EPFL : CERN openlab

#### INTRODUCTION

**Earth observation**: often train with partially or unlabelled dataset

 $\rightarrow$  Highly benefit from generative models, including Generative Adversarial Networks (GAN)

On-going study on Quantum Machine Learning (QML) applied in Earth observation domain [1]

#### **OBJECTIVES**

- Inspired by Ref. [2], we test **Quantum Convolutional Neural Network** (QCNN) architecture on Earth observation images (EuroSAT dataset)
- Test QCNN as a binary classifier for real and fake data and as a multiclass classifier
- Based on the initial works, we ultimately aim to reproduce unlabelled Earth observation images using quantum generative adversarial networks

#### QUANTUM EMBEDDING

To encode classical data x as a quantum state  $|\psi(x)\rangle$ , we use **Hybrid Angle Encoding** (HAE) [2] with b blocks of m qubits:

$$|\psi(x)\rangle = \bigotimes_{k=1}^{b} |\psi_k(x)\rangle \tag{1}$$

$$|\psi_k(x)\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{2^m} \prod_{j=0}^{m-1} \cos^{1-i_j}(x_{g(j),k}) \sin^{i_j}(x_{g(j),k}) |i\rangle_k \quad (2)$$

where  $g(j) = 2^j + \sum_{\ell=0}^{j-1} i_\ell 2^\ell$  and  $|i\rangle = |i_0 \cdots i_m\rangle$  with  $i_j \in \{0, 1\}.$ 



Figure 1: Quantum circuit to embed a classical data as a 4qubits quantum state with the equation

**Pros**: 1. Able to get x back from the probability distribution (unlike dense qubit encoding). 2. Good qubit-gate compromise (between the two extremes of qubit and amplitude encodings)

**Cons**: Increase in circuit complexity (two-qubit gates number)

# **QMLFOR EARTH OBSERVATION IMAGES**

SU YEON CHANG<sup>1,2</sup>, BERTRAND LE SAUX<sup>3</sup>, SOFIA VALLECORSA<sup>1</sup>, MICHELE GROSSI<sup>1</sup> <sup>1</sup> CERN, Openlab, <sup>2</sup> EPFL, Department of Physics, <sup>3</sup> European Space Agency,  $\Phi$ -lab

## QUANTUM CNN

The convolutional circuits that we tested are taken from Ref. [2]

 Convolutional Filters - Parameterized Quantum Circuits (PQC) with single-qubit and two-qubit operations.

$-R_x(\theta_1)-R_z(\theta_3)$	$R_z(\theta_5)$	•	$R_x( heta_7)$	$R_z(\theta_9)$
$-R_x(\theta_2) - R_z(\theta_4)$	•	$R_x( heta_6)$	$R_x( heta_8)$	$R_z(\theta_{10})$ –

(a)  $U_6$  (10 parameters)

$-U3(\theta_1,\theta_2,\theta_3)$	$- R_z(\theta_7)$	$\Theta$ $R_y(\theta_9)$	$\bullet U3(\theta_{10},\theta_{11},\theta_{12})$
$-U3(\theta_4, \theta_5, \theta_6)$	$\Theta$ $R_z(\theta_8)$	├	$\bigcup U3(\theta_{13},\theta_{14},\theta_{15})$

(b)  $U_{SU4}$  (15 parameters)

Figure 2: Examples of convolutional filters used for the study. Further details could be found in Ref. [2]

- Pooling PQC applied on two-qubits to reduce the two-qubit states to one-qubit states.
- Reduces the risk of barren plateau
- Version 1: Identical PQCs in a single layer  $\rightarrow$  Translational invariance
- Version 2: Different parameters in each convolutional filters  $\rightarrow$  increased model complexity and flexibility
- Study the influence of different gates on the model expressibility.

# **DIMENSIONALITY REDUCTION**

- Impossibility of original image size encoding (EuroSAT:  $64 \times 64 = 4096$  features)  $\rightarrow$  **Extract features** using classical methods:
  - 1. PCA
  - Autoencoder (keeps spatial 2. Convolutional structure)
- For this study, we reduce the images to N = 30features  $\rightarrow$  QCNN with 2 blocks of 4 qubits

#### REFERENCES

- A. Sebastianelli et al. On circuit-based hybrid quantum neural networks for remote sensing imagery classification, 2021.
- [2] T. Hur, L. Kim, and D. K. Park. Quantum convolutional neural network for classical data classification, 2021.

## **BINARY CLASSIFICATION**

1.000.95 0.90 ŭ 0.85 ₹ 0.80 0.75 $0.70^{-1}$ 

**Figure 3:** Influence of the choice of gates for a real-fake classification task on the EuroSAT dataset. The fake dataset is created by sampling randomly from a uniform distribution.

label

Figure 4: Confusion matrix obtained by binary classifications using PCA and  $U_6$  circuit. The classification is performed by taking successively couples of classes among 4 classes.







#### DISCUSSION

High Accuracy of real-fake binary classification  $\rightarrow$  Best result with **version2** + **autoencoder**  $\rightarrow$  Possibility to use QCNN as a discriminator in quantum GAN

Accuracy of binary classification varies depending on the classes  $(50\% \sim 97\%)$ 

High accuracy for multiclass classification of MNIST dataset (except for class 2), but more simulations and studys are required for EuroSAT dataset

# class classification. labels

Figure 6: Confusion matrix of 4-class classification for MNIST dataset with  $U_6$  circuit.



roSAT dataset with  $U_6$  circuit.

# **ONGOING RESEARCH**

We are planning to increase the input feature size and investigate other feature extraction methods and convolution filters to improve the classification accuracy. Ultimately, we aim to use QCNN as a generator in the quantum GAN to generate Earth observation images with a classical (hybrid model) or a quantum discriminator (quantum model). The inverse transform of the features will be essential in this case.



#### MULTICLASS

We perform L-class classification by measuring the probability distribution for  $\log_2(L)$  qubit and using categorical cross entropy.

ta Embedding	QCNN	
		$ \longrightarrow $

Figure 5: Schematic diagram of quantum circuit for four-

0.89	0.012	0.0041	0.095	- 0.
0	1	0.00088	0.0035	- 0.0
0.056	0.2	0.66	0.085	- 0.4
0.005	0.16	0.011	0.83	- 0.5
0	1	2	3	

Predicted labels



Predicted labels Figure 7: Confusion matrix of 4-class classification of Eu-