

Bounds for Quantum Circuits using Logic-Based Analysis

Benedikt Fauseweh ¹, Ben Hermann ¹, and Falk Howar ¹

Abstract: We explore ideas for scaling verification methods for quantum circuits using SMT (Satisfiability Modulo Theories) solvers. We propose two primary strategies: (1) decomposing proof obligations via compositional verification and (2) leveraging linear over-approximation techniques for gate effects. We present two examples and demonstrate the application of these ideas to proof Hamming weight preservation.




Keywords: quantum computing, verification, logic, quantum circuit, analysis

1 Introduction

In the formulation of quantum circuits developers struggle to design circuits that stay within their correct sub-space. The correct reasoning to be followed during software development is non-trivial and requires deep insight into the mechanics of the quantum program as well as their underlying theory. However, means to determine or prove that such a circuit stays within a certain sub-space do not exist at the moment.

Showing that such bounds apply to a circuit would reduce the need for full quantum simulation of this circuit. Properties of interest here are, for instance, the Hamming distance between initial and evolved states of a circuit. When the Hamming distance is low, it could show us that an evolution of states over a circuit would not deviate significantly from its initial state. Such a property is interesting for instance for a quantum circuit description of Many-Body Localized Discrete Time Crystals (MBL-DTCs). Furthermore, verification techniques can be used to show a low entanglement character of a circuit.

We propose to determine these properties using logic-based program analysis. Logic-based semantic descriptions of quantum circuits and verification problems based on these descriptions have been recently proposed by others, however, they lack scalability. They show some scalability under some optimization in the mapping of circuits to formulas (namely, so-called *direct mapping*) and for simple abstractions on the Hilbert space. We build on these ideas and establish an assume-guarantee decomposition of proof obligations to scale verification to real-world quantum programs. We show that these compositions hold even for non-identical but equivalent quantum circuits. Moreover, we introduce some concrete examples of properties.

¹ Technische Universität Dortmund,
benedikt.fauseweh@tu-dortmund.de,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-4861-7101>;
ben.hermann@tu-dortmund.de,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0001-9848-2017>;
falk.howar@tu-dortmund.de,  <https://orcid.org/0000-0002-9524-4459>

The novel contribution of our work is the formulation of the analysis or verification problem in a compositional manner. We decompose the proof obligations and show that we can establish compositional bounds for (partial) circuits. We approach the inherent scalability problem of quantum program analysis with this compositionality as well as linear over-approximation of gate effects. Such an over-approximation enables us to provide meaningful bound in reasonable time.

2 Related Work

The derivation of properties for quantum programs or circuits has been studied before. We give an overview over current verification techniques and their applications. Proofs of these properties can be massively supported by judgements on circuit equivalence and symmetry.

Verification Techniques Bauer-Marquart et al. [BLS23] provide a framework for symbolic verification of quantum programs. Verification problems can be expressed as an SMT formula checked by a δ -complete solver in their approach. We draw inspiration from their work and also express circuits in such a manner, but apply a linear over-approximation in order to scale better. Takagi et al. [TDO24] extend Dynamic Quantum Logic in order to automate verification. They use bra-ket notation instead of complex vectors and matrices, thus, relying on a more compact representation. Chareton et al. [Ch21] contribute QBricks, a first-order-logic-based framework for the specification and proof of quantum programs. They also use a symbolic representation of quantum states. Feng and Xu [FX23] present a verification system for non-deterministic quantum programs based on Hoare-style logic. Lewis et al. [LSZ23] provide a survey on verification techniques for quantum programs. Sarkar [Sa24] outlines a research vision for automated quantum software engineering where verification of quantum programs is a key step in the support of developers.

Equivalence and Symmetry Verification tasks for quantum circuits can be aided with a proof of circuit equivalence. Mei et al. [Me24] provide a reduction of the (universal) quantum circuits equivalence problem to weighted model counting (WMC). This reduction outperforms classic equivalence checking based on the ZX calculus. Anselmetti et al. [An21] propose gate fabrics that express equivalent behavior as complex circuits for the simulation of strongly correlated ground and excited states of molecules and materials under the Jordan–Wigner mapping. The gate fabrics can be implemented linearly locally and preserve all relevant quantum numbers.

Another helpful property is symmetry preservation. Gard et al. [Ga20] present general schemes to facilitate state preservation circuits for quantum simulation that respect a number of symmetries. This effectively reduces the Hilbert space to explore in simulations.




Fig. 1: (a) Quantum circuit for the kicked Ising MBL-DTC. (b) A time crystals spontaneously breaks the time translational invariance of the drive.

3 Motivating Example

The study of Many-Body Localized Discrete Time Crystals (MBL-DTCs) provides a motivating example for our approach on higher-level programming abstractions in quantum software engineering [Ba24]. MBL-DTCs represent a non-equilibrium phase of matter characterized by a spontaneous breaking of discrete time-translation symmetry, resulting in a subharmonic response that spontaneously breaks the periodicity of an external drive [KMS19]. This phenomenon emerges from the interplay between many-body localization (MBL), the generalization of Anderson localization [EM08] to interacting systems, and external periodic driving, leading to a form of spatiotemporal order in quantum systems.

Despite significant interest, the existence of MBL-DTCs remains an open question due to the potential instability of the underlying MBL phase. Specifically, MBL systems may be susceptible to an “avalanche” mechanism, where rare regions of ergodicity can lead to thermalization over very long timescales [DRH17, Mo22, Se22, EMB23]. Traditional analytical proofs addressing this issue are complex and challenging to verify, while numerical simulations are limited to small system sizes that cannot capture the avalanche mechanism in the thermodynamic limit.

MBL-DTCs can be effectively described using quantum circuits, making them amenable to abstract analysis techniques. Recent work has demonstrated that quantum computers can be programmed to realize the DTC phase [Ip21, CF24, Fa24] and experimentally detect its dynamical properties [Mi22], leveraging extensive capabilities in programmability, initialization, and readout. Additionally, evidence for MBL-DTCs in higher dimensions have been presented using infinite tensor network states [Ks21].

As a typical example for an MBL-DTC we consider the one dimensional periodically kicked Ising model,

$$U_F = e^{-i\frac{T}{4} \sum_{j=1}^{L-1} J_j \sigma_j^z \sigma_{j+1}^z} e^{-i\frac{T}{2} \sum_{j=1}^L h_j \sigma_j^z} e^{-i\frac{\pi g}{2} T \sum_{j=1}^L \sigma_j^x}. \quad (1)$$

This unitary directly translates to a quantum circuit on a 1D topology of qubits. The parameter T represents the Floquet period of the external drive, which we set to $T = 1$. The

parameter g is the pulse parameter, with $g = 1$ representing a perfect bit flip. The coupling parameters J_j and the magnetic fields h_j are randomly sampled from uniform distributions [Mi22] with $J_j \in [-1.5\pi, -0.5\pi]$ and $h_j \in [-\pi, \pi]$.

Applying abstract analysis methods to these quantum circuits can be used to verify preserved properties. By focusing on specific quantities that characterize the MBL-DTC phase, we can perform logic-based analyses without the need for full quantum simulations [FZ21], making only statements about limited but insightful aspects of the system's behavior.

One such property is the Hamming distance between the initial and evolved states. The Hamming distance d quantifies the minimum number of bit flips required to transform one bitstring into another. In MBL-DTC systems, unlike in ergodic dynamics where an initial bitstring state quickly spreads over the entire computational basis, the evolution prevents the state from deviating significantly from its initial configuration.

Another critical property is the low entanglement characteristic of the MBL-DTC phase. Given that states in this phase do not significantly deviate from their initial values, the entanglement entropy of initially random bit string states remains low compared to that in ergodic phases, where entanglement rapidly increases. This property can be analyzed using reduced density matrices of subsystems. It has been shown that abstract interpretation can effectively analyse these properties in a scalable way [YP21]. By proving that the entanglement entropy remains low, we can infer that the system retains localization properties over time.

Hence applying logic based analysis to MBL-DTCs could provide valuable insights into the conditions necessary for their stability against thermalization and avalanches. This methodology allows for the decomposition of complex verification tasks into manageable sub-tasks, enabling the analysis of large-scale quantum circuits that model MBL-DTCs.

4 Preliminaries

We briefly introduce some basic formalization of computations on qubits and logic-based verification techniques.

4.1 Qubits and Quantum Circuits

Qubits A qubit, the fundamental unit of quantum information, is represented as a vector in a two-dimensional complex Hilbert space. Using Dirac's bra-ket notation, the state of a qubit $|q\rangle$ can be expressed as a superposition of the computational basis states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, $|q\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$, where $\alpha, \beta \in \mathbb{C}$ are complex coefficients satisfying the normalization condition $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. The basis states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ form an orthonormal basis of the Hilbert space \mathbb{C}^2 , allowing for the full description of any qubit state within this space. For a

system of $n > 1$ qubits, we can compute the state from the coefficients of the individual qubits as the nested Kronecker product $\bigotimes_{1 \leq i \leq n} |q_i\rangle$. This representation, however, does not lend itself to analysis with constraint solvers as the repeated multiplication of coefficients results in many non-linear expressions. We can alternatively represent the state of the system by 2^n complex coefficients of its 2^n basis states. We iterate with $c_{b(i)}$ over these coefficients, where $b(i) = i_2$ for $0 \leq i < 2^n$. For a two-qubit system, e.g., the four basis states are $|00\rangle$, $|01\rangle$, $|10\rangle$, and $|11\rangle$. While this representation avoids non-linear expressions in the state, it requires exponentially many variables (in the number of qubits) and will likely not scale to big quantum circuits.

Quantum Circuits Quantum circuits apply so-called *gates* to individual qubits or two pairs of qubits. Some commonly used gates are the Hadamard gate, rotations, or Pauli gates. We express the effect of gates on qubits as unitary matrices. The Hadamard gate H , e.g. is a single-qubit operation that maps the basis state $|0\rangle$ to $\frac{|0\rangle+|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$ and $|1\rangle$ to $\frac{|0\rangle-|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$ creating an equal superposition of the two basis states. Other gates rotate qubits around some axis and are parameterized by the angle of rotations, e.g. $R_y(\theta)$ rotates a qubit around the y-axis by θ and can be represented by the matrix. Gates that entangle necessarily work on multiple qubits, i.e., at least on two qubits. The controlled Z (CZ) gate for example uses one qubit as the control and changes the relative phase of the target qubit when the control qubit is in the state $|1\rangle$. We compute the effect of gates on states as matrix-vector products of gates and states. Quantum circuits will typically also contain measurements which collapse superpositions and read out classical results of computations.

Sub-Space Preservation We are interested in showing that a quantum circuit preserves the sub-space of the input. These properties are relevant in many applications, e.g. sub-spaces determined by symmetry in digital quantum simulation [Li24, Ng24] or constrained sub-spaces in combinatorial optimization [Fu22]. One simple example is the preservation of the Hamming weight of a quantum state. The expected Hamming weight of a quantum state is the weighted sum of its basis states. Consider a general n -qubit state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} c_i |i\rangle$ where c_i are complex coefficients, and $|i\rangle$ represents the computational basis state corresponding to the binary representation of i . The probability of each basis state is $|c_i|^2$. For each computational basis state $|i\rangle$, the Hamming weight $w(i)$ is the number of qubits in the state $|1\rangle$. The expected Hamming weight of the quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ can be calculated as:

$$\text{HW}(|\psi\rangle) = \sum_{i=0}^{2^n-1} w(i) \cdot |c_i|^2$$

For a two-qubit state $|\psi\rangle = c_0|00\rangle + c_1|01\rangle + c_2|10\rangle + c_3|11\rangle$, the expected Hamming weight is $0 \cdot |c_0|^2 + 1 \cdot |c_1|^2 + 1 \cdot |c_2|^2 + 2 \cdot |c_3|^2$. There, the complex absolute square $|a + ib|^2$ can be expressed by the quadratic expression $a^2 + b^2$.




Fig. 2: Left: two-qubit circuit C with pre-condition P and post-condition Q . Right: Matrix representations of Hadamard gate (1) and CNOT gate (2).

4.2 Logic-based Verification of Quantum Circuits

First Order Logic and Theories For a set \mathbf{x} of variables, let $\varphi[\mathbf{x}]$ be a logic formula in some theory T over variables \mathbf{x} . The theory provides a signature Σ defining constants, functions, and relations, as well as a set of axioms A_T (i.e., closed formulae) that constrain the interpretation of the signature. A model $M = (D, I)$ is a pair of domain D and interpretation I . There I maps elements of the signature to concrete constants, functions, and relations on D . We call $v : \mathbf{x} \rightarrow D$, mapping variables to values in D , a variable assignment. A model M is then a T -model, if $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_{M,v}$ is true for all $\varphi \in A_T$ and assignments v , where $\llbracket \cdot \rrbracket_{M,v}$ denotes the evaluation under M and v . As an example, the formula $(x = 0)$ is true for $v(x) = 0$ and model M with $D = \mathbb{R}$ and $I(=)$ the usual interpretation of *equality* of real numbers. A Σ -formula φ is T -satisfiable, if there is a T -model M for which $\llbracket \varphi \rrbracket_M$ is true — the formula is T -valid if this is the case for every model M . We say that a formula φ entails another formula ψ , denoted by $\varphi \models \psi$ if ψ is true when φ is true, i.e., when the formula $(\neg\varphi \vee \psi)$ is T -valid or equivalently $(\varphi \wedge \neg\psi)$ is not T -satisfiable. SMT solvers implement decision procedures for deciding satisfiability for certain theories. Two theories that we use in this work are QF_LRA , the quantifier-free fragment of linear real arithmetic and QF_NRA , the quantifier-free fragment of the non-linear real arithmetic. Some SMT solvers offer approximating analysis for extensions of these theories, e.g., with support for trigonometric functions.

Logic-based Verification When analysing quantum circuits, we are interested in showing that, given some condition P on the on the inputs of the circuit, some condition Q holds on the outputs. We refer to P as the precondition and to Q as the post-condition. The verification problem is then to decide if $\{P\}C\{Q\}$ is a (so-called) valid Hoare-triple for the circuit C . To this end, we encode the circuit and the conditions as logic formulas and then decide the entailment $(P \wedge C) \models Q$, which holds if $(P \wedge C) \wedge \neg Q$ is not satisfiable. We do not define the translation formally here but only provide some intuition. We refer readers to previous work by others [BLS23] for a detailed formal account.

In the example shown in Figure 2 we are interested in proving that the state after the circuit is in the subspace spanned by $|00\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$ if the two qubits are $|0\rangle$ initially. Figure 3 shows the logic encoding for this small two-qubit circuit. We encode a quantum circuit in variables and constraints by introducing complex variables for the coefficients c_i of the basis states at different stages of the computation, with c_i^0 representing the initial value of c_i over which we express the pre-condition and c_i^k represents the value after k steps. For $0 < j \leq k$, we encode the effect of step j of the circuit (i.e., the effect of some gate) as a logic formula over variables c_i^{j-1} and c_i^j .

$$\begin{aligned}
P &:= (c_{00}^0 = 1) \wedge (c_{01}^0 = 0) \wedge (c_{10}^0 = 0) \wedge (c_{11}^0 = 0) \\
C &:= (c_{00}^2 = c_{00}^1) \wedge (c_{00}^1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{00}^0 + c_{10}^0)) \wedge (c_{01}^2 = c_{01}^1) \wedge (c_{01}^1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{01}^0 + c_{11}^0)) \wedge \\
&\quad (c_{10}^2 = c_{11}^1) \wedge (c_{10}^1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{00}^0 - c_{10}^0)) \wedge (c_{11}^2 = c_{10}^1) \wedge (c_{11}^1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{01}^0 - c_{11}^0)) \\
Q &:= (c_{01}^2 = 0) \wedge (c_{10}^2 = 0)
\end{aligned}$$

Fig. 3: Logic encoding of the quantum circuit C in Figure 2 along with pre-condition P and post-condition Q , expressed as first-order formulas over the complex coefficients of the basis states. This representation is translated to formulas over reals to decide $P \wedge C \models Q$ with an SMT solver.

5 Compositional Verification of Quantum Circuits

The SMT-based verification of quantum circuits presented in the previous section will not scale to bigger circuits due to large numbers of variables and constraints that are required to encode these circuits. We propose two strategies for scaling verification: (1) decomposition of proof obligations and (2) over-approximation of gate effects, drawing inspiration from the application of these techniques for the verification of airplane control systems [Br15].

Compositional Verification In compositional verification we decompose a circuit C into sub-circuits C_1, \dots, C_n , such that $C = C_1; \dots; C_n$, i.e., C is the sequential composition of the sub-circuits. We then introduce local properties A_1, \dots, A_n such that $P \models A_1$, and $A_i \wedge C_i \models A_{i+1}$ for $1 \leq i < n$, and $A_n \wedge C_n \models Q$. In the example from the previous section, we could decompose the proof as shown in Figure 4. Proving properties in this style will be especially scalable if (a) component-level proofs do not have to be computed on the complete state but only on the affected qubits and if (b) appropriate intermediate guarantees can be computed in an automated way.

We conjecture that for many gates, assumptions can be computed using the gate matrix and the post-condition in style of a weakest precondition predicate transformer. In fact, the assumptions in the example are exactly the weakest pre-conditions that are obtained by replacing equal terms. In these cases, we would not even have to use an SMT solver to proof

$$\begin{aligned}
P &:= (c_{00}^0 = 1) \wedge (c_{01}^0 = 0) \wedge (c_{10}^0 = 0) \wedge (c_{11}^0 = 0) \\
A_1 &:= \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{01}^0 + c_{11}^0) = 0\right) \wedge \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{01}^0 - c_{11}^0) = 0\right) \\
C_1 &:= (c_{00}^1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{00}^0 + c_{10}^0)) \wedge (c_{01}^1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{01}^0 + c_{11}^0)) \wedge (c_{10}^1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{00}^0 - c_{10}^0)) \wedge (c_{11}^1 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(c_{01}^0 - c_{11}^0)) \\
A_2 &:= (c_{01}^1 = 0) \wedge (c_{11}^1 = 0) \\
C_2 &:= (c_{00}^2 = c_{00}^1) \wedge (c_{01}^2 = c_{01}^1) \wedge (c_{10}^2 = c_{11}^1) \wedge (c_{11}^2 = c_{10}^1) \\
Q &:= (c_{01}^2 = 0) \wedge (c_{10}^2 = 0)
\end{aligned}$$

$$\text{Compositional proofs: } P \models A_1 \quad A_1 \wedge C_1 \models A_2 \quad A_2 \wedge CNOT \models Q$$

Fig. 4: Decomposition of the proof from Figure 3.

an obligation as the assumption results from a syntactic transformation and is the weakest pre-condition by construction.

Local Properties and Over-Approximation For systems with many qubits, it will be necessary to find strategies for encoding only the part of the system that pertains to a particular proof and for over-approximating expressions that are hard to analyze. We present these ideas on a second example: the gate fabric on the left of Figure 6 preserves the hamming weight of the state and we want to check this. Let $H64[\psi_1, \psi_2]$ be the set of expressions that describe the effect of $H(2^6)$ on input state ψ_1 and output state ψ_2 and let $H4^i[\psi_1, \psi_2]$ be expressions that encode the effect of the $H(4)$ circuit on the i -th and $(i + 1)$ -th qubits between ψ_1 and ψ_2 . Finally, let $HW(\psi)$ be the arithmetic expression for the expected Hamming weight of ψ . To show that $H(2^6)$ preserves the Hamming weight, we have to check that $H64[\psi_1, \psi_2] \models HW[\psi_1] = HW[\psi_2]$. We can decompose this proof into a series of smaller proofs that show the preservation of the expected Hamming weight for the individual $H(4)$ gates but we can also apply two more optimizations.

$$H(4) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & c & +s & 0 \\ 0 & -s & c & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

for $c := \cos(\lambda/2)$
 $s := \sin(\lambda/2)$

Fig. 5: $H(4)$ gate matrix for parameter λ .

Over-Approximation. Using the matrix representation of $H(4)$ shown in Figure 6 and a relaxation on s and c , namely only requiring that $0 \leq s, c \leq 1$ and that $s^2 + c^2 = 1$, we can further simplify the proof obligations and remove trigonometric functions, making it possible to encode the checks in a logic that is suitable for of-the-shelf SMT solvers. In this example, we know from the literature that the matrix describes the effect of $H(4)$. An automated approach will have proof the correctness of abstractions — similar to loop invariants in the verification of classic programs.




Fig. 6: The $H(2^6)$ gate fabric from [An21].

Local Properties. Finally, we can reduce the proof obligations much more drastically by making an observation that is outside of the scope of automated analysis: a two-qubit gate that preserves the expected Hamming weight of a two-qubit state will also preserve the expected Hamming weight of a larger system when applied to two qubits of that system. Let G be some two-qubit gate on qubits i and j that preserves the expected Hamming weight on a two-qubit system. Since G only affects qubits i and j , applying G does not alter the total expected Hamming weight of the n -qubit state². This observation reduces our proof obligation to the proof that the $H(4)$ block, given by its matrix representation in Figure 6, preserves the expected Hamming weight on a two-qubit circuit. In general, however, it will not be this simple to reduce proof obligations or obvious how to do it. We conjecture that static analysis and data-flow analysis can be used for finding beneficial decompositions.

6 Demonstration

We demonstrate the feasibility and efficiency of compositional verification of quantum circuits for the two examples presented in the previous sections. We have generated different verification conditions in the SMTLib format: for the H-CNOT circuit, we generate a monolithic encoding as well as the compositional proofs from Figure 4. The [H+CNOT, P+A1] proof doubles as the proof obligation in a weakest precondition approach. For the $H(2^6)$ circuit, we have generated precise encoding using trigonometric functions as well as over-approximating encoding that use the matrix that summarizes the effect of $H(4)$ components. To analyze scalability, we generate variants that check preservation of Hamming weights only for the first k $H(4)$ components. Finally, we have generated the verification condition for hamming weight preservation of $H(4)$ in a two-qubit system.

We have checked all generated SMT problems with the Z3 constraint solver, version 4.13.3. Experiments were executed on an Apple M3 Pro MacBook with 36 GB of RAM, running macOS 14.6. We have repeated all experiments five times and report results in Table 1. The table shows number of variables and assertions for every verification condition as well as the used logic, obtained verdict, and average wall-clock runtime.

² In the n -qubit system, the total expected Hamming weight is: $\sum_{k \neq i, j} \langle \psi | \frac{1-Z_k}{2} | \psi \rangle + \langle \psi | \frac{1-Z_i}{2} + \frac{1-Z_j}{2} | \psi \rangle$

Tab. 1: Experimental results for verification of examples from previous sections. †: for approximated $1/\sqrt{2}$, DNS: did not attempt to solve, DNF: timeout after 30 min.

Example	Encoding			Analysis	
	Vars	Ass.	Logic	Res.	wct [s]
H+CNOT	25	26	LRA [†]	✓	0.005
H+CNOT, C1	17	11	LRA [†]	✓	0.005
H+CNOT, C2	17	11	LRA [†]	✓	0.003
H+CNOT, P+A1	9	3	LRA [†]	✓	0.004
H(2 ⁶), naive	10 370	5 191	TRIG	-	DNS
H(2 ⁶), precise	3 330	1 671	TRIG	-	DNS
H(2 ⁶)	1 412	647	NRA	d/k	DNF
H(2 ⁶), 9/10	1 284	583	NRA	✓	8.25
H(2 ⁶), 8/10	1 156	519	NRA	✓	2.29
H(2 ⁶), 7/10	1 028	455	NRA	✓	1.59
H(2 ⁶), 5/10	772	327	NRA	✓	0.23
H(2 ⁶), 1/10	260	71	NRA	✓	0.02
H(4)	20	15	NRA	✓	0.01

The experiments show that the proposed techniques (decomposition, over-approximation, and computing weakest pre-conditions) are effective: for the H-CNOT circuit, checking the weakest pre-condition requires less than half the variables and significantly fewer assertions than the other proofs. For the H(2⁶) circuit, monolithic verification times out at 30 minutes, while analyzing one H(4) component finishes in 20 ms. Checking the Hamming weight preservation of H(4) on a two-qubit system is even more efficient.

7 Conclusion

We have presented some ideas for scaling logic-based verification of quantum circuits through decomposition and abstraction. We have demonstrated the effect of these techniques on two small examples. The presented ideas can hopefully provide a basis for scaling verification for quantum circuits with an SMT solver, especially for circuits where local properties and clusters of gates can be isolated.

Bibliography

- [An21] Anselmetti, Gian-Luca R; Wierichs, David; Gogolin, Christian; Parrish, Robert M: Local, expressive, quantum-number-preserving VQE ansätze for fermionic systems. *New Journal of Physics*, 23(11):113010, 11 2021.
- [Ba24] Basermann, Achim; Epping, Michael; Fauseweh, Benedikt; Felderer, Michael; Lobe, Elisabeth; Röhrig-Zöllner, Melven; Schmiedinghoff, Gary; Schuhmacher, Peter K.; Setyawati, Yoshinta; Weinert, Alexander: Quantum Software Ecosystem Design. In (Exman, Iakov; Pérez-Castillo, Ricardo; Piattini, Mario; Felderer, Michael, eds): *Quantum Software*:

Aspects of Theory and System Design. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, pp. 143–188, 2024.

- [BLS23] Bauer-Marquart, Fabian; Leue, Stefan; Schilling, Christian: symQV: Automated Symbolic Verification of Quantum Programs. In: FM. volume 14000 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, pp. 181–198, 2023.
- [Br15] Brat, Guillaume; Bushnell, David H.; Davies, Misty D.; Giannakopoulou, Dimitra; Howar, Falk; Kahsai, Temesghen: Verifying the Safety of a Flight-Critical System. In: FM. volume 9109 of Lecture Notes in Computer Science. Springer, pp. 308–324, 2015.
- [CF24] Camacho, Gonzalo; Fauseweh, Benedikt: Prolonging a discrete time crystal by quantum-classical feedback. *Phys. Rev. Res.*, 6:033092, 7 2024.
- [Ch21] Chareton, Christophe; Bardin, Sébastien; Bobot, François; Perrelle, Valentin; Valiron, Benoît: An Automated Deductive Verification Framework for Circuit-building Quantum Programs. In: ESOP 2021. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, Heidelberg, p. 148–177, 2021.
- [DRH17] De Roeck, Wojciech; Huvneers, François: Stability and instability towards delocalization in many-body localization systems. *Phys. Rev. B*, 95:155129, 4 2017.
- [EM08] Evers, Ferdinand; Mirlin, Alexander D.: Anderson transitions. *Rev. Mod. Phys.*, 80:1355–1417, 10 2008.
- [EMB23] Evers, Ferdinand; Modak, Ishita; Bera, Soumya: Internal clock of many-body delocalization. *Phys. Rev. B*, 108:134204, 10 2023.
- [Fa24] Fauseweh, Benedikt: Quantum many-body simulations on digital quantum computers: State-of-the-art and future challenges. *Nature Communications*, 15(1):2123, 3 2024.
- [Fu22] Fuchs, Franz Georg; Lye, Kjetil Olsen; Møll Nilsen, Halvor; Stasik, Alexander Johannes; Sartor, Giorgio: Constraint Preserving Mixers for the Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithm. *Algorithms*, 15(6), 2022.
- [FX23] Feng, Yuan; Xu, Yingte: Verification of Nondeterministic Quantum Programs. In: Proceedings of the 28th ACM International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems, Volume 3. ASPLOS 2023, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, p. 789–805, 2023.
- [FZ21] Fauseweh, Benedikt; Zhu, Jian-Xin: Digital quantum simulation of non-equilibrium quantum many-body systems. *Quantum Information Processing*, 20(4):138, 4 2021.
- [Ga20] Gard, Bryan T.; Zhu, Linghua; Barron, George S.; Mayhall, Nicholas J.; Economou, Sophia E.; Barnes, Edwin: Efficient symmetry-preserving state preparation circuits for the variational quantum eigensolver algorithm. *npj Quantum Information*, 6(1):10, 1 2020.
- [Ip21] Ippoliti, Matteo; Kechedzhi, Kostyantyn; Moessner, Roderich; Sondhi, S.L.; Khemani, Vedika: Many-Body Physics in the NISQ Era: Quantum Programming a Discrete Time Crystal. *PRX Quantum*, 2:030346, 9 2021.
- [KMS19] Khemani, Vedika; Moessner, Roderich; Sondhi, S. L.: A Brief History of Time Crystals, 2019.
- [Ks21] Kshetrimayum, A.; Goihl, M.; Kennes, D. M.; Eisert, J.: Quantum time crystals with programmable disorder in higher dimensions. *Phys. Rev. B*, 103:224205, 6 2021.

- [Li24] Lively, Kevin; Bode, Tim; Szangolies, Jochen; Zhu, Jian-Xin; Fauseweh, Benedikt: Robust Experimental Signatures of Phase Transitions in the Variational Quantum Eigensolver, 2024.
- [LSZ23] Lewis, Marco; Soudjani, Sadeq; Zuliani, Paolo: Formal Verification of Quantum Programs: Theory, Tools, and Challenges. *ACM Transactions on Quantum Computing*, 5(1), December 2023.
- [Me24] Mei, Jingyi; Coopmans, Tim; Bonsangue, Marcello; Laarman, Alfons: Equivalence Checking of Quantum Circuits by Model Counting. In (Benzmüller, Christoph; Heule, Marijn J.H.; Schmidt, Renate A., eds): *Automated Reasoning*. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, pp. 401–421, 2024.
- [Mi22] Mi, Xiao; Ippoliti, Matteo; Quintana, Chris; Greene, Ami; Chen, Zijun; Gross, Jonathan; Arute, Frank; Arya, Kunal; Atalaya, Juan; Babbush, Ryan; Bardin, Joseph C.; Basso, Joao; Bengtsson, Andreas; Bilmes, Alexander; Bourassa, Alexandre; Brill, Leon; Broughton, Michael; Buckley, Bob B.; Buell, David A.; Burkett, Brian; Bushnell, Nicholas; Chiaro, Benjamin; Collins, Roberto; Courtney, William; Debroy, Dripto; Demura, Sean; Derk, Alan R.; Dunsworth, Andrew; Eppens, Daniel; Erickson, Catherine; Farhi, Edward; Fowler, Austin G.; Foxen, Brooks; Gidney, Craig; Giustina, Marissa; Harrigan, Matthew P.; Harrington, Sean D.; Hilton, Jeremy; Ho, Alan; Hong, Sabrina; Huang, Trent; Huff, Ashley; Huggins, William J.; Ioffe, L. B.; Isakov, Sergei V.; Iveland, Justin; Jeffrey, Evan; Jiang, Zhang; Jones, Cody; Kafri, Dvir; Khattar, Tanuj; Kim, Seon; Kitaev, Alexei; Klimov, Paul V.; Korotkov, Alexander N.; Kostritsa, Fedor; Landhuis, David; Laptev, Pavel; Lee, Joonho; Lee, Kenny; Locharla, Aditya; Lucero, Erik; Martin, Orion; McClean, Jarrod R.; McCourt, Trevor; McEwen, Matt; Miao, Kevin C.; Mohseni, Masoud; Montazeri, Shirin; Mruczkiewicz, Wojciech; Naaman, Ofer; Neeley, Matthew; Neill, Charles; Newman, Michael; Niu, Murphy Yuezhen; O’Brien, Thomas E.; Opremcak, Alex; Ostby, Eric; Pato, Balint; Petukhov, Andre; Rubin, Nicholas C.; Sank, Daniel; Satzinger, Kevin J.; Shvarts, Vladimir; Su, Yuan; Strain, Doug; Szalay, Marco; Trevithick, Matthew D.; Villalonga, Benjamin; White, Theodore; Yao, Z. Jamie; Yeh, Ping; Yoo, Juhwan; Zalcman, Adam; Neven, Hartmut; Boixo, Sergio; Smelyanskiy, Vadim; Megrant, Anthony; Kelly, Julian; Chen, Yu; Sondhi, S. L.; Moessner, Roderich; Kechedzhi, Kostyantyn; Khemani, Vedika; Roushan, Pedram: Time-crystalline eigenstate order on a quantum processor. *Nature*, 601(7894):531–536, 1 2022.
- [Mo22] Morningstar, Alan; Colmenarez, Luis; Khemani, Vedika; Luitz, David J.; Huse, David A.: Avalanches and many-body resonances in many-body localized systems. *Phys. Rev. B*, 105:174205, 5 2022.
- [Ng24] Nguyen, Quynh T.; Schatzki, Louis; Braccia, Paolo; Ragone, Michael; Coles, Patrick J.; Sauvage, Frédéric; Larocca, Martín; Cerezo, M.: Theory for Equivariant Quantum Neural Networks. *PRX Quantum*, 5:020328, 5 2024.
- [Sa24] Sarkar, Aritra: Automated quantum software engineering. *Automated Software Engineering*, 31(1):36, April 2024.
- [Se22] Sels, Dries: Bath-induced delocalization in interacting disordered spin chains. *Phys. Rev. B*, 106:L020202, 7 2022.
- [TDO24] Takagi, Tsubasa; Do, Canh Minh; Ogata, Kazuhiro: Automated Quantum Program Verification in Dynamic Quantum Logic. In (Gierasimczuk, Nina; Velázquez-Quesada, Fernando R., eds): *Dynamic Logic. New Trends and Applications*. Springer Nature Switzerland, Cham, pp. 68–84, 2024.

- [YP21] Yu, Nengkun; Palsberg, Jens: Quantum abstract interpretation. In: Programming Language Design and Implementation. PLDI 2021, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, p. 542–558, 2021.