Quantum mechanicalUniversal constructor

A run K.Pati^(y) and Sam uelL.Braunstein Inform atics, Bangor University, Bangor LL57 1UT, UK ^(y)Institute of Physics, Sainik SchoolPost, Bhubaneswar-751005, Orissa, India (March 29, 2024)

Abstract

A rbitrary quantum states cannot be copied. In fact, to make a copy we must provide complete information about the system. However, can a quantum system self-replicate? This is not answered by the no-cloning theorem. In the classical context, Von N eum ann showed that a 'universal constructor' can exist which can self-replicate an arbitrary system, provided that it had access to instructions for making copy of the system. We equestion the existence of a universal constructor that may allow for the self-replication of an arbitrary quantum system. We prove that there is no determ inistic universal quantum constructor which can operate with nite resources. Further, we delineate conditions under which such a universal constructor can be designed to operate dterm inistically and probabilistically.

The basis of classical computation is the Church-Turing thesis [1,2] which says that every recursive function can be computed algorithm ically provided the algorithm can be executed by a physical process. How ever, fundam ental physical processes are not governed by classical mechanics, rather by quantum mechanical laws. The possibility of performing reversible computation [3] and the fact that classical computers cannot e ciently simulate quantum system s [4,5] gave birth to the concept of the quantum Turing m achine [6]. This led to a urry of discoveries in quantum computation [7], quantum algorithms [8{11], quantum simulators [12], quantum autom aton [13] and program mable gate array [14]. In another developm ent, von Neum ann [15] thought of an extension of the logical concept of a universal computing machine which might minic a living system . One of the hall-mark properties of a living system is its capability of self-reproduction. He asked the question: Is it possible to design a machine that could be program med to produce a copy of itself, in the same spirit that a Turing machine can be programmed to compute any function allowed by physical law. More precisely, he de ned a 'universal constructor' as a machine which can reproduce itself if it is provided with a program containing its own description. The process of selfreproduction requires two steps: rst, the constructor has to produce a copy of itself and second, it has to produce the program of how to copy itself. The second step is in portant in order that the self-reproduction continues, otherwise, the child copy cannot self-reproduce. W hen the constructor produces a copy of the program, then it attaches it to the child copy and the process repeats. Unexpectedly, working with classical cellular autom aton it was

found that there is indeed a universal constructor capable of self-reproducing.

In a sense, von Neumann's universal constructor is a \Turing test of life" [16] if we attribute the above unique property to a living system, though there are other complex properties such as the ability to self-repair, grow and evolve. From this perspective, the universal constructor is very usefulm odel to explore and understand under what conditions a system is capable of self-reproducing (either arti cially or in reality). If one attempts to understand elementary living systems as quantum mechanical systems in an information theoretic sense, then one must rst try to nd out whether a universal quantum mechanical constructor exists. In a simple and decisive manner, we nd that an all-purpose quantum mechanical constructor exist.

The quantum world is fundamentally dierent in many respects than any classical world. There are many kinds of machines which are possible classically but in possible quantum mechanically. Wigner was probably the rst to address the question of replicating machines in the quantum world and found that it is in nitely unlikely that such machines can exist [17]. It is now well known that the information content of a quantum state has two remarkable properties: rst, it cannot be copied exactly [18,19] and second, given several copies of an unknown state we cannot delete a copy [20]. For example, if one could clone an arbitrary state then one could violate the Heisenberg uncertainty relation, and moreover, using non-local resources one could send signals faster than the speed of light [19]. In addition, non-orthogonal quantum states cannot be perfectly copied whereas orthogonal quantum states can be. [21]. The extra information needed to make a copy must be as large as possible | a recent result known as the stronger no-cloning theorem [22]. The no-cloning and the no-deleting principles taken together reveal some kind of permanence' of quantum information.

First, we observe that merely copying of inform ation is not the self-replication. Therefore, with the quantum mechanical toolkit, we must form alize the question of a self-replicating machine. Let A be a universal construction machine. If j i is the state of a species that would self-replicate, then by furnishing a suitable description of the instructions U to produce j i (in accordance with the stronger no-cloning theorem we have to supply the full inform ation about j i) then A will construct a copy of j i. However, this A is not yet self-reproducing, because A has produced a copy of j i but without a copy of U. If we add the description of U to itself it will not solve the problem, as this would lead to in nite regression. In von N eum ann's spirit we can in agine that there exists an additional quantum system B that stores the instructions U and can make a copy of them. Another ancillary system C, called the control unit, will insert the copy of U into j i and then will separate from the com posite system A + B.

are available in the environment in which the universal constructor is operating (they are analogous to the low-entropy nutrient states that are required by a real living system). The justi cation for nite number of such states comes from the fact that in the universe the total energy and negative entropy available at any time is always nite [17]. To copy the program state the machine uses m blank states in one generation, so $K = N^m$. Thus M is nite but M N;K. The initial state of the universal constructor is j if u if j i. A universal constructor will be said to exist if it can implement copying of the original and the stored program by a xed linear unitary operator L acting on the combined H ilbert space of the input, program, control and (m + 1) blank states that allows the following transform ation

where j^{c} ⁰i is the nal state of the control unit. It is worth emphasizing that (1) is not a cloning transformation. It is a recursively de ned transformation where the xed unitary operator L acts on the initial (parent) con guration and the same eacts on the nal (child) con guration after the copies have been produced. This de nition is required in order that the self-replication proceeds in an autonom ous way until the blank states are exhausted. The xed unitary operator will not act on the child con guration unless (m + 1) nutrient states are available in the universe. Once the transformation is complete, the control unit separates the original information from the program states (parent information) so that the o -spring exists independently. (i.e. there is no quantum entanglement between the parent and the child information). It then continues to self-reproduce.

If such a universal constructor exists, then when it is fed with another state j i and a suitable program \mathcal{P}_V i to create it via V (j i)) = j ij i then it will allow the transform ation

$$L (j i \mathcal{D} i \mathcal{P}_{V} i \mathcal{D} i^{m} \mathcal{L} i) \mathcal{D} i^{n} (m+1) = j i \mathcal{P}_{V} i L (j i \mathcal{D} i \mathcal{P}_{V} i \mathcal{D} i^{m} \mathcal{L}^{0} i) \mathcal{D} i^{n-2(m+1)}:$$
(2)

If such a machine can make a copy of any state along with its program in a unitary manner, then it must preserve the inner product. This im plies that we must have

$$h j ih \mathbb{P}_{u} \mathcal{P}_{v} i = h j i^{2} h \mathbb{P}_{u} \mathcal{P}_{v} i^{2} h \mathbb{C}^{0} j \mathbb{C}^{0} i$$
(3)

holds true. However, the above equation tells us that the universal constructor can exist only under two conditions, namely, (i) either h j i = 0 and hP $_{\rm U}$ P_V i \in 0 or (ii) h j i \in 0 and hP_U P_V i = 0. The rst condition suggests that for orthogonal states as the carrier of information, there is no restriction on the program state. This means that with a nite dimensional program state and nite number of blank states orthogonal states can selfreplicate. Such a universal constructor can exist with a nite resources. This corresponds to the realization of a classical universal constructor, and is consistent with von N eum ann's thesis, that a self-reproducing general purpose machine can exist, in principle, in a determ inistic universe [15]. However, the second condition tells us that for non-orthogonal states, the program states have to be orthogonal. This means that to perfectly self-replicate a collection of non-orthogonal states fj ig together with their program states fP_{Ui}ig; (i = 1;2;:::) one requires that the set fP_{Ui}ig's should be orthogonal. Since an arbitrary state such as j i = $\begin{bmatrix} P \\ i \end{bmatrix}$ if with the complex numbers is varying continuously can be viewed as an in nite collection of non-orthogonal states (or equivalently the set of non-orthogonal states for a single quantum system is in nite, even for a simplest two-state system such as a qubit), one requires an in nite-dimensional program state to copy it. In one generation of the selfreplication the number of blank states used to copy the program state is $m = \log_2 K = \log_2 N$ and when $K \ 1$ the nutrient resource needed also becomes in nite. As a consequence, to copy an in nite-dimensional H ilbert space program state one needs an in nite collection of blank states to start with. Furthermore, the number of generations g for which the selfreproduction can occur with a nite nutrient resource is $g = \log_2 M = (\log_2 K N)$. When K becomes in nite, then there can be no generations supporting self-reproduction. Therefore, we sum ise that with a nite-dimensional program state and a nite nutrient resource there is no determ inistic universal constructor for arbitrary quantum states. However, if one is interested in self-replication of a nite number K of the non-orthogonal states with K the dimension of the program H ilbert space, then it m ay be possible to design a universal constructor with nite resources. Because, one may nd K mutually orthogonal program states that span the program H ilbert space.

One may ask is it not possible to rule out the nonexistence of determ inistic universal constructor from no-cloning principle? The answer is ho' for two reasons. First, a simple universal cloner is not a universal constructor. Second, in a universal constructor we provide the complete speci cation about the input state, hence it should have been possible to selfreproduce, thus reaching an opposite conclusion! Even though Eq.(3) may look the same to what one gets in the cloning operation, the transform ation de ned in Eq.(1) is not. One similarity for example, is that if one stores the information in an orthonormal basis states fj ig, (i = 1;2;::N), then the cloning and the self-replication both are allowed. The surprising and remarkable result is that when we ask to self-replicate any arbitrary living species, then it cannot. By providing complete information of a quantum system, one may think that it should be able to self-replicate. Because when we know the state completely then we can design a program to copy the state. If a universal quantum constructor exist then, the program is supposed to contain the description of the species, i.e. the information about j i. So it should have been able to self-replicate. But The perplexity of the problem lies when we allow the program to be copied. If it has to self-replicate then it violates unitarity of quantum theory.

This result may have immense bearing on explaining life based on quantum theory. One may argue that after all if everything comes to the molecular scale then there are variety of physical actions and chemical reactions which might be explained by the basic laws of quantum mechanics. However, if one applies quantum theory, then as we have proved quantum mechanical living organism cannot self-replicate. Interpreting di erently, we might say that the present structure of quantum theory cannot model a living system as it fails to minic a minimal living system. For quantum mechanizing a living system seems to be an impossible task. If that holds true, then this conclusion is going to have rather deep implication on our present search for ultimate laws of nature encompassing physical and biological world. On the other hand, because the self-reproducible information must be classical' the replication of DNA in a living cell can be understood purely by classical means. Having said this, our result does not preclude the possibility that quantum theory might play a role in explaining other features of the living system s [23]. For example, there is a recent proposal that quantum mechanics may explain why the living organism s have four nucleotide bases and twenty am ino acids [24]. It has been also reported that the gam e of life can emerge in the sem i-quantum mechanical context [25].

Though we have ruled out the existence of determ inistic universal constructor with nite resource, one can construct probabilistic universal constructor for non-orthogonal species states fj_iig with certain probability of success, given a nite dimensional program state f_{U_i} ig and a nite collection of blank states. It is given by

$$L (j_{i}ij) P_{U_{i}}ij = p_{\overline{p_{i}}j_{i}i} P_{U_{i}}iL (j_{i}ij) P_{U_{i}}ij) p_{\overline{p_{i}}} p$$

where p_i is the probability of success that the universal constructor works, M i is the initial probe state and M^{0} is the nalprobe state whose measurement can tell that it really succeeds, and K_{i} is the failure component of the whole constructor. It can be proved that the above transformation can exists if and only if the set fj $_{i}iP_{U_i}$ ig is linearly independent [26]. This implies that the quantum species states need not be necessarily linearly independent. It is only su cient to have that condition satis ed. The error in the probabilistic self-replication process of two non-orthogonal states j $_{i}i$ and j $_{j}i$ is bounded by

$$f_{ij} = \frac{\cancel{p}_{ij} \cancel{j} \cancel{p}_{U_i} \cancel{p}_{U_j} \cancel{j}}{1 + \cancel{p}_{ij} \cancel{j} \cancel{p}_{U_i} \cancel{p}_{U_j} \cancel{j} \cancel{p}_{U_i} \cancel{j}};$$
(5)

From the above it is clear that there is no error introduced in the self-replicating process of any two orthogonal states, even if the program states are not orthogonal.

In plications of our results are multifold for physical and biological sciences. It is beyond doubt that progress in the burgeoning area of quantum information technology can lead to revolutions in the machines that one cannot think of at present. If a quantum mechanical universal constructor would have been possible, future technology would have allow ed quantum computers to self-replicate them selves with little or no hum an input. That would have been a complete autonom ous device | a truly marvelous thing. However, a determ inistic universal constructor with a nite resources is in possible in principle. One has to look for probabilistic universal constructors which can self-replicate with only limited probability of success, sim ilar to probabilistic cloner [26]. This could still have great im plications for the future. With complete speci cation such a machine could construct copies based on its own quantum information processing devices. Future lines of exploration may lead to the design of approximate universal constructors in analogy with approximate universal quantum cloners [27].

How life emerges from inanimate quantum objects has been a conundrum [28{30]. W hat we have shown here is that quantum mechanics fails to mimic a self-reproducing unit in an autonom ous way. Nevertheless, if one allows for errors in self-replication, which actually do occur in real living systems, then an approximate universal constructor should exist. Such a machine would constitute a quantum mechanical mutation machine. It would be important to see how variations in 'life' emerge due to the errors in self-replication. From this perspective, if quantum mechanics is the nal theory of nature, our result indicates that the information stored in a living organism are copied imperfectly and the error rate may be just right in order formutation to occur to drive D arw inian evolution. In addition, one could study how the quantum evolution of species leads to an increase in the level of com plexity in living systems. Since understanding these basic features of life from quantum mechanical principles is a fundamental task, we hope that the present result is a rst step in that direction, and will be important in the areas of quantum information, articial life, cellular automaton, and last but not least in the biophysical science.

A cknow ledgm ents: W e thank C.Fuchs for bringing the paper of E.P.W igner to our attention. AKP wishes to thank C.H.Bennett, S.Lloyd, I.Chuang and D.Abbott for useful discussions. This work started during AKP's stay at Bangor University during 1999 and was completed during a visit to M SRI, University of Berkeley, in 2002. SLB currently holds a W olfson-Royal Society Research M erit Award.

REFERENCES

- [1] A. Church, Am. J. M ath. 58 345-363 (1936).
- [2] A.M. Turing, Proc. Lond. M ath. Soc. 42, 230-265 (1936).
- [3] C.H.Bennett, IBM Journal of Research and Development, 17, 525-532 (1973).
- [4] R.Feynman, Int.J.Theo.Phys. 21, 467-488 (1982).
- [5] P.Benio, Phys. Rev. Lett. 48, 1581-1585 (1982).
- [6] D. Deutsch, Proc R. Soc. Lond A 400, 97-117 (1985).
- [7] R. Feynm an, Found. Phys. 16, 507-531 (1986).
- [8] E.Bernstein, and U.Vazirani, Proc. 25th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Com puting, 11-20 (1993).
- [9] D. Deutsch, & R. Jozsa, Proc. R. Soc. London A 449, 553-558 (1992).
- [10] P.Shor, SIAM J.Comput. 265, 1484-1509 (1997)
- [11] L.K.Grover, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 325-328 (1997).
- [12] S. Lloyd, Science 263, 1073-1078 (1996).
- [13] D.Z.Albert, Phys. Lett. A 98, 249-252 (1983).
- [14] M.A.Nielsen, & I.Chuang, Phys. Rev. Lett. 79, 321-324 (1997).
- [15] J.von Neum ann, The Theory of Self-Replicating Autom ata. University of Illinois Press, Urbana, IL (1966) (work by J.von Neum ann in 1952-53).
- [16] C. Adam i, Arti cial Life 1, 429-438 (1995).
- [17] E.P.W igner, The Probability of the Existence of a Self-Reproducing unit. The Logic of Personal Know ledge: Essays Presented to M ichael Polany on his Seventieth B inthday (Routledge & Kegan Paul, London) 231-238 (1961).
- [18] W.K.Wootters, & W.H.Zurek, Nature 299, 802-803 (1982).
- [19] D. Dieks, Phys. Lett. A 92, 271-272 (1982).
- [20] A.K. Pati, & S.L. Braunstein, Nature 404, 164 (2000).
- [21] H.P.Yuen, Phys. Lett. A 113, 405-407 (1986).
- [22] R. Jozsa, Quant. Ph., 0204153 (2002).
- [23] R. Penrose, Shadows of the M ind. Oxford University Press, Oxford, (1994).
- [24] A. Patel, J. of Bioscience 26, 145-151 (2001).
- [25] A.P.Flitney, & D.Abbott, Quant.Ph., 0208149 (2002).
- [26] L.M. Duan, & G.C. Guo, Phys. Rev. Lett. 80, 4999-5002 (1998).
- [27] V.Buzek, & M.H.Hillery, Phys. Rev A 54, 1844-1852 (1996).
- [28] E. Schrodinger, W hat is life. Cam bridge University Press, London, (1944).
- [29] W.M.Elsasser, The Physical Foundation of Biology, Pergam on Press, London, (1958).
- [30]G.J.Chaitin, ACM SICACT News 4, 12-18 (1970).