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I Fundamental concepts

1 Introduction and overview

Science offers the boldest metaphysics of the age. It is a thoroughly human construct, driven by the faith that if we dream, press to discover, explain, and dream again, thereby plunging repeatedly into new terrain, the world will somehow come clearer and we will grasp the true strangeness of the universe. And the strangeness will all prove to be connected, and make sense.

– Edward O. Wilson

Information is physical.

– Rolf Landauer

What are the fundamental concepts of quantum computation and quantum information? How did these concepts develop? To what uses may they be put? How will they be presented in this book? The purpose of this introductory chapter is to answer these questions by developing in broad brushstrokes a picture of the field of quantum computation and quantum information. The intent is to communicate a basic understanding of the central concepts of the field, perspective on how they have been developed, and to help you decide how to approach the rest of the book.

Our story begins in Section 1.1 with an account of the historical context in which quantum computation and quantum information has developed. Each remaining section in the chapter gives a brief introduction to one or more fundamental concepts from the field: quantum bits (Section 1.2), quantum computers, quantum gates and quantum circuits (Section 1.3), quantum algorithms (Section 1.4), experimental quantum information processing (Section 1.5), and quantum information and communication (Section 1.6).

Along the way, illustrative and easily accessible developments such as quantum teleportation and some simple quantum algorithms are given, using the basic mathematics taught in this chapter. The presentation is self-contained, and designed to be accessible even without a background in computer science or physics. As we move along, we give pointers to more in-depth discussions in later chapters, where references and suggestions for further reading may also be found.

If as you read you’re finding the going rough, skip on to a spot where you feel more comfortable. At points we haven’t been able to avoid using a little technical lingo which won’t be completely explained until later in the book. Simply accept it for now, and come back later when you understand all the terminology in more detail. The emphasis in this first chapter is on the big picture, with the details to be filled in later.

1.1 Global perspectives

Quantum computation and quantum information is the study of the information processing tasks that can be accomplished using quantum mechanical systems. Sounds pretty
simple and obvious, doesn’t it? Like many simple but profound ideas it was a long time before anybody thought of doing information processing using quantum mechanical systems. To see why this is the case, we must go back in time and look in turn at each of the fields which have contributed fundamental ideas to quantum computation and quantum information – quantum mechanics, computer science, information theory, and cryptography. As we take our short historical tour of these fields, think of yourself first as a physicist, then as a computer scientist, then as an information theorist, and finally as a cryptographer, in order to get some feel for the disparate perspectives which have come together in quantum computation and quantum information.

1.1.1 History of quantum computation and quantum information
Our story begins at the turn of the twentieth century when a unheralded revolution was underway in science. A series of crises had arisen in physics. The problem was that the theories of physics at that time (now dubbed classical physics) were predicting absurdities such as the existence of an ‘ultraviolet catastrophe’ involving infinite energies, or electrons spiraling inexorably into the atomic nucleus. At first such problems were resolved with the addition of ad hoc hypotheses to classical physics, but as a better understanding of atoms and radiation was gained these attempted explanations became more and more convoluted. The crisis came to a head in the early 1920s after a quarter century of turmoil, and resulted in the creation of the modern theory of quantum mechanics. Quantum mechanics has been an indispensable part of science ever since, and has been applied with enormous success to everything under and inside the Sun, including the structure of the atom, nuclear fusion in stars, superconductors, the structure of DNA, and the elementary particles of Nature.

What is quantum mechanics? Quantum mechanics is a mathematical framework or set of rules for the construction of physical theories. For example, there is a physical theory known as quantum electrodynamics which describes with fantastic accuracy the interaction of atoms and light. Quantum electrodynamics is built up within the framework of quantum mechanics, but it contains specific rules not determined by quantum mechanics. The relationship of quantum mechanics to specific physical theories like quantum electrodynamics is rather like the relationship of a computer’s operating system to specific applications software – the operating system sets certain basic parameters and modes of operation, but leaves open how specific tasks are accomplished by the applications.

The rules of quantum mechanics are simple but even experts find them counter-intuitive, and the earliest antecedents of quantum computation and quantum information may be found in the long-standing desire of physicists to better understand quantum mechanics. The best known critic of quantum mechanics, Albert Einstein, went to his grave unreconciled with the theory he helped invent. Generations of physicists since have wrestled with quantum mechanics in an effort to make its predictions more palatable. One of the goals of quantum computation and quantum information is to develop tools which sharpen our intuition about quantum mechanics, and make its predictions more transparent to human minds.

For example, in the early 1980s, interest arose in whether it might be possible to use quantum effects to signal faster than light – a big no-no according to Einstein’s theory of relativity. The resolution of this problem turns out to hinge on whether it is possible to clone an unknown quantum state, that is, construct a copy of a quantum state. If cloning were possible, then it would be possible to signal faster than light using quantum effects.
However, cloning – so easy to accomplish with classical information (consider the words in front of you, and where they came from!) – turns out not to be possible in general in quantum mechanics. This no-cloning theorem, discovered in the early 1980s, is one of the earliest results of quantum computation and quantum information. Many refinements of the no-cloning theorem have since been developed, and we now have conceptual tools which allow us to understand how well a (necessarily imperfect) quantum cloning device might work. These tools, in turn, have been applied to understand other aspects of quantum mechanics.

A related historical strand contributing to the development of quantum computation and quantum information is the interest, dating to the 1970s, of obtaining complete control over single quantum systems. Applications of quantum mechanics prior to the 1970s typically involved a gross level of control over a bulk sample containing an enormous number of quantum mechanical systems, none of them directly accessible. For example, superconductivity has a superb quantum mechanical explanation. However, because a superconductor involves a huge (compared to the atomic scale) sample of conducting metal, we can only probe a few aspects of its quantum mechanical nature, with the individual quantum systems constituting the superconductor remaining inaccessible. Systems such as particle accelerators do allow limited access to individual quantum systems, but again provide little control over the constituent systems.

Since the 1970s many techniques for controlling single quantum systems have been developed. For example, methods have been developed for trapping a single atom in an ‘atom trap’, isolating it from the rest of the world and allowing us to probe many different aspects of its behavior with incredible precision. The scanning tunneling microscope has been used to move single atoms around, creating designer arrays of atoms at will. Electronic devices whose operation involves the transfer of only single electrons have been demonstrated.

Why all this effort to attain complete control over single quantum systems? Setting aside the many technological reasons and concentrating on pure science, the principal answer is that researchers have done this on a hunch. Often the most profound insights in science come when we develop a method for probing a new regime of Nature. For example, the invention of radio astronomy in the 1930s and 1940s led to a spectacular sequence of discoveries, including the galactic core of the Milky Way galaxy, pulsars, and quasars. Low temperature physics has achieved its amazing successes by finding ways to lower the temperatures of different systems. In a similar way, by obtaining complete control over single quantum systems, we are exploring untouched regimes of Nature in the hope of discovering new and unexpected phenomena. We are just now taking our first steps along these lines, and already a few interesting surprises have been discovered in this regime. What else shall we discover as we obtain more complete control over single quantum systems, and extend it to more complex systems?

Quantum computation and quantum information fit naturally into this program. They provide a useful series of challenges at varied levels of difficulty for people devising methods to better manipulate single quantum systems, and stimulate the development of new experimental techniques and provide guidance as to the most interesting directions in which to take experiment. Conversely, the ability to control single quantum systems is essential if we are to harness the power of quantum mechanics for applications to quantum computation and quantum information.

Despite this intense interest, efforts to build quantum information processing systems
have resulted in modest success to date. Small quantum computers, capable of doing
dozens of operations on a few qubits represent the state of the art in quantum computation.
Experimental prototypes for doing quantum cryptography—a way of communicating in
secret across long distances—have been demonstrated, and are even at the level where they
may be useful for some real-world applications. However, it remains a great challenge
to physicists and engineers of the future to develop techniques for making large-scale
quantum information processing a reality.

Let us turn our attention from quantum mechanics to another of the great intellectual
triumphs of the twentieth century, computer science. The origins of computer science
are lost in the depths of history. For example, cuneiform tablets indicate that by the time
of Hammurabi (circa 1750 B.C.) the Babylonians had developed some fairly sophisticated
algorithmic ideas, and it is likely that many of those ideas date to even earlier times.

The modern incarnation of computer science was announced by the great mathematician
Alan Turing in a remarkable 1936 paper. Turing developed in detail an abstract
notion of what we would now call a programmable computer, a model for computation
now known as the Turing machine, in his honor. Turing showed that there is a Universal
Turing Machine that can be used to simulate any other Turing machine. Furthermore,
he claimed that the Universal Turing Machine completely captures what it means to per-
form a task by algorithmic means. That is, if an algorithm can be performed on any piece
of hardware (say, a modern personal computer), then there is an equivalent algorithm
for a Universal Turing Machine which performs exactly the same task as the algorithm
running on the personal computer. This assertion, known as the Church–Turing thesis
in honor of Turing and another pioneer of computer science, Alonzo Church, asserts the
equivalence between the physical concept of what class of algorithms can be performed
on some physical device with the rigorous mathematical concept of a Universal Turing
Machine. The broad acceptance of this thesis laid the foundation for the development of
a rich theory of computer science.

Not long after Turing’s paper, the first computers constructed from electronic com-
ponents were developed. John von Neumann developed a simple theoretical model for
how to put together in a practical fashion all the components necessary for a computer
to be fully as capable as a Universal Turing Machine. Hardware development truly took
off, though, in 1947, when John Bardeen, Walter Brattain, and Will Shockley developed
the transistor. Computer hardware has grown in power at an amazing pace ever since, so
much so that the growth was codified by Gordon Moore in 1965 in what has come to be
known as Moore’s law, which states that computer power will double for constant cost
roughly once every two years.

Amazingly enough, Moore’s law has approximately held true in the decades since
the 1960s. Nevertheless, most observers expect that this dream run will end some time
during the first two decades of the twenty-first century. Conventional approaches to
the fabrication of computer technology are beginning to run up against fundamental
difficulties of size. Quantum effects are beginning to interfere in the functioning of
electronic devices as they are made smaller and smaller.

One possible solution to the problem posed by the eventual failure of Moore’s law
is to move to a different computing paradigm. One such paradigm is provided by the
theory of quantum computation, which is based on the idea of using quantum mechanics
to perform computations, instead of classical physics. It turns out that while an ordinary
computer can be used to simulate a quantum computer, it appears to be impossible to
perform the simulation in an efficient fashion. Thus quantum computers offer an essential speed advantage over classical computers. This speed advantage is so significant that many researchers believe that no conceivable amount of progress in classical computation would be able to overcome the gap between the power of a classical computer and the power of a quantum computer.

What do we mean by ‘efficient’ versus ‘inefficient’ simulations of a quantum computer? Many of the key notions needed to answer this question were actually invented before the notion of a quantum computer had even arisen. In particular, the idea of efficient and inefficient algorithms was made mathematically precise by the field of computational complexity. Roughly speaking, an efficient algorithm is one which runs in time polynomial in the size of the problem solved. In contrast, an inefficient algorithm requires super-polynomial (typically exponential) time. What was noticed in the late 1960s and early 1970s was that it seemed as though the Turing machine model of computation was at least as powerful as any other model of computation, in the sense that a problem which could be solved efficiently in some model of computation could also be solved efficiently in the Turing machine model, by using the Turing machine to simulate the other model of computation. This observation was codified into a strengthened version of the Church–Turing thesis:

Any algorithmic process can be simulated efficiently using a Turing machine.

The key strengthening in the strong Church–Turing thesis is the word efficiently. If the strong Church–Turing thesis is correct, then it implies that no matter what type of machine we use to perform our algorithms, that machine can be simulated efficiently using a standard Turing machine. This is an important strengthening, as it implies that for the purposes of analyzing whether a given computational task can be accomplished efficiently, we may restrict ourselves to the analysis of the Turing machine model of computation.

One class of challenges to the strong Church–Turing thesis comes from the field of analog computation. In the years since Turing, many different teams of researchers have noticed that certain types of analog computers can efficiently solve problems believed to have no efficient solution on a Turing machine. At first glance these analog computers appear to violate the strong form of the Church–Turing thesis. Unfortunately for analog computation, it turns out that when realistic assumptions about the presence of noise in analog computers are made, their power disappears in all known instances; they cannot efficiently solve problems which are not efficiently solvable on a Turing machine. This lesson – that the effects of realistic noise must be taken into account in evaluating the efficiency of a computational model – was one of the great early challenges of quantum computation and quantum information, a challenge successfully met by the development of a theory of quantum error-correcting codes and fault-tolerant quantum computation. Thus, unlike analog computation, quantum computation can in principle tolerate a finite amount of noise and still retain its computational advantages.

The first major challenge to the strong Church–Turing thesis arose in the mid 1970s, when Robert Solovay and Volker Strassen showed that it is possible to test whether an integer is prime or composite using a randomized algorithm. That is, the Solovay–Strassen test for primality used randomness as an essential part of the algorithm. The algorithm did not determine whether a given integer was prime or composite with certainty. Instead, the algorithm could determine that a number was probably prime or else composite with
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certainty. By repeating the Solovay–Strassen test a few times it is possible to determine with near certainty whether a number is prime or composite. Of especial interest at the time the Solovay–Strassen test was proposed was that no efficient deterministic test for primality was known. Thus, it seemed as though computers with access to a random number generator would be able to efficiently perform computational tasks with no efficient solution on a conventional deterministic Turing machine. This discovery inspired a search for other randomized algorithms which has paid off handsomely, with the field blossoming into a thriving area of research.

Randomized algorithms pose a challenge to the strong Church–Turing thesis, suggesting that there are efficiently soluble problems which, nevertheless, cannot be efficiently solved on a deterministic Turing machine. This challenge appears to be easily resolved by a simple modification of the strong Church–Turing thesis:

*Any algorithmic process can be simulated efficiently using a probabilistic Turing machine.*

This *ad hoc* modification of the strong Church–Turing thesis should leave you feeling rather queasy. Might it not turn out at some later date that yet another model of computation allows one to efficiently solve problems that are not efficiently soluble within Turing's model of computation? Is there any way we can find a single model of computation which is guaranteed to be able to efficiently simulate any other model of computation?

Motivated by this question, in 1985 David Deutsch asked whether the laws of physics could be used to derive an even stronger version of the Church–Turing thesis. Instead of adopting *ad hoc* hypotheses, Deutsch looked to physical theory to provide a foundation for the Church–Turing thesis that would be as secure as the status of that physical theory. In particular, Deutsch attempted to define a computational device that would be capable of efficiently simulating an arbitrary physical system. Because the laws of physics are ultimately quantum mechanical, Deutsch was naturally led to consider computing devices based upon the principles of quantum mechanics. These devices, quantum analogues of the machines defined forty-nine years earlier by Turing, led ultimately to the modern conception of a quantum computer used in this book.

At the time of writing it is not clear whether Deutsch’s notion of a Universal Quantum Computer is sufficient to efficiently simulate an arbitrary physical system. Proving or refuting this conjecture is one of the great open problems of the field of quantum computation and quantum information. It is possible, for example, that some effect of quantum field theory or an even more esoteric effect based in string theory, quantum gravity or some other physical theory may take us beyond Deutsch’s Universal Quantum Computer, giving us a still more powerful model for computation. At this stage, we simply don’t know.

What Deutsch’s model of a quantum computer did enable was a challenge to the strong form of the Church–Turing thesis. Deutsch asked whether it is possible for a quantum computer to efficiently solve computational problems which have no efficient solution on a classical computer, even a probabilistic Turing machine. He then constructed a simple example suggesting that, indeed, quantum computers might have computational powers exceeding those of classical computers.

This remarkable first step taken by Deutsch was improved in the subsequent decade by many people, culminating in Peter Shor’s 1994 demonstration that two enormously important problems – the problem of finding the prime factors of an integer, and the so-
called ‘discrete logarithm’ problem – could be solved efficiently on a quantum computer. This attracted widespread interest because these two problems were and still are widely believed to have no efficient solution on a classical computer. Shor’s results are a powerful indication that quantum computers are more powerful than Turing machines, even probabilistic Turing machines. Further evidence for the power of quantum computers came in 1995 when Lov Grover showed that another important problem – the problem of conducting a search through some unstructured search space – could also be sped up on a quantum computer. While Grover’s algorithm did not provide as spectacular a speed-up as Shor’s algorithms, the widespread applicability of search-based methodologies has excited considerable interest in Grover’s algorithm.

At about the same time as Shor’s and Grover’s algorithms were discovered, many people were developing an idea Richard Feynman had suggested in 1982. Feynman had pointed out that there seemed to be essential difficulties in simulating quantum mechanical systems on classical computers, and suggested that building computers based on the principles of quantum mechanics would allow us to avoid those difficulties. In the 1990s several teams of researchers began fleshing this idea out, showing that it is indeed possible to use quantum computers to efficiently simulate systems that have no known efficient simulation on a classical computer. It is likely that one of the major applications of quantum computers in the future will be performing simulations of quantum mechanical systems too difficult to simulate on a classical computer, a problem with profound scientific and technological implications.

What other problems can quantum computers solve more quickly than classical computers? The short answer is that we don’t know. Coming up with good quantum algorithms seems to be hard. A pessimist might think that’s because there’s nothing quantum computers are good for other than the applications already discovered! We take a different view. Algorithm design for quantum computers is hard because designers face two difficult problems not faced in the construction of algorithms for classical computers. First, our human intuition is rooted in the classical world. If we use that intuition as an aid to the construction of algorithms, then the algorithmic ideas we come up with will be classical ideas. To design good quantum algorithms one must ‘turn off’ one’s classical intuition for at least part of the design process, using truly quantum effects to achieve the desired algorithmic end. Second, to be truly interesting it is not enough to design an algorithm that is merely quantum mechanical. The algorithm must be better than any existing classical algorithm! Thus, it is possible that one may find an algorithm which makes use of truly quantum aspects of quantum mechanics, that is nevertheless not of widespread interest because classical algorithms with comparable performance characteristics exist. The combination of these two problems makes the construction of new quantum algorithms a challenging problem for the future.

Even more broadly, we can ask if there are any generalizations we can make about the power of quantum computers versus classical computers. What is it that makes quantum computers more powerful than classical computers – assuming that this is indeed the case? What class of problems can be solved efficiently on a quantum computer, and how does that class compare to the class of problems that can be solved efficiently on a classical computer? One of the most exciting things about quantum computation and quantum information is how little is known about the answers to these questions! It is a great challenge for the future to understand these questions better.

Having come up to the frontier of quantum computation, let’s switch to the history
of another strand of thought contributing to quantum computation and quantum information: information theory. At the same time computer science was exploding in the 1940s, another revolution was taking place in our understanding of communication. In 1948 Claude Shannon published a remarkable pair of papers laying the foundations for the modern theory of information and communication.

Perhaps the key step taken by Shannon was to mathematically define the concept of information. In many mathematical sciences there is considerable flexibility in the choice of fundamental definitions. Try thinking naively for a few minutes about the following question: how would you go about mathematically defining the notion of an information source? Several different answers to this problem have found widespread use; however, the definition Shannon came up with seems to be far and away the most fruitful in terms of increased understanding, leading to a plethora of deep results and a theory with a rich structure which seems to accurately reflect many (though not all) real-world communications problems.

Shannon was interested in two key questions related to the communication of information over a communications channel. First, what resources are required to send information over a communications channel? For example, telephone companies need to know how much information they can reliably transmit over a given telephone cable. Second, can information be transmitted in such a way that it is protected against noise in the communications channel?

Shannon answered these two questions by proving the two fundamental theorems of information theory. The first, Shannon’s noiseless channel coding theorem, quantifies the physical resources required to store the output from an information source. Shannon’s second fundamental theorem, the noisy channel coding theorem, quantifies how much information it is possible to reliably transmit through a noisy communications channel. To achieve reliable transmission in the presence of noise, Shannon showed that error-correcting codes could be used to protect the information being sent. Shannon’s noisy channel coding theorem gives an upper limit on the protection afforded by error-correcting codes. Unfortunately, Shannon’s theorem does not explicitly give a practically useful set of error-correcting codes to achieve that limit. From the time of Shannon’s papers until today, researchers have constructed more and better classes of error-correcting codes in their attempts to come closer to the limit set by Shannon’s theorem. A sophisticated theory of error-correcting codes now exists offering the user a plethora of choices in their quest to design a good error-correcting code. Such codes are used in a multitude of places including, for example, compact disc players, computer modems, and satellite communications systems.

Quantum information theory has followed with similar developments. In 1995, Ben Schumacher provided an analogue to Shannon’s noiseless coding theorem, and in the process defined the ‘quantum bit’ or ‘qubit’ as a tangible physical resource. However, no analogue to Shannon’s noisy channel coding theorem is yet known for quantum information. Nevertheless, in analogy to their classical counterparts, a theory of quantum error-correction has been developed which, as already mentioned, allows quantum computers to compute effectively in the presence of noise, and also allows communication over noisy quantum channels to take place reliably.

Indeed, classical ideas of error-correction have proved to be enormously important in developing and understanding quantum error-correcting codes. In 1996, two groups working independently, Robert Calderbank and Peter Shor, and Andrew Steane, discov-
ered an important class of quantum codes now known as CSS codes after their initials. This work has since been subsumed by the stabilizer codes, independently discovered by Robert Calderbank, Eric Rains, Peter Shor and Neil Sloane, and by Daniel Gottesman. By building upon the basic ideas of classical linear coding theory, these discoveries greatly facilitated a rapid understanding of quantum error-correcting codes and their application to quantum computation and quantum information.

The theory of quantum error-correcting codes was developed to protect quantum states against noise. What about transmitting ordinary classical information using a quantum channel? How efficiently can this be done? A few surprises have been discovered in this arena. In 1992 Charles Bennett and Stephen Wiesner explained how to transmit two classical bits of information, while only transmitting one quantum bit from sender to receiver, a result dubbed superdense coding.

Even more interesting are the results in distributed quantum computation. Imagine you have two computers networked, trying to solve a particular problem. How much communication is required to solve the problem? Recently it has been shown that quantum computers can require exponentially less communication to solve certain problems than would be required if the networked computers were classical! Unfortunately, as yet these problems are not especially important in a practical setting, and suffer from some undesirable technical restrictions. A major challenge for the future of quantum computation and quantum information is to find problems of real-world importance for which distributed quantum computation offers a substantial advantage over distributed classical computation.

Let’s return to information theory proper. The study of information theory begins with the properties of a single communications channel. In applications we often do not deal with a single communications channel, but rather with networks of many channels. The subject of networked information theory deals with the information carrying properties of such networks of communications channels, and has been developed into a rich and intricate subject.

By contrast, the study of networked quantum information theory is very much in its infancy. Even for very basic questions we know little about the information carrying abilities of networks of quantum channels. Several rather striking preliminary results have been found in the past few years; however, no unifying theory of networked information theory exists for quantum channels. One example of networked quantum information theory should suffice to convince you of the value such a general theory would have. Imagine that we are attempting to send quantum information from Alice to Bob through a noisy quantum channel. If that channel has zero capacity for quantum information, then it is impossible to reliably send any information from Alice to Bob. Imagine instead that we consider two copies of the channel, operating in synchrony. Intuitively it is clear (and can be rigorously justified) that such a channel also has zero capacity to send quantum information. However, if we instead reverse the direction of one of the channels, as illustrated in Figure 1.1, it turns out that sometimes we can obtain a non-zero capacity for the transmission of information from Alice to Bob! Counter-intuitive properties like this illustrate the strange nature of quantum information. Better understanding the information carrying properties of networks of quantum channels is a major open problem of quantum computation and quantum information.

Let’s switch fields one last time, moving to the venerable old art and science of cryptography. Broadly speaking, cryptography is the problem of doing communication or...
Introduction and overview

Figure 1.1. Classically, if we have two very noisy channels of zero capacity running side by side, then the combined channel has zero capacity to send information. Not surprisingly, if we reverse the direction of one of the channels, we still have zero capacity to send information. Quantum mechanically, reversing one of the zero capacity channels can actually allow us to send information!

Computation involving two or more parties who may not trust one another. The best known cryptographic problem is the transmission of secret messages. Suppose two parties wish to communicate in secret. For example, you may wish to give your credit card number to a merchant in exchange for goods, hopefully without any malevolent third party intercepting your credit card number. The way this is done is to use a cryptographic protocol. We’ll describe in detail how cryptographic protocols work later in the book, but for now it will suffice to make a few simple distinctions. The most important distinction is between private key cryptosystems and public key cryptosystems.

The way a private key cryptosystem works is that two parties, ‘Alice’ and ‘Bob’, wish to communicate by sharing a private key, which only they know. The exact form of the key doesn’t matter at this point – think of a string of zeroes and ones. The point is that this key is used by Alice to encrypt the information she wishes to send to Bob. After Alice encrypts she sends the encrypted information to Bob, who must now recover the original information. Exactly how Alice encrypts the message depends upon the private key, so that to recover the original message Bob needs to know the private key, in order to undo the transformation Alice applied.

Unfortunately, private key cryptosystems have some severe problems in many contexts. The most basic problem is how to distribute the keys? In many ways, the key distribution problem is just as difficult as the original problem of communicating in private – a malevolent third party may be eavesdropping on the key distribution, and then use the intercepted key to decrypt some of the message transmission.

One of the earliest discoveries in quantum computation and quantum information was that quantum mechanics can be used to do key distribution in such a way that Alice and Bob’s security can not be compromised. This procedure is known as quantum cryptography or quantum key distribution. The basic idea is to exploit the quantum mechanical principle that observation in general disturbs the system being observed. Thus, if there is an eavesdropper listening in as Alice and Bob attempt to transmit their key, the presence of the eavesdropper will be visible as a disturbance of the communications channel Alice and Bob are using to establish the key. Alice and Bob can then throw out the key bits established while the eavesdropper was listening in, and start over. The first quantum cryptographic ideas were proposed by Stephen Wiesner in the late 1960s, but unfortu-
nately were not accepted for publication! In 1984 Charles Bennett and Gilles Brassard, building on Wiesner’s earlier work, proposed a protocol using quantum mechanics to distribute keys between Alice and Bob, without any possibility of a compromise. Since then numerous quantum cryptographic protocols have been proposed, and experimental prototypes developed. At the time of this writing, the experimental prototypes are nearing the stage where they may be useful in limited-scale real-world applications.

The second major type of cryptosystem is the public key cryptosystem. Public key cryptosystems don’t rely on Alice and Bob sharing a secret key in advance. Instead, Bob simply publishes a ‘public key’, which is made available to the general public. Alice can make use of this public key to encrypt a message which she sends to Bob. What is interesting is that a third party cannot use Bob’s public key to decrypt the message! Strictly speaking, we shouldn’t say cannot. Rather, the encryption transformation is chosen in a very clever and non-trivial way so that it is extremely difficult (though not impossible) to invert, given only knowledge of the public key. To make inversion easy, Bob has a secret key matched to his public key, which together enable him to easily perform the decryption. This secret key is not known to anybody other than Bob, who can therefore be confident that only he can read the contents of Alice’s transmission, to the extent that it is unlikely that anybody else has the computational power to invert the encryption, given only the public key. Public key cryptosystems solve the key distribution problem by making it unnecessary for Alice and Bob to share a private key before communicating.

Rather remarkably, public key cryptography did not achieve widespread use until the mid-1970s, when it was proposed independently by Whitfield Diffie and Martin Hellman, and by Ralph Merkle, revolutionizing the field of cryptography. A little later, Ronald Rivest, Adi Shamir, and Leonard Adleman developed the RSA cryptosystem, which at the time of writing is the most widely deployed public key cryptosystem, believed to offer a fine balance of security and practical usability. In 1997 it was disclosed that these ideas – public key cryptography, the Diffie–Hellman and RSA cryptosystems – were actually invented in the late 1960s and early 1970s by researchers working at the British intelligence agency GCHQ.

The key to the security of public key cryptosystems is that it should be difficult to invert the encryption stage if only the public key is available. For example, it turns out that inverting the encryption stage of RSA is a problem closely related to factoring. Much of the presumed security of RSA comes from the belief that factoring is a problem hard to solve on a classical computer. However, Shor’s fast algorithm for factoring on a quantum computer could be used to break RSA! Similarly, there are other public key cryptosystems which can be broken if a fast algorithm for solving the discrete logarithm problem – like Shor’s quantum algorithm for discrete logarithm – were known. This practical application of quantum computers to the breaking of cryptographic codes has excited much of the interest in quantum computation and quantum information.

We have been looking at the historical antecedents for quantum computation and quantum information. Of course, as the field has grown and matured, it has sprouted its own subfields of research, whose antecedents lie mainly within quantum computation and quantum information.

Perhaps the most striking of these is the study of quantum entanglement. Entanglement is a uniquely quantum mechanical resource that plays a key role in many of the most interesting applications of quantum computation and quantum information; entanglement is iron to the classical world’s bronze age. In recent years there has been a
tremendous effort trying to better understand the properties of entanglement considered as a fundamental resource of Nature, of comparable importance to energy, information, entropy, or any other fundamental resource. Although there is as yet no complete theory of entanglement, some progress has been made in understanding this strange property of quantum mechanics. It is hoped by many researchers that further study of the properties of entanglement will yield insights that facilitate the development of new applications in quantum computation and quantum information.

1.1.2 Future directions

We’ve looked at some at the history and present status of quantum computation and quantum information. What of the future? What can quantum computation and quantum information offer to science, to technology, and to humanity? What benefits does quantum computation and quantum information confer upon its parent fields of computer science, information theory, and physics? What are the key open problems of quantum computation and quantum information? We will make a few very brief remarks about these overarching questions before moving onto more detailed investigations.

Quantum computation and quantum information has taught us to think physically about computation, and we have discovered that this approach yields many new and exciting capabilities for information processing and communication. Computer scientists and information theorists have been gifted with a new and rich paradigm for exploration. Indeed, in the broadest terms we have learned that any physical theory, not just quantum mechanics, may be used as the basis for a theory of information processing and communication. The fruits of these explorations may one day result in information processing devices with capabilities far beyond today’s computing and communications systems, with concomitant benefits and drawbacks for society as a whole.

Quantum computation and quantum information certainly offer challenges aplenty to physicists, but it is perhaps a little subtle what quantum computation and quantum information offers to physics in the long term. We believe that just as we have learned to think physically about computation, we can also learn to think computationally about physics. Whereas physics has traditionally been a discipline focused on understanding ‘elementary’ objects and simple systems, many interesting aspects of Nature arise only when things become larger and more complicated. Chemistry and engineering deal with such complexity to some extent, but most often in a rather ad hoc fashion. One of the messages of quantum computation and information is that new tools are available for traversing the gulf between the small and the relatively complex: computation and algorithms provide systematic means for constructing and understanding such systems. Applying ideas from these fields is already beginning to yield new insights into physics. It is our hope that this perspective will blossom in years to come into a fruitful way of understanding all aspects of physics.

We’ve briefly examined some of the key motivations and ideas underlying quantum computation and quantum information. Over the remaining sections of this chapter we give a more technical but still accessible introduction to these motivations and ideas, with the hope of giving you a bird’s-eye view of the field as it is presently poised.
1.2 Quantum bits

The bit is the fundamental concept of classical computation and classical information. Quantum computation and quantum information are built upon an analogous concept, the quantum bit, or qubit for short. In this section we introduce the properties of single and multiple qubits, comparing and contrasting their properties to those of classical bits.

What is a qubit? We’re going to describe qubits as mathematical objects with certain specific properties. ‘But hang on’, you say, ‘I thought qubits were physical objects.’ It’s true that qubits, like bits, are realized as actual physical systems, and in Section 1.5 and Chapter 7 we describe in detail how this connection between the abstract mathematical point of view and real systems is made. However, for the most part we treat qubits as abstract mathematical objects. The beauty of treating qubits as abstract entities is that it gives us the freedom to construct a general theory of quantum computation and quantum information which does not depend upon a specific system for its realization.

What then is a qubit? Just as a classical bit has a state — either 0 or 1 — a qubit also has a state. Two possible states for a qubit are the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, which as you might guess correspond to the states 0 and 1 for a classical bit. Notation like ‘|⟩’ is called the Dirac notation, and we’ll be seeing it often, as it’s the standard notation for states in quantum mechanics. The difference between bits and qubits is that a qubit can be in a state other than $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$. It is also possible to form linear combinations of states, often called superpositions:

$$|\psi\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle. \quad (1.1)$$

The numbers $\alpha$ and $\beta$ are complex numbers, although for many purposes not much is lost by thinking of them as real numbers. Put another way, the state of a qubit is a vector in a two-dimensional complex vector space. The special states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ are known as computational basis states, and form an orthonormal basis for this vector space.

We can examine a bit to determine whether it is in the state 0 or 1. For example, computers do this all the time when they retrieve the contents of their memory. Rather remarkably, we cannot examine a qubit to determine its quantum state, that is, the values of $\alpha$ and $\beta$. Instead, quantum mechanics tells us that we can only acquire much more restricted information about the quantum state. When we measure a qubit we get either the result 0, with probability $|\alpha|^2$, or the result 1, with probability $|\beta|^2$. Naturally, $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$, since the probabilities must sum to one. Geometrically, we can interpret this as the condition that the qubit’s state be normalized to length 1. Thus, in general a qubit’s state is a unit vector in a two-dimensional complex vector space.

This dichotomy between the unobservable state of a qubit and the observations we can make lies at the heart of quantum computation and quantum information. In most of our abstract models of the world, there is a direct correspondence between elements of the abstraction and the real world, just as an architect’s plans for a building are in correspondence with the final building. The lack of this direct correspondence in quantum mechanics makes it difficult to intuit the behavior of quantum systems; however, there is an indirect correspondence, for qubit states can be manipulated and transformed in ways which lead to measurement outcomes which depend distinctly on the different properties of the state. Thus, these quantum states have real, experimentally verifiable consequences, which we shall see are essential to the power of quantum computation and quantum information.
The ability of a qubit to be in a superposition state runs counter to our ‘common sense’ understanding of the physical world around us. A classical bit is like a coin: either heads or tails up. For imperfect coins, there may be intermediate states like having it balanced on an edge, but those can be disregarded in the ideal case. By contrast, a qubit can exist in a continuum of states between $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ — until it is observed. Let us emphasize again that when a qubit is measured, it only ever gives ‘0’ or ‘1’ as the measurement result — probabilistically. For example, a qubit can be in the state

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle,$$

which, when measured, gives the result 0 fifty percent ($|1/\sqrt{2}|^2$) of the time, and the result 1 fifty percent of the time. We will return often to this state, which is sometimes denoted $|+\rangle$.

Despite this strangeness, qubits are decidedly real, their existence and behavior extensively validated by experiments (discussed in Section 1.5 and Chapter 7), and many different physical systems can be used to realize qubits. To get a concrete feel for how a qubit can be realized it may be helpful to list some of the ways this realization may occur: as the two different polarizations of a photon; as the alignment of a nuclear spin in a uniform magnetic field; as two states of an electron orbiting a single atom such as shown in Figure 1.2. In the atom model, the electron can exist in either the so-called ‘ground’ or ‘excited’ states, which we’ll call $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, respectively. By shining light on the atom, with appropriate energy and for an appropriate length of time, it is possible to move the electron from the $|0\rangle$ state to the $|1\rangle$ state and vice versa. But more interestingly, by reducing the time we shine the light, an electron initially in the state $|0\rangle$ can be moved ‘halfway’ between $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, into the $|+\rangle$ state.

![Figure 1.2. Qubit represented by two electronic levels in an atom.](image)

Naturally, a great deal of attention has been given to the ‘meaning’ or ‘interpretation’ that might be attached to superposition states, and of the inherently probabilistic nature of observations on quantum systems. However, by and large, we shall not concern ourselves with such discussions in this book. Instead, our intent will be to develop mathematical and conceptual pictures which are predictive.

One picture useful in thinking about qubits is the following geometric representation.
Because $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$, we may rewrite Equation (1.1) as

$$|\psi\rangle = e^{i\gamma} \left( \cos \frac{\theta}{2} |0\rangle + e^{i\varphi} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} |1\rangle \right),$$  

(1.3)

where $\theta, \varphi$ and $\gamma$ are real numbers. In Chapter 2 we will see that we can ignore the factor of $e^{i\gamma}$ out the front, because it has no observable effects, and for that reason we can effectively write

$$|\psi\rangle = \cos \frac{\theta}{2} |0\rangle + e^{i\varphi} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} |1\rangle.$$  

(1.4)

The numbers $\theta$ and $\varphi$ define a point on the unit three-dimensional sphere, as shown in Figure 1.3. This sphere is often called the Bloch sphere; it provides a useful means of visualizing the state of a single qubit, and often serves as an excellent testbed for ideas about quantum computation and quantum information. Many of the operations on single qubits which we describe later in this chapter are neatly described within the Bloch sphere picture. However, it must be kept in mind that this intuition is limited because there is no simple generalization of the Bloch sphere known for multiple qubits.

How much information is represented by a qubit? Paradoxically, there are an infinite number of points on the unit sphere, so that in principle one could store an entire text of Shakespeare in the infinite binary expansion of $\theta$. However, this conclusion turns out to be misleading, because of the behavior of a qubit when observed. Recall that measurement of a qubit will give only either 0 or 1. Furthermore, measurement changes the state of a qubit, collapsing it from its superposition of $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ to the specific state consistent with the measurement result. For example, if measurement of $|+\rangle$ gives 0, then the post-measurement state of the qubit will be $|0\rangle$. Why does this type of collapse occur? Nobody knows. As discussed in Chapter 2, this behavior is simply one of the fundamental postulates of quantum mechanics. What is relevant for our purposes is that from a single measurement one obtains only a single bit of information about the state of the qubit, thus resolving the apparent paradox. It turns out that only if infinitely many
identically prepared qubits were measured would one be able to determine \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) for a qubit in the state given in Equation (1.1).

But an even more interesting question to ask might be: how much information is represented by a qubit if we do not measure it? This is a trick question, because how can one quantify information if it cannot be measured? Nevertheless, there is something conceptually important here, because when Nature evolves a closed quantum system of qubits, not performing any ‘measurements’, she apparently does keep track of all the continuous variables describing the state, like \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \). In a sense, in the state of a qubit, Nature conceals a great deal of ‘hidden information’. And even more interestingly, we will see shortly that the potential amount of this extra ‘information’ grows exponentially with the number of qubits. Understanding this hidden quantum information is a question that we grapple with for much of this book, and which lies at the heart of what makes quantum mechanics a powerful tool for information processing.

1.2.1 Multiple qubits

Hilbert space is a big place.

– Carlton Caves

Suppose we have two qubits. If these were two classical bits, then there would be four possible states, 00, 01, 10, and 11. Correspondingly, a two qubit system has four computational basis states denoted \( |00\rangle, |01\rangle, |10\rangle, |11\rangle \). A pair of qubits can also exist in superpositions of these four states, so the quantum state of two qubits involves associating a complex coefficient – sometimes called an amplitude – with each computational basis state, such that the state vector describing the two qubits is

\[
|\psi\rangle = \alpha_{00}|00\rangle + \alpha_{01}|01\rangle + \alpha_{10}|10\rangle + \alpha_{11}|11\rangle.
\] (1.5)

Similar to the case for a single qubit, the measurement result \( x (= 00, 01, 10 \text{ or } 11) \) occurs with probability \( |\alpha_x|^2 \), with the state of the qubits after the measurement being \( |x\rangle \). The condition that probabilities sum to one is therefore expressed by the normalization condition that \( \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^2} |\alpha_x|^2 = 1 \), where the notation ‘\{0, 1\}^2’ means ‘the set of strings of length two with each letter being either zero or one’. For a two qubit system, we could measure just a subset of the qubits, say the first qubit, and you can probably guess how this works: measuring the first qubit alone gives 0 with probability \( |\alpha_{00}|^2 + |\alpha_{01}|^2 \), leaving the post-measurement state

\[
|\psi'\rangle = \frac{\alpha_{00}|00\rangle + \alpha_{01}|01\rangle}{\sqrt{|\alpha_{00}|^2 + |\alpha_{01}|^2}}.
\] (1.6)

Note how the post-measurement state is re-normalized by the factor \( \sqrt{|\alpha_{00}|^2 + |\alpha_{01}|^2} \) so that it still satisfies the normalization condition, just as we expect for a legitimate quantum state.

An important two qubit state is the Bell state or EPR pair,

\[
\frac{|00\rangle + |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}.
\] (1.7)

This innocuous-looking state is responsible for many surprises in quantum computation
and quantum information. It is the key ingredient in quantum teleportation and super-
dense coding, which we’ll come to in Section 1.3.7 and Section 2.3, respectively, and
the prototype for many other interesting quantum states. The Bell state has the property
that upon measuring the first qubit, one obtains two possible results: 0 with probability
1/2, leaving the post-measurement state \( |\varphi\rangle = |00\rangle \), and 1 with probability 1/2, leaving
\( |\varphi\rangle = |11\rangle \). As a result, a measurement of the second qubit always gives the same result
as the measurement of the first qubit. That is, the measurement outcomes are correlated.
Indeed, it turns out that other types of measurements can be performed on the Bell
state, by first applying some operations to the first or second qubit, and that interesting
correlations still exist between the result of a measurement on the first and second qubit.
These correlations have been the subject of intense interest ever since a famous paper
by Einstein, Podolsky and Rosen, in which they first pointed out the strange properties
of states like the Bell state. EPR’s insights were taken up and greatly improved by John
Bell, who proved an amazing result: the measurement correlations in the Bell state are
stronger than could ever exist between classical systems. These results, described in de-
tail in Section 2.6, were the first intimation that quantum mechanics allows information
processing beyond what is possible in the classical world.

More generally, we may consider a system of \( n \) qubits. The computational basis states
of this system are of the form \( |x_1 x_2 \ldots x_n\rangle \), and so a quantum state of such a system
is specified by \( 2^n \) amplitudes. For \( n = 500 \) this number is larger than the estimated
number of atoms in the Universe! Trying to store all these complex numbers would not
be possible on any conceivable classical computer. Hilbert space is indeed a big place.
In principle, however, Nature manipulates such enormous quantities of data, even for
systems containing only a few hundred atoms. It is as if Nature were keeping \( 2^{100} \) hidden
pieces of scratch paper on the side, on which she performs her calculations as the system
evolves. This enormous potential computational power is something we would very much
like to take advantage of. But how can we think of quantum mechanics as computation?

1.3 Quantum computation

Changes occurring to a quantum state can be described using the language of quantum
computation. Analogous to the way a classical computer is built from an electrical circuit
containing wires and logic gates, a quantum computer is built from a quantum circuit
containing wires and elementary quantum gates to carry around and manipulate the
quantum information. In this section we describe some simple quantum gates, and present
several example circuits illustrating their application, including a circuit which teleports
qubits!

1.3.1 Single qubit gates

Classical computer circuits consist of wires and logic gates. The wires are used to carry
information around the circuit, while the logic gates perform manipulations of the inform-

ation, converting it from one form to another. Consider, for example, classical single bit
logic gates. The only non-trivial member of this class is the NOT gate, whose operation
is defined by its truth table, in which 0 \( \rightarrow \) 1 and 1 \( \rightarrow \) 0, that is, the 0 and 1 states are
interchanged.

Can an analogous quantum NOT gate for qubits be defined? Imagine that we had
some process which took the state \( |0\rangle \) to the state \( |1\rangle \), and vice versa. Such a process
would obviously be a good candidate for a quantum analogue to the NOT gate. However, specifying the action of the gate on the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ does not tell us what happens to superpositions of the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, without further knowledge about the properties of quantum gates. In fact, the quantum NOT gate acts linearly, that is, it takes the state

$$\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$$

(1.8)

to the corresponding state in which the role of $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ have been interchanged,

$$\alpha|1\rangle + \beta|0\rangle.$$  (1.9)

Why the quantum NOT gate acts linearly and not in some nonlinear fashion is a very interesting question, and the answer is not at all obvious. It turns out that this linear behavior is a general property of quantum mechanics, and very well motivated empirically; moreover, nonlinear behavior can lead to apparent paradoxes such as time travel, faster-than-light communication, and violations of the second laws of thermodynamics. We’ll explore this point in more depth in later chapters, but for now we’ll just take it as given.

There is a convenient way of representing the quantum NOT gate in matrix form, which follows directly from the linearity of quantum gates. Suppose we define a matrix $X$ to represent the quantum NOT gate as follows:

$$X = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$  (1.10)

(The notation $X$ for the quantum NOT is used for historical reasons.) If the quantum state $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$ is written in a vector notation as

$$\begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix},$$  (1.11)

with the top entry corresponding to the amplitude for $|0\rangle$ and the bottom entry the amplitude for $|1\rangle$, then the corresponding output from the quantum NOT gate is

$$X \begin{bmatrix} \alpha \\ \beta \end{bmatrix} = \begin{bmatrix} \beta \\ \alpha \end{bmatrix}.$$  (1.12)

Notice that the action of the NOT gate is to take the state $|0\rangle$ and replace it by the state corresponding to the first column of the matrix $X$. Similarly, the state $|1\rangle$ is replaced by the state corresponding to the second column of the matrix $X$.

So quantum gates on a single qubit can be described by two by two matrices. Are there any constraints on what matrices may be used as quantum gates? It turns out that there are. Recall that the normalization condition requires $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$ for a quantum state $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$. This must also be true of the quantum state $|\psi\rangle = \alpha'|0\rangle + \beta'|1\rangle$ after the gate has acted. It turns out that the appropriate condition on the matrix representing the gate is that the matrix $U$ describing the single qubit gate be unitary, that is $U^\dagger U = I$, where $U^\dagger$ is the adjoint of $U$ (obtained by transposing and then complex conjugating $U$), and $I$ is the two by two identity matrix. For example, for the NOT gate it is easy to verify that $X^\dagger X = I$.

Amazingly, this unitarity constraint is the only constraint on quantum gates. Any unitary matrix specifies a valid quantum gate! The interesting implication is that in contrast to the classical case, where only one non-trivial single bit gate exists — the NOT
gate – there are many non-trivial single qubit gates. Two important ones which we shall use later are the $Z$ gate:

$$Z = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix},$$

(1.13)

which leaves $|0\rangle$ unchanged, and flips the sign of $|1\rangle$ to give $-|1\rangle$, and the Hadamard gate,

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

(1.14)

This gate is sometimes described as being like a ‘square-root of \(\text{NOT}\)’ gate, in that it turns a $|0\rangle$ into $(|0\rangle + |1\rangle) / \sqrt{2}$ (first column of $H$), ‘halfway’ between $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, and turns $|1\rangle$ into $(|0\rangle - |1\rangle) / \sqrt{2}$ (second column of $H$), which is also ‘halfway’ between $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. Note, however, that $H^2$ is not a NOT gate, as simple algebra shows that $H^2 = I$, and thus applying $H$ twice to a state does nothing to it.

The Hadamard gate is one of the most useful quantum gates, and it is worth trying to visualize its operation by considering the Bloch sphere picture. In this picture, it turns out that single qubit gates correspond to rotations and reflections of the sphere. The Hadamard operation is just a rotation of the sphere about the $\hat{y}$ axis by $90^\circ$, followed by a reflection through the $\hat{x}$-$\hat{y}$ plane, as illustrated in Figure 1.4. Some important single qubit gates are shown in Figure 1.5, and contrasted with the classical case.

There are infinitely many two by two unitary matrices, and thus infinitely many single
qubit gates. However, it turns out that the properties of the complete set can be understood from the properties of a much smaller set. For example, as explained in Box 1.1, an arbitrary single qubit unitary gate can be decomposed as a product of rotations

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
\cos \frac{\alpha}{2} & -\sin \frac{\alpha}{2} \\
\sin \frac{\alpha}{2} & \cos \frac{\alpha}{2}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

and a gate which we’ll later understand as being a rotation about the \(\hat{z}\) axis,

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
e^{-i\beta/2} & 0 \\
0 & e^{i\beta/2}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

together with a (global) phase shift – a constant multiplier of the form \(e^{i\gamma}\). These gates can be broken down further – we don’t need to be able to do these gates for arbitrary \(\alpha, \beta\) and \(\gamma\), but can build arbitrarily good approximations to such gates using only certain special fixed values of \(\alpha, \beta\) and \(\gamma\). In this way it is possible to build an arbitrary single qubit gate using a finite set of quantum gates. More generally, an arbitrary quantum computation on any number of qubits can be generated by a finite set of gates that is said to be universal for quantum computation. To obtain such a universal set we first need to introduce some quantum gates involving multiple qubits.

### Box 1.1: Decomposing single qubit operations

In Section 4.2 starting on page 174 we prove that an arbitrary \(2 \times 2\) unitary matrix may be decomposed as

\[
U = e^{i\alpha} \begin{bmatrix}
0 & e^{-i\beta/2} \\
e^{i\beta/2} & 0
\end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix}
\cos \frac{\alpha}{2} & -\sin \frac{\alpha}{2} \\
\sin \frac{\alpha}{2} & \cos \frac{\alpha}{2}
\end{bmatrix},
\]

where \(\alpha, \beta, \gamma, \text{and} \ \delta\) are real-valued. Notice that the second matrix is just an ordinary rotation. It turns out that the first and last matrices can also be understood as rotations in a different plane. This decomposition can be used to give an exact prescription for performing an arbitrary single qubit quantum logic gate.

#### 1.3.2 Multiple qubit gates

Now let us generalize from one to multiple qubits. Figure 1.6 shows five notable multiple bit classical gates, the AND, OR, XOR (exclusive-OR), NAND and NOR gates. An important theoretical result is that any function on bits can be computed from the composition of NAND gates alone, which is thus known as a universal gate. By contrast, the XOR alone or even together with NOT is not universal. One way of seeing this is to note that applying an XOR gate does not change the total parity of the bits. As a result, any circuit involving only NOT and XOR gates will, if two inputs \(x\) and \(y\) have the same parity, give outputs with the same parity, restricting the class of functions which may be computed, and thus precluding universality.

The prototypical multi-qubit quantum logic gate is the controlled-NOT or CNOT gate. This gate has two input qubits, known as the control qubit and the target qubit, respectively. The circuit representation for the CNOT is shown in the top right of Figure 1.6; the top line represents the control qubit, while the bottom line represents the target.