

Tight Quantum Lower Bound for Approximate Counting with Quantum States

Aleksandrs Belovs*

Ansis Rosmanis†

Abstract

We prove tight lower bounds for the following variant of the counting problem considered by Aaronson *et al.* [1]. The task is to distinguish whether an input set $x \subseteq [n]$ has size either k or $k' = (1 + \varepsilon)k$. We assume the algorithm has access to

- the membership oracle, which, for each $i \in [n]$, can answer whether $i \in x$, or not; and
- the uniform superposition $|\psi_x\rangle = \sum_{i \in x} |i\rangle / \sqrt{|x|}$ over the elements of x . Moreover, we consider three different ways how the algorithm can access this state:
 - the algorithm can have copies of the state $|\psi_x\rangle$;
 - the algorithm can execute the reflecting oracle which reflects about the state $|\psi_x\rangle$;
 - the algorithm can execute the state-generating oracle (or its inverse) which performs the transformation $|0\rangle \mapsto |\psi_x\rangle$.

Without the second type of resources (related to $|\psi_x\rangle$), the problem is well-understood, see Brassard *et al.* [12]. The study of the problem with the second type of resources was recently initiated by Aaronson *et al.* [1].

We completely resolve the problem for all values of $1/k \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$, giving tight trade-offs between all types of resources available to the algorithm. Thus, we close the main open problems from [1].

The lower bounds are proven using variants of the adversary bound from [7] and employing analysis closely related to the Johnson association scheme.

1 Introduction

Counting is one of the basic computational tasks. Not surprisingly, quantum complexity of approximate counting was settled down early on in the history of quantum computation. It is known¹ that $O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{n/|x|}\right)$ queries to the membership oracle suffice to count the number of elements in a set $x \subseteq [n]$ with multiplicative precision ε [12, 11]. Also, it is known that $\Omega(\sqrt{n/|x|})$ membership queries are necessary for this task when $\varepsilon = O(1)$ [9].

However, the membership oracle is not the only way how to encode the input set x . Another possibility is to encode the set using a uniform quantum superposition over the elements of the set:

$$\psi_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|x|}} \sum_{i \in x} |i\rangle. \quad (1)$$

Aaronson *et al.* [1] raised the question of estimating complexity of approximate counting when the quantum algorithm has access not only to the membership oracle, but also to the state ψ_x .

*Faculty of Computing, University of Latvia

†Graduate School of Mathematics, Nagoya University, Japan

¹It is customary to denote input strings to quantum algorithms using lower case Latin letters like x or y , with x_i denoting individual symbols of the input string. We continue with this tradition, and, while we mostly think of the input x as a subset of $[n]$ rather than the corresponding bit-string, we still denote it by a lower case Latin letter.

This requires clarification: what does it mean to have access to ψ_x ? The following two models were assumed in [1]: the algorithm can have copies of the state ψ_x and it can reflect about ψ_x .

It was proven in [1] that, in order to distinguish whether the size of the input set x is k or $2k$, the quantum algorithm either has to invoke the membership oracle $\Omega(\sqrt{n/k})$ times or access the state ψ_x at least $\Omega(\min\{k^{1/3}, \sqrt{n/k}\})$ times in the aforementioned way. It was shown to be optimal in the sense that $O(\sqrt{n/k})$ membership queries *alone* suffice to solve this problem, as well as $O(\min\{k^{1/3}, \sqrt{n/k}\})$ accesses to the state ψ_x *alone* suffice. Thus, nothing can be gained by combining the two resources.

Several problems remained open in [1]. One was to distinguish the cases $|x| = k$ and $|x| = (1+\varepsilon)k$ for $\varepsilon \ll 1$. The other was to determine the complexity of the problem when the algorithm only has access to copies of the state ψ_x without having an access to the reflection oracle.

In this paper, we completely resolve these problems for all values of ε between 0 and 1, and go beyond that. In addition to accessing ψ_x via copies of it and the reflecting oracle, we also allow the state-generating oracle, which performs the transformation $|0\rangle \mapsto |\psi_x\rangle$ for some predetermined state $|0\rangle$ (as it is customary, we also allow to run this transformation in reverse). The state-generating oracle encompasses both copies of the state and the reflecting oracle, in the sense that one invocation of the state-generating oracle suffices to get a copy of ψ_x , while two invocations (one direct and one reverse) suffice to reflect about ψ_x . On the other hand, it is hard to simulate the state-generating oracle using just copies and reflections.

The formulation of our main result is as follows:

Theorem 1. *Consider a quantum algorithm that distinguishes whether the input set $x \subseteq [n]$ has size k or $k' = (1+\varepsilon)k$. For simplicity, we assume that $n \geq 5k$ and $1/k \leq \varepsilon \leq 1$. The algorithm has copies of the state ψ_x and has access to the reflecting, the state-generating, and the membership oracles (and their inverses). Let us denote by ℓ the number of copies of ψ_x the algorithm has, and by ℓ' the number of executions of the state-generating oracle. Then, in order to solve the problem, the algorithm should²*

- either have $\Omega\left(\min\left\{k, \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\varepsilon}, \frac{n}{k\varepsilon^2}\right\}\right)$ copies of the state ψ_x ;
- or execute the state-generating oracle $\Omega\left(\min\left\{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell}}, \frac{k^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3}}\right\}\right)$ times;
- or execute the reflecting oracle $\Omega\left(\min\left\{\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell+\ell'}}\right\}\right)$ times;
- or execute the membership oracle $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\right)$ times;
- or
 - have at least one copy of the state ψ_x , or
 - execute the state-generating oracle at least once, or
 - execute the membership oracle $\Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\right)$ times, or
 - execute the reflecting oracle $\Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\right)$ times;

²In the following, we outline priority of our logical operations using different levels of indentation.

and

– execute the reflecting oracle $\Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{\varepsilon}}\right)$ times.

This is tight (up to the $\log k$ factor in the first bullet point) as demonstrated by the algorithms in Section 3.

A substantial difference between our paper and [1] is in the techniques used. Aaronson *et al.* use the method of Laurent polynomials, whereas we use the adversary method.

The method of Laurent polynomials is a generalisation of the well-known polynomial method due to Beals *et al.* [5]. In Laurent polynomials negative powers of the variables are allowed. The positive degree bounds the number of executions of the membership oracle (like in the original version), executions of the reflecting oracle, and the number of copies, whereas the negative degree bounds the latter two.

The adversary bound was first formulated by Ambainis [2], and then significantly strengthened by Høyer *et al.* [14]. The later version was shown to be tight for every function by Reichardt [17, 18]. These versions of the bound assumed the standard quantum input oracle which encodes the input string. Building on the work of Ambainis *et al.* [4] and Lee *et al.* [16], Belovs [7] constructed a version of the bound for the general case when the input oracle is an arbitrary unitary.

We use this general-case version of the bound. Using the symmetry of the problem via representation theory of the symmetric group, we arrive at an optimisation problem that provides the required lower bound. We are able to track the number of applications of different input oracles separately by assigning different weights to them. Up to our knowledge, this is the first time weights are used to obtain tradeoffs between different input oracles. Previously, weights were used in composition theorems to allow different inner subroutines [19].

Our technique has a number of advantages compared to the Laurent polynomials. The Laurent-polynomial method depends crucially on the state being a uniform superposition over some set, the size of the set being an important parameter. While Laurent polynomials can handle a restricted number of possible input resources, adversary method, in principle, can be applied to any state-generating, reflecting, or any other type of input oracle without these restrictions. Laurent polynomials also cannot distinguish between copies of the state and invocations of the reflecting oracle, whereas we are able to count all input resources independently. Finally, even for the usual membership oracle, the polynomial method is known to be suboptimal [3], whereas the adversary method gives tight characterisation of quantum query complexity.

Let us touch a bit on the organisation of the paper. The paper can be divided into two big parts. The first one, consisting of Sections 2–7, is devoted to the proof of Theorem 1. The second one, spanned over Sections 8–11, is devoted to the proof of the main technical Lemmas 13–16 used in the proof of Theorem 1. The first part is self-contained and, assuming the correctness of the lemmas, can be read without the second part. For the first part, we assume basic familiarity with quantum query algorithms, while the second part mostly relies on the representation theory of the symmetric group.

With Lemmas 13–16 at our disposal, the proof of our lower bound is relatively concise and direct. We believe that similar estimations can be helpful for other problems involving oracles that prepare uniform superpositions over some unstructured set.

2 Preliminaries

We mostly use standard linear-algebraic notation. We use ket-notation for vectors representing quantum states, but generally avoid it. We use A^* to denote conjugate operators (transposed

and complex-conjugated matrices). We use $A[x, y]$ to denote the (x, y) -th entry of the matrix A . For matrices, vectors, and scalars, notation \oplus always stands for direct sum of matrices, and we often treat scalars as 1×1 -matrices; \oplus also denotes the direct sum of spaces. For P a predicate, we use 1_P to denote 1 if P is true, and 0 if P is false. We use $[n]$ to denote the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$.

2.1 Model of quantum algorithms

In this section, we describe our model of quantum algorithms, few aspects of which are not entirely standard.

Our problem can be cast into the model of quantum state conversion with general input oracles. The resources the algorithm can access are copies of quantum states, state-generating oracles, reflecting oracles, and standard oracles. We will now proceed with defining all these notions.

We start with defining *state conversion* problem [16] with *general input oracles* [7].

Definition 2. Let D be a set of labels, and \mathcal{L} and \mathcal{K} be two vector spaces. For each $x \in D$, let $v_x, \tau_x \in \mathcal{K}$ be quantum states and O_x be a unitary acting in \mathcal{L} . The *state conversion problem* $v_x \mapsto \tau_x$ with the input oracles O_x is defined as follows.

The workspace of the quantum algorithm contains a copy of the space \mathcal{K} , namely, the workspace is of the form $\mathcal{K} \oplus \mathcal{W}$ for some \mathcal{W} . The algorithm is given black-box access to a unitary O acting on \mathcal{L} , and it is promised that $O = O_x$ for some $x \in D$.

The algorithm can perform arbitrary unitary transformations on its workspace, independent from $x \in D$. In addition, the algorithm can make *queries* to O . Each query is an execution of either $O \otimes I$ or its inverse $O^{-1} \otimes I$ on some subspace of its workspace, where I is an arbitrarily large identity transformation. The subspaces on which the black-box is applied do not depend on $x \in D$.

For each $x \in D$, if $O = O_x$, the algorithm has to map v_x into τ_x on its copy of the space \mathcal{K} . The algorithm knows all v_x , τ_x , and O_x in advance, but it does not know which O_x it is given in a specific execution. The complexity of the algorithm is the number of queries it performs; the objective is to minimise it.

Usually, the task is to evaluate some function f defined on D . In this case, $v_x = |0\rangle$ and $\tau_x = |f(x)\rangle$. Our goal too is to evaluate a function: $f(x) = 0$ if the size of the input set x is k , and $f(x) = 1$ if it is k' . However, we also provide the algorithm with an additional resource: a state φ_x that depends on $x \in D$. This scenario can be described as state conversion with $v_x = \varphi_x$ and $\tau_x = |f(x)\rangle$.

However, this is not entirely precise, because we consider the *approximate* version of the problem. In this, we allow the algorithm to make small *errors* and output the final state *non-coherently*. That is, we assume that \mathcal{K} is of the form $\mathbb{C}^2 \otimes \mathcal{K}'$, and we allow any final state $\tau_x \in \mathcal{K}$ such that measuring it in the first register gives us $f(x)$ with probability³ at least $2/3$. We will prove a lower bound for any collection of vectors $\{\tau_x\}$ that satisfies the above conditions. And, for a fixed collection $\{\tau_x\}$, this is a state conversion problem in the above sense.

Input oracles. First, we use *state-generating input oracles*. In this case, for each $x \in D$, the algorithm is given a black-box access to a unitary O_x performing the transformation $|0\rangle \mapsto |\psi_x\rangle$

³As per usual, the error probability can be reduced below any constant by repeating the algorithm several times and taking the majority. For that, however, we might need several copies of the state φ_x , in which case we might have to redefine φ_x .

for some state $\psi_x \in \mathcal{L}$, where $|0\rangle$ is some fixed state in \mathcal{L} . The algorithm should work equally well for any unitary O_x performing this transformation⁴.

Second, we use *reflecting input oracles*. In this case, the black-box unitary O_x is the reflection about the state $\psi_x \in \mathcal{L}$: $O_x = 2\psi_x\psi_x^* - I$.

Third, we use *standard input oracles*. In this case, D is a subset of the set $[q]^n$ of strings of length n on some alphabet $[q]$, and $\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{C}^n \otimes \mathbb{C}^q$. For $x \in D$, the corresponding input oracle performs the transformation $O_x: |i\rangle|0\rangle \mapsto |i\rangle|x_i\rangle$. This can be seen as a direct sum of the state-generating oracles performing transformations $|0\rangle \mapsto |x_i\rangle$ over all $i \in [n]$.

It is easy to see that, for any given state, the state-generating input oracle is at least as strong as the reflecting oracle and the copies of the state. Indeed, it is possible to implement the reflecting oracle using the state-generating oracle twice; and, using it once, it is possible to get a copy of the state. Other than that, the above resources are incomparable.

Finally, we allow our algorithm to access all these input oracles simultaneously. We account for this by defining O_x as the direct sum of the three input oracles.

2.2 Relative γ_2 -norm

In this and the next sections, we describe the formalism behind our lower bounds that allows us to combine state-generating, reflecting, and standard oracles. It is mostly based on [7]. The notion of the relative γ_2 -norm, which we define next, is pivotal for this formalism.

Definition 3 (Relative γ_2 -norm). Let $\mathcal{X}_1, \mathcal{X}_2, \mathcal{Z}_1$, and \mathcal{Z}_2 be vector spaces, and D_1 and D_2 be some sets of labels. Let $A = (A_{xy})$ and $\Delta = (\Delta_{xy})$, where $x \in D_1$ and $y \in D_2$, be two families of linear operators: $A_{xy}: \mathcal{Z}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{Z}_1$ and $\Delta_{xy}: \mathcal{X}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_1$. The *relative γ_2 -norm*,

$$\gamma_2(A|\Delta) = \gamma_2(A_{xy} \mid \Delta_{xy})_{x \in D_1, y \in D_2},$$

is defined as the optimal value of the following optimisation problem, where Υ_x and Φ_y are linear operators:

$$\text{minimise} \quad \max \left\{ \max_{x \in D_1} \|\Upsilon_x\|^2, \max_{y \in D_2} \|\Phi_y\|^2 \right\} \quad (2a)$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad A_{xy} = \Upsilon_x^* (\Delta_{xy} \otimes I_{\mathcal{W}}) \Phi_y \quad \text{for all } x \in D_1 \text{ and } y \in D_2; \quad (2b)$$

$$\mathcal{W} \text{ is a vector space, } \Upsilon_x: \mathcal{Z}_1 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_1 \otimes \mathcal{W}, \quad \Phi_y: \mathcal{Z}_2 \rightarrow \mathcal{X}_2 \otimes \mathcal{W}. \quad (2c)$$

This is a generalisation of the usual γ_2 -norm, also known as Schur (Hadamard) product operator norm [10]. For $A = (a_{x,y})_{x,y}$ a $D_1 \times D_2$ matrix, its (usual) γ_2 -norm is defined as

$$\gamma_2(A) = \gamma_2(a_{x,y} \mid 1)_{x \in D_1, y \in D_2}. \quad (3)$$

Thus, to better understand the relative γ_2 -norm in the context of the usual γ_2 -norm, it is instructive to think of A as a $D_1 \times D_2$ block matrix, where each block of the matrix is a linear operator A_{xy} .

The relative γ_2 -norm admits an equivalent dual formulation. To define it, we need the following piece of notation. Let $A = (A_{xy})$ be a family of linear operators as in Definition 3. Let Γ be a $D_1 \times D_2$ real matrix. Define $\Gamma \circ A$ as a $D_1 \times D_2$ block matrix, where the block corresponding to $x \in D_1$ and $y \in D_2$ is given by $\Gamma[x, y]A_{x,y}$. With this piece of notation, the dual version of the norm is especially concise.

⁴To formally encapsulate this into the formalism of the general input oracles, we consider an *infinite* set D of labels with each label of the form (x, O_x) , where O_x is some unitary performing the required transformation, and the output of the algorithm only depends on the first part of the label.

Proposition 4. *In the notations of Definition 3, the value of $\gamma_2(A|\Delta)$ is equal to the value of the following optimisation problem:*

$$\text{maximise} \quad \|\Gamma \circ A\| \tag{4a}$$

$$\text{subject to} \quad \|\Gamma \circ \Delta\| \leq 1. \tag{4b}$$

2.3 Application to quantum algorithms

Let us now turn to applications of this bound to quantum query algorithms. We start with the state conversion problem $v_x \mapsto \tau_x$ with the input oracles O_x . The adversary bound corresponding to this problem is

$$\gamma_2(\langle v_x, v_y \rangle - \langle \tau_x, \tau_y \rangle \mid O_x - O_y)_{x,y \in D}. \tag{5}$$

This bound is *semi-tight*: it is a lower bound on the quantum query complexity of the exact version of the problem and an upper bound on the quantum query complexity of the approximate version.

The γ_2 -norm formalism is modular in the sense that the general task can be replaced by something more specific. For instance, if our task is to evaluate a function f defined on D , then the adversary bound reads as

$$\gamma_2(1_{f(x) \neq f(y)} \mid O_x - O_y)_{x,y \in D}.$$

In this case, the bound is tight: it is also a lower bound on quantum query complexity of the approximate version of the problem.

As another example, consider the standard input oracle O_x encoding a string $x \in [q]^n$. Recall that it is a direct sum of unitaries performing the transformations $|0\rangle \mapsto |x_i\rangle$. Using the modular approach, the corresponding adversary bound becomes

$$\gamma_2(\langle v_x, v_y \rangle - \langle \tau_x, \tau_y \rangle \mid \bigoplus_{j \in [n]} 1_{x_j \neq y_j})_{x,y \in D},$$

where \bigoplus stands for the direct sum of 1×1 matrices (resulting in a diagonal $n \times n$ matrix).

Now consider the state-generating oracle encoding some state $\psi_x \in \mathcal{L}$. Suppose that $\mathcal{L} = \mathbb{C}^m$ and e_0 is a vector orthogonal to \mathcal{L} . The corresponding γ_2 -object can be defined in two alternative ways [8]:

$$L_{\psi_x} = \psi_x e_0^* + e_0 \psi_x^* \quad \text{or} \quad L_{\psi_x} = \psi_x \oplus \psi_x^*. \tag{6}$$

In the second expression, ψ_x is an $m \times 1$ -matrix and ψ_x^* is a $1 \times m$ -matrix, the resulting matrix being of size $(m+1) \times (m+1)$. The corresponding adversary bound is

$$\gamma_2(\langle v_x, v_y \rangle - \langle \tau_x, \tau_y \rangle \mid L_{\psi_x} - L_{\psi_y})_{x,y \in D}.$$

Finally, consider the reflecting oracle. If O_x performs reflection about ψ_x and O_y about ψ_y , then $O_x - O_y = 2(\psi_x \psi_x^* - \psi_y \psi_y^*)$. In this case, we can use the general bound (5). For simplicity, we will drop the constant factor 2.

Now we describe how we can account for queries to several input oracles within one algorithm. Here we give a brief account, a slightly more extended version can be found in Appendix A. Suppose we have two input oracles O'_x and O''_x , and we would like the algorithm to access both of them. As mentioned at the end of Section 2.1, it is possible to combine the two oracles in a single oracle $O_x = O'_x \oplus O''_x$ so that one query to O_x gives queries to either O'_x or O''_x .

However, this does not yet give us the possibility to count queries to O'_x and O''_x independently. In order to account for that, we have to introduce *weights*. We define a “meta-oracle”

O_x so that one query to O_x can serve as either α queries to O'_x or β queries to O''_x . Or, to put it differently, one query to O'_x costs $1/\alpha$ queries to O_x and one query to O''_x costs $1/\beta$ queries to O_x . The corresponding γ_2 -object is $\alpha O'_x \oplus \beta O''_x$. Choosing the weights α and β so that the problem can be solved in a single query to the meta-oracle O_x , we get the following formulation. If

$$\gamma_2\left(\langle v_x, v_y \rangle - \langle \tau_x, \tau_y \rangle \mid \alpha(O'_x - O'_y) \oplus \beta(O''_x - O''_y)\right)_{x,y \in D} \geq 1 \quad (7)$$

then either $\Omega(\alpha)$ queries to O'_x or $\Omega(\beta)$ queries to O''_x are required to perform the state conversion $v_x \mapsto \tau_x$.

To prove lower bounds, we should use the dual formulation of the relative γ_2 -norm from Proposition 4. Let us define $S_{xy} = \langle v_x, v_y \rangle - \langle \tau_x, \tau_y \rangle$, $\Delta'_{xy} = O'_x - O'_y$, and $\Delta''_{xy} = O''_x - O''_y$. Then it suffices to find a $D \times D$ matrix Γ such that

$$\|\Gamma \circ S\| \geq 1, \quad \|\Gamma \circ \Delta'\| \leq 1/\alpha, \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Gamma \circ \Delta''\| \leq 1/\beta. \quad (8)$$

The same construction works for any constant number of input oracles. For special cases like state-generating or standard input oracles, it is also possible to replace the oracles O_x by appropriate γ_2 -objects.

3 Upper Bounds

In this section, we briefly describe the algorithms matching our lower bounds in Theorem 1. All of them are relatively easy; some of them are folklore, many are taken from [1].

Proposition 5. *It is possible to solve the approximate counting problem using $O\left(k \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right) = O(k \log k)$ classical samples from x .*

Proof. The algorithm is as follows. Sample the elements out of x sufficiently many times. Output that $|x| = k$ if the number of distinct elements observed is at most k , otherwise output that $|x| = k'$. The algorithm has 1-sided error.

The analysis follows from the standard coupon collecting problem. The expected number of samples required to observe more than k elements out of k' is

$$k' \left(\frac{1}{k'} + \frac{1}{k'-1} + \cdots + \frac{1}{\varepsilon k} \right) = k' \Theta(\log k' - \log(\varepsilon k)) = \Theta\left(k \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right).$$

By Markov's inequality, if $|x| = k'$ and we take $\Theta\left(k \log \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\right)$ samples, we will observe more than k distinct elements with probability $\Omega(1)$. \square

Proposition 6. *It is possible to solve the approximate counting problem using $O\left(\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\varepsilon}\right)$ classical samples from x .*

Proof. The idea of the algorithm is to sample from x and then to count the number of pairs of equal samples. Assume we have ℓ classical samples: s_1, s_2, \dots, s_ℓ . For $1 \leq i < j \leq \ell$, let $Z_{ij} = 1_{s_i=s_j}$. The expectation is $\mathbb{E}[Z_{ij}] = 1/|x|$, and the variance is $\text{Var}[Z_{ij}] = O(1/k)$. The events Z_{ij} are not independent, but they are *pairwise* independent, which allows to write

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\sum_{i,j} Z_{ij}\right] = \frac{\ell(\ell-1)}{2|x|} \quad \text{and} \quad \text{Var}\left[\sum_{i,j} Z_{ij}\right] = O\left(\frac{\ell^2}{k}\right).$$

By Chebyshev's inequality, we can distinguish whether $|x| = k$ or $|x| = k'$ if

$$\frac{\ell(\ell-1)}{2k} - \frac{\ell(\ell-1)}{2k'} = \Omega\left(\frac{\ell}{\sqrt{k}}\right).$$

Since

$$\frac{\ell(\ell-1)}{2k} - \frac{\ell(\ell-1)}{2k'} = \Omega\left(\frac{\ell^2}{k}\varepsilon\right),$$

this happens when $\ell \geq C\sqrt{k}/\varepsilon$ for a sufficiently large constant C . \square

Proposition 7. *It is possible to solve the approximate counting problem using $O\left(\frac{n}{k\varepsilon^2}\right)$ copies of the state ψ_x from 1.*

Proof. Consider the following procedure. Take a copy of state ψ_x and measure it against the uniform superposition $\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \sum_{i \in [n]} |i\rangle$. The probability of measuring the uniform superposition is exactly $|x|/n$. We have to detect whether this probability is k/n or $k(1+\varepsilon)/n$. By the standard argument, this requires $O\left(\frac{n}{k\varepsilon^2}\right)$ samples. \square

Proposition 8. *It is possible to solve the approximate counting problem using any of the following input oracles $O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\right)$ times: the state-generating, the reflecting, or the membership one.*

Proof. For the case of the standard membership oracle, this is just quantum counting [12, 11]. For the cases of the reflecting and the state-generating oracles, we reflect about the state ψ_x , which does not change the way the algorithm works. \square

Proposition 9. *Assume ℓ distinct elements of x are given to the algorithm. Then, it is possible to solve the approximate counting problem using any of the following input oracles $O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell}}\right)$ times: the state-generating, or the reflecting one.*

Proof. Let S be the subset of ℓ elements of x that are given to us. We perform amplitude estimation [11] on ψ_x , where the marked elements are the ones in S . The amplitude is either $\sqrt{\ell/k}$ or $\sqrt{\ell/k'}$, and it takes $O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell}}\right)$ queries to the reflecting or the state-generating oracles to distinguish the two cases. \square

Proposition 10. *It is possible to solve the approximate counting problem using $O(k^{1/3}/\varepsilon^{2/3})$ queries to the state-generating oracle.*

Proof. We first obtain $\ell \leq k/2$ samples out of x , and then execute the algorithm of Proposition 9. It takes

$$O\left(\ell + \frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell}}\right)$$

queries to the state-generating oracle. The optimal value of ℓ is $k^{1/3}/(2\varepsilon^{2/3}) \leq k/2$. \square

Proposition 11. *Assume the algorithm is given an element out of x . Then, it is possible to solve the approximate counting problem using $O\left(\sqrt{k/\varepsilon}\right)$ queries to the reflecting oracle.*

Note that, similarly to Proposition 8, it is possible to obtain one element of x using the membership or the reflecting oracle $O(\sqrt{n/k})$ times. Also, measuring one copy of the state ψ_x in the computational basis gives an element of x . Note that in this case it suffices to have only a single copy of ψ_x to reduce error probability via repetition in contrast to Footnote 3.

Proof of Proposition 11. Assume we know a non-empty subset S of x , where $|S| < k/2$. Then it is possible to obtain an element in $x \setminus S$ using the reflecting oracle $O(\sqrt{k/|S|})$ times. Indeed, we use amplitude amplification by starting at $\psi_S = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|S|}} \sum_{i \in S} |i\rangle$, and alternating between reflections about ψ_x and ψ_S . The inner product between ψ_x and ψ_S is $\Omega(\sqrt{|S|/k})$. Hence, if we measure the state of the algorithm in the standard basis after $O(\sqrt{k/|S|})$ iterations, we will see an element of $x \setminus S$ with probability $\Omega(1)$.

Now we use the above procedure to get ℓ distinct elements of x and then execute the algorithm of Proposition 9. The total number of queries to the reflecting oracle is

$$O\left(\sqrt{k} + \sqrt{\frac{k}{2}} + \cdots + \sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell}} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell}}\right) = O\left(\sqrt{k\ell} + \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell}}\right).$$

The optimal choice for ℓ is $1/\varepsilon$. □

4 Formulation of the γ_2 -problem

In this section, we formulate the optimisation problem encapsulating the complexity of the approximate counting problem. It is based on the techniques outlined in Section 2.3.

In this case, the set D of labels is $X \cup Y$, where X consists of all the n -bit strings of Hamming weight k and Y consists of all the n -bit strings with Hamming weight $k' = (1 + \varepsilon)k$.

One of the resources available to the algorithm are the copies of the uniform superposition over the elements of the set x :

$$\psi_x = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|x|}} \sum_{i \in x} |i\rangle.$$

We deal with them using the state-conversion formalism. If the algorithm has ℓ copies of this state, we let $v_x = \psi_x^{\otimes \ell}$. Define an $X \times Y$ matrix Ψ by

$$\Psi[x, y] := \langle \psi_x, \psi_y \rangle. \tag{9}$$

Concerning the final states τ_x , recall that we assume $\mathcal{K} = \mathbb{C}^{\otimes 2} \otimes \mathcal{K}'$. We can reduce the error by standard error reduction, so we can assume the error does not exceed a small constant δ . Thus, the measurement of the first register in τ_x gives us $f(x)$ with probability at least $1 - \delta$.

We will assume that the matrix Γ satisfies the condition $\Gamma[x, y] = 0$ if $f(x) \neq f(y)$. So, the matrix breaks down into two symmetric blocks—an $X \times Y$ and a $Y \times X$ block—and we have $\|\Gamma\| = \|\Gamma[X, Y]\| = \|\Gamma[Y, X]\|$. The same holds for $\Gamma \circ M$ with any symmetric matrix M . Thus, for sake of simplicity, we can assume that Γ is an $X \times Y$ matrix.

We deal with the error using an approach taken from [16]. Let ρ and σ be the $X \times Y$ matrices defined by $\rho[x, y] := \langle v_x, v_y \rangle$ and $\sigma[x, y] := \langle \tau_x, \tau_y \rangle$. By [16], we have⁵ $\gamma_2(\sigma) \leq 2\sqrt{\delta}$. The objective value of the dual formulation (4a) of the relative γ_2 -norm (5) is $\|\Gamma \circ (\rho - \sigma)\|$.

Assume that $\|\Gamma\| = 1$ and $\|\Gamma \circ \rho\| \geq 3\sqrt{\delta}$. Then,

$$\|\Gamma \circ (\rho - \sigma)\| \geq \|\Gamma \circ \rho\| - \|\Gamma \circ \sigma\| \geq 3\sqrt{\delta} - 2\sqrt{\delta} = \Omega(1),$$

⁵Here is a sketch of the proof for completeness. Let Π_0 and Π_1 be the projectors of the final measurement. Thus, $\|\Pi_1 \tau_x\|^2, \|\Pi_0 \tau_y\|^2 \leq \delta$ for all $x \in X$ and $y \in Y$. We have

$$\langle \tau_x, \tau_y \rangle = \left\langle \sqrt[4]{\delta} \Pi_0 \tau_x, \frac{\Pi_0 \tau_y}{\sqrt[4]{\delta}} \right\rangle + \left\langle \frac{\Pi_1 \tau_x}{\sqrt[4]{\delta}}, \sqrt[4]{\delta} \Pi_1 \tau_y \right\rangle,$$

which proves the required inequality.

where in the second inequality we used the dual formulation (4) of the usual γ_2 -norm (3). Since δ is an arbitrary constant, it suffices to assume that

$$\|\Gamma\| = 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Gamma \circ \rho\| = \Omega(1). \quad (10)$$

Observe that in our case $\rho = \Psi^{\circ \ell}$.

Let us define various Δ -matrices for different types of input oracles. First, let us take care of the standard input oracle. For $i \in [n]$, define an $X \times Y$ matrix Δ_i in the usual way as⁶

$$\Delta_i[x, y] := 1_{x_i \neq y_i}. \quad (11)$$

For the state-generating input oracles, we define two families of matrices Δ_ψ and Δ_{ψ^*} by

$$(\Delta_\psi)_{x,y} := \psi_x - \psi_y \quad \text{and} \quad (\Delta_{\psi^*})_{x,y} := \psi_x^* - \psi_y^*. \quad (12)$$

The idea is that $(\Delta_\psi)_{x,y} \oplus (\Delta_{\psi^*})_{x,y} = L_{\psi_x} - L_{\psi_y}$, where L_{ψ_x} is as in (6). For the reflecting oracle, we define a family $\Delta_{\psi\psi^*}$ of matrices by

$$(\Delta_{\psi\psi^*})_{x,y} := \psi_x \psi_x^* - \psi_y \psi_y^*. \quad (13)$$

Now we use the formulation in (8), and take in consideration (10). This gives the following guideline for finding the adversary matrix.

Proposition 12. *Assume we can find an $X \times Y$ matrix Γ such that*

- $\|\Gamma\| = 1$;
- $\|\Gamma \circ \Psi^{\circ \ell}\| = \Omega(1)$ with Ψ as in (9);
- for each $i \in [n]$, we have $\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_i\| \leq 1/T_1$ with Δ_i as in (11);
- both $\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_\psi\|$ and $\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi^*}\|$ are at most $1/T_2$ with Δ_ψ and Δ_{ψ^*} as in (12);
- and $\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi\psi^*}\| \leq 1/T_3$ with $\Delta_{\psi\psi^*}$ as in (13).

Then, every quantum algorithm, given ℓ copies of the state ψ_x , and solving the approximate counting problem must

- *either execute the membership oracle $\Omega(T_1)$ times;*
- *or execute the state-generating oracle at least $\Omega(T_2)$ times;*
- *or execute the reflecting oracle $\Omega(T_3)$ times.*

5 Adversary matrix: symmetries and general estimates

In this section, we will describe how the adversary matrix Γ looks like and will give estimates on the norm of the matrix when various Δ -operators are applied to it. Using a variant of the automorphism principle as in [14], we can assume that the matrix Γ is symmetric with respect to the permutation of the input variables. Then the representation theory of the symmetric group tells us that the adversary matrix has the form

$$\Gamma = \sum_{j=0}^k \gamma_j \Phi_j, \quad (14)$$

⁶More precisely, if one wishes to adhere to the language of Proposition 4, Δ_i is a family of 1×1 -matrices $(\Delta_{i,xy})$, with $x \in X$, $y \in Y$, and $\Delta_{i,xy} = 1_{x_j \neq y_j}$. However, we will stick with the usual way of defining Δ_i as a matrix.

where Φ_j are the morphisms between the copies of the irreps of the symmetric group in \mathbb{R}^Y and \mathbb{R}^X . (See Section 8.3 for more detail.) For the purpose of this and the next sections, it suffices to know that the ranges of different Φ_j are pairwise orthogonal, and so are their coimages. Hence, in particular, $\|\Gamma\| = \max_j |\gamma_j|$.

Now let us describe how different operations act on matrices of the form (14). In order to define our results, the following quantities will be of particular importance, where j ranges from 0 to k :

$$\phi_{j,0} := \sqrt{\frac{j(k-j+1)(n-k-j+1)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j+1)k}}, \quad \phi'_{j,0} := \sqrt{\frac{j(k'-j+1)(n-k'-j+1)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j+1)k'}}, \quad (15a)$$

$$\phi_{j,1} := \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}}, \quad \phi'_{j,1} := \sqrt{\frac{k'}{n}}, \quad (15b)$$

$$\phi_{j,2} := \frac{n-2k}{\sqrt{nk}} \sqrt{\frac{j(n-j+1)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}, \quad \phi'_{j,2} := \frac{n-2k'}{\sqrt{nk'}} \sqrt{\frac{j(n-j+1)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}, \quad (15c)$$

$$\phi_{j,3} := \sqrt{\frac{(n-j+1)(k-j)(n-k-j)}{(n-2j+1)(n-2j)k}}, \quad \phi'_{j,3} := \sqrt{\frac{(n-j+1)(k'-j)(n-k'-j)}{(n-2j+1)(n-2j)k'}}. \quad (15d)$$

Here $\phi_{j,i}$ and $\phi'_{j,i}$ differ only in that the second one has k' everywhere the first one has k .

Using these quantities, we define a number of 4-dimensional vectors:

$$\phi_j = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{j,0} \\ \phi_{j,1} \\ \phi_{j,2} \\ \phi_{j,3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \phi'_j = \begin{pmatrix} \phi'_{j,0} \\ \phi'_{j,1} \\ \phi'_{j,2} \\ \phi'_{j,3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \tilde{\phi}_j = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{j-1}\phi_{j,0} \\ \gamma_j\phi_{j,1} \\ \gamma_j\phi_{j,2} \\ \gamma_{j+1}\phi_{j,3} \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{and} \quad \tilde{\phi}'_j = \begin{pmatrix} \gamma_{j-1}\phi'_{j,0} \\ \gamma_j\phi'_{j,1} \\ \gamma_j\phi'_{j,2} \\ \gamma_{j+1}\phi'_{j,3} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (16)$$

Note that in $\tilde{\phi}_0$ and $\tilde{\phi}'_0$ the value of γ_{j-1} is irrelevant because $\phi_{0,0} = \phi'_{0,0} = 0$. For $\tilde{\phi}_k$ and $\tilde{\phi}'_k$, we will assume that the value of γ_{k+1} is 0.

Now we can formulate the necessary technical results. All of them will be proven in Sections 10 and 11.

Lemma 13. *For Γ as in (14) and Ψ as in (9), we have*

$$\Gamma \circ \Psi = \sum_{j=0}^k \langle \phi_j, \tilde{\phi}'_j \rangle \Phi_j = \sum_{j=0}^k \langle \phi'_j, \tilde{\phi}_j \rangle \Phi_j.$$

Lemma 14. *For Γ as in (14) and Δ_ψ and Δ_{ψ^*} as in (12), we have*

$$\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_\psi\| = \max_j \|\tilde{\phi}'_j - \gamma_j \phi_j\| \quad \text{and} \quad \|\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi^*}\| = \max_j \|\gamma_j \phi'_j - \tilde{\phi}_j\|.$$

Lemma 15. *For Γ as in (14) and $\Delta_{\psi\psi^*}$ as in (13), we have*

$$\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi\psi^*}\| = \max_j \|\phi'_j \tilde{\phi}_j^* - \tilde{\phi}_j \phi_j^*\|.$$

Lemma 16. *For Γ as in (14), Δ_i as in (11), and for all values of $i \in [n]$, we have*

$$\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_i\| = \max_j \max \left\{ \left| \frac{\sqrt{(k-j)(n-k'-j)}}{n-2j} \gamma_j - \frac{\sqrt{(k'-j)(n-k-j)}}{n-2j} \gamma_{j+1} \right|, \right. \\ \left. \left| \frac{\sqrt{(k'-j)(n-k-j)}}{n-2j} \gamma_j - \frac{\sqrt{(k-j)(n-k'-j)}}{n-2j} \gamma_{j+1} \right| \right\}.$$

6 Adversary matrix: construction

We will make the following choice for the coefficients γ_j in (14). We take a parameter $1 \leq t \leq k/5$, to be defined later, and let

$$\gamma_j = \max\left\{1 - \frac{j}{t}, 0\right\}. \quad (17)$$

It is obvious that $\|\Gamma\| = 1$. We will now use general results from Section 5 to get estimates on the matrices that interest us. However, before that, we need the following technical lemma.

Lemma 17. *For $\phi_{j,i}$ defined in (15), we have the following estimates on their values and the differences between the primed and the non-primed versions, assuming that $n \geq 5k$ and $k \geq 5j$:*

i	$\phi_{j,i}, \phi'_{j,i}$	$ \phi'_{j,i} - \phi_{j,i} $
0	$O\left(\sqrt{\frac{j}{n}}\right)$	$O\left(\varepsilon \frac{j^{3/2}}{k\sqrt{n}} + \varepsilon \frac{\sqrt{jk}}{n^{3/2}}\right)$
1	$O\left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}}\right)$	$O\left(\varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}}\right)$
2	$O\left(\sqrt{\frac{j}{k}}\right)$	$O\left(\varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{j}{k}}\right)$
3	$O(1)$	$O\left(\varepsilon \frac{j}{k} + \varepsilon \frac{k}{n}\right)$

One thing to observe from this table is that the row corresponding to $i = 0$ is dominated by the remaining rows, and as such, in most cases can be ignored.

Proof. The estimates on the values are straightforward. The estimates on the differences are also easy to derive. Use the inequality $|h(1+\varepsilon) - h(1)| \leq \int_1^{1+\varepsilon} |h'(t)| dt$, and estimate $h'(t)$ using basic calculus. For $\phi'_{j,3} - \phi_{j,3}$, we have

$$O\left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}\right) \left| \sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{j}{k(1+\varepsilon)}\right)(n - k(1+\varepsilon) - j)} - \sqrt{\left(1 - \frac{j}{k}\right)(n - k - j)} \right| = O\left(\varepsilon \frac{j}{k} + \varepsilon \frac{k}{n}\right).$$

For $\phi'_{j,2} - \phi_{j,2}$, we have

$$O\left(\frac{\sqrt{j}}{n}\right) \left| \frac{n - 2k(1+\varepsilon)}{\sqrt{k(1+\varepsilon)}} - \frac{n - 2k}{\sqrt{k}} \right| = O\left(\varepsilon \frac{\sqrt{jk}}{n} + \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{j}{k}}\right) = O\left(\varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{j}{k}}\right).$$

For $\phi'_{j,1} - \phi_{j,1}$, we have

$$\left| \sqrt{\frac{k(1+\varepsilon)}{n}} - \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} \right| = O\left(\varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}}\right).$$

And $\phi'_{j,0} - \phi_{j,0}$ is similar to $\phi'_{j,3} - \phi_{j,3}$. □

6.1 Copies of the state $|\psi_x\rangle$

To deal with copies of the state $|\psi_x\rangle$, we need the following result, whose proof constitutes the current section.

Proposition 18. *In order to have $\|\Gamma \circ \Psi^{\circ \ell}\| = \Omega(1)$, it suffices that the following conditions are met:*

$$t \geq 2\ell, \quad \text{and} \quad \ell \leq C \min\left\{\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\varepsilon}, \frac{n}{k\varepsilon^2}\right\}$$

for a sufficiently small constant C .

Denote $D_j = \langle \phi_j, \phi'_j \rangle$, and let D be the minimum of D_j as j ranges from 0 to ℓ .

Claim 19. *We have $\|\Gamma \circ \Psi^{\circ \ell}\| \geq D^\ell/2$.*

Proof. Let $\Gamma \circ \Psi^{\circ s} = \sum_{j=0}^k \gamma_j^{(s)} \Phi_j$. By Lemma 13, we have

$$\gamma_j^{(s+1)} = \gamma_{j-1}^{(s)} \phi_{j,0} \phi'_{j,0} + \gamma_j^{(s)} \phi_{j,1} \phi'_{j,1} + \gamma_j^{(s)} \phi_{j,2} \phi'_{j,2} + \gamma_{j+1}^{(s)} \phi_{j,3} \phi'_{j,3}. \quad (18)$$

We prove by induction on s that for all $s \in \{0, 1, \dots, \ell\}$ and all $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, \ell - s\}$ we have $\gamma_j^{(s)} \geq D^s/2$. The base case $s = 0$ follows from (17) and our assumption that $t \geq 2\ell$.

The inductive step from s to $s+1$ proceeds as follows. By (18) and because all $\phi_{j,i}, \phi'_{j,i} \geq 0$, we have that

$$\gamma_j^{(s+1)} \geq \min\left\{\gamma_{j-1}^{(s)}, \gamma_j^{(s)}, \gamma_{j+1}^{(s)}\right\} \langle \phi_j, \phi'_j \rangle \geq D^{s+1}/2. \quad \square$$

Thus, it suffices to lower bound D .

Claim 20. *Both ϕ_j and ϕ'_j are unit vectors: $\|\phi_j\| = \|\phi'_j\| = 1$.*

Proof. This can be verified by a direct computation. However, there is a reason behind this; see Remark 36. \square

Let α_j be the angle between ϕ_j and ϕ'_j . Now we have

$$D_j^2 = \cos^2 \alpha_j = 1 - \sin^2 \alpha_j = 1 - O(\|\phi_j - \phi'_j\|^2).$$

Using Lemma 17, and removing the subdominant terms, we get

$$\|\phi_j - \phi'_j\|^2 = O\left(\varepsilon^2 \frac{j}{k} + \varepsilon^2 \frac{k}{n}\right).$$

Recall that for D we only consider D_j with $j \leq \ell$. Hence,

$$D^\ell \geq \left(1 - O\left(\frac{\ell}{k} \varepsilon^2 + \frac{k}{n} \varepsilon^2\right)\right)^{\ell/2} \geq 1 - O\left(\frac{\ell^2}{k} \varepsilon^2 + \frac{\ell k}{n} \varepsilon^2\right) = \Omega(1)$$

by our assumption on ℓ .

6.2 Applications of Deltas

Proposition 21. *Both $\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_\psi\|$ and $\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi^*}\|$ are $O\left(\varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{t}{k}} + \frac{1}{t}\right)$.*

Proof. Upper bounding the ℓ_2 -norm by the ℓ_1 -norm, and since $0 \leq \gamma_i \leq 1$, we get that

$$\left\|\gamma_j \phi'_j - \tilde{\phi}_j\right\|, \left\|\tilde{\phi}'_j - \gamma_j \phi_j\right\| \leq \frac{1}{t}(\phi'_{j,0} + \phi'_{j,3}) + \|\phi'_j - \phi_j\|_1 = O\left(\frac{1}{t} + \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{j}{k}}\right),$$

where we used Lemma 17. The result now follows from Lemma 14 because the left-hand side of the above equation is 0 if $j > t+1$ due to (17). \square

Proposition 22. *We have $\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi\psi^*}\| = O\left(\frac{1}{t} + \varepsilon\right)\left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{t}{k}}\right)$.*

Proof. We can upper bound the norm of the matrix $\phi'_j \tilde{\phi}'_j{}^* - \tilde{\phi}_j \phi_j^*$ by the sum of the absolute values of its entries. Up to a constant factor, it is

$$\frac{1}{t} \left((\phi_{j,0} + \phi_{j,3})(\phi_{j,1} + \phi_{j,2}) + \phi_{j,0} \phi_{j,3} \right) + \left(\|\phi'_j\|_1 + \|\phi_j\|_1 \right) \|\phi'_j - \phi_j\|_1,$$

which, using Lemma 17, is

$$O \left(\frac{1}{t} \left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{j}{k}} \right) + \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{j}{k}} \right).$$

By Lemma 15, and using that $\phi'_j \tilde{\phi}'_j{}^* - \tilde{\phi}_j \phi_j^* = 0$ for $j > t + 1$ due to (17), we get the required bound. \square

Proposition 23. *We have $\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_i\| = O \left(\frac{1}{t} + \varepsilon \right) \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}}$.*

Proof. We use Lemma 16. We estimate the first difference

$$\left| \frac{\sqrt{(k-j)(n-k'-j)}}{n-2j} \gamma_j - \frac{\sqrt{(k'-j)(n-k-j)}}{n-2j} \gamma_{j+1} \right|$$

in the formulation of the lemma, the second one being similar. It is bounded by

$$\begin{aligned} & O \left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} \right) |\gamma_{j+1} - \gamma_j| + O \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \left| \sqrt{k-j} - \sqrt{k'-j} \right| + O \left(\frac{\sqrt{k}}{n} \right) \left| \sqrt{n-k'-j} - \sqrt{n-k-j} \right| \\ & = O \left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} \right) \frac{1}{t} + O \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right) \varepsilon \sqrt{k} + O \left(\frac{\sqrt{k}}{n} \right) \frac{\varepsilon k}{\sqrt{n}}, \end{aligned}$$

from which the proposition follows since we may assume that $j \leq t + 1$. \square

7 Adversary matrix: proof of Theorem 1

Let us gather up all the inequalities from Section 6:

$$2\ell \leq t \leq k/5, \quad \ell \leq C \min \left\{ \frac{\sqrt{k}}{\varepsilon}, \frac{n}{k\varepsilon^2} \right\}, \quad (19)$$

$$\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_\psi\|, \|\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi^*}\| = O \left(\varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \varepsilon \sqrt{\frac{t}{k}} + \frac{1}{t} \right), \quad (20)$$

$$\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi\psi^*}\| = O \left(\frac{1}{t} + \varepsilon \right) \left(\sqrt{\frac{k}{n}} + \sqrt{\frac{t}{k}} \right), \quad (21)$$

$$\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_i\| = O \left(\frac{1}{t} + \varepsilon \right) \sqrt{\frac{k}{n}}. \quad (22)$$

It is clear that the conditions on ℓ in (19) are the negations of the first point of Theorem 1. So, from now on, everywhere in this section, we will assume that ℓ satisfies the conditions in (19).

The proof of the Theorem follows from the two lemmas below. In both of them, we assume the notation of Theorem 1.

Lemma 24. Assume the algorithm uses the state-generating oracle

$$\ell' \leq C \min \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell}}, \frac{k^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3}} \right\}$$

times, where C is a sufficiently small constant. Then, in order to solve the problem, the algorithm should

- either execute the reflecting oracle $\Omega \left(\min \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell + \ell'}}, \sqrt{\frac{k}{\varepsilon}} \right\} \right)$ times;
- or execute the membership oracle $\Omega \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{n}{k}} \right)$ times;

Lemma 25. Assume the algorithm does not have any copies of the state and does not execute the state-generating oracle. Then, in order to solve the problem, it should

- execute the reflecting or the membership oracle $\Omega \left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}} \right)$ times.

Proof of Theorem 1 assuming Lemmas 24 and 25. The only case when Lemma 24 does not cover Theorem 1 is when the reflecting oracle is used $\Omega(\sqrt{k/\varepsilon})$ times. In this, case Lemma 25 gives the fifth case of Theorem 1. \square

Proof of Lemma 24. In the proof, we will need a bit more careful tracking of constants than usually. We will use two constants: C as in the statement of the lemma, and one additional constant C' . The O s and Ω s in the proof of the lemma do not depend on C and C' , whereas the Ω s in the formulation of the lemma do depend on them.

We will take

$$t = \max \left\{ 2\ell, C'\ell', \frac{1}{5\varepsilon} \right\},$$

where C' is a sufficiently large constant. First, we have to check that t satisfies (19). Indeed, $t \geq 2\ell$. Also,

$$2\ell \leq k/5, \quad C'\ell' \leq C' \frac{k^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3}} \leq \frac{k}{5}, \quad \text{and} \quad \frac{1}{5\varepsilon} \leq \frac{k}{5},$$

if C is small enough and because $\varepsilon \geq 1/k$.

Now we can use (20)—(22). Since $t = \Omega(1/\varepsilon)$, we have that $O(\varepsilon + 1/t) = O(\varepsilon)$. Proposition 12 gives us that one of the following three cases holds:

- The state-generating oracle is used

$$\Omega \left(\min \left\{ t, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{k}{t}} \right\} \right) = \Omega \left(\min \left\{ t, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell}}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{k}{C'\ell'}}, \sqrt{\frac{k}{\varepsilon}} \right\} \right) \quad (23)$$

times; or

- the reflecting oracle is used

$$\Omega \left(\min \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{k}{t}} \right\} \right) = \Omega \left(\min \left\{ \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}, \frac{1}{\varepsilon} \sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell + C'\ell'}}, \sqrt{\frac{k}{\varepsilon}} \right\} \right)$$

times; or

- the membership oracle is used $\Omega\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\right)$ times.

Now, in order to prove the lemma, it suffices to show that the first case cannot hold, that is, ℓ' is smaller than (23). For that, we have to compare ℓ' to the five elements in the minimum on the right-hand side of (23).

First, $t \geq C'\ell'$. This gives contradiction to $\ell' = \Omega(t)$ if C' is large enough. Second and third, we have $\ell' \leq C\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}$ and $\ell' \leq C\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell'}}$, and we can take C small enough. Forth, we have

$$\ell' \leq C\frac{k^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3}} \implies \ell'^{3/2} \leq C^{3/2}\frac{\sqrt{k}}{\varepsilon} \implies \ell' \leq C^{3/2}\frac{1}{\varepsilon}\sqrt{\frac{k}{\ell'}}$$

and we can take C small enough. Fifth and finally, we have

$$\ell' \leq C\frac{k^{1/3}}{\varepsilon^{2/3}} \leq C\sqrt{\frac{k}{\varepsilon}}$$

because $\varepsilon \geq 1/k$. Again, we can take C small enough.

The order of choosing the values of the constants above is as follows. First, we choose the value of C' large enough to get contradiction to $\ell' = \Omega(t)$. Then, based on the value of C' , we choose the value of C small enough. This ends the proof of Lemma 24 \square

Proof of Lemma 25. In this case we have $\ell = \ell' = 0$. We take $t = 1$. Thus, $\gamma_0 = 1$ and $\gamma_j = 0$ for all $j \geq 1$. Clearly (19) is satisfied.

By (22), we have that

$$\frac{1}{\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_i\|} = \Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\right).$$

We will use a different analysis of $\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi\psi^*}\|$, tailored for this special case. Note that $\phi_{0,0} = \phi'_{0,0} = \phi_{0,2} = \phi'_{0,2} = 0$, hence, we get that the matrix $\phi'_0 \widetilde{\phi_0^*} - \widetilde{\phi_0} \phi_0^*$ from Lemma 15 equals

$$\begin{pmatrix} 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \phi_{0,1}'^2 - \phi_{0,1}^2 & 0 & -\phi_{0,1}\phi_{0,3} \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & \phi_{0,1}'\phi_{0,3}' & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix},$$

and

$$\phi_1' \widetilde{\phi_1^*} - \widetilde{\phi_1} \phi_1^* = \begin{pmatrix} \phi_{1,0}'^2 - \phi_{1,0}^2 & -\phi_{1,0}'\phi_{1,1}' & -\phi_{1,0}'\phi_{1,2}' & -\phi_{1,0}'\phi_{1,3}' \\ \phi_{1,0}'\phi_{1,1}' & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \phi_{1,0}'\phi_{1,2}' & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ \phi_{1,0}'\phi_{1,3}' & 0 & 0 & 0 \end{pmatrix}$$

and all the remaining matrices are zeroes. Now we can use Lemma 15. Taking the maximal absolute values of all the entries in the above two matrices and using Lemma 17, we get that

$$\frac{1}{\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi\psi^*}\|} = \Omega\left(\sqrt{\frac{n}{k}}\right).$$

Application of Proposition 12 finishes the proof of Lemma 25 and Theorem 1. \square

8 Preliminaries on the Johnson scheme and the symmetric group

To conclude the proof of our lower bounds, we are left with two tasks. The first one is to define the morphisms Φ_j used in the construction of the adversary matrix Γ . The second one is to prove Lemmas 13–16. In this section, we introduce the basics of the representation theory of the symmetric group and the Johnson association scheme, and we use them to define morphisms Φ_j . We leave the proofs of Lemmas 13–16 to the final two sections.

8.1 Representation Theory

In this section, we introduce basic notions from the representation theory of finite groups. For more background, the reader may refer to [13, 22]. We will work with real vector spaces in this paper, which is justified by the fact that the adversary matrix Γ is customary real-valued, and that the theory of irreducible representations of the symmetric group is the same over all fields of characteristic 0.

Assume G is a finite group. The *group algebra* $\mathbb{R}G$ is the real vector space with the elements of G forming an orthonormal basis, where the multiplication law of G is extended to $\mathbb{R}G$ by linearity. A (left) G -module, also called a *representation* of G , is a real vector space \mathcal{V} with a left multiplication operation by the elements of $\mathbb{R}G$ satisfying the usual associativity and distributivity axioms. We can treat elements of $\mathbb{R}G$ as linear operators acting on \mathcal{V} . We assume the module \mathcal{V} is equipped with a G -invariant inner product, that is, $\langle gv, gu \rangle = \langle v, u \rangle$ for all $u, v \in \mathcal{V}$ and $g \in G \subset \mathbb{R}G$. Thus, the linear operators corresponding to $g \in G$ are unitary.

A G -morphism (or just morphism, if G is clear from the context) between two G -modules \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} is a linear operator $\theta: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ that commutes with all $\alpha \in \mathbb{R}G$: $\theta\alpha = \alpha\theta$, where the first α acts on \mathcal{V} and the second one on \mathcal{W} . By linearity, θ is a morphism if and only if $\theta g = g\theta$ for all $g \in G$.

If \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} are two G -modules, then the direct sum $\mathcal{V} \oplus \mathcal{W}$ and the tensor product $\mathcal{V} \otimes \mathcal{W}$ are also G -modules defined by $g(v, w) = (gv, gw)$ and $g(v \otimes w) = (gv) \otimes (gw)$ for all $v \in \mathcal{V}$, $w \in \mathcal{W}$, and $g \in G$.

An important special case is when $\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{R}^X$, where X is a finite set with a *group action* of G on it. A group action is a map $(g, x) \mapsto g(x)$ from $G \times X$ onto X satisfying $g(h(x)) = (gh)(x)$ for all $g, h \in G$ and $x \in X$. By linearity, this gives a G -module. Moreover, the linear operator on $\mathcal{V} = \mathbb{R}^X$ corresponding to $g \in G$ is given by a permutation matrix in the standard basis. Hence, the standard inner product in \mathbb{R}^X is G -invariant.

Proposition 26. *Assume X and Y are two sets with group action of G defined on them. A linear operator $A: \mathbb{R}^Y \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^X$ is a G -morphism if and only if $A[x, y] = A[g(x), g(y)]$ for all $x \in X$, $y \in Y$, and $g \in G$.*

A G -module is called *irreducible* (or just irrep for irreducible representation) if it does not contain a non-trivial G -submodule. Schur's Lemma is an essential result in representation theory, stated as follows.

Lemma 27 (Schur's Lemma). *Assume $\theta: \mathcal{V} \rightarrow \mathcal{W}$ is a morphism between two irreducible G -modules \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} . Then, $\theta = 0$ if \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} are non-isomorphic, otherwise, θ is uniquely determined up to a scalar multiplier.*

In the latter case of the above lemma, θ is obviously an isomorphism between \mathcal{V} and \mathcal{W} . Moreover, if we scale it so that θ has norm 1 as a linear operator, then θ becomes an isometry. In the real case, it is defined up to a ± 1 -sign. We call such an isometric isomorphism between two instances of the same irrep a *transporter*.

Schur's lemma has a number of important consequences. First, non-isomorphic irreps in a fixed G -module \mathcal{V} are orthogonal (with respect to the G -invariant inner product). For any G -module \mathcal{V} , one can define its *canonical* decomposition into the direct sum of *isotypic* subspaces, each spanned by all the copies of a fixed irrep in \mathcal{V} . A G -module is said to be *multiplicity-free* if all its isotypic subspaces are isomorphic to the corresponding irreps.

8.2 Symmetric group

In this section, we apply the general theory to the special case of the symmetric group. Refer to [15, 21] for more background.

If A is a finite set, S_A denotes the *symmetric group* on A , that is, the group with the permutations of A as elements, and composition as the group operation. We will usually write S_n instead of $S_{[n]}$. Representation theory of S_n is closely related to *partitions of integers*, defined as follows.

A *partition* λ of an integer n is a non-increasing sequence $(\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_\ell)$ of positive integers satisfying $\lambda_1 + \dots + \lambda_\ell = n$. For each partition λ of n , one assigns an irreducible S_n -module \mathcal{S}^λ , called the *Specht module*. All these modules are pairwise non-isomorphic, and give a complete list of all the irreps of S_n . For a precise definition of the Specht module, see [15, Chapter 3] or [13, §28]. Here we will be interested only in Specht modules $\mathcal{S}^{(n-j,j)}$ and, in passing, $\mathcal{S}^{(n-j,j-1,1)}$. Because of that, in order to simplify notation, we will denote $\mathcal{S}^{(n-j,j)}$ as $\mathcal{E}(n,j)$.

We will only use the following two properties of Specht modules, as well as their connection to the Johnson scheme described in Section 8.3.

Since S_{n-1} can be seen as a subgroup of S_n , every S_n -module is automatically an S_{n-1} -module. Clearly, the modules irreducible with respect to S_n need not be such with respect to S_{n-1} . The *branching rule* characterises how irreducible S_n -modules decompose into irreducible S_{n-1} -modules. In our case, we only need one consequence of this rule:

$$\mathcal{E}(n,j) \cong \mathcal{E}(n-1,j-1) \oplus \mathcal{E}(n-1,j).$$

A tensor product of two representations is itself a representation. It is known how a tensor product of two S_n -irreps decomposes into irreps. Again, we only need a handful of special cases. The Specht module $\mathcal{S}^{(n)} = \mathcal{E}(n,0)$ corresponds to the one-dimensional trivial representation, therefore $\mathcal{E}(n,j) \otimes \mathcal{S}^{(n)}$ is trivially isomorphic to $\mathcal{E}(n,j)$. In addition, for $1 \leq j \leq n/2 - 1$, we have

$$\mathcal{E}(n,j) \otimes \mathcal{E}(n,1) \cong \mathcal{E}(n,j-1) \oplus \mathcal{E}(n,j) \oplus \mathcal{E}(n,j+1) \oplus \mathcal{S}^{(n-j,j-1,1)} \oplus \mathcal{S}^{(n-j-1,j,1)}, \quad (24)$$

where the term $\mathcal{S}^{(n-j,j-1,1)}$ is non-existent for $j = 1$ (see [20, Cor. 1.13]).

8.3 Johnson association scheme

In our discussion of the Johnson association scheme, we abuse terminology and use the term Johnson (association) scheme to refer to the space on which the operators in the Bose–Mesner algebra corresponding to the Johnson association scheme act on. With this in mind, for A a finite set, the Johnson association scheme $\mathcal{J}(A,k)$ is a linear space with the set of all subsets of A of size k as a basis. We can define group action of S_A on $\mathcal{J}(A,k)$ in an obvious way $\pi(x) := \{\pi(i) : i \in x\}$ for $\pi \in S_n$ and x a subset of A of size k .

Again, we write $\mathcal{J}(n,k)$ instead of $\mathcal{J}([n],k)$. We will assume that $n \geq 2k$. The decomposition of $\mathcal{J}(n,k)$ into S_n -irreps is given by

$$\mathcal{J}(n,k) \cong \mathcal{E}(n,0) \oplus \mathcal{E}(n,1) \oplus \mathcal{E}(n,2) \oplus \dots \oplus \mathcal{E}(n,k). \quad (25)$$

We can also describe how the individual terms $\mathcal{E}(n,j)$ above are embedded into $\mathcal{J}(n,k)$. For that, the following notation is handy. For two disjoint sets A and B , let $A \boxtimes B$ denote their disjoint union, which we extend by linearity. For instance,

$$\left(\{1\} - \{2\}\right) \boxtimes \left(\{3\} - \{4\}\right) = \{1,3\} - \{1,4\} - \{2,3\} + \{2,4\},$$

which is an element of the Johnson association scheme with $k = 2$ and $n \geq 4$. In essence, this is similar to the way tensor product is handled in quantum computation, but with the exception that the sets are unordered and the promise that the multipliers are disjoint. We use a different notation to emphasise these differences.

Denote

$$R_j := \left(\{n\} - \{n-1\} \right) \boxtimes \left(\{n-2\} - \{n-3\} \right) \boxtimes \cdots \boxtimes \left(\{n-2j+2\} - \{n-2j+1\} \right) \quad (26)$$

and

$$T_\ell^A := \sum_{T \subset A, |T|=\ell} T. \quad (27)$$

Theorem 28 ([6]). *The irrep $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$ in $\mathcal{J}(n, k)$ is spanned by the vectors $\pi(R_j \boxtimes T_{k-j}^{[n-2j]})$ where π ranges over S_n . Moreover, the unique, up to a scalar, S_n -morphism from the copy of $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$ in $\mathcal{J}(n, k')$ to the copy of $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$ in $\mathcal{J}(n, k)$ maps the vector $R_j \boxtimes T_{k'-j}^{[n-2j]}$ into the vector $R_j \boxtimes T_{k-j}^{[n-2j]}$.*

Normalising the vectors of the theorem above, we define unit vectors

$$v := \frac{R_j \boxtimes T_{k-j}^{[n-2j]}}{\sqrt{2^j \binom{n-2j}{k-j}}} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{v} := \frac{R_j \boxtimes T_{k'-j}^{[n-2j]}}{\sqrt{2^j \binom{n-2j}{k'-j}}}. \quad (28)$$

Then, the transporter Φ_j between the copies of $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$ in $\mathcal{J}(n, k')$ and $\mathcal{J}(n, k)$ satisfies

$$\Phi_j: \hat{v} \mapsto v. \quad (29)$$

With this choice, we fix the ± 1 -ambiguity mentioned after Lemma 27. Being an S_n -morphism, Φ_j also satisfies $\Phi_j: \pi(\hat{v}) \mapsto \pi(v)$ for all $\pi \in S_n$. From Schur's lemma, we get that any S_n -morphism from $\mathcal{J}(n, k')$ to $\mathcal{J}(n, k)$ is a linear combination of Φ_j as $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$.

9 Orthonormal bases for spaces containing v

In this section, we analyse the vector v from (28), which will be important for us as a reference vector living in $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$. When applying the Δ_i operator from (11), the vector naturally breaks down into two parts: the one spanned by the subsets containing i , and the one spanned by the subsets not containing i . We will denote these parts by w_i and w_o later. In order to understand how the Φ_j operator acts on these vectors, we write them down in an alternative basis, where each vector of the basis belongs to a specific irrep of S_n .

In the above situation, we say that we fix one element i . In this section, we study the case when one element is fixed, as above, and when two elements are fixed. These calculations will be useful for us later in the proofs of Lemmas 13–16.

9.1 One element fixed

In this section, we consider what happens if we fix one element. It will suffice to consider the element $b = n - 2j$, which we chose because of notational convenience.

Let $\beta_2 := \sqrt{2^j \binom{n-2j}{k-j}}$, which is the normalisation factor in the definition of v . Define two sets of vectors, $\{v, v_\sim\}$ and $\{w_i, w_o\}$, where v is as in (28),

$$v_\sim := \frac{R_j \boxtimes \sum_{a=1}^{n-2j-1} \left[\left(\{a\} - \{b\} \right) \boxtimes T_{k-j-1}^{[n-2j-1] \setminus \{a\}} \right]}{\beta_2 \sqrt{(k-j)(n-k-j)}},$$

and

$$w_o := \frac{R_j \boxtimes T_{k-j}^{[n-2j-1]}}{\beta_2 \sqrt{\frac{n-k-j}{n-2j}}}, \quad w_i := \frac{R_j \boxtimes \{b\} \boxtimes T_{k-j-1}^{[n-2j-1]}}{\beta_2 \sqrt{\frac{k-j}{n-2j}}}. \quad (30)$$

The vectors w_o and w_i are clearly orthogonal, as the former has overlap only with sets that do not contain b , while the later only with sets that do. It is also easy to see that they are of unit length, therefore, $\{w_o, w_i\}$ is an orthonormal system.

It is not obvious, but we will show that the vectors v and v_\sim also form an orthonormal system. First, these vectors are orthogonal as they belong to different irreps of S_n . Indeed, we already know that v belongs to $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$. On the other hand, v_\sim belongs to $\mathcal{E}(n, j+1)$ because it is a linear combination of vectors of the form $R_j \boxtimes (\{a\} - \{b\}) \boxtimes T_{k-j-1}^{[n-2j-1] \setminus \{a\}}$, each belonging to $\mathcal{E}(n, j+1)$ per Theorem 28. Normalisation of the vectors can be verified by direct calculation, however, we will prove orthonormality of $\{v, v_\sim\}$ once again later as we express them in terms of w_i and w_o .

We claim that $\{v, v_\sim\}$ and $\{w_i, w_o\}$ span the same subspace. First, note the equality

$$R_j \boxtimes T_{k-j}^{[n-2j]} = R_j \boxtimes T_{k-j}^{[n-2j-1]} + R_j \boxtimes \{b\} \boxtimes T_{k-j-1}^{[n-2j-1]}$$

whose terms are unnormalised (i.e., scaled) versions of vectors v , w_o , and w_i . Taking normalisation into account, we have

$$v = \sqrt{\frac{n-k-j}{n-2j}} w_o + \sqrt{\frac{k-j}{n-2j}} w_i.$$

From the symmetries of v_\sim , one can easily see that it is some linear combination of w_o and w_i . To obtain the corresponding coefficients, consider the “representative” sets

$$s_o := r_j \cup [k-j] \quad \text{and} \quad s_i := r_j \cup \{b\} \cup [k-j-1]$$

of size k , where $r_j := \{n, n-2, n-4, \dots, n-2j+2\}$. Therefore, s_o and s_i are elements of the standard basis of $\mathcal{J}(n, k)$. We have

$$\langle s_o, w_o \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{n-2j}{n-k-j}} / \beta_2, \quad \langle s_i, w_o \rangle = 0, \quad \langle s_o, w_i \rangle = 0, \quad \langle s_i, w_i \rangle = \sqrt{\frac{n-2j}{k-j}} / \beta_2.$$

Consider the sum over $a \in [n-2j-1]$ that defines v_\sim , and how each term contributes to coefficients of s_o and s_i . For the coefficient of s_o , only values $a \in [k-j]$ contribute, while for the coefficient of s_i , only values $a \notin [k-j-1]$ contribute. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle w_o, v_\sim \rangle &= \frac{\langle s_o, v_\sim \rangle}{\langle s_o, w_o \rangle} = \frac{\frac{(k-j) \cdot 1}{\sqrt{(k-j)(n-k-j)}} / \beta_2}{\sqrt{\frac{n-2j}{n-k-j}} / \beta_2} = \sqrt{\frac{k-j}{n-2j}}, \\ \langle w_i, v_\sim \rangle &= \frac{\langle s_i, v_\sim \rangle}{\langle s_i, w_i \rangle} = \frac{\frac{(n-k-j) \cdot (-1)}{\sqrt{(k-j)(n-k-j)}} / \beta_2}{\sqrt{\frac{n-2j}{k-j}} / \beta_2} = -\sqrt{\frac{n-k-j}{n-2j}}. \end{aligned}$$

As a result, the vector v_\sim can be expressed as

$$v_\sim = \sqrt{\frac{k-j}{n-2j}} w_o - \sqrt{\frac{n-k-j}{n-2j}} w_i.$$

From $\{w_o, w_i\}$ being an orthonormal basis, we see that $\{v, v_\sim\}$ is also an orthonormal basis of the same space. We can summarise our findings in the form of the following lemma.

Lemma 29. *The sets $\{v, v_\sim\}$ and $\{w_i, w_o\}$ are orthonormal basis of the same subspace, and Table 1 gives the transformation matrix between the bases. The vector v belongs to $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$ and v_\sim belongs to $\mathcal{E}(n, j+1)$.*

	v	v_\sim
w_o	$\sqrt{\frac{n-k-j}{n-2j}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{k-j}{n-2j}}$
w_i	$\sqrt{\frac{k-j}{n-2j}}$	$-\sqrt{\frac{n-k-j}{n-2j}}$
	$\mathcal{E}(n, j)$	$\mathcal{E}(n, j+1)$

Table 1: The coefficients for expressing the vectors of $\{v, v_\sim\}$ in terms of $\{w_o, w_i\}$, and vice versa.

9.2 Two elements fixed

For two fixed elements, it will suffice to consider the case of $c = n-2j+2$ and $d = n-2j+1$ being fixed. Let $\beta_4 := \sqrt{2^{j-1} \binom{n-2j}{k-j}}$. Consider two sets of vectors, $\{v_+, v, v_o, v_+\}$ and $\{w_\emptyset, w_c, w_d, w_{cd}\}$, where v is as above,

$$\begin{aligned}
v_- &:= \frac{R_{j-1} \boxtimes T_{k-j+1}^{[n-2j+2]}}{\beta_4 \sqrt{\frac{(n-2j+2)(n-2j+1)}{(k-j+1)(n-k-j+1)}}}, \\
v_o &:= \frac{R_{j-1} \boxtimes \sum_{a=1}^{n-2j} \left[\left(\{a\} - \{c\} \right) \boxtimes T_{k-j}^{[n-2j+2] \setminus \{a, c\}} + \left(\{a\} - \{d\} \right) \boxtimes T_{k-j}^{[n-2j+2] \setminus \{a, d\}} \right]}{\beta_4 \sqrt{2(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}, \\
v_+ &:= \frac{R_{j-1} \boxtimes \sum_{a, a' \in [n-2j], a \neq a'} \left[\left(\{a\} - \{c\} \right) \boxtimes \left(\{a'\} - \{d\} \right) \boxtimes T_{k-j-1}^{[n-2j] \setminus \{a, a'\}} \right]}{\beta_4 \sqrt{(n-2j+1)(n-2j)(n-k-j+1)(k-j)}}
\end{aligned}$$

and

$$w_\emptyset = \frac{R_{j-1} \boxtimes T_{k-j+1}^{[n-2j]}}{\beta_4 \sqrt{\frac{n-k-j}{k-j+1}}}, \quad w_c = \frac{R_{j-1} \boxtimes \{c\} \boxtimes T_{k-j}^{[n-2j]}}{\beta_4}, \quad (31)$$

$$w_d = \frac{R_{j-1} \boxtimes \{d\} \boxtimes T_{k-j}^{[n-2j]}}{\beta_4}, \quad w_{cd} = \frac{R_{j-1} \boxtimes \{c, d\} \boxtimes T_{k-j-1}^{[n-2j]}}{\beta_4 \sqrt{\frac{k-j}{n-k-j+1}}}. \quad (32)$$

The remainder of the section is devoted to the proof of the following lemma.

Lemma 30. *The sets $\{v_-, v, v_o, v_+\}$ and $\{w_\emptyset, w_c, w_d, w_{cd}\}$ are orthonormal basis of the same subspace, and Table 2 gives the corresponding transformation matrix. The vectors v_-, v, v_o, v_+ belong to $\mathcal{E}(n, j-1)$, $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$, $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$, and $\mathcal{E}(n, j+1)$, respectively.*

First, it is straightforward to see that the vectors $w_\emptyset, w_c, w_d, w_{cd}$ are orthogonal, as their supports (elements of the standard basis they are spanned over) are disjoint. And, up to a sign, all sets in their supports appear with the same coefficient, so it is also easy to verify that they are of unit length.

Also, Theorem 28 implies that v_-, v, v_o, v_+ belong to $\mathcal{E}(n, j-1)$, $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$, $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$, and $\mathcal{E}(n, j+1)$, respectively. From this, the orthogonality of these vectors follows, since it is relatively easy

	v_-	v	v_0	v_+
w_\emptyset	$\sqrt{\frac{(n-k-j+1)(n-k-j)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j+1)}}$	0	$\sqrt{\frac{2(k-j+1)(n-k-j)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{(k-j+1)(k-j)}{(n-2j+1)(n-2j)}}$
w_c	$\sqrt{\frac{(k-j+1)(n-k-j+1)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j+1)}}$	$\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{n-2k}{\sqrt{2(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}$	$-\sqrt{\frac{(k-j)(n-k-j)}{(n-2j+1)(n-2j)}}$
w_d	$\sqrt{\frac{(k-j+1)(n-k-j+1)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j+1)}}$	$-\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}$	$-\frac{n-2k}{\sqrt{2(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}$	$-\sqrt{\frac{(k-j)(n-k-j)}{(n-2j+1)(n-2j)}}$
w_{cd}	$\sqrt{\frac{(k-j+1)(k-j)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j+1)}}$	0	$-\sqrt{\frac{2(k-j)(n-k-j+1)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}$	$\sqrt{\frac{(n-k-j+1)(n-k-j)}{(n-2j+1)(n-2j)}}$
	$\mathcal{E}(n, j-1)$	$\mathcal{E}(n, j)$	$\mathcal{E}(n, j)$	$\mathcal{E}(n, j+1)$

Table 2: The coefficients for expressing the vectors of the basis $\{v_-, v, v_0, v_+\}$ in the basis of $\{w_\emptyset, w_c, w_d, w_{cd}\}$, and vice versa.

to see that v is orthogonal to v_0 . But again, the orthonormality of this collection of vectors follows from the unitarity of the matrix in Table 2. Thus, it suffices to verify the coefficients in the table.

First of all, via symmetry arguments, one can see that each vector in $\{v_-, v, v_0, v_+\}$ can be expressed as a linear combination of $w_\emptyset, w_c, w_d, w_{cd}$ with some coefficients. For v_- and v , it is straightforward to verify the coefficients as there is no summation over a . To analyse v_0 and v_+ , let $r_{j-1} := \{n, n-2, n-4, \dots, n-2j+4\}$ and consider the “representative” sets

$$\begin{aligned} s_\emptyset &:= r_{j-1} \cup [k-j+1], & s_c &:= r_{j-1} \cup \{c\} \cup [k-j], \\ s_d &:= r_{j-1} \cup \{d\} \cup [k-j], & s_{c,d} &:= r_{j-1} \cup \{c, d\} \cup [k-j-1], \end{aligned}$$

all of size k . Again, these are elements of the standard basis of $\mathcal{J}(n, k)$. Among vectors $w_\emptyset, w_c, w_d, w_{cd}$, the set s_\emptyset appears only in the w_\emptyset and it appears with coefficient $\sqrt{\frac{k-j+1}{n-k-j}}/\beta_4$, the set s_c appears only in the w_c and it appears with coefficient $1/\beta_4$, et cetera.

For illustrative purposes, we will show the calculation of inner products $\langle w_\emptyset, v_0 \rangle$ and $\langle w_c, v_0 \rangle$. The other coefficients in Table 2 can be calculated similarly, and we omit these tedious but simple computations.

Consider the sum over a that defines v_0 , and let us analyse which values contribute to the coefficients of $s_\emptyset, s_c, s_d, s_{cd}$. For the coefficient of s_\emptyset , values $a \in [k-j+1]$ each contribute $2 \frac{1}{\beta_4 \sqrt{2(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}$ to the sum, while values $a \notin [k-j+1]$ do not contribute at all. Hence

$$\langle w_\emptyset, v_0 \rangle = \frac{\langle s_\emptyset, v_0 \rangle}{\langle s_\emptyset, w_\emptyset \rangle} = \frac{\frac{(k-j+1) \cdot 2}{\sqrt{2(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}/\beta_4}{\sqrt{\frac{k-j+1}{n-k-j}}/\beta_4} = \sqrt{\frac{2(k-j+1)(n-k-j)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}.$$

Similarly, for s_c , values $a \in [k-j]$ each contribute $\frac{1}{\beta_4 \sqrt{2(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}$ to the sum, while values $a \notin [k-j]$ contribute $-\frac{1}{\beta_4 \sqrt{2(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}$. Hence

$$\langle w_c, v_0 \rangle = \frac{\langle s_c, v_0 \rangle}{\langle s_c, w_c \rangle} = \frac{\frac{(k-j) \cdot 1 + (n-k-j) \cdot (-1)}{\sqrt{2(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}/\beta_4}{1/\beta_4} = -\frac{n-2k}{\sqrt{2(n-2j+2)(n-2j)}}.$$

9.3 The action of Φ_j

We end this section with an easy observation of the action of Φ_j and Φ_j^* on the above vectors.

Let $\hat{v}_-, \hat{v}, \hat{v}_0, \hat{v}_+$ be unit vectors in $\mathcal{J}(n, k')$ defined exactly as v_-, v, v_0, v_+ , respectively, except replacing k by k' (including within definitions of β_2 and β_4). The following lemma follows from the above discussion and a straightforward application of (29) to (30), (31) and (32).

Lemma 31. *Vectors v_-, v_0, v_+, v_\sim belong to $\mathcal{E}(n, j-1), \mathcal{E}(n, j), \mathcal{E}(n, j+1), \mathcal{E}(n, j+1)$, respectively, and they satisfy*

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_{j-1}\hat{v}_- &= v_-, & \Phi_j\hat{v} &= v, & \Phi_j\hat{v}_0 &= v_0, & \Phi_{j+1}\hat{v}_+ &= v_+, & \Phi_{j+1}\hat{v}_\sim &= v_\sim, \\ \Phi_{j-1}^*v_- &= \hat{v}_-, & \Phi_j^*v &= \hat{v}, & \Phi_j^*v_0 &= \hat{v}_0, & \Phi_{j+1}^*v_+ &= \hat{v}_+, & \Phi_{j+1}^*v_\sim &= \hat{v}_\sim. \end{aligned}$$

10 Proof of Lemma 16

Now we proceed with estimating the norm of $\Gamma \circ \Delta_i$ for $i \in [n]$. It is a linear operator from \mathbb{R}^Y to \mathbb{R}^X , and it is also an $S_{[n] \setminus \{i\}}$ -morphism. We decompose X as a disjoint union $X^i \sqcup X^\circ$, where X^i consists of the sets that contain i and X° of those that do not. Similarly, $Y = Y^i \sqcup Y^\circ$. As $S_{[n] \setminus \{i\}}$ -modules, the linear spaces $\mathbb{R}^{X^i}, \mathbb{R}^{X^\circ}, \mathbb{R}^{Y^i}$, and \mathbb{R}^{Y° are isomorphic to $\mathcal{J}([n] \setminus \{i\}, k-1), \mathcal{J}([n] \setminus \{i\}, k), \mathcal{J}([n] \setminus \{i\}, k'-1)$, and $\mathcal{J}([n] \setminus \{i\}, k')$, respectively.

Note that, due to the action of Δ_i , the operator $\Gamma \circ \Delta_i$ is a direct sum of its two restrictions $\Gamma \circ \Delta_i: \mathbb{R}^{Y^\circ} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{X^i}$ and $\Gamma \circ \Delta_i: \mathbb{R}^{Y^i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{X^\circ}$. Hence, its norm is equal to the maximum of the norms of these restrictions. Further applying Schur's lemma, the norm of $\Gamma \circ \Delta_i$ is attained by its restriction to a copy of some irrep $\mathcal{E}(n-1, j)$ in either Y° or Y^i .

Fix a value of j . Due to the machinery we have already established, let us consider the action of Δ_b , where $b = n - 2j$ as in Section 9.2. By Schur's lemma again, it suffices to take any vector in the corresponding irrep and evaluate the norm of its image. We will take the unit vectors \hat{w}_o and \hat{w}_i , which belong to the copies of $\mathcal{E}(n-1, j)$ in \mathbb{R}^{Y° and \mathbb{R}^{Y^i} , respectively. We consider \hat{w}_o first, which corresponds to the norm of $\Gamma \circ \Delta_i: \mathbb{R}^{Y^\circ} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{X^i}$ when restricted to the copy of $\mathcal{E}(n-1, j)$ in \mathbb{R}^{Y° .

By the arguments of Section 9.2, \hat{w}_o is a linear combination of \hat{v} and \hat{v}_\sim , which Γ maps to $\gamma_j v$ and $\gamma_{j+1} v_\sim$, respectively. The latter two, in turn, are linear combinations of $w_o \in \mathbb{R}^{X^\circ}$ and $w_i \in \mathbb{R}^{X^i}$. Therefore, we have $\|(\Gamma \circ \Delta_b)\hat{w}_o\| = |w_i^* \Gamma \hat{w}_o|$. By applying basis change according to Table 1, the norm of $\Gamma \circ \Delta_i$ on the copy of $\mathcal{E}(n-1, j)$ in \mathbb{R}^{Y° equals the absolute value of

$$\begin{aligned} w_i^* \Gamma \hat{w}_o &= \left(\sqrt{\frac{k-j}{n-2j}} v - \sqrt{\frac{n-k-j}{n-2j}} v_\sim \right) \Gamma \left(\sqrt{\frac{n-k'-j}{n-2j}} \hat{v} + \sqrt{\frac{k'-j}{n-2j}} \hat{v}_\sim \right) \\ &= \frac{\sqrt{(k-j)(n-k'-j)}}{n-2j} \gamma_j - \frac{\sqrt{(k'-j)(n-k-j)}}{n-2j} \gamma_{j+1}. \end{aligned}$$

The norm of $\Gamma \circ \Delta_i$ on the copy of $\mathcal{E}(n-1, j)$ in \mathbb{R}^{Y^i} can be evaluated similarly. However, it is easier to note that the norm of $\Gamma \circ \Delta_i: \mathbb{R}^{Y^i} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{X^\circ}$ equals to the norm of $(\Gamma \circ \Delta_i)^*: \mathbb{R}^{X^\circ} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}^{Y^i}$, the latter being the same operator as above with X and Y swapped. This corresponds to switching k and k' . Hence, the norm of $\Gamma \circ \Delta_i$ on this irrep is given by

$$\left| \frac{\sqrt{(n-k-j)(k'-j)}}{n-2j} \gamma_j - \frac{\sqrt{(n-k'-j)(k-j)}}{n-2j} \gamma_{j+1} \right|.$$

This finishes the proof of the lemma.

11 Proof of Lemmas 13–15

11.1 Notation

The lemmas and their proofs have much in common, so we start by establishing certain results and notation shared by their proofs. Recall that $\Gamma \circ \Delta_\psi$, $\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi^*}$, and $\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi\psi^*}$ are $X \times Y$ block matrices with each block being of dimensions, respectively, $n \times 1$, $1 \times n$, and $n \times n$.

Let us introduce some notation to better cope with such matrices. Let M be a set with a group action of S_n on it, so that \mathbb{R}^M is an S_n -module, and let $Z \in \{X, Y\}$. Given a $Z \times M$ matrix A and an $M \times Z$ matrix B , let us define

$$A^{\uparrow_1 \psi}, \quad A^{\uparrow_1 \psi^*}, \quad A^{\uparrow_1 \psi \psi^*}, \quad B^{\uparrow_2 \psi}, \quad B^{\uparrow_2 \psi^*}, \quad B^{\uparrow_2 \psi \psi^*} \quad (33)$$

as a block matrix of the same dimensions as A and B , respectively, whose block corresponding to the row x and the column y is

$$A[x, y]\psi_x, \quad A[x, y]\psi_x^*, \quad A[x, y]\psi_x\psi_x^*, \quad B[x, y]\psi_y, \quad B[x, y]\psi_y^*, \quad B[x, y]\psi_y\psi_y^*,$$

respectively, where ψ_x is defined in (1). This notation should be read as extending each entry of the matrix with ψ_z , ψ_z^* , or $\psi_z\psi_z^*$, respectively, where z corresponds to the first or the second index in $[x, y]$, respectively.

Note that

$$A^{\uparrow_1 \psi \psi^*} = (A^{\uparrow_1 \psi^*})^{\uparrow_1 \psi} \quad \text{and} \quad B^{\uparrow_2 \psi \psi^*} = (B^{\uparrow_2 \psi})^{\uparrow_2 \psi^*}. \quad (34)$$

All the six transformations preserve linearity, hence, in particular, from (14) we get

$$\Gamma \circ \Delta_\psi = \Gamma^{\uparrow_1 \psi} - \Gamma^{\uparrow_2 \psi} = \sum_{j=0}^k \gamma_j (\Phi_j^{\uparrow_1 \psi} - \Phi_j^{\uparrow_2 \psi}), \quad (35)$$

$$\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi^*} = \Gamma^{\uparrow_1 \psi^*} - \Gamma^{\uparrow_2 \psi^*} = \sum_{j=0}^k \gamma_j (\Phi_j^{\uparrow_1 \psi^*} - \Phi_j^{\uparrow_2 \psi^*}), \quad (36)$$

$$\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi\psi^*} = \Gamma^{\uparrow_1 \psi\psi^*} - \Gamma^{\uparrow_2 \psi\psi^*} = \sum_{j=0}^k \gamma_j (\Phi_j^{\uparrow_1 \psi\psi^*} - \Phi_j^{\uparrow_2 \psi\psi^*}). \quad (37)$$

The transformations in (33) also preserve the S_n -module structure. For concreteness, we will now consider the case when A is a linear transformation from \mathbb{R}^M to \mathbb{R}^X . Then, $A^{\uparrow_1 \psi}$ is a linear transformation from \mathbb{R}^M to $\mathbb{R}^X \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$. Here, \mathbb{R}^n is isomorphic to $\mathcal{J}(n, 1)$ and decomposes into irreps as

$$\mathbb{R}^n \cong \mathcal{E}(n, 0) \oplus \mathcal{E}(n, 1). \quad (38)$$

Let $\{e_i\}$ denote the standard basis in \mathbb{R}^n , and take $u = \sum_{i \in [n]} e_i / \sqrt{n}$. Define $\Pi_0 := uu^*$ and $\Pi_1 := I_n - uu^*$. Then, Π_0 and Π_1 project onto the irreps $\mathcal{E}(n, 0)$ and $\mathcal{E}(n, 1)$ in \mathbb{R}^n , respectively.

Proposition 32. *If A is an S_n -morphism from \mathbb{R}^M to \mathbb{R}^X , then $A^{\uparrow_1 \psi}$ is an S_n -morphism from \mathbb{R}^M to the tensor product of S_n -modules \mathbb{R}^X and \mathbb{R}^n .*

Proof. Since the modules are obtained from the group action of S_n on the basis elements, we can use Proposition 26:

$$A^{\uparrow_1 \psi}[\pi(x, i), \pi(y)] = A[\pi(x), \pi(y)]\psi_{\pi(x)}[\pi(i)] = A[x, y]\psi_x[i] = A^{\uparrow_1 \psi}[(x, i), y]. \quad \square$$

The same holds true for the other transformations as well. We will implicitly use this observation throughout this section.

Finally, it is possible to define the transformations in (33) in an alternative way. For that we will need the following transformations

$$V = I_X^{\uparrow_1 \psi} = I_X^{\uparrow_2 \psi} \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{V} = I_Y^{\uparrow_1 \psi} = I_Y^{\uparrow_2 \psi}, \quad (39)$$

where I_X and I_Y are the identity operators in \mathbb{R}^X and \mathbb{R}^Y , respectively.

Proposition 33. *Both V and \hat{V} are isometries. For any $X \times M$ matrix A , $M \times X$ -matrix B , $Y \times M$ matrix C , and $M \times Y$ matrix D , we have*

$$\begin{aligned} A^{\uparrow_1 \psi} &= VA, & B^{\uparrow_2 \psi} &= (B \otimes I_n)V, & C^{\uparrow_1 \psi} &= \hat{V}C, & D^{\uparrow_2 \psi} &= (D \otimes I_n)\hat{V}, \\ A^{\uparrow_1 \psi^*} &= V^*(A \otimes I_n), & B^{\uparrow_2 \psi^*} &= BV^*, & C^{\uparrow_1 \psi^*} &= \hat{V}^*(C \otimes I_n), & B^{\uparrow_2 \psi^*} &= D\hat{V}^*. \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Proof. The first claim follows from the fact that V and \hat{V} map the standard basis $\{e_x\}$ of \mathbb{R}^X or \mathbb{R}^Y , respectively, into an orthonormal system $\{e_x \otimes \psi_x\}$. The equalities for $A^{\uparrow_1 \psi}$ and $B^{\uparrow_2 \psi}$ follow by comparing the entries, and the rest follow by symmetry. \square

11.2 Decomposition of V

Our plan for completing the proofs is as follows. First, we show how to decompose the morphism V as a linear combination of transporters. Next, we show how Φ_j interplays with these transporters, which allows us to prove Lemmas 13–15.

The operator V defined in (39) is an S_n -morphism from \mathbb{R}^X into $\mathbb{R}^X \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$. First, we have to find the decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^X \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$ into irreps. We know how both \mathbb{R}^X and \mathbb{R}^n decompose into irreps by (25) and (38). To find the irreps of their tensor product, we can use (24). For each j , the decomposition of $\mathbb{R}^X \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$ contains one instance of each $\mathcal{S}^{(n-j, j-1, 1)}$ and $\mathcal{S}^{(n-j-1, j, 1)}$. However, \mathbb{R}^X does not use these irreps, therefore, by Schur's Lemma, the image of V will be orthogonal to these subspaces; hence, we can ignore them. On the other hand, for each $j \geq 1$, the irrep $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$ has multiplicity four in $\mathbb{R}^X \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$ because a unique instance of it appears in each of the tensor products:

$$\mathcal{E}(n, j-1) \otimes \mathcal{E}(n, 1), \quad \mathcal{E}(n, j) \otimes \mathcal{E}(n, 0), \quad \mathcal{E}(n, j) \otimes \mathcal{E}(n, 1), \quad \text{and} \quad \mathcal{E}(n, j+1) \otimes \mathcal{E}(n, 1).$$

Let us define E_j as the orthogonal projector onto $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$ in \mathbb{R}^X . For $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and $(\ell, m) \in L := \{(1, -1), (0, 0), (1, 0), (1, 1)\}$, define

$$\Xi_j^{\ell, m} := \frac{(E_{j+m} \otimes \Pi_\ell) V E_j}{\|(E_{j+m} \otimes \Pi_\ell) V E_j\|}. \quad (42)$$

The operator $\Xi_j^{\ell, m}$ is a transporter between the sole instance of $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$ in \mathbb{R}^X and the sole instance of $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$ contained in the sole copy of $\mathcal{E}(n, j+m) \otimes \mathcal{E}(n, \ell)$ in $\mathbb{R}^X \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$. To cover the border cases, let us also define $\Xi_0^{1, -1}$, $\Xi_0^{1, 0}$, $\Xi_k^{1, +1}$, $\Xi_{-1}^{1, +1}$, and $\Xi_{k+1}^{1, -1}$ as zero operators.

We will denote the corresponding objects for the module \mathbb{R}^Y with the hat above them: \hat{V} , which is already defined, as well as \hat{E}_j and $\hat{\Xi}_j^{\ell, m}$.

Lemma 34. *We have*

$$V = \sum_{j=0}^k \left(\phi_{j,0} \Xi_j^{1, -1} + \phi_{j,1} \Xi_j^{0, 0} + \phi_{j,2} \Xi_j^{1, 0} + \phi_{j,3} \Xi_j^{1, +1} \right) \quad (43)$$

and

$$\hat{V} = \sum_{j=0}^k \left(\phi'_{j,0} \hat{\Xi}_j^{1, -1} + \phi'_{j,1} \hat{\Xi}_j^{0, 0} + \phi'_{j,2} \hat{\Xi}_j^{1, 0} + \phi'_{j,3} \hat{\Xi}_j^{1, +1} \right), \quad (44)$$

where the coefficients are given by (15).

Recall that there is an ambiguity in the ± 1 sign when defining a transporter between two copies of the same irrep. By (42), the operator V dictates how to resolve this ambiguity in the

case of $\Xi_j^{\ell,m}$. Recall also from (29) the transporter Φ_j from the image of \hat{E}_j to that of E_j . Now consider the following mapping

$$(\Phi_{j+m} \otimes I_n) \hat{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m}. \quad (45)$$

The operator $\Phi_{j+m} \otimes I_n$ maps the image of $\hat{E}_{j+m} \otimes \Pi_\ell$ onto the image of $E_{j+m} \otimes \Pi_\ell$. Since it is also an S_n -morphism, it also maps the image of $\hat{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m}$ onto the unique copy of $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$ contained in that subspace. Thus, the operator in (45) is a transporter from the image of \hat{E}_j to the image of $\Xi_j^{\ell,m}$. But the same is true with regards to $\Xi_j^{\ell,m} \Phi_j$. Hence, from general principles, the two operators are equal up to a sign. The next lemma states that the sign is equal as well.

Lemma 35. *For all $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and $(\ell, m) \in L$, we have*

$$(\Phi_{j+m} \otimes I_n) \hat{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m} = \Xi_j^{\ell,m} \Phi_j \quad \text{and} \quad (\Phi_{j+m}^* \otimes I_n) \Xi_j^{\ell,m} = \hat{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m} \Phi_j^*.$$

Lemmas 34 and 35 will be proven in Section 11.4.

11.3 Proofs of the main lemmas

Now we turn to the decomposition of $\Phi_j^{\uparrow 1\psi}$, $\Phi_j^{\uparrow 2\psi}$, $\Phi_j^{\uparrow 1\psi^*}$, and $\Phi_j^{\uparrow 1\psi^*}$. We will write them in terms of transporters

$$\overleftarrow{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m} = \Xi_j^{\ell,m} \Phi_j \quad \text{and} \quad \overrightarrow{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m} = \Phi_j (\hat{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m})^*,$$

where $j \in \{0, \dots, k\}$ and $(\ell, m) \in L$. From Lemma 35, we get that

$$(\Phi_j \otimes I_n) \hat{\Xi}_{j-m}^{\ell,m} = \overleftarrow{\Xi}_{j-m}^{\ell,m} \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\Xi_{j-m}^{\ell,m} \right)^* (\Phi_j \otimes I_n) = \overrightarrow{\Xi}_{j-m}^{\ell,m}. \quad (46)$$

We repeatedly use that

$$\left\| \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{(\ell,m) \in L} a_j^{\ell,m} \overleftarrow{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m} \right\| = \left\| \sum_{j=0}^k \sum_{(\ell,m) \in L} a_j^{\ell,m} \overrightarrow{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m} \right\| = \max_j \sqrt{\sum_{(\ell,m) \in L} \left(a_j^{\ell,m} \right)^2}. \quad (47)$$

and

$$\text{tr} \left[\left(\overleftarrow{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m} \right)^* \overleftarrow{\Xi}_{j'}^{\ell',m'} \right] = \text{tr} \left[\left(\overrightarrow{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m} \right)^* \overrightarrow{\Xi}_{j'}^{\ell',m'} \right] = \begin{cases} d_j, & \text{if } j = j', \ell = \ell', \text{ and } m = m'; \\ 0, & \text{otherwise;} \end{cases} \quad (48)$$

where $d_j = \text{tr } E_j = \text{tr } \hat{E}_j$ is the dimension of $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$. We will also implicitly use that $\Phi_j = E_j \Phi_j \hat{E}_j$.

By (40) and (43), we have

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_j^{\uparrow 1\psi} &= V \Phi_j = \left[\sum_{i=0}^k \left(\phi_{i,0} \Xi_i^{1,-1} + \phi_{i,1} \Xi_i^{0,0} + \phi_{i,2} \Xi_i^{1,0} + \phi_{i,3} \Xi_i^{1,+1} \right) \right] \Phi_j \\ &= \phi_{j,0} \overleftarrow{\Xi}_j^{1,-1} + \phi_{j,1} \overleftarrow{\Xi}_j^{0,0} + \phi_{j,2} \overleftarrow{\Xi}_j^{1,0} + \phi_{j,3} \overleftarrow{\Xi}_j^{1,+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (49)$$

Also, by (40), (44), and (46), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_j^{\uparrow 2\psi} &= (\Phi_j \otimes I_n) \hat{V} = (\Phi_j \otimes I_n) \sum_{i=0}^k \left(\phi'_{i,0} \hat{\Xi}_i^{1,-1} + \phi'_{i,1} \hat{\Xi}_i^{0,0} + \phi'_{i,2} \hat{\Xi}_i^{1,0} + \phi'_{i,3} \hat{\Xi}_i^{1,+1} \right) \\ &= \phi'_{j+1,0} \overleftarrow{\Xi}_{j+1}^{1,-1} + \phi'_{j,1} \overleftarrow{\Xi}_j^{0,0} + \phi'_{j,2} \overleftarrow{\Xi}_j^{1,0} + \phi'_{j-1,3} \overleftarrow{\Xi}_{j-1}^{1,+1}. \end{aligned} \quad (50)$$

Similarly,

$$\Phi_j^{\uparrow 1\psi^*} = V^*(\Phi_j \otimes I_n) = \phi_{j+1,0} \overrightarrow{\Xi_{j+1}^{1,-1}} + \phi_{j,1} \overrightarrow{\Xi_j^{0,0}} + \phi_{j,2} \overrightarrow{\Xi_j^{1,0}} + \phi_{j-1,3} \overrightarrow{\Xi_{j-1}^{1,+1}}, \quad (51)$$

$$\Phi_j^{\uparrow 2\psi^*} = \Phi_j \hat{V}^* = \phi'_{j,0} \overrightarrow{\Xi_j^{1,-1}} + \phi'_{j,1} \overrightarrow{\Xi_j^{0,0}} + \phi'_{j,2} \overrightarrow{\Xi_j^{1,0}} + \phi'_{j,3} \overrightarrow{\Xi_j^{1,+1}}. \quad (52)$$

Now we are in position to finally prove Lemmas 13–15. We start with Lemma 14 as the simplest one.

Proof of Lemma 14. By (35), (49), and (50), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma \circ \Delta_\psi = \sum_{j=0}^k \gamma_j (\Phi_j^{\uparrow 1\psi} - \Phi_j^{\uparrow 2\psi}) &= \sum_{j=0}^k \left((\gamma_j \phi_{j,0} - \gamma_{j-1} \phi'_{j,0}) \overleftarrow{\Xi_j^{1,-1}} + (\gamma_j \phi_{j,1} - \gamma_j \phi'_{j,1}) \overleftarrow{\Xi_j^{0,0}} \right. \\ &\quad \left. + (\gamma_j \phi_{j,2} - \gamma_j \phi'_{j,2}) \overleftarrow{\Xi_j^{1,0}} + (\gamma_j \phi_{j,3} - \gamma_{j+1} \phi'_{j,3}) \overleftarrow{\Xi_j^{1,+1}} \right), \end{aligned}$$

which has norm $\max_j \|\gamma_j \phi_j - \tilde{\phi}_j\|$ by (47). Similarly, using (36), (51), and (52), we get that $\|\Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi^*}\| = \max_j \|\tilde{\phi}_j - \gamma_j \phi'_j\|$ \square

Proof of Lemma 13. Fix $j \in \{0, 1, \dots, k\}$. Note that Ψ and $\Psi \circ \Phi_j$ are S_n -morphisms. Because of Schur's lemma, we can write $\Phi_j \circ \Psi = \sum_i \alpha_i \Phi_i$ for some coefficients α_i . Recall that $d_i = \text{tr } E_i$ is the dimension of $\mathcal{E}(n, i)$. We have

$$\alpha_i = \frac{\text{tr}[\Phi_i^*(\Phi_j \circ \Psi)]}{d_i} = \frac{1}{d_i} \sum_{x,y} \Phi_i[x, y] \Phi_j[x, y] \langle \psi_x, \psi_y \rangle = \frac{\text{tr}[(\Phi_i^{\uparrow 1\psi})^* \Phi_j^{\uparrow 2\psi}]}{d_i}.$$

Using the expressions (49) and (50) for $\Phi_j^{\uparrow 1\psi}$ and $\Phi_j^{\uparrow 2\psi}$ above as well as (48), we get that

$$\Phi_j \circ \Psi = \phi_{j-1,3} \phi'_{j-1,3} \Phi_{j-1} + (\phi_{j,1} \phi'_{j,1} + \phi_{j,2} \phi'_{j,2}) \Phi_j + \phi_{j+1,0} \phi'_{j+1,0} \Phi_{j+1},$$

and the lemma follows by linearity. \square

Proof of Lemma 15. Using (34) and Proposition 33, we have

$$\Phi_j^{\uparrow 1\psi\psi^*} = V \Phi_j^{\uparrow 1\psi^*} \quad \text{and} \quad \Phi_j^{\uparrow 2\psi\psi^*} = \Phi_j^{\uparrow 2\psi} \hat{V}^*.$$

Thus, from (37), Lemma 34, as well as (51) and (50), we get

$$\begin{aligned} \Gamma \circ \Delta_{\psi\psi^*} &= \sum_{j=0}^k \left[\left(\phi_{j,0} \Xi_j^{1,-1} + \phi_{j,1} \Xi_j^{0,0} + \phi_{j,2} \Xi_j^{1,0} + \phi_{j,3} \Xi_j^{1,+1} \right) \right. \\ &\quad \left(\gamma_{j-1} \phi_{j,0} \overrightarrow{\Xi_j^{1,-1}} + \gamma_j \phi_{j,1} \overrightarrow{\Xi_j^{0,0}} + \gamma_j \phi_{j,2} \overrightarrow{\Xi_j^{1,0}} + \gamma_{j+1} \phi_{j,3} \overrightarrow{\Xi_j^{1,+1}} \right) \\ &\quad - \left(\gamma_{j-1} \phi'_{j,0} \overleftarrow{\Xi_j^{1,-1}} + \gamma_j \phi'_{j,1} \overleftarrow{\Xi_j^{0,0}} + \gamma_j \phi'_{j,2} \overleftarrow{\Xi_j^{1,0}} + \gamma_{j+1} \phi'_{j,3} \overleftarrow{\Xi_j^{1,+1}} \right) \\ &\quad \left. \left(\phi'_{j,0} \hat{\Xi}_j^{1,-1} + \phi'_{j,1} \hat{\Xi}_j^{0,0} + \phi'_{j,2} \hat{\Xi}_j^{1,0} + \phi'_{j,3} \hat{\Xi}_j^{1,+1} \right)^* \right]. \end{aligned}$$

The j -th term in the above sum corresponds to the action of the operator on the isotypic subspace corresponding to $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$. Since the isotopic subspaces are orthogonal, the norm of the operator is equal to the maximal norm of the terms in the sum. Note that

$$\Xi_j^{m,\ell} \overrightarrow{\Xi_j^{m',\ell'}} = \overleftarrow{\Xi_j^{m,\ell}} (\hat{\Xi}_j^{m',\ell'})^* = \Xi_j^{m,\ell} \Phi_j(\hat{\Xi}_j^{m',\ell'})^*$$

is the transporter from the image of $\hat{\Xi}_j^{m', \ell'}$ in $\mathbb{R}^Y \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$ onto the image of $\Xi_j^{m, \ell}$ in $\mathbb{R}^X \otimes \mathbb{R}^n$. Writing out the term in the basis of these irreps, we get that it is a 4×4 -matrix

$$\phi_j \tilde{\phi}_j^* - \tilde{\phi}_j' \phi_j'^*$$

which is tensor multiplied by the identity on $\mathcal{E}(n, j)$. The norm of this term is the norm of the corresponding 4×4 -matrix, which proves the lemma. \square

11.4 Proofs of Lemmas 34 and 35

Recall the unit vector $v \in \mathcal{E}(n, j)$ from (28). It treats the indices in $[n - 2j]$ equally. Also, it treats the indices in $\{n - 2j + 1, \dots, n\}$ equally up to a sign. As in Section 9, we choose the indices $b = n - 2j$ and $d = n - 2j + 1$ to represent these two sets, respectively. Recall also the orthonormal bases $\{v, v_\sim\}$, $\{w_o, w_i\}$, $\{v_-, v, v_0, v_+\}$, and $\{w_\emptyset, w_c, w_d, w_{cd}\}$ from the same section.

Note that v can be expressed as a linear combination of w_i and w_o as well as a linear combination of w_c and w_d . Recall that $\{e_a\}$ denotes the standard basis of \mathbb{R}^n . By the definition of V , we have

$$\begin{aligned} (I_X \otimes e_b^*)Vw_i &= w_i/\sqrt{k}, & (I_X \otimes e_b^*)Vw_o &= 0, \\ (I_X \otimes e_d^*)Vw_c &= 0, & (I_X \otimes e_d^*)Vw_d &= w_d/\sqrt{k}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, by consulting Tables 1 and 2, we have

$$(I_X \otimes e_b^*)Vv = \langle w_i, v \rangle w_i/\sqrt{k} = \sqrt{\frac{k-j}{(n-2j)k}} w_i, \quad (53)$$

$$(I_X \otimes e_d^*)Vv = \langle w_d, v \rangle w_d/\sqrt{k} = -w_d/\sqrt{2k}. \quad (54)$$

Also note that, since $\Pi_0 = uu^*$, we have

$$(I_X \otimes \Pi_0)Vv = (I_X \otimes u\sqrt{k/n})v = (v \otimes u)\sqrt{k/n}. \quad (55)$$

Note that (53)–(55) also hold when k, I_X, v, V, w_i, w_d are replaced by $k', I_Y, \hat{v}, \hat{V}, \hat{w}_i, \hat{w}_d$, respectively.

Proof of Lemma 34. Here we only prove (43), the decomposition of V , as (44), the decomposition of \hat{V} , follows directly from the same reasoning by replacing k with k' .

We consider the unit vector $v \in \mathcal{E}(n, j)$. Since $E_j v = v$, it suffices to evaluate the norm of $(E_{j+m} \otimes \Pi_\ell)Vv$ for $(\ell, m) \in L$. We start with the hardest case.

Case $m = \pm 1$ (and $\ell = 1$). Throughout the analysis of this case, the \pm notation is consistent with $m = \pm 1$. We want to calculate the norm of the vector $(E_{j\pm 1} \otimes \Pi_1)Vv$, which we decompose as

$$(E_{j\pm 1} \otimes \Pi_1)Vv = (E_{j\pm 1} \otimes I_n)Vv = \sum_{a \in [n]} (I_X \otimes e_a)E_{j\pm 1}(I_X \otimes e_a^*)Vv.$$

For all $a \in [n]$, the operators $I_X \otimes e_a$ are linear isometries with orthogonal ranges. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(E_{j\pm 1} \otimes \Pi_1)Vv\|^2 &= \sum_{a \in [n]} \|E_{j\pm 1}(I_X \otimes e_a^*)Vv\|^2 \\ &= (n-2j)\|E_{j\pm 1}(I_X \otimes e_b^*)Vv\|^2 + 2j\|E_{j\pm 1}(I_X \otimes e_d^*)Vv\|^2 \\ &= \frac{k-j}{k}\|E_{j\pm 1}w_i\|^2 + \frac{j}{k}\|E_{j\pm 1}w_d\|^2, \end{aligned}$$

as, by the symmetries of v , we can see that $\|(E_{j\pm 1} \otimes e_a^*)Vv\|^2$ takes the same value for all $a \in [n-2j]$ and the same value for all $a \in \{n-2j+1, \dots, n\}$. Here we also used (53) and (54).

According to Table 1, we have $\|E_{j-1}w_i\|^2 = 0$ and $\|E_{j+1}w_i\|^2 = \langle w_i, v_\sim \rangle^2 = \frac{n-k-j}{n-2j}$. And $E_{j\pm 1}w_d = \langle w_d, v_\pm \rangle v_\pm$, so, according to Table 2,

$$\|E_{j-1}w_d\|^2 = \frac{(k-j+1)(n-k-j+1)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j+1)} \quad \text{and} \quad \|E_{j+1}w_d\|^2 = \frac{(k-j)(n-k-j)}{(n-2j+1)(n-2j)}.$$

By combining everything above, we obtain

$$\|(E_{j-1} \otimes \Pi_1)Vv\|^2 = \frac{k-j}{k} \cdot 0 + \frac{j}{k} \cdot \frac{(k-j+1)(n-k-j+1)}{(n-2j+2)(n-2j+1)} = \frac{j(k-j+1)(n-k-j+1)}{k(n-2j+2)(n-2j+1)}$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|(E_{j+1} \otimes \Pi_1)Vv\|^2 &= \frac{k-j}{k} \cdot \frac{n-k-j}{n-2j} + \frac{j}{k} \cdot \frac{(k-j)(n-k-j)}{(n-2j+1)(n-2j)} \\ &= \frac{(n-j+1)(k-j)(n-k-j)}{k(n-2j)(n-2j)}. \end{aligned}$$

Case $m = 0$ (and $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$). Since E_j and I_X act equally on v , from (55), we have

$$\|(E_j \otimes \Pi_0)Vv\| = \|\sqrt{k/n}(v \otimes u)\| = \sqrt{k/n}.$$

Finally, we can find the norm of $(E_j \otimes \Pi_1)Vv$ from

$$\|(E_{j-1} \otimes \Pi_1)Vv\|^2 + \|(E_j \otimes \Pi_1)Vv\|^2 + \|(E_{j+1} \otimes \Pi_1)Vv\|^2 + \|(E_j \otimes \Pi_0)Vv\|^2 = \|Vv\|^2 = 1. \quad \square$$

Remark 36. Note that the above equation essentially gives $\phi_{j,0}^2 + \phi_{j,1}^2 + \phi_{j,2}^2 + \phi_{j,3}^2 = 1$ as stated in Claim 20.

Proof of Lemma 35. Here we prove $\Xi_j^{\ell,m} \Phi_j = (\Phi_{j+m} \otimes I_n) \hat{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m}$; the proof for the other equality of the lemma is equivalent. We say that two equally dimensional matrices (including vectors and scalars as special cases) are *positively proportional* if one can be obtained from the other by multiplying it with some strictly positive scalar, and we denote this relation with \propto_+ .

By the discussion before Lemma 35, the transporters

$$\Xi_j^{\ell,m} \Phi_j \quad \text{and} \quad (\Phi_{j+m} \otimes I_n) \hat{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m}$$

are either equal or sum to 0. To prove the former, it suffices to show that they are positively proportional. So, throughout the proof, we will use the \propto_+ notation to freely shed positive factors.

To show that the two transporters above are positively proportional, it suffices to show that the images of \hat{v} under them are positively proportional. Using the definitions of $\Xi_j^{\ell,m}$ and $\hat{\Xi}_j^{\ell,m}$, we can see that these images are positively proportional to

$$(E_{j+m} \otimes \Pi_\ell)Vv \quad \text{and} \quad (\Phi_{j+m} \otimes \Pi_\ell)\hat{V}\hat{v}, \quad (56)$$

respectively. Thus it suffices to show that the two vectors in (56) are positively proportional for all four choices of $(\ell, m) \in L$.

Since we know that vectors in (56) are proportional, to show that they are *positively* proportional, it suffices to come up with the vector whose inner products with the two vectors in (56) are of the same non-zero sign. Namely, both inner products are positive or both are negative. We do that case by case.

Case $m = 0$ (and $\ell \in \{0, 1\}$). We multiply both vectors (56) from the left side with $v^* \otimes e_b^*$, obtaining

$$v^*(I_X \otimes e_b^* \Pi_\ell) V v \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{v}^*(I_Y \otimes e_b^* \Pi_\ell) \hat{V} \hat{v},$$

respectfully. It suffices to show that these two values are of the same sign. We do that by calculating them exactly and showing that they are both positive for $\ell = 0$ and negative for $\ell = 1$.

For $\ell = 0$, we get

$$v^*(I_X \otimes e_b^* \Pi_0) V v = v^*(I_X \otimes e_b^* u) v \sqrt{k/n} = \sqrt{k/n} > 0.$$

from (55). This quantity is also useful in the $\ell = 1$ case: since $\Pi_1 = I_n - \Pi_0$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} v^*(I_X \otimes e_b^* \Pi_1) V v &= v^*(I_X \otimes e_b^*) V v - \sqrt{k/n} = v^* w_i \langle w_i, v \rangle / \sqrt{k} - \sqrt{k/n} \\ &= \frac{\langle w_i, v \rangle^2}{\sqrt{k}} - \frac{\sqrt{k}}{n} = \frac{k-j}{(n-2j)\sqrt{k}} - \frac{\sqrt{k}}{n} = -\frac{j(n-2k)}{n(n-2j)\sqrt{k}} < 0, \end{aligned}$$

where we have used (53). The same way we show that $\hat{v}^*(I_Y \otimes e_b^* \Pi_\ell) \hat{V} \hat{v}$ is positive for $\ell = 0$ and, since $n - 2k' > 0$, negative for $\ell = 1$.

Case $m = \pm 1$ (and $\ell = 1$). Throughout this case, we use \pm consistently with $m = \pm 1$. Note, however, that the positive proportionality coefficients hidden under \propto_+ notation are not necessarily the same in $m = +1$ and $m = -1$ cases.

Since $m \neq 0$, in (56) we can replace Π_1 with I_n . We then multiply both vectors (56) from the left side with $v_\pm^* \otimes e_d^*$, obtaining

$$v_\pm^*(I_X \otimes e_d^*) V v = -\langle v_\pm, w_d \rangle / \sqrt{2k} \propto_+ \pm 1 \quad \text{and} \quad \hat{v}_\pm^*(I_Y \otimes e_d^*) \hat{V} \hat{v} = -\langle \hat{v}_\pm, \hat{w}_d \rangle / \sqrt{2k'} \propto_+ \pm 1,$$

respectfully, where we have used (54). This concludes the proof. \square

Acknowledgements

A.B. is supported by the ERDF project number 1.1.1.2/I/16/113. A.R. is a JSPS International Research Fellow supported by the JSPS KAKENHI Grant Number JP19F19079. Part of this work was done while A.R. was at the Centre for Quantum Technologies at the National University of Singapore supported by the Singapore Ministry of Education and the National Research Foundation under grant R-710-000-012-135, and while he was at Kyoto University.

References

- [1] S. Aaronson, R. Kothari, W. Kretschmer, and J. Thaler. Quantum lower bounds for approximate counting via laurent polynomials. [arXiv:1904.08914](#).
- [2] A. Ambainis. Quantum lower bounds by quantum arguments. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 64(4):750–767, 2002. Earlier: *STOC'00*, [arXiv:quant-ph/0002066](#).
- [3] A. Ambainis. Polynomial degree vs. quantum query complexity. In *Proc. of 44th IEEE FOCS*, pages 230–239, 2003. [arXiv:quant-ph/0305028](#).
- [4] A. Ambainis, L. Magnin, M. Rötteler, and J. Roland. Symmetry-assisted adversaries for quantum state generation. In *Proc. of 26th IEEE CCC*, pages 167–177, 2011. [arXiv:1012.2112](#).
- [5] R. Beals, H. Buhrman, R. Cleve, M. Mosca, and R. de Wolf. Quantum lower bounds by polynomials. *Journal of the ACM*, 48(4):778–797, 2001. Earlier: *FOCS'98*, [arXiv:quant-ph/9802049](#).

- [6] A. Belovs. Quantum algorithms for learning symmetric juntas via the adversary bound. *Computational Complexity*, 24(2):255–293, 2015. Earlier: *CCC’14*, [arXiv:1311.6777](#).
- [7] A. Belovs. Variations on quantum adversary. [arXiv:1504.06943](#), 2015.
- [8] A. Belovs. Quantum Algorithms for Classical Probability Distributions. In *Proc. of 27th ESA*, volume 144 of *LIPIcs*, pages 16:1–16:11. Dagstuhl, 2019. [arXiv:1904.02192](#).
- [9] C. H. Bennett, E. Bernstein, G. Brassard, and U. Vazirani. Strengths and weaknesses of quantum computing. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26(5):1510–1523, 1997. [arXiv:quant-ph/9701001](#).
- [10] R. Bhatia. *Positive definite matrices*. Princeton University Press, 2009.
- [11] G. Brassard, P. Høyer, M. Mosca, and A. Tapp. Quantum amplitude amplification and estimation. In *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information: A Millennium Volume*, volume 305 of *AMS Contemporary Mathematics Series*, pages 53–74, 2002. [arXiv:quant-ph/0005055](#).
- [12] G. Brassard, P. Høyer, and A. Tapp. Quantum counting. In *Proc. of 25th ICALP*, volume 1443 of *LNCS*, pages 820–831. Springer, 1998. [arXiv:quant-ph/9805082](#).
- [13] C. W. Curtis and I. Reiner. *Representation theory of finite groups and associative algebras*. AMS, 1962.
- [14] P. Høyer, T. Lee, and R. Špalek. Negative weights make adversaries stronger. In *Proc. of 39th ACM STOC*, pages 526–535, 2007. [arXiv:quant-ph/0611054](#).
- [15] G. James and A. Kerber. *The Representation Theory of the Symmetric Group*, volume 16 of *Encyclopedia of Mathematics and its Applications*. Addison-Wesley, 1981.
- [16] T. Lee, R. Mittal, B. W. Reichardt, R. Špalek, and M. Szegedy. Quantum query complexity of state conversion. In *Proc. of 52nd IEEE FOCS*, pages 344–353, 2011. [arXiv:1011.3020](#).
- [17] B. W. Reichardt. Span programs and quantum query complexity: The general adversary bound is nearly tight for every Boolean function. In *Proc. of 50th IEEE FOCS*, pages 544–551, 2009. [arXiv:0904.2759](#).
- [18] B. W. Reichardt. Reflections for quantum query algorithms. In *Proc. of 22nd ACM-SIAM SODA*, pages 560–569, 2011. [arXiv:1005.1601](#).
- [19] B. W. Reichardt and R. Špalek. Span-program-based quantum algorithm for evaluating formulas. *Theory of Computing*, 8:291–319, 2012. Earlier: *STOC’08*, [arXiv:0710.2630](#).
- [20] A. Rosmanis. *Lower Bounds on Quantum Query and Learning Graph Complexities*. PhD thesis, University of Waterloo, July 2014. Available at UWSpace.
- [21] B. E. Sagan. *The symmetric group: representations, combinatorial algorithms, and symmetric functions*, volume 203 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 2001.
- [22] J.-P. Serre. *Linear Representations of Finite Groups*, volume 42 of *Graduate Texts in Mathematics*. Springer, 1977.

A Quantum Algorithms with Access to Several Input Oracles

In this appendix, we briefly describe our approach towards the adversary bound when the quantum algorithm has access to several input oracles. Before even deriving the adversary formulation for this type of situation, we have to clarify how we count queries to different input oracles. Since we are interested in proving lower bounds, we allow as a flexible model as possible.

Let $O^{(1)}, O^{(2)}, \dots, O^{(\ell)}$ be some number of input oracles. For each $x \in D$ and each i , the unitary the oracle $O^{(i)}$ implements on input x is $O_x^{(i)}$. We model our algorithm as a usual one-oracle quantum query algorithm with access to the combined input oracle O given by

$$O_x = O_x^{(1)} \oplus O_x^{(2)} \dots \oplus O_x^{(\ell)}.$$

We will not restrict the number of queries to this combined oracle *per se*, however, we will account for the number of queries to each of the individual input oracles as follows.

Let $\psi_{t,x}$ be the state of the algorithm on the input x just before the t -th application of the combined input oracle. Let $\psi_{t,x}^{(i)}$ be the part of $\psi_{t,x}$ processed by $O_x^{(i)}$. Thus, the state $\psi_{t,x}$ is the direct sum of all $\psi_{t,x}^{(i)}$ together with some part $\psi_{t,x}^{(0)}$ which is not given to any of the oracles. We *define* the number of queries to the oracle $O^{(i)}$ on input x as

$$T_x^{(i)} = \sum_t \left\| \psi_{t,x}^{(i)} \right\|^2.$$

Thus, the number of queries can vary for different inputs x . Note also that this definition differs slightly from the usual one even in the case of one input oracle: the number of queries according to our definition can be smaller than the number of queries as defined usually. Therefore, lower bounds in this model also apply to the model where, independently from x , it is predetermined which oracle $O^{(i)}$ to be called at which stage of the algorithm.

Now, choose a weight $w_i \geq 0$ for each of the input oracles $O_x^{(i)}$, and define the total query complexity of the algorithm on input x as

$$T_x = \sum_i w_i T_x^{(i)}.$$

The total query complexity T is defined as the maximum of all T_x .

The following result is a straightforward modification of Theorem 10 from [7]. We omit the proof.

Theorem 37. *Assume there exists a quantum algorithm that solves a state conversion problem $v_x \mapsto \tau_x$ exactly and whose query complexity is T , everything in the above sense. Then,*

$$\gamma_2 \left(\langle v_x, v_y \rangle - \langle \tau_x, \tau_y \rangle \mid \bigoplus_i \frac{O_x^{(i)} - O_y^{(i)}}{w_i} \right)_{x,y \in D} \leq T.$$

To obtain (7), use the above theorem with $w_1 = 1/\alpha$ and $w_2 = 1/\beta$.