

Neural Networks with c-NOT Gated Nodes

Fariel Shafee
Department of Physics
Princeton University
Princeton, NJ 08540
*USA.**

We try to design a quantum neural network with qubits in place of classical neurons with deterministic states, and also with quantum operators replacing the classical action potentials. With our choice of gates interconnecting the neural lattice, it appears that the state of the system behaves in ways reflecting both the strength of coupling of between neurons as well as the initial conditions. We find that depending on whether there is a threshold for emission from excited to ground state, the system shows either aperiodic oscillations or coherent ones with periodicity depending on the strength of coupling.

PACS numbers: PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 07.05.Mh, 84.35.+i, 87.18.Sn
Keywords: neural network; quantum computing

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum computing is attracting a lot of attention as it is known now that a quantum computer can perform many tasks faster than a classical computer, because the memory elements can simultaneously hold multiple information and the processor can operate in parallel on many qubits. Quantum entanglement between the elements permits the use of different kinds of algorithms for such quantum computers as well, which too are now being explored.

We [1] have previously worked on classical neural networks with integrate and fire neurons [2], and work is also in progress about a semiclassical version of that work [3]. In these works we have studied the periodicity of dynamical neural networks acted on by the environment and also with nearest neighbor action between the neighboring neurons.

In the present work we want to investigate the design of a fully quantum machine which most closely resembles our previously studied models, so that we can understand some aspects of the differences between a classical and a semiclassical network and a fully quantum one.

Whereas a quantum computer would be useful for calculating quantities, with an input operated on by the processor and producing an output, a quantum neural network may possibly also be used for the purpose of enriched learning of a different variety than the Hebbian learning of classical networks. This possibility has not yet been fully explored, though Altaisky [4] has made some preliminary investigations into a single quantum perceptron. Learning is of course an irreversible process,

and the unitarity of the operators involved in a net does not permit such an irreversible change of the system in the ordinary sense. There have been many attempts [5] to explain such a change with decoherence at the output with reversal of the intermediate processes in a quantum computer. This approach has mostly been suggested for quantum computers. For quantum neural networks usually the transition to a certain eigenstate is inserted in an ad hoc manner, as in Altaiskys work and also in that of Zak et al [6].

In this work we shall not go into the details of the complications of the separation of the quantum processing into a classical output. We shall instead try to mimic as nearly as possible our previous model of an integrate and fire neural network with qubit being interconnected to nearest neighbors by quantum gates.

II. THE QUANTUM NEURAL NETWORK MODEL

In the integrate and fire model a neuron receives a current from the fired neighbors, and when its own potential exceeds the threshold it too fires, feeding its own neighbors. We have studied the effect of the finite duration of the signal from a neuron to the neighbor. In a quantum process all transitions of the neurons must be designated by unitary operators. So in place of the firing of a neuron we have a less spectacular unitary transformation that simply performs a sort of rotation of the state vector or the qubit.

In principle this operation should involve time too, and we should write:

$$|t\rangle = U(t, t_0)|0\rangle \quad (1)$$

to indicate the transformation of a neuron from time

*Electronic address: fshafee@princeton.edu

to time t . For small time changes it is often possible to write:

$$U(t_0 + dt, t_0) = U(t_0, t_0) + idtH \quad (2)$$

So that

$$d|t\rangle = idtH|t\rangle \quad (3)$$

in the lowest order, with a hermitian operator H , usually the Hamiltonian.

Transformations to states with even the opposite parity is possible with properly chosen H , e.g. in field theory, by coupling with a pseudoscalar meson or with a γ^5 factor in a fermion bilinear form.

In quantum computing it has been shown that a complete set of unitary operators exist to express the classical logical operations such as NOT, AND or XOR. These may make use of Hadamard gates, phase change gates or controlled NOT (c-NOT) gates. These gates may be combined to give entanglement between different nodes, e.g. the c-NOT or the Toffoli gate, which is a kind of adder.

It is not necessary for the whole network to be completely entangled by the basic operators of the net to form a useful network. It is known that we can have pair-wise entanglements at the lowest nontrivial level. However, even if we entangle only nearest neighbors, the entanglement may spread throughout the net after successive operations. The process is similar to obtaining a dense matrix from the multiplication of a large number of sparse matrices with nonzero elements at different positions.

We postulate the following physical model:

1. the neurons represent qubits;
2. an excited neuron $[|1\rangle]$ will turn on a neighbor in a ground state $|0\rangle$;
3. an excited state will make an excited neighbor 'fire' and go down to the ground state [induced emission] ;
4. the excited state itself will go down to the ground state after exciting the neighbors;
5. an unexcited neuron does nothing to itself or any neighbor.

Postulates 2, 3 and 5 can be satisfied by a c-NOT gate, with the first neuron serving as the controller, and operating on its neighbor. With a square lattice we consider for simplicity there are four neighbors for each neuron, so that in place of c-NOT gates we shall need $c - NOT^4$ gates, i.e. one controller flipping all four neighbors if it is in state $|1\rangle$ and doing nothing if it is in state $|0\rangle$.

Postulate 4 can be satisfied by using an AND gate connection every neuron with a common $|0\rangle$ state after the $c - NOT^4$ gate.

For any particular neighbor the c-NOT gate can be represented by

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & \sigma_1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (4)$$

where σ_1 is the flipping Pauli matrix. Eq. represents a hermitian operator.

The $.AND.|0\rangle$ can be represented by another hermitian operator in the qubit space:

$$U' = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix} \quad (5)$$

where the sequence of states in the rows and columns are, as usual $|1\rangle|1\rangle$, $|1\rangle|0\rangle$, $|0\rangle|1\rangle$ and $|0\rangle|0\rangle$, the first being the controlling state.

So we get at each node the controlling qubits remain unchanged due to its own action:

$$\begin{pmatrix} c \\ s \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} c \\ s \end{pmatrix} \quad (6)$$

and the following change for the neighbors receiving signal from it, i.e. operated on by the $c - NOT^4$ gates:

$$\begin{pmatrix} c' \\ s' \end{pmatrix} \rightarrow \begin{pmatrix} c' \\ s' \end{pmatrix} + \epsilon \begin{pmatrix} -s'.c \\ c'.c \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

Since the small ϵ approximation of the unitary operators are not themselves unitary, in simulation it is necessary to renormalize each qubit at each step.

III. RESULTS OF SIMULATION

As in the classical cases in previous works, for ease of comparison we constructed a 40X40 network of qubits with periodic boundary conditions. so that it behaves in some ways as a much larger lattice. In the quantum case of course in reality a large lattice would very difficult to realize in the laboratory at the present stage of technology, but for such a theoretical study it makes no difference.

We put the input data on qubits in the periphery and made the inside neurons either all random or all zero $[(0,1)]$. Then we updated the qubits according to Eq.6 and 7.

A large number (40,000) of time steps were chosen and various ϵ values. This parameter may be interpreted as the strength of coupling of the neurons, but as it occurs together with dt , it may also indicate the width of the pulse at each time step.

In our first model we did not use a threshold for the firing of the neurons, so that each neuron was allowed to go up to its full qubit value of (1,0) with $c = +1$ or -1 . It is interesting to observe that in this case there is no well-defined periodicity, either for any single neuron or for the average neuron (i.e. the sum) in the network (Fig. 1,2). Though all neurons do indeed go through the (1,0) to (0,1) cycles, the oscillations are aperiodic. This may be because the exact equation of motion coupling the nearest neighbor neurons becomes insoluble in terms of periodic functions.




FIG. 1: Oscillations of the c part of a qubit for a non-cutoff model with $\epsilon = .01$. There is no fixed periodicity.




FIG. 2: Correlation between two qubits for no threshold case with $\epsilon = 0.01$, $\langle 10, 10 | 20, 21 \rangle$, where the qubits are located by their (x, y) coordinates.

We also experimented with a slightly different version of the model of the network more akin to the classical one. Here we introduced a threshold for the excited part of the neuron, which when crossed, causes the qubit to jump to the ground state $(0, 1)$, i.e. if $c > c_{thres}$, any (c, s) makes a transition to the $(0, 1)$ state. This may be considered to be due to emission of energy by an excited element on reaching a threshold. So, in this case the $.AND.|0\rangle$ operation works on reaching the threshold.

We found more interesting results with this model. In this case we get periodic oscillations of the system, with all neurons almost in the same phase. We put the threshold at 0.7 which is just below $1/\sqrt{2}$, because this seems to be critical threshold that gives regular oscillations.

We believe this happens because here the cut-off effectively serves to truncate the complicated coupled behavior of the system, reducing it to a simpler periodic system, just as the truncation of a transcendental function by a polynomial with a finite number of terms provides it with a simpler behavior. For example, the function:

$$F(t) = \cos(\theta + \epsilon \sin \theta) \quad (8)$$

with $\theta = \omega t$ assumes the periodic form

$$F(t) = \cos[(1 + \epsilon)\omega t] \quad (9)$$

For small ϵ only, but has a more complicated behavior at large ϵ . Obviously this requires more thorough and careful study.

We note that these oscillations are seen in the behavior of a single neuron (Fig. 3), or the sum of all neurons of the system, or even in the correlation $\langle i|j \rangle$ between neuron $|i\rangle$ and neuron $|j\rangle$ (Fig. 4).




FIG. 3: Oscillation of the c parts summed of all qubits in the network for $threshold = 0.7$, $\epsilon = 0.01$. All boundaries excited initially.




FIG. 4: Correlation $\langle 10, 10 | 20, 21 \rangle$ for the above case.

Most interestingly, it appears that for large ϵ (> 0.7), if we put the initial signal only at two parallel sides of the square, there is no oscillation (Fig. 5), but a static asymptotic state, which is quickly reached, but if we put the signal on all four sides, then periodic oscillations continue with changed frequency.




FIG. 5: c of a single neuron for $\epsilon = 0.8$, only x sides excited initially. There are no oscillations asymptotically (we have plotted only after 39500 time steps).

It is possible that the lack of signal in the orthogonal direction allows the neurons in the net the extra freedom to adjust themselves to fixed static states in the direction of the signal. This is reminiscent of the one-dimensional Ising model having a trivial phase transition. When signals arrive from both x and y -directions, presumably the attractor for the system becomes dynamic, as it tries to adjust in both directions, but cannot find a static equilibrium state.

IV. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that a quantum neural network somewhat similar to the integrate and fire neuron network can be constructed with quantum elements, consisting of qubit nodes connected by c-NOT and AND gates.

We have found that with no threshold the system converges to a dynamic state with no fixed period and no phase locking, somewhat like a chaotic system, but with a kind of average behavior which is not entirely chaotic.

With a threshold stated that takes an excited qubit to the zero state, we see dynamic oscillations of the system. The period is almost inversely proportional to the

coupling strength (Fig. 6), but shows nonlinearity for strong coupling. For quite strong coupling, if there are initial excitations only in one direction, the system seems to converge rapidly to a static attractor, but with excitations from both directions of the square lattice, dynamic oscillations continue.

In the case of fixed period oscillations, the correlation between neurons as measured by the overlap of the two qubits, $\langle i|j \rangle$ also shows some periodic time dependence.

Hence this simple model of a quantum neural network with c-NOT gates can hold dynamic memories of the input.

Obviously with complex phases in the coupling the pattern generated may be more interesting; also if there is a




FIG. 6: Variation of periodicity with ϵ for excitations from all sides.

dynamic external agent affecting the peripheral neurons, and not just an initial input. We can also introduce delay lines between the neurons to introduce a time scale. These are now being studied.

Acknowledgments

The author is grateful to Princeton University for financial support.

-
- [1] F. Shafee F. (submitted for publication) available at arxiv.org, cond-mat/011115 (2001)
 - [2] J.J. Hopfield and A.V.M. Herz, Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci. 92, 6655 (1995)
 - [3] F. Shafee, in preparation (2001)

- [4] M.V. Altaisky, quant-ph/0107012 (2001)
- [5] A. Eckert et al, University of Oxford preprint(2000) and other reviews at arxiv.org
- [6] M. Zak et al, JPL-Caltech preprint 97-1153(1997)