

# Supplementary Information for “Modeling singlet fission on a quantum computer”

Daniel Claudino,<sup>1\*</sup> Bo Peng,<sup>2†</sup> Karol Kowalski<sup>2</sup> and Travis S. Humble<sup>3</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Computational Sciences and Engineering Division,*

*Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, 37831, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Physical Sciences Division, Pacific Northwest National Laboratory, Richland, WA 99352, USA*

<sup>3</sup>*Quantum Science Center, Oak Ridge National Laboratory, Oak Ridge, TN, 37831, USA<sup>‡</sup>*

## I. ELECTRONIC STRUCTURE THEORY

Here we discuss the most salient underpinnings of electronic structure theory relevant to this article. In general, quantum chemistry seeks stationary states that solve the non-relativistic Schrödinger equation

$$\hat{H}\Psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N; \mathbf{R}) = E\Psi(\mathbf{x}_1, \dots, \mathbf{x}_N; \mathbf{R}), \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{x}_i$  are the spatial and spin coordinates of electron  $i$  and  $\mathbf{R}$  are the collective nuclear coordinates, while the Hamiltonian is given by

$$\hat{H} = -\sum_i \frac{1}{2} \nabla_i^2 - \sum_{i,A} \frac{Z_A}{|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{R}_A|} + \sum_{i,j} \frac{1}{|\mathbf{r}_i - \mathbf{r}_j|} + E_R, \quad (2)$$

where indices  $i$  and  $A$  represent electrons and nuclei, respectively, and atomic units are adopted. The exclusively nuclear contribution,  $E_R$ , is simply the electrostatic interaction between pairs of nuclei, and the nuclear kinetic energy is neglected, assuming the validity of the Born-Oppenheimer approximation.

Alternatively, Equation 1 concerns with finding eigenstates of the molecular Hamiltonian in the absence of any external time-dependent field operator. As a common zero-th order approximation to the many-electron wave function, one chooses Hartree-Fock theory, which approximates the wave function by a Slater determinant  $|\Phi\rangle$  built off of an antisymmetrized product of one-electron wave functions  $\{\psi_k\}$ , also known as spin-orbitals. This determinant has the property of being the lowest-energy single determinant for a given many-body wave function, filling the  $N_e$ -lowest spin orbitals, in the case of  $N_e$  electrons. Practically, these spin-orbitals are expanded in a basis of  $N_b$  functions, hence yielding  $N_v = N_b - N_e$  virtual (unoccupied) spin-orbitals. The ground state approximation afforded by the chosen basis can be obtained by an expansion over the Fock basis states characterized by the  $N_e$  particle number:

$$|\Psi_0\rangle \approx \left( 1 + \sum_{ia} c_i^a a_a^\dagger a_i + \frac{1}{4} \sum_{ijab} c_{ij}^{ab} a_a^\dagger a_b^\dagger a_i a_j \dots \right) |\Phi\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where  $a_p^\dagger$  and  $a_p$  are creation and annihilation operators associated with the  $p$ -th fermionic mode, with  $\{i, j, k, \dots\}$  indexing occupied spin-orbitals and  $\{a, b, c, \dots\}$  indexing virtual orbitals. Coupled cluster (CC)<sup>1</sup> theory provides an exponential parameterization of  $|\Psi_0\rangle$  in terms of the various excitation manifolds:

---

\* claudinodc@ornl.gov

† peng398@pnnl.gov

<sup>‡</sup>This manuscript has been authored by UT-Battelle, LLC, under Contract No. DE-AC0500OR22725 with the U.S. Department of Energy. The United States Government retains and the publisher, by accepting the article for publication, acknowledges that the United States Government retains a non-exclusive, paid-up, irrevocable, world-wide license to publish or reproduce the published form of this manuscript, or allow others to do so, for the United States Government purposes. The Department of Energy will provide public access to these results of federally sponsored research in accordance with the DOE Public Access Plan.

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Psi_0\rangle &\approx e^{\hat{T}_1+\hat{T}_2+\dots}|\Phi\rangle, \\
\hat{T}_1 &= \sum_{ia} t_i^a \hat{a}_a^\dagger \hat{a}_i, \\
\hat{T}_2 &= \frac{1}{4} \sum_{ijab} t_{ij}^{ab} \hat{a}_a^\dagger \hat{a}_b^\dagger \hat{a}_i \hat{a}_j, \\
&\vdots \\
\hat{T}_n &= \left(\frac{1}{n!}\right)^2 \sum_{ij\dots p, ab\dots q} t_{ij\dots p}^{ab\dots q} \hat{a}_a^\dagger \hat{a}_b^\dagger \dots \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_i \hat{a}_j \dots \hat{a}_p,
\end{aligned} \tag{4}$$

where the amplitudes  $t$  are scalars. The exact ground state for the chosen basis includes cluster operators  $\hat{T}_n$  with  $n$  up to  $N_e$ . One can target the excited state  $|\Psi_k\rangle$  via the excitation operator  $\hat{R}_k$  by the equation-of-motion (EOM)<sup>2</sup> variant of CC:

$$|\Psi_k\rangle = \hat{R}_k |\Psi_0\rangle \tag{5}$$

with the corresponding excitation energy  $\Delta E_k = E_k - E_0$  given by

$$[\hat{H}, \hat{R}_k] |\Psi_0\rangle = \Delta E_k \hat{R}_k |\Psi_0\rangle \tag{6}$$

where  $\hat{R}_k$  is expanded in a basis of excitation operators, similarly to  $\hat{T}_n$  in Equation 4. Thus, in the present context, (EOM)CCSD, (EOM)CCSDT, and (EOM)CCSDTQ mean  $\hat{T}$  in Equation 4 (and  $\hat{R}_k$ , Equation 5) include up to double ( $\hat{T}_2$ ), triple ( $\hat{T}_3$ ), and quadruple ( $\hat{T}_4$ ) excitation operators, respectively. Because the H<sub>4</sub> molecule has four electrons, the operators  $\hat{T}$  and  $\hat{R}$  in (EOM)CCSDTQ span the entire subspace for the desired particle number, thus recovering the exact eigenspectrum in the one-particle basis of choice.

## II. STATE ENERGIES

Table I reports the energy values obtained from quantum computations with a noiseless statevector simulator and the H1-1 system and Table II shows the energies computed classically from various levels of CC and EOM-CC theories.

TABLE I: Energies (in a.u.) for the  $S_0$ ,  $S_1$ , and  $T_0$  states computed with a noiseless statevector simulator and the H-1 quantum hardware.

	$S_0$	$S_1$	$T_0$
Noiseless	-1.897780	-1.856543	-1.881876
H1-1	-1.898401	-1.864233	-1.881865

TABLE II: Coupled cluster energies (in a.u.) for the  $S_0$  and  $T_0$  states and the EOM coupled cluster energies (in eV) for the  $S_0 \rightarrow S_1$  transition.

	$S_0$	$T_0$	$S_0 \rightarrow S_1$
(EOM)CCSDT	-1.916086	-1.881875	0.13139
(EOM)CCSDT	-1.908069	-1.881876	0.06631
(EOM)CCSDTQ	-1.897781	-1.881876	0.04117

Table III provides the contribution of each doubly-excited determinant in the  $S_1$  state for the different levels of EOM-CC theory.

Intuitively, the  $|\Phi_{11}^{44}\rangle$  determinant should be the least important contribution among the determinants that are a pair excitation away from the reference (HF) determinant. However, EOM-CCSD and EOM-CCSDT both place

TABLE III: Contributions from doubly-excited determinants for the different levels of EOM-CC theory.

	CCSD	CCSDT	CCSDTQ
$ \Phi_{12}^{34}\rangle$	0.24438	0.23674	0.14833
$ \Phi_{22}^{33}\rangle$	0.57627	0.51145	0.29432
$ \Phi_{11}^{33}\rangle$	0.28854	0.32796	0.25263
$ \Phi_{22}^{44}\rangle$	0.27117	0.30838	0.23670
$ \Phi_{11}^{44}\rangle$	0.36685	0.34619	0.18536
$ \Phi_{12}^{34}\rangle$	0.20310	0.14869	—

an undue importance on this determinant, which in these two instances provides the second largest contribution, second only to the determinant that represents the HOMO-LUMO transition ( $|\Phi_{22}^{33}\rangle$ ). This inadequacy is remedied by EOM-CCSDTQ, which also does not find any support in the determinant of the type  $|\Phi_{12}^{34}\rangle$ , whose contribution is non-negligible in both EOM-CCSD and EOM-CCSDT.

### III. ERROR ANALYSIS

Both the state preparation stage as well as the change of basis to the QWC rotation operators are carried out solely by single-qubit gates, whose error rates are  $1 \times 10^{-5} - 3 \times 10^{-4}$ . However, the state preparation and measurement (SPAM) error is 1-2 orders of magnitude higher than those of one-qubit gates ( $2 \times 10^{-3} - 5 \times 10^{-3}$ ), hence they are expected to dominate the error observed from quantum channels. A simple, but effective, classically inspired correction is to assume there is a matrix  $\mathbf{A}$  that maps ideal probability distributions  $P_{\text{ideal}}$  onto the observed, noisy ones  $P_{\text{noisy}}$

$$P_{\text{noisy}} = \mathbf{A}P_{\text{ideal}} \Rightarrow P_{\text{ideal}} = \mathbf{A}^{-1}P_{\text{noisy}}. \quad (7)$$

Each element  $A_{ij}$  corresponds to the probability of preparing the bit string indexed by  $i$  but to measure the  $j$ -th string. Since we use all 20 qubits available in the H1-1 system (except for a single experiment for both spin states), building the entire  $\mathbf{A}$  is not desirable, neither from a quantum viewpoint, since it takes  $2^{20}$  distinct experiments, nor classically, as it involves storage of  $2^{20} \times 2^{20} = 2^{40}$  double precision elements, or  $2^{19}(2^{20+1})$  unique elements, which demands terabytes of storage. Fortunately, we need only the relevant elements in  $\mathbf{A}$ , which we can access as shown in Ref. 3. In that approach,  $\mathbf{A} = \bigotimes_{k=0}^{19} \mathbf{S}^k$ , where  $\mathbf{S}^k$  stores the probabilities of each outcome given the initial state of the  $k$ -th qubit:

$$\mathbf{S}^k = \begin{pmatrix} p_{00}^k & p_{01}^k \\ p_{10}^k & p_{11}^k \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

where  $p_{ij}^k$  indicates the probability that the qubit in state  $|i\rangle$  be measured in the state  $|j\rangle$ ,  $i, j \in \{0, 1\}$ .

In an ideal setting, all trapped ions are equivalent, and so are the corresponding qubits, which makes all  $\mathbf{S}_i$  numerically identical. While the ions are equivalent, the vicinity around each one is not, which can impact each qubit slightly differently. However, Quantinuum reports the minimum, maximum, and average SPAM errors over all qubits. Furthermore, ideally we would also observe  $p_{00}^k = p_{11}^k$  and  $p_{01}^k = p_{10}^k$ , and experiments we conducted did not reveal any noticeable bias, so we take these equalities as valid. Therefore, assuming the equivalence of the qubits at hand, if the probability of flipping any given qubit is  $p$ , then

$$\mathbf{S}^k = \begin{pmatrix} 1-p & p \\ p & 1-p \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

Although Ref. 3 also details how to include effects of correlated noise, we assume it is non-existing/negligible, as Ref. 4 affirms absence of crosstalk errors. First, we recognize that  $\mathbf{A}^{-1} = \bigotimes_{i=0}^{19} (\mathbf{S}^k)^{-1}$ , with:

$$(S_{ij}^k)^{-1} = \frac{p - \delta_{ij}}{2p - 1} \quad (10)$$

Thus, the error-mitigated probability  $\tilde{P}_i$  of obtaining the  $k$ -th bit string is:

$$\tilde{P}_i = \sum_{j \in B} \prod_{k=0}^{19} (S_{ij}^k)^{-1} P_j \quad (11)$$

where  $B$  is the set of all bit strings indices. Because the probability distribution is highly sparse, we take  $B = \{j \in [0, 2^{20}] : P_j \neq 0\}$ . Finally, one needs to ensure the mitigated probability distributions are normalized.

However, we can see in Table IV that mitigating SPAM errors ultimately imparts little effect to the final energies.

TABLE IV: Energies (in a.u.) for the state  $S_0$ ,  $S_1$ , and  $T_0$  computed with probabilities mitigated according to Equation 11 for different bit-flip probabilities  $p$ .

$p$	$S_0$	$S_1$	$T_0$
0	-1.898402	-1.864233	-1.881865
$1 \times 10^3$	-1.898403	-1.864241	-1.881869
$5 \times 10^3$	-1.898407	-1.864278	-1.881874

Turning to the qsim<sup>5</sup> simulator and considering only sampling noise, we run simulations measuring a single QWC rotation string at a time (serial) and four QWC rotation strings (parallel), as discussed in the main text, and we observe the energies reported in Table V.

TABLE V: Energies (a.u.) for the state  $S_0$ ,  $S_1$ , and  $T_0$  computed from the qsim simulator with sampling noise (shots).

	$S_0$	$S_1$	$T_0$
Noiseless	-1.897780	-1.856543	-1.881876
Serial (8192 shots)	-1.897768	-1.854326	-1.881877
Serial ( $10^5$ shots)	-1.897779	-1.855315	-1.881875
Parallel (8192 shots)	-1.899059	-1.867473	-1.881857
Parallel ( $10^5$ shots)	-1.899086	-1.868069	-1.881861

As we assert in the main text, PDS( $K$ ) is a theory primarily concerned with the ground state, corroborated by the much slower convergence of the  $S_1$  state. Table V provides evidence that the bound to the energy of this state is much more vulnerable to sampling error. The absence of two-qubit gate errors, the one-qubit gate errors being negligible in the scale of the other noise sources, and mitigating SPAM errors having a meager influence, Table V leads us to the conclusion that sampling noise is the primary culprit for the deviation of the estimate for the  $S_1$  state from the reference values, and consequently for the  $S_0 \rightarrow S_1$  transition.

- 
- <sup>1</sup> Shavitt I and Bartlett R J 2009 *Many-Body Methods in Chemistry and Physics: MBPT and Coupled-Cluster Theory* Cambridge Molecular Science (Cambridge University Press)
- <sup>2</sup> Monkhorst H J 1977 *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry* **12** 421–432 (Preprint <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/pdf/10.1002/qua.560120850>) URL <https://onlinelibrary.wiley.com/doi/abs/10.1002/qua.560120850>
- <sup>3</sup> Nation P D, Kang H, Sundaresan N and Gambetta J M 2021 *PRX Quantum* **2**(4) 040326 URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PRXQuantum.2.040326>
- <sup>4</sup> System Model H1 Product Data Sheet Accessed November 1, 2022 URL <https://www.quantinuum.com/products/h1>
- <sup>5</sup> Quantum AI team and collaborators 2020 qsim URL <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.4023103>