Symmetries, graph properties, and quantum speedups

Daochen Wang (Maryland) FOCS 2020, full version: arXiv: 2006.12760



Shalev Ben-David (Waterloo)



Andrew Childs (Maryland)



(Caltech)







(Ottawa)

Quantum speedups in query complexity

Query complexity

Let Σ be a finite alphabet and let $f : \mathcal{D} \subset \Sigma^n \to \{0, 1\}$ be a known function.

- ► How many positions of input x ∈ D do you need to query to compute f(x) with high probability in the worst case?
- ► Answer denoted R(f) and Q(f) in the classical and quantum cases respectively. Quantumly, can query x in superposition.
- We want to know when $R(f) = Q(f)^{\omega(1)}$ (large speedup) and when $R(f) = Q(f)^{O(1)}$ (small speedup).
- Interesting facts:
 - 1. When $\mathcal{D} = \Sigma^n$, there can only be small speedups¹.
 - 2. Large speedups exist! For example, in 1997, Simon exhibited an f with $R(f) = \Theta(\sqrt{n})$ and $Q(f) = \Theta(\log(n))$.

¹Beals, Buhrman, Cleve, Mosca, and de Wolf (2001); Aaronson, Ben-David, Kothari, and Tal (2020).

Characterization of quantum speedups for symmetric functions: "must be small for hypergraph-based symmetries, else can be large"

Symmetric functions

Definition

Let $f : \mathcal{D} \subset \Sigma^n \to \{0, 1\}$ be a function. f is symmetric under a permutation group G on $\{1, \ldots, n\}$ if, for all $\pi \in G$, we have:

1.
$$x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n) \in \mathcal{D} \implies x \circ \pi \coloneqq (x_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\pi(n)}) \in \mathcal{D}.$$

2.
$$f(x) = f(x \circ \pi)$$
 for all $x \in \mathcal{D}$.

Near-complete characterization theorem

Prior art²: small quantum speedup for f symmetric under $G = S_n$. Our theorem:



²Aaronson and Ambainis (2009); Chailloux (2018).

・ロト ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ ・ 日 ・ うへぐ

There exists an exponential quantum speedup for graph property testing in the adjacency list model

< □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > < □ > <

The glued trees problem

Given access to the adjacency list of a glued trees graph and the label of ENTRANCE, a quantum algorithm can find the label of EXIT exponentially faster than any classical algorithm³.



³Childs, Cleve, Deotto, Farhi, Gutmann, and Spielman (2003).

◆□▶ ◆圖▶ ★ 圖▶ ★ 圖▶ / 圖 / のへで

Use glued trees to construct a property testing problem with exponential quantum speedup

The graph property:



- Can *classically* test the *entire* glued-trees if we mark the leaves of the two trees that are glued.
- Mark the leaves in a way that can only be read efficiently by a quantum computer but not a classical computer – use further copies of the glued-trees problem.

・ロト ・ 理 ト ・ ヨ ト ・ ヨ ト

-

where





In particular: quantum speedups of computing graph properties depend significantly on the input model!

Adjacency list: an exponential quantum speedup exists even for graph property testing.

Adjacency matrix: there can be at most polynomial quantum speedup, $R(f) = O(Q(f)^6)$.

These results resolve an open question of Ambainis, Childs, and Liu (2010) and Montanaro and de Wolf (2013).

Thank you for your attention!

<□ > < @ > < E > < E > E のQ @

Open problems

Thank you for your attention! Here are some of our open problems:

- 1. We showed $R(f) = O(Q(f)^{3p})$ for *p*-uniform hypergraph properties *f* in the adjacency matrix model as part of our characterization theorem. How tight is this?
- 2. Can we complete our characterization theorem?
- 3. Is there a *useful* graph property testing problem in the adjacency list model with super-polynomial quantum speedup?