

# Approximate quantum cloning

The making of a quantum spy

Quantum Information Project report

Juan Torres

Francesco Zatelli

Yuning Zhang



# Contents

<b>1</b>	<b>Introduction</b>	<b>1</b>
<b>2</b>	<b>Approximate quantum cloning</b>	<b>3</b>
2.1	No-cloning theorem . . . . .	3
2.2	Universal quantum cloning machine . . . . .	3
2.2.1	Preparation of the state . . . . .	3
2.2.2	Copying process . . . . .	4
2.2.3	Single qubit fidelity . . . . .	5
2.3	Phase covariant quantum cloning machine . . . . .	6
2.4	Economical phase covariant quantum cloning machine . . . . .	9
2.5	Quantum cloning and quantum key distribution . . . . .	11
<b>3</b>	<b>Implementation</b>	<b>13</b>
3.1	Preparation of the input states . . . . .	13
3.2	Measurement of the fidelity of the copies . . . . .	13
3.3	Universal quantum cloning machine . . . . .	14
3.4	Phase covariant quantum cloning machine . . . . .	14
3.5	Economical phase covariant quantum cloning machine . . . . .	14
3.6	Readout calibration . . . . .	14
<b>4</b>	<b>Results</b>	<b>15</b>
4.1	Universal quantum cloning machine . . . . .	15
4.1.1	Sphere . . . . .	15
4.1.2	Equator . . . . .	15
4.1.3	BB84 states. . . . .	15
4.2	Phase covariant quantum cloning machine . . . . .	15
4.2.1	Sphere . . . . .	15
4.2.2	Equator . . . . .	16
4.2.3	BB84 states. . . . .	16
4.3	Economical phase covariant quantum cloning machine . . . . .	16
4.3.1	Sphere . . . . .	16
4.3.2	Equator . . . . .	16
4.3.3	BB84 states. . . . .	16
<b>5</b>	<b>Conclusions</b>	<b>17</b>
	<b>Bibliography</b>	<b>19</b>



# Introduction

The no-cloning theorem is a fundamental result of quantum mechanics, which states that a generic quantum state can not be copied exactly [11]. However, imperfect cloning is not forbidden, as was observed by Bužek and Hillery in 1996, who first proposed an approximate quantum cloning machine (QCM) for qubits [2]. Such QCM produces two identical imperfect copies of an arbitrary input state, making use of an extra ancillary qubit. The quality of the copies is independent of the input state, therefore it is known as universal quantum cloning machine (UQCM). Other QCMs were then proposed, for example the phase-covariant quantum cloning machine (PCQCM), which optimally clones the states on an equator of the Bloch sphere [1]. Another category of quantum cloning machines is economical quantum cloning machines (EQCM), which do not use the extra ancillary qubit [8].

Quantum cloning is of particular interest in the context of quantum key distribution (QKD) [10]. The security of QKD protocols relies on the no-cloning theorem, therefore a QCM is a suitable means of attack. An eavesdropper could intercept the state that Alice is sending to Bob, clone it approximately and send the imperfect copy to Bob. Since, the copy is not exact, Alice and Bob would find some missing correlations after their measurements. Nonetheless, if the errors introduced by the QCM could be confused with generic noise and the eavesdropper could go unnoticed. **Thus, it is relevant to investigate how the set quantum cloning machines behaves in real devices for all possible single qubit states.**

In this project we have implemented an experimental realization of the universal, the phase-covariant and the economical phase-covariant QCMs on the quantum processors available via Quantum Inspire [9] and IBM Quantum Experience [7]. The purpose of the present work is to compare the performances of different backends with each other and with the theoretical expectations, addressing the question of whether current quantum computers could be used as QCMs, focusing in particular on their use for eavesdropping. We considered three different sets of input states in order to evaluate the QCMs: the whole Bloch sphere, the equator of the Bloch sphere in the  $xz$  plane and the BB84 states (i.e. the computational and the Hadamard basis). In each of these cases we have calculated the average fidelity of the two copies. Moreover, we also studied the results calibrating the readout.

The report is structured as follows: in Section 2 we introduce the afore-mentioned QCMs, in Section 3 we discuss the experimental setup with which we have implemented and tested them on real hardware, in Section 4 we examine the obtained results, in Section 5 we draw some conclusions and discuss possible further developments.



# 2

## Approximate quantum cloning

### 2.1. No-cloning theorem

It is a fundamental result of quantum mechanics that a generic quantum states can not be copied exactly.

### 2.2. Universal quantum cloning machine

It is well known that an arbitrary quantum state cannot be copied due to the unitarity of quantum mechanics. Nevertheless, there are several approaches to produce an imperfect quantum copy[1–3, 5]. Here, we discuss a well known approach for copying arbitrary quantum states with a maximum possible fidelity of  $F = 5/6$ . This fidelity was initially found to be a high fidelity for quantum copies[2]. Later studies[6, 10] found that this is the highest possible fidelity that can be achieved by a quantum copy machine.

Let us start by considering an arbitrary state,

$$|\Psi\rangle_{a_0} = \alpha |0\rangle_{a_0} + \beta |1\rangle_{a_0}. \quad (2.1)$$

We are interested in copy this state using the copy machine devised in Ref. [2]. For such purpose, we require two ancillary registers. The full quantum circuit corresponding to the UQCM contains two stages, as can be seen in Fig. ??.

#### 2.2.1. Preparation of the state

The first stage of the UQCM starts before interacting with the input qubit. The two bottom qubits are required to be in an arbitrary state,

$$|\phi\rangle_{a_1 b_1} = C_1 |00\rangle + C_2 |01\rangle + C_3 |10\rangle + C_4 |11\rangle. \quad (2.2)$$

For such purpose we use the circuit shown in Fig. ?? with an input state  $|00\rangle_{a_1 b_1}$ .

We analyse each stage of the preparation process. To simplify the notation used, we label  $|00\rangle_{a_1 b_1} = |00\rangle$ , where the qubit from left to right side is always  $a_1 b_1$ .

The rotation gate shown in Fig. ?? is defined as,

$$R_y(\theta) = \cos(\theta/2)\hat{I} - i\sin(\theta/2)\hat{Y} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta/2) & -\sin(\theta/2) \\ \sin(\theta/2) & \cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix}.$$




Figure 2.1: General circuit for the universal quantum cloning machine initially presented in Ref. [2].




Figure 2.2: Preparation stage of the circuit shown in Fig. ?? . Each step of the process is labeled.

The evolution of the ancilla qubits along each stage of the circuit is given by,

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\phi_0\rangle &= |00\rangle \\
 |\phi_1\rangle &= (\cos(\theta_1/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta_1/2)|1\rangle)|0\rangle \\
 |\phi_2\rangle &= \cos(\theta_1/2)|00\rangle + \sin(\theta_1/2)|11\rangle \\
 |\phi_3\rangle &= \cos(\theta_1/2)|0\rangle(\cos(\theta_2/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta_2/2)|1\rangle) + \sin(\theta_1/2)|1\rangle(-\sin(\theta_2/2)|0\rangle + \cos(\theta_2/2)|1\rangle) \\
 &= \cos(\theta_1/2)\cos(\theta_2/2)|00\rangle + \cos(\theta_1/2)\sin(\theta_2/2)|01\rangle \\
 &\quad - \sin(\theta_1/2)\sin(\theta_2/2)|10\rangle + \sin(\theta_1/2)\cos(\theta_2/2)|11\rangle \\
 |\phi_4\rangle &= \cos(\theta_1/2)\cos(\theta_2/2)|00\rangle + \cos(\theta_1/2)\sin(\theta_2/2)|11\rangle \\
 &\quad - \sin(\theta_1/2)\sin(\theta_2/2)|10\rangle + \sin(\theta_1/2)\cos(\theta_2/2)|01\rangle \\
 |\phi_5\rangle &= (\cos(\theta_3/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta_3/2)|1\rangle)(\cos(\theta_1/2)\cos(\theta_2/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta_1/2)\cos(\theta_2/2)|1\rangle) \\
 &\quad + (-\sin(\theta_3/2)|0\rangle + \cos(\theta_3/2)|1\rangle)(\cos(\theta_1/2)\sin(\theta_2/2)|1\rangle - \sin(\theta_1/2)\sin(\theta_2/2)|0\rangle)
 \end{aligned}$$

After these transformation, we can express it as an arbitrary two-qubit quantum state,

$$|\phi\rangle = C_1|00\rangle + C_2|01\rangle + C_3|10\rangle + C_4|11\rangle. \quad (2.3)$$

From which we can observe that the coefficients depend explicitly on the rotation angles as,

$$C_1 = \sin(\theta_1/2)\sin(\theta_2/2)\sin(\theta_3/2) + \cos(\theta_1/2)\cos(\theta_2/2)\cos(\theta_3/2) \quad (2.4)$$

$$C_2 = \sin(\theta_1/2)\cos(\theta_2/2)\cos(\theta_3/2) - \cos(\theta_1/2)\sin(\theta_2/2)\sin(\theta_3/2) \quad (2.5)$$

$$C_3 = \cos(\theta_1/2)\cos(\theta_2/2)\sin(\theta_3/2) - \sin(\theta_1/2)\sin(\theta_2/2)\cos(\theta_3/2) \quad (2.6)$$

$$C_4 = \sin(\theta_1/2)\cos(\theta_2/2)\sin(\theta_3/2) + \cos(\theta_1/2)\sin(\theta_2/2)\cos(\theta_3/2) \quad (2.7)$$

The angles used to produce an arbitrary state have been previously studied in Ref. [2? ]. The following angles were used for the preparation of the state given in Eq. (2.9), that is,

$$\cos(2\theta_1) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{5}}, \quad \cos(2\theta_2) = \frac{\sqrt{5}}{3}, \quad \cos(2\theta_3) = \frac{2}{\sqrt{5}}. \quad (2.8)$$

### 2.2.2. Copying process

The copying process can be described as controlled entanglement between the input and prepared qubits. Once the ancilla qubits are prepared in the desired input state, we proceed to apply the copy machine. The circuit corresponding to the copy process can be observed in the following circuit, where the prepared initial state and the input state that we consider are given respectively by,

$$|\phi\rangle_{a_1, b_1}^{(prep)} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(2|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |11\rangle), \quad |\psi\rangle_{a_0}^{(in)} = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle. \quad (2.9)$$

We consider that the input state of the copy machine is  $|\Psi_0\rangle = |\psi\rangle_{a_0}^{(in)} |\phi\rangle_{a_1, b_1}^{(prep)}$ . Then, it will transform in






Figure 2.3: Copying stage of the circuit shown in Fig. ???. Each step of the process is labeled.

each stage of the copy process as,

$$\begin{aligned}
 |\Psi_1\rangle &= \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{6}}|0\rangle(2|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |11\rangle) + \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{6}}|1\rangle(2|10\rangle + |11\rangle + |01\rangle) \\
 |\Psi_2\rangle &= \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{6}}|0\rangle(2|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |11\rangle) + \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{6}}|1\rangle(2|11\rangle + |10\rangle + |00\rangle) \\
 &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}(\alpha|000\rangle + \beta|111\rangle) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(\alpha|001\rangle + \alpha|011\rangle + \beta|110\rangle + \beta|100\rangle) \\
 |\Psi_3\rangle &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}(\alpha|000\rangle + \beta|011\rangle) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(\alpha|001\rangle + \alpha|111\rangle + \beta|010\rangle + \beta|100\rangle) \\
 |\Psi_4\rangle &= \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}(\alpha|000\rangle + \beta|111\rangle) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(\alpha|101\rangle + \alpha|011\rangle + \beta|010\rangle + \beta|100\rangle) \\
 &= \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\alpha|00\rangle + \beta\frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}(|10\rangle + |01\rangle)\right)|0\rangle + \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\beta|11\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{6}}\alpha(|10\rangle + |01\rangle)\right)|1\rangle.
 \end{aligned}$$

The final state, after the application of the copy machine, can be written as,

$$|\Psi\rangle = |\chi_0\rangle|0\rangle + |\chi_1\rangle|1\rangle = \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\alpha|00\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\beta|\Phi_+\rangle\right)|0\rangle + \left(\sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\beta|11\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\alpha|\Phi_+\rangle\right)|1\rangle, \quad (2.10)$$

where we have defined,

$$|\chi_0\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\alpha|00\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\beta|\Phi_+\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\alpha|00\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}\beta|01\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}\beta|10\rangle \quad (2.11)$$

$$|\chi_1\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\beta|11\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{3}}\alpha|\Phi_+\rangle = \sqrt{\frac{2}{3}}\beta|11\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}\alpha|01\rangle + \sqrt{\frac{1}{6}}\alpha|10\rangle. \quad (2.12)$$

Note that both  $|\chi_0\rangle$  and  $|\chi_1\rangle$  are invariant under exchange of the qubits. This implies that the density matrices associated to the copy and to the original qubit are identical,  $\rho_{a_0} = \rho_{a_1}$ . Then, when we calculate the fidelity of these qubits, they would retrieve the same result.

### 2.2.3. Single qubit fidelity

After performing the copying process, the input qubit is separated from the copying qubits and measured in a different laboratory. Thus, they can only have access to the partial system involving only the input qubit. To determine the properties of this qubit, we trace out the qubits associated to the copying process, and express the density matrix of the system only in terms of the input qubit. That is,




Figure 2.4: Circuit corresponding to the PCQCM shown in Ref. [5].

$$\begin{aligned}
 \rho_{a_0} &= \text{Tr}_{a_1} [|\chi_0\rangle\langle\chi_0| + |\chi_1\rangle\langle\chi_1|] = \text{Tr}_{a_1} [|\chi_0\rangle\langle\chi_0|] + \text{Tr}_{a_1} [|\chi_1\rangle\langle\chi_1|] \\
 &= \frac{2}{3}|\alpha|^2|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{6}|\beta|^2|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{6}|\beta|^2|1\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{1}{3}\alpha\beta^*|0\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{1}{3}\alpha^*\beta|1\rangle\langle 0| \\
 &\quad + \frac{2}{3}|\beta|^2|1\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{1}{6}|\alpha|^2|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{6}|\alpha|^2|1\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{1}{3}\alpha\beta^*|0\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{1}{3}\alpha^*\beta|1\rangle\langle 0| \\
 &= \frac{5}{6}|\alpha|^2|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{5}{6}|\beta|^2|1\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{1}{6}|\beta|^2|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{6}|\alpha|^2|1\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{2}{3}\alpha\beta^*|0\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{2}{3}\alpha^*\beta|1\rangle\langle 0| \\
 &= \frac{5}{6}|\alpha|^2|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{5}{6}|\beta|^2|1\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{5}{6}\alpha\beta^*|0\rangle\langle 1| + \frac{5}{6}\alpha^*\beta|1\rangle\langle 0| \\
 &\quad - \frac{1}{6}\alpha\beta^*|0\rangle\langle 1| - \frac{1}{6}\alpha^*\beta|1\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{6}|\beta|^2|0\rangle\langle 0| + \frac{1}{6}|\alpha|^2|1\rangle\langle 1| \\
 &= \frac{5}{6}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \frac{1}{6}|\psi_\perp\rangle\langle\psi_\perp|.
 \end{aligned}$$

Finally, the density matrix of the input qubit, or the first copying qubit, is given by,

$$\rho_{a_0} = \frac{5}{6}|\psi\rangle\langle\psi| + \frac{1}{6}|\psi_\perp\rangle\langle\psi_\perp| = \frac{1}{2}\left(\mathbf{1} + \frac{2}{3}\hat{m} \cdot \vec{\sigma}\right), \quad (2.13)$$

where  $|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$  is the input state aligned along  $\hat{m}$ , and  $|\psi_\perp\rangle = \beta^*|0\rangle - \alpha^*|1\rangle$  is its orthogonal state. Then, we calculate the fidelity of a pure state with a mixed state, which is given by,

$$F(|\psi\rangle, \rho) = \langle\psi|\rho|\psi\rangle. \quad (2.14)$$

In our case, the fidelity of the output copies is:

$$F(|\psi\rangle, \rho_{a_0}) = \langle\psi|\rho_{a_0}|\psi\rangle = \frac{5}{6} = F(|\psi\rangle, \rho_{a_1}). \quad (2.15)$$

This is the maximum possible fidelity that can be obtained when one tries to copy an arbitrary quantum state. The final state is the same for the input qubit, and for the first copying qubit. One can think of the copying process as the interaction of the input qubit with an environment modeled by the copying qubits. After the copying process, the initial information is evenly distributed between the environment and the input qubit. This copy machine makes copies that are aligned along the same direction as the input qubit, but their magnitude decreases by a factor 2/3 as shown in Ref. [10].

### 2.3. Phase covariant quantum cloning machine

The circuit for the phase covariant quantum cloning machine (PCQCM) proposed in [5] is similar to the one for the universal quantum cloning machine (UQCM), but the output copies are on the register of the ancillae:

The only significant difference is the preparation of the two ancillae. In this case, different angles of rotation are used. In order to optimally clone the states on the  $xz$  equator, the following angles have to be chosen:

$$\theta_1 = \theta_3 = \frac{\pi}{4}, \quad \theta_2 = 0.$$

Hence, the circuit above can be rewritten removing the rotation  $R_y(\theta_2)$ :




Figure 2.5: Circuit corresponding to the PCQCM shown in Ref. [5] including the simplification previously discussed.




Figure 2.6: Circuit corresponding to the PCQCM shown in Ref. [5] including the simplification previously discussed.

The first two CNOT gates in the circuit shown in Fig. ?? act as a SWAP gate since  $|0\rangle_{a_1}$  is the input state of the central qubit. Hence, these two CNOT gates are not necessary. It is possible to ignore them, provided that  $R_y(\theta_3)$  is moved to the second qubit. Since  $\theta_1 = \theta_3 = \theta = \frac{\pi}{4}$ , the final circuit is obtained

We have managed to greatly simplify the circuit. We have removed 5 CNOT gates from the circuit that we were using on real quantum processors with linear connectivity: the 2 CNOT gates mentioned here and the 3 CNOT gates that were necessary in order to implement the SWAP gate that was necessary to respect the connectivity constraints. With this new circuit, only the top qubit has to be able to connect to the other two qubits. As a final observation, since this circuit is much more simple than the one for the universal QCM, the average fidelity over the whole Bloch sphere could be greater in this case than with the universal QCM.

We will now show, step by step, that this circuit does clone states on the  $xz$ -equator. We consider a generic input state

$$|\psi\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle,$$

therefore the initial state of the full circuit is

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = |\psi\rangle_{a_0} |0\rangle_{a_1} |0\rangle_{a_2}.$$

Each ancilla, after the rotation, is

$$R_y(\pi/4)|0\rangle = \cos(\pi/8)|0\rangle - \sin(\pi/8)|1\rangle.$$

Hence, the two ancilla are prepared in the following state:

$$\begin{aligned} |\phi\rangle &= (\cos(\pi/8)|0\rangle + \sin(\pi/8)|1\rangle)(\cos(\pi/8)|0\rangle + \sin(\pi/8)|1\rangle) = \\ &= \cos^2(\pi/8)|00\rangle + \cos(\pi/8)\sin(\pi/8)(|01\rangle + |10\rangle) + \sin^2(\pi/8)|11\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Right before the CNOT gates, the state of the three qubits is:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_1\rangle &= (\cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle)(\cos(\pi/8)|0\rangle + \sin(\pi/8)|1\rangle)(\cos(\pi/8)|0\rangle + \sin(\pi/8)|1\rangle) = \\ &= \cos(\theta/2)\cos^2(\pi/8)|000\rangle + e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta/2)\cos^2(\pi/8)|100\rangle \\ &+ \cos(\theta/2)\sin(\pi/8)\cos(\pi/8)|010\rangle + e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta/2)\sin(\pi/8)\cos(\pi/8)|110\rangle \\ &+ \cos(\theta/2)\cos(\pi/8)\sin(\pi/8)|001\rangle + e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta/2)\cos(\pi/8)\sin(\pi/8)|101\rangle \\ &+ \cos(\theta/2)\sin^2(\pi/8)|011\rangle + e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta/2)\sin^2(\pi/8)|111\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

After applying the first two CNOT gates:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_2\rangle = & \cos(\theta/2) \cos^2(\pi/8) |000\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \cos^2(\pi/8) |111\rangle \\ & + \cos(\theta/2) \sin(\pi/8) \cos(\pi/8) |010\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \sin(\pi/8) \cos(\pi/8) |101\rangle \\ & + \cos(\theta/2) \cos(\pi/8) \sin(\pi/8) |001\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \cos(\pi/8) \sin(\pi/8) |110\rangle \\ & + \cos(\theta/2) \sin^2(\pi/8) |011\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \sin^2(\pi/8) |100\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

After applying the last two CNOT gates:

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_3\rangle = & \cos(\theta/2) \cos^2(\pi/8) |000\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \cos^2(\pi/8) |111\rangle \\ & + \cos(\theta/2) \sin(\pi/8) \cos(\pi/8) |110\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \sin(\pi/8) \cos(\pi/8) |001\rangle \\ & + \cos(\theta/2) \cos(\pi/8) \sin(\pi/8) |101\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \cos(\pi/8) \sin(\pi/8) |010\rangle \\ & + \cos(\theta/2) \sin^2(\pi/8) |011\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \sin^2(\pi/8) |100\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The above state is invariant under the exchange of the second and third qubits, where the copies are made. This means that the single qubit states of the two copies are the same, i.e.:

$$\rho_{a_1} = \rho_{a_2} \quad \text{where} \quad \rho_{a_1} = \text{Tr}_{a_0, a_2} [|\Psi_3\rangle\langle\Psi_3|], \quad \rho_{a_2} = \text{Tr}_{a_0, a_1} [|\Psi_3\rangle\langle\Psi_3|]$$

In order to calculate the expected fidelity of the copies (we will consider the copy  $\rho_{a_1}$ ), we first isolate the qubits  $a_0$  and  $a_2$ :

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_3\rangle = & |0\rangle \left( \cos(\theta/2) \cos^2(\pi/8) |0\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \cos(\pi/8) \sin(\pi/8) |1\rangle \right) |0\rangle \\ & + |0\rangle \left( e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \sin(\pi/8) \cos(\pi/8) |0\rangle + \cos(\theta/2) \sin^2(\pi/8) |1\rangle \right) |1\rangle \\ & + |1\rangle \left( e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \sin^2(\pi/8) |0\rangle + \cos(\theta/2) \sin(\pi/8) \cos(\pi/8) |1\rangle \right) |0\rangle \\ & + |1\rangle \left( \cos(\theta/2) \cos(\pi/8) \sin(\pi/8) |0\rangle + e^{i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \cos^2(\pi/8) |1\rangle \right) |1\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

The single copy fidelity is then ( $\theta$  and  $\phi$  are the angles on the Bloch sphere of the input state):

$$\begin{aligned} F(\theta, \phi) = & \langle \psi | \rho_{a_1} | \psi \rangle = \langle \psi | \text{Tr}_{a_0, a_2} [|\Psi_3\rangle\langle\Psi_3|] | \psi \rangle = \\ = & \left( \cos^2(\theta/2) \cos^2(\pi/8) + \sin^2(\theta/2) \cos(\pi/8) \sin(\pi/8) \right)^2 \\ & + \left| e^{i\phi} \cos(\theta/2) \sin(\theta/2) \sin(\pi/8) \cos(\pi/8) + e^{-i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \cos(\theta/2) \sin^2(\pi/8) \right|^2 \\ & + \left| e^{i\phi} \cos(\theta/2) \sin(\theta/2) \sin^2(\pi/8) + e^{-i\phi} \sin(\theta/2) \cos(\theta/2) \sin(\pi/8) \cos(\pi/8) \right|^2 \\ & + \left( \cos^2(\theta/2) \cos(\pi/8) \sin(\pi/8) + \sin^2(\theta/2) \cos^2(\pi/8) \right)^2. \end{aligned}$$

The fidelity can be computed analytically. The final result is:

$$F(\theta, \phi) = \frac{3(4 - \sqrt{2}) + (3\sqrt{2} - 4) [\cos(2\phi) + \cos(2\theta) (1 - \cos(2\phi))]}{16(2 - \sqrt{2})}.$$

It is possible to observe that if  $\phi = 0$  is set, the fidelity becomes a constant:

$$F(\theta, 0) = \frac{3(4 - \sqrt{2}) + (3\sqrt{2} - 4)}{16(2 - \sqrt{2})} = \frac{8}{16(2 - \sqrt{2})} = \frac{1}{2} \frac{2 + \sqrt{2}}{2} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}.$$

Therefore, for input states on the  $xz$ -equator, the fidelity of the PCQCM is:

$$F_{equator}^{ideal} = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} \approx 0.854 \quad (2.16)$$

As discussed in [1] this is the optimal fidelity for a PCQCM. Moreover, this is the optimal result attainable also when trying to maximize the fidelity for BB84 input states. Indeed, the optimization over the two different sets of output is equivalent and leads therefore to the same result [1].




Figure 2.7: Circuit corresponding to a controlled Hadamard gate.

It might be of some interest to consider the performances of the PCQCM over the whole Bloch sphere. The average fidelity over the Bloch sphere  $S$  is (integrating over solid angle):

$$\bar{F} = \frac{1}{\int_S d\Omega} \int_S F(\Omega) d\Omega = \frac{1}{4\pi} \int_0^{2\pi} \int_0^\pi F(\theta, \phi) \sin(\theta) d\theta d\phi = \frac{7 + 2\sqrt{2}}{12} \approx 0.819.$$

The standard deviation can be calculated similarly:

$$\sigma_F = \sqrt{\overline{F^2} - \bar{F}^2} = \frac{1}{6} \sqrt{\frac{3 - 2\sqrt{2}}{5}} \approx 0.031.$$

We conclude that when considering the PCQCM over the whole Bloch sphere, it is not too far from the optimal bound of the UQCM (which was  $F = 5/6 \approx 0.833$ ). This could have some interesting consequences: since we managed to greatly simplify its circuit, the PCQCM could turn to be better than the UQCM when using real hardware, in contrast with what is expected theoretically. A similar analysis was carried out in [4] in the context of economical QCM.

## 2.4. Economical phase covariant quantum cloning machine

Given 2 qubits, with the first  $B$  (Bob) to be the target and the second  $E$  (Eve) to be the copy, an economical quantum cloning machine (EQCM) can be defined by

$$\begin{aligned} U_c |00\rangle_{BE} &= |00\rangle_{BE} \\ U_c |10\rangle_{BE} &= \cos \alpha |10\rangle_{BE} + \sin \alpha |01\rangle_{BE} \end{aligned}$$

With target to be an equatorial state in the XY plane of Bloch sphere

$$|\psi\rangle_B = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}|1\rangle)$$

The fidelity would be

$$\begin{aligned} F_B &= \langle \psi_B | \text{tr}_E(\rho) | \psi_B \rangle = \frac{1 + \cos \alpha}{2} \\ F_E &= \langle \psi_E | \text{tr}_B(\rho) | \psi_E \rangle = \frac{1 + \sin \alpha}{2} \end{aligned}$$

By the definition of a quantum cloning machine, the post-copy states must preserve same fidelities where  $F_B = F_E$ , thus  $\sin \alpha = \cos \alpha$ . We acquire that  $\alpha = \pi/4$ , thus

$$F_{XY} = \frac{1 + \cos \pi/4}{2} \approx 0.8535$$

The unitary  $U_c$  can be implemented with a controlled-Hadamard gate and a controlled-NOT gate

The circuit can be easily verified

$$\begin{aligned} U_c |00\rangle &= \text{CNOT}_{EB} \text{CH}_{BE} |00\rangle_{BE} = |00\rangle_{BE} \\ U_c |10\rangle &= \text{CNOT}_{EB} \text{CH}_{BE} |10\rangle_{BE} \\ &= \text{CNOT}_{EB} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle + |11\rangle)_{BE} \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|10\rangle + |01\rangle)_{BE} \end{aligned}$$




Figure 2.8: Circuit corresponding to a controlled Hadamard gate in terms of single qubit gates and CNOT gates.

The controlled hadamard gate can be compiled into common-used quantum gates where

$$S = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & i \end{pmatrix}, \quad T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/4} \end{pmatrix}$$

As the name shows, the economical quantum cloning machine is designed to use 2 instead of 3 qubits, which limited its performance on the whole bloch sphere. The controlled-Hadamard gate can be write in matrix form by definition. With the CNOT gate known, we can write the unitary of cloning machine

$$CH_{BE} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \end{pmatrix}, \quad U_c = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Consider the generic input state to be copied

$$|\psi\rangle_B = \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle_B + e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle_B,$$

The post copied state is

$$|\Psi\rangle_{BE} = U_c(|\psi\rangle_B \otimes |0\rangle_E), \quad \rho_{BE} = |\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|_{BE} = \begin{pmatrix} \cos^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) & \frac{e^{-i\phi}\sin(\theta)}{2\sqrt{2}} & \frac{e^{-i\phi}\sin(\theta)}{2\sqrt{2}} & 0 \\ \frac{e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta)}{2\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{2}\sin^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) & \frac{1}{2}\sin^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) & 0 \\ \frac{e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta)}{2\sqrt{2}} & \frac{1}{2}\sin^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) & \frac{1}{2}\sin^2\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Then we have the fidelity

$$F(\theta, \phi) = \langle\psi_B|\text{tr}_E(\rho_{BE})|\psi_B\rangle = \frac{1}{8} \left( 2\cos(\theta) - (\sqrt{2}-1)\cos(2\theta) + \sqrt{2}+5 \right)$$

The fidelity is not related with  $\phi$  and it can be verified that on XY equator

$$F(\pi/2) = \frac{1}{4}(\sqrt{2}+2)$$

which is exactly what we expected. The fidelity is shown below

The global fidelity on the whole bloch sphere is

$$\bar{F} = \frac{1}{\int_S d\Omega} \int_S F(\Omega) d\Omega = \frac{1}{\pi} \int_0^\pi F(\theta, \phi) \sin(\theta) d\theta = \frac{1}{12} (2\sqrt{2}+7) \approx 0.819036$$

With the lowest fidelity occurs at  $F(\theta = \pi) = 1/2$ .

And the deviation

$$\sigma_F = \sqrt{\bar{F}^2 - F^2} = \frac{1}{12} \sqrt{\frac{1}{5} (27 - 8\sqrt{2})} \approx 0.147603$$

For the BB84 states on the XZ equator, we can use a  $R_x(-\pi/2)$  gate to rotate input state onto the XY equator and then rotate it back after copying. This modified EQCM could copy states on the XZ plane and thus can be used to attack a BB84 QKD protocol.




Figure 2.9: Fidelity of Economical Quantum Cloning Machine




Figure 2.10: Circuit corresponding to the rotations to measure in the Z basis.

## 2.5. Quantum cloning and quantum key distribution

NB: optimal cloning and optimal eavesdropping are different! When using the 3 qubit phase covariant QCM Eve also has the ancilla, which carries some additional information. See [10] "In summary: without ancilla, Eve can make the best possible guess on the bit sent by Alice (because the machine realizes the optimal phase-covariant cloning) but has very poor information about the result obtained by Bob. Adding the ancilla does not modify the estimation of Alice's bit but allows Eve to deterministically symmetrize her information on Alice and Bob's symbols. However, the two machines are equally good from the point of view of cloning."





# 3

## Implementation

### 3.1. Preparation of the input states

We have prepared a generic state on the Bloch sphere using the following two rotations:

$$|\psi\rangle = R_z(\phi)R_y(\theta)|0\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + e^{i\phi}\sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle,$$

where  $\theta$  is the polar angle and  $\phi$  is the azimuthal angle. For the preparation of an input state on the  $xz$ -equator, only the rotation about the  $y$  axis is needed:

$$|\psi\rangle = R_y(\theta)|0\rangle = \cos(\theta/2)|0\rangle + \sin(\theta/2)|1\rangle.$$

### 3.2. Measurement of the fidelity of the copies

The fidelity of the two copies can be measured directly. If the input state was  $|\psi\rangle$ , it is sufficient to perform a measurement in the  $\{|\psi\rangle, |\psi_\perp\rangle\}$  basis. The fidelity corresponds to the probability of measuring  $|\psi\rangle$ . Indeed, if the copies are  $\rho_{1,2}$  and their fidelities with respect to the input state are  $F_{1,2}$ :

$$p_{1,2}^\psi = \text{Tr}[|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|\rho_{1,2}] = \langle\psi|\rho_{1,2}|\psi\rangle = F_{1,2}.$$

Since  $|\psi\rangle$  was prepared with the rotation  $R_z(\phi)R_y(\theta)$ , it follows that a measurement in the  $\{|\psi\rangle, |\psi_\perp\rangle\}$  basis can be performed implementing the opposite rotation and then measuring in the computational basis.

It is worth mentioning that both the preparation and the fidelity measurement are not required in the normal use of QCMs, they are just a means of testing their performances. It should therefore be taken into account that the additional gates could decrease the quality of the copies because of the greater depth of the run circuits.

### 3.3. Universal quantum cloning machine

### 3.4. Phase covariant quantum cloning machine

### 3.5. Economical phase covariant quantum cloning machine

### 3.6. Readout calibration



Figure 3.1: Circuit corresponding to the preparation of any state in the Bloch sphere.

$$|0\rangle \longrightarrow \boxed{R_y(\theta)} \longrightarrow |\psi\rangle$$

Figure 3.2: Circuit corresponding to the preparation any state in the equator of the Bloch sphere.

$$\begin{array}{c}
 \rho_1 \longrightarrow \boxed{R_z(-\phi)} \longrightarrow \boxed{R_y(-\theta)} \longrightarrow \boxed{\text{Measurement}} \xrightarrow{|0\rangle, |1\rangle} p_0 = F_1 \\
 \rho_2 \longrightarrow \boxed{R_z(-\phi)} \longrightarrow \boxed{R_y(-\theta)} \longrightarrow \boxed{\text{Measurement}} \xrightarrow{|0\rangle, |1\rangle} p_0 = F_2
 \end{array}$$

Figure 3.3: Circuit corresponding to a measurement in the  $\{|\psi\rangle, |\psi_\perp\rangle\}$  basis.

# 4

## Results

NB: COMPARISON WITH OTHER EXPERIMENTAL RESULTS?

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/1909.03170.pdf> UQCM with gates (not peer-reviewed, but it has some review of modern experimental results)

<https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.88.187901> UQCM with NMR (bad results)

<https://science-sciencemag-org.tudelft.idm.oclc.org/content/296/5568/712> (photons)

<https://arxiv.org/pdf/quant-ph/0311010.pdf> economical phase covariant with NMR

### 4.1. Universal quantum cloning machine

#### 4.1.1. Sphere

#### 4.1.2. Equator

#### 4.1.3. BB84 states

### 4.2. Phase covariant quantum cloning machine

THIS RESULTS ARE TEMPORARY AND ARE GOING TO BE MODIFIED WITH THE UPDATED VERSION OF THE CODE.

#### 4.2.1. Sphere

Without readout correction:

	Starmon 5	Athens	Ourense	Santiago	Valencia	Vigo	Yorktown
$F_1$	0.759	0.779	0.812	0.770	0.805	0.782	0.779
$\sigma_{F_1}$	0.033	0.033	0.031	0.043	0.032	0.030	0.028
$F_2$	0.760	0.824	0.786	0.791	0.794	0.812	0.765
$\sigma_{F_2}$	0.038	0.031	0.034	0.043	0.034	0.036	0.009

With readout correction:

	Starmon 5	Athens	Ourense	Santiago	Valencia	Vigo	Yorktown
$F_1$	0.786	0.779	0.812	0.774	0.799	0.798	0.775
$\sigma_{F_1}$	0.034	0.034	0.033	0.045	0.035	0.036	0.030
$F_2$	0.767	0.823	0.788	0.802	0.787	0.812	0.763
$\sigma_{F_2}$	0.040	0.032	0.035	0.057	0.037	0.038	0.043

### 4.2.2. Equator

	Starmon 5	Athens	Ourense	Santiago	Valencia	Vigo	Yorktown
$F_1$	0.780	0.807	0.837	0.819	0.842	0.792	0.778
$\sigma_{F_1}$	0.029	0.017	0.007	0.008	0.014	0.019	0.045
$F_2$	0.785	0.850	0.815	0.817	0.823	0.838	0.758
$\sigma_{F_2}$	0.038	0.015	0.010	0.009	0.016	0.019	0.005

	Starmon 5	Athens	Ourense	Santiago	Valencia	Vigo	Yorktown
$F_1$	0.801	0.808	0.840	0.822	0.840	0.814	0.775
$\sigma_{F_1}$	0.032	0.017	0.008	0.009	0.015	0.023	0.047
$F_2$	0.791	0.848	0.818	0.815	0.822	0.841	0.778
$\sigma_{F_2}$	0.040	0.015	0.010	0.010	0.019	0.020	0.024

### 4.2.3. BB84 states

	Starmon 5	Athens	Ourense	Santiago	Valencia	Vigo	Yorktown
$F_1$	0.787	0.808	0.834	0.789	0.840	0.76	0.76
$\sigma_{F_1}$	0.037	0.013	0.009	0.010	0.007	0.03	0.02
$F_2$	0.790	0.848	0.820	0.835	0.824	0.75	0.76
$\sigma_{F_2}$	0.029	0.015	0.011	0.004	0.012	0.03	0.02

	Starmon 5	Athens	Ourense	Santiago	Valencia	Vigo	Yorktown
$F_1$	0.809	0.807	0.836	0.793	0.6	0.76	0.76
$\sigma_{F_1}$	0.041	0.013	0.009	0.011	0.2	0.03	0.02
$F_2$	0.796	0.847	0.822	0.834	0.6	0.75	0.76
$\sigma_{F_2}$	0.031	0.015	0.012	0.004	0.2	0.03	0.02

## 4.3. Economical phase covariant quantum cloning machine

### 4.3.1. Sphere

### 4.3.2. Equator

### 4.3.3. BB84 states

# 5

## Conclusions

More backends with different technologies.



# Bibliography

- [1] Dagmar Bruß, Mirko Cinchetti, G. Mauro D'Ariano, and Chiara Macchiavello. Phase-covariant quantum cloning. *Phys. Rev. A*, 62:012302, Jun 2000. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.62.012302. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.62.012302>.
- [2] V. Bužek and M. Hillery. Quantum copying: Beyond the no-cloning theorem. *Phys. Rev. A*, 54:1844–1852, Sep 1996. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.54.1844. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.54.1844>.
- [3] V Bužek and Mark Hillery. Universal optimal cloning of qubits and quantum registers. In *NASA International Conference on Quantum Computing and Quantum Communications*, pages 235–246. Springer, 1998.
- [4] Thomas Durt and Jiangfeng Du. Characterization of low-cost one-to-two qubit cloning. *Phys. Rev. A*, 69:062316, Jun 2004. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.69.062316. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.69.062316>.
- [5] Heng Fan, Keiji Matsumoto, Xiang-Bin Wang, and Miki Wadati. Quantum cloning machines for equatorial qubits. *Phys. Rev. A*, 65:012304, Dec 2001. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.65.012304. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.65.012304>.
- [6] N Gisin. Quantum cloning without signaling. *Physics Letters A*, 242(1-2):1–3, May 1998. doi: 10.1016/s0375-9601(98)00170-4. URL [https://doi.org/10.1016/s0375-9601\(98\)00170-4](https://doi.org/10.1016/s0375-9601(98)00170-4).
- [7] IBM. IBM Quantum Experience. URL <https://quantum-computing.ibm.com>.
- [8] Chi-Sheng Niu and Robert B. Griffiths. Two-qubit copying machine for economical quantum eavesdropping. *Phys. Rev. A*, 60:2764–2776, Oct 1999. doi: 10.1103/PhysRevA.60.2764. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevA.60.2764>.
- [9] QuTech. Quantum Inspire Home. URL <https://www.quantum-inspire.com>.
- [10] Valerio Scarani, Sofyan Iblisdir, Nicolas Gisin, and Antonio Acín. Quantum cloning. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 77:1225–1256, Nov 2005. doi: 10.1103/RevModPhys.77.1225. URL <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/RevModPhys.77.1225>.
- [11] W. K. Wootters and W. H. Zurek. A single quantum cannot be cloned. *Nature*, 299(5886):802–803, Oct 1982. ISSN 1476-4687. doi: 10.1038/299802a0. URL <https://doi.org/10.1038/299802a0>.