

QUANTUM ANALOG OF SHANNON'S LOWER BOUND THEOREM

SAUGATA BASU AND LAXMI PARIDA

ABSTRACT. Shannon proved that almost all Boolean functions require a circuit of size $\Theta(2^n/n)$ [11]. We prove a quantum analog of this classical result. Unlike in the classical case the number of quantum circuits of any fixed size that we allow is uncountably infinite. Our main tool is a classical result in real algebraic geometry bounding the number of realizable sign conditions of any finite set of real polynomials in many variables.

1. INTRODUCTION

Boolean circuit complexity measures complexity of Boolean functions $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ by the size of the smallest circuit computing f . We assume that the gates of a circuit come from some fixed finite universal set of gates. We refer the reader to [13, Page 7, Definition 3.1] for the precise definition of a circuit. Notice that in this case the set of circuits of bounded size is finite.

The study of circuit complexity of Boolean functions naturally leads to the definitions of “non-uniform” analogs of classical complexity classes such as \mathbf{P} . For example, the non-uniform analog of the class \mathbf{P} is the set of sequences of Boolean functions

$$(f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\})_{n>0}$$

for which there exists a polynomial $p(n)$ such that for each $n > 0$, there exists a circuit of size bounded by $p(n)$ computing f_n .

Shannon [11] showed using a counting argument (using the fact that as noted before that the set of circuits of bounded size is finite) very early that almost all Boolean functions need circuits of size $\Omega(2^n/n)$ (see [13, Page 90, Theorem 2.1]). Here almost all refers to the fact that the number of Boolean functions that require circuits of size $\Omega(2^n/n)$ is bounded from below by $2^{2^n}(1 - o(1))$. It is also known (see for instance [13, Page 92, Theorem 2.2]) that every Boolean function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ can be computed by a circuit of size $O(2^n/n)$.

Remark 1. In the theorems cited above the set of gates used is assumed to be all possible gates of arity two (i.e. the finite set of $2^{2^2} = 16$ gates computing

2000 *Mathematics Subject Classification.* Primary 68Q12; Secondary 14P10, 81P68.

Key words and phrases. Quantum circuits, Shannon's lower bound theorem, real algebraic geometry.

all possible Boolean functions $g : \{0, 1\}^2 \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. The arity two is not important. The same asymptotic results will hold even if we allow all gates of some bounded arity $q \geq 2$ (the constants will depend on the arity) .

In this paper we are concerned with proving analogous results for quantum circuits.

Quantum complexity theory is a relatively new discipline. A quantum circuit computes a unitary transformation of a certain finite but exponentially large dimensional Hilbert space. We refer the reader to [8, Definition 6.1] for the precise definition of a quantum circuit. The Hilbert space comes equipped with a computational basis whose elements should be thought of as the elements of the Boolean hypercube. There is a standard definition of what it means for such a circuit to compute a Boolean function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which we explain later in the paper. The notion of a size of a quantum circuit mirrors the classical definition (i.e. the number of gates) though we also take into account the number of ancillary qubits which form the workspace of the quantum circuit. But there is one crucial difference between classical and quantum circuits which we explain below.

In analogy with classical circuits (cf. Remark 1), by a quantum circuit we will mean a circuit as defined in [8, Definition 6.1] where we allow all quantum gates of some bounded arity. Even if one fixes the arity (say $q > 0$) of a quantum gate, unlike in the classical case there is a *continuum many* choices of such a gate – namely, each element of the unitary group¹ $\mathbf{U}(2^q)$ is a possible quantum gate of arity q . The real dimension of the group $\mathbf{U}(2^q)$ is equal to 2^{2q} . Thus, with such an uncountable choice of the set of gates, the cardinality of the set of quantum circuits of size bounded by any fixed positive number is also uncountable. Thus it makes sense to ask whether using this additional flexibility quantum circuits of “small” (in terms of n) sizes can actually compute all the 2^{2^n} Boolean functions $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$. The main result of the paper (see Corollary 1) can be colloquially framed as saying that Shannon’s lower bound for classical circuits also hold for quantum circuits (even after we allow arbitrary quantum gates of bounded arity) i.e. almost all Boolean functions $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ require quantum circuits of size $\Omega(2^n/n)$. Since a classical circuit computing a Boolean function can be converted into a quantum circuit with at most a constant factor increase in size it follows that every Boolean function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ can be computed by a quantum circuit of size at most $O(2^n/n)$. Thus, it is the lower bound part of Shannon’s result that is of main interest.

We prove our quantum version of Shannon’s theorem by first proving an upper bound on the number of Boolean functions that can be computed by

¹The unitary group $\mathbf{U}(N)$ is the group of $N \times N$ complex matrices U satisfying $UU^\dagger = \text{Id}_n$. It is a real Lie group of dimension N^2 .

a quantum circuit of a given size (see Theorem 1 below). A key tool in the proof of Theorem 1 is a bound from real algebraic geometry (that we explain in Section 3.1) which gives an upper bound on the number of realizable sign conditions of any finite set of real polynomials in several indeterminates of bounded degrees. This result actually bounds the zero-th Betti number of the realizations of all sign conditions of the set of polynomials and has generalizations to higher Betti numbers as well [3]. It has previously been used in proving upper bounds on the number of configurations in various geometric settings (see for example [6] for one such example), but to the best of our knowledge has not been used in proving lower bounds in quantum complexity theory.

The rest of the paper is organized as follows. In Section 2 we state our main results. In Section 3 we prove the main theorem and its corollary. In Section 4 we discuss an alternative approach towards proving the main result of this using variants of Solovay-Kitaev approximation and explain its deficiency. In Section 5 we discuss some possible future work.

2. MAIN RESULTS

We follow the usual conventions. We denote by $|0\rangle, |1\rangle$ the computational basis for each qubit. We identify a 0-1 string $x_{n-1} \cdots x_0$ of length n , with the integer

$$x = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} x_k \cdot 2^k,$$

and denote the corresponding (separable) state $|x_{n-1}\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |x_0\rangle$ simply by $|x\rangle$. Similarly, we will often abbreviate $|0\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes |0\rangle$ by $|0\rangle$.

For $q \geq 1$ we denote by \mathcal{U}_q the (uncountably infinite) set of quantum gates with at most q inputs. Each gate $g \in \mathcal{U}_q$ corresponds to a unitary transformation $U_g \in \mathbf{U}(2^{k_g})$, where $k_g \leq q$ is the arity (fan-in) of the gate g . For $q \geq 2$, \mathcal{U}_q is a universal family. Namely, any unitary transformation can be implemented by a quantum circuit with gates from \mathcal{U}_2 .

A quantum circuit $C \in \mathcal{C}_1$ with n input qubits, (whose values will be denoted by x_1, \dots, x_n) and t ancillary qubits (whose values will be denoted by z_1, \dots, z_t), and having r gates drawn from \mathcal{U}_q is determined by the following data:

1. an ordering of the r gates (lets suppose the ordered tuple of gates is g_1, \dots, g_r , with the gate g_i having arity $k_i \leq q$), and
2. for each $i, 1 \leq i \leq r$, an ordered choice of k_i elements from amongst $x_1, \dots, x_n, z_1, \dots, z_t$.

For $q \geq 1$, we will denote by \mathcal{C}_q , the set of quantum circuits using gates from the set \mathcal{U}_q .

For C , a quantum circuit with n qubits as input and t ancillary qubits, we denote by $U(C) \in \mathbf{U}(N)$ the unitary transformation implemented by C where $N = 2^{n+t}$.

We now explain what is meant by a quantum circuit computing a Boolean function. For ease of understanding, we start with a provisional (very stringent) definition and then give a more general (much less stringent) definition afterwards. We will use the more general (less stringent) definition in the rest of the paper noting that a lower bound result is more powerful if the definition is less stringent.

Let $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ be a Boolean function. We associate a unitary transformation $U_f \in \mathbf{U}(2^{n+1})$ to f which takes for $x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}, y \in \{0, 1\}$, the separable state $|\mathbf{x}\rangle \otimes |y\rangle$ to the state $|\mathbf{x}\rangle \otimes |f(x) \oplus y\rangle$, where \oplus denotes “exclusive-or”. This motivates calling a quantum circuit C taking as input n qubits x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} and an ancillary qubit y , such that $U(C) = U_f$, a circuit computing *stringently* the Boolean function f . Note that using the measurement postulate of quantum mechanics, if we set the input qubits to $|\mathbf{x}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$ and measure the ancillary bit in the output, we will be left in the state $|1\rangle$ if $f(x) = 1$ and in the state $|0\rangle$ if $f(x) = 0$ with probability 1.

We can state our main result already for the stringent model described above. Later we will state and prove a more powerful result by making the definition less stringent to take into account a much looser notion of an acceptable output for the quantum circuit computing a Boolean function and also allow additional ancillary bits (exponentially many). The following theorem can be deduced from Corollary 1 stated later.

For a quantum circuit C , we will denote by $\mathcal{G}(C)$ the set of gates of C .

Theorem. *For each $q \geq 1$, there exists $c = c_q, 0 < c < 1$ (depending only on q), such that for each $n > 0$ the number of distinct Boolean functions on n variables that can be computed stringently by quantum circuits belonging to \mathcal{C}_q , with*

$$\text{card}(\mathcal{G}(C)) \leq c \cdot \frac{2^n}{n}$$

is bounded by

$$2^{2^{n-1}}.$$

Consequently, the fraction of Boolean functions that need quantum circuits in \mathcal{C}_q of size greater than $c \cdot \frac{2^n}{n}$ is $1 - 2^{-2^{n-1}} = 1 - o(1)$.

Remark 2. Notice that since the set of gates \mathcal{U}_q is infinite (uncountably so), and hence the number of distinct quantum circuits of any bounded size is also uncountably infinite. So a priori there is no reason for such circuits not being able to compute all Boolean functions on n variables.

Remark 3. A lower bound similar to the one in the theorem stated above with a finite choice of the gate set has appeared in the literature [5, Claim F.1]. The proof of the result in [5] strongly uses the finiteness of the set of gates and indeed the constant in the theorem depends on the cardinality of this set. The import of our result is that the choice of quantum gates we allow is uncountable (only the arity is fixed) – while the lower bound stays the same.

As mentioned before we will work with a more general notion of what it means for a quantum circuit to compute a Boolean function. We relax our prior definition in two ways. First, instead of ending up in the right state depending on the value of the function f with probability 1, we are satisfied if we end at the right state with probability $> 1/2$. We will also allow more than one ancillary bits. The precise definition is as follows.

Definition 2.1 (Computation of Boolean functions by a quantum circuit). A quantum circuit C on n qubits denoted x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} and $t + 1$ ancillary bits denoted by y, z_1, \dots, z_t , computes f , if for each $x, x', 0 \leq x, x' \leq 2^n - 1$, $y \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$(2.1) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{x}' y \mathbf{0} | U(C) | \mathbf{x} \mathbf{0} \mathbf{0} \rangle|^2 &> 1/2 \text{ if } x' = x \text{ and } y \oplus f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = 0, \\ &< 1/2 \text{ otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

$(|\mathbf{x}\rangle \otimes |y\rangle \otimes |\mathbf{0}\rangle)$ is abbreviated as $|\mathbf{x} y \mathbf{0}\rangle$.

Remark 4. Note that if a quantum circuit computes a Boolean function f stringently, then it also computes f according to Definition 2.1. Also note that the inequality appearing in (4.1) is the most relaxed possible in as much as we do not insist on any positive gap between the accepting and rejecting probabilities. This point will be important later when we discuss an alternative possible method for obtaining lower bounds using the Solovay-Kitaev approximation theorem (see Section 4).

We now fix a notion for size of quantum circuits.

Definition 2.2. For C a quantum circuit taking as input n qubits. We denote by $t(C)$ the number of ancillary qubits used by C and $r(C)$ the number of gates in C . We will denote by $s(C) = t(C) + r(C)$ and call $s(C)$ the *size* of C . We will denote the set of all quantum circuits $C \in \mathcal{C}_q$ with n inputs, and with $t(C) = t$ and $r(C) = r$, by $\mathcal{C}_{q,n,r,t}$.

Our main theorem is the following.

Theorem 1. *The number of distinct Boolean functions $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which can be computed approximately by a quantum circuit belonging to $\mathcal{C}_{q,n,r,1+t}$ is bounded by*

$$t^{q \cdot r} \cdot (2^n \cdot r)^{c \cdot 2^{2q} \cdot r}$$

for some universal constant $c > 0$.

Theorem 1 has the following important corollary.

Corollary 1. *There exists $c = c_q, 0 < c < 1$ (depending only on q), such that for each $n > 0$, the number of distinct Boolean functions on n variables that can be computed by quantum circuits belonging to*

$$\mathcal{C}_{q,n,c,\frac{2^n}{n},2^n}$$

is bounded by

$$2^{2^{n-1}}.$$

Consequently, the fraction of Boolean functions that need quantum circuits of size $\Omega(\frac{2^n}{n})$ is $1 - 2^{-2^{n-1}} = 1 - o(1)$.

3. PROOF OF THEOREM 1 AND COROLLARY 1

For $g \in \mathcal{G}(C)$, we denote by $U_{g,C}$ the $2^{k_g} \times 2^{k_g}$ unitary matrix corresponding to g , where k_g is the arity of the gate g .

Let $C \in \mathcal{C}_{q,n,r,t}$ and denote the sequence of gates of C by g_1, \dots, g_r with corresponding arities k_1, \dots, k_r . For each $i, 1 \leq i \leq r$, denote the entries of the two real $2^{k_i} \times 2^{k_i}$ matrices, $\text{Re}(U_{g_i,C}), \text{Im}(U_{g_i,C})$ by $\left(v_{h,h'}^{(i)}\right)_{1 \leq h,h' \leq 2^{k_i}}$ and $\left(w_{h,h'}^{(i)}\right)_{1 \leq h,h' \leq 2^{k_i}}$. So,

$$U_{g_i,C} = \left(v_{h,h'}^{(i)}\right)_{1 \leq h,h' \leq 2^{k_i}} + \sqrt{-1} \cdot \left(w_{h,h'}^{(i)}\right)_{1 \leq h,h' \leq 2^{k_i}}.$$

We use the notation introduced above in the following lemma. We use the convention that upper case letters with indices such as $V_{h,h'}^{(i)}, W_{h,h'}^{(i)}$ are used to denote indeterminates in certain polynomials and the corresponding lower case letters $v_{h,h'}^{(i)}, w_{h,h'}^{(i)}$ are used to denote real numbers to which the corresponding indeterminates are specialized.

Lemma 3.1. *For each $x, x', 0 \leq x, x' \leq 2^n - 1, z, z', 0 \leq z, z' \leq 2^t - 1$, there exists a real polynomial*

$$P_{|\mathbf{xz}\rangle, |\mathbf{x'z'}\rangle, C} \in \mathbb{R} \left[\left(V_{h,h'}^{(i)}, W_{h,h'}^{(i)} \right)_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r, \\ 1 \leq h,h' \leq 2^{k_i}}} \right],$$

with $\deg(P_{|\mathbf{xz}\rangle, |\mathbf{x'z'}\rangle, C}) \leq 2r$, such that

$$|\langle \mathbf{xz} | U(C) | \mathbf{x'z'} \rangle|^2 = P_{|\mathbf{xz}\rangle, |\mathbf{x'z'}\rangle, C} \left(\left(v_{h,h'}^{(i)}, w_{h,h'}^{(i)} \right)_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r, \\ 1 \leq h,h' \leq 2^{k_i}}} \right).$$

Proof. Let $N = 2^{n+t}$. Observe that $\langle \mathbf{xz} | U(C) | \mathbf{x}'\mathbf{z}' \rangle$ is the $(2^t \cdot x + z, 2^t \cdot x' + z')$ -th entry of the $N \times N$ unitary matrix $U(C)$ where $U(C)$ is a product of r many $N \times N$ unitary matrices of the form $U_{g_i, C} \otimes \mathbf{1}_{N-2^{k_i}}$.

Observe that the (h, h') -th entry of $U_{g_i, C}$ equals $v_{h, h'}^{(i)} + \sqrt{-1} \cdot w_{h, h'}^{(i)}$. Thus, the real and the imaginary parts of each entry of $U(C)$ is a polynomial in the real numbers $v_{h, h'}^{(i)}, w_{h, h'}^{(i)}, 1 \leq i \leq r, 1 \leq h, h' \leq 2^{k_i}$ having degree at most r , and taking the square of the modulus gives a polynomial of degree at most $2r$. \square

Next, we count the number of distinct ‘‘topologies’’ underlying quantum circuits of bounded size. In order to make this precise we introduce the following definition.

Definition 3.1. For any quantum circuit C , we will denote by \tilde{C} the quantum circuit obtained by replacing for each $g \in \mathcal{G}(C)$, the gate g , by g_0 with the same input and output but with $U_{g_0} = \mathbf{1}_{2^{k_g}}$ where k_g is the arity of g .

For any two quantum circuits $C, D \in \mathcal{C}_{q, n, r, t}$, we will say that C, D are equivalent (denoted $C \sim_{q, n, r, t} D$) if $\tilde{C} = \tilde{D}$. Clearly $\sim_{q, n, r, t}$ is an equivalence relation.

We denote by $\mathcal{T}_{q, n, r, t}$ the set of equivalence classes of $\sim_{q, n, r, t}$.

Remark 5. The set $\mathcal{T}_{q, n, r, t}$ should be thought of as the set of underlying ‘‘topologies’’ of quantum circuits with r gates with fan-ins at most q , with n qubits as input and t ancillary bits.

The following lemma establishes an upper bound on the cardinality of $\mathcal{T}_{q, n, r, t}$ in terms of q, n, r and t .

Lemma 3.2. *For every $q, n, r, t > 0$,*

$$\text{card}(\mathcal{T}_{q, n, r, t}) \leq q^r \cdot (n + t)^{q \cdot r}.$$

Proof. Each of the r gates have arities $\leq q$. The number of r -tuples (k_1, \dots, k_r) of possible arities, where $1 \leq k_i \leq q$ is equal to q^r . The equivalence class T of a circuit is determined by the ordered choice of $k_i \leq q$ from amongst the input qubits x_1, \dots, x_n and the t ancillary bits z_1, \dots, z_t . The number of choices for the i -th gate g_i is

$$(k_i)! \binom{n+t}{k_i} \leq (n+t)^{k_i} \leq (n+t)^q.$$

Since there are r gates the total number of choices is bounded by

$$q^r \cdot (n+t)^{q \cdot r}.$$

\square

Remark 6. Lemma 3.2 gives a rather crude bound that suffices for our purpose. It is possible to prove a much tighter upper bound (see for example [13, Page 88, Lemma 2.1]).

We will now fix an equivalence class $T \in \mathcal{T}_{q,n,r,1+t}$ and ask how many distinct Boolean functions can be computed (cf. Definition 2.1) using quantum circuits belonging to T . Our strategy is to identify a finite set of real polynomials (denoted by \mathcal{P}_T below), and associate to each Boolean function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which is computed by some circuit $C \in T$ a unique realizable sign condition (see below). Our bound on the number of Boolean functions that can be computed using circuits in T will then follow from an upper bound on the number of realizable sign conditions on \mathcal{P}_T which is furnished by a classical result in real algebraic geometry.

3.1. Bound on the number of realizable sign condition. Suppose that \mathcal{P} be a finite set of polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$. For each $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$, and $P \in \mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$, we define

$$\mathbf{sign}(P(x)) = \begin{cases} +1, & \text{if } P(x) > 0, \\ -1, & \text{if } P(x) < 0, \\ 0, & \text{if } P(x) = 0. \end{cases}$$

Similarly, for a finite tuple of polynomials \mathcal{P} and $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$, we similarly define

$$\mathbf{sign}(\mathcal{P}(x)) = (\mathbf{sign}(P))_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \in \{0, 1, -1\}^{\mathcal{P}}.$$

We say that an element $\sigma \in \{0, 1, -1\}^{\mathcal{P}}$ is a *realizable sign condition* of \mathcal{P} if there exists $x \in \mathbb{R}^k$ such that

$$\mathbf{sign}(\mathcal{P}(x)) = \sigma.$$

We denote the set of realizable sign conditions of a finite tuple \mathcal{P} of polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$ by $\text{Sign}(\mathcal{P}) \subset \{0, 1, -1\}^{\mathcal{P}}$.

Observe that if \mathcal{P} has length N , then the cardinality of $\text{Sign}(\mathcal{P})$ could potentially be as large as 3^N . It is an important result in real algebraic geometry (with many applications), that if k as well as the degrees of the polynomials in \mathcal{P} are small compared to N , then the $\text{card}(\text{Sign}(\mathcal{P}))$ is much smaller than 3^N . The precise result that we need is the following.

Proposition 3.1. [4, Proposition 7.31] *Let \mathcal{P} be a finite tuple of polynomials in $\mathbb{R}[X_1, \dots, X_k]$. Then,*

$$\text{card}(\text{Sign}(\mathcal{P})) \leq \sum_{1 \leq j \leq k} \binom{N}{j} 4^j d(2d-1)^{k-1} = (O(Nd))^k,$$

where $N = \text{length}(\mathcal{P})$ and $d = \max_{P \in \mathcal{P}} \deg(P)$.

Remark 7. Various versions of Proposition 3.1 are known (see for example [12, 2]). It appears in the more precise form as stated above in [3], where the bound is proved on the number of connected components of the realizable sign conditions (i.e. the sum of the zero-th Betti number of the realizations of each sign condition). Note this is a priori larger than just the number of realizable sign conditions.

We now return to the proof of Theorem 1 by proving an upper bound on the number of distinct Boolean functions that can be computed by quantum circuits belonging to a fixed equivalence class $T \in \mathcal{T}_{q,n,r,1+t}$.

First notice that for each $T \in \mathcal{T}_{q,n,r,1+t}$ and $C, C' \in T$, $0 \leq x, x' \leq 2^n - 1$, $y, y' \in \{0, 1\}$ and $0 \leq z, z' \leq 2^t - 1$,

$$P_{|\mathbf{x}y\mathbf{z}\rangle, |\mathbf{x}'y'\mathbf{z}'\rangle, C} = P_{|\mathbf{x}y\mathbf{z}\rangle, |\mathbf{x}'y'\mathbf{z}'\rangle, C'}$$

(see Lemma 3.1). We will denote by $P_{|\mathbf{x}y\mathbf{z}\rangle, |\mathbf{x}'y'\mathbf{z}'\rangle, T}$ the polynomial $P_{|\mathbf{x}y\mathbf{z}\rangle, |\mathbf{x}'y'\mathbf{z}'\rangle, C}$ for some and hence all $C \in T$.

Lemma 3.3. *For each $T \in \mathcal{T}_{q,n,r,1+t}$, the number of distinct Boolean functions computed by some quantum circuit $C \in T$ is bounded by*

$$(2^n \cdot r)^{O(2^{2q} \cdot r)}.$$

Proof. Let \mathcal{P}_T denote the tuple of polynomials

$$\left(P_{|\psi\rangle, |\psi'\rangle, T} - 1/2 \right)_{\substack{|\psi\rangle = |\mathbf{x} \mathbf{0} \mathbf{0}\rangle, |\psi'\rangle = |\mathbf{x}' y \mathbf{0}\rangle \\ 0 \leq x, x' \leq 2^n - 1, \\ y \in \{0, 1\}}}$$

Suppose that $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ is a Boolean function computed by $C \in T$. We will follow the notation introduced in Lemma 3.1 and denote by

$$\left(v_{h,h'}^{(i)}, w_{h,h'}^{(i)} \right)_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r, \\ 1 \leq h, h' \leq 2^{k_i}}}$$

the tuple of real numbers which correspond to the real and imaginary parts of the unitary matrices corresponding to the gates of C .

Then, for $0 \leq x, x' \leq 2^n - 1$, $|\psi\rangle = |\mathbf{x} \mathbf{0} \mathbf{0}\rangle$, $|\psi'\rangle = |\mathbf{x}' y \mathbf{0}\rangle$, the sign of the polynomial

$$P_{|\psi\rangle, |\psi'\rangle, T}$$

evaluated at the point

$$\left(v_{h,h'}^{(i)}, w_{h,h'}^{(i)} \right)_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq r, \\ 1 \leq h, h' \leq 2^{k_i}}}$$

(following the notation introduced in Lemma 3.1)

$$= \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } y \oplus f(x) = 0 \text{ and } x = x', \\ -1 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Denote by $\sigma_f \in \{0, 1, -1\}^{\mathcal{P}_T}$ the corresponding sign condition on \mathcal{P}_T . Hence, each Boolean function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ computable by a quantum circuit C in T defines a realizable sign condition $\sigma_f \in \text{Sign}(\mathcal{P}_T)$. Moreover, if $f \neq f'$, then $\sigma_f \neq \sigma_{f'}$. This implies that the number of distinct Boolean functions $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ which are computable by a quantum circuit C in T , is bounded by $\text{card}(\text{Sign}(\mathcal{P}_T))$.

Now, $\text{card}(\mathcal{P}_T) = 2^n \cdot 2^{n+1} \leq 2^{2n+1}$. The degrees of the polynomials in \mathcal{P}_T are bounded by $2r$, and the number of indeterminates by $2 \cdot 2^{2q} \cdot r$. We obtain using Proposition 3.1 that

$$\text{card}(\text{Sign}(\mathcal{P}_T)) \leq (O(2^{2n+1} \cdot 2 \cdot r))^{2 \cdot 2^{2q} \cdot r} = (2^n \cdot r)^{O(2^{2q} \cdot r)}.$$

□

Remark 8. Note that in the proof of Lemma 3.3 we are not using the fact the real dimension of the unitary group $\mathbf{U}(2^k)$ is equal to 2^{2k} . It is possible to take this into account and use a more refined estimate on the number of realizable sign conditions whose combinatorial part (i.e. the part depending on the number of polynomials) depends on the dimension of the ambient real variety (see [3]). However, this would only improve the constant in our theorem at the cost of introducing more technicalities and so we avoid making this more refined analysis.

Proof of Theorem 1. Multiplying the bounds in Lemmas 3.2 and 3.3 we obtain that the number of Boolean functions $\{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that can be computed using quantum circuits in $\mathcal{C}_{q,n,r,t}$

$$q^r \cdot (n+t)^{q \cdot r} \cdot (2^n \cdot r)^{O(2^{2q} \cdot r)} = t^{q \cdot r} \cdot (2^n \cdot r)^{O(2^{2q} \cdot r)}.$$

□

Proof of Corollary 1. From Theorem 1 there exists $c > 0$ such that the number of distinct Boolean functions $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$ that can be computed by quantum circuits in $\mathcal{C}_{q,n,r,2^n}$ is bounded by $(2^n \cdot r)^{c \cdot r}$ for some constant $c = c_q$ depending only on q .

Suppose that $r \leq \frac{2^n}{4cn}$.

Then, the number of Boolean functions that can be computed by such circuits is bounded by

$$(2^n \cdot r)^{c \cdot r} \leq \left(2^n \cdot \frac{2^n}{4cn}\right)^{\frac{2^n}{4cn}} \leq (2^{2n})^{\frac{2^n}{4n}} = 2^{2^{n-1}}.$$

Thus, the fraction of all Boolean formulas in n variables that can be computed by such circuits is bounded by

$$\frac{2^{2^{n-1}}}{2^{2^n}} = 2^{-2^{n-1}} = o(1).$$

□

4. ALTERNATIVE APPROACH USING APPROXIMATION AND COUNTING

In this section we explore an alternative approach towards proving Corollary 1. It is a classical result due to Solovay and Kitaev [7] that there exists $c > 0$, such that for any fixed subset $\mathcal{U}' \subset \mathbf{U}_2$ generating a dense subgroup of $\mathbf{U}(2)$ and each $\varepsilon > 0$, an arbitrary unitary matrix $U \in \mathbf{U}(2)$ can be approximated by an element $U' \in \mathbf{U}(2)$ with $\|U - U'\| \leq \varepsilon$ where U' is a product of at most $\log^c(1/\varepsilon)$ elements of \mathcal{U}' and $\|\cdot\|$ is the operator norm.

There has been many later improvements on this fundamental result reducing the value of the constant c . In particular, it is possible to choose a finite set of gates (Clifford and Toffoli gates) for which one can take $c = 1$ [9, 10]. Using this fact it is not too difficult to prove the following.

Proposition 4.1. *For each $\varepsilon > 0$, and any quantum circuit $C \in \mathcal{C}_{q,n,r,t}$, there exists another circuit $C' \in \mathcal{C}_{q,n,r',t}$ which uses only Clifford and Toffoli gates, such that $\|U(C) - U(C')\| \leq \varepsilon$ and*

$$r' = O(r \log r + r \log(1/\varepsilon)).$$

Proof sketch. Replace each gate in C by a circuit using only Clifford and Toffoli gates such that the error in norm is bounded by ε/r . Since there are r gates in C the total error will be bounded by ε . \square

An approach towards proving Corollary 1 would then be as follows. Given any $C \in \mathcal{C}_{q,n,r,t}$ computing a Boolean function f , let C' be a circuit using only Clifford and Toffoli gates that approximates $U(C)$ sufficiently well so that C' also computes f . Using Proposition 4.1 one would obtain an upper bound on the size of C' and since the number of circuits with Clifford and Toffoli gates is finite one can then use a counting argument. However, Definition 2.1 gives no room for any approximation, as any error could mean that the new circuit C' does not compute f .

One can make the Definition 2.1 more stringent (thus easier for proving lower bounds). For instance, consider the following definition which we call δ -stringent.

Definition 4.1 ($(\delta$ -stringent)-computation of Boolean functions by a quantum circuit). Let $0 \leq \delta < 1/2$. A quantum circuit C on n qubits denoted x_0, \dots, x_{n-1} and $t + 1$ ancillary bits denoted by y, z_1, \dots, z_t , computes f δ -stringently, if for each $x, x', 0 \leq x, x' \leq 2^n - 1$, $y \in \{0, 1\}$,

$$(4.1) \quad \begin{aligned} |\langle \mathbf{x}' y \mathbf{0} | U(C) | \mathbf{x} \mathbf{0} \mathbf{0} \rangle|^2 &> 1/2 + \delta \text{ if } x' = x \text{ and } y \oplus f(x_0, \dots, x_{n-1}) = 1, \\ &< 1/2 - \delta \text{ otherwise.} \end{aligned}$$

$(|\mathbf{x}\rangle \otimes |y\rangle \otimes |\mathbf{0}\rangle)$ is abbreviated as $|\mathbf{x} y \mathbf{0}\rangle$.

Remark 9. Definition 2.1 is the special case of being 0-stringent.

One can carry through the program sketched earlier using approximation and counting, if we take Definition 4.1 as our definition for quantum circuit computing Boolean function with $\delta > 0$. In this case one would need to replace C by a circuit C' using Clifford and Toffoli gates which approximates $U(C)$ within $\delta/2$ in max-norm. Using Proposition 4.1 one can take $r' = O(r \log r + r \log(1/\delta))$. Since the number of such circuits is bounded by $n^{O(r \log r + r \log(1/\delta))}$. From the inequality

$$n^{O(r \log r + r \log(1/\delta))} \geq 2^{2^n}$$

one derives the lower bound

$$r \geq \Omega(\min(2^n/(n \log n), 2^n/((\log(1/\delta) \log n))))$$

from which one can conclude that almost all Boolean functions need quantum circuits of size

$$\Omega(\min(2^n/(n \log n), 2^n/((\log(1/\delta) \log n)))).$$

Notice that the above lower bound is worse than that in Corollary 1, and moreover goes to 0 as $\delta \rightarrow 0$ and thus does not produce any meaningful lower bound for $\delta = 0$ (which is the case in Definition 2.1).

5. CONCLUSION AND FUTURE WORK

We have introduced a new algebraic technique for proving lower bounds in quantum complexity theory. This might have applications in proving lower bounds for other problems in quantum complexity theory. One important feature of our method is that it does not need unitarity of the gates (see Remark 8). This may be relevant for proving results about the complexity class **PostBQP** [1]. We leave this for future work.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We thank Sergey Bravyi, Elena Grigorescu, Dmitri Maslov and Eric Samperton for their comments on a draft version of the paper which helped to improve the paper.

REFERENCES

- [1] Scott Aaronson. Quantum computing, postselection, and probabilistic polynomial-time. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. Ser. A Math. Phys. Eng. Sci.*, 461(2063):3473–3482, 2005. [12](#)
- [2] N. Alon. Tools from higher algebra. In *Handbook of combinatorics, Vol. 1, 2*, pages 1749–1783. Elsevier, Amsterdam, 1995. [9](#)
- [3] S. Basu, R. Pollack, and M.-F. Roy. On the Betti numbers of sign conditions. *Proc. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 133(4):965–974 (electronic), 2005. [3](#), [9](#), [10](#)

- [4] S. Basu, R. Pollack, and M.-F. Roy. *Algorithms in real algebraic geometry*, volume 10 of *Algorithms and Computation in Mathematics*. Springer-Verlag, Berlin, 2006 (second edition). [8](#)
- [5] Nai-Hui Chia, Chi-Ning Chou, Jiayu Zhang, and Ruizhe Zhang. Quantum meets the minimum circuit size problem, 2021. [5](#)
- [6] J. Goodman and R. Pollack. There are asymptotically far fewer polytopes than we thought. *Bull. Amer. Math. Soc. (N.S.)*, 14(1):127–129, 1986. [3](#)
- [7] A. Yu. Kitaev. Quantum computations: algorithms and error correction. *Uspekhi Mat. Nauk*, 52(6(318)):53–112, 1997. [11](#)
- [8] A. Yu. Kitaev, A. H. Shen, and M. N. Vyal'yi. *Classical and quantum computation*, volume 47 of *Graduate Studies in Mathematics*. American Mathematical Society, Providence, RI, 2002. Translated from the 1999 Russian original by Lester J. Senechal. [2](#)
- [9] Vadym Kliuchnikov, Dmitri Maslov, and Michele Mosca. Fast and efficient exact synthesis of single-qubit unitaries generated by Clifford and T gates. *Quantum Inf. Comput.*, 13(7-8):607–630, 2013. [11](#)
- [10] Peter Selinger. Efficient Clifford+T approximation of single-qubit operators. *Quantum Inf. Comput.*, 15(1-2):159–180, 2015. [11](#)
- [11] Claude. E. Shannon. The synthesis of two-terminal switching circuits. *The Bell System Technical Journal*, 28(1):59–98, 1949. [1](#)
- [12] H. E. Warren. Lower bounds for approximation by nonlinear manifolds. *Trans. Amer. Math. Soc.*, 133:167–178, 1968. [9](#)
- [13] Ingo Wegener. *The complexity of Boolean functions*. Wiley-Teubner Series in Computer Science. John Wiley & Sons, Ltd., Chichester; B. G. Teubner, Stuttgart, 1987. [1](#), [8](#)

DEPARTMENT OF MATHEMATICS, PURDUE UNIVERSITY, WEST LAFAYETTE, IN 47906, U.S.A.

Email address: sbasu@math.purdue.edu

URL: www.math.purdue.edu/~sbasu

IBM T.J. WATSON RESEARCH CENTER, YORKTOWN HEIGHTS, NY 10598.

Email address: parida@us.ibm.com

URL: researcher.ibm.com/person/us-parida