

State preparation based on Grover's algorithm in the presence of global information about the state

Andrei N. Soklakov and Rüdiger Schack

*Department of Mathematics, Royal Holloway, University of London,
Egham, Surrey TW20 0EX, United Kingdom*

3 October 2004

Abstract

In a previous paper [1] we described a quantum algorithm to prepare an arbitrary state of a quantum register with arbitrary fidelity. Here we present an alternative algorithm which uses a small number of quantum oracles encoding the most significant bits of the absolute value of the complex amplitudes, and a small number of oracles encoding the most significant bits of the phases. The algorithm given here is considerably simpler than the one described in [1], on the assumption that a sufficient amount of knowledge about the distribution of the absolute values of the complex amplitudes is available.

1 Overview

The first step of many quantum computer algorithms is the preparation of a quantum register in a simple initial state, e.g., the equal superposition of all computational basis states. Some applications of quantum computers, such as the simulation of a physical system [2, 3, 4], require the initial preparation of more general states. Here we consider the state preparation problem in the case that the Hilbert-space dimension of the quantum register is so large that listing the complex coefficients of the state is impractical.

In a previous publication [1] we have shown how to use elements of Grover's algorithm [5] to prepare a register of $\log_2 N$ qubits, with arbitrary fidelity, in an approximation to the state

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{p(x)} e^{2\pi i \phi(x)} |x\rangle \quad (1)$$

for any probabilities $p(x)$ and phases $\phi(x)$. We assume that N is an integer power of 2. Here and throughout the paper, $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, \dots$ denote computational basis states.

We will now describe an alternative algorithm to achieve the same goal, i.e., to prepare the quantum register in a state $|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle$ such that the fidelity, $|\langle \tilde{\Psi} | \Psi \rangle|$, is close to 1. In the

description of the algorithm below, we introduce three positive integer parameters, T , T' , and a . We will indicate how to choose these parameters, and derive a lower bound on the fidelity $|\langle \tilde{\Psi} | \Psi \rangle|$ in terms of them. We will also show how the required computational resources scale with these parameters. This will put us in a position to compare the two versions of the algorithm. See Ref. [1] for a comparison with the state-preparation algorithms by Kaye and Mosca [6] and Grover and Rudolph [7].

The functions $p(x)$ and $\phi(x)$ are assumed to be given in the form of classical algorithms. The function $p(x)$ is used to construct a set of quantum *oracles* as follows. Let T be a positive integer. For $k = 1, \dots, T$, we define

$$O_k(x) = c_k(x) , \quad (2)$$

where $c_k(x) \in \{0, 1\}$ are the coefficients in the binary expansion

$$\sqrt{\eta N p(x)} = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c_k(x) 2^{-k} , \quad (3)$$

and where η is a positive real number, $\eta < 1$, such that

$$p(x) \leq \frac{1}{\eta N} \quad \text{for all } x . \quad (4)$$

We extend this definition beyond the domain of the function p by setting $O_k(x) = 0$ for $x \geq N$. The quantum oracles are unitary operators defined by

$$\hat{O}_k |x\rangle = (-1)^{O_k(x)} |x\rangle , \quad (5)$$

which can be realized as quantum gate sequences using the classical algorithm to compute the probabilities $p(x)$. For each oracle, we define the number of solutions

$$N_k = \sum_x O_k(x) . \quad (6)$$

Now let T' be a positive integer, and let $c'_k(x) \in \{0, 1\}$ be the coefficients in the binary expansion

$$\phi(x) = \sum_{k=1}^{\infty} c'_k(x) 2^{-k} . \quad (7)$$

For $k = 1, \dots, T'$, we define unitary operations, $U_1, \dots, U_{T'}$, on our quantum register by

$$U_k |x\rangle = e^{2\pi i c'_k(x)/2^k} |x\rangle . \quad (8)$$

The operators U_k are conditional phase shifts that can be realized as quantum gate sequences using the classical algorithm to compute the phases $\phi(x)$ [8].

The algorithm can now be described as follows. Choose a suitable (small) number, a , of *auxiliary qubits*, and define $L = \log_2 N + a$. Prepare a register of L qubits in the state

$$|\Psi^0\rangle = (2^a N)^{-1/2} \sum_{x=0}^{2^a N - 1} |x\rangle . \quad (9)$$

For $k = 1, \dots, T$, define the Grover operator

$$\hat{G}(O_k, t_k) = \left((2|\Psi^0\rangle\langle\Psi^0| - \hat{I})\hat{O}_k \right)^{t_k}, \quad (10)$$

where \hat{I} is the L -qubit identity operator, and where the integer “times” t_k are defined in Eq. (42) below. Apply the Grover operators successively to the register to create the state

$$|\Psi^T\rangle = \hat{G}(O_T, t_T) \cdots \hat{G}(O_1, t_1) |\Psi^0\rangle. \quad (11)$$

Now measure the a auxiliary qubits in the computational basis. If one of the outcomes is 1 (the probability for this will be shown to be small), this stage of the algorithm has failed, and one has to start again by preparing the register in the state $|\Psi^0\rangle$ as in Eq. (9). Otherwise, i.e., if all a outcomes are 0, this stage of algorithm has succeeded, and the resulting state of the remaining $L - a = \log_2 N$ qubits, which we denote by $|\tilde{\Psi}_r\rangle$, will be a good approximation to the real-amplitude state

$$|\Psi_r\rangle = \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{p(x)} |x\rangle, \quad (12)$$

obtained from our target state $|\Psi\rangle$ by setting the phases $\phi(x)$ to zero.

The final stage of the algorithm adds phases to the state $|\tilde{\Psi}_r\rangle$ by applying the operators $U_1, \dots, U_{T'}$,

$$|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle = U_1 U_2 \cdots U_{T'} |\tilde{\Psi}_r\rangle. \quad (13)$$

In the next section, we analyse the dependence of the state $|\Psi^T\rangle$ on the numbers t_k , and thus motivate the definition (42). At the end of the section, we derive upper bounds on the numbers t_k and therefore on the required number of oracle calls. In the final section, we derive a lower bound on the fidelity in terms of the parameters T , T' and a .

2 Number of oracle calls

In the following we will use the notation $1 : n$ to index an ordered sequence of n symbols, for example,

$$q_{1:n} = q_1, \dots, q_n. \quad (14)$$

Using this notation, the statement $q_{1:n} = c_{1:n}$ means that $q_j = c_j$ for any $j = 1, \dots, n$.

We define a set of refined oracles,

$$O_{q_{1:n}}(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } q_{1:n} = c_{1:n}(x), \\ 0 & \text{otherwise,} \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

which can be expressed in terms of the oracles O_k as follows.

$$O_{q_{1:n}}(x) = \prod_{k=1}^n |O_k(x) - 1 + q_k|. \quad (16)$$

Let $\Omega_{q_{1:k}}$ be the set of values that are accepted by the oracle $O_{q_{1:k}}$, i.e.

$$\Omega_{q_{1:k}} = \{x : O_{q_{1:k}}(x) = 1\}. \quad (17)$$

Furthermore, denote by $N_{q_{1:k}}^k$ the size of the set $\Omega_{q_{1:k}}$,

$$N_{q_{1:k}}^k = \sum_x O_{q_{1:k}}(x). \quad (18)$$

The first stage of our algorithm takes the initial state $|\Psi^0\rangle$ through a series of intermediate states, $|\Psi^k\rangle$, to the state $|\Psi^T\rangle$. Due to the properties of the Grover operators, $\hat{G}(O_k, t_k)$, the intermediate states are of the form

$$|\Psi^k\rangle = \sum_{q_{1:k}} \sum_{x \in \Omega_{q_{1:k}}} A_{q_{1:k}}^k |x\rangle, \quad (19)$$

where

$$A_{q_{1:k}}^k = B^k + \sum_{j=1}^k q_j h_j, \quad (20)$$

where the *features* h_j are positive numbers determined by the times t_k , and where the B^k are real numbers determined by the normalization conditions $\langle \Psi^k | \Psi^k \rangle = 1$.

We show next how the features h_k depend on the numbers of Grover iterations t_k .

2.1 General oracle

We will be using the following result of Biham *et. al.* [9]. Consider an oracle O , which accepts r values (out of the total of $2^a N$, i.e., $\sum_{x=0}^{2^a N-1} O(x) = r$). We shall call such values of x *good*, as opposed to *bad* values of x that are rejected by the oracle. Using different notation for the coefficients of good and bad states, we have that after t Grover iterations an arbitrary quantum state

$$|\Psi^{\text{ini}}\rangle = \sum_{\text{good } x} g_x^{\text{ini}} |x\rangle + \sum_{\text{bad } x} b_x^{\text{ini}} |x\rangle \quad (21)$$

is transformed into

$$|\Psi^{\text{fin}}\rangle = \hat{G}(O, t) |\Psi^{\text{ini}}\rangle = \sum_{\text{good } x} g_x^{\text{fin}} |x\rangle + \sum_{\text{bad } x} b_x^{\text{fin}} |x\rangle. \quad (22)$$

Let \bar{g}^{ini} and \bar{b}^{ini} be the averages of the initial amplitudes of the good and the bad states respectively:

$$\bar{g}^{\text{ini}} = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{\text{good } x} g_x^{\text{ini}}, \quad \bar{b}^{\text{ini}} = \frac{1}{2^a N - r} \sum_{\text{bad } x} b_x^{\text{ini}}, \quad (23)$$

and similarly for the final amplitudes

$$\bar{g}^{\text{fin}} = \frac{1}{r} \sum_{\text{good } x} g_x^{\text{fin}}, \quad \bar{b}^{\text{fin}} = \frac{1}{2^a N - r} \sum_{\text{bad } x} b_x^{\text{fin}}, \quad (24)$$

Let us also define

$$\Delta g_x^{\text{ini}} = g_x^{\text{ini}} - \bar{g}^{\text{ini}}, \quad \Delta b_x^{\text{ini}} = b_x^{\text{ini}} - \bar{b}^{\text{ini}}. \quad (25)$$

In other words, Δg_x^{ini} and Δb_x^{ini} define the features of the initial amplitude functions g_x^{ini} and b_x^{ini} relative to their averages \bar{g}^{ini} and \bar{b}^{ini} . Biham *et. al.* have shown that the change of the amplitudes is essentially determined by the change of the averages:

$$\begin{aligned} g_x^{\text{fin}} &= \bar{g}^{\text{fin}} + \Delta g_x^{\text{ini}} \\ b_x^{\text{fin}} &= \bar{b}^{\text{fin}} + (-1)^t \Delta b_x^{\text{ini}}, \end{aligned} \quad (26)$$

where the averages \bar{g}^{fin} and \bar{b}^{fin} are given as follows. Define

$$\omega = \arccos \left(1 - \frac{2r}{2^a N} \right), \quad (27)$$

$$\alpha = \sqrt{|\bar{b}^{\text{ini}}|^2 + |\bar{g}^{\text{ini}}|^2 \frac{r}{2^a N - r}}, \quad (28)$$

$$\phi = \arctan \left(\frac{\bar{g}^{\text{ini}}}{\bar{b}^{\text{ini}}} \sqrt{\frac{r}{2^a N - r}} \right). \quad (29)$$

The averages are given by

$$\begin{aligned} \bar{g}^{\text{fin}} &= \sqrt{\frac{2^a N - r}{r}} \alpha \sin(\omega t + \phi), \\ \bar{b}^{\text{fin}} &= \alpha \cos(\omega t + \phi). \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

These formulas allow us to calculate the number of Grover iterations t from the ratios $\bar{g}^{\text{ini}}/\bar{b}^{\text{ini}}$ and $\bar{g}^{\text{fin}}/\bar{b}^{\text{fin}}$ as follows. From Eqs. (30) we have

$$\frac{\bar{g}^{\text{fin}}}{\bar{b}^{\text{fin}}} = \sqrt{\frac{2^a N - r}{r}} \tan(\omega t + \phi), \quad (31)$$

which, together with Eq.(29), gives

$$\omega t = \arctan \left(\frac{\bar{g}^{\text{fin}}}{\bar{b}^{\text{fin}}} \sqrt{\frac{r}{2^a N - r}} \right) - \arctan \left(\frac{\bar{g}^{\text{ini}}}{\bar{b}^{\text{ini}}} \sqrt{\frac{r}{2^a N - r}} \right). \quad (32)$$

2.2 Formulas for t_k

Consider the state $|\Psi^k\rangle$, i.e. the state that results after building the first k features using the oracles O_1, \dots, O_k . Let $\bar{g}_{k+1}^{\text{ini}}$, $\bar{b}_{k+1}^{\text{ini}}$ be the average amplitudes of the ‘‘good’’ and ‘‘bad’’ states within $|\Psi^k\rangle$ with respect to the oracle O_{k+1} . By direct calculation we have

$$\bar{g}_{k+1}^{\text{ini}} = \frac{\sum_{q_{1:k}} A_{q_{1:k}}^k N_{q_{1:k}^1}^{k+1}}{\sum_{q_{1:k}} N_{q_{1:k}^1}^{k+1}}, \quad \bar{b}_{k+1}^{\text{ini}} = \frac{\sum_{q_{1:k}} A_{q_{1:k}}^k N_{q_{1:k}^0}^{k+1}}{\sum_{q_{1:k}} N_{q_{1:k}^0}^{k+1}}, \quad (33)$$

and therefore

$$\frac{\bar{g}_{k+1}^{\text{ini}}}{\bar{b}_{k+1}^{\text{ini}}} = \frac{(N - N_{k+1}) \sum_{q_{1:k}} A_{q_{1:k}}^k N_{q_{1:k}^1}^{k+1}}{N_{k+1} \sum_{q_{1:k}} A_{q_{1:k}}^k N_{q_{1:k}^0}^{k+1}}. \quad (34)$$

Similarly, in the case of the final averages $\bar{g}_{k+1}^{\text{fin}}$ and $\bar{b}_{k+1}^{\text{fin}}$ we obtain

$$\frac{\bar{g}_{k+1}^{\text{fin}}}{\bar{b}_{k+1}^{\text{fin}}} = \frac{(N - N_{k+1}) \sum_{q_{1:k}} A_{q_{1:k}1}^{k+1} N_{q_{1:k}1}^{k+1}}{N_{k+1} \sum_{q_{1:k}} A_{q_{1:k}0}^{k+1} N_{q_{1:k}0}^{k+1}}. \quad (35)$$

Below we need expressions for the ratios $\bar{g}_k^{\text{ini}}/\bar{b}_k^{\text{ini}}$ and $\bar{g}_k^{\text{fin}}/\bar{b}_k^{\text{fin}}$, which follow by substituting k for $k+1$. The number of Grover iterations, t_k , required for converting the state $|\Psi^{k-1}\rangle$ into $|\Psi^k\rangle$ can then be obtained from Eq. (32),

$$\omega_k t_k = \arctan \left(\frac{\bar{g}_k^{\text{fin}}}{\bar{b}_k^{\text{fin}}} \sqrt{\frac{N_k}{2^a N - N_k}} \right) - \arctan \left(\frac{\bar{g}_k^{\text{ini}}}{\bar{b}_k^{\text{ini}}} \sqrt{\frac{N_k}{2^a N - N_k}} \right), \quad (36)$$

where

$$\omega_k = \arccos \left(1 - \frac{2N_k}{2^a N} \right). \quad (37)$$

Of course these formulas for the integer times t_k are useless by themselves, because they depend on the coefficients $A_{q_{1:k}}^k$, which are defined in terms of the unknown features h_k [see Eq. (20)]. The following argument leads to an explicit formula for the t_k .

By construction of the sets $\Omega_{q_{1:k}}$, the sums $\sum_{j=1}^k q_j 2^{-j} / \sqrt{\eta N}$ are k -bit approximations to the target amplitudes $\sqrt{p(x)}$ for all $x \in \Omega_{q_{1:k}}$. We thus aim for the features h_j to be as close as possible to the values $2^{-j} / \sqrt{\eta N}$. This motivates the following choice for the t_k . Instead of the amplitudes (20), we define

$$A_{q_{1:k}}^k = B^k + \sum_{j=1}^k q_j 2^{-j} / \sqrt{\eta N}, \quad (38)$$

where the h_j have been replaced by $2^{-j} / \sqrt{\eta N}$, and where the terms B^k are determined by the normalization conditions $\langle \Psi'^k | \Psi'^k \rangle = 1$ for the states

$$|\Psi'^k\rangle = \sum_{q_{1:k}} \sum_{x \in \Omega_{q_{1:k}}} A_{q_{1:k}}^k |x\rangle. \quad (39)$$

These states can be regarded as k -bit approximations to the intermediate states $|\Psi^k\rangle$. We thus get the following modified expressions for the average amplitudes.

$$\frac{\bar{g}_{k+1}^{\text{ini}}}{\bar{b}_{k+1}^{\text{ini}}} = \frac{(N - N_{k+1}) \sum_{q_{1:k}} A_{q_{1:k}1}^k N_{q_{1:k}1}^{k+1}}{N_{k+1} \sum_{q_{1:k}} A_{q_{1:k}0}^k N_{q_{1:k}0}^{k+1}} \quad (40)$$

and

$$\frac{\bar{g}_{k+1}^{\text{fin}}}{\bar{b}_{k+1}^{\text{fin}}} = \frac{(N - N_{k+1}) \sum_{q_{1:k}} A_{q_{1:k}1}^{k+1} N_{q_{1:k}1}^{k+1}}{N_{k+1} \sum_{q_{1:k}} A_{q_{1:k}0}^{k+1} N_{q_{1:k}0}^{k+1}}. \quad (41)$$

The final expression for the times t_k is then

$$t_k = \left\lfloor \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{\omega_k} \left(\arctan \left(\frac{\bar{g}_k^{\text{fin}}}{\bar{b}_k^{\text{fin}}} \sqrt{\frac{N_k}{2^a N - N_k}} \right) - \arctan \left(\frac{\bar{g}_k^{\text{ini}}}{\bar{b}_k^{\text{ini}}} \sqrt{\frac{N_k}{2^a N - N_k}} \right) \right) \right\rfloor, \quad (42)$$

where the extra term $1/2$ combined with the $\lfloor \dots \rfloor$ operation amounts to a rounding to the nearest integer.

The expressions for t_k depend explicitly on the numbers $N_{q_{1:k}}^k$, i.e., the numbers of points x for which the k most significant bits of $\sqrt{\eta N p(x)}$ are given by $q_{1:k}$. If this *global information* about the probabilities $p(x)$ is available, the version of our state preparation algorithm described here will often be simpler than the original version of the algorithm described in Ref. [1]. If the numbers $N_{q_{1:k}}^k$ are not available initially, they can be obtained via the quantum counting algorithm [10]. In this case, the algorithm described here loses much of its appeal. The analysis of the original algorithm in Ref. [1] includes bounds for the resources required for the initial quantum counting step.

2.3 Bound on the number of oracle calls

We have, by definition,

$$\frac{2N_k}{2^aN} = 1 - \cos \omega_k = 2 \sin^2 \frac{\omega_k}{2}. \quad (43)$$

Since $x^2 \geq \sin^2 x$ we obtain

$$\omega_k \geq 2\sqrt{\frac{N_k}{2^aN}}. \quad (44)$$

Furthermore, we have

$$\omega_k t_k \leq 2\pi, \quad (45)$$

and hence

$$t_k \leq \frac{2\pi}{\omega_k} \leq \pi \sqrt{\frac{2^aN}{N_k}}. \quad (46)$$

The overall number of oracle calls is therefore bounded by the expression $T' + T\pi\sqrt{2^aN/N_k}$. A typical value for the fraction N_k/N is $1/2$. The worst case for the number of oracle calls corresponds to $N_k = 1$, which is equivalent to Grover database search [5]. The efficiency of our algorithm can be improved by ignoring very small values of N_k . Bounds for the corresponding fidelity reduction have been derived in Ref. [1]. An analysis of the asymptotic number of oracle calls in the limit of large N is possible, e.g., for a sequence of states for which the parameter η does not depend on N and the ratios N_k/N tend to a constant C_k as $N \rightarrow \infty$. In this case, the fidelity bound (56) does not depend on N . For the right-hand side of the bound (46), we have then

$$\pi \sqrt{\frac{2^aN}{N_k}} \rightarrow \pi \sqrt{2^a/C_k} \text{ as } N \rightarrow \infty, \quad (47)$$

i.e., the bound for the required number of oracle calls tends to a constant for large N .

3 Fidelity analysis

In this section we derive a lower bound for the fidelity $|\langle \tilde{\Psi} | \Psi \rangle|$. We start by considering the fidelity between the real-amplitude target state $|\Psi_r\rangle$ defined in Eq. (12) and the state $|\Psi^T\rangle$ resulting from the Grover iterations, but before the a auxiliary qubits have been

measured [see Eq. (11)]. It follows from the discussion at the start of Sec. 2 that $|\Psi^T\rangle$ can be written in the form

$$|\Psi^T\rangle = \sum_{x=0}^{2^a N - 1} \left(B^T + \sum_{j=1}^T c_j(x) h_j \right) |x\rangle. \quad (48)$$

The first step is done in subsection 3.1, where we show that the choice Eq. (42) for the integer times t_k implies that the features h_k , for $k = 1, \dots, T$, satisfy the inequalities

$$\left| h_k - \frac{2^{-k}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} \right| < \frac{2^{1-a/2}}{\sqrt{\eta N}}. \quad (49)$$

Subsection 3.2 uses this result to derive the fidelity bound

$$\begin{aligned} |\langle \Psi_r | \Psi^T \rangle| &= \sum_{x=0}^{2^a N - 1} \sqrt{p(x)} \left(B^T + \sum_{j=1}^T c_j(x) h_j \right) \\ &= \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{p(x)} \left(B^T + \sum_{j=1}^T c_j(x) h_j \right) \\ &> 1 - 3T \frac{2^{-a/2}}{\eta}, \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

where we have used the fact that $p(x) = 0$ for $x \geq N$, and where we have assumed that T is chosen to be the smallest integer for which

$$\frac{2^{-T}}{2T^2} \leq 2^{-a}. \quad (51)$$

One can of course use bigger values of T , but this would not improve the performance of the algorithm as the fidelity of the state preparation is limited by the choice of a [see Eq. (49)].

The next step of the algorithm is the measurement of the auxiliary qubits. The probability of failure, p_{fail} , i.e. the probability of obtaining a nonzero result, is given by

$$p_{\text{fail}} = (2^a N - N) |B^T|^2, \quad (52)$$

where B^T is the normalization term in the expression (48) for $|\Psi^T\rangle$. Subsection 3.2 derives the following bound on the failure probability.

$$p_{\text{fail}} \leq 16T \frac{2^{-a/2}}{\eta}. \quad (53)$$

If there is no failure, i.e., if the measurement outcome is zero, the post-measurement state is given by

$$|\tilde{\Psi}_r\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - p_{\text{fail}}}} \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} \left(B^T + \sum_{j=1}^T c_j(x) h_j \right) |x\rangle. \quad (54)$$

Together with Eqs. (48) and (50) it follows directly that

$$|\langle \Psi_r | \tilde{\Psi}_r \rangle| = \frac{1}{\sqrt{1 - p_{\text{fail}}}} |\langle \Psi_r | \Psi^T \rangle| > 1 - 3T \frac{2^{-a/2}}{\eta}. \quad (55)$$

Finally, in subsection 3.3 we combine this bound with a simple analysis of the last stage in which the phases are added to the real amplitudes of the state $|\tilde{\Psi}_r\rangle$. The result is the following overall lower bound on the fidelity between the target state $|\Psi\rangle$ and the state $|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle$ prepared by the algorithm,

$$|\langle\tilde{\Psi}|\Psi\rangle| > \left(1 - 3T \frac{2^{-a/2}}{\eta}\right) (1 - 2^{-2T'-1}). \quad (56)$$

This bound determines the performance of the state preparation algorithm described in this paper.

3.1 Upper bound on $|h_k - 2^{-k}/\sqrt{\eta N}|$

Consider the development of a single feature, h , in t Grover iterations based on an oracle O . Let r be the number of good states, or solutions, of O . It follows from Eqs. (30) that h depends on t via

$$h(t) = \alpha \sqrt{2^a N/r} \sin(\omega t - \xi), \quad (57)$$

where the values of α and ξ depend on the initial average amplitudes \bar{g}^{ini} and \bar{b}^{ini} of the good and the bad states with respect to the oracle O . According to Eq. (28) we have

$$\alpha^2 = |\bar{b}^{\text{ini}}|^2 + |\bar{g}^{\text{ini}}|^2 \frac{r/N}{2^a - r/N}. \quad (58)$$

The average amplitude of “bad” states is bounded as

$$\bar{b}^{\text{ini}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^a N}}, \quad (59)$$

and the maximum possible value of the average amplitude of “good” states is bounded as

$$\bar{g}^{\text{ini}} \leq \frac{1}{\sqrt{\eta N}}. \quad (60)$$

Hence Eq. (58) implies

$$\begin{aligned} \alpha^2 &\leq \frac{1}{2^a N} + \frac{r/N}{\eta N(2^a - r/N)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^a N} + \frac{1}{\eta N(2^a - 1)} \\ &\leq \frac{1}{2^a N} + \frac{2}{\eta 2^a N} \\ &< \frac{4}{\eta 2^a N}. \end{aligned} \quad (61)$$

Since in our algorithm the value of t_k is rounded to the nearest integer, $h_k = h(t_k)$ will rarely coincide with the target value of $2^{-k}/\sqrt{\eta N}$. The mistake, however, can be bounded as

$$\left| h_k - \frac{2^{-k}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} \right| \leq \max |h(t+1) - h(t)|, \quad (62)$$

where the maximum is taken with respect to the quantities α , ω , ξ , r and t . The parameters characterizing the algorithm, a , η and N , are being kept constant. Using (61) we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} \left| h_k - \frac{2^{-k}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} \right| &< \max \frac{2}{\sqrt{\eta r}} \left| \sin((\omega t - \xi) + \omega) - \sin(\omega t - \xi) \right| \\ &\leq \max \frac{2}{\sqrt{\eta r}} \sin(\omega/2), \end{aligned} \quad (63)$$

where the last inequality follows from the properties of the sin function. Since $0 \leq \omega \leq \pi$ we have

$$\sin(\omega/2) = \sqrt{\frac{1 - \cos \omega}{2}} = \sqrt{\frac{r}{2^a N}}, \quad (64)$$

which implies the bound

$$\left| h_k - \frac{2^{-k}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} \right| < \frac{2^{1-a/2}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} \quad (65)$$

as required.

3.2 Lower bound on $|\langle \Psi_r | \Psi^T \rangle|$

Directly from the definitions we have

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Psi_r | \Psi^T \rangle &= \sum_{x=0}^{2^a N-1} \sqrt{p(x)} \left(B^T + \sum_{j=1}^T c_j(x) h_j \right) \\ &= \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{p(x)} \left(B^T + \sum_{j=1}^T c_j(x) \frac{2^{-j}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} + \sum_{j=1}^T c_j(x) \left(h_j - \frac{2^{-j}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} \right) \right), \end{aligned} \quad (66)$$

where we have used the fact that $p(x) = 0$ for $x \geq N$. Let us define

$$b(x) = \sum_{j=T+1}^{\infty} c_j(x) \frac{2^{-j}}{\sqrt{\eta N}}, \quad \delta(x) = \sum_{j=1}^T c_j(x) \left(h_j - \frac{2^{-j}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} \right). \quad (67)$$

Since

$$\sum_{j=1}^T c_j(x) \frac{2^{-j}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} = \sqrt{p(x)} - b(x), \quad (68)$$

and since $\sum_{x=0}^{N-1} p(x) = 1$ we have

$$|\langle \Psi_r | \Psi^T \rangle| \geq 1 - \left| \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{p(x)} (B^T - b(x)) \right| - \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{p(x)} |\delta(x)|. \quad (69)$$

Using the bound (65), one can show that

$$|\delta(x)| \leq 2T \frac{2^{-a/2}}{\sqrt{\eta N}}, \quad (70)$$

and therefore, using $\sqrt{p(x)} \leq 1/\sqrt{\eta N}$,

$$|\langle \Psi_r | \Psi^T \rangle| \geq 1 - \left| \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} \sqrt{p(x)} (B^T - b(x)) \right| - 2T \frac{2^{-a/2}}{\eta}. \quad (71)$$

The function $b(x)$ satisfies the bounds

$$0 \leq b(x) \leq 2^{-T}/\sqrt{\eta N}. \quad (72)$$

In order to find the lower bound on $|\langle \Psi_r | \Psi^T \rangle|$ from Eq. (71) we need to calculate $|B^T|$. This can be done by examining the normalization condition $\langle \Psi^T | \Psi^T \rangle = 1$ which reads

$$\sum_{x=0}^{2^a N-1} \left(B^T + \sum_{j=1}^T c_j(x) h_j \right)^2 = 1. \quad (73)$$

Using the definitions (67), this can be rewritten as

$$\sum_{x=0}^{2^a N-1} \left(B^T + \sqrt{p(x)} - b(x) + \delta(x) \right)^2 = 1. \quad (74)$$

This leads to a quadratic equation for B^T :

$$(B^T)^2 + 2UB^T + V = 0, \quad (75)$$

where

$$U = \frac{1}{2^a N} \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} \left(\sqrt{p(x)} + \delta(x) - b(x) \right), \quad (76)$$

$$V = \frac{1}{2^a N} \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} \left(2\sqrt{p(x)} + \delta(x) - b(x) \right) \left(\delta(x) - b(x) \right). \quad (77)$$

Since $\sqrt{p(x)} - b(x) \geq 0$, using the inequalities (70) and (72) together with the bound $\sqrt{p(x)} \leq 1/\sqrt{\eta N}$ we obtain

$$-2T \frac{2^{-3a/2}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} \leq U \leq \frac{2^{-a}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} (1 + 2T 2^{-a/2}), \quad (78)$$

$$-4T \frac{2^{-a}}{\eta N} \left(\frac{2^{-T}}{2T} + 2^{-a/2} \right) \leq V \leq 4T \frac{2^{-3a/2}}{\eta N} (1 + T 2^{-a/2}). \quad (79)$$

As mentioned earlier, we assume that T is chosen to be the smallest integer for which

$$\frac{2^{-T}}{2T^2} \leq 2^{-a}. \quad (80)$$

The above bounds can then be simplified as follows.

$$|U| \leq 2 \frac{2^{-a}}{\sqrt{\eta N}}, \quad (81)$$

$$|V| \leq 8T \frac{2^{-3a/2}}{\eta N}. \quad (82)$$

The value of B^T therefore satisfies the bound

$$\begin{aligned}
|B^T| &\leq |U| + \sqrt{U^2 + |V|} \\
&\leq 2 \frac{2^{-a}}{\sqrt{\eta N}} + \sqrt{9T 2^{-3a/2}/(\eta N)} \\
&\leq 4\sqrt{T} \frac{2^{-3a/4}}{\sqrt{\eta N}}.
\end{aligned} \tag{83}$$

Using this bound together with (72) we obtain from Eq. (71) the result

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \Psi_r | \Psi^T \rangle| &\geq 1 - \frac{1}{\eta} \left(4\sqrt{T} 2^{-3a/4} + 2^{-T} + 2T 2^{-a/2} \right) \\
&> 1 - 3T \frac{2^{-a/2}}{\eta}.
\end{aligned} \tag{84}$$

Directly from Eq. (83) we obtain the upper bound on the failure probability,

$$p_{\text{fail}} = (2^a N - N) |B^T|^2 \leq 16T \frac{2^{-a/2}}{\eta}. \tag{85}$$

3.3 Adding phases

The state $|\tilde{\Psi}_r\rangle$ resulting from the measurement of the a auxiliary qubits has real amplitudes, i.e., it is of the form

$$|\tilde{\Psi}_r\rangle = \sum_x \sqrt{\tilde{p}(x)} |x\rangle. \tag{86}$$

The final stage of the algorithm, see Eq. (13), turns $|\tilde{\Psi}_r\rangle$ into the final state $|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle$, which can be written as

$$|\tilde{\Psi}\rangle = \sum_x \sqrt{\tilde{p}(x)} \exp[2\pi i \tilde{\phi}(x)] |x\rangle, \tag{87}$$

where the $\tilde{\phi}(x)$ are T' -bit approximations to the target phases $\phi(x)$, i.e.,

$$|\phi(x) - \tilde{\phi}(x)| \leq 2^{-T'}. \tag{88}$$

Putting everything together, we find

$$\begin{aligned}
|\langle \tilde{\Psi} | \Psi \rangle| &= \left| \sum_x \sqrt{p(x)\tilde{p}(x)} \exp[2\pi i(\phi(x) - \tilde{\phi}(x))] \right| \\
&\geq \sum_x \sqrt{p(x)\tilde{p}(x)} \cos[\phi(x) - \tilde{\phi}(x)] \\
&\geq \sum_x \sqrt{p(x)\tilde{p}(x)} (1 - [\phi(x) - \tilde{\phi}(x)]^2/2) \\
&\geq \sum_x \sqrt{p(x)\tilde{p}(x)} (1 - 2^{-2T'-1}) \\
&= |\langle \Psi_r | \tilde{\Psi}_r \rangle| (1 - 2^{-2T'-1}) \\
&> \left(1 - 3T \frac{2^{-a/2}}{\eta} \right) (1 - 2^{-2T'-1}),
\end{aligned} \tag{89}$$

which is the required lower bound for the overall fidelity of the prepared state.

References

- [1] A. N. Soklakov and R. Schack, e-print quant-ph/0408045.
- [2] S. Lloyd, *Science* **273**, 1073 (1996).
- [3] C. Zalka, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **454**, 313 (1998).
- [4] S. S. Somaroo, C.-H. Tseng, T. F. Havel, R. Laflamme, and D. G. Cory, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **82**, 5381 (1999).
- [5] L. K. Grover, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **79**, 325 (1997).
- [6] P. Kaye and M. Mosca, in *Proceedings, International Conference on Quantum Information* (Rochester, New York, 2001), e-print quant-ph/0407102.
- [7] L. Grover and T. Rudolph, e-print quant-ph/0208112.
- [8] R. Cleve, A. Ekert, C. Macchiavello, and M. Mosca, *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A* **454**, 339 (1998).
- [9] E. Biham, O. Biham, D. Biron, M. Grassl, and D. A. Lidar, *Phys. Rev. A* **60**, 2742 (1999).
- [10] M. Boyer, G. Brassard, P. Høyer, and A. Tapp, *Fortschr. Phys.* **46**, 493 (1998).