

# A. C. Hughes, J. F. Goodwin, M. A. Sepiol, J. E. Tarlton, C. J. Ballance, D. P. Nadlinger, T. P. Harty, A. M. Steane, D. M. Lucas Single-qubit memory error metrology at short timescales

### Ion Trap Quantum Computing Group - Department of Physics, University of Oxford

We achieve a coherence time of 1 minute in a  $^{43}Ca^+$  qubit, but the relevant timescale for fault-tolerant quantum computing is the time for which the memory error remains <  $10^{-2} - 10^{-4}$ . Information regarding these initial stages of decoherence is usually provided by extrapolation of models only verified at long timescales. Here we use randomised benchmarking techniques to directly measure errors at the 10<sup>-6</sup> level and to characterise the underlying noise spectrum. We find  $\epsilon_{memory} < 10^{-4}$  up to  $\sim 100$  ms (far longer than predicted from the T2\* time). Using a simple CPMG dynamical decoupling sequence, we observe  $\varepsilon_{memory} < 10^{-3}$  for storage times greater than 1 s. At this level, we conclude that our memory performance is primarily limited by microwave local oscillator noise.



- Surface (chip) rf trap featuring integrated microwave circuitry [1]
- Gates driven by near-field microwaves
- Heating rate 1.4(3) quanta/ms, axial secular frequency  $2\pi \times 500$  kHz
- <sup>43</sup>Ca <sup>+</sup> hyperfine ground state clock qubit at 146 G
- Initialisation: optical pumping and microwave transfer pulses ~ 3.2 GHz
- Readout: "shelve"  $|\uparrow\rangle \rightarrow 3D_{5/2}$  via  $4P_{3/2}$ , + fluorescence detection

| ref [2], [3] | SPAM              | Single-qubit gate | Two-qubit gate |
|--------------|-------------------|-------------------|----------------|
| Error        | ~10 <sup>-3</sup> | ~10 <sup>-6</sup> | <b>~10</b> ⁻³  |

- timescales is usually extrapolated from longer times
- Instead, we use **randomised benchmarking** [4], [5]

to directly measure very small errors ( $\sim 10^{-6}$ )



#### Randomised benchmarking (RBM) results **RBM** data $10^{-1}$ $10^{-1}$ Fit to white and 1/f frequency noise Ramsey data Exponential fit to Ramsey delay > 1 s 10<sup>-2</sup> 10<sup>-2</sup> [6] memory memory $10^{-3}$ $10^{-3}$ rrected $10^{-4}$ rrected 10<sup>-4</sup>

# Detuning the field

- Shuttling ions between regions of larger traps could improve scalability
- During shuttling, an ion is likely to travel through areas of less wellcontrolled magnetic field strength
- We consider memory errors incurred by detuning the field from the clock



- Ramsey experiments struggle when  $\varepsilon_{\text{memory}} \sim \varepsilon_{\text{SPAM}}$  (10<sup>-3</sup>)
- RBM allows probing of much smaller errors
- We measure  $\epsilon_{memory} < 10^{-4}$  up to  $\sim 100$  ms at least 3 orders of magnitude longer than gate or measurement times
- **Extrapolating from data at T2\*-like timescales overestimates** memory errors at short timescales by an order of magnitude



- Dynamical decoupling
- Including a simple CPMG dynamical decoupling sequence of repeated X gates during the delay periods, at a rate of 1 per 100 ms, reduces  $\varepsilon_{memory}$  to < 10<sup>-3</sup> for longer than 1 s
- Memory performance at computationally relevant timescales is limited by microwave local oscillator noise (see below)

## RBM sequences and BB1 gates

- Clifford group
- Error per delay can be calculated by **comparing the fidelity of interleaved** sequences vs sequences without the interleaved delays



# Sources of decoherence

- Memory data is well-approximated by a fit to a combination of white and 1/f frequency noise
- CPMG sequence suppresses the 1/f component (possible candidate: varying AC Zeeman shifts due to movement of the ion in the trapping field)
- Noise on each component of microwave chain

- field without adjusting the microwave frequency
- Qubit remains robust to memory errors over typical shuttling times at large detunings

-  $\epsilon_{\text{memory}} < 10^{-3}$  maintained for 20 ms even at 25 mG detuning

[1] D. T. C. Allcock et. al., App. Phys. Lett. 102, 044103 (2012) [2] T. P. Harty et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 113, 20501 (2014) [3] T. P. Harty et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 117, 140501 (2016) [4] E. Magesan et. al., Phys. Rev. Lett. 109, 080505 (2012)

[5] P. J. J. O'Malley et. al., Phys. Rev. Applied 3, 044009 (2015) [6] D. Kielpinski et. al., Nature 417, 709711 (2002) [7] S. Wimperis, J. Mag. Res. 109, 221231 (1994)



UK NATIONAL QUANTUM TECHNOLOGIES





- ~~~

www.physics.ox.ac.uk/users/iontrap

joseph.goodwin@physics.ox.ac.uk

amy.hughes@physics.ox.ac.uk

Department of Physics, Clarendon Laboratory, Parks Road, Oxford, OX1 3PU, United Kingdom