

Modular Synthesis of Efficient Quantum Uncomputation

HRISTO VENEV, INSAIT, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Bulgaria

TIMON GEHR, ETH Zurich, Switzerland

DIMITAR DIMITROV, INSAIT, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Bulgaria

MARTIN VECHEV, ETH Zurich, Switzerland

A key challenge of quantum programming is uncomputation: the reversible deallocation of qubits. And while there has been much recent progress on automating uncomputation, state-of-the-art methods are insufficient for handling today’s expressive quantum programming languages. A core reason is that they operate on primitive quantum circuits, while quantum programs express computations beyond circuits, for instance, they can capture families of circuits defined recursively in terms of uncomputation and adjoints.

In this paper, we introduce the first modular automatic approach to synthesize correct and efficient uncomputation for expressive quantum programs. Our method is based on two core technical contributions: (i) an intermediate representation (IR) that can capture expressive quantum programs and comes with support for uncomputation, and (ii) modular algorithms over that IR for synthesizing uncomputation and adjoints.

We have built a complete end-to-end implementation of our method, including an implementation of the IR and the synthesis algorithms, as well as a translation from an expressive fragment of the Silq programming language to our IR and circuit generation from the IR. Our experimental evaluation demonstrates that we can handle programs beyond the capabilities of existing uncomputation approaches, while being competitive on the benchmarks they can handle. More broadly, we show that it is possible to benefit from the greater expressivity and safety offered by high-level quantum languages without sacrificing efficiency.

1 INTRODUCTION

Classical programs often change data irreversibly. For example, when a variable is assigned a new value, then the old one is erased from memory and it cannot be recovered anymore. In contrast, quantum programs can rarely afford to destroy information and primarily use reversible operations. Assignment is commonly emulated with the controlled NOT gate $y := x \oplus y$, which sets y to the exclusive or of the two variables. If y is guaranteed to equal zero beforehand, then the gate effectively acts as an assignment. However, ensuring reversibility complicates many otherwise simple tasks. Notably, temporary variables have to be deallocated reversibly in order to preserve quantum interference patterns [Shor 1997]. This process is known as *uncomputation*, and involves resetting a variable to its *zero state* by undoing all changes to it, last to first [Bennett 1973; Lecerf 1963; Toffoli 1980]. Once reset, the variable can be marked as free for later use. While uncomputation may sound straightforward, programming it manually is tedious and error-prone, which makes it a major practical issue, and therefore, it is crucial to automate it as much as possible.

1.1 Uncomputation is more than adjoints

The first step towards automating uncomputation is the ability to synthesize *adjoints* f^\dagger : the inverses of whole units of code f . Circuit description languages like Quipper [Green et al. 2013] and Qwire [Paykin et al. 2017], and libraries like Qiskit [Aleksandrowicz et al. 2019] can generate adjoints of circuits, and the Q# language [Microsoft 2020] supports adjoints of recursive procedures. Although the specifics vary, the fundamental idea of adjoint synthesis is to rewrite code using the equivalence $(A; B)^\dagger = B^\dagger; A^\dagger$ known from linear algebra. Figure 1 illustrates this transformation for the ITERATE procedure, which iterates n times another procedure f .

Authors’ addresses: Hristo Venev, INSAIT, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Sofia, Bulgaria, hristo.venev@insait.ai; Timon Gehr, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland, timon.gehr@inf.ethz.ch; Dimitar Dimitrov, INSAIT, Sofia University “St. Kliment Ohridski”, Sofia, Bulgaria, dimitar.dimitrov@insait.ai; Martin Vechev, ETH Zurich, Zurich, Switzerland, martin.vechev@inf.ethz.ch.

ITERATE($n, f, \mathbf{in} x, \mathbf{out} y$)

```

1 if  $n = 0$ :  $y := x \oplus y$ 
2 else alloc  $t$ 
3   ITERATE( $n - 1, f, x, t$ )
4    $f(t, y)$ 
5   ITERATE†( $n - 1, f, x, t$ )
6   alloc†  $t$ 

```

(a) For $n \geq 1$ ITERATE first computes iteration $n-1$, then applies f , and finally uncomputes iteration $n-1$ by calling the adjoint procedure ITERATE[†].

ITERATE[†]($n, f, \mathbf{in} x, \mathbf{out}^\dagger y$)

```

1 if  $n = 0$ :  $y := x \oplus y$ 
2 else alloc  $t$ 
3   ITERATE( $n - 1, f, x, t$ )
4    $f^\dagger(t, y)$ 
5   ITERATE†( $n - 1, f, x, t$ )
6   alloc†  $t$ 

```

(b) ITERATE[†] is almost the same, except that it is called with y already equal to the n th iteration and uncomputes it with $f^\dagger(\mathbf{in} x, \mathbf{out}^\dagger y)$.

Fig. 1. ITERATE reversibly computes the n th iteration of the procedure $f(\mathbf{in} x, \mathbf{out} y)$, which reads x , and updates y in-place. Here n and f hold classical data, while x and y hold quantum data. Input quantum parameters are not modified, output ones are expected in a zero state, and adjoint output ones are uncomputed to a zero state. Allocation and deallocation happens with two primitives: **alloc** pops a zeroed quantum register from the free list, while its adjoint **alloc**[†] pushes a zeroed quantum register back.

Although key, adjoint synthesis alone does not guarantee correct and efficient uncomputation.

Lack of correctness guarantees. Extra care is needed to ensure that an adjoint indeed uncomputes a variable. For example, in the typical compute-use-uncompute pattern $f; g; f^\dagger$, if g accidentally modifies a variable computed by f , then the adjoint f^\dagger will not undo that update, and the variable will not be zeroed. More importantly, even if no updates are missed, uncomputation can still fail when the quantum effects of f and g are incompatible (see, e.g., [Bichsel et al. \[2020\]](#)). This aspect is overlooked in languages with built-in support for the compute-use-uncompute pattern, that is, for *conjugation*: Quipper, Q#, Tower [[Yuan and Carbin 2022](#)], and Qunity [[Voichick et al. 2023](#)] all support conjugation but provide no correctness guarantees for uncomputation.

Lack of efficiency guarantees. Naively implemented uncomputation, even when correct, can greatly increase resource usage and cause an exponential blowup in recursive procedures. This is the case for ITERATE in Fig. 1, which makes 2^{n-1} calls to the procedure f and $2^{n-1} - 1$ calls to f^\dagger , provided $n \geq 1$. This happens because to uncompute $f^{n-1}(x)$, ITERATE invokes ITERATE[†], which in turn recurses again to recompute $f^{n-2}(x)$. Such recomputation can be avoided by switching the base algorithm to a tail recursive scheme, as noted by [Yuan and Carbin \[2022\]](#). However, this transformation can significantly complicate the code and obscure its correctness.

A key challenge then is how to automatically synthesize both correct and efficient uncomputation.

1.2 Existing work towards uncomputation for quantum programs

Synthesis of correct and efficient uncomputation was initially developed to transform irreversible classical machines [[Bennett 1973](#); [Lecerf 1963](#)] and circuits [[Toffoli 1980](#)] into reversible ones. These methods were later utilized for compiling classical programs to quantum circuits [[Amy et al. 2017](#); [Green et al. 2013](#); [Parent et al. 2015](#); [Rand et al. 2019](#)]. However, more research was needed to extend them to more general quantum programs.

1.2.1 Specifying uncomputation. For more general quantum programs we need a linguistic device for specifying the variables to be uncomputed. The mechanism should have a precise semantics that abstracts the concrete operational details, allowing a variety of implementations. It should also have a clear criterion when a variable can be uncomputed correctly. These questions were first

ITERATE(n, f , **in** x , **out** y)

```

1 if  $n = 0$ :  $y := x \oplus y$ 
2 else alloc  $t$ 
3   ITERATE( $n - 1, f, x, t$ )
4    $f(t, y)$ 
5   forget  $t$ 

```

(a) A declarative version of ITERATE.

ITERATE^G(n, f , **in** x , **out** y , **bin** g)

```

1 if  $n = 0$ :  $y := x \oplus y$ 
2 else alloc  $t$ 
3   ITERATEG( $n - 1, f, x, t, g$ )
4    $f^G(t, y, g)$ 
5   dispose  $t$  in  $g$ 

```

(b) A garbage-producing version of ITERATE.

Fig. 2. A **forget** statement can be thought of a placeholder for yet to be synthesized uncomputation. That uncomputation can be delayed by throwing the data into a garbage bin using **dispose**.

investigated in depth in the high-level quantum programming language Silq [Bichsel et al. 2020]. The key idea of Silq is to separate the specification of uncomputation from its implementation. Towards that, it features the **forget** statement with a *declarative* semantics that magically deletes a quantum variable from the state, without actual uncomputation happening. Figure 2a shows how ITERATE’s uncomputation can be abstracted this way. The declarative semantics of **forget** is in general unphysical, in accordance with the no-deleting theorem [Kumar Pati and Braunstein 2000]. However, the authors proved that a physical interpretation exists in case the forgotten variable was computed *without* any quantum superposition or phase effects. This condition implies that correct uncomputation could be synthesized, and is enforced by Silq’s effect tracking system. Unfortunately, due to the expressivity of the language, the challenge of actually synthesizing the uncomputation has remained open.

1.2.2 Delaying uncomputation. One of the keys to efficient uncomputation is to avoid doing it prematurely. In general, there is more than one point in time when a datum t can be uncomputed. It might happen, as in Fig. 1, that the first such point is earlier than a later use of the same datum by another uncomputation. In this case, uncomputing t at the first opportunity will only result in recomputing it at that later point, creating overhead. If, on the other hand, the datum is kept around as long as it is needed, then the overhead will be avoided. For our ITERATE example this means accumulating the intermediate iterations $f^0(x), \dots, f^{n-1}(x)$ until $y = f^n(x)$ is computed, and then uncomputing them in reverse order. Delaying uncomputation was understood early on and it is an essential part of Bennett’s constructions [Bennett 1973, 1989] for Turing machines. For procedural programming languages, however, there has been only a partial progress so far.

James and Sabry [2012] interpret what is essentially a classical **forget** instruction as *hiding*: data that is supposed to be erased is actually discarded into a global garbage dump. This allowed them to give a reversible semantics of a non-reversible classical language. The global garbage dump, however, is never uncomputed. While this is unproblematic for classical programs, for quantum programs hiding is not equivalent to **forget**. In fact, Heunen and Kaarsgaard [2022] noted that hiding alone gives a purification semantics of measurement. This can be explained with the *principle of implicit measurement* [Nielsen and Chuang 2000, p. 187]: The global garbage dump can be assumed to be measured at the end of the execution. If instead of measurement one needs uncomputation, then of course the garbage dump has to be uncomputed. Precisely for that purpose, Fu et al. [2020] introduced the *garbage monad*, which allows *disposing* data into a local garbage bin that can be uncomputed when needed. Delayed uncomputation is done by: (1) disposing data instead of uncomputing it right away; (2) uncomputing the whole bin *manually* at the right moment.

To apply this recipe to ITERATE, we replace **forget** with **dispose**, obtaining the procedure ITERATE^G in Fig. 2b. Note that because the garbage is left uncomputed, this procedure has a

different semantics. Nonetheless, we can use it to implement ITERATE efficiently by conjugation:

$$\text{ITERATE}^G(n-1, f, x, t, \mathbf{bin} g) ; f(t, y) ; \text{ITERATE}^{G^\dagger}(n-1, f, x, t, \mathbf{bin}^\dagger g).$$

Evidently, only twice the work of ITERATE is done if we count **forget** as costing nothing: once for the computation and once for the uncomputation. However, correctness is not guaranteed still.

1.2.3 Synthesizing uncomputation for circuits. Paradis et al. [2021] gave the first uncomputation synthesis algorithm for arbitrary quantum circuits. The algorithm transforms a garbage-producing circuit into a garbage-free circuit, where the garbage qubits have been uncomputed efficiently. Moreover, it ensures Silq-style correctness by tracking quantum effects of gates. Also, there is a variant [Paradis et al. 2022] that trades time for space efficiency following Bennett [1989].

Even though the method applies to circuits and not to recursive quantum programs, let us see what it can do for our example. What we can do is to get a circuit that implements the ITERATE^G procedure for given concrete arguments, and then run the synthesis algorithm. The most widespread way for this is to write a *script*, denoted ITERATE^{GC} , that generates the circuit, e.g., using a library such as Qiskit: we reinterpret quantum operations as instructions that append gates to the circuit, procedure calls become calls to scripts, and **dispose** marks qubits as garbage. Then, we extend this script with an instruction to run the uncomputation synthesis algorithm of Paradis et al. to obtain the final script ITERATE^{GCV} , which produces an efficient circuit for ITERATE:

$$\text{ITERATE}^G \mapsto \text{ITERATE}^{GC} \mapsto \text{ITERATE}^{GCV}.$$

1.3 Limitations of existing approaches

We now describe three fundamental orthogonal challenges that need to be addressed.

1.3.1 Expressivity. To illustrate the expressivity challenge, let us consider the ETARETI procedure in Fig. 3a, which is defined recursively in terms of its own adjoint. Such procedures, where adjoints and uncomputation can be combined freely, are expressible in modern languages (e.g., Silq). When we try to execute the sketched uncomputation approach from above, we encounter a problem at step two, which translates the procedure to a script ETARETI^{GC} . We need to interpret the call to the adjoint ETARETI^\dagger as a call to some script. The problem here is where does this script actually come from. Ideally, we would invoke the script $\text{ETARETI}^{\dagger GC}$, but to derive it we need an explicit definition of the adjoint. However, the adjoint is defined only implicitly and has to be synthesized first. Unfortunately, existing methods for adjoint synthesis do not support programs with **forget**, which is a placeholder and not an operation that can be inverted.

An alternative strategy would be to recursively invoke the script ETARETI^{GC} itself, and then derive a circuit for the supposed call to $\text{ETARETI}^{\dagger GC}$. There are two options, but neither is satisfactory:

- (1) $\text{ETARETI}^{GC}(n-1, f, x, t)^\dagger$. This circuit is not viable because it consumes garbage, while we are generating a circuit that produces garbage.
- (2) $\text{ETARETI}^{GC}(n-1, f, x, t)^{\vee\dagger}$. This circuit computes the correct result, but it already includes all uncomputation, leading to the exponential blowup seen for ITERATE^\dagger in Fig. 1b: the circuit for f^\dagger will be inlined 2^{n-1} times, while the one for f will be inlined $2^{n-1} - 1$ times.

This example shows a deeper problem: there is a vicious circle between adjoint synthesis and uncomputation synthesis. To synthesize the uncomputation, we need the adjoint. To synthesize the adjoint, we need the uncomputation. Therefore, to guarantee efficiency for expressive quantum languages one has to go beyond existing approaches.

1.3.2 Modular uncomputation synthesis. The garbage monad and Paradis et al. [2021]’s approach (called Unqomp), discussed above, facilitate program modularity by encapsulating garbage. However, they are not *modular transformations*: before they can synthesize uncomputation, they need to inline

$$\text{ETARETI}(n, f, \mathbf{in} \ x, \mathbf{out}^\dagger \ y)$$

```

1  if  $n = 0$ :  $y := x \oplus y$ 
2  else alloc  $t$ 
3       $\text{ETARETI}^\dagger(n - 1, f, x, t)$ 
4       $f^\dagger(t, y)$ 
5  forget  $t$ 

```

(a) An alternative implementation of ITERATE^\dagger .
$$\text{ETARETI}^U(n, f, \mathbf{in} \ x, \mathbf{out}^\dagger \ y)$$

```

1  if  $n = 0$ :  $y := x \oplus y$ 
2  else alloc  $t$ 
3       $\text{ETARETI}^{U\dagger G}(n - 1, f, x, t, \mathbf{bin} \ g)$ 
4       $f^\dagger(t, y)$ 
5       $\text{ETARETI}^{U\dagger G\dagger}(n - 1, f, x, t, \mathbf{bin}^\dagger \ g)$ 
6  alloc  $t$ 

```

(b) ETARETI after uncomputation synthesis.
$$\text{ETARETI}^{U\dagger}(n, f, \mathbf{in} \ x, \mathbf{out} \ y)$$

```

1  if  $n = 0$ :  $y := x \oplus y$ 
2  else alloc  $t$ 
3       $\text{ETARETI}^{U\dagger G}(n - 1, f, x, t, \mathbf{bin} \ g)$ 
4       $f(t, y)$ 
5       $\text{ETARETI}^{U\dagger G\dagger}(n - 1, f, x, t, \mathbf{bin}^\dagger \ g)$ 
6  alloc  $t$ 

```

(c) The synthesized adjoint of ETARETI .
$$\text{ETARETI}^{U\dagger G}(n, f, \mathbf{in} \ x, \mathbf{out} \ y, \mathbf{bin} \ g)$$

```

1  if  $n = 0$ :  $y := x \oplus y$ 
2  else alloc  $t$ 
3       $\text{ETARETI}^{U\dagger G}(n - 1, f, x, t, g)$ 
4       $f^G(t, y, g)$ 
5  dispose  $t$  in  $g$ 

```

(d) Uncomputation erasure of $\text{ETARETI}^{U\dagger}$.

Fig. 3. Our uncomputation synthesis approach for ETARETI . Here, the **bin** operator binds a garbage bin to a variable, and its adjoint \mathbf{bin}^\dagger unbinds one, uniquely identifying a computation-uncomputation pair. The pairing enables *uncomputation erasure*: the replacement of uncomputation with **dispose**. The resulting procedure accepts a garbage **bin** parameter to which temporary variables are disposed; the adjoint procedure accepts a \mathbf{bin}^\dagger parameter from which garbage can be removed using the adjoint operation **dispose** † .

all subcircuits, unable to treat them as black-box components. This leads to two major limitations. First, synthesis itself is less efficient in case a subcircuit is inlined in many places: the algorithm will be repeated for every place, and this can lead to a substantial increase in synthesis running time in the presence of recursion. Second, inlining subcircuits can obscure error reporting because it makes it difficult to track the root cause of an error. These two considerations make synthesis modularity a desirable property.

1.3.3 Intermediate representations. To realize the goal of modular, correct and efficient uncomputation synthesis for expressive quantum programs, one needs a suitable IR that strikes a balance between three main considerations:

Expressivity The IR should be expressive enough as a compilation target for the source language ensuring that uncomputation details do not leak during lowering. For example, when applying Unqomp to ETARETI in Fig. 3a, the call to ETARETI^\dagger could be interpreted in the two ways mentioned above, both unsatisfactory. This would not occur if Unqomp 's IR supported recursive calls and adjoints.

Simplicity Some IR features complicate matters without added benefits. For instance, supporting mutable quantum data and even aliasing, as in QIR [Lubinski et al. 2022], would require tracking old versions of variables, as uncomputation of x could depend on an old version of y . Instead, an SSA based IR makes old versions explicit and is much simpler.

Uncomputation support The IR would ideally include features to support uncomputation. For example, it makes sense to distinguish between variable uses that “consume” the variable

from scope, such as forgetting a variable, and uses that “conserve” the variable in scope, e.g., in a controlled NOT.

To the best of our knowledge, no existing IR addresses these concerns simultaneously.

1.4 Our contributions

We now discuss our main contributions.

Intermediate representation. We first introduce a novel intermediate representation (Section 3) that is designed to address the three concerns discussed above. Like QUIRO [Peduri et al. 2022] and QSSA [Peduri et al. 2022], our IR is in SSA form, supports recursion, as well as both quantum and classical computation. This makes it expressive enough for a wide variety of programs. Additionally, borrows two features from Silq that help with uncomputation:

- (1) It tracks quantum effects to determine whether a variable can be correctly uncomputed.
- (2) It distinguishes between “consumed” and “conserved” function arguments.

Algorithm. We then introduce a modular algorithm (Section 4) for synthesizing correct and efficient uncomputation even when adjoints and uncomputation are mixed. The key idea is to extend the transformation $f \mapsto f^G$ to replace not only **forget** with **dispose**, but also synthesized uncomputation. We call this *uncomputation erasure* as uncomputation is erased, and the temporary variables are thrown in the bin instead. The vicious circle between adjoints and uncomputation is broken by synthesizing uncomputation first, and adjoints later. Then uncomputation erasure can be applied whenever necessary in order to ensure efficiency. The approach is illustrated in Fig. 3.

Implementation and evaluation. We have built an end-to-end implementation of our approach consisting of: a complete implementation of our IR and the uncomputation synthesis algorithm along with a translation from Silq to the IR and a code generator from the IR to low-level circuits. This enables us, for the first time, to handle an expressive fragment of Silq that includes automatic uncomputation, reaching a major milestone towards a full compiler. Further, we have extensively evaluated our system vs. Unqomp on a variety of benchmarks. The results indicate that we can achieve performance on par with the state of the art, demonstrating that one can benefit from the greater expressivity and safety offered by high-level languages without sacrificing efficiency.

2 BACKGROUND

In this section we will introduce the fundamental concepts of quantum computation necessary to understand our work. We refer readers wishing to gain an in-depth understanding of quantum computation to the excellent introduction by Nielsen and Chuang [2000].

2.1 Quantum states

A quantum computation transforms a quantum state.

One qubit. Quantum information is usually represented in terms of qubits. Like a classical bit, a qubit can be in one of the computational basis states $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$. In contrast to a classical bit, any superposition (complex linear combination) $\varphi = \alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle$ with $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ is a valid state for a qubit. It is in this sense that a qubit is often thought to be both 0 and 1 at the same time. More formally, qubit states are unit vectors in the two-dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}(\{0, 1\})$ spanned by the basis $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$. (In finite dimensions, a Hilbert space is just a complex vector space with an inner product.)

Two qubits. For a pair of qubits, the computational basis states represent all four combinations of two-bit values: $|00\rangle$, $|01\rangle$, $|10\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$. Like in the single-qubit case, any superposition $\varphi =$

$\alpha |00\rangle + \beta |01\rangle + \gamma |10\rangle + \delta |11\rangle$ with $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 + |\gamma|^2 + |\delta|^2 = 1$ is a valid state for the two-qubit system.

More qubits. This naturally generalizes to the case of arbitrarily many qubits: An n -qubit system has 2^n computational basis states representing all combinations of n -bit values, and states of the system are given by superpositions of those basis states. More formally, n -qubit states are unit vectors in the Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}(\{0, 1\}^n)$, where each element of $\{0, 1\}^n$ induces one basis vector.

Tensor products. In general, we use the tensor product \otimes to build composite quantum states. The tensor product is a bilinear mapping. For example, the tensor product of the two single-qubit states $\varphi = \alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle$ and $\varphi' = \alpha' |0\rangle + \beta' |1\rangle$ is given by

$$\varphi \otimes \varphi' = (\alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle) \cdot (\alpha' |0\rangle + \beta' |1\rangle) = \alpha\alpha' (|0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle) + \alpha\beta' (|0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle) + \beta\alpha' (|1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle) + \beta\beta' (|1\rangle \otimes |1\rangle).$$

We now simply identify the tensor product $|b\rangle \otimes |b'\rangle$ of computational basis states with the computational basis state $|bb'\rangle$. In this way, we obtain the two-qubit state

$$\varphi \otimes \varphi' = \alpha\alpha' |00\rangle + \alpha\beta' |01\rangle + \beta\alpha' |10\rangle + \beta\beta' |11\rangle.$$

The valid quantum states of the composite system are always superpositions of tensor products of valid states of the two components of the system.

Entanglement. There are composite quantum states that cannot be written as a tensor product of component states. A well-known example is the two-qubit state $\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$. We can write this state as a superposition of tensor products, namely $\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle) - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle)$. However, we can show that any tensor product $\varphi \otimes \varphi'$ of single-qubit states cannot be equal to ψ . (Consider the expression obtained in the previous paragraph, we would need to simultaneously have $\alpha\alpha' = 0$, $\alpha\beta' \neq 0$, $\beta\alpha' \neq 0$, and $\beta\beta' = 0$. This is a contradiction.)

Measurement. To get classical results from a quantum computation, we need to measure the state. If we measure a single-qubit system that is in the state $\varphi = \alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle$, we will get the value 0 with probability $|\alpha|^2$ and the value 1 with probability $|\beta|^2$. Furthermore, the state of the qubit collapses to either $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ accordingly.

In general, we might measure only one component of a quantum system with multiple components. For example, consider a two-qubit state ψ . We want to measure the first component. We first write ψ in the form

$$\psi = \alpha |0\rangle \otimes (\alpha_0 |0\rangle + \beta_0 |1\rangle) + \beta |1\rangle \otimes (\alpha_1 |0\rangle + \beta_1 |1\rangle), \quad |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1, |\alpha_0|^2 + |\beta_0|^2 = 1, |\alpha_1|^2 + |\beta_1|^2 = 1.$$

Such a decomposition always exists and is unique up to relative phases (i.e., a factor of unit magnitude) between α and α_0, β_0 as well as between β and α_1, β_1 . (Group two-qubit basis states by the value they assign to the first bit, pick α and β such that they have the same squared magnitude as the sum of squared magnitudes of the coefficients in the respective group.)

After measurement, with probability $|\alpha|^2$ we get result 0 and the state collapses into $|0\rangle \otimes (\alpha_0 |0\rangle + \beta_0 |1\rangle)$, and with probability $|\beta|^2$ we get result 1 and the state collapses into $|1\rangle \otimes (\alpha_0 |0\rangle + \beta_0 |1\rangle)$. Note that the resulting states are unique only up to a global phase (i.e., a factor of unit magnitude). This does not bother us because all possible results represent identical physical situations that cannot be distinguished using further measurements.

For example, let $\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$ be the maximally-entangled state from above. Recall that we can write it as

$$\psi = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (\text{I.e., } \alpha = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \beta = -\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}, \alpha_1 = \beta_0 = 1, \alpha_0 = \beta_1 = 0.)$$

Therefore, after measuring the first qubit, we either get result 0 and state $|01\rangle$ or result 1 and state $|10\rangle$, both with equal probability.

2.2 Quantum circuits

Computation. Quantum computations are often expressed as quantum circuits, representing a transformation on multiple qubits. Quantum circuits on n qubits are visualized as n horizontal lines, called *wires*. Quantum *gates* operate on one or several wires at a time, transforming the qubits as they pass the wires from left to right.

For example, the 2-qubit quantum circuit on the right uses the single-qubit gates H, X and Z, and the two-qubit gate CX. All of those gates apply unitary linear operations to the respective qubits:

- H is the Hadamard transform. It maps $|0\rangle$ to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$ and $|1\rangle$ to $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$. This gate is self-inverse: Applying it twice to the same qubit results in the identity.
- X is the not gate. It maps $|0\rangle$ to $|1\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ to $|0\rangle$.
- CX is the controlled not gate. It maps $|ab\rangle$ to $|a\rangle \otimes |a \oplus b\rangle$, where \oplus is the XOR operation.
- Z is the controlled phase flip gate. It maps $|0\rangle$ to $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ to $-|1\rangle$.





Fig. 4. An example of a quantum circuit. CX is often written .

For our purposes, it is sufficient to write down a sequence of gates and the indices of the qubits they operate on. This fully specifies the operation of a quantum circuit. For example, for the illustrated circuit, we could write H 0; X 1; CX 0 1; Z 0, where the top qubit has index 0 and the bottom qubit has index 1. This specification has some redundant ordering information. For example, the order of H 0 and X 1 does not matter, as they operate on independent qubits.

We now show the operation of our example quantum circuit on the initial state $|00\rangle$, where qubit 0 is on the left and qubit 1 is on the right:

- Initial state: $|00\rangle$.
- H 0: $(H|0\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |10\rangle)$.
- X 1: $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle \otimes (X|0\rangle) + |1\rangle \otimes (X|0\rangle)) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |11\rangle)$.
- CX 0 1: $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(CX|01\rangle + CX|11\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle + |10\rangle)$.
- Z 0: $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}((Z|0\rangle) \otimes |1\rangle + (Z|1\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$.

Therefore, our computation produced the entangled state we encountered in earlier examples.

Uncomputation. Assume that we are done with qubit 0 and would like to free it up for further computations by resetting it back into the $|0\rangle$ state. A naive way to achieve this is to measure qubit 0 and to apply a X 0 gate if we measure value 1. However, because qubit 0 is entangled with qubit 1, doing so also collapses the state of qubit 1:




Fig. 5. Uncomputation circuit.

- Initial state: $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$.
- M 0: We measure qubit 0.
 - Result 0, state collapses to $|01\rangle$: Done.
 - Result 1, state collapses to $|10\rangle$:
 - * X 0: $(X|1\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle = |00\rangle$. Done.

$f ::= \dots$	(functions)
$x ::= \dots$	(quantum variables)
$x_c ::= \dots$	(classical variables)
$o ::= f \mid \gamma \mid \lambda \mid \text{forget}$	(operations)
$c ::= x_c \mid \overline{x_c} \mid x \mid \overline{x}$	(conditions)
$e ::= p \mid q \mid m$	(effects)
$s ::= \vec{x}_c, \vec{x} :=_e o[\vec{x}_c, \vec{x}](\vec{x}) \text{ if } \vec{c}$	(statements)
$F ::= f[\vec{x}_c, \vec{x}](\vec{x}) := \{\vec{s}\} \triangleright \vec{x}_c, \vec{x}$	(function definitions)
$P ::= \vec{F}$	(program)

Fig. 6. Syntax

I.e., we end up in state $|01\rangle$ or $|00\rangle$, each with equal probability. However, we instead would like to end up in the superposed state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |00\rangle) = |0\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle - |0\rangle)$, leaving intact the superposition of the second qubit. The circuit $X \ 1; CX \ 1 \ 0; X \ 1$ achieves this:

- State: $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |10\rangle)$.
- $X \ 1$: $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle - |11\rangle)$.
- $CX \ 1 \ 0$: $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle - |01\rangle)$.
- $X \ 1$: $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|01\rangle - |00\rangle) = |0\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|1\rangle - |0\rangle)$.

I.e., qubit 0 has been successfully *uncomputed*. In this work, we aim to automatically synthesize uncomputation.

3 INTERMEDIATE REPRESENTATION

In this section we introduce our intermediate representation which, as discussed in Section 1, aims to balance expressiveness, simplicity and uncomputation support. We first present the basics of the IR and two features needed for uncomputation synthesis: quantum effect annotations and the distinction between conserved and consumed arguments. We then highlight a variety of features useful to compile expressive quantum programming languages: dynamic qubit allocation, automatic adjoint synthesis, controlled application, classical computation, and multi-qubit values.

The complete syntax of our intermediate representation is shown in Fig. 6.

3.1 Functions, variables, and effects

Each function consists of a list of parameters, a body, and a list of return values. A body is simply a sequence of statements (there is no block-structure). Quantum variables denote single qubits (classical and multi-qubit variables are discussed in Sections 3.7 and 3.8). The only kind of statement is a combined variable definition/function call. Multiple variables can be defined from the results of a single function call. Arguments between parenthesis are “consumed”: the variable is removed from scope. Ours is an SSA IR, thus each variable can be defined at most once.

To reason about uncomputation correctness, we require that statements are (correctly) annotated with effects, some borrowed from the programming language Silq, but now realized in an IR setting:

- (1) p (pure) – This is the weakest effect. It indicates that the operation consists of pure reversible classical computation applied to qubits, i.e., it maps basis states to basis states (corresponding to the notion of `qfree` in Silq). Operations that may introduce or destroy superposition or

may affect relative or global phase are not permitted. As shown in Silq and Unqomp, this restriction is necessary in order to be able to guarantee uncomputation safety.

- (2) q (quantum) – This effect indicates that the operation does not perform measurement (corresponding to the notion of `mfree` in Silq). However, it is allowed to have any reversible quantum effect, including superposition, relative phase, and global phase, but excluding measurement. We only support adjoint synthesis on functions that have this effect or weaker.
- (3) m (measure) – This effect is given to operations that perform measurements. They are irreversible, automatic adjoint synthesis is not supported, and their results cannot be uncomputed.

With this in mind, we can take a look at our first example, a function that creates an EPR pair:

$$\text{EPR}(a, b) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} a' \quad :=_q \quad H(a) \\ a'', b' \quad :=_p \quad CX(a', b) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright a'', b'$$

Assuming the initial state is $|ab\rangle = |00\rangle$, after applying the Hadamard gate on a , we get $|a'b\rangle = \frac{|00\rangle + |10\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$. Then we apply a controlled X gate on b with a' as control, meaning that the final state is $|\Phi^+\rangle = \frac{|00\rangle + |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$.

3.2 Conserved use of values

Many operations take parameters that they return unchanged in the computational basis. One such example is the CX gate, for which the first parameter is a control which determines whether an X gate is to be applied to the second parameter. We call such parameters “conserved”. They are not consumed (or returned) by the function and are denoted using brackets. Our built-in CX gate can now take its control as conserved, and we update the EPR example accordingly:

$$\text{EPR}(a, b) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} a' \quad :=_q \quad H(a) \\ b' \quad :=_p \quad CX[a'](b) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright a', b'$$

We use a definition identical to that of Unqomp. Assuming we have variables $a_1, \dots, a_n, b_1, \dots, b_m$ and an operation that conserves a_1, \dots, a_n , we consider a decomposition of the initial state $\psi \in \mathcal{H}(\{0, 1\}^{n+m})$, based on the assignment $i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ of a_1, \dots, a_n into separate sub-states $\psi_i \in \mathcal{H}(\{0, 1\}^m)$ of b_1, \dots, b_m . When the resulting quantum state ψ' after the operation is decomposed the same way, the magnitudes for each i must remain the same:

$$\psi = \sum_{i \in \{0,1\}^n} |i\rangle \otimes \psi_i \quad \rightarrow \quad \psi' = \sum_{i \in \{0,1\}^n} |i\rangle \otimes \psi'_i$$

$$\forall i \cdot |\psi_i| = |\psi'_i|$$

The mapping $\psi_i \rightarrow \psi'_i$ may be an arbitrary transformation and may depend on i .

We also note that conserved uses of a single variable commute, so multiple conserved uses do not induce dependencies. However, it is required that all conserved uses of a variable happen after the variable is produced, but before it is consumed. The ability to keep variables unmodified and in scope is critical for uncomputation, as demonstrated in Section 3.6 and further elaborated in Section 4.1.

3.3 Allocation

We provide a mechanism to encapsulate the allocation of qubits inside functions. While some languages use a stack discipline for allocation (e.g. Q#), we take a more general approach similar

to Quipper and introduce allocation operations. This makes it possible to define functions that perform computation without requiring the caller to preallocate space for the result. The allocation operation new_v for $v \in \{0, 1\}$ take no arguments and return one qubit.

We can now update our EPR pair example, factoring out a function for creating an entangled copy (note, a copy in the Z basis, not a clone of the quantum state):

$$\begin{aligned} \text{dup}[a] &:= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} b :=_p \quad \text{new}_0 \\ b' :=_p \quad \text{CX}[a](b) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright b' \\ \text{EPR}() &:= \left\{ \begin{array}{l} a :=_p \quad \text{new}_0 \\ a' :=_q \quad \text{H}(a) \\ b :=_p \quad \text{dup}[a'] \end{array} \right\} \triangleright a', b \end{aligned}$$

3.4 Adjoints

Our representation also supports adjoint function calls. In the adjoint of the function, the roles of the produced variables (left of $:=$) and the consumed variables (inside $()$) are swapped. The conserved variables (inside $[]$) remain the same, as on the circuit level they are both inputs and outputs. The example below duplicates a into b and then unduplicates a using b , implementing an inefficient version of the identity function:

$$\text{slow_id}(a) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} b :=_p \quad \text{dup}[a] \\ \quad :=_p \quad \text{dup}^\dagger[b](a) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright b$$

The adjoint of allocation new_v^\dagger naturally corresponds to deallocation, so we will denote it as del_v for better readability. Similarly we will use undup to denote dup^\dagger . Note that when the adjoint of a function is applied incorrectly, e.g., when del_v is used to deallocate a qubit whose value is not v , or when $\text{undup}[b](a)$ is called when $a \oplus b$ may be nonzero, the behavior is undefined.

3.5 Controlled application

Many quantum languages and libraries support controlled application of gates and subcircuits. In our representation, we permit control modifiers on all operations that do not perform measurement (effect $< m$). For example, the Pauli-Z gate can be expressed as controlled global phase:

$$\text{Z}[a] := \left\{ \quad :=_q \quad \text{phase}_\pi \quad \text{if } a \right\}$$

Controlled application typically means that the operation is treated as the identity when its condition does not hold. However, in our IR this cannot be done directly, as we allow operations with incompatible conserved and produced variables (e.g. dup has outputs but no inputs). Instead, we introduce a pair of operations: “distribute”, denoted λ , that splits one variable into two based on a control, and “select”, denoted γ , that merges two variables back into one.

When λ is applied on a variable, the conserved argument determines which of the two outputs will be given the value. The other output will be considered to be undefined.

Similarly, γ is applied on two variables, where one of them must have a value and the other one must be undefined, and which one has a value must be correctly identified by the conserved argument.

When the condition of a statement is true, it is executed, all variables it uses must be defined. However, if its condition is false, it is not executed, and all variables it consumes and produces must be undefined. In general, the condition of a statement can be any conjunctive clause. In our implementation we ensure the program is valid using syntactic equivalence (for consumed and produced variables) and syntactic implication (for conserved variables).

The combination of γ and λ lets us keep the SSA form of the IR, and preserves the property that each variable is consumed once (SSA in reverse).

For example, here is how CX can be expressed as a controlled application of X:

$$\text{CX}[a](b) := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} b_0, b_1 & :=_p \quad \lambda[a](b) \\ b'_1 & :=_p \quad X(b_1) \quad \text{if } a \\ b' & :=_p \quad \gamma[a](b_0, b'_1) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright b'$$

Suppose we start in a state

$$|ab\rangle = \alpha_0 |00\rangle + \alpha_1 |01\rangle + \alpha_2 |10\rangle + \alpha_3 |10\rangle$$

We split b based on a into b_0 and b_1 :

$$|ab_0b_1\rangle = \alpha_0 |00\perp\rangle + \alpha_1 |01\perp\rangle + \alpha_2 |1\perp 0\rangle + \alpha_3 |1\perp 1\rangle$$

Then when $a = 1$ we apply X to b_1 , producing b'_1 :

$$|ab_0b'_1\rangle = \alpha_0 |00\perp\rangle + \alpha_1 |01\perp\rangle + \alpha_2 |1\perp 1\rangle + \alpha_3 |1\perp 0\rangle$$

Finally, we merge b_0 and b'_1 :

$$|ab'\rangle = \alpha_0 |00\rangle + \alpha_1 |01\rangle + \alpha_2 |11\rangle + \alpha_3 |10\rangle$$

Note that while we define controlled application via the undefined value \perp , the program correctness requirements stated above mean that implementations do not need an explicit representation of \perp , and may even allocate multiple variables to the same qubits if it is known that at most one of them is defined.

3.6 Automatic uncomputation

We define *forget* to be a special form of deallocation that does not need to be told the value of the variable it is deallocating. On Hilbert spaces this corresponds to erasing the variable from the labels of the basis vectors.

For example, we can implement the majority function $\text{maj}(a, b, c) = [a + b + c \geq 2]$ by first computing $x = a \oplus b$, then the result $r = \begin{cases} b & \text{if } x = 0 \\ c & \text{if } x = 1 \end{cases}$, and finally using *forget* to clean up x .

$$\text{maj}[a, b, c] := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} t & :=_p \quad \text{dup}[a] \\ x & :=_p \quad \text{CX}[b](t) \\ r_0 & :=_p \quad \text{dup}[b] \quad \text{if } \bar{x} \\ r_1 & :=_p \quad \text{dup}[c] \quad \text{if } x \\ r & :=_p \quad \gamma[x](r_0, r_1) \\ & :=_p \quad \text{forget}(x) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright r$$

Suppose we apply *maj* to the state

$$\begin{aligned} |abc\rangle &= \frac{|0\rangle + |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \otimes \frac{|0\rangle - |1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} \otimes |1\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} |001\rangle - \frac{1}{2} |011\rangle + \frac{1}{2} |101\rangle - \frac{1}{2} |111\rangle \end{aligned}$$

After computing x and r , we have

$$|abcxr\rangle = \frac{1}{2} |00100\rangle - \frac{1}{2} |01111\rangle + \frac{1}{2} |10111\rangle - \frac{1}{2} |11101\rangle$$

Then *forget*(x) corresponds to erasing x :

$$|abc\rangle = \frac{1}{2} |0010\rangle - \frac{1}{2} |0111\rangle + \frac{1}{2} |1011\rangle - \frac{1}{2} |1111\rangle$$

In this case we know that $\text{forget}(x)$ is realizable, because x is computed from b and a (the latter is used to compute the temporary t), and they are both in scope. However, in some cases forget can be unphysical, as it can collapse different non-zero-amplitude basis vectors. In the example below, after the Hadamard gate H we are in a state $\frac{|0\rangle+|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$, and after the $\text{forget}(a')$ we would be in $\frac{|\cdot\rangle+|\cdot\rangle}{\sqrt{2}} = \sqrt{2}|\cdot\rangle$, meaning that the transformation is not unitary.

$$\text{BAD}() := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} a & :=_p \quad \text{new}_0 \\ a' & :=_q \quad H(a) \\ & :=_p \quad \text{forget}(a') \end{array} \right\}$$

Furthermore, in some cases it may be safe to forget a variable, but doing so would be computationally difficult. In the following example, assuming f_{inj} implements an injective function, the forget would be possible, as x is a function of y . However, implementing it would be equivalent to finding an inverse of the f_{inj} , which may not be easy.

$$\text{HARD}(x) := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} y & :=_p \quad f_{inj}[x] \\ & :=_p \quad \text{forget}(x) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright y$$

In Section 4.2 we discuss our algorithm for replacing forget with explicit uncomputation and the cases it supports.

3.7 Classical variables

We also extend our representation with support for classical variables, which we denote with subscript c . Classical variables cannot be consumed and may be implicitly discarded at the end of the function. They are returned by the measure built-in and can be used as controls. For example, here is how one could implement quantum teleportation [Bennett et al. 1993] given $(a, b) :=_q \text{EPR}()$:

$$\text{send}(a, x) := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} a_0, a_1 & :=_p \quad \lambda[x](a) \\ a'_1 & :=_p \quad X(a_1) \quad \text{if } x \\ a' & :=_p \quad \gamma[x](a_0, a'_1) \\ a_c & :=_m \quad \text{measure}(a') \\ x' & :=_q \quad H(x) \\ x_c & :=_m \quad \text{measure}(x') \end{array} \right\} \triangleright a_c, x_c$$

$$\text{recv}[a_c, x_c](b) := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} b_0, b_1 & :=_p \quad \lambda[a_c](b) \\ b'_1 & :=_p \quad X(b_1) \quad \text{if } a_c \\ y & :=_p \quad \gamma[a_c](b_0, b'_1) \\ & :=_q \quad \text{phase}_\pi \quad \text{if } x_c \wedge y \end{array} \right\} \triangleright y$$

To make reasoning about programs easier, we require that all classical variables be marked as such. In general, it is allowed for classical variables to have composite types, assuming the necessary built-in functions are provided.

With the support for classical computation and conditionals, it is also possible for functions to be recursive.

3.8 Multi-qubit values

Our representation also supports composite values. For example, multi-qubit variables could be used via concatenation (`concat`) and its adjoint (`concat†`, partitioning). Note that in order for adjoint synthesis (Section 4.3) to work, we need to make sure that both `concat` and `concat†` are given the sizes of the variables they are working on. For example, we can use these operations to define a function `extract[nc, ic](a)` for extracting the *i_c*-th element of an *n_c*-element qubit array *a*, returning both the extracted element and the remaining *n_c - 1* elements:

$$\text{extract}[n_c, i_c](a) := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} j_c :=_p \quad \quad \quad n_c - I_c - i_c \\ x, y, z :=_p \quad \text{concat}_3^\dagger[i_c, I_c, j_c](a) \\ a' :=_p \quad \quad \quad \text{concat}_2[i_c, j_c](x, z) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright a', y$$

All these features allow the IR to be a compilation target for higher-level languages, including Silq (discussed in Section 5) and of course, simpler representations such as circuits.

4 ALGORITHMS

In this section, we present algorithms for uncomputation synthesis as well as adjoint synthesis. We first show a modular precondition on the validity of a `forget` statement that can be checked at the function level. This precondition ensures that uncomputation synthesis will succeed.

Furthermore, we will argue that uncomputation synthesis correctly implements `forget` statements in terms of explicit uncomputation, and that an arbitrary combination of uncomputation and adjoint synthesis always preserves the asymptotic running time of a program.

4.1 Uncomputation precondition

As mentioned in Section 3.6, `forget` statements may not always be realizable. We define a simple modular precondition that we will show is sufficient for our uncomputation synthesis procedure:

Property 4.1 (Forgettable at location). A quantum variable *x* is *forgettable at a program point P* if

- (1) The variable is defined as the result of a statement *S* with *S.effect* < *q* mode before point *P*.
- (2) Any quantum argument to this statement *S* is either in scope or forgettable at point *P*.

If *x* is forgettable at a point *P*, the quantum arguments to the call *C* are called the *dependencies* of *x*.

A variable may be forgettable at some program point even if it has already gone out of scope by that point. Intuitively, a quantum variable *x* is forgettable at some program point *P* iff it can be recomputed at point *P* from available information other than *x* itself, separately in each basis state.

Consider the function `maj` from Section 3.6. The variable *x* is forgettable at the point *P* of the `forget(x)` because (1) it is the result of the pure call `x :=p CX[b](t)` (i.e., without quantum effects such as phase or superposition) and (2) the quantum argument *b* to this call is in scope at point *P* and the quantum argument *t* is forgettable at point *P* (though it is not in scope). Quantum argument *t* is forgettable at point *P* because (1) it is the result of the pure call `t :=p dup[a]` and (2) the quantum argument *a* to this call is still in scope at point *P*.

Property 4.2 (Well-forgotten). A function *f* is *well-forgotten* if for every `forget` statement *S* in the function *f*, every quantum argument to *S* is forgettable at the program point of *S*.

It immediately follows that in a pure function with no consumed arguments, every quantum variable that is not a conserved argument is always forgettable after its definition, and therefore the function is well-forgotten. We have (1) because all statements within a pure function are pure, and (2) by induction because every argument is conserved and therefore always in scope.

SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION(f)

```

1   $alive := f.conservd \cup f.produced$ 
2   $undone := \{\}$ 
3   $extended := \{\}$ 
4  for  $S \in reversed(f.statements)$ :
5    if  $\langle forget(x) \rangle := S$ :
6      ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED( $S, x$ )
7      REMOVE( $S$ )
8      continue
9      // fix variables with extended lifetimes
10   for  $x \in S.consumed \cap extended$ :
11      $x' := FRESH-VARIABLE()$ 
12     INSERT-BEFORE ( $S, \langle x' := dup[x] \rangle$ )
13     SUBSTITUTE( $S, x \mapsto x'$ )
14    $alive := (alive \setminus S.produced) \cup S.consumed$ 

```

subprocedure ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED(S, x)

```

1  // ensure  $x$  is in scope at  $S$  and uncomputed later
2  assert  $x \notin f.conservd \cup f.consumed$ 
3   $C := producer(x)$ 
4  assert  $C.effect < q$ 
5  if  $C \notin undone$ :
6     $undone := undone \cup \{C\}$ 
7    UNDO-STATEMENT( $S, C$ )

```

subprocedure UNDO-STATEMENT(S, C)

```

1   $\langle \vec{y} := g[\vec{c}](\vec{x}) \rangle := C$ 
2  // ensure all inputs to  $C$  are
3  // alive or uncomputed after  $S$ 
4  for  $x \in (\{\vec{c}\} \setminus alive) \cup \{\vec{x}\}$ :
5    ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED( $S, x$ )
6  // insert inverse of  $C$  right after  $S$ , before
7  // any newly-synthesized uncomputation
8   $U := \langle \vec{x}' := g^\dagger[\vec{c}](\vec{y}) \rangle$  ( $\vec{x}'$  fresh variables)
9  INSERT-AFTER( $S, U$ )
10 CONNECT-GARBAGE( $C, U$ )
11 // clean up the results produced by  $U$ 
12 for  $(x, x') \in zip(\vec{x}, \vec{x}')$ :
13   INSERT-AFTER ( $U, \langle undup[x](x') \rangle$ )
14 // dup variables consumed after  $S$ 
15 for  $y \in \{\vec{y}\} \cap alive$ :
16   //  $y$  is consumed after  $S$ , so dup it
17   // and use the duplicate after  $U$ 
18    $y' := FRESH-VARIABLE()$ 
19   INSERT-BEFORE ( $U, \langle y' := dup[y] \rangle$ )
20   SUBSTITUTE( $all\text{-}after(S), y \mapsto y'$ )
21 // extend results consumed before  $S$ 
22  $extended := extended \cup (\{\vec{y}\} \setminus alive)$ 

```

Fig. 7. Uncomputation synthesis

The pure function $\text{maj}[a, b, c]$ is hence well-forgotten. However, the function $\text{BAD}()$ from Section 3.6 is not well-forgotten, as condition (1) does not hold: the quantum variable a' is not the result of a pure call (its definition $a' :=_q H(a)$ has a quantum effect annotation $:=_q$).

4.2 Uncomputation synthesis

The definition of Property 4.2 and the underlying intuition suggests a naive implementation of $\text{forget}(x)$ that recomputes all dependencies of x that are not already in scope, uses them to uncompute x using the adjoint of its defining call, and then uncomputes the dependencies. Unfortunately, this is likely to result in a very inefficient program, possibly even with exponential overhead, as every forget statement may increase the size of a program prefix by a constant factor.

Instead, in Fig. 7, we describe an efficient uncomputation synthesis algorithm that does not perform any redundant recomputation. We present our algorithm as a single backwards pass over a function. When a statement $S \simeq \langle \text{forget}(x) \rangle$ is encountered, we ensure that x is uncomputed using $\text{ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED}(S, x)$ in line 6 of $\text{SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION}$. If x has been previously uncomputed at a later point in the function (recall that we transform the function backwards), nothing remains to be done (line 5 of ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED). Otherwise, x still has to be uncomputed.

To uncompute x , we synthesize the adjoint of the statement that computed x using the call $\text{UNDO-STATEMENT}(S, C)$ in line 7 of ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED . Suppose we are undoing C , a call to f . If some of the inputs to C are not in scope, we make them available by forcing their uncomputation to happen later in the function (lines 4-5 of UNDO-STATEMENT). Then, we insert a new call U to f^\dagger (lines 8-9) and clean up its outputs, if any (lines 12-13).

The call to f^\dagger consumes exactly the results of the call to f . However, they are already consumed by the function elsewhere, which we need to resolve. In the case where they are still in scope, i.e., the original consumption is after the current point, we create duplicates that are used for the remainder of the function (lines 15-20 of UNDO-STATEMENT). If they are not in scope, meaning that their original consumption is before the current point, we mark them for lifetime extension (line 22 of UNDO-STATEMENT), which will result in a dup being inserted later, when the original consumer is visited (lines 10-13 of SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION). In the case where the original consumer is a forget, no duplication takes place as the forget is removed (line 7 of SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION).

In order to keep the presentation simple, the pseudocode in Fig. 7 does not handle conditionals. The complete implementation does – all we need to do is to define the conditions on the newly synthesized statements. In UNDO-STATEMENT, the newly-added statement U needs to have the same condition as C . The conditions of the dup and undup operations are the same as the conditions of the statements before which they are inserted, optionally also conditioned on the control argument if that statement is a γ or λ .

For now, we completely ignore CONNECT-GARBAGE, which we will elaborate upon in Section 4.4. Consider again our example `maj` from Section 3.6. Uncomputation synthesis on this function results in the following new function:

$$\text{maj}^U[a, b, c] := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} t :=_p & \text{dup}[a] \\ t'' :=_p & \text{dup}[t] \\ x :=_p & \text{CX}[b](t'') \\ r_0 :=_p & \text{dup}[b] \quad \text{if } \bar{x} \\ r_1 :=_p & \text{dup}[c] \quad \text{if } x \\ r :=_p & \gamma[x](r_0, r_1) \\ t' :=_p & \text{CX}^\dagger[b](x) \\ :=_p & \text{undup}[t](t') \\ :=_p & \text{undup}[a](t) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright r$$

The statement `forget(x)` has been replaced with the explicit uncomputation code $t' :=_p \text{CX}^\dagger[b](x)$, and calls to `dup` and `undup` have been inserted to ensure that values are in scope when they are needed for uncomputation and then properly disposed of again after they are no longer required.

Explanation. The algorithm initially encounters the $S = \langle \text{forget}(x) \rangle$ statement and calls the subprocedure ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED(S, x). We have $C = \text{producer}(x) = \langle x :=_p \text{CX}[b](t) \rangle$. As C has not been undone yet, we call UNDO-STATEMENT(S, C).

In order to ensure that we have access to the dependency t , the algorithm then calls the subprocedure ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED(S, t), which in turn sets $C' = \text{producer}(t) = \langle \text{dup}[a] \rangle$ and calls UNDO-STATEMENT(S, C'). This inserts the statement `undup[a](t)` after S (line 9) and further adds t to the set *extended* to later extend its lifetime (line 22). Execution then returns to UNDO-STATEMENT(S, C) at line 6. This inserts the explicit uncomputation code $U = \langle t' :=_p \text{CX}^\dagger[b](x) \rangle$ after S (line 8) and finally inserts `undup[t](t')` after U to clean up the result t' .

Execution then returns to SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION(f), which first removes $S = \langle \text{forget}(x) \rangle$ (line 7) and proceeds to only update the *alive* variables (line 14) until it encounters the statement $S = \langle x :=_p \text{CX}[b](t) \rangle$, which consumes the variable t that we had put into the set *extended*. Lines 12-13 extend the lifetime of t by creating the duplicate $t'' :=_p \text{dup}[t]$ and making the statement S consume t'' instead of t . Execution then terminates with the updated function maj^U shown above.

Simplifications. We can further perform basic simplifications to remove redundant dup calls. For example, t is computed as $\text{dup}[a]$ and then uncomputed as $\text{undup}[a]$, so it can be replaced with a :

$$\text{maj}^U[a, b, c] := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} t'' :=_p & \text{dup}[a] \\ x :=_p & \text{CX}[b](t'') \\ r_0 :=_p & \text{dup}[b] \quad \text{if } \bar{x} \\ r_1 :=_p & \text{dup}[c] \quad \text{if } x \\ r :=_p & \gamma[x](r_0, r_1) \\ t' :=_p & \text{CX}^\dagger[b](x) \\ :=_p & \text{undup}[a](t') \end{array} \right\} \triangleright r$$

Completeness. We show that for any well-forgotten function f , $\text{SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION}(f)$ terminates successfully, i.e., the assertions in ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED do not fail.

Preconditions. We will show that for all invocations of $\text{ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED}(S, x)$, x is not in scope and forgettable at the point after S , and that $\text{UNDO-STATEMENT}(S, x)$ is only called on statements that produce at least one variable that is forgettable at the point after S .

- When $\text{SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION}$ calls $\text{ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED}(S, x)$ for some statement $S = \langle \text{forget}(x) \rangle$ on line 6, this holds because the function f is well-forgotten, therefore x is forgettable at S , and because x is consumed by S , therefore not in scope.
- When $\text{ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED}(S, x)$ calls $\text{UNDO-STATEMENT}(S, \text{producer}(x))$ on line 7, this holds because x is forgettable at the statement S .
- When $\text{UNDO-STATEMENT}(S, C)$ calls $\text{ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED}(S, x)$ on line 5 for some variable $x \in (C.\text{conserved} \setminus \text{alive}) \cup C.\text{consumed}$, the precondition holds because C produces a variable that is forgettable at S , and x is an argument to C that is not in scope, so x is also forgettable, due to the well-forgotten property.
Note that $C.\text{consumed} \cap \text{alive} = \{\}$, as consumed variables are removed from scope.
- Finally, even though UNDO-STATEMENT modifies the function, it only makes changes after S , which does not affect the forgettability of variables at S .

As in $\text{ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED}(S, x)$, the variable x is forgettable and not in scope, it must be a parameter and must be produced by a function without quantum effects. Therefore the assertions hold.

A proof that this procedure indeed synthesizes correct uncomputation for all well-forgotten functions is provided in Appendix A.

4.3 Adjoint synthesis

The next transformation we present is adjoint synthesis. The goal of this transformation is, given a function f , to generate its adjoint f^\dagger . Note that for adjoint synthesis to be possible, f must not perform any measurements, as measurement is usually irreversible and therefore its adjoint cannot be defined in general.

Algorithm. First, we define the transformation $\text{SYNTHESIZE-CLASSICAL}(f)$ that, given some function f with effect $< m$, generates a function f^0 that only performs the classical computation of f without any quantum effects, and only has classical inputs and outputs. It works by transforming each statement in order. Classical built-ins are transformed to themselves, and quantum built-ins become no-ops. We need this step because the potentially irreversible classical computation still has to proceed in forward direction, while we need to reverse the order of the quantum computations.

Next, we define $\text{SYNTHESIZE-ADJOINT}(f)$ that synthesizes the adjoint of a function f . The result is a function f^\dagger , where the roles of the consumed quantum arguments and produced quantum results

<pre> SYNTHESIZE-CLASSICAL(f) 1 assert f.effect < m 2 f⁰ := NEW-FUNCTION() 3 f⁰.classical-in := f.classical-in 4 f⁰.classical-out := f.classical-out 5 for S ∈ f.statements: 6 if S.classical-out ≠ {}: 7 S⁰ := MAKE-CLASSICAL(S) 8 APPEND(f⁰, S⁰) 9 return f⁰ MAKE-CLASSICAL(S) 1 ⟨y_c, ȳ := g[c_c, c̄](x̄)⟩ := S 2 return ⟨y_c := g⁰[c_c⟩ MAKE-ADJOINT(S) 1 ⟨y_c, ȳ := g[c_c, c̄](x̄)⟩ := S 2 return ⟨y_c[†], x̄ := g[†][c_c, c̄](ȳ)⟩ </pre>	<pre> SYNTHESIZE-ADJOINT(f) 1 assert f.effect < m 2 f[†] := NEW-FUNCTION() 3 f[†].classical-in := f.classical-in 4 f[†].classical-out := f.classical-out 5 f[†].conserved := f.conserved 6 f[†].consumed := f.produced 7 f[†].produced := f.consumed 8 for S ∈ f.statements: 9 if S.classical-out ≠ {}: 10 S⁰ := MAKE-CLASSICAL(S) 11 APPEND(f[†], S⁰) 12 for S ∈ reversed(f.statements): 13 S[†] := MAKE-ADJOINT(S) 14 APPEND(f[†], S[†]) 15 return f[†] </pre>
---	--

Fig. 8. Adjoint synthesis

have been swapped. The algorithm is quite simple – we first synthesize the classical computation, which gives us all classical variables defined in f , and then copy over the adjoints of all quantum statements in reverse order. Fig. 8 displays those algorithms in pseudocode.

One interesting example is extract from Section 3.8, where we need to perform the classical computation first, and then reverse only the quantum computation:

$$\text{extract}^\dagger[n_c, i_c](a', y) := \left. \begin{array}{l} \text{// classical part} \\ j_c :=_p \qquad \qquad \qquad n_c - I_c - i_c \\ \text{// quantum part} \\ x, z :=_p \qquad \text{concat}_2^\dagger[i_c, j_c](a') \\ a :=_p \qquad \text{concat}_3[i_c, I_c, j_c](x, y, z) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright a$$

The function $\text{extract}^\dagger[n_c, i_c](a', y)$ inserts a qubit y at index i_c of a the multi-qubit variable a' .

4.4 Uncomputation erasure

Finally, we reintroduce the garbage monad. This is done using *garbage variables*, which are produced by calls in *garbage mode* (denoted f^G) and consumed by their adjoint (denoted f^{G^\dagger}).

In a garbage mode function, the `dispose` operation can be used to throw a quantum variable into the garbage bin or to propagate the garbage variable of another function.

Garbage-mode calls are key to our efficiency guarantees, as they avoid the uncomputation and recomputation of intermediate variables within the two components of a compute-uncompute pair. Instead, the compute component computes such variables, and throws them into the garbage bin. The uncompute component takes them back out of the garbage bin and finally uncomputes them.

4.4.1 Algorithm. Our functions for garbage management are presented in Fig. 9. In Section 4.2, we had already marked all compute-uncompute pairs with `CONNECT-GARBAGE`, but deferred the explanations to the current section. `CONNECT-GARBAGE` introduces a new garbage variable, that is produced by a modified garbage-mode compute statement and consumed by a modified garbage-mode uncompute statement. The function op^G is produced by calling `ERASE-UNCOMPUTATION(op)`.

<pre> CONNECT-GARBAGE(C, U) 1 $op := C.operation$ 2 assert $U.operation = op^\dagger$ 3 $C.operation := op^G$ 4 $U.operation := op^{G^\dagger}$ 5 $g := FRESH-GARBAGE()$ 6 $C.produced := C.produced \# [g]$ 7 $U.consumed := U.consumed \# [g]$ PROPAGATE-GARBAGE(S) 1 if S does not produce garbage: 2 $g := FRESH-GARBAGE()$ 3 $S.operation := S.operation^G$ 4 $S.produced := S.produced \# [g]$ 5 INSERT-AFTER ($S, \langle dispose(g) \rangle$) </pre>	<pre> ERASE-UNCOMPUTATION(f) 1 assert $f.effect < q$ 2 $f^G := CLONE-FUNCTION(f)$ 3 for $S \in f^G.statements$: 4 if S produces garbage g: 5 $U := consumer(g)$ 6 // we remove U, so get its results from S 7 for $(x, x') \in zip(U.produced, S.consumed)$: 8 INSERT-BEFORE ($S, \langle x := dup[x'] \rangle$) 9 for $x \in U.consumed$: 10 INSERT-BEFORE ($U, \langle dispose(x) \rangle$) 11 REMOVE($U$) 12 else if $S.operation \neq dispose$: 13 PROPAGATE-GARBAGE(S) 14 return f^G </pre>
--	--

Fig. 9. Uncomputation erasure.

When SYNTHESIZE-ADJOINT is performed on a garbage-mode call, the garbage variable remains, but the roles of computation and uncomputation are swapped. We also slightly adjust the MAKE-ADJOINT helper from Fig. 8 such that it preserves garbage variables.

Finally, we introduce ERASE-UNCOMPUTATION(f), which is used to transform a pure function f into the garbage-producing function f^G . This transformation works by removing all instances of uncomputation from f and replacing them with `dispose`. Uncomputation is identified as those statements that consume garbage. It also transforms all other function calls in f into garbage mode and disposes all garbage variables. In the example below we have performed the transformation ERASE-UNCOMPUTATION on maj^U :

$$\text{maj}^{UG}[a, b, c] := \left\{ \begin{array}{ll} t'', g_0 & :=_p \quad \text{dup}^G[a] \\ & :=_p \quad \text{dispose}(g_0) \\ t' & :=_p \quad \text{dup}[t''] \\ x, g_1 & :=_p \quad \text{CX}^G[b](t'') \\ & :=_p \quad \text{dispose}(g_1) \\ r_0, g_2 & :=_p \quad \text{dup}^G[b] \quad \text{if } \bar{x} \\ & :=_p \quad \text{dispose}(g_2) \quad \text{if } \bar{x} \\ r_1, g_3 & :=_p \quad \text{dup}^G[c] \quad \text{if } x \\ & :=_p \quad \text{dispose}(g_3) \quad \text{if } x \\ r, g_4 & :=_p \quad \gamma^G[x](r_0, r_1) \\ & :=_p \quad \text{dispose}(g_4) \\ & :=_p \quad \text{dispose}(x) \\ r, g_5 & :=_p \quad \text{undup}^G[a](t') \\ & :=_p \quad \text{dispose}(g_5) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright r$$

Note that maj^U itself already contains garbage-mode calls connecting the two compute-uncompute pairs for x and t , respectively. This is a detail we ignored in Section 4.2. The compute-uncompute pair for t we had already simplified away earlier, so only the compute-uncompute pair for x remains. ERASE-UNCOMPUTATION removes the uncomputation of x and replaces it with `dispose x` (lines 10–11). Because the uncomputation of x produced the variable t' , our algorithm has to now produce it in another way. It achieves this by duplicating t'' before it is consumed (line 8).

All other statements from maj^U are transformed into garbage-mode calls and we propagate the new garbage variables by immediately throwing them into the garbage bin using `dispose`.

There is still some opportunity for optimization. For example, we can see that t' is computed as $\text{dup}[t'']$, which in turn is $\text{dup}[a]$, and uncomputed as $\text{undup}[a]$. It is also unused, so it can be removed.

$$\text{maj}^{UG}[a, b, c] := \left\{ \begin{array}{l} t'', g_0 :=_p \text{dup}^G[a] \\ \quad :=_p \text{dispose}(g_0) \\ x, g_1 :=_p \text{CX}^G[b](t'') \\ \quad :=_p \text{dispose}(g_1) \\ r_0, g_2 :=_p \text{dup}^G[b] \quad \text{if } \bar{x} \\ \quad :=_p \text{dispose}(g_2) \quad \text{if } \bar{x} \\ r_1, g_3 :=_p \text{dup}^G[c] \quad \text{if } x \\ \quad :=_p \text{dispose}(g_3) \quad \text{if } x \\ r, g_4 :=_p \gamma^G[x](r_0, r_1) \\ \quad :=_p \text{dispose}(g_4) \\ \quad :=_p \text{dispose}(x) \end{array} \right\} \triangleright r$$

We have shown how to connect computation-uncomputation pairs during uncomputation synthesis and modularly propagate their garbage. Next, we will argue that the resulting code is efficient.

Running time. We will now show that with the use of garbage, for any source function f , after uncomputation synthesis the asymptotic running time of f^U remains the same as that of f , even if we assume that every forget statement in f takes *constant* time to execute.

Consider a call from f to callee. There are two cases:

- In **SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION**, the call to callee was not undone. This means that in the resulting function there is one call to callee, and in f^\dagger there is one call to callee † . In both f^G and $f^{\dagger G}$ there is one call to callee G instead.
- In **SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION**, the call to callee was undone. This means that it was replaced with a call to callee G followed by a call to callee G† . In f^\dagger the two calls are swapped and adjoined, meaning that there is one call to callee $^{G\dagger\dagger} = \text{callee}^G$ followed by a call to callee G† . In both f^G and $f^{\dagger G}$, the call to callee G† is removed and only the call to callee G remains.

Therefore once we enter a function called in garbage mode, we never leave garbage mode, and there is a 1-1 correspondence between function calls in the original and the resulting program.

When we are in normal (not garbage) mode, each call is either translated to a single call in normal mode, or to two calls in garbage mode.

Thus the total number of calls performed during a call of f^U after uncomputation synthesis is at most double that of a call of the original function f . The number of `dup` and `undup` statements inserted during the transformations is at most a constant multiple of the number of arguments and results of function calls. Therefore, the asymptotic running time indeed remains the same.

5 EXPERIMENTAL EVALUATION

We now present an extensive experimental evaluation of our approach. Across a number of existing and new benchmarks, our evaluation aims to answer the following key research questions:

- Q1** *Completeness*: Is our uncomputation synthesis approach effective when automatic uncomputation is intertwined with taking adjoints of subprograms?
- Q2** *Efficiency*: Is our modular uncomputation synthesis algorithm competitive with state-of-the-art (non-modular) synthesis approaches?

Choice of Baseline. We compare our approach to the state-of-the-art uncomputation synthesis algorithm Unqomp [Paradis et al. 2021]. Among other evaluation examples, we also include an evaluation on all of the original benchmark algorithms used by Paradis et al. [2021] to substantiate that Unqomp outperforms previous approaches. Overall, we are able to positively answer both questions above. We now proceed to discuss our evaluation.

5.1 Implementation and experimental setup

We implemented a compiler from a subset of the quantum programming language Silq [Bichsel et al. 2020] to our quantum intermediate representation, in the process substantiating the utility of the IR as a target for high level quantum programming languages. We map automatic uncomputation in Silq to our forget operation, resulting in the first effective procedure for synthesizing explicit uncomputation code for Silq.

As Unqomp produces Qiskit circuits, we further implemented a simple lowering strategy for our IR, targeting Qiskit circuits via OpenQASM. In this way, our results can be directly compared to Unqomp results.

Unrolling. In contrast to our algorithm, Unqomp does not support recursion or variable-length quantum registers. Therefore, all evaluation examples we use to compare to the Unqomp baseline are similarly free of variable-length data, and we are able to completely inline and unroll our programs after modular uncomputation and adjoint synthesis are done.

Simplifications. After inlining and unrolling, we apply some standard simplifications, such as constant propagation, common subexpression elimination, and dead code elimination.

Register allocation. Because OpenQASM does not support dynamic qubit allocation, we further have to perform a register allocation pass. We use a simple strategy with a greedy heuristic that attempts to use the same registers for qubits that are distributed and selected in λ and γ operations.

Finally, we translate the resulting code directly into OpenQASM and import it as a Qiskit circuit. In all experiments, we first send the input qubits through a Hadamard transform to preclude constant folding. Like Paradis et al. [2021] does in the original Unqomp evaluation, we decompose all circuits (Unqomp and ours) into the universal gate set consisting of single-qubit unitary operations and two-qubit controlled-not (CX) gates.

5.2 Q1: Completeness

We now demonstrate the benefits of our approach in cases where uncomputation and adjoint synthesis are intertwined. The benefit is illustrated on an example where the effect is pronounced. Consider the two example recursive programs in Fig. 2. We implemented two recursive algorithms following the recursive structure of ITERATE and ETARETI respectively (discussed earlier), operating on quantum registers of size 10. Instead of $y := x \oplus y$, the base case consists of an operation that is not its own adjoint, implemented using CX gates. Single-qubit X gates are used to initialize the variable t to a list of 10 qubits in state $|1\rangle$. We implemented versions of both algorithms in Silq (with native support for **forget** statements) and Unqomp (implementing the **forget** statement using Unqomp’s automatic ancilla management).

Note that Unqomp does not have native support for inverting an ancilla circuit. This is analogous to the how the simulator distributed with the Silq reference implementation is not able to simulate the example with adjoints (at the time of writing), due to the way it takes the adjoint of functions containing **forget** statements. Therefore, in the second benchmark, we invert Unqomp’s ancilla circuits manually, in the canonical way, by first converting them to a Qiskit circuit (using Unqomp’s

Table 1. Recursive benchmarks. The best numbers are indicated in bold. In each row we report the number of single-qubit unitary gates (single), two-qubit controlled-not gates (CX), the total number of gates (Gates = single + CX) in a circuit produced using Unqomp or the new approach which is Ours.

Algorithm	Unqomp				Ours			
	single	CX	Gates	Qubits	single	CX	Gates	Qubits
No adjoints								
$n = 1$	40	96	136	21	46	46	92	26
$n = 2$	60	160	220	31	66	70	136	32
$n = 3$	80	224	304	41	90	94	184	38
$n = 4$	100	288	388	51	110	118	228	44
$n = 5$	120	352	472	61	134	142	276	50
$n = 6$	140	416	556	71	154	166	320	56
$n = 7$	160	480	640	81	178	190	368	62
$n = 8$	180	544	724	91	198	214	412	68
$n = 9$	200	608	808	101	222	238	460	74
$n = 10$	220	672	892	111	242	262	504	80
Adjoints								
$n = 1$	40	96	136	21	46	46	92	26
$n = 2$	80	224	304	31	68	70	138	32
$n = 3$	160	480	640	41	94	94	188	38
$n = 4$	320	992	1312	51	116	118	234	44
$n = 5$	640	2016	2656	61	142	142	284	50
$n = 6$	1280	4064	5344	71	164	166	330	56
$n = 7$	2560	8160	10720	81	190	190	380	62
$n = 8$	5120	16352	21472	91	212	214	426	68
$n = 9$	10240	32736	42976	101	238	238	476	74
$n = 10$	20480	65504	85984	111	260	262	522	80

uncomputation synthesis), inverting the Qiskit circuit, and transforming the result back into an ancilla circuit with the appropriate number of state and ancilla qubits.

For decomposition, we use Qiskit’s preset pass manager with optimization level 0 (no optimizations). Table 1 shows the results for this experiment. For the algorithm without adjoints, Unqomp and our approach both scale linearly in the recursion depth. In contrast, for the algorithm where we take an adjoint of every recursive call, the Unqomp implementation scales exponentially in the recursion depth, while our approach remains linear.

5.3 Q2: Efficiency

We now demonstrate that our algorithms are competitive with the state of the art in terms of efficiency, namely the number of operations and qubits used, despite our IR allowing for more expressive quantum programs than circuits.

We implemented all benchmark programs from Unqomp in Silq. For Unqomp, we use the original implementations. Further, we implemented Shor’s algorithm in both Silq and Unqomp¹. We have used the richer and more varied set of benchmark parameters from [Paradis et al. \[2022\]](#), in both

¹For Shor’s algorithm, we had to patch Unqomp to add support for measurements and to fix a bug in the implementation of MCX.

Table 2. Comparison to Unqomp without circuit-level optimizations. The best numbers are indicated in bold.

Algorithm	Unqomp				Ours			
	single	CX	Gates	Qubits	single	CX	Gates	Qubits
small								
Adder	288	400	688	36	298	155	453	35
Deutsch-Jozsa	127	108	235	19	132	58	190	20
Grover’s algorithm	407	336	743	9	457	179	636	10
IntegerComparator	184	130	314	24	155	80	235	24
MCRY	147	136	283	24	173	68	241	24
MCX	142	132	274	23	171	67	238	24
Multiplier	675	920	1595	24	407	220	627	24
PiecewiseLinearR	1526	1812	3338	13	1281	743	2024	12
PolynomialPauliR	607	660	1267	9	642	453	1095	6
WeightedAdder	1499	1618	3117	25	754	403	1157	20
Shor’s algorithm	3610	3760	7370	16	83	29	112	8
big								
Adder	2576	3568	6144	300	2762	1387	4149	299
Deutsch-Jozsa	1387	1188	2575	199	1392	598	1990	200
Grover’s algorithm	6012	5100	11112	19	6564	2603	9167	20
IntegerComparator	1746	1192	2938	200	1381	690	2071	200
MCRY	2591	2392	4983	400	2993	1196	4189	400
MCX	2586	2388	4974	399	2991	1195	4186	400
Multiplier	7440	10336	17776	79	4620	2431	7051	79
PiecewiseLinearR	13858	15792	29650	81	11733	6739	18472	80
PolynomialPauliR	51112	53144	104256	19	51927	45403	97330	11
WeightedAdder	3542	3794	7336	38	2332	1248	3580	32
Shor’s algorithm	51462	50692	102154	24	22845	10673	33518	22

the **small** and the **big** variants. For Shor’s algorithm, the **small** variant factors 15 using 4 modulus bits, 2 exponent bits, and a witness of 2, while the **big** variant factors 55 using 6 modulus bits, 12 exponent bits, and a witness of 2.

For decomposition, we use Qiskit’s preset pass manager with optimization level 0 (no optimizations). Table 2 shows the results for this experiment.

We also report results after applying further circuit-level optimizations in Table 3. For those results, we use Qiskit’s preset pass manager with the highest optimization level of 3.

Gate count. Our synthesis algorithms and simplifications outperform Unqomp on all benchmarks in terms of multi-qubit CX gates used. This is significant because multi-qubit gates are particularly hard to realize in hardware. Unqomp however often beats our results in terms of single-qubit gates.

We are ahead in overall gate count except for the polynomial Pauli rotation example with circuit optimizations enabled, where the Unqomp result appears to be more amenable to further circuit optimizations than what we produce.

Qubit count. Our qubit allocation strategy often matches Unqomp’s ancilla allocation strategy and sometimes outperforms it. This is because with our more flexible approach, qubit allocation

Table 3. Comparison to Unqomp after circuit-level optimizations. The best numbers are indicated in bold.

Algorithm	Unqomp				Ours			
	single	CX	Gates	Qubits	single	CX	Gates	Qubits
small								
Adder	156	356	512	36	152	149	301	35
Deutsch-Jozsa	92	108	200	19	94	55	149	20
Grover’s algorithm	224	336	560	9	244	155	399	10
IntegerComparator	101	130	231	24	101	77	178	24
MCRY	102	136	238	24	128	68	196	24
MCX	99	132	231	23	127	67	194	24
Multiplier	343	840	1183	24	197	191	388	24
PiecewiseLinearR	1102	1784	2886	13	799	682	1481	12
PolynomialPauliR	290	556	846	9	434	438	872	6
WeightedAdder	898	1554	2452	25	462	379	841	20
Shor’s algorithm	1985	3720	5705	16	51	29	80	8
big								
Adder	1388	3172	4560	300	1384	1381	2765	299
Deutsch-Jozsa	992	1188	2180	199	994	595	1589	200
Grover’s algorithm	3102	5100	8202	19	3472	2208	5680	20
IntegerComparator	937	1192	2129	200	893	687	1580	200
MCRY	1794	2392	4186	400	2196	1196	3392	400
MCX	1791	2388	4179	399	2195	1195	3390	400
Multiplier	3566	9376	12942	79	1946	2182	4128	79
PiecewiseLinearR	9276	15440	24716	81	7166	6397	13563	80
PolynomialPauliR	25867	51680	77547	19	49123	45362	94485	11
WeightedAdder	2072	3602	5674	38	1394	1187	2581	32
Shor’s algorithm	26078	50482	76560	24	11097	10522	21619	22

can benefit from previous simplifications such as constant folding. In all examples we consider, if Unqomp is better, it is only by at most one qubit.

Overall, these results demonstrate that our approach is competitive with state-of-the-art uncomputation algorithms, despite the fact that our algorithms work on a representation which allows for greater expressiveness of quantum computation than plain circuits do.

6 CONCLUSION

We presented an intermediate representation (IR) which handles expressive quantum computation and provides uncomputation support together with efficient algorithms for modular uncomputation synthesis over that IR. The IR modularly captures the information needed for uncomputation and adjoint synthesis in a manner that allows our algorithms to naturally proceed on a function-by-function basis. Uncomputation synthesis uses the garbage monad to ensure that the resulting code does not perform redundant uncomputation. The resulting code can then be further simplified.

We have built an end-to-end system consisting of a complete implementation of our IR and synthesis algorithms as well as translation from Silq to that IR and circuit generation from the IR. Our extensive evaluation shows that our system can efficiently handle benchmarks that are out of reach of existing methods for uncomputation synthesis, and that we are competitive with the

state of the art at their own, more restricted, uncomputation benchmarks. These results indicate that it is in fact possible to benefit from the greater expressivity and safety offered by high-level languages without sacrificing efficiency.

ACKNOWLEDGMENT

This research was partially funded by the Ministry of Education and Science of Bulgaria (support for INSAIT, part of the Bulgarian National Roadmap for Research Infrastructure).

REFERENCES

- Gadi Aleksandrowicz, Thomas Alexander, Panagiotis Barkoutsos, Luciano Bello, Yael Ben-Haim, David Bucher, Francisco Jose Cabrera-Hernández, Jorge Carballo-Franquis, Adrian Chen, Chun-Fu Chen, Jerry M. Chow, Antonio D. Córcoles-Gonzales, Abigail J. Cross, Andrew Cross, Juan Cruz-Benito, Chris Culver, Salvador De La Puente González, Enrique De La Torre, Delton Ding, Eugene Dumitrescu, Ivan Duran, Pieter Eendebak, Mark Everitt, Ismael Faro Sertage, Albert Frisch, Andreas Fuhrer, Jay Gambetta, Borja Godoy Gago, Juan Gomez-Mosquera, Donny Greenberg, Ikko Hamamura, Vojtech Havlicek, Joe Hellmers, Lukasz Herok, Hiroshi Horii, Shaohan Hu, Takashi Imamichi, Toshinari Itoko, Ali Javadi-Abhari, Naoki Kanazawa, Anton Karazeev, Kevin Krsulich, Peng Liu, Yang Luh, Yunho Maeng, Manoel Marques, Francisco Jose Martín-Fernández, Douglas T. McClure, David McKay, Srujan Meesala, Antonio Mezzacapo, Nikolaj Moll, Diego Moreda Rodríguez, Giacomo Nannicini, Paul Nation, Pauline Ollitrault, Lee James O’Riordan, Hanhee Paik, Jesús Pérez, Anna Phan, Marco Pistoia, Viktor Prutyaynov, Max Reuter, Julia Rice, Abdón Rodríguez Davila, Raymond Harry Putra Rudy, Mingi Ryu, Ninad Sathaye, Chris Schnabel, Eddie Schoute, Kanav Setia, Yunong Shi, Adenilton Silva, Yukio Siraichi, Seyon Sivarajah, John A. Smolin, Mathias Soeken, Hitomi Takahashi, Ivano Tavernelli, Charles Taylor, Pete T aylour, Kenso Trabing, Matthew Treinish, Wes Turner, Desiree Vogt-Lee, Christophe Vuillot, Jonathan A. Wildstrom, Jessica Wilson, Erick Winston, Christopher Wood, Stephen Wood, Stefan Wörner, Ismail Yunus Akhalwaya, and Christa Zoufal. 2019. *Qiskit: An Open-source Framework for Quantum Computing*. <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2562111>
- Matthew Amy, Martin Roetteler, and Krysta M Svore. 2017. Verified compilation of space-efficient reversible circuits. In *International Conference on Computer Aided Verification*. Springer, 3–21.
- C. H. Bennett. 1973. Logical Reversibility of Computation. *IBM Journal of Research and Development* 17, 6 (Nov. 1973), 525–532. <https://doi.org/10.1147/rd.176.0525>
- Charles H. Bennett. 1989. Time/Space Trade-Offs for Reversible Computation. *SIAM J. Comput.* 18, 4 (Aug. 1989), 766–776. <https://doi.org/10.1137/0218053> Publisher: Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics.
- Charles H. Bennett, Gilles Brassard, Claude Crépeau, Richard Jozsa, Asher Peres, and William K. Wootters. 1993. Teleporting an unknown quantum state via dual classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen channels. *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 70 (Mar 1993), 1895–1899. Issue 13. <https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.70.1895>
- Benjamin Bichsel, Maximilian Baader, Timon Gehr, and Martin Vechev. 2020. Silq: A High-Level Quantum Language with Safe Uncomputation and Intuitive Semantics. In *Proceedings of the 41st ACM SIGPLAN Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (London, UK) (PLDI 2020)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 286–300. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3385412.3386007>
- Peng Fu, Kohei Kishida, Neil J Ross, and Peter Selinger. 2020. A tutorial introduction to quantum circuit programming in dependently typed Proto-Quipper. In *Reversible Computation: 12th International Conference, RC 2020, Oslo, Norway, July 9-10, 2020, Proceedings 12*. Springer, 153–168.
- Alexander S. Green, Peter LeFanu Lumsdaine, Neil J. Ross, Peter Selinger, and Benoît Valiron. 2013. Quipper: a scalable quantum programming language. In *PLDI’13*. ACM Press, Seattle, Washington, USA. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2491956.2462177>
- Chris Heunen and Robin Kaarsgaard. 2022. Quantum information effects. *Proceedings of the ACM on Programming Languages* 6, POPL (Jan. 2022), 2:1–2:27. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3498663>
- Roshan P. James and Amr Sabry. 2012. Information effects. In *Proceedings of the 39th annual ACM SIGPLAN-SIGACT symposium on Principles of programming languages (POPL ’12)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 73–84. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2103656.2103667>
- Arun Kumar Pati and Samuel L. Braunstein. 2000. Impossibility of deleting an unknown quantum state. *Nature* 404, 6774 (March 2000), 164–165. <https://doi.org/10.1038/404130b0> Publisher: Nature Publishing Group.
- Yves Lecerf. 1963. Machines de Turing réversibles. Récursive insolubilité en $n \in \mathbb{N}$ de l’équation $u = \theta^n u$, où θ est un isomorphisme de codes. *Comptes Rendus Hebdomadaires des Seances de L’academie des Sciences* 257 (1963), 2597–2600.
- Thomas Lubinski, Cassandra Granade, Amos Anderson, Alan Geller, Martin Roetteler, Andrei Petrenko, and Bettina Heim. 2022. Advancing hybrid quantum–classical computation with real-time execution. *Frontiers in Physics* 10 (2022). <https://doi.org/10.3389/fphy.2022.940293>
- Microsoft. 2020. *Q# Language Specification*. Retrieved Jul 7, 2023 from <https://github.com/microsoft/qsharp-language/tree/main/Specifications/Language#q-language>
- Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. 2000. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press.
- Anouk Paradis, Benjamin Bichsel, Samuel Steffen, and Martin Vechev. 2021. Unqomp: Synthesizing Uncomputation in Quantum Circuits. In *Proceedings of the 42nd ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Programming Language Design and Implementation (Virtual, Canada) (PLDI 2021)*. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 222–236. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3453483.3454040>
- Anouk Paradis, Benjamin Bichsel, and Martin Vechev. 2022. Reqomp: Space-constrained Uncomputation for Quantum Circuits. arXiv:2212.10395 [quant-ph]

- Alex Parent, Martin Roetteler, and Krysta M. Svore. 2015. Reversible circuit compilation with space constraints. *CoRR* abs/1510.00377 (2015). arXiv:1510.00377 <http://arxiv.org/abs/1510.00377>
- Jennifer Paykin, Robert Rand, and Steve Zdancewic. 2017. QWIRE: a core language for quantum circuits. In *POPL'17*. ACM Press, Paris, France. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3009837.3009894>
- Anurudh Peduri, Siddharth Bhat, and Tobias Grosser. 2022. QSSA: An SSA-Based IR for Quantum Computing. In *Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGPLAN International Conference on Compiler Construction* (Seoul, South Korea) (CC 2022). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2–14. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3497776.3517772>
- Robert Rand, Jennifer Paykin, Dong-Ho Lee, and Steve Zdancewic. 2019. ReQWIRE: Reasoning about Reversible Quantum Circuits. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 287 (Jan. 2019), 299–312. <https://doi.org/10.4204/EPTCS.287.17> arXiv: 1901.10118.
- Peter W. Shor. 1997. Polynomial-Time Algorithms for Prime Factorization and Discrete Logarithms on a Quantum Computer. *SIAM J. Comput.* 26, 5 (Oct. 1997), 1484–1509. <https://doi.org/10.1137/s0097539795293172>
- Tommaso Toffoli. 1980. Reversible computing. In *Automata, Languages and Programming (Lecture Notes in Computer Science)*, Jaco de Bakker and Jan van Leeuwen (Eds.). Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, 632–644. https://doi.org/10.1007/3-540-10003-2_104
- Finn Voichick, Liyi Li, Robert Rand, and Michael Hicks. 2023. Qunity: A Unified Language for Quantum and Classical Computing. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 7, POPL, Article 32 (jan 2023), 31 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3571225>
- Charles Yuan and Michael Carbin. 2022. Tower: Data Structures in Quantum Superposition. *Proc. ACM Program. Lang.* 6, OOPSLA2, Article 134 (oct 2022), 30 pages. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3563297>

A PROOF OF UNCOMPUTATION SYNTHESIS

First, we will show some invariants that guarantee that the resulting program is well-formed:

- (1) *alive* contains the variables in scope at the point after the current statement.
This is maintained by line 14 of SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION.
- (2) All variables not in *extended* are consumed exactly once, after being produced.
This invariant is maintained by the **for** loop on lines 15-20 of UNDO-STATEMENT. In the case where a variable x is not added to *extended*, this is because it is not consumed before the current statement S , and is instead consumed after it, so we introduce a duplicate x' that is used for the remainder of the function (the parts that have already been visited).
- (3) ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED is only invoked on variables $x \notin \textit{alive}$.
We check the two call sites: In SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION, $S.\textit{consumed} \cap \textit{alive} = \{\}$, as S is considered to be before the current point. In UNDO-STATEMENT, $C.\textit{consumed} \cap \textit{alive} = \{\}$, as C is before S .
- (4) After ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED is invoked on a variable x , we have $x \in \textit{extended}$.
There are two cases we need to consider:
 - (a) When $\textit{producer}(x) \notin \textit{undone}$, UNDO-STATEMENT($S, \textit{producer}(x)$) is invoked, which adds x to *extended*.
 - (b) When $\textit{producer}(x) \in \textit{undone}$, it is impossible for UNDO-STATEMENT($S, \textit{producer}(x)$) to be in progress at this point because we only ever go from a statement to a producer of one of its arguments. Therefore UNDO-STATEMENT($S', \textit{producer}(x)$) has already been performed with some S' at or after S , and as because variables never reenter scope, x was not in scope at the time, therefore it has added x to *extended*.
- (5) All variables in *extended* are consumed once or twice:
 - once after the current statement, by the inverse of a statement in *undone*
 - optionally once by or before the current statement
 To prove this, we need to consider both updating *extended* and visiting statements:
 - (a) When a variable is added to *extended* in UNDO-STATEMENT, it is not in scope, meaning that it has been consumed before the current statement. A second consumption has been added in the statement U .
 - (b) When a statement S that consumes $x \in \textit{extended}$ is visited, S is either a *forget*, in which case it is removed, or it is not, in which case a dup of x is created. In either case, the result is that x is no longer consumed at the point after S .

Now we can prove that the result is well-formed:

- (1) At the end of SYNTHESIZE-UNCOMPUTATION, all variables are consumed exactly once.
This follows from the fact that at the end there are no statements before the current one, so all variables in *extended* are consumed once.
- (2) All previously-existing conserved uses remain valid.
This follows from the fact that we only ever extend lifetimes of variables.
- (3) All newly-introduced conserved uses are valid.
The only non-trivial cases are the uncomputation statement U and the undup statements after it. In both cases, we invoke ENSURE-UNCOMPUTED on all variables not in scope, which ensures that the variables are added to *extended*. They must be consumed twice: once before and once after S . After the end of the transformation only the consumption after S will remain, so the conserved use is valid.

What remains is to show that the uncomputation we synthesize is correct.

Suppose in $\text{UNDO-STATEMENT}(S, C)$ we have a computation statement

$$C = \{y_1, \dots, y_m := f[c_1, \dots, c_k](x_1, \dots, x_n)\}$$

Then we insert an uncomputation statement

$$U = \{x'_1, \dots, x'_n := f^\dagger[c_1, \dots, c_k](y_1, \dots, y_m)\}$$

Here f^\dagger is called with the same conserved arguments as f , and consumes the variables produced by f . As f is pure, and any use of c_i and y_i between computation and uncomputation necessarily conserves their value in the computational basis, the resulting uncomputation is safe, i.e., x'_i are equivalent to the original x_i .

We also add x_i to *extended*, which results in dup statements being added before C . Combined with the undup statements after U , after uncomputation synthesis, the complete result is non-consuming computation followed by its exact adjoint, which is non-producing uncomputation:

$$\begin{aligned} x''_1 &:= \text{dup}[x_1] & \dots & & x''_n &:= \text{dup}[x_n] \\ y_1, \dots, y_m &:= f[c_1, \dots, c_k](x''_1, \dots, x''_n) \\ &\dots & & & & \\ &\dots & & & & \\ x'_1, \dots, x'_n &:= f^\dagger[c_1, \dots, c_k](y_1, \dots, y_m) \\ \text{undup}[x_1](x'_1) &\dots & \text{undup}[x_n](x'_n) \end{aligned}$$

Overall, our procedure synthesizes code with correctly scoped variables that still performs the same computation as the original code, but is free of the (hard-to-implement) forget statements.