The ZX-calculus is incomplete for quantum mechanics

Christian Schröder de Witt [1] Vladimir Zamdzhiev [2]

[1] Scherenbergstr. 22, 10439 Berlin

[2] Department of Computer Science,
University of Oxford

5 June 2014

ZX-calculus

- Introduced by Coecke and Duncan in 2008

ZX-calculus

- Introduced by Coecke and Duncan in 2008
- Diagramatic logical calculus for studying quantum information processing

ZX-calculus

- Introduced by Coecke and Duncan in 2008
- Diagramatic logical calculus for studying quantum information processing
- Can be used as an alternative to traditional Hilbert space formalism

ZX-calculus

- Introduced by Coecke and Duncan in 2008
- Diagramatic logical calculus for studying quantum information processing
- Can be used as an alternative to traditional Hilbert space formalism
- Has been used to study:
  - Quantum algorithms
  - Quantum security protocols
  - Quantum error-correcting codes
  - and other problems involving quantum information

Atomic Diagrams (1)

$\llbracket$ $\rrbracket = \begin{pmatrix}1 & 0\\ 0 & 1\end{pmatrix} = I$

$\llbracket$  $\rrbracket = \begin{pmatrix}1 & 0 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0\\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0\\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1\end{pmatrix} = \sigma$

$\llbracket$  $\rrbracket = \langle 00| + \langle 11|$

$\llbracket$  $\rrbracket = |00\rangle + |11\rangle$

$\llbracket$  $\rrbracket = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\begin{pmatrix}1 & 1\\ 1 & -1\end{pmatrix} = H$

Atomic Diagrams (2)



$$= \begin{cases} |0^m\rangle & \mapsto |0^n\rangle \\ |1^m\rangle & \mapsto e^{i\alpha}|1^n\rangle \\ \text{rest} & \mapsto 0 \end{cases}$$



$$= \begin{cases} |+^m\rangle & \mapsto |+^n\rangle \\ |-^m\rangle & \mapsto e^{i\alpha}|-^n\rangle \\ \text{rest} & \mapsto 0 \end{cases}$$

where $\alpha \in [0, 2\pi)$

Compound Diagrams



$= D_1$ and



$= D_2$

then



$= D_1 \otimes D_2$

and



$= D_1 \circ D_2$

Examples

$\llbracket$  $\rrbracket = \sqrt{2}\,|0\rangle$

$\llbracket$  $\rrbracket = \sqrt{2}\,|1\rangle$

$\llbracket$  $\rrbracket = \sqrt{2}\,|+\rangle$

$\llbracket$  $\rrbracket = \sqrt{2}\,|-\rangle$

$\llbracket$  $\rrbracket = \mathsf{Z}$

$\llbracket$  $\rrbracket = \mathsf{X}$

$\llbracket$  $\rrbracket = \mathsf{CNOT}$

Axioms (1)

"Only the topology matters"

Example



Axioms (2)





Axioms (3)



Axioms (4)

- 
- 
- 

Axioms (5)



Axioms(6)



Example derivation



Soundness, Completeness and Universality results

- The ZX-calculus is sound

Soundness, Completeness and Universality results

- The ZX-calculus is sound
  - $ZX \vdash D_1 = D_2 \Longrightarrow [\![D_1]\!] = e^{i\phi}[\![D_2]\!]$

Soundness, Completeness and Universality results

- The ZX-calculus is sound
  - $ZX \vdash D_1 = D_2 \implies [\![D_1]\!] = e^{i\phi}[\![D_2]\!]$
- The ZX-calculus is universal

Soundness, Completeness and Universality results

- The ZX-calculus is sound
  - $ZX \vdash D_1 = D_2 \implies [\![D_1]\!] = e^{i\phi}[\![D_2]\!]$
- The ZX-calculus is universal
  - $\forall U : \mathcal{Q}^n \to \mathcal{Q}^m,\ \exists D.[\![D]\!] = U$

Soundness, Completeness and Universality results

- The ZX-calculus is sound
  - $ZX \vdash D_1 = D_2 \implies [\![D_1]\!] = e^{i\phi}[\![D_2]\!]$
- The ZX-calculus is universal
  - $\forall U : \mathcal{Q}^n \to \mathcal{Q}^m,\ \exists D.[\![D]\!] = U$
- Completeness of ZX (with the Euler decomposition of the Hadamard gate rule) was unknown.

Soundness, Completeness and Universality results

- The ZX-calculus is sound
  - $ZX \vdash D_1 = D_2 \implies [\![D_1]\!] = e^{i\phi}[\![D_2]\!]$
- The ZX-calculus is universal
  - $\forall U : \mathcal{Q}^n \to \mathcal{Q}^m,\ \exists D.[\![D]\!] = U$
- Completeness of ZX (with the Euler decomposition of the Hadamard gate rule) was unknown.
  - $[\![D_1]\!] = [\![D_2]\!] \implies ZX \vdash D_1 = D_2$

Soundness, Completeness and Universality results

- The ZX-calculus is sound
  - $ZX \vdash D_1 = D_2 \implies [\![D_1]\!] = e^{i\phi}[\![D_2]\!]$
- The ZX-calculus is universal
  - $\forall U : \mathcal{Q}^n \to \mathcal{Q}^m,\ \exists D.[\![D]\!] = U$
- Completeness of ZX (with the Euler decomposition of the Hadamard gate rule) was unknown.
  - $[\![D_1]\!] = [\![D_2]\!] \implies ZX \vdash D_1 = D_2$
- The ZX-calculus is complete for stabilizer quantum mechanics

Soundness, Completeness and Universality results

- The ZX-calculus is sound
  - $ZX \vdash D_1 = D_2 \implies [\![D_1]\!] = e^{i\phi}[\![D_2]\!]$
- The ZX-calculus is universal
  - $\forall U : \mathcal{Q}^n \to \mathcal{Q}^m,\ \exists D.[\![D]\!] = U$
- Completeness of ZX (with the Euler decomposition of the Hadamard gate rule) was unknown.
  - $[\![D_1]\!] = [\![D_2]\!] \implies ZX \vdash D_1 = D_2$
- The ZX-calculus is complete for stabilizer quantum mechanics
  - If D_1 and D_2 are ZX-SQM diagrams and $[\![D_1]\!] = [\![D_2]\!]$ then $ZX \vdash D_1 = D_2$

Euler Decomposition

Recall that for single-qubit unitary maps:



where $\alpha_i, \beta_i, \gamma_i, \phi_i \in [0, 2\pi)$

Alternative Models

Consider the following models:



$$[\![\cdot]\!]_k := [\![\cdot]\!] \text{ , otherwise}$$

These models are sound when $k = 4p + 1$ for $p \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Counter-example diagrams

$D_1 :=$ 

and $D_2 :=$ 

Counter-example diagrams (cont.)

where

$$\alpha := -\arccos\left(\frac{5}{2\sqrt{13}}\right) \approx 0.2561\pi$$

$$\beta := -2\arcsin\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right) \approx -0.2851\pi$$

$$\phi := \arcsin\left(\frac{\sqrt{3}}{4}\right) - \alpha \approx 0.3987\pi$$

Incomplete

We have:

$$[\![D_1]\!] = [\![D_2]\!]$$

but for any $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$:

$$[\![D_1]\!]_{-3} \neq \lambda [\![D_2]\!]_{-3}$$

However, $[\![\cdot]\!]_{-3}$ is a sound model of ZX, so

$$ZX \nvdash D1 = D2$$

and therefore the ZX-calculus is incomplete for quantum mechanics.

ZX is incomplete, what next?

- Nothing special about counter-example, others easily doable using the same approach

ZX is incomplete, what next?

- Nothing special about counter-example, others easily doable using the same approach
- Color-swap rule might be needed for completeness

ZX is incomplete, what next?

- Nothing special about counter-example, others easily doable using the same approach
- Color-swap rule might be needed for completeness



where

$$\alpha_2 := f_1(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1) \quad ; \quad f_1 = ?$$
$$\beta_2 := f_2(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1) \quad ; \quad f_2 = ?$$
$$\gamma_2 := f_3(\alpha_1, \beta_1, \gamma_1) \quad ; \quad f_3 = ?$$

Even then, more challenges



Approximate completeness instead?

- Restrict generators, drop universality and work towards approximate completeness

Approximate completeness instead?

- Restrict generators, drop universality and work towards approximate completeness
- If diagram angles are of the form $\frac{k\pi}{2}$ (Stabilizer QM):

Approximate completeness instead?

- Restrict generators, drop universality and work towards approximate completeness
- If diagram angles are of the form $\frac{k\pi}{2}$ (Stabilizer QM):
  - completeness holds

Approximate completeness instead?

- Restrict generators, drop universality and work towards approximate completeness
- If diagram angles are of the form $\frac{k\pi}{2}$ (Stabilizer QM):
    - completeness holds
    - calculus is not even approximately universal

Approximate completeness instead?

- Restrict generators, drop universality and work towards approximate completeness
- If diagram angles are of the form $\frac{k\pi}{2}$ (Stabilizer QM):
  - completeness holds
  - calculus is not even approximately universal
- If diagram angles are of the form $\frac{k\pi}{4}$ (Clifford+T):

Approximate completeness instead?

- Restrict generators, drop universality and work towards approximate completeness
- If diagram angles are of the form $\frac{k\pi}{2}$ (Stabilizer QM):
  - completeness holds
  - calculus is not even approximately universal
- If diagram angles are of the form $\frac{k\pi}{4}$ (Clifford+T):
  - calculus is approximately universal

Approximate completeness instead?

- Restrict generators, drop universality and work towards approximate completeness
- If diagram angles are of the form $\frac{k\pi}{2}$ (Stabilizer QM):
  - completeness holds
  - calculus is not even approximately universal
- If diagram angles are of the form $\frac{k\pi}{4}$ (Clifford+T):
  - calculus is approximately universal
  - calculus is complete for line-graphs (next talk)

Approximate completeness instead?

- Restrict generators, drop universality and work towards approximate completeness
- If diagram angles are of the form $\frac{k\pi}{2}$ (Stabilizer QM):
  - completeness holds
  - calculus is not even approximately universal
- If diagram angles are of the form $\frac{k\pi}{4}$ (Clifford+T):
  - calculus is approximately universal
  - calculus is complete for line-graphs (next talk)
  - completeness is unknown