Spectral 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

May 25, 2022

Abstract

Understanding computational speed-up is fundamental for the development of efficient quantum algorithms. In this paper, we study such problem under the framework of the Quantum Query Model, which represents the probability of output $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ as a function $\pi(x)$, and denotes by $L(\pi)$ the spectral norm for π defined over the Fourier basis of the linear space of functions $f : \{0, 1\}^n \to \mathbb{R}$. We then present a classical simulation for output probabilities π , whose error depends on $L(\pi)$. Such dependence implies upper-bounds for the quotient between the number of queries of an optimal classical algorithm and our quantum algorithm, respectively. These upper-bounds show a strong relation between spectral norm and quantum parallelism. This result also implies that there is no asymptotic quantum speed-up for a sequence of boolean functions of constant degree.

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. The quantum and classical decision tree models allow us to prove the existence of quantum speedup in several query problems [6, 15, 27]. 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 [10]. 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 [18], thus this formalism is powerful enough for analyzing important algorithms, such as search algorithms [1] or even nonquery 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, 10]. The second approach is commonly implemented by identifying which quantum features are hard to simulate within classical sources [5]. One of the earliest attempts to explain quantum advantage is the discussion of quantum parallelism in quantum algorithms [14].

A well studied quantum feature is quantum entanglement [19], which has been identified as a necessary condition for quantum speed-up in pure-state algorithms [20]. At the same time, the study of quantum entanglement depends on whether pure or mixed quantum states are allowed [12] and the measure defined for such entanglement [20, 29]. 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 [20]. 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 [29]. Using a model previously defined by Knill and Laflamme [22], different conditions for quantum speed-up were also identified. Such conditions are formulated on quantum correlations that are analyzed by a measure known as quantum discord [11]. A recent proposal comes from no-go theorems, identifying contextuality [9, 23] as a necessary condition for quantum speed-up—this condition presents an inequality violation in contrast to the other conditions based in measures [17]. The identification of necessary conditions for quantum advantages is an important issue for theoretical purposes and for the design of better quantum algorithms, specially if the conditions can be monitored in our design. Summarizing, a general goal in this line of research is to obtain sufficient and necessary conditions for quantum speed-up.

The present work offers a new perspective about speed-up produced by quantum algorithms in the Quantum Query Model (QQM), which is the quantum generalization for decision tree models. First, we consider that the probability of obtaining a given output is a linear combination of orthonormal functions, where such set of functions is denoted as *Fourier basis* [13]. This approach is usually referred to as analysis of boolean functions, and has several results in quantum query and computer science [28, 26, 24, 25]. Using such representation of the output probability, we define a classical simulation of the quantum algorithm. The idea of our simulation is implementing minor simulations for parity functions from the Fourier basis, where each simulated function appears in the Fourier decomposition of the output probability. Similarly to related works in the context of quantum entanglement or quantum discord, in this paper we follow a strategy known as *dequantization* [5], which consists in analyzing how hard is the simulation of some algorithm in relation to a given measure. We prove that the error in our simulation depends on the spectral norm defined over the Fourier basis, where such spectral norm is computed for the output probability. Thereby, a necessary property for a hard classical simulation of a given quantum algorithm, is having a large spectral norm for its output probability functions. This necessary condition is formalized as an upper bound for the quotient between the number of queries of an optimal classical algorithm and of the simulated quantum algorithm, respectively. Notice that a well designed algorithm in the QQM setting should maximize such quotient. In the present work, we prove as a consequence of this bound, that there are no asymptotic benefits to using quantum algorithms computing a sequence of total boolean functions with constant degree.

The state of any algorithm in the QQM can be described as a sum of vectors whose phases change depending on the input. The phase of each of these vectors may depend on different values from input, which shows quantum parallelism in action [16]. We show that the minimum size and the number of such vectors limit the value of the spectral norm, which allows alternative necessary conditions for quantum speed-up. The spectral norm is maximized by the homogeneity on the size of the vectors. Which implies that simulating such balanced probabilities can be expensive by classical means. Therefore, 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 about the QQM. In Sec. 3, we describe a classical simulation of quantum algorithms. In Sec. 4, we present the upper bounds from our simulation. In Sec. 5, we present our conclusion.

2 Preliminary notions

The QQM [8] describes algorithms computing functions whose domain is a subset of $\{0,1\}^n$. We describe the states and operations within such model, over a Hilbert space \mathcal{H} with basis states $|i\rangle |j\rangle$, where $i \in \{0, 1, ..., n\}$ and $j \in \{1, ..., m\}$, 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

$$\sum_{z \in T} P_z = I_{\mathcal{H}},\tag{1}$$

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 $f: D \to T$ within error ε if $\pi_x(f(x)) \ge 1 - \varepsilon$ for all input $x \in D \subset \{0,1\}^n$.

2.1 An alternative formulation for the QQM

In this section, we introduce notation from a previous work [16]. We define a product of unitary operators $\tilde{U}_n = U_n U_{n-1} \dots U_0$. We denote a CSOP $\{\bar{P}_k : 0 \le k \le n\}$, where the range of each \bar{P}_i is composed by vectors of the form $|i\rangle |\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$, for $i \in \{0, 1, ..., n\}$ and any state $|\psi\rangle$. We also introduce 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 $\{\tilde{P}_k^j : 0 \le k \le n\}$ is also a CSOP. The following definition introduce an alternative representation for quantum query algorithms on the QQM.

Definition 2. Consider a set $\mathbb{Z}_{n+1} = \{0, 1, ..., n\}$. 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

$$\left|\Psi\left(a\right)\right\rangle = \widetilde{P}_{a_{t}}^{t} \dots \widetilde{P}_{a_{1}}^{1} \widetilde{P}_{a_{0}}^{0} \left|\Psi\right\rangle,\tag{2}$$

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

In Theorem 1, we show that vectors associated with some algorithm represent the final state as phase flips [16]. In Sec. 4, we analyze the relation between minimum norm (or cardinality) 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

$$\widetilde{U}_{t}^{\dagger}O_{x}U_{t}\dots U_{1}O_{x}U_{0}|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{k_{t}=0}^{n}\dots\sum_{k_{0}=0}^{n}(-1)^{\sum_{i=0}^{t}x_{k_{i}}}|\Psi(k_{0},\dots,k_{t})\rangle.$$
 (3)

Proof. Following Ref. [16], we give a proof by induction on t. For t = 0, we have that Eq. (3) holds,

$$\widetilde{U}_{0}^{\dagger}O_{x}U_{0}|\Psi\rangle = U_{0}^{\dagger}O_{x}U_{0}|\Psi\rangle$$
$$= \sum_{k_{0}=0}^{n} (-1)^{x_{k_{0}}}|\Psi(k_{0})\rangle.$$
(4)

For the second part of the induction, we shall notice that the equation

$$O_x |\Psi\rangle = \sum_{i \in \{k: x_k = 0\}} \bar{P}_i |\Psi\rangle - \sum_{i \in \{k: x_k = 1\}} \bar{P}_i |\Psi\rangle$$
(5)

implies the equation

$$\widetilde{U}_{j}^{\dagger}O_{x}\widetilde{U}_{j}\left|\Psi\right\rangle = \sum_{i\in\{k:x_{k}=0\}}\widetilde{U}_{j}^{\dagger}\bar{P}_{i}\widetilde{U}_{j}\left|\Psi\right\rangle - \sum_{i\in\{k:x_{k}=1\}}\widetilde{U}_{j}^{\dagger}\bar{P}_{i}\widetilde{U}_{j}\left|\Psi\right\rangle.$$
(6)

Suppose that Eq. (3) holds for some t, then applying Eq. (6) we obtain

$$\widetilde{U}_{t+1}^{\dagger}O_{x}\dots O_{x}U_{0}|\Psi\rangle =$$

$$\sum_{k_{t}=0}^{n}\dots\sum_{k_{0}=0}^{n}(-1)^{\sum_{i=0}^{t}x_{k_{i}}}\sum_{k_{t+1}=0}^{n}(-1)^{x_{k_{t+1}}}\widetilde{P}_{k_{t+1}}^{t+1}|\Psi(k_{0},\dots,k_{t})\rangle =$$

$$\sum_{k_{t+1}=0}^{n}\dots\sum_{k_{0}=0}^{n}(-1)^{\sum_{i=0}^{t+1}x_{k_{i}}}\widetilde{P}_{k_{t+1}}^{t+1}|\Psi(k_{0},\dots,k_{t})\rangle =$$

$$\sum_{k_{t+1}=0}^{n}\dots\sum_{k_{0}=0}^{n}(-1)^{\sum_{i=0}^{t+1}x_{k_{i}}}|\Psi(k_{0},\dots,k_{t+1})\rangle.$$

The previous theorem shows that a quantum state depends on several components whose phases change independently on input x. Notice that the phase $(-1)^{\sum_{i=0}^{t} x_{k_i}}$ of each component $|\Psi(k_0, \ldots, k_t)\rangle$ is a Walsh function. Then, each of such components depends on t values from input, which at first sight is not impressive as deterministic classical algorithms generally compute any function that depends on t values using t queries. However all components together depend on the size n of input. Thus, we have the possibility of computing on nvariables using just t queries, which gives us another intuition about the computational speed-up by quantum means. Therefore, this formulation presents quantum parallelism more explicitly than a sequence of unitary operators.

3 A classical simulation for quantum query algorithms

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 vector space of all functions $f: \{0,1\}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ [13] given by the functions

$$\chi_b: \{0,1\}^n \to \{1,-1\},\$$

such that $\chi_b(x) = (-1)^{b \cdot x}$ for $b \in \{0,1\}^n$ and $b \cdot x = \sum_i b_i x_i$. This family contains a constant function that we denote as $\chi_0 = 1$. Therefore, any function



Figure 1: The simulation produces a contracted version of the original output probability. The new output probability can be represented as a linear transformation applied over the original output probability.

 $f: \{0,1\}^n \to \mathbb{R}$ can be represented as a linear combination

$$f = \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}^n} \alpha_b \chi_b,\tag{7}$$

and we denote the spectral norm of f as

$$L(f) = \sum_{b \in \{0,1\}^n} |\alpha_b|.$$
 (8)

Another measure is the degree of f, which is defined as

$$\deg\left(f\right) = \max_{|b|} \left\{b : \alpha_b \neq 0\right\},\tag{9}$$

where |b| denotes the number of ones in b.

Figure 1 presents the intuition behind our simulation. At the right, we have $\pi_x(1)$, the probability of obtaining output 1 by a quantum query algorithm on input x. Such function is decomposed into a linear combination of functions χ_b , following Eq. (7). The sub-simulations imply emulating each function χ_b by a classical algorithm that outputs 1 with probability $\hat{\pi}_x^b(1)$, where: (i) $\chi_b(x) = 1$ implies that $\hat{\pi}_x^b(1) = 1$; and, (ii) $\chi_b = -1$ implies that $\hat{\pi}_x^b(1) = 0$. Notice that each $\hat{\pi}_x^b(1)$ is a probability and can not have negative values as functions χ_b . The composition step is assigning appropriate probabilities to each output $\hat{\pi}_x^b(1)$, such that the sum produces an output probability whose shape resembles $\pi_x(z)$. As each $\hat{\pi}_x^b(1)$ is similar but different in relation to χ_b , this procedure accumulates an important error. The proof of the following theorem shows the details.

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

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

and 2t queries.

Proof. If a quantum algorithm applies t queries, then deg $(\pi_x(z)) \leq 2t$ for all output z [21]. Let $\mathcal{D}(b)$ be the deterministic classic algorithm which outputs 1 with probability given by

$$\widehat{\pi}_x^b(1) = \frac{1}{2} + \operatorname{sgn}\left(\alpha_b\right) \left(\frac{\chi_b}{2}\right),\tag{10}$$

for $|b| \leq 2t$, where sgn is the signal function. We consider a randomized algorithm \mathcal{R} which simply selects either: (i) an algorithm $\mathcal{D}(b)$, with probability $\frac{2|\alpha_b|}{1+2L(\pi_x(1))}$; or, (ii) an algorithm that outputs 0 for any x, with probability $\frac{1}{1+2L(\pi_x(1))}$. Notice that algorithm \mathcal{R} is the composition of sub-simulations, as we represent in Figure 1. Since we denote by $\hat{\pi}_x(1)$ the probability of obtaining output 1 given x with \mathcal{R} , by Eq. (10) we have

$$\widehat{\pi}_{x}(1) = \frac{\sum_{b}^{2} |\alpha_{b}| \,\widehat{\pi}_{x}^{b}(1)}{1 + 2L(\pi_{x}(1))} \tag{11}$$

$$=\frac{\sum\limits_{b}|\alpha_{b}|+\sum\limits_{b}\alpha_{b}\chi_{b}^{n}}{1+2L\left(\pi_{x}\left(1\right)\right)}.$$
(12)

The algorithm \mathcal{R} applies no more than 2t queries, since $\mathcal{D}(b)$ applies no more than 2t queries for each $|b| \leq 2t$.

Now, we must prove an upper bound for the error in the simulation. We divide such proof in two cases, when f(x) = 1 and f(x) = 0. If f(x) = 1, then

 $\varepsilon \ge 1 - \pi_x (1) = 1 - \sum_b \alpha_b \chi_b$. This implies that

$$1 - \hat{\pi}_{x}(1) = 1 - \frac{\left(L(\pi_{x}(1)) + \sum_{b} \alpha_{b} \chi_{b}\right)}{1 + 2L(\pi_{x}(1))}$$
(13)

$$= \frac{1 + L(\pi_x(1)) - \sum_b \alpha_b \chi_b}{1 + 2L(\pi_x(1))}$$
(14)

$$\leq \tilde{\varepsilon}.$$
 (15)

Analogously, if f(x) = 0, then $\varepsilon \ge \pi_x(1) = \sum_b \alpha_b \chi_b$ and this implies that

$$\widehat{\pi}_x(1) \le \frac{\varepsilon + L(\pi_x(1))}{1 + 2L(\pi_x(1))} = \widetilde{\varepsilon}.$$
(16)

Г		
L		
L		

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 $f: S \to \{0, 1\}$ for $S \subset \{0, 1\}^n$, with error ε and t queries. Then, there is a classical algorithm which computes f within error $\exp\left(-\frac{j}{2(1-\tilde{\varepsilon})}\left(\frac{1}{2}-\tilde{\varepsilon}\right)^2\right)$, where $\tilde{\varepsilon} = \frac{\varepsilon+L(\pi_x(1))}{1+2L(\pi_x(1))}$ and using 2jt queries.

Proof. We use a corollary of Chernoff bound [7]. For j, p, β such that $0 \le p \le 1$, $0 \le \beta \le 1$ and $0 \le j$, we have

$$\sum_{i=0}^{m} {j \choose i} p^{i} \left(1-p\right)^{j-i} \le \exp\left(-\beta^{2} j p/2\right), \tag{17}$$

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

We define an algorithm $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ using the classical algorithm \mathcal{R} within error $\widetilde{\varepsilon}$ from Theorem 2. Algorithm $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ consists in applying probability amplification on \mathcal{R} , that is, executing algorithm \mathcal{R} *j* times and then selecting the most frequent result. Define *X* as the random variable that represents the number of correct answers. Taking $\beta = 1 - \frac{1}{2(1-\widetilde{\varepsilon})}$ and $p = (1 - \widetilde{\varepsilon})$ in Eq. (17), then the error in

 $\widehat{\mathcal{R}}$ is upper-bounded by

$$\mathbb{P}\left[X \le \left\lfloor \frac{j}{2} \right\rfloor\right] \le \exp\left(-\frac{j}{2\left(1-\tilde{\varepsilon}\right)} \left(\frac{1}{2}-\tilde{\varepsilon}\right)^2\right) \tag{18}$$

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. In this sense, we measure the quantum speed-up for a given quantum algorithm by the quotient $\frac{R}{t}$, where (i) such quantum algorithm applies t queries, and (ii) an optimal classical algorithm executes the same computational task in R queries. This quotient can be interpreted as how faster is a quantum algorithm in relation to the best classical algorithm.

The following theorem, which upper-bounds quantum speed-up using spectral norm, is the core of our results. It basically shows how high values for spectral norm are related to the speed quotient that we denoted. In the appendix, we give an example of this theorem using Deutsch-Jozsa Algorithm.

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

$$F_{\varepsilon}(x) = \left[\frac{-16\ln(\varepsilon)(1+x)(1+x-\varepsilon)}{(1-2\varepsilon)^2}\right],$$
(19)

then

$$\frac{R_{\varepsilon}(f)}{t} \le F_{\varepsilon}\left(L\left(\pi_{x}\left(1\right)\right)\right),\tag{20}$$

where $R_{\varepsilon}(f)$ denotes the minimum number of queries that are necessary for computing f within error ε by a randomized decision tree. (See Ref. [10] for a detailed definition.)

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. (18), we have

$$\varepsilon = \exp\left(-\frac{j}{2\left(1-\tilde{\varepsilon}\right)}\left(\frac{1}{2}-\tilde{\varepsilon}\right)^2\right).$$
(21)

As $\frac{R_{\varepsilon}(f)}{t} \leq \lceil 2j \rceil$, if we obtain j from Eq. (21) we have Eq. (20).

We may expect from spectral norm that low values must imply problems that are easily simulated by classical means. Theorem 4 guarantees that low values of the spectral norm in relation to t, imply such efficient classical simulation. In Section 4.1, we show an example that presents our claim.

On the following theorem we use the notation $Q_{\varepsilon}(f)$. This represents the minimum number of queries required for computing f within error ε by a QQM algorithm.

Theorem 5. Let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be any total function such that deg $(f) \leq K$, for some constant K. If $n \to \infty$, then $R_{\varepsilon}(f) \in O(Q_{\varepsilon}(f))$.

Proof. There is the following bound for spectral norm [25]

$$L(f) \le 2^{(deg(f)-1)}.$$
 (22)

If $deg(f) \leq K$, then equations (22) and (20) imply that $\frac{R_{\varepsilon}(f)}{Q_{\varepsilon}(f)} \leq K'$, for some constant K'.

Previous theorem implies that if the degree cannot grow in our set of functions, then there is no advantage by quantum means in relation to classical algorithms.

Notice that spectral norm is defined on the output probability. Then, an explicit expression for the spectral norm as a function of the algorithm itself may be useful. Let k, h be vectors in \mathbb{Z}_{n+1}^t and $|b| \leq 2t$. We denote $(k, h) \sim b$, if

$$(-1)^{\sum_{i} x_{k_i} + \sum_{i} x_{h_i}} = \chi_b(x).$$

Thus, for a t-query algorithm we have the expression

$$L(\pi_{x}(1)) = \sum_{|b| \le 2t} \left| \sum_{(k,h) \sim b} \langle \Psi(k) | P_{1} | \Psi(h) \rangle \right|.$$
(23)

Now, we can obtain the next upper bound for $L(\pi_x(1))$,

$$\widetilde{L}(\pi_{x}(1)) = \sum_{k} \sum_{h} |\langle \Psi(k) | P_{z} | \Psi(h) \rangle|.$$
(24)

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 6. 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

$$\frac{R_{\varepsilon}\left(f\right)}{t} \le F_{\varepsilon}\left(\widetilde{L}\left(\pi_{x}\left(1\right)\right)\right),\tag{25}$$

$$\frac{R_{\varepsilon}(f)}{t} \le F_{\varepsilon}\left(\left(\sum_{k} \left\|\left|\Psi\left(k\right)\right\rangle\right\|\right)^{2}\right),\tag{26}$$

$$\frac{R_{\varepsilon}\left(f\right)}{t} \le F_{\varepsilon}\left(d\right),\tag{27}$$

and

$$\frac{R_{\varepsilon}(f)}{t} \le F_{\varepsilon}\left(\frac{1}{\min_{k} \langle \Psi(k) | \Psi(k) \rangle}\right).$$
(28)

Proof. As F_{ε} is an increasing function, Eq. (25) follows directly from Eq. (24) and Theorem 4. Eq. (26) is also derived from Eq. (24) by observing that

$$\left|\left\langle \Psi\left(k\right)\right|P_{z}\left|\Psi\left(h\right)\right\rangle\right| \leq \left\|\left|\Psi\left(k\right)\right\rangle\right\|\left\|\left|\Psi\left(h\right)\right\rangle\right\|,\tag{29}$$

which gives

$$L\left(\pi_{x}\left(1\right)\right) \leq \left(\sum_{k} \left\|\left|\Psi\left(k\right)\right\rangle\right\|\right)^{2}.$$
(30)

Applying Theorem 1, we obtain

$$\langle \Psi | \Psi \rangle = \sum_{k,h} \langle \Psi (k) | \Psi (h) \rangle = 1.$$
(31)

Then, using it with $\sum_{k} \||\Psi(k)\rangle\| \le \sqrt{d} \sum_{k} \langle \Psi(k)| |\Psi(k)\rangle$ and Eq. (30), we have

$$L\left(\pi_x\left(1\right)\right) \le d.\tag{32}$$

Finally, Eq. (28) follows from $d\left(\min_{k} \langle \Psi(k) | \Psi(k) \rangle\right) \leq 1$.

4.1 Analyzing spectral norm in Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm

We can now 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 obtain the terms $\{\alpha_b\}$ by applying the pairwise orthogonality between functions χ_b . The algorithm works by applying just one query. Thus, from the fact that deg $(\pi_x(1)) \leq 2t$ [21], we have that if |b| > 2then $\alpha_b = 0$. This leaves us with three cases to analyze. First, if |b| = 0, then $\alpha_b = \frac{1}{n}$, notice that there is just one index b satisfying |b| = 0. Second, if |b| = 1, then $\alpha_b = 0$. Third, there are $\frac{n(n-1)}{2}$ indices b such that |b| = 2, in this case $\alpha_b = \frac{2}{n^2}$. Therefore, we have that $\sum |\alpha_b| = 1$, which implies

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

This is not quite tight numerically because a classical decision tree applies $R_0 = 2$ queries in order to solve Deutsch-Jozsa problem within error $\frac{1}{3}$. However, this is asymptotically tight and proves that Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm can be simulated classically using a constant number of queries and fixed error.

5 Conclusion

In the present work we identified a necessary property for a hard classical simulation of quantum query algorithms, namely a high spectral norm defined over the output probability. A remarkable feature about spectral 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 spectral norm for approximating quantum gain depends on a simulation, whose relation with the most efficient classical simulation is unknown. We also formalized the advantage given by quantum algorithms, as the quotient between the classical and quantum complexities for a given task. We have that such quotient is upper-bounded by an expression which depends quadratically on the spectral norm. Thus, a large factor between quantum and classical algorithms implies a large spectral norm. Our result suggests the following intuitions:

- 1. Output probabilities with large spectral norms imply that such output probability can be represented by a function whose shape is much different from any function in the Fourier basis—functions that can be efficiently simulated by classical means.
- 2. Output probabilities with high spectral norms imply that many functions from Fourier basis are acting simultaneously. That strongly suggests quantum parallelism.

We find that analyzing spectral norm show interesting properties about quantum query, for example Theorem 5. This result implies that there is no quantum advantage if our boolean function has a degree upper-bounded by a constant. Such property is completely opposite to partial boolean functions, where we can find the biggest gap between quantum and classical query on a complexity problem with constant degree, that is the forrelation problem [4].

We also can link spectral norm to quantum parallelism as follows. A quantum query algorithm can be viewed as a state decomposition by Theorem 1. which is denoted as a set of vectors associated to the algorithm. This formulation emphasizes the presence of quantum parallelism, because each combination of vectors in the decomposition represents a function in the Fourier basis, where such functions are added producing an output probability function. The spectral norm is related to this decomposition. Since a high spectral norm implies: (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 $\left(\min_{k} \langle \Psi(k) | \Psi(k) \rangle\right)$; then (a) and (b) are also necessary conditions for a hard classical simulation. Both measures can be linked to quantum parallelism by the following intuition. 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 Fourier basis.

Finally, the present work leaves some open problems:

- Finding the relation between spectral 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 spectral norm. Nevertheless, such algorithms are developed in other *ad hoc* models and spectral norm condition would require a translation to such settings.

Acknowledgements

This work received financial support from CAPES, FAPERJ, and CNPq. The authors thank R. Portugal, S. Collier, J. Szwarcfiter, and E. Galvão for useful discussions and suggestions.

References

- 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.
- 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] Scott Aaronson and Andris Ambainis. Forrelation: A problem that optimally separates quantum from classical computing. In *Proceedings of the forty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 307– 316. ACM, 2015.
- [5] Alastair A Abbott and Cristian S Calude. Understanding the quantum computational speed-up via de-quantisation. arXiv:1006.1419, 2010.
- [6] Andris Ambainis. Quantum walk algorithm for element distinctness. SIAM Journal on Computing, 37(1):210–239, 2007.

- [7] 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.
- [8] Howard Barnum, Michael Saks, and Mario Szegedy. Quantum decision trees and semidefinite. Technical Report LA-UR-01-6417, Los Alamos National Laboratory, May 2002. Available at http://lib-www.lanl.gov/cgibin/getfile?00818934.pdf.
- [9] John S Bell. On the problem of hidden variables in quantum mechanics. *Reviews of Modern Physics*, 38(3):447, 1966.
- [10] Harry Buhrman and Ronald De Wolf. Complexity measures and decision tree complexity: a survey. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 288(1):21–43, 2002.
- [11] Animesh Datta, Anil Shaji, and Carlton M Caves. Quantum discord and the power of one qubit. *Physical Review Letters*, 100(5):050502, 2008.
- [12] Animesh Datta and Guifre Vidal. Role of entanglement and correlations in mixed-state quantum computation. *Physical Review A*, 75(4):042310, 2007.
- [13] Ronald De Wolf. A brief introduction to fourier analysis on the boolean cube. Theory of Computing, Graduate Surveys, 1:1–20, 2008.
- [14] 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.
- [15] 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.
- [16] S. A. Grillo and F. L. Marquezino. Quantum query as a state decomposition. arXiv:1602.07716, 2016.
- [17] Mark Howard, Joel Wallman, Victor Veitch, and Joseph Emerson. Contextuality supplies the 'magic' for quantum computation. *Nature*, 510(7505):351–355, 2014.

- [18] Stephen Jordan. Quantum algorithm zoo. http://math.nist.gov/quantum/zoo/, 2015.
- [19] Richard Jozsa. Entanglement and quantum computation. arXiv:quantph/9707034, 1997.
- [20] Richard Jozsa and Noah Linden. On the role of entanglement in quantumcomputational 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.
- [21] Phillip Kaye, Raymond Laflame, and Michele Mosca. An Introduction to Quantum Computing. Oxford University Press, 2007.
- [22] Emanuel Knill and Raymond Laflamme. Power of one bit of quantum information. *Physical Review Letters*, 81(25):5672, 1998.
- [23] 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.
- [24] Ashley Montanaro. Some applications of hypercontractive inequalities in quantum information theory. Journal of Mathematical Physics, 53(12):122206, 2012.
- [25] Ryan O'Donnell. Analysis of boolean functions. Cambridge University Press, 2014.
- [26] Maris Ozols, Martin Roetteler, and Jérémie Roland. Quantum rejection sampling. ACM Transactions on Computation Theory (TOCT), 5(3):11, 2013.
- [27] 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.
- [28] Martin Rötteler. Quantum algorithms for highly non-linear boolean functions. In Proceedings of the twenty-first annual ACM-SIAM symposium on Discrete Algorithms, pages 448–457. SIAM, 2010.
- [29] Guifré Vidal. Efficient classical simulation of slightly entangled quantum computations. *Physical Review Letters*, 91(14):147902, 2003.