

# Improving quantum gate fidelities using optimized Euler angles

K. Ch. Chatzisavvas,<sup>1,\*</sup> G. Chadzitaskos,<sup>2,†</sup> C. Daskaloyannis,<sup>3,‡</sup> and S. G. Schirmer<sup>4,5,§</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Physics Department, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 54124 Thessaloniki, Greece*

<sup>2</sup>*Department of Physics, FNSPE, Czech Technical University, Brehova 7, CZ-115 19 Praha 1, Czech Republic*

<sup>3</sup>*Mathematics Department, Aristotle University of Thessaloniki, 54124 Thessaloniki, Greece*

<sup>4</sup>*Department of Applied Maths and Theoretical Physics, University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge, CB3 0WA, United Kingdom*

<sup>5</sup>*Department of Maths and Statistics, University of Kuopio, PO Box 1627, 70211 Kuopio, Finland*

(Dated: June 26, 2022)

An explicit algorithm for calculating the optimized Euler angles for both qubit state transfer and gate engineering given two *arbitrary* fixed Hamiltonians is presented. It is shown how the algorithm enables us to efficiently implement single qubit gates even if the control is severely restricted and the experimentally accessible Hamiltonians are far from orthogonal. It is further shown that using the optimized Euler angles can significantly improve the fidelity of quantum operations even for systems where the experimentally accessible Hamiltonians are nearly orthogonal. Unlike schemes such as composite pulses, the proposed scheme does not significantly increase the number of local operations or gate operation times.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx 02.30.Yy 07.05.Dz

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum computing [1] generally relies on the decomposition of arbitrary multi-qubit operations into products of elementary single and two-qubit gates, which must be implemented with very high fidelity. Although the availability of an entangling two-qubit gate is crucial for universal quantum computing [2], single qubit operations dominate virtually any decomposition of a multi-qubit quantum gate. For example, if we decompose a two-qubit gate into two-qubit gates that can be generated by a natural Ising interaction and local operations using the Cartan decomposition [3], at most three two-qubit terms are required in addition to 12 single qubit rotations. Therefore the fidelity of single qubit gates is critical, as even small single qubit gate errors quickly accumulate, resulting in poor multi-qubit gate fidelities even if the entangling gate is perfect.

One approach to improving gate fidelities and gate operation times is using optimal control. In general, optimal control fields can be derived by simultaneous optimization of many control parameters using numerical algorithms based on Poyntriagin's Maximum principle (see e.g. [4, 5, 6, 7, 8, 9]). Optimal control may be the only viable option for implementing quantum gates for systems with highly complex Hamiltonians including off-resonant excitation and multi-body fixed coupling terms [10], but numerical optimization can be time-consuming and the resulting optimal control fields can be quite complicated and not necessarily easy to imple-

ment. By contrast, geometric control, vaguely inspired by nuclear magnetic resonance (NMR) [11], requires only sequences of simple pulses to implement arbitrary single and multi qubit gates. Although compared optimally designed pulses the results may be suboptimal, this approach remains popular especially in an experimental setting, due to its conceptual and experimental simplicity. However, there are limits to the applicability of standard techniques such as the Euler and Cartan decomposition, for instance, when we cannot implement local rotations about orthogonal axes, a situation that arises in various settings, from global electron-spin architectures [12] to charge-based semi-conductor quantum dot systems [13].

Geometric control generally relies heavily on Lie group decompositions such as the standard Euler decomposition [14] of rotations in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ , which provides an explicit formula for decomposing any rotation in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  into a sequence of (at most) three rotations about two fixed, orthogonal axes,  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$ . Due to the equivalence of  $\text{SU}(2)$  and  $\text{SO}(3)$  ( $\text{SO}(3) \simeq \text{SU}(2)/\{-1, 1\}$ ), it also provides an explicit scheme to decompose any special unitary operator in  $\text{SU}(2)$  into elementary complex rotations, combined with the generalized Cartan decomposition for multi-qubit gates, it provides a basis for generating arbitrary multi-qubit gates. The main drawback of the standard Euler angle decomposition is that requires orthogonal rotation axes, or respectively, Hamiltonians, while the Hamiltonians that are experimentally easily accessible are often at best approximately orthogonal, subject to certain simplifications such as negligible drift, rotating wave approximation, etc. Applying the standard Euler angle decomposition when the available basic Hamiltonians are not orthogonal reduces the fidelity of most local gates, and hence virtually all multi-qubit quantum gates, regardless of the quality of the entangling gates, decoherence or other sources of noise that may reduce the fidelities of quantum operations. This is a significant

\*Electronic address: kchatz@auth.gr

†Electronic address: goce.chadzitaskos@jfifi.cvut.cz

‡Electronic address: daskalo@auth.gr

§Electronic address: sgs29@cam.ac.uk

problem for applications such as quantum computation, where extremely high accuracy of the elementary gates is a prerequisite for scalability.

One way to improve the accuracy of elementary gates is using composite pulse sequences [15, 16, 17] to compensate for certain systematic errors such as rotation axis alignment and rotation angle errors. Such approaches have proved to be extremely valuable in ensemble-based quantum computing schemes such as liquid-state NMR, where multiple qubits are encoded into different nuclear spins of a larger molecule, and the system consists of an ensemble of a large number of identical molecules in solution. Due to magnetic field gradients, diffusion processes and inter-molecular interactions, the actual fields experienced by the individual molecules are subject to fluctuations, resulting in rotation angle errors, and to a lesser extent, rotation axis errors. Composite pulses reduce these errors by replacing simple unitary operations (rotations) with sequences of rotations designed to “cancel” certain errors. However, this systematic error cancellation comes at the expense of increased overhead in the number of elementary operations, and hence time required to implement a single quantum gate, especially if the systematic errors are so large as to require the use of concatenated composite pulses [18]. This can exacerbate other problems such as decoherence. Composite pulses can be applied to implement gates that are robust with respect to model uncertainty in non-ensemble-based systems. However, unlike in ensemble-based schemes, where the systematic errors are a direct consequence of the fact that different molecules in the ensemble experience different forces, systematic errors due to model uncertainty in non-ensemble systems can be minimized by experimental system identification [19, 20, 21, 22], and this has been shown to be advantageous in that it reduces to level of concatenation required for composite pulse sequences [18]. In this paper we show that if the actual Hamiltonians are known to sufficient accuracy then we can significantly improve gate fidelities with minimal overhead simply by optimizing the Euler angles in the decomposition, potentially completely eliminating the need for expensive composite pulse sequences.

## II. QUANTUM GATE ENGINEERING USING LIE GROUP DECOMPOSITIONS

Quantum computing generally relies on decomposing multi-qubit gates into products of elementary single and two-qubit gates, which can be applied simultaneously or sequentially to produce a desired unitary evolution. Following the idea of using realistic physical Hamiltonians to generate quantum gates efficiently [23, 24, 25], one approach is to decompose a desired unitary operation  $U$  into elementary unitary operations that can be easily generated by natural Hamiltonian flows of the system. For instance, given a system with a natural Ising coupling  $\sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(2)}$  between adjacent qubits, and the ability

to generate arbitrary local unitary operations, any two-qubit gate can be factorized into a product of local operations, and the natural flows  $Z(t) = \exp(-it\sigma_z^{(1)}\sigma_z^{(2)})$  using the Cartan decomposition [26]

$$U = U_1 [K_x^\dagger Z(\alpha_1) K_x] [K_y^\dagger Z(\alpha_2) K_y] Z(\alpha_3) U_2, \quad (1)$$

where  $Z(\alpha)$  corresponds to free evolution of the system under the Ising-coupling Hamiltonian for the time  $t = \alpha$ , and  $U_1, U_2, K_x$  and  $K_y$  are simultaneous local operations on both qubits.  $U_1$  and  $U_2$  depend on the particular gate to be implemented, while  $K_x = U_x^{(1)}(\pi) \otimes U_x^{(2)}(\pi)$ , where  $U_x^{(k)}(\alpha) = \exp(-i\frac{\alpha}{2}\sigma_x^{(k)})$ ,  $k = 1, 2$ , and similarly for  $K_y$ . The Cartan decomposition can be generalized to interactions involving more than two qubits [7], and an explicit algorithm to calculate the generalized Cartan decomposition was presented in [27]. Similar decompositions also exist for other natural non-local Hamiltonians but we still require very accurate single qubit gates. In principle such gates are easy to implement. Any  $W \in \mathbb{SU}(2)$  can be written as

$$W(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\alpha) e^{i\beta} & \sin(\alpha) e^{i\gamma} \\ -\sin(\alpha) e^{-i\gamma} & \cos(\alpha) e^{-i\beta} \end{pmatrix} \quad (2)$$

where  $0 \leq \alpha \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ ,  $0 \leq \beta, \gamma < 2\pi$ . We also have  $W = \exp(-i\tilde{H})$  with  $-i\tilde{H} \in \mathfrak{su}(2)$ , i.e.,

$$\tilde{H} = \tilde{H}(\mathbf{d}) = d_x \sigma_x + d_y \sigma_y + d_z \sigma_z \quad (3)$$

with the usual Pauli matrices

$$\sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

Let  $\mathbf{d} = (d_x, d_y, d_z)$  with  $\Omega = \|\mathbf{d}\|$  and  $\mathbf{n} = \Omega^{-1}\mathbf{d}$ . As  $H^2 = \Omega^2 \mathbb{I}$ , where  $\mathbb{I}$  is the identity matrix, we have

$$\begin{aligned} e^{-itH} &= \exp[-i\Omega t(n_x \sigma_x + n_y \sigma_y + n_z \sigma_z)] \\ &= \cos(\Omega t) \mathbb{I} - i \sin(\Omega t) (n_x \sigma_x + n_y \sigma_y + n_z \sigma_z) \\ &= \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\Omega t) - i n_z \sin(\Omega t) & -(n_y + i n_x) \sin(\Omega t) \\ (n_y - i n_x) \sin(\Omega t) & \cos(\Omega t) + i n_z \sin(\Omega t) \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$

and comparison of the last equation with Eq. (2) shows that  $W = \exp(-iTH)$  if we choose  $\mathbf{n}$ ,  $\Omega$  and  $T$  such that

$$\Omega T = \arccos(\cos \alpha \cos \beta) \quad (5a)$$

$$\mathbf{n} = -S^{-1}(\sin \alpha \sin \gamma, \sin \alpha \cos \gamma, \cos \alpha \sin \beta) \quad (5b)$$

with  $S = \sin(\Omega T)$ . Thus, if we have full control over the single qubit Hamiltonians then we can implement any single qubit gate in a single step, and if there are no constraints on the magnitude  $\Omega$  of the Hamiltonian then the gate operation time  $T$  can be made arbitrarily small.

Unfortunately, for most physical systems we cannot implement arbitrary Hamiltonians even locally. For example, the single qubit Hamiltonians for many potential qubit systems from ions to quantum dots are of the form

$H = \frac{1}{2}(d_z\sigma_z + d_x\sigma_x)$  or  $H = \frac{1}{2}(d_x\sigma_x + d_y\sigma_y)$ , restricting us to rotations about axes in the  $xz$  or  $xy$  planes, respectively. If we have sufficient control over both  $d_x$  and  $d_z$  such as to be able to perform rotations about two orthogonal axes in the plane, then we can still implement arbitrary single qubit gates using the standard Euler decomposition, e.g.,

$$W(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) = U_z\left(\beta + \gamma - \frac{\pi}{2}\right) U_x(\alpha) U_z\left(\beta - \gamma + \frac{\pi}{2}\right) \quad (6)$$

where  $U_x(\alpha) = \exp(i\frac{\alpha}{2}\sigma_x)$  and  $U_z(\alpha) = \exp(i\frac{\alpha}{2}\sigma_z)$  are elementary rotations about the  $x$  and  $z$  axis respectively.

However, in practice there are often more constraints, limiting us to varying or both parameters within a certain range. For example, for certain solid-state architectures such as charge-based semi-conductor quantum dot systems [13], it is difficult or impossible to dynamically control the tunnel coupling  $d$  in the model Hamiltonian  $H = \Delta\omega\sigma_z + d\sigma_x$ . Thus  $d \in [d_{\min}, d_{\max}]$  and if  $d_{\min} > 0$  then we cannot implement rotations about the  $z$  axis, no matter how much control we have over the energy level splitting  $\Delta\omega$ , and practical constraints often make it impossible to find operating parameters  $(\Delta\omega_1, d_1)$  and  $(\Delta\omega_2, d_2)$  such that the corresponding Hamiltonians are exactly orthogonal. The same problem arises for other architectures where the amount of control is limited, such as global electron spin systems where many electron spins in quantum dots are simultaneously controlled by a fixed global field, and we can only control the detuning  $\Delta\omega$  of individual spins from the global field via local voltage gates [12]. In other cases  $\Delta\omega$  may be fixed while we have limited control over the coupling strength  $d_x$  or Rabi-frequency.

In these examples (and other similar systems) we have a fixed drift Hamiltonian and constraints on a controllable parameter. Without loss of generality, let us consider  $H(\kappa) = \frac{d}{2}(\sigma_x + \kappa\sigma_z)$  with  $d > 0$  fixed and  $\kappa \in [0, \kappa_{\max}]$ .  $\text{Tr}(\sigma_x\sigma_z) = 0$  and  $\text{Tr}(\sigma_x^2) = \text{Tr}(\sigma_z^2) = \text{Tr}(\mathbb{I}) = 2$  shows that the Hilbert-Schmidt inner product  $\langle H(\kappa_1) | H(\kappa_2) \rangle = \text{Tr}[H(\kappa_1)^\dagger H(\kappa_2)]$  satisfies

$$\langle H(\kappa_1) | H(\kappa_2) \rangle \leq \langle H(0) | H(\kappa_{\max}) \rangle = \frac{d^2}{2}, \quad (7)$$

and  $\|H(\kappa)\| = \sqrt{\langle H(\kappa) | H(\kappa) \rangle} = d\sqrt{(1 + \kappa^2)/2}$ . Thus, provided  $d \neq 0$ , the angle  $\zeta$  between the Hamiltonians  $H(0)$  and  $H(\kappa_{\max})$  is determined by

$$\cos \zeta = \frac{\langle H(0) | H_{\kappa_{\max}} \rangle}{\|H(0)\| \cdot \|H_{\kappa_{\max}}\|} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 + \kappa_{\max}^2}}. \quad (8)$$

Thus,  $\zeta \rightarrow \frac{\pi}{2}$  only for  $\kappa_{\max} \rightarrow \infty$ . For any finite value of  $\kappa_{\max}$  the maximum angle between the accessible rotation axes will be less than  $\frac{\pi}{2}$ . If we use the standard Euler decomposition of a single qubit gate

$$U = U_x(\alpha)U_z(\beta)U_x(\gamma), \quad (9)$$

assuming  $U_x(\alpha) = \exp(-i\frac{\alpha}{2}X)$  and  $U_z(\beta) = \exp(-i\frac{\beta}{2}Z)$ , but the actual “ $z$ ”-rotation is a rotation about  $\tilde{Z} =$

$X \cos \zeta + Z \sin \zeta$  with  $\zeta = (1 \pm \epsilon)\frac{\pi}{2}$  then the gate actually implemented is

$$\tilde{U} = U_x(\alpha)U_z^\epsilon(\beta)U_x(\gamma) \quad (10)$$

and if there are no other errors the gate fidelity will be

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{F}(\beta, \epsilon) &= \frac{1}{2} |\text{Tr}(U^\dagger \tilde{U})| = \frac{1}{2} |\text{Tr}[U_z(\beta)^\dagger U_z^\epsilon(\beta)]| \\ &= \cos^2(\beta/2)[1 - \cos(\epsilon\pi/2)] + |\cos(\epsilon\pi/2)| \end{aligned} \quad (11)$$

and the gate error  $\mathcal{E}(\beta, \epsilon) = 1 - \mathcal{F}(\beta, \epsilon)$ . Thus the maximum single qubit gate error is  $1 - |\cos(\frac{\pi}{2})| = \mathcal{E}(\pm\pi, \epsilon)$  and, noting  $\langle \cos^2(x) \rangle = \frac{1}{2}$ , the average single qubit gate error is  $\mathcal{E}_{\text{ave}}(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{2}[1 - \cos(\frac{\pi}{2})]$ , and for the maximum single qubit error to be below  $10^{-4}$ , the rotation angle error must be less than  $\epsilon = 0.9\%$  or equivalently

$$\cos\left(\frac{\pi}{2}\epsilon\right) = \sin \zeta = \frac{\kappa_{\max}}{\sqrt{1 + \kappa_{\max}^2}} \geq 0.9999 \quad (12)$$

or  $\kappa_{\max} \geq 70.7054$ . Hence, to keep the maximum gate error for a single qubit gate below the error threshold of  $10^{-4}$ , for example, we would have to be able to make the energy splitting  $\Delta\omega$  (the controllable parameter) at least 71 greater than the fixed coupling  $d$ , even if there were no other sources of error. If a CNOT-gate is implemented using the Cartan decomposition (1) with  $(\alpha_1, \alpha_2, \alpha_3) = (\pi/4, \pi/4, 0)$  and  $U_1 = U_1^{(1)} \otimes U_1^{(2)}$ ,  $U_2 = U_2^{(1)} \otimes U_2^{(2)}$ ,  $K_x = K_x^{(1)} \otimes K_x^{(2)}$ ,  $K_y = K_y^{(1)} \otimes K_y^{(2)}$ , where

$$K_x^{(1)} = K_x^{(2)} = U_x(\pi) \quad (13a)$$

$$K_y^{(1)} = K_y^{(2)} = U_x(\pi)U_z(\pi) \quad (13b)$$

$$U_1^{(1)} = U_2^{(1)} = U_z(1.75\pi) \quad (13c)$$

$$U_1^{(2)} = U_x(0.5\pi)U_z(1.5\pi)U_x(1.5\pi) \quad (13d)$$

$$U_2^{(2)} = U_z(1.5\pi)U_x(0.5\pi) \quad (13e)$$

then assuming that our  $z$ -rotations are really rotations about the tilted axis  $U_z^\epsilon(\beta) = \exp(-i\frac{\beta}{2}\tilde{Z})$  with  $\tilde{Z} = X \sin(\frac{\pi}{2}\epsilon) + Z \cos(\frac{\pi}{2}\epsilon)$ , shows that the fidelity of the CNOT gate will be  $< 0.9999$  unless the rotation axis angle error is less than about 0.6%, or  $\kappa_{\max} \geq 100$ , even if the entanglement-generating Ising-coupling terms are perfect and there are no other sources of error such as decoherence. In practice, other sources of error would mean that the error resulting from the rotation axis misalignment would have to be much smaller, and thus  $\kappa_{\max}$  much bigger, for the total errors to remain below the error threshold. Also note that for  $\kappa_{\max} = 1$  the rotation axis angle error is 50%, and the maximum single qubit gate error is  $1 - \cos(\pi/4)$ , almost 30%, and the error for a CNOT gate implemented using the Cartan decomposition above with unoptimized single qubit gates jumps to over 50%, assuming no errors in the Ising terms.

### III. OPTIMIZED EULER DECOMPOSITION

The previous section shows that accurate single qubit gates are crucial, and even small deviations of the experimentally accessible single qubit Hamiltonians from orthogonality are problematic, not to mention situations where the experimentally accessible Hamiltonians are far from orthogonal. On the other hand, we know that any local unitary operation can be generated by performing a sequence of complex rotations about any two Hamiltonians  $H_1$  and  $H_2$  that generate  $\mathfrak{su}(2)$ , i.e., satisfy  $[H_1, H_2] \neq 0$ , and various Lie group decompositions have been considered for the related problem of implementing local qubit operations exactly in the presence of various types of fixed drift terms [28]. Ideally, however, we would like a simple explicit algorithm to calculate an optimal sequence of rotations given a fixed set of Hamiltonians (rotation axes) and an arbitrary local gate.

In the following we consider general decompositions of  $\mathbb{SO}(3)$  instead of  $\mathbb{SU}(2)$  using the equivalence between  $\mathbb{SU}(2)$  and  $\mathbb{SO}(3)$  (modulo  $\pm 1$ ). As a brief reminder we recall that any quantum state of a two-level system can be represented by a density operator

$$\rho = \rho(r, \theta, \phi) = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 + r^2 \cos(\theta) & r^2 e^{-i\phi} \sin(\theta) \\ r^2 e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta) & 1 - r^2 \cos(\theta) \end{pmatrix} \quad (14)$$

with  $0 \leq \theta \leq \pi$ ,  $0 \leq \phi \leq 2\pi$  and  $0 \leq r \leq 1$ . Thus we can define a unique mapping between density operators  $\rho$  and points in the unit ball in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  by

$$\rho(r, \theta, \phi) \mapsto \mathbf{s}(r, \theta, \phi) = r \begin{pmatrix} \sin \theta \cos \phi \\ \sin \theta \sin \phi \\ \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (15)$$

or more specifically, between states of constant purity  $\text{Tr}[\rho^2] = \frac{1}{2}(1 + r^2)$  and points on a sphere of radius  $r$  in  $\mathbb{R}^3$ . The evolution of  $\rho$  under a constant Hamiltonian  $H$  then corresponds to a rotation of the Bloch vector  $\mathbf{s}$  about the unit axis  $\hat{\mathbf{n}} = \Omega^{-1} \mathbf{d}$  with constant angular velocity  $\Omega = \|\mathbf{d}\|$ . Furthermore, any target operator  $W(\alpha, \beta, \gamma) \in \mathbb{SU}(2)$  is equivalent (modulo  $\pm 1$ ) to a rotation  $R(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{SO}(3)$  acting on the Bloch vector  $\mathbf{s}$  with  $a = \frac{1}{2}\alpha$ ,  $b = \frac{1}{2}(\beta + \gamma)$  and  $c = \frac{1}{2}(\beta - \gamma)$ . Setting  $a_1 = \sin(a)$ ,  $a_2 = \cos(a)$ , and similarly for  $b$  and  $c$ , we have explicitly

$$R(a, b, c) = \begin{pmatrix} -b_1 c_1 + a_2 b_2 c_2 & b_2 c_1 + a_2 b_1 c_2 & -a_1 c_2 \\ -b_1 c_2 - a_2 b_2 c_1 & b_2 c_2 - a_2 b_1 c_1 & a_1 c_1 \\ a_1 b_2 & a_1 b_1 & a_2 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

We start with the problem of steering a state represented by a vector  $\mathbf{s}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^3$  of length  $r$  to another state  $\mathbf{s}_f \in \mathbb{R}^3$  the same distance from the origin using only rotations about two fixed rotation axes given by the unit vectors  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$  in the next section. Despite the fact that a unitary operator  $W \in \mathbb{SU}(2)$  is completely determined by the image of a single Hilbert space vector  $|\psi\rangle$ , we note that the problem of quantum state engineering is similar but not equivalent to quantum gate engineering for reasons discussed in detail in Appendix B.




FIG. 1: Sphere with arbitrary rotation axes, respective coordinate system and an arbitrary vector  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$  (angles  $\theta$  and  $\phi$ ).

Assuming  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$  arbitrary with  $\zeta = \arccos(\hat{\mathbf{h}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{g}})$ , we first define a rectangular coordinate system  $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\mathbf{z}})$  by

$$\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{y}} = \frac{\hat{\mathbf{h}} \times \hat{\mathbf{g}}}{\|\hat{\mathbf{h}} \times \hat{\mathbf{g}}\|}, \quad \hat{\mathbf{x}} = \hat{\mathbf{y}} \times \hat{\mathbf{h}}. \quad (17)$$

For any  $\mathbf{s} \in \mathbb{R}^3$  with  $\|\mathbf{s}\| = r > 0$  we define the corresponding unit vector  $\hat{\mathbf{a}} = r^{-1} \mathbf{s}$  and its spherical coordinates  $(\theta, \phi)$  with respect to the coordinate system  $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\mathbf{z}})$  by

$$\theta = \theta(\hat{\mathbf{a}}) = \arccos(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}}) \quad (18a)$$

$$\phi = \phi(\hat{\mathbf{a}}) = \arctan(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}) \quad (18b)$$

where we define

$$\arctan(y, x) = \begin{cases} \arctan |y/x| & x \geq 0, y \geq 0 \\ \pi - \arctan |y/x| & x < 0, y \geq 0 \\ \pi + \arctan |y/x| & x < 0, y < 0 \\ 2\pi - \arctan |y/x| & x \geq 0, y < 0. \end{cases} \quad (19)$$

#### A. Qubit Initialization

The objective of qubit initialization is to steer the system from some known initial state  $\mathbf{s}_0 = (r, \theta_0, \phi_0)$  on a sphere of radius  $r$  to a target state  $\mathbf{s}_f = (r', \theta_f, \phi_f)$ . We note that with unitary control only states on the same sphere as the initial state are accessible by performing a sequence of rotations about the axes  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ , respectively. We shall assume  $r = 1$ , noting that the sequence of rotations that steers the normalized initial state  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0$  to the normalized target state  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f$  steers  $\mathbf{s}_0$  to  $\mathbf{s}_f$  if they lie on the same sphere of radius  $r$ , and to a state  $\mathbf{s}'_f$  that is as close to the target state as we can get with unitary

---

**Algorithm 1** Compute polar coordinates of  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$  with respect to orthogonal frame induced by  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$

---

**Input:** unit vectors  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathbb{R}^3$   
**Output:** polar coordinates  $(\theta, \phi)$  of  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}$   
 $\hat{\mathbf{z}} = \hat{\mathbf{h}}$   
 $\mathbf{y} = \hat{\mathbf{h}} \times \hat{\mathbf{g}}$   
 $\hat{\mathbf{y}} = \mathbf{y}/\|\mathbf{y}\|$   
 $\hat{\mathbf{x}} = \hat{\mathbf{y}} \times \hat{\mathbf{h}}$   
 $\theta = \arccos(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}})$   
 $\phi = \arctan(\hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\mathbf{a}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}})$

---

control if  $r \neq r'$ . A general strategy to get from  $\mathbf{s}_0$  to  $\mathbf{s}_1$  with a minimum number of rotations about the axes  $\hat{\mathbf{h}} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}} = (\sin \zeta, 0, \cos \zeta)^T$ , following [29] and earlier work [30, 31, 32], is to rotate the initial state by a suitable angle about either axis to map it to a point on the great circle in the  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{z}}$  plane, followed by a sequence of  $\pi$ -rotations, alternating about the  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$  axis, until the angle  $\theta'$  of the current state differs by less than  $2\zeta$  from the  $\theta_f$  of the target state, i.e., we are within direct reach of the target state, followed by a final rotation by a suitable angle about the same axis we started with. By Lowenthal's criterion any state can be reached from any other state in at most  $k + 1$  steps,  $k$  being the smallest integer  $\geq \frac{\pi}{\zeta} - 1$  [30], and in the special case  $\zeta = \frac{\pi}{2}$  at most two steps are required.

Based on this idea, we can derive an explicit algorithm for calculating the generalized Euler angles of an optimal decomposition given the angle  $\alpha$  between the rotation axes  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ , and the relative coordinates  $(\theta_0, \phi_0)$  and  $(\theta_f, \phi_f)$  of the initial and final state. Assume  $\theta_0 > \theta_f$  and  $\zeta < \pi/2$ . If  $\theta_0 - \theta_f \leq 2\zeta$  then we can get from  $(\theta_0, 0)$  to  $(\theta_f, 0)$  in two steps, either by rotating  $(\theta_0, 0)$  around  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$  by an angle  $\theta$ , followed by a rotation about  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  by an angle  $\phi$  (Subroutine PR1), or by a rotation around  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  by an angle  $\phi$ , followed by a rotation around  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$  by an angle  $\theta$  (Subroutine PR2). If  $\theta_0 - \theta_f > 2\zeta$  then we move from the initial point to a point with  $\theta'_0 - \theta_f \leq 2\zeta$  via a sequence of  $\pi$ -rotations around axes  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  as described before. If  $\zeta \leq \pi/2$  but  $\theta_0 < \theta_f$  then we exchange the initial and final points, apply the algorithm and finally reverse the sequence of rotations. If  $\zeta > \pi/2$  we set  $(\theta_1, \phi_1) = (\pi - \theta_0, \phi_0)$ ,  $(\theta_2, \phi_2) = (\pi - \theta_f, \phi_f)$  and  $\tilde{\zeta} = \pi - \zeta$  and apply the algorithm.

The algorithm returns a list of pairs  $(\epsilon, \hat{\mathbf{r}})$ , where  $\epsilon \in [0, \pi]$  is a generalized Euler angle and  $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \hat{\mathbf{h}}$  or  $\hat{\mathbf{r}} = \hat{\mathbf{g}}$  indicates the rotation axis, which defines the necessary sequence of the rotations. E.g. if  $\theta_0 > \theta_f$ ,  $\zeta < \frac{\pi}{2}$  and routine PR1 was used, then

$$\mathbf{s}(\theta_f, \phi_f) = R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\phi_f)R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\phi)R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\theta)T^p R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(-\phi_0)\mathbf{s}(\theta_0, \phi_0). \quad (20)$$

---

**Algorithm 2** Calculate sequence of rotations about arbitrary, fixed axes  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$  required to move from one point on the unit sphere to another.

---

**Input:**  $(\theta_0, \phi_0), (\theta_f, \phi_f)$  – polar coordinates of initial and final point with respect to relative coordinate system (17).  
**Output:** List of pairs  $(\epsilon, \hat{\mathbf{u}})$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{u}} \in \{\hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{\mathbf{g}}\}$  defining rotation steps necessary to get from initial state to final state.  
**if**  $\theta_0 = \theta_f$  **return**  $\{(\phi_f - \phi_0, \hat{\mathbf{h}})\}$   
**else**  
 $p = \lfloor (\theta_0 - \theta_f)/2\zeta \rfloor$   
 $\theta_0 = \theta_0 - 2p\zeta$   
**if**  $\theta_0 = \theta_f$  **return**

$$\{(\phi_f, \hat{\mathbf{h}}), \underbrace{(\pi, \hat{\mathbf{g}}), (\pi, \hat{\mathbf{h}}), \dots, (\pi, \hat{\mathbf{g}}), (\pi, \hat{\mathbf{h}})}_{2p \text{ pairs}}, (-\phi_0, \hat{\mathbf{h}})\}$$

**else if**  $\theta_0 \leq \zeta$  or  $(2\zeta - \theta_0 \geq 0$  and  $2\zeta - \theta_0 > \theta_f)$   
**return**

$$\{(\phi_f, \hat{\mathbf{h}}), \underbrace{(\pi, \hat{\mathbf{g}}), (\pi, \hat{\mathbf{h}}), \dots, (\pi, \hat{\mathbf{g}}), (\pi, \hat{\mathbf{h}})}_{2p \text{ pairs}}, \text{PR2}[\theta_0, \theta_f, \zeta], (-\phi_0, \hat{\mathbf{h}})\}$$

**else return**

$$\{(\phi_f, \hat{\mathbf{h}}), \underbrace{(\pi, \hat{\mathbf{g}}), (\pi, \hat{\mathbf{h}}), \dots, (\pi, \hat{\mathbf{g}}), (\pi, \hat{\mathbf{h}})}_{2p \text{ pairs}}, \text{PR1}[\theta_0, \theta_f, \zeta], (-\phi_0, \hat{\mathbf{h}})\}$$

**end if**

**end if**

---

where the angles  $\phi$  and  $\theta$  are given by

$$\cos \phi = \frac{\sin \theta_0 - \cot \zeta (\cos \theta_f - \cos \theta_0)}{\sin \theta_f} \quad (21a)$$

$$\cos \theta = \frac{-\cos \zeta \cos(\zeta - \theta_0) + \cos \theta_f}{\sin \zeta \sin(\zeta - \theta_0)}. \quad (21b)$$

Similarly, if PR2 was used

$$\mathbf{s}(\theta_f, \phi_f) = R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\phi_f)R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\theta)R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\phi)T^p R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(-\phi_0)\mathbf{s}(\theta_0, \phi_0) \quad (22)$$

where the angles  $\phi$  and  $\theta$  are determined by

$$\cos \phi = \frac{\sin \theta_f - \cot \zeta (\cos \theta_0 - \cos \theta_f)}{\sin \theta_0} \quad (23a)$$

$$\cos \theta = \frac{-\cos \zeta \cos(\zeta - \theta_f) + \cos \theta_0}{\sin \zeta \sin(\zeta - \theta_f)}. \quad (23b)$$

The procedures PR1 and PR2 are described in Appendix A, and in both cases we have

$$T^p = \underbrace{R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\pi)R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\pi) \dots R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\pi)R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\pi)}_{2p \text{ rotations}}. \quad (24)$$

The minimal number of steps can be calculated explicitly. If  $\theta_0 = \theta_f$  then only a single rotation about  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  is

required, otherwise the minimal number of steps to get from  $(\theta_0, \phi_0)$  to  $(\theta_f, \phi_f)$  starting with a rotation about  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  is  $N = 2p + 2 + \Theta(q)$ , where  $\Theta(q) = 1$  for  $q > 0$  and 0 otherwise,

$$p = \text{int}[(\theta_0 - \theta_f)/2\zeta] \quad (25a)$$

$$q = \cos \theta_f - [\tan \zeta (\sin \bar{\theta} - \sin \theta_f \cos \phi_f) + \cos \bar{\theta}] \quad (25b)$$

and  $\bar{\theta} = \theta_0 - 2p\zeta$ . Here,  $\text{int}$  indicates the integer part.

The minimal number of steps to get from  $(\theta_0, \phi_0)$  to  $(\theta_f, \phi_f)$  starting with a rotation about  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$  is  $N' = 2 + \Theta(\theta' - \theta_f) [2p + 1 + \Theta(q)]$ , where

$$p = \text{int}[(\theta' - \theta_f)/2\zeta] \quad (26a)$$

$$q = \cos \theta_f - [\tan \zeta (\sin \bar{\theta} - \sin \theta_f \cos \phi_f) + \cos \bar{\theta}] \quad (26b)$$

with  $\theta' = \arccos(\cos \zeta \cos \theta_0 + \sin \zeta \sin \theta_0 \cos \phi_0) - \zeta$  and  $\bar{\theta} = \theta' - 2p\zeta$ .

## B. Quantum Gate Engineering

To uniquely determine a rotation in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  the images of two (non-antipodal) points are required (see Appendix B). Let  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0, \hat{\mathbf{b}}_0)$  and  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f, \hat{\mathbf{b}}_f)$  two pairs of points representing initial and final points, respectively, where all points must have the same distance from the origin and the distance between the pair of initial and final states must be the same. A simple strategy to pass from the initial points to the final points on sphere using the state transfer protocol from the previous section is

1. Use the state transfer algorithm calculate the series of rotations  $S_1$  that steers  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0$  to  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f$ .
2. Use the state transfer algorithm calculate the series of rotations  $S_0$  that steers  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f$  to the north pole  $(0, 0)$  of the coordinate system (17).
3. Calculate the difference  $\Delta\phi$  between the  $\phi$ -angles of  $S_0\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f$  and  $S_0S_1\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0$  using Eq. (18b).
4. Move from  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0, \hat{\mathbf{b}}_0)$  to  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f, \hat{\mathbf{b}}_f)$  with the following sequence of rotations

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f = S_0^{-1} R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\Delta\phi) S_0 S_1 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_0 \quad (27a)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f = S_0^{-1} R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\Delta\phi) S_0 S_1 \hat{\mathbf{b}}_0 \quad (27b)$$

where  $S_0^{-1}$  is the inverse series of rotations  $S_0$ .

Using the algorithm we pass from  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0$  to  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f$  via the sequence of rotations  $S_1$ . This procedure also moves the point  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0$  to  $S_1\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0$ , which is in general not equal to  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f$  but must have the same distance from  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f$  as  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f$ . The final position of the first point is further moved by a sequence of admissible rotations  $S_0$  to the north pole  $(0, 0)$  of the sphere with respect to the coordinate system (17). Applying the same sequence of rotations  $S_0$  to  $S_1\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f$  maps them to the points  $S_0S_1\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0$  and  $S_0\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f$ ,

---

**Algorithm 3** Calculate Generalized Euler Angles  $\epsilon$  for decomposition of arbitrary  $R \in \mathbb{SO}(3)$ .

---

**Input:**  $R \in \mathbb{SO}(3)$ , unit vectors  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathbb{R}^3$ ,  $\hat{\mathbf{h}} \neq \pm\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ .

**Output:** Euler angles  $\epsilon = (\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_{2p+2})$

```

 $\zeta = \arccos(\hat{\mathbf{h}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{g}})$ 
 $(\theta_{af}, \phi_{af}) = \text{Polar}(R\hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{\mathbf{g}})$ 
 $p = \lceil \theta_{af}/2\zeta \rceil$ 
if  $p > 0$ 
     $p = p - 1$ 
end if
 $\theta = \theta_{af} - 2\zeta p$ 
 $\epsilon_1 = -\arccos[\cot \zeta \tan(\theta/2)]$ 
 $\epsilon_2 = -\arccos[(-\cos^2 \zeta + \cos \theta)/\sin^2 \zeta]$ 
 $\epsilon_3 = \phi_{af}$ 
 $T_p = (R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\pi) R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\pi))^p$ 
 $S_1 = R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(-\epsilon_1) R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(-\epsilon_2) T_p R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(-\epsilon_3)$ 
 $(\theta_{b1}, \phi_{b1}) = \text{Polar}(S_1 R R_{\hat{\mathbf{y}}}(\pi/2) \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{\mathbf{h}}, \hat{\mathbf{g}})$ 
if  $p = 3$ 
     $\epsilon = [\phi_{b1}, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 + \epsilon_3]$ 
else if
     $\epsilon = [\phi_{b1}, \epsilon_1, \epsilon_2 + \pi, \underbrace{\pi, \dots, \pi}_{2p-1}, \epsilon_3]$ 
end if
 $\epsilon = \epsilon + 2\pi \lfloor (2\pi - \epsilon)/(2\pi) \rfloor$ 
 $\epsilon = \epsilon * (\epsilon < 2\pi)$ 

```

---

respectively, which must have the same distance from the north pole  $(0, 0)$ , since  $S_1\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f$  have the same distance from  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f$ . This means that the  $\theta$ -angle of points  $S_0S_1\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0$  and  $S_0\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f$  is the same and thus that we can move from  $S_0S_1\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0$  to  $S_0\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f$  by performing a single rotation with angle  $\Delta\phi$  around  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$ , which clearly leaves the relative north pole unchanged. Thus performing the inverse sequence of rotations  $S_0$  maps the north pole back to  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f$  and  $R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\Delta\phi)S_0\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f$  to  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f$  and we therefore have found a sequence of admissible rotations that simultaneously maps the points  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0, \hat{\mathbf{b}}_0)$  to  $(\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f, \hat{\mathbf{b}}_f)$ .

We can use this idea to derive an explicit decomposition of an arbitrary target operator  $R \in \mathbb{SO}(3)$  into a sequence of rotations about two admissible axes  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}}$ . Choose the (orthogonal) initial states

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0 = \hat{\mathbf{h}} = (0, 0), \quad (28a)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0 = R_{\hat{\mathbf{y}}}(\frac{\pi}{2}) \hat{\mathbf{a}}_0 = (\frac{\pi}{2}, 0), \quad (28b)$$

where the pairs  $(\theta, \phi)$  are the polar coordinates with respect to the coordinate system  $(\hat{\mathbf{x}}, \hat{\mathbf{y}}, \hat{\mathbf{z}})$  defined in (17), and compute the corresponding images under the target rotation  $R$

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f = R\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0 = (\theta_{af}, \phi_{af}), \quad (29a)$$

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_f = R\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0 = (\theta_{bf}, \phi_{bf}). \quad (29b)$$

By the previous section  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0 = S_1\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f$ , where  $S_1$  is a series of rotations that steer  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_f$  to  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0$ ,

$$S_1 = R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(-\epsilon_1) R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(-\epsilon_2) T^p R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(-\phi_{af})$$

where  $T = R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\pi)R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\pi)$  and  $p$  is the largest integer strictly less than  $\theta_{af}/2\zeta$ , i.e.,  $p = \lceil \theta_{af}/2\zeta \rceil - 1$ . The generalized Euler angles  $\epsilon_1$  and  $\epsilon_2$  can be obtained by inserting  $\theta_f = 0$  and  $\theta_0 = \theta_{af} - 2p\zeta \neq 0$  into subroutine PR2

$$\epsilon_2 = -\arccos \left[ \cot \zeta \tan \left( \frac{\theta_{af} - 2p\zeta}{2} \right) \right] \quad (30a)$$

$$\epsilon_1 = -\arccos \left[ \frac{-\cos^2 \zeta + \cos(\theta_{af} - 2p\zeta)}{\sin^2 \zeta} \right] \quad (30b)$$

Moreover,  $S_1 \hat{\mathbf{b}}_f = (\frac{\pi}{2}, \phi_{b1})$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0$  are unit vectors with the same  $\theta$ -angle ( $\theta = \frac{\pi}{2}$ ) since the same series of rotations preserve the distance between the points. Hence

$$\hat{\mathbf{b}}_0 = R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(-\phi_{b1})S_1 \hat{\mathbf{b}}_f.$$

Since  $R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}$  rotations leave  $\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0$  unchanged we also have

$$\hat{\mathbf{a}}_0 = R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(-\phi_{b1})S_1 \hat{\mathbf{a}}_f.$$

Thus  $R = S_1^{-1}R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\phi_{b1})$  and we have the decomposition

$$R = R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\epsilon_3)T^{-p}R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\epsilon_2)R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\epsilon_1)R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\epsilon_0) \quad (31)$$

where  $T^{-1} = R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\pi)R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\pi)$  and  $\epsilon_0 = \phi_{b1}$ ,  $\epsilon_3 = \phi_{af}$  and  $\epsilon_1$ ,  $\epsilon_2$  as in (30). If  $p > 1$  we can combine the two subsequent  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  rotations, while for  $p = 0$ ,  $T^p = \mathbb{I}$ , thus the optimal decomposition is

$$R = \begin{cases} R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\epsilon_3 + \epsilon_2)R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\epsilon_1)R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\epsilon_0), & p = 0 \\ R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\epsilon_3)T^{-p+1}R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\pi)R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\epsilon_2)R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\epsilon_1)R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\epsilon_0), & p > 0 \end{cases} \quad (32)$$

with  $\tilde{\epsilon}_2 = \epsilon_2 + \pi$ . Note that we can add multiples of  $2\pi$  to each of the Euler angles to ensure that the rotation angles are always between  $[0, 2\pi)$ . This factorization shows that in general  $2(p-1) + 5 = 2p + 3$  rotations are necessary. This procedure is summarized in Algorithm 3. Its output is a vector  $\epsilon = (\epsilon_0, \dots, \epsilon_{2p+2})$  of Euler angles with  $0 \leq \epsilon_k < 2\pi$  such that the target operator is

$$R = R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\epsilon_{2p+2}) \dots R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\epsilon_2)R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\epsilon_1)R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\epsilon_0), \quad (33)$$

i.e., the values  $\epsilon_k$  are arranged in the order in which the rotations are applied, where we always start and finish with a rotation about  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$ .

Noting that  $\theta_f \leq \pi$ , we see that the maximum number of steps is  $2p + 3 \leq \lceil \frac{\pi}{\zeta} \rceil + 1$ , which is equal to the order of generation of  $\mathbb{SO}(3)$ , which is  $k = \lceil \frac{\pi}{\zeta} \rceil + 1$  according to Lowenthal's criterion [30]. This shows that the decomposition (32) is optimal in the sense of requiring the smallest number of rotations, in general, though we note that the decomposition of individual gates is not unique, and in some special cases the algorithm may produce a decomposition that can be simplified further sometimes.

**Example III.1** Consider the swap gate  $\sigma_x$ , whose  $\mathbb{SO}(3)$  representation is  $R_X = \text{diag}(1, -1, -1)$ . If we choose the orthogonal axes  $\hat{\mathbf{h}} = (0, 0, 1)^T$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}} = (1, 0, 0)^T$  then algorithm 3 returns  $\epsilon = (\frac{3}{2}\pi, \pi, \frac{3}{2}\pi)$ , which corresponds to the decomposition  $R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\frac{3}{2}\pi)R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\pi)R_{\hat{\mathbf{h}}}(\frac{3}{2}\pi)$ , and which simplifies to  $R_{\hat{\mathbf{g}}}(\pi)$  since  $\hat{\mathbf{h}} = \hat{\mathbf{z}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}} = \hat{\mathbf{x}}$  and we have  $R_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(a)R_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}(\pi)R_{\hat{\mathbf{z}}}(a) = R_{\hat{\mathbf{x}}}(\pi)$  for any  $a \in \mathbb{R}$ .

## IV. APPLICATIONS

To apply the results in the previous section to implement a quantum gate

$$U = \exp[i\Phi(n_x\sigma_x + n_y\sigma_y + n_z\sigma_z)] \quad (34)$$

given the Hamiltonians

$$H_1 = \frac{d}{2}\sigma_x, \quad H_2 = \frac{d}{2}(\sigma_x + \kappa\sigma_z), \quad (35)$$

we identify the normalized Hamiltonians  $\tilde{H}_1 = \sigma_x$  and  $\tilde{H}_2 = (\sigma_x + \kappa\sigma_z)/\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2}$  with the unit vectors  $\hat{\mathbf{h}} = (1, 0, 0)^T$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{g}} = (1, 0, \kappa)^T/\sqrt{1 + \kappa^2}$ , respectively, and use algorithm 3 to decompose the corresponding  $\mathbb{SO}(3)$ -representation of the target operator  $U$

$$A = \exp[\Phi(n_xR_x + n_yR_y + n_zR_z)] \quad (36)$$

where  $R_x$ ,  $R_y$  and  $R_z$  are the rotation generators

$$R_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 2 \\ 0 & -2 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, R_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & -2 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 2 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, R_z = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 2 & 0 \\ -2 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Table I shows the optimized Euler angle decomposition results for the gates  $S = \exp(i\frac{\pi}{4}\sigma_z)$ ,  $T = \exp(i\frac{\pi}{8}\sigma_z)$ ,

$$U_{\text{Had}} = \exp\left(i\frac{\pi}{2\sqrt{2}}(\sigma_x + \sigma_z)\right) \quad (37)$$

as well as for the single qubit gates (13) required to implement a CNOT gate via the Cartan decomposition (1). Gates that require only  $\sigma_x$  rotations have been omitted as they are trivial to implement with the given Hamiltonians. Using the optimized Euler angles rounded to four significant digits, the gate errors for all single qubit gates in the table, as well as the CNOT gate, are below  $3 \times 10^{-9}$  for values of  $\kappa$  shown, while the gate errors using the standard Euler angles increase to almost 30% for  $K_y$  and  $\kappa = 1$ . The error for the resulting CNOT gate increases from  $\approx 10^{-4}$  for  $\kappa = 100$  to over 51% for  $\kappa = 1$ . Also note that the penalty for non-orthogonal Hamiltonians in terms of the number of rotation steps required is actually rather small unless  $\kappa$  is very small. Indeed for  $\kappa \geq 1$  all of the elementary gates in the table can be implemented in at most four steps, and for  $\kappa > 1$ , this is indeed the maximum number of steps required for any single qubit gate. To see this recall that Lowenthal's criterion guarantees that the maximum number of steps in the decomposition of any single qubit gates is

$$K = \left\lceil \frac{\pi}{\zeta} \right\rceil + 1 = \left\lceil \frac{\pi}{\arccos[(1 + \kappa^2)^{-1/2}]} \right\rceil + 1, \quad (38)$$

which yields  $K = 3$  for  $\kappa = \infty$  and  $K = 4$  for  $1 < \kappa < \infty$ ,  $K = 5$  for  $\kappa = 1$ ,  $K = 6$  for  $\sqrt{[\cos(\pi/5)]^2 - 1} < \kappa < 1$ , and so forth.

	$\kappa$	$\mathcal{E}_0$ (%)	$\epsilon(\tilde{H}_1)$	$\epsilon(\tilde{H}_2)$	$\epsilon(\tilde{H}_1)$	$\epsilon(\tilde{H}_2)$
$T$	$\infty$	0	0	1.7500	0	
	100	0.0007	0.0013	1.7500	0.0013	
	50	0.0029	0.0026	1.7499	0.0026	
	10	0.0727	0.0132	1.7487	0.0132	
	5	0.2844	0.0264	1.7448	0.0264	
	1	4.2893	0.1359	1.6359	0.1359	
$S$	$\infty$	0	0	1.5000	0	
	100	0.0025	0.0032	1.5000	0.0032	
	50	0.0100	0.0064	1.4999	0.0064	
	10	0.2481	0.0319	1.4968	0.0319	
	5	0.9710	0.0641	1.4873	0.0641	
	1	14.6446	0.5000	1	0.5000	
$U_{\text{Had}}$	$\infty$	0	1.5000	1.5000	1.5000	
	100	0.0025	1.5032	1.5000	1.5032	
	50	0.0100	1.5064	1.4999	1.5064	
	10	0.2481	1.5319	1.4968	1.5319	
	5	0.9709	1.5641	1.4873	1.5641	
	1	14.6442	0	1	0	
$U_1^{(2)}$	$\infty$	0	0.5000	1.5000	1.5000	
	100	0.0025	0.5032	1.5000	1.5032	
	50	0.0100	0.5064	1.4999	1.5064	
	10	0.2481	0.5319	1.4968	1.5319	
	5	0.9709	0.5641	1.4873	1.5641	
	1	14.6443	1	1	0	
$U_2^{(2)}$	$\infty$	0	0	1.5000	0.5000	
	100	0.0025	0.0032	1.5000	0.5032	
	50	0.0100	0.0064	1.4999	0.5064	
	10	0.2481	0.0319	1.4968	0.5319	
	5	0.9709	0.0641	1.4873	0.5641	
	1	14.6445	0.5000	1	1	
$K_y^{(1)}$	$\infty$	0	0	0	1	1
	100	0.0050	0.5000	1.9936	0.5000	1
	50	0.0200	0.5001	1.9873	0.5001	1
	10	0.4963	0.5032	1.9362	0.5032	1
	5	1.9419	0.5127	1.8718	0.5127	1
	1	29.2893	1	1	1	1

TABLE I: Optimized Euler angles (in units of  $\pi$ ) for various single qubit gates and different values of  $\kappa$ .  $\epsilon(\tilde{H}_1)$  indicates a rotation by  $\epsilon$  about the normalized axis  $\tilde{H}_1$ .  $\mathcal{E}_0$  is the gate error that results if the standard Euler angles for  $\kappa = \infty$  are used. The gate errors using the optimized Euler angles truncated to four decimal digits are  $< 3 \times 10^{-9}$  for all gates, and can be made arbitrarily small by increasing the number of significant digits of the Euler angles.

## V. CONCLUSIONS

The Euler decomposition of unitary operators in  $\mathbb{S}\text{U}(2)$  is widely used to implement single qubit gates by decomposing them into products of rotations about two orthogonal axes determined by fixed Hamiltonians. The

approach can be problematic however as experimentally accessible Hamiltonians in many cases may not be orthogonal. Depending on the situation, in some cases the Hamiltonians can be made almost orthogonal, while in others the constraints may be far more severe. In either case, however, lack of orthogonality of the underlying Hamiltonians leads to errors in the gates implemented, and even small errors can propagate. A rotation axis angle error of even 1% results in single qubit gate errors above the error threshold of  $10^{-4}$  even if there are no other sources of errors, and the single qubit errors compound and lead to even larger errors for two-qubit gates. Such systematic errors can easily be corrected, however, by adapting the Euler decomposition to the actual Hamiltonians available.

We have presented an explicit algorithm to calculate the optimized Euler angles for any single qubit gate and two arbitrary fixed Hamiltonians, and shown that we can substantially improve single and two-qubit gate fidelities by using optimized rather than standard Euler angles. The idea is attractive because the computational overhead to calculate the optimized Euler angles is minimal and the implementation is no more demanding than standard geometric control, i.e., no additional resources are required. There is a small price to pay in terms of an increase in the number of rotation steps required to implement a particular gate, but unless the maximum angle between the experimentally accessible Hamiltonians is very small, this increase is very slight, e.g., from at most three steps for orthogonal Hamiltonians to four for Hamiltonians with angle  $\zeta$  greater than  $45^\circ$  and five if  $\zeta = 45^\circ$ . For a model Hamiltonian  $H(\kappa) = \frac{d}{2}(\sigma_x + \kappa\sigma_z)$  with a fixed coupling parameter  $d$ , this condition is satisfied if the energy level splitting can be made at least as large as the tunnelling energy  $d$ , or  $\kappa = 1$ , whereas the standard Euler decomposition would require  $\kappa \rightarrow \infty$ , or energy level splittings that are orders of magnitude greater than the tunnelling energy  $d$  to achieve near-orthogonal Hamiltonians.

Overall, the overhead in terms of complexity of the pulse sequences is small compared to alternative ways to correct for rotation axis errors, such as composite pulse sequences, and this overhead seems acceptable, considering that relaxing the need to be able to perform rotations about orthogonal axes may allow for substantial simplifications of the underlying architectures. Another source of overhead of the technique is the need for initial characterization of the Hamiltonians. It must also be stressed that optimized Euler angles are designed to minimize errors for a single system. They cannot compensate for ensemble errors, i.e., errors arising from the fact that individual systems in a large ensemble may experience different fields and thus different effective rotations. However, the approach is an effective way to improve gate fidelities for non-ensemble systems with non-ideal Hamiltonians.

Further work is necessary to extend the results to higher-dimensional systems. Another issue is that different gates require different amounts of time to implement.



This is not a problem for a single system but would be for a large register if one wants to implement gates on different qubits simultaneously. Here we have only used two fixed Hamiltonians with a fixed angle between them. In many cases, however, we may be able to vary the controllable parameter continuously up to some maximum value. An interesting question in this regard is whether we can exploit the (limited) variation in the tilt angle to design simple geometric controls that allow us to implement arbitrary gates in a fixed amount of time.

## VI. ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

SGS acknowledges support from EPSRC ARF Grant EP/D07195X/1, European Union Knowledge Transfer Programme MTDK-CT-2004-509223, Hitachi and (US) National Science Foundation Grant NSF PHY05-51164. GC is supported by Grant VZ3407391 of the Ministry of Education, Youth and Sports of the Czech Republic. CD acknowledges support of the Program of the Cultural Exchanges-2008 between the Czech and the Hellenic Republic.

### APPENDIX A: SUBROUTINES PR1 AND PR2

Both procedures take only the  $\theta$ -angles of the initial and final points,  $\theta_0$  and  $\theta_f$ , respectively, and the angle  $\alpha$  between the axes  $\hat{\mathbf{h}}$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$  as input, assuming that the points have already been shifted to the  $\hat{\mathbf{x}} - \hat{\mathbf{z}}$ -plane.

#### 1. Subroutine PR1

Fig. 2 shows that  $\|\mathbf{MB}\| = \|\mathbf{MQ}'\|$  and  $\|\mathbf{NA}\| = \|\mathbf{NQ}'\|$  and

$$\cos \phi = \frac{|\mathbf{MB} \cdot \mathbf{MQ}'|}{\|\mathbf{MB}\|^2}, \quad \cos \theta = \frac{|\mathbf{NA} \cdot \mathbf{NQ}'|}{\|\mathbf{NA}\|^2}. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Noting that  $\mathbf{A} = (\sin \theta_0, 0, \cos \theta_0)$  and  $\mathbf{Q}' = (q, p, \cos \theta_f)$  for suitable values of  $p$  and  $q$ , and taking  $\mathbf{Q} = (q, 0, \cos \theta_f)$  to be the projection of  $\mathbf{Q}'$  onto the  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}\hat{\mathbf{z}}$  plane, shows

$$\cot \zeta = -\frac{\mathbf{QA} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{QA} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}}} = \frac{\sin \theta_0 - q}{\cos \theta_0 - \cos \theta_f} \quad (\text{A2})$$

and thus  $q = \sin \theta_0 - \cot \zeta (\cos \theta_f - \cos \theta_0)$ . Noting further that  $\mathbf{B} = (\sin \theta_f, 0, \cos \theta_f)$  and  $\mathbf{M} = (0, 0, \cos \theta_f)$ , shows that  $\mathbf{MQ}' = (q, p, 0)$ ,  $\mathbf{MB} = (\sin \theta_f, 0, 0)$ , and therefore

$$\cos \phi = \frac{q \sin \theta_f}{\sin^2 \theta_f} = \frac{\sin \theta_0 - \cot \zeta (\cos \theta_f - \cos \theta_0)}{\sin \theta_f}. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Furthermore, we have  $\mathbf{N} = r(\sin \zeta, 0, \cos \zeta)$  with  $r =$





FIG. 2: Rotations on the sphere and projection to the  $x - z$  plane for subroutine PR1

$\cos(\theta_0 - \zeta)$  and  $|\mathbf{NA}| = \sin(\theta_0 - \zeta)$ , and

$$\mathbf{NA} = (\sin \theta_0 - r \sin \zeta, 0, \cos \theta_0 - r \cos \zeta)$$

$$\mathbf{NQ}' = (q - r \sin \zeta, p, \cos \theta_0 - r \cos \zeta)$$

$$\mathbf{NA} \cdot \mathbf{NQ}' = (\sin \theta_0 - n_x)(q - n_x) + (\cos \theta_0 - n_z)^2,$$

which after some simplification gives

$$\cos \theta = \frac{-\cos \zeta \cos(\zeta - \theta_0) + \cos \theta_f}{\sin \zeta \sin(\zeta - \theta_0)}. \quad (\text{A4})$$





FIG. 3: Rotations on the sphere and projection to the  $x-z$  plane for subroutine PR2

## 2. Subroutine PR2

Fig. 3 shows that  $\|\mathbf{MA}\| = \|\mathbf{MQ}'\|$  and  $\|\mathbf{NB}\| = \|\mathbf{NQ}'\|$  and

$$\cos \phi = \frac{|\mathbf{MA}||\mathbf{MQ}'|}{|\mathbf{MA}|^2}, \quad \cos \theta = \frac{|\mathbf{NB}||\mathbf{NQ}'|}{|\mathbf{NB}|^2}. \quad (\text{A5})$$

Noting that  $\mathbf{B} = (\sin \theta_f, 0, \cos \theta_f)$  and  $\mathbf{Q}' = (q, p, \cos \theta_0)$  for suitable  $p$  and  $q$  as before, shows that

$$\cot \zeta = -\frac{\mathbf{QB} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{x}}}{\mathbf{QB} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{z}}} = -\frac{\sin \theta_f - q}{\cos \theta_f - \cos \theta_0} \quad (\text{A6})$$

i.e.,  $q = \sin \theta_f - \cot \zeta (\cos \theta_0 - \cos \theta_f)$ .

Taking  $\mathbf{Q} = (q, 0, \cos \theta_0)$  to be the projection of  $\mathbf{Q}'$  onto the  $\hat{\mathbf{x}}\hat{\mathbf{z}}$  plane, and noting that  $\mathbf{A} = (\sin \theta_0, 0, \cos \theta_0)$  and  $\mathbf{M} = (0, 0, \cos \theta_0)$  shows that  $\mathbf{MQ}' = (q, p, 0)$ ,

$\mathbf{MA} = (\sin \theta_f, 0, 0)$ , and thus

$$\cos \phi = \frac{q \sin \theta_0}{\sin^2 \theta_0} = \frac{\sin \theta_f - \cot \zeta (\cos \theta_0 - \cos \theta_f)}{\sin \theta_0}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Furthermore, we have  $\mathbf{N} = r(\sin \zeta, 0, \cos \zeta)$  with  $r = \cos(\theta_f - \zeta)$  and  $|\mathbf{NB}| = \sin(\theta_f - \zeta)$ , and

$$\mathbf{NB} = (\sin \theta_f - r \sin \zeta, 0, \cos \theta_f - r \cos \zeta)$$

$$\mathbf{NQ}' = (q - r \sin \zeta, p, \cos \theta_0 - r \cos \zeta)$$

$$\mathbf{NA} \cdot \mathbf{NQ}' = (\sin \theta_0 - n_x)(q - n_x) + (\cos \theta_0 - n_z)^2,$$

which after some simplification gives

$$\begin{aligned} \cos \theta &= -\cot \zeta \cot(\zeta - \theta_f) + \cos \theta_0 \csc \zeta \csc(\zeta - \theta_f) \\ &= \frac{-\cos \zeta \cos(\zeta - \theta_f) + \cos \theta_0}{\sin \zeta \sin(\zeta - \theta_f)}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{A8})$$

## APPENDIX B: STATE VS GATE CONTROL

The parametrization (2) for a unitary operator  $W \in \text{SU}(2)$  shows immediately that the image  $W|\psi\rangle$  of a single Hilbert space vector  $|\psi\rangle$  is sufficient to fix all three parameters. The corresponding real rotation  $R(a, b, c) \in \text{SO}(3)$  (16), however, cannot be fully determined by the image of a single Bloch vector. Let  $\hat{\mathbf{v}}$  be a unit vector in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  and  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}$  its image under  $R(a, b, c)$ . Since  $R(a, b, c)$  is an isometry, i.e., preserves the norm,  $\|\hat{\mathbf{u}}\| = \|\hat{\mathbf{v}}\| = 1$ , and thus we have only two independent equations  $u_1 = \sum_k R_{1k} v_k$  and  $u_2 = \sum_k R_{2k} v_k$  as  $u_3^2 = 1 - u_1^2 - u_2^2$ , which is not sufficient to fully determine  $R(a, b, c)$ . In general, the mapping of a single point (vector) defines a one-parameter family of elements of  $\text{SO}(3)$ , and two non-antipodal points and their images are required to determine all three parameters  $a, b, c$  of  $R$ . This is easy to see as the image  $\hat{\mathbf{u}}' = R\hat{\mathbf{v}}'$  of a second point  $\hat{\mathbf{v}}'$  that is not antipodal to the first yields two more equations  $u'_1 = \sum_k R_{1k} v'_k$  and  $u'_2 = \sum_k R_{2k} v'_k$ . Only one of them is independent since a rotation also preserves the inner product  $\hat{\mathbf{v}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{v}}' = \hat{\mathbf{u}} \cdot \hat{\mathbf{u}}'$  but the extra equation is sufficient to uniquely determine  $R(a, b, c)$ .

The reason for the apparent discrepancy is that when we transform from complex Hilbert space vectors  $|\psi\rangle$  to density matrices  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ , the information about the global phase of  $|\psi\rangle$  is lost. Thus, while the pair  $|\psi\rangle = (0, 1)^T$  and  $|\psi'\rangle = W|\psi\rangle = (r_1 e^{i\phi_1}, r_2 e^{i\phi_2})^T$  with  $r_1^2 + r_2^2 = 1$  uniquely determines  $W$ ,

$$\zeta = \arccos(r_1), \quad \beta = \phi_1, \quad c = \phi_2, \quad (\text{B1})$$

the corresponding density operator  $\rho = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$  and its image  $\rho' = |\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'| = W\rho W^\dagger$  with

$$\rho' = \begin{pmatrix} r_1^2 & r_1 r_2 e^{i(\phi_1 - \phi_2)} \\ r_1 r_2 e^{-i(\phi_1 - \phi_2)} & r_2^2 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{B2})$$

only determines  $\zeta$  and  $\beta - \gamma$ . Since there is a one-to-one correspondence between Bloch vectors and density matrices for  $n = 2$ , this is consistent with the previous

observation that the image of a single vector in  $\mathbb{R}^3$  can only fix two of the parameters of  $R(a, b, c)$ .

- 
- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000).
- [2] D. Deutsch, A. Barenco, and A. Ekert, Proc. Roy. Soc. **449**, 669 (1995).
- [3] A. W. Knap, *Lie groups beyond an introduction*, Vol. 140 of *Progress in Mathematics*, 2nd ed. (Birkhauser, Boston, 2002).
- [4] S. Shi and H. Rabitz, J. Chem. Phys. **92**, 364 (1990).
- [5] S. G. Schirmer, M. D. Girardeau, and J. V. Leahy, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 012101 (1999).
- [6] Y. Maday and G. Turinici, J. Chem. Phys. **118**, 8191 (2003).
- [7] N. Khaneja, R. Brockett, and S. J. Glaser, Phys. Rev. A **63**, 032308 (2001).
- [8] Y. Ohtsuki, G. Turinici, and H. Rabitz, J. Chem. Phys. **120**, 5509 (2004).
- [9] N. Khaneja, T. Reiss, C. Kehlet, T. Schulte-Herbrueggen, and S. J. Glaser, J. Mag. Resonance **172**, 296 (2005).
- [10] S. Schirmer, J. Mod. Opt. **56**, 831 (2009).
- [11] D. J. Siminovich, Concepts in Magnetic Resonance **9**, 211 (1997).
- [12] C. D. Hill, L. C. L. Hollenberg, A. G. Fowler, C. J. Wellard, A. D. Greentree, and H.-S. Goan, Phys. Rev. B **72**, 045350 (2005).
- [13] J. Gorman, D. G. Hasko, and D. A. Williams, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 090502 (2005).
- [14] L. Euler, St Petersburg Academy of the Sciences **2**, 43 (1862), reprinted Opera Omnia: Series 2. Springer-Birkhauser, 1968, Vol. 9, p.413-441.
- [15] M. Levitt and R. Freeman, J. Magn. Reson. **33**, 473 (1979).
- [16] M. Levitt, Prog. NMR Spectroscopy **18**, 61 (1986).
- [17] H. K. Cummins and J. A. Jones, New. J. Physics **2**, 6.1 (2000).
- [18] M. Testolin, Ph.D. thesis, University of Melbourne, 2008.
- [19] S. G. Schirmer, A. Kolli, and D. K. L. Oi, Phys. Rev. A **69**, 050306(R) (2004).
- [20] J. H. Cole, S. G. Schirmer, A. D. Greentree, C. J. Wellard, D. K. L. Oi, and L. C. L. Hollenberg, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062312 (2005).
- [21] J. H. Cole, A. D. Greentree, D. K. L. Oi, S. G. Schirmer, C. J. Wellard, and L. C. L. Hollenberg, Phys. Rev. A **73**, 062333 (2006).
- [22] S. Schirmer and D. Oi, qph0902.3434 (2009).
- [23] J. Zhang and K. B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 052317 (2005).
- [24] K. C. Chatzisavvas, C. Daskaloyannis, and C. P. Panos, Quantum Computers and Computing **4**, 93 (2003).
- [25] K. C. Chatzisavvas, C. Daskaloyannis, and S. G. Schirmer, in *AIP Conference Proceedings*, edited by T. E. Simos and G. Maroulis (AIP, USA, 2007), Vol. 963 (Volume 2B), p. 748.
- [26] J. Zhang, J. Vala, S. Sastry, and K. B. Whaley, Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 020502 (2004).
- [27] H. A. Sa Earp and J. K. Pachos, J. Math. Phys. **46**, 1 (2005).
- [28] V. Ramakrishna, K. Flores, H. Rabitz, and R. Ober, Phys. Rev. A **62**, 053409 (2000).
- [29] D. D'Alessandro, Automatica **40**, 1997 (2004).
- [30] F. Lowenthal, Can. J. of Math. **24**, 713 (1972).
- [31] P. E. Crouch and Silva Leite, Systems and Control Letters **2**, 341 (1983).
- [32] Silva Leite, Rocky Mountain Journal of Mathematics **21**, 879 (1991).