Hardware-efficient error-correcting codes for large nuclear spins

Jonathan A. Gross,¹,* Clément Godfrin,¹,† Alexandre Blais,¹,² and Eva Dupont-Ferrier¹,‡

¹Institut quantique and Département de Physique, Université de Sherbrooke, Sherbrooke, Québec, J1K 2R1, Canada
²Canadian Institute for Advanced Research, Toronto, ON, Canada

(Dated: March 16, 2021)

Universal quantum computers require a large network of qubits robust against errors. Recent theoretical and experimental studies on donor nuclear spins in silicon, engineered on semiconductor platforms compatible with industrial fabrication, show their coherent behavior and potential for scalability. Here we present a hardware-efficient quantum protocol that corrects phase flips of a nuclear spin using explicit experimentally feasible operations. We introduce the MAUS encoding (Moment AngUlar System encoding) which uses the large Hilbert space provided by the nuclear spin of the donor to encode the information and employ the electron spin of the donor as an ancilla for error correction. Simulations using present-day experimental manipulation fidelities predict significant improvement in logical qubit fidelity over existing spin quantum-error-correction protocols. These results provide a realizable blueprint for a corrected spin-based qubit.

We reach the summit of universal, fault-tolerant quantum computation one step at a time. Creating a logical qubit that use error correction to outperform bare physical qubits is a key step in this journey. The community has dubbed this achievement “beating the break-even point” [1]. So far, the greatest progress toward this goal has been made in superconducting platforms by focusing on correcting the dominant relaxation errors caused by photon loss [2, 3].

Dopants in silicon are another very promising platform for quantum information processing [4]. Their nuclear spins show record coherence times and single-gate fidelity for a solid-state platform [5, 6]. Their electron spins allow QND measurements of the nuclear spins [7] and potentially facilitate long-distance coupling of two nuclear spins via the charge degree of freedom [8]. Recently, two-qubit gates based on exchange coupling were implemented on two-dopant systems [9, 10]. Additionally, dopants are compact compared to superconducting qubits and can be embedded in devices manufactured in a CMOS foundry [11], allowing them to benefit from the decades of development of the microelectronic industry to integrate them in large-scale platforms based on silicon transistor technology.

Unlike in superconducting circuits, relaxation errors are negligible in donor nuclear spins. Instead, the relevant errors are dominated by dephasing, as evidenced by the separation between relaxation time $T_1 = 65\, s$ and coherence time $T_2 = 60\, ms$ reported in [7] and the $T_2 = 1.75\, s$ reported in [12] for dopants embedded in a nanostructure. Here we propose a hardware-efficient error-correction scheme that exploits this highly biased noise in a similar spirit to bosonic codes and numerically demonstrate its capacity to beat the break-even point with near-term technology. Because we choose to encode in a large single spin rather than several small spins to protect against dephasing, our proposal, which we christen the MAUS encoding (Moment AngUlar System encoding), is the “bosonic code” version of the protocols outlined in Ref. [13]. In pursuing the goal of scalable dopant-based architecture, using high nuclear spin offers an advantage as it allows for built-in error correction.

Describing the system.—The system we consider—illustrated in Fig. 1 (a)—is a single donor implanted in enriched $^{28}\text{Si}$ whose electron spin $S = 1/2$ is coupled to its nuclear spin, $I \geq 3/2$, via a hyperfine dipole interaction $A$ and a quadrupole interaction $Q$. The magnitude of the nuclear spin is necessary to ensure that the Hilbert space is large enough to detect and recover from at least one error. The donor electron spin is coupled to the spin
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of a ancillary accumulation dot via an exchange coupling \( J_{\text{ex}} \). The charge state of the accumulation dot can then be directly measured using a readout dot. This geometry allows a measurement of the electron spin state of the donor without affecting its charge spatial distribution \([14, 15]\). Therefore the hyperfine coupling \( A \) resulting from a contact interaction, remains constant during the protocol, preventing unwanted nuclear dephasing. The full spectrum of the spins and the QND aspect of the measurement is discuss in the Supplemental Material \([16]\). These spins are subjected to a static magnetic field \( B_z \) along the \( z \) axis and an oscillating magnetic field \( B_1 \). This field is generated by an on-chip antenna \([17]\) and oscillates in the \( x\)-\( y \) plane at frequency \( f \) to manipulate the spin states. The Hamiltonian describing this system is

\[
H = (\gamma_e S_z - \gamma_n I_z)B_z + AS \cdot I + QI_z^2/4 + (\gamma_e S_y - \gamma_n I_y)B_1 \cos(2\pi ft) .
\]

In order to detail the protocol on a minimal system, we focus our discussion on an arsenic donor with nuclear spin \( I = 3/2 \) and depict only the spin transitions of the donor in Fig. 1 (b); however, our protocol generalizes to all donors with a nuclear spin \( I \geq 3/2 \) \([16]\). For arsenic, \( \gamma_e/2\pi = 28.02 \text{ GHz} \cdot \text{T}^{-1} \), \( \gamma_n/2\pi = 7.31 \text{ MHz} \cdot \text{T}^{-1} \), \( A/2\pi = 198.35 \text{ MHz} \) \([18]\), and \( Q/2\pi \), which depends on the strains at the donor position, is on the order of 50 kHz \([19, 20]\). Notice that the dipole coupling \( A \) can be tuned from the given value down to 0, for donor in its neutral and ionized charge state respectively, with the gate potential \( V_d \) \([8]\). To ensure a Zeeman splitting much larger than the electron temperature (necessary for a high-fidelity spin readout) the amplitude of the static field \( B_z \) must be on the order of 1 T. The typical size of this system is less than 1 \( \mu \text{m}^2 \), making it a highly compact corrected systems. The manipulations applied to the system via magnetic field generated by the current \( i_{\text{MW-RF}} \) [see Fig. 1 (a)] provide both Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR) and Electron Spin Resonance (ESR) [see Fig. 1 (b)]. When applying ESR pulse we drive the electron-spin transition \( f^{(k)} \) with the nucleus in state \( |k\rangle \), whose frequencies \((\gamma_e B_z + 2kA)/2\pi \) are typically on the order of 30 GHz. The theoretical maximum Rabi frequency for this transition is the dipole interaction \( A \). Experimentally, heating effects due to the large current needed to generate the magnetic field limit the Rabi frequency \( \Omega \) to a value on the order of 100 kHz \([12]\). When applying NMR pulses, we weakly drive the nuclear-spin transitions \( \nu^j \), with \( j \) going from 1 to 3 for the transition \(|3/2\rangle_z \leftrightarrow |1/2\rangle_z \); \(|1/2\rangle_z \leftrightarrow |−1/2\rangle_z \), and \(|−1/2\rangle_z \leftrightarrow |−3/2\rangle_z \), respectively, with frequencies \((\gamma_n B_z + A + (j−2)Q)/2\pi \). This pulse, of frequency around 200 MHz, with an amplitude on the order of 0.1 mT, induces a Rabi frequency \( \Omega \) on the order of 1 kHz. This Rabi frequency is sufficiently weak compared to the quadrupole term so as to allow us to address the nuclear transitions individually, otherwise known as the slow-drive regime. The protocol requires a \( I_z \) rotation, which could be applied with a pulse of frequency \((\gamma_n B_z + A)/2\pi \) driven strongly to ensure a Rabi frequency much higher than the quadrupole term. This would require an oscillating magnetic field larger than 10 mT, far from the reported experimental limit \([6]\). To implement this \( I_z \) rotation we propose using a 3-frequency pulse simultaneously driving all the nuclear-spin transitions. This would ensure the \( I_z \) rotation stays in the slow-drive regime. More details are provided on the nuclear spin manipulation in the Supplemental Material \([16]\).

**Correcting errors.**—The preëminence of \( T_2 \)-type errors in spin systems means that extending the coherence time of logical information is primarily dependent on correcting \( I_z \) errors. Codespaces constructed from extremal eigenstates of an angular-momentum operator in the equatorial plane (such as \( I_y \)) are ideal for correcting \( I_z \) errors. Expressed in terms of the raising and lowering operators \( I_y^{(\pm)} \) for the \( y \) component of angular momentum, \( I_z = (I_y^{(\uparrow)} + I_y^{(\downarrow)})/2 \), so the effect of an \( I_z \) error on the extremal eigenstates of \( I_y \) is to decrement the magnitude of the \( I_y \) eigenvalues: \(|\pm I\rangle_y \rightarrow |\pm(I-1)\rangle_y \). As long as \( I \geq 3/2 \), such an error is exactly correctable. In fact, for \( I = (2p + 1)/2 \) it is possible to correct up to \( p \) consecutive \( I_z \) errors, analogous to a code of distance \( d = 2p + 1 \) \([21, \text{ Sec. 2.2}\)]. Since extremal eigenstates of angular-momentum operators are spin coherent states, these MAUS codespaces are analogous to the cat codes constructed from coherent states in harmonic oscillators \([22-27]\).

Correction of dephasing errors in oscillators has been discussed autonomously with cat codes \([24]\) and in analogy with spin coherent states in binomial codes \([28, \text{ Sec. VI. C.}] \). Native implementation in a spin system, however, is advantageous for at least two reasons. First, in spin systems, the primary source of error is in fact physical dephasing, unlike in harmonic oscillators where the primary loss channel is usually photon loss. Second, the measurements and recovery operations required are much more natural in spin systems than the analogous operations in an oscillator.

**Describing the protocol.**—For the sake of simplicity we illustrate the working principle of our error correction protocol on a 3/2 nuclear spin system (see Fig. 2). The same protocol for error correction can be applied to any higher nuclear spin (see Fig. 3 and Fig. 4) resulting in different performance. Full protocol for higher nuclear spin is detailed in the Supplemental Material \([16]\).

Encoding a logical state starts with preparing the nucleus in the ground state \(|3/2\rangle_z \). To create a superposition of computational-basis states \(|0\rangle = |3/2\rangle_y \) and \(|1\rangle = |−3/2\rangle_y \), one performs a \( \pi \) pulse to transfer the population from \(|3/2\rangle_z \) to \(|1/2\rangle_z \), from which one cre-
ates the desired logical superposition by manipulating the $|\pm1/2\rangle_z$ subspace. Parallel $\pi$ pulses transfer the populations from $|\pm1/2\rangle_z$ to $|\pm3/2\rangle_z$. The maximum time needed for this information-encoding step is that required for a 3π nuclear-spike pulse, typically 1 ms, much shorter than $T_1$ and $T_2$ as are all pulses lengths used for manipulations. At this point, the information is encoded in the $I_n$ basis, where it is vulnerable to dephasing from the fluctuating magnetic field. To transfer the information to the $I_n$ basis, where it will be protected from this fluctuating field, one finally applies a linear drive to rotate the entire spin by an angle of $\pi/2$ about the $x$ axis, completing the encoding in the subspace that protects against dephasing errors. This encoding procedure is illustrated in the left part of Fig. 2.

Error detection is performed by reversing the $\pi/2$ pulse about the $x$ axis and driving transitions that flip the electron spin when the nuclear spin is in the states $|\pm1/2\rangle_z$. Notice that the waiting time between two error-detection pulses must be an integer multiple of $4\pi/Q$, on the order of 0.2 ms, to remove the evolution induced by the quadrupole term. Subsequent measurement of the electron effects a measurement projecting the nuclear spin into the subspace spanned by $|\pm3/2\rangle_z$ (signalling no error) or the subspace spanned by $|\pm1/2\rangle_z$ (signalling an $I_z$ error). One measures the electron spin of the donor by applying a $\pi$ pulse on the ancillary dot electron only resonant if the donor electron is in its exited state. By adjusting the gate potential $V_0$ of the ancillary dot, one can set its chemical potential such that the electron on the ancillary dot can only tunnel to the readout dot when it is in its excited state [31]. By measuring the presence or absence of such tunneling, one completes the measurement chain, resulting in a QND measurement of the nuclear spin that does not affect the charge state of the donor. More details about this error-detection protocol are given in the Supplemental Material [16]. The typical time needed for the electron-spin manipulation is 0.1 ms. Adding this to the QND readout time, on the order of 0.5 ms [15], gives an error-detection time of 0.6 ms. This is much shorter than the electron-spin lifetime in a static magnetic field of 1 T, which is on the order of $10^8$ seconds [32].

During the detection protocol, in the case of an error we allow the electron to remain in its flipped state. Because of the hyperfine coupling, depending on whether the number of errors during the full protocol is even or odd the $|0\rangle$ state of the qubit will be encoded in the nuclear-spin state $|3/2\rangle_y$ or $|−3/2\rangle_y$, respectively, which we must keep track of in order to correctly interpret the outcomes of decoding measurements.

The recovery operation, to be performed if an error is detected, is simply parallel $\pi$ pulses to transfer population from $|1/2\rangle_z \rightarrow |3/2\rangle_z$ and $|−1/2\rangle_z \rightarrow |−3/2\rangle_z$. The typical duration of this pulse is 0.5 ms. In the event that no error is detected, no recovery operation is needed. Fi-
nally, a $\pi/2$ rotation about the $x$ axis is performed again to return the information to the protected subspace.

Information decoding is a $\pi/2$ pulse about the $x$ axis follow by two ESR pulses separated in time. If the electron spin flip occurs during the first (second) ESR pulse we know that the nuclear spin is in the $|{-3/2}\rangle_z$ ($|3/2\rangle_z$) state. If the electron spin fails to flip during either of the ESR pulses, this indicates an error has occurred, though a faithful measurement result could still be obtained by using ESR pulses to flip the electron spin conditioned on the nucleus being in the states $|\pm 1/2\rangle_z$.

Noise Effect.—Detection and recovery operations are necessarily noisy, which implies that the correction step should not be repeated too frequently. Figure 4 depicts how a code executed with these imperfections can pass from beating the break-even point to performing worse than a bare qubit if the time $t$ between correction cycles is made too short. Additionally, the fact that detection and recovery are performed while the information is encoded in the $I_z$ basis means that the information is exposed to uncorrectable errors during the procedure, so as usual it is important to perform these operations as quickly as possible. Even so, this procedure provides a means of extending the lifetime of logical quantum information by storing it predominantly in the protected subspace (where the noise does not corrupt the information).

The baseline against which we compare the performance of our protocol is the uncorrected encoding of logical information in the subspace spanned by $|\pm 1/2\rangle$. This is a subspace that experiences minimal dephasing, and so provides the best storage of logical information in the absence of any error correction. For optimal performance, one would use tools from optimal control—such as GRAPE [33]—to craft optimal pulse sequences for achieving the desired operations.

Quantifying performance.—To quantify the performance of these codes and the proposed correction protocol, we perform a series of numerical experiments, using entanglement fidelity/infidelity of the corrected dephasing channel with the ideal identity channel as our figure of merit. The dephasing channel we use is generated by the master equation

$$\dot{\rho} = \Gamma_n D[\sigma_\zeta] \rho + \frac{1}{2} \Gamma_e D[\sigma_\zeta] \rho ,$$

where $\Gamma_n$ and $\Gamma_e$ quantify the dephasing rates of the nuclear and the electron spins, respectively. Figure 3 illustrates the performance of the spin-3/2 code and the analogous higher-spin codes in an idealized setting where the detection and recovery operations are performed perfectly and instantaneously. The size of the nuclear spin determines how many $I_z$ dephasing errors can be successfully recovered, so in the limit of small dephasing $\Gamma_n t \ll 1$ the infidelity scales as a power of the dephasing that grows with the size of the nuclear spin. The most analogous existing codes are called minimal qudit codes [29] and require a nucleus of at least spin 5/2. As Fig. 3 reveals, even our smallest spin-3/2 code outperforms the spin-5/2 minimal qudit code for all but exceedingly large dephasing.

Figure 4 illustrates the fidelities we can expect from this error-correction procedure in the more realistic setting of noisy detection and recovery. As there is some ambiguity when modeling as to where to locate the imperfections, we choose to concentrate all the noise in the environmental dephasing and leave the control Hamiltonians ideal. Taking the Rabi frequencies for the transitions between neighboring nuclear and electron spin states to be $\Omega$, we consider nuclear dephasing rates $\Gamma_n$ ranging from $10^{-7} \Omega$ to $10^{-4} \Omega$ (for donor charge state going from neutral to ionized, respectively) and electron dephasing rates of at least $\Gamma_e = 5 \times 10^{-4} \Omega$. These parameter values reflect the greater susceptibility of the electron spin to environmental noise, and result in a nuclear-spin $\pi$-pulse fidelity going from 99% to 99.99% and an electron-spin $\pi$-pulse fidelity of at most 99.95%, which is consistent with experimentally measured values reported in the literature [6]. For nuclear dephasing rate $\Gamma_n = 10^{-4} \Omega$ one can beat the break-even point with repetition rates less than
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$10^3 \Gamma_n$, giving several orders of magnitude over which we can significantly reduce errors. We find as much as an order-of-magnitude reduction of entanglement infidelity at the optimal rate $30 \Gamma_n$ before hitting a floor when the correction procedure introduces noise more rapidly than the environment. Larger spins again exhibit more rapid suppression of entanglement infidelity initially as the repetition rate is increased, though the more complicated correction procedure implies a higher noise floor.

Figures 5(a) and 5(b) illustrate parameter regimes in which our protocol beats the break-even point for the spin-3/2 code. As one can see in Fig. 5(a), there is a horizontal transition from beating the break-even point to failing to beat that point as the electron dephasing rate increases. This indicates that, for a given nuclear dephasing rate, there is a maximum electron dephasing rate beyond which the error-correction measurements are so noisy as to be useless. Likewise there is a vertical transition from beating the break-even point to failing to beat the break-even point as the waiting time between correction cycles decreases. This happens when the time between error-correction cycles is so short that the environmental dephasing is negligible compared to the errors introduced by imperfect detection and recovery operations. For a fixed electron dephasing rate, as shown in Fig. 5(b), the minimum waiting time above which it is possible to beat the break-even point varies proportionately with the nuclear dephasing rate. Even for a nuclear dephasing rate of $10^{-2} \Omega$, as one would expect for less favorable neutral donors, one still has a range of correction-cycle-repetition rates spanning an order of magnitude that beats the break-even point.

Conclusion.—We have described a hardware-efficient error-correction protocol capable of correcting the most relevant noise in spins. Our simulations show that this protocol can beat the break-even point given the performance demonstrated in present-day experimental systems. Our protocol resembles some error-correcting codes for harmonic oscillators, with the advantage that the operations required by the code are native to the spin system. Recent advances in fast spin readout [34, 35], fast QND read-out [36] and coupling between nuclear spins [8, 37] will further improve the performance and broaden the applications of our protocol.
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SUPPLEMENTAL MATERIAL

Simulations

The error channel we consider in all simulations is obtained by integrating the Lindblad master equation Eq. (2). For Fig. 3, to illustrate the optimal performance of the codes we consider, the detection and recovery operations are assumed to take place instantaneously. For the MAUS codes, this means applying a quantum operation that projects the nucleus onto one of the several subspaces spanned by $I_y$ basis vectors.

Coherent manipulations

In this section, we detail the nuclear and electron spin manipulation Hamiltonians and we discuss the microwave-pulse properties as well as the fidelities we expect given recent experimental results. A spin subjected to a resonant monochromatic microwave pulse rotates at an angular frequency $\Omega$ around an axis $r = (\sin \phi, -\cos \phi, 0)$, $\phi$ being the phase of the pulse. The spin state at any time $\tau$ can be calculated by the equation $|\Psi(\Omega \tau)\rangle = R_\phi(\Omega \tau)|\Psi(0)\rangle$. The rotation operator $R$ depends on the applied pulse.
Nuclear spin

The record reported fidelity of a coherent manipulation of a single donor nuclear spin in enriched silicon 28 is 99.99% [6]. This fidelity is obtained when the donor is in its ionised state. The reported fidelity for the donor in its neutral state is 99% [6]. Because we need a non null dipole coupling term $A$ to implement the protocol, we take these two values as extreme case in the calculation of the code fidelity Fig. 5(b). All NMR manipulations are applied in the slow-manipulation limit ($\Omega_\nu \ll Q$), meaning the applied oscillating magnetic field is much smaller than 0.5 mT. Each transition can then be manipulated individually. In this regime, the generalised rotating-frame approximation is appropriate to describe the dynamics of the nuclear spin [38].

We first discuss the quasi mono-chromatic regime. In this regime, each nuclear spin is subjected to a maximum of one resonant pulse. Under this approximation, a pulse of frequency $\nu_{pq}$, phase shift $\phi$ and duration $\tau$, resonant with the nuclear spin transition $|p\rangle \leftrightarrow |q\rangle$, induces a Rabi oscillation of angle $\theta = \Omega_{pq}\tau$. The expression for the rotation unitary is then

$$R_\phi^{(p\rangle \leftrightarrow |q\rangle}(\theta) = \exp[i\theta(\sigma^x_{p\rangle \leftrightarrow |q\rangle} \cos \phi + \sigma^y_{p\rangle \leftrightarrow |q\rangle} \sin \phi)/2], \quad (3)$$

with $\sigma^x_{p\rangle \leftrightarrow |q\rangle}$ and $\sigma^y_{p\rangle \leftrightarrow |q\rangle}$ being Pauli operators acting on the subspace spanned by $|p\rangle$ and $|q\rangle$. As shown in Fig. 2, we use this unitary evolution during the information-encoding step ($\pi$ pulse on the first transition, arbitrary pulse on the second transition and simultaneous $\pi$ pulse on the first and the third transition) and the error-correction step (simultaneous $\pi$ pulse on the first and the third transition). The typical frequency of the microwave pulse sent to perform these manipulations is 200 MHz. For the $I_x$ rotation, the dynamic is different in the sense that a given state can be subjected to two components of the poly-chromatic pulse. We then need to treat the generalised rotating frame Hamiltonian in its more general form. Considering pulse frequency component $\nu_j = \gamma_n B_z + A + (2 - j)Q$ of amplitude $B_j$ resonant with the nuclear spin transition $j$, the Hamiltonian of the nuclear spin dynamic is:

$$H_{G.R.F} = \gamma_n/2 \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{3}B_1 & 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{3}B_1 & 0 & 2B_2 & 0 \\ 0 & 2B_2 & 0 & \sqrt{3}B_3 \\ 0 & 0 & \sqrt{3}B_3 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

It is then possible to calibrate the magnetic field amplitude of each pulse frequency component to reach the equality $H_{G.R.F} = I_x$. This manipulation is used before and after each free evolution. The typical frequencies of the microwave pulse component sent to perform these manipulations are 200 MHz.

A key point of the protocol is the quantum non demolition (QND) read out of the nuclear spin. Even though Fig. 1 only depicts the double dot approach, we discuss two approaches in this section. The first is the one implemented in the experiment that gave the state-of-the-art coherent-manipulation fidelity for donors [6], the second is a proposal that would induce less dephasing during the error detection step.

QND read-out

To find out if the nuclear spin is in the $\{|-1/2\rangle , |1/2\rangle\}$ subspace, we apply a polychromatic pulse ($f^{(-1/2)}$ and $f^{(1/2)}$) of amplitude and duration guaranteeing a $\pi$ rotation of the electron spin. If the nuclear spin is in the subspace $\{|-3/2\rangle , |3/2\rangle\}$ the pulse won’t have any effect on the system. By contrast, if the nuclear spin is in $\{|-1/2\rangle , |1/2\rangle\}$ the pulse is resonant and will reverse the electron spin. This change of electron spin induces an electron transfer back and forth with the lateral dot tuned with a appropriate chemical potential. This electron transfer with the dot can be measured by a transport measurement through a SET or by rf-reflectometry on the dot. The electron transfer between the donor and the dot impacts the nuclear spin dynamic. Indeed, the harmonic $A$ term of the hyperfine coupling comes from a contact interaction between the nuclear spin and the electron spin. When the electron tunnels back and forth between the donor and the dot, the nuclear spin is no longer subject to the same dynamics. This induces a loss of information on the phase of the nuclear spin $\delta\phi = A\delta t$, $\delta t$ being the time resolution of the electron position measurement. The hyperfine interaction term $A$ is of the order of $10^8$ Hz and the fastest charge readout, based on reflectometry measurement [39, 40], is of the order of $10^{-7}$ s, giving a phase uncertainty of the order of 10 rad. To reduce this uncertainty down to $10^{-3}$, a value where this dephasing mechanism could be negligible compared with the environmental dephasing process, it is necessary both to reduce the coupling term $A$ and to use a faster charge-readout technique. A proposal [8] shows that by applying a DC electric field on top of the donor, the electron wave function can be delocalised to an interface charge state. It is then possible to tune the $A$ term from zero to its zero field value. Notice that the value of $A$ cannot be null in the proposed protocol to keep a sufficiently high energy difference in between the different electron spin transitions. This decrease of $A$ added to the temporal resolution offered by reflectometry techniques would lower the phase uncertainty. However, in order to have a reasonable phase uncertainty, technical developments are necessary, which is why we propose a double-dot system.

Single-dot measurement

To find out if the nuclear spin is in the $\{|-1/2\rangle , |1/2\rangle\}$ subspace, we apply a polychromatic pulse ($f^{(-1/2)}$ and $f^{(1/2)}$) of amplitude and duration guaranteeing a $\pi$ rotation of the electron spin. If the nuclear spin is in the subspace $\{|-3/2\rangle , |3/2\rangle\}$ the pulse won’t have any effect on the system. By contrast, if the nuclear spin is in $\{|-1/2\rangle , |1/2\rangle\}$ the pulse is resonant and will reverse the electron spin. This change of electron spin induces an electron transfer back and forth with the lateral dot tuned with a appropriate chemical potential. This electron transfer with the dot can be measured by a transport measurement through a SET or by rf-reflectometry on the dot. The electron transfer between the donor and the dot impacts the nuclear spin dynamic. Indeed, the harmonic $A$ term of the hyperfine coupling comes from a contact interaction between the nuclear spin and the electron spin. When the electron tunnels back and forth between the donor and the dot, the nuclear spin is no longer subject to the same dynamics. This induces a loss of information on the phase of the nuclear spin $\delta\phi = A\delta t$, $\delta t$ being the time resolution of the electron position measurement. The hyperfine interaction term $A$ is of the order of $10^8$ Hz and the fastest charge readout, based on reflectometry measurement [39, 40], is of the order of $10^{-7}$ s, giving a phase uncertainty of the order of 10 rad. To reduce this uncertainty down to $10^{-3}$, a value where this dephasing mechanism could be negligible compared with the environmental dephasing process, it is necessary both to reduce the coupling term $A$ and to use a faster charge-readout technique. A proposal [8] shows that by applying a DC electric field on top of the donor, the electron wave function can be delocalised to an interface charge state. It is then possible to tune the $A$ term from zero to its zero field value. Notice that the value of $A$ cannot be null in the proposed protocol to keep a sufficiently high energy difference in between the different electron spin transitions. This decrease of $A$ added to the temporal resolution offered by reflectometry techniques would lower the phase uncertainty. However, in order to have a reasonable phase uncertainty, technical developments are necessary, which is why we propose a double-dot system.
Double-dot measurement

Figure 1 (a) illustrates another idea to avoid the dephasing effect due to the modification of the hyperfine coupling during the readout process. The idea is to use a read-out technique that does not affect the charge state of the donor. Such a technique has been demonstrated in several different systems [14, 41], including silicon based quantum dots [15]. In this last case, a $\pi$ pulse is applied to the electron spin below $V_a$. This pulse is resonant with the electron-spin transition only if the donor electron spin is in its excited state. The electron-spin flip induces a transfer back and forth of the ancillary electron with the SET as for the actual donor spin readout. Notice that in the donor system, the degeneracy between the dot and the donor electron spin is lifted by the hyperfine coupling, meaning that no micro-magnets are needed (see Fig. 6). In this protocol, a microwave pulse needs to be added to the sequence of Fig. 2. In the error-detection part, after the $f_{0}^{\pm 1/2}(\pi)$ pulse, a $\pi$ pulse is applied to the electron spin located under $V_a$. This pulse is resonant only if the donor electron spin has been flipped by the $f_{0}^{\pm 1/2}(\pi)$ pulse. This exchange coupling may affect the fidelity of the electron-spin manipulation. In addition, the charge state of the donor is kept in its neutral state. This avoids the uncertainty of the previous protocol but induces a bigger constant dephasing due to a higher coupling of the nuclear spin to the environment through the hyperfine coupling. Indeed, as measured [12], the nuclear spin $T_2$ goes from 1.75s in its ionized state to 20.4ms in its neutral state. However, the hyperfine coupling $A$ can be tuned from its zero-field value down to zero with the gate potential $V_d$ [8]. An intermediate value of $A$ allows lower dephasing rates while keeping a non-zero value, necessary for the pulse selectivity of the protocol. Figure 5(b) displays a significant gain of the MAUS code compared with a bare qubit for a range of nuclear-spin dephasing rates going from its neutral to ionized charge-state value.

Protocol for higher order spin

Increasing the size of the nuclear spin increases the complexity of the pulse sequence, especially for the error detection. Here we briefly describe the protocol for a $|5/2\rangle$ nuclear spin. To limit the average number of manipulations required, we first flip the electron spin conditioned on one or two errors having occurred. Most of the time, no error will be detected at this stage. If an error is detected, a second pulse is then sent to distinguish between one and two errors having occurred. The same logic can be generalized to higher spins, making sure that each binary measurement can unambiguously identify the most likely error at each step.
FIG. 6. Spin transitions of the donor/double-dot system. (a) At each column an interaction is added to display how the degeneracies are lifted. On the right (b), the spin transitions are ordered as function of their energies. The nuclear spin transitions $\nu_J^J$ are in yellow, the error detection pulses $J_0^{\pm 1/2}$ are in solid red line ($\gamma - J/2 \pm A$) and the ancillary-dot-electron transition is in solid green line ($\gamma - \pm J/2$). This spectrum shows that the transitions of the donor and dot electron spins are at two different energies due to the hyperfine coupling. Besides, the dot electron-spin manipulation is conditioned by the electron spin to the donor as needed to perform the QND readout without modifying the charge state of the donor.

FIG. 7. Illustration of the MAUS error correcting protocol applied to a spin $5/2$. 