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ABSTRACT

Transient stability assessment (TSA), a cornerstone for resilient operations of today’s interconnected power grids, is a grand challenge yet to be addressed since the genesis of electric power systems. This paper is a confluence of quantum computing, data science and machine learning to potentially resolve the aforementioned challenge caused by high dimensionality, non-linearity and uncertainty. We devise a quantum TSA (qTSA) method, a low-depth, high expressibility quantum neural network, to enable scalable and efficient data-driven transient stability prediction for bulk power systems. qTSA renders the intractable TSA straightforward and effortless in the Hilbert space, and provides rich information that enables unprecedentedly resilient and secure power system operations. Extensive experiments on quantum simulators and real quantum computers verify the accuracy, noise-resilience, scalability and universality of qTSA. qTSA underpins a solid foundation of a quantum-enabled, ultra-resilient power grid which will benefit the people as well as various commercial and industrial sectors.

Introduction

Texas’ and California’s rolling outages [1, 2] in recent years signaled that our existing power infrastructures can hardly sustain the ever-expanding communities and deep integration of low-inertia renewables [3, 4]. The situations are rapidly deteriorating as our power grids are increasingly integrating massive DERs, such as intermittent rooftop solar photovoltaics (PVs), as well as solar farms and offshore wind systems, and have been subject to more frequent weather events [5, 6].

A key technology to secure today’s bulk power grids is transient stability assessment (TSA) which aims to determine the ability of the system to ride-through large disturbances (contingencies) and to reach the post-contingency steady-state [7]. Transient instability is a fast phenomenon typically taking only a few seconds for the bulk system to collapse after contingencies occur. Due to this very nature, system operators in the control center never have sufficient time to steer the power system away from instability upon the occurrence of contingencies. For this reason, we have to rely on computer-based TSA without any manual interaction from human operators to assess the transient stability of the system [8].

TSA, however, is a grand challenge yet to be addressed since the genesis of power systems in the era of Tesla, Edison and Westinghouse [9]. Interconnected power systems are the largest and most complicated man-made dynamical systems on this planet. Those bulk systems are highly nonlinear, exhibit multi-scale behaviors spatially and temporally, and are increasingly stochastic and uncertain due to deep integration of renewable energy resources. The majority of the TSA methods being used in power industry rely on the explicit integration or implicit integration of differential equation models of the bulk power systems, which are known to be intractable to handle large power systems [10–12]. Discrete events such as frequent plug-and-plays of renewables, microgrids and loads in today’s power systems [13, 14] and unknown models due to data privacy issues [15] make existing TSA methods even more computationally formidable even if they are executed on the powerful and expensive real-time simulators. Even worse, a large number of power system TSA must be conducted to examine the stability of the system in relation to massive ‘N – k’ contingencies (k components have failed in a power system with N components), which further impedes the application of TSA in real-world power system operations. All the aforementioned challenges have made classical TSA prohibitively difficult for the online operation of large interconnected grids.

Today’s power systems are undergoing an Enlightenment, where the confluence of big data, quantum computing and machine learning altogether is to drive a regime shift in the analysis and operation of our critical power infrastructures. Big data is the force behind the revolution: massive new types of intelligent electronic sensors such as synchronized phasor measurement units (PMUs), advanced metering infrastructure (AMI) meters and remote terminal units (RTUs) [16] are continuously generating gigantic volumes of data which allow for the development of data-driven power system analytics. Most recently, the successes in exploiting the potential of quantum supremacy [17, 18] shed lights on a ‘quantum leap’ of computing capabilities. The power of quantum computing is derived from its ability to prepare and maintain complex superpositions of...
quantum states across many quantum degrees of freedom. While classically the number of required physical resources $N$ grows exponentially with the system complexity $n$, $N$ grows linearly with $n$ in a quantum computer, resulting in exponential speedups over classical computing. Furthermore, highly entangled states, very difficult to represent on classical computers, are easily represented on a quantum computer [19, 20]. Therefore, the intractable power system problems aforementioned, if formulated properly through programmable quantum circuits, can be executed efficiently on a quantum computer.

Inheriting the exponential speedup of quantum computing in tensor manipulation [21], the swift growth in quantum machine learning (QML) techniques [22–24] ignites new hopes of developing unprecedentedly scalable and efficient data-driven power system analytics. QML is promisingly efficacious for data processing and model training in high-dimensional space that are intractable for classical algorithms [25, 26]. Ideally, unique quantum operators such as superposition and entanglement, which can not be represented by classical operators, enable a superior representation of complicated data relationships [27–29]. Nevertheless, the existing noisy quantum devices are still restrictive, hindering the implementing of QML if deep quantum circuits are needed.

This paper is the first attempt to unlock the potential of QML for power system TSA. A low-depth, high expressibility quantum neural network (QNN)-based transient stability assessment (qTSA) method is devised to enable scalable, reliable and efficient data-driven transient stability prediction. In particular, we are focusing on designing an efficient qTSA circuit that is feasible to pursue on near-term devices, considering the noisy-intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) era [30, 31], but general enough to be directly expandable to the noise-free quantum computer of a distant future (5-10 years). We have designed systematical studies which have demonstrated the robustness, accuracy and fidelity of qTSA on real-scale power systems. Our qTSA has shown consistently high performance on quantum computers at different noise levels.

Stability assessment plays a central role in nearly every field of the life sciences, physics and engineering. Our qTSA therefore is promising to positively impact the modeling, analysis, controlling and securing various high-dimensional, nonlinear, hybrid dynamical systems. In particular, qTSA underpins a solid foundation of a quantum-enabled resilient power grid, i.e., tomorrow’s unprecedentedly autonomic power infrastructure towards self-configuration, self-healing, self-optimization and self-protection against grid changes, renewable power injections, faults, disastrous events and cyberattacks. Such a quantum-enabled grid will benefit the people as well as various commercial and industrial sectors.

Results

Power system transients are generically modelled as a set of nonlinear differential algebraic equations:

\[
\begin{align*}
\dot{X} &= F_D(X, Y) \\
0 &= F_A(X, Y)
\end{align*}
\]

where $X$ and $Y$ separately denote the differential variables and algebraic variables; (1a) formulates the nonlinear dynamics of power devices, such as generators (e.g., synchronous machines, distributed energy resources), controllers (e.g., governors, exciters, inverters), power loads, etc; (1b) formulates the instantaneous power flow of the entire power grid.

TSA appraises a power system’s capability of resisting large disturbance [7]. Denote $Z = (X, Y)$, and $\phi(t, Z)$ as the orbit of (1) starting from $Z$. An asymptotically stable equilibrium point (SEP) $Z_s$ of (1) satisfies that: (a) $Z_s$ is Lyapunov stable; (b) there exists an open neighborhood $\mathcal{O}$ of $Z_s$ such that $\forall Z \in \mathcal{O}$ converges to $Z_s$ when $t$ approaches infinity [32]. The stability region of $Z_s$ encloses all the states that can be attracted by $Z_s$ within an infinite time:

\[
\mathcal{A}(Z_s) = \{ Z \in \mathbb{R}^n : \lim_{t \to \infty} \phi(t, Z) = Z_s \}
\]

Stability region theory states that system stability after a large disturbance is determined by whether the post-disturbance state is within the stability region of an SEP [32]. Therefore, to formulate the data-driven TSA, the idea is to establish a direct mapping between the post-disturbance power system states and the stability results [33, 34].

The keystone of qTSA, different from classical machine learning techniques, is that the transient stability features in a Euclidean space $Z \in \mathcal{E}$ are embedded into quantum states in a Hilbert space $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ through a variational quantum circuit (VQC), which serves as a QNN to explicitly separate the stable and unstable samples.

Our key innovation is a design of low-depth, high expressibility qTSA, as presented in Fig. 1 (see also Methods). Fig. 1(a) first visualizes the low-depth variational qTSA circuit which addresses the dimensionality and nonlinearity obstacles in TSA as well as the nonnegligible noise and source limitations on near-term quantum devices. Kernel ingredients in qTSA circuit include (see Methods):

1) Non-Gaussian feature encoding: $|\psi_E\rangle = U_E(p_E, Z)|0\rangle$ which adopts parameterized, activation-enhanced quantum gates to enable a flexible, nonlinear and dimension-free encoding of power system stability features $Z$;
(a) Variational layer designed for qTSA
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- Non-Gaussian Feature Encoding
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2) Properly-arranged Gaussian quantum gates: \( \ket{\psi'} = U_V(p_V) \ket{\psi_E} \) to efficiently represent the solution space;
3) Feature re-encoding: \( \ket{\psi} = U_R(p_R, Z) \ket{\psi_V} \) for enhanced expressibility of nonlinear behaviors in power systems;
4) Repetitive layered structure: \( \ket{\psi_l} = U^{(l)}(p, Z) \ket{\theta_0} = U^{(2)}(p, Z) \ldots U^{(1)}(p, Z) \ket{\theta_0} \) to realize a more expressive and entangled VQC, where \( U^{(l)} = U^{(l)}_R U^{(l)}_V \) denotes the unitary operation at \( l \)th layer and \( p \) assembles the circuit parameters at each layer.

Then, as presented in Fig. 1(b), qTSA employs a hybrid quantum-classical framework for QNN training. The parameterized qTSA circuit is executed on a quantum computer as the feedforward functionality of QNN, and parameter optimization is executed on a classical computer as the backpropagation functionality. The two subroutines interact to train the VQC’s parameters. Here, we introduce a generalized quantum natural gradient to enable a faster training of qTSA:

\[
p - \eta \left( \frac{\hat{\mathcal{L}}}{\sqrt{\mathcal{L}_p}} + \hat{\mathcal{V}}_p \right)^{-1} \mathcal{L}_p \rightarrow p,
\]

where \( \mathcal{L} \) is the nonconvex cross-entropy loss representing the correctness of quantum-embedded power system stability results, \( \mathcal{V}_p \) is the quantum gradient function and \( F_p \) is the Fisher information matrix of the non-Gaussian quantum circuit (see Methods).

Extensive experiments of qTSA on typical power systems ranging from benchmark grids to a real U.S. grid. qTSA is coded with Qiskit [35] and PennyLane [36], and is implemented on both a noise-free quantum simulator (ibmq_qasm_simulator, a 32-qubit simulator) and a real IBM quantum device (ibmq_boeblingen, a 20-qubit machine). Power system transient simulations with random fault locations and random fault clearing time are conducted by Power System Toolbox (PST) [37] to generate the stability features for qTSA, such as power outputs, rotor angles and rotor speeds of generators, power flows through transmission lines, and bus voltage angles and amplitudes.

The following sections investigate the capability of qTSA in assessing power system stability on both noise-free simulators and near-term noisy quantum computers, as well as the performance of different quantum circuit designs for qTSA.

**Validity of qTSA on Noise-Free Quantum Simulator**

Three typical power systems are studied:

- **Single-machine infinite-bus (SMIB) system,** one of the most widely-used test systems in power system research. Since the stability region of SMIB (i.e., a 2-dimensional region) can be analytically computed, SMIB always serves as an indispensable benchmark for testing the performance of a TSA method.
- **Two-area system,** another most widely-used benchmark system exhibiting both local and inter-area oscillation modes. The system models and parameters are constructed from a real North American power system [7].
- **Northeast Power Coordinating Council (NPCC) test system,** a real Northeastern US power system [37] which was involved in the Northeast blackout of 2003.

The overall qTSA procedure is exemplified via the SMIB system. We then verify the efficacy of qTSA on all the test systems.

**Training Preparation.** Various dynamics samples are generated by performing transient simulations on the disturbed SMIB system (see Fig. 2(a)). Fig. 2(b) shows both the stable cases with damped oscillations and the unstable cases where power generators run out-of-step. The initial states of the post-disturbance system, as shown in Fig. 2(c), constructs the feature set for qTSA training. Identifying the stability region in the classical feature space is generally an intractable task. Our hope is that qTSA can directly distinguish the stable and unstable samples in the Hilbert space.

**qTSA Training.** A qTSA circuit with 2 qubits, 6 layers (denoted by qTSA(2,6)) is constructed for the SMIB system. Fig. 2(d) to (f) show how an untrained qTSA circuit evolves into a well-trained one. We use Bloch sphere and quantum states overlap to evaluate the qTSA efficacy in the Hilbert space.
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Figure 2. Demonstration of qTSA procedure on the SMIB test system. Subplots (a)-(c) demonstrate training preparation. Subplots (d)-(f) demonstrate qTSA training. Subplots (g)-(i) demonstrate the stability insights obtained by qTSA learning. (a): Topology of the SMIB system. (b): Time-domain simulations of SMIB under random disturbances to generate stability features (i.e., rotor angle and rotor speed in this case). (c): Samples in the classical feature space (green for stable samples and red for unstable samples). (d): Samples embedded in the Hilbert space by a randomly-initialized qTSA circuit. The quantum states are observed by both the Bloch sphere (i.e., a point (\(\theta, \phi\)) on the Bloch sphere represents a one-qubit state \(y = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle\) where \(\alpha = \cos(\theta/2)\) and \(\beta = e^{\theta/2}\sin(\theta/2)\) and the data overlap (i.e., fidelity between quantum states corresponding to each pair of samples). (e): Loss function evolution during qTSA training process and the final confusion matrix. (f): Samples embedded in the Hilbert space by the well-trained qTSA, where the stable and unstable samples are distinctly separated. (g): Stable and unstable regions discovered by the well-trained qTSA and its comparison with the analytic stability boundary (i.e., black line). (h): Contour plot of probability on measuring |1⟩ from the qTSA circuit. Either a high probability on |1⟩ or a high probability on |0⟩ (i.e., low probability on |1⟩) reflects a high fidelity of transient stability prediction. (i): Stability boundaries discovered by qTSA under different fidelity levels.

Starting with a randomly-initialized qTSA circuit, Fig. 2(d) shows that the stable and unstable samples are mixed on the Bloch sphere and quantum states corresponding to stable and unstable samples are highly overlapped, meaning the untrained circuit cannot be used for TSA. Then, Fig. 2(e) shows the evolution of loss function during the qTSA training, where the classification accuracy exceeds 99% for both stable and unstable samples at the final stage. The Hilbert space observations in Fig. 2(f) demonstrate the efficacy of the trained qTSA. It can be seen that the well-trained quantum circuit successfully embeds the stable (unstable) samples to the lower-(upper-) half Bloch sphere. As can be seen from the data overlap, the mutual fidelity between samples from the same class is almost 1, while that from different classes is close to 0. Both observations verify a successful qTSA being able to clearly separate the opposite classes through the VQC.

Stability Insights by qTSA. A unique feature of qTSA is that it offers not only the stability classification results but also the fidelity of stability or instability, by virtue of the multi-shot execution of VQC.

First, qTSA is able to accurately discover power system stability regions \(\mathcal{A}(Z_e)\) (see (2)). As shown in Fig. 2(g), there is a faithful match between the stable/unstable regions learned by qTSA (i.e., the green and red regions) and those obtained from analytical solutions. Stability regions discovered by qTSA allow power system operators to identify or predict the system stability under arbitrary contingencies in real-time. For instance, the SMIB system will remain stable if its post-contingency state (a vector of rotor angle and rotor speed in this case) locates in the green zone, whereas it must collapse if the post-contingency state locates in the red zone.
Second, the \( qTSA \) results contain the probabilities of system stability. As shown in Fig. 2(h), for a post-contingency state falling in the stable zone, the farther it deviates from the stability boundary, the system stability (|1⟩) would be assured with a higher probability. Similarly, the system would collapse (|0⟩) with a higher probability if its state lies in the deeper red zone. The operating points with probabilities near 0.5 indicate marginal cases, which are observed to be located near the stability boundary. The probabilities associated with system stability provide valuable new information for system operators and decision makers to make more suitable planning, operation and remedial action schemes. Either the risk-averse or risk-takers will then selectively use such information to optimize the social welfare and improve electricity resilience.

Further, \( qTSA \) is able to calculate stability regions at different risk levels. Fig. 2(i) exhibits the stability boundaries corresponding to different fidelity thresholds. Being less risk-tolerant leads to shrunken stability regions because higher fidelity levels are adopted.

**Verification on Practical Power Systems.** We further exhibit the versatility and efficacy of \( qTSA \) in the stability assessment of large power systems. Fig. 3 presents the \( qTSA \) results for the two-area system and the NPCC system. For both systems, as shown in Fig. 3(b) and Fig. 3(f), their high-dimensional features are irregularly distributed in the classical space and their stable/unstable samples are highly mixed. Once a trained \( qTSA \) embeds the classical features into quantum states, surprisingly, it successfully arranges the stable and unstable samples onto the upper- and lower- halves of a Bloch sphere, rendering the

---

Table 1. Comparison of accuracy: \( qTSA \) vs. TSA based on classical machine learning methods

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Training Set</th>
<th>Test Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>( qTSA )</td>
<td>SVM</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SMIB System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>0.9906</td>
<td>0.9525</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>0.9867</td>
<td>0.9672</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>0.9911</td>
<td>0.9185</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1-Score</td>
<td>0.9889</td>
<td>0.9422</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Two-Area System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>0.9975</td>
<td>0.9931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>0.9972</td>
<td>0.9917</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>0.9991</td>
<td>0.9981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1-Score</td>
<td>0.9981</td>
<td>0.9949</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NPCC System</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>0.9800</td>
<td>0.9550</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>0.9831</td>
<td>0.9442</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>0.9846</td>
<td>0.9854</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F1-Score</td>
<td>0.9838</td>
<td>0.9644</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\[ \text{Accuracy} = \frac{TP}{TP+FP}, \text{Precision} = \frac{TP}{TP+FP}, \text{Recall} = \frac{TP}{TP+FN}, F_1\text{-Score} = 2(\text{Precision}^{-1} + \text{Recall}^{-1})^{-1}. \] Here, TP, TN, FP, FN respectively denote the number of true positive, true negative, false positive and false negative samples.
### Evaluation Indices

- **0.4685**
- **0.8688**
- **0.8994**
- **0.4379**
- **0.5636**
- **0.8851**
- **0.9889**
- **0.9906**
- **0.9206**
- **0.8993**

### Bloch Sphere

### Impact of circuit width

![Impact of circuit width](image)

### Impact of circuit layer structure

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Circuit Layer Structure</th>
<th>Evaluation Indices</th>
<th>Stability Region</th>
<th>Bloch Sphere</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Our qTSA(2,6) circuit</td>
<td>Accuracy 0.9906</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F$_1$-Score 0.9889</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$Tr(\sigma_0\sigma_1)$ 0.1981</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>IQP circuit [27]</td>
<td>Accuracy 0.8688</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F$_1$-Score 0.8241</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$Tr(\sigma_0\sigma_1)$ 0.5636</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>QAOA circuit [29]</td>
<td>Accuracy 0.8994</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F$_1$-Score 0.8851</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$Tr(\sigma_0\sigma_1)$ 0.4685</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Data reuploading [39]</td>
<td>Accuracy 0.9206</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F$_1$-Score 0.8993</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>$Tr(\sigma_0\sigma_1)$ 0.4379</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Image of quantum circuit structures](image)

**Figure 4.** qTSA performances with different quantum circuit designs: A comparison. Three indices are employed to evaluate the transient stability prediction capability of quantum circuits: classification accuracy, F$_1$-Score and $Tr(\sigma_0\sigma_1)$ (i.e., $\sigma_0 = \text{mean}e_{S_1}(|\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|)$ and $\sigma_1 = \text{mean}e_{S_1}(|\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|)$). An improved separation between the stable and unstable classes is indicated by improved accuracy, increased F$_1$-Score and decreased $Tr(\sigma_0\sigma_1)$. (a), (b): Performance of our qTSA circuits (qTSA design architecture is illustrated in Fig. 1) with different number of layers or qubits. (c): Performance comparison between our qTSA(2,6) circuit and other typical QNN structures. The IQP and QAOA circuits both employ 3 qubits and 10 layers. The data reuploading circuit employs 2 qubit and 10 layers.

Challenging power system stability identification straightforward and effortless in the Hilbert space.

Table 1 quantitatively evaluates the accuracy of qTSA. For the small- and medium-scale power system, qTSA achieves high accuracy on both the training set (> 99%) and test set (> 98%). Even for the large-scale NPCC system, qTSA exhibits outstanding performance of 98% accuracy on the training set and 95% accuracy on the testing set. qTSA is further compared with two data-driven TSA methods based on classical machine learning algorithms, i.e., a support vector machine (SVM) with the radial basis function kernel, and a deep neural network (DNN) with a three-layer perceptron architecture. Both SVM- and DNN-based approaches are implemented in Scikit-learn [38]. Both the F$_1$-scores and accuracy validate qTSA’s competency and high performance in comparison with classical-machine-learning-empowered TSA approaches.

### Comparison of Quantum Circuits

The realization of a quantized TSA is by no means unique; rather, numerous quantum circuits could be devised for this purpose. In this section, we demonstrate how different designs of quantum circuits impact qTSA’s performance. Three factors are taken into consideration: circuit depth (i.e., number of layers), circuit width (i.e., number of qubits) and circuit layer structure. In addition to classification accuracy and F$_1$-Score, another performance index $Tr(\sigma_0\sigma_1)$ is introduced for qTSA, where $\Theta_0 = \text{mean}e_{S_1}(|\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|)$ and $\Theta_1 = \text{mean}e_{S_1}(|\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|)$ respectively denote the mean density matrices of unstable/stable samples. A decrease in $Tr(\sigma_0\sigma_1)$ thus indicates an improved separation between the stable and unstable classes. Without loss of generality, the comparative studies are performed on the SMIB system, as presented in Fig. 4.

Subplots 4(a) and 4(b) jointly show the impacts of scaling factors such as circuit’s depths and widths. The following insights can be obtained:

- Initially, increasing the number of layers tends to cause improved accuracy and better separations between stable/unstable samples. The rationale behind this is an enhanced expressibility of the quantum circuit. Note that the performance of qTSA starts to saturate once the depth goes beyond a certain number (6 in this case).

- Increasing the number of qubits also leads to improved qTSA performance, whereas the expressibility saturation is again observed. A noteworthy observation is that qTSA manifests impressive expressibility even with a single qubit, where the classification accuracy still reaches 97.38%.

- Although more layers and qubits definitely boost the expressibility of qTSA, an overscale quantum circuit is not recommended. Such a circuit would demand prohibitively expensive quantum resources due to the saturation phenomenon. It also aggravates the burden of QNN training accompanied with the increased parameters of the variational circuit.
Table 2. Comparison of qTSA accuracy: noisy real quantum device ibmq_boelingen vs. noise-free simulator ibmq_qasm_simulator

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Training Set</th>
<th>Test Set</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ibmq_boelingen ibmq_qasm_simulator</td>
<td>ibmq_boelingen ibmq_qasm_simulator</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>SMIB System</strong></td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>0.9819</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>0.9708</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>0.9867</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1-Score</td>
<td>0.9787</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Two-Area System</strong></td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>0.9907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>0.9882</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>0.9980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1-Score</td>
<td>0.9931</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>NPCC System</strong></td>
<td>Accuracy</td>
<td>0.9710</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Precision</td>
<td>0.9727</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recall</td>
<td>0.9806</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>F1-Score</td>
<td>0.9767</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Stability region discovery by ibmq_boelingen
(b) Distribution of measuring $|1\rangle$ of different qTSA circuits

Figure 5. Implementation of qTSA on the noisy IBM Quantum computer (ibmq_boelingen). (a): Stability predictions obtained on the simulator ibmq_qasm_simulator and the real noisy QC ibmq_boelingen. Accordingly, there are four types of results: green dots (samples predicted as stable on both devices); red dots (samples predicted as unstable on both devices); yellow dots (samples predicted as stable on the simulator but unstable on the real QC); blue dots (samples predicted as unstable on the simulator but stable on the real QC). Two typical samples exemplify the quantum state probability measured from qTSA circuit. Sample (A) illustrates an identical prediction on both devices, which represents the most cases (green and red dots), whereas sample (B) illustrates an opposite prediction, which is observed mainly around the stability boundary. (b): Probability distribution function (PDF) and cumulative distribution function (CDF) of the probability of measuring $|1\rangle$ from different-scaled qTSA circuits.

Finally, a large-scale quantum circuit is prone to the noisy quantum environment, leading to a sharply declined TSA performance on real quantum devices (which will be further discussed in the next subsection).

Then, Fig. 4(c) compares the performance of our low-depth, high expressibility qTSA circuit with those of three typical QNN structures, i.e., an Instantaneous Quantum Polynomial (IQP) circuit [27], the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm (QAOA) inspired circuit [29], and a data reuploading circuit [39]. Our qTSA circuit exhibits the best expressibility benefiting from its non-Gaussian feature encoding and entanglement layers.

Validity of qTSA on Noisy, Real Quantum Computing Environment

Today’s quantum devices are limited by gate errors [40], which hinders the implementation of deep quantum circuits. As an ultimate test of the practicality of qTSA, we now implement it on a real quantum computer and systematically verify it under noisy quantum computing environments.

We run qTSA on the IBM Quantum device ibmq_boelingen which is a 20-qubit superconducting quantum computer (QC). Table 2 presents qTSA’s accuracy obtained from ibmq_boelingen. Compared with those results on the noise-free IBM Quantum simulator ibmq_qasm_simulator, a surprising finding is that a noisy real quantum computing environment has little effect on
the performance of qTSA and the overall classification is still of high quality. Even in the most challenging case of the real NPCC system, only a 1% decrease in the accuracy is reported, and the qTSA results remain compelling as compared with those from classical machine learning algorithms. This experiment exhibits the effectiveness of qTSA on the near-term quantum devices and verifies the inherent resilience of qTSA against noisy quantum computing environments.

Fig. 5(a) further investigates the rationale behind the resilience of qTSA, where the stability identification results are again obtained by qTSA(2,6). It can be seen that samples of inconsistent prediction from ibmq_boelingen and ibmq_qasm_simulator (highlighted by the blue and yellow dots) are mostly distributed around the stability boundary. The measurement probability distribution of two typical samples illustrated in Fig. 5(a) shows that the measurement probabilities from ibmq_boelingen and ibmq_qasm_simulator do not differ much. This indicates qTSA(2,6) is only slightly perturbed by the noisy quantum device. Therefore, only for the low-fidelity areas where the quantum circuit output already has a similar probability on both |0⟩ and |1⟩, a slight perturbation from the noisy environment would possibly produce an opposite classification result, as exemplified by sample (B). According to our previous study in Fig. 2(h), those samples locate in a narrow area around the stability boundary, which are actually of low stability margin, and thus their stability by their very nature is uncertain. Whereas, for the high-fidelity areas as exemplified by sample (A), the quantum circuit output in the noisy device does not change the final qTSA prediction. Therefore, qTSA generate reliable results for most samples even on noisy QCs.

Even though qTSA(2,6) maintains high accuracy, a larger scale qTSA circuit may fail to produce similar results. Fig. 5(b) illustrates the performance of qTSA circuits of different scales on noisy QCs, where qTSA(2,6) as the default case, qTSA(2,10) with 10 layers and qTSA(3,6) with an additional qubit are compared.

- On the noise-free ibmq_qasm_simulator, all circuits achieve high accuracy over 99% with a notable feature that the quantum measurements mainly accumulate around 0 and 1. This indicates that most samples are predicted at high confidences, which again is coincident with Fig. 2(h), i.e., only the narrow areas around the stability boundary are of low fidelity.
- For qTSA(2,6) running on the noisy ibmq_boelingen, the peaks of the probability distribution slightly shift towards the center, indicating a slightly decreased prediction fidelity.
- For qTSA(2,10), although its accuracy on the noisy QC remains comparable to that of qTSA(2,6), the shift of probability distribution peaks is more obvious, reflecting a further decreased fidelity on the noisy prediction.
- For qTSA(3,6) involving more qubits and accordingly deeper circuit depth, the accuracy on the real QC sharply deteriorates down to 52.02%, making the evaluation on the noise-free simulator meaningless. The probability distribution histogram shows most of the measurements center around 0.5, indicating that output states from qTSA are nearly random due to the noisy environment and quantum decoherence.
- Consequently, a high quality qTSA need to possess both high accuracy and high fidelity. This is important to ensure a high tolerance against noises.

Since different quantum devices may have different noise features, it is necessary to systematically examine the qTSA’s performance under various noisy environments. We adjust the noise levels through a noise module provisioned by IBM and the noise settings are modified from the ibmq_boelingen’s real noise data. As Fig. 6 shows, excessive gate error and decoherence time certainly lead to the collapse of the qTSA circuit. Nevertheless, high TSA accuracy can still be obtained with gate errors smaller than 0.02 or the thermal relaxation time smaller than 10μs, which can be easily satisfied by today’s quantum hardware. The qTSA’s excellent performance is therefore universal.
Conclusion

This paper unlocks the potential of quantum machine learning in revolutionizing power system data-driven analytics. The key innovation is to develop quantum neural network-based transient stability assessment to enable an ultra-scalable and efficient transient stability analysis for resilient and secured decision-making of large-scale power systems. The new quantum transient stability analysis algorithm achieves outstanding performances both on a quantum simulator and a real IBM quantum device (ibmq_boeblingen, a 20-qubit machine). Therefore, it has the penitential to resolve a grand challenge since the genesis of alternative current power systems.

Data availability

The data supporting the findings of this study can be obtained upon reasonable request to the corresponding author.
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