

# Quantum Algorithms for Simon's Problem Over General Groups

Gorjan Alagic  
University of Connecticut  
alagic@math.uconn.edu

Cristopher Moore\*  
University of New Mexico  
moore@cs.unm.edu

Alexander Russell†  
University of Connecticut  
acr@cse.uconn.edu

April 1, 2022

## Abstract

Daniel Simon's 1994 discovery of an efficient quantum algorithm for solving the hidden subgroup problem (HSP) over  $\mathbb{Z}_2^n$  provided one of the first algebraic problems for which quantum computers are exponentially faster than their classical counterparts. In this paper, we study the generalization of Simon's problem to arbitrary groups. Fixing a finite group  $G$ , this is the problem of recovering an involution  $\bar{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n) \in G^n$  from an oracle  $f$  with the property that  $f(\bar{x})f(\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y}) \Leftrightarrow \bar{y} \in \{\bar{1}, \bar{m}\}$ . In the current parlance, this is the hidden subgroup problem (HSP) over groups of the form  $G^n$ , where  $G$  is a nonabelian group of constant size, and where the hidden subgroup is either trivial or has order two.

Although groups of the form  $G^n$  have a simple product structure, they share important representation-theoretic properties with the symmetric groups  $S_n$ , where a solution to the HSP would yield a quantum algorithm for Graph Isomorphism. In particular, solving their HSP with the so-called "standard method" requires highly entangled measurements on the tensor product of many coset states.

Here we give quantum algorithms with time complexity  $2^{O(\sqrt{n \log n})}$  that recover hidden involutions  $\bar{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_n) \in G^n$  where, as in Simon's problem, each  $m_i$  is either the identity or the conjugate of a known element  $m$  and there is a character  $\chi$  of  $G$  for which  $\chi(m) = -\chi(1)$ . Our approach combines the general idea behind Kuperberg's sieve for dihedral groups with the "missing harmonic" approach of Moore and Russell. These are the first nontrivial hidden subgroup algorithms for group families that require highly entangled multiregister Fourier sampling.

---

\*Supported by NSF grants CCR-0220070, EIA-0218563, and CCF-0524613, and ARO-ARDA grant 47976-PH-QC.

†Supported by NSF CAREER award CCR-0093065, NSF grants EIA-0523456 and EIA-0523431, and ARO-ARDA grant 47976-PH-QC.

# 1 Introduction

## 1.1 Simon’s problem over general groups

Let  $G$  be a finite group of even order and suppose we are given access to an oracle function  $f$ , from  $G^n$  to some set  $S$ , with the property that  $f(\bar{x} \cdot \bar{y}) = f(\bar{x}) \Leftrightarrow \bar{y} \in \{\bar{1}, \bar{m}\}$  for some “hidden” involution  $\bar{m} \in G^n$ . Our task is to determine  $\bar{m}$  by querying the oracle  $f$ . While this problem is classically intractable, a beautiful quantum algorithm of Daniel Simon’s solves it efficiently when  $G \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$  [18]. In this article, we study this problem over general groups. This problem fits into the framework of the *Hidden Subgroup Problem* (HSP), which also underlies Shor’s celebrated quantum algorithms for factoring and discrete logarithm [17]. In general, an instance of a hidden subgroup problem over a group  $K$  is described by a function  $f : K \rightarrow S$  that “hides” a subgroup  $H \leq K$  in the sense that

$$f(k) = f(k \cdot h) \Leftrightarrow h \in H. \quad (1)$$

The problem is to determine the subgroup  $H$  by making queries to the function  $f$ . For the cases of interest in this article, the group  $K = G^n$  is exponentially large, and we measure the complexity of algorithms for the problem as a function of  $\log |K| = \Theta(n)$ . Moreover, the subgroup  $H$  is of constant size, making it easy to rule out the possibility of efficient classical algorithms.

The number-theoretic problems solved by Shor’s algorithms are naturally related to the HSP on *abelian* groups which are, at this point, quite well understood. The HSP on *nonabelian* groups has very exciting algorithmic applications, including Graph Isomorphism and certain lattice problems [15]; however, these problem appear to be quite challenging in general. Efficient algorithms exist for a number of families of nonabelian groups (e.g., [16, 8, 3, 12, 7, 2]) but all of these are “nearly abelian” in one sense or another. In contrast, the groups of greatest interest, the symmetric groups  $S_n$  whose hidden subgroup problems correspond to Graph Isomorphism, have steadfastly resisted the community’s advances. A series of negative results [6, 14, 5] have shown that the standard approach of measuring a *coset state*, i.e., a uniform superposition over a random coset of  $H$ , is inherently limited. The strongest of these results, due to Hallgren et al. [5] shows that even to obtain enough *information* to solve the HSP (regardless of the computational complexity of processing this information) any algorithm based on this approach must involve highly entangled measurements on the tensor product of  $\Omega(\log |S_n|) = \Omega(n \log n)$  coset states.

In spite of the fact that groups of the form  $G^n$  have a simple direct product structure, all the known negative results that apply to  $S_n$  apply in this setting as well. In particular, whenever  $G$  is nonabelian almost all the representations of  $G^n$  have dimensions which are exponentially large, causing strong Fourier sampling of single coset states to fail [1]. Moreover, solving Simon’s problem on  $G^n$  requires highly entangled measurements over  $\Omega(\log |G^n|) = \Omega(n)$  coset states.

In this article, we describe a family of algorithms for Simon’s problem on  $G^n$  so long as there is a character  $\chi$  of  $G$  which, as in the original problem on  $\mathbb{Z}_2^n$ , “identifies” nontrivial coordinates of the involution. Specifically, we recover hidden subgroups  $H$  of the form  $\{1, \bar{m}\}$  where, as in Simon’s original problem, (i.) each  $m_i$  is either the identity or the conjugate of a known element  $\mu \in G$  and (ii.) there is a character  $\chi$  of  $G$  for which  $\chi(\mu) = -\chi(1)$ . Our algorithms take time  $2^{O(\sqrt{n \log n})}$ . We emphasize that these are the first subexponential-time algorithms to which the negative results of [14, 5] apply, and for which highly entangled measurements are necessary.

Our algorithms use an adaptive sieve similar to that employed by Kuperberg in his algorithm for the dihedral groups [10]. Specifically, we combine registers pairwise in an effort to generate states lying in one-dimensional representations. The rules by which we match pairs of registers

together are more complicated than those in the dihedral group, however, and depend on the Clebsch-Gordan problem in  $G$ . Ultimately, our algorithms produce states which lie in representations which are chosen uniformly from the one-dimensional representations of  $G^n$  which are orthogonal to the hidden subgroup. Their success rests on the fact that, given any order-2 subgroup  $H$ , at least half of these representations are “missing harmonics” of  $H$  and cannot appear [13] unless the hidden subgroup is in fact trivial.

## 1.2 The representations of $G^n$

Recall that a *representation* of a group  $K$  is a homomorphism  $\rho : K \rightarrow \mathbf{U}(V_\rho)$ , where  $\mathbf{U}(V_\rho)$  is the set of unitary operators acting on some vector space  $V_\rho$ , whose dimension we denote by  $d_\rho$ . A representation is *irreducible* if there are no proper subspaces of  $V_\rho$  which are preserved by  $\rho(g)$  for all  $g \in K$ . Schur’s Lemma asserts that for any irreducible representation (or “irrep”)  $\rho$ , the only operators which commute with its image  $\text{Im } \rho \in \mathbf{U}(V)$  are the scalar matrices  $\lambda \mathbb{1}$  where  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ .

We say that two irreps are *isomorphic* if there is a unitary change of basis that maps one onto the other; that is,  $\rho_1 \cong \rho_2$  if there is a  $T$  such that  $\rho_1(g) = T^\dagger \rho_2(g) T$  for all  $g \in K$ . If  $K$  is finite, there are a finite number of equivalence classes under isomorphism, and we let  $\hat{K}$  denote one irrep from each of these equivalence classes. Given an irrep  $\rho$ , its *character* at a group element  $k$  is defined to be  $\chi_\rho(k) = \text{tr } \rho(k)$ , and one-dimensional irreps can be identified with their characters.

Once a basis is chosen for the spaces  $V_\rho$  of each  $\rho \in \hat{K}$ , the  $\rho(g)$  become explicit matrices, and the matrix elements of the irreps in  $\hat{K}$  form a basis for  $\mathbb{C}K$ , the algebra of complex-valued functions on  $K$ . The *quantum Fourier transform* is the change of basis from the group basis

$$\{|k\rangle : k \in K\}$$

of  $\mathbb{C}G$  to the Fourier basis

$$\{|\rho, i, j\rangle : \rho \in \hat{K} \text{ and } 1 \leq i, j \leq d_\rho\} . \quad (2)$$

If  $\rho : K \rightarrow \mathbf{U}(V)$  is a *reducible* representation, one may find an orthogonal decomposition  $V_\rho = V_1 \oplus \cdots \oplus V_k$  with the remarkable property that every  $\rho(g)$  preserves each subspace  $V_i$  and, moreover, that the matrices  $\rho_i(g)$  obtained by restricting  $\rho(g)$  to  $V_i$  form an irreducible representation. In this case we write  $\rho \cong \oplus_i \rho_i$ . Note that, up to isomorphism, a given representation  $\tau \in \hat{K}$  may appear many times in such a decomposition.

We remark that if  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are representations of a group  $K$ , one may naturally define a representation  $\rho \otimes \sigma$  on the space  $V_\rho \otimes V_\sigma$  by the “diagonal action”: the matrix  $[\rho \otimes \sigma](g)$  is defined to be  $\rho(g) \otimes \sigma(g)$ . Even when  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$  are irreducible, the representation  $\rho \otimes \sigma$  is, in general, reducible; the problem of determining the irreducible constituents of  $\rho \otimes \sigma$  is the *Clebsch-Gordan* problem.

Finally, we mention that the representation theory of a product group decomposes into that of its factors. In particular, each irrep  $\bar{\rho}$  of  $G^n$  is a tensor product  $\rho_1 \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_n$  of  $n$  irreps of  $G$ . Specifically,  $\bar{\rho}(\bar{x}) = \rho_1(x_1) \otimes \cdots \otimes \rho_n(x_n)$  (note that this differs from the “diagonal” tensor product construction described above, since the components of  $\bar{x}$  may differ). The dimension  $d_{\bar{\rho}}$  of  $\bar{\rho}$  is hence equal to the product of the dimensions of the  $\rho_i$ , and the character  $\chi_{\bar{\rho}}(\bar{x})$  is equal to the product  $\chi_{\rho_1}(x_1) \cdots \chi_{\rho_n}(x_n)$  of the characters of the  $\rho_i$  at the  $x_i$ .

## 2 Previous negative results

### 2.1 Weak sampling fails

The standard approach to the HSP is to create a uniform quantum superposition over the group, and then measure the value of the oracle  $f$ . This produces the so-called *coset state*, which is a uniform superposition over a random coset of the hidden subgroup  $H$ .

Using the techniques of [11], it is easy to perform the quantum Fourier transform for groups of the form  $G^n$  in  $\text{poly}(n)$  time. The process of *weak Fourier sampling* then consists of measuring just the “name” of the representation  $\bar{\rho} \in \widehat{G^n}$  (that is, the leading portion of the register in the Fourier basis (2)), while *strong Fourier sampling* also measures the row and column  $i, j$  in a basis of our choice. We begin by discussing the probability distribution  $P_H(\bar{\rho})$  on  $\widehat{G^n}$  observed under weak sampling. This is given by

$$P_H(\bar{\rho}) = \frac{d_{\bar{\rho}}|H|}{|G|^n} \text{rk } \Pi_H^{\bar{\rho}}, \quad (3)$$

where

$$\Pi_H^{\bar{\rho}} = \frac{1}{|H|} \sum_{h \in H} \bar{\rho}(h)$$

is the projection operator formed by averaging the representation  $\bar{\rho}$  over  $H$ . When  $H = \{\bar{1}\}$ , this is

$$P_{\{\bar{1}\}}(\bar{\rho}) = \frac{d_{\bar{\rho}}^2}{|G|^n},$$

often referred to as the *Plancherel* distribution; this is simply the dimensionwise fraction of  $\mathbb{C}G^n$  consisting of copies of  $\bar{\rho}$ . The following proposition, proved in [1], asserts that if the “base group”  $G$  possesses an involution outside its center  $Z(G)$ , then weak sampling cannot solve Simon’s problem on  $G^n$ : that is, there are many involutions  $\bar{m}$  which it cannot distinguish from each other, and indeed it cannot distinguish the order-2 subgroup  $\{\bar{1}, \bar{m}\}$  from the trivial subgroup.

**Proposition 1.** *Let  $G$  be a group with an involution  $\mu \notin Z(G)$ , and let  $H = \{\bar{1}, (m_1, \dots, m_n)\} \leq G^n$ , where each  $m_i$  is conjugate to  $\mu$ . Then the total variation distance between the weak Fourier sampling distributions for  $H$  and  $\{\bar{1}\}$  is at most  $2^{-n/2}$ .*

### 2.2 Strong sampling fails

Using the machinery of Moore, Russell, and Schulman [14], one can show that performing strong Fourier sampling on a single coset state also fails to solve Simon’s problem on  $G^n$  for many choices of  $G$ . Given a suitable condition on  $G$ , a simple application of a Chernoff bound shows that the dimension of the irrep  $\bar{\rho}$  resulting from weak Fourier sampling is exponentially large in  $n$  with overwhelming probability. It is not hard to use this fact and the results of [14] to show that single-register strong Fourier sampling then fails for  $G^n$ ; for details, see the present authors’ preprint [1].

For a slightly stronger condition on  $G$ , Hallgren, Moore, Rötteler, Russell and Sen [5] recently showed that entangled measurements over  $\Omega(n)$  registers are required to distinguish subgroups of  $G^n$ . This result applies to many interesting base groups, including all nonabelian simple groups and the symmetric groups  $S_k$  for  $k \geq 4$ .

These negative results strongly suggest that there is little hope of developing a generic recursive approach to the HSP based on breaking the group into a tower of subgroups. Not only can we

decompose  $G^n$  into the tower  $G^n > G^{n-1} > \dots > \{1\}$ , but if  $G$  is *solvable* we can further refine this tower so that each subgroup is normal and all the quotient groups are abelian. For certain solvable groups, Friedl et al. [3] showed that such a tower allows us to solve the HSP recursively. However, there are groups to which the results of [1, 5] apply which are solvable and even *nilpotent*, such as the “chandelier groups” formed by the  $k$ -fold wreath product  $\mathbb{Z}_2 \wr \dots \wr \mathbb{Z}_2$  and which describe the automorphisms of a binary tree of depth  $k$ .

### 3 An algorithm for the product groups $S_k^n$

#### 3.1 Outline of the algorithm

In this section, we outline our algorithm for Simon’s problem on  $G^n$  for  $G$  of constant size. For concreteness, we will describe the case where  $G$  is the symmetric group  $S_k$ . Our algorithm will determine the hidden subgroup  $H \leq S_k^n$ , given oracle access to a function  $f$  satisfying (1), and the promise that  $H$  is either the trivial subgroup  $\{\bar{1}\}$  or of the form  $\{\bar{1}, \bar{m}\}$  where  $\bar{m} = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n)$  with each  $m_i$  an odd involution in  $S_k$ . Note that for any odd permutation  $\pi \in S_k$ ,  $\chi_{\pm}(\pi) = -1 = -\chi_{\pm}(1)$ , where  $\chi_{\pm} : S_k \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  is the *sign* representation mapping each permutation to its sign. We explain how to generalize the algorithm to other base groups and subgroups in Section 4.

For enhanced readability, we make two additional simplifications in this section. First, our algorithm will only determine if  $H$  is trivial or nontrivial; in Section 3.4 we show how to determine the involution  $\bar{m}$ . Second, we put off detailed descriptions of the quantum computational ingredients of the algorithm until Section 3.3, choosing instead to simply list them here and outline the algorithm in terms which require only a basic knowledge of representation theory. These “quantum ingredients” are efficient in the sense that they require time at most polynomial in  $n$ . We thus assume that:

1. We can use the oracle to sample irreps  $\bar{\rho}$  of  $S_k^n$  according to the probability distribution (3). In particular, if  $H$  is the trivial subgroup, it will sample irreps according to the Plancherel distribution.
2. Given two irreps  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\bar{\sigma}$  of  $S_k^n$ , we can “Fourier sample” inside  $\bar{\rho} \otimes \bar{\sigma}$ . When  $H$  is the trivial subgroup this results in an irrep  $\bar{\tau}$  according to the natural distribution induced by its appearance in the decomposition of  $\bar{\rho} \otimes \bar{\sigma}$  into  $G^n$ -irreps. When  $H$  is nontrivial, the distribution depends both on  $H$  and the history of the algorithm up to that point.
3. Finally, if we can use (1) and (2) to produce a *missing harmonic* [13], i.e., one for which  $\bar{\rho}(\bar{m}) = -\mathbb{1}$ , then  $H$  is the trivial subgroup. These are exactly the one-dimensional  $\bar{\rho}$  such that the number of  $\rho_i$  isomorphic to the sign representation of  $S_k$  is odd. On the other hand, producing a one-dimensional  $\bar{\rho}$  with an even number of sign representations provides evidence that  $H$  is nontrivial.

Our algorithm will first use (1) to produce a large number of irreps of  $S_k^n$ , then use (2) repeatedly in a “sieve” to whittle our irreps down to one-dimensional ones, and finally apply (3) to make a correct guess about  $H$  with overwhelming probability.

We now discuss our method for selecting irreps to combine via step (2). Suppose we have the tensor product of two irreps  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\bar{\sigma}$  of  $S_k^n$ . We wish to decompose them into a direct sum of irreps

of  $S_k^n$ ,

$$\bar{\rho} \otimes \bar{\sigma} = \bigoplus \bar{\tau} .$$

These  $\bar{\tau}$  are simply tensor products of the  $\tau_i$  appearing in the decomposition of  $\rho_i \otimes \sigma_i$  into irreps of  $S_k$  for each  $i$ . Now, if  $d_{\rho_i} = d_{\sigma_i} = 1$ , then clearly  $\rho_i \otimes \sigma_i$  consists of a single one-dimensional irrep. It is a fact of the representation theory of the symmetric group that if  $\sigma_i$  is isomorphic to  $\rho_i$ , then  $\rho_i \otimes \sigma_i$  contains one copy of the trivial representation; likewise, if  $\sigma_i$  is isomorphic to the conjugate representation  $\rho_i^\perp$  (obtained by flipping  $\rho_i$ 's Young diagram across its main diagonal) then  $\rho_i \otimes \sigma_i$  contains one copy of the sign representation.

Hence, we would ideally like to use (2) to combine irreps  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\bar{\sigma}$  which match up in a nice way, i. e., such that  $\rho_i$  is one-dimensional exactly when  $\sigma_i$  is one-dimensional, and such that either  $\sigma_i \cong \rho_i$  or  $\sigma_i \cong \rho_i^\perp$  for all other indices  $i$ . In that case, if  $H$  is trivial, each  $\tau_i$  would be one-dimensional with constant probability. However, producing such pairs of irreps of  $S_k^n$  simply using (1), i. e., by independently weak sampling each one, would require exponential time. Instead, we work our way towards missing harmonics with a sieve in the spirit of Kuperberg's algorithm for the dihedral groups [10].

Specifically, we will use (1) to produce a pool of  $2^{\Theta(\sqrt{n \log n})}$   $S_k^n$ -irreps, and then repeatedly pair-wise combine them using (2) according to the following rule. First, for each  $\bar{\rho}$  in our pool, we flip  $\sqrt{n/\log n}$  coins, setting  $z_j^\rho = 0$  or 1 with equal probability for  $j = 1, \dots, \sqrt{n/\log n}$ . We then consider the  $\sqrt{n/\log n}$  leftmost indices  $i$  for which  $d_{\rho_i} > 1$ . We say that  $\bar{\sigma}$  is a *partner* for  $\bar{\rho}$  if, for the  $j$ th such index  $i$ , we have  $\rho_i \cong \sigma_i$  or  $\rho_i \cong \sigma_i^\perp$  if  $z_j^\rho = 0$  or 1 respectively, and moreover if  $z_j^\rho = z_j^\sigma$  for all  $j$ . Observe that there are then at most

$$\begin{aligned} \left( \frac{n}{\sqrt{n/\log n}} \right) (2|\widehat{S}_k|)^{\sqrt{n/\log n}} \\ \approx \left( \frac{en}{\sqrt{n/\log n}} \right)^{\sqrt{n/\log n}} (2|\widehat{S}_k|)^{\sqrt{n/\log n}} \\ = 2^{\Theta(\sqrt{n \log n})} \end{aligned}$$

different types of  $S_k^n$ -irreps for the purposes of this method of matching. Our algorithm relies on the fact that if  $\bar{\tau}$  is produced from  $\bar{\rho} \otimes \bar{\sigma}$  using (2), then whenever  $\rho_i \cong \sigma_i$  or  $\rho_i \cong \sigma_i^\perp$ , we will have  $d_{\tau_i} = 1$  with constant probability.

The following is an outline of our algorithm.

- Use quantum ingredient (1) to produce a collection  $\Lambda$  of  $2^{\Theta(\sqrt{n \log n})}$  irreps of  $S_k^n$ .
- Repeat  $6\sqrt{n \log n}$  times:
  - Pair up the irreps from  $\Lambda$  according to the rule specified above, and discard any unpaired irreps.
  - Use quantum ingredient (2) to combine each pair of partners to produce a new  $S_k^n$ -irrep. Redefine  $\Lambda$  to be the set of “children” produced in this manner.
- By quantum ingredient (3), we may output “trivial” if  $\Lambda$  contains any missing harmonics, and “nontrivial” otherwise.



Since we never discard more than a constant fraction of the irreps at each step, it is clear that we will still have the necessary  $2^{\Theta(\sqrt{n \log n})}$  irreps at the last step. If  $H$  is trivial, it is easy to see that every one-dimensional irrep has the same probability of appearing in the final list  $\Lambda$  since our coin-flipping process chooses partners where  $\sigma_i \cong \rho_i$  or  $\rho_i^\perp$  with equal probability. Since half of the possible one-dimensional irreps are missing harmonics, the probability that  $\Lambda$  contains no missing harmonics in this case is superexponentially small. Hence the probability the final collection contains a missing harmonic is  $1 - o(1)$  if  $H$  is trivial, and 0 if it is not. The output is thus correct with high probability.

### 3.2 Analysis

Suppose  $\bar{\tau}$  is a child resulting from applying ingredient (2) to a pair of partners. Let the *weight* of  $\bar{\tau}$  be the number of its factors  $\tau_i$  with  $d_{\tau_i} > 1$ . Ideally, we would like  $\bar{\tau}$  to satisfy one of the following three conditions: 1) the weight of  $\bar{\tau}$  is zero; 2) the parents have weight at least  $\sqrt{n/\log n}$ , and the weight of  $\bar{\tau}$  is at least  $c_1 \sqrt{n/\log n}$  lower; 3) the parents have weight less than  $\sqrt{n/\log n}$  and the weight of  $\bar{\tau}$  is lower by a constant fraction  $c_2$ . Since we know the dimensions of the irreps of  $S_k$  (which is of constant size), it is easy to select the constants  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  such that one of these three conditions is satisfied with probability at least  $1/2$ , for every child produced in this manner. In the following, we assume that these constants have been chosen as prescribed, and that the algorithm is run for  $m = 6\sqrt{n \log n}$  steps.

Let  $\bar{\rho}_0$  be an irrep of  $S_k^n$  sampled at the beginning of the algorithm, and let  $\{\bar{\rho}_j\}_{j=1}^m$  be the sequence consisting of the descendants of  $\bar{\rho}_0$  given in the obvious order (e.g.  $\bar{\rho}_2$  is the child of  $\bar{\rho}_1$ , which is the child of  $\bar{\rho}_0$ .) Note that we are assuming that we have selected an irrep produced initially via ingredient (1) which has a surviving descendant in the final collection  $\Lambda$ . Our goal is to prove that  $\bar{\rho}_m$  is one-dimensional (i.e., has weight zero) with very high probability. Define a sequence of random variables  $\{A_j\}_{j=1}^m$  such that  $A_j = 1$  if  $\bar{\rho}_j$  satisfies one of the three conditions outlined above, and  $A_j = 0$  otherwise. Notice that

$$\mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^m A_j \right] \geq \frac{m}{2} = 3\sqrt{n \log n} ,$$

but that  $\bar{\rho}_m$  has weight zero unless

$$\sum_{j=1}^m A_j < \sqrt{n \log n} + O(\log n) .$$

We now define the random variables

$$C_k = \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^m A_j \mid \{A_i : i \leq k\} \right] \quad k = 0, 1, 2, \dots, m .$$

We will control the quantity

$$|C_m - C_0| = \left| \sum_{j=1}^m A_j - \mathbb{E} \left[ \sum_{j=1}^m A_j \right] \right| .$$

Observe that  $\{C_k\}_{k=0}^m$  defines a (sub)martingale, i.e.,  $\mathbb{E}[C_{k+1} \mid C_k] \geq C_k$ , and that  $|C_{k+1} - C_k| \leq 1$ . We can thus apply Azuma's inequality, which asserts that

$$\Pr \left[ |C_m - C_0| \geq \sqrt{n \log n} \right] \leq 2e^{-\sqrt{n \log n}/12} ,$$

and conclude that, with overwhelming probability,

$$\sum_{j=1}^m A_j \geq 2\sqrt{n \log n}$$

and the weight of  $\bar{\rho}_m$  is zero, as desired.

### 3.3 Weak sampling tensor product states and missing harmonics

Quantum ingredient (1) of our algorithm is the familiar tool of weak Fourier sampling. We continue here with a discussion of the slightly less familiar quantum ingredients (2) and (3), for a general group  $G$  and subgroup  $H$ . Recall that at the beginning of the algorithm, each register contains the mixed coset state

$$\rho_H = \frac{1}{|G|} \sum_{c \in G} |cH\rangle \langle cH| ,$$

where  $|S\rangle$  denotes the state

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{|S|}} \sum_{s \in S} |s\rangle ;$$

note that this is the completely mixed state in the case where  $H$  is trivial. We then apply weak Fourier sampling to each register, projecting it into a right-invariant irreducible subspace of  $\mathbb{C}G$  corresponding to some irrep  $\rho$  of  $G$ . We remark at this point that the density matrix  $\rho_H$  is invariant under right multiplication by any element of  $H$ ; in particular,

$$R_h \rho_H = \rho_H R_h = \rho_H \quad (4)$$

where  $R_h$  is the unitary operator  $R_h : |g\rangle \mapsto |gh\rangle$  corresponding to (right) multiplication by an element  $h \in H$ . Note that this is stronger than the property that  $\rho_H$  commutes with  $R_h$ , which is another sense in which a mixed state can be invariant under a unitary operator.

The “combine” step of our algorithm consists of the following sampling procedure, identical to that used by Kuperberg [10] for the dihedral groups. First, a pair of these weakly sampled registers can be described as a state in the vector space

$$V_\rho \otimes V_\sigma \subset \mathbb{C}G \otimes \mathbb{C}G$$

where  $V_\rho$  and  $V_\sigma$  are irreducible right-invariant spaces of  $\mathbb{C}G$  corresponding to irreps  $\rho$  and  $\sigma$ . When  $V_\rho \otimes V_\sigma$  is treated as a representation of  $G$  under the right diagonal action it is typically reducible, as stated in Section 1.2: its Clebsch-Gordan decomposition is the direct sum  $V_\rho \otimes V_\sigma \cong \bigoplus_\tau W_\tau$ , where, for an irrep  $\tau$ ,  $W_\tau$  is the span of all subspaces of  $V_\rho \otimes V_\sigma$  isomorphic to  $\tau$ . We call such a subspace *isotypic*. Our goal is to perform “isotypic sampling” on this tensor product state: in other words, to measure the irrep name  $\tau$  corresponding to the isotypic subspace  $W_\tau$ .

If  $|\psi\rangle$  is our original state in  $V_\rho \otimes V_\sigma$ , let  $|\psi_\tau\rangle$  denote the projection of  $|\psi\rangle$  into  $W_\tau$ . We begin by applying the controlled-multiplication operation to the entire space  $\mathbb{C}G \otimes \mathbb{C}G$  defined by

$$M : |a\rangle|b\rangle \mapsto |a\rangle|ba^{-1}\rangle.$$

As pointed out in [10], this unitary transformation transports the right diagonal  $G$ -action to the  $G$ -action on the first register. Therefore, we can now apply the quantum Fourier transform to the first



register of the result and measure a representation name  $\tau$ . The portions of this first register corresponding to a state in a right  $G$ -invariant space (a “column” of  $\tau$ ) are kept; all other portions of this register and the right hand register are left unmeasured (and unused!). By computing the internal trace across these qubits, we see that the resulting mixed state is precisely the one we wanted: the irrep name  $\tau$  is measured with probability  $\|\psi_\tau\|^2$ . Moreover, as promised in ingredient (2), when  $H$  is the trivial subgroup we have the fully mixed state at each point of the algorithm and hence the probability of observing  $\tau$  is precisely  $\dim W_\tau / (\dim V_\rho \cdot \dim V_\sigma)$ , the dimensionwise fraction of  $V_\rho \otimes V_\sigma$  composed of copies of  $\tau$ . This establishes the claims of ingredient (2).

Note, however, that when the subgroup  $H$  is nontrivial the distribution induced by the observation above may be rather complicated, depending both on the subgroup  $H$  and the exact sequence of measurements that resulted in the states present in  $V_\sigma$  and  $V_\tau$ . The only fact we shall use about the states produced at intermediate stages of the algorithm for nontrivial  $H$ , however, is that the combine step preserves invariance under right multiplication by elements of  $H$ . Indeed, if  $\alpha_\rho$  and  $\alpha_\sigma$  are mixed states over the spaces  $V_\rho$  and  $V_\sigma$ , respectively, satisfying property (4) then indeed

$$(R_h \otimes R_h) \cdot (\alpha_\rho \otimes \alpha_\sigma) = (R_h \alpha_\rho) \otimes (R_h \alpha_\sigma) = \alpha_\rho \otimes \alpha_\sigma$$

and the resulting mixed state on  $V_\rho \otimes V_\sigma$  is invariant under right (diagonal) multiplication by  $h$ .

Returning to the case where  $G = S_k^n$  and

$$H = \{\bar{1}, \bar{m} = (m_1, \dots, m_k)\} ,$$

note that if  $\bar{\rho} = \rho_1 \otimes \dots \otimes \rho_n$  is a one-dimensional representation of  $G^n$  in which the number of  $\rho_i$  isomorphic to the sign representation is odd, then  $\bar{\rho}(\bar{1}) = 1$  while  $\bar{\rho}(\bar{m}) = -1$ . Thus the projection operator  $\Pi_H^{\bar{\rho}} = (1/2)(R_1 + R_m)$  is the *zero operator*, and  $\bar{\rho}$  is a missing harmonic in the sense of [13]. Since there are no mixed states  $\alpha$  over  $V_{\bar{\rho}}$  with the property that  $R_h \alpha = \alpha$  for all  $h \in H$ , such a  $\bar{\rho}$  can never be observed in the course of the sieve process. This establishes the statement in ingredient (3).

### 3.4 Determining the hidden subgroup

We now describe how the above algorithm, which determines only if the hidden subgroup is the trivial subgroup, can be used to determine  $H$  exactly in the case  $H = \{\bar{1}, \bar{m}\}$ . For each  $i$  from 1 to  $n$ , and each odd involution  $b \in S_k$ , we will apply our algorithm to determine if  $m_i = b$ . To accomplish this, we run the algorithm with the modified oracle  $f_i^b$  defined by

$$f_i^b(\bar{g}) = (f(\bar{g}), c_b(g_i)) ,$$

where  $c_b(g_i)$  returns the coset representative of the coset of  $\{1, b\}$  containing  $g_i$ . If  $m_i = b$ , then  $f_i^b$  will be distinct and constant on the cosets of  $H$ , and the algorithm will output that the subgroup is nontrivial. Otherwise,  $f_i^b$  will be one-to-one and the algorithm will output that the subgroup is trivial. Repeating this process for every  $i$ , and every  $b$ , we can fully determine  $\bar{m}$ .

We have assumed throughout this section that when  $H$  is nontrivial, every coordinate of the hidden involution  $\bar{m}$  is nontrivial. We show in Section 4.2 how to determine which coordinates are nontrivial and so relax this assumption.

## 4 Generalizing to other base groups

### 4.1 High-dimensional missing harmonics

While our exposition above focused on symmetric base groups  $G = S_k$ , our algorithm can be generalized to a much larger family of groups. Most generally, we consider base groups  $G$  with an involution  $\mu$  and an irrep  $\rho$  such that  $\rho(\mu) = -\mathbb{1}$ . This turns out to be equivalent to a nice group-theoretic condition, as the following proposition shows:

**Proposition 2.** *Let  $G$  be a group with an involution  $\mu$ . The following statements are equivalent:*

1. *There is a  $\rho \in \hat{G}$  such that  $\rho(\mu) = -\mathbb{1}$ .*
2. *There is a normal subgroup  $N$  of  $G$  such that  $\mu \notin N$  and  $\mu N \in Z(G/N)$ .*

*Proof.* First, assume (1) and let  $N$  denote the kernel of  $\rho$ . Then certainly  $\mu \notin N$ . Also,  $G/N \cong \text{Im } \rho$  via the isomorphism  $gN \mapsto \rho(g)$ , and  $\rho(\mu) = -\mathbb{1} \in Z(\text{Im } \rho)$ .

Conversely, assume (2) and choose any irrep  $\rho'$  of  $G/N$  which takes a nontrivial value on  $\mu N$ . We can pull  $\rho'$  back to a  $G$ -irrep  $\rho$  via  $\rho(g) = \rho'(gN)$ . Since  $\mu N \in Z(G/N)$ ,  $\rho(\mu) = \rho'(\mu N) = \lambda \mathbb{1}$  by Schur's Lemma, and since  $\mu^2 = 1$ , we have  $\lambda = -1$ .  $\square$

With base group  $G$  as above, our general algorithm will identify subgroups of the form  $H = \{\bar{1}, \bar{m}\} \leq G^n$  where each  $m_i$  is 1 or a conjugate of  $\mu$ . Our algorithm for  $S_k^n$  above relied on the fact that the sign representation of  $S_k$  is one-dimensional. However, given the condition of Proposition 2, the dimension of  $\rho$  could certainly be greater than one. This problem is easily overcome by treating this Simon's problem over  $K^n$  rather than  $G^n$ , where  $K$  is the *projective kernel* of  $\rho$ , i.e., the subgroup of  $G$  consisting of elements  $g$  such that  $\rho(g)$  is a scalar. Indeed, as  $K$  is normal, it contains the conjugates of  $\mu$ , and hence  $H \leq K^n$ . Furthermore, the restriction of  $\rho$  to  $K$  decomposes into  $d_\rho$  copies of some one-dimensional irrep of  $K$ , and thus

$$\text{Res}_N^G \rho(g) \cong \bigoplus_{i=1}^{d_\rho} \chi(g)$$

for some character  $\chi$ . In particular,  $\rho(\mu) = -\mathbb{1}$  implies  $\chi(\mu) = -1$ , reducing to the previous situation where the missing harmonic is one-dimensional.

### 4.2 One-dimensional missing harmonics and determining nontrivial coordinates

Let  $G$  be a group, let  $\mu$  be an involution, and let  $G' = [G, G]$  denote the commutator subgroup of  $G$ . Since  $G/G'$  is abelian, the existence of a character  $\chi$  of  $G$  such that  $\chi(\mu) = -1$  is equivalent to the condition  $\mu \notin G'$ . Under this condition on the base group  $G$ , we consider the HSP over  $G^n$  where the hidden subgroup is  $H = \{\bar{1}, \bar{m}\}$ , where each  $m_i$  is either 1 or a conjugate of  $\mu$ . Indeed, this is the case in the original Simon's problem, where  $\mu$  is the nonidentity element of  $\mathbb{Z}_2$ , and  $\chi$  is the nontrivial character.

To adapt our algorithm to the case described above, we make one simple modification. For the symmetric base group case, we paired  $S_k^n$ -irreps  $\bar{\rho}$  according to a rule which attempted to pair  $S_k$ -factors  $\rho_i$  with either  $\rho_i^*$  or  $\rho_i^\perp \cong \rho_i^* \otimes \pi$ , where  $\pi$  is the sign character of  $S_k$ . Instead, we will now pair a  $G$ -factor  $\rho_i$  with  $\rho_i^* \otimes \psi$ , where  $\psi$  is a one-dimensional representation of  $G$  selected uniformly

at random. Note that since  $\rho_i \otimes \rho_i^*$  contains a copy of the trivial representation,  $\rho_i \otimes \rho_i^* \otimes \psi$  will contain a copy of  $\psi$ , and hence each pairing made in this fashion will allow our algorithm to make progress, as before. The final collection  $\Lambda_{\text{end}}$  of irreps will thus consist entirely of one-dimensional representations of  $G^n$ . To see how we can determine the nontrivial coordinates of  $\bar{m}$ , we now show that these final irreps will in fact be uniformly random elements of

$$H^\perp = \left\{ \psi \in \widehat{G}^n : \psi \text{ one-dimensional, } H \subset \ker \psi \right\},$$

i. e. the one-dimensional representations of  $G^n$  which take the value 1 on  $H$ . Since characters outside  $H^\perp$  take the value  $-1$  on  $\bar{m}$ , they cannot appear in  $\Lambda_{\text{end}}$  since they are missing harmonics, as before. It thus suffices to show that the distribution which dictates the appearance of irreps in  $\Lambda_{\text{end}}$  is invariant under multiplication (tensor product) by any element of  $H^\perp$ . We accomplish this by demonstrating, given  $\psi \in H^\perp$  and  $\bar{\rho} \in \Lambda_{\text{end}}$ , an “alternate history” of the algorithm which instead produces  $\bar{\rho} \otimes \psi$  with the same probability.

We first remark that the formalism of quantum mechanics does not distinguish between the state  $|\phi\rangle$  and  $\lambda|\phi\rangle$ , when  $\lambda \in \mathbb{C}$ ; indeed, they determine the same density matrix. In particular, letting  $A_\chi$  be the operator  $\sum_g \chi(g) |g\rangle \langle g|$  we have  $A_\chi |cH\rangle = \chi(c) |H\rangle$  whenever  $\chi \in H^\perp$ ; thus  $\rho_H$  is invariant under  $A_\chi$  for any  $\chi \in H^\perp$ . Note, furthermore, that for any element  $f \in \mathbb{C}G$ ,

$$\widehat{f}(\rho \otimes \chi) = \sum_g \rho(g) \psi(g) f(g) = \widehat{A_\chi f}(\rho) . \quad (5)$$

Evidently, for  $\chi \in H^\perp$  the representations  $\rho$  and  $\rho \otimes \chi$  are equally likely to appear as initial irreps in our sieve and, moreover, the mixed state observed in these two cases is equivalent (under the natural isomorphism of the vector spaces on which  $\rho$  and  $\rho \otimes \chi$  operate).

The sieve history of our final  $\bar{\rho} \in \Lambda_{\text{end}}$  is described by a (directed) binary tree whose vertices are decorated with the  $G^n$ -irreps measured at the point when the two children were combined; the leaves are labeled by initially sampled irreps. We also associate with each vertex the mixed state produced by sampling the states of the children. Our alternate history is described simply by choosing any (directed) path that begins with  $\bar{\rho}$  and ends with some initially sampled irrep, and applying the tensor product by  $\psi$  to the label of each vertex along that path; as  $\chi \in H^\perp$ , it is one-dimensional, and the labels along the path still correspond to irreps. The rest of the tree remains unchanged.

Recall that each internal node in the tree corresponds to an application of quantum ingredient (2), which produces a new child state in an isotypic subspace  $W_\tau$  from parents lying in irreps  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\bar{\sigma}$ . Observe, first of all, that if  $\bar{\rho} \otimes \bar{\sigma} = \bigoplus \bar{\tau}$  and  $\chi \in H^\perp$ , then  $\bar{\rho} \otimes (\bar{\sigma} \otimes \chi) = \bigoplus \bar{\tau} \otimes \chi$ . At the very least, this new labeling of the tree is consistent with decomposition of tensor products into their constituent isotypic spaces. Note, also, that as the matching algorithm pairs a representation  $\rho$  uniformly with representations  $\rho \otimes \psi$  (for one-dimensional  $\psi$ ), the probability associated with each “combine” step is unchanged.

Finally, note that if  $\bar{\rho}$  and  $\chi$  are representations of  $G^n$ , with  $\chi$  one-dimensional as above, then there is an isomorphism between the space on which  $\bar{\rho}$  acts and the space on which  $\bar{\rho} \otimes \chi$  acts which preserves the decomposition of these spaces into irreducible subspaces. For concreteness, we may treat these spaces to be the same in the original and alternate trees above (where the only difference in  $G$ ’s action on the subspaces is by a scalar given by  $\chi$ ); in particular, the projection operators associated with the measurements occurring at each combine step are identical. By (5),

the mixed state appearing at the leaf involved in the relabeling is also unaffected by this process, as desired. Hence, the final irreps are selected uniformly at random from  $H^\perp$ . Since we required that  $\mu \notin G'$ , we can now efficiently determine the nontrivial coordinates of  $\bar{m}$  by linear algebra, just as in Simon's original algorithm.

### 4.3 Examples

The case described in the previous section can provide us with a large family of familiar examples of base groups. If  $G$  has a subgroup  $K$  of index 2, then  $K$  is normal with  $G/K \cong \mathbb{Z}_2$ . It follows that  $G$  has a one-dimensional representation  $\pi$ , analogous to the sign representation in  $S_k$ , which is  $+1$  on  $K$  and  $-1$  on the nontrivial coset of  $K$ . Thus  $\pi$  is a missing harmonic for any involution  $\mu \notin K$ , and we can distinguish subgroups of the form  $H = \{\bar{1}, \bar{m}\}$  for  $m = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n)$  where each  $m_i$  is 1 or an involution outside  $K$ . In the case  $G = S_k$  studied above,  $K$  is the alternating subgroup  $A_k$  and  $\pi$  is simply the sign representation. Similarly, if  $G$  is a dihedral group  $D_k$ , the normal subgroup  $K \cong \mathbb{Z}_k$  consists of the rotations. Finally, if  $G$  is a wreath product of the form  $L \wr \mathbb{Z}_2$ , then  $K \cong L \times L$ . For a detailed description of the irreps of  $G$  in this case, see [1].

## References

- [1] Gorjan Alagic, Cristopher Moore, Alexander Russell. Strong Fourier Sampling Fails over  $G^n$ . Preprint, quant-ph/0511054 (2005).
- [2] David Bacon, Andrew Childs, and Wim van Dam. From optimal measurement to efficient quantum algorithms for the hidden subgroup problem over semidirect product groups. *Proc. 46th Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, 2005.
- [3] Katalin Friedl, Gábor Ivanyos, Frédéric Magniez, Miklos Santha, and Pranab Sen. Hidden translation and orbit coset in quantum computing. *Proc. 35th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2003.
- [4] William Fulton and Joe Harris. *Representation Theory: A First Course*. Number 129 in Graduate Texts in Mathematics. Springer-Verlag, 1991.
- [5] Sean Hallgren, Cristopher Moore, Martin Rötteler, Alexander Russell, and Pranab Sen. Limitations of quantum coset states for graph isomorphism. *Proc. 38th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2006.
- [6] Sean Hallgren, Alexander Russell, and Amnon Ta-Shma. Normal subgroup reconstruction and quantum computation using group representations. *Proc. 32nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 627–635, 2000.
- [7] Yoshifumi Inui and François Le Gall. An efficient algorithm for the hidden subgroup problem over a class of semi-direct product groups. *Proc. EQIS 2004*.
- [8] Gábor Ivanyos, Frédéric Magniez, and Miklos Santha. Efficient quantum algorithms for some instances of the non-abelian hidden subgroup problem. *Int. J. Found. Comput. Sci.* 14(5): 723–740, 2003.

- [9] A.Yu. Kitaev, A.H. Shen, M.N.Vyalyi, *Classical and Quantum Computation*. Graduate Studies in Mathematics, Vol. 47, AMS (2002).
- [10] Greg Kuperberg. A subexponential-time quantum algorithm for the dihedral hidden subgroup problem. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 35(1):170–188, 2005.
- [11] Cristopher Moore, Daniel Rockmore, Alexander Russell. Generic Quantum Fourier Transforms. *Proc. 15th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 778–787, 2004.
- [12] Cristopher Moore, Daniel Rockmore, Alexander Russell, and Leonard Schulman. The value of basis selection in Fourier sampling: hidden subgroup problems for affine groups. *Proc. 15th Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1113–1122, 2004.
- [13] Cristopher Moore and Alexander Russell. Explicit Multiregister Measurements for Hidden Subgroup Problems; or, Fourier Sampling Strikes Back. Preprint, quant-ph/0504067 (2005).
- [14] Cristopher Moore, Alexander Russell, Leonard Schulman. The symmetric group defies strong Fourier sampling. *Proc. 46th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 479–488, 2005.
- [15] Oded Regev. Quantum computation and lattice problems. *Proc. 43rd Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 520–530, 2002.
- [16] Martin Rötteler and Thomas Beth. Polynomial-time solution to the hidden subgroup problem for a class of non-abelian groups. Preprint, quant-ph/9812070 (1998).
- [17] Peter Shor. Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26(5):1484–1509.
- [18] Daniel Simon. On the Power of Quantum Computation. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 26(5).