

Quantum Lower Bounds for Fanout

M. Fang* S. Fenner† F. Green‡ S. Homer* Y. Zhang†

November 2, 2018

Abstract: We prove several new lower bounds for constant depth quantum circuits. The main result is that parity (and hence fanout) requires log depth circuits, when the circuits are composed of single qubit and arbitrary size Toffoli gates, and when they use only constantly many ancillae. Under this constraint, this bound is close to optimal. In the case of a non-constant number a of ancillae, we give a tradeoff between a and the required depth, that results in a non-trivial lower bound for fanout when $a = n^{1-o(1)}$.

1 Introduction

There has been significant recent progress in understanding the power of constant depth quantum circuits. Such circuits are of considerable interest as the first quantum circuits will certainly be small circuits with limited gates and constant depth. Much of the progress in this area has been in showing that constant depth circuits are more powerful than their classical counterparts. However, these and other upper bounds seem to require the presence of a (reversible) quantum *fanout* gate. A fanout gate takes an arbitrary number of bits and fans out one of them by taking its XOR with each of the others. Here we consider the question of whether fanout gates are necessary for these upper bounds. We prove several lower bounds showing that fanout cannot be computed using only generalized (i.e., unbounded size) Toffoli and single qubit gates when the number of extra work bits (ancillae) that the circuit uses is limited.

Fanout gates have proved to be unexpectedly powerful. Moore [5] first observed that fanout gates and parity gates, in the presence of single qubit gates using 0 ancillae, are equivalent up to depth 3. This was extended by Green et al. [2]: fanout is even equivalent to *any* MOD_q function (for $q \geq 2$), which determines if the number of 1s in the input is not divisible by q . Here the equivalence is again up to constant depth, but using $O(n)$ ancillae. One may interpret this result by defining quantum circuit classes analogous to classical constant-depth circuit classes. For example, a reasonable analog of the classical unbounded fanin and fanout class AC^0 is QAC_{wf}^0 , the class of constant depth quantum circuit families

*Computer Science Department, Boston University, Boston, MA 02215, {heroes|homer}@bu.edu

†Dept. of CS and Eng., University of South Carolina, Columbia, SC 29208, {fenner|zhang29}@cse.sc.edu

‡Dept. of Math and CS, Clark University, Worcester, MA 01610, fgreen@black.clarku.edu

composed of single qubit, generalized Toffoli, and fanout gates. (Here the subscript “*wf*” denotes “with fanout.”) Similarly one may define quantum analogs of $\text{ACC}(q)$ (called $\text{QACC}(q)$) and ACC (called QACC). Thus the equivalence of fanout with MOD_q implies that, for any $q > 2$, $\text{QAC}_{wf}^0 = \text{QACC}(q) = \text{QACC}$. Contrast this with the fact that $\text{AC}^0 \neq \text{ACC}$, and, for any distinct primes q, p , $\text{ACC}(q) \neq \text{ACC}(p)$ [7, 8]. More recently, Høyer and Spalek [3] have improved these results by proving these same QAC_{wf}^0 circuits can compute threshold functions. Thus $\text{QAC}_{wf}^0 = \text{QTC}^0$, an even sharper contrast with the classical classes. Indeed, this result implies that we can approximate the quantum fast Fourier transform in constant depth using fanout. Thus the “quantum part” of Shor’s renowned quantum factoring algorithm can be carried out with a quite simple, constant depth quantum circuit that uses the fanout operator.

These results suggest the following question: Is fanout really necessary to do the quantum Fourier transform in constant depth? While so much can be “reduced” to *fanout*, it is far from clear how much can be reduced to *fanin*, even in what appears to be its weakest form (i.e., the generalized Toffoli gate). Although generalized Toffoli gates can involve just as many bits as fanout gates, they may be more feasible to implement and it is instructive to investigate their power in constant-depth circuits. Note that Cleve and Watrous [1] proved that with only one and two qubit gates it is not possible to approximate the quantum Fourier transform in less than \log depth, but no similar lower bounds against quantum circuits containing gates of unbounded size are known.

Our main result, proved in Section 4, is that one cannot compute parity (and hence fanout) with QAC^0 circuits (i.e., in constant depth, *without* fanout) using a constant number of ancillæ. This is the first hard evidence that QAC^0 and QAC_{wf}^0 may be different, and that fanout may be necessary for all the upper bound results mentioned above (it certainly is if we can get by with only constantly many ancillæ). The issue of the necessity of ancillæ in quantum computations is a murky one. It is generally accepted that a limited number (polynomially many relative to the number of inputs) are needed. This seems reasonable as it allows polynomially extra space in which to carry out a computation. However, it is possible to approximate any unitary operator with a small set of universal gates without ancillæ (although one apparently needs circuits of great depth and size in order to do so). Furthermore, to our knowledge, no systematic investigation into the absolute necessity of ancillæ has been done. They play a crucial role in the present result, in which we find the lower bound to be difficult to obtain when more than sublinearly many ancillæ are allowed. To help clarify this problem, we provide a proof (implicitly claimed, but omitted, in Cleve and Watrous) that quantum circuits with gates of bounded size must be of \log depth to compute parity (and hence fanout) exactly. In particular, we carefully address the problem of including ancillæ, and show that in this case the depth of the circuit must be $\log n$ to compute parity, no matter how many ancillæ are used. This is given in Section 3. In Section 4, we allow circuits to include Toffoli gates of unbounded size. It is easiest to see the \log -depth lower bound in the case of zero ancillæ, so this result is given first, in Theorem 4.3. We then explain how the proof yields a depth/ancillæ trade-off, showing that with fewer ancillæ one needs greater depth to compute fanout.

We end with some open questions.

2 Preliminaries

In this section we set down most of our notational conventions and the circuit elements we use. Some acquaintance with quantum computational complexity as described in [6] or [4] is assumed.

The following notation and terminology will be convenient. Let \mathcal{H} denote the 2-dimensional Hilbert space spanned by the computational basis states $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$. Let $\mathcal{H}_1, \dots, \mathcal{H}_n$ be n copies of \mathcal{H} . By $\mathcal{B}_{\{1, \dots, n\}}$ (or simply “ \mathcal{B}_n ” when the set notation is clearly understood) we denote the 2^n -dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_n$ spanned by the usual set of computational basis states of the form $|x_1, \dots, x_n\rangle$, where each $x_i \in \{0, 1\}$. We also consider “quotient spaces of $\mathcal{B}_{\{1, \dots, n\}}$ over m bits,” defined as $\mathcal{B}_{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}} = \mathcal{H}_{i_1} \otimes \dots \otimes \mathcal{H}_{i_m}$, where $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\} \subseteq \{1, \dots, n\}$, which obviously have dimension 2^m . A “state over a set of m bits” is a state in such a quotient space. A quantum gate G corresponds to a unitary operator (also denoted G) acting on some quotient space $\mathcal{B}_{\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}}$ of \mathcal{B}_n . We will say that G *involves* the bits i_1, \dots, i_m . We will freely identify G with any “extension by the identity” that acts on a bigger quotient space \mathcal{B}_A for any set of bits $A \supseteq \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$, that is, G can be identified with the operator $G \otimes I$, where I is the identity on $\mathcal{B}_{A - \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}}$. If we fix a state $|\Psi_m\rangle$ over m bits $\{i_1, \dots, i_m\}$, we are effectively restricting $\mathcal{B}_{\{1, \dots, n\}}$ to the 2^{n-m} -dimensional linear subspace $|\Psi_m\rangle \otimes \mathcal{B}_{\{1, \dots, n\} - \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}}$. The space $\mathcal{B}_{\{1, \dots, n\} - \{i_1, \dots, i_m\}}$ is referred to as the quotient space of $\mathcal{B}_{\{1, \dots, n\}}$ *complementary* to $|\Psi_m\rangle$.

A *single-qubit gate* is a 2×2 unitary matrix (e.g., acting in $\mathcal{B}_{\{1\}}$). For example, the Hadamard gate H is the single-qubit gate,

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & -1 \end{bmatrix}.$$

A *generalized Toffoli gate*, which we refer to in this paper as simply a *Toffoli gate* T , transforms computational basis states as follows:

$$T|x_1, \dots, x_n\rangle = |x_1, \dots, x_n, b \oplus \bigwedge_{i=1}^n x_i\rangle$$

A *generalized Z-gate*, which we refer to as a *Z-gate* for brevity, has the following effect:

$$Z|x_1, \dots, x_n\rangle = (-1)^{\bigwedge_{i=1}^n x_i} |x_1, \dots, x_n\rangle.$$

It is not hard to show that, $T = HZH$ where the Hadamard gate H in this equation is applied to the target bit of T . Hence we may substitute Z -gates for T -gates in any circuit that allows Hadamards (which will be true throughout the paper). Z -gates are useful for our purposes since they do not permute computational basis states, and thus have no preferred target bit.

The *fanout* gate F and the *parity* gate P are defined, respectively, by

$$\begin{aligned} F|x_1, \dots, x_n, b\rangle &= |b \oplus x_1, \dots, b \oplus x_n, b\rangle, \\ P|x_1, \dots, x_n, b\rangle &= |x_1, \dots, x_n, b \oplus \bigoplus_{i=1}^n x_i\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

There is no obvious *a priori* relation between these operators, but as was observed by Moore, F is conjugate to P via an $n + 1$ -fold tensor product of Hadamards applied to all the bits:

$$F = H^{\otimes(n+1)} P H^{\otimes(n+1)} \tag{1}$$

Recall that Hadamard, phase, CNOT (Toffoli gates for $n = 1$), and $\pi/8$ gates are a universal set of gates in that any unitary operator can be approximated to an arbitrary degree of precision with them. Our lower bound techniques work against *arbitrary* sets of single-qubit gates combined with Z -gates, which is also a universal set by the above discussion.

A quantum circuit is constructed out of layers. Each layer L is a tensor product of a certain fixed set of gates (in our main theorems, these will consist of single-qubit and Z -gates). A circuit is simply a (matrix) product of layers $L_1 L_2 \cdots L_d$. (Observe that “last” layer L_d is actually the one that is applied directly to the inputs, and L_1 is the output layer.) The number of layers d is called the *depth* of C . A circuit C over n qubits is then a unitary operator in the 2^n -dimensional Hilbert space $\mathcal{B}_{\{1, \dots, n\}}$. Clearly, C computes a unitary operator U *exactly* if for all computational basis states, $C|x_1, \dots, x_n\rangle = U|x_1, \dots, x_n\rangle$. This is in general too restrictive, however. One must allow for the presence of “work bits,” called *ancillæ*, that make extra space available in which to do a computation. In that case, in order to exactly compute the operator U we extend the Hilbert space in which C acts to the 2^{n+m} -dimensional space spanned by computational basis states $|x_1, \dots, x_n, a_1, \dots, a_m\rangle$, where again $x_i, a_i \in \{0, 1\}$, the a_i serving as ancillæ. Then we say that C *cleanly computes* U if, for any x_1, \dots, x_n and y_1, \dots, y_n ,

$$\langle y_1, \dots, y_n, 0, \dots, 0 | C | x_1, \dots, x_n, 0, \dots, 0 \rangle = \langle y_1, \dots, y_n, 0, \dots, 0 | (U \otimes I) | x_1, \dots, x_n, 0, \dots, 0 \rangle,$$

where I is the identity in the subspace that acts on the ancillæ, and the number of 0s in each state above is m . That is, C does a clean computation if the ancillæ begin and end all as 0s. We assume all of our circuits perform clean computations. This is a reasonable constraint, since only then is it easy to compose the circuits.

Lastly, all circuits should be understood to be elements of an infinite *family* of circuits $\{C_n | n \geq 0\}$, where C_n is a quantum circuit for n qubits.

3 Fanout Requires Log Depth with Bounded Size Gates

It is easy to see that, by an obvious divide-and-conquer strategy, we can compute parity in depth $\log n$ using just CNOT gates and 0 ancillæ. In this section we prove this is optimal




Figure 1: Decomposition of the layers of the circuit C .

for any bounded size multi-qubit gates, and furthermore that no number of ancillae help to reduce the depth of the circuit.

Let $C = L_1 \cdots L_d$ consist entirely of arbitrary two-qubit gates and single-qubit gates. (The extension to arbitrary, but fixed, size gates is straightforward.) Further suppose that M is an observable on a single qubit in the last layer. Let L'_1 denote the gate whose output M is measuring. L'_1 could be a two-qubit or a single-qubit gate. In either case, $L_1 = L'_1 \otimes R_1$, where R_1 is the tensor product of all the other gates in that layer, if any. More generally, we decompose layer i similarly, writing $L_i = L'_i \otimes R_i$, where L'_i is a transformation that acts on some subset of the bits, and R_i acts on the rest.

Lemma 3.1. For each d , there are layers L'_1, \dots, L'_d such that

$$L_d^\dagger L_{d-1}^\dagger \cdots L_1^\dagger M L_1 \cdots L_{d-1} L_d = L_d'^\dagger L_{d-1}'^\dagger \cdots L_1'^\dagger M L_1' \cdots L_{d-1}' L_d'$$

where, for each i , L'_i acts on at most 2^i bits. Furthermore, for each i , L'_i acts on bits with indices in some set S_i such that $S_d \supseteq S_{d-1} \supseteq \dots \supseteq S_1$.

Figure 1 makes the notation a little clearer. Note that the *input* will, as usual, be on the *left*, but it doesn't enter the claim (or the following argument) at all.

Proof: The proof of Lemma 3.1 is by induction on d . First consider $d = 1$. Then consider the operator $L_1^\dagger M L_1$. By the observations above, we may write $L_1 = L'_1 \otimes R_1$, where L'_1 is either a single or two-qubit gate. So,

$$L_1^\dagger M L_1 = (L_1'^\dagger \otimes R_1^\dagger) M (L'_1 \otimes R_1) = L_1'^\dagger M L_1',$$

by virtue of the fact that M and R_1 commute. Since L'_1 only depends on ≤ 2 qubits, this establishes the result for $d = 1$.

Now suppose that we can write,

$$L_d^\dagger L_{d-1}^\dagger \cdots L_1^\dagger M L_1 \cdots L_{d-1} L_d = L_d'^\dagger L_{d-1}'^\dagger \cdots L_1'^\dagger M L_1' \cdots L_{d-1}' L_d'$$

where, for each i , L'_i acts on at most 2^i bits. In particular, note that L'_d acts on at most 2^d bits. Suppose that L'_d acts on indices in the set S_d (where S_d has size $\leq 2^d$). Now by the induction hypothesis,

$$L'_{d+1}L'_d \cdots L'_1 M L_1 \cdots L_d L_{d+1} = L'_{d+1}L'_d \cdots L'_1 M L'_1 \cdots L'_d L_{d+1},$$

and $S_d \supseteq S_{d-1} \supseteq \dots \supseteq S_1$.

The gates in L'_d involve at most the bits in S_d . Since the circuit only contains at most two-qubit gates, all the gates in L_{d+1} involving bits in S_d can act on at most 2^{d+1} bits. Let the tensor product of these gates be denoted by L'_{d+1} , and S_{d+1} denote the set of bits on which L'_{d+1} acts. Clearly $S_{d+1} \supseteq S_d$. Then for some tensor product of single and two-qubit gates R_{d+1} we may write $L_{d+1} = L'_{d+1} \otimes R_{d+1}$. Since R_{d+1} acts on bits not in S_{d+1} , it commutes with all the L'_i and M , which only act on bits inside S_{d+1} . Hence R_{d+1} “cancels out” and we have the desired relation. \square

Theorem 3.2. Let C be a quantum circuit on n inputs of depth d , consisting of single-qubit and two-qubit gates, with any number of ancillæ that cleanly computes parity exactly. Then $d \geq \log n$. If C computes fanout in the same way, then $d \geq \log n - 2$.

Proof: Let $C = L_1 \cdots L_d$ as in Lemma 3.1. Suppose C uses m ancillæ, and that it cleanly computes the parity operator P in depth $d < \log n$. It follows that for any x_1, \dots, x_n, b and any measurement operator M on the target bit,

$$\langle x_1, \dots, x_n, b, 0, \dots, 0 | C^\dagger M C | x_1, \dots, x_n, 0, \dots, 0 \rangle = \langle x_1, \dots, x_n, b | P M P | x_1, \dots, x_n, b \rangle. \quad (2)$$

By Lemma 3.1,

$$C^\dagger M C = L'_d L'_{d-1} \cdots L'_1 M L_1 \cdots L_{d-1} L_d = L'_d L'_{d-1} \cdots L'_1 M L'_1 \cdots L'_{d-1} L'_d,$$

where the operator $L'_1 \cdots L'_d$ acts on at most 2^d inputs. Since $2^d < n$, there is an input on which that operator does not act. Hence the value on the left hand side of eq. (2) remains unchanged if we can flip some x_i . However, the outcome of the measurement on the parity gate on the right hand side depends on every input, which is a contradiction.

The second assertion in the Theorem follows from eq. (1). \square

It is clear that if we have a family of circuits that use a fixed set of multi-qubit gates with arity independent of n , that a similar proof will work. Thus we have the following as a corollary of the proof of Theorem 3.2:

Corollary 3.3. Let C be a quantum circuit on n inputs of depth d , consisting of single-qubit and multi-qubit gates of size $O(1)$, with any number of ancillæ, that cleanly computes parity, or fanout, exactly. Then $d = \Omega(\log n)$.

4 Parity Requires Log Depth with Few Ancillæ

In this section we treat circuits that contain Toffoli gates or, equivalently, Z -gates, of arbitrary size (i.e., that can depend on n). The technique of the preceding section does not work in this case. This is because the large gates in general do not cancel, since they may not commute with the measurement operator M .

To see how to proceed, it is useful to briefly consider classical circuits with similar constraints. Suppose we have a classical circuit with NOT gates and unbounded fan-in AND and OR gates, but that we do *not* allow any fanout. Once inputs (or outputs of other gates) are used in either an AND or an OR gate, they can not be used again. It is obvious that if such a circuit has constant depth, it cannot compute such functions as parity. The AND and OR gates can be killed off by restricting a small set of inputs, resulting in a constant function, while parity depends on all the inputs.

In the quantum case, it appears again that the only thing to do is to attempt to “kill off” the large Toffoli gates. However, the quantum case is much more subtle since we must face the fact that intermediate states are a superposition of computational basis states, and furthermore that the Z -gates, in combination with the single-qubit gates, may cause entanglement.

As before, write $C = L_1 L_2 \cdots L_d$. Thus the circuit C transforms the state $|\Psi\rangle$ to $L_1 \cdots L_d |\Psi\rangle$. We assume wlog that each layer L_i is a tensor product of Z -gates and single-qubit gates. Further assume wlog that a specific bit (say, the n^{th} bit) of C serves as the output or *target* bit (which eventually is supposed to agree with the output bit of a parity gate).

Our main technical lemma is easiest to see in the case that C has *no ancillæ*, which we assume until later in the section:

Lemma 4.1. Let C be a circuit as described above, with no ancillæ. Then for each $1 \leq k \leq d$, there exists a state $|\Psi_k\rangle$ over at most 2^k bits such that for any state $|R\rangle$ in the quotient space of \mathcal{B}_n complementary to $|\Psi_k\rangle$, the state $L_1 L_2 \cdots L_k (|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi_k\rangle)$ has a 0 in the target position of C .

Proof: The proof is by induction on k . First let $k = 1$. There are two cases:

1. In layer L_1 , the target is the output of a single-qubit gate S . Then let the state $|\Psi_1\rangle = S^\dagger|0\rangle$ over the n^{th} bit. Now we may write $L_1 = L'_1 \otimes S$, where L'_1 acts on the quotient space \mathcal{R} complementary to $|\Psi_1\rangle$. No matter what state $|R\rangle \in \mathcal{R}$ we choose over the bits $\{1, \dots, n-1\}$, it follows that $L_1(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi_1\rangle) = (L'_1|R\rangle) \otimes (S|\Psi_1\rangle) = (L'_1|R\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle$ has a 0 in the n^{th} position.
2. In layer L_1 , the target is the output of a Z -gate. Write $L_1 = L'_1 \otimes G$, where G is this Z gate. In this case, we choose $|\Psi_1\rangle = |0\rangle$ over the n^{th} bit. Now G acts both on $|\Psi_1\rangle$ as well as the complementary quotient space \mathcal{R} (via extension by the identity). But since G involves a bit that is 0 (i.e., the n^{th} bit), G is equivalent to the unit matrix in \mathcal{R} . Hence for any state $|R\rangle \in \mathcal{R}$, $L_1(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi_1\rangle) = (L'_1 \otimes G)(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi_1\rangle) = (L'_1|R\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle$ again has a 0 in the n^{th} position.




Figure 2: The sets K_k and R_k . A Z gate that involves bits in both sets is shown.

Now suppose the assertion is true for $k-1$ where $k > 1$. We will show that it remains true for k . Suppose the $|\Psi_{k-1}\rangle$ in the assertion is a state over the (at most) 2^{k-1} bits in the set K_{k-1} . Let R_{k-1} denote the rest of the bits $\{1, \dots, n\} - K_{k-1}$. Thus $|\Psi_{k-1}\rangle$ is a state in $\mathcal{B}_{K_{k-1}}$, and the quotient space complementary to $|\Psi_{k-1}\rangle$ is $\mathcal{B}_{R_{k-1}}$, which for convenience we denote by \mathcal{R}_{k-1} . We specify the state $|\Psi_k\rangle$ as follows: Start with $K_k := K_{k-1}$ and $R_k := R_{k-1}$. If a Z -gate G in L_k involves bits both in K_k and in R_k , we remove a *single* bit from R_k on which G acts, add it to K_k , declare the gate G *killed*, and remove G from further consideration. Continue until all such Z -gates have been killed. Since each bit in K_{k-1} can be involved with at most one Z -gate in L_k , the number of bits added to K_k (and removed from R_k) in this process is at most 2^{k-1} . Let $L_k^{(K)}$ denote the gates in L_k that involve the bits in K_k , excluding the Z -gates that have been killed. Then finally, we define the state $|\Psi_k\rangle$ as the tensor product of $L_k^{(K)\dagger}|\Psi_{k-1}\rangle$ with the state in which all the bits in $K_k - K_{k-1}$ are 0.

Note that $|\Psi_k\rangle$ is a state over at most $2 \cdot 2^{k-1} = 2^k$ bits, as seen in Figure 2.

Let \mathcal{R}_k denote the quotient space complementary to $|\Psi_k\rangle$. Clearly, $\mathcal{R}_k = \mathcal{B}_{R_k}$. Now let $|R\rangle$ be any state in \mathcal{R}_k (equivalently, over the bits in R_k), and apply L_k to $|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi_k\rangle$. Let $L_k^{(R)}$ denote the gates in L_k acting in \mathcal{R}_k , again excluding the Z -gates that have been killed. Note that any Z -gate in layer L_k that involves bits in K_k as well as R_k acts as the identity on $\mathcal{R}_k \otimes |\Psi_k\rangle$, by the construction of $|\Psi_k\rangle$. Thus we have eliminated these gates from L_k without any loss of generality. Thus,

$$L_k(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi_k\rangle) = (L_k^{(R)} \otimes L_k^{(K)})(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi_k\rangle) = (L_k^{(R)}|R\rangle) \otimes (L_k^{(K)}|\Psi_k\rangle).$$

Now $L_k^{(K)}|\Psi_k\rangle$ is the tensor product of $|\Psi_{k-1}\rangle$ with a number of $|0\rangle$ states. So we conclude that $L_k(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi_k\rangle)$ is of the form $|R'\rangle \otimes |\Psi_{k-1}\rangle$ for some state $|R'\rangle \in \mathcal{R}_{k-1}$. Then,

$$L_1 L_2 \cdots L_{k-1} L_k(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi_k\rangle) = L_1 L_2 \cdots L_{k-1}(|R'\rangle \otimes |\Psi_{k-1}\rangle).$$

By the induction hypothesis, the right hand side of the above equation has a 0 target bit, which proves the lemma. \square

Remark. With a bit more careful analysis, Lemma 4.1 can be improved to the following:

Lemma 4.2. Let C be a circuit as described above. Then for each $1 \leq k \leq d$, there exists a state $|\Psi_k\rangle$ over at most $2^{k/2}$ bits such that for any state $|R\rangle$ in the quotient space of \mathcal{B}_n complementary to $|\Psi_k\rangle$, the state $L_1 L_2 \cdots L_k(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi_k\rangle)$ has a 0 in the target position of C .

The difference is that now $|\Psi_k\rangle$ is over only $2^{k/2}$ bits instead of 2^k . Instead of giving a formal proof, we will just sketch the reasons for Lemma 4.2. When some bit (the i^{th} bit, say) is moved from R_k to K_k , it is set to the $|0\rangle$ state. Consider the gate G (if any) in L_{k+1} that involves this bit. If G is a single-qubit gate, then no Z -gate is killed involving the i^{th} bit, so no additional bit needs to be added to K_{k+1} for the sake of the i^{th} bit. If G is a Z -gate, then the i^{th} bit alone is enough to kill G , since this bit is already 0. So again, no additional bit must be added to K_{k+1} to kill G . Thus k must increase by 2 for the size of K_k to double. Note that we handled the base case of Lemma 4.1 this way, obtaining a state over $1 = 2^0$ bits.

Theorem 4.3. Let C be a circuit of depth d consisting of single-qubit gates and Z -gates, and uses 0 ancillæ. If $d < 2 \log n$, then C cannot compute P .

Proof: Suppose $C = P$. Then for any input state, the target bit of C is 0 iff the target bit of P is 0. By Lemma 4.2, there exists a state $|\Psi\rangle$ on at most $2^{d/2} < n$ bits such that, for any state $|R\rangle$ on the remaining $n - 2^{d/2}$ bits, $C(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi\rangle)$ has a 0 value for the target. First let $|R\rangle$ be the state with 0s in all $n - 2^{d/2}$ positions (since $n - 2^{d/2} > 0$, such positions exist). Then $P(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi\rangle)$ has a 0 target. This is only possible if the state $|\Psi\rangle$ is in a quotient space of \mathcal{B}_n spanned by computational basis states in which an even number of the variables are 1. Now change one of the bits of $|R\rangle$ from 0 to 1. The target of $C(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi\rangle)$ still has the value 0, but the target of $P(|R\rangle \otimes |\Psi\rangle)$ must change to 1, which contradicts the assumption that $C = P$. \square

Since fanout and parity are equivalent up to depth 3 (with 0 ancillæ), we have immediately the following.

Corollary 4.4. Let C be a circuit of depth d consisting of single-qubit gates and Z -gates, and uses 0 ancillæ. Then, if $d < 2 \log n - 2$, C cannot compute the fanout operation.

We now consider the case in which our circuit has a non-zero number of ancillæ. Firstly, it is clear that Lemmas 4.1 and 4.2 work if we set a target and all ancillæ to 0 at the same time. If there are a many ancillæ, then we are setting $a + 1$ “outputs.” The conclusion of the analogous Lemma for a ancillæ would then be that the state $|\Psi\rangle$ is over $(a + 1)2^{d/2}$ bits (since the number of “committed” bits doubles with each second layer, as in Lemma 4.2). These bits may include all the ancillæ, and assuming that C does a clean computation, $|\Psi\rangle$ will be 0 on the ancillæ (since they must all start out as 0 in order to return to their final value of 0). Therefore, if $n > (a + 1)2^{d/2}$, the state $|R\rangle$ does not involve any of the ancillæ and is thus free to take on any value. Thus if $n > (a + 1)2^{d/2}$, the output of C is insensitive

to changes in at least one of the inputs, and hence the circuit is defeated as before. Note we have a depth/ancillæ trade-off as a result. We thus have the following corollary of the proof of Theorem 4.3:

Corollary 4.5. Let C be a circuit of depth d consisting of single-qubit gates and Z -gates. Then, if C cleanly computes the parity function with a ancillæ, then $d \geq 2 \log(n/(a+1))$.

We conjecture that d must be at least $2 \log n$ no matter what a is.

We offer an alternative interpretation of our result that arose out of conversations with L. Longpré. Let us say that a quantum circuit C *robustly computes* a unitary operator U if C computes U cleanly and, in addition, if its output is insensitive to the initial state of the ancillæ. Thus the ancillæ of C can start out in any state whatsoever; the circuit C is guaranteed to return the ancillæ to that state in the end, and always gives the same answer. This of course puts a much stronger constraint on the circuit (since in the usual model we only insist on a clean computation when the ancillæ are initialized to 0), but such circuits can be useful (e.g., see exercise 8.5 in Kitaev et al. [4]). It is not hard to see that in this case, if C consists only of single-qubit and Toffoli gates, then it must have depth $\log n$ to compute parity, regardless of the number of ancillæ.

5 Conclusions and Open Problems

Following the line of earlier work of Green et al., Høyer and Spalek, and Cleve and Watrous [1], our main result gives an optimal, $O(\log n)$ lower bound on the depth of QAC-type circuits computing fanout, in the presence of limited (slightly sublinear) numbers of ancillæ. It would clearly be desirable to extend our result to obtain the same conclusion when polynomially many (or an unlimited number of) ancillæ are allowed, and thus to prove that $\text{QAC}^0 \neq \text{QAC}_{wf}^0$.

The role of ancillæ in quantum computation has not received much detailed attention. Prompted by our considerations here, there are several interesting questions that arise. One issue is the necessity of ancillæ for specific quantum computations or classes of quantum computations. Is there a problem that can be done in constant depth with ancillæ but which requires $\log n$ depth without ancillæ? Similarly, are there computational problems for which $\log n$ depth is possible with ancillæ but without ancillæ, polynomial depth is needed? In general, how many ancillæ are needed for specific problems? Is there a general tradeoff that can be proved between numbers of ancillæ and circuit depth?

While much has recently been learned concerning constant depth circuit classes, a few interesting questions still remain. It would be worthwhile to be able to distinguish between the power of quantum gates of unbounded arity. We have seen that Toffoli and Z gates (which are equivalent up to constant depth) are weaker than parity and fanout (which are equivalent not only to each other but also, for all intents and purposes, to other mod gates, threshold gates and the quantum Fourier transform). Are there other natural types of gates that lie between these two classes, or is every gate either equivalent, up to constant depth,

to either single qubit and CNOT gates, or to Toffoli gates, or to parity? It would also be of interest to characterize exactly what can be computed in constant depth using only single qubit and CNOT gates, as even very optimistically, this is the kind of circuit that might be built in the not too distant future.

6 Acknowledgements

We thank Luc Longpré for helpful discussions and comments on this paper. This work was supported in part by the National Security Agency (NSA) and Advanced Research and Development Agency (ARDA) under Army Research Office (ARO) contract numbers DAAD 19-02-1-0058 (for M. Fang, S. Homer, and F. Green) and DAAD 19-02-1-0048 (for S. Fenner and Y. Zhang).

References

- [1] R. Cleve and J. Watrous, “Fast parallel circuits for the quantum Fourier transform,” *Proceedings of the 41st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science* (2000), 526–536.
- [2] F. Green, S. Homer, C. Moore and C. Pollett, ”Counting, Fanout and the Complexity of Quantum ACC,” *Quantum Information and Computation* **2** (2002) 35–65.
- [3] P. Høyer and R. Spalek, “Quantum circuits with unbounded fan-out,” *20th STACS Conference, 2003*, LNCS 2607, 234–246.
- [4] A. Yu. Kitaev, A. H. Shen, and M. N. Vyalyi, *Classical and Quantum Computation*, American Mathematical Society, 2002.
- [5] Cristopher Moore. Quantum Circuits: Fanout, Parity, and Counting. In Los Alamos Preprint archives (1999), quant-ph/9903046.
- [6] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, 2001.
- [7] A. A. Razborov, Lower bounds on the size of bounded depth networks over a complete basis with logical addition, *Matematicheskie Zametki* **41** (1987) 598-607. English translation in *Mathematical Notes of the Academy of Sciences of the USSR* **41** (1987) 333-338.
- [8] R. Smolensky, Algebraic methods in the theory of lower bounds for Boolean circuit complexity, in *Proceedings of the 19th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing* (1987) 77-82.