arXiv:1603.06505v6 [quant-ph] 5 Jun 2017

Characterizations of symmetrically partial Boolean functions with exact quantum query complexity

Daowen Qiu*, Shenggen Zheng**

School of Data and Computer Science, Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510006, China

Abstract

We give and prove an optimal exact quantum query algorithm with complexity $k+1$ for computing the promise problem (i.e., symmetric and partial Boolean function) DJ_n^k defined as: $DJ_n^k(x) = 1$ for $|x| = n/2$, $DJ_n^k(x) = 0$ for $|x|$ in the set $\{0, 1, \ldots, k, n-k, n-k+1, \ldots, n\}$, and it is undefined for the rest cases, where n is even, $|x|$ is the Hamming weight of x. The case of $k = 0$ is the well-known Deutsch-Jozsa problem. We outline all symmetric (and partial) Boolean functions with degrees 1 and 2, and prove their exact quantum query complexity. Then we prove that any symmetrical (and partial) Boolean function f has exact quantum 1-query complexity if and only if f can be computed by the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm. We also discover the optimal exact quantum 2-query complexity for distinguishing between inputs of Hamming weight $\{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor, \lceil n/2 \rceil\}$ and Hamming weight in the set $\{0, n\}$ for all odd n. In addition, a method is provided to determine the degree of any symmetrical (and partial) Boolean function.

Keywords: Exact quantum query algorithms, Deutsch-Jozsa problems, Query complexity, Symmetrically partial Boolean functions

1. Introduction

Quantum computing models can be divided into *bounded-error* and *exact* versions in terms of their outputs. A bounded-error model means that the mistake probability for any output cannot be beyond an error value given a priori, and an exact model requires its outputs be fully correct always, without any error allowed. *Exact quantum computing models* have been studied in the frameworks of *quantum finite automata* [11, 38] and particularly *quantum query models* (for example, [8, 10, 19, 20, 28, 40, 42]).

The quantum query models are the quantum analog to the classical Boolean decision tree models, so they are also called *quantum decision tree* models and are at least as powerful as the classical decision tree models [20]. The implementation procedure of a quantum decision tree model is exactly a *quantum query algorithm*, and it can be roughly described as: it starts with a fixed starting state $|\psi_s\rangle$ of a Hilbert $\mathcal{H}$ and will perform the sequence of operations $U_0, O_x, U_1, \ldots, O_x, U_t$, where U_i's are unitary operators that do not depend on the input x but the query O_x does. This leads to the final state $|\psi_f\rangle = U_t O_x U_{t-1} \cdots U_1 O_x U_0 |\psi_s\rangle$. The result is obtained by measuring the final state $|\psi_f\rangle$.

A quantum query algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ *computes exactly* a Boolean function f if its output equals $f(x)$ with probability 1, for all input x. $\mathcal{A}$ *computes with bounded-error* f if its output equals $f(x)$ with probability at

* *E-mail address:* issqdw@mail.sysu.edu.cn (D. Qiu). Corresponding author.
** *E-mail address:* zhengshg@mail2.sysu.edu.cn (S. Zheng). Corresponding and also co-first author.

least $\frac{2}{3}$, for all input x. The *exact quantum query complexity* denoted by $Q_E(f)$ is the minimum number of queries used by any quantum algorithm which computes $f(x)$ exactly for all input x.

For the bounded-error case, quantum query algorithms have been investigated extensively and deeply (for example, [2, 3, 5, 7, 12, 18, 22, 27, 30, 32, 37, 47–49] and the references therein), and some of them have either polynomial speed-up over classical algorithms for computing total Boolean functions. The exact quantum query algorithms for computing total Boolean functions also have been studied [3, 5, 8–10, 23, 29, 33, 39, 41, 42, 50]. In 2013, as a breakthrough result, Ambainis [8] has presented the first example of a Boolean function for which exact quantum algorithms have superlinear advantage over exact classical algorithms, *i.e.* $Q_E(f) = O(D(f)^{0.8675\cdots})$, where $D(f)$ denotes the minimum number of queries used by any classical deterministic query algorithm. The result was improved by Ambainis *et al* [3, 5] to nearly-quadratic separation in 2016.

Brassard and Høyer [16] gave an example of a partial function whose exact quantum query complexity is exponentially lower than its classical randomized query complexity. However, for computing partial Boolean functions, there can be more than exponential separation between exact quantum and classical deterministic query complexity, and the first result was the well-known Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm [28].

Deutsch-Jozsa problem [28] can be described as a partial Boolean function $DJ_n^0 : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ defined as: n is even, and $DJ_n^0(x) = 1$ for $|x| = \frac{n}{2}$ and $DJ_n^0(x) = 0$ for $|x| = 0$ or n, and the other cases are undefined, where $|x|$ is the Hamming weight of x. Deutsch-Jozsa problem has attracted a lot of research and discussion (for example, [13, 24, 42]), and the physical realization was implemented in [46]. Montanaro, Jozsa, and Mitchison [42] generalized the Deutsch-Jozsa problem to another partial Boolean function, say $DJ_n^1 : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ defined as DJ_n^0 except for $DJ_n^1(x) = 0$ for $|x| = 0, 1, n-1, n$. Also, Montanaro *et al* [42] designed an exact quantum 2-query algorithm to compute it by using an analytical method.

Aaronson and Ambainis [1] have showed that there can be at most a quadratic separation between quantum and classical bounded-error algorithms for computing any symmetric partial boolean function. In this paper we will study symmetric partial boolean function for the exact computing cases. Ambainis [6] showed that almost all total Boolean functions have high approximate degree, so, we are also interested in partial Boolean functions with lower degree. Indeed, partial Boolean functions have also been called as promise problems [31, 34], and both symmetric Boolean functions and partial Boolean functions have had important applications in cryptography (for example, [26, 31, 34]).

1.1. Definitions

Let f be a Boolean function from $D \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ to $\{0,1\}$. If $D = \{0,1\}^n$, then f is called a total Boolean function. Otherwise, f is called a partial Boolean function or a promise problem [31, 34] and D is referred to as the domain of definition or promised set.

A (partial) Boolean function f is called symmetric if $f(x)$ only depends on the Hamming weight of x, i.e., $|x|$. Some characteristics of the symmetric Boolean functions were given in, for example, [26]. Some common symmetric functions over $\{0,1\}^n$ are listed as follows.

- $OR_n(x) = 1$ if and only if $|x| \geq 1$;
- $AND_n(x) = 1$ if and only if $|x| = n$;
- $PARITY_n(x) = 1$ if and only if $|x|$ is odd;
- $MAJ_n(x) = 1$ if and only if $|x| > n/2$;

- $EXACT_n^k(x) = 1$ if and only if $|x| = k$, where $0 \leq k \leq n$;
- $THRESHOLD_n^k(x) = 1$ if and only if $|x| \geq k$, where $0 \leq k \leq n$.

Remark 1. In [21], *partially symmetric Boolean functions* were studied and the definition is: For a subset $J \subseteq [n] := \{1, \ldots, n\}$, a function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ is J-symmetric if permuting the labels of the variables of J does not change the function. So, a partially symmetric Boolean function is a total function but its symmetric property is partial. If $J = [n]$, then it is exactly a symmetric Boolean function.

So, different from partially symmetric Boolean functions [21], the functions DJ_n^0 and DJ_n^1 above are both symmetric and partial, called *symmetrically partial Boolean functions* (i.e. promise problems) in this paper and the exact definition can be described as follows.

Definition 1. Let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be a partial Boolean function, and let $D \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$ be its domain of definition. If for any $x \in D$ and for any $y \in \{0,1\}^n$ with $|x| = |y|$, it holds that $y \in D$ and $f(x) = f(y)$, then f is called a *symmetrically partial Boolean function*. When $D = \{0,1\}^n$, f is an symmetric function.

So, a symmetrically partial Boolean function equals a symmetric and partial Boolean function, and has been called a *promise problem* [31, 34]. Clearly, if $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ is a symmetrically partial function, then its domain of definition has the version $\{x : |x| = k_1, k_2, \ldots, k_l\}$ for some $0 \leq k_i \leq n$ with $i = 1, 2, \ldots, l$.

Isomorphism is useful in the study of query complexity, and two partial functions f and g over $\{0,1\}^n$ are *isomorphic* if they are equal up to negations and permutations of the input variables, and negation of the output variable.

Fact 1. For any two partial functions f, g over $\{0,1\}^n$, if they are isomorphic, then they have the same (exact) quantum query complexity.

Proof. Let $g(x) = (\neg)f(\pi((\neg)x_1, (\neg)x_2, \ldots, (\neg)x_n))$ where π is a permutation. Suppose that there is a t-queries quantum algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ that computes $f(x)$, and let $\mathcal{A}(x)$ represent the output (0 or 1) for input x. Now for any x in the domain of definition of g, we consider the following t-queries quantum algorithm $\mathcal{A}'$:

$$\mathcal{A}'(x) = (\neg)\mathcal{A}U_1U_0(x), \tag{1}$$

where $U_0(x) = ((\neg)x_1, (\neg)x_2, \ldots, (\neg)x_n)$ and $U_1(x) = \pi(x)$. It is clear that $\mathcal{A}'$ computes exactly function g. □

Remark 2. Given a partial symmetric function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$, with the domain D of definition, it can be equivalently described by a vector $(b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in \{0,1,*\}^{n+1}$, where $f(x) = b_{|x|}$, i.e. b_k is the value of $f(x)$ when $|x| = k$, and $f(x)$ is 'undefined' for $b_{|x|} = *$. In the interest of simplicity, sometimes we will use the vector to denote a symmetrically partial function in this article.

Concerning the n-bit symmetrically partial functions, it is clear that the following functions are isomorphic to each other:

- $(b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n)$;
- $(b_n, b_{n-1}, \ldots, b_0)$;
- $(\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{b}_n)$;

- $(\bar{b}_n, \bar{b}_{n-1}, \ldots, \bar{b}_0)$.

We need to introduce some complexity measures for symmetrically partial functions.

Definition 2. Let f be a partial function with a domain of definition $D \subseteq \{0,1\}^n$. For $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1/2$, we say a real multilinear polynomial p approximates f with error ε if:

(1) $|p(x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in D$;

(2) $0 \leq p(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \{0,1\}^n$.

The approximate degree of f with error ε, denoted by $\widetilde{\deg}_\varepsilon(f)$, is the minimum degree among all real multilinear polynomials that approximate f with error ε.

Clearly, if $\varepsilon = 0$, then $\widetilde{\deg}_0(f)$ is the *exact degree* of f. Furthermore, if $D = \{0,1\}^n$, i.e. f is a total function, then the exact degree of f is exactly the degree of f as usual [20], denoted by $\deg(f)$. In the interest of simplicity, sometimes we just identity $\widetilde{\deg}_0(f)$ with $\deg(f)$ for any partial Boolean function f, since no confusion leads.

1.2. Preliminaries

Let input $x = x_1 \cdots x_n \in \{0,1\}^n$ for some fixed n. We will consider a Hilbert space $\mathcal{H}$ with basis states $|i,j\rangle$ for $i \in \{0,1,\ldots,n\}$ and $j \in \{1,\cdots,m\}$ (where m can be chosen arbitrarily). A query O_x to an input $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ will be formulated as the following unitary transformation:

- $O_x|0,j\rangle = |0,j\rangle$;
- $O_x|i,j\rangle = (-1)^{x_i}|i,j\rangle$ for $i \in \{1,2,\cdots,n\}$.

A quantum query algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ which uses t queries for an input x consists of a sequence of unitary operators $U_0, O_x, U_1, \ldots, O_x, U_t$, where U_i's do not depend on the input x and the query O_x does. The algorithm will start in a fixed starting state $|\psi_s\rangle$ of $\mathcal{H}$ and will perform the above sequence of operations. This leads to the final state

$$|\psi_f\rangle = U_t O_x U_{t-1} \cdots U_1 O_x U_0 |\psi_s\rangle. \tag{2}$$

The final state is then measured with a measurement $\{M_0, M_1\}$. For an input $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, we denote $\mathcal{A}(x)$ the output of the quantum query algorithm $\mathcal{A}$. Obviously, $Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) = 0] = \|M_0|\psi_f\rangle\|^2$ and $Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) = 1] = \|M_1|\psi_f\rangle\|^2 = 1 - Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) = 0]$. We say that the quantum query algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ computes f within an error ε if for every input $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ it holds that $Pr[\mathcal{A}(x) = f(x)] \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. If $\varepsilon = 0$, we says that the quantum algorithm is exact. For more details on quantum query complexity, we may refer to [8, 19, 20, 42].

Quantum query models are one of most important computing models in quantum computing. In this complexity models [20], an algorithm is charged for "queries" to the input bits, while any intermediate computation is considered as free. For many functions one can obtain large quantum speed-ups in the case algorithms are allowed a constant small probability of error (bounded error). As the most famous example, Grover's algorithm [37] computes the n-bit OR function with $O(\sqrt{n})$ queries in the bounded-error mode, while any classical algorithm needs $\Omega(n)$ queries. The model of *exact quantum query*, where the algorithms must output the correct answer with certainty for every possible input, seems to be more intriguing [16, 23, 28]. It is much more difficult to come up with exact quantum algorithms that outperform classical deterministic algorithms.

In the exact quantum query complexity, it was recognized that the best quantum speed-up for computing total functions was by a factor of 2 for many years [33]. In a breakthrough result, Ambainis has presented the first example of a Boolean function $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ for which exact quantum algorithms have superlinear advantage over classical deterministic algorithms [8]. The result was improved in 2016 [3, 5]. Based on the results in [10, 42], Ambainis, Gruska, and Zheng [9] have verified that exact quantum algorithms have certain advantage for most of Boolean functions.

Ambainis *et al* [10] have developed optimal exact quantum algorithms for computing functions $EXACT_n^k$ and $THRESHOLD_n^k$, which are to determine whether an n-bit string has Hamming weight exactly k and to determine whether an n-bit string has Hamming weight at least k. The complexity is:

- $Q_E(EXACT_n^k) = \max(k, n-k)$;
- $Q_E(THRESHOLD_n^k) = \max(k, n-k+1)$.

If f is allowed to be a partial function, the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm [28] proved that there can be more than exponential separation between exact quantum and classical deterministic query complexity. Some generalizations [25, 38, 42, 51] of the Deutsch-Jozsa problem were also investigated, and we will indicate them carefully if there exist relations to our results.

1.3. Our main results and proof methods

A general generalization of Deutsch-Jozsa problem is the following partial symmetric function:

$$\mathrm{DJ}_n^k(x) = \begin{cases} 1 & \text{if } |x| = n/2, \\ 0 & \text{if } |x| \le k \text{ or } |x| \ge n-k, \end{cases} \tag{3}$$

where n is even and $0 \le k < n/2$.

Clearly, when $k = 0$, it is the Deutsch-Jozsa problem, and when $k = 1$, it equals the problem given by Montanaro *et al* [42].

Our first main result is as follows.

Theorem 1. *The exact quantum query complexity of* DJ_n^k *satisfies:*

$$Q_E(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k) = k+1. \tag{4}$$

However, the classical deterministic query complexity for DJ_n^k *is:*

$$D(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k) = n/2 + k + 1. \tag{5}$$

Remark 3. When $k = 1$, Montanaro *et al.* [42] designed an exact quantum 2-query algorithm to compute it, and their method is somewhat complicated for deriving a unitary operator from solving a system of equations, but the optimality with 2-query was not verified. Our result also shows the algorithm by Montanaro *et al* [42] is optimal.

Proof method of Theorem 1: Using the exact quantum query algorithms for computing $EXACT_n^k$ and $THRESHOLD_n^k$ due to Ambainis *et al* [10], we can give an exact quantum $(k+1)$-query algorithm for computing DJ_n^k. On the other hand, we will prove that $\widetilde{\deg}_0(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k) \ge 2k+2$, and therefore $Q_E(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k) \ge \frac{\widetilde{\deg}_0(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k)}{2} = k+1$.

A natural question is what common characters are for the Boolean functions with the same exact quantum query complexity? Due to the importance and simplicity of symmetric functions, here we consider the case of exact quantum 1-query complexity for all symmetrical and partial functions.

Therefore, the question is what can be solved with exact quantum 1-query complexity? Notably, Aaronson, Ambainis, Iraids, and Kokainis [4] recently proved that a partial Boolean function f is computable by a 1-query quantum algorithm with error bounded by $\varepsilon < 1/2$ if and only if f can be approximated by a degree-2 polynomial with error bounded by $\varepsilon' < 1/2$.

We can pose the question more precisely: if an exact quantum 1-query algorithm $\mathcal{A}$ computes a symmetrically partial function f, then, can any symmetrical and partial function g with $Q_E(g) = 1$ be computed by $\mathcal{A}$? Our second main result answers this question as follows.

Theorem 2. *Any symmetric and partial Boolean function f has $Q_E(f) = 1$ if and only if f can be computed by the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm.*

To prove the above theorem, we prove the following three results.

Theorem 3. *Let $n > 1$ and let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be an n-bit symmetric and partial Boolean function. Then:*

(1) $\deg(f) = 1$ *if and only if f is isomorphic to the function $f^{(1)}_{n,n}$;*

(2) $\deg(f) = 2$ *if and only if f is isomorphic to one of the functions*

$$f^{(1)}_{n,k}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k, \end{cases} \tag{6}$$

$$f^{(2)}_{n,k}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k \text{ or } |x| = k+1, \end{cases} \tag{7}$$

$$f^{(3)}_{n,l}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = l, \end{cases} \tag{8}$$

$$f^{(4)}_{n}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \text{ or } |x| = \lceil n/2 \rceil, \end{cases} \tag{9}$$

where $n - 1 \geq k \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, and $\lceil n/2 \rceil \geq l \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.

With the above theorem we can further prove the two theorems as follows.

Theorem 4. *Let n be even and let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be an n-bit symmetric and partial function. Then $Q_E(f) = 1$ if and only if f is isomorphic to one of these functions: $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$ and $f^{(3)}_{n,n/2}$, where $k \geq n/2$.*

Theorem 5. *Let n be odd and let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be an n-bit symmetric and partial function. Then $Q_E(f) = 1$ if and only if f is isomorphic to one of the functions $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$, where $k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$.*

Proof method of Theorem 2: Suppose that $Q_E(f) = 1$. Then:

(1) for n being odd, f is isomorphic to one of the functions $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$, where $k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$;

(2) for n being even, f is isomorphic to one of these functions: $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$ and $f^{(3)}_{n,n/2}$, where $k \geq n/2$.

If f is isomorphic to $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$, then we pad $2k - n$ zeros to the input of the function $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$. As a result, it is equivalently to compute the function $f^{(1)}_{2k,k}$. Clearly $f^{(1)}_{2k,k}$ is a more special problem than Deutsch-Jozsa problem, and therefore it can also be computed by the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm.

If f is isomorphic to $f^{(3)}_{n,n/2}$ (n being even), then it is just the Deutsch-Jozsa problem.

Consequently, $Q_E(f) = 1$ implies that f can always be computed by the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm.

On the other hand, if f can be computed by the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm, then $Q_E(f) = 1$ (here we omit the ordinary case of f being a constant function, and therefore we always suppose $Q_E(f) > 0$).

1.4. Problems

A problem for further study is to characterize the symmetric and partial Boolean functions by exact quantum $(k+1)$-query complexity for $k \geq 0$. It can be described more precisely in the following.

Let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be an n-bit partial symmetric Boolean function with domain of definition D, and let $0 \leq k < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Then, for $2k+1 \leq \deg(f) \leq 2(k+1)$, how to characterize f by giving all functions with degrees from $2k+1$ to $2k+2$? A possible conjecture by means of generalization is that f may be isomorphic to one of the following functions:

$$f^{(1),k}_{n,m}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| \leq k, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = m, \end{cases} \tag{10}$$

$$f^{(2),k}_{n,m}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| \leq k, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = m \text{ or } |x| = m+1, \end{cases} \tag{11}$$

$$f^{(3),k}_{n,l}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| \leq k \text{ or } |x| \geq n-k, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = l, \end{cases} \tag{12}$$

$$f^{(4),k}_{n}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| \leq k \text{ or } |x| \geq n-k, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \text{ or } |x| = \lceil n/2 \rceil, \end{cases} \tag{13}$$

where $m \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor \leq l \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil$.

Moreover, how to characterize the symmetrically partial Boolean function f in terms of its exact quantum $(k+1)$-query complexity? Can any symmetrically partial Boolean function f with exact quantum $(k+1)$-query complexity be computed by the presented exact quantum $(k+1)$-query algorithm for computing the generalized Deutsch-Jozsa problem DJ^k_n?

Related are another two questions:

1. $2 \leq Q_E(f^{(2)}_{n,k}) \leq 4$ for $n/4 \leq k < n$ and $2 \leq Q_E(f^{(4)}_n) \leq 5$ will be verified in the article. How to determine $Q_E(f^{(2)}_{n,k})$ and $Q_E(f^{(4)}_n)$?

2. For the function $\mathrm{DW}^{k,l}_n$, defined as:

$$\mathrm{DW}^{k,l}_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = k, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = l, \end{cases}$$

   we will give some optimal exact quantum query algorithms for some special choices of k and l. Can we give optimal exact quantum query algorithms for any k and l?

1.5. Organization

The remainder of this article is organized as follows. In Section 2 we study the representation of symmetrically partial Boolean functions with multilinear polynomials, and give a method for finding the approximate (and exact) degree of symmetrically partial Boolean functions. Then in Section 3 we investigate the exact quantum and classical deterministic query complexity of a generalized Deutsch-Jozsa problem, that is, the

function DJ_n^k, and we present an optimal exact quantum $(k+1)$-query algorithm to compute DJ_n^k, but its classical deterministic query complexity is $n/2+k+1$. After that, in Section 4 we give all symmetrically partial Boolean functions with exact degree 1 or 2 in the sense of isomorphism. By combining the results of Section 4, in Section 5 we study the exact quantum query complexity for symmetrically partial Boolean functions with exact degree 1 or 2, and in particular, we present all symmetrically partial Boolean functions with exact quantum 1-query complexity as well as prove that these function can be computed by the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm. In addition, we in Section 6 study further the exact quantum query complexity for some symmetrically partial Boolean functions.

2. Degree of polynomials for symmetric and partial functions

First we study the exact degree of symmetrically partial functions. We can use the method of symmetrization [43] to prove the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *For any symmetrically partial function f over $\{0,1\}^n$ with domain of definition D, suppose $\widetilde{deg}_0(f) \leq d$. Then there exists a real multilinear polynomial q representing f and q can be written as*

$$q(x) = c_0 + c_1V_1 + c_2V_2 + \cdots + c_dV_d, \tag{14}$$

where $c_i \in \mathbf{R}$, $V_i = \Sigma_{j_1j_2\ldots j_i\in\{1,2,\ldots,n\}^i} x_{j_1}x_{j_2}\ldots x_{j_i}$ where any $j_1j_2\ldots j_i \in \{1,2,\ldots,n\}^i$ is without repeated number, $1 \leq i \leq d$, for example, $V_1 = x_1 + \cdots + x_n$, $V_2 = x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + \cdots + x_{n-1}x_n$, etc.

Proof. Let p be a multilinear polynomial representing f and let $\deg(p) = \widetilde{\deg}_0(f) = d$. If π is some permutation and $x = (x_1, \ldots, x_n)$, then $\pi(x) = (x_{\pi(1)}, \ldots, x_{\pi(n)})$. Let S_n be the set of all $n!$ permutations. For any $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, the symmetrization of p is,

$$p^{\mathrm{sym}}(x) = \frac{\sum_{\pi\in S_n} p(\pi(x))}{n!}. \tag{15}$$

Clearly, $0 \leq p(x) \leq 1$ implies $0 \leq p^{\mathrm{sym}}(x) \leq 1$ for $x \in \{0,1\}^n$. Since f is symmetric, $x \in D$ implies $\pi(x) \in D$. For all $x \in D$, we have $f(\pi(x)) = f(x)$. Since p represents f, for any $x \in D$, we have $p(\pi(x)) = f(\pi(x)) = f(x) = p(x)$. Therefore, for any $x \in D$,

$$p^{\mathrm{sym}}(x) = \frac{\sum_{\pi\in S_n} p(\pi(x))}{n!} = \frac{\sum_{\pi\in S_n} p(x)}{n!} = p(x) = f(x). \tag{16}$$

So p^{sym} can represent f. Let the multilinear polynomial $q = p^{\mathrm{sym}}$. According to Minsky and Papert's result [43] (also Lemma 2 in [20]), q can be written as

$$q(x) = c_0 + c_1V_1 + c_2V_2 + \cdots + c_dV_d. \tag{17}$$

Therefore, the lemma has been proved. □

Example 1. Let us give an example to find out $\widetilde{\deg}_0(f)$ for $f = \mathrm{DJ}_n^0$, which is the Deutsch-Jozsa problem. We prove that $\widetilde{\deg}_0(\mathrm{DJ}_n^0) \leq 2$. Therefore, we assume that there is a multilinear polynomial $q(x) = c_0 + c_1V_1 + c_2V_2$ representing DJ_n^0. For $|x| = 0$, we have $q(x) = c_0 = f(x) = 0$. For $|x| = n$, we have $q(x) = \binom{n}{0}c_0 + \binom{n}{1}c_1 + \binom{n}{2}c_2 = \binom{n}{1}c_1 + \binom{n}{2}c_2 = 0$. For $|x| = \frac{n}{2}$, we have $q(x) = \binom{n/2}{0}c_0 + \binom{n/2}{1}c_1 + \binom{n/2}{2}c_2 = \binom{n/2}{1}c_1 + \binom{n/2}{2}c_2 = 1$. Therefore, we need to find out the solution of the following linear system of equations:

$$\begin{cases} c_0 = 0, \\ \binom{n}{0}c_0 + \binom{n}{1}c_1 + \binom{n}{2}c_2 = 0, \\ \binom{n/2}{0}c_0 + \binom{n/2}{1}c_1 + \binom{n/2}{2}c_2 = 1. \end{cases} \tag{18}$$

It is easy to obtain that $c_0 = 0$, $c_1 = \frac{4(n-1)}{n^2}$, $c_2 = -\frac{8}{n^2}$ and $q(x) = \frac{4(n-1)}{n^2}V_1 - \frac{8}{n^2}V_2$ representing DJ_n^0. Therefore, $\widetilde{\deg_0}(\mathrm{DJ}_n^0) \leq 2$.

Suppose that $\widetilde{\deg_0}(\mathrm{DJ}_n^0) \leq 1$. Then there exists a multilinear polynomial $q(x) = c_0 + c_1 V_1$ representing DJ_n^0. We need to get the solution for the following linear group of equations:

$$\begin{cases} c_0 = 0, \\ \binom{n}{0}c_0 + \binom{n}{1}c_1 = 0, \\ \binom{n/2}{0}c_0 + \binom{n/2}{1}c_1 = 1. \end{cases} \tag{19}$$

It is easy to deduce that there is no solution. Therefore, $\widetilde{\deg_0}(\mathrm{DJ}_n^0) > 1$, and consequently $\widetilde{\deg_0}(\mathrm{DJ}_n^0) = 2$. The example ends.

For any total function f, with the next lemma it has been proved [14] (or see [20]) that $Q_E(f) \geq \frac{1}{2}\deg(f)$.

Lemma 2. [14, 20] *Let $\mathcal{A}$ be a quantum query algorithm that makes t queries. Then there exist complex-valued n-variate multilinear polynomials α_i of degree at most t, such that the final state of $\mathcal{A}$ is*

$$\sum_{i\in\{0,1\}^m} \alpha_i(x)|i\rangle \tag{20}$$

for every input $x \in \{0,1\}^n$.

Indeed, according to the proof of Theorem 17 in [20] (also refer to [14]), the following result still holds, and we also give a similar proof.

Lemma 3. *For any partial Boolean function f, $Q_\varepsilon(f) \geq \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{deg}_\varepsilon(f)$, where $Q_\varepsilon(f)$ denotes the quantum query complexity for f with bounded-error ε.*

Proof. Consider a $Q_\varepsilon(f)$-query quantum algorithm for f with error ε. Let S be the set of basis states corresponding to a 1-output. Consider the polynomial $p(x) = \sum_{i\in S} |\alpha_i(x)|^2$, which is the probability that the algorithm outputs 1. If $x \in D$ and $f(x) = 1$, then $p(x) \geq 1 - \varepsilon$. If $x \in D$ and $f(x) = 0$, then $p(x) \leq \varepsilon$. Therefore, $|p(x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon$ for all $x \in D$. Since the algorithm procedure to get the last state for any input x is the implementation of a sequence of unitary operators, it is clear that $0 \leq p(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \{0,1\}^n$. So polynomial $p(x)$ approximates f with error ε. According to Lemma 2, the α_i are polynomials of degree no more than $Q_\varepsilon(f)$, therefore $p(x)$ is a polynomial of degree no more than $2Q_\varepsilon(f)$. Consequently, we have

$$\widetilde{\deg_\varepsilon}(f) \leq \deg(p) \leq 2Q_\varepsilon(f), \tag{21}$$

and the lemma has been proved. □

In particular, when $\varepsilon = 0$ we have the following special case.

Lemma 4. *For any symmetrically partial function f, $Q_E(f) \geq \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{deg}_0(f)$.*

We have proved that $\widetilde{\deg_0}(\mathrm{DJ}_n^0) = 2$. According to the above lemma, $Q_E(\mathrm{DJ}_n^0) \geq \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{\deg_0}(\mathrm{DJ}_n^0) = 1$. It is known that $Q_E(\mathrm{DJ}_n^0) \leq 1$ [28]. Therefore, we can use the above lemma to conclude $Q_E(\mathrm{DJ}_n^0) = 1$.

Now we deal with the case of approximating representation.

Lemma 5. *For any symmetrically partial Boolean function f over $\{0,1\}^n$ with domain of definition D, suppose $\widetilde{deg}_\varepsilon(f) = d$. Then there exists a real multilinear polynomial q approximates f with error ε and q can be written as*

$$q(x) = c_0 + c_1V_1 + c_2V_2 + \cdots + c_dV_d \tag{22}$$

where $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$, $V_1 = x_1 + \cdots + x_n$, $V_2 = x_1x_2 + x_1x_3 + \cdots + x_{n-1}x_n$, etc.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 1. For the readability, we outline it again. Let p be a multilinear polynomial with degree d that approximates f with error ε. The symmetrization of p is

$$p^{\mathrm{sym}}(x) = \frac{\sum_{\pi \in S_n} p(\pi(x))}{n!}. \tag{23}$$

If $x \in D$, then $|p(x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon$. Since f is symmetric, we have $|p^{\mathrm{sym}}(x) - f(x)| = |p(x) - f(x)| \leq \varepsilon$. Since $0 \leq p(\pi(x)) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, we have $0 \leq p^{\mathrm{sym}}(x) \leq 1$ for all $x \in \{0,1\}^n$. According to Minsky and Papert's result [43] (also Lemma 2 in [20]), p^{sym} can be written as

$$p^{\mathrm{sym}}(x) = c_0 + c_1V_1 + c_2V_2 + \cdots + c_dV_d. \tag{24}$$

Therefore, p^{sym} is the polynomial required. □

It is important to determine the approximate degree of symmetrically partial functions. The following lemma shows if or not a symmetrically partial function has degree d.

Lemma 6. *For any symmetrically partial function f over $\{0,1\}^n$ with domain of definition D, and for the fixed d and $0 \leq \varepsilon < 1/2$, there is a linear programming algorithm to discover whether or not there exists*

$$q(x) = c_0 + c_1V_1 + c_2V_2 + \cdots + c_dV_d = \sum_{k=0}^{d} c_kV_k \tag{25}$$

approximating f with error ε.

Proof. Suppose that f is fully described by the vector $(b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in \{0,1,*\}^{n+1}$, where $f(x) = b_i$ for $|x| = i$. For input x, $V_k = \binom{|x|}{k}$. If there exists a polynomial q with degree d approximating f with error ε, then for $0 \leq i \leq n$, $q(x)$ satisfies the following inequalities and equalities:

1. $0 \leq q(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{d} c_k\binom{i}{k} \leq \varepsilon$ if $b_i = 0$;
2. $1 - \varepsilon \leq q(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{d} c_k\binom{i}{k} \leq 1$ if $b_i = 1$;
3. $0 \leq q(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{d} c_k\binom{i}{k} \leq 1$ if $b_i = *$.

Therefore, it suffices to verify whether the polyhedra has solution or not. It is easy to transfer the above polyhedra to the normal form, i.e., $P = \{c | Ac \leq h\}$, where matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+1)\times(d+1)}$ and vector $h \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+1)}$. We now consider the following linear programming problem:

$$\text{LP: Max } Z, \tag{26}$$

$$\text{s.t. } Ac + eZ \leq h, \tag{27}$$

$$Z \leq 0, \tag{28}$$

where $e \in \mathbb{R}^{2(n+1)}$ and $e^T = (1, 1, \ldots, 1)$. It is clear that $S \neq \emptyset$ if and only if the maximal value $Z^* = 0$. □

According to Lemma 5, determining $\widetilde{\deg}_\varepsilon(f)$ is equivalent to find out the minimal d such that $q(x) = \sum_{k=0}^{d} c_k V_k$ approximates f with error ε.

Theorem 6. *For any symmetrically partial Boolean function f over $\{0,1\}^n$ with domain of definition D, and for the fixed $0 \le \varepsilon < 1/2$, there exists an algorithm to find out $\widetilde{deg}_\varepsilon(f)$ with time complexity $O(\log n)\cdot t(LP)$, where $t(LP)$ is the time complexity to use linear programming algorithm to find the maximal value Z^* in Lemma 6.*

Proof. Let $\mathbf{b} = (b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ be the vector describing f. Let subroutine $\mathrm{LP}(n, \mathbf{b}, \varepsilon, d) = 1$ (0) if there does (not) exist polynomial q with degree d approximating f with error ε. The subroutine $\mathrm{LP}(n, \mathbf{b}, \varepsilon, d)$ can be done with a linear programming algorithm according to Lemma 6. We give a binary search algorithm to find out $\widetilde{\deg}_\varepsilon(f)$ as following:

Algorithm 1 Algorithm for finding out $\widetilde{\deg}_\varepsilon(f)$

```
1: procedure DEGREE(integer n, array b, real ε)        ▷ b ∈ {0,1,*}^{n+1}
2:     integer l := 0, r := n;
3:     while l ≤ r do
4:         d = ⌊(l + r)/2⌋;
5:         if LP(n, b, ε, d)=0 then l = d + 1;
6:         else  r = d − 1;
7:         end if
8:     end while
9: return l;
10: end procedure
```

In each iteration of the 'while' loop, it holds that $\mathrm{LP}(n, \mathbf{b}, \varepsilon, r+1) = 1$ and $\mathrm{LP}(n, \mathbf{b}, \varepsilon, l-1) = 0$. We have $\widetilde{\deg}_\varepsilon(f) \le r+1$ and $\widetilde{\deg}_\varepsilon(f) > l-1$. When the 'while' loop is finished, we have that $l = r+1$ and $\widetilde{\deg}_\varepsilon(f) \le r+1 = l$. Therefore, $\widetilde{\deg}_\varepsilon(f) = l$. The time complexity is $O(\log n)\cdot t(LP)$. □

3. Generalized Deutsch-Jozsa problem

In this section we consider a generalized Deutsch-Jozsa problem DJ_n^k that was described by Eq. (3), that is, the problem of distinguishing between the inputs of Hamming weight $n/2$ and Hamming weights in the set $\{0, 1, \ldots, k, n-k, n-k+1, \ldots, n\}$ for all even n with $0 \le k < n/2$.

3.1. Exact quantum algorithm

By combining the exact quantum query algorithms for the functions EXACT and THRESHOLD by Ambainis *et al* [10], in this subsection we give an exact quantum query algorithm for computing DJ_n^k.

Theorem 7. *The exact quantum query complexity of DJ_n^k satisfies:*

$$Q_E(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k) \le k+1. \tag{29}$$

Proof. We will give an exact quantum algorithm using $k+1$ queries for DJ_n^k. One of the important subroutines that we will use in this paper is as following.

- Input: $x = x_1, x_2, \ldots, x_m$.
- Output: If the output is $(0,0)$ then $|x| \neq m/2$. Otherwise, it will output (i,j) such that $x_i \neq x_j$.

We call this subroutine Xquery. Let $x \in \{0,1\}^m$. If Xquery$(m,x) = (0,0)$, then $|x| \neq m/2$. If Xquery$(m,x) = (i,j)$, then $x_i \neq x_j$.

Indeed, according to [10] by Ambainis *et al*, the subroutine Xquery can be implemented in one exact quantum query algorithm, and we put the details concerning the subroutine Xquery in Appendix A.

Based on the subroutine Xquery, now we give an algorithm (Algorithm 2) for DJ_n^k. It is clear that Algorithm 2 uses at most $k+1$ queries.

Algorithm 2 Algorithm for DJ_n^k

```
1: procedure DJ(integer n, integer k, array x)                ▷ x ∈ {0,1}^n
2:     integer l:=1
3:     while l ≤ k do
4:         Output ←Xquery(n, x)
5:         if Output=(0,0) then return 0
6:         end if
7:         if Output=(i, j) then
8:             x ← x \ {x_i, x_j}
9:             l ← l + 1
10:            n ← n − 2
11:        end if
12:    end while
13:    Output ←Xquery(n, x)
14:    if Output=(0,0) then return 0
15:    end if
16:    if Output=(i, j) then return 1
17:    end if
18: end procedure
```

□

3.2. Lower bound of exact quantum query complexity

The purpose of this subsection is to prove that the exact quantum query complexity of DJ_n^k is no less than $k+1$, i.e., $Q_E(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k) \geq k+1$.

Theorem 8. *The exact quantum query complexity of* DJ_n^k *satisfies:*

$$Q_E(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k) \geq k+1. \tag{30}$$

Proof. We will prove that $\widetilde{\deg_0}(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k) \geq 2k+2$. Let us consider a simple case $k=1$ and $n \geq 6$ first. Suppose that $\widetilde{\deg_0}(\mathrm{DJ}_n^1) \leq 3$, according to Lemma 1, there exists a multilinear polynomial $q(x) = \sum_{i=0}^{3} c_i V_i$

representing DJ_n^1. For $|x|=0$, we have $q(x)=c_0=f(x)=0$. For $|x|=1$, we have $q(x)=c_0+\binom{1}{1}c_1=f(x)=0$ and therefore $c_1=0$. For $|x|=n,n-1,n/2$, we have the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} \binom{n}{2}c_2+\binom{n}{3}c_3=0, \\ \binom{n-1}{2}c_2+\binom{n-1}{3}c_3=0, \\ \binom{n/2}{2}c_2+\binom{n/2}{3}c_3=1. \end{cases} \tag{31}$$

Let us consider the determinant

$$\begin{vmatrix} \binom{n}{2} & \binom{n}{3} \\ \binom{n-1}{2} & \binom{n-1}{3} \end{vmatrix} = \begin{vmatrix} \binom{n}{n-2} & \binom{n}{n-3} \\ \binom{n-1}{n-3} & \binom{n-1}{n-4} \end{vmatrix} \tag{32}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\begin{vmatrix} \binom{n}{n-2} & \binom{n}{n-3} \\ n\binom{n-1}{n-3} & n\binom{n-1}{n-4} \end{vmatrix} \tag{33}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\begin{vmatrix} \binom{n}{n-2} & \binom{n}{n-3} \\ (n-2)\binom{n}{n-2} & (n-3)\binom{n}{n-3} \end{vmatrix} \tag{34}$$

$$= \frac{1}{n}\begin{vmatrix} \binom{n}{n-2} & \binom{n}{n-3} \\ \binom{n}{n-2} & 0 \end{vmatrix} \neq 0. \tag{35}$$

Therefore, in order to satisfy the first two equations, we have $c_2=c_3=0$. The last equation will not hold, which means that such q does not exist. Thus, $\widetilde{\deg}_0(\mathrm{DJ}_n^1)\geq 4$. According the Lemma 4, we have $Q_E(\mathrm{DJ}_n^1)\geq \frac{1}{2}\widetilde{\deg}_0(\mathrm{DJ}_n^1)\geq 2$. That is to say, the algorithm in Theorem 7 for DJ_n^1 is optimal. The algorithm in [42] for DJ_n^1 is also optimal.

Now we consider for the general case. Suppose that $\widetilde{\deg}_0(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k)\leq 2k+1$, according to Lemma 1, there exists a multilinear polynomial $q(x)=\sum_{i=0}^{2k+1}c_iV_i$ representing DJ_n^k. For $0\leq|x|\leq k$, $f(x)=0$. Therefore, we have $c_0=c_1=\cdots=c_k=0$. For $|x|=n,n-1,\ldots,n-k$, we have the following equations:

$$\begin{cases} \binom{n}{k+1}c_{k+1}+\binom{n}{k+2}c_{k+2}+\cdots+\binom{n}{2k+1}c_{2k+1}=0, \\ \binom{n-1}{k+1}c_{k+1}+\binom{n-1}{k+2}c_{k+2}+\cdots+\binom{n-1}{2k+1}c_{2k+1}=0, \\ \cdots \\ \binom{n-k}{k+1}c_{k+1}+\binom{n-k}{k+2}c_{k+2}+\cdots+\binom{n-k}{2k+1}c_{2k+1}=0. \end{cases} \tag{36}$$

Let us consider the determinant (see Appendix B for the detailed proof):

$$\begin{vmatrix} \binom{n}{k+1} & \binom{n}{k+2} & \cdots & \binom{n}{2k+1} \\ \binom{n-1}{k+1} & \binom{n-1}{k+2} & \cdots & \binom{n-1}{2k+1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \binom{n-k}{k+1} & \binom{n-k}{k+2} & \cdots & \binom{n-k}{2k+1} \end{vmatrix} = (-1)^{\frac{k(k+5)}{2}}\cdot\frac{\prod_{i=k+1}^{2k+1}\binom{n}{i}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k}\binom{n}{i}}\neq 0. \tag{37}$$

Therefore, we have $c_{k+1}=\cdots=c_{2k+1}=0$. Then for $|x|=n/2$, $f(x)=q(x)=0$, which is a contradiction. Therefore, $\widetilde{\deg}_0(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k)\geq 2k+2$ and $Q_E(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k)\geq\frac{1}{2}\widetilde{\deg}_0(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k)\geq k+1$. □

3.3. Exact classical query complexity

Theorem 9. *The classical deterministic query complexity of* DJ_n^k *satisfies:*

$$D(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k)=n/2+k+1. \tag{38}$$

Proof. If the first $n/2$ queries return $x_i = 1$ and the next k queries return $x_i = 0$, then we will need to make another query as well. Therefore, $D(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k) \geq n/2 + k + 1$.

Now suppose that we have made $n/2 + k + 1$ queries. If no more than k queries return $x_i = 0$, then there are more than $n/2 + 1$ queries returning $x_i = 1$ and $\mathrm{DJ}_n^k(x) = 0$. If no more than k queries return $x_i = 1$, then there are more than $n/2+1$ queries returning $x_i = 0$ and $\mathrm{DJ}_n^k(x) = 0$. If there are more than k queries return $x_i = 0$ and also more than k queries return $x_i = 1$, then it must be balanced and $\mathrm{DJ}_n^k(x) = 1$. Therefore, $D(\mathrm{DJ}_n^k) \leq n/2 + k + 1$ and the theorem has been proved. □

Remark 4. Again, we make some comparisons to the previous results. When $k = 0$, this is the Deutsch-Jozsa problem; when $k = 1$, this problem was considered by Montanaro *et al* [42] and an exact quantum 2-query algorithm was given to solve it, but the optimality was not verified. Also, the method in [42] is different (the unitary operator in their query algorithm was derived from distinguishing two orthogonal subsets of states).

So far, according to **Theorem** 7, **Theorem** 8, **Theorem** 9, our first main result, **Theorem** 1 has been proved.

4. symmetrically partial functions with degree 1 or 2

This section is to give all symmetrically partial functions with degree 1 or 2 in the isomorphic sense. From now on, we just identity $\deg(f)$ with $\widetilde{\deg_0}(f)$ for any partial Boolean function f.

Lemma 7. *For $n > 1$, then*

$$deg(f_{n,n}^{(1)}) = 1, \tag{39}$$

where $f_{n,n}^{(1)}$ is defined as Eq. (40) with $k = n$, and the following symmetrically partial Boolean functions have degree 2:

$$f_{n,k}^{(1)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k, \end{cases} \tag{40}$$

$$f_{n,k}^{(2)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k \text{ or } |x| = k+1, \end{cases} \tag{41}$$

$$f_{n,l}^{(3)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = l, \end{cases} \tag{42}$$

$$f_{n}^{(4)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \text{ or } |x| = \lceil n/2 \rceil, \end{cases} \tag{43}$$

where $n - 1 \geq k \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, and $\lceil n/2 \rceil \geq l \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. As usual, for odd n, $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor = (n-1)/2$ and $\lceil n/2 \rceil = (n+1)/2$.

Proof. Since the polynomial $q(x) = \frac{x_1+x_2+\ldots+x_n}{n} = \frac{1}{n}V_1$ can approximate $f_{n,n}^{(1)}$ with error 0, $\deg(f_{n,n}^{(1)}) = 1$ is verified. Next, we prove that the rest functions have degree 2 exactly.

Case 1. For $n-1 \geq k \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, it is easy to check that $\deg(f_{n,k}^{(1)}) > 1$, since the polynomial $q(x) = \frac{1}{k}V_1 > 1$ for $|x| \geq k$. As for the proof of $\deg(f_{n,k}^{(1)}) = 2$, it follows from the following Case 2.

Case 2. For $n - 1 \geq k \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, it is easy to verify that $\deg(f_{n,k}^{(2)}) > 1$. Indeed, we can further verify that $\deg(f_{n,k}^{(2)}) = 2$ in terms of the polynomial $q(x) = \frac{2}{k+1}V_1 - \frac{2}{k(k+1)}V_2$.

(1) First, we have $q(x) = f^{(2)}_{n,k}(x)$ for $|x| = 0, k, k+1$.

(2) Second, it follows $0 \le q(x) \le 1$ from $q(x) = \frac{2}{k+1}$ for $|x| = 1$ and $q(x) = \frac{2}{k+1}\binom{i}{1} - \frac{2}{k(k+1)}\binom{i}{2} = \frac{i(2k+1-i)}{k(k+1)}$ for $|x| = i \ge 2$. Indeed, since $k \ge \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, we have $q(x) \ge 0$; on the other hand, $i(2k+1-i) - k(k+1) = -(i-k-1/2)^2 + 1/4 \le -(1/2)^2 + 1/4 \le 0$, consequently we have $0 \le q(x) \le 1$.

So, this $q(x)$ can approximate $f^{(2)}_{n,k}$ with error 0, and therefore $\deg(f^{(2)}_{n,k}) = 2$. Since $\deg(f^{(1)}_{n,k}) \le \deg(f^{(2)}_{n,k})$, we have also $\deg(f^{(1)}_{n,k}) = 2$ for $n - 1 \ge k \ge \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.

Case 3. We now verify $\deg(f^{(4)}_n) = 2$. It is easy to verify that $\deg(f^{(4)}_n) > 1$. If n is even, the function $f^{(4)}_n$ is the well-known Deutsch-Jozsa problem with $Q_E(f^{(4)}_n) = 1$, and with Lemma 4 we have $\deg(f^{(4)}_n) \le 2$. Therefore $\deg(f^{(4)}_n) = 2$. If n is odd with $n = 2m+1$, then we consider the polynomial $p(x) = \frac{2}{m+1}V_1 + \frac{2}{m(m+1)}V_2$. When $|x| = 0, n, m, m+1$, we have $p(x) = f^{(4)}_n(x)$. If $|x| = 1$, then $p(x) = \frac{2}{m+1}$ and $0 \le p(x) \le 1$. For $2 \le |x| = i \le n$, then $p(x) = \frac{2}{m+1}\binom{i}{1} - \frac{2}{m(m+1)}\binom{i}{2} = \frac{i(2m+1-i)}{m(m+1)}$. According to Case 2 (2) above we also have $0 \le p(x) \le 1$. Hence $p(x)$ can approximate $f^{(4)}_n(x)$ with error 0 and $\deg(f^{(4)}_n) = 2$.

Case 4. It is easy to verify that $\deg(f^{(3)}_{n,l}) > 1$. On the other hand, we always have $\deg(f^{(3)}_{n,l}) \le \deg(f^{(4)}_n) = 2$. Therefore, we have $\deg(f^{(3)}_{n,l}) = 2$.

First we note $\deg(f^{(2)}_{n,l}) \le \deg(f^{(3)}_{n,l})$ with $l = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Then we only need to give a polynomial $q(x)$ of degree 2 to approximate $f^{(3)}_{n,l}$ with error 0. Consider this polynomial $q(x) = \frac{4}{n+1}V_1 - \frac{8}{(n-1)(n+1)}V_2$. Omitting the details, we can check that $0 \le q(x) \le 1$ and $q(x) = f^{(3)}_{n,l}(x)$ for $|x| = 0, n, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor, \lceil n/2 \rceil$.

Summarily, the functions above have degree 2 except for the degree of $f^{(1)}_{n,n}$ being 1.

□

Indeed, the following lemma shows that those functions in Lemma 7 contain all symmetrically partial functions with degree 1 or 2. First, we consider the case of n being odd. Indeed, the case of n being even is similar.

Lemma 8. *Let $n > 1$ be odd, and let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be an n-bit symmetrically partial Boolean function. Then:*

(1) if $\deg(f) = 1$, then f is isomorphic to the function $f^{(1)}_{n,n}$;

(2) if $\deg(f) = 2$, then f is isomorphic to one of the functions

$$f^{(1)}_{n,k}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k, \end{cases} \tag{44}$$

$$f^{(2)}_{n,k}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k \text{ or } |x| = k+1, \end{cases} \tag{45}$$

$$f^{(3)}_{n,l}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = l, \end{cases} \tag{46}$$

$$f^{(4)}_{n,1}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \text{ or } |x| = \lceil n/2 \rceil, \end{cases} \tag{47}$$

where $n - 1 \ge k \ge \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, and $\lceil n/2 \rceil \ge l \ge \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.

Proof. The lemma can be easily verified for $n \le 3$, so we now prove the case of $n > 3$. Since the degree of function f to be considered is not 0, f is not a constant function. Let $(b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n) \in \{0, 1, *\}^{n+1}$ be the vector describing f. Then there exist $0 \le i < j \le n$ such that $b_i = 0$ and $b_j = 1$, otherwise, we can consider

its isomorphic function $(\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{b}_n)$, instead of f. Also, we note that if a polynomial q approximates function $(b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ with error 0, then the polynomial $1 - q$ can approximate function $(\bar{b}_0, \bar{b}_1, \ldots, \bar{b}_n)$ with error 0, and the polynomial $q(\bar{x})$ can approximate function $(b_n, b_{n-1}, \ldots, b_0)$ with error 0, as well as the polynomial $1 - q(\bar{x})$ can approximate function $(\bar{b}_n, \bar{b}_{n-1}, \ldots, \bar{b}_0)$ with error 0.

(1) If $\deg(f) = 1$, according to Lemma 5, there is a polynomial $q(x) = c_0 + c_1 V_1$ that approximates f with error 0. Therefore, we have:

(a) $q(x) = c_0 + c_1 \cdot i = 0$ for $|x| = i$, and $q(x) = c_0 + c_1 \cdot j = 1$ for $|x| = j$;

(b) $0 \leq q(x) = c_0 + c_1 \cdot m \leq 1$ for $0 \leq |x| = m \leq n$.

From (a), we have $c_0 = -i/(j-i)$ and $c_1 = 1/(j-i)$. However, (b) implies $0 \leq c_0 \leq 1$ by taking $|x| = 0$. Therefore $i = 0$ and $c_0 = 0$. In addition, when $|x| = n$, it follows from (b) that $c_1 \leq 1/n$. Therefore $j = n$ and $c_1 = 1/n$. Moreover, b_k is undefined (i.e., $*$) for $k \notin \{0, n\}$, otherwise, $q(x) = k/n \neq b_k$.

Therefore, the symmetrically partial Boolean function f must isomorphic to $(0, *, \ldots, *, 1)$, i.e. the function $f^{(1)}_{n,n}$.

(2) If $\deg(f) = 2$, with Lemma 5, there is a polynomial $q(x) = c_0 + c_1 V_1 + c_2 V_2$ approximating f with error 0. Suppose that $b_i = 0$ and $b_j = 1$ for some $0 < i < j < n$. Then we have:

(a) $q(x) = c_0 + c_1\binom{i}{1} + c_2\binom{i}{2} = 0$ for $|x| = i$, and $q(x) = c_0 + c_1\binom{j}{1} + c_2\binom{j}{2} = 1$ for $|x| = j$;

(b) $0 \leq q(x) = c_0 + c_1\binom{m}{1} + c_2\binom{m}{2} \leq 1$ for $0 \leq |x| = m \leq n$.

By virtue of (a), we have:

$$c_1 = -\frac{i+j-1}{ij}c_0 - \frac{i-1}{j(j-i)},$$

$$c_2 = \frac{2}{ij}c_0 + \frac{2}{j(j-i)}.$$

On the other hand, by taking $|x| = 0$, (b) implies $0 \leq c_0 \leq 1$. Now for $|x| = n$ we have

$$\begin{aligned} q(x) &= c_0 + c_1\binom{n}{1} + c_2\binom{n}{2} \\ &= c_0 + n(-\frac{i+j-1}{ij}c_0 - \frac{i-1}{j(j-i)}) + \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)(\frac{2}{ij}c_0 + \frac{2}{j(j-i)}) && (48) \\ &= \frac{(n-i)(n-j)}{ij}c_0 + \frac{n(n-i)}{j(j-i)} && (49) \\ &\geq \frac{n(n-i)}{j(j-i)} && (50) \\ &> 1, && (51) \end{aligned}$$

but this contradicts to $q(x) \leq 1$. This contradiction is derived from the assumption of $b_i = 0$ and $b_j = 1$ for some $0 < i < j < n$. So, by combining with the isomorphic property, we have obtained the following result:

Result 1: If $b_i \in \{0, 1\}$ for $0 < i < n$, then $b_j \neq \bar{b}_i$ for $0 < j < n$.

So, furthermore it suffices to consider $b_0 = 0$ or $b_n = 1$. We now consider the case $b_0 = 0$.

Note that $b_0 = 0$ implies $c_0 = 0$. Suppose that $b_1 = 1$. Then we have (1) $q(x) = c_1\binom{1}{1} + c_2\binom{1}{2} = c_1 = 1$ for $|x| = 1$ and, (2) $0 \leq q(x) = c_1\binom{m}{1} + c_2\binom{m}{2} \leq 1$ for $0 \leq |x| = m \leq n$.

With (2), by taking $|x| = n$, we have $0 \leq c_1\binom{n}{1} + c_2\binom{n}{2} \leq 1$ and therefore $\frac{-2}{n-1} \leq c_2 \leq \frac{-2}{n}$. When

$|x| = n-2$, with (2) we have

$$\begin{aligned} q(x) =& c_1\binom{n-2}{1} + c_2\binom{n-2}{2} && (52)\\ =& n-2+\frac{1}{2}(n-2)(n-3)c_2 && (53)\\ \geq& n-2+\frac{1}{2}(n-2)(n-3)\frac{-2}{n-1} && (54)\\ >& 1, && (55)\end{aligned}$$

which is a contradiction to $q(x) \leq 1$. Therefore $b_1 \neq 1$.

Indeed, for $1 < j < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ we also have $b_j \neq 1$: Suppose that $b_j = 1$ for some $1 < j < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Then we have

(a) $q(x) = c_1\binom{j}{1} + c_2\binom{j}{2} = 1$ for $|x| = j$;

(b) $0 \leq q(x) = c_1\binom{m}{1} + c_2\binom{m}{2} \leq 1$ for $0 \leq |x| = m \leq n$.

With (a) we have

$$c_2 = \frac{2}{j(j-1)} - \frac{2}{j-1}c_1. \tag{56}$$

With (b), by taking $|x| = n$ and combining with Eq. (56) we have

$$\begin{aligned} 0 \leq& nc_1 + \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)c_2 && (57)\\ =& nc_1 + \frac{1}{2}n(n-1)(\frac{2}{j(j-1)} - \frac{2}{j-1}c_1) && (58)\\ \leq& 1, && (59)\end{aligned}$$

which follows

$$\frac{n+j-1}{nj} \leq c_1 \leq \frac{n-1}{j(n-j)}. \tag{60}$$

Similarly, with (b), by taking $|x| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$ and combining with Eq. (56) we have

$$\begin{aligned} q(x) =& \frac{n+1}{2}c_1 + \frac{1}{2}\frac{n+1}{2}(\frac{n+1}{2}-1)c_2 && (61)\\ =& \frac{n+1}{2}c_1 + \frac{1}{2}\frac{n+1}{2}(\frac{n+1}{2}-1)(\frac{2}{j(j-1)} - \frac{2}{j-1}c_1) && (62)\\ =& \frac{\frac{n+1}{2}(\frac{n+1}{2}-1)}{j(j-1)} + (\frac{n+1}{2} - \frac{\frac{n+1}{2}(\frac{n+1}{2}-1)}{j-1})c_1. && (63)\end{aligned}$$

Therefore, with $j < \lceil n/2 \rceil$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} q(x) \geq& \frac{\frac{n+1}{2}(\frac{n+1}{2}-1)}{j(j-1)} + (\frac{n+1}{2} - \frac{\frac{n+1}{2}(\frac{n+1}{2}-1)}{j-1})\frac{n-1}{j(n-j)} && (64)\\ =& \frac{\frac{n+1}{2}(n-\frac{n+1}{2})}{j(n-j)}. && (65)\end{aligned}$$

Furthermore, with $j < \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{n-1}{2}(n-\frac{n-1}{2}) - j(n-j) && (66)\\ =& (\frac{n-1}{2} - j)(n - \frac{n-1}{2} - j) > 0. && (67)\end{aligned}$$

Together with the above equations we obtain $q(x) \geq 1$ for $|x| = \lceil n/2 \rceil$, a contradiction. So, we conclude the following result.

Result 2: If $b_j = 1$, then $j \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.

Let l be the smallest integer satisfying $b_l = 1$ (of course, $l \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$). Next we will prove that $b_k \neq 1$ for any $k > l + 1$.

Assume that $b_k = 1$. Then we have $c_0 = 0$, $c_0 + c_1\binom{l}{1} + c_2\binom{l}{2} = 1$ and $c_0 + c_1\binom{k}{1} + c_2\binom{k}{2} = 1$. Therefore, $c_0 = 0$, $c_1 = \frac{l+k-1}{lk}$ and $c_2 = \frac{-2}{lk}$. For $|x| = l + 1 < k$, we have

$$q(x) = c_0 + c_1\binom{l+1}{1} + c_2\binom{l+1}{2} \tag{68}$$

$$= (l+1)\frac{l+k-1}{lk} + \frac{1}{2}l(l+1) \cdot \frac{-2}{lk} \tag{69}$$

$$= \frac{(l+1)(k-1)}{lk} \tag{70}$$

$$> 1, \tag{71}$$

which is a contradiction. Therefore, we have proved this result:

Result 3: If l is the smallest integer satisfying $b_l = 1$, then $b_k \neq 1$ for any $k > l + 1$.

Now let l be the smallest integer satisfying $b_l = 1$. Next we complete the proof by considering l with five cases.

(I) $l = n$, i.e., $b_i \neq 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Since the isomorphic function $(\bar{b}_n, \bar{b}_{n-1}, \ldots, \bar{b}_0)$ also has degree 2 and $\bar{b}_n = 0, \bar{b}_0 = 1$, according to the above Result 3, we have $\bar{b}_i \neq 1$ for $2 \leq i \leq n - 1$, that is $b_i \neq 0$ for $2 \leq i \leq n - 1$. Therefore f can be described by $\mathbf{b} = (0, b_1, *, \ldots, *, 1)$. If $b_1 = *$, then $\deg(f) = 1$. So, we conclude f must be the formulation $\mathbf{b} = (0, 0, *, \ldots, *, 1)$, and it is isomorphic to $f^{(2)}_{n,n-1}$.

(II) $l = n - 1$, i.e., $b_i \neq 1$ for $1 \leq i < n - 1$. From Result 1 we know that $b_j \neq \bar{b}_l$ for $0 < j < n$, that is $b_j \neq 0$ for $0 < j < n$. As a result, f has this formulation $\mathbf{b} = (0, *, \ldots, *, 1, b_n)$. However, if $b_n = 0$, then it is isomorphic to $(0, 1, *, \ldots, 0)$, which results in $\deg(f) > 2$. Therefore, $b_n = 1$ and f is described by $\mathbf{b} = (0, *, \ldots, *, 1, 1)$, exactly the function $f^{(2)}_{n,n-1}$ as well.

(III) $\lceil n/2 \rceil < l < n-1$, that is, $b_i \neq 1$ for $1 \leq i < l$ and $l+1 < i \leq n$. From Result 1 it follows that $b_j \neq 0$ for $0 < j < n$. As a consequence, f has the formulation $\mathbf{b} = (0, *, \ldots, *, 1, b_{l+1}, *, \ldots, *, b_n)$ where $b_n \neq 1$. If $b_n = 0$, then f is isomorphic to $(0, *, \ldots, *, b_{l+1}, 1, *, \ldots, *, 0)$, which from Result 2 follows $\deg(f) > 2$, a contradiction. So, it holds that $b_n = *$, and f thus has the form $\mathbf{b} = (0, *, \ldots, *, 1, b_{l+1}, *, \ldots, *)$. In this representation, $b_{l+1} = *$ implies the function $f = f^{(1)}_{n,l}$; and $b_{l+1} = 1$ results in $f = f^{(2)}_{n,l}$.

(IV) $l = \lceil n/2 \rceil$. Then $b_i \neq 1$ for $1 \leq i < (n+1)/2$ and $(n+1)/2 + 1 < i \leq n$. With Result 1 we have also $b_j \neq 0$ for $0 < j < n$. Now it concludes that f has this representation $\mathbf{b} = (0, *, \ldots, *, 1, b_{l+1}, *, \ldots, b_n)$. Furthermore, if $b_{l+1} = *$ and $b_n = *$, then $f = f^{(1)}_{n,l}$; if $b_{l+1} = *$ and $b_n = 0$, then $f = f^{(3)}_{n,l}$; if $b_{l+1} = 1$ and $b_n = *$, then $f = f^{(2)}_{n,l}$. Finally, both $b_{l+1} = 1$ and $b_n = 0$ result in $\deg(f) > 2$, which is an impossible case.

(V) $l = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$. Then $b_i \neq 1$ for $1 \leq i < (n-1)/2$ and $(n-1)/2 + 1 < i \leq n$. Result 1 also implies $b_j \neq 0$ for $0 < j < n$. Therefore f has this representation $\mathbf{b} = (0, *, \ldots, *, 1, b_{l+1}, *, \ldots, b_n)$. In addition, if $b_{l+1} = *$ and $b_n = *$, then $f = f^{(1)}_{n,l}$; if $b_{l+1} = *$ and $b_n = 0$, then $f = f^{(3)}_{n,l}$; if $b_{l+1} = 1$ and $b_n = *$, then $f = f^{(2)}_{n,l}$; if $b_{l+1} = 1$ and $b_n = 0$, then $f = f^{(4)}_{n,1}$.

So, the case of $b_0 = 0$ has been proved. Finally, we consider the case $b_n = 1$ with an isomorphic method. Because $\mathbf{b} = (b_0, b_1, \ldots, b_n)$ is isomorphic to $\mathbf{b}' = (\bar{b}_n, \bar{b}_{n-1}, \ldots, \bar{b}_0)$, we have $\deg(\mathbf{b}') = \deg(\mathbf{b}) = 2$. Since $\bar{b}_n = 0$, as we have proved above, the function $\mathbf{b}'$ must be isomorphic to the one of the following functions:

$f^{(1)}_{n,k}$, $f^{(2)}_{n,k}$, $f^{(3)}_{n,l}$ and $f^{(4)}_{n,1}(x)$, where $n \geq k \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor \leq l \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil$. Therefore, f must be isomorphic to the one of the following functions: $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$, $f^{(2)}_{n,k}$, $f^{(3)}_{n,l}$ and $f^{(4)}_{n,1}(x)$, where $n \geq k \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$ and $\lfloor n/2 \rfloor \leq l \leq \lceil n/2 \rceil$. □

If n is an even, then with a similar process of proof to the case of n being odd we have the following result.

Lemma 9. *Let $n > 1$ be even, and let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be an n-bit symmetrically partial Boolean function. Then:*

(1) if $\deg(f) = 1$, then f is isomorphic to the function $f^{(1)}_{n,n}$;

(2) if $\deg(f) = 2$, then is isomorphic to one of the functions

$$f^{(1)}_{n,k}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k, \end{cases} \tag{72}$$

$$f^{(2)}_{n,k}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k \text{ or } |x| = k+1, \end{cases} \tag{73}$$

$$f^{(3)}_{n,n/2}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = n/2, \end{cases} \tag{74}$$

where $n - 1 \geq k \geq n/2$.

Therefore, combining Lemmas 7 with 8 and 9, we have the following two lemmas.

Lemma 10. *Let $n > 1$ be odd, and let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be an n-bit symmetrically partial Boolean function. Then:*

(1) $\deg(f) = 1$ if and only if f is isomorphic to the function $f^{(1)}_{n,n}$;

(2) $\deg(f) = 2$ if and only if f is isomorphic to one of the functions

$$f^{(1)}_{n,k}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k, \end{cases} \tag{75}$$

$$f^{(2)}_{n,k}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k \text{ or } |x| = k+1, \end{cases} \tag{76}$$

$$f^{(3)}_{n,l}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = l, \end{cases} \tag{77}$$

$$f^{(4)}_{n,1}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \text{ or } |x| = \lceil n/2 \rceil, \end{cases} \tag{78}$$

where $n - 1 \geq k \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, and $\lceil n/2 \rceil \geq l \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.

Lemma 11. *Let $n > 1$ be even, and let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be an n-bit symmetrically partial Boolean function. Then:*

(1) $\deg(f) = 1$ if and only if f is isomorphic to the function $f^{(1)}_{n,n}$;

(2) $\deg(f) = 2$ *if and only if* f *is isomorphic to one of the functions*

$$f_{n,k}^{(1)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k, \end{cases} \tag{79}$$

$$f_{n,k}^{(2)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k \text{ or } |x| = k+1, \end{cases} \tag{80}$$

$$f_{n,n/2}^{(3)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = n/2, \end{cases} \tag{81}$$

where $n - 1 \geq k \geq n/2$.

Combining Lemmas 10 and 11 we obtain the following result concerning the characterizations of all symmetrically partial Boolean functions with degree 1 or 2.

Theorem 10. *Let* $n > 1$ *and let* $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ *be an* n*-bit symmetrically partial Boolean function. Then:*

(1) $\deg(f) = 1$ *if and only if* f *is isomorphic to the function* $f_{n,n}^{(1)}$*;*

(2) $\deg(f) = 2$ *if and only if* f *is isomorphic to one of the functions*

$$f_{n,k}^{(1)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k, \end{cases} \tag{82}$$

$$f_{n,k}^{(2)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k \text{ or } |x| = k+1, \end{cases} \tag{83}$$

$$f_{n,l}^{(3)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = l, \end{cases} \tag{84}$$

$$f_{n}^{(4)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \text{ or } |x| = \lceil n/2 \rceil, \end{cases} \tag{85}$$

where $n - 1 \geq k \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, *and* $\lceil n/2 \rceil \geq l \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.

Remark 5. According to Lemma 4, symmetric Boolean functions that can be computed by exact quantum 1-query algorithm must have degree not more than 2. Therefore, Theorem 10 describes all possible symmetric Boolean functions that can be computed by exact quantum 1-query algorithms.

5. symmetrically partial functions with exact quantum 1-query complexity

In this section, we try to find out all symmetrically partial functions that can be computed with exact quantum 1-query algorithms. More precisely, we will obtain that any partial symmetric function has exact quantum 1-query complexity if and only if it can be computed by Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm.

First, we have the following proposition that was proved in [38].

Proposition 1. *[38] Let* $n > 1$. *Then for any* $n \geq k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$, $Q_E(f_{n,k}^{(1)}) = 1$.

The exact quantum query complexity of $f_{n,k}^{(2)}$ is beyond 1, and this is the following result.

Theorem 11. *Let* $n > 1$. *Then for any* $0 < k < n$, $Q_E(f_{n,k}^{(2)}) \geq 2$.

Proof. The proof is divided into two cases in terms of $0 < k < n-1$ and $k = n-1$.

Case 1: $0 < k < n-1$**.** Assume that there is an exact quantum 1-query algorithm with U_0, O_x and U_1 being the sequence of unitary operators for $f^{(2)}_{n,k}$, and $|\psi_s\rangle$ being its starting state. Let $U_0|\psi_s\rangle = \sum_{i=0,j=1}^{n,m} \alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle$. When $|x| = 0$, we have

$$|\psi_0\rangle = O_x U_0|\psi_s\rangle = \sum_{i=0,j=1}^{n,m} \alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle.$$

Denote $\beta_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} |\alpha_{ij}|^2$.

When $|x| = k$, let $x_1 = \cdots = x_k = 1$ and $x_{k+1} = \cdots = x_n = 0$, and then we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\psi_k\rangle &= O_x U_0|\psi_s\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1,j=1}^{k,m} -\alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_{0j}|0\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{i=k+1,j=1}^{n,m} \alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

Since the algorithm is exact, the quantum state $U_1|\psi_0\rangle$ must be orthogonal to the quantum state $U_1|\psi_k\rangle$. Therefore, we have

$$0 = (U_1|\psi_0\rangle)^\dagger U_1|\psi_k\rangle = \langle\psi_0|\psi_k\rangle \tag{86}$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i=0,j=1}^{n,m} \overline{\alpha}_{ij}\langle i|\langle j|\right) \times \tag{87}$$

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_{0j}|0\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{i=1,j=1}^{k,m} -\alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{i=k+1,j=1}^{n,m} \alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle\right) \tag{88}$$

$$= \sum_{j=1}^{m} |\alpha_{0j}|^2 + \sum_{i=1,j=1}^{k,m} -|\alpha_{ij}|^2 + \sum_{i=k+1,j=1}^{n,m} |\alpha_{ij}|^2 \tag{89}$$

$$= \beta_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{k} \beta_i + \sum_{i=k+1}^{n} \beta_i. \tag{90}$$

When $|x| = k+1$, let $x_1 = \cdots = x_{k+1} = 1$ and $x_{k+2} = \cdots = x_n = 0$, and then we have

$$\begin{aligned}|\psi_{(k+1)^0}\rangle &= O_x U_0|\psi_s\rangle \\ &= \sum_{i=1,j=1}^{k+1,m} -\alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_{0j}|0\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{i=k+2,j=1}^{n,m} \alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle.\end{aligned}$$

We also have

$$0 =(U_1|\psi_0\rangle)^\dagger U_1|\psi_{(k+1)^0}\rangle = \langle\psi_0|\psi_{(k+1)^0}\rangle \tag{91}$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i=0,j=1}^{n,m} \overline{\alpha}_{ij}\langle i|\langle j|\right) \times \tag{92}$$

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m}\alpha_{0j}|0\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{i=1,j=1}^{k+1,m} -\alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{i=k+2,j=1}^{n,m}\alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle\right) \tag{93}$$

$$=\beta_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{k+1}\beta_i + \sum_{i=k+2}^{n}\beta_i \tag{94}$$

$$= -2\beta_{k+1}, \tag{95}$$

where the last equality is according to $\beta_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{k}\beta_i + \sum_{i=k+1}^{n}\beta_i = 0$ from Eq. (90). So, we have $\beta_{k+1} = 0$.

Let $x_1 = \cdots = x_k = 1$, $x_l = 1$ for an $l > k+1$ and let the others be 0. With such an input x then we can similarly obtain $\beta_l = 0$.

As a result, we have obtained that $\beta_i = 0$ for $k+1 \le i \le n$, and therefore

$$\beta_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{k}\beta_i = 0. \tag{96}$$

Let $x_l = 0$ for an $l \le k$, let $x_j = 1$ for $j \le k+2$ with $j \ne l$, and the others $x_i = 0$ for $n \ge i \ge k+3$. For such an input x, denote $|\psi_{(k+1)^l}\rangle = O_x U_0|\psi_s\rangle$. Then similarly we have

$$0 =(U_1|\psi_0\rangle)^\dagger U_1|\psi_{(k+1)^l}\rangle = \langle\psi_0|\psi_{(k+1)^l}\rangle \tag{97}$$

$$= \left(\sum_{i=0,j=1}^{n,m} \overline{\alpha}_{ij}\langle i|\langle j|\right) \times \tag{98}$$

$$\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m}\alpha_{0j}|0\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{i=1,j=1}^{l-1,m} -\alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{j=1}^{m}\alpha_{lj}|l\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{i=l+1,j=1}^{k+2,m} -\alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle\right) \tag{99}$$

$$=\beta_0 - \sum_{i=1}^{l-1}\beta_i + \beta_l - \sum_{i=l+1}^{k+2}\beta_i \tag{100}$$

$$=2\beta_l, \tag{101}$$

where the last equality follows from Eq. (96).

Therefore, now we have $\beta_l = 0$ for $1 \le l \le n$. From Eq. (96) it follows that $\beta_0 = 0$. So far, we have concluded that $\beta_l = 0$ for $0 \le l \le n$, which result in $\alpha_{ij} = 0$ for $0 \le i \le n$ and $1 \le j \le m$.

Consequently, $U_0|\psi_s\rangle = \sum_{i=0,j=1}^{n,m}\alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle = \mathbf{0}$ and $|\psi_s\rangle = \mathbf{0}$, a contradiction.

Case 2: $k = n-1$**.** By using the above method as Case 1, it is easy to verify that 1-query is not enough. Therefore, we have $Q_E(f_{n,k}^{(2)}) \ge 2$ for $0 < k < n$. □

Combining Lemma 11 and Theorem 11 as well as Proposition 1, we have the following result.

Theorem 12. *Let n be even and let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be an n-bit symmetrically partial function. Then $Q_E(f) = 1$ if and only if f is isomorphic to one of these functions: $f_{n,k}^{(1)}$ and $f_{n,n/2}^{(3)}$, where $k \ge n/2$.*

Proof. Suppose that $Q_E(f) = 1$. Then according to Lemma 4, $\deg(f) \leq 2Q_E(f) = 2$. By virtue of Lemma 11, f is isomorphic to one of these functions: $f^{(1)}_{n,n}, f^{(1)}_{n,k}, f^{(2)}_{n,k}, f^{(3)}_{n,n/2}$ for $n-1 \geq k \geq n/2$. Furthermore, Proposition 1 shows that $Q_E(f^{(1)}_{n,k}) = 1$ for $n \geq k \geq n/2$; and $Q_E(f^{(3)}_{n,n/2}) = 1$ is derived from Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm; Theorem 11 gives $Q_E(f^{(2)}_{n,k}) \geq 2$ for any $0 < k < n$. Consequently, $Q_E(f) = 1$ implies that f is isomorphic to one of these functions: $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$ and $f^{(3)}_{n,n/2}$, where $k \geq n/2$.

On the other hand, since $Q_E(f^{(1)}_{n,k}) = 1$ for $n \geq k \geq n/2$, and $Q_E(f^{(3)}_{n,n/2}) = 1$, if f is isomorphic to one of these functions: $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$ and $f^{(3)}_{n,n/2}$, where $k \geq n/2$, by **Fact 1**, $Q_E(f) = 1$ follows.

□

To consider the case of n being odd, we need the following result.

Theorem 13. *For any integer $h > 0$, $Q_E(f^{(1)}_{2h+1,h}) \geq 2$.*

Proof. The method of proof is similar to that of Theorem 11. Let $n = 2h+1$. Assume that there is an exact quantum 1-query algorithm with U_0, O_x and U_1 being the sequence of unitary operators for $f^{(1)}_{2h+1,h}$, and with starting state $|\psi_s\rangle$. Let $U_0|\psi_s\rangle = \sum_{i=0,j=1}^{n,m} \alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle$. When $|x| = 0$, we have $|\psi_0\rangle = O_x U_0|\psi_s\rangle = \sum_{i=0,j=1}^{n,m} \alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle$. Denote $\beta_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} |\alpha_{ij}|^2$. We prove that $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_n$ as follows.

Given two inputs x and y such that $|x| = |y| = h$, $x_k \neq y_k$, $x_l \neq y_l$ and $x_i = y_i$ for $i \neq k, l$ (in this case $x_k \neq x_l$ and $y_k \neq y_l$), then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 =& (U_1|\psi_0\rangle)^\dagger U_1 O_x|\psi_0\rangle - (U_1|\psi_0\rangle)^\dagger U_1 O_y|\psi_0\rangle && (102)\\
=& \langle\psi_0|O_x|\psi_0\rangle - \langle\psi_0|O_y|\psi_0\rangle && (103)\\
=& \left(\sum_{i=0,j=1}^{n,m} \overline{\alpha}_{ij}\langle i|\langle j|\right) && (104)\\
& \times \left(\sum_{i=1,j=1}^{n,m} (-1)^{x_i}\alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle - \sum_{i=1,j=1}^{n,m} (-1)^{y_i}\alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle\right) && (105)\\
=& (-1)^{x_k}\beta_k + (-1)^{x_l}\beta_l - ((-1)^{y_k}\beta_k + (-1)^{y_l}\beta_l) && (106)\\
=& \left((-1)^{x_k} - (-1)^{y_k}\right)(\beta_k - \beta_l) = 2(-1)^{x_k}(\beta_k - \beta_l). && (107)
\end{aligned}
$$

Therefore, $\beta_1 = \cdots = \beta_n = \beta$ for some β.

In addition, suppose that the input x satisfies $x_i = 1$ for $1 \leq i \leq h$, and $x_j = 0$ for $h+1 \leq j \leq n$. Then we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
0 =& (U_1|\psi_0\rangle)^\dagger U_1 O_x|\psi_0\rangle && (108)\\
=& \left(\sum_{i=0,j=1}^{n,m} \overline{\alpha}_{ij}\langle i|\langle j|\right)\left(\sum_{j=1}^{m} \alpha_{0j}|0\rangle|j\rangle + \sum_{i=1,j=1}^{n,m} (-1)^{x_i}\alpha_{ij}|i\rangle|j\rangle\right) && (109)\\
=& \beta_0 + (-1)h\beta + (h+1)\beta = \beta_0 + \beta = 0, && (110)
\end{aligned}
$$

but this leads to $\beta_0 = \cdots = \beta_n = 0$ and thus $\alpha_{ij} = 0$ for $0 \leq i \leq n$ and $1 \leq j \leq m$, which is a contradiction. Hence, $Q_E(f^{(1)}_{2h+1,h}) \geq 2$. □

Since any exact quantum query algorithm being able to compute $f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m}$ can also compute $f^{(1)}_{2m+1,m}$, it follows that $Q_E(f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m}) \geq Q_E(f^{(1)}_{2m+1,m}) > 1$. Moreover, $f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m+1}$ is isomorphic to $f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m}$. Combining Theorems 10 and 13 as well as Proposition 1, we have the following result.

Theorem 14. *Let n be odd and let $f : \{0,1\}^n \to \{0,1\}$ be an n-bit symmetrically partial function. Then $Q_E(f) = 1$ if and only if f is isomorphic to one of the functions $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$, where $k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$.*

Proof. Suppose that $Q_E(f) = 1$. From Lemma 4 it follows $\deg(f) \leq 2Q_E(f) = 2$. Due to Lemma 10, f is isomorphic to one of these functions: $f^{(1)}_{n,n}, f^{(1)}_{n,k}, f^{(2)}_{n,k}, f^{(3)}_{n,l}, f^{(4)}_{n,1}$, where $n-1 \geq k \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, and $\lceil n/2 \rceil \geq l \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$.

By using Proposition 1, $Q_E(f^{(1)}_{n,k}) = 1$ for $n \geq k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$.

Next we verify the remainder functions have exact query complexity more than 1.

Firstly, Theorem 13 shows that $Q_E(f^{(1)}_{n,k}) > 1$ for $k = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$;

Secondly, Theorem 11 verifies that $Q_E(f^{(2)}_{n,k}) > 1$ for $n-1 \geq k \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$;

Thirdly, for $l = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, since any exact quantum query algorithm being able to compute $f^{(3)}_{n,l}$ can also compute $f^{(1)}_{n,l}$, it follows that $Q_E(f^{(3)}_{n,l}) \geq Q_E(f^{(1)}_{n,l}) > 1$. Moreover, for $l = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, $f^{(3)}_{n,l}$ is isomorphic to $f^{(3)}_{n,l+1}$, so, $Q_E(f^{(3)}_{n,l+1}) = Q_E(f^{(3)}_{n,l}) \geq Q_E(f^{(1)}_{n,l}) > 1$.

Finally, for $\lceil n/2 \rceil \geq l \geq \lfloor n/2 \rfloor$, any exact quantum query algorithm computing $f^{(4)}_{n,1}$ can also compute $f^{(3)}_{n,l}$, so, $Q_E(f^{(4)}_{n,1}) \geq Q_E(f^{(3)}_{n,l}) > 1$.

In a word, $Q_E(f) = 1$ implies f is isomorphic to one of the functions $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$, for $k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$.

On the other hand, since $Q_E(f^{(1)}_{n,k}) = 1$ for $k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$, if f is isomorphic to one of these functions $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$ for $k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$, by **Fact 1**, it holds $Q_E(f) = 1$.

□

Remark 6. $f^{(3)}_{n,n/2}$ is the Deutsch-Jozsa problem. Sometimes we can equivalently transform some problems to the Deutsch-Jozsa problem or its more special cases by padding some strings. Indeed, if we pad $2k-n$ zeros to the input of the function $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$, then it is equivalently to solve $f^{(1)}_{2k,k}$ that is simpler and more special than the Deutsch-Jozsa problem. Therefore we can use the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm to solve the problem. That is to say, a symmetrically partial Boolean function f has $Q_E(f) = 1$ if and only if f can be computed by the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm after appropriate padding of the input.

Therefore, with Theorems 12 and 14 we are ready to obtain the second main result of the article:

Theorem 1. *Any symmetric and partial Boolean function f has $Q_E(f) = 1$ if and only if f can be computed by the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm.*

Next we further discuss the exact quantum query complexity for the partial symmetric Boolean functions with degree 2.

We have already proved that $Q_E(f^{(1)}_{2m+1,m}) > 1$ and $Q_E(f^{(2)}_{2m+1,m}) > 1$, and furthermore $Q_E(f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m+1}) = Q_E(f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m}) \geq Q_E(f^{(1)}_{2m+1,m}) > 1$.

More investigations concerning $Q_E(f^{(2)}_{n,k})$ and $Q_E(f^{(4)}_{n})$ will be done in next section. Now we give two optimal algorithms for $f^{(1)}_{2m+1,m}$ and $f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m+1}$ in the following.

Theorem 15. $Q_E(f^{(1)}_{2m+1,m}) = Q_E(f^{(3)}_{2m+1,l}) = 2$, *where* $m \leq l \leq m+1$.

Proof. Let $n = 2m+1$. Let $\mathrm{DJ}(n, 0, x)$ be the subroutine to compute the Deutsch-Jozsa problem. Let $\mathrm{DHW}(n, k, x)$ be the subroutine to compute the function $f^{(1)}_{n,k}$, where $k \geq \lceil n/2 \rceil$. As we knew, the exact quantum algorithms just use 1 query in the above subroutines. We now give an exact quantum 2-query algorithm to compute $f^{(1)}_{2m+1,m}$ as Algorithm 3.

We give an exact quantum 2-query algorithm to compute $f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m+1}$ as Algorithm 4.

Algorithm 3 Algorithm for $f^{(1)}_{2m+1,m}$

```
1: procedure F1(integer n, array x)                    ▷ x ∈ {0,1}^n
2:     Query x_1
3:     if x_1 = 1 then return 1
4:     end if
5:     if x_1 = 0 then
6:         x ← x \ {x_1}
7:         return DHW(n − 1, ⌊n/2⌋, x)
8:     end if
9: end procedure
```

Algorithm 4 Algorithm for $f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m+1}$

```
1: procedure F3(integer n, array x)                    ▷ x ∈ {0,1}^n
2:     Query x_1
3:     x ← x \ {x_1}
4:     if x_1 = 1 then
5:         return DJ(n − 1, 0, x)
6:     end if
7:     if x_1 = 0 then
8:         return DHW(n − 1, ⌈n/2⌉, x)
9:     end if
10: end procedure
```

It is clear that the above two algorithms can compute the functions $f^{(1)}_{2m+1,m}$ and $f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m}$ with two queries, respectively. The function $f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m}$ is isomorphic to the function $f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m+1}$, so it holds that $Q_E(f^{(3)}_{2m+1,m}) = 2$. □

Remark 7. From Theorem 15 it follows the optimal exact quantum query complexity is 2 for solving a variant of the Deutsch-Jozsa problem, i.e. distinguishes between inputs of Hamming weight in $\{\lfloor n/2 \rfloor, \lceil n/2 \rceil\}$ and Hamming weight in $\{0, n\}$ for all odd n.

6. Further results

This section first studies n-bit symmetrically partial function $\mathrm{DW}^{k,l}_n$:

$$\mathrm{DW}^{k,l}_n(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = k, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = l. \end{cases} \tag{111}$$

We will give some optimal exact quantum query algorithms to compute the function $\mathrm{DW}^{k,l}_n$ for some special choices of k and l, and then use $\mathrm{DW}^{k,l}_n$ as subroutines to give some exact quantum query algorithms to compute the functions $f^{(2)}_{n,k}$ and $f^{(4)}_n$.

Theorem 16. $Q_E(\mathrm{DW}^{m,3m}_{4m}) = 2$.

Proof. We give a 2-query exact quantum algorithm to compute $\mathrm{DW}^{m,3m}_{4m}$ as Algorithm 5, where the subroutine Grover(n, x) is a 1-query Grover search [37] which returns an index i. We describe Grover(n, x) as follows:

(1) Begin with the quantum state $|1\rangle$, and a unitary transformation acts on it, resulting in $|\psi_0\rangle = W|1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |i\rangle$.

(2) Act on the quantum state $|\psi_0\rangle$ with the transformation $G = -WZ_1W^\dagger Z_f$, where

$$Z_1|i\rangle = \begin{cases} -|i\rangle \text{ if } i = 1, \\ \ \ |i\rangle \text{ if } i \neq 1, \end{cases} \quad \text{and} \quad Z_f|i\rangle = (-1)^{x_i}|i\rangle. \tag{112}$$

(3) Measure the quantum state with the projective measurement $\{|i\rangle\langle i|\}_{i=1}^n$, then returning the measurement result i.

Let us consider the quantum state after the transformation G:

$$|\psi\rangle = G|\psi_0\rangle = -WZ_1W^\dagger Z_f \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |i\rangle \tag{113}$$

$$= -W(I - 2|1\rangle\langle 1|)W^\dagger Z_f \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |i\rangle \right) \tag{114}$$

$$= (2W|1\rangle\langle 1|W^\dagger - I) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{x_i}|i\rangle \right) \tag{115}$$

$$= \left(2 \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} |i\rangle \right) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \langle i| \right) - I \right) \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} (-1)^{x_i}|i\rangle \right) \tag{116}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i=1}^{n} \left(\left(\frac{2}{n} \sum_{j=1}^{n} (-1)^{x_j} \right) - (-1)^{x_i} \right) |i\rangle. \tag{117}$$

When $|x| = n/4$, we have $\frac{2}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(-1)^{x_j} = 1$ and $|\psi\rangle = \frac{2}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i:x_i=1}|i\rangle$. When $|x| = 3n/4$, we have $\frac{2}{n}\sum_{j=1}^{n}(-1)^{x_j} = -1$ and $|\psi\rangle = \frac{-2}{\sqrt{n}}\sum_{i:x_i=0}|i\rangle$. Therefore, after the measurement, the subroutine Grover(n, x) will return an index i such that $x_i = 1$ if $|x| = n/4$ and $x_i = 0$ if $|x| = 3n/4$.

Algorithm 5 Algorithm for $\mathrm{DW}_{4m}^{m,3m}$

```
1: procedure DW1(integer n, array x)                    ▷ x ∈ {0,1}^n
2:     i ← Grover(n, x)
3:     Query x_i
4:     return 1 − x_i.
5: end procedure
```

According to the above analysis, it is clear that Algorithm 5 computes the function $\mathrm{DW}_{4m}^{m,3m}$ with 2 queries and thus $Q_E(\mathrm{DW}_{4m}^{m,3m}) \leq 2$. We now prove $Q_E(\mathrm{DW}_{4m}^{m,3m}) \geq 2$ as follows. We note that the function $\mathrm{DW}_{4m}^{m,3m}$ is not isomorphic to any function pointed out in Theorem 10. Therefore, we have $\deg(\mathrm{DW}_{4m}^{m,3m}) > 2$ and $Q_E(\mathrm{DW}_{4m}^{m,3m}) > 1$ as well. Therefore, $Q_E(\mathrm{DW}_{4m}^{m,3m}) = 2$. □

Using the padding method (similar method used in [17]), we have

Corollary 1. *For any integers n and k such that $0 < k < n/3$, $l \geq \max\{(2n+k)/3, 3k\}$ and $l-k$ is even, then $Q_E(\mathrm{DW}_n^{k,l}) = 2$.*

Proof. By padding $(3l-k)/2 - n$ zeroes and $(l-3k)/2$ ones to the inputs of the function $\mathrm{DW}_n^{k,l}$, we have the new $n' = n + (3l-k)/2 - n + (l-3k)/2 = 2(l-k)$. The new $k' = k + (l-3k)/2 = (l-k)/2$ and the new $l' = l + (l-3k)/2 = 3(l-k)/2$. Therefore, the new function is $\mathrm{DW}_{n'}^{n'/4,3n'/4}$ and, from Theorem 16 it follows that $Q_E(\mathrm{DW}_n^{k,l}) = 2$. □

Let $k \leq n/4$. Then $\max\{(2n+k)/3, 3k\} = 3n/4$. We have the following result.

Corollary 2. *For any integers n and k such that $0 < k \leq n/4$, $3n/4 \leq l < n$ and $l-k$ is even, then $Q_E(\mathrm{DW}_n^{k,l}) = 2$.*

The next theorem is implicit in the combination of the proof in [17] and Theorem 10.

Theorem 17. *For any integers n and l such that $\frac{n}{4} \leq l < \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$, then $Q_E(\mathrm{DW}_n^{0,l}) = 2$.*

Proof. Padding $(4l-n)$ zeros to the input, we have $n' = n + 4l - n = 4l$. The function changes to $\mathrm{DW}_{4l}^{0,l}$. We give an exact quantum 2-query algorithm to compute $\mathrm{DW}_{4l}^{0,l}$ as Algorithm 6. Similar to the analysis

Algorithm 6 Algorithm for $\mathrm{DW}_{4l}^{0,l}$

```
1: procedure DW2(integer n, array x)                    ▷ x ∈ {0,1}^n
2:     i ← Grover(n, x)
3:     Query x_i
4:     return x_i.
5: end procedure
```

in Theorem 16, it is clear that Algorithm 6 computes $\mathrm{DW}_{4l}^{0,l}$. Therefore, we have $Q_E(\mathrm{DW}_n^{0,l}) \leq 2$ for $\frac{n}{4} \leq l < \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. According to Theorem 10, we have $\deg(\mathrm{DW}_n^{0,l}) > 2$ for $\frac{n}{4} \leq l < \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. Therefore, we have $Q_E(\mathrm{DW}_n^{0,l}) \geq 2$ for $\frac{n}{4} \leq l < \lfloor \frac{n}{2} \rfloor$. □

Now we use $\mathrm{DW}_n^{k,l}$ as subroutines to give some algorithms for the functions that we discussed in Section 4.

Theorem 18. *For $n/4 \leq k < n$, $Q_E(f_{n,k}^{(2)}) \leq 4$, where*

$$f_{n,k}^{(2)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = k \text{ or } |x| = k+1. \end{cases} \tag{118}$$

Proof. We give an exact quantum 4-query algorithm for the function as Algorithm 7.

Algorithm 7 Algorithm for $f_{n,k}^{(2)}$

```
1: procedure F2(integer n, integer k, array x)                ▷ x ∈ {0,1}^n
2:     Pad 4k − n zeros to the input x and get a new input y.
3:     i ← Grover(4k, y)
4:     Query x_i
5:     if x_i = 1 then
6:         return 1
7:     end if
8:     Pad 4(k + 1) − n zeros to the input x and get a new input y.
9:     i ← Grover(4(k + 1), y)
10:    Query x_i
11:    return x_i
12: end procedure
```

It is clear that Algorithm 7 can computes the function $f_{n,k}^{(2)}$. □

Theorem 19. *For any odd n, $Q_E(f_n^{(4)}) \leq 5$, where*

$$f_n^{(4)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = 0 \text{ or } |x| = n, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor \text{ or } |x| = \lceil n/2 \rceil. \end{cases} \tag{119}$$

Proof. We give a 5-query exact quantum algorithm for the function as Algorithm 8.

If $x_1 = 1$, then the function reduces to the following function:

$$f_{n-1,1}^{(4)}(x) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } |x| = n-1, \\ 1 & \text{if } |x| = \lfloor n/2 \rfloor - 1 \text{ or } |x| = \lceil n/2 \rceil - 1, \end{cases} \tag{120}$$

which is isomorphic to $f_{n-1,\lfloor n/2 \rfloor}^{(2)}$. It is clear that Algorithm 8 can compute the function $f_n^{(4)}$. □

Acknowledgements

We thank Lvzhou Li for much essential discussions on query complexity and this article. This work was supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Nos. 61572532, 61272058, 61602532) and the Fundamental Research Funds for the Central Universities of China (Nos. 17lgjc24, 161gpy43).

Algorithm 8 Algorithm for $f_n^{(4)}$

procedure F4(**integer** n, **array** x) ▷ $x \in \{0,1\}^n$
    Query x_1
    $x \leftarrow x \setminus \{x_1\}$
    if $x_1 = 0$ **then**
        return F2$(n-1, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor, x)$
    end if
    if $x_1 = 1$ **then**
        Let the new input $y = \overline{x}$
        return F2$(n-1, \lfloor n/2 \rfloor, y)$
    end if
end procedure

References

[1] S. Aaronson, A. Ambainis, *The Need for Structure in Quantum Speedups*, Theory of Computing **10** (2014) 133–166.

[2] S. Aaronson, A. Ambainis, *Forrelation: A problem that optimally separates quantum from classical computing*, In Proceedings of the 47th STOC (2015) 307–316.

[3] S. Aaronson, S. Ben-David, R. Kothari, *Separations in query complexity using cheat sheets*, In Proceedings of the 48th STOC(2016) 863–876.

[4] S. Aaronson, A. Ambainis, J. Iraids, M. Kokainis, *Polynomials, Quantum Query Complexity, and Grothendieck's Inequality*, In Proceedings of the 31st CCC (2016), pp. 25:1-25:19. Also arXiv:1511.08682.

[5] A. Ambainis, K. Balodis, A. Belovs, T. Lee, M. Santha, J. Smotrovs, *Separations in Query Complexity Based on Pointer Functions*, In Proceedings of 48th STOC (2016) 800–813.

[6] A. Ambainis, *A note on quantum black-box complexity of almost all Boolean functions*, Information Processing Letters **71** (1999) 5–7. Also, quant-ph/9811080.

[7] A. Ambainis, *Quantum walk algorithm for element distinctness*, SIAM J. Comput. **37** (2007) 201–239. Earlier version in FOCS'04. Also quant-ph/0311001.

[8] A. Ambainis, *Superlinear advantage for exact quantum algorithms*, SIAM J. Comput. **45** (2016) 617–631. Earlier version in STOC'13.

[9] A. Ambainis, J. Gruska, S.G. Zheng, *Exact quantum algorithms have advantage for almost all Boolean functions*, Quantum Information and Computation **15** (2015) 0435–0452. Also arXiv:1404.1684.

[10] A. Ambainis, A. Iraids, J. Smotrovs, *Exact quantum query complexity of EXACT and THRESHOLD*, In Proceedings of the 8th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC'2013), pp. 263–269. Also arXiv:1302.1235.

[11] A. Ambainis, A. Yakaryilmaz, *Superiority of exact quantum automata for one promise problems*, Information Processing Letters **112** (2012) 289-291.

[12] A. Belovs, *Span programs for functions with constant-sized 1-certificates*, In Proceedings of the 43rd STOC (2011) 77–84. Also arXiv:1105.4024.

[13] D. Bera, *A Different Deutsch-Jozsa*, Quantum Information Processing **14** (2015) 1777–1785.

[14] R. Beals, H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, M. Mosca, R. de Wolf, *Quantum lower bounds by polynomials*, Journal of the ACM **48** (2001) 778–797. Earlier version in FOCS'98. Also arXiv:9802049.

[15] S. Boyd and L. Vandenberghe, *Convex optimization*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2004.

[16] G. Brassard, P. Høyer, *An exact quantum polynomial-time algorithm for Simon's problem*, In Proceedings of the Fifth Israeli Symposium on Theory of Computing and Systems, 1997, pp. 12–23. Also arXiv:9704027.

[17] J. Briët, H. Buhrman, D. Leung, T. Piovesan, F. Speelman, *Round elimination in exact communication complexity*, In Proceedings of the 10th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2015), pp. 206–225.

[18] H. Buhrman, C. Dürr, M Heiligman, P. Høyer, F. Magniez, M. Santha, R. de Wolf, *Quantum Algorithms for Element Distinctness*, In Proceedings of 16th CCC (2001) 131–137.

[19] H. Barnum, M. Saks, M. Szegedy, *Quantum query complexity and semi-definite programming*, In Proceedings 18th CCC (2003) 179–193.

[20] H. Buhrman, R. de Wolf, *Complexity measures and decision tree complexity: a survey*, Theoretical Computer Science **288** (2002) 1–43.

[21] E. Blais, A. Weinstein, Y. Yoshida, *Partially symmetric functions are efficiently isomorphism testable*, SIAM J. Comput. **44** (2015) 411–432.

[22] A. Childs, W. van Dam, *Quantum algorithms for algebraic problems*, Reviews of Mod- ern Physics **82** (2010) 1-52. Also arXiv:0812.0380.

[23] R. Cleve, A. Eckert, C. Macchiavello, M. Mosca, *Quantum algorithms revisited*, In Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, 454A (1998): 339–354. Also arXiv:9708016.

[24] D. Collins, K. W. Kim, W. C. Holton, *Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm as a test of quantum computation*, Phys. Rev. A **58** (1998) R1633–R1636.

[25] D. P. Chi, J. Kim, S. Lee, *Quantum Algorithm for Generalized Deutsch-Jozsa Problem*, 2000, quant-ph/0005059.

[26] A. Canteaut, M.Videau, *Symmetric Boolean Functions*, IEEE Transactions on Information Theory **51** (2005) 2791–2811.

[27] C. Dürr, M. Heiligman, P. Høyer, M. Mhalla, *Quantum query com- plexity of some graph problems*, In Proceedings of the 31st ICALP (2004) 481– 493.

[28] D. Deutsch, R. Jozsa, *Rapid solution of problems by quantum computation*, In Proceedings of the Royal Society of London, 439A (1992): 553–558.

[29] A. Dubrovska, T. Mischenko-Slatenkova, *Computing boolean functions: Exact quantum query algorithms and low degree polynomials*, 2006, quant-ph/0607022

[30] S. Dörn, T. Thierauf, *The Quantum Query Complexity of Algebraic Properties*, 2007, arXiv:0705.1446.

[31] S. Even, A.L. Selman, Y. Yacobi, *The Complexity of Promise Problems with Applications to Public-Key Cryptography*, Information and Control **61** (1984) 159–173.

[32] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutman, *A Quantum Algorithm for the Hamil- tonian NAND Tree*, Theory of Computing **4** (2008) 169–190. Also quant- ph/0702144.

[33] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, M. Sipser, *A limit on the speed of quantum computation in determining parity*, Physical Review Letters **81** (1998) 5442–5444. Also arXiv:9802045.

[34] O. Goldreich, *On promise problems: A survey, Shimon Even Festschrift*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science **3895** (2006) 254–290.

[35] J. Gruska, D.W. Qiu, S.G. Zheng, *Potential of quantum finite automata with exact acceptance*, International Journal of Foundation of Computer Science **26** (2015) 381–398.

[36] J. von zur Gathen, J. R. Roche, *Polynomials with two values, Combinatorica* **17** (1997) 345–362.

[37] L.K. Grover, *A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search*, In Proceedings of the 28th STOC (1996) 212–219.

[38] J. Gruska, D.W. Qiu, S.G. Zheng, *Generalizations of the distributed Deutsch-Jozsa promise problem*, Mathematical Structures in Computer Science, 2015, doi:10.1017/S0960129515000158. Also arXiv:1402.7254.

[39] T. Hayes, S. Kutin, D. van Melkebeek, *The quantum black-box complexity of majority*, Algorithmica **34** (2002) 480–501. Also quant-ph/0109101.

[40] P. Høyer, R. Špalek, *Lower bounds on quantum query complexity*, Bulletin of the European Association for Theoretical Computer Science **87** (2005) 78–103. Also quant-ph/0509153.

[41] G. Midrijānis, *Exact quantum query complexity for total Boolean functions*, 2004, quant-ph/ 0403168.

[42] A. Montanaro, R. Jozsa, G. Mitchison, *On exact quantum query complexity*, Algorithmica **419** (2015) 775–796. Also arXiv:1111.0475.

[43] M. Minsky and S. Papert, *Perceptrons*, 2nd expanded ed., MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1988.

[44] M. Nielsen, I. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.

[45] N. Nisan, M. Szegedy, *On the degree of Boolean functions as real polynomials*, Computational Complexity **4** (1994) 301–313. Earlier version in STOC'92.

[46] B. Perez-Garciaa, M. McLarenb, S. K. Goyalc, R. I. Hernandez-Arandaa, A. Forbesb, T. Konradc, *Quantum computation with classical light: implementation of the Deutsch-Jozsa Algorithm*, 2015, arXiv:1510.03365.

[47] B. Reichardt, R. Špalek, *Span-program-based quantum algorithm for evaluating formulas*, In Proceedings of the 40th STOC (2008) 103–112. Also arXiv:0710.2630.

[48] P.W. Shor, *Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer*,

SIAM J. Comput. **26** (1997) 1484–509. Earlier version in FOCS'94. Also quant-ph/9508027.

[49] D.R. Simon, *On the power of quantum computation*, SIAM J. Comput. **26** (1997) 1474–1483. Earlier version in FOCS'94.

[50] T. Mischenko-Slatenkova, A. Vasilieva, I. Kucevalovs, R. Freivalds, *Quantum Queries on Permutations*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science **9118** (2015) 177–184.

[51] S.G. Zheng, D.W. Qiu, *From quantum query complexity to state complexity*, Gruska Festschrift, Lecture Notes in Computer Science **8808** (2014) 231–245. Also arXiv:1407.7342.

Appendix A: The subroutine for Xquery

The subroutine will use basis state $|0,0\rangle$, $|i,0\rangle$ and $|i,j\rangle$ with $1 \le i < j \le m$.

1. The subroutine Xquery begins in the state $|0,0\rangle$ and then a unitary mapping U_1 is applied on it:

$$U_1|0,0\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}|i,0\rangle. \tag{121}$$

2. The subroutine Xquery then performs the query:

$$\sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}|i,0\rangle \to \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}(-1)^{x_i}|i,0\rangle. \tag{122}$$

3. The subroutine Xquery performs a unitary mapping U_2 to the current state such that

$$U_2|i,0\rangle = \sum_{j>i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}|i,j\rangle - \sum_{j<i} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}|j,i\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}|0,0\rangle \tag{123}$$

and the resulting quantum state will be

$$\begin{aligned} & U_2 \sum_{i=1}^{m} \frac{1}{\sqrt{m}}(-1)^{x_i}|i,0\rangle \\ =& \frac{1}{m}\sum_{i=1}^{m}(-1)^{x_i}|0,0\rangle + \frac{1}{m}\sum_{1\le i<j}((-1)^{x_i}-(-1)^{x_j})|i,j\rangle. \end{aligned} \tag{124}$$

4. The subroutine Xquery measures the resulting state in the standard basis. If the outcome is $|0,0\rangle$, then $\sum_{i=1}^{m}(-1)^{x_i} \neq 0$ and $|x| \neq m/2$. Otherwise, suppose that we get the state $|i,j\rangle$. Then we have $x_i \neq x_j$ and the subroutine outputs (i,j).

Appendix B: Proof of Equality (37)

Proof. We define $\binom{p}{l} = 0$ if $p < l$ and also $\binom{p}{l} = 0$ if $l < 0$. For any integers p and l, it is easy to see that $\binom{p}{l} = \binom{p}{p-l}$. Now we prove that for any integers p and l,

$$(p+1)\binom{p}{l} = (l+1)\binom{p+1}{l+1}. \tag{125}$$

There are several cases as follows:

Case 1 $p < l$. In this case, $\binom{p}{l} = 0$ and $\binom{p+1}{l+1}$, the equality holds.

Case 2 $p \geq l \geq 0$. In this case, $(p+1)\binom{p}{l} = (p+1)\frac{p!}{l!(p-l)!} = (l+1)\frac{(p+1)!}{(l+1)!((p+1)-(l+1))!} = (l+1)\binom{p+1}{l+1}$.

Case 3 $p \geq l$ and $l < -1$. In this case, $\binom{p+1}{l+1} = 0$ and $\binom{p}{l} = 0$, the equality holds.

Case 4 $p \geq l$ and $l = -1$. In this case, $\binom{p}{l} = 0$ and $(l+1)\binom{p+1}{l+1} = 0$, the equality holds.

Therefore, the equality holds.

Now we are ready to prove Equality (37).

$$
\begin{vmatrix}
\binom{n}{k+1} & \binom{n}{k+2} & \cdots & \binom{n}{2k} & \binom{n}{2k+1} \\
\binom{n-1}{k+1} & \binom{n-1}{k+2} & \cdots & \binom{n-1}{2k} & \binom{n-1}{2k+1} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\binom{n-k+1}{k+1} & \binom{n-k+1}{k+2} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+1}{2k} & \binom{n-k+1}{2k+1} \\
\binom{n-k}{k+1} & \binom{n-k}{k+2} & \cdots & \binom{n-k}{2k} & \binom{n-k}{2k+1}
\end{vmatrix}
$$

$$
= \begin{vmatrix}
\binom{n}{n-k-1} & \binom{n}{n-k-2} & \cdots & \binom{n}{n-2k} & \binom{n}{n-2k-1} \\
\binom{n-1}{n-k-2} & \binom{n-1}{n-k-3} & \cdots & \binom{n-1}{n-2k-1} & \binom{n-1}{n-2k-2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\binom{n-k+1}{n-2k} & \binom{n-k+1}{n-2k-1} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k-1} & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k} \\
\binom{n-k}{n-2k-1} & \binom{n-k}{n-2k-2} & \cdots & \binom{n-k}{n-3k} & \binom{n-k}{n-3k-1}
\end{vmatrix}
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{(n-k+1)} \times
\begin{vmatrix}
\binom{n}{n-k-1} & \binom{n}{n-k-2} & \cdots & \binom{n}{n-2k} & \binom{n}{n-2k-1} \\
\binom{n-1}{n-k-2} & \binom{n-1}{n-k-3} & \cdots & \binom{n-1}{n-2k-1} & \binom{n-1}{n-2k-2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\binom{n-k+1}{n-2k} & \binom{n-k+1}{n-2k-1} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k-1} & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k} \\
(n-k+1)\binom{n-k}{n-2k-1} & (n-k+1)\binom{n-k}{n-2k-2} & \cdots & (n-k+1)\binom{n-k}{n-3k} & (n-k+1)\binom{n-k}{n-3k-1}
\end{vmatrix}
$$

$$
= \frac{1}{(n-k+1)} \times
\begin{vmatrix}
\binom{n}{n-k-1} & \binom{n}{n-k-2} & \cdots & \binom{n}{n-2k} & \binom{n}{n-2k-1} \\
\binom{n-1}{n-k-2} & \binom{n-1}{n-k-3} & \cdots & \binom{n-1}{n-2k-1} & \binom{n-1}{n-2k-2} \\
\vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\
\binom{n-k+1}{n-2k} & \binom{n-k+1}{n-2k-1} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k-1} & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k} \\
(n-2k-1)\binom{n-k+1}{n-2k} & (n-2k-2)\binom{n-k+1}{n-2k-1} & \cdots & (n-3k)\binom{n-k+1}{n-3k-1} & (n-3k-1)\binom{n-k+1}{n-3k}
\end{vmatrix}
\tag{126}
$$

$$\overset{r_{k+1}-(n-3k-1)r_k}{=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=\!=} \frac{1}{(n-k+1)} \begin{vmatrix} \binom{n}{n-k-1} & \binom{n}{n-k-2} & \cdots & \binom{n}{n-2k} & \binom{n}{n-2k-1} \\ \binom{n-1}{n-k-2} & \binom{n-1}{n-k-3} & \cdots & \binom{n-1}{n-2k-1} & \binom{n-1}{n-2k-2} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \binom{n-k+1}{n-2k} & \binom{n-k+1}{n-2k-1} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k-1} & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k} \\ k\binom{n-k+1}{n-2k} & (k-1)\binom{n-k+1}{n-2k-1} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k-1} & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$

$$\overset{\cdots}{=\!=\!=} \frac{1}{(n-k+1)(n-k+2)\cdots n} \begin{vmatrix} \binom{n}{n-k-1} & \binom{n}{n-k-2} & \cdots & \binom{n}{n-2k} & \binom{n}{n-2k-1} \\ k\binom{n}{n-k-1} & (k-1)\binom{n}{n-k-2} & \cdots & \binom{n}{n-2k} & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ k\binom{n-k+2}{n-2k+1} & (k-1)\binom{n-k+2}{n-2k} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+2}{n-3k} & 0 \\ k\binom{n-k+1}{n-2k} & (k-1)\binom{n-k+1}{n-2k-1} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k-1} & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$

$$= \frac{k(k-1)\cdots 1}{(n-k+1)(n-k+2)\cdots n} \begin{vmatrix} \frac{1}{k}\binom{n}{n-k-1} & \frac{1}{k-1}\binom{n}{n-k-2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{1}\binom{n}{n-2k} & \binom{n}{n-2k-1} \\ \binom{n}{n-k-1} & \binom{n}{n-k-2} & \cdots & \binom{n}{n-2k} & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \binom{n-k+2}{n-2k+1} & \binom{n-k+2}{n-2k} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+2}{n-3k} & 0 \\ \binom{n-k+1}{n-2k} & \binom{n-k+1}{n-2k-1} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k-1} & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$

$$= \frac{1}{\binom{n}{k}} \begin{vmatrix} \frac{1}{k}\binom{n}{n-k-1} & \frac{1}{k-1}\binom{n}{n-k-2} & \cdots & \frac{1}{1}\binom{n}{n-2k} & \binom{n}{n-2k-1} \\ \binom{n}{n-k-1} & \binom{n}{n-k-2} & \cdots & \binom{n}{n-2k} & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots & \vdots \\ \binom{n-k+2}{n-2k+1} & \binom{n-k+2}{n-2k} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+2}{n-3k} & 0 \\ \binom{n-k+1}{n-2k} & \binom{n-k+1}{n-2k-1} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k-1} & 0 \end{vmatrix}$$

$$= (-1)^{k+2} \cdot \frac{\binom{n}{n-2k-1}}{\binom{n}{k}} \begin{vmatrix} \binom{n}{n-k-1} & \binom{n}{n-k-2} & \cdots & \binom{n}{n-2k} \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \binom{n-k+2}{n-2k+1} & \binom{n-k+2}{n-2k} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+2}{n-3k} \\ \binom{n-k+1}{n-2k} & \binom{n-k+1}{n-2k-1} & \cdots & \binom{n-k+1}{n-3k-1} \end{vmatrix}$$

$$\overset{\cdots}{=\!=\!=} (-1)^{k+2}(-1)^{k+1}\cdots(-1)^3 \frac{\binom{n}{n-2k-1}\binom{n}{n-2k}\cdots\binom{n}{n-k-2}}{\binom{n}{k}\binom{n}{k-1}\cdots\binom{n}{1}} \left| \binom{n}{n-k-1} \right|$$

$$= (-1)^{\frac{k(k+5)}{2}} \cdot \frac{\prod_{i=k+1}^{2k+1}\binom{n}{i}}{\prod_{i=1}^{k}\binom{n}{i}} \neq 0.$$

□