

On Hitting Times for General Quantum Markov Processes

Lorenzo Laneve,^{1,2,*} Francesco Tacchino,^{2,†} and Ivano Tavernelli^{2,‡}

¹Faculty of Informatics — Università della Svizzera Italiana, 6900 Lugano, Switzerland

²IBM Quantum, IBM Research — Zurich, Säumerstrasse 4, 8803 Rüschlikon, Switzerland

Random walks (or Markov chains) are models extensively used in theoretical computer science. Several tools, including analysis of quantities such as hitting and mixing times, are helpful for devising randomized algorithms. A notable example is Schöning’s algorithm for the satisfiability (SAT) problem. In this work, we use the density-matrix formalism to define a *quantum Markov chain* model which directly generalizes classical walks, and we show that a common tools such as hitting times can be computed with a similar formula as the one found in the classical theory, which we then apply to known quantum settings such as Grover’s algorithm.

I. INTRODUCTION

Random walks are stochastic models which are extensively used in theoretical computer science: One of the best known classical algorithms for the satisfiability problem (SAT) relies on the behaviour of a random walk [1].

Research of the past decades tried to extend the idea to the quantum setting, in order to see whether it is possible to achieve further speedup using quantum effects. Notable examples are the works by Kempe [2, 3], where the *unitary walk model* is introduced: such a walk consists in repeatedly applying a unitary to a pure (finite-dimensional) quantum state.

$$|\phi_{t+1}\rangle = U|\phi_t\rangle$$

A comprehensive review of quantum random walks can for example be found in [4], where several definitions and applications are listed. While many interesting results have been proven over the years, such as novel algorithms [3, 5–7] and general constructions for quadratic speed-up [8, 9], the unitary walk model cannot by itself be considered a full generalization of classical random walks, as unitary evolution is purely reversible.

In this work, we use a different formalization of quantum random walks using the density-matrix formalism (also seen in, e.g., [10]). As this model can express both unitary and classical walks, it provides a natural generalization of the well-known classical Markov model, and will easily allow us to formalize and analyze an important property for algorithmic applications of random walks: *hitting times* [11].

Hitting times entail the idea of stopping the execution of the walk whenever we ‘hit’ a state. Since acquiring this information necessarily implies some sort of measurement of our state, and measurements cannot be formalized within the (finite) unitary model, quantum hitting times have always been difficult to define within such framework: Magniez et al. [12] gave a *Monte Carlo* definition of hitting time starting from a revisited classical

definition, while Kempe [3] and Szegedy [9] also defined the hitting time in a ‘one-shot’ version, where the hitting time is defined as the first point in time where the overlap with the target state reaches some reasonable threshold. Although these definition are perfectly exploitable in algorithms, they are harder to analyze. In particular, since they are far from the traditional definition given for classical walks, one cannot directly apply to them the results known for classical hitting times. Another interesting result to point out is the construction by Ying and Ying [13] which suggests that the ‘one-shot’ definition and the one we are going to give are tightly related.

Importantly, modeling random walks through a density-matrix formalism allows us to develop a complete theory of such processes by a simple extension of the classical model. In the case of hitting times, we show that such comprehensive model gives, with the aid of the algebra of quantum channels, a clean formula for the *concurrent hitting time*, a definition based on measurements originally proposed by Kempe [3] for unitary walks.

The manuscript is organized as follows. In Section II, we recall the definition of classical random walks and formalize a simple notion of *quantum Markov chain* using quantum channels and density matrices, showing that every piece is in direct analogy with its classical counterpart.

In Sections III and IV, we define quantum notions of hitting time and we prove formulas which resemble the ones already known for classical walks.

Finally, in Sections V and VI we show how computation of hitting times using the proposed formulas can be applied, respectively to analyze Grover’s algorithm as a quantum walk and estimate the time to traverse a cycle using quantum/classical hybrid dynamics.

II. QUANTUM MARKOV CHAINS

In classical theory, the notion of random walk is formalized using a stochastic process called *Markov chain*.

Definition 1. A *Markov chain* is a tuple (S, P) where

- S is a finite set of states;

* lorenzo.laneve@usi.ch

† fta@zurich.ibm.com

‡ ita@zurich.ibm.com

- $P \in [0, 1]^{|S| \times |S|}$ is a stochastic matrix, i.e., a entry-wise non-negative matrix where each row sums up to 1.

The matrix P defines how a general probability distribution of states becomes at the next step of the process.

The system is in a state $X_t \in S$ at time $t \in \mathbb{N}$, where X_t follows a distribution q_t , which can be seen as a (row) vector in S , whose entries are non-negative and sum up to 1 (the so-called *state probability vector*). The stochastic matrix P is used to retrieve the distribution q_{t+1} of the state in the next time step:

$$q_{t+1} = q_t P \implies q_t = q_0 P^t.$$

Therefore, a classical random walk can be seen as a (linear) evolution of a state q . A more detailed introduction to the topic can be found, e.g., in [11].

In order to analyze quantum random walks, we need a suitable model that conveniently defines such processes. As argued in the introduction, the unitary model is purely reversible and thus it cannot simulate an classical Markov chain (unless the stochastic matrix P of the chain is a permutation of the standard basis vectors and every probability distribution is trivial). Moreover, works by Kendon and Tregenna [14, 15] involving numerical experiments suggest that classical randomness and noise may even accelerate the behaviour of quantum walks in some cases, and such feature cannot be expressed in the unitary model.

In this work we want to use a more general model to formalize the process using CP maps and density matrices. This definition can also be seen as the discrete-time counterpart of the Quantum Stochastic Walk model [10].

Definition 2. A quantum Markov chain consists of a tuple $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ where:

- \mathcal{H} is a finite-dimensional Hilbert space;
- $\mathcal{E} : \text{Hom}(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow \text{Hom}(\mathcal{H})$ is a completely positive trace-preserving map.

The evolution is defined through a repeated application of a CP map \mathcal{E} onto a (generally mixed) quantum state in \mathcal{H} .

We show that this formalization is a straightforward extension of the classical Markov model: indeed, the density matrix formalism can be seen as a state probability vector (the diagonal of the matrix) completed with quantum coherences. Therefore, a general quantum random walk is simply a (linear) transformation of a density matrix:

$$\rho_{t+1} = \mathcal{E}(\rho_t) \implies \rho_t = \mathcal{E}^t(\rho_0).$$

This model has several advantages over the unitary formalization: quantum channels can represent any hybrid quantum-classical process. In particular, an arbitrary

Markov chain (S, P) can be simulated by a quantum Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ where $\mathcal{H} = \text{span}\{|x\rangle : x \in S\}$ and

$$\mathcal{E}(\rho) = \sum_{x, y \in S} [P]_{xy} |y\rangle \langle x| \rho |x\rangle \langle y|. \quad (1)$$

This construction projects all our quantum states onto a fixed measurement basis (in this case, the computational basis), and any quantum coherence is ignored, leaving us with a classical Markovian dynamics. On the other hand, also unitary walks are particular cases of this model, as the application of a unitary can always be represented through a quantum channel. Therefore, this model unifies the two theories, while its expressiveness allows to include classical random choices and decoherence into the picture. Moreover, there could be some type of quantum walk that lies in the middle between fully coherent and fully classical processes. For example, Kendon et al. [15] already showed that such hybrid dynamics could be beneficial in some contexts.

III. HITTING TIMES

Using the formalism introduced above, it is possible to extend classical results to the quantum setting by analogy. For example, if we translate a definition of hitting times proposed by Kempe (in particular, see Definition 3.3 in [3]) to this model, we obtain a natural generalization of the classical definition of hitting time, and a well-known formula for its computation can be derived for the quantum case with analogous methods.

The classical setting is as follows: we start from a state X_0 distributed according to a state probability vector q , and we want to reach a given state $z \in S$. We want to quantify how many steps, in expectation, we need to run before reaching such state.

Definition 3. Given a Markov chain (S, P) , a starting state q and a target state $z \in S$, define the following random variable:

$$T_z(q) = \min\{t \geq 0 : X_t = z, X_0 \sim q\}.$$

The z -hitting time is defined as the expectation of such variable:

$$h_z(q) := \mathbb{E}[T_z(q)].$$

A more complete approach on the classical theory of hitting times can be also found in [11].

The analysis of hitting times is at the heart of many algorithms exploiting Markov chains [1], as the hitting time is usually tightly related to some complexity metric (e.g. time complexity). For the quantum case, we can extend a definition proposed by Kempe for unitary walks to our model. In particular, given a quantum Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ and a target state $|z\rangle$, we consider a process

in which we alternate applications of the evolution map \mathcal{E} with a measurement of the observable

$$O_z = \Pi_z - \Pi_{-z}.$$

where $\Pi_z := |z\rangle\langle z|$ and $\Pi_{-z} := \mathbb{1} - |z\rangle\langle z|$. If such measurement returns $+1$, then the state will collapse to our target state, and the process will stop. Otherwise, we repeat the procedure by executing \mathcal{E} and trying another measurement.

Definition 4. Let $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain, and let $|z\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$ be an arbitrary state. Considering the procedure described above, let M_i be a random variable equal to 1 if and only if the i -th measurement makes the state collapse to $|z\rangle$, the quantum hitting time $h_z(\rho)$ is defined as the expectation of

$$T_z(\rho) = \min\{t \geq 0 \mid M_t = 1\}.$$

One can see that this definition is closely related the classical one: in fact, both Definitions 3 and 4 imply a check on the state to see whether z was reached or not, and this bit of information is the only one we use in order to decide whether to stop the algorithm. However, in the quantum case some quantum coherences are in general destroyed at each step. It is worth highlighting here that such measurement is nevertheless different from a full collapse of the quantum state, which would always return a probabilistic mixture of measurement eigenstates, hence yielding a classical Markov process over the elements of the measurement basis itself (exactly what we did in Eq. (1)).

We now derive a formula for computing such hitting times in the quantum general case. Consider the projector map $\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho) := \Pi_{-z}\rho\Pi_{-z}$, which basically removes from a state ρ the probability mass in the subspace spanned by our target state $|z\rangle$. For the rest of the work we define $\rho_{-z} := \mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)$ and $\mathcal{E}_{-z} := \mathcal{P}_{-z} \circ \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z}$.

Theorem 5. Let $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain and fix a target state $|z\rangle$. Moreover, suppose that each eigenvalue λ of the map \mathcal{E}_{-z} satisfies $|\lambda| < 1$. The following holds:

$$h_z(\rho) = \text{tr}[(\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{E}_{-z})^{-1}(\rho_{-z})].$$

Before proving Theorem 5, we want to give an interpretation of the results. First of all, the requirement on the eigenvalues of \mathcal{E}_{-z} has a precise meaning: under the assumption, each eigenvalue of $(\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{E}_{-z})$ is non-zero, and thus the map is invertible, implying that the hitting time is finite. On the other hand, a unitary eigenvalue would suggest that the corresponding eigenstate ρ is completely outside of the target subspace $\text{span}\{|z\rangle\}$. As a consequence, for any k , also $\mathcal{E}^k(\rho)$ will always have zero overlap with $|z\rangle$. Under these conditions, each measurement would give zero probability of collapsing to the target state, and the hitting time would be infinite.

A second observation is that this result is in full correspondence with the known classical counterpart: indeed,

for a classical Markov chain (S, P) the formula for the hitting time as in Definition 3 (as used, e.g., by Magniez et al. [12]) is:

$$h_z(q) = q_{-z}(\mathbb{1} - P_{-z})^{-1}\mathbf{1}.$$

where P_{-z} (resp. q_{-z}) is taken from P (resp. q) by zeroing out the columns/rows corresponding to z , and $\mathbf{1}$ is the vector of all ones. This suggests that our formalization of the quantum hitting time is indeed a natural extension of the classical one. We would also like to remark that the target state $|z\rangle$ can be replaced with an arbitrary target subspace $S \subseteq \mathcal{H}$: in this case, the process will stop as soon as the state collapses to *any* of the states within S . This can be achieved by replacing Π_z with the projector onto S .

Proof of Theorem 5. We are going to use the law of total expectation on the outcome of the first measurement. Let E be the event occurring when the first measurement makes the state collapse to $|z\rangle$. Conditioning on such event we have:

$$h_z(\rho) = \mathbb{E}[T_z(\rho) \mid E] \Pr[E] + \mathbb{E}[T_z(\rho) \mid \bar{E}] \Pr[\bar{E}],$$

where $\Pr[E] = \text{tr}(\Pi_z\rho)$ is the probability of measuring $|z\rangle$ from the starting state ρ using the observable O_z . When E occurs, we measure our target state in zero steps, implying that

$$\mathbb{E}[T_z(\rho) \mid E] = 0.$$

If E does not occur, then the state will collapse to the post-measurement state

$$\rho \mapsto \frac{\Pi_{-z}\rho\Pi_{-z}}{\text{tr}(\Pi_{-z}\rho)} = \frac{\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)}{\text{tr}(\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho))}.$$

Then the algorithm will apply the step procedure \mathcal{E} once to this state, and the process will start over, by the Markov property. Therefore, the second conditional expectation can be expressed as:

$$\mathbb{E}[T_z(\rho) \mid \bar{E}] = 1 + h_z\left(\mathcal{E}\left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)}{\text{tr}(\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho))}\right)\right).$$

In order to simplify the proof from now on, we make an educated guess: we assume that $h_z(\rho)$ is linear in ρ . Notice that this only adds constraints to our functional equation, therefore, any solution we find is also valid in the original setting [16]. Therefore, the equation above can be rewritten as:

$$\begin{aligned} h_z(\rho) &= \Pr[\bar{E}] + h_z(\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)) \\ &= \text{tr}(\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)) + h_z(\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)) \end{aligned}$$

and, by developing this recurrence N times, we obtain that:

$$\begin{aligned} h_z(\rho) &= \sum_{k=0}^N \text{tr}(\mathcal{P}_{-z} \circ (\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z})^k(\rho)) + \\ &+ h_z((\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z})^{N+1}(\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

By exploiting the fact that $\mathcal{P}_{-z}^2 \equiv \mathcal{P}_{-z}$, the second term becomes, for $N \geq 2$:

$$\begin{aligned} h_z((\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z})^{N+1}(\rho)) &= h_z\left(\mathcal{E} \circ (\mathcal{P}_{-z} \circ \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z})^N(\rho)\right) \\ &= h_z\left(\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{E}_{-z}^N(\rho)\right). \end{aligned}$$

Taking the limit as $N \rightarrow \infty$, $\mathcal{E}_{-z}^N \rightarrow \mathbf{0}$ (by the condition on its eigenvalues), and thus the last term tends to $h_z(0) = 0$, by linearity of h_z . Therefore, we find that the hitting time satisfies

$$\begin{aligned} h_z(\rho) &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \text{tr}(\mathcal{P}_{-z} \circ (\mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z})^k(\rho)) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \text{tr}((\mathcal{P}_{-z} \circ \mathcal{E} \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z})^k \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \text{tr}(\mathcal{E}_{-z}^k(\rho_{-z})) = \text{tr}\left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}_{-z}^k(\rho_{-z})\right]. \end{aligned}$$

A geometric sum argument concludes the proof. \square

IV. GENERALIZED HITTING TIME

Definition 4 states that a measurement with the observable O_z must be carried out at each step. As this procedure removes relevant quantum coherences very often due to quantum measurement back-action, it is desirable to further generalize the idea of hitting time as follows: instead of checking at each step, we extract a number of steps $T \sim \sigma$, where σ is a fixed discrete probability distribution over non-negative integers. Then we run the step procedure \mathcal{E} for T times before measuring for the first time.

This approach allows us to apply the classical analysis of hitting times to quantum processes relying on prolonged coherent dynamics, such as Grover's algorithm [17] (see Section V).

Definition 6. Let $\{X_k\}_{k \in \mathbb{N}}$ be an infinite sequence of independent random variables where $X_k \sim \sigma$. Moreover, define Q as the number of times we measure with O_z without hitting z , before succeeding. The generalized z -hitting time $h_z^\sigma(\rho)$ with respect to σ is the expectation of the following random variable

$$T_z^\sigma(\rho) = \sum_{k=1}^Q X_k.$$

Notice that this generalized definition is only relevant in the quantum case. Indeed, since measurements do not affect the behaviour of a classical walk, not looking at the state at some point of the evolution can only increase the hitting time. We remark that Q can also be 0, in the case where the first measurement succeeds (we do a

measurement at the beginning, like in the basic case). Let us also define the map

$$\mathcal{E}^\sigma := \mathbb{E}_{T \sim \sigma} [\mathcal{E}^T] = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \Pr_\sigma [T = t] \mathcal{E}^t$$

This quantum operation represents the process of sampling a $T \sim \sigma$ and running \mathcal{E} for T times. We then have the following result.

Theorem 7. Let $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E})$ be a quantum Markov chain and fix a target state $|z\rangle$, and suppose that each eigenvalue λ of the map \mathcal{E}_{-z}^σ satisfies $|\lambda| < 1$. The following holds:

$$h_z^\sigma(\rho) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma [T] \cdot \text{tr}[(\mathcal{I} - \mathcal{E}_{-z}^\sigma)^{-1}(\rho_{-z})]$$

Informally, notice that, if we consider the Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{E}^\sigma)$, the trace operation in the formula of Theorem 7 returns exactly the hitting time of such chain, i.e., the number of times \mathcal{E}^σ is executed before hitting z . Then the expectation of T represents the number of executions of \mathcal{E} per execution of \mathcal{E}^σ . Despite this result seems reasonable, a formal argument is required to show that statistical interdependence between Q and X_k 's does not influence the hitting time.

Proof of Theorem 7. We follow a similar approach as in Theorem 5. Considering the event E occurring when the first measurement of O_z returns +1 and conditioning the expectation on this event we obtain, as in Theorem 5:

$$h_z^\sigma(\rho) = \mathbb{E} [T_z^\sigma(\rho) | \bar{E}] \Pr [\bar{E}].$$

What essentially changes here is the computation of this conditional expectation, since in this case we will apply \mathcal{E}^{X_1} , for $X_1 \sim \sigma$. Hence, let us condition on the value of this variable:

$$\mathbb{E} [T_z^\sigma(\rho) | \bar{E}] = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathbb{E} [T_z^\sigma(\rho) | X_1 = t, \bar{E}] \cdot p_t.$$

where $p_t := \Pr_\sigma [X_1 = t]$. If the measurement does not hit $|z\rangle$, and t steps of \mathcal{E} are executed, the conditional expectation will be:

$$\mathbb{E} [T_z^\sigma(\rho) | X_1 = t, \bar{E}] = t + h_z^\sigma \left(\mathcal{E}^t \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)}{\text{tr}(\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho))} \right) \right).$$

This because the process will start over, by the Markov property, after applying \mathcal{E} for t times to the post-measurement state, and we incur a cost of t in terms of hitting times to do so. As in Theorem 5, we make the educated guess that h_z^σ is linear in ρ , and this implies that:

$$h_z^\sigma(\rho) = \Pr [\bar{E}] \cdot \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \left[t + h_z^\sigma \left(\mathcal{E}^t \left(\frac{\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)}{\text{tr}(\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho))} \right) \right) \right] \cdot p_t.$$

Since $\Pr[\bar{E}] = \text{tr}(\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho))$, we can exploit linearity to simplify:

$$h_z^\sigma(\rho) = \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} [t \cdot \Pr[\bar{E}] + h_z^\sigma(\mathcal{E}^t \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho))] \cdot p_t.$$

By splitting the sum, we obtain that the first term is $\Pr[\bar{E}] \cdot \mathbb{E}_\sigma[T]$ by definition of expectation. Again by linearity, the second term becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} h_z^\sigma(\mathcal{E}^t \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)) &= h_z^\sigma \left[\left(\sum_{t=0}^{\infty} \mathcal{E}^t \cdot p_t \right) \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho) \right] \\ &= h_z^\sigma(\mathcal{E}^\sigma \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)). \end{aligned}$$

To sum up, the recurrence relation for h_z^σ is:

$$h_z^\sigma(\rho) = \text{tr}(\mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)) \cdot \mathbb{E}_\sigma[T] + h_z^\sigma(\mathcal{E}^\sigma \circ \mathcal{P}_{-z}(\rho)).$$

By developing this recurrence as we did in the proof of Theorem 5, we obtain

$$h_z^\sigma(\rho) = \mathbb{E}_\sigma[T] \cdot \text{tr} \left[\sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (\mathcal{E}^\sigma)^k_{-z}(\rho_{-z}) \right].$$

A geometric sum argument concludes the proof. \square

V. HITTING TIMES FOR GROVER'S ALGORITHM

In this section we show how to apply our analysis of hitting times to a well-known problem in the literature: the *unstructured search problem*. Defining $N = 2^n$, the problem consists of a function $f : [N] \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ given as an oracle, for which there is exactly one value $x_0 \in [N]$ such that $f(x_0) = 1$. Any classical algorithm needs $\Omega(N)$ queries in order to output x_0 with non-trivial success probability. However, a famous algorithm by Grover [17] can find such value within $\mathcal{O}(\sqrt{N})$ queries to the oracle.

Roughly speaking, Grover's algorithm starts in the state $|+\rangle := |+\rangle^{\otimes n}$. Using the oracle of f , one can construct a unitary G that rotates the state in the plane $\mathcal{H}^* = \text{span}\{|+\rangle, |x_0\rangle\}$ by an angle of

$$2\gamma = 2 \arcsin \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}.$$

Grover [17] showed that, after applying G for $r = \Theta(\sqrt{N})$ times, the success probability can be shown to be:

$$|\langle x_0 | G^r |+\rangle|^2 = 1 - \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{1}{N}\right)$$

The original algorithm runs G for r times and then tries a full measurement in the computational basis, making the state collapse to the desired state with the aforementioned probability. Here, we want to use the hitting time framework to recover the same result. As a warm up,

let us consider the case where we measure at each step. Therefore, we are considering a quantum Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ where $\mathcal{H} = \text{span}\{|x\rangle : x \in \mathbb{N}\}$ and

$$\mathcal{G}(\rho) = G\rho G^\dagger,$$

and we want to compute the hitting time $h_{x_0}(|+\rangle\langle +|)$ with respect to this chain.

Theorem 8. $h_{x_0}(|+\rangle\langle +|) = N/4$.

This result basically shows that measuring at each step nullifies all the quantum speed-up given by Grover's algorithm. It is important to remark, however, that this is *not* a classical walk, as we are not doing a full measurement in the computational basis at each step. Indeed, the $\frac{1}{4}$ factor is still not achievable by a classical walk.

Proof of Theorem 5. First of all, notice that both G and O_z are invariant with respect to \mathcal{H}^* , i.e. any state in \mathcal{H}^* will stay in such subspace after an application of the unitary G or a measurement of O_z . Since these are the only two operations we are going to apply, we can restrict ourselves to this two-dimensional subspace. Hence, we can analyze the hitting time with respect to the quantum Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}^*, \mathcal{G}|_{\mathcal{H}^*})$, where $\mathcal{G}|_{\mathcal{H}^*}$ is the application of the unitary G restricted to \mathcal{H}^* :

$$G|_{\mathcal{H}^*} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos 2\gamma & -\sin 2\gamma \\ \sin 2\gamma & \cos 2\gamma \end{bmatrix}$$

We can represent $\mathcal{E}, \mathcal{I}, \mathcal{P}_{-x_0}$ as 4×4 matrices, and density matrices as 4-dimensional vectors, we can apply the formula of Theorem 5 (the trace operator becomes the dot product with the representation of the identity matrix). By doing this computations with a software of symbolic calculation [18], one can check that this formula gives $\frac{N}{4}$. \square

As expected, destroying quantum coherence too often hinders the performance of Grover's algorithm. As a second attempt, we consider the case in which the measurement is carried out at each step only with probability p . The analysis of such processes coincides with the notion of the generalized hitting time (Definition 6), where σ is the geometric distribution with parameter p .

To make use of the formula given by Theorem 7, we first need to compute a closed form representation for the linear map \mathcal{E}^σ . In the case of a geometric distribution, this can be achieved easily as detailed in the following lemma.

Lemma 9. *If $\sigma = \text{Geom}(p)$, then*

$$\mathcal{E}^\sigma = p\mathcal{E} \circ (\mathcal{I} - (1-p)\mathcal{E})^{-1}$$

Note that such operation is always well-defined as long as the probability p of measuring is non-zero: since \mathcal{E} is completely positive and trace-preserving, any eigenvalue λ of \mathcal{E} satisfies $|\lambda| < 1$, and thus all the eigenvalues μ of the map $\mathcal{I} - (1-p)\mathcal{E}$ satisfy $|\mu| \geq p > 0$, giving us an invertible map.

Proof of Lemma 9. Since σ is a geometric distribution, $\Pr_\sigma [T = t] = p(1-p)^{t-1}$. Therefore, by definition of \mathcal{E}^σ :

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{E}^\sigma &= \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} p(1-p)^{t-1} \mathcal{E}^t \\ &= p\mathcal{E} \circ \sum_{t=1}^{\infty} (1-p)^{t-1} \mathcal{E}^{t-1} \\ &= p\mathcal{E} \circ \sum_{t=0}^{\infty} [(1-p)\mathcal{E}]^t \\ &= p\mathcal{E} \circ (\mathcal{I} - (1-p)\mathcal{E})^{-1} \end{aligned}$$

□

We can now prove the following general result.

Theorem 10. *Let $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{G})$ be a quantum Markov chain describing a Grover search as above, and let $p > 0$ be the probability of measuring at each step. The generalized z -hitting time of such process is*

$$h_{x_0}^\sigma(|+\rangle\langle +|) = \Theta\left(Np + \frac{1}{p}\right)$$

As a first observation, this claim extends the result of Theorem 8, proving that no constant probability p can give quantum speed-up in Grover's search. Secondly, our upper bound is fully consistent with the well-known result about the optimality of Grover's algorithm, proving a lower bound of $\Omega(\sqrt{N})$ quantum queries for the unstructured search problem. Indeed, our upper bound reaches its optimum when we choose $p = \Theta(N^{-1/2})$, achieving an optimal algorithm.

Proof of Theorem 10. As in the proof of Theorem 8, we can simply study the two-dimensional quantum Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}^*, \mathcal{G}|_{\mathcal{H}^*})$, since we are still applying the same set of operations to the starting state $|+\rangle\langle +|$. Again, we represent every super-operator as 4×4 matrix and quantum states as 4-dimensional vectors. What changes here is the formula we have to compute: we first use Lemma 9 to compute the matrix representation of \mathcal{E}^σ and then use this to apply Theorem 6 (for a geometric distribution, $\mathbb{E}_\sigma [T] = \frac{1}{p}$). With the help of a software for symbolic calculation [18], we obtain that:

$$h_{x_0}^\sigma(|+\rangle\langle +|) = \frac{1}{p} \frac{N^2 p^2 - 16Np + 16N + 16p - 16}{8N - 4Np}$$

For $p = 1$ we obtain $\frac{N}{4}$, as entailed by Theorem 8. For $p = o(1)$, this is asymptotically equal to $\frac{Np}{8} + \frac{2}{p}$. □

VI. TRAVERSING THE CYCLE

In this section we consider a different example, showing that results of Section III can be exploited not only to derive analytical expressions for hitting times, but also to

provide numerical estimations. Consider a cyclic structure with $2N$ sites such as the one depicted in Fig. 1 (left) and a unitary Markov chain $(\mathcal{H}, \mathcal{U})$ whose Hilbert space can be decomposed as $\mathcal{H} = \mathcal{H}_C \otimes \mathcal{H}_S$ where $\mathcal{H}_S = \text{span}\{|x\rangle : x \in \mathbb{Z}_{2N}\}$ denotes the nodes along the cycle, and $\mathcal{H}_C = \text{span}\{|\uparrow\rangle, |\downarrow\rangle\}$ denotes a coin register. This setup is known in the literature as a *coined unitary walk* [2], where the coin register is used to move to different sites in superposition. In our case, \mathcal{U} applies a unitary of the form $U = S(H_C \otimes \mathbb{1}_S)$, where H is the Hadamard gate, and S moves from $|x\rangle$ to $|x+1\rangle$ if the coin is in state $|\uparrow\rangle$, and to $|x-1\rangle$ if the coin is in state $|\downarrow\rangle$. Therefore, the unitary U acts on the total state as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} U|\uparrow, x\rangle &= \frac{|\uparrow, x+1\rangle + |\downarrow, x-1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \\ U|\downarrow, x\rangle &= \frac{|\uparrow, x+1\rangle - |\downarrow, x-1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \end{aligned}$$

We start from the state $|\uparrow, 0\rangle$ and we want to reach the opposite state in the cycle, namely the state $|N\rangle$ (regardless of the state of the coin register). We can apply the formula from Theorem 4, where the projector outside the subspace of $|N\rangle$ is

$$\Pi_{-N} = \mathbb{1}_C \otimes (\mathbb{1}_S - |N\rangle\langle N|)$$

Using *numpy* [19], we can numerically compute the matrices for $\mathcal{U}, \mathcal{P}_{-N}$, and the formula can be calculated using matrix algebra, just like we did in Section V. Estimates of the generalized hitting time for $\sigma = \text{Geom}(p)$, with $p = \frac{1}{100}, \frac{2}{100}, \dots, 1$ give interesting behaviours: in the case where $p = 1$ (which coincides with the regular hitting time), numerical estimations consistently give an hitting time of N^2 , which is consistent with the symmetric classical case (see Gambler's Ruin [11]). On the other hand, the optimal choice for p seems to depend on the parity of N : while an odd N always yields a quadratic hitting time, for even values of N there exist a p that achieves a hitting time scaling linearly with the size of the cycle.

We repeated these computations for a cycle of odd length (see Fig. 1, right) and, unlike the even case, under optimal p any value of N led to a linear hitting time. All the numerical results are summarized in the plots of Fig. 2.

VII. IMPLEMENTATION WITH DIGITAL QUANTUM CIRCUITS

The generalized hitting-time paradigm as shown in Section IV consists of interrupting the execution of a quantum circuit as soon as (1) the measurement takes




FIG. 1: Quantum walk on a $2N$ -cycle (left), and on a $(2N + 1)$ -cycle (right). We start from the state $|0\rangle$ (with coin register on $|\uparrow\rangle$), and we want to reach the state $|N\rangle$.

place (this happens with probability p), and (2) the observable for the hit yields a $+1$, making the state collapse to the target subspace.

Although this paradigm seems conceptually simple, such a hybrid process is not straightforward to implement on current quantum computing platforms. In fact, one essentially needs a classical process that interacts with the quantum device in an *online* fashion, conditioning the execution on the measurement outcomes. In principle, this represents a possible intriguing use case for dynamic circuits [20, 21].

In this section we show how to carry out hitting time experiments in the standard unitary quantum circuit model using Qiskit [22]. To be completely general, we assume that it is not possible to conditionally interrupt the execution of a quantum circuit cannot be conditionally stopped, hence we fix a number N of steps to run and, besides the n qubits needed to store the state of our walk, we also allocate N classical bits $\{b_i\}_i$, where b_i stores the measurement outcome at the i -th step. Two extra qubits are used to emulate the classical coin flip which decides whether to try the measurement or not (q_R), and to carry out the measurement (q_M). The quantum circuit implementing a single step is depicted in Figure 3. Here we use R_X to rotate q_R by an angle $\theta = \arcsin \sqrt{p}$, so that the measurement yields $|1\rangle$ with probability p . The measurement qubit q_M will be flipped if q_R is in state $|1\rangle$ and

ρ is in the state $|111\rangle$, which is the target state in our toy example. One could change the target state by simply replacing the CNOT with $UCNOTU^\dagger$, where U is a unitary mapping $|111\rangle$ onto a different vector. After the measurement, b_i will tell whether the walk should stop at the i -th step. Running this circuit N times will yield N classical bits, from b_1 to b_N , and the hitting time can be computed as the smallest i such that $b_i = 1$ [23]. We used this construction to run Grover’s algorithm as described in Section V. All numerical experiments confirmed the predictions of Theorem 10, see Figure 4.

VIII. CONCLUSIONS

In the present work we gave an alternative and more general way to formalize quantum random walks, including both coherent dynamics and classical randomness. Within this framework, the notions of (concurrent) hitting time given by Kempe [3] for unitary walks can be naturally extended. Moreover, we found that this concept of hitting time is the natural generalization of the notion well-understood in the classical theory. This work also aims at suggesting that a theory of quantum walks - as well as tools to analyze their behaviour - can be developed in tight analogy to classical Markov chains, already used to devise important classical algorithms.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank David Sutter, Sabrina Maniscalco and Stefan Wolf for insightful discussions and feedback. We acknowledge the use of IBM Quantum services for this work. IBM, the IBM logo, and ibm.com are trademarks of International Business Machines Corp., registered in many jurisdictions worldwide. Other product and service names might be trademarks of IBM or other companies. The current list of IBM trademarks is available at <https://www.ibm.com/legal/copytrade>.

-
- [1] T. Schöning, in *40th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (Cat. No.99CB37039)* (1999) pp. 410–414.
 - [2] J. Kempe, *Contemporary Physics* **44**, 307–327 (2003).
 - [3] J. Kempe, *Probability Theory and Related Fields* **133**, 215 (2005).
 - [4] K. Kadian, S. Garhwal, and A. Kumar, *Computer Science Review* **41**, 100419 (2021).
 - [5] A. Ambainis, in *45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (2004) pp. 22–31.
 - [6] A. M. Childs and J. M. Eisenberg, *Quantum Information and Computation* **5**, 10.26421/qic5.7 (2005).
 - [7] N. Shenvi, J. Kempe, and K. B. Whaley, *Physical Review A* **67**, 10.1103/physreva.67.052307 (2003).
 - [8] D. Aharonov, A. Ambainis, J. Kempe, and U. Vazirani, *Conference Proceedings of the Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* (2001).
 - [9] M. Szegedy, in *45th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (2004) pp. 32–41.
 - [10] J. D. Whitfield, C. A. Rodríguez-Rosario, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, *Physical Review A* **81**, 10.1103/physreva.81.022323 (2010).
 - [11] J. R. Norris, *Markov Chains*, Cambridge Series in Statistical and Probabilistic Mathematics (Cambridge University Press, 1997).
 - [12] F. Magniez, A. Nayak, P. C. Richter, and M. Santha, *Algorithmica* **63**, 91 (2012).




FIG. 2: Plots of the hitting time for the opposite side of a cycle of length $2N$ (left) and of length $2N + 1$ (right) with respect to N . The circles are the numerical computations of the formula given by Theorem 7, while the continuous lines are the regressions. In the left plot, when $p = 1$ the regression gives N^2 , while for the optimal p we obtain $\sim 2N$ (even N) and $\sim N^2/1.15$ (odd N). In the right case, any N yields a linear hitting time with the optimal p .




FIG. 3: Circuit implementing a step with measurement for the generalized hitting time.

- [13] S. Ying and M. Ying, *Physical Review A* **87**, 012337 (2013), publisher: American Physical Society.
- [14] V. Kendon, *Mathematical Structures in Computer Science* **17**, 10.1017/s0960129507006354 (2007).
- [15] V. Kendon and B. Tregenna, *Physical Review A* **67**, 10.1103/physreva.67.042315 (2003).
- [16] This constraint is actually not necessary to conclude the proof. However, assuming that the function is linear sig-

nificantly simplifies the exposition.

- [17] L. K. Grover, in *Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '96 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1996) p. 212–219.
- [18] W. R. Inc., *Mathematica, Version 13.1*, champaign, IL, 2022.
- [19] C. R. Harris, K. J. Millman, S. J. van der Walt, R. Gommers, P. Virtanen, D. Cournapeau, E. Wieser, J. Taylor, S. Berg, N. J. Smith, R. Kern, M. Picus, S. Hoyer, M. H. van Kerkwijk, M. Brett, A. Haldane, J. F. del Río, M. Wiebe, P. Peterson, P. Gérard-Marchant, K. Sheppard, T. Reddy, W. Weckesser, H. Abbasi, C. Gohlke, and T. E. Oliphant, *Nature* **585**, 357 (2020).
- [20] A. D. Córcoles, M. Takita, K. Inoue, S. Lekuch, Z. K. Mineev, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 100501 (2021).
- [21] A. Cross, A. Javadi-Abhari, T. Alexander, N. D. Beaudrap, L. S. Bishop, S. Heidel, C. A. Ryan, P. Sivarajah, J. Smolin, J. M. Gambetta, and B. R. Johnson, *ACM Transactions on Quantum Computing* **3**, 1 (2022).
- [22] M. S. ANIS, H. Abraham, *et al.*, *Qiskit: An open-source framework for quantum computing* (2021).
- [23] To be consistent with Definition 6, a measurement has to be done also at the beginning, yielding b_0 , so that the experimental hitting time can be also zero like its theoretical counterpart.




FIG. 4: Plots of the concurrent hitting time with respect to the step-wise measurement probability p . The red line is the theoretical expectation as computed in the proof of Theorem 10, while the blue circles are the estimations computed by running the circuit with the given p for 1000 independent times.