Recovering models of open quantum systems from data via polynomial optimization: Towards globally convergent quantum system identification
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Current quantum devices suffer imperfections as a result of fabrication, as well as noise and dissipation as a result of coupling to their immediate environments. Because of this, it is often difficult to obtain accurate models of their dynamics from first principles. An alternative is to extract such models from time-series measurements of their behavior. Here, we formulate this system-identification problem as a polynomial optimization problem. Recent advances in optimization have provided globally convergent solvers for this class of problems, which using our formulation prove estimates of the Kraus map or the Lindblad equation. We include an overview of the state-of-the-art algorithms, bounds, and convergence rates, and illustrate the use of this approach to modeling open quantum systems.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum technologies [1, 2], which rest on the ability to actively control microscopic systems and exploit their unique quantum mechanical features, have the potential for high impact in a number of different fields; from precision sensing [3–5] and communication [6, 7], to encryption [8] and very prominently quantum computing [1, 9, 10]. The extreme sensitivity of quantum effects to their immediate environment, combined with the exquisite control required to exploit these effects, necessitates accurate dynamical modeling. However, fabrication imperfections and the complex nature of the environment often make it impossible to obtain an accurate dynamical description from first principles. Because of this, one must determine a sufficiently accurate model from measurements of the quantum system. In machine learning and control engineering, this task is referred to as system identification [11].

In the quantum technology community, system identification tools are used to better understand, characterize, and benchmark quantum devices, and in certain contexts are referred to as quantum process tomography [1] Chapter 8. More precisely, the goal of quantum process tomography is to reconstruct a description of a quantum process from the measurement outcomes of the expectation values of certain operators, which are sampled uniformly. The measurements fed into the SID algorithms can be obtained in a number of different ways. Most often, they are given as the outputs of quantum state tomography, where one usually prepares or initializes several identical copies of the input quantum states (probe states) \( \rho_0 \), which evolve according to some unknown quantum process \( \mathcal{P} \) which is sampled and results in measuring expectation values \( \langle O_i \rangle \) with respect to a complete set of Hermitian operators \( \{ O_i \} \), see Fig. 1. In this way, one can reconstruct the evolved state which will be used in the quantum system identification algorithms [1].

Several methods have been developed for identifying quantum systems in various contexts [12–23] including approaches based on active learning [24]. These approaches may involve starting the system from a set of initial states and then making measurements at a given final time, with the purpose of determining the linear map from the initial to the final time. Here, we are also interested in obtaining the dynamical equations of motion for the system. Without an interaction with the environment, the quantum evolution is completely captured by the Hamiltonian \( \mathcal{H} \) of the system. When there is an environmental component, the system is referred to as being “open” and the evolution is given by a “master equation” whose form is constrained by the need to conserve the trace and positivity of the density matrix \( \rho \). The first constraint is particularly important since the preservation of the unit trace of the density matrix in particular is important because it implies the probability preservation of the quantum system. However, in numerical integration schemes the requirements for positivity are slightly relaxed, due to the nature of these numerical methods and due to the dissipative nature of open quantum systems.

In the references cited above, mainly closed (Hamiltonian) quantum systems were considered. However, especially in the NISQ era of quantum technologies [23], noise is abundant. In practice, a quantum device is never completely isolated. Thus, one has to identify the open quantum systems [1, 20, 27].

Several methods have been proposed to determine master equations of open quantum systems from time-series data. For example, Zhang and Sarovar drew on the lin-
ear system identification theory to create a method for obtaining parameters of parametrized Hamiltonians and master equations from time-series [28]. McCauley et al. used a linear SID method to obtain minimal models of open systems [29]. The core element of these methods is the singular value decomposition of a matrix constructed from the data.

More recently, Samach et. al. [20] designed a technique for extracting the Hamiltonian, jump operators, and corresponding decay rates in open quantum systems, with the aim of characterizing superconducting qubit platforms. Closely related to the current paper is the work of Xue et. al [21] who proposed a method for obtaining parametrized master equations for open quantum systems based on the following steps: (1) Collect time series measurements \( D_N \) of the evolution of the density matrix \( \rho \) of the system of interest. (2) Define a parametrized model for the system and estimate the evolution. (3) Define a cost function and optimize it taking into account possible constraints. Update the parameters accordingly. (4) If the error satisfies the desired criteria, stop. Otherwise, adjust the model accordingly. The algorithms of both Samach et. al. and Xue et. al. concern open quantum systems with Markovian dynamics, which are described by the master equation in terms of the Lindbladian operator \( \mathcal{L} \) (see Sec. II). In [20], maximum likelihood estimation is used while [21] uses the full exponential of the Lindbladian where after defining a cost function they apply a gradient step, where the gradient is with respect to the parameters of the Hamiltonian. This procedure resembles common machine learning techniques for recovering the dynamics of open quantum systems, e.g. [30].

In this paper, we assume an open quantum system with both arbitrary dissipative dynamics described by Kraus operators and Markovian dynamics described by a Lindbland master equation. We use time series \( D_N \) as obtained, e.g., by quantum state tomography. However, with the aim of being as generic as possible, we chose not to parametrize the Hamiltonian of the system, leaving it arbitrary, as we do with the jump operators. Furthermore, using certain approximations for the evolution operator \( \exp(\mathcal{L} \Delta t) \), where \( \Delta t \) is the chosen time step, we can cast the problem as a polynomial optimization problem, unlike previous approaches [20, 21]. This is particularly important because

1. Formulating the problem as a polynomial optimization problem opens the door to utilizing methods with proven guarantees of global asymptotic convergence.

2. Our numerical illustrations show that even quasi-Newton methods on one of our formulations converged in all \( 1.06 \times 10^5 \) tests carried out.

To appreciate the significance of point (2) above, consider the fact that optimization algorithms based on first-order methods, including the quasi-Newton ones utilized in the numerical illustration of this paper, are heuristic, in the sense that they can diverge or converge to arbitrarily poor solutions, when applied to a non-convex optimization problem without further structure. Therefore, no guarantees about their global convergence can be provided. On the other hand, the semi-algebraic sets we consider in the polynomial optimization problems are tame (definable in o-minimal structure, [31]) by definition. Recent studies [32] have shown certain first-order methods to be well behaved when the graph of the function is tame [32]. This observation may be of independent interest.

To appreciate the significance of point (1) above, note that for a single formulation of the problem, multiple methods without guarantees of global convergence may produce multiple estimates of the open quantum system, especially when starting from multiple initial solutions. This has an impact on any subsequent uses of the estimates. Consider, for example, the uses of the estimates in quantum optimal control [33, 34]. An imprecise estimate of the open quantum system may lead to poor quality control signals, which in turn lead to low-fidelity 2-qubit gates [35] or poor outcomes in the laser control [36] of chemical reactions. In contrast, the guarantees of global asymptotic convergence for the optimization over semi-algebraic sets make it possible to obtain the best possible estimates.

**Notation**

The imaginary unit is denoted as \( i := \sqrt{-1} \) while \( i \) is reserved for the sample indexing of the measurement time series \( D_N \). We denote by \( \|A\|_F := \sqrt{\text{Tr}(A^A)} \) the Frobenius norm of a matrix \( A \), while by \( A \) we denote the estimate of \( A \).
II. SET UP

Most often, one considers a quantum system of interest composed of smaller subsystems. In general, the evolution of this combined dissipative quantum system, in state $\rho$, is described by a process $\mathcal{P}: \rho(0) \to \rho(t)$ formulated in terms of the CPTP Kraus map operator sum representation [1]

$$\rho(t) = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} E_k \rho(0) E_k^\dagger.$$  \hspace{1cm} (1)

The operators $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^{\ell}$ are called Kraus operators and satisfy the completeness relation $\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} E_k^\dagger E_k = 1$ with $\ell \leq n^2 - 1$. The process responsible for Eq. (1) is linear, preserves the trace and hermiticity, and corresponds to a positive map. Additionally, the super-operator $\mathcal{P}$, also known as the process, can be considered as the carrier of noise due to the exchange of energy with the bath surrounding the quantum system of interest. For the reasons described in Sec. [1] we are interested in algorithmic procedures that identify such processes $\mathcal{P}$.

A natural question to ask is whether $\mathcal{P}$ is identifiable in the first place. This question motivated Wang et al. to define the notion of quantum identifiability [19] using similarity transformations. However, this work focuses on the case of continuous evolution. Practically, and as will be described in the following, one can only work in the discrete domain, that is, to consider the discrete-time stroboscopic evolution of the open quantum system. The notion of identifiability for this case is defined and analyzed in [37].

Assuming that discrete quantum identifiability holds, one can attempt to perform system identification of $\mathcal{P}$ for open quantum systems by finding a set of Kraus operators $\{E_k\}_{k=1}^{\ell}$ modeling the dynamics of open quantum systems, that is, they describe the evolution of the initial state $\rho$ in the data $D_N$. Here, $E_k$ denote the search variables that estimate $E_k$. Specifically, using state reconstruction techniques, such as quantum state tomography, one can obtain empirical estimates of the state of the total system at time $t$. When uniformly sampling the process $\mathcal{P}$ a total $N$ times such that $t = N \Delta t$, one obtains a time series $D_N = \{\rho(0), \ldots, \rho(N)\}$. For a given time sample $i$, the evolution of $\rho(i)$ by $\Delta t$ yields $\rho(i+1)$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}: \rho(i) \mapsto \rho(i+1),$$  \hspace{1cm} (2)

for all $i = 0, 1, \ldots, N$.

III. SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION FOR THE KRAUS-MAP

Given the description of the quantum open system as described in Eq. (1), as well as the quantum identifiability assumption, the task to be performed amounts to finding the Kraus operators that recover the time evolution of the density matrix that is closest to the data $D_N$, providing the best estimate for $\mathcal{P}$. Given a single input and output state, a natural formulation yields the following optimization problem

$$\text{minimize } \ell \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \left\| \tilde{E}_k \rho(0) \tilde{E}_k^\dagger - \rho(1) \right\|_F^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (3)

subject to $\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \tilde{E}_k^\dagger \tilde{E}_k = 1$.

In this optimization problem, we have chosen as an objective function the Frobenius norm between the measured sample $\rho_0$ and the estimated one $\tilde{\rho}_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \tilde{E}_k \rho_0 \tilde{E}_k^\dagger$. Taking into account the time series $D_N$ in its entirety, one generalizes the objective to

$$\text{minimize } \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} \ell \sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \left\| \tilde{E}_k \rho(i) \tilde{E}_k^\dagger - \rho(i+1) \right\|_F^2$$  \hspace{1cm} (4)

subject to $\sum_{k=1}^{\ell} \tilde{E}_k^\dagger \tilde{E}_k - 1 = 0$.

In closing this section, it is worth mentioning that an approach to consider is to perform a linearization of the system, similar to [19, 38]. In [37], starting from the Kraus representation, a linearization of the discretized system is considered to allow the reformulation of Prob. [3] as a linear dynamical system, and it is shown that using noncommutative polynomial optimization, the problem can be attacked using a series of convergent relaxations. Furthermore, under certain tameness assumptions, as well as assumptions on the dimensions of the density matrices, the problem can be attacked using standard gradient-like methods.

IV. SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION FOR LINDBLAD MASTER EQUATIONS

For certain applications within quantum optics [39] and cavity quantum electrodynamics [40], both being very relevant as different approaches for current NISQ and future FTEC quantum devices, as well as optomechanic applications [41], the Lindblad master equation is a widely popular theoretical tool for modeling open quantum system dynamics. The Lindblad equation (also known as the Gorini-Kossakowski-Sudarshan-Lindblad equation) [42, 43] reads

$$\frac{d}{dt} \rho(t) = \mathcal{L} \rho(t),$$  \hspace{1cm} (5)

where the Lindbladian operator is given as

$$\mathcal{L}[\rho] = \frac{i}{\hbar} [H, \rho] + \sum_{j=1}^{\ell} \left\{ 2 A_j \rho A_j^\dagger - \left\{ A_j^\dagger A_j, \rho \right\} \right\},$$  \hspace{1cm} (6)
where $H$ is the Hamiltonian and the set $\{A_j\}$ are called jump operators describing the dampening of the system.

Sections [V A] and [V B] below present two fundamentally different ways of formulating the identification problem for Eq. (5) in terms of polynomial optimization.

A. The Padé method

Exponentiating the Lindblad operator (6) one obtains the process mapping (2) such that the recorded time series $D_N$ can be written as

$$\rho_{(i+1)} = e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}} \rho_{(i)}, \quad i = 0, 1, \ldots, N. \quad (7)$$

In the context of the Lindblad master equation, therefore, identifying the process $P$ amounts to recovering the operators of the master equation that predict the evolution of the open quantum system closest to the data. In other words, in this context, identifying $P$ amounts to finding an estimate $\hat{\rho}$ of the time-trace of density matrices $D_N$ that correspond to the evolution of the density matrix.

The exponent in Eq. (7) can be rewritten as

$$e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}} = \frac{1}{1 - \tanh(\Delta t \mathcal{L}/2)} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^3), \quad (9)$$

and by Taylor expanding tanh, one obtains the Padé approximation

$$e^{\Delta t \mathcal{L}} = \frac{1 + \Delta t \mathcal{L}/2}{1 - \Delta t \mathcal{L}/2} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^3), \quad (9)$$

that can be used to linearize the problem of identifying $P$. Note that this is equivalent to the 1st-order Padé approximation [14] (closely related to the Cayley transform), which explicitly preserves unitary in the case $A_j = 0$. Linearization of the same problem is also considered in [19] in the continuous case, as well as in [37] in the discrete case, but in both cases approaching the problem from the Kraus map perspective described in Section [III].

Substituting the Padé approximation [9] into Eq. [7], we obtain

$$\left(1 - \Delta t \mathcal{L}/2\right) \rho_{(i)} = \left(1 + \Delta t \mathcal{L}/2\right) \rho_{(i-1)} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^3),$$

which can be further simplified to

$$\rho_{(i)} - \rho_{(0)} - \Delta t \mathcal{L} \left[\frac{\rho_{(i)} + \rho_{(i-1)}}{2}\right] = \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^3). \quad (10)$$

Following the steps that led to the formation of Prob. [4] up to $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^3)$ errors, the identification of Lindbladian [6] from the time-trace of density matrices $D_N$ is reduced to the following unconstrained polynomial optimization problem

$$\min_{A_j, \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \rho_{(i)} - \rho_{(i-1)} - \Delta t \mathcal{L} \left[\frac{\rho_{(i)} + \rho_{(i-1)}}{2}\right]\right\|_F^2. \quad (11)$$

B. The integral method

A very different approach is obtained if the master equation (5) is integrated over the time interval $[t_0, t_f]$,

$$\rho_{(i)} - \rho_{(0)} = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \frac{d}{dt} \rho(t) dt = \int_{t_0}^{t_f} \mathcal{L}[\rho(t)] dt = \mathcal{L} \left[\int_{t_0}^{t_f} \rho(t) dt\right]. \quad (12)$$

The uniform discretization of the integration domain $[0, t_f]$, by sampling the process $N$ times, yields the formulation for the identification of Lindbladian [6] as the following unconstrained polynomial optimization problem

$$\min_{A_j, \mathcal{H}} \sum_{i=1}^{N} \left\| \rho_{(i)} - \rho_{(0)} - \mathcal{L} \left[\int_{0}^{t_f} \rho(t) dt\right]\right\|_F^2. \quad (13)$$

Given the time series $D_N$, the integral can be readily evaluated, e.g., within $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2)$ accuracy via the trapezoidal rule and within $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^4)$ accuracy via Simpson’s rule. However, as will be shown in Sec. [VII] despite the fact that the Padé [11] has a lower asymptotic accuracy of $\mathcal{O}(\Delta t^3)$ [15], in practice it outperforms Simpson’s method.

V. SYSTEM IDENTIFICATION AS POLYNOMIAL OPTIMIZATION

The formulations of the open system identification problem above are natural and easy to interpret, but to a non-expert, it may not be obvious how to solve these problems. Crucially, the formulations of the problem of Hamiltonian identification as in Probs. [4] and [11], [13] correspond exactly to polynomial optimization problems, which form one of the broadest classes of non-convex optimization problems, for which we have (asymptotic) guarantees of convergence to the global optima.

While it is common to rely to first-order heuristic methods, such as the gradient descent, this might not be always sensible, especially if no tameness assumptions on the algebraic structure of the feasible sets are made. In such cases, one might run into common problems associated with first-order methods, for example, suboptimal solutions or divergence. Nevertheless, the global optimum can be estimated to any precision using newly developed hierarchies of convexifications. The development of such algorithms is a rapidly growing field. In Table [I] we summarize several such methods for solving polynomial optimization methods as well as their convergence guarantees. We provide an overview of the mathematical structure of such globally convergent methods in the Supplemental material. In particular, Appendix [A] presents an overview of the state-of-the-art algorithms for solving either Prob. [4], Prob. [11] or Prob. [13] using hierarchies of convexifications, which guarantee convergence to the global optima of polynomial optimization problems.
To illustrate the identification methods presented in Sects. [11] and [15] we run in total over $340 \times 10^3$ tests. The statistics obtained are visualized in Fig. 2. For every test, we i) randomly generate open quantum systems, ii) obtain a time trace, iii) run a polynomial optimization algorithm to identify a model from the time trace, and finally, iv) compare the known system with the identified model. Let us describe every stage of this pipeline in detail.

To generate a time series $D_N$ of $2 \times 2$ density matrices, we first randomly generate a Hamiltonian $H$, using the function rand_herm from the Python library qutip [68, 69], an initial state $\rho^{(0)} \text{exact}$ (via qutip.rand_dm), and a non-Hermitian jump operator $A_1$. Then, the Lindblad master equation (5) and (6) ($\ell = 1$) is solved to generate a time series of 50 density matrices using qutip.mesolve. To mimic experimental noise, for each density matrix $\rho^{\text{exact}}$ of the time series, a random density matrix $\rho^{\text{rand}}$ is admixed as follows:

$$\rho^{\text{noisy}} = (1 - w)\rho^{\text{exact}} + w\rho^{\text{rand}},$$

$$0 \leq w < 1, \quad i = 0, \ldots, N,$$

(14)

to form the final time series $D_N \ (N = 49)$ that is then used for identification. In Eq. (14), $w$ is a mixing coefficient, which quantifies the magnitude of noise. The higher $w$, the noisier the time series is. Note that by construction $\rho^{\text{noisy}}$ is non-negative.

The polynomial objective functions (4), (11), (13) and their gradients are computed from the time series $D_N$ by using the Python library sympy [70].

First, we considered an encoding of the polynomial optimization problems in ncpol2sdpa. However, the size of the SDP instances would result in a vast carbon footprint. Therefore, the optimization was performed using a local optimization method implemented in scipy.optimize. In particular, we have used the implementation of the basin-hopping algorithm [71] version of the Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno (BFGS) quasi–Newton method [46–49], which is the first row of Table [I]. Essentially, this is a global optimization algorithm with local minimization via a modified gradient descent.

Having solved the corresponding polynomial minimization, we identify a model of the open quantum system. To quantify the accuracy of the identification, we use the minimum fidelity $F_{\text{min}}$ between the exact and identified time series, which is calculated in two steps: First, the backed-out model is used to propagate the known initial condition $\rho^{\text{noisy}}_0$ to obtain the identified time series $\rho^{\text{sid}}_i$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, $\rho^{\text{sid}}_0 = \rho^{\text{noisy}}_0$. The index $i$ labels the same time moments here and in Eq. (14). Second, we evaluate $F_{\text{min}}$ as

$$F_{\text{min}} = \min_{i=0, \ldots, N} F\left(\rho^{\text{exact}}_i, \rho^{\text{sid}}_i\right),$$

(15)

$$F\left(\rho^{\text{exact}}_i, \rho^{\text{sid}}_i\right) = \text{Tr} \left\sqrt{\rho^{\text{exact}}_i \rho^{\text{sid}}_i} \sqrt{\rho^{\text{exact}}_i} \right\.$$

(16)

Figure 2 displays the minimum fidelity distribution for the tests of (a) the Kraus map identification, the Lindblad master equation identification via (b) the Padé, (c) trapezoidal, and (d) Simpson methods. The figure also demonstrates the robustness to noise of the developed methods.

It is noteworthy that the algorithm converged to the minimum of the polynomial optimization problem for every attempted test of the Kraus map identification problem [4] [Figs. 2(a)] as well as the Padé formulation (11) of the Lindblad equation identification problem [Figs. 2(b)]. In contrast, the basin-hopping algorithm did not converge in half of cases (irrespective of noise) for the integral formulations of the trapezoidal and Simpson integral formulations (13) of the Lindblad equation identification problem. Hence, Figs. 2(c, d) visualize only the converged tests.

### VI. COMPUTATIONAL ILLUSTRATIONS

To illustrate the identification methods presented in Sects. [11] and [15] we run in total over $340 \times 10^3$ tests. The statistics obtained are visualized in Fig. 2. For every test, we i) randomly generate open quantum systems, ii) obtain a time trace, iii) run a polynomial optimization algorithm to identify a model from the time trace, and finally, iv) compare the known system with the identified model. Let us describe every stage of this pipeline in detail.

To generate a time series $D_N$ of $2 \times 2$ density matrices, we first randomly generate a Hamiltonian $H$, using the function rand_herm from the Python library qutip [68, 69], an initial state $\rho^{(0)} \text{exact}$ (via qutip.rand_dm), and a non-Hermitian jump operator $A_1$. Then, the Lindblad master equation (5) and (6) ($\ell = 1$) is solved to generate a time series of 50 density matrices using qutip.mesolve. To mimic experimental noise, for each density matrix $\rho^{\text{exact}}$ of the time series, a random density matrix $\rho^{\text{rand}}$ is admixed as follows:

$$\rho^{\text{noisy}} = (1 - w)\rho^{\text{exact}} + w\rho^{\text{rand}},$$

$$0 \leq w < 1, \quad i = 0, \ldots, N,$$

(14)

to form the final time series $D_N \ (N = 49)$ that is then used for identification. In Eq. (14), $w$ is a mixing coefficient, which quantifies the magnitude of noise. The higher $w$, the noisier the time series is. Note that by construction $\rho^{\text{noisy}}$ is non-negative.

The polynomial objective functions (4), (11), (13) and their gradients are computed from the time series $D_N$ by using the Python library sympy [70].

First, we considered an encoding of the polynomial optimization problems in ncpol2sdpa. However, the size of the SDP instances would result in a vast carbon footprint. Therefore, the optimization was performed using a local optimization method implemented in scipy.optimize. In particular, we have used the implementation of the basin-hopping algorithm [71] version of the Broyden–Fletcher–Goldfarb–Shanno (BFGS) quasi–Newton method [46–49], which is the first row of Table [I]. Essentially, this is a global optimization algorithm with local minimization via a modified gradient descent.

Having solved the corresponding polynomial minimization, we identify a model of the open quantum system. To quantify the accuracy of the identification, we use the minimum fidelity $F_{\text{min}}$ between the exact and identified time series, which is calculated in two steps: First, the backed-out model is used to propagate the known initial condition $\rho^{\text{noisy}}_0$ to obtain the identified time series $\rho^{\text{sid}}_i$, $i = 0, \ldots, N$, $\rho^{\text{sid}}_0 = \rho^{\text{noisy}}_0$. The index $i$ labels the same time moments here and in Eq. (14). Second, we evaluate $F_{\text{min}}$ as

$$F_{\text{min}} = \min_{i=0, \ldots, N} F\left(\rho^{\text{exact}}_i, \rho^{\text{sid}}_i\right),$$

(15)

$$F\left(\rho^{\text{exact}}_i, \rho^{\text{sid}}_i\right) = \text{Tr} \left\sqrt{\rho^{\text{exact}}_i \rho^{\text{sid}}_i} \sqrt{\rho^{\text{exact}}_i} \right\.$$

(16)

Figure 2 displays the minimum fidelity distribution for the tests of (a) the Kraus map identification, the Lindblad master equation identification via (b) the Padé, (c) trapezoidal, and (d) Simpson methods. The figure also demonstrates the robustness to noise of the developed methods.

It is noteworthy that the algorithm converged to the minimum of the polynomial optimization problem for every attempted test of the Kraus map identification problem [4] [Figs. 2(a)] as well as the Padé formulation (11) of the Lindblad equation identification problem [Figs. 2(b)]. In contrast, the basin-hopping algorithm did not converge in half of cases (irrespective of noise) for the integral formulations of the trapezoidal and Simpson integral formulations (13) of the Lindblad equation identification problem. Hence, Figs. 2(c, d) visualize only the converged tests.

### VII. CONCLUSIONS

We have demonstrated globally convergent methods for the estimation of Kraus maps and Lindblad master equations directly from time series data by formulating the problem as a polynomial optimization problem. We
discussed in detail the benefits of the polynomial optimization formulation and explained methods for obtaining global optima. Improved estimates of models of open quantum systems should, in turn, allow for improved pulse shaping for 2-qubit gates [35] and improved error cancellation [32]. Our work here starts with the results of quantum state tomography. Instead, one could start at the readout-pulse level [73] or with randomized measurements [24]. This seems to open up further important applications of polynomial optimization in quantum information science.
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Appendix A: Polynomial optimization illustrated

In this section, we present a technical overview of the state-of-the-art algorithms for solving polynomial optimization problems, such as Prob. (4), Prob. (11) and Prob. (13). Most of these approaches build up a hierarchy of relaxations, i.e., auxiliary problems whose objective functions monotonically increases and provides progressively improving lower bounds on the true objective function. This can be interpreted as a procedure, where one augments the search space in a way that convexifies it and then step by step starts shrinking it again such that at some point, the relaxations become sufficient to extract the global optimizer, i.e., the solution which attains the global optimum in terms of the objective function value. A crucial aspect of the approaches summarized is the rate of growth of the (dimensions, numbers, and dimension of constraints in the) relaxations within the hierarchy and the rate of growth of the lower bounds provided by the relaxations.

Broadly speaking, all of these approaches are based on various Positivstellensätze to form the relaxations. In real algebraic geometry, Positivstellensätze characterize polynomials that are positive on a semialgebraic set, which can be thought of as real analogues of Hilbert’s Nullstellensatz. (These are sometimes known as sum-of-squares representation theorems.) Using Putinar’s Positivstellensatz [77], Lasserre obtained his original hierarchy, while others have used it to obtain the SOCP hierarchies [64]. Using Krivine–Stengle Positivstellensatz [78], one be used to obtain the SOCP hierarchy. Generally, each Positivstellensatz can yield multiple hierarchies of relaxations of various properties. See the Supplementary material for further illustrations.

For example, let us consider the moment/SOS hierarchy of semidefinite relaxations [50, 51] (see [80] for a survey) are applied to polynomial optimization problems such as Prob. (4). The idea behind moment/SOS relaxations is to use the so-called moment and localization matrices that, at each higher order, by appropriately amplifying and essentially convexifying the search space, they approximate better the actual non-convex problem one is interested in solving. In particular, the moment/SOS approaches of Lasserre and Parrilo are based on probability density measures $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$ and polynomials over $\mathbb{R}[x]$, $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$, respectively. In Prob. (4), one needs to impose the Archimedean property [81], which states that a semi-algebraic set $K$, defined as

$$K := \{ x \in \mathbb{R}^n | p_i(x) \geq 0 \text{ and } h_j(x) = 0, \forall i, j \}, \ (A1)$$

for polynomials $\{p_i\}_{i=1}^m \in \mathbb{R}[x]$ and $\{h_j\}_{j=1}^r \in \mathbb{R}[x]$, is associated with the quadratic module $\mathcal{M}(g; h) = \mathcal{M}(g_1, \ldots, g_m; h_1, \ldots, h_r) \subset \mathbb{R}[x]$, a subring of $\mathbb{R}[x]$ defined as the set of polynomials that can be written in the form

$$\sigma_0 + \sum_{j=1}^m \sigma_j(x)p_j(x) + \sum_{j=1}^r \phi_j(x)h_j(x)$$

where $\{\sigma_j\}_{j=0}^m \subset \mathbb{R}[x]$ are sum-of-square polynomials and $\{\phi\}_{j=1}^r \subset \mathbb{R}[x]$.

When dealing with the constrained Prob. (4), the Archimedean condition must be assumed. This is, however, not the case with Prob. (11) and Prob. (13).

A graphical summary of the architecture of the Moment/SOS relaxation routines is provided in Figure 3.

Many extensions of the moment/SOS relaxations have been developed, some of those as well other algorithmic approaches are summarized in Table II.

For the benefit of practitioners, in Table II, we list a collection of libraries for Python, Julia, and MATLAB that implement the hierarchies of convexifications described previously. These can be used in the context of open quantum system identification to yield globally optimal results. In the same table, we further list a small subset of the publicly available solvers. Note that the last column (Solver) is independent to the previous ones, in the sense that the rows of the last column do not mean there is a one-to-one correspondence with the row of the previous columns.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Library</th>
<th>Methods</th>
<th>Solver</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Python</td>
<td>Irene</td>
<td>50, 51</td>
<td>DSDP5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>ncpol2sdpa</td>
<td>50, 51</td>
<td>Mosek</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Julia</td>
<td>SumOfSquares.jl</td>
<td>50, 51</td>
<td>NAG</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>PolyJuMP.jl</td>
<td>50, 51</td>
<td>PENNON</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TSOS</td>
<td>79</td>
<td>PENLAB</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>CS-TSSOS</td>
<td>75, 76</td>
<td>COSMIO</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MATLAB</td>
<td>YALMIP</td>
<td>50, 51</td>
<td>SDPNAL+</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>REPOP</td>
<td>62, 63</td>
<td>ECOS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SOSTOOLS</td>
<td>50, 51</td>
<td>SCS</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>SparsePOP</td>
<td>52, 54</td>
<td>SDPA</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>GloptiPoly</td>
<td>50, 51</td>
<td>Sedumi</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

TABLE II. A small selection of available modeling languages and SDP solvers. Note that most of the modeling languages support multiple SDP solvers, although Sedumi, CDCS, and SDPNAL+ are restricted to MATLAB environment. For further relaxations, see Table II.
Non-convex matrix-valued problem in $W \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$, with rank($W$) = 1

Convex problem of moments in $\mathcal{M}(\mathbb{R}^n)$

Polynomial optimization problem (POP) in $\mathbb{R}^n$

Signomial optimization in cones in $\mathbb{R}^n$

Truncated problem of moments (TPM)

Sum-of-Squares (SoS) relaxation

Relative entropy (RE) relaxation

TPM 2nd moment

SoS 1st degree

1st RE relaxation

TPM 4th moment

SoS 2nd degree

2nd RE relaxation

TPM 2n-th moment

SoS n-th degree

n-th RE relaxation

Relaxation order 1

Relaxation order 2

Relaxation order $r$

FIG. 3. A graphical summary of some of the reformulations of polynomial optimization and their relaxations: two columns in the middle suggest the Moment/SOS hierarchy [50, 51], which is best known. To the right, the so called relative-entropy relaxations [62, 63] based on the sums of arithmetic-geometric-exponential (SAGE) decompositions. The bended arrows denote inclusions. See Table II for further relaxations.