

# Asymptotically Optimal Synthesis of Reversible Circuits

Xian Wu\*, Lvzhou Li\*\*

*Institute of Quantum Computing and Software, School of Computer and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510006, China*

---

## Abstract

Reversible circuits have been studied extensively and intensively, and have plenty of applications in various areas, such as digital signal processing, cryptography, and especially quantum computing. In 2003, the lower bound  $\Omega(2^n n / \log n)$  for the synthesis of  $n$ -wire reversible circuits was proved. Whether this lower bound has a matching upper bound was listed as one of the future challenging open problems in the survey (M. Saeedi and I. L Markov, ACM Computing Surveys, 45(2):1–34, 2013). In this paper we propose an algorithm to implement an arbitrary  $n$ -wire reversible circuit with no more than  $O(2^n n / \log n)$  elementary gates, and thus close the open problem.

*Keywords:* Quantum Computing, Reversible Circuit Synthesis, Circuit Optimization.

---

## 1. Introduction

### 1.1. Background

Reversible circuits play a crucial role in both classical and quantum computing, and one can refer to the excellent survey [1] for full information. In classical computing, many cryptographic algorithms [2, 3, 4] use bit permutation instructions, whose performance can be improved by using better reversible computation synthesis methods. In addition, signal processing often

---

\*wuxian3@mail2.sysu.edu.cn

\*\*Corresponding author. lilvzh@mail.sysu.edu.cn

requires reversible transforms, and the reversible data hiding algorithm is useful in signal processing [5, 6]. In quantum computing, reversible circuits are indispensable. First, some prominent quantum algorithms use blocks of reversible circuits [7, 8, 9], for example, the modular exponentiation in Shor’s algorithm [10]. Second, reversible circuit synthesis has a great significance in quantum computing, as pointed out in [11] that the non-optimality of quantum circuits derives mainly from the exponential complexity of reversible circuits. Third, reversible circuits are a fundamental part of quantum compilation, as mentioned in [12] that ”Design of Boolean Components” is one of two tasks to compile quantum algorithms.

Reversible logic synthesis is the process of generating a compact reversible circuit from a given specification. More formally, given a reversible Boolean function or a permutation matrix, reversible logic synthesis considers how to implement it by a reversible circuit. A frequently used cost is the number of elementary gates (also known as size), which will also be used in this paper. Furthermore, when incorporating redundant input-output line-pairs (referred to as ancillary bits or temporary storage channels) in the synthesis process, the number of elementary gates needed may decrease; however, this unavoidably leads to additional space overhead. The utilization of ancillary bits is also a crucial factor to consider in circuit synthesis, particularly in the realm of quantum compilation. Therefore, it is advisable to minimize their usage.

By using Lupanov representation, one can build a circuit for any boolean function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  with no more than  $O(2^n/n)$  elementary gates. It thus implies that for an arbitrary  $n$ -bit reversible function, one can construct a circuit with no more than  $O(2^n)$  elementary gates. Furthermore, as shown in [13], every irreversible elementary gate such as the AND gate can be simulated by a Toffoli gate with ancillary bits. Thus, for an arbitrary  $n$ -bit reversible function, one can construct a reversible circuit with no more than  $O(2^n)$  gates. However, this trivial idea has the defect that exponential ancillary bits are required. In this paper, we will propose a reversible logic synthesis approach which does not employ any ancillary bit.

### 1.2. Related work

In 2003, Ref. [14] proved that an  $n$ -wire reversible circuit needs at least  $\Omega(2^n n / \log n)$  gates in the worst case, no matter whether classical or quantum elementary gates are used (see Lemma 6 for details). Whether this lower bound has a matching upper bound was listed as one of the future challenging open problems in the survey [1]. There are some works devoted to approaching the lower bound  $\Omega(2^n n / \log n)$ . Ref. [15] used Young subgroups and exclusive sum-of-products (ESOPs) to implement reversible circuits, but the upper bound is  $O(n2^n)$ . The best upper bound  $8.5n2^n + o(2^n)$  was obtained by a cycle-based method [16], which is better than the previous bounds in terms of coefficients, but the order of magnitude remains the same. Note that these results above are without the use of auxiliary bits and require the use of quantum gates. With the help of auxiliary bits, Binary Decision Diagram (BDD) -based synthesis can construct reversible circuits much faster, yet they still require  $O(2^n n)$  elementary gates in the worst case [17].

### 1.3. Motivation

Despite the effort of the above works, the problem whether the lower bound  $\Omega(2^n n / \log n)$  has a matching upper bound has been left open for about 20 years. The significance of this problem can be seen as follows. (i) In theory, the pursuit of tight complexity bounds has been an eternal topic in theoretical computer science, and a lot of works are to continuously improve some complexity bounds little by little. (ii) In experiment, optimizing the size of a quantum circuit is critical for the success of experiments, and even a constant multiple improvement of the circuit size is very valuable. Before the realization of large-scale error correction, the noise of quantum devices is unavoidable, and the noise impact of the entire quantum circuit will increase monotonically with the circuit size. Therefore, it is of great importance to optimize the size of quantum circuits.

### 1.4. Contributions

In this paper, we will present a new synthesis method that can achieve the lower bound  $\Omega(2^n n / \log n)$ , thus closing an open problem.

**Theorem 1.** *Any  $n$ -bit reversible function can be computed by a reversible circuit with no more than  $O(2^n n / \log n)$  elementary gates and without the use of ancillary bits.*

**Remark 1.** *The elementary gates we use here are  $\{NOT, S, T, H, CNOT, \text{controlled-}R_x(\theta), \text{controlled-}V_i, \text{controlled-}V_i^\dagger\}$ , where  $\theta \in \{\pi, \pm\frac{\pi}{2}, \pm\frac{\pi}{4}, \dots, \pm\frac{\pi}{2^{n-3}}\}$  and  $V_i$  satisfies  $(V_i)^{2^i} = NOT$  for  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n-2\}$ . This gate library meets the requirement in Lemma 6. One can further decompose these controlled gates into several CNOT gates and single-bit gates, but for convenience, we treat them here as elementary gates. Actually, we can construct any  $n$ -wire reversible circuit with the NCT gate library<sup>1</sup> and no more than one  $C^{n-1}NOT$  gate [14] (see Definition 3). NCT gate can be constructed with only  $\{S, T, H, CNOT\}$ , but the  $C^{n-1}NOT$  gate requires extra  $\{\text{controlled-}R_x(\theta), \text{controlled-}V_i, \text{controlled-}V_i^\dagger\}$ , adding up to  $O(n)$  extra elementary gates [18].*

The main idea behind the proof of Theorem 1 is to recognize that if the number of inputs  $x$  such that  $f(x) \neq x$  is small enough (roughly  $2^{n/2}$ ), then it is easy to synthesize  $f$  (essentially using swaps). Therefore, the crucial step is to discover a new permutation, denoted as  $g$ , that, when composed with the original permutation, results in a small number of  $x$  instances where  $g(f(x)) \neq x$ . Furthermore, we will demonstrate that such a permutation  $g$  requires no more than  $O(2^n n / \log n)$  elementary gates. This achievement is made possible by employing specific structural lemmas (refer to Lemma 7, 8, and 9), which serve as foundational elements for our argument.

### 1.5. Organization

The remainder of this document is organized as follows. In Section 2, we provide essential background information and formal definitions. Section 3 presents our synthesis methodology. In Section 4, we introduce an algorithm that is an enhancement of the approach described in Section 3, yielding improved performance compared to existing algorithms. Finally, we conclude in Section 5.

---

<sup>1</sup>The NCT gate library means the gate set of NOT, CNOT, and Toffoli.

## 2. Preliminaries

In this section, we shall introduce some notations and definitions related to reversible circuits and quantum gates.

Let  $\mathbb{F}_2$  denote the two-element field. For an  $n$ -bit non-negative integer  $i$ , we shall employ  $i$  as its binary representation.  $\vec{i}$  shall depict its  $n$ -bit binary string in a column format, while  $|i\rangle$  represents the  $2^n$ -dimensional vector with only the  $(i + 1)$ -th element being 1 and the others being 0. To be more precise, let  $i = \sum_{j=1}^n a_j 2^{n-j}$ . Then we have  $\vec{i} = [a_1 \ a_2 \ \dots \ a_n]^T$  and  $|i\rangle = |a_1\rangle \otimes |a_2\rangle \cdots \otimes |a_n\rangle$ .

The  $n \times n$  identity matrix can be expressed as  $I = [\vec{e}_1 \ \vec{e}_2 \ \dots \ \vec{e}_n]$ , where  $\vec{e}_t$  is a vector whose  $t$ -th element is 1, and the others are 0. These basis vectors play an important role in our method.

A function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$  is said to be reversible if it is a bijection. An  $n$ -bit reversible function can be represented by a  $2^n \times 2^n$  permutation matrix  $P$  such that if  $f(i) = x_i$  for  $i \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , then we have  $P|i\rangle = |x_i\rangle$ .

**Definition 1.** For a given permutation matrix  $P$ , let  $S_P = \{i : P|i\rangle \neq |i\rangle\}$  be the set of integers that is changed under  $P$ , and  $|S_P|$  be the number of elements in  $S_P$ .

Obviously, for any  $i$ , if  $i \in S_P$ , then we have  $x_i \in S_P$ . Usually,  $|S_P|$  is positively correlated with the cost of the circuit implementing  $P$ .

**Lemma 2.** For a  $2^n \times 2^n$  permutation matrix  $P$ , if  $P|0\rangle \neq |0\rangle$ , then we can use no more than  $n$  NOT gates to implement an operator  $T$ , such that  $TP|0\rangle = |0\rangle$ .

*Proof.* If the  $i$ -th bit of  $P|0\rangle$  is 1, then we apply a NOT gate on the  $i$ -th bit. Since it only has  $n$  bits, it costs no more than  $n$  NOT gates. ■

This lemma makes sure that we don't need to consider  $|0\rangle$ , which is important in Section 3.

In this work, we consider how to implement a reversible function by a reversible circuit which is made of reversible gates. A reversible circuit has the

same number of input and output wires, and it is said to be  $k$ -bit or  $k$ -wire, if it has  $k$  input and output wires.

Linear reversible circuits form an important sub-class of reversible circuits, and here we will give their formal definition.

**Definition 2.** *A reversible function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$  is called linear if  $\forall x, y \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,  $f(x \oplus y) = f(x) \oplus f(y)$ , where  $\oplus$  denotes bitwise XOR. A reversible circuit is called linear, if the function it realizes is linear.*

For an  $n$ -bit linear reversible function  $f$  (or an  $n$ -bit linear reversible circuit), we can use an  $n \times n$  reversible matrix  $R$  over  $\mathbb{F}_2$  to represent it such that  $R\vec{i} = \vec{f(i)} = \vec{x}_i$ . Since all linear reversible circuits can be constructed with CNOT gates alone and adding a small number of additional single and double qubit gates does not result in an order of magnitude improvement (as can be seen in the proof of the lower bound of reversible circuits), we typically only use CNOT gates to construct linear reversible circuits. From Ref. [19], we know the following result.

**Lemma 3.** *Any  $n$ -bit linear reversible circuit (or  $n \times n$  reversible matrix) can be constructed by using only CNOT gates and no more than  $O(n^2 / \log n)$  CNOT gates are required.*

One straightforward approach is to leverage the outcomes of linear reversible circuits to optimize reversible circuits. However, the actual implementation is not as intuitive. We need to introduce certain techniques. In Section 3, we shall show how to use linear reversible circuits to help construct reversible circuits.

**Definition 3.** *A  $C^m$  NOT gate denotes a NOT gate with  $m$  control bits: if the  $m$  control bits are all 1, then the target bit flips. Otherwise, leaves the target bit unchanged.*

For  $m = 0, 1, 2$ , the gates are NOT, CNOT, Toffoli, respectively. The three gates are the most common reversible gates and they compose the NCT gate library, from which one can construct any  $n$ -bit reversible circuit with at most one extra  $C^{n-1}$ NOT gate [20].

**Lemma 4.** *In an  $n$ -bit circuit, the cost of  $C^m$ NOT gate is linear with  $m$  except for  $m = n - 1$ . The cost of  $C^{n-1}$ NOT gate is  $O(n^2)$ .*

*Proof.* For  $n \geq 5$  and  $m \in \{3, 4, \dots, n - 2\}$ , a  $C^m$ NOT gate can be implemented by using a linear cost of Toffoli gates [21]. And each Toffoli gate can be constructed in a constant cost with gate library  $\{NOT, S, T, H, CNOT\}$ .

For  $C^{n-1}$ NOT gate, the best cost so far is  $O(n^2)$  elementary gates [18]. ■

If we desire a  $C^m$ NOT gate that effectively permits a control bit to assume the value 0, we simply incorporate a single NOT gate prior to and another following the  $C^m$ NOT gate. These are known as general  $C^m$ NOT gates (or MCT gate), and the added expense amounts to no more than  $2m$  elementary gates.

The fundamental concept underlying our synthesis methodology is to disassemble a reversible circuit into these versatile  $C^m$ NOT gates. By quantifying the known expense of these gates, we can assess the overall cost of the circuit.

**Definition 4.** *When we use  $q_i$  ( $\bar{q}_i$ ) to denote the control bit, the controlled gate works only when the  $i$ -th bit is 1(0).*

**Lemma 5.** *Given numbers  $a, b \in \{0, 1\}^n$  with  $a \neq b$ , we can use no more than  $O(n^2)$  elementary gates to construct an operator  $T$  such that*

$$T|x\rangle = \begin{cases} |b\rangle, & x = a \\ |a\rangle, & x = b \\ |x\rangle, & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (1)$$

*Proof.* Let  $\vec{c} = \vec{a} \oplus \vec{b}$ , and  $c_i$  be the  $i$ -th element of  $\vec{c}$ . Since  $a \neq b$ , there exists  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $c_t = 1$ .

For each  $s \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  such that  $c_s = 1$  and  $s \neq t$ , apply a CNOT gate on  $q_s$ , whose control bit is  $q_t$ . It's obvious that it will not cost more than  $n - 1$  CNOT gates. After these gates,  $a$  and  $b$  only differ in  $q_t$ .  $q_t$  should be applied with a general  $C^{n-1}$ NOT gate, using the remaining bits as control bits. Then apply the CNOT gates above in the reverse order, obtaining the operator  $T$ .

The total cost is  $O(n) + O(n^2) = O(n^2)$ . ■

For each  $i \in S_P$ , we can construct a  $T$  which swaps  $i, x_i$  and leaves the others unchanged. Then we have  $TP|i\rangle = |i\rangle$  and  $TP|j\rangle = |j\rangle$  for any  $j$  satisfying  $P|j\rangle = |j\rangle$ . If we can reduce  $|S_P|$  to small enough, then the gate complexity of implementing  $T$  can be neglected in the synthesis process.

**Definition 5.** *An  $n$ -wire circuit is said to be one-gate, if it consists of only one elementary gate.*

For the convenience of readers, we recall the lower bound of reversible logic synthesis proved in [14].

**Lemma 6.** *Given an elementary gate library  $L$ , if the number of one-gate circuits on  $n$  wires generated by  $L$  is polynomial with  $n$ , then in the worst case an  $n$ -bit reversible circuits requires  $\Omega(2^n n / \log n)$  gates from  $L$ .*

*Proof.* It's a special case of Lemma 8 in [14].

Let  $b$  be the number of one-gate circuits on  $n$  wires generated by  $L$ . Let  $d$  be the gate number of the largest  $n$ -bit reversible circuit generated by  $L$ . At most  $b^d$  matrices can be generated by such a circuit. Let  $M$  be the number of all the  $n$ -bit reversible circuits with  $d$  gates. Then we have

$$b^d \geq M \geq (2^n)! , \quad (2)$$

where  $(2^n)!$  is the number of all the  $n$ -bit reversible functions. Therefore,

$$d \geq \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} \log_b i = \frac{1}{\ln b} \sum_{i=1}^{2^n} \ln i . \quad (3)$$

Since  $b = \text{poly}(n)$ , we have  $d = \Omega(2^n n / \log n)$ . ■

**Remark 2.** *Note that any gate library  $L$  with  $\text{poly}(n)$  one-qubit gates and two-qubit gates satisfies the requirement in Lemma 6. In addition, the lower bound  $\Omega(2^n n / \log n)$  still holds when  $\text{poly}(n)$  ancillary qubits are allowed.*

### 3. Asymptotically Optimal Synthesis

In this section, we are going to prove Theorem 1. More specifically, we will prove that for an arbitrarily given  $2^n \times 2^n$  permutation matrix  $P$  or  $n$ -bit



reversible function  $f$ , we can implement it by a reversible circuit with no more than  $O(2^n n / \log n)$  elementary gates.

In the following, we should remember that  $P$  is a  $2^n \times 2^n$  permutation matrix,  $f$  means the reversible function corresponding to  $P$  and  $S_P = \{i : P|i\rangle \neq |i\rangle\}$ . Also note that all matrices and vectors are over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ .

We will construct a series of  $Q_1, Q_2, \dots, Q_d$  such that  $|S_{Q_d \dots Q_2 Q_1 P}| \leq 2^{n/2-1}$ , where  $d$  is no more than  $O(2^n/n)$  and each  $Q_i$  costs no more than  $O(n^2/\log n)$  gates. This result is formally stated in Theorem 11, which leads to the main result—Theorem 1. Before proving it, we need several technical lemmas showing how to construct  $Q_i$ . For the reader's convenience, the relationship among the lemmas and theorems obtained in this paper is shown in Figure 1.




Figure 1: Relationship among the lemmas and theorems obtained in this paper.

**Lemma 7.** Let  $m = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor - 1$ . When  $|S_P| > 2^{n/2-1}$ ,  $2^{m-1}$  pairs of  $(i, x_i)$  from  $S_P$  can be selected to construct  $V = \begin{bmatrix} \vec{i}_1 & \vec{x}_{i_1} & \vec{i}_2 & \vec{x}_{i_2} & \dots & \vec{i}_{2^{m-1}} & \vec{x}_{i_{2^{m-1}}} \end{bmatrix}$  and  $U = \begin{bmatrix} \vec{i}_1 & \vec{z}_1 & \vec{i}_2 & \vec{z}_2 & \dots & \vec{i}_{2^{m-1}} & \vec{z}_{2^{m-1}} \end{bmatrix}$ , such that the columns of  $U$  are linearly independent, with  $\vec{z}_1 = \vec{x}_{i_1}$ , and for  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{m-1}\}$ , neither  $v_{2t-1}$  nor  $v_{2t}$  is a linear combination of  $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{2t-2}\}$ , where  $u_t(v_t)$  denotes the  $t$ -th column of  $U(V)$ .

*Proof.* At the beginning, let  $U = \begin{bmatrix} & \\ & \end{bmatrix}$ ,  $V = \begin{bmatrix} & \\ & \end{bmatrix}$ . Then we add vectors into the two matrices from left to right by repeating the following iteration  $2^{m-1}$  times.

In the  $t$ -th iteration ( $t = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{m-1}$ ), we take the following three steps.

- (1) Select a pair  $(i_t, x_{i_t})$  from  $S_P$  such that both  $\vec{i}_t$  and  $\vec{x}_{i_t}$  are not a linear combination of the columns of  $U$  (it will be proved later such a pair can always be found if  $|S_P| > 2^{n/2-1}$ ).
- (2) Append  $\vec{i}_t$  and  $\vec{x}_{i_t}$  to  $V$ .
- (3) Append  $\vec{i}_t$  to  $U$  and check whether the columns of the obtained  $U$  together with  $\vec{x}_{i_t}$  are linearly independent. If yes, then append  $\vec{x}_{i_t}$  to  $U$ . Otherwise, select a vector  $l$  such that the the columns of  $U$  together with  $l$  are linearly independent and then append it to  $U$ .

Now we explain why the pair  $(i_t, x_{i_t})$  in the first step above can always be found. When we are selecting the  $t$ -th pair  $(i_t, x_{i_t})$ , it means  $t - 1$  pairs have been selected and there are  $2(t - 1)$  columns in  $U$ . Thus, the number of all the linear combinations of the columns of  $U$  is  $2^{2t-2}$ , and each vector  $\vec{u}$  from this set will lead to that  $(u, f(u)), (f^{-1}(u), u)$  can not be selected. Thus, there are at most  $2 \times 2^{2t-2} = 2^{2t-1}$  pairs that can not be the candidate for the  $t$ -th pair. Therefore, when  $|S_P| > 2^{2t-1}$ , the  $t$ -th pair  $(i_t, x_{i_t})$  can be selected. Furthermore, when  $|S_P| > 2^{n/2-1} \geq 2^{2^m-1}$ ,  $2^{m-1}$  pairs of  $(i, x_i)$  can always be found. ■

Based on the construction of  $V$ , it has the following properties:

- (1)  $\forall t \in \{1, 2, 3, 5, 7, \dots, 2^m - 1\}$ ,  $v_t = u_t$ .
- (2)  $\forall t \in \{4, 6, 8, \dots, 2^m\}$ , either  $v_t = u_t$  or  $v_t = u_{t-1} \oplus \sum_{j=1}^{t-2} k_j u_j$ , where at least one  $k_j$  is equal to 1, with each  $k_j \in \{0, 1\}$ .

Here we explain item (2). Lemma 7 ensures that  $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{t-2}, v_{t-1}\}$  and  $\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{t-2}, v_t\}$  are both linearly independent sets. If  $v_t \neq u_t$ , then

$\{u_1, u_2, \dots, u_{t-2}, u_{t-1}, v_t\}$  are not linearly independent set. Then we have the fact that  $v_t \oplus u_{t-1} = v_t \oplus v_{t-1} = \sum_{j=1}^{t-2} k_j u_j$  and at least one  $k_j$  equals 1. Thus, by adding  $u_{t-1}$  to the two sides of the equation, we get item (2).

Furthermore, it's easy to augment  $U$  to an  $n \times n$  linearly independent matrix over  $\mathbb{F}_2$  by adding some columns. Correspondingly,  $V$  is also augmented by adding the same columns. The augmented matrices are still denoted by  $U$  and  $V$ .

**Lemma 8.** *Once we get  $U, V$  above, we can construct an  $n \times n$  reversible matrix  $R_1$  over  $\mathbb{F}_2$ , such that  $R_1 U = I$ . As a result,  $V' := R_1 V$  is an upper triangular matrix having the following properties:*

- (1)  $\forall t \in \{1, 2, 3, 5, 7, \dots, 2^m - 1\}$ ,  $v'_t = \vec{e}_t$ , where  $v'_t$  is the  $t$ -th column vector of  $V'$ .
- (2)  $\forall t \in \{4, 6, 8, \dots, 2^m\}$ , if  $v_t = u_t$ , then  $v'_t = \vec{e}_t$ ; otherwise,  $v'_t = \vec{e}_{t-1} \oplus \sum_{j=1}^{t-2} k_j \vec{e}_j$ , where  $k_j$  belongs to  $\{0, 1\}$  and at least one  $k_j$  equals 1.

*Proof.* First it is easy to get item (1) from the fact that  $R_1 u_t = \vec{e}_t$ .

Because of the property (2) of  $V$ ,  $\forall t \in \{4, 6, 8, \dots, 2^m\}$ , if  $v_t \neq u_t$ , then  $R_1 v_t = R_1 u_{t-1} \oplus \sum_{j=1}^{t-2} k_j R_1 u_j = \vec{e}_{t-1} \oplus \sum_{j=1}^{t-2} k_j \vec{e}_j$ . Therefore, item (2) holds. It's easy to check that the  $k_j$  of  $v'_t$  in property (2) is the  $j$ -th element of  $v'_t$ . For  $t \in \{2^m + 1, 2^m + 2, \dots, n\}$ , we have  $u_t = v_t$  and  $R_1 v_t = \vec{e}_t$ .

Based on these properties, we have  $v'_{t',t} = 0$  for any  $t' > t$ , where  $v'_{i,j}$  means the  $i$ -th row and  $j$ -column element of  $V'$ . Thus  $V'$  is an upper triangular matrix. ■

**Lemma 9.** *Once we get  $V'$  from Lemma 8, we can use no more than  $O(n^2 / \log n)$  elementary gates to transform  $V'$  to the identity matrix  $I$ .*

*Proof.* We first show that one can use no more than  $O(n)$  elementary gates to transform  $V'$  to an upper triangular matrix with the main diagonal elements being 1. More specifically, we address each column  $v'_t$  of  $V'$  from left to right (i.e.,  $t$  begins with 1 and ends with  $n$ ) as follows.

First note that the column  $v'_t$  with  $t \in \{1, 2, 3, 5, 7, \dots, 2^m - 1\}$  requires no more treatment, since it has been in the form of a column of  $I$ , that is,  $v'_t = \vec{e}_t$ .

Now given  $v'_t$  with  $t \in \{4, 6, 8, \dots, 2^m\}$ , if  $v'_{t,t} = 1$ , then no operation will be done. Otherwise, according to the property (2) of  $V'$ , it must be in the form:  $v'_t = \vec{e}_{t-1} \oplus \sum_{j=1}^{t-2} k_j \vec{e}_j$  for at least one  $k_j$  being 1. In other words,  $v'_{t-1,t} = 1$  and there exists  $t' < t - 1$  such that  $v'_{t',t} = 1$ . Then we apply a Toffoli gate on the bit  $q_t$ , with control bits being  $q_{t-1}, q_{t'}$ , which changes  $v'_{t,t}$  to be 1. Note that this gate will not change  $v'_{l < t}$  (the columns before  $v'_t$ ) by observing the following two points: (i) by the property (1) of  $V'$ ,  $v'_{t-1} = \vec{e}_{t-1}$  will not be affected by the Toffoli gate; (ii) for  $v'_1, v'_2, \dots, v'_{t-2}$ , their  $(t-1)$ -th bits are all 0 due to the fact that  $V'$  is an upper triangular matrix, and thus they will not be affected by the Toffoli gate too. Therefore, the matrix is still upper triangular after the above Toffoli gate.

We now consider the effect of the above Toffoli gate on  $v'_{l > t}$  (the columns after  $v'_t$ ). If the Toffoli gate doesn't work on  $v'_l$ , the properties of  $V'$  still hold. Obviously, the Toffoli gate has no effect on the odd column of  $V'$ , since they have only one 1.

Suppose  $v'_l$  is affected by the Toffoli gate generated by  $v'_t$ , then it must hold that  $l \geq t + 2$  and  $l \in \{4, 6, 8, \dots, 2^m\}$ . It's easy to check  $v'_l = \vec{e}_{l-1} \oplus \sum_{j=1}^{l-2} k_j \vec{e}_j$  still holds for at least one  $k_j$  being 1 after the Toffoli gate ( $k_{t-1}, k_{t'}$  are 1 and  $k_t$  flips). Therefore, the properties of  $v'_{l > t}$  are not changed by the Toffoli gate generated by  $v'_t$ . As a result, we can similarly deal with the next column  $v'_{(t+1)}$ .

Because there are no more than  $2^{m-1} - 1$  vectors satisfying  $v_t \neq u_t$ , this procedure will cost no more than  $2^{m-1} - 1$  Toffoli gates, which means no more than  $O(n)$  elementary gates are needed. After the above procedure,  $V'$  has been transformed to an upper triangular matrix  $V''$  with the main diagonal elements being 1, and thus is a full rank matrix. Then we can use another  $n \times n$  reversible matrix  $R_2$  over  $\mathbb{F}_2$  such that  $R_2 V'' = I$ . Note that  $R_2$  consumes  $O(n^2 / \log n)$  CNOT gates by Lemma 3. Therefore, the total gate cost is  $O(n^2 / \log n) + O(n) = O(n^2 / \log n)$ . ■

The three Lemmas above can be summarized as follows.

**Lemma 10.** *Let  $m = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor - 1$ . When  $|S_P| > 2^{n/2-1}$ ,  $2^{m-1}$  pairs of  $(i, x_i)$  from  $S_P$  can be selected, for which we can use no more than  $O(n^2/\log n)$  elementary gates to construct an reversible operator  $P_e$  satisfying  $P_e |i_t\rangle = |e_{2t-1}\rangle$  and  $P_e |x_{i_t}\rangle = |e_{2t}\rangle$  for any selected pair  $(i_t, x_{i_t})$ .*

*Proof.* The lemmas above have shown that  $P_e$  costs two  $n \times n$  reversible matrices and no more than  $2^{m-1} - 1$  Toffoli gates. Therefore, it will cost no more than  $O(n^2/\log n)$  elementary gates to implement  $P_e$ . ■

After proving these lemmas, we obtain the following crucial result.

**Theorem 11.** *For a given  $2^n \times 2^n$  permutation matrix  $P$ , there exists a procedure using no more than  $O(2^n n/\log n)$  elementary gates to implement a permutation matrix  $P_Q$ , such that  $|S_{P_Q P}| \leq 2^{n/2-1}$ .*

*Proof.* The procedure is as follows:

- (1) Let  $m = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor - 1$ . Take  $2^{m-1}$  pairs  $\{(i_t, x_{i_t}) : t = 1, 2, \dots, 2^{m-1}\}$  from  $S_P$  which satisfy the requirement in Lemma 7. Let  $|a_t\rangle = |i_t\rangle$ ,  $|b_t\rangle = |x_{i_t}\rangle$  ( $\forall t \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{m-1}\}$ ). If no such  $2^{m-1}$  pairs can be selected, the procedure ends.
- (2) Construct a reversible operator  $P_e$ , which satisfies  $\forall t \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{m-1}\}$ ,  $P_e |a_t\rangle = |e_{2t-1}\rangle$ ,  $P_e |b_t\rangle = |e_{2t}\rangle$ . Since  $P_e$  is reversible, for those  $x \notin \{a_1, b_1, \dots, a_{2^{m-1}}, b_{2^{m-1}}\}$ ,  $P_e |x\rangle \notin \{|e_1\rangle, |e_2\rangle, \dots, |e_{2^m}\rangle\}$ .
- (3) Construct a reversible operator  $P_{map}$ , which satisfies  $P_{map} |e_i\rangle = |y_i\rangle$  ( $\forall i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^m\}$ ), where  $|y_i\rangle = |10 \dots 0\rangle_{n-m} |i-1\rangle_m$  and  $|i-1\rangle_m$  means the  $m$ -bit binary string of  $i-1$ . Since  $P_{map}$  is reversible, for those  $x \notin \{e_1, e_2, \dots, e_{2^m}\}$ ,  $P_{map} |x\rangle \notin \{|y_1\rangle, |y_2\rangle, \dots, |y_{2^m}\rangle\}$ .
- (4) Deploy a  $C^{n-m}$ NOT gate on the bit  $q_n$ , with the control bits being the first  $n-m$  bits  $|10 \dots 0\rangle_{n-m}$ . We call this step a main swap, and use  $T_{ms}$  to represent its matrix form.

(5) Apply  $P_{map}^{-1}, P_e^{-1}$ . After these operations mentioned before, we get an operator  $Q = P_e^{-1}P_{map}^{-1}T_{ms}P_{map}P_e$ , which satisfies

$$Q|x\rangle = \begin{cases} |b_t\rangle, & x = a_t \\ |a_t\rangle, & x = b_t \\ |x\rangle, & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

$(\forall t \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{m-1}\})$ .

(6) Update  $P = QP$ . Return to Step 1.

We now explain why  $Q|x\rangle = |x\rangle$  for other values of  $x$ . Combining step (2) and step (3), we have  $P_{map}P_e|x\rangle \notin \{|y_1\rangle, |y_2\rangle, \dots, |y_{2^m}\rangle\}$ , and thus  $Q|x\rangle = P_e^{-1}P_{map}^{-1}P_{map}P_e|x\rangle = |x\rangle$ . The framework of this procedure is shown in Figure




Figure 2: Framework of Theorem 11

2. After each iteration, we have  $QP|a_t\rangle = |a_t\rangle$  for all  $t \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^{m-1}\}$ . In addition, for  $i$  satisfying  $P|i\rangle = |i\rangle$ , we have  $QP|i\rangle = |i\rangle$ . Thus,  $|S_P| -$

$|S_{QP}| \geq 2^{m-1} \geq n/8$ , which means the procedure won't work more than  $8 \cdot 2^n/n$  iterations.

According to Lemma 10,  $P_e$  needs  $O(n^2/\log n)$  elementary gates.

Here we show how to construct  $P_{map}$ . For each  $e_i$ , we use  $q_i$  as the control bit to apply CNOT gate to flip  $q_1$  such that  $q_1 = 1$  and the last  $m$  bits to be the binary string of  $i - 1$ . The result is that we transform  $|e_i\rangle$  to  $|10 \cdots 0\rangle_{i-1} |10 \cdots 0\rangle_{n-m-i+1} |i-1\rangle_m$ . The cost of this transformation is no more than  $m + 1$  gates. Then apply a  $C^m$ NOT gate on bit  $q_i$  with control bits being the last  $m$  bits, which flips the  $i$ -th bit when the last  $m$  bits are  $|i-1\rangle_m$ . As a result,  $|e_i\rangle$  is transformed to  $|y_i\rangle$ . Because  $2^m < n - m$ , these gates have no effect on  $|y_j\rangle$  and  $|e_{j \neq i}\rangle$  for any  $j$ . Since Lemma 4 shows these  $C^m$ NOT gates have a linear cost,  $P_{map}$  costs no more than  $O(2^m m) = O(n \log n)$  elementary gates. Without losing generality, we can assume that  $m > 1$ . According to Lemma 4, the cost of  $C^{n-m}$ NOT gate in step (4) is  $O(n - m)$ .

Therefore, each  $Q$  needs no more than  $O(n^2/\log n + n \log n) = O(n^2/\log n)$  elementary gates. Let  $P_Q = Q_d \cdots Q_2 Q_1$ , where  $d$  is the number of iterations and has been shown to be less than  $8 \cdot 2^n/n$ . Therefore, the total cost of this procedure is no more than  $O(2^n n/\log n)$ .

When this procedure ends, it means we can't select  $2^{m-1}$  pairs as Lemma 7 requires, then we get  $|S_{PQP}| \leq 2^{n/2-1}$ . ■

**Example.** The following example illustrates our method. Suppose  $n = 8$ , and thus  $m = 2$ . The reversible function we want to implement is as follows:

$$f(x) = \begin{cases} 0, & x = 0 \\ 1, & x = 254 \\ 2, & x = 255 \\ x + 2, & \text{else} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

(1) We select the pair  $(1, 3)$ , then we have

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}, V = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (6)$$

(2) Since  $\vec{1}$ ,  $\vec{2}$ ,  $\vec{3}$  can be represented by the linear combination of  $U$ , the pairs  $(254, 1)$ ,  $(255, 2)$ ,  $(1, 3)$ ,  $(2, 4)$ ,  $(3, 5)$  are invalid. Now we select  $(4, 6)$ , and update

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

Since  $\vec{6}$  is the linear combination of  $\{\vec{1}, \vec{3}, \vec{4}\}$ , we take  $\vec{8}$  as  $u_4$  and update

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (8)$$



(3) After  $2^{m-1} = 2$  pairs have been selected, augment  $U$  so that it is a full rank matrix

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (9)$$

Then, augment  $V$  with the same vectors. We have

$$V = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

(4) Construct an  $n \times n$  reversible matrix  $R_1$  which satisfies  $R_1U = I$ . Meanwhile,

$$V' = R_1V = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (11)$$

(5) Apply a Toffoli gate on  $q_4$ , with the control bits being  $q_1$  and  $q_3$ . Then

we have

$$V'' = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (12)$$

Since  $V''$  is a full rank matrix now, we can construct another  $n \times n$  reversible matrix  $R_2$  such that  $R_2 V'' = I$ . Step 4 and Step 5 construct  $P_e$ .

(6) For  $|e_1\rangle = |y_1\rangle = |10000000\rangle$ , we don't need to do anything.

For  $|e_2\rangle = |01000000\rangle$ , apply CNOT gate on  $q_1, q_8$  with the control bit being  $q_2$  and we have  $|11000001\rangle$ . Apply C<sup>2</sup>NOT gate on  $q_2$  with the control bits being  $\bar{q}_7, q_8$ , getting  $|y_2\rangle = |10000001\rangle$ .

For  $|e_3\rangle = |00100000\rangle$ , apply CNOT gate on  $q_1, q_7$  with control bit is  $q_3$  and we have  $|10100010\rangle$ . Apply C<sup>2</sup>NOT gate on  $q_3$  with control bits being  $q_7, \bar{q}_8$ , getting  $|y_3\rangle = |10000010\rangle$ .

For  $|e_4\rangle = |00010000\rangle$ , apply CNOT gate on  $q_1, q_7, q_8$  with the control bit being  $q_4$  and we have  $|10010011\rangle$ . Apply C<sup>2</sup>NOT gate on  $q_4$  with the control bits being  $q_7, q_8$ , getting  $|y_4\rangle = |10000011\rangle$ .

Obviously, the gates above have no effect on other  $|e_i\rangle$  and  $|y_i\rangle$ .

(7) Apply a C<sup>6</sup>NOT gate on  $q_8$ , with the control bits being the first 6 bits  $|100000\rangle$ . Then apply the gates above in a reverse order, and get an operator  $Q$ , which satisfies

$$Q|x\rangle = \begin{cases} |3\rangle & x = 1 \\ |1\rangle & x = 3 \\ |6\rangle & x = 4 \\ |4\rangle & x = 6 \\ |x\rangle & \text{else} \end{cases}. \quad (13)$$

Therefore,

$$QP|x\rangle = \begin{cases} |x\rangle & x = 0, 1, 4 \\ |3\rangle & x = 254 \\ |6\rangle & x = 2 \\ |2\rangle & x = 255 \\ |x+2\rangle & \text{else} \end{cases} . \quad (14)$$

Here we have  $|S_{QP}| = |S_P| - 2$ . This is how an iteration works. Then we update  $P = QP$ , and repeat the above procedure until we can't take  $2^{m-1}$  pairs which satisfy the requirement of Lemma 7.

Now we give the proof of Theorem 1.

**Proof of Theorem 1.** For a given  $n$ -bit circuit, we use a  $2^n \times 2^n$  permutation matrix  $P$  to represent it. Theorem 11 proves that we can use no more than  $O(2^n n / \log n)$  elementary gates to implement  $P_Q$ , such that  $|S_{P_Q P}| \leq 2^{n/2-1}$ .

Let

$$P_r = P_Q P . \quad (15)$$

We call  $P_r$  the rest part, and have  $|S_{P_r}| \leq 2^{n/2-1}$ . Then we can use Lemma 5 to address the rest part, and the cost is no more than  $O(2^{n/2} n^2)$ . Hence, the total cost is  $O(2^n n / \log n + 2^{n/2} n^2) = O(2^n n / \log n)$ .

#### 4. Improving The Decomposition of Rest Part

For the rest part  $P_r$  of Theorem 11, the algorithm provided by Lemma 5 is really trivial. In this section, we propose an algorithm using no more than  $2^{n/2-1}(4n + 64 \log n + O(1))$  elementary gates to implement it. The best algorithm so far requires no more than  $2^{n/2-1}(8.5n + O(1))$  [16]. Our algorithm will have a better performance when  $n > 100$ .

Since we want to compare with the best result so far, we need to use the same gate library. The gate library includes NOT, CNOT, Hadamard, controlled-V gate, with  $V = \frac{i+1}{2} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & -i \\ -i & 1 \end{bmatrix}$  and rotation gate  $R_a(\theta)$ , which  $a \in \{x, y, z\}$  and  $\theta \in [0, 2\pi]$ . By Ref.[22], for  $n \geq 5$  and  $m \in \{3, 4, \dots, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor\}$ , a  $C^m$ NOT gate

can be implemented using no more than  $12m - 22$  elementary gates. For  $n \geq 7$  and  $m \in \{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 1, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor + 2, \dots, n - 2\}$ , a  $C^m$ NOT gate can be implemented using no more than  $24m - 40$  elementary gates

**Lemma 12.** *When  $|S_P| > 3 \cdot 2^{m-1} - 3$ ,  $2^{m-1}$  pairs of  $(i, x_i)$  can be selected, such that all of them are distinct, where  $m$  is an integer satisfying  $0 \leq m \leq \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor$ .*

*Proof.* Suppose we are selecting the  $t$ -th pair, which means  $t - 1$  pairs have been selected. Each selected pair  $(i, x_i)$  would make  $(i, x_i), (x_i, f(x_i)), (f^{-1}(i), i)$  unable to be selected. Hence there are at most  $3t - 3$  pairs unavailable at this moment. Thus, when  $|S_P| > 3 \cdot 2^{m-1} - 3$ ,  $2^{m-1}$  pairs of  $(i, x_i)$  could be selected. ■

**Theorem 13.** *For the rest part  $P_r$  of Theorem 11 with  $|S_{P_r}| \leq 2^{n/2-1}$ , there exists an algorithm requiring no more than  $2^{n/2-1}(4n + 64 \log n + O(1))$  elementary gates to implement it.*

*Proof.* The framework of this algorithm is the same as the one in Theorem 11, but needs to slightly modify  $P_e$  and  $P_{map}$ . In this algorithm, our  $2^{m-1}$  pairs of  $(i, x_i)$  only need to satisfy all the numbers are distinct. We set  $m = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor$  at the beginning.

For  $P_e$ , it requires no more than  $2^m(n + O(1))$  elementary gates. We need to transform the selected ones to  $e_t$  one by one. We will do it in the ascending order.

When we are turning  $v$  to  $e_t$ , check whether the  $t$ -th bit is 1. If not, since  $v \neq 0$ , we can find at least one  $t_1$  satisfying the  $t_1$ -th bit is 1. If we can't find another  $t_2 \neq t_1$  satisfying the  $t_2$ -th bit is 1, we have  $t_1 > t$  since  $v$  can't be  $e_{t' < t}$ . Apply a CNOT gate on the  $t$ -th bit with  $q_{t_1}$  being the control bit. Otherwise, use a Toffoli gate on the  $t$ -th bit with  $q_{t_1}, q_{t_2}$  being the control bits. In other words, the maximum cost is  $2^m - 1$  Toffoli gates, which come at a elementary gate cost of  $2^m \cdot O(1)$ . The  $O(1)$  here is the cost of Toffoli gates. Depending on their construction methods, the elementary gate cost may vary. For example, [23] describes a method with a minimum two-bit gate overhead,

while [24] describes a method with a minimal depth. Here we will use  $O(1)$  to represent its cost and treat it as a constant-cost quantum gate.

When the  $t$ -th bit is 1, apply no more than  $n - 1$  CNOT gates to turn the other bits to 0, whose control bit is  $q_t$ . Obviously, these gates have no effect on  $e_{t' < t}$ . Thus,  $P_e$  can be constructed with no more than  $2^m(n - 1) + 2^m \cdot O(1) = 2^m(n + O(1))$  elementary gates.

For  $P_{map}$ , it's possible that  $2^m > n - m$ , so we need to give another way to transform  $|e_{t > n-m}\rangle$  into  $|y_{t > n-m}\rangle$ . Let  $|e'_t\rangle = |10 \cdots 0\rangle_i |10 \dots 0\rangle_{n-t-i} |10 \dots 0\rangle_t$ , in which  $t = n - m + i$  and  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, 2^m - (n - m)\}$ . We apply 2 CNOT gates on  $q_1$  and  $q_{i+1}$ , whose control bit is  $q_t$ . After transforming all  $e_{t' > n-m}$  to  $e'_{t' > n-m}$ , apply no more than  $m$  Toffoli gates to transform the last  $m$  bits to be  $|t' - 1\rangle_m$  with control bits being  $q_1, q_{i+1}$ . Then apply  $C^m$ NOT gates on  $q_{i+1}$  with the last  $m$  bits being the control bits, which only flips the target bit when the last  $m$  bits are  $|t' - 1\rangle_m$ . Since these  $m$  Toffoli gates have common control bits, they can be done by  $2m - 2$  CNOT gates and one Toffoli gate [25], which requires  $2m + O(1)$  elementary gates. Similarly, the  $O(1)$  here is the cost of a Toffoli gate. After that, just follow Theorem 11 to deal with those  $e_{j \leq n-m}$ .

After that, all the  $e_{t' > n-m}$  have been transformed to  $y_{t' > n-m}$ . For each  $e_{t' > n-m}$ , it requires no more than  $m$  Toffoli gates, a  $C^m$ NOT gate and two CNOT gates. For those  $e_{j \leq n-m}$ , each needs no more than  $m + 1$  CNOT gates and one  $C^m$ NOT gate.

Because  $m = \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor \leq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ ,  $C^m$ NOT gate needs no more than  $14m - 22$  elementary gates. Thus, the cost of  $P_{map}$  is less than  $2^m(16m + O(1))$ .

Similar to step (4) in Theorem 11, we need to use a  $C^{n-m}$ NOT gate to implement the main swap. Since  $n - m > n/2$ , the cost of a general  $C^{n-m}$ NOT gate is  $26(n - m) + O(1)$ .

Therefore, the cost of an iteration is no more than  $2^m(2n + 32m + O(1)) + 26(n - m) + O(1)$ . Each iteration removes at least  $2^{m-1}$  elements from  $S_{P_r}$ . Therefore, removing each element from  $S_{P_r}$  takes no more than  $4n + 64m + 26(n - m)/2^{m-1} + O(1) = 4n + 64m + O(1)$  elementary gates when  $|S_{P_r}|$  is large enough (larger than  $1.5n$ ).

Lemma 12 shows that when the required  $2^{m-1}$  pairs are unavailable for the first time, we have  $|S_{P_r}| < 1.5n$ , which won't affect the gate complexity.

We could reduce  $m$  by 1, and repeat this algorithm until  $m = 0$ . When  $0 < m < \lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor$ , the total gate cost is no more than

$$\sum_{m=1}^{\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor - 1} 1.5(2^{m+1} - 2^m) \cdot (4n + 64m + 26(n - m)/2^{m-1} + O(1)) \quad (16)$$

$$\leq \sum_{m=1}^{\lfloor \log_2 n \rfloor - 1} 2^m(6n + 96m + O(1)) + 78(n - m) \quad (17)$$

$$\leq n \log_2 n(6n + 96 \log_2 n + O(1)) + 78n \log_2 n \quad (18)$$

Obviously, this term will not affect the overall cost. When  $m = 0$ ,  $|S_{P_r}| \leq 3$ , this algorithm uses no more than  $2^{n-1}$  NOT gates. Therefore, the total gate number is no more than  $2^{n/2-1}(4n + 64m + O(1))$ . ■

Here we give an example to help readers understand  $P_{map}$  better. Suppose  $n=8$  and  $m=3$ . We have to deal with  $e_6, e_7, e_8$  first. We apply CNOT gates on  $q_1, q_2$  with control bit  $q_6$ . Then we have  $|e'_6\rangle = |11000100\rangle$ . Similarly,  $|e'_7\rangle = |10100010\rangle$  and  $|e'_8\rangle = |10010001\rangle$ . Then we use  $q_1, q_2$  as control bits to apply a Toffoli gate on  $q_8$  to get  $|11000101\rangle$ . After that, apply a  $C^3$ NOT gate on  $q_2$  with the control bits being  $q_6, \bar{q}_7, q_8$  to get  $|y_6\rangle = |10000101\rangle$ . Obviously, the above gates have no effect on  $e'_{t \neq 6}, e_{t \neq 6}, y_{t \neq 6}$ . By this pattern, we have  $y_6, y_7, y_8$  and leave  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5$  unchanged.

For  $e_1, e_2, e_3, e_4, e_5$ , just follow the steps in Theorem 11, and those gates won't work on  $y_6, y_7, y_8$ .

## 5. Conclusion

In this paper, we have proved that any arbitrary  $n$ -bit reversible circuit can be implemented with no more than  $O(2^n n / \log n)$  elementary gates without using any ancillary bits, thus achieving the lower bound  $\Omega(2^n n / \log n)$  proposed in 2003 and closing the open problem in [1]. In the future, one may consider

more efficient methods, since our method costs much time to check linear independence.

### Acknowledgments

The authors would like to thank the anonymous reviewers for their thoughtful comments which helped greatly improve the presentation. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 62272492), the Guangdong Provincial Quantum Science Strategic Initiative (Grant No. GDZX2303007), and the Guangdong Basic and Applied Basic Research Foundation (Grant No. 2020B1515020050).

### References

- [1] Mehdi Saeedi and Igor L Markov. Synthesis and optimization of reversible circuits—a survey. *ACM Computing Surveys (CSUR)*, 45(2):1–34, 2013.
- [2] Zhijie Shi and Ruby B Lee. Bit permutation instructions for accelerating software cryptography. In *Proceedings IEEE International Conference on Application-Specific Systems, Architectures, and Processors*, pages 138–148. IEEE, 2000.
- [3] Yedidya Hilewitz and Ruby B Lee. Fast bit gather, bit scatter and bit permutation instructions for commodity microprocessors. *Journal of Signal Processing Systems*, 53(1):145–169, 2008.
- [4] CG Thorat and VS Inamdar. Implementation of new hybrid lightweight cryptosystem. *Applied computing and Informatics*, 2018.
- [5] Guangyong Gao and Yun-Qing Shi. Reversible data hiding using controlled contrast enhancement and integer wavelet transform. *IEEE Signal Processing Letters*, 22(11):2078–2082, 2015.

- [6] Lizhi Xiong, Zhengquan Xu, and Yun-Qing Shi. An integer wavelet transform based scheme for reversible data hiding in encrypted images. *Multi-dimensional Systems and Signal Processing*, 29(3):1191–1202, 2018.
- [7] David Beckman, Amalavoyal N Chari, Srikrishna Devabhaktuni, and John Preskill. Efficient networks for quantum factoring. *Physical Review A*, 54(2):1034, 1996.
- [8] Igor L Markov and Mehdi Saeedi. Constant-optimized quantum circuits for modular multiplication and exponentiation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1202.6614*, 2012.
- [9] Philipp Niemann, Saikat Basu, Amlan Chakrabarti, Niraj K Jha, and Robert Wille. Synthesis of quantum circuits for dedicated physical machine descriptions. In *International Conference on Reversible Computation*, pages 248–264. Springer, 2015.
- [10] Peter W Shor. Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring. In *Proceedings 35th annual symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 124–134. Ieee, 1994.
- [11] Nabila Abdessaied and Rolf Drechsler. *Reversible and Quantum Circuits: Optimization and Complexity Analysis*. Springer International Publishing, Cham, 2016.
- [12] Alwin Zulehner and Robert Wille. *Introducing design automation for quantum computing*, volume 11. Springer, 2020.
- [13] Michael A Nielsen and Isaac Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*, 2002.
- [14] Vivek V Shende, Aditya K Prasad, Igor L Markov, and John P Hayes. Synthesis of reversible logic circuits. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 22(6):710–722, 2003.



- [15] Nabila Abdessaied, Mathias Soeken, Michael Kirkedal Thomsen, and Rolf Drechsler. Upper bounds for reversible circuits based on young subgroups. *Information Processing Letters*, 114(6):282–286, 2014.
- [16] Mehdi Saeedi, Morteza Saheb Zamani, Mehdi Sedighi, and Zahra Sasanian. Reversible circuit synthesis using a cycle-based approach. *ACM Journal on Emerging Technologies in Computing Systems (JETC)*, 6(4):1–26, 2010.
- [17] Robert Wille and Rolf Drechsler. Bdd-based synthesis of reversible logic for large functions. In *Proceedings of the 46th Annual Design Automation Conference*, pages 270–275, 2009.
- [18] Adenilton J da Silva and Daniel K Park. Linear-depth quantum circuits for multi-qubit controlled gates. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.11882*, 2022.
- [19] Ketan N Patel, Igor L Markov, and John P Hayes. Optimal synthesis of linear reversible circuits. *Quantum Inf. Comput.*, 8(3):282–294, 2008.
- [20] Bart Desoete and Alexis De Vos. A reversible carry-look-ahead adder using control gates. *Integration*, 33(1-2):89–104, 2002.
- [21] Adriano Barenco, Charles H Bennett, Richard Cleve, David P DiVincenzo, Norman Margolus, Peter Shor, Tycho Sleator, John A Smolin, and Harald Weinfurter. Elementary gates for quantum computation. *Physical review A*, 52(5):3457, 1995.
- [22] Dmitri Maslov, Gerhard W Dueck, D Michael Miller, and Camille Negravegne. Quantum circuit simplification and level compaction. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 27(3):436–444, 2008.
- [23] Nengkun Yu, Runyao Duan, and Mingsheng Ying. Five two-qubit gates are necessary for implementing the toffoli gate. *Physical Review A*, 88(1):010304, 2013.

- [24] Matthew Amy, Dmitri Maslov, Michele Mosca, and Martin Roetteler. A meet-in-the-middle algorithm for fast synthesis of depth-optimal quantum circuits. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 32(6):818–830, 2013.
- [25] Dmitri Maslov, Gerhard W Dueck, and D Michael Miller. Toffoli network synthesis with templates. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 24(6):807–817, 2005.