## Decoherence of electric dipole rotation in a double quantum dot

<u>T. Hayashi<sup>1</sup></u>, T. Fujisawa<sup>1</sup>, H. D. Cheong<sup>2</sup>, Y. H. Jeong<sup>3</sup>, and Y. Hirayama<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>NTT Basic Research Laboratories, 3-1 Morinosato-Wakamiya, Atsugi, 243-0198, Japan

<sup>2</sup> Department of Physics, Keimyung University, Taegu, Korea

<sup>3</sup> Pohang University of Science and Technology, Pohang, kyungpook, Korea

<sup>4</sup> CREST, 4-1-8 Honmachi, Kawaguchi 331-0012, Japan

Semiconductor double quantum dots (QDs) can be considered as a quantum two-level system (qubit) with high controllability [1] and is a promising candidate to implement a scalable quantum computer. In a similar way as Nakamura et al did for a superconducting single-Cooper-pair box [2], we introduced a short voltage pulse to the drain electrode and observed the coherent oscillation of the electric dipole. In this letter, we would like to discuss decoherence of our qubit.

We studied a lateral double QD fabricated in an AlGaAs / GaAs heterostructure (the inset of Fig. a). Before the pulse, a large source-drain voltage is applied and the localized states belonging to each QD are out of resonance. The inelastic current associated with phonon emission flows through the double QD. The left and right tunneling rates ( $\Gamma_L$  and  $\Gamma_R$ ) are adjusted to be much larger than the phonon emission rate so that, for most of the time, an electron is practically localized in the left QD. At a time (t = 0), the source drain voltage becomes zero and the two localized energy levels get closer. Here we define  $\varepsilon$  as the energy difference between the localized energy levels. The electron trapped in the left QD starts oscillating between the two QDs. At a certain time  $(t = t_p)$  later, the source-drain voltage goes back to the large value. If the electron exists in the right QD at that moment, it can tunnel out to the right electrode and contribute to the pulse-modulated current. If the electron is in the left OD, the electric state after the pulse is the same as the state before the pulse and, therefore, does not give any current. We repeat this pulse sequence with repetition frequency  $f_{rep} = 100$  MHz and pulse length  $t_p = 0.08 - 2$  ns. We measured the current difference  $I_{mod}$  with or without the voltage pulse as a function of pulse length  $t_p$ . Clear oscillation of  $I_{\text{mod}}$  (oscillation frequency  $\Omega/2\pi = 2.3$  GHz and phase relaxation rate  $T_2 = 0.9$  ns) can be seen in Fig. a. The circles are the experimental data and the line is the fitting curve of a damping cosine function. We also observed that it was possible to change the oscillation frequency which is related to the strength of inter-dot coupling  $\Delta = 10 \text{ µeV}$ , by changing the gate voltage between QDs.

In general, a coherent two-level system is coupled with several kinds of environments and loses its coherency. Total decoherence rate  $T_2^{-1}$  is a sum of the decoherence rates for each factor. Fig. b-d show the  $\varepsilon$ ,  $\Delta$ , and temperature dependence of the  $T_2^{-1}$  estimated from the current spectra for two samples; Sample I (black circle) and Sample II (white circle). As shown in Fig. b, the  $T_2^{-1}$  has a minimum at  $\varepsilon = 0$ , which is a common feature for any  $\Delta$ . To analyze this, we presume there is a finite fluctuation in  $\varepsilon$ . This fluctuation  $\delta \varepsilon$  is attributed to the background charge fluctuation in the electric circuit [3] and the fluctuation in the gate voltages. According to the relationship  $\hbar\Omega = \sqrt{\varepsilon^2 + \Delta^2}$ , the fluctuation  $\delta\varepsilon$  leads to the fluctuation in  $\Omega$  which brings on decoherence: decoherence rate  $\Gamma_{\epsilon} = |\delta \Omega|$ . The dash-dotted line in Fig. b is the  $\Gamma_{\epsilon}$  ( $\delta \epsilon = 1.6 \ \mu eV$ ) which reproduces the  $\varepsilon$  dependence of the experimental  $T_2^{-1}$ . We obtained the similar results for the other  $\Delta$ . The  $T_2^{-1}$  is minimal at  $\varepsilon = 0$  because the first order derivative of  $\Omega$  in terms of  $\varepsilon$  is zero. The finite  $T_2^{-1}$  at  $\varepsilon = 0$  should be mainly attributed to the other sources of decoherence such as the electron-phonon interaction [4] and cotunneling. We calculated the decoherence rate  $\Gamma_{ph}$  caused by the electron-phonon interaction (dotted line in Fig. c and d) with a spin-boson model for an Ohmic spectral density [4] (we used dimensionless coupling strength of the electron-phonon

interaction g ~ 0.03). We also calculated the cotunneling rates  $\Gamma_{cot}$  (solid line in Fig. c and d) with higher order Golden rule (we assume the left and right tunneling barriers are identical). Both  $\Gamma_{ph}$  and  $\Gamma_{cot}$  are comparable to the observed  $T_2^{-1}$ .

- [1] T. H. Oosterkamp et al, Nature 395, 873 (1998).
- [2] Y. Nakamura et al, Nature **398**, 786 (1999).
- [3] Y. Nakamura et al, Phys. Rev. Lett. 88, 047901 (2002).
- [4] T. Brandes et al, Phys. Rev. B66, 075341 (2002).



Fig. a Pulse-modulated current spectrum as a function of pulse length  $t_p$ . The solid line is the fitting curve of a damping cosine function. The dotted line represents the reduction of the inelastic current. The inset is a scanning microscope image of the sample and the schematic measurement setup.

Fig. b Energy difference  $\varepsilon$  dependence of the decoherence rate  $T_2^{-1}$  for  $\Delta = 9 \mu eV$ . The dash-dotted line is a calculated  $T_2^{-1}$  due to a finite fluctuation in  $\varepsilon$ .

Fig. c Inter-dot coupling strength  $\Delta$  dependence of the decoherence rates  $T_2^{-1}$  at  $\epsilon = 0$  for for sample I (black circle) and for sample II (white circle). The dotted line is the calculated  $T_2^{-1}$  caused by the electron-phonon interaction. The solid lines are the calculated cotunneling rates. The left and right tunneling rates are assumed to be  $\hbar \Gamma_{L/R} = 30 \ \mu eV$  (for sample I) and 13  $\mu eV$  (for sample II).

Fig. d Lattice temperature  $T_{\text{lat}}$  dependence of decoherence rate  $T_2^{-1}$  at  $\varepsilon = 0$  for  $\Delta = 5 \ \mu\text{eV}$ .