





http://www.nature.com/nphys/journal/v2/n1/images/nphys171-f2.jpg

#### http://nodens.physics.ox.ac.uk/~mcdonnell/wardPres/wardPres.html





http://www.physics.gatech.edu/ultracool/lons/7ions.jpg



#### Outline

- A brief history
- ◇ Two types of qubits
- ♦ Entangling gates
- ♦ Scalability

#### Table 4.0-1 The Mid-Level Quantum Computation Roadmap: Promise Criteria

	The DiVincenzo Criteria							
QC Approach	Quantum Computation						QC Networkability	
	#1	#2	#3	#4	#5		#6	#7
NMR	<b>S</b>	$\odot$	Ø	$\bigcirc$	8		<b>S</b>	
Trapped Ion	$\odot$	$\odot$	Ø	$\odot$	$\odot$		Ø	Q
Neutral Atom	Ø	$\bigotimes$	Ô	$\odot$	Ø		$\odot$	$\odot$
Cavity QED	Ø	$\bigcirc$	Ø	8	$\bigcirc$		$\odot$	Ø
Optical	Ø	$\bigcirc$	$\bigcirc$	8	8		$\bigotimes$	$\bigotimes$
Solid State	Ô	$\odot$	Ø.	$\odot$	Ø		Ô	Ô
Superconducting	8	$\bigcirc$	8	8	8		<b>S</b>	<b>S</b>
Unique Qubits	This field is so diverse that it is not feasible to label the criteria with "Promise" symbols.							

Legend: 😔 = a potentially viable approach has achieved sufficient proof of principle

🍥 = a potentially viable approach has been proposed, but there has not been sufficient proof of principle

🍈 = no viable approach is known

The column numbers correspond to the following QC criteria:

#1. A scalable physical system with well-characterized qubits.

#2. The ability to initialize the state of the qubits to a simple fiducial state.

#3. Long (relative) decoherence times, much longer than the gate-operation time.

#4. A universal set of quantum gates.

#5. A qubit-specific measurement capability.

#6. The ability to interconvert stationary and flying qubits.

#7. The ability to faithfully transmit flying qubits between specified locations.

#### http://qist.lanl.gov/qcomp\_map.shtml



David Wineland, NIST-Boulder

"Ion trappers are encouraged because we can at least see a straightforward path to making a large processor, but the technical problems are extremely challenging. It might be fair to say that ion traps are currently in the lead; however, a good analogy might be that we're leading in a marathon race, but only one metre from the start line."

# Trapped ion qubits - a timeline









### RF (Paul) ion trap



Hyperbolic surfaces
Good for trapping single ions
Poor optical access





#### Ray optics analogy



(... unless placed too far apart)



Ready

(+-)

#### Linear RF Ion Trap

axial confinement:static "endcaps"~ few tens volts

#### transverse confinement: 2D rf ponderomotive potential



~ few tens MHz ~ few hundred volts

Linear trap (D. Berkeland, LANL)



#### Linear RF Ion Trap continued...



#### "Endcap" linear trap – U. Mich, UW, Oxdord...



3-layer geometry:
allows 3D offset compensation
scalable to larger structures

d

rf



3-layer Tee-trap (U. Michigan)

dc

rf

dc



# Planar, or surface, traps





Planar trap field simulation (R. Slusher, Lucent Labs)

#### Gold-on-alumina planar trap (U. Mich)



# NIST planar traps and trap arrays

- The planar traps are in fact even "more scalable" than the 3-layer traps.
- The electrodes are patterned on the surface; control electronics may be integrated in the same chip.



Qubits

## "Hyperfine" and "optical" qubits: an unbiased view

Hyperfine qubits:

- Spontaneous emission negligible
- ♦ Require stable RF sources (easy!)
- ♦ Fun to work with

Optical qubits:

- Vpper state decays on the timescale of seconds
- Require stable laser sources (hard!)
- ♦ Pain to work with



Entanglement

### Cirac-Zoller CNOT gate

1. Ion string is prepared in the ground state of motion (n=0)

2. Control ion's spin state is mapped onto quantized motional state of the ion string

3. Target ion's spin is flipped conditional on the motional state of the ion string

4. Motion of the ion string is extinguished by applying pulse #2 with negative phase to the control ion



Scaling up





### Integration

#### U.Michigan



#### M. Blian, C. Tigges/Sandia Labs



#### R. Slusher/Lucent Labs



## A vision



R. Slusher/Lucent Labs

## Motion heating is a problem ...

- Small traps = faster (quantum logic) gates ... but...
- Small traps = faster heating of ion's motion
- (Quantized) motion is the quantum data bus, thus
   heating = decoherence!



L. Deslauriers et al. *PRA* **70**, 043408 (2004)

#### Probabilistic entanglement of ions and photons



1. The atom is initialized in a particular ground state

2. The atom is excited with a short laser pulse to a particular excited state

3. The atom decays through multiple decay channels (we like when there's only two)

4. The emitted photon is collected and measured

The final state of the atom is entangled with the polarization state of the photon.

This creates an entangled state

 $|\psi\rangle = |H\rangle|\uparrow\rangle + |\vee\rangle|\downarrow\rangle$ 

# Price we pay: this entanglement is probabilistic Entanglement success probability: $P = P_{\text{excitation}} d\Omega \eta_{\text{detection}} (\sim 10^{-3} \text{ now})$ Better detectors! Unit excitation with a fast (ps) laser pulse Cavity QED setup ("bad cavity") $g^2/\kappa \sim \gamma$ and $\kappa >> g$ γ

#### Remote Ion Entanglement using entangled ion-photon pairs



Coincidence only if photons are in state:  $|\Psi^{-}\rangle = |H\rangle_{1}|V\rangle_{2} - |V\rangle_{1}|H\rangle_{2}$ 

This projects the ions into ...

 $\left|\uparrow\right\rangle_{1}\left|\downarrow\right\rangle_{2} - \left|\downarrow\right\rangle_{1}\left|\uparrow\right\rangle_{2} = \left|\Psi^{-}\right\rangle_{\text{ions}}$ 

The ions are now entangled!

Things to do with this four-qubit system: teleportation between matter and light
loophole-free Bell inequality tests
decoherence studies
quantum repeaters, computers

Simon and Irvine, PRL, 91, 110405 (2003)

Quantum networking and quantum computing using ion-photon entanglement



#### Conclusions...

◇ Ion trap technology currently a leader, but you've heard the marathon analogy quote

Clear path to scaling up, but technology needs to mature

 Integration of electronic controls and optics is likely the next step

An alternative scaling through ion-photon entanglement