Testing and Debugging Quantum Programs: The Road to 2030

Neilson C. L. Ramalho neilson@usp.br School of Arts, Sciences, and Humanities – University of São Paulo São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil Higor A. de Souza higor.souza@unesp.br Department of Computing – São Paulo State University Bauru, São Paulo, Brazil Marcos L. Chaim chaim@usp.br School of Arts, Sciences, and Humanities – University of São Paulo São Paulo, São Paulo, Brazil

Abstract

Quantum Computing has existed in the theoretical realm for several decades. Recently, given the latest developments in hardware, quantum computing has re-emerged as a promising technology with the potential to solve problems that a classical computer could take hundreds of years to solve. With the rising interest in the field, there are challenges and opportunities for academics and practitioners in terms of software engineering practices, particularly in testing and debugging quantum programs. This paper presents a roadmap for addressing these challenges, pointing out the existing gaps in the literature and suggesting research directions. We present the current state-of-the-art testing and debugging strategies, including classical techniques applied to quantum programs, the development and implementation of quantum-specific assertions, and the identification and classification of bug patterns unique to quantum computing. Additionally, we introduce a conceptual model to illustrate the main concepts regarding the testing and debugging of quantum programs as well as the relationship between them. Those concepts are then used to identify and discuss the main research challenges to cope with quantum programs through 2030, focusing on the interfaces between classical and quantum computing and on creating testing and debugging techniques that take advantage of the unique quantum computing characteristics.

CCS Concepts

Software and its engineering → Software testing and debugging; Hardware → Quantum computation.

ACM Reference Format:

Neilson C. L. Ramalho, Higor A. de Souza, and Marcos L. Chaim. 2024. Testing and Debugging Quantum Programs: The Road to 2030. In *Proceedings of*. ACM, New York, NY, USA, 10 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnn. nnnnnnn

1 Introduction

Quantum computing has leaped forward in recent years, gaining attention from both academia and industry. The main reason to develop software and hardware solutions based on the quantum realm is the need to speed up the processing of complex problems.

ACM ISBN 978-x-xxxx-xxxx-x/YY/MM...\$15.00

A quantum computer is a device that takes advantage of the specific properties described by quantum mechanics to perform computation [19]. While quantum computers have been a theoretical concept for years, several companies are now engaged in developing hardware, programming frameworks, and quantum programming languages such as Q# from Microsoft¹, Cirq from Google², and Qiskit from IBM³. As hardware development progresses, quantum computing applications are becoming increasingly important and promising, with potential in fields such as molecular simulations, cybersecurity, finance, and logistics. Quantum computing has also been used to accelerate the execution of classical machine learning and to create new quantum machine learning algorithms [10].

Software Engineering practices and techniques must support the development of quantum applications to achieve productivity, quality, and business-oriented solutions. On one hand, software engineers must know the fundamental basis of quantum computing to understand its specificities. On the other hand, specialists in developing quantum applications should comprehend the importance of software engineer practices, methods, and techniques to deliver bug-free applications that can be maintained during their lifecycles.

With the spread of frameworks and programming languages, it is important to ensure that quantum computing applications will work as expected, both as standalone components and as sub-modules of larger hybrid applications with classical computing components. Quantum computing has certain characteristics that pose new challenges for testing and debugging for researchers and practitioners [50]. To keep up with advances made by practitioners, researchers are proposing strategies to test and debug quantum applications, adapting existing techniques or creating new approaches based on quantum computing concepts.

This paper presents a roadmap with insights concerning the future of testing and debugging of quantum programs. We will first provide a brief theoretical background about quantum computing. Concepts such as quantum bits (qubits), superposition, and entanglement are explained and illustrated with an example. By doing so, we will be able to discuss the impact of those quantum characteristics for testing and debugging. In Section 3, we present an overview of the state-of-the-art and state-of-the-practice in quantum computing, such as classical testing and debugging techniques applied for quantum programs, quantum assertions, bug patterns, and bug hierarchies in quantum programs. In Section 4, we propose a conceptual model that represents the topics related to testing and debugging quantum applications. This model will be used to discuss concerns and challenges for the future on the road to 2030. Finally, Section 5 contains our remarks and conclusions.

Permission to make digital or hard copies of all or part of this work for personal or classroom use is granted without fee provided that copies are not made or distributed for profit or commercial advantage and that copies bear this notice and the full citation on the first page. Copyrights for components of this work owned by others than ACM must be honored. Abstracting with credit is permitted. To copy otherwise, or republish, to post on servers or to redistribute to lists, requires prior specific permission and/or a fee. Request permissions from permissions@acm.org.

[,] May 2024,

^{© 2024} Association for Computing Machinery.

https://doi.org/10.1145/nnnnnnnnnnnn

¹https://learn.microsoft.com/en-us/azure/quantum/user-guide/

²https://quantumai.google/cirq

³https://qiskit.org/

2 Quantum computing concepts

To understand the differences between a Classical Program (CP) and a Quantum Program (QP) in terms of testing and debugging, it is useful to explore some of the key characteristics of QC [50]:

- Quantum parallelism: Superposition is the quantum principle that allows calculations to consider multiple quantum states simultaneously, thus leveraging parallelism.
- **Statistical results in most cases**: unlike classical programs, most quantum computing applications are governed by the inherent uncertainty of superposition.
- Exponential scaling: as qubits can assume two values (|0⟩ and |1⟩), the input space of quantum programs scales as 2^N, where N is the number of qubits. With 50 qubits, for example, the number of possibilities increases to 2⁵⁰, which can not be simulated even by current supercomputers.
- Quantum interference: interference occurs when two quantum states are combined so that their amplitudes either amplify (constructive interference for the right answer) or cancel (destructive interference for incorrect answers).
- Asking the right question: This characteristic refers to the mapping of the problem statement such as it can be solved by a quantum computer.

Besides the concepts mentioned above, there are also characteristics such as entanglement and the no-cloning theorem that directly impact the testing and debugging of quantum programs. These concepts will be discussed in detail in the following paragraphs with the support of the running example presented in Listing 1.

```
1 from qiskit import QuantumCircuit
2 from qiskit_aer import Aer
3 from qiskit import transpile
4 from qiskit.visualization import plot_histogram
5 from matplotlib import pyplot as plt
6
7 # creating a circuit with 2 classical
8 # registers and 2 quantum registers
9 circuit = QuantumCircuit(2)
10
11 circuit.h(0)
12 circuit.cx(0,1)
13 circuit.measure_all()
14
15 # Transpile for simulator
16 simulator = Aer.get_backend('aer_simulator')
17 circuit = transpile (circuit, simulator)
18 # simulates the circuit
19 result = simulator.run(circuit, shots=100).result()
20 counts = result.get counts(circuit)
21 plot_histogram(counts)
22 plt.show()
```

Listing 1: Running example with the Bell state circuit

The code is written in Python and is based on Qiskit, an opensource software development kit for working with quantum computers at the level of pulses, circuits, and application modules [5]. One of the central aspects of programming using Qiskit is the circuit, which consists of one or more quantum operators. Figure 1 presents the Python code based on Qiskit for the quantum circuit described in Listing 1. Quantum circuits are composed of wires and quantum gates, responsible for carrying around and manipulating quantum information [40]. The vertical dashed lines are called barriers and are used in this example to divide the circuit into pieces so it is easier to explain the parts individually. The circuit of Figure 1 is composed of two qubits (q_0 and q_1), a Hadamard, and a CNOT operator, as well as the measurements for each qubit.



Figure 1: Running example circuit

Similarly to classical bits, qubits can assume two different measurable states: $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$, which are, to a certain extent, equivalent to the classical binary states 0 and 1. However, since qubits are physically subatomic particles, they have certain quantum mechanical properties such as superposition of states and entanglement. Computations that would normally need to be performed serially on 0 and 1 separately on a classical computer could now be completed in a single operation using a qubit on a quantum computer, making computations faster [23].

Qubits can be in different states, represented in Quantum Mechanics as vectors, usually with the Dirac notation. In this notation, vectors are represented as bra-kets, in which a ket is the column vector and a bra its conjugate transpose. In this way, the vectors representing the states $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ are defined as:

$$|0\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 1\\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad |1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} 0\\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$$

In Listing 1, line 9, the constructor *QuantumCircuit* creates two qubits initialized with the base state $|0\rangle$ and two classical registers to store the results of the measurements operations in each qubit created. The circuit is composed of q_0 and q_1 and is, at this point, a composite system. A system with multiple qubits is called a composite quantum system [26] and is the result of the tensor product of the separate, individual spaces. For instance, a composite system with two qubits consists of a single quantum system with four dimensions. In general terms, a composite of a quantum system of N qubits consists of a single quantum system with 2^N dimensions.

The composition is represented by the symbol \otimes , which is the tensor product of the state vectors that represent each qubit individually. For two qubits, the computational basis is $|00\rangle$, $|01\rangle$, $|10\rangle$, and $|11\rangle$. The tensor product is defined in the Dirac notation as:

$$|x\rangle \otimes |y\rangle \equiv |x\rangle |y\rangle \equiv |xy\rangle$$

As stated by quantum mechanics principles, systems are set to a definite state only once they are measured. Before a measurement, the systems are in an indeterminate state. For instance, the superposition of $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ is a linear combination of these states:

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle \tag{1}$$

The state presented in Equation 1 is usually represented as $|+\rangle$, whereas the state $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |0\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle$ is represented by $|-\rangle$.

When quantum states are in a superposition, the probability of a state resulting after the measurement is equal to the modulus squared of the amplitude of that state. This is known as the Born Rule and it was demonstrated by Max Born in 1926. In Equation 1, the probability of the state $|0\rangle$ or $|1\rangle$ being returned after measurement is equal to:

$$P(|0\rangle) = P(|1\rangle) = \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right|^2 = \frac{1}{2}$$
 (2)

Notice that the Born Rule maps state measurements to the concept of probability, i.e., the sum of the squares of the amplitudes of all possible states in the superposition is equal to 1:

$$|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1 \tag{3}$$

For the example in Listing 1, the qubits are measured in line 13 (*measure_all* method). Based on the Born Rule, q_0 will have a 50% chance of collapsing to $|0\rangle$ and 50% of collapsing to $|1\rangle$, as follows:

$$\left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right|^2 + \left|\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}\right|^2 = 1$$

However, since the example circuit is composed of q_0 and q_1 , the result is a combined state between these two qubits, which is represented by the tensor product (\otimes). Another interesting characteristic of QC is *Entanglement*, which can be defined as a physical phenomenon in which multiple qubits are correlated with each other, such as the measurement of one of them automatically triggers correlated states of the others, even if these qubits are separated by great distances. In mathematical terms, entangled qubits represent superposition states that are not separable, i.e., cannot be factored into product states. In Listing 1, the entanglement is achieved with the CNOT (Conditional NOT) operator (line 12), which acts on two qubits, a control qubit (which is in superposition) and a target qubit, as follows:

- if the control qubit is |0>, no action is taken on the target qubit.
- However, in case the control qubit is |1⟩, the target qubit is switched.
- the control qubit remains the same.

With the circuit defined, the next step consists of assembling it and submitting it to a back-end for execution. For Listing 1, the circuit is submitted on line 19 to the Aer simulator (defined in line 16), which consists of an ideal (noise-free) simulator running in the local computer [52]. Given the probabilistic nature of quantum programs, experiments usually need to be executed multiple times (parameter shots, defined in line 19 in the run method), so the results can be checked against a certain expected probabilistic distribution. Once the circuit is executed, the results are collected in a variable called count, which contains a map of the returned values as well as their frequency. Lastly, the function *plot_histogram* will print the returned results on (the x-axis) and their respective frequencies (on the y-axis). Because of the differences in devices in terms of quantum architectures and hardware implementation details, there is a process called transpilation, which is responsible for rewriting a given input circuit to match the topology of that specific quantum device and optimizing the circuit [5]. In the running example, the

transpilation is executed in line 17, by calling the method transpile with the circuit and the target execution environment (Aer simulator). One key difference of QC applications when compared to their classical counterparts is the inability to clone quantum states. This is known as the *No-cloning Theorem*. In classical computing, making multiple copies or inspecting the value of variables is a common task. The no-cloning theorem states that it is not possible to create a copy of an arbitrary quantum state [50]. Thus, a read operation of an intermediate state in a qubit will make the quantum state collapse to a classical value, which will be the output state. Thus, the no-cloning theorem poses an important limitation to the process of debugging quantum programs.

There are also gates such as R_x , R_y , and R_z that are defined in terms of angles or rotations. These gates accept an angle as a parameter and rotate the target qubit around their respective axis by the specified angle. They are used in variational quantum algorithms, which are the basis of many Quantum Machine Learning (QML) algorithms. QML is currently a very active research area in QC and has emerged as a dominant paradigm for circuit-based quantum programs in the current noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) era [48].

In QML applications, there is typically a predefined parameterized quantum circuit (or variational circuit) with predefined architectures whose parameters are optimized by classical optimization algorithms. They are composed of different elements such as parameterized gates and entangling blocks. The classical data are coded into quantum states using different techniques and fed into the parameterized circuit. The output is read and sent to the classical optimizer. Some of the techniques for coding the classical data into quantum states are Basis Encoding, Amplitude Encoding, Time-Evolution Encoding, and Hamiltonian Encoding. As for the output, the most common approaches to map the results of the measurements to a class or label in a classification problem are Parity Post Processing [18] and Measuring the first qubit.

3 Current testing and debugging approaches for quantum computing

This section summarizes the main testing strategies applied to QPs, as well as assertions, bug patterns, taxonomies, and benchmarks. Finally, an overview of the main debugging techniques is presented.

3.1 Testing strategies

In terms of testing QPs, there are systematic studies [11, 14, 63] that present a broad overview of different techniques, varying from adapting classical approaches to QPs with multiple measurements and statistical analyses to using Hoare logic to determine whether a quantum program is correct. These works also cover topics such as Bug Benchmark frameworks for QPs [8, 65], reusability of quantum algorithms, data structures, and libraries [16], quantum algorithm development [51], formal verification of quantum protocols [6], simulation of QP [49], and other traditional classical methods such as Mutation Testing, Property-based testing, and Fuzz testing. Other authors [63] explore the issues with testing and debugging QPs from a different perspective: they study bug types, taxonomies, bug repositories [8, 66] and benchmarks [21, 32, 65]. These systematic reviews cover in detail other topics such as Assertions types [22,

27, 29, 62], and the overall challenges associated with the testing of QPs [37]. In what follows, we describe the most promising testing and debugging techniques for QPs.

Classical testing strategies developed for QC cover different aspects of a QP. For instance, Quito (QUantum InpuT Output coverage) [2] is a framework to tackle the problem of test oracles for QPs, as well as coverage criteria for the program input, output, and input-output relations. The framework takes into account a Program Specification (PS) and uses statistical analysis of the test results to determine the criteria for passing the tests. Two Test Oracles are defined: Wrong Output Oracle (WOO) and Output Probability Oracle (OPO). Another classical approach used to tackle the dimensional problem of the input space is equivalence class partitioning, which is a functional testing technique that consists of dividing the input domain into different classes in which the software being tested has supposedly the same behavior [54]. For QPs, Long and Zhao [31] have defined two equivalence partitioning criteria, namely:

- Classical-Superposition Partition (CSP) each input variable of each quantum state type is divided into classical state input and superposition state input.
- (2) Classical-Superposition-Mixed partition (CSMP) each input variable of each quantum state type is divided into classical state input, superposition state input, and mixed state input.

In terms of general classical testing approaches adapted for the testing of QPs, a few other examples in the literature are detailed in the following subsections.

Combinatorial Testing. The coverage criterion defined in Quito has scalability issues as the number of qubits increases. Thus, researchers have been working on optimization approaches to limit the input space. An example of such an approach is QuCAT (QUantum CombinAtorial Testing) [58], a framework that applies Combinatorial Testing (CT) to generate tests for QP. The idea is that faulty points in the program can be reached through a particular combination of the input values of a given characteristic such as pair-wise or 3-wise.

Search-based testing. A test generation tool for quantum programs, QuSBT (Search-based Testing of Quantum Programs) [59], uses genetic algorithms to generate a test suite for quantum programs with the maximum number of failing tests. The input for the tool consists of the quantum program under test, a list of the input and output qubits, the total number of qubits, and a program specification (PS). The PS maps each input value to its respective probability of occurrence. A statistical test (Pearson's chi-square) is used for checking failures with a probabilistic nature, in which the user can also specify the significance level for the test.

Fuzz Testing. Wang *et al.* [55] investigated the use of Fuzz Testing in the generation of rare inputs in QP to trigger sensitive branches and thus induce crashes or discover defects. The idea is to use a gray box testing approach to first identify the code measurement operations and the branches produced by these measurements. The procedure continues by producing input matrices that will maximize the probability of these sensitive branches being triggered, thus reaching the code with the possible defect. As measurement

operations make qubits collapse to classical values, this approach is more of a hybrid quantum-classical technique, as everything after the measurement is purely classical and does not depend on any quantum characteristic.

Property-Based Testing. The probabilistic nature of QC programs makes it difficult to assert the value of certain quantum states, especially for test cases in which superposition plays a role. Propertybased testing has been studied as an alternative to mitigate the non-deterministic nature of QPs [20], as its main approach consists of generating tests based on general properties of the artifact being tested and not in concrete test cases. As with the classical property-based testing approach, the properties are described as preconditions as well as post-conditions and concrete program states become higher-level abstractions. The authors created a property specification language for testing Q# programs and a propertybased testing method to generate, execute, and statistically assert the results of concrete test cases. To assert the test results, the authors define five types of assertions: Assert Probability, Assert Entanglement, Assert Equal, Assert Teleported, and Assert Transformed.

Mutation Testing. Mutation testing plays two important roles in QPs: (1) mutation operators can be used to create faulty versions of QP [2], thus mitigating the lack of quantum bug repositories and quantum benchmark programs, and (2) to assess the quality of test suites for QP. In terms of the assessment of the quality of test suites, Mendiluze et al.[33] developed a mutation analysis tool for QPs called Muskit (MUtation testing for QisKIT) based on the Qiskit framework. Muskit has three components: Mutants Generator, Mutants Executor, and a Test Analyzer. The mutant generator component defines three mutation operators: Add Gate, Remove Gate, and Replace Gate. Similarly, Fortunato et al.[13] investigated the application of mutation testing in QPs written in Qiskit. The authors created a set of mutation operators to generate mutants based on qubit measurements and quantum gates. These operations were incorporated in a framework called QMutPy, which consists of an extension of the MutPy, a Python-based tool for mutation testing. QMutPy extends the mutation operators already present in MutPy with five quantum operators: Quantum Gate Replacement (QGR), Quantum Gate Deletion (QGD), Quantum Gate Insertion (QGI), Quantum Measurement Insertion (QMI), and Quantum Measurement Deletion (QMD), which derive from the classical mutant operations.

Metamorphic Testing. Previous works [1] developed an approach to use metamorphic relations to test quantum programs. In their work, the authors use metamorphic rules, written as quantum functions and based on properties of the QP, to avoid or delay direct qubit measurement. These metamorphic relations are written as functions that can be executed directly in a quantum computer, consisting of what the authors call an "oracle quantum program". Another approach developed by Paltenghi and Pradel [44] is MorphQ, a metamorphic testing framework that aims to tackle two challenges related to testing QPs: (1) the lack of quantum programs available for testing; and (2) the oracle problem. MorphQ is equipped with an automatic quantum program generator, which uses both templatebased and grammar-based code generation. The resulting programs do not crash during execution, as the generating strategies consider domain-specific constraints of quantum computing. To alleviate the oracle problem, MorphQ implements ten metamorphic transformations, such that the source and the follow-up programs have related outputs with equivalent behaviors.

Other Quantum-based Testing Approaches. The characteristics of QC described in Section 2, notably superposition and the impossibility of cloning quantum states, pose interesting challenges for researchers in Quantum Software Testing. However, other particularities of quantum systems have been leveraged in the development of novel testing approaches. Reversibility and the unitary nature of quantum operations are cornerstone concepts in specific testing techniques, including: (i) partial equivalence checking [9], (ii) fast equivalence checking for quantum circuits [61], (iii) fault testing for reversible circuits [45], (iv) methods for k-CNOT gates (multiplecontrol Toffoli gates) [39], and (v) design techniques for gates such as Toffoli, Fredkin, and mixed Toffoli-Fredkin that aim to improve circuit testability [15]. Other approaches such as Qraft [46] are fully based on the reversal of the circuit being tested to predict the program output. The idea of Qraft is to reverse the quantum circuit and execute the full forward as well as its reversed version to deduce the correct program output for all the quantum states of the original (forward) circuit. Similarly, Qdiff [56], a differential testing framework for testing QPs, takes advantage of reversibility and unitary operators to generate logically equivalent variants of the QPs being tested. Finally, Miranskyy's [36] approach considers using QCs to speed up dynamic tests of classical programs. Although the focus of his work is not the test of QPs per se, the author shows that, in some cases, it is possible to translate a classical program to a quantum program and then take advantage of QC computational power.

3.2 Assertions

Assertions in QPs are an important area of study due to the unique constraints posed by quantum computing (Section 2). These include non-deterministic outcomes causing the oracle problem, and the no-cloning theorem. The probabilistic behavior also studied in the testing of classical programs is particularly relevant due to the uncertain nature of quantum states. Thus, for the programmer creating tests for a quantum routine, it is considerably difficult to define an oracle upon which the assertions can be based. The inability to directly read quantum states without collapsing them to classical values makes it impossible to use assertions in the middle of a QP. Consequently, the approaches that emerged to tackle the challenges associated with assertions in QPs are:

(1) Measurement-based Assertions – these assertions measure the qubit under test at a certain point during the program execution. As such, the state of the qubit collapses and the subsequent execution of the program is impacted. These assertions assume that the program needs to be executed multiple times to perform statistical tests and determine the possible state of the qubit given a certain significance level. Examples of measurement-based assertions are Statistical Assertions [22], Assertions using Swap-Tests [25], and Projection-based Assertions [27].

- (2) Quantum-based Assertions these assertions are usually called runtime or dynamic assertions and do not rely on measuring the assessed qubit. As the qubit is not measured, the program state is not impacted as the quantum state does not collapse to a classical value. The main types of quantum-based assertions defined in the literature are Runtime (Dynamic) Assertion checking [29], Assertions for Memberships / Approximate Assertions, and Swap-based assertions [30].
- (3) Other types of assertions found in the literature explore particular characteristics of the circuit being tested. They are: Assertions for Symmetry States [28], Nondestructive discrimination (NDD) assertions [29], and Invariant and Inductive assertions [62].

3.3 Bug Patterns in Quantum Programs

In terms of improving the quality of quantum programs and reducing the likelihood of producing software with defects, there have been efforts focusing on mainly two strategies: (i) developing techniques to identify and fix bugs, and (ii) studying the most common defect patterns in QP as well as their characteristics. Knowing the most recurrent bugs and how they manifest themselves in real QPs can help researchers in the development of new ways to mitigate these bugs before they occur.

Focusing on debugging QPs, Huang and Martonosi [21] surveyed a set of quantum computing (QC) algorithms and conducted smallscale experiments. These experiments were based on the implementation and the gradual debugging of each step of these programs. Through this process, the authors identified a set of bug types and proposed methods for mitigating them. The bug types found by the authors are Incorrect classical input parameters, Incorrect quantum initial values, Incorrect operations and transformations, Incorrect composition of operations using iteration, Incorrect deallocation of qubits, Incorrect composition of operations using mirroring, and Incorrect composition of operations using recursion. Following a similar structure, but centering their work more on static analysis and less on debugging, Zhao et al.[65] studied bug patterns in QPs written in Qiskit. The authors identified eight bug types, classified into four areas: Initialization, Gate operations, Measurements, and Deallocation. The authors further define bug types for each of the areas listed above. They are Unequal Classical Bits and Qubits, Custom Gates not Recognised, Insufficient Initial Qubits, Over Repeated Measurement Incorrect Operations after Measurement, Unsafely Uncomputation, Inappropriately Modification of Register Size, and Method measure_all. On a more general work, Luo et al. [32] studied 96 real-world bugs and their fixes in four programming languages: Qiskit, Cirq, Q#, and ProjectQ. The bugs analyzed were collected from public repositories on GitHub and questions posted by programmers in Q&A websites Stack Overflow and Stack Exchange. The authors found that more than 80% of the bugs analyzed were related to the quantum-specific parts of the applications. Furthermore, all bugs categorized as having high complexity were found to be associated with quantum computing components in the programs analyzed.

3.3.1 Bug Taxonomies. Following a similar approach as Luo et al.[32], Paltenghi and Pradel [43] ran an empirical study and analyzed 223 bugs from 18 open-source quantum computing projects, showing that 39.9% of all analyzed bugs were related to quantumspecific parts of these platforms such as parts that represent, compile, and optimize quantum programming abstractions. Moreover, the authors show that many of those bugs do not cause the executing program to crash, but return erroneous results, making it more challenging to identify them. The findings indicate that 9.9% of all bugs analyzed by the authors are related to quantum computing concepts and are placed in components that implement, assemble, and optimize quantum-related routines. In terms of bugs in QML frameworks, Zhao et al. [64] investigated 391 real-world bugs collected from 22 open-source repositories of nine popular QML frameworks. They identified that 28% of the bugs found are on quantum-specific parts of the code, underscoring the importance of developing methods to find and prevent them.

3.3.2 Bug Benchmarks. Benchmarks are widely used in classical software testing to simplify repeated experiments and provide repeatable and objective comparisons [53]. Bug benchmarks are datasets with known bugs, usually including the faulty code, a fixed version, and a test to replicate the problem. For Quantum Software, in terms of bug benchmarks, QBugs [8] is a framework that consists of a collection of bugs in quantum software. As quantum algorithms available for testing are scarce, QBugs' authors suggest the creation of an open-source catalog for quantum algorithms, along with a supporting infrastructure that can be used for developers and thus facilitate the execution of controlled empirical experiments. Following a practical approach, Bugs4Q [66] is another bug benchmark that consists of 36 real bugs from Qiskit. These bugs were collected, validated, and made available for the community with their respective test cases for reproducing the erroneous behaviors. The idea of the framework is to keep evolving by adding new bugs with new versions of Qiskit, thus building up a reference bug database with their fixes, unit tests to reproduce buggy behavior, and an interface to access and run experiments.

3.4 Debugging Techniques

Classical debugging methods such as backtracking, cause elimination, and brute force, have been explored and suggested as possible approaches for debugging quantum programs [37, 38]. However, debugging quantum programs is currently a challenging problem due to the characteristics of QC such as superposition and the inability to clone quantum states. For instance, a typical debugging approach, which consists of adding print statements in the code to display intermediate values for certain variables, can not be used in QPs due to the collapsing problem. Although simulators help to observe quantum states for QPs running on classical computers, they are limited to small programs, as the state explosion for programs with a higher number of qubits makes it unmanageable for classical computers. Furthermore, there are challenges in the interpretation of simulation results, even for small quantum programs [21], which present research opportunities in developing scalable visualizations and improving the interpretability of large-scale graphs that developers can use to inspect and better understand the intermediate states of the QPs being debugged [7]. The tooling for developing

and debugging quantum algorithms is still limited and has scattered features. Practitioners, for instance, tend to use different tools (such as IBM Composer [24] and OpenQASM [42]) and alternate between them while debugging quantum algorithms [7]. In terms of debugging strategies for quantum algorithms, programmers may vary from coarse-grained (e.g., for quantum chemistry simulations in which the pair-wise electron interactions do not have inherent physical meanings) to fine-grained as inspecting the inner details of the intermediate subroutines, allowing one to compare intermediate results with the known expected values [21]. Previous research [34] adapted debugging with slicing (a classical debugging technique) for OPs. The approach consists of dividing quantum circuits into smaller blocks by adding breakpoints in the form of circuit barriers and executing the blocks separately either in a simulator or a quantum computer. The barriers might have the side effect that some qubits are not used in certain slices, thus allowing the user to add a horizontal slice and separate the unused qubits from the analysis. The vertical slicing is similar to the statistical assertions, as the remaining parts of the circuit need to be simulated to allow the inspection of the intermediate states.

The efforts discussed in this section show that several advances have been made in the realm of testing and debugging in quantum computing. Notwithstanding, there are still gaps to tackle on the road to understanding and proposing effective techniques for the improvement of QPs. The next section is dedicated to discussing these challenges and outlining potential research directions in the testing and debugging of QPs.

4 2030 Horizon: Emerging Challenges and Opportunities

Figure 2 shows a conceptual model representing the main testing and debugging concepts discussed until now and how they are related to each other. We will rely on Figure 2 as a guide for the discussion throughout this section. We will mainly deal with the concepts highlighted in the figure, indicated in boldface, and with those that stem from them, which are indicated in italic.

Quantum computing is in a stage comparable to the initial days of classical computing, in which programs were created using lowlevel machine languages [11]. This lack of higher abstractions to the circuit-based model as well as the absence of **quantum-specific testing techniques** (unlike the adaptation of their classical counterparts) and tooling can pose extra challenges in the testing and debugging of quantum programs.

When it comes to testing techniques, the issues with handling the *combinatorial explosion* of the **input states** in the test of QPs have been well documented [2]. This is notorious for pure QPs, i.e., those conceptualized to demonstrate theoretical concepts or to function as small example programs. In practice, a QP will not exist as an isolated entity, but as part of a complete solution with classical components. In this *hybrid setup*, the first step consists of mapping classical data to quantum data. In these approaches, the inputs of a QP are not only discrete but can also assume continuous values that go through a set of steps to be processed by a QC. Thus, mapping input states with **expected outputs** and developing testing techniques for these areas becomes even more complex.



Figure 2: Conceptual model of quantum computing applications

Following the need to reduce the search space on the **input domain**, several techniques have been developed such as **combinatorial testing**, **search-based testing**, and **fuzz testing**. These techniques are labor intensive, require significant computational resources and effort, and do not tackle the problem completely, as in most real scenarios the input states are not discrete.

On the testing and debugging QPs front, one of the major factors impacting future techniques is the *inability to clone quantum states*, which impacts the inspection of the qubit state. Thus, a simple print statement or the analysis of a qubit in a breakpoint makes the qubit collapse to a classical value, affecting the subsequent execution of the QP. Dynamic assertions can be seen as a way to overcome this limitation, albeit with restrictions. They are limited to asserting certain characteristics of the quantum state, such as identifying superposition or entanglement. While this approach has its practical applications, it shares a limitation with property-based testing: it is limited to asserting properties of the quantum state, rather than the actual quantum state itself. The use of simulators in the development and debugging of QPs can help to circumvent these issues, but they are limited to small programs due to state explosion. Thus, a variety of classical structural testing techniques cannot be directly applied to the testing and debugging of quantum programs. Other research directions that have been followed are the study of **bug patterns**, **taxonomies**, and techniques for debugging quantum programs. Although bug patterns may address known bugs, helping to reduce their occurrences, there may be other bug

types that do not fit into the existing categories. This highlights the importance of developing effective strategies to identify them and overcome existing debugging limitations such as the inability to directly observe intermediate quantum states.

When it comes to the test of *QML applications*, it is observed that, similarly to other QPs, there are efforts to **adapt classical techniques** to the quantum space. The similarities between QML algorithms and neural networks make them suitable to share similar testing approaches. The differences we observe are related to the *encoding of the classical values* to quantum states as well as the outputs produced by the quantum algorithms to classification labels. Although several techniques cover both topics, the testing strategies are, as far as we know, non-existent. On a broader scope, although some testing strategies exist for pure QC applications as well as for QML counterparts, not so much has been developed in terms of the testing of the interfaces between the classical and the quantum world.

As illustrated in Figure 3, QC applications exist as part of a complete application in which the quantum-specific components will execute a part of the job. Thus, exploring testing alternatives and developing ways to test these interfaces is important. Likewise, understanding bug patterns in **hybrid** (classical-quantum) programs and adapting classical debugging techniques to quantum programs are ongoing challenges.

In Figure 4 we summarize the main testing approaches categorizing the type of program being tested and the type of test created for



Figure 3: Quantum Algorithms in the context of a complete application. Adapted from [17].

it. In quadrant A, classical programs are tested and debugged using classical techniques. These are the traditional programming, testing, and debugging strategies without any quantum-related elements. In quadrant B, classical programs are tested and debugged with the support of quantum-centered techniques. In this quadrant, the initiatives focus on using quantum-specific phenomena to speed up classical software testing techniques. For instance, Abreu et al. [1] shown that it is possible to take advantage of quantum parallelism to speed up the testing process of metamorphic rules. Likewise, there have been initiatives [57] focused on utilizing QC, more specifically Quantum Approximate Optimization Algorithms (QAOA), in test case optimization problems. Similarly, other works use Quantum Annealers, which are specialized quantum computers for solving combinatorial optimization problems, to tackle the test minimization problem [60]. In quadrant C, a quantum program is tested and debugged with the support of classical testing and debugging techniques adapted to the context of QC. Most of the existing techniques described in this paper focus on this quadrant, as they are about adapting classical software techniques to quantum programs. Although this approach can help us understand the complexities of testing QPs, it is important to consider the use of quantum mechanics characteristics such as *parallelism* and *interference* in developing the testing and debugging techniques themselves. Quadrant D, on the other hand, contains the least explored domain so far, which consists of quantum programs being tested and debugged with quantum-centered approaches. In this case, the tests are developed targeted to the quantum realm and leveraging quantum-specific features such as superposition, entanglement, and interference.



Figure 4: The four dimensions of Quantum Software Testing and Debugging. Based on [47] and adapted to the context of Quantum Software Testing and Debugging.

The interdisciplinary nature of QC poses an additional challenge to the development of quantum algorithms. On one hand, Computer Scientists have formal education in Software Engineering, Software Testing, and general programming practices, but might lack the necessary understanding of Quantum Physics [4] to produce significant contributions to QC. On the other hand, physicists, with a background in quantum mechanics, might lack knowledge of good software development practices [12]. Some authors [3, 41] already pointed out the importance of developing quantum-specific paradigms that can abstract away the complexity of working with quantum mechanics concepts.

A shift in the testing approaches is expected to happen once high-level frameworks and programming languages gain traction. Platforms such as Classiq⁴ and Silq⁵ already explore the idea that QP can be created with higher abstractions other than the circuit-based model. The argument is that circuit-based quantum programming is the equivalent of creating classical circuits using logical gates such as NAND, OR, NOT, and so on. Although circuits can work for small, simple examples, it does not scale up when it comes to bigger applications. The concept of *Quantum Algorithm Design* [35] emerges as an attempt to create computer-aided design (CAD) for QPs, in which high-level functional models are created by the user and translated to quantum circuits in the background. As these macro-component approaches mature, there will be challenges testing the interfaces between the usable components proposed by them, as well as with the testing of the individual components themselves. Similarly to what happened with higher-level programming languages, we expect to see new paradigms being created, as well as design, architectural, and integration patterns for computer systems with both classical and quantum components.

5 Conclusions

In recent years, Quantum Computing has emerged as a promising field due to its capabilities of solving complex problems and the developments in quantum hardware. As we approach 2030, the rising interest in quantum programming languages and frameworks underscores the importance of the study and development of specialized techniques for testing and debugging quantum programs. In this paper, we presented an overview of the main concepts and techniques for testing and debugging quantum computing applications and illustrated their relations in a conceptual model. We presented the current challenges in the field and proposed a path forward that involves not only adapting existing practices to the quantum realm but also creating higher-level abstractions to the circuit-based programming model, along with new implementations that can leverage quantum computing's unique characteristics. Additionally, we highlighted the importance of developing approaches for testing and debugging hybrid applications, exploring the interfaces between classical and quantum components to develop more reliable and efficient applications.

⁴https://www.classiq.io/ ⁵https://silq.ethz.ch/ Testing and Debugging Quantum Programs: The Road to 2030

References

- Rui Abreu, João Paulo Fernandes, Luis Llana, and Guilherme Tavares. 2022. Metamorphic Testing of Oracle Quantum Programs. In Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 3rd International Workshop on Quantum Software Engineering (Q-SE 2022). IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 16–23. https://doi.org/10.1145/3528230. 3529189
- [2] Shaukat Ali, Paolo Arcaini, Xinyi Wang, and Tao Yue. 2021. Assessing the Effectiveness of Input and Output Coverage Criteria for Testing Quantum Programs. In Proceedings of the 14th IEEE Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST'21). IEEE, Porto de Galinhas, Brazil, 13–23.
- [3] Shaukat Ali and Tao Yue. 2023. On the Need of Quantum-Oriented Paradigm. In Proceedings of the 2nd International Workshop on Quantum Programming for Software Engineering (<conf-loc>, <city>San Francisco</city>, <state>CA</tate>, <country>USA</country>, </conf-loc>) (QP4SE 2023). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 17–20. https://doi.org/10.1145/3617570.3617868
- [4] Shaukat Ali, Tao Yue, and Rui Abreu. 2022. When software engineering meets quantum computing. *Commun. ACM* 65, 4 (mar 2022), 84–88. https: //doi.org/10.1145/3512340
- [5] MD Sajid Anis, Abby-Mitchell, Héctor Abraham, AduOffei, Rochisha Agarwal, Gabriele Agliardi, Merav Aharoni, Vishnu Ajith, Ismail Yunus Akhalwaya, and Gadi Aleksandrowicz. 2021. Qiskit: An Open-source Framework for Quantum Computing. https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.2573505
- [6] Linda Anticoli, Carla Piazza, Leonardo Taglialegne, and Paolo Zuliani. 2018. Entanglle: A Translation Framework from Quipper Programs to Quantum Markov Chains. In New Frontiers in Quantitative Methods in Informatics, Simonetta Balsamo, Andrea Marin, and Enrico Vicario (Eds.). Springer International Publishing, Cham, 113–126.
- [7] Zahra Ashktorab, Justin D. Weisz, and Maryam Ashoori. 2019. Thinking Too Classically: Research Topics in Human-Quantum Computer Interaction. In Proceedings of the 2019 CHI Conference on Human Factors in Computing Systems (Glasgow, Scotland Uk) (CHI '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1--12. https://doi.org/10.1145/3290605.3300486
- [8] José Campos and André Souto. 2021. Qbugs: A collection of reproducible bugs in quantum algorithms and a supporting infrastructure to enable controlled quantum software testing and debugging experiments. In Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 2nd International Workshop on Quantum Software Engineering (Q-SE 2021). IEEE Computer Society, Madrid, Spain, 28–32.
- [9] Tian-Fu Chen, Jie-Hong R. Jiang, and Min-Hsiu Hsieh. 2022. Partial Equivalence Checking of Quantum Circuits. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2208.07564
- [10] Elías F. Combarro. 2022. Quantum Computing Foundations. In *Quantum Software Engineering*, Manuel A. Serrano, Ricardo Pérez-Castillo, and Mario Piattini (Eds.). Springer, Switzerland, Chapter 1, 1–24.
- [11] Antonio García de la Barrera, Ignacio García-Rodríguez de Guzmán, Macario Polo, and José A. Cruz-Lemus. 2022. Quantum Software Testing: Current Trends and Emerging Proposals. In *Quantum Software Engineering*, Manuel A. Serrano, Ricardo Pérez-Castillo, and Mario Piattini (Eds.). Springer, Switzerland, Chapter 9, 167–191.
- [12] Michael Felderer, Davide Taibi, Fabio Palomba, Michael Epping, Malte Lochau, and Benjamin Weder. 2023. Software Engineering Challenges for Quantum Computing: Report from the First Working Seminar on Quantum Software Engineering (WSQSE 22). SIGSOFT Softw. Eng. Notes 48, 2 (apr 2023), 29––32. https://doi.org/10.1145/3587062.3587071
- [13] Daniel Fortunato, José Campos, and Rui Abreu. 2022. QMutPy: A Mutation Testing Tool for Quantum Algorithms and Applications in Qiskit. In Proceedings of the 31st ACM SIGSOFT International Symposium on Software Testing and Analysis (Virtual, South Korea) (ISSTA 2022). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 797–800. https://doi.org/10.1145/3533767.3543296
- [14] Antonio García de la Barrera, Ignacio García-Rodríguez de Guzmán, Macario Polo, and Mario Piattini. 2021. Quantum software testing: State of the art. *Journal* of Software: Evolution and Process 35, 4 (2021), e2419. https://doi.org/10.1002/smr. 2419
- [15] Hari Mohan Gaur, Ashutosh Kumar Singh, and Umesh Ghanekar. 2021. Testable Designs of Toffoli Fredkin Reversible Circuits. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV. 2108.07448
- [16] Cláudio Gomes, Daniel Fortunato, João Paulo Fernandes, and Rui Abreu. 2020. Off-the-shelf Components for Quantum Programming and Testing. In Proceedings of the 1st Quantum Software Engineering and Technology Workshop (Q-SET'20, Vol. 2705), Ricardo Pérez-Castillo, Mario Piattini, Guido Peterssen, and Jose Luis Hevia (Eds.). CEUR-WS.org, Denver, USA, 14–19. http://ceur-ws.org/Vol-2705/short2.pdf
- [17] Google. 2022. Production ML Systems. https://developers.google.com/machinelearning/crash-course/production-ml-systems. Accessed: March 31st, 2024.
- [18] Vojtěch Havlíček, Antonio D. Córcoles, Kristan Temme, Aram W. Harrow, Abhinav Kandala, Jerry M. Chow, and Jay M. Gambetta. 2019. Supervised learning with quantum-enhanced feature spaces. *Nature* 567, 7747 (March 2019), 209–212. https://doi.org/10.1038/s41586-019-0980-2

- [19] Jack D. Hidary. 2019. Quantum Computing: An Applied Approach. Springer. [Online; accessed 2022-08-02].
- [20] Shahin Honarvar, Mohammad Reza Mousavi, and Rajagopal Nagarajan. 2020. Property-Based Testing of Quantum Programs in Q#. In Proceedings of the IEEE/ACM 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering Workshops (Seoul, Republic of Korea) (ICSEW'20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 430--435. https://doi.org/10.1145/3387940.3391459
- [21] Yipeng Huang and Margaret Martonosi. 2018. QDB: from quantum algorithms towards correct quantum programs. arXiv preprint arXiv:1811.05447 (2018).
- [22] Yipeng Huang and Margaret Martonosi. 2019. Statistical Assertions for Validating Patterns and Finding Bugs in Quantum Programs. In Proceedings of the 46th International Symposium on Computer Architecture (Phoenix, Arizona) (ISCA '19). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 541–553. https://doi.org/10.1145/3307650.3322213
- [23] Ciaran Hughes, Joshua Isaacson, Anastasia Perry, Ranbel F. Sun, and Jessica Turner. 2021. Quantum Computing for the Quantum Curious. Springer Nature. [Online; accessed 2022-08-02].
- [24] IBM. 2024. IBM Composer. https://quantum.ibm.com/composer. Accessed: March 31st, 2024..
- [25] Kamil Khadiev. 2022. Lecture Notes on Quantum Algorithms. https://arxiv.org/ abs/2212.14205
- [26] Martin Laforest. 2015. The mathematics of quantum mechanics. University of Waterloo (2015).
- [27] Gushu Li, Li Zhou, Nengkun Yu, Yufei Ding, Mingsheng Ying, and Yuan Xie. 2020. Projection-Based Runtime Assertions for Testing and Debugging Quantum Programs. In Projection-Based Runtime Assertions for Testing and Debugging Quantum Programs, Vol. 4. Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, Article 150, 29 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3428218
- [28] Peiyi Li, Ji Liu, Yangjia Li, and Huiyang Zhou. 2022. Exploiting Quantum Assertions for Error Mitigation and Quantum Program Debugging. In 2022 IEEE 40th International Conference on Computer Design (ICCD). 124–131. https: //doi.org/10.1109/ICCD56317.2022.00028
- [29] Ji Liu, Gregory T. Byrd, and Huiyang Zhou. 2020. Quantum Circuits for Dynamic Runtime Assertions in Quantum Computation. In Proceedings of the Twenty-Fifth International Conference on Architectural Support for Programming Languages and Operating Systems (Lausanne, Switzerland) (ASPLOS '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 1017–1030. https: //doi.org/10.1145/3373376.3378488
- [30] Ji Liu and Huiyang Zhou. 2021. Systematic Approaches for Precise and Approximate Quantum State Runtime Assertion. In 2021 IEEE International Symposium on High-Performance Computer Architecture (HPCA). 179–193. https://doi.org/10.1109/HPCA51647.2021.00025
- [31] Peixun Long and Jianjun Zhao. 2022. Testing Quantum Programs with Multiple Subroutines. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2208.09206
- [32] Junjie Luo, Pengzhan Zhao, Zhongtao Miao, Shuhan Lan, and Jianjun Zhao. 2022. A Comprehensive Study of Bug Fixes in Quantum Programs. https: //doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2201.08662
- [33] Eñaut Mendiluze, Shaukat Ali, Paolo Arcaini, and Tao Yue. 2021. Muskit: A Mutation Analysis Tool for Quantum Software Testing. In 2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE). 1266–1270. https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE51524.2021.9678563
- [34] Sara Ayman Metwalli and Rodney Van Meter. 2022. A Tool For Debugging Quantum Circuits. In 2022 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE). 624–634. https://doi.org/10.1109/QCE53715.2022.00085
- [35] Nir Minerbi. 2022. Quantum Software Development with Classiq. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 269–280. https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-031-05324-5_14
- [36] Andriy Miranskyy. 2022. Using Quantum Computers to Speed up Dynamic Testing of Software (*QP4SE 2022*). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 26–31. https://doi.org/10.1145/3549036.3562061
- [37] Andriy Miranskyy and Lei Zhang. 2019. On Testing Quantum Programs. In Proceedings of the 41st International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results (Montreal, Quebec, Canada) (ICSE-NIER 19). IEEE Press, 57–60. https://doi.org/10.1109/ICSE-NIER.2019.00023
- [38] Andriy Miranskyy, Lei Zhang, and Javad Doliskani. 2020. Is Your Quantum Program Bug-Free?. In Proceedings of the ACM/IEEE 42nd International Conference on Software Engineering: New Ideas and Emerging Results (Seoul, South Korea) (ICSE-NIER '20). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 29–32. https://doi.org/10.1145/3377816.3381731
- [39] Joyati Mondal, Debesh K. Das, Dipak K. Kole, and Hafizur Rahaman. 2013. A design for testability technique for quantum reversible circuits. In *East-West Design & Test Symposium (EWDTS 2013)*. 1–4. https://doi.org/10.1109/EWDTS. 2013.6673147
- [40] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. 2011. Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: 10th Anniversary Edition (10th ed.). Cambridge University Press, USA.
- [41] Santiago Núñez-Corrales. 2023. Quantum abstract machines without circuits: the need for higher algorithmic expressiveness. arXiv:2307.08422 [quant-ph]

- [42] OpenQasm. 2024. OpenQASM Live Specification. https://openqasm.com. Accessed: March 31st, 2024..
- [43] Matteo Paltenghi and Michael Pradel. 2022. Bugs in Quantum Computing Platforms: An Empirical Study. 6, OOPSLA1, Article 86 (apr 2022), 27 pages. https://doi.org/10.1145/3527330
- [44] Matteo Paltenghi and Michael Pradel. 2022. MorphQ: Metamorphic Testing of Quantum Computing Platforms. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2206.01111
- [45] Ketan N. Patel, John P. Hayes, and Igor L. Markov. 2004. Fault Testing for Reversible Circuits. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.QUANT-PH/0404003
- [46] Tirthak Patel and Devesh Tiwari. 2021. Qraft: Reverse Your Quantum Circuit and Know the Correct Program Output (ASPLOS '21). Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 443–455. https://doi.org/10.1145/3445814.3446743
- [47] Maria Schuld and Francesco Petruccione. 2021. Machine Learning with Quantum Computers. Springer Nature. [Online; accessed 2022-08-02].
- [48] Osvaldo Simeone. 2022. An Introduction to Quantum Machine Learning for Engineers. arXiv:2205.09510
- [49] Mikhail Smelyanskiy, Nicolas P. D. Sawaya, and Alán Aspuru-Guzik. 2016. qHiP-STER: The Quantum High Performance Software Testing Environment.
- [50] D.D. Stancil and G.T. Byrd. 2022. Principles of Superconducting Quantum Computers. Wiley. https://books.google.de/books?id=zc94zQEACAAJ
- [51] Damian S. Steiger, Thomas Häner, and Matthias Troyer. 2018. ProjectQ: an open source software framework for quantum computing. 2 (jan 2018), 49.
- [52] Qiskit Development Team. 2021. Qiskit AerSimulator. https://qiskit.org/ ecosystem/aer/stubs/qiskit_aer.AerSimulator.html. Accessed: April 27, 2023.
- [53] W.F. Tichy. 1998. Should computer scientists experiment more? Computer 31, 5 (1998), 32–40. https://doi.org/10.1109/2.675631
- [54] Frank Tsui, Orlando Karam, and Barbara Bernal. 2022. Essentials of software engineering. Jones & Bartlett Learning.
- [55] Jiyuan Wang, Fucheng Ma, and Yu Jiang. 2021. Poster: Fuzz Testing of Quantum Program. In 2021 14th IEEE Conference on Software Testing, Verification and Validation (ICST). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/icst49551.2021.00061

- [56] Jiyuan Wang, Qian Zhang, Guoqing Harry Xu, and Miryung Kim. 2021. QDiff: Differential Testing of Quantum Software Stacks. In 2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE). 692–704. https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE51524.2021.9678792
- [57] Xinyi Wang, Shaukat Ali, Tao Yue, and Paolo Arcaini. 2023. Guess What Quantum Computing Can Do for Test Case Optimization. arXiv:2312.15547 [cs.SE]
- [58] Xinyi Wang, Paolo Arcaini, Tao Yue, and Shaukat Ali. 2021. Application of Combinatorial Testing to Quantum Programs. In 2021 IEEE 21st International Conference on Software Quality, Reliability and Security (QRS). IEEE. https: //doi.org/10.1109/qrs54544.2021.00029
- [59] Xinyi Wang, Paolo Arcaini, Tao Yue, and Shaukat Ali. 2022. QuSBT: Search-Based Testing of Quantum Programs. In 2022 IEEE/ACM 44th International Conference on Software Engineering: Companion Proceedings (ICSE-Companion). IEEE. https://doi.org/10.1109/icse-companion55297.2022.9793826
- [60] Xinyi Wang, Asmar Muqeet, Tao Yue, Shaukat Ali, and Paolo Arcaini. 2023. Test Case Minimization with Quantum Annealers. arXiv:2308.05505 [cs.SE]
- [61] Shigeru Yamashita and Igor L. Markov. 2009. Fast Equivalence-checking for Quantum Circuits. (2009). https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.0909.4119
- [62] Mingsheng Ying, Shenggang Ying, and Xiaodi Wu. 2017. Invariants of Quantum Programs: Characterisations and Generation. SIGPLAN Not. 52, 1 (jan 2017), 818–832. https://doi.org/10.1145/3093333.3009840
- [63] Jianjun Zhao. 2020. Quantum Software Engineering: Landscapes and Horizons. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2007.07047
- [64] Pengzhan Zhao, Xiongfei Wu, Junjie Luo, Zhuo Li, and Jianjun Zhao. 2023. An Empirical Study of Bugs in Quantum Machine Learning Frameworks. arXiv:2306.06369 [cs.SE]
- [65] Pengzhan Zhao, Jianjun Zhao, and Lei Ma. 2021. Identifying Bug Patterns in Quantum Programs. https://doi.org/10.48550/ARXIV.2103.09069
- [66] P. Zhao, J. Zhao, Z. Miao, and S. Lan. 2021. Bugs4Q: A Benchmark of Real Bugs for Quantum Programs. In 2021 36th IEEE/ACM International Conference on Automated Software Engineering (ASE). IEEE Computer Society, Los Alamitos, CA, USA, 1373–1376. https://doi.org/10.1109/ASE51524.2021.9678908