

A polynomial quantum computing algorithm for solving the dualization problem

Fernando Cuartero Gomez, Mauro Mezzini, Fernando Pelayo,
Jose Javier Paulet Gonzales, Hernan Indibil de la Cruz Calvo
Vicente Pascual

September 2023

Abstract

Given two prime monotone boolean functions $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ and $g : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ the dualization problem consists in determining if g is the dual of f , that is if $f(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \overline{g(\overline{x_1}, \dots, \overline{x_n})}$ for all $(x_1, \dots, x_n) \in \{0, 1\}^n$. Associated to the dualization problem there is the corresponding decision problem: given two monotone prime boolean functions f and g is g the dual of f ? In this paper we present a quantum computing algorithm that solves the decision version of the dualization problem in polynomial time.

1 Introduction

A boolean function is monotone if given any two boolean vectors $v = (v_1, \dots, v_n)$ and $w = (w_1, \dots, w_n)$ if $v_i \leq w_i$ for all $i \in \{1, \dots, n\}$ we have that $f(v) \leq f(w)$.

The *dualization* problem [1, 2, 3, 4], given a monotone boolean function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ expressed in a prime (i.e. irredundant) disjunctive normal form (DNF), consists in finding the prime DNF of a monotone boolean function g such that $f(x) = \overline{g(\overline{x})}$ for all $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$. The decision version of the dualization problem, called *dual*, is defined as follows: given two prime monotone boolean functions f and g is g the dual of f ? The dualization problem and its associated decision version, are prominent problems in several research areas such as machine learning and data mining [5, 6, 7, 8] artificial intelligence [9, 10, 11] and others (see [1] and the references within). Borrowing the notation from [4] we express the monotone boolean functions f and g in DNF as

$$f = \bigvee_{I \in F} \bigwedge_{i \in I} x_i$$

and

$$g = \bigvee_{J \in G} \bigwedge_{j \in J} x_j$$

where $I, J \subseteq \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ and F (resp. G) is the set of prime implicants of f (resp. g). The best deterministic classical computing algorithm for solving the dual problem has complexity $O(N^{o(\log N)})$ where N is the number of prime implicants of f and g , that is $N = |F| + |G|$ [4]. Determining the complexity status of the dualization problem and its associated decision version is a prominent open problem. Equally interesting is the self-dualization problem, that is, the problem of determining if a monotone boolean function is self-dual. It has the same complexity of the dual problem since it can be reduced to self-dualization of the function $yf \vee zg \vee yz$ where y and z are two additional boolean variables [4]. In this paper we develop a polynomial time quantum computing algorithm for the dual (resp. self-dual) problem.

2 Methods

In the following the variable x is interpreted sometimes as a boolean (or binary) n -dimensional vector and sometimes as the decimal expression of the binary vector. In particular if x is the decimal value of the binary vector (x_1, \dots, x_n) then the decimal value of the binary vector $(\bar{x}_1, \dots, \bar{x}_n)$ is $\bar{x} = 2^n - x - 1$. We start with the following propositions which will be much used later in the paper.

Proposition 1 ([4]). *Necessary condition for two monotone boolean functions g and f expressed in their DNF to be mutually dual is that*

$$I \cap J \neq \emptyset \text{ for every } I \in F \text{ and } J \in G \quad (1)$$

Proof. If, by contradiction, there exist implicants $I \in F$ and $J \in G$ such that $I \cap J = \emptyset$, let $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ such that $x_i = 1$ if $i \in I$ and $x_i = 0$ if $i \notin I$. Clearly $f(x) = 1 = g(\bar{x})$ and f and g could not be mutually dual. \square

By Proposition 1, if f is self-dual then every implicant of F must intersect every other implicant.

Lemma 2. *Suppose f is self-dual. Then f is balanced, that is, for half of x values is 0 and for the other half is 1.*

Proof. Let $0 \leq x < 2^n$, then $\bar{x} = 2^n - x - 1$. Furthermore since f is self-dual we have that $f(x) \neq f(\bar{x})$ for all $0 \leq x < 2^n$. Therefore

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{x=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} f(x) + \sum_{x=2^{n-1}}^{2^n-1} f(x) = \\ & \sum_{x=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} f(x) + \sum_{x=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} f(2^n - x - 1) = \\ & \sum_{x=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} [f(x) + f(\bar{x})] = 2^{n-1} \end{aligned}$$

\square

Lemma 3. *Let f be a monotone boolean function expressed in its DNF which satisfies also (1). Then f is self-dual if and only if $\sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} f(x) = 2^{n-1}$*

Proof. The necessity is given by Lemma 2. As for the sufficiency, suppose that $\sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} f(x) = 2^{n-1}$ and suppose by contradiction that $f(x) = f(\bar{x})$ for some $0 \leq x < 2^n$. Since (1) holds, when $f(x) = 1$ there exists an implicant I such that $x_i = 1$ for all $i \in I$. But then $f(\bar{x}) = 0$ since I intersects all other implicants of F . In other words $f(x) + f(\bar{x}) \leq 1$ for all x . Therefore we must have that $f(z) = f(\bar{z}) = 0$ for some $0 \leq z < 2^n$. But since

$$2^{n-1} = \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} f(x) = \sum_{x=0}^{2^{n-1}-1} [f(x) + f(\bar{x})] \leq 2^{n-1}$$

we must have, for every $0 \leq x < 2^{n-1}$, that $f(x) + f(\bar{x}) = 1$, and this is a contradiction. \square

We define $w(x)$ the *Hamming weight* of the integer $0 \leq x < 2^n$, as the number of ones in the binary representation of x , or, equivalently, if $x = (x_1, \dots, x_n)$ is a binary vector, then $w(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i$.

We said that the complexity of the dualization problem is measured with respect to the combined size of f and g , that is, with respect to $N = |F| + |G|$. Furthermore as stated in [4], the number n of variables of the boolean functions is always less than $|F||G|$. However there exists instances of the self-dual problem in which $N = O(2^n)$ as in the following example.

Choose $n > 4$ odd and consider the following boolean function φ whose set of implicants F is the set of all subsets of $\{1, \dots, n\}$ of cardinality $\lceil n/2 \rceil$ where $\lceil a \rceil$ is the least integer greater or equal than a .

Lemma 4. *The function φ is self-dual and the number of its implicants is $\binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$.*

Proof. Trivially $|F| = \binom{n}{\lceil n/2 \rceil}$. If there exist two implicants I and J such that $I \cap J = \emptyset$ then $|I \cup J| = |I| + |J| = 2 \lceil n/2 \rceil > n$ a contradiction to the fact that the number of variables is n . So we have that (1) holds.

For every x such that $w(x) < \lceil n/2 \rceil$ we have that $\varphi(x) = 0$ since every implicant I of $\varphi(x)$ has cardinality $|I| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$. On the other hand for every x such that $w(x) \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$ then $\varphi(x) = 1$ since if we consider x as a binary vector we will always find an implicant I such that $x_i = 1$ for all $i \in I$. Now it is immediate to check that $|\{x : w(x) \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil\}| = 2^{n-1}$. By Lemma 3, φ is self-dual. \square

2.1 The quantum computing algorithm

Given two boolean function f and g we build the function $h(x) = f(x) \oplus \bar{g}(\bar{x})$ where \oplus is the sum modulo two.

Note that h can be obtained from f and g by using a linear number of logic gates. If $f(x) = \bar{g}(\bar{x})$ for all x then $h(x) = 0$ for all x . We prepare a

black box U_h which performs the transformation $|x\rangle|y\rangle \rightarrow |x\rangle|y \oplus h(x)\rangle$, for $0 \leq x < 2^n$. We use the blackbox in the Deutsch-Joshua algorithm. We have that the measurements of first n qubits will be

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{z=0}^{2^n-1} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^{x \cdot z + h(x)} |z\rangle$$

and the probability of measuring for $|z\rangle = |0\rangle$ is, when $h(x) = 0$ for all x , equal to 1 since

$$\frac{1}{2^n} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} (-1)^{h(x)} |0\rangle = |0\rangle$$

so we have the following remark

Remark 5. *Let f and g two monotone prime boolean functions and $h = f \oplus g$. If we measure at the end of the Deutsch-Joshua algorithm with blackbox function h , a value $|x\rangle \neq |0\rangle$ then f is not the dual of g .*

From Remark 1 Lemma 2 and Lemma 3 we can devise a simple quantum algorithm for checking if a function f is self-dual as follows.

Algorithm Quantum Dual

Input: A black box U_f which performs the transformation $|x\rangle|y\rangle \rightarrow |x\rangle|y \oplus f(x)\rangle$, for $0 \leq x < 2^n$ and $f(x) \in \{0, 1\}$

Output: *True* if f is self-dual and *False* otherwise.

Procedure:

1. Use the Deutsch-Joshua algorithm to check if f is balanced. If the output of the Deutsch-Joshua algorithm is equal to $|0\rangle$ then output *False* and exit.
2. Let $h(x) = f(x) \oplus \bar{f}(\bar{x})$. Use the Deutsch-Joshua algorithm to check if h is constant. If the output of the Deutsch-Joshua algorithm is not equal to $|0\rangle$ then output *False* and exit.
3. Use the Quantum Counting algorithm to count the number of x such that $f(x) = 1$ using $t = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ qubits to measure the phase angle. If the measurement at the end of the algorithm is $|y\rangle$ and if $y \neq 2^{t-2}$ then output *False* and exit.
4. Use the Grover algorithm to find an x such that $f(x) = f(\bar{x})$. If such x is found then output *False* and exit.
5. Output *True*

The complexity of the algorithm is dominated by the complexity of the Quantum Counting and of the Grover algorithms. Both algorithms achieve a complexity on the number of quantum gates which is $O(2^{n/2})$ while the best deterministic classical computing algorithm has time complexity of $O(N^{o(\log N)})$ [4]. However, we saw in Lemma 4 that a self-dual function can have a number of implicants in its DNF equal to $\binom{n}{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}$ which is asymptotic to $O(2^n)$. Therefore we have that $N \leq 2^n$ from which we obtain that the complexity of our quantum algorithm for the dualization problem is $O(\sqrt{N})$.

References

- [1] T. Eiter, G. Gottlob, K. Makino, New results on monotone dualization and generating hypergraph transversals, *SIAM Journal on Computing* 32 (2) (2003) 514–537.
arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1137/S009753970240639X>,
doi:10.1137/S009753970240639X.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/S009753970240639X>
- [2] T. Eiter, G. Gottlob, Identifying the minimal transversals of a hypergraph and related problems, *SIAM Journal on Computing* 24 (6) (1995) 1278–1304.
arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539793250299>,
doi:10.1137/S0097539793250299.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539793250299>
- [3] T. Eiter, K. Makino, G. Gottlob, Computational aspects of monotone dualization: A brief survey, *Discrete Appl. Math.* 156 (11) (2008) 2035–2049.
doi:10.1016/j.dam.2007.04.017.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.dam.2007.04.017>
- [4] M. L. Fredman, L. Khachiyan, On the complexity of dualization of monotone disjunctive normal forms., *J. Algorithms* 21 (3) (1996) 618–628.
- [5] D. Gunopulos, R. Khardon, H. Mannila, H. Toivonen, Data mining, hypergraph transversals, and machine learning, in: *Proceedings of the Sixteenth ACM SIGACT-SIGMOD-SIGART Symposium on Principles of Database and Knowledgebase Systems (PODS'97)*, ACM, United States, 1997, pp. 209–216.
- [6] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan, K. Makino, Dual-bounded generating problems: Partial and multiple transversals of a hypergraph, *SIAM Journal on Computing* 30 (6) (2001) 2036–2050.
arXiv:<https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539700370072>,
doi:10.1137/S0097539700370072.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1137/S0097539700370072>
- [7] E. Boros, V. Gurvich, L. Khachiyan, K. Makino, On the complexity of generating maximal frequent and minimal infrequent sets, in: H. Alt, A. Ferreira (Eds.), *STACS 2002*, Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2002, pp. 133–141.

- [8] C. Domingo, N. Mishra, L. Pitt, Efficient read-restricted monotone cnf/dnf dualization by learning with m
Mach. Learn. 37 (1) (1999) 89–110. doi:10.1023/A:1007627028578.
URL <https://doi.org/10.1023/A:1007627028578>
- [9] R. Khardon, Translating between horn representations and their charac-
teristic models, J. Artificial Intelligence Res. 3 (1995) 349–372.
- [10] G. Gogic, C. Papadimitriou, M. Sideri, Incremental recompilation of knowl-
edge, J. Artificial Intelligence Res. 8 (1998) 23–37.
- [11] R. Reiter, A theory of diagnosis from first principles, Artificial Intelligence
32 (1987) 57–95.