

6.845 Problem Set 4: Quantum Lower Bounds and More

1. Let f be the $\log_2 N$ -level AND/OR tree. Show that $Q(f) = \Omega(\sqrt{N})$. [*Hint*: Show that you can reduce a PARITY problem of size \sqrt{N} to f .]
2. Suppose $f : \{0, 1\}^N \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a symmetric Boolean function: that is, it has the form $f(x_1, \dots, x_N) = f(k)$ where $k = x_1 + \dots + x_N$ is the Hamming weight of x . Suppose also that $f(k^*) \neq f(k^* + 1)$ for some Hamming weight k^* . Using Ambainis's quantum adversary theorem, show that $Q(f) = \Omega(\sqrt{(N - k^*)(k^* + 1)})$.
3. Consider the following *graph connectivity* problem: given an undirected graph $G = (V, E)$ with $|V| = N$, which is specified by an $N \times N$ adjacency matrix, decide whether or not G is connected.
 - (a) Show that any classical algorithm for this problem (even a randomized one) requires $\Omega(N^2)$ queries to the adjacency matrix entries.
 - (b) Give a quantum algorithm that solves the problem with bounded error using $O(N^{3/2} \log N)$ queries. [*Hint*: Use Grover's algorithm as a subroutine.]
 - (c) Show that any quantum algorithm requires $\Omega(N^{3/2})$ queries. [For this problem, you can assume Ambainis's quantum adversary theorem. Partial credit for proving a weaker lower bound of $\Omega(N)$.]
4. A Boolean function $f : \{0, 1\}^N \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is called *monotone* if $f(x_1, \dots, x_N) \leq f(y_1, \dots, y_N)$ whenever $x_i \leq y_i$ for all i .
 - (a) Show that if f is monotone, then $C(f) = bs(f)$.
 - (b) Conclude that $D(f) = O(Q(f)^4)$ for all monotone f .
5. Given a Boolean function $f : \{0, 1\}^N \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$, let $R_0(f)$ denote the *zero-error randomized query complexity* of f : that is, the minimum expected number of queries made by any randomized algorithm that computes $f(x)$ with probability 1 for every input x (maximized over x). Also, recall that $R(f)$ denotes the *bounded-error randomized query complexity* of f : that is, the minimum expected number of queries made by any randomized algorithm that computes $f(x)$ with probability at least $2/3$ for every input x (maximized over x). In this problem, you will prove the best-known analogues of the $D(f) = O(Q(f)^6)$ theorem for $D(f)$ versus $R_0(f)$ and $D(f)$ versus $R(f)$.
 - (a) Show that $R_0(f) \geq C(f)$ for all Boolean functions f . Combining with the $D(f) \leq C(f)^2$ theorem, conclude that $D(f) \leq R_0(f)^2$.
 - (b) Show that $D(f) \leq C(f)bs(f)$ for all Boolean functions f . [*Hint*: Consider the algorithm from class used to show $D(f) \leq C(f)^2$. Show that this algorithm terminates not merely after $C(f)$ iterations, but after $bs(f)$ iterations.]

(c) Show that $R(f) = \Omega(bs(f))$ for all Boolean functions f . Combining with part b., conclude that $D(f) = O(R(f)^3)$ for all f .

6. The *swap test* is an amazing procedure that takes as input two quantum states $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\varphi\rangle$, and determines whether they are close or far. To apply it, we first place a control qubit in the state $\frac{|0\rangle+|1\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$. Next, conditioned on the control qubit being $|1\rangle$, we *swap* $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\varphi\rangle$. This produces the state

$$\frac{|0\rangle|\psi\rangle|\varphi\rangle + |1\rangle|\varphi\rangle|\psi\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}.$$

Finally, we apply a Hadamard gate to the control qubit, measure the control qubit in the standard basis, and accept if and only if we get the outcome $|0\rangle$.

(a) Show that swap test accepts with probability equal to $(1 + |\langle\psi|\varphi\rangle|^2)/2$ —so in particular, if $|\psi\rangle = |\varphi\rangle$ then the test accepts with probability 1, while if $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\varphi\rangle$ are orthogonal then the test accepts with probability $1/2$. [*Hint*: You may find the identities $\| |a\rangle + |b\rangle \|_2^2 = (\langle a| + \langle b|)(|a\rangle + |b\rangle) = \langle a|a\rangle + \langle b|b\rangle + \langle a|b\rangle + \langle b|a\rangle$ and $(\langle a| \otimes \langle b|)(|c\rangle \otimes |d\rangle) = \langle a|c\rangle \langle b|d\rangle$ to be helpful.]

(b) Prove that there is no analogue of the swap test with classical probability distributions in place of quantum states.

7. In this problem, we'll consider a system of k identical fermions in $n \geq k$ modes. Suppose the initial state of this system is $|1, \dots, k\rangle$: that is, the first k modes are occupied by a single fermion each, while the remaining $n - k$ modes are unoccupied. Also, suppose we apply an $n \times n$ unitary transformation $U = (u_{i,j})$ to the modes. Then you saw from Alex's lecture that the new state of the k fermions will be

$$\sum_{1 \leq i_1 \leq \dots \leq i_k \leq n} \det \begin{pmatrix} u_{1,i_1} & \dots & u_{1,i_k} \\ \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ u_{k,i_1} & \dots & u_{k,i_k} \end{pmatrix} |i_1, \dots, i_k\rangle.$$

Using the above formula, explain why we will never see two or more of the k fermions “colliding” (i.e., occupying the same mode). (Physicists know this fact as the *Pauli exclusion principle*.)

8. In quantum communication complexity, suppose we require Alice and Bob to send *pure states* rather than mixed states at every time step. Show that this increases the communication complexity by at most a factor of 2.

9. Recall that the *equality function*, $\text{EQ}(x, y)$ for Boolean strings $x, y \in \{0, 1\}^N$, evaluates to 1 if $x = y$ and to 0 otherwise. Show that $Q(\text{EQ})$, the bounded-error quantum communication complexity of the equality function, is $\Theta(\log N)$. [*Hint*: For the lower bound, use a counting argument.]

MIT OpenCourseWare
<http://ocw.mit.edu>

6.845 Quantum Complexity Theory
Fall 2010

For information about citing these materials or our Terms of Use, visit: <http://ocw.mit.edu/terms>.