Push-Pull Optimization of Quantum Controls
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Quantum optimal control involves setting up an objective function that evaluates the quality of an operator representing the realized process w.r.t. the target process. Here we propose a stronger objective function which incorporates not only the target operator but also a set of its orthogonal operators. We find significantly superior convergence of optimization routines with the combined influences of all the operators. We refer to this method as the push-pull optimization. In particular, we describe adopting the push-pull optimization to a gradient based approach and a variational-principle based approach. We carry out extensive numerical simulations of the push-pull optimization of quantum controls on a pair of Ising coupled qubits. Finally, we demonstrate its experimental application by preparing a long-lived singlet-order in a two-qubit system using NMR techniques.
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Introduction: Controlling a quantum process plays an important role in several areas of science and engineering. Usually, control parameters need to be optimized to maximize performance. Optimal control theory is well established and finds applications in diverse fields such as finance, science, engineering, etc. [1, 2]. Quantum optimal control has also gained significant attention over the last several years [3, 4]. It helps in achieving robust steering of quantum dynamics as has been demonstrated in chemical kinetics [5, 6], spectroscopy [7–9], quantum computing [10, 11], and many more.

Here we consider optimization of quantum controls to prepare a target state or to realize a target unitary. This can be achieved with the help of several powerful numerical techniques. They include stochastic-search based strongly modulating pulses [12], gradient based approaches such as GRadient Ascent Pulse Engineering (GRAPE) [13, 14] and gradient optimization of analytical control [15], variational-principle based Krotov optimization [16–18], chopped random basis optimization [19, 20], genetic algorithm with bang-bang controls [21, 22], etc. These algorithms are routinely used for different quantum architectures such as NMR [9, 23], NV centers [24], ion trap [25], superconducting qubits [26], magnetic resonance imaging [27], etc.

Most of the above techniques are based on an objective function that evaluates the overlap of the realized operator with the target operator. Here we propose a modified objective function that not only depends on the target operator, but also on a set of operators orthogonal to the target operator. Considering the dual roles employed, we refer to this method as push-pull optimization of quantum controls (PPOQC). We find a significant improvement in the convergence rate of PPOQC over the standard methods. Although this method can easily be adopted in several algorithms, here we have numerically analyzed PPOQC for GRAPE and Krotov algorithms. We also experimentally demonstrate the efficacy of PPOQC in an NMR quantum testbed by preparing a long-lived singlet-order.

The optimization problem: Let us consider a quantum system with an internal or fixed Hamiltonian $H_0$ and a set of $M$ control operators $\{A_k\}$. Thus the quantum system is governed by the total Hamiltonian $H(t) = H_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{M} u_k(t)A_k$, where the coefficients $u_k(t)$ represent the control amplitudes amenable to optimization. The propagator for a control sequence of duration $T$ is $U(T) = D \exp\left(-i \int_0^T H(t')dt'\right)$, where $D$ is the Dyson time-ordering operator. Here we omitted $\hbar$ by rescaling the Hamiltonian in units of angular frequencies. An easier approach to evaluate the propagator is by using piecewise-constant control amplitudes with $N$ segments each of duration $\tau$, such that $T = N\tau$ (see Fig. 1(a)). In this case, the overall propagator is of the form $U_{1:N} = U_N U_{N-1} \cdots U_2 U_1$, where $U_j = \exp(-i H_j \tau)$ is the propagator for the $j$th segment with $H_j = H_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{M} u_{jk}A_k$. The task is to optimize the control sequence $\{u_{jk}\}$ depending on the following two kinds of optimizations:

(i) **Unitary synthesis** (US): Here the goal is to achieve an overall propagator $U_i$ that is independent of the initial state. This is realized by maximizing the unitary-fidelity

$$ F(U_i) = |\langle U_i | U_{1:N} \rangle|^2 = \left| \text{Tr} \{ U_i^\dagger U_{1:N} \} \right|^2, \quad (1) $$

(ii) **State-to-State optimization** (SS): Here the goal is to drive a given initial state $\rho_0$ to a desired target state $\rho_t$. This can be achieved by maximizing the state-fidelity

$$ F(\rho_t) = \langle \rho_t | \rho_{1:N} \rangle = \text{Tr} \{ \rho_t \rho_{1:N} \}, \quad (2) $$

where $\rho_{1:N} = U_{1:N} \rho_0 U_{1:N}^\dagger$.

In practice, hardware limitations impose bounds on the control parameters $\{u_{jk}\}$ and therefore it is generally desirable to minimize the overall control resource $r_k = \sum_j u_{jk}^2$. Accordingly, one generally uses the per-
performance function \( J = F - \sum_{k=1}^{M} \lambda_k r_k \), where \( \lambda_k \) are penalty constants. We refer the above optimization, that is based on the maximization of the overlap with the target operator, as the pull optimization.

**Push-Pull Optimization of Quantum Controls (PPOQC):** As described above, the control optimization involves a target operator, be it a target propagator or a target state. In either case, for a \( d \)-dimensional operator, there are \( d - 1 \) orthogonal operators, which can be efficiently constructed via Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization procedure [28]. While the target operator pulls the control-sequence towards itself, the orthogonal operators push it away from them (see Fig. 1(b)). The push fidelities are

\[
\text{US: } F_o(\{V_i\}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L} F(V_l),
\]

\[
\text{SS: } F_o(\{R_i\}) = \frac{1}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L} F(R_l),
\]

where \( \{V_i\} \) and \( \{R_i\} \) are \( L \leq d - 1 \) orthogonal operators such that \( F(U_t, V_i) = 0 \) and \( F(\rho_t, R_l) = 0 \). Although \( d \) increases exponentially with the size of the system, it is usually sufficient to consider only a subset of \( L \) orthogonal operators. Also, note that for a given target operator, the set of orthogonal operators is not unique and can be generated randomly and efficiently in every iteration. Now we define the push-pull performance function

\[
J_{PP} = F - \alpha F_o - \sum_{k=1}^{M} \lambda_k r_k,
\]

where \(-1 \leq \alpha \leq 1\) is the push weight.

In the following, we describe two popular optimal quantum control methods and incorporate push-pull into them.

**GRAPE optimization:** It starts with a random guess sequence and calculates appropriate gradients to determine the direction of maximum ascent. Being a local search method, it is sensitive to the initial guess and may not lead to global optimization. It is nevertheless simple, powerful, and popular. It involves an iterative update of all the control parameters \( \{u_{jk}\} \) via the gradient

\[
g_{jk}^{(i)} = \frac{\partial J^{(i)}}{\partial u_{jk}}:
\]

\[
\text{US: } g_{jk}^{(i)}(U_t) = 2\tau \text{ Im}\{(P_j|A_k U_{1:j}|U_{1:j}|P_j)\}
\]

\[
\text{SS: } g_{jk}^{(i)}(\rho_t) = -i\tau(\rho_t|A_k, \rho_{1:j}),
\]

where \( i \) denotes iteration number, \( P_j = U_{1:j}^\dagger U_t \) and \( \rho_j = U_{1:j}^\dagger \rho U_{1:j} \) [13]. Collective updates \( u_{jk}^{(i+1)} = u_{jk}^{(i)} + \epsilon g_{jk}^{(i)} \) after iteration \( i \) on all the segments with a suitable step size \( \epsilon \), proceeds with monotonot convergence.

**PP-GRAPE:** Using Eq. 4 we recast the gradients as

\[
\text{US: } G_{jk}^{(i)}(U_t, \{V_i\}) = g_{jk}^{(i)}(U_t) - \frac{\alpha}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L} g_{jk}^{(i)}(V_l) \quad \text{and}
\]

\[
\text{SS: } G_{jk}^{(i)}(\rho_t, \{R_i\}) = g_{jk}^{(i)}(\rho_t) - \frac{\alpha}{L} \sum_{l=1}^{L} g_{jk}^{(i)}(R_l),
\]

and the update rule as \( u_{jk}^{(i+1)} = u_{jk}^{(i)} + \epsilon G_{jk}^{(i)} \). The revised gradients lead to a superior convergence as demonstrated in the later part.

**Krotov optimization:** Based on variational-principle, this method looks to achieve a global optimum. Here maximizing the performance function is achieved with an appropriate Lagrange multiplier \( B_j \). One sets up a Lagrangian of the form,

\[
\mathcal{L} = F - \sum_{k=1}^{M} \lambda_k r_k - \sum_{j=1}^{N} \text{Re} \left( B_j \left| \frac{d}{dt} + iH_j \right| U_{0:j} \right),
\]

where the first two terms are same as the performance function \( J \), and looks for a stationary point satisfying \( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \rho} = 0 \), \( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial u_{jk}} = 0 \), and \( \frac{\partial \mathcal{L}}{\partial \lambda_k} = 0 \). The second differential equation leads to \( u_{jk} = \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \text{ Im}(B_j|A_k U_{0:j}) \), and the last differential equation constrains evolution according to the Schrödinger equation \( \dot{B}(t) = -i H(t) B(t) \).

At every iteration \( i \), the Krotov algorithm evaluates a pair of sequences \( \{u_{jk}^{(i)}\} \) and \( \{\tilde{u}_{jk}^{(i)}\} \). The algorithm starts with a random guess \( \{u_{jk}^{(0)}\} = \{\tilde{u}_{jk}^{(0)}\} \). The forward propagation of the sequence \( \{u_{jk}^{(i)}\} \) gives \( U_{1:j} \) and the backward propagation of the sequence \( \{\tilde{u}_{jk}^{(i)}\} \) from the boundary \( B_N = \partial F/U_{1:N} \) leads to \( B_j \). Specifically,

\[
\text{US: } B_N = (U_t|U_{0:N})U_t
\]

\[
\text{SS: } B_N = \rho U_{0:N} \rho_0 + \kappa U_{0:N}.
\]

Here \( U_{0:N} = U_0 U_{1:N} U_0 = 1 \), and \( \kappa \) is a positive constant that ensures the positivity of fidelity function. Thus

\[
B_j = U_{j+1}^\dagger \cdots U_{N-1}^\dagger U_N \tilde{B}_N,
\]

where \( \tilde{B}_j = \exp(-i\tilde{H} \tau) \) and \( \tilde{H}_j = H_0 + \sum_{k=1}^{M} \tilde{u}_{jk} A_k \).
Now we can update the sequence \( \{u_{jk}^{(i)}\} \) according to

\[
\tilde{u}_{jk}^{(i)} = (1 - \delta)\tilde{u}_{jk}^{(i-1)} + \frac{\delta}{\lambda_k} \text{Im}(B_j^{(i-1)}|A_k U_{0:j-1}^{(i)}\rangle)
\]

and evaluate the propagator \( U_{0:j}^{(i)} \). Repeating the previous two steps will fetch propagators \( U_{0:1}^{(i)}, U_{0:2}^{(i)}, \ldots, U_{0:N}^{(i)} \).

The terminal Lagrange multiplier \( B_N^{(i)} \) is evaluated using the Eq. 8. The sequence \( \{\tilde{u}_{jk}^{(i)}\} \) is now calculated as follows. The terminal control amplitude \( \tilde{u}_{NK}^{(i)} \) is evaluated via

\[
\tilde{u}_{jk}^{(i)} = (1 - \eta)\tilde{u}_{jk}^{(i)} + \frac{\eta}{\lambda_k} \text{Im}(B_j^{(i)}|A_k U_{0:j}^{(i)}\rangle)
\]

with \( j = N \). The Lagrange multiplier \( B_{N-1}^{(i)} = \tilde{U}_N^\dagger B_N^{(i)} \) is evaluated by back-propagating with the updated amplitude \( \tilde{u}_{NK}^{(i)} \). Repeating the last two steps updates the whole sequence \( \{\tilde{u}_{jk}^{(i)}\} \). This algorithm is iterated until the desired fidelity is reached.

**PP-Krotov:** Instead of two sequences, here we use \( L + 2 \) sequences, \( \{u_{jk}^{(i)}\}, \{\tilde{u}_{jk}^{(i)}\}, \{\tilde{v}_{jkl}^{(i)}\} \), where the last sequence is calculated for each of the orthogonal operators \( \{V_l\} \) or \( \{R_l\} \). To realize push-pull effect, we first calculate the terminal Lagrange multipliers \( \{C_{N,l}\} \) using similar equations as in Eq. 8:

\[
\text{US: } C_{N,l} = (V_l U_{0:N}) V_l \\
\text{SS: } C_{N,l} = R_l U_{0:N} \rho_0 + \kappa U_{0:N}.
\]

The revised update rule for \( \{u_{jk}^{(i)}\} \) is

\[
u_{jk}^{(i)} = (1 - \delta)\tilde{u}_{jk}^{(i-1)} + \frac{\delta}{\lambda_k} \text{Im}(B_j^{(i-1)}|A_k U_{0:j-1}^{(i)}\rangle) \\
+ \frac{\alpha \delta}{L} \sum_{i=1}^{L} \left[ \tilde{v}_{jkl}^{(i)} - \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \langle C_j^{(i)}|A_k U_{0:j-1}^{(i)}\rangle \right],
\]

where, \( \tilde{v}_{jkl}^{(i)} = \frac{\alpha \eta}{L} \left[ u_{jk}^{(i)} - \frac{1}{\lambda_k} \sum_{i=1}^{L} \text{Im}(C_j^{(i)}|A_k U_{0:j}^{(i)}\rangle) \right] \).

Note that \( \alpha \) is the push weight as in Eq. 4. Here the intermediate Lagrange multiplier \( C_{j,l}^{(i)} \) is evaluated by back-propagating \( C_{N,l} \) in a similar way as described in Eq. 9, but by using the corresponding orthogonal operator \( V_l \) (or \( R_l \)) instead of \( U_l \). (or \( \rho_l \)).

**Results:** We first numerically analyze PPOQC by considering its applications in a model two-qubit system with an Ising interaction. Performances are evaluated for GRAPE and Krotov as shown in Fig. 2. For US, the target was a two-qubit CNOT gate, while for SS, the initial state was the product state \( |00\rangle \) and the target state was the entangled singlet, \( |S_0\rangle = (|01\rangle - |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2} \). In each case, we used a fixed set of one hundred random initial guess-sequences and varied the number \( L \) of orthogonal operators with push weight \( \alpha = 0.1 \). The infidelities \( 1 - F \) are plotted versus iteration number \( (i) \) and the number \( L \) of orthogonal operators in Fig. 2 (a). The mean infidelity, as well as relative computing time, for each \( L \) are displayed in Fig. 2 (b). In all the cases PPOQC \( (L \geq 1) \) resulted in superior convergences than the standard pull-only \( (L = 0) \) algorithms. The PP-GRAPE algorithm...
appears to be more efficient than PP-Krotov in terms of computing time. To further analyze the advantage of PPOQC over the standard algorithms, we define an advantage factor \((1 - F_{L=\alpha})/(1 - F_{L>\alpha})\), where the denominator is averaged over all nonzero \(L\) values. Fig. 2 (c) shows the histogram of the advantage factors taken over the 100 guess-pulses in each case. All the distributions weighed above 2, indicating the superior performance of PPOQC. In particular, PP-Krotov US weighed about 4. There are incidents of the advantage factors being as high as 10 and in the case of PP-Krotov US, it is as high as 20. Only in about 5% of the incidents, most of them in GRAPE SS, the advantage factors were less than 1.

Fig. 3 displays infidelities of PP-GRAPE as well as PP-Krotov algorithms versus the push-weight \(\alpha\). We notice that, on the positive side, the infidelity is generally superior to the pull-only algorithm (\(\alpha = 0\)). In each case, there exists an optimal push-weight roughly in the range \(\alpha \in [0.1, 0.3]\) at which the PPOQC works best. It is interesting to see that some negative regions also display superior performances.

**NMR experiments**: We now demonstrate the efficacy of PPOQC via an important application in NMR spectroscopy, i.e., preparation of a long-lived state (LLS). Carravetta et al. have demonstrated that a pair of homonuclear spins can be prepared into a singlet-state \((|01\rangle - |10\rangle)/\sqrt{2}\) that not only outlives other nonequilibrium spin states, but also lasts for several factors of the spin-lattice relaxation time constants \((T_1)\) [29, 30]. Prompted by numerous applications in spectroscopy and imaging, several efficient ways of preparing LLS have been explored [31]. In the following we describe using PP-Krotov SS optimization for this purpose.

We have chosen a two-qubit system realized by two spin-1/2 protons of 2,3,6-trichlorophenol (TCP: see Fig. 4 (a)). The sample consisted of 7 mg of TCP dissolved in 0.6 ml of deuterated dimethyl sulfoxide. The experiments are carried out on a 500 MHz Bruker NMR spectrometer at an ambient temperature of 300 K. The thermal equilibrium spectrum of TCP shown in Fig. 4 (a) indicates the resonance offset frequencies \(\pm \Delta \nu/2 = 63.8\) Hz and the scalar coupling constant \(J = 8.8\) Hz. The internal Hamiltonian of the system, in a frame rotating about the direction of the Zeeman field at an average Larmor frequency, is \(H_0 = -\pi \Delta \nu I_z^A + \pi \Delta \nu I_z^B + 2 \pi J I_x^A I_x^B\), where \(I_z^A\) and \(I_z^B\) are the z-components of the spin angular momentum operators \(I^A\) and \(I^B\) respectively.

The thermal equilibrium state at high-temperature approximation is of the form \(\rho_0 = I_x^A + I_x^B\) (up to an identity term representing the background population). The target LLS state is \(\rho_S = -I^A \cdot I^B\). The goal is to design an RF sequence which efficiently converts \(\rho_0\) into \(\rho_S\). The Hamiltonian under the application of an RF sequence is \(H(t) = H_0 + u_x(t)(I_x^A + I_x^B) + u_y(t)(I_y^A + I_y^B)\), where \(u_x(t)\) and \(u_y(t)\) are the RF amplitudes.

A PP-Krotov SS sequence optimized with five ortho-
onal operators ($L = 5$) is shown in Fig. 4 (b). It consists of 1000 segments in a total duration of 45 ms, which amounts to about 30\% reduction in time compared to a standard sequence that requires $\frac{1}{27} + \frac{3}{42\Delta \nu} = 63$ ms [30]. The fidelity profile shown in Fig. 4 (c) indicates the robustness of the sequence against 10\% RF inhomogeneity distribution with an average final fidelity above 95\%. The LLS spectrum shown in Fig. 4(a) is the characteristic of the singlet state $\rho_S$. Fig. 4 (d) shows the experimental results of LLS storage under 1 kHz WALTZ-16 spin-lock. It confirms the long life-time $T_{\text{LLS}}$ of about 24.5 s or about 4.5 times $T^A_1$ and $T^B_1$ measured by inversion recovery experiments. A comparison with the standard method (as in ref. [30]) indicated a 27 \% higher singlet order, further indicating the superiority of the PP-Krotov SS sequence.

**Summary:** We devised a push-pull optimization of quantum controls that simultaneously takes into account the distances from a target operator and its orthogonal operators. Of course, the total number of orthogonal operators increases exponentially with the size of the quantum system. However, it is not necessary to include an exhaustive set of orthogonal operators. Even a few orthogonal operators can bring about a substantial improvement in convergence. This method can be adapted to a wide variety of quantum optimization routines simply by redefining the objective function. Specifically, we described adapting the push-pull approach into a gradient based and a variational-principle based optimizations. It exhibited considerable improvements in convergence rates, without overburdening computational costs. Furthermore, we designed a push-pull Krotov control sequence preparing a long-lived singlet order and verified its robustness experimentally using NMR methods. Push-pull approach can also be used in conjunction with other techniques such as conjugate gradients, incoherence averaging, etc. In principle, it is possible to extend the method to control open quantum systems. Push-pull approach thus promises to find applications in diverse fields involving quantum control optimizations.

**Acknowledgments:** We acknowledge useful discussions with Deepak Khurana and Soham Pal. This work was partly supported by DST/SJF/PSA-03/2012-13 and CSIR 03(1345)/16/EMR-II.

---

* priya.batra@students.iiserpune.ac.in
† krithika_yr@students.iiserpune.ac.in
‡ mahesh.ts@iiserpune.ac.in