OPENING THE BLACK BOX OF QUANTUM MACHINE LEARNING

LEONARDO BANCHI — UNIVERSITY OF FLORENCE & INFN FIRENZE



OUTLINE OF QUANTUM MACHINE LEARNING

- Something has to be quantum (e.g. data, or algorithm)
- Learning problem
- We need to use a machine, the problem is too complex for pen and paper calculations
- Data driven: we learn from examples*, defining a mathematical model is often impossible

Current Personal interests: theoretical guarantees (what kind of problems can be learnt easily? Why?)



CQ: QUANTUM LEARNING OF CLASSICAL DATA IN NISQ DEVICES

 Classical data is mapped onto a quantum state using a parametric quantum circuit, namely a composition of unitary gates that depend on classical variables.

$$\hat{U}_j(x) = \exp\left(i\,x\cdot\hat{H}_j\right)$$

- Once data are loaded into a quantum register, we apply a classification unitary $\hat{U}_{\mathcal{M}}(\theta)$, with external parameters θ
- A measurement in the computational basis (probabilistically) determines the class
- Parametric Quantum Circuits ≡ Quantum Neural Networks



samples $\{c, x\}$



class/label c = "cat"



embedding circuit $x \mapsto \rho(x)$ decision via POVM Π_c

(c) Dilated measurements



optimization of POVM Π_c

=optimization
of unitary $U_{\mathcal{M}}$



HOW DO WE OPTIMISE QUANTUM NEURAL NETWORKS? GRADIENTS!

- Parameter Shift Rule / Hadamard test for $e^{i\theta\hat{\sigma}}$ gates
- K Mitarai et al. Physical Review A, 2018
- M Schuld et al. Physical Review A, 2019
- Stochastic PSR for general Hamiltonian evolution $\rho i(\hat{H} + \theta \hat{V})$
- L Banchi, GE Crooks, Quantum 5, 386 (2021)
- Continuous variable systems / GBS distribution
- N Killoran, et al. Phys. Rev. Research (2019)
- L Banchi et al., Phys. Rev. A 102, 012417 (2020)

$$\nabla_{\Theta} f = f(\Theta_{i}) - f(\Theta_{2})$$
$$= \Theta_{\Theta_{1}} = \Theta_{\Theta_{2}} = \Theta_{\Theta_{2$$

$$\frac{4}{e^{i(1-s)(\hat{H}+\theta\hat{V})}} - \frac{4i}{e^{is(\hat{H}+\theta\hat{V})}} - \frac{1}{e^{is(\hat{H}+\theta\hat{V})}} - \frac{1}{e^{is(\hat{H$$



QML WITH "QUANTUM DATA"

- For classical data we want to use a quantum computer, hoping to get a computational advantage
- Example problems with quantum data: quantum sensing, quantum state and process tomography





Our review on QC

V Gebhart [...] L Banchi [...], arXiv:2207.00298 Nature Reviews Physics (accepted)

irement	
ata	
1	
· · · ·	
i i	
· · · · ·	
i i	
1. Contraction of the second s	
i i	
1	
i	
1	
i	
1	
-	



MANY-BODY PHYSICS (QC/QQ)

- Many-Body Entanglement Measurement from PPT-moments Tr $|(\rho_{AB}^{T_B})^n|$
 - J Gray, L Banchi, A Bayat, S Bose, Phys. Rev. Lett. 121, 150503 (2018)

- Quantum Phase Recognition
 - I Cong, S Choi, MD Lukin, Nature Physics 15, 1273 (2019)

$$H = -J \sum_{i=1}^{N-2} Z_i X_{i+1} Z_{i+2} - h_1 \sum_{i=1}^{N} X_i - h_2 \sum_{i=1}^{N-1} X_i X_{i+1}$$

L Banchi, J Pereira, S Pirandola, PRX Quantum 2, 040321 (2021)

(b)

$$\langle i|\langle j|\rho_{AB}|k\rangle|l\rangle = \prod_{k=1}^{i} \rho_{AB}^{T_{B}} = \prod_{k=1}^{i} S = X$$

$$r\left[(\rho_{AB}^{T_{B}})^{3}\right] = \prod_{k=1}^{i} \left[\rho^{\otimes 3}S_{A}^{2,3}S_{A}^{1,2}S_{B}^{1,2}S_{S$$





QQ: QUANTUM CHANNEL DISCRIMINAT

detect objects xfrom the scattered state of light $\rho(x)$

Images live in the physical world



Optimise the (entangled) input probe state of light and the detection POVM



QUANTUM BARCODES AND PATTERN RECOGNITION

- Barcode classification must identify each pixel correctly
- Handwriting classification is easier as errors are tolerated!

error $\simeq F(\rho_{\text{black}}, \rho_{\text{white}})^{\text{Hamming}_{4\leftrightarrow 9}}$

- L. Banchi, Q. Zhuang, S. Pirandola,
 Phys. Rev. Applied 14, 064026 (2020)
- C Harney, L Banchi, S Pirandola, Phys. Rev. A 103, 052406 (2021)
- JL Pereira, L Banchi, Q Zhuang, S Pirandola, Phys. Rev. A 103, 042614 (2021)



QC: LEARNING QUANTUM SYSTEMS USING CLASSICAL ML

Quantum Information np

npj Quantum Information (2016) 2, 16019; doi:10.1038/npjqi.2016.19; published online 19 July 2016

ARTICLE OPEN Quantum gate learning in qubit networks: Toffoli gate without

Modelling non-markovian quantum processes with recurrent neural networks **IOP** Publishing

Leonardo Banchi^{1,5}, Edward Grant^{2,4}, Andrea Rocchetto^{2,3} and Simone Severini²

 $\mathcal{L}_{\leq t}[\rho] = -\mathrm{i}[H + 1] + \sum_{k=1}^{J} \left[L_{\leq k}^{\mu} \right]$

www.nature.com/npjqi



New J. Phys. **20** (2018) 123030

$$\begin{array}{l} H_{\leqslant t}^{LS}, \, \rho \end{array} \\ & \underset{\leqslant t}{}^{\mu} \rho L_{\leqslant t}^{\,\mu\dagger} - \frac{1}{2} \{ L_{\leqslant t}^{\,\mu\dagger} L_{\leqslant t}^{\,\mu}, \, \rho \} \right], \end{array}$$





DOES THE MODEL GENERALISE?



- We have a training set \mathcal{T} made of T correctly classified states $\mathcal{T} = \{(\rho(x_t), c_t) \text{ for } t = 1, ..., T\}$
- We can empirically check generalisation using a testing set \mathcal{T}' with T' correctly classified states
- How difficult is to define a reliable classier, given the available data?



c = 1 or c = 2?

 $|\mathcal{X}|$





Empirical loss / training error

$R_{\mathcal{T}}(\Pi,\rho) = \frac{1}{T} \sum_{(c_k,x_k)\in\mathcal{T}} \sum_{c\neq c_k} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\Pi_c \rho(x_k)\right] = 1 - \frac{1}{T} \sum_{(c_k,x_k)\in\mathcal{T}} \operatorname{Tr}\left[\Pi_{c_k} \rho(x_k)\right]$

Abstract classification error

 $R(\Pi, \rho) = \mathbb{E}_{(c,x)\sim P(c,x)} \left(\sum_{c \neq \tilde{c}} \operatorname{Tr} \left[\Pi_{\tilde{c}} \rho(x) \right] \right) = 1 - \mathbb{E}_{(c,x)\sim P(c,x)} \operatorname{Tr} \left[\Pi_{c} \rho(x) \right]$

• Optimal empirical measurement $\Pi^{\mathcal{T}} = \operatorname{argmin}_{\Pi} R_{\mathcal{T}}(\Pi, \rho)$

• Real optimal $\Pi^* = \operatorname{argmin}_{\Pi} R(\Pi, \rho)$

lesting error

 $R_{\mathcal{T}}(\Pi_{\mathcal{T}}, \rho)$





LEARNING WITH QUANTUM STATES



Generalization error

L BANCHI, J PEREIRA, S PIRANDOLA PRX QUANTUM 2, 040321 (2021)



Embedding complexity



STATISTICAL LEARNING THEORY

- testing error
- A fundamental result of statistical learning theory binds \mathcal{G} using the Rademacher complexity

$$\mathcal{G} \leq 4\mathcal{C}_T(\mathcal{H}) + \sqrt{\frac{2\log(1/\delta)}{T}},$$



\triangleright The generalisation error \mathscr{G} is the difference between the (average) training and

 $\mathcal{C}_{T}(\mathcal{H}) := \mathbb{E}_{T \sim P^{T}} \mathbb{E} \left[\sup_{h \in H} \frac{1}{T} \sum_{k=1}^{T} \sigma_{k} \ell_{h}(c_{k}, x_{k}) \right],$



TAKE HOME MESSAGE

- Computable upper bound via information theoretic quantities
- Generalisation favoured by discarding information about the input that is irrelevant for predicting the output. Quantum compression?
- Algorithm: variational information bottleneck
- Quantum convolutional neural networks iteratively discard information via **pooling** layers.
- Algorithmic-independent data-dependent bounds
- Greater physical insight (wait for QQ!)



image from: I Cong et al. Nature Physics (2019)









BOTTLENECK FOR QUANTUM

- $\rho(x)$ as "bottleneck" that squeezes the relevant information that x provides about c. Compression with side information
- IB principle (loss independent): minimise

$$\mathscr{L}_{IB} = I(X:Q) - \beta I(C:Q)$$

- Self-consistent solutions (similar for ρ)
- $\tilde{\lambda}_{z} | \psi(z) \rangle = e^{(1-\beta)\log\bar{\rho} + \beta \sum_{c} P(c|z)\log\rho_{c}} | \psi(z) \rangle$

L BANCHI, J PEREIRA, S PIRANDOLA PRX QUANTUM 2, 040321 (2021)







VARIATIONAL QUANTUM INFORMATION BOTTLENECK (CQ)



$$|\psi_{w}(x)\rangle = \prod_{\ell=1}^{L} [R^{z}(w^{z\ell} \cdot x + w_{0}^{z\ell})R^{y}(w^{y\ell} \cdot x + w_{0}^{y\ell})]|0\rangle,$$

For two-qubit states the "re-upoading" embedding can be trained with an efficient variational minimisation of the IB Lagrangian









QUANTUM PHASE RECOGNITION

- A Hamiltonian $\mathcal{H}(\theta)$ depends on external parameters $\theta = (\theta_1, \theta_2, ...)$, e.g. magnetic fields etc.
- phases
- The order parameter is either unknown or too complex (e.g. non-local)
- For some θ , the Hamiltonian is either exactly solvable, so and we can
- generalisation to arbitrary values of θ

> Depending on θ , the ground state of $\mathscr{H}(\theta)$ belongs to different quantum

mathematically compute its phase, or numerical approximations work well

> ML perspective: we use the computable points for training and then check

IM PHASE RECOGNITION



What about the physics of this problem?





JELITY APPROACH TO QUANTUM PHASE TRANSITIONS

- Fidelity between two ground states $F(\theta, \phi) = |\langle gs(\theta) | gs(\phi) \rangle|^2$
- Metric in parameter space $1 F(\theta, \theta + d\theta) = g_{\mu\nu} d\theta_{\mu} d\theta_{\nu}$
- \triangleright Close to the phase transition |g| diverges
- States belonging to different phases are quite different
- States belonging to the same phase are clustered (mind chaotic phases though!)

Zanardi et al. PRE 74,031123 (2006) Banchi et al. PRE 89,022102 (2014)





CLUSTERING IN HILBERT SPACES

- States are clustered in the (large!) Hilbert space
- There should be an efficient algorithm to classify the phases!
- Generalisation depends on both data and algorithm
- Data-dependent quantitative argument :



L BANCHI, J PEREIRA, S PIRANDOLA PRX QUANTUM 2, 040321 (2021)



QUANTUM PHASE RECOGNITION

Task: recognize the phases of matter of a quantum many-body system by taking measurements on the quantum system itself

$$H = -\sum_{i=1}^{L} (\sigma_i^x \sigma_{i+1}^x + h \sigma_i^z), \quad \Longrightarrow \quad \mathscr{B} \simeq$$

Ordered (|h| < 1) / disordered (|h| > 1) phases

- T: number of training samples per class
- S: number of measurement shots

L BANCHI, J PEREIRA, S PIRANDOLA



QUANTUM KERNELS

For pure state embeddings $\rho(x) = |\psi(x)\rangle\langle\psi(x)|$ we find

$$\mathscr{B} = \left[\mathrm{Tr}\sqrt{K}\right]^2$$

where $K_{xy} = \sqrt{p(x)p(y)} |\langle \psi(x) | \psi(y) \rangle|$ is a (normalised) kernel matrix. This makes the calculation \mathscr{B} easier for large-dimensional embeddings.

Quantum kernels are used in

- Quantum support vector machines
- Quantum enhanced-feature space

Take home message: avoid $K \propto$ identity (bad generalisation)







CONCLUDING REMARKS



CONCLUSIONS

- or quantum information encoded in quantum states
- Different applications:
 - sensor
 - Classification of quantum states and phases of matter
 - Quantum embeddings of classical data
- Foundational aspects: generalisation & sample complexity, information theoretic tools

Quantum and Classical Algorithms to process either classical data (e.g. images)

quantum pattern recognition with entanglement-enhanced quantum







QUANTUM GANS FOR N

SuperQGANs: Quar Networks for learnir





P Braccia, L Banchi, F Caruso, Phys. Rev. Applied 17, 024002 (2022)

Favourable Scaling

- Good embeddings should maximise I(C:Q)and minimise $I_2(X:Q)$
- Spoiler: Information Bottleneck!
- Two extreme cases:
 - BASIS ENCODING: $x \mapsto \rho(x) = |x\rangle \langle x|$ MINIMUM $\mathscr{A}(\rho) = 0$, Maximum $\mathscr{G}_{\mathscr{T}}(\rho)$

CONSTANT EMBEDDING: $x \mapsto \rho$ MAXIMUM $\mathscr{A}(\rho)$, MINIMUM $\mathscr{G}_{\mathscr{T}}(\rho) = 0$

