

A BQP-complete problem related to the Ising model partition function via a new connection between quantum circuits and graphs

Joseph Geraci

University of Toronto

Department of Mathematics and

University of Southern California

CQIST - Center for Quantum Information Science and Technology

Abstract

We present a simple construction that maps quantum circuits to graphs and vice-versa. Inspired by the results in [15] linking the Ising partition function with quadratically signed weight enumerators (QWGTs) [17], we also present a BQP-complete problem for the additive approximation of a function over graphs related to the generating function of Eulerian subgraphs. We discuss connections with the Ising partition function.

I. INTRODUCTION

Relationships between quantum computation and graph theory are emerging beyond applications to graph theoretic problems. For example in the one-way quantum computation setting, quantum graph states and their relationship to entanglement is already well known [16]. Here one sees the correspondence between a graph and a quantum state where the vertices correspond to the qubits of the state and the edges correspond to pairs of qubits. For quantum circuits one may make use of a graph to actually represent the circuit or architecture [11]. For example, if we let $G = (V, E)$ be a graph, then the set of vertices V may represent the individual qubits (or input into the circuit) and the edges E correspond to any pair of qubits that may be acted upon by a two qubit gate. In another related approach provided in [24], they instruct to “regard each gate as a vertex, and for each input/output wire add a new vertex to the open edge of the wire.” Using this correspondence they prove statements about families of quantum circuits that are classically simulatable.

In this paper we provide a simple construction which makes a direct connection between quantum circuits and graphs via their incidence structure. As an application we construct a function related to the generating function of Eulerian subgraphs and discuss the relationship to the Ising partition function. We show that quantum computers can provide additive approximations of this related generating function, which we call the *signed* generating function of Eulerian subgraphs, $E'(G, \lambda)$. We demonstrate that it is a BQP-complete problem as it is intimately related to quadratically signed weight enumerators (QWGTs) [17] via this construction. It is well known that the Ising partition function Z may be expressed in terms of the generating function of Eulerian subgraphs, $E(G, \lambda)$. We provide some ideas for the future to use $E'(G, \lambda)$ for efficient additive approximations of Z . Recently in [9], an additive approximation algorithm of the Tutte polynomial was given which solved instances shown to be BQP-complete. As the Ising partition function is just a specialization of the Tutte polynomial, the complexity of additive approximations of certain non-planar instances of the Ising partition function is an interesting open problem.

The methods used here are currently being employed to study quantum circuits which may

be simulated classically [6].

A. Ising spin model

We shall first introduce the Ising spin model in order to motivate the computation of generating function of Eulerian subgraphs. Let $G = (E, V)$ be a finite, arbitrary undirected graph with $|E|$ edges and $|V|$ vertices. In the Ising model, each vertex is associated with a classical spin ($\sigma_i = \pm 1$) and each edge $(i, j) \in E$ with a bond ($J_{ij} = \pm J$). The Hamiltonian of the spin system is then

$$H(\sigma) = - \sum_{(i,j) \in E} J_{ij} \sigma_i \sigma_j. \quad (1)$$

The probability of the spin configuration σ in thermal equilibrium at temperature T is given by the Gibbs distribution: $P(\sigma) = \frac{1}{Z} W(\sigma)$, where the Boltzmann weight is $W(\sigma) = \exp[-\beta H(\sigma)]$, $\beta = 1/kT$, and Z is the partition function:

$$Z_{\{J_{ij}\}}(\beta) = \sum_{\sigma} \exp[-\beta H(\sigma)]. \quad (2)$$

B. Generating function of Eulerian subgraphs

An Eulerian subgraph of a graph G is a set of edges that form a tour (a path that begins and ends at the same vertex) in which every vertex is of even degree. The *generating function of Eulerian subgraphs of G* is given by

$$E(G, x) = \sum_a x^{wt(a)}$$

where the sum is over all Eulerian subgraphs and wt is a weight function (in this case the number of edges in the subgraph). This brings us to another expression for the Ising partition function which was discovered by van der Waerden and is given by

$$Z(\beta) = 2^{|V|} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E} \cosh(\beta J_{ij}) E(G, \tanh(\beta J_{ij})) \quad (3)$$

It is this form of the partition function that motivates this work [23, 27].

II. QWGTS AND THEIR RELATION TO THE ISING PARTITION FUNCTION

Definition 1 *Quadratically Signed Weight Enumerators (QWGTs) in general are of the form [17]*

$$S(A, B, x, y) = \sum_{b: Ab=0} (-1)^{bBb} x^{|b|} y^{n-|b|}, \quad (4)$$

where A and B are $0, 1$ -matrices with B of dimension $n \times n$ and A of dimension $m \times n$. The variable b in the summand ranges over $0, 1$ -column vectors of dimension n . All calculations involving A, B or b are done modulo 2.

Note that the evaluation of a QWGT, given x and y are natural numbers, is in general a #P problem and as it includes evaluations of the weight enumerator of binary linear codes it is in fact #P-complete [17].

We shall now review how QWGT's were constructed in [17] in some detail. Let \mathbf{G} be a quantum circuit and $U(\mathbf{G})$ the corresponding unitary operator. Note that a universal gate set can be achieved by allowing arbitrary rotations about any product of Pauli operators i.e.

$$e^{-i\sigma_b\theta/2} = \cos\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) I + i \sin\left(\frac{\theta}{2}\right) \sigma_b$$

where $\sigma_b = \prod_{i=1}^n \sigma_{b_i}^{(i)}$ such that $\sigma_{00} = I, \sigma_{01} = \sigma_X, \sigma_{11} = \sigma_Y$ and $\sigma_{10} = \sigma_Z$ [19]. This means that b is a binary vector whose length is $2n$, twice the number of qubits, and the superscript (i) represents the qubit which is operated on by the corresponding Pauli matrix.

It is possible to express our unitary operator as a product of real gates and we can do this as follows. Take the product $U(\mathbf{G}) = G_N G_{N-1} \cdots G_1$ where each gate is of the form

$$G_k = \frac{1}{\gamma} (\alpha \pm i\beta\sigma_{b_k})$$

where again b_k is a binary vector of length $2n$ but each b_k can only contain an odd number of 1's i.e. each gate can only have an odd number of Pauli Y operators σ_Y . Also note that $\gamma = \sqrt{\alpha^2 + \beta^2}$. As a further modification, which will allow us to have simple multiplication rules for our gates, define

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{b_k} = (-i)^{|b|_Y} \sigma_{b_k}$$

where $|b|_Y$ is the number of σ_Y 's occurring in σ_{b_k} .

We can now write

$$G_k = \frac{1}{\gamma}(\alpha + \beta \tilde{\sigma}_{b_k}).$$

Now define C to be the block diagonal matrix whose blocks consist of

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then the property that b_k has an odd number of 1's is given by $b^t C b = 1$ and so we have the multiplication rule

$$\tilde{\sigma}_{b_1} \tilde{\sigma}_{b_2} = (-1)^{b_1^t C b_2} \tilde{\sigma}_{b_1 + b_2} \quad (5)$$

where the addition in the subscript is bit by bit modulo 2.

Let H be the $(2n \times N)$ matrix whose columns are the b_k . H is a polynomial size representation of the quantum circuit where each column represents a gate and every pair of rows represents a qubit. We then have the following expansion.

$$U(\mathbf{G}) = \prod_{k=N}^1 G_k \quad (6)$$

$$= \prod_{k=N}^1 \frac{1}{\gamma} (\alpha + \beta \tilde{\sigma}_{b_k}) \quad (7)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\gamma^N} \sum_a (-1)^{a^t \text{wtr}(H^t C H) a} \alpha^{|a|} \beta^{N-|a|} \tilde{\sigma}_{H a} \quad (8)$$

Now note that if we only sum over the a 's such that $C H a = 0$ then we assure that

$$\langle 00 \dots | U(\mathbf{G}) | 00 \dots \rangle = \frac{1}{\gamma^N} \sum_a (-1)^{a^t \text{wtr}(H^t C H) a} \alpha^{|a|} \beta^{N-|a|}$$

is always non-zero for this omits X and Y gates from our sum.

As a simple example to illustrate the correspondence between the matrix representation H of the circuit and the actual operation of the circuit, consider

$$H = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

This matrix represents a circuit which operates in the following way:

$$e^{-iZ^{(1)} \otimes X^{(2)} \otimes Y^{(3)} \frac{\theta}{2}} e^{-iZ^{(1)} \otimes Z^{(2)} \otimes Y^{(3)} \frac{\theta}{2}} e^{-iY^{(1)} \otimes Z^{(2)} \otimes Z^{(3)} \frac{\theta}{2}}$$

where the superscripts represent which qubit is being acted upon. Thus each column encodes each exponentiated operator, i.e., each gate.

In [15] it was shown that the Ising partition function can be expressed in terms of a QWGT.

Let A be the incidence matrix of a graph g , i.e.,

$$A_{v,(i,j)} = \begin{cases} 1 & (v = i \text{ and } (i,j) \in E) \\ 0 & \text{else} \end{cases} . \quad (9)$$

Then we have

$$Z_w(\lambda) = \frac{2^{|V|}}{(1 - \lambda^2)^{|E|/2}} \sum_a (-1)^{a^t B a} \lambda^{|a|} = \frac{2^{|V|}}{(1 - \lambda^2)^{|E|/2}} \sum_{a \in \ker A} (-1)^{a \cdot w} \lambda^{|a|} \quad (10)$$

$$= \frac{2^{|V|}}{(1 - \lambda^2)^{|E|/2}} S(A, dg(w), \lambda, 1) \quad (11)$$

where $w = (w_{12}, w_{13}, \dots)$ (w gives the distribution of ferromagnetic ($w_{ij} = 0$) or anti-ferromagnetic ($w_{ij} = 1$) interactions along the edges of the given graph), $\lambda = \tanh(\beta J)$ (the “temperature”), V is the set of vertices, E is the set of edges and $B = dg(w)$ is the diagonal matrix formed by putting w on the diagonal and zeros everywhere else. This form of Z will be considered in future work.

III. A RELATIONSHIP BETWEEN GRAPHS AND QUANTUM CIRCUITS VIA QWGTs

The following “mapping” between graphs and quantum circuits was first introduced to obtain a class of quantum circuits which can be simulated classically in [6] and is based on equation (11). This mapping involves interpreting the matrix representation H of the quantum circuit, as outlined above, as coming from the incidence matrix of a graph. In this way we have a many to one mapping from quantum circuits to a graph.

A. THE MAPPING

Here, the motivation for this mapping is to obtain a QWGT equal to a matrix element of the unitary matrix of a quantum circuit that looks something like the generating function of Eulerian subgraphs $E(G, \lambda)$. If we were able to efficiently approximate $E(G, \lambda)$ then according to equation (3) we would have an efficient method of approximating the Ising partition function.

It turns out that if we take the ansatz

$$G_k = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\lambda^2 + 1}}(\lambda + \tilde{\sigma}_{b_k}) \quad (12)$$

for the gate set we obtain

$$U(\mathbf{G}) = \prod_{k=N}^1 \frac{1}{(\lambda^2 + 1)}(\lambda + \tilde{\sigma}_{b_k}) \quad (13)$$

$$= \frac{1}{(\lambda^2 + 1)} \prod_{k=N}^1 (\lambda + \tilde{\sigma}_{b_k}) \quad (14)$$

$$= \frac{1}{(\lambda^2 + 1)^{N/2}} \sum_a (-1)^{a^t \text{tr}(H^t C H)_a} \lambda^{|a|} \tilde{\sigma}_{H_a}. \quad (15)$$

Notice that the normalization $\sqrt{\lambda^2 + 1}$ is essential in order for our gates G_k to be rotations about products of Pauli matrices. Now, ignoring the normalization we have

$$\langle 00 \dots | U(\mathbf{G}) | 00 \dots \rangle \propto \sum_{a \in \text{Ker}(CH)} (-1)^{a^t \text{lwtr}(H^t CH) a} \lambda^{|a|}$$

Let us make the following assumptions:

1. Take CH to be a binary matrix with only two 1's per column i.e. CH will be identified with the incidence matrix of the given graph g .
2. H is a matrix of dimension $2n \times N$ with one (11) and at most one (01) per column, i.e., one Y operation and at most one X operation per gate respectively. The source of this restriction will be explained below. For example a column may look like

$$\left(110001100010 \right)^T.$$

H encodes the quantum circuit.

These assumptions will provide the basis for a natural mapping between quantum circuits and graphs. If we make the additional assumption

- 3.

$$a^t \text{lwtr}(H^t CH) a = 0 \pmod{2} \quad \forall a \in \text{ker}(CH). \quad (16)$$

this ensures that the matrix element $\langle 00 \dots | U(\mathbf{G}) | 00 \dots \rangle$ is equal to the generating function of eulerian subgraphs. This is achieved as follows.

First we need to associate the incidence matrix A with a matrix CH . The only thing we need to do is to create a matrix with double the number of rows of A , with row $2i - 1$ occupied by the i^{th} row of A , and each even row the zero vector. Thus we obtain

$$CH = \begin{pmatrix} A_{11} & A_{12} & \dots & A_{1N} \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & \dots & A_{2N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \dots & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

As far as the graph is concerned, this amounts to adding isolated vertices, which does not add any cycles. We now have the $2n \times N$ matrix CH as our representation for g . By the action of C , we see that CH gives us some freedom in our choice of H , which is the matrix representation of the quantum circuit. Specifically we have

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} x_1 & x_2 & \dots & x_N \\ A_{11} & A_{12} & \dots & A_{1N} \\ x_{N+1} & x_{N+2} & \dots & x_{2N} \\ A_{21} & A_{22} & \dots & A_{2N} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \dots & \vdots \\ A_{n1} & A_{n2} & \dots & A_{nm} \end{pmatrix}$$

The x_i must be selected according to the constraints mentioned above. We see that column k of H will only have two A_{ik} 's which are equal to 1 as these come from an incidence matrix and by definition, an incidence matrix has only two 1's per column. One 1 is possible as this represents a loop, i.e., an edge that begins and terminates at the same vertex. Further, by the QWGT formalism constructed above, we must have an odd number of Y ((11) entry in the column) operations per gate. Hence, there must be one 11 per column in the matrix H . There are only two positions where we could select an x_i in column k to be 1 such that it will be followed by an A_{jk} that is equal to 1. Thus each column (or gate) must have only one Y operation. By the same reasoning we see that there is only one possible place to put an X operation, i.e., only one way to place a (01) in column k . So there can be at most one X operation per gate. There is no restriction as to the number of Z operations per gate as we have the freedom of putting a 1 before any A_{ik} that is set to 0. By turning the x_i on or off (1 or 0 respectively) we obtain different circuits. This provides a degree of freedom that allows one to choose a quantum circuit that may satisfy the final assumption which ensures that the sum $\sum_{a \in \text{Ker}(CH)} (-1)^{a^t \text{lwtr}(H^t CH)a} \lambda^{|a|}$ is equal to $\sum_{a \in \text{Ker}(CH)} \lambda^{|a|}$ which is $E(G, \lambda)$ as desired.

Without the restriction given by

$$a^t \text{lwtr}(H^t CH)a = 0 \pmod{2} \quad \forall a \in \text{ker}(CH),$$

we actually have that

$$\langle 00 \cdots | U(\mathbf{G}) | 00 \cdots \rangle = \frac{1}{(\lambda^2 + 1)^{|E|/2}} \sum_{a \in \text{Ker}(CH)} (-1)^{h_a} \lambda^{|a|}.$$

This means that knowledge of the matrix element $\langle 00 \cdots | U(\mathbf{G}) | 00 \cdots \rangle$ amounts to knowledge of

$$E'(G, \lambda) = \sum_{a \in \text{Ker}(CH)} (-1)^{h_a} \lambda^{|a|} \quad (17)$$

where the h_a refer to the $a^t \text{lwtr}(H^t CH)a$. We shall call $E'(G, \lambda)$ the *signed* generating function of Eulerian subgraphs as the sum is over all subgraphs whose edges have even degree. Specifically, as CH is associated with the incidence matrix of a graph, the whole null space of CH are the characteristic vectors of all Eulerian subgraphs[29].

IV. BQP-COMPLETENESS

Theorem 1 *Additive approximations of the signed generator function of Eulerian subgraphs is BQP-complete.*

Proof:

It is clear from the above that an approximation of the matrix element $\langle 00 \cdots | U(\mathbf{G}) | 00 \cdots \rangle$ will give an approximation to $E'(G, \lambda)$. Recall from [10, 21] that via the Hadamard test one can obtain an additive approximation of this matrix element. This means that using a quantum computer we can retrieve an approximation m (with some probability of success bounded below by .75, say) which satisfies

$$\langle 00 \cdots | U(\mathbf{G}) | 00 \cdots \rangle - p < m < \langle 00 \cdots | U(\mathbf{G}) | 00 \cdots \rangle + p$$

where p is a polynomially small parameter. (This intuitive form can be easily derived via the definition of an additive approximation provided in [3].)

Now, assuming that we have at our disposal the universal gate set given by $\theta = \pm 2 \arccos(4/5)$ rotations of products of Pauli operators, then with an overhead of $\text{polylog}(|E|/\epsilon)$ of gates we may approximate our gates G_k , to accuracy $O(\epsilon/|E|)$ [17]. This

means that we may indeed approximate the signed generator function of Eulerian subgraphs via the Hadamard test and so this problem is in BQP.

Now, the other direction. We must demonstrate that knowledge of $E'(G, \lambda)$ is enough to simulate any quantum circuit. First we demonstrate that any quantum circuit corresponds to a graph under the scheme presented above.

1. Encode the given circuit with a matrix H' as follows: Each column is a gate where a rotation about X, Y, Z or I is encoded by 01, 11, 10 and 00 respectively in every two rows, i.e., each two rows is designated one of these operations as specified by the original circuit, and designates which qubit is being operated upon. We wish to transform H' to H .
2. We must now impose the following restrictions: Each column of H can have at most one 01 and must have one 11. This is done by working down the column of H' and replacing the second 01 and 11 in each column by a 00 (these are referred to as removed operations) and then adding an adjacent column to H' . (Z operations or 10 entries are not restricted and may be left as they are as they do not contribute to the incidence structure of the graph under this scheme.) This new column will have at most one 01 but must have a 11 placed into to it as required to replace the removed operations. Adding one Y operation to a column amounts to adding a loop to a graph, that is an edge that begins and terminates at the same vertex. Repeat this process for every column until you only have at most one X , as many Z or identity operations, and exactly one Y operation per column. If a column from the original circuit, H' , has no Y operations then the transformation to H will involve adding a Y operation to that column and then adding a column with all identity operations and one Y operation placed so as to cancel the previously added Y operation, i.e., $Y^2 = I$. The number of additional gates required to perform this transformation is $O(|E||V|)$ in the worst case. This transformation can be done more efficiently but we just wish to convince the reader that any quantum circuit has a graph representation under this scheme.
3. In this way we have the transformation $H' \longrightarrow H$. Multiplying H by C we obtain the

incidence matrix of some graph.

This process always terminates with a matrix representation that will readily encode a graph via its incidence structure. See section IV A for an example.

Now that we see that any quantum circuit has a graph representation through an incidence structure inherited by the relationships between X and Y operations per gate, we must demonstrate that knowledge of $E'(G, \lambda)$ is enough to simulate quantum computation. Since BQP is a decision class all we have to do is convert a quantum circuit into its decision making counterpart. This may be done as follows [22].




FIG. 1: A circuit illustrating the procedure to apply a quantum circuit U to a decision problem.

Let U be a quantum circuit for some decision problem and without loss of generality, assume that the “yes” or “no” answer is given by the output of the first qubit U_1 , i.e., $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ is “yes” or “no” respectively. The remaining qubits are ignored and assumed to be extraneous. Now, take an ancilla qubit U_A set to $|0\rangle$ and adjoin it to U . Next, CNOT the output of U_1 with U_A and encode the answer as the state $|\psi\rangle$. Apply the inverse of the circuit, U^\dagger , to all the output qubits except $|\psi\rangle$, to uncompute the outputs of U to $|00\cdots 0\rangle$. In this way, one arrives at the state $|00\cdots 0\rangle|\psi\rangle$ which will either be $|00\cdots 0\rangle|0\rangle$ or $|00\cdots 0\rangle|1\rangle$, effectively

“deciding” the decision problem. Thus one can assume, with no loss of generality, that any quantum circuit that solves some decision problem either outputs $|00 \cdots 0\rangle|0\rangle$ or $|00 \cdots 0\rangle|1\rangle$ (see FIG. 1). This argument depends on the quantum circuit being able to output the correct answer with certainty. This is of no matter as a similar argument can be made for a circuit which outputs the correct answer with some constant probability above a half [28]. Thus, knowledge that $\langle 00 \cdots |U|00 \cdots \rangle = 1$ implies that the control qubit will be $|0\rangle$ and thus $|\psi\rangle = |0\rangle$.

This means that knowledge of $E'(G, \lambda)$ can be used to effectively decide the decision problem for any quantum circuit as it is equal to the matrix element $\langle 00 \cdots |U|00 \cdots \rangle$. In our case, a natural decision problem would be to decide if $E'(G, \lambda)$ is bounded above by some constant or to decide its sign. The result of this decision would correspond to $|\psi\rangle$ either being $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ in FIG. 1 ■

A. Examples

Here are two simple yet instructive examples.

1) Let the given quantum circuit be encoded as

$$H' = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}.$$

We have to transform this to an acceptable representation. This example illustrates repeating operations in order to cancel them, thanks to the Pauli algebra. By following the procedure given we obtain

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

The incidence matrix (ignoring isolated vertices) can be retrieved easily from H and it is given by

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

Here is the corresponding graph.




FIG. 2: The graph obtained from the simple circuit given by H .

2) For this example, consider the sign flip operator [18] given by

$$e^{-i\sigma_z^1 \otimes \sigma_z^2 \frac{\pi}{4}}$$

which acts in the following way

$$|0b\rangle \longrightarrow e^{-i\sigma_z^2 \frac{\pi}{4}} |0b\rangle$$

and

$$|1b\rangle \longrightarrow e^{i\sigma_z^2 \frac{\pi}{4}} |1b\rangle.$$

If we had to perform the transformation as demonstrated in the previous example, then we would end up with the operator

$$e^{-i\sigma_z^1 \otimes I \frac{\pi}{4}} e^{-iI \otimes \sigma_z^2 \frac{\pi}{4}}$$

and we may end up losing the effect of the sign flip. This is not the case as we have the action

$$|0b\rangle \longrightarrow e^{-I \frac{\pi}{4}} e^{-i\sigma_z^2 \frac{\pi}{4}} |0b\rangle$$

and

$$|1b\rangle \longrightarrow e^{iI \frac{\pi}{4}} e^{i\sigma_z^2 \frac{\pi}{4}} |1b\rangle.$$

V. FUTURE WORK: APPROXIMATING THE ISING PARTITION FUNCTION

Recall the following form of the Ising partition function

$$Z(\beta) = 2^{|V|} \prod_{\{i,j\} \in E} \cosh(\beta J_{ij}) E(G, \tanh(\beta J_{ij}))$$

and note the difference between the function we are able to approximate via quantum computation, $E'(G, \lambda)$, and the actual generating function of Eulerian subgraphs $E(G, \lambda)$. We have that

$$E'(G, \lambda) = \sum_{a \in \text{Ker}(CH)} (-1)^{a^t \text{wtr}(H^t CH) a} \lambda^{|a|}.$$

If we wanted to use this for the approximation of the Ising partition function, as previously mentioned we would require that $a^t \text{lwtr}(H^t CH)a = 0 \pmod{2} \quad \forall a \in \ker(CH)$. If this requirement was met then we would run the quantum approximation algorithm with gate sets corresponding to $\lambda = \tanh(\beta J_{ij})$. This would require $O(|E|)$ different approximations as indicated by the product over all edges in the above formula. In effect we would have a polynomial additive approximation of the Ising partition function for any set of edge interactions and for any graph.

But alas, there is a problem. The equation that must be solved (equation (16)) in order to ensure that $E'(G, \lambda) = E(G, \lambda)$ in fact determines which particular quantum circuit must be used for the computation. By brute force this could require an exponential number of calculations in the number of vertices. Future work will involve studying this approach to see if one can in fact a priori guarantee that equation (16) is satisfied for certain non-planar graphs. For example, if one has knowledge about the parity of all the Eulerian subgraphs (number of edges) then this may be used to efficiently find the representation H of the quantum circuit required. The cubic lattice is an example where every Eulerian subgraph contains an even number of edges. This issue also arises in a very similar approach outlined in [6] but which deals explicitly with equation (11). Other applications of $E'(G, \lambda)$ will be explored as well as an extension to a two variable function.

VI. CONCLUSION

We provide a new way of relating quantum circuits to graphs and vice-versa via an incidence structure of the circuit or graph. We also provide a generating function related to the generating function of Eulerian subgraphs and demonstrate that additive approximations of it are BQP-complete. Connections to the Ising spin glass partition function were made and a discussion of future work dealing with additive approximations of the Ising partition function was provided.

Acknowledgments

I would like to thank Daniel Lidar for financial support and for providing me with the opportunity to learn from him. I would also like to thank Ravi Minhas, Stephan Jordan and Dave Bacon for helpful conversations.

-
- [1] R.P. Feynman, Intl. J. Theor. Phys. **21**, 467 (1982).
- [2] S. Lloyd, Science **273**, 1073 (1996).
- [3] M. Bordewich, M. Freedman, L. Lovasz and D. Welsh, *Approximate Counting and Quantum Computation*, Combinatorics, Probability and Computing, **14**, 737-754 (2005).
- [4] D.A. Lidar and O. Biham, Phys. Rev. E **56**, 3661 (1997).
- [5] J. Geraci and D.A. Lidar, *On the Exact Evaluation of Certain Instances of the Potts Partition Function by Quantum Computers*, accepted for publication in Commun. Math. Phys. Available online as [quant-ph/0703023], (2007).
- [6] J. Geraci and D.A. Lidar, *Classical Ising model test for quantum circuits*, paper in preparation.
- [7] J. Yepez, Phys. Rev. E **63**, 046702 (2001); D.A. Meyer, Proc. Roy. Soc. London Ser. A **360**, 395 (2002).
- [8] B. Georgeot and D.L. Shepelyansky, Phys. Rev. Lett. **86**, 5393 (2001); *ibid* **86**, 2890 (2001); M. Terraneo, B. Georgeot, D.L. Shepelyansky, Eur. Phys. J. D **22**, 127 (2003).
- [9] D. Aharonov, I. Arad, E. Eban and Z. Landau, *Polynomial Quantum Algorithms for Additive approximations of the Potts model and other Points of the Tutte Plane*, quant-ph/0702008.
- [10] D. Aharonov and I. Arad, *The BQP-hardness of approximating the Jones Polynomial*, quant-ph/0605181.
- [11] D. Cheung, D. Maslov and S. Severini, *Translation techniques between quantum circuit architectures*, available online at <http://www.iqc.ca/~sseverin/qipabs.pdf>
- [12] L.H. Kauffman, eprint math.QA/0105255. L.H. Kauffman, *Knots and Physics*, Vol. 1 of *Knots and Everything* (World Scientific, Singapore, 2001).
- [13] F. Barahona, J. Phys. A **15**, 3241 (1982).
- [14] L. Onsager, Phys. Rev. **65**, 117 (1944). R.J. Baxter, *Exactly Solved Models in Statistical Mechanics* (Academic, New York, 1982).
- [15] D.A. Lidar, Quantum Estimation of the Partition Function for Ising Spin Glasses, Knot Invariants, and Quadratically Signed Weight Enumerators, eprint quant-ph/0309064.
- [16] M. Hein, J. Eisert and H.J. Briegel, *Multi-party entanglement in graph states*, eprint quant-

- ph/0307130.
- [17] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, *Quantum Computing and Quadratically Signed Weight Enumerators*, Inf. Proc. Lett. **79**, 173 (2001).
 - [18] E. Knill and R. Laflamme, *On the power of one bit of quantum information*, arXiv preprint: quant-ph/9802037 (1998).
 - [19] E. Bernstein and U. Vazirani, *Quantum Complexity Theory*, SIAM J. Comput., **26**, 1411 (1997).
 - [20] S. Bravyi and R. Raussendorf, *On measurement-based quantum computation with the toric code states*, Physical Review A, **76**, Issue 2 (2007).
 - [21] P. W. Shor and S. P. Jordan, *Estimating Jones polynomials is a complete problem for one clean qubit*, arXiv preprint: quant-ph/0707.2831 (2007).
 - [22] C.M. Dawson, H.L. Haselgrove, A.P. Hines, D. Mortimer, M.A. Nielsen, and T.J. Osborne, *Quantum computing and polynomial equations over the finite field \mathbf{Z}_2* , *Quantum Information and Computation*, **5**, 102 (2005).
 - [23] D.J.A. Welsh, *Complexity: Knots, Colourings and Counting*, London Mathematical Society Lecture Note Series 186, (Cambridge University Press, 1993).
 - [24] I.L. Markov and Y. Shi, *Simulating quantum computation by contracting tensor networks*, preprint quant-ph/0511069 (2007).
 - [25] J. Gross and J. Yellen, *Graph theory and its applications*, Discrete mathematics and its applications, CRC Press, (1999).
 - [26] M. Jerrum and A. Sinclair, *Polynomial-time approximation algorithms for the Ising model*, Proc. 17th ICALP, EATCS, (1990).
 - [27] A. Galluccio, M. LoebL and J. Vondrak, *New Algorithm for the Ising Problem: Partition Function for Finite Lattice Graphs*, Phys. Rev. Lett. **84**, 5924 - 5927 (2000).
 - [28] C. H. Bennett, E. Bernstein, G. Brassard, and U. Vazirani, *Strengths and weaknesses of quantum computing*, SIAM J. Comp., **26(5)**, 15101523 (1997).
 - [29] A. Galluccio and M. LoebL, *On the theory of Pfaffian Orientations II. T-joins, K-cuts, and duality of enumeration*, The Electronic Journal of Combinatorics, vol. 6 (1), Research Paper 7, 1999.