

On the simulation of quantum circuits

Richard Jozsa

*Department of Computer Science, University of Bristol,
Merchant Venturers Building, Bristol BS8 1UB U.K.*

Abstract

We consider recent works on the simulation of quantum circuits using the formalism of matrix product states and the formalism of contracting tensor networks. We provide simplified direct proofs of many of these results, extending an explicit class of efficiently simulable circuits (log depth circuits with 2-qubit gates of limited range) to the following: let \mathcal{C} be any poly sized quantum circuit (generally of poly depth too) on n qubits comprising 1- and 2- qubit gates and 1-qubit measurements (with 2-qubit gates acting on arbitrary pairs of qubit lines). For each qubit line i let D_i be the number of 2-qubit gates that touch or cross the line i i.e. the number of 2-qubit gates that are applied to qubits j, k with $j \leq i \leq k$. Let $D = \max_i D_i$. Then the quantum process can be classically simulated in time $n \text{poly}(2^D)$. Thus if $D = O(\log n)$ then \mathcal{C} may be efficiently classically simulated.

1 Introduction

The issue of finding nontrivial families of quantum circuits that can be classically efficiently simulated is a fundamentally important one for the understanding of quantum computational power and for the design of new quantum algorithms. It is known [1] that the absence of increasing multi-partite entanglement in a quantum algorithm is sufficient to guarantee an efficient simulation and that the question of efficient simulability is closely related to the variety of different possible mathematical formalisms for the representation of quantum states and operations. To further study the origins quantum computational speedup it is thus natural to try to identify classes of circuits that can generate entanglement yet which can also be classically efficiently simulated. Interesting such families have been recently identified by Markov and Shi [3] (using the notion of tree-width of a graph and the formalism of contracting tensor networks) and by Yoran and Short [2] (using matrix product state representations and the one-way quantum computer formalism). The purpose of this note is to present alternative derivations of many of their results with proofs that are simpler and considerably more direct. We also extend the identified families of efficiently simulable circuits (although our extension may well be also amenable to analysis by the techniques of [3] too). We refer to the introduction of [3] for a comprehensive summary of existing results on the simulation of quantum circuits, which we do not duplicate here.

We begin with a statement of our main result.

Definition 1 *Let \mathcal{C} be any poly sized quantum circuit on n qubits comprising 1- and 2- qubit gates. The reduced form \mathcal{C}_{red} of \mathcal{C} is constructed as follows. First we multiply together all 1-qubit gates that lie consecutively along any single line and then multiply the result into the following or preceding 2-qubit gate. This eliminates all 1-qubit gates from \mathcal{C} . Next for every*

pair of lines i, j we consider all collections of consecutive 2-qubit gates acting on lines i, j that can be performed in sequence without any other interposed gate. Each such collection is replaced by the single 2-qubit gate given by the product. The resulting circuit \mathcal{C}_{red} is the reduced form of \mathcal{C} .

An example of a circuit reduction is shown in figure 1.




Figure 1: Single black dots denote 1-qubit gates and a dot pair connected by a vertical line denotes a 2-qubit gate acting on the designated lines.

It is clear that the passage from the gate description of any poly sized circuit \mathcal{C} to its reduced form \mathcal{C}_{red} can be calculated in poly time (as the passage involves the multiplication of at most poly many matrices of sizes 2 by 2 or 4 by 4). Also \mathcal{C} and \mathcal{C}_{red} clearly represent the same overall transformation. Hence \mathcal{C} can be classically efficiently simulated iff \mathcal{C}_{red} can. Our main result is (two elementary proofs of) the following.

Theorem 1 *Let \mathcal{C} be any poly sized (and generally poly depth) quantum circuit on n qubits comprising 1- and 2- qubit gates (with 2-qubit gates acting on arbitrary pairs of qubit lines). Let the input be any product state of the n qubits and let the output be the result of a measurement in the standard basis on any prescribed subset of qubits after the application of \mathcal{C} . Let \mathcal{C}_{red} be the reduced form of \mathcal{C} . For each qubit line i in \mathcal{C}_{red} let D_i be the number of 2-qubit gates that touch or cross the line i i.e. the number of 2-qubit gates that are applied to qubits j, k with $j \leq i \leq k$. Let $D = \max_i D_i$. Then the output of the quantum process can be classically simulated in time $n \text{poly}(2^D)$. Thus if $D = O(\log n)$ then \mathcal{C} may be classically efficiently simulated.*

We will give two direct elementary proofs of this theorem, the first using matrix product states (MPS) and the second using just the simple process of multiplying gates (“contracting tensors”). Our MPS proof will extend the results of [2]. In that paper the one way quantum computer formalism (1WQC) is combined with MPS to show (amongst other results) that log depth circuits involving 2-qubit gates of restricted range only, can be classically efficiently simulated. Our result improves on this in several ways: we use only MPS without any recourse to 1WQC in our proof and our theorem, clearly including circuits of the above type, includes many further circuit families of fully poly depth and involving 2-qubit gates of unrestricted range.

We note that theorem 1 is closely similar to proposition 5.1 of [3] where the proof involves recourse to the labyrinthine theory of tree decompositions and tree width of graphs

and associated contraction orderings. In contrast our second proof is transparently elementary and our theorem appears to cover essentially all the explicitly mentioned families of efficiently simulable circuits in [3]. Thus it would be interesting to display a family of circuits that can be seen to be efficiently simulable from the sophisticated formalism of tree decompositions of graphs etc. but which is not amenable to the elementary methods that we present below.

We note that our theorem may also be readily extended to the case where \mathcal{C} allows 1-qubit measurements within the body of the circuit, with choices of later gates and measurements depending adaptively on earlier measurement outcomes. (In that case we apply the definition of D_i to \mathcal{C} rather than \mathcal{C}_{red}). But for clarity of exposition we state our theorem in the simpler form above. Also all results and definitions in this paper generalise immediately from qubits to qudits for any fixed dimension d but again for clarity we work with qubits ($d = 2$) throughout.

2 Matrix product states

A product state of n qubits has the form

$$|\psi\rangle_{1\dots n} = |\alpha\rangle_1 |\beta\rangle_2 \dots |\kappa\rangle_n \quad (1)$$

which manifestly depends on a number of parameters that grows only linearly with n (in contrast to exponentially, for general states). This restriction on the size of the state description is significant since it allows an efficient classical simulation of quantum processes involving such states. In the standard basis $|\psi\rangle$ may be written as $\sum c_{i_1\dots i_n} |i_1\rangle \dots |i_n\rangle$ but now we have an exponentially large description (the set of amplitudes) which is restricted by further conditions viz. that $c_{i_1\dots i_n} = a_{i_1} b_{i_2} \dots k_{i_n}$ for some a_i, \dots, k_i 's.

A matrix product state (MPS) of n qubits is a natural generalisation of the form eq. (1): we simply replace each state $|\alpha\rangle, \dots$ by a *matrix* of (generally sub-normalised) states $|\alpha_{ij}\rangle \dots$ and form a corresponding matrix product of the n matrices:

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i,j,k,l,\dots m} |\alpha_{ij}\rangle |\beta_{jk}\rangle |\gamma_{kl}\rangle \dots |\kappa_{mi}\rangle. \quad (2)$$

The sizes of the matrices may be freely chosen subject only to the compatibility requirement for the formation of matrix products. Note that the first and last indices (i in eq. (2)) are also summed. If we write the matrices $|\alpha_{ij}\rangle$ as A etc. then $|\psi\rangle = \text{tr}(ABC\dots K)$. The special case of eq. (1) is recovered if all the matrices are 1 by 1. If we write all states in components in the standard basis:

$$|\alpha_{ij}\rangle = \sum_{i_1} A_{ij}^{(i_1)} |i_1\rangle, \quad \dots, \quad |\kappa_{mi}\rangle = \sum_{i_n} K_{mi}^{(i_n)} |i_n\rangle$$

then we get the more cumbersome expression

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i,\dots,m,i_1,\dots,i_n} A_{ij}^{(i_1)} B_{jk}^{(i_2)} \dots K_{mi}^{(i_n)} |i_1\rangle |i_2\rangle \dots |i_n\rangle \quad (3)$$

which now involves matrices of complex numbers rather than quantum states.

Remark on PEPS: the definition of MPS requires a choice of *one*-dimensional ordering of the qubit subsystems. However there is an alternative description of MPS – the so-called “projected entangled pairs state” description (PEPS) [4, 5] with the useful feature that it generalises in a natural way to two and higher dimensional arrays of subsystems. Briefly it works as follows: consider the MPS of n qubits in eq. (3) with each matrix having size at most L by L . We start with a sequence of n maximally entangled pairs of L -level systems in states $|\lambda\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{i=0}^{L-1} |i\rangle |i\rangle$ arranged in a line as depicted in figure 2.




Figure 2: Each line connecting a pair of stars represents the L -level maximally entangled state $|\lambda\rangle$. Each site comprises two L -level systems and we apply a linear projection from $L \times L$ dimensions to 2 dimensions at each site, resulting in a state of n qubits. This PEPS is identified as having the MPS form with matrices in eq. (3) given directly by the matrices of the linear projection operations.

Consider the linear maps from $L \times L$ to 2 dimensions:

$$P_1 = A_{ij}^{i_1} |i_1\rangle \langle ij|, \quad P_2 = B_{ij}^{i_2} |i_2\rangle \langle ij|, \quad \dots, \quad P_n = K_{ij}^{i_n} |i_n\rangle \langle ij|$$

applied at sites $1, 2, \dots, n$ respectively resulting in an n qubit state called a PEPS. Since $|\lambda\rangle$ has Kronecker delta components $|\lambda\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{L}} \sum_{ij} \delta_{ij} |i\rangle |j\rangle$ we immediately see that the resulting PEPS of n qubits is precisely the MPS in eq. (3).

To generalise to 2 (or higher) dimensional arrays of sites we begin instead with a 2 dimensional grid of the entangled $|\lambda\rangle$ states. Now each site in the body of the grid has 4 L -level systems (or 3 or 2 at the edges or corners respectively, of the 2-dimensional grid) and we can consider similar site projections from each whole site into a 2-dimensional subspace of the site. If L is restricted to stay suitably small (e.g. grow only polynomially with the number of sites) then the resulting multi-qubit PEPS will again depend on only poly many parameters. This formalism was introduced and exploited in [5] to provide ground breaking new techniques in the study of 2 and 3 dimensional strongly correlated quantum systems in condensed matter physics. It is also noteworthy that the Raussendorf-Briegel cluster state (in 1 or 2 or higher dimensional array configurations) underlying the one-way quantum computation model is very special in having the simplest possible PEPS description: the entangled pairs always have minimal possible dimension $L = 2$ and the projections are all the same, viz. $P = \sum_i |i\rangle \langle ii \dots i|$ identifying at each site the qubit subspace spanned by the two kets of “all 0’s and all 1’s” (cf [6] or [8] for a more detailed description). For applications to quantum circuits in this note we will consider only multi-qubit states in a *one*-dimensional ordering. \square

It is not hard to see (cf. below for one method) that any state $|\psi\rangle$ of n qubits can be expressed in the form eq. (2) but generally requiring matrices of exponential size in n . Here we will be interested in those states expressible using matrices of restricted sizes. If each matrix has size L by L then the state $|\psi\rangle$ will depend on $O(nL^2)$ parameters. Hence if we restrict L to be poly(n) we will obtain a family of states (generalising product states)

that depend on only poly-many parameters, hence allowing efficient classical simulation of their processing if we are given suitable methods of updating the MPS description after application of gates and measurements.

This rather abstract restriction of requiring limited matrix sizes may be usefully related to more familiar constructs such as Schmidt rank of bipartite divisions of $|\psi\rangle$ and log-depthness of poly sized quantum circuits (cf. below).

To see that any state $|\psi\rangle$ of n qubits may be expressed in the MPS form we describe an explicit construction using an iterated Schmidt decomposition, introduced by Vidal [7]. The qubits are always taken to be labelled $1, 2, \dots, n$ in linear order from left to right. We will use the following elementary facts about Schmidt decompositions. Let $|\phi\rangle_{AB}$ be any bipartite state with Schmidt rank r and Schmidt form

$$|\phi\rangle_{AB} = \sum_{i=1}^r \sqrt{\lambda_i} |a_i\rangle_A |b_i\rangle_B.$$

Then:

Fact 1: if $|\xi\rangle_B$ is any state that is orthogonal to all the $|b_i\rangle$'s then $|\eta\rangle_A \equiv \langle \xi | \phi \rangle = 0$.

Fact 2: if $|\phi\rangle = \sum_i |\xi_i\rangle |b_i\rangle$ for some $|\xi_i\rangle$'s then $|\xi_i\rangle = \sqrt{\lambda_i} |a_i\rangle$ for all i .

Fact 3: the Schmidt rank r is equal to the dimension of the support of the reduced state of A in $|\phi\rangle$.

To get an MPS form for $|\psi\rangle$ we begin by writing it in its Schmidt form for the partition $1|2 \dots n$:

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_j |a_j\rangle_1 |\xi_j\rangle_{2 \dots n}.$$

Here we have absorbed the Schmidt coefficients into the LH set: $|a_j\rangle$ are orthogonal and subnormalised, and $|\xi_j\rangle$ are orthonormal. The range of the index j is the Schmidt rank of $|\psi\rangle$ for this partition. Next let $|\eta_k\rangle_{3 \dots n}$ be the orthonormal Schmidt basis of $|\psi\rangle$ for the RH part of the partition $12|3 \dots n$. Then for each j we have

$$|\xi_j\rangle_{23 \dots n} = \sum_k |b_{jk}\rangle_2 |\eta_k\rangle_{3 \dots n}$$

where $|b_k\rangle$ are again generally subnormalised (and non-orthogonal). To see that $|\xi_j\rangle$ cannot have a component outside the span of the $|\eta_k\rangle$'s let $|\gamma_l\rangle$ be a set of orthonormal vectors extending $|\eta_k\rangle$ to a full basis of the $3 \dots n$ system, so in complete generality we can write $|\xi_j\rangle_{23 \dots n} = \sum_k |b_{jk}\rangle_2 |\eta_k\rangle_{3 \dots n} + \sum_l |c_{jl}\rangle_2 |\gamma_l\rangle_{3 \dots n}$. Then $\langle \gamma_l | \psi \rangle = \sum_j |a_j\rangle |c_{jl}\rangle$ which must be zero by fact 1. Since $|a_j\rangle$ are orthogonal this implies $|c_{jl}\rangle = 0$ for all jl .

Thus we have $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{jk} |a_j\rangle_1 |b_{jk}\rangle_2 |\eta_k\rangle_{3 \dots n}$. Continuing in this way we get

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{j,k,l,\dots,p} |a_j\rangle_1 |b_{jk}\rangle_2 |c_{kl}\rangle_3 \dots |k_p\rangle. \quad (4)$$

This is of the MPS form eq. (2): the size of the i^{th} matrix is s by t where s (resp. t) is the Schmidt rank of $|\psi\rangle$ for the partition $1 \dots (s-1)|s \dots n$ (resp. $1 \dots s|(s+1) \dots n$). We also have further special conditions always satisfied by this particular MPS construction:

(i) the first (resp. last) matrix has only one row (resp. one column);

- (ii) the last matrix is an orthonormal set of states;
- (iii) if we consider any partition $1 \dots i | (i+1) \dots n$ and sum the respective parts first:

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_m \left(\sum_{j \dots l} |a_j\rangle_1 |b_{jk}\rangle_2 \dots |d_{lm}\rangle_i \right) \left(\sum_{n \dots p} |e_{mn}\rangle_{(i+1)} \dots |k_p\rangle_n \right) \equiv \sum_m |A_m\rangle_{1 \dots i} |B_m\rangle_{(i+1) \dots n}$$

then $\{|B_m\rangle\}$ is the orthonormal Schmidt basis for the system $(i+1) \dots n$ and $\{|A_m\rangle\}$ is the orthogonal Schmidt set for the system $1 \dots i$, subnormalised to the corresponding Schmidt coefficients. (To see this we just halt the iterative process leading to eq. (4) at stage i , showing that $\{|B_m\rangle\}$ is the orthonormal Schmidt basis for the system $(i+1) \dots n$ and then use fact 2).

3 Simulating computations using MPS's

For any n qubit state $|\psi\rangle$ let χ_ψ be the maximal Schmidt rank of any partition $1 \dots i | (i+1) \dots n$ of the linearly ordered qubits into a left and right part.

Vidal[7] and Yoran and Short[2] have shown the following.

Lemma 1 [7, 2] *If a single qubit unitary gate is applied to any qubit of $|\psi\rangle$ then the MPS description eq. (4) can be updated in $O(\chi_\psi^2)$ computational steps.*

Lemma 2 [7] *If a 2-qubit unitary gate is applied to any adjacent qubits (numbered $i, i+1$) of $|\psi\rangle$ then the MPS description eq. (4) can be updated in $O(\chi_\psi^3)$ computational steps.*

Remark: A 2-qubit gate U applied to *non*-adjacent qubits on lines l and $l+r$ can be replaced by $(2r-1)$ adjacent gates viz. $(r-1)$ swaps on adjacent qubits to make lines l and $l+r$ adjacent, U on adjacent qubits and $(r-1)$ further adjacent swaps to return the lines to their original positions, as shown in figure 3. Hence the whole process can be simulated with $O(\chi_1^3) + \dots + O(\chi_{2r-1}^3)$ computational cost where χ_i is χ of the i^{th} state in this process. We will see later (cf lemma 4 and theorem 1) that $\max_i \chi_i$ is in fact $O(\chi_\psi)$ (where $|\psi\rangle$ is the initial state to which U was applied) so the cost is $O(r\chi_\psi)$. In a quantum circuit on n qubits we have $r = O(n)$ so the total cost will be $\text{poly}(n)$ if $\chi_\psi = \text{poly}(n)$. \square




Figure 3: A non-adjacent 2-qubit gate acting on lines r apart is replaced by $2r-1$ adjacent gates. The double headed arrows denote swap gates. In this replacement each qubit line is affected by at most 4 gates.

Lemma 3 [2] *If a single qubit measurement (in any chosen basis) is made on a qubit of $|\psi\rangle$ then the outcome probabilities and MPS description (as in eq. (4)) of any post-measurement state can be calculated in $\text{poly}(\chi_\psi)$ computational steps.*

Vidal [7] concluded the following: consider any pure state poly time quantum computation with input size n . If the state at every stage has χ bounded by $\text{poly}(n)$ then the quantum computation can be efficiently classically simulated. But he did not relate his χ -condition to any prospective structural property of a quantum circuit.

Yoran and Short [2] noted further that the 1WQC cluster state based on a 2 dimensional grid of size $M \times N$ has an MPS description of the form eq.(4) with $\chi \leq 2^{\min(M,N)}$. Consequently any 1WQC process (defined by a sequence of at most MN adaptive 1-qubit measurements on the $M \times N$ cluster state) can be simulated classically in $MN\text{poly}(\chi)$ time where $\chi = 2^{\min(M,N)}$. They concluded the following result: *let \mathcal{C} be any quantum gate array on n qubits comprising 1- and 2-qubit gates such that (a) \mathcal{C} has log depth and (b) the range of each 2-qubit gate is bounded by a constant r i.e. each 2-qubit gate acts on a pair of qubits at most r lines apart. Then the computation can be classically efficiently simulated.*

Their proof proceeds by noting that any such computation can be translated by standard methods into the 1WQC formalism using a cluster state of size $M \times N$ where $\min(M, N) = O(\log n)$ (because the circuits are log depth) and also $\max(M, N) = \text{poly}(n)$. Hence each state in the 1WQC process will have $\chi = \text{poly}(n)$ and lemma 3 gives the result.

In the translation into the 1WQC formalism, each 2-qubit gate acting on lines r apart requires a piece of cluster state of size $O(r) \times O(r)$. If r is constant, the total cluster state for the whole (log depth) circuit will thus have a log sized minimum dimension, but if r is even allowed to be $O(\log n)$ large, then the resulting required cluster may have minimum dimension $O((\log n)^2)$ and hence the simulation by the method of [2] will now require $\text{poly}(2^{O((\log n)^2)}) = \text{poly}(n^{\log n})$ time classically.

We now introduce a further lemma about the Schmidt MPS form eq. (4). This leads to a more direct proof of the above result for quantum circuits satisfying (a) and (b) without recourse to the 1WQC model or cluster states. Indeed any such circuit clearly has $D = O(\log n)$. At the same time, by proving our theorem 1, we will extend the class of quantum circuits that can be classically efficiently simulated.

Lemma 4 *Let $|\psi\rangle_{1\dots n}$ have Schmidt rank r for the partition $A|B = 1\dots i|(i+1)\dots n$.
(i) Let $|\psi'\rangle$ be obtained from $|\psi\rangle$ by applying a 2-qubit gate U to two qubits numbered k, l of $|\psi\rangle$. Let r' be the $A|B$ Schmidt rank of $|\psi'\rangle$. If k, l are both in A or both in B then $r' = r$. If one of k, l is in A and the other in B then $r' \leq 4r$.
(ii) Let $|\psi'\rangle$ be obtained from $|\psi\rangle$ by application of a 1-qubit gate. Then $r' = r$.
(iii) Let $|\psi'\rangle$ be any post-measurement state resulting from a 1-qubit measurement on $|\psi\rangle$. Then $r' \leq r$.*

Remark: the bound $r' \leq 4r$ in (i) is tight. Let $|\phi^+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$ and take $|\psi\rangle_{1234} = |\phi^+\rangle_{12}|\phi^+\rangle_{34}$ with partition $A|B = 12|34$. Consider the 2-qubit gate U of swap on 2,3. Then $|\psi\rangle$ has $r = 1$ but after U we have $r' = 4$. (For qudits the tight upper bound is a multiplicative factor of d^2).

Proof of lemma 4: (i) If k, l are both on the same side of the partition then clearly $r' = r$. Thus suppose k, l lie on the two sides. Without loss of generality we may assume that $k = i$ and $l = i + 1$ since swap operations within A and B do not change Schmidt rank. Let $|\psi\rangle = \sum_{k=1}^r |a_k\rangle_A |b_k\rangle_B$ be the Schmidt form. For each k let σ_k be the reduced state of qubit $i + 1$ in $|b_k\rangle$ and let $|s_k\rangle, |t_k\rangle$ be its two eigenstates. Hence in $U|\psi\rangle$ the reduced state of $A \cup \{i + 1\}$ is spanned by the $2r$ states $U(|a_k\rangle |s_k\rangle), U(|a_k\rangle |t_k\rangle)$ for $k = 1, \dots, r$. Tracing out qubit $i + 1$ from each of these (generally entangled) states gives a rank 2 state of A for each k , so the reduced state of A in $U|\psi\rangle$ is supported on dimension at most $2(2r)$. Hence $r' \leq 4r$ follows by fact 3.

(ii) is clear. (iii) follows by noting that any post-measurement state is obtained by applying a suitable projection to $|\psi\rangle$. Hence the support of any reduced state cannot increase and fact 3 gives the result. \square

Proof of theorem 1 using MPS formalism: Let \mathcal{C} be any poly sized quantum circuit on n qubits, of the kind in the statement of the theorem. Replace each 2-qubit gate U of \mathcal{C}_{red} that acts on non-adjacent qubits r lines apart, by $r - 1$ adjacent swap gates, U on adjacent qubits, and $r - 1$ further adjacent swap gates to restore the line positions. It is clear from figure 3 that this sequence of $2r - 1$ 2-qubit gates (each now acting on adjacent qubits) touches any given qubit line at most 4 times (and crosses no qubit lines because of adjacency). Thus as a result of this replacement the D value D' of the circuit is increased by at most a factor of 4 ($D' \leq 4D$) and now all 2-qubit gates act on adjacent qubits. The starting state has $\chi_{\psi_0} = 1$. Consider simulating the circuit operations in order using lemmas 1,2,3. Let $|\psi_k\rangle$ be the state at any stage of the process. For any partition $1 \dots i | (i + 1) \dots n$, $|\psi_k\rangle$ will, by lemma 4, have a Schmidt rank of at most $4^{D'_i}$ where D'_i is the number of 2-qubit gates acting on lines $i, i + 1$. Hence the maximal Schmidt rank χ_{max} of any state k in the process, across any partition, is at most $4^{D'} = 4^{O(D)}$. Lemmas 1,2,3 then show that each step can be classically simulated in $\text{poly}(4^{D'}) = \text{poly}(4^D)$ classical computational steps and the whole process in time $T \text{poly}(4^D)$ where T is the total number of gates in \mathcal{C}_{red} . Note that for any circuit \mathcal{C} on n qubits, if D is prescribed then \mathcal{C} can have at most $nD/2$ 2-qubit gates as each such gate touches or crosses at least 2 lines. Hence the full simulation time is $n \text{poly}(4^D) = n \text{poly}(2^D)$, and if $D = O(\log n)$ then the simulation is efficient. \square

Remark: the $D = O(\log n)$ condition in theorem 1 does not imply an efficient simulation of *all* poly sized log depth quantum circuits. Recall that a general poly sized log depth quantum circuit on n qubits is one for which the gates can be transversally partitioned into $O(\log n)$ layers of gates such that all gates in each layer can be done simultaneously in parallel. Thus a layer may contain $O(n)$ gates so D could be $O(n)$ and hence not efficiently simulable by the method in the proof of theorem 1. (For example the circuit could have $O(n)$ gates applied to qubits $(1, \frac{n}{2} + 1), (2, \frac{n}{2} + 2), \dots, (\frac{n}{2}, n)$ in a single layer and then $D_{n/2}$ would be $O(n)$). Indeed in [9] it was shown that if circuits of even *constant* depth 3 (followed by a measurement layer) are efficiently simulable then all quantum computation would be efficiently simulable (i.e. then BQP=BPP). They also showed by an elementary argument that any circuit of depth 2 (followed by a measurement layer) *is* efficiently simulable. From the notions in theorem 1 this can be seen as follows: firstly we can reorder the qubit lines so that all 2-qubit gates in layer 1 act on adjacent qubits i.e. on line pairs $(1, 2), (3, 4), \dots, (n - 1, n)$. Then the gates in layer 2 may still have $O(n)$ range but it is straightforward to see that the line *pairs* can now be reordered (thus preserving adjacency of layer 1 gates) so that layer 2

gates have range at most 4, and the efficient simulability then follows from theorem 1. \square

Remark: The condition $D = O(\log n)$ in theorem 1 (for efficient simulability) does not require that the circuit be of log depth. For example a “ladder circuit” of $O(n)$ 2-qubit gates applied in order to qubits $(1, 2), (2, 3), \dots, (n - 1, n)$, has $D = 2$ and it is poly sized with poly depth too. This circuit can be efficiently simulated by the method in the proof of theorem 1 but not by the method of ref [2] as its 1WQC translation requires a cluster state of poly by poly size in 2 dimensions. \square

Corollary 1 (*This reproduces a result from [2]*). *Consider any 1WQC process on a 2 dimensional cluster state of size $M = \text{poly}(n)$ by $N = O(\log n)$. Then the process can be simulated in $\text{poly}(n)$ classical time.*

Proof: Using the linear labelling used in [2] of qubits in a cluster state of size $M \times N$ with $N = O(\log n)$, it is clear that this cluster state can be manufactured by a poly sized circuit with $D = O(\log n)$ and then by theorem 1 (or more precisely, a straightforward extension allowing adaptive gates and measurements) the subsequent measurement sequence can be simulated in $\text{poly}(n)$ time too (as 1-qubit gates or measurements do not change the value of D). \square

4 Contracting linear networks

We now give a completely different proof of theorem 1 based on the idea of “contracting tensor networks”. This really just amounts to multiplying out the matrices corresponding to gates in a circuit and noting conditions under which this calculation (with matrices of potentially exponentially growing size) can remain only poly sized. This subject was recently introduced into the study of quantum circuits by Markov and Shi [3]. Our treatment here has the advantage of being much simpler but may lack the full generality of their results.

In the above proof of theorem 1 we made much use of unitarity and orthogonality, for example in the very concept of a Schmidt decomposition and unitarity preserving orthogonality in updating the Schmidt MPS description. Thus it is surprising to note that the tensor network approach below, based on general linear algebraic properties only, makes no use of unitarity at all and remains valid for arbitrary linear gates!

Proof of theorem 1 using linear network formalism: Let \mathcal{C} be any circuit of the kind in theorem 1 with $D = \max D_i$. Consider first the case that the output of the circuit is a single 1-qubit measurement on any single qubit line, without loss of generality (wlog) the first line.

Also assume wlog that \mathcal{C} has been reduced. Since \mathcal{C} is poly-sized this can be effected in $\text{poly}(n)$ time and the circuit now comprises only 2-qubit gates.

Furthermore assume wlog that all 2-qubit gates act on *adjacent* qubit lines – using the construction of figure 3 this can be arranged subject only to at most a constant factor 4 increase in the value of D .

Suppose also wlog, that the input state for the circuit is the n -qubit state $|0\rangle \dots |0\rangle$. (Any other product input state can then be manufactured first using only 1-qubit gates). Let b_i denote the components of the vector $|0\rangle$ in the standard basis.

On the circuit diagram of \mathcal{C} , for each qubit line we place an index label on each segment between the occurrence of two 2-qubit gates and we label the beginning of each line with the input state b . This is illustrated in figure 4 for a simple typical circuit.




Figure 4: Index labels for a simple illustrative circuit of four 2-qubit gates U, V, W, X . On the first line we use i 's, on the second line, j 's etc. for the index names. The number of indices on any line is $O(D)$.

Each 2-qubit gate now has 2 input indices and 2 output indices. We write inputs as subscripts and outputs as superscripts so for example in figure 4, V has components $V_{j_2 k_1}^{j_3 k_2}$. Summing over common indices corresponds to composition of the gates in the circuit. For example in figure 4, the 4-qubit output state A has components labelled by indices i_3, j_4, k_3, l_2 and is given by the contracted expression (easily read off from figure 4):

$$A^{i_3 j_4 k_3 l_2} = b^{i_1} b^{j_1} b^{k_1} b^{l_1} U_{i_1 j_1}^{i_2 j_2} V_{j_2 k_1}^{j_3 k_2} W_{i_2 j_3}^{i_3 j_4} X_{l_1 k_2}^{l_2 k_3}.$$

Here all the repeated indices are understood as being summed (i.e. contracted: the RHS has an implied $\sum_{i_1 j_1 k_1 l_1 i_2 j_2 k_2 j_3}$).

Next suppose we want to compute $\text{prob}(k)$, the probability of obtaining $k = 0$ or $k = 1$ from a standard basis measurement on line 1. Let Π_m^n be the matrix of the projector $|k\rangle\langle k|$. Then for the example of figure 4, $\text{prob}(k)$ is given by the number obtained from the full contraction of all indices in figure 5:




Figure 5: The fully contracted linear network whose value is $\text{prob}(k)$. Here Π is the 1-qubit operation $|k\rangle\langle k|$ and dagger denotes the adjoint matrix. This is the circuit of figure 3 extended with a reflected adjoint copy and Π inserted in the centre on line 1.

For a general \mathcal{C} (with $D = \max_i D_i$) we see that the corresponding construction (obtained

by extending \mathcal{C} with a reflected adjoint copy and inserting Π in the centre on line 1) has at most $2D + 1 = O(D)$ gates affecting any full single line. It now follows that the number $\text{prob}(k)$ can be readily explicitly computed in $n\text{poly}(2^{O(D)})$ steps. To do this we consider the full tensor expression (as depicted in figure 5 for our illustrative example) and sum all indices on line 1 e.g. all i -indices in figure 5. There are $O(D)$ i -indices each taking values 0 and 1 i.e. a total of $2^{O(D)}$ terms in the sum for each set of $O(D)$ j -index values. These j -indices have $2^{O(D)}$ sets of values too so the total computational effort to do all the corresponding i -sums, for all j -values, is $2^{O(D)}\text{poly}(2^{O(D)}) = \text{poly}(2^{O(D)})$.

Having summed the i -indices we are left with a single object with $O(D)$ j -indices and further 2-qubit gates with indices j, k, \dots, l .

Next we sum out all the j -indices. This again requires $2^{O(D)}$ sums (for all the k -index values) each of which is a sum over $2^{O(D)}$ terms (i.e. the sum over all j -index values). Continuing in this way, if there are n qubit lines the final number $\text{prob}(k)$ is computed in $n\text{poly}(2^{O(D)})$ steps. If $D = O(\log n)$ this whole computation is poly time.

In this way we can compute $\text{prob}(k)$ for $k = 0, 1$ and then sample the resulting distribution. This completes the simulation of the quantum qubit measurement outcome.

Next suppose the output is not just a single measurement but the measurement of a subset $\{a, b, \dots, e\}$ of the qubit lines (a subset whose size could be $O(n)$). To simulate this, we first compute as above, the distribution for line a only and sample the distribution to get an outcome k_a say. Then we place the matrix $\Pi(k_a)/\sqrt{\text{prob}(k_a)}$ on line a and calculate the distribution for line b given that line a has value k_a , by repeating the above procedure. Then we sample the resulting $\text{prob}(k_b|k_a)$ distribution to get a value k_b for line b . Continuing in this way we sample the whole required joint distribution on lines a, b, \dots, e . If $D = O(\log n)$ this whole simulation is clearly still poly time as the size of the set of lines is at most $O(n)$.

Finally consider the more general type of circuit \mathcal{C} in which 1-qubit measurements can be performed in the body of the circuit and choice of later gates may depend on previous measurement outcomes. To simulate this situation we consider the circuit \mathcal{C} only up to its first measurement and simulate the output distribution as above. After sampling it we place the matrix of the corresponding projector, divided by its square-root probability, on its line and fix the identity of any later gates that depended on this outcome. Continuing in this way with each subsequent measurement in order of occurrence we simulate the whole circuit \mathcal{C} . Since \mathcal{C} has at most $\text{poly}(n)$ such measurements this entire simulation will be poly time if $D = O(\log n)$.

Acknowledgements

This work was supported in part by the UK's EPSRC-QIPIRC network and by the European Commission under the Integrated Project Qubit Applications (QAP) funded by the IST directorate as Contract Number 015848.

References

- [1] Jozsa, R. and Linden, N. Proc. Roy. Soc. Lond. A **459**, 2011-2032 (2003).
arXiv:quant-ph/0201143

- [2] Yoran, N. and Short, A. arXiv:quant-ph/0601178 (2006)
- [3] Markov, I. and Shi, Y. arXiv:quant-ph/0511069 (2005)
- [4] Verstraete, F., Porras, D. and Cirac, I. Phys. Rev. Lett. **93**, 227205 (2004).
arXiv:cond-mat/0404706 (2004)
- [5] Verstraete, F. and Cirac, I. arXiv:cond-mat/0407066 (2004)
- [6] Verstraete, F. and Cirac, I. Phys. Rev. A 70, 060302(R) (2004).
arXiv:quant-ph/0311130
- [7] Vidal, G. Phys. Rev. Lett. **91**, 147902 (2003). arXiv:quant-ph/0301063
- [8] Jozsa, R. arXiv:quant-ph/0508124 (2005)
- [9] Terhal, B. and DiVincenzo, D. Quant. Inf. Comput. **4(2)**:134-145 (2004).
arXiv:quant-ph/0205133