

Spin Architectures for Investigating Quantum Phenomena: NMR and NV Centers in Diamond

A thesis

Submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirements of the degree of

Doctor of Philosophy

by:

V.S. Anjusha

Registration ID 20122037



Department of Physics

INDIAN INSTITUTE OF SCIENCE EDUCATION AND RESEARCH

PUNE-411008, India

Certificate

Certified that the work incorporated in the thesis entitled “**Spin Architectures for Investigating Quantum Phenomena: NMR and NV Centers in Diamond**” submitted by **V S Anjusha** was carried out by the candidate, under my supervision. The work presented here or any part of it has not been included in any other thesis submitted previously for the award of any degree or diploma from any other university or institution.

Date:

(Supervisor)

Declaration

I declare that this written submission represents my ideas in my-own words and where others ideas have been included, I have adequately cited and referenced the original sources. I also declare that I have adhered to all principles of academic honesty and integrity and have not misrepresented or fabricated or falsified any idea/data/fact/source in my submission. I understand that violation of the above will be cause for disciplinary action by the Institute and can also evoke penal action from the sources which have thus not been properly cited or from whom proper permission has not been taken when needed.

Date:

(V.S. Anjusha)

To my **Family**

List of publications

1. **V. S. Anjusha**, S. S. Hegde and T. S. Mahesh, *NMR investigation of the quantum pigeonhole effect*, Phys. Lett. A, **380 (4), 577-580 (2016)**.
2. G. Bhole, **V. S. Anjusha** and T. S. Mahesh, *Steering quantum dynamics via bang-bang control: Implementing optimal fixed-point quantum search algorithm*, Phys. Rev. A, **93 (4), 042339 (2016)**.
3. **V. S. Anjusha** and T. S. Mahesh, *Optimized dynamical protection of nonclassical correlation in a quantum algorithm*, ArXiv preprint **ArXiv:1802.02792 (2018)**.
4. S. Pal, S. Moitra, **V. S. Anjusha**, A. Kumar, T. S. Mahesh, *Hybrid scheme for factorization: Factoring 551 using a 3-qubit NMR quantum adiabatic processor*, Pramana - J Phys, **92: 26 (2019)**.
5. V. R. Krithika, **V. S. Anjusha** and T. S. Mahesh, *NMR studies of quantum chaos in a two-qubit kicked top*, Phys. Rev. E, **99, 032219 (2019)**.

Acknowledgement

I am grateful to several people for helping and supporting me in completing the first stage of my scientific career, the Ph.D. I take this opportunity to remember and thank some of them who made it a special experience.

First and foremost, I would like to thank my supervisor, Dr. T S Mahesh, for his constant guidance and support throughout my Ph.D. His enthusiasm and excitement for science are infectious which easily and constantly got me excited and motivated to work on several projects. His deep knowledge in the field is very inspiring. His humour and spontaneity in coming up with new scientific ideas made our group meetings very joyful at the same time also turned out to be the occasion for me to learn new things.

I would like to extend my acknowledgment to my research advisory committee (RAC) members, Dr. Umakant Rapol and Dr. Rejish Nath. Their valuable feedback and suggestions during yearly RAC meetings greatly helped me to make progress in my projects and thereby my thesis.

I would also like to thank all my collaborators, Prof. Anil Kumar, Swathi S Hegde, Gaurav Bhole, Rupak Bhattacharya, Soham Pal, Koti kamineni Koteshwara Rao, Tan-moy Chakrobarthy and Phani Kumar Peddibhotla. It was indeed a wonderful experience to work with them and I could learn many new things in the field of experimental quantum information. Rupak and I built the first NV setup in Dr. Mahesh's lab and he patiently taught me everything about optics experiments including the basics like aligning the optics, handling optics, etc. Apart from science, I always admired his deep knowledge in Indian classical music and I always enjoyed our discussions on music during tea breaks from experiments.

I am very grateful to all my labmates, Abhishek Shukla, Swathi S Hegde, Sudheer Kumar, Deepak Khurana , Soham Pal, V R Krithika, Gaurav Bhole, Rupak Bhattacharya and Priya Batra for all those discussions we used to have, especially the ones that made

it easier for me to comprehend many difficult concepts.

It is never enough to thank my batchmates Tomin James, Chetan Kumar Vishwakarma, Meghna Mane, Abhishek Swarnakar, Aditi Nandi, Sneha Banerjee, V M Hridya and Prachi Telang for being a constant source of entertainment. Especially, I am indebted to Chetan for helping me at any time by going out of his way. The discussions we used to have on anything under the sun at night canteen were refreshing after a long day at the lab.

I would like to thank my besties in IISER, Hridya, Krithika, Dibyata, Prachi, Ajith, Giri and Sumit for making my life outside lab more colorful and filled with beautiful moments. All the fun activities, ‘mad tea parties’ in my room and traveling we did together be deeply missed. Thank you, Hridya, for being my “partner in crime” and I will miss our evening walk and our cooking experiments when the mess food became a nightmare. I was very lucky to get a Junior in lab cum best friend like Krithika and working on a project together was a pleasant memory. I would like to thank Ajith and Dibyata for being my great critiques and every time it helped me to become a better person. I always enjoyed science discussions with Sumit whom we fondly called “bro”. He is very caring like a brother. Our dinner is never complete without Prachi’s very un-realistic dreams and stories which we often refer as “Prachi logic”. Although Giri spent very little time with us as he had to move to London, he has always been a part of our friend’s circle ever since we met. I am very sure that our friendship will continue as strong as before even after my Ph.D. I am also indebted to my best friend since bachelors, Krishna, for her unconditional friendship.

It was a great opportunity for me to spend the last year of my Ph.D. at Prof. Fedor Jelezko’s lab at the University of Ulm. His deep knowledge and experience in applications of nitrogen-vacancy (NV) centers in diamond greatly helped me to write the second part of my thesis. Discussions with Jochen Scheuer and Christoph Müller

helped me to understand NV center experiments better and it helped me in improving the second part of my thesis.

Last but not the least, I am thankful to my family, Achan, Amma, Sruthy (Aparna) and my brother-in-law for their all support and encouragement throughout my Ph.D. My family is incomplete without my grandparents and they have been always the most delightful people in my life. I am very lucky to have cool grandparents like them. And, special thanks to my beautiful little niece, Nithara; it was the wish to meet her soon that propelled me to write this thesis faster.

V. S. Anjusha

List of Figures

1.1	Schematic representation of quantum simulation protocol.	2
2.1	Bloch sphere representation of a qubit	7
2.2	Zeeman splitting of a spin 1/2 nucleus.	14
2.3	population distribution for a 2 qubit system, a) Thermal equilibrium state, b) Pure state, and c) Pseudo pure state . Image taken and modified from [1].	19
2.4	NMR Free Induction Decay(FID).	21
3.1	(a) Three quantum particles entering a Mach-Zehnder interferometer consisting of two beam-splitters (BS1 and BS2) and phase shifter (Z), and two particle-detectors D0 and D1. (b) Circuit for NMR investigation of QPHE. Hadamard gates perform the function of beam splitters, and Z-gate performs phase shift. Intermediate state information of the particle-qubits (F_1, F_2, F_3) is encoded onto an ancilla qubit (H_4) using one of the controlled operations U_{12}, U_{13} , and U_{23} . The ancilla qubit is measured at the end of the circuit.	24
3.2	Gradient ascent algorithm	27

3.3	Schematic representation of the GRAPE algorithm. The control amplitude at each segment is assumed as a constant and the vertical arrows show the gradients indicating how each amplitude should be modified in the next iteration in order to improve the cost function.	28
3.4	The molecular structure of 3-bromo-2,4,5-trifluorobenzoic acid. The chemical shifts (diagonal elements) and effective coupling constants J'_{ij} (off-diagonal elements) are shown in table. The NMR spectrum of ancilla is shown in Fig. 3.5(a).	30
3.5	The ancilla NMR at various stages of QPHE simulation, each obtained by a final 90° detection pulse. The simulated and experimental spectra are shown in the left and right columns respectively. (a) Thermal equilibrium state ρ_{eq} (the background baseline is due to the liquid crystal signal), (b) The partial pseudopure state $\rho(0)$, and (c) after the entire MZI-circuit (without U_{ij}) indicating the various combinations of detections. Spectra in (d-f) correspond to the complete QPHE circuit shown in Fig. 3.1(b) obtained with U_{12} , U_{13} , and U_{23} respectively. The dashed boxes highlight the peaks corresponding to the postselected states as described in the text.	31
3.6	(a) Realizing U_{ij} by a pair of CNOT gates. (b-d) NMR pulse sequences corresponding to $C_1\text{NOT}_4$, $C_2\text{NOT}_4$, and $C_3\text{NOT}_4$ respectively. All the π pulses (open rectangles) are about y axis and the phases of the $\pi/2$ pulses (filled rectangles) are as indicated. The delays are set according to $\tau_i = 1/(8J'_{i,4})$	33

4.1	Smooth modulation (SM) vs bang-bang (BB) sequence. Ω_j , ϕ_{jk} , Δt are the amplitude, phase, and duration of the segments, and T is the total duration of the sequence. The helix represents the crusher gradient required for nonunitary gates. Performance of BB improves over SM for lower duty cycles as illustrated in the graph. Here τ_{SM} and τ_{BB} indicate respectively SM and BB computational times for calculating 10-qubit propagators of $T = 0.5$ ms duration.	39
4.2	Quantum circuit for OFPQS algorithm. Here the angles α and β depend on the iteration number l as indicated in Eqn. 4.4.	42
4.3	(a) Molecular structure of dibromo fluoromethane, (b) the Hamiltonian parameters and relaxation time constants in seconds, and (c-e) PPS spectra (upper trace), equilibrium spectra (middle trace), and PPS pulse-sequences (bottom trace) for the ^1H , ^{19}F and ^{13}C qubits, (f) bar diagram representing theoretical (red) and experimental (blue) diagonal elements of the traceless deviation density matrix corresponding to $ 000\rangle$ PPS. In (b), the diagonal and off-diagonal elements are respectively resonance off-sets and J-coupling constants in Hz.	43
4.4	The experimental ^{13}C spectra after various steps of OFPQS algorithm (a) equilibrium state, (b) pseudopure state $ 000\rangle$, (c) initial state preparation, (d) oracle, (e-g) after amplification with $l = 1, 2$, and 3 respectively. Spectra in (a) to (d) are obtained after a Hadamard gate.	45

4.5	The theoretical and experimental results for the probability P_L of finding (a) one ($ 10\rangle$) and (b) two ($ 10\rangle$ and $ 11\rangle$) marked states among four items versus the number of iterations l . The red and blue points respectively represent the theoretically predicted and experimentally obtained probabilities measured directly from the ancilla (^{13}C) spectra (shown in insets).	45
4.6	(a) Molecular structure of the five-qubit system 1-bromo-2,4,5-trifluorobenzene and its Hamiltonian parameters wherein diagonal and off-diagonal numbers represent resonance off-sets and effective (J+2D)-coupling constants (in Hz), (b-f) the spectra corresponding to the thermal equilibrium state (blue) and $ 00000\rangle$ PPS prepared from the nonunitary BB sequence (red), and (g) bar diagram representing theoretical (red) and experimental (blue) diagonal elements of the traceless deviation density matrix corresponding to $ 00000\rangle$ PPS.	47
5.1	Protected quantum gate scheme. Certain segments are reserved for the full-amplitude ($\Omega_{\max}$) DD-pulses (P_{β_j, α_j}) and other segments are subject to optimization to realize a given target unitary U_T	54
5.2	(a) Fidelity of the protected NOT gate versus offset error (in deg) corresponding to the DD sequences $U_{P_{cz}} = U_{cz} P_{\beta, x} U_{cz}$. (b) Fidelity of the protected NOT gate $U_{cz}^{(y)} P_{\beta, y} U_{cz}^{(y)} U_{cz}^{(x)} P_{\beta, x} U_{cz}^{(x)}$ versus DD angle β and amplitude of the random phase-rotations. For the unprotected NOT gate, the fidelity drops below 0.9 for the noise amplitude $\phi_z > 3^\circ$ as indicated by the dashed line.	57

5.3	Venn diagram representing the total information $H(S, A)$ of a bipartite system. $H(A)$ and $H(S)$ are individual information of the system A and S respectively, $I(S : A)$ is the mutual information and $H(S A)$ and $H(A S)$ are conditional entropies.	57
5.4	Various experimental stages of Grover's search algorithm for up to six iterations subjected to a random noise (top trace). It begins with a thermal initial state, followed by preparation of pseudopure state (PPS), Hadamard operator (H), and application of Grover's iterates (U_G) consisting of oracle (U_W) and diffusion (U_D) operators. The middle and bottom traces show ideal evolutions of probability of marked state $\langle k_0 \rangle$ and QD respectively (simulated in MATLAB).	60
5.5	Idealized estimations from MATLAB simulations (solid lines) and experimental (filled circles) QD (in units of $\epsilon^2 / \ln 2$) (a, c) and probability $\langle k_0 \rangle - 0.25$ (in units of ϵ ; constant 0.25 is due to the traceless deviation matrix experimentally estimated) of the marked state (b, d) under Grover iterates with XY DD-protections without (a, b) and with (c, d) additional incoherence. The top trace ($\beta = 0$) corresponds to unprotected Grover iterates. The middle ($\beta = \pi/2$) and the bottom ($\beta = \pi$) traces correspond to XY DD protected Grover iterates.	60

5.6	Average root-mean-square deviation (bars with solid edges) between the experimental data and ideal theoretical values (shown in Fig. 5.5) for QD (in units of $\epsilon^2 / \ln 2$) (a) and the probability $\langle k_0 \rangle$ (in units of ϵ) (b) of marked state versus DD flip angle β without incoherence (open bars) and with incoherence (filled bars). The corresponding numerical simulations are shown by bars with dashed edges. (c) Numerically estimated fidelities of U_G averaged over six iterations without (open bars) and with (filled bars) incoherence. Here errorbars indicate variations over six iterations.	65
5.7	Experimental values of QD for six Grover iterations plotted against the probability $\langle k_0 \rangle - 0.25$ without (a) and with (b) incoherence. Simulated values of QD versus probability for 10 Grover iterations without (c) and with (d) incoherence. In all the cases, QD values are in units of $\epsilon^2 / \ln 2$ and probability values are in units of ϵ	66
6.1	Four possible crystallographic orientations of NV center. Image taken and modified from [2]	74
6.2	NV center can be described by a triplet ground state, a triplet excited state, and a singlet intermediate state. NV center is excited with a 532 nm laser, and the spin conserving optical transitions are possible between the ground and the excited state with a zero phonon line of 637 nm.	75
6.3	NV energy level splittings with different interactions including Zero Field Splitting, Zeeman interaction and hyperfine interaction with ^{14}N or ^{15}N . The nuclear spin eigenstates are shown with a subscript 'n'. Image taken and modified from [2]	77

7.1	A simple confocal setup. The conjugate nature of the source plane and the image plane is shown by considering three points in the source plane at different depths focusing at the image plane after passing through two biconvex lenses. The pinhole blocks the lights from the other points except for the light from the point source of interest. Image adopted and modified from [3]	82
7.2	Fluorescent confocal setup.	83
7.3	Confocal Image. The diffraction limited red spots are the high Fluorescent regions and those are the locations of NV centers in the diamond sample.	86
7.4	Designing of the PCB board.	86
7.5	Microwave Circuit.	87
7.6	Fluorescence response during laser pulse while NV center is initialized in $m_s = 0$ (Red) and $m_s = \pm 1$ (green). Image modified from the reference [2]	88
7.7	Zero Field splitting (ZFS) ODMR.(a) The fluorescence response was dropped at the frequency $\nu = 2.87$ GHz which corresponds to the ZFS between $m_s = 0$ and $m_s = \pm 1$. (b) ODMR performed with an external field aligned along one out of 4 possible orientations and the splitting between the $ - 1 \rangle$ and $ + 1 \rangle$ transitions is given by $\Delta\nu = 2\gamma_{NV}B_z$ where γ_{NV} is the gyromagnetic ratio of the NV center and B_z is the magnetic field along the NV axis. Other 3 possible orientations are symmetric to the aligned axis and the splitting due to the components of B_z along those axes are not resolved due to the high FWHM of the ODMR dips.	89

7.8	Rabi oscillations. (a) pulse sequence for Rabi experiments. (b) Fluorescence oscillations with the MW pulse duration and the π -pulse duration corresponding to the maximum population inversion is ≈ 86 ns.	90
7.9	Free Induction Decay (FID) curve (a) pulse sequence for characterizing T_2^* . (b) Fluorescence count with the free precession time; the T_2^* is ≈ 180 ns.	92
7.10	T_1 relaxation experiments.	93

List of Tables

3.1	The classical and quantum possibilities are tabulated for various arrangements of three particles in two containers. The top two rows correspond to QPHE.	34
6.1	Hamiltonian parameters corresponding to different nuclei coupled to the NV center. The values are taken from [4, 5]	78

Contents

Declaration	v
List of publications	ix
Acknowledgments	xi
List of figures	xv
List of tables	xxiii
1 Overview	1
2 Introduction	5
2.1 Quantum Information Processing	5
2.1.1 Quantum bit	6
2.1.2 Density Matrix	8
2.1.3 Quantum Entanglement	8
2.1.4 Quantum Gates	9
2.1.5 Quantum Measurements	10
2.1.6 Divincenzo's criteria	12

2.1.7	Experimental Architectures	12
2.2	Nuclear Magnetic Resonance	13
2.2.1	Zeeman interaction	14
2.2.2	Chemical Shift	15
2.2.3	J- Coupling	15
2.2.4	Dipole-Dipole Interaction	16
2.2.5	Quadrupolar Interaction	17
2.3	Thermal equilibrium state in NMR	17
2.3.1	Pseudo Pure state	18
2.4	Spin manipulations using RF field	19
2.5	NMR Readout	21
3	NMR investigation of quantum pigeonhole effect	23
3.1	Introduction	23
3.2	Theory	24
3.2.1	Quantum Pigeonhole Effect (QPHE)	25
3.2.2	GRAPE algorithm for realizing unitary operators	27
3.3	NMR simulation	29
3.4	Conclusions	35
4	Steering Quantum Dynamics via Bang-Bang Control:	
	Implementing optimal fixed point quantum search algorithm	37
4.1	Introduction	38
4.2	Bang-bang approach	38
4.3	OFPQS algorithm	41
4.4	NMR Implementation	44
4.4.1	Ancilla measurements	46

4.5	Realizing non-unitary operations using BB	48
4.6	Conclusions	49
5	Optimized dynamical protection of nonclassical correlation in a quantum algorithm	51
5.1	Introduction	51
5.2	Dynamically protected gates	52
5.2.1	Theory	52
5.2.2	A simple model:	
	Protected NOT gate on a single qubit	55
5.3	Quantum Discord (QD)	58
5.3.1	QD in Grover's algorithm	59
5.4	Experiments	62
5.4.1	Pure-phase Quantum State Tomography	62
5.4.2	Results and Discussions	63
5.5	Conclusions	67
6	Nitrogen-vacancy Centers in diamond	69
6.1	Introduction	70
6.2	Diamond	70
6.2.1	High Pressure High Temperature (HPHT) growth	71
6.2.2	Chemical Vapour Deposition (CVD)	72
6.3	Color Centers in Diamond	72
6.3.1	Nitrogen-Vacancy Center	73
6.3.2	Electronic Structure of NV Center	74
6.4	NV Center Hamiltonian	76
6.4.1	Electronic Spin Hamiltonian	76

6.4.2	Nuclear spin and Electron-Nuclei Hamiltonian	78
7	Experimental Setup	81
7.1	Confocal Microscope	81
7.1.1	Scanning, Fluorescence Confocal Microscope	82
7.2	Microwave Circuit	85
7.3	Experiments	88
7.3.1	Continuous Wave ODMR	88
7.3.2	Rabi Flops Experiments	89
7.3.3	Spin relaxation experiments	91
8	Conclusion and Outlook	95
8.1	Conclusion	95
8.2	Outlook	96
	Bibliography	97

Chapter 1

Overview

“A classical computation is like a solo voice– one line of pure tones succeeding each other. A quantum computation is like a symphony–many lines of tones interfering with one another.”

– Seth Lloyd [6]

Simulating a quantum system on a classical computer is often a complex task as the Hilbert space describing the system grows exponentially with the increase of system scale. Consequently, such simulations demand huge computational power in terms of memory and time [7]. In 1982, Feynman proposed an alternative approach to tackle this issue by encoding the system information on a specially engineered experimental system that itself is governed by the laws of quantum mechanics [8]. Such specially engineered systems are now popularly known as quantum computers.

The quantum computer is considered as the ”holy grail of quantum technology”. Many research groups and companies are making great efforts to build a quantum computer. Quantum simulation is one of the key applications of a quantum computer. As the name suggests, quantum simulation is about simulating a quantum system which is

less accessible and controllable using a controllable quantum platform. The goal is to simulate the dynamics of a system which is initially prepared in a state $|\psi(0)\rangle$. This system will evolve to a final state $|\psi(t)\rangle$ under a unitary transformation, U , and it is given by,

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = U|\psi(0)\rangle \quad (1.1)$$

The general protocol for quantum simulation is shown in Fig.1.1. A quantum system (small circle) can be simulated on a quantum simulator (shown with a bigger circle assuming it is a universal quantum simulator with a large Hilbert space), if we can find a mapping $|\psi(0)\rangle \mapsto |\bar{\psi}(0)\rangle$. Now, we can apply some unitary operations on the quantum simulator to take the state to $|\bar{\psi}(t)\rangle$. And, the final stage of the quantum simulation is finding a mapping $|\bar{\psi}(t)\rangle \mapsto |\psi(t)\rangle$ [9].




Figure 1.1: Schematic representation of quantum simulation protocol.

All simulations discussed in this thesis come under the class of Digital Quantum simulations (DQS) which are circuit based quantum simulations. The DQS has mainly three stages; initialization, unitary operations and measurement. And, you will see in the later part of the thesis that, all three stages often require some unitary operations. Therefore, realizing any arbitrary unitary operation is one of the major requirements of a quantum simulator. Spin architectures such as Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR)

and Nitrogen Vacancy (NV) centers in diamond form a convenient testbed for the experimental investigations of quantum phenomena as well as quantum information. In this direction, the thesis focuses on quantum simulations and quantum controls using spin based quantum architectures.

This thesis focuses on two spin architectures namely NMR and NV centers in diamond. The first five chapters discuss the experiments done on an NMR quantum simulator. Chapter 2 deals with the theory of quantum information processing and NMR. Later, we will discuss simulations of some quantum phenomena using nuclear spin $1/2$ systems in a liquid state NMR setup.

We provided the first experimental investigation of the quantum pigeonhole effect using a four qubit NMR quantum register and the experimental details are discussed in Chapter 3. In this experiment, we adapted the GRadient Ascent Pulse Engineering (GRAPE) technique for realizing unitary operators.

Later on, we realized unitary and non-unitary quantum controls by adapting the bang-bang (BB) method. Using the pulses realized by bang-bang control, we implemented the Optimal Fixed-Point Quantum Search algorithm (OFPQS) on a three-qubit NMR quantum register (Chapter 4). We also demonstrated some nonunitary operations using BB along with Pulsed Field Gradients (PFG).

In Chapter 5, we briefly discuss realizing dynamically protected quantum gates by integrating Dynamical Decoupling (DD) and optimal control techniques. We experimentally demonstrated the protection of quantum discord during Grover's search algorithm by applying dynamically corrected quantum gates.

Then we come to the second goal of this thesis which is the quantum information processing using NV centers in diamond. We introduce the physical properties of the NV centres such as electronic energy levels and Hamiltonian in Chapter 6.

In Chapter 7, we discuss the confocal setup and the microwave electronics for ad-

addressing and manipulating the electronic spin in an NV center. Finally, we discuss some basic experiments performed on NV center-based spin architecture.

Chapter 2

Introduction

2.1 Quantum Information Processing

Quantum information processing (QIP) [10, 11] is an interdisciplinary field of research that combines areas like theoretical and experimental physics, mathematics, computer science, material science and engineering. QIP is the way of information processing and computation by taking advantage of quantum mechanical laws such as superposition of the quantum states and entanglement. Simulating a quantum system on a classical computer becomes impossible when the system size gets exponentially larger as it requires huge memory to store the state of the system [12]. In 1982, Richard Feynman put forward the idea of simulating a quantum system using another quantum system which is more accessible and controllable. He said "let the quantum computer itself be built with quantum mechanical elements which obey quantum mechanical laws" [8]. Apart from simulating quantum systems, in 1984 C. Bennett and G. Brassard presented cryptographic key distribution model using Wiesner's conjugate coding on a quantum computer [13]. This work opened up a secured way for communication and cryptography. In 1991, A. Ekert proposed a protocol for secure quantum communication based on quantum entanglement [14, 15]. Peter Shor at Bell laboratories developed a quantum

algorithms for the prime factorization of a large number in the year of 1994 [16, 17]. This work was, infact, a major challenge for many of the existing encryption codes such as the RSA code that exploit the difficulty of prime factorization on a classical computer. Followed by Shor's algorithm, in 1996, Lov Grover, again from Bell laboratories, came up with an algorithm for data search on an unsorted database. This algorithm offers a quadratic speed up over any of the existing classical search algorithm [18, 19]. In the same year, S. Lyod showed that a quantum computer can indeed act like a universal quantum simulator [20]. That means, a quantum computer can be initialized and measured after performing a universal set of quantum gates. The first experimental quantum information processing was demonstrated by David Cory et al. and Neil Gershenfeld and Isaac Chuang independently in the same year of 1997 using liquid state NMR. In this chapter, I shall discuss the basics of QIP [21, 22].

2.1.1 Quantum bit

A quantum bit or qubit is considered as the basic unit of quantum information processing analogous to a bit in a classical computer. However, while a bit can take only 1 or 0 as an input, the quantum superposition allows a qubit to exist in both possible states simultaneously. The two orthogonal states of the qubit are generally represented by $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. The general state of a qubit can be written as,

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle, \quad (2.1)$$

where α and β are the complex probability amplitudes such that $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. The matrix representation of the above state can be written as $|\psi\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix}$. A measurement made on the state gives the outcome either $|0\rangle$ with a probabily $|\alpha|^2$ or $|1\rangle$ with a probability $|\beta|^2$. Often, the state of a qubit is represented by a vector on a Bloch sphere of unit radius as shown in Fig.2.4. Now, the equ.2.1 can be rewritten as,




Figure 2.1: Bloch sphere representation of a qubit

$$|\psi\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle \quad (2.2)$$

where, θ and ϕ are the polar and azimuthal angles respectively.

Now consider a quantum register of n qubits. Its superposition state can be expressed as a linear combination of its basis states. For example, for a 2 qubit quantum register the state can be written as,

$$|\psi\rangle = c_1|00\rangle + c_2|01\rangle + c_3|10\rangle + c_4|11\rangle, \quad (2.3)$$

where c_i s are the complex probability amplitudes such that $\sum_i |c_i|^2 = 1$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |00\rangle &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}; & |01\rangle &= \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}; \\ |10\rangle &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}; & |11\rangle &= \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} \otimes \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \end{bmatrix}. \end{aligned}$$

2.1.2 Density Matrix

Another way of expressing the state of a quantum register is using a point in a Liouville space and it is called a density matrix. This is often required when we deal with a statistical ensemble of quantum systems as in NMR QIP. Assume we have an ensemble containing states $|\psi_i\rangle$ with probabilities p_i , then the density matrix which describes the state of the ensemble can be expressed as,

$$\rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|, \quad (2.4)$$

where $\sum p_i = 1$.

When $\text{Tr}\rho^2 = 1$, then the system is in a pure state that means all members of the ensemble are in the same state. The condition for a system being in a mixed state is $\text{Tr}\rho^2 < 1$. A density matrix must satisfy the following three conditions:

- ρ is Hermitian. i.e., $\rho = \rho^\dagger$;
- ρ is a positive operator such that all eigenvalues are non-negative;
- $\text{Tr}[\rho] = 1$.

The most general density matrix representation for a single qubit is,

$$\rho = \frac{\mathbb{1} + \vec{r} \cdot \vec{\sigma}}{2} \quad (2.5)$$

where, $\mathbb{1}$ is the identity matrix, $\vec{r}$ is the Bloch vector and $\vec{\sigma} = \sigma_x \hat{x} + \sigma_y \hat{y} + \sigma_z \hat{z}$ is the Pauli vector operator.

2.1.3 Quantum Entanglement

Quantum entanglement is one of the unique quantum mechanical phenomena. And, it is an important resource for quantum communication, quantum computation and cryp-

tography. Consider a composite system with n components. Then, the system is in an entangled state if the total state of the composite system can not be expressed as a tensor product of states of the each component. i.e.,

$$|\psi\rangle \neq |\psi_1\rangle \otimes |\psi_2\rangle \cdots |\psi_n\rangle. \quad (2.6)$$

This is called the non-separability criterion for an entangled state. The most famous examples for maximally entangled states are the Bell states which are expressed as:

$$|\phi_{\pm}\rangle = \frac{|00\rangle \pm |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \quad (2.7)$$

and

$$|\psi_{\pm}\rangle = \frac{|01\rangle \pm |10\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}. \quad (2.8)$$

The physical implication of the entanglement is that the measurement made on one of the qubits affect the measurement outcome of the other qubit. For example, in the state $|\phi_{\pm}\rangle$, the measurement made on the first qubit gives the output either $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ with 50 : 50 probabilities. If the first qubit collapses to $|0\rangle$ then the second qubit also collapses to the qubit state $|0\rangle$.

2.1.4 Quantum Gates

Analogous to classical computers, the qubit manipulations are performed by using local as well as nonlocal quantum operators and those are called quantum gates. Unlike a classical gate, a quantum gate, U , always has to satisfy the condition $UU^{\dagger} = \mathbb{1}$. Consequently, all unitary operations performed on a quantum register are reversible. In this section, I will describe some of the basic quantum gates.

Single Qubit Gates

NOT Gate: This gate is very similar to the NOT operation in classical information. This gate acted upon a qubit transforms the state $|0\rangle$ to $|1\rangle$ and vice-versa. This operator is nothing but the Pauli operator σ_x and the matrix form of this operator can be written as;

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Hadamard Gate: Hadamard (H) gate acted upon the state $|0\rangle$ transforms this into an equal superposition state $|+\rangle = \frac{|0\rangle+|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $|1\rangle$ into the state $|-\rangle = \frac{|0\rangle-|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$. The matrix form of H is;

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Phase Gate: The Phase gate (R_ϕ) operated on the basis state $|1\rangle$ takes it to $e^{i\phi}|1\rangle$ and leaves the basis state $|0\rangle$ unchanged as $R_\phi|0\rangle = |0\rangle$. And, the matrix form of R_ϕ gate is;

$$R_\phi = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi} \end{bmatrix}.$$

where, ϕ is the phase shift.

Non-local Quantum Gates

Non-local quantum operators are applied on more than one qubits simultaneously. Controlled-NOT (CNOT) gate is one of the examples of a non-local quantum gates.

CNOT: CNOT gate is often used for selectively inverting a target qubit. The target qubit flips when the control qubit is in the state $|1\rangle$ else it remains unchanged. The matrix representation of this operator is;

$$CNOT = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

2.1.5 Quantum Measurements

Quantum measurement is one of the most intricate problems in quantum mechanics. There are various measurements schemes in quantum mechanics and Projective mea-

surement is the most basic measurement scheme. The quantum theory of measurement itself a hot research area. Apart from projective measurements, other schemes like weak measurements and Positive Operator Valued Measurements (POVM) are also getting more popular in QIP.

Projective Measurements: In QM, we often assume the system as a closed system that a system prepared in a superposition state unless it is measured. For example, a qubit is in a superposition of states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ and a measurement performed on it collapse the qubit to one of the states. Now the system can be described by a unitary time evolution under a Hamiltonian and it can be measured via a projective measurement. Projective measurements are described by a set of measurement operators or projectors $\{M_m = |m\rangle\langle m|\}$ which form a complete basis such that $\sum_m M_m = \mathbb{1}$. The projectors have the property $M_m^2 = M_m$. If the pre-measurement state of a quantum system is $|\psi\rangle$, the post measurement state corresponding to the outcome m is given by:

$$|\psi_m\rangle = \frac{M_m|\psi\rangle}{P_m} \quad (2.9)$$

where, $P_m = \langle\psi|M_m|\psi\rangle$ is the probability of the measurement outcome m .

Positive Operator Valued Measurements (POVM): In practice, a quantum system is not a closed system and projective measurements are inadequate to measure the system. However the larger system consists of system and environment still follows the unitary evolutions. It turns out that the projective measurement is a limited case of a POVM measurements. POVM encompasses everything except the environment. It is considered as the most general scheme for quantum measurement as the measurement operators M_m are not necessarily orthogonal. The POVM measurement elements are defined as $E_m = M_m M_m^\dagger$ with the condition $\sum_m E_m = \mathbb{1}$. The probability of the outcome is $P_m = \langle\psi|E_m|\psi\rangle$.

Ensemble Average: The measurement outcome of a quantum mechanical system

is probabilistic. Therefore, one may perform independent measurements on multiple copies of identically prepared quantum systems. The ensemble average allows obtaining the expectation value of a given observable A . If the ensemble is prepared in a density matrix ρ , the expectation value of A is given by

$$\langle A \rangle = \text{Tr}[\rho A]. \quad (2.10)$$

2.1.6 Divincenzo's criteria

A qubit can be realized using various two level quantum systems. And such systems are abundant in nature. But Divincenzo proposed a list of minimal requirements for the physical implementation of a quantum computer. The criteria are the following:

- A scalable physical system with a well defined qubit
- Ability to initialize system to any quantum state
- Long relevant coherence time
- A universal set of quantum gates
- Qubit specific measurement

Later two additional criteria are also proposed especially for the quantum communication tasks:

- The ability to inter-convert stationary and flying qubits
- The ability to faithfully transmit flying qubits between specified locations

2.1.7 Experimental Architectures

Various physical systems have been anticipated for building a quantum computer based on Divincenzo's criteria. However, none of them satisfies all 7 criteria. It is still a

question which one of them is going to be the full-fledged quantum computer. These are some of the architectures:

- Nuclear Magnetic Resonance (NMR)
- Nitrogen Vacancy (NV) Centers in diamond
- Superconducting Circuits
- Trapped Atom/Ion
- Linear Optics
- Quantum Dots

This thesis covers both NMR and NV center architectures. In the following section, we will discuss the basics of NMR and NV centers will be discussed in Chapter 6 of the thesis.

2.2 Nuclear Magnetic Resonance

All nuclei possess an intrinsic physical property called Spin. Spin quantum number can be either an integer or an integer multiple of $1/2$. Spins are associated with magnetic moments. In other words, a spin acts like a tiny magnet. In NMR QIP, a qubit is realized using a spin $1/2$ nucleus in an external magnetic field, B_0 . When a spin $1/2$ nucleus is placed in a magnetic field, its energy eigenstates will become nondegenerate under the Zeeman Hamiltonian (see Fig.2.2).

The energy required to induce a transition is the energy difference between these levels, $\Delta E = \gamma \hbar B_0 / 2\pi$ where γ is the gyro-magnetic ratio of the nucleus and $\hbar$ is the Planck's constant. With typical magnetic fields of a few tesla, achieved by superconducting magnets, the frequency of the nuclear transition

$$\nu_0 = \gamma B_0 / 2\pi \quad (2.11)$$




Figure 2.2: Zeeman splitting of a spin 1/2 nucleus.

is usually in the radio-frequency (RF) range. This is called the Larmor resonance frequency. Resonant transitions can be induced by irradiating the system with an RF radiation whose frequency matches with ν_0 . This phenomenon is popularly known as the nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR).

Many qubits can be realized if the NMR system has more than one NMR active nucleus. In that scenario, there will be additional interactions other than Zeeman interaction as discussed below [23].

2.2.1 Zeeman interaction

Consider a particle with spin angular momentum operator $\mathbf{I}$. The corresponding magnetic moment is $\vec{\mu} = \gamma \hbar \mathbf{I} / 2\pi$ where γ is the gyromagnetic ratio of the nucleus and h is the Planck's constant. Let us now apply a magnetic field, B_0 along the z axis and the corresponding Zeeman interaction Hamiltonian is given by

$$H_{Zeeman} = -\vec{\mu} \cdot B_0 \hat{z} = -\gamma \hbar B_0 I_z, \quad (2.12)$$

where I_z is the z component of the spin operator and $\hbar = h/2\pi$. A spin I nucleus has $(2I + 1)$ energy eigenstates under the Zeeman Hamiltonian with eigenvalues $E_m = -\gamma \hbar B_0 m$ where, $m = -I, -I + 1, \dots, I - 1, I$ and $E_{m+1} - E_m = \Delta E = \hbar \omega_0$, where

$\omega_0 = -\gamma B_0$ is the Larmor frequency. The nuclear Larmor frequencies in standard spectrometers range from about 30 MHz to 1000 MHz.

2.2.2 Chemical Shift

Now consider the case where we have two spin 1/2 particles of same species, i.e, both have the same gyro-magnetic ratio. Nevertheless, the local magnetic field felt by the individual nuclei need not be the same. This is because the local field is the sum of external field and the induced field by the nearby electrons. The chemical environment is different for different nuclei; hence the local fields are different. The local field can be written as,

$$B_{Loc} = B_0(1 - \sigma_0) \quad (2.13)$$

where, σ_0 is called the Chemical shift tensor. This often plays a major role in addressing different qubits in NMR.

2.2.3 J- Coupling

It is an indirect interaction between two nuclei which is mediated by covalent electrons. This is also known as spin-spin or indirect dipole-dipole interaction. Two nuclear spins are indirectly connected via a magnetic interaction transmitted by the bonding electrons. The Hamiltonian corresponding to J-coupling interaction is,

$$H_J = 2\pi \sum_{i < j}^n J_{ij} I^i \cdot I^j, \quad (2.14)$$

where J_{ij} is the J-coupling constant or the scalar coupling constant and I^i and I^j are the spin operator of the i^{th} and the j^{th} spins respectively.

2.2.4 Dipole-Dipole Interaction

A nucleus behaves like a tiny magnet and it possesses a magnetic dipole moment. Two nuclei interact with each other directly through space. This interaction is called direct dipole-dipole (DD) interaction. The Hamiltonian corresponding to DD interaction of two nuclei is given by

$$H_{DD} = b^{ij} \{A + B + C + D + E + F\} \quad (2.15)$$

where,

$$\begin{aligned} A &= I_z^i I_z^j (1 - 3 \cos^2 \theta) \\ B &= \frac{-1}{4} (I_+^i I_-^j + I_-^i I_+^j) (1 - 3 \cos^2 \theta) \\ C &= \frac{-3}{2} (I_+^i I_z^j + I_z^i I_+^j) \sin \theta \cos \theta e^{-i\phi} \\ D &= \frac{-3}{2} (I_-^i I_z^j + I_z^i I_-^j) \sin \theta \cos \theta e^{i\phi} \\ E &= \frac{-3}{4} I_+^i I_+^j \sin^2 \theta e^{-i2\phi} \\ F &= \frac{-3}{4} I_-^i I_-^j \sin^2 \theta e^{i2\phi} \end{aligned}$$

with polar coordinates θ and ϕ and the spin operators $I_+ = I_x + iI_y$ and $I_- = I_x - iI_y$ are called the ladder operators. Here $b^{ij} = -\mu_0 \gamma^i \gamma^j \hbar^2 / 4\pi r_{ij}^3$ is the dipolar coupling constant, with μ_0 being the magnetic permeability of free space, γ being the gyromagnetic ratio of the nuclear spin, and r_{ij} being the distance between i^{th} and j^{th} spin. Under secular approximation for the weakly coupled system (which is usually the case in a heteronuclear system) the Hamiltonian becomes,

$$H_{DD} = 2d^{ij} I_z^i I_z^j, \quad (2.16)$$

where $d^{ij} = b^{ij}(1 - 3 \cos^2 \theta)$. However, in liquid-state NMR, due to the fast tumbling motion, this interaction gets averaged out to zero.

2.2.5 Quadrupolar Interaction

A nuclear spin with $I > 1/2$ possesses a quadrupolar charge distribution and consequently an associated electric quadrupolar moment. This quadrupole moment interacts with its surrounding electric field gradient. For a nuclear spin oriented an angle θ with the external magnetic field which is assumed to be along the z axis, the first order quadrupole Hamiltonian can be written as,

$$H_Q = \frac{\omega_Q}{6}(3I_z^2 - I(I + 1)) \quad (2.17)$$

with $\omega_Q = \frac{eQ\bar{V}^{zz}}{2I(2I-1)\hbar}$ where, e is the electronic charge, Q is the quadrupole moment and $\bar{V}^{zz}$ is the parallel component of the electric field tensor.

2.3 Thermal equilibrium state in NMR

NMR is an ensemble quantum computer. Therefore, at thermal equilibrium the system is in a completely mixed state and the corresponding density matrix is given by,

$$\rho_{eq} = \frac{e^{-\mathcal{H}_z/k_B T}}{Z} \quad (2.18)$$

where, $\mathcal{H}_z$ is the internal Hamiltonian with corresponding partition function Z , k_B is the Boltzmann constant and T is the absolute temperature [24]. This is a diagonal matrix with diagonal elements,

$$(\rho_{eq})_{ii} = \frac{e^{-E_i/k_B T}}{\sum_i^N e^{-E_i/k_B T}} \quad (2.19)$$

where E_i gives the population corresponding to different energy levels and N is the dimension of the Hilbert space. At a high temperature such that $k_B T \gg E_i$, ρ_{eq} can be

approximated by,

$$\begin{aligned}\rho_{eq} &\approx (\mathbb{1} - \mathcal{H}_z/k_B T)/\text{Tr}(\mathbb{1} - \mathcal{H}_z/k_B T) \\ &\approx \mathbb{1}/N - \mathcal{H}_z/Nk_B T.\end{aligned}\quad (2.20)$$

The term $\mathbb{1}/N$ is unaffected by the unitary transformations and neither does it contribute to the NMR signal. Therefore this term can be neglected in operator algebra. For an ensemble of spin 1/2 nuclei, the second term is of the form ϵI_z , where $\epsilon = \hbar\omega_0/k_B T$ is often known as purity factor. In the case of ^1H nucleus, $\epsilon \sim 10^{-5}$ at room temperature in typical NMR fields. Now consider an ensemble of spin systems each containing n interacting spin 1/2 nuclei. The traceless part of the density matrix, also known as *deviation density matrix*, is

$$\rho_{eq}^{dev} = \sum_{k=1}^n \epsilon_k I_{kz} \quad (2.21)$$

where, $\epsilon_k = \frac{\hbar\omega_{0k}}{nk_B T}$.

2.3.1 Pseudo Pure state

A quantum register needs to be initialized into a pure state for carrying out QIP tasks. Ideally, all members in the ensemble has to be initialized into a desired state $|\psi\rangle$ with corresponding density matrix, $\rho_{pure} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$. In practice, it is very difficult to achieve this condition, particularly in NMR. Nevertheless, this can be overcome by preparing the system into a Pseudo Pure State (PPS) state. The PPS density matrix can be written as,

$$\rho_{pps} = (1 - \epsilon)\mathbb{1}/N + \epsilon\rho_{pure}. \quad (2.22)$$

In PPS, all states except one state have equal population. The population distribution in different NMR states are illustrated in Fig.2.3.

The pseudo-pure state preparation of liquid-state NMR qubits involves RF pulses,




Figure 2.3: population distribution for a 2 qubit system, a) Thermal equilibrium state, b) Pure state, and c) Pseudo pure state . Image taken and modified from [1].

free evolution under spin-spin interaction, and pulsed-field-gradients (PFGs) [25]. A pulsed field gradient is used for creating inhomogeneity in static magnetic field by applying a short timed pulse with spatial dependent field intensity. And, we will see in the next section that RF pulses are used in NMR for realising unitary operations. Preparing the system into a pseudo-pure state starting from a maximally mixed state (often starts with thermal equilibrium state) can not be solely attained via unitary transformations. Therefore, pulsed-field gradients are exploited during this step to destroy the coherences and retain only the populations. This is effectively a non-unitary process.

2.4 Spin manipulations using RF field

In this section, I will discuss how to realise quantum gates in NMR using an external RF field. In QIP, after the system is initialized, system manipulations have to be done to steer the evolution of the system to a desired final state. A system initialized into a density matrix, $\rho(0)$ evolves to a final density matrix $\rho(t)$ via a unitary transformation, which can be expressed as,

$$\rho(t) = U\rho(0)U^\dagger. \quad (2.23)$$

Here U is a unitary operator with a condition $UU^\dagger = U^\dagger U = \mathbb{I}$. A single qubit quantum gates can be realized by a rotation about an axis $\hat{n}$ on a Bloch sphere and it is given by,

$$R_{\hat{n}}^\theta = e^{i\theta\hat{n}\cdot\sigma/2} = \cos(\theta/2)\mathbb{I} + i\sin(\theta/2)(\hat{n}_x\sigma_x + \hat{n}_y\sigma_y + \hat{n}_z\sigma_z) \quad (2.24)$$

where $\hat{n} \in \hat{n}_x, \hat{n}_y, \hat{n}_z$ is the 3-D unit vector, $\sigma \in X, Y, Z$ are the Pauli matrices and θ is the angle of rotation. Non-local operators such as CNOT gates can be realized by the single qubit rotations along with free evolution operator under J-coupling.

Single qubit rotations are realized with the help of RF field applied perpendicular to the external magnetic field B_0 . The RF Hamiltonian can be written as,

$$H_{rf} = -\gamma B_1 \{\cos(\omega_{rf}t + \phi)I_x + \sin(\omega_{rf}t + \phi)I_y\} \quad (2.25)$$

where $\omega_1 = -\gamma B_1$ is the RF amplitude, ω_{rf} is the RF frequency and ϕ is the RF phase. The resonance condition is met when $\omega_{rf} = \omega_0$ where, ω_0 is the Larmor frequency of the spin. Let us first consider the resonance case with $\omega_{rf} = \omega_0$. Under rotating frame approximation, the effective RF Hamiltonian becomes,

$$H_{eff} = \omega_1(\cos(\phi)I_x + \sin(\phi)I_y) \quad (2.26)$$

Now suppose there is an offset, $\Omega = \omega_0 - \omega_{rf}$, the effective Hamiltonian will have an additional term along the longitudinal axis. The effective Hamiltonian is written as,

$$H_{eff} = \Omega I_z + \omega_1(\cos(\phi)I_x + \sin(\phi)I_y) \quad (2.27)$$

This is equivalent to say, on resonance condition the effective field is along the $\hat{x}$ axis and it is on the $\hat{x} - \hat{z}$ plane when there is an offset. And, the nuclear spin will start nutating around the effective field with a nutation frequency, $\omega_{eff} = \sqrt{\Omega^2 + \omega_1^2}$.




Figure 2.4: NMR Free Induction Decay(FID).

Therefore, any angle of rotation, θ can be realized by choosing the RF duration, τ such that $\omega_1 \tau = \theta$.

2.5 NMR Readout

The next crucial step is to readout the final state of the system. In NMR, the state readout is carried out with the aid of an RF coil placed along the sample. The measurement observable is the bulk transverse magnetization of the ensemble. At thermal equilibrium, the bulk magnetization vector points along the external field B_0 . An RF field B_1 applied along the transverse plane, flips the magnetization to the transverse plane. Now, the bulk magnetization precesses around the transverse field and produces electromotive field in the coil placed around the sample tube in accordance with Faraday's law of induction. However, due to decoherence and the static field inhomogeneity, the induced field will start decaying with time and it is called the free induction decay (FID).

The NMR spectrum is obtained by Fourier transforming the FID signal. The final

bulk magnetization can be expressed as,

$$s(t) \propto \text{Tr}(\rho(t)D_{op}) \quad (2.28)$$

where $s(t) = s_x(t) + is_y(t)$ is the complex signal, $\rho(t)$ is the final density matrix and $D_{op} = I_x + iI_y$ is the detection operator. The signal in frequency domain is obtained via Fourier transformation of $s(t)$.

Chapter 3

NMR investigation of quantum pigeonhole effect

In this chapter, I will discuss the NMR simulation of a recent quantum phenomenon called quantum pigeonhole effect using unitary operators realized via the GRadient Ascent Pulse Engineering (GRAPE) technique [26].

3.1 Introduction

Quantum theory has been often known for contradicting logic applied to our everyday life and quantum pigeonhole effect (QPHE) [27,28] is one of the examples. The pigeonhole principle is one of the most famous principles in mathematics and it states that if n items are put in $m < n$ containers, then at least one container must have more than one items [29]. Although, it is the simple logic for counting, it has got several interesting applications in mathematics [30–32], computer science [33–35], graph theory [36], and combinatorics [37].

Recently, Aharonov and co-workers have theoretically illustrated certain quantum mechanical scenarios appearing to contradict the pigeonhole principle [38]. This phenomenon, known as QPHE has already raised considerable interest. For example Yu




Figure 3.1: (a) Three quantum particles entering a Mach-Zehnder interferometer consisting of two beam-splitters (BS1 and BS2) and phase shifter (Z), and two particle-detectors D0 and D1. (b) Circuit for NMR investigation of QPHE. Hadamard gates perform the function of beam splitters, and Z-gate performs phase shift. Intermediate state information of the particle-qubits (F_1 , F_2 , F_3) is encoded onto an ancilla qubit (H_4) using one of the controlled operations U_{12} , U_{13} , and U_{23} . The ancilla qubit is measured at the end of the circuit.

and Oh demonstrated the emergence of QPHE from quantum contextuality [39]. Rae and Forgan suggested that QPHE arises as a result of interference between the wave-functions of weakly-interacting particles [40]. In this work, we simulate QPHE using a four-qubit NMR quantum simulator.

3.2 Theory

In the following section, I shall discuss the theoretical modeling of quantum pigeonhole effect (subsection 3.2.1). I will also briefly discuss the optimal control technique namely

GRAPE algorithm for realizing unitary operators for quantum simulation (subsection 3.2.2).

3.2.1 Quantum Pigeonhole Effect (QPHE)

Let us discuss the theory of QPHE by considering three identical particles simultaneously entering a Mach-Zender interferometer as shown in Fig. 3.1 (a). The Mach-zender interferometer consists of two beam-splitters (BS1 and BS2), a 90 degree phase-shifter (Z), and two identical detectors (D0 and D1). BS1 is used to create a superposition of two paths labelled $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. When a particle initially prepared in state $|0\rangle$ enters BS1, it transforms to $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$. Both paths are guided towards BS2 using mirrors. After the 90 degree phase-shifter Z, the state of the particle is $|+i\rangle = (|0\rangle + i|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, and after BS2 it becomes $\{(1+i)|0\rangle + (1-i)|1\rangle\}/2$. Thus the particle has equal probability of reaching either of the detectors. The state $|+\rangle$ can also be written in terms of $|\pm i\rangle$, i.e.,

$$|+\rangle = \frac{1-i}{2}|+i\rangle + \frac{1+i}{2}|-i\rangle. \quad (3.1)$$

We notice that the first component, namely $|+i\rangle$ transforms to $|-\rangle = (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ after Z, and then to $|1\rangle$ after BS2, and finally ends up in detector D1. Similarly, the second component, namely $|-i\rangle$ transforms to $|+\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ after Z, and then to $|0\rangle$ after BS2, and finally ends up in detector D0. In this sense, a measurement outcome of $|0\rangle$ (or $|1\rangle$) amounts to postselecting $|-i\rangle$ (or $|+i\rangle$) state just before the phase-shifter.

Suppose, three particles are initially in a state $|000\rangle$ and after BS1, the state of the particles is described by the superposition $|\psi_a\rangle = |+, +, +\rangle$. The final state may collapse with equal probability to any one of the states $\{|000\rangle, |001\rangle, |010\rangle, |011\rangle, |100\rangle, |101\rangle, |110\rangle, |111\rangle\}$.

The projectors

$$P_{12} = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathbb{1} + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \mathbb{1} \quad (3.2)$$

$$P_{13} = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes \mathbb{1} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| \quad (3.3)$$

$$P_{23} = \mathbb{1} \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle\langle 0| + \mathbb{1} \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |1\rangle\langle 1|, \quad (3.4)$$

probe if any two of the particles are in the same state, i.e., $|00\rangle$ or $|11\rangle$. The expectation values of the projectors give corresponding probabilities. Evaluating the expectation values for the state $|+, +, +\rangle$, we find that $\langle P_{12} \rangle = \langle P_{23} \rangle = \langle P_{13} \rangle = 1/2$. Just after BS1, the probability for any two particles being in the same path is therefore $1/2$.

We shall now consider only the cases wherein all the three particles reach the same detector, say D0 (or D1) and discard all other possibilities. Then the measurement outcome $|000\rangle$ (or $|111\rangle$) is equivalent to postselecting the state $|\phi_1\rangle = |-i, -i, -i\rangle$ (or $|\phi_0\rangle = |+i, +i, +i\rangle$) before the phase-shifter.

The projection $|\psi_{j,k}^{same}\rangle = P_{jk}|\psi_a\rangle$ describes the component of $|\psi_a\rangle$ corresponding to particles j and k being in the same path. Since,

$$\langle \phi_0 | \psi_{1,2}^{same} \rangle = \langle -i, -i, -i | P_{12} | +, +, + \rangle \quad (3.5)$$

$$= \frac{\langle -i, -i, -i | 0, 0, + \rangle + \langle -i, -i, -i | 1, 1, + \rangle}{2} \quad (3.6)$$

$$= 0, \quad (3.7)$$

This is equivalent to saying that the postselected state $|\phi_0\rangle$ has no component having particles 1 and 2 in the same path. Owing to the symmetry in the pre- ($|\psi_a\rangle$) and post- ($|\phi_0\rangle$) selected states, the above conclusion can be extended to any pair of particles. This effect is interpreted as - if all the three particles have to reach the same detector D0, then no two particles can take the same path inside the Mach-Zender interferometer. Of course, similar interpretation can also be given for the case in which all the three




Figure 3.2: Gradient ascent algorithm

particles reach the same detector D1. This phenomenon which seems to violate the classical pigeonhole effect is called QPHE.

We realized all the gates required for the experimental demonstration of QPHE using GRAPE algorithm. Therefore, before discussing the experimental details, let us see how does GRAPE algorithm work.

3.2.2 GRAPE algorithm for realizing unitary operators

Realizing any arbitrary unitary is one of the major requirements for building a universal quantum simulator. Optimal control techniques have been extensively used for realizing robust quantum gates in NMR quantum simulator. We also used GRAPE algorithm for realizing unitary operators required for this simulation.

GRAPE is a gradient based optimization algorithm. The goal of any optimization algorithm is to find the parameter co-ordinates (in n dimensional parameter space) where a cost function $\mathbb{C}$ is either maximum or minimum. Calculating the gradient of the cost function at each point in the parameter space gives the direction to the maxima (see Fig.3.2).




Figure 3.3: Schematic representation of the GRAPE algorithm. The control amplitude at each segment is assumed as a constant and the vertical arrows show the gradients indicating how each amplitude should be modified in the next iteration in order to improve the cost function.

Consider the total Hamiltonian of an NMR system which is of the form,

$$\mathcal{H}(t) = \mathcal{H}_{int} + \sum_{k=1}^M u_k(t) h_k \quad (3.8)$$

where, $\mathcal{H}_{int}$ is the internal Hamiltonian and the latter term is the RF Hamiltonian with RF amplitude, u_k , corresponding to different spin species, M and spin operator h_k . And, a total unitary operator at time, T can be written as,

$$U(T) = D \exp \left(-i \int_0^T \mathcal{H}(t) dt \right) \quad (3.9)$$

where, D is the Dyson time ordering operator coming from the time dependence of the Hamiltonian.

For practical convenience, the total time T can be discretized into N step of $\Delta t = N/T$ duration and during each time step, the RF amplitude u_k can be treated as a con-

stant as shown in Fig.3.3. Now the unitary corresponding to each segment j can be written as,

$$U_j = e^{-i\mathcal{H}_j\Delta t} \quad (3.10)$$

and, the total unitary at time T is the cumulative product of the unitaries U_j s. For a given Unitary, U_{targ} , the goal is to optimize the RF amplitudes at each segment by maximizing a cost function which is nothing but the fidelity at time T in our case and is defined as,

$$\mathbb{C} = \langle U_{targ}|U_T\rangle = \langle U_{targ}|U_N...U_1\rangle \quad (3.11)$$

$$= \langle U_{j+1}^\dagger...U_N^\dagger U_{targ}|U_j...U_1\rangle \quad (3.12)$$

$$= \langle P_j|X_j\rangle \quad (3.13)$$

where, $P_j = U_{j+1}^\dagger...U_N^\dagger U_{targ}$ is the backward evolving propagation starting from the target unitary, U_{targ} , and $X_j = U_j...U_1$ is the forward evolving propagator at time $j\Delta t$.

The algorithm begins with initial guess amplitudes u_k s and in the next iteration, amplitudes get modified as

$$u_k(j) = u_k(j) + \epsilon \frac{\partial \mathbb{C}_0}{\partial u_{k(j)}} \quad (3.14)$$

where, $\frac{\partial \mathbb{C}_0}{\partial u_{k(j)}} = -\langle P_j|i\Delta t H_k X_j\rangle$ is the gradient at each segment j and ϵ is the step size (see Fig.3.2.2). The mathematics for getting the above expression for $\frac{\partial \mathbb{C}_0}{\partial u_{k(j)}}$ can be found in reference [26]. We then repeat the algorithm until the desired fidelity has been reached.

3.3 NMR simulation

We used a 4-qubit quantum register consists of *3-bromo-2,4,5-trifluorobenzoic acid* (see Fig. 3.4) partially oriented in a liquid crystal N-(4-methoxybenzaldehyde)-4-butylnline




Figure 3.4: The molecular structure of 3-bromo-2,4,5-trifluorobenzoic acid. The chemical shifts (diagonal elements) and effective coupling constants J'_{ij} (off-diagonal elements) are shown in table. The NMR spectrum of ancilla is shown in Fig. 3.5(a).

(MBBA) for simulating QPHE. The three ^{19}F spins and the ^1H spin are respectively used as the three particle qubits and the ancilla qubit for encoding the intermediate path information. All the experiments were carried out on a 500 MHz Bruker NMR spectrometer at an ambient temperature of 298 K. The effective couplings in this system are due to scalar interactions (J_{ij}) as well as partially averaged dipolar interactions (D_{ij}). Thus the internal Hamiltonian for the system, under weak-coupling approximation, can be written as

$$H = -2\pi \sum_i \nu_i I_{zi} + 2\pi \sum_{ij} J'_{ij} I_{zi} I_{zj}, \quad (3.15)$$

where ν_i are the resonance frequencies, $J'_{ij} = (J_{ij} + 2D_{ij})$ are the effective coupling constants, and I_{zi} is the z -component of spin angular momentum operator of i th spin [41]. All the relevant Hamiltonian parameters like chemical shifts and effective coupling constants are tabulated in Fig. 3.4.

The first step of the experiment is the initialization the particle-qubits (three ^{19}F nuclei) in a pseudo pure state and the ancilla can be still in thermal state. Such a state can be expressed as,

$$\rho(0) = \mathbb{1}/16 + \epsilon|000\rangle\langle 000| \otimes \sigma_z/2 \quad (3.16)$$




Figure 3.5: The ancilla NMR at various stages of QPHE simulation, each obtained by a final 90° detection pulse. The simulated and experimental spectra are shown in the left and right columns respectively. (a) Thermal equilibrium state ρ_{eq} (the background baseline is due to the liquid crystal signal), (b) The partial pseudopure state $\rho(0)$, and (c) after the entire MZI-circuit (without U_{ij}) indicating the various combinations of detections. Spectra in (d-f) correspond to the complete QPHE circuit shown in Fig. 3.1(b) obtained with U_{12} , U_{13} , and U_{23} respectively. The dashed boxes highlight the peaks corresponding to the postselected states as described in the text.

where $\epsilon \sim 10^{-5}$ is the purity factor. This state can be very easily realized by taking difference between two initial states: (i) ρ_{eq} corresponding to thermal equilibrium state and (ii) ρ_{in} obtained by inverting the populations of levels $|0000\rangle$ and $|0001\rangle$ using a low-power transition-selective Gaussian pulse of duration 80 ms [21, 42–45]. The ancilla spectrum corresponding to the initial state obtained by a 90° detection pulse (shown in Fig. 3.5 (b)) clearly indicates the transition corresponding to the particle-state $|000\rangle$.

The next step is to apply the various elements of the Mach-Zehnder interferometer as shown in Fig. 3.1 (b). All the unitary operations were realized by GRAPE optimal control technique [46]. The durations of the GRAPE pulses ranged from $400 \mu\text{s}$ to $700 \mu\text{s}$, and the fidelities were better than 0.99 over a 10 % RF inhomogeneity range.

The experimental spectrum after the complete MZI-circuit is shown in Fig. 3.5(c). To probe the component of the wave-function prior to the phase gate, we insert operator U_{ij} as shown in Fig. 3.1 (b). The action of U_{ij} is given by

$$U_{ij} = P_{ij} \otimes \mathbb{1}_a + (\mathbb{1}_s - P_{ij}) \otimes X_a, \quad (3.17)$$

where P_{ij} are the projections as described in eqns. 3.4, $\mathbb{1}_s, \mathbb{1}_a$ are respectively the identity operators on system and ancilla, and X_a is the NOT operator on ancilla. Effectively, U_{ij} conserves the ancilla if particles i and j are in the same path, but inverts it otherwise. Thus in the ancilla NMR spectrum, a positive ancilla peak indicates two particles being in the same path, while a negative peak indicates them being in different paths. Each of the U_{ij} operations is realized by a pair of CNOT gates as described in Fig. 3.6 (a). The NMR pulse-sequences to generate each of the CNOT gates are shown in Fig. 3.6 (b-d).

The NMR spectra obtained after the complete MZI-circuit along with probing of particles (1, 2) (by U_{12}), (1, 3) (by U_{13}), and (2, 3) (by U_{23}), are shown respectively on the right side of Figs. 3.5(d-f). The corresponding simulated spectra are shown on




Figure 3.6: (a) Realizing U_{ij} by a pair of CNOT gates. (b-d) NMR pulse sequences corresponding to $C_1\text{NOT}_4$, $C_2\text{NOT}_4$, and $C_3\text{NOT}_4$ respectively. All the π pulses (open rectangles) are about y axis and the phases of the $\pi/2$ pulses (filled rectangles) are as indicated. The delays are set according to $\tau_i = 1/(8J'_{i,4})$.

Arrangement	Possibility		
	Classical	Quantum	
		D0 Postselection	D1 Postselection
Any two in same container	At least one pair	None	None
Any two in different containers	At most two pairs	All three pairs	All three pairs
Any pair in container-0 (container-1)	Probable	NO	NO
All three in same container	Probable	NO	NO
One of the particles in container -0 (container-1)	Probable	YES (NO)	NO (YES)

Table 3.1: The classical and quantum possibilities are tabulated for various arrangements of three particles in two containers. The top two rows correspond to QPHE.

the left side. The intensity variations in the experimental spectra are mainly due to the imperfections in executing CNOT operations resulting from RF field inhomogeneities, nonlinearities of the RF amplifiers, as well as decoherence. However, we observe an overall agreement of the experimental results with the quantum theoretical simulations. In particular, we focus on the NMR transition 000 (111) corresponding to postselection of all the three particles reaching D0 (D1). These transitions are highlighted by dashed lines in Fig. 3.5(d-f)). All these transitions have negative intensities indicating that no two particles are in the same path. This is a clear demonstration of QPHE.

For three particles and two containers, the various other arrangements and their classical as well as quantum possibilities are shown in Table 1. Here the first two arrangements, where there is a clear contradiction between classical and quantum, correspond to QPHE. For the other cases, while the possibilities are probabilistic in the classical regime, they are certain in the quantum regime. Of course, it is also possible to generalize QPHE to n particles in $m < n$ containers [27].

3.4 Conclusions

Quantum pigeonhole effect is yet another illustration of quantum systems displaying effects beyond the classical predictions. The nonclassical effect in this case emerges as a result of assignment of premeasurement states based on the knowledge of post-measurement values.

Here we provided the first experimental simulation of QPHE using an NMR quantum simulator. The quantum register consisted of three ^{19}F spins simulating three quantum particles whose intermediate state was probed by a ^1H spin (ancilla). The experimental results agreed well with the quantum theoretical predictions. The successful demonstration of QPHE also illustrated good quantum control achieved on a four-qubit heteronuclear NMR system partially oriented in a liquid crystal.

The general formalism of this phenomenon for n particle in $m < n$ boxes is already being proposed in the theory paper by Aharnov et al. In this case, each particle is initially prepared in a state,

$$|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{k=1}^m |k\rangle, \quad (3.18)$$

and the final state is given by,

$$|-i\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}} \sum_{k=1}^m e^{i(\pi k/m)} |k\rangle. \quad (3.19)$$

In other words, the pre-selected state be,

$$|\psi_a\rangle = |+\rangle_1 |+\rangle_2 \cdots |+\rangle_n, \quad (3.20)$$

and the post-selected state is,

$$|\phi_0\rangle = |-i\rangle_1 |-i\rangle_2 \cdots |-i\rangle_n. \quad (3.21)$$

Suppose an intermediate measurement is performed to find if particle j and k are in the state state of not. Now, the initial state will collapse to $|\psi_{j,k}^{same}\rangle = P_{jk}|\psi_a\rangle$ which is again orthogonal to ϕ_0 . This shows the generalization where n particles are in $m < n$ boxes, but no two particles are in the same box.

Chapter 4

Steering Quantum Dynamics via Bang-Bang Control: Implementing optimal fixed point quantum search algorithm

In this chapter, I will introduce a quantum control technique called Bang-Bang (BB) control (section 4.2). Then, I will discuss the Optimal Fixed Point Quantum Search (OFPQS) algorithm for finding marked items among unsorted item in section 4.3 and show how we have experimentally implemented the algorithm on a NMR quantum simulator using the unitary operators realized using BB control (section 4.4). I will also show how to realize certain non-unitary operations using BB control in section 4.5. This work was carried out in collaboration with Gaurav Bhole. Gaurav and I contributed equally to the work. Gaurav did the coding for Bang-Bang control, computational simulations for the optimal fixed-point search algorithm, and designing of the quantum circuit for the experiments. My contribution was mainly in the experimental part of the work where I did the NMR experiments and experimental data analysis.

4.1 Introduction

Steering a quantum state from one state to another is often required during a quantum simulation and there has been a remarkable progress in the field of quantum control during the past several years (eg. [26, 47–50]). In most of the previous methods, smooth modulations (SM) of the control parameters is assumed (see Fig. 4.1). Therefore, those require repeated calculation of the unitaries during each segment of the discretized time (see section.3.2.2 in Chapter 3) in every iteration. Another approach for steering a quantum evolution is based on a sequence of short bursts of full-power control fields. Such an approach, popularly known as a bang-bang (BB) control, has been successfully used in a variety of quantum architectures (for example, [51, 52]). Similar sequences have also been used for controlling spin dynamics. For example, a train of short high-power RF pulses is used to generate a DANTE composite pulse in NMR [53–55].

Here we propose a BB control to generate an arbitrary quantum state steering. We also discuss how this scheme scales much more efficiently with the size of the control sequence compared to the SM scheme. Combined with a global optimization routine, this BB scheme can be used to generate not only arbitrary unitaries but also certain nonunitary operations with high fidelities.

4.2 Bang-bang approach

Although the following methods can be generalized to other quantum architectures, for the sake of clarity, we shall use the rotating frame picture of an NMR spin system (in an isotropic medium or in a partially oriented medium). Denoting ω_r , J_{rs} , D_{rs} respectively for resonance off-sets, indirect (scalar), and direct coupling constants, and I_r for spin




Figure 4.1: Smooth modulation (SM) vs bang-bang (BB) sequence. Ω_j , ϕ_{jk} , Δt are the amplitude, phase, and duration of the segments, and T is the total duration of the sequence. The helix represents the crusher gradient required for nonunitary gates. Performance of BB improves over SM for lower duty cycles as illustrated in the graph. Here τ_{SM} and τ_{BB} indicate respectively SM and BB computational times for calculating 10-qubit propagators of $T = 0.5$ ms duration.

operators, the secular part of the internal Hamiltonian can be written in the form

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = - \sum_r \omega_r I_{rz} + 2\pi \sum_{r < s} (J_{rs} + 2D_{rs}) I_{rz} I_{sz} \quad (4.1)$$

$$+ 2\pi \sum_{r < s} (J_{rs} - D_{rs}) (I_{rx} I_{sx} + I_{ry} I_{sy}), \quad (4.2)$$

wherein the third term vanishes for weakly interacting spins, particularly for spins belonging to different nuclear species [23].

The BB approach relies on intermittent bursts of full control power instead of its smooth modulation. For generality we consider a spin-system having several nuclear species, and let the j th species be irradiated by an independent RF source with an amplitude switching between either 0 or a maximum value Ω_j , but with a variable RF phase $\phi_j \in [0, 2\pi]$ (see Fig. 4.1). The propagator for the BB sequence can easily be setup by discretizing the total control period T into short segments of duration Δt . Let $\mathbf{S}_j = \sum_m \mathbf{I}_m^{(j)}$ be the collective spin operator of m spins belonging to the j th species. We call $X_j = \exp\{-i(\mathcal{H}_0 + \Omega_j \mathbf{S}_{jx})\Delta t\}$ as the basic propagator and it needs to be computed only once. No matrix exponential needs to be calculated during the run-time of iterations, and therefore one obtains a significant speed-up over the SM techniques.

During the k th segment there can be a delay or a pulse. If the k th segment is a delay,

then $U_{jk} = \exp(-i\mathcal{H}_0\Delta t)$ is also a constant operator and therefore needs to be evaluated only once. On the other hand, if the k th segment is a pulse with a phase ϕ_{jk} , then the propagator is simply obtained by rotating X_j about the z -axis, i.e., $U_{jk} = Z_{jk}X_jZ_{jk}^\dagger$. Here $Z_{jk} = \exp(-i\phi_{jk}S_{jz})$ is a diagonal operator in the Zeeman product basis and is therefore efficiently evaluated in the run-time of the iterations. The net propagator for the entire control sequence is simply the cumulative product $U = \prod_k \left(\prod_j U_{jk} \right)$.

Typically complex unitaries involving non-local quantum operations require long evolutions under spin-spin interactions, and have low duty cycles. In such cases, the BB approach is orders of magnitude faster than the conventional methods which require repeated matrix exponentiations to evaluate the segment unitaries (Fig. 4.1). If $[\mathcal{H}_0, Z_{jk}] = 0$ (eg. weak-coupling case: $|\omega_r - \omega_s| \gg 2\pi|J_{rs} - D_{rs}|$ for all r and s), then a further speed-up ensues, since the delay propagators become diagonal.

Given a target unitary U_T , we optimize the BB parameters $\{\Omega_{jk}, \phi_{jk}\}$ using the genetic algorithm by maximizing the unitary fidelity F_u . If the goal is to prepare a specific quantum state ρ_T starting from an initial state ρ_{in} , then we need to calculate the output state $\rho_{\text{out}} = U\rho_{\text{in}}U^\dagger$ and the state fidelity

$$F_s = \frac{|\text{Tr}(\rho_T \rho_{\text{out}})|}{\sqrt{\text{Tr}(\rho_T^2) \text{Tr}(\rho_{\text{out}}^2)}} \quad (4.3)$$

is to be maximized.

The procedure for using the genetic algorithm is as follows. As indicated in Fig. 1, BB sequence consists of bunches of pulses separated by variable delays. Each bunch of w -pulses is assigned with $w + 1$ genes - one for the number of pulses, and remaining for the phases $\{\phi_w\}$. In order to accommodate variable number of bunches in the pulse sequence, it is necessary to pad the vector with dummy genes which are not necessarily used in the optimization routine. There occurs a delay gene after every bunch of pulses and the delay gene d indicates the number of delays (each of duration Δt) to be inserted

between the bunches. Thus the overall gene sequence for two bunches may look like $[w_1, d_1, w_2, d_2, \{\phi_1\}, \{\phi_2\}]$. All genes, except the phase genes, are rounded to nearest integers. For example, a particular gene sequence $[3, 3, 2, 4, 0, \{0.7, 0.9, 1.2\}, \{0.5, 1.1\}]$ refers to two bunches of pulses containing a sequence of 3 pulses, $3\Delta t$ delay, 2 pulses, $4\Delta t$ delay, and the corresponding phase vectors are $\{0.7, 0.9, 1.2\}$ and $\{0.5, 1.1\}$ respectively. Here 0 is the dummy gene. Genetic algorithm begins with a set of initial gene sequences called population. In every iteration, it picks up the fittest populations and passes them onto the next generation. The genetic algorithm seeks to determine an optimal gene-sequence that maximizes the fidelity. We have utilized the genetic algorithm protocol implemented in MATLAB for our optimizations. Here we also note that the genetic algorithm has earlier been used for various optimization purposes in NMR [56, 57].

4.3 OFPQS algorithm

Classical search algorithms can find one or more ‘marked’ items among an unsorted database of Q items in $\mathcal{O}(Q)$ steps. On the other hand, Grover’s quantum search algorithm achieves the same task in $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{Q})$ steps, thereby providing a quadratic speedup over the classical counterpart [58]. Grover’s algorithm identifies one of the R marked items among Q unsorted items with the help of a given oracle function that can recognize the marked items. It can also be interpreted as the rotation of an initial state vector $|\psi_Q\rangle$ in the 2D space spanned by the superposition of $Q - R$ non-solution states $|\psi_{Q-R}\rangle$ and the superposition of R solution states $|\psi_R\rangle$ [59]. The Grover iteration thus drives $|\psi_Q\rangle$ towards $|\psi_R\rangle$ in $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{Q/R})$ steps. However, if we do not know the number of marked items R beforehand, we cannot predict the number of iterations which would land the initial state closest to the marked state. Too few iterations give us a state comprising of mostly non-solution states, whereas, too many iterations can surpass




Figure 4.2: Quantum circuit for OFPQS algorithm. Here the angles α and β depend on the iteration number l as indicated in Eqn. 4.4.

the solution states and we may end up getting non-solution states, yet again. In order to overcome this problem, attempts have been made to develop fixed point quantum search (FPQS) algorithms, which monotonically amplify the probability of obtaining the marked states [60,61]. While these FPQS algorithms lacked the quadratic speedup, a recent optimal FPQS (OFPQS) algorithm proposed by Yoder *et. al.* achieves this speedup while maintaining the fixed point behavior [62]. In the following we outline the various steps involved in the OFPQS algorithm.

The quantum circuit for the OFPQS algorithm is shown in Fig. 4.2 (for 3-qubits). We need to extract $|\psi_R\rangle$ from $|\psi_Q\rangle$ with a success probability $P_L \geq 1 - \delta^2$ for a predefined parameter δ . The algorithm needs a quantum register with a total number of qubits $n \geq \log_2(Q) + 1$ including an ancilla qubit, all initialized in the ground state $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$. The system qubits are then transformed into a uniform superposition by applying $n - 1$ Hadamard gates. We are provided with an oracle U_G which when acted upon the marked state, flips the ancilla qubit. Thus, $U_G|\psi_R\rangle|a\rangle = |\psi_R\rangle|a \oplus 1\rangle$ and $U_G|\psi_{Q-R}\rangle|a\rangle = |\psi_{Q-R}\rangle|a\rangle$, where $|a\rangle$ represents the ancilla qubit. Various gates in the generalized Grover iteration are also shown in Fig. 4.2. Let us consider l generalized Grover iterations. Defining $L = 2l + 1$ and $\gamma^{-1} = T_{1/L}(1/\delta)$ where $T_L(x) = \cos(L \cos^{-1} x)$ is the L^{th} Chebyshev polynomial of the first kind, the phase




Figure 4.3: (a) Molecular structure of dibromo fluoromethane, (b) the Hamiltonian parameters and relaxation time constants in seconds, and (c-e) PPS spectra (upper trace), equilibrium spectra (middle trace), and PPS pulse-sequences (bottom trace) for the ¹H, ¹⁹F and ¹³C qubits, (f) bar diagram representing theoretical (red) and experimental (blue) diagonal elements of the traceless deviation density matrix corresponding to |000> PPS. In (b), the diagonal and off-diagonal elements are respectively resonance off-sets and J-coupling constants in Hz.

rotations are given by

$$\alpha_j = -\beta_{l-j+1} = 2 \cot^{-1} \left(\tan(2\pi j/L) \sqrt{1 - \gamma^2} \right) \quad (4.4)$$

for all $j = 1, 2, \dots, l$ [62]. As each Grover iterate contains two applications of the oracle U_G , the query complexity is $L - 1$.

4.4 NMR Implementation

We implement the OFPQS algorithm on a quantum register involving two system qubits 1H and ^{19}F , along with an ancilla qubit ^{13}C of dibromofluoromethane- ^{13}C [63] dissolved in acetone-D6 (see Fig. 4.3). All the experiments were carried out on a Bruker 500 MHz NMR spectrometer at an ambient temperature of 300 K. Here, we demonstrate the optimal search algorithm for searching one and two marked items among four unsorted items. As described in the circuit in Fig. 4.2, the experiment mainly involves three stages: (i) preparation of $|000\rangle$ state, (ii) iterations of the generalized Grover operation, and (iii) measurement of the final probabilities using the ancilla qubit. Fig. 4.3 shows the BB-sequence consisting of both RF pulses and crusher gradients automatically generated for the 3-qubit initialization by maximizing the state-to-state fidelity F_s . In the experiment, the crushers are easily achieved using three PFGs whose time instants are obtained by BB optimization scheme. Fidelity of the experimental results of $|000\rangle$ PPS preparation shown in Fig. 4.3 (c-e) is estimated to be 0.998 ± 0.001 . Steering the system from thermal state to $|000\rangle$ PPS state causes change in purity hence, it is essentially a non-unitary process. Therefore BB can be also used for realizing non-unitary operations along with crusher gradient and this will be addressed in detail in the next section.

As shown in the circuit of Fig. 4.2, we then prepare the uniform superposition state $|\psi_Q\rangle$ by applying a Hadamard gate on each of the system qubits.

First we divide the circuit shown in Fig. 4.2 into several segments as indicated by the vertical dashed lines. Each of these segments is realized by a BB sequence with an average fidelity of 0.98 over 10% RF inhomogeneity. In order to demonstrate the ability of the BB scheme to realize highly intricate and long circuits, we also implemented the entire generalized Grover iterate (Fig. 4.2) by a single BB sequence. The durations of the BB sequences for $l = \{1, 2, \dots, 10\}$ varied in the range 40 ms to 220 ms, and




Figure 4.4: The experimental ^{13}C spectra after various steps of OFPQS algorithm (a) equilibrium state, (b) pseudopure state $|000\rangle$, (c) initial state preparation, (d) oracle, (e-g) after amplification with $l = 1, 2$, and 3 respectively. Spectra in (a) to (d) are obtained after a Hadamard gate.




Figure 4.5: The theoretical and experimental results for the probability P_L of finding (a) one ($|10\rangle$) and (b) two ($|10\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$) marked states among four items versus the number of iterations l . The red and blue points respectively represent the theoretically predicted and experimentally obtained probabilities measured directly from the ancilla (^{13}C) spectra (shown in insets).

consisted of 8,000 to 44,000 segments, each segment being $5 \mu s$ long. The simulated fidelities were about 0.98 over 10% RF inhomogeneity. While such long sequences implementing multiple control operations are hard to realize by other control methods, the present BB scheme exploits the very low duty-cycle and the one-time evaluation of basic propagators to efficiently compute the overall unitaries. But, all our experiments were performed with formal pulses (where we segregate the circuit into several segments) in order to measure the ancilla spectrum after each stage of the algorithm. We performed the experiments for one ($|10\rangle$) and two ($|10\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$) marked items by systematically increasing the number of iterations (l) in each case.

In order to measure the final probabilities of finding the marked states, we first destroy the coherences by applying a crusher gradient (Fig. 4.2). The relative probabilities of the system qubits being in various eigenstates are encoded in the population differences of the ancilla qubit. Therefore we finally measure the ancilla after applying a Hadamard operator, as shown in Fig. 4.2.

4.4.1 Ancilla measurements

In all our experiments, we set $\delta^2 = 0.2$ so that the theoretical lower bound for the probabilities of finding the marked state is $1 - \delta^2 = 0.8$. The spectra obtained at various stages of the algorithm for one marked state, i.e., $|10\rangle$ are shown in Fig. 4.4. The final spectra (e-g) after amplification with $l = 1, 2$, and 3 clearly identify the marked state with experimental probabilities being in the range 0.7 ± 0.05 . Probability of finding the marked items after various iterations are shown in Fig. 4.5. The experimental probabilities were in the range 0.75 ± 0.07 and 0.74 ± 0.05 for one and two marked states respectively. The lower values of experimental probabilities are mainly due to pulse imperfections as well as decoherence. In spite of the lower probabilities, the marked states can be clearly identified from the spectra. It is clear that as the number of iterations increases, each final state remains close to the solution state, thus exhibiting the fixed point behavior.




Figure 4.6: (a) Molecular structure of the five-qubit system 1-bromo-2,4,5-trifluorobenzene and its Hamiltonian parameters wherein diagonal and off-diagonal numbers represent resonance offsets and effective (J+2D)-coupling constants (in Hz), (b-f) the spectra corresponding to the thermal equilibrium state (blue) and $|00000\rangle$ PPS prepared from the nonunitary BB sequence (red), and (g) bar diagram representing theoretical (red) and experimental (blue) diagonal elements of the traceless deviation density matrix corresponding to $|00000\rangle$ PPS.

4.5 Realizing non-unitary operations using BB

The another important aspect of BB is that it can also be used for realizing certain nonunitary operators along with crusher gradient. In the algorithm, the nonunitary operators are realized by inserting one or more crusher genes. A crusher gene g can take values 0 or 1, corresponding to ON or OFF. $g = 0$ keeps the state unaltered, while $g = 1$ retains only the diagonal elements of the density matrix, thus completely destroying all the coherences.

In this work, we also describe preparing a 3 and 5 qubit PPS target state with the help of a crusher gradient which is essentially a nonunitary operator that attenuates all the coherences, ultimately retaining only the diagonal elements of the density matrix in the computational basis. Simple pulsed-field-gradients (PFGs) used here are efficient in this task unless one generates homonuclear zero-quantum coherences, in which case more advanced twirling methods are needed [64]. Although it is possible to incorporate the effects of decoherence, in our present scheme we ignore such effects by assuming that the control sequences are much shorter than the decoherence time-scales. The PPS spectrum of a 3 qubit PPS and diagonal density matrix obtained after diagonal tomography are shown in Fig.4.3.

To demonstrate the potential of the BB scheme in a larger quantum register, we carried out preparation of pseudopure state in a five-qubit system consisting of three ^{19}F and two ^1H spins of 1-bromo-2,4,5-trifluorobenzene (see inset of Fig. 4.6) partially oriented in a liquid crystal [65]. The nonunitary transformation was realized using a single BB sequence of 89.1 ms duration involving four crusher gradients. The normal and PPS spectra of each spin are also shown in Fig. 4.6. The overall fidelity of the PPS preparation was estimated to be 0.96 ± 0.02 . The lower fidelity compared to the 3-qubit register is not only due to the increased complexity, but also due to the temporal fluctuations in the dipolar interaction strengths of the 5-qubit system. Nevertheless, the

automatic procedure for generating the nonunitary transformation promises applications in a variety of physical implementations involving quantum control.

4.6 Conclusions

Bang-bang pulses are efficient to compute, easier to implement, and are robust against pulse errors. Using a nonlocal optimization algorithm, such as the genetic algorithm, it is possible to efficiently optimize the BB sequence to generate any desired unitary transformation or to prepare a quantum state. For example, in the case of NMR, long control sequences are often needed to apply nonlocal transformations. It is unnecessary to apply RF pulses throughout the control sequence, which is not only hard to compute but also prone to RF inhomogeneity errors. The BB control technique allowed us to carry-out the first experimental demonstration of optimal fixed point quantum search algorithm on a three-qubit NMR register. The experimental spectra easily identified the marked state out of a database of four unsorted items.

Combined with crusher gradients it is also possible to realize nonunitary transformations. Using this scheme, we have demonstrated the synthesis and experimental implementation of pseudopure states in 3- as well as 5-qubit NMR quantum registers.

BB sequences can be realized by on and off switching of the control field and therefore it is also applicable to a variety of other architectures where smooth amplitude modulation of control fields is difficult. It may also be possible to realize a hybrid control sequence by combining the BB scheme with other optimal control techniques. Although the present experimental demonstration is in an NMR system, the simplicity of the BB scheme should allow its application in other architectures such as SQUID or NV⁻ center-based quantum registers.

Chapter 5

Optimized dynamical protection of nonclassical correlation in a quantum algorithm

This chapter focuses on realizing dynamically protected gates by integrating dynamical decoupling (DD) and optimal control techniques. I will also discuss about preserving non-classical correlations, in particular quantum discord, during Grover’s search algorithm by applying dynamically protected gates.

5.1 Introduction

Quantum correlations such as quantum discord (QD) and quantum entanglement are regarded as precious resources for QIP [66–68]. Hence, it is important to preserve these resources during the process of computation. A quantum register interacts with its environment and suffers loss of information stored in it via decoherence. In practice, another important source of information loss is via incoherence, which results from the spatial inhomogeneity in the control fields [69]. Therefore it is necessary to realize noise-free quantum controls which preserve quantum correlations. Dynamical decoupling (DD)

involves modulating the system-environment interaction and thereby suppress decoherence as well as incoherence [70, 71]. It usually consists of a sparse sequence of instantaneous qubit-flips to systematically modulate the system-environment interaction. Unlike the fault-tolerant schemes based on error-correction or decoherence-free subspaces, DD requires no additional resource in terms of ancillary registers [72–74]. Accordingly, DD has been widely studied and implemented experimentally [75–78]. Recently several experimental studies have been performed towards protecting quantum correlations in quantum memory [79, 80]. More recently, combining DD and quantum gates had been studied theoretically [81] as well as experimentally [82–84].

In this work, we incorporate DD within the optimal control procedure, which not only avoids the manual slicing of the gate segments, but also naturally takes care of DD pulse-errors. In particular, we demonstrate realizing protected gates by combining DD and Gradient Ascent Pulse Engineering (GRAPE) protocol [26]. As a specific case, we study the experimental efficiency of protected gates implementing Grover’s search algorithm in terms of preserving QD and of maintaining the probability of marked state.

5.2 Dynamically protected gates

5.2.1 Theory

In this subsection, I shall discuss the theoretical description of DD protected gate. Let us consider an N -spin system with an internal Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_S$ and a control Hamiltonian

$$\mathcal{H}_C(t) = \sum_{i=1}^N \Omega_x(t) I_{ix} + \Omega_y(t) I_{iy} \quad (5.1)$$

where $\Omega_x(t)$ and $\Omega_y(t)$ represent the x and y components of the amplitude and phase modulated RF fields being applied on all the spins. Simultaneously, let us also consider the system-environment interaction Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{SE}(t)$, so that the total Hamiltonian

is of the form

$$\mathcal{H}(t) = \mathcal{H}_S + \mathcal{H}_C(t) + \mathcal{H}_{SE}(t). \quad (5.2)$$

While the system-environment interaction Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{SE}$ that is responsible for the decoherence, is usually hard to characterize, it is still possible to minimize its disruptive effect by controlled system modulations. The goal here is to achieve a quantum operation while protecting the quantum register against the environmental decoherence. In the following, we first describe the procedure for integrating DD with Quantum Control (QC) to achieve a protected quantum operation.

Suppose a propagator U_T is to be realized by the control fields $\{\Omega_x(t), \Omega_y(t)\}$. In practice, time-discretized (piecewise constant) amplitudes are used, i.e., during the k th segment $[(k-1)\Delta t, k\Delta t]$, the control parameters are $\{\Omega_{x,k}, \Omega_{y,k}\}$ (see Fig. 5.1). The ideal closed-system unitary for the k^{th} segment is

$$u_k = \exp[-i(\mathcal{H}_S + \mathcal{H}_{C,k})\Delta t], \quad (5.3)$$

where $\mathcal{H}_{C,k} = \sum_i \Omega_{x,k} I_{ix} + \Omega_{y,k} I_{iy}$. The control propagator for a sequence of n -segments is $U = u_n u_{n-1} \cdots u_1$.

In the presence of environmental interaction however, the actual open-system propagator for the k^{th} segment becomes

$$u_k^{\text{op}} = \exp[-i(\mathcal{H}_S + \mathcal{H}_{C,k} + \mathcal{H}_{SE})\Delta t], \quad (5.4)$$

which acts on the joint system-environment state. Subsequent tracing out of the environmental part results in decoherence of the quantum system. DD pulses modulate the system-environment evolution and thereby suppress decoherence.

The propagator for a DD pulse with flip-angle β and phase α is given by $P_{\beta,\alpha} = \exp(-i\beta S_\alpha)$, where $S_\alpha = \sum_i I_{ix} \cos \alpha + I_{iy} \sin \alpha$. The overall propagator for a pro-

tected sequence consisting of M DD pulses sandwiched between control propagators is (see Fig. 5.1),

$$U_P = U_{M+1} \prod_{j=1}^M P_{\beta_j, \alpha_j} U_j. \quad (5.5)$$

Using the toggling-frame picture [84, 85], we may rewrite the above in the form,

$$U_P = U_{M+1} \prod_{j=1}^M \tilde{U}_j, \quad (5.6)$$

where the toggling frame unitaries $\tilde{U}_j = T_j^\dagger U_j T_j$, and $T_j = P_{\beta_{j-1}, \alpha_{j-1}} P_{\beta_{j-2}, \alpha_{j-2}} \cdots P_{\beta_1, \alpha_1}$ and $T_1 = T_{M+1} = \mathbb{1}$. Given a target propagator U_T , we optimize the control amplitudes which maximize the fidelity

$$F(U_P, U_T) = \text{Tr} [U_T^\dagger U_P] / \text{Tr} [U_T^\dagger U_T]. \quad (5.7)$$




Figure 5.1: Protected quantum gate scheme. Certain segments are reserved for the full-amplitude ($\Omega_{\max}$) DD-pulses (P_{β_j, α_j}) and other segments are subject to optimization to realize a given target unitary U_T .

Unlike the previous works on the protected gates [83, 84], where $\beta = \pi$ was used, in this work we generalize to variable DD flip angles. We also integrate periodic, full-amplitude, DD pulses in the optimal control procedure itself, by pre-assigning segments and freezing their amplitudes and phases. The main advantage of this method is that the DD pulses along with their imperfections, like additional spin-flips, RF inhomogeneity, and offset errors, are accounted and corrections are incorporated by the control segments in order to achieve a robust sequence for implementing the target propagator. Moreover, there is no need for the manual slicing of control pulses to introduce DD pulses. In the following, we shall consider the dynamical protection of a single qubit and illustrate how it can be achieved by DD pulses with a range of flip-angles.

5.2.2 A simple model:

Protected NOT gate on a single qubit

For a simple demonstration of dynamical protection, we choose the NOT gate, $U_T = \exp(-i\pi I_x)$ on a single qubit. We consider a DD pulse $P_{\beta,x} = \exp(-i\beta I_x)$ sandwiched between two identical effective control propagators $U = \exp(-i\pi/2 I_x)$, such that the total propagator $U_P = UPU$. Here the DD pulse has not been accounted by the control propagators, and therefore the fidelity $F(U_P, U_T) = \cos(\beta/2)$ drops with the flip-angle. In order to account for the DD pulse, we introduce a correction in the control propagator such that $U_c = \exp\{-i(\pi/2 - c)I_x\}$, where c is the correction factor. In this case, fidelity of the target with the net corrected propagator $U_{Pc} = U_c P_{\beta,x} U_c$ becomes $F(U_{Pc}, U_T) = \cos(\beta/2 - c)$. Thus setting $c = \beta/2$ leads to unit fidelity for arbitrary DD flip-angles. We now consider an undesired offset-error ϕ_z such that the DD-corrected control propagators take the form $U_{cz} = \exp[-i\{(\pi/2 - \beta/2)I_x + \phi_z I_z\}]$, then the

fidelity of the operation $U_{Pcz} = U_{cz}P_{\beta,x}U_{cz}$ becomes

$$F(U_{Pcz}, U_T) = \left(\frac{4\phi_z^2}{\gamma^2} + \frac{\eta^2}{\gamma^2} \cos \frac{\gamma}{2} \right) \sin \frac{\beta}{2} + \frac{\eta}{\gamma} \sin \frac{\gamma}{2} \cos \frac{\beta}{2}, \quad (5.8)$$

where $\gamma^2 = \eta^2 + 4\phi_z^2$ and $\eta = \pi - \beta$. Clearly $F(U_{Pcz}, U_T) = 1$ for $\beta = \pi$. However, for small values of ϕ_z , $F(U_{Pcz}, U_T) \approx 1$ for all values of β . Without the DD pulse, the fidelity of the unprotected operation $U_z^2 = \exp\{-2i(\pi/2 I_x + \phi_z I_z)\}$ is $F(U_z^2, U_T) = \frac{\pi}{\gamma} \sin \frac{\gamma}{2}$, which starts from unity for $\phi_z = 0$, but drops as ϕ_z starts increasing. Fig. 5.2(a) displays the relative performances of these DD sequences with respect to the offset-error ϕ_z . For this simple model, it turns out that while $\beta = \pi$ works the best, even $\beta = \pi/2$ can show significant protection.

We now consider a more general case of a XY-DD protected NOT gate

$U_{cz}^{(y)} P_{\beta,y} U_{cz}^{(y)} U_{cz}^{(x)} P_{\beta,x} U_{cz}^{(x)}$, where

$$U_{cz}^{(x/y)} = \prod_{j=1}^n \exp \left\{ -i \left(\frac{\pi}{4n} - c_{x/y} I_x - d_{x/y} I_y + \phi_z \eta_j \right) \right\}$$

subjected to a random noise in the range $[-\phi_z \eta_j, +\phi_z \eta_j]$ with a variable amplitude ϕ_z . We have studied the above gate with $n = 100$ segments and numerically optimized the correction factors $c_{x/y} I_x$ and $d_{x/y}$. During the above optimization, noise term $\phi_z \eta_j$ need not be considered. The contour plot of the fidelity of such an XY-DD protected NOT gate is shown in Fig. 5.2(b). For the unprotected NOT gate, the fidelity drops below 0.9 for $\phi_z > 3^\circ$ as shown by the dashed line. However in this region, fidelity of the protected NOT gate is above 0.99 for a wide range of DD angles. These models indicate that unlike the coherence storage schemes where $\beta = \pi$ is usually considered, protected quantum gates can also be constructed out of $\beta \neq \pi$.

Before we discuss the experimental and numerical studies, we first briefly review quantum discord and its evolution during different stages of Grover's algorithm.




Figure 5.2: (a) Fidelity of the protected NOT gate versus offset error (in deg) corresponding to the DD sequences $U_{P_{Cz}} = U_{Cz}P_{\beta,x}U_{Cz}$. (b) Fidelity of the protected NOT gate $U_{Cz}^{(y)}P_{\beta,y}U_{Cz}^{(y)}U_{Cz}^{(x)}P_{\beta,x}U_{Cz}^{(x)}$ versus DD angle β and amplitude of the random phase-rotations. For the unprotected NOT gate, the fidelity drops below 0.9 for the noise amplitude $\phi_z > 3^\circ$ as indicated by the dashed line.




Figure 5.3: Venn diagram representing the total information $H(S, A)$ of a bipartite system. $H(A)$ and $H(S)$ are individual information of the system A and S respectively, $I(S : A)$ is the mutual information and $H(S|A)$ and $H(A|S)$ are conditional entropies.

5.3 Quantum Discord (QD)

Quantum entanglement is considered as an important resource in QIP [86, 87]. Even when the entanglement is absent, a bipartite quantum system (S, A) may possess another useful type of quantum correlation known as quantum discord (QD) [88]. QD is quantified by the minimal mismatch between the mutual information obtained in two classically equivalent, but quantum mechanically distinct ways. As can be seen from Fig. 5.3, the mutual information can be expressed either as

$$I(S : A) = H(A) + H(S) - H(S, A), \quad (5.9)$$

or as

$$J(S : A) = H(S) - H(S|A). \quad (5.10)$$

In classical information,

$$H(X) = - \sum_x p_x \log_2 p_x \quad (5.11)$$

is the Shannon entropy obtained using the probabilities p_x of x th outcome. Similarly, the joint entropy

$$H(S, A) = - \sum_{a,s} p(s, a) \log_2 p(s, a), \quad (5.12)$$

is obtained using the joint probabilities $p(s, a)$ and the conditional entropy

$$H(S|A) = - \sum_{a,s} p_a p(s|a) \log_2 p(s|a), \quad (5.13)$$

is obtained using the conditional probability $p(s|a)$, which is the probability of occurrence of outcome s given that the outcome a has occurred.

In quantum information, we replace the Shannon entropy with von Neumann entropy, i.e.,

$$H(\rho_X) = - \sum_x \lambda_x \log_2(\lambda_x), \quad (5.14)$$

where λ_x are the eigenvalues of the density matrix ρ_X . The joint von Neumann entropy $H(S, A)$ is evaluated using the eigenvalues $\lambda_{s,a}$ of the full density matrix $\rho_{S,A}$. On the other hand, the conditional entropy $H_{\Pi}(S|A)$ is evaluated using the eigenvalues $\lambda_{s|a\Pi}$ of the post-measurement density matrix $\rho_{S|A\Pi}$ after carrying out a measurement along a basis $\{\Pi_i^a\}$.

While the two forms $I(S : A)$ and $J(S : A)$ of mutual information are identical in the classical case, the requirement of measurement for the latter form makes them different in the quantum case. This difference, when minimized over the entire set of orthormal measurement bases $\{\Pi\}$, is often nonvanishing, and is attributed to a form of quantum correlation termed as quantum discord (QD) [88, 89], i.e.,

$$D(S|A) = I(S : A) - \max_{\Pi} J(S : A). \quad (5.15)$$

Since QD is also regarded as an important resource for quantum computing, it is necessary to understand its evolution during quantum algorithms. In the following we discuss the evolution of QD in Grover's search algorithm.

5.3.1 QD in Grover's algorithm

Grover's algorithm identifies a marked item in an unsorted database of N items in $O(\sqrt{N})$ iterations, while a classical algorithm needs $O(N)$ iterations on an average.




Figure 5.4: Various experimental stages of Grover's search algorithm for up to six iterations subjected to a random noise (top trace). It begins with a thermal initial state, followed by preparation of pseudopure state (PPS), Hadamard operator (H), and application of Grover's iterates (U_G) consisting of oracle (U_W) and diffusion (U_D) operators. The middle and bottom traces show ideal evolutions of probability of marked state $\langle k_0 \rangle$ and QD respectively (simulated in MATLAB).




Figure 5.5: Idealized estimations from MATLAB simulations (solid lines) and experimental (filled circles) QD (in units of $\epsilon^2 / \ln 2$) (a, c) and probability $\langle k_0 \rangle - 0.25$ (in units of ϵ ; constant 0.25 is due to the traceless deviation matrix experimentally estimated) of the marked state (b, d) under Grover iterates with XY DD-protections without (a, b) and with (c, d) additional incoherence. The top trace ($\beta = 0$) corresponds to unprotected Grover iterates. The middle ($\beta = \pi/2$) and the bottom ($\beta = \pi$) traces correspond to XY DD protected Grover iterates.

The algorithm starts with initializing a quantum register into an uniform superposition

$$|\psi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} |k\rangle. \quad (5.16)$$

It then uses an oracle

$$U_W = \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (-1)^{\delta_{k,k_0}} |k\rangle\langle k| \quad (5.17)$$

that flips a marked state $|k_0\rangle$, and a diffusion operator

$$U_D = 2|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| - \mathbb{1}, \quad (5.18)$$

which inverts each of the basis states about the mean. Together these two operations constitute a Grover's iterate, i.e., $U_G = U_D U_W$, that amplifies the marked state amplitude.

The top trace of Fig. 5.4 displays various stages in the Grover's algorithm up to six iterations. The middle trace displays the periodic evolution of the probability $\langle k_0 \rangle$ of the marked state $|k_0\rangle = |01\rangle$. The bottom trace displays the corresponding evolution of QD over six iterations. As expected, QD vanishes whenever the system reaches the marked state - which is a classical state. QD vanishes also for uncorrelated states of the form $\rho_S \otimes \rho_A$ not involving mutual interaction between S and A . The question that we ask is, how does QD evolve in a noisy channel implementing Grover's algorithm, and how well it can be protected by interleaving the Grover's iterates with DD. In the following section, we explore the answer to the above question by NMR based experiments.

5.4 Experiments

In our NMR experiments we utilize the two spin-1/2 proton nuclei of Cytosine dissolved in deuterated dimethylsulfoxide (DMSO-D₆). All the experiments are carried out on a Bruker 500 MHz NMR spectrometer at an ambient temperature of 300 K. The resonance offsets of the two protons are 436 Hz and -436 Hz, while the scalar coupling constant $J = 7.0$ Hz. Starting from the thermal equilibrium state $I_{Sz} + I_{Az}$, we use the spatial averaging technique [25] to prepare the pseudopure state (PPS) $(1 - \epsilon)\mathbb{1}/4 + \epsilon|00\rangle\langle 00|$, where $\epsilon \sim 10^{-5}$ is the purity factor typically present in NMR systems.

We generated the DD-protected oracle operator U_W corresponding to the marked state $|k_0\rangle = |01\rangle$ and the diffusion operator U_D by incorporating DD pulses into the GRAPE optimal control technique [26, 90] as described in section II. Each GRAPE segment was of duration $5.1 \mu\text{s}$. The fidelities of these GRAPE pulses, each about 75 ms long, were above 0.99 after averaging over 10% RF inhomogeneity distribution. A full power DD pulse was introduced in between every 1000 segments. The phase α of the DD pulses was alternated between x and y .

To estimate QD, we need to obtain the density matrix at various stages of Grover's algorithm (see Fig. 5.4). The density matrix is generally obtained using quantum state tomography (QST) which involves a set of independent experiments (on identically prepared states) each measuring a particular set of observables. The expectation values are then obtained by measuring the signal intensities. We have adopted a QST procedure that results in only absorptive spectral lines which precisely quantify the expectation values without requiring any further numerical processing.

5.4.1 Pure-phase Quantum State Tomography

In the conventional scheme (like the ones mentioned in [59], [91], [92]), one obtains absorptive, or dispersive, or even mixed-phase spectral lines which are often hard to

quantify. A pure-phase tomography has been designed to obtain only absorptive spectral lines which are far easier and precise to quantify. In the case of a two-qubit homonuclear system involves a set of six experiments:

$$(i) \quad \triangleright \equiv G_z - 60_{90} - \tau$$

$$(ii) \quad 75_{-180} - \triangleright$$

$$(iii) \quad 75_{105} - \triangleright$$

$$(iv) \quad 1/2J - 75_{30} - \triangleright$$

$$(v) \quad 5/12J - 75_{105} - \triangleright$$

$$(vi) \quad 75_{195} - 5/12J - 75_{15} - \triangleright.$$

Here G_z is the pulsed-field gradient to destroy the coherences, τ is the delay optimized to suppress the homonuclear zero-quantum coherence, and J is the indirect spin-spin coupling constant. The rotation angles are written in degrees and the corresponding phases also in degrees are mentioned in the subscript. Four absorptive transitions obtained after each of the above experiments are integrated and the density matrix is estimated using the constraint-matrix procedure described in [91,92].

5.4.2 Results and Discussions

After obtaining the experimental density matrix ρ_{exp} , we estimated QD via the optimal set of measurement bases proposed by Lu et al. [89]. Similarly, we also estimated the probability $\langle k_0 \rangle = \langle k_0 | \rho_{\text{exp}} | k_0 \rangle$ of the marked state for $|k_0\rangle = |01\rangle$. Fig. 5.5 (a) displays experimentally estimated QD values (in units of $\epsilon^2 / \ln 2$) at various stages of the Grover's algorithm for up to six iterations, with unprotected (top trace) as well as for XY DD-protected Grover's iterates with $\beta = \pi/2$ (middle trace) and $\beta = \pi$ (bottom trace). Fig. 5.5 (b) displays the corresponding probability of the marked state $|01\rangle$. Thus, in the absence of incoherence, we observed that the experimental values are in reasonably good agreement with the idealized predictions represented by solid lines

(also described in Fig. 5.4) indicating high-quality of quantum controls as well as low inherent noise in the NMR system.

To further investigate the power of DD protection, we deliberately introduced incoherence in the form of linear static-field inhomogeneity along the z-axis by using approximately 5 mG/cm pulsed-field-gradient (PFG). It introduces a differential offset of ± 10 Hz across the sample volume corresponding to a phase shift $\phi_z \sim 0.1^\circ$ during a single GRAPE segment of duration $5.1 \mu\text{s}$. The total duration for six Grover-iterations was about 0.9 second, and the translational diffusion of the molecules over this period further introduces randomness in the overall dephasing. The top trace of Fig. 5.5 (c,d) display respectively the experimentally measured QD values and probabilities with unprotected Grover iterates in the presence of such an incoherence. Clearly, the experimental data without DD protection show little correlation with the ideal trajectories. The other traces of Fig. 5.5 (c,d) display the experimental data under XY DD-schemes with $\beta = \pi/2$ and $\beta = \pi$ as indicated. The best protection was achieved by the XY DD sequence consisting of $\pi/2$ pulses.

The bars with solid edges in Fig. 5.6 show the average root-mean-square (RMS) deviation of the experimental QD (a) and probabilities $\langle k_0 \rangle$ (b) from the idealized theoretical values displayed in Fig. 5.5 for various DD flip angles without (open bars) and with (filled bars) incoherence. In general, RMS deviations are enhanced by incoherence, but suppressed by DD. Interestingly, the DD protection with $\beta = \pi/2$ showed the best performance in suppressing the effects of incoherence. To further strengthen this claim, we simulated RMS deviations using GRAPE pulses corresponding to U_{PG} for six iterations with 20% inhomogeneous RF fields and incoherent fields ranging from -10 Hz to $+10$ Hz. The results are shown by bars with dashed edges in Fig. 5.6 (a,b). The simulations also support the experimental finding that $\beta = \pi/2$ DD protection has a superior performance. We also estimated the mean fidelities $F_m = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{j=1}^6 F(U_{PG}^j, U_G^j)$




Figure 5.6: Average root-mean-square deviation (bars with solid edges) between the experimental data and ideal theoretical values (shown in Fig. 5.5) for QD (in units of $\epsilon^2 / \ln 2$) (a) and the probability $\langle k_0 \rangle$ (in units of ϵ) (b) of marked state versus DD flip angle β without incoherence (open bars) and with incoherence (filled bars). The corresponding numerical simulations are shown by bars with dashed edges. (c) Numerically estimated fidelities of U_G averaged over six iterations without (open bars) and with (filled bars) incoherence. Here errorbars indicate variations over six iterations.

(see Eq. 5.7) as displayed in Fig. 5.6 (c). All the mean fidelities have good values in the absence of incoherence again indicating a good control. However in the presence of incoherence, while the unprotected iterate completely fails, both $\beta = \pi/2$ and $\beta = \pi$ cases show relatively better performances.

We now try to understand the correlation between probability of the marked state and QD. Fig. 5.7 displays the experimental QD values versus the probabilities without (a) and with (b) incoherence. Ideally, the initial superposition state has no QD, but has same probability of 0.25 for all the four basis states, which corresponds to the bottom left corner as indicated by the dashed line. The intermediate state after the oracle U_W takes the superposition to a highly correlated state with a maximum QD, but still without any higher probability for the marked state, which corresponds to the bottom-right corner. Diffusion operator then amplifies the probability of the marked state, which is a classical state with no QD, and therefore corresponds to the top-left corner. In the case of no incoherence, most of the data points are localized to the expected corners. However,




Figure 5.7: Experimental values of QD for six Grover iterations plotted against the probability $\langle k_0 \rangle - 0.25$ without (a) and with (b) incoherence. Simulated values of QD versus probability for 10 Grover iterations without (c) and with (d) incoherence. In all the cases, QD values are in units of $\epsilon^2 / \ln 2$ and probability values are in units of ϵ .

in the presence of incoherence, while there is a significant dispersion of data points belonging to the unprotected gates ($\beta = 0$), those belonging to protected gates ($\beta \neq 0$) still maintain localization. Thus DD schemes preserve quantum correlations and thereby assure success of the algorithm. Here again $\beta = \pi/2$ shows the best performance. Figures 5.7 (c,d) display the simulated values of probability versus QD without (c) and with (d) incoherent fields (ranging from -10 Hz to $+10$ Hz) for 10 Grover iterations. In the absence of incoherence there is a reasonable localization for all the three values of β . However, with incoherence the unprotected Grover iterates completely fail since the maximum probability of the marked state remained less than 0.4 throughout the iterations. The data points corresponding to protected Grover iterates with $\beta = \pi$ are significantly dispersed, but still show signatures of localization, while those with $\beta = \pi/2$ show the best localization consistent with the experimental results.

5.5 Conclusions

Quantum correlations such as quantum discord and quantum entanglement form resources that fuel quantum information processors. In this work, we experimentally studied the evolution of quantum discord as well as the probability of a marked state over six iterations of Grover’s quantum search algorithm on an ensemble of spin-1/2 nuclear pairs using nuclear magnetic resonance methods. Unlike the earlier works on protected quantum gates which considered only π pulses, we have generalized to DD-pulses with variable flip angles. Further, we have integrated the dynamical protection into GRAPE optimal control protocol by pre-assigning the positions of dynamical flips. In this way, protected quantum gates are robust by construction against the external noise. Similar protocol can also be incorporated in other optimal control techniques such as Bang-Bang [93], Krotov [94], etc. While the protected gates performed generally better, to investigate the extent of protection, we introduced an additional incoherent noise in the form of a pulsed field gradient. In this case, we observed a significant benefit of dynamically protected gates. Interestingly, we found that the dynamical protection with $\pi/2$ flip-angles to outperform those with π . We have supported our experimental findings with numerical simulations and also provided simple single-qubit models to explain this observation. Although, DD with non-inversion pulses might appear counter intuitive at the outset, $\pi/2$ -rotation based modulation schemes such as WAHUHA [95] and solid-echo sequences [85] have long been used in NMR spectroscopy. We believe that our study will be useful in understanding dynamical protections and thereby designing robust quantum controls.

Chapter 6

Nitrogen-vacancy Centers in diamond

This chapter, and the following chapters of my thesis focus on the experimental platform for performing quantum information processing using Nitrogen-vacancy (NV) centers in diamond. Both NMR and NV center in diamond are theoretically very similar and follow similar spin dynamics. The motivation of this thesis was to use both of the above architectures for simulating some quantum phenomena such as quantum pigeonhole effect, search algorithms and, quantum discord. Therefore, in the final year of my PhD, I anticipated to build a setup where I can perform some of the above quantum simulations using NV centers in diamond. All previously discussed quantum controls can also be realised on NV centers using microwave field in place of RF field. However, due to the technical limitations such as getting the suitable sample, delay in acquiring experimental components as well as the time constraint, I couldn't demonstrate any quantum simulation using NV center as a testbed on the setup which I was able to build by the end of my PhD. This chapter discusses the fundamental properties of the NV center in diamond.

6.1 Introduction

Nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) is a powerful technique for obtaining structure and dynamics of molecules in chemistry. It also got high importance in medical applications, namely, the magnetic resonance imaging (MRI) [96]. However, NMR is not so promising as a quantum computer as it is an ensemble-based quantum processor. The NMR quantum register is in a statistical mixture of all possible states in thermal equilibrium and, it is challenging to initialize them in a pure state under ambient conditions. It often requires extreme conditions such as high magnetic field and cryogenic temperature. Besides, scalability is a challenge in NMR as it is not possible to find a molecule with large number of NMR active nuclei in nature.

Nitrogen-Vacancy (NV) centers in diamond have recently emerged as a promising candidate for quantum information processing. The electronic spin states of the NV center can be initialized with purity better than 80% through off-resonant optical pumping and resonance fluorescence can be exploited to detect the electronic spin state of the NV center even at room temperature [97–99]. Nevertheless, the fidelity can push up to 95% with resonant optical excitations done at cryogenic temperatures [100].

6.2 Diamond

Diamond is known as the hardest naturally occurring substance found on Earth. It is one of the allotropes of carbon where four sp^3 hybridized adjacent carbon atoms are bounded via covalent bonds with a bonding angle of 109.5° . The unit cell consists of two face-centered-cubic (fcc) Bravais lattices, which are displaced by $a/4 (1, 1, 1)$, where $a = 3.57 \text{ \AA}$ is the lattice parameter and the distance between neighboring carbon atoms is $d = 1.44 \text{ \AA}$.

Diamond is an insulator with a band gap of 5.45 eV, and the corresponding wavelength is in the ultraviolet range. Therefore, diamond transmits visible light and ap-

appears transparent. However, defects in the diamond lattice introduce extra energy levels between the valence and conduction bands and transitions between them result in coloration of the diamond.

The diamond is naturally grown in the mantle of earth where it has the favorable conditions to grow such as the pressure in the range of 7-8 GPa and the temperature ranging from 1400 to 1600°C. Under ambient conditions, the diamond is not a stable allotrope of carbon but graphite. Even though, diamond to graphite conversion process is a rather slow due to the high energy barrier of about 728 KJ/mol under ambient conditions [101].

Many efforts have been made for growing diamonds in the lab due to their special properties. And, now, diamonds can be grown in laboratories by creating the growth conditions. The most common techniques for creating diamonds are High-Pressure High- Temperature (HPHT) growth and chemical vapour deposition (CVD).

6.2.1 High Pressure High Temperature (HPHT) growth

HPHT diamonds are subjected to extremely high temperature ($>2000^{\circ}\text{C}$) and pressure (≈ 10 GPa) inside special chambers in a lab in order to recreate the process that takes place in the mantle of the earth. The phase transition from graphite to diamond is allowed under these conditions. This method is highly used in jewelry industries as it incorporates large amount of impurities such as nitrogen and boron during the growth. For example, introducing nitrogen during the growth turns the diamond yellow. Diamonds can be classified into four types depending up on the amount of nitrogen and boron impurities [102, 103].

- **Type Ia:** This type of diamonds contain nitrogen (< 3000 ppm) in large clusters throughout the crystal lattice.
- **Type Ib:** These diamonds contain single nitrogen (< 500 ppm) atoms instead of

clusters dispersed throughout the crystal lattice.

- **Type IIa:** Low nitrogen (< 1 ppm) content.
- **Type IIb:** Low nitrogen (< 1 ppm) content as in type IIa but boron impurities.

6.2.2 Chemical Vapour Deposition (CVD)

CVD and particularly microwave plasma-activated CVD is another popular method for growing synthetic diamond. This method requires a diamond seed crystal placed inside a growth chamber which is at a pressure of about 10s of mbar and temperature in the range of 700-1200°C. The surface of the diamond seed crystal serves as a growth substrate. It mainly consists of a gas mixture of Hydrogen and a small amount of carbon-containing gas such as methane(CH_4) which is heated up by microwave irradiation, and eventually becomes a plasma. The hydrogen atoms serve the process mainly in two ways. Firstly, the diamond lattice is stabilized, and the formation of graphite is prevented by termination with hydrogen atoms. Secondly, the gaseous activation process dissociates the molecular hydrogen into hydrogen atoms. This leads to the formation of reactive Carbon-containing radicals such as CH_3 radicals by reacting with the source hydrocarbon. These hydrogen atoms also remove the hydrogen from the surface CH bonds and create surface radical sites. These radical sites often react with the gas-phase carbon-containing radicals and hence; resulting in diamond growth. The complete details of this process can be found in Ref. [104]. Colored diamonds can be grown by doping with nitrogen or boron impurities. These color centers can also be created through the irradiation process after the synthesis.

6.3 Color Centers in Diamond

Over 500 luminescent centers are found in the diamond. Those are mainly due to additionally incorporated atoms such as Silicon or Phosphorous or just due to missing carbon

atoms. Such defects introduce additional energy levels between valence and conduction band of the diamond which are of 5.45 eV apart. Consequently, additional transitions are allowed with transition frequencies in the visible light range. NV^- center is one of that kind, and this is the defect we are particularly interested in for our experiments. NV^- centers have recently gained more popularity due to their applications in quantum sensing, quantum information processing and metrology. In the following section, I am going to briefly discuss the electronic, and spin properties of the NV^- center in diamond.

6.3.1 Nitrogen-Vacancy Center

NV center is a point defect in diamond consisting of substitutional Nitrogen atom with an adjacent vacancy. Together with the three sp^3 neighbor Carbon atoms which form a tetrahedral structure resulting in a $C3v$ symmetry with the Nitrogen atom and the vacancy lying on the symmetry axis (NV axis). Owing to this symmetry, it can have four different orientations along the four crystallographic axes $[111]$, $[\bar{1}\bar{1}1]$, $[1\bar{1}\bar{1}]$, and $[\bar{1}1\bar{1}]$ as shown in Fig.6.1 [105]. The center can possess three possible charges such as NV^- , NV^0 , and NV^+ . NV^0 has five electrons coming from three dangling bonds of the carbon atoms and the lone pair electrons of the Nitrogen atom. The center can gain a charge of positive or negative respectively depending on the presence of acceptors or donors in the lattice. NV^- and NV^0 can be identified by their optical Zero Phonon Lines (ZPL) at 1.945 eV(637nm) and 2.156 eV(575nm) respectively. And, the associated vibronic bands extend the ZPL to higher in absorption and lower in emission [106]. An additional infrared ZPL at 1.190 eV (1042nm) related to the spin-singlet levels has been observed associated with NV^- center under optical illumination. NV^- and NV^0 have been observed experimentally, but NV^+ is still a theoretical prediction. This thesis mainly focuses on NV^- centers, and now onwards I refer NV^- center as NV center.




Figure 6.1: Four possible crystallographic orientations of NV center. Image taken and modified from [2]

6.3.2 Electronic Structure of NV Center

NV center possesses six valence electrons, and it has an electron spin, $S = 1$. From group theory, NV center has a spin-triplet Ground state with 3A_2 symmetry and a spin-triplet of 3E symmetry excited state. And, it also possesses intermediate singlet states described by 1A_1 and 1E . The electronic structure of the NV center is shown in Fig.6.2.

Spin Initialization and readout

NV center can be excited off-resonantly by a 532nm laser. Consequently, a spin preserving fluorescence occurs between the 3A_2 and the 3E states. Also, a new decay path through Inter-System Crossing (ISC) is enabled via the intermediate singlet states, and it is a non-radiative decay ($ZPL = 1042nm$). And, this plays a major role in the spin initialization and readout of NV center. The state, $m_s = |\pm 1\rangle$ has a 30% higher probability for undergoing ISC compared to $m_s = |0\rangle$ state. Fluorescence along with ISC




Figure 6.2: NV center can be described by a triplet ground state, a triplet excited state, and a singlet intermediate state. NV center is excited with a 532 nm laser, and the spin conserving optical transitions are possible between the ground and the excited state with a zero phonon line of 637 nm.

optically pump the NV center predominantly into $m_s = |0\rangle$ ground state. The fluorescence lifetimes of the excited NV center is of 12 ns for the $m_s = |0\rangle$ state and 7.8 ns for the $m_s = |\pm 1\rangle$ state. However, ISC takes about 300 ns to decay to $m_s = |0\rangle$ state.

The electronic spin state can be distinguished by the differential fluorescence between $m_s = |0\rangle$ and $m_s = |\pm 1\rangle$ state. The NV center which is initialized into $m_s = |\pm 1\rangle$ state emits about 30% less number of photons than that of $m_s = |0\rangle$ state. Therefore, the NV center can be initialized as well as readout via optical pumping. We can distinguish between the two quantum state $m_s = |0\rangle$ and $m_s = |\pm 1\rangle$ state by counting the fluorescent photons, hence one can realize a qubit by considering these two states.

In NV center experiments, the readout performance is quantified by the signal-to-noise ratio(SNR) and the signal is generally the number of photons detected in a fixed readout cycle [107] . Therefore, the SNR under shot noise approximation can be defined as:

$$SNR = \frac{\alpha_0 - \alpha_1}{\sqrt{\alpha_0 + \alpha_1}} \quad (6.1)$$

where, α_i is the average photon detected for a single measurement of spin state $|i\rangle$. And, the contrast between the two signals can be written as:

$$C = (1 - \frac{\alpha_1}{\alpha_0}) \quad (6.2)$$

The contrast, $C \approx 0.3$ for an NV center in bulk diamond during the typical fluorescent-based readout method. However, we often need to average the signal by repeating the experiments many times to improve the SNR. Therefore, time-averaged SNR after N measurements is:

$$\langle SNR \rangle = \sqrt{N} \times SNR \quad (6.3)$$

6.4 NV Center Hamiltonian

In this section, I shall discuss the ground state Hamiltonian of the NV center. The Hamiltonian mainly has three parts: electronic spin Hamiltonian, nuclear spin Hamiltonian and electron-nuclei spin Hamiltonian, which is the hyperfine interaction. Therefore, the general ground state Hamiltonian of the NV center can be written as

$$\mathcal{H}_{gs} = \mathcal{H}_e + \mathcal{H}_n + \mathcal{H}_{hf}. \quad (6.4)$$

6.4.1 Electronic Spin Hamiltonian

The NV center is effectively a spin 1 electronic system consisting of two unpaired electrons. The ground state electronic spin Hamiltonian consists of two parts, namely, Zero Field Splitting (ZFS) which occurs due to the crystallographic field and the Zeeman splitting which is the splitting due to the external magnetic field. For simplicity, we




Figure 6.3: NV energy level splittings with different interactions including Zero Field Splitting, Zeeman interaction and hyperfine interaction with ^{14}N or ^{15}N . The nuclear spin eigenstates are shown with a subscript 'n'. Image taken and modified from [2]

assume the external field to be aligned along the NV axis which is generally considered as the Z-axis; hence the Zeeman Hamiltonian only has the contribution from the S_z component. Consequently, the electronic spin Hamiltonian in the unit of the Plank's constant, h , can be written as,

$$\mathcal{H}_e = \mathcal{H}_{ZFS} + \mathcal{H}_{zeeman} = \mathcal{D}_{gs}[S_z^2 - E(S_x^2 - S_y^2)] + \gamma_e B_0 S_z. \quad (6.5)$$

where, $\gamma_e = 2.8025 \text{ MHz/G}$ is the gyro-magnetic ratio of the NV center, $\mathcal{D}_{gs} \approx 2.87 \text{ GHz}$ is the ground state ZFS component at room temperature, E is the off-axis component of the ZFS ($E \ll D$) and $S = (S_x, S_y, S_z)$ are the spin angular momentum operators of the NV center where,

$$S_x = \frac{\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad S_y = \frac{i\hbar}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & -1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix} \quad S_z = \hbar \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Nuclei Type	γ (kHz/G)	$A_{\parallel}$ (MHz)	$A_{\perp}$ (kHz)	Q (MHz)
^{14}N	0.3077	-2.14	-2.7	-4.945
^{15}N	-0.4316	3.03	3.65	-
^{13}C	1.071	Varies with position in the lattice		-

Table 6.1: Hamiltonian parameters corresponding to different nuclei coupled to the NV center. The values are taken from [4,5]

6.4.2 Nuclear spin and Electron-Nuclei Hamiltonian

The nitrogen atom in the NV center has a nuclear spin, I . The nitrogen has two possible isotopes such as ^{14}N with $I = 1$ and ^{15}N with $I = 1/2$. The natural abundance of ^{14}N isotope is 99.6%. Depending on which isotope of nitrogen atom, the nuclear part can have up-to two parts:- nuclear Zeeman splitting which shifts the nuclear eigenstates and the quadrupole part which is only present in the case of $I > 1/2$. Besides, NV center can be often surrounded by one or more ^{13}C carbon atoms of spin $I = 1/2$. The nuclear spin Hamiltonian can be described as;

$$\mathcal{H}_n = \mathcal{H}_{Zeeman(n)} + \mathcal{H}_Q = - \sum_{i=1}^N (\gamma_i B_0 \cdot I) + Q(I_z^2 - \frac{1}{3}I(I+1)). \quad (6.6)$$

The Hamiltonian parameters are listed in Table.6.1.

The next part of the Hamiltonian is due to the interaction between NV center electron spin and the nuclear spin, and it is known as the hyperfine interaction. The hyperfine Hamiltonian can be written as,

$$\mathcal{H}_{hf} = \sum_{i=1}^N S A_i I_i = \sum_{i=1}^N A_i^{\parallel} S_z I_{zi} + A_i^{\perp} (S_x I_{xi} + S_y I_{yi}) \quad (6.7)$$

Where, A_i is the hyperfine tensor, and it can be diagonalized to have the form:

$$A = \begin{bmatrix} A^\perp & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & A^\perp & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & A^\parallel \end{bmatrix}$$

Where $A^\parallel$ and $A^\perp$ are the parallel and perpendicular components of the A tensor respectively. Again, the hyperfine interaction parameters corresponding to different nuclei are shown in Table.6.1, and the energy level splittings due to different interactions are depicted in Fig.6.3. However, the hyperfine tensor can be varied for the ^{13}C nuclei depending on the position of the carbon atom in the diamond lattice.

Chapter 7

Experimental Setup

In the previous chapter, we have discussed the physical properties and the Hamiltonian of the NV centers. Now, let us see how these defects centers can be addressed experimentally and manipulated using a MW field. In this chapter, I shall discuss the confocal setup for addressing the defect centers in diamond and the microwave setup for the spin manipulations of those centers. And, I will also discuss some of the experimental results.

7.1 Confocal Microscope

A confocal microscope is used for selective imaging of different points in the source plane by blocking the lights from all other points in the source plane [108]. This can be accomplished by placing a pinhole in the image plane such that only the light from the point of interest is passed through the pinhole. Although a confocal microscope can be built using two biconvex lenses and a pinhole, in practice, it can be more complex, requiring more optical components. A schematic of the simplest confocal setup is shown in Fig.7.1

A scanning confocal enables the access of more than one point in the source plane [109, 110]. It can be achieved either by sweeping the pinhole position in the image plane




Figure 7.1: A simple confocal setup. The conjugate nature of the source plane and the image plane is shown by considering three points in the source plane at different depths focusing at the image plane after passing through two biconvex lenses. The pinhole blocks the lights from the other points except for the light from the point source of interest. Image adopted and modified from [3]

or by moving the source plane such that the lights from the new source point of interest are collected by the pinhole. In our case, we used the latter method, that is, moving the source plane for obtaining the scanning image of the diamond and hence, finding out the NV centers.

7.1.1 Scanning, Fluorescence Confocal Microscope

A scanning confocal microscope was built using various optical components, as shown in Fig.7.2. In this section, I will be explaining the confocal setup in detail.

The most important part of the fluorescent confocal technique is to excite the NV center with the right-wavelength laser, and in our case, it is 532 nm. Ideally, a laser with spatial mode TEM_{00} is preferred. We used 1 W Gem-532 laser from Laser Quantum GmbH. The NV centers were never excited with a power more than 150 mW during our experiments, and the power is controlled using the remote laser control software provided by the same company.




Figure 7.2: Fluorescent confocal setup.

Often during NV experiments, the laser needs to be turned on and turned off on few nanosecond time scale in a highly controlled manner. This is done by using an Acousto-Optic Modulator (AOM). We used an AOM of crystalline quartz optical medium with an acoustic velocity of $5.74 \text{ mm}/\mu\text{s}$ from Gooch & Housego. The refractive index of the optical medium can be changed by introducing mechanical oscillations in the medium. A piezoelectric material which is attached to the optical medium is driven by an RF signal to produce mechanical oscillations in the piezoelectric material, thereby creating oscillations in the optical medium. The compression and rarefaction in the material introduce regions of low and high refractive indices and it will act as a diffraction grating. The first-order diffraction beam is picked off with an iris, and all other orders are blocked. The maximum first-order efficiency ($> 98\%$) is achieved with an RF driver of frequency 250 MHz and RF power 6.6 W. The RF driver of rising time 20 ns is controlled using

the TTL input which is generated by the pulse-blaster (SpinCore PBESR-PRO-500).

The AOM is placed at the focal point of the L_1 (LA1608-A, Thorlabs). This is to ensure that the beam size is smaller than the active area of the AO medium which is $0.25 \text{ mm} \times 0.25 \text{ mm}$. The original beam diameter of our laser is $\approx 1 \text{ mm}$. The first order is again a diverging beam, and we placed a lens L_2 (LA1484-A, Thorlabs) to make it collimated.

It is assumed that the first diffraction order is not completely Gaussian and the Gaussian mode is filtered using a single-mode fiber (P1-460B-FC-2, Thorlabs). The maximum fiber coupling efficiency is achieved only if the incident laser is highly collimated. The fiber coupler, c1 (SM1FC-FC/PC, Thorlabs) is placed at the focal point of an achromatic lens L_3 (AC050-015-A-ML, Thorlabs) which was mounted on an xyz stage (XYZCTS50, Holmarc Pvt. Ltd). The other end of the fiber acts as a point source, hence the light coming out of the fiber is diverging. Therefore, the fiber end is placed at the focus of a small focal length lens, L_4 (LA1951-A, Thorlabs), so that the laser beam is again collimated. The mirrors M_1 (BB1-E02-10, Thorlabs) and M_2 (BB1-E02-10, Thorlabs) gives the additional degrees of freedom. We found that the beam expansion after L_4 was sufficient enough to completely fill the backplane of the microscope objective, thereby achieving the tight focusing. So we didn't have to expand the beam further.

Next, a dichroic mirror (DMLP567R, Thorlabs) which is placed before the microscope objective has high reflectivity for the green light and high transmissivity in the red region. Therefore, the red fluorescent from the NV is collected at the detector. A 100X magnification, oil immersion objective with a numerical aperture 1.4 from Olympus (UPLSAPO 100XO) is used in our setup. The microscope objective was placed on a PI nano-stage (P-527.2CL) with a closed-loop travel of $200 \mu\text{m}$ in both x and y axes and $50 \mu\text{m}$ in the z-axis.

The diamond sample is glued on a home-designed PCB board and it is mounted on a XYZ micro stage. The 3D translational stage was constructed by combining a XY-stage (XYT1/M, Thorlabs) unit and a Z-stage unit (MVS010/M, Thorlabs) along with an extended top platform (AMA005/M, Thorlabs). The light emitted from the sample which is in the wavelength range 600-800 nm transmits through the dichroic mirror and focused to a pinhole via an achromatic lens with a focal length $f=100$ mm (ACN254-100-A, Thorlabs) which is mounted on a XYZ (XYZCT65, Holmarc Pvt. Ltd) stage for the fine adjustments. Another achromatic lens with a focal length of 50 mm (ACN254-50-A, Thorlabs) is placed at a distance $2f$ from the $50\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ pinhole (P50D, Thorlabs) and the light is collected by a single photon counting module (SPCM-AQRH-W4, Excelitas) with a dark count of 100 c/s. The data acquisition from the SPCM is done using a NI DAQ card from National Instruments (NIPCIe 6363) and a scanning counter software is developed using LABVIEW. A $10\text{ }\mu\text{m} \times 10\text{ }\mu\text{m}$ XY-scanned image obtained is shown in Fig.7.3. This image is obtained by performing a scan on a sample where there are many single color centers and all other pulsed experiments (will be discussed at the end of this chapter) are done on a different sample with the ensemble of NV center.

7.2 Microwave Circuit

A basic microwave circuit was built for manipulating the electronic spins of the NV center. A copper wire strapped across the diamond sample delivers the microwave to the sample. Both ends of the copper wire are soldered tightly on the PCB sample holder. The PCB board is carefully designed to match the impedance to $50\text{ }\Omega$. The dimensions of the PCB board is shown in Fig.7.4.

The microwave generated by the Keysight N9310A microwave generator is amplified up to 16 W after the amplifier (ZHL-16W-43+, Mini-Circuits) and passed through the copper wire. A microwave switch (ZYSW-2-50DR, Mini-Circuits) is placed before




Figure 7.3: Confocal Image. The diffraction limited red spots are the high Fluorescent regions and those are the locations of NV centers in the diamond sample.




Figure 7.4: Designing of the PCB board.




Figure 7.5: Microwave Circuit.

the amplifier for turning it on while it is needed. The microwave switch is triggered with TTL pulses generated by the same Pulse-blaster which is used for triggering the AOM controller. The same pulse-blaster is also used for triggering the fast counting device (FAST ComTec MCS6A) which recorded the photon counting events from the SPCM during pulsed experiments. In addition to it, the microwave switch is used to achieve the desired microwave pulse duration. The outgoing microwave after the PCB board is attenuated using a MW attenuator (VAT-2W2+, Mini-Circuits) and finally terminated using a $50\ \Omega$ terminator (KARN-50+, Mini-Circuits). The schematic of the microwave circuit is shown in Fig.7.5. The current microwave circuit is incapable of controlling the phases of the microwave, and this can be achieved by introducing an additional arbitrary waveform generator (AWG), and an IQ mixer. This part will be looked up in the future.




Figure 7.6: Fluorescence response during laser pulse while NV center is initialized in $m_s = 0$ (Red) and $m_s = \pm 1$ (green). Image modified from the reference [2]

7.3 Experiments

The main three stages of NV center experiments are spin initialization, spin manipulations and readout of the final spin state. Both spin initialization and readout are done optically applying laser pulses of duration $2 \mu s$. The confocal setup addresses the fluorescing defects centers in diamond and it is not alone sufficient to confirm if it is an NV center or not. Therefore, we performed the Optically Detected Magnetic Resonance (ODMR) for establishing those to be NV center.

7.3.1 Continuous Wave ODMR

The electronic structure of the NV center can be characterized by applying a microwave of different frequency to the diamond sample. In continuous wave ODMR, the NV centers are initialized into $m_s = 0$ spin state by applying a laser pulse of duration $2 \mu s$. When the microwave frequency matches the energy difference between $m_s = \pm 1$ and $m_s = 0$, the spin state of the NV center is rotated between the energy level; hence there will be a drop in the fluorescence count. The fluorescent response during laser pulse while the NV center is initialized into different spin states are shown in Fig.7.6 [111]. In the presence of an external magnetic field, the degeneracy between $m_s = \pm 1$ is




Figure 7.7: Zero Field splitting (ZFS) ODMR. (a) The fluorescence response was dropped at the frequency $\nu = 2.87$ GHz which corresponds to the ZFS between $m_s = 0$ and $m_s = \pm 1$. (b) ODMR performed with an external field aligned along one out of 4 possible orientations and the splitting between the $|-1\rangle$ and $|+1\rangle$ transitions is given by $\Delta\nu = 2\gamma_{NV}B_z$ where γ_{NV} is the gyromagnetic ratio of the NV center and B_z is the magnetic field along the NV axis. Other 3 possible orientations are symmetric to the aligned axis and the splitting due to the components of B_z along those axes are not resolved due to the high FWHM of the ODMR dips.

lifted, and consequently, we observe two resonant frequencies. The ODMR spectra we observed are shown in Fig7.7.

7.3.2 Rabi Flops Experiments

We confirmed the observation of NV centers by performing ODMR, and the next step was to characterize the coherent properties of them. We performed the basic pulsed experiments such as Rabi, Ramsey oscillations, and spin-lattice relaxation experiments. During pulsed experiments, the fast counter recorded the events at the SPCM for the whole measurement sequence.

In Rabi flop experiments, strong mw pulses of variable duration are applied. The NV centers are initialized into $m_s = 0$ state. The mw pulses rotate the spin state and




Figure 7.8: Rabi oscillations. (a) pulse sequence for Rabi experiments. (b) Fluorescence oscillations with the MW pulse duration and the π -pulse duration corresponding to the maximum population inversion is ≈ 86 ns.

bring them into a superposition;

$$\psi = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|\pm 1\rangle$$

where, $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$ and, the probability amplitudes, α and β vary as a function of MW duration. Consequently, we observe an oscillating fluorescence response as a function of MW pulse duration, as shown in Fig. 7.8 [112]. The decay in oscillation gives the information about the spin-spin relaxation time T_2^* of the NV center. As we performed experiments on the ensemble NV centers, the T_2^* is rather small; thus the oscillation decayed faster. In this case, the Rabi nutation frequency, $\Omega = \gamma B_1$ where $\gamma = 2.8$ MHz/G is the gyromagnetic ratio of the NV center electronic spin and B_1 is the component of MW excitation field along the NV axis, which is found to be 6.28 MHz (the power of the MW field was ≈ 35 dBm).

7.3.3 Spin relaxation experiments

The NV center, which is initialized into one of the electronic state or the coherent superposition of electronic states, often interacts with the environment and decays back to the thermally mixed states via relaxation processes. These are mainly due to the spin-spin interactions in the ensemble of NV centers as well as the other spin impurities such as C^{13} , and nitrogen associated to the NV center. These interactions mainly cause a dephasing of the coherent NV spin state, and it is characterized by the T_2^* [113].

In T_2^* characterization experiments, the NV center is optically initialized into $m_s = 0$ state. Then a $\pi/2$ pulse is applied to create the coherent superposition of two possible electronic spin states, and it is written as;

$$\psi_{ini} = (|0\rangle + |\pm 1\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \quad (7.1)$$

Then they are allowed to evolve freely under its internal Hamiltonian (See Chapter 5, Sec.6.4) for time τ . During this time, the state ψ_{ini} accumulates a relative phase between $|0\rangle$ and $|\pm 1\rangle$ due to dephasing. After a time τ , another $\pi/2$ pulse is applied to bring it back to the $|0\rangle$ and $|\pm 1\rangle$ basis. The fluorescence response is recorded as a function of τ and T_2^* is estimated from the decay time. The decaying fluorescence response versus precession time τ is shown in Fig. 7.9. The oscillations observed in the experiment were due to the offset in the ODMR frequency [114]. Although, experiments are done at zero fields, there could be a stray magnetic field coming from the sample holder, and the objective lens and different NV orientations will split asymmetrically under this field. And, other possibilities are the energy level splitting under strain as well as the hyperfine coupling with Nitrogen nucleus and Carbon nuclei. As the experiments are done on ensemble NV centers, the oscillations could also be due to all of the above possibilities.





Figure 7.9: Free Induction Decay (FID) curve (a) pulse sequence for characterizing T_2^* . (b) Fluorescence count with the free precession time; the T_2^* is $\approx 180 \text{ ns}$.

The other possible spin relaxation is due to the spin-flips caused by the phononic interaction with the crystal lattice, and it is characterized by the T_1 time. As a result of this, the spin state initialized into $m_s = 0$ state goes back to the thermal state. This experiments can be performed easily by letting the NV spin which is optically initialized evolve freely for a time τ which we refer to it as the dark time as it redistributes the populations of the spin states as and the pulse sequence is shown in Fig. 7.10 (a). The decaying fluorescent response as a function of τ is shown in Fig.7.10 (b). The decay time gives the value of T_1 [115, 116].

**Figure 7.10:** T_1 relaxation experiments.

Chapter 8

Conclusion and Outlook

8.1 Conclusion

In this thesis, we successfully showed experimental realization of the recent quantum phenomena called the quantum pigeonhole effect and the implementation of the optimal fixed quantum search algorithm. Another important objective of the thesis is to achieve robust quantum control. In some of the experiments, we adapted the popular optimal control technique, GRAPE for realizing optimal control pulses.

We also proposed a novel method for realizing robust controls through bang-bang control. In this technique, the smooth modulation of the control parameters is avoided. Therefore, repeated calculation of basic unitaries during the discrete-time steps is not often required, hence it is computationally inexpensive. In practice, smooth modulation of the RF field is more difficult than turning on and off the full power RF field in a controlled manner. So, here we used the intermittent burst of full power RF field which we called a bang along with free evolution under the intrinsic Hamiltonian of the quantum system.

Another important achievement of this thesis was realizing optimized protected quantum gates by integrating dynamical decoupling and optimal control techniques.

In this work, we also looked into how to protect non-classical correlations in particular quantum discord during Grover's search algorithm. Quantum correlations are known to be an important resource for quantum computing as well as quantum simulations hence, it is important to preserve them during computations. Protected quantum gates happened to show a good advantage in protecting quantum discord over unprotected quantum gates. We also found that an XY-DD with 90° pulse angle over-performs the 180° pulses.

Later during my PhD, we worked on setting up the experimental platform where we can perform quantum information processing using Nitrogen vacancy centers in diamond in the future. Nitrogen vacancy center are gaining significant attention for applications in developing quantum technologies such as a quantum computer, quantum sensors and metrology. We could successfully build a confocal setup in our lab and address NV centers in a diamond sample which was lent to us by Dr. Phani Kumar. However, all other spin manipulation experiments were performed on NV ensemble in a bulk diamond which we bought from Diamond Elements Pvt. Ltd. We also, conducted spin relaxation studies on NV center ensemble.

8.2 Outlook

There is a lot of scope for improving the techniques and experiments we discussed in this thesis. It would be interesting to address mutually interacting NV center qubits and repeating experiments such as quantum pigeon hole effect and optimal quantum search algorithm on them. It is also possible to apply the optimal control techniques such as GRAPE, BB and optimized protected quantum gates on NV center quantum simulator. In order to implement these techniques, we need to incorporate some more electronics such as an extra arbitrary waveform generator and an IQ mixer in our existing microwave circuit for controlling the phase of the microwave pulses.

Bibliography

- [1] A. Shukla, “Ancilla assisted quantum information processing: General protocols and nmr implementations”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1601.00234* (2016).
- [2] C. Müller. *Sensing single spins with colour centres in diamond*. Ph.D. thesis, Universität Ulm (2016).
- [3] O. Patange. *On an instrument for the coherent investigation of nitrogen-vacancy centres in diamond*. Master’s thesis, University of Waterloo (2013).
- [4] S. Felton, A. Edmonds, M. Newton, P. Martineau, D. Fisher, D. Twitchen, and J. Baker, “Hyperfine interaction in the ground state of the negatively charged nitrogen vacancy center in diamond”, *Physical Review B* **79**(7), 075203 (2009).
- [5] S. Felton, A. Edmonds, M. E. Newton, P. Martineau, D. Fisher, and D. Twitchen, “Electron paramagnetic resonance studies of the neutral nitrogen vacancy in diamond”, *Physical Review B* **77**(8), 081201 (2008).
- [6] S. Lloyd. *Programming the universe: a quantum computer scientist takes on the cosmos* (Vintage, 2006).

-
- [7] C. Zalka, “Simulating quantum systems on a quantum computer”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London. Series A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **454**(1969), 313 (1998).
- [8] R. P. Feynman, “Simulating physics with computers”, *International journal of theoretical physics* **21**(6), 467 (1982).
- [9] I. M. Georgescu, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, “Quantum simulation”, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **86**(1), 153 (2014).
- [10] M. Nielson and I. Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information (Cambridge Series on Information and the Natural Sciences)[Paperback]* (Cambridge, 2000).
- [11] D. P. DiVincenzo and D. Loss, “Quantum information is physical”, *Superlattices and Microstructures* **23**(3-4), 419 (1998).
- [12] J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, “Goals and opportunities in quantum simulation”, *Nature Physics* **8**(4), 264 (2012).
- [13] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, S. Breidbart, and S. Wiesner. Quantum cryptography, or unforgeable subway tokens. In *Advances in Cryptology*, pp. 267–275 (Springer, 1983).
- [14] A. K. Ekert, “Quantum cryptography based on bells theorem”, *Physical review letters* **67**(6), 661 (1991).
- [15] R. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, M. Horodecki, and K. Horodecki, “Quantum entanglement”, *Reviews of modern physics* **81**(2), 865 (2009).
- [16] P. W. Shor, “Scheme for reducing decoherence in quantum computer memory”, *Physical review A* **52**(4), R2493 (1995).

- [17] P. W. Shor, “Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer”, *SIAM review* **41**(2), 303 (1999).
- [18] L. K. Grover, “A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search”, *arXiv preprint quant-ph/9605043* (1996).
- [19] L. K. Grover, “Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack”, *Physical review letters* **79**(2), 325 (1997).
- [20] S. Lloyd, “Universal quantum simulators”, *Science* pp. 1073–1078 (1996).
- [21] D. G. Cory, A. F. Fahmy, and T. F. Havel, “Ensemble quantum computing by nmr spectroscopy”, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **94**(5), 1634 (1997).
- [22] N. A. Gershenfeld and I. L. Chuang, “Bulk spin-resonance quantum computation”, *science* **275**(5298), 350 (1997).
- [23] M. H. Levitt. *Spin dynamics: basics of nuclear magnetic resonance* (John Wiley & Sons, 2001).
- [24] J. Cavanagh. *Protein NMR spectroscopy: principles and practice* (Academic Pr, 1996).
- [25] D. G. Cory, M. D. Price, and T. F. Havel, “Nuclear magnetic resonance spectroscopy: An experimentally accessible paradigm for quantum computing”, *Physica D: Nonlinear Phenomena* **120**(1), 82 (1998).
- [26] N. Khaneja *et. al.*, “Optimal control of coupled spin dynamics: design of nmr pulse sequences by gradient ascent algorithms”, *Journal of Magnetic Resonance* **172**(2), 296 (2005). URL <http://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S1090780704003696>.

-
- [27] Y. Aharonov, F. Colombo, S. Popescu, I. Sabadini, D. C. Struppa, and J. Tollaksen, “The quantum pigeonhole principle and the nature of quantum correlations”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1407.3194* (2014).
- [28] Y. Aharonov and E. Cohen, “Weak values and quantum nonlocality”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1504.03797* (2015).
- [29] E. C. Milner and R. Rado, “The pigeon-hole principle for ordinal numbers”, *Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society* **3**(1), 750 (1965).
- [30] M. Ru. *Nevanlinna theory and its relation to Diophantine approximation* (World Scientific, 2001).
- [31] S. R. Buss, “Polynomial size proofs of the propositional pigeonhole principle”, *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* **52**(04), 916 (1987).
- [32] J. B. Paris, A. J. Wilkie, and A. R. Woods, “Provability of the pigeonhole principle and the existence of infinitely many primes”, *The Journal of Symbolic Logic* **53**(04), 1235 (1988).
- [33] M. Ajtai. The complexity of the pigeonhole principle. In *Foundations of Computer Science, 1988., 29th Annual Symposium on*, pp. 346–355 (IEEE, 1988).
- [34] M. E. Factor and E. D. Farchi, “Caching in a data processing system using the pigeon hole principle” (2000). US Patent 6,094,706.
- [35] H. Pape, L. Riepe, J. Schopper, *et al.*, “A pigeon-hole model for relating permeability to specific surface”, *The Log Analyst* **23**(01) (1982).
- [36] D. B. West *et al.* *Introduction to graph theory*, vol. 2 (Prentice hall Upper Saddle River, 2001).

- [37] R. A. Brualdi. *Introductory combinatorics* (New York, 1992).
- [38] Y. Aharonov, F. Colombo, S. Popescu, I. Sabadini, D. C. Struppa, and J. Tollaksen, “Quantum violation of the pigeonhole principle and the nature of quantum correlations”, *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences* **113**(3), 532 (2016).
- [39] S. Yu and C. Oh, “Quantum pigeonhole effect, cheshire cat and contextuality”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1408.2477* (2014).
- [40] A. Rae and T. Forgan, “On the implications of the quantum-pigeonhole effect”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1412.1333* (2014).
- [41] M. H. Levitt. *Spin dynamics: basics of nuclear magnetic resonance* (John Wiley & Sons, 2001).
- [42] B. Fung, “Pairs of pseudopure states for 4-and 5-qubit nuclear magnetic resonance systems”, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **115**(17), 8044 (2001).
- [43] E. Knill, I. Chuang, and R. Laflamme, “Effective pure states for bulk quantum computation”, *Physical Review A* **57**(5), 3348 (1998).
- [44] T. Mahesh and A. Kumar, “Ensemble quantum-information processing by nmr: Spatially averaged logical labeling technique for creating pseudopure states”, *Physical Review A* **64**(1), 012307 (2001).
- [45] T. Mahesh, N. Sinha, K. Ramanathan, and A. Kumar, “Ensemble quantum-information processing by nmr: Implementation of gates and the creation of pseudopure states using dipolar coupled spins as qubits”, *Physical Review A* **65**(2), 022312 (2002).

- [46] N. Khaneja, T. Reiss, C. Kehlet, T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, and S. J. Glaser, “Optimal control of coupled spin dynamics: design of nmr pulse sequences by gradient ascent algorithms”, *Journal of Magnetic Resonance* **172**(2), 296 (2005).
- [47] E. M. Fortunato, M. A. Pravia, N. Boulant, G. Teklemariam, T. F. Havel, and D. G. Cory, “Design of strongly modulating pulses to implement precise effective hamiltonians for quantum information processing”, *The Journal of chemical physics* **116**(17), 7599 (2002).
- [48] T. Mahesh and D. Suter, “Quantum-information processing using strongly dipolar coupled nuclear spins”, *Physical Review A* **74**(6), 062312 (2006).
- [49] Z. Tošner, T. Vosegaard, C. Kehlet, N. Khaneja, S. J. Glaser, and N. C. Nielsen, “Optimal control in nmr spectroscopy: Numerical implementation in simpson”, *Journal of Magnetic Resonance* **197**(2), 120 (2009).
- [50] X. Wang and S. Schirmer, “Entanglement generation between distant atoms by lyapunov control”, *Physical Review A* **80**(4), 042305 (2009).
- [51] J. J. Morton, A. M. Tyryshkin, A. Ardavan, S. C. Benjamin, K. Porfyakis, S. Lyon, and G. A. D. Briggs, “Bang–bang control of fullerene qubits using ultrafast phase gates”, *Nature Physics* **2**(1), 40 (2006).
- [52] W. Zhou, S. Schirmer, M. Zhang, and H.-Y. Dai, “Bang–bang control design for quantum state transfer based on hyperspherical coordinates and optimal time–energy control”, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical* **44**(10), 105303 (2011).
- [53] G. Bodenhausen, R. Freeman, and G. A. Morris, “A simple pulse sequence for selective excitation in fourier transform nmr”, *Journal of Magnetic Resonance* (1969) **23**(1), 171 (1976).

- [54] G. A. Morris and R. Freeman, "Selective excitation in fourier transform nuclear magnetic resonance", *Journal of Magnetic Resonance (1969)* **29**(3), 433 (1978).
- [55] R. Freeman, "Selective excitation in high-resolution nmr", *Chemical Reviews* **91**(7), 1397 (1991). <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/cr00007a006>, URL <http://dx.doi.org/10.1021/cr00007a006>.
- [56] R. Freeman and W. Xili, "Design of magnetic resonance experiments by genetic evolution", *Journal of Magnetic Resonance (1969)* **75**(1), 184 (1987).
- [57] V. Manu and A. Kumar, "Singlet-state creation and universal quantum computation in nmr using a genetic algorithm", *Physical Review A* **86**(2), 022324 (2012).
- [58] L. K. Grover, "Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack", *Physical review letters* **79**(2), 325 (1997).
- [59] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information* (Cambridge university press, 2010).
- [60] L. K. Grover, "Fixed-point quantum search", *Physical Review Letters* **95**(15), 150501 (2005).
- [61] T. Tulsı, L. K. Grover, and A. Patel, "A new algorithm for fixed point quantum search", *Quantum Info. Comput.* **6**(6), 483 (2006). URL <http://dl.acm.org/citation.cfm?id=2011691.2011693>.
- [62] T. J. Yoder, G. H. Low, and I. L. Chuang, "Fixed-point quantum search with an optimal number of queries", *Physical review letters* **113**(21), 210501 (2014).
- [63] A. Mitra, K. Sivapriya, and A. Kumar, "Experimental implementation of a three qubit quantum game with corrupt source using nuclear magnetic resonance quantum information processor", *Journal of Magnetic Resonance* **187**(2), 306 (2007).

- [64] M. Anwar, L. Xiao, A. Short, J. Jones, D. Blazina, S. Duckett, and H. Carteret, “Practical implementations of twirl operations”, *Physical Review A* **71**(3), 032327 (2005).
- [65] A. Shukla, K. R. K. Rao, and T. Mahesh, “Ancilla-assisted quantum state tomography in multiqubit registers”, *Physical Review A* **87**(6), 062317 (2013).
- [66] F. F. Fanchini, D. d. O. S. Pinto, and G. Adesso. *Lectures on General Quantum Correlations and Their Applications* (Springer, 2017).
- [67] T. S. Mahesh, C. S. Sudheer Kumar, and U. T. Bhosale, “Quantum correlations in nmr systems” pp. 499–516 (2017).
- [68] A. Datta, A. Shaji, and C. M. Caves, “Quantum discord and the power of one qubit”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **100**(5), 050502 (2008).
- [69] M. K. Henry, A. V. Gorshkov, Y. S. Weinstein, P. Cappellaro, J. Emerson, N. Boulant, J. S. Hodges, C. Ramanathan, T. F. Havel, R. Martinez, *et al.*, “Signatures of incoherence in a quantum information processor”, *Quantum Information Processing* **6**(6), 431 (2007).
- [70] L. Viola, E. Knill, and S. Lloyd, “Dynamical decoupling of open quantum systems”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**(12), 2417 (1999).
- [71] L. Viola, “Quantum control via encoded dynamical decoupling”, *Phys. Rev. A* **66**(1), 012307 (2002).
- [72] A. M. Souza, G. A. Álvarez, and D. Suter, “Robust dynamical decoupling”, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. A* **370**(1976), 4748 (2012).
- [73] D. A. Lidar, “Review of decoherence free subspaces, noiseless subsystems, and dynamical decoupling”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1208.5791* (2012).

- [74] D. Suter and G. A. Álvarez, “Colloquium: Protecting quantum information against environmental noise”, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **88**(4), 041001 (2016).
- [75] G. A. Alvarez, A. Ajoy, X. Peng, and D. Suter, “Performance comparison of dynamical decoupling sequences for a qubit in a rapidly fluctuating spin bath”, *Phys. Rev. A* **82**(4), 042306 (2010).
- [76] A. Ajoy, G. A. Álvarez, and D. Suter, “Optimal pulse spacing for dynamical decoupling in the presence of a purely dephasing spin bath”, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**(3), 032303 (2011).
- [77] X. Peng, D. Suter, and D. A. Lidar, “High fidelity quantum memory via dynamical decoupling: theory and experiment”, *Journal of Physics B: Atomic, Molecular and Optical Physics* **44**(15), 154003 (2011).
- [78] J. Shim, I. Niemeyer, J. Zhang, and D. Suter, “Robust dynamical decoupling for arbitrary quantum states of a single nv center in diamond”, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **99**(4), 40004 (2012).
- [79] H. Katiyar, S. S. Roy, T. S. Mahesh, and A. Patel, “Evolution of quantum discord and its stability in two-qubit nmr systems”, *Physical Review A* **86**(1), 012309 (2012).
- [80] H. Singh, K. Dorai, *et al.*, “Experimentally freezing quantum discord in a dephasing environment using dynamical decoupling”, *EPL (Europhysics Letters)* **118**, 50001 (2017).
- [81] K. Khodjasteh and L. Viola, “Dynamically error-corrected gates for universal quantum computation”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**(8), 080501 (2009).

- [82] X. Rong, J. Geng, Z. Wang, Q. Zhang, C. Ju, F. Shi, C.-K. Duan, and J. Du, “Implementation of dynamically corrected gates on a single electron spin in diamond”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 050503 (2014). URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.050503>.
- [83] J. Zhang and D. Suter, “Experimental protection of two-qubit quantum gates against environmental noise by dynamical decoupling”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 110502 (2015). URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.115.110502>.
- [84] J. Zhang, A. M. Souza, F. D. Brandao, and D. Suter, “Protected quantum computing: Interleaving gate operations with dynamical decoupling sequences”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 050502 (2014). URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.050502>.
- [85] U. Haeberlen. *High Resolution NMR in solids selective averaging: supplement 1 advances in magnetic resonance*, vol. 1 (Elsevier, 2012).
- [86] R. Raussendorf and H. J. Briegel, “A one-way quantum computer”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **86**(22), 5188 (2001).
- [87] C. H. Bennett and D. P. DiVincenzo, “Quantum information and computation”, *Nature* **404**(6775), 247 (2000).
- [88] H. Ollivier and W. H. Zurek, “Quantum discord: A measure of the quantumness of correlations”, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **88**, 017901 (2001). URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.017901>.
- [89] X.-M. Lu, J. Ma, Z. Xi, and X. Wang, “Optimal measurements to access classical correlations of two-qubit states”, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 012327 (2011). URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.83.012327>.

- [90] G. Bhole and T. S. Mahesh, “Rapid exponentiation using discrete operators: Applications in optimizing quantum controls and simulating quantum dynamics”, *arXiv preprint arXiv:1707.02162* (2017).
- [91] S. Roy and T. Mahesh, “Density matrix tomography of singlet states.”, *Journal of magnetic resonance (San Diego, Calif.: 1997)* **206**(1), 127 (2010).
- [92] A. Shukla, K. R. K. Rao, and T. S. Mahesh, “Ancilla-assisted quantum state tomography in multiqubit registers”, *Phys. Rev. A* **87**, 062317 (2013). URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.87.062317>.
- [93] G. Bhole, V. S. Anjusha, and T. S. Mahesh, “Steering quantum dynamics via bang-bang control: Implementing optimal fixed-point quantum search algorithm”, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 042339 (2016). URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.93.042339>.
- [94] I. I. Maximov, Z. Tošner, and N. C. Nielsen, “Optimal control design of nmr and dynamic nuclear polarization experiments using monotonically convergent algorithms”, *The Journal of Chemical Physics* **128**(18), 05B609 (2008).
- [95] B. Gerstein, “High-resolution nmr in solids with strong homonuclear dipolar broadening: combined multiple-pulse decoupling and magic angle spinning”, *Phil. Trans. R. Soc. Lond. A* **299**(1452), 521 (1981).
- [96] P. Mansfield, “Snapshot magnetic resonance imaging (nobel lecture)”, *Angewandte Chemie International Edition* **43**(41), 5456 (2004).
- [97] L. Childress and R. Hanson, “Diamond nv centers for quantum computing and quantum networks”, *MRS bulletin* **38**(2), 134 (2013).
- [98] J. Wrachtrup and F. Jelezko, “Processing quantum information in diamond”, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **18**(21), S807 (2006).

- [99] M. G. Dutt, L. Childress, L. Jiang, E. Togan, J. Maze, F. Jelezko, A. Zibrov, P. Hemmer, and M. Lukin, “Quantum register based on individual electronic and nuclear spin qubits in diamond”, *Science* **316**(5829), 1312 (2007).
- [100] A. Batalov, V. Jacques, F. Kaiser, P. Siyushev, P. Neumann, L. Rogers, R. McMurtrie, N. Manson, F. Jelezko, and J. Wrachtrup, “Low temperature studies of the excited-state structure of negatively charged nitrogen-vacancy color centers in diamond”, *Physical review letters* **102**(19), 195506 (2009).
- [101] Y.-P. Xie, X.-J. Zhang, and Z.-P. Liu, “Graphite to diamond: Origin for kinetics selectivity”, *Journal of the American Chemical Society* **139**(7), 2545 (2017). PMID: 28166629.
- [102] F. Bundy, H. T. Hall, H. Strong, and R. W. Jun, “Man-made diamonds”, *nature* **176**(4471), 51 (1955).
- [103] A. M. Zaitsev. *Optical properties of diamond: a data handbook* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2013).
- [104] J. Butler, Y. A. Mankelevich, A. Cheesman, J. Ma, and M. Ashfold, “Understanding the chemical vapor deposition of diamond: recent progress”, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **21**(36), 364201 (2009).
- [105] M. W. Doherty, N. B. Manson, P. Delaney, F. Jelezko, J. Wrachtrup, and L. C. Hollenberg, “The nitrogen-vacancy colour centre in diamond”, *Physics Reports* **528**(1), 1 (2013).
- [106] G. Davies, “The a nitrogen aggregate in diamond-its symmetry and possible structure”, *Journal of Physics C: Solid State Physics* **9**(19), L537 (1976).
- [107] D. Hopper, H. Shulevitz, and L. Bassett, “Spin readout techniques of the nitrogen-vacancy center in diamond”, *Micromachines* **9**(9), 437 (2018).

- [108] M. Born and E. Wolf. *Principles of optics: electromagnetic theory of propagation, interference and diffraction of light* (Elsevier, 2013).
- [109] M. Minsky, “Memoir on inventing the confocal scanning microscope”, *Scanning* **10**(4), 128 (1988).
- [110] M. Marvin. Microscopy apparatus (1961). US Patent 3,013,467.
- [111] A. Gruber, A. Dräbenstedt, C. Tietz, L. Fleury, J. Wrachtrup, and C. Von Borzyskowski, “Scanning confocal optical microscopy and magnetic resonance on single defect centers”, *Science* **276**(5321), 2012 (1997).
- [112] F. Jelezko, T. Gaebel, I. Popa, A. Gruber, and J. Wrachtrup, “Observation of coherent oscillations in a single electron spin”, *Physical review letters* **92**(7), 076401 (2004).
- [113] L. Jiang, J. Hodges, J. Maze, P. Maurer, J. Taylor, D. Cory, P. Hemmer, R. L. Walsworth, A. Yacoby, A. S. Zibrov, *et al.*, “Repetitive readout of a single electronic spin via quantum logic with nuclear spin ancillae”, *Science* **326**(5950), 267 (2009).
- [114] L. Childress, M. G. Dutt, J. Taylor, A. Zibrov, F. Jelezko, J. Wrachtrup, P. Hemmer, and M. Lukin, “Coherent dynamics of coupled electron and nuclear spin qubits in diamond”, *Science* **314**(5797), 281 (2006).
- [115] A. Jarmola, V. Acosta, K. Jensen, S. Chemerisov, and D. Budker, “Temperature- and magnetic-field-dependent longitudinal spin relaxation in nitrogen-vacancy ensembles in diamond”, *Physical review letters* **108**(19), 197601 (2012).
- [116] N. Manson, J. Harrison, and M. Sellars, “Nitrogen-vacancy center in diamond: Model of the electronic structure and associated dynamics”, *Physical Review B* **74**(10), 104303 (2006).