

# Quantum classification

Sébastien Gambs  
 Département d'informatique et de recherche opérationnelle  
 Université de Montréal  
 C.P. 6128, Succ. Centre-Ville, Montréal (Québec), H3C 3J7 CANADA  
 gamsseb@iro.umontreal.ca

February 24, 2019

## Abstract

Quantum classification is defined as the task of predicting the associated class of an unknown quantum state drawn from an ensemble of pure states given a finite number of copies of this state. By recasting the state discrimination problem within the framework of Machine Learning (ML), we can use the notion of learning reduction coming from classical ML to solve different variants of the classification task, such as the weighted binary and the multiclass versions.

## 1 Introduction

Suppose that you are given an unknown quantum state drawn from an ensemble of possible pure states where each state is labeled after the class from which it originated. How well can you predict the class of this unknown state? This general question is often referred to in the literature as (quantum) *state discrimination*<sup>1</sup> [6] and has been studied at least as far back as the seminal work of Helstrom in the seventies in the field of *quantum detection and estimation theory* [17]. Of course, the answer will depend on parameters such as the structure and your knowledge of the ensemble of pure states, the dimension of the Hilbert space in which the quantum states live and the number of copies of the unknown state you received.

In this paper, we take a Machine Learning (ML) view of the problem by recasting it as a learning task called *quantum classification*. Our main goal by doing so is to bring new ideas and insights from ML to help solve this task and some of its variants. Other motivations include the characterization of these learning tasks in terms of the amount of information needed to complete them (measured for instance by the number of copies of the quantum states) and the development of a framework that can be used to relate and compare these tasks.

This approach of performing learning on quantum states was originally taken and defined in [2], where it was illustrated by giving an explicit algorithm for the task of *quantum clustering*, where the goal is to group in clusters quantum states that are similar (using the fidelity as a similarity measure) while putting states that are dissimilar in different clusters. The model of learning on quantum states put forward in this paper is complementary to a model proposed by Aaronson [1], where the training dataset is composed of POVM's (*Positive-Operator Valued Measurement*), and not quantum states. In Aaronson's model, we receive a finite number of copies of an unknown quantum state and the goal is, by "training" this state on a few POVM's, to produce with high probability a hypothesis that can generalize with a reasonable accuracy on unobserved POVM's belonging to this training dataset.

The outline of this paper is as follows. First, the model of performing learning in a quantum world is introduced in Section 2 along with the notion of learning reduction which allows us to relate together different learning tasks. Afterwards, in Section 3, the task of binary classification is described, and the weighted and

---

<sup>1</sup>Other common names include *state distinguishability* and *state identification*.

multiclass versions of this task are defined respectively in Sections 4 and 5. Finally, Section 6 concludes with a discussion.

## 2 Learning in a quantum world

*Machine Learning* (ML) [15, 22, 29] is the field that studies techniques to *give to machines the ability to learn from past experience*. Typical tasks in *supervised learning* include the ability to predict the class (*classification*) or some unobserved characteristic (*regression*) of an object based on some observations. In *unsupervised learning*, the goal is to find some structure hidden within the data such as discovering “natural” clusters (*clustering*), finding a meaningful low-dimensional representation of the data (*dimensionality reduction*) or learning explicitly a probability function (also called density function) that represents the true distribution of the data (*density estimation*). ML algorithms learn from a training dataset which contains observations about objects, which are either obtained empirically or acquired from experts.

### 2.1 Learning with a classical dataset

In *classical* ML, the observations and the objects are implicitly considered to be classical and the machine which performs the learning is assumed to be a classical computer (such as a classical Turing machine or a classical logical circuit). For instance, in *supervised learning*, a training dataset containing  $n$  data points can be described as  $D_n = \{(x_1, y_1), \dots, (x_n, y_n)\}$ , where  $x_i$  would be a vector of *observations* on the *characteristics* of the  $i^{\text{th}}$  object (or data point) and  $y_i$  is the corresponding *class* of that object. As a typical example, each object can be described using  $d$  real-valued attributes (i.e.  $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d$ ) and if we are dealing with binary classification (i.e.  $y_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ ).

**Example 1** (Classical classification tasks). *Recognition of the digital fingerprints or the face of a person (in this case each class corresponds to a person), automatically classify a news article as belonging to the “culture” or “sports” section, detection of frauds, music genre classification, etc. . .*

The main difference between supervised and *unsupervised* learning is that in the latter case, the  $y_i$  values are unknown. This could mean that we know the possible labels in general but not the specific label of each data point, or that even the number of classes and their labels are unknown to us.

### 2.2 Learning with a quantum dataset

In a quantum world, an ML algorithm still needs a training dataset from which to perform learning, but this dataset now contains *quantum* objects instead of classical observations on classical objects (the machine is also a quantum computer).

**Definition 1** (Quantum training dataset). *A quantum training dataset containing  $n$  pure quantum states can be described as  $D_n = \{(|\psi_1\rangle, y_1), \dots, (|\psi_n\rangle, y_n)\}$ , where  $|\psi_i\rangle$  is the  $i^{\text{th}}$  quantum state of the training dataset and  $y_i$  is the class associated with this state.*

**Example 2** (Quantum training dataset composed of pure states defined on  $d$  qubits). *In the context where all the pure states in the training dataset live in a Hilbert space formed by  $d$  qubits and we are interested in the task of binary classification ;  $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2^d}$  and  $y_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ .*

In this work, we will restrict ourselves to the case where the states are quantum but the classes remain classical. Further generalization is to consider the situation in which objects can be in a quantum superposition of classes<sup>2</sup>. Another extension of the model is to allow the quantum states to be mixed, and not only pure.

---

<sup>2</sup>Note that being in a quantum superposition of classes is not equivalent to the classical notion of data point belonging to several classes in a fuzzy or probabilistic manner.

## 2.3 Learning classes

One of the intrinsic difficulty of defining learning in the quantum world comes from the many ways in which quantum states can be specified in the training dataset. For instance, the training dataset could contain a finite number of copies of each quantum state or consist of a classical description of these (like an explicit description of their density matrices). This latter case is the most “powerful” in the sense of information theory because from a classical description of a state, it is always possible in principle to produce as many quantum copies as desired.

To formalize this notion, the concept of learning classes that differ in the form of the training dataset, the learner’s technological sophistication and his learning goal was introduced in [2].

**Definition 2** (Learning class). *For learning class  $\mathbb{L}_{goal}^{context}$ , let subscript “goal” refer to the learning goal and superscript “context” to the form of the training dataset and/or the technology to which the learner has access.*

Possible values for *goal* are *cl*, which stands for doing ML with a classical purpose, in mind, and *qu* for ML with a quantum motivation. Similarly, the superscript *context* can be *cl* for “classical” if everything is classical (with a possible exception for the goal) or *qu* if something “quantum” is going on in the learning process. Other values for *context* can be used when we need to be more specific. For example,  $\mathbb{L}_{cl}^{cl}$  corresponds to ML in the usual sense, in which we want to use classical means to learn from classical observations about classical objects. Another example is  $\mathbb{L}_{cl}^{qu}$ , in which we have access to a quantum computer to facilitate the learning but the goal remains to perform a classical task: the quantum computer could serve to speed up the learning process.

In this paper, we are only concerned with the specific case where “*goal* = *qu*”.

**Definition 3** (Quantum learning from the classical description of the quantum states).  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{cl}$  is defined as the learning class in which we receive the classical descriptions of the quantum states from the training dataset (i.e.  $D_n = \{(\psi_1, y_1), \dots, (\psi_n, y_n)\}$ , where  $\psi_i$  is the classical description of quantum state  $|\psi_i\rangle$ ).

Learning becomes more challenging<sup>3</sup> when the dataset is available only in its quantum form, in which case more copies make life easier as we can potentially extract more information on the state. For instance, a corollary of the *Holevo bound* [19, 13] states that it is impossible to extract more than  $d$  classical bits of information from a quantum state living in a Hilbert space formed by  $d$  qubits. Moreover, the *no-cloning theorem* [30] forbids us to produce two identical copies of an unknown quantum state. Finally, some *tradeoffs exist between the amount of information* that we can learn on a quantum state and *the corresponding perturbation* than this process will generate (see [21] for instance).

**Definition 4** (Quantum learning from a finite number of copies of the quantum states).  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s}$  is defined as the learning class in which we are given at least  $s$  copies of each quantum state of the training dataset (i.e.  $D_n = \{(|\psi_1\rangle^{\otimes s}, y_1), \dots, (|\psi_n\rangle^{\otimes s}, y_n)\}$ ; where  $|\psi_i\rangle^{\otimes s}$  symbolizes  $s$  copies of state  $|\psi_i\rangle$ ).

Contrast these classes with ML in a classical world (such as  $\mathbb{L}_{cl}^{cl}$ ), in which additional copies of a particular object are obviously useless as they do not carry new information. The main purpose of defining quantum learning classes is to be able to put some quantum training datasets and some learning tasks within them.

The quantum learning classes form a *hierarchy in an information-theoretic sense*, where the higher a class is located inside the hierarchy, the more information it contains in order to realize tasks linked to the datasets belonging to this class. The class  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{cl}$  is at the top of the hierarchy since it corresponds to having a *complete knowledge* about the quantum states forming the training set. Let  $\equiv_\ell$ ,  $\leq_\ell$  and  $<_\ell$  be the operators which denote respectively the *equivalence*, the *weaker or equal* and the *strictly weaker* relationships within

---

<sup>3</sup>Remark however that the classical description of a state is generally exponentially longer to write if it is represented classically as a string of bits compare to the corresponding quantum state in the form of qubits. Therefore, we can imagine a paradoxical situation where to describe classically the  $2^{1000}$  amplitudes of quantum state defined on 1000 qubits, we would need more memory than there are atoms in the universe, and this even if each atom could be used individually as a classical unit of memory (i.e. a bit). By contrast, if we can coherently manipulate the atoms and maintain them in superposition, 1000 atoms would suffice to store the same state.

the hierarchy. The following propositions (first stated in [2]) describe some relations between the learning classes forming the hierarchy.

**Proposition 1.**  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s} \equiv_{\ell} \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{cl}$  as  $s \rightarrow \infty$ .

*Proof.* When the number of copies tends to infinity, it is always possible to estimate  $|\psi\rangle$  using *quantum tomography* and reconstruct the classical description with arbitrary precision.  $\square$

**Proposition 2.**  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes 1} \leq_{\ell} \dots \leq_{\ell} \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s} \leq_{\ell} \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s+1} \leq_{\ell} \dots \leq_{\ell} \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{cl}$ .

*Proof.* Each new copy of a state gives potentially more information on that state. Therefore for any positive integer  $s$ , we have  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s} \leq_{\ell} \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s+1}$ , which implies that if a learning task  $A \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s}$ , it also belongs to  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s+1}$ . Furthermore due to Proposition 1, a classical description of a state is as good as any number of copies.  $\square$

**Proposition 3.**  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s} + \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes 1} \leq_{\ell} \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s+1}$ , where “+” denotes a restriction that the first  $s$  copies must be measured separately from the the last.

*Proof.* Performing a *joint* measurement by allowing  $s + 1$  copies to interact together can potentially give more information than performing a joint measurement on  $s$  copies plus a separated measurement on another copy. (See [26] for a specific instance where  $s = 1$  and [12] for results about arbitrary  $s$ .)  $\square$

An interesting open question is whether or not this hierarchy is strict.

**Open question 1** (Strict hierarchy of learning classes). *In the expression  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes 1} \leq_{\ell} \dots \leq_{\ell} \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s} \leq_{\ell} \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s+1} \leq_{\ell} \dots \leq_{\ell} \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{cl}$ , can some of these  $\leq_{\ell}$  be replaced by  $<_{\ell}$ ?*

There are good reasons to believe that the answer is positive since it is usually the case that more information can be obtained about a quantum state when more copies are available. Moreover, it has been proven that in some situations that joint measurements are more informative than individual measurements [26, 12]. However, it does not *necessarily* follow that this additional information can be used in a constructive manner to solve some learning tasks.

## 2.4 Learning reduction

The notion of *reduction between learning tasks* [8] was developed and formalized during these last years in the context of classical ML by Langford and co-authors<sup>4</sup>.

**Definition 5** (Learning reduction [8]). *A learning task  $A$  reduces to some other learning task  $B$  if by having access to a black-box (an oracle) that solves  $B$ , it is also possible to solve  $A$ .*

A learning reduction can be seen as an *information-theoretic statement* about how well it is possible to solve a particular learning task given an algorithm (modelled abstractly by an oracle) that can solve another task. Although in general it is desirable for this transformation to be efficient, learning reductions differ from the “traditional” reductions used in complexity theory (such as Turing or Karp reductions) in the sense they do not try to characterize the computational time needed to solve a particular task. Rather, learning reductions offer a way to compare and relate two different learning tasks in the sense of information-theory. If  $A$  reduces to  $B$ , it means that any progress made on how to solve  $B$  can be transferred directly to  $A$  by using the reduction. Moreover, if different tasks all reduce to a single *learning primitive*, it means that an improvement on this primitive has a direct impact on all the other tasks. For instance, in sections 4 and 5, we will see how to solve the *weighted binary* and the *multiclass classification* tasks given an oracle for solving the *standard binary classification* (section 3).

A good reduction often offers some guarantee on how well the performance of the black-box in solving problem  $B$  also implies a good performance regarding problem  $A$ . For instance in classification, this guarantee could take the form of *upper bounds on the error achieved by the final classifier*. The upper bounds generally

---

<sup>4</sup>See for instance the webpage of Langford’s project on learning reductions <http://hunch.net/~j1/projects/reductions/reductions.html>.

relate the average error of the classifiers generated by the oracle on subproblems  $B$  to the global error that the final combined classifier will make on the general problem  $A$ .

**Definition 6** ((Training) error). *The (training) error  $\epsilon$  (or error rate) of a classifier  $f$  is defined as the probability that this classifier predicts the wrong class  $y_i$  on a quantum state  $|\psi_i\rangle$  drawn randomly from the states of the quantum training dataset  $D_n$ . Formally:*

$$\epsilon_f = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Prob}(f(|\psi_i\rangle) \neq y_i) \quad (1)$$

This definition characterizes precisely the training error of the classifier but not its *generalization error*, which corresponds to how well the classifier predicts on states that it has not observed exactly beforehand (i.e. that are not part of the training dataset). For now, we will focus only on the minimization of this training error but we will come back to the generalization error (which is really the essence of ML) in the discussion (Section 6).

In the context of quantum classification, the notion of *regret* also takes a particular importance.

**Definition 7** (Regret). *The regret  $r$  of a classifier  $f$  is defined as the difference between its error rate  $\epsilon_f$  and the smallest achievable error  $\epsilon_{opt}$  that can be achieved on the same problem. Formally:*

$$r_f = \epsilon_f - \epsilon_{opt} \quad (2)$$

The regret of a classifier, as well as its error, can potentially take any value in the range between zero and one. The concept of regret is particularly meaningful in the context of hard learning problems, where the raw error rate alone is not an appropriate measure to characterize the inherent difficulty of the learning. Indeed, in some learning situations, it is possible to observe a high error rate but a low (or even null) regret. In the classical setting, a high error rate but a low regret is an indication of a high level of noise. The situation is different in the quantum world where a high error rate might be due to the intrinsic physical difficulty of distinguishing two classes, but does not necessarily imply a high level of noise. Regardless of the context, if the regret of a classifier is zero, it essentially means that this classifier is optimal.

Quantumly, a reduction or a learning task may also have a *cost* associated with it. Indeed, each call to the oracle may require sacrificing some copies of the quantum states due to the measurements performed by the oracle during the training. This cost is measured in terms of the number of copies required *individually* for each quantum state of the training dataset. Another way to define this cost would have been to count *globally* the number of copies required relative to the size of the training dataset<sup>5</sup>. The cost can be differentiated between the number of copies needed during the *training/learning phase*, where we learn/build a POVM  $f$  that acts as the classifier, and during the *classification time* (or *testing phase*) where we use  $f$  to classify an unknown quantum state  $|\psi?\rangle$ .

**Definition 8** (Training/learning cost). *The training/learning cost of a reduction is equal to the number of calls to the oracle made by the reduction, multiplied by the number of copies of each quantum states that are used in each call. In the case of a learning task, the cost is directly characterised by the number of copies of each state necessary to perform this task.*

If we have a classical description of the quantum states (i.e.  $D_n \in \mathcal{L}_{qu}^{cl}$ ), the training/learning does not cost anything in terms of information because we already have complete knowledge of the quantum states.

**Definition 9** (Classification cost). *The classification cost corresponds to the number of copies of the unknown quantum state  $|\psi?\rangle$  that will be used by the classifier to predict the class  $y?$  of this state.*

In the next three sections, we will define respectively the quantum analogues of three learning tasks: *binary classification*, *weighted binary classification* and *multiclass classification*.

---

<sup>5</sup>Which is generally the same as multiplying the individual cost by a factor linear in  $n$ , the number of states in the training dataset.

### 3 Binary classification

The task of *binary classification* consists in predicting the class  $y_i \in \{-1, +1\}$  of an unknown quantum state  $|\psi_i\rangle$ , given a *single copy of this state*<sup>6</sup>. Formally, this learning task can be defined in the following manner.

**(Quantum) binary classification :**

**Input:**  $D_n = \{(|\psi_1\rangle, y_1), \dots, (|\psi_n\rangle, y_n)\}$ , a quantum training dataset, where  $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2^d}$  and  $y_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ .

**Output:** A POVM acting as a binary classifier  $f$  that can predict the class  $y_i$  of an unknown quantum state  $|\psi_i\rangle$  given a single copy of this state.

**Goal:** Construct a binary classifier  $f$  that minimizes the training error  $\epsilon_f = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{Prob}(f(|\psi_i\rangle) \neq y_i)$ .

A natural question to ask is what is the best probability of success we can hope for, or, equivalently, the smallest error rate achievable. The easiest situation occurs when we have *complete classical knowledge of the quantum states which compose the training dataset* ( $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{cl}$ ). However, even in this case, it is not generally possible to devise a process that always correctly classifies any unknown state from a single copy of this state. This remains true even if we know in advance that this state corresponds *exactly* to one of the states in the training set<sup>7</sup>. From the classical description of the states, it is possible to analytically build the optimal POVM that minimizes the training error. Of course, it remains to be seen how such an approach would *generalize when faced with a state which does not belong to the training set*. This fundamental question will be briefly discussed in Section 6.

Let  $m_-$  be the number of quantum states in  $D_n$  for which  $y_i = -1$  (negative class), and its complement  $m_+$  be the number of states for which  $y_i = +1$  (positive class), such that  $m_- + m_+ = n$ , the total number of data points in  $D_n$ . Moreover,  $p_-$  is the *a priori* probability of observing the negative class and is equal to  $p_- = \frac{m_-}{n}$ , and  $p_+$  its complementary probability for the positive class such that  $p_- + p_+ = 1$ .

**Definition 10** (Statistical mixture of the negative class). *The statistical mixture representing the negative class  $\rho_-$ , is defined as  $\frac{1}{m_-} \sum_{i=1}^n I\{y_i = -1\} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ , where  $I\{\cdot\}$  is the indicator function which equals 1 if its premise is true and 0 otherwise.*

**Definition 11** (Statistical mixture of the positive class). *In the same manner, the statistical mixture representing the positive class  $\rho_+$  is defined as  $\frac{1}{m_+} \sum_{i=1}^n I\{y_i = +1\} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$ .*

The problem of classifying an unknown state  $|\psi_i\rangle$  drawn from the training set is equivalent to distinguish between the mixed states  $\rho_-$  and  $\rho_+$ . Consider for instance the following scenario which illustrates this idea.

**Scenario 1** (Preparation of the state of a class by a demon<sup>8</sup>). *Imagine a demon that sits inside a black-box with a single button. Each time the button is pressed, the demon chooses at random between the negative and positive class according to their a priori probabilities  $p_-$  and  $p_+$ . Once the class is determined, the demon chooses uniformly at random one of the states belonging to this class and prepares the corresponding state (we suppose that the demon in its infinite power knows the classical description of the states and can prepare perfectly any one of them). This state is returned as output by the black-box. Therefore, finding the class of this state is essentially the same as guessing which class the demon<sup>9</sup> has chosen during the first step, but not necessarily identifying the exact state.*

The minimal error rate of this classification process is linked to the *statistical overlap* of the mixtures  $\rho_-$  and  $\rho_+$ . This kind of problem has already been studied in *quantum detection and estimation theory* [17], a field that predates quantum information processing. Some results from this field can be used to *give bounds on the best training error* that quantum learning algorithms might reach.

<sup>6</sup>See however the work of Sasaki and Carlini [28] for the case of more than one copy of the unknown state  $|\psi_i\rangle$  are available.

<sup>7</sup>Unless we are in the trivial situation where all the states are mutually orthogonal. In this case, a *non-destructive measure* in a basis formed by these states will reveal the state without perturbing it.

<sup>8</sup>This scenario could be reformulate by replacing the demon by a probabilistic algorithm. This raises the question of how much classical memory will the algorithm need to remember the description of the states.

<sup>9</sup>Here the role of the demon is simply to prepare the state, and not to act as an adversary which tries to fool the learner who is outside the box.

**Theorem 1** (Helstrom measurement [17]). *The error rate of distinguishing between the two classes  $\rho_-$  and  $\rho_+$  is bounded from below by  $\epsilon_{hel} = \frac{1}{2} - \frac{D(\rho_-, \rho_+)}{2}$ , where  $D(\rho_-, \rho_+) = \text{Tr}|p_- \rho_- - p_+ \rho_+|$  is a distance measure between  $\rho_-$  and  $\rho_+$  called the trace distance (here,  $p_-$  and  $p_+$  represent the a priori probabilities of classes  $\rho_-$  and  $\rho_+$ , respectively). Moreover, this bound can be achieved exactly by the optimal POVM called the Helstrom measurement.*

**Corollary 1** (Regret of Helstrom measurement). *The Helstrom’s measurement is a binary classifier that has a null regret, which means  $r_{hel} = 0$ .*

*Proof.* The null regret of the Helstrom measurement follows directly from the optimality of this POVM to distinguish between the two classes.  $\square$

**Remark 1** (Error rate of the Helstrom measurement for equiprobable classes). *Consider the case where both the negative class and the positive class are equiprobable. If  $\rho_-$  and  $\rho_+$  are two density matrices which correspond to the same state, their trace distance  $D(\rho_-, \rho_+)$  is equal to zero, which means that the error  $\epsilon_{hel}$  of the Helstrom measurement is  $\frac{1}{2}$ . On the other hand, if  $\rho_-$  and  $\rho_+$  are orthogonal, this means that  $D(\rho_-, \rho_+) = 1$  and that the Helstrom measurement has an error  $\epsilon_{hel} = 0$ .*

The purpose of a learning algorithm in the quantum setting is to give a constructive way to come close to (or to achieve) the Helstrom bound. If we know the classical description of the quantum states, it corresponds to finding an efficient implementation of the Helstrom measurement. If  $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes s}$ , the learning becomes more challenging and it is difficult to characterize the exact relationship between the number  $s$  of copies of each training state that are available, the dimension  $d$  of the Hilbert space in which the quantum states lives and the minimal error rate  $\epsilon$  we can hope to reach. Contrary to classical ML, where it is always possible (but not recommended in terms of generalization) to bring the training error down to zero (for instance using a memory-based classifier such as 1-nearest neighbour), the situation is different in the quantum context as expressed by the following lemma.

**Lemma 1.** *It is impossible to reach a training error of zero in the quantum case from a single copy of an unknown quantum state unless of the states of the training dataset are mutually orthogonal.*

*Proof.* From Theorem 1 and Remark 1, it is easy to see that it is impossible to construct a POVM that perfectly classifies a quantum state drawn from the training set  $D_n$ , unless all the states of the ensemble are mutually orthogonal, or equivalently that the distance between the two density matrices of the classes is  $D(\rho_-, \rho_+) = 1$ .  $\square$

Given a finite number of copies of each state of the training set, the possible *learning strategies* include:

- (1) the estimation of the training set by making measurements (joint or not) on some of the copies to construct a POVM that will differentiate between the two classes,
- (2) the design of a classification mechanism that uses the copies only when the time of classifying an unknown quantum state  $|\psi_?\rangle$  comes or
- (3) any hybrid strategy between (1) and (2).

For the classification, several *measurement strategies* exist in the quantum context such as:

- (a) *maximizing the probability of predicting the class of an unknown quantum state* (which corresponds to the Helstrom measurement [17]),
- (b) *minimizing the probability of making a wrong guess*. This strategy is called *unambiguous discrimination* [18] and is possible only when the states of  $D_n$  are linearly independent. In this specific case, it is possible to design a measurement that is allowed to sometimes answer “I don’t know”, but when it makes a prediction regarding one the classes we can be 100% confident that its prediction is correct.

- (c) *any strategy between these two extremes* (a) and (b). A *confidence-based measurement*<sup>10</sup> [14] is a measure that can identify the class of a state with some confidence (that is known), or answer “I don’t know” the rest of the time. For a fixed chosen confidence, the main objective when we build such a measure, is to minimize the probability that it outputs “I don’t know”. When the confidence is fixed at 100% this directly corresponds to the unambiguous discrimination, whereas if an inconclusive answer is not allowed it corresponds to the Helstrom measurement. It is sometimes possible to design a confidence-based measurement (with a confidence greater than the Helstrom measurement) even when perfect unambiguous discrimination is impossible (for instance if the states of  $D_n$  are linearly dependent).

In this paper, we will focus only (exception made of section 5.1) on the measurement strategy of maximizing the probability of identifying correctly the class of a state (measurement strategy (a)) by learning from the training dataset a POVM that can act as a classifier (learning strategy (1)). We will make the assumption that we have access to an oracle, called the *Helstrom oracle*, than can efficiently solve the task of binary classification.

**Definition 12** (Helstrom oracle). *The Helstrom oracle is an abstract construction that takes as input:*

Version 1: *a classical description of the density matrices  $\rho_-$  and  $\rho_+$  and their a priori probabilities  $p_-$  and  $p_+$  (learning class  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{cl}$ ) or*

Version 2: *a finite number of copies of each state of the quantum training dataset  $D_n$  (learning class  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes \Theta(t_{bin})}$ ).*

*From this input, the oracle can be “trained” to produce an efficient implementation (exact or approximative) of the POVM of the Helstrom measurement  $f_{hel}$ , in the form of a quantum circuit that can distinguish between  $\rho_-$  and  $\rho_+$ . In the second version of the oracle, its training cost  $t_{bin}$  corresponds to the minimum amount of copies of each state of the training dataset that the oracle has to sacrifice in order to construct  $f_{hel}$ .*

One fundamental question deals with the (non-)existence of an efficient implementation for the Helstrom measurement.

**Open question 2** (Efficient implementation of the Helstrom measurement). *What are the learning situations (i.e. the ensembles of quantum states) for which it is possible to implement efficiently (for instance with a polynomial-size circuit) an approximate version of the Helstrom measurement?*

There is no *a priori* guarantee that the description of the POVM which corresponds to the Helstrom measurement can be physically realized by a quantum circuit whose size is polynomial in the number of input qubits. Indeed in the worst case, it could happen that this circuit requires a number of gates that is exponential in its input size, and this even for its approximate version.

By assuming the existence of the Helstrom oracle, we deliberately avoid the burden of describing explicitly how the learning algorithm, which acts as the oracle in practice, works (and how many quantum states it requires for the learning process). Designing a learning algorithm that can solve the binary classification task in practice is a fundamental open question.

**Open question 3** (Construction of a learning algorithm implementing the Helstrom oracle). *Is it possible to design a learning algorithm that implements explicitly the Helstrom oracle? If so, what would be the value of  $t_{bin}$ , the minimum number of copies of each training state, that this algorithm requires during the learning?*

This is a fundamental question on its own but instead we focus on what tasks could be solved if we have access to such an oracle. If we know a learning algorithm which has a low – albeit not optimal – error rate, it is possible to use it instead of the Helstrom oracle in almost all the reductions described in this paper.

---

<sup>10</sup>The original term is *maximum-confidence measurement*.



Suppose that we have a binary classifier  $f$  that can predict the class of an unknown quantum state  $|\psi_?\rangle$  with an error  $\epsilon$ , for  $\epsilon < \frac{1}{2}$ . If we have access to a constant number of copies of  $|\psi_?\rangle$ , we can simply repeat the application of this classifier and output the majority of its predictions. By standard Chernoff argument, this will diminishes the probability of making an error exponentially fast with the number of copies spent. This is true in the quantum world due to the inherent probabilistic nature of the measurement process. In classical ML, the situation is different as generally classifiers behave in a deterministic manner, meaning that they will always predict the same outcome when we present them with the same data point.

## 4 Weighted Binary Classification

The *weighted binary classification* task is similar to the standard binary case, except that now each data point has a *weight*  $w$  associated to it that indicates the importance of correctly classifying this state. This weight can represent for instance a penalty that we have to pay if we predict the wrong class for this object. If  $w = \frac{1}{n}$  for each state, then this corresponds to the standard binary classification.

**(Quantum) weighted binary classification :**

**Input:**  $D_n = \{(|\psi_1\rangle, y_1, w_1), \dots, (|\psi_n\rangle, y_n, w_n)\}$ , a quantum training dataset, where  $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2^d}$ ,  $y_i \in \{-1, +1\}$  and  $w_i \in [0, +\infty)$ .

**Output:** A POVM acting as a binary classifier  $f$  that can predict the class  $y_?$  of an unknown quantum state  $|\psi_?\rangle$ .

**Goal:** Construct a binary classifier  $f$  that minimizes the weighted training error rate  $\epsilon_f = \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \text{Prob}(f(|\psi_i\rangle) \neq y_i)$ .

Once again, if we are in the idealized situation where we know the classical descriptions of the states (learning class  $\mathbb{L}_{qu}^{cl}$ ), their weights can be directly incorporated in the description of the density matrices of their classes. In this scenario, the following reduction formalizes how to solve the weighted binary classification task given the access to an Helstrom oracle (version (1)).

**Reduction 1** (Reduction from weighted binary classification to standard binary classification (via Helstrom oracle)). *Given the access to an Helstrom oracle that takes as inputs the description of the density matrices  $\rho_-$  and  $\rho_+$  (and their a priori probabilities  $p_-$  and  $p_+$ ), it is possible to reduce the task of weighted binary classification to the task of standard binary classification.*

**Training cost:** null.

**Classification cost:**  $\Theta(1)$ .

*Proof.* The weight  $w_i$  of a particular state can be converted to a probability  $p_i$  reflecting its importance by setting

$$p_i = \frac{w_i}{\sum_{j=1}^n w_j}. \quad (3)$$

Let  $\hat{p}_-$ , be the new *a priori* probability of the negative class, which is equal to

$$\hat{p}_- = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i I\{y_i = -1\} \quad (4)$$

and  $\hat{p}_+$ , its complementary probability such that  $\hat{p}_- + \hat{p}_+ = 1$ . Theorem 2 demonstrates that the Helstrom measurement which discriminates between the density matrices in which the weights are incorporated is precisely the POVM which minimizes the weighted error. Therefore, it suffices to call the Helstrom oracle with inputs

$$\hat{\rho}_- = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i I\{y_i = -1\} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \quad (5)$$

and

$$\hat{\rho}_+ = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i I\{y_i = +1\} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i| \quad (6)$$

(with *a priori* probabilities  $\hat{p}_-$  et  $\hat{p}_+$ ). This reduction makes only one call to the Helstrom oracle and requires only one copy of the unknown quantum state at classification.  $\square$

**Theorem 2** (Helstrom measurement minimizing the weighted error). *The Helstrom measurement which minimizes the training error between  $\hat{\rho}_- = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i I\{y_i = -1\} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$  and  $\hat{\rho}_+ = \sum_{i=1}^n p_i I\{y_i = +1\} |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$  (with *a priori* probabilities  $\hat{p}_-$  and  $\hat{p}_+$ ) is also the POVM which minimizes the weighted classification error on the quantum training dataset  $D_n = \{(|\psi_1\rangle, y_1, w_1), \dots, (|\psi_n\rangle, y_n, w_n)\}$ .*

*Proof.* The Helstrom measurement is the POVM  $f$  that minimizes the discrimination error between  $\hat{\rho}_-$  and  $\hat{\rho}_+$ . This POVM can be decomposed into two elements  $\Pi_-$  et  $\Pi_+$  which both correspond to positive semi-definite matrices such that  $\Pi_- + \Pi_+ = I$ , where  $I$  is the identity matrix. Therefore, we have:

$$\epsilon_{Hel} = \min_f (\text{Tr}(\Pi_- \hat{\rho}_+) + \text{Tr}(\Pi_+ \hat{\rho}_-)) \quad (7)$$

that can also be express as

$$\epsilon_{Hel} = \min_f \sum_{i=1}^n p_i I\{y_i = +1\} \text{Tr}(\Pi_- |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|) + \quad (8)$$

$$\sum_{i=1}^n p_i I\{y_i = -1\} \text{Tr}(\Pi_+ |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|) \quad (9)$$

and that simplifies to

$$\epsilon_{Hel} = \min_f \left( \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \text{Prob}(f(|\psi_i\rangle) \neq y_i) \right) \quad (10)$$

which is the same as minimizing the weighted training error:

$$\epsilon_{opt} = \min_f \left( \sum_{j=1}^n w_j \times \epsilon_{Hel} \right) \quad (11)$$

$$\epsilon_{opt} = \min_f \left( \sum_{j=1}^n w_j \sum_{i=1}^n p_i \text{Prob}(f(|\psi_i\rangle) \neq y_i) \right) \quad (12)$$

$$\epsilon_{opt} = \min_f \left( \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \text{Prob}(f(|\psi_i\rangle) \neq y_i) \right) \quad (13)$$

As this POVM is optimal, it automatically implies that its regret is zero.  $\square$

In the case where only a finite number of copies of each quantum state is accessible, but we know a way of producing an efficient binary classifier (such as the Helstrom oracle, version 2), then the *costing reduction* [31] enables to reduce weighted binary classification to standard binary classification. This reduction proceeds via a *rejection sampling* mechanism (Algorithm 1) and the *aggregation of several classifiers* (Algorithm 2), and generates an ensemble of  $T$  binary classifiers, where  $T$  is a small constant chosen independently from  $D_n$ .

The output of the final classifier is simply a majority vote on the outputs of the individual classifiers. The number of copies of the unknown state  $|\psi_?\rangle$  used by the final classifier is a constant  $\Theta(T)$ , corresponding to the number of binary classifiers forming the aggregated classifier (Algorithm 3). It is clear that the more evaluations are done, the more accurate the classification will be, but more copies of  $|\psi_?\rangle$  will be needed.

---

**Algorithm 1** rejection\_sampling( $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes \Theta(t_{bin})}$ )

---

Choose a constant  $c$  greater than any weight  $w$   
**for** each state  $|\psi_i\rangle^{\otimes \Theta(t_{bin})}$  **do**  
    Flip a coin which has a *bias* of  $\frac{w_i}{c}$   
    **if** the result is “tails” **then**  
        Keep the copies of the state  
    **else**  
        Put them aside  
    **end if**  
**end for**  
**Return** the new generated distribution  $\tilde{D}$

---



---

**Algorithm 2** costing\_training( $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes \Theta(Tt_{bin})}$ )

---

**for**  $j = 1$  to  $T$  **do**  
    Call rejection\_sampling( $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes \Theta(t_{bin})}$ ) to obtain  $\tilde{D}_j$   
    Call the Helstrom oracle on  $\tilde{D}_j$  to learn the binary classifier  $f_j$   
**end for**  
**Return** the final classifier  $f = \text{majority}(f_1, \dots, f_T)$

---

**Reduction 2** (Reduction from weighted binary classification to standard binary classification (via costing [31])). *Given the access to an Helstrom oracle (version 2) and a quantum training dataset  $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{t_{bin}}$ , it is possible to reduce the task of weighted binary classification to the task of standard binary classification.*

**Training cost:**  $\Theta(Tt_{bin})$ .

**Classification cost:**  $\Theta(T)$ .

*Proof.* During the training, the algorithm costing\_training calls the Helstrom oracle  $T$  times, for a constant  $T$  chosen independently from the training dataset  $D_n$ . The training cost is therefore  $\Theta(Tt_{bin})$ , which corresponds to the number of calls to the Helstrom oracle multiplied by  $t_{bin}$  the number of copies of each state required at each call. As each call to the Helstrom oracle produces a classifier, the classification cost is  $\Theta(T)$ , which requires to use a copy of the unknown state  $|\psi_i\rangle$  for each generated classifier. The analysis of the costing reduction [31] demonstrates that the average of the standard training errors that minimize the individual classifiers  $f_1, \dots, f_T$  on the distributions  $\tilde{D}_1, \dots, \tilde{D}_T$  is the same as indirectly minimizing the weighted training error of the global classifier  $f$ , which means:

$$\epsilon_f \sim \min_f \sum_{i=1}^n w_i \text{Prob}(f(|\psi_i\rangle) \neq y_i) \quad (14)$$

□

---

**Algorithm 3** costing\_classification( $|\psi_i\rangle^{\otimes \Theta(T)}, f = (f_1, \dots, f_T)$ )

---

**for**  $j = 1$  to  $T$  **do**  
    Measure  $y_j = f_j(|\psi_i\rangle)$   
**end for**  
**Return**  $y_i = \text{majority}(y_1, \dots, y_T)$

---

The quantum version of rejection sampling (Algorithm 1) has the additional benefit of “saving” some copies of the quantum states during the generation of the distribution biased according to their weights. Indeed, the states having a low weight have a higher probability of not being kept in the new generated

distribution. Therefore, these states can be put aside and used later, for instance during another step of rejection sampling.

## 5 Multiclass classification

In the multiclass version of classification, each state is labeled after a class chosen among  $k$  possible ones, for  $k > 2$ . The goal is to build a classifier  $f$  which, given a finite number of copies of an unknown state  $|\psi_i\rangle$ , can predict its class  $y_i$  with a good accuracy.

**(Quantum) multiclass classification :**

**Input:**  $D_n = \{(|\psi_1\rangle, y_1), \dots, (|\psi_n\rangle, y_n)\}$ , a quantum training dataset, where  $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2^d}$  and  $y_i \in \{1, \dots, k\}$ .

**Output:** A POVM acting as a multiclass classifier  $f$  that can predict the class  $y_i$  of an unknown quantum state  $|\psi_i\rangle$ .

**Goal:** Construct a multiclass classifier  $f$  that minimizes the training error rate  $\epsilon_f = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \text{prob}(f(|\psi_i\rangle) \neq y_i)$ .

Moving from the binary to the multiclass case is far from being trivial, and very few things are known for the case where the number of classes  $k > 2$ . In particular even for three classes, the exact form of the optimal POVM that can distinguish between these three classes given a single copy of a state is not known. However, we will see in Section 5.4 that if we know the classical description of the states, it is possible to design a measure (called the *Pretty Good Measurement* [16]), whose error is bounded by the square root of the error of the optimal POVM.

The following sections describe different training and classification strategies for the cases where we have access to a number of copies of the unknown quantum state  $|\psi_i\rangle$  to classify which is:

- linear in  $n$ , the number of states in  $D_n$  (Section 5.1).
- linear in  $k$ , the number of classes in  $D_n$  (Section 5.2).
- logarithmic in  $k$  (Section 5.3).
- a single copy or possibly a constant number of them (Section 5.4).

### 5.1 Classification via state identification

The most direct way of recognizing the class of a state is to *identify exactly this state*. Once the state is identified, this information allows also to recover directly its class (unless there are two, or more, states that are identical but labeled with different classes). If  $\Theta(n)$  copies of the unknown quantum state  $|\psi_i\rangle$  are available, the **Control-Swap** test [3, 11] can be used between this state and each of the state of the training dataset  $D_n \in \mathcal{L}_{qu}^{\Theta(1)}$ . This method does not require any effort during the training, all the work being done at classification time (therefore it corresponds to a learning strategy type (2), Section 3). This learning strategy can be seen as the quantum analogue of the one-nearest neighbours. Indeed, for each state of the training dataset, we search the one which is the closest/ the most similar (in the sense of fidelity) from the unknown quantum state. Unless there are two quantum states in  $D_n$  that are identical but labeled with two different classes, this method is guarantee to have a null classification error (and therefore a null regret). The following algorithm formalize this method.

---

**Algorithm 4** classification\_via\_identification( $|\psi_i\rangle^{\otimes \Theta(n)}$ ,  $D_n \in \mathcal{L}_{qu}^{\otimes \Theta(1)}$ )

---

**for**  $i = 1$  to  $n$  **do**

Measure the fidelity between  $|\psi_i\rangle$  and  $|\psi_j\rangle$  by using the **Control-Swap** test which gives an estimate of  $Fid(|\psi_i\rangle, |\psi_j\rangle)$

**end for**

**Return** the class  $y_j$  of the state  $|\psi_j\rangle$  whose fidelity with the unknown quantum state is maximal  $\arg \max_j Fid(|\psi_i\rangle, |\psi_j\rangle)$

---

**Theorem 3** (Classification via state identification). *The algorithm `classification_via_identification` classifies an unknown quantum state  $|\psi_?\rangle$  with a null classification error given  $\Theta(n)$  copies of this state and  $\Theta(1)$  copies of each state of  $D_n$ .*

*Proof.* Each `Control-Swap` test require a constant number of copies and as we estimate the similarity between  $|\psi_?\rangle$  and all the  $n$  states of  $D_n$ , the global cost of `classification_via_identification` will be  $\Theta(n)$  copies of the unknown state and  $\Theta(1)$  of each state of the training dataset. Moreover, if there are not two states in  $D_n$  that are identical but labeled with two different classes, the algorithm is guarantee to obtain of null classification error (which implies a null regret).  $\square$

If we want to base the prediction of the class of  $|\psi_?\rangle$  on its  $k$  nearest neighbours instead of only its nearest neighbour, the Algorithm 4 can be easily adapt to base its prediction on a majority vote of their classes (the training and classification cost remain unchanged). An interesting avenue of research is to design a quantum equivalent to classical data structures that can be used to facilitate the search for nearest neighbours, such as the  $kd$ -trees [5] for instance. Quantumly, the main purpose of such a structure would be to retrieve the nearest neighbours of an unknown state by consuming less copies than require with the direct naïve method (for instance by using a number of copies logarithmic in  $n$  and linear in  $c$  the number of neighbours considered). If we do not know the classical description of the states, the construction of this data structure may have a non-negligible training cost.

## 5.2 One-against-all reductions

---

**Algorithm 5** `one_against_all_training`( $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes \Theta(k t_{bin})}$ )

---

```

for  $j = 1$  to  $k$  do
  Initialize  $D^{(j)}$  as the empty dataset
  for  $i = 1$  to  $n$  do
    Add the example  $(|\psi_i\rangle^{\otimes \Theta(t_{bin})}, 1 - 2I\{y_i = j\})$  to  $D^{(j)}$ 
  end for
  Call the Helstrom oracle on the dataset  $D^{(j)}$  to learn a binary classifier  $f_j$  that discriminates between
  the class  $j$  and the union of all the other classes
end for
Return the ensemble of binary classifiers  $f_1, \dots, f_j$ 

```

---

The main idea of the *one-against-all reduction* [27] is to train a binary classifier for each of the  $k$  classes. Each of this binary classifier *discriminates between its own class and the union of all the other classes*. This reduction can be adapted in a straightforward manner to the quantum context by constructing for each class a POVM acting as a binary classifier, which discriminates between the density matrix of this class and the statistical mixture composed of the density matrices of the other classes. We will say that a classifier “click” if it predicts that the unknown state  $|\psi_?\rangle$  belongs to its own class, and that it “does not click” otherwise. Given the access to an Helstrom oracle, it is possible to reduce the multiclass classification to the standard binary case by using the following training and classification algorithms (Algorithms 5 and 6).

**Reduction 3** (Reduction from multiclass classification to standard binary classification (via one-against-all)). *Given the access to an Helstrom oracle and a quantum training dataset  $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\Theta(k t_{bin})}$ , it is possible to reduce the multiclass classification task to the standard binary classification via a one-against-all reduction.*

**Training cost:**  $\Theta(k t_{bin})$ .

**Classification cost:**  $\Theta(k)$ .

*Proof.* The algorithm `one_against_all_training` calls the Helstrom oracle a number of times which is linear in the number of classes  $k$ , and each call consumes a number of copies of each state of  $D_n$  in  $\Theta(t_{bin})$ . Therefore,

---

**Algorithm 6** one\_against\_all\_classification( $|\psi_?\rangle^{\otimes k}$ )

---

```
for  $j = 1$  to  $k$  do
    Apply a binary classifier  $f_j$  on  $|\psi_?\rangle$  to obtain the prediction whether or not this state belongs to the
    class  $j$ 
end for
if only one classifier “has clicked” then
    Return the class associated with the classifier which has “clicked”
else
    if several classifiers have “clicked” then
        Return a class chosen at random among all the classifiers which have “clicked”
    else
        Return a class chosen uniformly at random among the  $k$  classes
    end if
end if
```

---

the training cost of this reduction is  $\Theta(kt_{bin})$ . Regarding the classification, we need to sacrifice a copy of the unknown state  $|\psi_?\rangle$  for each of the  $k$  binary classifiers generated, which leads to a total cost of  $\Theta(k)$ .

Regarding the analysis of the error of this reduction, let  $\epsilon_j$  be the error of the classifier of class  $j$ . The worst situation that can happen is that the classifier of the “good class” does not click (which corresponds to a false negative). In this situation and if no other classifier has clicked, we choose the class to predict uniformly at random, which lead to an error with probability  $\frac{k-1}{k}$ . In the case of false positives, where  $c$  classifiers click when they should not, the error rate will be only  $\frac{c}{c+1}$  because we will choose at random among the classifiers which have reacted. As each binary classifier  $f_j$  leads to an error rate of  $\frac{k-1}{k}$  in the worst case with probability  $p_j\epsilon_j$  (where  $p_j$  is the *a priori* probability of class  $j$ ) and there are  $k$  binary classifiers, the global error of the classifier will be upper bounded by  $\frac{k-1}{k} \sum_{j=1}^k p_j\epsilon_j$ , which simplifies itself to  $(k-1)\epsilon$  if all the classes have the same *a priori* probability  $\frac{1}{k}$  and the same error rate  $\epsilon$  for all the binary classifiers. (This reduction does not seem to offer any guarantee for the regret.)  $\square$

**Remark 2** (Difficulty of intermediary learning situations generated by the reduction). *Nothing guarantee a priori than the intermediary learning situations generated by the reduction (for instance here the  $k$  binary classification) are easy to solve. Indeed, even if the access to the Helstrom oracle guarantee than the  $k$  binary classifiers will be optimal for their respective classification settings, it is possible than the observed average error will be important. In the quantum case, it can happen for instance than the trace distance between the density matrix of a class and the mixture composed of the union of all the other classes is low (which implies that they are difficult to distinguish). If we have a complete classical knowledge of the quantum states instead a simply deriving an upper bound of the error of the global classifier, a finer analysis will reveal the exact training error of this classifier.*

A weighted variant of the reduction, called *weighted one-against-all* [9], offers a better upper bound in terms of error than the basic version. This variant exploits the fact than false negatives (not detecting the true class) are more damageable to the error of global classifier than false positives (predicting the wrong class). In practice, this means that a datapoint will have a higher weight during the construction of the classifier of its class. The algorithm proceeds by reducing the multiclass classification to weighted binary classification and then use the costing reduction [31] to reduce the weighted binary classification to the standard binary classification. The main advantage of the weighted version of this reduction is that it offers a guarantee on the error bound of the global classifier of  $\frac{k}{2}\epsilon$ , for  $\epsilon$  the average error of the binary classifiers generated, which is divided by two compared to the basic version. In this case, the training cost of the weighted version of the one-against-all reduction is  $\Theta(kTt_{bin})$  where  $k$  is the number of classes,  $T$  the constant number of classifiers generated by the costing reduction and  $t_{bin}$  the number of copies used by each call of the Helstrom oracle. The classification cost will be  $\Theta(kT)$ . Quantumly, if we know the classical description of the states of

the training dataset ( $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{cl}$ ), we can replace the costing reduction via the reduction using the Helstrom oracle (Reduction 1) which results in a training cost of  $\Theta(k t_{bin})$  and a classification cost of  $\Theta(k)$ .

### 5.3 Binary tree reductions

Another way of solving the multiclass version is to build a binary tree where *each node is a binary classifier which discriminates between two subsets of classes* and where *the leaves are labeled after a specific class*. The root contains the set of all classes and use a binary classifier to divide this set into two subsets of classes of approximatively same size. To classify an unknown state, we start from the root and we go down the tree according to the output of the binary classifier observed at each node until we reach a leaf, in which case we predict the class associated to this leaf. There are several ways of building the binary tree (for instance in a bottom-up or top-down fashion), which might lead to a different global error of the final classifier. The Algorithms 7 and 8 detail a possible way of constructing recursively the binary tree from the root to the leaves, and then use it for classification.

---

**Algorithm 7** `binary_tree_training`( $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes \Theta(t_{bin} \log k)}$ )

---

**if** all the states in  $D_n$  belongs to the same class **then**  
    **Create** a leaf labeled according to this class  
    **Return**  
**end if**  
**Choose** at random two subsets of classes  $Y_a$  and  $Y_b$  among  $D_n$  such that  $|Y_a| \approx |Y_b|$   
**Separate** the training dataset  $D_n$  into two subsets  $D_a$  and  $D_b$  according to the two subsets of classes  $Y_a$  and  $Y_b$  (let  $\rho_a$  be the density matrix representing the subset  $D_a$  and  $\rho_b$  the density matrix representing the subset  $D_b$ )  
**Call** the Helstrom oracle to learn the binary classifier  $f_{(\rho_a, \rho_b)}$  which distinguishes between the two density matrices  $\rho_a$  and  $\rho_b$   
**Create** a node in the binary tree whose test corresponds to the binary classifier  $f_{(\rho_a, \rho_b)}$   
**Call** `binary_tree_training`( $D_a$ )  
**Call** `binary_tree_training`( $D_b$ )

---



---

**Algorithm 8** `binary_tree_classification`( $|\psi_?\rangle^{\otimes \Theta(\log k)}$ , a classifier  $f$  which is a binary classification tree)

---

**Start** the traversal of the tree at the root  
**while** a leaf is not reach **do**  
    Use a copy of the state  $|\psi_?\rangle$  in the binary classifier corresponding to the current node  
    **if** the classifier predicts the negative class **then**  
        Go down the tree on the left  
    **else**  
        Go down the tree on the right  
    **end if**  
**end while**  
**Return** the class labeled at this leaf

---

**Reduction 4** (Reduction of multiclass classification to standard binary classification (via binary tree)).  
*Given the access to an Helstrom oracle and a quantum training dataset  $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes \Theta(t_{bin} \log k)}$ , it is possible to reduce the multiclass classification task to the standard binary classification via a binary tree reduction.*

**Training cost:**  $\Theta(t_{bin} \log k)$ .

**Classification cost:**  $\Theta(\log k)$ .

*Proof.* During the construction of the binary tree, the Helstrom oracle is called a number of times which is directly proportional to the number of nodes in the tree. However, each call to the oracle splits the dataset

into two subsets (whose sum of sizes is equal to that of the original training dataset), which implies that at each level of the tree the number of copies of each quantum state used by the different calls of the Helstrom oracle is  $\Theta(t_{bin})$ . The global cost of the training is therefore  $\Theta(t_{bin} \log k)$  because the depth of the tree is  $\Theta(\log k)$  (for  $k$  the number of classes) as it is built to be balanced. The classification cost is also directly proportional to the depth of the tree and is  $\Theta(\log k)$ .

The global error of the final binary tree classifier is the sum of probability for each class of having an error in the path going from the root to the leaf of this class which is upper bounded by  $\epsilon \log k$ , if for simplification we suppose that all the classes are equiprobable and that all binary classifiers have the same error  $\epsilon$ . Indeed in this case, an error can occur with probability  $\epsilon$  at each node traversed which implies that the global error maybe  $\epsilon \log k$  in the worst case.  $\square$

**Corollary 2** (State identification). *Let  $D_n$  be a quantum training dataset composed of  $n$  pure states such that there are not two identical states in  $D_n$ . A POVM exists that can identify the index of an unknown quantum state  $|\psi_?\rangle$  chosen at random among the states of  $D_n$  with a non-trivial accuracy given  $\Theta(\log n)$  copies of this state.*

*Proof.* The proof is relatively direct, it simply involves setting  $k = n$ , which means assigning a different class to each of the  $n$  points of the quantum dataset  $D_n$ , and applying the Reduction 4.  $\square$

If we are in the situation where we have a complete knowledge of the states of the training set ( $D_n \in \mathcal{L}_{qu}^{cl}$ ), it is possible to choose the two subsets of classes such that they maximize the trace distance between the two density matrices of these subsets. In this case, it is possible to build the tree from the root to the leaves by splitting the dataset into two subsets which maximize the trace distance. Another way of growing the tree is by starting from the leaves to the root, where at each level we pair the classes that are the easiest to distinguish. In particular, a reduction called “*filter tree*” [10] exists which reduce the multiclass classification to the standard binary classification (via weighted binary classification and the *costing* reduction [31]). This reduction builds a multiclass classifier which has the form of a binary tree by starting from the leaves and guarantee that the error of this classifier is upper bounded by  $\epsilon \log k$ , for  $k$  the number of classes and  $\epsilon$  the average error of the binary classifiers generated. The strength of this reduction is that it offers a similar guarantee for the regret (which was not the case of the algorithm `binary_tree_training` presented previously). The regret of the multiclass classifier will be at most  $r \log k$ , for  $r$  the average regret of the binary classifiers.

## 5.4 Pretty good measurement

If we know the classical description of the states ( $D_n \in \mathcal{L}_{qu}^{cl}$ ), a general measurement strategy exists, called the “*Pretty Good Measurement*”<sup>11</sup> [16], which enables us to build a classifier, which given a single copy of an unknown state  $|\psi_?\rangle$ , can predict the class of this state with an error bounded by the square root of the error of the optimal classifier.

**Theorem 4** (Error rate of the Pretty Good Measurement [4]). *Given the classical description of  $k$  density matrices  $\rho_1, \dots, \rho_k$ , it is possible to build a POVM, called the Pretty Good Measurement, whose error rate  $\epsilon_{PGM}$  to distinguish between these  $k$  mixed states, given a single copy  $\rho_?$  of one of these states, is in the worst case quadratically higher than the error  $\epsilon_{opt}$  that would have the optimal POVM. Formally, this means that:*

$$\epsilon_{opt} \leq \epsilon_{PGM} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{opt}} \tag{15}$$

**Corollary 3** (Bound on the regret of the Pretty Good Measurement). *The regret of the Pretty Good Measurement is bounded by:*

$$r_{PGM} \leq \sqrt{\epsilon_{opt}} - \epsilon_{opt} \tag{16}$$

---

<sup>11</sup>This measure is sometimes called “*square-root measurement*” in the literature due to the explicit form of this POVM.



Montanaro [23] proved that the error of the Pretty Good Measurement is always smaller than that of the prediction strategy that does not even measure the state, but rather chooses one of the classes at random according to their *a priori* probabilities. He also derived an upper bound on the error of the Pretty Good Measurement which depends on the fidelity between each pair of states forming the training dataset. This bound is:

$$\epsilon_{PGM} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^n \frac{1}{\sum_{j=1}^n \text{Fid}(|\psi_i\rangle, |\psi_j\rangle)} \quad (17)$$

**Definition 13** (Similarity matrix of a quantum training dataset). *A similarity matrix<sup>12</sup>  $S_n$  of a quantum training dataset containing  $n$  states is a matrix of size  $n$  by  $n$ , where each entry  $S(i, j)$  of the matrix (for  $i, j \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ ) contains an estimate of the fidelity between the state  $|\psi_i\rangle$  and the state  $|\psi_j\rangle$ .*

It follows directly from the symmetry property of the fidelity, that the similarity matrix is a *symmetric matrix*. An efficient algorithm exists to compute this matrix, which requires only a number of copies of each state that is linear in  $n$ , the number of states in the quantum training dataset. The Algorithm 9 formalizes how to compute the similarity matrix for a quantum dataset  $D_n$ .

---

**Algorithm 9** similarity\_matrix\_computation( $D_n \in \mathbb{L}_{qu}^{\otimes \Theta(en)}$ )

---

**for**  $i = 1$  to  $n$  **do**

$S(i, i) = 1$

**end for**

**for**  $i < j$  **do**

    Estimate the fidelity between the two states  $|\psi_i\rangle$  and  $|\psi_j\rangle$  by using the C-Swap test  $e$  times

    Set the estimate of  $\text{Fid}(|\psi_i\rangle, |\psi_j\rangle)$  to be equal to  $1 - \frac{2 \times \#|1\rangle}{e}$  (where  $\#|1\rangle$  represents the number of times where the result  $|1\rangle$  has been observed)

    Update  $S(i, j) = S(j, i) = \text{Fid}(|\psi_i\rangle, |\psi_j\rangle)$

**end for**

**Return**  $S_n$  the computed similarity matrix

---

**Theorem 5** (Computation of the similarity matrix). *It is possible to compute the similarity matrix of a quantum dataset  $D_n$  with a precision  $\epsilon$ , for  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{e}$ , from  $\Theta(en)$  copies of each state.*

*Proof.* For each pair of states  $(|\psi_i\rangle, |\psi_j\rangle)$  of the training dataset  $D_n$ , the Control-Swap test allows us to estimate the fidelity between these states with a precision  $\epsilon$ , where  $\epsilon = \frac{1}{e}$  for  $e$  the number of copies used during the test. As the matrix  $S_n$  is symmetric, the number of entries to estimate is  $\Theta(\frac{n(n-1)}{2}) = \Theta(n^2)$ . Therefore for each state  $|\psi\rangle$ , we will need  $\Theta(e)$  copies for each of the  $n$  Control-Swap tests where this state appears, which makes a global cost of  $\Theta(en)$  copies per state.  $\square$

**Corollary 4** (Upper bound on the error of the Pretty Good Measurement). *Given  $\Theta(n)$  copies of each state of a quantum training dataset  $D_n$ , it is possible to compute an upper bound on the error of that Pretty Good Measurement will make on  $D_n$ .*

*Proof.* The proof is straightforward, we only need to apply the algorithm similarity\_matrix\_computation and evaluate the formula 17 by using the estimate the fidelity between each pair of states from the corresponding entries of the similarity matrix.  $\square$

Montanaro also gave another upper bound on the error of the Pretty Good Measurement which depends directly on the eigenvalues of the similarity matrix  $S_n$ . Let  $\lambda_i$ , be the  $i^{\text{th}}$  eigenvalue of the similarity matrix.

---

<sup>12</sup>The similarity matrix is often called *Gram matrix* in the literature, especially in classical ML.

The error of the Pretty Good Measurement is bounded from above by:

$$\epsilon_{PGM} \leq 1 - \frac{1}{n} \left( \sum_{i=1}^n \sqrt{\lambda_i} \right)^2 \quad (18)$$

This bound can also be explicitly computed from the similarity matrix  $S_n$  by diagonalizing it to extract the eigenvalues.

Regarding a lower bound of the Pretty Good Measurement, a recent bound [24], also due to Montanaro, proved that this error is bounded from below by:

$$\epsilon_{PGM} \geq \sum_{i=1}^n \sum_{j=i}^n p_i p_j F_{id}(|\psi_i\rangle, |\psi_j\rangle), \quad (19)$$

where  $p_i$  and  $p_j$  are the *a priori* probabilities of the states  $|\psi_i\rangle$  and  $|\psi_j\rangle$ . In the situation where all these states are equiprobable, we can replace all the probabilities by the  $\frac{1}{n}$  in the formula 19. Here also the bound can be directly estimated from the similarity matrix  $S_n$ .

Intuitively, this bounds seem to indicate that the fidelity between pair of states is a sufficient measure to assess the difficulty of distinguishing the states of the training dataset. This intuition is wrong, indeed Jozsa and Schlienz [20] have shown that there exist situations where the fidelity between pair of states in the quantum dataset  $D_n$  is low (which means it is easy to discriminate one of state from the other), while at the same time it is impossible to distinguish efficiently in a global manner one state from all the other states.

To summarize, *it is possible to bound the error that the Pretty Good Measurement would realize even without explicitly constructing it.* Indeed, we can bound the error of the Pretty Good Measurement given a linear number of copies of each state of the quantum dataset, whereas if we want to build explicitly the POVM corresponding to this measure all the techniques currently known seems to require to know a classical description of the states (which requires an exponential number of copies in the number of qubits if we use the tomography in the case of an unknown state). An important avenue of research is whether or not it is possible to design a learning algorithm that “learns” an approximate version of the Pretty Good Measurement (in the same sense as the Helstrom oracle) from a finite number of copies of each state of  $D_n$ .

**Conjecture 1** (Amount of information necessary to learn the Pretty Good Measurement). *The minimal number of copies  $t_{PGM}$  of each state of the quantum training dataset  $D_n$  necessary to “learn” a circuit that could implement a non-trivial approximation of the Pretty Good Measurement is polynomial in  $n$  the number of quantum states in  $D_n$  and  $k$  the number of classes.*

## 6 Discussion and conclusion

The following table summarizes the training/learning and the classification cost of the different learning tasks and reductions that we have seen in this paper. The *binary classification is the main learning primitive* as the weighted and the multiclass classification can be reduced to it via the Helstrom oracle.

In practice, the Helstrom oracle will be implemented by a learning algorithm, which from a finite number of copies of each state from the training dataset, outputs a POVM  $f$  which can act as a binary classifier. Contrary to the Helstrom oracle, this algorithm does not need to be optimal in terms of classification error as long as it offers a non-trivial precision which is better than simply guessing randomly the class of the unknown quantum state. Even in this case, almost all the reductions presented in this paper will work although the global error of the generated classifier will likely be higher due to the non-optimality of the constructed POVM. Designing a learning algorithm as the Helstrom oracle will enable us to estimate the minimum number of copies  $t_{bin}$  of each state of the training dataset that is necessary to perform the binary classification.

The essence of ML is to learn from data coming from past experience with the hope of generalizing on new situations in the future. In this paper, we concentrate on the accurate classification of states coming

Learning task	Training cost	Classification cost
Binary classification	$\Theta(t_{bin})$	$\Theta(1)$
Weighted binary classification (reduction via Helstrom oracle) (costing reduction)	$\Theta(t_{bin})$ $\Theta(Tt_{bin})$	$\Theta(1)$ $\Theta(T)$
Multiclass classification (state identification via Control-SWAP test) (one-against-all reduction) (binary tree reduction) (Pretty Good Measurement) (Bound on the error of the PGM)	$\Theta(1)$ $\Theta(kt_{bin})$ $\Theta(t_{bin} \log k)$ unknown $\Theta(n)$	$\Theta(n)$ $\Theta(k)$ $\Theta(\log k)$ $\Theta(1)$ not applicable

Table 1: Table summarizing the training and classification costs of the different quantum learning tasks and reductions seen in this paper.

from the training dataset  $D_n$  but we did not discuss how this approach could generalize on quantum states unobserved previously. A natural way of defining that a POVM  $f$  acting as a classifier generalize is if this POVM can recognize the class of a state that is close to one of the state of the training dataset but without being identical. The closeness between two pure states can be defined using the fidelity or other distance measures such as the *Euclidean distance*.

**Definition 14** (Euclidean distance between pure states [7]). *The Euclidean distance between two pure states  $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d \alpha_i |i\rangle$  and  $|\phi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^d \beta_i |i\rangle$  is defined as  $Dist_{L2}(|\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle) = \sqrt{\sum_{i=1}^d |\alpha_i - \beta_i|^2}$ .*

Bernstein and Vazirani [7] have proven that if two pure states  $|\psi\rangle$  and  $|\phi\rangle$  of same dimension are within  $\epsilon$  Euclidean distance of each other, the same measure performed on the two states generates samples from two distributions which have a total variational distance of at most  $4\epsilon$ . Therefore, if two states are close in terms of their Euclidean distance this give a good indication that a POVM  $f$  acting as a classifier will with high probability predicts the same class for these two states. Future work in this model of doing machine learning on quantum information include the formalization of the notion of testing and generalization error, as well as the study of different models of classical and quantum noise (see for instance the section 8.3 of [25] for different forms of quantum noise) and how they affect the robustness of the quantum learning algorithms.

ML is a field where it is important to valide experimentally the performance of a learning algorithm and to compare it to other existing algorithms. Classically, numerous repositories of datasets are publicly available such as the repository of the University of California at Irvine<sup>13</sup> (*UCI repository*) or the *MNIST database* for the recognition of characters<sup>14</sup>. Quantumly, once several learning algorithms have been proposed, it is also important to test them experimentally on quantum datasets representing realistic situations that experimentalists are likely to encounter in their laboratories. The main idea would not be to create physically these datasets but rather to give access to their classical descriptions to the community so that anyone who want to use and experiment with them using their favorite classical simulator can do it freely. An example of two possible classes could be for instance entangled state versus separable states. Moreover, several situations that people encounter in quantum information processing can be recast naturally as a classification problem, such as for instance the scenario in quantum cryptography where the eavesdropper try to maximize his probability of guessing correctly the class of the state that he has intercepted.

## Acknowledgments

I would like to thanks Gilles Brassard for enlightening discussions on the subject and Frédéric Dupuis for proofreading an early version of this paper and his suggestions and comments.

<sup>13</sup><http://archive.ics.uci.edu/ml/>

<sup>14</sup><http://yann.lecun.com/exdb/mnist/>

## References

- [1] Aaronson, S., “The learnability of quantum states”, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A* **463**(2088), 2007.
- [2] Aïmeur, E., Brassard, G. and Gambs, S., “Machine learning in a quantum world”, *Proceedings of the 19th Canadian Conference on Artificial Intelligence (Canadian AI'06)*, pp. 433–444, 2006.
- [3] Barenco, A., Berthiaume, A., Deutsch, D., Ekert, A., Jozsa, R. and Macchiavello, C., “Stabilisation of quantum computations by symmetrisation”, *SIAM Journal of Computing* **26**(5), pp. 1541–1557, 1997.
- [4] Barnum, M. and Knill, E., “Reversing quantum dynamics with near-optimal quantum and classical fidelity”, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **43**(5), pp. 2097–2106, 2002.
- [5] Bentley, J.L., “Multidimensional binary search tree used for associative searching”, *Communications of the ACM* **9**(18), pp. 509–517, 1975.
- [6] Bergou, J., Herzog, U. and Hillery, M., “Discrimination of quantum states”, *Chapter 11: Invited Review Article in Lectures Notes in Physics, vol 649: Quantum State Estimation*, pp. 417–465, Springer-Berlin, 2004.
- [7] Bernstein, E. and Vazirani, U., “Quantum complexity theory”, *Proceedings of the 25th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC'93)*, pp. 11–20, 1993.
- [8] Beygelzimer, A., Dani, V., Hayes, T., Langford, J. and Zadrozny, B., “Error limiting reductions between classification tasks”, *Proceedings of the 22th Annual International Conference of Machine Learning (ICML'05)*, pp. 49–56, 2005.
- [9] Beygelzimer, A., Langford, J. and Zadrozny, B., “Weighted one-against-all”, *Proceedings of the 20th National Conference on Artificial Intelligence (AAAI'05)*, pp. 720–725, 2005.
- [10] Beygelzimer, A., Langford, J. and Ravikumar, P., “Multiclass classification with filter trees”, *Unpublished*, 2007.
- [11] Buhrman, H., Cleve, R., Watrous, J. and de Wolf, R., “Quantum fingerprinting”, *Physical Reviews Letters* **87**(16), article 167902, 2001.
- [12] Chiribella, G., Mauro D’Ariano, G., Perinotti, P. and Sacchi, M., “Covariant quantum measurements which maximize the likelihood”, *Physical Reviews A* **70**, article 061205, 2004.
- [13] Cleve, R., van Dam, W., Nielsen, M. and Tapp, A., “Quantum entanglement and the communication complexity of the inner product”, *Proceedings of the First NASA International Conference on Quantum Computing and Quantum Communications*, pp. 61–74, 1999.
- [14] Croke, S., Anderson, E., Barnett, S.M., Gilson, C.R. and Jeffers, J., “Maximum confidence quantum measurements”, *Physical Reviews* **76**, 2006.
- [15] Duda, R., Hart, P. and Stork, D., *Pattern Classification*, Wiley-Interscience, 2001.
- [16] Hausladen, P., and Wootters, W.K., “A “pretty good” measurement for distinguishing quantum states”, *Journal of Modern Optics* **41**, 1994.
- [17] Helstrom, C.W., *Quantum Detection and Estimation Theory*, Academic Press, 1976.
- [18] Herzog, U. and Bergou, J.A., “Optimal unambiguous discrimination of two mixed quantum states”, *Physical Reviews A* **71**, article 050301, 2005.
- [19] Holevo, A.S., “Bounds for the quantity of information transmitted by a quantum mechanical channel”, *Problems of Information Transmissions* **9**, pp. 177–183, 1973.

- [20] Jozsa, R. and Schlienz, J., “Distinguishability of states and the von Neumann entropy”, *Physical Reviews A* **62**, article 012301, 2000.
- [21] Maccone, L., “Information-disturbance tradeoff in quantum measurements”, *Physical Reviews A* **73**, article 042307, 2006.
- [22] Mitchell, T., *Machine Learning*, McGraw Hill, 1997.
- [23] Montanaro, A., “On the distinguishability of random quantum states”, *Communication in Mathematical Physics* **273**(3), pp. 619–636, 2006 .
- [24] Montanaro, A., “A lower bound on the probability of error in quantum state discrimination”, *Proceedings of IEEE Information Theory Workshop*, 2008.
- [25] Nielsen, M. A. and Chuang, I. L., *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [26] Peres, A. and Wootters, W. K., “Optimal detection of quantum information”, *Physical Reviews Letters* **66**(9), pp. 1119–1122, 1991.
- [27] Rifkin, R. and Klatau, A., “In defense of one-vs-all classification”, *Journal of Machine Learning Research* **5**, pp. 101–141, 2004.
- [28] Sasaki, M. and Carlini, A., “Quantum learning and universal quantum matching machine”, *Physical Reviews A* **66**(2), article 022303, 2002.
- [29] Vapnik, V., *The Nature of Statistical Learning Theory*, Springer, 1995.
- [30] Wootters, W. K. and Żurek, W. C., “A single quantum cannot be cloned”, *Nature* **66**, pp. 802–803, 1982.
- [31] Zadrozny, B., Langford, J. and Naoki, A., “Cost-sensitive learning by cost-proportionate example weighting”, *Proceedings of the 3rd IEEE International Conference on Data Mining (ICDM’03)*, pp. 435–442, 2003.