

# NP vs $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$

Salman Beigi\*

*Department of Mathematics, Massachusetts Institute of Technology*

## Abstract

Shor's factoring algorithm, as the first step in quantum complexity theory, shows that there are non-trivial problems in NP that can be solved efficiently on a quantum computer. However, we don't know whether a quantum computer can solve an NP-hard problem or not. Recently it has been proved that, we can solve an NP problem given a "short" quantum proof; Blier and Tapp in [4] have shown that Arthur given "two un-entangled" witnesses of size  $\log(n)$  can solve an NP-hard problem. More precisely,  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$  with the gap  $\frac{1}{24n^6}$ . On the other hand, Aaronson et al. [1] have shown that we can get to a constant gap by considering  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$  witnesses of logarithmic-size, and they believe that this can be improved to two  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$ -size witnesses with the same gap. However, we still don't know if  $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$  with constant gap contains NP. In this paper, we improve the result of [4] by increasing the gap from  $\frac{1}{24n^6}$  to  $\frac{1}{n^{3+\epsilon}}$ , for every constant  $\epsilon > 0$ .

## 1 Introduction

QMA is the class of problems that can be solved by a quantum polynomial time verifier (Arthur), given a polynomial size quantum proof by Merlin. This complexity class was first introduced by Watrous [15]. Then by the profound result of Kiteav et al. [8], who showed that the *local Hamiltonian problem* is QMA-complete, QMA was turned to an important complexity class. Although QMA and local Hamiltonian problem are considered as the quantum analogue of NP and 3-SAT, there are variants of quantum Merlin-Arthur games without any classical analogue.

In the classical case,  $k$  Merlins, each one of which sends Arthur his own witness, is the same as just one Merlin who sends all the messages. However, in the quantum case we may assume that the  $k$  Merlins are not entangled and then send a separable state to Arthur. Therefore, we cannot argue that one Merlin can send all the witnesses since he may cheat by sending an entangled state. So, we get to the complexity class  $\text{QMA}(k)$  introduced by Kobayashi et al. [9]. By definition, we have  $\text{QMA} = \text{QMA}(1) \subseteq \text{QMA}(2) \subseteq \text{QMA}(3) \subseteq \dots$ , and the first question that arises is whether we have equality somewhere or whether all the inclusions are strict. Also the error amplification problem is not an easy one for  $\text{QMA}(k)$ . The first idea to prove error amplification is to ask each Merlin to send polynomially many copies of his witness and then repeat the verification procedure many times. But it fails because one of the Merlins may cheat by entangling his copies. Then after the first round of the procedure we end up with some entanglement between different messages, which is not allowed. So, there are two important questions regarding  $\text{QMA}(k)$ . First, is there some  $k$  such that  $\text{QMA}(k+1) = \text{QMA}(k)$ , and second, can we amplify the gap in  $\text{QMA}(k)$  protocols? It is interesting that these two questions are related [9, 1]; If we could amplify the error in

---

\*salman@mit.edu

$\text{QMA}(k)$  protocols then  $\text{QMA}(2) = \text{QMA}(k)$ , for any  $k \geq 2$ . Also it is proved by Aaronson et al. [1] that we can amplify the error if the *Weak Additivity Conjecture* holds.

Other than the number of Merlins, we can consider the case where the size of the witnesses is less than  $\text{poly}(n)$ . For example, in the classical case  $\log(n)$ -size witnesses never help the verifier to solve a problem beyond P. Because, he can check all such witnesses in polynomial time. But this argument fails in the quantum case and we can define the complexity classes  $\text{QMA}_{\log}(k)$ . Although the beautiful error amplification protocol of [11] for  $\text{QMA} = \text{QMA}(1)$  shows that for  $k = 1$  we have  $\text{QMA}_{\log} = \text{BQP}$ , which is the same situation as in the classical case, we don't know any non-trivial upper bound for  $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$ .

Recently, Blier and Tapp [4] showed that  $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$  with perfect completeness and soundness  $1 - \frac{1}{24n^6}$  contains NP, turning this complexity class to an interesting one which contains both BQP and NP. The only issue is that the gap has to be very small,  $(\frac{1}{24n^6})$ . In contrast, Aaronson et al. showed that NP has a constant gap quantum Merlin-Arthur protocol in which there are  $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n})$  Merlins each one of which sends a  $\log(n)$ -qubit state. They believe that this result can be improved to just two Merlins each one of which sends a  $\sqrt{n}$ -qubit state.

In this paper we improve the result of [4] by showing that NP is in  $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$  with the gap  $\frac{1}{n^{3+\epsilon}}$ , for any constant  $\epsilon > 0$ .

## 1.1 Main idea

Blier and Tapp have proved  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$  by finding a  $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$ -protocol for 3-coloring problem. Here, we prove this containment by a different idea and get to a larger gap.

Suppose that Arthur has been given a quantum state over two registers of sizes  $\log(n)$ , and wants to recognize whether this state is entangled or not. We don't know any quantum polynomial time algorithm to recognize entanglement. But if two unentangled Merlins give Arthur two witnesses, Arthur by comparing them to his state can check whether the state is separable or not. It means that, a two-prover Merlin-Arthur protocol can recognize separable states. On the other hand, Gurvits [5] has shown that given the classical description of a quantum state over two registers, it is NP-complete to decide whether the state is separable or not. Therefore, we have a way of comparing  $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$  and NP. In this paper we use this idea and change it a little to get better completeness and soundness bounds.

## 2 Definitions and basic properties

Through this paper we assume that the reader is familiar with the basic theory of quantum computing [12], and complexity theory [14, 13].

### 2.1 $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$

**Definition 2.1** *Let  $k$  be an integer, and  $a = a(n), b = b(n)$  be functions such that,  $0 \leq b < a \leq 1$ . Also, let  $f(n)$  be a function of  $n$ . Then the complexity class  $\text{QMA}_{f(n)}(k, a, b)$  consists of languages  $L$  for which there exists a quantum polynomial time verifier  $V$  such that for any  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ ,*

- *Completeness: If  $x \in L$  then there are  $O(f(n))$ -qubit states  $|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_k\rangle$ , such that  $\text{Pr}(V(|x\rangle|\psi_1\rangle \dots |\psi_k\rangle) \text{ accepts}) \geq a$ .*
- *Soundness: If  $x \notin L$  then for any  $O(f(n))$ -qubit states  $|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_k\rangle$  we have  $\text{Pr}(V(|x\rangle|\psi_1\rangle \dots |\psi_k\rangle) \text{ accepts}) \leq b$ .*

In other words,  $\text{QMA}_{f(n)}(k, a, b)$  contains all languages that have a quantum Merlin-Arthur protocol with  $k$  unentangled Merlins.

Here, when we don't mention the number  $k$  or function  $f(n)$  we mean that  $k = 1$  and  $f(n)$  is a polynomial of  $n$ . Other than the usual case  $f(n) = \text{poly}(n)$ ,  $f(n) = \log(n)$  is also of interest. Marriott and Watrous [11] considered  $f(n) = \log(n)$  for the first time.

**Theorem 2.1** [11]  $\text{QMA}_{\log} = \text{BQP}$ .

Proof of this theorem is based on an error amplification argument without increasing the size of witness. Such an error amplification is not known for  $\text{QMA}(2)$ . So, we get to a non-trivial complexity class  $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$ . Indeed, it is non-trivial because of the recent result of Blier and Tapp.

**Theorem 2.2** [4]  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{QMA}_{\log}(2, 1, 1 - \frac{1}{24n^6})$ .

## 2.2 2-out-of-4-SAT

To prove the containment  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$  we should find a protocol to solve some NP-complete problem in  $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$ . Although the most well-known such problem is 3-SAT, it is convenient for us to use another version of this problem called 2-out-of-4-SAT. We can formulate this problem as follows. Let  $|a_1\rangle, |a_2\rangle, \dots, |a_m\rangle$  be vectors of the form

$$|a_k\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n c_{ki} |i\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where  $c_{ki} = 0$  or  $\pm \frac{1}{2}$ , and for each  $k$  there are exactly four non-zero  $c_{ik}$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Now the problem is to decide whether there exists a vector  $|\psi\rangle$  orthogonal to all  $|a_k\rangle$ 's and of the form

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} |i\rangle. \quad (2)$$

**Lemma 2.1** [1] *There exists a polynomial time Karp reduction that maps a 3-SAT instance  $\alpha$  to a 2-out-of-4-SAT instance  $\beta$  such that*

- *If  $\alpha$  has  $n$  variables and  $m \geq n$  clauses, then  $\beta$  has  $O(\text{mpoly log}(m))$  variables and  $O(\text{mpoly log}(m))$  clauses.*
- *Every variable of  $\beta$  occurs in at most  $c$  clauses, for some constant  $c$ .*
- *The reduction is a PCP, meaning that satisfiable instances map to satisfiable instances, while unsatisfiable instances map to instances in which at most a constant fraction of the clauses can be satisfied at the same time.*

## 3 Complexity of recognizing entanglement

Let  $H$  be a hermitian matrix of polynomial size. Then, the problem of maximizing  $\langle \phi | H | \phi \rangle$  over all states  $|\phi\rangle$  is an eigenvalue problem and can be solved in polynomial time. Now assume that we are restricting  $|\phi\rangle$  to be a separable state. Then it is an NP-hard problem due to the following observation by Gurvits [5].

Let  $H$  be of the form

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & B_1 & \cdots & B_s \\ B_1 & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ B_s & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (3)$$

where  $B_i$ ,  $1 \leq i \leq s$ , is a hermitian matrix. Then

$$\langle \psi | \langle \phi | H | \phi \rangle | \psi \rangle = \langle \phi | H (|\psi\rangle) | \phi \rangle,$$

where

$$H(|\psi\rangle) = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & \langle \psi | B_1 | \psi \rangle & \cdots & \langle \psi | B_s | \psi \rangle \\ \langle \psi | B_1 | \psi \rangle & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ \langle \psi | B_s | \psi \rangle & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}. \quad (4)$$

It means that the maximum of  $\langle \psi | \langle \phi | H | \phi \rangle | \psi \rangle$ , for a fixed  $|\psi\rangle$  is equal to the maximum eigenvalue of  $H(|\psi\rangle)$ .  $H(|\psi\rangle)$  is a rank 2 matrix with eigenvalues 0 and  $\pm(\langle \psi | B_1 | \psi \rangle^2 + \cdots + \langle \psi | B_s | \psi \rangle^2)^{1/2}$ . Therefore

$$\max_{|\phi\rangle, |\psi\rangle} \langle \psi | \langle \phi | H | \phi \rangle | \psi \rangle = \max_{|\psi\rangle} [\langle \psi | B_1 | \psi \rangle^2 + \cdots + \langle \psi | B_s | \psi \rangle^2]^{1/2}. \quad (5)$$

Now note that given the maximum point  $|\phi\rangle, |\psi\rangle$ , a quantum polynomial time verifier can compute  $\langle \psi | \langle \phi | H | \phi \rangle | \psi \rangle$ , or equivalently the left hand side of (5). Therefore proving that computing the left hand side is NP-hard is equivalent to  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$ . Although this is known [3], we have to change the  $\text{QMA}_{\log(n)}(2)$  protocol to get a larger gap.

## 4 $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$

In this section we prove our main result.

**Theorem 4.1** *For every constant  $\epsilon > 0$ ,  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{QMA}_{\log}(2, a, a - \frac{1}{n^{3+\epsilon}})$ , for some  $a$  independent of  $\epsilon$ .*

To prove this theorem we give a Merlin-Arthur protocol for the 2-out-of-4-SAT problem. This protocol consists of two parts. First, given a satisfying assignment we should check whether this state is a *proper state*, that is a state the form (2). Second, we should check whether it is orthogonal to all vectors in the 2-out-of-4-SAT instance. We state these parts in two lemmas.

**Lemma 4.1** *Let  $\epsilon > 0$  be a constant. Then there exists a Merlin-Arthur protocol in which Merlins send state  $|\phi\rangle, |\psi\rangle$  and Arthur can check whether  $|\psi\rangle$  is  $(5n^{-\epsilon/4})$ -close, in trace distance, to a proper state. More precisely, if  $|\psi\rangle$  is proper then Arthur accepts with probability*

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3n} \left(2 - \frac{2}{n}\right)^{1/2},$$

*and if it is not  $(5n^{-\epsilon/4})$ -close to a proper state then he rejects with probability*

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3n} \left(2 - \frac{2}{n}\right)^{1/2} - \frac{1}{20n^{3+\epsilon}}.$$

Now consider an instance  $\alpha$  of 3-SAT. Arthur can reduce  $\alpha$  to an instance  $\beta$  of 2-out-of-4-SAT with the conditions in Lemma 2.1, and ask Merlin to send him a satisfying assignment. Then if  $\beta$  is satisfiable, Arthur by measuring Merlin's state can verify whether it is orthogonal to  $|a_k\rangle$ 's or not. This idea is elaborated by Aaronson et al. to give a protocol for checking whether a given proper state is a satisfying assignment for  $\beta$  or not.

**Lemma 4.2** [1] *Let us assume that Merlin is restricted to send a proper state. Then Arthur can solve 3-SAT with perfect completeness and constant soundness.*

□

The following corollary is a straightforward consequence of this lemma.

**Corollary 4.1** [1] *Let us assume that Merlin is restricted to send a state that is  $\delta$ -close, in trace distance, to a proper state, for a constant  $\delta > 0$ . Then Arthur can solve 3-SAT with perfect completeness and constant soundness.*

□

**Proof of Theorem 4.1:** Given a 3-SAT instance  $\alpha$  Arthur reduces it to a 2-out-of-4-SAT instance  $\beta$  over  $m$  variables using Lemma 2.1, and asks Merlins to send him  $|\phi\rangle|\psi\rangle$  where  $|\psi\rangle$  is a satisfying assignment for  $\beta$ . Then he applies one of the tests in Lemmas 4.1 or 4.2, each with probability  $1/2$ .

If  $|\psi\rangle$  is not  $(5m^{-\epsilon'/4})$ -close to a proper state, for some  $\epsilon > \epsilon' > 0$ , Arthur rejects the test in Lemma 4.1 with probability  $\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3m}(2 - \frac{2}{m})^{1/2} - \frac{1}{20m^{3+\epsilon'}}$ . On the other hand, if it is  $(5m^{-\epsilon'/4})$ -close to a proper state while not a satisfying assignment then Arthur rejects the test of Lemma 4.2 and Corollary 4.1 with constant probability. Therefore,  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{QMA}_{\log}(2, a, b)$ , where

$$a = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3m} \left( 2 - \frac{2}{m} \right)^{1/2} \right],$$

and

$$b = \frac{1}{2} \left[ 1 + \frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3m} \left( 2 - \frac{2}{m} \right)^{1/2} \right] - \frac{1}{n^{3+\epsilon}}.$$

Here we replace  $\epsilon'$  with  $\epsilon$ , to consider the poly-logarithmic blowup in the size of problem by reducing it from a 3-SAT instance to a 2-out-of-4-SAT instance, and also to get ride of the constants in Lemma 4.1.

□

So the only remaining part is the proof of Lemma 4.1.

#### 4.1 Proof of Lemma 4.1

For any  $1 \leq i < j \leq n$ , define the hermitian matrices

$$B_{ij} = |i\rangle\langle j| + |j\rangle\langle i|.$$

Let

$$H = \begin{pmatrix} 0 & B_{1,2} & \cdots & B_{(n-1)n} \\ B_{1,2} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots & \ddots & \vdots \\ B_{(n-1)n} & 0 & \cdots & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (6)$$

be a hermitian matrix. A simple calculation shows that  $\lambda$  is an eigenvalue of  $H$  iff  $\lambda^2$  is an eigenvalue of  $\sum_{i,j} B_{ij}^2$ . Then,  $\|H\|$ , the norm of matrix  $H$ , is

$$\|H\|^2 = \left\| \sum_{i,j} B_{ij}^2 \right\| \leq \sum_{i,j} \|B_{ij}\|^2 = \binom{n}{2} \leq n^2.$$

Therefore,  $\frac{1}{2}I + \frac{1}{3n}H$  is a hermitian positive semi-definite matrix, and in fact a  $O(\log(n))$ -local Hamiltonian, with norm  $\|\frac{1}{2}I + \frac{1}{3n}H\| < 1$ . Then by the idea of [8, 2] having the state  $|\phi\rangle|\psi\rangle$  Arthur can throw a coin with probability of head being  $\langle\psi|\langle\phi|\frac{1}{2}I + \frac{1}{3n}H|\phi\rangle|\psi\rangle$  and accept if it was head. Then by (5) the probability of accepting is at most

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3n} \max_{|\psi\rangle} \left[ \sum_{i,j} \langle\psi|B_{ij}|\psi\rangle^2 \right]^{1/2}. \quad (7)$$

Now we need the following lemma.

**Lemma 4.3**  $\sum_{i,j} \langle\psi|B_{ij}|\psi\rangle^2 \leq 2 - \frac{2}{n}$ , and equality holds iff  $|\psi\rangle$  is a proper state. Also if

$$\sum_{i,j} \langle\psi|B_{ij}|\psi\rangle^2 \geq 2 - \frac{2}{n} - \frac{1}{n^{2+\epsilon}}, \quad (8)$$

then  $|\psi\rangle$  is  $(5n^{-\epsilon/4})$ -close to a proper state in trace distance.

Using this lemma the probability of accepting is at most

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3n} \left(2 - \frac{2}{n}\right)^{1/2},$$

and if it is greater than

$$\frac{1}{2} + \frac{1}{3n} \left(2 - \frac{2}{n}\right)^{1/2} - \frac{1}{20n^{3+\epsilon}},$$

then by Lemma 4.3,  $|\psi\rangle$  is  $(5n^{-\epsilon/4})$ -close to a proper state.

So it remains to prove Lemma 4.3.

**Proof of Lemma 4.3:** Let

$$|\psi\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n x_i |i\rangle.$$

Then

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{i,j} \langle\psi|B_{ij}|\psi\rangle^2 &= \sum_{i<j} (\bar{x}_i x_j + x_i \bar{x}_j)^2 \\ &= \sum_{i<j} \bar{x}_i^2 x_j^2 + x_i^2 \bar{x}_j^2 + 2|x_i|^2 |x_j|^2 \\ &= \left(\sum_i \bar{x}_i^2\right) \left(\sum_i x_i^2\right) - \sum_i |x_i|^4 + 2 \sum_{i<j} |x_i|^2 |x_j|^2 \\ &= \left|\sum_i x_i^2\right|^2 + \left(\sum_i |x_i|^2\right)^2 - 2 \sum_i |x_i|^4. \end{aligned}$$

Now using  $\sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|^2 = 1$ ,

$$\sum_i |x_i|^4 \geq \frac{1}{n}, \quad (9)$$

and

$$\left| \sum_i x_i^2 \right|^2 \leq 1, \quad (10)$$

we find that  $\sum_{i,j} \langle \psi | B_{ij} | \psi \rangle^2 \leq 2 - \frac{2}{n}$ , and equality holds iff  $x_j^2 = e^{i\theta} \frac{1}{n}$ ,  $1 \leq j \leq n$ , for a constant  $\theta$ , or equivalently iff  $|\psi\rangle$  is a proper state.

Now assume that (8) holds. Then by (9) and (10) we have

$$\sum_i |x_i|^4 \leq \frac{1}{n} + \frac{1}{n^{2+\epsilon}}. \quad (11)$$

and

$$\left| \sum_i x_i^2 \right|^2 \geq 1 - \frac{1}{n^{2+\epsilon}}. \quad (12)$$

Note that

$$\sum_i (|x_i|^2 - \frac{1}{n})^2 = \sum_i (|x_i|^4 + \frac{1}{n^2} - \frac{2}{n}|x_i|^2) = \sum_i |x_i|^4 - \frac{1}{n}.$$

Therefore by (11), for every  $i$

$$\left| |x_i|^2 - \frac{1}{n} \right| \leq \frac{1}{n^{1+\delta}}, \quad (13)$$

where  $\delta = \epsilon/2$ . Then for sufficiently large  $n$

$$\left| |x_i| - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n^{1+\delta}}. \quad (14)$$

Also using (12) we have

$$\left| \sum_i |x_i|^2 \right|^2 - \left| \sum_i x_i^2 \right|^2 \leq \frac{1}{n^{2+\epsilon}},$$

and then

$$|x_i x_j|^2 - \operatorname{Re} x_i^2 \bar{x}_j^2 \leq \frac{1}{n^{2+\epsilon}}, \quad (15)$$

for any  $i$  and  $j$ .

Now let  $x_j = s_j r_j e^{i\theta_j}$ , where  $s_j \in \{+1, -1\}$ ,  $r_j$  is a non-negative real number, and  $-\frac{\pi}{2} < \theta_j \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ . Then by (14)

$$\left| r_i - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n^{1+\delta}}. \quad (16)$$

Also by (13) and (15)

$$1 - \operatorname{Re} e^{2i(\theta_k - \theta_j)} \leq \frac{1}{n^{2+\epsilon}} \left( \frac{1}{n} - \frac{1}{n^{1+\delta}} \right)^{-2} = (n^\delta - 1)^{-2} \leq \frac{2}{n^\epsilon}, \quad (17)$$

for sufficiently large  $n$ . Without loss of generality, we may assume that  $\theta_1 = 0$  and then for any  $j$  we have

$$1 - \operatorname{Re} e^{2i\theta_j} \leq \frac{2}{n^\epsilon}, \quad (18)$$

and since  $-\frac{\pi}{2} < \theta_j \leq \frac{\pi}{2}$ ,

$$1 - \operatorname{Re} e^{i\theta_j} \leq \frac{2}{n^\epsilon}. \quad (19)$$

Now using  $(\operatorname{Re} e^{i\theta_j})^2 + (\operatorname{Im} e^{i\theta_j})^2 = 1$ , it is easy to see that

$$|1 - e^{i\theta_j}| \leq \frac{4}{n^\delta}. \quad (20)$$

Therefore using (16) and (20)

$$|r_j e^{i\theta_j} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}| \leq |r_j - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}| + |r_j(1 - e^{i\theta_j})| \quad (21)$$

$$\leq \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n^{1+\delta}} + \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} + \frac{\sqrt{n}}{n^{1+\delta}}\right) \frac{4}{n^\delta}, \quad (22)$$

or

$$|r_j e^{i\theta_j} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}}| \leq \frac{10\sqrt{n}}{n^{1+\delta}}. \quad (23)$$

Now define the proper state

$$|\phi\rangle = \sum_j \frac{s_j}{\sqrt{n}} |j\rangle.$$

We have

$$|\langle\phi|\psi\rangle| = \left| \sum_j \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} s_j^2 r_j e^{i\theta_j} \right| \quad (24)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left| \sum_j r_j e^{i\theta_j} \right| \quad (25)$$

$$\geq \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left( \sqrt{n} - \left| \sum_j r_j e^{i\theta_j} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \right| \right). \quad (26)$$

Using (23) we get

$$|\langle\phi|\psi\rangle| \geq 1 - \sqrt{n} \frac{10\sqrt{n}}{n^{1+\delta}} = 1 - \frac{10}{n^\delta}. \quad (27)$$

Therefore,

$$\|\psi - \phi\|_{tr} = (1 - |\langle\phi|\psi\rangle|^2)^{1/2} \leq \left(\frac{20}{n^\delta}\right)^{1/2} < 5n^{-\delta/2}, \quad (28)$$

and we are done.  $\square$

## 5 Conclusion

Although the gap in our  $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$  protocol for NP is larger than the gap in the proof of Blier and Tapp ( $\frac{1}{n^{3+\epsilon}}$  versus  $\frac{1}{24n^\delta}$ ), their protocol has one-sided error. So, one direction to improve this result is to turn it to a protocol with perfect completeness.

Another open question is that whether this gap is optimal, or whether we can find a constant gap  $\text{QMA}_{\log}(2)$  protocol for NP. This question is related to the question of whether recognizing states that are  $\delta$ -close to a separable state, for some *constant*  $\delta > 0$ , is NP-hard or not.

**Acknowledgement.** The author is thankful of Peter Shor for helpful discussions.



## References

- [1] S. Aaronson, S. Beigi, A. Drucker, B. Fefferman and P. Shor, *The Power of Unentanglement*, arXiv:0804.0802
- [2] Dorit Aharonov and Tomer Naveh, *Quantum NP - A Survey*, quant-ph/0210077
- [3] A. Ben-Tal and A. Nemirovski, *Robust convex optimization*, Mathematics of Operational Research, Vol. 23, 4 (1998), 769-805.
- [4] Hugue Blier and Alain Tapp, *All languages in NP have very short quantum proofs*, quant-ph/0709.0738
- [5] Leonid Gurvits, *Classical deterministic complexity of Edmonds' problem and Quantum Entanglement*, quant-ph/0303055
- [6] J. Kempe, A. Kitaev, and O. Regev, *The Complexity of the Local Hamiltonian Problem*, SIAM Journal of Computing, Vol. 35(5), p. 1070-1097 (2006)
- [7] J. Kempe and O. Regev, *3-Local Hamiltonian is QMA-complete*, Quantum Inf. Comput., 3(3):258-264, 2003
- [8] A. Kitaev, A. Shen, and M. N. Vyalyi, *Classical and Quantum Computation*, American Mathematical Society, 2002
- [9] Hiro tada Kobayashi, Keiji Matsumoto, Tomoyuki Yamakami, *Quantum Certificate Verification: Single versus Multiple Quantum Certificates*, quant-ph/0110006
- [10] Hiro tada Kobayashi, Keiji Matsumoto, Tomoyuki Yamakami, *Quantum Merlin-Arthur Proof Systems: Are Multiple Merlins More Helpful to Arthur?*, quant-ph/0306051
- [11] Chris Marriott, John Watrous, *Quantum Arthur-Merlin Games*, Computational Complexity, 14(2): 122 - 152, 2005
- [12] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000
- [13] C. H. Papadimitriou, *Computational Complexity*, Addison-Wesley Publishing Company, Inc., 1994.
- [14] Michael Sipser, *Introduction to the Theory of Computation*, PWS Publishing Company, 2005
- [15] J. Watrous, *Succinct quantum proofs for properties of finite groups*, Proceedings of IEEE FOCS'2000, pp. 537-546, 2000