

#### University College London

UCL PhD Upgrade Report

### Qubit Coherence and Control

Author:
David F. Wise

Supervisor: Prof. John Morton

Submitted in partial fulfilment for the degree of MRes Quantum Technologies

February 21, 2018

#### Abstract

Scientific documents often use LATEX for typesetting. While numerous packages and templates exist, it makes sense to create a new one. Just because.

## Contents

1 Introduction 3

# List of Figures

# 1 Introduction

Quantum computing has been an active field of research since the concept was first suggested by Richard Feynman in the early 1980s [5]. Originally proposed as an efficient method for simulating chemical processes (something that traditional computers find extremely taxing) the discovery of several algorithms offering significant speed increases over classical computers has further fueLled research [12, 13]. Strong initial scepticism abounded regarding the potential for quantum computers to exist in the real world, primarily due to the concerns that error correction with such a complex device would be impossible[9]. This pessimism gave way with the identification of an error threshold for quantum computation. Given an error rate below a critical threshold it was possible to perform an arbitrarily long computation with negligible possibility of significant error [1, 11]. Following these discoveries serious attention has been given to the development of error correcting codes that might be implemented to allow a physical quantum computer to be *fault tolerant*.

Gottesman identified the class of error correcting codes known as *stabilizer codes*, where codes are defined by the group of logical operators that leave the code unchanged [6]. This class of quantum error correcting codes have become the dominant form in theoretical research. Of these one in particular has become the focus of much of the ongoing research of quantum computing, *the surface code*, developed by Bravyi and Kitaev [4]. Although other quantum error correcting codes (such as colour codes [14]) exist, the surface code has become the focus for experimental implementations. This is due mainly to the relatively high error threshold that it is able to tolerate,  $\sim 0.5\%$ , and the simple architecture of a planar grid of qubits.

In recent years there has been rapid progress in the development of physical qubits. Groups in both the academic and private sectors have shown small numbers of qubits functioning with error rates above the fault tolerant threshold [3, 10]. The successful recent approaches have tended to focus on superconducting circuits to produce their qubits. Whilst these have proved excellent for the small numbers of qubits currently in use, it is likely that they will present significant additional challenges when scaling to numbers sufficient for useful, fault-tolerant quantum computation. With the numbers required likely to be close to  $100 \times 10^6$  and the current size of these qubits close to  $1 \text{mm}^2$ , it will likely be impossible to use these qubits in their current form in a fault-tolerant quantum computer.

Although there are many alternative systems that could provide a qubit, this paper will focus on the use of the spins of nuclei and electrons bound to donors in semiconductors, particularly silicon. A seminal paper by Kane [7] stimulated much of the research interest in this field. He proposed using the spin of phosphorus nuclei in silicon as qubits with the ability to mediate interactions between neighbouring donor nuclei using the interaction between the electrons bound to each. These types of qubit are attractive due to their exceptionally long coherence times, the time that the qubit reliably stores quantum information for. A long coherence time relative to

qubit gate times is essential, as this determines the error rate of the qubits. Coherence times as long as several seconds have been reported for donor spin qubits in silicon, whilst gate times can be as low as several nanoseconds [15]. Despite these advantages, development of these types of qubits for quantum computers has lagged behind the superconducting and ion trap versions [2]. This is due to the difficulty of isolating and addressing single donors in a silicon lattice. Kane's proposal required extreme, sub nano-metre precision, in qubit placement to facilitate inter-qubit interactions.

This paper has been significant in driving the field of solid state quantum computing forward. More recent approaches have focussed on how such an architecture, based on donors in silicon, could be designed with the surface code in mind. One such proposal is from O'Gormann et al [8].

$$\hat{H} = \mu_b B g_e S_z + \mu_n g_n B I_z + A \hat{S} \cdot \hat{I}$$
(1.1)

#### **BIBLIOGRAPHY**

- 1. D. Aharonov and M. Ben-Or. "Fault-tolerant quantum computation with constant error". *Proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing STOC* '97,1997, pp. 176–188. ISSN: 1533-. DOI: 10.1145/258533.258579. arXiv: 9906129v1 [arXiv:quant-ph].
- 2. C. J. Ballance et al. "Laser-driven quantum logic gates with precision beyond the fault-tolerant threshold". *arXiv preprint*, 2015, pp. 1–12. arXiv: 1512.04600. URL: http://arxiv.org/abs/1512.04600.
- 3. R. Barends et al. "Digital quantum simulation of fermionic models with a superconducting circuit". *Nature Communications* 6:May, 2015, p. 7654. ISSN: 2041-1723. DOI: 10.1038/ncomms8654.arXiv: 1501.07703v1. URL: http://www.nature.com/ncomms/2015/150708/ncomms8654/full/ncomms8654.html{\%}5Cnhttp://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/ncomms8654.
- 4. S. B. Bravyi and A. Y. Kitaev. "Quantum codes on a lattice with boundary . \*". 96, 2008, pp. 1–6. arXiv: 9811052v1 [arXiv:quant-ph].
- 5. R. P. Feynman. "Simulating physics with computers". *International Journal of Theoretical Physics* 21:6-7, 1982, pp. 467–488. ISSN: 00207748. DOI: 10.1007/BF02650179. arXiv: 9508027 [quant-ph].
- 6. D. Gottesman. "Stabilizer Codes and Quantum Error Correction". 2008, 1997. ISSN: 0163-6804. DOI: 10.1017/CB09781107415324.004. arXiv: 9705052 [quant-ph].
- 7. B. E. Kane. "A silicon-based nuclear spin quantum computer". *Nature* 393:6681,1998, pp. 133–137. ISSN: 0028-0836. DOI: 10.1038/30156. URL: http://www.nature.com/doifinder/10.1038/30156{\%}5Cnpapers2://publication/doi/10.1038/30156.
- 8. J. O'Gorman et al. "A silicon-based surface code quantum computer". *arXiv* 1:October 2015, 2014, pp. 1–11. ISSN: 2056-6387. DOI: 10.1038/npjqi.2015.19. arXiv: 1406.5149.
- 9. J. Preskill. "Reliable Quantum Computers", 1997, pp. 1–24. ISSN: 1364-5021. DOI: 10.1098/rspa.1998.0167. arXiv: 9705031 [quant-ph]. URL: http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9705031{\%}0Ahttp://dx.doi.org/10.1098/rspa.1998.0167.
- 10. M. Reagor et al. "Demonstration of Universal Parametric Entangling Gates on a Multi-Qubit Lattice", 2017, pp. 1–7. arXiv: 1706.06570. URL: http://arxiv.org/abs/1706.06570.
- 11. P. W. Shor. "Fault-tolerant quantum computation", 1996. ISSN: 0272-5428. DOI: 10.1109/SFCS.1996.548464. arXiv: 9605011 [quant-ph]. URL: http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9605011.

- 12. P. W. Shor. "Polynomial-Time Algorithms for Prime Factorization and Discrete Logarithms on a Quantum Computer\*". *SIAM Journal on Computing* 26:5, 1997, pp. 1484–1509. ISSN: 0097-5397. DOI: 10.1137/S0097539795293172. arXiv: 9508027 [quant-ph].
- 13. P. Shor. "Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring". *Proceedings 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 1994, pp. 124–134. ISSN: 0272-5428. DOI: 10.1109/SFCS.1994.365700.
- 14. M. Vasmer and D. E. Browne. "Universal Quantum Computing with 3D Surface Codes", 2018, pp. 1–21. arXiv: 1801.04255. URL: http://arxiv.org/abs/1801.04255.
- 15. G. Wolfowicz et al. "Atomic clock transitions in silicon-based spin qubits." *Nature nanotechnology* 8:8, 2013, pp. 561–4. ISSN: 1748-3395. DOI: 10.1038/nnano.2013.117. arXiv: 1301.6567. URL: http://www.ncbi.nlm.nih.gov/pubmed/23793304.