Alessandro Scala



Quantum Abstract Interpretation

Seminar for the Introduction to Quantum Computing course

Università di Pisa Dipartimento di Informatica

Roadmap

Preliminaries
 Density Matrix
 Reduced Density Matrix

2 Abstract Domain Abstraction and Concretization Functions



Introduction

As quantum computing advances, we would like to have some means to prove correctness properties on quantum programs, *especially* since quantum programming is counterintuitive.



The naive way to check properties of a program is to run it and observe its behaviour.



The naive way to check properties of a program is to run it and **observe** its behaviour.

We cannot observe the state of a quantum program!



The naive way to check properties of a program is to run it and **observe** its behaviour.

We cannot observe the state of a quantum program!

Could **simulation** on a classical machine solve this issue?



The naive way to check properties of a program is to run it and **observe** its behaviour.

We cannot observe the state of a quantum program!

Could **simulation** on a classical machine solve this issue?

No: exponential space and time cost.



$$n_{qubits}=1$$

$$|0\rangle\langle 0|$$

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

 $2^2 = 4$ complex numbers



$$n_{qubits}=2$$

$$|00\rangle \langle 00|$$

$$2^4 = 16$$
 complex numbers



$$n_{qubits} = 3$$

$$|000\rangle\,\langle000|$$

 $2^6 = 64$ complex numbers



$$n_{qubits} = 300$$

$$\left|0\right>^{\otimes_{300}}\left<0\right|^{\otimes_{300}}$$

?????



$$n_{qubits} = 300$$

$$\left|0\right>^{\otimes_{300}}\left<0\right|^{\otimes_{300}}$$

 $2^{600} = 41495155688809929585124078636911611510124462322424368$ 999956573296906528114129081463997070489471037942881978866113 007891823951510754117753078868748341139636870611818034015095 23685376

Bigger than the number of atoms in the universe.



The naive way to check properties of a program is to run it and **observe** its behaviour.

We cannot observe the state of a quantum program!

Could **simulation** on a classical machine solve this issue?

No: exponential space and time cost.



The naive way to check properties of a program is to run it and **observe** its behaviour.

We cannot observe the state of a quantum program!

Could **simulation** on a classical machine solve this issue?

No: exponential space and time cost.

Solution: abstract interpretation



Ingredients

- Abstract domain
 - Abstraction function
 - Concretization function
 - Abstract operations
- Assertions



Density Matrix

Instead of dealing with a state $|\phi\rangle$ in vector form, we use their density matrix:

$$\rho_{\phi} = |\phi\rangle \langle \phi|$$
 (For a pure state)

- positive semi-definite
- $Tr(\rho) = 1$
- projection $(P = P^{\dagger} = P^2)$



Density Matrix

Instead of dealing with a state $|\phi\rangle$ in vector form, we use their density matrix:

$$ho_{\phi} = \ket{\phi} \bra{\phi}$$
 (For a pure state)

- positive semi-definite
- $Tr(\rho) = 1$
- projection $(P = P^{\dagger} = P^2)$

Example:

$$\begin{split} |\beta_{00}\rangle &= \frac{|00\rangle + |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \\ \rho_{\beta_{00}} &= |\beta_{00}\rangle \langle \beta_{00}| = \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)(\langle 00| + \langle 11|) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}(|00\rangle \langle 00| + |00\rangle \langle 11| + |11\rangle \langle 00| + |11\rangle \langle 11|) \\ &= \frac{1}{2}\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{split}$$



Reduced Density Matrix

Suppose we have a composite quantum system $AB=A\otimes B$, and we want to focus our attention on a state $|\phi\rangle\in AB$ with respect to the subsystem A.

$$egin{aligned} A &= \mathbb{C}^{2^n} imes \mathbb{C}^{2^n} \ B &= \mathbb{C}^{2^m} imes \mathbb{C}^{2^m} \ AB &= (\mathbb{C}^{2^n} imes \mathbb{C}^{2^n}) \otimes (\mathbb{C}^{2^m} imes \mathbb{C}^{2^m}) \end{aligned}$$

$$Tr_{B}[\rho]:AB \to A$$
 $Tr_{A}[\rho]:AB \to B$ $Tr_{B}[\rho] = \sum_{v=0}^{2^{m}} (I_{A} \otimes \langle v|) \rho (I_{A} \otimes |v\rangle)$ $Tr_{A}[\rho] = \sum_{v=0}^{2^{n}} (\langle v| \otimes I_{B}) \rho (|v\rangle \otimes I_{B})$

$$\mathit{Tr}_{B}[
ho] = \sum_{v=0}^{2^{m}} (\mathit{I}_{A} \otimes \langle v |)
ho(\mathit{I}_{A} \otimes | v \rangle) \qquad
ho_{eta_{00}} = rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$\begin{split} Tr_{B}[\rho_{\beta_{00}}] = & (I_{2} \otimes \langle 0|) \rho_{\beta_{00}}(I_{2} \otimes |0\rangle) + (I_{2} \otimes \langle 1|) \rho_{\beta_{00}}(I_{2} \otimes |1\rangle) \\ = & \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + \\ & \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{split}$$



$$extit{Tr}_{B}[
ho] = \sum_{v=0}^{2^{m}} (I_{A} \otimes \langle v |)
ho(I_{A} \otimes | v
angle) \hspace{1cm}
ho_{eta_{00}} = rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$egin{aligned} Tr_B[
ho_{eta_{00}}] = & (I_2 \otimes \langle 0|)
ho_{eta_{00}}(I_2 \otimes |0
angle) + (I_2 \otimes \langle 1|)
ho_{eta_{00}}(I_2 \otimes |1
angle) \ = & rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$



$$\mathit{Tr}_{B}[
ho] = \sum_{v=0}^{2^{m}} (\mathit{I}_{A} \otimes \langle v |)
ho(\mathit{I}_{A} \otimes | v
angle) \qquad
ho_{eta_{00}} = rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$egin{aligned} Tr_B[
ho_{eta_{00}}] = & (I_2 \otimes \langle 0|)
ho_{eta_{00}}(I_2 \otimes |0
angle) + (I_2 \otimes \langle 1|)
ho_{eta_{00}}(I_2 \otimes |1
angle) \ = & rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \ = & rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \end{aligned}$$



$$\mathit{Tr}_{B}[
ho] = \sum_{v=0}^{2^{m}} (\mathit{I}_{A} \otimes \langle v |)
ho(\mathit{I}_{A} \otimes | v
angle) \qquad
ho_{eta_{00}} = rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

$$egin{aligned} Tr_B[
ho_{eta_0}] = & (I_2 \otimes \langle 0|)
ho_{eta_{00}}(I_2 \otimes |0
angle) + (I_2 \otimes \langle 1|)
ho_{eta_{00}}(I_2 \otimes |1
angle) \ = & rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} + rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \ = & rac{1}{2} egin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \ = & rac{|0
angle \langle 0| + |1
angle \langle 1|}{2} \end{aligned}$$



Loss of precision

Computing a reduced density matrix **discards information**!

$$\begin{split} \rho_{\beta_{00}} = & \frac{\left|00\right\rangle\left\langle00\right| + \left|00\right\rangle\left\langle11\right| + \left|11\right\rangle\left\langle00\right| + \left|11\right\rangle\left\langle11\right|}{2} & \text{(Pure state)} \\ \rho_{2} = & \frac{\left|00\right\rangle\left\langle00\right| + \left|01\right\rangle\left\langle01\right| + \left|10\right\rangle\left\langle10\right| + \left|11\right\rangle\left\langle11\right|}{4} & \text{(Mixed state)} \end{split}$$



Loss of precision

Computing a reduced density matrix discards information!

$$\begin{split} \rho_{\beta_{00}} = & \frac{\left|00\right\rangle\left\langle00\right| + \left|00\right\rangle\left\langle11\right| + \left|11\right\rangle\left\langle00\right| + \left|11\right\rangle\left\langle11\right|}{2} & \text{(Pure state)} \\ \rho_{2} = & \frac{\left|00\right\rangle\left\langle00\right| + \left|01\right\rangle\left\langle01\right| + \left|10\right\rangle\left\langle10\right| + \left|11\right\rangle\left\langle11\right|}{4} & \text{(Mixed state)} \end{split}$$

$$Tr_{B}[
ho_{eta_{00}}] = \frac{\ket{0}\bra{0} + \ket{1}\bra{1}}{2} = Tr_{B}[
ho_{2}]$$

The partial traces of two different initial states can be equal.

Moreover, for a state $\rho \in A \otimes B$, even if we know $Tr_B[\rho]$ and $Tr_A[\rho]$, we cannot uniquely determine ρ .



Abstract Domain

$$\mathcal{D} = \mathbb{C}^{2^n} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{2^n}, \quad S = (s_1, ..., s_m), \quad 1 \leq m \leq 2^n, \quad s_i \subseteq [n]$$

$$AbsDom(S) = \left\{ (P_{s_1}, ..., P_{s_m}) \mid P_{s_i} \text{ is a projection in } \mathbb{C}^{2^{\lfloor s_i \rfloor}} \otimes \mathbb{C}^{2^{\lfloor s_i \rfloor}} \right\}$$

Intuitively, given a tuple S of sets of gubits, an abstract state $\overline{\sigma} \in AbsDom(S)$ is a tuple of projections over those qubits.

Special case:

$$T = ([n]) \implies AbsDom(T) = \mathcal{D}$$



Fineness Relation

Let
$$S=(s_1,...,s_m)$$
 and $T=(t_1,...,t_m)$ (with $1\leq m\leq 2^n$), then:
$$\underbrace{S\unlhd \mathcal{T}}_{\text{"T is finer than S"}} \triangleq \forall i\in[m].\ s_i\subseteq t_i$$



Abstraction Function

$$lpha_{T o S}: AbsDom(T) o AbsDom(S) \ lpha_{T o S}(Q_{t_1}, ..., Q_{t_m}) = (P_{s_1}, ..., P_{s_m}) \ P_{s_i} = \bigcap_{t_i.\ s_i \subseteq t_J} supp(Tr_{t_j \setminus s_i} Q_{t_j})$$

