

# Generation of C-NOT, SWAP, and C-Z Gates for Two Qubits Using Coherent and Incoherent Controls and Stochastic Optimization

Oleg V. Morzhin<sup>1,\*</sup> and Alexander N. Pechen<sup>1,†</sup>

<sup>1</sup> Department of Mathematical Methods for Quantum Technologies,  
Steklov Mathematical Institute of Russian Academy of Sciences,  
8 Gubkina Str., Moscow, 119991, Russia  
(<http://www.mi-ras.ru/eng/dep51>)

## Abstract

In this work, we consider a general form of the dynamics of open quantum systems determined by the Gorini–Kossakowsky–Sudarchhan–Lindblad type master equation with simultaneous coherent and incoherent controls with three particular forms of the two-qubit Hamiltonians. Coherent control enters in the Hamiltonian and incoherent control enters in both the Hamiltonian and the superoperator of dissipation. For these systems, we analyze the control problems of generating two-qubit C-NOT, SWAP, and C-Z gates using with piecewise constant controls and stochastic optimization in the form of an adapted version of the dual annealing algorithm. In the numerical experiment, we analyze the minimal infidelity obtained by the dual annealing for various values of strength of the interaction between the system and the environment.

**Keywords:** open quantum system, two qubits, optimal quantum control, coherent control, incoherent control, C-NOT, SWAP, C-Z.

## 1 Introduction

Optimal control of quantum systems such as atoms or molecules is an important research direction at the intersection of mathematics, physics, chemistry, and technology. It aims to obtain desired properties of the controlled quantum system using external variable influence. Quantum control is crucial for development of various quantum technologies such as quantum computing, NMR, laser chemistry, etc. [1–21].

In general, in quantum control various types of optimization tools are used including Pontryagin maximum principle ([21, Ch. 4], [22]), Krotov type methods [23–29]), Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellmann equation [30], Zhu–Rabitz [31] method, Gradient Ascent

---

\*E-mail: [morzhin.oleg@yandex.ru](mailto:morzhin.oleg@yandex.ru); [mathnet.ru/eng/person30382](http://mathnet.ru/eng/person30382); ORCID 0000-0002-9890-1303

†Corresponding author. E-mail: [apechen@gmail.com](mailto:apechen@gmail.com); [mathnet.ru/eng/person17991](http://mathnet.ru/eng/person17991); ORCID 0000-0001-8290-8300

Pulse Engineering (GRAPE) [26, 32–34] operating with piecewise constant controls, gradients, matrix exponentials, conditional gradient method [35], gradient projection methods [29, 35, 36], speed-gradient method [37], gradient-free Chopped RANdom Basis (CRAB) ansatz [38–40] with coherent control defined using trigonometric functions, genetic algorithms [41–43], dual annealing [29], machine learning [44, 45], etc.

From the experimental point of view, quantum systems are often open, i.e. they interact with their environment. On one hand, this is considered as an obstacle for controlling quantum systems. However, in some cases one can try to use the environment as a useful control resource — in this work we exploit the *incoherent control* approach which was proposed in [42, 46], where spectral, generally time-dependent and non-equilibrium, density of incoherent photons was used as control jointly with *coherent control* by lasers. Following this approach, various types and aspects of optimal control problems for one- and two-qubit systems were analyzed recently in our works [33, 35, 36, 47], etc. In this approach, the dynamics (both for Markovian, including in the Born-Markov approximation, and non-Markovian cases) of an  $N$ -level quantum system is considered with general master equation under simultaneous coherent  $u$  and incoherent  $n$  controls:

$$\frac{d\rho(t)}{dt} = \mathcal{L}_t^{u,n}(\rho(t)) := -i[H_t^{u,n}, \rho(t)] + \varepsilon \underbrace{\sum_k \gamma_k(t) \mathcal{D}_k(\rho(t))}_{\mathcal{D}_t^n(\rho(t))}, \quad \rho(0) = \rho_0. \quad (1)$$

Here  $\rho(t) : \mathcal{H} \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$  is  $N \times N$  density matrix (positive semi-definite,  $\rho(t) \geq 0$ , with unit trace,  $\text{Tr}\rho(t) = 1$ );  $H_t^{u,t}$  is the Hamiltonian which represents either memoryless Markovian or having memory terms non-Markovian case; the coefficient  $\varepsilon > 0$  determines strength of the interaction between the system and the environment; the last term in is the dissipator (superoperator of dissipation) depending on incoherent control  $n$  where  $\{\gamma_k\}$  denote decoherence rates depending on time;  $\rho_0$  is a given initial density matrix. In this work we consider the Planck’s constant  $\hbar = 1$ .

Basic objects in quantum information and computing are qubits, qutrits, qudits and quantum gates (e.g., the recent papers [6, 48, 49], also [50–54], etc.). Mathematical modeling of physical processes for generating quantum gates involves, e.g., the Schrödinger equation with coherent control in the Hamiltonian, the Gorini–Kossakowski–Sudarshan–Lindblad (GKSL) master equation with coherent (in the Hamiltonian) and incoherent (in the Hamiltonian via the Lamb shift and in the superoperator of dissipation) controls [27, 33, 55] and various objective functionals for characterizing how well certain unitary quantum gate is generated.

Proposed in [27] approach for modelling generation of  $M$ -qubit quantum gates ( $M \geq 1$ ) considers dissipative dynamics depending only on coherent control and uses only three initial density matrices instead of the corresponding full basis (e.g., three matrices instead of sixteen for the two-qubit case). While the recent work [55] considers only coherent control (similar to [27]), the recent works [33, 47] extend the approach of [27] to the GKSL-type quantum systems with simultaneous coherent control and incoherent control (in the approach of [42, 46]) for generating various one- and two-qubit quantum gates (H, T, C-NOT, C-PHASE including C-Z). As in [47], below we use the abbreviation “GRK” meaning the Goerz–Reich–Koch approach.

In this work, on one hand similarly to [47] we consider the same three versions of the two-qubit quantum system, the same approach with piecewise constant controls, one of

the objective functionals and DAA. In difference, we consider SWAP gate in addition to C-NOT and C-Z gates, and obtain the DAA results for C-NOT, SWAP, C-Z under different DAA settings and upper constraint for incoherent controls for analyzing dependence of the objective values on the parameter  $\varepsilon$  determining strength of the interaction between the system and the environment. The DAA implementation [56] is adapted.

The structure of the paper is the following. Sec. 2 contains the formulation of the considered three types of open quantum systems and one type of the GRK objectives which is used here for C-NOT, SWAP, C-Z gates. Sec. 3 describes the DAA optimization approach and the corresponding numerical results with respect to varying  $\varepsilon$ . Conclusions section 4 resumes the article.

## 2 Two-Qubit Quantum Systems and Objective Functionals

### 2.1 Quantum Systems with the Three Kinds of the Hamiltonian

For two qubits ( $M = 2$ ), the Hilbert space is  $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathbb{C}^2 \approx \mathbb{C}^4$ , i.e.  $N = 4$ . As in [29, 36, 47], consider the corresponding Markovian two-qubit case of (1). The Hamiltonian  $H_t^{u,n}$  for each of the three systems ( $k = 1, 2, 3$ ) has the following general form:

$$H_{t,k}^{u,n} = H_{S,k} + \varepsilon H_{\text{eff},t}^n + V_k u(t). \quad (2)$$

Here scalar coherent control  $u$  and vector incoherent control  $n = (n_1, n_2)$  are considered, in general, as piecewise continuous on  $[0, T]$  and piecewise constant in the optimization DAA approach used in this article, control  $f = (u, n)$ ;  $H_{S,k}$  is the free Hamiltonian;  $H_{\text{eff},n(t)}$  is the effective Hamiltonian depending on values of incoherent control which describes the Lamb shift;  $V_k$  is a given Hermitian matrix which determines interaction with  $u(t)$ ; the coefficient  $\varepsilon > 0$ . Below in this article, we change  $\varepsilon$  for generating a series of instances for each  $H_{t,k}^{u,n}$ ,  $k = 1, 2, 3$ .

We denote by  $\mathbb{I}_2$  the  $2 \times 2$  identity matrix, and denote Pauli matrices and uppering, lowering one-qubit matrices as

$$\sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma_z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^+ = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \sigma^- = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

The effective Hamiltonian in (2) and the superoperator of dissipation are the same for all three considered systems:

$$H_{\text{eff},t}^n = \Lambda_1 n_1(t) (\sigma_z \otimes \mathbb{I}_2) + \Lambda_2 n_2(t) (\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma_z), \quad (3)$$

$$\mathcal{D}^n(\rho) = \mathcal{D}^{n_1}(\rho) + \mathcal{D}^{n_2}(\rho), \quad (4)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{D}_t^{n_j}(\rho) = & \Omega_j (n_j(t) + 1) (2\sigma_j^- \rho \sigma_j^+ - \sigma_j^+ \sigma_j^- \rho - \rho \sigma_j^+ \sigma_j^-) + \\ & + \Omega_j n_j(t) (2\sigma_j^+ \rho \sigma_j^- - \sigma_j^- \sigma_j^+ \rho - \rho \sigma_j^- \sigma_j^+), \quad j = 1, 2, \end{aligned}$$

where  $\Lambda_j > 0$  and  $\Omega_j > 0$  are some constants depending on the details of interaction between the system and the environment,  $\sigma_1^\pm = \sigma^\pm \otimes \mathbb{I}_2$ , and  $\sigma_2^\pm = \mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma^\pm$ .

For the general form (2), we consider the following three variants which produce the corresponding three quantum systems.

**System 1.** The free and interaction Hamiltonians are

$$H_{S,1} = \frac{\omega_1}{2} (\sigma_z \otimes \mathbb{I}_2) + \frac{\omega_2}{2} (\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma_z),$$

$$V_1 = \sigma_x \otimes \mathbb{I}_2 + \mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma_x.$$

**System 2.** The free and interaction Hamiltonians are

$$H_{S,2} = H_{S,1} = \frac{\omega_1}{2} (\sigma_z \otimes \mathbb{I}_2) + \frac{\omega_2}{2} (\mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma_z),$$

$$V_2 = \sigma_x \otimes \sigma_x.$$

**System 3.** The free and interaction Hamiltonians are

$$H_{S,3} = \sigma_z \otimes \mathbb{I}_2 + \mathbb{I}_2 \otimes \sigma_z + \alpha(\sigma_y \otimes \sigma_y + \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z), \quad \alpha > 0,$$

$$V_3 = \sigma_x \otimes \mathbb{I}_2.$$

We consider the following constraints on controls:

$$f(t) = (u(t), n(t)) \in [-u_{\max}, u_{\max}] \times [0, n_{\max}]^2, \quad t \in [0, T], \quad (5)$$

where  $u_{\max}, n_{\max} > 0$ .

As in [29, 36, 47], consider the following realification (parameterization) of the two-qubit density matrix:

$$\rho = \begin{pmatrix} \rho_{1,1} & \rho_{1,2} & \rho_{1,3} & \rho_{1,4} \\ \rho_{1,2}^* & \rho_{2,2} & \rho_{2,3} & \rho_{2,4} \\ \rho_{1,3}^* & \rho_{2,3}^* & \rho_{3,3} & \rho_{3,4} \\ \rho_{1,4}^* & \rho_{2,4}^* & \rho_{3,4}^* & \rho_{4,4} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 + ix_3 & x_4 + ix_5 & x_6 + ix_7 \\ x_2 - ix_3 & x_8 & x_9 + ix_{10} & x_{11} + ix_{12} \\ x_4 - ix_5 & x_9 - ix_{10} & x_{13} & x_{14} + ix_{15} \\ x_6 - ix_7 & x_{11} - ix_{12} & x_{14} - ix_{15} & x_{16} \end{pmatrix}.$$

Here  $x_j \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $j = \overline{1, 16}$ . The condition  $\text{Tr} \rho = 1$  implies the linear condition  $x_1 + x_8 + x_{13} + x_{16} = 1$ . Using the realification for the three two-qubit systems of (1) with (2), (3), (4), in [47] we considered two-qubit gate generation using DAA and GRAPE.

## 2.2 Goerz–Reich–Koch Type Objective Functionals for the Problems of Generating C-NOT, SWAP, and C-Z Gates

For the two-qubit systems ( $N = 2$ ), consider the problems of generation of the following target unitary gates: C-NOT (controlled NOT), SWAP, and C-Z = C-PHASE( $\pi$ ) (controlled  $\pi$  phase) gates. These gates are defined in the computational basis by the unitary matrices

$$\text{C-NOT} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{SWAP} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{C-Z} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Following the GRK approach, for the problem of generating such a two-qubit gate, we consider — instead of the ( $N^2 = 16$ )-dimensional set of states — the proposed in [27] minimal set consisting just of the three states which, for the two-qubit case, have the form

$$\rho_{0,1} = \text{diag} \left( \frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{10}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{10} \right), \quad \rho_{0,2} = \frac{1}{4} J_4, \quad \rho_{0,3} = \frac{1}{4} \mathbb{I}_4, \quad (6)$$

where  $J_4$  denotes the  $4 \times 4$  matrix whose all elements are equal to 1. Further, the objective functional to be minimized is defined by the mean value of the three squared Hilbert–Schmidt distances multiplied by 1/2, each of them is considered between the  $m$ th final density matrix,  $\rho_m(T)$  (corresponds to the  $m$ th special initial density matrix,  $\rho_{0,m}$ ), and the target density matrix  $\rho_{\text{target},m} = U\rho_{0,m}U^\dagger$ :

$$F_U^{\text{GRK,sd}}(f) = \frac{1}{6} \sum_{m=1}^3 \|\rho_m(T) - U\rho_{0,m}U^\dagger\|^2 \rightarrow \inf. \quad (7)$$

The objective  $F_U^{\text{GRK,sd}}$  in principle is the same that the formula (A1) in [27], but we introduce the multipliers 1/2 and 1/3. The set of initial states (6) is a particular case for the general formulas (4a), (4b), (4c) given in the same article and also in the dissertation [57, p. 71]. For brevity, we sometimes call the objective to be minimized in this work as infidelity.

Table 1 shows for each of the three considered gates that  $U\rho_{0,m}U^\dagger$ :

- does not change all the three initial states  $\rho_{0,m}$ ,  $m = 1, 2, 3$ ;
- changes only one initial state: if  $U$  is C-NOT or SWAP, then the first initial state is changed, while if  $U$  is C-Z, then the second initial state is changed.

Table 1: The matrices  $U\rho_m(0)U^\dagger$  for  $m = 1, 2, 3$  when  $U$  is either C-NOT, SWAP or C-Z. Color highlights cases when action of the gate on the matrix is non-trivial.

Gate, $U$ \backslash Target state	$U\rho_{0,1}U^\dagger$	$U\rho_{0,2}U^\dagger$	$U\rho_{0,3}U^\dagger$
C-NOT	diag $(\frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{10}, \frac{1}{10}, \frac{1}{5}) \neq \rho_{0,1}$	$\frac{1}{4}J_4 = \rho_{0,2}$	$\frac{1}{4}\mathbb{I}_4 = \rho_{0,3}$
SWAP	diag $(\frac{2}{5}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{3}{10}, \frac{1}{10}) \neq \rho_{0,1}$	$\frac{1}{4}J_4 = \rho_{0,2}$	$\frac{1}{4}\mathbb{I}_4 = \rho_{0,3}$
C-Z	diag $(\frac{2}{5}, \frac{3}{10}, \frac{1}{5}, \frac{1}{10}) = \rho_{0,1}$	$\frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & -1 \\ -1 & -1 & -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \neq \rho_{0,2}$	$\frac{1}{4}\mathbb{I}_4 = \rho_{0,3}$

### 3 Numerical Approach and Results

#### 3.1 Approach Based on Piecewise Constant Controls and Dual Annealing

Here we define the class of admissible piecewise constant coherent and incoherent controls at the uniform grid introduced on  $[0, T]$  with  $K$  equal subintervals, i.e.

$$u(t) = \sum_{i=1}^K \theta_{[t_i, t_{i+1})}(t) u^i, \quad n_j(t) = \sum_{i=1}^K \theta_{[t_i, t_{i+1})}(t) n_j^i, \quad j = 1, 2, \quad (8)$$

and with fixed  $u_{\text{max}}, n_{\text{max}}$  in (5). In (8), we consider  $t_1 = 0$ ,  $t_{i+1} - t_i = T/K$ ,  $\theta_{[t_i, t_{i+1})}(t)$ , and the characteristic function which returns 1, if  $t \in [t_i, t_{i+1})$ , and returns 0, if otherwise. For the final time  $t = t_{K+1} = T$ , we continue the last values:  $u(T) = u(T-)$ ,  $n_j(T) = n_j(T-)$ . The DAA search is performed in the parallelepiped  $[-u_{\text{max}}, u_{\text{max}}]^K \times [0, n_{\text{max}}]^{2K}$ .

Thus, instead of optimization work in the infinite-dimensional space, here we should perform finite-dimensional optimization work where the control parameters

$$\{u^1, \dots, u^K, n_1^1, \dots, n_1^K, n_2^1, \dots, n_2^K\}$$

are considered in the  $3K$ -dimensional parallelepipedal domain.

DAA is a zeroth-order stochastic tool as genetic algorithms, differential evolution, particle-swarm optimization, sparrow search algorithm, etc. It tries to find a global minimizer of an objective function without using its gradient or/and Hessian. As [56] informs, the corresponding implementation of DAA in SciPy represents the combination of the simulated annealing from [58, 59] and the local search strategy [60, 61].

We use DAA with the default settings [56] except of the following three items: 1) the default `initial_temp` (initial artificial temperature) is increased to  $3 \times 10^4$ , i.e. near in six times; 2) `maxfun` (which determines the number of objective calls) is decreased from the default  $10^7$  to  $3 \times 10^4$ ; 3) `maxiter` is increased from the default  $10^3$  to  $3 \times 10^3$ . With respect to the algorithmic parameter `initial_temp`, we read “higher values to facilitates a wider search ... allowing dual\_annealing to escape local minima that it is trapped in” in [56].

Taking into account the stochastic nature of DAA, we perform for the same optimization problem several trials of DAA and then compare the computed value of the objective over the trials. For speed up the DAA work, it was performed in the parallel and sequential computations. For the numerical results, their storing and visualization are done, correspondingly, with help of the Python libraries `sqlite3` and `Matplotlib`.

In contrast to the use of DAA in [47], here we do the following changes:

- we set  $K = 200$  instead of  $K = 100$ ;
- we set  $n_{\max} = 20$  instead of  $n_{\max} = 10$  and  $u_{\max} = 20$  instead of  $u_{\max} = 30$ ;
- for each particular optimal control problem, we perform ten DAA trials instead of three DAA trials;
- we vary  $\varepsilon$  along the set (9) instead of considering only  $\varepsilon = 0.1$ ;
- we use automatically generated initial points in DAA instead of setting our initial guess.

### 3.2 Values of the Systems Parameters. Statistical Characteristics

As in [47], consider the Systems 1, 2, 3 with the following values of the systems parameters:

$$\omega_1 = 1, \quad \omega_2 = 1.1, \quad \Omega_1 = \Omega_2 = \Lambda_1 = \Lambda_2 = 0.5$$

and the final time  $T = 20$ . For System 3, set the parameter  $\alpha = 0.2$ .

Independently for System 1, System 2, and System 3, we consider the series of values

$$\varepsilon \in \{0, 0.01, 0.02, 0.03, 0.04, 0.05, 0.06, 0.07, 0.08, 0.09, 0.1\} \quad (9)$$

and have the problem of minimizing the objective of the general type (7) for a given quantum gate for analyzing the corresponding dependences between increasing  $\varepsilon$  and the objective values.

For a fixed quantum gate  $U$  and the parameter  $\varepsilon = \varepsilon_k \in \{0, 0.01, 0.02, \dots, 0.1\}$ , consider the following characteristics over 10 trials of DAA started from automatically generated initial points:

$$F_{U, \min\text{-min}}^{\text{GRK,sd}}(\varepsilon_k) = \min_{1 \leq i \leq 10} \left\{ F_U^{\text{GRK,sd}}(f_i^*; \varepsilon_k) \right\}, \quad (10)$$

$$F_{U, \max\text{-min}}^{\text{GRK,sd}}(\varepsilon_k) = \max_{1 \leq i \leq 10} \left\{ F_U^{\text{GRK,sd}}(f_i^*; \varepsilon_k) \right\}, \quad (11)$$

$$F_{U, \text{mean}\text{-min}}^{\text{GRK,sd}}(\varepsilon_k) = \frac{1}{10} \sum_{i=1}^{10} F_U^{\text{GRK,sd}}(f_i^*; \varepsilon_k), \quad (12)$$

where consider  $\{f_i^*\}_{i=1}^{10}$  being the set of the resulting piecewise constant controls computed via 10 trials of DAA for the same problem of minimizing the objective  $F_U^{\text{GRK,sd}}(f)$  under the given  $U$ ,  $\varepsilon_k$ . Thus, the word ‘‘min’’ on the right in the lower index reflects this numerical meaning.

### 3.3 For C-NOT Gate




Figure 1: For C-NOT gate and Systems 1, 2, 3, the obtained via DAA values of (10)–(12): (a) for System 1; (b) for System 2; (c) for System 3. The DAA computed values are shown via the markers, the piecewise linear interpolation is shown in addition.

For Systems 1, 2, 3, the results of DAA are shown in Figure 1 in terms of (10)–(12). We see that increasing  $\varepsilon_k$  from 0 to 0.1 with the step 0.01 gives, in principle: 1) increasing the min–min (graphs with round markers), max–min (graphs with square markers), and mean–min (graphs with x-form markers) values of the objective; 2) increasing the diversity between the min–min and mean–min, max–min values for the same  $\varepsilon$ , i.e. we see that increasing  $\varepsilon$  makes the DAA work more difficult.

Figure 2 shows, for each  $\varepsilon = 0, 0.03, 0.06, 0.1$ , the resulting values of the objective  $F_{\text{C-NOT}}^{\text{FRK,sd}}(f)$  in all the 10 trials of DAA for Systems 1, 2, 3; these objective’s values show

that: 1) increasing  $\varepsilon$  removes the objective's values further from zero; 2) DAA used for the same case can give different resulting values of the objective under the same settings of DAA that reminds about the importance of performing at least more than one of trials of DAA with the further comparing.




Figure 2: For C-NOT gate and Systems 1, 2, 3. For each  $\varepsilon = 0, 0.03, 0.06, 0.1$ , the resulting values of the objective  $F_{C-NOT}^{GRK,sd}(f)$  in all the 10 trials of DAA: (a) for System 1; (b) for System 2; (c) for System 3. The DAA computed values are shown via the markers.

For each of System 1, System 2, and System 3, we performed 10 DAA trials for each of 11 values of  $\varepsilon$ . In each of these 330 DAA trials, we observe which minimal and maximal values of coherent and two incoherent controls considered as piecewise constraint with  $K = 200$  partitions on  $[0, T = 20]$ . With respect to the question about incoherent controls, shortly we note that their resulting values in this series of trials are various in the admissible range  $[0, n_{\max} = 20]$ .

### 3.4 For SWAP Gate

For Systems 1, 2, 3, the results of DAA are shown in Figure 3 in terms of (10)–(12). Figure 4 shows, for each  $\varepsilon = 0, 0.03, 0.06, 0.1$ , the resulting values of  $F_{C-NOT}^{GRK,sd}(f)$  in all the 10 trials of DAA for Systems 1, 2, 3. Figures 3, 4 for SWAP gate provide the similar conclusions to what is written above about the dependences with respect to Figures 1, 2 for C-NOT gate.






Figure 3: For SWAP gate and Systems 1, 2, 3, the obtained via DAA values of (10)–(12): (a) for System 1; (b) for System 2; (c) for System 3. The DAA computed values are shown via the markers.




Figure 4: For SWAP gate and Systems 1, 2, 3. For each  $\epsilon = 0, 0.03, 0.06, 0.1$ , the resulting values of the objective  $F_{\text{C-NOT}}^{\text{FRK,sd}}(f)$  in all the 10 trials of DAA: (a) for System 1; (b) for System 2; (c) for System 3. The DAA computed values are shown via the markers.




Figure 5: For C-Z gate (i.e.  $\pi$ -C-PHASE gate) and System 3, the obtained via DAA results: (a) values of (10)–(12); (b) for each  $\varepsilon = 0, 0.03, 0.06, 0.1$ , the resulting values of the objective  $F_{C-\text{NOT}}^{\text{FRK,sd}}(f)$  in all the 10 trials of DAA.

### 3.5 For C-Z Gate

For System 3, the results of DAA are shown in Figure 5(a) in the terms of (10)–(12) and in Figure 5(b) in the terms of the series of 10 trials of DAA. These figures for C-Z gate provide the similar conclusions to what is written above about the dependences with respect to Figures 1–4 for C-NOT and SWAP gates.

## 4 Conclusions

This work considers a general form of open quantum systems determined by the GKSL type master equation with simultaneous coherent and incoherent controls and the three versions of this general form with three Hamiltonians. Coherent control enters through the Hamiltonian and incoherent control enters through both the Hamiltonian and the superoperator of dissipation. For these systems, we analyze the control problems of generating two-qubit C-NOT, SWAP, and C-Z gates using piecewise constant controls and stochastic optimization in the form of adapted version of the dual annealing algorithm. In the numerical experiment, we analyze the dependencies between the obtained by the dual annealing minimal objective values for various values of the strength of interaction between the system and the environment.

The obtained numerical results for increasing  $\varepsilon$  from 0 to 0.1 with the step 0.01 show that:

- increasing infidelity further from zero, increasing the min–min (10), max–min (11),

and mean–min (12) values of the infidelity;

- increasing the diversity between the min–min and mean–min, max–min infidelity values for the same  $\varepsilon$ , i.e. we see that increasing  $\varepsilon$  makes the DAA operation more difficult;
- DAA operation with the same settings and for the same situation can give different resulting values of the objective that reminds about the importance of performing multiple trials of DAA for a subsequent comparison.

## Funding

This work was funded by Russian Federation represented by the Ministry of Science and Higher Education of Russian Federation (Project No. 075-15-2020-788).

## Acknowledgments

We thank Vadim N. Petruhanov for his Python code for computing values of the objective by operating with the matrix exponentials corresponding to the realficated quantum systems with piecewise constant controls. This Python code was included by the first author into the code realizing the stochastic optimization approach for the article [47] and this article.

## References

- [1] D. Dong and I. R. Petersen. *Learning and Robust Control in Quantum Technology*. Springer, Cham, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-20245-2>
- [2] I. Kuprov. *Spin: From Basic Symmetries to Quantum Optimal Control*. Springer, Cham, 2023. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-05607-9>
- [3] C. P. Koch, U. Boscain, T. Calarco, G. Dirr, S. Filipp, S. J. Glaser, R. Kosloff, S. Montangero, T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, D. Sugny, and F. K. Wilhelm. Quantum optimal control in quantum technologies. Strategic report on current status, visions and goals for research in Europe. *EPJ Quantum Technol.* **9**, 19 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1140/epjqt/s40507-022-00138-x>
- [4] D. D’Alessandro. *Introduction to Quantum Control and Dynamics. 2nd Edition*. Chapman and Hall/CRC, Boca Raton, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003051268>
- [5] G. Kurizki and A. G. Kofman. *Thermodynamics and Control of Open Quantum Systems*. Cambridge Univ. Press, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1017/9781316798454>
- [6] S. Kwon, A. Tomonaga, G. L. Bhai, S. J. Devitt, and J.-S. Tsai. Gate-based superconducting quantum computing. *J. Appl. Phys.* **129** (4), 041102 (2021). <https://doi.org/10.1063/5.0029735>

- [7] S.-Y. Bai, C. Chen, H. Wu, and J.-H. An. Quantum control in open and periodically driven systems. *Adv. Phys. X.* **6**, 1870559 (2021).  
<https://doi.org/10.1080/23746149.2020.1870559>
- [8] A. Acín, I. Bloch, H. Buhrman, T. Calarco, C. Eichler, J. Eisert, D. Esteve, N. Gisin, S. J. Glaser, F. Jelezko, S. Kuhr, M. Lewenstein, M. F. Riedel, P. O. Schmidt, R. Thew, A. Wallraff, I. Walmsley, and F. K. Wilhelm. The quantum technologies roadmap: a European community view. *New J. Phys.* **20** (8), 080201 (2018).  
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/aad1ea>
- [9] C. P. Koch. Controlling open quantum systems: Tools, achievements, and limitations. *J. Phys.: Condens. Matter.* **28** (21), 213001 (2016).  
<https://doi.org/10.1088/0953-8984/28/21/213001>
- [10] W. Dong, R. Wu, X. Yuan, C. Li, and T.-J. Tarn. The modelling of quantum control systems. *Sci. Bull.* **60**, 1493–1508 (2015).  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11434-015-0863-3>
- [11] S. Cong. *Control of Quantum Systems: Theory and Methods*. John Wiley & Sons, Hoboken, 2014.  
<https://www.wiley.com/en-ie/Control+of+Quantum+Systems%3A+Theory+and+Methods-p-9781118608159>
- [12] C. Altafini and F. Ticozzi. Modeling and control of quantum systems: An Introduction. *IEEE Trans. Automatic Control.* **57** (8), 1898–1917 (2012).  
<https://doi.org/10.1109/TAC.2012.2195830>
- [13] B. Bonnard and D. Sugny. *Optimal Control with Applications in Space and Quantum Dynamics*. AIMS, Springfield, 2012.  
<https://www.aims sciences.org/book/AM/volume/21>
- [14] J. E. Gough. Principles and applications of quantum control engineering. *Philos. Trans. Royal Soc. A.* **370** (1979), 5241–5258 (2012).  
<https://doi.org/10.1098/rsta.2012.0370>
- [15] M. Shapiro and P. Brumer. *Quantum Control of Molecular Processes. Second, Revised and Enlarged Edition*. Wiley–VCH Verlag GmbH & Co. KGaA, 2012.  
<https://doi.org/10.1002/9783527639700>
- [16] C. Brif, R. Chakrabarti, and H. Rabitz. Control of quantum phenomena: Past, present and future. *New J. Phys.* **12** (7), 075008 (2010).  
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/12/7/075008>
- [17] A. L. Fradkov. *Cybernetical Physics: From Control of Chaos to Quantum Control*. Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2007.  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-46277-4>
- [18] V. Letokhov. *Laser Control of Atoms and Molecules*. Oxford Univ. Press, 2007.  
<https://global.oup.com/academic/product/laser-control-of-atoms-and-molecules-9780198504444>

- [19] D. J. Tannor. *Introduction to Quantum Mechanics: A Time Dependent Perspective*. Univ. Science Books, Sausalito, CA, 2007.  
<https://uscibooks.aip.org/books/introduction-to-quantum-mechanics-a-time-depend>
- [20] S. A. Rice and M. Zhao. *Optical Control of Molecular Dynamics*. John Wiley & Sons, Inc., New York, 2000.
- [21] A. G. Butkovskiy and Yu. I. Samoilenko. *Control of Quantum–Mechanical Processes and Systems* / Transl. from the edition published in Russian in 1984. Kluwer Acad. Publ., Dordrecht, 1990.
- [22] U. Boscain, M. Sigalotti, and D. Sugny. Introduction to the Pontryagin maximum principle for quantum optimal control. *PRX Quantum*. **2**, 030203 (2021).  
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PRXQuantum.2.030203>
- [23] V. A. Kazakov and V. F. Krotov. Optimal control of resonant interaction between light and matter. *Automat. Remote Control*. **48** (4), 430–434 (1987).
- [24] D. J. Tannor, V. Kazakov, and V. Orlov. Control of photochemical branching: Novel procedures for finding optimal pulses and global upper bounds. In: *Time-Dependent Quantum Molecular Dynamics*. Springer, Boston, 1992, pp. 347–360.  
[https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2326-4\\_24](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-1-4899-2326-4_24)
- [25] A. Bartana, R. Kosloff, and D. J. Tannor. Laser cooling of molecules by dynamically trapped states. *Chem. Phys.* **267** (1–3), 195–207 (2001).  
[https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-0104\(01\)00266-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0301-0104(01)00266-X)
- [26] G. Jäger, D. M. Reich, M. H. Goerz, C. P. Koch, and U. Hohenester. Optimal quantum control of Bose-Einstein condensates in magnetic microtraps: Comparison of GRAPE and Krotov optimization schemes. *Phys. Rev. A*. **90** (3), 033628 (2014).  
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.90.033628>
- [27] M. H. Goerz, D. M. Reich, and C. P. Koch. Optimal control theory for a unitary operation under dissipative evolution. *New J. Phys.* **16** (5), 055012 (2014).  
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/16/5/055012>. (Also: [arXiv:1312.0111v2](https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.0111v2) [quant-ph] (2021), <https://arxiv.org/abs/1312.0111v2>).
- [28] O. V. Morzhin and A. N. Pechen. Krotov method for optimal control of closed quantum systems. *Russian Math. Surveys*. **74** (5), 851–908 (2019).  
<https://doi.org/10.1070/RM9835>
- [29] O. V. Morzhin and A. N. Pechen. Krotov type optimization of coherent and incoherent controls for open two-qubit systems. *Bull. Irkutsk State Univ. Ser. Math.* **45**, 3–23 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.26516/1997-7670.2023.45.3>
- [30] J. Gough, V. P. Belavkin, and O. G. Smolyanov. Hamilton–Jacobi–Bellman equations for quantum optimal feedback control. *J. Opt. B: Quantum Semiclass. Opt.* **7** (10), S237–S244 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1464-4266/7/10/006>
- [31] W. Zhu and H. Rabitz. A rapid monotonically convergent iteration algorithm for quantum optimal control over the expectation value of a positive definite operator. *J. Chem. Phys.* **109**, 385–391 (1998). <https://doi.org/10.1063/1.476575>

- [32] N. Khaneja, T. Reiss, C. Kehlet, T. Schulte-Herbrüggen, and S. J. Glaser. Optimal control of coupled spin dynamics: design of NMR pulse sequences by gradient ascent algorithms. *J. Magn. Reson.* **172**, 296–305 (2005).  
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jmr.2004.11.004>
- [33] V. N. Petruhanov and A. N. Pechen. Quantum control landscapes for generation of  $H$  and  $T$  gates in an open qubit with both coherent and environmental drive. *Photonics.* **10** (11), 1200 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.3390/photonics10111200>
- [34] V. N. Petruhanov and A. N. Pechen. GRAPE optimization for open quantum systems with time-dependent decoherence rates driven by coherent and incoherent controls. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **56** (30), 305303 (2023).  
<https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/ace13f>
- [35] O. V. Morzhin and A. N. Pechen. Maximization of the overlap between density matrices for a two-level open quantum system driven by coherent and incoherent controls. *Lobachevskii J. Math.* **40** (10), 1532–1548 (2019).  
<https://doi.org/10.1134/S1995080219100202>
- [36] O. V. Morzhin and A. N. Pechen. Optimal state manipulation for a two-qubit system driven by coherent and incoherent controls. *Quantum Inf. Process.* **22**, 241 (2023).  
<https://doi.org/10.1007/s11128-023-03946-x>
- [37] A. N. Pechen, S. Borisenok, and A. L. Fradkov. Energy control in a quantum oscillator using coherent control and engineered environment. *Chaos, Solitons & Fractals.* **164**, 112687 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.chaos.2022.112687>
- [38] T. Caneva, T. Calarco, and S. Montangero. Chopped random-basis quantum optimization. *Phys. Rev. A.* **84** (2), 022326 (2011).  
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.84.022326>
- [39] P. Doria, T. Calarco, and S. Montangero. Optimal control technique for many-body quantum dynamics. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **106** (19), 190501 (2011).  
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.106.190501>
- [40] M. M. Müller, R. S. Said, F. Jelezko, T. Calarco, and S. Montangero. One decade of quantum optimal control in the chopped random basis. *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **85**, 076001 (2002). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1361-6633/ac723c>
- [41] R. S. Judson and H. Rabitz. Teaching lasers to control molecules. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **68**, 1500 (1992). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.68.1500>
- [42] A. Pechen and H. Rabitz. Teaching the environment to control quantum systems. *Phys. Rev. A.* **73** (6), 062102 (2006).  
<https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.73.062102>
- [43] J. Brown, M. Paternostro, and A. Ferraro. Optimal quantum control via genetic algorithms for quantum state engineering in driven-resonator mediated networks. *Quantum Sci. Technol.* **8**, 025004 (2023).  
<https://doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/acb2f2>

- [44] D.-Y. Dong, C.-L. Chen, T.-J. Tarn, A. Pechen, and H. Rabitz. Incoherent control of quantum systems with wavefunction controllable subspaces via quantum reinforcement learning. *IEEE Trans. Syst. Man Cybern.* **38** (4), 957–962 (2008). <https://doi.org/10.1109/TSMCB.2008.926603>
- [45] M. Y. Niu, S. Boixo, V. N. Smelyanskiy, et al. Universal quantum control through deep reinforcement learning. *npj Quantum Inf.* **5**, 33 (2019). <https://doi.org/10.1038/s41534-019-0141-3>
- [46] A. Pechen. Engineering arbitrary pure and mixed quantum states. *Phys. Rev. A.* **84** (4), 042106 (2011). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.84.042106>
- [47] A. N. Pechen, V. N. Petruhanov, O. V. Morzhin, and B. O. Volkov. Control landscapes for high-fidelity generation of C-NOT and C-PHASE gates with coherent and environmental drive. (Submitted).
- [48] T. Roy, Z. Li, E. Kapit, and D. I. Schuster. Two-qutrit quantum algorithms on a programmable superconducting processor. *Phys. Rev. Applied.* **19**:6, 064024 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevApplied.19.064024>
- [49] Y. Wang, Z. Hu, B. C. Sanders, and S. Kais. Qudits and high-dimensional quantum computing. *Front. Phys.: Sec. Quantum Engineering and Technology.* **8**, 589504 (2020). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2020.589504>
- [50] S. Kurgalin and S. Borzunov. *Concise Guide to Quantum Computing. Algorithms, Exercises, and Implementations.* Springer, Cham, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-030-65052-0>
- [51] A. S. Holevo. *Quantum Systems, Channels, Information: A mathematical Introduction. 2nd Rev. and Expanded Ed.* De Gruyter, Berlin, Boston, 2019. <https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110642490>
- [52] M. Nielsen and I. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information. 10th Anniversary Edition.* Cambridge Univ. Press, Cambridge, 2010. <https://doi.org/10.1017/CB09780511976667>
- [53] K. A. Valiev. Quantum computers and quantum computations. *Physics-Uspokhi.* **48** (1), 1–36 (2005). <https://doi.org/10.1070/PU2005v048n01ABEH002024>
- [54] J. P. Palao and R. Kosloff. Optimal control theory for unitary transformations. *Phys. Rev. A.* **68** (6), 062308 (2003). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.68.062308> (Erratum: *Phys. Rev. A*, **69**, 059901 (2004), <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.69.059901>).
- [55] M. E. F. Fernandes, F. F. Fanchini, E. F. de Lima, and L. K. Castelano. Effectiveness of the Krotov method in finding controls for open quantum systems. *J. Phys. A: Math. Theor.* **56** (49), 495303 (2023). <https://doi.org/10.1088/1751-8121/ad0b5b>
- [56] Dual annealing optimization in SciPy. [https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/generated/scipy.optimize.dual\\_annealing.html](https://docs.scipy.org/doc/scipy/reference/generated/scipy.optimize.dual_annealing.html)

- [57] D. M. Reich. Efficient Characterisation and Optimal Control of Open Quantum Systems – Mathematical Foundations and Physical Applications: Dissertation. Universität Kassel, 2015.  
<https://kobra.uni-kassel.de/handle/123456789/2015061948576>
- [58] C. Tsallis. Possible generalization of Boltzmann–Gibbs statistics. *J. Stat. Phys.* **52**, 479–487 (1988). <https://doi.org/10.1007/BF01016429>
- [59] C. Tsallis and D. A. Stariolo. Generalized simulated annealing. *Physica A.* **233** (1–2), 395–406 (1996). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4371\(96\)00271-3](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0378-4371(96)00271-3)
- [60] Y. Xiang, D. Y. Sun, W. Fan, and X. G. Gong. Generalized simulated annealing algorithm and its application to the Thomson model. *Phys. Lett. A.* **233** (3), 216–220 (1997). [https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601\(97\)00474-X](https://doi.org/10.1016/S0375-9601(97)00474-X)
- [61] Y. Xiang and X. G. Gong. Efficiency of generalized simulated annealing. *Phys. Rev. E.* **62** (3), 4473–4476 (2000). <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevE.62.4473>