

# The Representation of Natural Numbers in Quantum Mechanics

Paul Benioff

Physics Division, Argonne National Laboratory

Argonne, IL 60439

e-mail: pbenioff@anl.gov

(February 19, 2019)

The widespread use of numbers and their representation by states of physical systems in science and in computers contrasts with the limited amount of work done on what conditions must be satisfied so that a physical system has states that represent numbers. This is part of a more basic question regarding the precise meaning of the representation of numbers by states of a quantum system. Here this question is examined for microscopic quantum systems, although much of the work also applies to macroscopic systems. The role of maps that assign numbers both to the distinguishability parameters and internal state parameters of components of a composite physical system is examined. The maps are needed to assign numbers to product states of a physical system. Comparison of different maps shows that two product states that are identical physically may represent different numbers and states that represent the same number may be different physically. Grover's and Shor's Algorithms are seen to be very different regarding dependence on these maps. The main requirement, which is dynamical, is that a physical system must be such that the basic arithmetic operations are efficiently implementable. This condition dictates the need for separate definitions of the basic operators  $V_j^{+1}$  for each  $j = 1, 2, \dots, L$  that describe addition of  $k^{j-1} \bmod k^L$  for  $k$ -ary representations of length  $L$ . The operators  $+$  and  $\times$  are defined based on the  $V_j^{+1}$ . Another definition of the basic operators that is independent of prior numberings is given. Some aspects of the use of numbers as part of the necessary conditions for product states of a system to represent numbers are also discussed.

03.65.-w, 89.70.+c, 03.65.Bz

## I. INTRODUCTION

As is well known numbers play an essential role in physics and in many other disciplines. The results of both experimental work and theoretical computations are often given as numbers. Comparison of these numbers is essential to the validation process for any physical theory such as quantum mechanics. As inputs to or outputs of computations or experiments, numbers correspond to states of physical systems. From an information theoretic viewpoint, this correspondence is essential as these states carry information. As Landauer has emphasized, "Information is Physical" [1]. This is taken very seriously here.

If quantum mechanics, or a related theory such as quantum field theory, is universal, then all physical sys-

tems are quantum systems and all states of these systems are (pure or mixed) quantum states. This is the case whether the systems are microscopic or macroscopic. It is also independent of the fact that macroscopic systems are well described by classical mechanics. Since computers are physical systems and computations correspond to dynamical changes of states of physical systems, it follows that, during all stages of the computation process, numbers are represented by states of quantum systems. This is the case for both quantum computers and for macroscopic or classical computers.

The widespread use of numbers and their representation by states of quantum systems is to be contrasted with the limited amount of work done to date on the question regarding what properties a physical system must have so that it has states that represent numbers. Such a question is not trivial as there are many physical systems with states that are not suitable for representing numbers. Systems subject to strong and chaotic interactions with other systems or degrees of freedom are an example of this type. This question is investigated in some detail in this paper. Here numbers will be taken to be the natural numbers or nonnegative integers used for counting.

Such a study is also relevant to the development of a coherent theory of mathematics and physics together, which, in one form or another, is a goal of many physicists [2–4]. Any such coherent theory must take account in detail of how numbers are represented by states of physical systems.

For quantum systems numbers are represented by tensor products of states of component systems. For microscopic systems the components are often called qubits if their state space is 2-dimensional [5] (See also [6]) and qubytes if their state space is  $> 2$  dimensional. However it is clear from the actual usage of the term there is another condition that a quantum system must satisfy, besides state space dimensionality, to be called a qubit or qubyte. This is that the states of the system must be such that the switching time  $t_{sw}$ , is short compared to the decoherence time  $t_{dec}$  [7].

This condition eliminates many state spaces of systems for representation of numbers. For qubits an example would be the state space based on two highly excited states of nuclei that have half-lives short compared to  $t_{sw}$ . On the other hand spin 1/2 nuclei in their nuclear ground states in a magnetic field are qubits in NMR quantum computers which are of much recent interest [8–10].

Here the terms "qubits" or "qubytes" will be used for systems with  $2-$  or  $\geq 2-$  dimensional state spaces and  $t_{sw} \ll t_{dec}$  [7]. This condition is dynamic as it is based on the Hamiltonian for the systems including their interaction with other systems and the environment. Note that here qubits are qubytes.

It is good to begin with the well known relationship between a tensor product state  $|\underline{s}\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{s}(j)\rangle$  of  $L$  qubits and the number  $s$  it represents:  $s = \sum_{j=1}^L s_j 2^{j-1}$  where  $s_j = 0, 1$  is the number represented by the state  $|\underline{s}(j)\rangle$ . More generally for  $k$ -ary representations the relationship is given by

$$s = \sum_{j=1}^L k^{j-1} s_j. \quad (1)$$

where  $s_j$  can take any value in  $0, 1, \dots, k-1$ . Here underlining denotes a function. So  $\underline{s}$  is a function from the numbers  $1, 2, \dots, L$  to the numbers  $0, 1, \dots, k-1$  with  $\underline{s}(j)$  the value of  $\underline{s}$  at  $j$ .  $|\underline{s}\rangle$  is the tensor product state of component systems in states corresponding to the values of  $\underline{s}$ .

The numbers  $s$  and  $s_j$ , corresponding to the states  $|\underline{s}\rangle$  and  $|\underline{s}(j)\rangle$ , are not underlined [11]. Note that here  $\underline{s}(j)$  and  $s_j$  both denote the same number whereas  $s$  is a number and  $\underline{s}$  is a function.

More general representations can be used in which the value of  $k$  in Eq. 1 depends on  $j$ . These may be useful in special situations. However they will not be pursued here [12].

It is clear from Eq. 1 and the preceding material that there are several conditions that must be satisfied by physical systems so that their states represent numbers. Here the goal is to describe and discuss these conditions. The emphasis will be on microscopic physical systems and quantum states as used by quantum algorithms. However, most of the following (and preceding) also applies to macroscopic systems, including macroscopic (classical) computers which are in such wide use. Macroscopic systems will be briefly discussed later in Section VIII.

This work will be limited to quantum systems with an arbitrary but fixed, finite number of component systems. So the concern here is with numbers and arithmetic modulo some finite number. Since systems with  $L$  qubits or qubytes are included and  $L$  is arbitrary, this is not a serious practical limitation. However it may be of interest to extend this work to Fock space or to quantum field theory to include systems with an infinite number of degrees of freedom.

Also, in agreement with most of the literature on quantum (and classical) computation, the concern here is with digital representations of natural numbers. Other work [13–15] shows that nondigital representations, including use of continuous variables for quantum computation, are of some interest.

The emphasis of this paper is on composite physical systems and sets of basis states that are tensor products

of states of component systems. The plan is to discuss the conditions a quantum system must satisfy so that it has product states that correspond to numbers as given by Eq. 1. The discussion in the next section begins with tensor product states indexed by a set  $A$  of physical parameters, such as eigenvalues of a physical observable  $\hat{A}$ , by which the component systems are distinguished. Such a state does not represent a number. This is remedied by use of bijective maps from sets of natural numbers to sets of physical parameters. The changes in these states as these numbering maps are changed is studied. It is seen that for different maps states that represent the same physical state may represent different numbers. Other states are shown that represent the same number even though they are different physically.

A comparison follows of Grover's [16] and Shor's [17] Algorithms regarding their dependence on map changes that do not physically change the states. It is seen that the dynamics of Grover's Algorithm is independent of these map changes whereas for Shor's Algorithm the dynamics does depend on the maps.

Probably the most important requirement that a quantum system must satisfy so that it has states that represent numbers is that there exist a physically realizable dynamics that can *efficiently implement* the basic arithmetic operations. This condition is discussed in more detail in Section IV. Efficient implementation by Hamiltonians is discussed as are restrictions on both the thermodynamic resources needed to implement the operations and on the values of  $k$ .

One consequence of the efficient implementability condition is the need to define, for each  $j$ , operators  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  on the tensor product states that correspond to addition of  $k^{j-1} \bmod k^L$  in Eq. 1. The subscript  $f$  denotes a path on the parameter space that serves to distinguish the component systems. The superscript  $d$  denotes an assignment of numbers to the other states of each component. These operators are defined in Section V and some properties described. The definitions and discussion is more abstract as it is done on  $V_j^{+1}$  without the maps  $d, g$  as an operator on tensor product states that represent strings of numbers. From this viewpoint  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  is an interpretation or model of the more abstract  $V_j^{+1}$  on states of a composite physical system. This form is more appropriate for the discussion of efficient implementation and the role these operators play in quantum computation. This is followed by definitions of the arithmetic  $+$  and  $\times$  operators in Section VI and, in subsection VIC, a brief discussion of the properties that these operators must have.

Another approach to defining the  $V_j^{+1}$  is outlined in Section VII. Here a set  $\{V_a | a \in A\}$  of operators is defined that is not based on tensor product states of number strings. The operators are required to be efficiently implementable and to satisfy properties from which the required maps can be deduced. The paper ends with a brief discussion of macroscopic systems and of the fact

that numbers seem to be required in the description of conditions needed so quantum states of a system represent numbers.

## II. THE NUMBERING MAPS

It is necessary to clarify at the outset what is meant here by a numbering map. Here a numbering map is a bijection (one-one onto map) from a set of nonnegative integers onto a set of physical parameters of a system. Typically the parameter set is the set or a subset of the eigenvalues for an observable of the system being considered.

### A. Numbering Maps and Tensor Product States

The main points of this paper begin with the observation that for a state of a quantum system to represent a number it is necessary, but not sufficient, that the states be tensor products of states of component systems. Additional conditions are needed. To see this consider a tensor product state of the form  $|\underline{t}\rangle = \otimes_{a \in A} |\underline{t}(a), a\rangle$  where  $\underline{t}$  is a function with domain  $A$  and range  $S$ . Here  $A$  is a set of different values of some physical property or observable  $\hat{A}$  that serves to distinguish or label the different components and  $S$  is a set of values of a different physical property associated with each component system. For example  $A$  could be a set of  $L$  arbitrary locations of component spin 1/2 systems on a 2 dimensional surface with  $\underline{t}(a)$  equal to either  $\uparrow$  or  $\downarrow$ . These denote the spin aligned along or opposite some axis of quantization. Another example, representative of NMR quantum computation [8–10], has  $A$  as a set of hyperfine splittings of nuclear spin states and  $S = \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ . Here the values of  $a$  must contain sufficient information so the physical process can distinguish between the different nuclear spins.

The reason for the presence of the  $a$  component of the state  $|\underline{t}(a), a\rangle$  can be seen by considering the state description of product qubit states as  $|\underline{s}\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{s}(j)\rangle$  that is often used in the literature. Here the property by which an algorithm distinguishes the different qubits is not shown. However, the presence of this property in the state is essential. This is the case if one accepts the view that the state of the composite quantum system contains all the quantum information available to the algorithm. In particular the states must contain sufficient information so that the algorithm can distinguish among the component systems. This is especially the case for any algorithm whose dynamics is described by a Hamiltonian that is selfadjoint and time independent. This is an example of Landauer's dictum "Information is Physical" [1]. Also the need for this distinguishing information is independent of whether  $A$  is ordered or not.

An example of a generalization of this description in which the observable  $\hat{S}$  and basis  $\mathcal{B}_S$  of eigenstates of

$\hat{S}$  depend on  $a$  and component systems are replaced by different degrees of freedom of one system is shown by an ion trap example [20]. Here the states of one degree of freedom are the ground and first excited state of the ion in the harmonic well trap. The corresponding states of the other are the ground and first excited electronic state of the ion. This type of generalization will not be pursued here.

It is also the case that a product of  $n$  component states for two quantum computers that are equal in the sense that they represent the same number can be quite different physically. For example the state  $|\underline{0}\rangle$  in a linear ion trap quantum computer, assuming one can be built, represents the same number, 0 as does the state  $|\underline{0}\rangle$  in a quantum NMR computer. This is the case even though the physical systems, degrees of freedom, and physical states, representing the same component states are quite different.

It is clear that the product states  $|\underline{t}\rangle = \otimes_{a \in A} |\underline{t}(a), a\rangle$  do not represent numbers. The reason is that there is no association between the labels  $a$  and powers of  $k$ ; also there is no association between the range set  $S$  of  $\underline{t}$  and numbers. Numbering maps are one way to provide these associations.

It is worthwhile to consider the two types of numbering maps separately. Let  $g$  be a numbering map for  $A$ . Define the state  $|\underline{t}_g, g\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{t}_g(j), g(j)\rangle$ . Here  $\underline{t}_g$  is a function from  $1, \dots, L$  to  $S$  defined by  $\underline{t}_g(j) = \underline{t}(g(j))$ . The state  $|\underline{t}_g, g\rangle$  represents a binary string of eigenvalues in  $S = \{\uparrow, \downarrow\}$ . However  $|\underline{t}_g, g\rangle$  does not represent a number as no association of the elements of  $S$  to numbers is given. Let  $0 \rightarrow \uparrow$ ;  $1 \rightarrow \downarrow$  denote a numbering map  $d$  for  $S$ . and let  $\underline{s}_g^d$  be a function from  $1, \dots, L$  to  $\{0, 1\}$  defined by  $\underline{s}_g^d(j) = d^{-1}(\underline{t}_g(j))$ . Then the tensor product state  $|\underline{s}_g^d, g\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{s}_g^d(j), g(j)\rangle$  is a tensor product of qubyte states that represents a string of the numbers  $0, 1, \dots, k-1$ . This state corresponds to a number as shown in Eq. 1 if the index  $j$  in of the tensor product is identified with the summation index of Eq. 1.

Schematically the imposition of these maps can be shown by

$$|\underline{t}\rangle \xrightarrow{A \text{ Map}} |\underline{t}_g, g\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{inv } S \text{ Map}} |\underline{s}_g^d, g\rangle. \quad (2)$$

where  $|\underline{s}_g^d, g\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |d^{-1}(\underline{t}_g(j)), g(j)\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{s}_g^d(j), g(j)\rangle$ . What is interesting here is that the state  $|\underline{t}\rangle$  does not correspond to any parameter string or to any number,  $|\underline{t}_g, g\rangle$  corresponds to a binary string of values in  $S$  but not a number, and  $|\underline{s}_g^d, g\rangle$  corresponds to a number. Yet physically these three states are identical. No physical property of the states is changed by these maps.

Note that the string represented by the state  $|\underline{t}_g, g\rangle$  depends on  $g$ . To see this let  $g$  and  $h$  be two different maps onto  $A$ . Define  $|\underline{t}_g, g\rangle$  and  $|\underline{t}_h, h\rangle$  by

$$\begin{aligned} |\underline{t}_g, g\rangle &\equiv \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{t}_g(j), g(j)\rangle \\ |\underline{t}_h, h\rangle &\equiv \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{t}_h(j), h(j)\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

The states  $|\underline{t}_g, g\rangle$ ,  $|\underline{t}_h, h\rangle$  represent different strings because the  $j$ th elements  $\underline{t}_g(j)$  and  $\underline{t}_h(j)$  are different in general. Yet  $|\underline{t}_g, g\rangle$ ,  $|\underline{t}_h, h\rangle$ , and the unordered state  $|\underline{t}\rangle$  all represent the same physical state of the  $L$  component systems. All that is done here is to assign different numbers,  $g^{-1}(a), h^{-1}(a)$  to the components  $|\underline{t}(a), a\rangle$  of  $|\underline{t}\rangle$ . The correspondence between  $\underline{t}(a)$  and  $a$ , which determines whether the states are the same physically or not, is not changed.

These considerations also apply to states representing numbers. To see this define the numbers  $s_g^d, s_h^d$  by

$$s_g^d = \sum_{j=1}^L d^{-1}(\underline{t}_g(j))k^{j-1}, \quad s_h^d = \sum_{j=1}^L d^{-1}(\underline{t}_h(j))k^{j-1}. \quad (4)$$

In general  $s_g^d \neq s_h^d$  because if  $g \neq h$  then there are many  $|\underline{t}\rangle$  for which  $\underline{t}_g(j) \neq \underline{t}_h(j)$  for at least one value of  $j$ .

As a simple example of the above consider the 3 qubit state  $|0, x\rangle|1, y\rangle|0, z\rangle$ . For maps  $1 \rightarrow x, 2 \rightarrow y, 3 \rightarrow z$  or  $1 \rightarrow z, 2 \rightarrow y, 3 \rightarrow x$  this state represents the number 2. For maps  $1 \rightarrow x, 2 \rightarrow z, 3 \rightarrow y$  or  $1 \rightarrow z, 2 \rightarrow x, 3 \rightarrow y$  the state represents 4. For maps  $1 \rightarrow y, 2 \rightarrow x, 3 \rightarrow z$  or  $1 \rightarrow y, 2 \rightarrow z, 3 \rightarrow x$  the state represents 1. But the state is physically the same for each of these 6 maps. However the state  $|1, x\rangle|0, y\rangle|0, z\rangle$ , in which the 1 at  $x$  and the 0 at  $y$  are interchanged, is different physically.

Note that in the states  $|\underline{s}_g^d\rangle$  the values of  $\underline{s}_g^d$  are numbers but the values of  $g$  lie in  $A$ . This emphasizes the physical nature of the distinguishability of the component systems. However one can also write these states using numbers only by replacing  $g(j)$  by  $j$ . This representation will be used later in Section V.

For any set  $A$  with  $L$  elements there are  $L!$  possible numbering maps. Depending on the physical property represented by the values in  $A$ , most of these would be difficult, but not impossible, to work with dynamically in implementation of any quantum algorithm. Often there are just a few maps that are easiest to use in the implementation of an algorithm. These respect the topological or neighborhood properties of the elements of  $A$ . For example if  $A$  is a set of positions on a straight line there are just two maps that respect the spatial ordering or topology of points on the line. If  $A$  is a set of positions in a 2 or 3 -  $D$  space region there may be several maps that respect the neighborhood properties of the space region.

The description of product qubyte states  $|\underline{s}_h^d, h\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{s}_h^d(j), h(j)\rangle$  can be extended to states  $|\underline{s}_g^d, h\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{s}_g^d(j), h(j)\rangle$  where  $g \neq h$ .  $|\underline{s}_h^d, h\rangle$  and  $|\underline{s}_g^d, h\rangle$  are related by a unitary permutation operator  $W_{g,h}$  defined by  $W_{g,h}|\underline{s}_h^d, h\rangle = |\underline{s}_{gh^{-1}h}^d, h\rangle = |\underline{s}_g^d, h\rangle$ .  $W_{g,h}$  represents a permutation or change of the  $S$  states relative to the  $A$  states shown in  $|\underline{s}\rangle$ . It is different from unity as the state  $|\underline{s}_g^d, h\rangle$  is physically different from the state  $|\underline{s}_h^d, h\rangle$ .  $gh^{-1} = g(h^{-1}(-))$  is a permutation (bijection) on the numbers  $1, \dots, L$ . All the numbering maps have inverses as they are bijections.

More generally one has for any numbering maps  $p, f, g, h$  for  $A$ ,

$$W_{g,h}|\underline{s}_p^d, f\rangle = |\underline{s}_{gh^{-1}p}^d, f\rangle = |\underline{s}_p^d, hg^{-1}f\rangle \quad (5)$$

The latter equality is a consequence of the fact that any change of the maps, applied to both subscripts, leaves the state unchanged.

The action of  $W_{g,h}$  on the states  $|\underline{t}_{p,f}\rangle$  is the same. From Eq. 2 one has

$$W_{g,h}|\underline{t}_p, f\rangle = |\underline{t}_{gh^{-1}p}, f\rangle = |\underline{t}_p, hg^{-1}f\rangle. \quad (6)$$

This form will be used later on.

Some additional properties of  $W_{g,h}$  are worth noting. If and only if  $W_{g,h}$  is a permutation corresponding to the pairwise exchange of component states with no indices in common (e.g. exchange the 2nd and 4th  $|\underline{s}\rangle$  states, and the 3rd and 5th  $|\underline{s}\rangle$  states) then  $W_{g,h}^2 = 1$  or  $W_{g,h}^\dagger = W_{h,g}$ . This follows from the fact that in this case  $(gh^{-1})^2 = 1$  which gives  $gh^{-1} = hg^{-1}$ . In this case the states  $|\underline{s}_g^d, h\rangle$  and  $|\underline{s}_h^d, g\rangle$  are equal physically (but they represent different numbers in general). Also the state  $|\underline{s}_g^d, h\rangle$  can be replaced by the state  $|\underline{s}'_h^d, h\rangle$  where  $\underline{s}'_h^d$  is a different function from  $1, \dots, L$  to  $0, 1$  than is  $\underline{s}_g^d$ . These two states are equal provided  $\underline{s}'_h^d(j) = \underline{s}_g^d(j)$  for all  $j = 1, 2, \dots, L$ .

For these states physical equality is unrelated to numerical equality. For instance the states  $|\underline{s}_h^d, h\rangle$  and  $|\underline{s}_g^d, g\rangle$  are equal as they are physically identical. However they represent different numbers. The states  $|\underline{s}_g^d, h\rangle$  and  $|\underline{s}_g^d, g\rangle$  are in general different physically. Yet they represent the same numbers. In particular the interpretation of  $|\underline{s}_g^d, h\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{s}_g^d(j), h(j)\rangle$  is that for each  $j$  the state  $|\underline{s}_g^d(j)\rangle$  or the component system labeled by  $|h(j)\rangle$  gives the numerical multiplier of  $k^{j-1}$ .

These properties extend to linear superpositions of the product states. To show this it is easiest to start with a linear superposition  $\Psi = \sum_{\underline{t}} c_{\underline{t}} |\underline{t}\rangle$  of the states  $|\underline{t}\rangle$ . Based on the definitions given so far one has (suppressing subscripts and superscripts on  $\underline{s}$ )  $\underline{s} = d^{-1}\underline{t}h$  where  $\underline{t}h = \underline{t}_h$ . This expression or its equivalent  $d\underline{s} = \underline{t}h$  shows that, for fixed maps  $d, h$ , there is a one-one relationship between the functions  $\underline{s}, \underline{t}$ . So the sum over  $\underline{t}$  can be replaced by a sum over  $\underline{s}$ . This and  $|\underline{t}\rangle = |\underline{t}h, h\rangle$  gives  $\Psi = \sum_{\underline{s}} c_{d\underline{s}h^{-1}} |d\underline{s}, h\rangle$ . This shows the component state corresponding to the number  $s$  has associated the coefficient  $c_{d\underline{s}h^{-1}}$ .

For another map  $g$  it was seen that  $|\underline{t}h, h\rangle = |\underline{t}g, g\rangle$  physically. Use of this and the fact that  $\underline{t}g = \underline{t}h h^{-1}g = d\underline{s}h^{-1}g$  show that  $\Psi$  can also be written as  $\Psi = \sum_{\underline{s}} c_{d\underline{s}h^{-1}} |d\underline{s}h^{-1}g, g\rangle$ . This expression shows the component state  $|d\underline{s}h^{-1}g, g\rangle$  corresponding to the number  $sh^{-1}g$  associated with the coefficient  $c_{d\underline{s}h^{-1}}$ . Since the number  $sh^{-1}g \neq s$  in general, this shows that the association between coefficients and the numbers represented by component states depends on the maps used even though

the physical identity of the superposition is independent of the choice of maps.

These points are illustrated by the example set out in Table II A for  $L = 6$  and  $A = \{u, v, w, x, y, z\}$ . Note that  $|\underline{s}_g, h\rangle$  and  $|\underline{s}_g, g\rangle$  both denote the number 19 and are different physically.  $|\underline{s}_h, h\rangle (= |\underline{s}_g, g\rangle)$  denotes the number 41. It is left to the reader to see that the other properties described are satisfied.

$\underline{s}_a$	1	0	0	1	0	1
$a \in A$	u	v	w	x	y	z
$h$	1	2	3	4	5	6
$g$	2	3	4	5	6	1
$p$	1	4	5	2	3	6
$f$	2	4	1	6	5	3

TABLE I. Example of Different maps onto  $A$  for  $L = 6, k = 2$ . The numbers in each row denote the argument of the numbering functions listed in the first column. Thus  $h(2) = g(3) = v$ , etc.. Relative to  $h$ ,  $p$  is a map that consists of two pairwise exchanges (2nd, 4th and 3rd, 5th) with no indices in common.  $g$  and  $f$  do not have this property relative to  $h$ .

It might be thought that product qubyte states that are the same physically but represent different numbers are identical for quantum algorithms and their dynamics. That this is not the case, and to see the role that these maps play in algorithms, it is instructive to consider both Grover's [16] and Shor's [17] Algorithms.

## B. Grover's and Shor's Algorithms

Grover's Algorithm [16] and Shor's Algorithm [17] are quite different in their sensitivity to numbering maps that do not physically change states. Grover's Algorithm corresponds to a quantum search of a set of data where each element of the data base corresponds to a quantum state. The goal is to find the one unknown but unique state with some property different from the others. Here the quantum state representing each data element will be taken to be a tensor product of qubit states. This is not necessary, as Lloyd [21] has shown. However, the price for this is the need for an exponential overhead of resources.

Here the relevant feature of Grover's Algorithm is that it is independent of what numbers are assigned to the component states [22]. Dynamically the algorithm is the same whether it operates on states  $|\underline{t}\rangle$  or on the states  $|\underline{t}_g, g\rangle$  or  $|\underline{s}_g^d, g\rangle$ . It is sufficient that these states represent the same physical condition. In fact Grover's Algorithm can be described and implemented with no numberings of the elements of  $A$  or  $S$ .

To see this let the initial state  $\psi = (1/\sqrt{N}) \sum_{\underline{t}} |\underline{t}\rangle$  where  $|\underline{t}\rangle = \otimes_{a \in A} |\underline{t}_a, a\rangle$  and  $N = 2^L$ . No numbering is assumed for  $A$  and no  $0-1$  assignment to  $|\uparrow\rangle_a |\downarrow\rangle_a$  is given so these states represent neither strings nor numbers. This is not a problem because neither the definition of the unitary Grover operator  $-WI_{\uparrow}WI_{\underline{t}_u}$  nor its iteration on  $\psi$  depends on numberings. Here  $I_{\uparrow} = 1 - 2|\uparrow\rangle\langle\uparrow|$  where  $|\uparrow\rangle$  is the state with all  $L$  systems in the  $|\uparrow\rangle$  state.  $I_{\underline{t}_u} = 1 - 2|\underline{t}_u\rangle\langle\underline{t}_u|$  and  $W$  is the Walsh Hadamard transformation. Here  $|\underline{t}_u\rangle$  is the unknown product state that is to be amplified, and  $W = \otimes_{a \in A} (1/\sqrt{2})(\sigma_x + \sigma_z)_a$  is a tensor product of single qubit operators. The  $\sigma_x, \sigma_z$  are the Pauli spin operators and  $\psi = W|\uparrow\rangle$ .

The goal of Grover's Algorithm is to pick out by amplification the state  $|\underline{t}_u\rangle$  from the  $2^L$  states  $|\underline{t}\rangle$  in  $\psi$ . Recall that each of these states corresponds to a function  $\underline{t}$  from  $A$  to  $S$ . Determination if a state  $|\underline{t}\rangle$  is or is not  $|\underline{t}_u\rangle$  does not depend on numberings of either  $A$  or  $S$ .

Shor's Algorithm [17] for finding the two prime factors of a large number is quite different in that it is essential that the tensor product states of qubits represent numbers. This can be seen from the steps of the algorithm

$$\begin{aligned}
\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\underline{s}} |\underline{s}\rangle |\underline{i}\rangle &\Rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{\underline{s}} |\underline{s}\rangle |\underline{f}_m(\underline{s})\rangle \\
&\Rightarrow \frac{1}{N} \sum_{\underline{w}} |\underline{w}\rangle \sum_{\underline{s}} e^{-2\pi i \underline{w} \underline{s} / N} |\underline{f}_m(\underline{s})\rangle
\end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

Here  $|\underline{z}\rangle$  is the product qubit state representing the initial state of a quantum register, usually shown as a constant sequence of 0s.  $f_m$  is a numerical function defined by  $f_m(x) = m^x \bmod M$  where  $m$  and  $M$  are relatively prime. The number  $M$ , which is to be factored, and  $N$  are related by  $M^2 \leq 2^N \leq 2M^2$  [17,23].

To see that Eq. 7 requires numbers associated with elements of both  $A$  and  $S$  it helps to show the numbering maps explicitly. This can be done by replacing  $s$  by  $s_g^d$  and  $w$  by  $w_g^d$ .  $f_m(s_g^d)$  is the numerical value of  $f_m$  at  $s_g^d$  where  $s_g^d$  is related to  $|\underline{s}_{g,g}^d\rangle$  by Eq. 4.  $|f_m(s_g^d)\rangle$  is the tensor product state that corresponds, through Eq. 4, to the number  $f_m(s_g^d)$ . Eq. 4 is also used for the exponent factor  $w_g^d s_g^d / N$  in the Discrete Fourier Transform in Eq. 7. Methods for explicit evaluation of the Fourier transform and Shor's algorithm using quantum circuits are described in the literature [23]. They make explicit use of Eq. 4.

This shows that Shor's Algorithm requires the mappings (or numberings) for meaningful implementation. Of course any specific physical model of the Algorithm, as a physical dynamical process, can be implemented on the unmapped states  $|\underline{t}\rangle$ . However without knowledge of the maps assumed in the dynamics, it will have no meaning as an implementation of the Algorithm.

It follows from this sensitivity that any specific physical model of the dynamics of implementing Shor's Algorithm is different for the map  $h$  than for  $g$ . This is a consequence of the requirement that the numerical output of the algorithm must be independent of the numbering used. Shor's Algorithm must calculate the prime factors of  $M$  whatever map is used. Because of this, the numberings used by the dynamics of the algorithms must also be the same as those used for the states of numerical input parameters. Also the chosen maps would have to be explicitly used to read or interpret the output state (i.e. the numerical value of  $\underline{w}_g^d$  in Eq. 7).

It is good to summarize the functional and state relationships introduced in Eqs. 2,3, and 4. As functions  $\underline{t}$ ,  $\underline{t}_g$ ,  $\underline{s}_g^d$  are related by  $\underline{s}_g^d(j) = d^{-1}(\underline{t}_g(j)) = d^{-1}(\underline{t}(g(j)))$ . If  $d$  and  $g$  are fixed, then there is a one-one map between the functions  $\underline{t}$  and  $\underline{s} \equiv \underline{s}_g^d = d^{-1}\underline{t}_g$ . Because of this a sum over  $\underline{s}$  in a general states is equivalent to a sum over  $\underline{t}$ . The states  $|\underline{t}\rangle = \otimes_{a \in A} |\underline{t}(a), a\rangle$ ,  $|\underline{t}_g, g\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{t}_g(j), g(j)\rangle$ ,  $|\underline{s}_g^d, g\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{s}_g^d(j), g(j)\rangle$  are all physically the same state as no physical property is changed by the use of numbering maps. Yet  $|\underline{t}\rangle$  is not a string state;  $|\underline{t}_g, g\rangle$  is a string state of the parameters in  $S$ , the range set of  $\underline{t}$ ; and  $|\underline{s}_g^d, g\rangle$  is a number string state.

### III. THE PRECISE MEANING OF NUMBER REPRESENTATION BY STATES

So far in the discussion of numbering maps and of physical and numerical equivalence of product states, the association of states to numbers has been quite informal

and intuitive. This needs to be put on a more rigorous basis. One needs to say exactly what it means for a product qubyte state of a quantum system to represent a number. That is, what does it mean to say that the state  $|\underline{s}_g^d, g\rangle$  represents a number  $s$  given by Eq. 1?

One method to answer this question is suggested by a study of mathematical logic. Elements of some abstract set are numbers if they satisfy the axioms of number theory or arithmetic [18,19]. These axioms give properties that certain operations on the set must satisfy. The operations are the successor, plus, and times. Here since states of a composite quantum system are to represent numbers, operators must be defined that correspond to these operations. The proof that these operators do carry out the intended operations consists in showing that they satisfy the axioms of arithmetic modified for the modulo property.

To this end operators  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  that act on the tensor product states of a system will be defined for each  $j = 1, \dots, L$ . The definitions are based on the numbering maps described so far. The idea is that  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  corresponds to the operation of addition  $\bmod k^L$  of  $k^{j-1}$  along path  $g$  in  $A$ . These operators are basic to everything that follows and are used in the definitions of operators for  $+$  and  $\times$ .

It is noted that the  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  are defined separately for each  $j$  rather than defining one operator  $V_{g,1}^{d,+1}$  and then defining the  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  as iterated powers of  $V_{g,1}^{d,+1}$ . The reason for this is to avoid conflict with the requirement of efficient implementability of basic arithmetic operations.

### IV. EFFICIENT IMPLEMENTABILITY OF ARITHMETIC OPERATIONS

Probably the most important requirement is that of efficient implementability of basic arithmetic operations. This means that, for states of a physical system to represent numbers, it must be possible to physically implement these operations and the implementation must be efficient. This includes at least the operations implied by Eq. 1 as efficient implementation of these is a necessary condition for states of a quantum system to represent numbers.

In the case of the  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  physical implementability means there must exist a physically realizable Hamiltonian  $H_{g,j}^d$  such that for some time  $t_j$ ,  $U_{g,j}^d(t_j) = e^{-iH_{g,j}^d t_j}$  corresponds to carrying out  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  on the states of the system. As  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  will be defined to be unitary, one has  $e^{-iH_{g,j}^d t_j} = V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$ .  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  will be defined so that the action of  $e^{-iH_{g,j}^d t_j}$  on a state representing a number is the state corresponding to adding  $k^{j-1} \bmod k^L$  to the number. The presence of the map indices  $d, g$  shows that  $H_{g,j}^d$  may depend on these maps.

Efficient implementation means that the time  $t_j$  must

be short. For microscopic systems this is equivalent to the condition that  $t_j$  must be less than the decoherence time  $t_{dec}$ . If the Hamiltonian and system are such that  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  is carried out in a number  $n_j$  of basic switching steps of duration  $\Delta$ , then  $n_j = t_j/\Delta < t_{dec}/\Delta$  [7] must hold.

For macroscopic systems the efficiency requirement is different as  $t_{dec} \ll \Delta$ . In this case  $n_j$  must be polynomial and not exponential in  $L$ . This means that  $n_j = O(L^c)$  with  $c \geq 0$  and  $c$  not too large.  $O()$  means "of the order of".

The efficiency requirement is much stricter for microscopic systems than for macroscopic ones. The reason is that for most systems  $t_{dec}$  is small [7]. This is one reason why quantum computers are so hard to implement compared to macroscopic computers. However, the requirement that  $n_j$  be polynomial in  $L$  would also apply to any microscopic system for which  $t_{dec}/\Delta$  is very large, (e.g.  $t_{dec}$  is several hours or even longer).

The above is rather general in that it assumes that for each  $j$  there is a distinct Hamiltonian  $H_{g,j}^d$  to implement  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$ . However for many systems all the  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  may be implemented by just one Hamiltonian  $H_g^d$  with the different values of  $j$  expressed by different states of some ancillary systems.

The requirement of efficient implementation is the reason that the  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  are defined separately for each  $j$  rather than defining them from  $V_{g,1}^{d,+1}$  by  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1} = (V_{g,1}^{d,+1})^{k^{j-1}}$ . Here  $V_{g,1}^{d,+1}$  corresponds to the successor operation "+1" in axiomatic arithmetic [18,19]. This equation shows that it is not sufficient to limit the requirement of efficient implementation to  $V_{g,1}^{d,+1}$ . In this case carrying out  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  by repetitions of  $V_{g,1}^{d,+1}$  is not efficient as exponentially many repetitions are required.

For many physical systems, efficient implementation of the  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  can be carried out by shifting the implementation of  $V_{g,1}^{d,+1}$  along any path (not necessarily  $g$ ) in  $A$  until a component system in the state  $|g(j)\rangle$  is encountered. At this point implementation of  $V_{g,1}^{d,+1}$  is started. During this phase motion should be along the path  $g$  to successfully implement the operation. This is because the "carry 1" operation implied in the definition is along the path  $g$ .

Another aspect of the efficient implementability condition is that the thermodynamic resources required to implement  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  must be polynomial and not exponential in  $j$ . This takes account of the fact that all computations occur in a noisy environment and one must spend thermodynamic resources to protect the system from errors. This is especially the case for quantum computation for which entanglements of states that develop as the computation progresses must be protected from decoherence [26–28]. Methods of protecting these states include the use of quantum error correction codes [24] and possibly generation and use of EPR pairs [25]. These considera-

tions are another reason why it is important to minimize the time required to implement  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$ .

There are many physical systems where the resources needed to implement  $V_{g,j}^{d,+1}$  (other than those involved in the shift) are either independent of  $j$  or are at most polynomial in  $L$ . The needed resources do not depend exponentially on  $j$  or  $L$ . These systems satisfy the requirement of efficient implementability. There are others that do not. Consider, for example, a 1-D lattice of systems where the intensity of environmental interference and noise grows exponentially with  $j$ . Here the thermodynamic resources needed to protect the system from decoherence, etc., would grow exponentially with  $j$ . Another simpler type of system that would be excluded would be a row of isolated harmonic oscillator potentials each containing a single spinless particle. The proposed two qubit states are the ground and first excited states in the well. However the spring constants of the wells depend exponentially on  $j$ . For example the spring constant  $p(j+1)$  of the  $j+1$ st well is related to that for the  $j$ th well by  $p(j+1) = kp(j)$ .

The condition of efficient implementability also places restrictions on the values of  $k$  allowed in Eq. 1. In general values of  $k$  are used that are quite small (e.g.  $k = 2$ ,  $k = 10$ , etc.). Except for special cases,  $k = 1$  (unary) representations are excluded as arithmetic operations are exponentially hard. Also the value of  $k$  cannot be too large. One reason is that there are physical limitations on the amount of information that can be reliably stored and distinguished per unit space time volume [21]. Also the requirement of efficient implementation enters in that for large  $k$  (e.g.  $k = 10^6$ ), even a simple process such as adding two single digit numbers becomes quite lengthy.

## V. DEFINITION OF THE $V_j^{+1}$

In this section the emphasis will be changed to focus directly on ordered product qubyte states and operators on these states. This will be done partly to save on notation and also to show that this approach, which emphasizes the mathematical character of product qubyte states and operators, can also be used. In this case these states and operators represent numbers and basic arithmetic operations if and only if they satisfy the axioms of arithmetic [18,19]. In this approach any physical realization of the qubyte product states and operators must use maps such as  $d, g$  to describe the corresponding states and operators for any physical system being considered. These maps were used explicitly in the previous section to emphasize both the dynamical dependence on  $d, g$  and the basic physical nature of the requirement of efficient implementability.

To this end one starts with the  $k^L$  orthonormal product qubyte states  $|\underline{s}\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{s}(j), j\rangle$  where  $\underline{s}$  is a function from  $1, \dots, L$  to  $0, \dots, k-1$ . Here the state  $|j\rangle$  denotes

the distinguishability parameter of the  $j$ th qubyte independent of any physical interpretation.

The operator  $V_j^{+1}$  can be easily defined for an  $L$  qubyte system. For each  $j$  let  $u_j$  be a cyclic shift [30] of period  $k$  that acts on the states  $|\ell, j\rangle$  according to  $u_j|\ell, j\rangle = |\ell + 1 \bmod k, j\rangle$ .  $u_j$  is the identity on all states  $|m, j'\rangle$  where  $j' \neq j$ . Define  $V_j^{+1}$  by

$$V_j^{+1} = \begin{cases} u_j P_{\neq(k-1),j} + V_{j+1}^{+1} u_j P_{(k-1),j} & \text{if } 1 \leq j < L \\ u_L & \text{if } j = L \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

Here  $P_{(k-1),j} = |k-1, j\rangle\langle k-1, j| \otimes 1_{\neq j}$  is the projection operator for finding a qubyte in the state  $|k-1, j\rangle$  and the other qubites in any state.  $P_{m,j}$  and  $u_j$  satisfy the commutation relation  $u_j P_{m,j} = P_{m+1,j} u_j \bmod k$  for  $m = 0, \dots, k-1$ . Also  $P_{(\neq k-1),j} = 1 - P_{(k-1),j}$ . This follows from the fact that the label spaces for each qubyte are one dimensional so that the operator  $1 \otimes |j\rangle\langle j| \otimes 1_{\neq j}$  is the identity on the Hilbert space spanned by the  $k^L$  states  $|\underline{s}\rangle$ .

This definition is implicit in that  $V_j^{+1}$  is defined in terms of  $V_{j+1}^{+1}$ . An explicit definition is given by

$$V_j^{+1} = \sum_{n=j}^L u_n P_{(\neq k-1),n} \prod_{\ell=j}^{n-1} u_\ell P_{(k-1),\ell} + \prod_{\ell=j}^L u_\ell P_{(k-1),\ell} \quad (9)$$

In this equation the unordered product is used because for any  $p, q$ ,  $u_m P_{p,m}$  commutes with  $u_n P_{q,n}$  for  $m \neq n$ . Also for  $n = j$  the product factor with  $j \leq \ell \leq n-1$  equals 1.

There are two basic properties the operators  $V_j^{+1}$  must have: that they are cyclic shifts and they satisfy

$$(V_j^{+1})^k = V_{j+1}^{+1} \quad (10)$$

for each  $j < L$ . Also if  $j = L$  then  $(V_L^{+1})^k = 1$ . To show that  $V_j^{+1}$  is a shift, let  $|\underline{s}\rangle$  be a product qubyte state such that for each  $m = 1, 2, \dots, L$  the component qubyte states  $|\underline{s}_m\rangle, u_m|\underline{s}\rangle, (u_m)^2|\underline{s}\rangle, \dots, (u_m)^{k-1}|\underline{s}\rangle$  are pairwise orthonormal. It then follows from Eq. 9 and the properties of the  $u_m$  that any product state  $|\underline{s}\rangle$  is orthogonal to the state  $V_j^{+1}|\underline{s}\rangle$  and that  $V_j^{+1}$  is norm preserving on these states.

Assume that Eq. 10 is valid. Then for each  $j$   $(V_j^{+1})^{k^{L-j+1}} = 1$ . This, and the facts that for all tensor product qubyte states  $|\underline{s}\rangle$ ,  $V_j^{+1}|\underline{s}\rangle$  is also a tensor product state which is orthogonal to  $|\underline{s}\rangle$ , show that  $V_j^{+1}$  is a cyclic shift. The existence of a tensor product basis that is common to all the  $V_j^{+1}$  follows from Eq. 10.

To prove Eq. 10 it is easiest to use Eq. 8. Since  $V_{j+1}^{+1}$  commutes with  $u_\ell P_{n,\ell}$  for all  $\ell \leq j$  and the commutation relations  $P_{\neq n,j} u_j = u_j P_{\neq(n-1),j}$  and  $P_{n,j} u_j = u_j P_{(n-1),j}$  hold, one has for each  $m \leq k$

$$(V_j^{+1})^m = (u_j)^m \prod_{\ell=1}^m P_{\neq(k-\ell),j} + V_{j+1}^{+1} (u_j)^m \left( \sum_{\ell=1}^m P_{(k-\ell),j} \right).$$

Here  $P_{\neq n,j} = 1 - P_{n,j}$ . For  $m = k$  the term with the product of the projection operators gives 0 and the sum of the projection operators gives unity. The desired result follows from the fact that  $(u_j)^k = 1$ . Also  $(V_L^{+1})^k = 1$  follows directly from the definition of  $V_L^{+1}$ .

The above shows that informally the action of  $V_j^{+1}$  corresponds to addition  $\bmod k^L$  of  $k^{j-1}$  on the product basis. This cannot yet be proved as addition  $\bmod k^L$  has not yet been defined. Also the adjoint  $(V_j^{+1})^\dagger$  of  $V_j^{+1}$  corresponds informally to subtraction  $\bmod k^L$  of  $k^{j-1}$ . This can be seen from the fact that  $(V_j^{+1})^\dagger V_j^{+1} = 1$  where

$$(V_j^{+1})^\dagger = \sum_{n=j}^L P_{(\neq k-1),n} u_n^\dagger \prod_{\ell=j}^{n-1} P_{(k-1),\ell} u_\ell^\dagger + \prod_{\ell=j}^L P_{(k-1),\ell} u_\ell^\dagger. \quad (11)$$

This result is obtained using the commutativity of the shifts and projection operators for different component systems.

It should be noted that the operators  $V_j^{+1}$  play an important role in quantum computation. This is the case even though for each product state  $|\underline{s}\rangle$  the state  $V_j^{+1}|\underline{s}\rangle$  is also a product state and is not a linear superposition of these states. The importance comes from the fact that these operators along with their efficient implementation are used to define the basic arithmetic operations (Section VI) for a quantum computer and to carry out quantum algorithms. For example in Shor's factoring quantum algorithm [17], they are used in the step in which the function  $f_y(s) = y^s \bmod N$  is calculated for each component state  $|\underline{s}\rangle$ .

To show the effect of transformations  $W_{g,h}$  and discuss efficient implementation it is useful to consider a physical model of the  $V_j^{+1}$ . As before let  $A, S$  be sets of physical parameters, or eigenvalues, of physical observables  $\hat{A}, \hat{S}$  for a composite quantum system and the maps  $f: \{1, \dots, L\} \rightarrow A$ ,  $d: \{0, \dots, k-1\} \rightarrow S$  be as defined before. For these maps, which correspond to an interpretation of the  $V_j^{+1}$  and states  $|\underline{s}\rangle$ ,  $V_j^{+1}$  becomes the operator  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  where, from Eq. 9,

$$V_{f,j}^{d,+1} = \sum_{n=j}^L u_{f(n)}^d P_{\neq d(k-1),f(n)} \prod_{\ell=j}^{n-1} u_{f(\ell)}^d P_{d(k-1),f(\ell)} + \prod_{\ell=j}^L u_{f(\ell)}^d P_{d(k-1),f(\ell)} \quad (12)$$

This form emphasizes the dependence of the projection and shift operators on physical parameters and is useful in considering physical models for implementing these operators.



The action of the unitary transformation operators  $W_{g,h}$  on  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  is given by

$$W_{g,h}^\dagger V_{f,j}^{d,+1} W_{g,h} = V_{gh^{-1}f,j}^{d,+1} \quad (13)$$

To prove this it is sufficient to consider the action of  $W_{g,h}$  on individual projection and shift operators. One has from Eq. 6

$$\begin{aligned} W_{g,h}^\dagger P_{d(k-1),f(\ell)} W_{g,h} |\underline{t}_{f,f}\rangle &= W_{h,g} P_{d(k-1),f(\ell)} |\underline{t}_{gh^{-1}f,f}\rangle \\ &= W_{h,g} |\underline{t}_{gh^{-1}f,f}\rangle \delta_{\underline{t}_{gh^{-1}f}(\ell),d(k-1)} \\ &= P_{d(k-1),gh^{-1}f(\ell)} |\underline{t}_{gh^{-1}f,gh^{-1}f}\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where  $W_{g,h}^\dagger = W_{h,g}$ . A similar set of equalities holds for  $P_{\neq d(k-1),f(n)}$  with the delta function replaced by  $1 - \delta_{\underline{t}_{gh^{-1}f}(\ell),d(k-1)}$ .

For  $u_{f(\ell)}^d$  one has a similar set of equalities:

$$\begin{aligned} W_{g,h}^\dagger u_{f(\ell)}^d |\underline{t}_{gh^{-1}f,f}\rangle &= \\ W_{h,g} u_{f(\ell)}^d |\underline{t}_{gh^{-1}f(\ell),f(\ell)}\rangle \otimes_{j=1,\neq\ell}^L |\underline{t}_{gh^{-1}f(j),f(j)}\rangle \\ &= u_{gh^{-1}f(\ell)}^d |\underline{t}_{gh^{-1}f,gh^{-1}f}\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof.

To discuss efficient implementation one notes that  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  is a nonlocal many particle operator, whereas physically reasonable Hamiltonians are restricted to local interactions that are mainly two body. This means that efficient implementation by a realistic Hamiltonian will require a number  $n > 1$  of steps where  $n$  is not too large.

It is quite likely that efficient implementations exist for these operators for some microscopic quantum systems. For macroscopic systems this is demonstrated by the widespread use of many types of computers, counters, clocks, etc.. Also there are many ways to efficiently implement the  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  in quantum circuits [31–33] which are potentially applicable to microscopic systems. In addition, it is a simple exercise to give a schematic implementation of a quantum Turing machine that efficiently implements the  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$ .

One method consists of shifting a head along the  $A$  path  $f$  to the  $j$ th component system (i.e. the one with property  $f(j)$ ). Then the head continues moving by increasing  $\ell$ , converting the states  $|\underline{t}_f(\ell), f(\ell)\rangle = |d(k-1), f(\ell)\rangle$  to  $|d(0), f(\ell)\rangle$  until the first  $|\underline{t}_f(\ell), f(\ell)\rangle$  where  $\underline{t}_f(\ell) \neq d(k-1)$  is found. After converting this state to  $u_{f(\ell)}^d |\underline{t}_f(\ell)\rangle$  the head returns to the component with property  $f(j)$ . The number of steps this takes is at most  $cL$  where  $c$  is a constant that accounts for house-keeping steps to ensure reversibility.

This description shows explicitly that  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  depends dynamically on the path  $f$  in that the motion of the head in the parameter set  $A$  depends on  $f$ . For paths that reflect neighborhood properties of  $A$  the motion will in general require less resources to implement than motion along other paths.

Ongoing work on physical implementation of qubits and quantum gates suggests that implementation of the  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  by quantum circuits or quantum Turing machines may be realized for some microscopic systems. For these systems the maximum value of  $L$  for which  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  can be efficiently implemented for each  $j$  and coherence preserved depends on the physical system. It is given roughly by  $cL < t_{dec}/t_{sw}$  where  $c$  is a constant.

## VI. PLUS AND TIMES

Here definitions of plus and times operators are given to show their dependence on and efficient implementability relative to that for the  $V_j^{+1}$ . The purpose is definitely not to represent these widely used operations as something new.

### A. Plus

It is straightforward to define the plus (+) operation in terms of the  $V_j^{+1}$ . To ensure unitarity the definition will be based on states of the form  $|\underline{s}, \underline{w}\rangle = |\underline{s}\rangle \otimes |\underline{w}\rangle$  that describe two  $L$  qubyte product states.

To define the + operation let  $V_j^{+\ell} = (V_j^{+1})^\ell$  represent  $\ell$  iterations of  $V_j^{+1}$ . Then + is defined by

$$\begin{aligned} + |\underline{s}\rangle \otimes |\underline{w}\rangle &= |\underline{s}\rangle \otimes V_L^{+sL} V_{L-1}^{+sL-1} \dots V_2^{+s2} V_1^{+s1} |\underline{w}\rangle \\ &= |\underline{s}, \underline{s} + \underline{w}\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Here the numeral expression  $|\underline{s} + \underline{w}\rangle$  is defined to be that generated from  $|\underline{w}\rangle$  by the action of the product  $\prod_{j=1}^L V_j^{+s_j}$ . Note that the different  $V_j^{+1}$  commute.

As defined the + operator is unitary on the Hilbert space spanned by all pairs of length  $L$  numeral expression states. Thus a reversible implementation of it is possible where the procedure makes use of the procedures for implementing the  $V_j^{+1}$ . Eq. 14 shows that the procedure can be carried out by carrying out, for each  $j = 1, 2, \dots, L$   $s_j$  iterations of  $V_j^{+1}$  where  $s_j$  is the number  $\underline{s}(j)$  associated with the qubyte state  $|\underline{s}_j, j\rangle$  in  $|\underline{s}\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{s}(j), j\rangle$ . Since + is unitary, so is the adjoint,  $+\dagger$ . Since + was defined to correspond to addition modulo  $k^L$ , the adjoint corresponds to subtraction modulo  $k^L$ . That is if  $+\underline{s} \otimes \underline{w} = \underline{s} \otimes \underline{s} + \underline{w}$  then  $+\dagger \underline{s} \otimes \underline{s} + \underline{w} = \underline{s} \otimes \underline{w}$ .

As was the case for the  $V_j^{+1}$  any physical model of + requires use of the numbering maps. This shows that the dynamics of any implementation depends on these maps. Also as is well known, there are many ways to efficiently implement the + operation (See for example [31]). One method starts by copying the state  $|\underline{s}(1)\rangle$  in  $|\underline{s}(1), 1\rangle$ . Then subtraction of 1 from the copy state is interleaved with iteration of  $V_1^{+1}$  on the state  $|\underline{w}\rangle$  until the copy state returns to its original state  $|\underline{0}_j\rangle$ . This

process is repeated on  $V_j^{+1}$  for  $j = 2, 3, \dots, L$  to carry out the  $+$  operation.

For this model the total number of steps required to implement the  $s_j$  iterations of  $V_j^{+1}$  is at most  $Ks_jL$  where  $K$  is a constant. Based on this the number of steps needed to implement  $+$  is less than  $K'L \sum_{j=1}^L s_j < M_+L^2$ .  $M_+$  is a constant that includes the number of housekeeping steps such as the copying of the  $|\underline{s}_j\rangle$ , etc.. For a procedure with this dependence on  $L$  the maximum allowed value of  $L$  is given, as before, by the requirement that  $M_+L^2 < t_{dec}/t_{sw}$ . A physical system satisfying this requirement would admit a representation of numbers on which one iteration of  $+$  could be carried out coherently. More iterations are possible if addition can be done more efficiently.

Sufficient operations on basis product states have now been defined to show that the state  $|\underline{s}\rangle = \otimes_{j=1}^L |\underline{s}(j), j\rangle$  can be obtained from the state  $|\underline{0}\rangle$  by operations corresponding to those shown in Eq. 1. To see this assume that: the number 0 corresponds to  $|\underline{0}\rangle$ ; the numbers  $\ell k^{j-1}$  correspond to  $V_j^{+\ell}|\underline{0}\rangle$  for each  $\ell = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$  and  $j = 1, 2, \dots, L$ ; and  $+$  defined by Eq. 14 is a valid definition of addition in arithmetic. Then the correspondence given by Eq. 1 holds for all numbers  $s = 0, 1, \dots, k^L - 1$  and states  $|\underline{s}\rangle$ .

The proof of this is based on use of Eq. 14 to obtain

$$|\underline{s}\rangle = V_1^{+s_1}|\underline{0}\rangle + V_2^{+s_2}|\underline{0}\rangle + \dots + V_L^{+s_L}|\underline{0}\rangle. \quad (15)$$

which holds for all  $k^L$  basis states  $|\underline{s}\rangle$ . One sees that the operations on product states shown by Eq. 15 correspond exactly to those shown by Eq. 1 on numbers. As noted above this result extends the  $kL+1$  correspondences between numbers and states for the states  $|\underline{0}\rangle$  and  $V_j^{+\ell}|\underline{0}\rangle$  to  $k^L$  correspondences between all the product states  $|\underline{s}\rangle$  and numbers  $s$ .

## B. Times

Here a definition of multiplication is given that is based on efficient iteration of  $+$  and is similar to the method taught in primary school. The method is efficient relative to that for  $+$ .

Reversibility of the operations requires that the operator  $\times$  be unitary. (Caution: the adjoint of  $\times$  is not division.) This means that both input product qubyte states and the product state with the result must be preserved. It is also convenient to have one extra product state for storing and acting on intermediate results. This state begins and ends as  $|\underline{0}\rangle$ . For initial states of the form,  $|\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{0}, \underline{0}\rangle = |\underline{s}\rangle \otimes |\underline{w}\rangle \otimes |\underline{0}\rangle \otimes |\underline{0}\rangle$ ,

$$\times |\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{0}, \underline{0}\rangle = |\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{0}, \underline{s \times w}\rangle \quad (16)$$

where  $|\underline{s \times w}\rangle$  is the state resulting from the action of  $\times$ . It is supposed to correspond to the result of multiplying,

$\text{mod } k^L$ , the numbers corresponding to the states  $|\underline{s}\rangle$  and  $|\underline{w}\rangle$ .

In order to define  $\times$  explicitly one needs to be able to generate the states  $|\underline{k^{j-1} \times w}\rangle$  corresponding to multiplication of  $w$  by  $k^{j-1}$ . For each  $j = 1, \dots, L$  these states are added to themselves  $s_j$  times. The final result is obtained by adding all the resulting states so obtained.

To this end define  $Q_j(2, 3)$  for  $j = 1, \dots, L$  as operators on the second and third product states that convert  $|\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{w0^{j-1}}, \underline{z}\rangle$  to  $|\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{w0^j}, \underline{z}\rangle$ . It has the effect of multiplying  $|\underline{w0^j}\rangle$  by  $k$ . An efficient reversible implementation of this, acting on the state  $|\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{y}, \underline{z}\rangle$  is obtained by subtraction,  $\text{mod } k$ , of the  $L-j+1$ st component qubyte state of  $|\underline{w}\rangle$  from the  $L$ th component state of  $|\underline{y}\rangle$ , shifting all the elements of  $|\underline{y}\rangle$  by one site and putting the result of the subtraction at the newly opened first site. This works because, if  $|\underline{y}\rangle = |\underline{w0^{j-1}}\rangle$ , then  $|\underline{y}_L\rangle = |\underline{w_{L-j+1}}\rangle$ . The result,  $|\underline{0}_L\rangle$ , of the subtraction is moved to the first site of  $|\underline{y}\rangle$  after the shift. One has

$$Q_j(2, 3)|\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{y}, \underline{z}\rangle = |\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{y}', \underline{z}\rangle \quad (17)$$

where  $|\underline{y}'_{j+1}\rangle = |\underline{y}_j\rangle$  for  $1 \leq j \leq L-1$  and  $|\underline{y}'_1\rangle = |\underline{y}_L\rangle \ominus |\underline{w_{L-j+1}}\rangle$ . Here  $\ominus$  denotes subtraction  $\text{mod } k$ . Note that  $Q_j(2, 3)$  is unitary.

The operator  $\times$  is defined from the  $Q_j(2, 3)$  and  $+$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \times |\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{y}, \underline{z}\rangle &= Q_L(2, 3)(+_{3,4})^{s_L} Q_{L-1}(2, 3)(+_{3,4})^{s_{L-1}} \\ &\dots (+_{3,4})^{s_2} Q_1(2, 3)(+_{3,4})^{s_1} +_{2,3} |\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{y}, \underline{z}\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Here  $+_{m,n}$  carries out the action defined in Eq. 14 on the  $m$ th and  $n$ th product state. The  $m$ th state remains unchanged in this action.  $s_h$  is the number  $\underline{s}(h)$  in the state component  $|\underline{s}(h), h\rangle$  of  $|\underline{s}\rangle$ . Note that since each operator in the righthand product of the equation is unitary, so is  $\times$ .

To see that  $\times$  as defined above does carry out the intended multiplication operation on initial states of the form  $|\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{0}, \underline{0}\rangle$  one carries out the action of the  $2L+1$  operators shown above. The steps give

$$\begin{aligned} |\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{0}, \underline{0}\rangle &\xrightarrow{+_{2,3}} |\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{w}, \underline{0}\rangle \xrightarrow{(+_{3,4})^{s_1}} |\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{w}, \underline{s_1 w}\rangle \\ Q_1(2, 3) &\xrightarrow{} |\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{w0}, \underline{s_1 w}\rangle \xrightarrow{(+_{3,4})^{s_2}} |\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{w0}, \underline{s_1 t + s_2 t0}\rangle \\ \dots &\xrightarrow{Q_L(2, 3)} |\underline{s}, \underline{w}, \underline{0}, \underline{s_1 w + s_2 t0 + \dots + s_L t0^{L-1}}\rangle \end{aligned}$$

Note that  $Q_L(2, 3)$  acting on  $|\underline{-}, \underline{w}, \underline{w0^{L-1}}, \underline{-}\rangle$  gives  $|\underline{-}, \underline{w}, \underline{0}, \underline{-}\rangle$  in accordance with Eq. 16 as  $|\underline{w0^L}\rangle = |\underline{0}\rangle$ . Here  $|\underline{s_1 w}\rangle$  denotes  $s_1$  iterations of adding  $|\underline{w}\rangle$  to  $|\underline{0}\rangle$ ; also  $s_j w0^{j-1}$  denotes the result of  $s_j$  additions of  $|\underline{w0^{j-1}}\rangle$  to the  $4$ th product state.

The number of basic switching steps needed to implement  $\times$  can be crudely estimated. It was seen in the last section that the number of steps required to implement  $+$  is  $O(L^2)$ . Since there are  $L+1$   $+$  operations the

number of steps for all  $+$  operations is  $O(L^3)$ . As this is more than the number needed for all of the  $Q(2,3)$  one estimates that the  $\times$  operation as defined takes  $O(L^3)$  switching steps. Again this is a rough result and is not meant to represent the most efficient method of implementing  $\times$ .

### C. Required Properties of Plus, Times

There are several properties that  $+$  and  $\times$  must satisfy, based on the axioms of arithmetic [18,19] modified for the modularity property and the presence of  $L$  successor operators. One may also use axioms for a commutative ring with identity as they apply to modular arithmetic [34]. The presence of  $L$  successor operators rather than just one is the price paid for the requirement of efficient implementation of the arithmetic operations.

Properties that must be satisfied include the requirements that the successor operations commute with  $+$ , the existence of additive and multiplicative identities, which are the states  $|\underline{0}\rangle$  and  $|\underline{1}\rangle = V_1^{+1}|\underline{0}\rangle$ , and the distributivity of  $\times$  over  $+$ . Also  $+$  and  $\times$  are associative and commutative.

Proof of these properties from the definitions and Eq. 10 is straight forward and will not be given here. Note that the proofs refer to the product qubyte states. There is no reference to a separate number  $s$  corresponding to the state  $|\underline{s}\rangle$ . However the proofs do use the corresponding properties of the numbers appearing in the exponents. For example to prove that addition is commutative,  $|\underline{s+w}\rangle = |\underline{w+s}\rangle$ , Eqs. 14 and 9 give  $|\underline{s+w}\rangle = \prod_{h=1}^L (V_j^{+1})^{s_h+w_h} |\underline{0}\rangle$  and  $|\underline{w+s}\rangle = \prod_{h=1}^L (V_j^{+1})^{w_h+s_h} |\underline{0}\rangle$ . The equality of these two states follows from  $s_h + w_h = w_h + s_h$  for each  $h$ .

## VII. AN ALTERNATE APPROACH

The approach taken so far has been to define the operators  $V_j^{+1}$  based either directly on numbers, as in Eqs. 8 or 9, or on physical parameter sets  $A, S$  as in Eq. 12. In the latter case numbering maps  $d, f$  are required to show the equivalence between the two definitions and to show that the operators have the required arithmetic properties. Also the definitions are explicit in the sense that they are made up of sums of products of single system shifts and projection operators.

There is another more global approach that avoids explicit definitions based on the use of projection operator and shifts for component systems and avoids use of numbers in the definitions, either directly as in Eqs. 8 or 9, or indirectly through maps as in Eq. 12. Instead one can define a set of operators  $V_a$  indexed by a parameter set  $A$  and give the properties that the operators must satisfy without direct reference to numbers. The properties

must be such that the needed numbering maps  $d, f$  can be obtained from them.

To this end it is required that for states of a physical system to give a  $k$ -ary representation of numbers, there must exist a Hamiltonian  $H$  and a set  $\{V_a | a \in A\}$  of  $L$  operators such that  $H$  can efficiently implement each operator  $V_a$  in the set. The  $V_a$  are required to have the following properties:

1. Each  $V_a$  is a cyclic shift.
2. The  $V_a$  all commute with one another.
3. For each  $a \in A$  there is a unique  $a'$  such that  $(V_a)^k = V_{a'}$ .
4. For each  $a'$  there is a unique  $a$  such that  $(V_a)^k = V_{a'}$ .
5. There is just one  $a$  for which  $(V_a)^k = 1$ .

The properties reflect those possessed by the  $V_j^{+1}$ , note especially Eq. 10. Properties 3-5 can be used to establish a numbering of the label set  $A$  with the maximum label given by property 5. The existence of a unique minimum label  $a_1$  follows from the finiteness of  $A$ . The commutativity and cyclic shift properties [30] give the existence of a set  $\mathcal{B}$  of pairwise orthogonal subspaces of states such that for each  $a$  and each subspace  $\langle$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $V_a \langle$  is in  $\mathcal{B}$  and is orthogonal to  $\langle$ . In the special case that the subspaces in  $\mathcal{B}$  are one dimensional,  $\mathcal{B}$  corresponds to a set of pairwise orthogonal states such that for each  $|\underline{t}\rangle$  in  $\mathcal{B}$ ,  $V_a |\underline{t}\rangle$  and  $|\underline{t}\rangle$  are orthogonal.

One can use property 3 along with iterations  $(V_a)^h$  for  $h = 0, 1, \dots, k-1$  for each  $a$  to generate a cyclic ordering or numbering of the states in  $\mathcal{B}$  and show that the set contains  $k^L$  states. However none of this is sufficient to select a state as the zero state  $|\underline{0}\rangle$ . This must be done by making an arbitrary choice.

6. There is a unique state in  $\mathcal{B}$  which is the zero state.

Based on this choice one can associate with each string of numbers,  $n_L, n_{L-1}, \dots, n_\ell, \dots, n_2, n_1$  with  $0 \leq n_\ell \leq k-1$  for each  $\ell$  a unique state  $|\underline{t}\rangle$ . The association is given by

$$|\underline{t}\rangle = \prod_{\ell=1}^L (V_{a_\ell})^{n_\ell} |\underline{0}\rangle.$$

Since the properties show that the states  $|\underline{t}\rangle$  for different number strings are orthogonal, and each  $n$  value can vary independently of the others in the string, it seems that  $|\underline{t}\rangle$  must have a product state structure with  $t_\ell$  corresponds to  $n_\ell$ . However this remains to be proved. The above can also be used to define addition as in Eq. 14 and show that  $|\underline{0}\rangle$  is the additive identity. All this suggests that this approach may indeed be valid. However, additional work is required to see if this is the case.

## VIII. DISCUSSION

Several points about the work done here should be noted. The state descriptions of composite quantum systems used in this paper have not taken account of whether or not the component systems are distinguishable by properties other than those explicitly shown in the states. This is based on the consideration that the only properties used by a quantum algorithm are those expressed explicitly in the states and operators representing the basic arithmetic operations. For indistinguishable systems, it is suspected that taking account of their bosonic or fermionic nature, as has been done elsewhere [35,36], will not change the results obtained. However, this must be investigated.

One aspect of the work presented here is that numbers have already been used in the description of necessary conditions for states of a quantum system to represent numbers. For example the numbering of the component systems and the  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  by the  $j = 1, \dots, L$  and the assignment of numbers to the internal components by maps such as  $d$ , already imply or use numbers. Similarly the definitions of  $+$  and  $\times$  were given in terms of numbers of iterations of  $V_j^{+1}$  and  $+$  respectively.

There are two important aspects of this. One is that the role of these numbers is limited to the dynamical implementation of the  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$ ,  $+$ , and  $\times$ . For example, any method based on a Hamiltonian  $H_f^d$  that implements  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  as a translation of a procedure for implementing  $V_{f,1}^{d,+1}$  by  $j$  sites along  $f$  requires a state of the form  $|j\rangle \otimes \phi$  as the input. The action on this state must correspond to the repeated subtraction of 1 from  $j$  interleaved with motion of some system, such as a head or quantum robot [37], along  $f$  until  $j = 0$  is reached. In addition the "carry 1" operation, which is part of  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  means that motion along the remaining  $L - j$  elements of path  $f$  must be built into  $H_f^d$ .

It is worth contrasting this with another implementation method in which the site  $j$  is marked by an ancillary qubit. Then the head or quantum robot, starting from some site, searches among the component qubits until the marked one is found. The searching, corresponding to motion along some arbitrary search path, can be completely unrelated to the path  $f$ . However, once the marked qubit is located, implementation of  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  requires motion along  $f$  in the "carry 1" operations.

Similar arguments apply for the efficient carrying out of the  $+$  operation as this requires up to  $k$  iterations of  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$  for each  $j$ . One method of implementation requires interleaving the implementation of a procedure for  $V_{f,j}^{+1}$  with subtractions of 1 from a state  $|\underline{x}_j\rangle$ , Eq. 14, until  $|\underline{0}_j\rangle$  is obtained.

The other aspect of the use of numbers in the description of the conditions is that the magnitudes of the numbers appearing in the dynamical description are exponentially smaller than those represented by the system

being considered. States of a composite quantum system satisfying the conditions for  $k$ -ary number representations of length  $L$ , represent the first  $k^L$  numbers. Numbers appearing in the dynamics range up to  $k$  and  $L = \log_k k^L$ . This exponential decrease is a consequence of the requirement of efficient implementability of arithmetic operations.

The requirement of efficient physical implementability also applies to the numbers appearing in the dynamics. This is especially evident in any implementation method which interleaves evaluation of some arithmetic function with carrying out an action until a specified function value is reached. For instance, implementation of the  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$ , e.g. by use of a head or quantum robot with an on board quantum computer [37], would require a quantum computer with at least  $O([\log_m(L)] + 1)$  qubits for an  $m$ -ary representation of numbers up to  $L$ . ( $[-]$  denotes the largest integer in.) Here the dynamics that carries out these operations is subject to all the requirements described so far. It is also part of the dynamics for implementing  $V_{f,j}^{d,+1}$ .

This suggests that it may be possible to iterate the dynamical description where the number of qubits needed in any iteration is exponentially smaller than the number needed in the preceding one. This suggests that at most very few numbers are needed to represent any (finite) set of numbers, no matter how large.

This can be illustrated by a simple example using binary representations only. A physical representation of the first  $2^L$  numbers with  $L = 10^6$  requires a system with  $10^6$  component systems. Numeral expression states are sums of tensor products of  $10^6$  states of these component systems as qubits or bits.

Efficient implementation of arithmetic operations on these states requires up to  $L$  iterated subtractions of 1 and testing for 0 interleaved with actions. Efficient implementation of these subtractions in turn requires numeral expression states for the numbers up to  $10^6$ , which requires of the order of  $20 \sim \log_2(\log_2(2^L))$  component systems as qubits or bits.

One can also apply the argument to subtraction of 1 from numbers up to 20. However here 20 is so small that it does not matter if this is done efficiently or inefficiently. As a practical matter the iteration can be stopped when the amount of time consumed in inefficient arithmetic operations is of the order of that used in other housekeeping operations in the overall process being considered.

Finally it should be noted that the use of numbering maps and efficient implementability condition, which have been applied to microscopic quantum systems, also apply to macroscopic quantum systems. In this case  $t_{dec} \ll t_{sw}$  so the limitation that the number of steps is  $< t_{dec}/t_{sw}$  is not applicable. Instead efficient implementation means that there exists a dynamics such that the number of steps needed to carry out arithmetic operations is polynomial in  $L$ . Also the states of the system used to represent numbers are those that are stabilized

by the interactions with the environment, the "pointer states" [38–40]. The fact that these conditions are much less onerous than the limitations on microscopic systems is shown by the widespread use of macroscopic computers and counting devices and timers.

## ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

Discussions with Murray Peshkin on several points of this paper were much appreciated. This work is supported by the U.S. Department of Energy, Nuclear Physics Division, under contract W-31-109-ENG-38.

- 
- [1] R. Landauer, *Physics Today* **44**, No 5, 23, (1991); *Physics Letters A* **217** 188, (1996); in *Feynman and Computation, Exploring the Limits of Computers*, A.J.G.Hey, Ed., (Perseus Books, Reading MA, 1998).
- [2] M. Tegmark, *Ann. Phys.* **270**, 1 (1998).
- [3] S. Weinberg, *Dreams of a Final Theory* Vintage Books, New York, 1993.
- [4] P. Benioff, *Phys. Rev. A* **59**, 4223 (1999).
- [5] B. Schumacher, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 2738 (1995); R. Jozsa and B. Schumacher *J. Modern Optics* **41**, 2343 (1994).
- [6] R. Fazio, G.M. Palma, and J. Siewert, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **83** 5383 (1999).
- [7] D. P. DiVincenzo, *Science* **270** 255, (1995); Los Alamos Archives quant-ph/0002077.
- [8] N.A. Gershenfeld, *Science* **275** 350 (1997)
- [9] D.G. Cory, A.F. Fahmy, and T.F. Havel, *Proc. Natl. Acad. Sci.* **94**, 1634 (1997)
- [10] L.M.K. Vandersypen, C.S. Yannoni, M.H. Sherwood, and I.L. Chuang, quant-ph/9905041.
- [11] A. Ekert and R. Jozsa, *Revs. Modern Phys.* **68**, 733, (1996).
- [12] Let  $f$  be any function from and to the natural numbers (nonnegative integers). The  $f$ -ary representation is defined by
- $$s = \sum_{j=1}^L \prod_{l=1}^{j-1} f(l) s_j \quad (18)$$
- where  $s_j$  is any number between 0 and  $f(j) - 1$ . For example, if  $f(j) = j$ , then  $\prod_{l=1}^{j-1} f(l) = (j-1)!$ . For some specialized problems these  $f$ -ary representations may be more efficient than the usual ones. For instance, if  $f(j) = j$ , the base  $e$  of the natural logarithms has the simple rational number expansion  $1.11111 \dots$ .
- [13] G.L. Litvinov, V.P. Maslov, G.B. Shpiz, quant-ph/9904025.
- [14] S. Lloyd and S.L. Braunstein, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **82** 1784, (1999). (quant-ph/9810082).
- [15] E. Farhi and S. Gutmann, quant-ph/9612026.
- [16] L.K.Grover, in *Proceedings of 28th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* ACM Press New York 1996, p. 212; *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **79** 325 (1997); G. Brassard, *Science* **275**, 627 (1997); L. K. Grover, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **80**, 4329 (1998).
- [17] P. W. Shor, in *Proceedings, 35th Annual Symposium on the Foundations of Computer Science*, S. Goldwasser (Ed), IEEE Computer Society Press, Los Alamitos, CA, 1994, pp 124-134; *SIAM J. Computing*, **26**, 1481 (1997).
- [18] J. R. Shoenfield, *Mathematical Logic* (Addison-Wesley, Reading, MA 1967).
- [19] *Gödel's Incompleteness Theorems* (Oxford University Press, Oxford, 1992).
- [20] C. Monroe, D.M. Meekhof, B.E. King, W.M. Itano, and D.J.Wineland, *Phys. Rev. Letters*, **75**, 4714, (1995)
- [21] S. Lloyd, *Phys. Rev. A* **61**, 010301(R) (2000).
- [22] P. Shor, Los Alamos Archives Preprint quant-ph/0005003.
- [23] C. Miquel, J.P.Paz, R. Perazzo, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 2605 (1996); D. Beckman, A. N. Chari, S. Devabhaktuni, and J. Preskill, Los Alamos Archives quant-ph/9602016; C. Zalka, Los Alamos Archives quant-ph/9806084.
- [24] R. Laflamme, C. Miquel, J. P. Paz, and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **77** 198 (1996); D. P. DiVincenzo and P. W. Shor, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **77** 3260 (1996); E. M. Rains, R. H. Hardin, P. W. Shor, and N. J. A. Sloane, *Phys. Rev. Letters* **79** 954 (1997); E. Knill, R. Laflamme, and W. H. Zurek, *Science* **279**, 342 (1998).
- [25] C.H. Bennett in *Feynman and Computation, Exploring the Limits of Computers* A.J.G.Hey, Ed., (Perseus Books, Reading MA, 1998); C.H.Bennett D.P.DiVincenzo, C.A.Fuchs, T.Mor, E.Rains, P.W.Shor, J.A.Smolin, and W.K.Wooters, *Rev. A* **59** 1070 (1999).
- [26] W. H. Zurek, *Physics Today* **44** No. 10, 36 (1991); J.R. Anglin, J. Paz, and W. H. Zurek, *Phys. Rev A* **55**, 4041 (1997).
- [27] W. G. Unruh, *Phys. Rev. A* **51**, 992 (1995).
- [28] H. Brandt, *Progr. Quant. Elect.* **22** 257, (1998); *Optical Eng.* **37**, 600 (1998).
- [29] S. Lloyd, Los Alamos Archives, quant-ph/9908043
- [30] P. R. Halmos and L. J. Wallen, *Jour. Math. Mech.* **19**, 657 (1970); P.R. Halmos, *A Hilbert Space Problem Book* 2nd Edition, Graduate Texts in Mathematics 19 (Springer Verlag, New York 1982); B. Sz. Nagy and C. Foias, *Harmonic Analysis of Operators in Hilbert Space* (North-Holland, New York, 1970).
- [31] V.Vedral, A. Barenco, and A. Ekert, *Phys. Rev. A*, **54**, 147 (1996).
- [32] R.P.Feynman. *Opt. News*, **11**,11 (1985), reprinted in *Found. Phys.* **16**,507 (1986).
- [33] A. Barenco, C. Bennett, R. Cleve, D. DiVincenzo, N. Margolus, P. Shor, T. Sleator, J. Smolin, and H. Weinfurter, *Phys. Rev. A*, **52** 3457-3467 (1995).
- [34] I.T.Adamson, *Introduction to Field Theory*, 2nd. Edition, Cambridge University Press, London, 1982.
- [35] S. B. Bravyi and A. Y. Kitaev, Los Alamos Archives Preprint quant-ph/0003137.
- [36] A. Y. Vlasov, Los Alamos Archives Preprint quant-ph/0001100.
- [37] P. Benioff *Phys. Rev. A* **58**, 893 (1998); *Quantum Robots*

- in, Feynman and Computation, Exploring the Limits of Computers, Anthony Hey, Ed, Perseus Books, Reading, MA. 1998; Los Alamos Archives Preprint quant-ph/9807032.
- [38] W. H. Zurek, Phys. Rev. D **24** 1516, (1981); **26** 1862 (1982).
  - [39] E. Joos and H. D. Zeh, Z. Phys. B **59**, 23, (1985); H. D. Zeh quant-ph/**9905004**; E Joos, quant-ph/**9808008**.
  - [40] A. Venugopalan, Phys. Rev. A **56** 4307 (1997); quant-ph/**9909005**.