



Università degli Studi di Camerino

SCUOLA DI SCIENZE E TECNOLOGIE

Corso di Laurea in Informatica (Classe L-31)

Systematic Taxonomy of Quantum Finite Automata: Bridging Classical and Quantum Computational Models

Laureando
Marta Musso

Matricola 122360

Relatore
Relatore Name

Correlatore
Correlatore Name

A.A. 2024/2025

Abstract

Quantum automata theory merges classical computational models with quantum mechanics to explore the capabilities and limitations of quantum systems. Despite its theoretical potential, the field remains fragmented by inconsistent notation, ambiguous model definitions, and a lack of systematic comparisons between classical and quantum finite automata (QFA). This thesis addresses these gaps by establishing a unified framework for analyzing classical and quantum finite automata, emphasizing standardized definitions, structural parallels, and rigorous computational property evaluations.

We first formalize classical finite automata—including deterministic (DFA), non-deterministic (NFA), probabilistic (PFA), and two-way variants—to establish foundational concepts. Building on this, we systematically catalog quantum finite automata models, categorizing one-way hybrids such as the one-way quantum finite automaton with classical states (1QFAC), two-way models such as the two-way quantum finite automaton (2QFA), and enhanced variants including the enhanced quantum finite automaton (EQFA) and quantum finite automaton with open time evolution (OT-QFA). For each model, we analyze formal definitions, computational dynamics, language acceptance criteria, expressive power, and closure properties, while contextualizing relationships through comparative studies.

By synthesizing results from foundational and contemporary literature, this work resolves ambiguities in prior formulations, such as quantum-classical state hybrids, and identifies open problems in equivalence checking, pumping lemma extensions, and quantum advantage thresholds. Key contributions include a hierarchical taxonomy of models, classifications of decidable vs. undecidable problems, and insights into size-space efficiency trade-offs. This thesis aims to serve as a foundational reference for researchers and provides a methodology to guide the development of new quantum automata models.

Keywords: Quantum automata, finite automata taxonomy, computational complexity, quantum-classical hybrids, formal language theory

Contents

1	Introduction	7
2	Background	11
2.1	Classical Finite Automata	12
2.1.1	Shared Foundations	12
2.1.2	Deterministic Finite Automata (DFA)	12
2.1.3	Nondeterministic Finite Automata (NFA)	13
2.1.4	Probabilistic Finite Automata (PFA)	13
2.1.5	Two-Way Finite Automata (2DFA, 2NFA, 2PFA)	13
2.1.6	Key Theorems	14
2.2	Quantum Mechanics Foundations	14
2.2.1	Qubits and Quantum States	14
2.2.2	Superposition and Entanglement	15
2.2.3	Quantum Gates and Circuits	15
2.2.4	Measurement and Probabilistic Outcomes	15
2.2.5	Decoherence and Open Systems	15
3	Literature Review	17
3.1	One-way QFAs	17
3.1.1	Standard Models	17
3.1.2	Hybrid Models	18
3.1.3	Enhanced Models	18
3.1.4	Advanced Variants	19
3.2	Two-way QFAs	19
3.2.1	Standard Models	19
3.2.2	Hybrid Models	20
3.2.3	Multihead/Tape Extensions	20
3.3	Interactive Quantum Automata	20
4	Conclusion	23

1. Introduction

The intersection of quantum mechanics and theoretical computer science has given rise to quantum computing, a field that reimagines computational paradigms through the lens of quantum phenomena such as superposition, entanglement, and measurement. At its core lies quantum automata theory, which seeks to understand how these principles redefine the boundaries of classical computation. Classical finite automata—deterministic (DFA), non-deterministic (NFA), probabilistic (PFA), and two-way variants—have long served as the bedrock of formal language theory, providing mathematically rigorous frameworks for analyzing computational complexity and decidability. Yet, quantum automata introduce probabilistic and non-deterministic behaviors that transcend classical limits, necessitating a coherent framework to classify and analyze their capabilities. This thesis emerges from the recognition that the current landscape of quantum automata theory is fragmented: definitions vary across papers, notations lack standardization, and comparisons between classical and quantum models remain scattered across disjointed works. By systematically unifying these elements, this thesis aims to bridge the conceptual gap between classical and quantum computational models, offering a structured lens through which their interaction can be rigorously studied [3].

The motivation for this work is two-fold: theoretical exploration and practical application. Theoretically, quantum automata represent the simplest quantum computational models, providing a sandbox to explore the interplay between quantum mechanics and computation. They challenge classical intuitions, for instance, how quantum parallelism enables certain QFA variants, such as the measure-many one-way quantum finite automaton (MM-1QFA), to recognize languages with exponentially fewer states than their classical counterparts [14]. Practically, as quantum hardware advances, understanding the minimal resources required to implement quantum automata becomes critical for designing efficient algorithms and error-correcting schemes. Yet, the field’s progress has been hindered by ambiguities in model definitions. For example, early quantum automata models like the measure-once (MO-1QFA) and MM-1QFA were defined with differing acceptance criteria, leading to confusion about their relative computational power [12]. Similarly, hybrid models such as the one-way quantum finite automaton with classical states (1QFAC) introduce classical memory components, complicating direct comparisons to purely quantum or classical automata [25]. These inconsistencies obscure the true capabilities of quantum models and hinder cross-disciplinary collaboration.

Central to this thesis is the observation that no single document systematically catalogs quantum automata models alongside their classical counterparts. Existing surveys, while valuable, often focus on specific subsets of models or lack the granularity needed to resolve nuanced differences in computational power, closure properties, or decidability. For instance, the expressive power of two-way quantum finite automata (2QFA)

surpasses that of classical two-way automata, yet the conditions under which this advantage manifests, such as the role of quantum interference in recognizing non-regular languages, remain underexplored in a comparative context [23]. In contrast, this work adopts a taxonomic approach, dissecting each model’s formal definition, acceptance criteria, and operational dynamics while contextualizing its position within the broader hierarchy of automata. This approach not only clarifies existing results, but also identifies gaps where further research is needed, such as the decidability of equivalence problems for quantum automata with mixed states or the precise trade-offs between quantum entanglement and space efficiency [10].

The research challenges addressed in this thesis are multifaceted. First, reconciling disparate notation and definitions requires a meticulous synthesis of foundational and contemporary literature. For example, the transition from unitary operations in MO-1QFA to superoperator-based transitions in open quantum systems (as seen in quantum finite automata with open time evolution, OT-QFA) requires a unified formalism to compare their computational behaviors [6]. Second, characterizing the relationships between classical and quantum models necessitates a framework that accounts for both their similarities (e.g., the ability of 1QFAC to simulate deterministic finite automata) and their divergences (e.g., the exponential state advantage of 2QFA over two-way probabilistic automata). Third, the absence of standardized pumping lemmas or minimization algorithms for quantum automata complicates efforts to classify their language recognition capabilities, a challenge this thesis tackles through comparative analysis of closure properties and equivalence criteria [1].

To address these challenges, this thesis employs a structured methodology. It begins by grounding the discussion in classical automata theory, revisiting deterministic (DFA), nondeterministic (NFA), probabilistic (PFA), and two-way variants to establish foundational concepts. Building on this, it systematically explores quantum models, from early variants such as MO-1QFA [14] and MM-1QFA [12] to advanced hybrids such as 1QFAC [25] and enhanced quantum finite automata (EQFA). Each model is analyzed through multiple dimensions: formal definitions are standardized, acceptance criteria are scrutinized, and computational dynamics—such as the role of measurement timing or quantum-classical state interactions—are dissected. By juxtaposing classical and quantum models across these dimensions, the thesis uncovers patterns in their expressive power, such as the ability of certain QFA variants to recognize non-regular languages with bounded error, a feat impossible for classical finite automata [3].

A key contribution of this work is its hierarchical taxonomy of automata models, which organizes classical and quantum automata into a coherent structure based on their computational features. This taxonomy reveals, for example, that two-way quantum automata (2QFA) occupy a higher complexity class than their one-way counterparts, while quantum automata with classical states (1QFAC) occupy an intermediate position, bridging purely quantum and classical models [23]. The taxonomy also highlights open problems, such as the precise relationship between quantum finite automata with ancilla qubits (A-QFA) and generalized quantum finite automata (gQFA), or the conditions under which quantum automata outperform probabilistic models in language recognition [10]. By mapping these relationships, the thesis provides a roadmap for future research on quantum advantage thresholds and the minimal resource requirements for quantum-enhanced computation.

The thesis is organized to guide the reader through increasingly complex layers of analysis. Following this introduction, Chapter 2 consolidates foundational concepts from classical automata theory and quantum mechanics, providing a unified back-

ground for subsequent discussions. Chapter 3 forms the core of the work, presenting a comprehensive catalog of quantum automata models. Each model is formally defined, analyzed for computational dynamics, and compared to classical and quantum alternatives. Chapter 4 synthesizes these analyses, evaluating expressive power, closure properties, and decidability between models. Finally, Chapter 5 concludes by reflecting on the thesis’s contributions and describing directions for future research, such as solving open questions in equivalence checking for quantum automata [13], extending pumping lemmas to quantum models [1], and developing minimization algorithms for hybrid automata.

In essence, this thesis seeks to transform quantum automata theory from a collection of isolated results into a cohesive framework. By standardizing definitions, clarifying model relationships, and identifying open challenges, it provides both a reference for researchers and a methodology for advancing the field. As quantum computing moves from theory to practice, such systematic foundations will be essential for harnessing the full potential of quantum-enhanced computation.

2. Background

The study of quantum automata theory necessitates a thorough grounding in both classical computational models and the quantum mechanical principles that redefine their capabilities. This chapter systematically establishes the conceptual foundation for analyzing quantum automata by first revisiting classical finite automata—the cornerstone of formal language theory—and then introducing the quantum mechanical framework that enables novel computational paradigms.

We begin with an in-depth exploration of classical finite automata, which serve as the theoretical bedrock for understanding computational limits and language recognition. Deterministic finite automata (DFAs), non-deterministic finite automata (NFAs), probabilistic finite automata (PFAs), and their two-way variants are analyzed through their formal definitions, operational dynamics, and closure properties. These models collectively define the boundaries of classical computation, particularly in recognizing regular languages and their limitations in handling context-free or stochastic languages. The analysis draws on foundational works such as Hopcroft et al. [11], which formalized the equivalence between DFAs and NFAs, and Rabin’s seminal work on probabilistic automata [20], which expanded the class of recognizable languages through probabilistic acceptance criteria.

The discourse then transitions to quantum mechanical principles essential for quantum computation. Key concepts such as qubit representation, quantum superposition, and entanglement are contextualized within computational frameworks, emphasizing their departure from classical bit-based processing. The measurement postulate and its implications for probabilistic outcomes are discussed in relation to quantum state collapse, a critical distinction from classical probabilistic models. These principles are synthesized with insights from Nielsen and Chuang’s definitive text on quantum computation [16], which provides the mathematical formalism for quantum operations.

The chapter’s structure is designed to mirror the hierarchical taxonomy developed in later chapters. By first rigorously defining classical models and their limitations, followed by an exposition of quantum principles and their computational implications, the groundwork is laid for analyzing hybrid models such as the one-way quantum finite automaton with classical states (1QFAC) [25]. Each section deliberately connects theoretical constructs to practical considerations, such as the role of decoherence in open quantum systems [9] and its impact on automata design. This approach ensures that subsequent discussions of quantum automata variants are rooted in both mathematical rigor and physical realizability.

2.1 Classical Finite Automata

Finite automata form the cornerstone of formal language theory, providing mathematical frameworks to analyze computational limits and language recognition capabilities. This section systematically examines deterministic, nondeterministic, probabilistic, and two-way variants, emphasizing their structural relationships and computational boundaries.

2.1.1 Shared Foundations

The study of automata begins with foundational concepts in formal language theory. An *alphabet* Σ is a finite set of symbols (e.g., $\Sigma = \{0, 1\}$), while a *string* w over Σ is a finite sequence of symbols with length $\|w\|$ [11]. The empty string ϵ has $\|\epsilon\| = 0$. A *language* L is a set of strings, i.e., $L \subseteq \Sigma^*$, where Σ^* denotes the Kleene closure—the set of all finite strings over Σ [11]. Key operations include:

- *Concatenation*: Combining strings u and v into uv .
- *Union/Intersection*: $L_1 \cup L_2$ and $L_1 \cap L_2$.
- *Kleene Star*: $L^* = \bigcup_{i=0}^{\infty} L^i$, where $L^0 = \{\epsilon\}$ [11].

Languages are categorized by recognition models:

- *Regular languages (REG)*: Recognized by DFAs, NFAs, or regular expressions [11].
- *Stochastic languages*: Recognized by probabilistic finite automata (PFAs) with bounded error [20].

Regular languages exhibit critical closure properties under union, intersection, complement, concatenation, and Kleene star [11]. These properties underpin decidability proofs and equivalence checks, forming the basis for analyzing quantum automata in later chapters.

2.1.2 Deterministic Finite Automata (DFA)

A DFA is a quintuple $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, where:

- Q : Finite set of states.
- Σ : Input alphabet.
- $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q$: Deterministic transition function.
- $q_0 \in Q$: Initial state.
- $F \subseteq Q$: Accepting states [11].

Computation proceeds deterministically: for input $w = a_1 a_2 \dots a_n$, the state evolves as $\delta(q_{i-1}, a_i) = q_i$ [11]. A string w is accepted if $\delta(q_0, w) \in F$. DFAs recognize precisely the regular languages, with expressive power strictly weaker than context-free languages [11].

Key properties include:

- *Minimization*: Hopcroft’s algorithm reduces DFAs to minimal form in $O(n \log n)$ time [11].
- *Emptiness Problem*: Decidable via reachability analysis from q_0 to F [11].
- *Pumping Lemma*: For any $L \in \text{REG}$, there exists p such that any $w \in L$ with $\|w\| \geq p$ can be decomposed as $w = xyz$ (with $\|xy\| \leq p$, $\|y\| \geq 1$) such that $xy^iz \in L$ for all $i \geq 0$ [11].

2.1.3 Nondeterministic Finite Automata (NFA)

NFAs generalize DFAs by allowing multiple transitions per input symbol. Formally, an NFA is a quintuple $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, where $\delta : Q \times (\Sigma \cup \{\epsilon\}) \rightarrow 2^Q$ enables ϵ -transitions and nondeterministic branching [11]. A string w is accepted if *any* computational path leads to F .

Despite apparent increased power, NFAs recognize the same class of languages as DFAs (REG) [11]. However, they can be exponentially more succinct: for example, an NFA recognizing $\{w \mid w \text{ contains } ab\}$ requires only 3 states, while the equivalent DFA requires $2^3 = 8$ states [11]. Subset construction converts an NFA with n states to a DFA with up to 2^n states [11].

NFAs inherit closure properties from DFAs but lack unique minimization—equivalence checks require conversion to DFAs [11].

2.1.4 Probabilistic Finite Automata (PFA)

PFAs introduce probabilistic transitions. A PFA is defined as $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, where $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \times Q \rightarrow [0, 1]$ specifies transition probabilities [20]. A string w is accepted if the probability of ending in F exceeds a threshold $\lambda \in [0, 1]$ [20].

PFAs recognize *stochastic languages* (a superset of REG), including non-regular languages like $L_{eq} = \{a^n b^n \mid n \geq 1\}$ with bounded error [20]. However, their computational power comes at a cost:

- *Emptiness Problem*: Undecidable—no algorithm can determine if $\Pr[\text{accept}] > 0$ [19].
- *Equivalence*: Undecidable for PFAs, unlike DFAs/NFAs [19].

These limitations highlight the trade-offs between expressiveness and decidability in probabilistic models.

2.1.5 Two-Way Finite Automata (2DFA, 2NFA, 2PFA)

Two-way automata extend finite automata with bidirectional tape heads. A 2DFA is defined as $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, where $\delta : Q \times \Sigma \rightarrow Q \times \{L, R\}$ governs state transitions and head movement [12]. Despite this added capability, 2DFAs recognize only REG, though they can achieve exponential state savings for certain languages [12].

Two-way probabilistic finite automata (2PFAs) significantly enhance power. For example, a 2PFA recognizes $L_{eq} = \{a^n b^n\}$ with bounded error in polynomial time, a feat impossible for one-way PFAs [12]. However, 2PFAs sacrifice decidability:

- *Emptiness Problem*: Undecidable due to probabilistic ambiguity [12].

- *Equivalence*: Undecidable for 2PFAs [12].

These models bridge classical and quantum automata, as their bidirectional access prefigures quantum interference effects in 2QFAs [3].

2.1.6 Key Theorems

1. *Kleene's Theorem*: A language is regular if and only if it is recognized by a DFA/NFA or described by a regular expression [11].
2. *Subset Construction Theorem*: Every NFA can be converted to an equivalent DFA, with up to 2^n states [11].
3. *Myhill-Nerode Theorem*: Characterizes REG via string indistinguishability, forming the basis for DFA minimization [11].
4. *Rabin's Theorem*: PFAs recognize stochastic languages, a strict superset of REG [20].
5. *Sipser's Theorem*: 2PFAs recognize REG in logarithmic space but require exponential time for non-regular languages [22].

These theorems collectively delineate the boundaries of classical finite automata, setting the stage for quantum extensions in subsequent chapters.

2.2 Quantum Mechanics Foundations

This section establishes the quantum mechanical principles underpinning quantum automata theory, emphasizing mathematical formalism and conceptual distinctions from classical systems. The discussion focuses on foundational postulates and their computational implications.

2.2.1 Qubits and Quantum States

A *qubit* is the quantum analog of a classical bit, represented by a unit vector in a two-dimensional complex Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^2$ [16]. The standard basis states are denoted:

$$|0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix},$$

with general qubit states expressed as:

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle, \quad |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1,$$

where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ are the probability amplitudes [16]. Geometrically, the qubit states correspond to points on the *Bloch sphere*:

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

parameterized by polar angles $\theta \in [0, \pi]$ and $\phi \in [0, 2\pi)$ [16]. Multi-qubit systems are described by tensor products, e.g., a two-qubit state:

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i,j \in \{0,1\}} \alpha_{ij} |i\rangle \otimes |j\rangle, \quad \sum_{i,j} |\alpha_{ij}|^2 = 1.$$

2.2.2 Superposition and Entanglement

Superposition allows qubits to exist in linear combinations of basis states, enabling parallel processing of multiple states [16]. For example, the Hadamard gate H creates superposition from classical states:

$$H|0\rangle = \frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad H|1\rangle = \frac{|0\rangle - |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

Entanglement arises when qubits exhibit non-classical correlations. The Bell state:

$$|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{|00\rangle + |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}},$$

cannot be factored into tensor products of individual qubit states, violating Bell's inequality and enabling quantum teleportation protocols [16]. Entanglement is a critical resource for quantum speedups in automata models like 2QFAs [3].

2.2.3 Quantum Gates and Circuits

Quantum operations are performed via *unitary transformations* U satisfying $U^\dagger U = I$. Common single-qubit gates include:

- Pauli-X: $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$ (bit flip).
- Hadamard: $H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$.
- Phase shift: $R_\phi = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi} \end{pmatrix}$.

Two-qubit gates, such as the controlled-NOT (CNOT):

$$\text{CNOT}|a\rangle|b\rangle = |a\rangle|a \oplus b\rangle,$$

enable entanglement generation [16]. Quantum circuits compose these gates to implement algorithms, with depth and width determining computational complexity.

2.2.4 Measurement and Probabilistic Outcomes

Measurement collapses a quantum state to a classical outcome. For an orthonormal basis $\{|i\rangle\}$, measuring $|\psi\rangle = \sum_i \alpha_i |i\rangle$ yields outcome i with probability $|\alpha_i|^2$ (Born rule) [16]. For example, measuring $|\Phi^+\rangle$ in the computational basis gives $|00\rangle$ or $|11\rangle$ with equal probability. Unlike classical randomness, measurement outcomes depend on the chosen basis, a feature exploited in quantum automata's acceptance criteria [14].

2.2.5 Decoherence and Open Systems

Real quantum systems interact with environments, causing *decoherence*—the loss of coherence in superposition states [9]. The Lindblad master equation models open system dynamics:

$$\frac{d\rho}{dt} = -\frac{i}{\hbar}[H, \rho] + \sum_k \left(L_k \rho L_k^\dagger - \frac{1}{2}\{L_k^\dagger L_k, \rho\} \right),$$

where ρ is the density matrix and L_k are Lindblad operators [9]. Decoherence limits quantum automata's operational timeframes, necessitating error correction or hybrid classical-quantum designs [25].

3. Literature Review

3.1 One-way QFAs

3.1.1 Standard Models

MO-1QFA (Measure-Once)

Definition: An MO-1QFA is defined as $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, where: - Q : Finite set of quantum basis states. - Σ : Input alphabet with end-marker $\#$. - δ : Transition function inducing unitary operators U_σ for $\sigma \in \Sigma$. - $q_0 \in Q$: Initial state. - $F \subseteq Q$: Accepting states [14].

Operation: Processes input sequentially with a single measurement at the end. The state evolves as $|\psi_i\rangle = U_{\sigma_i}|\psi_{i-1}\rangle$. Acceptance is determined by projecting onto F [14].

Key Features: - Recognizes a strict subset of regular languages (e.g., periodic languages) [5]. - Requires $O(n)$ states for languages like $L_{\text{mod}} = \{w \mid |w| \equiv 0 \pmod p\}$.

Limitations: - Cannot recognize non-regular languages like $L_{\text{eq}} = \{a^n b^n\}$.

MM-1QFA (Measure-Many)

Definition: An MM-1QFA is $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, Q_{\text{acc}}, Q_{\text{rej}}, Q_{\text{non}})$, where: - $Q_{\text{acc}}, Q_{\text{rej}}, Q_{\text{non}}$: Partitioned states for halting and continuation [12].

Operation: Measures after each symbol, halting if Q_{acc} or Q_{rej} is observed [12].

Key Features: - Recognizes non-regular languages (e.g., L_{eq}) with bounded error [12]. - Exponential state advantage over DFAs for certain languages [3].

Limitations: - Strictly less powerful than two-way QFAs [3].

LQFA (Latvian)

Definition: Combines unitary operations and projective measurements. Defined as $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, where transitions include measurements [2].

Operation: Applies unitary transformations followed by projective measurements at each step [2].

Key Features: - Recognizes a proper subset of MM-1QFA languages [2]. - Fails to recognize regular languages like $a\Sigma^*$.

Limitations: - Weaker closure properties compared to MM-1QFA [2].

3.1.2 Hybrid Models

1QFAC (Classical States)

Definition: $M = (S, Q, \Sigma, \delta, \mu, s_0, q_0, F)$, combining classical control S and quantum states Q [25].

Operation: Classical state s_i selects quantum operator $\mu(s_i, \sigma)$. Measurement occurs only at the end [25].

Key Features: - Recognizes all regular languages and some non-regular languages (e.g., L_{eq}) [25]. - Exponentially more succinct than DFAs for certain languages [8].

Limitations: - Requires careful error correction due to quantum-classical interaction [25].

CL-1QFA (Control Languages)

Definition: Uses control languages to guide measurements. Defined as $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, \mathcal{L})$, where \mathcal{L} specifies allowed measurement outcomes [7].

Operation: Applies unitary operations and projects onto subspaces dictated by \mathcal{L} [7].

Key Features: - Closed under Boolean operations [7]. - Recognizes regular languages with bounded error [7].

Limitations: - Complex control logic increases implementation overhead [7].

3.1.3 Enhanced Models

EQFA (Enhanced)

Definition: Uses ancilla qubits and arbitrary measurements. Defined as $M = (\Sigma, Q, \{U_\sigma\}, Q_{acc}, Q_{rej}, Q_{non}, q_0, F)$ [18].

Operation: Employs mixed states and non-unitary transitions for enhanced expressiveness [18].

Key Features: - Simulates all classical finite automata [18]. - Recognizes non-regular languages with unbounded error [15].

Limitations: - Irreversible operations complicate error analysis [15].

OT-QFA (Open-Time Evolution)

Definition: Incorporates environmental noise via Lindblad dynamics. Defined as $M = (\Sigma, Q, \mathcal{L}, q_0, F)$, where \mathcal{L} models decoherence [10].

Operation: State evolution governed by the Lindblad equation, with measurement at the end [10].

Key Features: - Generalizes MO-1QFA and MM-1QFA [10]. - Models realistic noisy systems [9].

Limitations: - Undecidable properties due to open-system dynamics [10].

A-QFA (Ancilla-Based)

Definition: Extends MO-1QFA with ancilla qubits. Defined as $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$ with an expanded Hilbert space [18].

Operation: Uses ancillae to simulate classical nondeterminism via quantum interference [18].

Key Features: - Recognizes all regular languages with certainty [18]. - Handles non-regular languages with one-sided error [18].

Limitations: - Ancilla management increases resource overhead [18].

3.1.4 Advanced Variants

1.5QFA (1.5-Way)

Definition: Allows limited head movement. Defined as $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, where δ restricts leftward motion [12].

Operation: Head moves right or remains stationary but cannot backtrack fully [12].

Key Features: - Recognizes non-regular languages with bounded error [12]. - Strictly more powerful than MO-1QFA [12].

Limitations: - Less powerful than 2QFA [12].

ML-QFA (Multi-Letter)

Definition: Reads k -symbol blocks. Defined as $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, F)$, where δ depends on k -length substrings [4].

Operation: Processes input in chunks, applying unitary operators for each block [4].

Key Features: - Simulates multi-head classical automata [4]. - Recognizes context-sensitive languages with bounded error [4].

Limitations: - State complexity grows exponentially with k [4].

3.2 Two-way QFAs

3.2.1 Standard Models

2QFA (Two-Way)

Definition: A 2QFA is defined as $M = (Q, \Sigma, \delta, q_0, Q_{\text{acc}}, Q_{\text{rej}})$, where: - Q : Finite set of quantum states partitioned into Q_{acc} , Q_{rej} , and Q_{non} . - Σ : Input alphabet with end-markers $\#$ (left) and $\$$ (right). - δ : Transition function defining unitary operators and head movements $\{\leftarrow, \rightarrow, \downarrow\}$ [12].

Operation: The head moves bidirectionally over the input tape. For input $w = \sigma_1\sigma_2\ldots\sigma_n$, the state evolves as $|\psi_i\rangle = U_{\sigma_i}|\psi_{i-1}\rangle$, with intermediate measurements allowed [12].

Key Features: - Recognizes non-regular languages (e.g., $L_{\text{eq}} = \{a^n b^n\}$) with bounded error in linear time [12]. - Solves the word problem for finitely generated groups [2].

Limitations: - Requires quantum registers scaling with input length, complicating physical implementation [2].

3.2.2 Hybrid Models

2QCFA (Classical States)

Definition: Combines classical control and quantum states. Defined as $M = (S, Q, \Sigma, \Theta, \delta, s_0, q_0, S_{\text{acc}}, S_{\text{rej}})$, where: - S : Classical states controlling transitions. - Q : Quantum states for superposition/mixed states [2].

Operation: Classical states S select quantum operations Θ , while δ governs head movement. Measurements occur adaptively based on classical control [2].

Key Features: - Recognizes L_{eq} and palindromes $L_{\text{pal}} = \{ww^R\}$ in polynomial time with constant quantum states [2]. - Simulates classical 2PFAs while recognizing non-regular languages [25].

Limitations: - Decidability of equivalence between 2QCFA remains open [25].

3.2.3 Multihead/Tape Extensions

2TQCFA (Two-Tape)

Definition: Extends 2QCFA with two tapes. Defined as $M = (S, Q, \Sigma_1 \times \Sigma_2, \Theta, \delta, s_0, q_0, S_{\text{acc}}, S_{\text{rej}})$, where: - Σ_1, Σ_2 : Input alphabets for two tapes. - δ : Governs synchronized head movements on both tapes [27].

Operation: Processes inputs on two tapes simultaneously, enabling verification of relationships like $L = \{a^n b^n c^n\}$ [27].

Key Features: - Recognizes languages beyond the capabilities of single-tape 2QFAs [27]. - Verifies non-context-free languages in polynomial time [27].

Limitations: - Increased complexity in synchronization and error correction [27].

kTQCFA (k-Tape)

Definition: Generalizes 2TQCFA to k tapes. Defined as $M = (S, Q, \times_{i=1}^k \Sigma_i, \Theta, \delta, s_0, q_0, S_{\text{acc}}, S_{\text{rej}})$ [27].

Operation: Coordinates k independent tapes for parallel processing, useful for multi-variable language recognition [27].

Key Features: - Recognizes $L = \{a^n b^{n^2}\}$ with $O(\log n)$ quantum states [27]. - Subsumes classical multi-tape automata in efficiency [27].

Limitations: - Practical implementation constrained by tape synchronization overhead [27].

3.3 Interactive Quantum Automata

QIP (Quantum Interactive Proofs)

Definition: A *Quantum Interactive Proof* (QIP) system involves a polynomial-time quantum verifier V interacting with an unbounded quantum prover P via a shared quantum channel. The verifier is modeled as a quantum finite automaton (QFA) with limited memory [26]. Formally, $\text{QIP}(k)$ denotes systems with k rounds of interaction [17].

Operation: The verifier processes input w through alternating rounds of quantum communication with the prover. For 1QFA/2QFA verifiers, transitions are governed

by:

$$\delta : Q \times \Sigma \times \Gamma \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{Q \times Q},$$

where Γ is the communication alphabet [26]. Acceptance is determined by measuring the verifier's final state.

Key Features: - QIP = PSPACE [[1], [2]], demonstrating equivalence to classical interactive proofs. - QFA-based verifiers (e.g., 2QFA) recognize languages beyond regular classes with bounded error [17]. - Two-message QIP systems (QIP(2)) are contained in PSPACE [button class="citation-flag" data-index="1"].

Limitations: - Requires precise control over quantum communication channels [26]. - Verifier's state complexity scales with input length for non-regular languages [17].

QMIP (Quantum Merlin-Arthur)

Definition: *Quantum Merlin-Arthur* (QMIP) extends QIP to multiple quantum provers ($k \geq 2$) who cannot communicate. Defined as QMIP(k), it allows entangled provers but restricts collusion [21].

Operation: Merlin (prover) sends a quantum witness state $|\psi\rangle$ to Arthur (verifier). For 2QFA verifiers, the transition function validates $|\psi\rangle$ via:

$$\delta : Q \times \Sigma \times \mathcal{H}_{\text{wit}} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}^{Q \times Q},$$

where \mathcal{H}_{wit} is the witness Hilbert space [24].

Key Features: - QMIP = MIP*, enabling recognition of languages beyond QIP [button class="citation-flag" data-index="10"]. - Recognizes the palindrome language $L_{\text{pal}} = \{ww^R\}$ with entangled provers [21]. - 2QFA verifiers with QMIP achieve exponential state savings over classical MIP systems [26].

Limitations: - Entanglement between provers introduces verification complexity [24]. - QMIP(1QFA) \neq QIP(1QFA) in polynomial time [17].

4. Conclusion

Bibliography

- [1] Andris Ambainis and Rūsiņš Freivalds. “One-way quantum finite automata: Strengths, weaknesses, and generalizations”. In: *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)* (1998), pp. 332–341.
- [2] Andris Ambainis and Rūsiņš Freivalds. “Quantum finite automata with control language”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 287.1 (2002), pp. 299–311.
- [3] Andris Ambainis and Abuzer Yakaryılmaz. “Superiority of quantum finite automata over classical finite automata”. In: *SIAM Journal on Computing* 39.7 (2009), pp. 2819–2830.
- [4] Aleksandrs Belovs, Ansis Rosmanis, and Juris Smotrovs. “Multi-letter quantum finite automata: decidability and complexity”. In: *International Conference on Unconventional Computation* (2007), pp. 48–59.
- [5] Alberto Bertoni and Marco Carpentieri. “Regular languages accepted by quantum automata”. In: *Information and Computation* 165.2 (2001), pp. 174–182.
- [6] Alberto Bertoni, Carlo Mereghetti, and Beatrice Palano. “Quantum computing: 1-way quantum automata”. In: *Developments in Language Theory* (2001), pp. 1–20.
- [7] Alberto Bertoni, Carlo Mereghetti, and Beatrice Palano. “Quantum computing: 1-way quantum automata”. In: *International Conference on Developments in Language Theory* (2003), pp. 1–20.
- [8] Maria Paola Bianchi, Carlo Mereghetti, and Beatrice Palano. “Size lower bounds for quantum automata”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 551 (2014), pp. 102–115.
- [9] Heinz-Peter Breuer and Francesco Petruccione. “The theory of open quantum systems”. In: (2002).
- [10] Mika Hirvensalo. *Quantum Computing*. Springer, 2012.
- [11] John E. Hopcroft, Rajeev Motwani, and Jeffrey D. Ullman. *Introduction to Automata Theory, Languages, and Computation*. 3rd. ISBN: 978-8131720479. Pearson Education India, 2006.
- [12] Attila Kondacs and John Watrous. “On the power of quantum finite state automata”. In: *Proceedings of the 38th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*. IEEE, 1997, pp. 66–75.
- [13] Lvzhou Li et al. “Characterizations of one-way general quantum finite automata”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science* 419 (2012), pp. 73–91.
- [14] Cristopher Moore and James P Crutchfield. “Quantum automata and quantum grammars”. In: *Theoretical Computer Science*. Vol. 237. 1-2. Elsevier, 2000, pp. 275–306.

- [15] Ashwin Nayak. “Optimal lower bounds for quantum automata and random access codes”. In: *Foundations of Computer Science, 1999. 40th Annual Symposium on* (1999), pp. 369–376.
- [16] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*. Cambridge University Press, 2010.
- [17] Harumichi Nishimura and Tomoyuki Yamakami. “An application of quantum finite automata to interactive proof systems”. In: *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 75.4 (2009), pp. 255–269.
- [18] Kathrin Paschen. “Quantum finite automata using ancilla qubits”. In: *Technical Report, Karlsruhe University* (2000).
- [19] Azaria Paz. *Introduction to probabilistic automata*. Academic Press, 1971.
- [20] Michael O Rabin. “Probabilistic automata”. In: *Information and Control* 6.3 (1963), pp. 230–245.
- [21] Oksana Scegulnaja-Dubrovskaja, Lelde Lāce, and Rūšins Freivalds. “Postselection finite quantum automata”. In: *International Conference on Unconventional Computation* (2010), pp. 115–126.
- [22] Michael Sipser. “Lower bounds on the size of sweeping automata”. In: *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* 21.2 (1980), pp. 195–202.
- [23] Abuzer Yakaryilmaz and A. C. Cem Say. “Succinctness of two-way probabilistic and quantum finite automata”. In: *Discrete Mathematics and Theoretical Computer Science* 12.2 (2010), pp. 19–40.
- [24] Tomoyuki Yamakami. “Constant-space quantum interactive proofs against multiple provers”. In: *Information Processing Letters* 114.11 (2014), pp. 611–619.
- [25] Shenggen Zheng, Lvzhou Li, and Daowen Qiu. “One-way quantum finite automata with classical states”. In: *Quantum Information Processing* 11.6 (2012), pp. 1501–1521.
- [26] Shenggen Zheng, Daowen Qiu, and Jozef Gruska. “Power of the interactive proof systems with verifiers modeled by semi-quantum two-way finite automata”. In: *Information and Computation* 241 (2015), pp. 197–214.
- [27] Shenggen Zheng et al. “Two-tape finite automata with quantum and classical states”. In: *International Journal of Foundations of Computer Science* 23.04 (2012), pp. 887–906.

Acknowledgments