

Quantum computation in continuous time using dynamic invariants

M. S. Sarandy^{1,*}

Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal Fluminense, Av. Gal. Milton Tavares de Souza s/n, Gragoatá, 24210-346, Niterói, RJ, Brazil.

E. I. Duzzioni

Instituto de Física, Universidade Federal de Uberlândia, Caixa Postal 593, 38400-902, Uberlândia, MG, Brazil

R. M. Serra

Centro de Ciências Naturais e Humanas, Universidade Federal do ABC, R. Santa Adélia 166, Santo André, 09210-170, São Paulo, Brazil

Abstract

We introduce an approach for quantum computing in continuous time based on the Lewis-Riesenfeld dynamic invariants. This approach allows, under certain conditions, for the design of quantum algorithms running on a nonadiabatic regime. We show that the relaxation of adiabaticity can be achieved by processing information in the eigenlevels of a time dependent observable, namely, the dynamic invariant operator. Moreover, we derive the conditions for which the computation can be implemented by time independent as well as by adiabatically varying Hamiltonians. We illustrate our results by providing the implementation of both Deutsch-Jozsa and Grover algorithms via dynamic invariants.

Keywords: Quantum Computation; Quantum Information; Dynamic Invariants

1. Introduction

Quantum information processing can be implemented through different quantum computation (QC) models. One promising such a model is provided by adiabatic QC (AQC) [1]. In AQC, rather than using a circuit of unitary quantum gates as in the standard QC model (SQC), an algorithm is implemented via the slow continuous evolution of a time-dependent Hamiltonian $H(t)$. The quantum system is prepared in some simple eigenstate $|n(0)\rangle$ of the initial Hamiltonian $H(0)$ and is then allowed to evolve adiabatically so that it remains in the corresponding instantaneous eigenstate $|n(t)\rangle$ of $H(t)$ at all times. At the end of the process, the solution of the problem is encoded in the final state of

the system, whence it can be read out by means of a convenient measurement. Protection of AQC against decoherence has been investigated in several works [2, 3, 4], settling AQC as a favorable approach for QC in real (open) quantum systems.

However, while decoherence-protected AQC is potentially attainable [4], adiabatic steps may be a harsh requirement in several experiments [5]. Moreover, nonadiabatic shortcuts are also helpful to clarify the role played by adiabaticity for QC in continuous time. In this context, inspired by AQC, the aim of this work is to propose an alternative approach to perform QC via continuous evolution in Hilbert space, which is based on the theory of dynamic invariants introduced by Lewis and Riesenfeld [6, 7]. The theory of dynamic invariants was conceived as a tool to solve time-dependent problems in quantum mechanics. In turn, as a first application, it was used to discuss the nonadiabatic dynamics of a time-dependent harmonic oscillator [6]. Since then, the dynamic invariants

*Corresponding author

Email addresses: msarandy@if.uff.br (M. S. Sarandy), duzzioni@infis.ufu.br (E. I. Duzzioni), serra@ufabc.edu.br (R. M. Serra)

¹Tel.: +55-21-2629-5802 / Fax: +55-21-2629-5887

technique has been applied to a number of problems, which include quantum optics [8], atomic systems [9], and geometric phases [10, 11].

In the present work, we will show that dynamic invariants can be used to implement a nonadiabatic approach to perform QC. In QC by dynamic invariants (QCDI), the computation process will be developed in an arbitrary eigenstate (here chosen as the lowest eigenvalue state) of a time-dependent quantum observable – the so-called dynamic invariant operator, which will conveniently be defined below. The final (target) state is achieved in a nonprobabilistic way and the procedure is independent of the adiabatic approximation. Nevertheless, QCDI is not proposed here to supersede the adiabatic approach, since the required unitary interpolation for the dynamic invariant operator may lead to the necessity of many-body interactions in the Hamiltonian, whose simulation compromises scalability. However, the method provides a suitable implementation of a quantum algorithm in continuous time either if nonadiabaticity is needed in a test-bed small-scale QC or if many-body interactions can be avoided in a particular problem. As an illustration of QCDI, we will provide implementations for both Deutsch-Jozsa and Grover algorithms.

2. Lewis-Riesenfeld dynamic invariants

For a closed quantum system, a dynamic invariant $I(t)$ is defined as an Hermitian operator that satisfies [6, 7]

$$\frac{\partial I(t)}{\partial t} + \frac{i}{\hbar} [H(t), I(t)] = 0, \quad (1)$$

where $H(t)$ is the Hamiltonian of the system and, from now on, \hbar will be set to one. Dynamic invariants are quantum mechanical constants of motion, implying therefore that their expectation values are constant, i.e., $d\langle I(t) \rangle / dt = 0$. The construction of such an operator allows for the direct integration of the time-dependent Schrödinger equation

$$H(t)|\psi(t)\rangle = i|\dot{\psi}(t)\rangle, \quad (2)$$

with the dot symbol denoting time derivative. Let us consider an instantaneous orthonormal eigenbasis for $I(t)$

$$I(t)|\varphi_i(t)\rangle = \lambda_i|\varphi_i(t)\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where we assume, for simplicity, that the $I(t)$ has non-degenerate eigenlevels. Then, we expand the

wave function $|\psi(t)\rangle$ in the invariant operator basis $\{|\varphi_i(t)\rangle\}$, yielding

$$|\psi(t)\rangle = \sum_i c_i(t)|\varphi_i(t)\rangle. \quad (4)$$

By inserting Eq. (4) in Eq. (2) and projecting the result onto $\langle\varphi_j(t)|$ we obtain

$$\dot{c}_j = - \sum_i c_i (i\langle\varphi_j|H|\varphi_i\rangle + \langle\varphi_j|\dot{\varphi}_i\rangle). \quad (5)$$

On the other hand, taking the derivative of Eq. (3) and projecting it onto $\langle\varphi_j(t)|$ we get

$$\dot{\lambda}_i \delta_{ij} + (\lambda_i - \lambda_j) (i\langle\varphi_j|H|\varphi_i\rangle + \langle\varphi_j|\dot{\varphi}_i\rangle) = 0.$$

The equation above implies that

$$i = j : \dot{\lambda}_i = 0 \Rightarrow \lambda_i = \text{constant}, \quad (6)$$

$$i \neq j : \langle\varphi_j|\dot{\varphi}_i\rangle = -i\langle\varphi_j|H|\varphi_i\rangle. \quad (7)$$

Equation (6) is a direct consequence of $I(t)$ being a constant of motion. Concerning Eq. (7), it allows for the integration of Schrödinger equation. Indeed, use of Eq. (7) into Eq. (5) yields

$$c_j(t) = c_j(0) e^{[-\int_0^t d\tau (\langle\varphi_j|\frac{\partial}{\partial\tau}|\varphi_j\rangle + i\langle\varphi_j|H|\varphi_j\rangle)]}.$$

Therefore, if we initially prepare the system in the eigenstate $|\varphi_j(0)\rangle$ of $I(t)$ then the system will necessarily evolve to $|\varphi_j(t)\rangle$ at any time t . The non-transitional evolution of an eigenstate of $I(t)$ plays the role of the adiabatic evolution of an eigenstate of $H(t)$. As we will show, this suitably built evolution in Hilbert space can be used to perform QC with no adiabatic constraint.

3. Quantum computation by invariants

Let us now introduce a mechanism to perform QCDI. Our approach, proposed here to implement QC, closely resembles in several aspects the invariant-based inverse engineering method to accelerate adiabatic processes via nonadiabatic shortcuts [12, 13, 14, 15] as well as the Berry's transitionless tracking algorithm [16].

First, before the definition of the Hamiltonian operator H , we introduce a time-dependent dynamic invariant $I(s)$, where s denotes the normalized time, namely, $s = t/T$, with T standing for the total evolution time and $0 \leq s \leq 1$. The operator $I(s)$ is

constructed such that: (a) $I(0)$ has a nondegenerate lowest eigenvalue state $|\phi(0)\rangle$ exhibiting a simple structure; (b) $I(1)$ has a nondegenerate lowest eigenvalue state $|\phi(1)\rangle$ that contains the solution of the problem (similarly to AQC, this can be obtained by providing an eigenvalue penalty for any state that violates the solution to be found); (c) $I(s)$ is defined, for intermediary values of s ($0 < s < 1$), by a conveniently chosen interpolation. Just for simplicity, we will call the lowest eigenvalue state of $I(s)$ from now on as its ground state.

As a second step, we can determine the Hamiltonian under which the system will be evolved by requiring that $I(s)$ is a dynamic invariant. This is done here after the definition of $I(s)$ and can be achieved by imposing Eq. (1) which, in terms of the normalized time s , becomes

$$\frac{\partial I(s)}{\partial s} + iT[H(s), I(s)] = 0. \quad (8)$$

As a final step, we prepare the system in the ground state $|\phi(0)\rangle$ of $I(0)$ and let it evolve during a fixed evolution time T . The system will then be naturally led to the corresponding ground state $|\phi(1)\rangle$ of $I(1)$, since $I(s)$ is built (by definition) as a dynamic invariant. As the solution of the problem is encoded in $|\phi(1)\rangle$, then it can be read out from a suitable measurement. The correct final state $|\phi(1)\rangle$ is reached with absolute certainty in a non-probabilistic way. A schematic description of QCDI is provided in Fig. 1. The form of Eq. (8) leads to a unitary evolution for $I(s)$, i.e.,

$$I(s) = \tilde{U}(s)I(0)\tilde{U}^\dagger(s), \quad (9)$$

where $\tilde{U}(s)$ is the unitary evolution operator and $I(0)$ is the invariant operator at $s = 0$. The unitary interpolation for $I(s)$ given in Eq. (9) has the property of preserving the spectral gaps among the eigenvalues of $I(s)$ during all the evolution [17]. This ensures the absence of level crossings in the spectrum of $I(s)$. Note that no adiabaticity constraint is imposed on the evolution of the invariant operator $I(s)$ and, consequently, on the evolution of the interpolating state $|\phi(s)\rangle$. If we allow for an adiabatic evolution of $I(s)$, i.e., by using that $\partial I(s)/\partial s \simeq 0$, we obtain from Eq. (8) that the eigenstates of $I(s)$ become also eigenstates of the Hamiltonian, since $[H(s), I(s)] \simeq 0$. For such a case, QCDI gets completely equivalent to AQC. On the other hand, if we discretize the unitary transformation $\tilde{U}(s)$ as sequence of quantum




Figure 1: (Color online) Schematic description of QCDI. An evolution in continuous time connects the initial and final lowest eigenvalue states of the interpolating dynamic invariant operator. The invariant operator then fixes the Hamiltonian to be implemented through a suitable quantum system.

gates, we recover the SQC model. In this case, $\tilde{U}(s) = \tilde{U}_1(s) \otimes \dots \otimes \tilde{U}_N(s)$, where $\tilde{U}_i(s)$ stands for a one or two-qubit quantum gate.

4. Interpolation of the dynamic invariant

We consider now a possible strategy to implement the unitary interpolation of a dynamic invariant which evolves from $|\phi(0)\rangle$ to $|\phi(1)\rangle$. Let us begin by expanding the unitary evolution for $I(s)$ as

$$\tilde{U}(s) = \exp \left[i \sum_{i=1}^N f_i(s) O_i \right], \quad (10)$$

with $f_i(s)$ being real functions of time and O_i time independent Hermitian operators. To obtain the Hamiltonian that implements the evolution operator given in Eq. (10), we can apply the theory of dynamic invariants as follows. Let $\mathcal{C}_N = \{O_1, \dots, O_N\}$ be the set of operators composing $\tilde{U}(s)$ in Eq. (10). We assume that \mathcal{C}_N is a subset of $\mathcal{C}_M = \{O_1, \dots, O_M\}$, with $M \geq N$, where the elements of \mathcal{C}_M define an arbitrary Lie algebra $[O_i, O_j] = \sum_{k=1}^M C_{ij}^k O_k$. We write $I(0)$ as

$$I(0) = \sum_{i=1}^M \lambda_i(0) O_i, \quad (11)$$

with $\lambda_i(0)$ being real coefficients. Then, substituting Eqs. (10) and (11) into Eq. (9), we obtain $I(s) = \sum_{k=1}^M \lambda_k(s) O_k$, with

$$\lambda_k(s) = \left[\lambda_k(0) + i \sum_{i=1}^N \sum_{j=1}^M f_i(s) C_{ij}^k \lambda_j(0) + \dots \right]. \quad (12)$$

As the operators O_k are elements of a Lie algebra, we take the Hamiltonian of the system as a linear combination of such operators, namely, $H(s) = \sum_{k=1}^M h_k(s) O_k$, with $h_k(s) \in \mathbb{R}$. This expansion of H is rather convenient since it ensures that, after evaluating the invariant operator $I(s)$, we may obtain the coefficients $h_k(s)$ through Eq. (8). Moreover, note that $h_k(s)$ can be determined by the solution of a set of coupled linear algebraic equations instead of a set of linear differential equations. In particular, taking qubits as the building blocks of QC, we can always expand the Hamiltonian in terms of tensor product of Pauli spin matrices (satisfying the $su(2)$ algebra) in the form

$$H(s) = \sum_{\{k_i\}} h_{1, \dots, n}^{k_1, \dots, k_n}(s) \sigma_1^{k_1} \otimes \sigma_2^{k_2} \otimes \dots \otimes \sigma_n^{k_n}, \quad (13)$$

where the lower indices enumerate n qubits and the upper indices refer to the set $\{\mathbf{1}, \sigma^x, \sigma^y, \sigma^z\}$ of identity and Pauli spin-1/2 matrices. The coefficients $h_i^{k_i}(s) \in \mathbb{R}$ since $H(s)$ is Hermitian. The Hamiltonian given by Eq. (13) will exhibit many-body interactions if all the coefficients $h_{1, \dots, n}^{k_1, \dots, k_n}(s)$ are nonvanishing. Naturally, the simulation of such a Hamiltonian is typically hard. However, as mentioned before, this approach provides a suitable implementation either if nonadiabaticity is needed in a test-bed small-scale QC or if many-body interactions can be avoided in a particular problem.

5. Applications

5.1. Example 1: the Deutsch-Jozsa problem

Given a binary function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ (n is the number of bits) which is promised to be either constant or balanced, the Deutsch-Jozsa (DJ) problem consists in determining which type the function is. Here we construct an implementation by dynamic invariants for the optimized version of the algorithm [18] (see also Refs. [3, 19] for AQC formulations for the DJ problem).

5.1.1. DJ problem for $n=1$

Let us begin with the simple case $n = 1$. The input state is $|\phi(0)\rangle = |+\rangle$, where $|\pm\rangle = (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, with $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$ being the computational basis for the qubit (eigenstates of the Pauli matrix σ^z). The initial dynamic invariant is chosen such that its ground state is $|\phi(0)\rangle$, i.e., $I(0) = \omega|-\rangle\langle-|$, where ω is a free parameter introduced to set the

gap between the eigenstates of $I(0)$. Note that $I(0)$ is introduced in a such a way that a penalty is provided for any state having a contribution of $|-\rangle$. Hence $|\phi(0)\rangle$ is its ground state. The DJ problem can be solved by a single computation of the function f through the unitary transformation $U|x\rangle = (-1)^{f(x)}|x\rangle$ ($x \in \{0, 1\}^n$) [18], so that in the $\{|x\rangle\}$ (computational) basis U is represented by the diagonal matrix $U = \text{diag}[(-1)^{f(0)}, (-1)^{f(1)}]$. In terms of the Pauli matrices the operator U may be written as $U = \xi_+ \mathbf{1} + \xi_- \sigma^z$, where $\xi_{\pm} = (1/2)[(-1)^{f(0)} \pm (-1)^{f(1)}]$.

Our implementation requires a final dynamic invariant $I(1)$ such that its ground state is $|\phi(1)\rangle = U|\phi(0)\rangle = \xi_+|+\rangle + \xi_-|-\rangle$. This is accomplished by a unitary transformation on $I(0)$, i.e., $I(1) = UI(0)U^\dagger$. Note that this is similar to the nonlinear interpolation for the DJ problem proposed in Ref. [3] in the context of AQC. However, the nonlinear interpolation is implemented here on $I(s)$ instead of being realized on $H(s)$. The final dynamic invariant encodes the solution of the DJ problem in its ground state, which can be extracted via a measurement of the qubits in the basis $\{|+\rangle, |-\rangle\}$. Indeed, for a constant function, we obtain $\xi_+ = \pm 1$ and $\xi_- = 0$. Then $|\phi(1)\rangle = |+\rangle$ (up to a possible global phase). On the other hand, for a balanced function, we have $\xi_+ = 0$ and $\xi_- = \pm 1$. Then $|\phi(1)\rangle = |-\rangle$ (up to a possible global phase). In order to explicitly evaluate $I(s)$ we consider the evolution operator in the form

$$\tilde{U}(s) = \exp[-i\alpha(s)U]. \quad (14)$$

Then, from Eq. (9), we obtain

$$I(s) = \frac{\omega}{2} \{ \mathbf{1} - \cos[2\alpha(s)\xi_-] \sigma^x - \sin[2\alpha(s)\xi_-] \sigma^y \}. \quad (15)$$

Since the operator U displays the properties $UU^\dagger = \mathbf{1}$ and $U = U^\dagger$, we can implement the algorithm through the Hamiltonian

$$H(s) = \frac{1}{T} \frac{d\alpha(s)}{ds} U = \frac{1}{T} \frac{d\alpha(s)}{ds} (\xi_+ \mathbf{1} + \xi_- \sigma^z). \quad (16)$$

Hence, by controlling the time variation of $\alpha(s)$ and the frequency T^{-1} we can optimize the run time of the algorithm. Naturally, the run time is constrained by the quantum brachistochrone [20], which poses a physical limitation on the speed of unitary transformations.

5.1.2. DJ problem for $n=2$

Let us consider now a possible generalization for the case $n = 2$. In this case, we can apply a simpler interpolation scheme in comparison with the method delineated in Section 4. As we will see, since the initial and the final invariant operators exhibit similar forms, we just need to replace their coefficients by time-dependent functions obeying the required boundary conditions at $s = 0$ and $s = 1$. Such strategy will allow us to find out the simplest Hamiltonian to implement the algorithm. We begin by taking the initial state of the system as $|\phi(0)\rangle = |+\rangle_1 |+\rangle_2$. A simple initial dynamic invariant $I(0)$ that exhibits $|\phi(0)\rangle$ as its ground state can be defined by imposing an eigenvalue penalty for every individual spin whose quantum state has a contribution of the basis state $|-\rangle$, i.e. $I(0) = |-\rangle_1 \langle -| \otimes \mathbf{1}_2 + \mathbf{1}_1 \otimes |-\rangle_2 \langle -|$. The final dynamical invariant $I(1)$ can be obtained by the application of the unitary operator $U = \sum_{i=0}^3 [(-1)^{f(i)} |e_i\rangle \langle e_i|]$, where $|e_0\rangle = |00\rangle$, $|e_1\rangle = |01\rangle$, $|e_2\rangle = |10\rangle$, and $|e_3\rangle = |11\rangle$. Indeed, we can rewrite $I(0)$ in the computational basis as

$$I(0) = \mathbf{1}_{12} - \frac{1}{2} [(|e_0\rangle + |e_3\rangle)(\langle e_1| + \langle e_2|) + (|e_1\rangle + |e_2\rangle)(\langle e_0| + \langle e_3|)]. \quad (17)$$

Then, by using that $I(1) = UI(0)U^\dagger$, we obtain

$$I(1) = \mathbf{1}_{12} - \frac{1}{2} \left[(-1)^{f(0)+f(1)} \rho_{01} + (-1)^{f(0)+f(2)} \rho_{02} + (-1)^{f(1)+f(3)} \rho_{13} + (-1)^{f(2)+f(3)} \rho_{23} \right], \quad (18)$$

where $\rho_{ij} = |e_i\rangle \langle e_j| + |e_j\rangle \langle e_i|$. The ground state of $I(1)$ is $|\phi(1)\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^3 \frac{1}{2} [(-1)^{f(i)} |e_i\rangle]$. Note that both the initial and final invariants display the same structure, which allows for the definition of the interpolating invariant as

$$I(s) = \mathbf{1}_{12} - [\alpha(s) |e_0\rangle \langle e_1| + \beta(s) |e_0\rangle \langle e_2| + \gamma(s) |e_3\rangle \langle e_1| + \delta(s) |e_3\rangle \langle e_2| + \text{H.C.}], \quad (19)$$

with H.C. standing for Hermitian conjugate, $\alpha(0) = \beta(0) = \gamma(0) = \delta(0) = 1/2$, and

$$\alpha(1) = \frac{(-1)^{f(0)+f(1)}}{2}, \quad \beta(1) = \frac{(-1)^{f(0)+f(2)}}{2}, \quad (20)$$

$$\gamma(1) = \frac{(-1)^{f(1)+f(3)}}{2}, \quad \delta(1) = \frac{(-1)^{f(2)+f(3)}}{2}. \quad (21)$$

Remarkably, the evolution from $|\phi(0)\rangle$ to $|\phi(1)\rangle$ can be implemented through a local Hamiltonian $H(s)$ on each qubit. Indeed, we propose $H(s)$ as

$$H(s) = (h_{00}^1 |0\rangle_1 \langle 0| + h_{11}^1 |1\rangle_1 \langle 1|) \otimes \mathbf{1}_2 + \mathbf{1}_1 \otimes (h_{00}^2 |0\rangle_2 \langle 0| + h_{11}^2 |1\rangle_2 \langle 1|), \quad (22)$$

where h_{00}^i and h_{11}^i ($i = 1, 2$) are real coefficients to be determined by the dynamic invariant equation of motion. From Eq. (8), we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha(s) &= \frac{1}{2} \exp \left\{ iT \int_0^1 [h_{11}^2(s') - h_{00}^2(s')] ds' \right\}, \\ \beta(s) &= \frac{1}{2} \exp \left\{ iT \int_0^1 [h_{11}^1(s') - h_{00}^1(s')] ds' \right\}, \\ \gamma(s) &= \beta^*(s), \quad \delta(s) = \alpha^*(s). \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

Since $(-1)^{f(0)+f(1)+f(2)+f(3)} = 1$, Eqs. (20)-(21) yield $\alpha(1) = \delta(1)$ and $\beta(1) = \gamma(1)$. Therefore, a possible simple choice for the Hamiltonian is obtained by defining $h_{00}^1 = -\pi f(2)/T$, $h_{11}^1 = \pi f(0)/T$, $h_{00}^2 = -\pi f(1)/T$, $h_{11}^2 = \pi f(0)/T$. Hence, the DJ problem for $n = 2$ can be solved by QCDI through the local constant Hamiltonian

$$H = \frac{\pi}{2T} [-(f(0) + f(2)) \sigma_z^1 + (f(0) + f(1)) \sigma_z^2 - (f(2) - f(1)) \mathbf{1}_{12}]. \quad (24)$$

Observe that no two-body interactions are needed to run the algorithm. For $n > 2$, interaction terms in $H(s)$ are expected to appear. Naturally, the scaling of such interactions with n is an important issue in order to implement QCDI in large systems.

5.2. Example 2: The search problem

A simple implementation of QCDI for the search problem [21] can be given as follows. We start by proposing an oracle in a general form given by $U_0 = \theta |w\rangle \langle w| + \delta (|w\rangle \langle \phi(0)| + |\phi(0)\rangle \langle w|) + \varepsilon |\phi(0)\rangle \langle \phi(0)|$ so that $\theta, \delta, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}$ and $|w\rangle$ is the target state in a Hilbert space of n qubits, whose dimension is denoted by $N = 2^n$. The initial state $|\phi(0)\rangle$ can be decomposed as $|\phi(0)\rangle = \alpha |w\rangle + \beta |y\rangle$, where $\langle w|y\rangle = 0$ and $\alpha^2 + \beta^2 = 1$, with $\alpha = \langle w|\phi(0)\rangle$ and $\beta = \langle y|\phi(0)\rangle$ assumed as real constants. In order to rewrite U_0 in terms of $|w\rangle$ and $|y\rangle$ we define the matrices $\mathbf{1} = |w\rangle \langle w| + |y\rangle \langle y|$, $\sigma_x = |w\rangle \langle y| + |y\rangle \langle w|$, $\sigma_y = -i(|w\rangle \langle y| - |y\rangle \langle w|)$, and $\sigma_z = |w\rangle \langle w| - |y\rangle \langle y|$. Then we can write $U_0 = r_0 \mathbf{1} + \vec{r} \cdot \vec{\sigma}$, where $r_0 = (\theta + \varepsilon + 2\alpha\delta)/2$, $\vec{\sigma} = (\sigma_x, \sigma_y, \sigma_z)$ and $\vec{r} = (r_x, 0, r_z)$, with $r_x =$

$\beta(\delta + \varepsilon\alpha)$ and $r_z = [\theta - \varepsilon + 2\alpha(\delta + \varepsilon\alpha)]/2$. Disregarding the term proportional to the identity, we introduce an interpolation operator $\tilde{U}(s)$ such as in Eq. (14), with $\alpha(s) = \pi s/2$ and U given by $U = (\vec{r} \cdot \vec{\sigma})/|\vec{r}|$. Note that U is unitary and Hermitian. Let us determine now the conditions for which $\tilde{U}(s)$ yields an interpolation between $|\phi(0)\rangle$ and the solution state $|w\rangle$. Indeed $\tilde{U}(0) = \mathbf{1}$ and therefore $\tilde{U}(0)|\phi(0)\rangle = |\phi(0)\rangle$. For the final time we have

$$\tilde{U}(1)|\phi(0)\rangle = \left[\frac{(r_x\beta + r_z\alpha)}{i|\vec{r}|} |w\rangle + \frac{(r_x\alpha - r_z\beta)}{i|\vec{r}|} |y\rangle \right].$$

Since we want $\tilde{U}(1)|\phi(0)\rangle = \exp(i\phi)|w\rangle$ (where ϕ is an arbitrary unimportant angle), we impose $r_x\alpha = r_z\beta$. From this condition, we obtain $\theta = \varepsilon$. In terms of the vector \vec{r} , this result implies that $r_x = \beta(\delta + \varepsilon\alpha)$ and $r_z = \alpha(\delta + \varepsilon\alpha)$. Then $|\vec{r}| = |\delta + \varepsilon\alpha|$. Bearing these results in mind, we are then able to build an oracle which allows for the determination of the element under search at the final time $s = 1$. The dynamic invariant $I(s)$ can be defined by encoding $|\phi(0)\rangle$ as its initial ground state and $|w\rangle$ as its final ground state. Here, this can be conveniently obtained by defining $I(0)$ as the projector $I(0) = \mathbf{1} - |\phi(0)\rangle\langle\phi(0)|$. The interpolation given by Eq. (9) then yields

$$I(s) = \mathbf{1} + \frac{i}{2} \sin(\pi s) (|w\rangle\langle\phi(0)| - |\phi(0)\rangle\langle w|) - \cos^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) |\phi(0)\rangle\langle\phi(0)| - \sin^2\left(\frac{\pi}{2}s\right) |w\rangle\langle w|. \quad (25)$$

Then, the Hamiltonian operator reads

$$H = \frac{\pi}{2T} U = \frac{\pi}{2T} \frac{\vec{r} \cdot \vec{\sigma}}{|\vec{r}|} = \pm \frac{\pi}{2T} (\beta\sigma_x + \alpha\sigma_z). \quad (26)$$

In order to have both a dynamic invariant and a Hamiltonian that do not depend on knowing the value of $|w\rangle$, we fix $\alpha = 1/\sqrt{N}$, which implies $\beta = \sqrt{(N-1)/N}$. Then, Eq. (26) becomes

$$H = \mp \frac{\pi}{2T\sqrt{N}} \left(\sqrt{N-1}\sigma_x + \sigma_z \right). \quad (27)$$

The equation above resembles the Hamiltonian used in Ref. [22] to implement the analog analogue of QC. Simulation of such a kind of Hamiltonian can be implemented by a quantum circuit whose number of oracle calls grows as $O(\sqrt{N})$.

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, we have proposed an approach for implementing QC in continuous time based on Lewis-Riesenfeld invariants. Our method opens up the possibility of realizing QC with new Hamiltonians and with no adiabatic constraint, which may represent a step forward for QC in continuous time (at least for a small-scale regime). On the other hand, locality is not ensured *a priori* for these Hamiltonians due to the unitary interpolation required by the invariant operator. In turn, the absence of the adiabaticity condition may be counterbalanced by the hardness of simulating many-body interactions in the case of large n QCDI. Anyway, since QC is still in its early stage, the existence of a diversity of QC models can be a valuable way of providing new experimental routes as well as insights for the design of quantum algorithms. Robustness of QCDI under decoherence is also an important further point. In this context, a possible direction can be provided by the theory of dynamic invariants for open systems as in Ref. [10]. We leave this analysis for future research.

Acknowledgments

We gratefully acknowledge financial support from CNPq, FAPESP, FAPERJ, FAPEMIG, and the Brazilian National Institute for Science and Technology of Quantum Information (INCT-IQ).

References

- [1] E. Farhi *et al.*, Science **292**, 472 (2001).
- [2] A. M. Childs, E. Farhi, and J. Preskill, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 012322 (2001); J. Roland and N. J. Cerf, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 032330 (2005); S. P. Jordan, E. Farhi, and P. W. Shor, Phys. Rev. A **74**, 052322 (2006).
- [3] M. S. Sarandy and D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **95**, 250503 (2005).
- [4] D. A. Lidar, Phys. Rev. Lett. **100**, 160506 (2008).
- [5] X. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 123003 (2010).
- [6] H. R. Lewis, Phys. Rev. Lett. **18**, 510 (1967).
- [7] H. R. Lewis and W. B. Riesenfeld, J. Math. Phys. **10**, 1458 (1969).
- [8] C. J. Villas-Bôas *et al.*, Phys. Rev. A **68**, 053808 (2003); V. V. Dodonov and V. I. Man'ko (Eds.), *Theory of Nonclassical States of Light*, Taylor & Francis, New York, 2003.
- [9] S. S. Mizrahi, Phys. Lett. A **144**, 282 (1990); K. Lendi, J. Phys. A **27**, 609 (1994).
- [10] M. S. Sarandy, E. I. Duzzioni, and M. H. Y. Moussa, Phys. Rev. A **76**, 052112 (2007).
- [11] E. I. Duzzioni, R. M. Serra, and M. H. Y. Moussa, Europhys. Lett. **82**, 20007 (2008).

- [12] J. G. Muga *et al.*, J. Phys. B **42**, 241001 (2009).
- [13] X. Chen *et al.*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **104**, 063002 (2010).
- [14] X. Chen *et al.*, J. At. Mol. Sci. **1**, 1 (2010).
- [15] X. Chen, E. Torrontegui, and J. G. Muga, e-print arXiv:1102.3449 (2011).
- [16] M. V. Berry, J. Phys. A **42**, 365303 (2009).
- [17] M. S. Siu, Phys. Rev. A **71**, 062314 (2005).
- [18] D. Collins, K. W. Kim, and W. C. Holton, Phys. Rev. A **58**, R1633 (1998).
- [19] S. Das, R. Kobes, and G. Kunstatter, Phys. Rev. A **65**, 062310 (2002); Z. H. Wei and M. S. Ying, Phys. Lett. A **356**, 312 (2006).
- [20] D. C. Brody and D. W. Hook, J. Phys. A **39**, L167 (2006).
- [21] L. K. Grover, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 325 (1997).
- [22] E. Farhi and S. Gutmann, Phys. Rev. A **57**, 2403 (1998).