

Simple scheme for implementing the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm in thermal cavity

Wen-Xing Yang^{1,2}, Zhe-Xuan Gong^{3,†}, Wei-Bin Li^{1,2} and Xiao-Xue Yang³

¹State Key Laboratory of Magnetic Resonance and Atomic and Molecular Physics, Center for Cold Atom Physics, Wuhan Institute of Physics and Mathematics, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Wuhan 430071 China

²Graduate School, Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100080, China

³Department of Physics, Huazhong University of Science and Technology, Wuhan 430074, China
(dated: February 14, 2021)

We present a simple scheme to implement the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm based on two-atom interaction in a thermal cavity. The photon-number-dependent parts in the evolution operator are canceled with the strong resonant classical field added. As a result, our scheme is immune to thermal field, and does not require the cavity to remain in the vacuum state throughout the procedure. Besides, large detuning between the atoms and the cavity is not necessary neither, leading to potential speed up of quantum operation. Finally, we show by numerical simulation that the proposed scheme is equal to demonstrate the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm with high fidelity.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 03.65.Ta, 42.50.Dv

Ever since Feynman first pointed out the concept of a quantum computer in 1982 [1], quantum computation has undergone rapid progress. The new type of computer can solve some problems much faster than its classical counterpart. For example, the well-known Deutsch-Jozsa problem, which is to identify whether a binary-valued function $f(x)$ of N bits variables is constant for all values of x , or balanced (equal to 1 for exactly half of all the possible x , and 0 for the other half), can be solved by using a single query of $f(x)$ on a quantum computer [2, 3], whereas classical computer needs up to $(2^{N-1} + 1)$ queries [4]. Till now, the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm has been widely studied [5]–[9], with its efficiency experimentally tested [10, 11].

The Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm can be briefly described as follows: Assume for the simplest case that $f(x)$ has only a one-bit input ($x = 0$ or 1). The algorithm can be performed in a system consist of one query qubit 1 and an auxiliary working qubit 2, which are initially prepared in the superposed state:

$$|j_{i_1}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|j_{i_1} + j_{i_1}\rangle + |j_{i_2} - j_{i_1}\rangle) \quad (1)$$

Then an unitary operator U_{fn} is used to calculate $f(x)$, which acts as $U_{fn}|x_{i_1}\rangle|y_{i_2}\rangle = |x_{i_1}\rangle|y_{i_2} \oplus f(x)\rangle$. Here $x, y \in \{0, 1\}$, and \oplus indicates addition modulo 2. The implementation of U_{fn} on $|j_{i_1}\rangle$ yields

$$|j_{i_2}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}[(1)^{f(0)}|j_{i_2}\rangle + (-1)^{f(1)}|j_{i_2}\rangle] \quad (2)$$

There are actually four possible U_{fn} : U_{f_1} corresponds to $f(0) = f(1) = 0$; U_{f_2} corresponds to $f(0) = f(1) = 1$; U_{f_3} corresponds to $f(0) = 0$ and $f(1) = 1$; U_{f_4} corresponds to $f(0) = 1$ and $f(1) = 0$; After performing a Hadamard transformation on the query qubit, the state of qubit 1 will be in $|j_{i_1}\rangle$ for U_{f_1} and U_{f_2} , while for U_{f_3} and U_{f_4} it becomes $|j_{i_1}\rangle$. Thus a measurement on the query qubit will tell us whether $f(x)$ is constant or balanced.

Recently, Zheng proposed a scheme [12] for implementing the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm in cavity QED, in which two atoms, one as a preparing qubit and one as the query bit, sequentially interact with the cavity mode, which serves as the auxiliary working qubit. The main drawback of this scheme, as well as several other implementations of quantum algorithms using cavity QED [13, 14], is that they are sensitive to cavity decay or thermal field, which makes practical experiment difficult to be scalable. Although the decoherence time of the cavity can be prolonged by keeping the cavity excited merely in a virtual way [15], one has to make sure that the cavity remains always in the vacuum state throughout the procedure, otherwise it is still sensitive to thermal field [16].

We notice that by resorting to a strong classical field, such drawbacks can be overcome [17] in that the photon-number-dependent parts in the evolution operator are canceled with resonant classical field added, thus rendering immunity to thermal field. Based on the state evolution presented in Ref. [17], we propose an improved scheme for

† Electronic address: wwxingyang2@126.com
† Electronic address: gongzhexuan@qmail.com

implementing Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm which outruns the previous scheme in Ref. [12] in three important aspects: (1) Both the preparing atom and the auxiliary atom level used in Ref. [12] are not necessary; instead we only use two two-level atoms, which might simplify the experimental procedures effectively if scalability is concerned; (2) Cavity is not required to remain in the vacuum state all of the time, and insensitivity to thermal field is still insured; (3) No large detuning between atoms and the cavity is necessary, potentially giving rise to better performance of the speed and fidelity of the whole procedure.

To describe our scheme, let us first consider two identical two-level atoms simultaneously interacting with a single-mode cavity field and driven by a classical field. The Hamiltonian (assuming $\hbar = 1$) in the rotating-wave approximation reads [17]-[19]

$$H = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^2 \omega_{z;j} + \omega_a a^\dagger a + \sum_{j=1}^2 [g(a^\dagger_j + a_j) + (\Omega_j e^{i\omega_c t} + \Omega_j e^{-i\omega_c t})]; \quad (3)$$

where $\omega_{z;j} = \langle \tilde{e}_{i;j} | h_{e;j} - \tilde{g}_{i;j} | h_{g;j} \rangle$, $\omega_j = \langle \tilde{e}_{i;j} | h_{g;j} \rangle$, $\omega_j = \langle \tilde{g}_{i;j} | h_{e;j} \rangle$, with $\tilde{e}_{i;j}$ ($\tilde{g}_{i;j}$) being the excited (ground) state of the j th atom. ω_0 , ω_a and ω_c are the frequencies for atomic transition, cavity mode, and classical field, respectively. a^\dagger and a are the creation and annihilation operators for the cavity mode. g is the atom-cavity coupling strength and Ω is the Rabi frequency of the classical field. Assume that $\omega_0 = \omega_c$. Then we can obtain the following interaction Hamiltonian in the interaction picture:

$$H_I = \sum_{j=1}^2 [(\Omega_j^+ + \Omega_j^-) + g(e^{i\omega_c t} a^\dagger_j + e^{-i\omega_c t} a_j)]; \quad (4)$$

where $\Omega_j^\pm = \omega_0 \pm \omega_a$. For the new atomic basis $|j, \tilde{e}_j\rangle = (\tilde{g}_{i;j} | \tilde{e}_{i;j} - \tilde{e}_{i;j} | \tilde{g}_{i;j}) = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$, we can rewrite $H_I = H_e + H_0$ with

$$H_0 = \sum_{j=1}^2 S_{z;j}; \quad (5)$$

$$H_e = \sum_{j=1}^2 g [e^{i\omega_c t} a^\dagger_j (S_{z;j} + \frac{1}{2} S_j - \frac{1}{2} S_j^+) + H.c.]; \quad (6)$$

Here $S_{z;j} = (\tilde{g}_{i;j} | h_{e;j} - \tilde{e}_{i;j} | h_{g;j}) = 2$, $S_j^+ = \tilde{g}_{i;j} | h_{e;j}$ and $S_j = \tilde{e}_{i;j} | h_{g;j}$. Assuming that $\Omega_j^\pm \gg g$, we can neglect the fast oscillating terms. Then the effective Hamiltonian H_e reduces to

$$H_e = g(e^{i\omega_c t} a^\dagger + e^{-i\omega_c t} a) x; \quad (7)$$

where $x = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{j=1}^2 (\Omega_j^+ + \Omega_j^-)$. The evolution operator for Hamiltonian (Eq. 7) can be written as:

$$U_e(t) = e^{iA(t)} x e^{iB(t)} x a e^{iC(t)} x a^\dagger; \quad (8)$$

which was first proposed for trapped-ion system [20]. By solving the Schrödinger equation $i \frac{dU_e(t)}{dt} = H_I U_e(t)$, we can obtain $B(t) = g(e^{i\omega_c t} - 1) = i$, $C(t) = -g(e^{i\omega_c t} - 1) = -i$ and $A(t) = \frac{1}{2} [t + (e^{i\omega_c t} - 1) = i]$. Setting $t = 2$, we have $B(t) = C(t) = 0$. Then we can get the evolution operator of the system

$$U_I(t) = e^{iH_0 t} U_e(t) = e^{i2 \sum_{j=1}^2 S_{z;j} t}; \quad (9)$$

with $\omega_c = g^2 = 2$. We note that the evolution operator is independent of the cavity field state, allowing it to be in a thermal state. Unlike Ref. [15], our scheme does not require $\Omega_j^\pm \gg g$. The atoms interact with the cavity mode for a time t , leading to

$$\begin{aligned} & \tilde{e}_{i;1} \tilde{g}_{i;2} \rightarrow e^{i\omega_c t} \cos(t) [\cos(t) \tilde{e}_{i;1} - i \sin(t) \tilde{g}_{i;1}] \\ & \quad [\cos(t) \tilde{g}_{i;2} - i \sin(t) \tilde{e}_{i;2}] - i \sin(t) \\ & \quad [\cos(t) \tilde{g}_{i;1} - i \sin(t) \tilde{e}_{i;1}] \cos(t) \tilde{e}_{i;2} \\ & \quad - i \sin(t) \tilde{g}_{i;2} g; \end{aligned} \quad (10)$$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 |j_1 j_2\rangle &= e^{-i t g} [\cos(t) |j_1 j_2\rangle - i \sin(t) |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle] \\
 &= [\cos(t) |j_1 j_2\rangle - i \sin(t) |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle] - i \sin(t) \\
 &= [\cos(t) |j_1 j_2\rangle - i \sin(t) |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle] \cos(t) |j_1 j_2\rangle \\
 &= i \sin(t) |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle;
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{11}$$

We choose the interaction time and Rabi frequency appropriately so that $t = (2m + 1) \frac{\pi}{2g}$ (m is an integer) and $t = \frac{\pi}{2g}$, then we obtain the Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen state (EPR state)

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|j_1 j_2\rangle - i |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle);
 \tag{12}$$

and

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|j_1 j_2\rangle - i |\bar{j}_1 j_2\rangle);
 \tag{13}$$

where we have discarded the common phase factor. These calculations are useful in the later numerical analysis of delity.

Now we'd like to show that with the help of $U_I(t)$ as shown in Eq. 9, all the relevant unitary operators U_{fn} in the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm can be easily achieved. But before that, we first need to show how to use the above idea to realize the quantum CNOT gate. For the present problem we let first atom serve as the query qubit and the second atom as the auxiliary working qubit, i.e. $|j_1\rangle$ and $|\bar{j}_1\rangle$ respectively represent $|j_i\rangle$ and $|\bar{j}_i\rangle$ ($i = 1;2$) in Eq. 1.

According to the Eq. 9, it can be easily shown that

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_I(t) |j_1 j_2\rangle &= e^{i2(\dots)t} |j_1 j_2\rangle \\
 U_I(t) |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle &= |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle \\
 U_I(t) |\bar{j}_1 j_2\rangle &= |\bar{j}_1 j_2\rangle \\
 U_I(t) |\bar{j}_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle &= e^{i2(\dots)t} |\bar{j}_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{14}$$

By setting $t = \frac{\pi}{2g}$ and $gt = \frac{\pi}{2}$, we can make the interacting time t and Rabi frequency satisfy $t = \frac{\pi}{2g}$ and $t = (2k + \frac{1}{2}) \frac{\pi}{2g}$ (k is an integer). Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
 U_I(t) |j_1 j_2\rangle &= |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle \\
 U_I(t) |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle &= |j_1 j_2\rangle \\
 U_I(t) |\bar{j}_1 j_2\rangle &= |\bar{j}_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle \\
 U_I(t) |\bar{j}_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle &= |\bar{j}_1 j_2\rangle
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{15}$$

As a result, we obtain a controlled-phase gate, which can be transformed into CNOT gate through a few single-qubit unitary operations:

$$\begin{aligned}
 &X_1 \quad H_1 \quad U_I(t) \quad H_1 \quad X_1 \quad Z_1 \\
 |j_1 j_2\rangle &= |j_1 j_2\rangle = |j_1 j_2\rangle = |j_1 j_2\rangle = |j_1 j_2\rangle = |j_1 j_2\rangle \\
 |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle &= |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle = |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle = |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle = |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle = |j_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle \\
 |\bar{j}_1 j_2\rangle &= |\bar{j}_1 j_2\rangle = |\bar{j}_1 j_2\rangle = |\bar{j}_1 j_2\rangle = |\bar{j}_1 j_2\rangle = |\bar{j}_1 j_2\rangle \\
 |\bar{j}_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle &= |\bar{j}_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle = |\bar{j}_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle = |\bar{j}_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle = |\bar{j}_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle = |\bar{j}_1 \bar{j}_2\rangle
 \end{aligned}
 \tag{16}$$




FIG. 1: Experimental apparatus of the whole scheme, where atoms A and B cross the cavity with same velocity but at different positions, allowing for single-qubit operation of each one in the process.

Here H_1 , X_1 , and Z_1 are Hadamard, x and z operations on the first atom with computational basis being $|j_1\rangle$ and $|j_1\rangle$, which can be easily realized by choosing the appropriate amplitudes and phases of classical fields, respectively.

U_{f1} operation: This operation on the atomic qubits does not require any interaction with the cavity mode. In this case the atoms can be tuned far off resonant with the cavity mode and thus the atom-cavity evolution is freezing. Thus the system remains in the state of $|j_1\rangle$.

U_{f2} operation: We first apply the aforementioned CNOT gate, and then perform the single-qubit transformation $|j_1\rangle \rightarrow |j_1\rangle$ and $|j_1\rangle \rightarrow |j_1\rangle$ on the atom A by using a Ramsey pulse. Then we repeat the controlled-NOT operation and perform the transformation $|j_1\rangle \rightarrow |j_1\rangle$ and $|j_1\rangle \rightarrow |j_1\rangle$ by using a Ramsey pulse with a phase difference relative to the first Ramsey pulse. Therefore we obtain

$$\begin{aligned} |j_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} (|j_1\rangle + |j_1\rangle) (|j_1\rangle - |j_1\rangle) \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (|j_1\rangle - |j_1\rangle) (|j_2\rangle - |j_2\rangle): \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

U_{f3} operation: By performing the CNOT gate operation of Eq. 16, the output state of two-atom is given by

$$\begin{aligned} |j_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} [|j_1\rangle (|j_2\rangle - |j_2\rangle) + |j_1\rangle (|j_1\rangle - |j_1\rangle)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (|j_1\rangle - |j_1\rangle) (|j_2\rangle - |j_2\rangle): \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

U_{f4} operation: Firstly, we perform the single-qubit transformation $|j_1\rangle \rightarrow |j_1\rangle$ and $|j_1\rangle \rightarrow |j_1\rangle$ on the atom A; Secondly, the CNOT operation of Eq. 16 is applied; Finally we perform the single-qubit transformation $|j_1\rangle \rightarrow |j_1\rangle$ and $|j_1\rangle \rightarrow |j_1\rangle$. This leads to

$$\begin{aligned} |j_2\rangle &= \frac{1}{2} [|j_1\rangle (|j_2\rangle - |j_2\rangle) + |j_1\rangle (|j_1\rangle - |j_1\rangle)] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} (|j_1\rangle + |j_1\rangle) (|j_2\rangle - |j_2\rangle): \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

The whole scheme of the implementation of Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm is displayed in Fig. 1. Two atoms 1 and 2, first simultaneously prepared in highly lying circular Rydberg state denoted by $|j_1\rangle |j_2\rangle$, are in the initial average state after a Hadamard operation. Then they undergo the operations in Fig. 1 from left to right. In order to realize the different operations U_{fn} , we have to employ an inhomogeneous field to distinguish the two atoms by the same trick as in Ref. [13]. Finally the atoms 1 and 2 are separately read out by the state-selective field-ionization detectors.

We briefly discuss the experimental feasibility of our proposal. Although the evolution operator is independent of the thermal photons of cavity field as decided by the condition $t = 2$, the two-atom system is entangled with the cavity during the atom-cavity interaction. We have to neglect the cavity decay during this interaction time. We assume that the atom-cavity coupling constant is $g = 2 \times 25 \text{ kHz}$ [21, 22], $\omega = 2g$. Direct calculation shows that the interaction time is at the order of 10^{-5} s. Note that the photon decay time is $T_c \sim 10^{-3}$ s, thus much longer than the interaction time. After the interaction, the atoms are disentangled with the cavity, that is, the operation will not be affected by the cavity decay during the interaction time. Besides, the radiative time for the Rydberg atoms is $T_r = 3 \times 10^2$ s and the implementation time needed to complete the whole procedure in the cavity is much shorter than T_r as the time for single-qubit transformation is negligible. Thus the proposed scheme is realizable with the present cavity QED techniques. The most probable difficulty is to send two atoms simultaneously through the cavity,




FIG. 2: Numerical results for the fidelity of our scheme: (a) error introduced by the Stark Shifts ($\Delta = 20$); (b), (c) show the dependence of the fidelity on pulse imperfections and initial cavity Fock state ($g = 2$, $\Delta = 25\text{kHz}$, $\Delta = 20$ g, $n = 400$ g).

but other work have shown that even though there exist time difference, the negative influence is almost negligible. [15, 18].

In the obtaining of Eq. 7, we have discarded the fast oscillating terms, which induce Stark shifts on the states $|j_i\rangle$ and $|j_j\rangle$. Here we numerically simulate the dependence of fidelity considering the error introduced by the Stark shift for generations of EPR state as in Eq. 12 with different values of detuning, as shown in Fig. 2(a). (Note that we have set $\Delta = 20$). The result from the plot shows that even for $\Delta = 2g$, the fidelity is still larger than 97%, from which we know that large detuning is not required in our scheme. Besides, if we consider the fluctuation of the Rabi frequency $\Omega = 0.01$, directly calculation shows that the fidelity for the generation of EPR state decreases by only 0.02.

To check the feasibility of our scheme more strictly, we show in Fig. 2(b) the estimated achievable fidelity of the produced EPR state, where we consider the existence of fluctuations in the atom-cavity interaction that leads to imperfections of the quantum Rabi pulses [23]. The fidelity is plotted for various strengths of imperfections in the Rabi pulses, where we assume for simplicity that the initial cavity state is in $|j_i\rangle$ and each pulse suffers the same imperfection. The result from the plot tells that even for 10% pulse error, the fidelity is still larger than 80%. (Note that in real experiments this kind of imperfection can be controlled around 3%).

Furthermore, we show in Fig. 2(c) that if we assume that the cavity is initially in a Fock state $|j_i\rangle$, the success probability for producing EPR state slightly decreases with the increase of photon number. Even for $n = 10$, the fidelity is still larger than 99.5%, which means that the whole process is almost independent of the cavity field state.

In principle, our scheme may offer a viable way to realize a scalable quantum algorithm. Based on the effective interaction between two atoms with single mode cavity, our scheme can be also extended to multi-bit Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm, since the multi-bit entangled transformation U_{fn}^0 can be constructed by single qubit quantum gates and CNOT gates [24]. However, it is still somewhat difficult for our scheme to be extended to many qubits based on current technology [22]. Furthermore, it should be pointed out that the single atom sources are required in our scheme.

To sum up, we have proposed a simple scheme for implementing the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm in cavity QED based on effective interaction of two two-level atoms with a single-mode cavity with the assistance of a strong classical driving field. Compared with the scheme in Ref. [12], our scheme is immune to thermal field and does not require the cavity to remain in vacuum state. In addition, the scheme may work in a fast way since large detuning is not required. Besides, our scheme does not require the auxiliary atom-level for the implementation of the quantum CNOT operation and all the operations except the single-qubit transformation are imposed on both atoms simultaneously, making our scheme easier to be carried out practically. Based on these features, we present finally the numerical analysis of the fidelity of our scheme with respect to the practical experiment under the influence of detuning, pulse imperfection and initial cavity Fock state.

The authors acknowledge Professor Ying Wu for many helpful discussions and encouragement. This work was partially supported by National Fundamental Research Program of China 2005CB724508, by National Natural Science Foundation of China under Grant Nos. 60478029, 90503010, 10634060 and 10575040.

[1] Feynman R, 1982 Int. J. Theor. Phys. 21 467.

[2] Deutsch D, 1985 Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A 400 97.

[3] Deutsch D and Jozsa R, 1992 Proc. R. Soc. London, Ser. A 493 553.

- [4] Nielsen M A and Chuang I L, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge, 2002), Page 34.
- [5] Chuang I L, Vandersypen I M K, Zhou X, Leung D W, and Lloyd S, 1998 *Nature* (London) 393 143.
- [6] Jones T F and Mosca M, 1998 *J. Chem. Phys.* 109 1648.
- [7] Gulde S, et al, 2003 *Nature* (London) 421 48.
- [8] Mohseni M, Lundeen J S, Resch K J, and Steinberg A M, 2003 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 91 187903.
- [9] Dasgupta S, Biswas A, and Agarwal G S, 2005 *Phys. Rev. A* 71 012333.
- [10] Dorai K, Arvind, and Kumar A, 2000 *Phys. Rev. A* 61 (2000) 042306.
- [11] Das R and Kumar A, 2003 *Phys. Rev. A* 68 032304.
- [12] Zheng S B, 2004 *Phys. Rev. A* 70 034301.
- [13] Yamaguchi F, Milon P, Brunel M, Raimond J M, and Haroche S, 2002 *Phys. Rev. A* 66 010302 (R).
- [14] Scully M O and Zubairy M S, 2002 *Phys. Rev. A* 65 052324.
- [15] Zheng S B and Guo G C, 2000 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 85 2392.
- [16] Onghia S, Bertet P, Audeves A, Aioli P, Brunel M, Raimond J M, and Haroche S, 2001 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 87 037902.
- [17] Zheng S B, 2002 *Phys. Rev. A* 66 060303 (R).
- [18] Ye L and Guo G C, 2005 *Phys. Rev. A* 71 034304.
- [19] Zheng S B, 2003, *Phys. Rev. A* 68 035801.
- [20] Sørensen A and Mølmer K, 2000 *Phys. Rev. A* 62 022311.
- [21] Fujiwara S and Hasegawa S, 2005 *Phys. Rev. A* 71 012337.
- [22] Rauschenbeutel A, Nogues G, Onghia S, Bertet P, Brunel M, Raimond J M, and Haroche S, 1999 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 83 5166; Bertet P, et al, 2002 *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 89 200402; Rauschenbeutel A, et al, 2000 *Science* 288 2024.
- [23] Messina A, 2002 *Eur. Phys. J. D* 18 379; Lutterbach L G and Davidovich L, 2000 *Phys. Rev. A* 61 023813.
- [24] Deutsch D. Universality in quantum computation. *Proc. R. Soc. London A*, 1995, 449 (1937) :631C 633.