

# When can a local Hamiltonian be recovered from a steady state?

Jing Zhou

*Institute of Physics, Beijing National Laboratory for Condensed Matter Physics,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China and  
School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China*

D. L. Zhou\*

*Institute of Physics, Beijing National Laboratory for Condensed Matter Physics,  
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China  
School of Physical Sciences, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China  
Collaborative Innovation Center of Quantum Matter, Beijing 100190, China and  
Songshan Lake Materials Laboratory, Dongguan, Guangdong 523808, China  
(Dated: December 20, 2021)*

With the development of quantum many-body simulator, Hamiltonian tomography has become an increasingly important technique for verification of quantum devices. Here we investigate recovering the Hamiltonians of two spin chains with 2-local interactions and 3-local interactions by measuring local observables. For these two models, we show that when the chain length reaches a certain critical number, we can recover the local Hamiltonian from its one steady state by solving the homogeneous operator equation (HOE) developed in Ref. [1]. To explain the existence of such a critical chain length, we develop an alternative method to recover Hamiltonian by solving the energy eigenvalue equations (EEE). By using the EEE method, we completely recovered the numerical results from the HOE method. Then we theoretically prove the equivalence between the HOE method and the EEE method. In particular, we obtain the analytical expression of the rank of the constraint matrix in the HOE method by using the EEE method, which can be used to determine the correct critical chain length in all the cases.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In quantum mechanics, all the information on a quantum system is contained in its Hamiltonian [2, 3]. For example, all the energy eigenvalues and eigenstates can be obtained by solving the eigenvalue problem of the Hamiltonian. For a condensed matter system, however, its (effective) Hamiltonian is unknown when prepared. Then it is crucial to determine the Hamiltonian by making some quantum measurements, which is called Hamiltonian tomography [4–6]. In a Hamiltonian tomography, the quantum measurements made must provide sufficient information such that the Hamiltonian can be specified uniquely. For a generic Hamiltonian, a successful Hamiltonian tomography needs the information on all the energy eigenvalues and eigenstates. This implies that the number of independent quantum measurements increases exponentially with the number of particles in a Hamiltonian tomography.

Fortunately, the Hamiltonian of a physically realizable system is usually not generic but local, which means that interactions arise only between (or among) local particles [7, 8]. This information on the local interaction pattern of the Hamiltonian is extremely useful to reduce the necessary information from the quantum measurements in a Hamiltonian tomography. For example, it has been shown that the local Hamiltonian can be reconstructed uniquely by the information on one eigenstate when the

particle number becomes large in most cases [9, 10].

One of the major challenges in Hamiltonian tomography is to develop an algorithm to recover the Hamiltonian from numbers of measurements which is in accord with demands of resource limitation with high accuracy [11]. The measurement resource in the state-of-the-art algorithm for recovering a generic local Hamiltonian scales polynomial to the system size [12, 13]. Many algorithms have been proposed to recover the Hamiltonian by making quantum measurements on its eigenstate [1, 14–18], dynamics [19–22] and quantum quench process [23]. Several algorithms have been employed to successfully recover some local Hamiltonians with a specific pattern [24–26].

Recent years have witnessed the rapid development of quantum simulators and computation devices, such as controlling trapped ions [27–30] and superconducting circuits [31, 32]. To verify the above devices, it's necessary to recover its Hamiltonian from the measured observables, which makes the Hamiltonian tomography become increasingly important in condensed matter physics and quantum computing. Given the practical value of Hamiltonian tomography and significant development of numerical methods of this task, several Hamiltonian tomography algorithms have been implemented on real physical systems [33–35].

However, there is still a fundamental problem in Hamiltonian tomography that does not have a satisfactory answer: When can a local Hamiltonian be uniquely recovered from a steady state? Note that this problem have been solved partially. For example, the authors in Ref. [1] found that when the rank of the constraint matrix equals

---

\* zhoujl72@iphy.ac.cn

to the number of independent parameters minus one, the Hamiltonian can be uniquely recovered. However, we do not know what factors determine the rank of the constraint matrix for a given local Hamiltonian. Here we aim to present an analytical answer to this fundamental problem. Based on our analytical results, in particular, we can predict the critical chain length for any local Hamiltonian, i.e., the Hamiltonian with the chain length beyond which can be uniquely recovered.

The paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, after reviewing the HOE method derived from a steady state [1], we implement the HOE to reconstruct two local Hamiltonians in a spin chain from a steady state, where we find that HOE fails to recover Hamiltonian when the chain length is smaller than the critical chain length. In Sec. III, we develop the EEE method to give the analytical expressions for the critical chain lengths for any local Hamiltonian tomography. Sec. III contains three subsections. In Sec. III A, we employ the EEE method to recover the same two local Hamiltonians as studied in Sec. II. In Sec. III B, we prove the equivalence of the HOE and EEE in a Hamiltonian tomography. In Sec. III C, we determine when the local Hamiltonian can be recovered from a steady state. In Sec. IV, we give a brief summary.

## II. RECONSTRUCTING HAMILTONIAN BY HOMOGENEOUS OPERATOR EQUATIONS

In this section, we review and apply the method developed in Ref. [1] to solve the Hamiltonian tomography problem whose goal is to recover the Hamiltonian of a quantum system by measuring some observables when the system stays in a steady state. According to quantum mechanics, the steady state may be an eigenstate of the Hamiltonian, or a mixed state of several such eigenstates.

In general, the Hamiltonian to be recovered is decomposed as the sum

$$H = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n h_n, \quad (1)$$

where each  $h_n$  is a known Hermitian operator,  $a_n$  is an unknown real parameter and  $N$  is the number of terms in the Hamiltonian. The task of the Hamiltonian tomography is to determine the vector  $\vec{a} = (a_1, a_2, \dots, a_N)$ , which is formed by all the unknown parameters in the Hamiltonian. Suppose that our system stays in the steady state  $\rho$ . Thus the expectation value of any observable  $K$  is invariant under the quantum dynamic evolution, which is expressed in the Heisenberg picture as

$$\partial_t \langle K \rangle = -\langle i[K, H] \rangle = 0, \quad (2)$$

where  $\langle O \rangle = \text{Tr}[O\rho]$  denotes the expectation value of the observable  $O$  in the steady state  $\rho$ . Inserting Eq. (1) into Eq. (2), we conclude a homogeneous linear equation for

the vector  $\vec{a}$ ,

$$\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \langle i[K, h_n] \rangle = 0. \quad (3)$$

Since Eq. (3) works for any observable  $K$ , we can choose a set of observables  $\{K_m\}_{m=1}^M$  and obtain  $M$  linear constraints on the vector  $\vec{a}$

$$\forall m : \sum_{n=1}^N a_n \langle i[K_m, h_n] \rangle = 0, \quad (4)$$

which can be briefly written in the matrix form as

$$G\vec{a} = 0, \quad G_{mn} = \langle i[K_m, h_n] \rangle. \quad (5)$$

Eqs. (4) or Eqs. (5) are called the linear homogeneous operator equations (HOE), which are the basic equations to recover the Hamiltonian developed in Ref. [1].

The degree of freedom of the vector  $\vec{a}$  satisfying Eqs. (5) is determined by the rank of the constraint matrix  $G$ , denoted as  $\text{Rank } G = r$ . In the Hamiltonian tomography, we assume that there always exists a nonzero solution of  $\vec{a}_{\text{true}}$ , which implies that the rank  $r < N$ . The rank of  $G$  larger, the solutions of  $\vec{a}$  more determined. However, even when the rank of  $G$  arrives at its maximum  $r = N - 1$ , there still are an infinite number of solutions in the form of  $\alpha \vec{a}_{\text{true}}$  with  $\alpha$  being any real number. To remove the trivial ambiguity of the solutions, we reconstruct the task into a convex optimization with constraint

$$\min_{\vec{a}} \|\vec{a}\|, \quad \text{s.t. } \|\vec{a}\| = 1. \quad (6)$$

The solution to Eq. (6) is the lowest right-singular vector of the constraint matrix  $G$ , i.e., the row vector of  $V^T$  that corresponds to the lowest singular value of  $G$  in the singular value decomposition  $G = U\Sigma V^T$ . The error of the reconstructing task is defined as the distance between the normalized true vector  $\vec{a}_{\text{true}}$  and the recovered vector  $\vec{a}_{\text{recovered}}$

$$\Delta = \left\| \frac{\vec{a}_{\text{true}}}{\|\vec{a}_{\text{true}}\|} - \frac{\vec{a}_{\text{recovered}}}{\|\vec{a}_{\text{recovered}}\|} \right\|. \quad (7)$$

In Ref. [1], the HOE method has been applied to recover the local Hamiltonian from local measurements. More precisely, the local Hamiltonians of 6 middle qubits in a one-dimensional 12-qubit chain with random two-local interactions are successfully recovered by measuring the middle qubits.

Here, we apply the HOE to study how to recover the local Hamiltonian from one single steady state. For comparison, we study recovering the Hamiltonians of two forms of spin 1/2 chain. The first spin chain consists of local terms and nearest-neighbor interactions, whose Hamiltonian

$$H_2 = \sum_{l=1}^L \sum_{\eta} a_{l\eta} \sigma_l^{\eta} + \sum_{l=1}^{L-1} \sum_{\eta} \sum_{\theta} a_{l\eta\theta} \sigma_l^{\eta} \sigma_{l+1}^{\theta}, \quad (8)$$

		q=1		q=2		q=3	
L	N	r	$\delta$	r	$\delta$	r	$\delta$
2	15	6	8	10	4	12	2
3	27	14	12	26	0	26	0
4	39	30	8	38	0	38	0
5	51	50	0	51	0	51	0
6	63	62	0	62	0	62	0
7	75	74	0	74	0	74	0
8	87	86	0	86	0	86	0
9	99	98	0	98	0	98	0

TABLE I. Reconstructing  $H_2$  by means of HOE from steady state.  $N$ ,  $r$  and  $(N-1)-r$  with  $q=1, 2, 3$  as the function of  $L$ .

		q=1		q=2		q=3	
L	N	r	$\delta$	r	$\delta$	r	$\delta$
3	63	14	48	26	36	36	26
4	111	30	80	58	52	84	26
5	159	62	96	122	36	158	0
6	207	126	80	206	0	206	0
7	255	254	0	254	0	254	0
8	303	302	0	302	0	302	0
9	351	350	0	350	0	350	0

TABLE II. Reconstructing  $H_3$  by means of HOE from steady state.  $N$ ,  $r$  and  $\delta$  with  $q=1, 2, 3$  as the function of  $L$

where  $L$  is the spin chain length,  $\eta$  and  $\theta$  take values in the set  $\{x, y, z\}$ ,  $\sigma_l^\eta$  is the  $\eta$  component of the Pauli matrix of the  $l$ -th spin, and all  $a_{l\eta}$  and  $a_{l\eta\theta}$  are the unknown parameters to be recovered.

The second spin chain consists all three-neighbor interactions besides the terms appearing in the Hamiltonian  $H_2$ , i.e., its Hamiltonian


$$H_3 = H_2 + \sum_{l=1}^{L-2} \sum_{\eta} \sum_{\theta} \sum_{\delta} a_{l\eta\theta\delta} \sigma_l^\eta \sigma_{l+1}^\theta \sigma_{l+2}^\delta. \quad (9)$$

The state prepared to be measured is the mixed state which is a mixture of  $q$  eigenstates of  $H$ , the Hamiltonian to be recovered.


The corresponding single steady state is assumed to be

$$\rho = \sum_{j=1}^q p_\mu |\lambda_\mu\rangle \langle \lambda_\mu|, \quad (10)$$

where  $|\lambda_\mu\rangle$  is the  $\mu$ -th eigen state of the Hamiltonian ( $H_2$  or  $H_3$ ) with nonzero probability  $p_\mu$ , and  $q$  is the rank of the state  $\rho$ . Intuitively, the Hamiltonian  $H_3$  contains more unknown parameters than the Hamiltonian  $H_2$ , and we expect that  $H_3$  is more difficult to be recovered from the information in a steady state.



(a)



(b)

FIG. 1. We reconstruct (a)  $H_2$  and (b)  $H_3$  by means of HOE from steady state. Simulations are executed over 200 random Hamiltonians with three different states for each chain length  $L$ . The squares, circles and triangles represent states of  $q=1, 2$  and  $3$ , respectively.

Now we apply the HOE method reviewed in Sec. II to recover the above Hamiltonians, whose procedure is given as follows. First, for each given chain length  $L$  we prepare the Hamiltonians to be recovered by generating 200 random vectors  $\{\vec{a}_{\text{true}}\}$  of the Gaussian distribution with zero mean and unit standard deviation. Second, for each random vector  $\vec{a}_{\text{true}}$  we numerically calculate the eigenstates of the prepared Hamiltonian and construct three mixed states  $\rho$  with  $q=1, 2, 3$  as given in Eq. (10). Third, we choose the terms  $\{h_i\}_{i=1}^N$  in the prepared Hamiltonian as the observables  $\{K_m\}$ , and calculate the constraint matrix  $G$ . Note that such a choice makes the number of equations equal to the number of unknown parameters in the prepared Hamiltonian. Fourth, we calculate the recovered vector  $\vec{a}_{\text{recovered}}$  by the singular decomposition of  $G$ , along with the error as given in Eq. (7).

Following the above HOE procedure, we numerically obtain the reconstructing errors of the Hamiltonians  $H_2$  and  $H_3$  from mixed states  $\rho$  with the chain length  $L$  from 1 to 9 shown in Fig. 1. We find that the HOE method

successfully recovers the Hamiltonian  $H_2$  when  $L \geq L_c$  where (1)  $L_c = 5$  when  $q = 1$  (2)  $L_c = 3$  when  $q = 2$  (3)  $L_c = 3$  when  $q = 3$ , and it successfully recovers the Hamiltonian  $H_3$  when  $L \geq L_c$  (1)  $L_c = 7$  when  $q = 1$  (2)  $L_c = 6$  when  $q = 2$  (3)  $L_c = 5$  when  $q = 3$ . Here the reconstructing error  $\Delta \simeq 1$  implies the failure of the HOE method, and  $\Delta < 10^{-6}$  implies the success of the HOE method.

Note that for a given type of Hamiltonians, the more eigenstates are contained in mixed state  $\rho$ , i.e.,  $q$  is larger, the more Hamiltonians can be uniquely recovered. In addition, it is easier to recover  $H_2$  than to recover  $H_3$  from a steady state with the same  $q$ .

As discussed in Sec. II, the condition for the Hamiltonian to be successfully recovered by the HOE method is  $\delta = N - (r + 1) = 0$ , where  $N$  is the number of unknown parameters in the Hamiltonian, and  $r$  is the rank of the constraint matrix  $G$ . Here we numerically verify that  $\delta = 0$  only when  $L \geq L_c$  for the Hamiltonian  $H_2$  and  $H_3$ , which are shown in Table. I and Table. II respectively. In fact, the number of unknown parameters in the Hamiltonians can be directly counted. For the Hamiltonian  $H_2$ ,  $N = 12L - 9$ ; for the Hamiltonian  $H_3$ ,  $N = 39L - 63$ . From the numerical results, we observe that  $r$  depends not only on the Hamiltonian (including the length  $L$ ) but also on the rank  $q$  of the steady state. However, we have no idea of how to directly determine the analytical relation between  $r$  and the variables  $L$  and  $q$  for a given Hamiltonian from the HOE method.

### III. DETERMINING RANK OF CONSTRAINT MATRIX WITH ENERGY EIGENVALUE EQUATIONS

To determine the value of Rank  $G$ , it is instructive to study the energy eigenvalue equations (EEE). In this section, we first apply EEE to recover Hamiltonians  $H_2$  and  $H_3$  from the mixed state with different rank. Then, we prove the equivalence of HOE and EEE. Finally, we determine the value of Rank  $G$  using the characteristics of EEE.

#### A. Reconstructing Hamiltonians by Energy Eigenvalue Equation

When our system stays in the steady state  $\rho$  in Eq. (10), the most complete information about the state  $\rho$  can be obtained through quantum tomography. In general, we assume the spectrum of  $\rho$  is not degenerate. Then we can explicitly obtain every eigenstate  $|\lambda_\mu\rangle$  and its probability  $p_\mu$ . Since generally the probability  $p_\mu$  contains no information of the Hamiltonian, all the information of the Hamiltonian is contained in the eigenstates  $\{|\lambda_\mu\rangle\}$ . Based on this consideration, we develop the following approach to recover the Hamiltonian directly based on the energy eigenvalue equation, which is

briefly called the EEE approach.

The energy eigenvalue equation of local Hamiltonian  $H = \sum_{n=1}^N a_n h_n$  can be written as

$$\sum_{n=1}^N a_n h_n |\lambda_\mu\rangle = \lambda_\mu |\lambda_\mu\rangle, \quad (11)$$

where  $|\lambda_\mu\rangle$  is the eigenstate with eigenvalue  $\lambda_\mu$  appearing in Eq. (10). In a specific basis  $\{|i\rangle\}$  Eq. (11) becomes

$$\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \langle i | h_n | \lambda_\mu \rangle = \lambda_\mu \langle i | \lambda_\mu \rangle. \quad (12)$$

Splitting Eq. (12) into the real and the imaginary part

$$\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \Re \langle i | h_n | \lambda_\mu \rangle - \lambda_\mu \Re \langle i | \lambda_\mu \rangle = 0, \quad (13a)$$

$$\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \Im \langle i | h_n | \lambda_\mu \rangle - \lambda_\mu \Im \langle i | \lambda_\mu \rangle = 0, \quad (13b)$$

where  $\Re z$  and  $\Im z$  denotes the real and the imaginary part of complex number  $z$  respectively. Denoting  $L$  as the chain length, we can get  $q \cdot 2^{L+1}$  homogeneous linear equations with the unknowns  $\vec{x} = (a_1, \dots, a_N, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q)$ , which can be written in the matrix form as

$$Q \vec{x} = 0, \quad (14)$$

where the constraint matrix  $Q$  is a  $q \cdot 2^{L+1} \times (N + q)$  matrix:

$$Q = \begin{pmatrix} \Re A_1 & \Re B_1 \\ \Im A_1 & \Im B_1 \\ \Re A_2 & \Re B_2 \\ \Im A_2 & \Im B_2 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ \Re A_q & \Re B_q \\ \Im A_q & \Im B_q \end{pmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

with  $A_\mu$  being a  $2^L \times N$  matrix:

$$A_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} \langle 1 | h_1 | \lambda_\mu \rangle & \cdots & \langle 1 | h_N | \lambda_\mu \rangle \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \langle 2^L | h_1 | \lambda_\mu \rangle & \cdots & \langle 2^L | h_N | \lambda_\mu \rangle \end{pmatrix} \quad (16)$$

and  $B_\mu$  being a  $2^L \times q$  matrix with nonzero elements in its  $\mu$ -th column:

$$B_\mu = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \cdots & 0 & -\langle 1 | \lambda_\mu \rangle & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 & \cdots & 0 & -\langle 2^L | \lambda_\mu \rangle & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (17)$$

Here Eq. (14) plays the same role as Eq. (5) in the HOE method. Similarly, we can solve the parameter vector  $\vec{a}$  by the following constraint optimization problem

$$\min_{\vec{a}} \|Q \vec{x}\|, \text{ s.t. } \|\vec{a}\| = 1. \quad (18)$$

The degree of freedom of the vector  $\vec{x}$  is determined by rank of constraint matrix  $Q$ , which is denoted as  $\text{Rank } Q = r'$ . The number of unknowns of linear equations Eq. (14) is represented as  $N' = N + q$ .

The procedure to apply the EEE to recover the local Hamiltonians is given as follows. First, for each given chain length  $L$  we prepare the Hamiltonians to be recovered by generating 200 random vectors  $\{\vec{a}_{\text{true}}\}$  of the Gaussian distribution with zero mean and unit standard deviation. Second, for each random vector  $\vec{a}_{\text{true}}$  we numerically calculate the eigenstates of the prepared Hamiltonian and construct three mixed states  $\rho$  with  $q = 1, 2, 3$  as given in Eq. (10). Third, we extract the eigenstates by eigendecomposition of density matrix  $\rho$ . Then we construct constraint matrix  $Q$  by Eq. (15) and calculate the  $\text{Rank } Q$ . Fourth, we solve the Eq. (18) using the least-squares method by NumPy function `numpy.linalg.lstsq` and calculate the reconstructing errors.





FIG. 2. We reconstruct (a)  $H_2$  and (b)  $H_3$  by means of EEE from steady state. Simulations are executed over 200 random Hamiltonians with three different states for each chain length  $L$ . The squares, circles and triangles represent states of  $q=1, 2$  and 3, respectively.

Following the above EEE procedure, we obtain the reconstructing errors of the Hamiltonians  $H_2$  and  $H_3$  from

	q=1			q=2			q=3		
$L$	$N'$	$r'$	$\delta'$	$N'$	$r'$	$\delta'$	$N'$	$r'$	$\delta'$
2	16	7	8	17	12	4	18	15	2
3	28	15	12	29	28	0	30	29	0
4	40	31	8	41	40	0	42	41	0
5	52	51	0	53	52	0	54	53	0
6	64	63	0	65	64	0	66	65	0
7	76	75	0	77	76	0	78	77	0
8	88	87	0	89	88	0	90	89	0
9	100	99	0	101	100	0	102	101	0

TABLE III. Reconstructing  $H_2$  by means of EEE from steady state.  $N'$ ,  $r'$  and  $\delta'$  with  $q = 1, 2, 3$  as the function of  $L$ .

	q=1			q=2			q=3		
$L$	$N'$	$r'$	$\delta'$	$N'$	$r'$	$\delta'$	$N'$	$r'$	$\delta'$
3	64	15	48	65	28	36	66	39	26
4	112	31	80	113	60	52	114	87	26
5	160	63	96	161	124	36	162	161	0
6	208	127	80	209	208	0	210	209	0
7	256	255	0	257	256	0	258	257	0
8	304	303	0	305	304	0	306	305	0
9	352	351	0	353	352	0	354	353	0

TABLE IV. Reconstructing  $H_3$  by means of EEE from steady state.  $N'$ ,  $r'$  and  $\delta'$  with  $q = 1, 2, 3$  as the functions of  $L$  and  $q$ .

mixed states with chain length  $L$  from 1 to 9 shown in Fig. 2. We present the accurate value of number of unknowns  $N'$ , Rank  $Q$  and difference  $\delta' = N' - (r' + 1)$  as the function of  $L$  with  $q = 1, 2, 3$  for  $H_2$  and  $H_3$  in Table. III and Table. IV, respectively. For all the cases with the same  $N$  and  $q$ , we observe that

$$\delta' = \delta, \quad (19)$$

$$r' = r + q. \quad (20)$$

Eq. (19) implies that the EEE method and the HOE method has the same power to recover the Hamiltonians in all the cases, which are numerically verified by the results shown in Fig. 1 and Fig. 2. Eq. (20) show that the rank of  $G$  can be obtained by calculating the rank of  $Q$ .

Up to now, we tackled the Hamiltonian tomography problem of  $H_2$  and  $H_3$  by both HOE and EEE methods. It turns out that the Local Hamiltonians space that HOE and EEE can successfully recover contains the area that satisfies  $\delta = \delta' = 0$ . In other words, it gives the same critical chain length  $L_c$  in all the cases. Here, we emphasize that, in the HOE procedure, when all the Hamiltonian terms are used as observables  $\{K_m\}$ , adding new observables to matrix  $G$  will not increase the value of  $\text{Rank } G$ . Subsequently,  $r$  in Table. I and Table. II is the



maximum value of Rank  $G$  to the corresponding type of Hamiltonians. We can infer that the number of linearly independent functions in HOE can be no more than the number of independent functions in EEE.

### B. Equivalence between HOE and EEE

In this subsection, we prove the equivalence of HOE and EEE.

We first derive the HOE from the EEE.

In the EEE method, the complex conjugation of Eq. (12) gives

$$\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \langle \lambda_\mu | h_n | j \rangle = \lambda_\mu \langle \lambda_\mu | j \rangle, \quad (21)$$

where  $|j\rangle$  is any basis vector. Combining Eq. (12) and Eq. (21), for any two basis vectors  $|i\rangle$  and  $|j\rangle$  we obtain

$$\langle \lambda_\mu | [[j]\langle i |, H] | \lambda_\mu \rangle = 0, \quad (22)$$

which immediately leads to the basic equations of the HOE:

$$\sum_{n=1}^N a_n \langle i | K_m | h_n \rangle = \sum_{\mu, j, i} i p_\mu \langle j | K_m | i \rangle \langle \lambda_\mu | [[j]\langle i |, H] | \lambda_\mu \rangle = 0, \quad (23)$$

where  $K_m$  is any linear operator on the Hilbert space.

Now we derive the EEE from the HOE.

We start from the basic equations of the HOE, Eq. (23). Because  $K_m$  is an arbitrary operator, we can always make the coefficients  $p_\mu \langle j | K_m | i \rangle$  linear independent when  $\{p_\mu, \mu = 1, 2, \dots, q\}$  are non-degenerate. Thus we obtain Eq. (22) from Eq. (23). Note that Eq. (22) can be written as

$$\text{Tr}(|j\rangle\langle i| [H, |\lambda_\mu\rangle\langle\lambda_\mu|]) = 0. \quad (24)$$

Because  $\{|j\rangle\langle i|\}$  constructs a basis of the operator space, Eq. (24) gives

$$[H, |\lambda_\mu\rangle\langle\lambda_\mu|] = 0, \quad (25)$$

which implies that  $|\lambda_\mu\rangle$  is an eigenstate of  $H$ , i.e., that it satisfies the eigenvalue equation (11). This completes our proof of the equivalence of the HOE and the EEE.

Consequently, Eq. (19) and Eq. (20) directly follow from the above equivalence.

### C. Determining the Rank of Constraint Matrix

We are now in a position to determine Rank  $G$  from Rank  $Q$  by Eq. (20). As mentioned above, the matrix  $Q$  satisfies Eq. (14), which contains  $q \cdot 2^{L+1}$  homogeneous linear equations with the unknowns  $\vec{x} = (a_1, \dots, a_N, \lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_q)$ . However, Eq. (12) gives

$$\sum_n a_n \langle \lambda_\nu | h_n | \lambda_\mu \rangle = \lambda_\mu \delta_{\mu\nu}, \quad \mu, \nu = 1, \dots, q \quad (26)$$

Since  $\langle \lambda_\nu | h_n | \lambda_\mu \rangle$  is complex in general, the above equations gives  $2q^2$  real constraint linear equations. Because every  $h_n$  is Hermitian, Eq. (26) implies

$$\sum_n a_n \langle \lambda_\mu | h_n | \lambda_\nu \rangle = \lambda_\mu \delta_{\mu\nu}, \quad \mu, \nu = 1, \dots, q \quad (27)$$

Then there are  $q^2$  constraint independent homogeneous linear equations with the unknowns  $\vec{x}$  in Eq. (26). Thus there are at most  $q \cdot 2^{L+1} - q^2$  independent linear equations in Eq. (14), i.e.,  $r' \leq q \cdot 2^{L+1} - q^2$ . In addition, because there are always nonzero solutions of Eq. (14), which implies that  $r' \leq N + q - 1$ . Therefore, we obtain

$$r' = \min\{q \cdot 2^{L+1} - q^2, N + q - 1\}. \quad (28)$$

By using Eq. (20), we arrives at

$$r = \min\{q \cdot 2^{L+1} - q^2 - q, N - 1\}. \quad (29)$$

The above analytical expressions of the rank of  $G$  in Eq. (29) and the rank of  $Q$  in Eq. (28) are numerically verified in Tables I, II, III, IV.

The critical chain length is denoted as  $L_c$ . When chain length  $L \geq L_c$ , we can uniquely recover the corresponding Hamiltonian. Now, we determine the  $L_c$  from Eq. (29). To uniquely recover the Hamiltonian, Rank  $G$  should equal to the number of unknowns minus 1, which leads to

$$q \cdot 2^{L+1} - q^2 - q \geq N - 1. \quad (30)$$

For the 2-local Hamiltonian  $H_2$ ,  $N = 12L - 9$ . From Eq. (30), the critical chain length

$$L_c(H_2, \rho) = \min_L q \cdot 2^{L+1} - q^2 - q \geq 12L - 10, \quad (31)$$

where  $L \geq 2$  and  $1 \leq q \leq 2^L$ .

Similarly, for the 3-local Hamiltonian  $H_3$ ,  $N = 39L - 63$ . From Eq. (30), the critical chain length

$$L_c(H_3, \rho) = \min_L q \cdot 2^{L+1} - q^2 - q \geq 39L - 64, \quad (32)$$

where  $L \geq 3$  and  $1 \leq q \leq 2^L$ .

We point out that our method not only works for local Hamiltonians  $H_2$  and  $H_3$ , it can also be used to predict  $L_c$  for any one-dimensional spin 1/2 chain with local Hamiltonians. To demonstrate its effectiveness, we calculate the  $L_c$  of  $H'_2$ , which contains the nearest and the next nearest neighbor interaction,

$$H'_2 = H_2 + \sum_{l=1}^{L-2} \sum_{\eta} \sum_{\theta} a_{l\eta\theta} \sigma_l^\eta \sigma_{l+2}^\theta. \quad (33)$$

For the Hamiltonian  $H'_2$ ,  $N = 21L - 27$ . The critical chain length can be calculated by

$$L_c(H'_2, \rho) = \min_L q \cdot 2^{L+1} - q^2 - q \geq 21L - 28. \quad (34)$$

The critical chain length for  $H_2$ ,  $H'_2$  and  $H_3$  with  $q = 1, \dots, 6$  are shown in Table V.

$L_c \backslash q$	1	2	3	4	5	6
$H_2$	5	3	3	3	3	3
$H'_2$	6	4	3	3	3	3
$H_3$	7	6	5	4	4	3

TABLE V. The critical chain length  $L_c$  for  $H_2$ ,  $H'_2$  and  $H_3$  with  $q = 1, \dots, 6$ .

#### IV. CONCLUSION

We revisit the problem of reconstructing a local Hamiltonian when the system stays in a steady state by measuring a collection of observables. Applying the HOE method to the two spin chains with 2-local interactions and 3-local interactions, we numerically find that only when the chain length  $L$  is not less than some critical chain length  $L_c$  can we uniquely recover the corresponding local Hamiltonian. The critical chain length  $L_c$  depends not only on the spin chain model, but also on the rank  $q$  of the steady state.

To explain the underlying mechanism for the existence of the critical chain length  $L_c$ , we observe that when the rank  $r$  of the constraint matrix  $G$  is not less than the number of unknown parameters in the recovered Hamiltonian minus 1, the Hamiltonian can be uniquely recovered. To further determine the rank  $r$ , we develop an alternative method called the EEE method, which is used to recover all the results from the HOE method. Fur-

ther more, we proved the equivalence between the HOE method and the EEE method. Especially, we obtain the analytical expression of the rank  $r$  by using the EEE method, which can be used to determine the critical chain length  $L_c$  analytically.

Our work studies the condition for a local Hamiltonian can be recovered from its one steady state. For the two spin chain models with 2-local interactions and 3-local interactions, we show the Hamiltonians can be reconstructed uniquely only when the chain length is not less than the critical chain length. Furthermore, our quantitative method Eq. (30) for determining the critical chain length  $L_c$  can be used on any one-dimensional spin 1/2 chain with local Hamiltonians. In principle, we can extend our analytical result on the critical length to the critical system size for two-dimensional and three-dimensional local Hamiltonians. We hope that our work will shed novel light on the Hamiltonian tomography problem.

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work is supported by NSF of China (Grants No. 11775300 and No. 12075310), the Strategic Priority Research Program of Chinese Academy of Sciences (Grant No. XDB28000000), and the National Key Research and Development Program of China (Grant No. 2016YFA0300603).

- 
- [1] E. Bairey, I. Arad, and N. H. Lindner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 020504 (2019).
  - [2] A. Paramekanti, M. Randeria, and N. Trivedi, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **87**, 217002 (2001).
  - [3] P. Anderson, *Materials Research Bulletin* **8**, 153 (1973).
  - [4] C. Di Franco, M. Paternostro, and M. S. Kim, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **102**, 187203 (2009).
  - [5] J. S. Lundeen, A. Feito, H. Coldenstrodt-Ronge, K. L. Pregnell, C. Silberhorn, T. C. Ralph, J. Eisert, M. B. Plenio, and I. A. Walmsley, *Nature Physics* **5**, 27 (2009).
  - [6] S. G. Schirmer and D. K. L. Oi, *Phys. Rev. A* **80**, 022333 (2009).
  - [7] H. L. Haselgrove, M. A. Nielsen, and T. J. Osborne, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 210401 (2003).
  - [8] A. Molnar, N. Schuch, F. Verstraete, and J. I. Cirac, *Phys. Rev. B* **91**, 045138 (2015).
  - [9] J. R. Garrison and T. Grover, *Phys. Rev. X* **8**, 021026 (2018).
  - [10] X.-L. Qi and D. Ranard, *Quantum* **3**, 159 (2019).
  - [11] A. Anshu, S. Arunachalam, T. Kuwahara, and M. Soleimanifar, *Nature Physics*, 1 (2021).
  - [12] G. Bentsen, I.-D. Potirniche, V. B. Bulchandani, T. Scaffidi, X. Cao, X.-L. Qi, M. Schleier-Smith, and E. Altman, *Phys. Rev. X* **9**, 041011 (2019).
  - [13] A. Zubida, E. Yitzhaki, N. H. Lindner, and E. Bairey, (2021), [arXiv:2108.08824 \[quant-ph\]](https://arxiv.org/abs/2108.08824).
  - [14] S.-Y. Hou, N. Cao, S. Lu, Y. Shen, Y.-T. Poon, and B. Zeng, *New Journal of Physics* **22**, 083088 (2020).
  - [15] C. Cao, S.-Y. Hou, N. Cao, and B. Zeng, *Journal of Physics: Condensed Matter* **33**, 064002 (2020).
  - [16] W. Zhu, Z. Huang, and Y.-C. He, *Phys. Rev. B* **99**, 235109 (2019).
  - [17] X. Turkeshi, T. Mendes-Santos, G. Giudici, and M. Dalmonte, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **122**, 150606 (2019).
  - [18] J. Chen, Z. Ji, B. Zeng, and D. L. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. A* **86**, 022339 (2012).
  - [19] J. Zhang and M. Sarovar, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **113**, 080401 (2014).
  - [20] Y. Wang, D. Dong, B. Qi, J. Zhang, I. R. Petersen, and H. Yonezawa, *IEEE Transactions on Automatic Control* **63**, 1388 (2018).
  - [21] N. Wiebe, C. Granade, C. Ferrie, and D. G. Cory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112**, 190501 (2014).
  - [22] D. Burgarth, K. Maruyama, and F. Nori, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 020305 (2009).
  - [23] Z. Li, L. Zou, and T. H. Hsieh, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **124**, 160502 (2020).
  - [24] E. Bairey, C. Guo, D. Poletti, N. H. Lindner, and I. Arad, *New Journal of Physics* **22**, 032001 (2020).
  - [25] M. Dupont, N. Macé, and N. Laflorencie, *Phys. Rev. B* **100**, 134201 (2019).
  - [26] C. Kokail, R. van Bijnen, A. Elben, B. Vermersch, and

- P. Zoller, *Nature Physics* **17**, 936 (2021).
- [27] R. Blatt and C. Roos, *Nature Physics* **8**, 277 (2011).
  - [28] A. E. Webb, S. C. Webster, S. Collingbourne, D. Braud, A. M. Lawrence, S. Weidt, F. Mintert, and W. K. Hensinger, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **121**, 180501 (2018).
  - [29] C. J. Ballance, T. P. Harty, N. M. Linke, M. A. Sepiol, and D. M. Lucas, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **117**, 060504 (2016).
  - [30] J. I. Cirac and P. Zoller, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **74**, 4091 (1995).
  - [31] R. Barends, J. Kelly, A. Megrant, D. Sank, E. Jeffrey, Y. Chen, Y. Yin, B. Chiaro, J. Mutus, C. Neill, P. O'Malley, P. Roushan, J. Wenner, T. C. White, A. N. Cleland, and J. M. Martinis, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111**, 080502 (2013).
  - [32] R. Barends, J. Kelly, A. Megrant, A. Veitia, D. Sank, E. Jeffrey, T. C. White, J. Mutus, A. G. Fowler, B. Campbell, Y. Chen, Z. Chen, B. Chiaro, A. Dunsworth, C. Neill, P. O'Malley, P. Roushan, A. Vainsencher, J. Wenner, A. N. Korotkov, A. N. Cleland, and J. M. Martinis, *Nature* **508**, 500 (2014).
  - [33] S.-Y. Hou, H. Li, and G.-L. Long, *Science Bulletin* **62**, 863 (2017).
  - [34] X. Chen, Y. Li, Z. Wu, R. Liu, Z. Li, and H. Zhou, *Phys. Rev. A* **103**, 042429 (2021).
  - [35] J. Wang, S. Paesani, R. Santagati, S. Knauer, A. A. Gentile, N. Wiebe, M. Petruzzella, J. O'Brien, J. G. Rarity, and A. Laing, *Nature Physics* **13**, 551 (2017).