

Quantum Learning Machine

Jeongho Bang,¹ James Lim,¹ M. S. Kim,² and Jinhyoung Lee¹

¹*Department of Physics, Hanyang University, Seoul 133-791, Korea*

²*School of Mathematics and Physics, The Queen's University of Belfast, BT7 1NN, United Kingdom*
(Received January 26, 2023)

We propose a novel notion of a quantum learning machine for automatically controlling quantum coherence and for developing quantum algorithms. A quantum learning machine can be trained to learn a certain task with no a priori knowledge on its algorithm. It is demonstrated that the quantum learning machine learns Deutsch's task and itself finds its quantum algorithm, that is different from but equivalent to the original one.

Quantum automatic control.- Quantum information science has emerged by applying quantum physics to information science [1]. For this purpose, controlling quantum coherence plays a fundamental role and it enables quantum state-engineering [2, 3]. Quantum computation has been shown to be more powerful than the classical computation by finding quantum algorithms, computational processes intended to be operated on quantum-mechanical systems. However, there are only a few quantum algorithms known such as Deutsch-Josza algorithm [4, 5], Shor's factorization [6, 7], Grover's database search [8], and hidden subgroup problems. The complexity and difficulties of understanding quantum physics are obstacles to develop a new quantum algorithm. Finding new quantum algorithms is a very challengeable subject.

The controllability of quantum coherence and the ability of developing new quantum algorithms require to investigate novel approaches. Here, we propose a new approach of "quantum automatic control." In this approach, state-engineering is supposed to be automatically implemented by using a feed-back method: A feed-back system adjusts unitary operations so that the adjusted unitary operations can bring out target states intended. The feed-back system performs a single-shot quantum measurement on the output system and figures out if it is in the target state. If not, it modifies the control parameters of unitary operation. The feed-back system repeats over an ensemble of the given quantum system, one by one, until the adjusted unitary operation outputs the target state. In fact, feed-back systems have been extensively studied for classical and quantum automatic control which include quantum neural network [9], estimating a quantum state [10], and automatic engineering of wave packets for molecules or monochrome light with a genetic algorithm [11, 12, 13]. Our approach of quantum automatic control contrasts with the aforementioned methods. It is fundamentally involved in quantum information processes and adopts notions in quantum information theory. The present approach is intended to be able to perform a certain information processing by automatically adjusting the internal unitary operation. Hence we call the entire system including the unitary operation device of the quantum system, the single-shot

measurement, and the feed-back system as a "quantum learning machine."

The present approach can also be applied to develop new algorithms. Quantum random walk can be regarded as a typical example of our approach and it has intensively been studied for probabilistic algorithms. In this work, we demonstrate a quantum learning machine that can itself find Deutsch's algorithm.

Quantum learning machine.- In the present theory of quantum automatic control, a quantum learning machine (QLM) is supposed to learn a certain task, given by a supervisor, and eventually to be able to perform it. A task is represented by a function $f(x)$ where x is an input and $t = f(x)$ is target. For the function f , the supervisor selects a subset of N input-target pairs, $T = \{(x_1, f(x_1)), (x_2, f(x_2)), \dots, (x_N, f(x_N))\}$, and sends the subset T to the QLM through a classical channel. The machine is to learn and to perform the task, now represented by the subset T . A QLM can be used for controlling quantum coherence and developing new quantum algorithms. It is necessary to know if a subset of task T suffices for the machine to find an optimal algorithm in case of developing quantum algorithms.

The QLM basically performs quantum information processing and contains a preparation device P of prepar-




FIG. 1: Constituents of a quantum learning machine: A preparation device P , a unitary operation device U , a single-shot quantum measurement device M , and a feed-back system F equipped with a classical memory storage S .

ing a quantum system Q to be in a certain input state, an operation device U of performing a unitary operation on Q , and a measurement device M of measuring Q . The basic idea for QLM is to provide the basic building blocks of information processing, P - U - M , with a feed-back system F , so that F can adjust the control parameters of U , depending on the measurement outcome in M . For this purpose the feed-back system F is equipped with a classical memory storage S , which stores the parameter values of U and records measurement outcomes at M , and two classical channels C_{FU} and C_{MF} , where C_{FU} (C_{MF}) makes one-way connection from F to U (from M to F). Fig. 1 presents the schematic diagram of the QLM.

The feed-back system F is responsible for QLM's learning and eventually performing the task: It controls that the operation device U eventually brings out the target t according to the input x for each element (x, t) in the given set of task T . The feed-back system F can determine if the target t is obtained, as monitoring an outcome m from the measurement device M . The outcome is transferred from M to F through the classical channel C_{MF} .

An input value x can be encoded in two ways: a) Encoded on a quantum state in the preparation device P or b) on a unitary operation in the operation device U . In most cases encoding on the unitary operation is appropriate and this is the case for finding Deutsch's algorithm. For the purpose the operation device is decomposed into three sub-devices, of which a middle one performs unitary operations to incorporate input values x . For instance, in Deutsch's algorithm, the middle device applies one of 4 functions [14]. Throughout this work we will only consider encoding on a unitary operation, as in finding Deutsch's algorithm.

The QLM runs in an iterative way as checking if it always works for the given task T . At the first iteration, the feed-back system F selects "randomly" an element $(x, t_x) \in T$. It prepares the control parameters in the operation device U of three sub-devices U_1 , U_2 , and U_3 . As the input values are encoded on unitary operations in the middle sub-device U_2 , F dials to the predetermined value of the parameters $\mathbf{p}_2(x)$ with respect to the input value x and it chooses *arbitrary* values of parameters \mathbf{p}_1 and \mathbf{p}_3 for U_1 and U_3 , respectively. This arbitrariness of parameter values is crucial in our approach of the QLM, as this implies the machine does not require any *a priori* knowledge about the algorithm [note that predetermining parameters in U_2 is a part of defining the task]. The preparation device P prepares a system Q to be in a certain fixed state $|0\rangle$. After going through U , Q becomes to be in the output state,

$$|\psi_x\rangle = \hat{U}_x|0\rangle = \hat{U}_3(\mathbf{p}_3)\hat{U}_2(\mathbf{p}_2(x))\hat{U}_1(\mathbf{p}_1)|0\rangle. \quad (1)$$

The measurement device M detects Q in the standard basis $\{|m\rangle\}$ and its outcome m is sent to F through C_{MF} .

If m is equal to the target t_x , F records "success", say bit '1', in the classical memory storage S and, otherwise, it records "fail", bit '0', in S .

At every iteration, QLM repeats the first iteration. However, the feed-back system F adjusts the control parameters $\mathbf{p}_{1,3}$ in the operation device U due to a certain learning algorithm. The classical memory storage S records each measurement outcome sequentially. If it is fully occupied, S eliminates the first record and shifts each record to the lower sequence, as seen in Fig. 2. If the storage is filled all by "success," F terminates the learning process, called a halt condition, and announces the values of $\mathbf{p}_{1,3}$ to the supervisor. The size of S , N decides the precision of the QLM. When it satisfies the halt condition, the QLM is said to complete the learning. We call, as a learning probability $P(n)$, the probability that the QLM completes the learning process before the n th iteration. Then, $Q(n) = 1 - P(n)$ is called a "survival" probability that the QLM does not complete until n .

A learning algorithm tells the feed-back system F how to update the parameter values $\mathbf{p}_{1,3}$ in the operation device U and when F halts the learning process before announcing $\mathbf{p}_{1,3}$ to the supervisor. We propose a learning algorithm how F updates the parameter vector, $\mathbf{p} \equiv (\mathbf{p}_1, \mathbf{p}_3)$. After receiving \mathbf{p}_n , the parameter vector at the n th iteration, (and also $\mathbf{p}_2(x)$ for the random input x), U performs the corresponding unitary operation so that the system Q becomes in an output state $|\psi_x\rangle$, as in Eq. (1), for the input x . The measurement device M tests if $|\psi_x\rangle$ is the target state $|t_x\rangle$ and it sends the result to F . F records the outcome in S , as described in the previous paragraph. If the outcome is '1' or success, F trusts the parameter values and leaves them unchanged: $\mathbf{p}_{n+1} = \mathbf{p}_n$. Otherwise, F needs to modify the parameter values. Instead of using any *a priori* knowledge on the algorithm, F generates a *random* vector \mathbf{r} and adjusts the parameter vector as

$$\mathbf{p}_{n+1} = \mathbf{p}_n + \frac{N_F}{N_T} \mathbf{r}, \quad (2)$$

where N_F and N_S are the numbers of fail and success records in S , respectively, and $N_T = \min(N, N_S + N_F)$. The learning algorithm is intuitively understandable: \mathbf{p} remains invariant if no fail outcomes are obtained,




FIG. 2: The scheme for updating the records in the classical memory storage S when S is fully occupied. Here bit '1' and '0' denote "success" and "fail", respectively. S records sequentially each measurement outcome. If it is fully occupied, the old data in the last cell is deleted, remaining data are shifted by one cell into the next neighboring position and the first memory cell is filled up with the new data.

whereas it changes more as fail outcomes increase. Note that the oldest records in S will be eliminated as the learning process continues, keeping F on using the latest records for the adjustment. [Nevertheless, further studies are necessary to improve the learning algorithm.]

Demonstration: finding Deutsch's algorithm.- To investigate the possibility of QLM for developing new quantum algorithms, we consider a QLM for Deutsch's problem of judging if a function is balanced or constant. The QLM will be shown to always find optimal algorithms, possibly different from but equivalent to Deutsch's original algorithm. For the purpose we employ a *quantum Monte-Carlo method* to numerically simulate an experiment.

Deutsch's algorithm is a quantum algorithm of deciding if an arbitrary binary function is constant or balanced [14]. Consider a function f with the domain and the image both being the binary set $\{0, 1\}$. There are four possible functions,

$$f_0(0) = 0, \quad f_0(1) = 0 \quad (3)$$

$$f_1(0) = 0, \quad f_1(1) = 1 \quad (4)$$

$$f_2(0) = 1, \quad f_2(1) = 0 \quad (5)$$

$$f_3(0) = 1, \quad f_3(1) = 1. \quad (6)$$

If $f(0) = f(1)$ as in Eqs. (3) and (6), the function f is said to be constant and the function balanced, otherwise (as in Eqs. (4) and (5)). A classical algorithm is simple: Obtaining the values $y = f(x)$ for all inputs $x = 0, 1$ and judging if $f(0) = f(1)$. Such an algorithm requires two queries of f for two inputs. On the other hand, Deutsch's algorithm enables the judgement of f only by a single query of f , as it uses a quantum superposition of two input states.

A quantum circuit for Deutsch's algorithm is presented in Fig. 3. In the circuit, H is a Hadamard gate which transforms an input state $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ to a quantum superposition $\hat{H}|0\rangle = (|0\rangle + |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ or $\hat{H}|1\rangle = (|0\rangle - |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$, respectively. The operation device U_f is a gate to calculate a given function f , which transforms an input state $|x, y\rangle_{AB}$ to $|x, y \oplus f(x)\rangle_{AB}$. The Hadamard gate on the system A is to make a quantum superposition for the argument x so that U_f can calculate f for the two values




FIG. 3: A quantum circuit for Deutsch's algorithm, where \hat{H} is Hadamard operator and \hat{U}_f is an operator for a given function f which results in the output state $|x, y \oplus f(x)\rangle$ when applied on an input state $|x, y\rangle$.

of x by a single operation, utilizing quantum parallelism. After going through the gates in the circuit, the qubits A and B are in the state

$$|\psi_f\rangle = \begin{cases} \pm|0\rangle_A \frac{(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)_B}{\sqrt{2}}, & \text{if } f \text{ is constant,} \\ \pm|1\rangle_A \frac{(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)_B}{\sqrt{2}}, & \text{if } f \text{ is balanced.} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

The outcome at the measurement device M tells us if f is constant or balanced. It needs to detect a single qubit in the standard basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. The efficiency of the quantum algorithm is dramatically improved by enlarging the domain of a function, as in Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm [4, 5].

We consider a QLM that learns Deutsch's task and itself find an optimal internal operation. Analyzing the optimal internal operation, we present quantum algorithms which are different from but equivalent to Deutsch's original one. Deutsch's task is represented by a set,

$$T = \{(f_0, 'c'), (f_1, 'b'), (f_2, 'b'), (f_3, 'c')\}, \quad (8)$$

where f_i is defined in Eqs. (3)-(6) and 'c' and 'b' stand for constant and balanced, respectively. For an element $(f, t) \in T$, the input f thus stands for one of functions f_i and the target t does its property, constant or balanced, in QLM.

The QLM is schematically presented in Fig. 4. A preparation device prepares two qubits A and B to be in certain fixed states, say $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, respectively. Here the prepared states are the same as in Deutsch's original algorithm but they do not matter at all: They may be changed as far as fixed throughout the learning process. The internal operation device U is divided into three, U_1 , U_2 , and U_3 . The middle sub-device U_2 is placed for calculating the function of a given input f . The first sub-device U_1 performs a two-qubit unitary operations. On the other hand, U_3 does a single-qubit unitary operation. It is because the task demands the QLM to output one bit of information on the function property, constant or balanced. U has 18 controlling parameters; $4^2 - 1 = 15$ for two-qubit operation U_1 and $2^2 - 1 = 3$ for one-qubit operation U_3 . The sub-device U_2 is a part of defining the task and the parameter values are predetermined with




FIG. 4: A structure of the unitary operation U , consisting of three sub-operations (see the text). Here \hat{U}_1 and \hat{U}_3 are two-qubit and single-qubit operators, respectively. The operator \hat{U}_f is the same as in Deutsch's algorithm.




FIG. 5: (a) Learning probability $P(n)$ and (b) survival probability $Q(n) = 1 - P(n)$ in terms of the number of iterations n , constructed by quantum Monte-Carlo method with 1000 trials for 300 bits of the classical memory storage. Solid line is a fitting function and the survival probability is well fitted to $Q(n) = e^{-(n-1)/n_c}$ with a fitting parameter n_c , called a characteristic constant. The exponential behavior implies that the QLM always succeeds in learning the task.




FIG. 6: a) Fidelity averaged over 1000 trials for a given memory size N . Each error bar is a standard deviation over the trials. (b) Characteristic constant n_c as a function of N on a log-log scale. The data are well fitted to $n_c = AN^D$ with $D \simeq 3.46$ and $A \simeq 10^{-1.06}$.

respect to an input function f , such that U_2 transforms an input state $|x, y\rangle_{AB}$ to $|x, y \oplus f(x)\rangle_{AB}$.

We perform the quantum Monte-Carlo simulation, sampling 1000 trials, where the QLM starts each trial by refreshing all the previous parameters. In Fig. 5(a), we present a learning probability $P(n)$ in terms of the number of iterations n , constructed by 1000 trials with 300 bits of the classical memory employed. The survival probability $Q(n) = 1 - P(n)$ in Fig. 5(b) is well fitted to an exponential function, $e^{-(n-1)/n_c}$ with a fitting parameter n_c , called a “characteristic constant” implying how many iterations are necessary for the learning. Note that the QLM always learns the task with a *finite* n_c . It is found that each unitary operator \hat{U}_1 after completing the learning process is a product of two one-qubit operators within the precision allowed. The two one-qubit operators are in general not equal to the two Hadamard operators but \hat{U}_1 together with \hat{U}_3 performs Deutsch’s task. Thus, the found quantum algorithms are equivalent to Deutsch’s original one, assuming all one-qubit

operations costs the same. We say that the QLM always finds Deutsch’s quantum algorithms in the iterations n_c in the sense that the survival probability exponentially decays as the iteration is repeated.

In Fig. 6(a), we present the average fidelity with respect to a memory size N . Here the fidelity $f = \sum_{x=0}^3 \langle t_x | \hat{\rho}_x | t_x \rangle / 4$ is averaged over 1000 trials for a given N , where $|t_x\rangle$ ($\hat{\rho}_x$) are target (output) states. The average fidelity f approaches unity as increasing the memory size N as expected. For instance, $f \simeq 0.989$ for $N = 300$. Fig. 6(b) presents the characteristic constant n_c as a function of N on a log-log scale. It is found that the characteristic constant n_c is well fitted to a polynomial function of N , i.e., $n_c = AN^D$ with $D \simeq 3.46$ and $A \simeq 10^{-1.06}$.

In summary, we proposed a novel notion of the quantum learning machine for automatically controlling quantum coherence and for developing quantum algorithms. We illustrated that the QLM always find the quantum algorithms equivalent to Deutsch’s in the sense that the survival probability that the QLM can not find any algorithm, exponentially decays.

Note added.- As completing this work, we recently found a related work [15]

-
- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Springer, 1999).
 - [2] W. H. Zurek, Los Alamos Science **27** (2002).
 - [3] D. P. DiVincenzo, Fortschr. Phys. **48**, 771 (2000).
 - [4] D. Deutsch and R. Jozsa, Proc. R. Soc. London A **439**, 553 (1992).
 - [5] R. Cleve, A. Ekert, C. Macchiavello, and M. Mosca, Proc. R. Soc. London A **454**, 339 (1998).
 - [6] P. W. Shor, SIAM J. comput. **26**, 1484 (1997).
 - [7] A. Ekert and R. Jozsa, Rev. Mod. Phys. **68**, 733 (1996).
 - [8] L. K. Grover, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 325 (1997).
 - [9] G. Purushothaman and N. B. Karayiannis, IEEE Trans. Neural Networks **8**, 679 (1997).
 - [10] D. G. Fischer, S. H. Kienle, and M. Freyberger, Phys. Rev. A **61**, 032306 (2000).
 - [11] R. S. Judson and H. Rabitz, Phys. Rev. Lett. **68**, 1500 (1991).
 - [12] T. Baumert, T. Brixner, V. Seyfried, M. Strehle, and G. Gerber, Appl. Phys. B **65**, 779 (1997).
 - [13] A. Assion, T. Baumert, M. Bergt, T. Brixner, B. Kiefer, V. Seyfried, M. Strehle, and G. Gerber, Science **282**, 919 (1998).
 - [14] D. Deutsch, Proc. R. Soc. London A **400**, 97 (1985).
 - [15] S. Gammelmark and K. Molmer, arXiv:0803.1418 (2008).