

# Compressed Optimization of Device Architectures for Semiconductor Quantum Devices

Adam Frees,<sup>1,\*</sup> John King Gamble,<sup>2,3</sup> Daniel R. Ward,<sup>2</sup> Robin Blume-Kohout,<sup>2</sup> M.A. Eriksson,<sup>1</sup> Mark Friesen,<sup>1</sup> and S.N. Coppersmith<sup>1,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, University of Wisconsin-Madison, Madison, Wisconsin 53706, USA*

<sup>2</sup>*Center for Computing Research, Sandia National Laboratories, Albuquerque, New Mexico 87123, USA*

<sup>3</sup>*Quantum Architectures and Computation Group, Microsoft Research, Redmond, Washington 98052, USA*

<sup>4</sup>*School of Physics, University of New South Wales, Sydney, New South Wales 2052, Australia*



(Received 13 June 2018; revised manuscript received 13 January 2019; published 25 February 2019)

Recent advances in nanotechnology have enabled researchers to manipulate small collections of quantum-mechanical objects with unprecedented accuracy. In semiconductor quantum-dot qubits, this manipulation requires controlling the dot orbital energies, the tunnel couplings, and the electron occupations. These properties all depend on the voltages placed on the metallic electrodes that define the device, the positions of which are fixed once the device is fabricated. While there has been much success with small numbers of dots, as the number of dots grows, it will be increasingly useful to control these systems with as few electrode voltage changes as possible. Here, we introduce a protocol, which we call the “compressed optimization of device architectures” (CODA), in order both to efficiently identify sparse sets of voltage changes that control quantum systems and to introduce a metric that can be used to compare device designs. As an example of the former, we apply this method to simulated devices with up to 100 quantum dots and show that CODA automatically tunes devices more efficiently than other common nonlinear optimizers. To demonstrate the latter, we determine the optimal lateral scale for a triple quantum dot, yielding a simulated device that can be tuned with small voltage changes on a limited number of electrodes.

DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevApplied.11.024063](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevApplied.11.024063)

## I. INTRODUCTION

Nanoscale systems are challenging to control, in part because their size makes them susceptible to even the smallest material defects. Quantum devices present special challenges because their energy spectra and tunnel couplings each require precise control [1,2]. Here, we focus on quantum bits (qubits) formed in electrostatically gated quantum dots [3]. In these systems, voltages are simultaneously tuned on many electrodes to precisely shape the electrostatic potential landscape within a device. Working with a small number of qubits, researchers have already demonstrated excellent qubit coherence and performance in devices based on GaAs [4–7] and silicon [8–18], including the successful implementation of two-qubit gates [19–21] and algorithms [22]. Additionally, there has been rapid progress in systems with electrons bound to donors [23–32], which share many of the same design challenges as quantum-dot qubits. Tuning schemes for these devices are typically determined empirically; however, there has been recent progress toward automatic tuning of quantum dots

both experimentally [33,34] and in simulated systems [35]. One challenge in controlling quantum-dot devices is to ensure that the voltage changes on the electrodes remain small during tuning, a property that we refer to as *voltage moderation*. The imposition of voltage moderation reduces the power required during dynamic operation and lowers the risk of instability. Another challenge is to ensure that a small number of electrodes can be used to tune quantum dots, preferably with those electrodes proximal to the relevant dots. We refer to this property as *voltage sparsity*, which eases the demands on control electronics and will be increasingly important as devices are scaled to very large numbers of quantum dots. In order to achieve these goals, it is critical to use simulations both to identify moderate and sparse tunings and to design these features into devices before they are fabricated.

Here, we introduce the compressed optimization of device architectures (CODA) protocol, which both determines optimized ways to change the voltages in a given system to achieve a desired outcome and provides a metric to characterize the ease with which the device can be tuned. We show that by minimizing the  $L_1$  norm of the applied voltage changes, we can simultaneously achieve voltage

\*frees@wisc.edu

moderation and voltage sparsity. We minimize this norm by implementing the CODA protocol, which relies on results and methods used for compressed sensing [36,37] in the signal-processing literature. Using a simulated eight-dot device, we demonstrate that CODA yields solutions that are simultaneously sparse and moderate. Moreover, we show that by imposing voltage sparsity and moderation, we obtain solutions that only involve gates that are proximal to the dot being manipulated—an extremely desirable property for extensibility. To further demonstrate the extensibility of the CODA protocol, we use a simple model to measure the number of device simulations required to tune devices with up to 100 quantum dots. We find that CODA requires nearly an order of magnitude fewer simulations than other commonly used nonlinear optimization techniques. Additionally, the formulation of control as an optimization problem allows us to directly compare the effectiveness of different device architectures, enabling improvement of the electrode designs themselves. To demonstrate this, we use CODA to optimize the overall lateral scale of a triple quantum dot, which leads to a device that is optimally “tunable.”

## II. AUTOMATIC TUNING OF SIMULATED DEVICES

For qubit applications, the main properties that we wish to control are the quantum-dot occupations, the orbital energy splittings, and the tunnel rates between the dots. Such properties are referred to as *quantities of interest*, which we represent as a vector  $\mathbf{q}$  in a vector space  $\mathcal{Q}$ . These values are controlled by the voltages applied to the electrodes. A given set of voltages is represented as a vector  $\mathbf{v}$  in a vector space  $\mathcal{V}$ . A physical system, or a simulation thereof, acts as a function that maps the voltages to the quantities of interest:  $\hat{S} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ , as shown in Fig. 1(a).

Because generically there are more electrodes than quantities of interest, many different  $\mathbf{v}$  can yield target values for the quantities of interest  $\mathbf{q}_{\text{target}}$ . The solutions are not all equivalently useful—it is our goal to select changes in voltages that are simultaneously moderate and sparse.

In Fig. 1(b), we highlight the advantage of choosing the solution that satisfies the equation

$$\tilde{\delta\mathbf{v}} = \underset{\delta\mathbf{v}}{\operatorname{argmin}} \|\delta\mathbf{v}\|_1, \quad \text{subject to } \hat{S}(\mathbf{v}_{\text{init}} + \delta\mathbf{v}) = \mathbf{q}_{\text{target}}, \quad (1)$$

where  $\mathbf{v}_{\text{init}}$  is the voltage vector at the starting point,  $\mathbf{q}_{\text{target}}$  is the vector of target quantities of interest,  $\delta\mathbf{v}$  is the voltage change from the starting point, and  $\|\cdot\|_1$  is the  $L_1$  norm, which is the sum of the absolute value of each element in the vector.

Minimization of the  $L_1$  norm of the voltage change vector both ensures that the magnitude of the individual voltage changes remain small (i.e., voltage moderation)

and that the voltage change vector is sparse. The sparsity achieved by  $L_1$  norm minimization is a property used extensively in the field of compressed sensing [36,37]. In contrast,  $L_2$  norm minimization (minimizing the Euclidean length of  $\delta\mathbf{v}$ ) does not guarantee voltage sparsity and  $L_0$  pseudonorm minimization (minimizing the number of nonzero elements of  $\delta\mathbf{v}$ ) does not guarantee voltage moderation. In principle, one could achieve both moderation and sparsity by minimizing some combination of these two quantities, but this would involve making an arbitrary choice for the relative weight given to the  $L_0$  and  $L_2$  norms. Additionally, finding the solution that minimizes the  $L_0$  pseudonorm is known to be an NP-hard problem [38], whereas convex programming methods can be used to minimize the  $L_1$  norm efficiently [39]. Therefore, by selecting the changes in voltages described in Eq. (1), the CODA procedure yields a device tuning in which a small number of voltages are changed by modest amounts.

To demonstrate the CODA protocol, we first perform automatic tuning of a simple toy example shown in Figs. 1(c)–1(f). This system comprises two electrode voltages  $\delta v_1$  and  $\delta v_2$  and one quantity of interest  $q(\delta v_1, \delta v_2) = (\delta v_1/(1 \text{ mV}) - 3/2)^2 + (\delta v_2/(1 \text{ mV}) - 3/4)^2$ . During the protocol, we treat this as a black-box function, as in more complicated device models we do not have access to an analytical form of the mapping from voltages to quantities of interest. Starting with  $\delta v_1 = \delta v_2 = 0 \text{ mV}$ , we wish to find the voltage changes with minimal  $L_1$  norm that are necessary to change the quantity of interest from  $q_{\text{current}} = 2.8125$  to  $q_{\text{target}} = 1$ . To achieve this, we apply an iterative algorithm to minimize the distance between the simulated quantities of interest and the target quantities of interest. At the starting point, we calculate the Jacobian  $\mathbf{J} = (\partial q/\partial \delta v_1, \partial q/\partial \delta v_2)$  and find all of the solutions to the linear equation  $q_{\text{target}} - q_{\text{current}} = \mathbf{J} \cdot \delta\mathbf{v}$ , shown as a red dashed line in Fig. 1(c). In this example, it is easy to minimize the  $L_1$  norm along this line; however, for more general and complicated problems, we employ a matrix-free conic-optimization algorithm [39] to determine the particular  $\delta\mathbf{v}$  that minimizes the  $L_1$  norm while satisfying this equation. This vector defines a search direction in voltage space; CODA moves along this direction in voltage space, stopping at the point that brings the simulation closest to the target quantities of interest. This process then repeats until the quantity of interest converges on  $q_{\text{target}}$ . In general, convergence is declared when  $\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_{\text{target}}\|_2$  falls below some threshold. We typically choose an error threshold of approximately  $10^{-2}$ ; in this example, we choose a threshold of  $5 \times 10^{-2}$ . We achieve convergence after two iterations, at which point  $q \approx 1.041$ , as shown in Fig. 1(d). In this example, we achieve the target quantity of interest by changing only one electrode voltage.

It is instructive to contrast this solution to one obtained using an analogous procedure in which the  $L_2$  norm is minimized, rather than the  $L_1$  norm, as demonstrated in




FIG. 1. Example implementations of the CODA protocol, including comparisons of using the  $L_1$  norm (the sum of absolute values) and the  $L_2$  norm (the Euclidian length) of the voltage changes needed to achieve the desired values of the quantities of interest (dot occupations, tunnel couplings, etc.). (a) A simulated quantum-dot device maps electrode voltages to quantities of interest. Generically, there are more electrodes in a device than quantities of interest. (b) There are many combinations of electrode voltages that result in a target system state (gray dashed line). By choosing the solution associated with the minimum  $L_1$  norm of voltage changes, described in Eq. (1) (purple), we simultaneously ensure that voltages are changed by small amounts on a small number of electrodes. Minimization of the  $L_2$  norm (orange) does not ensure that voltage changes will be applied to a small number of electrodes. (c)–(f) A depiction of the CODA-algorithm tuning voltages to obtain  $q_{\text{target}} = 1$  in a simple system. The voltages that yield the target quantity of interest are indicated with the circular segment in panels (c) and (e). Starting at  $\delta v_1 = \delta v_2 = 0$  mV (green circle), we calculate the Jacobian  $\mathbf{J}$  and find all of the solutions to the linear equation  $q_{\text{target}} - q_{\text{current}} = \mathbf{J} \cdot \delta \mathbf{v}$ , shown as a green dashed line. We then find the voltage changes on this line that minimize the  $L_1$  and  $L_2$  norms, the blue circles in panels (c) and (e), respectively. Using the derivatives at this new point, we again estimate the voltage changes required to hit the target (blue dashed line) and again find the solution that minimizes the appropriate norm (black circle). The solution found here converges on  $q_{\text{target}}$ . Additionally, we obtain the voltage changes associated with the minimum of the appropriate norm, indicated by the purple color scale in panel (c) and the orange color scale in panel (e). (g)–(i) CODA tuning of an eight-dot device. (g) A schematic of a simulated eight-dot device, with metal electrodes colored yellow or orange (lower level) and green (upper level). Here, the objective is to increase the occupation of the rightmost quantum dot (underneath the orange electrode) by one electron, keeping all other dot occupations and tunnel couplings unchanged. (h),(i) Visualization of the voltage changes obtained by the optimization protocol, plotted on a logarithmic color scale (electrodes with voltage changes less than  $0.5 \mu\text{V}$  are colored white), minimizing the (h)  $L_1$  and (i)  $L_2$  norms of the voltage changes. As expected, minimization of the  $L_1$  norm ensures that a limited number of electrode voltages are changed, whereas minimization of the  $L_2$  norm does not.

Figs. 1(e) and 1(f). Here, we again declare convergence after two iterations, with  $q \approx 1.012$ . However, the final solution involves changing the voltage on both electrodes to achieve the target quantity of interest and is therefore less sparse than the solution obtained using the  $L_1$  norm. For more details on the CODA algorithm, see Appendix A.

In a more realistic demonstration of CODA's capabilities, we can use it to perform automatic tuning of the accumulation-mode eight-dot device shown in Fig. 1(g). The device contains four capacitively coupled double-quantum-dot qubits in a Si/SiGe heterostructure.

In principle, the CODA protocol can use any underlying physical model. Here, we model the device using the semiclassical Thomas-Fermi approximation [40] to compute electron densities and potentials and the Wentzel–Kramers–Brillouin (WKB) approximation [41] to calculate tunnel rates, as described in Appendices B and C. The quantities of interest are chosen to be the eight dot occupations and the four intraqubit tunnel rates. While this semiclassical approach is appropriate for these quantities of interest, one may need a more sophisticated model to correctly capture the physics of different quantities of

interest, e.g., valley splitting within a dot [42]. Our starting point is chosen to give dot occupations of one electron and transmission coefficients between the dots of 0.01, corresponding to tunnel rates of approximately 400 MHz (for details of the simulation parameters and methods, see Appendices B and C). Our goal is to find the optimal changes in voltages that can be applied to the device electrodes to add one electron to the rightmost dot, leaving all other dot occupations and transmission coefficients unchanged.

In Fig. 1(h), we show the voltage changes needed to achieve convergence of the CODA procedure applied to the eight-dot device. Note that although voltages are allowed to vary on all the electrodes, CODA chooses to vary only four electrode voltages and those electrodes are proximal to the target of interest. For comparison, we also perform an alternative optimization protocol based on  $L_2$ -minimization, with results shown in Fig. 1(i). Note that although the latter protocol achieves the same target quantities of interest, the solution involves voltage changes on almost all of the electrodes, indicating that this solution is neither sparse nor proximal. In both tuning protocols, the magnitudes of the voltage changes applied to the electrodes are all under 5 mV. Because minimizing the  $L_2$  norm explicitly ensures voltage moderation, the similarity in the magnitude of voltage changes applied in both cases confirms that the solution found via  $L_1$ -norm minimization exhibits voltage moderation as well. Hence, we confirm that CODA is a practical tool for tuning a device, because it selects voltages that are both sparse and moderate while achieving the specified target quantities of interest.

### III. EXTENSIBILITY

In the previous section, we have applied the CODA protocol to simulated devices with up to eight quantum dots, showing that the method can find sparse voltage tunings that are moderate and sparse for these devices. These solutions are obtained after two iterative steps, suggesting that this procedure is efficient even for large systems. Here, we show that the CODA protocol scales efficiently with device size and can be used to find sparse tunings for devices with 100 quantum dots.

We consider the device shown in Fig. 2(a), which consists of  $m$  quantum dots,  $m - 1$  tunnel rates, and  $4m - 1$  electrodes. The electrode separating the quantum dots [thin blue rectangle in Fig. 2(a)] is 35 nm from the center of the neighboring electrodes [red and blue squares in Fig. 2(a)]. The centers of the square-shaped electrodes are separated by 50 nm. The quantum dots are located 20 nm below the electrodes.

There are many methods that one could employ to model this device, including taking the semiclassical approach described in Appendices B and C or self-consistently solving the Schrödinger and Poisson equations, which take




FIG. 2. A demonstration of the extensibility of the CODA protocol using a simple model involving up to 100 quantum dots. (a) A diagram of the simulated device. The quantities of interest in this device are the occupations  $n_i$  of the quantum dots (dashed circles) and the tunnel rate  $\tau_i$  between the dots (dashed double arrows). Each quantum dot has three electrodes in close proximity: one located directly above the quantum dot (blue square) and two located above and to either side of the quantum dot (red squares). Additionally, there is an electrode separating each pair of dots (thin blue rectangle). The dependence of  $n_i$  and  $\tau_i$  on the electrode voltages is defined phenomenologically in Eqs. (2) and (3), respectively. (b)–(d) Given a device with  $m$  quantum dots, we use a variety of nonlinear optimizers (including CODA) to find the changes in electrode voltages that add one electron to the leftmost quantum dot, keeping all other occupations and tunnel rates constant. We consider devices with  $m$  ranging from 2 to 100. The results corresponding to CODA are shown in green and the results corresponding with the other nonlinear optimizers considered are shown in hues of purple. In panel (b), we show the average over all considered devices of the maximum voltage change applied to any of the electrodes. The standard deviation is smaller than the points used in this plot. The uniformity of the results here indicates that all of the optimizers find solutions with similar voltage moderation. In panel (c), we show the number of electrodes used in each solution. The CODA procedure consistently requires fewer electrodes than any of the other nonlinear optimizers considered. In panel (d), we show the number of function calls used by each optimizer. CODA requires roughly an order of magnitude fewer function calls than any of the other nonlinear optimizers considered.

quantum effects into account more accurately. Here, we use a simple model that can be regarded as phenomenological, although it is physically motivated, describing a nonlinear system in which an electrode's proximity to a quantum dot or tunnel barrier determines that electrode's effect on the

corresponding quantity of interest. Specifically, we define the occupation  $n_i$  of dot  $i$  to be

$$n_i = \sum_j \frac{[V_j/(1 \text{ mV}) + \frac{1}{10} \text{sgn}(V_j)V_j^2/(1 \text{ mV}^2)]}{(\|\vec{r}_{V_j} - \vec{r}_{n_i}\|_2)^3/(1 \text{ nm}^3)}, \quad (2)$$

and the tunnel rate  $\tau_i$  between the  $i$ th and  $(i+1)$ th quantum dot is given by

$$\tau_i = \frac{1}{100} \sum_j \frac{[V_j/(1 \text{ mV}) + (1/2)\text{sgn}(V_j)V_j^2/(1 \text{ mV}^2)]}{(\|\vec{r}_{V_j} - \vec{r}_{n_i}\|_2)^3/(1 \text{ nm}^3)}. \quad (3)$$

In these equations,  $V_j$  is the voltage applied to electrode  $j$ ,  $\text{sgn}(x)$  is the sign function of  $x$ ,  $\vec{r}_{V_j}$  is the center position of electrode  $j$ ,  $\vec{r}_{n_i}$  is the center position of dot  $i$ , and  $\vec{r}_{\tau_i}$  describes the halfway point between dots  $i$  and  $(i+1)$ . The  $r^{-3}$  scaling of these quantities is the expected spatial decay for a screened 2DEG [43], while the voltage dependence is chosen assuming that these quantities scale approximately linearly with voltage, with an additional explicitly nonlinear contribution.

To study the extensibility of our approach, we employ a variety of nonlinear optimizers, including CODA, to tune the voltages in devices with  $m = 2$  to 100 dots. In each case, we begin with voltages of  $-100$  mV applied to each of the electrodes indicated with red in Fig. 2(a) and with positive voltages applied to the electrodes indicated with blue in Fig. 2(a). The latter voltages are set such that  $n_i = 1$  and  $\tau_i = 0.01$  for every  $i$ . We then find a combination of voltage changes that adds one electron to dot  $i = 1$ , keeping all other  $n_i$  and  $\tau_i$  fixed. We specifically consider the CODA protocol, the conjugate-gradient (CG) algorithm, the Broyden, Fletcher, Goldfarb, and Shanno (BFGS) algorithm, the Newton-conjugate-gradient (Newton-CG) algorithm, the limited-memory BFGS algorithm (L-BFGS-B), and the sequential-least-squares-programming (SLSQP) algorithm, as implemented in the SCIPY software package [44]. In all of these algorithms, we minimize  $\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_{\text{target}}\|_2$ , where  $\|\cdot\|_2$  denotes the  $L_2$  norm,  $\mathbf{q}$  is the vector consisting of every quantity of interest,  $n_i$  and  $\tau_i$ , and  $\mathbf{q}_{\text{target}}$  is the vector consisting of the target values for the quantities of interest. We define the system to be converged on the target when  $\|\mathbf{q} - \mathbf{q}_{\text{target}}\|_2 < 10^{-5}$ .

We assess the voltage moderation and sparsity of each of the solutions found by the nonlinear optimizers. The maximum voltage change  $V_{\text{max}}$  applied to a given device is shown in Fig. 2(b). The number of nonzero voltage changes found by each optimizer as a function of  $m$  is shown in Fig. 2(c). While all of the nonlinear solvers apply voltage changes of comparable magnitude, CODA consistently finds solutions that require changing fewer electrode voltages than any of the other optimizers we consider. Moreover, the number of electrodes used by CODA does

not change for devices with  $m \geq 26$ . In contrast, all of the other nonlinear optimizers show high variability in the number of electrodes used as a function of device size.

We find that the CODA protocol requires fewer function calls than any of the other nonlinear optimizers considered. In Fig. 2(d), we show the number of function calls made in each optimization. The average number of function calls made by a given nonlinear optimizer scales linearly with the number of quantum dots in the system, regardless of the optimizer used. In the case of the CODA protocol [green line in Fig. 2(d)], the number of function calls is exactly proportional to the device size, as the number of iterations required for CODA to converge is independent of the number of quantum dots. Although the overall scaling is the same for each of these optimizers, the CODA protocol achieves convergence using approximately an order of magnitude fewer function calls compared with the next most efficient optimizer, the L-BFGS-B algorithm. Since the device simulations dominate the computation time, the CODA protocol can therefore automatically tune simulated devices significantly faster than any of the other nonlinear optimizers considered. We conclude that CODA can efficiently find sparse and moderate solutions in large devices.

#### IV. DEVICE DESIGN OPTIMIZATION

In addition to automatically tuning quantum-dot devices, the CODA protocol can be used to characterize the voltage sparsity and moderation of typical gate operations, thus providing a key metric for evaluating and comparing different device designs. Here, we consider a series of triple-dot devices, shown in Fig. 3. Each device has the same electrode layout, save for the overall lateral scale—we parametrize this scale via the width of the paddle electrode, as shown in Fig. 4(a). All devices have an identical Si/SiGe heterostructure with a silicon quantum well a distance 30 nm below the electrodes. Optimization of the device size is important, because a device with electrodes that are too small will lead to instability and larger power requirements for switching, while a device with electrodes that are too large will not have sufficient control over the potential landscape at the required length scales. In particular, it has been observed in experiments [19,22,45] that in larger devices it is often necessary to form the quantum dots away from their intended locations. We now show that CODA can be used to determine an optimal device scale.

We again use the semiclassical Thomas-Fermi approximation [40] and the WKB approximation [41] to model the devices. Since it is relatively difficult to determine the gate voltages needed to achieve single-electron occupancies in each dot, we choose a starting point for our simulations with 30 electrons in all three dots and tunnel couplings that yield transmission coefficients of 0.01 between the left and




FIG. 3. The protocol used to compare the “tunability” of device designs. Given multiple simulated devices, we use the CODA protocol to find the minimum  $L_1$  norm of voltage variations needed to induce a common change in each device (e.g., to change the dot occupations in device #1, device #2, etc.). The device with the minimum norm can simultaneously provide voltage moderation and sparsity and should therefore be regarded as the most “tunable” device.

middle dots and the middle and right dots. In each device, we then use the CODA protocol to automatically tune gate voltages to achieve single-electron occupation of each dot, while keeping the transmission coefficients constant, exploiting CODA’s ability to automatically tune voltages. Additionally, we require the orbital energy splitting of each dot to be 1 meV or more, as is consistent with recent experiments. Orbital energy splittings are calculated using a two-dimensional (2D) finite-difference Schrödinger solver (for details, see Appendix B).

The minimized-voltage  $L_1$  norms required for the autotuning process in each device are plotted in Fig. 4(b). Comparing these results, we see that the voltage  $L_1$  norm is minimized for the device labeled (d), with a paddle width of approximately 80 nm, suggesting that this device is optimal from a control standpoint.

The voltage changes for the autotuning protocol and the resulting electron charge density distributions are shown in Figs. 4(c)–4(e). For the optimal device, shown in Fig. 4(d), the number of gates with voltage changes is relatively small, indicating good voltage sparsity. For devices smaller than the optimal device, voltage sparsity is still maintained, as a benefit of small device size. However, voltage moderation is not, with large voltage changes required on multiple electrodes, as shown in Fig. 4(c). For devices larger than optimal, voltage moderation is maintained but the solution is no longer sparse, as shown in Fig. 4(e). The constraints




FIG. 4. The use of CODA to optimize the triple-quantum-dot designs shown in Fig. 3. (a) Every device in the series has an identical electrode layout, save for the lateral scale of the device, which we characterize in terms of the width of the paddle electrode. The Si/SiGe heterostructures for all devices considered are identical. (b) For each device in the series, we use the CODA protocol to lower all three dots from an occupation of 30 electrons to one electron, keeping the transmission coefficients fixed at 0.01. Additionally, the single-electron dots are required to have orbital excitation energies greater than 1 meV. (c)–(e) A visualization of the optimized voltage variations required to tune each device. Voltage changes are shown in red and blue and the resulting electron density distributions are shown in black. For smaller devices [e.g., panel (c)], fewer electrodes are required to tune the device. However, larger voltage changes must be applied to those electrodes, resulting in a high-voltage  $L_1$  norm. For larger devices [e.g., panel (e)], quantum dots no longer form underneath the paddle electrodes (e.g., the rightmost dot, indicated with purple arrows), so that many electrodes are required to tune the device. The balancing of these effects leads to a local minimum in the voltage  $L_1$  norm, corresponding to the device shown in panel (d).

on dot occupation, dot energy, and transmission coefficients lead to constraints on the size and relative position of the dots. In smaller devices, such as those shown in Figs. 4(c) and 4(d), the dots can be formed underneath the paddle electrodes and still meet these requirements. In larger devices, such as the device in Fig. 4(e), to achieve

the required quantities of interest, the dots can no longer form under the paddle gate electrodes, with the rightmost dot forming under the nominal right tunnel-barrier electrode as indicated by the arrows. This misalignment between electrodes and dots, which has also been observed in experimental devices [19,22,45], leads to solutions that are less sparse than in the smaller devices.

## V. CONCLUSION

We introduce a protocol for the compressed optimization of device architectures (CODA), which determines the optimal voltage changes for a given device operation by minimizing their  $L_1$  norm. We demonstrate the effectiveness of this scheme by considering its application to semiconductor nanoelectronic quantum-dot systems. As devices continue to grow in complexity, such automated control schemes will be essential for design and operation. Our protocol is computationally efficient to implement and it provides a systematic approach for achieving local and sparse control. Through realistic semiclassical simulations of multidot devices, we illustrate how the CODA scheme can be used for quantitative benchmarking and device development. While the current work focuses on quantum-dot geometries, we note that the CODA protocol could also be applied to other device geometries, including donor-bound qubits, using simulation tools appropriate for those systems. This method provides a path toward the rational design and operation of extensible quantum nanodevices.

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank C. King, J. B. Aidun, J. Moussa, N. T. Jacobson, R. P. Muller, and C. Tahan for useful comments and discussions. This work was supported in part by ARO (W911NF-12-1-0607, W911NF-17-1-0274), NSF (PHY-1104660), and the Vannevar Bush Faculty Fellowship program sponsored by the Basic Research Office of the Assistant Secretary of Defense for Research and Engineering and funded by the Office of Naval Research through Grant No. N00014-15-1-0029. The views and conclusions contained herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing the official policies or endorsements, either expressed or implied, of the Army Research Office (ARO) or the U.S. Government. The U.S. Government is authorized to reproduce and distribute reprints for Governmental purposes, notwithstanding any copyright notation thereon. Sandia National Laboratories is a multimission laboratory managed and operated by National Technology & Engineering Solutions of Sandia, LLC, a wholly owned subsidiary of Honeywell International Inc., for the U.S. Department of Energy's National Nuclear Security Administration under

contract DE-NA0003525. We gratefully acknowledge support from the Sandia National Laboratories Truman Fellowship Program, which is funded by the Laboratory Directed Research and Development (LDRD) Program. This paper describes objective technical results and analysis. Any subjective views or opinions that might be expressed in the paper do not necessarily represent the views of the U.S. Department of Energy or the United States Government.

## APPENDIX A: THE CODA PROTOCOL

Here, we provide further details of the CODA protocol described in the main text. The simulated device is considered to be a nonlinear function  $\hat{S} : \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{Q}$ , where  $\mathcal{V}$  is the space of electrode voltages and  $\mathcal{Q}$  is the space of quantities of interest (e.g., dot occupations, dot energies, and transmission coefficients). Suppose that we have  $n$  quantities of interest and  $m$  electrode voltages and that  $m > n$ , so that the system is underconstrained. We first identify a starting point of experimental interest,  $(\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^0, \mathbf{q}_{\text{op}}^0)$ , such that  $\hat{S}(\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^0) = \mathbf{q}_{\text{op}}^0$ , and a target quantity of interest,  $\mathbf{q}_{\text{target}}$ . It is our goal to find the vector  $\delta \mathbf{v}_{\text{tot}}$  with the minimum  $L_1$  norm that satisfies  $\hat{S}(\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^0 + \delta \mathbf{v}_{\text{tot}}) = \mathbf{q}_{\text{target}}$ .

The following are the steps taken at the  $(i + 1)$ th iteration of CODA:

(1) Given a working point  $(\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^i, \mathbf{q}_{\text{op}}^i)$ , consider a set of linearly independent small voltage variations  $\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_m\}$  ( $\epsilon_j \in \mathcal{V}$ ) about the current working point. In the simulations described in the main text, we take  $\epsilon_j$  to correspond to a voltage change of 0.1 mV on the  $j$ th electrode. Perform  $m$  simulations  $\hat{S}(\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^i + \epsilon_j)$  to obtain the resulting  $m$   $\mathbf{q}_{\text{op}}^i + \delta \mathbf{q}_j$ . From the collection of  $\{\epsilon_1, \epsilon_2, \dots, \epsilon_m\}$  and the associated  $\{\delta \mathbf{q}_1, \delta \mathbf{q}_2, \dots, \delta \mathbf{q}_m\}$ , construct the Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{J}_i$  using the method of least squares. For small  $\delta \mathbf{v}$ ,  $\hat{S}(\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^i + \delta \mathbf{v}) \approx \mathbf{q}_{\text{op}}^i + \mathbf{J}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{v}$ .

(2) Using a convex program (such as the matrix-free conic optimization implemented in the CVXPY software package [39]), find the  $\delta \mathbf{v}_i$  that minimizes  $\left\| \mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^i - \mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^0 + \delta \mathbf{v}_i \right\|_1$  subject to the constraint  $\mathbf{q}_{\text{target}} = \mathbf{q}_{\text{op}}^i + \mathbf{J}_i \cdot \delta \mathbf{v}_i$ . The vector  $\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^i - \mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^0 + \delta \mathbf{v}_i$  is the total change in voltage from the initial working point  $(\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^0)$ .

(3) The voltage change vector  $\delta \mathbf{v}_i$  defines a search direction, similar to the gradient used in nonlinear gradient descent. Evaluate  $\hat{S}(\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^i + \delta \mathbf{v}_i)$ ; if the quantities of interest move closer to the target, i.e.,  $\left\| \hat{S}(\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^i + \delta \mathbf{v}_i) - \mathbf{q}_{\text{target}} \right\|_2 < \left\| \mathbf{q}_{\text{op}}^i - \mathbf{q}_{\text{target}} \right\|_2$ , then define  $\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^{i+1} = \mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^i + \delta \mathbf{v}_i$ . If not, then replace  $\delta \mathbf{v}_i$  with  $\delta \mathbf{v}_i/2$  and repeat this step. Continue until the quantities of interest move closer to the target.

We repeat this process until  $\|\mathbf{q}_{\text{op}}^i - \mathbf{q}_{\text{target}}\|_2$  is below a specified threshold value. For the simulations described in the main text, we assume a threshold value of 0.01. For a detailed explanation of the units of this vector, see the following section.

To decrease the total number of device simulations in CODA, one can replace step 1 in the protocol described above by Broyden's method [46]. This method finds an approximate Jacobian matrix  $\mathbf{J}_{i+1}$  by combining the Jacobian obtained in the previous iteration  $\mathbf{J}_i$  and the nonlinear error from the previous step:  $\hat{S}(\mathbf{v}_{\text{op}}^i + \delta\mathbf{v}) - (\mathbf{q}_{\text{op}}^i + \mathbf{J}_i \cdot \delta\mathbf{v})$ . Although this eliminates the need for explicit Jacobian formation, the use of Broyden's method often does increase the number of iterations required for convergence. In many cases, the use of this method leads to an overall speedup. However, in cases where sparse control cannot be achieved, we find that the number of iterations required for convergence increases dramatically, which negates any potential speedup.

As with all "hill-climbing" nonlinear optimization algorithms, there is no guarantee that the local optimum found by the CODA protocol is a global optimum. However, because CODA is a regularized optimization protocol, the solution with the globally minimal  $L_1$  norm is by definition "close" in control space to the starting point and therefore it is likely that the solution found by CODA is the global minimum. While it is certainly possible to devise systems in which the CODA protocol does not find the global minimum, all indications are that the solutions found in the main text are indeed global minima. In principle, one could better ensure global optimization for these systems by implementing a version of CODA that uses a basin-hopping protocol to sample across several local minima.

## APPENDIX B: SIMULATION DETAILS

We perform semiclassical Thomas-Fermi calculations [40] using the COMSOL Multiphysics software package to solve a nonlinear Poisson equation in three dimensions. We use zero-field boundary conditions on all sides of the simulated domain, with the exception of the bottom of the SiGe buffer, which is grounded. We assume the following heterostructure profile for all the modeled devices. This profile is consistent with the accumulation-mode devices described in Refs. [47] and [48]: 200 nm of  $\text{Si}_{0.7}\text{Ge}_{0.3}$  (with dielectric constant  $\varepsilon = 13.19$ ), a 10-nm Si quantum well ( $\varepsilon = 11.7$ ), 30 nm of  $\text{Si}_{0.7}\text{Ge}_{0.3}$ , 10 nm of  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$  ( $\varepsilon = 9.0$ ), a 10-nm layer of metallic electrodes embedded in the dielectric, 80 nm of  $\text{Al}_2\text{O}_3$ , and a second 10-nm layer of metallic electrodes, followed by vacuum. Midway within the Si quantum well, we define a plane of

charge, with the charge density given by

$$\sigma_{2\text{D}}(x, y) = -2 \times 2 \times \frac{em_{\text{eff}}(U(x, y) + E_F)}{2\pi\hbar^2} \times \theta(U(x, y) + E_F), \quad (\text{B1})$$

where  $e$  is the charge of an electron,  $m_{\text{eff}} = 0.19 m_{\text{electron}}$  is the transverse effective mass of a conduction electron in silicon,  $U(x, y)$  is the strength of the electrostatic potential energy as a function of the position,  $E_F$  is the Fermi energy (which we take to be at ground), and  $\theta(x)$  is the step function. The two prefactors account for the spin and valley degeneracies.

The dot occupations are calculated via integrating the charge density found with the Thomas-Fermi approximation. Transmission coefficients between dots are calculated by finding the center of charge of each dot and applying the WKB approximation [41] across a straight line connecting the two charge centers. Orbital dot energies are calculated via a 2D finite-difference Schrödinger solver in the plane of charge, using the electrostatic confinement potential obtained from the Thomas-Fermi analysis and the transverse effective mass of a conduction electron in silicon.

Our CODA protocol requires all the components of the voltage vector to have the same units (and comparable magnitudes, for numerical stability). The quantities of interest considered in our simulations are electron occupations and tunnel barrier heights. When populating our vectors in the space  $\mathcal{Q}$ , we use the units of electron number for dot occupation, millielectronvolts for dot energy, and we take the logarithm of the transmission coefficient, divided by 1000, since tunnel couplings can vary by orders of magnitude as a function of the gate voltage. These units are chosen to ensure rapid convergence.

The details of the initial working point used in the analysis of the eight-dot device are given in the Supplemental Material [49]. The physical attributes are listed first. The dot occupations are expressed in electron numbers and the transmission coefficients are unitless. Voltages are given for each electrode, with the following labeling convention defined with respect to Fig. 1(g) of the main text. Beginning with the upper layer of electrodes, electrode 1 is in the lower-right corner of the schematic and the ordering proceeds clockwise. In the lower layer of gates, electrode 5 is in the lower-right corner and the ordering again proceeds clockwise.

Similar details for working points on the devices shown in Fig. 4 are given in the Supplemental Material [49]. The dot occupations are given in numbers of electrons, the transmission coefficients are scaled as before, and the dot orbital energies are given in millielectronvolts. Here, the labeling convention for the electrodes begins with the upper layer at the electrode in the upper-right corner of the schematic and proceeds clockwise. On the lower layer



of electrodes, the labeling begins at the electrode in the upper-left corner and proceeds clockwise.

### APPENDIX C: TUNNEL RATES AND TRANSMISSION COEFFICIENTS

Following Ref. [50], one can derive that the tunnel coupling  $\Delta$  between two one-dimensional simple harmonic oscillators with frequencies  $\omega_1$  and  $\omega_2$  is approximately

$$\Delta \approx \frac{1}{2\pi} T_{\text{WKB}} \hbar \sqrt{\omega_1 \omega_2}, \quad (\text{C1})$$

where  $T_{\text{WKB}}$  is the transmission coefficient calculated via the WKB approximation. For quantum dots with orbital energies of approximately 1 meV, a transmission coefficient of 0.01 corresponds to a tunnel coupling of  $\Delta \approx 1.6 \mu\text{eV}$  or a tunnel rate of  $\Delta/h \approx 400$  MHz.

- 
- [1] R. Hanson, L. P. Kouwenhoven, J. R. Petta, S. Tarucha, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, Spins in few-electron quantum dots, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **79**, 1217 (2007).
- [2] F. A. Zwanenburg, A. S. Dzurak, A. Morello, M. Y. Simmons, L. C. L. Hollenberg, G. Klimeck, S. Rogge, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, Silicon quantum electronics, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **85**, 961 (2013).
- [3] D. Loss and D. P. DiVincenzo, Quantum computation with quantum dots, *Phys. Rev. A* **57**, 120 (1998).
- [4] K. D. Petersson, J. R. Petta, H. Lu, and A. C. Gossard, Quantum Coherence in a One-Electron Semiconductor Charge Qubit, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **105**, 246804 (2010).
- [5] O. E. Dial, M. D. Shulman, S. P. Harvey, H. Bluhm, V. Umansky, and A. Yacoby, Charge Noise Spectroscopy Using Coherent Exchange Oscillations in a Singlet-Triplet Qubit, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **110**, 146804 (2013).
- [6] G. Cao, H.-O. Li, G.-D. Yu, B.-C. Wang, B.-B. Chen, X.-X. Song, M. Xiao, G.-C. Guo, H.-W. Jiang, X. Hu, and G.-P. Guo, Tunable Hybrid Qubit in a GaAs Double Quantum Dot, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 086801 (2016).
- [7] F. Martins, F. K. Malinowski, P. D. Nissen, E. Barnes, S. Fallahi, G. C. Gardner, M. J. Manfra, C. M. Marcus, and F. Kueemeth, Noise Suppression Using Symmetric Exchange Gates in Spin Qubits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 116801 (2016).
- [8] D. Kim, Z. Shi, C. B. Simmons, D. R. Ward, J. R. Prance, T. S. Koh, J. K. Gamble, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, Quantum control and process tomography of a semiconductor quantum dot hybrid qubit, *Nature* **511**, 70 (2014).
- [9] D. Kim, D. R. Ward, C. B. Simmons, J. K. Gamble, R. Blume-Kohout, E. Nielsen, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, Microwave-driven coherent operation of a semiconductor quantum dot charge qubit, *Nature Nano.* **10**, 243 (2015).
- [10] M. D. Reed, B. M. Maune, R. W. Andrews, M. G. Borselli, K. Eng, M. P. Jura, A. A. Kiselev, T. D. Ladd, S. T. Merkel, I. Milosavljevic, E. J. Pritchett, M. T. Rakher, R. S. Ross, A. E. Schmitz, A. Smith, J. A. Wright, M. F. Gyure, and A. T. Hunter, Reduced Sensitivity to Charge Noise in Semiconductor Spin Qubits via Symmetric Operation, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **116**, 110402 (2016).
- [11] E. Kawakami, T. Jullien, P. Scarlino, D. R. Ward, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, V. V. Dobrovitski, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, M. A. Eriksson, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, Gate fidelity and coherence of an electron spin in an Si/SiGe quantum dot with micromagnet, *Proc. Nat. Acad. Sci. USA* **113**, 11738 (2016).
- [12] J. S. Schoenfeld, B. M. Freeman, and H. Jiang, Coherent manipulation of valley states at multiple charge configurations of a silicon quantum dot device, *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 64 (2017).
- [13] B. Thorgrimsson, D. Kim, Y.-C. Yang, L. W. Smith, C. B. Simmons, D. R. Ward, R. H. Foote, J. Corrigan, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, Extending the coherence of a quantum dot hybrid qubit, *NPJ Quantum. Inf.* **3**, 32 (2017).
- [14] J. Yoneda, K. Takeda, T. Otsuka, T. Nakajima, M. R. Delbecq, G. Allison, T. Honda, T. Koder, S. Oda, Y. Hoshi, N. Usami, K. M. Itoh, and S. Tarucha, A quantum-dot spin qubit with coherence limited by charge noise and fidelity higher than 99.9%, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **13**, 102 (2018).
- [15] N. Samkharadze, G. Zheng, N. Kalhor, D. Brousse, A. Sammak, U. C. Mendes, A. Blais, G. Scappucci, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, Strong spin-photon coupling in silicon, *Science* **359**, 1123 (2018).
- [16] X. Mi, M. Benito, S. Putz, D. M. Zajac, J. M. Taylor, G. Burkard, and J. R. Petta, A coherent spin-photon interface in silicon, *Nature* **555**, 599 (2018).
- [17] A. Crippa, R. Maurand, L. Bourdet, D. Kotekar-Patil, A. Amissé, X. Jehl, M. Sanquer, R. Laviéville, H. Bohuslavskiy, L. Hutin, S. Barraud, M. Vinet, Y.-M. Niquet, and S. De Franceschi, Electrical Spin Driving by g-Matrix Modulation in Spin-Orbit Qubits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 137702 (2018).
- [18] R. M. Jock, N. T. Jacobson, P. Harvey-Collard, A. M. Mounce, V. Srinivasa, D. R. Ward, J. Anderson, R. Manginell, J. R. Wendt, M. Rudolph, T. Pluym, J. K. Gamble, A. D. Baczewski, W. M. Witzel, and M. S. Carroll, A silicon metal-oxide-semiconductor electron spin-orbit qubit, *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 1768 (2018).
- [19] M. Veldhorst, C. H. Yang, J. C. C. Hwang, W. Huang, J. P. Dehollain, J. T. Muhonen, S. Simmons, A. Laucht, F. E. Hudson, K. M. Itoh, A. Morello, and A. S. Dzurak, A two-qubit logic gate in silicon, *Nature* **526**, 410 (2015).
- [20] J. M. Nichol, L. A. Orona, S. P. Harvey, S. Fallahi, G. C. Gardner, M. J. Manfra, and A. Yacoby, High-fidelity entangling gate for double-quantum-dot spin qubits, *NPJ Quantum. Inf.* **3**, 3 (2017).
- [21] D. M. Zajac, A. J. Sigillito, M. Russ, F. Borjans, J. M. Taylor, G. Burkard, and J. R. Petta, Resonantly driven CNOT gate for electron spins, *Science* **359**, 439 (2018).
- [22] T. F. Watson, S. G. J. Philips, E. Kawakami, D. R. Ward, P. Scarlino, M. Veldhorst, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, M. A. Eriksson, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, A programmable two-qubit quantum processor in silicon, *Nature* **555**, 633 (2018).

- [23] J. J. Pla, K. Y. Tan, J. P. Dehollain, W. H. Lim, J. J. L. Morton, D. N. Jamieson, A. S. Dzurak, and A. Morello, A single-atom electron spin qubit in silicon, *Nature* **489**, 541 (2012).
- [24] M. Fuechsle, J. A. Miwa, S. Mahapatra, H. Ryu, S. Lee, O. Warschkow, L. C. L. Hollenberg, G. Klimeck, and M. Y. Simmons, A single-atom transistor, *Nature Nano.* **7**, 242 (2012).
- [25] J. J. Pla, K. Y. Tan, J. P. Dehollain, W. H. Lim, J. J. Morton, F. A. Zwanenburg, D. N. Jamieson, A. S. Dzurak, and A. Morello, High-fidelity readout and control of a nuclear spin qubit in silicon, *Nature* **496**, 334 (2013).
- [26] R. H. Foote, D. R. Ward, J. R. Prance, J. K. Gamble, E. Nielsen, B. Thorgrimsson, D. E. Savage, A. L. Saraiva, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, Transport through an impurity tunnel coupled to a Si/SiGe quantum dot, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **107**, 103112 (2015).
- [27] T. F. Watson, B. Weber, M. G. House, H. Büch, and M. Y. Simmons, High-Fidelity Rapid Initialization and Read-Out of an Electron Spin via the Single Donor *D*- Charge State, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **115**, 166806 (2015).
- [28] A. Laucht, R. Kalra, S. Simmons, J. P. Dehollain, J. T. Muhonen, F. A. Mohiyaddin, S. Freer, F. E. Hudson, K. M. Itoh, D. N. Jamieson, J. C. McCallum, A. S. Dzurak, and A. Morello, A dressed spin qubit in silicon, *Nat. Nanotechnol.* **12**, 61 (2016).
- [29] T. F. Watson, B. Weber, Y.-L. Hsueh, L. C. L. Hollenberg, R. Rahman, and M. Y. Simmons, Atomically engineered electron spin lifetimes of 30 s in silicon, *Sci. Adv.* **3**, e1602811 (2017).
- [30] G. Tosi, F. A. Mohiyaddin, V. Schmitt, S. Tenberg, R. Rahman, G. Klimeck, and A. Morello, Silicon quantum processor with robust long-distance qubit couplings, *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 450 (2017).
- [31] P. Harvey-Collard, N. T. Jacobson, M. Rudolph, J. Dominguez, G. A. Ten Eyck, J. R. Wendt, T. Pluym, J. K. Gamble, M. P. Lilly, M. Pioro-Ladrière, and M. S. Carroll, Coherent coupling between a quantum dot and a donor in silicon, *Nat. Commun.* **8**, 1029 (2017).
- [32] M. A. Broome, S. K. Gorman, M. G. House, S. J. Hile, J. G. Keizer, D. Keith, C. D. Hill, T. F. Watson, W. J. Baker, L. C. L. Hollenberg, and M. Y. Simmons, Two-electron spin correlations in precision placed donors in silicon, *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 980 (2018).
- [33] T. A. Baart, P. T. Eendebak, C. Reichl, W. Wegscheider, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, Computer-automated tuning of semiconductor double quantum dots into the single-electron regime, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **108**, 213104 (2016).
- [34] C. J. van Diepen, P. T. Eendebak, B. T. Buijtenorp, U. Mukhopadhyay, T. Fujita, C. Reichl, W. Wegscheider, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, Automated tuning of inter-dot tunnel coupling in double quantum dots, *Appl. Phys. Lett.* **113**, 033101 (2018).
- [35] J. P. Zwolak, S. S. Kalantre, X. Wu, S. Ragole, and J. M. Taylor, QFLOW LITE dataset: A machine-learning approach to the charge states in quantum dot experiments, *PLoS ONE* **13**, 1 (2018).
- [36] E. J. Candès, J. K. Romberg, and T. Tao, Stable signal recovery from incomplete and inaccurate measurements, *Commun. Pure. Appl. Math.* **59**, 1207 (2006).
- [37] D. Donoho, Compressed sensing, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **52**, 1289 (2006).
- [38] B. K. Natarajan, Sparse approximate solutions to linear systems, *SIAM J. Comput.* **24**, 227 (1995).
- [39] S. Diamond and S. Boyd, CVXPY: A PYTHON-embedded modeling language for convex optimization, *J. Mach. Learn. Res.* **17**, 1 (2016).
- [40] M. Stopa, Quantum dot self-consistent electronic structure and the Coulomb blockade, *Phys. Rev. B* **54**, 13767 (1996).
- [41] R. Shankar, *Principles of Quantum Mechanics* (Springer, New York, 1994), 2nd ed.
- [42] T. B. Boykin, G. Klimeck, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, P. von Allmen, F. Oyafuso, and S. Lee, Valley splitting in low-density quantum-confined heterostructures studied using tight-binding models, *Phys. Rev. B* **70**, 165325 (2004).
- [43] J. H. Davies, *The Physics of Low-Dimensional Semiconductors: An Introduction* (Cambridge University Press, New York, 1997).
- [44] E. Jones, T. Oliphant, and P. Peterson *et al.*, SCIPY: Open source scientific tools for PYTHON (2001), <http://www.scipy.org/>.
- [45] D. R. Ward, D. Kim, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, R. H. Foote, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, State-conditional coherent charge qubit oscillations in a Si/SiGe quadruple quantum dot, *NPJ Quantum. Inf.* **2**, 16032 (2016).
- [46] C. G. Broyden, A class of methods for solving nonlinear simultaneous equations, *Math. Comp.* **19**, 577 (1965).
- [47] X. Wu, D. R. Ward, J. R. Prance, D. Kim, J. K. Gamble, R. T. Mohr, Z. Shi, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, and M. A. Eriksson, Two-axis control of a singlet-triplet qubit with an integrated micromagnet, *P. N. A. S.* **111**, 11938 (2014).
- [48] E. Kawakami, P. Scarlino, D. R. Ward, F. R. Braakman, D. E. Savage, M. G. Lagally, M. Friesen, S. N. Coppersmith, M. A. Eriksson, and L. M. K. Vandersypen, Electrical control of a long-lived spin qubit in a Si/SiGe quantum dot, *Nature Nano.* **9**, 666 (2014).
- [49] See the Supplemental Material at <http://link.aps.org/supplemental/10.1103/PhysRevApplied.11.024063> for details on the simulation of the eight-dot device (8DotDevice.txt) and on the series of triple-dot devices (TripleDot.txt).
- [50] L. Landau and E. Lifshitz, *Course of Theoretical Physics. Vol. 3: Quantum Mechanics. Non-relativistic Theory* (London, Pergamon, 1958), 3rd ed.