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State preparation and measurement (SPAM) errors limit the performance of many gate-based quantum computing architectures, but are partly correctable after a calibration step that requires, for an exact implementation on a register of \( n \) qubits, \( 2^n \) additional characterization experiments, as well as classical post-processing. Here we introduce an approximate but efficient method for SPAM error characterization requiring the classical processing of \( 2^n \times 2^n \) real matrices, but only \( O(n^2) \) measurements. The technique assumes that multi-qubit measurement errors are dominated by pair correlations, which are estimated with \( n(n-1)/2 \) two-qubit experiments, where \( k \) is a parameter related to the accuracy. We demonstrate the technique on the IBM and Rigetti online superconducting quantum computers, allowing comparison of their SPAM errors in both magnitude and degree of correlation. We also study the correlations as a function of the register’s geometric layout. We find that the pair-correlation model is fairly accurate on linear arrays of superconducting qubits. However qubits arranged in more closely spaced two-dimensional geometries exhibit significant higher-order (such as 3-qubit) SPAM error correlations.

I. SPAM ERROR CORRECTION

Errors in a quantum computation are typically classified into state-preparation errors, gate errors, and readout or measurement errors. A standard approach for correcting some of these errors is to measure the overlap-squared matrix between all initial and final \( \text{classical} \) states, and use this information to classically correct the measured data [1–6]. The technique can be described as follows: Let \( x, x' \in \{0,1\}^n \) be classical states of \( n \) qubits, and define elements of a \( 2^n \times 2^n \) transition matrix \( T \) by

\[
T(x|x') = \sum_{x_1, \ldots, x_n} E_{x} \rho_{x_1' \ldots x_n'} \quad \text{Tr} |x_1 \cdots x_n; x'_1 \cdots x'_n \rangle \langle x_1 \cdots x_n|.
\]

Here \( E_x \) is the multi-qubit POVM characterizing the non-ideal implementation of the projector \( {\bf 1}_x \langle x| \), and \( \rho_{x'} \) is the density matrix produced after attempting to prepare classical state \( |x'\rangle \langle x'| \). Each column of \( T \) is the raw probability distribution \( \text{prob}(x) \) measured immediately after preparing \( x' \). Ideally \( T(x|x') = \delta_{xx'} \), the \( 2^n \times 2^n \) identity. The exact implementation of the error correction technique is to measure \( T \) and classically apply \( T^{-1} \) to subsequently measured probability distributions [1–6]. This forces an empty circuit in the noisy device to behave ideally. We refer to this technique as state preparation and measurement (SPAM) error correction to emphasize that errors in preparing the \( x' \) get folded onto the \( T \) matrix.

However there are several problems with the technique: (1) An exact implementation requires \( 2^n \) probability measurements, which is not scalable. (2) The matrix \( T \) may become singular for large \( n \), preventing direct inversion. (3) The correction is not rigorously justified, meaning that we cannot be sure that we are only removing SPAM errors and not otherwise corrupting the estimated probability distribution.

In this work we partly address the first limitation by deriving an efficient method to estimate \( T \). The technique is efficient in the sense that it only requires \( O(n^2) \) probability measurements to estimate the entire set of \( 4^n \) matrix elements \( \{ T(x|x') \}_{x,x'} \). However evaluating these \( 4^n \) matrix elements from the measured data remains classically inefficient. (Experimental estimation of the probability distributions we are trying to correct is also unscalable.) While SPAM error correction based on the transition matrix approach is ultimately unscalable, we hope that the technique introduced in this paper will enable error correction on larger registers of qubits, perhaps up to 30 or 40 qubits.

Beyond its use to correct SPAM errors, the estimated \( T \) matrix can also be used to rapidly characterize and quantify correlated SPAM errors, including measurement crosstalk. We demonstrate this on three different online devices: (i) the 16-qubit IBM Rüeschlikon; (ii) the 5-qubit IBM Tenerife; and (iii) the 8-qubit Rigetti Agave. This allows us to compare simple measures of multi-qubit SPAM errors across different chips and as a function of qubit layout.

II. UNCOVERING THE TENSOR PRODUCT STRUCTURE: MAP TO UNCOUPLED QUBITS

The exact \( T \) matrix technique is not scalable because it does not make use of the tensor product structure of the system and the fact that the qubits are physical devices that mainly interact pairwise. However the tensor product structure is not immediately apparent in the def-
To each physical device we introduce an associated noninteracting (uncoupled-qubit) model consisting of a register of \( n \) qubits, each (optionally) coupled to its own independent measurement apparatus or detector, but with no cross coupling between qubits or detectors. The associated noninteracting model does not itself have to be experimentally realizable. For example, trapped ions can be spatially separated to turn off their qubit-qubit interaction, so in this case the noninteracting model is experimentally realizable. For example, trapped ions may be experimentally realizable. For example, trapped ions.

\[ \text{Tr}[(E_{x_1}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes E_{x_n}^{(n)}) \rho_{x_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{x_n}] \]  

(2)

Here \( E_{x_1}^{(i)} \) and \( E_{x_1}^{(i)} = I - E_{0}^{(i)} \) are single-qubit POVMs for qubit \( i \), which may vary from qubit to qubit. Due to detector nonidealities, the single-qubit POVMs may differ from projectors, but the multi-qubit POVMs are tensor products of the single-qubit POVMs as the qubits are uncoupled. Similarly, we have assumed the nonideal classical state \( \rho_{x_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{x_n} \) of single-qubit density matrices. The physical assumption underlying our analysis is that the interacting qubit system—the real device—is related to a noninteracting one by some CPTP map (acting on the separable state). With this assumption we can write (1) as

\[ T(x|x') = \text{Tr}[(E_{x_1}^{(1)} \otimes \cdots \otimes E_{x_n}^{(n)}) \Lambda(\rho_{x_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{x_n})] \]  

(3)

where \( \Lambda \) is a CPTP superoperator. This mapping is not unlike the adiabatic turning on of particle-particle interactions in many-body perturbation theory. However here we don’t require the map between the interacting and noninteracting limits to be adiabatic or even unitary. But we exclude cases where the initial state of the uncoupled register is entangled with the environment, and cases where turning on the qubit-qubit coupling causes leakage out of the register; in these cases the map is not CPTP.

We emphasize that experimental \( T \) matrix estimation is expected to be applied to interacting nonideal qubit systems. For this reason it is important to specify the actual set of physical qubits the \( T \) matrix applies to. We call this set of qubits the register. A register does not have to include every qubit in the device, but a \( T \) matrix measured for one register cannot be used to correct errors on a different register.

### III. Transition Matrix Estimation

In this section we show how to expand (3) in powers of SPAM error correlations. Each single-qubit POVM will be written as a mean value plus its fluctuation:

\[ E_{x_i}^{(i)} = T_i(x_i|x_i') I + (E_{x_i}^{(i)} - T_i(x_i|x_i') I). \]

(4)

Here \( I \) is the \( 2 \times 2 \) identity, and

\[ T_i(x_i|x_i') := \text{Tr}[E_{x_i}^{(i)} \Lambda(\rho_{x_i} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{x_n})] \].

(5)

In definition (5), tensor products of \( E_{x_i}^{(i)} \) with the identity have been suppressed. The elements in (5) define an effective transition matrix \( T_i \) for a single qubit \( i \) in a given interacting \( n \)-qubit register. Measuring \( T_i \) requires initializing qubit \( i \) with classical state \( x_i' \) and measuring \( \text{prob}(x_i) \). The remaining \( n-1 \) qubits in the register (other than qubit \( i \)) are called spectator qubits. Because the qubits are coupled, the matrix \( T_i \) depends on the states of the spectator qubits. The overline in (5) denotes an average over the initial states \( \{ x_i : j \neq i \} \) of the spectator qubits, which we estimate with \( k \) samples. It is simple to see that (5) is experimentally accessible by initializing qubit \( i \) with classical state \( x_i' \), initializing the spectator qubits randomly, measuring \( \text{prob}(x_i) \), and repeating \( k \) times. For a fixed initial state of the spectator qubits this protocol corresponds to measuring

\[ \text{prob}(x_i|x_i') = \prod_{j \neq i} \sum_{z_j = 0,1} T(x_1 \cdots x_i \cdots x_n|x_1' \cdots x_i' \cdots x_n') \]

(6)

in the interacting system. Using the POVM completeness conditions

\[ \sum_{x=0,1} E_{x}^{(i)} = I \]  

(7)

and averaging over spectators leads to (5).

Using (4) we can write \( T(x|x') \) as

\[ \text{Tr}\left[\left(\bigotimes_{i=1}^{n} [T_i(x_i|x_i') I + (E_{x_i}^{(i)} - T_i(x_i|x_i') I)]\right) \Lambda(\rho_{x_1} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{x_n})\right] \]

(8)

and expand in powers of fluctuations. The zeroth-order uncorrelated approximation for \( T(x|x') \) is

\[ T_{\text{prod}}(x|x') = T_1(x_1|x_1') T_2(x_2|x_2') \cdots T_n(x_n|x_n') \]

(9)

or, in matrix form,

\[ T_{\text{prod}} = T_1 \otimes T_2 \otimes \cdots \otimes T_n. \]

(10)

Measuring \( T_{\text{prod}} \) requires \( 2nk \) measurements because there are two initial conditions \( \{0\} \) and \( \{1\} \) for each of \( n \) qubits, and we average over \( k \) initial conditions of the spectator qubits.

The product form (10) neglects multi-qubit SPAM error correlations (crosstalk), and is not reliable. We find
this to be true even for physically non-adjacent qubits. To quantify the correlations we define a matrix

\[ T_{\text{corr}} = T - T_{\text{prod}}. \]  

(11)

To go beyond the product form we will calculate the leading-order approximation to \( T_{\text{corr}} \). The first-order correction, which is

\[ \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left[ \{ \text{Tr} \left[ E_{i}^{(j)} \Lambda (\rho_{x_{i}'} \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_{x_{n}'}) \right] - T_{i}(x_{i} | x_{i}' \}) \} \prod_{j \neq i} T_{j}(x_{j} | x_{j}') \right], \]

(12)

does not strictly vanish, only in an average sense. For example, consider the first term in (12), with \( i = 1 \). The spectator qubits are \( 2, 3, \ldots, n \). The \( i = 1 \) term does vanish after averaging over \( x_{2}', x_{3}', \ldots, x_{n}' \). The \( i = 2 \) term vanishes after averaging over \( x_{1}', x_{3}', \ldots, x_{n}' \). We exclude the entire first-order term (12) on the basis that it vanishes when spectator qubits are initialized randomly, in accordance with our single-qubit \( T \) matrix definition (5). Then we can write (11) as

\[ T_{\text{corr}} = T_{\text{pair}} + T_{\text{triple}} + \cdots, \]

(13)

where

\[ T_{\text{pair}}(x|x') = \sum_{i<j} C_{ij}(x_{i}x_{j} | x_{i}'x_{j}') \prod_{m \neq i,j} T_{m}(x_{m} | x_{m}') \]

(14)

and

\[ T_{\text{triple}}(x|x') = \sum_{i<j<k} D_{ijk}(x_{i}x_{j}x_{k} | x_{i}'x_{j}'x_{k}') \prod_{m \neq i,j,k} T_{m}(x_{m} | x_{m}'). \]

(15)

IV. SPAM ESTIMATION ON THE IBM AND RIGETTI DEVICES

Data was taken on the IBM R"ueschlikon, IBM Tenerife, and the Rigetti 8Q-Agave online quantum computers. The main features of the data are summarized in Table I. The first case we will consider is a linear chain \( Q_{1}Q_{2}Q_{3}Q_{4} \) of nearest-neighbor qubits on the IBM device, as shown in Fig. 1. The raw data for this case is given in Appendix B. Comparing \( T_{\text{corr}} \) and \( T_{\text{pair}} \) in Appendix B, we see that many features in \( T_{\text{corr}} \) are correctly captured by the pair-correlation approximation, but higher-order correlations are observed as well.

A measure \( \| T - I \|_{F} \) of the overall size of the SPAM error in this case is given in column 2. It is slightly larger than the other 4-qubit registers studied on the R"ueschlikon chip. This is because qubit \( Q_{2} \) has an especially large single-qubit measurement error (Appendix B). SPAM errors on Rigetti Agave are similar to R"ueschlikon, but errors on IBM Tenerife are somewhat larger.

Compare the \( Q_{1}Q_{2}Q_{3}Q_{4} \) case with \( Q_{5}Q_{6}Q_{7}Q_{8} \), another linear register of nearest-neighbor qubits at the other end of the R"ueschlikon device (Fig. 1). All SPAM errors are smaller on this register. However in both cases \( \| T_{\text{pair}} \|_{F} \) gives a reliable estimate of \( \| T_{\text{corr}} \|_{F} \).

Next we compare \( Q_{1}Q_{2}Q_{3}Q_{4} \) with \( Q_{5}Q_{6}Q_{7}Q_{8} \), a linear register of next-nearest-neighbor qubits. As expected, the correlations are noticeably smaller in this case.

So far we have discussed linear chains of qubits. The case \( Q_{7}Q_{8}Q_{9}Q_{10} \) is interesting because the four qubits form a square at the end of the R"ueschlikon device. In this case \( \| T_{\text{corr}} - T_{\text{pair}} \|_{F} \) is the same size as \( \| T_{\text{corr}} \|_{F} \), indicating the presence of significant higher-order correlations and a breakdown of the pair approximation. We interpret this breakdown as indicating the presence of strong measurement crosstalk.

The Agave chip geometry has qubits on the perimeter of a square. Qubits 0123 form nearest-neighbor register on the square and are in close proximity, similarly to the IBM register \( Q_{7}Q_{8}Q_{9}Q_{10} \). Here we again observe strong higher-order correlations and a breakdown of the pair approximation, consistent with the interpretation that
TABLE I. Summary of SPAM errors measured on different chips and registers. Qubits/devices are grouped together in rows: The top 5 rows are IBM Rüeschlikon qubits. Row 6 is from IBM Tenerife. The bottom 2 rows are Rigetti 8Q-Agave qubits. The first column gives the qubit register. $\|T-I\|_F$ measures the overall magnitude of the SPAM errors, with $\|\cdot\|_F$ the Frobenius norm. $\|T_{corr}\|_F$ and $\|T_{pair}\|_F$ are measures of the error correlations, and $\|T_{corr} - T_{pair}\|_F$ measures the higher-order (such as 3-qubit) correlations. The matrices $T_{corr}$ and $T_{pair}$ are defined in (11) and (14).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Qubits</th>
<th>$|T-I|_F$</th>
<th>$|T_{corr}|_F$</th>
<th>$|T_{pair}|_F$</th>
<th>$|T_{corr} - T_{pair}|_F$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_4$</td>
<td>1.279</td>
<td>0.190</td>
<td>0.187</td>
<td>0.082</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_2Q_3Q_4Q_5$</td>
<td>1.057</td>
<td>0.096</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.028</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_7$</td>
<td>1.014</td>
<td>0.057</td>
<td>0.068</td>
<td>0.035</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_3Q_4Q_9Q_{10}$</td>
<td>0.984</td>
<td>0.031</td>
<td>0.034</td>
<td>0.033</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_5$</td>
<td>1.983</td>
<td>0.245</td>
<td>0.276</td>
<td>0.062</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$Q_1Q_2Q_4Q_3$</td>
<td>1.631</td>
<td>0.625</td>
<td>0.610</td>
<td>0.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>0123</td>
<td>1.150</td>
<td>0.124</td>
<td>0.382</td>
<td>0.319</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>01234</td>
<td>3.254</td>
<td>1.849</td>
<td>4.731</td>
<td>6.124</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

clusters (as opposed to extended registers) of qubits have stronger measurement crosstalk.

V. CONCLUSION

Motivated by a common SPAM error correction technique [1–6], we develop and apply an $O(n^2)$ method to characterize correlated SPAM errors on a register of $n$ qubits. The technique assumes that correlated SPAM errors are dominated by pair correlations, which are estimated with $n(n-1)/2$ two-qubit experiments. Although we find that the pair-correlation model is accurate for extended registers of qubits, such as chains, it is not reliable for clustered geometries on current devices where crosstalk is evidently stronger.

There are a few natural extensions of the pair-correlation technique. The first is to employ the pair-correlation functions in a Gaussian error model. In this case the odd-order correlations will vanish and the even-order ones are determined by Isserlis’ (or Wick’s) theorem [7]. However, we did not find this to significantly improve the accuracy of the estimate for $T_{corr}$. A second extension, which we have not implemented, would be to include and directly measure the 3-qubit correlations, which would require $O(n^3)$ measurements.
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Appendix A: Properties of the transition matrices

The matrix $T(x|x')$ has the property that each column sums to unity. This is easily seen from the definition (1):

$$\sum_x T(x|x') = \left\langle \sum_x E_x \right\rangle_{x'} = 1. \quad (A1)$$

The single-qubit transition matrices (5) and $T_{prod}$ also have this property. It follows that $T_{corr}$ defined in (11) satisfies $\sum_x T_{corr}(x|x') = 0$ for every $x'$. It is also easily seen that $T_{pair}$ and $T_{triple}$ satisfy

$$\forall x': \sum_x T_{pair}(x|x') = 0 \quad (A2)$$

and

$$\forall x': \sum_x T_{triple}(x|x') = 0. \quad (A3)$$

The neglected higher order terms in the series (13) also have this property, which guarantees that probability is conserved as higher-order fluctuations are included in the model.
Appendix B: Raw transition matrix data for IBM qubits \(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_4\)

On a chain \(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_4\) of adjacent IBM qubits we find \([8]\)

\[
T_1 = \begin{pmatrix}
98.3\% & 13.5\% & 1.7\% & 86.5\%
\end{pmatrix}, \quad
T_2 = \begin{pmatrix}
99.0\% & 18.4\% & 1.0\% & 81.6\%
\end{pmatrix}, \quad
T_3 = \begin{pmatrix}
96.6\% & 5.8\% & 3.4\% & 94.2\%
\end{pmatrix}, \quad
T_4 = \begin{pmatrix}
96.5\% & 15.3\% & 3.5\% & 84.7\%
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
T_{\text{prod}} = \begin{pmatrix}
90.7\% & 14.4\% & 5.5\% & 0.9\% & 16.8\% & 2.7\% & 1.0\% & 0.2\% & 12.5\% & 2.0\% & 0.8\% & 0.1\% & 2.3\% & 0.4\% & 0.1\% & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]

\[
T_{\text{corr}} = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & -1.3\% & 0 & -0.2\% & -1.1\% & -0.4\% & 0 & 0 & -0.5\% & -0.2\% & 0 & 0 & -0.2\% & -0.1\% & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
\]
and

\[ T_{\text{pair}} =
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & -1.3\% & 0 & -0.2\% & -1.1\% & -0.5\% & -0.1\% & 0 & -0.5\% & -0.3\% & 0 & 0 & -0.2\% & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & -0.6\% & 0 & 0.6\% & 0 & -1.1\% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.2\% & 0 & -0.1\% & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1.3\% & -0.2\% & -6.5\% & 0 & 0.2\% & -1.4\% & -1.5\% & 0.5\% & 0.2\% & 0 & -0.9\% & 0 & 0 & -0.2\% & -0.2\% \\
0 & 0.6\% & 0 & 6.0\% & 0 & 0 & -0.2\% & 0 & 0.5\% & 0 & 0 & 1.5\% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.1\% \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1.1\% & -0.9\% & 0 & -0.2\% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -0.6\% & -0.2\% & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1.7\% & 0 & 0.6\% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -0.1\% & 0 & 0.2\% \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1.0\% & -1.0\% & -5.2\% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.4\% & 0.2\% & 0 & -0.7\% \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0.1\% & 0 & 0.5\% & 0 & 4.0\% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.4\% & 0 & 1.1\% \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1.1\% & 0.2\% & 0 & 0 & -3.2\% & -2.3\% & 0.3\% & -0.2\% & -0.9\% & -0.6\% & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1.0\% & 0 & 0 & -3.2\% & 0 & 0.9% & 0 & -0.9\% & 0 & 0.1\% \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0.1\% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1.1\% & 0.2% & 3.1\% & 1.6\% & -0.9\% & -6.4\% & 0.5\% & 0.3\% & -0.7\% & -1.4\% \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0.2% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1.0\% & 0.1\% & 3.3\% & 0 & 4.8\% & 0 & 0.6\% & 0 & 0.4% \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1.2\% & 0.2% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1.9\% & -1.5\% & 0.5\% & -0.1\% \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1.0\% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -2.1\% & 0 & 0.9\% \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1.3\% & 0.1% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 2.5\% & 1.3\% & 0.2\% & -4.9\% \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1.2\% & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0.2\% & 0 & 2.7\% & 0 & 4.6\%
\end{pmatrix},
\]

where elements with magnitude smaller than \(10^{-3}\) have been written as zero.

[8] Data was taken September 23, 2018 on qubits \(Q_1Q_2Q_3Q_4\) of the IBM Rüeschlikon (ibmqx5) ship with 32000 measurement samples.