Digital quantum simulation of open quantum systems using quantum imaginary time evolution
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Abstract

Quantum simulation on emerging quantum hardware is a topic of intense interest. While many studies focus on computing ground state properties or simulating unitary dynamics of closed systems, open quantum systems are an interesting target of study owing to their ubiquity and rich physical behavior. However, their non-unitary dynamics are also not natural to simulate on near-term quantum hardware. Here, we report algorithms for the digital quantum simulation of the dynamics of open quantum systems governed by a Lindblad equation using an adaptation of the quantum imaginary time evolution (QITE) algorithm. We demonstrate the algorithms on IBM Quantum’s hardware with simulations of the spontaneous emission of a two level system and the dissipative transverse field Ising model. Our work shows that the dynamics of open quantum systems can be efficiently simulated on near-term quantum hardware.
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I. INTRODUCTION

The development of quantum algorithms to simulate the dynamics of quantum many-body systems is now a topic of interest owing to advances in quantum hardware [1, 2]. While the real-time evolution of closed quantum systems on digital quantum computers has been extensively studied in the context of spin models [3–7], fermionic systems [8, 9], electron-phonon interactions [10], and quantum field theories [11–13], fewer studies have considered the time evolution of open quantum systems.

Open quantum systems exhibit rich dynamical behavior that does not occur in closed systems due to coupling of the system to its environment [14, 15]. However, the interaction with the environment leads to non-unitary evolution which is not directly simulable on quantum hardware. Early approaches to overcome this challenge included use of the quantum simulators’ intrinsic decoherence [16] and direct simulation of the environment [17–19]. Theoretical works examined the resources required for efficient quantum simulation of Markovian dynamics [20–22], concluding that arbitrary quantum channels can be efficiently simulated by combining elementary quantum channels.

Recently, several algorithms have been proposed for the digital quantum simulation of open quantum systems on the basis of the Kraus decomposition of quantum channels [23–27] as well as variational descriptions of general processes to simulate the stochastic Schrödinger equation [1, 7]. Simulation via Kraus decomposition is convenient when the Kraus operators corresponding to the time evolution of the system are known, such as modelling decoherence with amplitude damping or depolarizing channels. However, determining the Kraus operators of a general system requires either knowing the full unitary evolution of both the system and environment or casting a master equation into an operator sum representation for the density operator. The latter procedure is a classically hard task which is equivalent to solving the master equation [28]. Variational approaches [1, 7, 29] offer an attractive alternative for simulating open system dynamics, but as in the case of closed systems require an ansatz and a potentially high dimensional classical optimization.

The common feature of the above algorithms is that they reformulate non-unitary open system dynamics into unitary dynamics which can be simulated on a quantum computer. A similar approach is used in variational approaches to imaginary time evolution [30] and the quantum imaginary time evolution (QITE) algorithm, which has recently been introduced as
a way to find ground states and low lying excited states on near-term devices [31]. QITE has
since been used to compute finite-temperature correlation functions of many-body systems
[32], scattering in the Ising model [33], and binding energies in quantum chemistry [34, 35]
and nuclear physics [35]. It is therefore natural to consider how QITE might be adapted for
open quantum system evolution.

Here, we describe quantum algorithms to simulate open quantum dynamics using an
adaptation of the quantum imaginary time evolution (QITE) algorithm and demonstrate it
on IBM Quantum hardware. The first algorithm casts the Lindblad equation for the den-
sity operator into a Schrödinger type equation with a non-Hermitian Hamiltonian. Time
evolution is then achieved by simulating the unitary evolution via Trotterization, corre-
sponding to the Hermitian component of the Hamiltonian and using QITE to simulate the
anti-Hermitian component of the Hamiltonian. The second algorithm expresses the density
operator in terms of an ansatz which is preserved during both real and imaginary time evo-
lution. We demonstrate these algorithms on IBM Quantum hardware for two cases: the
spontaneous emission of a two level system (TLS) in a heat bath at zero temperature, and
the dissipative transverse field Ising model (TFIM) on two sites. We observe good agree-
ment between the exact and hardware results, showing that the dynamics of open quantum
systems are accessible on near-term quantum hardware.

II. THEORY

The dynamics of a Markovian open quantum system can be described by the Lindblad
equation

\[
\frac{\text{d}\rho}{\text{d}t} = -i[H, \rho] + \sum_k \left( L_k \rho L_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2} \{L_k^\dagger L_k, \rho\} \right)
\]  

where $\rho$ is the density operator of the system, $H$ the system’s Hamiltonian, and $L_k$ are
operators describing the coupling to the environment. The master equation in Lindblad
form is often derived assuming weak coupling between system and environment and absence
of memory effects (Born-Markov approximation) [15, 36].

We present two algorithms to simulate the master equation in Lindblad form on a digital
quantum computer. In this section, we describe the first quantum algorithm, based on a
vectorization of the density operator in Sec. II A, and the second algorithm which combines
a) Repeat $n$ times
\[
|\rho\rangle \xrightarrow{e^{-iH_1 \tau}e^{-H_2 \tau}}
\]

b) Repeat $n$ times
\[
|\psi\rangle \xrightarrow{e^{iH_1 \tau}e^{L_k^\dagger L_k \tau}}
\]
Repeat for all $k$.

FIG. 1: Circuit diagrams for Trotterized time evolution of the density operator with $n$ Trotter steps. a) Time evolution for the vectorized density operator $|\rho\rangle$ (Algorithm I). $e^{-iH_1 \tau}$ is a unitary evolution and can be directly implemented on the quantum simulator. The term $e^{-H_2 \tau}$ is implemented via QITE. b) Time evolution for the purification-based algorithm (Algorithm II). The inner box needs to be applied for every Lindblad operator $L_k$ at each time step. Although the time evolution operators act on the doubled system, $|\psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$, the algorithm requires only the system register to be represented on the device.

the QITE procedure with an ansatz for the time-dependent density operator in Sec. II B.

A. Algorithm I

The Lindblad equation can be rewritten as a Schrödinger type equation with non-Hermitian Hamiltonian by transforming the $n \times n$ density operator $\rho$ into an $n^2$ component vector $|\rho\rangle$ by column stacking the density operator [37]. The resulting transformation of the Lindblad equation is

\[
\frac{d|\rho\rangle}{dt} = \left[ -i\mathbb{I} \otimes H + i H^\dagger \otimes \mathbb{I} + \sum_k (\overline{L_k} \otimes L_k - \frac{1}{2} \mathbb{I} \otimes (L_k^\dagger L_k) - \frac{1}{2} (L_k^\dagger \overline{L_k}) \otimes \mathbb{I}) \right] |\rho\rangle \tag{2}
\]

where the bar indicates entrywise complex conjugation and $|\rho\rangle = |\rho(t)\rangle$ is the vectorized density operator [37]. Separating Eq. 2 into Hermitian and anti-Hermitian parts, the time evolution of the initial state can be written as:

\[
|\rho(t)\rangle = \exp(-i(H_1 - i H_2)t)|\rho(0)\rangle = [\exp(-iH_1 \tau) \exp(-H_2 \tau)]^n |\rho(0)\rangle + O(\tau^2). \tag{3}
\]
where in the last equality we have Trotterized to first order with time step \( \tau = t/n \) and \( H_1 \) and \( iH_2 \) are the Hermitian and anti-Hermitian components of the vectorized Hamiltonian, respectively. The first term \( \exp(-iH_1 \tau) \) is unitary and can implemented on a quantum simulator via Trotterization and standard quantum simulation techniques [2, 38, 39]. The term \( \exp(-H_2 \tau) \) is non-unitary and so cannot be directly applied to the quantum register. Instead, we implement it on a digital quantum simulator via analogy to quantum algorithms for imaginary time evolution [30, 31].

Imaginary time evolution of the Schrödinger equation with Hamiltonian \( H \) is carried out formally by substituting \( \beta = it \) into the real time propagator \( e^{-itH} \). This technique is typically used to find ground states \( |\psi\rangle = \lim_{\beta \to \infty} |\phi(\beta)\rangle |\phi(\beta)\rangle \), where \( |\phi(\beta)\rangle = e^{-\beta H} |\phi(0)\rangle \) and \( |\phi(0)\rangle \) has non-zero overlap with a ground state. If we interpret \( H_2 \) as the Hamiltonian of a system in the extended Hilbert space, \( \exp(-H_2 \tau) \) is an imaginary time evolution generated by \( H_2 \), which can be implemented by QITE [31]. The full time evolution is then applied as a sequence of real and imaginary time evolutions, as shown in Fig. 1a.

Once the desired time is reached, measurements of an observable \( O \) are obtained by evaluating the expectation value \( \langle O(t) \rangle = \text{Tr} (O\rho(t)) \) as \( \langle O^\dagger |\rho\rangle \), where \( |O\rangle \) is the vector obtained from column stacking the matrix representation of \( O \). Lindbladian evolution preserves \( \text{Tr} (\rho) \) whereas the algorithm preserves \( \text{Tr} (\rho^2) \), so the final physical observables are thus given by \( \langle O \rangle' = \langle O \rangle / \text{Tr} (\rho) \). Therefore, obtaining measurements on the state requires evaluating both \( \langle O \rangle \) and \( \text{Tr} (\rho) \) at each time step.

Both quantities can be obtained using a Hadamard test circuit [40]. In particular, \( \text{Tr} (\rho) \) can be evaluated up to a prefactor of \( 2^{-n/2}P^{-1/2} \) as \( \langle 0|V^\dagger U|0\rangle \), where \( U \) is the circuit that prepares \( |\rho\rangle \), \( V \) prepares the generalized Bell state \( |\beta\rangle = 2^{-n/2} \sum_x |x\rangle \otimes |x\rangle \), \( |x\rangle \) are the computational basis states on \( n \) qubits, and \( P \) is the purity of the initial state. Preparing the \( 2n \) qubit Bell state requires \( n \) Hadamard and \( n \) CNOT gates. Assuming \( |\rho\rangle = U|0\rangle \) for a unitary \( U \) with gate decomposition requiring \( u_1 \) and \( u_2 \) single qubit and CNOT gates, respectively, the measurement of \( \text{Tr} (\rho) \) requires a circuit with \( O(n+u_1) \) single qubit gates, \( O(n+u_1) \) CNOT gates, and \( O(n+u_2) \) CCNOT gates.

Measurement of \( k \)-local observables can be carried out similarly. We assume here without loss of generality that the \( k \)-local observable \( O \) has support on the first \( k \) qubits. The vectorized state can then be written as \( |\rho\rangle = P^{-1/2} \sum_{x_1,x_2,y_1,y_2} \rho_{x_1,x_2,y_1,y_2} |x_1,x_2,y_1,y_2\rangle |x_1,x_2,y_1,y_2\rangle \) where \( x_1, y_1 \) and \( x_2, y_2 \) are length \( k \) and \( (n-k) \) bit strings, respectively, and \( P \) is the purity of the
initial state. Defining the state

$$|O\rangle = \sum_{x_1 y_1 z} \frac{O_{x_1 y_1}}{\sqrt{2^{n-k}\text{Tr}(O'O)}} |x_1 y_1 z\rangle,$$

the expectation value of $O$ can be evaluated (up to a prefactor) as

$$\langle O\rangle = \sum_{x_1 y_1 z} \frac{O_{x_1 y_1} \rho_{x_1 y_1 z}}{\sqrt{2^{n-k}\text{Tr}(O'O)}} = \frac{\text{Tr}(O \rho)}{\sqrt{2^{n-k}\text{Tr}(O'O)}}.$$

(5)

We can prepare the state $|O\rangle$ as

$$U_{O'} V_{n-k} |0_k, 0_{n-k}, 0_k, 0_{n-k}\rangle = U_{O'} \left[ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n-k}}} \sum_{z} |0_k, z, 0_k, z\rangle \right],$$

(6)

where $V_{n-k}$ prepares the $n - k$ generalized Bell state and $U_{O'}$ prepares the 2k qubit state

$$|O\rangle = \sum_{x_1 y_1} \frac{O_{x_1 y_1}}{\sqrt{\text{Tr}(O'O)}} |x_1 y_1\rangle.$$

(7)

We then measure the un-normalized expectation value of $O$ using the Hadamard test. Since the purity is conserved by the algorithm, all observables can be renormalized after the measurement. Assuming a decomposition of $U$ into $u_1$ and $u_2$ single qubit and CNOT gates, respectively, and $V$ into $v_1$ and $v_2$ single qubit and CNOT gates, the total overhead for measurement of observables (including the trace evaluation) is $O(n + u_1 + v_1)$ single qubit gates, $O(n + u_1 + v_1)$ CNOT gates, and $O(n + u_2 + v_2)$ CCNOT gates.

B. Algorithm II

Algorithm I allows for efficient simulation of the full density operator; however, it requires a doubling of the number of qubits and an overhead of an ancilla and controlled operations for evaluating observables. In particular, the circuit required for measurements is too deep for near-term hardware. We therefore introduce a second algorithm based on the variational ansatz used to obtain the non-equilibrium steady states of Markovian systems \[29, 41\] that overcomes these limitations. The isomorphism maps a density operator as

$$\rho = \sum_{x \in I} p_x U|x\rangle \langle x|U^\dagger \rightarrow |\rho\rangle = \sum_{x \in I} p_x U|x\rangle \otimes U|x\rangle.$$

(8)
where the $|x\rangle$'s label the $n$-qubit computational basis states and $I$ is subset of all $2^n$ possible bit-strings. In the rest of the paper the index set $I$ is implied. We note that although we are using an ansatz for this algorithm, any density operator can be represented in this form provided the index set $I$ is large enough.

The Lindblad master equation is mapped identically to the vectorization mapping, resulting in Eq. (2). The propagator is again Trotterized and each term can be applied term by term. The unitary part of the propagator preserves the ansatz, as

$$\exp \left( (-iI \otimes H + iH^\top \otimes I) \tau \right) \sum_x p_x U|x\rangle \otimes U|x\rangle = \sum_x p_x e^{iH^\top} U|x\rangle \otimes e^{-iH} U|x\rangle$$

and $e^{-iH} = e^{iH^\top}$ for Hermitian $H$. The remaining terms in the propagator are of the form $\exp (-L_k^\top L_k \tau/2) \otimes \exp (-L_k^\dagger L_k \tau/2)$ and $\exp (\overline{L_k} \otimes L_k \tau)$. The first term preserves the ansatz but is non-unitary, while the second term does not preserve the ansatz and is non-unitary. Considering the first of non-unitary terms, as in the original QITE algorithm we seek a set of numbers $q_x$ and a Hermitian operator $A$ such that

$$V_k \sum_x p_x U|x\rangle \otimes U|x\rangle = \sum_x (p_x + q_x) \exp (iA) U|x\rangle \otimes \exp (-iA) U|x\rangle + O(\tau^2),$$

where $V_k = \exp (-L_k^\top L_k \tau/2) \otimes \exp (-L_k^\dagger L_k \tau/2)$. As shown in Appendix A, we find that

$$q_x = -\tau p_x \text{Re} \langle x| U^\dagger L_k^\top \overline{L_k} U|x\rangle.$$

Decomposing $A$ into a weighted sum of Pauli strings, $A = \sum_j a_j \sigma_j$, we find that the coefficients $a_j$ satisfy the linear system $Sa = b$, with

$$S_{ij} = \sum_x p_x^2 \text{Re} \langle x| U^\dagger (\sigma_i \sigma_j + \sigma_j \sigma_i) U|x\rangle - 2 \sum_{xy} p_x p_y \text{Re} \langle x| U^\dagger \sigma_i U|y\rangle \langle x| U^\dagger \sigma_j U|y\rangle, \quad (12)$$

$$b_i = -\tau \left( \sum_x p_x^2 \text{Im} \langle x| U^\dagger \sigma_i L_k^\top \overline{L_k} U|x\rangle + \sum_{xy} p_x p_y \text{Im} \langle x| U^\dagger \sigma_i U|y\rangle \langle y| U^\dagger L_k^\top \overline{L_k} U|x\rangle \right). \quad (13)$$

$q_x$, $S$, and $b$ for the second non-unitary term, $\exp (\overline{L_k} \otimes L_k \tau)$, take a similar form. The derivation for both terms is given in Appendix A. We note that the total probability $\sum_x p_x = 1$ is conserved by the algorithm since $\sum_x q_x = 0$ at each time step as shown in Eq. (A19).
With this ansatz, observables are computed as \( \langle O \rangle = \sum_x p_x \langle x|U^\dagger OU|x \rangle \), requiring the propagation of each \( |x \rangle \) in parallel while storing the \( p_x \)’s. The final observable is computed as a classical averages over all the propagated states and \( p_x \)’s. It is important to note that although the ansatz lies in a dilated Hilbert space, all measurements take place on the original system and no entangling operations between the system and ancilla are needed, and so no ancillae qubits are needed. In particular, for each time step measurements on the original Hilbert space are used to determine the Hermitian matrix \( A \). Expectation values of observables on this state are computed using the standard methods [1, 2].

The benefits of Algorithm II are that it requires no ancilla qubits, and no Hadamard test is required for measurements of observables. These characteristics, trading quantum for classical resources and simulating large quantum circuits using smaller quantum computers are important for near-term hardware [42–46]. Its main drawback is in the number of measurements required to evolve the system. Specifically, it requires measurement of the matrix elements \( \langle x|U^\dagger \sigma_i U|y \rangle \) for all Pauli strings \( \sigma_i \) supported on a domain \( D \) (measured in qubits) and all bit strings in \( x, y \in S \) for some subset \( S \) of the \( 2^n \) \( n \)-bit strings. This necessitates running \( \mathcal{O} (L4^D|S|^2) \) circuits per time step, where \( L \) is the number of Lindblad operators on the domain and \( |S| \) is the number of bit-strings we include in our computation. We require that the number of bit strings to include in \( S \) scales polynomially or slower with system size in order for the algorithm to be efficient. In practice, this requirement is plausible to satisfy because the domain size \( D \) can generally be taken to be smaller for dissipative systems compared to the same system with no dissipation, as dissipation generally reduces a system’s correlation length [47]. Similarly to the original QITE algorithm, we can choose the operator \( A \) to act on a restricted domain of the system determined by the correlation length. If \( A \) acts in some qubit domain \( D \), we need to store the \( p_x \)’s corresponding to the \( 2^D \) bit strings on this domain. Provided that \( D \) scales as \( \mathcal{O} (1) \) with the system size, there is no exponential classical overhead for Algorithm II.

Table I summarizes the asymptotic scaling of the number of circuits required per time step of both algorithms for open quantum system dynamical simulation on \( n \) sites.
TABLE I: Asymptotic number of circuits required per time step per Lindblad operator for both algorithms for an open system on $n$ sites. Here, $D$ is the domain size, and $S$ is a subset of all $n$-bit strings for which we measure the corresponding matrix elements.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Algorithm</th>
<th># of qubits</th>
<th>Circuits per Lindblad operator</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>$2n + 1$</td>
<td>$(n/D)4^D$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>II</td>
<td>$n$</td>
<td>$(n/D)4^D</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

III. RESULTS

We demonstrate Algorithm I on IBM Quantum hardware for two cases: the spontaneous emission of a two level system (TLS) in a heat bath at zero temperature (two qubits), and the dissipative transverse field Ising model (TFIM) on two sites (four qubits). We present noisy hardware emulations for Algorithm II for the two site TFIM (2 qubits). Considering Algorithm I, since simulation of the first case requires two physical qubits, both the real and imaginary time propagators can be exactly decomposed into six single qubit gates and two entangling gates via a $KAK$ decomposition [48–50]. As in Ref. [32], we use this decomposition to recompile the circuits to constant depth regardless of the number of time steps used. The two-site dissipative TFIM on 4 qubits does not have a constant depth circuit decomposition; Trotterizing both the real and imaginary time propagators results in a circuit with depth linear in the number of time steps. The resulting circuit is too deep for near-term devices. To overcome this limitation, we recompile the circuits as in Ref. [32]. For Algorithm I, the computation of overlaps is prohibitively expensive on available devices. For the small systems demonstrated here, we instead directly measure the diagonal elements of the density operator, $\rho_{xx}$, and classically compute $\text{Tr} (O \rho) = \sum_x \rho_{xx} O_{xx}$. Off-diagonal observables are obtained by appending a unitary at the end of the circuit to diagonalize the matrix prior to measurement. In both two and four qubit simulations, we correct for readout error using the built-in noise models in Qiskit [51–54]. All measurements reported represent the average of 8192 shots and were repeated three times. When constructing the QITE matrix, regularizers $1 \times 10^{-6}$ and 0.01, for the TLS and TFIM, respectively, were added to the diagonal terms to increase the condition number of the matrix $S$.

We first present results for the TLS model with the Hamiltonian
FIG. 2: (a) Population of the excited state (blue) and ground state (green) from numerical solutions obtained in QuTiP [55, 56] (lines), and hardware using Algorithm I (symbols), obtained from IBM’s ibmq_mumbai [57]. The deviation between the theoretical and experimental curves is largely due to Trotter error. The system approaches a non-equilibrium steady state for $\gamma t \gtrsim 5$. (b) Purity, $\text{Tr}(\rho^2)$, (red) and off diagonal term, $\text{Im}(\rho_{01})$, (black) corresponding to non-diagonal observables. In these figures the error bars are smaller than the symbol size.

\[
H = -\frac{\delta}{2} \sigma_z - \frac{\Omega}{2} \sigma_x
\]

and the Lindblad operator $\sqrt{\gamma} \sigma_-$, where $\sigma_-$ is the lowering operator of the system, $\delta$ the detuning, $\Omega$ the Rabi frequency, and $\gamma$ the spontaneous emission rate. We consider here the overdamped case where $\gamma$ is on the order of the other energies in the system. Algorithm I requires two physical qubits to model this system. The anti-Hermitian component $-iH_2$ of the vectorized TLS Hamiltonian $H_1 - iH_2$ has a stabilizer $\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z$, and so using the Pauli string reduction scheme introduced in [32], we can reduce the number of Pauli strings needed to implement the imaginary time evolution to only include $\sigma_x \otimes \sigma_y$ and $\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_x$.

We set $\delta = \Omega = \gamma = 1$, and the initial state was chosen to be the excited state. In Fig. 2a, we show the populations of the ground and excited states, with the experimental data averaged from three runs on IBM’s ibmq_mumbai [57]. We see good agreement in all
observables, with the deviation between the theoretical and experimental curves largely due to Trotter error. This was confirmed via numerical simulations and hardware emulations. We observe an initial exponential decay in the population of the excited state due to spontaneous emission into the bath, followed by an approach to the non-equilibrium steady steady state (NESS) for $\gamma t \gg 1$. Damped Rabi oscillations are visible between these two regimes. The populations in the NESS can be interpreted as a balance between the spontaneous emission due to coupling to the bath and the absorption and stimulated emission due to the Hamiltonian driving term $\sigma_x$ [58]. In the NESS, the combined spontaneous and stimulated emission rates are equal to the absorption rate.

In the absence of driving by an external electric field ($\Omega = 0$) the Hamiltonian is diagonal in the computational basis, resulting in the off diagonal matrix elements $\rho_{01} = \rho_{10}$ approaching zero as the system thermalizes. We see in Fig. 2b that these matrix elements remain non-zero as we approach the NESS, showing that quantum coherence is maintained even in the presence of damping. Also shown in Fig. 2b is the purity $\text{Tr}(\rho^2)$, which does not correspond to a Hermitian observable on the system, but can nonetheless be obtained from the density operator representation on the hardware. Time evolution preserves the inner product $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) = \langle \rho | \rho \rangle$ on the quantum simulator, but the physical quantity, the normalized trace, $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) / \text{Tr}(\rho)$, is not conserved. Since a quantum state with $\text{Tr}(\rho^2) < 1$ cannot be represented as a pure state $|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ without a Hilbert space dilation, Fig. 2b highlights the need to represent the full density operator.

We next present experimental and numerical results on the 2-site TFIM. The TFIM has the Hamiltonian

$$H = -J \sum_k \sigma_z^{(k)} \sigma_z^{(k+1)} - h \sum_k \sigma_x^{(k)}$$

and Lindblad operators $\sqrt{\gamma} \sigma_z^{(k)}$, with nearest neighbor coupling $J$, transverse magnetic field $h$, and decay rate $\gamma$. For Algorithm I, this simulation requires four physical qubits and so the KAK decompositions cannot be used. Instead, the circuits were recompiled to constant depth using the methods of [32]. For this model, the number of required Pauli strings could not be reduced by symmetry in Algorithm I. To reduce circuit depth, 16 Pauli strings were randomly selected out of the 256 possible Pauli strings on 4 qubits to implement the QITE unitary. We chose 16 Pauli strings as a balance between too few Pauli strings, which results
FIG. 3: Average magnetization $N^{-1} \sum_i \langle Z_i \rangle$ for the dissipative transverse field Ising model on 2 sites (4 physical qubits) using IBM Quantum’s `ibmq_guadalupe` processor [57] (blue symbols), a hardware emulation of Algorithm II using Qiskit’s built-in noise model (green dashed line and symbols), and numerical solutions obtained in QuTiP (black line). The error bars are the standard deviation from 3 hardware runs. Both algorithms capture the open system dynamics for all simulated times. The deviation between the noisy emulation and the exact result is due to Trotter error, which was confirmed via emulations with smaller Trotter steps.

in a poor approximation to normalized imaginary time evolution, and too many Pauli strings, which results in a large computational overhead and an ill-conditioned QITE matrix.

Figure 3 shows the average magnetization of the dissipative TFIM with the initial state given by both spins in the spin up state and $J = h = 1$ and $\gamma = 0.1$. Oscillations in magnetization are evident due to the relatively large transverse field. We observe qualitative agreement between the theoretical and experimental curves from Algorithm I with a Trotter step $\gamma t/n \sim 0.5$. Noisy hardware emulations of Algorithm II are in good agreement with the exact curve for all times, showing that the ansatz is able to accurately capture the non-unitary quantum channel induced by the Lindblad operators.

We now discuss the relative computational cost required by each algorithm for these sim-
ulations. Algorithm I is able to accurately describe the dissipative dynamics when using only 16 out of the total of 256 Pauli strings. Measuring an observable $\text{Tr} (O \rho) = \langle O^\dagger | \rho \rangle$ and $\text{Tr} (\rho)$ in Algorithm I requires measuring state overlaps, which can be done using the Hadamard test. This requires an overhead of CNOT and CCNOT gates which scales linearly in the number of time steps and qubits, assuming a fixed allowable error rate due to Trotterization and decomposition of unitaries into gates. Algorithm II requires measuring the matrix elements of all two qubit Pauli strings at each time step, requiring 836 circuits per time step, versus only measuring expectation values of 16 operators in the case of Algorithm I, which requires 16 circuits. These measurements are only needed on a domain of fixed size.

For larger dissipation rates $\gamma \sim J, h$, separate numerical simulations show that the deviation between the experimental and theoretical curves are larger when simulated with Algorithm I than Algorithm II. This discrepancy could be due to not including all Pauli strings in the QITE matrix, which results in worse approximations for the non-unitary evolution. Increasing the number of Pauli strings, reducing the number of strings via symmetry, or determining a better set of criteria for selecting the strings may allow us to increase the simulable dissipation rates. Further investigation is required to determine the optimal approach. Algorithm II is therefore advantageous for higher dissipation rates and limited number of hardware qubits, trading physical qubits and multi-qubit controlled operations for more measurement circuits. Although locality is preserved in Eq. 2, the term $L_k \otimes L_k$ creates correlations between the two halves of the doubled system in Algorithm I. As a result, the topology of the hardware needs to be considered when implementing Algorithm I.

IV. SUMMARY

We have introduced digital quantum algorithms for the time evolution of open quantum systems described by a Lindblad equation based on quantum imaginary time evolution. Algorithm I uses QITE to implement the non-unitary evolution introduced when the density operator is vectorized, whereas Algorithm II uses an adaptation of QITE to maintain a purification-based ansatz throughout the computation. Two and four qubit calculations for the spontaneous emission of a two level system and the dissipative transverse field Ising model, respectively, were carried out on IBM Quantum’s quantum processors. Good agree-
ment with the exact result was observed in all cases. Improved criteria for selecting which Pauli strings to include may increase the possible dissipation rates simulable with Algorithm I. These algorithms allow the dynamics of open quantum systems governed by Lindblad master equations to be simulated on near-term quantum hardware.
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Appendix A: Derivation of the QITE linear system for Algorithm II

Here we derive the QITE linear systems which need to be solved to obtain the time evolution of the density operator ansatz. Consider \( |\rho\rangle = \sum_x p_x T|x\rangle \otimes \overline{T}|x\rangle \), with \( T \) unitary. The complex time propagator is the same as in the vectorization method,

\[
X(t) = \exp \left( \left[ -iI \otimes H + iH^\top \otimes I + \sum_k \left( L_k \otimes L_k - \frac{1}{2} I \otimes (L_k^\dagger L_k) - \frac{1}{2} (L_k^\top L_k) \otimes I \right) \right] t \right) .
\]

(A1)

Trotterizing results in

\[
X(t) = \left\{ \exp \left( iH^\top \tau \right) \otimes \exp \left( -iH\tau \right) \right\} \prod_k \left[ \exp \left( \frac{-L_k^\dagger L_k \tau}{2} \right) \otimes \exp \left( \frac{-L_k L_k^\tau}{2} \right) \right] \exp \left( L_k \otimes L_k \tau \right) \bigg] \right\}^n + O \left( \frac{t^2}{n} \right)
\]

(A2)

with \( \tau = t/n \). Using the identity \( \exp(-iA) = \exp(iA^\top) \) for \( A \) Hermitian and \( \exp(B) = \exp(B) \) for arbitrary \( B \), the propagator can be rewritten as

\[
X(t) = \left\{ \left[ U \otimes \overline{U} \right] \prod_k \left[ V_k \otimes \overline{V}_k \right] W_k \right\}^n + O \left( \frac{t^2}{n} \right)
\]

(A3)

with \( U := \exp(iH^\top \tau) \), \( V_i := \exp(-L_k^\dagger L_k \tau/2) \), and \( W_i := \exp(L_k \otimes L_k \tau) \). It is immediate that evolution with \( U \otimes \overline{U} \) preserves the ansatz, as \( (U \otimes \overline{U}) \sum_x p_x T|x\rangle \otimes \overline{T}|x\rangle = \sum_x p_x (U T)|x\rangle \otimes (\overline{U T})|x\rangle \). The term \( V \otimes \overline{V} \) also preserves the ansatz, but is an imaginary time evolution with Hamiltonian \( L_k^\dagger L_k \tau/2 \), and so requires a modified QITE algorithm, described below, for implementing \( \exp(-L_k^\dagger L_k \tau/2)T|x\rangle \). Due to the non-unitarity of \( V_k \), we expect that in addition to a unitary evolution of the state the weights \( p_x \) will also evolve in time. The final term, \( W_k = \exp(L_k \otimes L_k \tau) \), does not preserve the ansatz, and we use a modified version of QITE, described below, to effectively apply \( W_k \) while preserving the form of ansatz.
1. Determining the Action of $V_k \otimes V_k$

Under real time evolution by the non-unitary operator $V_k \otimes \bar{V}_k$, the change in $|\rho\rangle$ can be expressed as

$$V_k \otimes \bar{V}_k \sum_x p_x T|x\rangle \otimes \bar{T}|x\rangle = \sum_x (p_x + q_x) \exp (iA)T|x\rangle \otimes \exp (-i\bar{A})\bar{T}|x\rangle + O(\tau^2), \quad (A4)$$

with $q_x \in \mathbb{R}$ and $A$ a Hermitian operator with $\|A\|_2 = O(\tau)$. Defining $B := (1/2)L_k^\dagger \bar{L}_k$, we then have

$$\exp (-\tau B) \otimes \exp (-\tau \bar{B}) \sum_x p_x T|x\rangle \otimes \bar{T}|x\rangle. \quad (A5)$$

Expanding both sides to first order in $\tau$ and discarding higher order terms results in

$$-\tau \sum_x p_x (BT|x\rangle \otimes \bar{T}|x\rangle + T|x\rangle \otimes \bar{B}T|x\rangle) =$$

$$\sum_x q_x T|x\rangle \otimes \bar{T}|x\rangle + i \sum_x p_x (AT|x\rangle \otimes \bar{T}|x\rangle - T|x\rangle \otimes \bar{A}T|x\rangle). \quad (A6)$$

Taking the inner product of Eq. (A6) with $\langle y|T^\dagger \otimes \langle y|T^\tau$ results in

$$-\tau \sum_x p_x (\langle y|T^\dagger BT|x\rangle \langle y|T^\tau T|x\rangle + \langle y|T^\dagger T|x\rangle \langle y|T^\tau BT|x\rangle) =$$

$$\sum_x q_x \langle y|T^\dagger T|x\rangle \langle y|T^\tau T|x\rangle + i \sum_x p_x (\langle y|T^\dagger AT|x\rangle \langle y|T^\tau T|x\rangle - \langle y|T^\dagger T|x\rangle \langle y|T^\tau AT|x\rangle). \quad (A7)$$

Using the identities $\langle y|T^\dagger T|x\rangle = \langle y|T^\tau T|x\rangle = \delta_{xy}$ for $T$ unitary results in

$$-\tau p_y (\langle y|T^\dagger BT|y\rangle + \langle y|T^\tau BT|y\rangle) = q_y + ip_y (\langle y|T^\dagger AT|y\rangle - \langle y|T^\tau AT|y\rangle). \quad (A8)$$

Because $A$ is Hermitian, we additionally have $\langle y|T^\dagger AT|y\rangle = \langle y|T^\tau AT|y\rangle$ so that the last two terms on the right-hand side cancel, resulting in

$$q_y = -2\tau p_y \text{Re} \langle y|T^\dagger BT|y\rangle \quad (A9)$$

With the $q_x$’s determined, we can now determine the operator $A$. Rearranging Eq. (A6), we first isolate the terms containing $A$:

$$i \sum_x p_x (AT|x\rangle \otimes T|x\rangle - T|x\rangle \otimes AT|x\rangle) =$$

$$-\tau \sum_x p_x (BT|x\rangle \otimes \bar{T}|x\rangle + T|x\rangle \otimes \bar{B}T|x\rangle) - \sum_x q_x T|x\rangle \otimes \bar{T}|x\rangle. \quad (A10)$$
We define the right hand side as

\[ |\Phi\rangle = -\tau \sum_x p_x (BT|x\rangle \otimes T|x\rangle + T|x\rangle \otimes BT|x\rangle) - \sum_x q_x T|x\rangle \otimes T|x\rangle. \tag{A11} \]

We then decompose \( A \) into a sum over Pauli strings with domain size \( D \),

\[ A = \sum_j a_j \sigma_j, \]

where the \( \sigma_j \) are Pauli strings acting on at most \( D \) qubits, \( a_j \in \mathbb{R} \) and \( a_j = \mathcal{O}(\tau) \) for all \( j \).

Substituting into the left hand side of Eq. (A10) yields

\[ i \sum_{x,j} p_x a_j (\sigma_j T|x\rangle \otimes T|x\rangle - T|x\rangle \otimes \sigma_j T|x\rangle) = \sum_j a_j |v_j\rangle = |\Phi\rangle, \tag{A12} \]

where we have defined the vectors \( |v_j\rangle := \sum_x p_x (\sigma_j T|x\rangle \otimes T^\dagger|x\rangle - T|x\rangle \otimes \sigma_j^* T^\dagger|x\rangle) \). Denoting by \( f \) the function

\[ f(a) = \left| |\Phi\rangle - i \sum_j a_j |v_j\rangle \right|^2 = \langle \Phi|\Phi \rangle + i \sum_j (a_j^* \langle v_j|\Phi \rangle - a_j \langle \Phi|v_j \rangle) + \sum_{jk} a_j^* a_k \langle v_j|v_k \rangle, \tag{A13} \]

the optimal coefficients \( a_j \) are determined by minimizing \( f \). This results in the set of equations

\[ 0 = \frac{\partial f}{\partial a_k} = -\text{Im}\langle v_k|\Phi \rangle + \sum_j a_j \text{Re}\langle v_k|v_j \rangle. \tag{A14} \]

Defining the matrix \( S_{jk} := \text{Re}\langle v_j|v_k \rangle \) and the vector \( b_j := \text{Im}\langle v_j|\Phi \rangle \), the optimal coefficients \( a \) are the solution to the linear system \( Sa = b \).

Using the definition’s of \( |v_j\rangle \) and \( |\Phi\rangle \), we can calculate calculate the matrix elements of \( S \) as

\[ S_{jk} = \text{Re}\langle v_j|v_k \rangle = \sum_x p_x^2 \text{Re}\langle x|T^\dagger(\sigma_j \sigma_k + \sigma_k \sigma_j)T|x \rangle - 2 \sum_{xy} p_x p_y \text{Re}\langle x|T^\dagger \sigma_j T|y \rangle \langle x|T^\dagger \sigma_k T|y \rangle, \tag{A15} \]

and the elements of \( b \) as

\[ b_j = -2\tau \left( \sum_x p_x^2 \text{Im}\langle x|T^\dagger \sigma_j BT|x \rangle + \sum_{xy} p_x p_y \text{Im}\langle x|T^\dagger \sigma_j T|y \rangle \langle y|T^\dagger B^\dagger T|x \rangle \right). \tag{A16} \]
2. Determining the Action of $W_k$

The real time evolution corresponding to $W_k = \exp (\tau L_k \otimes L_k)$ can be determined completely analogously to that of $V_k \otimes \overline{V}_k$ above. The resulting equations are

$$\begin{align*}
q_y &= \tau \sum_x p_x |\langle y| T^\dagger L_k T |x \rangle|^2 \\
S_{jk} &= \text{Re} \langle v_j | v_k \rangle \\
b_j &= \text{Im} \langle v_j | \Phi \rangle
\end{align*}$$

(A17)

where $Sa = b$ gives the optimal Pauli strings. The matrix elements for $S$ are the same, as the vectors $|v_j\rangle$ are identical in both cases. Since $|\Phi\rangle$ has a different form, the elements of $b$ are modified and given by

$$b_j = \text{Im} \langle v_j | \Phi \rangle = 2\tau \sum_{xy} p_x p_y \text{Im} \langle x | T^\dagger \sigma_j L_k T | y \rangle \langle y | T^\dagger L_k^\dagger T | x \rangle. \quad (A18)$$

3. Conservation of Probability

The trace of the density operator, given by $\text{Tr} (\rho) = \sum_x p_x = 1$, is preserved by time evolution generated by the Lindblad equation. Here we show that time evolution via Algorithm II also maintains the trace. The trace is preserved if the sum of all $q_x$’s is zero at each time step. This requires summing the contributions to the $q_x$’s from both the $V_k$ and $W_k$ terms as follows:

$$\begin{align*}
\sum_y q_y &= \sum_y \left( -\tau p_y \text{Re} \langle y | T^\dagger L_k^\dagger L_k T | y \rangle + \tau \sum_x p_x |\langle y| T^\dagger L_k T |x \rangle|^2 \right) \\
&= -\tau \sum_y p_y \langle y | T^\dagger L_k^\dagger L_k T | y \rangle + \tau \sum_x p_x \sum_y \langle x | T^\dagger L_k^\dagger T | y \rangle \langle y | T^\dagger L_k T | x \rangle \\
&= -\tau \text{Tr} \left( \rho L_k^\dagger L_k \right) + \tau \sum_x p_x \langle x | T^\dagger L_k^\dagger L_k T | x \rangle \\
&= -\tau \text{Tr} \left( \rho L_k^\dagger L_k \right) + \tau \text{Tr} \left( \rho L_k^\dagger L_k \right) \\
&= 0 \quad (A19)
\end{align*}$$

4. Measuring Observables

The result of the above real and imaginary time evolution, the weights $p_x(t)$ and the Hermitian operator $A(t)$ can be used to calculate the expectation value of any observ-
Inverting the Choi-Jamiolkowski isomorphism gives us the density operator \( \rho(t) = \sum_x p_x(t) T(t)|x\langle x| T^\dagger(t) \). Observables \( O \) are then calculated as

\[
\langle O(t) \rangle = \text{Tr} (O \rho(t)) = \sum_{xy} p_x(t) \langle y|OT(t)|x\rangle \langle x| T^\dagger(t)|y\rangle
\]

\[
= \sum_{xy} p_x \langle x| T^\dagger|y\rangle \langle y|OT|x\rangle
\]

\[
= \sum_x p_x \langle x| T^\dagger \left( \sum_y \langle y|y\rangle \right) OT|x\rangle
\]

\[
= \sum_x p_x \langle x| T^\dagger (t) OT(t)|x\rangle.
\]

(A20)

Beyond a certain number of qubits, storing all the \( p_x(t) \)'s is not possible, and a stochastic sampling approach is needed. Locality conditions suggest one possible approach to efficient sampling, described at the end of section (A.5), which converges faster than uniform random sampling.

5. Measuring Matrix Elements

To obtain the coefficients \( q_x \) and \( a_i \), we need to measure various matrix elements. In general, we can decompose any operator into a sum over Pauli strings, \( X = \sum_j x_i \sigma_i \). Since \( \langle x|X|y\rangle = \sum_j x_i \langle x|\sigma_i|y\rangle \), we then need to measure \( \langle x|\sigma_i|y\rangle \) for all Pauli strings \( \sigma_i \). This can be done using the following identities:

\[
2\text{Re}\langle x|X|y\rangle = \frac{\langle x + iy|X|x + iy\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} - \frac{\langle x - iy|X|x - iy\rangle}{\sqrt{2}},
\]

\[
2\text{Im}\langle x|X|y\rangle = \frac{\langle x + iy|X|x - iy\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} - \frac{\langle x - iy|X|x + iy\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}.
\]

(A21)

(A22)

In general, the state \((|x\rangle + i^p|y\rangle)/\sqrt{2}\), with \( p \in \{0, 1, 2, 3\} \), requires a quantum circuit comprising \( m \) CNOT gates and having depth \( m + 1 \), where \( m \) is the Hamming distance between the binary strings \( x, y \) [59]. Indeed, one can find an index \( k \) such that \( x_k \neq y_k \). Without loss of generality, one can assume that \( x_k = 1 \) (otherwise, just invert the roles of \( x, y \) and replace \( p \) with \( -p \mod 4 \)). One can then define the sets \( S = \{ l : x_l = 1, l \neq k \} \), \( T = \{ l : x_l \neq y_l, l \neq k \} \). Finally, starting from a register of \( n \) qubits prepared in \(|0\rangle^\otimes n\), the desired state is obtained by: (i) applying a product of \( X \) gates on qubits in the set \( S \), \( \prod_{l \in S} X_l \) (ii) applying to qubit \( k \) the gate \( g_p = H, SH, ZH, ZSH \), for \( p = 0, 1, 2, 3 \), respectively, (iii) applying a product of CNOT gates to qubits in \( T \) controlled by qubit \( k \), \( \prod_{l \in S} c_k X_l \).
For local observables the state preparation is simpler, as described in the following. Consider a $k$-qubit observable $X^{(k)} \otimes I_{n-k}$, with $X^{(k)}$ acting non-trivially on $k$ qubits out of a total of $n$ qubits. Then

$$\langle x|X^{(k)} \otimes I_{n-k}|y \rangle = \langle x_1, \ldots, x_k, x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_n|X^{(k)} \otimes I_{n-k}|y_1, \ldots, y_k, y_{k+1}, \ldots, y_n \rangle$$  \hspace{1cm} (A23)

$$= \delta_{x_{k+1},y_{k+1}} \cdots \delta_{x_n,y_n} \langle x_1, \ldots, x_k|X^{(k)}|y_1, \ldots, y_k \rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A24)

Thus we need only to prepare the states

$$\frac{|x_1, \ldots, x_k, x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_n\rangle + |y_1, \ldots, y_k, x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_n\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} = \frac{|x_1, \ldots, x_k\rangle + |y_1, \ldots, y_k\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \otimes |x_{k+1}, \ldots, x_n\rangle.$$  \hspace{1cm} (A25)

Since $k$ is typically small, only 1 or 2 qubits in most cases and independent of the system size, this state can be efficiently prepared. The form of Eq. (A25) suggests a stochastic sampling method to determine which $p_x$’s to store classically. For simplicity we describe the case of qubits in a line, and the indices $1, \ldots, n$ labelling the sites with the observable acting on the first $k$ qubits. The general case is similar. Since the matrix elements will depend more heavily on qubits $1, \ldots, k+m$ for some cutoff $m$, we can sample with higher frequency on the first $k+m$ qubits and with lower frequency on the rest. In addition, in many cases we expect the dissipation channels $L_k$ to reduce long range correlations, further increasing the convergence rate of local sampling.