Error measurements for a quantum annealer using the one-dimensional Ising model with twisted boundaries
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A finite length ferromagnetic chain with opposite spin polarization imposed at its two ends is one of the simplest frustrated spin models. In the clean classical limit the domain wall inserted on account of the boundary conditions resides with equal probability on any one of the bonds, and the degeneracy is precisely equal to the number of bonds. If quantum mechanics is introduced via a transverse field, the domain wall will behave as a particle in a box, and prefer to be nearer the middle of the chain rather than the ends. A simple characteristic of a real quantum annealer is therefore which of these limits obtains in practice. Here we have used the ferromagnetic chain with antiparallel boundary spins to test a real flux qubit quantum annealer and discover that contrary to both expectations, the domain walls found are non-uniformly distributed on account of effective random longitudinal fields present notwithstanding tuning carried out to zero out such fields when the couplings between qubits are nominally zero. We present a simple derivation of the form of the distribution function for the domain walls, and show also how the effect we have discovered can be used to determine the strength of the effective random fields (noise) characterizing the annealer. The noise measured in this fashion is smaller than what is seen during the single-qubit tuning process, but nonetheless qualitatively affects the outcome of the simulation performed by the annealer.
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INTRODUCTION
The low energy states of natural systems can correspond to the solutions of computationally difficult problems. Experiments suggest that these low energy states can be accessed and measured by taking advantage of quantum mechanics, using a technique known as quantum annealing. Here, the “difficult” problem is converted to an equivalent problem of finding the ground state of an Ising Hamiltonian, and that classical ground state is approached via the introduction and subsequent removal of quantum fluctuations, typically imposed via transverse fields. It is suspected but by no means universally agreed that quantum annealing could provide an improvement over other methods for certain classes of interesting problems. To harness the power of quantum annealing, machines must be constructed to faithfully implement the relevant transverse field Ising Hamiltonian (TFIM), and to do so represents a major challenge in quantum information science and engineering. We refer to such machines as annealers. While the eventual outputs of annealers usually take discrete binary values, the control parameters, which are the coupling constants in the TFIM, must be chosen from a continuous set of values. An annealer should therefore be considered an analog rather than a digital computer. For a review of adiabatic quantum computing and quantum annealing see and for a forward looking perspective on the field see.

Quantum annealing has attracted considerable experimental attention recently, which is understandable given the wide variety of applications, from traditional computer science problems, to more exotic uses such as aiding genetic algorithms to calculate radar waveforms, search engine ranking, and portfolio optimization. In addition, sampling using a quantum annealer, which is effectively the topic of the current paper, is highly relevant to many machine learning and statistical inference tasks.

Precision of control parameters is a fundamental issue in analog computing, not present in its digital counterpart. It is therefore important to ask what new complications these errors may add. One could hope, for example, that small uncorrelated control errors simply average out, leading to no noticeable effect as long as they are below a threshold. Long time-scale noise should also be considered a source of control error; this noise will be indistinguishable from the TFIM being mis-specified by the device. We demonstrate here that the effects of control errors can be counter-intuitive, giving nonuniform distributions within a degenerate manifold even for uncorrelated errors. We further argue that this effect captures error-causing noise that would be missed if we try to measure the errors with a different protocol.

There is a growing literature on error correction in quantum annealing. Most of the studies focus upon the effect of coupling to an external bath rather than control errors. However, the work does mention techniques that can reduce the effect of control errors, at the cost of some overhead, but cannot completely eliminate them. For the purposes of this study there are two kinds of relevant noise processes, the dissipation which occurs on a time scale comparable or faster than the system dynamics, and slower...
noise which appears with respect to these time scales and acts as effective random-field terms. The role of the faster noise is to hasten relaxation to a thermal distribution, while the slower noise (referred to as control errors) is what is directly measured in the experiments we report.

While the present study is dedicated to the consequences rather than the physical origins of this noise in flux qubit annealers, we note other literature describing this noise as due to interactions of the qubit with magnetic defects in the chip substrate. It typically takes a profile with a $\frac{1}{\tau}$ type frequency dependence, meaning that the noise contains both high and low frequency components. The low frequency components can be treated as effectively static control errors, and are responsible for the effects that we report here.

We examine experimentally the effect of control errors on the annealer constructed by D-Wave Systems, which mimics an Ising spin system. Our experiment shows a nonuniform distribution of control errors arising from stray magnetic fields from free spins and dangling bonds within the materials that make up the quantum processing unit (QPU). This could be considered equivalent to adding a term of the form,

$$H_{\text{fields}} = \sum_j \xi_j \sigma_j^z,$$

(4)

to the overall Hamiltonian, where $\xi_j$ are uncorrelated and Gaussianly distributed with a standard deviation $\sigma_\xi \ll J$ and zero mean $\langle \xi_j \rangle = 0$. The overline indicates an ensemble average. Random-field terms such as those in Eq. 4 appear naturally in implementations of the transverse field Ising model, including for example the dipole-coupled magnet LiHo$_2$Y$_4$F$_{18}$. Because the coupling between the qubits and the substrate is likely to change with bias, $\xi_j$ will generally be time-dependent, however as we show later the system remains in thermal equilibrium until very late in the anneal, so it may be treated as static for the purpose of these experiments.

One can also consider coupler control errors of the form

$$H = \sum_j \xi_j \sigma_j^z \sigma_{j+1}^z,$$

(5)

where $\sigma_j(\sigma_{j+1})$ is an operator which annihilates (creates) a domain wall at location $i$. While in principle quantum effects within this manifold could be observed, we find that control errors dominate in our experiment.
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in origin, both through numerical simulation and experiments using different runtimes. The reason that this system is dominated by classical rather than quantum effects is that it equilibrates quickly through thermal barrier hopping, as has been independently observed for one-dimensional chains in quantum annealers in Ref. 2.

**RESULTS**

**Theoretical analysis**

There is a vast literature on the one-dimensional Ising model dealing with issues ranging from random fields in the classical limit through disordered couplers and transverse fields, to twisted boundary conditions in the clean quantum limit (see e.g., Ref. 3). Nonetheless, we could not locate a paper which specifically addresses the domain-wall distribution for the one-dimensional Ising model with twisted boundary conditions and a longitudinal random field, and what is relevant for quantum simulators, the evolution of this distribution with a transverse field. While such domain-wall distributions can be easily obtained through numerical sampling as we describe below, we provide in this section an analytical calculation in the classical limit, followed by some remarks on what could happen during the quantum annealing process.

Let us start by considering the energy contribution from the field control errors in the case of a single-domain wall on the nth coupler in the chain, $E_n = \sum_{i=1}^{N} \text{sgn}(n - i + 0.5) \xi_i$. The difference in energy between two domain-wall positions is therefore $E_n - E_m = 2 \sum_{|n-i|>0.5} \xi_i$, where $n > m$.

Assuming that $\xi_i = 0$ and $\xi^2 = \sigma^2$, we note that

$$\langle E_n - E_m \rangle = 4\sigma^2 \min(n - m) \sqrt{(n - k)(n - m)}.$$

where $\Theta$ is a Heaviside theta. Note that this formula explicitly demonstrates that the domain-wall energies are correlated, even for uncorrelated fields. Also note that for a Gaussian distribution $\xi^2 = \sigma^2$.

The probability of finding a domain wall at site $n$ in a thermal ensemble averaged over noise is given by

$$P_n = \frac{Z^{-1}e^{-\beta E_n}}{Z^{-1}e^{-\beta E_0}} = \left[1 + \sum_{i=0}^{N} e^{-\beta(E_0 - E_n)}\right]^{-1}.$$

Let us now consider a high-temperature approximation to obtain an analytical formula. By expanding this probability to second order in $\beta = \frac{1}{k_B T}$ and applying Eq. 5 we obtain

$$P_n \approx \tilde{P} + \beta \xi \frac{2}{N}(n - \frac{N + 1}{2})^2$$

where $\tilde{P} = \frac{1}{N} \langle e^{-\beta E} \rangle \left(\frac{1}{4}N^2 + N^2 + \frac{1}{6}N + 1\right)$. This demonstrates that even small field control errors create a parabolic (U-shaped) distribution of domain walls. Simple, uncorrelated errors can have a strong effect on the equilibrium behavior of a simple domain-wall system. Note that this calculation relies upon the assumption that the system is in thermal equilibrium. We justify this assumption numerically in Supplementary Section 2.2. We also demonstrate other derivations at finite and zero temperature in SupplementarySections 2.3, 2.4. The expansion used in Eq. 6 is only guaranteed to be valid for temperatures much higher than the maximum difference in domain-wall energies, $\beta \sqrt{N} \ll 1$. We therefore expect that this approximation will breakdown for long chains, and experimentally demonstrate this breakdown in the paper. While the high-temperature expansion provides valuable intuition, we perform all analysis by comparing to computer aided numerical calculations.

The phenomenon of Eq. 6 is interesting as an experimental tool, because it provides a way of directly measuring the effect of the control errors on the evolution of a nontrivial Hamiltonian (i.e., with nonzero interactions between qubits). Therefore, we expect that the control errors measured in this way should give a more accurate portrayal of the errors experienced in a real computation than in single-qubit methods where interactions between qubits have been set to zero.

We conclude—to motivate future research—considerations of what might happen during genuine ($T = 0$) quantum annealing and quenches. Most noteworthy is that for the twisted boundary conditions represented by Eqs. 1, 2, we have a domain wall which can be thought of as a particle whose mass approaches zero and size (uncertainty in position) diverges as the quantum critical point where $A = \frac{1}{2}J$ is approached (see Ref. 45 and references therein). For a finite system, the wall is a particle in a box, which is more likely in its ground state to be found at the center of the box than at the edges. As we lower the transverse field below $J$, we expect the random fields to cause localization to occur as this is a one-dimensional system, i.e., in a chain of length $L$ the domain wall should be localized as soon as its quantum mechanically defined size is smaller than $L$. What this means is that for a quantum annealer which is truly at zero temperature, the system can become trapped in a configuration which does not minimize energy. Furthermore, the random longitudinal fields would produce a distribution of wall positions (read out via projection of of individual spins onto the z axis) broader than expected for the clean limit.

**Experimental results**

Experiments were performed on a D-Wave Processor as described in “Methods” (and in more detail in the Supplementary Material), and we describe the key findings here. Firstly consider an individual instance of the Hamiltonian shown in Fig. 1 used in a quantum annealing protocol. Figure 2 demonstrates such an experiment, in particular annealing on the same chain run repeatedly over time with no averaging either over different definitions of 0 and 1 on the qubits (gauge averaging), or over different physical chains. As with most other experiments reported here each anneal took 20 μs. The distribution of domain walls is nonuniform, as expected for local random fields even though we have tuned the qubit controls in an effort to eliminate such random fields.

We now check whether the simple classical considerations of the previous section can account for our experimental observations. To avoid effects due to local variations in qubits and couplers, we average over different chains and gauges. Figure 2 also shows that the deviation between runs is much larger than expected for identical samples drawn from the same distribution, which can be seen by comparing the actual spread of the points
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Fig. 3 Domain-wall probability distributions for 10-qubit frustrated chain. Crosses are raw experimental data. Asterisks are the same with a correction applied for background susceptibility. Circles are numerically calculated data from sampling Boltzmann distributions with field noise of the form Eq. 4 with $\frac{\Delta}{T} = 0.2363$. Lines joining points are a guide to the eye.

Fig. 4 Domain-wall distribution for a 50-qubit chain using the same experimental setup as Fig. 3 (including background susceptibility corrections). Dashed line is a parabolic fit. Error bars represent standard error.

with the standard error depicted in the error bars in the lower frame. This indicates that the control error has components that are faster than the time between samples. Fast errors are more difficult to detect, as well as to remove. For more discussion on this subject, see Supplementary Section 2.6.

The difference in domain-wall probabilities in Fig. 2 is due to a combination of control errors, of the form given in Eq. 4, and coupler control errors. However, as we described in Supplementary Section 2.1, measuring the average domain-wall distribution removes the effect of coupler errors, allowing us to measure only the field errors.

Figure 3 displays the results from running the QPU with the final Hamiltonian corresponding to the chain configuration shown in Fig. 1, while averaging over many embedding and gauge choices. An embedding corresponds to mapping a problem on a QPU such that every variable of the problem is represented by a subset of the qubits on the QPU. Note that chains can always be embedded in a one-to-one fashion, where every logical variable corresponds to one physical qubit; this is not true for more complicated graphs for which embedding is a more involved process.65. Gauge choices arise due to an invariance of the target Hamiltonian under flips in the sign of a particular spin and the corresponding local field and couplings between it and other spins. This averaging is explained in the “Methods” section and Supplementary Section 1.1.

The experiment now yields a U-shaped distribution, with the probability for the domain wall to be located at the very end of the chain suppressed. The suppression is predicted from well understood rf-SQUID background susceptibility effects, and can be removed by applying a simple linear correction; for more details see Supplementary Section 1.2. Figure 4 shows the behavior of the experiments when performed on a longer chain, where the distribution deviates from parabolic due to the breakdown of the assumptions underlying Eq. 6. For longer chains it is natural to ask whether Griffiths-McCoy-Wu singularities may be playing a role in the dynamics (such effects have recently been observed in two dimensional systems using quantum annealers). However, these would manifest themselves as unusual configurations such as multiple domain walls with regular spacings between them, rather than the distribution of single-domain walls present in the ground state of a frustrated chain. In our experiments we predominantly observed the single-domain wall state indicating that these effects were not playing a crucial role.

Although the theoretical predictions provide a good fit to the data, it is important to establish whether we are really justified in treating the output as a classical thermal distribution, and whether any residual quantum effects remain. It has been shown that performing quantum simulations on spin chain systems using D-Wave annealers is difficult due to the fact that a very fast quench is required to capture the dynamics. In fact simulations performed on unfrustrated spin chains in suggest that a quench would need to be of order $10^5$ times faster than currently available. As Supplementary Section 2.2 shows, we find the same result. The simulations in also suggest that the scaling of the experiments is not favorable with system size, indicating that it will actually be more difficult to observe quantum effects in longer chains than the short ones we have simulated. To further confirm that the system is very close to thermal equilibrium, we perform annealing at two very different annealing times, as depicted in Fig. 5. In this figure we see that making the run time orders of magnitude longer makes only a small difference in that the minimum of the distribution is slightly more pronounced at longer runtimes.

We next examine the effect of the weak transverse fields which are still present at the freeze time, and whether this can lead to interesting quantum effects. We assume that the freezing occurs when $A(t) = 0.1 \text{GHz}$, which is reasonable based upon previous work, and then compare the thermal distribution with or without the transverse field present, assuming a noise of $\frac{\Delta}{T} = 0.24$ which can be extracted by fitting our experimental data as described later. Assuming a temperature of $T = 15 \text{ mK} = 0.31 \text{GHz}$, we find the distributions in Fig. 6. The transverse field has very little effect, aside from a slight suppression of terminal site probabilities. We therefore conclude that the dominant effects observed in these experiments are indeed classical, and perform our remaining analysis from the perspective of classical thermodynamics.

Returning to analysis of the 10-qubit chain, the experimental data match the numerical data obtained by Boltzmann sampling over field noise of the type in Eq. 4 with $\frac{\Delta}{T} = 0.24(\sigma_T \approx 0.074 \text{GHz})$. This fitting was performed against numerical sampling results rather than Eq. 6 to allow for higher-order corrections. Specifically, the
By contrast, a naive estimate made by sampling uncoupled qubit error with respect to the experimental distribution was minimized. The result that a naive single decoupled qubit measurement of local random fields is substantially below the random fields needed to generate the nontrivial “U” distribution of domain walls for coupled qubits is a key outcome of our study. One possible explanation is that each sample is averaged over many annealing runs (each of which use the same annealing time as the domain wall experiments) and is therefore blind to any errors with a time-scale less than the time to collect all the samples, which is ~1 s.

A more sophisticated analysis based upon calculating autocorrelation via the Fourier transform (FT) of the single-qubit results yields $\frac{\sigma_x}{\text{GHz}} = 0.13$ (see Supplementary Section 1.3 for details) and so together with the outcome of the polarization sampling technique, brackets the result obtained from the domain-wall distribution for the Ising model with interacting couplers. As with the polarization calculation, the FT experiments are performed with the coupling turned off. This method is expected to be sensitive to a wider bandwidth of errors than the naive measurement, but should still be blind to any noise faster than the Nyquist interval, which in this case is about 178 $\mu$s. A summary of the different noise measurement techniques and the results obtained from them is shown in Table 1.

We also have checked experimentally whether state-dependent errors have a significant effect. Figure 8 demonstrates that the depth of the U-shaped distribution to be useful to measure field control errors requires the underlying assumption that the errors are uncorrelated. Most types of correlation between nearby qubits will be removed by the process of gauge averaging. However, coupler-mediated errors from a shared coupler may depend on the state (ferro or anti-ferro) of the coupler, and therefore may contain some correlations that survive gauge averaging. We suspect that this part of the error should be relatively small because these correlations will only come from one of the 5 or 6 couplers connected to a given qubit, and only a fraction of the error from each coupler is state dependent.

For the U-shaped distribution to be useful to measure field control errors requires the underlying assumption that the errors are uncorrelated. Most types of correlation between nearby qubits will be removed by the process of gauge averaging. However, coupler-mediated errors from a shared coupler may depend on the state (ferro or anti-ferro) of the coupler, and therefore may contain some correlations that survive gauge averaging. We suspect that this part of the error should be relatively small because these correlations will only come from one of the 5 or 6 couplers connected to a given qubit, and only a fraction of the error from each coupler is state dependent.

We also have checked experimentally whether state-dependent errors have a significant effect. Figure 8 demonstrates that the depth of the distribution to be useful to measure field control errors requires the underlying assumption that the errors are uncorrelated. Most types of correlation between nearby qubits will be removed by the process of gauge averaging. However, coupler-mediated errors from a shared coupler may depend on the state (ferro or anti-ferro) of the coupler, and therefore may contain some correlations that survive gauge averaging. We suspect that this part of the error should be relatively small because these correlations will only come from one of the 5 or 6 couplers connected to a given qubit, and only a fraction of the error from each coupler is state dependent.

Table 1. Summary of different noise measurement techniques and the results obtained from them.

| Measurement technique | Coupling on? | Sensitive to minimum time scale | $\frac{\sigma_x}{\text{GHz}}$ | $\sigma_f$ (GHz) |
|-----------------------|-------------|---------------------------------|-----------------------------|-----------------|
| Domain wall           | Yes         | N/A                             | 0.2363                      | 0.075           |
| Naive sampling        | No          | 1 s                             | 0.13                        | 0.040           |
| Fourier transform     | No          | 178 $\mu$s                      | 0.35                        | 0.11            |

Fig. 6 Top: Numerically calculated domain-wall distribution assuming thermal equilibrium in the presence or absence of a transverse field for experimentally realistic parameters. Bottom: same as top but with mid-point value subtracted to allow direct comparison, inset is difference between the two curves. Both data were taken using the same $10^5$ random noise realizations. Error bars are standard error, and this plot uses experimentally realistic parameters $\frac{\sigma_x}{T} = 0.24$ and $T = 15$ mK = 0.31 GHz.

Fig. 7 Domain-wall distribution with different gauge choices. X represents data taken in the gauge which all couplers are antiferromagnetic. Asterisks are averaged over random gauges. Circles are data for the gauge in which all couplers are ferromagnetic. All data in this figure have been corrected for background susceptibility.

Fig. 8 Difference between domain-wall probability on site $i$ from the probability that domain wall is found on site 5 for two scales of the coupling. Note that background susceptibility corrections have not been performed.
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Our method runs with the standard annealing protocol, 
requiring no privileged access to the control lines, and measures 
the component of the noise which acts as control error by con-
struction, with no frequency cutoff that depends on the 
annealing time. The second point means that the method could 
be used for arbitrarily long annealing times to observe deviations 
from the user-specified fields during the annealing process. On 
the other hand, should a processor be claimed to be a quantum 
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domain-wall problem will yield a distribution with a maximum 
rather than minimum at the center of the chain, thus providing a 
qualitative test as to whether the device is classical random-field 
or quantum fluctuation-dominated regimes has been 
observed for model magnets64, and we look forward to 
seeing a demonstration for properly programmable quantum 
simulators such as arrays of Josephson junctions or ion traps.

METHODS
Experimental methods
The data in all figures except Fig. 2 were taken on the USC Information 
Sciences Institute Vesuvius 6 D-Wave QPU. Except where otherwise stated, 
these data were averaged over gauges, as well as over ways of embedding 
on the QPU. For more details about the embedding see Supplementary 
Section 1.2. Data in Fig. 2 were taken using a GPU intermediate between 
the Vesuvius and Washington QPU generations made available by D-Wave 
Systems Inc. Unless otherwise stated all data were taken using an 
annealing time of 20 μs. All individual data sets are taken with 10,000 
annealing runs.
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