

New Journal of Physics

The open access journal at the forefront of physics

Deutsche Physikalische Gesellschaft Φ DPG

IOP Institute of Physics

Published in partnership
with: Deutsche Physikalische
Gesellschaft and the Institute
of Physics



PAPER

Continuous matrix product state tomography of quantum transport experiments

OPEN ACCESS

RECEIVED

22 June 2015

REVISED

29 September 2015

ACCEPTED FOR PUBLICATION

5 October 2015

PUBLISHED

6 November 2015

Content from this work
may be used under the
terms of the [Creative
Commons Attribution 3.0
licence](#).

Any further distribution of
this work must maintain
attribution to the
author(s) and the title of
the work, journal citation
and DOI.



G Haack^{1,2,3,4}, A Steffens³, J Eisert³ and R Hübener³

¹ University of Grenoble Alpes, INAC-SPSMS, F-38000 Grenoble, France

² CEA, INAC-SPSMS, F-38000 Grenoble, France

³ Dahlem Center for Quantum Complex Systems and Fachbereich Physik, Freie Universität Berlin, D-14195 Berlin, Germany

⁴ Author to whom any correspondence should be addressed.

E-mail: geraldine.haack@unige.ch

Keywords: tomography, waiting times, correlation functions, transport, condensed matter physics

Abstract


In recent years, a close connection between the description of open quantum systems, the input–output formalism of quantum optics, and continuous matrix product states (cMPS) in quantum field theory has been established. The latter constitute a variational class of one-dimensional quantum field states and have been shown to provide an efficient ansatz for performing tomography of open quantum systems. So far, however, the connection between cMPS and open quantum systems has not yet been developed for quantum transport experiments in the condensed-matter context. In this work, we first present an extension of the tomographic possibilities of cMPS by demonstrating the validity of reconstruction schemes based on low-order counting probabilities compared to previous schemes based on low-order correlation functions. We then show how fermionic quantum transport settings can be formulated within the cMPS framework. Our procedure, via the measurements of low-order correlation functions only, allows us to gain access to quantities that are not directly measurable with present technology. Emblematic examples are high-order correlations functions and waiting time distributions (WTD). The latter are of particular interest since they offer insights into short-time scale physics. We demonstrate the functioning of the method with actual data, opening up the way to accessing WTD within the quantum regime.

1. Introduction

Continuous matrix product states (cMPS) have recently been recognized as powerful and versatile descriptions of certain one-dimensional quantum field states [1–3]. As continuum limits of the MPS—a well-established type of tensor network states underlying the density-matrix renormalisation group [4]—they introduce the intuition developed in quantum lattice models to the realm of quantum fields, offering similar conceptual and numerical tools. In the cMPS framework, interacting quantum fields such as those described by Lieb–Liniger models have been studied, both in theory [1, 5, 6] and in the context of experiments with ultra-cold atoms [7].

On a formal level, cMPS are intricately related to Markovian *open quantum systems* [1, 2]: the open quantum system takes the role of an ancillary system in a sequential preparation picture of cMPS. Elaborating on this formal analogy, cMPS can capture properties of fields that are coupled to a finite dimensional open quantum system. This connection has been fleshed out already in the description of fermionic quantum fields [8] and of light emitted from cavities in cavity-QED [2, 9] in the quantum optical context, under the keyword of the *input–output formalism* [10].

Another methodological ingredient to this work is that cMPS have been identified as tools to perform efficient quantum state tomography of quantum field systems [7, 11–14], related to other approaches of tensor network quantum tomography [12, 15]. These efforts are in line with the emerging mindset that for quantum many-body and quantum field states, tomography and state reconstruction only make sense within a certain statistical model or a variational class of states. Importantly, in our context at hand, it turns out that cMPS can be



reconstructed from the knowledge of low-order correlation functions alone [11, 12]. This is a very attractive feature of cMPS: recently, a reconstruction scheme has successfully been applied to data on quantum fields obtained with ultra-cold Bose gases [7]. In section 2, after introducing the cMPS formulation, we will provide the reader with the key arguments that make this reconstruction scheme possible from low-order correlation functions only. Read in the mindset of open quantum systems, cMPS tomography can be interpreted as open system tomography by monitoring the environment of the open quantum system.

In this work, these methodological components will be put into a different physical context and substantially developed further as illustrated in figure 1. At the heart of the analysis is a tomographic approach, applied to an open quantum system, yet brought to a new level. In section 3, we extend the set of tomographic methods within the cMPS framework, showing that the dynamics of the ancillary system and of the whole open quantum system is not only accessible from low-order correlation functions, but also from low-order counting statistics. Specifically, we prove that for generic systems, the two density functions P_0 and P_1 —which express the probability of detecting zero and one particle, respectively, as a function of the time since the last detection—provide sufficient knowledge to successfully perform tomography of the open quantum system. The physical application of the established methods will also be different from the cavity-QED or the quantum field context: here, we treat *fermionic quantum transport experiments* within the cMPS framework.

In a general transport setting, a scatterer is coupled to a left reservoir (the ‘source’) and a right reservoir (the ‘drain’). Fermions (with or without a spin degree of freedom) can be seen as jumping in and out of the scattering region from the source to the drain and can be described by a leaking-out fermionic quantum field. In section 4, we show how the dynamics of the open quantum system (scatterer and leaking-out fermionic field) can be encoded into a cMPS state vector. To provide the reader with an intuition about the equivalence between the cMPS language and a more traditional Hamiltonian formulation, we will consider one of the simplest setups in quantum transport: a single-level quantum dot weakly coupled to two reservoirs. These results are also valid for transport experiments of ultra-cold fermions between a ‘hot’ and a ‘cold’ reservoir as recently realised in [16, 17].

This will clear the way for making use of the tomographic possibilities offered by the cMPS formalism to access various quantities in quantum transport that are not yet measurable with current experimental technologies (see figure 1). Emblematic examples are higher-order charge correlation functions and the distribution of waiting times (WTD, see section 5).

The waiting time is defined as the time interval between the arrivals of two *consecutive* electrons. Therefore, the WTD provides a privileged access to short-time physics, short-range interactions and the statistics of the particles. As such, it has gained a lot of attention recently [18–25], but WTDs suffer from their difficulty to be

measured effectively: measuring WTDs requires the detection of single events while ensuring that no events have been missed—for instance, due to the dead time of the detector.

With present technologies, WTDs in transport experiments can be measured when the injection rate of electrons is within the kHz range as in the experiments of [26, 27]. Indeed, at those frequencies, the current trace is resolved in time and the WTD can be directly deduced from it. As we will show in section 5, the WTD reflects the quantum statistics of the electrons. However, quantum coherence and entanglement cannot be detected at those frequencies. To observe these quantum effects, one needs to move to the GHz regime, which can be achieved either with DC sources with a typical bias of tens of meV, or with periodically driven sources at GHz frequencies [28–32]. In the GHz range, the current trace cannot be resolved in time so that the measurement of the WTD is not feasible at present. In contrast, second- and third-order correlation functions have been proven to be feasible [32, 33].

With these experimental constraints in mind, we propose in section 5 an indirect way to access the WTD with methods that are within reach of the experimental state of the art. Namely, the dynamics of the full open quantum system is accessed from measurements of low-order correlation functions (typically second- or third-order). This is made possible with a cMPS formulation of the transport experiments as explained in the following section.

We illustrate this indirect path of accessing the WTD by considering real data obtained in the experiment of [27], where single electrons tunnel through a single-level quantum dot in the kHz regime. Both the current trace resolved in time and the two- and three-point correlation functions have been measured. The data allows us to demonstrate a very good agreement between the WTD deduced directly from the current trace and the WTD obtained via our reconstruction scheme based on the data of the correlation functions. This gives substance to our protocol based on cMPS to access the WTD with present technologies. We claim that this method remains valid in the GHz frequency range and for more complex systems such as a double quantum-dot coupled to two reservoirs—which would exhibit quantum coherence effects—and for quantum transport experiments with fermionic quantum gases.

2. Tomography of cMPS

In order to present a self-contained analysis, we start by reviewing the cMPS formulation of capturing a finite dimensional open quantum system [2] and the tomography procedure of reconstructing the relevant cMPS parameter matrices [11]. Consider an open quantum system (in cMPS terms the *ancillary system*) with dimension d (called *bond dimension* in that context) and interacting with one or more quantum fields that are described by field operators $\hat{\psi}_\alpha$ for different fields α . Its dynamics can in general be represented by different mathematical objects:

- (a) The master equation in Lindblad form, which governs the evolution of the ancillary system described by its state vector $|\Psi\rangle$ defined on the Hilbert space \mathcal{H} of dimension $d \times d$. The degrees of freedom of the coupled fields are traced out in this approach.
- (b) The set of n -point correlation functions of the coupled fields.
- (c) The full counting statistics of the field system, i.e. the complete set of cumulants of the probability distribution of transferred particles. The n th cumulant of the generating function is linked to the n moments of this distribution, which correspond to the n -point correlation function.
- (d) The cMPS state vector $|\psi_{\text{cMPS}}\rangle$, which we now introduce.

2.1. Reconstruction of cMPS from correlation functions

An intuitive way of establishing the cMPS state vector $|\psi_{\text{cMPS}}\rangle$ consists in starting from the well-known Lindblad equation. This equation describes the evolution of the state ρ in time via the Liouvillian superoperator \mathcal{L}

$$\dot{\rho} = \mathcal{L}[\rho] = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[K, \rho] - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha=1}^p \left(\{R_\alpha^\dagger R_\alpha, \rho\} - 2R_\alpha \rho R_\alpha^\dagger \right). \quad (1)$$

The first term relates to the free evolution via a Hamiltonian $K \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$, while the last two terms describe the coupling to the environment (the according operator is known as the dissipator). The matrices $R_\alpha \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$, $\alpha = 1, \dots, p$, correspond to jump operators between the system and external quantum fields $\{\hat{\psi}_\alpha\}$. The matrices K and $\{R_\alpha\}$ completely characterize the evolution of the system.

Making use of the Choi–Jamiołkowski isomorphism [34] (which maps linear superoperators from \mathcal{H}_1 to \mathcal{H}_2 to linear operators acting on $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$) the state ρ is mapped to a state vector $|\rho\rangle$ and the Liouvillian \mathcal{L} to the

matrix T [1, 2] with

$$T = Q^* \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes Q + \sum_{\alpha} R_{\alpha}^* \otimes R_{\alpha}. \quad (2)$$

The matrix $T \in \mathbb{C}^{d^2 \times d^2}$ is known as the *transfer matrix* and the matrix Q is defined as

$$Q = -iK - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\alpha} R_{\alpha}^{\dagger} R_{\alpha}. \quad (3)$$

Formally, the isomorphism introduced above is defined by the following relations for an operator and the product of operators

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &\mapsto |\rho\rangle, \\ A^{\dagger} \rho B &\mapsto (A^* \otimes B) |\rho\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Being closely connected to K and $\{R_{\alpha}\}$ introduced above, the knowledge of the matrix and T and its components provides access to the dynamics of the open quantum system, and allows to directly derive the according Lindblad equation.

The (translationally invariant) cMPS state vector $|\Psi_{\text{cMPS}}\rangle$ on the interval $[0, L]$ is defined in terms of the matrices Q , $\{R_{\alpha}\}$ and the field operators $\hat{\psi}_{\alpha}^{\dagger}$ by

$$|\psi_{\text{cMPS}}\rangle = \text{Tr}_{\text{anc}} \left[\mathcal{P} \exp \int_0^L dx \left(Q \otimes \hat{\mathbb{1}} + \sum_{\alpha} R_{\alpha} \otimes \hat{\psi}_{\alpha}^{\dagger}(x) \right) \right] |\Omega\rangle. \quad (5)$$

This expression is related to the path ordered exponential that arises when integrating the Lindblad equation. The embedding of the cMPS state vector $|\psi_{\text{cMPS}}\rangle$ into Fock space becomes clear when expanding the path ordered exponential $\mathcal{P} \exp$. For more details, we refer to [3] where the authors formulate the cMPS in different representations such as the Fock space and a path integral formulation. After integration, the ancillary system is traced out via Tr_{anc} and the resulting term is applied to the vacuum state vector $|\Omega\rangle$, where $\hat{\psi}_{\alpha} |\Omega\rangle = 0$ for each α .

Compared to the Lindblad equation, the main difference is that the degrees of freedom of the ancillary system are traced out such that its dynamics is mapped into the dynamics of the coupled quantum fields $\{\hat{\psi}_{\alpha}\}$. The evaluation of expectation values of field operators leads to expressions that only contain quantities from the ancillary system, and information about the ancillary system can be inferred from according field operator measurements. For the sake of clarity, we restrict ourselves to the case where a single coupled quantum field, denoted as $\hat{\psi}_{\beta}$, is measured.

The density-like correlation functions of the measured quantum field $\hat{\psi}_{\beta}$ then read

$$C_n(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \psi_{\text{cMPS}} | \hat{n}(x_1) \dots \hat{n}(x_n) | \psi_{\text{cMPS}} \rangle, \quad (6)$$

where $\mathbf{x} := (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ and $\hat{n} := \hat{\psi}_{\beta}^{\dagger} \hat{\psi}_{\beta}$. According to the calculus of expectation values in the cMPS setting [3], inserting equation (5) into equation (6) in the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$ leads to the expression

$$C_n(\mathbf{x}) = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left[e^{D(L-x_n)} M e^{D(x_n-x_{n-1})} M \dots M e^{D(x_1-0)} \right]. \quad (7)$$

With D we denote the transfer matrix T —introduced in equation (2)—in its diagonal basis

$$D = X^{-1} T X, \quad (8)$$

where the columns of X represent the eigenvectors of T . Analogously, the matrix M denotes $R_{\beta}^* \otimes R_{\beta}$ in the diagonal basis of T

$$M = X^{-1} (R_{\beta}^* \otimes R_{\beta}) X. \quad (9)$$

Let us mention that the knowledge of X is in principle not necessary to reconstruct the matrices Q and R and hence the according Lindblad equation [11].

Specifically, the second- and third-order correlation functions take the form

$$C_2(x) = \text{Tr} \left[e^{D\infty} M e^{Dx} M \right] = \sum_{j=1}^{d^2} M_{1,j} M_{j,1} e^{\lambda_j x} \quad (10)$$

and

$$C_3(x, x') = \sum_{j,k=1}^{d^2} M_{1,k} M_{k,j} M_{j,1} e^{\lambda_j x} e^{\lambda_k (x'-x)}, \quad (11)$$

with $\{\lambda_j\}$ being the eigenvalues of T . Due to the translation invariance of the system, we can set $x_1 = 0$. The tomographic possibilities of the cMPS formalism can be understood from equations (10)–(11): if the products $\{M_{1,k}M_{k,j}M_{j,1}\}$ are known, we can—using gauge arguments [12]—require each of the matrix elements $\{M_{1,j}\}$ to be equal to one, which enables us to access each $M_{k,j}$ by dividing the appropriate terms:

$$\frac{M_{1,k}M_{k,j}M_{j,1}}{M_{1,1}M_{1,j}M_{j,1}} = M_{k,j}. \quad (12)$$

Both numerator and denominator appear as coefficients in C_3 and can be determined with spectral estimation procedures. This means that in principle we just need to analyse a three-point function in order to obtain the building elements M and D of arbitrary-order correlation functions.

This reconstruction scheme demonstrates the central role of the matrices M and D to derive the different equivalent objects that describe the dynamics of an open quantum system: the Lindblad equation, the set of n -point correlation functions, the full counting statistics of the number of transferred particles and the cMPS state vector. These matrices M and D can therefore be considered as the central quantities on which our reconstruction procedure is based; this is illustrated in figure 1.

2.2. Use of the thermodynamic limit

Intuitively, it is clear that the reconstruction of the matrices M and D should gain precision by increasing the number of correlation functions C_n on which the reconstruction scheme is based. The same statement is valid when increasing the size of the set of available counting probabilities P_n . But in general, experiments will only provide us measurements of low-order correlation functions, typically those of the second- and third-order [26, 27, 33]. *A priori*, this might render the reconstruction of the matrices M and D infeasible, but the work in [12] proved that this limitation can be circumvented by making use of the structure of the cMPS state vector combined with the thermodynamic limit.

For a given finite region I and a fixed bond dimension d , all expectation values can be computed from all correlation functions $C_n(\mathbf{x})$ taking values in the finite range I , $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n) \subset I^{\times n}$. This contrasts with the situation of having access to correlation functions $C_n(\mathbf{x})$ for *arbitrary* values of $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$, but for low n . Here, arbitrary values \mathbf{x} imply the thermodynamic limit, i.e. the finite region I tends to infinity. Then indeed, low order correlation functions (typically C_1, C_2, C_3) are sufficient to reconstruct an arbitrary expectation value of an observable supported on I .

3. Reconstruction of cMPS from low-order counting probabilities

In this section, we extend the central role played by the matrices M and D for tomographic purposes by showing that they (more precisely: their equivalents \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{D}) are also accessible from low-number detector-click statistics, i.e. the idle time probability density function P_0 and the density function P_1 , which correspond to the detection of zero and one particle, respectively, within a certain time interval τ .

It is well-known that correlators and counting statistics are closely related. When assuming perfect detectors, the probability to observe n events in the time interval between t and $t + \tau$ is given [35] by the expression

$$P_n(t, t + \tau) = \frac{1}{n!} \sum_{m=n}^{\infty} \frac{(-1)^{m-n}}{(m-n)!} \int_t^{t+\tau} dt_1 \cdots \int_t^{t+\tau} dt_m C_m(t_1, t_2, \dots, t_m), \quad (13)$$

where the correlation function C_m has been introduced in equation (6). For a translationally invariant system, we can without loss of generality set $t = 0$. Furthermore, when changing the integration bounds and performing the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, we obtain

$$P_n(\tau) := P_n(0, 0 + \tau) = \int_0^\tau dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_0^{t_{n-1}} dt_n \tilde{C}_n(\tau, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n), \quad (14)$$

with

$$\tilde{C}_n(\tau, t_1, \dots, t_n) := e_1^T Z^{-1} e^{\mathcal{D}t_n} \mathcal{M}_n \cdots \mathcal{M}_2 e^{\mathcal{D}(t_1-t_2)} \mathcal{M}_1 e^{\mathcal{D}(\tau-t_1)} Z e_1, \quad (15)$$

the canonical unit vector e_1 , the diagonal matrix \mathcal{D} of $Q^* \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes Q$ with basis transformation matrix Y , $\mathcal{M}_j := Y^{-1}(R_j^* \otimes R_j)Y$, and $Z := Y^{-1}X$, where X diagonalizes T as defined in equation (8). With equations (13)–(15), the low-order counting probabilities $P_0(\tau)$ and $P_1(\tau)$ within a cMPS formulation are given by similar expressions to equations (10) and (11), namely

$$P_0(\tau) = e_1^T Z^{-1} e^{\mathcal{D}\tau} Z e_1 = \sum_{j=1}^{d^2} \hat{z}_{1,j} z_{j,1} e^{\mu_j \tau}, \quad (16)$$

$$P_1(\tau) = \sum_{j,k=1}^{d^2} \hat{z}_{1,j} \mathcal{M}_{j,k} z_{k,1} \left((1 - \delta_{j,k}) \frac{e^{\mu_k \tau} - e^{\mu_j \tau}}{\mu_k - \mu_j} + \delta_{j,k} \tau e^{\mu_j \tau} \right), \quad (17)$$

with $\{\mu_j\}$ being the diagonal values of \mathcal{D} and $\{z_{j,k}\}$ being the elements of the matrix Z (with inverse $Z^{-1} = (\hat{z}_{j,k})$). See appendix for details.

As a first step, we can extract from P_0 and P_1 the coefficients $\{\hat{z}_{1,j} z_{j,1}\}$ and the eigenvalues $\{\mu_j\}$, which give rise to \mathcal{D} . The matrix elements of \mathcal{M} can then in principle be determined using gauge arguments and under the assumption that the additive components of P_n are linearly independent. From \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{D} , the cMPS matrices Q , R and K describing the dynamics of the open quantum system can be determined in a straightforward way (see appendix for details).

Let us comment on the feasibility of this reconstruction scheme with present technology. In order to measure P_0 and P_1 , efficient single-particle detectors without *dark-counting* and *tiny dead-time* are necessary. *Dark-counting* leads to detector output pulses in the absence of any incident photons while the *dead-time* is the time interval after a detection event during which the detector cannot detect another particle. Although significant experimental efforts have been made in order to improve single-photon [36] and single-electron detectors [37, 38], the state-of-the-art for single-particle detection is not yet sufficient to perform a reliable measurement of P_1 . For the moment, these experimental constraints make the reconstruction scheme based on P_1 only valid on a formal, mathematical level. In the light of the recent experimental progress towards the reliable detection of single particles, we believe that this idea will become relevant in the future.

4. Application to fermionic quantum transport experiments

Very recent works have successfully formulated experimental setups in cavity QED and ultra-cold Bose gases as well as the corresponding measurements in terms of cMPS [7, 9]. This allowed them to make predictions for higher-order correlation functions that are not accessible experimentally and to investigate the ground-state entanglement.

Here, we tackle the problem of formulating quantum transport experiments and the corresponding measurements (average charge current, charge noise) in cMPS terms. To this end, we demonstrate that the field that is leaking out and is measured in a quantum transport experiment belongs to the cMPS variational class. We then provide an example to illustrate the equivalence between an Hamiltonian and a cMPS formulation by considering one of the simplest transport experiment, namely single electrons tunnelling through a single-level quantum dot. We derive the first-order and second-order correlation functions in cMPS terms, and show that we recover the well-known expression of the average current and charge noise, when writing the cMPS state equation (5) in terms of the parameters of the quantum system.

4.1. Quantum transport experiments in terms of cMPS

We now turn to a description of the physical setting under consideration. We assume here transport experiments, where single electrons transit through a scatterer coupled to fermionic reservoirs. The reservoirs, considered at equilibrium, are characterized by their chemical potential and their temperature via the Fermi distribution. The bias energy and the bias temperature between the different reservoirs will set the direction of the charge current. For the sake of simplicity, we restrict ourselves to two reservoirs, the source and the drain. This transport setting can be described by the Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_T = \hat{H}_{\text{sys}} + \hat{H}_{\text{res}} + \hat{H}_{\text{int}}, \quad (18)$$

where \hat{H}_{sys} relates to the quantum system under investigation, which acts as scatterer. It is characterized by discrete energy levels ε_i with occupation number operators given by $\hat{d}_{i,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{i,\sigma}$ ($\hat{d}_{i,\sigma}$ and $\hat{d}_{i,\sigma}^\dagger$ denote the fermionic annihilation and creation operators for an electron on the energy level i and spin degree of freedom $\sigma = \uparrow, \downarrow$). The Hamiltonian \hat{H}_{res} relates to the left and right reservoirs, and \hat{H}_{int} describes the interaction between the quantum system and the reservoirs,

$$\hat{H}_{\text{res}} = \sum_{\alpha=L,R} \sum_{\sigma=\uparrow,\downarrow} \int_0^{E_\alpha} dE E \hat{c}_{\alpha,\sigma}^\dagger(E) \hat{c}_{\alpha,\sigma}(E), \quad (19)$$

$$\hat{H}_{\text{int}} = \sum_{\alpha=L,R} \sum_{i,\sigma} \int dE \left(t_{\alpha,i,\sigma}(E) \hat{d}_{i,\sigma} \otimes \hat{c}_{\alpha,\sigma}^\dagger(E) + \text{h.c.} \right). \quad (20)$$

The creation and annihilation operators of the reservoirs, \hat{c}_α and \hat{c}_α^\dagger , satisfy the canonical anti-commutation relations and $\alpha = L, R$ denotes the left and right reservoirs, respectively. The amplitude $t_{\alpha,i,\sigma}$ sets the interaction between the quantum system and its environments.

In order to model a DC source, the energy levels in the left and right reservoirs are assumed to be densely filled up to the energies $E_F + eV$ and E_F , respectively. Here, E_F is the Fermi energy and V is the bias potential applied on the ‘source’ reservoir. At zero temperature, the bias energy eV enables uni-directional transport of electrons between the left and right reservoirs. It plays a similar role to the frequency bandwidth when, e.g., considering cavity QED setups, and fixes the energy domain over which electronic transport takes place.

With this assumption about the direction of propagation of the electrons (from left to right), we will see that equation (18) is equivalent to a generalized version of the cMPS Hamiltonian introduced in [1, 2],

$$\hat{H}_{\text{cMPS}} = Q \otimes \hat{\mathbb{1}} + (R_L \otimes \hat{\psi}_L + R_R \otimes \hat{\psi}_R^\dagger), \quad (21)$$

where the matrices Q and $\{R_\alpha\}$ and the quantum fields $\{\hat{\psi}_\alpha\}$ have been introduced in section 2. The cMPS Hamiltonian for quantum transport experiment reflects the direction of the current: a fermionic excitation present on the left of the scatterer is annihilated at the scatterer as described by the quantum field $\hat{\psi}_L$ (an electron jumps into the scatterer). Similarly, a fermionic excitation present on the right of the scatterer is created at the scatterer as described by the quantum field $\hat{\psi}_R^\dagger$ (an electron jumps out of the scatterer). The case of a multi-terminal setup can be considered in a similar way. Showing that equations (18) and (21) are equivalent implicates that there is a fermionic quantum field leaking out of the scatterer to be measured and that it belongs to the cMPS variational class. Such a description of the transport experiment corresponds to a fermionic version of the input-output formalism of cavity-QED setups.

Using equation (20), the quantum field leaking out of the quantum system, $\hat{\psi}_R(t)$, can be written in terms of the creation operator in the right reservoir \hat{c}_R ; the incoming quantum field can be written in a similar way in terms of the creation operator in the left reservoir \hat{c}_L

$$\hat{\psi}_{\alpha,\sigma}^\dagger(t) = \int_E dE e^{-iEt/\hbar} \hat{c}_{\alpha,\sigma}^\dagger(E), \quad \alpha = L, R. \quad (22)$$

The Fermi sea for the electrons is taken into account in the following way: on the right side of the scatterer, the quantum field satisfies $\hat{\psi}_R(t)|E_F\rangle = 0$, where $|E_F\rangle$ denotes the state of the Fermi sea at energy E_F , whereas on the left side of the scatterer, $\hat{\psi}_L(t)|E_F + eV\rangle = 0$, where the state vector $|E_F + eV\rangle$ defines the state of a Fermi sea at energy $E_F + eV$.

Assuming that the energy levels ε_i of the quantum system are well inside the bias energy window eV , we can rewrite the integration over the energy domain E as $\int_E dE = \int_0^{eV} dE$.

This assumption is the so-called *large-bias limit*, which is considered in order to derive the master equation corresponding to the tight-binding Hamiltonian. In quantum optics, it corresponds to a finite frequency bandwidth, which allows the use of the rotating wave approximation [9, 10]. In the following, we assume that the interaction amplitude is spin- and energy-independent within the interval $[E_F, E_F + eV]: t_{\alpha,i,\sigma}(E) = t_\alpha$. Let us remark that the demonstration remains valid with an interaction amplitude that depends on spin and energy. Importantly, no assumption about the coupling strength is required here.

In a rotating frame with respect to the energies of the reservoirs and after a Jordan–Wigner transformation using the definitions of the quantum fields $\hat{\psi}_{R,L}$ given in equation (22), the Hamiltonian in equation (18) can be rewritten as

$$\hat{H}_T = \hat{H}_{\text{sys}} \otimes \hat{\mathbb{1}} + \sum_{\alpha=L,R} \sum_{i,\sigma} (t_\alpha \hat{d}_i \otimes \hat{\psi}_{\alpha,\sigma}^\dagger(t) + \text{h.c.}). \quad (23)$$


Following quantum optics calculations—which remain valid in this case because \hat{H}_T is a transport version of the spin-boson model—we finally arrive at an effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = \left(\hat{H}_{\text{sys}} - \frac{i\hbar}{2} \sum_{\alpha=L,R} \sum_{i,\sigma} \Gamma_\alpha \hat{d}_{i,\sigma}^\dagger \hat{d}_{i,\sigma} \right) \otimes \mathbb{1} + \sum_{i,\sigma} \left(\sqrt{\Gamma_R} \hat{d}_{i,\sigma} \otimes \hat{\psi}_{R,\sigma}^\dagger(t) + \sqrt{\Gamma_L} \hat{d}_{i,\sigma}^\dagger \otimes \hat{\psi}_{L,\sigma}(t) \right) \quad (24)$$

with $t_\alpha := \sqrt{\Gamma_\alpha}$. Expressed in the eigenbasis of \hat{H}_{sys} , the operators $\sqrt{\Gamma_R} \hat{d}_{i,\sigma}$ and $\sqrt{\Gamma_L} \hat{d}_{i,\sigma}^\dagger$ take the form of matrices labelled $R_{R,i,\sigma}$ and $R_{L,i,\sigma}$, respectively. The effective non-Hermitian Hamiltonian can then be rewritten in a compact form

$$\hat{H}_{\text{eff}} = Q \otimes \hat{\mathbb{1}} + \sum_{i,\sigma} \left(R_{L,i,\sigma}^\dagger \otimes \hat{\psi}_{L,\sigma}(t) + R_{R,i,\sigma} \otimes \hat{\psi}_{R,\sigma}^\dagger(t) \right). \quad (25)$$

When comparing this effective Hamiltonian with equation (21), the identification of the matrix Q and the matrices $\{R_\alpha\}$ is direct. For spin-less fermions, the matrices R verify $R_{\alpha,i,\sigma}^2 = 0$ in order to satisfy the Pauli principle. Equation (25) demonstrates that transport settings can be adequately formulated within the cMPS framework. This result is important as it clears the way for applying methods from cMPS tomography to fermionic quantum transport experiments.



4.2. Single energy-level quantum dot

To illustrate the input–output formalism and the cMPS formulation of quantum transport experiments, we consider one of the simplest setups, namely a single energy-level quantum dot, without spin-degree of freedom, weakly coupled to two fermionic reservoirs. Even though this experiment is characterized by Markovian dynamics, this example is of particular interest for this work as it has been widely investigated experimentally. In section 5, we will use real data obtained in [27] for this setup to show that cMPS tomography allows us to access the electronic distribution of waiting times.

This simple transport experiment is sketched in figure 2 and the corresponding Hamiltonian reads

$$\hat{H}_T = \varepsilon \hat{d}^\dagger \hat{d} + \sum_{\alpha=L,R} \int dE \left(\sqrt{\Gamma_\alpha} \hat{d} \otimes \hat{c}_\alpha^\dagger(E) + \text{h.c.} \right) + \hat{H}_{res}. \quad (26)$$

Assuming that we perform a measurement on the right of the scatterer, the first two correlation functions of the right quantum field $\hat{\psi}_R(t)$ read in terms of cMPS matrices

$$\langle \hat{\psi}_R^\dagger \hat{\psi}_R \rangle = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left[e^{TL} (R_R^* \otimes R_R) \right] \quad (27)$$

and

$$\langle \hat{\psi}_R^\dagger(0) \hat{\psi}_R^\dagger(\tau) \hat{\psi}_R(\tau) \hat{\psi}_R(0) \rangle = \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left[e^{T(L-\tau)} (R_R^* \otimes R_R) e^{T\tau} (R_R^* \otimes R_R) \right]. \quad (28)$$

The matrices $R_{R/L}$ correspond to the operators $\sqrt{\Gamma_R} \hat{d}$ and $\sqrt{\Gamma_L} \hat{d}^\dagger$ expressed in the eigenbasis of the single-level quantum dot, $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ (empty and occupied state)

$$R_L = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ \sqrt{\Gamma_L} & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad R_R = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \sqrt{\Gamma_R} \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (29)$$

Inserting these expressions into equation (27), we recover the well-known expression for the steady-state current of a single-level QD coupled to biased reservoirs [39, 40]

$$\langle \hat{\psi}_R^\dagger \hat{\psi}_R \rangle = \frac{\Gamma_L \Gamma_R}{\Gamma_R + \Gamma_L} =: \langle \hat{I} \rangle_{ss}. \quad (30)$$


Furthermore, we can derive the noise spectrum from equation (28) via the MacDonald formula [41–43]

$$S(\omega) = 2 \langle \hat{I} \rangle_{ss} \left(1 - \frac{2\Gamma_L \Gamma_R}{(\Gamma_L + \Gamma_R)^2 + \omega^2} \right). \quad (31)$$

This example aims at bridging the gap between a more traditional Hamiltonian and the cMPS formulation, which allows to write these well-known expressions in terms of the parameter matrices Q , T , and $\{R_\alpha\}$.

5. Reconstruction of waiting time statistics

In this section, we address the problem of accessing the distribution of waiting times in electronic transport experiments. As mentioned in the introduction, a direct measurement of the WTD in the GHz range is not yet possible due to the lack of single-particle detectors with sufficient accuracy at those frequencies. Here, we propose to reconstruct the WTD based on the experimental measurements of low-order correlation functions.



The reconstruction is carried out using the cMPS framework presented in section 2 and the formulation of transport experiments in terms of cMPS as exposed in section 4.

5.1. Definitions

The statistics of waiting times can be expressed in terms of the probability density function P_0 , which—as a function of τ —expresses the probability of having detected zero particles in the interval $[0, \tau]$. In terms of P_0 , the WTD has first been derived in the context of quantum transport experiments in [20],

$$\mathcal{W}(\tau) = \langle \tau \rangle \frac{\partial^2 P_0(\tau)}{\partial \tau^2}. \quad (32)$$

Here, $\langle \tau \rangle$ denotes the mean waiting time. Inserting $P_0(\tau)$ in cMPS terms (equation (16)), we arrive at an expression for \mathcal{W} in terms of the cMPS matrices D , \mathcal{D} and Z defined in equations (8) and (15),

$$\mathcal{W}(\tau) = \frac{1}{c} e_1^T \left(D^2 Z^{-1} - 2DZ^{-1}\mathcal{D} + Z^{-1}\mathcal{D}^2 \right) e^{D\tau} Z e_1. \quad (33)$$

The normalization factor $c > 0$ ensures that $\int_0^\infty \mathcal{W}(\tau) d\tau = 1$. Equation (33) allows us to access the WTD from the measurements of the low-order correlation functions only via the use of the cMPS framework to reconstruct the cMPS matrices D , \mathcal{D} and Z .

5.2. Results based on experimental data

We demonstrate our novel approach to derive the WTD from the measurement of correlation functions using experimental data obtained in [27] for spinless electrons tunnelling through a single-level quantum dot. This system is also known as a single-electron transistor at the nanoscale and has been discussed in section 4.2. The experiment in [27] has been carried out in the kHz frequency range, where a time-resolved measurement of the current trace is possible. Although all the statistics—including correlation functions of arbitrary order as well as the WTD—can directly be computed from this time-resolved current trace, this experiment provides an ideal test-bed for our proposal. We can compare the WTD obtained from our reconstruction scheme based on cMPS with the WTD directly deduced from the experimental current trace.

Due to the simplicity of the setup, our proposed method to access the WTD only requires the two-point function C_2 . This one can directly be derived from the experimental spike train I (the time-resolved current trace) and is shown in figure 3 (red dots). The rates $\Gamma_L = 13.23$ kHz and $\Gamma_R = 4.81$ kHz have been determined experimentally and the corresponding C_2 -function agrees very well with the analytical expression when the detector rate is taken into account [27]

$$C_2(\tau) = \frac{\Gamma_L \Gamma_R}{\Gamma_L + \Gamma_R} \left(1 - e^{-\tau(\Gamma_L + \Gamma_R)} \right). \quad (34)$$

In our reconstruction scheme, the quantity $\Gamma_L + \Gamma_R$ can be determined from the current spike train autocorrelation function $I * I$ by least squares methods or spectral estimation procedures analogous to the procedure described in [11]. By requiring $\Gamma_L > \Gamma_R$ and using the expression of the steady-state current (see




Figure 4. WTD obtained from state-of-the-art experimental measurements with data from [27]. The reconstructed WTD using equation (33) is shown in blue. It matches the WTD obtained directly from the time resolved experimental current trace (red dots) well. The deviation is due to the finite-sized time bin corresponding to the resolution of the current trace. A more accurate reconstruction of the WTD is expected by increasing the time resolution of the current trace or of the measurement of C_2 .

equation (30)), Γ_L and Γ_R can be uniquely identified. The reconstructed values for the rates are

$$\Gamma_L^{\text{recon}} = 10.80 \text{ kHz}, \quad (35)$$

$$\Gamma_R^{\text{recon}} = 4.76 \text{ kHz}. \quad (36)$$

The differences to the values from [27] are well within the range we would expect, regarding the time-resolution in the spike train data. The curve plotted from these reconstructed values of the parameters $\Gamma_{L,R}$ is shown in figure 3 in blue. The slight deviation between the experimental points and this reconstructed C_2 -function is due to the discretization of the counting time intervals used in the experiment: the size of each time bin is not much smaller than the time scale on which C_2 changes mostly. This leads to an error in the estimation of the damping factor $\Gamma_L + \Gamma_R$ and explains the difference of the blue and the red dotted curves. Naturally, one could expect a more accurate reconstruction of the parameters Γ_L and Γ_R when increasing the time resolution of the current trace or of the measurement of C_2 .

From Γ_L and Γ_R , the corresponding cMPS matrices R_L and R_R can be constructed, as well as the matrices M and D . In this simple case, we did not need to employ the whole reconstruction procedure from [11]. Indeed, it is clear from equation (34) that only two out of the four parameters that characterize the system appear: C_n only depends on the tunnelling rates Γ_L and Γ_R —the eigenenergies 0 and ϵ of \hat{H}_{sys} do not contribute⁵. This will in general not be the case.

The matrices R_L and R_R give access to the matrices D and \mathcal{D} by direct computation. Inserting the latter into equation (33), the WTD can be reconstructed and the result is plotted in figure 4 (blue curve). In order to build confidence in our procedure, we compare this result with the experimentally accessible WTD (red dots). Let us recall that the transport rate is in the kHz range, hence the WTD can directly be extracted from the current spike train I : by sorting, counting all (discrete) waiting times between two consecutive incidents, and subsequently normalizing the resulting histogram, one obtains the red-dotted WTD in figure 4. The slight deviation between the WTD reconstructed via our proposal and the experimental one is again due to the discretization of the counting time intervals. One could expect a more accurate reconstruction of the WTD when increasing the time resolution of the current trace.

The WTD in figure 4 shows elementary transport properties of single independent fermions that cannot tunnel at the same time through the single-level quantum dot, which is consistent with the fact that $\mathcal{W}(\tau) \rightarrow 0$ for $\tau \rightarrow 0$. It is important to emphasize that it is the first time a WTD is extracted from experimental data, therefore bridging the gap between theoretical predictions and experiments. The good agreement of the two curves demonstrates the potential of our cMPS-based reconstruction procedure to access the WTD from the measurements of low-order correlation functions. This opens the route to access the WTDs in the high-frequency domain from low-order correlation-functions measurements.

⁵ The eigenvectors of T only depend on Γ_L and Γ_R , this applies to M_L, M_R and all residues as well. Accordingly, the two non-real poles are the only quantities that depend on ϵ , however, only the residues connected to the two real poles do not vanish. When adding off-diagonal elements to K , the terms mix and a dependency on K arises.

6. Conclusion

In this work, we have taken an approach motivated by cMPS to perform tomographic reconstructions of quantum transport experiments. On a formal level, we have extended this formalism to perform a reconstruction of unknown dissipative processes based on the knowledge of low-order counting probabilities. We then demonstrated that cMPS is an adequate formalism to describe quantum transport experiments based on tight-binding Hamiltonians.

This work advocates a paradigm change in the analysis of transport experiments. The traditional method is to make explicit use of a model to put the estimated quantities into context, a model that may or may not precisely reflect the physical situation at hand. The cMPS approach is to not assume the form of the model, with the exception that the quantum state can be described by a cMPS. Such an approach is of particular interest as it opens the way to the access of quantities that are not measurable experimentally with current technologies, high-order correlation functions and distributions of waiting times.

To convincingly demonstrate the functioning of cMPS tomographic tools applied to quantum transport experiments, we presented a simple example that consists of electrons tunnelling through a single-level quantum dot. Making use of experimental data, we showed that we could successfully reconstruct the distribution of waiting times from the measurement of the two-point correlation function only. This work constitutes therefore a significant step towards accessing the waiting time distribution in the quantum regime experimentally, a challenge present for several years now. Importantly, the application of our reconstruction procedure goes beyond the interest in WTD: it also provides an access to higher-order correlation functions, which are key quantities to better understand interacting quantum systems.

In subsequent research, it would be desirable to further flesh out the statistical aspects of the problem. After all, the description in terms of cMPS constitutes a statistical model. It would constitute an exciting enterprise in its own right to identify region estimators that provide efficiently computable and reliable confidence regions [44] when considering the problem as a statistical estimation problem, related to the framework put forth in [45–47]. We hope that the present work inspires such further studies of transport problems in the mindset of quantum tomography.

Acknowledgments

We acknowledge the group of R Haug, and especially N Ubbelohde, for sharing with us the experimental data. We also acknowledge valuable comments and discussions with M Albert, D Dasenbrook and C Flindt. GH acknowledges support from the A von Humboldt foundation, from the Swiss NCCR QSIT and from the ERC grant MesoQMC, AS from the Studienstiftung des deutschen Volkes, JE from the BMBF (Q com), the EU (RAQUEL, SIQS, AQuS, COST), the DFG (SPP 1798), and the ERC grant TAQ.

Appendix. Reconstruction method from low-order counting probabilities

In this appendix, we provide further technical details on the reconstruction scheme based on the measurement of low-order counting probabilities, P_0 and P_1 . The goal is to access the central cMPS parameter matrices \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{D} . We refer to figure 1 for a general view of the reconstructible items. We start from equation (13) in the main text. By changing the integration bounds, we obtain equation (14),

$$P_n(\tau) = \int_0^\tau dt_1 \int_0^{t_1} dt_2 \cdots \int_0^{t_{n-1}} dt_n \tilde{C}_n(\tau, t_1, t_2, \dots, t_n),$$

where the integrand C_n is altered to

$$\tilde{C}_n(\tau, t_1, \dots, t_n) := \lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} \text{Tr} \left[e^{T(L-t_n-\tau)} e^{S t_n} R_n^* \otimes R_n \cdots R_2^* \otimes R_2 e^{S(t_1-t_2)} R_1^* \otimes R_1 e^{S(\tau-t_1)} \right]. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Note that in contrast to equation (7) where the propagating matrix is the transfer matrix T defined by equation (2) (or equivalently its diagonal representation D), the propagating matrix in the exponential terms between two measurement points now is the matrix S , which is defined by

$$S := Q^* \otimes \mathbf{1} + \mathbf{1} \otimes Q = T - \sum_j R_j^* \otimes R_j. \quad (\text{A.2})$$

We can further simplify equation (A.1) by performing the thermodynamic limit $L \rightarrow \infty$. The spectrum of T for a generic system consists of complex values with negative real part and only one eigenvalue being equal to zero. When taking the limit $L \rightarrow \infty$, all eigenvalue contributions to $e^{T(L-\tau)}$ vanish, except the one corresponding to the zero eigenvalue. Hence

$$\lim_{L \rightarrow \infty} e^{T(L-\tau)} = X e_1 e_1^T X^{-1}, \quad (\text{A.3})$$

with the first canonical unit vector denoted by e_1 and the basis transformation matrix X to the diagonal basis of T . Similar to D and T , we define the matrix \mathcal{D} as the diagonal matrix of S with basis transformation matrix Y :

$$S = Y \mathcal{D} Y^{-1}. \quad (\text{A.4})$$

By defining the matrices $\mathcal{M}_j := Y^{-1} (R_j^* \otimes R_j) Y$ for $j = 1, \dots, n$, and setting $Z := (z_{j,k}) := Y^{-1} X$ (with inverse $Z^{-1} := (\hat{z}_{j,k})$), we arrive at equation (15),

$$\tilde{C}_n(\tau, t_1, \dots, t_n) = e_1^T Z^{-1} e^{D t_n} \mathcal{M}_n \dots e^{D(t_2-t_3)} \mathcal{M}_2 e^{D(t_1-t_2)} \mathcal{M}_1 e^{D(\tau-t_1)} Z e_1.$$

Equations (15) and (7) have a close structural resemblance: the matrices M and \mathcal{M} are *similar* in the linear algebra sense, i.e., there exists a basis transformation from \mathcal{M} to M . The matrices D and \mathcal{D} are the diagonal matrices of the transfer matrix T and the matrix S , respectively. It is straightforward to transform M and D into \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{D} and vice versa: by subtracting M from D , we obtain S (up to similarity/basis transformation), whose diagonal matrix is \mathcal{D} . Applying the same basis transformation (from $(D - M)$ to \mathcal{D}) to the matrix M results in the matrix \mathcal{M} .

For $n = 0$, the counting probability function then reads

$$P_0(\tau) = e_1^T X^{-1} Y e^{D \tau} Y^{-1} X e_1, \quad (\text{A.5})$$

which can be rewritten as a sum of complex exponential terms, with $\{\mu_j\}$ being the eigenvalues of S as

$$P_0(\tau) = \sum_{j=1}^{d^2} \hat{z}_{1,j} z_{j,1} e^{\mu_j \tau}. \quad (\text{A.6})$$

This expression corresponds to the analogue of equation (10) in the main text. Since S is by definition a *Kronecker sum* of Q^* and Q with eigenvalues $\{q_j^*\}$ and $\{q_j\}$ respectively, the spectrum of S consists of the sums $q_j^* + q_k$ with $j, k = 1, \dots, d$. It is closed under complex conjugation (for each element of the set its complex conjugate is also element of the set), as well as the coefficient set $\{\hat{z}_{1,j} z_{j,1}\}$. This ensures that P_0 is real-valued. Being related to Q (which consists of a skew-hermitian matrix (with imaginary spectrum) and negative definite matrices), we have that $\text{Re } \mu_j < 0$ for each j , such that all summands vanish sufficiently fast and P_0 is normalizable. Furthermore, the dominance of the damping factors over the oscillatory components ensures the positivity of P_0 (in particular, the μ_j with the least damping is always real-valued). Analogously, for $P_1(\tau)$ we obtain

$$\sum_{j,k=1}^{d^2} \hat{z}_{1,j} \mathcal{M}_{j,k} z_{k,1} \left((1 - \delta_{j,k}) \frac{e^{\mu_k \tau} - e^{\mu_j \tau}}{\mu_k - \mu_j} + \delta_{j,k} \tau e^{\mu_j \tau} \right) \quad (\text{A.7})$$

with the Kronecker delta $\delta_{j,k}$,

$$f(\tau) = \sum_{m,n} c_{m,n} \tau^m e^{\mu_n \tau}. \quad (\text{A.8})$$

Assuming that the terms $\tau^m e^{\mu_n \tau}$ are linearly independent, in principle one can always single out these contributions as well as their corresponding prefactors $c_{m,n}$. This gives us the chance to extract the coefficients $\{\hat{z}_{1,j} z_{j,1}\}$ and the eigenvalues $\{\mu_i\}$ from P_0 , provided that no coefficient is identical to zero. Rearranging the values $\{\mu_i\}$ to a diagonal matrix in Kronecker sum form results in the matrix \mathcal{D} . One should note, however, that efficient spectral recovery algorithms like the *matrix pencil method* do not straightforwardly work for functions such as P_n , $n \geq 2$, where the exponential functions are multiplied with powers of τ .

In order to reconstruct the elements of the matrix \mathcal{M} together with the off-diagonal elements of Z , we use a gauge argument: All probability functions P_n are invariant under scaling and permutation of the eigenvectors in the matrices X and Y (except for the eigenvector of T corresponding to eigenvalue zero). This allows us to require all but one $\hat{z}_{1,j}$ to be equal to one, and immediately obtain the according number $z_{j,1}$. The remaining coefficient can then be determined via the normalization constraint

$$\sum_{j=1}^{d^2} \hat{z}_{1,j} z_{j,1} = 1, \quad (\text{A.9})$$

so that all $z_{j,1}$ are known. This can be used to obtain the diagonal elements $\mathcal{M}_{j,j}$ from \mathcal{M} . For the remaining matrix elements, only the symmetric elements $\mathcal{M}_{j,k} + \mathcal{M}_{k,j}$ (but not their constituents) are directly accessible since

$$\sum_{\substack{j,k=1 \\ j \neq k}}^{d^2} \hat{z}_{1,j} \mathcal{M}_{j,k} z_{k,1} \frac{e^{\mu_k \tau} - e^{\mu_j \tau}}{\mu_k - \mu_j} = \sum_{j < k} \left(\hat{z}_{1,j} \mathcal{M}_{j,k} z_{k,1} + \hat{z}_{1,k} \mathcal{M}_{k,j} z_{j,1} \right) \frac{e^{\mu_k \tau} - e^{\mu_j \tau}}{\mu_k - \mu_j}. \quad (\text{A.10})$$

However, this does not constitute a limitation for the reconstruction of the matrices Q and R of the ancillary system. To this end, we make use of the inner structure of \mathcal{M} . The diagonal matrix \mathcal{D} with eigenvalues μ_j can be

reordered such that it has the form $\mathcal{D} = D_Q^* \otimes \mathbb{1} + \mathbb{1} \otimes D_Q$ with diagonal D_Q consisting of the eigenvalues of Q . Reordering the eigenvectors in Y accordingly, we can assume that the matrix Y and hence the matrix \mathcal{M} have the form of a Kronecker product

$$\mathcal{M} = R_{\text{rec}}^* \otimes R_{\text{rec}}. \quad (\text{A.11})$$

Here $R_{\text{rec}} = (r_{j,k}) \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ is in general not diagonal. The symmetrized components of \mathcal{M} can then be written as $r_{j,k}^* r_{m,l} + r_{k,j}^* r_{m,l}$ and the constituents r_j can be determined (up to a phase factor) by equating them with the coefficients in equation (A.10). The according equation system can then be solved.

The important point is that R_{rec} and $Q_{\text{rec}} := D_Q$ are valid cMPS parameter matrices in the same gauge and hence are sufficient for reconstruction with the same argument as in [11, III.E]. Let us note that concrete values of the basis transformation matrices X and Y are in fact never used or needed in the reconstruction procedure. From R_{rec} and Q_{rec} , we can compute all quantities we need to establish the correlation and counting probability functions, in particular \mathcal{M} and \mathcal{D} . Regauging R_{rec} and Q_{rec} such that the orthonormalization condition [1] is fulfilled, yields a reconstruction of the free Hamiltonian K_{rec} of the ancillary system.

References

- [1] Verstraete F and Cirac J I 2010 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **104** 190405
- [2] Osborne T J, Eisert J and Verstraete F 2010 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105** 260401
- [3] Haegeman J, Cirac J I, Osborne T J and Verstraete F 2013 *Phys. Rev. B* **88** 085118
- [4] Schollwöck U 2011 *Ann. Phys.* **326** 96
- [5] Draxler D, Haegeman J, Osborne T J, Stojevic V, Vanderstraeten L and Verstraete F 2013 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111** 020402
- [6] Quijandria F, Garcia-Ripoll J J and Zueco D 2014 *Phys. Rev. B* **90** 235142
- [7] Steffens A, Friesdorf M, Langen T, Rauer B, Schweigler T, Hübener R, Schmiedmayer J, Riofrío C A and Eisert J 2015 *Nat. Commun.* **6** 7663
- [8] Sangwoo K S, Chung S and Bolech C J 2015 *Phys. Rev. B* **91** 121108(R)
- [9] Barrett S, Hammerer K, Harrison S, Northup T E and Osborne T J 2013 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** 090501
- [10] Gardiner C W and Zoller P 2004 *Quantum Noise* (Berlin: Springer)
- [11] Steffens A, Riofrío C, Hübener R and Eisert J 2014 *New J. Phys.* **16** 123010
- [12] Hübener R, Mari A and Eisert J 2013 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110** 040401
- [13] Bruderer M, Contreras-Pulido L D, Thaller M, Sironi L, Obreschkow D and Plenio M B 2014 *New J. Phys.* **16** 033030
- [14] Kiukas J, Guta M, Lesanovsky I and Garrahan J P 2015 *Phys. Rev. E* **92** 012132
- [15] Cramer M, Plenio M B, Flammia S T, Somma R, Gross D, Bartlett S D, Landon-Cardinal O, Poulin D and Liu Y-K 2010 *Nat. Commun.* **1** 149
- [16] Brantut J-P, Meineke J, Stadler D, Krinner S and Esslinger T 2012 *Science* **337** 1069
- [17] Brantut J P, Grenier C, Meineke J, Stadler D, Krinner S, Kollath C, Esslinger T and Georges A 2013 *Science* **342** 713
- [18] Brandes T 2008 *Ann. Phys.* **17** 477
- [19] Albert M, Flindt C and Büttiker M 2011 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **107** 086805
- [20] Albert M, Haack G, Flindt C and Büttiker M 2012 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108** 186806
- [21] Thomas K H and Flindt C 2013 *Phys. Rev. B* **87** 121405(R)
- [22] Rajabi L, Pötl C and Governale M 2013 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **111** 067002
- [23] Dasenbrook D, Flindt C and Büttiker M 2014 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **112** 146801
- [24] Albert M and Devillard P 2014 *Phys. Rev. B* **90** 035431
- [25] Tang G-M, Xu F and Wang J 2014 *Phys. Rev. B* **89** 205310
- [26] Gustavsson S, Leturcq R, Simovic B, Schleser R, Ihn T, Studerus P, Ensslin K, Driscoll D C and Gossard A C 2006 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **96** 076605
- [27] Ubbelohde N, Fricke C, Flindt C, Hohls F and Haug R J 2012 *Nat. Commun.* **3** 612
- [28] Fève G, Mahé A, Berroir J-M, Kontos T, Plaças B, Glatthli C, Cavanna A, Etienne B and Jin Y 2007 *Science* **316** 1169
- [29] Blumenthal M D, Kaestner B, Li L, Giblin S, Janssen T J B M, Pepper M, Anderson D, Jones G and Ritchie D A 2007 *Nat. Phys.* **3** 343
- [30] Fujiwara A, Nishiguchi K and Ono Y 2008 *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **92** 042102
- [31] Maire N, Hohls F, Kaestner B, Pierz K, Schumacher H W and Haug R J 2008 *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **92**
- [32] Dubois J, Jullien T, Portier F, Roche P, Cavanna A, Jin Y, Wegscheider W, Rouleau P and Glatthli D C 2013 *Nature* **502** 659
- [33] Gabelli J, Spietz L, Aumentado J and Reulet B 2013 *New J. Phys.* **15** 113045
- [34] Jamiolkowski A 1972 *Rep. Math. Phys.* **3** 275
- [35] Kelley P L and Kleiner W H 1964 *Phys. Rev.* **136** 316
- [36] Eisaman M D, Fan J, Migdall A and Polyakov S V 2011 *Rev. Sci. Instrum.* **82**
- [37] Thalineau R, Wieck A, Bäuerle C and Meunier T 2014 arXiv:1403.7770
- [38] Gasparinetti S, Viisanen K L, Saira O-P, Faivre T, Arzeo M, Meschke M and Pekola J P 2015 *Phys. Rev. Appl.* **3** 014007
- [39] Stoof T H and Nazarov Y V 1995 *Phys. Rev. B* **53** 1050
- [40] Blanter Y M and Büttiker M 2000 *Phys. Rep.* **336** 1
- [41] MacDonald D K C 1949 *Rep. Prog. Phys.* **12** 56
- [42] Flindt C, Novotny T and Jauho A-P 2005 *Phys. E* **29** 411
- [43] Lambert N, Aguado R and Brandes T 2007 *Phys. Rev. B* **75** 045340
- [44] Shao J 2003 *Mathematical Statistics* (Berlin: Springer)
- [45] Blume-Kohout R 2012 arXiv:1202.5270
- [46] Christandl M and Renner R 2012 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **109** 120403
- [47] Carpentier A, Eisert J, Gross D and Nickl R 2015 (arXiv:1504.03234)