Quantum Poker – a pedagogical tool to introduce the basic concepts of quantum computing and error mitigation techniques for NISQ devices
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Abstract

Quantum computers are on the verge of becoming a commercially available reality. They represent a paradigm shift in computing, with a steep learning gradient. The creation of games is a way to ease the transition for beginners. We present a game similar to the Poker variant Texas hold ‘em with the intention to serve as an engaging pedagogical tool to learn the basics rules of quantum computing. The difference to the classical variant is that the community cards are replaced by a quantum register that is "randomly" initialized, and the cards for each player are replaced by quantum gates, randomly drawn from a set of available gates. Each player can create a quantum circuit with their cards, with the aim to maximize the number of 1’s that are measured in the computational basis. The basic concepts of superposition, entanglement and quantum gates are employed. We provide a proof-of-concept implementation using Qiskit[1]. A comparison of the results for the created circuits using a simulator and IBM machines is conducted, showing that error rates on contemporary quantum computers are still very high. For the success of noisy intermediate scale quantum (NISQ) computers, improvements on the error rates and error mitigation techniques are necessary, even for simple circuits. We show that quantum error mitigation (QEM) techniques can be used to improve expectation values of observables.

1 Introduction

Quantum computing is an emerging technology exploiting quantum mechanical phenomena – namely superposition, entanglement, and tunneling – in order to perform computation. Quantum computers have huge potential to transform society in a similar way that classical computers have, because they open up the possibility to tackle certain types of problems that are beyond the reach of classical computers. The first commercially available quantum computers are expected within the next five years, and it is expected that quantum computers will outperform their classical counterparts in some tasks within the same time period. In order to utilize the potential power of quantum computers, one has to formulate a given problem in a form that is suitable for a quantum computer (encoding step) and develop specialized algorithms. These type of algorithms are fundamentally different from classical algorithms. Getting accustomed to quantum algorithms has a considerable learning curve and requires a multidisciplinary approach. Typically, knowledge from physics, mathematics, computers science and a firm understanding from an application area such as quantum chemistry, optimization, or machine learning is required. In addition, it is advantageous to have knowledge of the underlying physics, particularly in the NISQ era. The New York Times estimated in October 2018[1] that the global number of high-level researchers in quantum computing may be less than a thousand. The design of games that make use of the underlying rules of quantum computers are a way to attract more interest and ease the transition from classical algorithms to quantum algorithms for beginners.

Near-term applications of early quantum devices, such as electronic structure problems and optimization, rely on accurate estimates of expectation values to become of practical relevance. However, inherent noise in quantum devices leads to wrong estimates of the expectation values of observables. Therefore, getting rid of (most of) the noise inherent in quantum computing is a critical step toward making it useful for practical applications. Quantum error correction (QEC) can only be achieved by increasing quantum resources (ancillary qubits). The first scheme was proposed by Shor[14] and many other schemes were proposed since then, e.g., the class called stabilizer codes, see Gottesman[4]. However, the number of ancillary qubits needed to achieve QEC depends intrinsically on the error rates and is out of reach for NISQ devices. Quantum error mitigation (QEM), on the other hand can be achieved with additional classical resources only and is therefore applicable to NISQ devices.

The main contributions of this article are as follows.

- We introduce a novel quantum game based on classic Poker. The game is useful to introduce basic quantum computing concepts to beginners.
• We implement error mitigation schemes based on the extrapolation technique. A comparison of the results on simulators and real quantum devices is provided.

This article is organized as follows. After describing related work in Section 2 we present the description of our game in Section 3. Using a representative circuit from an example game we report results of ideal and noisy circuit sampling in Section 4. Finally, we describe methods for error mitigation in Section 5 before concluding in Section 6.

2 Related Work

There exist a number of games based on quantum physics and they can be categorized into the following two types. The first type attempt to illustrate quantum mechanical effects, and one might therefore call them quantum mechanics games. The second type illustrate quantum computing via qubits and quantum circuit building. It is the latter type of game that has been developed in connection with this paper. For a recent review of the subject of quantum games we refer to, e.g., [7]. Existing quantum computing games include ”Battleships with partial NOT gates”, solving puzzles by creating simple programs, and ”quantum chess”. Some are available as Jupyter Notebooks in Qiskit’s Github repository of tutorials.

Mitigating the effect of noise on the execution of circuits is critical for the success of NISQ devices. The ideal action of a gate is given by a unitary operator $U$ transforming a state $|\phi\rangle$ into $U|\phi\rangle$. The two basic types of noise. *Coherent noise* means that a small perturbation $\tilde{U}$ of $U$ is executed, where $\tilde{U}$ is still unitary and preserves the purity of the input state $|\phi\rangle$. An example is a slight over-rotation. *Incoherent noise* does not preserve the purity of the state. This type of noise comes from the (unwanted) interaction with the environment. In this case the evolution must be described through density matrices and Kraus operators. An example of incoherent noise is amplitude damping modeling relaxation from an excited state to the ground state. For a single qubit with decay probability $p$, the density matrix $\rho = |\phi\rangle \langle \phi |$ is mapped to $K_0 \rho K_0^\dagger + K_1 \rho K_1^\dagger$ with $K_0 = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{1-p} \end{pmatrix}$, $K_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \sqrt{p} \end{pmatrix}$. Different types of techniques have been presented in the literature that can be used to mitigate the influence of noise on the ideal circuit. In the following we discuss the most important ones.

*Quantum subspace expansion (QSE).* The main idea is to use operators from a given set (such as the set of Pauli operators) to expand about the variational solution. A generalized eigenvalue problem using linear subspaces is solved. This method leaves the circuit width (number of qubits) and depth (largest number of gates on any inputoutput path) unchanged. The method is introduced by Wecker et al. (2015) [17] where numerical evidence is provided. For the variational quantum eigensolver numerical evidence for error mitigation is provided by McClean et al. (2017) in [9]. An extension of the approach is given in Colless et al. (2018) [2]. The complete energy spectrum of the H$_2$ molecule is calculated with near chemical accuracy. Premakumar and Joynt (2018) [11] generalize the concept of decoherence-free subspace (DFS) to noise with correlations in space to avoid regions where decoherence measures are high. However, as the authors point out themselves, only dephasing noise is considered and it is unlikely that the method is useful for general error models. DFSs do not exist for other types of noise, e.g., if noise flips spins.

*Probabilistic error cancellation.* The main idea is to represent the ideal circuit as a quasi-probabilistic mixture of noisy ones. The circuit depth and width remain unchanged with this method. Temme et al. (2017) [16] present the method together with numerical evidence. Song et al. (2019) [15] demonstrate an error mitigation protocol based on gate set tomography and quasiprobability decomposition. One- and two-qubit circuits are tested on a superconducting device, and computation errors are successfully suppressed. Process tomography is not feasible for more than a few qubits since it scales exponentially with the number of qubits. In addition, process tomography is sensitive to noise in the pre- and post rotation gates plus the measurements (SPAM errors). Gate set tomography can take these errors into account, but the scaling becomes even worse.

*Extrapolation techniques.* The main idea is to amplify the noise deliberately in a controlled way. The information of the dependence of the expectation value on the noise level is used to extrapolate back to the zero noise level. The circuit width remains unchanged, but the circuit depth is longer (or gate times are prolonged in case of phase control). Temme et al. (2017) [16] and Li and Benjamin (2017) [8] introduced the technique and provide numerical evidence. Endo et al. (2018) [3] extend the work of [18] [8] by accounting for the inevitable imperfections in the experimentalist’s measuring the effect of errors in order to design efficient QEM circuits. Kandala et al. (2019) [6] presents important considerations for hardware and algorithmic implementations of the zero-noise extrapolation technique, and demonstrates tremendous improvements in the accuracy of variational eigensolvers implemented by a noisy superconducting quantum processor. Evidence on real quantum hardware is presented. In contrast to previous works, the increase of errors is not done by artificially introducing additional gates, but directly by pulse control. For IBM’s quantum computers, access at this level (pulse/machine level) is only possible for customers of, which makes this technique inaccessible to us. Otten and Gray (2019) [10] introduce a technique that can be viewed as a multidimensional extension. The approach corresponds to repeating the same quantum evolution many times with known variations on the underlying systems’ error properties. They show that the effective spontaneous emission, T1, and dephasing, T2, times can be increased using their method in both simulation and experiments on an actual quantum computer.

In this article we present results using the extrapolation method. We conduct experiments on simulators with error models and real quantum computers.

---

or in an entangled state like the Bell states is equal for all players. The matrix of qubits measured to the state $|\psi\rangle = X|0\rangle + Z|1\rangle$ is:

$$
\begin{pmatrix}
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 0
\end{pmatrix}
$$

The action of each of quantum logic gates consist of operations acting on one or two qubits. In our implementation, the set consists of the Hadamard gate $H$, the phase flip gate $Z$, the NOT gate $X$ and the controlled NOT gate $CX$. The action of each gate on a qubit is:

- $H|0\rangle = |+\rangle$ and $H|+\rangle = |0\rangle$,
- $Z|0\rangle = |0\rangle$ and $Z|1\rangle = |1\rangle$,
- $X|+\rangle = |+\rangle$ and $X|0\rangle = |0\rangle$,
- $CX|00\rangle = |00\rangle$ and $CX|01\rangle = |10\rangle$.

In quantum Poker each player acts on a personal “copy” of the community cards, consisting of a quantum register.

### 3 Quantum Poker Rules

The classical Texas hold ’em round involves five community cards on the table shared by all the players, while each player holds 2 unique cards in their own hand. Given the state $|\psi\rangle = X|0\rangle + Z|1\rangle$, the excited state is created. The matrix $n_{11}$ is given by $n_{11} = \sum_{i} \lambda_i |\langle \psi_i | \psi \rangle|^2$.

In quantum Poker each player acts on a personal “copy” of the community cards, consisting of a quantum register. Hence, the only interaction between the players is through betting. An example initial state is shown in Figure 1. The quantum Poker game considered here draws inspiration from Texas hold ’em Poker and shares its structure.

In quantum Poker each player acts on a personal “copy” of the community cards, consisting of a quantum register. Hence, the only interaction between the players is through betting. An example initial state is shown in Figure 1. The quantum Poker game considered here draws inspiration from Texas hold ’em Poker and shares its structure.

### List of useful quantum operations for quantum Poker

- $X|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$,
- $H|\psi\rangle = H|\psi\rangle$,
- $Z|\psi\rangle = Z|\psi\rangle$,
- $CX|\psi\rangle = CX|\psi\rangle$.

Figure 1: Example of a quantum Poker game and the basic rules needed to play.
number of ones in the computational basis. This can be done by choosing

\[ A = \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} b(i) P_i, \]

where \( b(i) \) is a function returning the number of ones of the binary representation of \( i \), and \( P_i = |i\rangle \langle i| \) is the measurement operator in the computational basis. \( A \) is a diagonal matrix with eigensystem \( \{ b(i), |i\rangle \} \). The matrix \( A \) can also be constructed via the number operator in the second quantization (a formalism used to describe and analyze quantum many-body systems), which is given by

\[ A = \sum_i N_i, \quad \text{where} \quad N_i = a_i^\dagger a_i. \]

The creation and annihilation operators are given by

\[
\begin{align*}
a_i^\dagger &= I^\otimes (n-i-1) \otimes Q^+ \otimes \sigma_z^i, \\
a_i &= I^\otimes (n-i-1) \otimes Q^- \otimes \sigma_z^i,
\end{align*}
\]

and the raising and lowering operator is given by

\[ Q^+ = \frac{1}{2} (\sigma_x + i\sigma_y), \]

i.e., \( Q^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \), \( Q^- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \). As an example, for two qubits \( A \) is a diagonal matrix with entries (0, 1, 1, 2), from upper left to lower right.

## 4 Results for ideal and noisy quantum circuit sampling

In the following we use Max’s circuit, shown in Figure 1b, as an example to investigate the effects of noise in NISQ devices.

### 4.1 Ideal simulator

The state that Max creates is given by \( |\phi_{\text{Max}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|01101\rangle + |11111\rangle) \). Each realization of the circuit on an ideal (simulated) quantum computer results in a classical bit string \( q_{n-1} \ldots q_0 \) after measurement. A state \( \phi = \sum_i \alpha_i |i\rangle \) induces a probability distribution \( P_\phi(i) = |\alpha_i|^2 \). For Max’s circuit this distribution is thus given by a 50% chance of being in either state \( |01101\rangle \) and \( |11111\rangle \). The expectation value for Max’s circuit is thus \( \langle A \rangle_{|\phi_{\text{Max}}\rangle} = 4 \). Figure 2 shows the convergence of sequence averages on an ideal simulator with respect to the number of repetitions to the expectation value, as well as the according probability distribution of the sequence. Here, we have used Qiskit’s simulator with 1024 repetitions, each consisting of 1024 shots.
4.2 Set of universal quantum gates and circuit mappings

On a real quantum device, such as IBM’s QX architectures, only certain types of operations/gates are supported. This set contains the single qubit gates $U_3, U_2, U_1$, and the CNOT gate. In order to execute a circuit, one needs to express the circuit in these basis gates. The Solovay-Kitaev theorem guarantees that this is always possible up to a given accuracy.

An additional complication comes from the fact that only a subset of qubits are physically connected. On IBM’s QX devices CNOT gates can only be applied to qubits that are connected by a bus resonator. As an example, Figure 3a shows the connectivity graph of IBM’s QX2 device, where edges mark qubits that are physically connected. In order to execute a circuit that does not fit the connectivity graph, additional gates, such as SWAP or BRIDGE gates, need be used to transform the circuit into an equivalent one that obeys the connectivity graph. Inserting one SWAP or BRIDGE gate increases the number of CNOT gates by three. On current NISQ devices the noise level of two-qubit gate (CNOT) times and error rates are one order of magnitude higher than for single qubit gates\[12\], see also Figure 3a. One therefore wishes to find a mapping with the lowest number of CNOT gates. In general, the problem of finding an optimal mapping is $\mathcal{NP}$-complete problem$[18]$. For recent heuristics we refer to $[5, 18]$ and references therein. For Max’s circuit it is easy to find an optimal mapping manually, which is shown in Figure 3b, using only one extra SWAP gate.

4.3 The effect of noise on quantum computation

Noise is inherent to quantum computers. Qiskit provides methods for automatic generation of approximate noise models matching a given hardware device. This enables us to simulate the effects of realistic noise on our computation before we run our circuits on a real quantum computer. Figure 2 shows the results of the original and adapted circuit, both transformed with the Qiskit transpiler to match IBM’s QX2 device using the highest optimization level, see
Figure 5: Pauli twirling has no effect on the simulated quantum circuits. However, it leads to an increased variance on the IBM QX2 device. In addition, it can be seen that the expectation value with the IBM QX2 device is converging to a much lower value than its simulated noise model, which is lower than the theoretical value. Compared with Figure 2, convergence takes longer on IBM QX2.

Due to the influence of noise, the resulting expectation values converge to a value around 3.85 for the simulated noise model and 3.54 on the IBM QX2 device, see Figure 5. Both values are far off the ideal value of 4. In the following we will show how to mitigate the effect of errors on expectation values in order to get a better estimate of the ideal expectation value.

5 Error mitigation.

In this section we will apply the zero-noise extrapolation method to our circuit. The basic assumption of the method is that the expectation value of an observable depends smoothly on a small noise parameter $\lambda \ll 1$ and admits the following power series,

$$\langle A \rangle_{\phi}(\lambda) = \langle A \rangle_{\phi}^* + \sum_{i=1}^{n} a_i \lambda^i + O(\lambda^{i+1}),$$

where $\langle A \rangle_{\phi}^*$ is the zero noise value we are trying to recover. Richardson’s deferred approach to the limit[13] can then be applied to get a better estimate of the zero noise value. The method requires to generate $n$ estimates to the expectation value, i.e., $\langle A \rangle_{\phi}(r_i \lambda)$ for $r_1 < r_2 < \cdots < r_n$. A better estimate of $\langle A \rangle_{\phi}^*$ is then constructed by combining these values in such a way that the lowest order terms in the power series cancel. Clearly, using $r_1 = 1$ generates the expectation value with the least noise. Amplification of noise with the factors $r_i > 1$ can either be achieved directly through pulse control or through modifying the circuit by adding certain extra gates. For IBM’s QX devices pulse control is only accessible for their customers, which leaves us with the second possibility.

5.1 Pauli Twirling

Before we apply the noise amplification, we convert the non-stochastic errors of CNOT gates into stochastic errors, see e.g. [8, section VII] for a detailed description. One way to achieve this is to apply Pauli-twirling. Twirling means surrounding a two qubit gate $\Lambda$ with gates randomly chosen from the set of twirling gates in such a way that the overall effect results only in a phase change, which does not change the measurement outcome.

In our case gates $\sigma^a$, $\sigma^b$, $\sigma^c$, $\sigma^d$ are inserted before and after each CNOT gate $\Lambda$, where $\sigma^i$ is chosen from the twirling set consisting of the Pauli gates $\{1, \sigma^x, \sigma^y, \sigma^z\}$. After randomly (with uniform probability) choosing $\sigma^a, \sigma^b$ the gates $\sigma^c, \sigma^d$ are then chosen to satisfy

$$\sigma^c \otimes \sigma^d = e^{i\theta} \Lambda(\sigma^a \otimes \sigma^b) \Lambda^\dagger.$$
The circuit constructed with Pauli-twirling applied to all CNOT gates is therefore equivalent to the original circuit. In practice this method is applicable, if the assumption holds that the qualities of single-qubit gates are an order of magnitude smaller than two-qubit gates. Twirling should then only have a negligible effect on the fidelity of the expectation value on NISQ devices. However, Figure 5 indicates that this is not true for the IBM QX2 device; the variance of the distribution has clearly increased. There is no effect for the simulation using an error model.

5.2 Noise amplification

In order to amplify the strength of the noise, we will apply random Pauli gates with a probability proportional to the error rate of the CNOT gate between a given pair of qubits. More precisely this is means applying gates $\sigma^e, \sigma^f$ randomly chosen form the set of Pauli gates $\{1, \sigma^x, \sigma^y, \sigma^z\}$ after the twirled CNOT gates with probability $(r - 1)\epsilon_{i,j}$. Here, $\epsilon_{i,j}$ is the two-qubit gate error rate between qubits $q_i$ and $q_j$. On average this increases the error rate to the desired value $\epsilon_{\text{new}} = \epsilon_{i,j} + (r - 1)\epsilon_{i,j} = r\epsilon_{i,j}$.

Figure 6 shows the result for both the simulated error model and the real quantum device. The assumption that the expectation value of an observable depends smoothly on $r$ seems to hold for the qasm simulator with the IBM QX2 noise model, but not for the IBM QX2 device itself, see Figure 6e. This is likely because some of the underlying assumptions of the method are violated for the QX2 device, e.g., the existence of non-Markovian noise, spatially or temporally correlated noise, etc. The result shown in Figure 6e seems to justify the assumption of the exponential variant of the extrapolation method presented in [3].

Additional insight is provided by looking at the distribution for $r \in \{1, 2, 4, 32\}$. Since we increase the noise of CNOT gates artificially by adding Pauli gates, this means that other outcome strings are becoming more likely. Figure 6a-d shows that expectation values of 1, 2, 3 become increasingly likely. The noise model shows the same basic behaviour as the ideal circuit. The results from the IBM QX2 device seem to “drown” in noise. However, Figure 6e clearly indicates that the biggest deviation from the error model is for small values of $r$. 

Figure 6: Each sample points uses $N = 1024$ randomly generated circuits with 1024 shots per circuit. The $r$-dependence of the simulated noise model is much smoother than that of IBM’s QX2 device.
5.3 Error mitigation of measurement noise

Measurement or read-out error is another major source of error. Here we use the model that assumes spatially uncorrelated errors of a bit flip. We compute the probability that the state $|j\rangle$ is observed if the state $|i\rangle$ is prepared, i.e. the conditional probability $P(|i\rangle|||j\rangle)$. The resulting probabilities for the simulated error model and IBM’s QX2 are shown in Figure 7. In the absence of errors $P(|i\rangle|||j\rangle) = \delta_{i,j}$, but we can see that there are off-diagonal nonzero entries. The result is worse for the real quantum computer. In order for the method to work, measurement errors must be at least one order of magnitude larger than state preparation and the execution of the $X$ gate. In addition it must be mentioned that this requires an exponential amount (in the number of qubits) of states to be prepared and measured. Given $P(|i\rangle|||j\rangle)$, one can construct a filter to counteract the effect of measurement noise. In this work we use the implementation provided by Qiskit[1]. In Figure 7 we can see the effect of applying the measurement filter for Max’s circuit.

5.4 Overall results

In all of our experiments we generate $N$ circuits randomly with and without Pauli-twirling and an amplified noise factor $r$. Each of this circuits is called a “repetition” and uses 1024 shots. The number of this random circuits (repetitions) have to be large enough to cover the whole sample space. Max’s circuits have around 10 CNOT operations, which is why we used $N = 1024$ repetitions. We can see in Figures 5c and 8 that this number is sufficient for convergence. We remark that for the special case where experiments are run without Pauli-twirling and no amplified noise, i.e., $r = 1$, this means that we sample the same circuit $1024^2$ times.

Figure 8 shows the convergence of the circuits and the effect of error mitigation techniques on the expectation value. With $E_r = E(r)$ we denote the expectation value achieved with amplification factor $r$, and by $R(.)$ the Richardson extrapolation. Theoretically, ordered by decreasing relative error with respect to the ideal expectation value we get $E_1$, $R(E_2, E_4)$, $R(E_1, E_2)$, $R(E_1, E_2, E_4)$. Applying a measurement filter should further decrease the relative error. The relative errors achieved in our experiments are shown in Figure 8.

The achieved results indicate that the extrapolation method applied to the simulated error model reduces the relative error from around 4% to below 1%, irrespective of if Pauli-twirling is applied or not. If we instead only apply a measurement filter, the relative error is below 2%. If we apply both the extrapolation technique and the measurement filter, we get errors between 0.4 and 2.2%. There is no big difference in the results between the original and the adapted circuit.
Figure 8: Results achieved using the qasm simulator and IBM’s QX2 device. In this case 1% relative error equals an absolute error of 0.04. The symbols E1, E2, E4 denote the expectation value for the noise amplification factor $r$ equal to 1, 2, 4, respectively.

The results for the experiments conducted on IBM’s QX2 device have an error between 10% to 15% which is much higher than the simulated error model. Applying the measurement filter decreases the relative error by around 1% to 2% in all cases. For the original circuit, the best results are achieved when Richardson extrapolation is used for $r = 2$, and $r = 4$, which is in contradiction to the expected behaviour. It is not obvious why this is the case. For the adapted circuit, the results have the expected behaviour. The best result is achieved when Richardson extrapolation is applied using all three values $E_1, E_2, E_4$ and both Pauli-twirling and measurement filters are applied.

6 Availability of Data and Code

The open source python/jupyter notebook implementation of the game and the full code for reproducing the results obtained in this article are available at [https://github.com/sintefmath/quantumpoker](https://github.com/sintefmath/quantumpoker).

7 Conclusion

We have presented a game intended to serve as a pedagogical tool for learning the basic rules of quantum computers. The aim was to make it a fun experience in order to avoid a shortage in experts when quantum computers become commercialized. To make the threshold for acquiring the game lower, it could be made available on smartphones as
In order to make the game more difficult one could generate a completely random initial state. The quantum Poker game works well on classical computers, because it requires only 5 qubits. However, on contemporary quantum computers the use of multiple error-prone CNOT gates and measurement operations, gives a large error in the output state of the circuits. We have presented and discussed several error mitigation techniques. Mitigation techniques are vital for the success of any practical application of quantum computers in the NISQ era.
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