

The Computational Power of Translationally Invariant Hamiltonians

Alastair Kay

Centre for Quantum Computation, DAMTP, Centre for Mathematical Sciences,
University of Cambridge, Wilberforce Road, Cambridge CB3 0WA, UK

(Dated: May 28, 2019)

The conversion a global control scheme into a fixed Hamiltonian enables the demonstration that the dynamics of a nearest-neighbor translationally invariant Hamiltonian in 1D with 30-level spins can be programmed to efficiently implement quantum computations, so classical simulation is expected to be hard. It is then shown that cooling such a Hamiltonian to its ground state in the presence of random magnetic fields solves a QMA-complete problem. The design of a Universal Quantum Interface is also described i.e. controlling a subsystem of fixed size enables control of an entire quantum system, including initialisation and readout.

Within the study of quantum computation, it is desirable to find ‘natural’ problems for a quantum computer to solve i.e. those that exhibit intrinsically quantum properties which elucidate the power of the device. For example, Feynman first proposed the quantum computer as a device that naturally simulates Hamiltonian dynamics. More recently, it has become apparent that finding the ground state energies of Hamiltonians is QMA-complete [1, 2, 3, 4, 5] i.e. this is a natural problem for the class where solutions can be efficiently verified on a quantum computer. The question that naturally arises with regards to both of these problems is that of the minimal properties that any such Hamiltonian must possess. The same question, viewed from another perspective demands when we should expect efficient classical approximations to the properties and dynamics of Hamiltonians. It is widely believed that certain symmetries, particularly translational invariance, make such classical simulations tractable and yet pertinent to physical phenomena.

The first steps towards incorporating translational invariance, for both Hamiltonian evolution and ground state properties, were taken in [5], which traded the spatial variation for another property such as the local Hilbert space dimension, which grew as $\text{poly}(N)$ for N spins. Necessary to this construction was the inclusion of both a time label (clock) and position label at each site, so that all the information was available locally. Processing was then achieved by implementing a read head that moved backwards and forwards over the system data.

In this paper we use global control (GC) schemes [7, 8] to remove the necessity of both time and position labels, realising a translational invariant, nearest-neighbor Hamiltonian of fixed local Hilbert space dimension that implements arbitrary quantum computations, thus implying the classical intractability of simulation of the dynamics, of which there is already some evidence [9]. The construction is easy to motivate because a GC scheme typically works by repeated application of a finite set of pulses “A”, “B” etc., which are local gates applied uniformly to all qubits in the system. As such, we immediately lose the need for spatial resolution in our Hamiltonian. To remove the time resolution, the program sequence is written on the initial state of some of the spins instead of encoding it in the Hamiltonian. Proceeding to




FIG. 1: Schematic of the Hamiltonian’s mechanism. At each site, there is a label to specify if that site is a data qubit or program qutrit. One location in the program bus is marked as the active region, and that value is stored in the read-head qubit. The read-head applies a unitary to each data qubit consecutively, controlled off its value. When it reaches the active program region, it exchanges its data with the next step in the program.

a proof of QMA-completeness for ground state properties still requires the introduction of spatially varying magnetic fields, but this in turn has severe implications for the cooling of physical systems in the presence of random external fields.

Computation by Hamiltonian Evolution: In [6], a GC scheme was developed based on just two nearest-neighbor gates, SWAP (S) and

$$G = \mathbf{1} \oplus (Z - iY)/\sqrt{2},$$

where Z and Y are the standard Pauli matrices. These gates need to be applied to distinct qubit pairings $(2n - 1, 2n)$ and $(2n, 2n + 1)$. Our construction involves writing this information on a sequence of program spins, and for each position on the tape in turn, sending a ‘read-head’ along all spins to apply the relevant gate to all data qubits.

Consider a 1D chain of spins of local dimension 30, which can be decomposed into several subsystems

$$s_i = q_i \otimes l_i \otimes ((a_i \otimes r_i) \oplus n_i). \quad (1)$$

The system q_i is a qutrit, serving two different purposes depending on the label of the qubit system l_i . If the label is $|0\rangle$, then $|0\rangle^q, |1\rangle^q$ encode a data qubit, otherwise the qutrit q_i contains program information – “skip”, G or S . The skip command allows us to specify the pairs that a two-qubit gate is applied between, as we shall see when we discuss the read-head. Finally, there is a single state which is not currently used, $|2\rangle^q |0\rangle^l$, and is reserved as a

special label to denote which program trit is active. The read-head will start from the active program trit, taking its value, and will always hop to the right, applying the relevant gate as it goes (see Fig. 1). When it reaches the $|20\rangle$ label from the other side (due to the periodic boundary conditions), it will read its value back onto the program trit and move to its neighbor before starting again. The natural start and end points to the computation are when the active program trit is at either end of the program bus, and are detected by a change in the l_i label between program and data spins.

The remaining levels of s_i are reserved for the read-head. In all but a single location, this system will be in the state $|n\rangle$ which is a single level that indicates that the read head is not present. The systems a_i and r_i are both qubits. a_i indicates if the read-head is ‘active’, and r_i contains the program information from the program trit (it does not need to carry ‘skip’). When we propagate the read-head to the right, the interaction that we implement on the program qubits is conditioned on the value of the read-head, and whether the read-head is active. Furthermore, when the read-head hops, we flip the active setting, so that it only applies an operation on every second qubit. Whether it works on pairings $(2n-1, 2n)$ or $(2n, 2n+1)$ is solely determined by the alignment of the program trit with respect to the start of the block of data qubits, which is why we require skip; such that the relative alignment changes. Assuming that there are an even number of spins in the system, if a read-head leaves a program trit in the active state, it returns in the active state. Consequently, an inactive read-head in the location of the active program trit can be used to indicate that the read-head is passing a skip label.

The main term in the Hamiltonian involves read-head propagation:

$$H_{prop}^i = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} |n\rangle_i |x0\rangle_{i+1}^{ra} \langle x1|_i^{ra} \langle n|_{i+1} \otimes \left(U_{i,i+1}^{x,q} \otimes |00\rangle \langle 00|_{i,i+1}^l - \mathbf{1}_{i,i+1}^q \otimes (|00\rangle \langle 00|_{i,i+1}^l - \mathbf{1}) \right) + h.c.$$

where $U^0 = G$, $U^1 = S$, but both are extended to act on qutrits q simply by defining the action on the states $|2\rangle$, $U_x |2\rangle |y\rangle = U_x |y\rangle |2\rangle = 0$ for all y . The only term that is not included here stops the read-head propagating if the state $|2\rangle^q |0\rangle^l$ is present i.e.

$$\tilde{H}_{prop}^i = H_{prop}^i (\mathbf{1} - |20\rangle \langle 20|_i^{ql}).$$

Next, program manipulation (when the read-head is in the neighborhood of the currently active program state):

$$H_{prog}^i = \sum_{x,y} (|n\rangle \langle x1|^{ra} \otimes |x+1\rangle \langle 2|^q \otimes |1\rangle \langle 0|^l)_i \otimes (|y1\rangle^{ra} \langle n| \otimes |2\rangle \langle y+1|^q \otimes |0\rangle \langle 1|^l)_{i+1} + h.c.$$

except that this doesn’t (yet) handle the skip. First, if we’re in a region where we’ve just arrived back from doing

a loop, and should be moving onto a skip label

$$H_{s1}^i = \sum_x (|n\rangle \langle x1|^{ra} \otimes |x+1\rangle \langle 2|^q \otimes |1\rangle \langle 0|^l)_i \otimes (|00\rangle^{ra} \langle n| \otimes |2\rangle \langle 0|^q \otimes |0\rangle \langle 1|^l)_{i+1} + h.c.$$

and, secondly, the step over the skip label

$$H_{s2}^i = \sum_x (|n\rangle \langle 00|^{ra} \otimes |0\rangle \langle 2|^q \otimes |1\rangle \langle 0|^l)_i \otimes (|x1\rangle^{ra} \langle n| \otimes |2\rangle \langle x+1|^q \otimes |0\rangle \langle 1|^l)_{i+1} + h.c.$$

Finally, the total Hamiltonian is

$$H_0 = \sum_i \tilde{H}_{prop}^i + H_{prog}^i + H_{s1}^i + H_{s2}^i.$$

For a basis of input states $|\psi_0\rangle$, define

$$|\psi_n\rangle = (\mathbf{1} - |\psi_{n-2}\rangle \langle \psi_{n-2}|) H_0 |\psi_{n-1}\rangle.$$

Since $\langle \psi_m | \psi_n \rangle = \delta_{mn}$ (the position of the read-head and active program label are unique at each step),

$$H_{\psi_0} = \sum_{n=0}^{M-1} |\psi_n\rangle \langle \psi_{n+1}| + |\psi_{n+1}\rangle \langle \psi_n|$$

where $|\psi_M\rangle$ is the final state, when the read-head is deactivated. The evolution $|\psi_0\rangle \rightarrow |\psi_M\rangle$ was studied by Bose under the guise of state transfer [10, 11], and one can achieve an arrival probability of $O(M^{-2/3})$ within a time $O(M)$ [10] ($M \sim \text{poly}(N)$, where N is the number of data qubits). Moreover, this transfer is heralded – by measuring the system, we know whether or not the transfer has occurred without disturbing the computational result. If the computation is not finished, we simply wait and try again. With this strategy, one can achieve an evolution which fails with probability less than ε in a time $O(M^{5/3} \log(1/\varepsilon))$ [10].

Evidently, having designed one such scheme, one can trade the range of interactions with the local Hilbert space dimension. For example, by allowing next-neighbor interactions, a scheme involving only 13-dimensional systems can be designed. Ultimately, one can reduce to qubits by encoding the previous spins across several qubits, reserving a unique patterning to denote the start of each block. Thus one can achieve this result with no more than 24-body terms [14].

QMA-completeness: In previous studies, Hamiltonian evolution has been used as a basis for classifying the problem of finding ground state energies of Hamiltonians with similar properties as QMA-complete. In the present case, this is not expected to be possible. However, by breaking the translational invariance, one arrives at similar results to [4], but only using local magnetic fields. To achieve this, we need to add several energy penalties; to detect the solution to the verifier circuit, to initialise ancillas in $|0\rangle$ and to prepare the initial state of the program tape for

a specific computation corresponding to the verifier of the QMA problem. To implement these penalties, we need to be able to locally detect that we are either at the beginning or end of a computation, requiring an increase in the local Hilbert space dimension, such that the system n has 2 levels. $|0\rangle^n$ will be used as before, to indicate that the read-head is inactive. $|1\rangle^n$ is a program command that will only get used once, as the first command. It is not necessary to program it, because two-body terms can readily detect the transition between the data and program spins. A further change is that the system a must be increased to dimension 3, leaving the overall Hilbert space dimension as 48. The extra level in a serves a dual purpose. Firstly, it can be used in the same way as $|1\rangle^n$, but to indicate the end of the computation, such that we can penalise the output qubit. Secondly, it is used to help ensure that the correct computational sequence occurs. We will adapt the Hamiltonian propagation such that if a read-head in either $|0\rangle^a$ or $|1\rangle^a$ arrives at the region of transition from data to program spins, it is converted into $|2\rangle^a$, which will continue to propagate through the program region until it gets to the active program spin, where it releases its information and gets reinitialised in $|1\rangle^a$. If the read-head reaches the end of the program region in the $|2\rangle^a$ state, it is deactivated, and the computation ends. In particular, this means that if the system were to be initialised without an active program label, the computation is much shorter than it would otherwise have been. The Hamiltonian is readily revised to take these alterations into account. An energy penalty for when the read-head passes a particular qubit in either $|1\rangle^n$ or $|2\rangle^a$ behaves exactly like the initial and final penalties that we require, so we simply use penalties

$$H_{in} = \sum_i |1\rangle \langle 1|_i^n \otimes |\bar{x}_i\rangle \langle \bar{x}_i|_i^q$$

where the tape value should be x_i ($x_i = 0$ for ancillas), and hence \bar{x}_i implies a sum over all other possible program (data) states, including the active label $|0\rangle^l |2\rangle^q$. The final result term (to test the output of the verifier on qubit o) is similar:

$$H_{out} = |2\rangle \langle 2|_o^a \otimes |0\rangle \langle 0|_o^q.$$

We have to be sure that the computation is initialised correctly, with all the spins correctly arranged. This is achieved by adding a constant term H_b . On program spins, this term is $|0\rangle \langle 0|^l \otimes (|0\rangle \langle 0| + |1\rangle \langle 1|)^q$, ensuring that they are never data qubits. On data spins, this term is the opposite, $|1\rangle \langle 1|^l \otimes \mathbf{1}^q + |0\rangle \langle 0|^l \otimes |2\rangle \langle 2|^q$. Taking all of this into account, one can directly apply the projection lemma of [3],

Lemma 1. *Let $H = H_1 + H_2$ be the sum of two Hamiltonians operating on some Hilbert space $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{S} + \mathcal{S}^\perp$. The Hamiltonian H_2 is such that \mathcal{S} is the ground state eigenspace (with eigenvalue 0) and the eigenvectors in \mathcal{S}^\perp*

have eigenvalue at least $J > 2\|H_1\|$. Then,

$$\lambda(H_1|_{\mathcal{S}}) - \frac{\|H_1\|^2}{J - 2\|H_1\|} \leq \lambda(H).$$

$\lambda(H)$ denotes the smallest eigenvalue of H .

For example, with $J = 8\|H_1\|^2 + 2\|H_1\|$, one obtains $\lambda(H_1|_{\mathcal{S}}) - \frac{1}{8} \leq \lambda(H)$. We start with the total Hamiltonian

$$H_{total} = J_0 H_0 + J_b H_b + J_{in} H_{in} + J_{out} H_{out} + \kappa \mathbf{1},$$

where $\kappa = -J_0 \lambda(H_0)$. H_0 takes a slightly different form to standard proofs since instead of mapping to a Heisenberg chain, it maps to an XX model, and hence the eigenvalues are $2 \cos(\pi m / (M + 2))$ for $m = 1 \dots M + 1$. There is an energy gap for computations that are fewer than M steps as well as a gap to the first excited state,

$$\begin{aligned} -2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{M+1}\right) + 2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{M+2}\right) &\geq \frac{c}{M^2} = \Delta E \\ -2 \cos\left(\frac{2\pi}{M+2}\right) + 2 \cos\left(\frac{\pi}{M+2}\right) &\geq \Delta E \end{aligned}$$

for some constant $c > 0$. In the case where ‘yes’ solutions exist, $\lambda(H_{total}) = J_0 \lambda(H_0) + \kappa = 0$. In the case where there are only ‘no’ solutions, we assign $H_2 = J_0 H_0 + J_b H_b + \kappa \mathbf{1}$ to find that $J \geq \min(J_b, J_0 \Delta E)$, and, furthermore, $\lambda(H_{total}) \geq \lambda(H_1|_{\mathcal{S}_0}) - 1/8$, provided $J \geq 8(J_{out} + J_{in})^2 + 2(J_{out} + J_{in})$, imposing a polynomial relation between J_0, J_b and J_{in}, J_{out} . Repeating the process on $\lambda(H_1|_{\mathcal{S}_0})$ with $H'_1 = J_{out} H_{out}|_{\mathcal{S}_0}$, shows that provided $J_{in} \geq 8J_{out}^2 + 2J_{out}$,

$$\lambda(H_1|_{\mathcal{S}_0}) \geq \frac{J_{out}(1-\varepsilon)}{M+1} \sin^2\left(\frac{(M+1)\pi}{M+2}\right) - \frac{1}{8}$$

where the verifier circuit of our QMA problem accepts the result with probability less than ε . Thus, by selecting $J_{out} = (M+1) \sin^{-2}\left(\frac{\pi}{M+2}\right) \leq c'M^3$, all the terms J_{out}, J_{in}, J_b and J_0 are polynomial in M , and

$$\lambda(H_{total}) \geq \frac{3}{4} - \varepsilon.$$

Distinguishing the ground state energy of this Hamiltonian to within $1/\text{poly}(M)$ determines the existence of ‘yes’ solutions, and thus finding the ground state energy is QMA-complete. In comparison to [4], all of the spatially varying terms are local magnetic fields.

Universal Quantum Interface: In [12], Lloyd *et al.* argued that quantum systems can be entirely controlled by acting only on small subsystems. The proof was non-constructive, and there has been some interest in demonstrating the idea [13]. Control theory proves the existence of solutions and offers numerical techniques to determine high-fidelity control. In contrast, we realise an exact UQI constructively by using identical concepts to those so far except that instead of laying down the program tape in

the initial state of the system, we do so through the controlling system. A major advantage lies in the fact that we can initialise the system in any desired state, and read it out, whereas these are extra elements that must be assumed for the Hamiltonian evolution. Consider a chain of N spins with the same structure as in Eqn. (1), except that since we no longer need to store program qubits, the label l_i is superfluous and q_i only needs to be a qubit, leaving a local dimension of 10.

We assume that we have complete control over spins 1 and N , and the rest of the system need only interact with a Hamiltonian which is derived from H_{prop} ,

$$H_{\text{UQI}}^i = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}} |n\rangle_i \langle x0|_{i+1}^{ra} \langle x1|_i^{ra} \langle n|_{i+1} \otimes U_{i,i+1}^{x,q} + h.c.,$$

where the Hamiltonian is translationally invariant, but with open boundary conditions, rather than the periodic boundary conditions that we have been considering otherwise. The system is designed such that if we start with all the read-head systems in the $|n\rangle$ state, and initialise that of qubit 1 in the state $|a, r\rangle$, then after a sequence of state transfer (which is, again, heralded), spin N will be in the state $|a, r\rangle$, and all the qubits q will have had the gate specified by r applied. The value of a is used to determine whether the gates are applied to even or odd pairings of qubits. Read-head N is then reset to $|n\rangle$, and we repeat the process for each of the gates that needs to be applied. For a system with the intrinsic Hamiltonian H_{UQI} , the majority of spins can in principle be isolated from the environment, and we only require single spin operations to implement the computation, which are often easier to realise than arbitrary control.

In principle, systems with even smaller local dimension can be used as a UQI because the arbitrary control of two spins (for example) is sufficient to implement the quantum elements of quantum computation – one- and two-qubit gates – and the Hamiltonian only needs to place any two computational qubits on those spins, rather than using the Hamiltonian to perform the entire computation as we have so far. The greatest possible reduction, while retaining the concept of a read-head, is

to dimension 4, which we can treat as two qubits, a , the read-head, and b , the computational qubit. One such realisation takes the following form,

$$H_{\text{UQI}} = \frac{1}{2} \sum_i (X_i^a X_{i+1}^a + Y_i^a Y_{i+1}^a) \otimes S_{i,i+1}^b.$$

From an initial state of $|00\rangle_{ab}^{\otimes N}$, and retaining control of spins 1, 2 and N , by changing spin r to $|1\rangle^a$ and performing a heralded transfer to s means that the qubit states b from r to s undergo a cyclic permutation from $|q_1 \dots q_r \dots q_s \dots q_N\rangle$ to $|q_1 \dots q_{r-1} q_{r+1} \dots q_s q_r q_{s+1} \dots q_N\rangle$. The transfers $1, 2 \rightleftharpoons N$ are sufficient to place any pair of computational qubits on spins 1 and 2 within $\frac{1}{2}N$ cycles, as desired.

Conclusions: Making use the GC scheme introduced in [6], we have developed three main results. Firstly, the evolution of a fixed Hamiltonian which is translationally invariant on a nearest-neighbor chain and has fixed spin dimension can simulate any arbitrary quantum computation, thereby suggesting that the evolution is hard to simulate classically because it is a BQP-complete problem. Even simulations over short time scales, $O(\Delta E^{-1/4})$, reveal the solution since we can project onto the heralded outcome. Secondly, finding the ground state of a translationally invariant Hamiltonian subject to random local magnetic fields is QMA-complete. This may be of physical significance to quantum computers because initialisation of a device typically requires it to be cooled. However, this result implies that in the presence of random magnetic fields, such a device may take a prohibitively long time to cool. Finally, using the same basic constructs, we have designed an implementation of a UQI [12], where an entire quantum system can be controlled by a fixed number of spins. In the future, we intend to examine whether the present work enables any useful insights into the problem of determining ground states for translationally invariant systems. It certainly leads to some natural conjectures which we are working to prove.

AK would like to thank F. Verstraete for useful conversations and Clare College, Cambridge for financial support.

-
- [1] A. Y. Kitaev, A. H. Shen, and M. N. Vyalyi, *Classical and quantum computation*, Graduate studies in mathematics (AMS, Providence, Rhodes Island, 2002).
- [2] R. Oliveira and B. M. Terhal (2005), quant-ph/0504050.
- [3] J. Kempe, A. Kitaev, and O. Regev, *SIAM Journal of Computing* **35**, 1070 (2006).
- [4] D. Aharonov *et al.* FOCS07, 373 (2007).
- [5] A. Kay, *Phys. Rev. A* **76**, 030307(R) (2007).
- [6] D. Shepherd, T. Franz, and R. Werner, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **97**, 020502 (2006).
- [7] S. Lloyd, *Science* **261**, 1569 (1993).
- [8] A. Kay, PhD Thesis, <http://cam.qubit.org/users/Alastair/thesis.pdf> (2006).
- [9] N. Schuch *et al.*, arXiv: 0801.2078.
- [10] S. Bose, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **91**, 207901 (2003); D. Burgarth and S. Bose, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 052315 (2005).
- [11] M. Christandl *et al.*, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 032312 (2005).
- [12] S. Lloyd, A. J. Landahl, and J. E. Slotine, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 012305 (2004).
- [13] D. Burgarth and V. Giovannetti (2007), arXiv: 0710.0302; S. G. Schirmer, I. C. H. Pullen and P. J. Pemberton-Ross (2008), arXiv: 0801.0721.
- [14] One needs $\lceil \log_2(30) \rceil$ qubits to encode a single 30-dimensional spin. To introduce a unique local patterning, this doubles, such that every second qubit is $|0\rangle$, and $|11\rangle$ to the front to denote the start of the block. Interactions extend over 2 such effective spins.