

Quantum Implementation of Parrondo Paradox

Piotr Gawron*

The Institute of Theoretical and Applied Informatics of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Baltycka 5, 44-100 Gliwice, Poland

Jarosław A. Miszczak

Institute of Physics, University of Silesia, Uniwersytecka 4, 40-007 Katowice, Poland and

The Institute of Theoretical and Applied Informatics of the Polish Academy of Sciences, Baltycka 5, 44-100 Gliwice, Poland

We propose quantum implementation of Parrondo paradox which uses $O(\log_2(n))$ qubits, where n is the number of Parrondo games. We present its implementation in Quantum Computer Language and simulation results.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum game theory[1, 2] is a new field of science having its roots in both game theory and quantum information theory[1, 2]. For about a decade quantum computer scientists have been searching for new methods of quantum algorithms designing. Thorough investigation of different quantum games may bring new insight into development of quantum algorithms.

It was shown that Grover's algorithm [3] can be treated as an example of quantum Parrondo paradox [4]. Operators used in Grover's algorithm can be treated as Parrondo games having separately zero expected value, but if they are intertwined expected value fluctuates. This effect is well known in Grover's algorithm.

Implementation of quantum Parrondo paradox has been described in papers [5–8]. In this paper we present a new implementation scheme of Parrondo paradox on relatively small number of qubits.

II. PARRONDO'S PARADOX

A. Classical version

Parrondo paradox consists of a sequence of games where each game can be interpreted as a toss of asymmetrical coin. Every success means that player gains one \$, every lost means that player loses one \$. There are two games. Game \mathbb{A} has probability of winning $1/2 - \epsilon$. Game \mathbb{B} depends on amount of capital accumulated by player. If his capital is a multiple of 3 player tosses coin B_1 , which has probability of winning $1/10 - \epsilon$, in the opposite case player tosses coin which has probability of winning $3/4 - \epsilon$. Originally $\epsilon = 0.005$, but generally it can be any small real number.

Both games \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} are biased and negative expected gain. But when player has possibility to choose which game he wants to play at each step of the sequence, he can choose such combination of games which permits him to obtain positive expected gain.

It is known, that sequences $(\mathbb{A}\mathbb{B}\mathbb{B}\mathbb{A}\mathbb{B})+$ or $(\mathbb{A}\mathbb{A}\mathbb{B}\mathbb{B})+$ give relatively high expected gain. This fact is known as Parrondo paradox.

III. PROPOSED QUANTUM IMPLEMENTATION

A. Overview

In [5, 8] quantum version of Parrondo games was proposed. The disadvantage of this scheme consists in large number of qubits required to store history of games.

The implementation of quantum Parrondo paradox introduced in this paper uses only few qubits even for relatively large number of games played, e.g. for 400 steps of strategy consisted of 3 elementary games it needs only 15 qubits.

* corresponding author: gawron@iitis.gliwice.pl

B. The implementation

1. Gates

To implement games \mathbb{A} and \mathbb{B} three arbitrary chosen one-qubit quantum gates A, B_1, B_2 are used. Each gate is described by 4 real parameters. Our scheme is described by set of parameters:

- $\{\delta_A, \alpha_A, \beta_A, \theta_A, \delta_{B_1}, \alpha_{B_1}, \beta_{B_1}, \theta_{B_1}, \delta_{B_2}, \alpha_{B_2}, \beta_{B_2}, \theta_{B_2}\}$ – real numbers describing gates A, B_1, B_2 ;
- \mathbb{S} – strategy: any sequence of games \mathbb{A}, \mathbb{B} ;
- n – size of $|\mathbb{S}\rangle$ – outcome register (see below);
- *offset* – initial capital offset.

Each gate is composed of elementary gates as presented in Eq. 1.

$$G(\delta_G, \alpha_G, \theta_G, \beta_G) = R_z(\beta_G)R_y(\theta_G)R_z(\alpha_G)Ph(\delta_G), \quad (1)$$

where $G \in \{A, B_1, B_2\}$ and

$$Ph(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\xi} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\xi} \end{pmatrix}, R_y(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\frac{\xi}{2}) & -\sin(\frac{\xi}{2}) \\ \sin(\frac{\xi}{2}) & \cos(\frac{\xi}{2}) \end{pmatrix}, R_z(\xi) = \begin{pmatrix} e^{-i(\frac{\xi}{2})} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i(\frac{\xi}{2})} \end{pmatrix}.$$

2. Registers

The quantum register used to perform this scheme consists of three subregisters:

- $|c\rangle$ – one-qubit register representing the coin,
- $|\mathbb{S}\rangle$ – n -qubit register storing players capital,
- $|o\rangle$ – 3-qubit auxiliary register.

3. Games

Raising and lowering of players capital is implemented by conditional incrementation gate – see Fig. 1(b). This gate increments register $|\mathbb{S}\rangle$ if $|c\rangle$ is in state $|1\rangle$ and decrements if it is in state $|0\rangle$. Game \mathbb{A} is directly implemented by gate A as presented in Fig. 1(a).

Game \mathbb{B} presented in Fig. 1(c), is a bit more complicated. It uses add_{mod3} gate which sets $|o_1\rangle$ and $|o_2\rangle$ registers to state $|1\rangle$ iff $|\mathbb{S}\rangle$ register contains a number being multiple of 3. In such case gate B_2 is applied to register $|c\rangle$ in opposite case B_1 is applied.

4. Sequence of games

Game procedure is composed of subsequent steps:

1. Preparation of $|c\rangle$ in state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$.
2. Preparation of $|\mathbb{S}\rangle$ in state $|(2^{(n-1)} + offset)\rangle$, where *offset* is small integer number,
3. Preparation of $|o_1 o_2 o_3\rangle$ in $|000\rangle$ state.
4. Application of A and B gates in some chosen order \mathbb{S} .

After each application of gate A or B the number stored in register $|\mathbb{S}\rangle$ is incremented or decremented. The initial state of register $|\mathbb{S}\rangle$ must be chosen in such way that integer overflow is avoided. Maximum number of elementary games cannot exceed capacity of register $|\mathbb{S}\rangle$.

5. Outcome of games

If our scheme would be implemented on physical quantum device it should be finalized by measurement. This would give single outcome representing final capital. Thus to obtain expected gain experiment should be repeated several times.

Simulation allows to observe state vector of quantum system. Using this property expected gain is calculated as average value of σ_z in state $|\mathbb{S}\rangle\langle\mathbb{S}| = Tr_{|c\rangle \otimes |o\rangle}$ obtained after tracing out the register with respect to coin and auxiliary subregisters:

$$\langle\mathbb{S}\rangle = Tr(\sigma_z |\mathbb{S}\rangle\langle\mathbb{S}|). \quad (2)$$




FIG. 1: Gates used to implement Parrondo paradox

IV. SIMULATION

Simulations of quantum Parrondo paradox presented in this article were performed using QCL language [9]. Source code of this implementation is attached in A.

A. Parameters

To carry out simulation gates A , B_1 and B_2 were prepared with coefficients listed in Table IV A. Those coefficients were chosen arbitrary.

δ_A	α_A	β_A	θ_A
0	1	0	$2(\frac{\pi}{2} + 0.01)$
δ_{B_1}	α_{B_1}	β_{B_1}	θ_{B_1}
0	1	0	$2(\frac{\pi}{10} + 0.01)$
δ_{B_2}	α_{B_2}	β_{B_2}	θ_{B_2}
0	1	0	$2(\frac{3\pi}{4} + 0.01)$

TABLE I: Coefficients of the experiment

B. Results of simulation

In Fig. 2 selection of results is presented. As one can see there are strategies that give positive expected value. For $offset = 0$ strategy $\mathbb{B}\mathbb{A}$ after 400 steps gives gain of 18.29. For $offset = 1$ strategy $\mathbb{A}\mathbb{B}$ after 400 steps gives gain of 18.72 and $\mathbb{A}\mathbb{B}\mathbb{B}$ gives 27.08.

Simulations have shown that finding winning strategy for given initial set of parameters is not trivial because they are not common. We found that parity of initial value kept in $|\$ \rangle$ register heavily influences the outcome, see Fig. 2.

As an example of result probability distributions at step 400 for strategies $\mathbb{A}\mathbb{B}$ and $\mathbb{B}\mathbb{A}$ with $offset = 1$ are shown in Fig. 3.



(a) Comparison of strategies for $offset = 0$ (b) Comparison of strategies for $offset = 1$

FIG. 2: Initial offset heavily influences the expected gain. One can see that strategies AB and ABB are winning for $offset = 1$ and losing for $offset = 0$ and BA is winning for $offset = 0$ and losing for $offset = 1$.

V. CONCLUSIONS

We have shown that it is possible to create scheme for quantum Parrondo paradox using less than 20 qubits. The main advantage of this scheme is that size of register grows as $O(\log_2(n))$, where n is the number of steps. We have found that parity of $|\$ \rangle$ initial value is important for selection of strategy. Simulation shown that for analysed set of strategies composed of 2, 3 or 4 elementary games winning strategies are very uncommon.




FIG. 3: Comparison of probability distribution of payoff at step 400 for strategies $\mathbb{A}\mathbb{B}$ and $\mathbb{B}\mathbb{A}$ in case of *offset* = 1. Initial value for payoff was $2^{11} + 1 = 2049$ and y-axis is in logarithmic scale.

APPENDIX A: SOURCE CODE

1. parrondo_operators.qcl

Implementation of operators used in simulation.

```
set library 1;
operator Ph(real alpha, qureg r) {
    Matrix2x2(E^(I*alpha),0,0,E^(I*alpha),r);
}
operator CID(qureg p, quconst c) { // if c==0 p-- else p++
    if (c==1) {
        inc(p);
    }
    else {
        !inc(p);
    }
}
operator Ai(real de, real al, real th, real be, qureg c) { // c - coin
    Ph(de,c);
    RotZ(al,c);
    RotY(th,c);
    RotZ(be,c);
}

operator A(qureg p, qureg c) {
    //p - payoff, c - coin
    Ai(Ade,Aal,Ath,Abe,c);
    CID(p,c);
    !Ai(Ade,Aal,Ath,Abe,c);
}
```

```

const offset=3;
operator Bi(real de, real al, real th, real be, qureg c, quconst o) {
//c - coin, o==1 <==> payoff|3

//
AXBXC

decomposition

see
  [10]
  Ph(de,c);
  //A
  RotZ(al,c);
  RotY(th/2.0,c);
  CNot(c,o);
  //B
  RotY(-th/2.0,c);
  RotZ(-(al+be)/2.0,c);
  CNot(c,o);
  //C
  RotZ((be-al)/2.0,c);
}

operator B(qureg p, qureg c, quvoid s, quvoid o)//p - payoff, c - coin
{
  muln(1, 3, p, s);
  CNot(o,s);
  Bi(B1de,B1al,B1th,B1be,c,o); //B1
  Not(o);
  Bi(B2de,B2al,B2th,B2be,c,o); //B2

  CID(p,c);

  !Bi(B2de,B2al,B2th,B2be,c,o); //!B2
  Not(o);
  !Bi(B1de,B1al,B1th,B1be,c,o); //!B1
  CNot(o,s);
  !muln(1, 3, p, s);
}
set library 0;

```

2. data.qcl

Example of a file containing simulation coefficients.

```

const epsilon = -0.01*pi;
const Ade = 0; //V
const Aal = 0; //RotZ
const Ath = 2*(pi/2-epsilon); //RotY
const Abe = 0; //RotZ
const B1de =0;
const B1al =0;
const B1th =2*(pi/10-epsilon);
const B1be =0;
const B2de =0;
const B2al =0;
const B2th =2*(3*pi/4-epsilon);
const B2be =0;

```

```
const regsize=12;
const steps=400;
```

3. strategy.qcl

This is an example of strategy operator. In this case strategy is $\mathbb{B}AAB$.

```
<<parrondo_operators ;
procedure strategy(qureg p, qureg c, qureg s, qureg o)
{
  B(p,c,s,o);
  A(p,c);
  A(p,c);
  B(p,c,s,o);
}
```

4. parrondo.qcl

Main program.

```
<<modarith;
<<examples;
<<data;
<<strategy;

qureg c[1]; // coin
H(c);
qureg p[regsize]; // payoff
qureg s[2]; // s <- p mod 3
qureg o[1]; // o==1 <=> p|3

set(2^(regsize-1)+offset,p);
int i;
int cc;
real rnd;

for i=1 to steps {
  strategy(p, c, s, o);
  print "i=",i;
  dump p;
}
```

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

This paper has been supported by the **Polish Ministry of Scientific Research and Information Technology** under the (solicited) grant No **PBZ-MIN-008/P03/2003**.

-
- [1] E. W. Piotrowski and J. Ślaskowski. An invitation to quantum game theory. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 42(5):1089–1099, May 2003.
 - [2] E. W. Piotrowski and J. Ślaskowski. The next stage: quantum game theory. In *Mathematical Physics Research at the Cutting Edge*. Nova Science Publishers, Inc., 2004. quant-ph/0308027.
 - [3] L. Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proc. 28th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computation*, pages 212–219, New York, NY, 1996. ACM Press, New York.
 - [4] C. F. Lee and N. Johnson. Parrondo games and quantum algorithms. quant-ph/0203043, 2002.
 - [5] A. P. Flitney, J. Ng, and D. Abbott. Quantum Parrondo’s games. *Physica A*, 314:35–42, 2002.

- [6] G. P. Harmer, D. Abbott, and P. G. Taylor. The paradox of Parrondo's games. *Proc. Royal Society London A*, 456(1994):247–259, 2000.
- [7] J. M. R. Parrondo, G. P. Harmer, and D. Abbott. New paradoxical games based on Brownian ratchets. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 85(24), 2000.
- [8] D. Meyer and H. Blumer. Parrondo games as lattice gas automata. *Journal of Statistical Physics*, 107(1-2):225–239, 2002.
- [9] Bernhard Ömer. Quantum programming in QCL. Master's thesis, TU Vienna, 2000.
- [10] Adriano Barenco, Charles H. Bennet, Richard Cleve, David P. DiVincenzo, Norman Margolus, Peter Shor, Tycho Sleator, John Smolin, and Harald Weinfurter. Elementary gates for quantum computation. *Phys. Rev. A*, 52:3457, 1995.