6)	Characterization	20	Quantum	Processes
- /		()-		

Previous chapters: Implementation of quantum gates and measurements.

In practice, such operations are subject to errors, e.g. due to ...

... decoherence of qubits during the operation. ... impaged control pulses.

Question: How to experimentally verify the posformance of a quantum operation?

6.1 State tomography

God: Infer density matrix g of an unknown stake from a set of measurements.

A Single quantum measurement connot distinguish botween non-orthogonal states, e.g. 10> and (10> +11>)AZ. Furthermore, outcome of measurements is probabilistic.

=> Nead ability to prepare quantum system repealedly in 8 to porform multiple experiments and average.

Elements of 8 are not directly measurable. Need to express in terms of measurable observables.

For single qubit:

Exercise: Show that (*) holds, by explicitly very fing
Measurement of expectation values (Ti) provides estimate of g.
Typically, apparatus measures in Z-basis
: - [prep 8]
How to measure in x & y basis? Insert - Ry(=)} or - Rx(=) Basis rotation pulses prior to measurement.
How to ensure that g estimated according to (*) is physical, i.e. Tr[g]=1 and g>1?
Consider the (extreme) case, in which we measure 5 times in each basis and obtain "o" in all 3x5=15 individual shots. For a state 10> this would e.g. occur with a (small) probability (2) x (2) = 0.1%.
=> <\tau_x> = <\tau_x> = <\tau_x> = 1 our estimated expectation
$= \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{2}{1} \right)^{-1} $ regalive eigenvalue!

Avoid un physical density matrix by asking: "What is the most likely physical dens. mat.
given the observed measurements?" = Maximum likelihood estimation Assuming independence of measurements and Gaussian distribution underlying the observables: 210g = [(Ti) - Tr [STi] /V: measured average of observable denc. matrix hegalive log-likelihood function Minimize Zlog W.T.+ elements of S subject to 8 > 0. Constrained ophinization. Solve e.g. using Sani-definit programming. Generalize to multiple qubits: 8= 2 = 2 \ \ \(\tau_{i_1,...,i_n} \) \(\tau_{i_1} \dots \tau_{i_n} \dots \dots \tau_{i_n} \dots \tau_{i_n} \dots \tau_{i_n} \dots \tau_{i_n} \dots \tau_{i_n} \dots \dots \tau_{i_n} \dots \dots \tau_{i_n} \dots \dot with T: E & MIT, J, J = 3 Full state tomo requires measurement of 4"-1 Pauli expediction values.

How close is measured state to target state? Heasure of distance: Fidelity F I = /(4/0/24) for pure target state = to the site for mixed St. For mathematical properties and motivation of this metric, see Nielsen & awang 9.2 6.2 Process tomography 8 -> E(8) quantum operation Example 1: E(g) = UgUt unitary

~ 2: E(g) = M; gM; measurement with orkere j

More generally $\mathcal{E}(g) = \sum_{k} E_{k} g E_{k}$ operator sum representation

Example: Decay with pros. of

En = (0.18)

En = (0.18)

10×01 g = 10×01 = (10×01) = (10×01) = (10×01) 3

troperhes of 2: · to [E(g)] = "prob that process & occurs" · completely positive · convex-linear map How to characterize a process? => Pesform state tomo on output states for complete set of (known) input states. basis rotation pulses Different representations: · X-malrix . Pauli transfer matrix R " with elements (Ti, Ti, ... >

(ET 1 2x 12x 25 3

example see slide.