On relationship between subjecting the qubit to dynamical decoupling and to a sequence of projective measurements
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We consider a qubit coupled to another system (its environment), and discuss the relationship between the effects of subjecting the qubit to either a dynamical decoupling sequence of unitary operations, or a sequence of projective measurements. We give a formal statement concerning equivalence of a sequence of coherent operations on a qubit, precisely operations from a minimal set \{1_Q, \hat{\sigma}_x\}, and a sequence of projective measurements of \(\hat{\sigma}_x\) observable. Using it we show that when the qubit is subjected to \(n\) such successive projective measurements at certain times, the expectation value of the last measurement can be expressed as a linear combination of expectation values of \(\hat{\sigma}_x\) observed after subjecting the qubit to dynamical decoupling sequences of \(\pi\) pulses, with \(k \leq n\) of them applied at subsets of these times. Performing a sequence of measurements on the qubit gives then the same information about qubit decoherence and dynamics of environment as that contained in dynamical decoupling signal. Analysing the latter has been widely used to gain information about the environmental dynamics (perform so-called noise spectroscopy), so our result shows how all the results obtained with dynamical decoupling based protocols are related to those that can be obtained just by performing multiple measurements on the qubit. We also discuss in more detail the application of the general result to the case of the qubit undergoing pure dephasing, and outline possible extensions to higher-dimensional (a qudit or multiple qubits) systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Unitary operations on an open quantum system are typically used in information manipulation since they preserve the purity of the state. They are used for control and manipulation of quantum information \[1,3\] encoded initially in the system, and the open nature of the system is most often treated as a nuisance - a source of decoherence - in this context \[4\]. In quantum metrology \[5\], one employs protocols consisting of unitary operations followed by a single measurement \[6,8\], or of periods of unitary evolution interlaced with multiple measurements for error correction \[9,11\]. Most interestingly for us here, they are routinely used for characterization of the influence that the environment has on the system \[12,13\], and gaining deeper insight into the process of decoherence, especially its relations to establishment of classical and quantum correlations between the system and the environment \[14\]. Projective measurements, on the other hand, are of entanglement breaking character, and never allow continuity of the correlation between system and environment in the further steps of the manipulation protocol \[15,17\]. This class of operations is most often employed for characterization of the system \[18,19\]. It is possible to exert some degree of control over the system by subjecting it to an appropriate sequence of measurements, typically also involving post-selection \[20,21\], but the system control protocols typically used to perform some form of characterization of environmental dynamics affecting the system (often called “environmental noise spectroscopy”) are based on sequences on unitary operations. While multiple measurements on a qubit are known to allow for characterization and changing the state of an environment that is static during its interaction with the qubit \[22,25\], only quite recently the possibility of performing such characterization of dynamics of environment by performing only measurements on the system has gathered more attention \[20,30\].

In fact, there are several pieces of evidence showing that the two above-mentioned classes of operations can provide similar information, provided that several sequences of measurements are together taken into account. Examples include observation that positive operator valued measures (POVMs) can be explained in terms of projective measurements \[31,32\], derivation of noisy quantum channel decoding efficiency bound via the expansion over projective sequential measurements \[33\]: projective measurement-(preparations) reconstruction of non-Markovian dynamics over limited controls \[34\], and explanation of non-Markovian control in terms of alternative formalism of quantum stochastic process constructed from a set of measurement-preparation pairs \[17\]. For this work, the most interesting is the observation that a widely used \[12,13,35,44\] dynamical decoupling based environmental noise spectroscopy scheme \[12,13\], can be emulated by a protocol in which only measurements are performed on the qubit \[27,29\]. when the environment can be treated as a source of classical external noise acting on the qubit. In the more general case of an environment treated fully quantum mechanically, it has been shown recently in Ref. \[30\] that an arbitrary higher order bath correlation, which could be obtained by dynamical decoupling technique \[45\], can also be recovered by using
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The main result of this paper is establishing of close relation between observables obtained using a class of protocols based on multiple measurements, and expectation values of qubit coherence under dynamical decoupling sequence of unitary operations. Specifically, we consider a typical control over a qubit generated from a minimal set of two operations \( \{ \mathbb{1}_Q, \hat{\sigma}_z \} \), the so-called (standard) dynamical decoupling procedure over the qubit, and we investigate arbitrary sequences of such operations interlaced with unitary evolutions of the composite (qubit+environment) system. On the other hand, we consider sequential measurements of qubit’s \( \hat{\sigma}_x \), and we investigate arbitrary sequences of such operations (standard) dynamical decoupling procedure over the qubit, and we provide a general statement (valid for any form of qubit-environment coupling) on this operational equivalence between sequential measurements on the qubit and applying a sequence of unitary operations, discuss its relevance for noise spectroscopy (more generally: characterization of environmental dynamics by measuring the qubit coupled to the given environment), and outline the generalization to higher-dimensional systems.

This paper is organized in the following way. The mathematical framework and conventions for coherent control and sequential measurement protocol are given in Section \( \text{I} \). In Section \( \text{II} \) we derive the main formal result: we express the operation done on the composite system by a sequence of measurements as a linear combination over dynamical decoupling unitary evolutions followed by a single measurement, and, conversely, we express the operation done by a sequence of \( \hat{\sigma}_x \) unitaries (\( \pi \) pulses about the \( x \) axis of the Bloch sphere of the qubit) as a linear combination of projections interlaced with unitary evolutions. This result is general, as it holds independently of the character of qubit-environment coupling and Hamiltonians of the qubit and the environment. Then, in Section \( \text{III} \) we focus on the application of this result to the observables most easily accessible in the experiment: decoherence signal under dynamical decoupling and expectation over measurement statistics. We also discuss there some features specific to the often-encountered case of pure dephasing of the qubit, as this is the case for which most of dynamical-decoupling based noise spectroscopy theory (for a recent exception see [16]) was developed. Some possible generalizations to measurements along multiple axes and higher-dimensional system case are sketched in Section \( \text{IV} \), while in Sec. \( \text{V} \) we put the obtained results in the context of recent works on characterization of dynamics of open quantum systems using the process tensor [16] [47], and on spectroscopy of classical environmental noise [12] [13].

**II. FRAMEWORK**

We consider a qubit \( Q \), with an arbitrary environment \( E \), undergoing unitary evolution \( \hat{U} \) acting on a state \( \hat{\rho} \in \mathfrak{S}(\mathcal{H}_Q \otimes \mathcal{H}_E) = \{ \rho \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_Q \otimes \mathcal{H}_E) : \text{tr}(\rho) = 1, \rho \geq 0, \rho = \rho^\dagger \} \). Let us define a sequence of \( n \) time steps \( (t_n, t_{n-1}, \ldots, t_1) \) with \( t_n > t_{n-1} > \ldots > t_1 \), and write \( \hat{U}_k = \hat{U}(t_k, t_{k-1}) \) for all \( k = 1, \ldots, n \). We call an operation on \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}) \) an operator thereon equipped with Hilbert-Schmidt algebra that obeys the conditions of complete positivity and trace preservation [3] [15], and we call the operation local on the subsystem \( Q \) if \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_Q) \otimes \mathcal{B} \), where \( \mathcal{B} \) is a bath operator, is closed under the operation. In open quantum system mechanism in our case the unitary evolutions \( \hat{U} \) can be either global or local operations, or a composition of them, while the operations associated with measurements or coherent interventions on the qubit (e.g. pulses that are applied in the dynamical decoupling protocol) are local.

In this work we consider two types of local operations: coherent ones and local projective operations (measurements on the qubit or the subsystem). The first preserve purity of the state in the qubit subsystem, i.e. \( \text{tr}\{[\text{tr}_Q(\hat{A} \hat{\rho})]^2] \} = \text{tr}\{[\text{tr}_Q(\hat{\rho})]^2] \} \) for any \( \hat{A} \) and \( \hat{\rho} \) a partial trace over qubit degrees of freedom. For the system being a qubit, we will focus on a restricted class consisting of idle operation \( \mathcal{I} \hat{\rho} = \hat{\rho} \), and single-axis echo operation \( \mathcal{A} \hat{\rho} = (\hat{\sigma}_x \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \hat{\rho} (\hat{\sigma}_x \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \) where \( \hat{\sigma}_x \) is a Pauli \( X \) operator. Similarly one could also use \( \mathcal{Y} \hat{\rho} = (\hat{\sigma}_y \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \hat{\rho} (\hat{\sigma}_y \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \) for Pauli \( Y \) operator \( \hat{\sigma}_y \). In this language a particular sequence of the coherent operations of length \( n - 1 \) interlaced with \( n \) evolutions is given by

\[
\hat{A}_{s_{n-1}, \ldots, s_1} = \hat{U}_n \circ \hat{A}_{s_{n-1}} \circ \ldots \circ \hat{U}_2 \circ \hat{A}_{s_1} \circ \hat{U}_1
\]

where \( \hat{A}_{s_k} = \begin{cases} \mathcal{I}, & s_k = (i) \\ \mathcal{X}, & s_k = (x) \end{cases} \) and \( s_k \in \{(i), (x)\} \) denotes the sequence of idle \((i)\) and echo \((x)\) operation at every time step. For example, a spin echo sequence corresponds to the operation \( \hat{U}_2 \circ \mathcal{X} \circ \hat{U}_1 \) with \( \hat{U}_2 = \hat{U}_1 \) describing evolution of the composite system for time \( \tau \), while a two pulse Carr-Purcell (CP) symmetric sequence corresponds the operation \( \hat{U}_3 \circ \mathcal{X} \circ \hat{U}_2 \circ \mathcal{X} \circ \hat{U}_1 \) with identical generators of the evolutions and their durations being \( \tau, 2\tau \) and \( \tau \) consecutively.

Another class of operations that we consider here is of the projective type. In accordance with our focus on \( \mathcal{X} \) operation we will consider the measurement in \( \mathcal{X} \) basis done via projections \( \hat{P}_\pm \) onto \( \{|+\rangle\} \) and \( \{-\rangle\} \) eigenstates of \( \hat{\sigma}_x \), i.e. \( \hat{\sigma}_x |\pm\rangle = \pm |\pm\rangle \), associated with a measurement outcome \( m = \pm 1 \). The corresponding operation is given by \( \hat{P}_m \hat{\rho} = (\hat{P}_m \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \hat{\rho} (\hat{P}_m \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \). Note that instead of preserving the purity of the state, the projective operation corresponding to given \( m \) will always increase it, as it corresponds to doing a measurement and post-selecting the state only when result \( m \) is obtained. The operation
of this form corresponds to an entanglement breaking channel [16], since a correlated state will become separable after the measurement. In a concatenated form, a sequence of \( n \) measurements interlaced with \( n \) evolutions is given by
\[
P_{m_n, \ldots, m_1} = P_{m_n} \circ U_n \circ P_{m_{n-1}} \circ \cdots \circ U_2 \circ P_{m_1} \circ U_1 \tag{2}
\]
where \( m_k \in \{+1, -1\} \) denote a measurement sequence at every time step.

### III. RELATION BETWEEN COHERENT OPERATIONS AND SEQUENTIAL MEASUREMENTS

Since \( P_m \) and \( \sigma_x \) commute, one may describe operation from one class as combinations of the operations from the other class. In particular we have a relation \( \mathcal{X} = 2 (\mathcal{P}_+ + \mathcal{P}_-) - \mathcal{I} \), or conversely \( P_m = \frac{1}{4} (\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{X} + m \mathcal{D}_X) \) where \( \mathcal{D}_X |\rho> = (\sigma_x \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \rho + \rho (\sigma_x \otimes \mathbb{1}_E) \). In the following, we will apply these relations to the sequences of operations of each type. Let us begin with the measurement-type concatenated operation,
\[
P_{m_n, \ldots, m_1} = \frac{1}{4^n} [(\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{X} + m_n \mathcal{D}_X) \circ U_n \circ \cdots \circ (\mathcal{I} + \mathcal{X} + m_1 \mathcal{D}_X) \circ U_1] .
\]
As one can see, on the operation level, the appearance of anti-commutation operation \( \mathcal{D}_X \) means that direct expansion will contain other sequences containing \( \mathcal{D}_X \). However, we can avoid this feature if we consider an operation \( \mathcal{O}_n \) defined by
\[
\mathcal{O}_n (m_n) = \sum_{m_{n-1}, \ldots, m_1} P_{m_n, \ldots, m_1} = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \left[ P_m \circ \sum_{s_{n-1}, \ldots, s_1} A_{s_{n-1}, \ldots, s_1} \right] \tag{3}
\]
which is effectively the composition of all possible \( 2^n - 1 \) sequences of coherent operations followed by a measurement at the time step \( t_n \). We remark that the above relation follows from the vanishing of summation over measurement results \( \sum_{m} m \mathcal{C} = 0 \) for any outcome-independent operation \( \mathcal{C} \). In practice, for a given qubit local observable and our choice of initial state, the effect of the left hand side is given by expectation over measurement sequences, while the right hand side is a combination of the expectations of the same observable for the system that underwent all the possible sequences of idle/echo pulse operations applied at times, at which measurements are made. For instance, for sequence of two measurements performed at times \( t_1 \) and \( t_2 \), we have
\[
\mathcal{O}_2 (m_2) = \sum_{m_1} P_{m_2} \circ U_2 \circ P_{m_1} \circ U_1
\]

**FIG. 1.** Schematics of sequential measurements (a.) and coherent operations (b.), and the final states after processing,
\[
= \frac{1}{2} (P_{m_2} \circ U_2 \circ U_1 + P_{m_2} \circ U_2 \circ \mathcal{X} \circ U_1)
\]
showing that, for any given initial state, the state after two measurements can be written as a convex combination of states obtained by making a single measurement at time \( t_2 \) with no control pulse, and with \( \pi \) pulse at time \( t_1 \). This relation is the basis of the classical environmental noise characterization scheme by two single-shot measurements described in [27], which has been recently generalized to \( n > 2 \) measurements and explicitly connected to dynamical-decoupling based noise spectroscopy in [29].

For the converse relation, it suffices to consider only the case of \((|x>, |x>, \ldots, |x>\rangle)\) because the insertion of idle operation between two unitary evolutions can be technically absorbed in a redefinition of unitary evolution \( U_k \circ \mathcal{I} \circ U_{k-1} \rightarrow U_{k-1} \) with shifting of indices \( k+1 \rightarrow k \), mapping the original operation sequence to a shorter sequence containing only echo operations. For example, the sequence \((|x>, i, \ldots, i\rangle)\) can be written as \((|x>, x\rangle)\) by redefinition \( U_k \circ \mathcal{I} \circ U_{k-1} \rightarrow U_{k-1} \) from the original sequence. For \( n-1 \) operations \( \mathcal{X} \) interlaced in the sequence with \( n \) consecutive unitary evolutions, the expression is given by
\[
A_{|x>, \ldots, |x>} = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (-1)^{n-k} 2^k U'_k (t_{ik}) \circ \sum_{(t_{ik}) \in \mathcal{I}_{n-1}} \sum_{m_k, \ldots, m_1} P'_{m_k, \ldots, m_1} \tag{4}
\]
where \( \mathcal{I}_{n-1} \) is a set of all possible subsequences \((t_{ik})_k := (t_{ik}, \ldots, t_{ik}, t_{ik})\) of length \( k \), for \( k = 1, \ldots, n - 1 \), of the operation time sequence \((t_{ik}, \ldots, t_{ik})_k \), \( U'_k (t_{ik}) \) is a composition of all unitary evolutions after last measurement in the subsequence \((t_{ik})_k \) and \( P'_{m_k, \ldots, m_1} = \prod_{k=1}^{n} (P_{m_k} \circ U'_k) \) with \( U'_k = U_k \circ \cdots \circ U_{k-1} \) is the composition of all unitary evolutions between measurement time steps \( t_{i-1} \) and \( t_i \) in the subsequence \((t_{ik})_k \) on which the measurements \( P_{m_i} \) are evaluated. In Fig. 1 we give a schematic illustration of the operations in Eqs. (3)-(4). For example, the operation that corresponds to spin echo sequence can be
written as
\[ U_2 \circ X \circ U_1 = -U_2 \circ U_1 + 2 \left( U_2 \circ P_+ \circ U_1 + U_2 \circ P_- \circ U_1 \right). \]

Thus, the operation on the composite system that is effected by letting it evolve for time \( t_1 \), applying a short \( \pi \) pulse on the qubit, and then letting the qubit and the environment evolve for time \( t_2 - t_1 \), is written as a linear combination of three other operations: evolution for time \( t_2 \), evolution for \( t_1 \) followed by projection on \( |+\rangle \) state and subsequent evolution for \( t_2 - t_1 \), and an analogous operation with projection on \( |-\rangle \) state at \( t_1 \). For the case of evolution interrupted by 2 pulses, we have
\[ U_1 \circ X \circ U_2 \circ X \circ U_1 = U_2 \circ U_1 - 2 \left( U_2 \circ P_+ \circ U_1 + U_2 \circ U_2 \circ P_- \circ U_1 \right) - 2 \left( U_2 \circ P_+ \circ U_2 \circ U_1 + U_2 \circ P_- \circ U_2 \circ P_- \circ U_1 \right) + 4 \left( U_2 \circ P_+ \circ U_2 \circ P_- \circ U_1 + U_2 \circ P_- \circ U_2 \circ P_- \circ U_1 + U_2 \circ P_+ \circ U_2 \circ P_- \circ U_1 + U_2 \circ P_- \circ U_2 \circ P_+ \circ U_1 \right). \]

We will see in the next section that this relation can be observed via decoherence signals from one end, and expectation of measurement results over measurement sequences from the other end.

### IV. DECOHERENCE SIGNALS AND REPREPARATIONS FOR PURE-DEPHASING

Our main results, Eqs. (3)-(4), show that the relation between coherent sequences and sequential projective measurements can be expressed at the level of operations on the composite system. However, it is more transparent, and closely related to possible experimental setups, to consider an expectation of a particular observable of the qubit, which one can study in experiments.

#### A. Relation between Dynamical Decoupling

Induced Decoherence Signal and Probabilities of Sequential Measurements

Here we will apply Eqs. (3)-(4) to a situation, in which the initial state of the system is given by \( \rho = P_+ \otimes \rho_E \), and we are interested in expectation value of \( \hat{\sigma}_x \) observable on the qubit after applying a sequence of operations. From the sequential measurement point of view one can capture the effect of the operation \( O_n(m_n) \) by calculating an expectation of the \( n \)th measurement \( O_n(t_n, \ldots, t_1) = \sum_{m_{n-1}} m_{n-1} \text{tr}\{O_n(m_n) \rho \} \), see Fig. 2a. It is related to the probability over measurements sequences via \( O_n(t_n, \ldots, t_1) = \sum_{m_{n-1}, \ldots, m_1} m_{n-1} P(m_{n-1}, \ldots, m_1) \) where \( P(m_{n-1}, \ldots, m_1) = \text{tr}\{P_{m_{n-1}, \ldots, m_1} \rho \} \) defines a probability of the measurement sequence.

\[ a.) \quad P_+ \otimes \rho_0^B \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P_\pm \otimes \rho_0^B = (m_n) \]

\[ b.) \quad P_+ \otimes \rho_0^B \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P_\pm \otimes \rho_0^B = W_{s_{n-1}, \ldots, s_1}(t_n, \ldots, t_1) \]

\[ c.) \quad P_+ \otimes \rho_0^B \rightarrow \cdots \rightarrow P_\pm \otimes \rho_0^B = (m_n, \ldots, m_1) \]

FIG. 2. Three different observables for spectroscopy with qubit undergoing pure dephasing: (a.) average of final measurement result from the collection of measurements without re-preparation (b.) decoherence signal induced by dynamical decoupling process and (c.) correlation of the collection of measurements with re-preparation (with inherited environmental state represented as a dashed line).

On the other hand, we consider an expectation value of \( \hat{\sigma}_x \) of the qubit at time \( t_n \), evaluated after the qubit was subjected to a sequence of coherent operations \( A_{s_n-1, \ldots, s_1} \):

\[ W_{s_{n-1}, \ldots, s_1}(t_n, \ldots, t_1) := \text{tr}\{ (\hat{\sigma}_x \otimes \mathbf{1}_E) A_{s_n-1, \ldots, s_1} \rho \}, \]

see Fig. 2b. Using Eq. (3) and \( \sum_m \text{tr}\{P_m \rho \} = \text{tr}\{ (\hat{\sigma}_x \otimes \mathbf{1}_E) \rho \} \) for any state \( \rho \), we obtain

\[ O_n(t_n, \ldots, t_1) = \frac{1}{2^{n-1}} \sum_{s_{n-1}, \ldots, s_1} W_{s_{n-1}, \ldots, s_1}(t_n, \ldots, t_1). \]

This equation relates the expectation value of the last measurement of \( \hat{\sigma}_x \) in a sequence of \( n \) measurements to a combination of decoherence signals (also expectation values of \( \hat{\sigma}_x \)) measured after subjecting the qubit to all the possible sequences of \( \mathbf{1}_Q \) and \( \hat{\sigma}_x \) operations. This result is a generalization of an analogous relation obtained in [23] within a much more restricted setting: for a qubit experiencing pure dephasing due to external classical noise. Here we do not assume anything about qubit-environment coupling, and the environment is treated quantum mechanically.

In addition, Eq. (5) can also be applied to a similar observable \( O_k \) with \( k < n \), with respect to the operation \( O_k(m_k) = \sum_{m_{n-1} \neq m_k} P_{m_{n-1}, \ldots, m_1} \) obtained from the sub-sequence of length \( n \) measurements. In particular, one can say that statistics of measurement results for sequence of shorter length \( k \) is contained in measurements statistics for sequences of length \( n \).

From these relations, at least for the initial state of the form \( P_+ \otimes \rho_E \), it is possible to state that the collection of expectations of \( \hat{\sigma}_x \), given by all measurement sub-sequences of length \( k < n \), contains the same information as the one that we can extract from a collection of decoherence signals from all possible idle/echo sequences of
the length \( n - 1 \). For clarification, let us consider the
converse relation as in the operation level, namely
\[
\mathcal{O}_k (m_k; t_n \oplus (t_k)) = \sum_{m_{k-1}, \ldots, m_1} \mathcal{P}_{m_k} \circ \mathcal{U}(t_{k-1}) \circ \mathcal{P}_{m_{k-1}, \ldots, m_1}
\]
and
\[
\mathcal{O}_k [t_n \oplus (t_k)] = \sum_{m_{k}, \ldots, m_1} m_k \text{tr}\{\mathcal{O}_k (m_k; t_n \oplus (t_k)) | \rho\}.
\]

The quantity in the last definition refers to the expectation of \( k^{th} \) measurement result constructed from the length \( k \) sequential measurement whose first \( k - 1 \) measurements are acting at the times specified by the subsequence \( (t_k)_{k-1} \) of \( (t_{n-1}, \ldots, t_1) \) and the \( k^{th} \) measurement is done at time \( t_n \), i.e. \( t_n \oplus (t_k)_{k-1} = (t_n, t_{k-1}, \ldots, t_1) \), while the unitary evolution between each consecutive time interval is inherited directly from the original sequence. In this language Eq. (4) will lead to the identity
\[
W_{(x), \ldots, (x)} (t_n \ldots, t_1) = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (-1)^{n-1-k} 2^k \sum_{(t_k)_{k-1} \in \mathcal{F}_{n-1}} \mathcal{O}_k [t_n \oplus (t_k)]_{k-1}.
\]

For example, the decoherence signals from a spin echo protocol (the decoherence signal as a function of \( t_2 \) with a pulse applied at \( t_1 \)) can be written as a composition of results of two measurement protocols
\[
W_{(x)} (t_2, t_1) = 2O_2 (t_2, t_1) - O_1 (t_2).
\]

In the above, \( O_2 (t_2, t_1) \) is an expectation value of \( \sigma_x \) measured at time \( t_2 \) when a previous measurement of this observable was done at time \( t_1 \), while \( O_1 (t_2) \) is an expectation value of \( \sigma_x \) measured at time \( t_2 \) that was not preceded by another measurement. The converse relation is simply
\[
O_2 (t_2, t_1) = \frac{1}{2} (W_{(i)} (t_2, t_1) + W_{(x)} (t_2, t_1)),
\]

where \( W_{(x)} (t_2, t_1) \) is the expectation value of \( \sigma_x \) measured at time \( t_2 \) when a \( \pi \) pulse about \( \sigma_z \) was done at time \( t_1 \), and \( W_{(i)} (t_2, t_1) \) is an expectation value of \( \sigma_x \) measured at time \( t_2 \) that was not preceded by another control pulse (so that in fact the \( t_1 \) argument in \( W_{(i)} (t_2, t_1) \) is spurious, as it just denotes the time at which we “apply” an identity operation). These two statements show that the decoherence induced by echo can be reproduced by two-measurement protocol and vice versa. An example of an earlier appearance of such a structure can be found in [27], where pure dephasing due to classical noise was considered. Such a case of environment being a source of external classical noise is considered in a more general setting with multiple measurements in [29].

Another example is a three measurement protocol for which the expectation value of the last measurement is
\[
O_3 (t_3, t_2, t_1) = \frac{1}{4} (W_{(i)} (t_3, t_2, t_1) + W_{(x)} (t_3, t_2, t_1) + W_{(i)} (t_3, t_2, t_1) + W_{(x)} (t_3, t_2, t_1))
\]

where the interventions are done at \( t_2 \) and \( t_1 \), and decoherence signals are evaluated at \( t_3 \). On the other hand, let us consider a two pulse CP sequence with inter-pulse delays given by \( \tau, 2\tau, \tau \). In the measurement protocol we have to assign then \( t_1 = \tau, t_2 = 3\tau, t_3 = 4\tau \). The total duration of overall evolution is thus \( 4\tau + \pi \) pulses are applied at times \( \tau \) and \( 3\tau \), leading to
\[
W_{\text{CP-2}} (4\tau) = O_1 (4\tau) - 2 [O_2 (4\tau, \tau) + O_2 (4\tau, 3\tau)] + 4O_3 (4\tau, 3\tau, \tau),
\]

where measurements are done at times given as arguments of \( O_k \) functions.

B. Relation between measurement protocols with and without re-preparation in case of pure dephasing

In the formulation above, we have considered the sequence of projective measurements without any re-preparation of the states. However, in practice one may desire an insertion of re-preparation of a particular state. For example, one may want to always re-prepare the qubit only in a state \( \rho \) regardless of the result of the previous measurement. Then, the measurement operation will be followed by a re-preparation operation \( \mathcal{R} [\rho] = \rho \otimes \mathcal{Q} \rho \). Consequently, the measurement protocol with re-preparation will be given by
\[
\mathcal{P}_{\rho} \circ \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{P}_{\rho} \circ \ldots \circ \mathcal{U} \circ \mathcal{R} \circ \mathcal{P}_{\rho} \circ \mathcal{U},
\]

where the prime symbol indicates the measurement results in this protocol. This is schematically illustrated in Fig. 2.

Let us focus now on the often-encountered case of pure dephasing evolution, in which one can find a basis for the qubit that consists of pointer states unperturbed by coupling to the environment [4, 49, 50], and only superpositions of these states are subjected to decoherence of dephasing kind. This is a situation in which the unitary evolution is generated by a Hamiltonian of the form
\[
\mathbf{H} = a_2 \sigma_z \otimes \mathbf{V} + a_1 \mathbf{I}_Q \otimes \mathbf{V} \mathbf{I}_1 \mathbf{V},
\]

where \( \sigma_z \) and \( \mathbf{I}_Q \) are Pauli and identity operator on the qubit, \( \mathbf{V}_z/1 \) is a Hermitian operation acting on \( \mathcal{H}_E \), and \( a_{2/1} \) is a (possibly time dependent) real number. This Hamiltonian describes a dominant decoherence mechanism for a wide class of qubits [12, 13, 55, 51]. For such a pure dephasing Hamiltonian, the unitary evolution is given by a conjugation with an operator \( \mathbf{U} = | \uparrow \rangle \langle \uparrow | \otimes \mathbf{U}_+ + | \downarrow \rangle \langle \downarrow | \otimes \mathbf{U}_- \)

where \( | \uparrow \rangle \langle \uparrow | \) is a projection onto maximum (minimum) eigenstate of \( \sigma_z \), and \( \mathbf{U}_\pm \) is a unitary operator.
acting locally on the environment, conditioned on the state of the qubit.

We observe that the sub-process constructed from such operator $P_m \circ U \ [P_\pm \otimes \rho_E]$ will detect only the relative direction from the incoming state regardless of labelling of the axis. In particular $P_m \circ U \ [P_+ \otimes \rho_E]$ is unitarily equivalent to the out-coming state $P_{-m} \circ U \ [P_- \otimes \rho_E]$. Furthermore, the set of measurement outcomes $\{+1, -1\}$ is closed under multiplication. These observations lead to the following relabelling relation between measurement sequences for the cases of Eqs. (2) and (11):

$$\mathbb{P}_R (m'_n, m'_{n-1}, ..., m'_1) \equiv \mathbb{P} (m_n \cdot m_{n-1}, ..., m_2 \cdot m_1, m_1),$$

(12)

where $\mathbb{P}_R$ is a probability of obtaining a sequence of results in the protocol with re-preparation. In other words, the input state $P_\pm$ will be relabeled as $P_\mp$ if the previous measurement result is $P_-$. and not be relabeled otherwise. Note that this labeling simply corresponds to a change of assignment convention of the measurement results to the measurement sequences. A more detailed derivation of this relation is given in Appendix A.

Taking into account the above relabeling, the expectation value $O_n$ that we previously considered, corresponds to a correlation of all the measurement results in the re-preparation case:

$$O_n(t_n, ..., t_1) = \sum_{m_n, ..., m_1} m_n \mathbb{P} (m_n, ..., m_1)$$

$$= \sum_{m'_n, ..., m'_1} \left( \prod_{k=1}^{n} m'_k \right) \mathbb{P}_R (m'_n, ..., m'_1).$$

Consequently, the relations between decoherence signals induced by coherent sequences, and expectations over measurement sequences, can also be applied to the protocol with re-preparation when the expectation $O_n$ is replaced by the correlation as in the last equation. The schematic representations of the measurement protocol without re-preparation, dynamical decoupling, and measurement protocol with re-preparation, are given in Fig. 2.

For example, one then has $O_2(t_2, t_1) = \langle \hat{\sigma}_z (t_2) \hat{\sigma}_z (t_1) \rangle$, and using Eq. (8) we arrive exactly at the result obtained in [27] in a restricted setting of environment being a source of classical noise. Here we have shown, without making any assumption about the nature of the environment that leads to pure dephasing of the qubit, that a correlation of $n$ measurements of $\hat{\sigma}_z$, each followed by a re-initialization of the qubit in $\mid + \rangle$ state, is related to measurements of coherence of qubits subjected to dynamical decoupling according to Eq. (5).

This generalizes the relationship between $n$-measurement protocols and dynamical decoherence protocols with $k \leq n$ pulses, derived in [28] for classical environmental noise, to quantum environments.

V. SOME POSSIBLE GENERALISATIONS

Apart from the minimal control algebra $\{1, \hat{\sigma}_x\}$, pulses about other axes can be also considered. For example, in the sequences of coherent operations one may replace some of $\hat{A}_x$ by $\hat{Y}$ operations in the protocols without re-preparation. The corresponding measurement protocol will need to follow the relation $Y = 2 (P_X^Y + P_Y^X) - I$ and $P_Y^X = \frac{1}{4} (I + Y - i m_Y D_Y)$, where the outcomes $m_Y$ have ${\pm}i$ values assigned in order to distinguish them from $P_X^Y$ measurement, and the elementary operations are defined in the similar fashion as for the $X$ axis. In fact, one can see that the coherent sequences, as well as the sequential measurements with an additional measurement axis $Y$, can be considered as an intertwining of sequences from the control sets $\{1, \hat{\sigma}_x\}$ and $\{1, \hat{\sigma}_y\}$. For instance, a measurement sequence $\hat{A}^Y \circ U \circ \hat{A}^X$, in which $\hat{A}^X/Y$ is a coherent operation with respect to $X/Y$ axis, can be related to $P_Y^X \circ U \circ P_X^Y$ in a similar fashion as in Eqs. (3)-(4) without additional difficulty. This idea agrees with the results in Ref. [30], where the higher order bath correlations (which can be obtained by pulse sequences in principle, see e.g. [45]) are extracted from measurements along multiple axes in a certain parameter regime. This suggests that sequences of coherent operations and of measurements give access to the same amount of information about the environment.

However, in the pure dephasing case and for the protocol with re-preparations, the relabeling procedure will become complicated in the case of multiple axes of pulses/measurements, since some sequences will contain an operation that follows another operation along a different axis e.g. $\hat{Y} \circ U \circ \hat{X}$. The re-preparation protocol $\mathbb{R}$ will map four possible outcome qubit states of the previously measured states $\mathbb{P}_\pm$ and $\mathbb{P}_Y$ into $\mathbb{P}_\mp$. The relabeling will be possible both in a single-axis and two-axis cases, because $\{+1, -1, +i, -i\}$ is still closed under multiplication, and one can construct the relabeling convention similar to the one in Eq. (12). Furthermore, $\mathbb{P}_\pm$ together with $\mathbb{P}_Y$ can be considered as a tomography basis for the subsystem evolution of the qubit, where the set of all positive value operators $\{P_\pm, P_Y^\mp\}$ will no longer fully orthogonal but symmetric and informationally complete (SIC-POVM) [52]. Hence it would be interesting to consider other choice of measurement for the expansions of coherent operations, e.g. a tetrahedral basis in the Bloch sphere [52].

For a general finite system, the expansion of coherent operations in terms of identity operations and measurement operations can be implemented in several ways, depending on the setup of the control algebra. One of the simplest examples is a sequential shifting protocol [17] [53] over $d$-dimensional system with the control set $\{1, S_1, ..., S_{d-1}\}$ generated by $S_k = g^k$, with a shifting
generator

\[
g = \begin{pmatrix}
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & \ldots & 0 \\
\vdots & \ddots & \ddots & \ddots & \vdots \\
1 & 0 & 0 & \ldots & 0
\end{pmatrix}.
\] (13)

Eigenprojections \( \{P_0, P_1, \ldots, P_{d-1}\} \) of the matrix \( g \) define the corresponding measurement axes, while eigenvalues belong to the set \( \{m_0 = 1, m_1, \ldots, m_{d-1}\} \); all possible \( d \)th roots of 1, namely the solutions of \( z^d = 1 \), will be assigned as measurement values to all projections. From the structure of the measurement outcomes, one can deduce that \( 1 + \sum_{j=1}^{d-1} m_j = 0, |m_j| = 1 \) for all \( j \), and \( \{m_j\}_{j=1}^{d-1} \) is closed under multiplication and complex conjugation. Now we write

\[
S_k [\rho] = S_k \rho S_k^\dagger, \quad S_k = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} m_i^{k} P_i,
\]

\[
P_i [\rho] = P_i \rho P_i \quad \text{and} \quad Q_{ij} [\rho] = P_i \rho P_j.
\]

It follows that

\[
I + \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} S_k = d \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} P_i + \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \sum_{j \neq i} \left[ 1 + \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} (m_i m_j)^k \right] Q_{ij}
\]

(14)

where \( m \) is a complex conjugate of \( m \). The element \( m_i m_j \) is also a root of unity then if all roots except 1 are primitive, e.g. \( d \) is a prime number, the set \( \{m_j\}_{j=1}^{d-1} \) will be equal to \( \{m_{k,j}\}_{k=0}^{d-1} \) for any \( m_j, j \neq 0 \). Hence the terms in the double summation will vanish and we will obtain an analogous version of \( I + X = 2 (P_+ + P_-) \) as

\[
I + \sum_{k=1}^{d-1} S_k = d \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} P_i,
\]

(15)

or simply speaking the overall shifting procedure can be reproduced by sequential measurements in the same basis. For the case with more than one non-primitive root \( m_j \), the structure may be folded into sub-cycle of shorter lengths for the order of its division. For example, with \( d = 4 \) we find that \( \{1, -1, i, -i\} = \{1, 1\} \), which is the set of measurement outcomes for two dimensions, and the elements in the double sum still vanish in this case. In addition, from Eq. (15), contrary to \( I + X = 2 (P_+ + P_-) \), for dimension \( d > 2 \) one cannot fully express the effect from single shifting operation, e.g. \( S_k \) for some \( k \), in terms of only measurement operations and identity operations, but operations of every orders (e.g. \( S_k \) for every \( k \)) need to be taken into account.

VI. DISCUSSION

The main theoretical result of this paper is contained in relations given in Eqs. (3) and (4), showing that a collection of sequential measurements on a qubit interacting with its environment contains the same information, as that which can be obtained from a sequence of coherent operations followed by a single measurement. Let us discuss some of the broader implications of this result.

First, let us describe the dynamics of the open quantum system using the abstract notion of process tensor introduced in Refs. [10][17]. In particular, in our case, one can consider the dynamics of the qubit and environment together with the initial state of the composite system, as an unknown single entity that an experimenter wants to study, by subjecting it to arbitrary quantum operations at a set of times \( t_1, \ldots, t_{n-1} \). The process tensor is the mapping from the sequence of operations \( A_1, \ldots, A_{n-1} \) to the final state at time \( t_n \). The experiment can examine the process tensor by subjecting the system to sequences of interventions (measurements and coherent operations), and collecting responses to these sequences from a final density matrix of the qubit. In this way one can extract partial information on the environment by applying various sequences of local unitary operations (control pulses) to the qubit, thus changing the arguments of the process tensor.

In addition to the unitary interventions, the experimenter can also implement the sequences of projections in order to examine the same properties of the tensor. The projections will break the entanglement between qubit and environment, and such quantum correlation is no longer inherited in the further steps of process. For instance, entanglement produced by the first evolution will not be encrypted in the initial state of the second step of the evolution, and the information from the projection sequence will be limited. However, as we have shown here, by combining the sequences of projections in a specific way, given in Eqs. (3), we can recover the effect that one obtains from a sequence of unitary interventions. This means that, at least for the considered minimal set of control operations considered here, using coherent operations on the qubit does not provide any theoretical advantage (practically it might be, of course, more efficient to implement) in characterization of the process tensor of the considered open quantum system.

Secondly, let us add a few remarks on implications that our results have for the research program of characterizing the environment and qubit-environment coupling by using either dynamical decoupling, or multiple measurements on the qubit. In the case of pure dephasing of the qubit, and the environment being either a source of external classical noise, or (possibly quantum) Gaussian noise, the relation between the dynamical decoupling signals and the properties of the environmental dynamics is well-established [12][13][45]. By an appropriate choice [38][55] of DD sequences one can reconstruct the power spectral density of Gaussian noise, and characterization of polyspectra of non-Gaussian noise is also possible, albeit more challenging [45][50]. Building on earlier results [27], we have recently established a close connection between the DD-based and multiple measurement-based noise spectroscopy in the case of pure dephasing due to
external classical noise [29]. In this work we show that such a close relationship between observables available in protocols based on multiple measurements, and the ones available after subjecting the qubit to dynamical decoupling, is much more general: it holds on the operational level without making any assumption on the initial state of the total system, the qubit-environment coupling, and the quantum or effectively classical nature of environmental dynamics affecting the qubit. We expect this result to contribute to the recently ongoing theoretical efforts aimed at understanding what information about quantum environment one can obtain from multiple measurements on the qubit [30, 57, 58], and at extending the DD-based noise spectroscopy paradigm to the case of general qubit-environment coupling [46].

VII. CONCLUSION

Summarizing, we have presented in this paper two main results. The first is a formal statement on the equivalence of effects from sequence of coherent local operations (for the minimal set of control \{1, \sigma_x\}) on the qubit, and sequential projective measurements on the qubit. We have shown that the operation effected on the composite system of the qubit and its environment in one of these ways, can be expressed as a linear combination of operations from the other class. Let us stress that this holds for any initial state of the whole system (including correlated qubit-environment states), and for any form of qubit-environment interaction.

The second result, following from the first one, is the relation between observables obtained in two kinds of experiments: one involving \( n \) projective measurements (at times \( t_1,\ldots,t_n \)) of \( \sigma_x \) on the qubit, and the other involving application of \( k < n \) rotations by \( \pi \) about the \( x \) axis (\( \tilde{\sigma}_x \) operations) at times forming a subset of times of first \( n - 1 \) of measurements, followed by measurement of \( \tilde{\sigma}_x \) at the \( t_{n-1} \) time. For an initially uncorrelated qubit-environment state, the expectation value of the last measurement in the first experiment can be expressed as a linear combination of expectations of \( \sigma_x \) measured after the application of the rotation sequences. In the case of pure dephasing of the qubit, such sequences of \( \pi \) pulses about the \( x \) axis lead to frequency-selective dynamical decoupling of the qubit from its environment, which is widely used to characterize the environmental dynamics affecting the qubit. We have thus shown how all the results for dynamical-decoupling based spectroscopy of qubits undergoing pure dephasing (for a general environment described quantum mechanically) can be recovered with protocols in which the qubit is subjected solely to multiple measurements. Let us also note that in the case of pure dephasing we have shown that the result of the above-described experiment involving multiple measurements is equivalent to a result of a protocol considered in \[27,29\], in which the qubit is re-initialized in a chosen state after each measurements, and correlation between results of multiple measurements are considered. As a consequence, the noise spectroscopy protocols considered in \[27\] and \[29\] for the case of the environment being a source of classical noise, can be also employed in the general case of environment described quantum mechanically.

We have also shown the converse result: the decoherence signal induced by an arbitrary sequence can be replicated by using observables obtained from multiple sequences of measurements on the qubit. This is an interesting example of being able to exchange the coherent control for a sequence of projective measurements. Fundamentally, the expression of the same signals from the protocol of different characteristics reflects the significant feature of the manipulations, namely coherent and entanglement breaking operations. This is a concept behind the introduction of process tensor [10,24] where the information imprinted in the structure of the dynamics can be extracted by performing different sets of measurement-preparation setups, and combining overall results according to the profiles of measurement-preparation sets (see Refs. [10,24] and references therein.)

Compared to the case of the qubit, extending the formulation to the case of higher dimensional systems is challenging. We have discussed a specific case of shifting protocols, but in the arbitrary control sets the formulation of an analogous relation between a class of protocols based on coherent operations on a subsystem, and on measurements on this subsystem, should be considered on a case by case basis. Further work in this direction, and establishing a more general connection between the two modes of manipulation of open quantum systems, remains open for further investigation.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Jan Krzywda, Damian Kwiatkowski, and Piotr Szafkowski for discussions. This work is supported by funds of Polish National Science Center (NCN), Grant no. 2015/19/B/ST3/03152.

Appendix A: Relation between protocols with and without re-initialization of the qubit

In this section we will consider in more detail the evolution of composite system generated by \( H = a_x \sigma_z \otimes V_x + a_1 \mathbb{1}_Q \otimes V_1 \) in the main text. We know that the state after \((k-1)^{th}\) measurement will be of the form 
\[
\frac{1}{2} \left( \mathbb{1} + p_k \sigma_x \right) \otimes \rho_{k-1}^{P_k},
\]
where \( p_k = \pm 1 \) according to the measurement outcome of the \((k-1)^{th}\) measurement. After an evolution \( \mathcal{U}_k \) followed by measurement in the state...
\[ \frac{1}{2} (1 + m_k \sigma_z), \] 
the unnormalised state will be

\[ \frac{1}{2} (1 + m_k \sigma_z) \otimes \rho_k^B = \frac{1}{2} (1 + m_k \sigma_z) \otimes (K_{m_k, p_k} [\rho_{k-1}^B]) \]

where \( K_{m_k, p_k} [\rho^B] = K_{m_k, p_k} \rho^B K_{m_k, p_k}^\dagger \). \( K_{m_k, p_k} = \frac{1}{2} (U_\uparrow (\tau_k) + p_k m_k U_\downarrow (\tau_k)) \) and \( U_\uparrow/\downarrow (\tau_k) = e^{-i\tau_k (a_1 V_1 \pm a_2 V_1)} \) with duration of the evolution given by \( \tau_k \).

From the the environment point of view, as can be deduced from the the reduced map \( \mathcal{K} \), it can be said that the effect on the environment from the measurement does not truly depend on the outcome state \( |\pm\rangle \), but on the difference in sign between the outcome and the incoming state; or in other words one can write \( K_{m_k, p_k} = K_{m_k, m_{k-1}, +} \). This holds for the pure dephasing case, since the average dynamical map is unital, and the Bloch ball can be separated into two subspaces concerning (I\( Z \)) and (XY) plane. Consequently, the transformation \((x, y) \mapsto (-x, -y)\) while the \( z \) is kept, can be done without disturbing the structure of the dynamics [45].

Using this notation, in addition to the measurement sequence we can consider \((p_1, \ldots, p_n)\) as a sequence of preparations, and then the probability of getting measurement sequence \((m_1, \ldots, m_n)\) given a sequence of preparation \((p_1, \ldots, p_n)\) reads

\[ \mathbb{P} (m_n, \ldots, m_1 \mid p_n, \ldots, p_1) = \text{tr} \left( \left( \prod_{k=n}^{1} K_{m_k, p_k} \right) [\rho_0^B] \right). \]  
(A2)

The protocol without re-preparation (the scheme considered in Sections III and IVA) can be described by the set of parameters \( p_1 = +1 \) and \( p_k = m_{k-1} \) for \( k > 1 \), while the protocol with re-preparation in \(|+\rangle\) (considered in Sec. IVB) will be denoted as \( p_k = +1 \) for all \( k \geq 1 \). From the observations in the previous paragraph one can see that

\[ \mathbb{P} (m_n, \ldots, m_1 \mid +, +, +) = \mathbb{P} (m_1, m_1 \cdot m_2 \cdot \ldots \cdot m_n \cdot m_{n-1} \mid +, m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1}) \]  
(A3)

so that the probabilities from the protocol with re-preparation can be bijectively mapped to that from the protocol without re-preparation in only \(|+\rangle\).

From a statistical point of view, it is clear that a moment or measurement correlation observed from the procedure with re-preparation, can be obtained from the statistics of the protocol without re-preparation. For instance, an \( n \) measurement correlation in the case with re-preparation, \( \left\langle \prod_{k=1}^{n} m_k \right\rangle \), can be reproduced from the expectation of the last measurement result from the protocol without re-preparation:

\[ \left\langle \prod_{k=1}^{n} m_k \right\rangle \mathbb{P} (m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1}, +) = \sum_{m_k} \left( \prod_{k=1}^{n} m_k \right) \mathbb{P} (m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1}, +) \]  
(A4)

\[ \left\langle \prod_{k=1}^{n} m_k \right\rangle \mathbb{P} (m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1}, +) = \sum_{m_k} m_n \left( \prod_{k=1}^{n-1} m_k^2 \right) \times \mathbb{P} (m_1, m_2, \ldots, m_{n-1}, +, m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1}) \]  
(A5)

where \( \left\langle A \right\rangle = \sum_{m_k} A \mathbb{P} (m_1, \ldots, m_{n-1}, p_n, \ldots, p_1) \).

We remark again that this property holds due to two factors: (i) the manipulated system is a qubit, so the choice of measured and prepared states is limited to \(|+1, -1\rangle\), and they can be related easily, and (ii) we consider the pure dephasing Hamiltonian, so the plane subspace (XY) and invariant subspace (IZ) will be evolve separately. In order to intuitively understand the origin of this relation, the basic idea is that in the protocol without re-preparation, the probability to get a particular measurement result at any time step depends on the previous measurement results. Consequently, the information obtained from the last measurement result will contain the information on the whole measurement sequence. On the other hand, in the protocol with re-preparation this situation cannot occur, so the experimenter needs to collect all the measurement results to obtain the same statistics as in the previous case.
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