

Title: Generalized contextuality as a necessary resource for universal quantum computation

Speakers: David Schmid

Collection: Foundations of Quantum Computational Advantage

Date: May 02, 2024 - 10:00 AM

URL: <https://pirsa.org/24050010>

Abstract: A universal and well-motivated notion of classicality for an operational theory is explainability by a generalized-noncontextual ontological model. I will here explain what notion of classicality this implies within the framework of generalized probabilistic theories. I then prove that for any locally tomographic theory, every such classical model is given by a complete frame representation. Using this powerful constraint on the space of possible classical representations, I will then prove that the stabilizer subtheory has a unique classical representation--namely Gross's discrete Wigner function. This provides deep insights into the relevance of Gross's representation within quantum computation. It also implies that generalized contextuality is also a necessary resource for universal quantum computation in the state injection model.



# Generalized contextuality as a necessary resource for universal quantum computing

**David Schmid**

Haoxing Du  
John Selby  
Matt Pusey

**Rob Spekkens**

Ravi Kunjwal  
Elie Wolfe

International Centre for Theory of Quantum Technologies (ICTQT)



A puzzle



Gross's discrete Wigner representation has been very useful in studying quantum computation




- Gottesman-Knill theorem extends to all processes represented nonnegatively in Gross's representation
- every state useful for magic state distillation has negativity in Gross's representation
- every state that promotes the stabilizer subtheory to universal quantum computation via magic state distillation must be Kochen-Specker contextual
- negativity in Gross's repn is a necessary resource for computation



But negativity in one particular quasiprobability repn is *not* generally sufficient to establish nonclassicality


Why would negativity in one particular repn (Gross's) be associated to a strong form of nonclassicality (UQC)?

Because Gross's is the unique classical (noncontextual) representation!



# Process Theory $\mathcal{G}$


collection of processes  
(on some systems)  
which is closed under  
composition




# Diagram Preserving $m$

$$\eta : \mathcal{G} \rightarrow \mathcal{G}'$$

takes processes from one theory  
to processes of another



commutes with composition




# Quantum theory as a process theory

systems are vector spaces of Hermitian operators on Hilbert spaces  
processes are channels

- processes with no inputs are density operators
- processes with no outputs are POVM elements
- composition of channels defined as usual



$$\text{Tr}[E\mathcal{E}(\rho)] =$$



# Substochastic matrices as a process theor




systems are sets

processes are substochastic maps

- processes with no inputs are sub-norm prob distributions
- processes with no outputs are response functions
- composition is matrix multiplication

$$\sum_{\lambda, \lambda'} \xi(\lambda') \Gamma(\lambda' | \lambda) \mu(\lambda) =$$



e.g. Louivillian mechanics

# QuasiSubstochastic matrices as a process

systems are sets


processes are **quasi**substochastic maps



$$\sum_{\lambda, \lambda'} \xi(\lambda') \Gamma(\lambda' | \lambda) \mu(\lambda)$$

can go negative!

=



# a GPT as a process theory


systems are real vector spaces

processes are linear maps on the vector space

- processes with no inputs are vectors in the space
- processes with no outputs are covectors
- composition of linear maps defined as usual



$$e(\mathbf{T}(\mathbf{s})) =$$




## Prepare-measure intuition for a GPT



state space



effect space



inner products give  $\Pr(\text{effect}|\text{state})$

- observable statistics (and hence the theory) are given by the geometry
- two GPT processes are distinct IFF they give distinct probabilities in at least one circuit



# Representations of GPTs

Quantum 8, 1283




# Ontological model of a GPT

Linear, diagram-preserving map


$$\xi : \mathbf{GPT} \rightarrow \mathbf{SubStoch}$$

which: 1) reproduces the predictions



2) represents ignoring appropriately

# Example:




# Quasiprobability repn

## ~~Ontological model~~ of a GPT

Linear, diagram-preserving map

$$\xi : \mathbf{GPT} \rightarrow \mathbf{SubStoch} \\ \mathbf{QuasiSubStoch}$$



which:

1) reproduces the predictions

2) represents ignoring appropriately

Clearly, a *positive* quasiprobability representation is just an OM!

## Classicality = generalized noncontextuality



- motivated by Leibniz's principle
- equivalent to quantum optics notion of classicality
- equivalent to GPT notion of classicality
- emerges in quantum Darwinist limit, or under sufficient noise/coarse-graining
- subsumes KS contextuality, Bell nonlocality, and anomalous weak values
- gen. contextuality is a resource for quantum computation, quantum communication, state discrim., cloning, metrology

We say that an (unquotiented) operational theory is classically explainable if and only if it admits of a noncontextual ontological model



...or equivalently,

if the GPT description of that theory admits of *any* ontological model

PRX Quantum 2, 010331




Consider an operational theory  $Op$  and the GPT  $G$  defined by quotienting it relative to operational equivalence



Theorem:

*There exists a noncontextual ontological model of an operational theory if and only if there exists an ontological model for the GPT associated to it.*





## Relation to the traditional notion of classicality in GPTs?

PRX Quantum 2, 010331





Traditionally, a GPT has been considered classical if it was *simplicial*:





state space: simplex

effect space: dual of simplex

d=3



- all states have unique decomposition into pure states
- all measurements are compatible.



This is just classical probability theory—subStoch!



At this point we have 4 equivalent conditions for a GPT to be classical:

1. the operational theory it came from is noncontextual
2. it admits of an OM
3. it is simplex-embeddable
4. it admits of a positive quasiprobability representation



# The structure of (diagram-preserving) quasiprobability representations

Quantum 8, 1283



## Structure theorem for DP quasiprobability reps of QT

pick a minimal basis of trace-one Hermitian operators  $\{F_\lambda\}$   
compute the unique dual basis satisfying  $\text{tr}[D_{\lambda'} F_\lambda] = \delta_{\lambda, \lambda'}$



states

$$\xi_\rho(\lambda) = \text{tr}[D_\lambda \rho]$$

effects

$$\xi_E(\lambda) = \text{tr}[F_\lambda E]$$

transformations

$$\xi_{\mathcal{E}}(\lambda' | \lambda) = \text{tr}[D_{\lambda'} \mathcal{E}(F_\lambda)]$$

Extends to all tomographically local GPTs

Every OM of a tomographically local GPT is of analogous form but where everything in the image of the map is positive



Every NCOM of a tomographically local op. theory is of this form, but where one quotients first

$\{F_\lambda\}_\lambda$  is a (non-overcomplete) basis

Powerful tool for studying noncontextuality

Excess baggage theorem  $\Rightarrow$  contextuality

8-state model (Wallman, Bartlett) for stabilizer qubits is contextual





# The Stabilizer Subtheory



The stabilizer subtheory can be implemented fault-tolerant

Some nonstabilizer states promote it to universality.

⇒ State injection model for quantum computation.



$$\{|x\rangle\}_{1,2,\dots,d} \quad \omega = e^{\frac{2\pi i}{d}}$$



$$X|x\rangle = |x+1\rangle \quad \text{position translator}$$

$$Z|x\rangle = \omega^x |x\rangle \quad \text{momentum translator}$$

$$\text{Weyl operators: } W_{p,q} := Z^p X^q \quad p, q \in \mathbb{Z}_d$$

states: eigenstates of these



allowed transformations (“Clifford unitaries”)  
are those that preserve Weyl operators:

$$UW_{p,q}U^\dagger \propto W_{p',q'}$$


closed under composition




## Gross's Representation

# reps of stabilizer states

$$\xi_{\rho_{\text{stab}}}(p, q) = \text{tr}[A_{p,q}\rho_{\text{stab}}]$$



(c)  $q_1 - q_2$  and  $p_1 + p_2$  known



These are all valid probability distributions




# reps of stabilizer unitaries


$$\xi_{U_{\text{stab}}}(p', q' | p, q) = \text{tr}[A_{p', q'} U_{\text{stab}} A_{p, q} U_{\text{stab}}^\dagger]$$



$q \mapsto p$   
 $p \mapsto -q$



$q_1 \mapsto q_1$   
 $p_1 \mapsto p_1 - p_2$   
 $q_2 \mapsto q_1 + q_2$   
 $p_2 \mapsto p_2$





Using this structure theorem for quasiprobability representat

In **odd** dimensions, every stabilizer subtheory has a *unique* positive quasiprobability representation, namely Gross's. (Equivalently, there is a unique NCOM.)

Gross's repn  $\Leftrightarrow$  Spekkens' toy theory (odd dim)

In **even** dimensions, there is no positive quasiprobability representation for any stabilizer subtheory. (Equivalently, there is no NCOM.)`



So there is a *unique* classical  
explanation of the stabilizer subtheory!



Against the backdrop of the odd dimensional stabilizer  
subtheory, negativity of a process *in Gross's repr*  
implies nonclassicality

Gross proved that his repn was the only one among the family of “GHW repns” satisfying Clifford covariance



advantages of our uniqueness result over Gross's:

- generalized noncontextuality is a notion of classicality (covariance is not)

- Gross's result requires two ad hoc mathematical assumptions ( $d \times d$  phase space, correct marginal probabilities)

- Gross's uniqueness result holds only for odd prime, ours holds for all odd dimensions

(similarly for Zhu's results)

Any state which promotes the stabilizer subtheory to UQC must have negativity in its Gross repn.



Negativity in Gross repn of a state  $\Rightarrow$  KS contextual

Howard et. al. (Nature 2014)

Negativity in Gross repn of a state  $\Rightarrow$  generalized contextuality

our result

So generalized contextuality (like KS contextuality)  
is necessary for UQC in this model

Is generalized contextuality sufficient for computatio



-not without caveats, at least  
(even-dimensional stabilizer subtheories are efficiently simulable)

...but maybe if we consider *quantifying* contextuality?

...*scaling* of contextuality?

...?

Thank you!



The stabilizer subtheory has a unique noncontextual model  
PRL 129 (12), 120403

A structure theorem for generalized-noncontextual ontological models  
Quantum 8, 1283