## Quantum Computing: Exercise Sheet 3

Steven Herbert and Anuj Dawar

- 1. Express controlled- $R_n$  and controlled- $R_n^{\dagger}$ , as defined in lecture 9, in matrix form and show that the latter is indeed the inverse of the former.
- 2. (a) What is the state after the controlled-unitary stage of the QPE algorithm estimating the phase of unitary  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$ , with three qubits in the first register, and the second register initialised in the state  $|0\rangle = \begin{bmatrix} 1 \\ 0 \end{bmatrix}$ ?

(b) What will the measurement outcomes be after the inverse QFT stage of the QPE algorithm?

- 3. Show that permutation matrices are unitary.
- 4. This question concerns using Shor's algorithm to factor the number 21.

(a) Step through Shor's algorithm on Slide 8 of lecture 10 with N = 21. Verify that 21 is neither even nor a prime power, and then use x = 10 for step 3 – find the order of 10 mod 21 and use this to factor 21.

(b) Say we were to run Shor's algorithm in full with x = 10, and were to measure the phase corresponding to the eigenvector  $u_1$  (as defined on Slide 14), express this eigenvector (in full, not as abbreviated by a sum) and its eigenvalue.

- 5. What would happen if we could only approximately prepare the state  $|1\rangle$  as the input to the second register in Shor's algorithm?
- 6. (a) Show that, as claimed in lecture 11:

$$e^{-i(\mathrm{H}_1+\mathrm{H}_2)\Delta t} = e^{-i\mathrm{H}_1\Delta t}e^{-i\mathrm{H}_2\Delta t} + \mathcal{O}(\Delta t^2)$$

(b) Show that we can obtain a more accurate simulation if, to estimate  $e^{-i(H_1+H_2)\Delta t}$ , we instead use:

$$e^{-i\mathrm{H}_1\Delta t/2}e^{-i\mathrm{H}_2\Delta t}e^{-i\mathrm{H}_1\Delta t/2}$$

- 7. If we are performing quantum chemistry on a *n*-qubit Hamiltonian, and we prepare the input to the second register as a uniform superposition of all eigenvectors, what is the probability that QPE gives us the ground-state phase?
- 8. The matrices defining probabilistic automata, as defined on Slide 7 of lecture 12, have the property that the entries in each column add up to 1. Prove that this property is preserved under matrix multiplication.
- 9. (a) What is the language accepted by the quantum automaton described on Slide 8 of lecture 12?

(b) Prove that there is no two-state probabilistic automaton with this behaviour.

(c) Describe a probabilistic automaton (with more than two states) that exhibits this behaviour.

10. Consider a quantum finite automaton with two basis states,  $|0\rangle$  being the start state and  $|1\rangle$  the only accepting state. The automaton operates on a two letter alphabet, with matrices:

$$M_a = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1\\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \quad ; \quad M_b = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0\\ 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}$$

Give a complete description of the probabilities of acceptance associated with various possible input strings.

- 11. Suppose M is a quantum Turing machine that accepts a language L in the bounded probability sense: for each string  $w \in L$ , there is a probability  $> \frac{2}{3}$  that M is observed in an accepting state after reading w and for each string  $w \notin L$ , there is a probability  $< \frac{1}{3}$  that M is observed in an accepting state after reading w. We define a new machine  $M_0$  that, on input w makes three independent runs of M on input w and decides acceptance by majority. What is the probability that  $M_0$  accepts  $w \in L$ ? What about  $w \notin L$ ?
- 12. (**Optional**) It can be proven that entanglement is necessary for exponential speed-ups. Give a sketch of a proof of this, by showing that an initial product state, which undergoes a circuit consisting of gates which always output a product state when a product state is input, can be simulated on a classical computer with only a polynomial overhead in the number of computations.