

Discussing the explanation of the quantum speed up

Giuseppe Castagnoli
Pieve Ligure, Italy, giuseppe.castagnoli@gmail.com

December 3, 2018

Abstract

In former work, we showed that a quantum algorithm is the sum over the histories of a classical algorithm that knows in advance 50% of the information about the solution of the problem – each history is a possible way of getting the advanced information and a possible result of computing the missing information. We gave a theoretical justification of this 50% advanced information rule and checked that it holds for a large variety of quantum algorithms. Now we discuss the theoretical justification in further detail and counter a possible objection. We show that the rule is the generalization of a simple, well known, explanation of quantum nonlocality – where logical correlation between measurement outcomes is physically backed by a causal/deterministic/local process with causality allowed to go backward in time with backdated state vector reduction. The possible objection is that quantum algorithms often produce the solution of the problem in an apparently deterministic way (when their unitary part produces an eigenstate of the observable to be measured and measurement produces the corresponding eigenvalue – the solution – with probability 1), while the present explanation of the speed up relies on the nondeterministic character of quantum measurement. We show that this objection would mistake the nondeterministic production of a definite outcome for a deterministic production.

The "50% advanced information rule" formulated in [1] and [2] says that a quantum algorithm can be broken down into a sum over the histories of a classical algorithm that knows in advance 50% of the information about the solution of the problem. Each history is a possible way of getting the advanced information and a possible result of computing the missing information. This rule explains the quantum speed up, the fact that quantum algorithms require a lower number of operations than their classical counterparts. We gave a theoretical justification of the rule and checked that the rule holds for a large variety of quantum algorithms. In the following, we review in further detail the theoretical justification, focusing on Grover's data base search algorithm.

First we review Grover's algorithm in the simple instance of database size $N = 4$. The exposition should be such that no previous knowledge of quantum

computer science is required.

Thus, we have a problem and the algorithm that solves the problem. The problem is defined as follows – we resort to a visualization to aid intuition. We have a chest of 4 drawers numbered 00, 01, 10, 11, a ball, and two players. The first player (the oracle) hides the ball in drawer number $\mathbf{k} \equiv k_0, k_1$, chosen at random, and gives to the second player the chest of drawers. This is represented by a black box that, given an input $\mathbf{x} \equiv x_0, x_1$ (a drawer number), computes the Kronecker function $\delta(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})$ (1 if $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{x}$, 0 otherwise). The second player – the algorithm – should find the drawer with the ball, i.e. specify its number, and this is done by computing $\delta(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})$ for different values of $\mathbf{x}$ – by opening different drawers. A classical algorithm requires 2.25 computations of $\delta(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})$ on average – 3 computations if one wants to be a priori certain of finding the solution. The quantum algorithm yields the solution with certainty with just 1 computation – see [3].

In our representation of the quantum algorithm, the quantum computer has three registers. A two qubit register K contains the oracle's choice of the value of $\mathbf{k}$, the first input of the computation of $\delta(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})$. The state of this register can be $|00\rangle_K$, or $|01\rangle_K$, etc., which means oracle's choice $\mathbf{k} = 00$, or $\mathbf{k} = 01$, etc.; of course, we can also have a superposition of such sharp quantum states. A two qubit register X contains the argument $\mathbf{x}$ to query the black box with – the other input of the computation of $\delta(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})$. A one qubit register V is meant to contain the result of the computation, modulo 2 added to its initial content for logical reversibility. The three registers undergo a suitable unitary evolution, where in particular $\delta(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})$ is computed once. Measuring the content of register K yields the oracle's choice $\mathbf{k}$; this measurement can be performed, indifferently, at the beginning or at the end of the algorithm. Measuring the content of register X at the end of the algorithm yields the solution of the problem $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{k}$.

The initial state of the computer registers is:

$$\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle_K + |01\rangle_K + |10\rangle_K + |11\rangle_K) (|00\rangle_X + |01\rangle_X + |10\rangle_X + |11\rangle_X) (|0\rangle_V - |1\rangle_V), \quad (1)$$

all registers are prepared in even weighted superpositions of all possibilities. This state is the input of the computation of $\delta(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})$. This means that the computation will be performed in quantum parallelism on each and every term of the superposition. Let us consider for example the input term – $|01\rangle_K |01\rangle_X |1\rangle_V$. It means that the input of the black box is $\mathbf{k} = 01$ and $\mathbf{x} = 01$ and that the initial content of register V is 1. The computation yields $\delta(01, 01) = 1$, which modulo 2 added to the initial content of V yields the output term – $|01\rangle_K |01\rangle_X |0\rangle_V$ (registers K and X keep the memory of the input, for logical reversibility). Similarly the input term $|01\rangle_K |01\rangle_X |0\rangle_V$ is transformed into the output term $|01\rangle_K |01\rangle_X |1\rangle_V$. Summing up, $|01\rangle_K |01\rangle_X (|0\rangle_V - |1\rangle_V)$ is transformed into $-|01\rangle_K |01\rangle_X (|0\rangle_V - |1\rangle_V)$. The computation of $\delta(\mathbf{k}, \mathbf{x})$ inverts the phase of those terms where $\mathbf{k} = \mathbf{x}$, leaving the other terms unaltered. In the overall, it changes (1) into:

$$\frac{1}{4\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} |00\rangle_K (-|00\rangle_X + |01\rangle_X + |10\rangle_X + |11\rangle_X) + \\ |01\rangle_K (|00\rangle_X - |01\rangle_X + |10\rangle_X + |11\rangle_X) + \\ |10\rangle_K (|00\rangle_X + |01\rangle_X - |10\rangle_X + |11\rangle_X) + \\ |11\rangle_K (|00\rangle_X + |01\rangle_X + |10\rangle_X - |11\rangle_X) \end{bmatrix} (|0\rangle_V - |1\rangle_V), \quad (2)$$

where four orthogonal states of K , each corresponding to a single value of $\mathbf{k}$, are correlated with four orthogonal states of X . This means that the information about the value of $\mathbf{k}$ has propagated to register X .

A suitable rotation of the measurement basis of X transforms entanglement between registers K and X into correlation between the outcomes of measuring their contents, transforming (2) into:

$$\frac{1}{2\sqrt{2}} (|00\rangle_K |00\rangle_X + |01\rangle_K |01\rangle_X + |10\rangle_K |10\rangle_X + |11\rangle_K |11\rangle_X) (|0\rangle_V - |1\rangle_V) \quad (3)$$

The solution is in register X . We incidentally note that the unitary transformation of (1) into (3) is the identity in the Hilbert space of register K .

The oracle's choice has not been performed as yet. It is performed by measuring $[K]$, the content of register K , in (3) or, indifferently, (1). Say that we obtain $\mathbf{k} = 01$. State (3) reduces to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |01\rangle_K |01\rangle_X (|0\rangle_V - |1\rangle_V). \quad (4)$$

Measuring $[X]$ in (4) yields the solution produced by the algorithm, namely the eigenvalue $\mathbf{x} = 01$. We can say that the oracle's choice of the drawer number 01 implies that the algorithm outputs 01. However, instead of measuring $[K]$ in (3), we could have measured $[X]$, obtaining, say, $\mathbf{x} = 01$, which means state reduction on (4) again. Measuring $[K]$ in (4) yields $\mathbf{k} = 01$. In this case we can say that reading the output of the algorithm and finding 01 implies that the oracle's choice is 01. In fact there is mutual implication between the two measurement outcomes. In the following we discuss the relationship between the logical notion of implication and the physical notion of causality, arguing that there must be a causal/deterministic/local process that physically backs logical implication. We will see that there is always such a process, provided that we allow causality to go backward in time with backdated state reduction.

Let us start with the similar but simpler case of polarization entanglement. We consider two photons, labeled L (left) and R (right), generated at time $t = 0$ in a common location x_O and in a singlet polarization state. The spatial and polarization state of the two photons at time $t = 0$ is $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |x_O\rangle_L |x_O\rangle_R (|0\rangle_L |1\rangle_R - |1\rangle_L |0\rangle_R)$, where 0 (1) stands for horizontal (vertical) polarization. At time $t = T > 0$, this state has evolved into $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |x_L\rangle_L |x_R\rangle_R (|0\rangle_L |1\rangle_R - |1\rangle_L |0\rangle_R)$, with the two photons in the two different locations x_L (on the left) and x_R (on the right). If we measure $[L]$ (the polarization of the left photon) at time T and find the eigenvalue 0, this implies state reduction on $|x_L\rangle_L |x_R\rangle_R |0\rangle_L |1\rangle_R$ and that the measurement of $[R]$, performed (say) at the same time, yields the eigenvalue 1. As

well known, this logical implication can be backed by the following causal (deterministic/local) process. We backdate state reduction on $|x_L\rangle_L |x_R\rangle_R |0\rangle_L |1\rangle_R$ to time $t = 0$. Correspondingly $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |x_O\rangle_L |x_O\rangle_R (|0\rangle_L |1\rangle_R - |1\rangle_L |0\rangle_R)$ reduces on $|x_O\rangle_L |x_O\rangle_R |0\rangle_L |1\rangle_R$. This can be interpreted as the L photon locally telling the R photon that its polarization should be 1, which goes forward in time back to $|x_L\rangle_L |x_R\rangle_R |0\rangle_L |1\rangle_R$, when $[R]$ is measured.

We apply this rationale to quantum computation. To start with, we should break down the content of register K into content of first qubit and content of second qubit – i. e. $[K]$ is broken down into $[K_0]$ and $[K_1]$. Similarly $[X]$ is broken down into $[X_0]$ and $[X_1]$. k_0 (k_1) is the eigenvalue obtained by measuring $[K_0]$ ($[K_1]$) – indifferently in (1) or (3). x_0 (x_1) is the eigenvalue obtained by measuring $[X_0]$ ($[X_1]$) – in (3).

We can see that, even allowing causality to go backward in time with backdated state reduction, it cannot be true that k_0, k_1 causes $x_0 = k_0, x_1 = k_1$. In fact computer science tells us that there is no causal (deterministic/local) process that goes from cause k_0, k_1 to effect $x_0 = k_0, x_1 = k_1$ through one computation of δ ; three computations are required. In other words, it is not true that choosing the drawer number to hide the ball in on the part of the oracle causes the drawer number the ball is found in by the algorithm. In this case logical implication is not backed by a causal process.

For the same reason, reversing the direction of time, it cannot be true that x_0, x_1 causes $x_0 = k_0, x_1 = k_1$. In other words, it is not true that reading the drawer number produced by the algorithm, with no oracle's choice having been performed as yet, puts the ball in the drawer with that number.

We should look for a different causal process that ends in the effect $x_0 = k_0, x_1 = k_1$ and involves one computation of δ . To this end, we note that the implication $(k_0, k_1) \rightarrow (x_0 = k_0, x_1 = k_1)$ is equivalent to $(k_0, x_1) \rightarrow (x_0 = k_0, x_1 = k_1)$, or to $(k_1, x_0) \rightarrow (x_0 = k_0, x_1 = k_1)$. Correspondingly, we have the two following causal processes:

- k_0, x_1 (the outcomes of measuring $[K_0]$ and $[X_1]$) causes $x_0 = k_0, x_1 = k_1$. Finding, for example, $k_0 = 0, x_1 = 1$ causes $k_1 = 1, x_0 = 0$ through a single computation of δ . In fact one bit of the ball location, $k_0 = 0$ (due to measuring $[K_0]$) should be ascribed to the oracle's choice, the other bit, $x_1 = 1$ (due to measuring $[X_1]$) should be ascribed to the second player – to her reading at the end of the algorithm the other bit of the ball location in register X , without any oracle's choice having been performed as yet on the value of that bit. This other bit is the ball put in that bit. Thus the quantum algorithm has to search only the bit ascribed to the oracle's choice $k_0 = 0$, which requires one computation of δ .
- k_1, x_0 (the outcomes of measuring $[K_1]$ and $[X_0]$) causes $x_0 = k_0, x_1 = k_1$. The discussion is similar.

If we measure $[K]$ in state (1), or indifferently backdate to before running the algorithm the outcome of measuring $[K]$ in (3), the oracle's choice is prefixed before running the algorithm, say to $k_0 = 0, k_1 = 1$. The second player

putting the ball in $x_1 = 1$, as from the above example, should be replaced by her knowing in advance one bit of the solution she will find in the future.

Correspondingly, the computation stage of the quantum algorithm can be broken down as a sum of all the possible histories of a classical algorithm that, knowing in advance 50% of the information about the solution, performs the computations still required to identify the missing information. Each history is represented in quantum notation as the sequence of two sharp states, one before and the other after the computation of δ .

For example, in the present case of Grover's algorithm, let us assume that the second player knows in advance that the oracle's choice is either $k_0 = 0$, $k_1 = 0$ or $k_0 = 0$, $k_1 = 1$ (which means knowing in advance 50% of the information about the oracle's choice, given that this choice has been restricted from 4 to 2 possibilities). To establish which is the case, she should query the black box with either $x_0 = 0$, $x_1 = 0$ or $x_0 = 0$, $x_1 = 1$. Let us assume it is with $x_0 = 0$, $x_1 = 0$. If the outcome of the computation is $\delta = 1$, this means that $k_1 = 0$. This pinpoints two possible histories, depending on the initial state of register V . History # 1: initial state $|00\rangle_K |00\rangle_X |0\rangle_V$, state after the computation $|00\rangle_K |00\rangle_X |1\rangle_V$. History #2: initial state $|00\rangle_K |00\rangle_X |1\rangle_V$, state after the computation $|00\rangle_K |00\rangle_X |0\rangle_V$. If instead the outcome of the computation is $\delta = 0$, this means that $k_1 = 1$. This pinpoints two other possible histories. History # 3: initial state $|01\rangle_K |00\rangle_X |0\rangle_V$, state after the computation $|01\rangle_K |00\rangle_X |0\rangle_V$. History #4 initial state $|01\rangle_K |00\rangle_X |1\rangle_V$, state after the computation $|01\rangle_K |00\rangle_X |1\rangle_V$. Etc.

If we sum together all the possible histories, each with a suitable phase (+1 or -1), and normalize, we obtain the transformation of state (1) into (2). This shows that the computation stage of the quantum algorithm can be broken down into a sum over the histories of a classical algorithm that knows in advance 50% of the information about the solution.

This has an important practical consequence: the speed up in terms of number of oracle's queries comes from comparing two classical algorithms, with and without advanced information. This allows to characterize the problems liable of being solved with a quantum speed up in an entirely computer science framework with no physics involved – an important simplification – see [1].

Furthermore, as we have shown in [1], the history phases that reconstruct the quantum algorithm are also such that they maximize – after the computation of δ – the entanglement between registers K and X . Then the final rotation of the basis of register X , transforming state (2) into (3), transforms entanglement between K and X into correlation between the outcomes of measuring $[K]$ and $[X]$. This allows to synthesize the quantum algorithm out of the advanced information classical algorithm. It is thus a tool for the search of new quantum speed ups.

We discuss a possible objection to the present explanation of the speed up. The oracle's choice can be fixed before running the algorithm, say to $k_0 = 0$, $k_1 = 1$. In this case the unitary part of the algorithm (deterministically) produces state (4) and quantum measurement of $[X]$ in (4) produces the solution $x_0 = 0$ and $x_1 = 1$ with probability 1. The objection could be that the quantum

algorithm in this case produces the solution in a deterministic way. Thus the nondeterministic character of quantum measurement would play no role in the quantum speed up. We show that this is not the case.

We start without a fixed oracle's choice and represent the data base search problem (for $N = 4$) as the problem of satisfying the nonlinear Boolean network

$$\delta = AND(y_0, y_1), \quad y_0 = \sim XOR(k_0, x_0), \quad y_1 = \sim XOR(k_1, x_1), \quad \delta = 1. \quad (5)$$

The relation between the Boolean variables k_0 , k_1 , x_0 , and x_1 established by this network is also the relation between the outcomes of measuring $[K]$ and $[X]$ in (3). Satisfying this network classically requires trying several computations of the three gates (discarding those that yield $\delta = 0$) – 2.25 on average. Instead the quantum algorithm (unitary part and measurement) nondeterministically satisfies the network with a single computation of the gates. This produces one of the four possible oracle's choices and the corresponding solution provided by the second player.

If, in (5), we fix the values of k_0 and k_1 , the difficulty of the problem remains unaltered. Measuring $[X]$ in (4) still nondeterministically satisfies a nonlinear Boolean network (with the values of k_0 and k_1 pre-fixed and the values of x_0 and x_1 unknown), the only difference is that the result is definite (produced with probability 1), but this is so just because this network admits only one solution. We should not mistake the nondeterministic production of a definite outcome for a deterministic production.

In conclusion, we believe that, in quantum algorithms, heuristics went ahead of theory, and that the present explanation of the quantum speed up provides a useful theoretical clarification.

Acknowledgements

The author thanks for useful discussions: Vint Cerf, Artur Ekert, David Finkelstein, Hartmut Neven, Daniel Sheehan, and Henry Stapp.

Bibliography

1. Castagnoli, G.: Quantum algorithms know in advance 50% of the solution they will find in the future. <http://arxiv.org/pdf/0906.1811> and <http://www.springerlink.com/openurl.asp?genre=article&id=doi:10.1007/s10773-009-0143-6> (2009)
2. Castagnoli, G.: The 50% advanced information rule of the quantum algorithms. *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* vol. 48, issue 8, 2412 (2009)
3. Grover, L. K.: A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for data base search. *Proc. 28th Ann. ACM Symp. Theory of Computing* (1996)