

## Quantum Algorithm for Researching the Nearest (QARN), 2023

### Abstract

Processing large amounts of data to this day causes difficulties due to the lack of power resources. Classical algorithms implement a chain of actions, requiring a certain time to execute, as well as space in the form of RAM. Parallelization, if it can be used, allows to gain time, but also needs buffering of all parallel actions. Quantum computing acts as an attractive alternative to parallel computing with qubits, qudits and their distinctive properties. The quantum algorithm proposed in this paper allows to search for the best (closest to a given) element in a random data array by storing all its initial elements in a superposition. This allows to perform the search operations on all elements at the same time and due to the same to save the amount of RAM.

### Introduction

Quantum computing has been fascinated by the prospect of using quantum effects for decades [1]. In particular, Shor's algorithm, based on quantum Fourier transform, demonstrates the use of qubit phase as an additional source for storing information [2, 3]. The same technique is implemented in the phase estimation algorithm [4] and the algorithm for solving systems of linear equations, known as HHL [5]. These and other quantum algorithms have their own field of application and related limitations, but the tools implemented in their schemes can be combined and used autonomously to solve different problems: the use of phase, superposition, qubit entanglement, transition to multilevel qudits [1, 6-8]. All these are powerful tools of quantum technologies, allowing to obtain advantages in comparison with classical computations.

As for the data search problem, the most well-known approach to its optimization contains Grover's algorithm [9]. However, even here we have to face a number of difficulties in implementation, such as determination of the number of calls to this algorithm, which affects its accuracy; the number of possible solutions, which must also be taken into account, and also the presence of a hypothetical oracle function, or black box (also used in Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm and the so-called Simon problem [10, 11]), whose action is described only in the abstract. This scheme is an excellent illustrative example of quantum superiority and is often used as demonstration and training material.

As mentioned above, Grover's algorithm searches for the desired element in a data array  $K$  and works with a certain structure of it containing the whole range of values from  $k_0 = 0$  to  $k_{n-1} = 2^n - 1$  ( $K = [k_i, k_{i+2}, \dots, k_{n-3}]$ , where  $n$  is the number of array element bits). This method imply that at least one element that exactly matches the sought one must exist. In practice, the array can contain only a part of the full spectrum ( $K' = [k_i, k_{i+2}, \dots, k_{n-3}]$ ), and if the very existence of the value exactly coinciding with the desired solution is not guaranteed, it is necessary to find the nearest, most suitable solution in the database with a minimum error. For this purpose, QARN is proposed and containing the following actions:

- a) receiving as inputs an array  $A$  of  $m$  elements of size  $n$  and a reference value  $B$  of size  $n$ ;
- b) creating, with the help of quantum logic gates, a superposition of all  $m$  elements of the array  $A$  in a special ancilla of  $n$  qubits and  $l$   $d$ -level qudits. The qubits serve as a buffer for copying and storing the array  $A$  and occupy a memory size equal to one element of the array being copied. The qudits act as an auxiliary tool to create superposition: each state of the qudits is entangled with a single copy element of the array  $A$ ;
- c) the bitwise implementation of finding the element nearest to  $B$  occurs simultaneously over all  $m$  elements, and also allows us to ignore the influence of the sign of the calculated difference. The result of comparing each element is recorded as a change in the probability of getting a qudit state entangled with the given element: the smaller the element matches the search conditions, the smaller the probability of getting a qudit state entangled with this element when measured;

- d) the measurement of the qudits of ancilla. The resulting state will indicate the number of the element being searched for.

### The essence of the problem

Let there exist an array  $A = [A_0, A_1, \dots, A_{m-1}]$  and some value  $B$ , for which it is required to find in the array  $A$  either an exact match, or the nearest. Obviously, you should subtract  $B$  from each element in turn, fix the value of difference at each step, at the end choose the smallest difference and by its index refer to the element of the array  $A$ , taken by this way the nearest to the reference value  $B$ .

In the classical version of calculations it is necessary to create a local copy ( $A'$ ) for array  $A$  of identical size. When searching for the smallest difference it would be necessary to perform successive calculations on each element of the copy and in addition to that to take into account the sign of the difference, which requires additional resources in the form of time.

### Execution of QARN

Figure 1 shows a schematic diagram, implemented on a quantum computer, for finding the nearest value (to a given  $B$ ) in an array  $A$ , where each of  $m$  elements consists of  $n$  qubits. The reference value  $B$  also consists of  $n$  qubits.




Figure 1

To create a local copy of the array  $A = \sum_{i=0}^{m-1} A_i$ , we will use ancillas  $C$  and  $D$ , where ancilla  $C$  occupies  $n$  qubits and ancilla  $D$  contains  $l$   $d$ -level qudits ( $D_0, D_1, \dots, D_{l-1}$ ). The number of possible states of the ancilla  $D$  is proportional to the array  $A$ , i.e.,  $d^l = m$ .

All qubits and qudits of the ancilla are initiated by zeros, the memory blocks  $A_0 \dots A_m$  and  $B$  receive at input the values which are required to be processed by the task condition.

The scheme works as follows.

The first step creates a superposition of all possible states in ancilla  $D$  by means of Hadamard gates, each of which is described by the formula [12]:

$$H_d = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{\mu, \nu=1}^d e^{i \frac{2\pi}{d} (\mu-1)(\nu-1)} |\mu\rangle \langle \nu|$$

Thus a superposition of all states is formed in the ancilla  $D$ :

$$\frac{1}{d^l} (|0_{l-1} \dots 0_1 0_0\rangle + |0_{l-1} \dots 0_1 1_0\rangle + \dots + |(d-1)_{l-1} \dots (d-1)_1 (d-1)_0\rangle)$$

For convenience, each of the ancillary states  $D$  will be denoted by  $d'_j, j \in \{0 \dots d^l-1\}$ .

The first step is necessary to entangle one element of a copy of the array  $A$  (placed in the ancilla  $C$ ) with each of the obtained states of the auxiliary ancilla  $D$ . Which is why  $d^l$  must be equal to  $m$ .

The entanglement of the qubits is carried out in step I (Figure 1) by means of controlling gates, where the controlling states are the values  $|1\rangle$  of the qubits of element  $A_k$  and the states  $d'_k$  of the ancilla  $D$  such that  $C_k$  (the  $k^{\text{th}}$  superposition state of ancilla  $C$ ) becomes equal to  $A_k$ :

$$\begin{aligned} & |B\rangle|A_0\rangle|A_1\rangle \dots |A_{m-1}\rangle|0_0 0_1 \dots 0_{n-1}\rangle|0_0 0_1 \dots 0_{l-1}\rangle \xrightarrow{H_d^{\otimes d}} \\ & \xrightarrow{H_d^{\otimes d}} \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n}{2}}} |B\rangle|A_0\rangle|A_1\rangle \dots |A_{m-1}\rangle(|0_0 0_1 \dots 0_{l-1}\rangle + |0_0 0_1 \dots 1_{l-1}\rangle + |d_0 d_1 \dots d_{l-1}\rangle) \xrightarrow{I} \\ & \xrightarrow{I} \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n}{2}}} |B\rangle|A_0\rangle|A_1\rangle \dots |A_{m-1}\rangle(|A_0\rangle|0_0 0_1 \dots 0_{l-1}\rangle + |A_1\rangle|0_0 0_1 \dots 1_{l-1}\rangle + \dots + |A_{m-1}\rangle|d_0 d_1 \dots d_{l-1}\rangle) \end{aligned}$$

In step II, a sequence of control gates making turns in the ancilla  $D$  is invoked. Here the main task is to find the closest value by calculating the difference between  $B$  and each element of the array  $A$  stored in the ancilla  $C$ . In doing so, the probability amplitude for each state  $d'_j$  entangled with  $C_j$  decreases in proportion to the difference  $B - C_j$  obtained.

An abstraction of the described action is shown in Figure 2.




Figure 2

If we represent all  $N = 2^n$  possible states of some system as basic orthogonal vectors of the hyperspace of states, the superposition vector will be the result vector equidistant from the basic ones, respectively, when measuring this system the probability of getting each of its possible states is the same and equal to  $\frac{1}{2^{\frac{n}{2}}}$ :

$$|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2^{\frac{n}{2}}} (|0_0 0_1 \dots 0_{n-1}\rangle + |0_0 0_1 \dots 1_{n-1}\rangle + \dots + |1_0 1_1 \dots 1_{n-1}\rangle) = \sum_{i=0}^{N-1} |\Psi_i\rangle$$

The weakening of the probability of the  $k^{\text{th}}$  state  $|\Psi_k\rangle$  means the shift of the result vector  $|\Psi\rangle$  towards the hyperplane  $\alpha$  of all other basis vectors ( $\sum_{i=0}^{N-1} |\Psi_i\rangle - |\Psi_k\rangle$ ) and away from the vector  $|\Psi_k\rangle$ .

The difference  $B - A_k = B - C_k$  is written as a rotation in ancilla  $D$  using rotation gates such that the probability of a state  $|D_k\rangle$  entangled with  $|A_k\rangle$  decreases in proportion to the value of  $B - A_k$ . The comparison is bitwise, so the  $i^{\text{th}}$  bit of the  $n$ -bit value of  $B$  is subtracted from the  $i^{\text{th}}$  bit of the  $n$ -bit ancilla  $C$ . The value of the rotation is discrete, depends on the significance of the bits being compared and is equal to  $\frac{\pi}{2^{i+1}}$ : the difference of the higher bits is written as a rotation by  $\pi/2$ , the next bits by  $\pi/4$ , etc. The difference of the low bits will rotate the state of the ancilla  $D$  by  $\frac{\pi}{2^n}$ .



$$|B\rangle|A_0\rangle|A_1\rangle|000\rangle|0\rangle \xrightarrow{H} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|B\rangle|A_0\rangle|A_1\rangle|000\rangle(|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \xrightarrow{I} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|B\rangle|A_0\rangle|A_1\rangle(|A_0\rangle|0\rangle + |A_1\rangle|1\rangle),$$

where the ancilla  $CD$  will have state  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|A_0\rangle|0\rangle + |A_1\rangle|1\rangle)$ .

Then it is necessary to determine  $|A_j\rangle$  nearest to  $|B\rangle$  and strengthen the probability to get the state  $|A_j\rangle|d_j\rangle$  when measuring ancilla  $D$  by writing the difference for each  $B - A_j$  as a rotation around the X axis with controlled gates  $R_x$ .

The gate provides a rotation only if the values of the qubits with the same significance are not equal to each other. That is, if you compare states 101 and 011, the qubit rotation will be at the expense of the high and middle bits, since the values of the low bits coincide and are equal to 1. The direction of rotation is initialized in any convenient way, only the sign of the difference determines the change of direction: if at a negative result the rotation is chosen clockwise, then at a positive one must be chosen counterclockwise, and vice versa. This is necessary for the correct calculation of the difference, so  $101 - 011 = 010$ , which in this example is equivalent to  $+\pi/2 - \pi/4 = \pi/4$ . If all turns are made in the same direction, the angle will be equal to  $3\pi/4$ , which is equivalent to 110, and this is incorrect.

Thus, if the state  $A_j$  is entangled with the state of a special  $D$  qubit was  $|0\rangle$  with each turn the probability of the value  $|1\rangle$  will increase in proportion to the difference  $B - A_j$ . It does not matter whether the total (by all digits) turn occurs clockwise or counterclockwise (more is subtracted from less or vice versa), because eventually in both cases the probability will "move away" from  $|0\rangle$  and get closer to  $|1\rangle$ . Consequently, the need to consider the sign is discarded.

The following values will be taken as an example:  $|B\rangle = |101\rangle$ ,  $|A_0\rangle = |010\rangle$ ,  $|A_1\rangle = |110\rangle$ ;  $B - A_0 = 101 - 010 = 011$ .

The result 011 should be written in qubit  $D$  as a rotation around the X-axis, the abstraction of the amplitude amplification  $|A_1\rangle|1\rangle$  is shown in Figure 4.




Figure 4

In calculating  $B - A_1 = 101 - 110 = -001$  the difference is negative, which does not affect the absolute value of the probability amplitude of state  $|A_0\rangle|0\rangle$  corresponding to a rotation angle of  $\pi/4$  (Figure 4).

As you can see, there is no need to consider the sign of the difference, because in this case it only affects the direction of motion: clockwise or counterclockwise ( $+\pi/2$  or  $-\pi/2$ ).  $101 - 010$  will be equal to  $011 - 110$ : the probability of getting  $|0\rangle$  when measuring the ancilla  $D$  will decrease towards  $|1\rangle$  in both cases equally.

The matrix of the rotation gates for this example will have the form shown below:

$$\begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & \cos\frac{\theta}{2} & i \cdot \sin\frac{\theta}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & i \cdot \sin\frac{\theta}{2} & \cos\frac{\theta}{2} & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & \cos\frac{\theta}{2} & -i \cdot \sin\frac{\theta}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -i \cdot \sin\frac{\theta}{2} & \cos\frac{\theta}{2} & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

So, given  $|B\rangle = |101\rangle$ ,  $|A_0\rangle = |010\rangle$ ,  $|A_1\rangle = |110\rangle$  the operation of the circuit shown in Figure 4 is described by equation:

$$\begin{aligned} & |B\rangle|A_0\rangle|A_1\rangle|000\rangle|0\rangle \xrightarrow{H} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|B\rangle|A_0\rangle|A_1\rangle|000\rangle(|0\rangle + |1\rangle) \xrightarrow{I} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|B\rangle|A_0\rangle|A_1\rangle(|A_0\rangle|0\rangle + |A_1\rangle|1\rangle) = \\ & = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|101\rangle|010\rangle|110\rangle(|010\rangle|0\rangle + |110\rangle|1\rangle) \xrightarrow{H} \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|101\rangle|010\rangle|110\rangle \otimes \\ & \otimes [ |010\rangle(\cos\frac{\pi}{4}(\cos\frac{\pi}{8}(\cos\frac{\pi}{16}|0\rangle - i \cdot \sin\frac{\pi}{16}|1\rangle) + i \cdot \sin\frac{\pi}{8}(-i \cdot \sin\frac{\pi}{16}|0\rangle + \cos\frac{\pi}{16}|1\rangle)) - \\ & - i \cdot \sin\frac{\pi}{4}(i \cdot \sin\frac{\pi}{8}(\cos\frac{\pi}{16}|0\rangle - i \cdot \sin\frac{\pi}{16}|1\rangle) + \cos\frac{\pi}{8}(-i \cdot \sin\frac{\pi}{16}|0\rangle + \cos\frac{\pi}{16}|1\rangle))] + \\ & + |110\rangle(i \cdot \sin\frac{\pi}{8}(\cos\frac{\pi}{16}|0\rangle - i \cdot \sin\frac{\pi}{16}|1\rangle) + \cos\frac{\pi}{8}(-i \cdot \sin\frac{\pi}{16}|0\rangle + \cos\frac{\pi}{16}|1\rangle))] \end{aligned}$$

## Conclusion

Taking into account all the arithmetic calculations after measuring the ancilla D the probability of getting  $|0\rangle$  is ~37% and probability of getting  $|1\rangle$  is ~63%. So, with a probability of ~63% depending on the proportions of differences  $B - A_0$  and  $B - A_1$ , the nearest to B value will be determined by the element  $A_1$ , which means that the goal by using the proposed scheme is achieved.

## Gratitude

I want to express my gratitude to the free application «Quantum Computing» by hex@dec: [https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=hu.hexadecimal.quantum&hl=en\\_AU&gl=US](https://play.google.com/store/apps/details?id=hu.hexadecimal.quantum&hl=en_AU&gl=US)  
This application allowed me to perform verification calculations to make sure that my algorithm works. I also want to express my gratitude to Yuri Ozhigov for his basic knowledge in this field.

## References

- [1] Yuri Ozhigov, *Three principles of quantum computing*, Quantum Inf. Comput. Vol.22 No.15&16 (2021).
- [2] P. Shor, *Algorithms for Quantum Computation: Discrete Logarithms and Factoring*, Foundations of Computer Science, 35th Annual Symposium on — IEEE (1994), pp.124–134.
- [3] D. Coppersmith, *An approximate Fourier transform useful in quantum factoring*, IBM Research Report (1994).
- [4] A. Kitaev, *Quantum measurements and the Abelian Stabilizer Problem*, arXiv:quant-ph/9511026 (1995).
- [5] Aram W. Harrow, Avinatan Hassidim, Seth Lloyd, *Quantum algorithm for solving linear systems of equations*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 103 (15) (2008).
- [6] Amit Saha, Ritajit Majumdar, Debasri Saha, Amlan Chakrabarti, and Susmita Sur-Kolay, *Asymptotically improved circuit for a d-ary Grover's algorithm with advanced decomposition of the n-qudit Toffoli gate*, Phys. Rev. A 105, 062453 (2022).

- [7] Yuchen Wang, Zixuan Hu, Barry C. Sanders, Sabre Kais, *Qudits and High-Dimensional Quantum Computing*, Front. Phys (2020).
- [8] G. Mogos, *The Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm for n-qudits*, 7th WSEAS International Conference on APPLIED COMPUTER SCIENCE, Venice, Italy (2007).
- [9] Lov K. Grover, *A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search*, Proceedings of the Twenty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing. STOC '96. Philadelphia, Pennsylvania (1996), pp.212–219.
- [10] David Deutsch, Richard Jozsa, *Rapid solutions of problems by quantum computation*, Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A. (1992), pp.553–558.
- [11] Daniel R. Simon, *On the Power of Quantum Computation*, SIAM J. Comput. 26 (5) (1997).
- [12] M. Chizzini, L. Crippa, A. Chiesa, F. Tacchino, F. Petiziol, I. Tavernelli, P. Santini, and S. Carretta, *Molecular nanomagnets with competing interactions as optimal units for qudit-based quantum computation*, Phys. Rev. Research 4, 043135 (2022).