

Medium induced jet broadening in a quantum computer

4th August 2022, Confinement XV

Based on: 2104.04661, with C. Salgado

2208.XXXX, with C. Salgado, M. Li, W. Qian, X. Du



João Barata, BNL

Why quantum computing for jets?

See also talks by L. Apolinário, P. Caucal, M. A. Escobedo, A. Sadofyev, ... Many of the pheno relevant effects in jet quenching have a quantum origin

e.g.



Qcomputers should be able to handle quantum systems naturally!



What can we learn about jets from these machines ?







Jet quenching in a QC: a possible approach







Integrating out x⁻ the quark propagator satisfies

$$\left(i\partial_t + \frac{\partial_{\boldsymbol{x}}^2}{2\omega} + g\mathcal{A}^-(t,\boldsymbol{x})\cdot T\right)G(t,\boldsymbol{x};0,\boldsymbol{y}) = i\delta(t)\delta(\boldsymbol{x}-\boldsymbol{y})$$

Parton evolution is equivalent to 2+1d non-rel. QM

$$\mathcal{H}(t) = rac{p^2}{2\omega} + g\mathcal{A}^-(t, \boldsymbol{x}) \cdot T = \mathcal{H}_K + \mathcal{H}_\mathcal{A}(t)$$

p-space x-space

Consider the simplest case:

- $|q\rangle$ Fock space only
- **2.** T = 1
- Stochastic background (hybrid approach) 3.



The quantum simulation algorithm

QComputers can efficiently simulate real time evolution ruled by:

$$|\psi\rangle(t) = \exp(-iHt)|\psi\rangle(0)$$

The 5 main steps of the Quantum Simulation Algorithm:

1. Provide
$$H = \sum_{k} H_k$$
 and $\psi(0)$

Encode the physical d.o.f's in terms of qubits and decompose H_k in terms of gates 2.

- 3. Prepare the initial wave function from a fiducial state ($|0\rangle^{\otimes n_{qubits}}$)
- **4.** Time evolve according to exp(-iHt)
- **5.** Implement a measurement protocol







1. Provide
$$H = H_K + H_A(t)$$
 and $\psi(0) =$

Encode the physical d.o.f's in terms of qubits and write H in terms of gates 2. Introduce 2d spatial lattice with $N_s = 2^{n_Q}$ sites per dimension

$$|\mathbf{x}\rangle = |x_1, x_2\rangle$$

such that

 $H = rac{oldsymbol{P}^2}{2E} + gA(t, oldsymbol{X}$

$$\hat{P}|p\rangle = p|p\rangle \qquad \hat{X}|z$$

Prepare the initial wave function from a fiducial state ($|0\rangle^{\otimes n_{\text{qubits}}}$) \checkmark 3.



$= \psi(\mathbf{p} = 0) + \text{ensemble of } \{A, p_A\}$

 $= a_{1} | n_{1}, n_{2} \rangle$

$$T = H_K + H_A(t)$$



 $x\rangle = x \,|\, x\rangle \qquad x, p \in \mathbb{Z}$



4. Time evolve according to U Assuming that field is static we use

and the second and the second second

$$U(L_{\eta}; 0) = \prod_{k=1}^{N_t} U(x_k^+; x_{k-1}^+)$$

Implement operators with a Fourier Transform in between

$$\exp\left\{-i\delta x^{+}\frac{\hat{p}^{2}}{2p^{+}}\right\} \quad |\psi_{\mathbf{p}}\rangle \qquad |\mathbf{p}\rangle \qquad qFT$$



$$U(x_k^+ + \delta x^+; x_k^+) \approx U_K(\delta x^+) U_A(\delta x^+, x_k^+)$$
$$\equiv \exp\left\{-i\delta x^+ \frac{\hat{p}^2}{2p^+}\right\} \exp\left\{-ig\delta x^+ \hat{A}_a^-(x_k^+)T^a\right\}$$

$$\left| \begin{array}{c} \mathbf{X} \\ \mathbf{X} \\$$





4. Time evolve according to ${\cal U}$

Field insertions require probing the field value. This is done classically



Requires $O(N_{\text{states}})$ field evaluations; Ok for resolving parton evolution

Major limitation of the approach due to classical treatment of medium

Can be made more efficient with further discretization of the field values





Implement a measurement protocol 5.



Rough estimate: for Gaussian errors and an uniform distribution, statistical error of 10% requires $\sim 10^2 \times \text{#states shots}$



 $\ket{\psi_L} = \sum_{\boldsymbol{q}} \psi_L^{\boldsymbol{q}} \ket{\boldsymbol{q}}$

Generic final state

Due to quantumness, measurement needs optimization: interference experiment

SWAP test: find overlap of 2 wave-functions

Rough estimate: ~ $10^2 \times \# \mathcal{O}(1)$ shots



Set up:

- 1. T = 1 (no colors) mostly
- Static brick of length 10 fm 2.
- 5/6 qubits per spatial dimension (1024/4096 states in total). 3.
- 4.

Determined by saturation scale:

$$g^2 \tilde{\mu} = \sqrt{\frac{2\pi Q_s^2}{C_F L_\eta}}$$

Determined by lattice saturation conditions:

$$\frac{\pi}{N_{\perp}m_g} \ll a_{\perp} \ll \frac{\pi}{Q}$$

(relevant physical region is covered)

$$a_{\perp}^2 Q_s^2 < \frac{4\pi^2}{3} \Big[\log(\frac{1}{a_{\perp}^2 m_g^2 / \pi^2} + 1) - \frac{1}{1 + a_{\perp}^2 m_g^2 / \pi^2} \Big]^{-1} \text{ (edge equation)}$$





We use 5 field configurations. These are determined by lattice spacing and the field strength



effects are absent)



The jet quenching parameter on the lattice is easily obtained analytically:

$$\hat{q} = \frac{1}{t} \int_{\boldsymbol{p},\boldsymbol{x},\boldsymbol{y}} \boldsymbol{p}^2 e^{-i\boldsymbol{p}\cdot(\boldsymbol{y}-\boldsymbol{x})} \langle\!\langle \boldsymbol{W}^{\dagger}(\boldsymbol{y})\boldsymbol{W}(\boldsymbol{x})\rangle\!\rangle = g^2 \langle\!\langle \boldsymbol{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}(\boldsymbol{0})\cdot\boldsymbol{\nabla}_{\boldsymbol{x}}\boldsymbol{\mathcal{A}}(\boldsymbol{0})\rangle\!\rangle = \frac{g^4}{4\pi} C_F \tilde{\mu}^2 \left\{ \log\left(1 + \frac{\frac{\pi^2}{a_{\perp}^2}}{m_g^2}\right) - \frac{1}{1 + \frac{a_{\perp}^2 m_g^2}{\pi^2}}\right\}$$





In accordance with expected result w/wo kinetic terms

Deviation at large saturation values due to lattice







Same result but for two different lattices at infinite jet energy











Same results but for a SU(2) background







Product formula decomposition



also works by JB, Sadofyev, Salgado; Fu, Casalderrey-Solana, Wang; Sadofyev, Sievert, Vitev; Sadofyev, Dominguez, Andrés; ...

See also talk by A. Sadofyev



Energy independent terms might give sizable contribution !













Conclusion and Outlook





See e.g.: 1907.03653 F. Dominguez, J. G. Milhano, C. Salgado, K. Tywoniuk, V. Vila

