

Quantum Circuits for Incompletely Specified Operators

Vivek V. Shende and Igor L. Markov[†]

Department of Electrical Engineering and Computer Science,
The University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan, 48109-2212, USA

Many recent papers in the theory of quantum circuits have sought to characterize the number of quantum gates required to simulate a given unitary operator up to global phase. However, in practice, the given unitary operator can be incompletely specified. In many quantum algorithms, one knows that the input will come as $|0\rangle$ and consequently one only cares how the unitary operator acts on this state. Moreover, it is often the case that a quantum computation is followed by measurement, during which process information is lost — it follows that one may vary the operator performed in any way that only affects the destroyed information.

In this work, we show that in several cases, such incompletely specified operators can in general be implemented using fewer quantum gates than are required for generic completely specified operators. We give exact results for the case of two qubits, and some asymptotics for the general case.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx, 03.65.Fd 03.65.Ud

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum circuits offer a common formalism to describe various quantum-mechanical effects and facilitate a unified framework for simulating such effects on a quantum computer [1]. The framework consists of two steps: (1) for a given unitary evolution, find a quantum circuit that computes it, (2) implement this circuit on a quantum computer. The first step is sometimes called quantum circuit synthesis [2], and is the focus of our work. Given that existing physical implementations are severely limited by the number of qubits, a considerable effort was made recently to synthesize small two-qubit circuits [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8]. More recent work has also resulted in n -qubit circuit decompositions with optimal asymptotics [9, 10]. In this work we show how to improve these results by taking into account additional degrees of freedom arising in applications of quantum circuits, such as quantum algorithms, cryptography and state synthesis.

Commonly-analyzed quantum circuits use arbitrary one-qubit gates and controlled-not (CNOT) gates. Various two-qubit gates were proposed recently as replacements or generalizations of CNOTs, but it is not yet clear whether such new gates can compete with CNOTs in major physical implementation technologies [7, 8]. A CNOT-based circuit that implements a typical two-qubit operator up to phase requires three CNOT gates [3, 4, 5]. However, the effect of measurement on the optimality of these results has not been considered in the literature before. Since measurement erases information, it allows for a variety of circuits that achieve the same result. Choosing smaller circuits from such coarse equivalence classes, rather than trying to implement a given operator up to phase, may improve gate counts. To this end, we show that straightforward types of measurement can save one or two out of three CNOT gates. We also indicate when asymptotic savings are possible for larger circuits.

Our work has parallels in synthesis of classical irreversible

logic circuits, where truth tables are sometimes underspecified, and the synthesis program must complete them so as to allow for smaller circuits. In other words, outputs produced for some input combinations can be arbitrary. Such unspecified behaviors of classical circuits are traditionally called “don’t-cares”. While covered in undergraduate circuits courses, they remain a worthy subject of research and appear in a variety of circumstances in practice. For example, if a given circuit operates on outputs of another circuit, the latter may not be able to produce certain combinations of bits. While this cannot happen with reversible quantum circuits, in many quantum algorithms, we know in advance that the input state will be $|0\rangle$. Similarly, in a physics experiment, we may only be interested in preparing a given state from $|0\rangle$. To this end, we show that an n -qubit state can be prepared using $O(2^n)$ gates — which is asymptotically optimal — whereas $O(4^n)$ gates are necessary to simulate a generic n -qubit unitary operator. We also show that at most one maximally entangling gate is necessary and sufficient to prepare a 2-qubit state, and, in particular, that a single CNOT suffices.

While synthesis up to measurement and state preparation may seem to be unrelated problems, we point out that both give rise to incomplete specifications of the desired unitary operator. Indeed, from a mathematical perspective, state synthesis is the same problem as synthesis up to a measurement of any one basis state: the first amounts to specifying only a single column of the unitary operator; the second to specifying a single row.

The remainder of this paper is structured as follows. Related previous work is covered in Section II. We discuss preparation of quantum states in Section III and measurement in Section IV. Conclusions are in Section V.

II. PREVIOUS WORK

To discuss the range of operators that can be simulated up to phase by a given type of circuit, we consider *generic circuits* [5]. These are diagrams with placeholders for unspecified (variable) gates and may also contain specific (constant) gates. Each placeholder corresponds to some subset of pos-

Electronic address: vshende@umich.edu

[†]Electronic address: imarkov@eecs.umich.edu

sible gates. In this work, all placeholders are for one-qubit gates, and all constant gates are either CNOTs or one-qubit gates; we call such circuits *basic*. We label placeholders corresponding to all of $SU(2)$ with lower-case letters, and placeholders representing gates of the form $R_x(\alpha)$, $R_y(\beta)$, or $R_z(\gamma)$ by $R_x;R_y;R_z$ respectively. Here, $R_n(\theta) = e^{i\sigma^n\theta/2}$. We refer to basic circuits whose only placeholders represent $R_x;R_y;R_z$ gates as *elementary*.

We say that a circuit on n wires is *universal* if, by specifying appropriate values for the placeholders, one can obtain a circuit simulating arbitrary $u \in U(2^n)$ up to global phase. For dimension reasons, an elementary circuit on n qubits cannot be universal unless there are at least $n^2 - 1$ placeholders [5]. Our general strategy for showing that a given incompletely specified circuit is not universal is to convert it into an elementary circuit, eliminate as many placeholders as possible via circuit identities, and then count gates. The first step is accomplished using the well known fact that any $u \in SU(2)$ may be written in the form $R_k(\alpha)R_l(\beta)R_m(\gamma)$ for $k, l, m \in \{x, y, z\}; k \neq l \neq m$ [1]. In subsequent work we use the following two circuit identities: the R_x (respectively, R_z) gate can pass through the target (respectively, control) of a CNOT gate.

The following facts have been determined previously:

Proposition II.1 [5] *There exist 2-qubit universal basic circuits that contain three CNOT gates and seven one-qubit placeholders. An example is given in Figure 1. The equivalent elementary circuit requires 15 placeholders, which is optimal. Any universal 2-qubit basic circuit requires at least three CNOT gates and a total gate-count of at least nine.*

For a given operator U , one can instantiate the unspecified circuit in Figure 1 and write out a concrete quantum circuit that implements U up to phase. Algorithms for this circuit synthesis task are given in [5].

III. PREPARATION OF PURE STATES

The bounds of Proposition II.1 apply when one must find a circuit to simulate a particular given two-qubit operator up to global phase. However, quantum-computational tasks arising in applications are often less completely specified, i.e., can be performed by a greater variety of quantum circuits.

One such task is state preparation. To prepare the n -qubit state Φ from Φ_I , we can use any operator $u \in U(2^n)$ with $u\Phi_I = \Phi$. Of course, a bad choice of u will guarantee that u cannot be simulated with fewer than $O(4^n)$ quantum gates. By dimension counting, one can hope to do as well as $O(2^n)$ gates, even in the worst case. This asymptotic bound can be achieved using the technique of [9].

Proposition III.1 *Preparing a generic n -qubit pure state from Φ_I requires on the order of 2^n quantum gates.*

Proof: The matrix decomposition used in [9] produces a circuit using approximately $8/7 \cdot 4^n$ CNOT gates. Their technique is based on the QR decomposition and gives a circuit that builds up a unitary matrix column by column. For our

present purposes, it suffices to truncate the circuit (i.e., stop the construction algorithm) after the first column is built — in doing so, we use only $O(2^n)$ quantum gates. \square

Using a different matrix decomposition, it is possible to give circuits for arbitrary quantum operators using $4^n - 2^{n+1}$ CNOTs [10], a factor of four away from the lower bound of $(4^n - 3n - 1)/4$ given in [5]. However, the technique used to do so does not build up the matrix column by column, and consequently does not translate immediately into a technique for state preparation. We point out that dimension counting arguments, such as those in [5], imply that at least $(4^n - 3n - 1)/4$ CNOTs are necessary to prepare a generic pure state from Φ_I , but the best known algorithm to do so, while exhibiting the proper asymptotics, is off by a constant factor of more than thirty. Thus there is a significantly larger gap between existing upper and lower bounds for the number of CNOTs required in circuits for state preparation, as compared to circuits for simulating unitary operators up to phase.

We now seek optimality results for the task of state preparation in the case of two qubits. As two-qubit states can be entangled, while Φ_I is not, it is clear that at least one use of a two-qubit gate is necessary to prepare any entangled state.

Proposition III.2 *Let $G \in SU(4)$. Then every state can be prepared from Φ_I by a circuit containing one-qubit gates and a single gate simulating G iff there is some unentangled state Φ such that $G\Phi$ is maximally entangled.*

Proof: For a two-qubit state $\Psi = \psi_0\Phi_I + \psi_1\Phi + \psi_2\Phi + \psi_3\Phi$, and let $\varepsilon(\Psi) = \psi_0\psi_3 - \psi_1\psi_2$. We claim that two states Φ and Ψ are interconvertible by one-qubit operators if and only if $\varepsilon(\Phi) = \varepsilon(\Psi)$; in other words, we claim that the orbits of the action of $SU(2)^2$ on the unit vectors \mathbb{C}^4 are classified by the quadratic form ε . By changing to the Magic Basis [11], we can instead consider the statement that the orbits of $SO(4)$ on \mathbb{C}^4 are classified by $v \mapsto v^T v$. Breaking v into its real and imaginary parts, $v = v_r + iv_i$, we see that $v^T v = v_r^T v_r - v_i^T v_i + 2iv_r^T v_i$. Since we know v to be a unit vector, $v^T v$ encodes the magnitudes of the real and imaginary parts of v , and the angle between them. From this it is clear that two unit vectors v, w in \mathbb{C}^4 can be interchanged by an element of $SO(4)$ if and only if $v^T v = w^T w$, and we have proven our claim. For the purposes of this proof, we call $\mathcal{E}(\Phi)$ the entanglement of Φ , and note that since global phase is irrelevant, two states can be interchanged by one-qubit operators if and only if they have the same entanglement.

It is immediate that our two-qubit gate must be able to prepare a maximally entangled state from an unentangled one. Now fix a two-qubit state $\Phi \in G$ and consider the underspecified circuit given by $(a \ b)G(c \ d)$ where $a; b; c; d$ are placeholders for arbitrary one-qubit operators. Let $v(a; b; c; d)$ be the operator simulated by the circuit, and note that the entanglement of $v(a; b; c; d)\Phi$ is a continuous function of $a; b; c; d$. Now suppose can find $a_0; b_0; c_0; d_0$ such that $v(a_0; b_0; c_0; d_0)\Phi$ is unentangled and $a_1; b_1; c_1; d_1$ such that $v(a_1; b_1; c_1; d_1)\Phi$ is maximally entangled. Then by continuity it follows that an arbitrary state can be prepared using the appropriate choice of $a; b; c; d$.

To prove our claim, it suffices to show that every two-qubit gate maps some unentangled state to some other unentangled state. The unentangled states $\mathfrak{J}i = \phi_0 \mathfrak{J}i + \phi_1 \mathfrak{J}i + \phi_2 \mathfrak{J}i + \phi_3 \mathfrak{J}i$ are those for which $\phi_0 \phi_3 - \phi_1 \phi_2 = 0$. Reducing modulo global phase, they form an codimension 1 subvariety of complex projective 3-space. The states $G\mathfrak{J}i$ for ϕ unentangled form another such, and these subvarieties must intersect. Thus there is some unentangled state $\mathfrak{J}i$ such that $G\mathfrak{J}i$ is also unentangled; now choose a_0, b_0 to be the identity and c_0, d_0 such that $c_0 \mathfrak{J}i - d_0 \mathfrak{J}i = \mathfrak{J}i$. 2

The CNOT gate can prepare maximally entangled states from unentangled states, thus one CNOT gate suffices to prepare an arbitrary two-qubit pure state from $\mathfrak{J}i$. We now give a more explicit construction in this case.

Proposition III.3 *Any two-qubit pure state can be prepared from $\mathfrak{J}i$ using the one CNOT gate and three one-qubit gates.*

Proof: Let $\mathfrak{J}i$ be an arbitrary two-qubit state. We find $c \in SU(2)$ such that $C_2^1(\mathcal{U} - c)\mathfrak{J}i$ is unentangled. Let $c\mathfrak{J}i = u\mathfrak{J}i + v\mathfrak{J}i$; note that $c \in SU(2)$ implies that $c = u\mathfrak{J}i\mathfrak{J}i^\dagger + v\mathfrak{J}i\mathfrak{J}i^\dagger + \bar{u}\mathfrak{J}i\mathfrak{J}i^\dagger + \bar{v}\mathfrak{J}i\mathfrak{J}i^\dagger$. Recall that a two-qubit state $\mathfrak{J}i = \psi_0 \mathfrak{J}i + \psi_1 \mathfrak{J}i + \psi_2 \mathfrak{J}i + \psi_3 \mathfrak{J}i$ is unentangled iff $\epsilon(\mathfrak{J}i) = \psi_0\psi_3 - \psi_1\psi_2 = 0$. We explicitly compute $\epsilon(C_2^1(\mathcal{U} - c)\mathfrak{J}i) = \phi_0\phi_2(u^2 - v^2) + \phi_1\phi_3(\bar{u}^2 - \bar{v}^2) - (\phi_0\phi_3 + \phi_1\phi_2)(u\bar{v} + v\bar{u})$. Making the change of variables $z = u^2 - v^2, \lambda = (u\bar{v} + v\bar{u})$, we note that $\lambda \in \mathbb{R}$ and $z^2 + \lambda^2 = 1$; we want to solve $\phi_0\phi_2 z - \phi_1\phi_3 \bar{z} = (\phi_0\phi_3 + \phi_1\phi_2)\lambda$ for z, λ . This is a linear system with two equations and three unknowns; thus we obtain z, λ up to a scalar multiple, and can choose the scalar so that $z^2 + \lambda^2 = 1$.

As $\mathfrak{J}i = C_2^1(\mathcal{U} - c)\mathfrak{J}i$ is unentangled, let us write it as $\mathfrak{J}i = \mathfrak{J}i\mathfrak{J}i^\dagger$. Let a be the unique operator in $SU(2)$ such that $a\mathfrak{J}i = \mathfrak{J}i$, similarly $b\mathfrak{J}i = \mathfrak{J}i$. Then $(a - b)C_2^1(\mathcal{U} - c)\mathfrak{J}i = \mathfrak{J}i$, hence $(\mathcal{U} - c^\dagger)C_2^1(a^\dagger - b^\dagger)\mathfrak{J}i = \mathfrak{J}i$ as desired. 2

IV. MEASUREMENT DON'T CARES

Fewer gates are required for state preparation because images of basis states other than $\mathfrak{J}i$ can be arbitrary (in other words, we are using additional information about the input). Similarly, we may be able to save gates if we know in advance how the circuit output will be used. In particular, we now suppose that we know the output is to be measured in some predetermined basis.

Suppose we intend to first simulate an operator u on a yet-unspecified input, then take a projective measurement with respect to some given orthogonal subspace decomposition $(\mathbb{C}^2)^n = \bigoplus E_i$, and we are interested only in having the measured state appear in a given subspace with the appropriate probability. In particular, if v is an operator that preserves each subspace E_i , then we do not care whether we implement u or vu . Conversely, if w is any operator which, upon any input, agrees with u after projective measurement with respect to the given subspace decomposition, then it is clear that wu^{-1} preserves each subspace E_i . If a given circuit simulates some such operator w up to phase, we say that this circuit simulates

u up to the measurement don't care associated to the given subspace decomposition.

Mathematically speaking, the problem of state preparation is essentially a special case of a measurement don't care. To prepare the state $\mathfrak{J}i$ from $\mathfrak{J}i$, it is enough to have any operator whose matrix in the computational basis has first column $\mathfrak{J}i$. On the other hand, suppose we are interested in simulating some given operator u , then taking a projective measurement with respect to two orthogonal subspaces: one spanned by $\mathfrak{J}i$ and the other by the rest of the computational basis vectors. Then we may replace u with any operator v such that $u\mathfrak{J}i = v\mathfrak{J}i$; that is, the matrices of u and v must have the same first row in the computational basis. Thus the problem of state preparation amounts to specifying a single column of a matrix, whereas the aforementioned measurement don't care amounts to specifying a single row. Thus Propositions III.1, III.2, and III.3 carry over to this context.

Proposition IV.1 *To simulate an arbitrary n -qubit operator up to a projective measurement onto two subspaces, one of which is one dimensional, at least $(2^n - 3n - 1)/4$ CNOT gates are necessary, and $O(2^n)$ CNOT gates are sufficient. For $n = 2$, one CNOT is necessary and sufficient.*

Suppose now we have a subspace decomposition and an underspecified circuit S which we believe is universal up to the associated measurement don't care – that is, we believe that for any u , appropriate specification of parameters will give a circuit simulating an operator w such that there exists some operator v preserving the subspace decomposition with $vu = w$. Let T be an underspecified circuit that precisely captures the set of operators that fix the subspace decomposition. It is clear that S is universal up to the given measurement don't care if and only if the concatenated circuit ST is universal. Therefore, as we show below, one cannot claim asymptotic savings for this problem in general.

Proposition IV.2 *To simulate an arbitrary n -qubit operator up to a projective measurement in which each of the subspaces is one-dimensional, at least $(4^n - 2^n - 3n)/4$ CNOT gates are required.*

Proof: First, note that an operator v can be right-multiplied by any diagonal operator δ (diagonal in the basis of the measurement) and that the group of diagonal matrices is 2^n -dimensional. Thus, $4^n - 2^n$ parameters must be accounted for. By the proof of Proposition 1 of [5], $(4^n - 2^n - 3n)/4$ CNOT gates are necessary to account for this many parameters. 2

Given that the best known circuit synthesis technique for n -qubit circuits is still a factor of four away from the theoretical lower bound of $(4^n - 3n - 1)/4$, it may be difficult to detect a savings of 2^n gates by analyzing specific circuits. Thus we turn to the two-qubit case, where all bounds are known, tight, and small — no more than three CNOT gates are required, and a savings of even one gate would be significant [5].

On two qubits, there are several different types of measurement possible. We classify them by the subspace dimensions, hence we have “3 + 1”, “2 + 2”, “2 + 1 + 1”, and “1 + 1 + 1 + 1” measurements. In what follows, we will generally require that

each subspace is spanned by computational basis vectors. We will refer collectively to the corresponding measurement don't cares as CB-measurement don't cares. Additionally, when dealing with $2 + 2$ measurements, we assume that one of the qubits is measured; that is, we do not consider the decomposition $\mathbb{C}^4 = \text{span}(|00\rangle, |11\rangle) \oplus \text{span}(|01\rangle, |10\rangle)$. Indeed, measuring a qubit is a common step in quantum algorithms and communication protocols.


We have already seen in Proposition IV.1 that one CNOT is necessary and sufficient in the $3 + 1$ case. We now show that at least two CNOTs are needed in the remaining cases

Proposition IV.3 *Let $\mathbb{C}^4 = \bigoplus E_i$ be a CB-subspace decomposition corresponding to the measurement don't-care M . Suppose no subspace is 3-dimensional, and further that the subspace decomposition is not $\mathbb{C}^4 = \text{span}(|00\rangle, |11\rangle) \oplus \text{span}(|01\rangle, |10\rangle)$. Then there exist two-qubit operators that cannot be simulated up to M by a circuit with only one CNOT.*


Proof: First, we consider subspace decompositions in which neither $\text{span}(|00\rangle, |11\rangle)$, nor $\text{span}(|01\rangle, |10\rangle)$ occur. Remaining cases with $2+1+1$ decompositions using one of those subspaces are considered separately below

Suppose an operator is universal up to a $1 + 1 + 1 + 1$ or $2 + 1 + 1$ CB-measurement don't-care satisfying the above condition. Then combining pairs of 1-dimensional subspaces into 2-dimensional subspaces, we see that the same circuit is universal up to a $2 + 2$ CB-measurement don't-care in which one of the qubits is measured. Suppose, without loss of generality, that it is the higher order qubit, hence that the subspaces are $\text{span}(|00\rangle, |01\rangle)$ and $\text{span}(|10\rangle, |11\rangle)$.


We now compose an arbitrary one-CNOT circuit with a circuit for operators preserving the relevant CB-subspaces, as outlined at the beginning of the section.



By conglomerating adjacent gates, we get




We now convert 3-dimensional place-holders to one-parameter gates, pass R_x and R_z through CNOT where desirable, and conglomerate adjacent gates again.




Observe that this circuit has 13 one-parameter gates, and hence the circuit we started with is not universal.

The $2 + 1 + 1$ cases where the 2-dimensional subspace is $\text{span}(|00\rangle, |11\rangle)$ or $\text{span}(|01\rangle, |10\rangle)$ can be dealt with similarly. We give the circuits preserving these subspace decompositions below; the left circuit corresponds to $\text{span}(|01\rangle, |10\rangle)$ and the right to $\text{span}(|00\rangle, |11\rangle)$.



In both cases, the placeholder marked R_z^0 can be conglomerated with another placeholder, leaving a circuit with 14 one-parameter placeholders. 2

In the $2 + 2$ case where measurement is performed “across qubits”, the key question is whether




is universal. Unfortunately, we have neither been able to find circuit identities to reduce the number of one-parameter gates below 15, nor to show that this circuit is universal.

It is a natural question whether one might do better with a different gate [8]. At least for the $1 + 1 + 1 + 1$ subspace decomposition, the answer is no.

Proposition IV.4 *Fix a two-qubit gate G . There exist two-qubit operators that cannot be simulated up to the $1 + 1 + 1 + 1$ CB-measurement don't care by a circuit limited to one-qubit operators and a single instance of G .*

Proof: We compose the circuit in question with a circuit for simulating a diagonal operator.




We may now merge the R_z gates with the c and d placeholders; there remain 13 parameters — three each in the $a; b; c; d$ placeholders and one in the controlled- R_z gate. Thus this circuit fails to be universal. 2

In a different direction, one may ask whether one can do better by measuring in a different basis.

Proposition IV.5 *Fix an arbitrary basis, and consider the corresponding $1 + 1 + 1 + 1$ measurement don't care, M . Then there exist two-qubit operators that cannot be simulated up to M by a circuit with a single CNOT.*

Proof: We concatenate the circuit in question with a placeholder for a diagonal operator in the given basis.



Counting parameters gives 13 (the placeholder for the diagonal operator counts for three.) Thus this circuit cannot be universal. 2

We finally show that any CB-measurement don't-care eliminates one CNOT in circuits for worst-case operators.






FIG. 1: A universal two-qubit circuit with **three** CNOT gates [5]. It contains seven one-qubit placeholders, which can be translated into 15 placeholders for one-parameter gates.

Proposition IV.6 *The 2-qubit circuit below is universal up to any CB-measurement don't-care.*



Proof: Consider a measurement with respect to any CB-subspace decomposition. The number and the probabilities of outcomes cannot change if we first measure along the $1 + 1 + 1 + 1$ subspace decomposition. Indeed, the number of outcomes is determined by the number of subspaces in the last measurement, and the probabilities of outcomes for a given pure state by squared norms of projections onto those subspaces. In a CB-subspace decomposition, the squared norm of a projection onto a 2- or 3-dimensional subspace equals, by the Pythagorean theorem, the sum of squared norms of projections onto the computational-basis vectors in that subspace. Therefore, a circuit which is universal up to a $1 + 1 + 1 + 1$ CB-measurement don't-care is universal up to any other CB-measurement don't-care, and it suffices to consider the $1 + 1 + 1 + 1$ case.

Recall that the circuit of Figure 1 is universal. As adding a reversible constant gate (e.g., CNOT) to the end does not affect universality, the circuit below is universal as well.



Observe that the right portion of this circuit simulates a diagonal operator, which preserves the subspaces spanned by the computational basis vectors. Thus, by the discussion earlier in the section, the left portion of this circuit is universal up to measurement in the computational basis. 2

In applications such as QKD, one may not know in advance which basis to measure in, but rather that one will choose at random between a given pair of bases for measurement. To save gates in this context, one could maintain two different circuits, one for each type of measurement. While it may seem

counterintuitive that building two circuits would save on gates, note that the “circuit” here consists of classical instructions to initiate a given laser pulse at a given time, thus we may maintain as many as we like in the memory of the classical computer we are using to control the quantum system.

An alternative approach to saving gates in such a context is to try and find circuits which simulate the desired operator up to either of the possible measurements. The only fact we used about the computational basis in the proof of Proposition IV.6 was that operators expressible as $C_2^\dagger (I - R_z(\theta)) C_2$ are diagonal in the computational basis. Such operators are also diagonal in any basis in which each vector lies in either $\text{span}(|\uparrow\rangle; |\downarrow\rangle)$ or $\text{span}(|\downarrow\rangle; |\uparrow\rangle)$. In particular, this includes bases of Bell states.

Proposition IV.7 *Two CNOTs suffice to simulate any two-qubit operator up to any measurement in a not necessarily predisclosed basis in which each vector lies in either $\text{span}(|\uparrow\rangle; |\downarrow\rangle)$ or $\text{span}(|\downarrow\rangle; |\uparrow\rangle)$.*

V. CONCLUSIONS

Algorithms and lower bounds for quantum circuit synthesis have significantly advanced in the last two years. In particular, several universal two-qubit circuits with optimal gate counts are available [3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8], and, in the general case of n -qubit circuits, asymptotically optimal gate counts can be realized by published matrix-decomposition algorithms [9, 10].

In this context, we recall that quantum algorithms and cryptographic protocols often apply measurements, known in advance, after reversible quantum circuits. This allows a greater variety of circuits to be functionally equivalent, and we prove that useful information about measurement often facilitates finding smaller circuits. Taking into account a known input state also decreases circuit sizes. Both cases can be viewed as circuit synthesis for incompletely specified operators.

Specific results proven in our work include a dramatic asymptotic reduction in CNOT counts and overall gate counts for n -qubit circuits. In the case of two qubits where optimal gate counts are known, we show that restricting the final measurement to the computational basis saves one CNOT out of three for generic operators, and knowing in advance that the input to the circuit is $|\uparrow\rangle$ saves two.

Acknowledgements. This work is funded by the DARPA QuIST program and an NSF grant. The views and conclusions contained herein are those of the authors and should not be interpreted as necessarily representing official policies or endorsements of employers and funding agencies.

-
- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, England, 2000).
 - [2] S. S. Bullock and I. L. Markov, “An Elementary Two-Qubit Quantum Computation In Twenty-Three Elementary Gates,”

Phys. Rev. A **68**, 012318 (2003).

- [3] G. Vidal and C. M. Dawson, “A universal quantum circuit for two-qubit transformations with three CNOT gates,” Phys. Rev. A **69**, 010301 (2004).

- [4] F. Vatan and C. Williams, “Optimal Realization of an Arbitrary

- Two-Qubit Quantum Gate”, *Phys. Rev. A* **69**, 032315 (2004).
- [5] V. V. Shende, I. L. Markov, and S. S. Bullock, “Minimal universal two-qubit controlled-NOT-based circuits,” [quant-ph/0308033](#).
 - [6] V. V. Shende, S. S. Bullock, and I. L. Markov, “Recognizing small-circuit structure in two-qubit operators,” [quant-ph/0308045](#).
 - [7] J. Zhang, J. Vala, S. Sastry, K. B. Whaley, “Optimal quantum circuit synthesis from Controlled-U gates,” [quant-ph/0308167](#).
 - [8] J. Zhang, J. Vala, S. Sastry and K. B. Whaley, “Minimum construction of two-qubit quantum operations,” [quant-ph/0312193](#).
 - [9] J. Vartiainen et al., “Efficient decomposition of quantum gates,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **92**, 177902 (2004).
 - [10] M. Mottonen et al., “Universal quantum computation,” [quant-ph/0404089](#).
 - [11] C. Bennett et al., “Mixed State Entanglement and Quantum Error Correction,” *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996).