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Abstract. We define a formal framework for equivalence checking of sequential quantum circuits. The model we adopt is a quantum state machine, which is a natural quantum generalisation of Mealy machines. A major difficulty in checking quantum circuits (but not present in checking classical circuits) is that the state spaces of quantum circuits are continuaums. This difficulty is resolved by our main theorem showing that equivalence checking of two quantum Mealy machines can be done with input sequences that are taken from some chosen basis (which are finite) and have a length quadratic in the dimensions of the state Hilbert spaces of the machines. Based on this theoretical result, we develop an (and to the best of our knowledge, the first) algorithm for checking equivalence of sequential quantum circuits, of which the complexity is comparable with that of the known algorithms for checking classical sequential circuits. Several case studies and experiments are presented.
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1 Introduction

Hardware verification is emerging as an important issue in quantum computing with the recent rapid progress in quantum hardware implemented by industries like IBM, Google and Intel. A series of testing and verification techniques have already been developed for quantum circuits in the last fifteen years (see for example [1] [8] [17] [35] [33] [41] [48]). More generally, Design Automation technology has been gradually introduced into quantum computing in the last few years (see for example [36] [43] [42]).

Equivalence checking is arguably the most important formal verification technique being employed in the design flows of classical computing hardware. Equivalence checking of quantum circuits was first studied in [45] based on a quantum variant of BDDs (Binary Decision Diagrams), called QuIDD (Quantum Information Decision Diagram). The notion of miter circuit was generalised
in [49] to reversible miter so that various simplification techniques of quantum circuits can be used in equivalence checking. In [23], a method for checking equivalence of multiple-valued quantum circuits was introduced by extending data structure XQDD (X-decomposition Quantum Decision Diagram) defined in [47]. In a series of papers [30] [11] [12], a scheme for checking equivalence of quantum circuits has been systematically developed using data structure QMDD (Quantum Multiple-Valued Decision Diagram) [26] [31]. Another way for checking equivalence of quantum circuits was proposed in [3] employing (a finite variant of) Feynman path integral.

As is well-known, digital logic circuits are divided into two categories: combinational circuits and sequential circuits. The output value of a combinational circuit is a function of only the current input value, and the output value of a sequential circuit depends on not only the external input value but also the stored internal information. Almost all practical digital devices contain (classical) sequential circuits. Recently, sequential circuit models started to play an essential role in quantum computing; for example, sequential quantum circuits are employed in the RUS (Repeat-Until-Success) scheme [32] for efficient implementation of quantum logic gates.

Example 1. $V_3 = (I + 2iZ)/\sqrt{5}$ is one of the six gates in the efficiently universal single-qubit gate set [16]. The RUS implementation of $V_3$ given in [32] is a sequential quantum circuit visualised in Figure 1 (the quantum gates used there will be explained in Section 2). At each step, it is supposed to implement $V_3$ with probability $5/8$ and identity with probability $3/8$. The circuit has two variables $q$ and $p$. The outcome of the measurement on $q$ is the output variable, indicating whether $V_3$ is successful implemented at the current step. Variable $p$ is used to store internal information. In particular, this sequential circuit was physically implemented on superconducting qubits [37].

**Contributions of This Paper:** The existing research on equivalence checking of quantum circuits focuses on their combinational logic. In this paper, we define a formal framework for equivalence checking of sequential quantum circuits, where a natural quantum generalisation of Mealy machines is adopted to model sequential quantum circuits. Then the notion of equivalence of sequential
Quantum circuits can be formally defined in terms of the equivalence of quantum Mealy machines.

A major difference between quantum circuits and classical circuits is that the state spaces of quantum circuits are continuums, and in contrast the state spaces of classical circuits are finite. In the case of combinational logic, it has been observed in the previous work mentioned above that equivalence checking of quantum circuits can be done with input sequences taken from some given basis (which are finite). To extend this idea to the case of sequential quantum logic, two additional dimensions of difficulty must be overcome:

- The dependence of the output of a sequential circuit on both the external input and the internal state complicates the procedure of reducing the equivalence checking to a specific basis of the state space;
- The quantum measurements in sequential circuits are essential when checking their equivalence; whereas the measurements in combinational circuits can always be pushed to the end and thus ignored in equivalence checking.

By circumventing these difficulties, we prove that equivalence checking of two quantum Mealy machines can be done with input sequences which are taken from a given basis and have a length quadratic in the dimensions of the state Hilbert spaces of the machines. Based on it, we develop an algorithm for checking equivalence of sequential quantum circuits. The complexity of our algorithm is comparable with that of the known algorithms for equivalence checking of classical sequential circuits.

To illustrate the effectiveness of our model and algorithm, we present several case studies and experiments, including testing of sequential quantum circuits in the above example and (i) quantum random walks, a tool widely used in quantum algorithm design (e.g. search and simulation); (ii) controlled quantum circuits (e.g. Toffoli gate); (iii) a circuit for testing quantum Fourier transforms; and (iv) quantum half adder. Although our examples only use several simple quantum gates, namely the Hadamard gate, CNOT gate, Toffoli gate and one-qubit rotations, the main results of this paper are not limited to these specific gates and can be applied to an arbitrarily given set of quantum gates.

**Organisation of the Paper:** For convenience of the reader, we briefly recall basics of combinational quantum circuits in Section 2. A formal description of sequential quantum circuits is given in Section 3. The notion of quantum Mealy machine is introduced in Section 4 as an abstract model of sequential quantum circuits. An algorithm for equivalence checking of quantum Mealy machines is developed in Section 5. The experiments of executing the algorithm on the examples mentioned are briefly discussed in Section 6. A brief conclusion is drawn in Section 7. *(For the limited space, the detailed case studies and the omitted parts of the proofs of our theorems are postponed into the Appendices.)*

## 2 Combinational Quantum Circuits

In this section, we briefly review the basics of combinational quantum circuits; for more details, we refer to [29].
2.1 Qubits

The basic unit of quantum information is called a quantum bit or qubit. For each qubit $q$, we write $\mathcal{H}_q$ for its state Hilbert space, which is two-dimensional. Using the Dirac notation, a (pure) state of $q$ is represented by $|\psi\rangle = \alpha_0|0\rangle + \alpha_1|1\rangle$ with complex numbers $\alpha_0$ and $\alpha_1$ satisfying the normalisation condition $|\alpha_0|^2 + |\alpha_1|^2 = 1$; for example, $q$ can be in not only the basis states $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ but also a superposition of them like: $|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle)$, $|–\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)$.

A sequence $\mathbf{q} = q_1, ..., q_n$ of distinct qubit variables is called a quantum register. Its state Hilbert space is the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_\mathbf{q} = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n} \mathcal{H}_{q_i}$, which is $2^n$-dimensional. To explicitly describe a state of quantum register $\mathbf{q}$, let an integer $0 \leq x < 2^n$ be represented by a string $x_1...x_n \in \{0, 1\}^n$ of $n$ bits: $x = \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \cdot 2^{n-i}$. We shall not distinguish integer $x$ from its binary representation. Thus, each (pure) state in $\mathcal{H}_{\mathbf{q}}$ can be written as: $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} \alpha_x |x\rangle$, where $\{|x\rangle\}$ is the computational basis, and complex numbers $\alpha_x$ satisfy the normalisation condition $\sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} |\alpha_x|^2 = 1$. This state can also be represented by the $2^n$-dimensional column vector $|\psi\rangle = (\alpha_0, ..., \alpha_{2^n-1})^T$, where $T$ stands for transpose. We write $\langle \psi | = (\alpha_0^*, ..., \alpha_{2^n-1}^*)$ to denote the conjugate transpose of $|\psi\rangle$, and $\langle \psi | \phi \rangle$ to denote the inner product of $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\phi\rangle$. For example, two qubits $q_1, q_2$ can be in an entangled state like the EPR (Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen) pair: $|\beta\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$.

2.2 Unitary Transformations

A transformation of a quantum register $\mathbf{q} = q_1, ..., q_n$ is modelled by a $2^n \times 2^n$ unitary matrix $U = (u_{ij})$ satisfying $U^\dagger U = I$, where $U^\dagger$ stands for the conjugate transpose of $U$ and $I$ the unit matrix. Thus, state $|\psi\rangle$ is transformed by $U$ to a new state represented by column vector $|\psi'\rangle = U|\psi\rangle$ (matrix multiplication), i.e. $|\psi'\rangle = (\alpha'_0, ..., \alpha'_{2^n-1})^T$ where $\alpha'_i = \sum_{j=0}^{2^n-1} u_{ij}\alpha_j$ for each $i = 0, ..., 2^n - 1$.

Example 2. Some unitary transformations used in quantum computing:

- Single-qubit transformations:
  
  Hadamard matrix $H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$; $\pi/8$ gate $T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/4} \end{pmatrix}$;
  
  Pauli matrices $I = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \end{pmatrix}$, $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $Y = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{pmatrix}$, $Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$.

  For instance, $H$ transforms the basis states $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ to $|+\rangle, |–\rangle$, respectively; that is, $H|0\rangle = |+\rangle$ and $H|1\rangle = |–\rangle$. Similarly, $Y|1\rangle = -i|0\rangle$, $Z|1\rangle = -|1\rangle$.

- The $4 \times 4$ matrix $CNOT = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & X \end{pmatrix}$ represents a unitary transformation of two qubits, called the controlled NOT. It can generate entanglement; for example, it transforms separable state $|+\rangle|0\rangle$ to the EPR pair $|\beta\rangle$. 
2.3 Quantum Measurements

According to a basic postulate of quantum mechanics, a way of reading out data from a quantum system is a quantum measurement. In quantum circuits, we mainly use the measurements in the computational basis. Let $\overline{q} = q_1, ..., q_n$ be a quantum register. It is divided into two segments $\overline{p} = q_1, ..., q_m$ ($m \leq n$) and $\overline{r} = q_{m+1}, ..., q_n$. If $\overline{q}$ is in state $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} \alpha_x |x\rangle$ and we perform a measurement on the first segment $\overline{p}$ in the computational basis, then output $a = (a_1, ..., a_m) \in \{0,1\}^m$ is obtained with probability

$$p(a) = \sum_{x \text{ s.t. } x_i = a_i (1 \leq i \leq m)} |\alpha_x|^2$$

and after that, the state of $\overline{r}$ becomes

$$|\varphi_a\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p(a)}} \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^{n-m}} \alpha_{ay} |y\rangle$$

where $ay \in \{0,1\}^n$ is the concatenation of $a$ and $y$. For example, if two qubits $q_1, q_2$ are in the entangled state $|\beta\rangle$, and we measure $q_1$ in the computational basis, then we obtain outcome 0 with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ and after that, $q_2$ is in the basis state $|0\rangle$, and we obtain outcome 1 also with probability $\frac{1}{2}$ and after that, $q_2$ is in state $|1\rangle$.

2.4 Quantum Gates and Quantum Circuits

Now we are ready to formally define the notions of quantum gates and quantum circuits. Here, we adopt the algebraic language defined in [51] [50].

**Definition 1 (Quantum gates).** For any positive integer $n$, if $U$ is a $2^n \times 2^n$ unitary matrix, and $q_1, ..., q_n$ are qubit variables, then $G \equiv U[q_1, ..., q_n]$ is called an $n$-qubit gate.

**Example 3 (Hadamard gate).** Whenever the Hadamard matrix $H$ acts on a qubit $q$, then we have the Hadamard gate $H[q]$. If $q$ is currently in state $|1\rangle$, it will be in state $|\rangle$ at the end of the Hadamard gate.

**Example 4 (Classically controlled quantum gates).**

1. Let $q_1, q_2$ be qubit variables. Then CNOT gate $CNOT[q_1, q_2]$ is a two-qubit gate with $q_1$ as the control qubit and $q_2$ as the target qubit. It acts as follows:

$$CNOT[q_1, q_2|i_1, i_2\rangle = |i_1, i_1 \oplus i_2\rangle$$

for $i_1, i_2 \in \{0,1\}$, where $\oplus$ is addition modulo 2; that is, if $q_1$ is set to $|1\rangle$, then $q_2$ is flipped, otherwise $q_2$ is left unchanged.
2. Let $q_1, q_2, q_3$ be qubit variables. Then the Toffoli gate is defined by

$$\text{Toffoli}[q_1, q_2, q_3] |i_1, i_2, i_3\rangle = |i_1, i_2, i_3 \oplus i_1 i_2\rangle$$

for $i_1, i_2, i_3 \in \{0, 1\}$; that is, $q_3$ is flipped if and only if $q_1$ and $q_2$ are both set to $|1\rangle$.

**Definition 2 (Quantum circuits).** A quantum circuit is a sequence of quantum gates: $C \equiv G_1 \ldots G_d$, where $d \geq 1$ and $G_1, \ldots, G_d$ are quantum gates.

For a quantum circuit $C = G_1 \ldots G_d$, let $\overline{q} = q_1, \ldots, q_n$ be all of the qubit variables occurring in $C$. Then for each $1 \leq i \leq d$, $G_i$ is modelled by a unitary matrix $U_i$ acting on a substring of $\overline{q}$. We often consider $U_i$ as a transformation on the whole string $\overline{q}$; that is, $U_i$ is identified with its cylindrical extension in $\mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}}$. Therefore, $C$ is represented by unitary matrix $U = U_d \ldots U_1$.

**Definition 3 (Equivalence of Circuits).** Let $C_1, C_2$ be quantum circuits and $\overline{q}$ be the sequence of qubit variables occurring in $C_1$ and $C_2$. Then $C_1$ and $C_2$ are called equivalent, written $C_1 = C_2$, if we have: $C_1 |\psi\rangle = C_2 |\psi\rangle$ for any $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{\overline{q}}$.

**Example 5.** The $\text{SWAP}$ gate is defined by $\text{SWAP}[q_1, q_2] |i_1, i_2\rangle = |i_2, i_1\rangle$ for $i_1, i_2 \in \{0, 1\}$. Intuitively, it swaps the states of two qubits $q_1, q_2$. $\text{SWAP}$ can be implemented by the following circuit consisting of three $\text{CNOT}$ gates:

$$\text{SWAP}[q_1, q_2] = \text{CNOT}[q_1, q_2] \text{CNOT}[q_2, q_1] \text{CNOT}[q_1, q_2].$$

As mentioned in Section 1, several algorithms have been proposed in the previous literature for checking equivalence of combinational quantum circuits.

## 3 Sequential Quantum Circuits

In this section, we extend the model of combinational quantum circuits defined in the last section to sequential quantum circuits.

### 3.1 Definition and Examples

Sequential circuits can be further divided into two subcategories: synchronous logic and asynchronous logic. As the first step, we only consider synchronous sequential quantum circuits in this paper. Recall from [20] that the output values of a sequential (classical) circuit depend both on the current inputs and on stored internal information (and thus also on the past inputs). So, a sequential circuit is a combinational circuit with memory. It is capable of storing data and also performing certain logical operations upon this data. In other words, the output values of a sequential circuit at a given time is then a function of external input values and the stored data at that time. Such a circuit model has a natural quantum generalisation:

**Definition 4.** A (synchronous) sequential quantum circuit $S$ consists of:
– $m$ input variables $q_1, \ldots, q_m$, each of which is a qubit;
– $m$ output variables $x_1, \ldots, x_m$, each of which is a classical binary variable, taking value 0 or 1;
– $l$ state variables $p_1, \ldots, p_l$, each of which is also a qubit;
– a combinational quantum circuit $C$ with $n = m + l$ qubits $q_1, \ldots, q_m, p_1, \ldots, p_l$;

A sequential quantum circuit is visualised in Figure 2. Intuitively, as in a classical synchronous circuit, a clock produces a sequence of clock signals. Each signal is distributed to all of the memory elements. The output of each memory element only changes when triggered by the clock signal. The quantum hardware implementing a sequential circuit works very differently from its classical counterpart (See Appendix B for a discussion about physical implementation of the “memory” and “clock” in a sequential quantum circuit). Another difference between classical and quantum models is that in the quantum case, a measurement appears at the end of each qubit $q_i$, which is needed to produce a (classical) outcome $x_i$. To show reasonableness of the above model, let us consider two simple examples (More examples are given in Appendix C, including controlled quantum circuits, quantum Fourier transforms and quantum half adder):

Example 6. The RUS (Repeat-Until-Success) implementation of quantum gate $V_3 = (I + 2iZ)/\sqrt{5}$ given in Example 1 can be formally described as a sequential quantum circuits with the following combinational part:


Example 7. Quantum random walks are quantum analogues of random walks, with many applications in designing quantum algorithms. Here, we consider a quantum particle moving on a 4-circle [19]:

Fig. 2. A synchronous sequential quantum circuit.
1. The circle has 4 different positions: 0, 1, 2, 3, and thus the position space is a 4-dimensional Hilbert space $H_p = \text{span}\{\ket{0}_p, \ket{1}_p, \ket{2}_p, \ket{3}_p\}$, that is, the complex vector space with $\{\ket{0}, \ket{1}, \ket{2}, \ket{3}\}$ as an orthonormal basis. In contrast to the classical case, the particle can be in a superposition of positions 0, 1, 2, 3, written $\alpha_0\ket{0} + \alpha_1\ket{1} + \alpha_2\ket{2} + \alpha_3\ket{3}$.

2. A quantum coin is used to control the walking direction. Its state space is $H_c = \text{span}\{\ket{0}_c, \ket{1}_c\}$, where 0, 1 denote direction right and left, respectively. In contrast to the classical case, the coin can be in a superposition $\beta_0\ket{0} + \beta_1\ket{1}$, meaning the particle moving to left and right simultaneously.

3. In each step of the walk, the coin is flipped with a unitary operator $C$, and then the conditional translation of position is performed: $T\ket{0}_c\ket{i}_p = \ket{0}_c\ket{i+1}_p$ and $T\ket{1}_c\ket{i}_p = \ket{1}_c\ket{i-1}_p$ for $i = 0, 1, 2, 3$. Here, we use the subscripts $c, p$ to indicate the states of coin and position, respectively. Intuitively, if the coin is in state 0 (resp. 1) then the position is changed from $i$ to $i+1$ (resp. $i-1$), where $i+1$ and $i-1$ are computed modulo 4.

4. A qubit $d$ together with a measurement is set to detect whether position 3 is reached. Whenever position 3 is reached, the detective qubit $d$ is flipped. As usual, we can employ two qubits $p_1$ and $p_2$ to encode the 4 positions: $\ket{0}_p = \ket{0}_{p_1}\ket{0}_{p_2}$, $\ket{1}_p = \ket{0}_{p_1}\ket{1}_{p_2}$, $\ket{2}_p = \ket{1}_{p_1}\ket{0}_{p_2}$, $\ket{3}_p = \ket{1}_{p_1}\ket{1}_{p_2}$. Then the walk can be implemented as a sequential quantum circuit shown in Figure 3. This circuit has four variables $d, c, p_1$ and $p_2$, where $d$ is the only input variable, and $c, p_1$ and $p_2$ are state variables. The outcome of measurement on $d$ is the output variable. The combinational part of the circuit is defined by

$$C_C = C[c]T[c, p_1, p_2] \text{Toffoli}[p_1, p_2, d].$$

(2)

3.2 Computation Process

Now we give a formal description of the computational process of a sequential quantum circuit. From the discussion in the last section, the combina-
tional circuit $C$ with $n$ qubits is represented by a $2^n \times 2^n$ unitary matrix $U = (U_{uv})_{u,v=0}^{2^n-1}$. Moreover, we need the following notations: for any column vector $|\psi\rangle = (\alpha_0, \alpha_1, ..., \alpha_{2^n-1})^T$, its conjugate transpose is row vector $\langle \psi | = (\alpha_0^*, \alpha_1^*, ..., \alpha_{2^n-1}^*)$. Thus, the inner product of two vectors $|\psi\rangle, |\varphi\rangle$ is $\langle \psi | \varphi \rangle$ (as an ordinary matrix multiplication), and matrix entries $U_{uv} = \langle u | U | v \rangle$ if we identify integers $u, v \in \{0, 1, ..., 2^n - 1\}$ with their binary representations $u, v \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

Let $|\varphi_1\rangle, ..., |\varphi_l\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^\otimes m$ (the tensor product of $m$ copies of the 2-dimensional Hilbert space) be an input sequence and $|\psi_0\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^\otimes l$ an initial state. Then the sequential circuit $S$ behaves as follows:

- **Step 1**: Input state
  
  $$|\varphi_1\rangle = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^m} \alpha_{1x} |x\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^\otimes m$$
  
  to variables $q_1, ..., q_m$. Variables $p_1, ..., p_l$ are initialised to state
  
  $$|\psi_0\rangle = \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^l} \beta_{0y} |y\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^\otimes l.$$ 

  Applying unitary $U$ on $q_1, ..., q_m, p_1, ..., p_l$ yields:
  
  $$U |\varphi_1\rangle |\psi_0\rangle = \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}^m, b \in \{0,1\}^l} \left( \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^m} \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^l} \alpha_{1x} \beta_{0y} \langle ab | U | xy \rangle \right) |ab\rangle.$$ 

  Measure $q_1, ..., q_m$ in the computational basis. Then a measurement outcome $a_1 = a_{11}, ..., a_{1m} \in \{0,1\}^m$ is output through variables $x_1, ..., x_m$, respectively, with probability
  
  $$p(a_1) = \| \langle a_1 | U | \varphi_1 \rangle |\psi_0\rangle \|^2 = \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}^l} \left( \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^m} \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^l} \alpha_{1x} \beta_{0y} \langle a_1 b | U | xy \rangle \right)^2.$$ 

  After that, variable $p_1, ..., p_l$ is in state
  
  $$|\psi_1\rangle = \frac{\langle a_1 | U | \varphi_1 \rangle |\psi_0\rangle}{\sqrt{p(a_1)}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p(a_1)}} \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}^l} \left( \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^m} \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^l} \alpha_{1x} \beta_{0y} \langle a_1 b | U | xy \rangle \right) |b\rangle.$$ 

  This state is then input to the memory elements and stored there.

- **Step $i$ ($i \geq 2$)**: Input state
  
  $$|\varphi_i\rangle = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^m} \alpha_{ix} |x\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^\otimes m$$
  
  to variables $q_1, ..., q_m$. Note that at the end of step $i - 1$, variables $p_1, ..., p_l$ are in state $|\psi_{i-1}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^\otimes l$, and this state is stored in the memory elements.
Now it is output from the memory elements to the combinational circuit. Assume that
\[ |\psi_{i-1}\rangle = \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^t} \beta_{(i-1)y}|y\rangle. \]

Unitary \( U \) transforms the state of \( q_1, \ldots, q_m, p_1, \ldots, p_l \) to:
\[
U|\varphi_i\rangle|\psi_{i-1}\rangle = \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}^m, b \in \{0,1\}^l} \left( \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^m, y \in \{0,1\}^l} \alpha_{ix}\beta_{(i-1)y} (ab|U|xy) \right) |ab\rangle.
\]

Then we measure \( q_1, \ldots, q_m \) in the computational basis, and the outcome \( a_i = a_{i1}, \ldots, a_{im} \in \{0,1\}^m \) is output through \( x_1, \ldots, x_m \), respectively, with probability
\[
p(a_i) = \frac{||\langle a_i|U|\varphi_i\rangle|\psi_{i-1}\rangle||^2}{p(a_i)} = \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}^l} \left( \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^m, y \in \{0,1\}^l} \alpha_{ix}\beta_{(i-1)y} (a_i,b|U|xy) \right) ^2.
\]

and variable \( p_1, \ldots, p_l \) is in state
\[
|\psi_i\rangle = \frac{\langle a_i|U|\varphi_i\rangle|\psi_{i-1}\rangle}{\sqrt{p(a_i)}} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{p(a_i)}} \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}^l} \left( \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^m, y \in \{0,1\}^l} \alpha_{ix}\beta_{(i-1)y} (a_i,b|U|xy) \right) |b\rangle.
\]

which is input to the memory elements and stored there.

4 Quantum Mealy Machines

The Mealy machine \([25]\) is a standard model of classical sequential circuits as a kind of finite-state machines. In this section, we introduce a quantum generalisation of Mealy machines, and show how the examples of sequential quantum circuits in the last section can be modelled as quantum Mealy machines.

4.1 Preliminaries and Notations

A formal definition of quantum Mealy machine requires more preliminaries from the quantum theory, which we briefly review here (More details can be found in the standard textbook \([29]\)). A mixed quantum state is modelled as an ensemble \( \{(p_i, |\psi_i\rangle)\} \) of pure states, meaning that the system is in state \( |\psi_i\rangle \) with probability \( p_i \), where \( \sum_i p_i = 1 \). It can also be described as a density matrix:
\[ \rho = \sum_i p_i |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i| \]. Let \( \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}) \) denote the set of all density matrices in Hilbert space \( \mathcal{H} \). After a unitary transform \( U \) is performed on a quantum system in mixed state \( \rho \), the system will be in state \( U \rho U^\dagger \). A quantum measurement is modelled by a family \( M = \{M_m\} \) of matrices satisfying a normalisation condition \( \sum_m M_m^\dagger M_m = I \) (the identity matrix in \( \mathcal{H} \)), where index \( m \) is used to
denote different possible outcomes. When we perform $M$ on a quantum system in state $\rho$, outcome $m$ is obtained with probability $p(m) = \text{tr}(M_m \rho M_m^\dagger)$. Right after the measurement, if the outcome is $m$, then the system will be in state $\rho' = \frac{1}{p(m)} M_m \rho M_m^\dagger$.

Let $A$ and $B$ be two quantum systems. Then the state space of the composite system $AB$ is the tensor product $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ of $A$'s state space $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $B$'s state space $\mathcal{H}_B$. Formally, suppose $\{|i\rangle_A\}$ and $\{|j\rangle_B\}$ are orthonormal bases of $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$, respectively. Then $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B = \text{span}\{ |i\rangle_A \otimes |j\rangle_B \}$, the complex vector space with $\{|i\rangle_A \otimes |j\rangle_B \}$ as an orthonormal basis. We often use $|ij\rangle$ to denote $|i\rangle_A \otimes |j\rangle_B$ for short. The inner product of $|ij\rangle$ and $|vw\rangle$ is defined by $\langle ij|vw \rangle = \langle i|v \rangle \langle j|w \rangle$. The state of a subsystem can be described using a reduced density operator. Let $\rho$ be a density operator in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$. Then its reduced density operator for $A$ is given as $\rho_A = \text{tr}_B(\rho)$, where $\text{tr}_B$ is a linear map, known as partial trace over $B$, defined by $\text{tr}_B(|i\rangle_A \langle v| \otimes |j\rangle_B \langle w|) = |ij\rangle_A \langle v$.

Suppose $U_A$ and $U_B$ are two operators on $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$, respectively. Then the tensor product $U_A \otimes U_B$ is an operator in $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$, defined by $(U_A \otimes U_B)(|i\rangle_A \otimes |j\rangle_B) = U_A |i\rangle_A \otimes U_B |j\rangle_B$. Moreover, the direct sum of spaces $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $\mathcal{H}_B$ is defined as $\mathcal{H}_A \oplus \mathcal{H}_B = \text{span}\{ |i\rangle_A \cup \{|j\rangle_B \} \}$ provided the two bases are disjoint. Then the direct sum of operators $U_A$ in $\mathcal{H}_A$ and $U_B$ in $\mathcal{H}_B$ is defined by $(U_A \oplus U_B)|i\rangle_A = U_A |i\rangle_A$ and $(U_A \oplus U_B)|j\rangle_B = U_B |j\rangle_B$. Obviously, we have the dimensions: $\dim(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B) = \dim \mathcal{H}_A \times \dim \mathcal{H}_B$ and $\dim(\mathcal{H}_A \oplus \mathcal{H}_B) = \dim \mathcal{H}_A + \dim \mathcal{H}_B$.

### 4.2 The Model of Quantum Mealy Machines

With the preparations in the last subsection, a quantum Mealy machine can be defined as a straightforward abstraction of the model of sequential quantum circuits described in the last section.

**Definition 5 (Quantum Mealy machines).** A quantum Mealy machine is a quintuple $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{H}_m, \mathcal{H}_s, U, M)$, where:

- $\mathcal{H}_m$ is a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, called the input space;
- $\mathcal{H}_s$ is also a finite-dimensional Hilbert space, called the state space;
- $U$ is a unitary operator on $\mathcal{H}_m \otimes \mathcal{H}_s$;
- $M = \{ M_a : a \in O \}$ is a quantum measurement in $\mathcal{H}_m \otimes \mathcal{H}_s$.

The examples of sequential quantum circuits presented in the previous section can be properly specified using the notion of quantum Mealy machine. In our examples, we only use measurements in $\mathcal{H}_m$, but for generality, $M$ in the above definition is allowed to be a measurement in $\mathcal{H}_m \otimes \mathcal{H}_s$. As will be seen in Section [5] this generalisation is particularly convenient in the description of equivalence checking of two quantum Mealy machines.

**Example 8.** The RUS implementation circuit of quantum gate $V_3$ in Examples [1] and [6] can be described as a quantum Mealy machine $\mathcal{M}_{\text{rus}} = (\mathcal{H}_q, \mathcal{H}_p, U, M)$, where:
1. input space $\mathcal{H}_q = \text{span}\{0_q, 1_q\}$,
2. state space $\mathcal{H}_p = \text{span}\{0_p, 1_p\}$,
3. unitary operator $U$ describes the combinational quantum circuit $\mathcal{C}_{rus}$ defined by equation (1),
4. $M = \{M_0 = |0\>_q \langle 0|, M_1 = |1\>_q \langle 1|\}$ is the measurement in the computational basis of $\mathcal{H}_q$.

**Example 9.** The circuit implementing the quantum walk on a 4-circle in Example 8 can be described as a quantum Mealy machine $M_C = (\mathcal{H}_d; \mathcal{H}_c \otimes \mathcal{H}_p, U, M)$, where:

1. input space $\mathcal{H}_d = \text{span}\{0_d, 1_d\}$,
2. state space $\mathcal{H}_c \otimes \mathcal{H}_p$ with $\mathcal{H}_c = \text{span}\{|0\>_c, |1\>_c\}$ and $\mathcal{H}_p = \mathcal{H}_{p_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{p_2}$, where $\mathcal{H}_{p_i} = \text{span}\{0_{p_i}, 1_{p_i}\}$ for $i = 1, 2$,
3. unitary operator $U$ describes the combinational quantum circuit $\mathcal{C}_C$ defined by equation (2),
4. $M = \{M_0 = |0\>_d \langle 0|, M_1 = |1\>_d \langle 1|\}$ is the measurement in the computational basis of $\mathcal{H}_d$.

Now let us formally describe how a quantum Mealy machine runs. To simplify the description, for each measurement outcome $a \in O$ and input state $\sigma$, we introduce a (super-)operator: for every $\rho$ in $\mathcal{H}_s$,

$$\mathcal{E}_{a|\sigma}(\rho) = \text{tr}_\mathcal{H}_m \left[ M_a U (\sigma \otimes \rho) U^\dagger M_a^\dagger \right],$$

where $\text{tr}_\mathcal{H}_m$ is used to trace out the input subsystem $\mathcal{H}_m$. Then for any input sequence $\sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_i, \ldots$ in $\mathcal{H}_m$ and initial (mixed) state $\rho_0$ in $\mathcal{H}_s$, the behaviour of machine $M$ can be described as follows:

- **Step 1:** After receiving the first input, $M$ is in state $\sigma_1 \otimes \rho_0$. Applying unitary $U$ yields $U (\sigma_1 \otimes \rho_0) U^\dagger$. Then we perform measurement $M$ on subsystem $\mathcal{H}_m$, and an outcome $a_1 \in O$ is output with probability

$$p(a_1|\sigma_1, \rho_0) = \text{tr} \left[ M_{a_1} U (\sigma_1 \otimes \rho_0) U^\dagger M_{a_1}^\dagger \right].$$

After that, subsystem $\mathcal{H}_s$ is in state

$$\rho_1 = \frac{1}{p(a_1|\sigma_1, \rho_0)} \mathcal{E}_{a_1|\sigma_1}(\rho_0).$$

- **Step $i$ ($i \geq 2$):** After receiving the $i$th input, $M$ is in state $\sigma_i \otimes \rho_{i-1}$. Unitary $U$ transforms it to $U (\sigma_i \otimes \rho_{i-1}) U^\dagger$. Then we measure subsystem $\mathcal{H}_m$, outcome $a_i \in O$ is output with probability

$$p(a_i|\sigma_i, \rho_{i-1}) = \text{tr} \left[ M_{a_i} U (\sigma_i \otimes \rho_{i-1}) U^\dagger M_{a_i}^\dagger \right],$$

and subsystem $\mathcal{H}_s$ is in state

$$\rho_i = \frac{1}{p(a_i|\sigma_i, \rho_{i-1})} \mathcal{E}_{a_i|\sigma_i}(\rho_{i-1}).$$
It is easy to see that equations (3), (4), (5), (6) are special cases of (8), (9), (10), (11), respectively.

The application of an input sequence is called an experiment on the machine. More explicitly, a given input sequence \( \pi = \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_k \) of length \( k \) and an initial state \( \rho_0 \) induce a probability distribution \( p(\cdot | \pi, \rho_0) \) over output sequences \( O^k \) of length \( k \): for every \( a = a_1, \ldots, a_k \in O^k \),

\[
p(a | \pi, \rho_0) = \prod_{i=1}^{k} p(a_i | \sigma_i, \rho_{i-1})
\]

where \( p(a_i | \sigma_i, \rho_{i-1}) \) is defined by equations (8) and (10).

**Remark 1.** (1) The reader should have noticed that in the above description of running a quantum Mealy machine, the initial state in \( \mathcal{H}_s \) is taken as a mixed state \( \rho_0 \) rather than a pure state \( |\psi_0\rangle \). The reason behind this design decision is that even if the machine starts in a pure initial state \( |\psi_0\rangle \), the subsequent states \( \rho_1, \ldots, \rho_i, \ldots \) can still be mixed states because they are obtained by tracing out the input subsystem \( \mathcal{H}_{in} \) (see Eqs. (9) and (11)).

(2) As is well known, the output of a Mealy machine depends on both the input and the machine’s (internal) state, but the output of a Moore machine depends only on the machine’s state. At the first glance, the model defined above is more like a quantum generalisation of Moore machines because the output comes directly from measurement \( M \) (see Eqs. (8) and (10)). But we argue that the model is actually a quantum generalisation of Mealy machines: after unitary operator \( U \) acts on \( \mathcal{H}_{in} \otimes \mathcal{H}_s \), the input state in \( \mathcal{H}_{in} \) is entangled with the machine’s state in \( \mathcal{H}_s \). Then measurement \( M \) is performed on \( \mathcal{H}_{in} \) (but not \( \mathcal{H}_s \)). Consequently, the outcome of \( M \) depends directly on the input state in \( \mathcal{H}_{in} \) and (less explicitly) on the machine’s state in \( \mathcal{H}_s \).

(3) Our quantum Mealy machine defined here is similar to the one defined in [46] at the first glance, but they are much different. Since the inputs are quantum, in each step, they can be entangled with the internal states. To fetch information, we must perform measurements on both input and state Hilbert spaces, rather than the only state space in [46]. Thus we need to use partial trace (see Eq. (7)) to trace out the input space, while [46] does not.

### 4.3 Equivalence of Quantum Mealy Machines

To conclude this section, we introduce the key notion of equivalence for quantum Mealy machines.

**Definition 6 (Equivalence of quantum Mealy machines).** Let \( \mathcal{M}_i = (\mathcal{H}_{in}, \mathcal{H}_s^{(i)}, U_i, M_i) \) \((i = 1, 2)\) be two quantum Mealy machines with the same input space \( \mathcal{H}_{in} \) and the same outputs \( O \) (i.e. measurements \( M_i = \{ M_a^{(i)} : a \in O \} \) for \( i = 1, 2 \)), let \( \rho_i \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_s^{(i)}) \) \((i = 1, 2)\), \( V \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{in}) \), and let \( K \) be a positive integer. Then:
1. \( M_1 \) with initial state \( \rho_1 \) and \( M_2 \) with initial state \( \rho_2 \) are (functionally) equivalent, written: \( (M_1, \rho_1) \sim (M_2, \rho_2) \), if for any input sequence \( \pi \) and for any \( a \in O|\pi| \),
\[
p(a|\pi, \rho_1) = p(a|\pi, \rho_2).
\] (12)

Note that the probability in the left-hand side of the above equation is defined in machine \( M_1 \) with \( \rho_1 \) as its initial state, and the probability in the right-hand side is given in \( M_2 \) with initial state \( \rho_2 \).

2. \( M_1 \) with \( \rho_1 \) and \( M_2 \) with \( \rho_2 \) are \( V \)-equivalent, written: \( (M_1, \rho_1) \sim_V (M_2, \rho_2) \), if equation (12) holds for all input sequences \( \pi \) in \( V \).

3. \( M_1 \) with \( \rho_1 \) and \( M_2 \) with \( \rho_2 \) are \( K \)-equivalent, written: \( (M_1, \rho_1) \sim_K (M_2, \rho_2) \), if equation (12) holds for all input sequences \( \pi \) with \(|\pi| \leq K \).

4. \( M_1 \) with \( \rho_1 \) and \( M_2 \) with \( \rho_2 \) are \( (V, K) \)-equivalent, written: \( (M_1, \rho_1) \sim_{V, K} (M_2, \rho_2) \), if equation (12) holds for all input sequences \( \pi \) in \( V \) with \(|\pi| \leq K \).

Intuitively, \( (M_1, \rho_1) \sim (M_2, \rho_2) \) means the probability distributions of the outputs of the two machines \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) are the same for any sequence of inputs, but \( V \)-equivalence only requires the distributions of outputs are the same for all inputs from a given range \( V \), and \( K \)-equivalence only requires the distributions are the same for all input and output sequences of length not greater than \( K \). Whenever \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) are the same and \( (M_1, \rho_1) \sim (M_2, \rho_2) \) (or \( (M_1, \rho_1) \sim_V (M_2, \rho_2) \), \( (M_1, \rho_1) \sim_K (M_2, \rho_2) \), \( (M_1, \rho_1) \sim_{V, K} (M_2, \rho_2) \)), we simply say that \( \rho_1 \) and \( \rho_2 \) are equivalent (resp. \( V \)-equivalent, \( K \)-equivalent, \( (V, K) \)-equivalent) and write \( \rho_1 \sim \rho_2 \) (resp. \( \rho_1 \sim_V \rho_2 \), \( \rho_1 \sim_K \rho_2 \), \( \rho_1 \sim_{V, K} \rho_2 \)). When two pure states \( |\psi_1\rangle \) and \( |\psi_2\rangle \) are equivalent, i.e. \( |\psi_1\rangle \langle \psi_1 | \sim |\psi_2\rangle \langle \psi_2 | \), we simply write \( |\psi_1\rangle \sim |\psi_2\rangle \).

5 Equivalence Checking

In this section, we present the main theoretical result of this paper. In particular, we develop an algorithm for checking equivalence of two quantum Mealy machines with initial states.

5.1 Main Theorem

The basic idea of our algorithm is a reduction from equivalence checking of two quantum Mealy machines with initial states to checking equivalence of two states in their direct sum, which is defined in the following:

Definition 7 (Direct sum of quantum Mealy machines). Let \( M_i \) (\( i = 1, 2 \)) be the same as in Definition 6. Then the direct sum of \( M_1 \) and \( M_2 \) is quantum Mealy machine
\[
M_1 \oplus M_2 = \left( \mathcal{H}_{in}, \mathcal{H}^{(1)}_{a} \oplus \mathcal{H}^{(2)}_{a}, U_1 \oplus U_2, M \right),
\]
where \( \oplus \) in the right-hand side of the above equation stands for direct sum of two Hilbert spaces or two operators, and measurement \( M = \{ M_a : a \in O \} \) with \( M_a = M^{(1)}_{a} \oplus M^{(2)}_{a} \) for every \( a \in O \).
To see that $\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$ is well-defined as a quantum Mealy machine, it suffices to note that for each $a \in O$, $M_a = M_a^{(1)} \oplus M_a^{(2)}$ is a matrix in $(\mathcal{H}_{in} \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^{(1)}) \oplus (\mathcal{H}_{in} \otimes \mathcal{H}_s^{(2)}) \cong \mathcal{H}_{in} \otimes (\mathcal{H}_s^{(1)} \oplus \mathcal{H}_s^{(2)})$, and normalisation condition $\sum_{a \in O} M_a^{(1)} M_a^{(2)} = I$ (the identity matrix in $\mathcal{H}_{in} \otimes (\mathcal{H}_s^{(1)} \oplus \mathcal{H}_s^{(2)})$) is satisfied.

There are two major difficulties in designing an algorithm for equivalence checking of quantum circuits. As in checking classical circuits, it is desirable to find an upper bound of the length of the needed input sequences. On the other hand, the input state space of a classical circuit is finite; in contrast, the input state of a quantum circuit is a continuum. These difficulties are resolved by the following theorem showing that equivalence checking of quantum Mealy machines can be done using only input sequences taken from some given basis and of length quadratic in the dimensions of the state Hilbert spaces of the machines. Surprisingly, the length of checking input sequences is independent of the dimension of the input space.

**Theorem 1.** Let $\mathcal{M}_i = \{ \mathcal{H}_{in}, \mathcal{H}_s^{(i)}, U_i, M_i \} (i = 1, 2)$ be two quantum Mealy machines with the same input space $\mathcal{H}_{in}$ and the same outputs $O$ (i.e. measurements $M_i = \{ M_a^{(i)} : a \in O \}$ for $i = 1, 2$), let $\rho_i \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_s^{(i)}) (i = 1, 2)$, and let $V$ be a subspace of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{in})$. Then the following two statements are equivalent:

1. $(\mathcal{M}_1, \rho_1) \sim_V (\mathcal{M}_2, \rho_2)$.
2. $\rho_1 \sim_{B, d_i^2 + d_i - 1} \rho_2$ (in $\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$), where $B$ is a basis of $V$, and $d_i = \dim \mathcal{H}_s^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, 2$.

**Proof:** Let us first outline the basic idea of the proof. We are going to prove the theorem in three steps:

(i) $(\mathcal{M}_1, \rho_1) \sim_V (\mathcal{M}_2, \rho_2)$ iff $\rho_1 \sim_V \rho_2$ in $\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$;
(ii) $\rho_1 \sim_B \rho_2$ in $\mathcal{M}$ iff $\rho_1 \sim_{\text{span } B} \rho_2$, where $\text{span } B$ is the subspace spanned by $B$.
(iii) $\rho_1 \sim_B \rho_2$ iff $\rho_1 \sim_{B, d_i^2 - 1} \rho_2$, where $d$ is the dimension of the state Hilbert space of $\mathcal{M}$.

The first two steps are intuitive and we put their tedious details into Appendix D. To prove step (iii), let $\rho$ be a density operator and $B \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{in})$ be a finite set with span $B = \text{span } \mathcal{V}$. By step (ii), we have $\rho_1 \sim_V \rho_2$ iff $\rho_1 \sim_B \rho_2$. Define $D(\rho, m) = \{ \mathcal{E}_{a|i} (\rho) : |i| \leq m, a \in O^{|i|}, \pi_i \in B \}$. We observe that $D(\rho, m) \subseteq D(\rho, m + 1)$, and thus span $D(\rho, m) \subseteq \text{span } D(\rho, m + 1)$ for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$.

**Claim.** If for some $m \in \mathbb{N}$, span $D(\rho, m) = \text{span } D(\rho, m + 1)$, then span $D(\rho, m) \subseteq \text{span } D(\rho, m + \delta)$ for all $\delta \in \mathbb{N}$.

This claim can be proved by induction. It is trivial for the case $\delta = 1$. Suppose that it is true for $\delta > 0$. Then for every $\mathcal{E}_{a_1, \ldots, a_t | \sigma_1 \ldots \sigma_t} (\rho) \in D(\rho, m + \delta + 1)$ with
t \leq m + \delta + 1$, we have: $E_{a_{1}...a_{t-1}|\sigma_{1}...\sigma_{t-1}}(\rho) \in \text{span } D(\rho, m + \delta) = \text{span } D(\rho, m)$ by the induction hypothesis, and

$$E_{a_{1}...a_{t}|\sigma_{1}...\sigma_{t}}(\rho) = E_{a_{1}|\sigma_{1}}(E_{a_{1}...a_{t-1}|\sigma_{1}...\sigma_{t-1}}(\rho)) \in E_{a_{1}|\sigma_{1}}(\text{span } D(\rho, m + \delta)) = \text{span } D(\rho, m + 1) = \text{span } D(\rho, m),$$

which implies that $\text{span } D(\rho, m + \delta + 1) = \text{span } D(\rho, m)$, that is, the claim is true for $\delta + 1$.

Now we notice that the claim implies: $\text{span } D(\rho, d^2 - 1) \supseteq \text{span } D(\rho, m)$ for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$ because $\text{dim } \text{span } D(\rho, m) \leq d^2$ and $\text{dim } D(\rho, 0) = 1$. Suppose $\rho_1$ and $\rho_2$ are $(B, d^2 - 1)$-equivalent. Then $\text{tr}(\rho) = 0$ for any $\rho \in D(\rho, d^2 - 1)$, where $\rho = \rho_1 - \rho_2$. On the other hand, for every input sequence $\pi$ and $a \in O^{[\pi]}$, we have: $E_{a|\pi}(\rho) \in D(\rho, |\pi|) \subseteq \text{span } D(\rho, d^2 - 1)$. Thus,

$$p(a|\pi, \rho_1) - p(a|\pi, \rho_2) = \text{tr } [E_{a|\pi}(\rho_1)] - \text{tr } [E_{a|\pi}(\rho_2)] = \text{tr } [E_{a|\pi}(\rho_1 - \rho_2)] = 0,$$

and this completes the proof of step (iii).

Finally, we can prove Theorem 1 by gluing the three steps. Our strategy is to show that clauses 1) and 2) of Theorem 1 and the following two statements are all equivalent:

a) $\rho_1 \sim B \rho_2$ (in $\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$), where $B$ is a basis of $V$;

b) $(\mathcal{M}_1, \rho_1) \sim_{d_1^2 + d_2^2 - 1} (\mathcal{M}_2, \rho_2)$.

a) $\Rightarrow$ 2) and 2) $\iff$ b) are trivial. By steps (i) and (ii), it holds that 1) $\iff$ a). Therefore, we only need to prove that 2) $\Rightarrow$ a). Let $E_{a|\pi}^{(1)}, E_{a|\pi}^{(2)}$ and $E_{a|\pi}$ be the super-operator defined in $\mathcal{M}_1, \mathcal{M}_2$ and $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$ by equation (7) and generalised by equation (13), respectively, and let $\rho = \rho_1 \oplus (\rho_2)$. Similar to the proof of step (iii), we define

$$D(\rho, m) = \{ E_{a|\pi}(\rho) : |\pi| \leq m, a \in O^{[\pi]}, \pi_i \in B \}.$$

From the definition of $\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$, it holds that $E_{a|\pi}(\rho) = E_{a|\pi}^{(1)}(\rho_1) \oplus E_{a|\pi}^{(2)}(\rho_2)$. Thus, we conclude that $D(\rho, m) \subseteq D(\mathcal{H}_s^{(1)}) \oplus D(\mathcal{H}_s^{(2)})$, which implies:

$$\text{dim } \text{span } D(\rho, m) \leq \text{dim } D(\mathcal{H}_s^{(1)}) + \text{dim } D(\mathcal{H}_s^{(2)}) \leq d_1^2 + d_2^2.$$

With the above inequality, we obtain that $\text{span } D(\rho, d_1^2 + d_2^2 - 1) \supseteq \text{span } D(\rho, m)$ for every $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Then the remaining part of the proof can be carried out in the same way as the proof of step (iii).

Clause 2) of Theorem 1 indicates that the length of input sequences for checking equivalence of two quantum Mealy machines is required to be quadratic in the dimensions of their state spaces. Essentially, the quadratic length comes from the dimensions of the spaces of mixed states, which occur inevitably even if the input is a pure state, because measurements can be performed at the middle
of a computation. Intuitively, the space spanned by the mixed states that are generated by the input and output sequences of length not greater than \( l \) is of dimension not less than \( \min\{l + 1, d\} \), where \( d = d_1^2 + d_2^2 \) is the dimension of the space of all possible mixed states in the state Hilbert space. Therefore, \( l \) is required to set to be at least \( d - 1 \) in order to make that the spanned space coincides with the space of all possible mixed states. On the other hand, it is not enough to require input sequences to be less than or equal to the dimension of the state Hilbert space, as already pointed out in [46].

5.2 Algorithm

An algorithm for checking equivalence of two quantum Mealy machines can be directly derived from Theorem 1 by enumerating all possible input sequences in \( B \) within length \( d_1^2 + d_2^2 - 1 \), but its complexity is \( d^{O(d_1^2 + d_2^2)} \), where \( d = \dim V \), exponential in the dimensions \( d_1 \) and \( d_2 \) of state Hilbert spaces of the machines. Here, we are able to develop a much more efficient algorithm with a time complexity polynomial in \( d_1 \) and \( d_2 \).

Description of the Algorithm

We assume that \( B \) is a basis of \( V \), which is a given subspace of \( \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{in}) \), and \( O \) is the set of outputs. Note that the choice of \( B \) is arbitrary; that is, \( B \) can be any basis of \( V \). In particular, when \( V = \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{in}) \), we can choose \( B \) to be the computational basis. In this algorithm, the queue is maintained to be monotonic in an admissible order on the set \((B \times O)^*\) that first compares the length and then the lexicographical order. That is, \( u < v \) for two different \( u, v \in (B \times O)^* \), if \( |u| < |v| \), or \( |u| = |v| \) and \( u \) has priority than \( v \) in lexicographical order. As we will see in the complexity analysis given in Section 5.2, the admissible order in the queue enables the algorithm terminate in polynomial time. For input sequence \( \pi = \sigma_1, \ldots, \sigma_k \) and output sequence \( a = a_1, \ldots, a_k \), we define:

\[
\mathcal{E}_{a|\pi} = \mathcal{E}_{a_k|\sigma_k} \circ \cdots \circ \mathcal{E}_{a_1|\sigma_1}
\]

(composition of (super-)operators), where super-operators \( \mathcal{E}_{a|\sigma} \) are defined in \( \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2 \). In case of \( k = 0 \) (i.e. the input sequence is empty), \( \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi} \) is defined to be \( \mathcal{I} \), the identity (super-)operator, which transforms any density operator to itself, i.e. \( \mathcal{I}(\rho) = \rho \) for every \( \rho \).

The algorithm is based on Lex-BFS (lexicographical breadth-first search). A queue \( Q \) is used to maintain possible candidates of \((\pi, a)\) in the admissible order discussed above, and a set \( \mathcal{B} \) is used to collect a basis of \( \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho) \) for all \( \pi \) and \( a \) chosen from the queue \( Q \) in the execution of the algorithm, where \( \rho = \rho_1 \oplus (-\rho_2) \).

1. Initially, a pair \((\pi = \epsilon, a = \epsilon)\) of empty sequences is pushed into \( Q \), and the set \( \mathcal{B} \) is set to be empty.
2. Whenever the queue is not empty, pop the front element \((\pi, a)\) of the queue, and check whether \( \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho) \in \text{span} \mathcal{B} \) or not. If not, add \( \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho) \) into \( \mathcal{B} \), and push \((\pi \sigma, a x)\) into \( Q \) for all \( \sigma \in B \) and \( x \in O \).
3. When the queue is empty, check whether $\text{tr}(\rho) = 0$ for all $\rho \in \mathcal{B}$ or not. If yes, then claim that $\rho_1 \sim_V \rho_2$, and $\rho_1 \not\sim_V \rho_2$ otherwise. It should be noted that $\text{tr}(E_{a|x}(\rho)) = 0$ implies the equivalence of $M_1$ and $M_2$ on input sequence $\pi$ and output sequence $a$.

The algorithm described above is formalised in Algorithm 1.

**Algorithm 1** A polynomial-time algorithm for checking equivalence of two quantum Mealy machines.

**Require:** $M_i$, $\rho_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $B$ are the same as in Theorem [1]

**Ensure:** Whether $(M_1, \rho_1) \sim_V (M_2, \rho_2)$ or not.

1: $\rho \leftarrow \rho_1 \oplus (-\rho_2)$.
2: $\mathcal{B} \leftarrow \emptyset$.
3: Let $Q$ be an empty queue and push $(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ into $Q$.
4: while $Q$ is not empty do
5:   Pop the front element $(\pi, a)$ of $Q$.
6:   if $E_{a|x}(\rho) \not\in \text{span} \mathcal{B}$ then
7:     Add $E_{a|x}(\rho)$ into $\mathcal{B}$.
8:   Push $(\pi\sigma, ax)$ into $Q$ for $\sigma \in B$ and $x \in O$.
9: end if
10: end while
11: return true if $\text{tr}(\rho) = 0$ for every $\rho \in \mathcal{B}$, and false otherwise.

**Correctness and Complexity** Correctness of Algorithm 1 can be proved using Theorem [1]. For readability, the proof is postponed into Appendix E.

The complexity of Algorithm 1 is analysed as follows. All mixed states are supposed to be stored as matrices with appropriate dimensions, and all quantum operations are then seen as the corresponding matrix operations. Since $\mathcal{B}$ is maintained to be linearly independent, $|\mathcal{B}| \leq d_1^3 + d_2^3$, where $d_i = \dim \mathcal{H}_i^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, 2$. Thus, there are at most

$$|\mathcal{B}| |O| \leq d_V (d_1^2 + d_2^2) |O|$$

elements that are pushed into the queue, where $d_V = \dim V = |\mathcal{B}|$. For each element $E_{a|x}(\rho)$ in the queue, it requires to check whether $E_{a|x}(\rho) \in \text{span} \mathcal{B}$, which needs $\mathcal{O}((d_1^2 + d_2^2)^3)$ time (for example, using Gaussian elimination). Here, we also need $\mathcal{O}(d_{in}^2 (d_1^2 + d_2^2))$ (by matrix multiplication) to compute $E_{a|x}(\rho)$ based on previous calculations, where $d_{in} = \dim \mathcal{H}_{in}$. Therefore, the total time complexity is $\mathcal{O}(|O| d_V (d_1^2 + d_2^2)^4) + \mathcal{O}(|O| d_V d_{in}^3 (d_3^2 + d_3^2)(d_1^2 + d_2^2)) = \mathcal{O}(|O| d_V d_{in}^3 d_3^4)$, where $d = d_1 + d_2$. On the other hand, only the mixed states in $\mathcal{B}$ are required to be stored, while other mixed states are calculated only when needed. For example, $E_{\sigma|x}(\rho)$ can be calculated by $E_{\sigma|x}(\rho) = E_{\sigma|x} (E_{\pi|x}(\rho))$. Therefore, the space complexity is $\mathcal{O}(|\mathcal{B}|^2) = \mathcal{O}((d_1^2 + d_2^2)^2)$. Formally, we have:
Theorem 2. There is an algorithm with time complexity $O(|O| d_V d^5 (d^3 + d_{in}^3))$ and space complexity $O((d_i^2 + d_j^2)^2)$ that, given $M_i, \rho_i (i = 1, 2)$ and $V$ be the same as in Theorem 1, checks whether $\rho_1 \sim_V \rho_2$ or not, where $d = d_1 + d_2$, $d_i = \dim \mathcal{H}_i^{(i)}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $d_V = \dim V$.

A careful comparison between the complexity of our algorithm for checking equivalence of sequential quantum circuits and the complexity of the known best algorithm for checking classical circuits should be helpful for understanding the difference between the classical and quantum cases. To check equivalence of two sequential quantum circuits with $m$ input qubit variables and $l_1$ and $l_2$ state qubit variables, respectively, we need to phrase them into the model of our quantum Mealy machine with $|O| = 2^m$, $d_V = \dim \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_m) = 2^{2m}$, $d_i = 2^{l_i}$ for $i = 1, 2$ and $d = d_1 + d_2 = 2^l$, where $l = \max\{l_1, l_2\}$. The overall complexity is then $O(2^{3m+5l}(2^{3m} + 2^{3l}))$, as given by Theorem 2. On the other hand, the state space traversal based algorithms have been extensively adopted for checking equivalence of classical sequential classical circuits; see for example [20] and [27]. Although several industrial improvements are proposed, for example [15] and [40], the worst case complexity remains unimproved. Table 1 gives a comparison between the complexities of checking equivalence of sequential quantum circuits and classical ones with the same numbers of input and state (qubit/Boolean) variables.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Complexity</th>
<th>Quantum</th>
<th>Classical</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$O(2^{3m+5l}(2^{3m} + 2^{3l}))$</td>
<td>$O(2^{3m+l})$</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

6 Experiments

Algorithm 1 is implemented in Python3 using NumPy package linked with OpenBLAS library. We test our algorithm on a workstation which has an Intel(R) Xeon(R) Platinum 8235 CPU with 16 cores.

An Overview of Test Cases: Several test cases are based on repeat-until-success scheme (Example 1), quantum random walk (Example 7), a testing circuit for quantum Fourier transform, quantum control circuit and quantum half adder. [The detailed descriptions of the testing circuit for quantum Fourier transform, quantum control circuit and quantum half adder are presented in Appendix C as Examples 11, 10 and 12, respectively. Some discussions about details of these case studies are given in Appendix F.]

It is difficult to find nontrivial equivalent test cases (that is, two equivalent sequential quantum circuits with different combinational parts). Most of our
equivalent test cases are based on the symmetry of quantum random walks, and some other known facts (for example, repeat-until-success scheme). Non-equivalent test cases are trivial because random sequential quantum circuits are likely to be non-equivalent. However, two random sequential quantum circuits usually reveal their non-equivalence by a very short input sequence. It turns out that it is even difficult to meet two non-equivalent sequential quantum circuits that are equivalent in short input length (formally, they are $K$-equivalent for small $K$). Our nontrivial non-equivalent test cases are based on quantum Fourier transform.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test case</th>
<th>$d_{in}$</th>
<th>$d_{V}$</th>
<th>$n$</th>
<th>Eq</th>
<th>RT(s)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>qwalk-small-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qwalk-small-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qwalk-sym-1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qwalk-sym-2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qwalk-sym-3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qwalk-irr</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qhalf-adder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qctrl-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qctrl-2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qhalf-adder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qctrl-1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>3.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>qhalf-adder</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>&lt;0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Efficiency Testing:** Our experiment results on the test cases are summarized in Table 2. We test 6 large test cases, which are qwalk-large-1 to qwalk-large-3 and qft-large-1 to qft-large-3 in Table 2. These large test cases are similar to the corresponding small ones, but a larger number of qubits are involved in them. A big difference between the running times of qwalk-small and qwalk-large occurs due to the exponentially increasing complexity in the number of qubits. For example, the running time of qwalk-large-3 is about 10 hours even if there are only 8 qubits. The situation of qft-large is different that the larger test cases have less running times. This is because the sequential quantum circuits in qft-large-2 and qft-large-3 are not equivalent, and our algorithm is designed (for efficiency) to halt as soon as it finds a witness that shows the non-equivalence of the circuits.

7 Conclusion

This paper defines a Mealy machine-based framework and develops an algorithm for equivalence checking of sequential quantum circuits. To the best of our knowledge, it is the first algorithm for this purpose. The complexity of this
algorithms is $O(2^{3m+5l}(2^{3m} + 2^{3l}))$ when applied to two circuits with $m$ input qubit variables and $l_1, l_2$ state qubit variables, respectively. Although the gap between it and the complexity of the known best algorithm for checking equivalence of classical sequential circuits is not very large (see Table 1), it seems that there is still some possibility to improve our algorithm. So, an important issue for future research is to find more efficient algorithms for equivalence checking of sequential quantum circuits.

It is widely believed that in the near future, only NISQ (Noisy Intermediate-Scale Quantum) devices are physically realisable and they will find real-world applications in such areas as quantum chemistry and many-body physics [34]. So, another interesting research topic is to develop algorithms for checking approximate equivalence between sequential quantum circuit and their noisy implementations. But the nature of this problem seems very different from the exact equivalence checking studied in this paper, as hinted by the results in [44] for probabilistic automata.

Model checking has been successfully applied to verify some sophisticated properties of very large classical sequential circuits; see for example [10]. In the last fifteen years, model checking techniques have been extended for verification of quantum communication protocols [14,18], quantum automata [52] and quantum Markov chains [53]. So, another interesting topic is to see how these quantum model checking techniques can be tuned for checking sequential quantum circuits.

Up to now, all of the algorithms for checking equivalence of (both combinational and sequential) quantum circuits are classical (i.e. to be run on classical computers). An even more interesting topic is to find quantum algorithms for equivalence checking of quantum circuits so that the existing small quantum computers can be used in designing larger and larger ones.
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A  Related Work

The work in [45] [26] [49] [23] [30] [3] mentioned in the Introduction targets checking equivalence of general combinational quantum circuits. Another line of related research [5] [6] [7] but not mentioned above is concerned with equivalence checking of a special class of combinational quantum circuits used in quantum communication protocols, in particular those that can be expressed in the stabiliser formalism.

The formal model employed in this paper is quantum Mealy machines, a kind of quantum finite-state machines. There have been a large number of references for various models of quantum finite-state machines; two of the earliest papers in this area are [28] [21]; for recent surveys, see [2] [9]. The work presented in the following interesting papers are the closest to ours. Quantum finite-state machines were already used in [24] to represent quantum circuits, including sequential quantum circuits, although only several interesting examples are presented in [24], without a formal description of quantum Mealy machines; in particular, equivalence checking of sequential quantum circuits was not considered there. The models proposed in [22] and [46] are similar to ours, but it is committed to accepting strings over a finite input alphabet. However, our model allows inputs to be strings over an infinite alphabet, i.e. sequences of quantum (mixed) states (in a finite-dimensional Hilbert space). In fact, this extension of inputs to quantum finite-state machines is helpful for checking equivalence of sequential quantum circuits.

B  Hardware Realisation of Sequential Quantum Circuits

To show that the sequential quantum circuit model is physically feasible and meaningful, we briefly discuss its realization on real quantum hardware in this section. We will take superconducting quantum computing as an example, which is now one of the most advanced and promising technique paths for quantum computers.

Different from classical circuits, quantum gates in superconducting quantum computers are realized by specific pulse signals instead of concrete electronic components, so quantum data will not “flow through” the quantum gates, and conversely, the gate pulses are applied on the quantum data, which are stored in quantum registers (namely, qubits). Quantum hardware itself needs a clock to ensure correct timing for gate pulses, otherwise the computing results will be totally unpredictable. Despite these differences, sequential quantum circuits are still realizable on superconducting quantum hardware.

The realization of sequential quantum circuits requires dynamic quantum computing [37]. Dynamic quantum computing allows feedforward and feedback, which means that qubits could be measured intermediately during the computation and the measurement outcomes might in return affect the following
computing. A common approach to realize dynamic quantum computing is to design a control system for quantum processors using field-programmable gate array (FPGA) [38] [39].

In our sequential quantum circuit model, it is only required that the rest qubits are still working after some qubits are measured, rather than a complete feedforward and feedback control mechanism. As stated in Section 3.1, a synchronous clock is needed in a sequential quantum circuit to synchronize the computation, which is different from the internal clock of FPGA control system (whose frequency is usually 100 MHz or higher) to guarantee correct gate pulses. A single-qubit or two-qubit unitary gate usually costs about 10 to 40 nanoseconds [13] [4]. Measurement operations usually take longer (about a few hundred nanoseconds) [37]. What we need is to design a synchronous clock with one-cycle duration longer than the whole time consumption of both the combination and measurement parts in the sequential quantum circuit (besides, the one-cycle duration of this clock should be a multiple of the one-cycle duration of the internal clock). Apparently this kind of synchronous clock is feasible and can be added to the control system. Figure 4 shows an example of sequential quantum circuits with \( n = 2 l \) qubits executed on an superconducting quantum processor with 3\( l \) qubits.

C Illustrative Examples

To illustrate the structure and behaviour of sequential quantum circuits, let us consider a series of examples.

Example 10 (Controlled quantum circuits). The sequential quantum circuit of this example is given in Figure 5. Suppose there are six qubits \( d, q_1, q_2, p_1, p_2, p_3 \), where \( d \) is the detective qubit, \( q_1, q_2 \) are control qubits, and \( p_1, p_2, p_3 \) are target qubits.

- **Implementing controls.** We have four possible gates to perform on \( p_1, p_2, p_3 \): \( H[p_1], H[p_2], H[p_3] \) and \( \text{Toffoli}[p_1, p_2, p_3] \). Qubits \( q_1, q_2 \) are used to control which gate is to perform at each step. Intuitively, if the state of \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) is:
  1. \( |00\rangle \), then \( H[p_1] \) is performed;
  2. \( |01\rangle \), then \( H[p_2] \) is performed;
  3. \( |10\rangle \), then \( H[p_3] \) is performed;
  4. \( |11\rangle \), then \( \text{Toffoli}[p_1, p_2, p_3] \) is performed.

But it should be noted that \( q_1 \) and \( q_2 \) can be in a superposition of the above basis states, and thus in a sense a superposition of the four gates is executed.

- **Measuring state variables.** Although the model of sequential quantum circuits is not allowed to perform measurements on state variables (for simplicity), this restriction makes no difference to the expressiveness. In order to detect the inner states, one or more detective qubits initiated to \( |0\rangle \) can be used. In our example, only one detective qubit \( d \) is used for detecting the first inner qubit \( p_1 \), which is achieved by
Fig. 4. A sequential circuit implemented on a 2D-grid superconducting quantum processor with $3l$ qubits. Here we set $m = l$. The $l$ qubits in middle row represent the $l$ state variables, while the $l$ qubits in the top row and $l$ qubits in the bottom row alternatively represent the $m$ ($m = l$) input variables. At Cycle 0, the first $l$ qubits are input variables and they together with the second row are applied by a combinational circuit, and after that their measurement outcomes are passed to the $l$ output variables. The bottom row in the dashed frame is prepared as input for Cycle 1. At Cycle 1, the qubits in the bottom row become the input variables, while the qubits in the top row are reset to prepare the input for Cycle 2. During the whole computing process, the $l$ qubits in middle row are always active.
1. initialising \( d \) to \( |0\rangle \); and
2. performing \( \text{CNOT}[p_1, d] \) at the end of the combinational quantum circuit.

Then classical information about \( p_1 \) can be obtained by measuring \( d \).
At the end of the combinational part, a CNOT gate is performed on $d$ and $p_3$ with $p_3$ being the control qubit so that certain classical information about $p_3$ can be obtained by measuring $d$. Formally, this sequential quantum circuit has $d, q$ as input variables and $p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4$ as state variables, and its combinational part is described by

$$C_{qft} = C^0 QFT_4[q, p_1, p_2, p_3, p_4] C^{1T}[q, p_1] CNOT[p_3, d].$$  \hspace{1cm} (15)

**Example 12 (Quantum half adder).** A sequential circuit involving a quantum half adder [17] is given in Figure 7, where

$$V = \sqrt{X} = \frac{1}{2} \left( \begin{array}{cc} 1 + i & 1 - i \\ 1 - i & 1 + i \end{array} \right).$$

There are three qubits $c, a$, and $b$, where $b$ is an accumulator that computes the sum of every $a$ modulo 2, and $c$ contains the carry of $a$ and $b$. More precisely, this sequential quantum circuit has $c, a$ as input variables and $b$ as the only state variable, and its combinational part is described by

$$C_{qha} = C^{1V}[b, c] CNOT[a, b] C^{1V}[b, c] C^{1V}[a, c] CNOT[a, c].$$  \hspace{1cm} (16)

A classical (reversible) implementation of this sequential circuit is given in Figure 8. The combinational part of sequential classical (reversible) circuit is described by

$$C_{ha} = Toffoli[a, b, c] CNOT[a, b].$$  \hspace{1cm} (17)

The examples of sequential quantum circuits presented above can be properly specified using the notion of quantum Mealy machine.
Example 13. The controlled circuit in Example 10 can be described as a quantum Mealy machine \( M_{\text{ctrl}} = (\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_q, \mathcal{H}_p, U, M) \), where:

1. input space \( \mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_q \) with \( \mathcal{H}_d = \text{span}\{ |0\>_d, |1\>_d \} \), \( \mathcal{H}_q = \mathcal{H}_{q_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{q_2} \), and \( \mathcal{H}_{q_i} = \text{span}\{ |0\>_{q_i}, |1\>_{q_i} \} \) for \( i = 1, 2 \);
2. state space \( \mathcal{H}_p = \mathcal{H}_{p_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{p_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{p_3} \) with \( \mathcal{H}_{p_i} = \text{span}\{ |0\>_{p_i}, |1\>_{p_i} \} \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3 \);
3. unitary operator \( U \) describes the combinational quantum circuit \( \mathcal{C}_{\text{ctrl}} \) defined by equation (14);
4. measurement \( M = \{ M_0 = |0\>_d \langle 0|, M_1 = |1\>_d \langle 1| \} \).

Example 14. The circuit of Example 11 can be modelled by a quantum Mealy machine \( M_{\text{qft}} = (\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_q, \mathcal{H}_p, U, M) \), where:

1. \( \mathcal{H}_d, \mathcal{H}_q \) and \( M \) are the same as Example 13;
2. state space \( \mathcal{H}_p = \mathcal{H}_{p_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{p_2} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{p_3} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{p_4} \) with \( \mathcal{H}_{p_i} = \text{span}\{ |0\>_{p_i}, |1\>_{p_i} \} \) for \( i = 1, 2, 3, 4 \);
3. unitary operator \( U \) describes the combinational quantum circuit \( \mathcal{C}_{\text{qft}} \) defined by equation (15).

Example 15. The circuit of Example 12 can be modelled by a quantum Mealy machine \( M_{\text{qha}} = (\mathcal{H}_c \otimes \mathcal{H}_a, \mathcal{H}_b, U, M) \), where:

1. input space \( \mathcal{H}_c \otimes \mathcal{H}_a \) with \( \mathcal{H}_c = \text{span}\{ |0\>_c, |1\>_c \} \) and \( \mathcal{H}_a = \text{span}\{ |0\>_a, |1\>_a \} \);
2. state space \( \mathcal{H}_b = \text{span}\{ |0\>_b, |1\>_b \} \).
3. unitary operator $U$ describes the combinational quantum circuit $C_{qha}$ defined by equation (16).

4. measurement $M = \{ M_{xy} = |x\rangle_c \langle x| \otimes |y\rangle_a \langle y| : x, y \in \{0, 1\}\}$.

For comparison, a quantum Mealy machine for the sequential classical circuit $C_{ha}$ is given as $M_{ha} = (H_{c} \otimes H_{a}, H_{b}, U', M)$, where unitary $U'$ describes the combinational circuit $C_{ha}$ defined by equation (17).

D Completing the Proof of Theorem

Here, we provide the details of steps (i) and (ii) outlined at the beginning of the proof of Theorem 1. These two steps will be carried out through a series of lemmas. We start from giving a technical lemma that gives explicit formulas for computing the transition probability and the machine’s state at each step.

**Lemma 1.** Let $\mathcal{M} = \{H_{in}, H_{s}, U, M\}$ be a quantum Mealy machine. Let $\mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}$ be the super-operator defined by equation (7) and generalised by equation (13). Then for every initial state $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{D}(H_{s})$, input sequence $\pi$ in $\mathcal{D}(H_{in})$ and output sequence $a \in O^{\pi}$, we have

$$p(a|\pi, \rho_0) = \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho_0) \right],$$

and the density operator on input sequence $\pi$ and output sequence $a$ is

$$\rho_{a|\pi} = \frac{1}{\text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho_0) \right]} \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho_0).$$

**Proof:** We prove it by induction on the length of $\pi$. It is trivial for the case that $\pi$ is empty, i.e. $|\pi| = 0$. Suppose it is true for the case $|\pi| = k$, i.e.

$$p(a|\pi, \rho_0) = \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho_0) \right]$$

for every initial state $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{D}(H_{s})$, input sequence $\pi$ in $\mathcal{D}(H_{in})$ with $|\pi| = k$ and output sequence $a \in O^{\pi}$. The density operator on input sequence $\pi$ and output sequence $a$ is

$$\rho_{k} = \frac{1}{\text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho_0) \right]} \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho_0).$$

Let the next input and output be $\sigma_{k+1}$ and $a_{k+1}$, respectively. Then the probability with output $a_{k+1}$ on input $\sigma_{k+1}$ is

$$p(a_{k+1}|\sigma_{k+1}, \rho_k) = \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a_{k+1}|\sigma_{k+1}}(\rho) \right] = \frac{1}{\text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho_0) \right]} \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{aa_{k+1}|\pi\sigma_{k+1}}(\rho_0) \right].$$

By the definition, the probability on input sequence $\pi\sigma_{k+1}$ and output sequence $aa_{k+1}$ is

$$p(aa_{k+1}|\pi\sigma_{k+1}, \rho_0) = p(a|\pi, \rho_0)p(a_{k+1}|\sigma_{k+1}, \rho_k) = \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{aa_{k+1}|\pi\sigma_{k+1}}(\rho_0) \right].$$
and the density operator is
\[
\rho' = \frac{1}{p(a_{k+1}|\sigma_{k+1}, \rho_k)} E_{a_{k+1}|\sigma_{k+1}}(\rho) = \frac{1}{\text{tr}\left[ E_{a_{k+1}|\pi_{\sigma_{k+1}}}(\rho_0) \right]} E_{a_{k+1}|\pi_{\sigma_{k+1}}}(\rho_0).
\]

Hence, the property also holds for the case \(|\pi| = k+1\), and the proof is completed.

The next lemma presents a characterisation of the dynamics of the direct sum of two machines in terms of their respective dynamics.

**Lemma 2.** Let \(M_i = \{H_{\text{in}}, H_s^{(i)}, U_i, M_i\} (i = 1, 2)\) be two quantum Mealy machines with the same input space \(H_{\text{in}}\) and the same outputs \(O\) (i.e. measurements \(M_i = \{M_a^{(i)} : a \in O\}\) for \(i = 1, 2\)). Let \(E_{a|\pi}^{(1)}, E_{a|\pi}^{(2)}\) and \(E_{a|\pi}\) be the super-operator defined in \(M_1, M_2\) and \(M = M_1 \oplus M_2\) by equation (7) and generalised by equation (13), respectively. Then
\[
E_{a|\pi}(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2) = E_{a|\pi}^{(1)}(\rho_1) \oplus E_{a|\pi}^{(2)}(\rho_2)
\]
for every \(\rho_i \in \mathcal{D}(H^{(i)}_{\text{in}}) (i = 1, 2)\).

**Proof:** We prove this lemma by induction on the length of \(\pi\). For the case of \(|\pi| = 1\), for \(a \in O\) and \(\sigma \in \mathcal{D}(H_{\text{in}})\), we can verify that
\[
E_{a|\sigma}(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2) = \text{tr}_{H_{\text{in}}} \left[ \left( M_a^{(1)} \oplus M_a^{(2)} \right) (U_1 \oplus U_2) \right]
\]
\[
= E_{a|\sigma}^{(1)}(\rho_1) \oplus E_{a|\sigma}^{(2)}(\rho_2).
\]
Now suppose it is true for the case of \(|\pi| = k\), i.e.
\[
E_{a|\pi}(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2) = E_{a|\pi}^{(1)}(\rho_1) \oplus E_{a|\pi}^{(2)}(\rho_2)
\]
holds for every input sequence \(\pi\) with \(|\pi| = k\) and output sequence \(a\). For every \(a_{k+1} \in O\) and \(\sigma_{k+1} \in \mathcal{D}(H_{\text{in}})\), we have
\[
E_{a_{k+1}|\pi_{\sigma_{k+1}}}(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2) = E_{a_{k+1}|\sigma_{k+1}}(E_{a|\pi}(\rho_1 \oplus \rho_2))
\]
\[
= E_{a_{k+1}|\sigma_{k+1}}^{(1)}(\rho_1) \oplus E_{a_{k+1}|\sigma_{k+1}}^{(2)}(\rho_2)
\]
Hence, the property also holds for the case \(|\pi| = k+1\), and we complete the proof.

Now we are ready to accomplish step (i). Formally, this step can be formulated as the following:
Lemma 3. Let $\mathcal{M}_i = \{\mathcal{H}_{in}, \mathcal{H}^{(i)}_{in}, U_i, M_i\}$ $(i = 1, 2)$ be two quantum Mealy machines with the same input space $\mathcal{H}_{in}$ and the same outputs $O$ (i.e., measurements $M_i = \{M^{(i)}_a : a \in O\}$ for $i = 1, 2$). Let $\rho_i \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}^{(i)}_{in})$ $(i = 1, 2)$ and $V \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{in})$. Then $(\mathcal{M}_1, \rho_1) \sim_V (\mathcal{M}_2, \rho_2)$ iff $\rho_1 \sim \rho_2$ in $\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$.

Proof: Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$. Furthermore, let $\mathcal{E}^{(i)}_{a|\pi}$ be the super-operator defined in $\mathcal{M}_i$ for $i = 1, 2$, and $\mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}$ be that defined in $\mathcal{M}$. We also use the notation $p^{(i)}(a|\pi, \rho)(i = 1, 2)$ and $p(a|\pi, \rho)$ to denote the probability that $M_i(i = 1, 2)$ and $\mathcal{M}$ with initial state $\rho$ output $a$ on input sequence $\pi$, respectively. Then by Lemma 1 we have:

$$p^{(i)}(a|\pi, \rho_i) = \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}^{(i)}_{a|\pi}(\rho_i) \right], \quad p(a|\pi, \rho_i) = \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho_i) \right]$$

for $i = 1, 2$. By Lemma 2 we have: $\mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho_i) = \mathcal{E}^{(i)}_{a|\pi}(\rho_i)$ for $i = 1, 2$. We immediately obtain that $p(a|\pi, \rho_i) = p^{(i)}(a|\pi, \rho_i)$, which implies that $(\mathcal{M}_1, \rho_1) \sim_V (\mathcal{M}_2, \rho_2)$ iff $\rho_1 \sim \rho_2$ in $\mathcal{M}_1 \oplus \mathcal{M}_2$ by the definition of $V$-equivalence.

Next, we turn to accomplish step (ii). Formally, we have:

Lemma 4. Let $\mathcal{M} = (\mathcal{H}_{in}, \mathcal{H}_s, U, M)$ be a quantum Mealy machine, and $B \subseteq \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{in})$. Then $\rho_1 \sim_B \rho_2$ iff $\rho_1 \sim_{\text{span } B} \rho_2$ for every $\rho_1, \rho_2 \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_s)$.

Proof: The “if” part is obvious. To prove the “only if” part, we first observe that for every input sequence $\pi$ and $a \in O^{\pi_1}$, $p(a|\pi, \rho) = \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho) \right]$. We only need to consider the case where $B$ is a finite set, say $B = \{\gamma_1, \gamma_2, \ldots, \gamma_k\}$. Suppose that $\rho_1 \sim_B \rho_2$. Then for every input sequence $\pi = \sigma_1 \sigma_2 \ldots \sigma_t$ and $a \in O^t$, where $\sigma_j \in \text{span } B$ for $1 \leq j \leq t$, we have

$$\sigma_j = \sum_{i=1}^{k} \alpha_{ji} \gamma_i,$$

for some coefficients $\alpha_{ji}$. By Lemma 1 we have

$$p(a|\pi, \rho_1) = \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho_1) \right]$$

$$= \sum_{i_1=1}^{k} \cdots \sum_{i_t=1}^{k} \alpha_{1i_1} \cdots \alpha_{ti_t} \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a|\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_t}(\rho_1) \right]$$

$$= \sum_{i_1=1}^{k} \cdots \sum_{i_t=1}^{k} \alpha_{1i_1} \cdots \alpha_{ti_t} \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a|\gamma_1 \cdots \gamma_t}(\rho_2) \right]$$

$$= \text{tr} \left[ \mathcal{E}_{a|\pi}(\rho_2) \right] = p(a|\pi, \rho_2),$$

which yields $\rho_1 \sim_{\text{span } B} \rho_2$.

As an immediate corollary, we see that $\rho_1 \sim \rho_2$ if and only if $\rho_1 \sim_B \rho_2$ for some basis $B$ of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{in})$ consisting of only pure states.
Correctness Proof of Algorithm 1

The correctness of Algorithm 1 is essentially based on Theorem 1. Indeed, by Theorem 1, we only need to prove that \( \text{span} \left( D(\rho, d_1^2 + d_2^2 - 1) \right) = \text{span} \mathcal{B} \). The inclusion \( \text{span} \left( D(\rho, d_1^2 + d_2^2 - 1) \right) \supseteq \text{span} \mathcal{B} \) is obvious. To prove the reverse inclusion, it is sufficient to show that 
\[
E_a|\pi(\rho) \in \text{span} \mathcal{B} \leq (\pi, a) \quad \text{for every} \quad E_a|\pi(\rho) \in D(\rho, d_1^2 + d_2^2 - 1),
\]
where 
\[
\mathcal{B}_{a}(\pi, a) = \{ E_a'|\pi'(\rho) : (\pi', a') \subset (\pi, a) \text{ and } E_a'|\pi'(\rho) \in \mathcal{B} \}
\]
and \( \subset \) can be \(<\) or \(\leq\). This can be proved by induction on the admissible order maintained in the queue. Note that 
\[
E_\epsilon|\epsilon(\rho) = \rho \in \text{span} \mathcal{B} \quad \text{for the basis. For every} \quad E_{ax}|\pi\sigma(\rho), \text{we consider the following two cases:}
\]

**Case 1.** If \( E_a|\pi(\rho) \) is added into \( \mathcal{B} \) at the step when \((\pi, a)\) is popped from \( Q \) in the algorithm, then \( E_{ax}|\pi\sigma(\rho) \) is pushed into \( Q \) in the execution of the algorithm and thus \( E_{ax}|\pi\sigma(\rho) \in \text{span} \mathcal{B} \leq (\pi, a) \) is guaranteed.

**Case 2.** If \( E_a|\pi(\rho) \) is not added into \( \mathcal{B} \) at the step when \((\pi, a)\) is popped from \( Q \) in the algorithm or even \((\pi, a)\) is never in the queue, then \( \mathcal{B} < (\pi, a) = \mathcal{B} \leq (\pi, a) \). By the induction hypothesis we have: 
\[
E_a|\pi(\rho) \in \text{span} \mathcal{B} \leq (\pi, a),
\]
which immediately yields 
\[
E_{ax}|\pi\sigma(\rho) = E_x|\sigma(E_a|\pi(\rho)) 
\in E_x|\sigma(\text{span} \mathcal{B} < (\pi, a)) 
= \text{span} E_x|\sigma(\mathcal{B} < (\pi, a)) 
\subseteq \text{span} \mathcal{B} < (\pi, a) 
\subseteq \text{span} \mathcal{B} \leq (\pi, a).
\]

Hence, \( E_{ax}|\pi\sigma(\rho) \in \text{span} \mathcal{B} \leq (\pi, a) \) is also guaranteed.

Therefore, it always holds that \( \text{span} D(\rho, d_1^2 + d_2^2 - 1) \subseteq \text{span} \mathcal{B} \) and correctness of the algorithm is proved.

Case Studies

To show the utility of the formal model defined in this paper and further illustrate Algorithm 1, we present several case studies in this section.

Repeat-until-Success Implementation

We first consider the repeat-until-success implementation example (Example 1 and 8). As pointed out in [32], the sequential quantum circuit in Figure 1 will produce \( V_3 |\psi\rangle \) with probability 5/8 and remain \( |\psi\rangle \) with probability 3/8, regardless of the exact state \( |\psi\rangle \). Indeed, this assertion can be verified by our algorithm in the sense that given any two different quantum states \( |\phi_1\rangle \) and \( |\phi_2\rangle \), we can conclude that they have the same probability to apply a unitary operator \( V_3 \) or the identity by verifying \( V_{russ} \)-equivalent in \( M_{russ} \), i.e.
whether consider the two initial states $\phi_1$ and $\phi_2$, where $V_{rus} = \text{span}\{0\}_q \langle 0 \}$. We select $\phi_1 = |0\rangle$ and $\phi_2 = |+\rangle$, and $\phi_1 = (|0\rangle + i|1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ and $\phi_2 = (|0\rangle + 2|1\rangle)/\sqrt{5}$ as examples (see Cases qrus-1 and qrus-2 in Table 1).

F.2 Quantum Random Walks

We consider the quantum random walk example (Example 7 and 9). Our algorithm is applied to the following equivalence checking problems:

1. **The same coin and different initial states**: Suppose the coin-flip operator $C$ is the Hadamard gate $H$. In this case, the machine is denoted $\mathcal{M}_H$. We consider the two initial states $|0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p$ and $|0\rangle_c |2\rangle_p$. We want to check: whether $\mathcal{M}_H$ with $|0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p$ is equivalent to the same $\mathcal{M}_H$ with $|0\rangle_c |2\rangle_p$? In other words, whether $|0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p \sim |0\rangle_c |2\rangle_p$, i.e., $|0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p \sim V_{rus} |0\rangle_c |2\rangle_p$ for $V_{rus} = D(\mathcal{H}_d)$? To this end, we choose the basis

$$B = \{|0\rangle_d |0\rangle, |1\rangle_d |1\rangle, |+\rangle_d (+), |\phi\rangle_d (\phi)\}$$

of $D(\mathcal{H}_d)$ that consists of only pure states, where

$$|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|0\rangle + i|1\rangle).$$

For convenience, we will use 0, 1, +, $\phi$ to denote the corresponding states (i.e., density matrices), and set

$$\rho = \left(|0\rangle_c |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle_p \langle 0 | \right) \oplus \left(-|0\rangle_c |0\rangle \otimes |2\rangle_p \langle 2 | \right).$$

Now let us see how the algorithm works. It first pushes $(\epsilon, \epsilon)$ into an empty queue $Q$. Repeating the “while” loop, it produces set

$$\mathcal{B} = \{\mathcal{E}_{\epsilon |\epsilon} (\rho), \mathcal{E}_{0|0} (\rho), \mathcal{E}_{1|0} (\rho), \mathcal{E}_{0|+} (\rho), \ldots \}.$$ 

We see that

$$\mathcal{E}_{00|00} (\rho) = \frac{1}{2} (|+\rangle_c (+) \otimes |1\rangle_p \langle 1 |) \neq 0 \in \mathcal{B},$$

but $\text{tr}(\mathcal{E}_{00|00} (\rho)) = \frac{1}{2} \neq 0$. Therefore, $|0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p$ is not equivalent to $|0\rangle_c |2\rangle_p$ in $\mathcal{M}_H$ (see Case qwalk-small-1 of Table 2). In fact,

$$p \left(0000 + 0000, |0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p \right) = \frac{1}{2} \neq p \left(0000 + 0000, |0\rangle_c |2\rangle_p \right) = 0.$$ 

This example shows an interesting difference between quantum and classical random walks. Note that two initial states $|0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p$ and $|0\rangle_c |2\rangle_p$ are symmetric in the classical case. In the quantum case, however, a superposition of states can be used in a detection. In other words, the Hadamard gate $H$ is biased over $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, but we can use $|\phi\rangle$ as the coin state to overcome this issue [19]. Surprisingly, $|\phi\rangle_c |0\rangle_p$ is equivalent to $|\phi\rangle_c |2\rangle_p$ in $\mathcal{M}_H$, which can also be verified by our algorithm (see Case qwalk-small-2 of Table 2).
Furthermore, using our algorithm, we can discover several other interesting symmetries in $M_H$: \(|0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p \sim |1\rangle_c |2\rangle_p, |0\rangle_c |1\rangle_p \sim |1\rangle_c |1\rangle_p\) and \(|0\rangle_c |2\rangle_p \sim |1\rangle_c |0\rangle_p\) (see Case qwalk-sym-1 to qwalk-sym-3 of Table 2).

(2) **Two different coins**: The previous example considers different initial states, but the combinational circuits are the same. Now we replace the Hadamard gate for coin-flip by the following gate

$$Y = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & i \\ i & 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

and the corresponding machine is denoted $M_Y$; that is, we set $C = Y$ in $M_C$. It can be verified that $(M_H, |0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p)$ is equivalent to $(M_Y, |0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p)$ by our algorithm (see Case qwalk-diff of Table 2).

(3) **Coins with irrational rotations**: Let us further consider two coins with irrational rotations $R_{\pm} = R_x(\pm \sqrt{2})$,

$$R_x(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta/2) & -i\sin(\theta/2) \\ -i\sin(\theta/2) & \cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix}.$$

In this case, the states of the machines may never repeat, as the angles of rotations are irrational. Nevertheless, it can be verified that $(M_{R_{+}}, |0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p)$ is equivalent to $(M_{R_{-}}, |0\rangle_c |0\rangle_p)$ by our algorithm (see Case qwalk-irr of Table 2).

**F.3 Controlled Quantum Circuits**

We now turn to consider controlled quantum circuits, where the input state is separated into two parts:

1. Ancilla part: This part consists of ancilla qubits, which are initialised to $|0\rangle$;
2. Control part: This part consists of control qubits, which are guaranteed to be in the computational basis.

In Example 10 and 13 the ancilla part is $\mathcal{H}_d$ and the control part is $\mathcal{H}_q$. Under this “classical control” design, we are not interested in equivalence of two machines with respect to the whole input space but a subspace of it. More precisely, we are interested in equivalence in a subspace $V_{ctrl}$ of $\mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_d \otimes \mathcal{H}_q)$:

$$V_{ctrl} = \text{span}\{ |0\rangle_d \langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle_{q_1} \langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle_{q_2} \langle 0|, |0\rangle_d \langle 0| \otimes |0\rangle_{q_1} \langle 0| \otimes |1\rangle_{q_2} \langle 1|, |0\rangle_d \langle 0| \otimes |1\rangle_{q_1} \langle 1| \otimes |0\rangle_{q_2} \langle 0|, |0\rangle_d \langle 0| \otimes |1\rangle_{q_1} \langle 1| \otimes |1\rangle_{q_2} \langle 1| \}.$$

The question is whether $\rho_1 \sim_V \rho_2$ instead of $\rho_1 \sim \rho_2$? For example, our algorithm can verify that \(|0\rangle_{p_1} |0\rangle_{p_2} |0\rangle_{p_3} \sim_{V_{ctrl}} |0\rangle_{p_1} |0\rangle_{p_2} |1\rangle_{p_3}\) (See Case qctrl-1 of Table 2) and \(|1\rangle_{p_1} |1\rangle_{p_2} |0\rangle_{p_3} \sim_{V_{ctrl}} |1\rangle_{p_1} |0\rangle_{p_2} |1\rangle_{p_3}\) (See Case qctrl-2 of Table 2).
F.4 Quantum Fourier Transforms

Example 11 and 14 are still a controlled quantum circuit, but they are much more complicated than classical control examples like Examples 10 and 13, because they allow to control a quantum circuit of quantum Fourier transform rather than a simple quantum gate. In particular, the dimension of state space is larger and the matrices are more complex than in the previous examples. Thus, it is more difficult to figure out whether two states are equivalent Example 11 and 14. For example, even when we consider subspace $V_{\text{qft}}$ more difficult to figure out whether two states are equivalent than a simple quantum gate. In particular, the dimension of state space is larger than a simple quantum gate. In particular, the dimension of state space is larger and the matrices are more complex than in the previous examples. Thus, it is not easy to check whether:

$$V_{\text{qft}} = \text{span}\{ |0\rangle_d (0) \otimes |0\rangle_q, |0\rangle_d (0) \otimes |1\rangle_q \},$$

it is not easy to check whether:

1. $|0\rangle_{p_1} |0\rangle_{p_2} |0\rangle_{p_3} |0\rangle_{p_4} \sim_{V_{\text{qft}}} |1\rangle_{p_1} |0\rangle_{p_2} |0\rangle_{p_3} |0\rangle_{p_4}$?
2. $|0\rangle_{p_1} |0\rangle_{p_2} |0\rangle_{p_3} |0\rangle_{p_4} \sim_{V_{\text{qft}}} |1\rangle_{p_1} |1\rangle_{p_2} |0\rangle_{p_3} |0\rangle_{p_4}$?

Indeed, our algorithm could verify that

1. $|0\rangle_{p_1} |0\rangle_{p_2} |0\rangle_{p_3} |0\rangle_{p_4} \not\sim_{V_{\text{qft}}} |1\rangle_{p_1} |0\rangle_{p_2} |0\rangle_{p_3} |0\rangle_{p_4}$, Moreover, the algorithm gives an counterexample to show that they are really not equivalent, which is an input sequence $\pi = |0\rangle_d |0\rangle_q, |0\rangle_d |0\rangle_q |0\rangle_d |1\rangle_q, |0\rangle_d |0\rangle_q$ and an output sequence $a = 0, 0, 1, 0$ (See Case qft-small-1 of Table 2).
2. $|0\rangle_{p_1} |0\rangle_{p_2} |0\rangle_{p_3} |0\rangle_{p_4} \not\sim_{V_{\text{qft}}} |1\rangle_{p_1} |0\rangle_{p_2} |0\rangle_{p_3} |0\rangle_{p_4}$, with a counterexample $\pi = |0\rangle_d |0\rangle_q, |0\rangle_d |1\rangle_q, |0\rangle_d |0\rangle_q, |0\rangle_d |1\rangle_q, |0\rangle_d |0\rangle_q$ and $a = 0, 1, 0, 1, 0$ (See Case qft-small-2 of Table 2).

F.5 Quantum Half Adders

Both a sequential classical circuit and a quantum circuit of half adder were presented in Example 12 and 13, where the classical circuit was chosen to have a reversible combinational part. For a comparison between the classical and quantum circuits, we should only consider the computational basis, or equivalently work on the subspace:

$$V_{\text{sha}} = \text{span}\{ |0\rangle_c (0) \otimes |0\rangle_a (0), |0\rangle_c (0) \otimes |1\rangle_a (1), |1\rangle_c (1) \otimes |0\rangle_a (0), |1\rangle_c (1) \otimes |1\rangle_a (1) \}.$$

To check whether the two sequential (quantum and classical) circuits in Figure 7 and Figure 8 are (classically functional) equivalent, one may ask, for example, whether $(\mathcal{M}_{\text{sha}}, |0\rangle_b) \sim_{V_{\text{sha}}} (\mathcal{M}_{\text{sha}}, |0\rangle_b)$? Indeed, our algorithm could give a positive answer (See Case qhalf-adder of Table 2).