



Locality and Error Mitigation of Quantum Circuits

Quantum Wednesday

Nate Stemen

Apr 19, 2023

Locality and Error Mitigation of Quantum Circuits

Minh C. Tran,¹ Kunal Sharma,¹ and Kristan Temme¹


¹*IBM Quantum, IBM T.J. Watson Research Center, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, USA*

(Dated: March 14, 2023)

In this work, we study and improve two leading error mitigation techniques, namely Probabilistic Error Cancellation (PEC) and Zero-Noise Extrapolation (ZNE), for estimating the expectation value of local observables. For PEC, we introduce a new estimator that takes into account the light cone of the unitary circuit with respect to a target local observable. Given a fixed error tolerance, the sampling overhead for the new estimator can be several orders of magnitude smaller than the standard PEC estimators. For ZNE, we also use light-cone arguments to establish an error bound that closely captures the behavior of the bias that remains after extrapolation.

<https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.06496>

Zero-Noise Extrapolation




- $\langle A(\lambda) \rangle = \text{tr}[A\rho(\lambda)]$
- biased estimator, but *no knowledge* of noise model needed
- scales with number of scale factors

¹McDonough et al., "Automated quantum error mitigation based on probabilistic error reduction".

²Temme, Bravyi, and Gambetta, "Error Mitigation for Short-Depth Quantum Circuits".

Probabilistic Error Cancellation




- $\langle A \rangle = \text{tr}[A\mathcal{U}(\rho)] = \sum_{\vec{\alpha}} \eta_{\vec{\alpha}} \langle A_{\vec{\alpha}} \rangle_{\text{noisy}}$
- *unbiased* estimator, but requires detailed knowledge of noise model
- more efficient methods exist¹

Local Observable

1. An *observable* is a thing that we can design an experiment to measure.
2. Mathematically, this means a self-adjoint, or Hermitian, operator $A = A^\dagger$.
3. **Local** means A is supported on a subset of the quantum systems at hand.
4. Examples:

Light Cone





1. something else


Assumptions

1.

Numerical Results



Numerical Results



$$\hat{o}_z^{\text{LoPEC}}(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} o_z(\boldsymbol{\sigma}) \prod_{(i,j) \in \mu} \gamma_{i,j} \sigma_{i,j}$$

$$\text{Var}[\hat{o}_z^{\text{LoPEC}}] = \mathcal{O}\left(\exp\left[4 \sum_{(i,j) \in \mu} \lambda_{i,j}\right]\right)$$

Do we want these techniques in Mitiq?

1. Does this slot into our existing `execute_with_pec` function?
2. How does this perform as an observable O go from local to “unlocal”.

V. CONCLUSIONS

In this paper, we analyzed and improved error-mitigation techniques for measuring expectation values of local observables. Our results directly improve the performance of near-term algorithms, which heavily rely on substantial mitigation of errors in quantum devices. In particular, one can use our results and similar light-cone arguments to combine error mitigation with other techniques, including circuit knitting and classical shadow tomography.

Thank you!