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The Role of Fourier Transform in Quantum Speed-ups
The Role of Fourier Transform in Quantum Speed-ups

Two opposing views:

- (van Dam) The Quantum Fourier Transform (QFT) is all there is to quantum algorithms, since the Toffoli gate and the Hadamard gate (the $\mathbb{Z}_2$ QFT) is an universal gate set

- (Hallgren, Harrow ’08) Almost any sufficiently long quantum circuit is useful for quantum speed-ups in the query complexity setting
(Hallgren, Harrow ‘08) Almost any sufficiently long quantum circuit is useful for quantum speed-ups in the query complexity setting.
The Role of Fourier in The Fourier Sampling Problem

(Hallgren, Harrow ’08) Almost any sufficiently long quantum circuit is useful for quantum speed-ups in the query complexity setting

- Almost any circuit can be used to solve a certain variant of Bernstein and Vazirani Fourier Sampling Problem with $O(1)$ queries vs. $\Omega(n)$ classical queries.

- The linear separation can be boosted by recursion to a polynomial versus superpolynomial gap, as in the original FSP

Can we apply the same trick to other oracle problems?
Can we get exponential speed-ups?
Can we get a simpler oracle problem? 😊
Yes we can

We show how generic circuits are “useful” for superexponential speed-ups by a simple adaptation of Fourier Checking Problem (Aar ‘09)
The plan

1. Review Fourier Checking
2. Introduce $U$-Circuit Checking
3. Classical Query Complexity of $U$-Circuit Checking
4. Quantum Query Complexity $U$-Circuit Checking
5. Family of unitaries exhibiting exponential speed-ups
6. Random Quantum Circuits are Unitary 3-designs
Fourier Checking

(Aaronson ‘09) Given two functions

\[ f, g : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1,1\} \]

with the promise that either

- f and g are chosen independently and uniformly at random
- f and g are forrelated: \( f(x)=\text{sgn}(u_x) \) and \( g(x)=\text{sgn}(\hat{u}_x) \) for a vector \( u = (u_1, u_2, \ldots) \) with i.i.d. entries drawn from a Normal \( N(0, 1) \) distribution and

\[
\hat{u}_x = \sum_{y \in \{0,1\}^n} (-1)^{x \cdot y} u_y
\]

Decide which is the case
Query Complexity of Fourier Checking

(Aar ‘09) Fourier Checking can be solved with $O(1)$ quantum queries and $O(1)$ quantum time.

It requires $\Omega(2^{n/4})$ classical queries, even with postselection.

A superexponential separation of quantum and postselected classical query complexities.

Quantum Algorithm:

$|+\rangle = \langle 0| + |1\rangle / \sqrt{2}$

$f$ : $H^\otimes n$ : $g$
Query Complexity of Fourier Checking

(Aar '09) Fourier Checking can be solved with $O(1)$ quantum queries and $O(1)$ quantum time.

- If $f$ and $g$ are independent random: $\Pr(\text{Accept}) = 2^{-n}$
- If $f$ and $g$ are forrelated: $\Pr(\text{Accept}) \geq \Omega(1)$

Quantum Algorithm:

$|+\rangle \rightarrow f \rightarrow H^\otimes n \rightarrow g \rightarrow |+\rangle$
The Role of Fourier in Fourier Checking

The Fourier Transform appears both in the definition of Fourier Checking and in the quantum algorithm solving it.

What property of the Fourier Transform is being exploited? Can we replace it by other mapping?
U-Circuit Checking

Given two functions

\[ f, g : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{-1, 1\} \]

with the promise that either

- f and g are chosen independently and uniformly at random
- f and g are *U-correlated*: \( f(x) = \text{sgn}(u_x) \) and \( g(x) = \text{sgn}(\text{Re}(\hat{u}_x)) \) for a vector \( u = (u_1, u_2, ...) \) with i.i.d. entries drawn from a Normal \( N(0, 1) \) distribution and

\[ \hat{u}_x = \sum_{y \in \{0, 1\}^n} U_{x,y} u_y \]

For a unitary \( U \). Decide which is the case
Lemma 1. U-circuit checking can be solved with $O(1)$ quantum queries and $O(1)$ quantum time for any unitary $U$ such that

$$\sum_{x,y} \text{Re}(U_{x,y})^2 \geq \Omega(1)$$

Obs: For any unitary $U$, either $U$ or $iU$ satisfies the condition of the Lemma.

Quantum Algorithm:
Quantum Query Complexity of $U$-Circuit Checking

Quantum Algorithm:
Quantum Query Complexity of $U$-Circuit Checking

Quantum Algorithm:

- If $f$ and $g$ are independent random: $\Pr(\text{Accept}) = 2^{-n}$
- If $f$ and $g$ are forrelated: $\Pr(\text{Accept}) \geq \Omega(1)$

Proof: Berry-Esseen theorem + simple algebra
Classical Query Complexity of $U$-Circuit Checking

We show an exponential lower bound for the classical query complexity of $U$-Circuit Checking for any unitary $U$ which is fairly flat.
Classical Query Complexity of $U$-Circuit Checking

We show an \textit{exponential lower bound} for the classical query complexity of \textit{$U$-Circuit Checking} for any unitary $U$ which is \textit{fairly flat}.

\textbf{Def 1.} (Flatness measure) For a unitary $U$ we define

$$C(U) := - \log(\max_{x, y} |U_{x, y}|^2)$$
Classical Query Complexity of $U$-Circuit Checking

We show an exponential lower bound for the classical query complexity of $U$-Circuit Checking for any unitary $U$ which is fairly flat.

**Def 1.** (Flatness measure) For a unitary $U$ we define

$$C(U) := -\log(\max_{x, y} |U_{x, y}|^2)$$

**Lemma 2.** The classical query complexity of $U$-Circuit Checking, with postselection, is lower bounded by $2^{C(U)/7}$.

Thus there is a superexponential gap of quantum and classical query complexities for every $n$-qubit $U$ such that $C(U) \geq \Omega(n)$,

$$C(H^\otimes n) = n \quad C(Diag(w_1, \ldots, w_{2^n})) = 0$$
Families of “Flat” Circuits

Lemma 3. (i) Let $U_G$ be the the QFT over the group $G$. Then
\[ C(U_G) \geq \log |G| / 2 \]

(ii) Given an $2^{-9n}$-approximate unitary 3-design on $n$ qubits all but a $2^{-n/2}$-fraction of its elements satisfy
\[ C(U) \geq n/6 \]

Def 2. An ensemble of unitaries \{\mu(dU), U\} on $U(d)$ is an $\epsilon$-approximate unitary $t$-design if for every balanced monomial
\[ M = U_{p1, q1... p_t, q_t} U^*_{r1, s1... r_t, s_t}, \]
\[ |E_\mu(M(U)) - E_{\text{haar}}(M(U))| \leq d^{2t} \epsilon \]
Families of “Flat” Circuits

Lemma 3. (i) Let $U_G$ be the QFT over the group $G$. Then $C(U_G) \geq \log |G| / 2$

(ii) Given an $2^{-9n}$-approximate unitary 3-design on $n$ qubits all but a $2^{-n/2}$-fraction of its elements satisfy $C(U) \geq n/6$

Def 2. An ensemble of unitaries $\{\mu(dU), U\}$ on $U(d)$ is an $\varepsilon$-approximate unitary $t$-design if for every balanced monomial $M = U_{p_1, q_1} ... U_{p_t, q_t} U^*_{r_1, s_1} ... U^*_{r_t, s_t}$,

$$|E_\mu(M(U)) - E_{\text{haar}}(M(U))| \leq d^{2t} \varepsilon$$
Most Quantum Circuits Are Flat

Main Technical Result:

Lemma 4. $5n \log(1/\epsilon)$-size local random quantum circuits form a $\epsilon$-approximate unitary 3-design

Def 3. Local Random Circuit: In each step an index is chosen uniformly at random and a two-qubit Haar unitary on $U(4)$ is applied to qubits $i$ and $i+1$

Hence all but a $2^{-\Omega(n)}$-fraction of $O(n^2)$-sized quantum circuits $U$ are such that $U$-Circuit Checking has a $O(1)$ vs $2^{\Omega(n)}$ quantum-to-classical gap in query complexity
Random Circuits as t-Designs

Previous work:

1. (Oliveira, Dalhsten, Plenio ’07; Harrow, Low ’08): Random Quantum Circuits are approximate 2-design
2. (Arnaud, Braun ’08): Numerical evidence that random quantum circuits are t-design for arbitrary t
3. (Znidaric ’08): Proof that RQC are approximate 2-design by mapping the mixing time of the walk to spectral properties of local quantum Hamiltonians
4. (Brown, Viola ’09): Argument that RQC are t-design for arbitrary t using connection to local quantum Hamiltonians and using a plausible - but unproven - assumption of the spectral gap of a Lipkin-Meshkov-Glick model (SU(4^t) multilevel)
Random Circuits are 3-design

Lemma 4 (again). $5n \log(1/\varepsilon)$-size local random quantum circuits form a $\varepsilon$-approximate unitary 3-design.

The main ingredient in the proof is the following technique from quantum many-body theory for bounding the spectral gap of local quantum Hamiltonians:

(Knabe ‘88) Let $H = \sum_k H_{k,k+1}$ be a 1D TI frustration-free local Hamiltonian with zero groundstate energy. Then

$$\Delta \left( \sum_{k=1}^{N} H_{k,k+1} \right) \geq \frac{n}{n-1} \left( \Delta \left( \sum_{k=1}^{n} H_{k,k+1} \right) - \frac{1}{n} \right)$$

In particular, \( \Delta \left( \sum_{k=1}^{N} H_{k,k+1} \right) \geq 2\Delta(H_{1,2} + H_{2,3}) - 1 \)
Random Circuits are 3-design

Lemma 4 (again). $5n \log(1/\varepsilon)$-size local random quantum circuits form a $\varepsilon$-approximate unitary 3-design

Proof Sketch: Let $G_{\mu^k, t} := \int_{U(d)} \mu^k (dU) U^{\otimes t} \otimes \overline{U}^{\otimes t}$

with $\mu^k := \int \delta_{U_1...U_k} \mu(dU_1)...\mu(dU_k)$

We show: $\left\| G_{\mu^k, t} - G_{\mu_H, t} \right\|_\infty \leq \left( 1 - \frac{1}{5n} \right)^k$, with $\mu_H$ the Haar measure.

We have $\left\| G_{\mu^k, t} - G_{\mu_H, t} \right\|_\infty \leq \left( \lambda_2(M_{t,n}) \right)^k$, with $M_{t,n} := \frac{1}{n} \sum_i P_{i,i+1}$

and $P_{i,i+1} := \int_{U(d)} \mu_H (dU) U_{i,i+1}^{\otimes t} \otimes \overline{U}_{i,i+1}^{\otimes t}$
Proof Sketch (part 2): The key step is the inequality:

\[ \lambda_2(M_{t,n}) \leq 1 - \frac{3 - 4\lambda_2(M_{t,3})}{n} \]

(We can bound the mixing time of the random walk on \( n \) qubits but the mixing time of the same walk on \( 3 \) qubits!)

It follows by applying Knabe’s trick to \( H := \sum H_{i,i+1} = n(I - M_{t,n}) \) with \( H_{i,i+1} := I - P_{i,i+1} \) (\( H \) is TI, frustration free and has zero ground-energy).

Finally we compute \( \lambda_2(M_{3,3}) = \frac{7}{10} \), giving \( \lambda_2(M_{3,n}) \leq 1 - (5n)^{-1} \)
Open Questions

• Can the Fourier transform be replaced by generic circuits in other oracle problems (e.g. Simon’s, ...)?

• Does U-Circuit Checking for a generic family of \{U_n\} provide an oracle separation of BQP and the polynomial hierarchy? (See talk on work by Fefferman and Umans on Friday)

• Are random quantum circuits approximate poly(n)-designs? Can the same technique be applied to t>3?

Thank you!