

Superlinear Advantage for Exact Quantum Algorithms

Andris Ambainis*
 Faculty of Computing
 University of Latvia
 Raiņa bulvāris 19
 Rīga, LV-1586, Latvia
 E-mail: ambainis@lu.lv

Abstract

A quantum algorithm is exact if, on any input data, it outputs the correct answer with certainty (probability 1). A key question is: how big is the advantage of exact quantum algorithms over their classical counterparts: deterministic algorithms?

We present the first example of a total Boolean function $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ for which exact quantum algorithms have superlinear advantage over deterministic algorithms. Any deterministic algorithm that computes our function must use N queries but an exact quantum algorithm can compute it with $O(N^{0.8675\dots})$ queries.

A modification of our function gives a similar result for communication complexity: there is a function f which can be computed by an exact quantum protocol that communicates $O(N^{0.8675\dots} \log N)$ quantum bits but requires $\Omega(N)$ bits of communication for classical protocols.

1 Introduction

Quantum algorithms can be either studied in the *bounded-error* setting (the algorithm must output the correct answer with probability at least $2/3$, for every input) or in the *exact* setting (the algorithm must output the correct answer with certainty, for every input). For the bounded-error case, there are many quantum

*Supported by ESF project 1DP/1.1.1.2.0/09/APIA/VIAA/044 and the European Commission under the FET-Open project QCS (Grant No. 255961), FET-Proactive project QALGO (Grant No. 600700) and ERC Advanced Grant MQC (Grant No. 320731). The conference version of this paper was published in proceedings of STOC'2013. Part of this work was done at IAS, Princeton, supported by National Science Foundation under agreement No. DMS-1128155. Any opinions, findings and conclusions or recommendations expressed in this material are those of the author(s) and do not necessarily reflect the views of the National Science Foundation.

algorithms that are better than classical algorithms ([34, 19, 3, 18] and many others).

It is much more difficult to come up with exact quantum algorithms that outperform classical algorithms. The requirement that the algorithm's answer must always be correct is very constraining: it means that, in the algorithm's final state, we cannot have even very small non-zero amplitudes for the basis states that correspond to an incorrect answer. Arranging the algorithm's transformations so that this requirement is satisfied for all possible inputs has been a very challenging problem.

We consider computing Boolean functions in the query model. Let $Q_E(f)$ ($Q_2(f)$) be the smallest number of queries in an exact (bounded-error) quantum algorithm that computes f and $D(f)$ be the smallest number of queries in a deterministic algorithm that computes f .

For total Boolean functions, the biggest gap between $Q_E(f)$ and $D(f)$ has been achieved for the PARITY of N input bits. A modification of Deutsch's algorithm [16] discovered by Cleve et al. [14] can compute PARITY of 2 input bits exactly with just 1 quantum query. This immediately implies that PARITY of N bits can be computed with $\lceil N/2 \rceil$ queries. In contrast, deterministic algorithms need N queries to compute PARITY.

Bigger speedups are known for partial functions. For example, Brassard and Høyer [9] show that Simon's algorithm [35] can be made exact. This gives a partial function $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ with $Q_E(f) = O(\log N)$ and $D(f) = \Omega(\sqrt{N})$. The value of this function $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$, however, is only defined for a very small fraction of all inputs (x_1, \dots, x_N) .

Many attempts have been made to come up with exact quantum algorithms for total functions but the best results have been algorithms that achieve the same separation as for the PARITY function: $Q_E(f) = N/2$ vs. $D(f) = N$ (either by using the parity algorithm as a subroutine (e.g. Vasilieva [36]) or by different methods (Montanaro et al. [26])).

In this paper, we give the first separation between $Q_E(f)$ and $D(f)$ that is more than a factor of 2. Namely, we obtain

$$Q_E(f) = O(D(f)^{0.8675\dots})$$

for a sequence of functions f (with $D(f) \rightarrow \infty$).

The sequence of functions is as follows. We start with the function $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ defined by

- $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 1$ if $x_i \neq x_j$ for some $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}$;
- $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0$ if $x_1 = x_2 = x_3$.

We define $NE^1 = NE$ and

$$NE^d(x_1, \dots, x_{3^d}) = NE(NE^{d-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{3^{d-1}}), \\ NE^{d-1}(x_{3^{d-1}+1}, \dots, x_{2 \cdot 3^{d-1}}), NE^{d-1}(x_{2 \cdot 3^{d-1}+1}, \dots, x_{3^d}))$$

for $d > 1$. This sequence of functions has been known as a candidate for a superlinear separation between $D(f)$ and $Q_E(f)$ for a long time (it appears that this idea was first mentioned in a 2002 survey by Buhrman and de Wolf [13]).

The reason for that is the relationship between $Q_E(f)$ and the polynomial degree of f by Beals et al. [7]. Let $\deg(f)$ be the degree of the unique multilinear polynomial that is equal to $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$. As shown in [7],

$$D(f) \geq Q_E(f) \geq \deg(f)/2.$$

If we also have $D(f) = \deg(f)$ (which is true for many functions f), this implies that $Q_E(f) \geq D(f)/2$.

To obtain a bigger gap between $D(f)$ and $Q_E(f)$, we should start with f which has $D(f) > \deg(f)$. NE^d has this property. We have $D(NE) = 3$ and $\deg(NE) = 2$ and one can deduce $D(NE^d) = 3^d$ and $\deg(NE^d) = 2^d$ from that [28]. (Kushilevitz [24] and Ambainis [2] have given other constructions of functions with $D(f) > \deg(f)$ by taking a different basis function f instead of NE and iterating it in the same way.)

Buhrman and de Wolf [13] observed that this means the following. If we determine $Q_E(f)$, we will either get $Q_E(f) = o(D(f))$ or $\deg(f) = o(Q_E(f))$ (showing that the degree lower bound on $Q_E(f)$ is not tight). Ambainis [2] showed that

$$Q_E(NE^d) \geq Q_2(NE^d) = \Omega(2.121\dots^d),$$

proving the second of these results. For bounded error algorithms, the work on negative adversary bound by Høyer et al. [21] and on span programs by Reichardt and Špalek [33, 31, 32] resulted in the conclusion that this bound is optimal: $Q_2(NE^d) = \Theta(2.121\dots^d)$.

For exact algorithms, there has been no progress, even though the function NE^d is quite well known. In this paper, we provide the first nontrivial exact quantum algorithm for NE^d showing that

$$Q_E(NE^d) = O(2.593\dots^d) = O(D(NE^d)^{0.8675\dots}).$$

Main ideas. The main ideas behind our algorithm are as follows. We create an algorithm in which one basis state has amplitude 1 if $NE^d(x_1, \dots, x_{3^d}) = 0$ and an amplitude $\alpha < 1$ if $NE^d(x_1, \dots, x_{3^d}) = 1$. The algorithm is constructed so that α is the same for all (x_1, \dots, x_{3^d}) with $NE^d(x_1, \dots, x_{3^d}) = 1$. The construction is by induction: we use the algorithm of this type for NE^{d-1} as a subroutine to construct the algorithm for NE^d .

Each such induction step decreases the difference between the $NE^d = 0$ and $NE^d = 1$ cases, bringing α closer to 1. To compensate for that, we interleave the induction steps with a form of quantum amplitude amplification [10] which increases the difference between α and 1. At the end, we perform the amplitude amplification again, to construct an algorithm that perfectly distinguishes between the two cases.

Communication complexity. As observed by Ronald de Wolf [37], our result also applies to the setting of communication complexity (in the standard

two-party communication model). Then, we get a total function $f(y_1, \dots, z_N)$ which can be computed by an exact quantum protocol that communicates $O(N^{0.8675\dots} \log N)$ quantum bits but requires $\Omega(N)$ bits for classical protocols in a variety of models (deterministic, bounded-error probabilistic and nondeterministic protocol).

Previously, it was known that a classical protocol that communicates k bits can be converted into a quantum protocol that uses shared entanglement and $k/2$ quantum bits of communication (via quantum teleportation [8]). However, no provable gap of any size between exact quantum and deterministic communication complexity was known for a total function in the case when the quantum protocol does not have shared entanglement. (As shown by Buhrman et al. [11], a communication complexity version of the Deutsch-Jozsa problem [17] gives an exponential gap for a partial function.)

2 Definitions

We assume familiarity with the standard notions of quantum states and transformations (as described in Nielsen and Chuang [27] or other textbooks on quantum information). We now briefly define the quantum query model, to synchronize the notation with the reader. (For more information on the query model we refer the reader to the survey by Buhrman and de Wolf [13].)

We assume that the task is to compute a Boolean function $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ where $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \{0, 1\}$. We consider a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with basis states $|i, j\rangle$ for $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$ (where M can be chosen arbitrarily). We define that a query Q is the following transformation:

- $Q|0, j\rangle = |0, j\rangle$;
- $Q|i, j\rangle = (-1)^{x_i}|i, j\rangle$ for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, N\}$.

A quantum query algorithm \mathcal{A} consists of a sequence of transformations $U_0, Q, U_1, \dots, U_{k-1}, Q, U_k$ where Q 's are *queries* and U_i 's (for $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, k\}$) are arbitrary unitary transformations that do not depend on x_1, \dots, x_N . The algorithm starts with a fixed starting state $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ and performs the transformations. This leads to the final state

$$|\psi_{final}\rangle = U_k Q U_{k-1} \dots U_1 Q U_0 |\psi_{start}\rangle.$$

We then measure this state and interpret the result as a binary value $y \in \{0, 1\}$. (That is, we define some of possible measurement results as corresponding to $y = 0$ and others as corresponding to $y = 1$.)

An algorithm \mathcal{A} computes $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ *exactly* if, for every $x_1, \dots, x_N \in \{0, 1\}$, the obtained value y is always equal to $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$.

3 Results and proofs

3.1 Results

Our main result is

Theorem 1

$$Q_E(NE^d) = O(2.593\dots^d).$$

Nisan and Szegedy [28] have shown that $D(NE^d) = 3^d$. (This follows from the fact that the *sensitivity* of NE^d is equal to 3^d : $NE^d(0, 0, \dots, 0) = 0$ but, for any input (x_1, \dots, x_N) containing exactly one 1, $NE(x_1, \dots, x_N) = 1$. Hence, any deterministic algorithm must query all 3^d variables.) This means that

$$Q_E(NE^d) = O(D(NE^d)^{0.8675\dots}),$$

giving a polynomial gap between $D(f)$ and $Q_E(f)$. One can also show that $R_2(NE^d)$, the (bounded error) probabilistic query complexity of NE^d , is of the order $\Omega(3^d)$ (since the sensitivity of NE^d on the all-zero input is 3^d). Therefore, we also get the same separation between $Q_E(NE^d)$ and $R_2(NE^d)$.

3.2 Examples

We start by giving a few examples which led us to discovering our algorithm. The purpose of this section is to explain the intuition behind our algorithm. Because of that, we omit the proofs of some statements (which will be later proven in a more general form in sections 3.3-3.5).

Algorithm 1. We consider the following simple algorithm for $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ with 1 query:

1. The state space of the algorithm is spanned by basis states $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle, |3\rangle$. The starting state is

$$|\psi_{start}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|1\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|2\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|3\rangle.$$

2. The algorithm performs $U_0 = I$, Q and a transformation U_1 such that $U_1|\psi_{start}\rangle = |0\rangle$, for example,

$$U_1 = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \\ \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & -\frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} & 0 & \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \end{pmatrix},$$

with rows and columns numbered in the natural order: $|0\rangle, |1\rangle, |2\rangle, |3\rangle$.

3. Then, the algorithm measures the state. If the measurement result is 0, the algorithm outputs 0. Otherwise, it outputs 1.

We claim that, if $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0$, the algorithm always outputs the correct answer 0. (If $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 1$, the algorithm outputs 0 with some probability and 1 with some probability.)

To see that, we first observe that the final state of this algorithm is

$$U_1 Q |\psi_{start}\rangle = \frac{(-1)^{x_1} + (-1)^{x_2} + (-1)^{x_3}}{3} |0\rangle \\ + \frac{(-1)^{x_1} - (-1)^{x_3}}{3} |1\rangle + \frac{(-1)^{x_2} - (-1)^{x_1}}{3} |2\rangle + \frac{(-1)^{x_3} - (-1)^{x_2}}{3} |3\rangle.$$

If the algorithm outputs 1, the amplitude of $|1\rangle$, $|2\rangle$ or $|3\rangle$ is non-zero and this means that two of the variables x_i are different. If $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0$, this never happens.

Moreover, if $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 1$, we always have $x_i = x_j$ for exactly one of pairs (i, j) (where $i, j \in \{1, 2, 3\}, i \neq j$) and $x_i \neq x_j$ for the other two pairs. Therefore, exactly one of amplitudes of $|1\rangle$, $|2\rangle$ or $|3\rangle$ is zero and the other two amplitudes are equal to $\pm \frac{2}{3}$. This means that, for any $x_1, x_2, x_3 : NE(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 1$, the algorithm outputs 1 with the same probability $2(\frac{2}{3})^2 = \frac{8}{9}$.

Algorithm 2. We would like to transform the algorithm 1 into a form in which it can be used as a subroutine in a bigger algorithm. To do that, we run algorithm 1 and then perform a sign flip T conditional on the state being one of the states in which we know that $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 1$:

$$T|0\rangle = |0\rangle, T|1\rangle = -|1\rangle, T|2\rangle = -|2\rangle, T|3\rangle = -|3\rangle.$$

We then perform algorithm 1 in reverse. This results in a 2-query algorithm consisting of transformations Q , $U_1^{-1} T U_1$, Q . This algorithm produces the following final state:

- If $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 0$, $U_1 Q |\psi_{start}\rangle$ is $|0\rangle$ or $-|0\rangle$. Hence, T has no effect and performing U^{-1} and Q returns the state to $|\psi_{start}\rangle$.
- If $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3) = 1$, the projection of $U_1 Q |\psi_{start}\rangle$ to the subspace spanned by $|1\rangle, |2\rangle, |3\rangle$ is always of the same length $\sqrt{8/9}$ (square root of the probability that Algorithm 1 outputs 1). In other words, T always flips the sign on a part of the state with the same length $\sqrt{8/9}$. It can be shown¹ that this implies

$$Q U_1^{-1} T U_1 Q |\psi_{start}\rangle = -\frac{7}{9} |\psi_{start}\rangle + |\psi^\perp\rangle$$

for some $|\psi^\perp\rangle \perp |\psi_{start}\rangle$ that depends on the values of x_1, x_2, x_3 .

We now see that the amplitude of $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ in the final state depends only on the value of $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3)$ (it is $-\frac{7}{9}$ if $NE = 1$ and 1 if $NE = 0$). This is important because it allows to use the algorithm as a subroutine in the next step.

¹The proof is a particular case of Case 2 of Lemma 2.

Algorithm 3. Next, we construct an algorithm for $NE^2(y_1, \dots, y_9)$ by taking Algorithm 1 and substituting copies of Algorithm 2 computing

$$NE(y_1, y_2, y_3), NE(y_4, y_5, y_6), NE(y_7, y_8, y_9)$$

instead of queries to x_1, x_2, x_3 .

This substitution is carried out as follows: We create 3 copies of the working space of Algorithm 2, with $|\psi_{start,i}\rangle$, $i \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ as the starting states. We also add an extra basis state $|0\rangle$ which is orthogonal to all 3 copies of the workspace. Algorithm 3 works as follows:

1. Algorithm's starting state is

$$|\psi_{start}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,1}\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,2}\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,3}\rangle.$$

2. The algorithm runs 3 copies of Algorithm 2 in parallel on the 3 copies of its workspace, for $NE(y_1, y_2, y_3)$, $NE(y_4, y_5, y_6)$, $NE(y_7, y_8, y_9)$.
3. Then, it performs the transformation U_2 on the subspace spanned by $|0\rangle$ and $|\psi_{start,i}\rangle$:

$$\begin{aligned} U_2|\psi_{start,1}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,1}\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,2}\rangle, \\ U_2|\psi_{start,2}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,2}\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,3}\rangle, \\ U_2|\psi_{start,3}\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,3}\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,1}\rangle \end{aligned}$$

which maps $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ to $|0\rangle$.

This algorithm has the following property:

Claim 1 *If $NE^2(x_1, \dots, x_9) = 0$, the final state of Algorithm 3 is orthogonal to all $|\psi_{start,i}\rangle$.*

Proof: $NE^2(x_1, \dots, x_9) = 0$ means that $NE(x_1, x_2, x_3)$, $NE(x_4, x_5, x_6)$, $NE(x_7, x_8, x_9)$ are either all equal to 0 or all equal to 1. If they are all 0, Algorithm 2 maps each of states $|\psi_{start,i}\rangle$ to itself. Hence, the state $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ is mapped to itself by Algorithm 2 and to $|0\rangle$ by U_2 .

If they are all 1, Algorithm 2 maps $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ to

$$\begin{aligned} &-\frac{7}{9\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,1}\rangle - \frac{7}{9\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,2}\rangle - \frac{7}{9\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start,3}\rangle + |\psi^\perp\rangle \\ &= -\frac{7}{9}|\psi_{start}\rangle + |\psi^\perp\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

where $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ is orthogonal to all of $|\psi_{start,i}\rangle$. U_2 then maps this state to $-\frac{7}{9}|0\rangle + |\psi^\perp\rangle$ (because $U_2|\psi_{start}\rangle = |0\rangle$ and $U_2|\psi^\perp\rangle = |\psi^\perp\rangle$). The resulting state $-\frac{7}{9}|0\rangle + |\psi^\perp\rangle$ is orthogonal to all $|\psi_{start,i}\rangle$. ■

In the case if $NE^2(x_1, \dots, x_9) = 1$, we again have the property that the projection of the final state of Algorithm 3 to the subspace spanned by all $|\psi_{start,i}\rangle$ is always of the same length - independent of x_1, \dots, x_9 . (Again, this is a particular case of Case 2 of Lemma 2 and it follows from Algorithm 2 having similar property. And, again, we omit the proof.)

Algorithms 4, 5, etc. We can repeat this construction, by taking Algorithm 3 and transforming it into a form in which it can be used as a subroutine (similarly how we obtained Algorithm 2 from Algorithm 1). We can then take the resulting Algorithm 4 and use it as a subroutine in an algorithm computing $NE^3(x_1, \dots, x_{27})$ and so on.

3.3 Framework

Next, we develop these ideas in a more general form. Similarly to Algorithm 2, we construct algorithms which produce a final state in which one amplitude takes one of two values - depending on $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$:

Definition 1 Let $p \in [-1, 1]$. A quantum query algorithm \mathcal{A} p -computes a function $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ if, for some $|\psi_{start}\rangle$:

- (a) $\mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle = |\psi_{start}\rangle$ whenever $f(x_1, \dots, x_N) = 0$;
- (b) if $f(x_1, \dots, x_N) = 1$, then

$$\mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle = p|\psi_{start}\rangle + \sqrt{1-p^2}|\psi\rangle$$

for some $|\psi\rangle : |\psi\rangle \perp |\psi_{start}\rangle$ (where $|\psi\rangle$ may depend on x_1, \dots, x_N).

We note that p -computing a function becomes easier when p increases. The easiest case is $p = 1$ when any function can be 1-computed in a trivial way by performing the identity transformation I on $|\psi_{start}\rangle$. For $p = 0$, an algorithm \mathcal{A} that 0-computes f is also an exact algorithm for f in the usual sense because we can measure whether the final state of \mathcal{A} is $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ or orthogonal to $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ and output 0 in the first case and 1 in the second case.

For $p = -1$, p -computing f means that $\mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle = |\psi_{start}\rangle$ whenever $f = 0$ and $\mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle = -|\psi_{start}\rangle$. This is the same transformation as the query black box. Hence, if we consider the iterated function

$$f(f(y_1, \dots, y_N), f(y_{N+1}, \dots, y_{2N}), \dots)$$

we can obtain an algorithm for (-1)-computing it by taking the algorithm \mathcal{A} for (-1)-computing $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_N)$ and, instead of queries to x_i , running \mathcal{A} to (-1)-compute $f(y_{(i-1)N-1}, \dots, y_{iN})$. Thus, an algorithm for (-1)-computing f with k queries immediately implies an algorithm for f^d with k^d queries. (In contrast, if we had to iterate an exact algorithm for f in the usual sense, we

would have to run it twice: in the forward direction to compute f and in reverse to uncompute the unnecessary extra information. As a result, we would obtain an exact algorithm for f^d with $(2k)^d$ queries.)

Because of this property, our goal is to obtain algorithms for (-1) -computing NE^d for some d . We will use algorithms for p -computing NE^d with $p > -1$ as stepping stones in our construction.

We also have

Lemma 1 *If an algorithm \mathcal{A} p -computes f with k queries, there is an algorithm \mathcal{A}' that p' -computes f with k queries, for any $p' > p$.*

Proof: We enlarge the state space of the algorithm by adding a new basis state $|0, j\rangle$ which is left unchanged by queries Q . We define \mathcal{A}' by extending all U_i to the enlarged state space by defining $U_i|0, j\rangle = |0, j\rangle$ and change the starting state to $|\psi'_{start}\rangle = \cos \alpha |\psi_{start}\rangle + \sin \alpha |0, j\rangle$.

If $f(x_1, \dots, x_N) = 0$, we have $\mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle = |\psi_{start}\rangle$ and, hence,

$$\mathcal{A}'|\psi'_{start}\rangle = |\psi'_{start}\rangle.$$

If $f(x_1, \dots, x_N) = 1$, then

$$\begin{aligned} \mathcal{A}'|\psi'_{start}\rangle &= \cos \alpha \mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle + \sin \alpha |0, j\rangle \\ &= p \cos \alpha |\psi_{start}\rangle + \sqrt{1-p^2} \cos \alpha |\psi^\perp\rangle + \sin \alpha |0, j\rangle \end{aligned}$$

where $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ is perpendicular to both $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ and $|0, j\rangle$. Hence,

$$\langle \psi'_{start} | \mathcal{A}' | \psi'_{start} \rangle = p \cos^2 \alpha + \sin^2 \alpha$$

and we have $\mathcal{A}'|\psi'_{start}\rangle = p'|\psi'_{start}\rangle + \sqrt{1-(p')^2}|\psi^\perp\rangle$ ($|\psi^\perp\rangle \perp |\psi'_{start}\rangle$) for $p' = p \cos^2 \alpha + \sin^2 \alpha$. By varying α over the interval $[0, \frac{\pi}{2}]$, we can achieve any value of p' between $p' = p$ (for $\alpha = 0$) and $p' = 1$ (for $\alpha = \frac{\pi}{2}$). ■

If we have an algorithm \mathcal{A} that p -computes NE^{i-1} , we can use it to build an algorithm \mathcal{A}' that p' -computes NE^i , through the following lemma.

Lemma 2 *If an algorithm \mathcal{A} p -computes NE^{d-1} with k queries, there is an algorithm \mathcal{A}' that p' -computes NE^d with $2k$ queries, for $p' = 1 - \frac{4(1-p)^2}{9}$.*

Proof: In section 3.5. ■

Applying Lemma 2 results in an algorithm with $p' > p$. Applying it several times degrades p even further (that is, p becomes closer and closer to 1). To compensate for that, we have the following lemma for improving p (which follows by adapting quantum amplitude amplification [10] to our setting).

Lemma 3 *If an algorithm \mathcal{A} p -computes a function f with k queries, for $p = \cos \alpha$, there is an algorithm \mathcal{A}' that p' -computes f with ck queries, for $p' = \cos c\alpha$.*

Proof: In section 3.5. ■

As a special case of Lemma 3, we obtain

Corollary 1 *If an algorithm \mathcal{A} p -computes NE^d with k queries, there is an algorithm \mathcal{A}' that p' -computes NE^d with $2k$ queries, for $p' = 2p^2 - 1$.*

Proof: We set $c = 2$ in Lemma 3. Then,

$$p' = \cos 2(\arccos p) = 2p^2 - 1.$$

■

3.4 Algorithm for NE^d

It is easy to see that

Lemma 4 *If there is an algorithm \mathcal{A} that (-1) -computes NE^t with k queries, there is an algorithm \mathcal{A}_l that (-1) -computes NE^{tl} with k^l queries for all $l \geq 1$.*

Proof: By induction. The algorithm \mathcal{A} itself forms the base case, for $l = 1$.

For the inductive case, we can obtain the function NE^{tl} by taking the function $NE^{t(l-1)}$ and, instead of each variable, substituting a function NE^t on a block of 3^t new variables. Therefore, we can take the algorithm \mathcal{A}_{l-1} that computes $NE^{t(l-1)}$ with k^{l-1} queries and, instead of each query, substitute the algorithm \mathcal{A} that performs $\mathcal{A}|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$ if $NE^t = 0$ for the corresponding group of 3^t variables and $\mathcal{A}|\psi\rangle = -|\psi\rangle$ if $NE^t = 1$.

In the resulting algorithm \mathcal{A}_l , each of k^{l-1} queries of \mathcal{A}_l is replaced by a sequence of transformations that involves k queries. Therefore, the total number of queries for \mathcal{A}_l is $k^{l-1}k = k^l$. ■

Moreover, we get that $Q_E(NE^{tl}) \leq k^l$, since an algorithm that (-1) -computes NE^{tl} can be transformed into an algorithm that 0-computes NE^{tl} , with no increase in the number of queries (Lemma 1) and an algorithm for 0-computing f can be used to compute f exactly. Therefore, we have

Corollary 2 *If there exists an algorithm \mathcal{A} that (-1) -computes NE^t with k queries, then $Q_E(NE^d) = O(k^{d/t})$.*

It remains to find a base algorithm that (-1) -computes NE^d with less than 3^d queries. We give two such constructions.

Construction 1:

1. $NE^0(x_1) = x_1$ can be (-1) -computed with 1 query by just performing a query $|1\rangle \rightarrow (-1)^{x_1}|1\rangle$.
2. Applying Lemma 2 with $p = -1$ gives that NE^1 can be $(-\frac{7}{9})$ -computed with 2 queries.
3. Applying Lemma 2 with $p = -\frac{7}{9}$ gives that NE^2 can be p' -computed with 4 queries for $p' = -\frac{295}{729}$.

4. Applying Lemma 1 gives that NE^2 can be 0-computed with 4 queries.
5. Applying Corollary 1 with $p = 0$ gives that NE^2 can be (-1) -computed with 8 queries.

By Corollary 2, this means that $Q_E(NE^d) = O(8^{d/2}) = O(2.828\dots^d)$. This result can be improved by using a more complicated base construction with a larger number of steps.

Construction 2:

1. Start with an algorithm that $(-\frac{295}{729})$ -computes NE^2 with 4 queries (from Construction 1).
2. Applying Lemma 2 with $p = -\frac{295}{729}$ gives that NE^3 can be p' -computed with 8 queries for $p' = \frac{588665}{4782969} = 0.123075\dots$
3. Applying Corollary 1 gives that NE^3 can be p' -computed with 16 queries for $p' = -0.969704\dots$
4. Applying Lemma 2 three times gives that NE^6 can be p' -computed with 128 queries for $p' = 0.223874\dots$
5. Applying Corollary 1 gives that NE^6 can be p' -computed with 256 queries for $p' = -0.8997602\dots$
6. Applying Lemma 2 two times gives that NE^8 can be p' -computed with 1024 queries for $p' = -0.14353\dots$
7. Applying Lemma 1 gives that NE^8 can be also 0-computed with 1024 queries and applying Corollary 1 gives that NE^8 can be (-1) -computed with 2048 queries,

This means that $Q_E(NE^d) = O(2048^{d/8}) = O(2.593\dots^d)$. Computer experiments [6] show that this is the best result that can be achieved by combining Lemmas 1 and 3 and Corollary 1, as long as $d \leq 1000$ and all intermediate algorithms have $p < 0.99999$. We suspect that nothing can be gained by using larger d or p .

Another possibility would be to construct an algorithm for p -computing NE^d by other means. In this direction, semidefinite optimization [22] shows that our algorithms for NE^1 and NE^2 are optimal: NE^1 cannot be p -computed with 2 queries for $p < -\frac{7}{9}$ and NE^2 cannot be p -computed with 4 queries for $p < -\frac{295}{729}$. We do not know whether the algorithms for NE^d , $d > 2$ are optimal.

3.5 Proofs of Lemmas

Lemma 2. *If an algorithm \mathcal{A} p -computes NE^{d-1} with k queries, there is an algorithm \mathcal{A}' that p' -computes NE^d with $2k$ queries, for $p' = 1 - \frac{4(1-p)^2}{9}$.*

Proof: We assume that the algorithm \mathcal{A} consists of transformations $U_0, Q, U_1, \dots, U_{k-1}, Q, U_k$, in a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with basis states $|i, j\rangle$, $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, 3^{d-1}\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, M\}$. Let $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ be the starting state of \mathcal{A} .

We consider a Hilbert space \mathcal{H}' with basis states $|i, j\rangle$, $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, 3^d\}$, $j \in \{1, \dots, 3M\}$. In this Hilbert space, we can compute $NE^{d-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{3^{d-1}})$, $NE^{d-1}(x_{3^{d-1}+1}, \dots, x_{2 \cdot 3^{d-1}})$, $NE^{d-1}(x_{2 \cdot 3^{d-1}+1}, \dots, x_{3^d})$ in parallel, in the following way.

Let \mathcal{H}_l ($l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$) be the subspace spanned by the basis states

$$|0, j\rangle, j \in \{(l-1)M+1, \dots, lM\}$$

and

$$|i, j\rangle, i \in \{(l-1)3^{d-1}+1, \dots, l3^{d-1}\}, j \in \{1, \dots, M\}.$$

We have an isomorphism $V_l : \mathcal{H}_l \rightarrow \mathcal{H}$ defined by

$$V_l|0, (l-1)M+j\rangle = |0, j\rangle,$$

$$V_l|(l-1)3^{d-1}+i, j\rangle = |i, j\rangle.$$

We define $U_i^{(l)} = (V_l)^\dagger U_i V_l$ and $|\psi_{start}^{(l)}\rangle = (V_l)^\dagger |\psi_{start}\rangle$. Then, the sequence of transformations

$$U_0^{(l)}, Q, U_1^{(l)}, \dots, U_{k-1}^{(l)}, Q, U_k^{(l)}$$

with the starting state $|\psi_{start}^{(l)}\rangle$ is a quantum algorithm p -computing the function $NE^{d-1}(x_{(l-1)3^{d-1}+1}, \dots, x_{l \cdot 3^{d-1}})$.

Let U'_i be a transformation which is equal to $U_i^{(l)}$ on \mathcal{H}_l , for each $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$. Then, the sequence of transformations $U'_0, Q, U'_1, \dots, U'_{k-1}, Q, U'_k$ can be used to p -compute any of $NE^{d-1}((l-1)x_{3^{d-1}+1}, \dots, x_{l \cdot 3^{d-1}})$, for $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$, depending on the starting state. Let

$$V = U'_k Q U'_{k-1} \cdots U'_1 Q U'_0$$

be the product of these transformations.

Let T be the unitary transformation defined by:

- $T|\psi'_{start}\rangle = |\psi'_{start}\rangle$ for $|\psi'_{start}\rangle = \sum_{l=1}^3 \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} |\psi_{start}^{(l)}\rangle$;
- $T|\psi\rangle = -|\psi\rangle$ for any $|\psi\rangle$ that is a linear combination of $|\psi_{start}^{(1)}\rangle, |\psi_{start}^{(2)}\rangle, |\psi_{start}^{(3)}\rangle$ and satisfies $|\psi\rangle \perp |\psi'_{start}\rangle$;
- $T|\psi\rangle = |\psi\rangle$ for any $|\psi\rangle$ that is perpendicular to all of $|\psi_{start}^{(1)}\rangle, |\psi_{start}^{(2)}\rangle, |\psi_{start}^{(3)}\rangle$.

We take the algorithm \mathcal{A}' which performs the transformation $\mathcal{A}' = V^{-1}TV$, on the starting state $|\psi'_{start}\rangle$. We claim that this algorithm p' -computes the function NE^d .

To prove it, we consider two cases.

Case 1: $NE^d(x_1, \dots, x_{3^d}) = 0$.

This means that we have one of two subcases.

Case 1a: $NE^{d-1}(x_{(l-1)3^{d-1}+1}, \dots, x_{l \cdot 3^{d-1}}) = 0$ for all $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Then, given a starting state $|\psi_{start}^{(l)}\rangle$, V performs the algorithm for p -computing

$$NE^{d-1}(x_{(l-1)3^{d-1}+1}, \dots, x_{l \cdot 3^{d-1}}) = 0.$$

This means that $V|\psi_{start}^{(l)}\rangle = |\psi'_{start}\rangle$ for all $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$ and, hence, $V|\psi'_{start}\rangle = |\psi'_{start}\rangle$. Since $T|\psi'_{start}\rangle = |\psi'_{start}\rangle$ (by the definition of T), we get that $\mathcal{A}'|\psi'_{start}\rangle = |\psi'_{start}\rangle$.

Case 1b: $NE^{d-1}((l-1)x_{3^{d-1}+1}, \dots, x_{l \cdot 3^{d-1}}) = 1$ for all $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Then,

$$V|\psi_{start}^{(l)}\rangle = p|\psi_{start}^{(l)}\rangle + \sqrt{1-p^2}|\psi^{(l)}\rangle$$

where $|\psi^{(l)}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_l$ and $|\psi^{(l)}\rangle \perp |\psi_{start}^{(l)}\rangle$. Trivially, we also have $|\psi^{(l)}\rangle \perp |\psi_{start}^{(l')}\rangle$ for $l \neq l'$ (since $|\psi^{(l)}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_l$, $|\psi_{start}^{(l')}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_{l'}$ and $\mathcal{H}_l \perp \mathcal{H}_{l'}$). This means that applying T to

$$V|\psi'_{start}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \sum_{l=1}^3 p|\psi_{start}^{(l)}\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \sqrt{1-p^2} \sum_{l=1}^3 |\psi^{(l)}\rangle.$$

does not change the state because the first component is equal to $p|\psi'_{start}\rangle$ and the second component is orthogonal to all $|\psi_{start}^{(l)}\rangle$. Hence,

$$V^{-1}TV|\psi'_{start}\rangle = V^{-1}V|\psi'_{start}\rangle = |\psi'_{start}\rangle.$$

Case 2: $NE^d(x_1, \dots, x_{3^d}) = 1$.

In this case, we have to prove

$$\langle \psi'_{start} | V^{-1}TV | \psi'_{start} \rangle = p'.$$

We express

$$V|\psi'_{start}\rangle = \alpha|\psi_+\rangle + \beta|\psi_-\rangle$$

where $T|\psi_+\rangle = |\psi_+\rangle$ and $T|\psi_-\rangle = -|\psi_-\rangle$ and α, β satisfy $|\alpha|^2 + |\beta|^2 = 1$. Then,

$$\langle \psi'_{start} | V^{-1}TV | \psi'_{start} \rangle = |\alpha|^2 - |\beta|^2 = 1 - 2|\beta|^2.$$

To calculate β , we consider two subcases:

Case 2a: $NE^{d-1}(x_{(l-1)3^{d-1}+1}, \dots, x_{l \cdot 3^{d-1}}) = 1$ for exactly one of $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that this is $l = 1$. Then,

$$V|\psi'_{start}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(p|\psi_{start}^{(1)}\rangle + \sqrt{1-p^2}|\psi^{(1)}\rangle + |\psi_{start}^{(2)}\rangle + |\psi_{start}^{(3)}\rangle \right).$$

We have

$$\begin{aligned} \beta|\psi_-\rangle &= \frac{2p-2}{3\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start}^{(1)}\rangle + \frac{1-p}{3\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start}^{(2)}\rangle + \frac{1-p}{3\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start}^{(3)}\rangle, \\ |\beta|^2 &= \frac{(2p-2)^2}{27} + 2\frac{(1-p)^2}{27} = \frac{2(1-p)^2}{9}. \end{aligned}$$

Case 2b: $NE^{d-1}(x_{(l-1)3^{d-1}+1}, \dots, x_{l \cdot 3^{d-1}}) = 1$ for exactly two of $l \in \{1, 2, 3\}$.

Without loss of generality, we assume that these are $l = 1$ and $l = 2$. Then,

$$V|\psi'_{start}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(p|\psi_{start}^{(1)}\rangle + \sqrt{1-p^2}|\psi^{(1)}\rangle \right. \\ \left. + p|\psi_{start}^{(2)}\rangle + \sqrt{1-p^2}|\psi^{(2)}\rangle + |\psi_{start}^{(3)}\rangle \right).$$

We have

$$\beta|\psi_{-}\rangle = \frac{p-1}{3\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start}^{(1)}\rangle + \frac{p-1}{3\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start}^{(2)}\rangle + \frac{2-2p}{3\sqrt{3}}|\psi_{start}^{(3)}\rangle$$

and, similarly to the previous case, we get $|\beta|^2 = \frac{2(1-p)^2}{9}$. \blacksquare

Lemma 3. *If an algorithm \mathcal{A} p -computes a function f with k queries, for $p = \cos \alpha$, there is an algorithm \mathcal{A}' that p' -computes f with ck queries, for $p' = \cos c\alpha$.*

Proof: [of Lemma 3] Let $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ be the starting state of \mathcal{A} . Let T be the transformation defined by $T|\psi_{start}\rangle = |\psi_{start}\rangle$ and $T|\psi\rangle = -|\psi\rangle$ for all $|\psi\rangle : |\psi\rangle \perp |\psi_{start}\rangle$.

The new algorithm \mathcal{A}' has the same starting state $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ and consists of transformations $V_1, T, V_2, T, \dots, T, V_c$ where $V_i = \mathcal{A}$ for odd i and $V_i = \mathcal{A}^{-1}$ for even i . Since \mathcal{A} and \mathcal{A}^{-1} both use k queries and T can be performed with no queries, the new algorithm \mathcal{A}' uses ck queries.

If $f(x_1, \dots, x_N) = 0$, then (by definition 1), $\mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle = |\psi_{start}\rangle$. Since this also means $\mathcal{A}^{-1}|\psi_{start}\rangle = |\psi_{start}\rangle$, we get that $\mathcal{A}'|\psi_{start}\rangle = |\psi_{start}\rangle$.

In the $f(x_1, \dots, x_N) = 1$ case, we have

$$\mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle = \cos \alpha |\psi_{start}\rangle + \sin \alpha |\psi_1\rangle \quad (1)$$

for some $|\psi_1\rangle \perp |\psi_{start}\rangle$. If c is odd, we have $\mathcal{A}' = (\mathcal{A}T\mathcal{A}^{-1}T)^{(c-1)/2}\mathcal{A}$. This is a particular case of the standard setting of quantum amplitude amplification [10] and the analysis of Brassard et al. [10] implies that

$$\mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle = \cos c\alpha |\psi_{start}\rangle + \sin c\alpha |\psi_1\rangle.$$

The even c case can be analyzed in a similar way. We observe that (1) implies

$$\mathcal{A}^{-1}|\psi_{start}\rangle = \cos \alpha |\psi_{start}\rangle + \sin \alpha |\psi_2\rangle$$

for some $|\psi_2\rangle \perp |\psi_{start}\rangle$ (because \mathcal{A} is unitary and, therefore, the inner product between $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ and $\mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle$ must be equal to the inner product between $\mathcal{A}^{-1}|\psi_{start}\rangle$ and $\mathcal{A}^{-1}\mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle = |\psi_{start}\rangle$).

We can express $\mathcal{A}' = T^{-1}(T\mathcal{A}^{-1}T\mathcal{A})^{c/2} = T(T\mathcal{A}^{-1}T\mathcal{A})^{c/2}$. The transformation $T\mathcal{A}^{-1}T\mathcal{A}$ can be viewed as a product of two reflections T and $\mathcal{A}^{-1}T\mathcal{A}$. Each of these reflections leaves a certain state ($|\psi_{start}\rangle$ for T and $\mathcal{A}^{-1}|\psi_{start}\rangle$)

for $\mathcal{A}^{-1}T\mathcal{A}$ unchanged and maps any $|\psi\rangle$ which is orthogonal to this state to $-|\psi\rangle$.

We consider the two dimensional subspace \mathcal{H}_2 spanned by $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ and $\mathcal{A}^{-1}|\psi_{start}\rangle$. Both T and $\mathcal{A}^{-1}T\mathcal{A}$ map this subspace to itself. (For T , the subspace \mathcal{H}_2 is spanned by $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ and a state $|\psi^\perp\rangle \perp |\psi_{start}\rangle$. T maps $|\psi_{start}\rangle$ to itself and $|\psi^\perp\rangle$ to $-|\psi^\perp\rangle$. Therefore, $T(\mathcal{H}_2) = \mathcal{H}_2$. For $\mathcal{A}^{-1}T\mathcal{A}$, the proof is similar, with $\mathcal{A}^{-1}|\psi_{start}\rangle$ instead of $|\psi_{start}\rangle$.) Since the starting state of \mathcal{A}' is $|\psi_{start}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2$, this means that algorithm's state always stays within \mathcal{H}_2 .

A composition of two reflections in a 2-dimensional subspace with respect to vectors ($|\psi_{start}\rangle$ and $\mathcal{A}|\psi_{start}\rangle$) that are at an angle α one to another is equal to a rotation by an angle 2α (as used in “two reflections” analysis of Grover’s algorithm [1] and amplitude amplification [10]) Repeating such a sequence of two reflections $c/2$ times leads to a state that is at an angle $2(c/2)\alpha = c\alpha$ with a starting state, i.e. to a state

$$(T\mathcal{A}^{-1}T\mathcal{A})^{c/2}|\psi_{start}\rangle = \cos c\alpha|\psi_{start}\rangle + \sin c\alpha|\psi_3\rangle$$

for some $|\psi_3\rangle \perp |\psi_{start}\rangle$. We then have

$$\mathcal{A}'|\psi_{start}\rangle = T(T\mathcal{A}^{-1}T\mathcal{A})^{c/2}|\psi_{start}\rangle = \cos c\alpha|\psi_{start}\rangle - \sin c\alpha|\psi_3\rangle.$$

■

3.6 Implications for communication complexity

We consider the problem of computing a function

$$f(y_1, \dots, y_N, z_1, \dots, z_N)$$

in the communication complexity setting in which one party (Alice) holds y_1, \dots, y_N and another party (Bob) holds z_1, \dots, z_N . The task is to compute $f(y_1, \dots, z_N)$ with the minimum communication. (For a review on quantum communication complexity, see Buhrman et al. [12].)

A quantum communication protocol is exact if, after communicating k qubits (for some fixed k), both parties output answers that are always equal to $f(y_1, \dots, z_N)$. The communication complexity counterpart of Theorem 1 is the following theorem (due to Ronald de Wolf [37]):

Theorem 2 [37] *There exists $f(y_1, \dots, y_N, z_1, \dots, z_N)$ such that*

1. *f can be computed exactly by a quantum protocol with communication of $O(N^{0.8675\dots} \log N)$ quantum bits;*
2. *Any deterministic protocol (or bounded-error probabilistic protocol or non-deterministic protocol) computing f communicates at least $\Omega(N)$ bits.*

Proof: Let $N = 3^d$. We define

$$f(y_1, \dots, z_N) = NE^d(y_1 \wedge z_1, \dots, y_N \wedge z_N).$$

As shown by Buhrman et al. [11], existence of a T query quantum algorithm for $g(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ implies the existence of a quantum protocol for $g(y_1 \wedge z_1, \dots, y_N \wedge z_N)$ that communicates $O(T \log N)$ quantum bits. (Alice runs the query algorithm and implements each query through $O(\log N)$ quantum bits of communication with Bob.) This implies the first part of the theorem.

The second part follows by a reduction from the set disjointness problem [23, 30]. We define $DISJ(y_1, \dots, z_N) = 1$ if the sets $\{i : y_i = 1\}$ and $\{i : z_i = 1\}$ are disjoint and $DISJ(y_1, \dots, z_N) = 0$ if these two sets are not disjoint. This is equivalent to

$$DISJ(y_1, \dots, z_N) = NOT\ OR(y_1 \wedge z_1, \dots, y_N \wedge z_N).$$

Theorem 3 [23, 30] *Any deterministic protocol (or nondeterministic protocol or bounded-error probabilistic protocol) for computing DISJ requires communicating $\Omega(N)$ bits, even if it is promised that y_1, \dots, y_N and z_1, \dots, z_N are such that there is at most one $i : y_i = z_i = 1$.*

We have $NE^d(x_1, \dots, x_N) = NOT\ OR(x_1, \dots, x_N)$ for inputs (x_1, \dots, x_N) with at most one $i : x_i = 1$. Hence, Theorem 3 implies the second part of Theorem 2. ■

4 Conclusion and open problems

We have shown that, for the iterated 3-bit non-equality function, $Q_E(NE^m) = O(D(NE^m)^{0.8675\dots})$. This is the first example of a gap between $Q_E(f)$ and $D(f)$ that is more than a factor of 2. We think that there are more exact quantum algorithms that are waiting to be discovered.

Some possible directions for future work are:

1. Can we improve on $Q_E(NE^d) = O(2.593\dots^d)$, either by using our methods or in some other way?
2. If $Q_E(NE^d)$ is asymptotically larger than $Q_2(NE^d) = \Theta(2.121\dots^d)$, can we prove that? There are cases in which we can show lower bounds on $Q_E(f)$ that are asymptotically larger than $Q_2(f)$ [7] but the typical lower bound methods are based on polynomial degree $deg(f)$ and, thus, are unlikely to apply to NE^d for which $deg(NE^d) = 2^d$ is smaller than both $Q_E(NE^d)$ and $Q_2(NE^d)$.
3. Our definition of p -computing captures the properties that an algorithm for a function f should satisfy so that we can substitute it instead of a query to x_i into Algorithm 1 for $NE(x_1, \dots, x_N)$. Are there other definitions of computability that correspond to the possibility of substituting the algorithm instead of a query into some algorithm?

4. How big can the gap between $Q_E(f)$ and $D(f)$ be (for total functions f)? Currently, the best lower bound is $Q_E(f) = \Omega(D(f)^{1/3})$ by Midrijānis [25].
5. There are other examples of functions $f^d(x_1, \dots, x_{n^d})$ with $\deg(f) = O(D(f)^c)$, $c < 1$, obtained by iterating different basis functions $f(x_1, \dots, x_n)$ [24, 2]. Can we show that $Q_E(f^d) = O(D(f^d)^c)$, $c < 1$ for those functions as well?
6. Computer experiments by Montanaro et al. [26] show that exact quantum algorithms can be quite common: $Q_E(f) < D(f)$ for many functions f on a small number of variables. In particular, they indicate that $Q_E(f) < D(f)$ for many symmetric Boolean functions. For some of those functions, exact quantum algorithms were developed by Ambainis et al. [5] but, in other cases, we still do not have an explicit exact algorithm.
7. More generally, can we develop a general framework that will be able to produce exact algorithms for a variety of functions $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$?
8. What is $Q_E(f)$ for a random N -variable Boolean function $f(x_1, \dots, x_N)$? We know that $Q_E(f) \leq N$ (trivially) and $Q_E(f) \geq Q_2(f) = \frac{N}{2} + o(N)$ [15, 4]. Is one of these two bounds optimal?
A similar question was recently resolved for $Q_2(f)$, by showing that $Q_2(f) = \frac{N}{2} + o(N)$ for a random f , with a high probability [4].

Acknowledgments. I thank Kaspars Balodis, Aleksandrs Belovs, Ashley Montanaro, Juris Smotrovs, Ronald de Wolf, Abuzer Yakaryilmaz and the referees of both conference and journal versions of this paper for useful comments and Ronald de Wolf for pointing out Theorem 2 and its proof.

References

- [1] D. Aharonov. Quantum computation. *Annual Reviews of Computational Physics VI*, pp. 259-346, World Scientific, 1999. Also quant-ph/9812037.
- [2] A. Ambainis. Polynomial degree vs. quantum query complexity. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 72(2):220-238, 2006. Earlier versions at FOCS'03 and quant-ph/0305028.
- [3] A. Ambainis. Quantum walk algorithm for element distinctness. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 37(1): 210-239, 2007. Also FOCS'04 and quant-ph/0311001.
- [4] A. Ambainis, A. Bačkurs, J. Smotrovs and R. de Wolf. Optimal quantum query bounds for almost all Boolean functions. *Proceedings of STACS'13*, Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPICS), 20:446-453, 2013. Also arXiv:1208.1122.

- [5] A. Ambainis, J. Iraids and J. Smotrovs. Exact quantum query complexity of EXACT and THRESHOLD. *Proceedings of TQC'2013*, Leibniz Institute Proceedings in Informatics (LIPICS), 22:263-269. Also arXiv:1302.1235.
- [6] K. Balodis. Personal communication, November 27, 2012.
- [7] R. Beals, H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, M. Mosca, and R. de Wolf. Quantum lower bounds by polynomials. *Journal of the ACM*, 48(4):778-797, 2001. Earlier versions at FOCS'98 and quant-ph/9802049.
- [8] C. H. Bennett, G. Brassard, C. Crpeau, R. Jozsa, A. Peres, W. K. Wootters, Teleporting an Unknown Quantum State via Dual Classical and Einstein-Podolsky-Rosen Channels, *Physical Review Letters*, 70:1895-1899, 1993.
- [9] G. Brassard and P. Høyer. An exact quantum polynomial-time algorithm for Simon's problem. *Proceedings of the Israeli Symposium on Theory of Computing and Systems (ISTCS)*, pp. 12-23, 1997. Also quant-ph/9704027.
- [10] G. Brassard, P. Høyer, M. Mosca, A. Tapp. Quantum amplitude amplification and estimation. In *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information Science*, AMS Contemporary Mathematics Series, 305:53-74, 2002. Also quant-ph/0005055.
- [11] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, A. Wigderson. Quantum vs. classical communication and computation. *Proceedings of STOC'98*, pp. 63-68. Also quant-ph/9802040.
- [12] H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, S. Massar, R. de Wolf. Non-locality and Communication Complexity. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 82:665-698, 2010. Also quant-ph/0907.3584
- [13] H. Buhrman, R. de Wolf. Complexity measures and decision tree complexity: a survey. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 288:21-43, 2002.
- [14] R. Cleve, A. Ekert, C. Macchiavello, M. Mosca. Quantum algorithms revisited. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A*, 454: 339-354, 1998.
- [15] W. van Dam. Quantum oracle interrogation: Getting all information for almost half the price. In *Proceedings of FOCS'98*, pp. 362-367. Also quant-ph/9805006.
- [16] D. Deutsch. Quantum theory, the Church-Turing principle and the universal quantum computer. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A*, 400:97-117, 1985.
- [17] D. Deutsch, R. Jozsa. Rapid solutions of problems by quantum computation. *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A*, 439:553-558, 1992.
- [18] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, A Quantum Algorithm for the Hamiltonian NAND Tree. *Theory of Computing*, 4:169-190, 2008. Also quant-ph/0702144.

- [19] L. K. Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. *Proceedings of STOC'96*, pp. 212-219.
- [20] T. Hayes, S. Kutin, and D. van Melkebeek. The quantum black-box complexity of majority. *Algorithmica*, 34(4):480-501, 2002. quant-ph/0109101.
- [21] P. Høyer, T. Lee, R. Špalek. Negative weights make adversaries stronger. *Proceedings of STOC'07*, pp. 526-535. Also quant-ph/0611054.
- [22] J. Iraids. Personal communication, December 19, 2012.
- [23] B. Kalyanasundaram and G. Schnitger. The probabilistic communication complexity of set intersection. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 5(4):545-557, 1992. Earlier version in Structures'87.
- [24] E. Kushilevitz. Personal communication, cited in [29].
- [25] G. Midrijānis. Exact quantum query complexity for total Boolean functions, quant-ph/0403168.
- [26] A. Montanaro, R. Jozsa, G. Mitchison. On exact quantum query complexity. *Algorithmica*, to appear (published online in August 2013). Also arXiv:1111.0475.
- [27] M. Nielsen, I. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, 2000.
- [28] N. Nisan and M. Szegedy. On the degree of Boolean functions as real polynomials. *Computational Complexity*, 4(4):301-313, 1994. Earlier version in STOC'92.
- [29] N. Nisan, A. Wigderson. On rank vs. communication complexity. *Combinatorica*, 15: 557-565, 1995. Also FOCS'94.
- [30] A. Razborov. On the distributional complexity of disjointness. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 106(2):385-390, 1992.
- [31] B. Reichardt. Span Programs and Quantum Query Complexity: The General Adversary Bound Is Nearly Tight for Every Boolean Function. *Proceedings of FOCS'09*, pp. 544-551. Also arXiv:0907.1622.
- [32] B. Reichardt. Reflections for quantum query algorithms. *Proceedings of SODA '11*, pp. 560-569. Also arXiv:1005.1601.
- [33] B. Reichardt, R. Špalek. Span-program-based quantum algorithm for evaluating formulas. *Theory of Computing* 8(1): 291-319, 2012. Also STOC'08 and arXiv:0710.2630.
- [34] P. Shor. Algorithms for Quantum Computation: Discrete Logarithms and Factoring. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26:1484-1509, 1997. Also FOCS'94 and quant-ph/9508027.

- [35] D. Simon. On the power of quantum computation. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26:1474-1483, 1997. Earlier version at FOCS'94.
- [36] A. Vasilieva. Exact Quantum Query Algorithm for Error Detection Code Verification. *Proceedings of MEMICS'09*, In *OpenAccess Series in Informatics (OASICs)*, vol. 13, Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum fuer Informatik. Also arXiv:0904.3660.
- [37] R. de Wolf. Personal communication. November 6, 2012.