




Reducing Mid-Circuit Measurements via Probabilistic Circuits

1st Yanbin Chen 
 TUM School of CIT
 Technical University of Munich
 Germany
 yanbin.chen@tum.de

2nd Innocenzo Fulginiti 
 TUM School of CIT
 Technical University of Munich
 Germany
 innocenzo.fulginiti@tum.de

3rd Christian B. Mendl 
 TUM School of CIT
 Technical University of Munich
 Germany
 christian.mendl@tum.de

Abstract—Mid-circuit measurements and measurement-controlled gates are supported by an increasing number of quantum hardware platforms and will become more relevant as an essential building block for quantum error correction. However, mid-circuit measurements impose significant demands on the quantum hardware due to the required signal analysis and classical feedback loop. This work presents a static circuit optimization algorithm that can substitute some of these measurements with an equivalent circuit with randomized gate applications. Our method uses ideas from constant propagation to classically precompute measurement outcome probabilities. Our proposed optimization is efficient, as its runtime scales polynomially on the number of qubits and gates of the circuit.

Index Terms—Mid-circuit measurement, Dynamic circuit, Quantum circuit optimization, Quantum compilation, Static analysis, Constant Propagation, Probabilistic programming


I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum dynamic circuits are quantum circuits with mid-circuit measurements. Such circuits offer a flexible framework for realizing quantum algorithms, where the gate sequence is not fully determined at compile time since operations can depend on measurement outcomes. Mid-circuit measurements enable, e.g., employing a qubit multiple times: By measuring a qubit, it is reset and, therefore, ready to be reused for further computation as “fresh” qubit [1]–[3].


Mid-circuit measurements are nowadays supported by quantum software frameworks like Qiskit, Pennylane or T|ket) [4]–[9]. Nevertheless, they impose large requirements on the quantum hardware and have a relatively long duration due to the required classical feedback loop [10]–[12].

Some mid-circuit measurements, though, are redundant. Example I.1 describes a toy model case.

Example I.1. The circuit in Fig. 1a contains one mid-circuit measurement, with the measurement outcome controlling the gate V . After gates U_1 and U_2 are applied, we assume that the first two qubits are entangled in state $|\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ and the last two qubits are entangled in an arbitrary two-qubit state $|\Psi\rangle$. A short calculation shows that the state of the first qubit at the second dashed line is $|0\rangle$. Therefore, one can remove the mid-circuit measurement and its controlled gate V since the measurement outcome will always be 0, which leads to the optimized circuit in Fig. 1b.



(a) A circuit containing one mid-circuit measurement



(b) A measurement-free circuit equivalent to Fig. 1a

Figure 1: Example of mid-circuit measurement elimination, where $|\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ and $|\Psi\rangle$ is an arbitrary two-qubit state.

At the time of writing, state-of-the-art quantum compilers, such as Qiskit and t|ket) [7], [9], have not yet considered optimization passes for mid-circuit measurements. To fill this gap, we propose a solution to reduce the number of mid-circuit measurements in dynamic circuits in this paper. Our solution requires that a mid-circuit measurement is performed on a pure state. The measurement and the gate controlled by this measurement outcome could be replaced by a standard rotation gate followed by a probabilistic gate and a controlled gate. The concepts of probabilistic gates and probabilistic circuits are introduced in the later sections. Importantly, whether a probabilistic gate is applied or not is determined in each shot by a classical computer at compile time. Therefore, replacing dynamic components containing mid-circuit measurements with probabilistic components reduces the runtime overhead caused by mid-circuit measurements.

Our method extends Quantum Constant Propagation (QCP) to first perform a static analysis. It then applies a purity test which uses the constant information gathered from QCP




Figure 5: The circuit diagram of the probabilistic gate $U(p)$.

uncertain quantum circuit can be described by the ensemble $\{(p_1, C_1), \dots, (p_n, C_n)\}$.

Example III.1. Suppose there is a situation where a coin is tossed to decide which gate to perform: An X gate will be performed for a head or an I gate for a tail. Then, before the coin is tossed, the operation to be performed can be described by the ensemble $\{(0.5, X), (0.5, I)\}$.

Next, the concepts of probabilistic gate and probabilistic circuit are introduced, which are essential to our method.

b) Probabilistic circuit: Probabilistic gates are non-deterministic quantum operations, of which the non-determinism comes from their stochastic compilation procedure, as described in Definition III.2 and Definition III.3.

Definition III.2 (Probabilistic quantum gate). A probabilistic quantum gate $U(p)$ consists of a quantum gate U and a probability p . The circuit diagram of a probabilistic quantum gate $U(p)$ is shown in Fig. 5.

For a probabilistic gate $U(p)$, the probability p is supposed to be viewed as a parameter fed to the compiler. At compile time, the gate $U(p)$ corresponds to a stochastic compilation procedure which generates a gate U at a probability of p or an identity gate otherwise, as described by Definition III.3.

Definition III.3 (Compilation of probabilistic gate). A probabilistic gate $U(p)$ compiles to a gate U at a probability of p or an identity gate I at a probability of $1 - p$.

A quantum circuit with at least one probabilistic gate is a probabilistic circuit. Each probabilistic gate in the circuit is compiled independently.

Definition III.4 (Probabilistic quantum circuit). A probabilistic circuit is a quantum circuit that contains probabilistic quantum gates.

Example III.2. In Fig. 6, an example of a probabilistic quantum circuit is shown. Since 2 probabilistic gates exist in the circuit in Fig. 6, 4 possible circuits as shown in Fig. 7 could be generated from compilation.

Probabilistic gates introduce randomness into circuits. This randomness is brought about by the stochastic compilation process embedded in probabilistic gates. Mid-circuit measurement provides another way of introducing randomness into quantum circuits since it enables the realization of operations relying on measurement outcomes at runtime.

Remark. The randomness from mid-circuit measurements is introduced at runtime, while the randomness from probabilistic gates is introduced at compile time. This point is emphasized







Figure 6: An example of probabilistic quantum circuit C_p containing a $CNOT(0.4)$, a $X(0.6)$, and a certain Hadamard gate. By compiling this probabilistic circuit, the $CNOT$ gate is generated at probability of 0.4 and the X gate is generated at probability of 0.6.




(a) A static circuit C_1 , where only $CNOT$ gate appears.



(b) A static circuit C_2 , where only X gate appears.



(c) A static circuit C_3 , where neither $CNOT$ nor X gate appear.



(d) A static circuit C_4 , where both $CNOT$ and X gate appear.

Figure 7: 4 possible circuits generated by the probabilistic circuit in Fig. 6.

here because it implies the ideology of our optimization: Replace dynamic circuit snippet with equivalent probabilistic circuit snippet to reduce runtime overhead at only an extra static cost.

Next, the concept of circuit ensemble is used to model the uncertainty brought about by probabilistic gates or mid-circuit measurements.

For a circuit C , a notation $\|C\|^*$ is invented to express every possible resulting circuit of C . $\|C\|^*$ denotes the ensemble of all possible circuits compiled from C (i.e., every probabilistic gate in C is compiled) and then every mid-circuit measurement in the compiled circuit is performed. Each circuit contained in the ensemble $\|C\|^*$ is paired with the probability of getting this circuit by compiling C and executing every mid-circuit measurement. The definition of the notation $\|\cdot\|^*$ is given in Definition III.5.

Definition III.5. For a circuit C , the ensemble $\|C\|^* := \{(C_i, p_i) \mid C_i \text{ is a static circuit achieved by compiling each probabilistic gate in } C \text{ and performing each mid-circuit measurement in the compiled result.}\}$

Remark. For a probabilistic circuit C_p , $\|C_p\|^*$ is an ensemble containing all possible resulting circuits after every probabilistic gate in C_p is compiled according to its probability; for

and the extra effort needed to compile the probabilistic X gate; the right-hand side of Eq. (2) is lower in runtime overhead because it is free of mid-circuit measurement.

A special case of this optimization step is suggested in the following Theorem III.2, where the mid-circuit measurement does not control any gate. Similarly, to replace the dynamic circuit snippet on the left-hand side of Eq. (10), the input state to the mid-circuit measurement needs to be statically determined and in pure state.

Theorem III.2. Given a quantum state $|\psi\rangle := \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, a rotation gate $R_{\psi \rightarrow 1}$ such that $R_{\psi \rightarrow 1}|\psi\rangle = |1\rangle$, and a probability $p = \|\alpha\|^2$, then

$$|\psi\rangle \text{ --- } \boxed{\text{---}} \triangleq |\psi\rangle \text{ --- } \boxed{R_{\psi \rightarrow 1}} \text{ --- } \boxed{\text{---}} \text{ --- } \boxed{X} \text{ --- } \text{ (10)}$$

p

Proof. The proof is very similar to that for Theorem III.1. \square

c) *Purity test:* The optimizations on mid-circuit measurements suggested by Theorem III.1 and Theorem III.2 both require that the input state to the mid-circuit measurement is pure. Therefore, before applying the optimization on mid-circuit measurements, information of purity on qubits is needed. The purity test presented in Theorem III.3 will be performed for each of the mid-circuit measurements to decide whether it can be replaced by static components, i.e. probabilistic gates and normal quantum gates.

Theorem III.3 (Purity test). For a n -qubit quantum state $|\Psi\rangle$, the procedure in Line 1 returns *true* if its i -th qubit is not entangled with other qubits.

For an input state containing k computational basis states, the above procedure has a computational complexity of $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$.

d) *Put everything together:* Finally, we are now ready to discuss the overall framework of our optimization method, which is presented in the form of pseudo-code in Algorithm 2. First, QCP is applied to propagate initial constant information throughout the circuit. Next, for each of the mid-circuit measurements in the circuit, the purity test presented in Theorem III.3 is performed to examine whether its input state is in a pure state. If it is, then we can, by theorem Theorem III.1 or Theorem III.2, replace the mid-circuit measurement and its controlling gate with a static circuit snippet consisting of a probabilistic gate and normal quantum gates.

e) *Asymptotic analysis:* For a n -qubit dynamic circuit of g gates, QCP runs in $\mathcal{O}(g \cdot c^2 \cdot n)$, where c is the maximum number of controls allowed for each gate. As mentioned below Theorem III.3, each purity test runs in $\mathcal{O}(k^2)$ where k is the number of computational basis states in the input state

¹For a computational basis state $|\phi\rangle$, $|\phi\rangle_p$ denotes the binary digit corresponding to the p -th qubit. E.g., $|0010\rangle_3 = 1, |101\rangle_2 = 0$.

²For a computational basis state $|\phi\rangle$, $|\phi\rangle_{\neq p}$ denotes the binary string representation of $|\phi\rangle$ after removing the digit corresponding to the p -th qubit. E.g., $|010101\rangle_{\neq 3} = 01101, |010101\rangle_{\neq 1} = 10101$.

Algorithm 1: Purity test


Data: $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}, |\Psi\rangle$,
where $|\Psi\rangle = \alpha_1 |\psi_1\rangle + \alpha_2 |\psi_2\rangle + \dots + \alpha_k |\psi_k\rangle$,
 $1 \leq k \leq 2^n; \forall j \in \{1, \dots, k\}, \alpha_j \neq 0$, and
 $|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_k\rangle$ are k different computational basis states
Result: $b \in \mathbb{B}$
 $A_0 \leftarrow \{\alpha_j \mid j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \text{ and } |\psi_j\rangle_i = 0\};$ ¹
 $A_1 \leftarrow \{\alpha_j \mid j \in \{1, \dots, k\} \text{ and } |\psi_j\rangle_i = 1\};$ ¹
if $|A_0| = 0$ **or** $|A_1| = 0$ **then**
| **return true**;
end
if $|A_0| \neq |A_1|$ **then**
| **return false**;
end
 $ratio \leftarrow 0;$
for each j **such that** $\alpha_j \in A_0$ **do**
| **if exists** j' **such that** $\alpha_{j'} \in A_1$ **and**
| $|\psi_j\rangle_{\neq i} = |\psi_{j'}\rangle_{\neq i}$ ² **then**
| | **if** $ratio \neq 0$ **and** $ratio \neq \alpha_j / \alpha_{j'}$ **then**
| | | **return false**;
| | **end**
| | $ratio \leftarrow \alpha_j / \alpha_{j'};$
| | $A_1 \leftarrow A_1 \setminus \{\alpha_{j'}\};$
| **end**
| **return false**;
end
return true;

being tested. In QCP, each entanglement group is limited in n_{max} many basis states [14]. Suppose there are m many mid-circuit measurements in the circuit, then $\mathcal{O}(m \cdot n_{max}^2)$ many steps are needed for the purity test. Finally, the computational complexity of the optimization is $\mathcal{O}(g \cdot c^2 \cdot n + m \cdot n_{max}^2)$. Since n_{max} is a constant, the optimization is polynomial in n, g, c and m .


Algorithm 2: Overall framework of optimization

Data: A dynamic circuit C
Result: An optimized circuit C_o with potentially less number of mid-circuit measurements
 $S_{const_info} \leftarrow \text{QCP.run}(C);$
for each mid-circuit measurement M **in** C **do**
| // purity-test is explained in Theorem III.3
| $purity \leftarrow \text{purity-test.run}(M.\text{input_state}, S_{const_info});$
| **if** $purity = true$ **then**
| | // Apply Theorem III.1 or Theorem III.2
| | $\text{optimize}(M);$
| **end**
end

f) *Demonstrating examples:* In this paragraph, our proposed optimization is applied to two dynamic circuits to briefly demonstrate its effectiveness. In the first example depicted in Fig. 8, our proposed optimization simplified the dynamic



(a) The dynamic circuit in the first demonstrating example.



(b) The circuit optimized by our proposed method.


Figure 8: The first demonstrating example.

circuit into a static circuit free of any mid-circuit measurement, significantly reducing runtime overhead. Besides, the circuit depth is decreased. The next example is depicted in Fig. 9. By Theorem III.1, one mid-circuit measurement, together with its controlled gate, is replaced with a rotation gate (a Hadamard gate in this case), a probabilistic X gate and a controlled gate. Another mid-circuit measurement is replaced with a normal quantum control because based on the information propagated by QCP, its input state is in one of the computational basis states. Although the depth of the circuit of Fig. 9b increases slightly, the optimization manages to exchange dynamic components in the circuit into static ones, vastly decreasing runtime cost.


IV. RELATED WORKS

The technology of mid-circuit measurements is being increasingly utilized in quantum computing. For example, qubit-reuse, the technique of recycling inactive qubits and using them in the rest of the circuits, could use mid-circuit measurements as one of the approaches to reset inactive qubits [1]–[3]. Mid-circuit measurement also plays a vital role in Quantum Error Correction. In many Quantum Error Correction codes like Surface Code, the mid-circuit measurement is an important part of the protocol [15], [16].

Quantum compilation is a process that transforms high-level source code into low-level entities executable by various quantum computers sitting at the backend. In recent decades, this field has seen an outpouring of research [17]. In the quantum compilation process, various optimization passes are



(a) The dynamic circuit in the second demonstrating example.



(b) The circuit optimized by our proposed method.

Figure 9: The second demonstrating example.

applied to achieve certain computations with less consumption of resources [7], [9].

As an effort to bring static analysis to the world of quantum computing, Chen et al. proposed the Quantum Constant Propagation, a circuit optimization pass that tries to propagate the initial information throughout the circuit and use the propagated information to simplify circuits [14].

The paradigm of probabilistic quantum circuits is similar to probabilistic programming, which encodes probability distribution in programming [18]. While the key advantage of probabilistic programming is its flexibility in representing and manipulating uncertain knowledge, the shining point of probabilistic quantum circuits is its ability to model the uncertainty of dynamic circuits at runtime.

V. CONCLUSION

Mid-circuit measurement poses significant challenges for quantum computing hardware. Therefore, this paper introduces a novel optimization approach to mitigate this issue by reducing the number of mid-circuit measurements for dynamic circuits. By introducing the concept of probabilistic circuits and taking advantage of QCP, our proposed method offers a promising avenue for addressing this challenge. Through our contributions, this paper advances the optimization of mid-circuit measurements and offers insights into the efficiency and scalability of the dynamic circuit model.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The research is part of the Munich Quantum Valley (MQV), which is supported by the Bavarian state government with funds from the Hightech Agenda Bayern Plus. We are grateful to Prof. Dr. Helmut Seidl for many fruitful discussions and his support at all times.

REFERENCES

- [1] M. DeCross, E. Chertkov, M. Kohagen, and M. Foss-Feig, “Qubit-reuse compilation with mid-circuit measurement and reset.” [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2210.08039>
- [2] S. Brandhofer, I. Polian, and K. Krsulich, “Optimal qubit reuse for near-term quantum computers.” [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2308.00194>
- [3] F. Hua, Y. Jin, Y. Chen, S. Vittal, K. Krsulich, L. S. Bishop, J. Lapeyre, A. Javadi-Abhari, and E. Z. Zhang, “Exploiting qubit reuse through mid-circuit measurement and reset,” version: 3. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2211.01925>
- [4] Ibm quantum platform february 2021 product updates. [Online]. Available: https://t.ly/_ypjY
- [5] P. Nation. How to measure and reset a qubit in the middle of a circuit execution. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ibm.com/quantum/blog/quantum-mid-circuit-measurement>
- [6] Bringing the full power of dynamic circuits to qiskit runtime. <https://www.ibm.com/quantum/blog/quantum-dynamic-circuits>. [Accessed 19-03-2024]. [Online]. Available: <https://www.ibm.com/quantum/blog/quantum-dynamic-circuits>
- [7] Qiskit contributors, “Qiskit: An open-source framework for quantum computing,” 2023.
- [8] V. Bergholm, J. Izaac, M. Schuld, C. Gogolin, S. Ahmed, V. Ajith, M. S. Alam, G. Alonso-Linaje, B. AkashNarayanan, A. Asadi, J. M. Arrazola, U. Azad, S. Banning, C. Blank, T. R. Bromley, B. A. Cordier, J. Ceroni, A. Delgado, O. D. Matteo, A. Dusko, T. Garg, D. Guala, A. Hayes, R. Hill, A. Ijaz, T. Isaacsson, D. Ittah, S. Jahangiri, P. Jain, E. Jiang, A. Khandelwal, K. Kottmann, R. A. Lang, C. Lee, T. Loke, A. Lowe, K. McKiernan, J. J. Meyer, J. A. Montañez-Barrera, R. Moyard, Z. Niu, L. J. O’Riordan, S. Oud, A. Panigrahi, C.-Y. Park, D. Polatajko, N. Quesada, C. Roberts, N. Sá, I. Schoch, B. Shi, S. Shu, S. Sim, A. Singh, I. Strandberg, J. Soni, A. Száva, S. Thabet, R. A. Vargas-Hernández, T. Vincent, N. Vitucci, M. Weber, D. Wierichs, R. Wiersema, M. Willmann, V. Wong, S. Zhang, and N. Killoran, “Pennylane: Automatic differentiation of hybrid quantum-classical computations,” 2022.
- [9] S. Sivarajah, S. Dilkes, A. Cowtan, W. Simmons, A. Edgington, and R. Duncan, “t—ket): a retargetable compiler for nisq devices,” *Quantum Science and Technology*, vol. 6, no. 1, p. 014003, nov 2020. [Online]. Available: <https://dx.doi.org/10.1088/2058-9565/ab8e92>
- [10] A. D. Córcoles, M. Takita, K. Inoue, S. Lekuch, Z. K. Mineev, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, “Exploiting dynamic quantum circuits in a quantum algorithm with superconducting qubits,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, vol. 127, p. 100501, Aug 2021. [Online]. Available: <https://link.aps.org/doi/10.1103/PhysRevLett.127.100501>
- [11] T. Lubinski, C. Granade, A. Anderson, A. Geller, M. Roetteler, A. Petrenko, and B. Heim, “Advancing hybrid quantum-classical computation with real-time execution,” 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2206.12950>
- [12] L. Ella, L. Leandro, O. Wertheim, Y. Romach, L. Schlipf, R. Szmuk, Y. Knol, N. Ofek, I. Sivan, and Y. Cohen, “Quantum-classical processing and benchmarking at the pulse-level,” 2023. [Online]. Available: <https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2303.03816>
- [13] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition*, 1st ed. Cambridge University Press, Jun. 2012.
- [14] Y. Chen and Y. Stade, “Quantum constant propagation,” in *Static Analysis*, M. V. Hermenegildo and J. F. Morales, Eds. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2023, pp. 164–189. [Online]. Available: https://link.springer.com/chapter/10.1007/978-3-031-44245-2_9
- [15] S. B. Bravyi and A. Y. Kitaev, “Quantum codes on a lattice with boundary.” [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9811052>
- [16] E. Dennis, A. Kitaev, A. Landahl, and J. Preskill, “Topological quantum memory,” *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 43, no. 9, pp. 4452–4505, 2002. [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0110143>
- [17] A. Elsharkawy, X.-T. M. To, P. Seitz, Y. Chen, Y. Stade, M. Geiger, Q. Huang, X. Guo, M. A. Ansari, C. B. Mendl, D. Kranzlmüller, and M. Schulz, “Integration of quantum accelerators with high performance computing – a review of quantum programming tools.” [Online]. Available: <http://arxiv.org/abs/2309.06167>
- [18] A. Pfeffer, *Practical probabilistic programming*. Simon and Schuster, 2016.