Neural networks for on-the-fly single-shot state classification
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Neural networks have proven to be efficient for a number of practical applications ranging from image recognition to identifying phase transitions in quantum physics models. In this paper we investigate the application of neural networks to state classification in a single-shot quantum measurement. We use dispersive readout of a superconducting transmon circuit to demonstrate an increase in assignment fidelity for both two and three state classification. More importantly, our method is ready for on-the-fly data processing without overhead or need for large data transfer to a hard drive. In addition we demonstrate the capacity of neural networks to be trained against experimental imperfections, such as phase drift of a local oscillator in a heterodyne detection scheme.

I. INTRODUCTION

Machine learning (ML) is ubiquitous in modern computer science, with applications ranging from image and speech recognition to self-driving vehicle and automated medical diagnostic systems. By virtue of its archetypal problem classes – regression and classification – ML algorithms and neural networks in particular have recently found a number of applications in quantum computing, helping researchers to tackle such tasks as optimizing gates and pulse sequences [1–4], identifying phase transitions [5, 6], correcting imperfections of measurement apparatus [7–9], classifying states [10, 11] or evolution [12–14] of a quantum system with little or no a priori knowledge, and even optimizing the fabrication process [15].

A proposal to use machine learning to discriminate measurement trajectories and outcomes was one of the first and most natural applications of ML in the field, and has led to improvements in readout assignment fidelity [16]. The technique is now being regularly implemented across the community [17–19]. As these methods continue to see success, neural networks have become a promising technique for incorporation into the readout procedure, due to their generalisability and capacity to extract useful features from dense data. A recent advancement uses neural networks to compensate for system dependent errors due to processes such as cross-talk in multiplexed qubit readout [20]. In this work we also apply neural networks to the readout of a superconducting transmon system. However, our approach works on-the-fly with no data processing overhead and can be trained against experimental parameter drifts, in addition to increasing readout fidelity in two and three state discrimination scenarios.

To deploy our neural-network-based state classification, we use an open source machine learning PyTorch library [21]. Geared towards computer vision and natural language processing, it includes the capability to realise deep neural networks and contains built-in functionality for data processing on a graphics processing unit (GPU). GPU integration enables our pipeline to be fast enough to perform on-the-fly data classification without the need to transfer raw measured signal to a hard drive. Amongst other advantages, it allows monitoring the readout assignment fidelity in real time.

With the initial training of the neural network taking on the order of minutes, consequent retraining of the network weights requires several seconds and allows the readout assignment fidelity to return to the optimal value. More importantly, the convolutional neural network used in the present work may be designed and trained in a way resilient to certain experimental parameter drifts. Specifically, we present a strategy to eliminate the effect of local relative phase drifts induced by generating microwave equipment on the readout assignment fidelity.

The paper is organized as follows. Section II contains the description of our measurement setup. In Section III we detail the optimal neural network architecture as well as compare the performance of competing methods. In Section IV, we present the real-time classification using GPU processing and investigate robustness of our methods against phase drift. In the final section we summarise the results, report conclusions and outline possible future extensions of our proposed methodology.

II. MEASUREMENT SETUP

The measurement setup caters to the repeated preparation and measurement of the transmon. We prepare the transmon in one of the two or three basis states,
followed by a measurement. The assignment fidelity, as defined in Equation 1 is used to compare the efficacy of different classification methods.

\[
\chi = \frac{\langle \Psi | \hat{Q} | \Omega \rangle}{\langle \Psi | \Omega \rangle}
\]

where \(\langle \Psi | \Omega \rangle\) is the ground (first excited) state and the first (second) excited state; applying no pulse to keep the transmon in its ground state |g⟩, applying one \(\pi\)-pulse at \(\omega_{ge}\) to prepare the transmon in its first excited state |e⟩, and applying two consecutive \(\pi\)-pulses at \(\omega_{ge}\) and \(\omega_{ef}\) respectively to prepare a transmon in the second excited state |f⟩. These protocols are illustrated in Fig. 2a.

Immediately after execution of the control pulses, a rectangular measurement pulse is applied to the input of the readout cavity. This measurement pulse populates the resonator with photons which leak out through an output port at a rate characterised by the photon decay rate \(\kappa\). To achieve a sufficiently high SNR for transmon readout in a single-shot regime, we use a Josephson parametric amplifier (JPA) similar to one described in Ref. [22]. Following amplification through the JPA, the readout signal is further amplified using a High Electron Mobility Transistor (HEMT) amplifier and multiple room temperature amplifiers. The signal is then downconverted to 25 MHz and acquired by a digitizer.

**B. GPU processing**

For the on-the-fly experiments with Sample B we acquired 512 time points per measurement, recorded to the buffer of a 500 MSa/s digitizer Spectrum M4i. After populating the buffer with 2048 time traces, we transferred the digital waveforms to PC memory (RAM) and then to the GPU memory for batch processing. While the data is being processed, the digitizer buffer is populated with new acquired waveforms. This parallel workflow enables our acquisition system to circumvent any overhead due to the data processing.

Within our data processing workflow, each acquired waveform undergoes digital downconversion (DDC) by multiplying the acquired signal with \(\cos(\omega_{DDC}t)\) (sin[\(\omega_{DDC}t\)]) where \(\omega_{DDC}/2\pi = 25\) MHz, to obtain the in-phase quadrature \(I(t)\) (out-of-phase quadrature \(Q(t)\)). A Finite Impulse Response (FIR) Filter with a window of 40 samples (20 ns) and a cutoff frequency of 20 MHz is applied to the signal to eliminate the signal image at 50 MHz along with 25 MHz noise (originally DC offset). After obtaining \(I(t)\) and \(Q(t)\), the signal undergoes further post-processing. This may include time integration, channel correlation, or even being fed through trained PyTorch neural networks (see more details in Section III).

Due to the large number of cores in the GPU the data can be processed in parallel, which allowed us to perform real time data acquisition for the on-the-fly experiment described in Section IV. Although the results of this paper were obtained with a repetition time of 40 \(\mu s\), our
GPU data processing can be run without overhead as fast as 3.2 $\mu s$ per repetition, obtaining 19 million traces (19 trillion samples) in 1 minute.

C. State classification by signal integration

In order to determine the baseline readout fidelity, we first employed the conventional method of state classification. Following this method, we prepare the relevant basis states of the transmon followed by a measurement pulse. The heterodyne measurement signal which resulted was integrated in time, giving us one complex number for each acquisition with integrated in-phase and out-of-phase quadratures $I$ and $Q$. By repeating the measurements, we can populate measurement outcome histograms for every prepared state on the I-Q plane, as shown in Fig. 2. The mean values of the state responses are then calculated and stored as calibration data. A particular measurement response can be classified by selecting the state whose mean response is closest to this recorded point on the I-Q plane. The assignment fidelity can be evaluated as

\[ F_a = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{i=1}^{N} P(i|i) \]  

(1)

where $P(i|j)$ is the probability of obtaining outcome “$i$” given the system was prepared in $j$th state. Here, we use $N = 2(3)$ and states $|g\rangle, |e\rangle (|g\rangle, |e\rangle, |f\rangle)$ to calculate qubit (qutrit) assignment fidelity.

For the coherence time of Sample B we found the optimal integration time of 1 $\mu s$, which provides a qutrit assignment fidelity of 83%. Given the rather short $T_1$ times of the transmon in Sample B, this fidelity is strongly affected by relaxation during measurement.

Alternatively, one can apply a matched filter to the heterodyne measurement signal prior to integration in the conventional method. Matched filters are calibrated by taking the means of all acquired signals corresponding to each basis states, and storing the complex conjugates of these expected responses. The complex conjugate is used to inflate the weight of signal samples with highest amplitude while enforcing constant phase, leading to a more meaningful final value for discrimination purposes than simple integration. An incoming signal for classification is passed through each of these three filters, and the differences between filtered signals are evaluated. The filter which returns maximum average amplitude upon application to the readout signal determines the classified basis state.

III. MACHINE LEARNING

Integrated cavity response provides a simple way to perform state classification, but neglects many properties of the signal. Fig. 3 shows the mean readout signal trajectories of the three transmon states on the I-Q plane, and corresponding examples of their single shots. Certain features of these responses (such as the fact that the response for the ground state curves clockwise while the responses for the first and second states curve anticlockwise) are not recoverable in the signal after time integration. While the matched filter processing may help to compensate for this deficiency, it is proposed that neural network-based machine learning may present a superior method for classifying trajectories according to these intrinsic features.

To identify the best ML learning method we first collected data from Sample A. The transmon was prepared in each of the three basis states $(|g\rangle, |e\rangle$ and $|f\rangle)$ followed by the 2 $\mu s$ measurement pulse, resulting in 50 time samples for each trace at 100 MHz. In total, we collected 16384 traces corresponding to each state for analysis. 90% of this data was used for training, and the rest was used to test and obtain the classification fidelity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parameter</th>
<th>Transmon A</th>
<th>Transmon B</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{0A}/2\pi$</td>
<td>7.08 GHz</td>
<td>7.63 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{0B}/2\pi$</td>
<td>6.27 GHz</td>
<td>5.49 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\omega_{cB}/2\pi$</td>
<td>5.95 GHz</td>
<td>5.16 GHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2\chi_{ge}/2\pi$</td>
<td>8.00 MHz</td>
<td>8.50 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$2\chi_{ef}/2\pi$</td>
<td>5.35 MHz</td>
<td>15.57 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$\kappa/2\pi$</td>
<td>1.31 MHz</td>
<td>1.56 MHz</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_1$</td>
<td>11.75 $\mu s$</td>
<td>4.07 $\mu s$</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$T_2$</td>
<td>3.17 $\mu s$</td>
<td>4.29 $\mu s$</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE I. Device parameters

FIG. 2. a) Transmon control pulses used for preparing the three basis states of the transmon. b) Histogram of integrated cavity responses $I + iQ$ for different prepared states. The blue, red and green points correspond to the transmon being prepared in the $|g\rangle$, $|e\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ states respectively. The relaxation of the f-state to the excited state and excited state to ground state is visible. Some of the points that are decaying from the f-state to the excited state will be classified as ground state due to their proximity to the ground state cluster.
This is likely because the transmon decayed from |f⟩ to |e⟩ early in its trajectory.

**TABLE II.** Assignment fidelities for different machine learning models evaluated on an identical test data set generated with Sample A. For all methods, there are significant improvements over the conventional method (time integration of readout signal and setting classification thresholds). CNN is the best model for classifying between three levels. This method was selected to be used in Section IV of the paper for on-the-fly data analysis. Note that the same data was used to extract both the qubit and qutrit fidelities. Since the readout parameters were optimised for the qutrit case the CNN model returns higher value for the 3 state fidelity.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>2 state fidelity</th>
<th>3 state fidelity</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Conventional</td>
<td>0.841</td>
<td>0.711</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Matched Filter</td>
<td>0.913</td>
<td>0.747</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>K Nearest Neighbours</td>
<td>0.902</td>
<td>0.845</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support Vector Machine</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.851</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Random Forest Classifier</td>
<td>0.917</td>
<td>0.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Vanilla Neural Network</td>
<td>0.912</td>
<td>0.925</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LSTM</td>
<td>0.909</td>
<td>0.904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CNN</td>
<td>0.919</td>
<td>0.928</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**A. Developing the model**

Before using neural networks, we evaluated the assignment fidelity of other common machine learning methods including the support vector machine, a random forest classifier, and a k-nearest-neighbors algorithm. After this, we deployed several neural network architectures, including a single hidden layer (‘vanilla’) feedforward neural network, several versions of convolutional neural networks (CNN), and long short term memory networks (LSTM). The assignment fidelities obtained using each of these algorithms is shown in Table II.

The k-nearest neighbour algorithm bears the most similarity to the baseline assignment fidelity method, using the mean trajectory instead of just the integrated point from a trajectory. The LSTM algorithm is popular in image classification. It is a neural network where the hidden layer is a convolution of the input with a kernel (or filter). We feed the time-domain signal data to the CNN with the I(t) and Q(t) traces as two channel inputs, analogous to the red, blue and green channels of a color image. The CNN model parameters which resulted in the highest fidelity are described in more detail in Sec. IV.

**B. Global phase robustness**

Single-shot readout trajectories are well separated in the I-Q plane by their relative differences in amplitude and phase. While the signal amplitude is generally stable the global phase of the readout signal can sometimes vary throughout the course of an experiment schedule. This is particularly relevant for our experimental setup, where the readout signal itself and the local oscillator for the signal downconversion were produced by separate microwave signal generators. In addition, time jitter of the acquisition trigger pulse for the digitizer can also introduce a global phase shift to the resultant readout signal. Drifts in phase will manifest themselves as overall rotation in the I-Q plane and will affect the classification fidelities for the conventional threshold methods.

The neural networks used for state classification can in principle learn to discriminate on the basis of relevant
features (general behaviours of single-shot readout trajectories associated with each state, ‘ground states curve clockwise’) rather than features which are localised to individual datasets (global phase rotation, ‘ground states project rightward’). To enforce robustness to such input parameter variations in a neural network, the training dataset should contain samples which are broadly distributed across the domain of that input parameter. This effectively removes the parameter (global phase) from the possible set of features upon which the model can learn.

To endow the network with global phase robustness, a dataset was created by obtaining 256 traces for each possible set of features upon which the model can learn. A predictable global phase was no longer a feature of individual datasets (global phase rotation, ‘ground states curve clockwise’) rather than features which are localised to integer multiples of 40 ns within the pulse sequence, phase coherence is conserved. By generating data with uniformly distributed initial wait times between 0 and 40 ns, a predictable global phase was no longer a feature of the training dataset, forcing the model to learn a phase-robust mapping from readout trajectory to qutrit state. We fed this data into a CNN network in the same manner as described in Sec. III A.

IV. ON-THE-FLY ACQUISITION

After selecting CNN as the method with the highest assignment fidelity, we apply this model to state classification on-the-fly. This on-the-fly protocol minimizes the size of data stored on the hard disk, reducing temporal overhead for data processing and allowing for real-time monitoring of the assignment fidelity.

A. FIR bandwidth optimization

We used a 5 MHz FIR low pass filter for Sample A. However, we found it was beneficial to increase the cut-off frequency of the FIR filter to 20 MHz when using CNN data processing for Sample B. This exposes the CNN to more noise, but potentially allows access to more information about the prepared states. Incidentally, this operation also requires fewer coefficients on the FIR filter, reducing computation complexity and significantly lowering the time required by the CNN to reach the highest fidelity.

B. The model

Here we describe the specific architecture of the network used in our CNN model. The network consists of the following layers:

1. **1D convolution**: A convolution layer with 2 input channels (corresponding to I and Q data channels), 16 output channels, and a kernel size of 128. The relatively large kernel size is hypothesised (but rigorously confirmed) to filter out higher frequency noise more effectively. The initial kernel weights (or filter coefficients) are manually set using the He initialisation function \([23]\), with experimentation demonstrating that CNN performance is very sensitive to this weight initialisation.

2. **ReLu activation**: After passing through the first layer the data undergoes mapping \(f(x) = \max(0, x)\) in order to expedite the learning process \([24]\).

3. **1D convolution**: A convolution layer with 16 input channels (corresponding to the output of the previous convolution layer), 32 output channels, and a kernel size of 5. This expands the previous 16 features to 32, by taking various linear combinations of the prior layer outputs.

4. **ReLu activation**: See above for details.

5. **Max pooling**: The maximums of every three neighbouring output values of the previous layer are evaluated, to reduce the size of the data representation and therefore computational time in the remainder of the network.

6. **Flattening**: This step reshapes data to a one-dimensional array removing input channel and time indices. This is necessary for data processing in upcoming layers. No data is fundamentally altered here.

7. **Dropout**: 50% of the data points are randomly selected to be set to zero (called ‘neuron deactivation’). This step was initially introduced to prevent the model from being overtained. Overtraining or overfitting of a ML model is known behaviour of the ML method when it learns ‘too much’ from the training data, showing an artificially high accuracy of classification while training, but failing to maintain performance when tested on new data. This may occur if there are certain features of the signal present in the training dataset due to noise or other conditions relevant to the data-taking process, which are not present in the testing data set (see more discussion on overfitting in Subsection IV C). The dropout layer safeguards against a heavy reliance on any single weight or feature.

8. **Linear**: This layer applies a linear transformation to the incoming data: \(y = Ax + b\), where weights (denoted as a matrix \(A\)) and biases (denoted as a vector \(b\)) are optimized. Here, the size of the output \(y\) is half of the size of the input \(x\).
9. **ReLu activation**: See above for details.

10. **Linear**: In this last linear layer the size of the output data is designed to be two for the qubit and three for the qutrit classification, corresponding to the possible preparation states.

All optimization in the neural network was performed with the Adam optimizer [25] and a mean squared error (MSE) loss function. The output was classified using a softmax function; for the qutrit case, this results in the mapping of three outputs to one state, $|g\rangle$, $|e\rangle$ or $|f\rangle$.

### C. Training

Generation of the labelled data required for model training involved preparing the transmon in each of the three states, probing with a measurement signal and recording the output. For each training cycle, we record 2048 traces of each state, and pass these through the model. The loss was calculated and gradient descent was undertaken at a learning rate of $10^{-3}$. This cycle takes $\sim 3$ seconds.

We trained the model on new data at every training cycle, acquired in real-time from the sample in the dilution refrigerator. This framework provides an intrinsic protection from overfitting: since there is a new dataset each time the loss is calculated, the model cannot learn on any spurious signal features localised to a single dataset. The low learning rate assists in helping the model to learn patterns that are common to data across training cycles, thereby increasing model stability.

### D. Testing

After each update of the model weights, a further 2048 acquisitions were made to test the model. The loss and assignment fidelity on test data were stored for monitoring. Fig. 4 shows the model learning over 100 training cycles.

### V. RESULTS

To investigate robustness of the CNN classification model against system parameter drifts, we performed continuous measurements over 24 hours and monitored the fidelity values as shown in Fig. 5. Each plot shows three fidelity values obtained from the same data but using different data processing techniques. First, we evaluated the fidelities obtained from the integrated responses as described in Sec. II C, where the mean responses for $|g\rangle$, $|e\rangle$ and $|f\rangle$ states are calibrated only once prior to the experiment “Cal-Baseline”). Second, we obtained the fidelity using the mean responses re-calibrated every 2048 repeated measurements (“Cal-Baseline”). Finally, we plot the fidelity obtained by the on-fly-processing with CNN model (“CNN”) as described in Sec. IV.

To acquire additional insight into behaviours of our CNN model we show two separate plots corresponding to different training regimes. Each of these scenarios are described in more detail below:

- **Retrain model** The model is trained for an initial 100 training cycles. The fidelity is then repeatedly tested for $\sim 1$ to 3.5 hours, before training the model again for another 20 training cycles. This retraining process is akin to recalibration in the “Cal-Baseline” measurement. This model performs better than both the “Baseline” and “Cal-Baseline” measurements, despite the frequency of recalibration being significantly lower than its “Cal-Baseline” counterpart.

- **No Retraining** This model is never retrained after the initial 100 training cycles. It also performs better than the Baseline throughout the 24 hours, but loses its enhanced fidelity after a few hours.

#### A. Global phase robustness

In contrast to retraining a CNN model at set time intervals to combat system parameter drifts, we also demonstrate the ability to generate a static CNN model robust to parameter drift by training and evaluating in an experimental configuration with induced phase shift as described in Sec. III B. The design of the neural network remains identical for this experiment, aside from using a kernel size of 10 in the first convolutional layer, exhibiting its versatility. Assignment fidelities are evaluated at 500 intervals with phase shifts ranging from 0
FIG. 5. Fidelity of different classification methods. Each point represents a fidelity evaluation using 2048 traces for each of the three states gathered on the fly, while each plot represents a different training regime. The black dashed lines indicate when the model was retrained. The retrain CNN model consistently does better than the cal-baseline measurement, even though it is only trained at discrete intervals. The no retraining model generally has a better fidelity than the baseline, but not always, due to parameter drifts. The 5 retraining and 10 retraining models are the same models as the retrain model, frozen to prevent further training at their respective number of retraining. The black arrows show which frozen model is used.

to $2\pi$ over the course of 9 minutes in Fig. 6, using both the baseline mean integration and CNN processing methods (trained/calibrated using data gathered immediately prior).

The CNN model classifies readout signals at a qutrit fidelity of $(77.9 \pm 2.5)\%$, with uncertainty representing the standard deviation over global phase. This is comparable to the baseline state classification with no phase drift calibrated prior to the experiment $(79.4 \pm 1.7)\%$, but any non-trivial phase drift will degrade the conventional approach markedly while the robust model maintains accuracy without any recalibration required.

FIG. 6. Assignment fidelities of the baseline mean calibration method and a phase-robust CNN model classifying data with an induced phase drift. Each point represents a fidelity evaluation using 2048 traces for each of the three states. The phase-robust CNN model displays considerably better performance than the baseline method in general, and comparable performance at zero phase shift (where the baseline was calibrated). Neither method undergoes any retraining or recalibration over the course of the experiment.

VI. CONCLUSION

In this work, we have investigated a set of machine learning methods for the two and three state classification of a transmon with the dispersive measurement. All ML methods trialled achieved higher assignment fidelities than the conventional method of readout signal time-integration and subsequent threshold calibration. Convolutional neural network methods demonstrated the highest performance consistent with the results from [20]. In particular, CNN methods were not only performant in the detection of relaxation events during measurement, but could also be trained against experimental imperfections such as the local oscillator phase drift.

The open-source library PyTorch facilitated the implementation of on-the-fly CNN data processing on a GPU. Due to batch processing this method is not readily suitable for quantum feedback but reduces data transfer to a hard drive and allowed us to investigate the performance of the CNN method in real time.

We found that after sufficient training, the assignment fidelity is able to maintain its value for a few hours. After this time, retraining is required to prevent a drop in assignment fidelity. We also found that retraining takes substantially less time than the initial training, and training on new measurement data taken during these few hours reduces overfitting of the model.

Improved assignment fidelity and ability to directly train the model against system imperfections are the key advantages for performing this readout signal processing using neural networks. The open-source, GPU-friendly, and easily implementable nature of PyTorch makes these neural networks an attractive tool for state classification.
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