

Problem 1: Working with the 3-qubit bit flip code

In this problem, we will study how to work with the 3-qubit bit flip code, i.e., how to explicitly perform the error correction, and also look at how to implement some gates without decoding the information.

1. Consider a qubit encoded with the 3-qubit code. Find a circuit which measures the error syndrome (i.e. which of the three qubits, if any, differs from the others), consisting of elementary gates and single-qubit measurements in the computational basis, and possibly using ancillas in the $|0\rangle$ state. (You should only need CNOT gates.) For each measurement outcome, give the correction operation.
2. Show that instead of measuring the ancillas, we can also perform quantum gates for the correction, and then discard (trace out) the ancillas, without the need for a measurement. Can this also be done only with CNOTs and simple single-qubit gates (Hadamard, Pauli)?
3. Show that the Pauli operators on the encoded (logical) qubit can be implemented by acting with single-qubit gates on the physical qubits, without decoding the code. (Again, single-qubit Paulis should suffice.)
4. Now consider two qubits, each encoded with a 3-qubit code. What happens when we apply CNOT gates between all three pairs of physical qubit (i.e. between qubit 1 of the 1st qubit and qubit 1 of the 2nd qubit, etc.)? (Logical gates which can be implemented in this way are called *transversal gates*; note that the same property also holds for the Paulis above.)

Problem 2: Grover’s algorithm with multiple marked elements.

Consider the Grover search problem of finding x_0 such that $f(x_0) = 1$ for a given function $f : \{0, N-1\} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. In the lecture, we derived Grover’s algorithm which finds x_0 given that it is unique. In this problem, we will derive a generalization of Grover’s algorithm which allows to tackle the search problem in the case where there are $K > 1$ solutions x to the equation $f(x) = 1$. The goal is to find one x with $f(x) = 1$ with high probability.

The oracle is constructed the same way as before, i.e., it acts as

$$O_f = \mathbb{I} - 2 \sum_{x:f(x)=1} |x\rangle\langle x| .$$

The algorithm proceeds the same way as before, namely, by starting in the state $|\omega\rangle$ (given in the lecture), repeatedly applying Grover iterations $G = -O_\omega O_f$ (with O_ω as in the lecture), and finally measuring in the computational basis.

1. Show that O_f can be obtained from $U_f : |x\rangle|y\rangle \mapsto |x\rangle|y \oplus f(x)\rangle$.
2. Show that the Grover iteration G leaves the space $\mathcal{S} = \text{span}(|\omega\rangle, |x_0\rangle)$ invariant, where $|\omega\rangle$ is as in the lecture, and

$$|x_0\rangle \propto \sum_{x:f(x)=1} |x\rangle .$$

3. What is the action of G on a state in \mathcal{S} ?
4. For a given number of solutions K , how many times do we have to apply G to get a good overlap with $|x_0\rangle$? What result will we get when measuring in the computational basis?
5. Compare this to the scaling of the classical algorithm (i.e. trying random x until a solution is found).

Problem 3: Quantum counting.

Consider the same setting and notation as in Problem 2 on this sheet. Here, we will use a combination of Grover iterations G and phase estimation (Problem 1 on Sheet #9) to estimate (“count”) the number K of solutions up to some error δK . Our goal will be to understand how the accuracy δK scales with the number Q of queries to f (or U_f).

1. First, determine the scaling δK for classical counting: Since we assume that f is a black-box function, the best we can classically do is to sample Q random values x_i , $i = 1, \dots, Q$, compute $f(x_i)$, and use this to estimate K . What is the error δK as a function of Q (and K , N)?
2. We will now construct a quantum algorithm for estimating K . First, determine the eigenvalues $e^{i\theta_k}$, $k = 1, 2$, of G restricted to the subspace \mathcal{S} . (This is most easily done by observing that G is a rotation by an angle 2ϕ with $\sin \phi = \sqrt{K/N}$ – cf. Problem 2 – in this two-dimensional space.)
3. Now assume we are given one of the corresponding eigenvectors $|\theta_k\rangle$. We can now use the phase estimation algorithm to determine the phase $\theta_k/2\pi$ corresponding this eigenvector up to some number d of digits. What is the number of queries to O_f required for that? What is the resulting accuracy of θ_k ? (You can assume that the phase estimation is exact, i.e. neglect the additional error arising from the fact that $\theta_k/2\pi$ does not stop after d digits.)
4. From θ_k , we can estimate K . What is the error δK as a function of Q (and K , N)?
5. Show that this algorithm can be adapted to work also if we cannot prepare the state $|\theta_k\rangle$, but rather start in some other easy-to-prepare state in the subspace \mathcal{S} .