



This is the accepted manuscript made available via CHORUS. The article has been published as:

Adiabatic coherent control in the anharmonic ion trap: Proposal for the vibrational two-qubit system

Lei Wang and Dmitri Babikov

Phys. Rev. A **83**, 052319 — Published 20 May 2011

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.83.052319](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.83.052319)

Adiabatic Coherent Control in the Anharmonic Ion Trap:

Proposal for the Vibrational Two-Qubit System

Lei Wang and Dmitri Babikov¹

Chemistry Department, Marquette University, PO Box 1881, Milwaukee, Wisconsin, 53201

Abstract

A method for encoding a multi-qubit system into the quantized motional/vibrational states of ion-string in an anharmonic linear trap is proposed. Control over this system is achieved by applying oscillatory electric fields (RF) shaped optimally for desired state-to-state transitions. Anharmonicity of the vibrational spectrum of the system plays key role in this approach to the control and quantum computation, since it allows resolving different state-to-state transitions and addressing them selectively. The anharmonic trap architecture proposed earlier [Phys. Rev. A, 83, 022305 (2011)] is explored here and the optimal control theory is used to derive pulses for a set of universal quantum gates. Accurate choice of pulse parameters allows deriving gates that are both accurate and simple. Practical realization of this approach seems to be within the reach of today's technology.

¹ Corresponding author: Dmitri.Babikov@mu.edu

1. Introduction

A string of atomic ions trapped and cooled in a linear Paul trap represents a man-made quantum system well isolated from the environment. Favorable properties of this system, such as long coherence time and possibility of fast and reliable manipulations with its quantum states, make it suitable for practical realization of quantum computation. In the original proposal of Cirac and Zoller [1], qubits are encoded into electronic states of ions and quantum gates are achieved by laser excitation of ions, dependent on their motional eigenstate. The motional mode of multiple ions in the trapping potential is used to create entanglement. Realization of this proposal in the experiment [2] led to many fascinating developments and explosive growth of the field [3-17].

While the architecture of Cirac and Zoller relies mostly on the electronic states of *individual* ions, the quantized states of *collective* vibrational motion of ions along the trap are also employed. These states represent quantized eigenstates and form the normal-mode progressions (somewhat similar to the vibrational states of naturally occurring molecules). In a standard setup the trapping potential is harmonic (quadratic) and the vibrational states are all equidistant, like the states of multi-dimensional harmonic oscillator. Frequencies of transitions between these states are usually in the few MHz region, but selective excitation/control of these states using the RF fields is impossible, because all state-to-state transitions of the “ladder” have the same frequency and occur simultaneously. In a standard setup of Cirac and Zoller, the selectivity is achieved by laser excitation from different vibrational states into the excited electronic state.

In the earlier publications [18, 19] we explored a new route for direct adiabatic control of the vibrational states of ions in a trap. This approach might help to implement the purely

vibrational qubits and gates. The idea is to introduce anharmonicity into the trapping potential in order to alter the spectrum of system, which should allow addressing the vibrational states of ions in trap selectively, through RF fields of appropriate frequency, amplitude, duration and phase. In this method of control all ions remain in the ground electronic state and no individual addressing of ions is necessary. Phase of vibrational motion can also be controlled, which makes this approach suitable for quantum computation. The time-varying control fields can be designed using the optimal control theory (or the feedback loop in the experiment) in order to optimize the desired control tasks, such as state-to-state transitions, qubit flips, quantum gates, etc.

In Refs. [18, 19] we showed that vibrational states of single ion can be easily controlled this way if *quartic* potential term is introduced in addition to the *quadratic* trapping potential. We carried out the computational studies/modeling of one qubit encoded into the vibrational states of single $^{111}\text{Cd}^+$ ion in such anharmonic trap, with $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ states of the qubit being the ground and first excited vibrational states of the system, respectively. The optimal control theory was employed in order to “shape” the control pulses for major quantum gates. Anharmonicity of the spectrum was characterized by the anharmonicity parameter, Δ , and it was found that when the value of Δ reaches roughly 1% of the frequency ($\Omega/2\pi = 2.77$ MHz) a very accurate control is possible by simple shaped pulses. Durations of predicted pulses was ten microsecond; the field amplitudes were on the order of 0.1 V/m. It was concluded that practical realization of such control scenario is within the reach of today’s technology.

Anharmonicity of spectrum plays key role in this method of control [18-24], but creating anharmonicities in the vibrational spectrum of a multiple-ion system appears to be less trivial. In the first paper of this series, Ref. [19], we considered a three-ion system in a linear trap arrangement and tried to determine what functional form of the trapping potential is needed in

order to create anharmonicities sufficient for the control (e.g., $\Delta \sim 1\%\Omega$). It was found that, in the three-ion case, adding quartic terms to the quadratic trapping potential doesn't permit to achieve the necessary amount of vibrational anharmonicity. Even if a purely quartic (strongly anharmonic) trapping potential is used, the normal mode progressions of vibrational states remain nearly harmonic (e.g., $\Delta \sim 0.001\%\Omega$). This surprising result was explained by deformation of the normal vibration modes in non-harmonic multi-dimensional potentials [19].

Further attempts to identify a three-ion system with a sufficiently anharmonic vibrational spectrum led us into consideration of the trapping potential of the following form:

$$U(z) = -\alpha z^2 + \beta z^4, \quad (1)$$

where α and β are two positive numbers. Note that the quadratic term in Eq. (1) is inverted and represents a repulsive, non-trapping contribution. By tuning the values of parameters α and β in Eq. (1) one can create a very flat strongly anharmonic trap. The shape of such potential, the equilibrium positions of three ions and the equilibrium energy of the system are shown in Fig. 1(a). The values of α and β are chosen such that the quadratic term creates a small repulsive “hill” in a trapping well, dominated by the quartic term. Energy of the system is well above the top of the hill. Analysis of the normal vibration modes in such trap revealed very significant anharmonicities. The center-of-mass motion mode is the most anharmonic ($\Delta \sim 1\%\Omega$), while the symmetric stretching and the asymmetric stretching modes are less anharmonic. It was concluded that this system is a promising candidate for implementing the direct adiabatic control scenario. Note that creating the trapping potentials such as in Eq. (1) is quite feasible in the experiment [3].

In this paper, the second paper of the series, we study further the system of three ions in a trap of Eq. (1), Fig. 1(a), with a focus on controllability issues, and explore computationally the

following opportunity. We propose to create a purely vibrational two-qubit system by encoding the first (control) qubit into the states of less anharmonic asymmetric stretching vibration mode, while the second qubit is encoded into the states of more anharmonic center-of-mass motion mode. The third mode of this system, symmetric stretching, appears to be dark and should not interfere. Using tools of the optimal control theory we carry out modeling of this two-qubit system and derive RF fields for direct adiabatic control of state-to-state transitions. Pulses for the major quantum gates are obtained and properties of the qubit transformations in this system are explored.

This paper is organized as follows: in Section 2 we review our theoretical framework, including Hamiltonian of the system, the method of calculating vibrational states in an anharmonic potential, the state-to-state transition moment matrix, and the optimal control theory. Optimization of pulses for gates NOT, CNOT and Hadamard transform is presented in Sec. 3. Major findings are summarized as Conclusions in Sec. 4.

2. Theoretical framework

2.a. Eigenstates of the System

For a system of three ions in a linear Paul trap the vibrational Hamiltonian is [3, 19]:

$$H_{\text{trap}} = T + V_{\text{trap}} + V_{\text{coulomb}} - V^{\text{eq}}. \quad (2)$$

Here the kinetic energy operator is:

$$T = -\frac{1}{2m_1} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_1^2} - \frac{1}{2m_2} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_2^2} - \frac{1}{2m_3} \frac{\partial^2}{\partial z_3^2}, \quad (3)$$

the potential energy of ions in a trap is:

$$V_{\text{trap}} = q_1 U(z_1) + q_2 U(z_2) + q_3 U(z_3), \quad (4)$$

the Coulomb repulsion energy is:

$$V_{\text{coulomb}} = \frac{q_1 q_2}{|z_2 - z_1|} + \frac{q_1 q_3}{|z_3 - z_1|} + \frac{q_2 q_3}{|z_3 - z_2|}, \quad (5)$$

and V^{eq} is a constant energy shift described below. A set of three Cartesian coordinates (z_1, z_2, z_3) is used to describe positions of three ions along the axis of linear trap. The radial motion of ions in a trap is considered to be sufficiently decoupled from the axial motion and is not included in the model. This is a very reasonable approximation for a flat trap with small number of ions. In this work we assume that all ions are equivalent and use the same masses and charges: $m_n = m = 111$ a.m.u., the mass of $^{111}\text{Cd}^+$ ion, and $q_n = q = +1e$, its electric charge. The trapping potential $U(z)$ of Eq. (1) is employed. The values of coefficients α and β , as suggested in the previous work, are $\alpha = 0.466 \text{ MHz}/a_0^2$ and $\beta = 3.912 \times 10^{-8} \text{ MHz}/a_0^4$. The energy shift by $V^{\text{eq}}/2\pi = 5.359 \times 10^5 \text{ MHz}$ in Eq. (2) is used for convenience. Its value represents the equilibrium (minimum) energy of the system:

$$V^{\text{eq}} = V_{\text{trap}}(z_1^{\text{eq}}, z_2^{\text{eq}}, z_3^{\text{eq}}) + V_{\text{coulomb}}(z_1^{\text{eq}}, z_2^{\text{eq}}, z_3^{\text{eq}}). \quad (6)$$

The equilibrium positions of ions $(z_1^{\text{eq}}, z_2^{\text{eq}}, z_3^{\text{eq}})$ were determined numerically using the Newton-Raphson method [19]: $z_1^{\text{eq}} = -2.862 \times 10^3 a_0$, $z_2^{\text{eq}} \approx 0$ and $z_3^{\text{eq}} = 2.862 \times 10^3 a_0$.

The time independent Schrödinger equation for this system is solved numerically. All details can be found in Ref. [19]; only a brief summary is given here. The Hamiltonian of Eq. (2) is transformed from the Cartesian coordinates (z_1, z_2, z_3) to the normal mode “unscaled” coordinates $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3)$ by:

$$\begin{pmatrix} z_1 \\ z_2 \\ z_3 \end{pmatrix} = \mathbf{A} \begin{pmatrix} (\omega_1/\omega_1)\zeta_1 \\ (\omega_1/\omega_2)\zeta_2 \\ (\omega_1/\omega_3)\zeta_3 \end{pmatrix} + \begin{pmatrix} z_1^{eq} \\ z_2^{eq} \\ z_3^{eq} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (7)$$

using the matrix of normal mode eigenvectors:

$$\mathbf{A} = \begin{pmatrix} a_{11} & a_{12} & a_{13} \\ a_{21} & a_{22} & a_{23} \\ a_{31} & a_{32} & a_{33} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (8)$$

and the normal mode frequencies $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$, derived from the normal mode analysis at the minimum energy point $(z_1^{eq}, z_2^{eq}, z_3^{eq})$. Wave function of the system is expressed in these coordinates, $\psi_v(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3)$, and is expanded in terms of the three-dimensional direct-product basis set of one-dimensional harmonic oscillator functions in ζ_1 , ζ_2 and ζ_3 :

$$\psi_v(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3) = \sum_{ijk} C_{v_{ijk}} \phi_i(\zeta_1) \phi_j(\zeta_2) \phi_k(\zeta_3). \quad (9)$$

An efficient basis set is constructed using frequencies $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$ and effective masses (μ_1, μ_2, μ_3) of the normal modes. Numerical diagonalization of the Hamiltonian matrix in this basis set gives accurate eigenvalues and eigenfunctions. These were tabulated and are available from Ref. [19]. Analysis of wave functions allowed to assign the normal mode quantum numbers (v_1, v_2, v_3) to these states and fit the spectrum by a multi-dimensional Dunham formula [25]. Coefficients of the fit gave us values of frequencies of the system [19]:

$$\begin{aligned} \Omega_1/2\pi &= 2.738 \text{ MHz}, \\ \Omega_2/2\pi &= 54.580 \text{ MHz}, \\ \Omega_3/2\pi &= 54.886 \text{ MHz}, \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and the following set of (intra-)mode anharmonicities:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_1/2\pi &= -4.361 \times 10^{-2} \text{ MHz}, \\
\Delta_2/2\pi &= 1.106 \times 10^{-3} \text{ MHz}, \\
\Delta_3/2\pi &= -1.371 \times 10^{-3} \text{ MHz},
\end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

for the three normal vibration modes. The inter-mode anharmonicities (couplings) are also important for the control; their values are:

$$\begin{aligned}
\Delta_{13}/2\pi &= -4.871 \times 10^{-3} \text{ MHz}, \\
\Delta_{12}/2\pi &= -1.102 \times 10^{-2} \text{ MHz}, \\
\Delta_{23}/2\pi &= 3.872 \times 10^{-2} \text{ MHz}.
\end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

From these results we see that Mode 1, the center-of-mass motion mode, is the most anharmonic ($\Delta_1 = 1.6\% \Omega_1$). We expect this mode to be the easiest to control and, based on this property, we choose to encode states of the main qubit (second qubit) into states of this mode. Mode 3, the asymmetric stretching mode, is considerably less harmonic ($\Delta_3 = 0.003\% \Omega_3$) and would be impossible to control by itself. However, we can try to employ this mode for encoding states of the *control* qubit (first qubit). Note that frequencies of these two modes are very different, 2.738 MHz and 54.886 MHz, which should simplify the control. Although it may look like the frequency of Mode 2, the symmetric stretching mode, is dangerously close to the frequency of Mode 3, it should not be a problem since Mode 2 appears to be dark (see Sec. 2.d. below) and should not interfere.

It is reasonable to choose two lower states (the ground and the first excited vibrational states) of each active mode to represent states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ of the corresponding qubit. So, the following mapping between the vibrational states of the three-ion-string, labeled by three normal mode quantum numbers (v_1, v_2, v_3) , and the four states of the two-qubit system is proposed:

$$\begin{aligned}
|00\rangle &\Leftrightarrow (0,0,0); & |01\rangle &\Leftrightarrow (1,0,0); \\
|10\rangle &\Leftrightarrow (0,0,1); & |11\rangle &\Leftrightarrow (1,0,1).
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

Energies of these states are shown in Fig. 1(b) relative to the classical minimum energy of the system V^{eq} . Note that energy of the ground state (0,0,0) above V^{eq} represents the quantum zero-point energy of the system.

We would like to note that notions of the normal modes are used here for qualitative purposes only, mostly for convenience of discussion. Their frequencies, anharmonicities, and the normal mode quantum numbers are all approximate moieties. In reality we are dealing with exact eigenstates of the system, use numerically accurate values of their energies and wave functions and encode states of the two-qubit system into these exact eigenstates.

2.b. Method of control

In order to control the vibrational states of ions in an anharmonic trap we propose to apply a time-dependent electric field $\mathcal{E}(z,t)$ along the axis of the trap. When this control field is introduced, the full Hamiltonian of the system becomes:

$$H = H_{\text{trap}} + q_1\Phi(z_1,t) + q_2\Phi(z_2,t) + q_3\Phi(z_3,t), \tag{14}$$

where

$$\Phi(z_n,t) = -\int_0^z \mathcal{E}(z_n,t) dz \tag{15}$$

is the electric potential of the control field at the position of each ion. The easiest approach for the control is to create a spatially homogeneous field with the time-dependent amplitude $\mathcal{E}(t)$, which results in a linear control potential with the time-dependent slope, $\Phi(z,t) = -z\mathcal{E}(t)$, and leads to a simple expression for the control Hamiltonian:

$$H = H_{\text{trap}} - (q_1 z_1 + q_2 z_2 + q_3 z_3) \mathcal{E}(t) . \quad (16)$$

For convenience, we introduce the dipole moment function of ions as

$$d(z_1, z_2, z_3) = q_1 z_1 + q_2 z_2 + q_3 z_3 . \quad (17)$$

Using this definition, the control Hamiltonian of Eq. (16) can be rewritten:

$$H = H_{\text{trap}} - \mathcal{E}(t) \cdot d , \quad (18)$$

For the case of three equivalent ions with the charge q , such as the system studied in this work, the dipole moment function is very simple:

$$d(z_1, z_2, z_3) = q(z_1 + z_2 + z_3) . \quad (19)$$

2.c. Optimal Control Theory

The purpose of computational pulse optimization is to derive the time dependence (shape) of the control pulse that permits to achieve the transfer of population from a given initial, ϕ_i , to a chosen final vibrational state, ϕ_f . Time-dependent wave function of the system driven by the pulse is denoted as $\vec{\psi}(t)$ and, ideally, we want to obtain $\vec{\psi}(T) = \phi_f$ starting with $\vec{\psi}(0) = \phi_i$, where T is duration of the pulse. In practice, the measure of success of the control pulse is the value of overlap $\left| \langle \vec{\psi}(T) | \phi_f \rangle \right|^2$ between the actual final wave function and wave function of the target state. The control pulse designed to induce *multiple* state-to-state transitions (e.g., different transitions of the quantum gate) can be assessed by the value of cumulative transition probability defined as:

$$P = \frac{1}{M} \sum_m \left| \langle \vec{\psi}^m(T) | \phi_f^m \rangle \right|^2 . \quad (20)$$

Here the index m labels M transitions we want to optimize simultaneously, $1 \leq m \leq M$. For example, for optimization of the gate NOT we can choose $|0\rangle \rightarrow |1\rangle$ and $|1\rangle \rightarrow |0\rangle$ transitions ($M = 2$) and define $\phi_i^{(1)} = |0\rangle$, $\phi_f^{(1)} = |1\rangle$, and $\phi_i^{(2)} = |1\rangle$, $\phi_f^{(2)} = |0\rangle$, respectively. For more complicated gates we have to include more transitions into the simultaneous optimization procedure. The M transitions chosen for pulse optimization are sometimes called the *training set* [26, 27].

The optimal control field $\mathcal{E}(t)$ is obtained by maximizing a multi-target functional defined as [28]:

$$J = P - \int_0^T \alpha(t) |\mathcal{E}(t)|^2 dt - \sum_m 2 \operatorname{Re} \left\{ \langle \tilde{\psi}^m(T) | \phi_f^m \rangle \int_0^T \langle \tilde{\psi}^m(t) | iH + \frac{\partial}{\partial t} | \tilde{\psi}^m(t) \rangle dt \right\}. \quad (21)$$

The second term in Eq. (21) is included in order to minimize energy of the pulse and constrain its smooth switching on and off. The penalty function $\alpha(t) = \alpha_0/s(t)$, where α_0 is a constant penalty factor and $s(t) = \sin^2(\pi t/T)$ is a smooth envelope function, allows to reduce the field amplitude at the beginning and the end of the pulse. Minimization of the last term in Eq. (21) ensures that evolution of wave function obeys the time-dependent Schrödinger equation. H is Hamiltonian of the system, Eq. (14).

Variations of the functional in Eq. (21) with respect to $\tilde{\psi}^m(t)$, $\tilde{\psi}^m(t)$ and $\mathcal{E}(t)$ leads to:

(i) A set of M Schrödinger equations

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \tilde{\psi}^m(t) = \hat{H} \tilde{\psi}^m(t), \quad \tilde{\psi}^m(0) = \phi_i^m, \quad (22)$$

to propagate M wave functions $\tilde{\psi}^m(t)$ from $t=0$ to $t=T$ independently, each with its own initial state ϕ_i^m as boundary condition;

(ii) A set of M Schrödinger equations

$$i \frac{\partial}{\partial t} \tilde{\psi}^m(t) = \hat{H} \tilde{\psi}^m(t), \quad \tilde{\psi}^m(T) = \phi_f^m, \quad (23)$$

to propagate M wave functions $\tilde{\psi}^m(t)$ from $t = T$ to $t = 0$ (backward in time) each with its own final state ϕ_f^m as boundary condition, and

(iii) One equation for the universal field that drives all these $2M$ transitions:

$$\varepsilon(t) = -\frac{s(t)}{\alpha_0} \text{Im} \sum_m \langle \tilde{\psi}(t) | \tilde{\psi}(t) \rangle \langle \tilde{\psi}(t) | d | \tilde{\psi}(t) \rangle. \quad (24)$$

The field $\varepsilon(t)$ of Eq. (24) is improved iteratively, using information from the forward and backward propagated wave functions $\tilde{\psi}^m(t)$ and $\tilde{\psi}^m(t)$ of Eqs. (22, 23). Note that $2M$ Schrödinger equations in (22) and (23) are coupled only through the field $\varepsilon(t)$ of Eq. (24).

Time-propagation of Schrödinger equation is carried out numerically by expanding wave function over the basis set of system eigenstates (calculated numerically, see Sec. 2.a):

$$\psi(t) = \sum_v a_v(t) e^{-iE_v t} \psi_v, \quad (25)$$

and solving a set of coupled equations for the time-dependent coefficients $a_v(t)$ using forth-order Runge-Kutta method [29].

2.d. Transition Matrix

The integral $\langle \tilde{\psi} | d | \tilde{\psi} \rangle$ in Eq. (24) can be expressed through time-dependent coefficients $a_v(t)$ of expansion (25) and elements of the dipole moment matrix:

$$M_{v,v'} = \langle \psi_v(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3) | d(z_1, z_2, z_3) | \psi_{v'}(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3) \rangle. \quad (26)$$

Note that in this formula the wave functions of eigenstates are expressed, and the integration is carried out, using the normal mode coordinates $(\zeta_1, \zeta_2, \zeta_3)$, while the dipole moment function,

as defined in Eq. (19), is expressed in Cartesian coordinates (z_1, z_2, z_3) . The dipole moment function should be converted into the normal mode coordinates using transformation of Eq. (7):

$$\begin{aligned} d = q(z_1 + z_2 + z_3) &= q \frac{\omega_1}{\omega_1} (a_{11} + a_{21} + a_{31}) \zeta_1 + q \frac{\omega_1}{\omega_2} (a_{12} + a_{22} + a_{32}) \zeta_2 \\ &+ q \frac{\omega_1}{\omega_3} (a_{13} + a_{23} + a_{33}) \zeta_3 + q(z_1^{eq} + z_2^{eq} + z_3^{eq}). \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

Note that for the system of three equivalent ions the last term in Eq. (27) vanishes simply because $z_1^{eq} = -z_3^{eq}$ and $z_2^{eq} = 0$. The symmetric stretching mode, Mode 2, is characterized by $a_{12} = -a_{32}$ and $a_{22} = 0$, which means that the second term in Eq. (27) also vanishes. Thus, the dipole moment function does not depend on ζ_2 at all, which means that Mode 2 is dark. The dependence of $d(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)$ on both ζ_1 and ζ_3 is linear:

$$d(\zeta_1, \zeta_3) = q(a_{11} + a_{21} + a_{31}) \zeta_1 + q \frac{\omega_1}{\omega_3} (a_{13} + a_{23} + a_{33}) \zeta_3. \quad (28)$$

Due to different frequencies and properties of the normal modes eigenvectors, the slope of $d(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)$ for Mode 1 is more than order of magnitude sharper than for Mode 3.

The dipole moment function of Eq. (27) and the wave functions of Eq. (9) are substituted into Eq. (26). Using properties of the basis set functions [30] the integration in Eq. (26) is carried out analytically and elements of the dipole moment matrix are expressed through coefficients $C_{v_{ijk}}$ of the basis set expansion:

$$\begin{aligned} M_{v, v'} &= (a_{11} + a_{21} + a_{31}) q \sum_{ijk} C_{v_{ijk}}^* \sum_{i'j'k'} C_{v'_{i'j'k'}} \frac{(\sqrt{i} \delta_{i, i'+1} + \sqrt{i+1} \delta_{i, i'-1})}{\sqrt{2\mu_1 \omega_1}} \delta_{j, j'} \delta_{k, k'} \\ &+ \frac{\omega_1}{\omega_2} (a_{12} + a_{22} + a_{32}) q \sum_{ijk} C_{v_{ijk}}^* \sum_{i'j'k'} C_{v'_{i'j'k'}} \frac{(\sqrt{j} \delta_{j, j'+1} + \sqrt{j+1} \delta_{j, j'-1})}{\sqrt{2\mu_2 \omega_2}} \delta_{i, i'} \delta_{k, k'} \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + \frac{\omega_1}{\omega_3} (a_{13} + a_{23} + a_{33}) q \sum_{ijk} C_{v_{ijk}}^* \sum_{i'j'k'} C_{v_{i'j'k'}} \frac{(\sqrt{k} \delta_{k,k'+1} + \sqrt{k+1} \delta_{k,k'-1})}{\sqrt{2\mu_3 \omega_3}} \delta_{i,i'} \delta_{j,j'} \\
& + (z_1^{eq} + z_2^{eq} + z_3^{eq}) q \sum_{ijk} C_{v_{ijk}}^* \sum_{i',j',k'} C_{v_{i',j',k'}} \delta_{i,i'} \delta_{j,j'} \delta_{k,k'}.
\end{aligned} \tag{29}$$

Here $(\omega_1, \omega_2, \omega_3)$ are frequencies and (μ_1, μ_2, μ_3) are effective masses of the basis set functions [19], i.e., normal modes of the trap. For the system studied in this work the second and last terms of this sum vanish exactly (due to properties of the dipole moment function, see above) and are given here only for the purpose of generality.

The usual symmetry considerations are applicable to the transition matrix of Eq. (29). The dipole moment function $d(\zeta_1, \zeta_3)$ is an asymmetric (linear) function of both ζ_1 and ζ_3 . Thus, the matrix elements are non-zero only for transitions between states of different symmetries (e.g., symmetric-to-asymmetric states and vice versa), leading to the following selection rules:

$$\Delta v = \pm 1, \pm 3, \pm 5 \text{ etc.}, \tag{30}$$

for both Modes 1 and 3. Since the system is only weakly anharmonic, the $\Delta v = \pm 1$ transitions are much brighter than the $\Delta v = \pm 3, \pm 5$ etc. transitions.

Note that the symmetric stretching mode is dark only in the case when a spatially homogeneous field is used, as assumed in this work. Creating a quadrupole potential would allow controlling the symmetric stretching mode too. This opportunity will be studied theoretically and computationally in the future work.

3. Results and Discussion

It is understood that it may be difficult to create in the experiment the time-varying field $\mathcal{E}(t)$ exactly as recommended by theory, and that the experimental implementation may have some practical constraints not included into our model. Still, it is desirable to have a theoretical benchmark of the approach, before any practical implementation is attempted, in order to see how difficult or easy would it be to implement this method of control.

3.a. Gate NOT on Second Qubit

For this gate the training set of four transitions was chosen as:

$$\text{NOT}|00\rangle \rightarrow |01\rangle, \quad (31)$$

$$\text{NOT}|01\rangle \rightarrow |00\rangle, \quad (32)$$

$$\text{NOT}|10\rangle \rightarrow |11\rangle, \quad (33)$$

$$\text{NOT}|11\rangle \rightarrow |10\rangle. \quad (34)$$

Recall that in our approach the qubits are encoded into *collective* vibration modes, not into individual ions, and the control field is applied to the entire system, not to the individual qubits. For this reason, the state of first qubit should also be reflected in the training set of transitions, even if we are trying to optimize pulse for controlling just the second qubit. In this sense our gates are global. First two transitions of the training set describe action of gate NOT on second qubit with the first qubit being in state $|0\rangle$, while next two transitions of the training set describe gate NOT on second qubit with the first qubit being in state $|1\rangle$. Due to anharmonicities, the frequencies of corresponding $|00\rangle \leftrightarrow |01\rangle$ and $|10\rangle \leftrightarrow |11\rangle$ transitions are slightly different.

Optimization procedure is not fully automated. The pulse duration and the maximum allowed field amplitude should be tuned manually. A number of independent computational experiments were carried out with different values of the target time in the range between 2 μs and 20 μs and different values of the penalty factor between 10^{11} and 10^{13} . The following values led to the simplest pulse shape and were finally adopted for the gate NOT: $T = 4 \mu\text{s}$ and $\alpha = 2.0 \times$

10^{12} . A very large number of iterations, 4000 forward-backward loops, were needed in order to converge the pulse shape. The length of time-step in the wave packet propagation was on the order of 0.5 nanosecond (9000 time steps in total).

The 4 μ s pulse derived for the gate NOT on the second qubit is presented in Fig. 2. The pulse is quite symmetric and its shape is simple, the maximum field is achieved in the middle of the pulse. This shape reflects the envelope function (see Sec. 2.c.) used to switch the pulse on and off smoothly. Amplitude of the electric field does not exceed 0.57 V/m. Such pulses should be relatively easy to produce in the experiment.

Figure 3 shows evolution of state populations during the pulse. Four frames of the picture correspond to four transitions of the training set. We see that, overall, the population transfer is quite direct, in a sense that population of the initial state(s) is monotonically transferred to the final state(s), without any reverse transfer. Note, however, that the system does not behave as an isolated four-state system of two qubits. Upper states of the normal mode progressions can gain some population during the pulse. Here, the states $|02\rangle$ and $|12\rangle$ are excited most significantly (populations exceeds 0.1), which can be seen in Fig. 3 without any magnification. However, the system is well controlled -- by the end of the pulse all population is dumped into the target state(s) of two qubits. The value of cumulative transition probability, as defined in Eq. (20), reaches $P = 0.996$.

Fourier analysis of the pulse in Fig. (2) shows that its spectrum is dominated by structure in the $\Omega/2\pi = 2.7$ -to- 3.2 MHz region, which corresponds to excitation of one quantum of vibration in the second qubit. The structure is asymmetric. Its most intensive peak corresponds to frequency of $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |1\rangle$ transition. A wing, composed of series of less intense peaks, extends into the blue part of spectrum and covers $|1\rangle \leftrightarrow |2\rangle$, $|3\rangle \leftrightarrow |4\rangle$ and $|4\rangle \leftrightarrow |5\rangle$ transitions, which means

that this pulse is trying to control *selectively* the ladder of transitions (an anharmonic oscillator). Note that all these transitions are well resolved by the pulse – the widths of peaks in the spectrum are narrower than frequency differences. However, the transitions $|00\rangle \leftrightarrow |01\rangle$ and $|10\rangle \leftrightarrow |11\rangle$ etc., are not resolved. Frequencies of these transitions are very close to each other because anharmonicity of first qubit is very small. Widths of peaks in the spectrum are much broader than this frequency difference, which means that the $|00\rangle \leftrightarrow |01\rangle$ and $|10\rangle \leftrightarrow |11\rangle$ transitions are controlled *together*, rather than selectively.

Intensity of the signal near the frequency of $|2\rangle \leftrightarrow |3\rangle$ transition is suppressed relative to others, which explains why the population of state $|3\rangle$ remains low during the pulse. Fourier analysis shows no frequency components near 2Ω for the second qubit, consistent with selection rules of Eq. (30), and only small intensity near $3\Omega/2\pi = 8.8$ MHz region, $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |3\rangle$ transition in the second qubit, consistent with low population of state $|3\rangle$. Nothing in the spectrum corresponds to transitions between states of the first qubit.

Results obtained with longer pulses indicate that increase of the pulse duration leads to the decrease of the field amplitude and, at a consequence, to the decrease of population of the interfering upper states. For example, we found that during the pulse optimized with $T = 20$ μ s the field does not exceed 0.25 V/m, populations of states $|02\rangle$ and $|12\rangle$ do not exceed 0.02, while the cumulative transition probability reaches $P = 0.9998$.

3.b. Conditional NOT (CNOT) on Second Qubit

For the gate CNOT the training set of transitions is:

$$\text{CNOT}|00\rangle \rightarrow |00\rangle, \quad (35)$$

$$\text{CNOT}|01\rangle \rightarrow |01\rangle, \quad (36)$$

$$\text{CNOT}|10\rangle \rightarrow |11\rangle, \quad (37)$$

$$\text{CNOT}|11\rangle \rightarrow |10\rangle. \quad (38)$$

Experimentation with pulse duration showed that CNOT gate requires much longer pulses than NOT gate. In order to obtain accurate CNOT gate, we had to increase the pulse duration to $T = 30 \mu\text{s}$. The number of time steps for wave packet propagation was increased to 18,000. Variation of the penalty factor revealed an interesting feature. It is demonstrated below using results for two pulses, one with $\alpha = 6.0 \times 10^{12}$ and the other with $\alpha = 8.0 \times 10^{11}$.

The pulse optimized with a larger penalty factor, $\alpha = 6.0 \times 10^{12}$, is shown in Fig. 4. This pulse is simply shaped, symmetric, and consists of two time-delayed sub-pulses. The maximum field amplitude of about 0.06 V/m is achieved at approximately $t = 7.5$ and $22.5 \mu\text{s}$. The state-to-state transitions driven by this pulse are shown in Fig. 5. Four frames correspond to four transitions of the training set. When the control qubit is in state $|1\rangle$ the population transfer is monotonic and is very much direct, see Figs. 5(b) and 5(d). Only two states of the system are involved and those are states $|10\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$ of the qubit. Transitions to any upper states of the system are suppressed. When the control qubit is in state $|0\rangle$ the population transfer is not monotonic: The first sub-pulse creates a superposition state of $|00\rangle$ and $|01\rangle$, while the second sub-pulse returns population back to the initial state(s), as required by this gate, see Figs. 5(a) and 5(c). Cumulative accuracy of the qubit transformation is very high, $P \sim 0.9995$. Fourier analysis of the optimized pulse shows that only the $|00\rangle \leftrightarrow |01\rangle$ and $|10\rangle \leftrightarrow |11\rangle$ transitions are induced (again, together rather than selectively), while the frequencies of all other transitions are completely suppressed. Even the frequency of $|1\rangle \leftrightarrow |2\rangle$ transition in the second qubit is entirely suppressed, which explains why population is restricted to only states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ of the qubit.

The fact that transitions to the upper states of the system can be suppressed and population is restricted to only four states of the 2×2 qubit space is very interesting. We believe that such high selectivity is made possible by the relatively low amplitude of field of the pulse in Fig. 4, leading to very delicate control of vibrational excitations.

In order to support this hypothesis we present results for another pulse, optimized with lower penalty factor $\alpha = 8.0 \times 10^{11}$. In general, lowering the penalty factor allows raising amplitude of the field during the optimization procedure. The optimized pulse shape for this case is presented in Fig. 6. The maximum field amplitude of this pulse is roughly 0.51 V/m, about an order of magnitude higher compared to the previous case. The pulse shape is much more complicated, asymmetric, containing multiple sub-pulses of different amplitudes. This shape reflects complicated evolution of state populations presented in Fig. 7. During the pulse, the populations are exchanged back and forth between the initial and the final states of the qubit, and are also transferred to the excited states of the system, $|02\rangle$ and $|12\rangle$. Despite complicated evolution during the pulse, at time $t=T$ the population is directed towards the target states, leading to high accuracy of qubit transformation, $P \sim 0.9996$. Fourier analysis of this optimized pulse shows a spectral structure that covers $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |1\rangle$, $|1\rangle \leftrightarrow |2\rangle$ and $|3\rangle \leftrightarrow |4\rangle$, transitions in the second qubit, which clearly corresponds to control of the ladder. The frequency of $|2\rangle \leftrightarrow |3\rangle$ transition is, again, somewhat suppressed.

Two examples of CNOT gate presented here suggest that a careful choice of constraints on the control field, such as pulse duration and field amplitude, may be necessary in order to obtain the control pulses of desirable accuracy and simplicity.

3.c. Hadamard Transform of Second Qubit

Training set of transitions for the Hadamard transform of the second qubit is:

$$\text{HAD}|00\rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |01\rangle), \quad (39)$$

$$\text{HAD}|01\rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle - |01\rangle), \quad (40)$$

$$\text{HAD}|10\rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle + |11\rangle), \quad (41)$$

$$\text{HAD}|11\rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle - |11\rangle), \quad (42)$$

$$\text{HAD}\frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |10\rangle + |11\rangle) \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |10\rangle). \quad (43)$$

The fifth transition here is the sum of the first four transitions and is included in order to achieve control over phases, which is essential for this gate. Note that the cumulative probability of Eq. (20) neglects phases of transitions, since moduli squared of overlaps are used. However, the accuracy of gates like Hadamard should be measured by a phase-sensitive moiety, like fidelity defined as [31, 32]:

$$F = \frac{1}{M^2} \left| \sum_m \langle \tilde{\psi}^m(T) | \phi_f^m \rangle \right|^2. \quad (44)$$

One solution is to replace P by F in the functional of Eq. (21) and re-derive the equations [31, 32], but this approach was not followed here. A simpler fix to the standard procedure is to include, in addition to four transitions of the training set, one more transition that represents sum of the previous four [21, 33]. In order to ensure that the phase is indeed controlled, the fidelity of Eq. (44), rather than probability of Eq. (20), should be monitored as convergence criterion.

Different values of pulse duration and penalty factor were tried and the following parameters were finally adopted: $\alpha = 1.0 \times 10^{12}$ and $T = 35 \mu\text{s}$. The number of time steps was also adjusted to 55,000.

The optimized pulse is presented in Fig. 8. The pulse is asymmetric and consists of three sub-pulses of slightly different amplitudes. Maximum amplitude of the field is about 0.13 V/m. Roles of these sub-pulses are revealed by analysis of state populations presented in Fig. 9. The first sub-pulse achieves a significant transfer of populations, creating a superposition state with probabilities close to needed 50/50, while the second sub-pulse manipulates phases of the optimized transitions (with only minor population transfer). Third sub-pulse finalizes the entire transformation by minor transfer of remaining populations and fine phase correction. Analysis of phase angle of the optimized transitions supports this conclusion: During the first sub-pulse phases are not controlled at all. The second sub-pulse reduces phase differences monotonically to only ~ 30 - 50° . The third sub-pulse reduces phase differences to less than 4° at the end of the pulse. The cumulative transition probability of this Hadamard gate is $P \sim 0.998$. Its fidelity is slightly lower, $F \sim 0.990$, due to small residual difference of phases.

Fourier analysis of the optimized pulse shows two spectral structures. First structure is in the $\Omega/2\pi = 2.7$ -to- 3.0 MHz region (excitation of one quantum in the second qubit). Here the $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |1\rangle$ transition is clearly dominant, while the $|1\rangle \leftrightarrow |2\rangle$ transition is significantly suppressed, consistent with low population of states $|02\rangle$ and $|12\rangle$ in Fig. 9. The second spectral structure is in the $\Omega/2\pi = 54.8$ -to- 54.9 MHz region, which corresponds to excitation of one quantum of the first qubit. Transitions between $|0\rangle \leftrightarrow |1\rangle$, $|1\rangle \leftrightarrow |2\rangle$, $|3\rangle \leftrightarrow |4\rangle$ and $|4\rangle \leftrightarrow |5\rangle$ states of the first qubit are covered by the blue-side wing of this spectral structure. We tend to state that these transitions are *partially* resolved because they all have different intensities, due to slope of the wing and some minor oscillations of intensity.

Note that frequency components that control first qubit have not been observed in the optimized NOT and CNOT pulses discussed above. We found that these frequencies appear only when we include the fifth transition into the training set (e.g., Eq. (43)) in order to control phases of the optimized transitions. The pulses optimized for such truly coherent manipulations of the qubit states always contain frequency components for control of both qubits of the two-qubit system.

4. Conclusions

In this paper we carried out the first optimal control study of a system of multiple ions in an anharmonic linear trap. The method of encoding qubits into the quantized collective motional/vibrational states of the linear ion-string was proposed and explored computationally. The time-varying RF fields were used to achieve adiabatic control over these states.

Although all ions are identical, the vibration modes of the ion-string are different and the qubits, encoded into these modes, are also different. The numerical analysis of frequencies and anharmonicities of the vibration modes was used to identify modes most suitable for encoding qubits. It was shown that in a strongly anharmonic trap, obtained by combining a repulsive quadratic with an attractive quartic potentials, the center-of-mass motion mode is the most anharmonic. It is most suitable for encoding states of the main qubit. The control qubit can be encoded into a less anharmonic asymmetric stretching mode. The symmetric stretching mode remains dark in our approach.

Optimal control theory was used to derive pulses for a set of universal quantum gates. It was shown that if the parameters of the pulse, such as pulse duration and maximum field amplitude, are carefully chosen, the qubit transformations (gates) are accurate and the pulses are

simple. Durations of the pulses obtained were in the 4 μ s to 40 μ s range. Amplitudes of the control fields were on the order of 0.1 V/m.

Only one set of parameters for the shape of the trap was considered in this paper. It seems feasible, however, to further increase anharmonicity of the vibrational spectrum of the system by changing parameters of the trapping potential. Higher anharmonicities, in turn, should simplify the control and allow deriving more accurate and shorter gate pulses. Exploring a system of more than three ions offers more opportunities. There should be more than one anharmonic mode that can be efficiently controlled and used for encoding qubits. These opportunities will be explored in the future work.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported by the National Science Foundation, grant number CHE-1012075. This research used resources of the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center, which is supported by the Office of Science of the U.S. Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC02-05CH11231. Professor Martine Gruebele at the University of Illinois at Urbana-Champaign is acknowledged for fruitful discussions.

Reference:

- [1] J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 4091 (1995).
- [2] C. Monroe, D. M. Meekhof, B. E. King, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **75**, 4714 (1995).
- [3] G. D. Lin, S. L. Zhu, R. Islam, K. Kim, M. S. Chang, S. Korenblit, C. Monroe, and L. M. Duan, Europhysics. Lett. **86**, 60004 (2009).
- [4] D. M. Meekhof, C. Monroe, B. E. King, W. M. Itano, and D. J. Wineland, Phys. Rev. Lett. **76**, 1796 (1996).

- [5] C. A. Sackett, D. Keilpinski, B. E. King, C. Langer, V. Meyer, C. J. Myatt, M. Rowe, Q. A. Turchette, W. M. Itano, D. J. Wineland, and C. Monroe, *Nature (London)* **404**, 256 (2000).
- [6] J. J. Garcia-Ripoll, P. Zoller, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 157901 (2003).
- [7] F. Schmidt-Kaler, H. Häffner, R. Riebe, S. Gulde, G. P. T. Lancaster, T. Deuschle, C. Becher, C. F. Roos, J. Eschner, and R. Blatt, *Nature (London)* **422**, 408 (2003).
- [8] H. Häffner, W. Hänsel, C. F. Roos, J. Benhelm, D. Chek-alkar, M. Challa, T. K. Farber, U. D. Rapol, M. Riebe, P. O. Schmidt, C. Becher, O. Gahne, and D. J. Wineland, *Nature (London)* **438**, 643 (2005).
- [9] D. Leibfried *et al.*, *Nature (London)* **438**, 639 (2005).
- [10] F. Schmidt-Kaler, H. Häffner, S. Gulde, M. Riebe, G. P.T. Lancaster, T. Deuschle, C. Becher, W. Hänsel, J. Eschner, C. F. Roos, and R. Blatt, *Appl. Phys. B* **77**, 789 (2003).
- [11] P. Bushev, D. Rotter, A. Wilson, F. Dubin, C. Becher, J. Eschner, R. Blatt, V. Steixner, P. Rabl, and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96**, 043003 (2006).
- [12] C. Monroe and D. Wineland, *Scientific American* (August, 2008), pp. 64-71.
- [13] D. Leibfried, R. Blatt, C. Monroe, and D. Wineland, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **75**, 281 (2003).
- [14] R. Blatt and D. J. Wineland, *Nature* **453**, 1008 (2008).
- [15] K. Kim, M. S. Chang, R. Islam, S. Korenblit, L. M. Duan, and C. Monroe, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 120502 (2009).
- [16] K. Kim, M. S. Chang, S. Korenblit, R. Islam, E. E. Edwards, J. K. Freericks, G. D. Lin, L. M. Duan, and C. Monroe, *Nature* **465**, 590 (2010).
- [17] L. M. Duan and C. Monroe, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **82**, 1209 (2010).
- [18] M. Zhao and D. Babikov, *Phys. Rev. A* **77**, 012338 (2008).
- [19] L. Wang and D. Babikov, *Phys. Rev. A*, **83**, 022305 (2011).
- [20] D. Babikov, *J. Chem. Phys.* **121**, 7577 (2004).
- [21] M. Zhao and D. Babikov, *J. Chem. Phys.* **125**, 024105 (2006).
- [22] M. Zhao and D. Babikov, *J. Chem. Phys.* **126**, 204102 (2007).
- [23] Y. Y. Gu and D. Babikov, *J. Chem. Phys.* **131**, 034306 (2009).
- [24] C. Gollub, U. Troppmann, and R. de Vivie-Riedle, *New J. Phys.* **8**, 48 (2006).
- [25] W. Demtröder, *Molecular Physics*. (2005).
- [26] D. Weidinger and M. Gruebele, *Mol. Phys.* **105**, 1999 (2007).
- [27] D. Weidinger and M. Gruebele, *Chem. Phys.* **350**, 139 (2008).

- [28] W. Zhu, J. Botina, and H. Rabitz, J. Chem. Phys. **108** 1953 (1998).
- [29] W. H. Press, B. P. Flannery, S. A. Teukolsky, and W. T. Vetterling, Numerical recipes. (1989).
- [30] B. H. Bransden and C. J. Joachain , Introduction to Quantum Mechanics. (1989).
- [31] J. P. Palao and R. Kosloff, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 188301 (2002).
- [32] J. P. Palao and R. Kosloff, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 062308 (2003).
- [33] C. M. Tesch and R. de Vivie-Riedle, J. Chem. Phys. **121**, 12158 (2004).




Fig. 1: a) Equilibrium positions of ions and minimum energy of a three-ion string trapped in a flat anharmonic potential of the form $-\alpha z^2 + \beta z^4$; b) Vibrational spectrum of this system and the encoding of two-qubit states proposed in this work.




Fig. 2: Optimally shaped pulse for the gate NOT.




Fig. 3 (Color online): Evolution of state-populations during the gate NOT. Four frames of this figure correspond to four transitions optimized as a training set.




Fig. 4: Optimally shaped pulse for the gate CNOT. Low field regime.




Fig. 5 (Color online): Evolution of state-populations during the gate CNOT. Low field regime. Four frames of this figure correspond to four transitions optimized as a training set.




Fig. 6: Optimally shaped pulse for the gate CNOT. High field regime.




Fig. 7 (Color online): Evolution of state-populations during the gate CNOT. High field regime. Four frames of this figure correspond to four transitions optimized as a training set.




Fig. 8: Optimally shaped pulse for the Hadamard transform.




Fig. 9 (Color online): Evolution of state-populations during the Hadamard transform. Four frames of this figure correspond to four transitions optimized as a training set.