Experimental Pauli-frame randomization on a superconducting qubit
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One proposal to address coherent and non-Markovian errors in quantum computing systems is to randomize circuits rendering the errors incoherent and leaving the computation unaffected. Here we demonstrate circuit randomization in a superconducting circuit system. We use high-accuracy gate set tomography to demonstrate that without randomization, errors experienced by our experiment have coherent character and that with randomization these errors are rendered incoherent. We also demonstrate that randomization suppresses signatures of non-Markovian evolution to statistically insignificant levels.

INTRODUCTION

Large-scale quantum computation poses a number of design and control challenges. Significant efforts are in progress [1–3] to meet and overcome challenges associated with initial state preparation, maintaining coherence, implementing universal gates, and measuring qubits reliably—all key criteria for building scalable quantum computers [4]. As the system coherence times continue to grow, coherent errors can become the dominant source of error. These errors can originate from miscalibration of qubit rotations, unintentional control frequency detunings, or interactions between systems that are otherwise assumed to be decoupled—all ubiquitous problems for experimental quantum computers. These errors are also particularly difficult to simulate in multiqubit systems, as they can interfere constructively and destructively, making prediction about the performance of quantum error correction codes and fault-tolerant computation quite difficult [5–7]. Moreover, theoretical lower bounds on the tolerable rates for coherent errors indicate they may be much more damaging than stochastic errors [8–11]. One way to address this problem is to transform coherent errors into incoherent stochastic errors, such as random bit and phase flips. Here we use a superconducting qubit system to implement a proposal known as Pauli-Frame Randomization (PFR) [12, 13], and discuss some additional benefits of the randomization process, such as decoupling of slow non-Markovian noise [14].

One significant challenge in determining whether PFR has indeed made coherent errors stochastic is their small magnitude. Thanks to the community’s progress towards fault-tolerance, the magnitudes of these errors are on the order of $10^{-3}$ or less in state-of-the-art devices. Measuring such small errors reliably runs into limitations of various characterization approaches: standard tomography is sensitive to preparation and measurement imperfections and has very low accuracy, while randomized benchmarking estimates a quantity (closely associated with the average fidelity [15, 16]) that does not differentiate between coherent and stochastic errors. In this demonstration we use gate set tomography (GST) [17–20], a tomographic reconstruction technique that provides: insensitivity to state preparation and measurement (SPAM) errors, nearly quantum-limited accuracy, and an open source library for experiment design and data analysis [21]. This allows us to accurately quantify not only the behavior of the diamond norm error [22] and average infidelity under randomization, but also the degree of coherence associated with individual gate errors and the degree to which the evolution is well described by a Markovian, time-invariance model—all of which help confirm the predicted behavior of PFR, despite the presence of imperfections in the randomization operations.

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows. In Section I we describe PFR, and discuss how to test its implementation in Section II. Section III describes the experiments as well as the infrastructure required to create and process randomized sequences. Finally, in Section IV we discuss the results.

I. PAULI-FRAME RANDOMIZATION

Pauli-frame randomization is a noise-shaping technique that reduces to applying random Pauli group operations between computational gates [12, 13]. If the computational gates consist of Clifford group operations [23] (a set of operations sufficient for error correction), the effect of these random Pauli operations can be easily tracked [24, 25] so that the computation itself can be unrandomized by reinterpreting measurement results. While this randomization is designed to have no impact on the ideal computation, it effectively symmetrizes the error, much like twirling [26–30] and randomized decoupling [14], leading to an effective error operation that corresponds to a mixture of Pauli group operations known as a Pauli channel.

These results can be derived in the limit of perfect randomization operations and gate-independent errors as follows. Throughout this discussion, we represent quantum operations by the corresponding superoperators, denoted with calligraphic upper-case letters ($\mathcal{A}$, $\mathcal{B}$,
Any sequence of ideal Clifford operations can be randomized, which results in the randomized sequence of Clifford group operations. Since Clifford group operations transform Pauli group operation to other Pauli group operations, the overall effect of these random Pauli group operations can be cancelled out by applying a final Pauli group operation at the end of the sequence of gates. Moreover, since the Pauli group is a subgroup of the Clifford group, one may simply combine the 4th random Pauli operation $P_i$ with the $i$th Clifford group operation $C_i$, to obtain a random Clifford group operations $D_i$. In other words, a given sequence of Clifford group operations $C_L C_{L-1} \cdots C_2 C_1$ becomes

$$\begin{align*}
\mathcal{P}_{L+1} C_L \mathcal{P}_L C_{L-1} \mathcal{P}_{L-1} \cdots C_2 \mathcal{P}_2 C_1 P_1
\end{align*}$$

which results in the randomized sequence of Clifford group operations $D_L D_{L-1} \cdots D_2 D_1$ executed in a randomized experiment. Note that many different realizations of the randomized sequence should be measured in order to get a good approximation to the noise transformation we discuss below.

It is possible to choose all $P_i$ independently at random and compensate for their action by flipping observed measurement outcomes in post-processing (as, by construction, we only measure in the computational basis). In order to simplify post-processing, we instead choose $\mathcal{P}_{L+1}$ to cancel the effect that all other random Pauli group operations would have on measurement results (i.e., $\mathcal{P}_{L+1}$ is a Pauli frame correction before measurement). In this way the measurement outcome of the randomized and unrandomized experiments can be treated exactly the same, with no additional post-processing for the randomized experiments.

In the presence of gate-independent imperfections, we can analyze the sequences above by replacing each operation with its noisy counterpart. We write the noisy operations $D_i = \mathcal{E} D_i$ (where $\mathcal{E}$ is an arbitrary but fixed completely-positive trace-preserving (CPTP) map) to obtain

$$\begin{align*}
\mathcal{E} D_L \mathcal{E} D_{L-1} \cdots \mathcal{E} D_2 \mathcal{E} D_1, \\
= \mathcal{E} P_{L+1} C_L \mathcal{E} P_L \mathcal{E} C_{L-1} \mathcal{E} P_{L-1} \cdots \mathcal{E} C_2 \mathcal{E} P_2 \mathcal{E} C_1 P_1.
\end{align*}$$

Defining $\mathcal{P}^C = \mathcal{C} \mathcal{P} \mathcal{C}^\dagger$, we can write $\mathcal{E} \mathcal{P} = \mathcal{P}^C \mathcal{C}$. Similarly, we define $\mathcal{P}_{n+1} = \mathcal{P}_n \mathcal{P}_{n+1} \mathcal{P}_{n+1}$ (with the base case $\mathcal{P}_{1,1} = P_1$). With these definitions, the entire sequence can then be rewritten as $\mathcal{E} \mathcal{P}_{L+1} C_L \mathcal{P}_{L-1} C_{L-1} \mathcal{E} \mathcal{P}_{L-1} C_{L-1} \cdots \mathcal{E} \mathcal{P}_{1} C_2 \mathcal{E} \mathcal{P}_{1} C_1$, where, in the experiments described here, we have chosen $\mathcal{P}_{L+1} = \mathcal{I}$ to be the identity. In other words, we choose $\mathcal{P}_i$ uniformly at random for $1 \leq i \leq L$, and choose $\mathcal{P}_{L+1}$ to get a trivial $\mathcal{P}_{L+1}$. Averaging over uniformly random choices of Pauli operations, we transform each $\mathcal{E}$ in the sequence into $\mathcal{E} = \frac{1}{2^L} \sum \mathcal{P} \mathcal{E} \mathcal{P}$, which correspond to twirling $\mathcal{E}$ over the Pauli group. This, in turn, ensures that the effective error $\mathcal{E}$ associated with each gate in the sequence corresponds to a statistical mixture of Pauli operations [29], as desired [31].

The calculation outlined above does require rather strong assumptions about the properties of the noise (e.g., that it is gate independent and Markovian), but due to similarities to randomized benchmarking (RB) [32–36], which has been shown to require weaker assumptions [16], we expect that these strong assumptions are not strictly necessary. Here we experimentally test such a hypothesis with the natural imperfections of a superconducting qubit experiment.

II. CHARACTERIZATION AND VERIFICATION

The task of checking whether the result of applying PFR to an experiment does indeed result in a Pauli channel is subtle. Modern experiments have very high fidelity to ideal operations so checking that the unrandomized errors are not well described by Pauli channel—i.e., determining that PFR is necessary—is already challenging, since error rates can be on the order of $10^{-3}$ or less. In both cases, it seems natural to consider long sequences of operations to amplify sensitivity to these small errors.

We choose to use long-sequence GST [19, 20] to observe these small effects, and use a readily available open-source package for experiment design and data analysis [21]. GST is an iterative procedure that refines the tomographic reconstruction of a set of gates by comparing predictions about long gate sequences to experimental observations, and adjusting the reconstruction for better agreement. Since long sequences allow for small perturbations to accumulate, this technique yields unparalleled agreement. Since long sequences to experimental predictions about long gate sequences to experimental observations, and adjusting the reconstruction for better agreement. Since long sequences allow for small perturbations to accumulate, this technique yields unparalleled agreement. Since long sequences allow for small perturbations to accumulate, this technique yields unparalleled agreement.

Even with a reconstruction in hand, another subtle question is how to quantify the degree of “non-Pauliness” of a channel. We use the likelihood ratio test for this purpose [37, 38], adapting the existing functionality within the GST software [21]. The null hypothesis $H_0$ is taken to be that the statistics for each sequence in the GST experiments leads to a separate Binomial distribution of outcomes. More explicitly, for the null hypothesis we consider two alternate hypotheses nested within $H_0$: that each gate in the sequence corresponds to a fixed CPTP
operation acting on the system (we call this alternate hypothesis \( H_1 \)), and that each gate in the sequence corresponds to a fixed Clifford group operation followed by a fixed Pauli stochastic error operation (we call this alternate hypothesis \( H_2 \)). Note that \( H_2 \) is contained within \( H_1 \), since Clifford group operations and random Pauli operations (as well as their composition) are CPTP operations.

We fit data to a model under \( H_0 \) by maximum-likelihood estimation of the Binomial distribution parameter \( p \) associated with each GST sequence. We fit data to a model under \( H_2 \) using progressive refinement of maximum-likelihood estimation, a heuristic developed for GST \([21]\). We fit data to a model under \( H_2 \) by projecting the fit of \( H_1 \) into a generalized monomial matrix (described below), determined by the corresponding noiseless Clifford group operation. The first two fits are part of the standard routines within GST, while the last fit is a small extension to the existing GST routines.

The fitting of data to a model under \( H_2 \) proceeds as follows. In the Pauli-Liouville representation \([39–45]\), a Clifford group operation is a monomial matrix—each row or column has a single non-zero matrix element, and this matrix element is \( \pm 1 \). In the presence of a Pauli error model, a noisy Clifford group operation will be a generalized monomial matrix, where the \( \pm 1 \) elements of the noiseless matrix are replaced by numbers in the interval \([-1,1]\) (but the 0 matrix elements remain unchanged). Collectively, these matrix elements must live in a simplex equivalent to the probability simplex for the Pauli channel \([30]\). Thus, the projection of an \( H_1 \) model onto an \( H_2 \) model simply corresponds to identifying which matrix elements should be set of zero (i.e., which matrix elements are zero in the ideal gate), and then adjusting the remaining non-zero matrix elements so that the resulting matrix lies in the appropriate simplex.

To capture how well each model tracks the data we adopt a badness-of-fit metric based on calculations done in standard GST \([19–21]\) and Wilk’s theorem \([38]\). Details of the badness-of-fit construction can be found in the Appendix B.

### III. EXPERIMENTS

#### Electronics and software stack

To test the hypotheses of Section II, we implement the PFR procedure on a superconducting qubit device. Details and device performance numbers can be found in Appendix A. Making the PFR process experimentally tractable requires leveraging a complex software and hardware control infrastructure. The long-sequence GST (rGST) experiments require large sets (~3500) of long experiment sequences (up to ~1000 gates depending on the rGST germ power), each requiring a large number of shots (~1000). Under PFR, each shot of each experiment must be randomized resulting in 1000 unique GST experiments. In addition, to allow for fair comparison between randomized and unrandomized experiments, both cases should be run in an interleaved fashion to ensure they experience the same noise environment (to the extent possible). For contrast, standard process tomography for single qubit experiments requires only 12 different sequences, each made up of 3 Clifford group operations. Randomized benchmarking, on the other hand, employs long sequences, but usually only a few different sequence lengths, and a few random instances for each length.

The process begins in software with \texttt{pyGSTi} \([21]\) creating standard one-qubit GST sequences. For the data presented in this Letter a maximum germ power of \( L = 1024 \) was used to ensure the GST experiments would have high accuracy (which increases with \( L \)), and be sensitive to non-Markovianity over the long timescale comparable to coherence times. With the GST sequences from \texttt{pyGSTi} in hand, each sequence is then randomized by inserting random Pauli group operations before each gate, as described in Section I. It is worth emphasizing the length of the randomized GST sequence is unchanged as the Pauli group operations are combined with a neighboring Clifford group operation, much like the randomized compiling proposal of Ref. \([13]\). This randomization occurs in the software preprocessing of the GST gate strings and produces \( N = 1000 \) uniquely randomized GST (rGST) experiments. The original, unrandomized sequences and the 1000 new randomizations respectively define the two experimental cases for comparison.

The gates strings are then passed to our compiler, QGL.jl \([47]\), that translates qubit gate instructions into machine instructions. This involves not only mapping high-level instructions to control pulses but also time-ordering and synchronizing instruction playback between
all qubit control and readout channels. This compiler, written in Julia [48] enabled a 4× speed-up per sequence over an earlier Python version [49]. Moreover, QGL.jl allows for parallel compilation of experiments using multithreading, increasing the speed-up proportionally to the number of available CPU cores. The compiled instructions are then passed to an arbitrary pulse sequencer (APSII) [50]. The APSII leverages pulse caching and sequencing capabilities which stores a compact representation of pulse sequences and amplitude data [46]. In the case of standard GST, the compiler exploits the repetitive structure of the GST experiments and the control flow of the APSII for a compact sequence representation that allows uninterrupted playback of sequence instructions. Due to the nature of the randomization process, the rGST experiments lack any kind of repetition or subroutine structure which completely rules out writing all unique randomizations to hardware memory. For these values of L and N we produce over 3.5 million single qubit instructions for the control hardware to process. This in turn is done for each data point presented in the results section.

To address this, the set of randomized experiments are broken into groups of 10 in order to fit in the hardware DRAM. These 10 single shot runs of rGST were then interleaved with 10 shots of unrandomized rGST. The process is repeated 100 times. Each data point in Fig. 2 corresponds to a single round of the process illustrated in Fig. 1.

In the canonical construction of the Clifford group, elements are composed of multiple \( \pi \) and \( \pi/2 \) gate operations. This leads to elements having a non-uniform length in time across the group. To account for this, we use a “diatomic” implementation of the group where each Clifford group operation is performed with two \( X_{\pi/2} \) pulses of fixed length (50 ns) and three possible Z-frame updates [45, 51]. This ensures all Clifford operations have equal duration.

The room temperature measurement signals were processed with an autodyne technique described in Ref. [52] using the BBN-QDSP digitization architecture [46] for the Innovative Integrations X6-1000M digitizer card. The final state assignment is then fed into the pyGSTi package for gate set reconstruction. pyGSTi also provides the likelihood of \( H_0 \) and \( H_1 \), while custom code generates the likelihood of \( H_2 \).

IV. RESULTS

The experiment outlined in Sec. II was performed to test the effectiveness of PFR. This process was repeated seven times, each taking roughly one hour to complete. The repetitions allow us to observe how drift affects the results over an operationally useful amount of time.

The question of the Pauliness of errors and the Markovian behavior of the evolution under PFR can be seen in Fig. 2 where the GST reconstruction quality is shown in terms of \( N_\sigma \) both with and without randomization. Several features are immediately apparent in Fig. 2: (1) the Markovian fits to the unrandomized experiments (circles) are orders of magnitude worse than the randomized experiments (squares), (2) the Pauli error model fits in the unrandomized experiments (solid red line) are roughly an order or magnitude worse than the randomized experiments (dashed blue line), (3) there is little difference between the quality of the fits for the randomized experiments (squares). In terms of the hypotheses we have outlined previously, for unrandomized experiments there is a large likelihood discrepancy between \( H_0 \) and the alternate hypotheses, greatly favoring the \( H_0 \) model, while for the randomized experiments all hypotheses have comparable likelihood, and it is reasonable to take the simplest hypothesis (\( H_2 \)) as the best explanation for the observations.

In other words, these features strongly indicate that the noise in the absence of randomization is not well described by a Markovian error model which follows from comment (1) above. Also apparent from comment (2) is that even the best Markovian error model does not approximate a Pauli model well. Conversely, these features indicate the noise under PFR is very well described by a Markovian Pauli error model. In much simpler terms, the features of non-Pauli error models (i.e., non-trivial off-diagonal matrix elements in the Pauli-Liouville representation [53]) are completely absent in the reconstructions of the randomized experiments, as Fig. 3 illustrates.
FIG. 3. Matrix representations of the reconstructed processes corresponding to the identity operation in the first of the seven experiments performed. Without randomization (left) there are significant off-diagonal contributions, corresponding to non-Pauli errors. With randomization (right) there are no statistically significant off-diagonal contributions, indicating the errors correspond to a Pauli error model. Error bars (95% confidence) for all experiments are smaller than ±0.0015 (unrandomized) and ±0.0012 (randomized).

V. SUMMARY

We have demonstrated that Pauli-frame randomization reduces both the non-Markovian features and the non-Pauli model features of errors in single qubit experiments. This demonstration relied on long sequence gate set tomography with a large germ power, which yields high accuracy reconstructions of all operations used in the experiments, which in turn required a high-degree of automation to make the experiments practical. Without randomization, the experiments were shown to have strong features not present in time-independent, Markovian models as well as strong features not present in Pauli error models. With randomization, we were able to show that none of these features were present, and that the experiments were well described by Markovian time-independent Pauli error models.

Areas for future work include speeding up the experiments using techniques such as active reset [54, 55], and pushing randomization process onto the hardware FPGA, which would allow for data acquisition of randomized Clifford group circuits without the user having to manually pre-compile random circuits.
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[31] Although the error in the last gate of the sequence is not randomized due to our choice to have the last randomization operation cancel all others, we can treat this as a measurement error. Alternatively, we could choose all randomization operations uniformly at random and changed the measurement outcome to undo the randomization, so that effectively the error in the last gate would also be twirled over the Pauli group.


Appendix A: Device Parameters

The superconducting qubit device was fabricated at BBN in collaboration with Raytheon Integrated Defense Systems. It consists of four fixed-frequency, transmon qubits, designed to be similar to those described in [3]. For the experiments described in this Letter, only one qubit (Q1) is measured. Q2,...,4 are sufficiently far detuned from Q1 to be safely ignored. Q1 is dispersively coupled to a readout resonator with a center frequency of $\omega_r/2\pi = 7.112$ GHz, $\kappa/2\pi = 3.4$ MHz, which is in turn capacitively coupled to a quarter-wave Purcell filter with external $Q = 22$ and a center frequency of $\omega_F = 7.27$ GHz [56] enabling fast qubit readout. Q1 has a fixed 0-1 transition frequency of $\omega_{1/2}/2\pi = 4.432$ GHz with an anharmonicity $\alpha/2\pi = 308$ MHz. Coherence times measured for Q1 are $T_1 = 10 \mu s$, $T_2 = 13 \mu s$ and a Hahn echo time of $T_{\text{echo}} = 16 \mu s$.

Appendix B: Badness-of-fit

We quantify how well the data is explained with each of the hypotheses discussed in the main text by computing a metric for the quality of the fits obtained, mirroring the calculation performed for generic GST fits [19–21], but extending to the hypotheses we consider here. The basis for this calculation is $L(H_i)$, the likelihood of the observed data given the model fitted under a particular hypothesis $H_i$.

Following Wilk’s theorem [38], we know the log-likelihood ratio $-2\log \frac{L(H_i)}{L(H_0)}$ has a distribution that asymptotically approaches a $\chi^2$ distribution with degrees of freedom given by the difference in the dimensionality of the two nested hypotheses, under the assumption that the null hypothesis is true. The mean and variance of the asymptotic distribution for the log-likelihood ratio are determined by the number of degrees of freedom. Given the fitted models, the likelihood of the observations under the various hypotheses are computed, and we follow the GST convention [20, 21] and report the deviation between the fitted models, the likelihood of the observations under a particular hypothesis $H_i$.

The log-likelihood ratios allow us to quantify whether (a) the observations are consistent with a Markovian error model (i.e., whether $H_1$ is plausible), and (b) whether the observations are consistent with a Clifford group operation with a Pauli error model (i.e., whether $H_2$ is plausible).
In particular, we are interested in testing whether the answer to these questions changes when we apply PFR to our experiments. For this, it is necessary to look at the likelihood of hypotheses in different data sets, which are quantities that cannot be compared meaningfully, as some deviation may arise simply from statistical fluctuations. As will become evident in the experimental results, however, the behavior of the randomized experiments will be qualitatively different (i.e., orders of magnitude more consistent with a Markovian Pauli error model than the unrandomized experiments).

**Appendix C: Error metrics under randomization**

As expected the randomization process also suppressed the amount of coherent error present the gate set. In Fig. 5 the effect of PFR on fidelity and diamond-norm error metrics are plotted. In the case of infidelity we see no appreciable difference in the reconstructed infidelity for the gate set, while the diamond-norm changes significantly in the presence of PFR. This is a consequence of the fact that twirling simply averages over different unitaries that individually have roughly the same fidelity to the target gate. Since the overall infidelity is the average of the individual infidelities, we see no change in that quantity. However, the overall diamond distance is not simply the average of the diamond distances, and averaging over different unitaries results in an incoherent process which is harder to distinguish from the target unitary, and so the diamond distance is reduced under PFR. This highlights that the infidelity is insensitive to coherent errors, and that the error rate, as measured by the diamond distance, is greatly improved under PFR.

**Appendix D: Reconstructed superoperators**

Figs. 6 through 12 show all reconstructed superoperators, for both the unrandomized and the randomized experiments. 90% confidence intervals are smaller than 0.00142 for the unrandomized experiments, and smaller than 0.00118 for the randomized experiments.
FIG. 5. (Left) Gate set infidelity and (Right) diamond norm distance estimates for all seven experiments. Both the randomized (dashed lines) and unrandomized (solid lines) experiments are plotted but the two cases show no appreciable difference in gate infidelity. All quantities are computed from the reconstructed process matrices. For the randomized case (dashed lines), the infidelity (left) and the diamond norm (right) are comparable. In the case of the unrandomized experiments, there is significant deviation between the diamond norm error rate and the infidelity. This suggests randomization process is substantially suppressing coherent errors which do not effect the infidelity metric. Error bars in both plots are smaller than the data points.
FIG. 6. Reconstructed superoperators for experiment 1.

FIG. 7. Reconstructed superoperators for experiment 2.
FIG. 8. Reconstructed superoperators for experiment 3.

FIG. 10. Reconstructed superoperators for experiment 5.

FIG. 12. Reconstructed superoperators for experiment 7.