

# **Development of an open-source calibration framework for superconducting qubits**



Master's degree in Physics

---

**Candidate:**

Elisa Stabilini

28326A

July 4th 2025

Università degli Studi di Milano - Department of Physics

**Supervisor:**

Prof. Dr. Stefano Carrazza

**Co-supervisors:**

Dr. Alessandro Candido

Dr. Andrea Pasquale

Dott. Edoardo Pedicillo

# Table of contents

1. Superconducting qubits
2. Quantum Middleware
3. Average Clifford gate fidelity optimization
4. Library additions
5. Conclusions & Outlooks

# Quantum Computing, what for?

- **Simulation of quantum system:**  
"Nature isn't classical, dammit, and if you want to make a simulation of nature, you'd better make it quantum mechanical, and by golly it's a wonderful problem, because it doesn't look so easy"  
- Richard Feynman, 1982, Simulating Physics with Computers
- Optimization and modeling (chemistry, finance, traffic, weather...), eg. VQE, QAOA
- Quantum Algorithms
- Quantum Machine Learning




## **Superconducting qubits**

---

# Artificial atoms

Qubit: two level system

Superconducting qubits: use Josephson Junctions to build anharmonic oscillators



DOI: 10.1109/MAP.2022.3176593

# Qubit control

Microwave pulse applied to the qubit

$$V_d(t) = A\varepsilon(t) \sin(\omega_d t + \alpha)$$


Qubit - electric field Hamiltonian (RWA)

$$\hat{H} = -\frac{\hbar(\omega_q - \omega_d)}{2}\hat{\sigma}_z + \frac{\hbar\Omega}{2}\varepsilon(t)(\hat{\sigma}_x \cos \alpha + \hat{\sigma}_y \sin \alpha)$$

Qubit evolution under microwave pulse:

$$R_{\hat{n}(\alpha)}(\theta) = e^{-\frac{i}{2}\hat{n}(\alpha) \cdot \vec{\sigma}\theta} = e^{-\frac{i}{2}(\hat{\sigma}_x \cos \alpha + \hat{\sigma}_y \sin \alpha)\theta}$$

where  $\theta = \Omega \int_0^{+\infty} \varepsilon(t') dt'$



DOI: 10.1109/MAP.2022.3176593

# State readout

Qubit - resonator Hamiltonian:


$$\hat{H} = \hbar\omega_r \hat{a}\hat{a}^\dagger - \frac{\hbar\omega_{01}}{2} \hat{\sigma}_z + \hbar g (\hat{\sigma}^+ \hat{a} + \hat{\sigma}^- \hat{a}^\dagger)$$

Dispersive regime ( $g \ll \omega_q - \omega_r$ ):

$$\hat{H}_{disp} = \hbar(\omega_r - \chi \hat{\sigma}_z) \hat{a}^\dagger \hat{a} - \frac{\hbar}{2} (\omega_{01} + \chi) \hat{\sigma}_z$$

dispersive shift:  $\chi = \frac{g^2}{\Delta}$ ,


$$\Delta = \omega_q - \omega_r$$



# **Quantum Middleware**

---

# Superconducting qubit calibration




We need to calibrate *only* native gates pulses

Native single qubit gates on superconducting qubits:  $R_X(\pi)$ ,  $R_X(\frac{\pi}{2})$ ,  $R_Z(\theta)$

For each pulse we calibrate frequency, duration, power, shape

# Qibo framework



## Average Clifford gate fidelity optimization

---

## Randomized Benchmarking [Knill et al. 2008]

Randomized benchmarking estimates average gate fidelity by applying random sequences of Clifford gates followed by an inverting gate.

Randomization with Clifford gates provides a depolarized noise channel:

$$\rho \rightarrow d \frac{\mathbb{I}}{2} + (1 - d)\rho$$


Randomized Benchmarking protocol:

1. Initialize the system in the ground state
2. For each sequence length  $m$  draw a sequence of Clifford group elements
3. Calculate the inverse gate
4. Measure complete sequence
5. Repeat the process for multiple sequences of the same length while varying the length

# Randomized Benchmarking [Knill et al. 2008]

The survival probability decays exponentially with the number of Clifford gates  
 $F(m) = Ap^m + B$  where  $1 - p$  is the depolarization rate.


From  $p$  we can extract the average error per Clifford gate.



Can we optimize the average Clifford gate fidelity to automate  $R_X(\pi)$  gate recalibration?

## RB optimization [Kelly et al. 2014]

Test closed-loop optimization with modern optimization libraries




Optimization parameters:

Pulse amplitude


Pulse frequency

Pulse shape (through  $\beta$  DRAG parameter)

# Average Clifford gate Fidelity



# Parameters evolution



## Library additions




---

# Native RX90


Qibolab single-qubit native gates are  $R_X(\pi)$  and  $MZ$

$R_X(\frac{\pi}{2})$  gate is implemented by halving the calibrated values for  $R_X(\pi)$

Add native  $R_X(\frac{\pi}{2})$  for more precise gates implementation




# Rabi amplitude experiment



# Flux pulse reconstruction [Rol et al. 2020]


Transmon frequency dependence on magnetic flux:

$$f_q(\Phi_q) \approx \left( \sqrt{8E_J E_C} \left| \cos \left( \pi \frac{\Phi_q}{\Phi_0} \right) \right| \right)$$




Detuning as function of the flux pulse:

$$\Delta f_q = \frac{\varphi_{\tau+\Delta\tau} - \varphi_\tau}{2\pi} \approx \frac{1}{\Delta\tau} \int_{\tau}^{\tau+\Delta\tau} \Delta f_q(\Phi_{q,\tau+\Delta\tau}(t))$$







# Filter determination



1. Determine exponential correction
2. Obtain coefficients for the Infinite Impulse Response from exponential correction
3. Determine Finite Impulse Response coefficients
4. Obtain coefficients for real-time correction

# Impact of correction on chevron plots



# Cryoscope routine



Qibocal · v0.2.2

Search

INTRODUCTION

Installation instructions

How to use Qibocal?

How to execute calibration protocols in Qibocal?

Minimal working example

GUIDES

Tutorials

Protocols

Time Of Flight (Readout)

Calibrate Discrimination Kernels

Resonator spectroscopy

Resonator punchout

Qubit spectroscopies

Rabi experiments

Ramsey experiments

`relaxation_time: float`

Wait time for the qubit to decohere back to the *gnd* state.

## Example

A possible runcard to launch a Cryoscope experiment could be the following:

```
- id: cryoscope

operation: cryoscope
parameters:
    duration_max: 80
    duration_min: 1
    duration_step: 1
    flux_pulse_amplitude: 0.7
    relaxation_time: 50000
```

The expected output is the following:



### Note

In the case where there are no filters the protocol will compute the FIR and the IIR filters. If the filters are already present the computation of the filters will be skipped and only the reconstructed waveform will be shown.

## Requirements

• Single Shot Experiments

ON THIS PAGE  
Cryoscope  
Parameters  
Example  
Requirements

## **Conclusions & Outlooks**

---

## Gate recalibration by RB optimization

- ✓ We can always find parameters configuration with average Clifford gate fidelity > 99.5%
- ✓ Does **not rely on manual tuning** by an operator
- ✗ RB evaluation is **computationally expensive** ( $\sim 30$  minutes)
- ✗ More stable methods (eg. Nelder-Mead) require many cost function evaluation
- ✗ Parameters drift makes optimization unstable

Possible future work: **optimize RB parameters** to allow a faster and more reliable optimization

## Library additions

- ✓ Extended Qibolab and Qibocal libraries to support **native  $R_X(\pi/2)$  gates** with dedicated calibration routines
- ✓ Implemented and added the **Cryoscope** calibration experiment to Qibocal library to correct flux-pulse distortions (average NMSE improvement  $\sim 70\%$ )
- ✗ Study long-time distortions of the flux-pulse

Possible future extensions:

- Readout optimization protocols
- Active qubit reset schemes
- Implement leakage mitigation strategies

**Thank you**

## References








---

-  Kelly, J. et al. (June 2014). “**Optimal Quantum Control Using Randomized Benchmarking**”. en. In: *Physical Review Letters* 112.24, p. 240504. ISSN: 0031-9007, 1079-7114. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.240504. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.112.240504> (visited on 02/24/2025).
-  Knill, E. et al. (Jan. 2008). “**Randomized benchmarking of quantum gates**”. In: *Phys. Rev. A* 77 (1), p. 012307. DOI: 10.1103/PhysRevA.77.012307. URL: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.77.012307>.
-  Rol, M. A. et al. (Feb. 2020). “**Time-domain characterization and correction of on-chip distortion of control pulses in a quantum processor**”. en. In: *Applied Physics Letters* 116.5. arXiv:1907.04818 [quant-ph], p. 054001. ISSN: 0003-6951, 1077-3118. DOI: 10.1063/1.5133894. URL: <http://arxiv.org/abs/1907.04818> (visited on 02/24/2025).

## Backup slides

---

# Qubit platforms

	atoms	electron superconducting loops & controlled spin	photons	
vendors	 	   	 	
labs (*)	        	      	                     	      

[cc] Olivier Erratty, October 2021

# Calibration workflow & assessment

Procedure:

1. Resonator characterization
2. Qubit characterization
3. Gate calibration
4. Gate set characterization

Metrics example:

- readout & assignment fidelity
- relaxation time  $T_1$
- decoherence time  $T_2$
- gate fidelity

# Calibration workflow & assessment

Main steps:

1. Resonator characterization
2. Qubit characterization
3. Gate calibration
4. Gate set characterization

Calibration quality metrics:


- readout & assignment fidelity
- relaxation time  $T_1$
- decoherence time  $T_2$
- gate fidelity

<b>Qubit</b>	<b>Readout Fidelity</b>	<b>Assignment Fidelity</b>	<b>T1 [μs]</b>	<b>T2 [μs]</b>	<b>Gate infidelity (<math>\cdot 10^{-3}</math>)</b>
<b>D1</b>	0.876	0.938	$26.4 \pm 0.4$	$13.0 \pm 2.0$	$27.0 \pm 21.0$
<b>D2</b>	0.945	0.973	$14.9 \pm 0.1$	$18.0 \pm 10.0$	$20.5 \pm 6.2$
<b>D3</b>	0.905	0.952	$23.6 \pm 0.3$	$28.0 \pm 12.0$	$7.0 \pm 18$
<b>D4</b>	0.929	0.964	$20.6 \pm 0.2$	$38.0 \pm 5.2$	$4.4 \pm 4.8$
<b>B2</b>	0.902	0.951	$17.5 \pm 0.2$	$27.5 \pm 5.2$	$18.0 \pm 16$

# Clifford gates


- Special subset of quantum gates that map Pauli operators to Pauli operators under conjugation
- Clifford gates group is generated by  $H$ ,  $S$ , ( $CNOT$ ) gates
- Quantum circuits that consist of only Clifford gates can be efficiently simulated with a classical computer  
(Gottesman–Knill theorem)

**Hadamard (H)**



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

**Phase (S, P)**



$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{bmatrix}$$

**Controlled Not (CNOT, CX)**



$$\begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

## RB optimization summary



Analysis Name	Iterations	Time [s]	Fidelity Best	Amplitude Best [a.u.]	Frequency Best [ $\times 10^9$ Hz]	$\beta$ Best
Nelder_Mead	40	2892	0.99731	0.04063	4.95701	-1.53253
init_simplex_1	40	3096	0.99533	0.04069	4.95820	-
init_simplex_2	40	3128	0.99564	0.04131	4.95817	-
init_simplex_3	40	3190	0.99554	0.04058	4.95819	-
SLSQP	15	3873	0.99518	0.04058	4.95822	-0.00115
CMA-ES	30	4536	0.99665	-0.16634	4.95822	0.08802
optuna_30	30	763	0.99583	0.28059	4.95601	2.75519
optuna_100	100	2257	0.99645	0.29026	4.955279	-1.46504
optuna_1000	1000	21811	0.99847	-0.00051	4.961836	0.2222
optuna no $\beta$	1000	21820	0.99846	0.04104	4.957374	-

## Filter determination details

Compensate distortion using a digital IIR filter based on an inverted exponential model

$$s_{\text{corr}}(t) = \frac{s(t)}{g(1 - Ae^{-t/\tau})}$$

parameters  $g$ ,  $A$ , and  $\tau$  are estimated via least-squares minimization using `scipy.optimize`



## Filter determination details

Digital IIR filter implemented in control hardware using discretized coefficients.

$$a_0 y[n] = \sum_{i=0}^N b_i x[n-i] - \sum_{i=1}^M a_i y[n-i],$$

Filter coefficients derived from fitted parameters (1st order IIR):

$$a_0 = 1,$$

where  $\alpha = 1 - \exp\left(-\frac{1}{f_s \cdot \tau(1+A)}\right)$  and

$$a_1 = -(1 - \alpha),$$

$$b_0 = 1 - k + k\alpha,$$

$$b_1 = -(1 - k)(1 - \alpha),$$

$$k = \begin{cases} \frac{A}{(1+A)(1-\alpha)}, & \text{if } A < 0, \\ \frac{A}{1+A-\alpha}, & \text{if } A \geq 0, \end{cases}$$

FIR filters:

$$y[n] = \sum_{i=0}^N b_i x[n-i],$$

FIR filter coefficients are optimized using CMA-ES to minimize the average relative deviation between the FIR-filtered IIR-corrected signal and the ideal step response.