

# 1 Edit Distance

**Definition 1.** Let  $\Sigma$  be a finite alphabet and let  $x, y \in \Sigma^*$ . The **edit distance between  $x$  and  $y$**  is the number of insertions/deletions/substitutions needed to transform  $x$  into  $y$ .

**Problem 1.1.** EDIT DISTANCE

*INSTANCE:* Two strings  $x, y$  over some alphabet  $\Sigma$ . We think of  $\Sigma$  as being fixed.

*QUESTION:* What is the edit distance between  $x$  and  $y$ ?

**Theorem 1.**

1. (Easy) EDIT DISTANCE can be computed in time  $O(n^2)$  where  $n = \max\{|x|, |y|\}$ .
2. (Backurs & Indyk [3]) Assuming **SETH**, EDIT DISTANCE requires  $\Omega(n^2)$  time.
3. (Abboud et al. [1]) With an assumption weaker than **SETH**, EDIT DISTANCE requires  $\Omega(n^2)$  time.

Theorem 1 settles the question for **exact** EDIT DISTANCE: quadratic time is both the upper and lower bound. Is there a subquadratic algorithm for approximating EDIT DISTANCE?

Can a quantum algorithm give a subquadratic approximation algorithm? Yes. Boroujeni et al. [4] proved the following:

**Theorem 2.**

1. (Theorem 4.5 of their paper) For all  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a quantum algorithm that (a) runs in time  $O(n^{2-(4/21)} \log(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$  and (b) returns a number that is  $\leq (3 + \epsilon)\text{OPT}(x, y)$ . Note that  $2 - (4/21) \sim 1.8095$ .
2. (Theorem 5.1 of their paper) For all  $\epsilon > 0$  there is a quantum algorithm that (a) runs in time  $\tilde{O}(n^\alpha)$  where  $\alpha = 2 - (5 - \sqrt{17}/3) \sim 1.7077$ . (b) returns a number that is  $\leq O(1/\epsilon)^{O(1/\epsilon)}$ .

So at this point it looks like quantum computers can give a constant approximation but classical can not. But then Chakraborty [5] obtained a constant approximation by taking one of the steps of the quantum algorithm of Boroujeni et al. [4] and figuring out how to do it classically. This is discussed in both Chakraborty [5] and a blog post of Rubinstein [6]. Chakraborty [5] showed the following:

**Theorem 3.** There exists a constant  $C$  and a randomized algorithm that (a) runs in time  $\tilde{O}(n^{2-(2/7)})$  and (b) with probability  $1 - n^{-5}$  returns a number that is  $\leq C\text{OPT}(x, y)$ . Note that  $2 - (2/7) \sim 1.7142$ . We note that the constant  $C$  is large.

Andoni & Nosatzki [2] obtained a classical subquadratic approximation result that is parameterized by  $\epsilon$ .

**Theorem 4.** For all  $\epsilon > 0$  there is an algorithm that (a) runs in time  $O(n^{1+\epsilon})$  and (b) returns a number that is  $\leq f(\frac{1}{\epsilon})\text{OPT}(x, y)$  where  $f$  is not given explicitly but is roughly double exponential in  $\frac{1}{\epsilon}$ .

**Open 1.** In this open problem the problem is of course approximate EDIT DISTANCE.

1. Find a constant  $D > 3$  such that that no classical algorithm can, in subquadratic time, obtain a  $D\text{OPT}(x, y)$  approximation. This would show that a subquadratic  $(3 + \epsilon)$ -approximation for EDIT DISTANCE is a problem that a quantum algorithm can do but a classical one cannot.

2. Improve the runtime of the quantum algorithm in Theorem 2.1.

**TWO UPSHOTS:** The problem at hand is EDIT DISTANCE.

1. The following can be done by a quantum algorithm but (at least for now) not by a classical algorithm: a subquadratic algorithm that, on input  $x, y$ , returns  $(3 + \epsilon)\text{OPT}(x, y)$ .
2. For this problem a quantum approximation algorithm inspired a classical one.

## References

- [1] A. Abboud, T. D. Hansen, V. V. Williams, and R. Williams. Simulating branching programs with edit distance and friends: or: a polylog shaved is a lower bound made. In D. Wichs and Y. Mansour, editors, *Proceedings of the 48th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2016, Cambridge, MA, USA, June 18-21, 2016*, pages 375–388. ACM, 2016. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2897518.2897653>.
- [2] A. Andoni and N. S. Nosatzki. Edit distance in near-linear time: it’s a constant factor. In S. Irani, editor, *61st IEEE Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science, FOCS 2020, Durham, NC, USA, November 16-19, 2020*, pages 990–1001. IEEE, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1109/FOCS46700.2020.00096>.
- [3] A. Backurs and P. Indyk. Edit distance cannot be computed in strongly subquadratic time (unless SETH is false). In R. A. Servedio and R. Rubinfeld, editors, *Proceedings of the Forty-Seventh Annual ACM on Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC 2015, Portland, OR, USA, June 14-17, 2015*, pages 51–58. ACM, 2015. <https://doi.org/10.1145/2746539.2746612>.
- [4] M. Boroujeni, S. Ehsani, M. Ghodsi, M. Hajiaghayi, and S. Seddighin. Approximating edit distance in truly subquadratic time: Quantum and mapreduce. *Journal of the ACM*, 68(3):19:1–19:41, 2021. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3456807>.
- [5] D. Chakraborty, D. Das, E. Goldenberg, M. Koucký, and M. E. Saks. Approximating edit distance within constant factor in truly sub-quadratic time. *J. ACM*, 67(6):36:1–36:22, 2020. <https://doi.org/10.1145/3422823>.
- [6] A. Rubinstein. Approximating edit distance, 2018. <https://theorydish.blog/2018/07/20/approximating-edit-distance/>.