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We present a modulated microwave approach for quantum computing with qubits comprising three spins in a triple quantum dot. This approach includes single- and two-qubit gates that are protected against low-frequency electrical noise, due to an operating point with a narrowband response to high frequency electric fields. Furthermore, existing double quantum dot advances, including robust preparation and measurement via spin-to-charge conversion, are immediately applicable to the new qubit. Finally, the electric dipole terms implicit in the high frequency coupling enable strong coupling with superconducting microwave resonators, leading to more robust two-qubit gates.

PACS numbers:

Spins in quantum dots as an architecture for quantum information processing require some combination of electric and magnetic field control at the nanometer scale [1]. While the intrinsic coherence properties of the spins can be remarkable, the need for such control inevitably couples the qubit degree of freedom to low-frequency electric or magnetic noise [2–8]. Approaches that mitigate this coupling, via dynamical decoupling or composite pulse sequences, all require rapid ‘pulsed gate’ control either for individual qubits or for two-qubit gates, which in turn requires wide bandwidths for the control electronics. While this has led to a variety of advances in the field, paradoxically it also leads to the use of quantum bits as sensors, rather than as protected devices [9].

Instead, we suggest that the use of so-called exchange-only qubits [10, 11], comprising three spins in a triple quantum dot [12–17] and implemented experimentally [18–21], provide an opportunity for protection against low-frequency control noise in analogy to advances in superconducting devices [22]. In particular, by having exchange couplings always on, a regime with no low-frequency field response and a narrowband, resonant response becomes accessible. We denote this the resonant exchange (RX) qubit, and refer the reader to the concurrent Ref. [23] for an experimental demonstration of these ideas. Furthermore, our approach has a protected two-qubit interaction via exchange [24, 25] or via resonant dipole-dipole interactions. As coupling between qubits relies on electric fields rather than tunneling, devices could be implemented in a wide variety of potential materials such as two dimensional electron gas and nanowire depletion dots. Finally, we show that the dipolar nature of the RX qubit also enables strong coupling with high quality factor microwave cavities.

The few electron regime of interest for our triple dot system we describe by the Hubbard model [15]

\[ H_{\text{hub}} = \sum_i U \frac{n_i}{2} (n_i - 1) - V_i n_i + \sum_{(i,j)} U_c n_i n_j - \frac{t_{ij}}{\sqrt{2}} c^\dagger_{i,\sigma} c^{}_{j,\sigma} \]

where \( U \) is the individual dot charging energy, \( U_c \) is the cross-charging energy, \( V_i \) is the local potential set by applied gate voltages on dot \( i \), \( t_{ij} \) is the tunneling between dots \( i \) and \( j \), and \( c^\dagger_{i,\sigma} \) is the creation operator for an electron on dot \( i \) with spin \( \sigma \). For simplicity, we assume a linear array and set \( t_{12} = t, t_{23} = t_r, t_{13} = 0 \), and have defined tunneling such that singlet-singlet tunneling has a rate \( t_{1,r} \). An appropriate choice of gate voltages makes the charge stability region (1,1,1) relatively narrow (Fig. 1a,b), where \( (n_1, n_2, n_3) \) indicates charge occupation numbers for each dot. Specifically, defining \( \epsilon = (V_3 - V_1)/2 \) and \( V_m = (V_1 + V_3)/2 - V_2 \), we find the (1,0,2)-(1,1,1) [(2,0,1)-(1,1,1)] charge transitions occur at \( \epsilon = \pm \Delta \equiv \pm (U - 2U_c - V_m) \), which also defines the width \( 2\Delta \) of the (1,1,1) region. We see that by making \( V_m \) sufficiently large, this window width can be made arbitrarily small. At the same time, triple dot configurations with a total charge number different than three can remain detuned by keeping the independent parameter \( V_{tot} = \sum_i V_i \) in an appropriate range.

Restricting our discussion to the reduced model with...
only (2,0,1), (1,1,1), and (1,0,2), for large positive or negative \( \epsilon \), the charge avoided crossing behaves in a manner analogous to a double quantum dot [7, 18], with the third charge (and spin) largely decoupled. Near these avoided crossings (shown in Fig. 1c), techniques from two-spin quantum bits, including singlet preparation and measurement [26], become available and provide a means of initializing and measuring the states of the total spin \( S = 1/2 \) manifold. Recently the necessary adiabatic mapping between the (2,0,1) singlet state and the lowest energy \( S = 1/2 \) state in (1,1,1) has been shown [18, 21].

Moving to the qubit itself, we consider small \(| \epsilon \rangle\).

In the context of our model, variations additional fields (no DC dipole), but with a narrow-band admixture parameter, determining when corrections to the Heisenberg model may become important. Under the application of a large external magnetic field \( \mu_B B_{\text{ext}} \gg t \), the Zeeman sub-levels of the Heisenberg chain split, and we are left with subspaces defined by the additional quantum numbers for the spins. In contrast to the case of two spins, where the only additional number is the total spin \( S \), here we have both the total spin and a symmetric group quantum number. It is in this symmetric group (permutation) sector that our quantum bit will be defined, following earlier work [10], and we label this regime of operation the RX regime.

The logical subspace with \( S = 1/2 \) is

\[
|1\rangle = |s\rangle_{13} |\uparrow\rangle_2, \tag{3}
\]

\[
|0\rangle = -\sqrt{1/3} |t_0\rangle_{13} |\uparrow\rangle_2 + \sqrt{2/3} |t_+\rangle_{13} |\downarrow\rangle_2. \tag{4}
\]

\(|t_0,\pm\rangle\) are the three spin triplet states. The third state, \(|Q_1/2\rangle = \sqrt{2/3} |t_0\rangle_{13} |\uparrow\rangle_2 + \sqrt{1/3} |t_+\rangle_{13} |\downarrow\rangle_2\) is a state with total \( S = 3/2 \) and has zero energy, as shown in Fig. 1c. We will work in this subspace \( \mathcal{P} \) for the remainder of this Letter. Defining \( J = J_t + J_r \), \( \lambda = J_t - J_r \),

\[
P_{\text{Heis}} \mathcal{P} = -\frac{3J}{2} |0\rangle\langle 0| - \frac{J}{2} |1\rangle\langle 1| - \sqrt{3/4} J |\langle 0|1\rangle + |1\rangle\langle 0| \rangle. \tag{5}
\]

Single-qubit gates: The RX qubit is designed to operate at the point in parameter space where the fixed electric fields yield qubit with no low-frequency response to additional fields (no DC dipole), but with a narrow-band response to an applied AC field at the qubit frequency (an AC dipole). In the context of our model, variations of \( \epsilon \propto \sum x_i \) (with \( x_i \) the position of dot \( i \) along the inter-dot axis) are equivalent to looking at the electric dipole response of the qubit system (Fig. 2a). Our ideal operation point – protected against low-frequency noise by the energy gap \( \sim J \) – occurs when the energy quantization axis in the \(|0\rangle,|1\rangle\) subspace for a fixed \( \epsilon_0 \) is perpendicular to the perturbation of the system due to a small variation \( \epsilon = \epsilon_0 + F \). For small tunneling asymmetry \( t_{1/0} = (1 \pm \delta) t \), we have \( \epsilon_0 = -\frac{\delta t}{2} y \). Variations of \( \epsilon \) around \( \epsilon_0 \) lead to variations of a perturbation orthogonal to the quantization axis, providing a direct dipole moment between ground and excited states as indicated by the virtual process in Fig. 2a. We write the Hamiltonian using Pauli matrices such that its eigenenergies are quadratic in \( F \):

\[
H_{\text{RX}} = \frac{\hbar \omega}{2} \sigma_z + F \eta \sigma_x \tag{6}
\]

with \( \hbar \omega = \sqrt{J^2 + 3\delta^2} \approx \sqrt{\xi(1 + \frac{3\delta^2}{2})} \) the energy difference between the two energy eigenstates and \( \eta = \sqrt{\langle \partial_t J \rangle^2 + 3\langle \partial_t \delta \rangle^2} \approx 2\sqrt{3}\xi(1 + \frac{3\delta^2}{2}) \) an effective matrix element coupling \( F \) to the qubit degree of freedom.

Rabi rotation becomes accessible if one drives \( \epsilon \) sinusoidally, i.e., \( F(\tau) = f(\tau) \cos(\nu \tau + \phi) \) where \( \phi \) is an adjustable phase and \( f(\tau) \) varies slowly compared to the gap \( \omega \). Near resonance (small \( \delta = \omega - \nu \)), we can work in a rotating frame and rotating wave approximation, and have a quantum bit rotation with Rabi frequency

\[
\Omega(\tau) \approx \frac{f(\tau)}{\hbar} \sqrt{3}\xi^2. \tag{7}
\]

Subsequent Rabi rotations, with differing \( \phi \), correspond to rotations about various axes along the equator of the Bloch sphere defined in \( H_{\text{out}} \).

The key feature of the RX qubit is a reduction in response to low-frequency noise, due to the gap \( \omega \). However, a secondary benefit arises from purely practical concerns: the necessary bandwidth for performing gates via modulated microwaves is on the order of \( 1/\tau_{\text{gate}} \) around the center frequency \( \omega \). This allows for filtering of classical noise in other frequencies to a high order. However, the adiabatic gate control necessary in the current scheme for preparation and measurement requires a second bandpass for control at a frequency much lower than \( \omega \). Alternatively, as we show below, preparation and readout can be accomplished using circuit QED [27, 28] coupling of the qubit levels to a microwave cavity, in direct analogy to the transmon superconducting qubit [29, 30].

Two-qubit gates: In addition, this so-called ‘sweet spot’ provides a several mechanisms for coupling RX qubits. In particular, two RX qubits in proximity will have a multipole-multipole interaction due to the coupling of the dipole to the electric field. At large distances \( R \gg a \) between two RX qubits with relative angle \( \theta \)
and dipole moments $\vec{a}_{a(b)}$, they interact via dipole-dipole terms (Fig. 2a,b):

$$V_{dd} = \frac{\vec{a}_a \cdot \vec{a}_b (1 - 3 \cos^2 \theta)}{4 \pi \varepsilon R^3} \approx h_{dd}(\sigma_{a(\sigma)}^{(a)} \sigma_{a(\sigma)}^{(b)} + \text{H.c.})$$

with an overall strength $h_{dd} \sim 2\varepsilon^2 a^2 \xi^4$, where $a$ is the left-right dot distance, $\varepsilon$ is the dielectric constant of the substrate, and non-secular terms have been neglected. This enables direct ‘swap’-type gates between the two qubits. Extensions of CORPSE pulse sequences allows for such gates to be integrated with homogeneous echo sequences [31], providing potential high-fidelity operation even for slow gates as implicit in the overall $\xi^4$ performance. For qubits with resonance frequencies differing by $\delta$, driving one qubit with a Rabi frequency $\Omega = \delta$ creates, in the double rotating frame, a resonant interaction, in direct analogy to Hartman-Hahn double resonance.

While a dipolar approximation yields a straightforward understanding of the coupling mechanism, the more general result will require inclusion of higher order terms, as $a \sim R$. Fortunately, a convenient approximation remains by expanding the interaction between the two RX qubits via their capacitive interaction, where we can include an explicit coupling between adjacent RX qubits of the form $U_{ab} \sum_i n_{a,i} n_{b,i}$ (Fig. 2c). This is a direct extension of efforts to couple double quantum dots capacitively [6, 32, 33]. In the transformed frame,

$$n_{a,1(3)} - 1 \approx \frac{t^2_{1(r)}}{4(\Delta \pm \gamma)^2} \left[ -\sigma_z^{(a)} \pm \sqrt{3}\sigma_x^{(a)} \right]$$

Written in the logical basis with $t_1 = t_r = t$, we have

$$V_{mm} = U_{ab} \frac{\varepsilon^4}{2} \left( \sigma_z^{(a)} \sigma_z^{(b)} + 3\sigma_x^{(a)} \sigma_x^{(b)} \right)$$

with non-secular terms such as $\sigma_x^{(a)} \sigma_x^{(b)}$ removed by symmetry. Going beyond the dipole expansion has added a $z - z$ coupling term, which can enable gates even when the qubits are at different resonant frequencies, as is commonly dealt with in NMR [34].

Finally, an additional mechanism for two-qubit gates is the direct coupling of an RX qubit to a high quality factor superconducting cavity (Fig. 2d), as has recently been achieved for double quantum dots [35, 36], where $g_{chq}/\omega \gtrsim 3$ was demonstrated. We can estimate the vacuum Rabi coupling of a dipole of size $ea$ ($a \sim 260 \text{ nm}$ is the size of the triple dot system) to a transmission-line circuit QED cavity with transverse mode area $A$ as $g_{chq} \sim \omega a^{1/2} a$, with $\alpha$ the fine structure constant. The corresponding coupling of the RX qubit is $g_{cav} = g_{chq} \sqrt{\frac{\alpha}{A}}$. For $\sqrt{A} \sim 3 \mu \text{m}$, we have $g_{cav}/\omega \sim 7 \times 10^{-3} \xi^2$. Thus for $\xi \gtrsim 0.03$ and for systems with high cavity $Q \gtrsim 10^6$ and long qubit $T_2 \gtrsim 20 \mu \text{s}$ [23], the strong coupling regime becomes accessible.

** Corrections from spin-orbit and nuclear spins**: One potential complication is the addition of spin-orbit coupling. However, if we neglect spin-flip terms in the spin-orbit coupling due to the large applied external field, the resulting spin-conserving terms correspond only to a re-definition of the singlet states. Specifically, including as an addition to tunneling terms $-\lambda_l \sigma_l \sum_{c,s} \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{6}} e^{J_{cs\gamma l}} c_{s\gamma l}$ and similarly for $r$, the qubit subspace is defined by the two non-orthogonal basis vectors $|0\rangle \propto (t_l - 3t_r) |\uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle - (t_l + 3t_r) |\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow\rangle$, $|1\rangle \propto (t_r + 3t_l) |\uparrow \uparrow \uparrow\rangle - (t_r - 3t_l) |\downarrow \downarrow \downarrow\rangle$. Thus spin-conserving spin-orbit serves only to renormalize the effective tunneling coefficients.

While spin-orbit coupling is mostly accounted for, nuclear spins and other magnetic gradient fields change can lead to additional noise [37]. In particular, for Zeeman terms $B_i$ in each dot aligned with the external homogeneous field (due to nuclear gradients or to other gradients), we have in the $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |Q_{1/2}\rangle$ basis

$$V_{\text{nuc}} = g' \mu_B m_s \left( \begin{array}{ccc} -B_Q & B_D & \sqrt{2}B_D \\ B_D & B_Q & -\sqrt{2}B_D \\ \sqrt{2}B_D & -\sqrt{2}B_D & 0 \end{array} \right)$$

with $B_Q = \frac{1}{3} (B_1 - 2B_2 + B_3)$ and $B_D = (B_3 - B_1)/\sqrt{3}$ the quadrupolar and dipolar contributions from the gradient. We remark that the nuclear effects, both on the qubit frequency $\omega$ and on the coupling between the two qubit
states and leakage state may be suppressed for triple dot devices with a non-trivial tunneling between dots 1 and 3, as recognized in molecular magnet studies [38–40].

Fortunately, while gradient terms change the Hamiltonian, they may be suppressed by two different effects. First, the coupling between qubit states (and to the leakage space) is suppressed by the large energy scale \( \omega \) set by exchange couplings. In essence, exchange averages over nuclear gradients, leading only to higher order effects from all terms except the diagonal terms in the Hamiltonian (which go as \( B_Q \) for the symmetric regime). Second, the \( B_Q \) terms are slowly varying with root-mean-square expectation of \( \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}} B_{\text{muc}} \) where \( B_{\text{muc}} \) is the average size of the nuclear field in a single quantum dot. As such, they may be suppressed by use of standard spin-echo due to their low-frequency character.

**Coupling to phonons:** Phonons provide an intrinsic source of electric field fluctuations that couple to the electronic dipole moment of the qubit via the electron-phonon interaction, causing relaxation [41, 42]. This interaction has the form [43]

\[
H_{\text{ep}} = \sum_{\mu, k} M_k \sqrt{\frac{\hbar}{2\rho_0 c_\mu k}} (k \beta \delta_{\mu, l} - i \Xi) \left( a_{\mu, k} + a_{\mu, k}^\dagger \right)
\]

\[
M_k \equiv \sum_{i, j = 1}^{3} (|i\rangle e^{ik \cdot r} |j\rangle c_{i, \sigma}^\dagger c_{j, \sigma}
\]

where \( M_k \) is the factor which depends on electronic degrees of freedom, and the constants are: mass density \( \rho_0 \), volume \( V_0 \), phonon speeds \( c_\mu \), deformation potential \( \beta_\mu \) for the longitudinal (l) mode, and piezoelectric constant \( \Xi \). The operator \( a_{\mu, k}^\dagger \) creates a phonon with wavevector \( k \), energy \( \varepsilon_{\text{ph}} = h c_\mu k \), and polarization \( \mu \), and \( \delta_{\mu, l} \) is the Kronecker delta function.

The rate \( \Gamma = T_{1}^{-1} \) of qubit relaxation due to \( H_{\text{ep}} \) is given by Fermi’s golden rule as \( \Gamma \approx |\langle 0 \rangle | H_{\text{ep}} | 1 \rangle |^2 \rho (\omega) \).

Here, \( \rho (\omega) \) is the phonon density of states evaluated at the exchange gap \( \omega \) between the states \( |0\rangle \) and \( |1\rangle \) that determines the energy of the emitted phonon. The matrix element \( |\langle 0 | H_{\text{ep}} | 1 \rangle| \) is evaluated by defining Gaussian wavefunctions \( \psi_i (r) \equiv \langle r | i \rangle \) which are shifted along the dot axis by \(- a/2, 0, a/2 \) for \( i = 1, 2, \) and 3, respectively, and by changing to the qubit basis via the same Schrieffer-Wolff and diagonalization transformations used to determine \( H_{\text{eff}} \). A simple model suggests \( \Gamma \approx \frac{\omega^5}{T_{1}^4} \xi^3 \), given the piezoelectric coupling domination at low frequencies and the dipole moment of the qubit, which is consistent with the more detailed prediction (Fig. 2c) fit with \( \nu_T \approx 2\pi \times 0.9 \text{ GHz} \). The simple and detailed models agree over the range \( \frac{\omega}{2\pi} = 0 - 2 \text{ GHz} \) and \( \xi = 0 - 0.3 \).

**Qubit performance:** We now seek optimal parameters for performance. We assume \( t_1 = t_2 = t \) (setting \( \epsilon_0 = 0 \)) and use \( \xi \) and \( \omega = t^2/\Delta \) to rewrite all terms with \( t \) or \( \Delta \). Nuclear spin-induced \( T_2^* \) is due to fluctuations in \( B_Q \). Variations in \( \epsilon \) are limited the width of our narrowband filter; thus \( \Omega \ll \omega \). A single qubit \( \pi \) rotation has an estimated infidelity \( I_1 \sim \frac{\pi^2}{(\Omega T_2^*)^2} + \pi / (\sqrt{\Omega T_2^*}) + (\Omega / (\sqrt{3}\omega))^2 \).

For long \( T_1 \) times, this yields \( I_1 \sim \frac{\pi^2}{(\Omega T_2^*)^2} \), though for sufficiently large \( \omega \), \( T_2 \) becomes important.

However, two-qubit gates are more limited by \( T_2 \) than by \( T_2^* \), as we can apply refocusing pulses during the two-qubit gate. In that case, we seek to balance the gate time against \( T_2 \). As \( T_2 \) may be limited by phonon relaxation at appreciable values of \( \omega \), we consider the \( T_1 \) limited scenario, with an estimate of the infidelity for an entangling gate \( I_2 \sim \frac{2\pi}{\sqrt{\Omega T_2^*}} = \frac{2\pi \omega}{U_{\text{ab}} T_2^*} \). Also requiring \( \omega \gg 1/T_2^* \) for single-qubit gates, an optimal qubit frequency is set by \( \omega \sim \sqrt{\frac{1}{\Omega T_2^*}} \). For \( U_{\text{ab}} \sim 2\pi \times 30 \text{ GHz} \) and \( 1/T_2^* \sim 2\pi \times 10 \text{ MHz} \), consistent with current GaAs devices [33], the optimal \( \omega \sim 2\pi \times 0.7 \text{ GHz} \) and \( I_2 \lesssim 0.08 \). Some improvement can occur by reduction of the nuclear field, improvement in capacitive coupling, or phonon band-gap engineering. However, the most dramatic increase of fidelity occurs in the presence of a resonant superconducting cavity. Then the product of cavity coupling and relaxation, \( g_{\text{cav}} T_1 \), increases with smaller \( \xi \), leading to gates that may be limited by \( T_2 \) processes.

Additional benefits to the resonance exchange approach may be achieved by exploring other coupling and control mechanisms, such as direct tunnel coupling between adjacent RX qubits [25].
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