

An alternative non-unitary implementation for the quantum search algorithm

Ammar Daskin *

Abstract

In this paper, we describe an alternative circuit implementation for the Grover search algorithm by replacing the amplitude amplification part with a non-unitary gate which can be implemented by using an additional ancilla register. We show that the final quantum state in the Grover search algorithm is the normalized marked quantum state in the Gram-Schmidt process. Therefore, one can try to generate this vector by using a non-unitary gate or an approximation of this non-unitary gate. Since we still use the marking part of the original algorithm, U_{mark} , the complexity of the algorithm is bounded by the complexity of this operator. We discuss how the implementation of the non-unitary may not be easy task and show the approximations to this operator e.g. through linear combination of unitary matrices or similar methods. Finally we discuss, how these approximations may change the complexity.

1 Introduction

The Grover search algorithm[1, 2] is an iterative algorithm consisting of two operators [3]: U_{mark} that marks (changes the sign of) the solution. The marking, for instance, can be done by controlling this operator by a register that represents the superposition state of the output of a function. The second operator is $U_{amplify}$ which increases the magnitude of the amplitude that is marked by the previous operator. After applying these two operators $O(\sqrt{N})$ times for a state of dimension N , the marked solution can be measured with probability ≈ 1 . The algorithm is generalized for searching multiple elements [4] and through the years its many variants and implementations are presented [5].

We can also understand the algorithm through the Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization process [6] used in

*Dept. of Computer Engineering, Istanbul Medeniyet University, Istanbul, Turkiye, adaskin25@gmail.com

linear algebra. In our case, the process start with assuming the initial state vector as \mathbf{v}_0 , generally a superposition state, and the marked state as \mathbf{v}_1 . Here, these two vectors differ only on the sign of one element and they are not orthogonal to each other: in the case when \mathbf{v}_0 is a superposition state $\mathbf{v}_0^T \mathbf{v}_1 = \frac{N-2}{N}$.

1.1 The Gram-Schmidt orthogonalization process

In the Gram-Schmidt process[6] the first vector does not change if it is normalized.

$$\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{v}_0. \quad (1)$$

The second vector is found by removing the residual in their inner product:

$$\mathbf{u}_1 = \mathbf{v}_1 - \alpha \mathbf{u}_0, \tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1 = \frac{\mathbf{u}_1}{\|\mathbf{u}_1\|}, \quad (2)$$

where $\tilde{\mathbf{u}}_1$ represents the normalized version of the vector \mathbf{u}_1 . For the normalized vectors;

$$\alpha = \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}_1 | \mathbf{u}_0 \rangle}{\langle \mathbf{u}_0 | \mathbf{u}_0 \rangle} = \langle \mathbf{v}_1 | \mathbf{v}_0 \rangle = \frac{N-2}{N}. \quad (3)$$

As an example consider the following two vectors:

$$\mathbf{v}_0 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}, \mathbf{v}_1 = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

The solution is chosen as the third element and marked by negative sign. Then we can define the orthogonal vectors: $\mathbf{u}_0 = \mathbf{v}_0$ and \mathbf{u}_1 as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_1 &= \mathbf{v}_1 - \frac{\langle \mathbf{v}_1 | \mathbf{u}_0 \rangle}{\|\mathbf{u}_0\|} \mathbf{u}_0 \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ -1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} - \frac{1}{4} \begin{pmatrix} 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \\ 1 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1/4 \\ 1/4 \\ -3/4 \\ 1/4 \end{pmatrix}. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

Therefore, the amplitude of the marked state after the orthogonalization becomes 3 times of the others. And the probability becomes three times of the sum of other probabilities. Note that normalization of \mathbf{v}_0 and \mathbf{v}_1 does not change this fact since it scales all the elements. In generic case with all elements one in \mathbf{u}_0 , we can define the terms as:

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \mathbf{v}_1 | \mathbf{u}_0 \rangle &= N - 2 \text{ if normalized } \langle \mathbf{v}_1 | \mathbf{u}_0 \rangle = \frac{N - 2}{N} \\ \| \mathbf{u}_0 \| &= \sqrt{N}, \text{ if normalized } \| \mathbf{u}_0 \| = 1 \end{aligned} \quad (6)$$

Therefore, we can define the vector elements of \mathbf{u}_1 as:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{u}_{1 \text{ unmarked}} &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{N - 2}{N\sqrt{N}} = \frac{2}{N\sqrt{N}}, \\ \mathbf{u}_{1 \text{ marked}} &= -\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} - \frac{N - 2}{N\sqrt{N}} = \frac{2 - 2N}{N\sqrt{N}} \end{aligned} \quad (7)$$

If we take the ratio of the amplitudes for the marked and unmarked elements given above, we see that overall the marked element is $(N - 1)$ times greater than the other elements. Therefore, we can consider this as the final state in the Grover search algorithm.

Note that in the Grover search algorithm, the final orthogonal vector is found through small changes by applying the U_{mark} and U_{amplify} operators successively.

2 Constructing \mathbf{u}_1 as a quantum state

Since we know every vector and value except the index of the signed vector element (solution) in the above equations, we can simply try to build Eq.(2) as a quantum state. Therefore, our first main goal is to construct unnormalized \mathbf{u}_1 by using a non-unitary gate and ancilla register. This will allow us to form a state similar to \mathbf{u}_1 inside a larger system.

For this purpose, we will consider to first construct the following vector (normalized):

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} \mathbf{v}_0 \\ \mathbf{v}_1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

Suppose we have the circuit for the marking part and we use the equal superposition state for \mathbf{v}_0 . We can generate the above state on quantum circuit by using the circuit depicted in Fig.1.




Figure 1: Partial circuit.

In terms of quantum states, after the Hadamard gates and the controlled U_{mark} , the circuit yields the following state:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle |\mathbf{v}_0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle |\mathbf{v}_1\rangle. \quad (9)$$

If we apply another Hadamard gate to the first qubit, the states becomes:

$$\begin{aligned} &\frac{1}{2} (|0\rangle + |1\rangle) |\mathbf{v}_0\rangle + \frac{1}{2} (|0\rangle - |1\rangle) |\mathbf{v}_1\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{2} |0\rangle (|\mathbf{v}_0\rangle + |\mathbf{v}_1\rangle) + \frac{1}{2} |1\rangle (|\mathbf{v}_0\rangle - |\mathbf{v}_1\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

We can write $|\mathbf{v}_0\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{v}_1\rangle$ as:

$$|\mathbf{v}_1\rangle = |\mathbf{rest}\rangle + |x\rangle \text{ and } |\mathbf{v}_0\rangle = |\mathbf{rest}\rangle - |x\rangle, \quad (11)$$

where x is the index of the marked element and $|\mathbf{rest}\rangle$ represents the remaining parts of the vector (the place represented by x is a zero element in the $|\mathbf{rest}\rangle$ and only non-zero element in $|x\rangle$). Note that these vectors alone are not normalized and similar to "good" and "bad" states in quantum counting [7]. Then if we substitute this with \mathbf{v}_1 and \mathbf{v}_0 , the state turns into the following simple form:

$$|0\rangle |\mathbf{rest}\rangle - |1\rangle |x\rangle. \quad (12)$$

The above equation just makes the solution as conditioned on the first qubit state. However, it does not change its probability which is still $1/N$.

2.1 Using a non-unitary operator

Instead of the last Hadamard gate, we can use a matrix which does not have uniformly scaled elements. Assume we are able to use a quantum gate described by the following matrix with generic real values:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix}. \quad (13)$$

Rewriting the equations where the Hadamard gate is used, we obtain the following:

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle) |\mathbf{v}_0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (c|0\rangle + d|1\rangle) |\mathbf{v}_1\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle (a|\mathbf{v}_0\rangle + c|\mathbf{v}_1\rangle) + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle (b|\mathbf{v}_0\rangle + d|\mathbf{v}_1\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Similarly, if we write in terms of $|x\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{rest}\rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle (a|\mathbf{rest}\rangle + a|x\rangle + c|\mathbf{rest}\rangle - c|x\rangle) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle (b|\mathbf{rest}\rangle + b|x\rangle + d|\mathbf{rest}\rangle + -d|x\rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle ((a+c)|\mathbf{rest}\rangle + (a-c)|x\rangle) \\ &\quad + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle ((b+d)|\mathbf{rest}\rangle + (b-d)|x\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

To maximize the probabilities of $|x\rangle$, we can conclude the matrix as:

$$M = \begin{pmatrix} a & b \\ c & d \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ -1 & 1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

The resulting circuit is represented in Fig.3. In circuit, after the application of M we obtain the following final quantum state:

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle |x\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle |x\rangle. \quad (17)$$

Measurement on the output gives the solution $|x\rangle$.

Here, M is a singular matrix with a zero eigenvalue. Instead of this we can insert the value of α into this which also makes the matrix non-singular with real eigenspectrum:

$$\tilde{M} = \frac{1}{\rho} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{N-2}{N} & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix} \text{ or } \frac{1}{\rho} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{N-2}{N} & 1 \\ 1 & -\frac{N-2}{N} \end{pmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

where ρ is a normalization constant. Note the matrix has one small and one big eigenvalue. And the resulting quantum state involves only two non-zero elements. Although \tilde{M} is not singular, it is still exponentially close to one. Therefore, instead of using $\frac{N-2}{N}$, we can try to use $\frac{\text{poly}(n)-2}{\text{poly}(n)}$. For instance; we can use:

$$\bar{M} = \frac{1}{\rho} \begin{pmatrix} -\frac{n-2}{n} & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (19)$$

Again ρ is just a scaling, normalization, constant. Note that this would make much easier to implement the gate. However, this will introduce more non-zero elements to the output state even though those elements would have less magnitude. On randomly chosen marked element and for $\rho = 1$, Fig.2a shows the change of its magnitude (the absolute value of the amplitude for the marked, x th, element in the state without applying any measurement on any qubits) for different number of qubits. If we use the coefficient $(n^2 - 2)/n^2$, then the magnitude of the marked element further dominates the output as shown in Fig.2b. Also note that as in the Grover search algorithm, one can start with an M which is easy to implement and iterate the application of this to the quantum state in combination with the U_{mark} .

2.2 Implementation and approximation of M

We can implement M by writing as a sum of unitary matrices:

$$M = -\frac{1}{2}X + \frac{1}{2}I. \quad (20)$$

Since there are only two terms we can implement this by using only one ancilla qubit and a gate which implements the coefficients. However, since the square root of the coefficients are $1/\sqrt{2}[1, i]$, this implementation also yields to another non-unitary gate and also reduces the complexity gain.

Similarly \tilde{M} can be implemented by using the following:

$$\tilde{M} = \alpha/2I + \alpha/2Z + X - 1/2I + 1/2Z. \quad (21)$$

This can be implemented by using two ancilla qubits.


To overcome the implementation difficulties, we can also increase the number of terms and the size of the ancilla register. For instance we can introduce Z or H gates to the equation:

$$M = -\frac{1}{2}X + \frac{1}{2}I + \beta Z - \beta Z + \eta H - \eta H, \quad (22)$$


where β and η are coefficients that can be adjusted to make the implementation easier.

One can also map the coefficients to parameterized quantum gates. In this way case the searching problem would become an optimization problem where classical methods can be employed to optimize the parameters.

To get a unitary quantum state result, we can also consider Eq.(2) again. It gives the final state. More



(a) The change of the magnitude of the marked element if we use $(n - 2)/n$ as in Eq.(19).



(b) The change of the magnitude of the marked element if we use $(n^2 - 2)/n^2$ in Eq.(19).

Figure 2: Change in the absolute value of the amplitude for the marked element for different number of qubits. Note that the overall unnormalized magnitude is twice the values reported in the graph since we have the marked state when the first qubit is in $|0\rangle$ and we have another when the first qubit is in $|1\rangle$.




Figure 3: Search algorithm circuit. M is a nonunitary gate.




Figure 4: Search algorithm circuit. M is implemented as a sum of unitary gates. \tilde{H} implements coefficients. However, it may require further processing or additional qubits. Since the coefficients for just two terms may not be implemented by a unitary matrix based method.

importantly it maximizes the probability of the solution in this state. Similarly to the above, in this case the coefficients are $[1, -\alpha]$ which also leads to the non-unitary gate implementations and requires additional terms and qubits.

In Fig.4, we give the base form for the circuit by assuming only two terms are used. Since we only used one Hadamard-like gate, \tilde{H} , on the ancilla, the success probability becomes $1/2$. However, as explained, this operator is also non unitary and therefore more additional qubits are needed. This would decrease the success probability exponentially in the number of qubits used in the ancilla.

3 Complexity Analysis

In its base form, the complexity of the circuit is bounded by the complexity of U_{mark} . Because of the ancilla qubit, the circuit also requires a few repetitions. The algorithm requires one additional qubit in comparison to the original algorithm.

However, as discussed above it is not easy to implement the non-unitary gate since it is also a singular matrix (one of its eigenvalues is zero). One can try to approximate gate M with the normalization factor α used in the Gram-Schmidt process. Or one can add more qubits to the ancilla which would further reduce the success probability however it would make easier to implement the necessary coefficients. As a result, the probability change by the imperfect implementation of this operator may require another iterative circuit and negate the complexity gain obtained in comparison to the standard implementation of the search algorithm.

4 Data Availability

The simulation code can be accessed from <https://github.com/adaskin/nonunitary-search.git> which is used to generate figures. A simple Python simulation code with a nonunitary gate (\tilde{M} or M) is also given below:

```
import numpy as np
import random
n = 10; N = 2*n
I = np.eye(N)
psi = 1/np.sqrt(2*N)*np.ones((2*N,1))

#mark element on the second half
imark = random.randint(N,2*N-1)
psi[imark] = -psi[imark]

a = (n- 2)/n ; b = 1
M = np.array([[ -a, +b], [ 1,  -1]])
#or we could use
# a = 1; b = 1
# M = np.array([[a, -b], [-b, a]])

U = np.kron(M, I)
psi2 = U@psi

print("elements > 1/2N:\n",
      np.argwhere(np.abs(psi2)>1/(2*N)))
print("norm of out state:",
      np.linalg.norm(psi2))
print("px, pmax:",
      psi2[imark - N], np.max(psi2))
print("1/n and 1/N", 1/n, 1/N)
```

5 Funding

This project is not funded by any funding agency.

References

- [1] Lov K Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 212–219, 1996.
- [2] Lov K Grover. Quantum computers can search arbitrarily large databases by a single query. *Physical review letters*, 79(23):4709, 1997.
- [3] Michael A Nielsen and Isaac L Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge university press, 2010.

- [4] David Biron, Ofer Biham, Eli Biham, Markus Grassl, and Daniel A Lidar. Generalized grover search algorithm for arbitrary initial amplitude distribution. *Lecture notes in computer science*, pages 140–147, 1999.
- [5] Pulak Ranjan Giri and Vladimir E Korepin. A review on quantum search algorithms. *Quantum Information Processing*, 16:1–36, 2017.
- [6] Gene H Golub and Charles F Van Loan. *Matrix computations*. JHU press, 2013.
- [7] Gilles Brassard, Peter Høyer, and Alain Tapp. Quantum counting. In *Automata, Languages and Programming: 25th International Colloquium, ICALP'98 Aalborg, Denmark, July 13–17, 1998 Proceedings 25*, pages 820–831. Springer, 1998.