

Quantum Algorithms for Boolean Equation Solving and Quantum Algebraic Attack on Cryptosystems*

Yu-Ao Chen^{1,2} and Xiao-Shan Gao^{1,2}

¹KLMM, Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China

²University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China
Email: tcag@163.com, xgao@mmrc.iss.ac.cn

December 14, 2024

Abstract

Decision of whether a Boolean equation system has a solution is an NPC problem and finding a solution is NP hard. In this paper, we present a quantum algorithm to decide whether a Boolean equation system \mathcal{F} has a solution and compute one if \mathcal{F} does have solutions with any given success probability. The runtime complexity of the algorithm is polynomial in the size of \mathcal{F} and the condition number of \mathcal{F} . As a consequence, we give a polynomial-time quantum algorithm for solving Boolean equation systems if their condition numbers are small, say polynomial in the size of \mathcal{F} . We apply our quantum algorithm for solving Boolean equations to the cryptanalysis of several important cryptosystems: the stream cipher Trivium, the block cipher AES, the hash function SHA-3/Keccak, and the multivariate public key cryptosystems, and show that they are secure under quantum algebraic attack only if the condition numbers of the corresponding equation systems are large. This leads to a new criterion for designing cryptosystems that can against the attack of quantum computers: *their corresponding equation systems must have large condition numbers*.

Keywords. Quantum algorithm, Boolean equation solving, polynomial system solving, HHL algorithm, condition number, stream cipher Trivium, block cipher AES, hash function SHA-3/Keccak, MPKC, 3-SAT, graph isomorphism.

1 Introduction

Solving Boolean equations is a fundamental problem in theoretical computer science. Decision of whether a Boolean equation system has a solution is an NPC problem and finding a solution is NP hard. On the other hand, finding a polynomial-time quantum algorithm for an NPC problem is a basic issue in quantum computing. In this paper, a quantum algorithm for Boolean equation solving will be given, which can be as much as exponentially faster than traditional algorithms for the same task under certain conditions.

* Partially supported by NSFC grants no. 11688101, no. 11101411.

1.1 Main results

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\}$ be a set of Boolean polynomials in variables $\mathbb{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ and with total sparseness $T = \sum_{i=1}^r \#f_i$, where $\#f_i$ is the number of terms in f_i . Then, we have

Theorem 1.1. *For $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there is a quantum algorithm which decides whether $\mathcal{F} = 0$ has a solution and computes one if $\mathcal{F} = 0$ does have solutions, with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$ and runtime complexity $\tilde{O}((n^{3.5} + T^{3.5})\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$, where \tilde{O} suppresses more slowly-growing logarithm terms and κ is the condition number of the Boolean polynomial system \mathcal{F} (refer to Theorem 5.9 for definition).*

As a consequence, we can solve Boolean equation systems using quantum computers with any given success probability and in polynomial-time if the condition number κ of \mathcal{F} and the sparseness T of \mathcal{F} are small, say when κ and T are $\text{poly}(n)$. Since T is the size of the input to the algorithm, it should be small for practical problems. For instance, all the equation systems from cryptanalysis in Section 6 are very sparse. Therefore, the key factor is the condition number. As a consequence, we give a polynomial-time quantum algorithm for solving Boolean equation systems if their condition numbers are small, say the condition numbers are $\text{poly}(n, T_{\mathcal{F}})$.

Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ be a set of polynomials with complex numbers as coefficients and with total sparseness $T = \sum_{i=1}^r \#f_i$. A solution \mathbf{a} for $\mathcal{F} = 0$ is called *Boolean*, if each coordinate of \mathbf{a} is 0 or 1. Clearly, deciding whether \mathcal{F} has a Boolean solution is NPC. We also give a quantum algorithm to compute Boolean solutions of \mathbb{F} .

Theorem 1.2. *and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there is a quantum algorithm which decides whether $\mathcal{F} = 0$ has a Boolean solution and computes one if $\mathcal{F} = 0$ does have Boolean solutions, with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$ and runtime complexity $\tilde{O}(n^{2.5}(n + T)\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$, where κ is the condition number of the polynomial system \mathcal{F} (refer to Theorem 4.3 for definition).*

We apply Theorem 1.1 to cryptanalysis of several important cryptosystems. As early as in 1946, Shannon [32] pointed out insightfully that “Construct our cipher in such a way that breaking it is equivalent to solving a certain system of simultaneous equations in a large number of unknowns.” We know that the analysis of many cryptosystems, such as the stream cipher Trivium, the block cipher AES, the hash function SHA-3/Keccak, and the multivariate public key cryptosystems (MPKC), can be reduced to solving Boolean equations. Note that all these cryptosystems are important. AES is a NIST standard since 2001 [16], Trivium is an international standard under ISO/IEC 29192-3, and Keccak [6] is the latest member of the Secure Hash Algorithm family of standards, released by NIST in 2015.

Cryptosystems	N_k	N_r	#Vars	#Eqs	T	Complexity
AES-128	4	10	4288	10616	252288	$2^{73.80} c\kappa^2$
AES-192	6	12	7488	18096	421248	$2^{76.44} c\kappa^2$
AES-256	8	14	11904	29520	696384	$2^{79.04} c\kappa^2$
Trivium		1152	3543	4407	24339	$2^{57.08} c\kappa^2$
Trivium		2304	6999	9015	49683	$2^{60.74} c\kappa^2$
	N_h	N_r	#Vars	#Eqs	T	Complexity
Keccak	384	24	76800	77160	611023	$2^{78.04} c\kappa^2$
Keccak	512	24	76800	77288	611540	$2^{78.04} c\kappa^2$

Table 1: Complexities of the quantum algebraic attack

In Table 1, we give the complexities of using Theorem 1.1 to perform quantum algebraic attack to these cryptosystems, where κ is the condition number of the corresponding Boolean equation systems, T is the total sparseness of the Boolean equations, and c is the complexity constant of the HHL algorithm (see Remark 2.4 for definition). For AES- m , $m = 32N_k$ is the key bit-length and N_r is the number of rounds. For Trivium, N_r is the number of rounds. For Keccak, N_h is the output size, N_r is the number of rounds, and the state bit-size b is 1600. From Table 1, we can see that these cryptosystems are secure under quantum algebraic attack only if the condition numbers of their corresponding equation systems are large. This leads to a new criterion for designing cryptosystems that can against the attack of quantum computers: *their corresponding equation systems must have large condition numbers*. Condition numbers for equation systems are generally difficult to estimate, and estimating the condition numbers for these cryptosystems is an interesting future work.

Many problems from computational theory and cryptography can be reduced to finding a Boolean solution for certain polynomial systems. In this paper, we use Theorem 1.2 to three such problems. The 3-SAT problem is clearly equivalent to Boolean equation solving. For a 3-SAT of r clauses and n variables, the quantum complexity to decide its satisfiability is $\tilde{O}((n^{2.5}(n+r)\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon))$. The *subset sum problem* is: given a set of n integers a_i , is there a non-empty subset whose sum equals to a given number b , which is to find a Boolean solution of the linear equation $\sum_i a_i x_i = b$. We show that there is a quantum algorithm to solve the subset sum problem with complexity $\tilde{O}(n^{3.5}\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$. The *graph isomorphism problem* is to determine whether two graphs with n vertices are isomorphic. It is not known whether this problem is NPC. The problem can be described as finding the Boolean solutions for a linear system and the quantum computational complexity is $\tilde{O}(n^{6.5}\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$.

1.2 Technical contribution

The main idea of the quantum algorithm proposed in this paper is that the solutions of a Boolean equation system can be obtained by solving a linear system with the HHL quantum algorithm [23]. For a linear system $Ax = |b\rangle$, the HHL algorithm can obtain an approximation to the solution state $|x\rangle$ exponentially faster than classic algorithms under certain conditions. Precisely, our algorithm has three main steps:

- Step 1** Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ have a finite number of solutions: $\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_w$. A *pseudo solution* of \mathcal{F} is defined to be a linear combination of *monomial solutions* of \mathcal{F} , that is, $\sum_{i=1}^w c_i \tilde{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{a}_i)$, where $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}$ is a vector of monomials in \mathbb{X} and c_i are complex numbers. We show that a pseudo solution of \mathcal{F} can be computed by solving a linear system with the HHL algorithm (see section 3).
- Step 2** For $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$, we show that Boolean solutions for \mathcal{F} can be computed from the pseudo solutions of \mathcal{F} obtained in Step 1 with high probability (see section 4).
- Step 3** The problem of solving a Boolean equation system is reduced to the computation of the Boolean solutions for a 6-sparse polynomial system over \mathbb{C} (see section 5). A polynomial system \mathcal{H} is called k -sparse if each polynomial in \mathcal{H} contains at most k terms.

We will introduce each of these steps briefly.

First, we show how to compute the pseudo solutions for a polynomial system. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ with $d_i = \deg(f_i)$, $T = \sum_{i=1}^r \#f_i$, and D a positive integer greater than $\max_i d_i$. Consider all the polynomials $m_j f_i$, where m_j are monomials with $\deg(m_j, x_k) \leq D - d_i$ for

each k . These equations $m_j f_i = 0$ can be written as a linear system $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D} \mathbf{m}_D = \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}$, where \mathbf{m}_D is the set of all the monomials m with $\deg(m, x_k) \leq D$ for each k and $\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is the set of the constant terms in $m_j f_i$. The linear system $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D} \mathbf{m}_D = \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is called the *Macaulay linear system*¹ of \mathcal{F} . Our contribution here are two folds. It is shown that by using the HHL algorithm to $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D} \mathbf{m}_D = \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}$, we obtain a pseudo solution for \mathcal{F} . We gave a modified HHL algorithm to solve the Macaulay linear system, which has better complexities than using the original HHL algorithm.

Second, we show how to compute the Boolean solutions for a polynomial system \mathcal{F} over \mathbb{C} , which are the solutions of $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1^2 - x_1, \dots, x_n^2 - x_n\}$. Our contribution here is to show that the solutions of $\mathcal{F}_1 = 0$ can be obtained from the pseudo solutions of $\mathcal{F}_1 = 0$ with high probability by combining the property of quantum states and that of Boolean solutions. The novelty of the approach is that the error bound for the solutions in the HHL algorithm is used to give the probability for finding Boolean solutions of \mathcal{F} .

Thirdly, let \mathcal{F} be a Boolean polynomial system in variables \mathbb{X} . Since the HHL algorithm works over \mathbb{C} and does not work for finite fields, we cannot use the HHL algorithm to the Macaulay linear system of \mathcal{F} . We prove that the solutions to \mathcal{F} are the same as the Boolean solutions of a 6-sparse polynomial system $\mathcal{F}_2 \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{U}]$ for some extra indeterminates \mathbb{U} . Furthermore, the numbers of variables in \mathbb{U} and the numbers of equations in \mathcal{F}_2 are linear in the size of \mathcal{F} . By computing the Boolean solutions of \mathcal{F}_2 , we find the solutions of $\mathcal{F} = 0$.

2 A modified HHL algorithm

In this section, we give a modified HHL algorithm for solving the linear system $Ax = b$, where special assumptions about A and b are made. The modified HHL algorithm will be used in our algorithm for solving Boolean equations.

For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$, the arithmetic square root of each nonzero eigenvalue of the matrix $A^\dagger A$ is called a *singular value* of A , and the quotient of the maximal and minimal singular values is called the *condition number* of A , where A^\dagger denotes the complex conjugate transpose of A . A matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$ is called *s-sparse* if each row and column of A have at most s nonzero entries. We say that the *query complexity* for A is $O(\gamma)$, if there is an algorithm to find all the nonzero entries in each row or column of A in time $O(\gamma)$.

The following HHL quantum algorithm [23] was given to solve a linear equation system $A|x\rangle = |b\rangle$ over \mathbb{C} .

Theorem 2.1. *Suppose that $A \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$ is an s -sparse matrix and the query complexity for A is $O(s)$. Let $|b\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^M$ be a unitary quantum state. Then, there is a quantum algorithm which can give an ϵ -approximation to a solution state of the linear system $A|x\rangle = |b\rangle$ in runtime complexity $\tilde{O}(\log(M + N)s^2\kappa^2/\epsilon)$, where κ is the condition number of A .*

As usual, the notation \tilde{O} suppresses more slowly-growing logarithm terms. With the best known algorithm for Hamiltonian simulation [5], the complexity of the HHL algorithm can be reduced to $\tilde{O}(\log(M + N)s\kappa^2/\epsilon)$. Ambainis gave a new version of the HHL algorithm which has complexity $\tilde{O}(\log(M + N)s^2\kappa/\epsilon^3)$ [2].

In the rest of this section, we will present a modified version of the HHL algorithm under the following assumptions.

¹The Macaulay linear system in Section 3.1 is more complicated than the one given here, although they are essentially the same. Here, we use this simple version to explain the ideas.

Assumption 1. $A \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$ is s -sparse and has a decomposition $A = \sum_{j=1}^s A_j$, where A_j are 1-sparse matrices with query complexity $O(\gamma)$.

Assumption 2. Let $b \in \{0, 1\}^M$ and $M = r2^v$ for positive integers v, r . Furthermore, $b[i] = 1$ if and only if $i = k2^v$ for $k = 0, \dots, \rho - 1$, where ρ is a positive integer $\leq r$.

We have the following modified HHL algorithm which follows from Lemma 2.9.

Theorem 2.2. *Under Assumptions 1 and 2, the HHL algorithm can give an ϵ -approximation to a solution state of the linear equation system $Ax = b$ in runtime complexity $\tilde{O}((\log(M+N) + \gamma)s\kappa^2/\epsilon)$, where κ is the condition number of A .*

Remark 2.3. *Theorem 2.2 differs from Theorem 2.1 in the following aspects. (1) b is given as a vector instead of a state $|b\rangle$. (2) A satisfies different conditions: A is s -sparse, but with query complexity $O(s\gamma)$. (3) γ is added to the complexity. (4) In the complexity, s^2 is reduced to s , which can also be done with best known algorithm for Hamiltonian simulation [5], but under the condition that A has query complexity $O(s)$.*

Remark 2.4. *In the cryptanalysis to be given later in this paper, we make the following approximation to the complexities of the HHL algorithm $\tilde{O}((\log(M+N) + \gamma)s\kappa^2/\epsilon) \simeq c(\log(M+N) + \gamma)s\kappa^2/\epsilon$, where c is called the complexity constant of the HHL algorithm.*

For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$, denote $I(A) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^\dagger & 0 \end{pmatrix} \in \mathbb{C}^{(N+M) \times (N+M)}$, which is a Hermitian matrix. In fact, the HHL algorithm will solve the linear system

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & A \\ A^\dagger & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ x \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} b \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

instead of $Ax = b$ [23].

We will prove Theorem 2.2 in two steps: first consider the Hamiltonian simulation for $e^{\mathbf{i}I(A)t}$ and second consider the preparation for the state $|b\rangle$, where $\mathbf{i} = \sqrt{-1}$. We need the following result about the quantum complexity for the Hamiltonian simulation.

Lemma 2.5 ([4]). *For a 1-sparseness decomposition $A = \sum_{j=1}^u A_j$ of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$ and a given time t , we can quantumly simulate $e^{\mathbf{i}I(A)t} \simeq (\prod_{j=1}^u e^{\mathbf{i}I(A_j)t_0})^{t/t_0}$ for any small number t_0 by $O(\log(M+N)(\log^*(M+N))^2 ut) = \tilde{O}(\log(M+N)ut)$ auxiliary operations and totally $O(\log^*(M+N)ut)$ queries for the A_j s, where $\log^*(n) = \min\{r \mid \log_2^{(r)} n < 2\}$ (the (r) indicating the iterated logarithm).*

In the following lemma, we modify the HHL algorithm to take into the fact that A has a given 1-sparseness decomposition.

Lemma 2.6. *Under Assumption 1, the HHL algorithm gives an ϵ -approximation to a solution state of the linear system $Ax = |b\rangle$ in time $\tilde{O}((\log(M+N) + \gamma)s\kappa^2/\epsilon)$, where κ is the condition number of A .*

Proof. The complexity for the HHL algorithm comes from the Hamiltonian simulation $e^{\mathbf{i}I(A)t}$ for time $t = \kappa^2/\epsilon$ [23]. It is proved that $I(A)$ can be decomposed as the summation of $(\log^*(M+N)s^2)$ 1-sparse matrices. By Lemma 2.5, the complexity for the HHL algorithm is $\tilde{O}(\log(M+N)s^2\kappa^2/\epsilon)$, where the complexity for the query is negligible.

Under **Assumption 1**, since $I(A)$ can be decomposed as the summation of s matrices of 1-sparseness, by Lemma 2.5, the complexity for the modified HHL algorithm will decrease to $\tilde{O}(\log(M+N)st + \log^*(M+N)st\gamma)|_{t=\kappa^2/\epsilon} = \tilde{O}((\log(M+N) + \gamma)s\kappa^2/\epsilon)$. \square

We need the following detailed information about the HHL algorithm.

Lemma 2.7. [23] Let $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$ be the singular values of $A \in \mathbb{C}^{M \times N}$, $|v_j\rangle$ ($|u_j\rangle$) the eigenvectors of $A^\dagger A$ (AA^\dagger) with respect to the nonzero eigenvalues λ_j^2 of $A^\dagger A$, and thus $A = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j |u_j\rangle\langle v_j|$ is the singular value decomposition of A . Then, the HHL algorithm returns an ϵ -approximation to the solution state $|\frac{\tilde{x}}{\|\tilde{x}\|}\rangle$, where

$$\tilde{x} = \sum_{j=1}^n \lambda_j^{-1} |v_j\rangle\langle v_j| b. \quad (1)$$

Furthermore, \tilde{x} has the minimal norm $\|\tilde{x}\| = \sqrt{\langle \tilde{x}, \tilde{x} \rangle}$ among all solutions for $Ax = b$.

In Lemma 2.6, $|b\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^M$ is given as a quantum state and there exist no efficient algorithms to generate $|b\rangle$ in the general case [1]. In the rest of this section, we will modify the HHL algorithm such that the input to the HHL algorithm is b instead of $|b\rangle$ under **Assumption 2**. We first prove a lemma.

Lemma 2.8. Let $Bx = c$ be obtained by adding more “equations” $0x = 1$ to $A|x\rangle = |b\rangle$. Then using HHL to $B|x\rangle = |c\rangle$, we obtain the same solution state as that of $A|x\rangle = |b\rangle$.

Proof. Let $B = \begin{pmatrix} A \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}$ and $c = \begin{pmatrix} b \\ 1 \end{pmatrix}$, where we use 0 (1) to represent certain matrix of zeros (ones) with the proper dimension. We have $B^\dagger B = A^\dagger A$. Then, adding some 0 rows to A will not change the nonzero eigenvalues of $A^\dagger A$ and the eigenvectors of $B^\dagger B$ are the same as that of $A^\dagger A$. Now, the lemma follows from Lemma 2.7. \square

In the following lemma, we modify the HHL algorithm to take into the fact that b contains ρ nonzero entries.

Lemma 2.9. Under **Assumptions 1 and 2**, the HHL algorithm can give an ϵ -approximation to a solution state of the linear system $Ax = b$ in time $\tilde{O}((\log(M+N) + \gamma)s\kappa^2/\epsilon)$.

Proof. Let $\sigma = \lceil \log_2 \rho \rceil \leq \log_2 r + 1$. Let $w \in \{0, 1\}^{2^\sigma}$ such that $w[0] = 1$ and $w[i] = 0$ for $i = 1, \dots, 2^\sigma - 1$. Adding $2^\sigma - \rho$ blocks w before the $\rho 2^v$ -th row of b , we have a vector c such that $c[i] = 1$ if and only if $i = k 2^v$ for $k = 0, 1, \dots, 2^\sigma - 1$. Correspondingly, by adding $(2^\sigma - \rho) 2^v$ zero rows to A before the $\rho 2^v$ -th row of A , we obtain a matrix $B \in \mathbb{C}^{((r+2^\sigma-\rho)2^v) \times N}$. Note that adding some zero rows will not increase the sparseness and the query complexity of a matrix. Then the equation system $Ax = b$ becomes

$$Bx = c \quad (2)$$

We may add more zero rows at the ends of B and c such that $B \in \mathbb{C}^{2^\eta \times N}$ and $c \in \mathbb{C}^{2^\eta}$, where $\eta = \lceil \log_2(r + 2^\sigma - \rho) \rceil + v$. With these assumptions, we can easily generate the state $|c\rangle$:

$$|c\rangle = \otimes_{i=1}^{\eta-\sigma-v} |0\rangle \otimes_{i=1}^{\sigma} (H|0\rangle) \otimes_{i=1}^v |0\rangle,$$

where $H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$ is the Hadamard operator. The complexity of generating $|c\rangle$ is $O(\eta) = O(v + \log r) = O(\log(M))$, since $\sigma = \lceil \log_2 \rho \rceil \leq \log_2 r + 1$ and $M = r2^v$. The equation system (2) becomes

$$C|x\rangle = |c\rangle \quad (3)$$

where $C = \frac{B}{2^{\sigma/2}}$. We show that C satisfies **Assumption 1**. It is clear that C can be written as the summation of s 1-sparse matrices C_j . The query complexity of C_j is the same as that of A_j , because the (u, v) -th element of C is the (u, v) -th element of B divided by $2^{\sigma/2}$, in other words, we do not need to actually generate the matrix C .

By Lemma 2.8, equation system (3) has the same solution state as that of $A|x\rangle = |b\rangle$, when using the HHL algorithm to them. As mentioned before, the HHL algorithm actually solves $I(C)(0, x)^T = (c, 0)^T$. Similar to the above procedure, we can add more zeros to the end of $(c, 0)^T$ to obtain a state, which costs at most $O(\log(2^n + N)) = O(\log(M + N))$.

By Lemma 2.6, the total complexity is the complexity of using the HHL algorithm to (3) plus that of generating $|c\rangle$, that is, $\tilde{O}((\log(M + N) + \gamma)s\kappa^2/\epsilon + \log(M + N)) = \tilde{O}((\log(M + N) + \gamma)s\kappa^2/\epsilon)$. \square

Remark 2.10. If γ is small, say $\gamma = O(\log(M + N))$, then the complexity of the modified HHL algorithm is $\tilde{O}((\log(M + N) + \gamma)s\kappa^2/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}(\log(M + N)s\kappa^2/\epsilon)$. Fortunately, the linear system to be solved in this paper has this property.

3 Quantum pseudo-solving of polynomial systems over \mathbb{C}

In this section, we give a quantum algorithm to find a pseudo solution of a polynomial system \mathcal{F} , which satisfies a system of linear equations.

3.1 Sparseness and efficient query of the modified Macaulay matrix

In this section, we will construct a modified Macaulay matrix for a finite set of polynomials and show that the matrix is sparse and can be efficiently queried. Precisely, we will show that the modified Macaulay matrix satisfies **Assumption 1** given in Section 2.

Let \mathbb{C} be the field of complex numbers and $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ the polynomial ring in the indeterminates $\mathbb{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$. For a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$, denote $\deg(f)$, $\#f$, and $\mathbf{m}(f)$ to be the total degree of f , the sparseness (the number of terms) of f , and the set of monomials of f . For $S \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$, we use $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(S) \subset \mathbb{C}^n$ to denote the common zeros of the polynomials in S .

Let \mathbf{m} denote the set of all the monomials in variables \mathbb{X} . In this section, we will use the lexicographic monomial ordering for $x_1 > \dots > x_n$. For convenience, we denote $\mathbf{0} = (0, 0, \dots, 0)$, $\mathbf{1} = (1, 1, \dots, 1) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, and $\mathbb{X}^\alpha = \prod_{i=1}^n x_i^{\alpha_i}$ for $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$. For a given positive integer d , let $\mathbf{m}_{\leq d}$ be the set of all monomials which are factors of $\mathbb{X}^{d\mathbf{1}} = x_1^d x_2^d \dots x_n^d$. We sort

$$\mathbf{m}_{\leq d} = \{m_{d,0}, m_{d,1}, \dots, m_{d,(d+1)^n-1}\}$$

in ascending lexicographic monomial ordering. Then $m_{d,0} = 1, m_{d,1} = x_n, m_{d,2} = x_n^2, m_{d,d} = x_n^d, m_{d,d+1} = x_{n-1}$ and $m_{d,(d+1)^n-1} = \mathbb{X}^{d\mathbf{1}}$. Also note that $\#\mathbf{m}_{\leq d} = (d+1)^n$.

In the rest of Section 3, let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ with $d_i = \deg(f_i)$ and $t_i = \#f_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$. Without loss of generality, we assume that each constant term $f_i(\mathbf{0})$ is either 0 or -1 for $i = 1, \dots, r$.

Remark 3.1. In this paper, the subscripts for a matrix or a vector always start from 0, because, the complexity analysis of the algorithm in this paper depends on the representation of the subscripts.

Let $D \in \mathbb{N}$ such that $D \geq \max_{i=1}^r d_i$. We will construct a modified Macaulay matrix for \mathcal{F} . Let \bar{d} be the minimal integer satisfying $\bar{d} \geq D - \min_i d_i$ and $\bar{d} + 1 = 2^\delta$ for certain $\delta \in \mathbb{N}$. Set \bar{D} to be the minimal integer satisfying $\bar{D} \geq \bar{d} + \max_i d_i$ and $\bar{D} + 1 = 2^\Delta$ for certain $\Delta \in \mathbb{N}$. For $i = 1, \dots, r$ and each $m_{\bar{d},j} \in \mathbf{m}_{\leq \bar{d}}$, $m_{\bar{d},j}f_i$ could be considered as a linear function in the monomials in $\mathbf{m}_{\leq \bar{D}}$. We rewrite these linear functions in matrix form:

$$\begin{matrix} m_{\bar{d},0}f_1 \\ \vdots \\ m_{\bar{d},(\bar{d}+1)^n-1}f_1 \\ m_{\bar{d},0}f_2 \\ \vdots \\ m_{\bar{d},(\bar{d}+1)^n-1}f_r \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} m_{\bar{D},1} < m_{\bar{D},2} < \dots < m_{\bar{D},(\bar{D}+1)^n-1} \\ \dots \\ \dots \\ \dots \\ \dots \\ \dots \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} m_{\bar{D},1} \\ m_{\bar{D},2} \\ \vdots \\ m_{\bar{D},(\bar{D}+1)^n-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} m_{\bar{D},0} = 1 \\ -f_1(\mathbf{0}) \\ \vdots \\ 0 \\ -f_2(\mathbf{0}) \\ \vdots \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (4)$$

denoted as

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D} \mathbf{m}_D = \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}, \quad (5)$$

where

$$\mathbf{m}_D = (m_{\bar{D},1}, m_{\bar{D},2}, \dots, m_{\bar{D},(\bar{D}+1)^n-1})^T.$$

Then the $(i-1)(\bar{d}+1)^n$ -th to the $(i(\bar{d}+1)^n-1)$ -th rows of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ are generated by $\mathbf{m}_{\leq \bar{d}}f_i$. The i -th column of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ consists of the coefficients of $m_{\bar{D},i+1}$ in $m_{\bar{d},0}f_1, \dots, m_{\bar{d},(\bar{d}+1)^n-1}f_r$. $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is called the *modified Macaulay matrix* of the polynomial system \mathcal{F} and (5) is called the *Macaulay linear system* of \mathcal{F} . $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is a matrix over \mathbb{C} of dimension $(r(\bar{d}+1)^n) \times ((\bar{D}+1)^n-1) = (r2^{n\delta}) \times (2^{n\Delta}-1)$.

Example 3.2. Let $f_1 = x_1^2 - x_2$, $f_2 = x_1/2 - 1$, $D = 2$. Then $\bar{d} = 1$, $\bar{D} = 3$ and the Macaulay linear system is

$$\begin{matrix} f_1 \\ x_2f_1 \\ x_1f_1 \\ x_1x_2f_1 \\ f_2 \\ x_2f_2 \\ x_1f_2 \\ x_1x_2f_2 \end{matrix} \begin{pmatrix} -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1/2 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} x_2 \\ x_2^2 \\ x_2^3 \\ x_1 \\ x_1x_2 \\ x_1x_2^2 \\ x_1x_2^3 \\ x_1^2 \\ x_1^2x_2 \\ x_1^2x_2^2 \\ x_1^2x_2^3 \\ x_1^3 \\ x_1^3x_2 \\ x_1^3x_2^2 \\ x_1^3x_2^3 \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 1 \\ 0 \\ 0 \\ 0 \end{pmatrix}.$$

For nonnegative integers $B > 1$ and $k < B^n$, we denote $k_{(B)} = (k_{n-1}, \dots, k_0)$, where $k = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} k_i B^i$ is the B -base representation of k and thus $0 \leq k_i < B$. On the other hand, for $\mathbf{k} = (k_{n-1}, \dots, k_0)$ such that $0 \leq k_i < B$, let $\mathbf{k}_{(B)} = \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} k_i B^i$. The following simple fact is crucial in the complexity analysis of our algorithm: the k -th element in $\mathbf{m}_{\leq d}$ is

$$m_{d,k} = \mathbb{X}^{k_{(d+1)}} = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} x_{i+1}^{k_i} \quad (6)$$

where $k_{(d+1)} = (k_{n-1}, \dots, k_0)$. Equation (6) is true under the assumption made in Remark 3.1.

Lemma 3.3. *We have $\bar{d} + 1 \leq 2D$ and $\bar{D} + 1 \leq 6D$. As a consequence, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is of dimension $(r(\bar{d} + 1)^n) \times ((\bar{D} + 1)^n - 1) = (r2^{n\delta}) \times (2^{n\Delta} - 1) = O(r(2D)^n) \times O((6D)^n)$.*

Proof. From the definition of \bar{d} and \bar{D} , we have $\bar{d} + 1 \leq 2D - 2\min_i d_i + 1 \leq 2D$ and $\bar{D} + 1 \leq 2\bar{d} + 2\max_i d_i + 1 \leq 4D - 4\min_i d_i + 2\max_i d_i + 1 \leq 6D$. \square

Lemma 3.4. *Let $f_i = \sum_{j=1}^{t_i} c_{ij} \mathbb{X}^{\alpha_{ij}}$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, where $t_i = \#f_i$. Then $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ has a natural 1-sparseness decomposition:*

$$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D} = \sum_{i=1}^r \sum_{j=1}^{t_i} c_{ij} \mathcal{M}_{ij}, \quad (7)$$

where each \mathcal{M}_{ij} is a 1-sparse $\{0, 1\}$ -matrix. In fact, only the $((i-1)(\bar{d}+1)^n + k, (k_{(\bar{d}+1)} + \alpha_{ij})_{(\bar{D}+1)})$ entries in \mathcal{M}_{ij} equal to 1 for $0 \leq k < (\bar{d}+1)^n$.

Proof. We can treat the coefficients c_{ij} of f_i as new indeterminates and then write $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ as a function in c_{ij} . The coefficient of c_{ij} is M_{ij} . Since $c_{ij} \mathbb{X}^{\alpha_{ij}}$ is a term of f_i , only $m_{\bar{d},k} f_i$ contain terms whose coefficient are c_{ij} , which corresponds to the $((i-1)(\bar{d}+1)^n + k)$ -th row generated by $m_{\bar{d},k} f_i$ for $0 \leq k < (\bar{d}+1)^n$. Since $m_{\bar{d},k} \cdot \mathbb{X}^{\alpha_{ij}} = \mathbb{X}^{k_{(\bar{d}+1)}} \cdot \mathbb{X}^{\alpha_{ij}} = \mathbb{X}^{k_{(\bar{d}+1)} + \alpha_{ij}} = m_{\bar{D},(k_{(\bar{d}+1)} + \alpha_{ij})_{(\bar{D}+1)}}$, only the $(k_{(\bar{d}+1)} + \alpha_{ij})_{(\bar{D}+1)}$ -th entry in the $((i-1)(\bar{d}+1)^n + k)$ -th row of \mathcal{M}_{ij} is nonzero. The 1-sparseness of \mathcal{M}_{ij} comes from the fact that the rows and columns of the nonzero entries are distinct. \square

As a direct consequence, we have

Corollary 3.5. *$\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is $T_{\mathcal{F}}$ -sparse, where $T_{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{i=1}^r t_i$ is called the total sparseness of \mathcal{F} .*

Lemma 3.6. *The query complexity for \mathcal{M}_{ij} is $O(n \log(D) + \log r)$, where \mathcal{M}_{ij} is introduced in Lemma 3.4.*

Proof. Given a row index i_0 , we want to know the nonzero entry in the i_0 -th row. By Lemma 3.4, the i_0 -th row has a nonzero entry if and only if $(i-1)(\bar{d}+1)^n \leq i_0 < i(\bar{d}+1)^n$. Compute the quotient l and remainder k such that $i_0 = (\bar{d}+1)^n l + k$. By Lemma 3.4, the i_0 -th row has a nonzero entry if and only if $l = i-1$, meanwhile the nonzero entry is at the $(k_{(\bar{d}+1)} + \alpha_{ij})_{(\bar{D}+1)}$ -th column.

We now analyse the complexity of the above step. Without loss of generality, we assume that all the numbers are represented in binary form, which is crucial to the complexity. Since $\bar{d} + 1 = 2^\delta$ is a power of 2, we can compute $(\bar{d} + 1)^n = 2^{\delta n}$ easily in time $O(\log(n) \log(\log(\bar{d})))$. Since all numbers are binary, the last δn bits of i_0 are exactly the remainder k , and other bits are the quotient l . As a result, we can compute both l and k in time $O(\log(n) \log(\log(\bar{d})))$. Since the number of bits for i_0 is $O(\log i_0) = O(\log(r(\bar{d} + 1)^n)) = O(\log r + n \log \bar{d})$, the complexity is

bounded by $O(\log r + n \log \bar{d})$. Since both $\bar{d} + 1 = 2^\delta$ and $\bar{D} + 1 = 2^\Delta$ are powers of 2 and k is in binary form, we can insert $(\Delta - \delta)$ zeros before each δ bits of k starting from lower digits to obtain $(k_{(\bar{d}+1)})_{(\bar{D}+1)}$ in time $O(n \log(\bar{D}))$. Totally, we can compute $(k_{(\bar{d}+1)} + \alpha_{ij})_{(\bar{D}+1)}$ in time $O(\log(n) \log(\log(\bar{D})) + n \log(\bar{D})) = O(n \log(\bar{D}))$. So the total complexity is $O(n \log(\bar{D}) + (\log r + n \log \bar{d})) = O(n \log(D) + \log r)$ by Lemma 3.3.

On the other hand, given a column index j_0 , we want to know the nonzero entries in the j_0 -th column. Compute $\mathbf{k} = (j_0)_{(\bar{D}+1)} - \alpha_{ij}$ first. If \mathbf{k} is a nonnegative vector, we can compute $\mathbf{k}_{(\bar{d}+1)}$. By Lemma 3.4, only the $(\mathbf{k}_{(\bar{d}+1)} + (j-1)(\bar{d}+1)^n)$ -th entry is nonzero in the j_0 -th column. Similarly, the complexity is $O(n \log(D) + \log r)$. \square

Lemmas 3.4 and 3.6 show that $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ satisfies **Assumption 1** with $\gamma = O(n \log(D) + \log r)$.

3.2 Solution of the Macaulay linear system

In this section, we give an explicit formula for the solution of the Macaulay linear system. We first introduce the concept of solving degree [26, 7].

Definition 3.7. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ and (\mathcal{F}) the ideal generated by \mathcal{F} . D is called the solving degree of \mathcal{F} , if we can use Buchberger's algorithm to compute the Gröbner basis of the ideal (\mathcal{F}) under the degree reverse lexicographic (DRL) monomial ordering such that all the polynomials in the procedure have degrees less than or equal to D . Denote the solving degree of \mathcal{F} by $\text{Sdeg}(\mathcal{F})$.

In terms of the F4 algorithm [18] or the XL algorithm [14], D is the solving degree of \mathcal{F} , if the Gröbner basis of the ideal (\mathcal{F}) can be obtained from $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D} \mathbf{m}_D = \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ by using Gaussian elimination over \mathbb{C} .

For a polynomial $f \in \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$, denote f^h to be the homogenization of f in $\mathbb{C}[x_0, \mathbb{X}]$. $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ is said to satisfy *Lazard's condition* if $\mathcal{F}^h = \{f_1^h, \dots, f_r^h\} \subset \mathbb{C}[x_0, \mathbb{X}]$ has a finite number of solutions in the projective space $P_{\mathbb{C}}^n$. Denote the maximal degree of the polynomials in the reduced Gröbner basis of ideal (\mathcal{F}) by $\text{MGBdeg}(\mathcal{F})$. Lazard [26] and more recently Caminata-Gorla [7] proved the following results which give an upper bound for the solving degree.

Theorem 3.8 ([26] Theorem 3). Let I be a zero dimensional homogenous ideal in $\mathbb{C}[x_0, \mathbb{X}]$ generated by $\mathcal{H} = \{h_1, \dots, h_r\}$ of degrees d_1, \dots, d_r , such that $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_r$. Choose the DRL monomial order. Then $\text{MGBdeg}(\mathcal{H}) \leq d_1 + \dots + d_{n+1} - n + 1$ with $d_{n+1} = 1$ if $r = n$.

Theorem 3.9 ([7] Corollary 3.14). Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$. Under the DRL monomial ordering with $x_0 < x_i$ for $i = 1, \dots, n$, we have $\text{Sdeg}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Sdeg}(\mathcal{F}^h) = \text{MGBdeg}(\mathcal{F}^h)$.

Combining Theorems 3.8 and 3.9 gives a bound for the solving degree:

Corollary 3.10. Let I be an ideal in $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ generated by $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\}$ of degrees d_1, \dots, d_r , such that $d_1 \geq d_2 \geq \dots \geq d_r$. Choose the DRL monomial ordering. If \mathcal{F} satisfies Lazard's condition, then $\text{Sdeg}(\mathcal{F}) \leq d_1 + \dots + d_{n+1} - n + 1$ with $d_{n+1} = 1$ if $r = n$.

Proof. Set \mathcal{H} in Theorem 3.8 to be \mathcal{F}^h . Since \mathcal{F} satisfies Lazard's condition, \mathcal{F}^h is a zero dimensional homogenous ideal. By Theorem 3.8, $\text{MGBdeg}(\mathcal{F}^h) \leq d_1 + \dots + d_{n+1} - n + 1$. By Theorem 3.9, $\text{Sdeg}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{MGBdeg}(\mathcal{F}^h) \leq d_1 + \dots + d_{n+1} - n + 1$. \square

Let $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ be the modified Macaulay matrix. Denote $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ to be the set of monomials $m_{\bar{D},k}$ in \mathbf{m}_D such that the $(k-1)$ -th column of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is $\mathbf{0}$. In the other words, $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is the set of monomials not occurring in $m_{\bar{d},j}f_i$ in (4). We introduce the notation $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathcal{F},D} \in \mathbf{m}^{(\bar{D}+1)^n-1}$: for $i = 1, \dots, (\bar{D}+1)^n - 1$,

$$\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathcal{F},D}[i-1] = \begin{cases} m_{\bar{D},i}, & \text{if } m_{\bar{D},i} \notin \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F},D}; \\ 0, & \text{if } m_{\bar{D},i} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F},D}. \end{cases} \quad (8)$$

The following lemma gives the solutions to the Macaulay linear system (4).

Lemma 3.11. *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ such that $I = (\mathcal{F})$ is a radical zero-dimensional ideal and $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I) = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_w\}$. Let D be a solving degree of \mathcal{F} . Then any solution \mathbf{m}_D of the linear system $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}\mathbf{m}_D = \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is of the form*

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}}_D = \sum_{i=1}^w \eta_i \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_D(\mathbf{a}_i) + \sum_{m_{\bar{D},k} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F},D}} \mu_k \mathbf{e}_{k-1},$$

where η_i are complex numbers such that $\sum_{i=1}^w \eta_i = 1$, μ_k are arbitrary complex numbers, and \mathbf{e}_k is the k -th unit vector in $\mathbb{C}^{(\bar{D}+1)^n-1}$.

Proof. For each $m_{\bar{D},k} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F},D}$, the $(k-1)$ -th row in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is a zero column, so $m_{\bar{D},k}$ can take arbitrary value in the solution of the Macaulay linear system and hence $\mu_k \mathbf{e}_{k-1}$ is a solution of the Macaulay linear system. Delete the $(k-1)$ -th column in $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ and the $(k-1)$ -th row in \mathbf{m}_D and $\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ to obtain a new system $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{F},D} \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathcal{F},D} = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathcal{F},D}$. For each monomial m and polynomial f_i with $\deg(mf_i) \leq D$, mf_i is included in the Macaulay linear system $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}\mathbf{m}_D = \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}$. Since D is a solving degree, we can obtain a Gröbner basis of the ideal I under the DRL monomial ordering by doing Gaussian elimination on the linear system. Denote $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{F},D} \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathcal{F},D} = \overline{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ to be such a linear system containing a Gröbner basis G of I . Denote $LT(I)$ to be set of the leading monomials of the polynomials in I . Then, the largest monomial in each row of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is in $LT(I)$ and each monomial in $LT(G)$ occurs as one of the leading monomials for some row. Thus, the dimension of the solution space of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{F},D} \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_{\mathcal{F},D} = \overline{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is at most $\#(\mathbf{m} \setminus LT(I)) - 1 = \#V(I) - 1 = w - 1$, where the first equality is true because I is radical. Since each $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}_D(\mathbf{a}_i)$ is a solution of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{F},D} \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_D = \overline{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathcal{F},D}$, $\{\sum \eta_i \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_D(\mathbf{a}_i) \mid \sum \eta_i = 1\}$ is a subspace of the solution space of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{F},D} \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_D = \overline{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathcal{F},D}$, that is, the solution space is of dimension at least $w - 1$. Then, $\{\sum \eta_i \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_D(\mathbf{a}_i) \mid \sum \eta_i = 1\}$ is exactly the solution space of $\overline{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{F},D} \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_D = \overline{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathcal{F},D}$, also that of $\widetilde{\mathcal{M}}_{\mathcal{F},D} \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_D = \tilde{\mathbf{b}}_{\mathcal{F},D}$. The lemma is proved. \square

Corollary 3.12. *In Lemma 3.11, if \mathcal{F} has a unique solution \mathbf{a} , then we have*

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}}_D = \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_D(\mathbf{a}) + \sum_{m_{\bar{D},k} \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F},D}} \mu_k \mathbf{e}_{k-1}.$$

Example 3.13. *The equation system in Example 3.2 has a unique solution $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 4$, and $\mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F},D} = \{x_2^3, x_1x_2^3, x_1^2x_2^2, x_1^2x_2^3, x_1^3x_2^2, x_1^3x_2^3\}$. By Corollary 3.12, the solution of the Macaulay linear system is $(4, 16, 0, 2, 8, 32, 0, 4, 16, 0, 0, 8, 32, 0, 0) + (0, 0, \mu_3, 0, 0, 0, \mu_7, 0, 0, \mu_{10}, \mu_{11}, 0, 0, \mu_{14}, \mu_{15})$, where each μ_i is an arbitrary complex number.*

3.3 A quantum algorithm for pseudo-solving of polynomial systems

In this section, we show that applying the HHL algorithm to the Macaulay linear system of \mathcal{F} , we obtain a pseudo solution of \mathcal{F} .

Let $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ with $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}) = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_w\}$ and $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}$ a vector of monomials in \mathbb{X} . The vector $\tilde{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{a}_i)$ is called a *monomial solution* of \mathcal{F} . A *pseudo solution* of \mathcal{F} is defined to be a linear combination of monomial solutions of \mathcal{F} , that is, $\sum_{i=1}^w c_i \tilde{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{a}_i)$, where c_i are complex numbers.

A pseudo solution for the monomial vector \mathbf{m}_D clearly satisfies the Macaulay linear system $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D} \mathbf{m}_D = \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ of \mathcal{F} . From Lemma 3.11, the converse is not true, that is, a solution of the Macaulay linear system is generally not a pseudo solution. Fortunately, applying the HHL algorithm to the Macaulay linear system, we will obtain a pseudo solution for \mathcal{F} .

Using the modified HHL algorithm (Theorem 2.2) to the Macaulay linear system, we have

Theorem 3.14. *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ such that $I = (\mathcal{F})$ is a radical zero-dimensional ideal, $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(I) = \{\mathbf{a}_1, \dots, \mathbf{a}_w\}$, and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$. Let D be a solving degree of \mathcal{F} . Using the modified HHL algorithm to the Macaulay linear system $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D} \mathbf{m}_D = \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}$, the answer is an ϵ -approximation to the following pseudo solution of \mathcal{F}*

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}}_D = \sum_{i=1}^w \eta_i \tilde{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{a}_i),$$

where η_i are complex numbers such that $\sum_{i=1}^w \eta_i = 1$ and $\|\sum_{i=1}^w \eta_i \tilde{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{a}_i)\|$ is minimal. The runtime complexity is $\tilde{O}(\log(D)nT_{\mathcal{F}}\kappa^2/\epsilon)$, where $T_{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{i=1}^r \#f_i$ and κ is the condition number of $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$.

Proof. By Lemma 3.11,

$$\hat{\mathbf{m}}_D = \sum_{\eta_i=1} \eta_i \mathbf{m}_D(\mathbf{a}_i) + \sum_{m_k \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F},D}} \mu_k \mathbf{e}_{k-1} = \sum_{\eta_i=1} \eta_i \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_D(\mathbf{a}_i) + \sum_{m_k \in \mathcal{N}_{\mathcal{F},D}} \tilde{\mu}_k \mathbf{e}_{k-1}.$$

By Lemma 2.7, $\|\hat{\mathbf{m}}_D\|$ is minimal. Since $\langle \mathbf{e}_{k-1} | \tilde{\mathbf{m}}_D(\mathbf{a}_i) \rangle = 0$, in order for $\|\hat{\mathbf{m}}_D\|$ to be minimized, each $\tilde{\mu}_k = 0$.

We may change the order of f_i such that, the first ρ polynomials f_i have nonzero constant terms. This step costs $O(r)$. By Lemma 3.4 and 3.6, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ satisfies **Assumption 1** for $s = T_{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{i=1}^r t_i$ and $\gamma = n \log D + \log r$. Since we assume that the constant terms of f_i are either 0 or -1 , by Lemma 3.3, $\mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ satisfies **Assumption 2** for $v = n\delta$. By Lemma 3.3, $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F},D}$ is of dimension $O(r(2D)^n) \times O((6D)^n)$. By Theorem 2.2 and Lemma 3.6, the complexity of the HHL algorithm is $\tilde{O}((\log(M+N) + \gamma)s\kappa^2/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}((\log(r(2D)^n + (6D)^n) + (n \log(D) + \log r))T_{\mathcal{F}}\kappa^2/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}((\log(r) + n \log(D))T_{\mathcal{F}}\kappa^2/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}(\log(r)T_{\mathcal{F}}\kappa^2/\epsilon + n \log(D)T_{\mathcal{F}}\kappa^2/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}(\log(D)nT_{\mathcal{F}}\kappa^2/\epsilon)$, since $r \leq T_{\mathcal{F}}$. We prove the theorem. \square

If \mathcal{F} satisfies Lazard's condition, by Corollary 3.9, we have the following three corollaries.

Corollary 3.15. *Set $D = (n+1)(d-1)+2$ in Theorem 3.14, the complexity is $\tilde{O}(\log(d)nT_{\mathcal{F}}\kappa^2/\epsilon)$, where $d = \max_i \deg(f_i)$.*

$\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ is called a *multivariate quadratic polynomial system (MQ)* if $\deg(f_i) = 2$.

Corollary 3.16. *For an MQ \mathcal{F} , we have $T_{\mathcal{F}} = O(rn^2)$, $D \leq n+3$ and the complexity is $\tilde{O}(n^3 r \kappa^2/\epsilon)$.*

Corollary 3.17. *If $\mathcal{F} = 0$ has a unique solution \mathbf{a} , then the solution state is $|\mathbf{m}\rangle = |\tilde{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{a})\rangle$. The complexity is $\tilde{O}(\log(d)nT_{\mathcal{F}}\kappa^2/\epsilon)$, where $d = \max_i d_i$.*

By Remark 2.4, the exact complexity for Theorem 3.14 is

Corollary 3.18. *The exact complexity to compute $|\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D\rangle$ is $c\log(M+N)T_{\mathcal{F}}\kappa^2/\epsilon$, where $N = r(\bar{d}+1)^n$, $M = (\bar{D}+1)^n - 1$, and c is the complexity constant of the HHL algorithm.*

Example 3.19. *If using the modified HHL algorithm to solve the linear system in Example 3.2, by Theorem 3.14, the solution is $(4, 16, 0, 2, 8, 32, 0, 4, 16, 0, 0, 8, 32, 0, 0)$. In order to find the unique solution $x_1 = 2, x_2 = 4$, we need to know how to project $(x_2, x_2^2, x_2^3, x_1, x_1x_2, x_1x_2^2, x_1x_2^3, x_1^2, x_1^2x_2, x_1^2x_2^2, x_1^2x_2^3, x_1^3, x_1^3x_2, x_1^3x_2^2, x_1^3x_2^3)$ to (x_1, x_2) efficiently.*

Motivated by the above example, we propose the following problem.

Problem 3.20. *Let $|u\rangle$ be an N -dimensional quantum state and $n \ll N$. How can we measure n selected coordinates of $|u\rangle$ efficiently.*

4 Find Boolean solutions for polynomial systems in $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$

In this section, we will give a quantum algorithm to compute the Boolean solutions of a polynomial system over \mathbb{C} .

4.1 A quantum algorithm to find Boolean solutions

A solution \mathbf{a} for $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ is called *Boolean*, if each coordinate of \mathbf{a} is 0 or 1. For $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$, the Boolean solutions of \mathcal{F} are $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}})$, where $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}} = \{x_1^2 - x_1, \dots, x_n^2 - x_n\}$. We first prove a lemma.

Lemma 4.1. *For $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$, $I = (\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}})$ is radical and satisfies Lazard's condition.*

Proof. Since $(\mathcal{F}) + (x_1 - a_1, \dots, x_n - a_n)$ is a maximal ideal in the ring $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$,

$$(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}}) = \bigcap_{a_1, \dots, a_n \in \{0, 1\}} ((\mathcal{F}) + (x_1 - a_1, \dots, x_n - a_n)),$$

is an intersection of maximal ideals and I is a radical ideal. I has no zeros at infinity, because $x_0 = 0$ and $x_i^2 - x_i x_0 = 0$ imply $x_i = 0$ for all i . So I satisfies Lazard's condition. \square

By Lemma 4.1, we can use Theorem 3.14 to compute $|\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D\rangle$ where the solving degree D is given in Corollary 3.10. Denote $\mathbf{0} = (0, \dots, 0)^T$ and $\mathbf{1} = (1, \dots, 1)^T$. Our quantum algorithm to compute Boolean solutions is given below.

Algorithm 4.2.

Input: $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ with $T_{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{i=1}^r \#f_i$ and $d_i = \deg(f_i)$. Also $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Output: A Boolean solution $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}})$ or \emptyset meaning that $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}}) = \emptyset$, with success probability at least $1 - \epsilon$.

Step 1: If $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$, return $\mathbf{0}$. If $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{1}) = \mathbf{0}$, return $\mathbf{1}$. Set $k = 1$.

Step 2: Let \mathcal{F}_1 be obtained from \mathcal{F} by replacing x_i^m in \mathcal{F} with x_i for all i and $m \in \mathbb{N}$. Let $\mathbb{Y} = \mathbb{X}$.

Step 3: Let $\mathcal{F}_2 = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{Y}}$, and $D = \text{Sdeg}(\mathcal{F}_2)$ as in Corollary 3.10.

Step 4: Use the modified HHL algorithm (Theorem 2.2) to the Macaulay linear system $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}_2, D}$ $\mathbf{m}_D = \mathbf{b}_{\mathcal{F}_2, D}$ to obtain a state $|\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D\rangle$ with the error bound $\sqrt{\epsilon_1/n}$, where ϵ_1 can be chosen arbitrarily in $(0, 1)$ such as $\epsilon_1 = 1/2$.

Step 5: Measuring $|\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D\rangle$, we obtain a state $|\mathbf{e}_{k-1}\rangle$ which corresponds $m_{\bar{D}, k}$ in \mathbf{m}_D .

Step 6: Let $m_{\bar{D}, k} = \prod_{i=1}^{u_k} x_{n_i}$. Set $x_{n_i} = 1$ in $\mathcal{F}_1 \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Y}]$ for $i = 1, \dots, u_k$.

Step 7: Remove 0 from \mathcal{F}_1 . Set $\mathbb{Y} = \mathbb{Y} \setminus \{x_{n_i} \mid i = 1, \dots, u_k\}$.

Step 8: If $1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ or $\mathbb{Y} = \emptyset$ then goto **Step 11**

Step 9: If $\mathcal{F}_1 \neq \emptyset$ and $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{0}) \neq \mathbf{0}$, then goto **Step 3**.

Step 10: Return (a_1, \dots, a_n) where $a_i = 0$ if $x_i \in \mathbb{Y}$ else $a_i = 1$.

Step 11: If $k > \lceil \log_{\epsilon_1} \epsilon \rceil$ then return \emptyset , else $k = k + 1$ and goto **Step 2**.

We have the following theorem, which will be proved in the rest of this section.

Theorem 4.3. *Algorithm 4.2 has the following properties.*

1. *If the algorithm returns a solution, then it is a Boolean solution of $\mathcal{F} = 0$. Equivalently, if \mathcal{F} has no Boolean solutions, the algorithm returns \emptyset .*
2. *If \mathcal{F} has Boolean solutions, the algorithm computes one with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$.*
3. *The runtime complexity of the algorithm is $\tilde{O}(n^{2.5}(n + T_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$ if using the HHL algorithm [23] and $\tilde{O}(n^{3.5}(n + T_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa \log 1/\epsilon)$ if using Ambainis' algorithm [2], where κ is the maximal condition number for all matrixes $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}_2, D}$ in Step 4 of the algorithm, called the condition number for the polynomial system \mathcal{F} .*

First, we briefly explain Algorithm 4.2. The algorithm has two loops: the inner loop from Step 3 to Step 9 and the outer loop from Step 2 to Step 11.

In the inner loop, we try to find a solution $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ of \mathcal{F}_1 and in each run of the loop at least one coordinate of \mathbf{a} , say a_k , is found. Then, we set $x_k = a_k$ and try to find the rest coordinates of \mathbf{a} in the rest of the loop. If the inner loop fails, then we restart from Step 2 and try to find a new solution.

The purpose of the outer loop is two folds. First, by using precision $\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_1}{n}}$ instead of $\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{n}}$ in Step 4, the algorithm uses less qubits. We can use a large value for $\epsilon_1 \in (0, 1)$, say $\epsilon_1 = 1/2$, then the precision needed in Step 4 is $\sqrt{\epsilon_1/n} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2n}}$ which is generally larger than $\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon}{n}}$. Second, the complexity of the algorithm related with the precision decreases from $O(1/\sqrt{\epsilon})$ to $O(\log 1/\epsilon)$. The reason is the algorithm runs $\lceil \log_{\epsilon_1} \epsilon \rceil$ more times of the inner loop but with less precision $\sqrt{\frac{\epsilon_1}{n}}$. Please refer to Lemma 4.7 for detailed analysis.

We will explain each step of the algorithm below. In Step 1, we first check two easy solutions. In Step 2, since $x_i^2 - x_i = 0$, we replace x_i^m by x_i in time $\tilde{O}(nT_{\mathcal{F}})$. As a consequence, $\deg(\mathcal{F}) \leq n$.

In the loop from step 3 to step 9, we will try to find a solution $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ of \mathcal{F}_1 . In Step 3, the solving degree from Corollary 3.10 can be used due to Lemma 4.1. We have $D = O(nd) < O(n^2)$, where $d = \max_{i=1}^n d_i$. In Step 4, we use the modified HHL to solve the Macaulay linear system.

In Step 5, we measure the quantum state $|\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D\rangle$. Let $|\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D\rangle = (\widehat{m}_{\bar{D},1}, \dots, \widehat{m}_{\bar{D},(\bar{D}+1)^{n-1}})^T$. Then by the property of quantum measurement, with probability $\widehat{m}_{\bar{D},k}$, the measurement returns $|\mathbf{e}_{k-1}\rangle$ (the subscript starts at 0).

In Step 6, we will show later that with high provability $m_{\bar{D},k} = \prod_{i=1}^{u_k} x_{n_i} \neq 0$ at the solution $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$ to be found. Since a_i is either 0 or 1, $\prod_{i=1}^{u_k} a_{n_i} \neq 0$ implies $a_{n_i} = 1$ for all n_i . We thus set $x_{n_i} = 1$ in Step 7 and try to find the other coordinates of \mathbf{a} in the loop from Step 3 to Step 9.

In Step 8, either $1 \in \mathcal{F}_1$ or $\mathbb{Y} = \emptyset$ implies $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{Y}}) = \emptyset$, because we have both $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{0}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathcal{F}(\mathbf{1}) \neq \mathbf{0}$ from step 1. This means that we did not find a solution in the loop from Step 3 to Step 9 and need to start a new solution by starting from Step 2 again.

In Step 9, if $\mathcal{F}_1 = \emptyset$ or $\mathcal{F}_1(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$, then we find a solution of \mathcal{F} : $x_i = 0$ for any $x_i \in \mathbb{Y}$ and $x_j = 1$ for any $x_j \notin \mathbb{Y}$, which will be returned in Step 10.

Secondly, we prove the correctness of Theorem 4.3. Part 1 of Theorem 4.3 is obviously true, since we have checked this fact in the algorithm. Part 2 of Theorem 4.3 follows from Lemma 4.6, and part 3 of Theorem 4.3 follows from Lemma 4.7.

The following key lemma gives the successful probability for Steps 5 and 6.

Lemma 4.4. *In Steps 5 and 6, with a probability $> 1 - \epsilon_1/n$, $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}_2) \neq \emptyset$ implies that there exists an $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}_2)$ with $a_{n_i} = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, u_k$.*

Proof. Let $|\mathbf{m}_D\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{(\bar{D}+1)^{n-1}} \alpha_j |\mathbf{e}_{j-1}\rangle$ be the solution state and $|\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{(\bar{D}+1)^{n-1}} \beta_j |\mathbf{e}_{j-1}\rangle$ be the approximate state obtained with the HHL algorithm. If we can measure the true solution $|\mathbf{m}_D\rangle$ and obtain $|\mathbf{e}_{k-1}\rangle$, then $\alpha_k \neq 0$. But the HHL algorithm actually returns $|\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D\rangle$. By the definition of quantum measurement, measuring $|\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D\rangle$ will return $|\mathbf{e}_{k-1}\rangle$ with probability β_k . Measuring $|\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D\rangle$ may lead a wrong $|\mathbf{e}_{k-1}\rangle$, that is, $\alpha_k = 0$ but $\beta_k \neq 0$. By the definition of quantum measurement, the probability for this wrong case to happen is $\|\sum_{j, \alpha_j=0} \beta_j |\mathbf{e}_{j-1}\rangle\|^2 = \|\sum_{j, \alpha_j=0} (\beta_j - \alpha_j) |\mathbf{e}_{j-1}\rangle\|^2 < \|\sum_{j=1}^{(\bar{D}+1)^{n-1}} (\beta_j - \alpha_j) |\mathbf{e}_{j-1}\rangle\|^2 = \|\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D - \mathbf{m}_D\|^2 < \epsilon_1/n$. In other words, if the HHL algorithm returns $|\mathbf{e}_{k-1}\rangle$, then with probability $> 1 - \epsilon_1/n$, the measurement returns a correct $|\mathbf{e}_{k-1}\rangle$ meaning $\alpha_k \neq 0$.

By Theorem 3.14, the HHL algorithm returns $\widehat{\mathbf{m}}_D = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}_2)} \eta_{\mathbf{a}} \widehat{\mathbf{m}}(\mathbf{a})$. Then, we have $\alpha_k = \sum_{\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}_2)} \eta_{\mathbf{a}} m_{\bar{D},k}(\mathbf{a})$. The condition $\alpha_k \neq 0$ implies that there exists a solution $\mathbf{a} \in \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}_2)$ such that $m_{\bar{D},k}(\mathbf{a}) \neq 0$. Since \mathbf{a} is a Boolean solution, we have $m_{\bar{D},k}(\mathbf{a}) = 1$. The lemma is proved. \square

We now compute the successful probability for the inner loop.

Lemma 4.5. *The loop from Step 3 to Step 9 will run at most n times, and returns \emptyset with probability $< \epsilon_1$ when $\mathcal{F} = 0$ has Boolean solutions.*

Proof. Since at each loop, the values of at least one x_i will be determined in Step 6, we will repeat this loop for at most n times. By Lemma 4.4, when $\mathcal{F} = 0$ has Boolean solutions, the algorithm returns \emptyset with probability $< 1 - (1 - \epsilon_1/n)^n < \epsilon_1$. \square

We now compute the successful probability for the algorithm.

Lemma 4.6. *The loop from Step 2 to Step 11 will run at most $\lceil \log_{\epsilon_1} \epsilon \rceil$ times and with probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$, returns a Boolean solution of $\mathcal{F} = 0$ when $\mathcal{F} = 0$ has Boolean solutions.*

Proof. By Lemma 4.5, if \mathcal{F} has Boolean solutions, then the probability that we reach step 11 is $< \epsilon_1$. The number of loops from Step 2 to Step 11 is at most $\lceil \log_{\epsilon_1} \epsilon \rceil$. Then, if \mathcal{F} has Boolean solutions, then the probability that the algorithm returns \emptyset is $\epsilon_1^{\lceil \log_{\epsilon_1} \epsilon \rceil} < \epsilon$. \square

We now estimate the runtime complexity of Algorithm 4.2.

Lemma 4.7. *The complexity for Algorithm 4.2 is $\sqrt{2}c(n \log_2(6n^2) + \log_2(r+1))n^{1.5}(n+1+T_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil$. Moreover, it equals to $\tilde{O}(n^{2.5}(n+T_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$.*

Proof. Step 4 is the dominate step in terms of complexities. The complexities for other steps are very low comparing to that of Step 4. So, we just omit them from the complexity analysis.

We have $D \leq (n+1)(d-1)+2$ from Corollary 3.10. Due to Step 2, we have $d \leq n$, so $D \leq n^2+1$. $\mathcal{M}_{\mathcal{F}_2, D}$ is of dimension $(r(\bar{d}+1)^n) \times ((\bar{D}+1)^n - 1)$ and $(2n+T_{\mathcal{F}})$ -sparseness. By Corollary 3.18, the complexity of Step 4 is approximately $c \log(r(\bar{d}+1)^n + (\bar{D}+1)^n - 1)(2n+T_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa^2 \sqrt{n/\epsilon_1}$.

By Lemma 4.5, the loop from Step 3 to Step 9 will run at most n times. Then the complexity for the loop from Step 3 to Step 9 is $\sum_{j=0}^{n-1} (c \log(r(\bar{d}+1)^n + (\bar{D}+1)^n - 1)(2(n-j)+T_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa^2 \sqrt{n/\epsilon_1}) = c \log(r(\bar{d}+1)^n + (\bar{D}+1)^n - 1)(n(n+1) + nT_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa^2 \sqrt{n/\epsilon_1}$.

By Lemma 4.6, the loop from Step 2 to Step 11 will run at most $\lceil \log_{\epsilon_1} \epsilon \rceil$ times. Then the total complexity of the algorithm is $c \log(r(\bar{d}+1)^n + (\bar{D}+1)^n - 1)(n(n+1) + nT_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa^2 \sqrt{n/\epsilon_1} \lceil \log_{\epsilon_1} \epsilon \rceil = c \log(r(\bar{d}+1)^n + (\bar{D}+1)^n - 1)n^{1.5}(n+1+T_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa^2 \sqrt{2} \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil$, by choosing ϵ_1 to be $1/2$.

Since $r(\bar{d}+1)^n + (\bar{D}+1)^n - 1 \leq (r+1)(\bar{D}+1)^n$, we have $\log(r(\bar{d}+1)^n + (\bar{D}+1)^n - 1) \leq \log(r+1) + n \log(\bar{D}) \leq \log(r+1) + n \log(6D) \leq \log(r+1) + n \log(6n^2)$ by Lemma 3.3 and $D = O(n^2)$.

The totally complexity for Algorithm 4.2 is $\sqrt{2}c(n \log_2(6n^2) + \log_2(r+1))n^{1.5}(n+1+T_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil = \tilde{O}((n + \log(r))n^{1.5}(n+T_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}(n^{2.5}(n+T_{\mathcal{F}})\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$, because $r \leq T_{\mathcal{F}}$. \square

We have completed the proof of Theorem 4.3. We can easily improve our algorithm to the following form.

Remark 4.8. *Given $(a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{C}^n$, $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$, we can obtain an element in $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}, x_1^2 - a_1x_1, \dots, x_n^2 - a_nx_n)$ by Algorithm 4.2, where we need to replace $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}}$ with $(x_1^2 - a_1x_1, \dots, x_n^2 - a_nx_n)$ and $x_{n_i} = 1$ with $x_{n_i} = a_{n_i}$ in Step 6.*

4.2 Obtain all the Boolean solutions

We will show how to find all Boolean solutions of \mathcal{F} . For a Boolean solution \mathbf{a} of \mathcal{F} , the following lemma shows how to construct a polynomial system \mathcal{F}_1 satisfying $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}_1, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}}) = \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}}) \setminus \{\mathbf{a}\}$.

Lemma 4.9. *For $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}})$, we have*

$$\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}}, \mathbb{S}, f_{\mathbf{a}}) = \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}}) \setminus \{\mathbf{a}\}$$

where $\mathbb{S} = \{\bar{x}_i + x_i - 1 \mid i = 1, \dots, n\}$, $f_{\mathbf{a}} = \prod_{a_i=0} \bar{x}_i \prod_{a_i=1} x_i$, and \bar{x}_i are new variables.

Then we can use the Algorithm 4.2 to find all Boolean Solutions for $\mathcal{F} = 0$.

Algorithm 4.10.

Input: $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ with $T_{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{i=1}^r \#f_i$ and $d_i = \deg(f_i)$. Also $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Output: $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}, \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}})$.

Step 1: Set $S = \emptyset$. $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F} \cup \{x_1 + \bar{x}_1 - 1, \dots, x_n + \bar{x}_n - 1\} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}, \bar{\mathbb{X}}]$ with $\bar{\mathbb{X}} = \{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$.

Step 2: Use Algorithm 4.2 to compute Boolean solutions of $\mathcal{F}_1 = 0$. If we obtain \emptyset , return S . Else we obtain a Boolean solution $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n)$.

Step 3: $S = S \cup \{\mathbf{a}\}$, $\mathcal{F}_1 = \mathcal{F}_1 \cup \{\prod_{a_i=0} \bar{x}_i \prod_{a_i=1} x_i\}$. Goto Step 2.

Theorem 4.11. *Let $w = \#D$. Then Algorithm 4.10 finds w Boolean solutions of $\mathcal{F} = 0$ with complexity $\tilde{O}(n^{2.5}(n + T_{\mathcal{F}} + w)w\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$, and probability at least $(1 - \epsilon)^w$.*

Proof. By Theorem 4.3, the complexity of the algorithm is $\sum_{i=0}^{w-1} \tilde{O}((2n)^{2.5}(2n + 3n + T_{\mathcal{F}} + i)\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}(n^{2.5}(n + T_{\mathcal{F}} + w)w\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$. \square

4.3 Computing Boolean solutions to linear systems and applications

Many well-known problems in computation theory and cryptography can be described as finding the Boolean solutions for linear systems. In this section, we consider two such problems and their computational complexities using our quantum algorithm.

The *subset sum problem* is an important problem in complexity theory and cryptography. The problem is: given a set of integers, is there a non-empty subset whose sum is a given number? The problem can be described as finding the Boolean solutions for a linear system. We have the following result.

Proposition 4.12. *Let $A \in \mathbb{Z}^{r \times n}$ for $r < n$ and $b \in \mathbb{Z}^r$. There is a quantum algorithm to find the Boolean solutions to the linear system $Ax = b$ with probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$ and complexity $\tilde{O}(n^{3.5}r\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$*

Proof. We have r linear equation of sparseness $(n + 1)$ and n quadratic binomials. Thus $T = 2n + nr + r$, and by Theorem 4.3, we can use Algorithm 4.2 to find a Boolean solution for $Ax = b$ in time $\tilde{O}(n^{2.5}(n + 2n + nr + r)\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}(n^{3.5}r\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$. \square

The *graph isomorphism problem* is another well-known problem in computational theory, which is to determine whether two finite graphs are isomorphic. We do not know whether it is NPC or P. The problem can be described as solving the Boolean solutions for a linear system. Let A and B in $\mathbb{F}_2^{n \times n}$ be the adjacent matrices for two graphs, the graph isomorphism problem is to decide whether there exists a permutation matrix P such that $AP = PB$.

Proposition 4.13. *There is a quantum algorithm to decide whether two graphs with n vertices are isomorphic with probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$ and complexity $\tilde{O}(n^{6.5}\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$.*

Proof. Let $A = (a_{ij})$, $B = (b_{ij})$, $P = (x_{ij})$ with $\sum_i x_{ij} = 1$ for each j , $\sum_j x_{ij} = 1$ for each i , and $x_{ij}^2 - x_{ij} = 0$ for each i, j . Thus in the equation system, the number of $2n$ -sparse linear equations is n^2 , the number of $(n + 1)$ -sparse linear equations is $2n$, and the number of quadratic binomials is n^2 . Thus $T = 2n^3 + 4n^2 + 2n$, by Theorem 4.3, we can use Algorithm 4.2 to find a Boolean solution for $AP = PB$ in time $\tilde{O}((n^2)^{2.5}(n^2 + 2n^3 + 4n^2 + 2n)\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}(n^8\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$.

Due to the special property of the problem, the complexity could be reduced as follows. Considering the loop from Step 3 to Step 9 in Algorithm 4.2, since exactly n of x_{ij} equal to 1 in the permutation matrix P , the number of loops will be n instead of n^2 . Thus the error bound in step 4 will be $\sqrt{\epsilon_1/n}$ instead of $\sqrt{\epsilon_1/n^2}$. Finally, we can use Algorithm 4.2 to find a Boolean solution for $AP = PB$ in time $\tilde{O}(n^{8-1.5}\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}(n^{6.5}\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$. \square

By Propositions 4.12 and 4.13, in order to determine the quantum complexity of these two problems, we need only to study the condition numbers of the corresponding equation systems.

5 Solving Boolean equation systems

In this section, we will give a quantum algorithm to solve Boolean equations by converting the problem into that of computing the Boolean solutions for a 6-sparse polynomial system over \mathbb{C} .

5.1 Reduce Boolean systems to polynomial systems over \mathbb{C}

Let \mathbb{F}_2 be the field consisting of 0 and 1. We will consider the problem of equation solving over \mathbb{F}_2 , or equivalently, solving Boolean equations. Let $\mathbb{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be a set of indeterminants and

$$\mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}] = \mathbb{F}_2[\mathbb{X}]/(\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}}),$$

where $\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}} = \{x_1^2 - x_1, \dots, x_n^2 - x_n\}$. Then $\mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}]$ is a Boolean ring and every ideal in \mathcal{R}_2 is radical. Elements in \mathcal{R}_2 are called *Boolean polynomials*, which have the form $\sum_i m_i$ and m_i are Boolean monomials with degree at most one for each x_i . Similar to Section 3, we use $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{F})$ to denote the zeros of $\mathcal{F} \subset \mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}]$ in \mathbb{F}_2 .

We first show how to reduce a given Boolean polynomial into several s -sparse Boolean polynomials for a given $s \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$. Let $f = \sum_{i=1}^t m_i$ be a Boolean polynomial. Set $S_t = \lceil \frac{t-s}{s-2} \rceil$ and $\mathbb{U}_f = \{u_1, \dots, u_{S_t}\}$ be a set of new variables depending on f . We define a Boolean polynomial set $S(f, s)$ as follows. If $t \leq s$, then $S(f, s) = \{f\}$. Otherwise, let

$$S(f, s) = \{\check{f}_1, \dots, \check{f}_{S_t+1}\} \subset \mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{U}_f] \quad (9)$$

where $\check{f}_1 = \sum_{k=1}^{s-1} m_k + u_1$, $\check{f}_j = \sum_{k=(j-1)(s-2)+2}^{j(s-2)+1} m_k + u_{j-1} + u_j$ for $j = 2, \dots, S_t$, and $\check{f}_{S_t+1} = \sum_{k=S_t(s-2)+2}^t m_k + u_{S_t}$. $S(f, s)$ is called the *splitting set* for f .

For convenience of presentation, in this paper, we give new meaning to the notation: $\lceil e \rceil = 0$ if $e \leq 0$. With this assumption, $\#\mathbb{U}_f = \lceil \frac{t-s}{s-2} \rceil$ and $\#S(f, s) = \lceil \frac{t-s}{s-2} \rceil + 1$.

For a set \mathcal{F} of Boolean polynomials, denote $\mathbb{U}(\mathcal{F}, s) = \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} \mathbb{U}(f, s)$, and

$$S(\mathcal{F}, s) = \bigcup_{f \in \mathcal{F}} S(f, s) \subset \mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{U}(\mathcal{F}, s)]. \quad (10)$$

The following results are easy to check.

Lemma 5.1. *Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}]$ and $t_i = \#f_i$. Then $S(\mathcal{F}, s)$ is s -sparse, $\deg(S(\mathcal{F}, s)) = \deg(\mathcal{F})$, $\#S(\mathcal{F}, s) = r + \sum_i \lceil \frac{t_i-s}{s-2} \rceil$, $\#(\mathbb{X} \cup \mathbb{U}(\mathcal{F}, s)) = n + \sum_i \lceil \frac{t_i-s}{s-2} \rceil$.*

Lemma 5.2. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}]$. For a given $s \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$, we have

$$(S(\mathcal{F}, s)) \cap \mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}] = (\mathcal{F}), \quad \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(S(\mathcal{F}, s)) = \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{F}),$$

where $(S(\mathcal{F}, s))$ is the ideal generated by $S(\mathcal{F}, s)$ in $\mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}, \mathbb{U}(\mathcal{F}, s)]$.

The following example shows that we cannot use a method of equation solving over \mathbb{C} to solve Boolean equations directly.

Example 5.3. Let $f = x_1 + x_2 + 1$. Then $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(f) = \{(0, 1), (1, 0)\}$. But $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(f, x_1^2 - x_1, x_2^2 - x_2) = \emptyset$.

The following lemma shows how to transfer Boolean equation solving to equation solving over \mathbb{C} .

Lemma 5.4. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\}$ be a set of Boolean polynomials with $t_i = \#f_i$. In $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$, let $F_i = \prod_{k=f_i(\mathbf{0})}^{\lfloor t_i/2 \rfloor} (f_i - 2k)$ and let

$$C(\mathcal{F}) = \{F_1, \dots, F_r\} \cup \mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{X}} \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]. \quad (11)$$

Then $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(C(\mathcal{F}))$. Furthermore, $(C(\mathcal{F}))$ is a radical ideal in $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ and satisfies Lazard's condition.

Proof. Let $f_i = \sum_{k=1}^{t_i} m_{ik}$ and $\mathbf{a} = (a_1, \dots, a_n) \in \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{F})$. When we regard f_i as a polynomial in $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$, $f_i(\mathbf{a}) = \sum_{k=1}^{t_i} m_{ik}(\mathbf{a})$ is an even integer between $f_i(\mathbf{0})$ and t_i , because $f_i(\mathbf{a}) \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$. Thus \mathbf{a} is a zero of $F_i = \prod_{k=f_i(\mathbf{0})}^{\lfloor t_i/2 \rfloor} (f_i - 2k)$. The other direction is easy: a zero \mathbf{a} of $F_i = \prod_{k=f_i(\mathbf{0})}^{\lfloor t_i/2 \rfloor} (f_i - 2k)$ satisfies $f_i(\mathbf{a}) = 2k$ for some k , and hence $f_i(\mathbf{a}) = 0$ in $\mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}]$. By Lemma 4.1, $(C(\mathcal{F}))$ is radical and satisfies Lazard's condition. \square

Corollary 5.5. Let F_i be defined in Lemma 5.4. Then the solving degree of $C(\mathcal{F})$ satisfies $\leq (n+1)(t/2+1)d - n + 1$, where $t = \max_i \#f_i$ and $d = \max_i \deg(f_i)$.

Proof. By Corollary 3.9, the solving degree of $(C(\mathcal{F}))$ satisfies $\text{Sdeg}(C(\mathcal{F})) \leq (n+1)(\max_i \deg(F_i) - 1) + 2 \leq (n+1)(t/2+1)d - n + 1$. \square

We summarize the results of this subsection as the following theorem.

Theorem 5.6. Let $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}]$ with $t_i = \#f_i$ and $d_i = \deg(f_i)$. For a given $s \in \mathbb{N}_{\geq 3}$, let $\mathbb{Y} = \mathbb{X} \cup \mathbb{U}(\mathcal{F}, s)$. Then we have a polynomial set

$$P(\mathcal{F}, s) = C(S(\mathcal{F}, s)) \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Y}]$$

such that $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{F}) = \text{Proj}_{\mathbb{X}} \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(P(\mathcal{F}, s))$ and $(P(\mathcal{F}, s))$ is a 0-dimensional radical ideal in $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Y}]$ satisfying Lazard's condition. Furthermore, $P(\mathcal{F}, s)$ is $s(s+1)^{\lfloor s/2 \rfloor}$ -sparse, $\deg(P(\mathcal{F}, s)) \leq (\lfloor s/2 \rfloor + 1)\deg(\mathcal{F})$, $\#P(\mathcal{F}, s) = r + n + 2 \sum_i \lceil \frac{t_i-s}{s-2} \rceil$, $\#\mathbb{Y} = n + \sum_i \lceil \frac{t_i-s}{s-2} \rceil$, $\text{Sdeg}(P(\mathcal{F}, s)) < (2n + sn + 5rt)d/2 + 2 = O((sn + rt)d)$.

Proof. For any $\tilde{F} = \prod_{k=\tilde{f}(\mathbf{0})}^{\lfloor s/2 \rfloor} (\tilde{f} - 2k) \in C(S(\mathcal{F}, s))$, $\#\tilde{f} \leq s$ implies $\#\tilde{F} \leq s(s+1)^{\lfloor s/2 \rfloor}$. By Corollary 5.5, the solving degree of $P(\mathcal{F}, s)$ is $\text{Sdeg}(P(\mathcal{F}, s)) \leq (\#\mathbb{Y} + 1)(s/2 + 1)\deg(S(\mathcal{F}, s)) - \#\mathbb{Y} + 1 = (n + \sum_i \lceil \frac{t_i-s}{s-2} \rceil + 1)(s/2 + 1)d - (n + \sum_i \lceil \frac{t_i-s}{s-2} \rceil) + 1 \leq (n + r(t-2)/(s-2))(s/2 + 1)d - 1 + 2 < (2n + sn + 5rt)d/2 + 2 = O((sn + rt)d)$. Other results are from Lemmas 5.1 and 5.4. \square

In our algorithm, we use $s = 3$ and from Theorem 5.6, we have

Corollary 5.7. *For $s = 3$, $P(\mathcal{F}, 3)$ is 6-sparse, $\deg(P(\mathcal{F}, 3)) \leq 2\deg(\mathcal{F})$, $\#P(\mathcal{F}, 3) = O(T_{\mathcal{F}} + n)$, $\#\mathbb{Y} = O(T_{\mathcal{F}} + n)$, $\text{Sdeg}(P(\mathcal{F}, 3)) < 2.5(n + rt)d + 2 = O((n + rt)d)$.*

Proof. We need only to show that $P(\mathcal{F}, 3)$ is 6-sparse and other results are easy to verify. For $s = 3$, we can replace $F_i = \prod_{k=f_i(\mathbf{0})}^{\lfloor t_i/2 \rfloor} (f_i - 2k)$ with

$$\hat{F}_i = \begin{cases} f_i - 2, & \text{if } f_i(\mathbf{0}) = 1; \\ 2m_{i1}m_{i2} + 2m_{i1}m_{i3} + 2m_{i2}m_{i3} - m_{i1} - m_{i2} - m_{i3}, & \text{if } f_i(\mathbf{0}) = 0, \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

where $f_i = m_{i1} + m_{i2} + m_{i3}$. In $P(\mathcal{F}, 3)$, we have $m^2 = m$ for any monomial m . Then, $F_i = f_i(f_i - 2) = m_{i1}^2 - 2m_{i1} + m_{i2}^2 - 2m_{i2} + m_{i3}^2 - 2m_{i3} + 2m_{i1}m_{i2} + 2m_{i1}m_{i3} + 2m_{i2}m_{i3} = 2m_{i1}m_{i2} + 2m_{i1}m_{i3} + 2m_{i2}m_{i3} - m_{i1} - m_{i2} - m_{i3} \pmod{\mathbb{H}_{\mathbb{Y}}}$, which is 6-sparse.

If $t_i \geq 3$ for all i , by Lemma 5.1, we have $\#S(\mathcal{F}, 3) = T_{\mathcal{F}} - 2r$ and $\#(\mathbb{X} \cup \mathbb{U}(\mathcal{F}, 3)) = n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r$, where $T_{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_i t_i$. Then, $\#P(\mathcal{F}, 3) = 2T_{\mathcal{F}} + n - 5r = O(T_{\mathcal{F}} + n)$, $\#\mathbb{Y} = T_{\mathcal{F}} + n - 3r = O(T_{\mathcal{F}} + n)$. \square

5.2 Quantum algorithm for Boolean equation solving

In this subsection, we will give a quantum algorithm to solve Boolean equations.

Algorithm 5.8.

Input: $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}]$ and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$.

Output: A zero of \mathcal{F} or \emptyset meaning that $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{F}) = \emptyset$ with probability $> 1 - \epsilon$.

Step 1: Compute $\mathcal{F}_1 = S(\mathcal{F}, 3) \subset \mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{Y}]$ as defined in (10), where $\mathbb{Y} = \mathbb{X} \cup \mathbb{U}(\mathcal{F}, 3)$.

Step 2: Compute $\mathcal{F}_2 = C(\mathcal{F}_1) \subset \mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Y}]$ as defined in (11).

Step 3: Use Algorithm 4.2 to find a Boolean solution of $\mathcal{F}_2 = 0$ over $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{Y}]$, with the probability bound ϵ . Return \emptyset if Algorithm 4.2 returns \emptyset , else we have a Boolean solution \mathbf{a} for \mathcal{F}_2 .

Step 4: Return $\text{Proj}_{\mathbb{X}}\mathbf{a}$.

Theorem 5.9. *Algorithm 5.8 has the following properties.*

- If the algorithm returns a solution, then it is a solution of $\mathcal{F} = 0$. Equivalently, if $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{F}) = \emptyset$, the algorithm returns \emptyset .
- If $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{F}) \neq \emptyset$, the algorithm computes a solution of $\mathcal{F} = 0$ with probability $> 1 - \epsilon$.
- The runtime complexity is $\tilde{O}((n^{3.5} + T_{\mathcal{F}}^{3.5})\kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$ if using HHL and $\tilde{O}((n^{4.5} + T_{\mathcal{F}}^{4.5})\kappa \log 1/\epsilon)$ if using Ambainis' algorithm [2], where $T_{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_i \#f_i$ and κ is the condition number of the polynomial system \mathcal{F}_2 , called the condition number of the Boolean system \mathcal{F} .

Proof. In Step 2, we split \mathcal{F} to 3-sparse polynomials and then turn them into a polynomial system over \mathbb{C} in time $O(T_{\mathcal{F}})$. By Theorem 5.6, $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{F}_2}(\mathcal{F}) = \mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}_2)$. Thus, we need only to solve \mathcal{F}_2 over \mathbb{C} in Step 3.

By Theorems 4.3 and 5.6, the complexity of Step 3 is $\tilde{O}((n + \sum_i \lceil \frac{t_i - s}{s-2} \rceil)^{2.5} (n + \sum_i \lceil \frac{t_i - s}{s-2} \rceil + (r + \sum_i \lceil \frac{t_i - s}{s-2} \rceil) s(s+1)^{\lfloor s/2 \rfloor}) \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon) = (n + T_{\mathcal{F}}/s)^{2.5} (n + T_{\mathcal{F}} s^{s/2}) \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon$. To minimize the complexity, we choose $s = 3$. By Corollary 5.7, the complexity is $\tilde{O}((n + T_{\mathcal{F}})^{2.5} (n + T_{\mathcal{F}} + (T_{\mathcal{F}} + n)) \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}((n^{3.5} + T_{\mathcal{F}}^{3.5}) \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$. \square

Remark 5.10. In Step 8 of Algorithm 4.2, we can replace $\mathbb{Y} = \emptyset$ with $\mathbb{X} \cap \mathbb{Y} = \emptyset$ so that Algorithm 5.8 can terminate early.

The following theorem gives the exact complexity for solving Boolean equations, which will be used in Section 6.

Theorem 5.11. Let $\mathcal{F} = \bigcup_{s=1}^t \{f_{s1}, \dots, f_{sr_s}\} \subset \mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}]$ be a Boolean equation system such that $s = \#f_{sj}$, $T_{\mathcal{F}} = \sum_{s=1}^t sr_s$, $r = \sum_{s=1}^t r_s$. Then we can find a solution of $\mathcal{F} = 0$ with runtime $2\sqrt{2}c \log_2(n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + r_2)(n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + r_2)^{2.5} (3n + 9T_{\mathcal{F}} - 21r + 12r_1 + 5r_2 + 1) \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil$, where c is the complexity constant of the HHL algorithm defined in Corollary 2.4.

Proof. By Corollary 5.7, $C(S(\mathcal{F}, 3))$ consists of r_1 monomials, $n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + 2r_2$ binomials, and $T_{\mathcal{F}} - 2r + r_1$ polynomials of sparseness 6, and the number of indeterminates is $n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + r_2$. Thus the total sparseness for $P = C(S(\mathcal{F}, 3))$ is $T_P = r_1 + 2(n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + 2r_2) + 6(T_{\mathcal{F}} - 2r + r_1) = 2n + 8T_{\mathcal{F}} - 18r + 10r_1 + 4r_2$. By Lemma 4.7, the exact complexity for Algorithm 5.8 to find a solution is $\sqrt{2}c(\log_2(r_1 + n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + 2r_2 + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 2r + r_1) + (n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + r_2) \log_2(6(n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + r_2)^2))(n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + r_2)^{1.5}((n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + r_2) + 1 + (2n + 8T_{\mathcal{F}} - 18r + 10r_1 + 4r_2)) \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil \leq 2\sqrt{2}c \log_2(n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + r_2)(n + T_{\mathcal{F}} - 3r + 2r_1 + r_2)^{2.5} (3n + 9T_{\mathcal{F}} - 21r + 12r_1 + 5r_2 + 1) \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil$. \square

5.3 Application to 3-satisfiability problem

Let $\mathbb{X} = \{x_1, \dots, x_n\}$ be Boolean indeterminates. A 3-SAT problem is to check the satisfiability of the propositional logic formula $y_{i1} \vee y_{i2} \vee y_{i3} = 1$ for $i = 1, \dots, r$, where $y_{ij} = x_k$ or $\neg x_k$ for some k . Decision of 3-SAT is NPC. The 3-SAT problem is equivalent to solve the Boolean equation system

$$\mathcal{F} = \{\bar{y}_{i1}\bar{y}_{i2}\bar{y}_{i3} : i = 1, \dots, r\} \cup \{x_k + \bar{x}_k + 1 : k = 1, \dots, n\}$$

in $\mathbb{R}_2[\mathbb{X}, \bar{\mathbb{X}}]$, where $\bar{\mathbb{X}} = \{\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n\}$.

Proposition 5.12. For a 3-SAT with r clauses, there is a quantum algorithm to decide its satisfiability with probability $\geq 1 - \epsilon$ and with complexity $\tilde{O}((n^{2.5}(n + r) \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon))$.

Proof. It is easy to see that solving the Boolean system \mathcal{F} is equivalent to find the Boolean solutions for the following polynomial system in $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}, \bar{\mathbb{X}}]$,

$$\mathcal{F}_1 = \{\bar{y}_{i1}\bar{y}_{i2}\bar{y}_{i3} : i = 1, \dots, r\} \cup \{x_k + \bar{x}_k - 1 : k = 1, \dots, n\} \cup \{x_k^2 - x_k : k = 1, \dots, n\},$$

that is, the 3-SAT problem is satisfiable if and only if $\mathbb{V}_{\mathbb{C}}(\mathcal{F}) \neq \emptyset$. Also note that $x + \bar{x} - 1 = 0$ and $x^2 - x = 0$ imply $\bar{x}^2 - \bar{x} = 0$. \mathcal{F}_1 consists of n binomials, n trinomials and r monomials. Thus $T_{\mathcal{F}_1} = 5n + r$, by Lemma 4.7, we can use Algorithm 4.2 to find a Boolean solution in time $\tilde{O}(n^{2.5}(n + 5n + r) \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon) = \tilde{O}(n^{2.5}(n + r) \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$. \square

The best classic probabilistic algorithm for 3-SAT was 1.334^n given in [30]. In order for our quantum algorithm to perform better n should be ≥ 64 , if κ is not too big.

6 Solving Boolean quadratic equations and cryptanalysis

Cryptanalysis of stream ciphers, block ciphers, certain hash functions, and MPKC can be reduced to the solving of Boolean multivariate quadratic equations (BMQ). In this section, we will apply our quantum algorithm to the analysis of these cryptosystems.

6.1 Quantum algebraic attack against AES

The Advanced Encryption Standard (AES), also known by its original name Rijndael, is a specification for the encryption of electronic data established by the U.S. National Institute of Standards and Technology in 2001 [16].

Murphy and Robshaw [28] proposed a method to construct a Boolean equation system, solving of which consists of an algebraic attack against AES. We will use this approach to establish a BMQ.

Denote the 32-bit key length of AES as N_k and the number of rounds as N_r . Denote $p, c \in \mathbb{F}_2^{4N_k \times 8}$ as the plaintext and the ciphertext of AES, $w_0 \in \mathbb{F}_2^{4N_k \times 8}$ as the key of AES, $w_i \in \mathbb{F}_2^{4N_k \times 8}$ as the expanded key of AES, $\bar{w}_i \in \mathbb{F}_2^{4N_k \times 8}$ as the image of w_i under the S-box map in the key expansion step, $x_i \in \mathbb{F}_2^{4N_k \times 8}$ as the state after the AddRoundKey step of AES, and $y_i \in \mathbb{F}_2^{4N_k \times 8}$ as the state after the InvSubBytes step of AES, where $x_i(j, m)$ means the m -th bit at the j -th word of state x for round i . In the key expansion step, several states \bar{w}_i are obtained as the image of w_i under the S-box. Then, an algebraic attack on the N_r -rounds AES with key length N_k is to solve the following BMQ, denoted as AES- (N_k, N_r) :

$$\begin{aligned}
0 &= x_0(j, m) + p(j, m) + w_0(j, m); \\
0 &= x_i(j, m) + w_i(j, m) + \sum_{j', m'} \alpha(j, m, j', m') y_{i-1}(j', m') && \text{for } i = 1, \dots, N_r - 1; \\
0 &= c(j, m) + w_{N_r}(j, m) + y_{N_r-1}(5j \bmod 16, m); \\
\mathbf{0} &= \mathcal{S}(x_i(\bar{j}, 0), \dots, x_i(\bar{j}, 7), y_i(\bar{j}, 0), \dots, y_i(\bar{j}, 7)) && \text{for } i = 0, \dots, N_r - 1; \\
\mathbf{0} &= \mathcal{S}(w_i(\bar{j}, 0), \dots, w_i(\bar{j}, 7), \bar{w}_i(\bar{j}, 0), \dots, \bar{w}_i(\bar{j}, 7)) && \text{for } \bar{j} = 4N_k - 4, \dots, 4N_k - 1; \\
0 &= w_i(\bar{j}, m) + w_{i-1}(\bar{j}, m) + \bar{w}_{i-1}(\bar{j} + 13, m) + \chi(m, i) && \text{for } \bar{j} = 0, 1, 2; \\
0 &= w_i(3, m) + w_{i-1}(3, m) + \bar{w}_{i-1}(12, m) + \chi(m, i). \\
\text{For } N_k \leq 6 : \\
0 &= w_i(\bar{j}, m) + w_{i-1}(\bar{j}, m) + w_i(\bar{j} - 4, m) && \text{for } \bar{j} = 4, \dots, 4N_k - 1. \\
\text{For } N_k > 6 : \\
\mathbf{0} &= \mathcal{S}(w_i(\bar{j}, 0), \dots, w_i(\bar{j}, 7), \bar{w}_i(\bar{j}, 0), \dots, \bar{w}_i(\bar{j}, 7)) && \text{for } \bar{j} = 12, \dots, 15; \\
0 &= w_i(\bar{j}, m) + w_{i-1}(\bar{j}, m) + \bar{w}_i(\bar{j} - 4, m) && \text{for } \bar{j} = 16, \dots, 19; \\
0 &= w_i(\bar{j}, m) + w_{i-1}(\bar{j}, m) + w_i(\bar{j} - 4, m) && \text{for } \bar{j} = 4, \dots, 15, 20, \dots, 4N_k - 1,
\end{aligned}$$

where j runs from 0 to $(4N_k - 1)$, and m runs from 0 to 7. $\bar{w}_i(j, m)$, $x_i(j, m)$, and $y_i(j, m)$ are state variables, $w_i(j, m)$ are key variables, \mathcal{S} is a set of 39 BMQ in $\mathbb{F}_2[x_0, \dots, x_7, y_0, \dots, y_7]$ representing the Rijndael S-box, which can be found in the Appendix of this paper. χ is the round constant. Thus x, y, w and \bar{w} are Boolean indeterminates and other alphabets are known constants. In the second group of equations, exactly 640 of $\alpha(j, m, j', m')$ are 1 for a given i .

The equation set \mathcal{S} of the S-box is given in the Appendix (Section 8), which can be simplified as follows. The original \mathcal{S} is a BMQ with total sparseness 1688. By doing Gaussian elimination,

we obtain a BMQ \mathcal{S} with total sparseness 1192. We can introduce 1075 new indeterminates u_{ij} to split \mathcal{S} into 3-sparse BMQ. Thus $P(\mathcal{S}, 3)$ consists of 1331 quadratic binomials, 115 quadratic polynomials, 989 cubic polynomials, and 10 quartic polynomials over \mathbb{C} .

Totally, the AES- (N_k, N_r) can be represented by a BMQ with number of indeterminates $n = 96N_kN_r + 32N_k + 32N_r$ (if $N_k \leq 6$) or $n = 96N_kN_r + 32N_k + 64N_r$ (if $N_k > 6$), number of equations $r = 220N_rN_k + 64N_k + 156N_r$ (if $N_k \leq 6$) or $r = 220N_rN_k + 64N_k + 312N_r$ (if $N_k > 6$), and total sparseness $T = 4928N_rN_k + 192N_k + 5440N_r$ (if $N_k \leq 6$) or $T = 4928N_rN_k + 192N_k + 10208N_r$ (if $N_k > 6$). By Theorem 5.11, we have

Proposition 6.1. *There is a quantum algorithm to obtain a solution of AES- (N_k, N_r) with complexity $2\sqrt{2}\log_2(4364N_kN_r + 32N_k + 5004N_r)(4364N_kN_r + 32N_k + 5004N_r)^{2.5}(40020N_kN_r + 480N_k + 45780N_r + 1)c\kappa^2\log_2 1/\epsilon$ (if $N_k \leq 6$), or $2\sqrt{2}\log_2(4364N_kN_r + 32N_k + 9336N_r)(4364N_kN_r + 32N_k + 9336N_r)^{2.5}(40020N_kN_r + 480N_k + 85512N_r)c\kappa^2\log_2 1/\epsilon$ (if $N_k > 6$) with probability $> 1 - \epsilon$, where κ is the condition number of \mathcal{F} and c is the complexity constant of the HHL algorithm.*

Set $N_k = 4, 6, 8$, $N_r = 4, 6, 8, 10, 12, 14$, and $\epsilon = 1\%$. We have the following complexities on quantum algebraic attack on various AESes. From Table 2, we can see that AES is secure under quantum algebraic attack only if the condition number κ is large.

AES	N_k	N_r	#Vars	#Eqs	T-Sparseness	Complexity
AES-128	4	4	1792	4400	101376	$2^{69.07}c\kappa^2$
AES-128	4	6	2624	6472	151680	$2^{71.16}c\kappa^2$
AES-128	4	8	3456	8544	201984	$2^{72.65}c\kappa^2$
AES-128	4	10	4288	10616	252288	$2^{73.80}c\kappa^2$
AES-192	6	12	7488	18096	421248	$2^{76.44}c\kappa^2$
AES-256	8	14	11904	29520	696384	$2^{79.04}c\kappa^2$

Table 2: Complexities of the quantum algebraic attack on AES

6.2 Quantum algebraic attack against Trivium

Trivium is a synchronous stream cipher designed by Cannière and Preneel [8] in 2005 to provide a flexible trade-off between speed and gate count in hardware, and reasonably efficient software implementation, which has been specified as an International Standard under ISO/IEC 29192-3. Trivium can be represented by the following nonlinear feedback shift registers (NFSR) which can also be considered as BMQ [34] \mathcal{F} :

$$\begin{aligned}
A(t+93) &= A(t+24) + C(t+45) + C(t) + C(t+1)C(t+2), & 0 \leq t \leq N_r - 67; \\
B(t+84) &= B(t+6) + A(t+27) + A(t) + A(t+1)A_2(t+2), & 0 \leq t \leq N_r - 70; \\
C(t+111) &= C(t+24) + B(t+15) + B(t) + B(t+1)B(t+2), & 0 \leq t \leq N_r - 67; \\
z(t) &= A(t+27) + A(t) + B(t+15) + B(t) + C(t+45) + C(t), & 0 \leq t \leq N_r - 1,
\end{aligned} \tag{13}$$

where A, B, C are state variables and z is the output. For an initial state $Z_0 = (A(0), \dots, A(92), B(0), \dots, B(83), C(0), \dots, C(110)) \in \mathbb{F}_2^{288}$, we can generate the key sequence $z(0), z(1), \dots, z(N_r - 1)$ with the above NFSR. Thus, for the N_r -round Trivium, \mathcal{F} consists of $(3N_r - 201)$ quadratic polynomials of sparseness 5, and N_r linear polynomials of sparseness 7, and with $(3N_r + 87)$ indeterminates. Thus, $T = 5(3N_r - 201) + 7N_r = 22N_r - 1005$.

The algebraic attack on the N_r -round Trivium is to solve the BMQ (13), where $z(0), z(1), \dots, z(N_r - 1)$ are constants. It is generally believed that for $N_r > 288$, (13) has a unique solution.

Proposition 6.2. *There is a quantum algorithm to find a solution for the N_r -round Trivium equation system in time $2^{17.69} \log_2(N_r) N_r^{3.5} c \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon$ with probability $> 1 - \epsilon$, where κ is the condition number of \mathcal{F} and c is the complexity constant of the HHL algorithm.*

Proof. By Theorem 5.11, the complexity is $2\sqrt{2}c \log_2((3N_r + 87) + (22N_r - 1005) - 3(4N_r - 201) + 2r_1 + r_2)((3N_r + 87) + (22N_r - 1005) - 3(4N_r - 201) + 2r_1 + r_2)^{2.5} (3(3N_r + 87) + 9(22N_r - 1005) - 21(4N_r - 201) + 12r_1 + 5r_2 + 1) \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil = \sqrt{2}c \log_2(13N_r - 315)(13N_r - 315)^{2.5} (123N_r - 4562) \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil \leq 2^{17.69} \log_2(N_r) N_r^{3.5} c \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil$. \square

In Table 3, we give the complexities for several N_r assuming $\epsilon = 1\%$. From Table 3, we can see that Trivium is secure under quantum algebraic attack only if the condition number κ is large.

Round	#Vars	#Eqs	T-Sparseness	Complexity
288	951	951	5331	$2^{49.48} c \kappa^2$
576	1815	2103	11667	$2^{53.36} c \kappa^2$
1152	3543	4407	24339	$2^{57.08} c \kappa^2$
2304	6999	9015	49683	$2^{60.74} c \kappa^2$

Table 3: Complexities of the quantum algebraic attack on Trivium

6.3 Quantum algebraic attack against Keccak

Keccak [6], the winner of SHA-3 contest, is the latest member of the Secure Hash Algorithm family of standards, released by NIST on August 5, 2015. For Keccak- $[N_h, b, N_r]$, we denote N_h, b , and N_r as the output bit size, the state bit size, and the number of rounds. Let $A_0(x, y, z)$ be the message, $A_i(x, y, z)$ be the state variable after applying the τ function for i -times, and $B_i(x, y, z)$ be the state variable after applying the π function for i -times, where $x, y \in \mathbb{Z}/5\mathbb{Z}$, $z \in \mathbb{Z}/w\mathbb{Z}$, and $w = b/25 = 1, 2, 4, \dots, 64$ is the bit length of each word. Then for Keccak- $[N_h, b, N_r]$, we have the following BMQ \mathcal{F} [35]:

$$\begin{aligned}
B_i(3y + x, x, z - r(3y + x, x)) &= A_{i-1}(x, y, z) + \sum_{j=0}^4 A_{i-1}(x-1, j, z) + \sum_{j=0}^4 A_{i-1}(x+1, j, z-1); \\
A_i(x, y, z) &= B_i(x, y, z) + (1 - B_i(x+1, y, z))B_i(x+2, y, z), \text{ for } x \neq 0 \text{ or } y \neq 0; \\
A_i(0, 0, z) &= B_i(0, 0, z) + (1 - B_i(1, 0, z))B_i(2, 0, z) + RC(z)
\end{aligned}$$

for $i = 1, \dots, N_r$, $x, y = 0, \dots, 4$, $z = 0, \dots, w$. In the preimage attack on Keccak, $r(3y + x, x)$ and $RC(z)$ are known constants, the first N_b of $A_{N_r}(x, y, z)$ are the known Hash output, and $A_i(x, y, z)$ ($i < N_r$) and $B_i(x, y, z)$ are indeterminates. Thus we have $n = 2bN_r$ indeterminates and $r = (2b-1)N_r + N_h$ Boolean quadratic equations with total sparseness $T = 401N_rw + 101N_h/25 - 101w$.

Proposition 6.3. *For the BMQ Keccak- $[N_h, b, N_r]$, there is a quantum algorithm to find a preimage in time $2\sqrt{2}c \log_2(401N_rw + 26N_h/25)(401N_rw + 26N_h/25)^{2.5} (3609N_rw + 384N_h/25) \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil \leq 2^{19.21} \log_2(N_r b) N_r^{3.5} b^{3.5} c \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil$ with probability $> 1 - \epsilon$, where κ is the condition number of \mathcal{F} and c is the complexity constant of the HHL algorithm.*

Proof. We have $n = 2bN_r$, $r = (2b-1)N_r + N_h$, and $T = 401N_rw + 101N_h/25 - 101w$. By Theorem 5.11, the complexity is $2\sqrt{2}c \log_2(2bN_r + (401N_rw + 101N_h/25 - 101w) - 3((2b-1)N_r + N_h))(2bN_r + (401N_rw + 101N_h/25 - 101w) - 3((2b-1)N_r + N_h))^{2.5} (32bN_r + 9(401N_rw + 101N_h/25 - 101w) -$

$$21((2b-1)N_r + N_h) + 1) \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil \leq 2\sqrt{2}c \log_2(401N_rw + 3N_r + 26N_h/25)(401N_rw + 3N_r + 26N_h/25)^{2.5} (3609N_rw + 21N_r + 384N_h/25 + 1) \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil \leq 2^{19.21} \log_2(N_rb) N_r^{3.5} b^{3.5} c \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil. \quad \square$$

Setting $N_h = 224, 256, 384, 512$, $N_r = 24$, $b = 1600$ and $\epsilon = 1\%$, the complexities for various (N_h, b, N_r) are given in Table 4. From Table 4, we can see that Keccak is secure under quantum algebraic attack only if the condition number κ is large.

N_h	b	N_r	#Vars	#Eqs	T-Sparseness	Complexity
224	1600	24	76800	77000	610377	$2^{78.04} c \kappa^2$
256	1600	24	76800	77032	610506	$2^{78.04} c \kappa^2$
384	1600	24	76800	77160	611023	$2^{78.04} c \kappa^2$
512	1600	24	76800	77288	611540	$2^{78.04} c \kappa^2$

Table 4: Complexities of the quantum preimage attack on Keccak

The best known traditional attacks on Keccak were given in [33] and [24]. In [33], practical collision attacks against the 5-round Keccak-224 and an instance of the 6-round Keccak collision challenge were given. In [24], key recovery attacks were given for 4- to 8-round Keccak.

6.4 Quantum algebraic attack against MPKC

Multivariate Public Key Cryptosystem (MPKC) is one of the candidates for post-quantum cryptography [17]. An MPKC is generally constructed as follows

$$H = L \circ G \circ R = (h_1(\mathbb{X}), \dots, h_r(\mathbb{X})) \quad (14)$$

where $L \in GL(m, \mathbb{F}_2)$, $R \in GL(n, \mathbb{F}_2)$, and $G : \mathbb{F}_2^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_2^m$ is a quadratic map whose inversion can be efficiently computed. L and R are the secret keys and H is the public map. The direct algebraic attack against the MPKC is to solve the BMQ:

$$y_1 = h_1(\mathbb{X}), \dots, y_r = h_r(\mathbb{X}) \quad (15)$$

where $\mathbb{X} = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is the plaintext and $\mathbb{Y} = (y_1, \dots, y_r)$ is the known ciphertext. Note that the BMQ in (15) are dense. We have

Proposition 6.4. *For dense BMQ $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}]$, there is a quantum algorithm to obtain a solution in time $2\sqrt{2}c \log_2(n + (n^2 + 3n - 4)r/2)(n + (n^2 + 3n - 4)r/2)^{2.5} (3n + (9n^2 + 27n - 24)r/2 + 1) \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil = O(n^7 r^{3.5} \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$ with probability $> 1 - \epsilon$, where κ is the condition number of \mathcal{F} and c is the complexity constant of the HHL algorithm.*

Proof. If \mathcal{F} is a dense BMQ, $T = (n+1)(n+2)r/2$. By Theorem 5.11, we can find a solution of $\mathcal{F} = 0$ in time $2\sqrt{2}c \log_2(n+T-3r)(n+T-3r)^{2.5} (3n+9(n+1)(n+2)r/2-21r+1) \kappa^2 \lceil \log_2 1/\epsilon \rceil = \tilde{O}(n^7 r^{3.5} \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$. \square

Corollary 6.5. *Suppose $r = \gamma n$. Then there is a quantum algebraic attack against MPKC in time $\tilde{O}(\gamma n^{10.5} \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$ with probability $> 1 - \epsilon$, where κ is the condition number of (15).*

Related to this problem, the BMQ Challenge is to solve a given random BMQ with $m = 2n$ or $n = 1.5m$ over the finite fields \mathbb{F}_2 , \mathbb{F}_{2^8} [36]. Considering the field $\mathbb{F}_{2^8} = \mathbb{F}_2[\alpha]/(\alpha^8 + \alpha^4 +$

$\alpha^3 + \alpha + 1$), each variable x over \mathbb{F}_{2^8} is a sum of eight Boolean variables, that is $x = \sum_{i=0}^7 x_i \alpha^i$. Then $\mathcal{F} = \{f_1, \dots, f_r\} \subset \mathbb{F}_{2^8}[x_1, \dots, x_n]$ can be rewritten as $\mathcal{F}_1 = \{f_{11}, \dots, f_{18}, f_{21}, \dots, f_{m8}\} \subset \mathcal{R}_2[x_{11}, \dots, x_{18}, x_{21}, \dots, x_{n8}]$, where x_{ij} and f_{ij} denote the j -th bit of x_i and f_i . As a consequence, equation solving over \mathbb{F}_{2^8} has the same complexity as Boolean equation solving. For the BMQ challenge [36], $m = 2n$ or $n = 1.5m$ implies the complexity is $\tilde{O}(T^{3.5} \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon) < \tilde{O}(n^{10.5} \kappa^2 \log 1/\epsilon)$.

The best known deterministic algebraic algorithms to solve the BMQ are the Gröbner basis method [3] which has complexity $O(2^{0.841n})$ under certain regularity condition for the equation system, and the multiplication free characteristic set method [20] which has bit complexity $O(2^n)$ for general BMQ. Although exponential in n , these methods had been used to solve BMQ from cryptanalysis with $n = 128$.

Remark 6.6. *From the above discussion, we can see that AES, Trivium, Keccak, and MPKC are secure under quantum algebraic attack only if the condition numbers of the related Boolean equation systems are large. This suggests that a possible new quantum criterion for cryptosystem design: the Boolean equation system of the cryptosystem has a large condition number.*

7 Conclusion

We give two quantum algorithms to find the Boolean solutions of a polynomial system in $\mathbb{C}[\mathbb{X}]$ and to solve Boolean equations in $\mathcal{R}_2[\mathbb{X}]$ in any given probability, whose complexities are polynomial in the number of variables, the total sparseness of the equation system, and the condition number of the equation system. As a consequence, we achieved exponential speedup for sparse Boolean equation solving if the condition number of the equation system is small.

The main idea of the algorithm is to solve the Macaulay linear system of the equation system using the modified HHL algorithm and to obtain the Boolean solutions based on the properties of quantum solution state.

The new quantum algorithm is used to give quantum algebraic attack against major cryptosystems AES, Trivium, and SHA-3/Keccak and show that these ciphers are secure under quantum algebraic attack only if the condition numbers of their equation systems are large. Similar results hold for MPKC, which is a candidate for post-quantum cryptosystems.

We also use the quantum algorithms to three famous problems from computational theory: the 3-SAT problem, the graph isomorphism problem, and the subset sum problem and show that the complexities to solve these problems are polynomial in the input size and the condition number of their corresponding equation system.

One of the major problems for future study is on the condition number: either to estimate the condition number of the cryptosystems and the 3-SAT problem, or to find new quantum method to solve Boolean systems, which has less relation with the condition number. It is also interesting to extend the method proposed in this paper to more general equation systems, such as equation solving over the field of complex numbers.

8 Appendix. Equations for the AES S-Box

We list the 39 Boolean quadratic polynomials for the AES S-Box used in this paper.

$$\begin{aligned} & x_5x_7 + x_5x_6 + x_3x_7 + x_3x_6 + x_2x_4 + x_1x_7 + x_1x_6 + x_1x_5 + x_1x_3 + x_1x_2 + x_0x_7 + x_0x_3 + x_0x_2 + \\ & x_6y_7 + x_7y_6 + x_6y_6 + x_7y_5 + x_5y_5 + x_7y_4 + x_1y_4 + x_2y_3 + x_0y_3 + x_6y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_3y_2 + x_0y_2 + x_4y_0 + \end{aligned}$$

$$x_2y_0 + x_7 + x_5 + x_3 + y_7 + y_2 + y_0 + 1,$$

$$x_6x_7 + x_5x_7 + x_4x_7 + x_4x_6 + x_4x_5 + x_3x_4 + x_2x_5 + x_1x_7 + x_1x_6 + x_1x_5 + x_1x_4 + x_1x_3 + x_1x_2 + x_0x_5 + x_0x_1 + x_6y_6 + y_5y_7 + x_3y_4 + y_4y_7 + y_4y_5 + x_5y_3 + x_0y_3 + y_3y_6 + y_3y_4 + x_3y_2 + x_0y_2 + y_2y_4 + y_2y_3 + x_5y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_1y_0 + y_0y_7 + y_0y_3 + y_0y_1 + x_5 + x_3 + x_0 + y_2 + 1,$$

$$x_1y_7 + x_0y_7 + y_6y_7 + x_7y_5 + x_6y_5 + y_5y_7 + x_7y_4 + x_5y_3 + x_2y_3 + y_3y_6 + x_2y_2 + x_0y_2 + y_2y_5 + x_6y_1 + x_4y_1 + x_1y_1 + y_1y_2 + x_6y_0 + x_5y_0 + x_4y_0 + y_0y_7 + y_0y_6 + y_0y_5 + y_0y_4 + y_0y_3 + x_3 + x_1 + y_3 + y_2 + y_1 + 1,$$

$$x_6x_7 + x_4x_6 + x_3x_7 + x_2x_7 + x_1x_4 + x_0x_6 + x_0x_3 + x_6y_7 + x_4y_7 + x_3y_7 + x_7y_6 + x_3y_6 + x_7y_5 + x_7y_4 + x_1y_4 + x_5y_3 + x_4y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_6y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_6y_1 + x_5y_1 + x_3y_1 + x_1y_1 + x_0y_1 + x_7y_0 + x_6y_0 + x_5y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_2y_0 + x_1y_0 + x_6 + x_1,$$

$$x_6y_7 + x_5y_7 + x_1y_7 + x_0y_7 + x_5y_6 + x_4y_6 + x_3y_6 + x_4y_4 + x_3y_4 + x_2y_4 + x_4y_3 + x_3y_3 + y_3y_5 + x_2y_2 + y_2y_7 + y_2y_4 + y_2y_3 + x_7y_1 + x_4y_1 + x_3y_1 + x_1y_1 + y_1y_7 + y_1y_6 + y_1y_5 + y_1y_2 + x_7y_0 + x_5y_0 + x_4y_0 + x_3y_0 + y_0y_4 + y_0y_3 + y_0y_2 + x_6 + x_4 + x_3 + y_2,$$

$$x_2y_7 + y_5y_6 + x_1y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_0y_3 + y_3y_6 + y_3y_4 + x_4y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_0y_2 + y_2y_6 + y_2y_5 + y_2y_3 + x_5y_1 + x_3y_1 + y_1y_7 + y_1y_5 + y_1y_4 + y_1y_3 + y_1y_2 + x_5y_0 + x_4y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_0y_0 + y_0y_6 + y_0y_1 + x_7 + x_6 + x_3 + x_2 + x_1 + y_4 + y_2 + y_1 + y_0,$$

$$x_5y_7 + x_3y_6 + x_2y_6 + x_0y_6 + x_6y_5 + x_5y_5 + x_0y_5 + x_6y_4 + x_5y_4 + x_3y_4 + x_2y_4 + x_0y_4 + y_4y_7 + y_3y_6 + y_3y_5 + x_3y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_0y_2 + y_2y_7 + y_2y_6 + y_2y_5 + x_3y_1 + x_2y_1 + y_1y_7 + y_1y_6 + y_1y_3 + x_5y_0 + x_4y_0 + x_1y_0 + y_0y_7 + y_0y_2 + x_6 + x_1 + y_4 + y_3 + y_1,$$

$$x_6y_7 + x_3y_7 + x_0y_7 + x_2y_6 + x_4y_4 + x_2y_4 + x_0y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_6y_3 + x_3y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_0y_3 + x_5y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_1y_2 + x_3y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_1y_1 + x_3y_0 + x_6 + x_2 + x_1 + x_0 + y_2,$$

$$x_7y_7 + x_4y_7 + x_1y_7 + x_7y_6 + x_6y_6 + x_1y_6 + y_6y_7 + x_7y_5 + x_6y_5 + x_2y_5 + x_0y_5 + x_6y_4 + x_4y_4 + x_2y_4 + y_4y_5 + x_4y_3 + x_3y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_0y_3 + y_3y_6 + y_3y_5 + x_3y_2 + y_2y_4 + x_6y_1 + x_5y_1 + x_4y_1 + y_1y_5 + y_1y_2 + x_6y_0 + x_2y_0 + x_1y_0 + y_0y_6 + y_4 + y_3,$$

$$x_4y_7 + x_3y_7 + x_4y_6 + x_2y_6 + x_1y_6 + x_0y_4 + x_3y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_0y_3 + x_7y_2 + x_3y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_1y_2 + x_0y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_6y_1 + x_5y_1 + x_4y_1 + x_3y_1 + x_0y_1 + x_4 + x_2 + x_1 + y_2,$$

$$x_3x_6 + x_2x_5 + x_1x_4 + x_1x_2 + x_0x_4 + x_0x_1 + x_4y_6 + x_2y_6 + x_1y_6 + x_7y_5 + x_7y_4 + x_2y_4 + x_6y_3 + x_4y_3 + x_3y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_7y_2 + x_0y_2 + x_4y_1 + x_3y_1 + x_5y_0 + x_2y_0 + x_1y_0 + x_4 + x_1 + y_4 + y_3 + y_0 + 1,$$

$$x_4x_7 + x_2x_3 + x_1x_5 + x_1x_4 + x_0x_7 + x_0x_6 + x_0x_5 + x_0x_4 + x_0x_1 + x_7y_7 + x_4y_7 + x_1y_6 + x_2y_4 + x_1y_4 + x_0y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_4y_3 + x_3y_3 + x_4y_2 + x_3y_2 + x_0y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_5y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_1y_1 + x_0y_1 + x_1y_0 + x_0y_0 + x_7 + x_1 + x_0 + y_2,$$

$$x_6x_7 + x_4x_5 + x_3x_7 + x_3x_5 + x_2x_5 + x_2x_4 + x_2x_3 + x_1x_7 + x_0x_6 + x_0x_4 + x_2y_7 + x_0y_7 + x_1y_6 + x_6y_5 + x_2y_4 + x_6y_3 + x_5y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_6y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_3y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_1y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_5y_1 + x_6y_0 + x_5y_0 + x_4y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_0y_0,$$

$$x_5x_7 + x_3x_6 + x_1x_7 + x_1x_2 + x_0x_4 + x_0x_3 + x_1y_7 + x_2y_6 + x_1y_6 + x_6y_5 + x_4y_5 + x_2y_5 + x_0y_4 + x_5y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_6y_2 + x_5y_2 + x_1y_2 + x_0y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_6y_0 + x_5y_0 + x_0y_0 + x_6 + x_1 + y_6 + y_2 + y_1,$$

$$x_1y_7 + x_0y_7 + x_2y_6 + x_6y_5 + x_2y_5 + x_4y_4 + x_3y_4 + x_2y_4 + x_1y_4 + x_0y_4 + x_5y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_7y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_3y_2 + x_1y_2 + x_6y_1 + x_3y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_1y_1 + x_0y_1 + x_5y_0 + x_0y_0 + x_3 + y_2,$$

$$x_5x_7 + x_3x_6 + x_1x_7 + x_1x_2 + x_0x_4 + x_0x_3 + x_6y_7 + x_3y_7 + x_0y_7 + x_4y_6 + x_5y_5 + x_2y_5 + x_4y_4 + x_3y_3 + x_1y_2 + x_0y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_5y_1 + x_4y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_7y_0 + x_6y_0 + x_1y_0 + x_6 + x_5 + x_4 + x_2 + x_0 + y_7,$$

$$x_7y_7 + x_7y_6 + x_6y_6 + x_4y_6 + x_2y_6 + x_1y_6 + x_7y_5 + x_2y_5 + x_7y_4 + x_1y_4 + x_0y_4 + y_4y_6 + x_7y_3 + x_3y_3 + y_3y_5 + y_3y_4 + x_7y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_3y_2 + y_2y_4 + y_2y_3 + y_1y_6 + x_3y_0 + x_2y_0 + x_1y_0 + y_0y_6 + y_0y_4 + y_0y_2 + y_0y_1 + x_5 + x_4 + x_3 + x_1 + y_4 + y_2 + y_1,$$

$$x_7y_6 + y_6y_7 + x_7y_5 + x_3y_5 + y_5y_7 + x_7y_4 + x_0y_4 + y_4y_7 + y_4y_5 + x_6y_3 + x_4y_3 + x_3y_3 + x_1y_3 + y_3y_7 + y_3y_6 + y_3y_5 + y_3y_4 + x_6y_2 + x_5y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_1y_2 + x_0y_2 + y_2y_5 + x_6y_1 + x_5y_1 + x_4y_1 + x_0y_1 + y_1y_7 + y_1y_4 + y_1y_2 + x_5y_0 + x_4y_0 + y_0y_7 + y_0y_5 + y_0y_4 + x_0 + y_0,$$

$$x_6y_6 + x_1y_6 + x_5y_5 + x_3y_4 + x_0y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_6y_3 + x_5y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_0y_3 + x_7y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_6y_1 + x_4y_1 + x_3y_1 + x_0y_1 + x_4y_0 + x_2y_0 + x_7 + x_6 + x_4 + x_3 + x_0 + y_2,$$

$$x_6x_7 + x_5x_7 + x_4x_6 + x_3x_7 + x_2x_7 + x_2x_5 + x_1x_7 + x_0x_6 + x_0x_1 + x_7y_7 + x_3y_7 + x_1y_7 + x_5y_6 + x_0y_4 + x_6y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_7y_2 + x_6y_2 + x_5y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_3y_2 + x_4y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_5y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_5 + x_2 + x_1 + x_0 + y_3 + y_2,$$

$$x_0y_7 + x_2y_6 + x_0y_6 + x_5y_5 + x_0y_5 + x_6y_4 + x_3y_4 + x_2y_4 + x_0y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_6y_3 + x_4y_3 + x_3y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_4y_2 + x_3y_2 + x_4y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_7y_0 + x_2y_0 + x_0y_0 + x_7 + x_4 + x_2 + x_1 + y_4 + y_1 + y_0,$$

$$x_5x_7 + x_5x_6 + x_4x_6 + x_3x_5 + x_2x_6 + x_2x_5 + x_1x_7 + x_1x_6 + x_0x_7 + x_0x_6 + x_0x_3 + x_0x_1 + x_6y_7 + x_3y_6 + x_3y_4 + x_0y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_4y_3 + x_3y_3 + x_5y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_6y_1 + x_4y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_1y_1 + x_1y_0 + x_5 + x_0 + y_4 + y_2,$$

$$x_5x_7 + x_5x_6 + x_3x_7 + x_3x_4 + x_2x_6 + x_2x_4 + x_1x_4 + x_1x_3 + x_1x_2 + x_0x_6 + x_7y_7 + x_6y_7 + x_4y_7 + x_3y_7 + x_1y_6 + x_1y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_3y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_6y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_0y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_5y_1 + x_4y_1 + x_3y_1 + x_6y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_1y_0 + x_6 + x_3 + x_2 + y_4,$$

$$x_5x_7 + x_4x_6 + x_4x_5 + x_3x_5 + x_2x_7 + x_2x_4 + x_2x_3 + x_0x_4 + x_0x_1 + x_4y_6 + x_2y_6 + x_7y_5 + x_7y_4 + x_6y_4 + x_1y_4 + x_6y_3 + x_5y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_7y_2 + x_5y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_6y_1 + x_0y_1 + x_4y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_1y_0 + x_3 + x_1 + y_4 + y_3,$$

$$x_5x_7 + x_4x_6 + x_3x_7 + x_3x_5 + x_3x_4 + x_2x_4 + x_1x_6 + x_1x_3 + x_1x_2 + x_0x_7 + x_4y_7 + x_3y_7 + x_0y_7 + x_4y_6 + x_2y_6 + x_0y_6 + x_5y_5 + x_0y_5 + x_6y_4 + x_6y_3 + x_6y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_3y_2 + x_1y_2 + x_5y_1 + x_4y_1 + x_5y_0 + x_1y_0 + x_0y_0 + x_7 + x_5 + y_1 + y_0,$$

$$x_6x_7 + x_4x_6 + x_4x_5 + x_2x_6 + x_2x_5 + x_2x_3 + x_1x_7 + x_1x_5 + x_1x_4 + x_1x_3 + x_0x_2 + x_1y_7 + x_2y_6 + x_1y_6 + x_6y_5 + x_2y_5 + x_2y_4 + x_3y_3 + x_7y_2 + x_3y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_5y_1 + x_1y_1 + x_7 + x_3 + x_0 + y_6 + y_4 + y_2 + y_1,$$

$$x_7y_5 + x_7y_4 + x_2y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_6y_3 + x_0y_3 + x_5y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_0y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_3y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_0y_1 + x_7y_0 + x_5y_0 + x_4y_0 + x_2y_0 + x_1y_0 + x_2 + x_1 + x_0 + y_4 + y_2 + y_1 + 1,$$

$$x_5x_6 + x_3x_7 + x_3x_6 + x_2x_5 + x_2x_4 + x_1x_6 + x_1x_5 + x_1x_4 + x_1x_3 + x_1x_2 + x_0x_7 + x_0x_2 + x_0x_1 + x_5y_7 + x_1y_6 + x_4y_4 + x_2y_4 + x_0y_4 + x_5y_3 + x_4y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_0y_2 + x_5y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_1y_1 + x_3y_0 + x_0y_0 + x_6 + x_5 + x_1 + y_3 + y_2,$$

$$x_6y_7 + x_3y_7 + x_1y_7 + x_6y_6 + x_5y_6 + x_1y_6 + x_5y_5 + x_1y_5 + x_6y_4 + x_6y_3 + x_5y_3 + x_4y_3 + x_3y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_6y_1 + x_1y_1 + x_6y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_2y_0 + x_5 + y_7 + y_3 + y_2 + y_1 + y_0,$$

$$x_5x_6 + x_4x_6 + x_3x_6 + x_3x_5 + x_3x_4 + x_1x_7 + x_1x_5 + x_0x_3 + x_0x_2 + x_5y_7 + x_1y_6 + x_6y_5 + x_2y_5 + x_2y_4 + x_0y_4 + x_6y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_1y_2 + x_6y_1 + x_5y_1 + x_4y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_5y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_7 + x_6 + x_4 + x_0 + y_6 + y_4 + y_2 + 1,$$

$$x_5y_7 + x_4y_7 + x_3y_7 + x_1y_7 + x_0y_7 + x_7y_6 + x_4y_6 + x_7y_5 + x_3y_5 + x_7y_4 + x_4y_4 + x_3y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_6y_3 + x_4y_3 + x_3y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_6y_2 + x_5y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_2y_1 + x_7y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_2y_0 + x_1y_0 + y_6 + y_2 + y_0,$$

$$x_7y_7 + x_4y_7 + x_1y_7 + x_6y_6 + x_5y_6 + x_5y_5 + x_2y_3 + x_1y_3 + x_0y_3 + x_5y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_1y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_0y_1 + x_6y_0 + x_5y_0 + x_4y_0 + x_0y_0 + x_6 + x_2 + x_1 + x_0 + y_7,$$

$$x_7y_7 + x_4y_7 + x_2y_7 + x_4y_6 + x_6y_5 + x_5y_5 + x_1y_5 + x_6y_4 + x_4y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_6y_3 + x_6y_2 + x_5y_2 + x_0y_2 + x_6y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_6y_0 + x_4y_0 + x_5 + x_4 + x_3 + x_1 + x_0 + y_7 + y_4 + y_2,$$

$$x_4x_6 + x_4x_5 + x_3x_5 + x_3x_4 + x_2x_7 + x_2x_6 + x_2x_4 + x_2x_3 + x_1x_6 + x_1x_5 + x_1x_4 + x_1x_2 + x_0x_7 + x_0x_6 + x_0x_2 + x_0x_1 + x_0y_5 + x_6y_4 + x_3y_4 + x_0y_4 + x_6y_3 + x_3y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_6y_2 + x_5y_2 + x_4y_2 + x_0y_2 + x_7y_1 + x_5y_1 + x_0y_0 + x_7 + y_1 + 1,$$

$$x_6y_7 + y_6y_7 + x_7y_5 + y_5y_7 + x_7y_4 + y_4y_7 + x_7y_3 + x_6y_3 + x_2y_3 + x_1y_3 + y_3y_5 + y_3y_4 + x_7y_2 + x_6y_2 + x_0y_2 + y_2y_3 + x_4y_1 + x_3y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_1y_1 + x_0y_1 + y_1y_5 + y_1y_2 + x_7y_0 + x_1y_0 + y_0y_7 + y_0y_6 + y_0y_3 + y_0y_1 + x_2 + y_5 + y_4,$$

$$x_4y_7 + x_3y_7 + x_1y_7 + x_5y_6 + x_4y_6 + x_1y_6 + x_4y_5 + x_0y_5 + x_7y_4 + x_6y_4 + x_4y_4 + x_2y_4 + x_1y_4 + x_5y_3 + x_4y_3 + x_3y_3 + x_0y_3 + x_3y_2 + x_0y_1 + x_6y_0 + x_1y_0 + x_6 + x_4 + x_2 + y_6 + y_2 + y_1,$$

$$x_5x_7 + x_4x_7 + x_2x_5 + x_2x_3 + x_1x_7 + x_1x_5 + x_0x_7 + x_0x_6 + x_0x_5 + x_0x_4 + x_0x_3 + x_4y_5 + x_6y_4 + x_5y_3 + x_4y_3 + x_0y_3 + x_7y_2 + x_3y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_5y_1 + x_3y_1 + x_0y_1 + x_5y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_0y_0 + x_7 + x_5 + x_1 + x_0 + y_4 + y_0 + 1,$$

$$x_7y_7 + x_4y_7 + x_0y_7 + x_6y_6 + x_5y_6 + x_0y_6 + x_0y_5 + x_6y_4 + x_5y_4 + x_3y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_6y_3 + x_0y_3 + x_7y_2 + x_3y_2 + x_2y_2 + x_6y_1 + x_3y_1 + x_1y_1 + x_5y_0 + x_4y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_1y_0 + x_3 + y_3,$$

$$x_4x_5 + x_3x_7 + x_3x_6 + x_3x_4 + x_2x_7 + x_2x_5 + x_2x_3 + x_1x_6 + x_1x_4 + x_1x_3 + x_0x_7 + x_1y_7 + x_2y_6 + x_1y_6 + x_6y_5 + x_2y_5 + x_4y_4 + x_3y_4 + x_7y_3 + x_3y_2 + x_5y_1 + x_2y_1 + x_0y_1 + x_4y_0 + x_3y_0 + x_0y_0 + x_3 + y_3 + y_2 + y_1 + y_0.$$

Acknowledgement. We would like to thank Zhenyu Huang and Wei Li for helpful discussions. Zhenyu Huang pointed out that the query complexity is not considered in the first version of the paper. Wei Li helped us to understand the solving degree.

References

- [1] Aharonov, D. and Ta-Shma, A., Adiabatic quantum state generation and statistical zero knowledge, *Proc. STOC'03*, 20-29, ACM Press, New York, 2003.
- [2] Ambainis, A., Variable time amplitude amplification and a faster quantum algorithm for solving systems of linear equations, *Proc. STACS*, 636-647, 2012.
- [3] Bardet, M., Faugère, J.C., Salvy, B., Spaenlehauer, P.J., On the complexity of solving quadratic Boolean systems, *Journal of Complexity*, 29(1), 53-75, 2013.
- [4] Berry, D.W., Ahokas, G., Cleve, R., Sanders, B.C., Efficient quantum algorithms for simulating sparse Hamiltonians. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 270(2): 359-371, 2007.
- [5] Berry, D.W., Childs, A.M., Kothari, R., Hamiltonian simulation with nearly optimal dependence on all parameters, *Proc. 56th FOCS*, 792-809, 2015.
- [6] Bertoni, G., Daemen, J., Peeters, M., Van Assche, G., Keccak sponge function family main document. Submission to NIST (Round 2) 3 (2009): 30.
- [7] Caminata, A. and Gorla, E., Solving multivariate polynomial systems and an invariant from commutative algebra, arXiv1706.06319, 2017.
- [8] Cannière, C.D., Preneel, B., Trivium, in *New Stream Cipher Designs: The eSTREAM Finalists*, LNCS, vol. 4986, 244-266, Springer, 2008.
- [9] Cao, Y., Daskin, A., Frankel, S., Kais S., Quantum circuit design for solving linear systems of equations, *Journal of Molecular Physics*, 1675-1680, 2012.
- [10] Y.A. Chen and X.S. Gao, Quantum Algorithms for Boolean Equation Solving and Quantum Algebraic Attack on Cryptosystems, arxiv 1712.06239, December, 2017; version 2, April, 2018.
- [11] Y.A. Chen, X.S. Gao, C.M. Yuan, Quantum Algorithms for Optimization and Polynomial Systems Solving over Finite Fields, arxiv 1802.03856, 2018.
- [12] Childs, A.M., Quantum algorithms: equation solving by simulation, *Nature Physics*, 5(12), 861-861, 2009.
- [13] Childs, A.M., Cleve, R., Deotto, E., Farhi, E., Gutmann, S., Spielman, D.A., Exponential algorithmic speedup by a quantum walk, *Proc. STOC'03*, 59-68, ACM Press, New York, 2003.

- [14] Courtois, N., Klimov, A., Patarin, J., Shamir, A., Efficient algorithms for solving overdefined systems of multivariate polynomial equations, *Eurocrypt'00*, LNCS, vol. 1807, 392-407, Springer, 2000.
- [15] Cox, D., Little, J., O'Shea, D., *Using Algebraic Geometry*, Springer, 1998.
- [16] Daemen, J. and Rijmen, V., *AES Proposal: Rijndael*, NIST, 1999.
- [17] Ding, J., Gower, J.E., Schmidt, D.S., *Multivariate Public Key Cryptosystems*, Springer, 2006.
- [18] Faugere, J.C., A new efficient algorithm for computing Gröbner bases (F4), *J. Pure Appl. Algebra*, 139, 61-88, 1999.
- [19] Faugère, J.C., Horan, K., Kahrobaei, D., Kaplan, M., Kashefi, E. L Perret, L., Fast quantum algorithm for solving multivariate quadratic equations, arXiv:1712.07211, 2017.
- [20] Gao, X.S. and Huang, Z., Characteristic set algorithms for equation solving in finite fields, *Journal of Symbolic Computation*, 47, 655-679, 2012.
- [21] Grassl, M., Langenberg, B., Roetteler, M., Steinwandt, R., Applying Grovers algorithm to AES: quantum resource estimates *International Workshop on Post-Quantum Cryptography Post-Quantum Cryptography*, 29-43, Springer, 2016.
- [22] Grover, L.K., A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search, *Proc. STOC'96*, 212-219, ACM Press, 1996.
- [23] Harrow, A.W., Hassidim, A., Lloyd, S., Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations. *Physical Review Letters*, 103(15): 150502, 2009.
- [24] Huang, S., Wang, X., Xu, G., Wang, M., Zhao, J., Conditional cube attack on reduced-round Keccak sponge function, *EUROCRYPT 2017*, 259-288, Springer, 2017.
- [25] Huang, Z., Sun Y., Lin D., On the efficiency of solving boolean polynomial systems with the characteristic set method, arXiv:1405.4596, 2016.
- [26] Lazard, D., Gröbner bases, Gaussian elimination and resolution of systems of algebraic equations, *Proc. Eurocal 83*, LNCS, vol. 162, 146-156, Springer, Berlin, 1983.
- [27] Macaulay, F.S., Some formulas in elimination, *Proc. of the London Mathematical Society*, 35(1), 3-38, 1902.
- [28] Murphy, S. and Robshaw, M., Essential algebraic structure within the AES. *CRYPTO'02*, 1-16, 2002.
- [29] Schwabe, P. and Westerbaan, B., Solving binary MQ with Grovers algorithm, *SPACE'16*, LNCS 10076, 303-322, 2016.
- [30] Schönig, U., A probabilistic algorithm for k-SAT and constraint satisfaction problems, *Proc. FOCS'99*, 410-414, 1999.
- [31] Shewchuk, J.R., An introduction to the conjugate gradient method without the agonizingpain, Tech. Rep. CMU-CS-94-125, Carnegie Mellon University, Pittsburgh, Pennsylvania, 1994.
- [32] Shannon, C.E., A mathematical theory of communication, *Bell Syst. Tech. J.*, 27(3), 379-423 and 623-656, 1948.

- [33] Song, L., Liao, G., Guo, J., Non-full Sbox linearization: applications to collision attacks on round-reduced Keccak. *CRYPTO'17*, 428-451, Springer, 2017.
- [34] Teo, S.G., Wong, K.K.H., Bartlett, H., Simpson L, Dawson, E., Algebraic analysis of Trivium-like ciphers. Proceedings of the Twelfth Australasian Information Security Conference-Volume 149. Australian Computer Society, Inc., 77-81, 2014.
- [35] Wu, C.K. and Feng, D., *Boolean Functions and their Applications in Cryptography*, Springer, 2016.
- [36] Yasuda, T., Dahan, X., Huang, Y.J., Takagi, T., Sakurai, K., MQ Challenge: hardness evaluation of solving multivariate quadratic problems, *The NIST Workshop on Cybersecurity in a Post-Quantum World*, 2015, <https://www.mqchallenge.org/>.