Shor's Algorithm Does Not Factor Large Integers in the Presence of Noise

Primes ... and Prime Factorizations

The Prime Factorization problem is to factor an arbitrary integer N into its (unique) expression as a product of primes $N = p_1^{e_1} p_2^{e_2} \cdots p_k^{e_k}$

The dignity of science requires that every possible means be explored for the solution of a problem so elegant and so celebrated. — C. F. Gauss

Theorem [Hadamard, de la Vallée]: There are about $\frac{N}{\ln N}$ primes up to integer N. **Theorem** [Fouvry]: There is a positive density of primes p such that p-1 has a largest prime factor $> p^{2/3}$.

Shor's Factoring Algorithm

In 1994, Peter Shor [1] gave a quantum polynomial-time algorithm that can factor large integers. This is the single most important algorithm in quantum computing. If such algorithms can be realized in practice, then public-key cryptographic systems such as **RSA** can be broken. **Billions** of dollars have been spent in this quest, and many more billions are planned.

Qubits and quantum operations

Unlike classical computing where the basic elements are the bits 0 and 1, quantum information processing is built on *qubits* which can be viewed as a unit length vector on the sphere (Figure from Wikipedia).



Quantum operations are rotations and reflections in these spheres. Multiple qubits reside in *superpositions* in a tensor product space, called a Hilbert space.

An important quantum operation is a (controlled-)rotation $R_k = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{2\pi i/2^k} \end{bmatrix}$, with angle $\frac{2\pi}{2^k}$. This is **tiny** for large k.

Quantum Fourier Transform

The magic step in Shor's algorithm is the following Quantum Fourier Transform (Figure from Wikipedia)



But, in any physical realization, one can expect some noise to be present. What happens to Shor's algorithm when a little bit of noise is introduced?

Consider an error model, where the operator R_k is substituted by

 $\widetilde{R_k} = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0\\ 0 & e^{2\pi i(1+\epsilon r)/2k} \end{bmatrix},$

where $r \sim N(0,1)$ is an *independent* normally distributed noise random variable, and ϵ is a global magnitude parameter.

Jin-Yi Cai University of Wisconsin - Madison

Billions and Billions ... — Carl Sagan

 $-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|0\rangle + e^{2\pi i[0.x_1...x_n]}|1\rangle\right)$ $-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\left(|0\rangle + e^{2\pi i[0.x_2...x_n]}|1\rangle\right)$ $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left(|0\rangle + e^{2\pi i [0.x_3...x_n]} |1\rangle \right)$

Theorem 1 [2] If each controlled- R_k -gate in the quantum Fourier transform circuit is replaced by controlled- R_k -gate, even with a vanishingly small amount of noise $\epsilon(n) \rightarrow 0$, Shor's algorithm does not factor n-bit integers of the form pq, where p and q are Fouvry primes, with high probability over quantum measurements.

The level of noise where failure provably occurs is when $\epsilon = \epsilon(n)$ exceeds

The failure is with probability exponentially close to 1, as $n \to \infty$.

The theorems actually go further, so that failure happens even if we only introduce noisy quantum gates at level R_b , as long as

With independent random noise present starting with controlled- R_b -gates, we need to analyse the quantity



where

are random variables i.i.d. $\sim N(0,1)$. After some work it turns out that the crux is to analyse the following sum

typical case among exponentially many terms. Then we use the following lemma

[1] P.W. Shor. "Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring". In: *Proceedings 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer* Science. 1994, pp. 124–134. DOI: 10.1109/SFCS.1994.365700. [2] Jin-Yi Cai. "Shor's Algorithm Does Not Factor Large Integers in the Presence of Noise". In: CoRR abs/2306.10072 (2023). DOI: 10.48550/arXiv.2306. 10072. arXiv: 2306.10072. URL: https://doi.org/10.48550/arXiv.2306.10072.



Main Results

$$\epsilon_0 \approx O(n^{-1/3}).$$

Theorem 2 [2] With the same level of noise, Shor's algorithm fails, with probability close to 1, to factor N = pq for uniformly randomly chosen *n*-bit primes p and q, as $n \to \infty$.

$$b + \log_2(1/\epsilon) < \frac{1}{3}\log_2 m - c.$$

A Taste of the Proof

$$\int_{0}^{1} \exp\left\{2\pi i \left[\sum_{t=1}^{n} \frac{\sum_{s=0}^{n-t} u_{n-t-s}^{(k)} v_s}{2^t} + \frac{\epsilon}{2^b} \left\{ \left(u_{n-b}^{(k)} r_0^{(0)} + \dots + \frac{u_0^{(k)} r_{n-b}^{(0)}}{2^{n-b}}\right) v_0 + \left(u_{n-b-1}^{(k)} r_0^{(1)} + \dots + \frac{u_0^{(k)} r_{n-b-1}^{(1)}}{2^{n-b-1}}\right) v_1 + \dots + u_0^{(k)} r_0^{(n-b)} v_n \right\}$$

$$r_0^{(0)}, \dots, r_{n-b}^{(0)}, r_0^{(1)}, \dots, r_{n-b-1}^{(1)}, \dots, r_0^{(n-b-1)}, r_1^{(n-b-1)}, r_0^{(n-b)}$$

$$\frac{\epsilon}{2^{b}} \left(u_{n-b}^{(k)} v_0 r_0^{(0)} + u_{n-b-1}^{(k)} v_1 r_0^{(1)} + \ldots + u_0^{(k)} v_{n-b} r_0^{(n-b)} \right) = \frac{\epsilon}{2^{b}} \sum_{i=b}^{n} u_{i-b}^{(k)} v_{n-i} r_0^{(n-i)}.$$

This quantity appears as a subsum in the exponent in $\exp\{2\pi i [\ldots]\}$ in (1).

The main proof is to establish that, the sum (2) in the exponent in the exponential sum (1), behaves sufficiently randomly, in the

Lemma [2] Let $\sigma > 0$ and $\xi_m = e^{2\pi i/m}$. Let $X_i \sim N(0,1)$, i.i.d. for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$, and let $\{S_k \subseteq [n] \mid 1 \leq k \leq K\}$ be a finite collection of sets. Assume, all except at most δ fraction of pairwise symmetric differences $S_i \Delta S_k$ have cardinality $\geq (m/\sigma)^2 t$ for $j \neq k$. Let $\Sigma_k = \varphi_k + \sigma \sum_{i \in S_k} X_i$, where $\varphi_k \in [0, 2\pi)$. Then, the expectation

$$\mathbf{E}[|\xi_m^{\Sigma_1} + \xi_m^{\Sigma_2} + \ldots + \xi_m^{\Sigma_K}|^2] \le K + 2\delta\binom{K}{2} + 2(1-\delta)\binom{K}{2}e^{-2\pi^2 t}.$$

What does this mean?

Quantum mechanics is unquestionably an accurate model of microscopic physical reality.

But, despite being very accurate, it is not infinitely accurate. I believe the SU(2) description of possible operations of a qubit to be only approximately true. Specifically, I don't believe arbitrarily small angle rotations permitted by SU(2) have physical meaning. The Schrödinger equation $i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\Psi(t)\rangle = \hat{H} |\Psi(t)\rangle$ suggests that small angles are related to small time periods. But physicists have suggested that time ultimately is also discrete. (Planck time is only about 5.39×10^{-44}).

It is unknown whether quantum error correction can save this. But if arbitrarily small angle rotations lack physical meaning, then it is doubtful quantum error correction code can correct to something that does not exist.

References

