

Coherence time of decoupled nuclear spins in silicon

T. D. Ladd,* D. Maryenko,[†] and Y. Yamamoto[‡]

Quantum Entanglement Project, SORST, JST, Edward L. Ginzton Laboratory, Stanford University, Stanford, California 94305-4085, USA

E. Abe and K. M. Itoh

Department of Applied Physics and Physico-Informatics, CREST, JST, Keio University, Yokohama, 223-8522, Japan

(Received 18 August 2004; published 4 January 2005)

We report NMR experiments using high-power rf decoupling techniques to show that a ^{29}Si nuclear spin in a solid silicon crystal at room temperature can preserve quantum phase for 10^9 precessional periods. The coherence times we report are more than four orders of magnitude longer than for any other observed solid-state qubit. We also examine coherence times using magic-angle-spinning techniques and in isotopically altered samples. In high-quality crystals, coherence times are limited by residual dipolar couplings and can be further improved by isotopic depletion. In defect-heavy samples, we provide evidence for decoherence limited by a noise process unrelated to the dipolar coupling. The nonexponential character of these data is compared to a theoretical model for decoherence due to the same charge trapping mechanisms responsible for $1/f$ noise. These results provide insight into proposals for solid-state nuclear-spin-based quantum memories and quantum computers based on silicon.

DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevB.71.014401

PACS number(s): 82.56.Jn, 03.67.Lx, 03.67.Pp, 76.60.Lz

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum information processing devices outperform their classical counterparts by preserving and exploiting the correlated phases of their constituent quantum oscillators, which are usually two-state systems called “qubits.” An increasing number of theoretical proposals have shown that such devices allow secure long-distance communication and improved computational power.¹ Solid-state implementations of these devices are favored due to both scalability and ease of integration with existing hardware, although previous experiments have shown limited coherence times for solid-state qubits. The development of quantum error-correcting codes² and fault-tolerant quantum computation³ showed that large-scale quantum algorithms are still theoretically possible in the presence of decoherence. However, the coherence time must be dauntingly long: approximately 10^5 times the duration of a single quantum gate, and probably longer depending on the quantum computer architecture.¹ The question of whether a scalable implementation can surpass this coherence threshold is not only important for the technological future of quantum computation, but also for fundamental understanding of the border between microscopic quantum behavior and macroscopic classical behavior.

Nuclear spins have long been considered strong candidates for robust qubits.^{4,5} In particular, the magnetic moment of a spin-1/2 nucleus intrinsically possesses the qubit’s simple two-state structure and has no direct coupling to local electric fields, making it extremely well isolated from the environment. The ^{29}Si isotope in semiconducting silicon is one example of such an isolated nucleus. Even at room temperature, the rate of thermal equilibrium for a ^{29}Si nuclear spin (T_1) exceeds 4 h, with much longer rates as the temperature is lowered.⁶ When this T_1 time scale is compared to the resonant frequencies for such nuclei at even modest mag-

netic fields, it is clear that these nuclei are extremely weakly coupled to any external degrees of freedom. Due to this isolation, combined with the highly developed engineering surrounding silicon, both the ^{29}Si nucleus and the ^{31}P impurity nucleus in silicon have been proposed as qubits in architectures for quantum computing.^{7,8}

The important time scale for quantum information is not the rate at which *energy* is exchanged with the environment, T_1 , but rather the rate at which *information* is exchanged, a rate which manifests as the loss of phase coherence, T_2 . The low resonant energy has led to speculation that T_2 for isolated nuclei in silicon will be similar to T_1 . Such speculation has not been tested because *isolated* nuclei are not available for measurement; the low sensitivity of nuclear detection has, in all experiments to date, required a large ensemble of nuclei, and these ensemble members couple to each other via magnetic dipolar couplings much more strongly than they couple to the environment. Existing measurements of T_2 for silicon nuclei therefore measure only the dynamics of these dipole couplings, albeit modified by the spin-echo pulse sequences intended to eliminate inhomogeneous broadening.⁹

In the present study, we attempt to determine the coherence of isolated ^{29}Si nuclei, principally by applying well-known rf pulse sequences and sample-spinning techniques which serve to reverse dipolar dynamics. These pulse sequences slow down dipolar evolution by over three orders of magnitude. We also use these methods while varying the isotopic content of ^{29}Si among the spin-0 ^{28}Si and ^{30}Si isotopes.¹⁰ These decoupling techniques and isotopic modifications, discussed in Sec. II, will both be necessary in quantum computer architectures.^{7,8,11}

In very pure single-crystal samples, which are expected to have the longest values of T_2 , we extend the decoherence time to 25 s, limited by internuclear dipolar couplings left over by the imperfect decoupling techniques. In defect-heavy silicon samples, however, we are able to decouple nuclei

well enough to observe intrinsic, lattice-induced decoherence. We find that low-frequency electronic fluctuations limit T_2 to still be much shorter than T_1 in these samples. These results are discussed in Sec. III. In Sec. IV, we discuss the processes which limit T_2 in our experiments. In particular we argue that the nonexponential decoherence we observe in polycrystalline silicon can be explained using a well-known model for electronic $1/f$ noise. To our knowledge, this is the first observation of such decoherence in solid-state NMR.

II. METHODS

In this work, we use the term ‘‘coherence’’ to refer to the coherence of single nuclei. In all experiments, we begin by placing many nuclei in the equal superposition state

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|\uparrow\rangle + e^{i\phi}|\downarrow\rangle), \quad (1)$$

and we seek to learn how the phase ϕ shifts in time between different nuclei. This dephasing is revealed by an *ensemble* measurement; if inhomogeneous broadening is eliminated, the ensemble result is similar to measuring a single nucleus repeatedly and averaging the results. Differences between ensemble and single-spin measurements are discussed in Appendix A. This single-spin definition of coherence is not always appropriate in solid-state NMR because nuclei evolve under dipolar couplings into coherent, highly correlated, many-body states. These states may be observed in experiments designed to measure ‘‘multiple quantum coherences;’’¹² such experiments show that even when the phase information of single nuclei has become lost to the ensemble, the ensemble as a whole has not lost that information to the environment. However, in the present study, as in ensemble-based quantum computers,^{5,7} we regard the evolution of such intraensemble correlations as a decoherence process, but one which we are able to partially reverse. We present the Hamiltonian governing the spin system in Sec. II A, and we summarize the theory behind the methods for partially reversing the dipolar coupling in Sec. II B. The specific challenges for experimental application of these methods to silicon are discussed in Sec. II C.

A. The spin system

The largest term in the nuclear Hamiltonian is the Zeeman term,

$$\mathcal{H}_Z = -\hbar\gamma B_0 \sum_j I_j^z - \hbar\gamma \sum_j \delta\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}_j) \cdot \mathbf{I}_j, \quad (2)$$

where \mathbf{I}_j is the spin operator for the j th ^{29}Si nucleus and $\delta\mathbf{B}(\mathbf{r}_j)$ is the static deviation of the local magnetic field from the applied field $B_0\hat{\mathbf{z}}$ at the position \mathbf{r}_j of the j th nucleus. It is convenient to shift to the ‘‘rotating reference frame,’’¹³ both because the uninteresting fast z rotation is removed, and because heterodyne inductive measurement effectively observes dynamics in this frame. This frame rotates about the z axis at the frequency $\omega \approx \gamma B_0$ of the applied radio-frequency (rf) field. Neglecting terms which oscillate at ω (rotating wave approximation), the Zeeman term is rewritten

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = -\hbar \sum_j \omega_j I_j^z, \quad (3)$$

where $\omega_j = \gamma[B_0 + \delta B^z(\mathbf{r}_j)] - \omega$. This unperturbed Hamiltonian sets the resonant frequency for each nucleus; completely ‘‘coherent’’ nuclei would evolve according to this term alone. Note that dephasing would still occur in the ensemble due to the variation of ω_j between nuclei (i.e., due to inhomogeneous magnetic fields); this dephasing is readily refocused as a spin echo and is therefore not regarded as decoherence.

The dipolar coupling, also in the rotating wave approximation, is written¹³

$$\mathcal{H}_D = - \sum_{j \neq k} D_{jk} [\mathbf{I}_j \cdot \mathbf{I}_k - 3I_j^z I_k^z]. \quad (4)$$

The dipolar coupling coefficients are

$$D_{jk} = \hbar^2 \gamma^2 \frac{1 - 3 \cos^2 \theta_{jk}}{r_{jk}^3}, \quad (5)$$

where $r_{jk} \cos \theta_{jk} = (\mathbf{r}_j - \mathbf{r}_k) \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}}$. For silicon sparse in the ^{29}Si isotope, as is isotopically natural silicon, the ^{29}Si nuclei are randomly located in the crystal lattice, leading to a random distribution of coupling constants D_{jk} .

Most solid-state NMR experiments are completely described by the ‘‘internal’’ Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}_{\text{int}} = \mathcal{H}_0 + \mathcal{H}_D$, along with the collective rotations controlled by rf fields, *except* for the presence of T_1 relaxation, which requires a term coupling the nuclear spin system to local fluctuating magnetic fields. In the present work, we shall also be concerned with T_2 decoherence due to such local fields. We therefore suppose the presence of a semiclassical random field $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ leading to the term

$$\mathcal{H}_{\text{env}}(t) = -\hbar \gamma \sum_j \mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r}_j, t) \cdot \mathbf{I}_j(t). \quad (6)$$

For the present work at room temperature, there is no reason to treat the decohering environment in a quantum mechanical way. The consequences of this term and the statistics of the random field $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r}, t)$ will be discussed in Sec. IV B.

B. Theory of dipolar decoupling

The dipolar evolution, as governed by Eq. (4), is the principal bottleneck for resolution in solid-state NMR spectroscopy. As a result, a variety of techniques have been developed to periodically reverse that evolution; we refer to such techniques as ‘‘decoupling.’’ Discussion of these techniques can be found in standard NMR textbooks.¹⁴ In this section, we review only the pertinent details required to understand the present results. We begin by discussing multiple pulse sequences (MPSs) for decoupling, and the related technique of magic angle spinning (MAS).

1. Multiple pulse sequences

In MPS decoupling, rapid rotations are applied to the spin system by short rf pulses in a periodic cycle. The key concept for comprehension of MPS decoupling is the toggling reference frame. This reference frame ‘‘follows’’ the pulses;




FIG. 1. (Color online) Schematic of the CPMG-MREV-16 \times 120 pulse sequence with spin-echo data. The echoes shown in the upper left and expanded in the upper right are data from an isotopically natural single crystal of silicon. These are obtained by first exciting the sample with a $\pi/2$ pulse of arbitrary phase ϕ , decoupling with the MREV-16 sequence shown in detail on the bottom line, and refocusing with π pulses of phase $\phi_{\perp} = \phi + \pi/2$ every 120 cycles of MREV-16. The magnetization is sampled once per MREV-16 cycle in the windows marked with an S.

if a $\pi/2$ pulse about the x axis occurs in the pulse sequence, then simultaneously the toggling reference frame rotates by $\pi/2$ about the x axis. Correspondingly, an isolated nucleus periodically rotated by the MPS would be seen as stationary in the toggling reference frame. The internal terms of the Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_0 and \mathcal{H}_D are time dependent in this frame, and are therefore written

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0(t) = U_{\text{rf}}^{\dagger}(t)\mathcal{H}_0U_{\text{rf}}(t), \quad (7)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_D(t) = U_{\text{rf}}^{\dagger}(t)\mathcal{H}_DU_{\text{rf}}(t), \quad (8)$$

where $U_{\text{rf}}(t)$ describes the unitary evolution due to the rf control sequence. Likewise, the coupling to the environment takes on an additional time dependence, leading to

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{env}}(t) = -\hbar\gamma\sum_j\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r}_j,t)\cdot U_{\text{rf}}^{\dagger}(t)\mathbf{I}_j(t)U_{\text{rf}}(t). \quad (9)$$

During some intervals of the multiple pulse sequence, the toggling frame and the rotating reference frame will be the same; it is during these intervals only that we measure the nuclear spin dynamics.

Floquet's theorem tells us that the unitary time-evolution operator generated by the periodic, time-dependent internal Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{int}}(t) = \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0(t) + \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_D(t)$ may be written $U_p(t)\exp(-iFt)$ where $U_p(t)$ is periodic with the same period. If we measure only once per period t_c ("stroboscopic observation"), then we are interested only in $U_p(mt_c) \times [\exp(-iFt_c)]^m$ for integers m . The prefactor $U_p(mt_c)$ is constant and may be neglected. In average Hamiltonian theory (AHT),¹⁵ Ft_c is expanded in orders of t_c , the cycle time of the MPS, using the Magnus expansion:

$$Ft_c = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} \tilde{\mathcal{H}}^{(n)}t_c. \quad (10)$$

The n th-order average Hamiltonian may be written as time integrals of commutators of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{int}}(t)$; the zeroth-order term is simply the time average of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{int}}(t)$.

The sequence we employ in this study, illustrated at the bottom of Fig. 1, consists of 16 properly phased and separated $\pi/2$ pulses, forming MREV-16, a variant of the MREV-8 sequence.¹⁶ With perfect pulses, the MREV-8 sequence results in the zeroth-order average internal Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{int}}^{(0)} = -(1/3)\sum_j\hbar\omega_j(I_j^x \pm I_j^y)$, where the sign of the x component of the effective field depends on the helicity of the sequence. The MREV-16 sequence, shown in Fig. 1, concatenates each helicity of MREV-8, leading to the effective field terms

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{(0)} = -\frac{1}{3}\sum_j\omega_jI_j^z, \quad (11)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{(1)} = \frac{\tau}{3}\sum_j\omega_j^2(I_j^x - 2I_j^y), \quad (12)$$

$$\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{(2)} = -\frac{\tau^2}{144}\sum_j\omega_j^3\left(3I_j^y - \frac{381}{2}I_j^z\right). \quad (13)$$

Here, $\tau = t_c/24$ as illustrated in Fig. 1. Although MREV-16 has reduced spectroscopic resolution over MREV-8 due to the smaller effective size of $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_0^{(0)}$, maintaining the effective field in the z direction (in zeroth order) allows easier nuclear control, and we are not interested in spectroscopy in the present study. The dipolar terms vanish in zeroth order; higher-order dipolar terms will be discussed in Sec. IV A.

We also tried a variety of other pulse sequences for decoupling, including BR-24,¹⁷ CORY-48,¹⁸ and SME-16.¹⁹ Although we observed decoupling with all of these sequences,

MREV-16 showed the best performance, as we further discuss in Sec. IV.

The inhomogeneous offsets described by the dominant $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_0^{(0)}$ term cause static dephasing, which we periodically refocus by applying π pulses every 120 cycles of MREV-16. We employ the Carr-Purcell-Meiboom-Gill (CPMG) phase convention to correct for π -pulse errors,²⁰ as shown in Fig. 1. Such inserted pulses²¹ would likewise be employed in an NMR quantum computer for decoupling and recoupling of multiple dipolar-coupled qubits.^{11,22} We refer to this combined sequence as CPMG-MREV-16 \times 120.

2. Magic angle spinning

MAS decoupling operates on a slightly different mechanism from MPS. Rather than using rf to induce nuclear rotations, the sample is physically rotated about an axis at angle θ_m from the z axis. In the sample's reference frame, the dipolar coupling constants D_{jk} become time dependent; the only component of $D_{jk}(t)$ constant in time is proportional to $3 \cos^2 \theta_m - 1$, which is eliminated by choosing θ_m to be the "magic angle" that eliminates this term. Other terms of $D_{jk}(t)$ oscillate at multiples of the sample spinning speed. Again, one may expand the Floquet Hamiltonian F in powers of the spinning cycle period $2\pi\Omega^{-1}$ and find that the spinning dipole Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_D(t)$ averages to zero in zeroth order but not in higher orders. In particular, the first-order correction is present.¹⁵

C. Experimental details

Although MPS and MAS experiments are now routine in solid-state NMR, the application of these techniques to silicon introduces new challenges related to the low ^{29}Si NMR signal-to-noise ratio (SNR). The low signal results from a small gyromagnetic ratio γ , a sparse isotopic abundance (4.7% ^{29}Si in isotopically natural silicon), and, most importantly, an extremely long T_1 . Silicon's long equilibration time makes averaging over multiple acquisitions impractical. Each echo time series in the present study was taken in a single measurement after thermal equilibration for one-half to five times T_1 , except where noted. We compensated for the low SNR in these single-shot experiments by using large samples, which resulted in substantial inhomogeneous broadening and required large rf coils. The MPS experiments, however, required short rf pulses, which can be challenging when using large coils at high field.

1. MPS experiments

a. Apparatus. The MPS experiments were performed using an 89-mm-bore 7 T superconducting solenoid NMR magnet (Oxford) and a commercial NMR spectrometer (Tecmag) operating at 59.575 MHz. All experiments were performed at room temperature. We designed and built the probe to be as rigid and robust as possible for high-power rf, employing variable vacuum capacitors (Jennings) and high-power ceramic capacitors (HEC) embedded in plastic to accommodate average rf powers of approximately 800 W. The capacitors were placed as close to the coil as possible in a

design that minimized arcing by shortening high-voltage leads. Using large capacitors near the coil allowed high SNR and flexible tuning for frequency and impedance matching. A small open BNC connector provided an antenna for direct monitoring of the rf field, which allowed us to symmetrize phase transients without NMR detection. We found that our results did not noticeably vary with asymmetric versus symmetric phase transients. Coil heating was a large concern, as the plastic coil holder would melt after about a minute of a high-power MPS; however, the probe tuning remained roughly constant as checked by continuous monitoring of the rf power reflected from the probe.

b. Spin locking. In these experiments, it is crucial to separate coherent oscillation from spin locking. Two kinds of spin locking are present in this experiment. Due to the finite pulse width and higher-order average Hamiltonian terms [see Eqs. (12) and (13)], the effective magnetic field witnessed by the nuclei is not exactly parallel to the z axis. Consequently, a magnetization spin locked to this effective field would have a small component in the xy plane which would be detectable under stroboscopic observation. This component was observed to decay very slowly, indicating a $T_{1\rho}$ of many minutes. To separate the coherent oscillations of the transverse field from this spin-locked signal, the rf was detuned about 120 Hz from the center of the nuclear resonance frequency. The transverse field was then seen to oscillate with a center frequency of $\Delta\omega \approx 40$ Hz, as expected from the zeroth-order average Hamiltonian. The small spin-locked "pedestal" shows no such oscillation, and was observed to change phase only when π pulses were applied. By Fourier transforming each echo, we were able to isolate the coherent oscillations, which appear as a broad peak at $\Delta\omega$ in each spectrum, from the spin-locked component, which appears as a spike at the center frequency. Decay curves were generated by integrating the detuned side peaks between half maxima. This procedure also eliminated the influence of pulse ring-down effects.

Pulsed spin locking²³ is a related effect which may be observed in samples undergoing rapid π pulses. This effect was observed when π pulses were applied every 5–10 cycles of MREV-16 and in spin-echo experiments without decoupling. The spin-locked decay time in this case was immeasurably long when π pulses were applied every 5 cycles, but rapidly decreased as the rate of π pulses was reduced. This effect can be deduced by careful observation of the phase of the signal after many π pulses; when pulsed spin locking is present, the phase of the signal near the tail of the decay is uncorrelated to the initial phase of the spins, as determined by the preparation pulse. We found pulsed spin locking to be present both when we used constant phase π pulses, as in the CPMG sequence, and when we used π pulses of alternating phase. For π pulses applied every 120 cycles, the effects of pulsed spin locking seem to be absent, although a very small tail in the echo decay is still present, presumably due to this effect.

c. Samples and coils. We used a variety of samples with different rf coils designed to maximize filling factor and rf homogeneity. We used an isotopically enhanced (96.9% ^{29}Si) cylindrical sample of single-crystal silicon; this sample and its NMR properties have been previously discussed.²⁴ We

also used a stack of polycrystalline silicon cylinders purchased from Alfa Aesar; these samples are free of impurities at the level of 0.1 ppm, with natural isotopic abundance (4.7% ^{29}Si). This stack was 2 cm long and 0.95 cm wide. We also investigated a smaller sample of isotopically depleted silicon, with between 0.98% and 1.3% ^{29}Si , varying across the sample. This sample, grown using the techniques described in Ref. 25, was a cylinder 6 mm in diameter and 2 cm long. It also featured 10^{17} cm^{-3} aluminum impurities introduced to shorten T_1 to allow signal averaging. With these samples, we used a 6-cm-long, 1-cm-diameter coil wound using 2-mm-diameter bare copper wire with variable pitch to improve rf homogeneity.²⁶ The coil was held firmly by a plastic coil form. The rf homogeneity was important for the longer samples; we characterized the homogeneity by measuring ^{29}Si Rabi oscillations using a similarly sized sample of solidified grease containing dimethyl siloxane. We found the free induction decay (FID) intensity for the antinode at pulse angle 450° to be 92% as strong as that at 90° , indicating moderate rf homogeneity. The $\pi/2$ -pulse duration was $9\ \mu\text{s}$ for this coil.

Our cleanest sample was a high-quality single crystal of silicon purchased from Marketech, also with natural isotopic abundance. This sample featured less than $5 \times 10^{13}\text{ cm}^{-3}$ n -type impurities. It was cut into a sphere of diameter 1.5 cm and fitted tightly in a constant-pitch coil approximately 6 cm long. The rf homogeneity for this coil over a spherical sample was roughly the same as the variable pitch coil over the cylindrical sample. The $\pi/2$ -pulse duration was $15\ \mu\text{s}$ for this coil.

We also investigated heavily doped wafers of metallic n -type silicon. These samples were convenient because the T_1 was only 50 s, unlike the purer samples for which we measured a T_1 of 4.5 h, consistent with earlier studies.²⁷ However, the SNR for the metallic silicon was always substantially lower, and decoupling sequences always performed poorly, even for powdered samples. We speculate that this is due to skin-depth effects.

2. MAS experiments

Power requirements were not an issue for MAS experiments, allowing the use of standard commercial equipment. These experiments were carried out using a commercial probe and spectrometer (Chemagnetics), in a 7 T magnet at room temperature. The magic angle was adjusted by measuring the locations of the methyl carbon and aromatic carbon peaks in the ^{13}C hexamethylbenzene MAS spectrum. By assuring that these peaks are within 0.2 ppm of their standard locations, the deviation from the magic angle is expected to be less than half a degree. Spinning rates were adjusted up to $\Omega/2\pi=5\text{ kHz}$; at rates higher than about 3.5 kHz the spinning became unstable. The CPMG refocusing sequence was employed to refocus inhomogeneous broadening, with varying pulse time. The $\pi/2$ -pulse duration was $9\ \mu\text{s}$.

We studied an isotopically natural single-crystal silicon sample from the same growth as the spherical sample employed for the MPS experiments. The sample was cut into a




FIG. 2. (Color online) Coherence time versus cycle time in single-crystal silicon. The solid line is a fit showing the exponent -2.09 ± 0.07 for the isotopically enhanced sample (left) and -2.00 ± 0.2 for the isotopically natural sample (right). The insets show the integrated logarithmic magnitude of the spin echoes decaying in time for a few cycle times.

cylinder 6 mm in diameter by 7 mm in height. Each MAS experiment was measured as a single shot after a 12 h thermalization time.

III. RESULTS

A. MPS experiments

As shown in Fig. 1, the CPMG-MREV- 16×120 sequence allows the observation of hundreds of spin echoes. Figure 2 shows the result of decoupling the single-crystal samples. The insets show the magnitude decay of the detuned echo; the data for both samples fit reasonably well to an exponential decay, as shown, and the resulting least-squares fit for each t_c is plotted. For the isotopically enhanced sample, the T_2 before decoupling is $450\ \mu\text{s}$ for the [001] orientation, as reported previously for this sample.²⁴ The CPMG-MREV- 16×120 sequence extends the T_2 in this sample to nearly 2 s. For long t_c , the coherence time reduces as t_c^{-2} , indicating that decoherence is dominated by second-order terms in the average Hamiltonian; we discuss this result further in Sec. IV A. For short t_c , finite pulse width effects become more important, and the sequence fails.¹⁴ In isotopically natural silicon single crystals, the coherence time is even longer due to the scarcity of ^{29}Si in the lattice. As shown in Figs. 1 and 2, the spin echoes in the sample last for as long as a minute, showing a T_2 of $25.0 \pm 0.2\text{ s}$. The effective Q of this qubit, then, is $\omega_0 T_2 = 10^9$, exceeding the Q of any other solid-state qubit, such as those based on Josephson junctions,^{28–30} by at least four orders of magnitude.

Without decoupling, the T_2 of isotopically natural silicon as measured using only the CPMG sequence appears to be approximately 11 ms, although we do observe a long tail in the echo decay lasting several hundred milliseconds, as recently reported in other work.⁹ The cause for this long tail is not well understood. However, we do not observe any fea-




FIG. 3. (Color online) Spin echoes for isotopically depleted silicon. The solid line shows $\exp[-t/8 \text{ s}]$, for comparison.

tures on this time scale when we apply decoupling, suggesting that this effect results only from the complexities of random dipolar couplings in the presence of inhomogeneous broadening and imperfect π pulses. We suspect that pulse errors are very significant, especially in heavily doped samples where skin-depth effects play an important role. The effects of pulsed spin locking, as discussed in Sec. II C, should not be discounted.

As the strength of the dipolar coupling is further decreased by isotopic depletion, the dipolar coupling constants D_{jk} become much smaller than the frequency offsets ω_j . The dominant second-order dipolar average Hamiltonian term leading to decoherence is then the dipolar/offset cross term, which scales as $\bar{H}^{(2)} \propto t_c^2 |D_{jk}| \omega_j^2$. For isotopic percentage p less than about 10%, we would expect T_2^{-1} to be proportional to the dipolar coupling constants, which vary as the inverse cube of the distance between ^{29}Si isotopes. Correspondingly, we expect $T_2^{-1} \propto p$, approaching T_1^{-1} as $p \rightarrow 0$. However, our attempt to observe this isotope effect was not successful. In the isotopically enhanced sample, the same decoupling sequence which led to $T_2 = 25 \text{ s}$ in isotopically natural silicon led to a decay time not exceeding 8 s, as shown in Fig. 3. These noisy data result from ten averages in one experiment lasting a week. We believe the reduced T_2 is due to the presence of lattice defects in the sample.

Similar data are observed in the sample of pure, polycrystalline silicon. Although the shallow impurity content of this sample is very low, leading to $T_1 = 4.5 \text{ h}$, the CPMG-MREV-16 $\times 120$ sequence leads to a decoherence time scale of approximately 8 s. The higher SNR for this isotopically natural sample allowed us to study this decay more carefully. There are two unusual features of these data, both revealed in Fig. 4. First, the decay curve is neither exponential nor Gaussian. Second, this decay curve retains its shape as t_c is altered. If this decay were due to residual dipolar coupling terms of the average Hamiltonian, some change in shape would be expected. We conclude that this decoherence is due to low-frequency noise intrinsic to the sample. In Sec. IV B we argue that the same thermal processes at defects which lead to $1/f$ charge noise are responsible for these unusual data. Our data in isotopically depleted silicon could be due to the same type of decoherence.

B. MAS experiments

The T_2 times in single-crystal silicon observed under MAS were not as long as in the MPS experiments. The ob-




FIG. 4. (Color online) Echo decay curves for pure polycrystalline silicon of natural isotopic abundance. No significant variation in the data is observed as t_c is changed. The solid line is a fit to the function described in Sec. IV B.

served decay is exponential with $T_2 = 2.6 \text{ s}$ at the fastest spinning speeds. We observe this decay to be independent of the π -pulse timing, as expected for dipolar couplings. The T_2 as a function of rotating speed Ω is shown in Fig. 5. The T_2 varies roughly linearly with Ω , as expected from first-order AHT and consistent with typical MAS results.³¹

IV. DISCUSSION

We now discuss the physical mechanisms for the observed residual T_2 after decoupling. In Sec. IV A, we discuss the source of decoherence observed in *single-crystal* silicon. In both MPS and MAS experiments, and for both isotopically enhanced and isotopically natural single crystals, this decoherence source is residual dipolar couplings. In Sec. IV B, we present the model for the decoherence source in *polycrystalline* silicon.

A. Residual dipolar decoherence

Both MREV-16 and MAS have first-order dipolar corrections in AHT. However, in the MREV-16 experiment in single-crystal silicon, we observe only second-order effects.




FIG. 5. (Color online). The decay of the spin-echo peaks under MAS for several rotation speeds Ω , with exponential fits (left), and the observed decay times T_2 plotted against Ω (right).

Since the offset term of the Hamiltonian is substantially larger than the dipole term, we believe this is due to the effects of second averaging,³² as we now explain.

The first-order average Hamiltonian under MREV-16 may be written

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{\mathcal{H}}_{D0}^{(1)} &= \frac{-i}{2t_c} \int_0^{t_c} dt_2 \int_0^{t_2} dt_1 [\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{int}}(t_1), \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{int}}(t_2)] \\ &= \frac{1+2i}{3} \tau \left[\frac{1}{2} \sum_j \omega_j^2 I_j^+ + \sum_{j \neq k} D_{jk} (\omega_j - \omega_k) I_j^+ I_k^+ \right] + \text{H.c.} \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The first term represents a transverse effective field; we have already seen this term as Eq. (12). The second term, the dipolar/offset term, would result in dipolar decoherence. However, since we apply our pulses off resonance, the dominant term in the Hamiltonian is the zero-order offset term of Eq. (11). In a reference frame omitting the dynamics of this most important term (a frame coincident with observation of spin echoes), every term in Eq. (14) becomes time dependent and may be considered to average to zero. The lowest-order *secular* terms appear in second order, consistent with our data.

The importance of this second averaging may explain why more sophisticated pulse sequences such as BR-24 and CORY-48 failed to outperform MREV-16. We find that the first-order dipolar-offset cross term in BR-24 and CORY-48 both have secular terms in the presence of heavy inhomogeneous broadening.

A remaining question is why the MPS experiments outperformed the MAS experiments. A rough comparison, following AHT, may be made as follows. For heavily inhomogeneously broadened samples, the leading order average Hamiltonian leading to decoherence under MAS is the first-order dipolar/offset cross term, $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{D0}^{(1)}$, which is of order $\sim t_c T_2^{-1} (T_2^*)^{-1}$. Here, T_2 is the uncoupled decoherence rate and T_2^* is the FID decay time due to inhomogeneous dephasing. Under CPMG-MREV-16 $\times 120$, the leading order term after second averaging, as discussed above, is $\bar{\mathcal{H}}_{D00}^{(2)} \sim t_c^2 T_2^{-1} (T_2^*)^{-2}$. If the cycle time for the MPS is comparable to the rotation period for MAS, and if the field inhomogeneity is approximately the same for both experiments, then MPS may be expected to outperform MAS if its cycle time is substantially faster than T_2^* . This condition seems to be met in our experiments. A more careful experimental comparison, however, would have to be performed in the same apparatus, so that inhomogeneities are the same in both experiments.

B. Decoherence due to $1/f$ noise

The observation of T_2 due to residual dipolar terms, as discussed in the previous section for single-crystal silicon, is typical of NMR. A more atypical result of the present study is the nonexponential, t_c -independent decoherence in pure polycrystalline silicon samples. We believe this decoherence is due to the same low-frequency noise source that leads to $1/f$ noise in silicon wafers.³³ This noise is attributed to charge traps at lattice defects and other deep impurities,

which lead to fluctuations of the diamagnetic shielding seen at nearby nuclei.

To discuss the t_c dependence, we use the cumulant expansion approach³⁴ to derive a formula for T_2 due to a classical fluctuating local field $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r}_j, t)$ in the presence of a MPS. The periodic, rf-induced evolution of the interaction Hamiltonian in the toggling frame, Eq. (9), is described by a Fourier expansion. The local random magnetic field at the j th nucleus, $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r}_j, t)$, is assumed to fluctuate according to a Markov process with correlation time Γ_j , so that

$$\gamma^2 \langle b^z(\mathbf{r}_j, \tau) b^z(\mathbf{r}_j, 0) \rangle = \Delta_j^2 e^{-\Gamma_j \tau}, \quad (15)$$

where Δ_j^2 is the variance of the frequency shift due to this fluctuating field. The details of this calculation are in Appendix B; the result is

$$\frac{1}{T_{2j}} = \frac{\Delta_j^2}{2} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} A_n^{zz} \frac{\Gamma_j}{\Gamma_j^2 + (2\pi n/t_c)^2}, \quad (16)$$

where the Fourier coefficient A_n^{zz} is found by

$$A_n^{zz} = \frac{1}{t_c} \int_0^{t_c} \frac{\text{Tr}\{U_{\text{rf}}^\dagger(t) I_j^z U_{\text{rf}}(t) I_j^z\}}{I(I+1)/3} e^{-2\pi i n t/t_c} dt. \quad (17)$$

Equation (16) indicates to us that if most spins see a correlation time Γ_j that is smaller than or of the same order as t_c^{-1} , then the observed T_2 should depend on t_c , in contrast to our data for polycrystalline silicon shown in Fig. 4. Our data would seem to be explained by processes with Γ_j much larger than t_c^{-1} , in which case $T_{2j} \propto \Gamma_j$.

The assumption $\Gamma_j \gg t_c^{-1}$ is the common “motional narrowing” or “white-noise” limit for this T_2 noise process. However, the noise is not strictly white at frequencies higher than t_c^{-1} ; in particular, it is unlikely to have a significant component near the Larmor frequency ω_0 , since T_1 , as given by the same approach in Eq. (B7), will then yield a value similar to T_{2j} , unless $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r}_j, t)$ is highly anisotropic. Correspondingly, free carriers and fixed dipolar paramagnetic impurities are unlikely to be responsible for the observed intrinsic T_2 , since these are well known to lead to isotropic magnetic noise with correlation times much shorter than the Larmor period. These sources are undoubtedly present and are likely the cause of the observed T_1 .³⁵

The physical picture we suggest for T_2 decoherence is as follows. Defect states are thermally charged and discharged. The resulting unpaired spins in such states rapidly fluctuate with correlation times far faster than ω_0 , explaining the observed field independence of T_1 but having little effect on T_2 , since the spin fluctuations are too fast. Rather, the much slower charging and discharging of these defect states changes the diamagnetic shielding at nearby nuclear sites, causing “chemical shifts” of order < 1 ppm. This fluctuating chemical shift is the cause of decoherence via spectral diffusion. The cumulant expansion approach leading to Eq. (16) is not appropriate for fluctuations that are very slow in comparison to the measurement time; however, the t_c independence of the data suggests that the dominant source of this decoherence is processes much faster than t_c . These faster processes *are* well described by the cumulant expansion ap-

proach, and since $\sum_n A_n^{zz}=1$, we presume they lead to a local decoherence rate given by

$$\frac{1}{T_{2j}} \approx \frac{\Delta_j^2}{2\Gamma_j}. \quad (18)$$

Although Eq. (18) is sufficient for our purposes, we also clarify the issue of time scales with another, nonperturbative approach³⁶ which neglects the fast MREV-16 pulse sequence but accounts for the slower refocusing effects of the π pulses. In this approach, the decay function with a single refocusing π pulse (Hahn echo) at the $2\tau_e$ echo peak and with frequency shifts fluctuating according to a Poisson random pulse train is given by

$$\langle e^{i\phi(2\tau_e)} \rangle = e^{-2\tau_e\Gamma_j} \left[\frac{\cosh(2\tau_e\Gamma_j\sqrt{1-g_j^2}) - g_j^2}{1-g_j^2} + \frac{\sinh(2\tau_e\Gamma_j\sqrt{1-g_j^2})}{\sqrt{1-g_j^2}} \right], \quad (19)$$

where $g_j = \Delta_j/\Gamma_j$. This result assumes a single π pulse; if we examine the more complicated equations for a train of π pulses, we find results comparable to assuming that unrefocused coherence is forgotten every echo cycle,³⁷ so that

$$\langle e^{i\phi(2n\tau_e)} \rangle \approx \langle e^{i\phi(2\tau_e)} \rangle^n. \quad (20)$$

Although time is measured discretely at the peak of each echo, we will set $t=2n\tau_e$ and treat it as continuous. However, the value of $\tau_e=120t_c$ in comparison to other time scales is critical, as evidenced by the following argument. Suppose nucleus k is coupled to a fluctuator that is slow in comparison to the chemical shift, so that $\Gamma_k \ll \Delta_k$. In this $g_k \rightarrow \infty$ limit, Eqs. (19) and (20) give

$$\langle e^{i\phi_k(t)} \rangle \rightarrow \exp\left(-\frac{4\Delta_k^2\tau_e^2\Gamma_k}{3}t\right). \quad (21)$$

Now suppose nucleus j is coupled to a very fast fluctuator, with $\Gamma_j \gg \Delta_j$. In this $g_j \rightarrow 0$ limit we find

$$\langle e^{i\phi_j(t)} \rangle \rightarrow \exp\left(-\frac{\Delta_j^2}{2\Gamma_j}t\right), \quad (22)$$

the same result as Eq. (18) derived using the toggling frame cumulant expansion in the $\Gamma_j \gg t_c^{-1}$ limit. We now ask whether nucleus j or k contributes more heavily to the observed ensemble signal. In our model, nuclei dephase independently, and the *sum* of their decay functions provides the signal. Consequently, those spins that decay the *slowest* contribute to the signal the most.³⁸ Thus we compare decay rates for our two spins:

$$\frac{T_{2i}}{T_{2k}} = \frac{8\Delta_k^2}{3\Delta_j^2}\Gamma_j\Gamma_k\tau_e^2. \quad (23)$$

If τ_e is larger than the geometric average of the two fluctuator rates, we find that the nuclei coupled to fast oscillators will dominate the sum, as these decay the slowest. The data's independence of $\tau_e=120t_c$ indicates that we are working in this regime, i.e., that our signal is dominated by spins close

to fast oscillators causing rapid spectral diffusion. This is the limit where the perturbative cumulant expansion approach agrees with the nonperturbative approach of Eq. (19). In the following, then, we assume that our signal is dominated by nuclei decaying according to Eq. (18).

We now introduce a distribution of Γ_j across the sample by assuming that the charging/discharging processes leading to this nuclear decoherence are the same as those which are well known to lead to $1/f$ noise near silicon surfaces. The standard model for $1/f$ noise supposes that across the sample, Γ_j is randomly distributed according to the probability density function

$$D_\Gamma(\gamma) = \begin{cases} [\gamma \ln(\Gamma_{\text{high}}/\Gamma_{\text{low}})]^{-1}, & \Gamma_{\text{low}} < \gamma < \Gamma_{\text{high}}, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (24)$$

It may be easily seen that this distribution leads to $1/f$ charge noise for $\Gamma_{\text{low}} \ll f \ll \Gamma_{\text{high}}$. The details of the physical processes leading to this distribution in silicon are discussed in Ref. 33

We presume our nuclei are dephased by a random selection of bistable oscillators with lifetime Γ_j . We also presume the nuclei undergo random shifts Δ_j , and since isotope placement is diffuse and random, we assume Δ_j will be mostly uncorrelated with Γ_j (corresponding to roughly one impurity per nucleus). We therefore arrive at the ensemble decay function

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_j \langle e^{i\phi_j(t)} \rangle &\approx \int d\delta D_\Delta(\delta) \int d\gamma D_\Gamma(\gamma) \exp\left(-\frac{\delta^2}{2\gamma}t\right) \\ &= \int d\delta D_\Delta(\delta) \frac{E_1(\delta^2 t/2\Gamma_{\text{high}}) - E_1(\delta^2 t/2\Gamma_{\text{low}})}{\ln(\Gamma_{\text{high}}/\Gamma_{\text{low}})}, \end{aligned} \quad (25)$$

where $E_1(x)$ is the exponential integral $\int_x^\infty dx e^{-x}/x$. The $E_1(\delta^2 t/2\Gamma_{\text{low}})$ term is much smaller than the $E_1(\delta^2 t/2\Gamma_{\text{high}})$ if $\Gamma_{\text{high}} \gg \Gamma_{\text{low}}$, as appears to be the case for $1/f$ noise observed in silicon, so we neglect this term. For the distribution of frequency shifts $D_\Delta(\delta)$, we assume that δ is peaked around some average $\langle \Delta \rangle$. We thus expand the integrand about this average to lowest order, allowing us to complete the δ integral without detailed knowledge of the distribution:

$$\sum_j \langle e^{i\phi_j(t)} \rangle \approx N^{-1}[E_1(\alpha t) + \beta(1 + 2\alpha t)\exp(-\alpha t)], \quad (26)$$

where $\alpha = \langle \Delta \rangle^2/2\Gamma_{\text{high}}$ and $\beta = \langle \Delta \rangle^2/\langle \Delta \rangle^2 - 1$. (The normalization constant N would be a free parameter for any model, since the magnitude of our data shifts from experiment to experiment due to differing initial magnetizations and probe temperatures.) This function has the correct shape for our data; we also reproduce its shape with computer simulations of the decoherence model described.

Figure 4 shows this theoretical curve, fitted to the data by the Levenberg-Marquadt method for least-squares fitting. We find insignificant difference between fitting all four experimental curves separately or fitting all the data simultaneously. The curve shown fits all the data assuming shared




FIG. 6. (Color online). Residuals versus time. The deviation of the data from the fitting function of Eq. (26), with a histogram of those residuals on the right, consistent with Gaussian noise.

constants α , β but independent normalization constants N for a total of six fitting parameters over 493 data points. The residuals are shown in Fig. 6, where they are checked against Gaussian noise with a χ^2 test.³⁹ The first two echoes are slightly weaker than the theoretical curve, and systematically deviate from the model. This is not surprising, since we omitted the effects of those spins which decay more rapidly due to slower spectral diffusion in the derivation of Eq. (26). Otherwise, we find that the residuals are consistent with $\sigma=0.02$ Gaussian noise with a χ^2 of 1.09 over 16 bins, leaving no indication of systematic disagreement between the data and the model.

The parameter fit is optimized at $\alpha=22\pm 2$ mHz and $\beta=0.20\pm 0.05$. This value of α would be consistent, for example, with an average chemical shift of ~ 0.5 ppm and a cutoff rate constant $\Gamma_{\text{high}}\sim 300$ kHz. In the Dutta-Horn model for $1/f$ noise,⁴⁰ we would expect $\Gamma_{\text{high}}\propto \exp(-E/kT)$, where E is an energy barrier for the fastest charge traps in the sample. This model thus predicts an exponential temperature dependence for this decoherence rate.

In summary, we find that our data in polycrystalline silicon is consistent with our model for decoherence induced by $1/f$ charging processes superimposed over unbiased Gaussian noise. This decoherence source should diminish in single crystals, as shown in our single-crystal data, and at low temperatures.

V. CONCLUSION

Our results have relevance for potential silicon-based quantum computers for two reasons. First, our CPMG-MREV- 16×120 experiment showed that, even at room temperature, nuclear coherence times exceed at least 25 s in single crystals, a modest lower bound for what is possible after isotopic depletion, sample cooling, and pulse sequence optimization. Second, the same experiment in polycrystalline silicon revealed experimentally the decoherence source that is likely to dominate silicon-based NMR computers: magnetic fluctuations due to $1/f$ noise at silicon surfaces. We

believe this result provides a first step in characterizing this decoherence in order that it may be avoided in potential devices. The elimination of $1/f$ noise from oxides and interfaces poses a critical fabrication challenge in quantum computing designs based on semiconductor impurities^{8,41} and Josephson junctions,^{28–30} but this noise is expected to be very small in high-quality bulk single-crystal silicon at low temperature.

Decoupling pulse sequences such as those used here have been proposed for nuclear memory in high-mobility GaAs/AlGaAs heterostructures.⁴² We caution that the large rf power required to effectively decouple the ubiquitous nuclear spins in this system may be inconsistent with millikelvin operation, even if small, high- Q coils and low-power, windowless sequences⁴³ are employed. For this reason, we believe isotopically depleted silicon to be a more promising material for nuclear quantum memory, assuming that efficient methods for transferring quantum information to and from its well-isolated nuclei can be found. The results presented here indicate no serious obstacle for the use of silicon nuclei as robust quantum memory in future devices.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The work at Stanford was sponsored by the DARPA-QuIST program. T.D.L. was supported by the Fannie and John Hertz Foundation. The work at Keio was partially supported by the Grant-in-Aid for Scientific Research in Priority Areas, Semiconductor Nanospintronics, No. 14076215. E.A. and K.M.I. thank the technical staff of the Central Research Facility of Keio University for the assistance with the MAS NMR measurements. We also thank N. Khaneja, R. de Sousa, C. Ramanathan, and D. G. Cory for useful discussions.

APPENDIX A: ENSEMBLE VS SINGLE-SPIN MEASUREMENT

We have compared our results for measurement of the T_2 decay of an ensemble of nuclei to the results of decoherence measurements of single qubits, but there are differences between ensemble measurements and single-qubit measurements. Important differences could include the practicality of each measurement method, the effect of back action, and the sensitivity to initial conditions. Even if measurement artifacts due to such factors are neglected, though, a fundamental difference between the two measurement types remains. We discuss this difference using the following formalism.

By definition, single-qubit decoherence is the uncontrolled decay of off-diagonal elements of the qubit density matrix in the logical basis. To be precise, let us denote by $\rho_j(t)$ the density matrix of the system after tracing over all degrees of freedom other than the j th qubit. The off-diagonal components are given by the function

$$G_j(t) = \frac{\text{Tr}\{I_j^+ \rho_j(t)\}}{\text{Tr}\{I_j^+ \rho_j(0)\}}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

The magnitude of this function will decay in the presence of decoherence. If single-nuclear-spin measurement were pos-

sible, then $|G_j(t)|$ is the decay function that we would construct by initializing a single spin in the same state many times, measuring its x and y spin projections (in separate experiments) at different times t , and averaging the results of an ensemble of experiments.

When we make a heterodyne NMR measurement of N spins evolving according to some pulse sequence, our observable is $\sum_{j=1}^N I_j^+$. In this discussion, we neglect the small variation in measurement strengths for each spin due to rf inhomogeneity. When we examine the magnitude $|M(t)|$ of the measured magnetization, we obtain

$$|M(t)|^2 = \frac{\sum_{j=1}^N G_j(t) \sum_{k=1}^N G_k^*(t)}{\sum_{j=1}^N G_j(0) \sum_{k=1}^N G_k^*(0)}. \quad (\text{A2})$$

If we assume that each qubit begins in the same initial state, as occurs in our sequence, this may be simplified to

$$|M(t)|^2 = \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_j |G_j(t)|^2 + \frac{1}{N^2} \sum_{j \neq k} G_j(t) G_k^*(t). \quad (\text{A3})$$

The first term may be recognized as an average of single-spin measurement results. The second term may be recognized as an interference term. As a simple example of this formalism, suppose there is only inhomogeneous broadening with no refocusing π pulses (so that each qubit oscillates at its own frequency ω_j) but otherwise no decoherence. Then $G_j(t) = \exp(i\omega_j t)$ and

$$|M(t)|^2 = \frac{1 + N^{-1} \sum_{j \neq k} e^{i(\omega_j - \omega_k)t}}{N} \rightarrow e^{-2t/T_2^*}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

The presence of inhomogeneous broadening is the most obvious difference between an ensemble and a single-spin measurement; hence the π pulses used to refocus such effects are crucial. As noted in Sec. IV A, inhomogeneous broadening continues to play a limiting role for decoherence in second-order AHT.

The principal question now is whether the dynamics in our system cause *constructive* or *destructive* interference in the second term of Eq. (A3). We would expect constructive interference in a system of high symmetry such as dipolar coupling in CaF_2 ; here the ensemble average is equivalent to a series of single-spin measurements, and the oscillatory character of the dipolar dynamics is revealed in experiments.⁴⁴ However, in isotopically natural silicon, the nuclear-nuclear couplings are random. When dipole-dipole couplings are the source of decoherence, as in our experiments in single crystals, each spin undergoes different oscillations in its own dipolar environment, and destructive interference is seen. Therefore, the dipole-limited coherence times we observe are underestimates for what one might observe through a series of single-spin measurements on a typical nucleus, for which more oscillatory decay curves would be expected. To illustrate this argument, we show in Fig. 7 the result of a simulation of eight spins evolving according to a dipolar coupling with couplings drawn randomly from a uniform distribution between $-D_0/2$ and $D_0/2$. While the initial decay observed in $|M(t)|$ represents the average of the




FIG. 7. (Color online) Simulated dipolar decoherence versus time. The broken lines represent individual spin measurements $\text{Re}\{G_j(t)\}$ on an eight-spin simulation of dipolar evolution with uniformly random coupling constants with range $[-D_0/2, D_0/2]$. The solid line is the magnitude sum $|M(t)|$.

initial decay of the individual spin measurements $G_j(t)$, the sum $|M(t)|$ masks the longer-lived oscillations observable in individual spin measurements.

When spectral diffusion is the leading cause of decoherence, single-spin decoherence would also be recovered in the ensemble measurement if each qubit witnessed the same noise spectral density. A canonical example of such *homogeneous* broadening is Doppler broadening in the optical spectroscopy of gases. In contrast, our model for spectral diffusion in polycrystalline silicon, discussed in Sec. IV B, proposes that the random fluctuating environment seen by each nucleus is different, depending on both the lifetime of the electronic fluctuation near each nucleus and the frequency shift it causes. Hence a spin-echo experiment on a single spin might result in a decay from one echo to the next given by Eq. (19), whereas a sum over many such spins yields the different function of Eq. (26). In this case the more rapidly diffusing spins contribute less to the ensemble average, and therefore the observed coherence times represent overestimates for what one might observe through a series of single-spin measurements on a typical nucleus.

APPENDIX B: CUMULANT EXPANSION IN THE TOGGLING FRAME

Nuclear relaxation is often theoretically described by a cumulant expansion approach,³⁴ which we employ here to analyze the importance of the MPS on T_2 relaxation due to a classically fluctuating field. In this approach, we seek the time dependence of $I_j^+ = I_j^x + iI_j^y$ from an initial state in which the spin begins in the transverse plane, as this is the measured observable with heterodyne detection of a toggling-frame FID experiment. We thus seek a phase decay for the j th spin, which is formally defined by

$$\langle e^{i\phi_j(t)} \rangle = \frac{\langle \text{Tr}\{U_{\text{env}}^\dagger(t) I_j^+ U_{\text{env}}(t) I_j^-\} \rangle}{\text{Tr}\{I_j^+ I_j^-\}}, \quad (\text{B1})$$

where $U_{\text{env}} = \mathcal{T} \exp(-i \int_0^t \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{env}}(t') dt' / \hbar)$. Here, $\langle \cdot \rangle$ refers to averaging over the classical random fields. To evaluate this function perturbatively, we assume

$$\langle e^{i\phi_j(t)} \rangle = \exp[\Psi_j(t)],$$

and expand $\Psi_j(t)$ in powers of the small perturbative Hamiltonian $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{env}}(t)$. The lowest-order result may be written⁴⁴

$$\langle e^{i\phi_j(t)} \rangle \approx \exp\left(-\int_0^t (t-\tau) \frac{\langle \text{Tr}\{[I_j^\dagger, \tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{env}}(\tau)][\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{env}}(0), I_j]\} \rangle}{\hbar^2 \text{Tr}\{I_j^\dagger I_j\}} d\tau\right). \quad (\text{B2})$$

The environment-coupling Hamiltonian in the rotating, toggling reference frame, $\tilde{\mathcal{H}}_{\text{env}}(t)$, contains two kinds of terms, which vary by the frequency at which the constituent spin operators oscillate due to the rotating and toggling frame transformations. There are the longitudinal terms, proportional to I_j^z , and the transverse terms, proportional to $I_j^\pm(t)$. All components oscillate according to the periodic rotations incurred by the pulse sequence; for these oscillations, we imagine expanding each spin operator in a Fourier series. For example, I_j^z in the rotating, toggling frame is written

$$U_{\text{rf}}^\dagger(t) I_j^z U_{\text{rf}}(t) = \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha=x,y,z} A_n^{z\alpha} e^{2\pi n i t / t_c} I_j^\alpha. \quad (\text{B3})$$

The transverse spin components, however, also oscillate at $\omega/2\pi=59.575$ MHz, the fastest frequency in the system. Thus the transverse components are written

$$U_{\text{rf}}^\dagger(t) I_j^\pm(t) U_{\text{rf}}(t) = e^{\pm i\omega t} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha=x,y,z} A_n^{\pm\alpha} e^{2\pi n i t / t_c} I_j^\alpha, \quad (\text{B4})$$

where $A^{\pm\alpha} = A^{x\alpha} + iA^{y\alpha}$. Thus, Eq. (B2) may be expanded as

$$\langle e^{i\phi_j(t)} \rangle = \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \sum_{s,r=0,\pm 1} \frac{A_n^{sr}}{1+s^2} \int_0^t (t-\tau) \times \langle b^{-s}(\mathbf{r}_j, t) b^r(\mathbf{r}_j, 0) \rangle e^{i(s\omega + 2\pi n i / t_c)t} d\tau\right). \quad (\text{B5})$$

We now assume that the components of $\mathbf{b}(\mathbf{r}_j, t)$ are uncorrelated, and assume cylindrical symmetry about the magnetic field, simplifying the sum over coordinates to

$$\langle e^{i\phi_j(t)} \rangle = \exp\left[-\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \sum_{n=-\infty}^{\infty} \left(A_n^{zz} \int_0^t (t-\tau) \times \langle b^z(\mathbf{r}_j, \tau) b^z(\mathbf{r}_j, 0) \rangle e^{2\pi n i t / t_c} d\tau + \sum_{s=\pm} \frac{A_n^{s,-s}}{2} \int_0^t (t-\tau) \times \langle b^{-s}(\mathbf{r}_j, \tau) b^s(\mathbf{r}_j, 0) \rangle e^{i(s\omega_0 + 2\pi n i / t_c)t} d\tau \right)\right]. \quad (\text{B6})$$

A similar calculation for T_{1j} , the thermal relaxation time for the j th spin, yields

$$e^{-t/T_{1j}} = \exp\left(-\frac{\gamma^2}{2} \int_0^t (t-\tau) \sum_{s=\pm} \langle b^{-s}(\mathbf{r}_j, \tau) b^s(\mathbf{r}_j, 0) \rangle e^{\pm i\omega_0 \tau} d\tau\right). \quad (\text{B7})$$

Although T_1 has been measured as 4.5 h for the sample in question, this bulk result is a consequence of both the relaxation of individual spins and spin diffusion. However, spin diffusion occurs on a time scale $T_2 \sim 10$ ms $\ll T_1$. Therefore, the thermal relaxation of individual spins must be on the order of hours. The second term of Eq. (B6) may be recognized as a T_1 term (lifetime broadening), and may be neglected in the current discussion.

We now use the autocorrelation function for a Markov process, Eq. (15). The important result of the cumulant expansion is the limit $t \gg \Gamma_j^{-1}$, where the time is sampled much more slowly than the fluctuations in $b^z(\mathbf{r}_j, t)$. Then we find that each spin loses phase coherence with time scale T_{2j} as given by Eq. (16).

It is important to remember that this theory is not sufficient for describing very slow fluctuations, for two reasons. First, we assumed the fluctuation time scale is much slower than the measurement time. Second, very slow fluctuations are partially refocused by the π pulses, a process not accounted for in this approach.

*Electronic address: tladd@stanford.edu

[†]Currently at Max-Planck-Institut für Festkörperforschung, D-70569, Stuttgart, Germany.

[‡]Also at National Institute of Informatics, Tokyo, Japan.

¹M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2000).

²P.W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **52**, R2493 (1995); A. M. Steane, Phys. Rev. Lett. **77**, 793 (1996).

³P.W. Shor, in *Proceedings, 37th Annual Symposium on Fundamentals of Computer Science (FOCS)* (IEEE Press, Los

Alamitos, CA, 1996), p. 56.

⁴D. P. DiVincenzo, Science **270**, 255 (1995).

⁵N. A. Gershenfeld and I. L. Chuang, Science **275**, 350 (1997); D. G. Cory, A. F. Fahmy, and T. F. Havel, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. U.S.A. **94**, 1634 (1997).

⁶B. Sapoval and D. Lepine, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **27**, 115 (1966).

⁷T. D. Ladd, J. R. Goldman, F. Yamaguchi, Y. Yamamoto, E. Abe, and K. M. Itoh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **89**, 017901 (2002).

⁸B. E. Kane, Nature (London) **393**, 133 (1998).

⁹A. E. Dementyev, D. Li, K. MacLean, and S. E. Barrett, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 153302 (2003); S. Watanabe and S. Sasaki, Jpn. J.

- Appl. Phys., Part 2 **42**, L1350 (2003).
- ¹⁰K. M. Itoh *et al.*, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys., Part 1 **42**, 6248 (2003).
- ¹¹F. Yamaguchi, T. D. Ladd, C. P. Master, Y. Yamamoto, and N. Khaneja, (unpublished).
- ¹²C. Ramanathan, H. Cho, P. Cappellaro, G. S. Boutis, and D. G. Cory, Chem. Phys. Lett. **369**, 311 (2003).
- ¹³A. Abragam, *Principles of Nuclear Magnetism* (Clarendon Press, Oxford, 1961).
- ¹⁴M. Mehring, *Principles of High Resolution NMR in Solids* (Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983).
- ¹⁵U. Haeberlen and J. S. Waugh, Phys. Rev. **175**, 453 (1968).
- ¹⁶P. Mansfield, M. J. Orchard, D. C. Stalker, and K. H. B. Richards, Phys. Rev. B **7**, 90 (1973); W.-K. Rhim, D. D. Elleman, and R. W. Vaughan, J. Chem. Phys. **59**, 3740 (1973).
- ¹⁷D. P. Burum and W. K. Rhim, J. Chem. Phys. **71**, 944 (1979).
- ¹⁸D. G. Cory, J. B. Miller, and A. N. Garroway, J. Magn. Reson. (1969-1992) **90**, 205 (1990).
- ¹⁹G. S. Boutis, P. Cappellaro, H. Cho, C. Ramanathan, and D. G. Cory, J. Magn. Reson. **161**, 132 (2003).
- ²⁰S. Meiboom and D. Gill, Rev. Sci. Instrum. **29**, 6881 (1958).
- ²¹We note that the CPMG convention changes the sequence according to the initial phase of the nuclear qubit, which is incompatible with the memory of unknown or entangled quantum states. However, more complex NMR techniques such as composite pulses are known to allow phase-independent pulse correction [M. H. Levitt and R. Freeman, J. Magn. Reson. (1969-1992) **43**, 65 (1981)]. The MREV-16 sequence and the observed T_2 times are otherwise independent of the initial nuclear phase.
- ²²D. W. Leung, I. L. Chuang, F. Yamaguchi, and Y. Yamamoto, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 042310 (2000).
- ²³E. D. Ostroff and J. S. Waugh, Phys. Rev. Lett. **16**, 1097 (1966); D. Suwelack and J. S. Waugh, Phys. Rev. B **22**, 5110 (1980).
- ²⁴A. S. Verhulst, D. Maryenko, Y. Yamamoto, and K. M. Itoh, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 054105 (2003).
- ²⁵K. Takyu, K. M. Itoh, K. Oka, N. Saito, and V. I. Ozhogin, Jpn. J. Appl. Phys., Part 2 **38**, L1493 (1999).
- ²⁶S. Idziak and U. Haeberlen, J. Magn. Reson. (1969-1992) **50**, 281 (1982).
- ²⁷R. G. Shulman and B. J. Wyluda, Phys. Rev. **103**, 1127 (1956); G. Lampel and I. Solomon, C. R. Hebd. Seances Acad. Sci. **258**, 2289 (1964); B. Sapoval and D. Lepine, J. Phys. Chem. Solids **27**, 115 (1966).
- ²⁸J. E. Mooij *et al.*, Science **285**, 1036 (1999); I. Chiorescu, Y. Nakamura, C. J. P. M. Harmans, and J. E. Mooij, *ibid.* **299**, 1869 (2003).
- ²⁹Y. Makhlin, G. Schön, and A. Shnirman, Nature (London) **398**, 305 (1999); Yu. A. Pashkin *et al.*, *ibid.* **421**, 823 (2003); D. Vion *et al.*, Science **296**, 886 (2002).
- ³⁰Y. Yu, S. Han, X. Chu, S.-I. Chu, and Z. Wang, Science **296**, 889 (2002); A. J. Berkley *et al.*, *ibid.* **300**, 1548 (2003).
- ³¹H. Kessemeier and R. E. Norberg, Phys. Rev. **155**, 321 (1967).
- ³²U. Haeberlen, J. D. Ellet, Jr., and J. Waugh, J. Chem. Phys. **55**, 53 (1971).
- ³³R. D. Black, M. B. Weissman, and P. J. Restle, J. Appl. Phys. **53**, 6280 (1982); Phys. Rev. B **28**, 1935 (1983).
- ³⁴R. Kubo and K. Tomita, J. Phys. Soc. Jpn. **9**, 888 (1954).
- ³⁵This speculation is suggested by the temperature dependence of T_1 in silicon with less than about 10^{15}cm^{-3} shallow dopants (Ref. 6); its exponential form suggests an important role for thermally activated carriers.
- ³⁶G. M. Zhidomirov and K. M. Salikhov, Sov. Phys. JETP **29**, 1037 (1969); R. de Sousa and S. Das Sarma, Phys. Rev. B **68**, 115322 (2003).
- ³⁷R. de Sousa (unpublished).
- ³⁸This is in contrast to models where a single electron spin (Ref. 36) or Josephson junction qubit [E. Paladino, L. Faoro, G. Falci, and R. Fazio, Phys. Rev. Lett. **88**, 228304 (2002)] couples to many bistable fluctuators, and the *fastest* decaying components contribute most to the final signal, which is calculated as a product over fluctuators rather than a sum.
- ³⁹P. R. Bevington and D. K. Robinson, *Data Reduction and Error Analysis for the Physical Sciences*, 2nd ed. (McGraw-Hill, New York, 1992).
- ⁴⁰P. Dutta, P. Dimon, and P. M. Horn, Phys. Rev. Lett. **43**, 646 (1979).
- ⁴¹R. Vrijen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 012306 (2000).
- ⁴²J. M. Taylor, C. M. Marcus, and M. D. Lukin, Phys. Rev. Lett. **90**, 206803 (2003).
- ⁴³D. P. Burum, M. Linder, and R. R. Ernst, J. Magn. Reson. (1969-1992) **44**, 173 (1981).
- ⁴⁴B. Cowan, *Nuclear Magnetic Resonance and Relaxation* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K. 1997).