

Choi's Proof and Quantum Process Tomography

Debbie W. Leung

IBM T.J. Watson Research Center, P.O. Box 218, Yorktown Heights, NY 10598, USA

November 26, 2024

Quantum process tomography is a procedure by which an unknown quantum operation can be fully experimentally characterized. We reinterpret Choi's proof of the fact that any completely positive linear map has a Kraus representation [Lin. Alg. and App., 10, 1975] as a method for quantum process tomography. Furthermore, the analysis for obtaining the Kraus operators are particularly simple in this method.

1 Introduction

The formalism of quantum operation can be used to describe a very large class of dynamical evolution of quantum systems, including quantum algorithms, quantum channels, noise processes, and measurements. The task to fully characterize an unknown quantum operation \mathcal{E} by applying it to carefully chosen input state(s) and analyzing the output is called quantum process tomography. The parameters characterizing the quantum operation are contained in the density matrices of the output states, which can be measured using quantum state tomography [1]. Recipes for quantum process tomography have been proposed [12, 4, 5, 6, 8]. In earlier methods [12, 4, 5], \mathcal{E} is applied to different input states each of exactly the input dimension of \mathcal{E} . In [6, 8], \mathcal{E} is applied to part of a fixed bipartite entangled state. In other words, the input to \mathcal{E} is entangled with a reference system, and the joint output state is analyzed.

Quantum processing tomography is an essential tool in reliable quantum information processing, allowing error processes and possibly imperfect quantum devices such as gates and channels to be characterized. The method in [4] has been experimentally demonstrated and used to benchmark the fidelities of teleportation [10] and the gate CNOT [2], and to investigate the validity of a core assumption in fault tolerant quantum computation [2].

The number of parameters characterizing a quantum operation \mathcal{E} , and therefore the experimental resources for any method of quantum process tomography, are determined by the input and output dimensions of \mathcal{E} . However, different methods can be more suitable for different physical systems. Furthermore, each method defines a procedure to convert the measured output density matrices to a desired representation of \mathcal{E} , and a simpler procedure will enhance the necessary error analysis.

In this paper, we describe in detail the method initially reported in [8], which is derived as a simple corollary of a mathematical proof reported in [3]. Our goal is two-fold. We hope to make this interesting proof more accessible to the quantum information community, as well as to provide a simple recipe for obtaining the Kraus operators of the unknown quantum operation. In the rest of the paper, we review the different approaches of quantum operations, describe Choi's proof and the recipe for quantum process tomography in Sections 2, 3, and 4. We conclude with some discussion in Section 5.

2 Equivalent approaches for quantum operations

A quantum state is usually described by a density matrix ρ that is positive semidefinite ($\rho \geq 0$, i.e., all eigenvalues are nonnegative) with $\text{tr}(\rho) = 1$. A quantum operation \mathcal{E} describes the evolution of one state ρ to another $\rho' = \mathcal{E}(\rho)$.

More generally, let \mathcal{H}_1 and \mathcal{H}_2 denote the input and output Hilbert spaces of \mathcal{E} . A density matrix can be regarded as an operator acting on the Hilbert space.¹ Let $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_i)$ denote the set of all bounded operators acting on \mathcal{H}_i for $i = 1, 2$. We can consider $\mathcal{E}(M)$ for any $M \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ without restricting the domain to density matrices. A mapping \mathcal{E} from $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ is a quantum operation if it satisfies the following equivalent sets of conditions:


1. \mathcal{E} is (i) linear, (ii) trace non-increasing ($\text{tr}(\mathcal{E}(M)) \leq \text{tr}(M)$) for all $M \geq 0$, and (iii) *completely positive*. The mapping \mathcal{E} is called *positive* if $M \geq 0$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ implies $\mathcal{E}(M) \geq 0$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$. It is called completely positive if, for any auxiliary Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_a , $\tilde{M} \geq 0$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_a)$ implies $(\mathcal{E} \otimes \mathcal{I})(\tilde{M}) \geq 0$ in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_a)$ where \mathcal{I}_a is the identity operation on $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_a)$.
2. \mathcal{E} has a *Kraus representation* or an *operator sum representation* [13, 3, 7]:

$$\mathcal{E}(M) = \sum_k A_k M A_k^\dagger \tag{1}$$

where $\sum_k A_k^\dagger A_k \leq I$, and I is the identity operator in $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$. The A_k operators are called the Kraus operators or the operation elements of \mathcal{E} .

3. $\mathcal{E}(M) = \text{Tr}_o [U(M \otimes \rho_a) U^\dagger (I \otimes P_o)]$. Here, $\rho_a \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_a)$ is a density matrix of the initial state of the ancilla, $I \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$ is the identity operator, $\mathcal{H}_2 \otimes \mathcal{H}_o = \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_a$, $P_o \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_o)$ is a projector, and Tr_o is a partial tracing over \mathcal{H}_o .

Each set of conditions represents an approach to quantum operation when the input is a density matrix ($M = \rho$). The first approach puts down three axioms any quantum operation should satisfy. The completely positive requirement states that if the input is entangled with some other system (described by the Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_a), the output after \mathcal{E} acts on \mathcal{H}_1 should still be a valid state. The third approach describes system-ancilla (or environment) interaction. Each of these evolutions results from a unitary interaction of the system with a fixed ancilla state ρ_a , followed by a measurement on a subsystem \mathcal{H}_o with measurement operators $\{P_o, I - P_o\}$, post-selection of the first outcome, and removing \mathcal{H}_o . The fact that the third approach



¹Even though the density matrix can be viewed as an operator, it is important to remember that it represents a state and thus evolves as a state rather than an operator. For this reason we use the name density matrix rather than the density operator.

is equivalence to the first is nontrivial – the evolutions described by the third approach are actually all the mappings that satisfy the three basic axioms. Finally, the second approach provides a convenient representation useful in quantum information theory, particularly in quantum error correction (see [11] for a review).

Proofs of the equivalence of the three approaches are summarized in [9, 8]. There are four major steps, showing that the 1st set of conditions implies the 2nd set and vice versa, and similarly for the 2nd and 3rd sets of conditions. The most nontrivial step is to show that every linear and completely positive map has a Kraus representation, and a proof due to Choi [3] for the finite dimensional case will be described next.

3 Choi’s proof

The precise statement to be proved is that, if \mathcal{E} is a completely positive linear map from $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ to $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_2)$, then $\mathcal{E}(M) = \sum_k A_k M A_k^\dagger$ for some $n_2 \times n_1$ matrices A_k , where n_i is the dimension of \mathcal{H}_i . Let $|\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n_1}} \sum_i |i\rangle \otimes |i\rangle$ be a maximally entangled state in $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$. Here, $\{|i\rangle\}_{i=1, \dots, n_1}$ is a basis for \mathcal{H}_1 . Consider $(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\tilde{M})$ where

$$\tilde{M} = n_1 |\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi| = \sum_{i,j=1}^{n_1} |i\rangle\langle j| \otimes |i\rangle\langle j|. \quad (2)$$

\tilde{M} is an $n_1 \times n_1$ array of $n_1 \times n_1$ matrices. The (i, j) block is exactly $|i\rangle\langle j|$:

$$M = \begin{bmatrix} \begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} 1 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 1 & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \end{array} & \begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \end{array} & \begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \end{array} & \begin{array}{ccc|ccc|ccc} 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 & \cdot & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \end{array} \end{bmatrix} \quad (3)$$

When $\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E}$ is applied to \tilde{M} , the (i, j) block becomes $\mathcal{E}(|i\rangle\langle j|)$, and

$$(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\tilde{M}) = \left[\begin{array}{c|c|c|c} \mathcal{E} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \mathcal{E} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \mathcal{E} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdot & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \hline \mathcal{E} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \mathcal{E} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & \cdot & 0 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \mathcal{E} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 1 \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & \cdot & 0 \end{pmatrix} \\ \hline \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ \hline \mathcal{E} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \mathcal{E} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot & \mathcal{E} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \cdot & \cdot & \cdot \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{array} \right] \quad (4)$$

which is an $n_1 \times n_1$ array of $n_2 \times n_2$ matrices.

We now express $(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\tilde{M})$ in a manner completely independent of Eq. (4). Since \tilde{M} is positive and \mathcal{E} is completely positive, $(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\tilde{M})$ is positive, and can be expressed as $(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\tilde{M}) = \sum_{l=1}^{n_1 n_2} |a_k\rangle\langle a_k|$, where $|a_k\rangle$ are the eigenvectors of $(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\tilde{M})$, normalized to the respective eigenvalues. One can represent each $|a_k\rangle$ as a column vector and each $\langle a_k|$ as a row vector. We can divide the column vector $|a_k\rangle$ into n_1 segments each of length n_2 , and define a matrix A_k with the i -th column being the i -th segment, so that the i -th segment is exactly $A_k|i\rangle$. Then

$$(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\tilde{M}) = \sum_k \begin{array}{|l} \boxed{} \\ \hline \boxed{} \\ \hline \boxed{} \\ \hline \boxed{} \\ \hline \boxed{} \end{array} \times \begin{array}{|c|c|c|c|} \hline \langle 1|A_k^\dagger & \langle 2|A_k^\dagger & & \langle n_1|A_k^\dagger \\ \hline \end{array}$$

4

and

$$(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\tilde{M}) = \sum_k \begin{bmatrix} A_k|1\rangle\langle 1|A_k^\dagger & A_k|1\rangle\langle 2|A_k^\dagger & \cdots & A_k|1\rangle\langle n_1|A_k^\dagger \\ A_k|2\rangle\langle 1|A_k^\dagger & A_k|2\rangle\langle 2|A_k^\dagger & \cdots & A_k|2\rangle\langle n_1|A_k^\dagger \\ \cdots & \cdots & \cdots & \cdots \\ A_k|n_1\rangle\langle 1|A_k^\dagger & A_k|n_1\rangle\langle 2|A_k^\dagger & \cdots & A_k|n_1\rangle\langle n_1|A_k^\dagger \end{bmatrix} \quad (5)$$

Comparing Eqs. (4) and (5) block by block $\mathcal{E}(M) = \sum_k A_k M A_k^\dagger$ for $\forall M = |i\rangle\langle j|$, and thus $\forall M \in \mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ by linearity.

4 Recipe for quantum process tomography

The basic assumptions in quantum process tomography are as follows. The unknown quantum operation, \mathcal{E} , is given as an ‘‘oracle’’ or a ‘‘blackbox’’ one can call without knowing its internal mechanism. One prepares certain input states and *measures* the corresponding output density matrices to learn about \mathcal{E} systematically. The task to measure the density matrix of a quantum system is called quantum state tomography [1]. To obtain a Kraus representation for \mathcal{E} , one needs an experimental procedure that specifies the input states to be prepared, and a numerical method for obtaining the Kraus operators from the measured output density matrices.

A method follows immediately from the proof in Sec. 3. We retain all the previously defined notations. The crucial observation is that $\frac{1}{n_1}\tilde{M}$ and $\frac{1}{n_1}(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\tilde{M})$ correspond to the input and output physical states $|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|$ and $(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|)$ which can be prepared and measured. The procedure is therefore to:

1. Prepare a maximally entangled state $|\Phi\rangle$ in $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_1$.
2. Subject one system to the action of \mathcal{E} , while making sure that the other system does not evolve.
3. Measure the joint output density matrix $(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|) = \frac{1}{n_1}(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(\tilde{M})$, multiply by n_1 , obtain the eigen-decomposition $\sum_k |a_k\rangle\langle a_k|$. Divide $|a_k\rangle$ (of length $n_1 n_2$) into n_1 equal segments each of length n_2 . A_k is the $n_2 \times n_1$ matrix having the i -th segment as its i -th column.

The maximally entangled state in the above procedure can be replaced by any pure state with maximum Schmidt number, $|\phi\rangle = \sum_i \alpha_i (U|i\rangle) \otimes (V|i\rangle)$ where $\alpha_i \geq 0$ are real and $\sum_i \alpha_i^2 = 1$. The output density matrix ρ_{out} is equal to $(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(|\phi\rangle\langle\phi|) = \sum_{i,j} \alpha_i \alpha_j (U|i\rangle\langle j|U^\dagger) \otimes \mathcal{E}(V|i\rangle\langle j|V^\dagger)$. One computes $(U^\dagger \otimes I) \rho_{\text{out}} (U \otimes I)$, divides the (i, j) block by $\alpha_i \alpha_j$, and performs eigen-decomposition to obtain a set of A_k operators. The Kraus operators of \mathcal{E} are given by $A_k V^\dagger$.

5 Discussion

We have provided an experimental and analytic procedure for obtaining a set of Kraus operators A_k for an unknown quantum operation. The set of A_k is called “canonical” in [3], meaning that the A_k are linearly independent. We remark that any other Kraus representation can be obtained from A_k using the fact that $\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_k A_k \rho A_k^\dagger = \sum_k B_k \rho B_k^\dagger$ if and only if $A_k = \sum_j u_{kj} B_k$ when u_{kj} are the entries of an isometry [3]. Alternatively, one can replace the eigen-decomposition of $(\mathcal{I} \otimes \mathcal{E})(|\Phi\rangle\langle\Phi|)$ by any decomposition into a positive sum to obtain other valid sets of Kraus operators.

Previous methods of quantum process tomography [12, 4, 5] involve preparing a set of physical input states ρ_i that form a basis of $\mathcal{B}(\mathcal{H}_1)$, and measuring $\mathcal{E}(\rho_i)$ to determine \mathcal{E} . The input states ρ_i are physical states, and cannot be chosen to be trace orthonormal, causing complications in the analysis. In contrast, the output state in the current method automatically contains complete information on $\mathcal{E}(|i\rangle\langle j|)$ for the unphysical orthonormal basis $|i\rangle\langle j|$ (see Eq. (4)), which greatly simplifies the analysis to obtain the Kraus operators. However, the current method requires the preparation of a maximally entangled state and the ability to stop the evolution of the reference system while \mathcal{E} is being applied. The previous methods are more suitable in implementations such as solution NMR systems, while the current method is more suitable for implementations such as optical systems.

Any efficient quantum process tomography procedure consumes approximately the same amount of resources, which is determined by the number of degrees of freedom in the quantum operation. In general, to measure an $n \times n$ density matrix, n^2 ensemble measurements are needed, requiring $\approx \mathcal{O}(n^2)$ steps. The previous methods require the determination of n_1^2 density matrices each $n_2 \times n_2$ and take $\approx \mathcal{O}(n_1^2 n_2^2)$ steps. The current method requires the determination of one $n_1 n_2 \times n_1 n_2$ density matrix which also requires $\approx \mathcal{O}(n_1^2 n_2^2)$ steps. In both cases, the number of steps is of the same order as the number of degrees of freedom in the quantum operation and are optimal in some sense.

6 Acknowledgement

We thank Isaac Chuang for suggesting the application of Choi’s proof in quantum process tomography. After the initial report of the current result in [8], G. D’Ariano and P. Presti independently reported a similar tomography method [6]. This work is supported in part by the NSA and ARDA under the US Army Research Office, grant DAAG55-98-C-0041

References

- [1] State tomography for infinite-dimensional systems was proposed in K. Vogel and H. Risken, *Phys. Rev. A* **40**, 2847 (1989). See [11] for a review of the simpler finite-dimensional case.
- [2] A. M. Childs, I. L. Chuang, and D. W. Leung. Realization of quantum process tomography in NMR. *Phys. Rev. A*, 64:012314, 2001. arXiv e-print quant-ph/0012032.
- [3] M.-D. Choi. Completely positive linear maps on complex matrices. *Linear Algebra and Its Applications*, 10:285–290, 1975.

- [4] I. L. Chuang and M. A. Nielsen. Prescription for experimental determination of the dynamics of a quantum black box. *J. Mod. Opt.*, 44:2455–2467, 1997. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9610001.
- [5] G. M. D’Ariano and L. Maccone, Measuring quantum optical Hamiltonians. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 80:5465, 1998. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9805032.
- [6] G. M. D’Ariano and P. Lo. Presti, Tomography of quantum operations, arXiv e-print quant-ph/00-12071.
- [7] K. Kraus. *States, Effects, and Operations*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 1983.
- [8] D. W. Leung, *Towards Robust Quantum Computation*. Ph.D. thesis, Stanford University (July 2000). arXiv e-print cs.CC/0012017.
- [9] M. A. Nielsen. *Quantum information theory*. PhD thesis, The University of New Mexico, Albuquerque, NM, 1998.
- [10] M. A. Nielsen, E. Knill, and R. Laflamme. *Complete quantum teleportation by nuclear magnetic resonance*. *Nature*, 395:PAGE, 1998.
- [11] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, U.K., 2000.
- [12] J. F. Poyatos, J. I. Cirac, and P. Zoller. Complete characterization of a quantum process: the two-bit quantum gate. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 78(2):390–393, 1997.
- [13] B. W. Schumacher. Sending entanglement through noisy quantum channels. *Phys. Rev. A*, 54:2614, 1996. arXiv e-print quant-ph/9604023.