W e begin this task by exam ining the nontrivial one and two qubit interactions which preserve the relevant DFS structure. We then discuss universal control on both the strong and weak collective decoherence D F.S. A discussion of the issue of con joining D FSS then allow us to clam universal unitary $m$ anipulation on the DFSs. P reparation and $m$ easurem ents on the collective DFSs is then discussed. F inally fault-tolerant quantum com putation using concatenated collective D FSs is discussed.

## 9.1 $N$ ontrivial one and tw o qubit interactions on the collective D FSs

It is alw ays possible to construct a set of interactions which is universal on an encoding corresponding to a given DFSs (see Section 7.3.4.) For physical reasons, how ever, we would like to lim it the interactions on qubit subsystem $s$ to be either single qubit orm ultiple qubit operators.

In this section we nd the one and two-qubit interactionswhich are in the com mu utant of the relevant algebra A for the weak and strong collective decoherence D FSs.

It will tum out to be su cient for universality to exam ine only elem ents of the com $m$ utant $A^{0}$.

### 9.1.1 W eak collective decoherence D FS com m utant operations

W eak collective decoherence on $n$ qubits has an O SR or SM E algebra A generated by the operations $f I ; S_{z}^{[n]} g$.

C onsider the single qubit H am iltonian acting on the k th qubit, $\mathrm{H}_{1}^{(\mathrm{k})}=\mathrm{q} \quad \mathrm{m}^{(\mathrm{k})}$. Taking the com $m$ utator of this operator $w$ th the nontrivialelem ent of $A$, we nd that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{z}}^{\mathrm{h}]} ; \mathrm{H}_{1}^{(\mathrm{k})^{\mathrm{i}}}=2 \mathrm{i} \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{x}}{\underset{y}{(\mathrm{k})} \quad \mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{y}}{ }_{\mathrm{x}}^{(\mathrm{k})}: ~: ~}_{\text {a }} \tag{9.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

U sing the trace-inner product, this im plies that the only single qubit operators which are in the com mutant of A are the operators $n_{z} z_{z}^{(k)}$.

Consider next a two qubit Ham iltonian acting between the $k$ th and lth qubit, $H_{2}^{(k 1)}={ }^{3}{ }_{;=1} h{ }^{(k)}$ (1). Taking the comm utator of this $w$ ith $S_{z}^{[h]}$ we nd that
 m ore if we collect like term s on the right hand side of the above com $m$ utator, and use the trace inner product we nd that we can $m$ ake the com $m$ utator vanish by setting $h_{12}=h_{21}$ and $h_{11}=h_{22}$. Thus the two-qubit operators which are in $A$ are all given by

The m ost general $H$ am iltonian on two qubits $i$ and $j$ is then of the form

$$
\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ij}}\left(\mathrm{z}_{1} ; \mathrm{z}_{2} ; \mathrm{z}_{3} ; \mathrm{z}_{4} ; \mathrm{h}\right)=\begin{array}{cccccc}
0 & \mathrm{z}_{1} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1  \tag{9.4}\\
B_{\mathrm{B}} & 0 & \mathrm{z}_{2} & \mathrm{~h} & 0 & \mathrm{C} \\
0 & \mathrm{C}^{2} & \mathrm{z}_{3} & 0 & \mathrm{~A} \\
0 & 0 & 0 & \mathrm{z}_{4}
\end{array} ;
$$

where we have expressed the operator in the standard com putationalbasis[109].

### 9.1.2 Strong collective decoherence D F S com m utant operations

Strong collective decoherence on n qubits has an OSR or SM E algebra A generated by $f I ; S_{x}^{[n]} ; S_{y}^{[n]} ; S_{z}^{[n]} g$.

There are no single-qubit operators in the com m utant of A. To see this note that for a single qubit operator $\mathrm{q} \quad \sim^{(i)}$, one can alw qys construct a ${ }_{i}$ collective operator me $S^{[n]}$ for someme such that me $\mathrm{n} \in 0$ and thusq $\sim^{(i)} ; \mathrm{mf} S^{[\mathrm{n}]} \in 0$.

For the two-qubit operators, we can im m ediately reduce the possible com $m$ uting H am iltonians to the two-qubit operators which are in the com mutant for the weak collective decoherence D FS,

Taking the com $m$ utator of this operator $w$ th $S_{x}^{[n]}$ we nd that
which vanishes only if $h_{11}=h_{33}$ and $h_{12}=0$. Thus we see that the $H$ am iltonian

Including a global phase I operator and scaling appropriately, this operator is the exchange interaction betw een qubits $i$ and $j$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{lllll}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0^{1}
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

where we have expressed the exchange operator in a $m$ atrix form over the standard com putationalbasis over the two qubits iand $j$. The exchange operator $E_{i j}$ exchanges $q u b i t s i a n d j: E_{i j} j i_{i} j i_{j}=j i_{i} j i_{j}$.

### 9.2 W eak collective decoherence D F S universality

In this section we discuss universal quantum com putation on the weak collective decoherence D FSs. Recalling Eq. (9.4), de ne the operators

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{P}} & =\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ij}}(1 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0)=\operatorname{diag}_{\mathrm{ij}}(1 ; 0 ; 0 ; 0) \\
\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\ell} & =\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ij}}(0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 1 ; 0)=\operatorname{diag}_{\mathrm{ij}}(0 ; 0 ; 0 ; 1) \\
\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{ij}} & =\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ij}}(0 ; 0 ; 1 ; 0 ; 0)=\operatorname{diag}_{\mathrm{ij}}(0 ; 0 ; 1 ; 0) ; \tag{9.9}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\operatorname{diag}_{i j}(\mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{b} ; \mathrm{c} ; \mathrm{d})=\mathrm{aj} 00 \mathrm{ih} 00 j+\mathrm{bj} 01 \mathrm{ih} 01 j+\mathrm{cj} 10 \mathrm{ih} 10 j+\mathrm{dj} 1 \mathrm{ihl1j}$ represents the a $m$ atrix w ith diagonal elem ents in the standard com putationalbasis. De ne the set

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{fE}_{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{i}+1} ; \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{i}+1} ; \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{i}+1}^{\mathrm{P}} ; \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{i}+1}: \mathrm{i}=1 ;::: ; \mathrm{n} \quad 1 \mathrm{~g}: \tag{9.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{i}+1}$ is the exchange interaction betw een the i and i+ 1th qubit. N otice that this set H contains nearest neighbor interactions. A ll of the operators in this set are in the commutant of the algebra generated by $f I ; S_{z}^{[n]}$ and thus preserve the DFS structure of the weak collective decoherence D FS.

The controla orded over the weak collective decoherence D F Ssw ith $H$ am iltonians from $H$ is described by the follow ing theorem :

Theorem 9.2.1 [109] For any n 2 qubits undergoing weak collective decoherence, the set of H am iltonians H generates (in the sense of a L ie algebra) a L ie algebra which acts independently as su $\left(n_{h}\right)$ on DFS $S_{n}(h)$. If $L$ denotes the $L$ ie algebra generated by H , then

To say that the Lie algebra $s u\left(n_{h}\right)$ acts independently on $D F S_{n}(h) m$ eans that there are elem ents in the Lie algebra which act only on DFS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{h})$ and annihilate all other


P roof: See A ppendix B .
Let us re ect on what this theorem implies. This theorem tells us that given controlover the H am iltonians in H , any unitary action on an encoded weak collective decoherence D FS can be enacted. Since these operators are in the com m utant of the weak collective decoherence algebra $A$, these operators are in som e sense maxim al: they can not m ix di erent DFSs and they operate as full su $\left(n_{h}\right)$ on the D FSs.

In Chapter 10 we w ill have the opportunity to calculate explicit representations of the gates needed for the physically relevant case of an ion trap quantum com puter.

### 9.2.1 C on join ing w eak collective decoherence D FSs and universality

In order to use weak collective decoherence D F Ss for universalquantum com putation, there $m$ ust be $m$ ap from the DFSs to the quantum circuit $m$ odel. In particular the $m$ apping from the encoded inform ation to the subsystem structure of the quantum circuit $m$ odel $m$ ust be $m$ ade. The fact that weak collective decoherence is $m$ ost likely to occur when qubits are closely spaced puts certain constraints on the subsystem structure. Suppose we use a weak collective decoherence D FS on $k$ qubits as our basic subsystem which encodes $d$ qubits of inform ation. N otice that the subsystem structure of the physicalqubits is $m$ apped to the subsystem structure of the quantum circuit m odel in the weak collective decoherence D FS case. Theorem 92.1 im plies that given the operators in H we can construct su (d) operations on these encoded subsystem s.

But what about when we bring the two subsystem s together to im plem ent m ore com plicated gates? W hen tw o encoded subsystem s are thus con joined we would like
to $m$ aintain the DF property of these states. W hen we conjoin two weak collective decoherence D FSS, these states inhabit a D F S of the com bined space. Ifh is the H am $m$ ing weight of the rst subsystem S DFS and $h$ is also the $H$ am ming weight of the second subsystem SDFS, then the con joined system inhabits the $2 \mathrm{~h} H$ am $m$ ing weight DFS ( $m$ ore general situations where the D FSs are of di ering $H$ am $m$ ing weights follow sim ilar argum ents.) Furthem ore, $T$ heorem 92.1 tells us that given the operators in H we can perform operations which preserve the h Hamm ing weight DFS.Am ong these operations are the operations which have an input output property which individually preserve each h H amming weight DFS. Thus we can perform nontrivial operations between the two subsystem s which always maintain the combined ( 2 h H am m ing weight) weak collective decoherence D FS.

Thus we see that Theorem 92.1 allows for universal quantum com putation on subsystem swhile m aintaining the D F condition under the caveat that conjoined subsystem smust also be D F. Since weak collective decoherence is conditioned on the close spacing of the qubits, one would therefore expect that subsystem $s$ involving the sm allest num ber of qubits would be used in such a con joining schem e.

### 9.3 Strong collective decoherence D FS universality

The follow ing theorem dem onstrates how the exchange interaction can be used for quantum com putation on the strong collective decoherence DFS:

Theorem 9.3.1 [109] For any n 2 qubits undergoing strong collective decoherence let $S$ be the set of exchange $H$ am iltonians $E_{i j}$ acting between qubits $i$ and $j$. The Lie algebra generated by $S$ contains the ability to perform $s u\left(n_{J}\right)$ independently on the degeneracy of every irrep $J$. If $L$ is the $L$ ie algebra generated by $S$ then
where $I_{d_{J}}$ represents an identity operator on the $d_{J}$ dim ensional irrep space. The ability to perform each $s u\left(n_{J}\right)$ independently $m$ eans that the $L$ ie algebra contains elem ents which act nontrivial on the Jth irrep but annihilate all states outside of this irrep.

Proof: See A ppendix C .
This theorem im plies that the only interaction needed to perform computation on the strong collective decoherence D FS is the exchange interaction. Like the weak collective decoherence case, this result is in som e sense maxim al: the operations do not m ix D FSs but act fully on the D FS encoded inform ation.

This rem ankable theorem implies that quantum com putation can be perform ed w ith only the exchange H am iltonian betw een qubits. In C hapter 11 we w ill have the opportunity to give explicit gate constructions in the context of a solid-state exchange based quantum com puter.

### 9.3.1 C on join ing strong collective decoherence D F S s for universality

C on joining strong collective decoherence D F Ss is slightly more com plicated than in the weak collective decoherence case because the D F Ss are now subsystem s and not subspaces. Suppose we use a strong collective decoherence DFS on $k$ qubits as our basic subsystem which encodes $d$ qubits of inform ation. O $n$ these $k$ qubits suppose we encode into the subsystem with total angular mom entum J. Theorem 9.3 .1 m plies that the exchange $H$ am iltonian can be used to perform any encoded su (d) on each of these individual subsystem s.

W hen the two subsystem s are conjoined, the resulting states inhabit m any di erent irreps of the con joined system. This can be understood via the rules of addition of angular $m$ om entum. If two $J$ irreps are conjoined, then the resulting system w ill have support over irreps on the con joined system with totalangular m om entum $J^{0}=0 ; J^{0}=1 ;::: ; J^{0}=2 J$.
where 1 and 2 label the degeneracies of the individual subsystem and 12 denotes the totaldegeneracy when the subsystem s are conjoined. In particular j ${ }_{12}$ i contains the tensor product of $j_{1} i$ and $j_{2} i$. If we let $H{ }_{12}$ denote the $H$ ilbert space of this degenerate inform ation, then

$$
\mathrm{H}_{12}=\left(\begin{array}{lll}
\mathrm{H}_{1} & \mathrm{H}_{2} \tag{9.14}
\end{array}\right) \quad \mathrm{H}_{12}^{0} ;
$$

where $H_{i}$ contains the inform ation in the ith degeneracy and $H_{i 2}$ denotes all of the other degeneracies. V ia $T$ heorem 9.3 .1 we can now perform any unitary $m$ anipulation on each of the subsystem $s$. Thus we can perform operations which act as operations whose nalresult is an operation on $\mathrm{H}_{1} \quad \mathrm{H}_{2}$. Thisw ill represent an encoded action between the encoded subsystem.

It is im portant to note that while the two subsystem are con joined, strong collective decoherence errors willa ect the di erent D F Ss indexed by $J^{0}$. This decoherence can distinguish between the di erent D FSs and thus it m ight appear that this w ould lead to problem s for the conjoined inform ation. To see that this is not a problem, one notes that the actions which distinguish between each of the di erent $J^{0}$ only act to change the $m$ anner in which the conjoining is achieved. D uring the course of
an operation on two con joined D FSS, strong collective decoherence errors act on the jn ${ }_{12} i$ index. $W$ hen the action on each of the $J^{0}$ irreps on the $H_{1} \quad H_{2}$ com ponents is identical, how ever, the e ect of these errors only serve to perhaps entangle the $\mathrm{jn}_{1}$ i and $\mathrm{jn}_{2} \mathrm{i}$ degrees of freedom.

### 9.4 W eak collective decoherence D F S preparation and $m$ easu rem ent

In order to m ake use of a weak collective decoherence D FS for quantum com putation, we m ust, in addition to the universalm anipulations described above, be able to prepare and $m$ easure the states in the DFS.

Here we would like to note that it is not necessary to prepare states that have support exclusively w ithin the D FS, i.e. that have no com ponent outside of the D FS. $T$ his follow s from the fact that in our construction, while a com putation is perform ed, there is no m ixing of states inside and outside of the DFS. If an initially prepared state is \contam inated" (has support outside of the DFS we want to com pute on), then the result of the com putation will have the sam e am ount of contam ination, ie. the initial error does not spread.

For exam ple, suppose we can prepare the state $=\left(\begin{array}{ll}1 & \mathrm{p}\end{array}\right)_{j}$ ih $j+\mathrm{pj}$ ? ih ? jwhere $j i$ is a state of a particularD FS and $j$ ? i is a state outside of the D FS.C om putation on the DFS will proceed independently on the DFS and the states outside of the D FS.R eadout will then obtain the result of the com putation w ith probability ( $1 \quad \mathrm{p}$ ). Repeated application can then be used to $m$ agnify this com putation. Thus perfect preparation is not a strict requirem ent. P reparation which is not perfect, how ever, will hinder the quantum com puter and thus it is desirable to be able to prepare D FS states.

For weak collective decoherence D FSs preparation of initial pure state is rather sim ple. P urse state preparation into a D FS w ith a Ham ming weight h corresponds to the preparation of a state w ith a speci c num ber of j0i and jli (eigenstates of the
 as well as the ability to perform ${ }_{x}^{(i)}$ gates (to $\backslash i p$ " the bits).

T he second crucial ingredient for com putation on a DFS (in addition to preparation) is the decoding or readout ofquantum inform ation resulting from a com putation. O nce again, there are $m$ any options for how this can be perform ed. For exam ple, in the w eak collective decoherence case one can $m$ ake a $m$ easurem ent $w$ hich distinguishes allofthe D F Ss and allof the states w thin this D F S by sim ply $m$ aking a m easurem ent in the $z$ basis on every qubit. Further, all $m$ easurem ents $w$ ith a given num ber of distinct eigenvalues can be perform ed by rst rotating the observable into one corresponding to a m easurem ent in the com putationalbasis (which, in tum, corresponds to a unitary operation on the DFS) and then perform ing the given $m$ easurem ent in the $z$ basis, and nally rotating back. There are other situations where one would
like to, say, m ake a m easurem ent of an observable over the D F S which has only two di erent eigenvalues. This type of $m$ easurem ent can be $m$ ost easily perform ed by a con joined $m$ easurem ent [9]. In this schem $e$, one attaches another D FS to the original DFS, form ing a single larger DFS. Then, assum ing uníversal quantum com putation over this larger D FS one can alw ays perform operations which allow a m easurem ent of the rst DFS by entangling it with the second DFS, and reading out (destructively as described for the weak collective decoherence case above) the second D FS .

For exam ple, suppose the rst DFS encodes two bits of quantum inform ation, $k ; l_{i}, k ; l=f 0 ; 1 g$, and the second DFS encodes a single bit ofquantum inform ation $\mathrm{f} j \mathrm{Di}_{\mathrm{L}}$, $\mathrm{jli} \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{L}} g$. Then one can $m$ ake a measurem ent of the observable $z \quad I$ on the rst D FS by perform ing an encoded controlled-N O T operation between the rst and the second DFS, and reading out the second DFS in the encoded $z_{z}$ basis. For the weak collective decoherence case the ability to $m$ ake this destructive $m$ easurem ent on the ancilla (not on the code) sim ply corresponds to the ability to measure single $z$ operations.


Figure 9.1: The con joined $m$ easurem ent schem e

F inally, we note that for a weak collective decoherence D FS there is a destructive $m$ easurem ent which distinguishes between di erent DFSs (oorresponding to a m easurem ent of the num ber of ji's). O ne can fault-tolerantly prepare a weak collective decoherence D FS state by repeatedly perform ing such a m easurem ent to guarantee that the state is in the proper D FS. T he con joined $m$ easurem ent procedures described above for any D FS are naturally fault-tolerant in the sense that they can be repeated and are non-destructive $[95,9]$. T hus fault-tolerant preparation and decoding is available for the weak collective decoherence D FS.

### 9.5 Strong collective decoherence DFS preparation and $m$ easurem ent

At rst glance it might seem di cult to prepare pure states of a strong collective decoherence D F S, because these states are nontrivially entangled. H ow ever, it is easy to see that every D F subspace contains a state which is a tensor product of singlet states:

$$
\begin{equation*}
j 0_{D} i=P_{\overline{2}}^{1}{ }_{n=2}^{\substack{n=2 \\ j=1}}(j 01 i \quad j 0 i) ; \tag{9.15}
\end{equation*}
$$

because these states have zero total angular $m$ om entum. T hus a supply of singlet states is su cient to prepare D F subspace states. Further, D F subsystem s alw ays contain a state which is a tensor product of a D F subspace and a pure state of the form jli ji. This can be seen from $F$ igure (82), where the low est path leading to a speci c DF $S_{n}(J)$ is com posed of a segm ent passing through a D F subspace (and is thus of the form $j_{D} i$ ), and a segm ent going straight up from there to $D F S_{n}(J)$. $T$ he corresponding state is equivalent to adding a spin-0 (D F subspace) and a spin- $J$ DF subsystem (the $j J ; m_{J}=J i$ state of the latter is seen to be $m$ ade up entirely of jli jli). In general, addition of a spin-0 DFS and a spin- DFS simply corresponds to tensoring the tw o states. N ote, how ever, that addition oftw o arbitrary D F subsystem s into a larger D FS is not nearly as sim ple: concatenation oftw o J 0 D F Ss does not correspond to tensoring.

Pure state preparation for a strong collective decoherence DFS can thus be as sim ple as the ability to produce singlet states and jli states (it is also possible to use the $j J ; m_{J}=J i=j 0 i \quad j 0 i$ or any of the otherijzthates plus singlets). O ther, $m$ ore com plicated pure state preparation procedures are also conceivable, and the decision as to which procedure to use is clearly determ ined by the available resources to $m$ anipulate quantum states. The pure state preparation of singlets and com putationalbasis states has the distinct advantage that veri cation of these states should be experim entally achievable. Such veri cation is necessary for fault-tolerant preparation [95].
$M$ easurem ents on the strong collective decoherence D FS can be perform ed by using the con joined $m$ easurem ent schem e detailed in the weak collective decoherence D FS discussion in Section 9.4. In particular, by attaching a strong collective decoherence D F subspace ancilla via such con joining, one can construct any con joined m easurem ent scenario. A ll that rem ains to be show $n$ is how to perform a destructive $m$ easurem ent on such an ancilla.

O ne way to perform a destructive $m$ easurem ent on the $n=4$ strong collective decoherence DF subspace was presented in [9] (for another see [64]). This scheme
 surem ent works, note that the four qubit strong D F subspace is spanned by the two
states

$$
\begin{aligned}
& j \mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}=\frac{1}{2}(\mathrm{j} 01 \mathrm{i} \quad \text { j10i })(\mathrm{j} 01 \mathrm{i} \quad \text { j10i }) \\
& \mathcal{j}_{\mathrm{L}} i=\frac{1}{\overline{12}}(2 \mathfrak{j} 0011 i+2 \mathfrak{j} 100 i \quad j 0101 i \quad \text { j1010i } \quad \text { j0110i } \quad \text { j1001i }):(9.16)
\end{aligned}
$$

 m ust be $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}$. If how ever, the m easurem ent yields, j 01 i or $\mathfrak{j} 0 \mathrm{i}$, then the rem aining two qubits are in the states

$$
\begin{align*}
& j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i} \quad!\quad P^{1} \frac{1}{2}(j 01 i \quad j 0 i)=P_{\overline{2}}^{1}(j \quad+i \quad j+\quad i) \\
& j_{L_{L}} i!\quad P_{\overline{2}}^{1}(j 01 i+j 0 i)=P_{\overline{2}}^{1}(j++i \quad j \quad i): \tag{9.17}
\end{align*}
$$

W here we have rew ritten the states in the eigenstates of $x$ : $x_{j} i=j$ i. M easurem ent of $x$ on the rem aining qubits then destructively distinguishes between $j_{\mathrm{L}}$ i and $j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}$.

Further, we note that the ability to perform a conjoined measurem ent scenario by conjoining an ancilla DFS com posed of a single encoded-qubit, can be used to perform any possible con joined D F S m easurem ent scenario. A sm entioned in the weak collective decoherence case, the con joined $m$ easurem ent procedures are fault-tolerant. Thus we have shown how to perform fault-tolerant preparation and decoding on the strong collective decoherence D FS.

### 9.6 Fault-tolerant quantum com putation and collective decoherence D FSs

So farwe have show $n$ how to im plem ent universalcom putation w ith localH am iltonians on a collective D FS corresponding to a single block ofqubits. This construction assum es that the only errors are collective. $T$ his is a very stringent sym $m$ etry require$m$ ent, which obviously becom es less realistic as the num ber of particles n increases signi cantly. It is thus necessary to be able to deal with perturbations that break the collective-decoherence (perm utation) sym $m$ etry. To dealw th these perturbations we will have to use a quantum error correcting code (QECC). This quantum error correcting code will work on the encoded DFS inform ation. W e then say that the DFSs are concatenated into a QECC.

O ne particular realization of this concatenation schem e was proposed in [135]. In [135]D F S blocks of four particles (each block constituting a single encoded qubit) into a QECC.The QECC in the outer layer then takes care of any single encoded-qubit errors on each of its constituent D FS Sblocks. By choosing an appropriate Q ECC it is
thus possible to dealw ith the appropriate type of non-collective error on the encoded DFS-qubits. M ore generally any dim ensional collective DFS can be concatenated into a fault-tolerant Q ECC scheme. In the previous sections we have shown how to $m$ anipulate this inform ation, how to fault-tolerantly $m$ easure the inform ation, and how to prepare the inform ation.

O ne issue arising with concatenation which we have not yet addressed is the ability to fault-tolerantly detect leakage errors on a DFS. C oncatenation resulting in unreliable leakage detection would be useless. H owever, this is not a problem here, since detection can easily be perform ed when one has the ability to $m$ ake som e fault-tolerant $m$ easurem ents on the D FS and also to perform universalm anipulations over any combination of DFS states. Both of these are valid w th the DFS-QECC concatenation, as we have sum $m$ arized above. In particular, it is alw ays possible to $m$ easure the relevant observables for leakage by (i) attaching ancilla encoded DFS states, (ii) perform ing the leakage syndrom e detection routine onto the ancilla states, and (iii) fault-tolerantly $m$ easuring this ancilla ( 9,109$]$ ).

W e re-em phasize that the fault-tolerance in our proposed schem e is not solely a result of properties of decoherence-free subsystem s. D ecoherence-free subsystem s $m$ ust be com bined w ith quantum error correcting codes to achieve full fault-tolerant quantum computation.

### 9.7 C ollective decoherence and quantum computation

In this chapter we have seen how collective decoherence D FSs can be used as a quantum com puter. O f particular im portance was the discovery that one and twobody interactions are su cient for universal quantum com putation on the encoding corresponding to the D FS. Furthem ore, realistically im plem entable preparation and $m$ easurem ent scenarios were put forth. Thus we see that under som e fairly nonstringent conditions collective decoherence D F Ss can be put to use to build a quantum com puter. This being said, the actual details of the im plem entations in physical system $s$ will have $m$ any im portant issues of actual execution of the tasks we have described in this chapter. In the follow ing two chapters we detail som e of the details of the using collective decoherence D F Ss in speci c physical system s.

## C hapter 10

## The W eak C ollective D ecoherence Ion $T$ rap $Q$ uantum Computer

The rst physical realization of a decoherence-free subspace under am bient conditions (i.e. naturally occuring decoherence) was realized in a trapped ion experim ent perform ed by a group at N IST [111, 110] in 2001. In this chapter we discuss how to perform universalquantum com putation on the ion trap D FS ofthis experim ent. The ion trap D FS corresponds of $[111,110]$ is the weak collective decoherence DF.S. In this chapter we discuss how to perform universal quantum com putation on clusters of these two qubit D FSs w ithin the context of an ion trap multi-qubit m anipulation schem e proposed by $S$ rensen and $M \operatorname{lm}$ er[179, 147, 180]. This is an im portant concrete application of the concepts presented in previous sections for universal quantum com putation on a DFS.

### 10.1 The ion trap quantum com puter

Ion traps are am ong the leading architectures for a future quantum com puter. In the ion trap quantum com puting architecture multiple ions are con ned strongly in two directions ( $x$ and $y$ ) com pared to the con nem ent along a third direction ( $z$ ). $W$ th few numbers of ions con ned into an appropriate trap, the ions form a linear chain. The physical qubits of an ion trap quantum com puter are associated with intemal quantum numbers for each ion (usually hyper ne levels). The intemal state of the ions can be prepared using optical pum ping and highly e cient readout of the qubit state can be achieved via electron shelving [151, 166, 22].

T he rst proposal for an ion trap quantum com puter was the proposal of $C$ irac and Zoller[47]. These authors show ed how to use the collective center ofm ass m otion of the trapped ions as a logicalbus state for enacting a nontrivialquantum operation between the intemal states of two ions. C ombined with single qubit gates on the qubits and the preparation and readout $m$ entioned above, this show ed that ions traps
could in principle realize all of the com ponents needed for quantum com putation. In order to $m$ ake this architecture scalable, som e $m$ ethod of $m$ oving ions betw een traps[205] or of coupling m ultiple traps together[48, 157, 192] m ust be added onto this basic schem e.
$M$ uch progress has been $m$ ade in the experim ental dem onstration of ion traps as coherent $m$ anipulators of quantum inform ation culm inating $w$ ith the recent dem onstration of an entangled state of four ions[165]. T he reader is referred to [184, 205] for a review of som e of the basics of the ion trap quantum com puter.

### 10.2 The ion trap D FS

Am ong the particular achievem ents of ion trap quantum com puting is the recent dem onstration of a D F subspace oftwo ions $[111,110]$. In the experim ent described in $[111,110]$ a single ion was intially prepared in the state $j i=p_{\overline{2}}^{1} j 0 i+e^{i} j 1 i$. The physical qubits j0i and jli in this experim ent corresponded to the $F=2, \mathrm{~m}_{\mathrm{F}}=2$ and $F=1, m_{F}=1$ sublevels of the ${ }^{2} S_{1=2}$ ground state of a ${ }^{9} \mathrm{Be}^{+}$ion. A tw o qubit interaction (of the form described in Section 10.3 below) was then applied to this single qubit state and a prepared j0i state of a second ion. This tw o qubit interaction has the e ect ofm oving the inform ation in the single qubit to a two qubit encoding

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { jOi } P_{\overline{2}}^{1} j 0 i+e^{i} j l i!P_{\overline{2}}^{1} j \text { i+ } e^{i} j+i \text {; } \tag{10.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $j \quad i=\frac{1}{2}(j 01 i \quad i j 10 i)$. $N$ ote that $j$ i span the sam e space as j01i, j10i. The state then hasbeen encoded into the w eak collective decoherence $D \mathrm{FS}_{2}$ (1). In the am bient conditions experim ent, this state w as then allow ed exposure to the environm ent and then the reverse encoding procedure was applied and the state of the qubit was read out. A sim ilar experim ent w ith no encoding and decoding but $w$ ith preparation into the state $j 0 i{ }^{1} \frac{1}{\overline{2}} \quad j 0 i+e^{i} \mathrm{Jli}$ was also perform ed. From these tw o experim ents, the decoherence tim e w ithout encoding was (7:9 1:5)ns while the decoherence tim e w th the D FS encoding was (2:2 0:3)ns. This, then, clearly dem onstrates how DF coding can result in protection of quantum inform ation from decoherence. Furtherm ore, the decoherence rates in this experim ent were severely lim ited by the delity of the encoding, decoding, and preparation mechanism $s$. Thus it appears that the lim iting decoherence rate attained w th the D FS encoding is m ostly the result of the heating of the trap. This heating is not seen as a fundam ental obstacle to ion trap quantum com puting [205] but has so far de ed identi cation.

W e would like to address the issue ofhow to use the D F S encoded states for quantum com puting in the \quantum CCD "m odelofan ion trap quantum com puter[110]. In the quantum CCD m odela large trap $w$ ith $m$ any independent $m$ icrotraps is envisioned. The ions in the $m$ icrotraps can perform localquantum com putations (using traps can be $m$ oved in between individual $m$ icrotraps to realize the quantum circuit

 they are $m$ oved around between the $m$ icrotraps. The question which arises when using the tw o qubit weak collective decoherence D FS for ion trap quantum com puting is

 decoherenœ DFS the ion trap DFS quantum com puter.

## 
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Figure 10.1: The quantum CCD ion trap quantum com puter
 110] both used a m ethod form anipulating trapped ionsw hich was devised by $S$ rensen and $M \mathrm{~lm}$ er. This schem e[179,147,180] is an in provem ent over the proposalgiven by C irac and Zoller [47] in that it does not require that the vibrationalstate of the center fm ass of the ions be cooled to the ground state. The $S$ rensen and $M$ mer schem e is fairly insensitive to the occupations of the vibrational states of the trap. In this section we present an overview of the $S$ rensen and $M$ m er schem e and dem onstrate
how it can be used to enact two di erent operations which we w ill then use to show how to perform universalquantum com puter on the ion trap D FS quantum com puter.
$n$ ions in a linear trap interacting with a laser eld of frequency ! are described by the H am iltonian

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{H}_{0}+\mathrm{V}(\mathrm{t}) ; \tag{102}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& H_{0}=a^{y} a+\frac{!}{0}_{2}^{x}{ }_{i}^{(i)} \\
& V(t)={ }_{i}^{X} \frac{i}{2}{ }_{+}^{(i)} e^{i_{i}\left(a+a^{y}\right)}{ }^{i!t+i}+{ }^{(i)} e^{i_{i}\left(a+a^{y}\right)+i!t i} \quad: \tag{10.3}
\end{align*}
$$

Here is the frequency of the vibrational m ode, $\mathrm{a}^{\mathrm{y}}$ and a are the ladder operators for this $m$ ode, $!_{0}$ is the energy di erence betw een the ions intemal states $w$ hidh are being used as qubits, and $i$ is the $R$ abifrequency of the ith ion. $i$ is the Lam $b-D$ icke param eter which represents the projection of the laser $k$ vector along the direction of the string ions and m s excursion of the ionic center-ofm ass along this direction and $i$ is the phase of the laser on the ith ion. W e have replaced the position of the ions by the ladder operators $\mathrm{kx}_{\mathrm{i}}={ }_{i}\left(\mathrm{a}+\mathrm{a}^{\mathrm{y}}\right)$ and assum ed that the laser is close to a sideband ! ! for a single vibrational mode. For sim plicity, we w ill also assum e that ${ }_{i}=$ : i.e. the coupling of the recoil to vibration is the sam e for all ions. $T$ he center of $m$ ass $m$ ode is one for which this assum ption is valid. W e assum e also that the $m$ ode has been su ciently cooled so that we are in the Lam b-D idke regin e ${ }^{2}(n+1) \quad 1$ so that $e^{i\left(a+a^{y}\right)} \quad I+i(a+\sharp)$. For sim plicity of notation, we place the phase into a new operator $s^{(i)}={ }^{(i)} e^{i} . W$ ew ill further assum e ions experience identical $R$ abi frequencies, $i=$.
$N$ otioe that we have assum ed that we can control the phase ${ }_{i}$ of the laser on each ions. Wew ill only need this single ion phase control for the two qubit case. In this case the phase betw een the ions can be adjusted by changing the oscillation frequency of the trap. By changing the oscillation frequency of the trap, the ion spacing can be precisely controlled and therefore the relative phase between the two ions can be controlled [111].

C onsider tw o lasers acting on the string of ions and assum e that these are tuned to frequencies ! + and! . In the Lamb-D icke lim it in the interaction picture w th respect to $\mathrm{H}_{0}$, the interaction H am iltonian is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
V(t)= & 2 J_{x}(\sim) \cos (t) \quad{ }^{p} \overline{2} J_{y}(\sim) x(\cos (\quad) t+\cos (+) t) \\
& +p(\sin (\quad) t+\sin (+) t)] ; \tag{10.4}
\end{align*}
$$

where $x=p^{1} \frac{1}{2}\left(a+a^{y}\right), p=p^{\frac{i}{2}}\left(a^{y} \quad a\right)$, and the we have de ned the operators

$$
J_{X}(\sim)=\frac{1}{2} X_{i}^{h} S_{+}^{(i)}\left(i_{i}\right)+s^{(i)}\left(i_{i}\right)^{i}=\frac{1}{2} X_{i}^{h} e^{i_{i}} \underset{+}{(i)}+e^{i_{i} \quad(i)}{ }^{i}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
J_{y}(\sim)=\frac{i^{X}}{2}{ }_{i}^{h} S_{+}^{(i)}\left(i_{i}\right) \quad s^{(i)}\left(i_{i}\right)^{i}=\frac{i x}{2}{ }_{i}^{h} e^{i_{i}} \stackrel{(i)}{+} e^{i_{i}}{ }^{(i)^{i}}: \tag{10.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

If the laser intensity is less than the detuning and the detuning is close the sidebands then the $H$ am iltonian becom es

$$
\begin{align*}
V(t) & =p_{\overline{2}} \quad \cos (\quad) \quad t_{T} J(\sim) x+\sin (\quad) t_{\Psi} J(\sim) p \\
V(t) & =f(t) J_{Y}(\sim) x+g(t) J_{y}(\sim) p: \tag{10.6}
\end{align*}
$$

The evolution operator for this H am iltonian is of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
U(t)=e^{i A(t) U_{y}^{Z_{y}}(\sim)} e^{\text {iF }(t) \Phi_{y}(\sim) \mathrm{x}} e^{\text {ig }(t) \Phi_{y}(\sim) p} ; \tag{10.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where

$$
\begin{align*}
& F(t)={ }_{z^{0}}^{Z_{t}} f() d=\frac{p_{\overline{2}}}{p_{-}} \sin (\quad) t \\
& G(t)={ }_{Z_{0}}^{Z_{t}} g() d=\frac{\mathrm{P}_{\overline{2}}}{}\left[\begin{array}{lll}
1 & \cos (\quad) t
\end{array}\right] \\
& A(t)={ }_{0}^{Z_{t}} F\left(\ln () d=\frac{2^{2} 2^{\prime \prime}}{} t \frac{1}{2( } \sin 2(\quad)^{\#} \quad t:\right. \tag{10.8}
\end{align*}
$$

By choosing the time ( $\quad$ t $=\mathrm{K} 2$ the ion -m ode entangling com ponents of the gate vanish $F\left(\tau_{K}\right)=0, G\left(\tau_{K}\right)=0$ and

$$
\begin{equation*}
A\left(t_{K}\right)=\frac{2^{2} 2^{2}}{\left(\quad{ }^{2}\right.} \mathrm{K} ; \tag{10.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

such that the evolution is

$$
\begin{equation*}
S(\sim ; K)=\exp ^{h} \quad \text { iA }\left(k_{k}\right) J_{y}^{2}(\sim)^{i}: \tag{10.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

W ew ill call the gate $S(K ; \sim) ; K 2 \mathbb{N}^{+} S$ rensen and $M \quad m$ er gates [180]. By adjusting $K$, and , the $S$ rensen and $M$ lm er gates gives us basic $H$ am iltonian control over the (e ective) Ham iltonian $J_{y}(\sim)$.

### 10.4 U niversal quantum com putation on the ion trap D FS quantum com puter

In this section we discuiss how to use the $S$ rensen and $M$ mer gates to perform quantum computation on the ion trap DFS quantum computer.

### 10.4.1 Single qubit rotations using $S$ rensen and $M$ lm er gates

N otice that the operation $J_{y}^{2}(\sim)$ is not in the com mutant of the weak collective decoherenc OSR algebra, $J_{y}^{2}(\sim) ; S_{z} \not 0$. For the single qubit gates, how ever, the $S$ rensen and $M \mathrm{~lm}$ er gates can still be used to perform computation entirely w thin the ion trap DFS. N ote however, that during the operation of the $S$ rensen and M m er gates, the states are entangled w th the vibrationalm odes and are also not within the D FS. Before and after the gates we w ill describe below, how ever, the DFS is preserved. T hus these gates $m$ ust be executed faster than the weak collective decoherence of the system in order to not expose the system to too much weak collective decoherence.

The single qubit gates on the ion trap D FS will be executed when 2 ions have been $m$ aneuvered such these two ions are the only ions in a $m$ icrotrap. C onsider the follow ing two ion operators

$$
\begin{align*}
& X=2 J_{y}^{2}{ }_{1}=\overline{2} ; 2=\overline{2}={\underset{x}{(1)}}_{x}^{(2)}+I \tag{10.11}
\end{align*}
$$

W hile neither of these operators in the in the com m utant of the OSR algebra form the weak collective decoherence case, the operations do preserve the tw o qubit weak collective decoherence D FS . Speci cally we see that, neglecting the global phase shiff produced by the identity I,

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { X j01i = j10i; } \mathrm{X} \text { j10i }=\text { j01i } \\
& \text { Y j01i }=\text { ij10i; } Y \text { j10i }=i j 01 i \text { : } \tag{10.12}
\end{align*}
$$

We thus see that X and Y act as encoded x and y respectively on the j01i, j10i basis. These are exam ples of operations which are not in the com $m$ utant but which preserve a particularD FS.N ote that these operations do not preserve allof the 2 qubit weak collective decoherence D FSs: D FS $2_{2}(2)$ (j00i) and D FS $S_{2}(0)$ ( $111 i$ ) are m ixed.
$U$ sing the $S$ rensen and $M$ lm er gates we can im plem ent the two $H$ am iltonian evolutions

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp ^{h} x t^{i} \text { and } \exp ^{h} \text { if } t^{i}: \tag{10.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus encoded rotations about x and y are possible using the $S$ rensen and M m er gates. These two operations in combination then serve to generate any single qubit rotation on the encoded states j01i and j10i.

### 10.4.2 A nontrivial two qubit gate utilizing $S$ rensen and M lm er gates

Having shown how to implem ent single qubit gates on the ion trap DFS, we now address the question of encoded two qubit operations. For encoded two qubit operations two two-ion D FSs are brought together into a m icrotrap where the four ions are sub jected to $S$ rensen and $M$ mergates. The conjoined qubits are now given by the states j0101i, j0110i, j1001i, and j1010i.

Let us show that there is a particular choice of param eters for which we can construct a S rensen andM $m$ er gatewhich acts non-trivially on the DFS, preserving the conjoined DFS space, but which m ust take the state out of the D FS during the course of the gate operation.

C onsider the four ion operator

$$
\begin{align*}
& Y Y=2 J_{Y}^{2}\left({ }_{1}=0 ;{ }_{2}=0 ;{ }_{3}=0 ;{ }_{4}=0\right) \\
& =\begin{array}{llll}
X^{4} & X^{4} \\
i=1 & j=i+1
\end{array} \quad y_{y}^{(i)} \quad{ }_{y}^{(j)}+2 I: \tag{10.14}
\end{align*}
$$

D isregarding the irrelevant global phase producing $I$, we nd that

Evaluating this fort $==4$, we nd that
$T$ his is a nontrivial gate on the two encoded D F Ss:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \exp \quad{\underset{i}{4}}_{i_{Y}} Y \quad j 0101 i=\frac{P_{\overline{2}}^{1}}{\overline{2}}(j 0101 i \quad \text { ij1010i }) \\
& \exp \quad{\underset{i}{4}}_{i_{Y}} Y \text { j0110i }=P_{\overline{2}}^{1}(j 0110 i \quad \text { ij1001i }) \\
& \left.\exp \quad \underset{4}{i_{4} Y Y} \text { j1001i }=\frac{P_{\overline{2}}^{2}}{(j 1001 i} \quad \text { ij0110i }\right) \\
& \exp \underset{4}{\dot{I}_{4} Y Y} \text { j1010i }=\frac{P^{1}}{\frac{1}{2}} \text { (j1010i ij0101i): } \tag{10.17}
\end{align*}
$$

This is a nontrivial encoded two-qubit gate between the ion trap D FS. Together $w$ ith single qubit rotations, this form s a universal set of gates.

The gate $\exp \quad \frac{j}{2} Y Y$ is a $S$ rensen and $M \quad \mathrm{~m}$ er gate executed with $A\left(t_{K}\right)=$. $T$ his condition is $m$ et if $\frac{4^{2} \frac{2}{1}}{}{ }^{2}=1$ and the tim e to execute this operation is given
by [180]

$$
\begin{equation*}
t_{K}=-^{p} \bar{K}: \tag{10.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

If $\mathrm{K}>1$ is required to satisfy the above condition, then the ion w ill repeatedly cycle through being entangled with the system and the vibrational mode and will only retum fully to the D FS after the com pletion of the operation. The gate we described above is exactly the gate used to create four body entanglem ent in [165].

### 10.5 U niversal quantum computation on the ion trap D FS

In the previous section we have seen how to perform gates on the ion trap D FS which preserve the D FS.T hese gates, unlike our previous discussion of universal gates on a D FS, do not preserve the D FS during the entire operation of the interaction. This is rem iniscent of the universal set of operators described by Lidar, B acon, K em pe, and $W$ haley in $[133,134]$. If these gates are fast on the tim e-scale of the weak collective decoherence $m$ echanism, then these gates $m$ esh nioely $w$ th the theory of fault-tolerant quantum error correcting codes. The reader is referred to [133; 134] for $m$ ore inform ation on this topic.

The example of the ion trap DFS is a good exam ple of how encoding can be used to reduce decoherence in a quantum com puting architecture. Just having an encoding w hich can help, how ever, is not in and of itselfthe only necessary com ponent of building a quantum com puter. In this chapter we have seen that using already developed $m$ ethods for $m$ anipulating trapped ions universal control of the encoded inform ation can also be easily achieved.

## C hapter 11

## The Exchange-B ased Q uantum C om puter

In this chapter we discuss a quantum com puter based only on the exchange interaction. This is particularly relevant to solid-state proposals for quantum com putation due to the di culty in supplem enting the exchange interaction $w$ ith other interactions to m ake the architecture fully universal. In contrast to these original proposals, in this chapter we discuss how to use encoded universality $w$ ith the exchange interaction as the basis for universal quantum com putation. W e begin by discussing som e of the generic properties of solid-state proposals including the di culty of engineering single qubit $m$ anipulations on these system $s$. $W$ e then discuss the relevance of geom etry, parallel operations, and subsystem $s$ in an exclusively exchange-based solid state quantum com puter. A $n$ explicit proposal using the sm allest possible encoding is then proposed. Single qubit gates and a two-qubit gate are then explicitly calculated. F inally, preparation, $m$ easurem ent, and leakage are discussed so as the present a com plete proposal for solid state quantum com putation using only the exchange interaction.

### 11.1 Solid-state quantum com puter proposals and the exchange interaction

Am ong the plethora of experim ental proposals for quantum com puters there has been w idespread interest in a num ber of solid-state approaches[141, 106, 201]. In the $m$ a jority of these proposals, a genuine spin $-1=2$ particle is used as the basic qubit for the architecture. T hese approaches have proposed as their basic qubit, for exam ple, the spin of a single electron on quantum dots[141], donor-atom nuclear spins[106], and electron spins in heterostructures[201]. A com $m$ on thread throughout all of these spin-based solid-state architectures is their use of the exchange interaction (also known as the $H$ eisenberg interaction) in order to produce tw o qubit gates betw een
neighboring spins. In allofthese proposals, controlofthis exchange interaction is then supplem ented by single qubit gates in order to generate a fiully universal quantum com puter.

C om pared to the exchange interaction, the single qubit gates in m ost solid-state proposals are considerably slow er, require greater device com plexity and potentially lead to an increase in the decoherence rate of the device. In the Table 11.1, we assem ble estim ated exchange interactions strengths, single qubit interaction tim es, and the di culty in constructing such single qubit interactions in a few of the solid state based quantum com puters.

Table 11.1: Solid-state quantum com puter estim ated param eters

| P roposal | Exchange <br> gate | Single qubit <br> gate | Single qubit di culties |
| :--- | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| D onor-atom nuclear spins <br> in Silicon [106] | 100 M Hz | 100 kHz | Slow single qubit gates. <br> Strong m agnetic elds <br> at low tem perature[107]. |
| E lectron spins <br> on quantum dots[141] | 1 GHz | 1 GHz | Strong inhom ogenous <br> m agnetic elds[141, 35]. <br> \g-factor" engineering <br> [63]. |
| E lectron spins in <br> Si-G e heterostructures[201] | 1 GHz | 1 GHz | \g-factor" engineering <br> 201, 63]. |

Table 11.1 illustrates that rem oval of the requirem ent of single qubit gates $m$ ay greatly bene these solid-state proposals. Luckily, we have seen in C hapter 11 that the exchange interaction $w$ thout the single qubit gates can be used to perform encoded universalquantum com putation. The idea, then, is to use the exchange interaction alone for solid-state quantum com puters via encoding the quantum inform ation. In principle, the proof (see A ppendix C) of the universality of the exchange interaction tells us that such a construction is possible. Possibility how ever has little say in practicality. In this chapter we will address som e of the details of such an solely-exchange-based quantum com puter. From explicit gate constructions, to description of preparation and $m$ easurem ent procedures, we therefore $w$ ill construct the basic outline of how an exchange-only based solid state quantum com puter would function.

### 11.2 U niversality and practicality

To get an idea of why it is im portant to understand the speci cs of the exchange interaction universality forpracticalpurposes, consider the results presented by B acon etal. in [9]. Thiswas the rst work to dem onstrate that the exchange operation alone could be used to perform quantum com putation. In this work, the four qubit strong
collective decoherence D F subspace was used as the basis of the subsystem sfor the quantum com puter. A fter dem onstrating how the exchange interaction could be used to perform single qubit gates on this encoding, it was shown that a controlled phase H am iltonian could be realized on this encoding via executing a com plicated series of com $m$ utators involving exchange interactions. In particular de ning

$$
\begin{align*}
H_{1} & \left.\left.=\mathbb{E}_{26} ; \mathrm{E}_{12}+\mathrm{E}_{25}\right]+\mathbb{E}_{15} ; \mathrm{E}_{12}+\mathrm{E}_{16}\right] \\
\mathrm{H}_{2} & =\mathrm{x}^{8}\left(\mathbb{E}_{1 j}+\mathrm{E}_{2 j}\right) \\
\mathrm{j}=5 & =\frac{1}{32}\left[H_{1} ;\left[H_{2} ; H_{1}\right]\right]: \tag{11.1}
\end{align*}
$$

W e then nd that the operator C acts a two-qubit interaction between two four-qubit encoded D FSs. If $j_{\mathrm{L}}$ i and $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{L}}$ i denote the encoded qubits in a particular basis, then $C$ acts as $j 0_{\mathrm{L}} 0_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}$ ! $0, j_{\mathrm{L}} 1_{\mathrm{L}}$ i! $j_{\mathrm{L}} 1_{\mathrm{L}}$ i, $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{L}} 0_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}$ ! $0, j_{\mathrm{L}} 1_{\mathrm{L}}$ i! 0 . This operation can be used, in conjunction with single qubit operations to perform universal quantum com putation.

In a sim ilar m anner, because the proof in A ppendix $C$ is inductively constructive it is always possible to exhibit such com plex com mutator and linear combinations which enact any operation on the strong collective decoherence D FS.V ia the K itaevSolovay theorem, we know that this gate set will be on equivalent footing w ith any other gate set, yet, in a practical sense we have not seen how to im plem ent this interaction $w$ thout resorting to the approxim ate form ula Eq. (3.38).

An example of the problem we face will help explain this problem. Suppose we were given the ability to perform the H am iltonians $\mathrm{H}_{1}=\quad \mathrm{x}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2}=\mathrm{y}$ and we w ished to im plem ent the H am iltonian $\mathrm{H}_{3}=\mathrm{x}^{+}$y for a time T . U sing a standard Euler angle construction we could perform a series of evolution with $\mathrm{H}_{1}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ which would result in this evolution. Suppose, how ever, instead of this Euler angle construction we decided to use the $T$ rotter approxim ation form ula

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp {\frac{i H_{1} T}{}}_{\mathrm{N}}{ }^{\#} \exp \frac{\mathrm{iH}_{2} \mathrm{~T}^{\#!}}{\mathrm{N}}{ }^{\mathrm{N}}=\exp \left[\mathrm{i}\left(\mathrm{H}_{1}+\mathrm{H}_{2}\right) \mathrm{T}\right]+\mathrm{O} \frac{1}{\mathrm{~N}^{2}} \text {; } \tag{112}
\end{equation*}
$$

to execute this gate. Recalling the de nition of the error between two unitary operators from Section 3.6.1 we can explicitly calculate this error for our sim ple exam ple. The results of this calculation are plotted in Figure 11.1 Since the error scales line $1=\mathrm{N}^{2}$, in order to obtain an accuracy, say, that is su cient for the threshold for quantum com putation which is currently estim ated at $10^{6}$, we see that $N^{2} \mathrm{~m}$ ust be of order $10^{3}$. G iven gates $w$ ith an interaction strength $g$, this im plies that these interactions m ust we sw itched on an o at a rate of $g=\mathrm{N}^{2}$ in order to obtain a reasonable approxim ation. For alm ost all proposals, how ever, such rapid control of the system will not be achievable. W ithout know ing about the Euler angle construction, then, the realworld functioning of the universality is unclear.


Figure 11.1: P lot of the error in the exam ple using the T rotter approxim ation

W e are faced w ith the problem of know ing that the exchange gates are universal but not know ing the explicit $m$ ethods for explicit construction of the gates in this set. O fcourse, one can alw ays resort to the $K$ itaev-Solovay theorem, which is constructive, to determ ine such gate sequences. For situations larger than a few qubits, how ever, this is an extrem ely daunting task to approach by brute force.

### 11.3 Subsystem s and geom etric layout

Before we discuss universality on the solely-exchange-based quantum com puter, we must rst discuss the subsystem structure of such a quantum com puter. In this chapter we will focus on the sm allest encoding which supports universality using the exchange interaction. This is the subsystem s encoding of one logical qubit into three physical qubits. In this chapter we will not be concemed with the decoherencefree properties of these states and will instead just focus on their use in a quantum com puter. Speci cally, we will focus on the encoding

$$
\begin{align*}
& j_{\mathrm{D}} \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{P}_{\overline{2}}^{1}(j 01 i \quad \text { j10i }) j 1 i \\
& \mathfrak{j}_{\mathrm{L}} i=\frac{P^{2}}{\frac{2}{3}} j 001 i \quad P_{\overline{3}}^{1}(j 01 i+j 10 i) j 0 i: \tag{11.3}
\end{align*}
$$

An im portant com ponent of any quantum com puter is the geom etric layout and connectivity of the physical qubits. In an encoded universality construction it is
especially im portant to consider the geom etry of the encoded qubits. W ewillconsider three di erent geom etries which w ill probably best represent future solid-state devige layouts. O ther arrangem ents are, of course, possible, but these layouts should be representative of real w orld constraints im posed on m ost solid-solid state system s .

In the rst layout, which w ill call the one-dim ensional layout, the physical qubits are assum ed to lie in linear succession. O nly nearest neighbor exchange interactions are allowed such that within an encoded qubit only two of three possible exchanger interactions can be im plem ented. This $m$ odel is sketched in $F$ igure 112.


Figure 112: T he one-dim ensional layout
In the second layout, which we will call the triangular layout, the physical qubits are assum ed to be arranged in a linear succession of triangular encoded qubits. E ach triangle represents an encoded qubit and successive triangles are only coupled by one exchange interaction. This $m$ odel is sketched in $F$ igure 11.3.


Figure 11.3: The triangular layout
Finally the third layout, which we call the two-dim ensional layout, consists of a square grid layout of physical qubits. The encoded qubits are then grouped into triplets of physical qubits which can couple only w ith other physical qubits which are nearest neighbors. T his m odel is sketched in F igure 11.4.

F inally we w illalso have the opportunity to consider serial and parallel operation of the devioe. In serial operation it is assum ed that only one exchange interaction


Figure 11.4: T he two-dim ensional layout
between qubits can be tumed on for a single tim e period. In parallel operation, $m$ ultiple exchange interactions, perhaps w ith varying strengths, can be tumed on for a single time period. Of course, for full quantum error correction som e am ount of parallel operation is necessary [2], how ever for early im plem entations of the exchangeonly solid-state proposals, this will not be an issue and considerable experim ental sim pli cation is expected when operations are not enacted in parallel.

### 11.4 Single encoded qubit gates using the exchange interaction

For single encoded qubit gates, the geom etries described above m otivate tw o different scenarios. In the rst scenario, only the exchange interaction between qubits 1;2 and 2;3 can be enacted and in the other scenario, interaction betw een all qubits can be enacted. W e call these situations the constrained and unconstrained geom etries respectively. Furthem ore we m ust also consider the case where parallel or serial operation is allowed. Thus we have four scenarios: parallel constrained, parallel unconstrained, serial constrained and serial unconstrained.
$F$ irst, it is easy to calculate the explicit action of the exchange gates on the logical basis de ned in Eq. (11.3):
where we have used the $j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}, \mathfrak{j}_{\mathrm{L}}$ i basis. We can also de ne the encoded m atrioes in the obvious $m$ anner such that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{E}_{12}=\quad \quad \text { z } \quad \mathrm{E}_{23}=\frac{1}{2} \quad z \frac{\mathrm{P}}{\overline{3}}_{2}^{x} ; \quad \mathrm{E}_{13}=\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{z}+\frac{\mathrm{P}}{\overline{3}}_{2}^{\mathrm{x}} \text { : } \tag{11.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

Let us dealw th two of the four scenarios, the parallel unconstrained scenario and the parallel constrained scenario. In particular we can use the fact that

$$
\begin{equation*}
x=\frac{2}{P_{\overline{3}}} E_{23}+\frac{1}{2} E_{12}: \tag{11.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Therefore if we allow parallel operations, then in both the unconstrained and constrained geom etries, we have the ability to enact the Ham iltonians z ( $\mathrm{E}_{12}$ ) and
$x$ (from above). U sing an Euler angle construction, we therefore have a $m$ ethod for constructing every possible single qubit gate on this encoding. In particular every single qubit gate can be constructed via a sequence like

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[\text { i } E_{12}\right] \exp \text { i } \frac{1}{2} E_{12}+E_{23} \quad \exp \left[\text { i } E_{12}\right] ; \tag{11.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

for som e com bination of ; ; . The circuit for this procedure is given in Figure 11.5 where the arrows indicate an exchange interaction betw een the connected qubits for the duration speci ed beside the arrow .


F igure 11.5: Single qubit encoded Euler angle construction with parallel operations
W hen serial operations are required and a constrained geom etry is used it is im possible to construct certain rotations w ith only three applications of the exchange gates. $N$ otice that in this case there are tw o possible orders for the application of the exchange interactions

$$
\left.\begin{array}{llllll}
\exp [ & \mathrm{i}_{12} & ] \exp [ & \mathrm{i}_{23} & ] \exp [ & \mathrm{i}_{12}
\end{array}\right]
$$

In order to understand why it is not possible to perform all single qubit gates with these tw o orders of rotations it is usefiul to work in the B loch sphere description of single qubit rotations (see C hapter 4 of [153]), i.e. $m$ apping the $S U$ (2) rotations onto so (3).

Suppose we are given two vectors on the block sphere. If we can perform any single qubit rotation, then we can $m$ anipulate these two vectors such that they point in any direction consistent with the inner product between the vectors unchanged. But now consider the rst sequence in Eq. (11.8). If we start the state in $j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}$, then the rst rotation does nothing, the second rotation can reach a ring on the bloch sphere which is not a great circle and the third rotation will nally be able to rotate this state to everyw here on the B loch sphere except a sm all cap. T his is illustrated in Figure 11.6. Sim ilarly using the second sequence in Eq. (11.8) one can start w ith the


Figure 11.6: B loch sphere picture of reachable operations in serialm ode
+1 eigenstate of $\mathrm{E}_{23}$ and there is an unreachable cap for this sequence of operations. See the second sequence in $F$ igure 11.6.
$T$ hus if we take these two vectors (the +1 eigenstates of $\mathrm{E}_{12}$ and $\mathrm{E}_{23}$ ) for each sequence there is a region which the vector cannot be rotated to. Thus there are rotations which cannot be achieved by the sequences in Eq. (11.8).

In order to be able to im plem ent any single qubit gate on the serial constrained
scenario we m ust, in fact, use four exchange interactions. In fact, with four operations there is an equivalence betw een constrained exchange interactions and the three interaction unconstrained case. O ne possible order for the four interactions is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\exp \left[\text { i } \mathrm{E}_{12}\right] \exp \left[\text { i } \mathrm{E}_{23}\right] \exp \left[\text { i } \mathrm{E}_{12}\right] \exp \left[\text { i } \mathrm{E}_{23}\right] \text { : } \tag{11.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

Choosing $=\frac{\overline{2}}{}$ and $={ }^{0}+\frac{\overline{2}}{}$, this becom es

$$
\begin{align*}
& E_{12} \exp \left[\text { i } E_{23} E_{12} \exp \left[i^{0} E_{12}\right] \exp \left[\text { i } E_{23}\right]\right. \\
& =\exp \left[\begin{array}{lll} 
& E_{13}
\end{array}\right] \exp \left[i^{0} E_{12}\right] \exp \left[\text { i } \mathrm{E}_{23}\right]: \tag{11.10}
\end{align*}
$$

D i erent orderings of the four interactions allow for di erent three interaction orderings. $W$ e therefore see that the four interaction constrained $m$ odel can be $m$ apped onto the three interaction unconstrained $m$ odel.

To show that the three interaction unconstrained $m$ odel is su cient to perform any single qubit operation one sim ply follow s the standard argum ent of an E uler angle constructions.

### 11.5 Explicit encoded controlled-not using a sequence of exchange interactions

H aving shown how to explicitly construct the encoded single qubit rotations the question now arises as to how to coupled together di erent encoded qubits. T his is a challenging question. The rst item to note is that there is no H am iltonian which by itself $w$ ill directly enact a coupling which preserves the tw o logical qubits. To see this, exam ine the two angular mom enta on two con joined encoded qubits

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left(S_{1}\right)={ }_{=1}^{x^{3}}\left(_{i=1}^{X^{3}} s^{(i)}\right)^{2} \\
& \left.\left(S_{2}\right)=\mathrm{X}^{3} \underset{=1}{\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}=4}^{6}} \mathrm{~S}^{(\mathrm{i})}\right)^{2} ; \tag{1..11}
\end{align*}
$$

where $s^{(i)}=\frac{1}{2}{ }^{(i)}$. It is easy to see that no linear combination of exchanges com $m$ utes $w$ ith both of these operators unless the exchanges in the linear combination act exchusively between the rst three qubits or exclusively between the nal three qubits. But these are just the encoded single qubit operators. Therefore there is no linear com bination of exchange operations which preserves the originalD F Ss.

In A ppendix E we present a gate sequence for enacting a controlled-phase betw een two four qubit strong collective decoherence D F.S. T his sequence uses parallel operations and was analytically derived using insights gained from using the strong D F S basis. W orking w ith the three qubit strong collective decoherence $D F$ Ss is not as
am enable to such analysis because con joining two strong collective decoherence D F subsystem $s$ is not as straightforw ard as in the subspace case.

In order to deal w ith deriving som e nontrivial gate on our encoded qubit, it is therefore necessary to resort to num erical searches. M uch of the di culty of these searches arises from the fact that while the fourbasis states $j_{\mathrm{L}} 0_{\mathrm{L}} i, j j_{\mathrm{L}} 1_{\mathrm{L}} i, j_{\mathrm{L}} 0_{\mathrm{L}}$ i, and $\eta_{\mathrm{L}} 1_{\mathrm{L}}$ i have totals spin $S=1$, the com plete space $w$ th these quantum num bers for six spins has nine states and exchanges perform rotations on this nine dim ensional space. $T$ he num erical search algorithm then $m$ ust search for a series of exchanges con ned to this 9 dim ensional space which perform s a nontrivial gate $G$ on the encoded qubits and any unitary $m$ atrix on the vedim ensional com ponent of the space perpendicular to this encoded space, i.e. $U=G \quad A_{5}$ where $A_{5}$ is any unitary $m$ atrix on the 5 dim ensional perpendicular space. A num erical search for optim al gates on the encoded states was perform ed in [62]. In this work search for a controlled-not gate was perform ed w ith the aid of two invariants identi ed by M akhlin. Explicitly, a controlled-not on the basis states acts as


Figure 11.7 presents the optim al (in the sense of few est exchange interaction gates) serial operation solution for the one-dim ensional layout. In this gure, the $t_{i}$ values represent the duration of the exchange interaction as in exp [ $i t_{i} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{ij}}$ ]. In F igure 11.7 the serial operation has been com pressed where gates com $m$ ute. The uncertainty of the naldigits is indicated in parenthesis and the accuracy of the gate is to $6 \quad 10{ }^{5}$.

Table 11 2: Num ber of exchange gates in di erent scenarios

| G ate size | O peration m ode | G eom etry | G ates |
| :--- | :--- | :--- | :--- |
| single qubit <br> single qubit | serial | serial | one-dim ensional, tw o-dim ensional |
| single qubit | triangular | 4 |  |
| parallel |  | one-dim ensional, tw o-dim ensional <br> triangular | 3 |
| tw o qubit | serial | one-dim ensional | 19 |
| tw o qubit | parallel | one-dim ensional | 8 |
| tw o qubit | parallel | tw o-dim ensional | 7 |

In Table 112 we assemble a list of the di erent optim al (in the sense of the best found by the search algorithm ) solutions for di erent operation m odes of described above. O ne shortcom ing of our construction is that it does not $m$ ake use of the subsystem nature of collective decoherence. A true controlled-not which preserves the subsystem structure was searched for and none was found for less than 26 serial


Figure 11.7: E ncoded controlled-not
exchange interactions, although in parallel operation, sequences w ith 8 exchange interactions where found. It would be w orthw hile to obtain optim al gate sequences not only for the three qubit subsystem exam ple, but also to exam ine the four qubit subspace exam ple. There are certain simpli cations which seem to im ply that these gate sequences for the subspace case $m$ ight be sim ple enough even for analyticaltreatm ent (as in the parallel operation of A ppendix E).

Together $w$ ith the single qubit rotations described above the controlled-not form $s$ a universal gate set. The tradeo sinherit in the exchange-only based techniques are thus clear. For a factor of 3 in space and 10 in clock cycles universality can be achieved using only the exchange interaction.

### 11.6 P reparation, $m$ easu rem ent, and leakage

F inally let us describe preparation, $m$ easurem ent, and leakage detection on the exchange-based quantum com puter.

Preparation can be achieved by preparing the state $j_{\mathrm{L}} i=p^{1} \frac{1}{2}(j 01 i \quad j 10 i) j 0 i$. This state can be prepared by tuming on an exchange interaction of strength $J$ betw een the rst two qubits and a moderately strong $m$ agnetic eld $B$ pointing along the $z$
direction is applied such that $k_{B} T \quad G{ }_{B} B<J . W$ ith these physical param eters, the ground state of the system is $j_{\mathrm{L}} i$ and a gap to the next excited state is of energy $g_{\text {в }} B$. Thus at low tem perature in com parison to this gap the encoded register will be in itialized to the $j 0_{\mathrm{L}}$ i state.
$M$ easurem ent on the encoded qubit can be achieved in a variety of $m$ anners. In particular if the singlet states of the rst two qubits can be distinguished from the triplet states of the rst two qubits then the encoded qubits can be distinguished. A $m$ ethod which $m$ eshes nicely $w$ th our current schem $e$ is the a.c. capacitance schem $e$ proposed by $K$ ane [106]. W hen two electrons occupy a com $m$ on potential well, in the absence of a $m$ agnetic eld, the Pauli exclusion principle $m$ andates that the singlet state of the two electrons lies at a low er energy than the triplet state. Therefore an electrom eter capable ofdetecting the num ber ofelectrons occupying a bound state can be used to determ ine whether the singlet or triplet is occupied. T he a.c. capacitance schem e of $K$ ane is directly analogous to this procedure for the solid-state quantum com puting proposals.

F inally we can brie y address the problem of leakage in the exchange-only setup. W hile encoded universality allows for an interaction which was previously not fully universal to be used in a universalm anner, one of the tradeo $s$ is that there is a particular nasty type of error which can occur in which the inform ation in leaks out of the encoded subspace. O ne particularly sim ple $m$ anner of dealing w ith leakage errors is to engineer a system such that the subspace upon which one is working on is the ground state of the system. Ifthis is the case, then at low enough tem perature, the leakage errors will be self-corrected by energy exchange with the environm ent. O ne way to achieve this in our case is to apply exchange interactions $w$ ith equal strength between all three qubits and a moderate $m$ agnetic eld along the $z$ direction. In this scenario the $j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}$ and $\mathrm{j}_{\mathrm{L}}$ i states are the degenerate ground state of the system . Further, a.c. capacitance probing of this system can be used to determ ine if states have leaked outside of the subspace. Therefore leakage detection can be achieved via this fairly straightforw ard $m$ ethodology.

### 11.7 Exchange-based quantum com putation

In this chapter we have seen how to achieve quantum com putation using only the exchange interaction. This allows for a considerable device sim pli cation as well as fundam ental speed increases for certain solid-state quantum com putation proposals. A $n$ im portant open question isw hether other quantum com puting architectures would bene $t$ from a sim ilar encoded universality.

## C hapter 12

## D ecoherence $F$ ree Subspaces in M ultilevelA tom ic System s

D ecoherence-free subspaces in single atom ic system s?
In this chapter we discuss the application of the theory of decoherence-free subspaces to m ultilevelatom ic system s . It is interesting to question whether decoherencefree conditions can exist in single atom ic system s . W e begin by developing a sort of no-go theorem for D F subspaces w th nondegenerate energy spectra. This leads to a discussion of coherent population trapping and we dem onstrate how coherent population trapping can be thought of as a sem i-classicalD F subspace.

### 12.1 O SR D F subspaces in multilevel sy stem s

Suppose we are given an atom ic $m$ ultilevel system $w$ th $N$ levels labeled by the states \#̈i, 1 i N, w th energies ! , which is coupled to a free space electrom agnetic eld w th $m$ odes labeled by $\widetilde{K}$ and polarizations $2 f 1 ; 2 g$. The $H$ am iltonian for this system is given by:
 functions of $\mathbb{K}$; and of $i ; j: q_{i}(i ; j)=f_{k} ; g_{i j}$. This decom position $m p l i e s$

$$
V=\begin{align*}
& x \quad x^{\mathrm{N}}  \tag{122}\\
& k ; i>j=1
\end{align*} \quad i j \quad g_{i j} f_{k ;} a_{k ;}+g_{i j} f_{k ;} a_{k ;}^{y} \quad:
$$

The creation and annihilation operators $a_{k}$; and $a_{k}^{y}$; com bined as we have done form ${ }_{P}^{a}$ single operator $a_{P}{ }^{2}$ d therefore the O SR algebra from this interaction is generated by $\underset{i>j=1}{N} g_{i j} \quad$ ij and ${ }^{P} \stackrel{N}{i>j=1} g_{i j} \quad i j$. The DF subspace condition then becom es

$$
\begin{align*}
& X^{N} \quad g_{i j} i j j i={ }_{1} j i{ }^{X^{N}} \quad g_{i j} i j j i=2 j i ;  \tag{12.3}\\
& i>j=1 \quad i>j=1
\end{align*}
$$

for $j$ i in a DF subspace de ned by 1 and 2 . In order for both of these conditions to be $m$ et, $1=2$ and the condition is really one condition

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{i>j=1}^{X^{N}} g_{i j} i j j i=j i \text { or }{\underset{i ; j=1}{x^{n}} G_{i j} \nexists i h j j i=j i ; ~}_{i} \tag{12.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $G_{i j}=g_{i j} ; i>j=1::: n, G_{i i}=0$, and $G_{i j}=g_{j i} ; i<j=1::: N$. Thus the spectrum ofG ${ }_{i j}$ essentially determ ines the states forw hich the D F subspace condition is fiul led. H ow ever, we also desire that $H_{0}$ not take the state outside of the D FS. W e recall that this $w$ ill be true if the diagonal form of system $H$ am iltonian can be written so that it contains on states from a particular D F subspace.

The rst result we will prove along these lines is that degeneracy of the system energy spectrum is necessary for a perfect D F subspace under the condition that there are no com pletely isolated levels of the multilevel system .

Lem mat2.1.1 A multilevelsystem with a non-degenerate energy spectrum does not support a D F subspace (in the strict sense of not evolving) with respect to interaction with an electrom agnetic eld if every energy levelhas at least one non-vanishing transition from the state to another state $\left(G_{i j} \not 0\right.$ for every $x e d i$ for at least one 1 j N).

Proof: Suppose that such a system did support a D $\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{P}}$ subspace. The diagonalized form of the system $H$ am iltonian $H_{0}$ is unique $H_{0}={ }_{i}$ ! ${ }_{i}$ \#̈hij because the energy spectrum is non-degenerate by assum ption. $V$ ia argum ents in Section 5.3.3, the state \#i m ust be a DF state for the supposed DF subspace in order that $H$ o preserve the D F subspace. H ow ever ${ }^{P}{ }_{i ; j=1}^{N} G_{j k}$ ग̈ihk jacting on $\ddot{i}$ i does not satisfy the D F condition because there is at least one transition from $7 i$ to another state. T herefore $7 i$ cannot be DF and there can be no DF subspace for this setup.

This lem m a implies that there can be no perfect D F subspace for a multilevel atom ic system unless there is a degeneracy in the energy spectrum of the multi-level system. Furthem ore it follow sfrom the proof of this lem m a that the only way a D F subspace can exist in a multilevel atom ic system is if the DF subspace has support over degenerate states of the system .

### 12.2 C oherent population trapping and D F subspaces

C onsider now an exam ple from quantum optics which appears to be a D F subspace but which violates Lemma 12.1. This is the case of coherent population trapping. C onsider a three level system jai, pi, and jci w th nondegenerate energies ! ${ }_{a},!_{b}$ and $!c$, respectively. The levels are in the so-called con guration in which the lower two levels jii and bi are coupled to a single higher level jci. T he transition betw een the jai and bi levels is assum ed to be strongly forbidden. W e suppose that this atom is being driven by two lasers of frequency 1 and 2. See F igure 12.1.


Figure 12.1: C oherent population trapping
The sem i-classical description of this problem is given by the H am iltonian

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{H}=\mathrm{H}_{0}+\mathrm{H}_{1}
\end{aligned}
$$

where $i$ is the Rabi frequency associated $w$ th the laser $w$ ith frequency $i$. In the interaction picture w th respect to $\mathrm{H}_{0}$, this H am ittonian becom es

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.V(t)=\frac{1}{2} e^{i_{1} \quad i\left(1 \quad!_{c}+!_{a}\right) t} \dot{\text { cinhaj }}+e^{i{ }^{i}+i(1} \quad!_{c}+!_{a}\right) t \text { jaihcj } \\
& +\frac{2}{2} e^{i_{2} \quad i\left(2 \quad!_{c}+!_{b}\right) t} \text { jicihbj+ } e^{i{ }_{2}+i\left(2 \quad!_{c}+!_{b}\right) t} \text { poihcj : } \tag{12.6}
\end{align*}
$$

At resonance this becom es

This H am iltonian has three eigenstates, two of which contain com ponents along the jci state and one ofw hich does not. The eigenstate which does not have a com ponent along the jci state is given by the coherent population trapped state

$$
\begin{equation*}
j \dot{i}=\frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}+{ }_{2}^{2}} \quad{ }_{2} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}_{2}} \dot{\operatorname{aj} i}+{ }_{1} \mathrm{e}^{\mathrm{i}_{1}} \text { pi : } \tag{12.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

This state shares som e of the characteristics of a state in a D F subspace. The state does not couple to resonant radiation eld even though it is a state which is a superposition of states which individually couple to the resonant radiation eld.
$N$ otice how ever that if the resonance condition is not $m$ et or the phases $i \quad u c-$ tuate the trapped state is di erent than that given in Eq. (12.8). In particular, this state is not robust to interaction $w$ ith any environm ental electrom agnetic eld $m$ ode. H ow ever, in the sem iclassical picture given above, the trapped state is indeed isolated from the driving lasers.

### 12.3 D F subspaces w ith respect to spontaneous em ission

D espite the fact that coherent trapped states are not exam ples of $F$ subspaces, we can still use the idea of this trapped states w ith in the context of $F$ subspace for a multilevel atom ic system sub ject to an approxim ation of which processes are $m$ ost likely to cause decoherence.

C onsider again the con guration but now in a fully quantum treatm ent. In this system, spontaneous em ission from jci into the jai and bi state is clearly possible. $T$ his is due to a $a_{k}^{Y}$ jaincjor $a_{k}^{Y}$ poihcjterm in the coupling $H$ am iltonian where $a_{k}^{Y}$ is the creation operator for the photon $m$ ode $k$. Suppose $!_{b}>!_{a}$. Spontaneous em ission from foi to jai can still occur, but now it must transverse virtually through the jci
 and w ill in m ost cases be $\mathrm{m} u$ ch weaker that the spontaneous em ission from jci.

If one derives a master equation for the con guration, unless the interaction is taken to high enough order, the only decohering term $s$ when interacting $w$ th the electrom agnetic vacuum are the spontaneous em ission term s . In such a treatm ent the Lindblad operators for the con guration are given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{L}_{1}=\text { jaihcj and } \mathrm{L}_{2}=\text { poihcj: } \tag{12.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

W ith respect to these Lindblad operators it is clear that there is a D F subspace is given by the two ground states jai and jbi ( $\mathrm{L}_{\mathrm{i}}$ annihilates both of these states).


Figure 12 2: M ultilevel spontaneous em ission D F subspace

In general, m ultilevel atom ic system s then can have D F subspaces w ith respect to the spontaneous em ission given by the states which do not spontaneously em it. $T$ his observation is not very profound. G iven, how ever, that such states exist we can how ever ask the $m$ ore interesting question ofhow one can $m$ anipulate the inform ation in these states. O f signi cance here is that the multiple states which do not spontaneously em it do not have strong transitions betw een them selves because if they did this would be a spontaneous em ission pathw ay.

## 12.4 $M$ anipulation of inform ation in spontaneous em ission D F subspaces

In order to understand how it $m$ ight be possible to $m$ anipulate the inform ation stored in states which do not spontaneously em it, consider the scenario diagram ed in Figure 12.3 below .
$H$ ere four laser w ith frequencies i ilhum inate a ve level system, four states $\dot{g}_{i} i$ which do not spontaneously em it and a th level jei which is sub ject to spontaneous em ission. Two of these transitions are driven on resonance and the other two are driven at a detuning of as shown in $F$ igure 12.3. T he sem iclassical $H$ am iltonian for this system in the interaction picture is given by


Figure 12.3: Four leveld F subspace schem e
where we have assum ed a xed phase for all of the incident light and $i$ are the Rabi frequencies of the transitions. M oving into a fram e rotating with $\lg _{1} i$ and $\dot{j}_{2} i$, this becom es

For sim plicity we will assum e that $i=$ for all $i$. There are then two eigenstates of $V(t)$ which have no support on the spontaneously em ilting state jei. These states are

$$
\begin{equation*}
j_{1} i=p_{\overline{2}}^{1}\left(\dot{g}_{1} i \quad \dot{g_{1}} i\right) \quad \text { and } \quad j_{2} i=P_{\overline{1}}^{1}\left(\dot{g}_{3} i \quad \dot{j} i\right) ; \tag{12.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

which are eigenstates of $V(t)$ with eigenvalue e and 0 respectively. Thus we could im agine encoding a qubit of inform ation into the states $j_{1} i$ and $j_{2} i$. It is then possible to use the above transitions so that a gate which acts as $z$ over these two states is achieved. Thus we see that it is possible to achieve di ering phase evolutions via the application of resonant coherent population trapping beam s and detuned coherent population trapping beam s.

H ow ever, the question which now rem ains is how to perform other single qubit operations other that the encoded ${ }_{z}$ ? W e can show, in fact, that it is not possible to rst order in time for such transitions to occur.

To see this, we note that the operations which we wish to enact are of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{cj} \mathrm{I}_{1} \mathrm{ih}_{2} \mathrm{j}+\mathrm{Cj} \mathrm{j}_{2} \mathrm{ih}_{1} \mathrm{j}+\text { any operator on the non } \text { DFS states: } \tag{12.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

The general coupling H am iltonian of these ve levels to laser elds is, assum ing only the allowed transitions,

$$
V(t)=\begin{align*}
& x^{4} x  \tag{12.14}\\
& i=1 \quad e^{i_{i j}} \quad i\left(l_{j} \quad!_{e}+!_{i}\right) t \\
& \dot{e} i h g_{i} j+e^{i{ }_{i j}+i\left(j_{j} \quad!_{e}+!_{i}\right) t} \dot{g}_{i} i n e j ; ~
\end{align*}
$$

where $j$ labels the laser $m$ ode of frequency $j$, $!_{e}$ is the energy of jei, $!_{i}$ is the energy of $j_{j} i$ and $i_{i j}$ is the phase of the $j$ th $m$ ode on the ith level $j_{j} i$. Exam ining this H am iltonian, it is apparent that there is no way to get an operator like that in Eq. (12.13). In particular, no term $s$ like $\mathrm{j}_{1} \mathrm{ing}_{3} j$ appear in this form ula.

### 12.5 O utlook

In this chapter we have addressed the issue ofD $F$ subspaces in $m$ ulti-level atom ic system s. Interestingly we have seen that such subspaces can exist under ideal assum ptions only when a level is degenerate. W hen levels are not degenerate, it is still possible that ground states $m$ ay be decoherence-free under the assum ption of a vacuum environm ent. U nfortunately, there are no rst or processes which preserve the D F subspace in such $m$ ultilevel-level atom ic system $s$ for the sam e reason that the $D F$ subspace exists. An interesting question is the existence of $D F$ subsystem $s$ in m ulti-level atom ic system s .

## C hapter 13

## D ecoherence-free Subsystem $s$ for Q uantum Computation

In part II of this thesis we have had the opportunity to exam ine a particular $m$ ethod for avoiding the detrim ental process of decoherence. The experim ental dem onstration of a D F subspace in the ion trap quantum com puting architecture [111, 110] (as well as proof-ofprinciple dem onstrations w ith engineered decoherence done by Kwiat, et al [127]) lends credit to the notion that the notion of D FSs will be an im portant of future quantum com puters. Theoretical argum ents for D FSs in other physical systems (of particular note are the solid state proposals of Zanardi and R ossi[219, 220] and the use of a decoherence-firee subspaces for creating Schrodinger cat states of a Bose E instein condensate [54]) also lend credit to the notion that decoherence-free system s will play an im portant part in overcom ing decoherence in constructing a quantum com puter.

An im portant lesson to be taken from DFSs is the notion that just because a system has a high decoherence rate that does not $m$ ean that the system cannot be used for robust quantum com putation. Symm etries of the system -environm ent coupling allow for system which $m$ ight otherw ise be discarded as having \too high a decoherence rate" to be $m$ anaged into a realm where quantum com putation $m$ ay becom e possible.

DFSs are a good exam ple of a sm all subsystem stechnique for dealing $w$ ith decoherenc. They cannot and are not the end-all solution for quantum com putation for reasons which we have detailed in the previous chapters. T hat being said, they can represent a large step tow ards $m$ aking such a solution technologically feasible.

## P art III

N atural Fault Tolerance

## C hapter 14

## The R oad A head

H ow di cult is it to build a quantum com puter?

The discovery that fault-tolerant quantum com putation can be used to solve the decoherence problem was am ong one of the greatest theoretical achievem ents of the end of the twentieth century. W ith enough control, decoherence can be reversed! W hile this discovery is heartening to the prospects of building a quantum com puter, the road tow ards the eventual construction of a quantum com puter is far from paved and it is certainly unknown if this pavem ent is m ade of gold or rather, as som e pessim ists believe, $m$ ere asphalt.

Tow ards this end, there is much to be said for thinking deeper about error correction, fault-tolerance, and the ultim ate use of physical system s to achieve the goal of quantum com putation. In $P$ art III of this thesis, we $m$ ake rst steps tow ards the idea that building a quantum com puter m ay not be as di cult as early experim ents and theoretical understanding indicates. In particular we w ill eschew the notion that quantum com puters must be build from the single quantum system up in lieu of the idea that there $m$ ay be $m$ any-body quantum system $s w h i c h$ are naturally faulttolerant.

O ne way to look at this is from the perspective of why classical com puters have achieved such success. W hen Turing, von N eum ann and others began thinking about constructing a physical device which carried out the theoretical concepts of com puter science, it was certainly unclear that classical com puters would eventually attain today's am azing speeds and versatility. H aving achieved so m uch w th them odem day silicon revolution, it is im portant to realize, how ever, that strict physicalprinciples are responsible for the robustness of classical com puters. T he discovery that decoherence is not a fundam ental roadblock tow ards building a quantum com puter leads us to question w hether there are sim ilar physicalprinciples which can lead to the robustness of a naturally fault-tolerant quantum com puter.

## C hapter 15

## Supercoherence

$\mathrm{N} \circ$, decoherence, you cannot forever walk uphill!
O ne ofthe physical principles which helpsm ake classical com puters robust is their use of energetics. In particular, a classical current in a transistor is robust because the energetics of the device directs the ow of inform ation through the transistor. C lassical conservation of the energy helps transistors from not $m$ aking errors. In this chapter we take the rst steps tow ards developing quantum system s which sim ilarly hamess the power of the transfer of energy to reduce the destructive e ect of decoherence. W e begin with a discussion of the relationship between (near) energy conservation and decoherence pathways. We then introduce a sim ple exam ple of a supercoherent system using a P auli stabilizer error detecting code. A supercoherent system is a multi-qubit system which has a ground state in which degenerate quantum inform ation is encoded. The degeneracy of this ground state is broken by single qubit error and these single qubits errors take the ground state to a state of higher energy. At low environm ent tem peratures, decoherence is then ine ective in destroying the coherence of the degenerate supercoherent inform ation. $W$ e then discuss the di culties of $m$ anipulating the inform ation in the particular $P$ auli stabilizer exam ple. W e then present an exam ple of a supercoherent qubit for which universalm anipulation of the quantum inform ation can be obtained while still retaining supercoherence. Solid state im plem entation of the supercoherent qubit is then discussed. A bath of harm onic oscillator coupling to a supercoherent system is then analyzed and the supercoherence is directly dem onstrated. F inally it is dem onstrated the C ooper pairs are quantum error detecting codes for resistance causing processes and the relationship of this to supercoherence is discussed.

### 15.1 Energetics and decoheren ce

It is typicalofm odem physicists that they erect skyscrapers of theory upon the slender foundations of outrageously sim pli ed models

In the absence of coupling, a system and its environm ents have separate dynam ics govemed by separate energy spectra. If a perturbing interaction between the system and environm ent is then introduced, the dynam ics of the system and environm ent is dom inated by $m$ echanism $s w h i d h$ conserve the energies of the unperturbed system and environm ent energy spectra. This is the essence of the rotating wave approxim ation in quantum optics (see, for exam ple, 5,169$]$ ). Thus the ow (or lack of ow) of energy between a system and the environm ent is, in the perturbing regim e com m only encountered, essential to determ ining the e ective $m$ echanism $s$ of decoherence. Let us exam ine a sim ple analytical exam ple which we can use to gain an understanding of this principle.

C onsider a system consisting of a qubit and its environm ent also m ade of a qubit. In the absence of coupling, we suppose the H am iltonian of the system is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{0}=!_{0} \quad \text { z } I+\left(!_{0}+\right) I \quad z ; \tag{15.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $2!0$ is the energy of the system and 2 is the di erence between the energy of the system and the environm ent qubit. We set $>\quad!0$ and ! $0>0$ so as to set the positivity of the energies on a solid footing. N ow suppose that a perturbing interaction of strength $g$ is introduced betw een these two qubits and is of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
V=g x \quad x ; \tag{152}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $g$ is the interaction energy. The evolution operator for this system can be exactly calculated and found to be

$$
\begin{align*}
U(t)= & \cos \left({ }_{1} t\right)(j 01 i h 01 j+j 10 i h 10) \quad i \sin \left({ }_{1} t\right)-(j 0 i h 10 j \quad j 01 i h 01 j) \\
& +\frac{g}{1}(j 01 i h 10 j+j 10 i h 01 j) \\
& +\cos \left(2_{2} t\right)(j 00 i h 00 j+j 11 i h 11 \jmath) \quad i \sin \left({ }_{2} t\right) \frac{2!_{0}+}{2}(j 00 i h 00 j \quad j 11 i h 11 \jmath) \\
& +\frac{g}{2}(j 00 i h 11 j+j 11 i h 00 j) ; \tag{15,3}
\end{align*}
$$

where $1_{1}=\mathrm{P} \overline{{ }^{2}+g^{2}}$ and ${ }_{2}=\mathrm{q} \overline{\left(2!_{0}+\right)^{2}+\mathrm{g}^{2}}$. In the lim it ofg $!_{0} ;!_{0}+\quad$ (the perturbing interaction lim it), the coupling between the j00i and j11i states reduces to the unperturbed evolution

Thus the evolution of the j00i and j11 subspace in the perturbing lim it is nearly identical to the unperturbed dynam ics. T he dynam ics of the j01i and $\mathcal{j 1 0 i}$ subspace, does not escape so easily and ism ore drastically a ected by the pertunbing interaction. In the absence of perturbation, the system has energies $!_{0}$ ( $j 0 i$ i) and $+!0$ ( 1 li ) and the environm ent has energies $!_{0}$ ( $\mathfrak{j} 10$ i) and ! $0^{+}$( 1 (i). W hen the perturbation is now tumed on, the dynam ics is dom inated by the action on the j01i, j10i pathways. T hese are exactly the pathw ays which m ost closely conserve the original energies of the system and environm ent. Furtherm ore the pathw ays which least conserve energy and act on the j00i and $\operatorname{jlli}$ states contribute liltle dynam ics di erent from the norm al evolution of these states. This sim ple exam ple then dem onstrates how decoherence is dom inated by pathw ays which m ost nearly preserve the unperturbed energies of the system and environm ent.

U nder the assum ption ofsuch a perturbative interaction, energetics play a key role in determ ining the rate of decoherence processes. T he notion that energetics plays a key role in determ ining decoherence rates is often confused w ith the statem ent that \the m ost dam aging decoherence is that in whidh energy is not exchanged betw een the system and the environm ent". W e em phasize here that the fact that the $m$ ost dam aging decoherence is often of a form where no energy is exchanged betw een the system and the environm ent is di erent from the fact that energetics play a key role in determ ining the dynam ics of decoherence. C ertainly it is true that the fact that energetics determ ines the decoherence pathw ays allow s decoherence which does not exchange energy to act, but the reason why such decoherence is typically m ore destructive is not related to the fact that decoherence is dom inated by nearly energy conserving dynam ics.
$H$ aving em phasized that energetics is key in determ ining decoherence dynam ics, it is useful to place decoherence in three di erent categories. Speci cally, energy conserving decoherence has three possible form $s$ : energy is supplied from the system to the environm ent (cooling), energy is supplied from the environm ent to the system (heating), or no energy is exchanged at all (non-dissipative). Thus even when the environm ent is a heat bath at zero tem perature, cooling and especially non-dissipative decoherence processes occur. A schem atic of these process is presented in $F$ igure 15.1.

A m ong the possible decoherence energetics, non-dissipative decoherence is often, but not alw ays, the $m$ ost dam aging source of decoherence. O f the possible energetically favored pathw ays, the easiest to elim inate is heating w here energy is transferred from the environm ent to the system. By cooling down the environm ent, heating can often be nearly com pletely elim inated as a decoherence pathw ay. Cooling and nondissipative dynam ics, on the other hand, cannot be elim inated by sim ply cooling the environm ent.


F igure 15.1: H eating, cooling, and non-dissipative decoherence dynam ics

### 15.2 A sim ple P aulistabilizer supercoherent quan-

 tum bit$H$ aving show $n$ that energetics dom inates the allow ed dynam ics of decoherence, we now present an approach to reducing decoherence which relies on this observation.

C onsider the sm allest possible additive quantum error detecting code which detects single qubit errors, the $[4 ; 2 ; 2]$ code (see A ppendix A. 7 for inform ation on this nom enclature and stabilizer codes). T he stabilizer of this code is generated by the two P auli operators

$$
\begin{array}{llllllll}
S_{1}=x & x & x & S_{2}= & z & z & z & z ; \tag{15.5}
\end{array}
$$

and encodes tw o qubits of inform ation. The logical (inform ational) operators for this code ( $m$ odulo the stabilizer) are given by

$$
\begin{array}{llllllllll}
X_{1}= & \mathrm{x} & \mathrm{x} & \mathrm{I} & \mathrm{I} ; \mathrm{Z}_{1}=\mathrm{I} & \mathrm{z} & \mathrm{z} & \mathrm{I} \\
\mathrm{X}_{2}=\mathrm{I} & \mathrm{x} & & \mathrm{x} & \mathrm{I} ; \quad \mathrm{Z}_{2}= & \mathrm{z} & \mathrm{z} & \mathrm{I} & \mathrm{I} ; \tag{15.6}
\end{array}
$$

( $Y_{i}=\frac{1}{2 i}\left[Z_{i} ; X_{i}\right]$, for each code, of course). A com plete set of com $m$ uting operators for this code is thus given by (for exam ple) $\mathrm{S}_{1} ; \mathrm{S}_{2} ; \mathrm{Z}_{1} ; \mathrm{Z}_{2}$. W e w ill denote the basis corresponding to this com plete set of comm uting operators by $\mathrm{j}_{1} ; \mathrm{S}_{2} ; \mathrm{Z}_{1} ; \mathrm{Z}_{2} \mathrm{i}$.

N ow consider the H am iltonian

$$
H=x \quad x \quad I \quad I+I \quad I \quad x \quad x+I \quad z \quad z \quad I+z \quad I \quad I \quad z:(15.7)
$$

The stabilizer of the $[4 ; 2 ; 2]$ code com $m$ utes $w$ th this $H$ am iltonian. $Z_{2}$ and $X_{2}$ also both com $m$ ute $w$ ith this $H$ am iltonian. This im plies that the action of the $H$ am iltonian acts only on the rst encoded qubit. Indeed we see that this Ham iltonian can be written in term $s$ of this code as

$$
\begin{align*}
H & =X_{1}+X_{1} S_{1}+Z_{1}+Z_{1} S_{2} \\
& =X_{1}\left(I+S_{1}\right)+Z_{1}\left(I+S_{2}\right): \tag{15.8}
\end{align*}
$$

N otioe how this Ham iltonian does not depend on the second qubit. Therefore this H am iltonian will have a spectrum which is two-fold degenerate: this degeneracy corresponding to the second encoded qubit.
$W$ e recall that the codespace of the $[4 ; 2 ; 2]$ code is labeled by the eigenvalues, $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ and $S_{2}$, of the stabilizer generators, $S_{1}$ and $S_{2}$ respectively. For each set ofeigenvalues for the stabilizer generators the action of on the corresponding subspace is di erent. In fact we see that

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.\mathrm{S}_{1}=+1 ; \mathrm{S}_{2}=+1\right) \mathrm{H}=2\left(\mathrm{X}_{1}+\mathrm{Z}_{1}\right) \\
& \left.\mathrm{S}_{1}=+1 ; \mathrm{S}_{2}=1\right) \mathrm{H}=2 \mathrm{X}_{1} \\
& \left.\mathrm{~S}_{1}=1 ; \mathrm{S}_{2}=+1\right) \mathrm{H}=2 \mathrm{Z}_{1} \\
& \left.\mathrm{~S}_{1}=1 ; \mathrm{S}_{2}=1\right) \mathrm{H}=0: \tag{15.9}
\end{align*}
$$

The eigenvalues of $H$ for these four cases are thus ${ }_{2}^{p} \overline{2} ; 2 ; 2$; and 0 respectively. W e therefore see that the ground state of H will be within the $\mathrm{S}_{1}=+1 ; \mathrm{S}_{2}=+1$ subspace of the $[4 ; 2 ; 2]$ code and $w i l l$ be the ${ }_{2}^{P} \overline{2}$ eigenvalue of $H$ over the rst encoded qubit. But what about the second encoded qubit? H ere we see that the ground state of the code is actually two-fold degenerate: corresponding directly to the second encoded qubit. The spectrum of this $H$ am iltonian is given in Figure 152.

The ground state of this $H$ am iltonian has a spectacular property $w$ ith respect to single qubit operators on this four qubit system. F irst recall that the code stabilized by $S_{1}$ and $S_{2}$ is a single qubit error detecting code. T hus every single qubit operator
${ }^{(i)}$ anticom $m$ utes $w$ ith at least one of $S_{1}$ and $S_{2}$. This in tum im plies that every single qubit error ips the value of the eigenvalue of $S_{1}$ or $S_{2}$ for every basis state $\mathrm{j}_{1} ; \mathrm{S}_{2} ; \mathrm{Z}_{1} ; \mathrm{Z}_{2} \mathrm{i}$.

For exam ple, suppose we are in the state labeled by ( $\mathrm{S}_{1}=+1 ; \mathrm{S}_{2}=+1$ ), w ith the H am iltonian eigenvalue of $\quad 2 \overline{2}$, and logicalbasis $j 0_{2}$ i for the second encoded qubit. $T$ his state is one of the ground states of $H$, the other being the logicalbasis $\mathfrak{j}_{2} i$. The


Figure 15 2: Spectrum of the $P$ auli supercoherent qubit
action of a single qubit operation $w$ ill act to change the value of $S_{1}$ or $S_{2}$ or possibly both. In any case, this im plies that the action of the single qubit operator is to take the system from this ground state to one of the higher energy eigenvalue states of H .


In fact we see that this is generically true for single qubit operators acting on a system $w$ ith this $H$ am iltonian. Every single qubit operator changes a value of $S_{1}$ and $S_{2}$ and therefore takes the system from the ground state to a higher energy state. $W$ e term such a $H$ am iltonian a supercoherent $H$ am iltonian and $m$ ake the follow ing general de nition:

De nition 15.2.1 (Supercoherence) A system of qubits with a system Ham iltonian $H$ which has a degenerate ground state and for which every single qubit operator takes the system out states in this degenerate ground state is called a supercoherent H am irtonian. In m ore generality, we $m$ ay allow the subsystem $s$ which $m$ ake up the system to be take any desired subsystem structure. The criteria used for supercoherence is then that every operator on an individual subsystem m ust take the system out of the


degenerate ground state. If $\ddot{j}$ i denotes the degenerate ground state of the H am iltonian $H$, then the condition for supercoherence is

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { hj jo }{ }^{(k)} \ddot{\mu} i=0 ; \quad 80^{(k)} ; \tag{15.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

for all $\ddot{j}$,,$\vec{j} i$ in the degenerate ground state and $O^{(k)}$ is the single subsystem operator o acting on the k th subsystem. Inform ation which has been encoded into the degenerate ground state of a supercoherent H am iltonian is referred to as a supercoherent quit or supercoherent quit, depending on the dim ension of the degeneracy.

N tote that the supercoherence condition Eq. (15.10) imp plies the ground states are an error detecting code for the operators single quit (subsystem) operators.

Why do we label such degenerate ground states supercoherent? Them ain reason for this lies in the fact that the H am iltonian of such a system has been constructed so that the only single quoit operations which can destroy the coherence of the system are interactions which heat the system. As we mentioned previously, it is often
possible to substantially decrease such decoherence mechanism s by sim ply cooling the system 's environm ent. We w ill have a chance to analytically dem onstrate this e ect in Section 15.4. In general, we expect that the condition for supercoherence to hold will occur when the tem perature $T$ ( $w e$ set $k_{B}=1$ ) is $m u c h$ less than the energy gap of from the degenerate ground state to the low est state excited by the single qubit operators. W hat kind of robustness should we expect for the supercoherent qubit? If the indinidualbaths have a tem perature $T$, then we expect the decoherence rate of the supercoherent qubit to scale at low tem peratures as e,where $=(\mathrm{kT})^{1}$. At low tem peratures there should thus be an exponential suppression of the decoherence.

It is helpful to com pare a supercoherent qubit to a single qubit w ith tw o di erent H am iltonians.
$F$ irst com pare a supercoherent qubit to a single qubit w ith non-degenerate energy levels $H=z^{2}$. N ow the single qubit error joihlj is a error which takes the system from a state of higher energy to one of low er energy. This error, then, w ill.be involved in a cooling type decoherence. The single qubit error jlihOjtakes the system from a state of low er energy to one of higher energy. This is a heating type decoherence. $F$ inally the single qubit error ${ }_{z}$ does not change the energy of the system but acts to dephase the system. T herefore this error is of the non-dissipative form. In contrast to this single qubit exam ple, all single qubit errors acting on a supercoherent ground state $m$ ust take the system from the ground state to a state ofhigher energy. T hus all of the above error $j 0 i h 1 j ; 1 \mathrm{ih} 0 j$ and $z$ are errors on the supercoherent H am iltonian of the heating form .

Second it is useful to com pare the supercoherent qubit to a single qubit w ith a degenerate $H$ am iltonian. In this case all errors act on this qubit are of the non-dissipative form because the two qubits have the sam e energy. This is in direct contrast to the supercoherent qubit for which all errors are of the heating form . D egeneracy alone is not enough for supercoherence.

### 15.2.1 Encoded operations on the $P$ auli supercoherent qubit

Retuming now the speci c P aulistabilizer supercoherent exam ple we began with, we can now ask the question of how to $m$ anipulate the inform ation encoded into the degeneracy. N othing is w orse than a quantum mem ory which one cannot $m$ anipulate!

In this case, we already know how to $m$ anipulate the quantum inform ation in the degeneracy because this degeneracy is sim ply the second encoded qubit. In particular the two-qubit operations $X_{2}=I \quad x \quad x \quad I$ andZ $2_{2}=z \quad z \quad I \quad I$ are encoded single qubit rotations on this qubit. By tuming on an 0 these interactions it is therefore possible to perform com putation any SU (2) rotation on the supercoherent qub立.

The question which is im ediately raised, how ever, is how tuming on an o the interactions a ects the supercoherent property of the system. Suppose that we have a supercoherent system w ith a gap from the ground state to the single qubit excited
states of energy . W hen we tum on $X_{2}$ or $Z_{2}$, we want to $m$ ake sure that this gap is still preserved and the supercoherent property that any single qubit gate $w$ ill take the supercoherent qubit to a state of higher energy is $m$ aintained.

In order for the gap to be still $m$ aintained the interaction strength $m$ ust be weak in com parison with the tem perature of the bath. To se this, we note that $X_{2}$ and $\mathrm{Z}_{2}$ break the degeneracy of the system. If these interactions are of strength , then this degeneracy is split by . The gap of size is therefore shrunk by c where c is a prefactor which $m$ ay be state dependent. In order to $m$ aintain the supercoherent condition, this shrinking $m$ ust not rem ove the condition that the gap is large com pared to the tem perature of the bath. Thus if $T$, the gap is $m$ aintained while the com putation is being perform ed.

A lso notice that the $m$ anipulation of the degenerate inform ation does not change the fact that single qubit interactions take the ground states (which are no longer degenerate due to the interaction) to states of higher energy. To see this is su cient to notioe that the interactions we im plem ent act only on the degeneracy. If, for exam ple, we tried to im plem ent $a \quad x$ on the codespace with $X_{2} X_{1}=x \quad I \quad x \quad I$, we would act not only on the degenerate supercoherent qubit, but also on the space of the H am iltonian H .

Having shown how to perform single qubit rotations on the inform ation in the supercoherent qubit, we can now ask the question of whether it is possible to perform universalquantum computation to perform universalquantum computation on conjoined sets of such supercoherent qubits. The di culty here is that any two qubit interaction which acts betw een tw o con joined supercoherent qubits act as single qubit operations on each inditidual supercoherent system s. T herefore any tw o qubit interaction necessarily excites the inform ation in the supercoherent ground state to an excited energy level. Of course, we could resort to $m$ ore than two qubit interactions. This m ethod, how ever, is highly unlikely to be practical and we w ill therefore disregard this technique.

O ne $m$ ethod for overcom ing this problem is, when an interaction between the encoded qubits is desired, another set of H am iltonians is tumed on which $m$ aintains the ground state condition of the individual supercoherent qubits but also creates other ground states which are degenerate w th these states. M anipulation of the quantum com putation is then perform ed over this larger supercoherent ground state. W e know of no such $m$ ethod for the P auli stabilizer supercoherent exam ple we have just presented, how ever, in the next section we w illpresent a m ore com plicated supercoherent system which can be used to perform universal quantum computation in a manner sim ilar to what we have just described.

### 15.3 Exchange-based supercoherent quantum bit

Am azingly there is a supercoherent system which is intim ately related to the strong collective decoherence DFS states which we have so thoroughly studied in P art II of this thesis. C onsider the H am iltonian

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}_{0}^{[\mathrm{[n]}}=\frac{-}{2}\left(\mathrm{~S}^{[\mathrm{n}]}\right)^{2} ; \tag{15.11}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we recall that $S^{[n]}=\frac{1}{2}{ }^{P} \underset{i=1}{n} \quad$ (i). This H am iltonian has eigenvalues $\frac{{ }_{2}}{2} J_{n}\left(J_{n}+1\right)$, w ith corresponding eigenstates given by the strong DFS basis $j ; J_{n} ; m$ i.

Let us brie y recall the de nitions of the strong DFS basis for com pleteness. Let $H_{n}=\left(\mathbb{C}^{2}\right)^{n}$ be a Hilbert space of $n$ qubits, and let $s^{(i)}$ be the th Pauli spin operator acting on the ith qubit tensored with identity on all other qubits. The $s^{(i)}$ satisfy the commutation and anticommutation rules, $\left[s^{(j)} ; s^{(k)}\right]=i_{j k} \quad s^{(j)}$ and $\mathrm{fs}^{(j)} ; \mathrm{S}^{(\mathrm{k})} \mathrm{g}=\frac{1}{2}{ }_{j k} \quad \mathrm{I}+2\left(1 \quad \mathrm{jk}_{\mathrm{j}}\right) \mathrm{S}^{(j)} \mathrm{S}^{(k)}$. W e de ne the kth partial collective spin operators on the $n$ qubits, $S^{[k]}={ }_{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{k}=1} \mathrm{~S}^{(\mathrm{i})}$. The total collective spin operators acting on alln qubits, $S^{[n]}$, form a Lie algebra $L$ which provides a representation of the L ie algebra su (2): $\left[S^{[n]} ; S^{[n]}\right]=i \quad S^{[n]}$. Thus L can be decom posed in a direct product of irreducible representations (irreps) of su (2), $L, \underset{\substack{n=2 \\ J=0 ; 1=2}}{L_{i=1}^{n_{J}}} L_{2 J+1}$, where $L_{2 J+1}$ is the $2 \mathrm{~J}+1$ dim ensional irrep of $\mathrm{su}(2)$ which appears $w$ th a multiplicity $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{J}}$. If we let ( $J_{d}$ ) be the operators of the d dim ensional irrep of su (2), then there exists a basis for the total collective spin operators such that $S^{[n]}=\underset{\substack{\mathrm{n}=2 \\ J=0 ; 1=2}}{\mathrm{I}_{\mathrm{n}}} \quad\left(\mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{J} J+1}\right)$. C orresponding to this decom position of $S^{[n]}$, the $H$ ibert space $H$ can be decom posed into states $j ; J_{n} ; m$ i classi ed by quantum num bers labeling the irrep, $J_{n}$, the degeneracy index of the irrep, , and an additionalintemal degree of freedom, m. A com plete set of com $m$ uting operators consistent $w$ ith this decom position and providing explicit values for these labels is given by $B=f\left(S^{[1]}\right)^{2} ;\left(S^{[2]}\right)^{2} ;::: ;\left(S^{[n}{ }^{1}\right)^{2} ;\left(S^{[n]}\right)^{2} ; S^{[n]} g[109]$. $T$ herefore a basis for the entire $H$ ilbert space is given by $j J_{1} ; J_{2} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 1 ; J_{n} ; m \quad$ i, where $\left(S^{[k]}\right)^{2} \mathrm{j}_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} ; m \quad i=J_{k}\left(J_{k}+1\right) j_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} ; m \quad i$ and $S{ }^{[n]} j_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} ; m \quad i=$ $\mathrm{m} \quad \mathrm{j}_{1} ;::: ; \mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{n}} ; \mathrm{m}$ i. The degeneracy index of a particular irrep having total collective spin $J_{n}$ is com pletely speci ed by the set of partial collective spin eigenvalues $J_{k}, k<n: f \mathcal{I}_{i}::: ; J_{n} 1 g$. This degeneracy is smply due to the $\left(n_{J}\right)$ di erent possible ways of constructing a spin $J_{n}$ out of $n$ qubits.

Thus the (possibly degenerate) ground state of the H am iltonian in Eq. (15.11) is given by the lowest $J_{n}$ states for a particular $n$. For $n$ even, these states have $J_{n}=0$, and for $n$ odd they have $J_{n}=1=2$. Furtherm ore, $H_{0}^{[n]}$ can be constructed from two-qubit interactions alone:

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{0}^{[n]}=\frac{L^{2}}{0}{ }_{i f j=1}^{x^{n}} s^{(i)} s^{(j)}+\frac{3 n}{4} I^{A}: \tag{15.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus we see that $H{ }_{0}^{[n]}$ is nothing $m$ ore than the $H$ eisenberg coupling $s^{(i)} s^{(j)}$ acting $w$ th equal $m$ agnitude betw een every pair of qubits. The identity com ponent of $\mathrm{H}_{0}$ produces only a trivialglobalphase on the system and is not relevant to ourdiscussion.
$H{ }_{0}^{[n]}$ has a highly degenerate spectrum, w ith energies determ ined by $J_{n}$. To deter$m$ ine the e ect of single qubit operations on these states we rst exam ine the e ect of a single qubit operation on the nth qubit, $s^{(n)}$. Since $\left[s^{(n)} ;\left(S^{k]}\right)^{2}\right]=0$ for $k<n$, we see that $s^{(n)}$ can not change the degeneracy index of a state $j ; J_{n} ; m$ i. Let $\left.O_{n}=\frac{1}{4} I+\left(S^{[n]}\right)^{2} \quad \mathbb{S}^{[n}{ }^{1}\right)^{2}$ (de ned for $\left.n>1\right) . O_{n}$ determ ines which nal step is taken in $m$ aking the addition from qubit $n \quad 1$ to qubit $n$ (see $F$ igure 15.4). If the nalstep from $J_{n} 1$ to $J_{n}$ was taken by adding $1=2$, then the eigenvalue of $O_{n} w$ illbe $O_{n}=J_{n} \quad 1+\frac{1}{2}$, while if it was taken by subtracting $1=2$, then $O_{n}=\left(\mathcal{L}_{1}+\frac{1}{2}\right)$. It is convenient to replace $\left(S^{[n]}\right)^{2}$ by $\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{n}}$ in our set of com $m$ uting operators, which can clearly be done while still $m$ aintaining a com plete set of com $m$ uting operators. W e can then replace the quantum num ber $J_{n}$ by $O_{n}$, to obtain the basis $j ; O_{n} ; m$ i. It is easy to verify that $f O_{n} ; s^{(n)} g=S^{[n]}$. If we exam ine the e ect of $s^{[n]}$ on the basis $j ; O_{n} ; m$ i (where we have de ned $m$ as the orientation corresponding to $S^{(n)}$ ), then we nd that

$$
\begin{align*}
\left(O_{n}^{0}+O_{n}\right) h & ; O_{n} ; m & \dot{\mathcal{j}}^{(n)} j^{0} ; O_{n}^{0} ; m^{0} i \\
& =m & ; O_{n} ; O_{n}^{0} m ; m^{0}: \tag{15.13}
\end{align*}
$$

$T$ hus we see that the only non-zero $m$ atrix elem ents occur when $O_{n}^{0}=O_{n}$ or $O_{n}^{0}=$
$\mathrm{O}_{\mathrm{n}}$. From this it follows that the nal step in the paths of F igure 15.4 can either
ip sign (e.g., 1! 1) or else $m$ ust rem ain the sam $e$. U sing the relation betw een $O_{n}$ and $J_{n}$ above, show $s$ that this results in the selection rules $J_{n}=1 ; 0$ for $\mathrm{s}^{(n)}$ acting on states in the $j ; J_{n} ; m$ i basis. Note further that if we had chosen a basis with $m$ instead ofm in Eq. (15.13) ( ), we would have obtained the sam e selection rule but now the $m$ com ponents could be $m$ ixed by the operation of $s^{(n)}$. W e recall (see A ppendix C) that the exchange operation $E_{i j}=\frac{1}{2} I+2 s^{(i)} s^{(j)}$ which exchanges qubits $i$ and $j m$ odi es only the degeneracy index of the $j ; J_{n} ; m$ ibasis. Because $s^{(j)}=E_{j n} s^{(n)} E_{j n}$, this implies that any single qubit operator $s^{(i)}$ can therefore give rise to $m$ ixing of both the spin projections $m$, and of the degeneracy indioes .

These selection rulesm ust be $m$ odi ed for the $J_{n}=0$ states. $O_{n}=1$ and $m=0$ for all $J_{n}=0$ states and any transitions betw een these states $w i l l$ therefore have zero m atrix elem ent, i.e., $h ; J_{n}=0 ; m \dot{j}^{(n)} j^{0} ; J_{n}^{0}=0 ; \mathrm{m}^{0} i=0$. Thus the transitions $J=0$ are forbidden for $J_{n}=0$, and $s^{(n)} \mathrm{m}$ ust take $J_{n}=0$ states to $J_{n}=1$ states. Furtherm ore, since $h ; J_{n}=0 ; 0 j^{(n)} j^{0} ; J_{n}^{0}=0 ; 0 i=0$, the degeneracy index for $J_{n}=0$ states is not a ected by any single qubit operation.

To sum $m$ arize, we have shown that any single qubit operation $s^{(i)}$ enforces the selection rules $J_{n}=1 ; 0 \mathrm{w}$ th the im portant exception of $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{h}}=0$ which m ust have $J_{n}=+1$. The degenerate $J_{n}=0$ states are therefore a quantum error detecting
code for single qubit errors [10, 109], w ith the special property that they are also the ground state of a realistically im plem entable H am ittonian.


Figure 15.4: D iagram show ing form ation of the $j ; J_{n} ; m$ i states
$F$ igure 15.4 show s that for an even number of qubits the $J_{n}=0$ ground state of $\mathrm{H}_{0}^{[\mathrm{m}]}$ is degenerate. For $\mathrm{n}=4$ physical qubits the ground state is tw o-fold degenerate [216]. This degeneracy cannot be broken by any single qubit operator and single qubit operations $m$ ust take the $J_{n}=0$ states to $J_{n}=1$ states as described above. This ground state is therefore a supercoherent qubit. If each qubit couples to its ow $n$ individual environm ent, we expect that the $m$ a jor source of decoherence for this ground states will indeed be the processes which take the system from $J_{n}=0$ to $J_{\mathrm{n}}=1$.

### 15.3.1 Encoded operations on the exchange-based supercoherent qubit

W e now tum to the question which we could not solve for the Pauli stabilized supercoherent qubits. In order to be useful for quantum com putation, the supercoherent qubits should allow for universal quantum com putation. Extensive discussion of fault-tolerant universal quantum com putation on qubits encoded in decoherencefree subsystem s has been given in Chapter 9 where it was shown that com putation on these encoded states can be achieved by tuming on $H$ eisenberg couplings betw een neighboring physical qubits. This $m$ eans that we need to add extra H eisenberg couplings to the supercoherent H am iltonian $\mathrm{H}_{0}^{[4]}$. For a single supercoherent qubit these additional H eisenberg couplings can be used to perform any SU (2) rotation, i.e., an
encoded one-qubit operation. In the present schem e one would like this additional coupling to avoid destroying the energy gap which suppresses decoherence. This can be achieved if the strength of the additionalcouplings, , ism uch less than the energy gap, i.e., . The trade-o betw een the decoherence rate and the speed of the one qubit operations can be quanti ed by calculating the gate delity $F / e^{( }$. F quanti es the num ber of operations which can be done within a typical decoherence time of the system. For sm all the gates are slower while for larger the gap is sm aller resulting in a tradeo. F is m inim ized for $0=\mathrm{kT}$. At this m inim um F is still exponentially suppressed for low er tem peratures, in particular, $F j=0 /{ }^{1} e$.

O fm ore conœm for the present schem e is how to perform com putation betw een two encoded supercoherent qubits, the question which perplexed us in the previous section. In Section 11.5 we saw that using only Heisenberg couplings, a nontrivial tw o encoded qubit gate cannot be done w ithout breaking the degeneracy of the $\mathrm{H}_{0}^{[4]}$ H am iltonian on the tw o sets of fourqubits. This can be circum vented by considering a joint H am iltonian of the eight qubits, $\mathrm{H}{ }_{0}^{[8]}$. This H am iltonian has a ground state which is 14-fold degenerate, including the tensor product states of the degenerate ground state of the $\mathrm{H}{ }_{0}^{[4]} \mathrm{H}$ am iltonian. The universality constructions previously presented in Chapter 9 and explicitly in A ppendix E can then easily be shown to never leave the ground state of this com bined system. Thus we se that we can circum vent the problem of the previous section. W hen a gate between two con joined exchange-based supercoherent qubits is needed, additional exchange interactions $m$ ust be tumed on to obtain the H am iltonian $\mathrm{H}{ }_{0}^{[8]}$ and additional exchanges m ust be used to produce a nontrivial gate betw een the two con joined supercoherent qubits.

### 15.3.2 Im plem entation of the exchange supercoherent qubit in quantum dot arrays

The technologicaldi culties in building a supercoherent qubit are daunting but we believe w ithin the reach of present experim ents. In particular the supercoherent qubit states appear perfect for solid state im plem entations of a quantum com puter using quantum dots[141, 64,63]. R elated encodings on 3-qubit states were recently show $n$ to perm it universal com putation with the exchange interaction alone in [62]. The $m$ ain new requirem ent for the supercoherent encoding, which allow $s$ the additional exponential suppression of decoherence, is the construction of $\mathrm{H} 0_{0}^{[4]}$ and $\mathrm{H} 0_{0}^{[8]} . \mathrm{H} 0_{0}^{[4]}$ can be im plem ented by a tw o dim ensional array with Heisenberg couplings betw een all four qubits. $\mathrm{H}{ }_{0}^{[8]}$ poses a m ore severe challenge, since the m ost natural geom etry for im plem enting this $H$ am iltonian is eight qubits on a cube w ith couplings betw een all qubits. Such structures should be possible in quantum dots by com bining lateral and vertical coupling schem e. Finally, estim ates of the strength of the $H$ eisenberg coupling in the quantum dot im plem entations are expected to be on the order of $0: 1 \mathrm{meV} \quad[141,64,63]$. Thus we expect that at tem peratures below $0: 1 \mathrm{meV} 1$
$K$, decoherence should be suppressed for such coupled dots by encoding into the supercoherent states proposed here.

### 15.4 H arm on ic baths coupled to a supercoherent quib it

A s an exam ple of the expected supercoherence we consider a quite generalm odel of 4 qubits coupling to 4 independent harm onic baths for the exchange-based supercoherent ${ }_{P} q u b i t$. The unperturbed H am iltonian of the system and bath is $\mathrm{H}_{0}^{[4]} \mathrm{I}+$ I ${ }_{i=1}^{4} \quad k_{i} h!{ }_{k_{i}} a_{k_{i}}^{Y} a_{k_{i}}$ where $a_{k_{i}}^{Y}$ is the creation operator for the ith bath $m$ ode $w$ ith energy $h!{ }_{k_{i}}$. The $m$ ost general linear coupling between each system qubit and its individualbath is ${ }^{P}{ }_{i=1}^{4}{ }_{k_{i}} \quad s^{(i)} \quad\left(g_{;} a_{k_{i}}+g_{i} ; a_{k_{i}}^{Y}\right)$. A coording to the selection rules described above we can write $s^{(i)}={ }^{P}{ }_{(m ; n) 2 s} A_{i ;}^{(m ; n)}+h ; c:$, where $A_{i}^{m ; n y}$ takes states $J_{n}=m$ to $J_{n}=n$ (and acts on and $m$ in som e possibly nontrivialm anner) and $S$ is the set of allowed transitions $S=f(0 ; 1) ;(1 ; 2) ;(1 ; 1) ;(2 ; 2)$. In the interaction picture, after $m$ aking the rotating-w ave approxim ation [169], this becom es

$$
\begin{align*}
& \left.+g_{i} ; e^{i(\bar{h} f(m ; n)} \quad k_{k_{i}}\right){ }^{\prime} A_{i}^{(m ; n) y} a_{k_{i}} ; \tag{15.14}
\end{align*}
$$

where $\mathrm{f}(\mathrm{m} ; \mathrm{n})=\mathrm{n}(\mathrm{n}+1) \quad \mathrm{m}(\mathrm{m}+1)$. Coupling to therm al environm ents of the sam e tem perature, under quite general circum stances $M$ arkovian dynam ics, sm ooth spectral density of the eld $m$ odes) we are led to a $m$ aster equation (see for exam ple [169])
with $\left.\left.L_{i}^{(m ; n)}[]=\left(\mathbb{A}_{i ;}^{(m ; n)} ; A_{i ;}^{(m ; n) y}\right]+\mathbb{A}_{i ;}^{(m ; n)} ; \mathbb{A}_{i ;}^{(m ; n) y}\right]\right)$. The only operators which act directly on the superooherent qubit are $A_{i}{ }_{i}^{(0 ; 1)}$. The relative decoherence rates satisfy ${ }_{i}{ }^{(0 ; 1)} / \mathrm{n}(\mathrm{T})$ where $\mathrm{n}(\mathrm{T})$ is the therm al average Bose occupation number $n(T)=[\exp () 1]^{1}$. Thus we see, as predicted that the supercoherent qubit decoheres at a rate which decreases exponentially as kT decreases below.

### 15.5 C ooper pairs as error detecting codes and supercoherence

F inally let us mention an interesting connection betw een our supercoherent constructions and $C$ ooper pairs in superconductivity. In the standard derivation ofsuperconductivity as initially put forth by Bardeen, C ooper, and Schrie er [11] electrons
with energies near the Ferm ienergy of a $m$ etal interact via the exchange of a phonon producing an attractive e ective potential between the electrons. The H am iltonian which describes the system is well described by [11]
where $c_{k ; s}$ is the single electron annihilation operator for an electron $w$ ith $w$ avenum ber $k$ and spin $s, E(k)$ is the energy of an electron $w$ th $w$ avenum ber $k$, and $V_{k k}{ }^{0}$ represents the attractive coupling. T he ground state of the superconductor to a good approxim ation (in the them odynam ic lim it) is [11]
where $k$ and $k$ are realcoe cients and $j 0 i$ is the vacuum state. The ground state is com posed of Cooper pairs of electrons with opposite $m$ om entum $k$;"ij $k$;\#i. Ifwe w ork in the fram e of reference which is drifting $w$ ith the superconducting current, then the types of e ects which nom ally establish resistivity in a conductor are those that change the m om entum of a single electron (via scattering from im purities, phonons, etc). W ew ill now show that C ooper pairs are a form ofquantum error detecting code for these single electron scattering processes.

W e recall that the open system evolution of a system which is initially decoupled from its environm ent is described in the operator-sum representation [126] as ( $t$ ) = ${ }^{P}{ }_{i} A_{i}(t) \quad(0) A_{i}^{Y}(t)$ where ${ }^{P}{ }_{i} A_{i}^{Y}(t) A_{i}(t)=I . Q$ uantum error correction and detection begin by expanding $A_{i}(t)$ in term $s$ of a suitable basis $E_{a}$ of possibly non-unitary \error" operators. A su cient condition for the detection of such processes on a code $w$ th states 7 it representing the encoded quantum inform ation is given by [120]

$$
\begin{equation*}
h j \not \Xi_{a} \nexists i=C_{a}{ }_{i j}: \tag{15.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

C onsider now a single $C$ ooper pair $w$ ith di erent wavenum bers $k$ and $k^{0}$ : $k$;"; $k$;\#i and $\mathrm{k}^{0} ; " \mathrm{k} ; \# \mathrm{i}$. A ny error operator E which acts on only one of the electrons and changes the m om entum of the electron, the operators which would norm ally cause resistance, can easily be seen to satisfy $h k ; " ; k ; \#$ 于 $k ; " ; k ; \# i=0$ because of the orthogonality of states on the electron which is not operated on. Further because E changes the m om entum of the single electron,
hl;"; l;\# ت ji;"; l;\#i= 0;
for both $l=k$ and $l=k^{0}$. W e therefore see that C ooper pairs satisfy Eq. (15.18) for all resistance causing interactions. C ooper pairs, then, are quantum error detecting codes for resistance cause scattering. If we could store quantum inform ation in the wavenum ber of a C ooper pair then we could use these C ooper pairs as a supercoherent system. W e note here that the fact that C ooper pairs are single electron error detecting codes which exhibit supercoherence does not how ever explain the zero electrical resistance of superconductors. It is interesting to note, how ever, the connections between C ooper pairs and supercoherence.

### 15.6 Supercoherence and the im portance of energetics

In this chapter we have introduced the notion of supercoherence. W hen the interaction between a system and its environm ent is perturbing (which is the case in $m$ ost system s of interest) decoherence follows pathw ays which preserve the unperturbed system and environm ent energies. This allows us to construct a m ethod for avoiding decoherence by engineering the system H am iltonian such that all single qubit decoherence processes are processes w hich heat the system. T hus by cooling the environm ent decoherence in a supercoherent system can bem inim ized. W e have therefore hamessed the power ofenergetics to help strengthen the resistance of quantum infor$m$ ation to decoherence. This represents a sm all step tow ards constructing a system which has resistance to decoherence built into the natural evolution of the system.

## C hapter 16

# A Supercoherent Spin Ladder w ith E rror C orrecting P roperties 

To be an E rror and to be C ast out is part of G od's D esign
\{ W illiam B lake

In this chapter we study a spin ladder which has both superooherent and error correcting properties. W e begin by presenting a stabilizer encoding which m aps this $m$ odelinto chusters of Ising $m$ odels $w$ ith transverse elds. W e then explicitly calculate the spectrum of this $m$ odel and show that there is a unique two-fold degenerate ground state for this spin ladder. It is then shown that this ground state detects single bit ips and corrects multiple phase errors. The ground state is therefore supercoherent with the added bene $t$ of being quantum error correcting. W e then discuss the role ofencoded operations on this state and conclude w ith som e discussion of the shortcom ings of this spin ladder for quantum com putation.

### 16.1 D escription of the spin ladder

Suppose we are given a spin ladder of $2 n$ qubits. $W$ e label these qubits via the indiges $(i ; j)$ where $1 \quad i \quad n$ and $j 2 f 1 ; 2 g w$ th the operator $O$ acting on the $(i ; j)$ th qubit tensored with identity on all other qubits as $O^{(i ; j)}$. De ne the two operators

$$
\begin{align*}
& H_{z}=\mathrm{X}^{\mathrm{n}} \underset{\mathrm{z}}{(\mathrm{i}, 1)} \underset{\mathrm{z}}{(\mathrm{i} ; 2)} \\
& \text { i= } 1 \tag{16.1}
\end{align*}
$$

The spin ladder we consider is the sum of these tw o H am iltonians with equalnegative strengths

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{n}=\quad!_{0}\left(H_{z}+H_{x}\right) ; \tag{162}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $!_{0}>0$. This spin ladder is sketched in $F$ igure 16.1


Figure 16.1: A supercoherent spin ladder.
Let us begin by understanding the intuition behind why this spin ladder system $m$ ay have interesting supercoherent properties. The ground state of this spin ladder system will attem pt to m inim ize the energy of the total H am iltonian. A ny given qubit is acted upon by an interaction which acts as $x$ or $z \quad z$ where the rst qubit is the qubit of concem and the other qubit is one of the qubits neighbors. W e call such couplings between the qubits bonds. If we individually diagonalize the interactions corresponding to the bonds, single qubit interactions act to change the eigenvalue of each of these operators. In particular, because we are dealing $w$ ith $P$ aulioperators, the eigenvalue $w i l l$ ip sign and therefore increase in energy. T he real ground state, of the system, of course cannot be analyzed in such a $m$ anner because all of the bond operators do not com mute. H ow ever, it is not unreasonable that the ground state w ill m aintain som e of this intuition, that single qubit interactions increase the energy and indeed we will see that our intuition does pay o and this is exactly what happens. Such spin ladders are known as frustrated spin ladders[187] due to the com petition of the di erent bonds in establishing a ground state.

### 16.1.1 Stab ilizer encoding

$T$ here are two transform ations which $m$ ake exact caloulation of the spectrum of this spin ladder possible. The rst of these is a P auli stabilizer encoding (see Appendix A.7). Instead of the Pauli basis (i;j), consider instead the follow ing set of Pauli operators

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{X}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i})}={ }_{\mathrm{x}}^{(\mathrm{i} ; 1)}{ }_{\mathrm{x}}^{(\mathrm{i} ; 2)} ; \quad \mathrm{Z}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i})}={ }_{\mathrm{z}}^{(\mathrm{i} ; 1)} ; \\
& \mathrm{X}_{2}^{(\mathrm{i})}={ }_{\mathrm{x}}^{(\mathrm{i} ; 2)} ; \mathrm{Z}_{2}^{(\mathrm{i})}={ }_{z^{(\mathrm{i} ; 1)}}{ }_{\mathrm{z}}^{(\mathrm{i} ; 2)}: \tag{16.3}
\end{align*}
$$

In particular, there is an encoding of inform ation such that $X_{1} ; Z_{1}$ act as corresponding $P$ aulioperators on the rst qubit and $X_{2} ; \mathrm{Z}_{2}$ act as corresponding $P$ aulioperators on the second qubit. In fact this encoding is sim ply the controlled-not basis change on the qubits from adjacent qubits connected by the rungs of the ladder
j00i! j00i; j01i! j01i; j10i! j11i; j11i! j10i:

U nder this basis, we nd that the spin ladder H am iltonian becom es

At this point it is useful to introduce a basis corresponding to the operators Eq. (16.3). A complete set of commuting operators corresponding to this basis is given by the operator $Z_{2}^{(i)}$ and $X_{1}^{(i)}$. $W$ e label this basis by the 1 eigenvalues of these operators as $\dot{\mathcal{Z}}_{2}^{(1)} ; \mathrm{z}_{2}^{(2)} ;::: ; \mathrm{z}_{2}^{(\mathrm{n})} ; \mathrm{x}_{1}^{(1)} ; \mathrm{x}_{2}^{(2)} ;::: ; \mathrm{x}_{2}^{(\mathrm{n})}$ i. W ew ill som etim es abbreviate this as $\dot{z}_{2} ; \mathrm{x}_{1} \mathrm{i}$ under the obvious correspondence.

U nder this basis

$$
\begin{equation*}
I+X_{1}^{(\mathrm{i})} \mathrm{X}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i}+1)} \quad \dot{\mathbb{Z}}_{2} ; \mathrm{x}_{1} \mathrm{i}=1+\mathrm{x}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i})} \mathrm{x}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i}+1)} \quad \dot{\mathrm{z}}_{2} ; \mathrm{x}_{1} \mathrm{i}: \tag{16.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

N ow $1+x_{1}^{(i)} x_{1}^{(i+1)}$ is either 0 if the signs of $x_{1}^{(i)}$ and $x_{1}^{(i+1)}$ di er or 2 if the signs of $\mathrm{x}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i})}$ and $\mathrm{x}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i}+1)}$ are identical. This identi cation allow s us to see that the spin ladder H am iltonian Eq. (16.5) acts as a di erent H am iltonian depending only the value of $\mathrm{x}_{1}$. In particular we see that

$$
\begin{aligned}
& H=!_{0} \quad M \quad X^{n} \quad Z_{2}^{(i)}+2 C_{i}\left(X_{1}\right) X_{2}^{(i)} X_{2}^{(i+1)} \quad \dot{\text { in }} i h x_{1} j \\
& \mathrm{x}_{1}^{(1)} ;::: ; \mathrm{X}_{1}^{(\mathrm{n})}=\mathrm{f} \quad 1 ;+1 \mathrm{~g}^{\mathrm{i}=1}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{i}}\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}\right)=\frac{1}{2} 1+\mathrm{x}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i})} \mathrm{x}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i}+1)}: \tag{16.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

$N$ otice $C_{i}(x)$ is a list over i of either +1 or $0 . W$ e therefore see that the spin ladder H am iltonian has been brought to a block diagonal form where each of the blocks corresponds to a given $\mathbf{x}_{1}$. Given a particular block with a $x_{1}$ the values of the $n \quad 1$ $c_{i}\left(X_{1}\right)$ then specify the exact form of the $H$ am iltonian in this block.

W e will now focus on these block diagonal H am ittonians for a xed $\mathrm{x}_{1}$. We see that a $H$ am iltonian for a particular $c_{i}\left(x_{1}\right)$ corresponds to $m$ ultiple Ising chains in a transverse eld. De ne the Ising chain with a transverse eld Ham iltonian as

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{I}^{j ; k}=!_{0}^{0} @_{i=j}^{k^{1}} 2 X_{2}^{(i)} X_{2}^{(i+1)}+X_{i=j}^{X^{k}} Z_{2}^{(i)} A \quad: \tag{16.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

and the transverse eld only Ham ittonian as

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{T}^{j ; k}=!_{i=j}^{X^{k}} Z_{2}^{(i)}: \tag{16.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

The Ham iltonian over the $z_{2}$ qubits for a $x e d x_{1}$ is given by a sum of such chains w ith transverse elds and transverse elds only:

Since each of the $H_{I}^{i_{j} i_{j+1}} H_{T}^{i_{j} ; i_{j+1}}$ act on di erent $\dot{x}_{2}^{(i)} i$ qubits they can each be individually diagonalized and the totalenergy added up. For the system $s$ w ith sim ply a transverse eld this is trivially achieved. The eigenstates are sim ply the single qubit con gurations of the qubits pointing $w$ ith or antito the transverse eld. Luckily, also, we can analyze the Ising chains w ith a transverse eld and nd analyticalexpressions for the energy and eigenstates of these chains up to a sm all correction.
16.1.2 The one dim ensional Ising chain in a transverse magnetic eld

W e need to consider an Ising chain of length $k$ in a transverse eld of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{I}={ }_{i=1}^{X^{k}} Z_{i} \quad 2_{i=1}^{X_{i}^{1}} X_{i} X_{i+1} ; \tag{16.12}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have relabeled our qubit operators in an obvious notion for sim plicity in this calculation. W e follow the calculation in [40]. De ne the raising and lowering operations

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.S_{i}=\frac{1}{2} X_{i} \quad i Y_{i}\right] ; \tag{16.13}
\end{equation*}
$$

such that

$$
\begin{align*}
H_{I} & ={ }^{x^{k}}\left(I \quad 2 S_{i}^{+} S_{i}\right) \quad 2_{i=1}^{k} S_{i}^{1 h}+S_{i}{ }^{i h} S_{i+1}^{+}+S_{i+1}^{i} \\
& =k I \quad 2{ }_{i=1}^{x^{k}} S_{i}^{+} S_{i}+{ }_{i=1}^{k / h} S_{i}^{+}+S_{i}{ }^{i h} S_{i+1}^{+}+S_{i+1} i^{!}: \tag{16.14}
\end{align*}
$$

Henceforth, we will drop the identily constant $k I$ and recover such constant term s at the end of our calculation (they will tum out to be im portant!).

N ext we can use the Jordan $W$ igner transform ation to take this $m$ odel, which is that of hard-core bosons, from spin operators to ferm ions. In particular if we de ne
then we see that the operators $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}} ; \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{i}}^{\mathrm{y}}$ are ferm ionic operators satisfying

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{fc}_{i} ; \mathrm{C}_{j} \mathrm{~g}=0 ; \quad \mathrm{fc}_{i} ; \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{j}}^{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{~g}=\mathrm{ij}: \tag{16.16}
\end{equation*}
$$

Expressing ourm odel in term sof the ferm ionic operators we nd

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{I}=\quad 2{\underset{i=1}{x^{k}} C_{i}^{y} C_{i}+{ }_{i=1}^{x^{k}} C_{i}^{y} \quad G^{i h} C_{i+1}^{y}+C_{i+1}^{i}}_{i}^{l}+C ; \tag{16.17}
\end{equation*}
$$

where addition is done m odulo k and C is a correction

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}=+2\left(\mathrm{c}_{1}^{\mathrm{y}}+\mathrm{C}_{1}\right)\left(\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{k}}^{\mathrm{y}} \quad \mathrm{G}\right): \tag{16.18}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e will ignore the correction term C for now and retum to the e ect of this term later. N otice also that this correction term only appears when $\mathrm{k}>2$.

To diagonalize this $H$ am iltonian it is usefulto work rst $w$ ith ferm ions in $m$ om entum space

$$
\begin{align*}
& c_{q}=P^{1} \overline{\bar{k}}_{j=1}^{x^{k}} c_{j} \exp (\text { iqj }) \\
& c_{q}^{y}=P_{\bar{k}_{j=1}^{1}}^{\bar{x}^{k}} c_{j}^{y} \exp (i q j) ; \tag{16.19}
\end{align*}
$$

where $q=\frac{2 \mathrm{~m}}{\mathrm{k}} \mathrm{w}$ ith $\mathrm{m}=\frac{\mathrm{k}}{2} ;::: ; \frac{\mathrm{k}}{2}$ for k even and $\mathrm{m}=\frac{\mathrm{k} 1}{2} ;::: ; \frac{\mathrm{k} 1}{2}$ for k odd. C heck that these still obey the ferm ion rules:

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{fC}_{\mathrm{q}} ; \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{~g}=\mathrm{fC}_{\mathrm{q}}^{\mathrm{y}} ; \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{q}}^{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{~g}=0 \tag{1620}
\end{align*}
$$

W e can com pute that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{q}}^{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{q}}=\frac{1}{k}_{\mathrm{a} ; \mathrm{b}=1}^{\mathrm{x}^{k}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{a}}^{\mathrm{y}} \mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{b}} \exp (\operatorname{iq}(\mathrm{~b} \quad \mathrm{a})): \tag{1621}
\end{equation*}
$$

So that

$$
\begin{aligned}
X_{q} C_{q}^{y} C_{q} & ={ }_{a=1}^{x^{k}} C_{a}^{y} c_{a} ; \\
2_{q}^{X} \cos (q) c_{q}^{y} c_{q} & =\underbrace{x}_{q}(\exp (i q)+\exp (\quad i q))_{a ; b=1}^{x^{k}} C_{a}^{y} c_{b} \exp (i q(b l a))
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{aligned}
& =\sum_{a=1}^{x{ }^{1}} C_{a}^{y} C_{a+1} \quad C_{a} C_{a+1}^{y} \\
& { }_{q}^{x} \exp (\quad i q){ }_{q} C^{y}{ }_{q}=\frac{1}{k}_{q}^{x}{ }_{a ; b=1}^{x^{k}} C_{a}^{y} C_{b}^{y} \exp (i q(b \quad a \quad 1))={ }_{a=1}^{k} C_{a}^{1} C_{a+1}^{y}
\end{aligned}
$$

Thuswe nd that

$$
\begin{align*}
& H_{I}=\int_{0}^{x}(1+2 \cos (q)) C_{q}^{y} C_{q} \int_{q}^{x}\left(\exp (\quad i q){ }_{q}^{y} C^{y}{ }_{q}+\exp (i q) C_{q} C \quad{ }_{q}\right)  \tag{1623}\\
& \left.=\quad 2^{@}{ }_{q>0}^{x}(1+2 \cos (q))\left(C_{q}^{y} C_{q}+c^{y}{ }_{q} c \quad{ }_{q}\right)+2 i^{x} \quad \sin (q) \quad C_{q}^{y} C^{y}{ }_{q}+C_{q} C \quad{ }_{q}\right)^{A}:
\end{align*}
$$

To diagonalize this $H$ am iltonian we apply a B ogoliubov transform ation

$$
\begin{align*}
& { }_{\mathrm{q}}^{\mathrm{y}}=\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{q}}^{\mathrm{Y}} \quad \mathrm{i} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{C} \quad \mathrm{q} \quad{ }_{\mathrm{y}}^{\mathrm{y}}{ }_{\mathrm{q}}=\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{C}^{\mathrm{y}}{ }_{\mathrm{q}}+i \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{C}_{\mathrm{q}} ; \tag{1624}
\end{align*}
$$

where $q>0$ everywhere and $u_{q} ; v_{q}$ are both real. We require that the ${ }_{q} ;{ }_{q}{ }_{q}$ are ferm ionic operators:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.\mathrm{f}_{\mathrm{q}^{0} ;}{ }_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{~g}=0 ; \quad \mathrm{f}{ }_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{Y}^{\prime} ;{ }_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{~g}=\mathrm{q}^{0} ; \mathrm{q} \quad\right) \quad \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{q}}^{2}+\mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{q}}^{2}=1: \tag{1625}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus we param eterize $u_{q}$ and $v_{q}$ via $u_{q}=\sin \left({ }_{q}\right) ; \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{q}}=\cos \left({ }_{q}\right)$. The inverse transfor$m$ ation to the Bogolinbov ferm ions is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
& C_{q}^{y}=u_{q}{\underset{q}{y}}^{y}+i v_{q} \quad q^{\prime} \quad c^{y}{ }_{q}=u_{q}{ }^{y}{ }_{q} \quad i v_{q}{ }_{q}: \tag{1626}
\end{align*}
$$

W hich can be used to rew rite the H am iltonian in term s of the B ogoliubov ferm ions:

$$
\begin{align*}
& H_{I}=\quad 2^{@}{ }_{q>0}^{\mathrm{X}}(1+2 \cos (\mathrm{q})) \quad\left(\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{q}} \underset{\mathrm{q}}{\mathrm{y}}+\mathrm{iv} \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{q}} \quad{ }_{\mathrm{q}}\right)\left(\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{q}} \quad \mathrm{q} \quad \mathrm{i} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{q}}{ }^{\mathrm{y}}{ }_{\mathrm{q}}\right) \\
& \left.+\left(\begin{array}{llll}
u_{q} & { }_{q} & i V_{q} & { }_{q}
\end{array}\right)\left(u_{q} \quad q^{+} v_{q}{ }_{q}^{y}\right)\right) \\
& +{ }_{q>0}^{X} 2 i \sin (q) \quad\left(u_{q}{\underset{q}{q}}_{Y_{i}}+i v_{q} \quad{ }_{q}\right)\left(u_{q}{ }^{y}{ }_{q} \quad i v_{q} \quad q^{\prime}\right) \\
& \left.+\left(\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{q}} \underset{\mathrm{q}}{ } \quad \mathrm{i}_{\mathrm{V}_{\mathrm{G}}}{ }^{\mathrm{y}}{ }_{\mathrm{q}}\right)\left(\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{q}} \quad \mathrm{q}^{+} \mathrm{iv}_{\mathrm{q}}{ }_{\mathrm{q}}^{\mathrm{Y}}\right)\right)  \tag{1627}\\
& =\quad 2^{@^{\mathrm{X}}} \underset{\mathrm{q}>0}{\mathrm{~h}}(1+2 \cos (\mathrm{q}))\left(\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{q}}^{2} \quad \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{q}}^{2}\right) \quad 4 \sin (\mathrm{q}) \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{~V}_{\mathrm{q}}{ }^{\mathrm{i}}\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\mathrm{y} & \mathrm{q}
\end{array}{ }^{\mathrm{y}}{ }_{\mathrm{q}} \quad{ }_{\mathrm{q}}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

up to a constant vacuum energy. $W$ e can $m$ ake the $o$-diagonal term $s$ vanish if

$$
\begin{equation*}
(1+2 \cos (\mathrm{q})) \mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{q}} \mathrm{v}_{\mathrm{q}}+\sin (\mathrm{q})\left(\mathrm{u}_{\mathrm{q}}^{2} \quad \mathrm{q}_{\mathrm{q}}^{2}\right)=0!\tan \left(2_{\mathrm{q}}\right)=\frac{2 \sin (\mathrm{q})}{(1+2 \cos (\mathrm{q}))}: \tag{1628}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus

$$
H_{I}=2_{q>0}^{X}\left[(1+2 \cos (q)) \quad 2 \sin \left(2_{q}\right) \sin (q)\right]\left(\begin{array}{ll}
\underset{q}{y} & q \tag{1629}
\end{array}{ }^{\mathrm{y}} \underset{q}{ } \quad\right. \text { i }
$$

or

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{I}=2_{q}^{x} q^{q+4 \cos (q)}{\underset{q}{q}}_{q}^{f}: \tag{16.30}
\end{equation*}
$$

W e can recover the constant vacuum energy by noting that the original H am iltonian w as traceless and the trace should be preserved under the canonical transform ations we have perform ed. Since $\left.\operatorname{Tr} \mathbb{H}_{\mathrm{I}}\right]=2 \mathrm{k}_{\mathrm{q}}^{\mathrm{P}}{ }^{\mathrm{P}} \overline{5+4 \operatorname{cosq}}$ we nd that

$$
\begin{equation*}
H_{I}=2_{q}^{x} \quad q \overline{5+4 \cos (q)} \quad{ }_{q}^{y} q \quad \frac{1}{2}: \tag{16.31}
\end{equation*}
$$

The vacuum (ground) state of this system has no B ogolinuov ferm ions occupying any sites. N ote that there is a gap between this state and excited states. Further note that the energy of this vacuum state is really dependent on $k$ :

$$
E_{g}(k)=x_{q} \quad \mathrm{q} \overline{5+4 \cos (q)}=\quad \begin{align*}
& \frac{k}{2}\left(\frac{k 1}{2}\right)  \tag{16.32}\\
& m=\frac{k}{2}\left(\frac{k 1}{2}\right)
\end{align*}
$$

W e note that $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{g}}(\mathrm{k})<\mathrm{k}$ because each term in the sum is greater than unity. Thus if we com pare a Ising chain in a transverse eld to one which is sim ply in a transverse eld the Ising chain in the transverse eld alw ays has a lower energy ground state. Further we note that $E_{g}(k)>E_{g}(j)$ if $k>j$.

Let us retum to the correction term C in Eq. (16.17). W hen we express this term in m om entum space we nd that

$$
\begin{equation*}
C=\frac{2}{k}{ }_{q ; q^{0}}^{X} e^{i q} C_{q}^{y}+e{ }^{i q} C_{q}^{y} \quad e^{i k q^{0}} C_{q^{0}}^{y} \quad e^{i k q} C_{q^{0}}: \tag{16.33}
\end{equation*}
$$

The rst observation is that for large $k$, this term becom es a sm all correction to the energy derived above. Furthem ore, each given term has an eigenvalue which has a value between $\frac{2}{k} \quad \frac{2}{k}$. This implies that the correction to our expression Eq. (16.31) w ill be bound from above by $\frac{4}{k}$. T hus we have found that

### 16.2 C lusters, clusters, everyw here

Having nearly exactly calculated the spectra of the Ising with transverse eld H am iltonian of length k we understand the spectrum of the total spin ladder H am iltonian. For each subspace corresponding to a speci cation of $\mathrm{c}_{\mathrm{i}}\left(\mathrm{x}_{1}\right)$ we can construct the binary string $e\left(x_{1}\right)=\left(C_{1}\left(x_{1}\right) ; c_{2}\left(x_{1}\right) ;::: ; G_{1}{ }_{1}\left(x_{1}\right)\right)$ labeling the structure of the H am iltonian on the $x_{1}$ speci ed subspace. Each such string can further be speci ed by the values where the elem ents take the value +1 and, in particular, we wish to sim ply label such a subspace by the structure of such +1 clusters. A +1 cluster from the ith to the $j$ qubit $w i l l$ be denoted by $(i ; j)$. Thus every string $w i l l$ correspond to som e chuster structure $b\left(x_{1}\right)=\left(i_{1} ; i_{2}\right)\left(i_{3} ; i_{4}\right):::\left(i_{2_{r}} ; i_{2 r}\right)$ where $r$ is the num ber of +1 chusters in a string. Thus, for exam ple $e=(+1 ;+1 ; 1 ; 1 ;+1 ; 1 ;+1 ;+1 ; 1)$ ) $\mathrm{b}=(1 ; 2)(5 ; 5)(7 ; 8)$ which has $3+1$ clusters, tw o of length 2 and one of length 1 . For each cluster labeling the spectrum of the H am iltonian H has a structure related only to the num ber and size of the clusters. In particular if two subspaces have identical cluster stnucture (num ber of cluster of a given length is identical) then they have an identical spectrum (w ith di erent eigenstates how ever). This is because, for a given cluster of length l, the Ham iltonian takes on the structure of an Ising chain with a transverse $m$ agnetic eld which we have analyzed above. Let us label the cluster structure by $\left.m_{2} ;::: ; \mathrm{m}_{n} \quad 1\right]$ where $m_{i}$ is the num ber of clusters of length i. $C$ learly ${ }_{\mathrm{P}}^{\mathrm{n}=2}{ }^{1} \mathrm{~m}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{i} \quad \mathrm{n} \quad 1$. Let $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{g}}(\mathrm{k})$ label the ground state energy of a cluster of length k physical qubits which corresponds to a cluster of $k$ in the bit string e. In particular from the previous section we know that

For elem ents which are not $m$ em bers acted upon by a cluster, only the $H_{T} \mathrm{H}$ am iltonian contributes to the spectrum of these sights. For a given chister structure $\left[m_{2} ; m_{3} ;::: ; \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{n}} \quad 1\right]$ the vacuum state of the H am iltonian has an energy

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.E\left(\left[m_{2} ; m_{3} ;::: ; \mathrm{m}_{n} \quad 1\right]\right)={ }_{i=2}^{\mathbb{X}^{1}} \mathrm{~m}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{g}}(\mathrm{i}) \quad!_{0}\left(\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{i}=2}^{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{~m}_{\mathrm{i}}^{1} \mathrm{i}\right)\right): \tag{16.36}
\end{equation*}
$$

It is easy to then verify that the global ground state corresponds to the subspace where $\left[m_{2}=0 ; m_{3}=0 ;::: ; \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{n}} \quad 2=0 ; \mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{n}} \quad 1=1\right]$, i.e. the full cluster situation.

Further we note that the for every chuster con guration $e\left(x_{1}\right)$ corresponds to two di erent $x_{1}$ con gurations and thus all of the levels of our H am iltonian are two-fild degenerate. To see this note that $e\left(x_{1}\right)$ is unchanged if the value of every elem ent in $x_{1}$ ip signs. Every elem ent of the spin ladder H am iltonian, therefore, is tw o-fold degenerate. The ground state of the system then corresponds to the $H$ am iltonian over the subspace de ned by $x_{1}=(+1 ;+1 ; \quad$; 1 ) and also 1 by 1 ; 1 ; ; 1).

### 16.3 Q uantum error correcting properties

Let us now exam ine the error detecting and correcting properties of the spin ladders ground state. W e w ill exam ine the error properties of inform ation encoded into the degeneracy of the ground state of the H am iltonian.

Instead ofusing the basis $\dot{\mathrm{k}}_{2} ; \mathrm{x}_{1} \mathrm{i}$ it is convenient to work w ith the basis $\dot{\mathrm{k}}_{2} ; \mathrm{e} ; \mathrm{x}_{1}^{(1)}$ i where $e\left(x_{1}\right)=\left(c_{1}\left(x_{1}\right) ; c_{2}\left(x_{1}\right) ;::: ; c_{n}\left(x_{1}\right)\right)$ where we recall that $c_{i}\left(x_{1}\right)=\frac{1}{2}(1+$ $\left.x_{1}^{(i)} x_{1}^{(i+1)}\right)$. The ground state is therefore labeled by $\dot{\mathbb{Z}}_{2}=g i \quad j ; 1 ;::: ; 1 i \quad$ 并 1 where $\dot{j}_{2}=g i$ is the ground state of the full chuster $H$ am iltonian, $\mathfrak{j} ; 1 ;::: ; 1 i$ represents $C_{1}=1 ; C_{2}=1 ;::: ; G_{n}=1$ and $x_{1}^{(1)}$ now labels the degeneracy of this ground state.

The rst thing to notioe is that any operator which acts as identity on the degeneracy is a detectable error. In other w ords

$$
\begin{align*}
& h \varepsilon_{2}=g ; e=(1 ; 1 ;::: ; 1) ; \mathrm{x}_{1}^{(1)} E \dot{\underline{Z}}_{2}=g ; e=(1 ; 1 ;::: ; 1) ; y_{1}^{(1)}{ }_{i} \tag{16.37}
\end{align*}
$$

where $c$ is the $m$ atrix elem ent hg; $=(1 ; 1 ;::: ; 1) \ddagger j ; e=(1 ; 1 ;::: ; 1)$ i.
Wewill now show that
where $E$ is any product of a single ${ }_{x}^{(i ; j)}$ operator and up to $n \quad 1{ }_{z}^{(i ; 1)}$ or ${ }_{z}^{(i ; 2)}$ operators.

F irst note that any product ofup to $n \quad 1 \quad{\underset{z}{i ; 1)}}_{(i ; 1}{ }_{z}^{(i ; 2)}$ operators is a product of up to $\mathrm{n} \quad 1 \mathrm{Z}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i})}$ operators and $\mathrm{n} \quad 1 \mathrm{Z}_{2}^{(\mathrm{i})}$ operators. Let us exam ine the case where E contains a ${ }_{x}^{(i ; j)}$ operator and then we will exam ine the case where ${ }_{x}^{(i ; j)}$ does not appear in E. A single ${ }_{x}^{(i ; j)}$ is either $X_{2}^{(i)}$ or $X_{2}^{(i)} X_{1}^{(i)}$. U nder the Jordan $\mp \mathrm{F}$ igner transform ation, $X_{2}^{(i)}$ is a sum of a product of an odd num ber of $B$ ogoliubov ferm ions. Furtherm ore any product of $Z_{2}^{(\mathrm{i})}$ 's is given by a sum of an even num ber of $B$ ogoliubov ferm ions. M ultiplying together a single $X_{2}^{(i)}$ and any num ber of $Z_{2}^{(i)}$ operators, we thus create an operator with a sum over an odd num ber of Bogolinbov ferm ions. It is an elem entary result of ferm ion operators, then, that an error E constructed from $X_{2}^{(i)}$ and any num ber of $Z{ }_{2}^{(i)}$ has a vanishing $m$ atrix elem ent over the ground state

$$
\begin{equation*}
h z_{2}=g ; e=(1 ; 1 ;::: ; 1) ; x_{1}^{(1)} F \dot{\dddot{z}}_{2}=g ; e=(1 ; 1 ;::: ; 1) ; y_{1}^{(1)} i=0: \tag{16.39}
\end{equation*}
$$

Furtherm ore, $m$ ultiplying such an errore any product of $Z_{1}^{(i)}$ and $X_{1}^{(i)}$ operators does not change this result because these operators act on a di erent tensor product subsystem. W e therefore see that any errorw hich contains a single $x_{x}^{(i ; j)}$ any com bination of ${ }_{z}^{(i ; j)}$ 's satis es the error detection criteria, Eq. (16.38).
$N$ ext let us exam ine the case where ${ }_{x}^{(i ; j)}$ does not appear in the error $E$, but the product of $n \quad 1 \underset{z}{(i ; j)}$ operators do appear in error E. Every such error will be a
product of up to $n \quad 1 Z_{1}^{(i)}$ operators and $n \quad 1 Z_{2}^{(i)}$ operators. $n \quad 1 Z_{1}^{(i)}$ operators acting on the ground state $\dot{z}_{2}=g ; e=(1 ; 1 ;::: ; 1) ; x_{1} i$ changes at lest one value of e. Therefore if E is the product of $\mathrm{n} \quad 1 \mathrm{Z}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i})}$ operators and operators $\mathrm{Z}_{2}^{(\mathrm{i})}$,

$$
\begin{equation*}
z_{2}=g ; e=(1 ; 1 ;:: ; ; 1) ; x_{1}^{(1)} E{\underset{\underline{y}}{2}}^{\prime}=g ; e=(1 ; 1 ;::: ; 1) ; y_{1}^{(1)} i=0: \tag{16.40}
\end{equation*}
$$

as long as E contains at least one $\mathrm{Z}_{1}^{(\mathrm{i})}$. If, on the other hand E contains only $\mathrm{Z}_{2}^{(\mathrm{i})}$, then

$$
\begin{equation*}
z_{2}=g ; e=(1 ; 1 ;::: ; 1) ; x_{1}^{(1)} E \dot{z}_{2}=g ; \mathbb{e}=(1 ; 1 ;::: ; 1) ; y_{1}^{(1)} i=E_{x_{1}^{(1)} ; y_{1}^{(1)}:} \tag{16.41}
\end{equation*}
$$

because $\mathrm{Z}_{2}^{(\mathrm{i})}$ acts only on the rst tensor product of the ground state. E is som e constant independent of $\mathrm{x}_{1}^{(1)}$ and $\mathrm{y}_{1}^{(1)}$.

W e have therefore show n that the ground state of the spin ladder is an error
 result is equivalent to saying that the code is an error detecting code for single ${\underset{x}{(i ; j)}}_{\text {(in }}$ operators and is an error correcting code for $\frac{n^{1}}{2} \quad \sum_{z_{i}(j)}^{(i ;)}$ operators.

### 16.4 Supercoherent properties of the spin ladder ground state

W e have now show $n$ that the ground state of the spin ladder is an error detecting
 to qualify as a supercoherent spin ladder, there m ust be a gap between the ground state energy and higher energy levels. W e know that this is true because we have found that a unique ground state. H ow ever, it is useful to qualify the size of this gap.

A s we calculated in Section 162 the ground state of the spin ladder occupies a speci c subspace assignm ent of e. Speci cally the ground state corresponded to $e=(+1 ;+1 ;::: ;+1)$ which is the \full cluster" subspace. There are two types of excitationswhich can occur on this ground state. The rst type ofexcitation is where operators $m$ aintain this subspace. These operators $w$ ill act as B ogoliubov excitations on the ground state. Recall that the $H$ am iltonian for this full cluster is given by

$$
H_{I}=2!_{0}{\underset{m}{2}=\frac{n}{2}\left(\frac{n-1}{2}\right)}_{\left.X^{2}\right)}^{5+4 \cos \frac{2 m}{n}} \quad \underset{q}{y} q \quad \frac{1}{2}+{ }_{k} ; \text { where } \operatorname{Trj} k j<\frac{4}{n} \text { : }
$$

r_

N ow $\mathrm{r} \overline{5+4 \cos \frac{2 \mathrm{~m}}{\mathrm{n}}}$ varies from 1 to 3. Thus there is always an energy gap in between the vacuum of this subspace and any B ogoliubov excitations of this vacuum . The size of such a gap is $2!_{0}$. N ote that this is true for any B ogoliubov excitations in any of the subspaces corresponding to a particulare.

The second type of excitation which can occur is from the ground state to a state $w$ ith a di erent e. This type of excitation has a gap which is the di erence in the vacuum energies of the ground state and the new state. The sm allest such gap occurs when only one elem ent ofe is ipped. This will then divide the system into two clusters. O ne of length land the other of length $n \quad l$. The energy of the vacuum for this con guration is given by

if the elem ent of e which was ipped was not $c_{1}$ or $C_{n}$. If the elem ent whidh was ipped was at the end, then there is a single qubit which just feels a transverse eld. The di erence between the ground state vacuum and all of the other vacuum $s$ can easily be estim ated to be approxim ately $!_{0}$. Figure 162 show $s$ this gap for $n$ even.


Figure 162: The energy gap in units of $!_{0}$ between clusters of length $l$ and $n \quad l$ for the n even spin ladder.

W e have therefore seen that the ground state of the spin ladder is separated from
all excitations by $!_{0}$. Thus, for the excitations which are error detecting all of these errors take the state up in energy.

A $n$ interesting property of this spin ladder was the fact that not only was the ground state error detecting for the ${ }_{x}^{(i ; j)}$ errors, the spin ladder is also error cor-
 suppressed at low tem peratures as in the supercoherent case, but it is also possible to now correct these errors. To see how this is done, we note that a ${ }_{z}^{(i, j)}$ error takes the ground state causes only an excitation which changes the subspace labeled by e. Therefore correcting these error corresponds to $m$ aking a m easurem ent of the operators corresponding to e. These are the operators
$M$ easurem ent of these observable diagnoses the ipped e elem ents and this can be used to ip these elem ents back and hence correct to the error.

W e have thus seen that the spin ladder we have constructed has som e am azing properties. The ground state of the spin ladder is doubly degenerate and separated
 from its ground state to a state of higher energy and at low tem peratures these errors should be suppressed. Sím ilarly multiple $l_{k}{ }_{z}^{(i ; j)}$ errors do not break the degeneracy of
 can be perform ed such that all of these errors can be corrected. Thus this spin ladder is a hybrid w ith both supercoherent and error correcting properties. Since
$z$ errors are generally $m$ ore dam aging to the coherence of a system, the rem arkable error correcting property should $m$ ake this spin chain extrem ely useful for protecting quantum inform ation.

### 16.5 Encoded operations

H aving show $n$ that the ground state of the spin ladder supports a supercoherent qubit w ith the extra property that it can error correct certain errors we now ask the question of what are the encoded operations on this degeneracy.

In fact, we could have begun our discussion of this spin ladder by exam ining the degeneracy of the spin ladder. T he operators
com $m$ ute with the spin-ladder H am iltonian H . Since each of these operators square to identity we know that these operators generate 2 -dim ensional representations of the P auligroup on one qubit. In other words they act like 2 dim ensional single qubit operations. Since these operators commute with $H$ we therefore know that these operators act on the tw o-fold degeneracy of $H$.

A further im portant point is necessary here. Every state in H is two-fold degenerate. N ot only the Z and X given above com m ute w ith this H am iltonian, but also
 encoded $z$ or $x$ on the degeneracy, how ever, each $m$ ay enact a di erent representation of these operators on the di erent levels of H . For any given level, how ever, the action of all of these operators is identical. Therefore one can enact an encoded
 operator on the ground state is identical.

U nfortunately, while we could easily im plem ent X as a H am iltonian on the code, the operator $Z$ is not so easily to im plem ent as a Ham iltonian on this code (see $[133,134]$ for possible $m$ ethods). T hus, like our earlier $P$ auli stabilizer code exam ple, we are left we a very good quantum $m$ em ory $w$ thout the ability to $m$ anipulate the inform ation.

A nother interesting problem with this spin chain is that while $\frac{n}{n}_{j_{1}}^{k} \quad{ }_{z}^{(i ; j)}$ errors can be corrected, it is possible for the environm ent to enact and error which cannot be corrected by using only ! o energy. We will not delve into the derivation of this result now as this point will be taken up in Chapter 18 where we discuss natural fault-tolerant quantum com putation.

### 16.6 T he supercoherent sp in ladder

In this chapter we studied an interesting spin ladder. This spin ladder has a supercoherent ground state, and this ground state also has additionalerror correcting properties. This is an im portant rst step tow ards incorporating $m$ ore than just the error detection properties of supercoherence but also error correction. U nfortunately this spin ladder's inform ation is not useful forquantum com putation because encoded actions cannot be enacted on the ground state. Further it is unfortunate that only phase errors can be corrected. B it ip errors are only detectable and robustness to these errors $m$ ust com efrom the low tem perature of the environm ent. In the next chapter we will see how it is possible to encode a fiull single qubit quantum error correcting code into the degenerate ground state of a system.

## C hapter 17

# A N aturally Q uantum Error C orrecting G round State 

To err is hum an; to forget, divine
\{J. H . G oldfuss

In this chapter we dem onstrate a spin lattice system whose ground state is a single qubit quantum error correcting code. This is the rst exam ple of a filly quantum error correcting ground state constructed w ith only two-qubit interaction in the H am iltonian. T he spectnum of the H am iltonian is presented using a sim pli ed Stabilizer encoding and it is shown that the ground state of this system is indeed a quantum error correcting code for single qubit errors. W e discuss the natural error correcting properties of this spin lattice ground state and encoded operations on this code. Finally we discuss how adiabatic passage can be used to prepare the ground state of the spin lattice.

### 17.1 The three-by-th ree quantum error correcting ground state

C onsider a three-by-three square lattioe w ith qubits on the vertiges of the lattige (nine qubits total). W e label the elem ents by the row and colum $n$ indiaes ( $i ; j$ ) respectively and an operator $O$ which acts on this qubit tensored w ith identity on all other qubits is $\mathrm{O}^{(i ; j)}$. T he H am ittonian we are interested is given by H


This spin-lattioe system is sketched in Figure 17.1.


Figure 17.1: The spin-fattice w ith a quantum error correcting ground state

### 17.1.1 Stabilizer en coding

O nce again, in order to understand this Ham iltonian it is useful to work in a di erent basis. Particularly useful in this case is a Pauli stabilized quantum error correction code (see A ppendix A.7). In particular consider the stabilizer code w ith stabilizer elem ents generated by the operators
and corresponding to this code are the ve logical operators

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{X}_{5}=\mathrm{x}_{\mathrm{x}}^{(1 ; 1)} \underset{\mathrm{x}}{(1 ; 2)} \underset{\mathrm{x}}{(1 ; 3)} ; \quad \mathrm{Z}_{5}=\underset{\mathrm{z}}{(1 ; 1)} \underset{\mathrm{z}}{(2 ; 1)} \underset{\mathrm{z}}{(3 ; 1)} \text { : } \tag{17.3}
\end{align*}
$$

U sing this code, we can express that H am iltonian as

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{H}= & !_{0} \mathrm{X}_{1}+\mathrm{X}_{2}+\mathrm{X}_{3}+\mathrm{X}_{4}+\mathrm{X}_{1} \mathrm{X}_{3} \mathrm{~S}_{3}+\mathrm{X}_{2} \mathrm{X}_{4} \mathrm{~S}_{4} \\
& +\mathrm{Z}_{1}+\mathrm{Z}_{2}+\mathrm{Z}_{3}+\mathrm{Z}_{4}+\mathrm{Z}_{1} \mathrm{Z}_{2} \mathrm{~S}_{1}+\mathrm{Z}_{3} \mathrm{Z}_{4} \mathrm{~S}_{2}: \tag{17.4}
\end{align*}
$$

$N$ otioe, as in the original supercoherent P auli exam ple, the fth encoded qubit does not appear in this Ham iltonian. This will be degenerate codespace we will use to store the quantum inform ation.

U nfortunately, even after the reduction to four encoded qubits, we have not found the exact eigenvalues and eigenstates of this $H$ am iltonian. Instead we resort to the $m$ athem atical package $M$ athem atica to calculate the spectrum .

### 17.2 The spin-lattice spectrum

C orresponding to the eigenvalues of $S_{1}, S_{2}, S_{3}$, and $S_{4}$, Eq. (17.4) has a speci c form. M oreover, $S_{1}, S_{2}, S_{3}$, and $S_{4}$ can be sim ultaneously diagonalized. $W$ e label each of the subspaces de ned by these operators via their eigenvalues $S_{1} ; \mathrm{S}_{2} ; \mathrm{S}_{3} ; \mathrm{S}_{4}$. For an assignm ent of $S_{1}, S_{2}, S_{3}, S_{4}$, the four qubit $H$ am ittonian in Eq. (17.4) The spectrum of the four qubit H am iltonian Eq. (17.4) w as calculated using the program $M$ athem atica. These energies are assem bled in Table 17.1.

W e see from Table 17.1 that the ground state of $H$ over the four encoded qubits is unique and inhabits the $S_{1}=+1 ; S_{2}=+1 ; S_{3}=+1 ; S_{4}=+1$ subspace. A s $m$ entioned above, the fth encoded qubit is not involved in $H$ and therefore allof the states in Table 17.1 w ill.be two-fold degenerate corresponding to this encoded qubit.

In order to label the states of the spin-lattice we use the basis $\mathrm{S}_{1} ; \mathrm{S}_{2} ; \mathrm{S}_{3} ; \mathrm{S}_{4} ; j ; z_{5} \mathrm{i}$ $w$ here $S_{i}$ are the 1 eigenvalues of $S_{i}, j$ labels the energy levels sorted from $j=0$ the low est energy to $j=15$ the highest energy (and picking som e arbitrary ordering and basis for the degenerate states), and $z_{5}$ is the 1 eigenvalue of $Z_{5}$.

### 17.3 G round state error correcting properties

The two-fold degenerate ground state of the spin-lattice system is given by the state $j+1 ;+1 ;+1 ;+1 ; 0 ; z_{5} i$. W ew ill now show that this state is an error correcting code for all single qubit errors. The condition that the ground state is an error correcting code for all single qubit errors is given by

$$
\begin{equation*}
h+1 ;+1 ;+1 ;+1 ; 0 ; z_{5} j^{(i ; j) \quad(j ; 1)} j+1 ;+1 ;+1 ;+1 ; 0 ; z_{5}^{0} \dot{j}=C ; ; i ; j ; k i z_{5} ; z_{5}^{0} ; \tag{17.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ; = $£ 0 ; 1 ; 2 ; 3 \mathrm{~g}$. N otice we allow the identity operators in this expression.
Every operator of the form ${ }^{(i ; j)}{ }^{(i ; j)}$ where antioommutes with at least one elem ent of the stabilizer generators $S_{i}$. This im plies that

$$
\begin{equation*}
h+1 ;+1 ;+1 ;+1 ; 0 ; z_{5} j^{(i ; j)} \quad(k ; 1) j+1 ;+1 ;+1 ;+1 ; 0 ; z_{5}^{0} i=0 \quad \text { : } \tag{17.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Table 17.1: Energy levels of the spin-lattice

| $\mathrm{S}_{1}$ | $\mathrm{S}_{2}$ | $\mathrm{S}_{3}$ | $\mathrm{S}_{4}$ | Sorted energies in units of ! ${ }_{0}$ (degeneracy) rounded to $10{ }^{2}$ |
| :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: | :---: |
| +1 | +1 | +1 | + 1 | $\begin{array}{lllll} 7: 79 ; & 4: 69 ; \quad 3: 46(2) ; 2 ; & 0: 94 ; & 0: 79 ; 0(2) ; 2(2) ; 2: 58 ; \\ 3: 46(2) ; 3: 62 ; 4(2) \end{array}$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} +1 \\ +1 \\ +1 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} +1 \\ +1 \\ 1 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} +1 \\ 1 \\ +1 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ +1 \\ +1 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | $7: 27 ;$ $4: 75 ; 3: 69 ; 3: 09 ; 2 ; 1: 20 ;$ $0: 85 ;$ $0: 23 ; 1: 19 ;$  <br> $1: 31 ; 2(3) ; 4: 13 ; 4: 75 ; 5: 69$     |
| $\begin{array}{r} \hline+1 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | +1 1 | 1 +1 | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ +1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 6:85; 4; 3:46; 3:23; 2(2); $1: 62 ; 0(2) ; 1: 62 ; 2(2) ; 3: 2 \beta ;$ $3: 46 ; 4 ; 6: 85$ |
| $\begin{array}{r} \hline+1 \\ +1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ 1 \\ +1 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} +1 \\ 1 \\ +1 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ +1 \\ 1 \\ +1 \end{array}$ | $6: 46 ;$ $5: 18 ; ~$ $3: 46(2) ; ~ 1: 52 ; ~ 1: 09 ; 0(4) ; 1: 09 ; 1: 52 ; 3: 46$ <br> $5: 18 ; 6: 46$  $\quad$ 2); |
| $\begin{array}{\|r\|} \hline+1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{array}$ | $\begin{array}{r} 1 \\ +1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ \hline \end{array}$ | 1 +1 | + |  |
| 1 | 1 |  |  | $4(2) ; ~ 3: 63 ; ~$ $3: 46(2) ; 2: 58 ; 2 ; 0(2) ; 0: 79 ; 0: 94 ; 2 ; 3: 46(2) ;$ <br> $4: 69 ; 7: 79$  |

This follow s from the standard reasoning about stabilizer codes. If the error elem ent antioom $m$ utes $w$ th one of the stabilizer elem ents, the action of this error is to ip the value of the corresponding $S_{i}$ eigenvalue. Therefore the $m$ atrix elem ent vanishes.

Thus we need only concem ourselves with the (i;j) ${ }^{(k ; i)}$ elem ents. The identity case, $=0$ is trivially lled. Som e of these elem ents antioom $m$ ute $w$ ith a generator of the stabilizer $S_{i}$ and therefore, via the argum ent of the previous paragraph satisfy Eq.(17.5). It is easy to chedk that allof the elem ents which do not anticom $m$ ute $w$ ith a generator of the stabilizer $S_{i}$ can be written as a product of the rst four encoded qubit operators and the stabilizer elem ents

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { (i;j) } \quad(j ; 1)=p X X_{1}^{c_{1}} X_{2}^{c_{2}} X_{3}^{c_{3}} X_{4}^{\mathrm{C}_{4}} Z_{1}^{d_{1}} Z_{2}^{d_{2}} Z_{3}^{d_{3}} Z_{4}^{d_{4}} S_{1}^{s_{1}} S_{2}^{s_{2}} S_{3}^{S_{3}^{3}} S_{4}^{S_{4}} ; \tag{17.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $p=1$ or $p=\quad i$ and $g d_{i} ; s_{i} 2 f 0 ; 1 g$. Therefore this operator only acts on the rst four encoded qubits and not the encoded qubit. Therefore we see that for these elem ents

$$
\begin{equation*}
h+1 ;+1 ;+1 ;+1 ; 0 ; z_{5} j^{(i ; j)}(k ; 1) j+1 ;+1 ;+1 ;+1 ; 0 ; z_{5}^{0} i=E_{; i ; j, k ; 1 z_{5} ; z_{5}^{0}} \text { : } \tag{17.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $E ; i ; j$; ; 1 does not depend on $z_{5}$ or $z_{5}^{0}$ and therefore satis es the error correcting requirem ent.

W e have thus seen that the ground state of the spin-lattioe system is a error correcting code for single qubit errors.

H ow does one perform the error correction procedure for this ground state? O ne $m$ anner is as follow s. There are two kinds of errors. The rst type of error takes the state from the $S_{i}=+1$; 8 isubspace to another $S_{i}$ labeled subspace. By $m$ easuring the stabilizer elem ents, these errors can be detected and corrected. T he second type of error preserves $S_{i}=1$;8isubspace but acts as an excitation on the four qubit encoded H am iltonian. O ne way to determ ine if there error has occurred is to $m$ easure the Ham iltonian itself $H$. If the value is not that of the ground state, then appropriate $m$ anipulations can be applied to restore the system to the ground state. Thism ethod of error correction is, how ever, appears very di cult to im plem ent on the ground state. H ow ever, in the next section we shall argue that the system w ill apply much of the error correction procedure through the naturally evolution of the system plus environm ent.

### 17.4 N atural error correction

Inspection of Table 17.1 show s that the ground state is separated from states reached by an error $0: 52!_{0}$. A ll single qubit errors, as in supercoherence, take the system from the global ground state to a state of higher energy. There is an im portant consequence, how ever, of the fact that the ground state of the spin-lattice is a quantum error correcting code.

C onsider supercoherence rst. Suppose a single qubit error occurs on the supercoherent ground state. The state w ill then be excited to higher energy levels. Since the supercoherent ground state is only error detecting, it is in general im possible to restore the system to the ground state $w$ ithout destroying the quantum inform ation stored into the degeneracy of the supercoherent system. In supercoherence then, a single qubit errorw illoccur and any relaxation of the system back to the ground state willoccur in such a way that the degeneracy is acted upon nontrivially. O nœ an error has happened on the superooherent ground state, the supercoherent inform ation is in trouble ofbeing decohered.

N ow consider the spin lattice we have described above. A s in the supercoherent case if a single qubit error occurs on the ground state of the spin-lattioe the state w ill be excited to higher energy levels. N ow, how ever, because the ground state is error correcting there is the possibillty of restoring the inform ation to the ground state without decohering the inform ation stored in the degeneracy. In fact, one of the relaxation pathw ays open to a system which decoheres back to the ground state w ill be exactly the error correction procedure necessary to restore the system to the ground state without destroying the degeneracy of the system. The fact that one of the open system evolution pathways open to the system is the error correcting procedure follow s directly from the H erm iticity of the H am iltonian. It is im portant to note that in our spin-lattioe case the relaxation back to the ground state is not alw ays error correcting. It is possible for the state to take a relaxation pathw ay which
goes through other energy levels and thus destroys the degeneracy of the ground state. This corresponds to a two qubit error which our single qubit error correcting code is not designed to correct. H ow ever, the $H$ em iticity of the $H$ am ittonian im plies that the relaxation pathw ay which xed the error is open an thus evolution of the spin-lattioe has a non-negligible com ponent along the error correction pathw ays.


Figure 17 2: Supercoherence evolution pathw ays


Figure 17.3: Q uantum error correcting ground state evolution pathways
In $F$ igures 172 and 17.3 we show a schem atic of the di erence betw een supercoherence and the quantum error correcting spin-lattioe.

The ability of a system to self-correct decoherence processes is an interesting property ofour spin-lattice system. In fact, our spin-lattice system is the rst exam ple of such autom atic or natural error correction which uses only tw o-body interactions
betw een qubits. There are tw o precedents for such autom atic error correction, one by $B$ ames and $W$ arren [14] and the other from $K$ itaev and cow orkers [112, 114, 34, 85].
$B$ ames and $W$ arren [14] present a schem e w here errors are autom atically corrected. These authors present an NM R im plem entation whose ground state is an error correcting code. W e note, how ever, that this im plem entation only corrects lim ited types oferrors. In particular their system does not correct single qubit phase errors. In fact, as we will discuss in Chapter 18, the system presented by B ames and $W$ arren is not any $m$ ore special than a two-dim ensional Ising system. In contrast to the proposal of $B$ ames and $W$ arren, the spin lattice we present can correct all single qubit errors. On the other hand, our system has the shortcom ing that correction does not alw ays succeed.

The second precedent for our spin lattice is the w ork of K itaev and cow orkers [112, $114,34,161,154,85]$. In this work, codes are constructed which have a ground state which is quantum error correcting. H ow ever, in these system s the interactions needed in order to $m$ ake this system naturally error correcting require either interactions betw een greater than three subsystem s or require tw o-body interactions betw een subsystem sw ith greater than 60 levels for each subsystem! T he bene $t$ of our spinlattice system should be obvious in this respect as it rem oves this $m$ any-body or $m$ any-level restriction.

### 17.5 Encoded operations

The encoded operation on the degeneracy are easy to nd. The encoded $x$ and $z$ are sim ply the $X_{5}$ and $Z_{5}$ operators. A s in the spin ladder system, we see that there is a di culty in im plem enting the operators on this spin lattice. W e shall not delve into $m$ ethod for xing this problem here. Needless to say, it is possible to construct lattioes which are error correct but for which can also be $m$ anipulated.

H ow ever, let us note tw o interesting properties of the encoded operators. Suppose wew anted to perform the gate x on the degeneracy. This corresponds to the operator $\mathrm{X}_{5}={ }_{x}^{(1 ; 1)}{\underset{x}{(1 ; 2)}}_{x_{x}^{(1 ; 3)}}$ (or such an operator tim es a stabilizer elem ent. O ne way in which this gate can be enacted is by perform ing single qubit rotations on each of the listed qubits. Suppose that one of these single qubit rotations was over rotated. Such an over rotation now becom es an error on the ground state. But this error will be correctable (either naturally or by our error correction procedure). This then is a form of fault-tolerance. The gate we use to im plem ent the rotation can be faulty and we still w ill obtain the correct operation. W e will have a chance to considerably extend this notion in C hapter 18.

Second we note that system smuch like the spin-lattice we have constructed here can $m$ ost easily be constructed from the encoded operations backw ards. In particular, the encoded operations $w$ ill be the operations whidh are errors on the system. Thus given encoded Pauli operators, constructing operations which are products of the
rem aining Pauli operators guarantees the error correcting properties of the ground state. This is a pow erfiultool for constructing such codes: work with the operators on the code rst!

### 17.6 P reparation via adiabatic passage

An interesting question which arises in the context of using the inform ation the ground state of the spin lattice is the question how to prepare the inform ation. A $m$ ethod for doing this can be achieved using the adiabatic theorem. Suppose, for
 tum these operators back on. In particular consider the ability to enact the time dependent H am iltonian
where $T$ is constant $w$ th units of time.
The adiabatic theorem [146] states that a system which is in an eigenstate of a tim e dependent $H$ am iltonian $w$ ill rem ain the instantaneous eigenstate of the system if variation of this $H$ am iltonian is slow enough and the energies of the $H$ am iltonian do not cross. In $F$ igure 17.4 we see that the ground state does not cross any other state. $T$ hus for su ciently long $T$, if we can prepare the state into the ground state of $H$ ( 0 ) we can then guarantee that we end up in the ground of the spin lattice H am iltonian H (T). Furtherm ore, the degeneracy of the system will rem ain intact throughout this evolution. But preparation into the ground state of $H(0)$ with a given degeneracy is easy. In particular the state where every qubit is j0i is such a ground state. H ow slow do we have to ram p up the eld? From the adiabatic theorem [146] we nd that we require $T>\frac{1}{!_{0}}$. Thus there is an easy $m$ ethod for preparing the state via the adiabatic theorem .

### 17.7 N aturalquantum error correction

In this chapter we have presented the rst exam ple of a ground state which is a full single qubit quantum error correcting code. This ground state has the intriguing property that all single qubit error excite the system to an energy level of higher energy and there is a non-vanishing probability that the system $w$ ill then decay back to the ground state in such a w ay as the correct the error. C learly the next step along these lines is to dem onstrate how one can obtain perfect autom atic error correction where each single error is alw ays corrected unless the system is excited to a higher


Figure 17.4: Energy levels in units of $!0$ as a function of the x com ponent ( $\mathrm{x}=\mathrm{t}=\mathrm{T}$ ) of the spin lattice $H$ am iltonian
energy. Furthem ore the issue of how to robustly perform operations on the spin lattice ground state was not satisfactorily addressed. In the next chapter we w ill have the chance to address these issues from the context of a m ore distanced perspective.

## C hapter 18

## Tow ards N aturally Fault-tolerant System s


#### Abstract

W hat passes for optim ism is $m$ ost often the ect of an intellectualerror


\{R aym ond A ron, The Opium of the Intellectuals [6]
B efore the discovery ofquantum error correction and fault-tolerant quantum com putation, there was much reason to be pessim istic $[190,129]$ about the fiuture technological prospects of the construction of a quantum com puter. H aving discovered quantum error correction follow ed by the penning of the threshold theorem for inde nite fault-tolerant quantum com putation, the prospects for building a quantum com puter has brightened considerably. The in uence of the discovery of quantum error correction, how ever, has not had m uch ofan im pact on the experim entalproposals for quantum com putation. True, $m$ any proposals now $m$ ention the explicit requirem ent that parallel operations are necessary for fault-tolerant quantum com putation [2], but the notions of fault-tolerance are m ostly view ed as an eventualgoalofa given physical proposal. C alculate your error rate, dem onstrate you have universal control, and you have a quantum com puter! To proceed in this $m$ anner calls on the argum ent of technological inevitability, but is it not possible that there are system $s$ w hich are naturally fault-tolerant for quantum com putation just as such system exist for classical computers? In this chapter we lay out the schem atics for such a naturally fault-tolerant quantum system built not from the single qubit up but from large num bers of qubits whose collective properties are used for quantum inform ation $m$ anipulation.

### 18.1 T he classical stability of in form ation

W hy is it that classical com puters are, to date, so overly robust to interaction w ith their environm ent? In fact, it is a $m$ istake to say that all classical com puters
are robust to interactions w ith their environm ent. O ne need only take a standard household personal com puter out into the hard radiation of space to see that classical com puters are only robust in certain environm ents. Further it is also obvious that the actualphysicalim plem entation of the classical com puter is essential to the robustness of the classical com puter: building a classical com puter out ofbilliard balls is possible, but then substantial error correction is needed to $m$ ake the system robust to sm all deviations in the trajectories of the billiard balls. So we should really ask, why are today's silicon-based com puters w ith magnetic recording devioes so robust to su ciently non-harsh environm ents?

We will begin by exam ining the question of what $m$ ake the robust long-term storage of classical in form ation possible.

### 18.1.1 C lassicalm em ory, security in num bers, and the lesson of dim ensionality

Today's classical mem ory devioes come in two form s , read-only and read-w rite m em ories. In a read-only m em ory, inform ation is im printed once and can be read out but not changed w ithout substantial technical prowess. W e will focus on the read-w rite $m$ em ories where classical inform ation can both be im printed and easily $m$ anipulated. In particular we will focus on the use of $m$ agnetic $m$ edia which is the $m$ edia used for storage in $m$ ost hard drives.

Inform ation on a hard drive is stored in spatially distinct grains of a ferrom agnetic substance. The grains of the ferrom agnetic substance consist of com plete magnetic dom ains and are $m$ agnetized in one of tw o possible directions which are the logical 0 and 1 of the classical inform ation. This inform ation is read and written using a device know $n$ as a read-w rite head. This head can read the inform ation by sensing the direction of the $m$ agnetized dom ains and $w$ rites inform ation by applying a $m$ agnetic eld $m$ agnetizes the dom ain.

The question of the stability of such a $m$ em ory is therefore a question of the stability of the $m$ agnetization of a ferrom agnetic substance. The properties of a ferrom agnetic substance are dom inated by an exchange energy betw een the electron spins of the substance

$$
\begin{equation*}
H=J s_{i} s_{j}: \tag{18.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In addition to this energy, $m$ ost $m$ aterials have a $m$ agnetocrystalline energy (or anisotropy energy) in which di erent directions ofm agnetization have a preferential (lower) energy. The exchange energy, how ever, dom inates the ferrom agnetic properties of the substance. The exchange energy is $m$ inim ized when all of the spins are com pletely aligned. This is the origin ofdom ains in $m$ agnetization of a ferrom agnetic $m$ aterial: the electrons would rather align $w$ th each other. The m agnetocrystalline energy is essential in determ ining which directions w ithin the solid are preferred.

Let us now show how such ferrom agnetic substances can be understood to be a
classical autom atic error correcting code. In order to see this, consider the sim pli ed $m$ odel of a ferrom agnet given by the Ising $m$ odel[103]. In this Ising $m$ odel, spins on a lattice are assum ed to point in one of two directions $s_{i}=1$ and the energy of system is given by nearest neighbor interactions of the form

$$
\begin{equation*}
E=J_{\langle i j\rangle}^{X} S_{i} s_{j}+B_{i}^{X} s_{i} ; \tag{182}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $J$ is the energy of the nearest neighborbonds < ij> and B is an applied eld. In the absence of an applied eld $B=0$, the ground state of this system is a tw o-fold degenerate with all of the spins parallel. In the presence of a magnetic eld, the ground state is one of the two con guration with all of the spins parallel determ ined by sign of the applied eld B. Let us ignore B for now but we will retum to nonzero B later.

The degenerate ground state of the Ising model with no magnetic eld can be considered an encoding of classical inform ation. Let us de ne logical 0 as the case $w$ here $s_{i}=+1$ for all lattioe sites $i$ and logical 1 as the case $w h e r e ~ s_{i}=1$ for all lattice sites i. An im portant consideration enters into the stability of this encoded inform ation: the dim ensionality of the lattice of spins. For now we will assum e that this dim ension is greater than or equal to two. At $T=0$ (i.e. com pletely isolated from any environm ent), the ground states will just stay where they are. But as the tem perature is tumed up $\mathrm{T}>0$, it is possible for the environm ent to excite the spins in the system and destroy the inform ation encoded into this degeneracy. W hat is it that protects the inform ation encoded into this degeneracy from such errors?

D e ne the spontaneousm agnetization as the expectation value of all of the lattioe spins $m=\frac{1}{N}{ }^{\mathrm{P}}{ }_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{hs}_{\mathrm{i}} \mathrm{i}$ where N is the number of spins in the lattice. For the twodim ensional Ising system on a square lattice, for exam ple, it is possible to exactly solve for the spontaneous m agnetization [159] which is given by

$$
\begin{align*}
\mathrm{m}(\mathrm{~T}) & =1 \frac{\left(1 \tanh ^{2}(J)\right)^{4}}{16 \tanh ^{4}(J)} \\
& =0 \mathrm{~T}>\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{c}} ; \tag{18,3}
\end{align*}
$$

where $=\frac{1}{T}$. At low enough tem peratures, $T \quad T_{c}$, the spontaneous $m$ agnetization of the system persists. Even though there the environm ent can heat the system, the inform ation stored in the totalm agnetization is una ected by these uctuations. In ferrom agnetic $m$ aterials, the tem perature $T_{c}$ is the $C$ urrie tem perature of the $m$ aterial: usually on the order of a thousand $K$ elvin. So the $m$ ystery has becom ewhy does this $m$ agnetization persist at non-zero tem perature.

C onsider taking a tw o-dim ensional Ising $m$ odel $w$ ith all of the spins parallel and ipping a single one of the spins. This will result in a change of energy of the system by 2 Jr where r is the num ber of neighbors to which the spin is attached. T his is the lowest energy excitation which can occur on the system without ipping N 1 out
of N spins. The second of these options, ipping $\mathrm{N} \quad 1$ out of N spins requires an extraordinary am ount of energy which just is not available. Suppose after we ip the single spin, we ip another spin. The energy of this new con guration must now be even higher than the system with just one spin ipped. To see this, rst note that if the next spin ipped is not a neighbor of the rst spin ipped, then there is certainly an increase in energy. If the second spin is a neighbor of the rst spin, because the dim ension of the spin lattice is greater than one the total num ber of violated Ising energies m ust increase. Se F igure 18.1.


Figure 18.1: Isingm odelin two dim ensions show ing the energy proportional to dom ain perim etere ect

W e can now see how the Ising $m$ odel in greater than two dim ensions can be view ed as an autom atic error correcting code. The codew ords are the $m$ a jority labeled states w ith all of the spins aligned in parallel. Each bit ip error that occurs on the system, until over $\mathrm{N}=2$ spins have been ipped, causes an increase in the energy of the system . $T$ herefore the tendency of the system is to self correct the errors which have occurred. There is security in num bers here and one sees the $m$ ost trivialerror correcting code, the majority code, at work. W hen one perform $s$ them odynam ical calculations of the $m$ agnetization of this system, the unlikelyhood of spin ips which ip between the 0 and 1 states is re ected in the persistence of spontaneous magnetization. At low enough tem perature, this $m$ agnetization thus persists. Long rang o diagonal order [144] is therefore an indication of the ability of the system to self-correct errors on the system. We also see how an applied eld can change the state of a airs. If the applied eld is strong enough, then it can overoom e the Ising bonds and ip the inform ation encoded into the degeneracy of the ground state. $N$ ote also that even the states which have up to $\mathrm{N}=2$ qubits ip still $m$ aintain the inform ation about the classical inform ation. It is only when the sign of the total m agnetization ips sign does the classical inform ation get destroyed.

O f œentral im portance in the argum ent for the stability of the inform ation in the degeneracy ofthe Ising $m$ odelw as the dim ension ofthe system. $W$ hen a spin is ipped
in the two dim ensional Ising $m$ odel from the ground state, the energy of the system is proportional to the num ber of bonds w ith nearest neighbors broken. M ore generally dom ains of ipped spins have an energy greater than the ground state energy which is proportional to the area of the perim eter of the dom ain. In d dim ensions, the energy of a dom ain is proportional to the d 1 dim ensional surface area of a dom ain. For one dim ension, we therefore se that this energy is a constant. This im plies that it is possible to exchange a minim al am ount of energy between the environm ent and the system while destroying the inform ation stored in the degeneracy. C onsider the one dim ensional Ising $m$ odel. O ne can ip a single spin which requires only the bond energy $2 J$, and then proceed to ip neighboring spins without expending any energy. $T$ hus it is possible to use only 2 J energy in destroying the degeneracy of the ground state. This is show $n$ in $F$ igure 182. T he condensed $m$ atter theorist w ould say, \there is no long range order at nonzero tem perature for the one dim ensional Ising $m$ odel" which we see is equivalent to the statem ent that the system will not autom atically correct its own errors. We will retum to this question when we consider quantum m odels, but we note here that all of the exam ples we have dem onstrated in Part III of this thesis are analogous to the one dim ensional Ising case in that errors (now quantum ) can occurw hich only exert a m inim alam ount ofenergy in order to decohere the degenerate quantum inform ation.


Figure 18 2: O ne dim ension Ising $m$ odelshow ing how the degeneracy can be adversely changed by ipping spins with only a m inim alam ount of work

W e have thus seen that classical inform ation stored in a m agnetic m edia is robust due to a robust autom atic error correcting code. This inform ation is robust because errors which occur to the inform ation are robustly $x e d$. Further the inform ation
can be written on by the application of a eld which breaks the degeneracy of the inform ation and further changed the energetics of the system which allowed for the degeneracy to be protected.

### 18.1.2 C lassical gates

$N$ ext we ask the question of what $m$ akes the classicalm anipulation of inform ation so robust to error. C lassical com putation occurs on the m anipulation of current in an integrated circuit and the im portant $m$ anipulation of the current is that of a sim ple sw itch. The prototype of such $m$ anipulation is the transistor. C onsider, for exam ple a standard bipolar junction transistor. In such a transistor, a sm all voltage bias between the em itter and the base can lead to a large change in the current running from (for a npn transistor) the collector to the em itter.
$T$ here are two lessons to be leamed from the $m$ anipulation of inform ation by a transistor. The rst lesson com es from the use of current to represent inform ation. It is im portant to realize that current represents a m ajority voting correcting code in a $m$ ethod sim ilar to that encountered in $m$ agnetic $m$ edium above. Surely current can run the wrong way in a circuit, but only at the expense of energy conservation. If insu cient energy is provided by an environm ent, then the m ajority of electrons will ow in the correct direction. The second lesson taken from the transistor is that a sm allchange in one inform ation carrier can $m$ ake a large change in the inform ation of another inform ation carrier. In particular this change $m$ ust be digital in the sense that the system is robust to sm all variations in the controlling $m$ echanism. T he transistor either does or does not allow current ow between the collector and em itter. This is a very im portant property of a fault-tolerant system : applying the gate and not applying the gate are two $m$ acroscopically separate actions.

C lassical gates therefore rely on a form of natural error correction by majority $m$ anipulation of the inform ation as well as a com pletely digitalm anipulation of the inform ation.

### 18.2 N aturalquantum error correction

H aving briskly described the reasons why classical com puters are so robust we now seek to extend these notions to quantum system s . T he lesson of quantum error correction is that quantum inform ation is a bit m ore com plicated, but very sim ilar to classical inform ation. $Q$ uantum error correction works because it deals not just with the bit ips of classical error correction but also because it deals w ith phase errors. It would not be surprising then to nd that, just as there are natural classical error correcting codes, there $m$ ay be naturalquantum error correcting codes.

For sim plicity we w ill assum e a collection of qubits which we desire to be naturally endow ned with error correction. Obvious generalizations are possible to other
subsystem $s$ and we shall leave these generalization im plicit.
A naturalquantum error correcting code is a collection of $N$ qubits and a system Ham iltonian $H(\mathbb{N})$ which satis es

1. The ground state of the H am ittonian $H(\mathbb{N})$ is degenerate.
2. The ground state of the $H$ am iltonian $H(\mathbb{N})$ is a quantum error correcting code for $l=O(\mathbb{N})$ qubit errors.
3. Let $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}}$ denote the energy of the low est level reachable by i single qubit errors on $\mathrm{the}_{\mathrm{P}}$ ground state. For $i$ less than the num ber of correctable errors, $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}}<\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}+1}$ and ${ }^{\mathrm{P}}{ }_{\mathrm{i}=1}^{\mathrm{E}} \mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{i}}=\mathrm{O}(\mathbb{N})$ :

Item 1 and 2 insure that inform ation can be encoded into the ground state and is a quantum error correcting code. Item 3 insures that each error must supply energy from the environm ent to the system and that the total energy needed to induce an error on the ground state is an extensive variable. T his last requirem ent is extrem ely im portant for natural error correction as it requires that the am ount of energy needed to break the degeneracy is a m acroscopic am ount of energy in the sense that it depends on the size of the system. F inally we note that due to the H em iticity of the system -environm ent $H$ am iltonian, error pathw ays are alw ays accom panied by correction pathw ays. T he basic idea is there that of the autom atic error correction of B ames and W arren [14] where errors are autom atically xed as they move up in energy. W em ust stress again, how ever, that the exam ple ofB ames and $W$ arren is only a classicalerror correcting code (just because a system is quantum this does not $m$ ake the dynam ics uniquely quantum ). H ere we would like to fully extend the notion to quantum error correction. Furthem ore we would also like to stress the requirem ent that breaking the degeneracy of the system require a m acroscopic expenditure of energy. This requirem ent protects the quantum inform ation from all but the $m$ ost energetic environm ental uctuations.

O ne of the best w ays to exam ine an error correcting code is to exam ine the encoded operations which $m$ anipulate the code. E ncoded operationsm ust consist of operators which act on greater than the num ber of qubits which the error correcting code can correct. This requirem ent im plies that all encoded operators $m$ ust be of size $O \mathbb{N}$ ) on a naturalerror correcting code. By exam ining the sm allest encoded operations on the code it is possible to determ ine whether the code can satisfy the naturalquantum error correcting criteria.

C onsider, for exam ple, an extension of the $P$ auli supercoherent exam ple of $C$ hapter 15 and the quantum error correcting ground state of C hapter 17. G iven alll l square lattioe w ith sites ( $i ; j$ ) acted upon by the H am iltonian

This $H$ am iltonian has a degenerate ground state for the follow ing reason. The sm allest Paulioperatorswhich commute $w$ ith $H$ are the colum $n \quad x$ operators: $X_{j}={\underset{i}{i=1}}_{1}^{S_{i}^{(i j)}}$ and the row $z$ operators: $Z_{i}={ }_{j=1}^{1}{\underset{z}{(i ; j)} \text {. Take any two of these operators. Since }}^{1}$ they square to identity and form a group isom onphic to the single qubit P auligroup, these operators act as $2^{\left(1^{2}\right)}{ }^{1} 2$-dim ensional irreps of the Pauli group. Therefore the $H$ am iltonian $H$ must have a degenerate ground state which is at least two-fold degenerate. The degeneracy of this ground state $m$ ay, in fact, be $m$ ore than this tw o-fold degeneracy. But notioe that we have show $n$ that there are operations on the degenerate ground state which involve 1 single qubit operators on a system $w$ ith $l^{2}$ qubits. This system, then, does not satisfy the requirem ent that the system is an error correcting code for $\mathrm{O}(\mathbb{N})$

It is perhaps best, then, when constructing a naturally quantum error correcting code to start from the operators which $m$ anipulate the inform ation and work backwards. Further we note that naturally quantum error correcting codes do in fact exist[160]. H ow ever, the know n constructions involve four dim ensional spatialcon gurations as well as unreasonably com plicated $m$ any-body or $m$ any-level interactions. The challenge of natural quantum error correction is to achieve a naturally error correcting code w ithout these unphysical assum ptions.

F inally we would like to note som e physical properties of a naturalquantum error correcting code. The quantum error correcting code condition implies that for a naturally quantum error correcting code

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{h j j}^{\mathrm{X}} \quad{ }^{\text {(i) }} \mathrm{ki}=\mathrm{C} \quad{ }_{\mathrm{ij}} \mathrm{i} \tag{18.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

i
where $\mathrm{ji} i$ and ki are the ground state codew ords and the sum is over all lattige sites. If, for exam ple, each qubit is a spin, this would im ply that the codew ords all have the sam e net $m$ agnetization. It is therefore im possible to $m$ easure the inform ation encoded into the degeneracy by sim ply $m$ easuring the bulk $m$ agnetization of such a naturally error correcting code. T he question of the readout of inform ation will be addressed in the next section where we discuss fault-tolerant quantum com putation.

### 18.3 N atural fault-tolerant quantum computation

Thenotion ofnaturalquantum error correction is not enough forquantum com putation. N aturalquantum error correcting codes w illprotect the quantum inform ation, but this says nothing about preparing the inform ation, $m$ anipulating the inform ation, and reading out the inform ation in a robust $m$ anner.

In classical inform ation $m$ anipulation, we saw that there were two requirem ents for fault-tolerance: the digital nature of $m$ anipulations as well as the self correcting energetics like standard quantum error correction.

Suppose we are given a naturalquantum error correcting code and w ish to perform a m anipulation of the inform ation stored in the code. T his w illlbe achieved by tuming
on som e H am iltonian which $m$ anipulates the inform ation. D ue to the natural error correcting criteria speci ed above the only operators whidn can a ect the degeneracy of the code states are those which involve qubit operators which are of size $O(n)$. $T$ his gate $w$ ill enact and operation on $O(n)$ qubits. A set of gates $G$ is said to be a fault-tolerant gate set if

1. Every gate can be im plem ented in a $m$ anner that faulty gates correspond to errors which can be corrected by the natural quantum error correcting code.
2. A ny two gates are separated from each other by $O(\mathbb{N})$ qubit operators.

W hen item 1 is ful lled, faulty gate creation corresponds to errors which can and will be naturally corrected by the code. This is the requirem ent of energetics: a m acrosoopic expenditure of energy enacts the operation and uctuations in this enacting cannot destroy the quantum inform ation unless these uctuations convey a m acrosoopic am ount of energy to the system. The second requirem ent is the requirem ent of the digital nature of the gate set. It $m$ ust not be possible for di erent encoded actions to be enacted which are close together in the space of errors.

C onsider, as an exam ple, a code on N qubits in which an encoded action is perform ed by enacting the G operatorwhich consists of $G G{ }^{(i)}$ on every qubit ${ }^{Q}{ }_{i} G{ }^{(i)}$. $N$ ow ${ }_{h}$ suppose that these operators $G{ }^{\text {(i) }}$ are created using a H am iltonian $H_{G}^{(i)}$ : $G^{\text {(i) }}=$ $\exp \quad i H_{G}^{(i)} T$ where $T$ is a xed constant. Now suppose that an over rotation in the ernacting of this gate occurs. Instead of ${ }^{(i)}$ on each qubit, the gaṭes enacted are $\exp \quad i H_{G}^{(i)}(T+T)$. For sm all $T$ this can be expressed as $G{ }^{\text {(i) }} I{ }^{(H)}{ }_{G}^{(i)} T$. The fullevolution if each gate is overrotated by $T$ is given by


The m a jor corrections to the evolution are therefore single, tw o, etc. qubit errors. If the error correcting code can naturally correct $O(\mathbb{N})$ errors, then the only evolution which escapes detection is a correction $\mathrm{T}^{\circ}{ }^{(N)}$ which is exponentially sm all. Thus $m$ icroscopically faulty errors $w$ ill not be able to destroy the quantum inform ation.

Two issues rem ain to be addressed for a naturally fault-tolerant quantum com puter. The rst is preparation and the second is m easurem ent. An im portant realization for a natural quantum error correcting code is that preparation does not $m$ ean perfect preparation of the degenerate ground state, but instead $m$ eans perfect preparation of the degenerate ground state plus a m inim al am ount of errors occurring on to this ground state. The im portant point of fault-tolerant preparation is that preparation should prepare a state which $m$ ay have errors but none of these errors are $m$ acroscopic errors which act nontrivially on the degeneracy. O nem ethod which appears to be extrem ely useful for preparation and $m$ easurem ent of inform ation in a naturally fault-tolerant code is the use adiabatic continuity. In order to prepare
a state, the degeneracy of the ground state should be m acroscopically broken. T his then $w$ illcorrespond to a $m$ acroscopic breaking of the degeneracy of the ground state. By adiabatically changing the system H am iltonian it should be possible to m ove from a state were this degeneracy is broken to the state w here this degeneracy is not broken while $m$ aintaining a robust error correcting criteria. F inally reversing this process adiabatically the degeneracy can again be restored and a m easurem ent of a m acroscopic variable can be used to read out the quantum inform ation.

### 18.4 The road ahead

W e can't solve problem s by using the sam e kind of thinking we used when we created them.
\{A lbert E instein

In this chapter we have sketched out a road $m$ ap for the possibility of natural quantum com puting system s. There is much work to be done! B esides the obvious physical consequences of natural fault-tolerant quantum com putation, the uniform ity ofsuch natural fault-tolerant system can serve as a good test bed for a rigorousproofof the quantum com puting threshold. T here are also interesting connectionsbetw een the idea ofnatural fault-tolerant quantum com putation and non-abelian gauge elds[114, 154]. O f particular interest are theories of high-tem perature superconductivity [170, 171, 172] and nonabelian e ects in the fractional quantum H alle ect [85, 150] which support discrete gauge groups.

The path towards building a quantum com puter will by no means be an easy joumey. C ertainly the technological revolution of $m$ odem classical com puters was an am azingly com plex and di cult revolution. H ow ever, it is unclear that all of the present experim ental proposals for a quantum com puter, which build the quantum com puter from the qubit up, will be the ultim ate $m$ anner in which a quantum com puter $w$ ill be built. In part III of this thesis we have given sim ple exam ples of system $s$ which begin to exhibit $m$ any of the conditions necessary for natural faulttolerant quantum com putation. The natural assum ption that a quantum com puter $m$ ust be an entirely di erent type of devioe than a classical com puter is, we believe, a fallacy bom of the $m$ ystery attributed to quantum theory.

## C hapter 19

## C onclusion

W ewilleither nd a way orm ake one.
\{H annibal

In the beginning there was A lan Turing, poking aw ay at the foundations of com puter science, dream ing that $m$ achines could perform am azing feats of calculation. Am ong Turing's other interests were the foundations of quantum mechanics[102] ${ }^{1}$. Today we stand in the $m$ iddle of a com puter revolution far outstripping anything possibly im agined by Turing. There is a hint, however, that A lan's other interest, the quantum theory of nature $m$ ay hold even $m$ ore revolutionary com putational pow er than his basic insights into classical com puter science. In this thesis we have, hopefiully, provided helpfiul steps tow ards the construction of a quantum com puter. Som eday, we m ay even dream, we m ay even be as lucky as A lan Turing: the pokings of this thesis $m$ ay tum into the revolutionary technologies of tom orrow .

[^3]
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## A ppendix A

## The quantum inform ation language

O ne strength of studying quantum inform ation is that it provides a language for understanding generic inform ational properties of quantum system $s$. In this section we introduce som e of the basic language and $m$ achinery which we use freely in this thesis.

## A. $1 \quad$ B asic quantum com putation notion

In classical inform ation the basic unit of inform ation is a bit which is conventionally described by the two possible states 0 and 1. In quantum inform ation the $m$ ost basic unit of inform ation is the qubit[168]. The state of a qubit inhabits a two dim ensional Hillert space $\mathbb{C}^{2}$. W hereas the classical bit has just two possible states 0 and 1 , the state of qubit is a unit vector in $\mathbb{C}^{2}: j i=j 0 i+j 1 i w h e r e$ ; $2 \mathbb{C}, j \mathfrak{j}+j \mathfrak{J}=1$, and we have picked some convenient orthogonal basis $j$ ji; jli for this state. M ore precisely, because the global phase of a quantum state has no physical relevance, the state of a qubit is identi ed w ith a ray in the $H$ ilbert space $j i=e^{i} \quad \cos (!) j 0 i+\sin (!) e^{i} j 1 i ; 8 \quad 2 R$.

In quantum com putation, a particular basis j0i, jli for a qubit is usually singled out as the com putationalbasis. In physical system $s$, this isasis is usually determ ined by som e physically $m$ otivated de nition (i.e. the eigenstates of the system H am ittonian). $G$ iven the xed basis $\mathrm{j}^{\mathrm{D}} \mathrm{i}$, jliwe can de ne the Paulim atrioes

These $m$ atrioes for a basis for linear operators on the qubit. Real com binations of these $m$ atrices are a basis for $H$ erm itian operators on a qubit. It is also convenient to de ne the $P$ auli spin $m$ atrices $s=\frac{1}{2}$.
$M$ ore generally the state of a single qubit is described by a density $m$ atrix which has a particularly useful param etrization as a vector in the \Bloch" sphere:
$=\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{I}+\mathrm{n} \sim$ where $\sim=(1 ; 2 ; 3)$.

## A. 2 Entangled and separable

Suppose one is given a bipartite H ilbert space $H=H_{A} \quad H_{B}$. A density m atrix, on this H ilbert space is de ned as separable if it can be wrilten as

$$
\begin{equation*}
={ }^{x} p_{i} \dot{j}_{i}{ }^{i h}{ }_{i} j \quad j_{i} i h_{i} \dot{j} \tag{A2}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $0<p_{i} \quad 1_{r}{ }^{P}{ }_{i} p_{i}=1, j_{i} i 2 H_{A}$, and $j_{i} i 2 H_{B}$. A density matrix which cannot be written in this form is called entangled.

## A . 3 F ixed basis form alism

Suppose one is given a d dim ensional H ilbert space H. It is convenient when exam ining linear operators on this space to work with a xed basis. The space of linear operators on H is spanned by a xed basis of herm itian traceless operators F $w$ ith $=1::: 2 d^{2} \quad 1$ and a scaled identity operator $F_{0}=p^{1} I$. These operators can alw ays be chosen to be trace orthogonal:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\operatorname{Tr}^{h} F^{y} F^{i}=: \tag{A.3}
\end{equation*}
$$

Linear com binations of the $F$ 's over $\mathbb{C}$ span all operators on $H$ while linear com binations of the $F$ 's over $\mathbb{R}$ span all Herm itian operators.

## A . 4 P ositive operator valued m easu rem ents

The m ost general notion of a m easurem ent on a quantum system is given by the concept of a positive operator valued measurem ent (POVM). A POVM is speci ed by a set of positive operators $E$. where labels the $m$ easurem ent outcom $e$, which satisfy $\mathrm{E}=\mathrm{I}$. The result of a POVM on the quantum state is the result w th probability $\mathrm{p}=\operatorname{Tr}[\mathrm{E}]$.

## A. $5 \quad$ D istance $m$ easures on density $m$ atrices

T he trace distance between two density $m$ atrioes is de ned as

$$
\begin{equation*}
D(;)=\frac{1}{2} \operatorname{Trj} \quad \dot{j} \tag{A.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\overline{\mathrm{A}} \mathrm{j}=\mathrm{P} \overline{\mathrm{A} \mathrm{YA}_{\mathrm{A}}}$. Suppose that one was attem pting to perform a m easurem ent which distinguished the two density $m$ atrices and. Perform ing a POVM with elem ents $\mathrm{fM} g$ one obtain result on the density $m$ atrioes and $w$ ith probabilities $p=\operatorname{Tr} M \quad$ ] and $q=\operatorname{Tr} M \quad$ ] respectively. A basic theorem ofdistance $m$ easures on density $m$ atrices (see, for exam ple [88]) tells us that

$$
\begin{equation*}
D(;)=\max _{\mathrm{fM}}^{\operatorname{ax}}{\underset{\mathrm{a}}{2}}_{\mathrm{x}}^{\mathrm{x}} \mathrm{p} \quad \mathrm{q} j \tag{A.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

where them axim ization is taken over allpossible P O VM s. D ensity $m$ atrioes which are close in trace distance are therefore hard to distinguish by a m axim ally distinguishing m easurem ent.

## A.6 D ecoherence rates under the trace inner product

$T$ he trace inner product $\left.\mathrm{hA} ; \mathrm{B} i=\operatorname{Tr} \mathbb{A}^{\mathrm{Y}} \mathrm{B}\right]$ is an easy to use $m$ etric for exam ining how a density $m$ atrix strays from its initial state. If we have a state ( 0 ) at $t=0$, we de ne the $m$ ixed-state $m$ em ory delity of this state at tim e $t$ later as

$$
\mathrm{F}_{\mathrm{m}}(\mathrm{t})=\operatorname{Tr}\left[\begin{array}{ll}
(0) & (\mathrm{t})]:  \tag{A..6}\\
\hline
\end{array}\right.
$$

W hile this delity has no intrinsic relation to, say, how distinguishable (t) has becom e from (0), the Taylor expansion of the $m$ em ory delity can give us a good idea about the rate of change of the density $m$ atrix from its intial state. Perform ing this Taylor series expansion,

$$
\begin{equation*}
F_{m}(t)=x_{n=0}^{x^{1}} \frac{1}{n!} \frac{t}{n}^{n} ; \tag{A.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

where we have de ned the decoherence rates $[65,66]$

$$
\begin{equation*}
\frac{1}{n}={ }^{n} \operatorname{Tr}^{h}(0)^{(n)}(0)^{i 0 \frac{1}{n}} ; \tag{A..8}
\end{equation*}
$$

where ${ }^{(n)}(0)={\frac{\varrho^{n}}{\varrho(t)}}_{t=0}$.

## A. $7 \quad$ The P auligroup and P auli stabilizer codes

The P auligroup $P$ on $n$ qubits is the group $m$ ade up ofallpossible tensor products of the Paulioperators ; ( $2 \mathrm{f0} ; 1 ; 2 ; 3 \mathrm{~g}$ ) togetherw ith possible globalphase factors f 1 ; ig. Elem ents of the Pauli group either com $m$ ute or anticom $m$ ute $w$ ith each other.

An abelian subgroup of the Pauli group is call a Pauli stabilizer group S. A n exam ple of a P aulistabilizer group consists of the elem ents $\mathrm{x} \quad \mathrm{x} \quad \mathrm{x}$, $\mathrm{y} \quad \mathrm{x} \quad \mathrm{y}$,
z I $\quad$, and I. Every P auli stabilizer group $S$ can be generated by a set of generating elem ents which are independent in the sense that none can be generated from the others. If a P aulistabilizer group hask generators, then there are $2^{\mathrm{k}}$ elem ents in the stabilizer (i.e. the order of the P auli stabilizer group is $2^{k}$ ). Since the P auli stabilizer groups are abelian, they can be sim ultaneously diagonalized.

A P auli stabilizer code is the subspace which has a +1 eigenvalue for all of the elem ents of the stabilizer $S$ 芳 $=7 i . W$ e then say that such a state is stabilized by the elem ent. In particular the $+1 \mathrm{com} m$ on eigenspace of the stabilzer elem ents de nes a $2^{\mathrm{n}}{ }^{\mathrm{k}}$ dim ensional subspace which is called the stabilizer code space.
$E$ lem ents of the $P$ auli group which anticom $m$ ute $w$ th an elem ent of the stabilizer group act to take codew ords from the stabilizer code space to the space perpendicular to the stabilizer code spac.
$T$ he set of all $P$ auli group $m$ em bers which com $m$ ute $w$ ith a P auli stabilizer group $S$ is called the centralizer of the group C (S). P roperties of the P auligroup im ply that the stabilizer is also the nom alizer of the group $N(S)$ which is de ned as the set of operators which $x S$ under conjugation. The operators which are in the norm alizer but not the stabilizer of $S$ are the logical operators on the stabilizer $T$ hese operators preserve the stabilizer code but act nontrivially on the $2^{\text {n }}{ }^{k}$ dim ensional stabilizer space. In fact these operators act like a $n \quad k$ qubit $P$ auli group.

A stabilizer code can detect all errors which antioom $m$ ute $w$ ith at least one stabilizer elem ents. The num ber of elem ents upon which a Pauli group elem ent act nontrivially is called the weight of the Pauli group elem ent. T he standard nom enclature for a code is given by $[n ; k ; d]$ where $n$ is the num ber of qubits for the code, $k$ is the num ber ofencoded qubits, and d is the distance of the code. T he sm allest weight of the P auli group which does not anticom $m$ ute $w$ ith any stabilizer elem ent is called the distance of the code. A code with can correct 1 single qubit errors $m$ ust have a distance of at least $21+1$.

The reader is referred to [95] for $m$ ore detailed inform ation on stabilizer codes.
Som e of the elem ents of the nom alizer of the single qubit $P$ auli group are often denoted as follow s

A ll of these gates map operators to them selves under conjugation by one of these elem ents.

## A ppendix B

## P roof of universality on the weak collective decoherence D FS

Let $D F S_{n}(K)$ denote the decoherence-fiee subsystem on $n$ physical qubits $w$ ith Hamming weight $h=\frac{n}{2} \cdot W$ e show here that

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{H}=\mathrm{fE}_{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{i}+1} ; \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{i}+1} ; \mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{i}+1}^{0} ; \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{i}+1}: \mathrm{i}=1 ;::: ; \mathrm{n} \quad 1 \mathrm{~g} ; \tag{B.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

is a universal generating set of H am iltonian for any of the D F Ss occurring in a system of $n$ physical qubits. It is convenient to work directly with the Ham iltonians, and to show that $H$ gives rise to the Lie-algebra su ( $d_{K}$ ) on each DFS $S_{n}(K)$ (via scalar m ultiplication, addition, and Lie-com $m$ utator; i.e. the allow ed com position operations for a Lie algebra). Exponentiation then gives the group $S U\left(d_{K}\right)$ on the DFS.W ew ill proceed by induction on $n$, the num ber of physical qubits, building the DFS-states of $n$ qubits out of DFS-states for $n 1$ qubits. A graphical representation of this construction is useful (and will also generalize to the strong case presented in the follow ing section C): see Figure (B.1) at the end of th is A ppendix.

W e have seen that in the weak collective decoherence case the DFS states are simply bitstrings of $n$ qubits in etther joi or jli. The di erent n-qubit D FSs are labeled by their eigenvalue

$$
\begin{equation*}
{ }_{k}=\text { (num ber of } 0^{0} S \quad \text { num ber of } \mathbb{1}^{S} \text { s) } \quad K_{n} \text { : } \tag{B2}
\end{equation*}
$$

To obtain a D FS-state ofn qubits out of D F S-state ofn 1 qubits corresponding to $K_{n} \quad{ }_{1}$ we can either add the $n^{\text {th }}$ qubit as joi ( $K_{n}=K_{n} \quad 1+1$ ) oras jli ( $\left.K_{n}=\begin{array}{lll}K_{n} & 1 & 1\end{array}\right)$. Each DFS-state can be built sequentially from the rst qubit onward by adding successively j0i or 11 i , and is uniquely de ned by a sequence $\mathrm{K}_{1} ;::: ; \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{n}}$ ofeigenvalues. In the graphical representation of F ig. (B.1) the horizontal axis $m$ arks $n$, the num ber of qubits up to whidh the state is already built, and the vertical axis show $\mathrm{s} \mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{n}}$, the di erence (num ber of 0 's - num ber of 1 's) up to the $n^{\text {th }}$ qubit. Adding a j0i at the $\mathrm{n}+1^{\text {th }}$ step w ill correspond to a line pointing upw ards, adding a jli to a line pointing
down. Each DFS-state of nqubits having eigenvalue ${ }_{k}=K_{n}$, is thus in one-to-one correspondence with a path on the lattice from the origin to $\left(n ; K_{n}\right)$.

C onsider the rst non-trivial case, $n=2$, which gives rise to one DFS-qubit: $\mathrm{DFS}_{2}(0)$. This corresponds to the two states $j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}=j 01 i$ [path 2 in F ig. (B.1)] and $j_{\mathrm{L}} \mathrm{i}=\mathrm{j} 0 \mathrm{i}$ (path 3 ) with $\mathrm{K}_{2}=0$. The rem aining H ibert space is spanned by the one-dim ensionalDFS (2) j00i (path 1) corresponding to $K_{2}=2$, and DFS $S_{2}(2)$ jlii (path 4) corresponding to $K_{2}=2$. The exchange $E_{12}$ ips $j 0_{\mathrm{L}} i$ and $j_{\mathrm{L}} i$ (path 2 and 3), and leaves the other tw o paths unchanged. The interaction $A_{12}=\operatorname{diag}(0 ; 0 ; 1 ; 0)$ induces a phase on $\mathcal{1}_{\mathrm{L}} i=$ j10i (path 3). Their commutator form $s$ an encoded $y$ acting entirely $w$ ithin the $\mathrm{DFS}_{2}(0)$ subspace. Its com $m$ utator $w$ ith $\mathrm{E}_{12}$ in tum form s an encoded $z$ w th the sam e property. Together they form the (encoded) Lie algebra su (2) acting entirely w thin this DFS. The Lie algebra is com pleted by form ing the com $m$ utator betw een these $Y$ and $Z$ operations. To sum $m$ arize:

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \begin{array}{lllll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{array}
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& 0 \quad 0 \quad 0 \quad 0  \tag{B.3}\\
& \left.Z_{12} \quad i \mathbb{E}_{12} ; Y_{12}\right] \\
& \mathrm{X}_{12} \text { i₹ }{ }_{12} ; \mathrm{Z}_{12} \text { ]: } \tag{B.4}
\end{align*}
$$

W e call the property of acting entirely w thin the speci ed D FS independence, $m$ eaning that the corresponding H am ittonian has zero entries in the rows and colum ns corresponding to the other DFSs $\mathbb{D F S} 2(2)=j 00 i$ and $\operatorname{DSS}_{2}(2)=j 1 i$ in this case]. W hen the H am iltonian is exponentiated, the corresponding gate w ill act as identity on all D FSs except D FS $\mathrm{S}_{2}(0)$.

To sum $m$ arize these considerations, the Lie-algebra form ed by $H_{0}^{2}=\mathrm{fX} ; \mathrm{Zg}$ is su (2), and generates $S U(2)$ on $D S_{2}(0)$ by exponentiation. In addition, this is an independent SU (2), nam ely, these operations act as identity on the otherD FSs: when w ritten as $m$ atrices over the basis of D FS-states, their generators in $H_{0}^{2}$ have zeroes in the row s and colum ns corresponding to all other D FSs.

In the follow ing we show how this construction generalizes to $n>2$ qubits, by proving the follow ing theorem :

Theorem B.0.1 For any n 2 qubits undergoing weak collective decoherence, there exist sets of H am iltonians $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{K}_{n}}^{\mathrm{n}}$ [obtained from H ofEq. (B.1) via scalarm ultiplication, addition, and Lie-comm utator] acting as $s u\left(d_{k_{n}}\right)$ on the DFS corresponding to the eigenvalue $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{n}}$. Furtherm ore each set acts independently on this D FS only (i.e., with zeroes in the $m$ atrix representation corresponding to their action on the other DFSS).

Before proving this theorem, we rst explain in detail the steps taken in order to go from the $\mathrm{n}=2$ to the $\mathrm{n}=3$ case, so as to m ake the general induction procedure $m$ ore transparent.

The structure of the DFSs for $n=2$ and 3 qubits is:

$\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(3)=$ fjl11ig:
(B.5)
$\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(3)$ is obtained by appending a joi to $\mathrm{DFS}_{2}(2)$. Sim ilarly $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(3)$ is obtained by appending a jli to $\mathrm{DFS}_{2}(2)$. G raphically, this corresponds to $m$ oving along the only allowed pathway from $\left.\mathrm{DFS}_{2}(2) \mathbb{D F S} S_{2}(2)\right]$ to $\left.D F S_{3}(3) \mathbb{D F S} S_{3}(3)\right]$, as shown in $F$ ig. (B.1). The lowest and highest $k$ for $n$ qubits $w i l l$ always be $m$ ade up of the single pathway connecting the lowest and highest $k$ for $n \quad 1$ qubits. The structure of $\mathrm{DS}_{3}(1)$ is only slightly $m$ ore com plicated. DFS3 (1) is $m$ ade up of one state, j001i, which com es from appending a jli (m oving down) to D FS $S_{2}$ (2). W e call j001i a $\backslash T$ op-state" in $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$. The two other states, $\mathfrak{j 0 1 0 i}$ and $\mathfrak{j} 1001$, com e from appending j0i ( $m$ oving up) to D FS $S_{2}(0)$. Sim ilarly, we call j010i and j100i \Bottom -states" in $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1) . \mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$ is constructed in an analogous m anner ( F ig. B .1 ).

W e showed above that it is possible to perform independent su (2) operations on $\mathrm{DFS}_{2}(0) . \mathrm{DFS}_{2}(2)$ are also both acted upon independently, but because they are one-dim ensional subspaces, independence im plies that su (2) operations annihilate them . Since the states $\mathrm{f} j 010 \mathrm{i} ; \mathbf{j} 100 \mathrm{ig} 2 \mathrm{DFS}(1)$ and the states $\mathrm{f} j 011 \mathrm{i} ; \mathfrak{j} 101 \mathrm{ig} 2$ $D F S_{3}(1)$ both have $f 01 i ; 110 i g 2 D F S_{2}(0)$ as their rst two qubits, one im mediate consequence of the independent action on $\mathrm{DFS}_{2}(0)$ is that one can sim ultaneously perform su (2) operations on the corresponding daughter subspaces created by expanding $D \mathrm{FS}_{2}(0)$ into $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$. The rst step in the general inductive proof is to elim inate this sim ultaneous action, and to act independently on each of these subspaces (the \independence step"). To see how this is achieved, it is convenient to represent the operators acting on the 8 -dim ensional H ilbert space of 3 qubits in the basis of the 4 D FSs:


The sim ultaneous action on $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$ can now be visualized in term s of both M ${ }_{1}$ being non-zero. Let us show how to obtain an action where, say, just $M_{1}$ is
non-zero. This can be achieved by applying the com $m$ utator of two operators $w$ ith the property that their intersection has non-vanishing action just on $M_{1} . T$ his is true for the $\mathrm{T}_{23}^{\mathrm{P}}$ and $\mathrm{X}_{12} \mathrm{H}$ am iltonians: $\mathrm{T}_{23}^{\mathrm{P}}$ anninilates every state except those that are j00i over qubits 2 and 3, nam ely j100i2 DFS $S_{3}(1)$ and j000i 2 D FS $S_{3}(3)$. This im plies that the only non-zero blocks in its $m$ atrix are

$$
M_{3}\left(T_{23}^{P}\right)=1 ; \quad M_{1}\left(T_{23}^{P}\right)=\begin{array}{llll}
0 & 0 & 0 & 1  \tag{B.6}\\
@ & 0 & 0 & \underset{A}{C}: \\
& & & 1
\end{array}
$$

On the other hand, $\mathrm{X}_{12}$ is non-zero only on those states that are j01i or $j 10 i$ on qubits 1 and 2. Therefore it w ill be non-zero on all 3-qubit states that have j01i or j10i as \parents". This means that in its $m$ atrix representation $M \quad 3=0$ and

C learly, taking the product of $\mathrm{T}_{23}^{\mathrm{P}}$ and $\mathrm{X}_{12}$ leaves non-zero just the low er $2 \quad 2$ block of $M_{1}$, and this is the crucial point: it show sthat an independent action on $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$ can be obtained by form ing their com $m$ utator. Speci cally, since the low er 2 2 block of $M_{1}\left(\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{T}_{23}\end{array}\right)$ is just $\frac{1}{2}\left(\begin{array}{ll}I & z\end{array}\right)$ :

$$
\begin{equation*}
\mathrm{i}\left[\mathrm{~T}{ }_{23}^{\mathrm{P}} ; \mathrm{X}_{12}\right]=\mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{fj} 100 \mathrm{i} ; 0 \mathrm{p} 10 \mathrm{ig}} ; \tag{B.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

ie., this commutator acts as an encoded y inside the $f 100 \mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{j} 010 \mathrm{ig}$ subspace of $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$. Sim ilarly, $\left.\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{fj} 100 \mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{p} 10 \mathrm{ig}}=\frac{i}{2} \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{fj} 100 \mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{j} 10 \mathrm{ig}} ; \mathrm{X}_{12}\right]$. Together the two operators fY ${ }_{f j 00 i ; 010 i g} ; Z_{f j 100 i ; 010 i g} g$ generate su (2) acting independently on the $\mathrm{fj} 100 \mathrm{i} ; \mathrm{jO10ig}$ subspace of $F S_{3}(1)$, which we achieved by subtracting out the action on $D F S_{3}(1)$.

In an analogousm anner, an independent su (2) can be enacted on the $f=011 i ; 1101 i g$ subspace ofD $\mathrm{FS}_{3}(\mathrm{l})$ by using the H am iltonians acting on DFS $(0)$ in conjunction w th $\mathrm{T}_{23}^{Q}$ to subtract out the su (2) action on $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1) .{ }^{1}$ Thus we can obtain independent action for each of the daughters of $\mathrm{FS}_{2}(0)$, i.e., separate actions on the subspace spanned by fj010i; $1100 i g$ and fj011i; $1101 i g$.

H aving established independent action on the two subspaces of DFS $S_{3}(1)$ and $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$ arising from $\mathrm{DFS}_{2}(0)$, we need only show that we can obtain the fullaction

[^4]on $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$ and $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$. For DFS3 (1) we need to m ix the subspace $\mathrm{f} j 010 \mathrm{i} ; \boldsymbol{j} 100 \mathrm{ig}$ over which we can already perform independent su (2), w ith the j001i state. To do so, note that the e ect of the exchange operation $E_{23}$ is to ip j001i and j010i, and leave $7100 i$ invariant. Thus the $m$ atrix representation of $\mathrm{E}_{23}$ is
\[

M_{1}\left(E_{23}\right)=$$
\begin{array}{llll}
0 & 0 & 1 & 1  \tag{B.9}\\
{ }_{Q}^{B} & 1 & 0 & A \\
A
\end{array}
$$:
\]

1

Unfortunately, $\mathrm{E}_{23}$ has a sim ultaneous action on $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$. This, however, is not a problem, since we have already constructed an independent su (2) on $D F S_{3}$ (1) ele$m$ ents. Thus we can elim inate the sim ultaneous action by sim ply form ing com $m$ utators w ith these $\mathrm{su}(2)$ elem ents. The Lie algebra generated by these com m utators w ill act independently on all of DFS3 (1). In fact we clam this Lie algebra to be all of su (3) (see A ppendix D for a general proof). In other w ords, the Lie algebra spanned by the su (2) elem ents $f{ }_{x}$; $y_{y}$; $g$ acting on the subspace $f 1001 ; j 010$ ig, togetherw ith the exchange operation $\mathrm{E}_{23}$, generate allofsu (3) independently on D FS (1). A sim ilar argum ent holds for $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$. This construction ilhustrates the induction step: we have show $n$ that it is possible to perform independent $s u\left(d_{k}\right)$ actions on all four of the $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(\mathrm{~K})(\mathbb{K}=3 ; 1)$, given that we can perform independent action on the three $D F S_{2}(K)(K=1 ; 0)$. In $F$ ig. (B 2) we have further illustrated these considerations by depicting the action of exchange on two of the 4 -qubit D FSs. Let us now proceed to the general proof.

Proof By induction.
The case $\mathrm{n}=2$ already treated above w illserve to in itialize the induction. A ssum e now that the theorem is true forn 1 qubits and let us show that it is then true for n qubits as well.

First note that each $D F S_{n}(K)$ is constructed either from the $D F S_{n} 1(K \quad 1)$ (to its lower left) by adding a joi for the $n^{\text {th }}$ qubit, or from DFS ${ }_{n} 1(K+1)$ (to its upper left) by adding a jli: the states in D F $S_{n}(K)$ correspond to allpaths ending in ( $n$; $K$ ) that either come from below (B) or from the top (T). See Fig. (B 3).

If we apply a certain gate $U=\exp (i H t)$ to $D F S_{n} 1(K+1)$, then this operation willinduce the sam eU on $D F S_{n}(K)$, by acting on allpaths (states) entering $D F S_{n}(K)$ from above. At the same time $U$ is induced on $D F S_{n}(K+2)$ by acting on all paths entering this DFS from below. So, U a ects two DFSs sim ultaneously. In other words, the set of valid H am iltonians $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{K}+1}^{\mathrm{n}}{ }_{1}^{1}$ [acting on $\mathrm{n} \quad 1$ qubits and generating su $\left.\left(d_{K+1}\right)\right]$ on D FS $S_{n} \quad(K+1)$, that we are given by the induction hypothesis, induces a sim ultaneous action of su ( $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{K}+1}$ ) on $\mathrm{DFS}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K})$ (on the paths com ing from above only) and $\mathrm{DFS}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K}+2$ ) (on the paths com ing from below only). A dditionally, it does not a ect any othern-qubit D FS, since we assum ed that the action on DFS $\mathrm{n}_{1}(\mathrm{~K}+1)$ was independent, and the only n-qubit D FSs built from DFS $\mathrm{n}_{1}(\mathbb{K}+1)$ are DFS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K})$ and $\operatorname{DFS}(\mathbb{K}+2)$. These considerations are depicted schem atically in $F$ ig. (B 3).

We now show how to annihilate, for a given non-trivial (i.e., dim ension > 1) $D F S_{n}(K)$, the unwanted simultaneous action on other DFSs (the \independence step"). We then proceed to obtain the entire su ( $d_{K}$ ), by using the su ( $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{K}} \quad{ }_{1}$ ) on $D F S_{n}{ }_{1}(\mathrm{~K} \quad 1)$ that are given by the induction hypothesis (the $\backslash m$ ixing step").

Independence
Let us call all the $t_{K}$ paths converging on $D F S_{n}(K)$ from above $\backslash T$ op-states", or $T$-states for short, and the $\mathrm{l}_{k}$ paths converging from below \Bottom - (or B) states" (recall that there is a 1 -to- 1 correspondence betw een paths and states). The total num ber ofpaths converging on a given D FS is exactly its dim ension, so $d_{k}=t_{k}+b_{k}$. By using the induction hypothesis on DFS $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K}+1)$ we can obtain su ( $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{K}}$ ) (generated by $H_{K}^{n}+\frac{1}{1}$ ) on the $T$-states of $F S_{n}(\mathbb{K})$, which will sim ultaneously a ect the $B$-states in the higher lying $D F S_{n}(K+2)$ as su $\left(\mathrm{o}_{\mathrm{K}}+2\right)$ (note that $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{K}}=\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{K}+2}$ ). The set $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{K}+1}^{\mathrm{n}}{ }_{1}^{1}$ is non-em pty only ifn $3 \quad \mathrm{~K}+1$ ( $\mathrm{n} \quad 3$ ) because the \highest" and \lowest" D FS are alw ays one-dim ensional and su $(1)=0$ ]. If this holds then $D F S_{n}(K+2)$ \above" $D F S_{n}(K)$ is non-trivial (dim ension $>1$ ), and there are paths in $D F S_{n}(K)$ ending in j11i ( $\backslash$ dow $n$, down"). This is exactly the situation in which we can use $T_{n}^{\ell} \quad 1 ; n$ to wipe out the unwanted action on DFS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K}+2)$ : recall that $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{n}}^{Q} \quad 1 ; \mathrm{n}$ annihilates all states except those ending in 711 , and therefore a ects non-trivially only these special Tstates in each DFS. Since the operations in $H_{K+1}^{n}$ a ect only B-states on DFS $\mathrm{N}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K}+$ 2), $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{n}}^{\ell}{ }_{1 ; \mathrm{n}}$ commutes w th $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{K}+1}^{\mathrm{n}} \stackrel{1}{1}$ on $\mathrm{DFS} \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K}+2)$. Therefore the com mutator of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{n}}^{\ell} \quad 1, \mathrm{n}$ w ith elem ents in $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{K}}^{\mathrm{n}}{ }_{1}^{1}$ annihilates all states not in $\mathrm{DFS} \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K})$. ${ }^{2}$ To show that commuting $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{n}}^{\ell} \quad 1 ; \mathrm{n}$ w ith $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{K}}^{\mathrm{n}}+\frac{1}{1}$ generates su( $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{K}}$ ) on the T -states ofD $\mathrm{F} \mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K})$ we need the follow ing lem ma, which show show to form su(d) from an overlapping su (d 1) and su (2):

Enlarging Lemma| Let H be a H ilbert space of dim ension d and let $\ddot{\mathrm{ji}} 2 \mathrm{H}$. A ssum e we are given a set of $H$ am iltonians $H_{1}$ that generates su ( $d \quad 1$ ) on the subspace of H that does not contain $\ddot{\mathrm{pi}}$ and another set $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ that generates su (2) on the
 (all com $m$ utators) generates su (d) on $H$ under closure as a Lie-algebra (ie., via scalar m ultiplication, addition and Lie-com $m$ utator) .

Proof See A ppendix D
 a $T$-state, but does not end in $j 11$ : Then we can generate su (2) on the subspace
 $\ddot{j}_{j}{ }^{\circ} \mathrm{ini}^{\circ} \mathrm{j}$ [a prime indicates the bitstring $w$ ith the last bit (a 1 in this case) dropped] in su $\left(\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{K}}\right) 2 \mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{K}+1}^{\mathrm{n}}{ }_{1}^{1}$ to generate a simultaneous action on DFS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K})$ and DFS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K}+2)$.

[^5]This interaction is represented by a $2 \quad 2 \mathrm{x}$-m atrix in the subspace spanned by
 sam e subspace, and commutes with $X_{i j}$ on $D F S_{n}(K+2)$ (since $X_{i j}$ a ects only Bstates in $D F S_{n}(K+2)$; and $T_{n}^{Q} \quad$; in non-zero only on states ending in $\left.\mathcal{j l 1 i}\right)$. Thus we can use it to create an independent action on DFS $S_{n}(\mathbb{K})$ alone: $Y_{i j}=i\left[T_{n}^{Q}{ }_{1 ; n} ; X_{i j}\right]$, $\left.Z_{i j}=\frac{i}{2} Y_{i j} ; X_{i j}\right]$.
 these operators vanish everyw here except on $D F S_{n}(K)$, their com $m$ utators w ith elem ents in $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{K}+1}^{\mathrm{n}}$ [acting as su( $\left.\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{K}}\right)$ ] willannihilate all other D F Ss. T herefore, using the Enlarging Lem $m$ a, in this way all operations in su ( $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{K}}$ ) acting on D F $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K})$ only can be generated.

So far we have shown how to obtain an independent su( $t_{K}$ ) on the $T$-states of $D F S_{n}(K)$ using $H_{K+1}^{n}{ }_{1}^{1}$ (for $\left.K \quad n \quad 4\right)$. To obtain an independent su (b) on the B-states of $E S_{n}(K)$ we use $H$ am iltonians in $H_{K}^{n}{ }_{1}^{1}$ (acting on DFS $S_{n} 1_{1}(\mathbb{K} \quad 1)$ \{ the D F S from below ). Thisw illgenerate a sim ultaneous su ( $\mathrm{o}_{\mathrm{K}}$ ) in D F $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathbb{K})$ and su ( $\mathrm{t}_{\mathrm{K}} \quad$ 2) in DFS $S_{n}\left(\begin{array}{ll}K & 2) \text {. To elim inate the unwanted action on DFS }\left(\begin{array}{ll}K & 2)\end{array}\right) \text { we apply the }\end{array}\right.$ previous argum ents alm ost identically, except that now we use $T_{n}^{P} \quad 1 ; n$ to $w$ ipe out the action on all states except those ending in j00i. W e thus get an independent su ( $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{K}}$ ) on DFS $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K})$. Together, the \above" and \below " constructions respectively provide independent su ( $\mathrm{t}_{K}$ ) and su( $\left(\mathrm{b}_{K}\right)$ on $\mathrm{DFS}(\mathrm{K})$. Finally, note that we did not really need both $T_{i j}^{P}$ and $T_{i j}^{Q}$, since once we established independent action on the $T$-states, we could have just subtracted out this action when considering the B-states. A lso, the speci c choice of $\mathrm{T}_{\mathrm{ij}}^{\mathrm{f}} \mathrm{il}$ was rather arbitrary (though convenient): in fact alm ost any other diagonal interaction would do just as well.

M ixing
In order to induce operations between the two sets of paths (from \above" and from \below") that make up DFS $S_{n}(\mathbb{K})$ consider the e ect of $\mathrm{E}_{\mathrm{n}} 1 ; \mathrm{n}$. This gate does not a ect any paths that \ascend" two steps to ( $\mathrm{n} ; \mathrm{K}$ ) (corresponding to bitstrings ending in $j 00 i$ ) and paths that \descend" two steps (ending in $j 11 i$ ), but it ips the paths that pass from ( $n \quad 2 ; K$ ) via ( $n \quad 1 ; K+1$ ) w ith the paths from ( $n \quad 2 ; K$ ) via (n 1; $\mathrm{K} \quad 1$ ) [see $F$ ig. ( B 3)]. It does this for all D F Ss sim ultaneously.

In order to get a fiull su ( $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{K}}$ ) on D FS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{K})$ we need to $\backslash \mathrm{m}$ ix" su ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{K}}$ ) (on the T states) and su ( $\mathrm{b}_{\mathrm{K}}$ ) (on the B-states) which we already have. W e show how to obtain an independent su (2) betw een a $T$-state and a B-state. By the Enlarging Lem $m$ a this generates su ( $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{K}}$ ).

Since n 3 DFS (K) contains states term inating in j00i and/or jlil. Let us assum e, w ithout loss of generality, that states term inating in $j 00 \mathrm{i}$ are present, and

 we have independent su ( $\mathrm{b}_{k}$ ). Then as is easily checked, $\left.\mathrm{i} \mathbb{E}_{\mathrm{n}} \mathrm{Im}_{\mathrm{n}} ; \mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{ij}}\right] \quad \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{jk}}$ yields y
 ki, thus com pleting a generating set for su (2) on the B-state jiji and the $T$-state ki, that a ects these two states only and annihilates all other states. $T$ his com pletes the proof.

To sum $m$ arize, we have shown constructively that it is possible to generate the entire Lie algebra su ( $d_{K}$ ) on a given weak collective-decoherence D F $S_{n}(K)$ ofdim ension $d_{K}$, from the elem entary com position of the operations of scalar m ultiplication, addition, Lie-com m utators (conjugation by unitaries was not necessary in the weak collective decoherence case). M oreover, this su ( $\mathrm{d}_{\mathrm{K}}$ ) can be generated independently on each D FS, im plying that universalquantum com putation can be perform ed inside each DFS $S_{n}(K)$. N aturally, one would like to do this on the largest D FS. Since given the num ber of qubits $n$ the dim ensions of the DFSS are $d_{k}={ }_{k}^{n}$, the largest DFS is the decoherence-free subspace $\mathrm{K}=0$. In principle it is possible, by virtue of the independence result, to universally quantum com pute in parallelon allD FSs.

[^6]

Figure B.1: G raphical representation for visualizing the weak collective decoherence universality proof
The horizontal axis $m$ arks the num ber of qubits. The vertical axis show $s$ (num ber of 0 's - num ber of 1's) in each state ( $\mathrm{K}_{\mathrm{n}}$ ). Each state in the standard basis thus corresponds to a path from the origin which follows the indicated arrow s. The dim ension of a DFS corresponds to the multiple pathw ays through which one can arrive at the same $J_{n}$. The DFSs are labeled by their values of $n$ and $K_{n}$, as $D F S_{n}\left(K_{n}\right)$. The insert show sthe $m$ atrix structure of operators acting on $D F S_{5}(3)$, in term $s$ of $T$ op (T) and Bottom (B) states (see text for de nition of these). N ote that there is only one $T$-state entering $\operatorname{DFS}_{5}$ (3), whence the action of exchange is represented by a $1 \quad 1$ block.


Figure B 2: G raphical representation of the action of exchange on DFS states for weak collective decoherence
Exchange acts to sim ultaneously ip di erent paths to a given DFS $S_{n}\left(K_{n}\right)$. A xes and labels are as de ned in $F$ igure $1 . E_{i j}$ denotes the exchange of the $i$-th and $j$-th qubits. $T$ hem atrices displayed at right are the representations ofE 34 on D FS $S_{4}$ (0) (low er) and $D F S_{4}$ (2) (upper).


Figure B 3: D etailed structure of the pathw ays connecting adjacent D FSs in the weak collective decoherence case
The action of the di erent su Lie algebras is indicated by the superposed heavy arrow S. DFS $S_{n}(K)$ denotes the DFS arising from $n$ qubits and having eigenvalue $K$.

## A ppendix C

## P roof of universality on the strong collective decoherence D FS

W hat is now proved was once only m agined
\{W illiam B lake
W e begin by exam ining the action of the exchange interaction on the three and four qubit strong collective decoherence D F S.

## C.1 Q uantum $C$ om putation on the $n=3$ and $n=4$ qub it strong collective decoherence D FS

W e begin our discussion of universal quantum com putation on strong collective decoherence D F Ssby exam ining the sim plest strong collective decoherence D FS which supports encoding of quantum inform ation: the $\mathrm{n}=3$ decoherence-free subsystem. W e label these states by jJ; ; i. Recall that the $J=3=2$ irrep is not degenerate and the $J=1=2$ irrep has degeneracy 2 . The $J=3=2$ states can be wrilten as $\frac{j_{2}^{3}}{2} ; 0$; $i$, w th $=\mathrm{m}=3=2 ; 1=2$. Since the action of exchange does not depend on (recall that it a ects paths, i.e., the com ponent only) it su ces to consider the action on the representative $=3=2$ only: j111i. Let us then explicitly calculate the action of exchanging the rst two physical qubits on this state and the four $J=1=2$ states. U sing Eq. (8.46):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \mathrm{E}_{12} \frac{3}{2} ; 0 ; \frac{3}{2} i=E_{12} \mathfrak{j} 11 i=\frac{3}{j} ; 0 ; \frac{3}{2} i
\end{aligned}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& \mathrm{E}_{12} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}} ; 1 ; 0 i=\mathrm{E}_{12} \mathrm{p}^{1} \frac{1}{6}(2 j 001 i+j 010 i+j 100 i)=\frac{1}{2} ; 1 ; 0 i \\
& \mathrm{E}_{12} \frac{1}{\frac{1}{2}} ; 1 ; 1 i=\mathrm{E}_{12} \frac{1}{6}(2 \mathfrak{1} 10 i \quad \text { j101i } \quad j 011 i)=\frac{1}{2} ; 1 ; 1 i: \tag{C.1}
\end{align*}
$$

Focusing just on the $J=1=2$ states, the exchange action on $j i j i$ can thus be w ritten as:

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{12}=\quad z \quad I: \tag{C2}
\end{equation*}
$$

Since the action of the $S$ operators on the $J=1=2$ states is $I_{n_{1=2}} \quad g l(2)$, this explicit form for $E_{12}$ con m s that is has the expected structure of operators in the com mutant of the algebra spanned by the $S$. It can also be seen that quantum inform ation should be encoded in the $j i$ com ponent.

U sing sim ilar algebra it is straightforw ard to verify that the e ect of the three possible exchanges on the $\mathrm{n}=3$ DFS states are given by:
where the rows and colum ns of these $m$ atrices are labeled by the basis elem ents $\mathrm{f} j \mathrm{~J}=3=2 ;=0 i ; j J=1=2 ;=0 i ; j J=1=2 ;=1 i g$. As expected from general properties of the com $m$ utant, the exchange operators do not $m$ ix the di erent $J$ irreps. N ow,
show ing that the last tw o linear com binations of exchanges look like the P auli $z$ and $x$ on $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1=2)$. U sing a standard Euler angle construction it is thus possible to perform any SU (2) gate on this DFS.M oreover, it is possible to act independently on $\operatorname{DFS}_{3}(3=2)$ and $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1=2)$. In other w ords, we can perform $U(1)$ on $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(3=2)$ alone, and $S U$ (2) on $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1=2)$ alone. N ote, how ever, that at this point we cannot yet claim universal quantum com putation on a register com posed of clusters of DFS $\mathrm{F}_{3}(\mathrm{~J})$ 's (J constant) because we have not shown how to couple such clusters.

Forn $=4$ the $H$ ilbert space splits up into one $J=2$-irrep $\mathbb{D F S} 4$ (2)], three $J=1$ irreps $\left.\mathbb{D ~ F S} S_{4}(1)\right]$, and two $J=0$-irreps $\left.\mathbb{D ~ F S} S_{4}(0)\right]\{$ see $T a b l e(82)$. D irect calculation
of the e ect of exchange on these DFSs shows that we can independently perform su (1) (i.e. zero), su (3), and su (2). In particular, we nd that [9]:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.X=P_{\frac{1}{3}}^{1}\left(E_{23} \quad E_{13}\right) \quad Y=\frac{P^{i}}{2^{2}} \mathbb{E}_{23} \quad E_{13} ; E_{34}\right] \quad Z=\frac{i}{2}[Y ; X]=E_{12} \tag{C.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

act as the corresponding su (2) P aulioperators on D F $S_{4}(0)$ only. Further, the follow ing operators act independently on the $J=1$-irreps (row s and colum ns are labeled by
$=0 ; 1 ; 2$. The action occurs sim ultaneously on allthree com ponents corresponding to a gi̇ven ):

These operators clearly generate su (3), and hence we have an independent SU (3) action on $\mathrm{DFS}_{4}(1)$.

## C . 2 U niversalQ uantum $C$ om putation on then 5 qubit strong collective decoherence D F S s

W e are now ready to prove our central result: that using only the two-body exchange H am ittonians every unitary operation can be perform ed on a strong collective decoherence D FS.M ore speci cally:

T heorem C.2.1 For any n 2 qubits undergoing strong collective decoherence, there exist sets of $H$ am iltonians $H_{J}^{n}$ obtained from exchange interactions only via scalarm ul tiplication, addition, Lie-com m utator and unitary conjugation, acting as su ( $\mathrm{d}_{J}$ ) on the DFS corresponding to the eigenvalue J. Furtherm ore each set acts independently on this DFS only (i.e., w ith zeroes in the $m$ atrix representation corresponding to their action on the other DFSs).

In preparation for the proof of this result let us note several usefiul facts:
(i) The exchange operators do not change the value ofm, because they are in the comm utant of $A=f S g$. Therefore in order to evaluate the action of the exchange operators on the di erentD $F S_{n}(J)$ ( $n$ given) it is convenient to $x m$, and in particular to work in the basis given by the $m$ axim alm value ( $m=J$ ). Expressions for these
$\backslash \mathrm{m}$ axim al" states in term s of $\mathrm{j}_{1} ; \mathrm{J}_{2} ;::: ; \mathrm{J}_{\mathrm{n}} \quad 2 ; \mathrm{m}$ i and the single qubit states of the last two qubits are given in A ppendix D.
(ii) Every $\left(S^{k]}\right)^{2}$ can be written as a sum of exchange operators and the identity operation. This follow sfrom noting that the exchange operator can be expanded as

$$
\begin{equation*}
E_{i j}=\frac{1}{2} I+\underset{x}{i} \underset{x}{j}+\underset{y}{i} \underset{y}{j}+\underset{z}{i} \underset{z}{j} ; \tag{C.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

so that:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left(S^{[k]}\right)^{2}=k \quad 1 \quad \frac{k}{4}^{!} I+\frac{1}{2}_{i f j=1}^{x^{k}} E_{i j}: \tag{C.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

Thus $\left(S^{[k]}\right)^{2}$ is a H am iltonian which is at our disposal.
W e are now ready to present our proofby induction. Recall the DFS dim ensionality formula for $n_{J}$, Eq. (8.42). We assume that it is possible to perform su $\left(n_{J}\right)$ on each of the di erent DFS $\mathrm{n}_{1}(\mathrm{~J})$ independently using only exchange operators and the identity H am iltonian. O ur construction above proves that this is true for 3 and 4 qubits. The assum ption that the actions we can perform can be perform ed independently translates into the ability to construct $H$ am iltonians which annihilate all of the D FSs except a desired one on which they act as su $\left(n_{J}\right)$.

As in the weak collective decoherence case a speci c DFS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{J})$ of dim ension $\mathrm{n}_{J}$ splits into states which are constructed by the subtraction of angularm om entum from $D F S_{n} 1(J+1=2)$ ( $T$-states), orby the addition of angularm om entum to DFS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}{ }_{1}(\mathrm{~J}$ 1=2) (B-states) [see Fig. (C 2)]. Perform ing $s u\left(n_{J+1=2}\right)$ on $D F S_{n}(J+1=2)$ will sim ultaneously act on $D F S_{n}(J)$ and DFS $S_{n}(J+1)$. In other words, su $\left(n_{J+1=2}\right)$ on $D F S_{n}(J+1=2)$ acts on both the B-states ofDFS ${ }_{n}(J+1)$ and on the $T$-states of $D F S_{n}(J) . W$ e split the proof into three steps. In the rst step we obtain an su (2) set of operators which acts only on DFS $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{J})$ and $m$ ixes particular B-and T-states. In the second step we expand the set of operators which $m$ ix B-and T-states to cover all possible su (2) algebras between any two B - and T-states. F inally, in the third step we apply a $M$ ixing Lem $m$ a which show $s$ that we can obtain the full su ( $n_{J}$ ) (i.e., also $m$ ix B-states and m ix T-states).
$T$ - and $B-M$ ixing
There are two sim ple instances where there is no need to show independent action in our proof: (i) $T$ he (upper) $J=n=2$-irrep is alw ays 1 -dim ensional, so the action on it is alw ays trivial (i.e., the H am iltonian vanishes and hence the action is independent by de nition); (ii) For odd n the \lowest" D FS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(1=2)$ is acted upon independently by the $s u\left(n_{0}\right)$ from $D F S_{n}(0)$ [i.e., su $\left(n_{0}\right)$ cannot act \downward"]. In order to facilitate our construction we extend the notion of $T$ and $B$-states one step further in the construction of the DFS.TB-states are those states which are constructed from $T$-states on ( $n$ 1)-qubits and from the $B$-states on $n$-qubit states [see $F$ ig. (C 2)].

Sim ilarly we can de ne the BT，TT，and BB－states：

$$
\begin{align*}
& \text { BTi } \quad \dot{1} ;::: ; J_{n} ; J_{n} ; J_{n}+\frac{1}{2} ; J_{n} ; m=J_{n} i=\% \&  \tag{C.9}\\
& \text { 打Bi } \quad \text { 位; }::: ; J_{n} \quad 3 ; J_{n} ; J_{n} \quad \frac{1}{2} ; J_{n} ; m=J_{n} i=\& \% \\
& \text { BBi } \quad \dot{1} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 3 ; J_{n} \quad 1 ; \Psi_{h} \quad \frac{1}{2} ; J_{n} ; m=J_{n} i=\% \quad \% \quad: \tag{C..10}
\end{align*}
$$

Every DFS $S_{n}(J)$ can be broken down into a direct sum of TT，BT，TB，and BB－states； e．g．，as seen in Fig．（C．1），in DFS ${ }_{6}(1)$ there are $1 \mathrm{TT}, 3 \mathrm{~TB}, 3 \mathrm{BT}$ and 2 BB states． $N$ ote that for $J=n=2 \quad 1$ there are no $T T$－states，for $J=0$ there are no $B B$ and $B T$－states，for $J=1=2$ there are no BB－states，and otherw ise there are as m any TB as there are BT states，

At this point it is useful to explicitly give the action of exchange on the last two qubits of a strong collective decoherence DFS．U sing Eq．（D ．8）we nd（assum ing the existence of the given states，ie．，n large enough and $J$ not too large）the represen－ tation
$\qquad$
where $\tan (J)=2 J(J+1)$ ．Thus exchange acts to transform the $B T$ and $T B$ states entering a given D FS into linear com binations of one another，while leaving invariant the $B B$ and $T T$ states．

Let us now consider the action ofsu（ $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{J}} \quad 1=2$ ）from $\mathrm{DFS}_{\mathrm{n}} \quad 1(\mathrm{~J} \quad 1=2)$［se F ig．（C 2）］． It acts on D FS $S_{n}\left(\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{J} & 1) \text { and DFS }(\mathrm{J}) \text { sim ultaneously．H ow ever，since the } T \text {－states of }\end{array}\right.$ $D F S_{n}(J \quad 1)$ and the $B$－states of DFS $(J)$ share the same set of quantum num bers $f J_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} 19$ ，the action of the $s u\left(n_{J} \quad 1=2\right)$ operators is identical on these two sets of states．
$W$ e rst dealw th the case where the num ber of $\operatorname{T} T$－states ofD $F S_{n}(J)$ is greater than 1．A s can be inferred from $F$ ig．（C．1），this condition corresponds to $J<n=2 \quad 1$ and $n>4$ ．W ew ill separately dealw ith the $J=n=21$ case at the end of the proof． Let jai and pi be any two orthogonal BT－states of $\mathrm{FFS}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{J})$（i．e．，states di ering only by the paths on the rst $n \quad 2$ qubits）．Corresponding to these are $f ; j^{0} i ; j b^{0} i g$ ： a pair of orthogonalBT－states of D FS $S_{n}(J)$ ．O ne of the elem ents in $s u\left(n_{J} \quad 1=2\right)$ is the traceless operator $C=$ jaihaj joihbj，which we have at our disposal by the induction hypothesis．Consider $\left.i \mathbb{E}_{n ; n} ; C\right]$ ：since $E_{n, n} 1$ acts as identity on $B B$ states，even though $C$ has an action on $\operatorname{DFS}_{n}(J \quad 1)$ the commutator acting on the BB states of $D F S_{n}(J \quad 1)$ vanishes．The action of $\left.i \mathbb{E}_{n ; n} 1 ; C\right]$ on the BT and TB states can be
calculated by observing, using Eq. (C.11), that the $m$ atrix representations of $C$ and


This yields:

Now let jci be a TT-state ofD $\mathrm{FS}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{J})$. Such a state alw ays exists unless $\mathrm{J}=\mathrm{n}=2 \quad 1$,
 in $s u\left(n_{J+1=2}\right)$. It follow $s$ that:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.X_{a a^{0}} \frac{1}{\sin (J)} i\left[i \mathbb{E}_{n ; n} \quad 1 ; C\right] ; D\right]=\dot{a}^{2} i^{0} j+\dot{\beta}{ }^{0} i h a j ; \tag{C.14}
\end{equation*}
$$

acts like an encoded x on $\dot{\mathrm{A} i}$ and $\dot{\mathfrak{j}} \mathrm{O} \mathrm{i}$ and annihilates all other states. Further, one can im plem ent the com $m$ utator
which acts like an encoded $y$ on $\dot{\beta} i$ and $\dot{\beta}^{0} i$. Finally, one can construct $Z_{\text {aa }}=$
 validly (using only exchange Ham iltonians) perform su (2) operations between j̉i, a speci c B-state and $\dot{j}{ }^{0}{ }^{i}$, its corresponding $T$-state, on D FS $S_{n}(J)$ only.

Extending the su (2)'s
W e now show that by using the operation of conjugation by a unitary we can construct su (2) betw een any two B and $T$-states. To se this recalleq. (5.53), which allow s one to take a H am iltonian H and tum it via conjugation by a unitary gate into the new H am iltonian $\mathrm{H}_{\mathrm{e}}=\mathrm{UH} \mathrm{U}^{\mathrm{y}}$. By the induction hypothesis we have at our disposal every SU gate which acts on the $T$-states of DFS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}$ ( J ) [and sim ultaneously acts on the $B$-states ofD $\left.F S_{n}(J+1)\right]$ and also every $S U$ gate which acts on the $B$-states ofD $F S_{n}(J)$ [and sim ultaneously acts on the $T$-states ofD $F S_{n}\left(\begin{array}{ll}\mathrm{J} & 1) \text { ]. A bove we have }\end{array}\right.$ shown how to construct $X, Y$, and Z operators betw een speci c T-and B-states:

[^7]
 where $O$ is an operator which acts on a DFS other than DFS $S_{n}(J)$ (included to $m$ ake $P_{i}{ }_{i}$ an $S U$ operator). It is smple to verify that
 on DFS $\mathrm{n}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{J}), \mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i} 0_{i}} \mathrm{w}$ ill also only act on the sam e DFS. Sim ilarly one can construct

$z$ on $\ddot{j} i i$ and $\ddot{i} i$. . T hus we have shown that one can im plem ent every su (2) between any two $T$ - and B-states in DFS $(J)$. Each of these su (2) operations is perform ed independently on D F $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{J})$.

M ixing $T$ - and $B$-States
N ext we use a Lem m a proved in A ppendix D :
$M$ ixing Lemma: $G$ iven is a $H$ ilbert space $H=H_{1} \quad H_{2}$ where dim $H_{j}=n_{j}$. Let $f \ddot{\mu}_{1} i g$ and $f \ddot{\mu}_{2} i g$ be orthonom al bases for $H_{1}$ and $\mathrm{H}_{2}$ respectively. If one can implem ent the operators $X_{i_{1} i_{2}}=\ddot{\mu}_{1} i h i_{2} j+\ddot{\mu}_{2} i h i_{1} j Y_{i_{1} i_{2}}=i \ddot{\mu}_{1} i h_{2} j \quad i \not{ }_{i} i h i_{1} j$ and $Z_{i_{1} i_{2}}=\ddot{\ddot{H}}_{1} i h i_{1} j \quad \ddot{\#}_{\#}$ ihi $_{2} j$ then one can im plem ent su $\left(n_{1}+n_{2}\right)$ on $H$.

A bove we have explicitly shown that we can obtain every $\mathrm{X}_{\mathrm{i}_{1} \mathrm{i}_{2}}, \mathrm{Y}_{\mathrm{i}_{1} \mathrm{i}_{2}}$, and $\mathrm{Z}_{\mathrm{i}_{1} \mathrm{i}_{2}}$ acting independently on D FS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{J})$. T hus direct application of the M ixing Lem m a tells us that we can perform $s u\left(n_{J}\right)$ independently on this DFS.

Special case of $J=n=2 \quad 1: W$ e have neglected $D F S_{n}(n=21)$ because it did not contain two di erent BT-states (nor a T T) state. The dim ension ofthis D FS is n 1. We now show how to perform su ( $n$ 1) on this DFS using the fact that we have already established su $\left(n_{J=n=2} \quad 2\right)$ on $D F S_{n}\left(\begin{array}{ll}n=2 & 2\end{array}\right)$. First, note that by the induction hypothesis we can perform $\operatorname{su}\left(n_{J=n=2} \quad 3=2\right)$ independently on $D F S_{n} \quad 1(n=2 \quad 3=2)$. A s above, this action sim ultaneously a ectsDFS $S_{n}\left(\begin{array}{ll}n=2 & 1) \text { and } D F S_{n}\left(\begin{array}{ll}n=2 & 2\end{array}\right) \text {. H ow ever, }\end{array}\right.$ since we can perform $s u\left(n_{J=n=2} \quad 2\right)$ on $D F S_{n}\left(\begin{array}{ll}n=2 & 2\end{array}\right)$, we can subtract out the action
 $B$-states ofD $F S_{n}\left(\begin{array}{ll}n=2 & 1) \text {. But the exchange operator } E_{n ; n} \quad 1 \text { acts to } m \text { ix the } B \text {-states }\end{array}\right.$ w ith the single $T$-state of $\operatorname{FS}_{n}(n=21)$. Thus we can construct an su (2) algebra between that single-T state and a single B-state in a $m$ anner directly analogous to the above proof for $J<n=2 \quad 1$. Finally, by the Enlarging Lem $m$ a it follow $s$ that we can obtain su $\left(\begin{array}{ll}n & 1) \text { on DFS }(n=2\end{array} 1\right)$.

This concludes the proof that the exchange interaction is independently universal on each of the di erent strong-collective-decoherence D FSs.


Figure C.1: G raphical representation of D FS states for strong collective decoherence $T$ he horizontal axis is the num ber of qubits, $n$, just as in $F$ igure 1 for w eak collective decoherence. The vertical axis is now the total angular $m$ om entum $J$ obtained by sum $m$ ing angular $m$ om enta of $n$ spin $1 / 2$ particles representing the $n$ qubit, rather than just the $z$-com ponent of this. The DFSs are denoted by DFS $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{n}}(\mathrm{J})$ as before. Each state in the D FS is represented by a pathw ay from the origin along the arrow S as indicated. The insert show sthe $m$ atrix structure of operators acting on $\mathrm{DS}_{6}(1)$, given in term sof T T, TB, BT, and BB-states.


Figure C 2: Schem e for visualizing the inductive proof of universal com putation using only the exchange H am iltonian
 on DFS $S_{n}(J)$ via DFS ${ }_{n}$ (J 1=2). See text in Section C 2 for details.

## A ppendix D

## Lem $m$ as and results for the collective universality proofs

H ere we collect som e lem m as and results which are used in the universality proofs for collective decoherence D FSs.

## D.1 M axim al-m J States of the Strong Collective D ecoherence D FS

W e show how to recursively express the $n$-particle total spin- states in term s of (n 1)-particle states. Let us focus on D F $\mathrm{S}_{\mathrm{h}}(\mathrm{J})$ and in particular on them axim alm $J$ state in it:

$$
\begin{equation*}
j \text { i }=j_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 1 ; J ; m_{J}=J i: \tag{D.1}
\end{equation*}
$$

In general ( $J \in 0 ; n=2$ ) there are two kinds of states: bottom ( $j i_{B}$ ) and top ( $j i_{T}$ ) ones. The angularm om entum addition rule that $m$ ust be satis ed for adding a single spin $-\frac{1}{2}$ particle is that

$$
m_{J_{n} 1} \frac{1}{2}=m_{J}:
$$

$T$ he $B$-state com es from adding a particle to them axim alm ${ }_{J}$ state in D F $S_{n} \quad 1(J \quad 1=2)$, which is:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\beta i=j_{1} ;::: ; \mathcal{J}_{n} \quad 2 ; \mathcal{J} \quad \frac{1}{2} ; m_{J_{n}}=J \quad \frac{1}{2} i: \tag{D2}
\end{equation*}
$$

There is only one way to go from $B i$ to $j i_{B}$, nam ely to add $1=2$ to $m_{J_{n} 1}=J \quad \frac{1}{2}$ in order to obtain $\mathrm{m}_{\mathrm{J}}=\mathrm{J}$. T hus

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i_{B}=\beta i \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i ; \tag{D3}
\end{equation*}
$$

where $\frac{1}{5} ; \frac{1}{2} i$ is the single-particle spin-up state. The situation is di erent for the T -state, which is constructed by adding a particle to

$$
\begin{equation*}
\text { 打 } i=j J_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 2 ; J+\frac{1}{2} ; m_{J_{n} 1}=J \quad \frac{1}{2} i: \tag{D.4}
\end{equation*}
$$

These two possibilities give:

$$
\begin{equation*}
j i_{T}=j+i \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i+\quad j \quad i j \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i \text { : } \tag{D.5}
\end{equation*}
$$

To nd the coe cients and , we use the collective raising operator $S_{+}=S_{x}+$ iS $_{y}$, where we recall that $s^{(k)}=\frac{1}{2}^{P} \underset{i=1}{k}{ }^{i}$. Since $j i$ is a maxim alm $J$ state it is annihilated by $S_{+} \quad S^{(n)}$. Sim ilarly, $\mathbb{T}_{+} i$ is annihilated by $S_{+}^{(n)}{ }^{1)}$. Therefore, since $S_{+}=S_{+}^{(n)}+\frac{1}{2} \xrightarrow{\mathrm{n}}$ :

$$
\begin{aligned}
S_{+}+i T^{\prime}+\frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i & =j T+i \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i \\
S_{+} j T i \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i & =p \frac{1}{2 J+1}-i+i \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i ;
\end{aligned}
$$

where in the second line we used the elem entary raising operator form ula $J_{+} \ddot{j} ; \mathrm{m} i=$ $[j(j+1) \quad m(m+1)]^{j=2}$ jj; $m+1 i w$ ith $j=J+\frac{1}{2}$ and $m=J \quad \frac{1}{2}$. Application of $S_{+}$ to Eq. (D .5) thus yields:

$$
\begin{equation*}
+\mathrm{P} \overline{2 \mathrm{~J}+1}=0: \tag{D.6}
\end{equation*}
$$

Hence, up to an anbitrary phase choice, we nd that

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\quad \frac{s}{2 J+1} \frac{p}{2 J+2} \frac{1}{2 J+2}: \tag{D.7}
\end{equation*}
$$

The special cases of $J=0 ; n=2$ di er only in that the corresponding D F Ss support just T - and B-states, respectively. T he calculation of the coe cients, therefore, rem ains the sam e.

In a sim ilarm anner one can carry the calculation one particle deeper. D oing this we nd for the $m$ axim alm $J$ states (provided they exist):

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i \frac{1}{2} ; \quad \frac{1}{2} i+\frac{1}{j} ; \quad \frac{1}{2} i j \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i
\end{aligned}
$$



$$
=\quad \frac{s}{\frac{2 J+1}{2 J+2}} \dot{j} J_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} 3 i J ; m_{J_{n}}=J i j \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i j \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i
$$

$$
+\frac{1}{(2 J+2)(2 J+1)} j_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 3 i J ; m_{J_{n}}=J i j \frac{1}{2} ; \quad \frac{1}{2} i j \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i
$$

$$
+\frac{\mathrm{s}}{\frac{2 J}{(2 J+1)(2 J+2)}} j_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 3 ; J ; m_{J_{n}}=J \quad 1 i \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i j \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i
$$


$=\quad \frac{\mathrm{s}}{\frac{2 J}{2 J+1}} j J_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 3 ; J_{j} m_{J_{n}}=J i j \frac{1}{2} ; \quad \frac{1}{2} i \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i$
$+p \frac{1}{2 J+1} j_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 3 i J^{\prime} m_{J_{n}}=J \quad 1 i \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i j \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i$
BBi $\quad j_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 3 \boldsymbol{J} \quad 1 ; J \quad \frac{1}{2} ; J_{j} m_{J}=J i$

$$
\begin{equation*}
=\quad j J_{1} ;::: ; J_{n} \quad 3 ; J \quad 1 ; m_{J_{n} 2}=J \quad 1 i \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i j \frac{1}{2} ; \frac{1}{2} i: \tag{D.8}
\end{equation*}
$$

C aution $m$ ust be exercised in using these expressions near the boundary of Table (8 2), where som e of the states $m$ ay not exist.

## D . 2 Enlarging Lem ma

Let H be a H ilbert space of dim ension $d$ and let $\ddot{\text { il }} 2 \mathrm{H}$. A ssume we are given a set of $H$ am iltonians $H_{1}$ that generates su ( $\mathrm{d} \quad 1$ ) on the subspace of $H$ that does not contain $\ddot{\mu}$ i, and another set $H_{2}$ that generates su (2) on the subspace of H spanned by
 su (d) on $H$ under closure as a Lie-algebra.

P roof: W e explicitly construct the Lie-algebra su (d) w ith the given $H$ am iltonians. Let $\mathrm{H}^{\sim} \quad \mathrm{H}$ be the d 1 dim ensional subspace $H$ acts on. Let us show that we can generate su (2) between ki $2 \mathrm{H}^{\sim}$ and $\mathrm{j} i$.


$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.Y_{i k} \quad i \mathbb{X}_{j k} ; X_{i j}\right]=\quad i \nexists i h k j+i j k i h i j \tag{D.9}
\end{equation*}
$$

acts as y on the states 7 ji ; ki. Sim ilarly

$$
\begin{equation*}
X_{i k} \quad i\left[Y_{i j} ; X_{j k}\right]=\ddot{\mu i h k} j+j \text { kihij } \tag{D.10}
\end{equation*}
$$

yields $x$ on the space spanned by $\ddot{j i} ; \mathrm{jki}$. These two operations generate su (2) on
 gives the desired result together w ith the observation that there we only use elem ents in $\left.\mathbb{H}_{1} ; \mathrm{H}_{2}\right]$.

## D . 3 M ixing Lem ma

C onsider the division of an $n$ dim ensional H ibert space H into a direct sum of two subspaces $H_{1} \quad H_{2}$ of dim ensions $n_{1}$ and $n_{2}$ respectively. Suppose that $\ddot{\mu}_{n} i$ is an orthonorm albasis for $H_{n}$. Then the $L$ ie algebras generated by $X_{i_{1} ; i_{2}}=\ddot{\mu}_{1} i_{i i_{2}} j+$


Proof: W e explicitly construct the elem ents of su $(n)$. C onsider $\left.i X_{i_{1} ; i_{2}} ; Y_{j_{1} ; j_{2}}\right]$. $C$ learly, if $i_{1} \in i_{2} j_{1} \in j_{2}$ this equals zero and if $i_{1}=j_{1}$ and $i_{2}=j_{2}$ then this commutator is $Z_{i_{1} ; i_{2}}$. If, however, $i_{1}=j_{1}$ and $i_{2} j_{2}$ this becom es

Sím ilarly:

$$
\begin{equation*}
\left.i \mathbb{X}_{i_{1} ; i_{2}} ; Y_{j_{1} ; i_{2}}\right]=\ddot{\mu}_{1} i h j_{j_{1}} j+\ddot{j}_{1} i h i_{1} j: \tag{D.12}
\end{equation*}
$$



$$
\begin{align*}
& i\left[X_{i_{1} ; i_{2}} ; X_{j_{1} ; i_{2}}\right]=i j_{1} i h j_{1} j \quad i j{ }_{j}{ }_{i} h_{1} j_{1}: \tag{D.13}
\end{align*}
$$

Thus every $i{ }_{j} \ddot{H}_{k} i h_{i} j \quad i j j_{j} i_{i} j$ is in the Lie algebra. Taking the com $m$ utator of these
 can be decom posed into a sum of overlapping su (2)'s[36], the Lie algebra is the entire su ( $n$ ), as claím ed.

## A ppendix E

## C ontrolled-phase on the four qubit strong collective decoherence D F S

In this A ppendix we provide an analytically derived gate sequence for perform ing a controlled-phase betw een the two four qubit strong collective decoherence D FSs. $T$ his sequence of operations was derived with the guidance of two insights. The rst insight com es from Eq. (D.8). This equation describes how nearest neighbor exchange interactions act nontrivially to m ix only B T and TB pathways. The second insight com es that executing $S^{[k]}{ }^{2}$ can be executed as a sum of exchanges on the rst $k$ qubit and this can be used to subtract out the diagonal elem ent of Eq. (D.8) on the TB and B T pathways. This allows us to construct evolutionswhich ip between the di erent basis states of the strong D FS basis (recall Section 8.6.1).

In $F$ igure $E$ we present the evolution of tw o con joined four qubit strong collective decoherence D F Ss under that action of the follow ing operators

$$
\begin{aligned}
& U_{1}=\exp _{"}^{\stackrel{i}{P}}{ }_{\overline{3}} E_{45}+\frac{1}{2}\left(E_{12}+E_{13}+E_{14}+E_{23}+E_{24}+E_{34}\right) \\
& \mathrm{U}_{2}=\exp \frac{\frac{1}{\mathrm{P}}}{{ }_{"} \overline{2}} \quad 3 \mathrm{E}_{56} \quad \frac{2}{3}\left(\mathrm{E}_{68}+\mathrm{E}_{68}+\mathrm{E}_{78}\right) \\
& \left.U_{3}=\exp { }_{n}^{{ }_{4}^{p}} \underset{\#}{\frac{i}{2}} \quad 3 \mathrm{E}_{34} \quad \frac{2}{3} \underset{\#}{\left(\mathrm{E}_{12}\right.}+\mathrm{E}_{13}+\mathrm{E}_{32}\right) \\
& \mathrm{U}_{4}=\exp {\underset{\mathrm{P}}{\overline{3}}}_{\frac{\mathrm{i}}{}} \mathrm{E}_{23}+\frac{1}{2} \mathrm{E}_{12} \text { \# } \\
& U_{5}=\exp \frac{\dot{i}}{\overline{3}} E_{67}+\frac{1}{2} E_{78} \text {; ; }
\end{aligned}
$$

and also the slightly $m$ ore $m$ ysterious

$$
U_{A}=\exp \quad \frac{i}{2} \cos ^{1} \quad \frac{1}{3} E_{45}
$$

$$
\begin{align*}
& U_{B}=\exp \frac{i}{2}\left(E_{12}+E_{13}+E_{14}+E_{23}+E_{24}+E_{34}\right) \\
& U_{6}=U_{A} U_{B} U_{A}^{Y} U_{B}^{Y} U_{A} U_{B} U_{A}^{Y} U_{B}^{Y}: \tag{E.1}
\end{align*}
$$

In $F$ igure $E$ we dem onstrate the result of these gates on the originald $F$ S states. This gure is accurate up to single qubit phases (ie. phases which can be generated by single qubit rotations). The rst ve $U_{i}$ acts imply to $m$ anipulate the encoded basis states to new strong DFS basis states. The nalU 6 was discovered by noting that after the basis states have been transferred to the indicated strong D F S basis states, $\mathrm{E}_{45}$ acts to m ix two of these basis states w ith other strong DFS basis states and $\mathrm{E}_{12}+\mathrm{E}_{13}+\mathrm{E}_{14}+\mathrm{E}_{23}+\mathrm{E}_{24}+\mathrm{E}_{34}$ acts as a phase on these strong basis states.

In order to lim it the total num ber of gates, one can further note that $\mathrm{U}_{2}$ and $\mathrm{U}_{3}$ can be executed at the sam e tim e as can $U_{4}$ and $U_{5}$ because these gates operate on com pletely separate qubits. Thus in $F$ igure $E$ we present the layout for this quantum circuit and from this diagram it becom es obvious that $\mathrm{U}_{4}$ is not needed in the gate array.


Figure E. 1: E ncoded controlled-phase gate sequence


Figure E 2: C ontrolled-phase diagram dem onstrating the usefiulness of the strong col lective decoherence basis


[^0]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~B}$ lessed be the com putationaluniverse w hich allow $s$ th is very thesis [7] to be typed onto a portable com puter in the com fort of a sorted array of pleasant locations.

[^1]:    ${ }^{2}$ P osing a signi cant retention problem for graduate physics program s!

[^2]:    ${ }^{1}$ An unfortunate state of nom enclature exists as to the use of the word decoherence. Early researchers $[222,223]$ used the word decoherence to refer to operations which destroyed quantum coherences and transferred inform ation to the environm ent in a very speci c manner. W th the developm ent of quantum com putation $m$ any authons loosened the use of this w ord to refer to any system -environm ent couplings, not just those which destroy coherence in a speci c basis or involve speci $c$ transfer of inform ation from the system to the environm ent. In this thesis we w ill use the word decoherence to refer to such generic system -environm ent couplings.

[^3]:    ${ }^{1}$ A lan Turing in fact rediscovered the Zeno paradox in quantum $m$ echanics[102].

[^4]:    ${ }^{1}$ Since $T_{23}^{\ell}$ annihilates every state except those that are $\mathcal{j 1} 1$ i over qubits 2 and 3, nam ely $j 011 i 2$ $\mathrm{DFS}_{3}(1)$ and $111 i 2 \mathrm{DFS}_{3}(3)$, the only non-zero blocks in its $m$ atrix are

    $$
    \mathrm{M} \quad{ }_{3}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{23}^{Q}\right)=1 ; \quad \mathrm{M} \quad{ }_{1}\left(\mathrm{~T}_{23}^{Q}\right)=@^{1} \begin{array}{llll}
    0 & & & 1 \\
    & 0 & 0 & A
    \end{array}:
    $$

[^5]:    ${ }^{2}$ The argum ent thus far closely parallels the discussion above show ing how to generate an independent su (2) on the fj011i; 101 ig subspace ofD $E S_{3}(1)$, starting from the $s u(2)$ on DFS $S_{2}(0)$ and $T{ }_{23}$.

[^6]:    

[^7]:    ${ }^{1} \mathrm{~W}$ e need to subtract jcihcj in order to obtain a traceless operator.

