

NOTE

---

---

# Discrete-Query Quantum Algorithm for NAND Trees

Andrew M. Childs      Richard Cleve      Stephen P. Jordan  
David Yonge-Mallo

*Received: September 30, 2008; published: July 1, 2009.*

**Abstract:** This is a comment on the article “A Quantum Algorithm for the Hamiltonian NAND Tree” by Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, and Sam Gutmann, *Theory of Computing* 4 (2008) 169–190. That paper gave a quantum algorithm for evaluating NAND trees with running time  $O(\sqrt{N})$  in the Hamiltonian query model. In this note, we point out that their algorithm can be converted into an algorithm using  $N^{1/2+o(1)}$  queries in the conventional (discrete) quantum query model.

**ACM Classification:** F.1.2, F.2.2

**AMS Classification:** 68Q10, 81P68

**Key words and phrases:** Quantum computation, quantum query complexity, formula evaluation, quantum walk, Hamiltonian simulation

---

A NAND tree of depth  $n$  is a balanced binary tree whose internal vertices represent NAND gates. Placing bits  $x_1, \dots, x_{2^n}$  at the leaves, the root of the NAND tree evaluates to the function  $f_n(x_1, \dots, x_{2^n})$ , where  $f_n : \{0, 1\}^{2^n} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  is defined recursively as follows. For  $n = 0$ ,  $f_0(x) = x$ , and for  $n > 0$ ,

$$f_n(x_1, \dots, x_{2^n}) = \neg(f_{n-1}(x_1, \dots, x_{2^{n-1}}) \wedge f_{n-1}(x_{2^{n-1}+1}, \dots, x_{2^n})). \quad (1)$$

The goal of the NAND tree problem is to evaluate  $f_n(x_1, \dots, x_{2^n})$ , making as few queries to the bits  $x_1, \dots, x_{2^n}$  as possible. The optimal classical randomized algorithm for this problem makes  $\Theta(N^{0.753})$  queries, where  $N = 2^n$  [9, 10, 11]. Until now, no better quantum algorithm was known, whereas the best known quantum lower bound is only  $\Omega(\sqrt{N})$  [2]. Here we show the following.

**Theorem.** *The bounded-error quantum query complexity of evaluating balanced binary NAND trees is  $N^{1/2+O(1/\sqrt{\log N})}$ .*

Very recently, Farhi, Goldstone, and Gutmann [6] proposed a quantum algorithm that evaluates NAND trees in time  $O(\sqrt{N})$ , albeit in the unconventional Hamiltonian oracle model [7, 8] rather than the conventional quantum query model. In their version of the Hamiltonian oracle model, we are given access to a Hamiltonian  $H_O$  acting on  $n + 1$  qubits as

$$H_O|b, k\rangle = -x_k|-b, k\rangle \tag{2}$$

for all  $b \in \{0, 1\}$  and  $k \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , and the goal is to perform the computation using evolution according to  $H_O + H_D(t)$  for as short a time as possible, where  $H_D(t)$  is an arbitrary driving Hamiltonian (that is possibly time-dependent and may act on an extended Hilbert space).

In the conventional quantum query model, the input is accessible via unitary operations of the form

$$U_O|k, a\rangle = |k, a \oplus x_k\rangle, \tag{3}$$

again acting on  $n + 1$  qubits. Two queries of  $U_O$  can be used to implement evolution according to  $H_O$  for an arbitrary time  $t$ , which can be seen as follows. The procedure acts on states of the form  $|b, k, a\rangle$  (where the last register is an ancilla qubit) as follows. First, apply  $U_O$  to the second and third registers. Then apply a controlled- $R(t)$  gate with the first register as the target and the third register as the control, where

$$R(t) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos t & i \sin t \\ i \sin t & \cos t \end{pmatrix}. \tag{4}$$

Finally, apply  $U_O$  to the second and third registers again. With the ancilla qubit initially in the  $|0\rangle$  state, the net effect of this procedure is the mapping  $|b, k, 0\rangle \mapsto \cos(x_k t)|b, k, 0\rangle + i \sin(x_k t)|-b, k, 0\rangle$ , which corresponds to evolution by  $H_O$  for time  $t$  (that is, the unitary operation  $e^{-iH_O t}$ ).

This simulation of  $H_O$  does not imply that any fast algorithm in the Hamiltonian oracle model can be turned into an algorithm with small query complexity in the conventional quantum query model. Accurate simulation of the evolution according to  $H_O + H_D(t)$  apparently requires many interleaved evolutions of  $H_O$  and  $H_D(t)$  each for a small time, yet each of which requires two unitary queries to simulate. Nevertheless, it turns out that a Hamiltonian of the kind used in [6] can be simulated in the conventional quantum query model with only small overhead.

*Proof of Theorem.* In the algorithm of [6],  $H_D(t)$  is time-independent, so the evolution for time  $t$  is given by  $e^{-i(H_O+H_D)t}$ . Such evolution according to a sum of time-independent Hamiltonians can be simulated using a high-order approximation of the exponential of a sum in terms of a product of exponentials of the individual terms. As noted in [3, 4], by using a  $p^{\text{th}}$  order approximation, the simulation can be performed with error at most  $\varepsilon$  in at most

$$2 \frac{5^{2p} (2ht)^{1+1/2p}}{\varepsilon^{1/2p}} \tag{5}$$

steps, where  $h = \|H_O + H_D\| \leq 3$ . This yields a simulation with bounded error in  $O(t^{1+1/2p})$  steps for any positive integer  $p$ , where the constant implied by the big O notation depends on  $\varepsilon$  and  $p$ . Moreover, setting  $p = \sqrt{\log t}$  in Eq. 5, we obtain the bound  $t^{1+O(1/\sqrt{\log t})}$  on the number of steps. Since the algorithm of [6] applies  $H$  for time  $t = O(\sqrt{N})$ , the Theorem follows.  $\square$

**Remark 1.** This result can also be deduced by noting that, given query access to the inputs via  $U_O$  (Eq. 3), one can easily simulate an oracle for the matrix elements of the underlying Hamiltonian  $H_O + H_D$  used in [6], and then applying results in [3, 4] for simulating sparse Hamiltonians.

**Remark 2.** After the first version of this note appeared [5], the algorithm of [7] was generalized to evaluate an arbitrary AND-OR formula in  $N^{1/2+o(1)}$  (discrete) queries [1]. Indeed, by using a discrete-time quantum walk, [1] shows that the bounded-error quantum query complexity of evaluating “approximately balanced” formulas is only  $O(\sqrt{N})$ . In particular, this improves the above Theorem to show that only  $O(\sqrt{N})$  discrete quantum queries suffice to evaluate a balanced binary NAND tree.

## Acknowledgments

AMC received support from the U.S. NSF under grant no. PHY-0456720, from the U.S. ARO under grant no. W911NF-05-1-0294, from Canada’s MITACS and NSERC, and from the U.S. ARO/DTO. RC received support from Canada’s CIAR, MITACS, NSERC, and the U.S. ARO/DTO. SPJ received support from the U.S. ARO/DTO’s QuaCGR program. DY received support from Canada’s MITACS, NSERC, and the U.S. ARO/DTO.

## References

- [1] A. AMBAINIS, A. M. CHILDS, B. W. REICHARDT, R. ŠPALEK, AND S. ZHANG: Any AND-OR formula of size  $N$  can be evaluated in time  $N^{1/2+o(1)}$  on a quantum computer. In *Proc. 48th IEEE FOCS*, pp. 363–372. IEEE Comp. Soc. Press, 2007. [[doi:10.1109/FOCS.2007.57](https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS.2007.57), [arXiv:quant-ph/0703015](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0703015), [arXiv:0704.3628](https://arxiv.org/abs/0704.3628)]. 121
- [2] H. BARNUM AND M. SAKS: A lower bound on the quantum query complexity of read-once functions. *J. Comput. System Sci.*, 69(2):244–258, 2004. [[doi:10.1016/j.jcss.2004.02.002](https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jcss.2004.02.002), [arXiv:quant-ph/0201007](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0201007)]. 119
- [3] D. W. BERRY, G. AHOKAS, R. CLEVE, AND B. C. SANDERS: Efficient quantum algorithms for simulating sparse Hamiltonians. *Comm. Math. Phys.*, 270(2):359–371, 2007. [[doi:10.1007/s00220-006-0150-x](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-006-0150-x), [arXiv:quant-ph/0508139](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0508139)]. 120, 121
- [4] A. M. CHILDS: *Quantum information processing in continuous time*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2004. 120, 121
- [5] ANDREW M. CHILDS, RICHARD CLEVE, STEPHEN P. JORDAN, AND DAVID YEUNG: Discrete-query quantum algorithm for NAND trees. Technical report, Arxiv.org, 2007. [[arXiv:quant-ph/0702160](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0702160)]. 121
- [6] E. FARHI, J. GOLDSTONE, AND S. GUTMANN: A quantum algorithm for the Hamiltonian NAND tree. *Theory of Computing*, 4(1):169–190, 2008. [[doi:10.4086/toc.2008.v004a008](https://doi.org/10.4086/toc.2008.v004a008)]. 120, 121
- [7] E. FARHI AND S. GUTMANN: Quantum computation and decision trees. *Phys. Rev. A*, 58:915–928, 1998. [[doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.58.915](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.58.915), [arXiv:quant-ph/9706062](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9706062)]. 120, 121

- [8] C. MOCHON: Hamiltonian oracles. *Phys. Rev. A*, 75(4):042313, 2007. [doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.75.042313, arXiv:quant-ph/0602032]. 120
- [9] M. SAKS AND A. WIGDERSON: Probabilistic Boolean decision trees and the complexity of evaluating game trees. In *Proc. 27th FOCS*, pp. 29–38. IEEE Comp. Soc. Press, 1986. 119
- [10] M. SANTHA: On the Monte Carlo Boolean decision tree complexity of read-once formulae. *Random Structures Algorithms*, 6(1):75–87, 1995. [doi:10.1002/rsa.3240060108]. 119
- [11] M. SNIR: Lower bounds on probabilistic linear decision trees. *Theoret. Comput. Sci.*, 38:69–82, 1985. [doi:10.1016/0304-3975(85)90210-5]. 119

## AUTHORS

Andrew M. Childs

Department of Combinatorics & Optimization and Institute for Quantum Computing

University of Waterloo

amchilds@uwaterloo.ca

<http://www.math.uwaterloo.ca/~amchilds>

Richard Cleve

David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science and Institute for Quantum Computing

University of Waterloo

and Perimeter Institute for Theoretical Physics

cleve@cs.uwaterloo.ca

<http://www.cs.uwaterloo.ca/~cleve>

Stephen P. Jordan

Institute for Quantum Information

California Institute of Technology

sjordan@caltech.edu

<http://www.its.caltech.edu/~sjordan>

David Yonge-Mallo

David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science and Institute for Quantum Computing

University of Waterloo

davinci@iqc.ca

<http://www.iqc.ca/people/person.php>

ABOUT THE AUTHORS

ANDREW CHILDS has been at [Waterloo](#) since 2007. Previously, he was a postdoc at the [Caltech Institute for Quantum Information](#). He received his Ph. D. in physics in 2004 at [MIT](#) under the supervision of [Eddie Farhi](#), writing a thesis on [Quantum Information Processing in Continuous Time](#). He is interested in quantum algorithms.

RICHARD CLEVE has been based in [Waterloo](#) since 2004. He received his Ph. D. in 1989 from the University of Toronto under the supervision of [Charles Rackoff](#), specializing in (non-quantum) cryptography and complexity theory. He became curious about quantum computing around 1994, and now works mostly in this field.

STEPHEN JORDAN received his Ph. D. in 2008 from MIT's [physics department](#) under the advising of [Eddie Farhi](#). His thesis was on [Quantum Computation Beyond the Circuit Model](#). His current [research interests](#) include quantum algorithms and alternative methods of quantum computation such as the adiabatic and topological models.

DAVID YONGE-MALLO has been a graduate student at the [David R. Cheriton School of Computer Science](#) at the [University of Waterloo](#) since 2004.