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In a recent breakthrough, Bravyi, Gosset and König (BGK) [Science, 2018] proved that “simulating” constant depth quantum circuits takes classical circuits $\Omega(\log n)$ depth. In our paper, we first formalise their notion of simulation, which we call “possibilistic simulation”. Then, from well-known results, we deduce that their circuits can be simulated in depth $O(\log^2 n)$. Separately, we construct explicit classical circuits that can simulate any depth-$d$ quantum circuit with Clifford and $t$ $T$-gates in depth $O(d + t)$. Our classical circuits use $\{\text{NOT, AND, OR}\}$ gates of fan-in $\leq 2$.

INTRODUCTION

Quantum computation is widely believed to be advantageous over classical computation. Popular science articles sometimes explain the advantage by some notion of quantum parallelism. Indeed, it is true that a quantum computer can efficiently operate, “in parallel”, upon a quantum wavefunction encompassing exponentially many classical states. Unfortunately, the class of efficient operations (standard quantum gates for example) is restrictive. Moreover, any quantum computation must finish with a measurement that collapses the quantum wavefunction to just one classical state. Even ignoring noise, these caveats mean it is not-at-all obvious if quantum computation holds any actual advantage.

In academia, belief in such advantage is more correctly sustained by evidence of quantum-classical separations in query [1], time, and circuit complexity.

In time complexity, the most well-known result is Shor’s quantum factoring algorithm [2] which runs in polynomial time, a feat not known to be possible classically. However, “not known to be possible” is very different from “impossible”, and in the arena of time complexity, there currently exists no proven separation. In circuit complexity, one early result is Ref. [3] which showed, among other things, that quantum circuits can compute in “constant” depth the parity of all input bits. Separation is therefore provably achieved because parity is provably uncomputable by constant depth classical circuits [4][5]. However, Ref. [3] assumed that the controlled-multi-NOT gate $c\cdot X^\otimes n$ can be implemented in constant depth. Indeed, parity can then be simply computed by conjugating $c\cdot X^\otimes n$ by Hadamard gates $H^\otimes (n+1)$. But as the physical difficulties of implementing $c\cdot X^\otimes n$ became clearer, results from Ref. [3] became less appealing. Only recently, in breakthrough work by Bravyi, Gosset and König [6] (henceforth BGK) was the need to use unreasonable quantum gates removed in achieving circuit complexity separation. Indeed, their separation was achieved by a quantum circuit with gates in $\{H, c\cdot Z, c\cdot S^\dagger\}$. What is particularly satisfying is that BGK proved their separation via Ref. [7] from quantum foundations, which can be viewed as extending fundamental Bell-type inequalities to a multi-party, bounded-locality setting. One can already catch a glimpse of the connection between circuits and foundations by noting that the BGK quantum circuit applies $c\cdot S^\dagger$ gates followed by $H$ gates just before computational basis measurement. But this is the same as controlled changing of measurement basis from $X$ to $Y$, a technique commonly used in optimal quantum strategies of non-local games like CHSH [8] or GHZ [9].

Notwithstanding the build-up of evidence in favour of quantum advantage, substantial efforts have also been devoted to the time-efficient classical simulation of quantum computation. In this arena, the most celebrated result is arguably the Gottesman-Knill theorem which says that quantum Clifford circuits on $n$ qubits, whereby $|0^n\rangle$ is evolved by $L$ Clifford gates, i.e. $\{H, S, c\cdot X\}$ [10] and followed by $M$ Pauli-observable measurements, can be efficiently simulated in time $O(LMn^3)$ [11][12][13].

One main motivation for studying simulation is to understand quantum advantage better. For example, Gottesman-Knill’s theorem means that entanglement is insufficient for time-complexity quantum advantage because Clifford circuits can generate entanglement [14]. Currently, there are two well-established notions of simulating a given quantum circuit [15]: strong and weak. Strong simulators approximate the probability of a particular output, while weak simulators approximately sample from the output distribution. A Gottesman-Knill simulator can be both with no approximation error.

In our paper, we extract from recent Refs. [6][16][19] a new notion of simulation, targeted at classical circuits. Essentially, we say a classical circuit simulates a quantum circuit if, over all inputs, the output of the classical circuit is a possible output of the quantum circuit. We call this “possibilistic simulation”, or “p-simulation”. Then, BGK’s result can be succinctly phrased as an unconditional $\Omega(\log n)$ lower bound on classical circuits that p-simulate constant-depth quantum circuits.

From well-known results, we deduce that the BGK quantum circuits can be p-simulated in depth $O(\log^2 n)$. Separately, we construct explicit classical circuits that can p-simulate any depth-$d$ quantum circuit with Clifford and $t$ $T$-gates in depth $O(d + t)$, cf. Corollary [1].
POSSIBILISTIC SIMULATION

In this section, we give our formal definition of p-simulation, as extracted from Refs. [9, 11, 13, 14].

Definition 1. We make the following definitions for circuits with $n$ variable input lines and $m$ output lines.

- A relation on Cartesian product $\{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^m$ is a subset $R \subset \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^m$.
- A quantum circuit $Q$ on $n$ input qubit lines and measured on $m$ qubit lines in the computational basis defines a relation $R(Q) \subset \{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^m$ by:
  \[
  (x,y) \in R(Q) \iff \langle y| Q |x \rangle \neq 0. 
  \] (1)
- Let $C : \{0,1\}^n \rightarrow \{0,1\}^m$ be a classical circuit, and $R$ a relation on $\{0,1\}^n \times \{0,1\}^m$. We say $C$ p-simulates $R$ if:
  \[
  (x,C(x)) \in R, \text{ for all } x \in \{0,1\}^n. 
  \] (2)

In our paper, we restrict classical circuits to have gates in the standard set $\{$NOT, AND, OR$\}$ of fan-in $\leq 2$, but arbitrary fan-out [20]. Following BGK, we allow quantum circuits to use additional all-zero “advice” bitstring inputs.

Definition 2. Let $Q$ and $C$ be quantum and classical circuits, respectively. We say $C$ p-simulates $Q$ if $C$ p-simulates $R(Q)$.

For example, we can set $m = n = 1$, and verify that $C = 0$ and $C = \text{NOT}$ p-simulates $Q = H$ (Hadamard gate) and $Q = X$ (Pauli X gate) respectively. Such simulation is neither weak nor strong as its difficulty arises only from the “for all $x$” condition in Eq. 2. Rather, it is a stronger form of “reproducing correlations” in the language of Ref. [7].

As an aside, we can define “probabilistic p-simulation”, where the probability is over random advice bits in the classical circuit or some input distribution. Indeed, the notion of “probably possibly correct” (borrowing from “PAC” [21]) already appears in Refs. [6, 10, 11] and may be worthy of study, but it lies outside our present scope. Henceforth, unless otherwise stated, “simulation” refers to p-simulation.

CLASSICAL CIRCUIT CONSTRUCTIONS

In this section, we construct two types of classical circuit simulators, $A$ and $B$. $A$ is implicit and simulates BGK circuits in depth $O(\log^2 n)$. $B$ is explicit and simulates any quantum circuit of depth $d$ with Clifford gates and $t$ $T$-gates in depth $O(d + t)$, cf. Corollary 1.

Construction $A$. The Hidden Linear Function (HLF) problem defined by BGK is a family of problems indexed by $M \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$ with $n = M(M+1)/2$ and $m = M$. HLF can be classically solved in three steps [4]: (i) find a basis $\{e_i\}_{i=1}^k \subset \mathbb{F}_2^r$ for the kernel of an input $M \times M$ binary matrix $A$, (ii) compute the values $b_i := e^T_i A e_i$ mod $4 \in \{0,2\}$, (iii) solve the linear equation $E z = \frac{1}{2} b$ for $z$ over $\mathbb{F}_2$ where $E$ has rows $e_i$ and $b$ has entries $b_i$. Since finding kernels and solving linear equations are in the classical complexity class $\text{NC}^2$ [22, 23], i.e. solvable by poly($n$)-sized circuits of $O(\log^2 n)$ depth and fan-in $\leq 2$, so is HLF. The $O(\log^2 n)$ can be seen as coming from characteristic-polynomial subroutines that multiply $n$ matrices of shape $O(n) \times O(n)$ [24, Prop. 4.2]: multiplying any two gives one log $n$, reaching $n$ gives the other.

BGK showed that HLF can be solved by quantum circuits (of maximum fan-in $\leq 3$) in constant depth when restricted to “2D-HLF”, where $M = N^2$ is indexed by $N \in \mathbb{Z}_{\geq 1}$, and $A$ is the adjacency matrix of an undirected $N$-by-$N$ square grid. On the other hand, they showed that for $n$ sufficiently large, bounded-fan-in classical circuits solving 2D-HLF must have $\Omega(\log n)$ depth.

Our discussion implicitly constructs $O(\log^2 n)$ depth classical circuits that simulate the BGK quantum circuits [6, Fig. 1] because this is equivalent to solving HLF [6, Lemma 2].

Construction $B$. We assume for simplicity that $m = n$ and that the quantum circuit takes no advice. It is straightforward to generalise this construction when these conditions do not hold.

We first construct classical circuits that simulate Clifford circuits and then extend to Clifford+$T$ circuits. The correctness of our constructions should be self-evident.

Clifford. Let $Q$ be a Clifford circuit. First, we can write an $n$-bit input $|x\rangle = |x_1, \ldots, x_n\rangle$ as $|x\rangle = X_{x_1}^{s_{n-1}} \cdots X_{x_n}^{s_0} |0^n\rangle$.

Now, we may use the commutation relations listed in Table 1 to commute all $X_{x_i}^{s_i}$ past the Clifford circuit $Q$ and just before (computational basis) measurements. Note that $Q$ would remain unchanged. Moreover, we may wlog (without-loss-of-generality) assume that the resulting $x$-dependent gates on qubit $i \in [n]$ are of the form $X_{x_i}^{a(i)}$ for some $a(i) \in \{0,1\}^n$. The “wlog” is with respect to our definition of simulation because, just before (computational basis) measurements, $Y$ can be replaced by $X$, and $Z$ by identity.

Now, to simulate $Q$, simply pre-compute [25] a $n$-bit string $s$ in the support of $Q |0^n\rangle$. Then $s$ defines a classical circuit $C$ which, on input $x \in \{0,1\}^n$, outputs:

\[
C(x) := \left( \prod_{i=1}^n X_{x_i}^{a(i)} \right) s. 
\] (3)

Writing $|\cdot|_1$ for the Hamming weight, it is clear that $a(i) \cdot x$ can be computed in parallel, across $i \in [n]$, in depth $O(\log \max_i |a(i)|)$ by an XOR-binary-tree [26]. $s$ can be incorporated in depth 1 via NOT gates. Therefore, $C$
can have depth $O(\log \max |a^{(i)}|)$. This completes our description of Construction B in the Clifford case.

Clifford+$T$. Let $Q$ be a quantum circuit with Clifford gates and $t$ $T$-gates. We may replace each $T$-gate by a (post-selected) $T$-gadget, shown in Fig. 1. Such replacement gives a Clifford circuit $Q$ on $n + t$ qubits.

$$|\psi\rangle \xrightarrow{T} |\psi\rangle$$

FIG. 1. The (post-selected) $T$-gadget. $|A\rangle$ is the so-called magic state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle + e^{i\pi/4}|1\rangle)$. $|0 \times 0\rangle$ is the post-selection projector onto $|0\rangle$ and can be performed just before measurement of the original qubit.

$Q$ has original input $|x\rangle$ on the top $n$ qubit lines and magic state inputs $|A\rangle^t$ on the bottom $t$ qubit lines. Just before measurements of the top $n$ qubit lines, $Q$ is post-selected for $|0^t\rangle$ in the bottom $t$ qubit lines. This construction is standard [27].

As in the Clifford case, we again write $|x\rangle = |x_1 \ldots x_n\rangle$ as $|x\rangle = X_{x_1}^\dagger \ldots X_{x_n}^\dagger |0^n\rangle$ and commute all $X_i^\dagger$ past the Clifford circuit $Q$. This results (again wlog) in $Q$ followed by $X_i^{a^{(i)} x}$ on qubit $i \in [n + t]$, for some $a^{(i)} \in \{0, 1\}^n$.

Next, we pre-compute the state $|\psi\rangle := Q |0^n A^t\rangle$ [28]. From $|\psi\rangle$, we pre-compute the $2^t$ states $|\psi_z\rangle := (|\psi\rangle \otimes |z\rangle)$ where $z \in \{0, 1\}^t$. $|\psi_z\rangle$ are necessarily non-zero $n$-qubit states equal to the output of $Q$ but with a $z$-dependent subset of $T$-gates replaced by $T^i$. Let $s^{(z)}$ be a $n$-bit string in the support of $|\psi_z\rangle$. $s^{(z)}$ defines a classical circuit $C_z$ which, on input $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$, outputs:

$$C_z(x) := \left(\prod_{i=1}^{n} X_i^{a^{(i)} x}\right) s^{(z)}, \quad (4)$$

where $a^{(i)} \cdot x$ can again be computed in depth $O(\log \max |a^{(i)}|)$. Up to this point, we have only used the $T$-gadget and commutation to define quantities.

In Fig. 2 we give an example with $n = 2$, $t = 1$, and

$$x_1 \xrightarrow{H} |0\rangle \xrightarrow{X^{z_1}} |H\rangle \xrightarrow{X^{z_2}} |0 \times 0\rangle$$

$$x_2 \xrightarrow{T} |0\rangle \xrightarrow{X^{z_2}} |A\rangle \xrightarrow{X^{z_2}} |0 \times 0\rangle$$

FIG. 2. Quantum circuit identities used to define quantities in Construction B as illustrated by an example with $n = 2$.

where the quantities defined are/can be:

$$a^{(1)} = 000, \quad a^{(2)} = a^{(3)} = 010, \quad (5)$$

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{2}(|000\rangle + |110\rangle + e^{i\pi/4} |001\rangle + e^{i\pi/4} |111\rangle), \quad (6)$$

$$|\psi_0\rangle, \quad |\psi_1\rangle \propto |00\rangle + |11\rangle, \quad (7)$$

$$s^{(0)} = 00, \quad s^{(1)} = 11. \quad (8)$$

Now, we proceed to describe the classical simulation circuit $C$. $C$ takes as input $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ and consists of three consecutive stages.

In Stage 1, we compute the $2^t$ $n$-bit strings $\{C_z(x) \mid z \in \{0, 1\}^t\}$ in depth $O(\log \max |a^{(i)}|)$.

In Stage 2, we compute the $t$-bit string:

$$z(x) := \left(\prod_{i=0}^{n+t} X_i^{a^{(i)} x}\right) 0^t, \quad (9)$$

in depth $O(\log \max |a^{(i)}|)$.

In Stage 3 [29], we compute the final $n$-bit string output $y := C_{z(x)}(x)$ in two serial steps: (i) compute a $2^{j'}$-bit string $f$ with $f_j = \delta_{j',z(x)}$ for $j \in \{0, \ldots, 2^{j'} - 1\}$ in depth $O(\log t)$, where $j'$ is the binary representation of $j$, (ii) compute bits $y_i$ of $y$ in depth $O(t)$ using:

$$y_i = \bigvee_{j=0}^{2^{j'}-1} \left[C_{j'}(x)\right]_i \wedge f_j. \quad (10)$$

In the Appendix, we draw our overall circuit with $n = t = 2$. This completes our description of Construction B.
Corollary 1. Any $n$-qubit quantum circuit $Q$ of depth $d$ with Clifford and $t$ T-gates can be simulated by a classical circuit $C$ of depth $d = O(d + t)$, where $O$ conceals a multiplicative constant independent of $n, Q$.

Proof. Define $C$ by Construction B applied to $Q$. The depth $\tilde{d}$ of $C$ can be analysed as follows.

In Eqs. [4, 9] we have:

$$|a(i)| = O(2^d), \quad \text{for all } i \in [n + l],$$

because $Q$ has depth $d$ with Clifford gates of fan-in $\leq 2$. So Stages 1 and 2 can be run in depth $O(d)$. Stage 3 can be run in depth $O(t)$ because there are $t$ T-gates.

DISCUSSION

In p-simulation, we have defined a natural framework that precisely captures the new type of quantum advantage that has recently come to light [6, 16, 19]. Then, we constrained the quantum-advantage space within this framework in two incomparable ways. First, from well-known results, we deduced that simulating BGK circuits takes $O(\log^2 n)$ depth. Second, we found that $T$ gates are necessary for advantage according to Corollary 1. Therefore, our paper helps motivate, as well as preclude, new candidate quantum circuits that exhibit advantage. In addition, Corollary 1 directly translates the BGK lower bound into a circuit synthesis lower bound.

We can also refine and extend Corollary 1 by thinking more carefully about Construction B. First, the depth of Stage 3 can be refined to $O(\rk(S))$, where $S$ denotes the $t \times n$ matrix $S_{ij} = a_{i+j}^{(n+1)}$ for $i \in [t], j \in [n]$. This refines $\tilde{d}$ to $O(d + \rk(S))$ in Corollary 1. Further refinement is possible by choosing $s(z)$ more carefully such that the size of set $\{s(z) | z \in \im(S)\}$ is minimised. Second, Pauli-$T$ commutation relations [30] instead of the T-gadget, sometimes suffice to handle a T-gate, which removes its constant depth contribution. Third, the only property of the T-gate used is that it can be applied by state injection into a Clifford circuit. Since this property holds for any gate that is diagonal [31] or in the third-level of the Clifford hierarchy [32], Corollary 1 extends to such gates.

We remark that it was not obvious to us how to immediately deduce Corollary 1 with $t = 0$ from Gottesman-Knill. While a usual Gottesman-Knill simulator [12, 13] can update each of $n$ stabilisers in parallel, updating the sign of each after, say, a Hadamard layer $H^\otimes n$, requires depth $O(\log n)$. Worse still, measurement in the standard basis, i.e., measurement of $n$ Pauli observables $Z_i$ for $i \in [n]$, requires sequential depth $O(n)$ and does not seem easily parallelisable. One reason why Gottesman-Knill may require more depth is that it is too excessive for p-simulation.

Lastly, we disclose that our linear-in-$t$ depth scaling should be considered inefficient because any function $f : \{0, 1\}^n \to \{0, 1\}^n$ can be computed in linear depth $O(n)$ (and exponential size) using a similar construction to Stage 3 of Construction B. Therefore, Corollary 1 mirrors the time-complexity results of Refs. [27, 31, 33].
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[1] We do not further discuss query complexity separations involving oracles except mention that Ref. [34], which showed BQP $\not\subset$ PH relative to an oracle, is arguably the most convincing evidence for quantum advantage to date.


[5] More precisely, so-called AC0 circuits, where gates are restricted to $\{\text{NOT}, \text{AND}, \text{OR}\}$ (of arbitrary fan-in or fan-out) and where circuit size (i.e. number of gates) is restricted to be polynomial. We need to restrict the gate set, or else a “parity gate” can compute parity in depth 1. We need to restrict circuit size, or else parity can be computed in depth 2, via the conjunctive normal form of XOR, if allowed an exponential number of gates in $\{\text{NOT}, \text{AND}, \text{OR}\}$ (of arbitrary fan-in or fan-out).


[10] For concreteness in our paper, “Clifford gates” always means $\{H, S, c-X\}$ gates. None of our results would essentially change if we say “Clifford gates” are one-qubit and two-qubit gates generated by $\{H, S, c-X\}$. Our results do change if we say “Clifford gates” are arbitrary multi-qubit gates generated by $\{H, S, c-X\}$. This change
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[1] We do not further discuss query complexity separations involving oracles except mention that Ref. [34], which showed BQP $\not\subset$ PH relative to an oracle, is arguably the most convincing evidence for quantum advantage to date.


[5] More precisely, so-called AC0 circuits, where gates are restricted to $\{\text{NOT}, \text{AND}, \text{OR}\}$ (of arbitrary fan-in or fan-out) and where circuit size (i.e. number of gates) is restricted to be polynomial. We need to restrict the gate set, or else a “parity gate” can compute parity in depth 1. We need to restrict circuit size, or else parity can be computed in depth 2, via the conjunctive normal form of XOR, if allowed an exponential number of gates in $\{\text{NOT}, \text{AND}, \text{OR}\}$ (of arbitrary fan-in or fan-out).


[10] For concreteness in our paper, “Clifford gates” always means $\{H, S, c-X\}$ gates. None of our results would essentially change if we say “Clifford gates” are one-qubit and two-qubit gates generated by $\{H, S, c-X\}$. Our results do change if we say “Clifford gates” are arbitrary multi-qubit gates generated by $\{H, S, c-X\}$. This change
is unimportant unless such gates also have constant-depth physical implementations.


[20] BGK proved their depth lower bound against this restricted class of classical circuits. Note that the fan-in (fan-out) of a gate is its number of input (output) lines.


[25] This can be done efficiently by Gottesman-Knill. It is important to note that pre-computation only helps construct the classical circuit which we first-and-foremost want to show exists. So, in principle, it does not matter if pre-computation is inefficient - as will be the case later.

[26] XOR can be replaced by its optimal decomposition into 4 standard gates: $XOR(x, y) = (x \lor y) \land \neg(x \land y)$.


[28] It is believed that this cannot be done efficiently, else we can efficiently strongly simulate quantum computation.

[29] Stage 3 implements a naive switching mechanism that switches to the output of circuit $C_{x(z)}$ upon input $x$. In v1 of this paper, its step (ii) was disregarded and not costed which led to major errors in the corollaries.

[30] $TZ = ZT, TX \propto (X + Y)T, TY \propto (X - Y)T$


Appendix: Construction B with $n = t = 2$

FIG. 3. Illustration of Construction B with $n = t = 2$, input $x$, and output $y$, showing how Stages 1-3 fit together in series. The notations $z(x)$, $C_z(x)$, and $f_j$ are defined in Eq. 9, Eq. 4, and the description of Stage 3 respectively. $z(x)$, $C_z(x)$ are $(t = 2)$-bit and $(n = 2)$-bit strings respectively, on which a subscript $i$ denotes the $i$-th bit. Note that each gate has fan-in $\leq 2$. 