arXiv:2207.09356v4 [quant-ph] 13 Feb 2023

Playing Mastermind on quantum computers *

Lvzhou Li
Institute of Quantum Computing and Computer Theory, School of Computer and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, China

Jingquan Luo
Institute of Quantum Computing and Computer Theory, School of Computer and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, China

Yongzhen Xu
Institute of Quantum Computing and Computer Theory, School of Computer and Engineering, Sun Yat-sen University, China

Abstract

From the 1970s up to now, the classic two-player game, Mastermind, has attracted plenty of attention, not only from the public as a popular game, but also from the academic community as a scientific issue. Mastermind with n positions and k colors is formally described as follows. The codemaker privately chooses a secret $s \in [k]^n$, and the codebreaker want to determine s in as few queries like $f_s(x)$ as possible to the codemaker. $f_s(x)$ is called a black-peg query if $f_s(x) = B_s(x)$, and a black-white-peg query if $f_s(x) = \{B_s(x), W_s(x)\}$, where $B_s(x)$ indicates the number of positions where s and x coincide and $W_s(x)$ indicates the number of right colors but being in the wrong position. The complexity of a strategy is measured by the number of queries used.

In this work we study playing Mastermind on quantum computers in both non-adaptive and adaptive settings, obtaining efficient quantum algorithms which are all exact (i.e., return the correct result with certainty) and show huge quantum speedups. The contributions are as follows. (i) Based on the discovery of new structure information, we construct two non-adaptive quantum algorithms which determine the secret with certainty and consume $k-1$ and at most $2\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ black-peg queries, respectively. (ii) If adaptive strategies are admitted, a more efficient exact quantum algorithm is obtained, which consumes only $O(\sqrt{k})$ black-peg queries. Furthermore, we prove that any quantum algorithm requires at least $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ black-peg queries. (iii) When black-white-peg queries are allowed, we propose an adaptive exact quantum algorithm with $O(\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil + \sqrt{|C_s|})$ queries, where C_s is the set of colors occupied by s. This algorithm breaks through the lower bound $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ when $n \leq k \leq n^2$. (iv) Technically, we develop a three-step framework for designing quantum algorithms for the general string learning problem, which not only allows huge quantum speedups on playing Mastermind, but also may shed light on exploring quantum speedups for other string learning problems.

Our results show that quantum computers have a substantial speedup over classical computers on playing Mastermind. In the non-adaptive setting, when $k \leq n$, the classical complexity is $\Theta(\frac{n \log k}{\max\{\log(n/k),1\}})$ and when $k > n$ the current best classical algorithm has complexity $O(k \log k)$. In the adaptive setting, the classical complexity is $\Theta(n\frac{\log k}{\log n} + \frac{k}{n})$. Therefore, significant gap between quantum and classical computing on playing Mastermind is clearly visible.

2012 ACM Subject Classification Theory of computation → Quantum query complexity; Applied computing → Computer games; Theory of computation → Algorithmic game theory

Keywords and phrases Mastermind, query complexity, quantum algorithms

Digital Object Identifier 10.4230/LIPIcs...

* The authors are ordered alphabetically.



© Lvzhou Li, Jingquan Luo, Yongzhen Xu;
licensed under Creative Commons License CC-BY 4.0
Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics
LIPICS Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl Publishing, Germany

Funding *Lvzhou Li*: [funding]
Jingquan Luo: [funding]
Yongzhen Xu: [funding]

1 Introduction

One of the core issues in the field of quantum computing is to discover more problems that admit quantum speedups, and to further design explicit quantum algorithms for these problems. Mastermind seems a good candidate for such problems, since the research on Mastermind in classical computing has continued since the 1970s and is intricate, which indicates that the structure of the problem is elusive from the perspective of classical computing, whereas in this paper we will obtain more efficient quantum algorithms with huge quantum speedups.

Mastermind is a classic board game invented in 1970 by the Israeli telecommunication expert Mordechai Meirowitz and can go back to the early work of Erdős and Rényi [19] in 1963. As mentioned in [40], before the commercial board game version of Mastermind was released in 1971, variations of this game have been played earlier under other names, such as the pen-and-paper based games of Bulls and Cows, and Jotto. The game has been played on TV as a game show in multiple countries under the name of Lingo. Recently, a similar web-based game has gained much attention under the name of Wordle.



Figure 1 Mastermind game with four pegs and six colors. The image comes from Ref. [17] for academic purposes.

In the commercial version of Mastermind, as shown in Figure 1, there are four pegs (positions), each of which could be selected from a set of six colors. The codemaker secretly chooses a color combination of four pegs. The goal of the codebreaker is to identify the secret in as few guesses as possible. In each round, he guesses a color combination of length 4 to tell the codemaker, and he receives two numbers (i.e., $BW_s(x)$ formally defined later) about how similar the guess is to the secret. In 1977, Knuth [35] proved that 5 queries are sufficient for a deterministic algorithm to identify the secret. In 1983, Chvátal [12] first studied the generalized version of Mastermind, i.e. n positions and k colors, which will be the topic of this paper. In the following, we first recall the formal definition.

1.1 Mastermind

Let $[k] = \{0, 1, \ldots k-1\}$ throughout this paper. The Mastermind game with n positions and k colors is formally described as follows. At the start of the game, the codemaker chooses a secret string $s \in [k]^n$. In each round, the codebreaker guesses a string $x \in [k]^n$ and the codemaker replies with $B_s(x)$ or $BW_s(x)$. The codebreaker "wins" the game if he gets the secret string s, with the goal being to win the game by using as few queries to $B_s(x)$ or $BW_s(x)$ as possible. When we mention "complexity" in this paper, it always means the number of queries used by the codebreaker. We call the game **Black-peg Mastermind** when only the black-peg query is allowed, and **Black-white-peg Mastermind** otherwise. It's obvious that any algorithm for Black-peg Mastermind works for Black-white-peg Mastermind, but the reverse is not true.

(a) **Black-peg query**: A black-peg query means an invocation to the function B_s associated with $s \in [k]^n$ that returns $B_s(x) = |\{i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} : s_i = x_i\}|$ for any $x \in [k]^n$ indicating the number of positions where s and x coincide.

(b) **Black-white-peg query**: Similarly, a black-white-peg query means an invocation to the function BW_s that returns $BW_s(x) = \{B_s(x), W_s(x)\}$ for any $x \in [k]^n$, with $W_s(x) = \max_{\sigma \in P_n} |\{i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} : s_i = x_{\sigma(i)}\}| - B_s(x)$ indicating the number of right colors but being in the wrong position, where P_n denotes the set of all permutations of the set $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$.

Mastermind has sparked a flurry of research, with scholars studying different variations. The components of variations are as follows [5, 12]:

- **The color number k and the position number n.** For example, the original version considered by Knuth [35] is with $k = 6$ and $n = 4$. When $k = 2$, the problem reduces to identifying a binary string, and the problem considered by Erdős and Rényi [19] is essentially equivalent to this problem. The degree to which people understand the complexity of Mastermind depends on the relationship between k and n. Thus, the following cases were usually separately considered in classical computing: $k = n$, $k < n^{1-\epsilon}$ with $\epsilon > 0$, and $k > n$. In quantum computing, the distinction among these different cases seems unnecessary.
- **The types of query information.** The game is called Black-peg Mastermind when only the black-peg query is allowed, and Black-white-peg Mastermind otherwise. From the definitions, it can be seen that the black-white-peg query offers more information than the black-peg query, which has also been strictly verified in classical computing, since Black-white-peg Mastermind has a lower complexity than the corresponding black-peg version as shown in [17, 39, 40]. The similar phenomenon also exists in the quantum situation as will be shown in this paper.
- **The query strategy.** Depending on the strategy of how an algorithm makes a query, algorithms can be divided into two kinds: adaptive and non-adaptive. In the adaptive strategy, the queries can be made sequentially one by one, and the next query can depend on the previous queries and the answers. In the non-adaptive strategy, all the query strings must be supplied in parallel at once, and then the secret is determined according to the returned answers without submitting any additional queries. Mastermind in the non-adaptive case was also called static Mastermind [24]. Note that the adaptive strategy is general and the non-adaptive one is more limited.
- **Whether errors are allowed.** Deterministic algorithms output results without errors. Randomized (probabilistic) and quantum algorithms usually output results with bounded

error. Sometimes, one can de-randomize a randomized algorithm, obtaining a deterministic one. Also, *exact* quantum algorithms that output results with certainty have received much attention. For example, the Deutsch-Jozsa algorithm [16] and the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm [6] are all exact. Simon's algorithm can also be improved to be exact [7]. In this paper, the quantum algorithms constructed for Mastermind are all exact.

- **Whether repeated colors are allowed.** Unless otherwise specified, the Mastermind game we are talking about in this paper allows color repetition, that is, both s and x are allowed to have the same color in different positions. However, it is worth mentioning that there are some papers considering Mastermind without color repetition [23, 37, 42].

From the 1970s up to now, Mastermind has attracted a lot of attention, not only from the public as a popular game, but also from the academic community as a scientific issue, especially from the field of mathematics and computer science (e.g. a partial list of references [12, 17, 19, 26, 32, 35]). Mastermind has been shown to have a closed relation to information theory and graph theory [10, 32]. Also, it has been used to study other problems, such as being a benchmark problem for intelligent algorithms (genetic and evolutionary algorithms) [34], understanding the intrinsic difficulty of heuristics [18], simulating pair attacks on genomic data [25], and cracking bank ciphers [21].

1.2 Contributions

While the classical strategies for playing Mastermind have been studied extensively and deeply, a natural question follows: Can we construct more efficient quantum algorithms for playing Mastermind?

We answer the above question affirmatively, obtaining algorithms with huge quantum speedups for Mastermind in both non-adaptive and adaptive settings. Our results are summarized in Table 1 and the classical results are presented in Table 2. Note that the lower bound for the adaptive setting is a trivial lower bound for the non-adaptive setting, and an algorithm with black-peg queries leads to a trivial algorithm with black-white-peg queries.

Table 1 Results for Mastermind in the quantum model.

	Adaptive	Non-adaptive
Black-peg	$\Theta(\sqrt{k})$ [Theorems 10, 12]	$O(k)$[Theorem 8]
Black-white-peg	$O(\min(\sqrt{k}, \lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil + \sqrt{\lvert C_s \rvert}))$ [Theorem 15]	/

More specifically, our main results are as follows.

(i) **Non-adaptive setting with black-peg query.** This is the most demanding situation: the query information is weak, and the restriction on the query strategy is strong. We obtain two non-adaptive quantum algorithms for Black-peg Mastermind that return the secret with certainty and consume $k-1$ and at most $2\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ black-peg queries, respectively (Theorem 8). It must be pointed out that the two algorithms rely heavily on the discovery of new structure information of Mastermind, rather than simply applying any existing algorithm to solve the problem. In addition, it seems not easy to design an efficient non-adaptive quantum algorithm because the non-adaptive characteristic is easy to be destroyed during the algorithmic design process.

Table 2 Results for Mastermind in the classical model. Note that "classical" here means that the algorithm can be deterministic or randomized.

	Adaptive	Non-adaptive	
Black-peg	$\Theta(n\frac{\log k}{\log n}+k)$ [39, 40]	$k \le n$	$k > n$
		$\Theta(\frac{n\log k}{\max\{\log(n/k),1\}})$ [12, 17]	$\Omega(n\log k) \sim O(k\log k)$ [5, 17]
Black-white-peg	$\Theta(n\frac{\log k}{\log n}+\frac{k}{n})$ [39, 40]	$k \le n^{1-\epsilon}$ for any fixed $\epsilon > 0$	others
		$\Theta(\frac{n\log k}{\log n})$ [12]	/

(ii) **Adaptive setting with black-peg query.** In this situation, the restriction on the query strategy is removed. An adaptive quantum algorithm is constructed for Black-peg Mastermind that uses $O(\sqrt{k})$ black-peg queries and succeeds with certainty (Theorem 10). Also we prove that any quantum algorithm needs at least $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ black-peg queries (Theorem 12). It is worth pointing out that we need to be very careful when proving lower bounds, since some subtle mistakes are likely to occur. Note that the non-adaptive algorithm is more practical than the adaptive one, since the former needs only to run a shorter quantum circuit $O(k)$ *times*, whereas the latter runs a longer quantum circuit consisting of $O(\sqrt{k})$ *blocks*.

(iii) **Adaptive setting with black-white-peg query.** In this situation, the query information is strong, and the restriction on the query strategy is removed. We proposed an adaptive quantum algorithm that returns the secret with certainty and consumes $O(\lceil\frac{k}{n}\rceil+\sqrt{|C_s|})$ black-white-peg queries, where C_s is the set of colors occupied by s (Theorem 15). This algorithm can break through the lower bound $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ when $n \le k \le n^2$. For instance, when $k = n^{\frac{3}{2}}$, we have $O(\lceil\frac{k}{n}\rceil+\sqrt{|C_s|}) = O(\sqrt{n})$, but the lower bound is $\Omega(\sqrt{k}) = \Omega(n^{\frac{3}{4}})$.

By comparing the results in Tables 1 and 2, one can see that quantum algorithms always have a substantial speedup advantage over classical counterparts in both non-adaptive and adaptive settings. (1) In the non-adaptive setting, our quantum algorithm needs only $O(k)$ black-peg queries that has no relation with n. Contrarily, when $k \le n$ the classical complexity is $\Theta(\frac{n\log k}{\max\{\log(n/k),1\}})$ monotonically increasing with respect to n, and when $k > n$ the current best classical algorithm with $\Omega(k\log k)$-complexity is still worse than our quantum one. (2) In the adaptive setting, our quantum algorithm needs only $O(\sqrt{k})$ black-peg queries. In contrast, the classical complexity is $\Theta(n\frac{\log k}{\log n}+\frac{k}{n})$ (or $\Theta(n\frac{\log k}{\log n}+k)$), which is $O(\frac{n}{\log n})$ when n is prominent and is $O(k)$ when k is prominent.

1.3 Techniques

In this section, we outline the ideas for obtaining the results. First note that the Mastermind problem considered here is an instance of the string learning problem: Alice has a secret string s and Bob wants to identify this secret string by asking as few queries as possible to an oracle provided by Alice that answers some piece of information of s. As will be mentioned in the related work section, a common idea in the literature about quantum algorithms for this problem is as follows: first convert the provided oracle into the inner product oracle, and then apply the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm [6]. Following this idea, we can obtain a

quantum algorithm with $O(k \log k)$ black-peg queries for Mastermind, which has already been superior to the classical ones. Although the algorithm is not readily available and require some skillful handling, we will not present it here, and one can refer to Appendix B.

One of the core issues in the field of quantum computing is clearly expressed by "How Much Structure Is Needed for Huge Quantum Speedups?"(the title of Aaronson' talk at the 28th Solvay Physics Conference [1]). Thus, in this paper we will reveal new structure information that supports more efficient and even optimal quantum algorithms for Mastermind in both non-adaptive and adaptive settings. We believe that the discovered structure information has general implications for string learning problems and may shed light on quantum algorithmic design for other string learning problems.

Non-adaptive setting with black-peg query.

Quantum algorithms are constructed for $k \geq 3$ and $k = 2$, respectively, with different ideas. Two algorithms (**Algorithm 2** and **Algorithm 3**) will be designed for $k \geq 3$, which are more inspiring, ingenious, and general. Thus, in the following we focus on the case of $k \geq 3$.

In order to design quantum algorithms for the case of $k \geq 3$, we develop a three-step framework for designing quantum algorithms for the string learning problem, by discovering a new structure that not only allows huge quantum speedups on Mastermind in the non-adaptive setting, but also is very likely helpful for exploring quantum speedups on other string learning problems with different types of query oracles. More specifically, our framework is as follows:

(a) Discover new structure allowing quantum speedups. For the secret $s \in [k]^n$, we first define the $k \times n$ characteristic matrix M with rows indexed by colors in $[k]$ and columns indexed by positions in $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$:

$$M(c_i, j) = \begin{cases} 1, & s_j = c_i, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

Then we have $s = \sum_{c_i \in [k]} c_i \cdot M(c_i, *)$, where $M(c_i, *)$ denotes the c_i-th row of M.

A crucial observation is that the set $\{M^{(c_2,c_1)}, M^{(c_3,c_1)}, \ldots, M^{(c_k,c_1)}\}$ where $M^{(c_l,c_h)}$ denotes the sum of the c_l-th and c_h-th rows of M suffices to determine the set $\{M(c_i, *) : c_i \in [k]\}$ and thus determine s (see Lemma 2). Also, we observe that $M^{(c_g,c_l)}$ and $M^{(c_l,c_h)}$ with $c_g \neq c_l \neq c_h$ suffice to determine the three rows of M: $M(c_g, *), M(c_l, *)$, and $M(c_h, *)$, and furthermore, s can be determined by $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ pairs in the form of $\{M^{(c_g,c_l)}, M^{(c_l,c_h)}\}$ (see Lemma 4).

(b) Design quantum procedure for learning $M^{(c_l,c_h)}$. For any two different colors $c_l, c_h \in [k]$, there is a quantum procedure to learn $M^{(c_l,c_h)}$ by using one query to the following oracle (see Lemma 6):

$$B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}|x\rangle|b\rangle = |x\rangle|b \oplus_{2^m} B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)\rangle,$$

where m is required to satisfy $2^m \geq (n+1)$, and $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)} : [2]^n \to \{0, 1, \cdots, n\}$ is defined as

$$B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\delta_{x_i 0}\delta_{s_i c_l} + \delta_{x_i 1}\delta_{s_i c_h}),$$

which indicates how many positions i satisfy s_i takes color c_l when $x_i = 0$ or c_h when $x_i = 1$.

(c) Construct $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$ from B_s. It is proved that the oracle $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$ can be constructed by using one query to the black-peg oracle B_s (see Lemma 7).

Therefore, combining Lemmas 2, 6 and 7 leads to the non-adaptive quantum algorithm with $k-1$ black-peg queries, and combining Lemmas 4, 6 and 7 results in the one with at most $2\lceil\frac{k}{3}\rceil$ queries.

Please note that the first two steps in our framework are independent of the Mastermind problem and apply to various types of string learning problems, with only the last step being for the Mastermind problem. Therefore, one may follow this framework to address other string learning problems, with the focus being put on the last step, that is, consider how to construct $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$ from the oracle in hand.

Adaptive setting with black-peg query.

The idea of the $O(\sqrt{k})$-complexity adaptive quantum algorithm (**Algorithm 5**) is to apply n Grover searches [27] synchronously on n positions. Note that the proportions of target states in the n synchronous Grover searches are all $\frac{1}{k}$. Thus, we can apply the exact Grover search [8,28,38] to make the algorithm error-free. However, more careful consideration is required on how to implement the general oracle used in the exact Grover search.

Regarding the proof of the lower bound of complexity, we would like to remind that this is not at all as simple as imagined. Why emphasize this? Because in previous versions of this paper it was claimed to have obtained the the tight lower bounds for both adaptive and non-adaptive settings, no matter whether black-peg or black-white-peg queries are used. Nobody ever told us an error on the proof, except for thinking that the proof was too simple. Here we present this seemingly correct conclusion and proof in the box.

> Result: For the Mastermind game with n positions and k colors, any non-adaptive quantum algorithm must require $\Omega(k)$ black-peg or black-white-peg queries, and any adaptive quantum algorithm must require $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ black-peg or black-white-peg queries.
> Proof: When $n=1$, one can see that a black-white-peg query is equivalent to a black-peg query, and the problem reduces to the unstructured search problem: searching for one color in k colors, whose non-adaptive and adaptive quantum lower bounds are well-known to be $\Omega(k)$ [36] and $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ [4], respectively.
> Analysis: This proof seems simple and correct, but unfortunately it is wrong. The reason is that the lower bound of $n=1$ cannot simply be considered as a lower bound of the general problem. As an example to refute the above conclusion, we have constructed an algorithm with black-white-peg queries whose complexity can break through the lower bound $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$.

So far, what we can prove is that any quantum algorithm for Mastermind needs at leas $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ black-peg queries, and the idea is as follows. Denote by $B(k,n)$ the Black-peg Mastermind with with n positions and k colors, and denote by $Q(k,n)$ the quantum query complexity of $B(k,n)$. We will show that $Q(k,n)\geq Q(k,m)$ if $n\geq m$, which guarantees $Q(k,n)\geq Q(k,1)$. On the other hand, $B(k,1)$ is actually the unstructured search problem: searching for one color in k colors, whose quantum lower bound is well-known to be $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ [4]. Thus, we have $Q(k,n)\geq Q(k,1)=\Omega(\sqrt{k})$. It is worth pointing that this proof idea cannot be applied to Black-white-peg Mastermind, since the black-white-peg oracle does not have the *separability* property that the black-peg oracle has. Actually, the lower bound $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ no

longer holds for Black-white-peg Mastermind. Also, it seems infeasible to obtain a nontrivial lower bound for non-adaptive algorithms by using the similar idea, since the proof process will destroy the non-adaptive characteristics of the algorithm.

Adaptive setting with black-white-peg query.

The $O(\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil + \sqrt{|C_s|})$-complexity quantum algorithm for Black-white peg Mastermind consists of two steps: (i) first apply the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm $\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil$ times to learn the color set $C_s \subseteq [k]$ occupied by the secret s, and (ii) then run the above $O(\sqrt{k})$-complexity algorithm to learn s with k replaced by $|C_s|$. Thus the total complexity is $O(\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil + \sqrt{|C_s|})$.

1.4 Related Work

1.4.1 Classical algorithms for Mastermind

Some results about the classical complexity and algorithms for Mastermind are summarized in the following, covering some but not all related to our study.

Non-adaptive complexity for black-peg Mastermind. In 1983, Chvátal [12] first studied black-peg Mastermind in the non-adaptive setting, proving that when $k < n^{1-\epsilon}$ with $\epsilon > 0$, $(2+\epsilon)n\frac{1+2\log k}{\log(n/k)}$ queries are sufficient to determine any secret string, matching the information-theoretic lower bound $\frac{n \log k}{\log C^2_{n+2}}$ to a constant factor. Until 30 years later, Doerr, Doerr, Spöhel and Thomas in a breakthrough paper published in Journal of the ACM [17] (appearing first in SODA 2013) proved that the non-adaptive query complexity is $\Theta(n \log k / \max\{\log(n/k), 1\})$ for $k \leq n$, which extends Chvátal's result. For $k > n$, the best upper bound is $O(k \log k)$ [5, 17], and has a gap away from the lower bound $\Omega(n \log k)$ [17].

The non-adaptive complexity of black-peg Mastermind is closely related to two problems. The coin-weighing problem with a spring scale by Shapiro and Fine in 1960 [43] is equivalent to black-peg Mastermind with two colors. The minimum number of queries for black-peg Mastermind with n positions and k colors in the non-adaptive setting is equivalent to the metric dimension of the Hamming graph [10]. From this perspective, Jiang and Polyanskii [32] recently showed that the minimum number of queries is $(2+o(1))n\frac{\log k}{\log n})$ for any constant k.

For $k \leq n$, the non-adaptive complexity of black-white-peg Mastermind is the same as black-peg Mastermind, since the non-adaptive strategy using only black-peg queries has reached the entropy lower bound. In contrast, for $k > n$ it is still not clear whether the non-adaptive strategy with black-white-peg queries can reduce currently the best bound $O(k \log k)$ achieved by the one with only black-peg queries [5, 17].

Adaptive complexity for black-peg Mastermind. Chvátal [12] gave a deterministic adaptive algorithm using $2(n\lceil \log n \rceil - 2^{\lceil \log n \rceil} + 1)$ guesses for $k = n$. Subsequently, an algorithm with $n\lceil \log n \rceil + \lceil (2 - 1/k)n \rceil + k$ queries was proposed by Goodrich [26] for any parameters n and k. This was further improved by Jäger and Peczarski [31] to $n\lceil \log n \rceil - n + k + 1$ for the case $k > n$ and $n\lceil \log k \rceil + k$ for the case $k \leq n$. For $k = n$, it is worth noting that there is a gap $\log n$ between the upper bound $O(n \log n)$ in the above results and the entropy lower bound $\Omega(n)$. This gap was reduced to $\log \log n$ by Doerr, Doerr, Spöhel and Thomas [17]. They gave the first separation between the adaptive and non-adaptive strategies in the case of $k = n$. Until recently, Martinsson and Su [40] presented for the first time a randomized algorithm with query complexity $O(n)$, closing the gap with the lower bound $\Omega(n)$, and proved that the randomized complexity of black-peg Mastermind is

$\Theta(n\frac{\log k}{\log n}+k)$ for any n and k based on the results of [12] and [17]. In 2022, Martinsson [39] achieved the same deterministic complexity utilizing a general query game framework.

Adaptive complexity for black-white-peg Mastermind. An upper bound of adaptive complexity of black-white-peg Mastermind was shown to be $2n\log k+4n$ for $n\leq k\leq n^2$ and $\lceil k/n\rceil+2n\log k+4n$ for $k\geq n$ by Chvátal [12]. For $k\geq n$, it was improved to $2n\lceil\log n\rceil+2n+\lceil k/n\rceil+2$ by Chen, Cunha, and Homer [11]. Also, Doerr, Doerr, Spöhel and Thomas [17] proved that $\Omega(n\log\log n+\frac{k}{n})$ queries are enough to determine any secret for $k\geq n$. Recently, Refs. [39, 40] proved that the randomized and deterministic complexities are both $\Theta(n\frac{\log k}{\log n}+\frac{k}{n})$ for any n and k.

1.4.2 Quantum algorithms related to Mastermind.

Although some anonymous reviewers told us that they and their collaborators considered Mastermind's quantum algorithm very early, to the best of our knowledge, surprisingly there has been few publications related to the quantum complexity/algorithms of Mastermind, except Refs. [9, 29]. In fact, Ref. [9] is just an abstract and one cannot verify the correctness of the conclusions. One may be curious why no full paper has been published. More importantly, assuming that the conclusions in Ref. [9] were correct, one can see the obvious gap between the conclusions obtained there and here. It was claimed that there exist quantum algorithms with $O(\sqrt{k})$ queries for the case $k\leq n$, and with $O(n)$ queries for the case $n\leq k\leq n^2$, but no algorithm was obtained for the general case. One message one can learn from the above is that the study of quantum algorithms for Mastermind has attracted attention very early from the academic community, but the problem has not been solved prior to our work.

Ref. [29] was not devoted directly to Mastermind, because neither the word "Mastermind" nor the word "game" appeared there. Hunziker and Meyer [29] considered the problem of identifying a base k string a given an oracle h_a which returns $h_a(x)=dist(x,a)$ mod r with $r=\max\{2,6-k\}$, i.e., the Hamming distance between the query string x and the solution a modulo r. This problem is similar to the black-peg Mastermind game but with a slightly different oracle. For the convenience of readers, we include in Appendix A the algorithm C with $k>4$ proposed by [29] which succeeds with probability $\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon$ when $n<-k\ln(\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)$. Hunziker and Meyer [29] claimed that the algorithm can be adjusted to an exact version of Grover's algorithm by the methods in [28, 38], but this is NOT true (On can refer to Appendix A for the reason). Thus, they obtained only an $O(\sqrt{k})$ algorithm for the case of $n<-k\ln(\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)$, and the complexity $O(\sqrt{k})$ no longer holds for the general n.

1.4.3 Quantum algorithms/complexity for string learning

As mentioned before, the Mastermind problem considered here is an instance of the string learning problem: Alice has a secret string s and Bob wants to identify this secret string by asking as few queries as possible to an oracle provided by Alice that answers some piece of information of s. There have been some quantum algorithms for string learning problems with different query oracles [2, 6, 13, 30, 45, 46]. A common idea of these quantum algorithms is to first convert the original oracle into the inner product oracle, and then apply the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm [6], as shown in the following examples.

- **Inner product query:** Return the inner product of the input string $x\in[2]^n$ and the secret string $s\in[2]^n$. Any classical algorithm needs n queries, and the Bernstein-Vazirani

algorithm [6] can learn s using a single query with certainty.

- **Standard value query:** Return the value s_i of the input i for $s \in [2]^n$. Also, any classical algorithm needs n queries. Surprisingly, van Dam [45] proposed a bounded-error quantum algorithm using $n/2 + O(\sqrt{n})$ queries based on the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm [6]. Later, the matching lower bound was proved in Ref. [20].
- **Balanced query:** Compare the weight of any pair of subsets of $s \in [2]^n$. Classically, the query complexity of the counterfeit coin problem is $\Theta(d \log(n/d))$, where d is the Hamming weight of s. However, there is a quantum algorithm in Ref. [30] based on the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm [6] using only $O(d^{1/4})$ queries for this problem.
- **Group testing query:** Check if there is 1 in a substring s_A of $s \in [2]^n$ indexed by the subset $A \subseteq \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$. The classical query complexity of the group testing problem is $\Theta(d \log(n/d))$ where the Hamming weight of s is at most d. In 2014, Ambainis and Montanaro [2] proposed a quantum algorithm based on the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm [6] for this problem using $d \log d$ queries on average, and they also gave a lower bound $\Omega(\sqrt{d})$. This gap was closed by Belovs [3] via the adversary bound.

In addition, there are some interesting works considering quantum algorithms for gradient estimation [22, 33] and for multivariate mean estimation [14, 44], and a crucial step of these algorithms is also to learn a string. Essentially, these references have the similar idea: (i) the considered problem is to find an approximation to the given precision of an n-dimensional real vector v hidden by an oracle, (ii) the problem can be reduced to learning a string $s \in [k]^n$ encoding the approximation of v, and (iii) then convert the given oracle into the inner product oracle, and thus apply the extended Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm [41] to obtain s.

As mentioned before, we can also construct the $O(k \log k)$-complexity algorithm for Mastermind following the BV-algorithm-based idea (see Appendix B). But, here we obtain more efficient quantum algorithms based on new structure information.

2 Preliminaries

Some notations and notion used throughout this paper are introduced here, whereas others will be defined when they appear for the first time. C^d denotes a d-dimensional Hilbert space. $\oplus_m$ stands for the operation of modulo m addition. $|A|$ is the cardinality of set A. For a positive integer k, we denote $\{0, 1, 2, \cdots k-1\}$ by $[k]$. For a function $F : A \to [m]$, we will use the same notation F to denote the quantum implementation for F, usually called *quantum oracle*, which works as $F|x\rangle|y\rangle = |x\rangle|y \oplus_m F(x)\rangle$ for $x \in A$ and $y \in [m]$. δ_{ij} indicates whether i equals j:

$$\delta_{ij} = \begin{cases} 1, & i = j, \\ 0, & i \neq j. \end{cases}$$

The quantum Fourier transform on a d-dimensional Hilbert space, denoted by QFT_d, is defined by

$$QFT_d|l\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \omega^{lj} |j\rangle, \tag{1}$$

with $\omega = e^{2\pi i/d}$ and $l \in \{0, 1, \cdots, d-1\}$. The inverse QFT_d, denoted by $QFT_d^\dagger$, is defined

by

$$QFT_d^\dagger |l\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{j=0}^{d-1} \omega^{-lj} |j\rangle . \tag{2}$$

3 Non-adaptive Quantum Algorithm

In this section, we consider non-adaptive quantum algorithms for Mastermind. We will construct two quantum algorithms using $k-1$ and at most $2\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ queries, respectively, for $k \geq 3$ in Sec. 3.1, and another algorithm using one black-peg queries for $k = 2$ in Sec. 3.2.

3.1 Non-adaptive Quantum Algorithm for $k \geq 3$

By first converting the provided oracle into the inner product oracle and then applying the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm [6], we can obtain a quantum algorithm with $O(k \log k)$ black-peg queries for Mastermind. This algorithm has already beaten the classical algorithms. One can refer to Appendix B for more details and note that the algorithm is adaptive. Here we will propose more efficient quantum algorithms. Specifically, we develop a three-step framework for designing quantum algorithms for the string learning problem, by discovering a new structure that not only allows huge quantum speedups on Mastermind in the non-adaptive setting, but also may shed light on exploring quantum speedups for other string learning problems with different types of query oracles.

3.1.1 New structure allowing quantum speedups

Given a string $x \in [k]^n$ and $c \in [k]$, the product of x and c is defined by $x \cdot c = (x_1 \cdot c)(x_2 \cdot c) \cdots (x_n \cdot c)$. Given two strings $x, y \in [k]^n$, the sum of x, y, denoted by $x + y$, is a n-length string with the ith position being $(x_i + y_i) \bmod k$ for $i = 1, 2, \cdots n$.

▶ **Definition 1.** *Let s be any secret string from $[k]^n$. M is a $k \times n$ matrix with rows indexed by colors in $[k]$ and columns indexed by positions in $\{1, 2, \ldots, n\}$, defined by*

$$M(c_i, j) = \begin{cases} 1, & s_j = c_i, \\ 0, & \textit{otherwise}. \end{cases}$$

M is called the characteristic matrix associated with s.

It is obvious that identifying s is equivalent to learning M. More specifically, it is easy to see M has the following properties:

(a) Every column of M contains only one 1 and all the other elements are zero.
(b) The secret string s can be represented as

$$s = \sum_{c_i \in [k]} c_i \cdot M(c_i, *), \tag{3}$$

where $M(c_i, *)$ denotes the c_i-th row of M.

Let $M^{(c_i,c_j)}$ be the sum of the c_i-th and c_j-th rows of M given by

$$M^{(c_i,c_j)} \equiv M(c_i,*) \oplus M(c_j,*) \tag{4}$$

where $c_i \neq c_j \in [k]$ and $\oplus$ denotes the bitwise XOR.

The next lemma is an important property of the characteristic matrix M.

▶ **Lemma 2.** *Suppose M is the characteristic matrix of $s \in [k]^n$. Then we can determine s from the set $\{M^{(c_2,c_1)}, M^{(c_3,c_1)}, \ldots, M^{(c_k,c_1)}\}$ where $c_i \neq c_j$ for $i \neq j$.*

Proof. First from Eq. (4), we have

$$M(c_i,*) = M(c_j,*) \oplus M^{(c_i,c_j)}, \tag{5}$$

Next, we can show

$$M(c_i,*) = M^{(c_i,c_j)} \wedge M^{(c_i,c_l)}, \tag{6}$$

where $\wedge$ denotes the bitwise AND, and $\vee$ denotes the bitwise OR in the sequel. Actually, we have

$$\begin{aligned} M^{(c_i,c_j)} \wedge M^{(c_i,c_l)} &= (M(c_i,*) \oplus M(c_j,*)) \wedge (M(c_i,*) \oplus M(c_l,*)) \\ &= (M(c_i,*) \vee M(c_j,*)) \wedge (M(c_i,*) \vee M(c_l,*)) \\ &= M(c_i,*) \vee (M(c_j,*) \wedge M(c_l,*)) \\ &= M(c_i,*) \vee \mathbf{0} \\ &= M(c_i,*), \end{aligned}$$

where the second and fourth equations hold from the fact that two different rows of M never have 1 on the same position.

Then from Eqs. (5) and (6), we have

$$M(c_1,*) = M^{(c_1,c_2)} \wedge M^{(c_1,c_3)},$$

and for $i = 2, 3, \ldots, k$, there is

$$\begin{aligned} M(c_i,*) &= M(c_1,*) \oplus M^{(c_i,c_1)} \\ &= (M^{(c_1,c_2)} \wedge M^{(c_1,c_3)}) \oplus M^{(c_i,c_1)}. \end{aligned}$$

It means that we can get $\{M(c_1,*), M(c_2,*), \ldots, M(c_k,*)\}$ from $\{M^{(c_2,c_1)}, M^{(c_3,c_1)}, \ldots, M^{(c_k,c_1)}\}$, and thus obtain s according to Eq. (3).

◀

▶ Remark 3. It can be seen that the i-th entry of $M^{(c_l,c_h)}$ is

$$M_i^{(c_l,c_h)} = \begin{cases} 1, & s_i = c_l \text{ or } c_h, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise}, \end{cases}$$

for $i \in \{1, 2, \cdots, n\}$, which thus indicates the positions where s takes the color c_l or c_h.

Moreover, another observation is the following lemma.

▶ **Lemma 4.** *Suppose M is the characteristic matrix of $s \in [k]^n$. Then $M^{(c_g,c_l)}$ and $M^{(c_l,c_h)}$ with $c_g \neq c_l \neq c_h$ suffice to determine the three rows of M: $M(c_g,*), M(c_l,*)$, and $M(c_h,*)$. Furthermore, s can be determined from $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ pairs in the form of $\{M^{(c_g,c_l)}, M^{(c_l,c_h)}\}$.*

Proof. Let $Tri = (c_g, c_l, c_h)$ with $c_g \neq c_l \neq c_h$. As shown in Table 3, the value of s_i can be inferred from $M_i^{(c_g,c_l)}$ and $M_i^{(c_l,c_h)}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$. As a result, on can learn in which position s takes the color c_g or c_l or c_h from $M^{(c_g,c_l)}$ and $M^{(c_l,c_h)}$ with $c_g \neq c_l \neq c_h$. That is, $M(c_g,*), M(c_l,*)$, and $M(c_h,*)$ can be determined.

Table 3 The value of s_i based on $M_i^{(c_g,c_l)}$ and $M_i^{(c_l,c_h)}$ for $i = 1, 2, \ldots, n$.

$M_i^{(c_g,c_l)}$	$M_i^{(c_l,c_h)}$	s_i
1	1	$s_i = c_l$
1	0	$s_i = c_g$
0	1	$s_i = c_h$
0	0	$s_i \notin Tri$

Following the above idea, one can divide the color set $[k]$ into $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ triples in the form of (c_g, c_l, c_h) with $c_g \neq c_l \neq c_h$ such that these triples are as disjoint as possible. For example, let $k = 10$. Then we have the following triples: $(0,1,2)$, $(3,4,5)$, $(6,7,8)$, $(7,8,9)$, with only the last triple having an intersection with the one in front. Furthermore, we have $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ pairs in the form of $\{M^{(c_g,c_l)}, M^{(c_l,c_h)}\}$, each of which is associated with a triple (c_g, c_l, c_h) and can be used to determine $M(c_g,*), M(c_l,*)$, and $M(c_h,*)$ as shown above. Therefore, All rows of M can be determined from the $\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ pairs. As a result, s can be determined by Eq. (3).

◀

▶ Remark 5. One will see soon later that Lemma 2 leads to the non-adaptive quantum algorithm for Mastermind with $k-1$ black-peg queries, and Lemma 4 results in the one with at most $2\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ queries.

3.1.2 Quantum procedure for learning $M^{(c_l,c_h)}$

Here we construct a quantum algorithm that takes any two different colors $c_l, c_h \in [k]$ as an input, and returns $M^{(c_l,c_h)}$ with certainty.

First, for the secret string $s \in [k]^n$ and any two colors $c_l, c_h \in [k]$ with $c_l \neq c_h$, we define a function $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)} : [2]^n \to \{0, 1, \cdots, n\}$ as

$$B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\delta_{x_i 0}\delta_{s_i c_l} + \delta_{x_i 1}\delta_{s_i c_h}),$$

which indicates how many positions i satisfy s_i takes color c_l when $x_i = 0$ or c_h when $x_i = 1$. Its quantum oracle works as

$$B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}|x\rangle|b\rangle = |x\rangle|b \oplus_{2^m} B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)\rangle,$$

where m is required to satisfy $2^m \geq (n+1)$.

Now we obtain the following result.

▶ **Lemma 6.** *There is a quantum algorithm that returns $M^{(c_l,c_h)}$ with certainty and consumes one query to the oracle $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$.*

Proof. We construct explicitly the quantum algorithm called *FindTwoColorPosition* (see Algorithm 1). It can be intuitively regarded as n synchronous executions of the Deutsch algorithm [15, 16].

Algorithm 1 FindTwoColorPosition

Input: A quantum oracle $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$ with $s \in [k]^n$ and two different colors $c_l, c_h \in [k]$.

Output: A string $M^{(c_l,c_h)} \in \{0,1\}^n$ satisfying $M_i^{(c_l,c_h)} = \begin{cases} 1, & s_i = c_l \text{ or } c_h, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$

Runtime: One query to $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$. Succeeds with certainty.

Procedure:

1 Prepare the initial state $|\Phi_0\rangle = |0\rangle^{\otimes n} |0\rangle^{\otimes m-1} |1\rangle \in (C^2)^{\otimes n} \otimes (C^2)^{\otimes m}$ with $2^m \geq (n+1)$;
2 Apply the unitary transformation $H^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m}$ to $|\Phi_0\rangle$;
3 Apply the oracle $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$;
4 Apply the unitary transformation $H^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m}$;
5 Measure the first n registers in the computational basis.

At the first step, we prepare the initial state

$$|\Phi_0\rangle = |0\rangle^{\otimes n} |0\rangle^{\otimes m-1} |1\rangle \in (C^2)^{\otimes n} \otimes (C^2)^{\otimes m}.$$

At the second step, applying the unitary operator $H^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m}$ to $|\Phi_0\rangle$, we get

$$|\Phi_1\rangle = H^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m} |\Phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} |x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}} \sum_{y=0}^{2^m-1} (-1)^y |y\rangle.$$

At the third step, recall that $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n (\delta_{x_i 0} \delta_{s_i c_l} + \delta_{x_i 1} \delta_{s_i c_h})$ and $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)} |x\rangle|b\rangle =$

$|x\rangle|b \oplus_{2^m} B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)\rangle$. Then after applying the oracle $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\Phi_2\rangle &= B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}|\Phi_1\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}}\sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1}\left(|x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}}\sum_{y=0}^{2^m-1}(-1)^y|y \oplus_{2^m} B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)\rangle\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}}\sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1}\left(|x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}}\sum_{y=0}^{2^m-1}(-1)^{y+B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)-B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)}|y \oplus_{2^m} B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)\rangle\right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}}\sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1}\left((-1)^{-B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)}|x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}}\sum_{y=0}^{2^m-1}(-1)^{y+B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)}|y \oplus_{2^m} B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)\rangle\right) \qquad (7) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}}\sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1}(-1)^{B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)}|x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}}\sum_{y'=0}^{2^m-1}(-1)^{y'}|y'\rangle \qquad (8) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}}\sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1}(-1)^{\sum_{i=1}^n(\delta_{x_i0}\delta_{s_ic_l}+\delta_{x_i1}\delta_{s_ic_h})}|x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}}\sum_{y'=0}^{2^m-1}(-1)^{y'}|y'\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}}\bigotimes_{i=1}^n[(-1)^{\delta_{s_ic_l}}|0\rangle + (-1)^{\delta_{s_ic_h}}|1\rangle] \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}}\sum_{y'=0}^{2^m-1}(-1)^{y'}|y'\rangle.
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that in Eq. (7), we have $(-1)^{y+B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)} = (-1)^{y\oplus_{2^m}B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)}$. Then by letting $y' = y \oplus_{2^m} B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)$, we get Eq. (8).

At the fourth step, applying $H^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m}$ to $|\Phi_2\rangle$, we get

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\Phi_3\rangle &= H^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m}|\Phi_2\rangle \qquad (9) \\
&= \bigotimes_{i=1}^n(-1)^{\delta_{s_ic_l}}|\delta_{s_ic_l} \oplus \delta_{s_ic_h}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes m-1}|1\rangle \qquad (10) \\
&= \bigotimes_{i=1}^n(-1)^{\delta_{s_ic_l}}|\delta_{s_ic_1} \vee \delta_{s_ic_h}\rangle \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes m-1}|1\rangle \qquad (11)
\end{aligned}
$$

where Eq. (11) holds because $\delta_{s_ic_l}$ and $\delta_{s_ic_h}$ never be both 1.

Finally, by measuring the first n registers, the algorithm outputs with certainty the string x satisfying $x_i = 1$ if $s_i = c_l$ or $s_i = c_h$, and $x_i = 0$ otherwise.

Note that the algorithm uses one query to $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$. ◀

3.1.3 Conversion between two oracles

Currently we are only the last step away from obtaining a quantum algorithm for Mastermind: showing how to construct $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$ from the black-peg oracle B_s. Now we are going to finish it.

▶ **Lemma 7.** *Given $s \in [k]^n$, and two colors $c_l, c_h \in [k]$ with $c_l \neq c_h$, $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$ can be constructed by using one black-peg oracle B_s.*

Proof. Given a secret string $s = s_1s_2\ldots s_n \in [k]^n$ and $x = x_1x_2\ldots x_n \in [2]^n$, we now describe how to compute $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x) = \sum_{i=1}^n(\delta_{x_i0}\delta_{s_ic_l}+\delta_{x_i1}\delta_{s_ic_h})$ by using B_s. The quantum

circuit diagram implementing $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$ is shown in Figure 2. First we define a string $y^x \in [k]^n$




Figure 2 The quantum circuit diagram implementing $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$

as

$$y_i^x = \begin{cases} c_l, & if\ x_i = 0, \\ c_h, & if\ x_i = 1. \end{cases}$$

Let $V = \{i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\} : x_i = 0\}$. Feeding the black-peg function B_s with y^x, we get

$$\begin{aligned} B_s(y^x) &= |\{i \in V : s_i = c_l\} \cup \{i \in \{1, 2, \cdots n\} - V : s_i = c_h\}| \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} (\delta_{x_i 0}\delta_{s_i c_l} + \delta_{x_i 1}\delta_{s_i c_h}) \\ &= B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x) \end{aligned}$$

As a result, $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}(x)$ can be computed by calling the black-peg function B_s once. ◀

3.1.4 Final quantum algorithm for Mastermind

Now we have two choices to construct a non-adaptive quantum algorithm for Mastermind. By combining Lemmas 2, 6 and 7, we obtain a quantum algorithm with $k-1$ black-peg queries, and by combining Lemmas 4, 6 and 7, we obtain the one with at most $2\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ queries.

▶ **Theorem 8.** *There exist two non-adaptive quantum algorithms for the Mastermind game with n positions and $k \geq 3$ colors returning the secret string with certainty: one uses $k-1$ black-peg queries and the other consumes at most $2\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ black-peg queries.*

Proof. As shown in Algorithm 2, the idea is to first apply the subroutine **FindTwoColorPositon** to get the result $M^{(c_1,c_i)}$ for $i \in \{2, 3, \ldots, k\}$, and then obtain all the rows of the characteristic matrix M, from which the secret string s can be deduced. The correctness of Algorithm 2 is ensured by Lemmas 2, 6 and 7. Since there are $k-1$ calls to **FindTwoColorPosition** and each call consumes one black-peg query to B_s by Lemma 6, the complexity of Algorithm 2 with respective to B_s is $k-1$.

The correctness of Algorithm 3 is ensured by Lemmas 4, 6 and 7. Note that $|T| = \lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$. Each pair $\{M^{(c_g,c_l)}, M^{(c_l,c_h)}\}$ associated with $(c_g, c_l, c_h) \in T$ except the last one (c_{k-2}, c_{k-1}, c_k) consumes two queries to B_s, and the last one may require only one query,

Algorithm 2 A non-adaptive quantum algorithm for Mastermind with n positions and $k \geq 3$ colors using $k-1$ black-peg queries

Input: A black-peg oracle B_s for $s \in [k]^n$ such that $B_s|x\rangle|b\rangle = |x\rangle|b \oplus_{2^m} B_s(x)\rangle$ with $2^m \geq n+1$.

Output: The secret string s.

Runtime: $k-1$ queries to B_s. Succeeds with certainty.

Procedure:

for *$i = 2$ to k* **do**
  Construct $B_s^{(c_1,c_i)}$ from B_s and the pair (c_1, c_i); //Lemma 6
  Call **FindTwoColorPosition** with $B_s^{(c_1,c_i)}$ as input to get $M^{(c_1,c_i)}$; //Lemma 7
end
Set $M(c_1, *) = M^{(c_1,c_2)} \wedge M^{(c_1,c_3)}$; // Here $k \geq 3$ is required;
for *$j = 2$ to k* **do**
  Set $M(c_j, *) = M(c_1, *) \oplus M^{(c_1,c_j)}$; //Lemma 2
end
Ouput the secret string $s = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i \cdot M(c_i, *)$.

Algorithm 3 A non-adaptive quantum algorithm for Mastermind with n positions and $k \geq 3$ colors using at most $2\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ black-peg queries.

Input: A black-peg oracle B_s for $s \in [k]^n$ such that $B_s|x\rangle|b\rangle = |x\rangle|b \oplus_{2^m} B_s(x)\rangle$ with $2^m \geq n+1$.

Output: The secret string s.

Runtime: At most $2\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ queries to B_s. Succeeds with certainty.

Procedure:

Let $T = \{(c_1, c_2, c_3), (c_4, c_5, c_6), \cdots, (c_{k-2}, c_{k-1}, c_k)\}$ where all the triples except the last one are disjoint from each other and last one may has an overlap with the one in front.
for *each triple $(c_g, c_l, c_h) \in T$* **do**
  Construct $B_s^{(c_g,c_l)}$ and $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$from B_s and the triple (c_g, c_l, c_h); //Lemma 6
  Call **FindTwoColorPosition** with $B_s^{(c_g,c_l)}$ as input to get $M^{(c_g,c_l)}$;
  Call **FindTwoColorPosition** with $B_s^{(c_l,c_h)}$ as input to get $M^{(c_l,c_h)}$; //Lemma 7
  Get $M(c_g, *), M(c_l, *), M(c_g, *)$ from $M^{(c_g,c_l)}$ and $M^{(c_g,c_l)}$; //Lemma 4
end
Ouput the secret string $s = \sum_{i=1}^{k} c_i \cdot M(c_i, *)$.

since it is likely to overlap with the one in front. Therefore, the algorithm consumes at most $2\lceil \frac{k}{3} \rceil$ queries to B_s.

◀

3.2 Non-adaptive Quantum Algorithm for $k = 2$

Inspired by the work of [29], we construct a quantum algorithm using only one black-peg query for $k = 2$.

Algorithm 4 A non-adaptive quantum algorithm for Mastermind with n positions and 2 colors

Input: A black-peg oracle B_s for $s \in [2]^n$ such that $B_s|x\rangle|b\rangle = |x\rangle|b \oplus_{2^m} B_s(x)\rangle$ with $2^m \geq n + 1$.
Output: The secret string s.
Runtime: One query to B_s. Succeeds with certainty.
Procedure:
1 Prepare the initial state $|\Phi_0\rangle = |0\rangle^{\otimes n} |0\rangle^{\otimes m-2} |01\rangle \in (C^2)^{\otimes n} \otimes (C^2)^{\otimes m}$ with $2^m \geq (n + 1)$ and $m \geq 2$;
2 Apply the unitary transformation $H^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m-2} \otimes QFT_4$ to $|\Phi_0\rangle$.
3 Call the black-peg oracle B_s once.
4 Apply the unitary transformation $U^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m-2} \otimes QFT_4^\dagger$, where $U = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \begin{bmatrix} i & 1 \\ 1 & i \end{bmatrix}$.
5 Measure the first n registers in the computational basis.

▶ **Theorem 9.** *There is a non-adaptive quantum algorithm for the Mastermind game with n positions and 2 colors that uses one black-peg query and returns the secret string with certainty.*

Proof. The non-adaptive algorithm is presented in Algorithm 4.

At the first step, prepare the initial state

$$|\Phi_0\rangle = |0\rangle^{\otimes n} |0\rangle^{\otimes m-2} |01\rangle \in (C^2)^{\otimes n} \otimes (C^2)^{\otimes m}.$$

At the second step, apply the unitary operator $H^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m-2} \otimes QFT_4$ to $|\Phi_0\rangle$. We get

$$|\Phi_1\rangle = H^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m-2} \otimes QFT_4 |\Phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} |x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}} \sum_{y=0}^{2^m-1} (i)^y |y\rangle.$$

At the third step, call the B_s oracle. By noting that $B_s(x) = \sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_{s_j x_j}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\Phi_2\rangle &= B_s|\Phi_1\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} \left(|x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}} \sum_{y=0}^{2^m-1} (i)^y |y \oplus_{2^m} B_s(x)\rangle \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} \left(|x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}} \sum_{y=0}^{2^m-1} (i)^{y+B_s(x)-B_s(x)} |y \oplus_{2^m} B_s(x)\rangle \right) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} \left((i)^{-B_s(x)} |x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}} \sum_{y=0}^{2^m-1} (i)^{y+B_s(x)} |y \oplus_{2^m} B_s(x)\rangle \right) \qquad (12) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} (-i)^{\sum_{j=1}^{n} \delta_{s_j x_j}} |x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}} \sum_{y=0}^{2^m-1} (i)^{y'} |y'\rangle \qquad (13) \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \bigotimes_{j=1}^{n} ((-i)^{\delta_{s_j 0}} |0\rangle + (-i)^{\delta_{s_j 1}} |1\rangle) \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^m}} \sum_{y=0}^{2^m-1} (i)^{y'} |y'\rangle.
\end{aligned}
$$

Note that in Eq. (12), we have $(i)^{y+B_s(x)} = (i)^{y \oplus_{2^m} B_s(x)}$[1]. Then by letting $y' = y \oplus_{2^m} B_s(x)$, we get Eq. (13).

At the fourth step, after applying the unitary operator $U^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m-2} \otimes QFT_4^{\dagger}$, we have

$$
\begin{aligned}
|\Phi_3\rangle &= U^{\otimes n} \otimes H^{\otimes m-2} \otimes QFT_4^{\dagger} |\Phi_2\rangle \\
&= |s_1 s_2 \cdots s_n\rangle \otimes |0\rangle^{\otimes m-1} |1\rangle.
\end{aligned}
$$

Finally, the secret string $s = s_1 s_2 \ldots s_n$ can be obtained with certainty after measuring the first n registers in the computational basis.

◀

4 Adaptive Quantum Algorithm

In this section, we discuss adaptive quantum algorithms for Mastermind. When only black-peg queries are allowed, we construct a $O(\sqrt{k})$-complexity quantum algorithm in Sec. 4.1 and prove the optimality of the algorithm in Sec. 4.2. When black-white-peg queries are allowed, we present a quantum algorithm with $O(\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil + \sqrt{|C_s|})$ queries in Sec. 4.3, which is more efficient than the one with black-queries when $n \leq k \leq n^2$.

4.1 Adaptive Algorithm with Black-peg Queries

Here we will present an adaptive quantum algorithm with $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ black-peg queries.

▶ **Theorem 10.** *There is an adaptive quantum algorithm for the Mastermind game with n positions and k colors that uses $O(\sqrt{k})$ black-peg queries and returns the secret string with certainty.*

[1] Let $f(a) = i^a$. Then 4 is the minimal positive period of f. In addition, it is required in Algorithm 4 that $m \geq 2$. Thus, it is easy to get $(i)^{y+B_s(x)} = (i)^{y \oplus_{2^m} B_s(x)}$.

Proof. The adaptive algorithm is presented in Algorithm 5, of which the key idea is to apply n Grover searches synchronously on n positions. It is well known that Grover's algorithm can be adjusted to an exact version that finds the target state with certainty, if the proportion of the target states, whose value is $\frac{1}{k}$ in our setting, is known in advance.

Algorithm 5 An adaptive quantum algorithm for Mastermind with n positions and k colors

Input: A black-peg oracle B_s for $s \in [k]^n$ such that $B_s|x\rangle|b\rangle = |x\rangle|b \oplus_{n+1} B_s(x)\rangle$
Output: The secret string s
Runtime: $O(\sqrt{k})$ queries to B_s. Succeeds with certainty.
Procedure:

Prepare the initial state $|\Phi_0\rangle = |0\rangle^{\otimes n}|0\rangle \in (C^k)^{\otimes n} \otimes C^{n+1}$; Set the number of iterations $T = \lceil \frac{\pi}{4\arcsin(\sqrt{\frac{1}{k}})} - \frac{1}{2} \rceil$ and the rotation angle $\phi = 2\arcsin(\frac{sin(\frac{\pi}{4T+2})}{\sin(\theta)})$.
Apply the unitary transformation $QFT_k^{\otimes n} \otimes I$ to $|\Phi_0\rangle$.
for *l = 1 to T* **do**
    Apply the unitary operator $O_s(\phi)$, where $O_s(\phi) = B_s^\dagger(I \otimes D(\phi))B_s$, $D(\phi) = \sum_{j=0}^{n} e^{ij\phi}|j\rangle\langle j|$.
    Apply the unitary operator $S_0(\phi)$, where $S_0(\phi) = (QFT_k(I + (e^{i\phi} - 1)|0\rangle\langle 0|)QFT_k^\dagger)^{\otimes n} \otimes I$.
end
Measure the first n registers in the computational basis.

At the first step, we prepare the initial state

$$\Phi_0 = |0\rangle^{\otimes n}|0\rangle \in (C^k)^{\otimes n} \otimes C^{n+1},$$

where $(C^k)^{\otimes n}$ is associated with the query registers used to store the query string x and C^{n+1} is associated with the auxiliary register used to store the query result $B_s(x)$. In addition, we need to set some parameters for the exact Grover search. There are several approaches to achieve the exact Grover search [8, 28, 38]. Here we use the approach proposed in [38], whose parameters including the number of iterations T and the rotation angle ϕ are given below:[2]

$$T = \lceil \frac{\pi}{4\arcsin(\sqrt{\frac{1}{k}})} - \frac{1}{2} \rceil,$$

$$\phi = 2\arcsin(\frac{sin(\frac{\pi}{4T+2})}{\sin(\theta)})$$

with $\theta = \arcsin(\sqrt{\frac{1}{k}})$.

At the second step, apply the unitary transformation $QFT_k^{\otimes n} \otimes I$ to $|\Phi_0\rangle$ to create the uniform superposition state

$$|\Phi_1\rangle = (QFT_k^{\otimes n} \otimes I)|\Phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k^n}} \sum_{x\in[k]^n} |x\rangle|0\rangle = \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{x_i=0}^{k-1} |x_i\rangle \right) \otimes |0\rangle.$$

[2] Note that in [38], ϕ equals $2\arcsin(\frac{sin(\frac{\pi}{4J+6})}{\sin(\theta)})$ with the iteration number being $J+1$. If we denote $J' = J+1$, then $\phi = 2\arcsin(\frac{sin(\frac{\pi}{4J'+2})}{\sin(\theta)})$.

From the third to the sixth step, apply T Grover iteration operators $(S_0(\phi)O_s(\phi))^T$ to $|\Phi_1\rangle$, where

$$S_0(\phi) = (QFT_k(I + (e^{i\phi} - 1)\,|0\rangle\,\langle 0|)QFT_k^\dagger)^{\otimes n} \otimes I,$$
$$O_s(\phi) = B_s^\dagger(I \otimes D(\phi))B_s,$$

with

$$D(\phi) = \begin{bmatrix} e^{i0\phi} & 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i1\phi} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & e^{i2\phi} & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & & \ddots & & \vdots \\ 0 & 0 & \cdots & 0 & e^{in\phi} \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus, after the sixth step we get

$$|\Phi_2\rangle = (S_0(\phi)O_s(\phi))^T|\Phi_1\rangle \tag{14}$$
$$= \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n}\left((S_0'(\phi)Q_{s_i}(\phi))^T\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\sum_{x_i=0}^{k-1}|x_i\rangle\right)\otimes|0\rangle \tag{15}$$
$$= |s_1 s_2\cdots s_n\rangle\,|0\rangle, \tag{16}$$

where $S_0'(\phi) = QFT_k(I + (e^{i\phi} - 1)\,|0\rangle\,\langle 0|)QFT_k^\dagger$ and $Q_{s_j}(\phi)$ is defined as

$$Q_{s_j}(\phi)\,|x_j\rangle = e^{i\phi\delta_{s_j x_j}}\,|x_j\rangle \tag{17}$$

which is to decide whether x_j equals to s_j or not. We will explain in more details later why Eq. (15) holds based on Lemma 11. Now assume that it is right. Then one see that $(S_0'(\phi)Q_{s_i}(\phi))^T\,\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}}\sum_{x_i=0}^{k-1}|x_i\rangle$ is actually the exact version of Grover's algorithm for identifying an x_i such that $x_i = s_i$. Since the proportions of the target states in n synchronous Grover searches are all $1/k$, the number of the iterations and the rotation angle are the same for each Grover search. As a result, we get Eq. (16), and then the algorithm outputs the secret string s with certainty by measuring the first n registers.

The number of iterations of the operator $O_s(\phi)$ is $T = \lceil\frac{\pi}{4\arcsin(\sqrt{\frac{1}{k}})} - \frac{1}{2}\rceil = O(\sqrt{k})$, and thus the number of queries to B_s is $O(\sqrt{k})$, which concludes the proof of Theorem 10. ◀

Now we are going to explain Eq. (15), which means that the unitary operator $(S_0(\phi)O_s(\phi))^T$ plays a role as n synchronous Grover searches on n positions. First, $S_0(\phi)$ represents the general diffusion operator of Grover's algorithm $S_0'(\phi) = QFT_k(I + (e^{i\phi} - 1)\,|0\rangle\,\langle 0|)QFT_k^\dagger$ applied on n k-dimensional spaces in parallel. Second, we have a look at the effect of $O_s(\phi) = B_s^\dagger(I \otimes D(\phi))B_s$. Recall that the black-peg oracle B_s works as $B_s|x\rangle|b\rangle = |x\rangle|b \oplus_{n+1} B_s(x)\rangle$, where $|x\rangle \in (C^k)^{\otimes n}$, $|b\rangle \in C^{n+1}$. Then we have

▶ **Lemma 11.** *Let $O_s(\phi) = B_s^\dagger(I \otimes D(\phi))B_s$. There is*

$$O_s(\phi)|x\rangle|0\rangle = \bigotimes_{j=1}^{n} Q_{s_j}(\phi)\,|x_j\rangle\,|0\rangle$$

for $s = s_1 s_2\cdots x_n \in [k]^n, x = x_1 x_2\cdots x_n \in [k]^n$.

Proof. By direct calculation, we have

$$\begin{aligned} O_s(\phi)|x\rangle|0\rangle &= B_s^\dagger(I\otimes D(\phi))B_s|x\rangle|0\rangle \\ &= B_s^\dagger(I\otimes D(\phi))|x\rangle|B_s(x)\rangle \\ &= e^{i\phi B_s(x)}B_s^\dagger|x\rangle|B_s(x)\rangle \\ &= e^{i\phi B_s(x)}|x\rangle|0\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that $B_s(x)=\sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{s_j x_j}$. Thus we have

$$O_s(\phi)|x\rangle|0\rangle = e^{i\phi\sum_{j=1}^n \delta_{s_j x_j}}|x_1x_2\cdots x_n\rangle|0\rangle \tag{18}$$

$$= \bigotimes_{j=1}^n e^{i\phi\delta_{s_j x_j}}|x_j\rangle|0\rangle \tag{19}$$

$$= \bigotimes_{j=1}^n Q_{s_j}(\phi)\,|x_j\rangle\,|0\rangle, \tag{20}$$

where Eq. (20) follows from substituting Eqs. (17) into (19). ◀

4.2 Tight Lower Bound for Quantum Black-peg Mastermind

We first prove the lower bound of quantum complexity for Black-peg Mastermind, and then conclude with some noteworthy remarks.

▶ **Theorem 12.** *For the Black-peg Mastermind with n positions and k colors, any quantum algorithm requires at least $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ black-peg queries.*

Proof. Denote by $B(k,n)$ the Black-peg Mastermind with with n positions and k colors, and denote by $Q(k,n)$ the quantum query complexity of $B(k,n)$. We will show that $Q(k,n)\geq Q(k,m)$ if $n\geq m$, which leads to $Q(k,n)\geq Q(k,1)$. On the other hand, $B(k,1)$ is actually the unstructured search problem: searching for one color in k colors, whose quantum lower bound is well-known to be $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ [4]. Thus, we have $Q(k,n)\geq Q(k,1)=\Omega(\sqrt{k})$.

It remains to prove $Q(k,n)\geq Q(k,m)$ if $n\geq m$. It suffices to show that if there is a quantum algorithm for $B(k,n)$, then we can construct a quantum algorithm for $B(k,m)$ with the same query complexity, provided $n\geq m$. We first present the idea in the classical case, and then show that it is feasible in the quantum case.

Let $s\in[k]^m$ be the secret string of $B(k,m)$. Firstly, we append a fixed color string of length $n-m$, say 1^{n-m}, to s, obtaining a new secret string s' of length n. In the following we show how to implement the black-peg oracle $B_{s'}$ by using the black-peg oracle B_s. Let x be any query string to the secret string s'. It is easy to see that

$$B_{s'}(x) = B_s(x[1\ldots m]) + \sum_{i=m+1}^{n}\delta_{s'_i x_i}. \tag{21}$$

By the same idea, we construct $B_{s'}$ by B_s in the quantum case as shown in Figure 3. Therefore, if A is an algorithm for $B(k,n)$, then, by replacing the query oracle in A with the circuit in Figure 3, we can obtain an algorithm A' for $B(k,m)$ that returns the secret $s'=s1^{n-m}$ where s is the m-bit secret we want.

◀




Figure 3 The quantum circuit diagram for implementing $B_{s'}$ with B_s where $U|x_{m+1\ldots n}\rangle|0\rangle = |x_{m+1\ldots n}\rangle|\sum_{i=m+1}^{n}\delta_{s'_i x_i}\rangle$ and $Adder|a\rangle|b\rangle|c\rangle = |a\rangle|b\rangle|c+a+b\rangle$. Note that the wire denoted by $|x_{m+1\ldots n}\rangle$ has no interaction with *Adder*, and thus is depicted with dotted lines when passing through *Adder*. It should be pointed out that the dimension of the auxiliary register of B_s is different from that of $|b\rangle$, so we did not directly add $B_s(x_{1\ldots m})$ to $|b\rangle$. Ignoring the two auxiliary registers indicted by 0, the overall effect the circuit achieves is $|x\rangle|b\rangle \to |x\rangle|b + B_{s'}(x)\rangle$, as desired.

▶ Remark 13. It is worth mentioning the following two points:

- Firstly, it is not trivial to reduce the problem of small scales to the one of large scales like what we have done in the above proof. In fact, the reason why the above reduction is available is the **separability** property that the black-peg oracle has, as shown in the following formula:

$$B_{s_1 s_2}(x_1 x_2) = B_{s_1}(x_1) + B_{s_2}(x_2), \tag{22}$$

  where s_i and x_i denote a substring. However, the black-white-peg oracle does not satisfy the separability property, and thus the above proof does not hold for black-white-peg Mastermind. Actually, if black-white-peg queries are allowed, then the quantum complexity can break through the lower bound $O(\sqrt{k})$ as shown in Theorem 15.
- Secondly, the reason why we did not use the same method to obtain the lower bound of the non-adaptive quantum complexity for Black-peg Mastermind may not be obvious. In the classical case, the reduction is easy to deal with. However, we must be more careful when addressing the quantum case. As showed in Figure 3, we need to call B_s twice sequentially in the conversion process, which destroys the non-adaptive characteristics of the algorithm. Therefore, it seems infeasible to obtain a lower bound for non-adaptive algorithm by using the idea behind the proof of Theorem 12.

4.3 Adaptive Quantum Algorithm with Black-white-peg Queries

For the secret $s \in [k]^n$, let $C_s = \{s_i \in [k] : i \in \{1, 2, \ldots, n\}\}$, that is, the set of colors occupied by string s. Thus, the size of C_s is not more than n. For an arbitrary color set $T = \{t_1, t_2, \cdots, t_{|T|}\} \subseteq [k]$ with $|T| \leq n$, a bit string $x^{(T,s)} = x_1^{(T,s)} \ldots x_{|T|}^{(T,s)}$ associated with s is defined by

$$x_i^{(T,s)} = \begin{cases} 1, & t_i \in C_s, \\ 0, & t_i \notin C_s, \end{cases} \tag{23}$$

which indicates whether the i-th color t_i in T is used in s or not. Then we have the following result.

▶ **Lemma 14.** *Given the secret $s \in [k]^n$ and an arbitrary color set $T \subseteq [k]$ with $|T| \leq n$, there is a quantum algorithm that uses $O(1)$ black-white-peg queries and returns $x^{(T,s)}$ with certainty.*

Proof. The idea is as follows: first convert the provided oracle into the inner product oracle, and then apply the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm [6]. Now we show the inner product $x^{(T,s)} \cdot y$ for $y \in [2]^{|T|}$ can be computed by using two black-white-peg queries.

First, we submit the string consisting of only 1 to the black-white-peg function BW_s and record the result as $\{B_s(1), W_s(1)\}$.

Second, given $y = y_1 y_2 \dots y_{|T|} \in [2]^{|T|}$, we define a string $z \in [k]^n$ as follows:

$$z_i = \begin{cases} t_i, & y_i = 1 \ \& \ 1 \leq i \leq |T| \\ 1, & y_i = 0 \ \& \ 1 \leq i \leq |T| \\ 1, & |T| + 1 \leq i \leq n. \end{cases}$$

Submit z to the black-white-peg function BW_s and record the result as $\{B_s(z), W_s(z)\}$. Then we have

$$x^{(T,s)} \cdot y = \begin{cases} B_s(z) + W_s(z) - \min\{n - |y|, B_s(1)\}, 1 \notin \{t_i | y_i = 1, 1 \leq i \leq |T|\} \text{ or } B_s(1) = 0 \\ B_s(z) + W_s(z) - \min\{n - |y|, B_s(1) - 1\}, \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

As a result, $x^{(T,s)} \cdot y$ can be computed by using two black-white-peg queries. Thus, $x^{(T,s)}$ can be learn with certainty using $O(1)$ black-white-peg queries by the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm [6]. ◀

Based on the above result, we obtain a quantum algorithm for identifying the secret s.

▶ **Theorem 15.** *There is an adaptive quantum algorithm for the Mastermind game with n positions and k colors that uses $O(\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil + \sqrt{|C_s|})$ black-white-peg queries and returns the secret s with certainty, where C_s is the set of colors occupied by s.*

Proof. The color set $[k]$ is divided into disjoint sets $T_1, \dots, T_{\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil}$ such that $|T_i| = n$ for $i < \lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil$ and $|T_{\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil}| \leq n$. By Lemma 14, we can learn C_s with certainty using $O(\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil)$ black-white-peg queries. Now, the problem is to solve Mastermind game with n positions and $|C_s|$ colors. This can be done using $O(\sqrt{|C_s|})$ black-white-peg queries by Theorem 10 (the white-peg information is simply ignored). The overall complexity is $O(\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil + \sqrt{|C_s|})$. ◀

▶ Remark 16. When $n \leq k \leq n^2$, the algorithm in Theorem 15 has a complexity lower than the bound $\Omega(\sqrt{k})$ given in Theorem 12. For instance, when $k = n^{\frac{3}{2}}$, we have $O(\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil + \sqrt{|C_s|}) = O(\sqrt{n})$, but $\Omega(\sqrt{k}) = \Omega(n^{\frac{3}{4}})$.

5 Conclusions and Discussions

In this paper, we have investigated quantum algorithms for playing the popular game of Mastermind, obtaining substantial quantum speedups. Technically, we have developed a framework for designing quantum algorithms for the general string learning problem, by discovering a new structure that not only allows huge quantum speedups on plying

Mastermind, but also is very likely helpful for addressing other string learning problems with different kinds of query oracles. It is worth pointing out that the non-adaptive algorithm is more practical than the adaptive one, since the former needs only to run a shorter quantum circuit $O(k)$ *times*, whereas the latter runs a longer quantum circuit consisting of $O(\sqrt{k})$ *blocks*.

In the following we list some problems maybe worthy of further consideration.

Problem 1: What is the tight lower bound of the non-adaptive quantum complexity for Black-peg Mastermind? We have presented two $O(k)$-complexity non-adaptive quantum algorithms for Black-peg Mastermind. However, it is not clear whether the algorithms are optimal in the non-adaptive setting.

Problem 2: What is the tight lower bound of the quantum complexity for Black-white-peg Mastermind? For Black-white-peg Mastermind, we have obtained a quantum algorithm with $O(\lceil \frac{k}{n} \rceil + \sqrt{|C_s|})$ queries. In further work, it is worth exploring the tight lower bound for Black-white-peg Mastermind in both adaptive and non-adaptive settings.

Problem 3: What is the quantum complexity of Mastermind without color repetition? There is a variation of Mastermind where color repetition is prohibited in both the secret string s and the query string x. In particular, when $k = n$, this variation is called *Permutation* Mastermind. Similar to the case with color repetition, the classical complexity of Permutation Mastermind in the non-adaptive setting is also $\Theta(n \log n)$ [23, 37]. The classical complexity of Permutation Mastermind in the adaptive setting leaves an $O(\log n)$ gap between the lower bound $\Omega(n)$ and the upper bound $O(n \log n)$ [42]. Our quantum algorithms seem not suitable for this variation.

References

1 Scott Aaronson. How much structure is needed for huge quantum speedups? *arXiv:2209.06930*, 2022. arXiv:2209.06930.

2 Andris Ambainis and Ashley Montanaro. Quantum algorithms for search with wildcards and combinatorial group testing. *Quantum Inf. Comput.*, 14(5-6):439–453, 2014.

3 Aleksandrs Belovs. Quantum algorithms for learning symmetric juntas via the adversary bound. *Comput. Complex.*, 24(2):255–293, 2015.

4 Charles H. Bennett, Ethan Bernstein, Gilles Brassard, and Umesh V. Vazirani. Strengths and weaknesses of quantum computing. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 26(5):1510–1523, 1997.

5 Aaron Berger, Christopher Chute, and Matthew Stone. Query complexity of mastermind variants. *Discret. Math.*, 341(3):665–671, 2018.

6 Ethan Bernstein and Umesh V. Vazirani. Quantum complexity theory. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 26(5):1411–1473, 1997.

7 Gilles Brassard and Peter Høyer. An exact quantum polynomial-time algorithm for simon's problem. In *Proceedings of the Fifth Israel Symposium on Theory of Computing and Systems*, pages 12–23, 1997.

8 Gilles Brassard, Peter Høyer, Michele Mosca, and Alain Tapp. Quantum amplitude amplification and estimation. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 305:53–74, 2002.

9 Harry Buhrman and André Souto. Quantum mastermind. 2008. This abstract can be found at https://www.math.tecnico.ulisboa.pt/~dil2008/index_files/quantum_mastermind_abstract_dil2008.pdf.

10 José Cáceres, M. Carmen Hernando, Mercè Mora, Ignacio M. Pelayo, María Luz Puertas, Carlos Seara, and David R. Wood. On the metric dimension of cartesian products of graphs. *SIAM J. Discret. Math.*, 21(2):423–441, 2007.

11 Zhixiang Chen, Carlos Cunha, and Steven Homer. Finding a hidden code by asking questions. In *Proceedings of the Second Annual International Conference on Computing and Combinatorics*, pages 50–55, 1996.

12 V. Chvátal. Mastermind. *Combinatorica*, 3(3-4):325–329, 1983.

13 Richard Cleve, Kazuo Iwama, François Le Gall, Harumichi Nishimura, Seiichiro Tani, Junichi Teruyama, and Shigeru Yamashita. Reconstructing strings from substrings with quantum queries. In *Proceedings of the 13th Scandinavian Symposium and Workshops on Algorithm Theory*, pages 388–397, 2012.

14 Arjan Cornelissen, Yassine Hamoudi, and Sofiene Jerbi. Near-optimal quantum algorithms for multivariate mean estimation. In *Proceedings of the 54th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 33–43, 2022.

15 David Deutsch. Quantum theory, the church–turing principle and the universal quantum computer. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 400:97–117, 1985.

16 David Deutsch and Richard Jozsa. Rapid solution of problems by quantum computation. *Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A*, 439:553–558, 1992.

17 Benjamin Doerr, Carola Doerr, Reto Spöhel, and Henning Thomas. Playing mastermind with many colors. *Journal of the ACM*, 63(5):1–23, 2016. Earlier version in SODA 2013, pages 695-704.

18 Stefan Droste, Thomas Jansen, and Ingo Wegener. Upper and lower bounds for randomized search heuristics in black-box optimization. *Theory Comput. Syst.*, 39(4):525–544, 2006.

19 Paul Erdős and Alfréd Rényi. On two problems of information theory. *Magyar Tud. Akad. Mat. Kutató Int. Közl*, 8:229–243, 1963.

20 Edward Farhi, Jeffrey Goldstone, Sam Gutmann, and Michael Sipser. Bound on the number of functions that can be distinguished with k quantum queries. *Phys. Rev. A*, 60:4331–4333, 1999.

21 Riccardo Focardi and Flaminia L. Luccio. Cracking bank pins by playing mastermind. In *Proceedings of the 5th International Conference on Fun with Algorithms*, pages 202–213, 2010.

22 András Gilyén, Srinivasan Arunachalam, and Nathan Wiebe. Optimizing quantum optimization algorithms via faster quantum gradient computation. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1425–1444. SIAM, 2019.

23 Christian Glazik, Gerold Jäger, Jan Schiemann, and Anand Srivastav. Bounds for the static permutation mastermind game. *Discret. Math.*, 344(3):112253, 2021.

24 Wayne Goddard. Static mastermind. *Journal of Combinatorial Mathematics and Combinatorial Computing*, 47:225–236, 2003.

25 Michael T. Goodrich. The mastermind attack on genomic data. In *Proceedings of 30th IEEE Symposium on Security and Privacy*, pages 204–218, 2009.

26 Michael T. Goodrich. On the algorithmic complexity of the mastermind game with black-peg results. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 109(13):675–678, 2009.

27 Lov K Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 212–219, 1996.

28 Peter Høyer. Arbitrary phases in quantum amplitude amplification. *Physical Review A*, 62(5):052304, 2000.

29 Markus Hunziker and David A Meyer. Quantum algorithms for highly structured search problems. *Quantum Information Processing*, 1(3):145–154, 2002.

30 Kazuo Iwama, Harumichi Nishimura, Rudy Raymond, and Junichi Teruyama. Quantum counterfeit coin problems. *Theor. Comput. Sci.*, 456:51–64, 2012.

31 Gerold Jäger and Marcin Peczarski. The number of pessimistic guesses in generalized black-peg mastermind. *Inf. Process. Lett.*, 111(19):933–940, 2011.

32 Zilin Jiang and Nikita Polyanskii. On the metric dimension of cartesian powers of a graph. *J. Comb. Theory, Ser. A*, 165:1–14, 2019. Earlier version in SODA 2019, pages 1215–1220.

33 Stephen P Jordan. Fast quantum algorithm for numerical gradient estimation. *Physical review letters*, 95(5):050501, 2005.

34 Tom Kalisker and Doug Camens. Solving mastermind using genetic algorithms. In *Proceedings of the Conference on Genetic and Evolutionary Computation (GECCO'03)*, pages 1590–1591, 2003.

35 Donald E Knuth. The computer as master mind. *Journal of Recreational Mathematics*, 9(1):1–6, 1977.

36 Pascal Koiran, Jürgen Landes, Natacha Portier, and Penghui Yao. Adversary lower bounds for nonadaptive quantum algorithms. *J. Comput. Syst. Sci.*, 76(5):347–355, 2010.

37 Maxime Larcher, Anders Martinsson, and Angelika Steger. Solving static permutation mastermind using $o(n \log n)$ queries. *Electron. J. Comb.*, 29(1), 2022.

38 Gui-Lu Long. Grover algorithm with zero theoretical failure rate. *Physical Review A*, 64(2):022307, 2001.

39 Anders Martinsson. Optimal schemes for combinatorial query problems with integer feedback. *arXiv:2203.09496*, 2022.

40 Anders Martinsson and Pascal Su. Mastermind with a linear number of queries. *arXiv:2011.05921*, 2020.

41 Michele Mosca. *Quantum computer algorithms*. PhD thesis, University of Oxford. 1999., 1999.

42 Mourad El Ouali, Christian Glazik, Volkmar Sauerland, and Anand Srivastav. On the query complexity of black-peg ab-mastermind. *Games*, 9(1):2, 2018.

43 H. S. Shapiro and N. J. Fine. E1399. *The American Mathematical Monthly*, 67(7):697–698, 1960.

44 Joran van Apeldoorn. Quantum probability oracles & multidimensional amplitude estimation. In *16th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2021)*. Schloss Dagstuhl-Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, 2021.

45 Wim van Dam. Quantum oracle interrogation: Getting all information for almost half the price. In *Proceedings of the 39th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 362–367, 1998.

46 Yongzhen Xu, Shihao Zhang, and Lvzhou Li. Quantum algorithm for learning secret strings and its experimental demonstration. *Physica A: Statistical Mechanics and its Applications*, 609:128372, 2023.

A The algorithm proposed by Hunziker and Meyer

For the convenience of readers, here we describe the algorithm proposed by Hunziker and Meyer [29].

The problem considered by Hunziker and Meyer [29] is similar to the problem considered in the article, which is aimed to identify an element of H_k^n defined as followed:

$$H_k^n = \{h_a : \{0, \cdots k-1\}^n \to \{0,1\} | a \in \{0, \cdots k-1\}^n \text{ and } h_a(x) = dist(x,a) \bmod 2\} \tag{24}$$

where $dist(x,a)$ is the generalized Hamming distance between a and x, i.e., the number of components at which they differ.

▶ **Theorem 17.** *[29] Algorithm 6 identifies an element of H_k^n with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon (0 < \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{2})$ for $n \leq -k\ln(\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)$, using $\lfloor \frac{\pi}{4}\sqrt{k} \rceil$ quantum queries.*

Algorithm 6 Alaogirhm C in [29]

Input: An oracle O_{h_a} for $a \in [k]^n$ such that $O_{h_a}|x\rangle|b\rangle = |x\rangle|b \oplus h_a(x)\rangle$.
Output: The secret string s.
Runtime: $O(\sqrt{k})$ queries to O_{h_a}. Succeeds with probability at least $\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon$ when $n < -k\ln(\frac{1}{2}+\epsilon)$.
Procedure:

1 Initial the state to $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}|0\rangle \in (C_k)^{\otimes n} \otimes C_2$.
2 Apply the unitary transformation $QFT_k^{\otimes n} \otimes (HX)$
3 **for** $i = 1 : \lfloor \frac{1}{2}(\pi/(2\arcsin(\frac{1}{\sqrt{k}})) - 1) \rceil$ **do**
4 apply the oracle O_{h_a}.
5 apply the unitary transformation $(QFT_k(I - 2|0\rangle\langle 0|)QFT_k^\dagger)^{\otimes n} \otimes I$
6 **end**
7 Measure the first n registers.

Hunziker and Meyer [29] claimed that the algorithm can be adjusted to an exact version of Grover's algorithm by the methods in [28,38], but this is NOT true as explained below.

Note that when $k > 4$, we have $h_a(x) = (n - \sum_{i=1}^n \delta_{s_i x_i}) \bmod 2$, and the quantum oracle works as $O_{h_a}|x\rangle|b\rangle = |x\rangle|b \oplus h_a(x)\rangle$ where $\oplus$ denotes XOR. We explain in details how the O_{h_a} oracle works in the algorithm as shown in Eqs. (25) $\sim$ (29). It should be pointed out that Eq. (28) holds as $(-1)^l = (-1)^{l \bmod 2}$ for any $0 \leq l \leq n$, but it will not hold if we replace -1 with $e^{i\phi}$ for general ϕ, since $e^{i\phi l} = e^{i\phi l \bmod 2}$ no longer holds. However, in the exact Grover search [28,38] it is necessary to realize a general phase $e^{i\phi}$. That is why the

algorithm given by [29] can't be adapted to be exact by the methods in [28, 38].

$$O_{h_a}(|x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle)) = |x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0 \oplus h_a(x)\rangle - |1 \oplus h_a(x)\rangle) \tag{25}$$

$$= (-1)^{h_a(x)}|x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \tag{26}$$

$$= (-1)^{(n-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_{s_i x_i}) \bmod 2}|x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \tag{27}$$

$$= (-1)^{n-\sum_{i=1}^{n}\delta_{s_i x_i}}|x\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \tag{28}$$

$$= (-1)^n \bigotimes_{i=1}^{n}(-1)^{\delta_{s_i x_i}}|x_i\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - |1\rangle) \tag{29}$$

B $O(k \log k)$ Quantum Algorithm

Here we present a quantum algorithm with $O(k \log k)$ black-peg queries. First, two functions will be employed, as described below:

- IPK_s, associated with $s \in [k]^n$, is defined by $IPK_s(x) = \sum_i s_i \cdot x_i \bmod k$ for any $x \in [k]^n$.
- IPT_s, associated with $s \in [k]^n$, is defined by $IPT_s(x) = \sum_i s_i \cdot x_i \bmod k$ for any $x \in [2]^n$.

Algorithm 7 A quantum algorithm for Mastermind with n positions and k colors

Input: A black-peg oracle B_s for $s \in [k]^n$ such that $B_s|x\rangle|b\rangle = |x\rangle|b \oplus_{n+1} B_s(x)\rangle$.
Output: The secret string s.
Runtime: $O(k \log k)$ queries to B_s. Succeeds with certainty.
Procedure:

1. Prepare the initial state $|\Phi_0\rangle = |0\rangle^{\otimes n}|k-1\rangle$, where $|0\rangle$ and $|k-1\rangle$ are basis states in a k-dimensional Hilbert space.
2. Apply quantum Fourier transform $QFT_k^{\otimes n+1}$.
3. Apply the quantum oracle of IPK_s that calls the black-peg oracle B_s $O(k \log k)$ times in parallel.
4. Apply inverse quantum Fourier transform $(QFT_k^{\dagger})^{\otimes n+1}$.
5. Measure the first n registers in the computational basis.

Now one of our main results is the following theorem.

▶ **Theorem 18.** *There is a quantum algorithm for the Mastermind game with n positions and k colors that uses $O(k \log k)$ black-peg queries and returns the secret string with certainty.*

Proof. Our algorithm is described in Algorithm 7. The main idea is to use a generalized version of the Bernstein-Vazirani algorithm [6] by calling IPK_s one time to find s and we further show that IPK_s can be constructed by calling the black-peg function B_s $O(k \log k)$ times in parallel. The process of Algorithm 7 can be depicted in Figure 4. Now assume that IPK_s is accessible. The state in Algorithm 7 evolves as follows.

First, we prepare the initial state $|\Phi_0\rangle = |0\rangle^{\otimes n}|k-1\rangle$, where there are $n+1$ registers and each one is associated with a k-dimensional Hilbert space.




Figure 4 The circuit diagram of Algorithm 7 is depicted above the dashed line. The idea of how to construct IPK_s is shown below the dashed line, where $A \xleftarrow{O(t)} B$ means that A can be implemented by $O(t)$ copies of B.

Second, after quantum Fourier transform $QFT_k^{\otimes n+1}$, the initial state is changed to

$$|\Phi_1\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k^n}} \sum_{x\in[k]^n} |x\rangle\,|\phi\rangle\,,$$

where

$$|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \omega^{k-j}\,|j\rangle$$

with $\omega = e^{2\pi i/k}$.

At the third step, apply the quantum oracle of IPK_s

$$IPK_s\,|x\rangle\,|y\rangle \longrightarrow |x\rangle\,|(IPK_s(x)+y) \bmod k\rangle\,.$$

Then, the state evolves to

$$\begin{aligned}
|\Phi_2\rangle &= IPK_s\,|\Phi_1\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{k^n}} \sum_{x\in[k]^n} \omega^{IPK_s(x)}\,|x\rangle\,|\phi\rangle \qquad \text{(by Lemma 19)} \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{k^n}} \sum_{x\in[k]^n} e^{\frac{2\pi i\left(\sum_{j=1}^{j=n} s_j\cdot x_j\right) \bmod k}{k}}\,|x\rangle\,|\phi\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{k^n}} \sum_{x\in[k]^n} e^{\frac{2\pi i \sum_{j=1}^{j=n} s_j\cdot x_j}{k}}\,|x\rangle\,|\phi\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{k^n}} \sum_{x=x_1\ldots x_n\in[k]^n} \prod_{j=1}^{j=n} e^{\frac{2\pi i s_j\cdot x_j}{k}}\,|x_1\ldots x_n\rangle\,|\phi\rangle \\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{x_1=0}^{k-1} e^{\frac{2\pi i s_1\cdot x_1}{k}}\,|x_1\rangle \otimes \cdots \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{x_n=0}^{k-1} e^{\frac{2\pi i s_n\cdot x_n}{k}}\,|x_n\rangle\,|\phi\rangle\,.
\end{aligned}$$

At the fourth step, after applying inverse quantum Fourier transform $(QFT^\dagger)^{\otimes n+1}$, we get the state

$$|\Phi_3\rangle = |s_1 s_2 \dots s_n\rangle |k-1\rangle .$$

Finally, the secret string $s = s_1 s_2 \dots s_n$ can be obtained with certainty after measuring the first n registers in the computational basis.

In the above procedure, the IPK_s oracle is queried once and can be constructed with $O(k \log k)$ queries to the black-peg function B_s based on Lemma 21 and Lemma 20. Hence, the complexity of Algorithm 7 with respective to B_s is $O(k \log k)$. ◀

▶ **Lemma 19.** *Let* $IPK_s |x\rangle |y\rangle \longrightarrow |x\rangle |(IPK_s(x) + y) \bmod k\rangle$. *Then, for*

$$|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \omega^{k-j} |j\rangle$$

with $\omega = e^{2\pi i/k}$, *we have*

$$IPK_s |x\rangle |\phi\rangle = \omega^{IPK_s(x)} |x\rangle |\phi\rangle .$$

Proof. Let $m_j = (IPK_s(x)+j) \bmod k$ for $j = 0, 1, \cdots, k-1$. Then $IPK_s(x)+j-m_j = t_j k$ for some integer t_j, that is,

$$j = t_j k + m_j - IPK_s(x).$$

Then we have

$$\begin{aligned}
IPK_s |x\rangle |\phi\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \omega^{k-j} IPK_s |x\rangle |j\rangle && (30)\\
&= \frac{1}{\sqrt{k}} \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \omega^{k-j} |x\rangle |(IPK_s(x) + j) \bmod k\rangle && (31)\\
&= \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \omega^{k-(t_j k + m_j - IPK_s(x))} |x\rangle |m_j\rangle && (32)\\
&= \omega^{IPK_s(x)} |x\rangle \sum_{j=0}^{k-1} \omega^{k-m_j} |m_j\rangle && (33)\\
&= \omega^{IPK_s(x)} |x\rangle \sum_{l=0}^{k-1} \omega^{k-l} |l\rangle && (34)\\
&= \omega^{IPK_s(x)} |x\rangle |\phi\rangle , && (35)
\end{aligned}$$

where note that in Eq. (32), $\omega^{t_j k} = 1$ holds for integer t_j, and in Eq. (33), when j traverses all the values in $\{0, 1, \cdots, k-1\}$, so does m_j.

◀

▶ **Lemma 20.** *Given* $s, x \in [k]^n$, $IPK_s(x)$ *can be computed by calling* IPT_s $\lceil \log(k) \rceil$ *times in parallel.*

Proof. Given $s = s_1 s_2 \dots s_n \in [k]^n$ and $x = x_1 x_2 \dots x_n \in [k]^n$, let $m = \lceil \log(k) \rceil$. $x_i(1)x_i(2)...x_i(n)$ denotes the binary representation of x_i. There is $x_i = \sum_{j=1}^{m} 2^{j-1} x_i(j)$ with $x_i(j) \in \{0, 1\}$. Then

$$\begin{aligned} IPK_s(x) &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} s_i \cdot x_i \bmod k \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^{n} \sum_{j=1}^{m} 2^{j-1} x_i(j) \cdot s_i \bmod k \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m} 2^{j-1} (\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i(j) \cdot s_i) \bmod k \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m} 2^{j-1} (\sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i(j) \cdot s_i \bmod k) \bmod k \\ &= \sum_{j=1}^{m} 2^{j-1} IPT_s(x(j)) \bmod k, \end{aligned}$$

where $x(j) = x_1(j)x_2(j)...x_n(j)$.

◀

▶ **Lemma 21.** *Given $s \in [k]^n$ and $x \in [2]^n$, $IPT_s(x)$ can be computed by using k black-peg queries B_s in parallel.*

Proof. We now describe how to compute $IPT_s(x) = \sum_i s_i \cdot x_i \bmod k$ using black-peg queries B_s.

Given $x = x_1 x_2 \dots x_n \in [2]^n$, we define k strings $y^c \in [k]^n$ for $c = 0, 1, ..., k-1$ as follows:

$$y_i^c = \begin{cases} c, & x_i = 1, \\ 0, & x_i = 0. \end{cases}$$

Feed the black-peg function B_s with y^c, and record the results as

$$n_c = B_s(y^c) = |\{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} : s_i = y_i^c\}|.$$

Let

$$\begin{aligned} &V = |\{i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} : x_i = 1\}|, \\ &v_c = |\{i | s_i = c, i \in V\}|, \ c = 0, 1, ..., k-1, \\ &a = |\{i | s_i = 0, i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\} - V\}|. \end{aligned}$$

For $c = 0, 1, ..., k-1$, obviously there are

$$n_c = v_c + a, \tag{36}$$

$$\sum_{c \in [k]} v_c = |V|. \tag{37}$$

Combine Eq. (36) and Eq. (37), we have

$$\sum_{c \in [k]} n_c = |V| + k \cdot a.$$

Hence, we get

$$v_c = n_c - \frac{\sum_{c\in[k]} n_c - |V|}{k}$$

for $c = 0, 1, ..., k-1$. That is, we can use the query results n_c to compute v_c for $c = 0, 1, ..., k-1$. Now we are ready to compute $IPT_s(x)$:

$$IPT_s(x) = \sum_{i\in V} s_i \bmod k \qquad = \sum_{c\in[k]} c \cdot v_j \bmod k.$$

As a result, $IPT_s(x)$ can be computed by k black-peg queries in parallel. ◀