

Simulating decoherence of coupled two spin qubits using generalized cluster correlation expansion

Xiao Chen¹, Silas Hoffman², James N. Fry^{1,2}, Hai-Ping Cheng^{1,2,3,4}

¹*Department of Physics, Northeastern University, Boston MA*

²*Department of Physics, U. Florida, Gainesville FL 32611 USA*

³*Quantum Theory Project, University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA and*

⁴*Center for Molecular Magnetic Quantum Materials,
University of Florida, Gainesville, FL 32611, USA*

We study the coherence of two coupled spin qubits in the presence of a bath of nuclear spins simulated using generalized cluster correlation expansion (gCCE) method. In our model, two electron spin qubits coupled with isotropic exchange or magnetic dipolar interactions interact with an environment of random nuclear spins. We study the time-evolution of the two-qubit reduced density matrix (RDM) and resulting decay of the off diagonal elements, corresponding to decoherence, which allows us to calculate gate fidelity in the regime of pure dephasing. We contrast decoherence when the system undergoes free evolution and evolution with dynamical decoupling pulses applied. Moreover, we study the dependence of decoherence on external magnetic field and system parameters which mimic realistic spin qubits, emphasizing magnetic molecules. Lastly, we comment on the application and limitations of gCCE in simulating nuclear-spin induced two-qubit relaxation processes.

I. INTRODUCTION

Localized electrons have been well studied theoretically and experimentally as candidates to store and manipulate quantum information.¹ In addition to being natural qubit candidates owing to their two-level structure, they are also endowed with the ability to interact. Specifically, the exchange interaction facilitates strong, short-range interactions while their magnetic dipoles allow for weaker, long-range interaction. Importantly, when using electrons as qubits, these interactions facilitate entangling two-qubit gates which are necessary for universal quantum computation. Moreover, in multielectron encodings of qubits, these entangling are often necessary to enable single-qubit control. Consequently, understanding the sources of infidelity and decoherence of two interacting qubits is an important problem.

One of the dominant sources of decoherence at low temperatures in spin-qubit systems is due to the surrounding nuclear spin bath.^{2,3} The state-of-the-art method to calculate decoherence of single qubits due to nuclear spins is generalized cluster-correlation expansion (gCCE)^{4,5}. Simulating decoherence of coupled two-spin systems due to quantum noises from nuclear spins, on the other hand, is still a largely unexplored subject with few works on special cases⁶⁻⁸.

In this work, we study precisely that: two coupled spin- $\frac{1}{2}$'s embedded in a random nuclear spin bath. In particular, using gCCE, we calculate the evolution of the two-qubit density matrix under free induction and upon application of dynamical decoupling sequences. Under a large range of system parameters, but guided by those typical for magnetic molecular spin systems, we focus on the off-diagonal elements of the density matrix which reflect decoherence in the two-spin system. We find an optimal regime of parameters in which coherence time is maximized. Consequently, we are able to calculate

(1) T_2^* and T_2 of qubits encoded in two spins and (2) the nuclei-bath limited two-qubit gate fidelity of Loss-DiVincenzo qubits. While the majority our calculations are done in the pure dephasing limit, we also consider the effect of nuclear-induced relaxation and the ability of gCCE to account for them.

The paper is organized as follow, in Sec. II, we introduce the model we investigate which consists of a pair of coupled two spin qubits interacting with a random nuclear spin bath. An description of the gCCE method is also included in this section. In Sec. III, we present the calculated coherence decay of the RDM as well as fidelity of the two spins in pure dephasing regime, in both scenarios with or without dynamical decoupling (DD) pulse sequence applied. Physical understanding of the decay are given in the framework of effective two-level Hamiltonians. In Sec. IV, we conclude the paper.

II. MODEL AND THE GENERALIZED CLUSTER-CORRELATION EXPANSION METHOD

A. Model

The model we consider consists of coupled two electron spin- $\frac{1}{2}$'s embedded in a randomly positioned nuclear spin bath. A sketch of the model is shown in Fig. 1, where the electron spins and the nuclear spins are represented by the red and black arrows, respectively. The bath spins are chosen to be either homogeneously Hydrogen nuclear spins or ²⁹Si nuclear spins, with the former being the main nuclear spin source of decoherence in magnetic molecular systems and the later in quantum dots in semiconductors. The line joining the two electron spins is assumed to be in z direction, and the distance between them is labelled d . We also set a radius r around

each electron spin that is free of nuclear spins in order to study the effect of nearby spins. A minimum separation s among nuclear spins is introduced to avoid unphysical interactions. The interaction between the two electron spins is modeled either by isotropic exchange which can simulate a \sqrt{SWAP} gate while the gate is turned on or magnetic dipolar interaction similarly for an $iSWAP$ gate. The interaction between electron and nuclear spins and that among nuclear spins is assumed to be dipolar. We will consider external magnetic fields both in z direction and perpendicular to the line joining two electron spins (x direction).




FIG. 1: A sketch of the model.

The Hamiltonian of the system reads

$$H = H_S + H_{SB} + H_B, \quad (1)$$

where

$$H_{SB} = \sum_n \vec{S}_1 \cdot \overleftrightarrow{A}_{1n} \cdot \vec{I}_n + \sum_n \vec{S}_2 \cdot \overleftrightarrow{A}_{2n} \cdot \vec{I}_n, \quad (2)$$

$$H_S = -B_z \gamma_e S_{1z} - B_z \gamma_e S_{2z} + J(S_{1x} S_{2x} + S_{1y} S_{2y} + S_{1z} S_{2z}). \quad (3)$$

H_S is the Hamiltonian for the two electron spins, taking isotropic exchange as an example. H_{SB} is the dipolar hyperfine interaction between electron and nuclear spins. H_B includes the Zeeman terms of and the dipolar interactions among the nuclear spins. We will use the method of generalized cluster correlation expansion (gCCE) as implemented in the PyCCE package⁹ to calculate the time evolution of the reduced density matrix (RDM) of the two electron qubits in the eigenbasis of H_S . The singlet and triplet eigenvalues and states of H_S in S_z basis are,

$$\begin{aligned} E_S &= -\frac{3}{4}J, \\ E_{T,-1} &= B_z \gamma_e + \frac{1}{4}J, \\ E_{T,0} &= \frac{1}{4}J, \\ E_{T,1} &= -B_z \gamma_e + \frac{1}{4}J \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} |E_S\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle - |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle), \\ |E_{T,-1}\rangle &= |\downarrow\downarrow\rangle, \\ |E_{T,0}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\downarrow\rangle + |\downarrow\uparrow\rangle), \\ |E_{T,1}\rangle &= |\uparrow\uparrow\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

B. The generalized cluster correlation expansion method

Evolution of the RDM is studied by simulating the time dependence of the normalized RDM elements of the two-qubit system,

$$L^{ab}(t) = \frac{\langle a | \hat{\rho}_S(t) | b \rangle}{\langle a | \hat{\rho}_S(0) | b \rangle}, \quad (6)$$

where t is the evolution time and a, b are from the orthonormal basis in Eq. 5. The decay of the off-diagonal elements, or decoherence, is a loss of information on the relative phase between the basis states and a breakdown of the superposition of them. The initial density matrix of the system is chosen to be a product state of $\hat{\rho}(0) = \hat{\rho}_S(0) \otimes \hat{\rho}_B(0)$ where $\hat{\rho}_S(0) = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ is some pure state of the two qubits. We assume a high temperature limit for the nuclear spin bath, $\hat{\rho}_B(0) = \otimes_i \hat{\rho}_i$ with $\hat{\rho}_i = \hat{I}_0 / (2I + 1)$ and \hat{I}_0 being the identity operator in nuclear spin state space.

For a large bath of a few hundred spins or more, the RDM can be efficiently calculated with the gCCE method. In gCCE, an RDM element of a central spin system in a nuclear spin bath is exactly expanded as a product of contributions from irreducible correlations of bath-spin clusters⁹⁻¹¹,

$$L^{ab}(t) = \tilde{L}_{\{\emptyset\}}^{ab}(t) \prod_{\{i\}} \tilde{L}_{\{i\}}^{ab}(t) \prod_{\{ij\}} \tilde{L}_{\{ij\}}^{ab}(t) \prod_{\{ijk\}} \tilde{L}_{\{ijk\}}^{ab}(t) \dots, \quad (7)$$

where $\tilde{L}_{\{\emptyset\}}^{ab}(t)$ is the phase factor of the free evolution of the central spin, $\tilde{L}_{\{i\}}^{ab}(t)$ is the contribution from single bath spin i , $\tilde{L}_{\{ij\}}^{ab}(t)$ is the contribution from unordered spin pairs $\{ij\}$, and $\tilde{L}_{\{ijk\}}^{ab}(t)$ from a cluster of three different spins, *etc.* The irreducible correlation of a cluster is defined iteratively as⁹⁻¹¹

$$\tilde{L}_C^{ab} = \frac{L_C^{ab}}{\prod_{C' \subset C} \tilde{L}_{C'}^{ab}}, \quad (8)$$

where L_C^{ab} is the coherence function of the central spin as in Eq. 6 if only the terms in the spin Hamiltonian Eq. 1 containing the central spin \hat{S} and bath spins \hat{I}_i in cluster C , but no other bath spins, are present. We label the

sum of these terms as H_{C+S} . Therefore,

$$L_C^{ab}(t) = \frac{\langle a | \text{Tr}_C [\hat{U}_{C+S}(t) \hat{\rho}_{C+S} \hat{U}_{C+S}^\dagger(t)] | b \rangle}{\langle a | \text{Tr}_C [\hat{U}_{C+S}(0) \hat{\rho}_{C+S} \hat{U}_{C+S}^\dagger(0)] | b \rangle}, \quad (9)$$

$$\hat{U}_{C+S}(t) = e^{-i\hat{H}_{C+S}t}, \quad (10)$$

where $\hat{\rho}_{C+S}$ is the initial density matrix for the subsystem of the central spin and the bath-spin cluster C , Tr_C is the partial trace over the state space of C . \hbar has been set to 1. Since contributions from subcluster correlations are divided from L_C , \tilde{L}_C represents the irreducible correlation involving all spins in C . Typically the expansion in Eq. 7 is truncated at some small order, i.e. the number of nuclear spins in a cluster, if it is already well converged with respect to this order on the time scale of interest.

For each random spatial configuration of nuclear spin bath, each RDM element $L^{ab}(t)$ as in Eq. 6 is calculated. The final result of time evolution of each RDM element is averaged over 300 random spatial configurations.

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

A. Free evolution without DD pulses

1. Evolution of the RDM in pure dephasing regime

We first consider the pure-dephasing regime where the populations, i.e. the diagonal elements of the two-qubit RDM, remains constant on the time scale of the decay of coherences, i.e. off-diagonal elements. This regime is satisfied by the condition that the energy differences among two-qubit levels in Eq. 4 are much larger than the hyperfine and nuclear Zeeman interactions in the Hamiltonian. In this regime, the generalized cluster-correlation expansion converges well for all the off-diagonal elements and shows very little fluctuations in populations around constant value in the first few orders of gCCE. A more detailed discussion on the applicability and limitations of gCCE on calculation of populations is in Sec. ??.

The first thing we notice is that the normalized modulus of the off-diagonal elements of the RDM, $\frac{|\langle E_i | \hat{\rho}_S(t) | E_j \rangle|}{|\langle E_i | \hat{\rho}_S(0) | E_j \rangle|}$, is independent of the initial state of the two electron spins, as long as the initial value is not zero, as exemplified in Fig. (2) for the element $\frac{|\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S(t) | E_S \rangle|}{|\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S(0) | E_S \rangle|}$ for three different initial states. This in fact directly follows from the requirement that we are in the pure-dephasing regime. In the pure-dephasing regime, the total Hamiltonian of the system can be decomposed within secular approximation into a combination of terms acting within each eigenenergy subspace of the two-qubit Hamiltonian as in Eq. 11. Here \hat{H}_{Bn} is the bath Hamiltonian conditioned on the two-qubit level $|n\rangle$. Proving independence of normalized coherence on initial state then follows straightforwardly:




FIG. 2: RDM elements, after being normalized and taken modulus, is independent of the initial state of the two spin qubits. The figure is an example of the element $\frac{|\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S(t) | E_S \rangle|}{|\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S(0) | E_S \rangle|}$ for three different initial states (Unnormalized) shown in legend. Here the interaction between two spin qubits is isotropic exchange, $J = 10$ GHz, $d = 3\text{\AA}$, $r = 5\text{\AA}$, $s = 2\text{\AA}$, $n_p = 0.01/\text{\AA}^3$, $B_z = 1$ T, bath consists of hydrogen nuclear spins.

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{n=1}^4 |n\rangle \langle n| \hat{H}_{Bn} = \sum_{n=1}^4 |n\rangle \langle n| E_n + \sum_{n=1}^4 |n\rangle \langle n| \hat{H}'_{Bn} \quad (11)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \langle m | \hat{\rho}_S(t) | n \rangle &= \langle m | \text{Tr}_B [e^{-i\hat{H}t} \hat{\rho}_S(0) \otimes \hat{\rho}_B(0) e^{i\hat{H}t}] | n \rangle \\ &= \langle m | \hat{\rho}_S(0) | n \rangle \text{Tr}_B [e^{-i\hat{H}_{Bn}t} \hat{\rho}_B(0) e^{i\hat{H}_{Bn}t}] \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

In the following, we focus on the initial two qubit state $\frac{1}{2}(|E_S\rangle + |E_{T,-1}\rangle + |E_{T,0}\rangle + |E_{T,1}\rangle)$ to investigate the behavior of individual RDM off-diagonal elements. This initial state of equal superposition of the two-qubit eigenstates also has property that the six upper triangular off-diagonal elements contribute equal weight in the evaluation of gate fidelity later.




FIG. 3: Four RDM elements, $\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,0} \rangle$, $\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S | E_S \rangle$, $\langle E_S | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,1} \rangle$ and $\langle E_{T,0} | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,1} \rangle$, that have the same normalized modulus of time evolution. Here the interaction between two spin qubits is isotropic exchange, $J = 10$ GHz, $d = 3\text{\AA}$, $r = 5\text{\AA}$, $s = 2\text{\AA}$, $n_p = 0.01/\text{\AA}^3$, $B_z = 1$ T, bath consists of hydrogen nuclear spins.

Four off-diagonal elements $\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,0} \rangle$, $\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S | E_S \rangle$, $\langle E_S | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,1} \rangle$ and $\langle E_{T,0} | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,1} \rangle$ have the same normalized modulus, as shown in Fig. 3.




FIG. 4: The RDM element that decay the fastest, $\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,1} \rangle$. Same parameters as Fig. 3




FIG. 5: The RDM element that does not decay in the pure dephasing regime, $\langle E_S | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,0} \rangle$. Same parameters as Fig. 3

The element $\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,1} \rangle$ (Fig. 4) has the fastest decay rate with a T_2^* time exactly half of that for the group of four elements that share the same decay profile. Note that we denote the decay life time of the off-diagonal elements by T_2^* , since the DD pulses are not applied here and the decay of coherence functions is due to inhomogeneous dephasing as a result of averaging over bath spin quantum states when we describe the initial bath state as a completely mixed state in high temperature limit. The remaining off-diagonal element $\langle E_S | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,0} \rangle$ shows no decay as in Fig. 5.

Each off-diagonal elements describe the coherence between two two-qubit energy states, and the above behavior of each of these elements can be understood by singling out the subspace spanned by the two states and considering the effective two-level Hamiltonian.

To derive the two-level Hamiltonians, first we write down the matrix elements of the electron spin operators in the two-qubit Hamiltonian eigenbasis, where the order of rows and columns follows $|E_{T,-1}\rangle, |E_S\rangle, |E_{T,0}\rangle, |E_{T,1}\rangle$,

$$S_{1x} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (13)$$

$$S_{1y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -\frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & -\frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (14)$$

$$S_{1z} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

$$S_{2x} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \\ \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

$$S_{2y} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ -\frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & -\frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} \\ -\frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 & 0 & \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & \frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{i}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

$$S_{2z} = \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (18)$$

From the above matrix elements we can write down effective two-level Hamiltonians for any two energy states within quasi-degenerate perturbation theory¹²⁻¹⁴ (“Löwdin partitioning”) by keeping only zeroth order terms in $\frac{1}{E_i - E_j}$ where $|E_i\rangle$ is either state of the two levels and $|E_j\rangle$ is either state out of the two-level space. For the group of four elements sharing the same decay profile, the effective two-level Hamiltonians for subspaces spanned by $|E_{T,-1}\rangle$ and $|E_S\rangle$, $|E_S\rangle$ and $|E_{T,1}\rangle$, $|E_{T,-1}\rangle$ and $|E_{T,0}\rangle$, and $|E_{T,0}\rangle$ and $|E_{T,1}\rangle$ are

$$H_S = \left(\frac{1}{2}B_z\gamma_e - \frac{1}{4}J\right)\hat{\sigma}_0 + \left(\frac{1}{2}B_z\gamma_e + \frac{1}{2}J\right)\hat{\sigma}_z \quad (19)$$

$$\begin{aligned} H_{SB} = & \left(-\frac{1}{4}\hat{\sigma}_z \pm \frac{1}{4}\hat{\sigma}_0\right) \sum_{n\alpha} A_{1n,z\alpha} \hat{I}_{n,\alpha} \\ & + \left(-\frac{1}{4}\hat{\sigma}_z \pm \frac{1}{4}\hat{\sigma}_0\right) \sum_{n\alpha} A_{2n,z\alpha} \hat{I}_{n,\alpha} \\ & + \left(\pm \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\hat{\sigma}_x\right) \sum_{n\alpha} A_{1n,x\alpha} \hat{I}_{n,\alpha} \\ & + \left(\pm \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\hat{\sigma}_y\right) \sum_{n\alpha} A_{1n,y\alpha} \hat{I}_{n,\alpha} \\ & + \left(\pm \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\hat{\sigma}_x\right) \sum_{n\alpha} A_{2n,x\alpha} \hat{I}_{n,\alpha} \\ & + \left(\pm \frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}}\hat{\sigma}_y\right) \sum_{n\alpha} A_{2n,y\alpha} \hat{I}_{n,\alpha} \end{aligned} \quad (20)$$

The bath part of the Hamiltonian, H_B , remains unchanged. Here different combinations of \pm signs in the qubits-bath coupling, H_{SB} , of the effective Hamiltonian correspond to different two-level systems from the four.

For the two levels $|E_{T,-1}\rangle$ and $|E_S\rangle$, the six \pm signs from in the first term to the last are $(-, -, -, +, +, -)$; For $|E_S\rangle$ and $|E_{T,1}\rangle$, $(+, +, +, -, -, +)$; For $|E_{T,-1}\rangle$ and $|E_{T,0}\rangle$, $(-, -, +, -, +, -)$; For $|E_{T,0}\rangle$ and $|E_{T,1}\rangle$, $(+, +, +, -, +, -)$. Only the $\hat{\sigma}_z$ terms in H_{SB} are the dephasing noises, which causes coherence function between the corresponding two level to decay. As we are in the pure dephasing regime, population transfer between the two level caused by $\hat{\sigma}_x$ and $\hat{\sigma}_y$ terms is negligible, not to mention the higher order dephasing as a result of the transfer.

The effective two-level Hamiltonian for $|E_{T,-1}\rangle$ and $|E_{T,1}\rangle$, after the same approximation, is

$$H_S = \frac{1}{4}J\hat{\sigma}_0 + B_z\gamma_e\hat{\sigma}_z \quad (21)$$

$$H_{SB} = \left(-\frac{1}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z\right) \sum_{n\alpha} A_{1n,z\alpha} \hat{I}_{n,\alpha} + \left(-\frac{1}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z\right) \sum_{n\alpha} A_{2n,z\alpha} \hat{I}_{n,\alpha} \quad (22)$$

where each of the $\hat{\sigma}_z$ term in H_{SB} which causes decoherence take exactly the same form but has a magnitude twice of that for the four two-level systems considered above, therefore the T_2^* time for the decoherence between $|E_{T,-1}\rangle$ and $|E_{T,1}\rangle$ states is half of that of those four two-level systems, since in free induction decay the time constant T_2^* in pure dephasing limit is inversely proportional to the characteristic width of the static noise distribution¹⁵. This explains the relation between T_2^* in Fig. 3 and 4.

The effective two-level Hamiltonian for $|E_S\rangle$ and $|E_{T,0}\rangle$, after the same approximation, is

$$H_S = -\frac{J}{4}\hat{\sigma}_0 - \frac{J}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z \quad (23)$$

$$H_{SB} = -\frac{1}{2}\hat{\sigma}_x \sum_{n\alpha} A_{1n,z\alpha} \hat{I}_{n,\alpha} + \frac{1}{2}\hat{\sigma}_x \sum_{n\alpha} A_{2n,z\alpha} \hat{I}_{n,\alpha} \quad (24)$$

where no $\hat{\sigma}_z$ term is included in the lowest order, explaining the lack of decoherence seen in Fig. 5.

2. Evolution of the gate fidelity averaged over bath states in the absence of DD pulses

To obtain a single value characterization of the decoherence of the coupled two spins in our model, next we consider the fidelity of gate of which is on state is represented by the coupled two spins. The fidelity defined as^{16,17}

$$F = \text{tr} \sqrt{\hat{\rho}_S^{\frac{1}{2}} \hat{\sigma} \hat{\rho}_S^{\frac{1}{2}}} \quad (25)$$

is a measure commonly used by the quantum information science community to quantify the closeness of a state after going through an imperfect quantum channel to the ideal target final state. For our purpose, the quantum channel is the $\sqrt{SWAP}(iSWAP)$ gate represented by our two spins coupled by isotropic exchange(magnetic point dipolar) interaction, and we consider the initial two qubit state $\frac{1}{2}(|E_S\rangle + |E_{T,-1}\rangle + |E_{T,0}\rangle + |E_{T,1}\rangle)$. $\hat{\rho}_S$ is the RDM of the two qubit interacting with the nuclear spin bath, and $\hat{\sigma}$ is the corresponding RDM at the same time as $\hat{\rho}_S$ but in the absence of the bath, i.e. the ideal gate state evolution. The fidelity F can take real values from 0 to 1, it is 1 when the two states in comparison are identical and decreases as their deviation increases. In the remaining of this subsection, we explore various parameters of the model and try to understand how each may or may not affect decoherence of the coupled two qubits. We will tune parameters around the reference set of values that describes typical coupled two spins in magnetic molecular systems: the interaction between two spin qubits being isotropic exchange, $J = 10$ GHz, $d = 3\text{\AA}$, $r = 5\text{\AA}$, $s = 2\text{\AA}$, $n_p = 0.01/\text{\AA}^3$, $B_z = 1$ T, bath consists of hydrogen nuclear spins, and compute the change in fidelity evolution.




FIG. 6: Fidelity as a function of r in the model of a two electron qubit \sqrt{SWAP} gate in the environment of a random proton bath.

When the radius free of protons is increased, the decay of the fidelity is slower, as can be seen from Fig. 6. This is expected because in pure dephasing regime T_2^* times of the RDM elements are inversely proportional to the characteristic width of the static noise distribution, which means for the commonly encountered Gaussian distribution of static noise they are inversely proportional to the root-mean-square of the noise field $\sum_{n\alpha} A_{(1or2)n,z\alpha} \hat{I}_{n,\alpha}$ in the $\hat{\sigma}_z$ terms of H_{SB} of the effective two-level Hamiltonian¹⁵. If r increases, this root-mean-square decreases, resulting in a longer decay time of the fidelity.

When the distance between the two qubits is increased, the decay of the fidelity is initially fast then slow and finally converges at a medium rate, as can be seen from Fig. 6. The overall effect of varying d on decoherence is minor. This can be explained by calculating again the T_2^* times of the RDM elements which follows from the root-mean-square of the noise term in the $\hat{\sigma}_z$ terms. It is




FIG. 7: Fidelity as a function of d in the model of a two electron qubit \sqrt{SWAP} gate in the environment of a random proton bath.

an interplay between the parameters d and r .




FIG. 8: Fidelity as a function of n_p in the model of a two electron qubit \sqrt{SWAP} gate in the environment of a random proton bath.

When the density of protons is increased, the decay of the fidelity is faster, as can be seen from Fig. 8. This is expected because if n_p increases, the root-mean-square of the noise field in the $\hat{\sigma}_z$ terms increases, due to more number of nuclear spins summed over in the expression of the noise field, resulting in a shorter decay time of the fidelity.




FIG. 9: Fidelity as a function of J in the model of a two electron qubit \sqrt{SWAP} gate in the environment of a random proton bath.

When the J is increased, the decay time of the fidelity is unchanged, as can be seen from Fig. 9. This is expected because T_2^* times of the RDM elements are determined only by the root-mean-square of the noise field in the $\hat{\sigma}_z$ terms. Changing J only changes the effective H_S for the two-level energy spacings.




FIG. 10: Fidelity as a function of B_z in the model of a two electron qubit \sqrt{SWAP} gate in the environment of a random proton bath.

When the B field strength is increased, the decay of the fidelity is unchanged, as can be seen from Fig. 10. Similar to the case with J , this is expected because changing B_z only changes the effective H_S for the two-level energy spacings but not the rms value of the noise field.

B. In the presence of DD pulses

Here we consider the effect of applying dynamical decoupling pulses on the coupled two qubits. The form of the pulse sequence is $T/(2N) - \pi_{xx} - T/(2N) - \pi_{xx} - \dots$, which is a repetition of a single cycle of $T/(2N) - \pi_{xx} - T/(2N) - \pi_{xx}$. Here T is the total evolution time of the system, N is the number of cycles and π_{xx} is the ideal π -pulse applied in the direction perpendicular to the external field simultaneously on each of the two spin qubits. This pulse sequence is one of the simplest dynamical decoupling sequence that counter the effect of dephasing noises that couple to the S_z terms of the two qubits^{18,19}. The most distinct changes in the behaviour of the RDM in the pulsed scenario compared to that of free evolution are summarized in the Figs. 11 and 12.




FIG. 11: The normalized modulus of the RDM element, $\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,1} \rangle$ in the presence of the DD sequence introduced in the main text compared with the no pulse scenario. A biggest increase of T_2 is found when the first cycle is applied. Here $d = 5\text{\AA}$, $r = 5\text{\AA}$, $n_p = 0.01/\text{\AA}^3$, $J = 10\text{ GHz}$, $B_z = 1\text{ T}$, minimum bath spin separation is 2\AA , bath consists of hydrogen nuclear spins.




FIG. 12: The normalized modulus of the RDM element, $\langle E_{T,-1} | \hat{\rho}_S | E_{T,1} \rangle$ as a function of the minimum spatial separation among nuclear spins. Here one cycle of the DD sequence is applied. In contrast to the scenario without the pulses, T_2 in the presence of the DD pulses depends on this minimum spatial separation, which implies that T_2 is affected now by the interactions among bath spins, consistent with the picture that bath spin flip-flop processes dominates decoherence in the pulsed scenario. Here $d = 5\text{\AA}$, $r = 5\text{\AA}$, $n_p = 0.01/\text{\AA}^3$, $J = 10\text{ GHz}$, $B_z = 1\text{ T}$, bath consists of hydrogen nuclear spins.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

In this work, we study a model of coupled two spin- $\frac{1}{2}$'s interacting via isotropic exchange or dipolar interaction embed in a random nuclear spin bath. In the pure dephasing regime, we found that normalized RDM elements of the two qubits are independent of the initial two-qubit state. The six off-diagonal RDM can be grouped into three different sets accordingly to different decay profile, with one of them representing coherence of a hybrid singlet-triplet qubit which does not show decoherence on the decay time scale of other off-diagonal elements. For the scenario of free evolution of the system without dynamical decoupling pulses, the coherence decay is due to inhomogenous dephasing. We found that in the pure dephasing regime, the decay time of two qubit fidelity strongly depend on the radius around each qubit that is free of nuclei, density of nuclei, the kind of nuclei, and both direction and strength of external field if the qubit-qubit interaction is dipolar; it does not depend on minimum spatial separation of the nuclei nor J and external field strength in the case of isotropic exchange interaction. The above behaviors were understood with effective two-level Hamiltonians each containing two levels of the coupled two qubits. For the scenario with a simple DD pulse sequence applied, besides the sensitivity of fidelity to the parameter similar to the no pulse scenario, the fidelity decay time now also depends on the minimum spatial separation among nuclear spins, which implies the important role played by nuclear spin-nuclear spin interaction and the nuclear spin flip-flop processes on decoherence of the coupled two qubits with DD pulses. Our work provides useful understanding on the factors that affects coupled two qubit decoherence due to nuclear spins and shows that gCCE method is reliable in simulating off-diagonal elements of multiqubit RDM.

Acknowledgements. The authors are grateful for useful conversations with Shuanglong Liu, Haechan Park, Steve Hill. This work is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, Basic Energy Sciences under Award No. DE-SC0022089. Computations were done using the utilities of the National Energy Research Scientific Computing Center and University of Florida Research Computing.

-
- ¹ G. Burkard, T. D. Ladd, A. Pan, J. M. Nichol, and J. R. Petta, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **95**, 025003 (2023).
 - ² W. Yao, R.-B. Liu, and L. Sham, *Physical Review B* **74**, 195301 (2006).
 - ³ A. V. Khaetskii, D. Loss, and L. Glazman, *Physical review letters* **88**, 186802 (2002).
 - ⁴ Z.-S. Yang, Y.-X. Wang, M.-J. Tao, W. Yang, M. Zhang, Q. Ai, and F.-G. Deng, *Annals of Physics* **413**, 168063 (2020).
 - ⁵ M. Onizhuk, K. C. Miao, J. P. Blanton, H. Ma, C. P. Anderson, A. Bourassa, D. D. Awschalom, and G. Galli, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 010311 (2021).
 - ⁶ D. Kwiatkowski and L. Cywiński, *Physical Review B* **98**, 155202 (2018).
 - ⁷ M. Onizhuk and G. Galli, *Physical Review B* **108**, 075306 (2023).
 - ⁸ D. Maile and J. Ankerhold, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.06234* (2022).
 - ⁹ M. Onizhuk and G. Galli, *Advanced Theory and Simulations* **4**, 2100254 (2021).
 - ¹⁰ W. Yang and R.-B. Liu, *Phys. Rev. B* **78**, 085315 (2008).
 - ¹¹ W. Yang and R.-B. Liu, *Phys. Rev. B* **79**, 115320 (2009).
 - ¹² P.-O. Löwdin, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **19**, 1396 (1951).
 - ¹³ J. M. Luttinger and W. Kohn, *Physical Review* **97**, 869 (1955).
 - ¹⁴ G. L. Bir and G. E. Pikus, (No Title) (1974).
 - ¹⁵ W. Yang, W.-L. Ma, and R.-B. Liu, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **80**, 016001 (2016).
 - ¹⁶ R. Jozsa, *Journal of modern optics* **41**, 2315 (1994).
 - ¹⁷ M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
 - ¹⁸ L. Viola and S. Lloyd, *Physical Review A* **58**, 2733 (1998).
 - ¹⁹ L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd, *Physical Review Letters* **82**, 2417 (1999).