Quantum information transport to multiple receivers.
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The importance of transporting quantum information and entanglement with high fidelity cannot be overemphasized. We present a scheme based on adiabatic passage that allows for transportation of a qubit, operator measurements and entanglement, using a 1-D array of quantum sites with a single sender (Alice) and multiple receivers (Bobs). Alice need not know which Bob is the receiver, and if several Bobs try to receive the signal, they obtain a superposition state which can be used to realize two-qubit operator measurements for the generation of maximally entangled states.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Hk, 72.25.Dc, 73.21.La

Allied to the efforts to build a working quantum computer (QC) is the requirement to replicate, in a quantum framework, the necessary features of a classical computer. In particular, some kind of quantum bus would be highly advantageous to allow a form of distributed QC [1]. Long range quantum information transfer usually exploits teleportation [2], or flying qubits [3]: we consider a mechanism more related to a quantum wire or fanout. Fanout operations are forbidden quantum mechanically, as they necessarily imply cloning, however, considering the closest quantum analog leads to a new approach to quantum communication, described here.

A naïve approach to transport in quantum systems is via sequential swap gates between sites. This approach is often undesirable due to, for example, noise introduced by sensitive nonadiabatic controls, poor level of gate control, insufficient bandwidth or impractical gate density [4]. Many authors have begun to examine alternatives [4, 5, 6] considering schemes where a desired coupling is set up (usually statically) and the system allowed to evolve until the information transfer has occurred. In such schemes the receivers may be passive [4], or active [5], but it is usually assumed that neither sender nor receiver can modify the qubit chain, except for control of their own qubit or qubits and local coupling to the chain.

We propose an extremely general alternative for adiabatic transfer of a particle between positional quantum states. An obvious application of this is as a transport mechanism for ion trap QCs. In one approach [7] a scheme for transporting ions sequentially from storage zones to interaction sites was proposed via a microtrap array [8]: the Quantum Charge Coupled Device. With minor modification, our scheme provides an interesting alternative. One attractive feature of the present scheme is that requirements on quantum state guidance are minimized, and sympathetic cooling following transport should not be required. One could also consider solid-state realizations of this scheme in a patterned GaAs quantum dot array [9, 10] or where the confining potentials are realized using ionized P donors in a Si matrix [11, 12, 13].

We consider a quasi-one-dimensional chain of quantum sites, realized, by the empty or singly occupied states of a positional eigenstate, see Fig. 1. The initial state $|\Psi(0)\rangle = |\phi\rangle_A$ goes to a spatial superposition state $|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{j} c_j |\phi\rangle_j$. The bus is defined by tunnel coupled sites 1 to n. Static, high tunneling matrix elements (TME) are shown by double lines, lower, controlled TME by single lines. Alice controls one site, A, and the Bobs are represented by the sites $B_j$, connected to the bus at sites 1, 3, ..., 2n − 1. Alice controls $\Omega_A$, and Bob j controls $\Omega_{B_j}$.

![FIG. 1: Quantum bus for qubit transfer from Alice to the Bobs. The initial state $|\Psi(0)\rangle = |\phi\rangle_A$ goes to a spatial superposition state $|\Psi(t)\rangle = \sum_{j} c_j |\phi\rangle_j$. The bus is defined by tunnel coupled sites 1 to n. Static, high tunneling matrix elements (TME) are shown by double lines, lower, controlled TME by single lines. Alice controls one site, A, and the Bobs are represented by the sites $B_j$, connected to the bus at sites 1, 3, ..., 2n − 1. Alice controls $\Omega_A$, and Bob j controls $\Omega_{B_j}$.](image)
ation \cite{18}. Although we explicitly consider spatial transfer of particles, information could be transferred using spin chains \cite{18} with time-varying adiabatic coupling sequences instead of static couplings.

To investigate transport, we write the Hamiltonian for a single qubit carried by a particle in a positional array

$$
\mathcal{H} = \sum_{i=1}^{2n-1} \left[ \frac{E_i}{2} c_{i,\sigma}^+ c_{i,\sigma} + \Omega_S c_{i+1,\sigma}^+ c_{i,\sigma} \right] + \sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ \frac{E_{Bj}}{2} c_{Bj,\sigma}^+ c_{Bj,\sigma} + \Omega_{Bj} c_{Bj,\sigma}^+ c_{Bj+1,\sigma} \right] + \text{h.c.},
$$

where we have introduced the (externally controlled) site energies, $E$, and $\Omega_S$ is the tunneling matrix element (TME) along the bus, which is not varied during the protocol. $\Omega_A$ is the TME between $A$ and $B$ which Alice can control, whilst $\Omega_{Bj}$ is the TME between $B_j$ and $2j-1$, and $c_{i,\sigma}$ is the annihilation operator for a qubit with state $\sigma = 0, 1$ on site $i$ for $i = A, 1 \cdots 2n-1, B_1 \cdots B_n$. Control of these TMEs is by varying the potential barrier between the sites and the chain. The exact method for this variation is implementation dependent, but for a GaAs or P:Si system could be via surface gates \cite{10, 12}, or mean well separation in an optical lattice \cite{16}. For notational brevity we do not indicate unoccupied sites explicitly, so well separation in an optical lattice \cite{16}. For notational brevity we do not indicate unoccupied sites explicitly, so

$$
\sum_{j=1}^{n} \left[ \frac{E_{Bj}}{2} c_{Bj,\sigma}^+ c_{Bj,\sigma} + \Omega_{Bj} c_{Bj,\sigma}^+ c_{Bj+1,\sigma} \right] + \text{h.c.},
$$

where the energy of the particle at the Bobs’ sites and their coupling from Alice to the chain, and the TMEs between chain sites, the second to the energy of the particle on Alice’s site, and the coupling from Alice to the chain, and the final term to the energy of the particle at the Bobs’ sites and their tunneling to the chain. For $n$ Bobs there must be at least $2n - 1$ sites in the chain, so we assume this number (extra sites in the chain do not interfere with the scheme as discussed below). As the qubit degree of freedom is decoupled from the positional degree of freedom, it is carried along as a ‘spectator’ storing information, but otherwise unaffected by the transfer.

To realize the counter-intuitive pulse sequence, we set all of the site energies to 0 (i.e. $E_i,\sigma = 0$ for $i = 1 \cdots 2n - 1, A, B_1 \cdots B_n$, using the external control. The TMEs are modulated (again via external control) in a Gaussian fashion according to (see Fig. 2)

$$
\Omega_A(t) = \Omega_A^{\text{max}} \exp \left\{ -\left[ t - (t_{\text{max}}/2 + s) \right]^2 / (2s^2) \right\},
$$

$$
\Omega_{Bj}(t) = \Omega_{Bj}^{\text{max}} \exp \left\{ -\left[ t - (t_{\text{max}}/2 - s) \right]^2 / (2s^2) \right\},
$$

where $\Omega_{Bj}^{\text{max}} \ll \Omega_S$, and $s$ is the width of the applied pulses. $\Omega_A^{\text{max}} = \Omega_{Bj}^{\text{max}}$ if Bob$_j$ wishes to receive a signal from Alice, and $\Omega_{Bj}^{\text{max}} = 0$ otherwise. The scheme is extremely robust to the choice of modulation, and in common with conventional adiabatic transfer schemes alternatives to Gaussians have little effect providing the

$$
\left| \psi_1 \right> = \left( \Omega_B, |\phi \rangle_A - \Omega_A |\phi \rangle_{Bj} \right) \sqrt{\Omega_A^2 + \Omega_{Bj}^2},
$$

$$
\left| \psi_2 \right> = \Omega_B^2 |\phi \rangle_A - \Omega_A \Omega_B \Omega_{Bj} \left| \phi \right>_{Bj} + \Omega_A |\phi \rangle_{Bj},
$$

where $\Omega_S \gg \Omega_A, \Omega_B, \Omega_{Bj}$, and $|\phi \rangle_A \equiv a|0 \rangle_A + b|1 \rangle_A$. Any linear combination of these two states is also a null state, so it suffices to find the state adiabatically connected to Alice’s site at $t = 0$, i.e. $|\psi(t = 0) \rangle = |\phi \rangle_A$. If $\Omega_{Bj}(t) = 0$, $|\psi_1 \rangle$ is adiabatically connected to $|\psi(t = 0) \rangle$ and the qubit is transferred from $|\phi \rangle_A$ to $|\phi \rangle_{Bj}$, if $\Omega_{Bj}(t) = 0$, then $|\psi_2 \rangle$ is adiabatically connected to $|\phi \rangle_A$, and the qubit transferred from $|\phi \rangle_A$ to $|\phi \rangle_{Bj}$. Hence the qubit can be sent from Alice to either Bob, without Alice knowing which Bob is the receiver.

If both Bobs are receivers, they choose $\Omega_{Bj}(t) = \Omega_B^2(t)$ and $(|\psi_1 \rangle - |\psi_2 \rangle)/2$ is adiabatically connected.
to $|\phi\rangle_A$. The final state of the system after MRAP is 
\[(|\psi\rangle_B - |\phi\rangle_B)/\sqrt{2},\] which is quantum fanout, with both Bobs sharing an equal positional superposition of the qubit. We stress that have not cloned Alice’s qubit, and measurements of the qubit position will collapse it at either $B_1$ or $B_2$. For adiabatic transport, the adiabaticity criterion \[\frac{\sqrt{2}}{\Omega} \approx 1\] must be satisfied, i.e., the inverse transfer time must be small compared with the energy gap between states, $E = [(\Omega^2_A + \Omega^2_B + \Omega^2_{B_2})/2]^{1/2}$ for large $\Omega$. 

In the general case the null space is spanned by
\[
|\psi_j\rangle = \frac{\Omega_{B_j}|\phi\rangle_A + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \frac{\Omega_k \Omega_{B_k}}{(-1)^j \Omega_{B_j}} |\phi\rangle_{2k} + (-1)^j \Omega_A |\phi\rangle_{B_j}}{\sqrt{\Omega_A^2 + \Omega_{B_j}^2}},
\]
and up to known signs, all receiver Bobs obtain an equal superposition of the qubit. One can show that the energy gap between the zero and next nearest eigenstate is $E_{\text{gap}} = [(\Omega_A^2 + \sum_{k=1}^{j-1} \Omega_{B_k}^2)/j]^{1/2}$, for the $j$-Bob protocol, so the scaling for more Bobs goes as $[(1 + j)/j]^{1/2}$.

We have performed preliminary studies of the robustness of this scheme, and find a similar resistance to errors as other adiabatic protocols. If the simultaneity of the Bob pulses is not exact, or if the $\Omega_B$ pulse areas are not exactly the same, then the superposition state shared following the protocol will not be exact. Providing adiabaticity is satisfied, such errors introduce a monotonic decrease in fidelity. It is difficult to explore the full state space because of the large range of parameters, however, the point is that MRAP is not exponentially sensitive to errors. We have also solved the case where the chain is cyclic, i.e. where site 1 is connected to sites 2 and $2n$, and the protocol works without modification. These results will be presented in more detail elsewhere.

We have shown the most general case of Alice sending a qubit to the Bobs, but a special case would be where Alice could be a factory of pure states. MRAP could be used to send these states with high fidelity around a quantum network, important for many QC architectures.

The only difference between Alice and Bobs is the order in which they vary their coupling to the bus. Therefore the Bobs can also perform inter-Bob communication by assuming the role of Alice or Bob as required. Reversing the protocol for the two-Bob case (with $\Omega_{B_1} = \Omega_{B_2}$) gives the transformations
\[
|\phi\rangle_{B_1} \rightarrow (1/\sqrt{2})|\phi\rangle_A + (1/2) (|\phi\rangle_{B_1} + |\phi\rangle_{B_2}),
\]
\[
|\phi\rangle_{B_2} \rightarrow -(1/\sqrt{2})|\phi\rangle_A + (1/2) (|\phi\rangle_{B_1} + |\phi\rangle_{B_2}).
\]

We have not included the effects of dephasing here, as it will vary significantly between different implementations. In most practical systems of particle transfer, one expects particle localization to dominate over spontaneous emission, i.e. $T_2 \ll T_1$. Hence we will ignore $T_1$. However, $T_2$ processes will take the system out of the null space, and will be detrimental to the transfer protocol. Dephasing has been considered analytically in STIRAP and numerically for higher order protocols. If the minimum transfer time is satisfied, the transfer failure probability goes as $\Gamma_2 T_{\text{tot}}$ where $\Gamma_2$ is the dephasing rate and $T_{\text{tot}}$ is the total protocol time, and this requirement is different from the requirements for charge-qubit systems. Our numerical models show that MRAP is not inherently more sensitive than the 1-D spatial adiabatic passage, although the total time that superposition states must be maintained will be longer than in the 1-D case, with corresponding (linear) decrease of robustness.

Considering implementations, the total time for the protocol must be $T_{\text{tot}} \gtrsim 10/\Omega_{\text{max}}$, and the chain TMEs must be $\Omega_{S} \gtrsim 10^{3} \Omega_{\text{max}}$. In a P:Si system, with Alice and Bob site separations from the chain of 30nm, and interchain separations of 20nm, rise to give rise to $\Omega_{\text{max}} \sim 100\text{GHz}$ and $\Omega_{S} \sim 1\text{THz}$, which gives a probability of transfer error of $10^{-2}$ for $\Gamma_2 = 100\text{MHz}$ for $T_{\text{tot}} \sim 2\text{ns}$, which is certainly feasible (though unmeasured) given current projections of P:Si architectures. Hu et al. \cite{hu} suggest that GaAs quantum dots with TMEs in the same range could be achieved with inter-dot spacings of 30 – 35nm. Petta et al. \cite{petta} measured charge dephasing rates of $\Gamma_2 \sim 10\text{GHz}$, suggesting that a proof of principle demonstration of MRAP is already possible, although improvements in $\Gamma_2$ are needed before a practical GaAs implementation is possible. Ion trap and optical lattice systems, however, show the most promise for demonstrations. Eckert et al. \cite{eckert} estimate adiabatic timescales for the three-state protocol of order milliseconds, and because the transfer is in vacuum, $\Gamma_2$ should be small compared with this rate.

MRAP can be extended to realize two-qubit operator measurements \cite{stirap}. The extension requires augmenting the existing protocol with extra qubits and the ability to perform entanglement operations between the Bob sites and these qubits. By using the bus as a mediator for entanglement, our protocol has a similar aim to the multiplexer of Paternostro et al. \cite{paternostro}, but arises from a very different mechanism. In addition to their vacant sites, $B_j$ each Bob has a qubit, $Q_j$, and can perform either a CNOT or CZ operation between sites $B_j$ (control) and $Q_j$ (target), depicted in Fig. 4. An example, we show the protocol for two-Bob MRAP, where the multi-Bob bus forms an effective qutrit ancilla (formed by the states $|1\rangle_A, |1\rangle_{B_1}, |1\rangle_{B_2}$), and we demonstrate projective
measurements of $U_1 U_2 \equiv \sigma_{U;Q_1} \otimes \sigma_{U;Q_2}$ for $U = X, Z$.

1. Initially, the $Q_j$’s are in the arbitrary state $|\Phi\rangle_{Q_1, Q_2}$, and the bus in state $|1\rangle_A$. The total system state is

$$|\Psi\rangle = |1\rangle_A |\Phi\rangle_{Q_1, Q_2}.$$  

2. MRAP is performed, the system’s state becomes

$$|\Psi\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2}) (|1\rangle_{B_1} - |1\rangle_{B_2}) |\Phi\rangle_{Q_1, Q_2}.$$  

3. The Bobs perform a Controlled-$U$ operation between sites $B_i$ and $Q_i$, where the action of the controlled operation is trivial when $B_i$ is unoccupied, the state evolves to

$$|\Psi\rangle = (1/\sqrt{2}) (|1\rangle_{B_1} U_{Q_1} I_{Q_2} - |1\rangle_{B_2} I_{Q_1} U_{Q_2}) |\Phi\rangle_{Q_1, Q_2},$$  

where $I$ is the identity operator.

4. MRAP transfer is reversed, generating the state

$$|\Psi\rangle = (1/2) |1\rangle_A (U_{Q_1} I_{Q_2} + I_{Q_1} U_{Q_2}) |\Phi\rangle_{Q_1, Q_2} +$$

$$(2/\sqrt{2})^{-1} (|1\rangle_{B_1} + |1\rangle_{B_2}) (U_{Q_1} I_{Q_2} - I_{Q_1} U_{Q_2}) |\Phi\rangle_{Q_1, Q_2}.$$  

5. A measurement is performed at Alice, detecting the bus qubit with probability 1/4, and projecting the state of $|Q_1, Q_2\rangle$ to $(U_{Q_1} I_{Q_2} + I_{Q_1} U_{Q_2}) |\Phi\rangle_{Q_1, Q_2}$, i.e. the $+1$ eigenstate of $U_{Q_1} U_{Q_2}$, if successful.

6. If no qubit was measured at Alice, the system is projected to $(U_{Q_1} I_{Q_2} - I_{Q_1} U_{Q_2}) |\Phi\rangle_{Q_1, Q_2}$, which is the $-1$ eigenstate of $U_{Q_1} U_{Q_2}$, so a $\sigma_z$ at $B_2$ allows the qubit to be deterministically returned to Alice in another reverse of the MRAP protocol. Hence MRAP affords a complete two-qubit operator measurement of $XX$ and $ZZ$.

As the above protocol gives $XX$ and $ZZ$ operator measurements on physically separated qubits, we may use this to create many-particle stabilizer states, e.g. the $N$ particle GHZ state $|GHZ\rangle_N = (1/2^{N/2})(|00\cdots0\rangle + |11\cdots1\rangle N)$ (for convenience we choose $N$ even). First, initialize $Q_1$ to $Q_N$ to $|0\rangle$. Then, perform $X_{2i-1} X_{2i}$ stabilizer measurements via two-Bob MRAP on the pairs of $Q_{2i-1}$ and $Q_{2i}$ for $i = 1, N/2$, creating a series of independent two-particle Bell states $\bigotimes_{i=1}^{N/2} (|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle)_{Q_{2i-1}, Q_{2i}}$, where the relative sign is known from the projective measurement result at Alice. Local single qubit operations can be used to convert the Bell pairs to $|00\rangle + |11\rangle$. Next $X_{2i} Z_{2i+1}$ stabilizer measurements are performed between the Bell pairs, and this is sufficient to project the computer into $|GHZ\rangle_N$ (up to local operations). If one has access to multiple Alice’s, and the ability to break the chain freely (with surface gates), then these operations can be performed in parallel, meaning that the $|GHZ\rangle_N$ state can be formed in two MRAP steps.

We have introduced a transport mechanism for quantum information around a network, based on adiabatic passage. With minor modification our scheme can also be used for generating entanglement and two-qubit measurements. The scheme is ideally suited as an alternative to conventional ionic transport in an ion trap quantum computer. However its utility not restricted to ion traps, and it should have wide applicability to all architectures, especially solid-state quantum computing architectures.
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