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The math of quantum computing on one slide

- Qubit is superposition of 0 and 1: $\alpha_0 |0\rangle + \alpha_1 |1\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^2$

- $n$-qubit system: superposition of all $n$-bit strings: $\alpha_x |x\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2^n}$

- Measurement: see outcome $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ with probability $|\alpha_x|^2$

- Unitary transformation: matrix that preserves the length of the vector of amplitudes.

- Gates: unitaries on 1 qubit
  - $X = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$
  - $Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$
  - $T = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\pi/4} \end{pmatrix}$
  - $H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$

- or on 2 qubits, CNOT: $|a, b\rangle \rightarrow |a, a \oplus b\rangle$

- Combine simultaneous gates via tensor product, combine sequential gates via matrix product
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Quantum algorithms

1. Start with qubits in some simple state (e.g. all $|0\rangle$)

2. Run circuit of gates to create the right interference, so final state has most of its weight on solutions to your computational problem

3. Measuring final state then gives solution to your problem

Two important questions:

▶ Can we build such a computer?

▶ What can it do?
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3. Measuring final state then gives solution to your problem
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Quantum algorithms: main examples that we know

▶ Shor’s algorithm ’94: can factor large integers and find discrete logarithms efficiently (runtime quadratic in number input bits)

▶ Grover’s algorithm ’96: search through an unstructured search space of size $N$ in time $\sqrt{N}$

▶ Quantum walks ’00ff: for more structured search problems on graphs, typically quadratic quantum speed-up or less

▶ HHL algorithm ’09: can solve a sparse, well-conditioned linear system $Ax = b$ very efficiently, but provides the answer as a quantum state $\text{Prob}(i) |i\rangle$ (when is this useful?)

▶ Hamiltonian simulation ’96ff: given classical description of a local Hamiltonian $H = \sum_j H_j$, implement the unitary evolution $e^{-iHt}$ as a small circuit of gates
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Quantum machine learning

- Machine learning: huge success since ± 2012

Hard-to-assess claims about speedups for natural problems using variational circuits ("quantum neural networks")

Proven claims about quantum improvements in time/sample complexity for problems with quantum data

Proven but subsequently dequantized quantum ML algorithms (Kerenidis-Prakash recommendation system by Ewin Tang)
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This talk: theoretical aspects of quantum ML

ML = data + optimization

Classical learner

Quantum learner

Classical data

Quantum data

Subareas of ML:

1. Supervised learning: from labeled data
   PAC learning from quantum data, positive & negative results

2. Unsupervised learning: from unlabeled data
   Quantum linear algebra, e.g. Principal Component Analysis

3. Reinforcement learning: from interaction with the environment
   Very interesting, but won't cover it here
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- **Subareas of ML:**

  1. **Supervised learning:** from labeled data
     PAC learning from quantum data, positive & negative results

  2. **Unsupervised learning:** from unlabeled data
     Quantum linear algebra, e.g. Principal Component Analysis

  3. **Reinforcement learning:** from interaction with the environment
     Very interesting, but won’t cover it here
A mathematical model for supervised learning: PAC

Concept: some function $f: X \rightarrow \{-1, 1\}$ (think $X = \{0, 1\}^n$)

Concept class $C$: set of concepts, e.g. small circuits, DNFs, ...

Want to learn unknown target concept $f \in C$ from examples: $(x, f(x))$, where $x \sim$ unknown distribution $D$ on $X$.

Goal: using some i.i.d. examples, learner for $C$ should output hypothesis $h$ that is probably approximately correct (PAC).

Error of $h$ w.r.t. target $f$: $err_D(f, h) = \Pr_{x \sim D}[f(x) \neq h(x)]$

An algorithm $(\varepsilon, \delta)$-PAC-learns $C$ if:

$\forall f \in C \forall D: \Pr[ err_D(f, h) \leq \varepsilon | \{z\} ] \geq 1 - \delta$
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▶ Much interesting quantum ML assumes classical data can be turned into quantum superposition. But this is expensive...

▶ Let’s try to circumvent the problem of putting classical data in superposition, by assuming we start from quantum data

▶ Bshouty-Jackson’95: suppose example is a superposition

\[ \sum_{x \in \mathcal{X}} \sqrt{\mathcal{D}(x)} |x, f(x)\rangle \]

Measuring this quantum state gives classical example \( \sim \mathcal{D} \)
so quantum examples are at least as powerful as classical

▶ Next slides: some cases where quantum examples are more powerful than classical for a fixed distribution \( \mathcal{D} \)
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$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} f(x)|x\rangle$$

Hadamard transform turns this into

$$\sum_{s \in \{0,1\}^n} \hat{f}(s)|s\rangle$$

$$\hat{f}(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x} f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x}$$ are the Fourier coefficients of $f$
Uniform quantum examples can help sometimes

- Quantum example for target concept $f$ under uniform $D$:
  \[
  \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} |x, f(x)\rangle
  \]

- Key subroutine: Fourier sampling (Bernstein-Vazirani’93):
  Can convert (with probability $1/2$) quantum example to
  \[
  \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} f(x)|x\rangle
  \]

  Hadamard transform turns this into
  \[
  \sum_{s \in \{0,1\}^n} \hat{f}(s)|s\rangle,
  \]

  \[
  \hat{f}(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x}
  \]
  are the Fourier coefficients of $f$

- This allows us to sample $s$ from distribution $\hat{f}(s)^2$
Two cases where Fourier sampling helps learning

Concept class $C$ of linear functions (mod 2):

$$f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x}$$ for fixed $a \in \{0, 1\}$.

Linear functions have very simple Fourier coefficients:

$$b_f(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x (-1)^{(a \oplus s) \cdot x} = 1$$ if $s = a$, 0 otherwise

We can learn $a$ (and hence $f$) from one Fourier sample!

▶ Bshouty-Jackson'95: learn Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF)
formulas in poly-time under uniform $D$:
Fourier sampling gives a parity-function that's weakly correlated with target DNF function $f$,
can combine this with classical "boosting" to find good hypothesis $h$.

Best known classical learner takes time $n \tilde{O}(\log n)$

▶ But what about learners that work for all $D$?
Two cases where Fourier sampling helps learning

- Concept class $\mathcal{C}$ of linear functions (mod 2):
  $f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x}$ for fixed $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$. 
Two cases where Fourier sampling helps learning

- Concept class \( \mathcal{C} \) of linear functions (mod 2):
  \[ f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x} \text{ for fixed } a \in \{0, 1\}^n. \]
  Linear functions have very simple Fourier coefficients:
  \[ \hat{f}(s) \]
Two cases where Fourier sampling helps learning

- Concept class $\mathcal{C}$ of linear functions (mod 2):
  $f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x}$ for fixed $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

  Linear functions have very simple Fourier coefficients:
  $\hat{f}(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x}$
Two cases where Fourier sampling helps learning

▶ Concept class $C$ of linear functions (mod 2):
$f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x}$ for fixed $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$.
Linear functions have very simple Fourier coefficients:

\[
\hat{f}(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x (-1)^{(a \oplus s) \cdot x}
\]
Two cases where Fourier sampling helps learning

- Concept class $\mathcal{C}$ of linear functions (mod 2):
  $f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x}$ for fixed $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

  Linear functions have very simple Fourier coefficients:
  $$\hat{f}(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x (-1)^{(a \oplus s) \cdot x} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s = a \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
Two cases where Fourier sampling helps learning

Concept class $C$ of linear functions (mod 2):
$f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x}$ for fixed $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

Linear functions have very simple Fourier coefficients:

\[ \hat{f}(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x (-1)^{(a \oplus s) \cdot x} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s = a \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \]

We can learn $a$ (and hence $f$) from one Fourier sample!
Two cases where Fourier sampling helps learning

- Concept class $\mathcal{C}$ of linear functions (mod 2):
  \[ f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x} \text{ for fixed } a \in \{0, 1\}^n. \]
  Linear functions have very simple Fourier coefficients:
  \[
  \hat{f}(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x (-1)^{(a \oplus s) \cdot x} = \begin{cases} 
  1 & \text{if } s = a \\
  0 & \text{otherwise}
  \end{cases}
  \]
  We can learn $a$ (and hence $f$) from one Fourier sample!

- Bshouty-Jackson’95: learn Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF) formulas in poly-time under uniform $D$:
Two cases where Fourier sampling helps learning

- Concept class $C$ of linear functions (mod 2):
  $f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x}$ for fixed $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$.
  Linear functions have very simple Fourier coefficients:
  $\hat{f}(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x (-1)^{(a \oplus s) \cdot x} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s = a \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$
  We can learn $a$ (and hence $f$) from one Fourier sample!

- Bshouty-Jackson'95: learn Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF) formulas in poly-time under uniform $D$:
  Fourier sampling gives a parity-function that’s weakly correlated with target DNF function $f$, 

Two cases where Fourier sampling helps learning

- Concept class $\mathcal{C}$ of **linear functions** (mod 2):
  
  $f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x}$ for fixed $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

  Linear functions have very simple Fourier coefficients:
  
  $\hat{f}(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x (-1)^{(a \oplus s) \cdot x} = \begin{cases} 
    1 & \text{if } s = a \\
    0 & \text{otherwise}
  \end{cases}$

  We can learn $a$ (and hence $f$) from one Fourier sample!

- Bshouty-Jackson’95: learn Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF) formulas in poly-time under uniform $\mathcal{D}$:

  Fourier sampling gives a parity-function that’s weakly correlated with target DNF function $f$, can combine this with classical “boosting” to find good hypothesis $h$. 
Two cases where Fourier sampling helps learning

- Concept class $\mathcal{C}$ of linear functions (mod 2):
  $$f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x}$$ for fixed $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

  Linear functions have very simple Fourier coefficients:
  $$\hat{f}(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x (-1)^{(a \oplus s) \cdot x} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s = a \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

  We can learn $a$ (and hence $f$) from one Fourier sample!

- Bshouty-Jackson'95: learn Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF) formulas in poly-time under uniform $\mathcal{D}$:
  Fourier sampling gives a parity-function that’s weakly correlated with target DNF function $f$, can combine this with classical “boosting” to find good hypothesis $h$.

  Best known classical learner takes time $n^{O(\log n)}$
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- **Concept class $C$ of linear functions (mod 2):**
  $$f(x) = (-1)^{a \cdot x}$$
  for fixed $a \in \{0, 1\}^n$.
  Linear functions have very simple Fourier coefficients:
  $$\hat{f}(s) = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x f(x)(-1)^{s \cdot x} = \frac{1}{2^n} \sum_x (-1)^{(a \oplus s) \cdot x} = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } s = a \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$
  We can learn $a$ (and hence $f$) from one Fourier sample!

- **Bshouty-Jackson'95:** learn Disjunctive Normal Form (DNF) formulas in poly-time under uniform $D$:
  Fourier sampling gives a parity-function that’s weakly correlated with target DNF function $f$, can combine this with classical “boosting” to find good hypothesis $h$.
  Best known classical learner takes time $n^{O(\log n)}$

- **But what about learners that work for all $D$?**
VC-dimension determines sample complexity in PAC model

Cornerstone of classical sample complexity: VC-dimension

\[ \text{VC-dim}(C) = \max \{ d : \exists S \subseteq X \text{ of size } d \text{ shattered by } C \} \]

Set \( S = \{ s_1, \ldots, s_d \} \subseteq X \) is shattered by \( C \) if for all \( \ell \in \{0, 1\}^d \), there is an \( f \in C \) s.t.

\[ \forall i \in [d] : f(s_i) = \ell_i \]

Classical sample complexity of \((\varepsilon, \delta)-\text{PAC-learner for } C\):

\[ \Theta(d \varepsilon + \log(1/\delta)) \varepsilon \]

Arunachalam & dW'17: same bound for quantum sample complexity!

Hence in distribution-independent PAC learning quantum examples are not significantly better than classical
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Early example: HHL algorithm to solve linear system $Ax = b$: given ability to prepare $|b\rangle$ and implement $e^{iA}$, we can efficiently compute solution-vector as quantum state $|x\rangle$

Modern approach: block-encoding of a matrix $A$ into a unitary $U = A \cdot \cdot \cdot U |0\rangle|\psi\rangle = |0\rangle A |\psi\rangle + |1\rangle |?\rangle$

Singular-value transformation (Gilyén, Su ao): can efficiently apply low-degree polynomial to $A$. Can recover most known quantum algorithms this way, and design new algorithms
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- View data-vector as amplitudes of quantum state 
  \( (d \text{ dimensions} \rightarrow \log(d) \text{ qubits}) \), manipulate with unitaries
- Early example: HHL algorithm to solve linear system \( Ax = b \): 
given ability to prepare \( |b\rangle \) and implement \( e^{iA} \), we can efficiently compute solution-vector as quantum state \( |x\rangle \)
- Modern approach: block-encoding of a matrix \( A \) into a unitary

\[
U = \begin{pmatrix} A & \cdots \\ \vdots & \ddots \end{pmatrix} \quad U|0\rangle|\psi\rangle = |0\rangle A|\psi\rangle + |1\rangle|?\rangle
\]

- Singular-value transformation (Gilyén, Su ao): can efficiently apply low-degree polynomial to \( A \). Can recover most known quantum algorithms this way, and design new algorithms
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Unsupervised learning: quantum PCA (LMR’14)

Principal Component Analysis: given vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$, reduce dimension to $k$ by projecting on top-$k$ eigenvectors of $A = \sum_{i=1}^{m} v_i v_i^T$

Suppose we can efficiently prepare $\log(d)$-qubit state $|v_i\rangle$. Doing this for a random $i$ gives "mixed" quantum state $\rho = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} |v_i\rangle\langle v_i| = \frac{1}{m} A$.

This quantum state has the same eigenvectors as $A$.

Quantum PCA: extract top-$k$ eigenvectors as quantum states via "phase estimation" on a copy of $\rho$.

For that we want to implement (powers of) the unitary $e^{i\rho}$.

We can implement $e^{i\rho\delta}$ with error $O(\delta^2)$ using one copy of $\rho$.

Doing this $O(t/\delta)$ times with $\delta = \epsilon/t$ implements $e^{i\rho t}$ with error $\epsilon$. 


Unsupervised learning: quantum PCA (LMR’14)

- Principal Component Analysis: given vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$, reduce dimension to $k$
Unsupervised learning: quantum PCA (LMR’14)

- Principal Component Analysis: given vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$, reduce dimension to $k$ by projecting on top-$k$ eigenvectors of

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^{m} v_i v_i^T$$

Suppose we can efficiently prepare $\log(d)$-qubit state $|v_i\rangle$. Doing this for a random $i$ gives "mixed" quantum state $\rho = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} |v_i\rangle \langle v_i|$. This quantum state has the same eigenvectors as $A$.

Quantum PCA: extract top-$k$ eigenvectors as quantum states via "phase estimation" on a copy of $\rho$. For that we want to implement $(\text{powers of})$ the unitary $e^{i\rho \delta}$. We can implement $e^{i\rho \delta}$ with error $O(\delta^2)$ using one copy of $\rho$. Doing this $O\left(\frac{t}{\delta}\right)$ times with $\delta = \frac{\epsilon}{t}$ implements $e^{i\rho t}$ with error $\epsilon$. 
Unsupervised learning: quantum PCA (LMR’14)

- Principal Component Analysis: given vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$, reduce dimension to $k$ by projecting on top-$k$ eigenvectors of

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^{m} v_i v_i^T$$

- Suppose we can efficiently prepare $\log(d)$-qubit state $|v_i\rangle$. Doing this for a random $i$ gives “mixed” quantum state

$$\rho = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} |v_i\rangle \langle v_i|$$
Unsupervised learning: quantum PCA (LMR’14)

- Principal Component Analysis: given vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$, reduce dimension to $k$ by projecting on top-$k$ eigenvectors of

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^{m} v_i v_i^T$$

- Suppose we can efficiently prepare $\log(d)$-qubit state $|v_i\rangle$. Doing this for a random $i$ gives “mixed” quantum state $\rho = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} |v_i\rangle\langle v_i| = \frac{1}{m} A$
Unsupervised learning: quantum PCA (LMR’14)
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▶ Principal Component Analysis: given vectors $v_1, \ldots, v_m \in \mathbb{R}^d$, reduce dimension to $k$ by projecting on top-$k$ eigenvectors of

$$A = \sum_{i=1}^{m} v_i v_i^T$$

▶ Suppose we can efficiently prepare $\log(d)$-qubit state $|v_i\rangle$. Doing this for a random $i$ gives “mixed” quantum state

$$\rho = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} |v_i\rangle\langle v_i| = \frac{1}{m} A$$

This quantum state has the same eigenvectors as $A$

▶ Quantum PCA: extract top-$k$ eigenvectors as quantum states via “phase estimation” on a copy of $\rho$. For that we want to implement (powers of) the unitary $e^{i\rho}$. We can implement $e^{i\rho \delta}$ with error $O(\delta^2)$ using one copy of $\rho$. Doing this $O(t/\delta)$ times with $\delta = \varepsilon/t$ implements $e^{i\rho t}$ with error $\varepsilon$. 
Quantum speedups for optimization problems

- ML = data + optimization.
  - If data is classical, we can still try to speed up optimization
    - Discrete optimization: for graph problems (shortest paths, sparsification), string problems, backtracking, dynamic programming. Often uses amplitude amplification/estimation
    - Continuous optimization: for linear programs, semidefinite programs, matrix scaling and balancing, linear regression. . .
    - Gradient descent: common iterative method to find local minimum of $f: \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$
      - Move current point along the direction of steepest descent ($= -\text{gradient of } f$ at current point).
      - Jordan's algorithm can compute gradient more efficiently
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Move current point along the direction of steepest descent ($= -\text{gradient of } f$ at current point).

Jordan’s algorithm can compute gradient more efficiently
One example of a quantum optimization algorithm for ML

Given \( m \) points \((x_1, y_1), \ldots, (x_m, y_m)\) with \( x_i \in \mathbb{R}^d \), \( y_i \in \mathbb{R} \), fit line through them:

Find coefficient-vector \( \theta \in \mathbb{R}^d \) s.t. linear function \( x^T \theta \) is a good predictor of \( y \)-variable

Find \( \theta \) to minimize least-squares loss \( L(\theta) = \frac{1}{m} \sum_{i=1}^{m} (x^T \theta - y_i)^2 \)

Closed-form solution for the minimizer:

\[
\theta^* = (X^T X)^+ X^T y
\]

Problems: this tends to overfit and yield very dense \( \theta \)-vectors

Lasso adds "\( \ell_1 \)-regularizer": min \( L(\theta) \) subject to \( \sum_{j=1}^{d} |\theta_j| \leq 1 \)
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- Machine learning = data + optimization

- Quantum data (superposition of classical data) can sometimes be useful, but not in distribution-independent PAC learning

- “Quantum linear algebra” can be useful to efficiently extract properties of data as quantum states

- There’s a growing body of quantum speedups for optimization problems, some rigorous and some heuristic. Much of this could be applied to ML problems