Non-Markovian Quantum Process Tomography

G. A. L. White,1,* F. A. Pollock,2 L. C. L. Hollenberg,1 K. Modi,2,† and C. D. Hill1,3,‡

1 School of Physics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC 3010, Australia
2 School of Mathematics and Statistics, University of Melbourne, Parkville, VIC, 3010, Australia
3 School of Physics and Astronomy, Monash University, Clayton, VIC 3800, Australia

Characterisation protocols have so far played a central role in the development of noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) computers capable of impressive quantum feats. This trajectory is expected to continue in building the next generation of devices: ones that can surpass classical computers for particular tasks – but progress in characterisation must keep up with the complexities of intricate device noise. A missing piece in the zoo of characterisation procedures is tomography which can completely describe non-Markovian dynamics. Here, we formally introduce a generalisation of quantum process tomography, which we call process tensor tomography. We detail the experimental requirements, construct the necessary post-processing algorithms for maximum-likelihood estimation, outline the best-practice aspects for accurate results, and make the procedure efficient for low-memory processes. The characterisation is the pathway to diagnostics and informed control of correlated noise. As an example application of the technique, we improve multi-time circuit fidelities on IBM Quantum devices for both standalone qubits and in the presence of crosstalk to a level comparable with the fault-tolerant noise threshold in a variety of different noise conditions. Our methods could form the core for carefully developed software that may help hardware consistently pass the fault-tolerant noise threshold.

I. INTRODUCTION

Central to the theme of progress in quantum computing has been the development and application of quantum characterisation, verification, and validation (QCVV) procedures [1–7]. These techniques model and identify the presence of errors in a quantum information processor (QIP). These errors may have different origins, such as coherent control noise, decoherence, crosstalk, or state preparation and measurement (SPAM) errors. The operational description of open quantum dynamics has been immensely useful in describing the noise present in QIPs [8, 9]. Typified by mappings of density operators, a discrete snapshot of a given noisy process can be characterised through a series of experiments on the QIP. The resulting object is the gold standard for describing two-time errors on a quantum device: a completely positive, trace-preserving (CPTP) map.

CPTP maps, however, are not sufficient to describe all dynamics present on real quantum devices. A generic quantum stochastic process represents many times, and carries correlations across multiple time scales as a rule rather than the exception [10]. The emergence of adverse effects from temporal correlations in quantum processes is known as non-Markovian noise, and arises from mutual interaction between a system and its complex environment. Standard CP maps – such as those characterised by quantum process tomography (QPT) – cannot describe reduced system-environment (SE) dynamics arising from a correlated state. Famously, this leads to CP-divisibility of a process as a granular measure of non-Markovianity [11–13] and prohibits their use in the detailed study of multi-time quantum correlations.

Discourse on device quality is mostly shaped either at the low level – by emphasis on the fidelity of individual gates; or at the high level – through holistic benchmarks such as quantum volume [14]. However, there is a discontinuity in these abstractions: the former does not consider the effects of context, while the latter coarsely summarises the average performance of a QIP in high-width, high-depth random circuits. Indeed, recent progress in quantum computing has led to the engineering of very low error gates [15–17], but evidence has shown that NISQ devices do not behave like the sum of their parts. Typically, they perform worse than predicted by constituent gate errors alone, which ignore non-Markovian quantum processes present in reality [4, 6, 18]. A simple example of how this complex noise can impact the outcome of an experiment is that the choice of a gate in the past may influence the action of a gate applied at the present. The two gates do not simply multiply out. Correlated noise can be particularly deleterious not only in its complexity, but in its ability to reduce or even eliminate completely the effectiveness of quantum error correcting codes [19, 20].

Characterising general quantum stochastic processes is the first step in explicating correlated noise on quantum processors. However, a clear procedure to this effect has been notably absent in the past; there are several technical and fundamental challenges that make this task highly non-trivial. In this work, we focus on formalising the tomographic reconstruction of multi-time quantum processes as a generalisation of two-time QPT. We build upon the theoretical framework of the process tensor, a recently developed mathematical framework to describe quantum stochastic processes [21]. In essence, this object is a multilinear mapping from sequences of gates to final states, conditioned on these interventions. As such, it is
able to account for correlated errors in sequence of gates, as well as quantifying the size of non-Markovian features of a process. In this work, we formally flesh out this missing puzzle piece in quantum tomography, which we call process tensor tomography (PTT). We then report the experimental characterisation of multi-time quantum stochastic processes in a way that is both consistent and fully inclusive of non-Markovian dynamics. The present work includes a pedagogical overview, as well as several significant theoretical advancements, practical developments, and experimental application of the established tools.

Our paper is structured as follows. In Section II, we give a brief background on quantum state tomography (QST) and QPT before continuing into the theory of quantum stochastic processes and tomographic reconstruction of a process tensor. In Section III we derive the main components of a maximum likelihood estimation (MLE) PTT protocol, including a positive causal projection necessary for reconstructed process tensors to be physical. This procedure is then benchmarked and validated on IBM Quantum devices. Using the tools of Section III, in Section IV we motivate and advance the theory of quantum Markov order, in which we determine how to adaptively truncate weaker long-time temporal correlations in the model. Such processes offer both an experimentally and computationally more efficient description of the process, following the concept of quantum Markov order outlined in [22]. In Section V we demonstrate some applications of our tool kit on IBM Quantum devices. The reliability of MLE and the efficiency due to Markov order truncation allows us to implement noise-aware control to significantly reduce the noise present across a variety of contexts. We demonstrate not only the utility of our technique here, but also its necessity by showing that improvement is contingent on the inclusion of higher order (i.e. multi-time) temporal correlations in the model.

II. A HIERARCHY OF QUANTUM TOMOGRAPHY

We start by outlining the fundamentals of QST, QPT, and PTT. These procedures build on each other; for a $d$-dimensional system, QST requires a set of $O(d^2)$ experiments, QPT is most easily thought of as $d^2$ QSTs and requires $O(d^4)$ experiments, and PTT $O(d^{18})$ experiments, where $k = 1, 2, \ldots$ is the number of times steps [23–25]. The familiarity of the first two lays the groundwork for the latter. The treatment and practical concerns of each technique are similar with respect to real data. One key difference lies in the fact that due to the higher-dimensional superoperator basis, especially for PTT, small errors can become magnified and require closer attention.

Fundamentally, quantum tomography is an exercise in reconstructing linear maps from experimental data. This can be accomplished by measuring the input-output relations on a complete basis for the input space. A disconnect between theory and experiment occurs when, in practice, the input vectors are faulty in some way (such as noisy preparation) or the measured output frequencies differ from that of the real population (due to a noisy probe or finite sampling error) [23]. As well as producing an object that may disagree with experiment for inputs away from the characterisation, the resulting estimate might not even be physical. A variety of different methods may be employed to overcome some of these problems: the collection of more data, the elevation of inputs and outputs to the model [24, 26], employing an overcomplete basis in the characterisation [27], and the treatment of the measured data to fit a physical model [28]. These techniques are applicable, regardless of the model type, and we will discuss their utility in PTT.

Before examining the PTT description of quantum stochastic processes, we will emphasise parallels to more conventional tomography in QST and QPT, such that the content can appear more familiar to readers. Along our exposition, we emphasise a ‘hierarchy’ in the sense that the information of each level is strictly contained within the characterisation of the next level. That is to say, QPT can describe the reconstructed state of QST, and PTT can describe the dynamical map of QPT. We present a summary of each map in Table I, as well as their physical requirements, and continue to flesh out here.

A. Quantum State and Quantum Process Tomography

The foundation of most QCVV procedures is the estimation of quantum states and quantum channels on an experimental device. By quantum state, we mean the density matrix representation of a system at a given time. A quantum channel – or quantum stochastic matrix, or dynamical map – then expresses the evolution of some state between two times, and has a freedom in representation. A convenient choice for QPT employs the Choi representation. Here, using the Choi-Jamiołkowski isomorphism (CJI), CP maps may be given by a positive matrix representation as a state, exploiting the correspondence between $\mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{in}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}(\mathcal{H}_{out})$ and $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{out}) \otimes \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_{in})$. Explicitly, for some channel $\mathcal{E}$, its Choi state $\hat{\mathcal{E}}$ is constructed through the action of $\mathcal{E}$ on one half of an unnormalised maximally entangled state $|\Phi^+\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{d} |i\rangle i\rangle$, with identity map $I$ on the other half:

$$\hat{\mathcal{E}} := (\mathcal{E} \otimes I) \left[ |\Phi^+\rangle \langle \Phi^+| \right] = \sum_{i,j=1}^{d} \mathcal{E} (|i\rangle \langle j| \otimes |i\rangle \langle j|).$$ (1)

All reconstruction of experimental properties must begin with a probe to read out quantum information. This extraction comes from a known POVM $\mathcal{J} := \{\Pi_i\}_{i=1}^{L}$ with associated elements called ‘effects’. To reconstruct any state, $\mathcal{J}$ must span the space of density matrices
TABLE I. Detail on different levels of the quantum tomography hierarchy, pertinent to experimental reconstruction. QST reconstructs a density operator, \( \rho \), a positive matrix with unit trace representing the quantum state. QPT reconstructs a quantum channel, \( \mathcal{E} \) through its action on different states. This map must be both CP and TP, conditions which, in Choi form, manifest themselves as positivity and affine constraints on the matrix. Finally, PTT reconstructs a process tensor \( T_{k,0} \) through its action on different control operations. This object must have a positive matrix Choi form, and respect causality. The information of each column is strictly contained in the column to the right.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Characterisation object</th>
<th>Quantum State</th>
<th>Quantum Process</th>
<th>Process Tensor</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mapping ( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S) ), a characteristic known as informational completeness (IC). For some density matrix ( \rho ), a POVM yields observable probabilities for each effect in accordance with Born’s rule:</td>
<td>Density Operator ( \rho )</td>
<td>Quantum Channel ( \mathcal{E} )</td>
<td>Process Tensor ( T_{k,0} )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Observing probabilities</td>
<td>( p_i = \text{Tr}[\Pi_i \rho] ).</td>
<td>( \mathcal{E} = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{B}_k(\mathcal{H}_S) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)] )</td>
<td>( \otimes_{i=1}^{k} \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S) \to \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S) )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Positivity Constraint</td>
<td>( \rho \succeq 0 )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{E} \succeq 0 )</td>
<td>( \mathcal{Y}_{k,0} \succeq 0 )</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affine Constraint</td>
<td>( \text{Tr} [\rho] = 1 )</td>
<td>( \text{Tr}_{\text{in}} [\mathcal{E}] = \mathbb{I}_n )</td>
<td>( \text{Tr}<em>{\text{out}} [\mathcal{Y}</em>{k,0}] = \mathbb{I}<em>n \otimes \mathcal{Y}</em>{k-1,0} \forall k )</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A typical approach to studying dynamical processes consists of monitoring the state of the system as a function of time, as in Figure 1a [11]. Although effects such as coherent state oscillation can flag non-Markovianity, any interrogation of the system necessarily disrupts its future evolution. For this reason, joint statistics cannot be measured across time and, consequently, multi-time correlations cannot be characterised. As a result, quantum non-Markovian effects, which can have a variety of different physical sources, have been historically difficult to theoretically describe, much less experimentally capture. Often, non-Markovian effects are quantified in terms of ‘leftover’ error, inferred by the extent to which Markov models break down [13, 29, 30].

Recently, the process tensor framework [21] (and the process matrix framework [31]) were proposed as a generalisation of classical stochastic processes to the quantum domain. Importantly, this generalisation allows for the study of multi-step stochastic processes – or non-Markovianity – in quantum systems. An important feature of the PTT formalism is that it maps all possible temporal correlations onto spatial correlations over sequences of CPTP channels, leaving non-Markovian measures as operationally well-defined as for any quantum or classical spatial correlation. Applying conventional many-body techniques allows for necessary and sufficient measures of device non-Markovianity, as well as the more fine-grained study of operation-specific context dependence. This fills a gap in the library of QCVQ resources [1].

Any continuous-time quantum stochastic process can be discretised in a number of time-steps: \( \mathbf{T}_k = \{t_0, t_1, \ldots, t_k\} \) (for example, in the context of a quantum circuit). A finite-time process tensor is then a marginal of the continuous time process tensor [32], which represents all possible correlations in \( \mathbf{T}_k \). To capture statistics for each \( t_i \in \mathbf{T}_k \), the experimenter applies an IC basis of control operations, which each change the trajectory of the state and maps to an output. In completing this pro-
To define a mapping from past controls $\rho$ where $U$ is a CP map on all states, after which we obtain a final state $\rho_k(A_{k-1:0})$ conditioned on this choice of interventions. These controlled dynamics have the form:

$$\rho_k(A_{k-1:0}) = \text{tr}_E[U_{k-1} A_{k-1} \cdots U_{1:0} A_0 (\rho_{0}^{S_E})],$$

where $U_{k-1} = \hat{A}_{k-1}^{\dagger} \hat{A}_{k-1}$. Eq. (6) can be used to define a mapping from past controls $A_{k-1:0}$ to future states $\rho_k(A_{k-1:0})$, which is the process tensor $T_{k:0}$:

$$T_{k:0}[A_{k-1:0}] = \rho_k(A_{k-1:0}).$$

The logic of the process tensor is depicted in Figure 1c, mirroring the trajectory sketch in Figure 1b.

In this sense, the process tensor is designed to account for intermediate control operations, and quantifies quantum correlations between past operations and future states. Just as in the case of CPTP maps, it can be shown that the process tensor too has a many-body Choi representation [21]. Both states $\rho$ and channels $\hat{E}$ have affine conditions ensuring unit probability and trace preservation, respectively. Similarly, the Choi state of the process tensor $Y_{k:0}$ also has affine conditions, these which guarantee causality. That is, any future control operations cannot affect the past statistics. These facets of the process tensor are all possible to experimentally reconstruct using many of the techniques from QPT and QST. We directly employ and build upon these ideas in this work. We start from the direct linear inversion construction of the process tensor Choi state in the next section, and then proceed with maximum likelihood estimation and truncated Markov models. Along the way, we make explicit the parallels between QPT and PTT as a generalisation in Figure 2 for pedagogical purposes. In particular, Figure 2b contrasts the generalised CJ of the process tensor with the standard channel CJ, emphasising the extension made.

**Linear Inversion Construction:** We begin by discussing the construction of the process tensor direct from experimental data, which recently was reported in Ref. [25]. The estimate here comes from (pseudo)inverting the feature matrix on observed data.

The resulting object need not be physical, and though it may be consistent with its measurement basis, it may not even serve as a good indicator for the behaviour of other sequences.

The sequence of interventions $A_{k-1:0}$ is a CP map on $2k$-partite Hilbert space. When the operations at each time step are chosen independently, the sequence is given by $A_{k-1:0} = \bigotimes_{j=0}^{k-1} A_j$. Each time-local operation may be expanded into a basis $\{B_{j}^{\mu j}\}$ such that any CP map can be expressed as $A_j = \sum_{\mu_j=1}^{d_k} \alpha_{\mu_j} B_{j}^{\mu j}$ and satisfies $\text{Tr}[B_{j}^{\mu j} B_{j}^{\nu j}] = \delta_{\mu_j, \nu_j}$. The subscript $j$ allows for the possibility of a different basis at each time, meanwhile the superscript $\mu_j$ denotes the elements of that particular set. The complete spatio-temporal basis is

$$\{B_{j}^{\mu j}\} = \left\{ \bigotimes_{j=0}^{k-1} B_{j}^{\mu j} \right\}_{\mu=(0,\ldots,\nu_{k-1})},$$

with vector of indices $\vec{\mu}$. To construct the process tensor, therefore, it suffices to measure the output $\rho_{k}^{\vec{\mu}} := \rho_k(A_{k-1:0}^{\vec{\mu}})$ for each $\vec{\mu}$, see Fig. 2f. To do so, we make use of the dual set $\{\Delta_{\nu j}^{\mu j}\}$ such that $\text{Tr}[\hat{B}_{j}^{\mu j} \Delta_{\nu j}^{\mu j}] = \delta_{\mu_j, \nu_j}$. Then, the Choi state $Y_{k:0}$ of the process tensor $T_{k:0}$ is given by

$$Y_{k:0} = \sum_{\vec{\mu}} \rho_{k}^{\vec{\mu}} \otimes \Delta_{\nu j}^{\mu j},$$

where $\{\Delta_{\nu j}^{\mu j}\} = \{\otimes_{j=0}^{k-1} \Delta_{\nu j}^{\mu j}\}$ satisfies $\text{Tr}[\hat{B}_{k-1:0}^{\nu j} \Delta_{\nu j}^{\mu j}] = \delta_{\vec{\mu}, \vec{\nu}}$. We remark here that the Choi form of a process tensor is an $2k + 1$-partite state with alternating input and output indices.
We use the notation \( o_j \) to denote an output leg of the process at time \( t_j \), and \( i_j \) for the input leg of the process at time \( t_{j-1} \). The collection of indices is therefore \( \{ o_k, i_k, \cdots, o_2, i_2, o_1, i_1, o_0 \} \). These correspond to the marginals of the process, \( \{ \hat{E}_{k:k-1}, \cdots, \hat{E}_{2:1}, \hat{E}_{1:0}, \rho_0 \} \) as shown in Figure 2b. Note that this ordering is opposite to the arrow of time in quantum circuits, following instead the convention of matrix multiplication.

Once characterised, the action of the process tensor on a sequence of operations is found by projecting the process tensor onto the Choi state of this sequence (up to a transpose). That is,

\[
\rho_k(A_{k-1:0}) = \text{Tr}_{T_k} \left[ T_{k:0} (I \otimes \rho_k \otimes A_{k-1} \otimes \cdots \otimes A_0)^T \right]
\]

(10)

where \( \overline{a}_k \) is every index except \( o_k \). This equation, reminiscent of the Born rule [33, 34], can determine the output of any sequence of operations (that are consistent with \( T_k \)), and is inclusive of all intermediate \( SE \) dynamics as well as any initial correlations. Predicting outcomes subject to control sequences naturally makes the process tensor a very useful object for quantum control.

The generalised CJI of the process tensor maps the multi-time process onto a many-body state. Conse-
quently, most of the analytical tools used for the description of spatial correlations can also be employed to describe the temporal correlations of the process. This provides a key motivator for carrying out PTT: the reconstructed process tensor Choi state provides all information any spatiotemporally correlated behaviour in a quantum device. This makes it a very useful diagnostic tool for near-term quantum devices: one can qualitatively and quantitatively describe the complexity of the system’s interaction with its environment. Conventional measures of non-Markovianity are well-motivated, but typically only describe a subset of non-Markovian processes. That is to say, they are sufficient but not necessary measures [10–13, 35–39]. The process tensor gives rise to both a necessary and sufficient measure of non-Markovianity through all CP-contractive quasi-distance measures between \( \mathcal{Y}_{k,0} \) and its closest Markov process tensor according to that distance. A Markovian process is one without any correlations in its Choi state – i.e. a product state of some CPTP maps \( \tilde{E}_{j+1,j} \) and average initial state \( \rho_0 \). In general the closest product state is not found with an analytic form, however there exist convenient choices. One example is the relative entropy, \( \mathcal{S}[\rho||\sigma] = \text{Tr}[\rho \log \rho - \log \sigma] \). For this, the closest Markov process tensor is obtained by discarding the correlations. That is,

\[
\mathcal{Y}_{k,0}^{\text{Markov}} = \text{Tr}_B[\mathcal{Y}_{k,0}] \otimes \text{Tr}_{B \rightarrow 0}[\mathcal{Y}_{k,0}] \otimes \cdots \otimes \text{Tr}_{j}[\mathcal{Y}_{k,0}],
\]

where \( j \) is the trace over every index except \( \sigma_j \) and \( i_j \). These marginals constitute exactly the above average CPTP maps. Once reconstructed with PTT, this informs the user how close their device performs when compared to a temporally uncorrelated (not necessarily noiseless) Markov model.

### C. Performing PTT on NISQ devices

To reconstruct the process tensor, a minimal complete basis for the process tensor requires \( d_S^4 \) operations spanning the superoperator space \( \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_S)) \) at each time-step. One mathematically convenient basis is an IC POVM, followed by a set of IC preparation states which are independent of the measurement outcomes. However, this procedure requires fast projective control in device hardware. Although some progress has been made on this front \[40\], fast control, in practice, is often too noisy and leads to a poor reconstruction. An exception to this is the recent work on process characterisation with intermediate measurements completed by Xiang et al. in \[41\]. A different approach to this measure-and-prepare strategy could implement this entire basis set through an interaction between the system qubit and an ancilla, followed by projective measurement in which the outcome of the ancilla is recorded. This too is problematic in practice as system-ancilla interactions will generate an operation which effectively depends on the circuit.

For a typical NISQ device, all intermediate operations are limited to unitary transformations, and a measurement is only allowed at the end. Nevertheless, it is possible to work within the experimental limitations and implement an informationally incomplete set of basis operations. This constructs what is known as a restricted process tensor \[42\] and has full predictive power for any operation in a subspace of operations. That is, these objects are well-defined as maps over the span of their incomplete basis, but do not form positive operators and do not uniquely fix a process tensor’s Choi state.

Working within the constraints of NISQ devices, we need to account for \( d_S^4 - 2d_S^2 + 2 \) unitary operation at each time-step. For a qubit, this amounts to \( N = 10 \) unitary gates per time step. However, any estimation procedure will come with sampling error, leading to both an incorrect and unphysical representation of the map. In a practical setting with finite sampling error, it is best to set up tomographic protocols without bias in the basis vectors \[43\]. This is especially true in high-dimensional spaces where even small errors may become significantly magnified. In Ref. \[25\], we found that a minimal single-qubit \( N = 10 \) unitary basis incurs substantial error in reconstructing the process. We thus resorted to an over-complete basis of \( N = 24 \), leading to very high fidelity reconstruction for the process tensor, within shot-noise precision. However, this was very resource-demanding, since:

\[
\text{number of experiments} \sim \mathcal{O}(N^k)
\]

for \( k \) time-steps.

Our focus here is to reduce the requirements of PTT reconstruction while obtaining accurate estimates. To do so, in the next section we first integrate the maximum likelihood optimisation for PTT. This has the advantage that we will no longer need an overcomplete basis and thus reduce the base \( N \). In order to do this, we ensure that the MLE accommodate the affine conditions of the process tensor; devise a numerical method to generate an approximately unbiased basis, which minimise reconstruction errors; and develop a projection method to ensure the physicality of the process tensor. Of course, the MLE alone is not enough if we also cannot reduce the exponent \( k \). In Section IV, we integrate the MLE tools with a more generic truncation method of Markov order (MO). The idea here is to truncate small long-time memory to exponentially reduce the number of reconstruction circuits, while retaining high fidelities for the reconstruction. Along the way, we demonstrate that both the MLE and the MO methods are practically implementable by applying these ideas to superconducting quantum devices.
III. MAXIMUM LIKELIHOOD PROCESS TENSOR TOMOGRAPHY

A major gap in the process tensor tomography toolkit is its lack of integration with standard tomography estimation tools like MLE, whose underlying principle is to find a physical model estimate that maximizes the probability of the observed data. Due to the intricate affine conditions of causality, this integration is nontrivial in general. The complexity of the procedure further grows when applied to restricted process process tensors, e.g., when control operations are restricted and/or when a finite Markov-order model is imposed. Our integration will naturally accommodate all of these variations. We now close this gap and present a MLE construction for PTT, which helps to put this on the same footing as other tomographic techniques. The MLE procedure estimates the physical quantum map most consistent with the data, according to some desired measure, while respecting the constraints listed in Table I. An estimate for the map is coupled with metric of goodness (the likelihood) which quantifies how consistent the map is with the data. The cost function is then minimised while enforcing the physicality of the map. The stored data vector in PTT is the object \( p_{i,\vec{\mu}} \), which are the observed measurement probabilities for the \( i \)th effect of an IC-POVM, subject to a sequence of \( k \) operations \( \bigotimes_{j=0}^{k=1} E_j^{(j)} \). As is typical in MLE tomography, this data is fit to a model for the process, \( \Upsilon_{k:0} \), such that

\[
p_{i,\vec{\mu}} = \text{Tr} \left( \left( \prod_{i} \otimes E_{k-1}^{n_{k-1}} \otimes \cdots \otimes E_0^{n_0} \right) \Upsilon_{k:0} \right).
\]

These predictions are then compared to the observed frequencies, \( n_{i,\vec{\mu}} \). The ‘likelihood’ of \( \Upsilon_{k:0} \) subject to the data is given by \( L = \prod_{i,\vec{\mu}} p_{i,\vec{\mu}}^{n_{i,\vec{\mu}}} \). The cost function of MLE algorithms is then the log-likelihood, i.e.,

\[
f(\Upsilon_{k:0}) = -\ln L = \sum_{i,\vec{\mu}} -n_{i,\vec{\mu}} \ln p_{i,\vec{\mu}},
\]

whose minimisation is the maximiser of the likelihood. A key part of the appeal to MLE is that the cost function is convex.

An extensive selection of different semi-definite program packages exist in the literature for the log-likelihood minimisation in QST and QPT under the appropriate constraints. In the construction of the MLE-PTT procedure, we employ and adapt the algorithm from Ref. [44], used for QPT. This algorithm is termed ‘projected gradient descent with backtracking’ (\texttt{pgdb}). We selected this both for its simplicity, and because it has been benchmarked as both faster and more accurate than other MLE-QPT algorithms. In this approach, the log-likelihood is minimised using conventional gradient descent, but at each iteration, a projection is made on the step direction to keep the map physical. The main steps are summarised in Figure 3.

The relevant projection – onto the intersection of the cone of CP maps with the affine space of TP channels – is performed using a procedure known as Dykstra’s alternating projection algorithm [45]. We offer two key advancements here for PTT. First, we determine the exact affine space generated by causality conditions on process tensors, such that the physical constraints are mathematically elucidated. Then, we adapt and introduce a conic projection technique from optimisation literature in order to project onto the space of completely positive, causal processes [46]. We find this projection method to far outperform Dykstra’s alternating projection algorithm in the problem instances, a fact which may be of independent interest for QPT. We detail each of these aspects in the following subsection. Finally, we benchmark the performance MLE-PTT on superconducting quantum devices. These devices, as mentioned above, are limited to unitary control in the middle and a measurement at the end. This is insufficient to uniquely reconstruct the complete Choi state of a process. As such, our MLE procedure yields a operationally well-defined restricted process tensor. However, the procedure is also equipped to find a family of full process tensors whose restriction to unitaries is consistent with the observed data. We focus on the (non-unique) properties of the former in our accompanying Letter [47], and the performance of the restricted process tensor in the present work.
A. Projecting onto the space of physical process tensors

Here, we describe in detail the physical conditions imposed on process tensors, as well as the approach used for projections onto the space of physical process tensors. Generally, this projection can be described as a problem of conic optimisation: finding the closest point lying on the intersection of a cone with an affine subspace. The affine constraints differ in each category: unit-trace for state tomography, trace-preservation for process tomography, and causality for the process tensor. Fundamentally, however, these techniques are applicable to all forms of quantum tomography, as shown in Table I.

Let \( \Upsilon_{k:0} \) be the Choi form for a \( k \)-step process tensor (we will occasionally switch to \( \Upsilon \) for brevity if the number of steps is not pertinent), and let \( |\Upsilon\rangle := \text{vec}(\Upsilon) \), where we employ the row-vectorised convention \([48]\). We discuss the mathematical demands of positivity and causality first, their individual projections, and then their simultaneous realisation.

Similar to a quantum channel, complete positivity of a process tensor is guaranteed by positivity of its Choi representation,

\[
\Upsilon_{k:0} \in \mathcal{S}_+^n, \tag{15}
\]

where \( \mathcal{S}_+^n \) is the cone of \( n \times n \) positive-semidefinite (PSD) matrices with complex entries. For \( k \) time-steps, \( n = 2^{2k+1} \). The Euclidean projection is computed with a single eigendecomposition. Diagonalising \( \Upsilon \) gives \( \Upsilon = U D U^\dagger \) where \( D = \text{diag}(\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \cdots, \lambda_n) \) is real. Then the projection onto \( \mathcal{S}_+^n \) is:

\[
\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{S}_+^n}(\Upsilon) = U \text{diag}(\lambda_1^+, \lambda_2^+, \cdots, \lambda_n^+) U^\dagger, \tag{16}
\]

where \( \lambda_j^+ := \max\{\lambda_j, 0\} \).

The Choi state must also obey causality, a generalisation of trace preservation. This is non-trivial to enforce, and ensures that future events should not influence past statistics. In the CJI picture of Figure 2b, there should be no correlations between the final input leg and the rest of the process when the final output leg is traced out. This is also a statement of containment of the process tensor: that the process over a subset of the total period is contained within the larger process tensor:

\[
\text{Tr}_{\mathcal{A}_k}[\Upsilon_{k:0}] = \mathbb{I}_{ik_k} \otimes \Upsilon_{k'-1:0}, \tag{17}
\]

iterated for all values of \( k' \) from 1 to \( k \). This statement is equivalent to causality in that the past stochastic process is unaffected by averaging over all future operations.

We approach the problem of causality enforcement in the Pauli basis. Examining the Choi state, this condition places constraints on the values of these expectations. Let \( \mathcal{P} := \{\mathbb{1}, X, Y, Z\} \) denote the single-qubit Pauli basis, \( \mathcal{P}^n \) its \( n \)-qubit generalisation, and \( \overline{\mathcal{P}} := \{X, Y, Z\} \). Focusing on the \( i_k \) subsystem, Equation (17) can be enforced if all Pauli strings connecting the identity on the left subsystems with \( \overline{\mathcal{P}} \) on the \( i_k \) subsystem have coefficients of zero. If this condition is imposed iteratively for all input legs on the process tensor, then Equation (17) will hold for all \( k' \). For example, in a two-step single qubit process (represented by a five-partite system), we have:

\[
\begin{align*}
\langle \mathbb{I} \mathbb{I}_2 P_{i_2} P_{i_1} P_{i_0} | P_{i_2} P_{i_1} P_{i_0} \rangle = 0 & \quad \forall \ P_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P} ; \ P_{i_1}, P_{i_0} \in \overline{\mathcal{P}} \\
\langle \mathbb{I} \mathbb{I}_2 P_{i_2} P_{i_1} P_{i_0} | P_{i_0} \rangle = 0 & \quad \forall \ P_{i_0} \in \overline{\mathcal{P}} ; \ P_{i_1}, P_{i_2} \in \mathcal{P}.
\end{align*} \tag{18}
\]

A simple way to enforce this condition is with the projection of Pauli coefficients. In particular, let \( \mathcal{P} \) be the elements of \( \mathcal{P}^{2k+1} \) whose expectations must be zero from equations (17) and (18). We can write this as a single affine constraint in the matrix equation:

\[
\begin{pmatrix}
0 \\
0 \\
\vdots \\
0 \\
d
\end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix}
\langle \mathbb{I} | \mathcal{P} \rangle \\
\langle \mathbb{I} | \mathcal{P} \rangle \\
\vdots \\
\langle \mathcal{P}_{m-2} | \mathbb{I} \rangle \\
\langle \mathcal{P}_{m-1} | \mathbb{I} \rangle
\end{pmatrix}, \tag{19}
\]

where \( d \) is the normalisation chosen for the Choi matrix (in this work, \( d = 1 \)).

Letting this set the context for our discussion of the projection routine, consider a full rank constraint matrix \( A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n^2} \), variable vector \( v \), and fixed right hand side coefficient vector \( b \). Let \( \mathcal{V} \) be the affine space:

\[
\mathcal{V} = \{v \in \mathbb{C}^{n^2} | Av = b\} \tag{20}
\]

The projection onto \( \mathcal{V} \) is given by

\[
\text{Proj}_\mathcal{V}(v_0) = [\mathbb{I} - A^\dagger (A A^\dagger)^{-1} A] v_0 + A^\dagger (A A^\dagger)^{-1} b. \tag{21}
\]

In general, however, a projection onto \( \mathcal{S}_+^n \) and a projection onto \( \mathcal{V} \) is not a projection onto \( \mathcal{S}_+^n \cap \mathcal{V} \). The conic and affine constraints are difficult to simultaneously realise. One approach to this is to use Dykstra’s alternating projection algorithm, as performed in [44] for quantum process tomography. This applies a select iterative sequence of (21) and (16). Although this method is straightforward and has guaranteed convergence, we find it unsuitable for larger-scale problems. For large gradient steps the convergence can take unreasonably many steps. More importantly, however, each step of the gradient descent requires many thousands of applications of (21). Although much of this expression can be pre-computed, the complexity grows strictly with \( n \), rather than the number of constraints. Moreover, the matrix inverse requirement can reduce much of the advantage of having a sparse \( A \).

In our MLE-PTT, instead of Dykstra’s alternating projection algorithm, we integrate a variant of the technique introduced in [46] and discussed further in [49]. This method regularises the projection into a single unconstrained minimisation, such that only eigendecompositions and matrix-vector multiplications by \( A \) are necessary, avoiding the need for (21). Because the projection is
In each respective regime of tomography, the increased number of constraints increases the amount of time, on average, for the projection to complete. However, we find substantial improvements in both the run-time and in the number of eigendecomposition calls between the direct conic projection in comparison to Dykstra’s. This is especially necessary for the fitting of process tensors where the difference between the two can be the difference between a run-time of days, or of fractions of a minute. We include QST here for completeness, however, note that the fixed projection of eigenvalues onto the canonical simplex with a single diagonalisation is more appropriate [50].

We now explicitly step through the direct conic projection method. For a given \(v_0\), we wish to find the closest (in Euclidean terms) \(v \in S^+_n \cap \mathcal{V}\). That is, to compute

\[
\arg\min_{v \in S^+_n \cap \mathcal{V}} \|v - v_0\|^2.
\]  

Note that when we talk about the vector \(v\) being PSD, we mean that its matrix reshape is PSD. The dual approach introduces the Lagrangian, which is a function of the primal variable \(v \in S^+_n\) and dual variable \(\lambda \in \mathbb{R}^m\) (for \(m\) affine constraints):

\[
\mathcal{L}(v; \lambda) = \|v - v_0\|^2 - \lambda^T(Av - b).
\]

Since \(v\) is PSD, it is Hermitian, meaning that the matrix-vector product \(Av\) is always real. This avoids the need for recasting the complex problem into real and imaginary pairs.

The vector \(v\) which minimises \(\mathcal{L}\) for a given \(\lambda\) provides a lower bound to the solution to the primal problem. We introduce the dual concave function

\[
\theta(\lambda) := \min_{v \in S^+_n} \mathcal{L}(v; \lambda)
\]

whose maximum is exactly the solution to (22). It is shown in Ref. [51] that the minimum (24) is uniquely attained by \(\nu(\lambda) = \text{Proj}_{S^+_n}(v_0 + A^\dagger\lambda)\) [51], and can hence be recast (up to a constant) as

\[
\theta(\lambda) = -\|\nu(\lambda)\|^2 + b^\dagger\lambda.
\]

It can further be shown that (25) is differentiable on \(\mathbb{R}^m\) with gradient

\[
\nabla \theta(\lambda) = -Av(\lambda) + b.
\]

Thus, the solution to the projection problem (22) becomes an unconstrained minimisation problem of (25) with respect to \(\lambda\), opening the door to a wealth of tested optimisation packages to be applied. The solution to the projection is then \(\text{Proj}_{S^+_n}(v_0 + A^\dagger\lambda\text{min})\). Specifically, in this work we select the L-BFGS algorithm to perform this minimisation, as we found it to give the fastest and most reliable solution [52]. Although we did not implement it here, it is also possible to compute the Clarke-generalised Jacobian of (26), allowing for exact second order optimisation techniques to be used [53, 54]. Note also that the difficulty of this minimisation is sensitive to the condition number of \(A\). Thus, we find the best approach to be to always frame affine constraints in the Pauli basis to ensure a uniform spectrum.

Another favourable reason to apply this conic projection method is in the arbitrary application of affine constraints. In an accompanying Letter [47], we show how this can be used for searching (and thus bounding quantities of) manifolds of states consistent with an incomplete set of data. Introducing a feature matrix as part of the affine constraint with observed probabilities permits this exploration. Without the faster method, we found that this was infeasible to perform.
B. Reconstruction Fidelity

In the linear inversion regime, the process tensor’s action on basis sequences will result in the experimentally observed density matrices by construction. Since it is a linear operator, its action on linear combinations of basis sequences should be exactly the linear combinations of observed basis actions. This idea is expressed in Figure 1c: the SE evolution between each operation is the same for all intermediate operations. In a linear expansion, these arbitrarily strong dynamics are entirely accounted for. By tracing over the input space, we have the following relationship between the state conditioned on an arbitrary sequence of operations $A_{k-1:0}$ and the states after each measured basis sequence:

$$\rho_k (A_{k-1:0}) = \sum_{\vec{\mu}} \alpha^{\vec{\mu}} \rho_k (B_{k-1:0}^{\vec{\mu}}),$$  \hspace{1cm} (27)

which is equivalent to Equation (10). Hence, we may (in principle) determine the system’s exact response to any sequence of operations in the presence of non-Markovian interaction. We use this as the figure of merit for the quality of characterisation. That is, we compute the fidelity over random sequences of operation between the state predicted by the process tensor – Equation (10) – and what is experimentally realised. In [25], we introduced this as the concept of reconstruction fidelity.

Formally, let the fidelity $F$ between two process tensors $T_{k:0}^{(1)}$ and $T_{k:0}^{(2)}$ for a given sequence of interventions $A_{k-1:0}$ is given by

$$F_{(1,2)} [A_{k-1:0}] = F \left( T_{k:0}^{(1)} [A_{k-1:0}], T_{k:0}^{(2)} [A_{k-1:0}] \right),$$

where $F (\rho, \sigma) = \text{Tr} \left[ \sqrt{\sqrt{\rho} \sigma \sqrt{\rho}} \right]^2$, \hspace{1cm} (28)

where $T_{k:0}^{(1)}$ is taken to be the reconstructed process and $T_{k:0}^{(2)}$ to be the real process, i.e., the experimental outputs. Then, the average reconstruction fidelity is an estimate of

$$\mathcal{F} := \int dA_{k-1:0} F_{(1,2)} [A_{k-1:0}].$$ \hspace{1cm} (29)

We can use this to estimate the quality of our reconstruction. The outputs to a real process is simply the state reconstruction conditioned on the sequence of gates $\{A_0, \cdots, A_{k-1}\}$. This integral can be estimated by performing sequences of randomly chosen operations and comparing the fidelity of the predictions made by $T_{k:0}$ with the actual outcomes measured. We use this as a metric for the accuracy with which a process has been characterised.

As well as MLE-PTT, we also improve upon LI-PTT through particular choice of a basis. Sampling error typically averages out to zero on a circuit-by-circuit basis, however this noise can be both biased and amplified if certain regions of superoperator space are overrepresented – i.e., if some elements of the basis overlap more than others. For this reason, we build upon the idea of a mutually unbiased basis (MUB) in conventional tomography. Unfortunately, mutually unbiased unitary bases (MUUBs) do not exist in ten dimensions [55]. However, in Appendix C we numerically find the best approximation to a MUUB.

We probe each of these characteristics by looking at three-step PTT on IBM Quantum devices. Using combinations of basis choice, and LI/MLE post-processing, we compute the reconstruction fidelities for random sequences of unitaries. The boxplots showing these distributions are shown in Figure 5. The use of MUUB alone finds substantial improvement in characterising the process. We continue to use these optimal parameter val-
ues as our unitary control basis for the remainder of this work. Reconstruction is improved further by MLE-PTT, in which we see not only an increase in median reconstruction fidelity, but there are far fewer outliers in the distribution. Compared to the random basis, linear inversion case, reconstruction fidelity increases greatly to within shot noise. This is essential for both validating process characterisation, and optimal control of the system.

In Ref. [25] (from which some of this experimental data is taken) much of the linear inversion characterisation noise was overcome with the use of an over-complete basis – up to 24 unitaries. Since PTT is exponential in the size of the basis, the employment of maximum-likelihood methods as shown here can offer a significant reduction in experimental requirements. Thus, in addition to offering an algorithm imposing physicality constraints, we show how to make the technique more practical to implement. As well as comparing processing methods, we also juxtapose our approximate MUUB with a minimal randomly-chosen unitary basis. This, too, sees a drastic improvement over the randomly chosen basis: though it is not guaranteed to produce a physical process tensor, we see that much higher quality predictions are possible without any additional effort in the linear inversion regime.

IV. CONDITIONAL MARKOV ORDER

Even in the classical case, the price of characterising the joint statistics of a stochastic process in full generality is exponentially high. Often, however, this is unnecessary in practice as physical processes are sparse. The necessary complexity of a process characterisation only grows modestly with the size of its memory if, after a certain amount of time, the history and the future are independent from one another. In such cases, the joint statistics are no longer required between those points in time. This motivates the idea of Markov order [56, 57]: the number of previous time steps in the process which are relevant to the present. We now apply this idea to MLE-PTT, and derive a resource-efficient way to characterise even processes with very large numbers of steps. To implement this, we build upon the ideas established in Ref. [22] and subsequently realised in Ref. [58]. A summary of our approach is to divide a $k$-step process up into a number of smaller, overlapping process tensors. These smaller process tensors are designed to account for a truncated number of past-time correlations. We then use MLE estimation to fit each of the memory process tensors according to a Markov order model chosen by the experimenter. The finite Markov order process tensor fitting, adaptive memory blocking, and action across sequences that we introduce here are all novel features of quantum Markov order, and offers a method by which non-Markovian behaviour on NISQ devices can be feasibly characterised and controlled.

A. Structure of quantum Markov order

In the quantum realm, the matter of Markov order is more nuanced than for classical processes. A quantum stochastic process has either Markov order one (the output at any leg is affected only by the previous input) or infinite Markov order (the memory persists indefinitely). That is to say, a Choi state may only be written as a product state, or there will exist correlations between all points in time (though, saying nothing about the strength of these correlations). For practical purposes however – especially in the context of quantum computing – there exists the useful concept of *conditional* Markov order. If an instrument is applied at an intermediate time, we update our model of the process conditioned on this instrument. The conditional state of the process may then exhibit past-future independence.

We now introduce Markov order for a quantum stochastic process, as well as the related notion of instrument-specific conditional Markov order. We then make clear that processes conditioned on generic operations may only exhibit approximate conditional Markov order. Finally, we explicitly walk through our calculations of tomographically reconstructing processes with an approximate conditional Markov order ansatz.

To begin, we describe a $k$-step process with Markov order $\ell$. When $\ell = 1$, the only relevant information to the CPTP map $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_j$ is the state mapped at the output of the $\hat{\mathcal{E}}_{j-1}$ step, described by the $\mathbf{o}_{j-1}$ leg of the process tensor. Consequently, there is no context to the previous gates. The choice of operation $\mathcal{A}_{i-1}$ is only relevant insofar as determining the output state for time $(i - 1)$. This constitutes a Markovian process, and the dynamics are CP-divisible. Otherwise, it is non-Markovian with $\ell = \infty$.

Although finite $\ell > 1$ Markov order is well-defined for classical stochastic processes, where there is only one basis, there is no generic way to write a quantum state with correlations persisting to the last $\ell$ subsystems. However, future and past statistics may be independent of one another for quantum stochastic processes when conditioned on the choice of an intermediate instrument. This notion of conditional Markov order may be described as follows. Consider a process tensor $\Upsilon_{k,0}$, which we denote as $\Upsilon_{FM,i}$ with the groupings for the past, the memory, and the future, respectively:

$$
\begin{align*}
  P_j &= \{t_0, \cdots, t_{j-1}\}, \\
  M_j &= \{t_j, \cdots, t_{j+\ell}\}, \\
  F_j &= \{t_{j+\ell+1}, \cdots, t_k\}.
\end{align*}
$$

For the moment, while discussing the basic properties of Markov order in quantum processes, we omit the $j$, and $\ell$. However, these will become important when propagating processes with a Markov order assumption.

Let a sequence of operations $\mathbf{C}_{j+\ell,j}$, with $k > j$ act on the memory block of the process and thus expressed as $\mathbf{C}_M$ henceforth. Let $\{\mathbf{B}_M^{(F)}\}$ be a minimal IC basis for
these times, which includes $C_M$, and let $\{\Delta^j_M\}$ be its dual set. The conditional process is given by

$$\Upsilon^{(C_M)}_{FP} = \text{Tr}_M \left[ \mathbf{T}_{FMP} C_M^{T} \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (31)

If the past and the future are independent in this conditional process, then it can be written as

$$\Upsilon^{(C_M)}_{FP} = \Upsilon^{(C_M)}_F \otimes \Upsilon^{(C_M)}_P,$$  \hspace{1cm} (32)

where

$$\Upsilon^{(C_M)}_X = \text{Tr}_M \left[ \mathbf{T}_{FMP} C_M^{T} \right] \quad X \in \{F, P\}$$  \hspace{1cm} (33)

If Equation (32) holds for all elements of $\{B^j_M\}$, then the process, by construction, can be written as

$$\mathbf{T}_{FMP} = \sum_{\tilde{\nu}} \Upsilon^{(B^j_M)}_F \otimes \Delta^j_M \otimes \Upsilon^{(B^j_M)}_P.$$  \hspace{1cm} (34)

A fact of practical importance is that for all sequences of operations $\mathbf{A}_M \not\in \{B^j_M\}$, Equation (32) cannot hold. This is because $\{B^j_M\}$ is informationally complete, meaning that some operation sequence from outside the set can be expressed as a linear combination

$$\mathbf{A}_M = \sum_{\tilde{\nu}} \alpha_{\tilde{\nu}} \mathbf{B}^j_M.$$  \hspace{1cm} (35)

Contracting this operation into the process then yields

$$\Upsilon^{(A_M)}_{FMP} = \text{Tr}_M \left[ \mathbf{T}_{FMP} \mathbf{A}_M^{T} \right]$$

$$= \text{Tr}_M \left[ \mathbf{T}_{FMP} \left( \sum_{\tilde{\nu}} \alpha_{\tilde{\nu}} \mathbf{B}^j_M \right) \right]$$

$$= \sum_{\tilde{\nu}} \alpha_{\tilde{\nu}} \Upsilon^{(B^j_M)}_F \otimes \Upsilon^{(B^j_M)}_P,$$  \hspace{1cm} (36)

which is no longer a product state, and thus the future and the past are \textit{separable}, but not completely uncorrelated.

The complexity of characterising a process grows exponentially in $\ell$; we would prefer to drop the instrument-specific component, and employ a generic conditional Markov order model. Explicitly, in this model, we truncate all conditional future-past correlations, treating the conditional state as a product, i.e.,

$$\Upsilon^{(A_M)}_{FMP} \approx \Upsilon^{(A_M)}_F \otimes \Upsilon^{(A_M)}_P.$$  \hspace{1cm} (37)

The cost, or approximation, in doing so will be determined by the actual memory strength of the process over different times. One meaningful measure of this is the quantum mutual information (QMI) of the conditional state, the LHS of Equation (37). Of course, this information is inaccessible in our truncated characterisation. Instead, we continue to use the reconstruction fidelity, and experimentally estimate this model error in the ability of each Markov order to predict the behaviour of actual sequences of random unitaries [59].

B. Stitching together finite Markov order processes

We turn now to our work in extending the concept of conditional quantum Markov order to a quantum circuit context, and tomographic characterisation. Here, we are interested not only in dividing up the process into a single past, memory, and future, but to do this for all times in the process. Then, for each time, the previous $\ell - 1$ operations are taken into account. This is performed by iterating through the above computation: at each time step, dividing the circuit up into past, memory and future. Correlations due to the memory are taken care of via contraction of the relevant operations, leaving the future and the past conditionally independent. This requires a tomographically reconstructed process tensor for the relevant memory steps. These memory process tensors are then stitched together by the overlapping operation’s map of the earlier output state. Our goal is predict $\rho_k(\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0})$ by making use of the Markov order structure. At the first step, we have no past $P_0 = \{\emptyset\}$, and the memory is given by the first $\ell$ operations. That is, we have to construct the full process tensor $\Upsilon_{M_0} = \Upsilon_{\ell:0}$, which contains all of the conditional states $\rho_j(\mathbf{A}_{j-1:0})$ in $M_0$, i.e. $j \leq \ell$. To go beyond time $t_\ell$, we need the conditional state $\rho_k(\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0})$ given by Equation (10) (see also the first line of Equation (38)): contracting $\Upsilon_{M_0}$ with $\mathbf{A}_{j-1:0}$. Importantly, this is the state propagated along with the sequences of operations. For this reason, the first memory process tensor is the only one for which the output state is not traced over, since we are not tracing over any alternative pasts. This means that it contracts one more local operation than the remainder.

To get state $\rho_{k+1}(\mathbf{A}_{k:0})$, we move one step forward with $P_1$, $M_1$, $F_1$. The relevant information is stored in $\Upsilon_{M_0}$ and $\Upsilon_{M_1} = \Upsilon_{\ell+1:1}$. For this process (and for all intermediate blocks in the process), there are three considerations: first, we must account for the memory through its action on the sequence $\mathbf{A}_{\ell-1:1}$ on $\Upsilon_{M_0}$ and trace over its output index at time $t_\ell$ (see the second line of Equation (38)) since this state corresponds to a different, fixed past. Finally, the operation $\mathbf{A}_j$ connects $\Upsilon_{M_0}$ and $\Upsilon_{M_1}$, by mapping the state $\rho_k(\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0})$ to time $t_{k+1}$ since, as per our conditional Markov order assumption, once $M_1$ is accounted for, $F_1$ and $P_1$ are independent, i.e. their dynamics can be treated as a tensor product. See Figure 6 for a graphical depiction.

Following this recipe, we proceed forward in single steps, generating blocks of $P_j$, $M_j$, $F_j$ until we reach time $t_k$ at which point the final state may be read out. For clarity, the sequence of conditional memory process tensor states is given by:

$$\rho_{k}(\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}) = \text{Tr}_{\mathbf{A}_k} \left[ \Upsilon_{M_0} \bigotimes_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \mathbf{A}_i^{T} \right],$$

$$\Upsilon_{j}(\mathbf{A}_{j-2j-\ell}) := \text{Tr}_{\mathbf{A}_j} \left[ \Upsilon_{M_{j-\ell}} \bigotimes_{i=j-\ell}^{j-2} \mathbf{A}_i^{T} \right].$$  \hspace{1cm} (38)
The conditional state $\rho_k(A_{k-1;0})$ has the free index $o_k$, corresponding to its output state. All others $\Upsilon_j^{(A_{j-2:2-j})}$ have free indices $i_j$ and $o_j$ which, respectively, are contracted with the output and input legs of the operation $A_j$ and $A_{j+1}$, respectively. These are the operations which stitch together the different conditional memory process tensors, where the conditional independence means that the state can be mapped as though it were a tensor product. Finally, the last output leg $o_k$ is read out by some POVM.

We condense this $k$-step Markov order $\ell$ process in the object $\Upsilon^\ell_{k;0} := \{\Upsilon_{M_{k-\ell}}, \Upsilon_{M_{k-\ell-1}}, \ldots, \Upsilon_{M_0}\}$. That is, the final state is defined by the collective action of each $\Upsilon_{M_j}$ as

$$
\rho_k(A_{k-1;0}) \approx \Upsilon^\ell_{k;0} \ast A_{k-1;0} := \text{Tr}_{\sigma_k} \left[ \Upsilon_k^{(A_{k-2:k-\ell})} \bigotimes_{j=\ell}^{k-1} \Upsilon_j^{(A_{j-2:j-\ell})} A_j^\Gamma \right].
$$

(39)

Note that since the same control operation may contract into multiple different memory process tensors, this action is no longer linear in $A_{k-1;0}$.

Recalling our earlier depiction of the process tensor in Figure 2, the dynamics can be described as a collection of correlated CPTP maps $\{\hat{E}_{j;j-1}\}$. In the CJI picture, past operations are equivalently seen as measurements on these earlier states. Thus, the $\Upsilon_j^{(A_{j-2:j-\ell})}$ are exactly the conditional memory states $\hat{E}_{j;j-1}$. With correlations accounted for, they can be treated locally in time. Any process may be written exactly as a sequence of conditional CPTP maps, but in full generality they depend on the whole past. Here, they only depend on the memory. The difference in complexity of characterisation is $O(N^k)$ vs. $O(N^\ell)$. Putting it all together we have an equivalent form of Equation (39)

$$
\rho_k(A_{k-1;0}) \approx \hat{E}_{k;k-1} \circ A_{k-1;k-2} \circ \cdots \circ \hat{E}_{k+2;k+1} \circ A_{k+1} \circ \hat{E}_{k+1;k+\ell} \circ A_{k}[\rho_k(A_{k-1;0})]
$$

with $\rho_k(A_{k-1;0}) = T_{M_0}[A_{k-1;0}]$.

(40)

To summarise, the process with a conditional Markov order $\ell$ ansatz $\Upsilon^\ell_{k;0}$ is represented by a collection of memory process tensors $\{\Upsilon_{k;k-\ell}, \Upsilon_{k-1;k-\ell-1}, \ldots, \Upsilon_{k+1;k+\ell}, \Upsilon_{k;0}\}$. As discussed, it cannot be represented generically by a quantum state, but this collection of memory process tensors defines its
action on a sequence of \( k \) operations. The contraction strategy for a series of control operations (with \( k = 4 \) and \( \ell = 2 \)) is shown in Figure 6. In short:

1. Contract the first \( \ell \) operations into \( \Upsilon_{\ell,0} \), producing the output state at time \( t_\ell \).
2. Contract operations 2 to \( \ell \) into \( \Upsilon_{\ell+1:1} \).
3. Trace over the output index of \( \Upsilon_{\ell+1:1} \) at time \( t_\ell \) (since this is not representative of the actual state of the system subject to all operations).
4. Taking the \((\ell + 1)\)th operation to be conditionally independent of the first, this can be applied across the tensor product of the two process tensors into the indices for the output state at time \( t_\ell \) and the input for time \( t_{\ell+1} \).
5. Repeat this pattern for the next \( k - \ell - 2 \) process tensors,
6. Read out the final state at time \( t_k \).

The full details of this computation can be found in Appendix B, where we fully describe an efficient tensor network contraction for the action of \( \Upsilon_{k,0} \).

C. Circuits for \( \Upsilon_{M_j} \)

With a framework established for constructing and operating a finite Markov order ansatz, we now explicitly detail how to tomographically reconstruct this model on a real device. This procedure does not deviate significantly from Section III. In order to estimate \( \Upsilon_{k,0} \), we must estimate each of the memory block process tensors. Recall that each \( \Upsilon_{M_j} := \Upsilon_{t_{j+1}:0} \) is equivalent to \( \Upsilon_{t_{j+1}:0} \) with the first \( j \) times projected out onto some series of interventions. In order to experimentally reconstruct each \( \Upsilon_{M_j} \), then, it suffices to fix the first \( j \) operations in the circuit, and then perform a complete basis of operations in each position from \( t_j \) to \( t_{\ell+j} \) and estimate the associated \( \ell \)-step process tensor. The circuits required for each of these are illustrated in Figure 7, with the fixed operation labelled \( B_f \). As well as sufficiently describing a Markov order \( \ell \) model, these circuits contain all of the information required for any lower-order Markov model if it is a full process tensor. Under the unitary-only restriction, there will be a small number of extra experiments required for any smaller memory blocks terminating earlier than \( t_\ell \). We note here also that the maximum likelihood procedure of Section III is necessary for conditional Markov order models if the set of instruments is restricted to the unitaries. This is because Equation 39 requires local partial traces, but unitary gates are equivalent to entangled measurements in the Choi picture. Hence, if a linear inversion restricted process tensor is constructed, the partial traces will not be well defined.

In the action of \( \Upsilon_{k,0} \), the state generated by each \( \Upsilon_{M_j} \) is traced over for all \( j > 0 \). Consequently, the fixed operations that precede \( M_j \) in the reconstruction circuits should, in principle, not affect the final outcome \( \rho_k \). Since, however, the CMO ansatz is an approximation to the true dynamics, then the fixed past operations will, in practice, affect this approximation. In the generic case, there is no reason to suspect any operation will put forth a better or worse approximation, hence we arbitrarily set this operation to be the first element of the basis set each time. This choice may require closer attention in practical situations.

![Circuits to construct a process tensor with conditional Markov order \( \ell \). For a \( k \)-step process, \( \Upsilon_{k,0} \), there are \( k - \ell - 1 \) memory process tensors that need constructing – each circuit represents the estimation of each of these, by varying all combinations of all indices from \( i_0 \) to \( i_{\ell-1} \). In the other gate positions, a fixed operation \( B_f \) is applied.](image)

V. APPLICATIONS OF MULTI-TIME CHARACTERISATION

The characterisation given in PTT can be useful for qualitatively different applications. Broadly speaking, these applications fall into two different camps: non-Markovian diagnostics, and non-Markovian optimal control. In the former, conventional many-body tools are applied to the Choi state to probe characteristics of the temporal correlations via correlations between the CPTP marginals \( \hat{\xi}_{j:j-1} \). These characteristics can reveal a great deal about the noise: its complexity, the probability of Markov model confusion, the size of the environment,
as well as its quantum or classical nature, as some examples [47, 60, 61]. Since the Choi state is, in general, non-uniquely defined for a restricted process tensor, we do not comment on these aspects here. In our accompanying Letter [47], we focus on applying our methods to extract and bound information about these quantities on NISQ devices, with examples shown on IBM Quantum devices.

Here, we focus on control. We present some examples of how a process tensor characterisation can straightforwardly yield superior circuit fidelities on real QIPs, and the extent to which a conditional Markov model can be used for this. Reconstruction fidelity validates the ability of the process tensor to accurately map a given sequence to its final state. This is especially applicable to near-term quantum devices whose control operations are high in fidelity but whose dynamics (non-Markovian or otherwise) are not under control. In the same way that a mathematical description of a quantum channel may be used to predict its behaviour on any input state, the process tensor can predict the output state of a process, subject to any sequence of input operations. A mapping from unitary gates to outcomes allows an experimenter to ask ‘What is the optimal sequence of gates that best achieves this outcome?’ Two key features distinguishing this from regular quantum optimal control is firstly that after characterisation, all optimisation can be performed classically with confidence. Secondly, the process is fully inclusive of non-Markovian dynamics, allowing for the suppression of correlated errors. Simply choose an objective function $L$ of the final state. Then $L(T_{k:0}[A_{k−1:0}])$ classically evaluates $L$ conditioned on some operation sequence $A_k$ using the process characterisation. This can be cast as a classical optimisation problem to find the sequence of gates which best results in the desired value of $L$. This idea was preliminarily explored in Ref. [25], and applied to pulse shaping in Ref. [62].

### A. Optimising for states using a full process tensor

To demonstrate the utility of this idea, we use the process tensor to improve the fidelity of IBM Quantum devices over multi-time processes. Note that this characterisation overcomes both Markovian and non-Markovian errors. In particular, we apply many sequences of random unitaries to a single qubit and measure the final state. Interleaved between each operation is a delay time roughly equivalent to the implementation duration of a CNOT gate. We then compare the fidelity of this output state to the ideal output subject to those unitaries, with gate set tomography (GST) to account for SPAM error. That is, generate a set of ideal outputs:

$$\rho_{\text{ideal}}^{ijk} = A_{3}^{k} \circ A_{2}^{i} \circ A_{1}^{j} |0\rangle \langle 0|, \tag{41}$$

with a set of values $F(\rho_{\text{ideal}}, \rho_{\text{actual}})$. Mirroring these dynamics, we construct a process tensor whose basis of inputs is at the same time as the target unitaries. Finally, we using the PTT characterisation we determine which set of unitaries, $V$ should be used (instead of the native ones, $A$) in order to achieve the ideal output state. Let each unitary gate $V$ corresponding to the map $V$ be parametrised in terms of $\theta$, $\phi$, and $\lambda$ as

$$V(\theta, \phi, \lambda) = \left( \begin{array}{ccc} \cos(\theta/2) & -e^{i\lambda} \sin(\theta/2) \\ e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) & e^{i(\lambda+\phi)} \cos(\theta/2) \end{array} \right). \tag{42}$$

The process prediction is then given with:

$$\rho_{\text{predicted}}^{ijk}(\theta, \phi, \lambda) = T_{3:0} \left[ V_{3}^{k}, V_{2}^{j}, V_{1}^{i} \right]. \tag{43}$$

Then, for each combination $ijk$, we find

$$\arg\max_{\theta, \phi, \lambda} F(\rho_{\text{ideal}}^{ijk}, \rho_{\text{predicted}}^{ijk}) \tag{44}$$

and use these optimal values in sequences on the device. The results across 216 random sequences are summarised in Figure 8a. The average observed improvement was

![FIG. 8. Results of using the process tensor to optimise multi-time circuits with different random single-qubit unitaries. The $x$-axis indicates the fidelity compared to ideal when the sequences are run on the device. The $y$-axis is the fidelity of the sequence when the process tensor is used to optimise to the ideal case. a Here, we have three sequential unitaries with a wait time interleaved similar to that of two CNOT gates (0.71 $\mu$s) on the $ibmq\_manhattan$. b A similar experiment is conducted on $ibmq\_bogota$, but with the neighbouring qubit in a $|+\rangle$ state and subject to four CNOT gates per time-step (2.5 $\mu$s).](image-url)
0.045, with a maximum of 0.10. In addition, the distribution of fidelities is much tighter, with the standard deviation of device-implemented unitaries at 0.0241, compared with our computed values at 0.00578. We also repeated similar experiments on ibmq_bogota with some characteristics of crosstalk: the neighbour in a $|+\rangle$ state to begin with, driving four sequential CNOTs to its other-side-nearest-neighbour between each unitary. We found that these native fidelities were much worse than on the ibmq_manhattan, despite possessing similar error rates – implicating the effects of crosstalk. We emphasise that the noise encountered in all our experiments is naturally occurring from device fabrication, rather than a contrived environment. Nevertheless, the process-tensor-optimal fidelities in Figure 8b are nearly as high. This suggests a path forward whereby quantum devices may be characterised using PTT and circuits compiled according to the correlated noise of that device. An obvious drawback of this is the characterisation requirements. We now investigate applied our conditional Markov order model to a similar task.

B. Optimising arbitrary circuits with finite Markov order process tensors

Using a complete process tensor model to optimise circuit sections may be feasible for a small number of gates, and, indeed, may be necessary for highly correlated noise. However, it is not desirable in a generic sense to characterise redundant information. Moreover, it is impractical to optimise over specific circuits in a state-dependent way when inputs may be reduced subsystems of a larger register. Here, we address both of these points. We target longer circuits with larger values of $k$ by using a truncated Markov model. In doing so, we both validate our conditional Markov order methodology, and demonstrate the need for approaching the problem of NISQ noise with temporal correlations in mind. Further we also change our optimisation approach: instead of trying to create a specific state on a circuit-by-circuit basis, we numerically find the sequence of gates which most closely takes the effective process to be the identity channel. This allows for arbitrary addressing of non-Markovian noise without a priori knowing the input state.

A five-step process is considered with delays of approximately 1.2µs after each gate. We characterise this process using conditional Markov order models of $\ell = 1$, $\ell = 2$, and $\ell = 3$ under three different cases: no operations on the background qubits, one nearest neighbour to the system initialised in a $|+\rangle$ state, and finally two nearest neighbours and one next-to-nearest neighbour in a $|+\rangle$ state. The first experiment took place on ibmq_manhattan and the second and third on ibmq_guadalupe. The purpose of the latter two experiments is to encourage any (predominantly ZZ) interaction which realistically might occur between qubits in an algorithm. We then generate 100 sequences of 5 random unitary gates, followed by

![FIG. 9. Results of using conditional Markov models to improve the fidelities of a five-step circuit on ibmq_montréal and ibmq_guadalupe. We construct conditional Markov order models for $\ell = 1$, $\ell = 2$, and $\ell = 3$ across five steps under a variety of background conditions. For randomised inputs, these models are used to optimise the next four operations. The four optimal operations are then applied to each input and the results compared to machine fidelity. The mean and standard deviation for each set of experiments is listed, as well as average reconstruction fidelity of the models. a No background operations are applied. b The nearest neighbour to the system is initialised in a $|+\rangle$ state. c Two nearest neighbours and one next-to-nearest neighbour from the system are initialised in a $|+\rangle$ state.](image-url)
gates, again, in terms of $\vec{\theta}$, $\vec{\phi}$, and $\vec{\lambda}$. However, this time, the gates are the same for each input. Finally, using each $\mathbf{Y}_{5:0}^{0}$, we compute:

$$\argmax_{\vec{\theta}, \vec{\phi}, \vec{\lambda}} \sum_i \left[ F(\rho_{\text{ideal}}^i, \rho_{\text{predicted}}^i) \right]^2.$$  \hspace{1cm} (45)

In plain words, we are finding the four gates which simultaneously best preserve all of our random input states. After running this optimisation for each Markov order model and each background, we then aimed to create the ideal output from the 100 random sequences. First, by creating the state with the first gate, then applying the four gates found from Equation (45). Following QST at the end, we compute the fidelity of each final state with respect to the ideal. The purpose of this routine was two-fold: to determine whether active circuit improvements (akin to dynamical decoupling) could be systematically found, even in the presence of non-Markovian noise, and to ascertain how the inclusion of higher order temporal correlations in the model could help achieve this task. Without randomising over the inputs, we found that the $\ell = 1$ model would hide each state in a decoherence-free subspace until the last gate, which is not a generalisable strategy. The results of these experiments are shown in Figure 9 for each sequence and each Markov model with both the mean circuit fidelities and reconstruction fidelities printed. With no activity on neighbouring qubits, we find a moderate amount of non-Markovian noise at this time scale. Interestingly, $\ell = 3$ predicts the dynamics moderately better than $\ell = 2$, signalling the presence of higher order correlations in the dynamics. However, the optimal interventions improve the average circuit fidelity to a similar level for each. The generic correctability for given circuit structures may saturate, regardless of the completeness of characterisation. For the second and third experiments, the dynamics are more complex and we see a clear separation between the different Markov orders. By accounting for these higher order temporal correlations, we are able to more substantially increase circuit fidelities, both in terms of the mean value, and in terms of the tightness of the distribution. Only in the last case do we find that a Markov model $\ell = 1$ is able to achieve an improvement, further highlighting the need for our multi-time process characterisation on NISQ devices.

VI. DISCUSSION

In NISQ devices, circuits performances are not solely determined by the simple composition of high-fidelity gates and measurements, but exhibit complex non-Markovian effects. It is therefore unavoidable to pivot the focus of characterisation techniques to the emergent, holistic behaviour of multi-time processes. In this paper, we have formally introduced a multi-time generalisation of quantum process tomography, in the form of estimating process tensor models. We have presented several key advancements that we believe will be valuable contributions to the community: we have shown how to obtain reliable, high-fidelity, minimal-resource estimations of quantum non-Markovian processes through our fast MLE procedure; derived a method by which low memory ansätze can be implemented; and shown how to use our tools to improve the performance of NISQ devices. This is, to the best of our knowledge, the first development of a maximum-likelihood technique for reconstructing multi-time processes. Moreover, it permits a modular description of non-Markovian memory.

Our technique requires computational resources which scale only linearly in time, while being exponential in the Markov order. The required Markov order plays two important roles: it limits the computational requirements, and benchmarks the degree of non-Markovianity in the device by answering “how many previous time-steps are relevant to our current description of the dynamics?”.

The next step is to further compress the process description by employing the myriad techniques for efficient tomography which are well described in the context of QST and QPT [63–66]. Alternatively, if one were interested in an informative snapshot of the temporal correlations, shadow tomography could efficiently estimate linear functions of the Choi state, supposing that an informationally complete basis of operations were available [67].

Applications of the process tensor have been promising for improving circuit fidelities. However, much more work needs to be accomplished to render this practical: what is the minimal characterisation required to realise this superior control? When can it be re-used on other qubits? Can the characterisation be used to improve generic (possibly unknown) circuits? The practical and theoretical tools developed here pave the pathway for answering many of these questions.

One important aspect of the results so far, is that they allow for optimisations which mitigate highly correlated noise. These suggest that current devices may be closer to fault tolerance than presently realised. For example, the native error-per-gate suggested in Figure 9c is $\approx 0.02$ in the presence of crosstalk, whereas applying an optimisation based on non-Markovian error characterisation reduces this to $\approx 0.005$. But this is not the only consideration; not only do our methods allow for the device to be cleaned up in an absolute sense, but also the reduction of correlated errors has the effect of lowering the stringency of quantum error correcting thresholds (when compared to a correlated error model). Thus, a non-Markovian characterisation can both raise the performance while lowering the bar. We strongly believe that characterisation techniques and software will play a large role in the eventual realisation of a fault tolerant quantum computer.
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APPENDIX

Appendix A: Process tensor contraction and maximum likelihood

Throughout the main text we omitted some of the lengthier computations and descriptions relevant to both linear inversion and maximum likelihood PTT. We include these as follows for completeness, as well as an outline of our algorithmic implementation of PTT.

Construction of a dual set

The procedure to construct the dual operators is as follows: we compile an IC operation set \( \{B_i\} \) into a single matrix \( \mathfrak{B} \). Write each \( B_i = \sum_j b_{ij} \Gamma_j \), where \( \{\Gamma_j\} \) form a Hermitian, self-dual, linearly-independent basis satisfying \( \text{tr}[\Gamma_j \Gamma_k] = \delta_{jk} \). In our case, we select \( \{\Gamma_j\} \) to be the standard basis, meaning that the \( k \)th column of the matrix \( \mathfrak{B} = \sum_{ij} b_{ij} |i\rangle\langle j| \) is flattened into a 1D vector. Because the \( \{B_i\} \) are linearly independent, \( \mathfrak{B} \) is invertible. Let the matrix \( \tilde{\mathfrak{F}} = \mathfrak{B}^{-1} \) such that \( \mathfrak{B} \cdot \tilde{\mathfrak{F}} = I \). This means that the rows of \( \tilde{\mathfrak{F}} \) are orthogonal to the rows of \( \mathfrak{B} \). The dual matrices can then be defined as \( \Delta_i = \sum_j f_{ij} \Gamma_j \), ensuring that \( \text{tr}[B_i \Delta_j] = \delta_{ij} \). Note that in this work, our basis is restricted to the sub-manifold of unitary matrices. This means that the dimension \( d \) of the space is less than the order \( n \) of the matrices. Therefore we construct \( \tilde{\mathfrak{F}} \) as the Moore-Penrose or the right inverse of \( \mathfrak{B} \). If a set of duals is with respect to an overcomplete basis, the same strategy may also be used. Here, we relax the duality condition \( \text{tr}[B_i \Delta_j] = \delta_{ij} \), but retain \( \sum_i \Delta_i = I \) to ensure that the expansion of any operation within the basis is complete.

1. Action of Choi states

When written in terms of its dual construction, it becomes apparent that the action of a quantum channel through its Choi representation is a linear expansion in terms of its action on an IC basis of inputs. Here, we step through this computation and then through the same computation for the process tensor in order to emphasise their parallels. Explicitly, consider \( \sigma = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \rho_i \). The action of \( \mathcal{E} \) on \( \sigma \) is given by:

\[
\text{Tr}_\text{in} \left[ (I_{\text{out}} \otimes \sigma^T) \mathcal{E} \right] = \text{Tr}_\text{in} \left[ (I_{\text{out}} \otimes \sigma^T) \sum_{i=1}^n \rho'_i \otimes \omega^T_i \right] = \text{Tr}_\text{in} \left[ (I_{\text{out}} \otimes \sum_{j=1}^n \alpha_j \rho_j^T) \sum_{i=1}^n \rho'_i \otimes \omega^T_i \right] = \text{Tr}_\text{in} \left[ \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \rho'_i \otimes \alpha_j \rho_j^T \omega_i^T \right] = \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=1}^n \rho'_i \alpha_j \text{Tr}[\rho_j \omega_i] = \sum_{i=1}^n \alpha_i \rho'_i. \tag{A1}
\]
Similarly, for a process tensor’s action on a generic sequence of operations $A_{k−1:0}$:

$$\mathcal{T}_{k:0} [A_{k−1:0}] = \text{tr}_\text{in} \left( \left( \bigotimes_{i=0}^{k-1} \hat{A}_i^T \otimes I \right) \sum_{\mathcal{D}_{k−1:0}} \left( \Delta_{k−1:0}^\mathcal{D} \otimes \rho_k^\mathcal{D} \right) \right)$$

$$= \text{tr}_\text{in} \left[ \sum_{\mu,\bar{\nu}} \alpha_{\mu} \prod_{i,j=0}^{k-1} \text{tr} \left( \hat{B}_i^{\mu_i} \Delta_{j}^{\nu_j} \right) \rho_k^\mathcal{D} \right]$$

$$= \sum_{\mu,\bar{\nu}} \alpha_{\mu} \prod_{i,j=0}^{k-1} \text{tr} \left( \hat{B}_i^{\mu_i} \Delta_{j}^{\nu_j} \right) \rho_k^\mathcal{D}$$

$$= \sum_{\mu,\bar{\nu}} \alpha_{\mu} \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \text{tr} \left( \hat{A}_i \Delta_{\mu_i}^{\nu_i} \right) = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha_{\mu_i}^{\nu_i}.$$  \hfill (A2)

The direct calculation of each expansion coefficient is therefore given by

$$\alpha_{\mu} = \text{tr} \left( \hat{A}_{k−1:0} \Delta_{k−1:0}^\mathcal{D} \right) = \text{tr} \left( \bigotimes_{i=0}^{k-1} \hat{A}_i \Delta_{\mu_i}^{\nu_i} \right)$$

$$= \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \text{tr} \left( \hat{A}_i \Delta_{\mu_i}^{\nu_i} \right) = \prod_{i=0}^{k-1} \alpha_{\mu_i}^{\nu_i}. \hfill (A3)$$

### 2. Maximum likelihood, cost evaluation, and gradient

Full details and benchmarking of the pgdb algorithm for QPT can be found in Ref. [44]. Here, we provide the pseudocode in this context, which forms the basis for our implementation of ML-PTT.

**Algorithm 1 pgdb**

1. $j = 0, n = d_{2k+1}^2$
2. Initial estimate: $\Upsilon_{k:0}^{(0)} = I_{n \times n}/n$
3. Set metaparameters: $\alpha = 2n^2/3, \gamma = 0.3$
4. **while** $f(\Upsilon_{k:0}^{(j)}) - f(\Upsilon_{k:0}^{(n+1)}) > 1 \times 10^{-6}$ **do**
5. \quad $D^{(j)} = \text{Proj}_{\mathcal{S}_n^+ \cap \Upsilon} \left( \Upsilon_{k:0}^{(j)} - \mu \nabla f(\Upsilon_{k:0}^{(j)}) \right) - \Upsilon_{k:0}^{(j)}$
6. \quad $\beta = 1$
7. \quad **while** $f(\Upsilon_{k:0}^{(j)} + \beta D^{(k)}) > f(\Upsilon_{k:0}^{(j)}) + \gamma \beta \left( D^{(j)}, \nabla f(\Upsilon_{k:0}^{(j)}) \right)$ **do**
8. \quad $\beta = 0.5 \beta$
9. **end while**
10. $\Upsilon_{k:0}^{(j+1)} = \Upsilon_{k:0}^{(j)} + \beta D^{(j)}$
11. $j = j + 1$
12. **end while**
13. **return** $\Upsilon_{k:0}^{(est)} = \Upsilon_{k:0}^{(j+1)}$

$\text{Proj}_{\mathcal{S}_n^+ \cap \Upsilon} (\cdot)$ here is the projection subroutine described in Section III. Although we have fixed the gradient step size here to be the same as in [44], we find this to be slightly problem-dependent in terms of its performance. The reason
is that the larger the step, the less physical $\mathbf{Y}^{(j)}_{k:0} - \mu \nabla f(\mathbf{Y}^{(j)}_{k:0})$ tends to be, increasing the run-time of the projection subroutine. In general, we find that decreasing $\mu$ to favour the runtime of the projection is overall favourable to the performance of the algorithm.

The process tensor action described in Equation (A2) is pedagogically useful, however in practice, we compute the action of some process tensor $\mathbf{T}_{k:0}$ on a sequence of control operations $\mathbf{A}_{k-1:0}$ via the projection of its Choi state onto as in Equation (13). Because the input operations are always tensor product (omitting the case of correlated instruments), this can be performed fast as a tensor network contraction. In this form, computation of the cost and the gradient is significantly sped up in comparison to multiplying out the full matrices.

Writing the Choi state of a process tensor $\mathbf{Y}_{k:0}$ explicitly with its indices as a rank $2(2k + 1)$ tensor, we have $2k + 1$ subsystems alternating with outputs from the $j$th step ($o_j$) and inputs to the $(j + 1)$th step ($i_j$), i.e.

$$
\mathbf{Y}_{k:0} \equiv \mathbf{(Y}_{k:0})^{b_{xz},b_{k_1},\ldots,b_{k_0}},
$$

where $b$ is shorthand for bra, and $k$ is shorthand for ket. The basis operation at time step $j$ has indices (we write its transpose) $\mathbf{(B)}^{k_{j+1},k_{j}}_{b_{j+1},b_{o_j}}$, meanwhile the POVM element $\Pi_i$ is written $\mathbf{(\Pi)}^{b_{xz}}_{k_{i}}$. Consequently, the full tensor of predicted probabilities for all basis elements is given by

$$
p_{i,\vec{\mu}} = \sum_{k_{xz},k_{1},\ldots,k_{1},k_{0},b_{xz},b_{k_1},\ldots,b_{k_0}} (\mathbf{Y}_{k:0})^{b_{xz},b_{k_1},\ldots,b_{k_0}} (\mathbf{\Pi})^{b_{k_0}}_{k_{xz}} (\mathbf{B}^{k_{k-1}}_{b_{1},b_{o_{1}}} (\mathbf{B}^{k_{k-2}}_{b_{1},b_{o_{2}}} \cdots (\mathbf{B}^{k_{1}}_{b_{1},b_{o_{1}}} (\mathbf{B}^{k_{0}}_{b_{1},b_{o_{0}}})
$$

We use the quantum information Python library QUIMB \[68\] to perform this, and all future tensor contractions straightforwardly. The cost function is then evaluation as in Equation (14) in the same way: through an element-wise logarithm of $p_{i,\vec{\mu}}$ followed by contraction with the data tensor $n_{i,\vec{\mu}}$. Since the cost function is linear in $\mathbf{Y}_{k:0}$, computing the gradient $\nabla f / \nabla \mathbf{Y}_{k:0}$ is simply $\nabla p_{i,\vec{\mu}} / \nabla \mathbf{Y}_{k:0} : (n/p)^{i,\vec{\mu}}$, which expands to:

$$
\frac{\nabla f}{\nabla \mathbf{Y}_{k:0}} = \sum_{i,\vec{\mu}} \left[ (\mathbf{B}^{k_{k-1}}_{b_{1},b_{o_{1}}} (\mathbf{B}^{k_{k-2}}_{b_{1},b_{o_{2}}} (\mathbf{B}^{k_{1}}_{b_{1},b_{o_{1}}} (\mathbf{B}^{k_{0}}_{b_{1},b_{o_{0}}})
$$

i.e. Equation (A5) without the inclusion of $\mathbf{Y}_{k:0}$.

**Appendix B: Approximate conditional Markov order**

In order to estimate a CMO process tomographically, we employ ML-PTT as described by the circuits in Figure 7. The action of the reduced process tensors under a finite conditional Markov order model is best posed as a tensor network contraction, so that tasks such as the optimisation in Section V can be performed quickly. We show this here. Note that the following extravagant working is equivalent to Figure 6, but we write it out in full generality in order to make the indices explicit and replication more straightforward. First, the conditional reduced states of each of the process tensors must be taken by contracting the relevant control operations (including final measurement) into the process tensors. These are:
Then, the tensor of predicted probabilities $p_{i_1 i_2}$ is obtained by stitching each conditional process tensor together with the overlapping control operations. That is:

$$\sum_{k_{o1}, k_{o1}, \ldots, k_{o1}} (\mathbf{Y}_{\ell_0}^{(B_{\ell_0}^{i_1 i_2})})^{b_{o1}}_{k_{o1}} (\mathbf{F}_{\ell_1}^{(B_{\ell_1}^{i_1 i_2})})^{b_{o1}}_{k_{o1}} (\mathbf{F}_{\ell_1}^{(B_{\ell_1}^{i_1 i_2})})^{b_{o1}}_{k_{o1}} \cdots (\mathbf{F}_{\ell_1}^{(B_{\ell_1}^{i_1 i_2})})^{b_{o1}}_{k_{o1}},$$

(B1)

$$\sum_{k_{o1}, \ldots, k_{o1}} (\mathbf{Y}_{\ell_0}^{(B_{\ell_0}^{i_1 i_2})})^{b_{o1}}_{k_{o1}} (\mathbf{F}_{\ell_1}^{(B_{\ell_1}^{i_1 i_2})})^{b_{o1}}_{k_{o1}} (\mathbf{F}_{\ell_1}^{(B_{\ell_1}^{i_1 i_2})})^{b_{o1}}_{k_{o1}} \cdots (\mathbf{F}_{\ell_1}^{(B_{\ell_1}^{i_1 i_2})})^{b_{o1}}_{k_{o1}},$$

(B2)

Which is precisely the generalisation of the strategy presented in Figure 6. When evaluated from left to right, this can be performed efficiently since every contraction is a rank-2 tensor with a rank-4 tensor. Note that in this instance, the index vector $\mathbf{\hat{\mu}}$ does not run from $(0, 0, \ldots, 0)$ to $(d_S^3, d_S^3, \ldots, d_S^3)$ but rather for each block of memory, it contains all $d_S^2$ combinations of basis elements, with all other operations fixed at $\mu_0$. There are therefore $(k - \ell + 1) \cdot d_S^2$ values taken by $\mathbf{\hat{\mu}}$.

Appendix C: Identifying minimal unitary basis overlap

The effects of basis overlap in quantum tomography on the reconstruction have been discussed both with respect to conventional QST and QPT, and more recently with respect to the process tensor. In particular, the process tensor has shown itself to be highly sensitive to any overlap in its control basis. With access to all 16 dimensions of superoperator space, a mutually unbiased basis can be constructed in the form of a symmetric IC-POVM followed by an update [69]. However, in the limited case of a unitary-only basis, the ideal method is less straightforward. A randomly chosen unitary basis has been shown to adversely affect the reconstruction fidelity by as much as 30%. Selecting a basis with mutual overlap here would be ideal, akin to the notion of a SIC-POVM in conventional quantum state tomography. However, it has been shown that MUUBs do not exist in dimension 10 (the dimension for single qubit channels). Because of this limitation, we numerically search for a basis which minimises its average overlap with the remainder of the set. This procedure is performed as follows:

We parametrise these gates using the standard qiskit unitary parametrisation:

$$u(\theta, \phi, \lambda) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta/2) & -e^{i\lambda} \sin(\theta/2) \\ e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) & e^{i\lambda + i\phi} \cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix}.$$  

(C1)

For two unitaries $u$ and $v$, let $\mathcal{U}$ and $\mathcal{V}$ be their superoperator equivalent, according to some representation. The overlap between the two channels is given by the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product:

$$\langle A, B \rangle_{HS} := \text{Tr}[A^\dagger B].$$  

(C2)
Importantly, this quantity is independent of representation, allowing us to select a form most desirable for computation. To this effect, we use the row-vectorised convention for states. Here, operations are given by $\mathcal{U} = u \otimes u^*$. The inner product between two unitaries parametrised as in (C1) is then:

$$\langle \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \rangle_{\text{HS}} = \text{Tr}[\mathcal{U}^\dagger \mathcal{V}]$$

$$= \text{Tr}[(u \otimes u^*)^\dagger \cdot (v \otimes v^*)]$$

$$= \text{Tr}[u^\dagger \cdot v \otimes (u^T \cdot v^*)]$$

$$= \text{Tr}[u^\dagger v] \cdot \text{Tr}[u^\dagger v]^*$$

$$= |\text{Tr}[u^\dagger v]|^2 \quad \text{(C3)}$$

If we write $u = u(\theta_1, \phi_1, \lambda_1)$ and $v = v(\theta_2, \phi_2, \lambda_2)$, then (C3) can be straightforwardly written (after some simplification) as

$$\text{Tr}[u^\dagger v] = \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2} + e^{i(\phi_2 - \phi_1)} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} + e^{i(\lambda_2 - \lambda_1)} \sin \frac{\theta_1}{2} \sin \frac{\theta_2}{2} + e^{i(\lambda_2 + \phi_2 - \lambda_1 - \phi_1)} \cos \frac{\theta_1}{2} \cos \frac{\theta_2}{2}$$

$$\Rightarrow \langle \mathcal{U}, \mathcal{V} \rangle_{\text{HS}} = 4 \cos^2 \left( \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_1 - \lambda_2 + \phi_1 - \phi_2) \right) \cos^2 (\theta_1 - \theta_2) \quad \text{(C4)}$$

This simple expression for the inner product of any two single-qubit unitaries allows us to construct an objective function for the straightforward mutual minisation of overlap between all ten elements of the basis set. Let

$$\mathcal{U} = \{\mathcal{U}_i\}_{i=1}^{10} \equiv \{ (\theta_i, \phi_i, \lambda_i) \}_{i=1}^{10} \quad \text{(C5)}$$

be our parametrised basis set. A basis set with the least mutual overlap can then be found by minimising the sum of the squares of each unitary with the remainder of the set. This minimises both the average overlap and the variance of overlaps with the remainder of the set. That is, by computing:

$$\min_{(\theta, \phi, \lambda)} \sum_{i=1}^{10} \sum_{i>j=1}^{10} |\langle \mathcal{U}_i, \mathcal{U}_j \rangle_{\text{HS}}|^2$$

$$= \sum_{i=1}^{10} \sum_{i>j=1}^{10} 16 \cos^4 \left( \frac{1}{2} (\lambda_i - \lambda_j + \phi_i - \phi_j) \right) \cos^4 (\theta_i - \theta_j) \quad \text{(C6)}$$

One such ideal set can be found in Table II. This is the basis set used for the experiments conducted in the main text. Its overlaps with respect to the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product are listed in Table III.

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\theta$</td>
<td>$\phi$</td>
<td>$\lambda$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{U}_1$</td>
<td>1.1148</td>
<td>1.5606</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{U}_2$</td>
<td>-2.1993</td>
<td>-2.0552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{U}_3$</td>
<td>0.9616</td>
<td>-0.8573</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{U}_4$</td>
<td>2.2655</td>
<td>-2.7083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{U}_5$</td>
<td>-0.1013</td>
<td>-0.5548</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{U}_6$</td>
<td>1.8434</td>
<td>0.8074</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{U}_7$</td>
<td>-2.2036</td>
<td>1.9589</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{U}_8$</td>
<td>-1.2038</td>
<td>-0.2023</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{U}_9$</td>
<td>2.1791</td>
<td>3.2836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\mathcal{U}_{10}$</td>
<td>-1.3116</td>
<td>2.3082</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. A set of thirty parameter values which constitute a set of ten unitary gates with minimal average mutual overlap.

Appendix D: IBM Quantum Experiments

The experimental procedures in this work were carried out on IBM Quantum cloud devices: `ibmq_boeblingen`, `ibmq_johannesburg`, `ibmq_valencia`, `ibmq_bogota`, `ibmq_manhattan`, `ibmq_montreal`, and `ibmq_guadalupe`. Data from the first three is the same as the data featured in Ref [25], with the exception of the MUUB experiments on `ibmq_valencia`, which was newly taken for this work. The detail of these experiments can be found within that reference. All other data taken from the remainder of the devices was newly collected for this work. All devices are fixed frequency superconducting transmon quantum computers. Below, we step through the experiments performed in Sections III B and V on these devices.
Reconstruction fidelity experimentally validates the quality of a model by comparing predictions made by the model with data generated by the device, where the data is not used to create the model. The process tensor establishes a mapping from a sequence of control operations to a final state. Therefore, in this context, the comparison is between the final state predicted by a process tensor model subject to a sequence of operations (from outside the basis set), with the actual state reconstructed when the same sequence of operations is run on the device. The results of Figure 5 are reconstruction fidelity distributions for a number of sequences of three random unitaries.

The procedure for constructing a single qubit three-step process tensor is as follows:

1. Initialise the system,
2. Wait some time $T_1$,
3. Apply basis element $U_{\mu_0}$,
4. Wait some time $T_2$,
5. Apply basis element $U_{\mu_1}$,
6. Wait some time $T_3$,
7. Apply basis element $U_{\mu_2}$,
8. Wait some time $T_4$,

The total number of circuits here is $10 \times 10 \times 10 \times 3 = 3000$. Finally, the data is then processed according to the LI/ML processing methods stipulated in the main text. For LI, this means constructing the density matrix corresponding to each basis sequence. For ML, this means shaping the data into a $(6, 10, 10, 10)$ array, where the first dimension corresponds to each of the six effects in the POVM $\{|+\rangle\langle+|, \langle+i|+|i\rangle, \langle0|0|, \langle-|, \langle+i|+|i\rangle, \langle1|1\rangle\}$, Note that in general, the times $T_i$ can be chosen to be different, and include whatever background dynamics and circuit structure the experimenter is interested in. This is simply a choice of quantum stochastic process being studied. In the cases of ibmq\_manhattan and ibmq\_bogota, the circuit structures are as described in Section V.

Once the process tensor data is collected and an LI/ML model constructed, a number of random unitary circuits are generated, with each gate chosen by the scipy.stats.unitary.rvs() function. These gates are then run on the real devices, following the same circuit structure. QST is then performed at the end of each sequence. The conditional state is computed by contracting the random sequence into the process tensor model. Finally, the state fidelity is computed between the predicted and the actual states. This then forms the data sets shown in Figure 5.

With all things equal, the average reconstruction fidelity will necessarily increase with an increased number of shots.

## TABLE III. Hilbert-Schmidt overlap between each element of the numerically constructed (approximate) MUUB. We find this to be the most uniformly overlapping unitary basis possible, thus optimal for PTT.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>$\text{Tr}[U_i^\dagger U_j]$</th>
<th>$U_1$</th>
<th>$U_2$</th>
<th>$U_3$</th>
<th>$U_4$</th>
<th>$U_5$</th>
<th>$U_6$</th>
<th>$U_7$</th>
<th>$U_8$</th>
<th>$U_9$</th>
<th>$U_{10}$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$U_1$</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_2$</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_3$</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.11111</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_4$</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_5$</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_6$</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.11111</td>
<td>0.11111</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_7$</td>
<td>0.03286</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_8$</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>0.03286</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_9$</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.11111</td>
<td>0.11111</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.11111</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$U_{10}$</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.03286</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>0.16758</td>
<td>0.19688</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Average 0.24907 0.25146 0.25146 0.24907 0.24907 0.25146 0.24907 0.24907 0.25146 0.24907
per circuit. It will also decrease if the final states are noisier or more mixed, since this will add to the variance of sampling statistics.

Once the model is validated to the desired level of accuracy, it becomes a useful tool for optimal control of the non-Markovian system. In Section V A we use the same process tensors from `ibmq_manhattan` and `ibmq_bogota` to show a circuit-by-circuit improvement of the fidelities of states generated by IBM Quantum devices. So as to avoid readout error obfuscating any results, or overstating any improvements, we first performed gate set tomography (GST) using the `pyGSTi` software package [70] in order to estimate the actual POVM giving X, Y, and Z projections on the device. This POVM was then used both in reconstructing the states, and in the PTT estimate.

2. Conditional Markov order circuit improvement

For each of the conditional Markov order experiments, a five step process with \(\ell = 1\), \(\ell = 2\), and \(\ell = 3\) is considered. This amounts to reconstructing, respectively, 5, 4, and 3 memory block process tensors. The structure of the circuits is similar to the three step process tensor, however not all circuit elements are varied. For example, with \(\ell = 3\), this means reconstructing the three process tensors corresponding to circuit structure \(U_{\mu_0} - U_{\mu_1} - U_{\mu_2} - \Pi_i\), \(U_0 - U_{\mu_0} - U_{\mu_1} - U_{\mu_2} - \Pi_i\), and \(U_0 - U_0 - U_{\mu_0} - U_{\mu_1} - U_{\mu_2} - \Pi_i\). For \(\ell = 2\), a subset of the same data can be reused: fixing \(\mu_0 = 0\) and varying \(\mu_1\) and \(\mu_2\), for example. The only additional information required is that a projective measurement needs to be made in position 2 of the circuit in order to determine the state at the end of the first \(\ell = 2\) memory block. A similar process follows for determination of \(\Upsilon_{2}^{5:0}\), with an extra memory block process tensor constructed with a projective measurement at position 1. This totals \(3 \times (10 \times 10 \times 10 \times 3) = 9000\) circuits for \(\Upsilon_{3}^{5:0}\), an extra \(10 \times 3 = 300\) circuits for \(\Upsilon_{2}^{5:0}\), and an extra \(10 \times 3 = 30\) circuits for \(\Upsilon_{1}^{5:0}\).

Since the state is being propagated along in our finite Markov order stitching procedure, it is important that it is well-characterised without measurement error. To this effect, we use GST again to estimate our POVM. This is more essential than before, since now our PTT construction is contingent on inputting the correct form of the operation. This is also true of the unitary gates we apply, however single qubit error rates are \(O(10^{-4})\), compared with measurement errors of \(O(10^{-2})\), and so a far smaller assumption.