

L_1 -norm and quantum speed-up

S. A. Grillo^{1,2} and F. L. Marquezino¹

¹Universidade Federal do Rio de Janeiro
Rio de Janeiro, Brazil

²Universidad Autónoma de Asunción
Asunción, Paraguay

sgrillo.pro@uaa.edu.py, franklin@cos.ufrj.br

December 9, 2024

Abstract

In theoretical quantum computer science, understanding where and how computational speed-ups occur while applying quantum properties is a primary goal. In this paper, we study such problem under the framework of Quantum Query Model and prove the significance of L_1 -norm in the simulation of a given quantum algorithm. This result is presented by upper-bounds for the quotient between optimal classical complexity and the complexity of the given quantum algorithm.

Key words: quantum query complexity, computational complexity, analysis of algorithms, simulation.

AMS subject classification: 81P68, 68Q12

1 Introduction

A primary motivation in quantum computing is obtaining algorithms that solve problems much faster than the best classical counterparts. In computational complexity, the quantum and classical decision tree models allow us to prove the existence of quantum speed-up in several query problems [5, 13, 21]. Query problems can be formulated as computing Boolean functions from inputs in $\{0, 1\}^n$, with complexity being defined as the number of queries to the input, ignoring other computations [8]. This implies an important simplification of the analysis in comparison to problems formulated by Turing machines, where separations between complexity classes are usually much harder to prove [2].

Several quantum algorithms can be formulated within query models [16], thus this formalism is powerful enough for analyzing important algorithms, such as search algorithms [1] or even non-query algorithms as Shor’s algorithm [3].

A complete understanding of quantum speed-up implies determining where and how it occurs. Thus, we can study such question from two distinct approaches: determining which *functions* or which *algorithms* allow a gap between quantum and classical computing. The first approach is intensively used in quantum query complexity, where effort is mainly invested in obtaining bounds for complexity measures and checking their tightness [1, 8]. The second approach is commonly implemented by identifying which quantum features are hard to simulate within classical sources [4]. One of the earliest attempts to explain quantum advantage is the discussion of quantum parallelism in quantum algorithms [12].

A well studied quantum feature is quantum entanglement [17], which has been identified as a necessary condition for quantum speed-up in pure-state algorithms [18]. At the same time, the study of quantum entanglement depends on whether pure or mixed quantum states are allowed [10] and the measure defined for such entanglement [18, 22]. As an example of a widely applied entanglement measure, we can consider the size of partitions that describe product states in the quantum algorithm. If the size of the subsets in those partitions are upper-bounded by a constant through all the steps of the quantum algorithm, then it has an efficient classical simulation [18]. In addition, we can analyze the entanglement in a quantum state by measuring the Schmidt rank, where a polynomial upper-bound for this measure implies a polynomial classical simulation [22]. Using a model previously defined by Knill and Laflamme [19], different conditions for quantum speed-up were also identified with quantum correlations that are analyzed by a measure known as *quantum discord* [9]. A recent proposal comes from *no-go* theorems, identifying contextuality [7, 20] as a necessary condition for quantum speed-up—this condition presents an inequality violation in contrast to the other conditions based in measures [15]. The identification of necessary conditions for quantum advantages is an important issue not only for theoretical purposes, but also for the design of better quantum algorithms, specially if such conditions are easy to control in the design. Summarizing, a general goal in this line of research is to obtain sufficient and necessary conditions for quantum speed-up.

The present work aims at understanding how quantum speed-up occurs in quantum algorithms considering the Quantum Query Model (QQM), which is

the quantum generalization for tree models. First, we consider that the probability of obtaining a given output can be represented as a linear space of orthogonal functions. Using such decomposition of the output probability, we define a classical simulation of the quantum algorithm. Similarly to related works in the context of quantum entanglement or quantum discord, in this paper we follow a procedure known as *dequantization* [4], which consists in analyzing how difficult it is to simulate some algorithm in relation to a given measure. The measure used here is the L_1 -norm from the linear space that contains our output probability function. Particularly, using our simulation we analyze how much the L_1 -norm affects the error of the dequantized algorithm. Thereby, a necessary property for a quantum function being hard to classically simulate is having a large L_1 -norm for its output probability function. This necessary condition is formalized, using an upper bound for the quotient between the complexity for an optimal classical algorithm and the complexity of the quantum algorithm. Notice that a well designed algorithm in the QQM setting should maximize such quotient.

In a previous work, we have proved that the evolution step of any algorithm in the QQM can be described as a sum of vectors, called Block Set, whose phase changes depend on the input [14]. From this formulation we define measures that are upper bounds for the L_1 -norm, which allows alternative necessary conditions for quantum speed-up. In this alternative formulation, each vector in the sum is similar to a parallel computation in the algorithm, thereby this result bounds computing power that can be enhanced when the quantum algorithm balances its “parallelism”. Simulating such balance can be expensive by classical means, so our results give more formality to the notion of quantum parallelism.

This work is structured as follows. In Sec. 2, we introduce preliminary formulations and theorems. In Sec. 3, we describe a classical simulation of quantum algorithms. In Sec. 4, we present the upper bounds that we obtain from our simulation. In Sec. 5, we present our conclusion.

2 Preliminaries

The Quantum Query Model (QQM) describes an algorithm that computes a function whose domain is $\{0, 1\}^n$. We describe the states and operations over a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with basis states $|i\rangle|j\rangle$, where $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and $j \in \{1, \dots, m\}$, for an arbitrary m . The query operator is defined as $O_x|i\rangle|j\rangle = (-1)^{x_i}|i\rangle|j\rangle$,

where $x \equiv x_0 x_1 \cdots x_n$ is the input, and $x_0 \equiv 0$. The final state of the algorithm over input x is defined as $|\Psi_x^f\rangle = U_t O_x U_{t-1} \dots O_x U_0 |\Psi\rangle$, where $\{U_i\}$ is a set of unitary operators over $\mathcal{H}$ and $|\Psi\rangle$ is a fixed state in $\mathcal{H}$. The number of queries or steps is defined as the times that O_x occurs in the algorithm.

Definition 1. An indexed set of pairwise orthogonal projectors $\{P_z : z \in T\}$ is called a Complete Set of Orthogonal Projectors (CSOP) if it satisfies

$$\sum_{z \in T} P_z = I_{\mathcal{H}}, \quad (1)$$

taking $I_{\mathcal{H}}$ as the identity operator for $\mathcal{H}$.

Given a CSOP defined for the algorithm, the probability of obtaining the output $z \in T$ is $\pi_x(z) = \|P_z |\Psi_x^f\rangle\|^2$. We say that an algorithm computes a function $f : D \rightarrow T$ within error ε if $\pi_x(f(x)) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$ for all input $x \in D \subset \{0, 1\}^n$.

Similarly to our previous work [14], we need to define a product of unitary operators $\tilde{U}_n = U_n U_{n-1} \dots U_0$. Then, consider the set $\{\bar{P}_k : 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ as a CSOP, where the range of each $\bar{P}_i$ are vectors of the form $|i\rangle |\psi\rangle$, where $i \in \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$ and $|\psi\rangle$ is an arbitrary state. We also define the notation $\tilde{P}_i^j = \tilde{U}_j^\dagger \bar{P}_i \tilde{U}_j$. Notice that for any fixed j we have that $\{\tilde{P}_k^j : 0 \leq k \leq n\}$ is also a CSOP.

Definition 2. Consider a set $\mathbb{Z}_{n+1} = \{0, 1, \dots, n\}$. An indexed set of vectors $\{|\Psi(k)\rangle \in \mathcal{H} : k \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+1}^{t+1}\}$ is associated with a quantum query algorithm if we have that

$$|\Psi(a)\rangle = \tilde{P}_{a_t}^t \dots \tilde{P}_{a_1}^1 \tilde{P}_{a_0}^0 |\Psi\rangle, \quad (2)$$

for all $a \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+1}^{t+1}$.

Finally, the following results show that vectors associated with some algorithm represent the final state as phase flips. In Sec. 4, we analyze the relation between minimum norm or the number of such vectors and the computational gap between classical and quantum query.

Theorem 1. If the indexed set of vectors $\{|\Psi(k)\rangle \in H_A : k \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+1}^{t+1}\}$ is associated with a quantum algorithm then

$$\tilde{U}_t^\dagger O_x U_t \dots U_1 O_x U_0 |\Psi\rangle = \sum_{k_t=0}^n \dots \sum_{k_0=0}^n (-1)^{\sum_{i=0}^t x_{k_i}} |\Psi(k_0, \dots, k_t)\rangle. \quad (3)$$

Proof. See Ref. [14]. □

Corollary 1. *Let $\{|\Psi(k)\rangle \in \mathcal{H} : k \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+1}^{t+1}\}$ be an indexed set of vectors associated to a given quantum query algorithm, where $\{P_z : z \in T\}$ is the CSOP that defines its final measurement. Then, the probability of obtaining z given input x is*

$$\pi_x(z) = \sum_{k,h} (-1)^{\gamma_x(k) + \gamma_x(h)} \langle \Psi(k) | P_z | \Psi(h) \rangle, \quad (4)$$

where $\gamma_x(k) = \sum_{i=0}^t x_{k_i}$.

3 Simulation

In this section, we introduce our simulation of quantum query algorithms by classical algorithms. This simulation is defined over the output probability $\pi_x(z)$ of the quantum algorithm.

We consider a basis for the Boolean cube [11] given by a family of functions

$$\mathcal{F}_k^n : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{1, -1\},$$

such that $\mathcal{F}_k^n(x) = \prod_{i=0}^{n-1} (-1)^{x_{k_i}}$ is defined for vectors $k \in \mathbb{Z}_n^n$.

Notice that, for $k \neq h$, we may have $\mathcal{F}_k^n = \mathcal{F}_h^n$. Thus, we define an equivalence relation $k \sim h$, for $k, h \in \mathbb{Z}_n^n$ such that $\mathcal{F}_k^n = \mathcal{F}_h^n$. We denote $\mathbb{S}_n$ as the quotient set from our relation and $[k] \in \mathbb{S}_n$ as the equivalence class of element k . We also denote a set $\mathbb{F}_n$, whose elements are functions indexed by $\mathbb{S}_n$ such that $\mathcal{F}_{[h]}^n = \mathcal{F}_k^n$ if and only if $k \in [h]$. The constant function is represented as $\mathcal{F}_{[k_0]}^n$. Now consider the linear space spanned by $\mathbb{F}_n$. The L_1 -norm for a linear combination

$$\mathcal{C} = \sum_{[k] \in \mathbb{S}_n} \alpha_{[k]} \mathcal{F}_{[k]}^n$$

is denoted as $L(\mathcal{C}) = \sum_{[k] \in \mathbb{S}_n} |\alpha_{[k]}|$. Applying Corollary 1, our linear space allows us to represent $\pi_x(z)$ as a vector, because $\langle \Psi(k) | P_z | \Psi(h) \rangle$ is a function of $\mathbb{F}_n$.

Lemma 1. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a quantum algorithm that applies t queries. The output probability of $\mathcal{A}$ can be represented as $\pi_x(1) = \sum_{[k] \in \mathbb{S}_n} \alpha_{[k]} \mathcal{F}_{[k]}^n$ and no $[k]$ contains an element k with $2t + 1$ non-zero distinct terms k_i .*

Proof. Follows from Corollary 1. □

Theorem 2. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a quantum algorithm that computes $f : S \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ for $S \subset \{0, 1\}^n$, within error ε and t queries. Then, there is a classical algorithm which computes f within error*

$$\tilde{\varepsilon} = \frac{\varepsilon + L(\pi_x(1))}{1 + 2L(\pi_x(1))}$$

and $2t$ queries.

Proof. From Lemma 1, we have that the output probability of $\mathcal{A}$ can be represented as $\pi_x(1) = \sum_{[k] \in \mathbb{S}_n} \alpha_{[k]} \mathcal{F}_{[k]}^n$. Let $\mathcal{D}([k])$ be the deterministic classic algorithm which outputs 1 after n queries with probability given by

$$\hat{\pi}_x^{[k]}(1) = \frac{1}{2} + \text{sgn}(\alpha_{[k]}) \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathcal{F}_{[k]}^n \right), \quad (5)$$

for $[k] \in \mathbb{S}_n$, where sgn is the signal function. We consider a randomized algorithm $\mathcal{R}$ which simply selects either: (i) an algorithm $\mathcal{D}([k])$, with probability $\frac{2|\alpha_{[k]}|}{1+2L(\pi_x(1))}$, or (ii) an algorithm that outputs 0 for any x , with probability $\frac{1}{1+2L(\pi_x(1))}$. Since we denote by $\hat{\pi}_x(1)$ the probability of obtaining output 1 given x with $\mathcal{R}$, by Eq. (5) we have

$$\hat{\pi}_x(1) = \frac{\sum_{[k]} 2|\alpha_{[k]}| \hat{\pi}_x^{[k]}(1)}{1 + 2L(\pi_x(1))} \quad (6)$$

$$= \frac{\sum_{[k]} |\alpha_{[k]}| + \sum_{[k]} \alpha_{[k]} \mathcal{F}_{[k]}^n}{1 + 2L(\pi_x(1))}. \quad (7)$$

The algorithm $\mathcal{R}$ applies no more than $2t$ queries, because for each k such that $\alpha_{[k]} \neq 0$ there are at most $2t$ different values k_i distinct from zero.

If $f(x) = 1$, then $\varepsilon \geq 1 - \pi_x(1) = 1 - \sum_{[k]} \alpha_{[k]} \mathcal{F}_{[k]}^n$. This implies that

$$1 - \hat{\pi}_x(1) = 1 - \frac{\left(L(\pi_x(1)) + \sum_{[k]} \alpha_{[k]} \mathcal{F}_{[k]}^n \right)}{1 + 2L(\pi_x(1))} \quad (8)$$

$$= \frac{1 + L(\pi_x(1)) - \sum_{[k]} \alpha_{[k]} \mathcal{F}_{[k]}^n}{1 + 2L(\pi_x(1))} \quad (9)$$

$$\leq \tilde{\varepsilon}. \quad (10)$$

Analogously, if $f(x) = 0$, then $\varepsilon \geq \pi_x(1) = \sum_{[k]} \alpha_{[k]} \mathcal{F}_{[k]}^n$ and this implies that

$$\hat{\pi}_x(1) \leq \frac{\varepsilon + L(\pi_x(1))}{1 + 2L(\pi_x(1))} = \tilde{\varepsilon}. \quad (11)$$

□

We described a classical simulation that imitates the output probability of a given quantum algorithm, but within a big error. Thus, the next theorem just gives a reduction of such error using probabilistic amplification.

Theorem 3. *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a quantum algorithm that computes $f : S \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ for $S \subset \{0, 1\}^n$, with error ε and t queries. Then, there is a classical algorithm which computes f within error $\exp\left(-\frac{k}{2(1-\tilde{\varepsilon})} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \tilde{\varepsilon}\right)^2\right)$, where $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \frac{\varepsilon + L(\pi_x(1))}{1 + 2L(\pi_x(1))}$ and using $2kt$ queries.*

Proof. We use a corollary of Chernoff bound [6]. For k, p, β such that $0 \leq p \leq 1$, $0 \leq \beta \leq 1$ and $0 \leq k$, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^m \binom{k}{i} p^i (1-p)^{k-i} \leq \exp(-\beta^2 kp/2), \quad (12)$$

where $m = \lfloor (1-\beta)kp \rfloor$.

We define an algorithm $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$ using the classical algorithm $\mathcal{R}$ within error $\tilde{\varepsilon}$ from Theorem 2. Algorithm $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$ consists in applying probability amplification on $\mathcal{R}$, that is, executing algorithm $\mathcal{R}$ k times and then selecting the most frequent result. Define X as the random variable that represents the number of correct answers. Taking $\beta = 1 - \frac{1}{2(1-\tilde{\varepsilon})}$ and $p = (1 - \tilde{\varepsilon})$ in Eq. (12), then the error in $\hat{\mathcal{R}}$ is upper-bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}\left[X \leq \left\lfloor \frac{k}{2} \right\rfloor\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{k}{2(1-\tilde{\varepsilon})} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \tilde{\varepsilon}\right)^2\right) \quad (13)$$

□

4 Upper bounds for quantum speed-up

In this section, we describe conditions which can slow down our simulation. Quantum speed-up only occurs when no classical simulation is efficient enough,

thus any condition that makes difficult any classical simulation is a necessary condition for this computational gain.

The following theorem, which upper-bounds quantum speed-up using L_1 -norm, is the core of our results. It basically shows how high values for L_1 -norm influences the simulation introduced before. In the appendix, we give an example of this theorem using Deutsch-Jozsa Algorithm.

Theorem 4. *Let $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a function that is computed within error $\varepsilon > 0$ and t queries, by a quantum query algorithm. If we define*

$$F_\varepsilon(x) = \left\lceil \frac{-16 \ln(\varepsilon) (1+x)(1+x-\varepsilon)}{(1-2\varepsilon)^2} \right\rceil, \quad (14)$$

then

$$\frac{R_\varepsilon(f)}{t} \leq F_\varepsilon(L(\pi_x(1))), \quad (15)$$

where $R_\varepsilon(f)$ denotes the minimum number of queries that are necessary for computing f within error ε by classical means.

Proof. Suppose that we simulate the quantum algorithm using the randomized algorithm of Theorem 3 and promising an error that do not exceed ε for f . Thereby, from Eq. (13), we have

$$\varepsilon = \exp\left(-\frac{k}{2(1-\tilde{\varepsilon})} \left(\frac{1}{2} - \tilde{\varepsilon}\right)^2\right). \quad (16)$$

As $\frac{R_\varepsilon(f)}{t} \leq \lceil 2k \rceil$, if we obtain k from Eq. (16) we have Eq. (15). $\square$

We can see that L_1 -norm always depends on the algorithm itself and not necessarily on the function. Then, an explicit expression for the L_1 -norm as a function of the algorithm itself may be useful. Let h^1, h^2 be vectors in $\mathbb{Z}_{n+1}^t$ and $[k]$ in $\mathbb{S}_n$. We denote $(h^1, h^2) \sim [k]$, if

$$(-1)^{\sum_i x_{h_i^1} + \sum_i x_{h_i^2}} = (-1)^{\sum_i x_{k_i}},$$

for some $k \in [k]$. Thus, for a t -query algorithm we have the expression

$$L(\pi_x(1)) = \sum_{[k] \in \mathbb{S}_n} \left| \sum_{\substack{h^1, h^2 \in \mathbb{Z}_{n+1}^t \\ (h^1, h^2) \sim [k]}} \langle \Psi(h^1) | P_1 | \Psi(h^2) \rangle \right|. \quad (17)$$

We can obtain the next upper bound for $L(\pi_x(1))$:

$$\tilde{L}(\pi_x(1)) = \sum_k \sum_h |\langle \Psi(k) | P_z | \Psi(h) \rangle|. \quad (18)$$

These expressions are based on the state decomposition given by Definition 2. Theorem 1 implies that each quantum algorithm has its own state decomposition, thus next theorem relates metrics on such set of vectors with the gap between quantum and classical query.

Theorem 5. *Using the same hypothesis of Theorem 4, denoting $\#S$ as the cardinality of set S and defining $d = \#\{k : |\Psi(k)\rangle \neq 0\}$, we have*

$$\frac{R_\varepsilon(f)}{t} \leq F_\varepsilon(\tilde{L}(\pi_x(1))), \quad (19)$$

$$\frac{R_\varepsilon(f)}{t} \leq F_\varepsilon\left(\left(\sum_k \|\Psi(k)\rangle\|^2\right)\right), \quad (20)$$

$$\frac{R_\varepsilon(f)}{t} \leq F_\varepsilon(d), \quad (21)$$

and

$$\frac{R_\varepsilon(f)}{t} \leq F_\varepsilon\left(\frac{1}{\min_k \langle \Psi(k) | \Psi(k) \rangle}\right). \quad (22)$$

Proof. As F_ε is an increasing function, Eq. (19) follows directly from Eq. (18) and Theorem 4. Eq. (20) is also derived from Eq. (18) by observing that

$$|\langle \Psi(k) | P_z | \Psi(h) \rangle| \leq \|\Psi(k)\rangle\| \|\Psi(h)\rangle\|, \quad (23)$$

which gives

$$L(\pi_x(1)) \leq \left(\sum_k \|\Psi(k)\rangle\|^2\right). \quad (24)$$

Applying Theorem 1, we obtain

$$\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle = \sum_{k,h} \langle \Psi(k) | \Psi(h) \rangle = 1. \quad (25)$$

Then, using it with $\sum_k \|\Psi(k)\| \leq \sqrt{d} \sum_k \langle \Psi(k) | \Psi(k) \rangle$ and Eq. (24), we have

$$L(\pi_x(1)) \leq d. \quad (26)$$

Finally, Eq. (22) follows from $d \left(\min_k \langle \Psi(k) | \Psi(k) \rangle \right) \leq 1$. □

5 Conclusion

In the present work we identified a necessary property for a hard classical simulation of quantum query algorithms, namely a high L_1 -norm defined over the output probability. A remarkable feature about L_1 -norm is that it depends on both evolution and measurement steps. Properties like quantum entanglement are defined just on the quantum states, which implies that a poor measurement step can cancel advantages obtained in the evolution stage, where we assume that such evolution stage was hard to simulate. Nevertheless, the accuracy of L_1 -norm for approximating quantum gain depends on a simulation, whose relation with the most efficient classical simulation is unknown.

A quantum query algorithm can be viewed as a state decomposition, which is denoted as a set of vectors associated to algorithm. This formulation seems to emphasize the presence of quantum parallelism, because each combination of vectors in the decomposition represents a function in the Boolean cube, such that all of them are added producing an output probability function. The L_1 -norm is not independent to this decomposition. That implies that (a) a big number of non-zero vectors in such decomposition, i.e., high values for $\#\{k : |\Psi(k)\rangle \neq 0\}$, and (b) minimum product values that are not too big for such vectors, i.e., low values for $\left(\min_k \langle \Psi(k) | \Psi(k) \rangle \right)$ are also necessary conditions for a hard classical simulation. Both measures can be linked to quantum parallelism. If $\#\{k : |\Psi(k)\rangle \neq 0\}$ is low, then there are less combinations of vectors adding functions on the output probability function. Larger values for $\min_k \langle \Psi(k) | \Psi(k) \rangle$ implies lower values for $\#\{k : |\Psi(k)\rangle \neq 0\}$, but also implies

that the output probability function has a shape closer to functions in the Boolean cube—functions that can be efficiently simulated by classical means.

Finally, this work leaves some open problems:

- Finding the asymptotic relation between $\frac{R_\varepsilon(f)}{t}$, L_1 -norm and the other measures, where t is the number of steps of a quantum algorithm that computes f within error ε .
- Finding the relation between L_1 -norm and other measures like entanglement, which can be defined in the QQM.
- Algorithms such as quantum-walk-based searches on graphs can be formulated within the QQM, thus they are affected by L_1 -norm. Nevertheless, such algorithms are developed in other *ad hoc* models and L_1 -norm condition would require a translation to such settings.

Acknowledgements

This work was partially supported by CAPES, CNPq, and FAPERJ. The authors thank the group of Quantum Computing at LNCC/MCTI and the Laboratory of Algorithms and Combinatorics at PESC/COPPE/UFRJ for helpful discussions.

References

- [1] Scott Aaronson. Limitations of quantum advice and one-way communication. In *Computational Complexity, 2004. Proceedings. 19th IEEE Annual Conference on*, pages 320–332. IEEE, 2004.
- [2] Scott Aaronson. BQP and the polynomial hierarchy. In *Proceedings of the forty-second ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 141–150. ACM, 2010.
- [3] Scott Aaronson and Andris Ambainis. The need for structure in quantum speedups. *Theory of Computing*, 10(6):133–166, 2014.
- [4] Alastair A Abbott and Cristian S Calude. Understanding the quantum computational speed-up via de-quantisation. *arXiv:1006.1419*, 2010.

- [5] Andris Ambainis. Quantum walk algorithm for element distinctness. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 37(1):210–239, 2007.
- [6] Dana Angluin and Leslie G Valiant. Fast probabilistic algorithms for hamiltonian circuits and matchings. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 18(2):155–193, 1979.
- [7] John S Bell. On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 38(3):447, 1966.
- [8] Harry Buhrman and Ronald De Wolf. Complexity measures and decision tree complexity: a survey. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 288(1):21–43, 2002.
- [9] Animesh Datta, Anil Shaji, and Carlton M Caves. Quantum discord and the power of one qubit. *Physical Review Letters*, 100(5):050502, 2008.
- [10] Animesh Datta and Guifre Vidal. Role of entanglement and correlations in mixed-state quantum computation. *Physical Review A*, 75(4):042310, 2007.
- [11] Ronald De Wolf. A brief introduction to fourier analysis on the boolean cube. *Theory of Computing, Graduate Surveys*, 1:1–20, 2008.
- [12] David Deutsch. Quantum theory, the church-turing principle and the universal quantum computer. In *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, volume 400, pages 97–117. The Royal Society, 1985.
- [13] David Deutsch and Richard Jozsa. Rapid solution of problems by quantum computation. In *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, volume 439, pages 553–558. The Royal Society, 1992.
- [14] S. A. Grillo and F. L. Marquezino. Quantum query as a state decomposition. arXiv:1602.07716, 2016.
- [15] Mark Howard, Joel Wallman, Victor Veitch, and Joseph Emerson. Contextuality supplies the ‘magic’ for quantum computation. *Nature*, 510(7505):351–355, 2014.
- [16] S. Jordan. Quantum algorithm zoo. <http://math.nist.gov/quantum/zoo/>, 2015.

- [17] Richard Jozsa. Entanglement and quantum computation. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/9707034*, 1997.
- [18] Richard Jozsa and Noah Linden. On the role of entanglement in quantum-computational speed-up. In *Proceedings of the Royal Society of London A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences*, volume 459, pages 2011–2032. The Royal Society, 2003.
- [19] Emanuel Knill and Raymond Laflamme. Power of one bit of quantum information. *Physical Review Letters*, 81(25):5672, 1998.
- [20] Simon Kochen and Ernst P Specker. The problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. In *The Logico-Algebraic Approach to Quantum Mechanics*, pages 293–328. Springer, 1975.
- [21] Ben W Reichardt and Robert Spalek. Span-program-based quantum algorithm for evaluating formulas. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 103–112. ACM, 2008.
- [22] Guifré Vidal. Efficient classical simulation of slightly entangled quantum computations. *Physical Review Letters*, 91(14):147902, 2003.

Appendix

In this appendix, we present an example for an application of Theorem 4. Consider Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm, thereby we have the output probability

$$\pi_x(1) = \frac{1}{n^2} (n - 2|x|)^2$$

for inputs of size n . We compute the terms $\{\alpha_{[k]}\}$ using the orthogonality of functions $\mathcal{F}_{[k]}^n$. As the algorithm works applying just one query, by Lemma 1 there are 3 kinds of equivalent classes that index our basis functions. First, we have the class $[k_0]$ that index the constant function $\mathcal{F}_{[k_0]}^n$. That implies $\alpha_{[k_0]} = \frac{1}{n}$. Second, we have the classes that contain at least one element k , such that there is only one $k_i \neq 0$. If $[k]$ is in such set, then $\alpha_{[k]} = 0$. Third, we have $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ classes that contain at least one element k and there are exactly two distinct indices i, j where $k_i \neq k_j$, $k_i \neq 0$ and $k_j \neq 0$. If $[k]$ is in such set,

then $\alpha_{[k]} = \frac{2}{n^2}$. Therefore, we have that $\sum |\alpha_{[k]}| = 1$, which implies

$$R_\varepsilon \leq \left\lceil \frac{-16 \ln(\varepsilon) (2 - \varepsilon)}{(1 - 2\varepsilon)^2} \right\rceil.$$

This is not quite tight for this example because $R_0 = 2$. However, since we are interested in the asymptotic behavior, this clearly proves that Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm can be simulated classically using a constant number of queries and fixed error.