

# Illusion of quantum speed-up

Antoni Wójcik\* and Ravindra W. Chhajlany†

*Faculty of Physics, Adam Mickiewicz University,*

*Umultowska 85, 61-614 Poznań, Poland*

(Dated: 9th February 2020)

Quantum computers are believed to surpass classical ones. Moreover, it is claimed that this belief reaches the level of a mathematically proven fact within the so-called oracle model of computation. Here we impair the whole class of the so-called rigorist proofs of quantum speed-up obtained within this model.

PACS numbers: 03.67.Lx

Keywords: quantum computing, quantum algorithms, Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm

Among the reasons underlying recent interest in quantum information processing is a “reasonable hope” [1] that quantum computers could speed up solving certain problems. This belief is supported by many results within the oracle model of computation, which are usually interpreted as rigorist proofs of quantum over classical computation superiority. We show, however, that the generally accepted method of comparing quantum and classical oracles, which is a cornerstone of these proofs, is inconsistent and that the quantum speed-up can disappear when the above-mentioned inconsistency is removed. Let us take as an example the Bernstein-Vazirani problem (BVP)[2, 3]: a  $n$ -bit string  $\vec{k}$  is embodied in an oracle and the goal is to identify  $\vec{k}$ . The classical oracle  $O_S$  (in the so-called standard form) transforms a  $(n + 1)$ -bit input string  $\vec{x} = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n)$  into an output string according to the following rules

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &\xrightarrow{O_S} x_0 \oplus \vec{k} \cdot \vec{x} \\ x_j &\xrightarrow{O_S} x_j \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, n) \end{aligned} \tag{1}$$

where  $\vec{k} \cdot \vec{x} = k_1 x_1 \oplus \dots \oplus k_n x_n$  and  $\oplus$  denotes addition modulo 2.

On the other hand the quantum oracle  $U_S$  is given in the form of a unitary operator acting on a string of qubits instead of bits. Although the algorithms which call different

---

\*Electronic address: antwoj@amu.edu.pl

†Electronic address: ravi@amu.edu.pl

oracles should not be compared, it is generally accepted to compare the “corresponding” classical and quantum oracles. To establish such a correspondence, a computational basis  $|\vec{z}\rangle = |z_0\rangle|z_1\rangle \dots |z_n\rangle$  is defined, *i.e.* for each qubit two orthonormal states are chosen and labeled  $|z_j\rangle$  ( $z = 0, 1$ ). Note that the choice of these states is arbitrary and can be made independently for each qubit. Having defined computational states,  $U_S$  can now be identified by giving its action on these states only

$$\begin{aligned} |z_0\rangle &\xrightarrow{U_S} |z_0 \oplus \vec{k} \cdot \vec{z}\rangle \\ |z_j\rangle &\xrightarrow{U_S} |z_j\rangle, \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, n). \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

The correspondence desired is based just on a formal identity of the transformation rules defining  $U_S$  and  $O_S$  (see Eqs.(1) and (2)). Comparison of two algorithms - the optimal classical algorithm, which needs  $n$  queries to  $O_S$ , with the famous Bernstein-Vazirani quantum algorithm [4] solving the problem with just a single query to  $U_S$ , provides the proof of the quantum speed-up in BVP. Our criticism of this proof starts with noting that  $O_S$  is not a unique oracle that can be considered as a classical counterpart (CCP) of  $U_S$ . Imagine, *e.g.*, that Alice, Bob and Steven are asked to prepare quantum oracles corresponding to three classical oracles  $O_A, O_B$  and  $O_S$ , respectively.  $O_A$  and  $O_B$  are defined in the following way

$$\begin{aligned} x_0 &\xrightarrow{O_A} x_0 \\ x_j &\xrightarrow{O_A} x_j + k_j x_0 \quad (j = 1, 2, \dots, n), \end{aligned} \quad (3)$$

$$\begin{aligned} x_n &\xrightarrow{O_B} x_n + k_n x_0 \\ x_j &\xrightarrow{O_B} x_j \quad (j = 0, 1, \dots, n-1). \end{aligned} \quad (4)$$

Note that BVP can be solved with a single query to  $O_A$ , and cannot be solved at all with the use of  $O_B$ . What can come as a surprise, is that all three parties can prepare the same quantum oracle  $U_A = U_B = U_S$ . This can happen because each party can define the computational basis in a different way. To see this let us denote by  $|\uparrow\rangle$  and  $|\downarrow\rangle$  two arbitrary orthogonal states which span each single qubit Hilbert space. Steven chooses these states as his computational states, *i.e.*

$$\begin{aligned} |0_j\rangle &= |\uparrow\rangle \\ |1_j\rangle &= |\downarrow\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$ . On the other hand Alice's choice is (for  $j = 0, 1, \dots, n$ )

$$\begin{aligned} |0_j\rangle &= 2^{-1/2}(|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle) \\ |1_j\rangle &= 2^{-1/2}(|\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\rangle). \end{aligned} \tag{6}$$

It follows that her quantum oracle  $U_A$  although defined by correspondence with the rules given by Eq.(3) is identical to Steven's oracle  $U_S$ . Bob takes advantage of the arbitrariness in defining each single qubit computational basis states by choosing

$$\begin{aligned} |0_j\rangle &= |\uparrow\rangle \\ |1_j\rangle &= |\downarrow\rangle \end{aligned} \tag{7}$$

for  $j = 1, \dots, n - 1$  and

$$\begin{aligned} |0_j\rangle &= 2^{-1/2}(|\uparrow\rangle + |\downarrow\rangle) \\ |1_j\rangle &= 2^{-1/2}(|\uparrow\rangle - |\downarrow\rangle). \end{aligned} \tag{8}$$

for  $j = 0, n$ . Similarly to Alice's case, the oracle of Bob will again be  $U_B = U_S$ . Obviously, there is no reason to favour any particular choice of computational basis. Thus both  $O_A$  and  $O_B$  should be considered as CCP of  $U_S$  as well as  $O_S$ . Now, the basic question arises: to which of its CCPs -  $O_A$ ,  $O_B$  or  $O_S$  should  $U_S$  be compared? Quantum speed-up obtained by comparing  $U_S$  to  $O_S$  disappears when the latter is replaced by  $O_A$ , whereas it approaches infinity in the case of  $O_B$ . This ambiguity presents a serious challenge, which can be approached in two ways. The first approach simply enforces the earlier mentioned statement that different oracles (*i.e.* quantum and classical) should not be compared. On the other hand, reliable estimation of quantum speed-up seems to be still possible, provided that the optimal CCP of quantum oracle is found and used for comparison. For example, in the case of BVP the quantum oracle  $U_S$  should not be compared with the classical oracle  $O_S$  but with  $O_A$ . Both  $U_S$  and  $O_A$  allow a single query solution of the problem. It follows that the claimed quantum speed-up in BVP is just an artefact of the non-optimal choice of computational basis. The above conclusion, although illustrated by the BVP example, is in fact general. In the light of this reasoning all the so-called rigorous proofs of quantum speed-up obtained previously within the oracle model of computation must be reviewed. This calls for the solution of the nontrivial problem of finding optimal CCP of a given unitary oracle if a reliable comparison of oracles is to be made.

## Acknowledgments

A. W. would like to thank the State Commission for Scientific Research for financial support under grant no. 0 T00A 003 23.

---

- [1] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, *Nature* **404**,247 (2000).
- [2] E. Bernstein, & U. Vazirani, *SIAM J. Comp.* **26**, 1411 (1997).
- [3] B. M. Terhal, & J. A. Smolin, *Phys. Rev.* **A 58**, 1822 (1998).
- [4] R. Cleve, A. Ekert, C. Machiavello, M. Mosca, *Proc R. Soc. London, Ser A* **454**, 339 (1998).