Universal computation by multi-particle quantum walk

Andrew Childs

David Gosset

Zak Webb



UNIVERSITY OF WATERLOO

arXiv:1205.3782 Science **339**, 791-794 (2013)

Quantum walk

Quantum analog of a random walk on a graph.

Idea: Replace probabilities by quantum amplitudes. Interference can produce radically different behavior!



Quantum walk algorithms

Quantum walk is a major tool for quantum algorithms (especially query algorithms with polynomial speedup).

- Exponential speedup for black-box graph traversal [Childs, Cleve, Deotto, Farhi, Gutmann, Spielman 02]
- Quantum walk search framework [Szegedy 05], [Magniez et al. 06]
 - Spatial search [Shenvi, Kempe, Whaley 02], [Childs, Goldstone 03, 04], [Ambainis, Kempe, Rivosh 04]
 - Element distinctness [Ambainis 03]
 - Subgraph finding [Magniez, Santha, Szegedy 03], [Childs, Kothari 10]
 - Matrix/group problems [Buhrman, Špalek 04], [Magniez, Nayak 05]
- Evaluating formulas/span programs
 - AND-OR formula evaluation [Farhi, Goldstone, Gutmann 07], [ACRŠZ 07]
 - Span programs for general query problems [Reichardt 09]
 - Learning graphs [Belovs 11] → new upper bounds (implicitly, quantum walk algorithms), new kinds of quantum walk search

Universality of quantum walk

A quantum walk can be efficiently simulated by a universal quantum computer.

N-vertex graph $\max \text{ degree } \operatorname{poly}(\log N) \qquad \qquad \Rightarrow \quad \operatorname{poly}(\log N) \text{ qubits}$ efficiently computable neighbors poly(log N) gates

circuit with

Conversely, quantum walk is a *universal computational primitive*: any quantum circuit can be simulated by a quantum walk. [Childs 09]

		graph with
N dimensions	\Rightarrow	$\operatorname{poly}(N,g)$ vertices
g gates	7	max degree 3
		walk for time $poly(g)$

Note: The graph is necessarily exponentially large in the number of qubits! Vertices represent basis states.

Quantum walk experiments



posed on the convective motions by the presence nterference phenomena with microscopic of a strong and inclined magnetic field. The departicles are a direct consequence of their velopment of systematic outflows is a direct conuantum-mechanical wave nature (1-5). The sequence of the anisotropy, and the similarities prospect to fully control quantum properties of between granulation and penumbral flows strongatomic systems has stimulated ideas to engineer ly suggest that driving the Evershed flow does not quantum states that would be useful for applicarequire physical processes that go beyond the tions in quantum information processing, for combination of convection and anisotropy intro-duced by the magnetic field. Weaker laterally example, and also would elucidate fundamental questions, such as the quantum-to-classical overturning flows perpendicular to the main filatransition (6). A prominent example of state engiment direction explain the apparent twisting moneering by controlled multipath interference is tions observed in some filaments (15, 16) and the quantum walk of a particle (7). Its classical lead to a weakening of the magnetic field in the flow channels through flux expulsion (6).

10 JULY 2009 VOL 325 SCIENCE www.sciencemag.org

aspects of our lives, providing insight fields: It forms the basis for algorith scribes diffusion processes in physic (8, 9), such as Brownian motion, used as a model for stock market Similarly, the quantum walk is exp

Institut für Angewandte Physik der Univer straße 8, 53115 Bonn, Germany.

*To whom correspondence should b karski@uni-bonn.de (M.K.); widera@

PHYSICAL REVIEW LETTERS

Hagai B. Perets, ^{1.*} Yoav Lahini,¹ Francesca Pozzi,² Marc Sorel,² Roberto Morandotti,³ and Yaron Silberberg¹ Faculty of Physics, The Weizmann Institute of Science, 76100 Rehovot, Israel ²Department of Electronics & Electrical Engineering, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Glasgow, Glasgow, Glasgow, Scotland, United Kingdom ³Institut Natural 4, In Particular Constants, University of Glasgow, Glasgow, Glasgow, Glasgow, Glasgow, J. S. Constants, United Kingdom ment of Electronics & Electrical Engineering, University of Glasgow, Glasgow G12 8QQ, Scotland, United K ³Institute National de la Recherche Scientifique. Universitá du Quebec, Varennes, Quebec J3X 1S2, Canada (Received 24 September 2007; published 2 May 2008)

Quantum random walks are the quantum counterpart of classical random walks, and were recently Quantum random warks are the quantum counterpart of classical random warks, and were recently studied in the context of quantum computation. Physical implementations of quantum walks have only been made in very small scale systems severely limited by decoherence. Here we show that the been made in very small scale systems severely innited by deconerence. Here we snow that the propagation of photons in waveguide lattices, which have been studied extensively in recent years, are propagation of photons in waveguide lattices, which have been studied extensively in recent years, are essentially an implementation of quantum walks. Since waveguide lattices are easily constructed at large essentiative an implementation of quantum walks. Since waveguide lattices are easily constructed at large scales and display negligible decoherence, they can serve as an ideal and versatile experimental scales and utsplay negligible deconference, they can serve as an ideal and versatile experiment playground for the study of quantum walks and quantum algorithms. We experimentally observe quantum in the second se playeround for the study of quantum warks and quantum algorithms, we experimentary observe quantum walks in large systems (\sim 100 sites) and confirm quantum walks effects which were studied theoretically,

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 05.40.Fb, 42.25.Dd, 42.50.Xa

to scale to much larger configurations. Moreover, even at

these very small scales, errors attributed to decoherence

Here we suggest a very different implementation of

CQWs using optical waveguide lattices. These systems

have been studied extensively in recent years [11], but

not in the context of QWs and quantum algorithms. We

week ending 2 MAY 2008

initial site on a lattice randomly chooses a direction, and then moves to a neighboring site accordingly. This process is repeated until some chosen final time. This simple random walk scheme is known to be described by a Gaussian probability distribution of the particle position, where the average absolute distance of the particle from the origin grows as the square root of time. First suggested by Feynman [1] the term quantum random walks was defined to describe the random walk behavior of a quantum particle. The coherent character of the quantum particle plays a major role in its dynamics, giving rise to markedly different behavior of quantum walks (QWs) compared with classical ones. For example, in periodic systems, the quantum particle propagates much faster than its classical counterpart, and its distance from the origin grows linearly with time (ballistic propagation) rather then diffusively [2]. In disordered systems, the expansion of the quantum mechanical wave-function can be exponentially suppressed

theoretically [2] and have been used to devise new quantum computation algorithms [3]. Both discrete and continuous time QWs (DQWs; CQWs) [4-6] have been studied. In DQWs the quantum particle hops between lattice sites in discrete time steps, while in CQW the probability amplitude of the particle leaks continuously to neighboring sites. Experimentally, many methods have been suggested for the implementation of DQWs (see [2]), but only a small scale system consisting of a few states was implemented, using linear optical elements [7]. For CQWs, a few suggestions have been made [8,9], yet only one experimental method have been implemented by realizing a small scale cyclic system (4 states) using a nuclear magnetic resonance system [10]. Such systems are difficult

0031-9007/08/100(17)/170506(4)

show that these systems can serve as a unique and robust tool for the study of CQWs. For this purpose we demonstrate three fundamental QW effects that have been theoretically analyzed in the QW literature. These include ballistic propagation in the largest system reported to date (\sim 100 sites), the effects of disorder on QWs, and QWs with reflecting boundary conditions (related to Berry's "particle in a box" and quantum carpets [12,13]). Waveguide lattices can be easily realized with even larger scales than shown here $(10^2 - 10^4$ sites with current fabrication technologies), with practically no decoherence. The high level of engineering and control of these systems enable the study of a wide range of different parameters and initial conditions. Specifically it allows the implementation and study of a large variety of CQWs and show experimental observations of their unique behavior. The CQW model was first suggested by Farhi and Gutmann [6], where the intuition behind it comes from continuous time classical Markov chains. In the classical random walk on a graph, a step can be described by a matrix M which transforms the probability distribution for the particle position over the graph nodes (sites). The entries of the matrix $M_{j,k}$ give the probability to go from site j to site k in one step of the walk. The idea was to carry this construction over to the quantum case, where the Hamiltonian of the process is used as the generator matrix.

The system is evolved using $U(t) = \exp(-iHt)$. If we start in some initial state $|\Psi_{in}\rangle$, evolve it under U for a time T and measure the positions of the resulting state, we obtain a 170506-1

© 2008 The American Physical Society

174

Galton's quin

through which

ing right or

Multi-particle quantum walk

With many walkers, the Hilbert space can be much bigger. m distinguishable particles on an n-vertex graph: n^m dimensions (similar scaling for indistinguishable bosons/fermions)

Main result: Any *n*-qubit, *g*-gate quantum circuit can be simulated by a multi-particle quantum walk of n + 1 particles interacting for time poly(n,g) on a graph with poly(n,g) vertices.

Consequences:

- Architecture for a quantum computer with no time-dependent control
- Simulating interacting many-body systems is BQP-hard (e.g., Bose-Hubbard model on a sparse, unweighted, planar graph)

Scattering theory on graphs



[Liboff, Introductory Quantum Mechanics]

Quantum walk

Quantum analog of a random walk on a graph G = (V, E).

Idea: Replace probabilities by quantum amplitudes.

$$\begin{split} \psi(t) \rangle &= \sum_{v \in V} a_v(t) |v\rangle \\ & \swarrow \\ & \texttt{amplitude for vertex } v \text{ at time } t \end{split}$$

Define time-homogeneous, local dynamics on G.

$$\mathrm{i} \frac{\mathrm{d}}{\mathrm{d}t} |\psi(t)\rangle = H |\psi(t)\rangle$$

Adjacency matrix:
$$H = \sum_{(u,v)\in E(G)} |u\rangle\langle v|$$

Momentum states

Consider an infinite path:

$$-7 \quad -6 \quad -5 \quad -4 \quad -3 \quad -2 \quad -1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7$$

Hilbert space: $\operatorname{span}\{|x\rangle: x \in \mathbb{Z}\}$

Eigenstates of the adjacency matrix: $|\tilde{k}\rangle$ with

$$\langle x|k\rangle := e^{ikx} \qquad k \in [-\pi,\pi)$$

Eigenvalue: $2\cos k$

Wave packets

A wave packet is a normalized state with momentum concentrated near a particular value k.

Example:
$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{x=1}^{L} e^{-ikx} |x\rangle$$
 (large L)
 $k \rightarrow$
 $-1 \quad 0 \quad 1 \quad 2 \quad 3 \quad 4 \quad 5 \quad 6 \quad 7 \quad 8 \quad 9 \quad 10 \quad 11 \quad 12 \quad 13 \quad \cdots$
Propagation speed: $\left|\frac{dE}{dk}\right| = 2|\sin k|$

Scattering on graphs

Now consider adding semi-infinite lines to two vertices of an arbitrary finite graph.

Before:



The S-matrix

This generalizes to any number N of semi-infinite paths attached to any finite graph.



Incoming wave packets of momentum near k are mapped to outgoing wave packets (of the same momentum) with amplitudes corresponding to entries of an $N \times N$ unitary matrix S(k), called the S-matrix.

Universal computation

Encoding a qubit

Encode quantum circuits into graphs.

Computational basis states correspond to paths ("quantum wires").

For one qubit, use two wires ("dual-rail encoding"):



Fix some value of the momentum (e.g., $k = \pi/4$).

Quantum information propagates from left to right at constant speed.

Implementing a gate

To perform a gate, design a graph whose S-matrix implements the desired transformation U at the momentum used for the encoding.



$$S(k) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & V \\ U & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Universal set of single-qubit gates



momentum for logical states: $k = \pi/4$

[Childs, Phys. Rev. Lett. 102, 180501 (2009)]

Multi-particle quantum walk

With m distinguishable particles:

states:
$$|v_1, \dots, v_m\rangle$$
 $v_i \in V(G)$
Hamiltonian: $H_G^{(m)} = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{(u,v)\in E(G)} |u\rangle \langle v|_i + \mathcal{U}$

Indistinguishable particles:

bosons: symmetric subspace fermions: antisymmetric subspace

Many possible interactions:

$$\begin{array}{ll} \text{on-site:} & \mathcal{U} = J \sum_{v \in V(G)} \hat{n}_v (\hat{n}_v - 1) & \hat{n}_v = \sum_{i=1} |v\rangle \langle v|_i \\ \\ \text{nearest-neighbor:} & \mathcal{U} = J \sum_{(u,v) \in E(G)} \hat{n}_u \hat{n}_v \end{array}$$

m

Two-particle scattering

In general, multi-particle scattering is complicated.

But scattering of indistinguishable particles on an infinite path is simple.

Before:



Phase θ depends on momenta and interaction details.

Momentum switch

To selectively induce the two-particle scattering phase, we route particles depending on their momentum.



Particles with momentum $\pi/4$ follow the single line.

Particles with momentum $\pi/2$ follow the double line.

Controlled phase gate

Computational qubits have momentum $\pi/4$. Introduce a "mediator qubit" with momentum $\pi/2$. We can perform an entangling gate with the mediator qubit.



Hadamard on mediator qubit



[Blumer, Underwood, Feder 11]

Error bound

Initial state: each particle is a square wave packet of length L

Consider a g-gate, n-qubit circuit:



2(n+1) paths, O(gL) vertices on each path Evolution time O(gL)Total # of vertices O(ngL)

Theorem: The error can be made arbitrarily small with L = poly(n, g).

Example: For Bose-Hubbard model, $L = O(n^{12}g^4)$ suffices.

Open questions

- Improved error bounds
- Simplified initial state
- Are generic interactions universal for distinguishable particles?
- New quantum algorithms
- Experiments
- Fault tolerance