

Enabling Leakage Reduction via Fast and High-Fidelity Qutrit Readout

Chaithanya Naik Mude¹, Satvik Maurya¹, Benjamin Lienhard^{2,3}, Swamit Tannu¹

¹Department of Computer Sciences, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, WI 53706 USA

²Department of Chemistry, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544 USA

³Department of Electrical and Computer Engineering, Princeton University, Princeton, NJ 08544 USA

Abstract—Quantum Error Correction (QEC) is key to operating quantum processors effectively at practical scales. QECs are designed for systems comprising two-level systems, such as qubits, as their fundamental building block. Unfortunately, qubits can leak to third and higher energy levels, making these leaks challenging to detect and mitigate. If not addressed promptly, these leakage errors can proliferate and undermine QEC, leading to significant computational inaccuracies. Here, we present a high-fidelity three-level qubit readout protocol that is simple to implement on dedicated hardware such as FPGAs. Our design enables faster and higher-fidelity leakage detection over approaches using conventional qubit-state discriminators.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum computers offer the potential to surpass classical systems in tackling intricate computational tasks like quantum simulations, unstructured searches, and factorization, leveraging sophisticated quantum algorithms [1]. However, realizing the full potential of these algorithms on quantum hardware hinges on developing efficient protocols to address inherent challenges. Chief among these challenges is the susceptibility of qubits, the foundational components of quantum computers, to diverse error sources, such as imperfect operations and limited coherence times. These factors contribute to computational inaccuracies, posing obstacles to the practical advancement of quantum technologies.

Fault-tolerant quantum computing (FTQC) is crucial for addressing these challenges by aiming to maintain computational accuracy despite the imperfections and instabilities of fundamental quantum components. Among the most promising platforms for FTQC are superconducting qubit systems, renowned for their scalability and ease of integration [2], [3]. However, experimental investigations of multi-qubit quantum processors shed light on significant vulnerabilities, particularly concerning qubit leakage [4]–[6]. This phenomenon occurs when qubits inadvertently transition to higher energy states, such as $|2\rangle$, $|3\rangle$, and so forth, which are non-computational. The computational subspace is spanned by $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. Various factors contribute to this leakage, including device imperfections, inaccuracies in control pulses, environmental interference, and interactions between qubits. Importantly, this leakage poses a significant challenge to traditional QEC methods, primarily designed to address errors occurring in computational states.

By encoding the information of one logical qubit into several physical qubits, QEC schemes can detect and correct errors, thereby ensuring the stability and reliability of quantum computations. Yet, current QEC protocols are ineffective against leakage errors, which occur when quantum systems occupy non-computational states, rendering them unresponsive to standard quantum operations. Such errors are not only outside the scope of conventional QEC models but also cause further inaccuracies, as operational gates malfunction when interacting with leaked qubits.

It is important to actively remove or reset the leaked qubits back to their designated computational states to mitigate the risk of accumulating leakage over time and degrade system performance. This corrective action is imperative for a reliable quantum processor.

To combat the risk of leakage, various leakage reduction circuits (LRCs) have been developed [4]–[10]. These circuits transform leakage errors, which occur when qubits populate higher, unwanted energy states, into a type of error known as Pauli errors that standard QEC can handle. However, their use must be carefully managed because LRCs can introduce additional leakage errors. LRCs are typically implemented after syndrome generation and measurement in the error correction process, which involves qubit readout.

Researchers have employed techniques based on multi-level readout to address leakage. These techniques are crucial for detecting when an ancilla qubit used in error detection leaks to a higher energy state and reset them quickly for the repetitive syndrome generation cycle. Rapid detection of leakage is critical because leakage errors can propagate from one qubit to another through two-qubit gates used during QEC cycles. The data qubits used in the QEC are not measured, and leakage propagated to those qubits from ancilla qubits can increase the leakage population. Such undetected leakage can escalate, resulting in widespread, uncorrectable errors. However, such leakage in data qubits can be removed by applying a swap gate with ancilla qubits and resetting the ancilla qubits [5]. This reinforces the need for efficient leakage removal in ancilla qubits.

For most superconducting quantum processors, it is key to implement efficient multi-level readout methods to actively remove leakage in qubits using multi-level reset. These methods must be accurate and fast, as delays in detecting and addressing

B.L. is supported by the Swiss National Science Foundation (Postdoc.Mobility Fellowship grant #P500PT_211060).




Fig. 1. Overview of our signal processing design starting with integrated readout data directly from the Analog-to-Digital converter (ADC), Matched Filters, and a Neural Network outputting the inferred qubit state.

leakage can severely compromise the effectiveness of QEC. This approach ensures that errors are managed promptly and accurately, maintaining the integrity and reliability of the quantum processor.

This paper presents the development of a three-level readout protocol specifically tailored for superconducting qubits. The primary objective of this protocol is to enable rapid detection and effective mitigation of leakage errors. A notable aspect of our approach is its implementation through software enhancements without requiring modifications to existing hardware. Figure 1 provides an overview of our protocol’s design and implementation strategy, highlighting its innovative aspects and demonstrating how it seamlessly integrates into the current technological framework to enhance leakage mitigation.

We investigate the optimization potential of the active reset procedure, considering various processing delays that occur during interactions between quantum hardware and classical hardware. We discuss the implications of this optimization for different scenarios, including quantum error correction (QEC) and situations involving multiple measurements within a circuit. Furthermore, we outline a procedure for optimizing other aspects of the circuit.

Additionally, we present techniques for identifying and analyzing faulty traces during the readout process, leveraging trace-level data to determine the corresponding states of faulty qubits accurately. Moreover, we demonstrate the versatility of our method by extending it to n -level systems, thereby enabling fast readout and significantly enhancing error detection and correction for complex quantum systems.

II. BACKGROUND AND MOTIVATION

A. Qubit Readout

Qubit readout, the process of converting quantum information into classical bits (‘0’ and ‘1’), is a critical yet challenging aspect of quantum computing. This process is inherently slow and susceptible to errors, complicating the accurate inference of a qubit’s state. In most superconducting architectures, the readout is conducted using dispersive measurements [11]. This kind of readout is often a Quantum Non-Demolition (QND) measurement, meaning the qubit remains in the measured state beyond the measurement [12].

The readout process involves both analog and digital components: initially, a microwave signal is sent to query the qubit. This signal undergoes a state-dependent phase shift based on the qubit’s state, which effectively encodes the quantum information into the phase of the microwave signal. The perturbed microwave signal is converted from an analog signal to a digital signal using an Analog-to-Digital Converter (ADC). The digitized data is then processed to determine the state of the qubit [13].

Many systems employ frequency-division multiplexed readout to enhance scalability and manage the complexities of simultaneously measuring multiple qubits. This technique allows multiple qubits to be measured sequentially or simultaneously using the same physical channel, significantly reducing the hardware complexity and improving the efficiency of the readout process.

In this paper, we focus on the digital portion of the readout pipeline. These components are explained in more detail below: **ADC.** The microwave signal received from the qubit is first analog demodulated to match the sampling rate of the Analog-to-Digital Converter (ADC). The demodulation splits the signal into the In-Phase (I) and Quadrature (Q) channels. Thus, two ADCs are needed for the analog-to-digital conversion.

Filtering. For most quantum processors operated today, readout is generally one of the longest operations, with latencies ranging from a few hundred nanoseconds to a few microseconds. Using all the samples generated by the ADCs during classification is computationally and memory-intensive. Consequently, most readout pipelines use a filtering scheme to condense many samples into a smaller subset (usually a single sample). A commonly used filter is a simple averaging filter.

Demultiplexing. Most systems today use frequency-multiplexed readout since it reduces the hardware complexity. With frequency-multiplexed readout, qubits are divided into fixed groups to perform readout using the same physical channel. However, the filtered sample(s) from the ADC must be demultiplexed to determine the state of individual qubits in a group.

Classification. The filtered, demultiplexed sample(s) can be classified as ‘0’ or ‘1’ using an appropriate classifier such as a Support Vector Machine (SVM), K-means, or a neural network.

B. Readout Discriminators

Recent advancements in qubit-state readout accuracy have been primarily driven by the adoption of sophisticated discriminators such as deep Neural Networks (NN) [14], [15], combinations of NN with traditional methods [16] such as matched filters [17], or Hidden Markov Models [18].

NNs [14], [19] can directly analyze digitized readout signals without pre-processing. This method enhances readout accuracy by capturing subtle nuances in the data that traditional techniques might miss. However, while NNs offer improved state-discrimination accuracy, they typically do so at the expense of increased computational demands and reduced scalability.

In response to these challenges, recent developments have introduced HERQULES [16], an innovative approach that integrates matched filters with a lightweight neural network. This hybrid technique aims to strike a balance by utilizing matched filters for initial dimensionality reduction, thereby simplifying the input for the neural network. The neural network then processes these reduced data to improve readout accuracy while keeping hardware complexity and latency minimal.

C. Leakage Reduction

Leakage Reduction Circuits (LRCs) are specifically designed to detect and mitigate leakage errors through statistical analysis and targeted application on leakage detected qubits. These circuits effectively reduce the leakage population by utilizing a conditional reset approach.

Conditional reset involves the design of a π -pulse tailored to shift the state of the qubit from a leaked state $|L\rangle$ back to the ground state $|0\rangle$ to eradicate the leakage. The success of this approach hinges on the ability to accurately discriminate higher-energy states, a factor determined by multi-level readout fidelity. This strategy is especially advantageous for parity qubits used in surface code architectures, which undergo regular measurement cycles, allowing for timely detection and correction of leakage, thereby enhancing the overall efficacy of leakage mitigation.

D. Multi-Level Readout

During the measurement process, the qubits can leak outside the computational basis. This necessitates Multi-Level Readout (MLR) to detect the leaked states during qubit computation. The quantum gates result in faulty outputs when a leaked qubit is involved. For example, a leaked measured qubit engaged in the surface code cycle could result in faulty syndrome measurements and incorrect detection of errors. Such errors can be reduced using LRCs, and π -pulse-based LRCs can be designed with the help of MLR.

Furthermore, scalable MLR is essential for computations employing qudits. Recent works include employing qudits for quantum search [20] and efficient decomposition of multi-controlled qubit gates, like Toffoli gate [21], [22]. MLR also helps reduce errors in π -pulse-based reset protocols and improve the qubit reuse efficiency. The challenges in scaling MLR require considering various metrics related to decoherence rates, error rates, crosstalk, resource requirements for control and measurement, and calibration.

III. SCALING HIGH-FIDELITY QUTRIT READOUT

The efficacy of quantum processors hinges on achieving high-fidelity readout. This section delves into the challenges associated with realizing scalable, high-fidelity single-shot readout for qutrit systems, as well as the effectiveness of current reset protocols.

A. Factors affecting single-shot accuracy

Single-shot readout fidelity refers to the accuracy of measuring the state of a qutrit in a single measurement attempt. It serves as a key metric for assessing the reliability of

quantum computations. Achieving high fidelity in single-shot readout is essential for minimizing errors, enabling efficient quantum algorithms, and ensuring the reliability of quantum computations. Several factors can significantly impact the fidelity of qutrit readout operations, such as relaxation errors, excitation errors, and errors due to environmental noise. Here, we focus on relaxation errors and excitation errors.

1) *Relaxation errors:* Relaxation errors stem from the spontaneous decay of higher-energy states during the readout process. As qutrits interact with their environment, they experience decoherence, leading to errors in the measured state. Such errors could occur during long-latency operations such as readout. Strategies to mitigate relaxation errors involve enhancing qutrit coherence times.

2) *Excitation errors:* Excitation errors can occur when qutrits are unintentionally excited to higher energy states during readout. The qutrits in the ground state, $|0\rangle$, can get excited to $|1\rangle$ or higher, similarly $|1\rangle$ can get excited to $|2\rangle$ or higher.

B. Readout latency and hardware complexity

As quantum systems increase in size, managing readout latency, the time required to perform readout operations, becomes ever more important for maintaining efficient quantum computations. Longer latencies can significantly hinder performance, especially in larger systems where timely feedback is essential for error correction and system stability. Concurrently, the readout hardware's complexity increases with the system's scale, particularly in architectures involving qutrits, requiring additional operations for the $|2\rangle$ state, adding more computational and resource demands. Thus, developing scalable solutions that can efficiently handle these growing requirements is necessary to advance quantum computing technologies.

C. Conditional reset pipeline

The conditional reset pipeline is integral for maintaining high-fidelity quantum state management. It begins with measuring a qutrit to determine if the desired computational basis is still occupied. If the state shows undesirable variations or errors, a decision is made to apply a reset π -pulse tailored to revert the quantum state to its ground state or another predefined state. The timing and effectiveness of this reset pulse are critical and can be affected by the control electronics latency, such as delays caused by the cable lengths in superconducting systems. To understand the order of latency, for an IBM system [23], the measurement is $300ns$ long, with $35ns$ for a reset pulse. Decreasing measurement latency can significantly improve the total time to implement the conditional reset process.

IV. ENABLING EFFICIENT QUTRIT READOUT

A. Qutrit Readout Classifier

1) *Baseline Design.:* We employ a neural network as a baseline qutrit readout classifier. We use individual IQ values after filtering and demultiplexing as input to our neural network for two reasons. Demultiplexed data give us access to IQ values for each qubit in the readout process to quickly process them. Using individual IQ values gives us a much simpler neural




Fig. 2. a) Initial clusters of state $|0\rangle$ (blue) and state $|1\rangle$ (orange) on the IQ-plane. b) Clusters of qubit states on the IQ-plane after identifying leakage traces, $|2\rangle$ (purple), along with state $|0\rangle$ (blue) and state $|1\rangle$ (orange) on IQ-plane. c) The mean trace value of the traces corresponding to states $|0\rangle$, $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$. d) The mean trace value of the error traces corresponding to state excitations

network than those directly using raw ADC samples [14]. A feed-forward neural network is employed. The dimension of the input layer is the length of IQ time steps for each qubit, and the dimension of the output layer is 3^N (the number of all possible outcomes as a three-level system). After the final layer, softmax activation is utilized to normalize the output into probability distributions to get the expected output.

B. Leakage cluster detection

The readout discriminators efficiently categorize averaged IQ data points into distinct clusters corresponding to different qubit states, enabling various clustering-based approaches for data analysis. When a significant number of outliers are detected within the zero and one state clusters, it typically indicates the occurrence of leakage during the quantum computation process. These outliers directly detect leakage signatures, eliminating the need to deliberately prepare the $|2\rangle$ state. The absence of such outliers suggests that leakage events are infrequent and not a significant concern. The clustering analysis to figure out the outliers can quickly become expensive with the number of qubits used in the system. We employ hierarchical centroid-based separation techniques to refine outlier detection further to differentiate these leakage clusters from the standard $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ -state clusters.

In this paper, we utilize a dataset from a custom five-qubit chip, as provided by the authors in Reference [14], to demonstrate the effectiveness of these methods in practical scenarios. Consider the clusters seen in the third qubit of this dataset as shown in Fig. 2a. The two dark clusters correspond to the characteristic cluster for the computational basis states, $|0\rangle$ (blue) and $|1\rangle$ (orange). However, the long trace that extends from $|1\rangle$ corresponds to probable leakage or error instances. We can remove the cluster points corresponding to darker regions of these clusters to analyze the tail. Using the centroid for this cluster to be a potential centroid for error traces and to classify all the IQ points in the dataset for the third qubit, we will find the error traces as shown in Fig. 2b.

The hierarchical centroid-based separation of the clusters can be extended to any n-level system. Suppose the readout data is regularly collected on the qubits without any additional state injection. In that case, we will observe the clusters for various states being formed proportional to the probability of the qubit being that particular state. For example, we started

with the data of the third qubit, where we collected data for the qubit in both state $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, forming the darker clusters. But due to possible error traces, the qubit occupies leaked state $|L\rangle$, creating the tail. Most of these error traces correspond to state $|1\rangle$ because it has a relatively higher probability of occupying state $|L\rangle$. With increasing data, if we see more formative clusters, we can employ a similar hierarchical separation technique to figure out potential centroids for those states.

C. Dimensionality Reduction with Matched Filter

In signal processing within the context of qubit-state readout, the matched filter is an essential tool designed to maximize the signal-to-noise ratio (SNR) in the presence of noise [17]. Here, we use the kernel of a matched filter derived from the statistical properties of the signal traces. Specifically, the kernel is formulated as the mean difference of the traces divided by the difference in the variances. Suppose μ_0 and μ_1 represent the mean of the traces corresponding to two distinct quantum states, and σ_0^2 and σ_1^2 their respective variances. In that case, the kernel k is defined as $k = \frac{\mu_1 - \mu_0}{\sigma_1^2 - \sigma_0^2}$. This formulation effectively enhances the filter's ability to distinguish between different states by weighting the trace differences inversely by the difference of their variances, thereby improving the filter's sensitivity and accuracy in state discrimination.

The trace information in each averaged I-Q data point is essential for effective qubit-state discrimination. We utilize matched filters with the kernel k , designed to enhance pattern recognition. However, conventional matched filters typically discriminate between only two classes, which poses a challenge in our scenario, where three distinct classes must be distinguished. To address this complexity, we deploy three matched filters tailored to identify different classes. Despite this strategy, the process remains susceptible to errors. We integrate a small neural network to refine the discrimination accuracy further and correct for non-linear errors that matched filters alone might miss.

We calculate the Mean Trace Value (MTV). The temporal mean of one such trace corresponds to a single point in Fig. 2c. The MTV of a trace Tr is given by the equation: $MTV = \frac{1}{len(Tr)} \sum_{t=0}^{len(Tr)} Tr(t)$. The difference in pattern for the mean trace for different states shows that we can use readout trace level information to improve discrimination of the qubit's state. This combined methodology improves accuracy and leverages

the inherent data patterns to optimize state classification in quantum systems.

As we can estimate the centroids and traces of all the states. We can label the traces corresponding to relaxation and excitation using this information and the ground truth. panel d in Fig. 2, shows the MTV for such excitation traces from $|0\rangle$ to $|1\rangle$ and $|2\rangle$. There is also a characteristic pattern for these traces, which can be leveraged to discriminate the qubit state. We design an excitation filter (EMF) and relaxation filter (RMF) to supplement the discriminator in detecting patterns for excitation traces and relaxation traces respectively. Furthermore, we use a matched filter information of all three states (MF) and two additional RMF, EMF, and a small neural network (NN) to tackle the remaining non-linearity; we call this design: *our method*, *MF-REMF-NN*, and the overview is shown in Fig. 1. The small-NN follows a similar design as a baseline, but the input size is greatly reduced due to dimensionality reduction with MF.

V. METHODOLOGY

A. Quantum Hardware

We obtained datasets containing the readout time traces collected directly from the ADC originating from a five-qubit chip used in Reference [14]. These qubits are read out through a common resonator feedline using frequency-multiplexing. The ADC sampling rate is 500MSamples/sec, and qubit relaxation (T_1) times range from $7\mu s$ to $40\mu s$. The dataset contains readout traces for all 32 basis states of the five qubits, with 50,000 traces per basis state ($32 \times 50000 = 1600000$ traces). We fixed the readout duration to $1\mu s$ for all qubits. We use the third and fourth qubits, which are more prone to $|2\rangle$ excitations. We get around 10000 total traces for each qubit after using a similar number of traces for each state.

B. Benchmarks

To evaluate leakage within surface code cycles, we define the leakage population as the ratio of the number of qubits existing outside the computational basis to those within it averaged across all the surface code cycles. We do not introduce leakage at the beginning of these cycles, and the leakage population evolves, particularly increasing due to failures in qutrit reset operations. This assessment method enables us to directly measure the resilience and efficacy of the qutrit reset mechanisms under actual operational conditions.

We employ a series of FTQC benchmarks running surface code for different categories such as Arithmetic (adder-28, multiplier-45), state preparation (gndstate-14, wstate-20, wstate-40, wstate-60), search and optimization (qaoa-14, qft-20, qft-40), and for random and data-augmented category (random-40, KetGPT-70). We use Microsoft Azure Quantum Resource Estimator [24] to estimate the code distance, required magic states, and total surface code rounds. These benchmarks are specifically chosen to cover various quantum computing applications and complexities, potentially being used as near-term fault-tolerant benchmarks. We can effectively evaluate the leakage population through these benchmarks, offering

essential insights into the impact of potential improvements due to qutrit readout on the overall system.

VI. EVALUATIONS

A. Impact on Readout Fidelity

Table I shows the readout fidelity for the baseline and proposed method. The proposed design shows 1-2% improvement over MF-NN, which lacks information about relaxations and excitations.

TABLE I
THE QUTRIT-STATE READOUT FIDELITY FOR DIFFERENT DESIGNS.

Design	Qubit 3	Qubit 4
LDA	0.8966	0.9181
QDA	0.9135	0.9213
NN	0.9394	0.9263
MF-NN	0.9391	0.9241
MF-RMF-NN	0.9509	0.9245
MF-REMF-NN	0.9593	0.9304

B. Impact on Readout Latency and QEC cycle time

Typically, qubit-state (or qutrit-state) readout is the slowest operation in the QEC cycle, in which parity qubits are continuously measured to detect errors. Any decrease in the readout duration will significantly reduce the total execution time of the QEC cycle, thereby reducing the execution time of the application. We analyze the readout discrimination accuracy for the third and fourth qubits with varying readout times (i.e., trace lengths). As shown in Fig. 3, we can reduce the readout duration by $200ns$, $300ns$ for qubit 3 and qubit 4, with a loss of 2% in discrimination fidelity, enabling faster readout.




Fig. 3. The variation of the qubit-state discrimination fidelity with varying readout duration.

Fig. 3 shows a tradeoff between readout fidelity and latency, and by tolerating 2% increase in readout fidelity, we can reduce the measurement latency by 20%, resulting in up to 17% reduction QEC cycle time for the surface-17 circuit shown in Reference [25]. Such a tradeoff would be favorable when we are forced to utilize logical qubits with large code distances.

C. FTQC benchmarks

We can improve the qutrit readout fidelity from 0.9391 to 0.9593 for Qubit 3. Assuming similar improvements on all physical qubits, we estimate the relative population of leaked parity qubits sustained after applying conditional reset protocol for a logical qubit using surface code. Using the FTQC benchmark from Azure QRE, we estimate up to 33% leakage population reduction in parity qubits for the proposed discriminator over a Match Filter design (see Fig. 4).




Fig. 4. Average leakage population in measured parity qubits for surface code logical qubits (lower is better).

D. Training samples

We see an improvement of 1.2% when we increase the number of training samples used from 10% to 90% for qubit 3, and 0.6% improvement for qubit 4, as illustrated in Fig. 5.




Fig. 5. Achievable qubit-state discrimination fidelity depending on the number of training samples.

VII. RELATED WORK

The approach for readout schemes varies with the availability of the level of data that can be obtained from the system. For instance, readout time traces, such as those available here, provide significantly more information on the qubit dynamics during the measurement.

Readout trace information. Machine learning (ML) approaches like clustering and various neural network architectures are commonly used. Other approaches utilize latent features of the trace-level data to pre-train ML models with autoencoders [19], and other employed architectures include FNN [14], [15], or HMM [18].

Averaged I-Q data points. With the data of average I-Q values, IBM provides a 0-1 state discriminator based on centroids. Statistical methods employ fitting the data onto a Gaussian distribution, inverting calibration matrices, or assignment probability matrices to correct for errors. Linear discriminant analysis (LDA) [21], [26] is also used to discriminate between states. Other methods [27] to decrease readout errors include improving the underlying physical system. IBM also provides a state discrimination procedure through mid-circuit measurement [28].

The necessity to improve qutrit readout arises from the detrimental effects of leakage, which compromises system reliability during QEC cycles, despite the improvements in qubit readout, reset [29], [30] and reuse [31]. Standard benchmarking techniques [32], [33] are applied to assess the quality of the qutrit system and the ability to use the system for efficient Toffoli-decomposition and qudit-computation [22], [34].

VIII. CONCLUSION

Information on the level of readout time traces uncovers distinct features of various errors, which are imperative for improving qutrit readout accuracy. Enhanced readout accuracy leads to more efficient and reliable quantum error correction (QEC) cycles. With the era of QEC nearing, swiftly addressing leakage issues becomes increasingly important. Our approach leverages specific error patterns to enhance detection accuracy. We provide a simple yet robust solution that streamlines the error detection process by hierarchically clustering errors and employing matched-filter-based pattern recognition. The proposed signal processing architecture yields an increase in discrimination fidelity. Faster readouts expedite these QEC cycles, enabling quicker error correction and facilitating rapid detection methods. Developing more effective error detection techniques based on readout is essential for a reliable, useful quantum processor.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. Brooks, “The race to find quantum computing’s sweet spot,” *Nature*, vol. 617, pp. S1–S3, 2023.
- [2] F. Arute *et al.*, “Quantum Supremacy using a Programmable Superconducting Processor,” *Nature*, vol. 574, pp. 505–510, Oct. 2019.
- [3] R. Acharya, I. Aleiner, R. Allen, T. I. Andersen, M. Ansmann, F. Arute, K. Arya, A. Asfaw, J. Atalaya, R. Babbush, D. Bacon, J. C. Bardoin, J. Basso, A. Bengtsson, S. Boixo, and *et al.*, “Suppressing quantum errors by scaling a surface code logical qubit,” *Nature*, vol. 614, pp. 676–681, Feb 2023.
- [4] M. Suchara, A. W. Cross, and J. M. Gambetta, “Leakage suppression in the toric code,” in *2015 IEEE International Symposium on Information Theory (ISIT)*, pp. 1119–1123, 2015.

- [5] M. McEwen, D. Kafri, Z. Chen, J. Atalaya, K. J. Satzinger, C. Quintana, P. V. Klimov, D. Sank, C. Gidney, A. G. Fowler, F. Arute, K. Arya, B. Buckley, B. Burkett, N. Bushnell, B. Chiaro, R. Collins, S. Demura, A. Dunsworth, C. Erickson, B. Foxen, M. Giustina, T. Huang, S. Hong, E. Jeffrey, S. Kim, K. Kechedzhi, F. Kostritsa, P. Laptev, A. Megrant, X. Mi, J. Mutus, O. Naaman, M. Neeley, C. Neill, M. Niu, A. Paler, N. Redd, P. Roushan, T. C. White, J. Yao, P. Yeh, A. Zalcman, Y. Chen, V. N. Smelyanskiy, J. M. Martinis, H. Neven, J. Kelly, A. N. Korotkov, A. G. Petukhov, and R. Barends, "Removing leakage-induced correlated errors in superconducting quantum error correction," *Nature Communications*, vol. 12, Mar. 2021.
- [6] K. C. Miao, M. McEwen, J. Atalaya, D. Kafri, L. P. Pryadko, A. Bengtsson, A. Opremcak, K. J. Satzinger, Z. Chen, P. V. Klimov, C. Quintana, R. Acharya, K. Anderson, M. Ansmann, F. Arute, K. Arya, A. Asfaw, J. C. Bardin, A. Bourassa, J. Bovaird, L. Brill, B. B. Buckley, D. A. Buell, T. Burger, B. Burkett, N. Bushnell, J. Campero, B. Chiaro, R. Collins, P. Conner, A. L. Crook, B. Curtin, D. M. Debroy, S. Demura, A. Dunsworth, C. Erickson, R. Fatemi, V. S. Ferreira, L. F. Burgos, E. Forati, A. G. Fowler, B. Foxen, G. Garcia, W. Giang, C. Gidney, M. Giustina, R. Gosula, A. G. Dau, J. A. Gross, M. C. Hamilton, S. D. Harrington, P. Heu, J. Hilton, M. R. Hoffmann, S. Hong, T. Huang, A. Huff, J. Iveland, E. Jeffrey, Z. Jiang, C. Jones, J. Kelly, S. Kim, F. Kostritsa, J. M. Kreikebaum, D. Landhuis, P. Laptev, L. Laws, K. Lee, B. J. Lester, A. T. Lill, W. Liu, A. Locharla, E. Lucero, S. Martin, A. Megrant, X. Mi, S. Montazeri, A. Morvan, O. Naaman, M. Neeley, C. Neill, A. Nersisyan, M. Newman, J. H. Ng, A. Nguyen, M. Nguyen, R. Potter, C. Rocque, P. Roushan, K. Sankaragomathi, H. F. Schurkus, C. Schuster, M. J. Shearn, A. Shorter, N. Shu, V. Shvarts, J. Skrzynny, W. C. Smith, G. Sterling, M. Szalay, D. Thor, A. Torres, T. White, B. W. K. Woo, Z. J. Yao, P. Yeh, J. Yoo, G. Young, A. Zalcman, N. Zhu, N. Zobrist, H. Neven, V. Smelyanskiy, A. Petukhov, A. N. Korotkov, D. Sank, and Y. Chen, "Overcoming leakage in quantum error correction," *Nature Physics*, vol. 19, pp. 1780–1786, Dec 2023.
- [7] J. Ghosh, A. G. Fowler, J. M. Martinis, and M. R. Geller, "Understanding the effects of leakage in superconducting quantum-error-detection circuits," *Physical Review A*, vol. 88, Dec. 2013.
- [8] B. G. Markkida and L.-A. Wu, "Implementation of leakage elimination operators and subspace protection," *Scientific Reports*, vol. 10, p. 18846, Nov 2020.
- [9] F. Battistel, B. Varbanov, and B. Terhal, "Hardware-efficient leakage-reduction scheme for quantum error correction with superconducting transmon qubits," *PRX Quantum*, vol. 2, July 2021.
- [10] C. J. Wood and J. M. Gambetta, "Quantification and characterization of leakage errors," *Physical Review A*, vol. 97, Mar. 2018.
- [11] A. Blais, R.-S. Huang, A. Wallraff, S. M. Girvin, and R. J. Schoelkopf, "Cavity quantum electrodynamics for superconducting electrical circuits: An architecture for quantum computation," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 69, p. 062320, Jun 2004.
- [12] R. Yanagimoto, R. Nehra, R. Hamerly, E. Ng, A. Marandi, and H. Mabuchi, "Quantum nondemolition measurements with optical parametric amplifiers for ultrafast universal quantum information processing," *PRX Quantum*, vol. 4, Mar. 2023.
- [13] P. Krantz, M. Kjaergaard, F. Yan, T. P. Orlando, S. Gustavsson, and W. D. Oliver, "A quantum engineer's guide to superconducting qubits," *Applied Physics Reviews*, vol. 6, June 2019.
- [14] B. Lienhard, A. Vepsäläinen, L. C. Govia, C. R. Hoffer, J. Y. Qiu, D. Ristè, M. Ware, D. Kim, R. Winik, A. Melville, B. Niedzielski, J. Yoder, G. J. Ribeill, T. A. Ohki, H. K. Krovi, T. P. Orlando, S. Gustavsson, and W. D. Oliver, "Deep-neural-network discrimination of multiplexed superconducting-qubit states," *Phys. Rev. Appl.*, vol. 17, p. 014024, Jan 2022.
- [15] U. Azad and H. Zhang, "Machine learning based discrimination for excited state promoted readout," 2022.
- [16] S. Maurya, C. N. Mude, W. D. Oliver, B. Lienhard, and S. Tannu, "Scaling qubit readout with hardware efficient machine learning architectures," in *Proceedings of the 50th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, ISCA '23, ACM, June 2023.
- [17] C. A. Ryan, B. R. Johnson, J. M. Gambetta, J. M. Chow, M. P. da Silva, O. E. Dial, and T. A. Ohki, "Tomography via correlation of noisy measurement records," *Phys. Rev. A*, vol. 91, p. 022118, Feb 2015.
- [18] B. M. Varbanov, F. Battistel, B. M. Tarasinski, V. P. Ostroukh, T. E. O'Brien, L. DiCarlo, and B. M. Terhal, "Leakage detection for a transmon-based surface code," *npj Quantum Information*, vol. 6, Dec. 2020.
- [19] P. Luchi, P. E. Trevisanutto, A. Roggero, J. L. DuBois, Y. J. Rosen, F. Turro, V. Amitrano, and F. Pederiva, "Enhancing qubit readout with autoencoders," *Phys. Rev. Appl.*, vol. 20, p. 014045, Jul 2023.
- [20] Y. Wang, Z. Hu, B. C. Sanders, and S. Kais, "Qudits and high-dimensional quantum computing," *Frontiers in Physics*, vol. 8, Nov. 2020.
- [21] P. Gokhale, J. M. Baker, C. Duckering, N. C. Brown, K. R. Brown, and F. T. Chong, "Asymptotic improvements to quantum circuits via qutrits," in *Proceedings of the 46th International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, ISCA '19, ACM, June 2019.
- [22] A. S. Nikolaeva, E. O. Kiktenko, and A. K. Fedorov, "Generalized toffoli gate decomposition using ququints: Towards realizing grover's algorithm with qudits," *Entropy*, vol. 25, p. 387, Feb. 2023.
- [23] A. Córcoles, M. Takita, K. Inoue, S. Lekuch, Z. K. Mineev, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, "Exploiting dynamic quantum circuits in a quantum algorithm with superconducting qubits," *Physical Review Letters*, vol. 127, Aug. 2021.
- [24] W. van Dam, M. Mykhailova, and M. Soeken, "Using azure quantum resource estimator for assessing performance of fault tolerant quantum computation," 2023.
- [25] R. Versluis, S. Poletto, N. Khammassi, B. Tarasinski, N. Haider, D. J. Michalak, A. Bruno, K. Bertels, and L. DiCarlo, "Scalable quantum circuit and control for a superconducting surface code," *Physical Review Applied*, vol. 8, Sept. 2017.
- [26] D. Volya and P. Mishra, "State preparation on quantum computers via quantum steering," *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering*, vol. 5, pp. 1–14, 2024.
- [27] N. Lacroix, L. Hofele, A. Remm, O. Benhayoune-Khadraoui, A. McDonald, R. Shillito, S. Lazar, C. Hellings, F. Swiadek, D. Colao-Zanuz, A. Flasby, M. B. Panah, M. Kerschbaum, G. J. Norris, A. Blais, A. Wallraff, and S. Krinner, "Fast flux-activated leakage reduction for superconducting quantum circuits," 2023.
- [28] N. Kanazawa, H. Emori, and D. C. McKay, "Qutrit state discrimination with mid-circuit measurements," 2023.
- [29] M. DeCross, E. Chertkov, M. Kohagen, and M. Foss-Feig, "Qubit-Reuse Compilation with Mid-Circuit Measurement and Reset," *Physical Review X*, vol. 13, p. 041057, Oct. 2023.
- [30] K. J. Mesman, F. Battistel, E. Reehuis, D. de Jong, M. J. Tiggelman, J. Gloudemans, J. C. van Oven, and C. C. Bultink, "Q-profile: Profiling tool for quantum control stacks applied to the quantum approximate optimization algorithm," 2023.
- [31] S. Brandhofer, I. Polian, and K. Krsulich, "Optimal qubit reuse for near-term quantum computers," 2023.
- [32] D. Amaro-Alcalá, B. C. Sanders, and H. de Guise, "Benchmarking of universal qutrit gates," *Physical Review A*, vol. 109, Jan. 2024.
- [33] C. J. Wood and J. M. Gambetta, "Quantification and characterization of leakage errors," *Physical Review A*, vol. 97, Mar. 2018.
- [34] A. Litteken, L. M. Seifert, J. D. Chadwick, N. Nottingham, T. Roy, Z. Li, D. Schuster, F. T. Chong, and J. M. Baker, "Dancing the quantum waltz: Compiling three-qubit gates on four level architectures," in *Proceedings of the 50th Annual International Symposium on Computer Architecture*, ISCA '23, ACM, June 2023.