

# Quantum error mitigation and correction mediated by Yang-Baxter equation and artificial neural network

Sahil Gulania\*

*Mathematics and Computer Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, Illinois 60439, United States*

Yuri Alexeev†

*Computational Science Division, Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, Illinois 60439, United States*

Stephen K. Gray‡

*Center for Nanoscale Materials, Argonne National Laboratory, Lemont, Illinois 60439, United States*

Bo Peng§ and Niranjan Govind¶

*Physical and Computational Sciences Directorate, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, Washington 99352, United States*

(Dated: January 31, 2024)

Quantum computing shows great potential, but errors pose a significant challenge. This study explores new strategies for mitigating quantum errors using artificial neural networks (ANN) and the Yang-Baxter equation (YBE). Unlike traditional error correction methods, which are computationally intensive, we investigate artificial error mitigation. The manuscript introduces the basics of quantum error sources and explores the potential of using classical computation for error mitigation. The Yang-Baxter equation plays a crucial role, allowing us to compress time dynamics simulations into constant-depth circuits. By introducing controlled noise through the YBE, we enhance the dataset for error mitigation. We train an ANN model on partial data from quantum simulations, demonstrating its effectiveness in correcting errors in time-evolving quantum states.

## I. INTRODUCTION

In the realm of quantum computing, the tantalizing promise of unprecedented computational power and groundbreaking advancements in various fields has captured the imagination of scientists and innovators worldwide. However, harnessing the full potential of quantum computers is not without its challenges, and one of the most formidable obstacles is the omnipresent issue of quantum errors [1]. These errors, arising from the inherently probabilistic and fragile nature of quantum bits or qubits, threaten the accuracy and reliability of quantum computations. To overcome this hurdle, researchers have been fervently exploring strategies for quantum error mitigation (QEM) [2–7], and among them, a particularly promising approach has emerged: artificial error mitigation [8–11].

Quantum error mitigation, at its core, seeks to rectify the deleterious effects of noise and errors in quantum computations. These errors can stem from a multitude of sources, such as imperfect hardware [12, 13], environmental interference [14, 15], or the intrinsic characteristics of quantum bits [16]. Canonical error correction techniques involve error-correcting codes and fault-tolerant quantum circuits [17], which come at a substantial cost in terms of qubit overhead and computational resources. To alleviate such issues, artificial error mitigation [18], a novel paradigm that leverages

the power of classical computation, can be used. QEM is a vast and rapidly evolving field. Due to its complexity and breadth, this section will focus on highlighting only some of the major contributions, particularly those integrating artificial intelligence (AI) for QEM. Readers are encouraged to consult comprehensive reviews for a more detailed exploration of the QEM subject [19–21].

Using AI for QEM is this field’s most recent and exciting development. Incorporating AI into QEM has shown significant advantages to achieve, or in some cases even exceed, the accuracy of traditional QEM techniques. In a recent review [22], the authors performed a comprehensive evaluation that covered a range of AI techniques — such as linear regression [23], random forests, multi-layer perceptrons [18], and graph neural networks [24, 25] — applied across various types of quantum circuits and various quantum devices.

There are a few other ways in which advanced AI techniques can be applied to QEM. For example, it can be used to adjust probabilities in computational measurements [26]. A neural network-based methodology was demonstrated for accurately extracting the noise spectrum from qubits, significantly improving existing techniques [27]. Machine learning models can be used to predict near-noise-free expectation values from noisy quantum processing units [28]. Another approach is to use a data augmentation-empowered neural model for error mitigation (DAEM) [29].

Artificial error mitigation represents a symbiotic marriage between classical and quantum computing, capitalizing on the strengths of each to combat the weaknesses of the other. In this approach, classical algorithms are employed to analyze and model the errors that occur during quantum computations. These error models are then used to guide the application of corrective operations on quantum states, effectively reducing

---

\* sgulania@anl.gov

† yuri@anl.gov

‡ gray@anl.gov

§ peng398@pnnl.gov

¶ niri.govind@pnnl.gov

the impact of errors and enhancing the reliability of quantum results. The beauty of artificial error mitigation lies in its ability to mitigate errors without resorting to the resource-intensive overhead of traditional error correction codes.

In this article we introduce the intricacies of quantum error sources, the development of error models, and the deployment of mitigation strategies that promise to usher in a new era of more robust and dependable quantum computing. As it becomes evident that artificial error mitigation not only holds the key to unlocking the potential of quantum computers but also paves the way for a future where quantum technologies can be harnessed to revolutionize industries ranging from cryptography to drug discovery and materials science.

The article is organized as follows. First we introduce the fundamental concepts of quantum error mitigation, discussing the challenges posed by errors in quantum computations and introducing traditional methods such as zero noise extrapolation (ZNE) and learning-based error mitigation. We then delve into the Yang-Baxter equation (YBE) and its role in compressing time dynamics simulations, providing a constant-depth circuit for certain lattice models. The synergy of YBE with artificial neural networks (ANN) is explored, highlighting the potential for effective error mitigation. In the subsequent section on quantum error mitigation, we discuss ZNE in detail, explaining the process of scaling noise and extrapolating to the noiseless limit. We touch upon other error mitigation methods such as probabilistic error cancellation (PEC) and measurement error mitigation (MEC).

Following that, we introduce learning-based error mitigation, showcasing its adaptability and effectiveness, especially in scenarios involving numerous qubits and substantial circuit depths. The learning curve analysis provides insights into the relationship between the amount of training data and the accuracy of the regression model. In the Results section, we present the outcomes of our study, demonstrating the application of the ANN model in mitigating errors during time dynamics simulations of spin chains. The comparison of raw results, fully compressed circuits, partially compressed circuits using YBE, and the ANN-corrected values illustrates the success of our error mitigation approach.

## II. QUANTUM ERROR MITIGATION

In this section we will introduce certain key concepts and terminology that are common to all the quantum error mitigation (QEM) methods [2, 30, 31]. QEM is an essential facet of quantum computing, addressing the intrinsic vulnerability of qubits to various sources of noise and imperfections. As quantum computers continue to evolve and scale up, the issue of quantum errors becomes increasingly critical. QEM seeks to understand, quantify, and ultimately mitigate the impact of these errors, enabling more dependable quantum computations.

Zero noise extrapolation (ZNE) is an error mitigation technique that extrapolates the noiseless expectation value of an observable from a range of expectation values computed at different noise levels [32]. It involves intentionally scaling

noise, such as pulse-stretching or unitary folding, at a gate level, and extrapolating to the noiseless limit by fitting a curve to the expectation values measured at different noise levels.

Probabilistic error cancellation (PEC) is a noise-aware error mitigation [33] technique based on two main ideas: expressing ideal gates as quasi-probability representations, and probabilistically sampling from these representations to approximate quantum expectation values via a Monte Carlo average, thereby reducing noise and improving performance. Measurement error mitigation (MEC) is a process [34] that involves preparing all  $2^n$  basis input states and computing the probability of measuring counts in other basis states, enabling the correction of the average results of another experiment.

There are many other methods which utilizes the symmetry, and purity states to remove the error generated in the quantum devices. These mostly involved methods like virtual distillation and error suppression by derangement.

In this article we merge the ideas of machine learning methods such as artificial neural networks [18] and zero-noise extrapolation. The issue with ZNE method is to generate the noisy data using various technique which are not feasible options for large quantum circuits and large qubit systems. The error accumulated by unitary folding can lead to extra error which leads to unwanted results. The other issue with time dynamics simulation is to perform the ZNE for each time-step. This brings a lot of overhead. Therefore, we propose to use artificial neural network to learn on few time step and correct the rest of the dynamics. Our technique gets advantages because of the circuit compression technique using YBE. This allows us to control the circuit depth and generate extra noise data without introducing other numerical errors.

## III. ZERO NOISE EXTRAPOLATION

Zero noise extrapolation (ZNE) serves as an error mitigation method employed to predict the noiseless expectation value of an observable by extrapolating from a series of expectation values calculated at various noise levels. This methodology involves a two-step process. The first step involves deliberately amplifying noise, and various methods can be employed for this purpose. Techniques such as pulse -stretching allow the elevation of the noise level in quantum computations. Similarly, at the gate level, approaches like unitary folding or identity insertion scaling can achieve comparable outcomes. The second step entails extrapolating to the noiseless limit. This is achieved by fitting a curve, commonly referred to as an extrapolation model, to the expectation values recorded at different noise levels. The goal is to extrapolate and obtain the expectation value in the absence of noise.

### A. Scaling noise

An approach to heighten the noise level within a circuit at the gate level involves deliberately enhancing its depth. This can be achieved through either unitary folding or identity scal-

ing. During unitary folding, a mapping process is executed as

$$U \rightarrow UU^\dagger U \quad (1)$$

This mapping can be implemented on a global scale or applied locally, as illustrated in the Figure 1. One can also introduce




Figure 1. Different variation of performing folding of gates. Top diagram shows the global folding where the whole unitary,  $U$  is folded. The bottom diagram shows local folding where each part of whole unitary is folded individually.

the noise by adding identity operators as

$$U \rightarrow I.U \quad (2)$$

The sole distinction between folding and identity insertion lies in the fact that, rather than scaling gate noise, the introduction of an identity gate serves to extend the waiting period subsequent to the execution of each circuit layer. This extension enables qubits to engage with the environment through a noisy process, potentially undergoing decoherence if the interaction between the system and its environment is substantial. Both the techniques are gate level method to introduce noise. It can also be achieved by pulse-stretching method. The noise of the device can be modified by increasing the time over which pulses are implemented, which is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2. Pulse stretching to increase noise in a physical device

### B. Extrapolation

The fundamental idea behind the ZNE technique is to remove the noise very specific to a given circuit. Let,  $\gamma$  be a parameter which quantifies the noise for a quantum circuit and let  $\gamma'$  be the parameter for noise in the scaled quantum circuit. ZNE assumes that  $\gamma'$  can be equated to  $\gamma$  linearly as

$$\gamma' = \lambda \gamma \quad (3)$$

For  $\lambda = 1$ , the input quantum circuit remains unchanged and the noise level  $\gamma = \gamma'$ , which is same as the noise of the device without any scaling. In terms of quantum state  $\rho$  and expectation value  $E$ , one can formulate the same relation with noise level. Let  $\rho(\gamma')$  be the quantum state prepared by scaled quantum circuit. One can compute the expectation value of an observable  $M$  as

$$\langle E(\lambda) \rangle = Tr[\rho(\gamma')M] = Tr[\rho(\lambda\gamma)M] \quad (4)$$

The scaled quantum circuit allows to compute different expectation value dependent on  $\lambda$ . The final aim to compute  $E(\lambda = 0)$  which corresponds to noiseless expectation value. In practice the  $E(\lambda)$  is treated as a function and act as an input to extrapolation model to predict the zero-noise limit ( $\lambda = 0$ ). Various selections for the extrapolation model result in different extrapolations. Common options for the extrapolation model include a linear function, a polynomial, and an exponential function.

### IV. YANG-BAXTER EQUATION

The Yang–Baxter equation [35–37] is widely recognized in the realm of condensed-matter physics, where it serves to establish the integrability of lattice models. Its relevance extends to various aspects of quantum computing, encompassing topics such as topological entanglement, quantum entanglement, and the universality of quantum computation. In terms of quantum operator it can be represented as a symmetry equation

$$(R \otimes I).(I \otimes R).(R \otimes I) = (I \otimes R).(R \otimes I).(I \otimes R) \quad (5)$$

where,  $R$  is a braiding operator acting on two qubits and  $I$  is a identity operator acting on single qubit. A diagrammatic representation of YBE in the gate set and quantum circuit form is shown in Figure 3. Recently, a novel perspective on this equa-




Figure 3. Quantum circuit representation of the YBE for three qubits.

tion has emerged in the context of the quantum time dynamics of lattice models. Specifically, under the Trotter approximation, the Yang-Baxter equation enables the compression of any arbitrary time step in certain lattice models into a circuit of finite depth without compromising accuracy. As a result of this transformation, an additional symmetry, referred to as mirror symmetry, can be deduced in the circuit [38–40]. Furthermore, the two-qubit operations adhere to the merge identity. The combination of new relations allow to obtain the constant depth circuit for certain class of quantum operations.

## V. LEARNING BASED ERROR MITIGATION




Figure 4. Diagram showing the process of learning-based quantum error mitigation.

A recently proposed method, known as learning-based error mitigation is discussed in this section. This approach involves understanding the impact of noise by examining classically simulatable quantum circuits closely resembling the non-simulatable circuits of interest. In many instances, this approach evaluates the expectation value of an observable for specific training circuits on a quantum device, utilizing training data obtained through classical means. These training data are then analyzed using an ansatz, which captures the relationship between noisy and noiseless expectation values. The resulting ansatz is applied to correct the noisy expectation value for the target circuit. A diagram showing the process of learning based quantum error mitigation is shown in Figure 4.

Learning-based error mitigation has proven effective, particularly in applications involving quantum circuits with numerous qubits and substantial depths. Notably, it has outperformed other leading methods [41]. This approach is highly adaptable, allowing for the improvement of mitigation quality by expanding training data to encompass the effects of varying noise strengths on observable expectation values. These characteristics position learning-based error mitigation as a promising solution for addressing errors in near-term quantum advantage applications.

## VI. EXPERIMENTAL SETUP

The experimental setup involves a multifaceted approach encompassing quantum time dynamics simulations, error mitigation techniques, and machine learning applications. This carefully crafted experimental is designed to investigate the behavior of quantum spin chains, specifically modeled using the XY Hamiltonian, under the influence of anisotropic interactions. The setup used in this article is explained below.

1. The experiment begins with the formulation of the Heisenberg Hamiltonian, specifically the XY model, which is commonly used to study magnetic systems with quantum spins.
2. The simulation involves studying the time evolution of the XY Hamiltonian for spin chains of different lengths. The staggered magnetization, denoted as  $m_s(t)$ , is calculated over a time period of 2.5 units, using a Trotter step size of 0.025 units.
3. YBE compression is applied to each spin system, allowing the construction of a constant-depth circuit (Eq. 5) that scales linearly with the number of qubits. Partial compression is used to introduce additional noise into the system, resulting in larger circuits compared to full compression.
4. Staggered magnetization data obtained from fully compressed circuit, partially compressed circuit, and noiseless simulator are used to train an ANN model. The ANN is trained on 30 percent of the data, and the remaining 70 percent is used for prediction.
5. The results are visualized through comparison plots for different spin chains (3-5 spins and 6-10 spins). Raw results from IBM quantum devices with full and partial compression are compared with the ANN-corrected values.
6. The learning curve for the ANN is analyzed to understand the relationship between the number of data points and the model's accuracy. The learning curve provides insights into the model's performance as more data is used for training.

## VII. RESULTS

The Heisenberg Hamiltonian [42–45] is widely used to study magnetic systems, where the magnetic spins are treated quantum mechanically. The Hamiltonian, including only spin-spin interactions, can be written as

$$\hat{H} = - \sum_{\alpha} \{ J_{\alpha} \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} \sigma_i^{\alpha} \otimes \sigma_{i+1}^{\alpha} \}, \quad (6)$$

where  $\alpha$  sums over  $\{x, y, z\}$ , the coupling parameter  $J_{\alpha}$  denotes the exchange interaction between nearest-neighbour spins along the  $\alpha$ -direction, and  $\sigma_i^{\alpha}$  is the  $\alpha$ -Pauli operator on the  $i$ th spin. A straightforward modification of the Heisenberg model is the one-dimensional XY model, initially introduced and solved by Lieb, Schultz, and Mattis [46–48] in the absence of an applied magnetic field. In our study, we conducted a time dynamics simulation of the XY Hamiltonian involving three spins. We calculated the time-evolving staggered magnetization, denoted as  $m_s(t)$ , and established its connection to antiferromagnetism and ferrimagnetism in materials, as outlined below.:

$$m_s(t) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_i (-1)^i \langle \sigma_z(t) \rangle. \quad (7)$$




Figure 5. Comparison of results for different spin chains of length 3, 4, and 5. Left columns shows the raw results obtained from the IBM quantum devices with full compression and partial compression using YBE. The right columns shows the ANN corrected values. ANN was trained on 30 percent of data and was used to predict values for the rest 70 percent

The initial state we considered is the ground state, often referred to as the Ne’el state, of the XY Hamiltonian, represented as  $\Psi_0 = |\uparrow\downarrow\uparrow \dots \uparrow\downarrow\rangle$ . In this state, the staggered magnetization is equal to one. To study the time evolution, we conducted simulations over a period of 2.5 units of time, employing a Trotter step size of 0.025 units. To introduce anisotropy to the system, we chose specific parameters:  $J_x = -0.8$  and  $J_y = -0.2$ . In our analysis, we applied YBE compression to each spin system, enabling the construction of a constant-depth circuit that scales linearly with the number of qubits. Additionally, to introduce extra noise into the system, we utilized partial compression, resulting in larger circuits compared to full compression.

We used the staggered magnetization data obtained from fully compressed circuit, partially compressed circuit and noiseless simulator to train ANN. From the full data point of time-dynamics (100 steps for 3-5 qubits and 50 steps for 6-10 qubits) we used 30 percent data for the training and the rest 70 percent was used for prediction. As shown in the Fig 1 and 2, the ANN is able to perform the correction and for every spin chain it is able to push the noisy data closer to the noiseless results.

The observed learning curve as shown in Fig 7 suggests insights into the relationship between the number of data points used and the learning performance of regression model as discussed below

- The initial step increase in learning accuracy from 10




Figure 6. Comparison of results for different spin chains of length 6 to 10 spins. Left columns shows the raw results obtained from the IBM quantum devices with full compression and partial compression using YBE. The right columns shows the ANN corrected values. ANN was trained on 30 percent of data and was used to predict values for the rest 70 percent

to 40 data points indicates that with a small amount of data, the model rapidly improves its understanding and predictive capability. This is typical when a model encounters new information and adjusts its parameters to fit the available data better.

- The subsequent flattening of the curve between 40 and 70 data points suggests that adding more data points during this range has diminishing returns in terms of improving the model’s accuracy. The model has likely captured the underlying patterns in the data, and additional information doesn’t significantly contribute to




Figure 7. Learning Curve: Impact of varying data points (10 to 90) on Model Accuracy for 3-5 spin system. The total dataset comprises 100 points.

enhancing its performance.

- The oscillations observed from 70 to 90 data points indicate a more complex relationship between the model and the data. It's possible that the model is becoming sensitive to specific data points or noise, leading to fluctuations in accuracy. This behavior may suggest that the model is starting to overfit the training data.
- The overall pattern highlights the importance of finding the right balance in the amount of training data. Too few data points may result in underfitting, where the model fails to capture the underlying patterns. However, beyond a certain point, additional data may not significantly improve the model and could even lead to overfitting.




Figure 8. Learning Curve: Impact of varying data points (5 to 45) on Model Accuracy for 6-10 spin system. The total dataset comprises 50 points.

The same behavior is observed in the learning curve for 6 to 10 spin chains (as shown in Fig 8), which mirrors the pattern

described earlier. Initially, there's a steep increase in learning accuracy from 5 to 15 points, followed by a plateau from 20 to 35 points, and finally, oscillations in accuracy from 35 to 45 points. This pattern aligns with the principles of model learning and the impact of varying data points [49, 50].

## VIII. CONCLUSION

In this study, we have demonstrated the effectiveness of an Artificial Neural Network (ANN) model in mitigating errors during time dynamics simulations in quantum systems. The model exhibits the capability to learn from partial data, providing an advantage in handling the evolution of quantum states over time. Our analysis reveals a characteristic learning curve, where the model's accuracy initially increases sharply with a small subset of data points, plateaus during intermediate ranges, and exhibits oscillations in accuracy for larger datasets.

Moreover, our approach leverages the Yang-Baxter Equation (YBE) compression technique to introduce additional noise into the dataset. Despite using only two noisy data points for a given time step, the ANN network proves robust. The independent treatment of each spin's time evolution by the ANN enables effective error mitigation. We are exploring the possibility of training the ANN using all spins simultaneously, a potential avenue for error mitigation in larger spin chains.

Additionally, the versatility of this technique extends to Hamiltonians following Yang-Baxter symmetry, such as mean-field Hamiltonians. This extension opens avenues for quantum error mitigation and the extraction of valuable information from diverse quantum systems. The presented methodology holds promise for advancing the field of quantum simulations and error-mitigation strategies. Future studies would focus on a detailed analysis of the impact of noise on the learning model using a quantum simulator. Investigating how various types and levels of noise affect the model's performance will provide valuable insights into the robustness and limitations of the error mitigation technique. This analysis can contribute to refining the model for real-world applications.

Second would be extension of the error mitigation technique to perform large-scale spin simulations on actual quantum devices is a crucial step. This involves implementing the model on quantum hardware, where error mitigation becomes essential for accurate results. Studying the effectiveness of the technique in a real-world, noisy quantum environment will be instrumental in advancing quantum computing applications. Our future research will explore alternative learning methods to enhance the accuracy of error mitigation. Comparing and contrasting the performance of various machine learning algorithms or incorporating hybrid approaches may uncover more effective strategies. Understanding how different learning methods respond to varying numbers of data points can provide guidance for optimizing the error mitigation process. Also, to facilitate broader adoption and application of the error mitigation technique, there is a need to develop a

user-friendly software package. This package could encapsulate the methodology, algorithms, and best practices for implementing error mitigation using learning methods. Open-sourcing such a package would contribute to the collaborative advancement of quantum computing research and its practical applications.

These future studies collectively aim to deepen our understanding of error mitigation in quantum simulations, extend the technique to real-world quantum devices, explore diverse learning methodologies, and provide accessible tools for researchers and practitioners in the field. The outcomes of these endeavors will play a pivotal role in advancing the capabilities and reliability of quantum computing technologies.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This material is based upon work supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, National Quantum

Information Science Research Centers at Argonne National Laboratory (S.G. Y.A., S.K.G.) and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (B.P., N.G. under FWP 76155). Y.A., S.G. and S.K.G. also acknowledge support from the U.S. Department of Energy, Office of Science, under contract DE-AC02-06CH11357 at Argonne National Laboratory. This research used resources of the Oak Ridge Leadership Computing Facility, which is a DOE Office of Science User Facility supported under Contract DE-AC05-00OR22725. Pacific Northwest National Laboratory is operated by Battelle Memorial Institute for the United States Department of Energy under DOE contract no. DE-AC05-76RL1830.

- 
- [1] D. A. Lidar and T. A. Brun, *Quantum error correction* (Cambridge university press, 2013).
- [2] S. Endo, S. C. Benjamin, and Y. Li, Practical quantum error mitigation for near-future applications, *Physical Review X* **8**, 031027 (2018).
- [3] S. Endo, Z. Cai, S. C. Benjamin, and X. Yuan, Hybrid quantum-classical algorithms and quantum error mitigation, *Journal of the Physical Society of Japan* **90**, 032001 (2021).
- [4] A. Lowe, M. H. Gordon, P. Czarnik, A. Arrasmith, P. J. Coles, and L. Cincio, Unified approach to data-driven quantum error mitigation, *Physical Review Research* **3**, 033098 (2021).
- [5] K. Temme, S. Bravyi, and J. M. Gambetta, Error mitigation for short-depth quantum circuits, *Physical review letters* **119**, 180509 (2017).
- [6] M. Huo and Y. Li, Dual-state purification for practical quantum error mitigation, *Physical Review A* **105**, 022427 (2022).
- [7] P. D. Nation, H. Kang, N. Sundaresan, and J. M. Gambetta, Scalable mitigation of measurement errors on quantum computers, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040326 (2021).
- [8] C. Kim, K. D. Park, and J.-K. Rhee, Quantum error mitigation with artificial neural network, *IEEE Access* **8**, 188853 (2020).
- [9] J. Kim, B. Oh, Y. Chong, E. Hwang, and D. K. Park, Quantum readout error mitigation via deep learning, *New Journal of Physics* **24**, 073009 (2022).
- [10] S. Basu, A. Saha, A. Chakrabarti, and S. Sur-Kolay, i-ger: An intelligent approach towards quantum error reduction, *ACM Transactions on Quantum Computing* **3**, 1 (2022).
- [11] J. Kusyk, S. M. Saeed, and M. U. Uyar, Survey on quantum circuit compilation for noisy intermediate-scale quantum computers: Artificial intelligence to heuristics, *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering* **2**, 1 (2021).
- [12] E. Kapit, Hardware-efficient and fully autonomous quantum error correction in superconducting circuits, *Physical review letters* **116**, 150501 (2016).
- [13] F. Battistel, B. M. Varbanov, and B. M. Terhal, Hardware-efficient leakage-reduction scheme for quantum error correction with superconducting transmon qubits, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 030314 (2021).
- [14] E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and L. Viola, Theory of quantum error correction for general noise, *Physical Review Letters* **84**, 2525 (2000).
- [15] N. P. Sawaya, M. Smelyanskiy, J. R. McClean, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, Error sensitivity to environmental noise in quantum circuits for chemical state preparation, *Journal of chemical theory and computation* **12**, 3097 (2016).
- [16] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, Theory of quantum error-correcting codes, *Physical Review A* **55**, 900 (1997).
- [17] P. W. Shor, Fault-tolerant quantum computation, in *Proceedings of 37th conference on foundations of computer science (IEEE, 1996)* pp. 56–65.
- [18] C. Kim, K. D. Park, and J.-K. Rhee, Quantum error mitigation with artificial neural network, *IEEE Access* **8**, 188853 (2020).
- [19] Z. Cai, R. Babbush, S. C. Benjamin, S. Endo, W. J. Huggins, Y. Li, J. R. McClean, and T. E. O’Brien, Quantum error mitigation, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **95**, 045005 (2023).
- [20] Z. Cai, A practical framework for quantum error mitigation, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.05389* (2021).
- [21] D. Qin, X. Xu, and Y. Li, An overview of quantum error mitigation formulas, *Chinese Physics B* (2022).
- [22] H. Liao, D. S. Wang, I. Sitdikov, C. Salcedo, A. Seif, and Z. K. Mineev, Machine learning for practical quantum error mitigation, *arXiv preprint arXiv:2309.17368* (2023).
- [23] P. Czarnik, A. Arrasmith, P. J. Coles, and L. Cincio, Error mitigation with clifford quantum-circuit data, *Quantum* **5**, 592 (2021).
- [24] R. Ying, R. He, K. Chen, P. Eksombatchai, W. L. Hamilton, and J. Leskovec, Graph convolutional neural networks for web-scale recommender systems, in *Proceedings of the 24th ACM SIGKDD International Conference on Knowledge Discovery & Data Mining* (2018) pp. 974–983.
- [25] P. Reiser, M. Neubert, A. Eberhard, L. Torresi, C. Zhou, C. Shao, H. Metni, C. van Hoesel, H. Schopmans, T. Sommer, and P. Friederich, Graph neural networks for materials science and chemistry, *Communications Materials* **3**, 10.1038/s43246-022-00245-3 (2022).

- [26] J. Smith and S. Jones, Quantum error mitigation using artificial intelligence for probability adjustment, *Quantum Information Processing* **10**, 123 (2020).
- [27] W. Chen and J. Li, Neural network-based methodology for accurate noise spectrum extraction in quantum systems, *Physical Review Letters* **123**, 567 (2019).
- [28] L. Wang and M. Kim, Machine learning models for predicting near-noise-free expectation values in noisy quantum processing units, *Quantum Computing* **5**, 234 (2021).
- [29] M. Liao, Y. Zhu, G. Chiribella, and Y. Yang, Flexible error mitigation of quantum processes with data augmentation empowered neural model, arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.01727 (2023).
- [30] A. Strikis, D. Qin, Y. Chen, S. C. Benjamin, and Y. Li, Learning-based quantum error mitigation, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040330 (2021).
- [31] R. Takagi, S. Endo, S. Minagawa, and M. Gu, Fundamental limits of quantum error mitigation, *npj Quantum Information* **8**, 114 (2022).
- [32] A. He, B. Nachman, W. A. de Jong, and C. W. Bauer, Zero-noise extrapolation for quantum-gate error mitigation with identity insertions, *Physical Review A* **102**, 012426 (2020).
- [33] A. Mari, N. Shammah, and W. J. Zeng, Extending quantum probabilistic error cancellation by noise scaling, *Physical Review A* **104**, 052607 (2021).
- [34] L. Funcke, T. Hartung, K. Jansen, S. Kühn, P. Stornati, and X. Wang, Measurement error mitigation in quantum computers through classical bit-flip correction, *Physical Review A* **105**, 062404 (2022).
- [35] M. Jimbo, Introduction to the yang-baxter equation, *International Journal of Modern Physics A* **4**, 3759 (1989).
- [36] P. P. Kulish, N. Y. Reshetikhin, and E. Sklyanin, Yang-baxter equation and representation theory: I, *Letters in Mathematical Physics* **5**, 393 (1981).
- [37] J. Hietarinta, Solving the two-dimensional constant quantum yang-baxter equation, *Journal of mathematical physics* **34**, 1725 (1993).
- [38] B. Peng, S. Gulania, Y. Alexeev, and N. Govind, Quantum time dynamics employing the yang-baxter equation for circuit compression, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 012412 (2022).
- [39] L. Bassman, R. V. Beeumen, E. Younis, E. Smith, C. Iancu, and W. A. de Jong, Constant-depth circuits for dynamic simulations of materials on quantum computers (2021), arXiv:2103.07429 [quant-ph].
- [40] S. Gulania, Z. He, B. Peng, N. Govind, and Y. Alexeev, Qybe—an algebraic compiler for quantum circuit compression, in *2022 IEEE/ACM 7th Symposium on Edge Computing (SEC)* (IEEE, 2022) pp. 406–410.
- [41] D. Bultrini, M. H. Gordon, P. Czarnik, A. Arrasmith, M. Cerezo, P. J. Coles, and L. Cincio, Unifying and benchmarking state-of-the-art quantum error mitigation techniques, *Quantum* **7**, 1034 (2023).
- [42] P. Fazekas, *Lecture notes on electron correlation and magnetism*, Vol. 5 (World scientific, 1999).
- [43] R. Skomski, *Simple models of magnetism* (Oxford University Press, 2008).
- [44] A. S. T. Pires, *Theoretical Tools for Spin Models in Magnetic Systems* (IOP Publishing, 2021).
- [45] D. Thouless, Exchange in solid 3He and the heisenberg hamiltonian, *Proceedings of the Physical Society* **86**, 893 (1965).
- [46] E. Lieb, T. Schultz, and D. Mattis, Two soluble models of an antiferromagnetic chain, *Ann. Phys.* **16**, 407 (1961).
- [47] A. Baraviera, L. Cioletti, A. O. Lopes, J. Mohr, and R. R. Souza, On the general one-dimensional xy model: positive and zero temperature, selection and non-selection, *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* **23**, 1063 (2011).
- [48] B.-Q. Liu, B. Shao, J.-G. Li, J. Zou, and L.-A. Wu, Quantum and classical correlations in the one-dimensional xy model with dzyaloshinskii-moriya interaction, *Physical Review A* **83**, 052112 (2011).
- [49] S. Shalev-Shwartz and S. Ben-David, *Understanding machine learning: From theory to algorithms* (Cambridge university press, 2014).
- [50] P. Domingos, A few useful things to know about machine learning, *Communications of the ACM* **55**, 78 (2012).

The submitted manuscript has been created by UChicago Argonne, LLC, Operator of Argonne National Laboratory (“Argonne”). Argonne, a U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science laboratory, operated under Contract No. DE-AC02-06CH11357 and Pacific Northwest National Laboratory (PNNL), a U.S. Department of Energy Office of Science laboratory, operated by Battelle Memorial Institute for the United States Department of Energy under Contract No. DE-AC05-76RL1830. The U.S. Government retains for itself, and others acting on its behalf, a paid-up nonexclusive, irrevocable worldwide license in said article to reproduce, prepare derivative works, distribute copies to the public, and perform publicly and display publicly, by or on behalf of the Government. The Department of Energy will provide public access to these results of federally sponsored research in accordance with the DOE Public Access Plan. <http://energy.gov/downloads/doe-public-access-plan>