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An *abstraction* consists of:

1. A data model.
2. A “programming language” for manipulating data.

It is the second part that distinguishes abstractions of CS from abstractions in mathematics or other disciplines.
Example: The Dictionary Abstraction

- **Data model**: a universal set \( U \) and a set \( S \subseteq U \).
- **Programming language**: Sequences of three operations:
  1. Insert\( (x) \): \( S := S \cup \{x\} \).
  2. Delete\( (x) \): \( S := S \setminus \{x\} \).
  3. Lookup\( (x) \): true if \( x \in S \) else false.
- **Example**: \( U = \) character strings, \( S = \) currently valid variable names in a program (used for compiler’s symbol table).
Fundamental Abstractions: To study algorithms for commonly occurring computations.

Abstract Implementations: To support fundamental abstractions, not for their own sake.

Declarative Abstractions: Tell what you want, not how to do it.

Computational Abstractions: Directly executable or close to it.
Two kinds:

- **Stand-alone** – studied in isolation.
  - **Examples**: Dictionary, Stack, Queue, Priority queue, ...

- Intended to be **embedded** in a general-purpose language.
  - Essentially classes + their methods, but without implementation.
  - **Examples**: many kinds of graphs (directed, undirected, labeled, multigraphs, unrooted trees, rooted trees, ...)

Why embedded? Say a graph abstraction has a “find neighbors” method. You need a loop outside to go over each neighbor.
Abstract Implementations

- Data structures useful for implementing many fundamental abstractions.
- **Examples**: hash tables, search trees, linked lists.
- Admit different implementations at the machine level.
  - **Example**: a hash table could be implemented in a RAM model of a computer or in a secondary-storage model, with very different notions of running time.
    - Disk-oriented model counts only disk I/O’s for running time, not machine instructions.
Declarative Abstractions

- Sufficiently high-level that serious optimization is needed to be executable.
  - Valuable because they make programming much easier.
- Never Turing-complete.
- **Examples**: regular expressions, context-free grammars, linear algebra, relational algebra.
Computational Abstractions

- Actual machine or directly translatable.
  - Serial-machine examples: C++, Python, RAM.
  - Parallel/distributed-machine examples: PRAM, MapReduce.
- Abstractions for computer-like things that are not “conventional.”
  - Examples: Turing machine, Boolean circuits, Quantum circuits.
Abstraction 1
Example: Dictionary

Algorithm 1
Example: Insert(7);
Lookup(25):...

Abstraction 2
Example: Hash Table

Algorithm 2
Example: b = h(7);
H-insert(7, b);...

Compilation and Running Time
Abstractions and Algorithms for Compiler Design
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Computational thinking is a fundamental skill for everyone, not just for computer scientists. To reading, writing, and arithmetic, we should add computational thinking to every child’s analytical ability.
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Computational Thinking
The thought processes involved in formulating problems using abstractions so their solutions can be represented as computational steps and algorithms.
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Regular Expression Abstraction

- **Data model**
  - Sets of strings

- **Operations**
  - Union
  - Concatenation
  - Kleene star

- **Examples**
  - integer: [0-9][0-9]*
  - identifier: [A-Za-z][A-Za-z0-9]*
Regular Expression Matchers

- Nondeterministic finite automata
  - McNaughton-Yamada-Thompson construction:
    \[ O(|RE| \times |input|) \] time

- Deterministic finite automata
  - Subset construction converting NFA to DFA:
    \[ O(2^{|RE|} + |input|) \]-time algorithm
  - Dynamic construction of DFA transitions:
    \[ O(|RE| + |input|) \] time observed

Alfred V. Aho
Algorithms for Finding Patterns in Strings
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Grammar Abstraction

Context-free grammar for arithmetic expressions with addition and exponentiation:

\[ E \rightarrow E + E \mid E^E \mid 1 \mid 2 \mid 3 \]
Shift-Reduce Parsing $1+2^3$

Shift-reduce parsing actions showing (stack, input):
$(\varepsilon, 1+2^3) \Rightarrow_s (1, +2^3) \Rightarrow_r (E, +2^3) \Rightarrow_s (E+, 2^3) \Rightarrow_s (E+2, ^3) \Rightarrow_r (E+E, ^3)$: Here we have reached a **shift-reduce conflict**.
Unambiguous Grammar

- Unambiguous grammar for arithmetic expressions:

  \[
  E \rightarrow E + T | T \\
  T \rightarrow F ^ T | F \\
  F \rightarrow 1 | 2 | 3 
  \]

- This grammar makes the addition operator + left associative, the exponentiation operator ^ right associative and gives the operator ^ a higher precedence than +.
Augmented Grammar

- Shift-reduce parsable ambiguous grammar with disambiguating rules:

\[
\%\text{left } '+' \\
\%\text{right } '^'
\]

\[
E \rightarrow E + E \mid E \cdot E \mid 1 \mid 2 \mid 3
\]

Shift-reduce parsing actions:

\[
(\varepsilon, 1+2^3) \Rightarrow_s (1, +2^3) \Rightarrow_r (E, +2^3) \Rightarrow_s (E+, 2^3) \Rightarrow_s (E+2, ^3) \Rightarrow_r \\
(E+E, ^3) \Rightarrow_s (E+E^, 3) \Rightarrow_s (E+E^3, \varepsilon) \Rightarrow_r (E+E^E, \varepsilon) \Rightarrow_r (E+E, \varepsilon) \Rightarrow_r (E, \varepsilon)
\]

A. V. Aho, S. C. Johnson, and J. D. Ullman
Deterministic parsing of ambiguous grammars
ACM POPL, pp. 1-21, 1973
Syntax Analyzer Generator

- yacc specification
- syntax analyzer generator
  YACC
- syntax analyzer
- syntax tree

Stephen C. Johnson
Yacc-Yet Another Compiler Compiler
CSTR 32, Bell Labs, 1975
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2007
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Early programming languages created with Lex and Yacc include:

- ampl for mathematical programming
- awk for data processing and transformation
- eqn for typesetting mathematics
- pcc, a portable C compiler
- pic for typesetting figures

The dragon books have been used for decades in universities around the worldwide in compiler courses.

A small team of students can create a new programming language and build a compiler for it in a one-semester compiler course.
Abstractions and algorithms have transformed the field of compiler design from an art to a science.
Abstractions for Large-Scale Data
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The Abstractions of Database Systems

- **Key Computational Abstraction**: secondary-storage model.
  - Addresses real issues regarding efficiency of database algorithms.
  - Yields different results for some problems.
    - **Example**: Balanced search trees (B-trees) and MergeSort look very good in this model.

- **Key Declarative Abstraction**: relational model.

- **Parallel-computing abstractions**.
  - **Examples**: shared-nothing, bulk-synchronous, MapReduce.
Secondary-Storage Abstraction

- When data is so large, it has to reside primarily on disk, you have a Computational Abstraction with a different measure of running time.
- Access to any data element requires moving its entire disk block to main memory.
  - Takes more time than what you typically do with the data once it is in main memory.
  - **Leads to**: running time = number of disk I/O’s.
B-Trees

- Balanced search tree whose nodes are entire disk blocks.
- Nodes of a binary search tree consist of two pointers, to left and right children plus a value that separates items found to left and right.
- In a B-tree, a node has pointers to $n$ children and $n - 1$ values that separate items found at each of the children.
  - $n$ can be in the thousands, so 3 levels of B-tree are sufficient for billions or trillions of items.
In the secondary-storage model, B-trees are a very efficient implementation of Dictionaries.

- Root node can be stored in main memory.
- Lookup in a 3-level B-tree requires only 2 disk I/O’s.
- Insert/Delete can usually be done in 3 I/O’s.
  - Occasionally, needs a few extra I/O’s to rebalance the tree.
## Relational Model

- Tables with sets of rows and with named columns.

### Examples:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewYorkCity</td>
<td>NewYork</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>Quebec</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SanJose</td>
<td>California</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>TamilNadu</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>38.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>114.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewYork</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>19.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>14.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TamilNadu</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>67.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Codd could have viewed the relational model as a Fundamental Abstraction, like graphs, where the operations are simple navigations among rows or columns.

- In fact, earlier database abstractions had exactly that kind of programming language.
- Rather, the relational model has always been viewed as a Declarative Abstraction, with a very high-level programming language.
It depends on what year it is.
Codd suggested two different, but equivalent, approaches:
- Relational algebra.
- Two forms of nonrecursive first-order logic.
Original SQL added:
- Bag and list options for data.
- Grouping, aggregation, sorting operations.
Datalog added recursion.
Five Relational-Algebra Operations

- Union, Set-Difference, Selection, Projection, Join.
- **Selection**: Take only the rows that meet a condition.
  - **Example**: Pop $\geq 20$.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>38.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>114.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewYork</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>19.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>14.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TamilNadu</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>67.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
- Remove columns and eliminate duplicates.
- **Example:** Project States onto Country.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>California</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>38.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>114.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewYork</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>19.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>14.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>TamilNadu</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>67.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Join – Applies to Two Relations

- Consider all pairs of rows, one from each relation.
- Construct a row from each pair that meets a condition.
- **Example**: join Cities and States on the condition that the State value from each relation is the same.
## Example: Join

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>City</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>State</th>
<th>Country</th>
<th>Pop</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Toronto</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>38.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NewYorkCity</td>
<td>NewYork</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>114.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mumbai</td>
<td>Maharashtra</td>
<td>NewYork</td>
<td>USA</td>
<td>19.45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Montreal</td>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Ontario</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>14.57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SanJose</td>
<td>California</td>
<td>Quebec</td>
<td>Canada</td>
<td>8.49</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Chennai</td>
<td>TamilNadu</td>
<td>TamilNadu</td>
<td>India</td>
<td>67.86</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Because of the declarative nature of the relational model and extensions, optimization is essential.

Conventional languages like C have “optimizing compilers,” but they don’t change the algorithm written in the source language.

If I write Bubblesort in C, the compiler won’t change it to Quicksort, because undecidability of Turing-complete languages precludes the compiler detecting Bubblesort or anything else.
Orders of magnitude improvement possible with relational algebra.

Example: Find the population of Mumbai’s state.

Obvious plan: join Cities and States, then select for City = ‘Mumbai’ and project onto Pop.

Much better plan: select on Cities for City = ‘Mumbai’, find that Mumbai is in Maharashtra state, select on States for State = ‘Maharashtra’, project onto Pop.
Assumes a computing cluster as “the machine.”
- Many processors with communication possible but not free.
- **Data model**: Sets of key-value pairs.
- **Programming language**: conventional Turing-complete language, but organized as two functions, **Map** and **Reduce**.
MapReduce – (2)

- Allows parallel computation without “thinking parallel.”
- Apply **Map** function to each input key-value pair.
  - Generates zero, one, or many key-value pairs.
    - Usually of a different type.
- Behind the scenes, all generated pairs are sorted by key and organized into (key, list-of values) pairs.
- Apply **Reduce** function to each (key, list-of-values).
  - The result of the job is the key-value pairs produced by all the applications of **Reduce**.
Several interesting considerations when developing good MapReduce algorithms.
- Wall-clock time of the parallel algorithm.
- Rental cost of cloud hardware.
  - Time multiplied by number of processors.
- Communication cost can dominate when Map function produces many pairs.
- Number of jobs needed.
  - Assumes no processor can handle more than a negligible fraction of the data.
Hardware platforms are evolving.

- **Special-purpose accelerators**: GPU, TPU, FPGA, etc.
- **Architectures**: e.g., “serverless” where data is stored in a file system and execution occurs at short-term-rental processors.

Are there good abstractions like MapReduce for exploiting these and other developments?
Abstractions in Quantum Computing

Postulates of Quantum Mechanics
Superposition and Entanglement
Quantum Circuits
Quantum Algorithms
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The four postulates of quantum mechanics
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The state space of an isolated physical system can be modeled by a Hilbert space, a complex vector space with an inner product.

The state of the system is completely described by a unit vector in this state space.
The state of a quantum bit, called a **qubit**, can be described by a unit vector in a 2-dimensional state space

\[ |\psi\rangle = \alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle \]

where \( \alpha \) and \( \beta \) are complex coefficients called the *amplitudes* of the computational basis states

\( |0\rangle = (1,0) \) and \( |1\rangle = (0,1) \). Note that \( |\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1 \).

\( |\psi\rangle \) is said to be in a **superposition** of \( |0\rangle \) and \( |1\rangle \).
The evolution of the state of a closed quantum system from one time to another can be described by a unitary operator.

A matrix $U$ is unitary if $UU^\dagger = I$ where $I$ is the identity. $U^\dagger$ is the conjugate-transpose of the matrix $U$. 
The Hadamard operator has the matrix representation:

\[ H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \]

\( H \) maps the qubit \( \alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle = (\alpha, \beta) \) to the qubit

\[ \frac{\alpha}{\sqrt{2}} ( |0\rangle + |1\rangle ) + \frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}} ( |0\rangle - |1\rangle ) = \left( \frac{\alpha + \beta}{\sqrt{2}}, \frac{\alpha - \beta}{\sqrt{2}} \right) \]

Note that \( HH = I \).
The two-qubit CNOT (controlled-NOT) operator has the matrix representation on the right:

\[
\begin{bmatrix}
1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\
0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\
0 & 0 & 1 & 0
\end{bmatrix}
\]

CNOT flips the target qubit \( t \) iff the control qubit \( c \) has the value 1:

\[|00\rangle \rightarrow |00\rangle, \quad |01\rangle \rightarrow |01\rangle\]
\[|10\rangle \rightarrow |11\rangle, \quad |11\rangle \rightarrow |10\rangle\]

\(|xy\rangle\) denotes the tensor product \(|x\rangle \otimes |y\rangle\).
Postulate 3: Measurements

- To get information from a closed quantum system, measurements need be applied to the system.
- A measurement returns an outcome with some probability.
- The sum of the probabilities of the possible outcomes is 1.
- A measurement collapses the state of a quantum system.
Consider the measurement of a qubit in the state 
\[ |\psi\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle \] in the computational basis.

The output of the measurement is a classical bit. The probability of getting 0 is \(|\alpha|^2\) and the probability of getting 1 is \(|\beta|^2\). Note that \(|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1\).

If the outcome is 0, the state after measurement is \(|0\rangle\); if the outcome is 1, the state after measurement is \(|1\rangle\).
Postulate 4: Composite Systems

The state space of a composite physical system is the tensor product space of the state spaces of its component subsystems.

Example: If $A = (a_1, a_2)$, $B = (b_1, b_2)$, $C = (c_1, c_2)$, then $A \otimes B$ is the vector $(a_1b_1, a_1b_2, a_2b_1, a_2b_2)$;

$A \otimes B \otimes C$ is the vector

$$(a_1b_1c_1, a_1b_1c_2, a_1b_2c_1, a_1b_2c_2, a_2b_1c_1, a_2b_1c_2, a_2b_2c_1, a_2b_2c_2)$$
If we combine $n$ single-qubit systems, we get a composite system with a state space of dimension $2^n$ by taking the tensor product of the state spaces of the $n$ single-qubit systems.
Quantum Circuit Abstraction

• A quantum circuit is an acyclic graph consisting of lines, quantum gates, and measurement gates.

• No fan-in: logical OR is not a unitary operation.

• No fan-out: in quantum mechanics, it is not possible to make a copy of an unknown quantum state (the no-cloning theorem).
Quantum Circuit for EPR States

Quantum circuit to generate Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen states, also known as Bell states:

Circuit maps

\[
|00\rangle \mapsto \frac{|00\rangle + |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad |01\rangle \mapsto \frac{|01\rangle + |10\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad |10\rangle \mapsto \frac{|00\rangle - |11\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}, \quad |11\rangle \mapsto \frac{|01\rangle - |10\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}
\]

Each output is an entangled state, one that cannot be written in a product form. (Einstein: “Spooky action at a distance.”)
1. Alice and Bob generate an EPR pair by entangling $|q_1\rangle$ and $|q_2\rangle$.

2. Alice takes one half of the pair; Bob the other half. Bob moves far away taking his qubit with him.

3. Alice gets her secret qubit $|\psi\rangle$, interacts it with her EPR-half with a CNOT and Hadamard gate, and then measures the two output qubits.

4. Alice sends the two resulting classical measurement bits to Bob.

5. Using the classical measurement bits sent by Alice, Bob interacts his half of the EPR pair with a classically controlled NOT gate and a classically controlled Pauli-Z gate to recreate $|\psi\rangle$. 

\[ |\psi\rangle = |q_0\rangle \]
\[ |0\rangle = |q_1\rangle \]
\[ |0\rangle = |q_2\rangle \]
Problem: Given a composite $n$-bit integer, find a prime factor.

Best-known deterministic algorithm on a classical computer has time complexity $\exp(O(n^{1/3} \log^{2/3} n))$.

A hybrid classical-computer, quantum-computer can solve this problem in $O(n^2 \log n \log \log n)$ operations.
Quantum Computer Compilers

Quantum Computer Compiler

QIR: quantum intermediate representation
QASM: quantum assembly language
QPOL: quantum physical operations language

Front End → QIR → Technology Independent Optimizer+CG → QASM → Technology Dependent Optimizer+CG → Technology Simulator
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K. Svore, A. Aho, A. Cross, I. Chuang, I. Markov
A Layered Software Architecture for Quantum Computing Design Tools
Conclusions and Open Problems

- Quantum circuits are a key abstraction for quantum computing programming languages.

- Open problems: useful algorithms, large scalable quantum computers