Efficient Quantum Tomography with Fidelity Estimation

Jun Wang,1 Zhao-Yu Han,1,2 Song-Bo Wang,1 Zeyang Li,1,3 Liang-Zhu Mu,1,* Heng Fan,4,5,1 and Lei Wang4,5,‡

1School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China
2Department of Physics, Peking University, Beijing, China
3Department of Physics, MIT-Harvard Center for Ultracold Atoms and Research Laboratory of Electronics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA
4Institute of Physics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China
5CAS Central for Excellence in Topological Quantum Computation, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

We propose a quantum tomography scheme for pure states which adopts machine learning methods, along with a built-in fidelity estimation approach to assess the reliability of the tomographic state. We prove the validity of the scheme theoretically and perform numerically simulated experiments on several typical target quantum states such as W, cluster and dimer states. We find that the required number of measurements to meet the convergence criterion does not grow exponentially in the number of qubits, thus the scheme achieves high efficiency that is crucial for large-scale quantum states tomography in laboratory.
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I. INTRODUCTION

With the fast developing techniques of fabricating quantum devices, we can now manipulate a growing number of entangled qubits. Medium sized quantum processors (10–100 qubits) have been implemented, for example, in the platforms of superconducting circuits and trapped ions [1–7]. Quantum state tomography (QST), which aims at reconstructing an unknown quantum state from suitable measurements on replicas of the state, is a gold standard for verifying and benchmarking the merits of the implementations. In particular it is necessary for characterizing the completeness of information that is provided by all feasible operations and measurements on a quantum processor. After a long history of developing its mathematical ground, we are now at a stage to consider the practical aspects of QST. In particular, the time efficiency, which is largely determined by the cost of repeated measurements on different copies of the state, is crucial for large-scale many-body states tomography.

Early studies of QST focused on mixed states, and found that it requires the information provided by projective measurements on a minimal set of $O(d)$ mutually unbiased bases [8–10], or by $O(d^2)$ expectations of positive-operator-valued measures (POVMs) [11–14]. This soon becomes impractical as Hilbert space dimension $d$ grows exponentially with the number of constituents (e.g. particles). For pure states, it was recently proved in terms of information that the adequate number of POVMs can be drastically reduced to $O(d)$ [15–17] and that of measurement bases can be reduced to four [18–20]. However, it is still experimentally intractable to realize these delicately designed measurements and to acquire corresponding converged probability distributions, since the size of the sample space $d$ is exponentially large [21].

There were several efforts towards an efficient QST scheme [22–29], mostly by the mean of exploiting the property of short-range entanglement in a matrix product state (MPS) [30]. Besides efficiency issues, another important practical concern called fidelity estimation [31–33] is drawing attention: after a QST scheme, how can we assess the proximity between the tomographic state and the target state in laboratory?

Some efforts [34–41] applied theories and techniques from machine learning field such as compressed sensing [42, 43] to QST problem. We note that there are indeed similarities between QST and unsupervised machine learning tasks such as density estimation [44]. In both tasks, one aims at modeling high-dimensional probability functions from observed data. However, QST is more complicated because probability distributions under different bases are inherently related and modeled simultaneously.

Our work, which to some extent adopts similar methodologies with previous ones, concentrates on reconstructing pure states in qubit systems as MPS by projective measurements. Viewing QST as an unsupervised machine learning task, we make innovations in its key components: data, model, cost function and optimization techniques [44]. For example, aside from a fixed bases protocol, we designed a compressed-sensing inspired random bases approach to acquire data on randomly rotated in situ measurement. We adopt MPS and the associated optimization algorithm as the model and learning approach for the target state, devising an averaged negative log-likelihood with an entanglement entropy penalty as the cost function. All these efforts help the scheme achieve high efficiency for several typical target states in our computer-simulated experiments. Moreover, we propose a fidelity estimation approach, which could be
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achieved in our tomography scheme with no overhead in measurements.

In this paper, we will first present the workflow of the scheme, then prove its validity theoretically and finally demonstrate its efficiency by computer-simulated experiments on several states of fundamental importance for quantum computation, such as W, dimer and cluster state.

II. THE PROCEDURE

The proposed QST scheme includes repeated projective measurements and training of the model, until the stop criterion concerning the fidelity estimation is met (see the flow chart in Fig. 1). In the following discussion, we employ MPS as the model for classical representation of the target pure quantum state. The general validity of the scheme does not (though the efficiency may) depend on the property of the target state. Exploiting a priori knowledge about the target state, one may also adopt other more suitable models and corresponding parameter learning algorithms in the training step.

A. Initialization

The procedure starts with initializing several MPS composed by N matrices whose components have been independently and randomly assigned. The initial bond dimensions D could be as low as 2, rendering the MPS compact. We use multiple random initializations to avoid being trapped in possible local minima of the cost function during the training processes.

B. Measurement

To model an unknown quantum state, we need to perform projective measurements on different bases. The minimal requirement is that, they should comprise an informationally complete set of orthonormal bases in order to avoid indistinguishable candidate states. In practice, one should also consider the simplicity for realizing the measurements. For example, local measurements are often preferred in experiments. Here we use the spin-1/2 picture to demonstrate our sets of bases on N-qubit system. The base denoted by \( B(\{n_i\}) \) is the eigenbase corresponding to the product of local operators \( \sigma_1 \times n_1 \times \sigma_2 \times n_2 \times \cdots \times n_N \times \sigma_N \), where \( n_i \) is the unit vector along the spin measurement direction on site- \( i \), and \( \sigma_i = (\sigma^x_i, \sigma^y_i, \sigma^z_i) \) are the Pauli operators on the same site.

One can perform the measurements on a prescribed set of fixed bases, for example the \( 2N + 1 \) bases in [34]. The first base \( B(\{z_1, z_2, \ldots, z_N\}) \) determines the amplitudes of the wave-function. The other \( 2N \) bases rotate one of the \( N \) directions from \( z \) to either \( x \) or \( y \), determining the local relative phases of the state. We prove completeness of the information that could be provided by this set of bases in Appendix A. Note that it still may fail to provide adequate information for certain target states though those states constitute a zero measure set.

In experimental tests, we found that sometimes exponentially large amount of measurements are needed for the convergence of probability on these fixed bases. For example, the product state \( \left( \frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \otimes N \) has at least \( 2^{N-1} \) non-zero component on every base, so the needed number of measurements grows exponentially in \( N \) to converge. Moreover, performing tomography on fixed bases can be biased for finite dataset since there exist special space directions in the measurements.

Considering these drawbacks, we propose to perform measurements on random bases. This is an analogy of compressed sensing, which recovers a sparse signal by utilizing observations from random perspectives. Each time in demand of a measuring outcome accumulation, one can randomly select \( N \) directions on the unit sphere for \( \{n_i\} \). This approach not only provides more information than the fixed bases approach does, but also achieves a much higher efficiency in experimental tests. Therefore, though the fixed bases QST requires less effort for the realization of measurement settings, we would like to focus on random bases QST hereinafter.

The outcome of each projective measurement on a copy of the state, a binary string \( r = (r_1 r_2 \cdots r_N) \) is accompanied with the setting of directions \( \{n_i\} \) of the base. After accumulating a batch of \( k \) measurement outcomes, we append them into the dataset \( \mathcal{V} \), whose size is denoted \( |\mathcal{V}| \) and subsequently train the MPS using the data in the updated \( \mathcal{V} \).

C. Training

The fundamental model in our scheme is representing the wave functions under a certain base, say \( B(\{z_1, \ldots, z_N\}) \), with an MPS. Under a different base \( B(\{n_i\}) \) the wave function is straightforwardly obtained by performing local unitary transformations, schemati-
where each box denotes a tensor in the MPS, and the circle $U_k$ denotes the single qubit unitary transformation $U(n_k)$ that rotates the direction $n_k$ to $e_z$. For introduction to the graphical notations of tensor networks, we refer to [45, 46]. For $n$ in $(\theta, \phi)$ direction, $U(n) = \exp(i\phi \sigma_z/2) \exp(i\theta \sigma_y/2) \exp(i\phi \sigma_z/2)$, where $\phi$ can be arbitrarily set because it does not affect the probabilities.

The MPS ansatz naturally provides with a probability model $P_{\text{MPS}}(r; \{n\}) = |\Psi(r; \{n\})|^2$ under the specified base $\{n\}$. The outcomes in $\mathcal{V}$, however, are from measurements on different bases, which means that a sample consists of both measurement outcome and base. For random bases approach, since the probability distribution of bases choice is uniform, the probability density in the sample space is exactly $|\Psi(r; \{n\})|^2$ up to a constant coefficient. Thus when we employ the negative log-likelihood (NLL) averaged over all measurements as the cost function, it is expressed as:

$$\text{NLL} = -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{(r, \{n\}) \in \mathcal{V}} \ln P_{\text{MPS}}(r; \{n\}).$$

The NLL determines the proximity of the modeled probability density $P_{\text{MPS}}(r; \{n\})$ to the empirical probability density defined by the data set $\mathcal{V}$. The cost function encodes information from different bases, so that we may not worry that the MPS overfits the probability distribution on certain base. We provide rigorous mathematical proof of the validity of our random bases QST in Appendix B, which shows that the state corresponding to the minimum of the cost function Eq. (2) is exactly the target state when training set $\mathcal{V}$ is infinitely large.

To minimize the cost function, we adopt the unsupervised learning approach proposed in our previous work [47]. The algorithm is similar with 2-site Density Matrix Renormalization Group [48] method and adjusts the capacity as well as the parameters of the MPS to the best description of the measured data. The major difference from the previous work is the gradient calculated for tuning, which results from the complex-value form of quantum wave-functions and the application of unitary transformations. Moreover, we can include a penalty term in the cost function, which is proportional to a summation of second order Rényi entanglement entropies on the bonds. It helps the MPS reduce the bond dimensions while training, and thus make the algorithm converge faster. Details for calculating the gradient of the cost function are in Appendix C.

We pick the MPS with the lowest cost function from different initializations, as our resulting state at each training step.

### D. Fidelity Estimation

Although the theoretical validity of the proposed scheme is proved for infinitely large dataset, it is hard to determine how close the MPS is to the actual target state. This presents practical problems of estimating the reliability of the tomographic state at a certain stage of the scheme only by the training result and history we have.

To estimate the actual proximity between our resulting MPS and the target state, we assume that similar states’ tomography have similar converging behavior when all the scheme parameters are fixed. Thus, when our tomographic state is trained to be a sufficient good approximation for the target state, we may use it as a virtual target state to simulate the tomography scheme in a computer: generate measuring outcomes according to the virtual target state and train a new MPS successively. The virtual process could be completely monitored and be used to approximate the real process at the same measurements accumulation stage.

We use $R = \sqrt{(1 - F^2)/2}$ to quantify the distance between two pure states $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$, where $F = |\langle \psi | \phi \rangle|$ is the quantum fidelity. In experimental tests, it is observed that the distance between the tomographic MPS and the target state, $R_{\text{real}}$, is asymptotically proportional to $|\langle \psi | \phi \rangle|^{-1/2}$, and the distance between two successive tomographic states, $R_{\text{succ}}$, is asymptotically proportional to $|\langle \psi | \phi \rangle|^{-1}$, at large $|\psi\rangle$. This indicates that $R_{\text{succ}}^2/R_{\text{real}}$ gradually approaches to a constant $C$ as measurements accumulate. By our assumption that similar states’ tomography have close converging processes, we can extract a good approximation of this unknown constant by fitting it with $R_{\text{real}}'$ and $R_{\text{succ}}'$ in the virtual tomography process, so that we can use $\sqrt{C R_{\text{succ}}}$ to estimate the actual distance $R_{\text{real}}$ and therefore the fidelity between the tomographic state and the target state in the laboratory.

To meet the desired accuracy, we may have to iterate the measurement (Sec. II B) and the training (Sec. II C) steps until the convergence criterion of real fidelity is satisfied. When successively trained MPS’ as virtual target states give converging estimate of $C$, the confidence in the fidelity estimation also increases.

### III. EXPERIMENTAL TESTS

In this section we test our QST scheme on random bases in computer-simulated experiments, in which experimental measurements are simulated with sampling from probability distribution under certain bases.

#### A. Tests of the Efficiency

Three typical kinds of states in the field of quantum information are invoked in the experiments: W state, dimer
state and cluster state. We represent these target states in compact MPS' [49] and employ the direct sampling approach explained in [47] to generate independent training samples. W states are decorated with local phases on each site, \(|W\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^{N} e^{i k \theta} |0_1 0_2 ... 0_k ... 0_N\rangle, \theta = 0.1 \text{rad.}
\)
It does not take long for the tomographic states to reach 0.9995 fidelity. As shown in Fig. 2, for a prescribed criterion of fidelity 0.9995, the needed \(|V\rangle\) does not exponentially scale up in \(N\). This remarkable efficiency could be intuitively understood by the fact that MPS with finite bond dimensions also imposes sparse constrains in their Schmidt space and the compressed-sensing-inspired approach could optimize the utility of the information from the measurements on random bases. To describe a MPS, we only need \(O(N P_{\text{max}}^2)\) parameters, while one projective measurement could also provide about \(N\) bits of information. Hence the nearly constant demand of measurements is comprehensible.

### B. Test of the Fidelity Estimation Approach

We test our fidelity estimation approach on the same states as in the last subsection. Here we demonstrate the result on a W state with length 30 in Fig. 3. We firstly found the asymptotic behavior of real and successive distances for both target state and virtual target state tomography show the relations: \(R_{\text{real}} \sim |V|^{-1/2}, R_{\text{succ}} \sim |V|^{-1}\), and \(\frac{R_{\text{real}}^2}{R_{\text{succ}}} \sim \text{constant.}\) Moreover, when the tomographic MPS is in the vicinity of the target state and plays the role of a virtual target state, it provides a good estimate of the constant \(C\) that the actual target state’s \(\frac{R_{\text{real}}^2}{R_{\text{succ}}}\) converges to. The same behavior also occurs to dimer and cluster state. Therefore, with \(C\) properly estimated, we are able to assess the real fidelity of our tomographic state to the physical target state.

### IV. CONCLUSION AND OUTLOOK

We propose an efficient quantum tomography scheme which chooses random bases for projective measurements and employs a learning algorithm with MPS model. We also suggest a built-in approach to estimate the fidelity between the tomographic state and the target state in the laboratory. The scheme achieves high efficiency in simulated experiments on typical quantum information states: the number of measurements needed for prescribed fidelity is nearly constant with respect to the system size. As the size of implemented quantum processor has increased to medium size, the standard QST is on the verge of intractability and efficient tomography is in demand. We expect these efforts could make the gold-standard tests of quantum devices more practical for large-scale many-body states. Quantum tomography characterizes whether all the operations and measurements practicable on a quantum processor provide complete information of
the state, and our work indicates that the more practicable operations the higher efficiency of quantum tomography. Generalization of this scheme, to mixed states or quantum process tomography is straightforward, so we look forward to efficiency in similar tasks rendered by the methods proposed in this work.
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Appendix A: Validity of $O(N)$ Fixed Bases

In this appendix, we construct $O(N)$ bases which are eigenstates of local operators and prove that they can provide sufficient information for tomography in the $N$-qubit pure state space except a measure zero set.

We first choose the standard base in $N$-qubit state space as $\{i_1i_2...i_N\}$, which are eigenstates of $\sigma_1^z \otimes \sigma_2^z \otimes ... \otimes \sigma_N^z$. In our construction of local measurement operators, it is important to think this set of base as a $N$-dimensional cube, and the adjacency relation (quantum mechanically a flip of spin) will be exploited. For the purpose of notational convenience, these basis vectors, or vertices of $N$-dimensional cube $C$, are identified with a $\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z}$ vector space: $C_N \cong (\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^N$. That is to say, we allow the addition between the labels $i_1...i_N$ for the base vectors, with periodic boundary condition applied. For instance, the label for all down spin $11...1$ added by the label $100...0$ will be $011...1$, because $2 = 0$ mod 2. One can see this addition operation is equivalent to applying a flip operator $\sigma^x$ on the first spin. If we go back to the $N-$dimensional cube, the operation gives a adjacent vertex. For convenience, we define a set of unit vector $\{e_i\}_{1 \leq i \leq N}$ in $C_N$, where $e_i$ means 1 in the $i$-th digit, and 0 in all others. Suppose the unknown pure state is $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i_1...i_N} c_{i_1...i_N} |i_1...i_N\rangle = \sum_{v \in C_N} c_v |v\rangle$.

In the following we will allow addition on the state labels, i.e. $|v+w\rangle$ represents another state in $N$-qubit space if $|v\rangle, |w\rangle$ are also states in the space. For example, $|11...1+10...0\rangle = |011...1\rangle$.

Now we define a set of hermitian operators $\{T^k_v, \tilde{T}^k_v\}_{1 \leq k \leq N, v \in C_N}$ which helps us determine the quantum state.

$$T^k_v = |v\rangle\langle v| + |v+e_k\rangle\langle v|$$

$$\tilde{T}^k_v = -i|v\rangle\langle v| + i|v+e_k\rangle\langle v|$$

Taking the expectation value of these operators under $|\psi\rangle$ gives

$$\langle \psi | T^k_v | \psi \rangle = c_v^* e_v+e_k + c.c.$$  

$$\langle \psi | \tilde{T}^k_v | \psi \rangle = -i c_v^* e_v+e_k + c.c$$

$$2c_v^* e_v+e_k = \langle \psi | T^k_v | \psi \rangle + i \langle \psi | \tilde{T}^k_v | \psi \rangle$$ (A1)

Now we write $T^k_v, \tilde{T}^k_v$ in terms of rank-1 operators, i.e. density matrices for a pure state.

$$T^k_v = \frac{1}{2}(|v\rangle\langle v| + |v + e_k\rangle\langle v + e_k|)$$

$$- \frac{1}{2}(|v\rangle - |v + e_k\rangle)\langle v - (v + e_k|)$$

$$\tilde{T}^k_v = \frac{1}{2}(|v\rangle\langle v| + i|v + e_k\rangle\langle v| - i\langle v| + e_k\rangle)$$

$$- \frac{1}{2}(|v\rangle - i|v + e_k\rangle)\langle v - i(v + e_k|)$$

Then the bases $B^k_v = \{|v\rangle + |v + e_k\rangle, |v\rangle - |v + e_k\rangle\}$, $B^k_y = \{|v\rangle + i|v + e_k\rangle, |v\rangle - i|v + e_k\rangle\}$ gives complete information of the Eq. (A1). We notice that $B^k_x, B^k_y$ are eigenvectors of the local measuring operator $\sigma_1^x \otimes \sigma_2^x \otimes ... \otimes \sigma_{k-1}^x \otimes \sigma_k^y \otimes \sigma_{k+1}^z \otimes ... \otimes \sigma_N^z$, and $\sigma_1^y \otimes \sigma_2^y \otimes ... \otimes \sigma_{k-1}^y \otimes \sigma_k^x \otimes \sigma_{k+1}^z \otimes ... \otimes \sigma_N^z$ respectively. Thus of total we have $2N + 1$ such local measuring operators.
In the case of \( c_\nu, c_{\nu+ek} \neq 0 \), the preceding equation allows us to compute one from another. Diagrammatically we draw an edge connecting \( v \) and \( v + e_k \). Do this repeatedly for all \( v \), and finally we get a graph. Alternatively we can also consider the vertices \( v \) with coefficient \( c_v = 0 \), and by our procedure, those vertices are exactly those whose edges are missing in the final graph. Then one can for example suppose \( c_{00...0} = 1 \), and compute the coefficients of the vertices connected to \( 00...0 \), by our equation of \( c_v \) and \( c_{v+ek} \). Maximally extended, the coefficients in the connected component of \( 00...0 \) are determined. We then see if the graph is connected, i.e. the only connected component by the graph itself, the state is determined up to an overall constant. If the graph is not connected, the coefficient in each component is determined up to an overall constant, but the ratio between the overall constants are undetermined. To be more clear, we choose representatives \( r_1, \ldots, r_k \) from each of the connected components. Once we know \( c_i \), the coefficients of the connected component containing \( r_i \) are known. Then in order to determine the state, what remains to be done is to determine the ratios between \( c_i \) and \( c_j \).

Define \( \Omega \) as the set of quantum state with no zero coefficient \( c_v \neq 0 \) for any \( v \). The states in \( \Omega \) can be uniquely determined, according to the previous discussion, and the complement \( A = \mathcal{H} - \Omega \) is a finite union of \( 2^N - 1 \) dimensional hyperplane \( A_v = \{ |v\rangle\langle v| = 0 \} \), thus is of measure zero. Projective measurement of operator \( \sigma_i^+ \otimes \sigma_j^+ \otimes \ldots \otimes \sigma_N^+ \) will determine whether the state is in \( \Omega \). Thus we have constructed \( 2N + 1 \) local measurements valid for determination of almost all states.

Since the \((\mathbb{Z}/2\mathbb{Z})^N\) is abelian and has exponent 2, the least number of generators for this group is \( N \). Then if we wish to use another set of vectors \( f_j \) instead of \( e_j \) to make the graph connected, we still need \( N \) vectors, and the \( 2N + 1 \) result cannot be improved in this sense.

We now discuss the measure zero set \( A = \bigcup_{v \in \mathbb{C}^N} A_v \) a bit further. We now allow an experimental and computational error of \( \varepsilon \), which means if \( |c_v| < \varepsilon \), we will regard it as \( c_v = 0 \). Such vectors form a set \( A^\varepsilon \), and \( A^\varepsilon \subset \bigcup_{v \in \mathbb{C}^N} A_v^\varepsilon \), where \( A_v^\varepsilon \) is the tabular neighborhood of \( A_v \) of radius \( \varepsilon \). Suppose after normalizing vectors in \( A, A^\varepsilon, A_v^\varepsilon \) we get \( B, B^\varepsilon, B_v^\varepsilon \) respectively, the probability of finding a vector in the normalized Hilbert space is

\[
P(A^\varepsilon) = \frac{\text{Vol}B^\varepsilon}{\alpha(2 \times 2^N)} \leq \frac{2^N \text{Vol}B^\varepsilon}{\alpha(2 \times 2^N)} \leq \frac{2N \alpha(2(2^N - 1))\varepsilon^2}{\alpha(2^N)} = \varepsilon^2
\]

where \( \alpha(k) \) is the volume for \( k \)-dimensional ball.

In order to reduce the measure of the states we cannot determine, we rotate the whole system by some axis and angle. For example, in our practical choice of the bases, the \( z \) axis is rotated to former \( x \) and \( y \) axes. We denote the state with small components in the new coordinate system as \( N^\varepsilon \). If the rotation is “large” in \( SU(2^N) \), we could expect the two events \( A^\varepsilon \) and \( A_v^\varepsilon \) are independent, thus the probability is \( P(A^\varepsilon \cap A_v^\varepsilon) = \varepsilon^4 \). By performing the “large” rotations repeatedly for \( K \) times, the probability can hopefully be reduced to order \( \varepsilon^{2K} \). This conclusion indicates that even when considering the possible error in the experiment and computation, the expectation of the number of needed bases is still bounded by \( O(N) \).

Furthermore, there are states whose coordinates do not change under any spatial rotations, i.e. total spin 0 states. If those states happen to have zero components and the corresponding graphs happen to be disconnected, they can not be uniquely determined by any single set of bases we proposed. One simplest example of such states is the singlet state \( \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle - |01\rangle) \). The state has total spin 0, thus its components are not changed under rotation. The corresponding graph is \( B_2 \) with vertices 00, 11 removed, and is disconnected. While this can be fixed, by combining the information from measurements under several rotated sets of bases.

**Appendix B: Validity of Random Bases**

In this section, we prove that the convergence in two quantum states’ probability distributions on our random bases implies the convergence of the distance between them. To be more clear, given a generic density matrix \( \rho \) for \( N \)-qubit system and a generic bases sampling probability density \( f(|n\rangle) \), we denote the probability density of yielding a result that corresponds to the set of direction \( |\nu\rangle = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \ldots, \nu_N) \)

\[
\mathbb{P}[\rho(|\nu\rangle)] = \sum_{s=\pm1} f(|s, \nu_1\rangle\langle s, \nu_1|\rho|\nu\rangle). \quad (B1)
\]

Defining \( d(|n\rangle) = (4\pi)^{-N}dn_1\ldots dn_N \) and normalizing with \( \int d(|n\rangle) f(|n\rangle) = 1 \), for uniformly sampled random bases we obtain \( f(|n\rangle) = 1 \), so \( \mathbb{P}[\rho(|\nu\rangle)] = 2^N \langle \nu | \rho | \nu \rangle \). We shall later prove that the Kullback-Leibler (K-L) divergence

\[
D_{KL}(\mathbb{P}[\sigma]|\mathbb{P}[\rho]) \leq \int d(|\nu\rangle) \mathbb{P}[\sigma](|\nu\rangle) \ln \left( \frac{\mathbb{P}[\rho](|\nu\rangle)}{\mathbb{P}[\sigma](|\nu\rangle)} \right) \quad (B2)
\]

bounds the Schatten norm of the difference of the density matrices \( \sigma - \rho \).

The physical implication is that if we know the precise distribution function \( \mathbb{P}[\sigma_{\text{target}}] \) given by the target state \( \sigma_{\text{target}} \), then the KL divergence \( D_{KL}(\mathbb{P}[\sigma_{\text{target}}]|\mathbb{P}[\rho_{\text{MPS}}]) \) is a valid loss function for the MPS model to learn, and so is the NLL because it only differs from the KL divergence by a constant depending on the target state. The precise distribution can be attained by an infinite number of measurements, by the law of large number, and the speed of convergence of the distribution is governed by the central limit theorem.
Pinsker’s inequality reads [50]:

\[ \delta(P, Q) \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{2} D_{KL}(P \| Q)}, \]

where \( \delta(\cdot, \cdot) \) is the total variation distance defined by

\[ \delta(P, Q) = \sup \{ |P(A) - Q(A)| \mid A \text{ is a measurable event} \}, \]

and \( P, Q \) refer to the probability measure given by the probability density functions \( P, Q \), respectively.

Taking an event \( A = \{ x \in \text{sample space} \mid P(x) \geq Q(x) \} \), with \( A \) being the complementary event, we obtain

\[
\int |P - Q| = \int_A P - Q + \int_A Q - P
= \int_A P - \int_A Q + 1 - \int_A Q - 1 + \int_A P
= 2(\int_A P - Q) = 2|P(A) - Q(A)| \leq 2\delta(P, Q)
\]

Connecting the two inequalities above, K-L divergence bounds the \( L^1 \) distance between \( P[\sigma] \) and \( P[\rho] \):

\[
\int d\nu [P[\sigma](\{\nu\}) - P[\rho](\{\nu\})] \leq \sqrt{2D_{KL}(P[\sigma]||P[\rho])}.
\]

Because \( \langle\{\nu\}|\rho(\{\nu\}) \rangle \leq 1 \), both the probability density functions are bounded \( |P[\sigma](\{\nu\})| \leq 2^N, |P[\rho](\{\nu\})| \leq 2^N \), so we have

\[
\int d\nu [P[\sigma]|P[\rho]|]^2 \leq 2^{N+1} \int d\nu [P[\sigma]|P[\rho]]. \quad (B3)
\]

In our case we only need to prove that the \( L^2 \) distance between probability distributions bounds usual matrix distances defined by the Schatten norm of the difference.

We introduce the following inner product in the linear space of \( 2^N \) by \( 2^N \) hermitian matrices:

\[
(\alpha, \beta) = \int d\nu \langle\{\nu\}|\alpha(\{\nu\})\rangle\langle\{\nu\}|\beta(\{\nu\})\rangle,
\]

whose bilinearity is trivial. We find the norm \( ||\alpha|| = \sqrt{(\alpha, \alpha)} \) directly relates to the \( L^2 \) distance, and because \( \langle\{\nu\}|\alpha(\{\nu\})\rangle \rangle \geq 0 \) the norm is zero iff the integrand is zero almost everywhere in \((S^2)^N\), namely iff \( \alpha = 0 \). Thus we confirm that \( (\cdot, \cdot) \) is an inner product in the \( 2^{2N} \)-dimensional real vector space of \( 2^N \) by \( 2^N \) hermitian matrices. Thus this norm is equivalent to the usual matrix norms and the distance is bounded. In summary,

\[
\sqrt{2D_{KL}(P[\sigma]|P[\rho])} \geq 2\delta(P[\rho], P[\sigma])
\geq \int d\nu |P[\rho] - P[\sigma]|
\geq \frac{1}{2^{N+1}} \int d\nu |P[\rho] - P[\sigma]|^2
= 2^{N-1} \int d\nu |\langle\{\nu\}|\rho - \sigma(\{\nu\})\rangle|^2
= 2^{N-1} ||\rho - \sigma||^2
\]

Appendix C: Computing the Gradient

A state of an \( N \)-qubit system has a general form:

\[
|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_N \in \{0,1\}} \Psi_{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_N} |v_1 v_2 \cdots v_N\rangle \quad (C1)
\]

With \( v_k \in \{0,1\} \) convention, \( |v_1 v_2 \cdots v_N\rangle \) could be an eigenstate of the operator \( \sigma_1^z \otimes \sigma_2^z \otimes \cdots \otimes \sigma_N^z \). The tensor \( \Psi_{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_N} \) could be decomposed to a matrix product state (MPS):

\[
\Psi_{v_1, v_2, \ldots, v_N} = \sum_{i_1, i_2, \ldots, i_{N-1}} A_{i_1}^{(1)} v_1 A_{i_2}^{(2)} v_2 \cdots A_{i_{N-2}}^{(N-1)} v_{N-1} A_{i_{N-1}}^{(N)} v_N \quad (C2)
\]

where the summation of \( i_k \) runs over 1 to \( D_k \). Schematically

\[
\Psi = \begin{array}{cccc}
A^{(1)} & A^{(2)} & \cdots & A^{(N)} \\
v_1 & v_2 & \cdots & v_N
\end{array}
\quad (C3)
\]

With bond dimensions \( D_k \) permitted to be sufficiently large, this decomposition is precise.

When the algorithm sweep to bond \( k \), the cost function is subjected to a penalty proportional to the Rényi entropy \( S_{2,k} = -\ln \text{Tr} (\rho_{R,k}^2) \), where \( \rho_{R,k} \) is the reduced density matrix of one of the two parts separated by bond \( k \).

\[
\mathcal{L} = \text{NLL} + \lambda S_{2,k}
\]

\[
= -\frac{1}{|\mathcal{V}|} \sum_{(r, \{n\}) \in \mathcal{V}} \ln |\Psi_{\text{MPS}}(r; \{n\})|^2 - \lambda \ln \text{Tr} (\rho_{R,k}^2) \quad (C4)
\]

where

\[
\mathcal{N} = \begin{array}{cccc}
 & & & \\
 & \text{bond} & & \\
 & & & \\
\end{array}
\]

\[
\text{Tr} (\rho_{R,k}^2) = \begin{array}{cccc}
 & & & \\
 & \text{bond} & & \\
 & & \text{bond} & \\
\end{array}
\quad (C7)
\]

In practice we take \( \lambda \) to be an annealing parameter, so that as the MPS becomes well trained, the penalty is fading away. After merging \( A^{(k)} \) and \( A^{(k+1)} \) as shown in Eq.(C8), gradients are calculated as Eq.(C9). Notice that \( \Psi \) takes complex value, so in order to decrease \( \mathcal{L} \), \( \langle A^{(k,k+1)} \rangle \) should vary in the direction of \( -\partial \mathcal{L}/\partial A^{(k,k+1)} \).

As in [47], we adapt the gauge for MPS so that whenever merging two adjacent matrices, the matrices on their left are left-canonical and right-canonical on their right.

As long as this gauge is kept, tensors such as \( \mathcal{N} \), \( \text{Tr} (\rho_{R,k}^2) \) that are for the calculation of gradient are greatly simplified as shown in Eqs.(C10)-(C14).
\[ i_{k-1} - A^{(k)} A^{(k+1)} i_{k+1} = i_{k-1} - A^{(k,k+1)} i_{k+1} \]

\[ \frac{-\partial L}{\partial A^{(k,k+1)*} w_k w_{k+1}} = \frac{1}{V} \sum_{(r;\{n\}) \in V} \Psi'(r;\{n\}) \Psi^*(r;\{n\}) \]  

\[ -\frac{N'}{N} + \frac{\lambda \tau}{\text{Tr}(\rho^2_{R,k})} \]  

in which

\[ N = \begin{bmatrix} A^{(b)} \\ A^{(b)*} \end{bmatrix} \]  

\[ \text{Tr}(\rho^2_{R,k}) = \begin{bmatrix} A^{(b)} \\ A^{(k)*} \end{bmatrix} \]  

\[ \Psi'(r,\{n\}) = \begin{bmatrix} v^1_r \\ v^1_{k-1} \\ v^1_k \\ v^1_{k+1} \\ v^1_{k+2} \\ v^1_N \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ \Psi^*(r;\{n\}) = \begin{bmatrix} v^1_r \\ v^1_{k-1} \\ v^1_k \\ v^1_{k+1} \\ v^1_{k+2} \\ v^1_N \end{bmatrix} \]

\[ \frac{\tau}{2} = \begin{bmatrix} i_{k-1} \\ i_{k+1} \end{bmatrix} \]  

\[ \begin{bmatrix} A^{(k,k+1)} \\ A^{(k,k+1)*} \end{bmatrix} \]