Quantum Programming Languages

Benoît Valiron

Université Paris-Saclay / CentraleSupélec

QI CDT Spring School 2026

Sabhal Mòr Ostaig, Isle of Skye

Plan

Plan

Plan

Model of Computation: Co-processor



Model of Computation: Co-processor



The program lives here

Model of Computation: Co-processor



This only holds the quantum memory

Model of Computation: Co-processor



Series of instructions/feedbacks

The Quantum Memory

A quantum memory

- Contains individually addressable quantum registers (qbits)
- State of n qbits: complex combination of strings of n bits
- E.g. for $n = 3$:

$$\begin{aligned} & -\tfrac{1}{2} \cdot 000 \\ + & \tfrac{1}{2} \cdot 001 \\ + & \tfrac{i}{2} \cdot 110 \\ - & \tfrac{i}{2} \cdot 111 \end{aligned}$$

- With a norm condition.

Unlike probabilistic distributions,

all are available at the same time.

Quantum Circuit Model

Stream of instructions: a series of elementary gates applied on the quantum memory, that are described by a quantum circuit.



- Each operation is reversible, unitary on the space of states
- Wire $\equiv$ quantum bit $\equiv$ a quantum register
- No "quantum loop", "conditional stop" nor "branching point"

Plan

Structure of (Static) Quantum Algorithms



Structure of (Variational) Quantum Algorithms



Quantum Algorithm, Probabilistic Algorithm

Simple probabilistic algorithm to factor 289884400687823

- Fair draw of a number among $2, 3, 4, 5, \ldots$
- Test: Euclidian division
- Found a factor: success. Otherwise: start over.

Very poor probability of success!

Shor's factorization algorithm

- Probabilistic sampling performed with measurement
- The quantum circuit build a "good" probability distribution.
  $\rightarrow$ boosts factors!

Quantum programming means building a circuit

(In case you're wondering: $315697 \cdot 918236159$)

Internals of Current Quantum Algorithms

The techniques used to described quantum algorithms are diverse.

1. Quantum primitives.
   - Quantum Fourier Transform
     Assuming $\omega = 0.\mathtt{xy}$, we want

$$\begin{array}{rl} & (e^{2\pi i\omega})^0 \cdot 00 \\ + & (e^{2\pi i\omega})^1 \cdot 01 \\ + & (e^{2\pi i\omega})^2 \cdot 10 \\ + & (e^{2\pi i\omega})^3 \cdot 11 \end{array} \qquad \longmapsto \qquad 1 \cdot \mathtt{xy}$$

Internals of Current Quantum Algorithms

The techniques used to described quantum algorithms are diverse.

1. Quantum primitives.
   - Phase estimation.
   - Amplitude amplification.
     Qubit 3 in state 1 means good.

$$\begin{array}{rl} & \alpha_0 \cdot 000 \\ + & \alpha_1 \cdot 011 \\ + & \alpha_2 \cdot 100 \\ + & \alpha_3 \cdot 110 \end{array} \longmapsto \begin{array}{rl} & \alpha_0 \cdot 000 \\ + & \alpha_1 \cdot 011 \\ + & \alpha_2 \cdot 100 \\ + & \alpha_3 \cdot 110 \end{array}$$

Internals of Current Quantum Algorithms

The techniques used to described quantum algorithms are diverse.

1. Quantum primitives.
   - Quantum Fourier Transform
   - Amplitude amplification.
   - Quantum walk.



Internals of Current Quantum Algorithms

The techniques used to described quantum algorithms are diverse.

1. Quantum primitives.
   - Quantum Fourier Transform
   - Amplitude amplification.
   - Quantum walk.
     After 5 steps of a probabilistic walk:



Internals of Current Quantum Algorithms

The techniques used to described quantum algorithms are diverse.

1. Quantum primitives.
   - Quantum Fourier Transform
   - Amplitude amplification.
   - Quantum walk.
     After 5 steps of a quantum walk:



Internals of Current Quantum Algorithms

The techniques used to described quantum algorithms are diverse.

1. Quantum primitives.
   - Quantum Fourier Transform
   - Amplitude amplification
   - Quantum walk
   - Hamiltonian simulation
   - ...

They are given as circuit templates

Internals of Current Quantum Algorithms

The techniques used to described quantum algorithms are diverse.

2. Oracles.
   - Take a classical function $f : \mathtt{Bool}^n \to \mathtt{Bool}^m$.
   - Construct

$$\begin{array}{rccc} \overline{f} : & \mathtt{Bool}^{n+m} & \longrightarrow & \mathtt{Bool}^{n+m} \\ & (x, y) & \longmapsto & (x, y \oplus f(x)) \end{array}$$

   - Build the unitary U_f acting on $n + m$ qubits computing $\overline{f}$.

Building the circuit depends on how f is given

Internals of Current Quantum Algorithms

The techniques used to described quantum algorithms are diverse.

3. Blocks of loosely-defined low-level circuits.



This is not a formal specification!

Internals of Current Quantum Algorithms

The techniques used to described quantum algorithms are diverse.

4. High-level operations on circuit:
   - Repetition



   - Inversion



   - Control



Internals of Current Quantum Algorithms

The techniques used to described quantum algorithms are diverse.

4. High-level operations on circuit:
   - Control : conditional action of a circuit



C is applied on qubits 2-4 only when qubit 1 is true:
Suppose that C flips its input bits. Then the above circuit does

$$\begin{array}{ll} \texttt{qbit} & \texttt{1234} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \texttt{1010} \\ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \texttt{0110} \end{array} \longmapsto \begin{array}{ll} \texttt{qbit} & \texttt{1234} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \texttt{1101} \\ + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} & \texttt{0110} \end{array}$$

This acts as a form of "quantum test"

Internals of Current Quantum Algorithms

The techniques used to described quantum algorithms are diverse.

5. Classical processing.
   - Generating the circuit...
   - Computing the input to the circuit.
   - Processing classical feedback in the middle of the computation.
   - Analyzing the final answer (and possibly starting over).

Plan

Case study: BWT algorithm



- Start at entrance, look for exit
- Description of the graph:

$$
\begin{array}{lcl}
I & : & \texttt{Node} \\
G & : & \texttt{Color} \times \texttt{Node} \to \texttt{Maybe Node} \\
O & : & \texttt{Node} \to \texttt{Bool}
\end{array}
$$

- Random/Quantum walk
- Parameters:
  height of tree ; number of steps.

Case study: BWT algorithm

- Initialization of a register to the input node (using I)
- 10^6 iterations:
  - Diffuse
  - Call oracle for red
  - Diffuse
  - Call oracle for green
  - Diffuse
  - Call oracle for blue
  - Diffuse
  - Call oracle for yellow



- Measure the node we sit on
- Test with O that we reached the output node.

Case study: QLS algorithm

Considering a vector $\vec{b}$ and the system

$$A \cdot \vec{x} = \vec{b},$$

compute the value of $\langle \vec{x} \,|\, \vec{r} \rangle$ for some vector $\vec{r}$.

Practical situation: the matrix A corresponds to the finite-element approximation of the scattering problem:

Case study: QLS algorithm

For more precision: `arXiv:1505.06552`

Three oracles:

- for $\vec{r}$ and for $\vec{b}$: input an index, output (the representation of) a complex number
- for A: input two indexes, output also a complex number

It uses many quantum primitives

- Amplitude estimation
- Phase estimation
- Amplitude amplification
- Hamiltonian simulation

Case study: QLS algorithm



- Yellow: Elementary gates.
- Red: Oracles.
- Blue: QFT's.
- Black: Subroutines.
- *Parameters:*
  Dimensions of the space;
  Precision for each of the vectors;
  Allowed error;
  Various parameters for A...
  In total, 19 parameters.

Case study: QLS algorithm

Oracle R is given by the function

```
calcRweights y nx ny lx ly k theta phi =
    let (xc',yc') = edgetoxy y nx ny in
    let xc = (xc'-1.0)*lx - ((fromIntegral nx)-1.0)*lx/2.0 in
    let yc = (yc'-1.0)*ly - ((fromIntegral ny)-1.0)*ly/2.0 in
    let (xg,yg) = itoxy y nx ny in
    if (xg == nx) then
        let i = (mkPolar ly (k*xc*(cos phi)))*(mkPolar 1.0 (k*yc*(sin phi)))*
                ((sinc (k*ly*(sin phi)/2.0)) :+ 0.0) in
        let r = ( cos(phi) :+ k*lx )*((cos (theta - phi))/lx :+ 0.0) in i * r
    else if (xg==2*nx-1) then
        let i = (mkPolar ly (k*xc*cos(phi)))*(mkPolar 1.0 (k*yc*sin(phi)))*
                ((sinc (k*ly*sin(phi)/2.0)) :+ 0.0) in
        let r = ( cos(phi) :+ (- k*lx))*((cos (theta - phi))/lx :+ 0.0) in i * r
    else if ( (yg==1) && (xg<nx) ) then
        let i = (mkPolar lx (k*yc*sin(phi)))*(mkPolar 1.0 (k*xc*cos(phi)))*
                ((sinc (k*lx*(cos phi)/2.0)) :+ 0.0) in
        let r = ( (- sin phi) :+ k*ly )*((cos(theta - phi))/ly :+ 0.0) in i * r
    else if ( (yg==ny) && (xg<nx) ) then
        let i = (mkPolar lx (k*yc*sin(phi)))*(mkPolar 1.0 (k*xc*cos(phi)))*
                ((sinc (k*lx*(cos phi)/2.0)) :+ 0.0) in
        let r = ( (- sin phi) :+ (- k*ly) )*((cos(theta - phi)/ly) :+ 0.0) in i * r
    else 0.0 :+ 0.0
```

Case study: circuit snippets

The algorithms create circuits whose sizes and shapes depend on the parameters. E.g. the size of the input register:



(QFT)

Case study: circuit snippets

The algorithms create circuits whose sizes and shapes depend on the parameters. E.g. the size of the input register:



(diffusion step in BWT)

Case study: circuit snippets

The algorithms create circuits whose sizes and shapes depend on the parameters. E.g. the size of the input register:



(piece of one subroutine of QLS)

Case study: circuit snippets

The algorithms create circuits whose sizes and shapes depend on the parameters. E.g. the size of the input register:



(the subroutine U_g)

Case study: circuit snippets

The algorithms create circuits whose sizes and shapes depend on the parameters. E.g. the size of the input register:



(the subroutine U_b)

Plan

Lessons learned

- Circuit construction
  - Procedural: Instruction-based, one line at a time
  - Declarative: Circuit combinators
    - Inversion
    - Repetition
    - Control
    - Computation/uncomputation
- Circuits as inputs to other circuits
- Regularity with respect to the size of the input
- Distinction parameter / input
- Need for automation for oracle generation

Plan

Programming framework

Two approaches

- Circuit as a record
  - One type `circuit`
  - Qubits $\equiv$ wire numbers
  - Native: vertical/horizontal concatenation, gate addition
  - $\rightarrow$ Some examples: Qiskit, most Pythonic frameworks
- Circuit as a function
  - Qubits $\equiv$ first-order objects
  - Input wires $\equiv$ function input
  - Output wires $\equiv$ function output
  - $\rightarrow$ Some examples: Quipper, Q#, Silq

Circuits as Records

Simplest model: an object holding all of the circuit structure

- Classical wires
- Quantum wires
- List of gates (or directed acyclic graph)
- This is for instance QisKit/QASM model

In this system

- Static circuit
- No high-level hybrid interaction: sequence
  1. circuit generation
  2. circuit evaluation
  3. measure
  4. classical post-processing
  5. back to (1)

Circuits as Records

Procedural construction (QisKit)

```
q = QuantumRegister(5)
c = ClassicalRegister(1)
circ = QuantumCircuit(q,c)

circ.h(q[0])
for i in range(1,5):
  circ.cx(q[0], q[i])
circ.meas(q[4],c[0])
```

- Static ID For registers
- Wires are numbers
- Gate $\equiv$ instruction
- Classical control: Circuit building
- Explicit "run" of circuit

Combinators: return a record `circuit`

- `circ.control(4)`
- `circ.inverse()`
- `circ.append(other-circuit)`

Circuits as Functions

A function (Quipper)

```
a -> Circ b
```

- Inputs something of type `a`
- Outputs something of type `b`
- As a side-effect, generates a circuit snippet.

Or

- Inputs a value of type `a`
- Outputs a computation of type `b`

Plan

Circuits as Functions

The circuit



can be typed with

```
Qubit -> Circ (Qubit,Qubit)
```

- Inputs one qubit
- Outputs a pair of qubits
- Spits out some gates when evaluated

The gates are however encapsulated in the function

Circuits as Functions

Representing circuits (Quipper)

Circuits as Functions

Procedural presentation of circuits:

```
prog :: Qubit -> Circ (Qubit,Qubit)
prog q = do
  hadamard_at q
  r <- qinit False
  qnot_at r `controlled` q
  return (q,r)
```



Circuits as Functions

Procedural presentation of circuits:

```
prog :: Qubit -> Circ (Qubit,Qubit)
prog q = do
  hadamard_at q
  r <- qinit False
  qnot_at r `controlled` q
  return (q,r)
```



Circuits as Functions

Procedural presentation of circuits:

```
prog :: Qubit -> Circ (Qubit,Qubit)
prog q = do
  hadamard_at q
  r <- qinit False
  qnot_at r `controlled` q
  return (q,r)
```



Circuits as Functions

Procedural presentation of circuits:

```
prog :: Qubit -> Circ (Qubit,Qubit)
prog q = do
  hadamard_at q
  r <- qinit False
  qnot_at r `controlled` q
  return (q,r)
```



Circuits as Functions

Procedural presentation of circuits:

```
prog :: Qubit -> Circ (Qubit,Qubit)
prog q = do
  hadamard_at q
  r <- qinit False
  qnot_at r `controlled` q
  return (q,r)
```



Circuits as Functions




```
import Quipper

circ ::
   Qubit -> Circ (Qubit,Qubit)
circ x = do
   y <- qinit False
   hadamard_at x
   qnot_at y `controlled` x
   return (x,y)
```

- Qubits ≡ first-class variable
- Circuit ≡ function
- Wires ≡ inputs and outputs
- Mix classical/quantum

Circuits as Functions

Wires do not have “fixed” location

```
circ2 :: Qubit -> Circ ()
circ2 x = do
   (x1,x2) <- circ x
   (y1,y2) <- circ x1
   (z1,z2) <- circ x2
   return ()
```



- Qubit $\not\equiv$ Wire number
- Circuits as functions: can be applied
- More expressive types

Circuits Combinators: Exercise !

What could be the corresponding operations ?

1. `(a -> Circ b) -> (b -> Circ c) -> (a -> Circ c)`
2. `(a -> Circ b) -> (b -> Circ a)`
3. `(a -> Circ b) -> (c -> Circ d)`
   `-> ((a,c) -> Circ (b,d))`
4. `(a -> Circ b) -> ((a,Qubit) -> Circ (b,Qubit))`
5. `(a -> Circ b) -> (Qubit -> a -> Circ (b,Qubit))`
6. `(a -> Circ b) -> (Qubit -> a -> Circ b)`

Circuits Combinators: Teleportation

Exercise: Decompose according to the dashed sections



Circuits Combinators: Teleportation



can be typed as

- `EPR :: Circ (Qubit, Qubit)`
- `Alice :: Qubit -> Qubit -> Circ (Bit,Bit)`
- `Bob :: Qbit -> (Bit,Bit) -> Circ Qubit`

Composing, we get

```
Circ (Qubit -> Circ (Bit,Bit), (Bit,Bit) -> Circ Qubit)
```

Plan

Families of Circuits

A program

- Inputs classical parameters
- Construct a circuit from these parameters
- Run the circuit

Circuits are parametrized families!

Families of Circuits

Example: QFT



Families of Circuits

Example: QFT



Families of Circuits

Example: QFT



Families of Circuits

Example: QFT



Families of Circuits

With the help of lists:

Families of Circuits

List combinators, e.g.

```
mapM ::  (a -> Circ b) -> [a] -> Circ [b]
```

Mixed presentation of circuits:

```
prog :: Qubit -> Circ (Qubit,Qubit)
prog q = do
  hadamard_at q
  r <- qinit False
  qnot_at r `controlled` q
  return (q,r)

prog2 :: [Qubit] -> Circ [(Qubit,Qubit)]
prog2 l = mapM prog l
```

List of size 2:



Families of Circuits

List combinators, e.g.

```
mapM ::  (a -> Circ b) -> [a] -> Circ [b]
```

Mixed presentation of circuits:

```
prog :: Qubit -> Circ (Qubit,Qubit)
prog q = do
  hadamard_at q
  r <- qinit False
  qnot_at r `controlled` q
  return (q,r)

prog2 :: [Qubit] -> Circ [(Qubit,Qubit)]
prog2 l = mapM prog l
```

List of size 10:



Plan

Example: Quipper Code

```
import Quipper

w :: (Qubit,Qubit) -> Circ (Qubit,Qubit)
w = named_gate "W"

toffoli :: Qubit -> (Qubit,Qubit) -> Circ Qubit
toffoli d (x,y) =
  qnot d `controlled` x .==. 1 .&&. y .==. 0

eiz_at :: Qubit -> Qubit -> Circ ()
eiz_at d r =
  named_gate_at "eiZ" d `controlled` r .==. 0

circ :: [(Qubit,Qubit)] -> Qubit -> Circ ()
circ ws r = do
  label (unzip ws,r) (("a","b"),"r")
  d <- qinit 0
  mapM_ w ws
  mapM_ (toffoli d) ws
  eiz_at d r
  mapM_ (toffoli d) (reverse ws)
  mapM_ (reverse_generic w) (reverse ws)
  return ()

main = print_generic EPS circ (replicate 3 (qubit,qubit)) qubit
```



Example: BWT

Result (3 wires):



Example: BWT

Result (30 wires):

Plan

Design Choices: Summary

Requirements for coding Circuits

- Classical structures!
- Hierarchical Representation
- Parametricity
- Non-trivial Combinators

A natural view

- Low Key, First-Order Functions
- Circuit construction seen as a monad

Circuit Construction as a Monad?

Monad: a type constructor `M` equipped with

- `return :: a -> M a`
- `app :: M a -> (a -> M b) -> M b`

Example: the list monad

- Type `[a]` : for lists of elements of type `a`
- `return x = [x]`
- `app [x1, x2, x3] f = (f x1) ++ (f x2) ++ (f x3)`

Circuit Construction as a Monad?

Monad: a type constructor `M` equipped with

- `return :: a -> M a`
- `app :: M a -> (a -> M b) -> M b`

Example: state monad `M a = Int -> (a, Int)`

- `return x = λ n .(x, n)`
- `app g f = λ n .let (y,m) = g n in f y m`

Special combinators

```
get :: M Int
get = λ n .(n,n)

inc :: Int -> M ()
inc n = λ m .((), m+n)
```

do-notation

```
double = do
    n <- get
    inc n
```

Circuit Construction as a Monad?

Monad: a type constructor `M` equipped with

- `return :: a -> M a`
- `app :: M a -> (a -> M b) -> M b`

Circuit monad: `M a = GateList -> (a, GateList)`

- `return x = λ n .(x, n)`
- `app g f = λ n .let (y,m) = g n in f y m`

Special combinators

```
addGate :: Gate -> Wire -> M ()
addGate g w = λ gs .((), [(g w) added to gs])

qinit :: M Wire
qinit = λ gs .([fresh wire not in gs], gs)
```

Interaction only performed through these combinators

Plan

Context

An oracle:

- classical description f of the problem
- turned into a reversible circuit:

$$U_f : |x\rangle \otimes |y\rangle \mapsto |x\rangle \otimes |y \oplus f(x)\rangle$$

- How to build U_f ?
  - Small size: circuit synthesis
  - Arithmetic or other studied functions: Specific (highly optimized) circuits
  - Other cases?

Context

What about an arbitrary program, for example

```
calcRweights y nx ny lx ly k theta phi =
 let (xc',yc') = edgetoxy y nx ny in
 let xc = (xc'-1.0)*lx - ((fromIntegral nx)-1.0)*lx/2.0 in
 let yc = (yc'-1.0)*ly - ((fromIntegral ny)-1.0)*ly/2.0 in
 let (xg,yg) = itoxy y nx ny in
 if (xg == nx) then
     let i = (mkPolar ly (k*xc*(cos phi)))*(mkPolar 1.0 (k*yc*(sin phi)))*
             ((sinc (k*ly*(sin phi)/2.0))+0.0) in
     let r = ( cos(phi)+k*lx )*((cos (theta - phi))/lx+0.0) in i*r
 else if (xg==2*nx-1) then
     let i = (mkPolar ly (k*xc*cos(phi)))*(mkPolar 1.0 (k*yc*sin(phi)))*
             ((sinc (k*ly*sin(phi)/2.0))+0.0) in
     let r = ( cos(phi)+(- k*lx))*((cos (theta - phi))/lx+0.0) in i*r
 else if ( (yg==1) and (xg<nx) ) then
     let i = (mkPolar lx (k*yc*sin(phi)))*(mkPolar 1.0 (k*xc*cos(phi)))*
             ((sinc (k*lx*(cos phi)/2.0))+0.0) in
     let r = ( (- sin phi)+k*ly )*((cos(theta - phi))/ly+0.0) in i*r
 else if ( (yg==ny) and (xg<nx) ) then
     let i = (mkPolar lx (k*yc*sin(phi)))*(mkPolar 1.0 (k*xc*cos(phi)))*
             ((sinc (k*lx*(cos phi)/2.0))+0.0) in
     let r = ( (- sin phi)+(- k*ly) )*((cos(theta - phi)/ly)+0.0) in i*r
 else 0.0+0.0
```

Problem Statement

This is the topic of this section. How to:

- in short time
- and automatically
- get efficient,
- scalable,
- yet guaranteed
- reversible implementation
- of a higher-order, classical function,
- parametrically on the input size.

Plan

Basic idea

Landauer's embedding:

- Record all intermediate results.
- With $(x \wedge y) \wedge z$

$$t \mapsto x \wedge y; \quad u \mapsto t \wedge z; \quad \text{returns } u$$

  while retaining t as "garbage".
- Trace as a partial execution

Basic idea

Example: $x : \texttt{bool} \longmapsto \texttt{let}\ f = \texttt{not}\ \texttt{in}\ (fx)\,\texttt{and}\,(fx) : \texttt{bool}$

Regular execution

- Needs a concrete input, e.g. $x = \texttt{true}$
- Then: rewriting of the term

$$
\begin{aligned}
& \texttt{let}\ f = \texttt{not}\ \texttt{in}\ (f\,\texttt{true})\,\texttt{and}\,(f\,\texttt{true}) \\
\to\ & (\texttt{not}\,\texttt{true})\,\texttt{and}\,(\texttt{not}\,\texttt{true}) \\
\to\ & \texttt{false}\,\texttt{and}\,(\texttt{not}\,\texttt{true}) \\
\to\ & \texttt{false}\,\texttt{and}\,\texttt{false} \\
\to\ & \texttt{false}
\end{aligned}
$$

Basic idea

Example: $x : \texttt{bool} \longmapsto \texttt{let } f = \texttt{not in } (fx)\,\texttt{and}\,(fx) : \texttt{bool}$

Trace of a partial execution

- Start with an unknown variable x
- Then: keep the trace of low-level actions to be performed on x

$$
\begin{array}{lll}
 & (\emptyset, & \texttt{let } f = \texttt{not in } (fx)\,\texttt{and}\,(fx)) \\
\to & (\emptyset, & (\texttt{not}\,x)\,\texttt{and}\,(\texttt{not}\,x)) \\
\to & ([y := \texttt{not}\,x] & y\,\texttt{and}\,(\texttt{not}\,x)) \\
\to & ([y \mapsto \texttt{not}\,x; z \mapsto \texttt{not}\,x], & y\,\texttt{and}\,z) \\
\to & ([y \mapsto \texttt{not}\,x; z \mapsto \texttt{not}\,x; t \mapsto y\,\texttt{and}\,z], & t)
\end{array}
$$

- . . . and make this trace reversible: Landauer's embedding

Basic idea

Example: $x : \texttt{bool} \longmapsto \texttt{let } f = \texttt{not in } (fx)\,\texttt{and}\,(fx) : \texttt{bool}$

Trace of a partial execution

» `not` becomes a CNOT ; `and` becomes a Toffoli



» And the full trace is



Plan

Composition Procedure

A function $f : \texttt{bool} \longrightarrow \texttt{bool}$
is turned into a map

$$V_f : \texttt{bool} \longrightarrow \mathrm{circuit}(\texttt{bool})$$

(Note: omit garbage in type)



Composition Procedure

A function $\langle f, g \rangle : \texttt{bool} \longrightarrow (\texttt{bool} \times \texttt{bool})$
is turned into a map

$$V_{\langle f,g \rangle} : \texttt{bool} \longrightarrow \text{circuit}(\texttt{bool} \times \texttt{bool})$$



Composition Procedure

A function $f : (\texttt{bool list}) \longrightarrow \texttt{bool}$
is turned into a map

$$V_f : (\texttt{bool list}) \longrightarrow \mathrm{circuit}(\texttt{bool})$$



(Parametric circuit !)

Composition Procedure

A function $f : A \longrightarrow B$
is turned into a map

$$f : A \longrightarrow \text{circuit}(\text{“}B\text{”})$$



Composition Procedure

Two function $f : A \longrightarrow B$ and $g : B \to C$
are turned into maps

$$V_f : A \longrightarrow \text{circuit}(\text{“}B\text{”})$$
$$V_g : B \longrightarrow \text{circuit}(\text{“}C\text{”})$$

Composition $g \circ f : A \longrightarrow C$ is turned into $A \longrightarrow \text{circuit}(\text{“}C\text{”})$



Composition Procedure

Example Try out

$$(x, y) \longmapsto \neg(\neg x) \wedge (\neg y)$$

Example Try out

$$x \longmapsto x^8$$

Assume x is a natural number modulo 2^N written as a bitstring of size N, and assume that we already have a very optimized V for the multiplication.

Oracle from V

We construct U as



This scheme is known as compute-uncompute.

Plan

Example: Adder

```
foldl :: (A → B → A) → A → [B] → A
foldl f a l = let rec g z l' = match (split l') with
                        nil   ↦ z
                      | ⟨h,t⟩ ↦ g (f z h) t
              in g a l

bit_adder : bit → bit → bit → (bit × bit)
bit_adder carry x y =
      let majority a b c = if (xor a b) then c else a in
      let z = xor (xor carry x) y in
      let carry' = majority carry x y in ⟨carry', z⟩

adder_aux : (bit × [bit]) → (bit × bit) → (bit × [bit])
adder_aux ⟨w, cs⟩ ⟨a, b⟩ = let ⟨w', c'⟩ = bit_adder w a b in ⟨w', c'::cs⟩

adder : [bit] × [bit] → [bit]
adder x y = snd (foldl adder_aux ⟨False, nil⟩ (zip y x))
```

adder is lifted to $[\mathtt{bit}] \times [\mathtt{bit}] \to \mathtt{circuit}([\mathtt{bit}])$.

Example: Adder

For $n = 5$, no optimization:



Size of circuit is proportional to number of low-level bit-operations in all execution paths of `adder`.

Example: Adder

n is the integer-size in bits.

paper	**ancillae**	**size**
VBE (1995)	n	$\sim 8n$
Cuccaro, Drapper & al. (2005)	0	$\sim 7n$
Drapper, Kutin & al. (2008)	$\sim 2n$	$\sim 10n$ (in place)
Drapper, Kutin & al. (2008)	$\sim n$	$\sim 5n$ (not in place)

How do we scale against these ?

Example: Adders

If $n = 5$:

paper	**ancillae**	**size**
VBE (1995)	5	~ 40
Cuccaro, Drapper & al. (2005)	0	~ 35
Drapper, Kutin & al. (2008)	~ 10	~ 50 (in place)
Drapper, Kutin & al. (2008)	~ 5	~ 50 (not in place)

Automatically generated (no optimization):



Example: Adders

If $n = 5$:

paper	**ancillae**	**size**
VBE (1995)	5	~ 40
Cuccaro, Drapper & al. (2005)	0	~ 35
Drapper, Kutin & al. (2008)	~ 10	~ 50 (in place)
Drapper, Kutin & al. (2008)	~ 5	~ 50 (not in place)

With a bit of (automated) optimization:



Example: The vector b

Hand-made circuits for: adders, multipliers, comparison, square root.

How about the b vector of the QLS algorithm ($Ax = b$) ?



It gives a program computing the circuit

- Program well-typed
- Size of circuit proportional to execution time
- Compositional

Oracle Synthesis Nowadays

A lot of progress! Even if everything is not solved yet.

- Remember Classiq's presentation yesterday!
- See e.g. Gidney's blog for a nice discussion :

  https://algassert.com/post/2500

Plan

Plan

Goal

Formalizing

- Functional programming
- Higher-order combinators
- Capable of manipulating quantum information
- And quantum circuits

The first two items

- Realm of lambda-calculus

Lambda-Calculus

- Formal system from Alonzo Church, ∼1930
- Concept of Function and Application
  - "Every term is a function!"
  - Core of functional programming
  - For example: Haskell, OCaml, F#, Lisp, Erlang, *etc.*
- Very simple grammar:
  - Variables $x_1, x_2, x_3, \ldots$
  - Application (binary, infix)
  - Abstraction: $\lambda x.t$ (where t is a term)
- $\lambda x.t$: the function "$x \mapsto t$"
- Notation
  - $\lambda x.t_1\ t_2\ t_3 = \lambda x.((t_1\ t_2)\ t_3)$
  - $\lambda xy.t = \lambda x.\lambda y.t$

Rewriting Rules

» β-reduction: $(\lambda x.t)u \longrightarrow_\beta t[x := u]$

! only the x bound by the corresponding λ are replaced

» Congruence:

Reduction can occur within a term

If $M \longrightarrow M'$, then $MN \longrightarrow M'N$

(Context-free rules)

Link with Functional Programming

$(\lambda x.t)u$ can be interpreted as $\text{let}\, x = u \,\text{in}\, t$

Example with

```
let a = 1 + 2 in
let b = 5 * a * a in
let f = λx . a * x * x in f b
```

(Here we assume that we have integers available somehow)

Evaluation Strategy

- Imagine that "`tic`" evaluates to 0 while emitting... a tic.
- Consider the term:

$$(\lambda x.xx)((\lambda yz.z)\,\texttt{tic})$$

- How many tics does the term emit?

Two standard strategies

- No rewriting under λ's
- Call by name: "As far left as possible" / "As early as possible"
  This is called lazy evaluation
  $\rightarrow$ Evaluation used in Haskell, for example
- Call by value: "As far right as possible"
  Evaluation starts with the arguments
  $\rightarrow$ The standard evaluation: OCaml, F#, etc.

Call-by-Value

```
let a = 1 + 2 in
let b = 5 * a * a in
let f = λx . a * x * x in f b
```

corresponds to the lambda term:

$$(\lambda a.(\lambda b.(\lambda f.fb)(\lambda x.a * x * x))(5 * a * a))(1 + 2)$$

Call by value evaluation:

$$\begin{aligned}
&\to (\lambda a.(\lambda b.(\lambda f.fb)(\lambda x.a * x * x))(5 * a * a))3 \\
&\to (\lambda b.(\lambda f.fb)(\lambda x.3 * x * x))(5 * 3 * 3) \\
&\to (\lambda b.(\lambda f.fb)(\lambda x.3 * x * x))45 \\
&\to (\lambda f.f\ 45)(\lambda x.3 * x * x) \\
&\to (\lambda x.3 * x * x)45 \\
&\to 3 * 45 * 45 \\
&\to 6075
\end{aligned}$$

No reduction under lambdas

Call-by-Value

```
let a = 1 + 2 in
let b = 5 * a * a in
let f = λx . a * x * x in f b
```

corresponds to the code transformation

```
let a = 3 in
let b = 5 * a * a in
let f = λx . a * x * x in f b
```

which rewrites to

```
let b = 5 * 3 * 3 in
let f = λx . 3 * x * x in f b
```

which rewrites to

```
let b = 45 in
let f = λx . 3 * x * x in f b
```

...

Simple Type System

Akin to a very small logic:

$$A, B \quad ::= \quad \texttt{nat} \mid A \to B$$

with an opaque type `nat` and a function type

Intuition

- $\lambda x.M$ is typed with $A \to B$ (if well-typed)
- 2 is typed with `nat`
- $+$ is typed with $\texttt{nat} \to \texttt{nat} \to \texttt{nat}$ (modulo infix notation)

Simple Type System

Typing context

$$x_1 : A_1, x_2 : A_2, \ldots x_n : A_n \vdash M : B$$

"Provided the variables x_i are typed as advertised, so is M"

Typing rules

$$\frac{\text{"If this is true..."}}{\text{"...so is this"}}$$

$$\frac{\Delta, x : A \vdash M : B}{\Delta \vdash \lambda x.M : A \to B} \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash M : A \to B \quad \Delta \vdash N : A}{\Delta \vdash MN : B}$$

$$\frac{}{\Delta, x : A \vdash x : A}$$

$$\frac{}{+ : \mathtt{nat} \to \mathtt{nat} \to \mathtt{nat}} \qquad \frac{}{2 : \mathtt{nat}} \qquad \text{(one for each } n\text{)}$$

Simple Type System

Typing context

$$A_1, \quad A_2, \ldots \quad A_n \vdash \quad B$$

Typing rules

$$\frac{\Delta, \quad A \vdash \quad B}{\Delta \vdash \quad A \to B} \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash \quad A \to B \quad \Delta \vdash \quad A}{\Delta \vdash \quad B}$$

$$\frac{}{\Delta, \quad A \vdash \quad A}$$

Curry-Howard correspondence: well-typed terms are proofs

Extensions

Example: Pairing, Boolean values:

$$A, B \quad ::= \quad \texttt{nat} \mid A \to B \mid A \times B \mid \texttt{bit}$$

Typing rules with new term constructs

$$\frac{\Delta, x : A \vdash M : B}{\Delta \vdash \lambda x.M : A \to B} \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash M : A \to B \quad \Delta \vdash N : A}{\Delta \vdash MN : B}$$

$$\frac{\Delta \vdash M : A \quad \Delta \vdash N : B}{\Delta \vdash \langle M, N \rangle : A \times B} \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash M : A_1 \times A_2}{\Delta \vdash \pi_i M : A_i}$$

$$\frac{\Delta \vdash P : \texttt{bit} \quad \Delta \vdash M, N : C}{\Delta \vdash \texttt{if } P \texttt{ then } M \texttt{ else } N : C} \qquad \frac{}{\Delta \vdash \texttt{true}, \texttt{false} : \texttt{bit}}$$

Safety Properties

- Subject reduction: type is preserves by reduction
- Progress: well-typed terms either reduce or reached a value

Plan

One problem: Entanglement

Let us add

- an opaque type `qbit`
- constants $|\phi\rangle$ for all possible states

We can do

$$\lambda f.(f\,|0\rangle)\,|1\rangle : (\texttt{qbit} \to \texttt{qbit} \to A) \to A$$

but what if the two states are entangled:

$$\lambda f.(f q_1) q_2 : (\texttt{qbit} \to \texttt{qbit} \to A) \to A$$

where q_1, q_2 is in state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)$?

Quantum Lambda-Calculus

Terms

- Pairing constructs and fixpoints
- Boolean `true` and `false`, if-then-else
- Constant, opaque terms: `qinit`, `measure`, `H`, `CNOT`, ...
- Quantum states not in the language
  $\rightarrow$ included as pointers

Operational semantics

- Abstract machine encapsulating the quantum memory:

$$\Big(\underbrace{\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle)}_{\text{state vector}}, \underbrace{|xy\rangle}_{\text{“linking function”}}, \underbrace{\lambda f.f\langle x, y\rangle}_{\text{lambda-term}}\Big)$$

- Call-by-value evaluation strategy

  (Reduction strategy linked to the type system!)

- Quantum operations through the evaluation strategy

Quantum Lambda-Calculus

$$[\alpha\,|0\rangle + \beta\,|1\rangle\,, |x\rangle\,, \texttt{let y = qinit false in CNOT } \langle \texttt{x, y}\rangle]$$

reduces to

$$[\alpha\,|00\rangle + \beta\,|11\rangle\,, |xy\rangle\,, \langle x, y\rangle]$$

Another Problem: Non-Duplicability

Consider the following

$$\left[\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + |1\rangle), |x\rangle\,, \langle \texttt{meas}\, x, \texttt{had}\, x\rangle\right]$$

In a purely functional world, the order should not matter!

Notion of linear type system

- » Quantum data is non-duplicable
- » Type system based on linear logic

Plan

Quantum Memory

Mathematical Structure

- Quantum register $\equiv$ (finite) Hilbert space
- Juxtaposition $\equiv$ Kronecker (tensor) product
- Reading $\equiv$ measure $\equiv$ getting a bit, probabilistic
- Quantum information is non-duplicable

Type Structure

- Based on (Intuitionistic) Multiplicative Linear Logic

$$A, B \quad ::= \quad \texttt{qbit} \mid \texttt{bit} \mid A \otimes B$$

- Entanglement:

$$[\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle), |xy\rangle, \langle x, y\rangle] \quad : \quad \texttt{qbit} \otimes \texttt{qbit}$$

Quantum Memory

Mathematical Structure

- Quantum register $\equiv$ (finite) Hilbert space
- Juxtaposition $\equiv$ Kronecker (tensor) product
- Reading $\equiv$ measure $\equiv$ getting a bit, probabilistic
- Quantum information is non-duplicable

Type Structure

- Based on (Intuitionistic) Multiplicative Linear Logic

$$A, B \quad ::= \quad \texttt{qbit} \mid \texttt{bit} \mid A \otimes B \mid A \multimap B$$

Type of linear functions

- Entanglement:

$$[\tfrac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|00\rangle + |11\rangle), |xy\rangle, \langle x, y\rangle] \quad : \quad \texttt{qbit} \otimes \texttt{qbit}$$

Linear Type System

Core Typing Rules

$$\frac{\Delta, x : A \vdash M : B}{\Delta \vdash \lambda x.M : A \multimap B} \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash M : A \multimap B \quad \Gamma \vdash N : A}{\Delta, \Gamma \vdash MN : B}$$

$$\frac{\Delta \vdash M : A \quad \Gamma \vdash N : B}{\Delta, \Gamma \vdash \langle M, N \rangle : A \otimes B} \qquad \frac{\Delta, x : A, y : B \vdash N : C \quad \Gamma \vdash M : A \otimes B}{\Delta, \Gamma \vdash \texttt{let } \langle \texttt{x,y} \rangle \texttt{ = } M \texttt{ in } N : C}$$

$$\frac{}{x : A \vdash x : A}$$

- Non-duplicability
- $\lambda x.\langle x, x \rangle$ is not typable

Quantum Circuit Model

In this model

- Circuit $\equiv$ pure function from input to output

1-qbit unitary	$\texttt{qbit} \multimap \texttt{qbit}$
2-qbit unitary	$\texttt{qbit} \otimes \texttt{qbit} \multimap \texttt{qbit} \otimes \texttt{qbit}$
measurement	$\texttt{qbit} \multimap \texttt{bit}$
initialization	$1 \multimap \texttt{qbit}$
discard	$\texttt{qbit} \multimap 1$

- Vertical composition $\equiv$ tensoring
- Horizontal composition $\equiv$ function composition
- Abstracts away the notion of register

Limitation

- Difficult to implement combinators

Entanglement of Functions

Example of higher-order entanglement: Teleportation



Entanglement of Functions

Example of higher-order entanglement: Teleportation



Entanglement of Functions

Example of higher-order entanglement: Teleportation



Entanglement of Functions

Example of higher-order entanglement: Teleportation



Entanglement of Functions

Example of higher-order entanglement: Teleportation



A pair of two entangled functions

$$(\texttt{qbit} \multimap \texttt{bit} \otimes \texttt{bit}) \otimes (\texttt{bit} \otimes \texttt{bit} \multimap \texttt{qbit})$$

inverses of each other.

Typing Duplication

A new type construct

$$A, B \ ::= \ \texttt{qbit} \mid \texttt{bit} \mid 1 \mid A \otimes B \mid A \multimap B \mid !A$$

- Based on linear logic
- Non-duplicable functions with $A \multimap B$
- Duplicable functions with $!(A \multimap B)$
- Quantum operations are duplicable
  $\rightarrow$ e.g. $\texttt{measure} : !(\texttt{qbit} \multimap \texttt{bit})$

Non-trivial mix

- Classical and quantum data, probabilistic setting
- Entanglement at higher-order

Entanglement of Functions

Example of higher-order entanglement: Teleportation



A pair of two entangled non-duplicable functions

$$(\texttt{qbit} \multimap \texttt{bit} \otimes \texttt{bit}) \otimes (\texttt{bit} \otimes \texttt{bit} \multimap \texttt{qbit})$$

inverses of each other.

Entanglement of Functions

Example of higher-order entanglement: Teleportation



A duplicable procedure generating non-duplicable functions

$$!(1 \multimap (\texttt{qbit} \multimap \texttt{bit} \otimes \texttt{bit}) \otimes (\texttt{bit} \otimes \texttt{bit} \multimap \texttt{qbit}))$$

inverses of each other.

Typing Duplication

Core typing rules

$$\frac{!\Delta \vdash V : A}{!\Delta \vdash V : !A}\ (P) \qquad \frac{\Delta \vdash M : !A}{\Delta \vdash M : A}\ (D)$$

$$\frac{\Delta, x :!A, y : !A \vdash M : B}{\Delta, x : !A \vdash M[y := x] : B}\ (C)$$

- Only values can be duplicated

(Call-by-value!)

Examples

- $\vdash \texttt{had}\ (\texttt{qinit true}) : !\texttt{qbit}$ (What is wrong?)
- $\vdash \lambda x.\langle x, x\rangle : !A \multimap !A \otimes !A$ (Why?)

Typing Duplication

Type these terms!

- `true`
- $\lambda x.x$
- $\lambda x.(\text{let } z = \texttt{H}\, x \text{ in } \texttt{CNOT}\, \langle z, \texttt{qinit false} \rangle)$
- $\texttt{H}\,(\texttt{qinit false})$
- $\langle \texttt{H}\,(\texttt{qinit false}),\ \lambda x.x \rangle$
- $\text{let } y = \texttt{H}\,(\texttt{qinit false}) \text{ in } \lambda f.f\, y$



Distinction between

- Procedure for generating a qbit: duplicable
- End result of the procedure: qbit value, non-duplicable

Quantum Lambda-Calculus

Bottom line

- Classical data handled natively
- Quantum data handled through pointers and instructions
- Mix of duplicable and non-duplicable data, with higher-order

Properties

- Type system imposed as axioms
- Safety properties derived "by hand"

(Could have used a realizability approach!)

Limitations

- Gates handled individually
- Far from what is done in quantum algorithm
- Need to consider an extended circuit model

Plan

The problem

Naïve approach for typing combinators:

- Repetition : $\mathbb{N} \multimap (A \multimap A) \multimap (A \multimap A)$ (OK)
- Inversion : $(A \multimap B) \multimap (B \multimap A)$ (WRONG)
- Control : $(A \multimap B) \multimap (\mathtt{qbit} \otimes A \multimap \mathtt{qbit} \otimes B)$ (WRONG)

Does not work

- Would require “reading” the gates.
- But gates can only be sent to the QRAM

Circuit Description Languages

Extending the quantum λ-calculus with

- A new opaque type for circuits: $\texttt{Circ}(A, B)$
- Box and unbox constructions

$$(A \multimap B) \underset{\texttt{unbox}}{\overset{\texttt{box}}{\rightleftarrows}} \texttt{Circ}(A, B)$$

  - Box: instantiate a new circuit
  - Unbox: evaluate a circuit
- A list of fixed, opaque circuits combinators such as

$$\begin{aligned} \texttt{ctl} &: \texttt{Circ}(A, B) \multimap \texttt{Circ}(\texttt{qbit} \otimes A, \texttt{qbit} \otimes B) \\ \texttt{rev} &: \texttt{Circ}(A, B) \multimap \texttt{Circ}(B, A) \end{aligned}$$

- Nice arrow-like, categorical semantics

Formalization of Quipper

- Proto-Quipper
- Notion of circuit-description language

Circuit Description Languages

Possible extensions

- Inductive types (such as lists)
- First-order quantifiers
  $\rightarrow$ limited to "classical types"

Dependent Proto-Quipper

- Type $[A]_n$ for lists of length n made of elements of type A
- In general, $B(n)$ is a type parameterized by n
- $f : \forall n : A \cdot B(n)$: function A to B, with $f(n)$ of type $B(n)$

Examples

- $\forall n : \mathbb{N} \cdot \texttt{Circ}([\texttt{qbit}]_n, [\texttt{qbit}]_n)$
- $\forall m, n : \mathbb{N} \cdot [[\texttt{qbit}]_m]_n \multimap [\texttt{qbit}]_{mn}$
- What about the diffusion step from BWT on slide 52?

Extended Quantum Circuit Model

Summary

- Circuits are now first-order citizens
- Close to what is done for "real algorithms"
- Suitable for formalization and extensions

  [Lindenhovius,Mislove,Zamdzhiev, 2018] [Fu, Selinger et al, 2020,2022,2024] [Lee, V et al, 2021] [Colledan, Dal Lago, 2025]

Limitations

- Circuits are built from opaque boxes
- The only control is classical

Plan

Conclusion: Quantum Programming Language

Practical aspect

- Coding quantum algorithms!
- Design choices for quantum circuit-description
- Monadic approach, amenable to oracle synthesis

Theoretical aspect

- Foundational work: quantum lambda-calculus
- Type system based on linear logic
- Extensions to capture circuit-description
- (Just for Louis) Expressing quantum control still WIP