Workshop on Quantum Computation using IBM Q

Salvador E. Venegas-Andraca

Tecnológico de Monterrey, Escuela de Ingeniería y Ciencias





Table of Contents

Deutsch-Jozsa Algorithm







We're given a black box quantum computer known as an **oracle** that implements some function

$$f: \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$$





We're given a black box quantum computer known as an **oracle** that implements some function

$$f: \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$$

i.e. it takes n-digit binary values as input and produces either a 0 or a 1 as output for each such value. We are *promised* that the function is either **constant** (0 on all outputs or 1 on all outputs), or **balanced** (returns 1 for half of the input domain and 0 for the other half); the task is to determine if f is constant or balanced by using the oracle.





What is the meaning of $f: \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$? Let's see what happens when n=1:

$$f: \{0,1\}^{n=1} \to \{0,1\}$$
 means:

since
$$\{0,1\}^1 = \{0,1\},\$$

f can take the values:

$$f(0) = 0, f(0) = 1,$$
 $f(0) = 0, f(0) = 1$
 $f(1) = 0, f(1) = 1,$ $f(1) = 1, f(1) = 0$





Let's see what happens when n = 2:

$$f: \{0,1\}^{n=2} \to \{0,1\}$$
 means:

since
$$\{0,1\}^2 = \{(0,0), (0,1), (1,0), (1,1)\},\$$

f can take the values:

$$f(0,0) = 0, f(0,0) = 1,$$
 $f(0,0) = 0, f(0,0) = 1$
 $f(0,1) = 0, f(0,1) = 1,$ $f(0,1) = 1, f(0,1) = 0$
 $f(1,0) = 0, f(1,0) = 1,$ $f(1,0) = 0, f(1,0) = 1$
 $f(1,1) = 0, f(1,1) = 1,$ $f(1,1) = 0,$



et cetera



$$f:\{0,1\}^{n=3}\to\{0,1\} \text{ means:}$$
 since $\{0,1\}^3=\{(0,0,0),(0,0,1),\dots,(1,1,0),(1,1,1)\},$

f can take the values:

$$f(0,0,0) = 0, f(0,0,0) = 1, \dots \qquad f(0,0,0) = 0, f(0,0,0) = 1$$

$$f(0,0,1) = 0, f(0,0,1) = 1, \dots \qquad f(0,0,1) = 1, f(0,0,1) = 0$$

$$\vdots \qquad \qquad \vdots$$

$$f(1,1,0) = 0, f(1,1,0) = 1, \dots \qquad f(1,1,0) = 0, f(1,1,0) = 1$$

$$f(1,1,1) = 0, f(1,1,1) = 1, \dots \qquad f(1,1,1) = 1, f(1,1,1) = 0$$



et cetera



Remember: the task is to determine if f is **constant** or balanced.







Motivation

The Deutsch-Jozsa problem is specifically designed to be easy for a quantum algorithm and hard for any deterministic classical algorithm.





Motivation

The Deutsch-Jozsa problem is specifically designed to be easy for a quantum algorithm and hard for any deterministic classical algorithm.

The motivation is to show a black box problem that can be solved efficiently by a quantum computer with no error, whereas a deterministic classical computer would need a large number of queries to the black box to solve the problem.





For a conventional deterministic algorithm where n is the number of bits, $2^{n-1}+1$ evaluations of f will be required in the worst case.





For a conventional deterministic algorithm where n is the number of bits, $2^{n-1}+1$ evaluations of f will be required in the worst case.

To prove that f is **constant**, just over half the set of inputs must be evaluated and their outputs found to be identical (remembering that the function is *guaranteed* to be either balanced or constant, not somewhere in between).





$$f(0,0) = 0$$





$$f(0,0) = 0$$

 $f(0,1) = 0$





$$f(0,0) = 0$$

 $f(0,1) = 0$
 $f(1,0) = 0$





$$\begin{array}{rcl} f(0,0) & = & 0 \\ f(0,1) & = & 0 \\ f(1,0) & = & 0 \\ f(1,1) & = & 0 \end{array}$$





So, for n=2, we need $2^{2-1}+1=2+1=3$ evaluations of f to prove wheter or not f is constant. For example:

$$f(0,0) = 0$$

$$f(0,1) = 0$$

$$f(1,0) = 0$$

$$f(1,1) = 0$$

we knew, from the third step, that f is a **constant** function, since we were *promised* that f is either balanced or constant.





$$f(0,0) = 1$$





$$f(0,0) = 1$$

 $f(0,1) = 1$





$$f(0,0) = 1$$

 $f(0,1) = 1$
 $f(1,0) = 1$





$$f(0,0) = 1$$

 $f(0,1) = 1$
 $f(1,0) = 1$
 $f(1,1) = 1$





So, for n=2, we need $2^{2-1}+1=2+1=3$ evaluations of f to prove wheter or not f is constant. For example:

$$f(0,0) = 1$$

$$f(0,1) = 1$$

$$f(1,0) = 1$$

$$f(1,1) = 1$$

we knew, from the third step, that f is a **constant** function, since we were *promised* that f is either balanced or constant.





$$f(0,0) = 0$$





$$f(0,0) = 0$$

 $f(0,1) = 1$





$$f(0,0) = 0$$

 $f(0,1) = 1$
 $f(1,0) = 0$





$$f(0,0) = 0$$

$$f(0,1) = 1$$

$$f(1,0) = 0$$

$$f(1,1) = 1$$





The best case occurs where the function is balanced and the first two output values that happen to be selected are different. For example:

$$f(0,0) = 0$$

$$f(0,1) = 1$$

$$f(1,0) = 0$$

$$f(1,1) = 1$$

we knew, from the *second* step, that f is a **balanced** function, since we were *promised* that f is either balanced or constant. Tecnológico de Monterrey

$$f(0,0) = 1$$





$$f(0,0) = 1$$

 $f(0,1) = 0$





$$f(0,0) = 1$$

 $f(0,1) = 0$
 $f(1,0) = 1$





$$f(0,0) = 1$$

$$f(0,1) = 0$$

$$f(1,0) = 1$$

$$f(1,1) = 0$$





The same applies to the other f:

$$f(0,0) = 1$$

$$f(0,1) = 0$$

$$f(1,0) = 1$$

$$f(1,1) = 0$$

we knew, from the *second* step, that f is a **balanced** function, since we were *promised* that f is either balanced or constant.





$$f(0,0) = 0$$





$$f(0,0) = 0$$

$$f(0,1) = 0$$





$$f(0,0) = 0$$

 $f(0,1) = 0$
 $f(1,0) = 1$





$$f(0,0) = 0$$

$$f(0,1) = 0$$

$$f(1,0) = 1$$

$$f(1,1) = 1$$





Another example, *f*:

$$f(0,0) = 0$$

$$f(0,1) = 0$$

$$f(1,0) = 1$$

$$f(1,1) = 1$$

we found out until the *third* step, that f is a **balanced** function, since we were *promised* that f is either balanced or constant.





$$f(0,0) = 1$$





$$f(0,0) = 1$$

 $f(0,1) = 1$





$$f(0,0) = 1$$

 $f(0,1) = 1$
 $f(1,0) = 0$





$$f(0,0) = 1$$

$$f(0,1) = 1$$

$$f(1,0) = 0$$

$$f(1,1) = 0$$





One final example, f:

$$f(0,0) = 1$$

$$f(0,1) = 1$$

$$f(1,0) = 0$$

$$f(1,1) = 0$$

we found out until the *third* step, that f is a **balanced** function, since we were *promised* that f is either balanced or constant.





For a conventional **randomized** algorithm, a constant k evaluations of the function suffices to produce the correct answer with a high probability (failing with a probability $\epsilon \leq 1/2^{k-1}$). However, $k=2^{n-1}+1$ evaluations are still required if we want an answer that is *always* correct.





The oracle computing f(x) from x has to be a quantum oracle which doesn't decohere x. It also mustn't leave any copy of x lying around at the end of the oracle call.







The oracle computing f(x) from x has to be a quantum oracle which doesn't decohere x. It also mustn't leave any copy of x lying around at the end of the oracle call.

The algorithm begins with the n+1 bit state $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}|1\rangle$. That is, the first n bits are each in the state $|0\rangle$ and the final bit is $|1\rangle$. A Hadamard transform is applied to each bit to obtain the state

$$H^{\oplus n}H(|0\rangle^{\oplus n}|1\rangle = (H^{\oplus n}|0\rangle^{\oplus n})(H|1\rangle)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}}\sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1}|x\rangle\right)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n+1}}}\sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1}|x\rangle(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$$





Let's try this procedure with n=2 and a function f that is balanced of the form

$$f(0,0) = 0$$

$$f(0,1) = 0$$

$$f(1,0) = 1$$

$$f(1,1) = 1$$





$$H^{\oplus 2}H(|0\rangle^{\oplus 2}|1\rangle = (H^{\oplus 2}|0\rangle^{\oplus 2})(H|1\rangle)$$

$$= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^2}}\sum_{x=0}^{2^2-1}|x\rangle\right)\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)\right)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}\sum_{x=0}^{3}|x\rangle(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$$





$$H^{\oplus 2}H(|0\rangle^{\oplus 2}|1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}(|00\rangle + |01\rangle + |10\rangle + |11\rangle) \otimes (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} (|000\rangle + |010\rangle + |100\rangle + |110\rangle - |000\rangle - |011\rangle - |101\rangle - |111\rangle)$$





We have the function f implemented as a quantum oracle. The oracle maps the state $|x\rangle\,|y\rangle$ to $|x\rangle\,|y\oplus f(x)\rangle$, where \oplus is addition modulo 2 (XOR function).





We have the function f implemented as a quantum oracle. The oracle maps the state $|x\rangle\,|y\rangle$ to $|x\rangle\,|y\oplus f(x)\rangle$, where \oplus is addition modulo 2 (XOR function). Applying the quantum oracle gives

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n+1}}} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} |x\rangle \left(|f(x)\rangle - |1 \oplus f(x)\rangle \right)$$





In our example, n=2

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^3}} \sum_{x=0}^{3} |x\rangle \left(|f(x)\rangle - |1 \oplus f(x)\rangle \right) =$$

thus,

$$\begin{split} &=\frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}(|00\rangle\otimes(|f(0,0)\rangle-|1\oplus f(0,0)\rangle)\\ &+|01\rangle\otimes(|f(0,1)\rangle-|1\oplus f(0,1)\rangle)\\ &+|10\rangle\otimes(|f(1,0)\rangle-|1\oplus f(1,0)\rangle)\\ &+|11\rangle\otimes(|f(1,1)\rangle-|1\oplus f(1,1)\rangle)) \end{split}$$





And, according to our definition of f:

$$\begin{split} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}} (|00\rangle \otimes (|0\rangle - |1 \oplus 0\rangle) \\ &+ |01\rangle \otimes (|0\rangle - |1 \oplus 0\rangle) \\ &+ |10\rangle \otimes (|1\rangle - |1 \oplus 1\rangle) \\ &+ |11\rangle \otimes (|1\rangle - |1 \oplus 1\rangle)) \end{split}$$





Finally, we apply the XOR function:

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}(|00\rangle \otimes (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$$

$$+ |01\rangle \otimes (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$$

$$+ |10\rangle \otimes (|1\rangle - |0\rangle)$$

$$+ |11\rangle \otimes (|1\rangle - |0\rangle))$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{8}}(|000\rangle - |001\rangle + |010\rangle - |011\rangle + |101\rangle - |100\rangle + |111\rangle - |110\rangle)$$





For each $x,\,f(x)$ is either 0 or 1. Testing these two possibilities, we see the above state is equal to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n+1}}} \sum_{x=0}^{2^{n}-1} (-1)^{f(x)} |x\rangle (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$$





For each x, f(x) is either 0 or 1. Testing these two possibilities, we see the above state is equal to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{n+1}}} \sum_{x=0}^{2^{n}-1} (-1)^{f(x)} |x\rangle (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$$

At this point the last qubit may be ignored.





In our case, ignoring the last qubit:

$$\frac{1}{2} \sum_{x=0}^{3} (-1)^{f(x)} |x\rangle |0\rangle = \frac{1}{2} ((-1)^{0} |00\rangle |0\rangle +$$

$$+ (-1)^{0} |01\rangle |0\rangle +$$

$$+ (-1)^{1} |10\rangle |0\rangle +$$

$$+ (-1)^{1} |11\rangle |0\rangle)$$

$$= \frac{1}{2} (|000\rangle + |010\rangle - |100\rangle - |110\rangle)$$





We apply a Hadamard transform to each qubit to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n - 1} (-1)^{f(x)} \left[\sum_{y=0}^{2^n - 1} (-1)^{x \cdot y} |y\rangle \right] = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{y=0}^{2^n - 1} \left[\sum_{x=0}^{2^n - 1} (-1)^{f(x)} (-1)^{x \cdot y} \right] |y\rangle$$





We apply a Hadamard transform to each qubit to obtain

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n - 1} (-1)^{f(x)} \left[\sum_{y=0}^{2^n - 1} (-1)^{x \cdot y} |y\rangle \right] = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{y=0}^{2^n - 1} \left[\sum_{x=0}^{2^n - 1} (-1)^{f(x)} (-1)^{x \cdot y} \right] |y\rangle$$

where $x \cdot y = x_0 y_0 \oplus x_1 y_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus x_{n-1} y_{n-1}$ is the sum of the bitwise product.





In the case of our example:

$$\frac{1}{4} \sum_{x=0}^{3} (-1)^{f(x)} \left[\sum_{y=0}^{3} (-1)^{x \cdot y} |y\rangle \right] = \frac{1}{4} \sum_{y=0}^{3} \left[\sum_{x=0}^{3} (-1)^{f(x)} (-1)^{x \cdot y} \right] |y\rangle$$





Finally we measure the probability of measuring $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$,

$$\left| \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n - 1} (-1)^{f(x)} \right|^2$$

which evaluates to 1 if f(x) is constant (constructive interference) and 0 if f(x) is balanced (destructive interference).



