

Picturing Counting Reductions with the ZH-Calculus

Tuomas Laakkonen^{1,a}, Konstantinos Meichanetzidis^{1,b}, John van de Wetering^{2,c}

¹ Quantinuum, 17 Beaumont Street, Oxford OX1 2NA, United Kingdom

² Informatics Institute, University of Amsterdam, 1098 XH Amsterdam, The Netherlands

^{a,b} {tuomas.laakkonen, k.mei}@quantinuum.com, ^c john@vdwetering.name

Counting the solutions to Boolean formulae defines the problem **#SAT**, which is complete for the complexity class **#P**. We use the ZH-calculus, a universal and complete graphical language for linear maps which naturally encodes counting problems in terms of diagrams, to give graphical reductions from **#SAT** to several related counting problems. Some of these graphical reductions, like to **#2SAT**, are substantially simpler than known reductions via the matrix permanent. Additionally, our approach allows us to consider the case of counting solutions modulo an integer on equal footing. Finally, since the ZH-calculus was originally introduced to reason about quantum computing, we show that the problem of evaluating scalar ZH-diagrams in the fragment corresponding to the Clifford+T gate set, is in **FP^{#P}**. Our results show that graphical calculi represent an intuitive and useful framework for reasoning about counting problems.

Graphical calculi like the ZX-calculus [15, 16] are seeing increased usage in reasoning about quantum computations. While earlier work in this area has mostly focused on *representing* existing quantum protocols and quantum algorithms in a graphical way in order to shed light on how these protocols work [17, 18, 26, 27, 33, 38, 39, 57, 66], recent years have seen the development of entirely new results that improve upon the existing state-of-the-art. For instance, there are now new results proved with a graphical calculus in quantum circuit optimization [5, 9, 20, 21, 25, 42], verification [13, 42, 49] and simulation [14, 43, 44, 48, 61], as well as new protocols in measurement-based quantum computing [4, 11, 41], surface codes [6, 30–32, 37] and other fault-tolerant architectures [51, 58].

These results in quantum computing show that diagrammatic reasoning can lead to new insights and algorithms that go beyond what is known or what even can be derived using other methods. However, these graphical languages are in actuality not restricted to just studying quantum computing. In fact, diagrams, the objects of a graphical calculus, can represent arbitrary tensor networks, which can represent arbitrary 2^n -dimensional tensors and so they can be used for a wide variety of problems. Whereas one would in general perform tensor contractions in order to compute with tensor networks, a graphical calculus equips its diagrams with a formal rewrite system, which respects their tensor semantics, and allows for reasoning in terms of two-dimensional algebra.

In this work, we focus on *counting problems* which are of both practical and theoretical importance for a variety of domains, from computing partition functions in statistical mechanics [52], to probabilistic reasoning [56] and planning [10]. The computational complexity of counting problems is of fundamental interest to computer science [55]. Counting problems also have a natural tensor network representation [29], and the complexity of computing with tensor networks has been thoroughly studied [23]. In practice, tensor contraction algorithms for counting problems have been developed, showing competitive performance against the state of the art [34, 45].

Graphical languages like the ZX-calculus, and its close relative, the ZH-calculus, have been used to rederive complexity-theoretic results. Townsend-Teague *et al.* [59] showed that the partition function of a family of Potts models, related to knot theory and quantum computation, is efficiently computable. de Beaudrap *et al.* [24] proved graphically that the decision version of a hard counting problem can be

solved in polynomial time. These proofs are constructive, in that they introduce algorithms in terms of rewriting strategies. Even though this line of work recasts known results in a graphical language, such an approach is arguably more unifying and intuitive, and thus has promising potential for generalization. Recent work by Laakkonen *et al.* [48] actually derived a *novel* complexity-theoretic result in the form of an improved runtime upper bound for counting problems. To obtain this result, reductions to specific counting problems were given a fully graphical treatment, to which then a known algorithm could be applied, after this algorithm was also treated graphically and generalized.

In this work, we continue building on this programme of applying graphical methods to counting. Specifically, we use the ZH-calculus to rederive various counting reductions that appear in the literature, providing a unified, and arguably simpler, presentation. Among others, we give reductions from **#SAT** to **#2SAT**, **#Planar-SAT** and **#Monotone-SAT**. See Table 1 for an overview. Our direct proof that **#2SAT** is **#P**-complete also allows us to considerably simplify the proof that computing the permanent of an integer matrix is **#P**-complete. Our results show that graphical languages can form a useful tool for the study of counting complexity.

In Section 1 we introduce the basics of counting complexity, the ZH-calculus and how to represent **#SAT** in ZH. Then in Section 2 we present our main reductions from **#SAT** by rewriting ZH-diagrams. Section 3 considers the converse problem of reducing ZH-diagram evaluation to **#SAT**. We conclude in Section 4, but note that we also present some additional reductions and proofs in the appendices.

1 Preliminaries

1.1 Counting reductions

Counting complexity is defined in terms of the complexity classes **#P** and **#_MP**, which are the ‘counting analogues’ of **NP**. The class **#P**, first defined by Valiant in 1979 [62], is the class of problems which can be defined as counting the number of accepting paths to a non-deterministic Turing machine (NTM) which halts in polynomial time, whereas **#_MP** is the class of problems which can be defined as counting, modulo M , the number of accepting paths to an NTM (that also halts in polynomial time). Note that the notation $\bigoplus \mathbf{P}$ is also used to indicate **#₂P**. These complexity classes are clearly related to **NP**, which consists of problems that can be defined as deciding whether an NTM has *any* accepting path.

Famously, the Boolean satisfiability problem **SAT** is **NP**-complete [19]. Similarly, there are notions of **#P**-completeness and **#_MP**-completeness [62]. A problem \mathcal{A} is **#P**-hard (**#_MP**-hard) if any problem in **#P** (**#_MP**) can be solved in polynomial time given an oracle for \mathcal{A} (that is, there exists a Cook reduction from any problem in **#P** to \mathcal{A}). A problem \mathcal{A} is **#P**-complete (**#_MP**-complete) if it is both **#P**-hard (**#_MP**-hard) and is in **#P** (**#_MP**).

Definition 1. Suppose $\phi : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ is a Boolean formula in Conjunctive Normal Form (CNF),

$$\phi(x_1, \dots, x_n) = \bigwedge_{i=1}^m (c_{i1} \vee c_{i2} \vee \dots \vee c_{ik_i}) \quad (1)$$

where $c_{ij} = x_l$ or $\neg x_l$ for some l , and let $\#(\phi) = |\{\vec{x} \mid \phi(\vec{x}) = 1\}|$. Each argument to ϕ is called a *variable* and each term $c_{i1} \wedge \dots \wedge c_{ik_i}$ a *clause*. Then, we define the following problems:

1. **SAT**: Decide whether $\#(\phi) > 0$,
2. **#SAT**: Compute the value of $\#(\phi)$,
3. **#_MSAT**: Compute the value of $\#_M(\phi) := \#(\phi) \bmod M$.

We additionally define variants, **kSAT**, **#kSAT**, **#_MkSAT**, which represent the case where ϕ is restricted to contain only clauses of size at most k (note that some sources take this to be size *exactly* k , but we can recover this from our definition by adding dummy variables to each clause). We also take \oplus **SAT** as alternate notation for **#₂SAT**.

To each formula ϕ we associate two graphs: the *incidence graph* is a bipartite graph with one vertex for each variable and one for each clause, and where a variable vertex is connected to a clause vertex if it occurs in that clause. The *primal graph* has one vertex for each variable, which are connected together if the variables occur together in a clause.

The Cook-Levin theorem [19] shows that **kSAT** is **NP**-complete for $k \geq 3$, but in fact also shows that **#kSAT** is **#P**-complete and **#_MkSAT** is **#_MP**-complete for any M , as it maps any NTM into a Boolean formula such that the number of satisfying assignments is exactly equal to the number of accepting paths. We will consider variants on these problems, and specifically the case where the structure of the formula ϕ is restricted in some way. For each of these variants, we will append a prefix to **SAT** to indicate the restriction:

- **PL**: The incidence graph of the formula is planar.
- **MON**: The formula is monotone - it contains either no negated variables or no unnegated variables.
- **BI**: The primal graph is bipartite - the variables can be partitioned into two sets such that each clause contains at most one variable from each set.

1.2 The ZH-calculus

The ZH-calculus is a rigorous graphical language for reasoning about ZH-diagrams in terms of rewriting [2]. We will give here a short introduction, referring the reader to [69, Section 8] for a more in-depth explanation.

ZH-diagrams represent tensor networks [54, Section 4.1] composed of the two generators of the language, the Z-spider and the H-box. The generators and their corresponding tensor interpretations are

$$\begin{aligned}
 \begin{array}{c} \sigma_1 \\ \sigma_2 \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_n \end{array} &= \delta_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_n} = \begin{cases} 1 & \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \dots = \sigma_n \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \\
 \begin{array}{c} \sigma_1 \\ \sigma_2 \\ \vdots \\ \sigma_n \end{array} &= 1 + (a - 1)\delta_{\sigma_1 \sigma_2 \dots \sigma_n} = \begin{cases} a & 1 = \sigma_1 = \sigma_2 = \dots = \sigma_n \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}
 \end{aligned} \tag{2}$$

where the H-box is labeled with a constant $a \in \mathbb{C}$, and we assume $a = -1$ if not given. The tensors corresponding to the generators are composed according to the tensor product and each wire connecting two tensors indicates a contraction, i.e. a summation over a common index [69]. We will also use two derived generators - the Z-spider with a phase, and the X-spider. These are given in terms of the other generators as:

$$\begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \vdots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} e^{i\alpha} \\ \vdots \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \alpha \\ \vdots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \frac{1}{2} \\ \alpha \\ \vdots \end{array} \tag{3}$$

Note that the tensors are symmetric under permutation of their wires, or indices. This implies that only the connectivity, or the topology, of the tensor network matters. In particular, we will not distinguish

indices of generators as inputs and outputs as in [2]. Any ZH-diagram with n open wires therefore represents a tensor with n indices. In the special case of no open wires this represents a scalar, and we will call such diagrams scalar diagrams.

The rewriting rules of the ZH-calculus are shown in Appendix A. The rules are *sound*, i.e. they respect the tensor semantics, and also *complete* for complex-valued linear maps, i.e. if two ZH-diagrams represent the same tensor, then there exists a sequence of rewrites which transforms one diagram to the other.

1.3 #SAT instances as ZH-diagrams

To embed #SAT instances into ZH-diagrams, we use the translation of de Beaudrap *et al.* [24] where each variable becomes a Z-spider, each clause a zero-labeled H-box, and X-spiders are used for negation. In particular the mapping is as follows

$$\text{Variables} \iff \begin{array}{c} \cdots \\ \circ \end{array} \quad \text{Clauses} \iff \begin{array}{c} \boxed{0} \\ \pi \quad \pi \\ \cdots \end{array} \quad \text{Negation} \iff \begin{array}{c} \pi \\ | \end{array} \quad (4)$$

and to form #SAT instances, we combine these as

$$\#(\phi) = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{0} \quad \cdots \quad \boxed{0} \\ \pi \quad \cdots \quad \pi \quad \pi \quad \cdots \quad \pi \\ \hline G \\ \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \end{array} \quad (5)$$

where G is a collection of wires and negations, connecting each variable to its corresponding clauses. Due to cancellation of adjacent X-spiders, an instance has an X-spider between a variable and a clause if the variable appears *unnegated* in that clause, and a wire if it appears negated. For example, for the formula $\phi(x_1, x_2, x_3) = (x_1 \vee \neg x_2 \vee \neg x_3) \wedge (x_2 \vee x_3) \wedge (\neg x_1 \vee \neg x_2)$, we have:

$$\#(\phi) = \begin{array}{c} \boxed{0} \quad \boxed{0} \quad \boxed{0} \\ \pi \quad \pi \quad \pi \\ \swarrow \quad \downarrow \quad \searrow \\ \circ \quad \circ \quad \circ \\ x_1 \quad x_2 \quad x_3 \end{array} \quad (6)$$

In this representation, a formula that is planar corresponds to a planar ZH-diagram and a monotone one corresponds to a ZH-diagram where there are no X-spiders or where there is an X-spider between every H-box and Z-spider. Instances with maximum clause size k correspond to ZH-diagrams where every H-box has degree at most k .

2 Reductions from #SAT

We will show using the ZH-calculus that the restricted versions of #SAT defined above—planar, monotone or bipartite—are #P- and/or #_MP-complete - Table 1 gives an overview of our reductions. All these results are already known in the literature, as will be discussed in each section, but our main contribution is to provide a simplifying and unifying viewpoint through the use of the ZH-calculus.

<i>Result</i>	<i>Reduction</i>	$\#_k\mathbf{P}$	\mathbf{NP}	$\mathbf{PL-}$	$\#2\mathbf{SAT}$	$\mathbf{MON-}$	$\mathbf{BI-}$	$\mathbf{3DEG-}$
Theorem 1	$\#SAT \rightarrow \#PL-SAT$	✓	✓	✓				
Theorem 2	$\#SAT \rightarrow \#2SAT$	✓		✓	✓		✓	
Theorem 3	$\#SAT \rightarrow \#MON-SAT$	†		✓	✓	✓		
Theorem 6	$\#SAT \rightarrow \#3DEG-SAT$	✓		✓	✓	✓	✓	✓

Table 1: An overview of the main reductions presented in this paper. The two leftmost columns give each theorem and the corresponding reduction. The middle columns (marked $\#_k\mathbf{P}$, and \mathbf{NP}) are given a checkmark if the corresponding reduction is valid for that complexity class as well as for $\#P$. A dagger is written for $\#_k\mathbf{P}$ if there are some additional restrictions placed on k . The rightmost columns (marked $\mathbf{PL-}$, etc) show what structure each reduction preserves - a checkmark is given if the corresponding reduction preserves the properties of the given $\#SAT$ variant (here $\#2SAT$ indicates that the maximum clause size is two), i.e. the reduction presented in Theorem 2 sends planar instances to planar instances, but does not send monotone instances to monotone instances. This applies for each complexity class that reduction is valid for (e.g Theorem 2 also implies a reduction $\#_k\mathbf{PL-SAT} \rightarrow \#_k\mathbf{PL-2SAT}$).

2.1 $\#SAT \rightarrow \#PL-SAT$

The first, and most commonly taught, proof that $\mathbf{PL-SAT}$ is \mathbf{NP} -complete was published in 1982 by Lichtenstein [50]. This reduction is parsimonious - every satisfying assignment of the original formula corresponds to one satisfying assignment of the planar formula. Hence, this proves also that $\#PL-SAT$ and $\#_M\mathbf{PL-SAT}$ are complete for $\#P$ and $\#_M\mathbf{P}$. Lichtenstein’s construction uses a large gadget to eliminate non-planarity. In the following construction, we derive a similar gadget from first principles, by building on a famous identity from quantum computing.

Lemma 1. For any $\phi \in \#kSAT$ with n variables and m clauses and $k \geq 3$, there is a planar $\phi' \in \#kSAT$ such that $\#(\phi) = \#(\phi')$. Furthermore, ϕ' has $O(n^2m^2)$ variables and clauses, and is computable in $O(\text{poly}(n, m))$ time.

Proof. Any instance $\phi \in \#kSAT$ can be drawn in the plane as a ZH-diagram with some number of crossing wires. By using the famous identity that a SWAP gate can be written as the composition of 3 CNOTs, we have that [53]:

$$\text{Diagram of SWAP gate} = \text{Diagram of 3 CNOT gates} \tag{7}$$

We now need to rewrite the X-spider, which represents a classical XOR function, into CNF for this to be a valid $\#SAT$ instance. Unfortunately, the direct translation via the Tseytin transformation [60] does not preserve planarity. However, we can instead use the following decomposition of an XOR as NAND gates, which is planar:

$$\text{Diagram of X-spider} = \text{Diagram of NAND gate circuit} \tag{8}$$

Finally, NAND gates themselves have the following planar Tseytin transformation [60] into CNF:

$$(9)$$

Therefore, applying this to ϕ gives ϕ' with $n + 12c$ variables and $m + 36c$ clauses where c is the number of crossings. If the ϕ is drawn with straight-line wires only, then since there are at most nm wires in the diagram and each pair can cross at most once, we have $c \leq O(n^2m^2)$. As this rewrite introduces only clauses of size three or less, ϕ' is still a **#kSAT** instance. \square

Theorem 1. We have the following:

1. **#PL-kSAT** and **#PL-SAT** are **#P**-complete for any $k \geq 3$.
2. **#_MPL-kSAT** and **#_MPL-SAT** are **#_MP**-complete for any $M \geq 2$ and $k \geq 3$.
3. **PL-kSAT** and **PL-SAT** are **NP**-complete for any $k \geq 3$.

Proof.

1. This follows immediately from Lemma 1 since the size of the rewriting does not depend on the clause size.
2. This also follows from Lemma 1, since $\#(\phi) = \#(\phi')$ implies $\#_M(\phi) = \#_M(\phi')$ for any M .
3. This follows immediately from Lemma 1 since if $\#(\phi) = \#(\phi')$ implies that ϕ is satisfiable if and only if ϕ' is satisfiable. \square

2.2 #SAT to #2SAT

While it is known that **#2SAT** is **#P**-complete [64], the proof by Valiant relies on a chain of reductions from **#SAT** to the permanent of an integer matrix, to the permanent of a binary matrix, to counting perfect matchings in graphs, to counting all matchings in graphs, and then finally to **#MON-BI-2SAT**. Moreover, this proof does not generalize to the case of **#_MP** - in fact, proof that \oplus **2SAT** is \oplus **P**-complete was only shown 27 years later in 2006 using a completely different method of holographic reductions [65], and then a reduction for any fixed M was given in 2008 by Faben [28]. In this section we give a simple direct reduction from **#SAT** to **#2SAT** that applies both for **#P** and **#_MP**.

Lemma 2 [48, Lemma 3.3]. The following equivalence holds:

$$(10)$$

Lemma 3. For any $M = 2^r + 1$ with $r \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\phi \in \#_M\mathbf{SAT}$ with n variables and m clauses, there is a $\phi' \in \#_M\mathbf{2SAT}$ with $O(n + mr)$ variables such that $\#_M(\phi) = \#_M(\phi')$, and ϕ' can be computed in $O(\text{poly}(n, m, r))$ time.

Proof. By evaluating the tensors, we have $\circ \boxed{0} \pi - = \boxed{2} -$ and therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \circ \boxed{0} &= \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \pi \boxed{0} \\ \vdots \end{array} \pi = \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \pi \boxed{0} \\ \vdots \end{array} \circ \boxed{-1} \equiv \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \pi \boxed{0} \\ \vdots \end{array} \circ \boxed{2^r} \pmod{2^r + 1} \\
 &\stackrel{M}{=} \left. \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \pi \boxed{0} \\ \vdots \end{array} \circ \begin{array}{c} \boxed{2} \\ \vdots \\ \boxed{2} \end{array} \right\} r \text{ copies} = \left. \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \pi \boxed{0} \\ \vdots \end{array} \circ \begin{array}{c} \pi \boxed{0} \\ \vdots \\ \pi \boxed{0} \end{array} \right\} r \text{ copies}
 \end{aligned} \tag{11}$$

In this way we can rewrite all of the clauses in ϕ to form a suitable ϕ' . □

Lemma 4. For any $M > 2$ and $\phi \in \#_M\text{SAT}$ with n variables and m clauses, there is a $\phi' \in \#_M\text{2SAT}$ with $O(n + mM)$ variables such that $\#_M(\phi) = \#_M(\phi')$, and ϕ' can be computed in $O(\text{poly}(n, m, M))$ time.

Proof. By evaluating the tensors, we have $\boxed{r} \circ \boxed{0} \pi - = \boxed{r+1} -$ for all $r \in \mathbb{C}$. Therefore:

$$\begin{aligned}
 \circ \boxed{0} &= \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \pi \boxed{0} \\ \vdots \end{array} \pi = \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \pi \boxed{0} \\ \vdots \end{array} \circ \boxed{-1} \equiv \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \pi \boxed{0} \\ \vdots \end{array} \circ \boxed{M-1} \pmod{M} \\
 &= \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \pi \boxed{0} \\ \vdots \end{array} \circ \underbrace{\begin{array}{c} \pi \boxed{0} \pi \boxed{0} \dots \pi \boxed{0} \boxed{1} \end{array}}_{M-2 \text{ copies}} \\
 &\stackrel{I,U}{=} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \pi \boxed{0} \\ \vdots \end{array} \circ \underbrace{\begin{array}{c} \pi \boxed{0} \circ \pi \boxed{0} \circ \dots \circ \end{array}}_{M-2 \text{ copies}}
 \end{aligned} \tag{12}$$

In this way we can rewrite all of the clauses in ϕ to form a suitable ϕ' . □

Theorem 2. We have the following:

1. $\#_M\text{2SAT}$ is $\#_M\text{P}$ -complete for any $M \geq 2$.
2. $\#2\text{SAT}$ is $\#\text{P}$ -complete.

Proof.

1. If $M = 2$, this follows from Lemma 3 with $r = 0$. If $M > 2$, then since M is fixed, this follows from Lemma 4.
2. For any $\phi \in \#\text{SAT}$ with n variables, note that $0 \leq \#(\phi) \leq 2^n$. Hence $\#(\phi) = \#_{2^n+1}(\phi)$, and so we can apply Lemma 3 with $r = n$ to generate $\phi' \in \#2\text{SAT}$ such that $\#(\phi) = \#_{2^n+1}(\phi') = \#(\phi') \pmod{2^n + 1}$ in polynomial time, giving a polynomial-time counting reduction from $\#\text{SAT}$ to $\#2\text{SAT}$. □

Corollary 1. $\#_M\text{PL-2SAT}$ is $\#_M\text{P}$ -complete for any $M \geq 2$, and $\#\text{PL-2SAT}$ is $\#\text{P}$ -complete.

Proof. Note that the reductions given in Lemmas 3 and 4 preserve the planarity of the input instance. Hence this follows by first applying Lemma 1 and then Theorem 2. □

Corollary 2. $\#_M\text{BI-2SAT}$ is $\#_M\text{P}$ -complete for any $M \geq 2$, and $\#\text{BI-2SAT}$ is $\#\text{P}$ -complete.

Proof. When we apply Lemmas 3 and 4, the $\#2\text{SAT}$ instance obtained will always be bipartite, so this follows from Theorem 2. We can see this as the primal graph has vertices in two groups: the set V of vertices corresponding to variables of the original formula, and the sets C_i of the vertices introduced to decompose clauses. The subgraph for each C_i is clearly bipartite, so let C_i^A and C_i^B be the corresponding partition. Each vertex in V only connects to at most one vertex c_i in each C_i , and assume without loss of generality that $c_i \in C_i^A$. Then the whole graph can be partitioned as $V \cup C_1^B \cup \dots \cup C_m^B$ and $C_1^A \cup \dots \cup C_m^A$, so it is bipartite. \square

2.3 $\#SAT \rightarrow \#MON-SAT$

While in the previous section we showed that $\#2\text{SAT}$ was $\#P$ -complete, other proofs [64] of this fact actually consider the subset $\#MON-BI-2SAT$. In this section we give a reduction from $\#SAT$ to $\#MON-SAT$, allowing us to remove negations from any CNF formula. This shows that our graphical method is not any less powerful than the reduction via the permanent, and we argue that this chain of reductions is more intuitive because it allows us to gradually restrict the formulae, rather than jumping straight to a highly restrictive variant.

Lemma 5. For any $r \geq 0$ and $\phi \in \#_{2^r}\text{SAT}$ with n variables, m clauses, and maximum clause size at least two, there is a monotone $\phi' \in \#_{2^r}\text{SAT}$ with $O(n + nmr)$ variables and $O(m + nmr)$ clauses such that $\#_{2^r}(\phi) = \#_{2^r}(\phi')$. Additionally, ϕ' preserves the maximum clause size of ϕ , and can be computed in $O(\text{poly}(n, m, r))$ time.

Proof. By evaluating the tensors, we have $\boxed{2} = \pi \boxed{0} \pi$ and therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \pi &= \pi \boxed{0} \pi \equiv \pi \boxed{0} \pi \equiv \pi \boxed{2^r} \pi \pmod{2^r} \\ &\stackrel{M}{\equiv} \pi \boxed{2} \dots \boxed{2} \pi \equiv \pi \boxed{0} \dots \boxed{0} \pi \equiv \pi \boxed{0} \dots \boxed{0} \pi \pmod{2^r} \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where the first equality follows from the Tseytin transformation of the NOT gate [60]. Thus we can remove every negation in ϕ as follows:

$$\pi \boxed{0} \pi \stackrel{SFZ}{\equiv} \pi \boxed{0} \pi \equiv \pi \boxed{0} \dots \boxed{0} \pi \pmod{2^r} \quad (14)$$

There are at most nm negations in ϕ , and each can be rewritten with $O(r)$ clauses and variables. Note that this rewrite introduces only clauses of size two, so the maximum clause size is preserved. \square

Theorem 3. We have the following:

1. $\#_{2^r}\text{MON-kSAT}$ and $\#_{2^r}\text{MON-SAT}$ are $\#_{2^r}\text{P}$ -complete for any $r \geq 0$ and $k \geq 2$.
2. $\#MON-kSAT$ and $\#MON-SAT$ are $\#P$ -complete for any $k \geq 2$.

Proof.

1. This follows immediately from Lemma 5. Since the transformation preserves maximum clause size, this holds for either bounded or unbounded clause size.
2. For any $\phi \in \#\mathbf{kSAT}$ with n variables and $k \geq 2$, note that $0 \leq \#(\phi) \leq 2^n$. Hence $\#(\phi) = \#_{2^{n+1}}(\phi)$, and so we can apply Lemma 5 with $r = n + 1$ to generate $\phi' \in \#\mathbf{MON-kSAT}$ such that $\#(\phi) = \#_{2^{n+1}}(\phi') = \#(\phi') \bmod 2^{n+1}$ in polynomial time, giving a polynomial-time counting reduction from $\#\mathbf{kSAT}$ to $\#\mathbf{MON-kSAT}$. The same argument also gives a reduction for $\#\mathbf{MON-SAT}$. \square

2.4 Other Reductions

Using similar methods we can also consider other restrictions of $\#\mathbf{SAT}$. For example, in Appendix B, we combine Theorems 1, 2, and 3 with further reductions to show that $\#\mathbf{MON-BI-PL-3DEG-2SAT}$, where $\mathbf{3DEG-}$ indicates each variable participates in at most three clauses, is $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete. This case is interesting because it is as small as possible - if we instead have each variable participate in only two clauses then this is in \mathbf{P} [22]. Indeed most upper bounds on runtime for $\#\mathbf{2SAT}$ have better special case for this type of formula [22, 67].

As phase-free ZH-diagrams naturally encode $\#\mathbf{SAT}$ instances, the ZH-calculus is mostly suited to treat variations on the $\#\mathbf{SAT}$ problem. To apply the technique of graphical reasoning to other (counting) problems, we hence may need to use other graphical calculi. In particular, in Appendix C, we show how the ZW-calculus [35] is naturally adapted to both the $\#\mathbf{XSAT}$ problem (of which $\#\mathbf{1-in-3SAT}$ is a special case) and the $\#\mathbf{PERFECT-MATCHINGS}$ problem, and use this shared structure to give graphical reductions showing that both are $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete. This complements the recent result of Carette *et al.* illustrating with the ZW-calculus that $\#\mathbf{PLANAR-PERFECT-MATCHINGS}$ is in \mathbf{P} [12].

While the reductions given above contribute to simplifying the literature in their own right, we can also derive other simplifications from them. For example, the original proof by Valiant [62] (and the simplification by Ben-Dor and Halevi [7]) that computing the permanent of a boolean matrix is $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete relies on a reduction from $\#\mathbf{3SAT}$. It would be simpler to reduce from $\#\mathbf{MON-2SAT}$, but the original proof that $\#\mathbf{MON-2SAT}$ is $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete relies on a reduction from the permanent, so this would be circular.

However, by Theorems 2 and 3 we have $\#\mathbf{P}$ -completeness for $\#\mathbf{MON-2SAT}$ independent of the permanent. This then allows us to give an alternate, simpler proof that computing the permanent of an integer matrix is $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete, which we present in Appendix D. In the original proof of Ben-Dor and Halevi [7], they construct for a given $\#\mathbf{3SAT}$ instance a weighted directed graph with two cycles per variable and a gadget of seven vertices for each clause such that the permanent of the adjacency matrix of the graph equals the value of the $\#\mathbf{3SAT}$ instance. As finding a suitable clause gadget was difficult, they found a suitable one using computer algebra. Our proof adapts theirs, but as we can start from a $\#\mathbf{MON-2SAT}$ instance, our graph can be made simpler, only requiring one cycle per variable, and a symmetric clause gadget of just four vertices. This was found, and can easily be proven correct, by hand.

3 Evaluating Scalar ZH-Diagrams

While we have so far shown that variants of $\#\mathbf{SAT}$ can be embedded into ZH-diagrams, and thus that the problem of evaluating an arbitrary scalar ZH-diagram is $\#\mathbf{P}$ -hard, we haven't yet answered how much harder it might be. I.e whether this problem is in $\#\mathbf{P}$. In this section we will show that evaluating scalar ZH-diagrams comprised of a certain fragment of generators is complete for $\mathbf{FP}^{\#\mathbf{P}}$. \mathbf{FP} is the class of

functions that can be evaluated in polynomial time by a deterministic Turing machine (i.e the function analog of \mathbf{P}), and $\mathbf{FP}^{\#\mathbf{P}}$ is thus the class of functions that can be evaluated in polynomial time by a deterministic Turing machine with access to an oracle for a $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete problem (in our case we will use $\#\mathbf{SAT}$).

In order to consider the problem of evaluating scalar ZH-diagrams formally, we first define the problem $\text{Eval-}F$ which is the task of finding the complex number corresponding to a scalar diagram that exists in fragment F of a graphical calculus. A fragment is a set of diagrams built from arbitrary combinations of a fixed subset of generators.

Definition 2. For a given fragment F , the problem $\text{Eval-}F$ is defined as follows:

Input A scalar diagram $D \in F$ consisting of n generators and wires in total, where any parameters of the generators of D can be expressed in $O(\text{poly}(n))$ bits.

Output The value $D \in \mathbb{C}$.

The runtime of an algorithm for $\text{Eval-}F$ is defined in terms of the parameter n .

We will examine two fragments $\text{ZH}_{\pi/2^k} \supseteq \text{ZH}_{\pi}$ and show that they can be reduced to $\#\mathbf{SAT}$. Far from being purely academic, ZH_{π} is expressive enough to capture Toffoli-Hadamard quantum circuits, and $\text{ZH}_{\pi/2^k}$ can additionally capture Clifford+T quantum circuits, both of which are approximately universal for quantum computation.

Definition 3. ZH_{π} is the fragment of ZH-calculus given by the following generators:

(15)

Lemma 6. The following diagram equivalence holds:

(16)

This is derived from the Tseytin transformation of the XOR operation [60].

Theorem 4. There is a polynomial-time counting reduction from the problem Eval-ZH_{π} to $\#\mathbf{3SAT}$ and so Eval-ZH_{π} is in $\mathbf{FP}^{\#\mathbf{P}}$. Note that Eval-ZH_{π} is equivalent to the problem $\#\mathbf{SAT}_{\pm}$ as defined in [48].

Proof. In order to rewrite a diagram D from ZH_{π} into $\#\mathbf{3SAT}$, we first rewrite all of the non-scalar H-boxes into zero H-boxes with two legs:

(17)

Where the second equality follows from Lemma A.4 in [48]. Now, we can remove all the X-spiders and π -phase Z-spiders as follows, to rewrite into a valid $\#\mathbf{SAT}$ diagram:

1. Any spiders or H-boxes with no legs should be removed from the diagram. Evaluate them by concrete calculation and multiply their values together to get a scalar multiplier c for the diagram. If there are no such spiders or H-boxes, set $c = 1$.

2. Extract the phases from all π -phase Z-spiders as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \pi \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} \pi \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \stackrel{\pi}{=} \begin{array}{c} \pi \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \pi \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \quad (18)$$

3. Unfuse the phase of every X-spider with at least two legs:

$$\begin{array}{c} a\pi \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \stackrel{SF}{=} \begin{array}{c} a\pi \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \quad (19)$$

4. For any X-spiders with at least three legs, unfuse them and apply Lemma 6 to each X-spider:

$$\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \dots \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \quad (20)$$

5. Replace X-spiders with one leg as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} = \boxed{0} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \pi \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} = \boxed{0} \begin{array}{c} \pi \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \quad (21)$$

6. Excepting the single Z-spider with a π -phase, use the SF_Z rule to fuse Z-spiders wherever possible. If there are two two-legged zero H-boxes connected together directly, introduce a Z-spider between them using the I_Z rule.

At this point, this diagram follows the form of a #3SAT diagram except for a possible single π -phase Z-spider. To remove the π -phase Z-spider, we can write the diagram as a sum of two diagrams which don't contain this phase:

$$\begin{array}{c} \pi \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} - \begin{array}{c} \pi \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} = \boxed{0} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} - \boxed{0} \begin{array}{c} \pi \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \quad (22)$$

Since these two diagrams are #3SAT diagrams associated with some Boolean functions f_1 and f_2 , the value of D is then given by $D = c(\#(f_1) - \#(f_2))$. \square

Note that this method of splitting an instance into positive and negative components is similar to Bernstein and Vazirani's proof that $\mathbf{BQP} \subseteq \mathbf{P}^{\#\mathbf{P}}$ [8, Theorem 8.2.5]. Now we can move on to considering larger fragments fairly easily. We will show that by using gadgets to copy certain "magic states" - that is, one-legged H-boxes with specific labels which we can split as sums - we can introduce phases which are multiples of $\frac{\pi}{2^k}$ for any fixed k .

Definition 4. $ZH_{\pi/2^k}$ for $k \in \mathbb{N}$ is the fragment of ZH-calculus given by the following generators

$$\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \frac{n\pi}{2^k} \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \frac{n\pi}{2^k} \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \quad (23)$$

where $n \in \mathbb{Z}$.

Lemma 7. The following diagram equivalence holds:

$$\begin{array}{c} \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} a \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} a^2 \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} a \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \begin{array}{c} a \\ \vdots \\ \dots \end{array} \quad (24)$$

Proof. We have that

$$(25)$$

where the first equality follows from [46, Lemma 3.2]. \square

Lemma 8. For all $k > 0$, there is a reduction from $\text{Eval-ZH}_{\pi/2^k}$ to $\text{Eval-ZH}_{\pi/2^{k-1}}$.

Proof. Let D be a diagram in $\text{ZH}_{\pi/2^k}$. In order to rewrite this into a diagram in $\text{ZH}_{\pi/2^{k-1}}$, we need to remove all Z-spiders with phases that are odd multiples n of $\frac{\pi}{2^k}$, since even multiples of $\frac{\pi}{2^k}$ are already valid for $\text{ZH}_{\pi/2^{k-1}}$. Assume that $n = 2m + 1$, then:

$$(26)$$

Let $a = e^{\frac{i\pi}{2^k}}$, then by applying Lemma 7, fold up all of a -labeled H-boxes into one

$$(27)$$

and note that $a^2 = \left(\frac{\pi}{2^{k-1}}\right)$ is in $\text{ZH}_{\pi/2^{k-1}}$. Remove all scalar H-boxes from D and let their product be c . Finally, we can split the remaining a -labeled H-box, giving D as the sum of two diagrams D_1 and D_2 in $\text{ZH}_{\pi/2^{k-1}}$:

$$(28)$$

so then $D = c(D_1 + aD_2)$. \square

Theorem 5. $\text{Eval-ZH}_{\pi/2^k}$ is $\mathbf{FP}^{\#\mathbf{P}}$ -complete for all $k \geq 0$.

Proof. By induction on Lemma 8 with the base case $k = 0$ given by Theorem 4, we have that $\text{Eval-ZH}_{\pi/2^k}$ is in $\mathbf{FP}^{\#\mathbf{P}}$. It is clearly $\mathbf{FP}^{\#\mathbf{P}}$ -hard, as $\text{ZH}_{\pi/2^k}$ contains the diagrams representing $\#\mathbf{SAT}$ instances, and hence is $\mathbf{FP}^{\#\mathbf{P}}$ -complete. \square

The fragment $\text{ZH}_{\pi/2^2}$ captures precisely those diagrams that represent postselected Clifford+T quantum circuits. Our results above hence also lead to a proof that $\mathbf{PostBQP} \subseteq \mathbf{P}^{\#\mathbf{P}}$, although note that this is weaker than Aaronson's result that $\mathbf{PostBQP} = \mathbf{PP}$ [1].

4 Conclusion

In this paper we have used the ZH-calculus to simplify and unify the proofs of several known results in counting complexity. In particular, we examined various variants of $\#\mathbf{SAT}$ and show that they are $\#\mathbf{P}$ -complete, and similarly that the corresponding $\#\mathbf{M}\mathbf{SAT}$ variants are $\#\mathbf{M}\mathbf{P}$ -complete. We for instance produced a simple direct reduction from $\#\mathbf{SAT}$ to $\#\mathbf{2SAT}$, which considerably simplified existing proofs

that proceed via a reduction to the matrix permanent. Our results show that graphical calculi like the ZH-calculus, even though originally meant for the domain of quantum computing, can provide an intuitive framework for working with counting problems, through their interpretation as tensor networks.

We also briefly examined how other graphical calculi can be used to reason about other counting problems, especially the ZW-calculus and its connection to counting perfect matchings in graphs. A natural future direction is to explore which counting problems can be naturally formulated in a graphical calculus. Finally, we also observed how the original domain of quantum computing can be related to #SAT via the ZH-calculus, and show that the computational problem of evaluating scalar ZH-diagrams that represent postselected Clifford+T or Toffoli+Hadamard quantum circuits is in $\mathbf{FP}^{\#\mathbf{P}}$, and hence can be efficiently evaluated with an #SAT oracle - evaluating whether this leads to a more efficient method for simulating quantum circuits is an interesting avenue for future research.

Acknowledgments

Some of this work was done while TL was a student at the University of Oxford, and the results in Section 3 are also presented in his Master’s thesis [47]. We thank Richie Yeung, Matty Hoban, Julien Coudsi, and the anonymous QPL reviewers for helpful feedback.

References

- [1] Scott Aaronson (2005): *Quantum computing, postselection, and probabilistic polynomial-time*. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* 461(2063), pp. 3473–3482, doi:10.1098/rspa.2005.1546.
- [2] Miriam Backens & Aleks Kissinger (2019): *ZH: A Complete Graphical Calculus for Quantum Computations Involving Classical Non-linearity*. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 287, pp. 23–42, doi:10.4204/EPTCS.287.2. arXiv:1805.02175.
- [3] Miriam Backens, Aleks Kissinger, Hector Miller-Bakewell, John van de Wetering & Sal Wolfs (2021): *Completeness of the ZH-calculus*, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2103.06610. arXiv:2103.06610.
- [4] Miriam Backens, Hector Miller-Bakewell, Giovanni de Felice, Leo Lobski & John van de Wetering (2021): *There and back again: A circuit extraction tale*. *Quantum* 5, p. 421, doi:10.22331/q-2021-03-25-421.
- [5] Niel de Beaudrap, Xiaoning Bian & Quanlong Wang (2020): *Fast and Effective Techniques for T-Count Reduction via Spider Nest Identities*. In Steven T. Flammia, editor: *15th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2020)*, *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)* 158, Schloss Dagstuhl–Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, pp. 11:1–11:23, doi:10.4230/LIPICs.TQC.2020.11.
- [6] Niel de Beaudrap & Dominic Horsman (2020): *The ZX calculus is a language for surface code lattice surgery*. *Quantum* 4, doi:10.22331/q-2020-01-09-218.
- [7] A. Ben-Dor & S. Halevi (1993): *Zero-One Permanent Is #P-complete, a Simpler Proof*. In: [1993] *The 2nd Israel Symposium on Theory and Computing Systems*, pp. 108–117, doi:10.1109/ISTCS.1993.253457.
- [8] Ethan Bernstein & Umesh Vazirani (1997): *Quantum Complexity Theory*. *SIAM Journal on Computing* 26(5), pp. 1411–1473, doi:10.1137/S0097539796300921.
- [9] Agustín Borgna, Simon Perdrix & Benoît Valiron (2021): *Hybrid quantum-classical circuit simplification with the ZX-calculus*. In Hakjoo Oh, editor: *Programming Languages and Systems*, Springer International Publishing, Cham, pp. 121–139, doi:10.1007/978-3-030-89051-3_8.
- [10] Tom Bylander (1994): *The computational complexity of propositional STRIPS planning*. *Artificial Intelligence* 69(1), pp. 165–204, doi:10.1016/0004-3702(94)90081-7.

- [11] Shuxiang Cao (2022): *Multi-agent blind quantum computation without universal cluster state*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2206.13330. arXiv:2206.13330.
- [12] Titouan Carette, Etienne Moutot, Thomas Perez & Renaud Vilmart (2023): *Compositionality of Planar Perfect Matchings*, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2302.08767. arXiv:2302.08767.
- [13] Kostia Chardonnet, Benoît Valiron & Renaud Vilmart (2021): *Geometry of Interaction for ZX-Diagrams*. In Filippo Bonchi & Simon J. Puglisi, editors: *46th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science (MFCS 2021), Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs) 202*, Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, pp. 30:1–30:16, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.MFCS.2021.30.
- [14] Julien Coadi & John van de Wetering (2022): *Classically Simulating Quantum Supremacy IQP Circuits through a Random Graph Approach*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2212.08609. arXiv:2212.08609.
- [15] Bob Coecke & Ross Duncan (2008): *Interacting quantum observables*. In: *Proceedings of the 37th International Colloquium on Automata, Languages and Programming (ICALP)*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-70583-3_25.
- [16] Bob Coecke & Ross Duncan (2011): *Interacting Quantum Observables: Categorical Algebra and Diagrammatics*. *New Journal of Physics* 13(4), p. 043016, doi:10.1088/1367-2630/13/4/043016.
- [17] Bob Coecke, Bill Edwards & Rob Spekkens (2011): *Phase groups and the origin of non-locality for qubits*. *Electronic Notes in Theoretical Computer Science* 270(2), pp. 15–36, doi:10.1016/j.entcs.2011.01.021.
- [18] Bob Coecke & Aleks Kissinger (2017): *Picturing Quantum Processes: A First Course in Quantum Theory and Diagrammatic Reasoning*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, doi:10.1017/9781316219317.
- [19] Stephen A. Cook (1971): *The Complexity of Theorem-Proving Procedures*. In: *Proceedings of the Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, STOC '71*, Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, pp. 151–158, doi:10.1145/800157.805047.
- [20] Alexander Cowtan, Silas Dilkes, Ross Duncan, Will Simmons & Seyon Sivarajah (2020): *Phase Gadget Synthesis for Shallow Circuits*. In Bob Coecke & Matthew Leifer, editors: *Proceedings 16th International Conference on Quantum Physics and Logic, Chapman University, Orange, CA, USA., 10-14 June 2019, Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 318, Open Publishing Association, pp. 213–228, doi:10.4204/EPTCS.318.13.
- [21] Alexander Cowtan, Will Simmons & Ross Duncan (2020): *A Generic Compilation Strategy for the Unitary Coupled Cluster Ansatz*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2007.10515. arXiv:2007.10515.
- [22] Vilhelm Dahllöf, Peter Jonsson & Magnus Wahlström (2002): *Counting Satisfying Assignments in 2-SAT and 3-SAT*. In Oscar H. Ibarra & Louxin Zhang, editors: *Computing and Combinatorics*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 535–543, doi:10.1007/3-540-45655-4_57.
- [23] Carsten Damm, Markus Holzer & Pierre McKenzie (2002): *The Complexity of Tensor Calculus*. *Computational Complexity* 11(1/2), pp. 54–89, doi:10.1007/s00037-000-0170-4.
- [24] Niel de Beaudrap, Aleks Kissinger & Konstantinos Meichanetzidis (2021): *Tensor Network Rewriting Strategies for Satisfiability and Counting*. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 340, pp. 46–59, doi:10.4204/EPTCS.340.3. arXiv:2004.06455.
- [25] Ross Duncan, Aleks Kissinger, Simon Perdrix & John van de Wetering (2020): *Graph-theoretic Simplification of Quantum Circuits with the ZX-calculus*. *Quantum* 4, p. 279, doi:10.22331/q-2020-06-04-279.
- [26] Ross Duncan & Maxime Lucas (2014): *Verifying the Steane code with Quantomatic*. In Bob Coecke & Matty Hoban, editors: *Proceedings of the 10th International Workshop on Quantum Physics and Logic, Castelldefels (Barcelona), Spain, 17th to 19th July 2013, Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 171, Open Publishing Association, pp. 33–49, doi:10.4204/EPTCS.171.4.
- [27] Ross Duncan & Simon Perdrix (2010): *Rewriting measurement-based quantum computations with generalised flow*. In: *International Colloquium on Automata, Languages, and Programming*, Springer, pp. 285–296, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-14162-1_24.


- [28] John Faben (2008): *The Complexity of Counting Solutions to Generalised Satisfiability Problems modulo k* , doi:10.48550/arXiv.0809.1836. arXiv:0809.1836.
- [29] Artur García-Sáez & José I. Latorre (2012): *An Exact Tensor Network for the 3SAT Problem*. *Quantum Info. Comput.* 12(3–4), p. 283–292, doi:10.5555/2230976.2230984.
- [30] Craig Gidney (2022): *A Pair Measurement Surface Code on Pentagons*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2206.12780. arXiv:2206.12780.
- [31] Craig Gidney & Austin G. Fowler (2019): *Efficient magic state factories with a catalyzed $|CCZ\rangle$ to $2|T\rangle$ transformation*. *Quantum* 3, p. 135, doi:10.22331/q-2019-04-30-135.
- [32] Craig Gidney & Austin G. Fowler (2019): *Flexible layout of surface code computations using AutoCCZ states*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.1905.08916. arXiv:1905.08916.
- [33] Stefano Gogioso & Aleks Kissinger (2017): *Fully graphical treatment of the quantum algorithm for the Hidden Subgroup Problem*, doi:10.48550/arXiv.1701.08669. arXiv:1701.08669.
- [34] Johnnie Gray & Stefanos Kourtis (2021): *Hyper-Optimized Tensor Network Contraction*. *Quantum* 5, p. 410, doi:10.22331/q-2021-03-15-410.
- [35] Amar Hadzihasanovic (2015): *A Diagrammatic Axiomatisation for Qubit Entanglement*, doi:10.48550/arXiv.1501.07082. arXiv:1501.07082.
- [36] John H. Halton (1966): *On the Divisibility Properties of Fibonacci Numbers*. *The Fibonacci Quarterly* 4(3), pp. 217–240. Available at <https://www.fq.math.ca/Scanned/4-3/halton.pdf>.
- [37] Michael Hanks, Marta P. Estarellas, William J. Munro & Kae Nemoto (2020): *Effective Compression of Quantum Braided Circuits Aided by ZX-Calculus*. *Physical Review X* 10, p. 041030, doi:10.1103/PhysRevX.10.041030.
- [38] Anne Hillebrand (2012): *Superdense Coding with GHZ and Quantum Key Distribution with W in the ZX-calculus*. *Electronic Proceedings in Theoretical Computer Science* 95, pp. 103–121, doi:10.4204/EPTCS.95.10.
- [39] Clare Horsman (2011): *Quantum pictorialism for topological cluster-state computing*. *New Journal of Physics* 13(9), p. 095011, doi:10.1088/1367-2630/13/9/095011.
- [40] Mark Jerrum, Alistair Sinclair & Eric Vigoda (2004): *A Polynomial-Time Approximation Algorithm for the Permanent of a Matrix with Nonnegative Entries*. *Journal of the ACM* 51(4), pp. 671–697, doi:10.1145/1008731.1008738.
- [41] Aleks Kissinger & John van de Wetering (2019): *Universal MBQC with generalised parity-phase interactions and Pauli measurements*. *Quantum* 3, doi:10.22331/q-2019-04-26-134.
- [42] Aleks Kissinger & John van de Wetering (2020): *Reducing the number of non-Clifford gates in quantum circuits*. *Physical Review A* 102, p. 022406, doi:10.1103/PhysRevA.102.022406.
- [43] Aleks Kissinger & John van de Wetering (2022): *Simulating quantum circuits with ZX-calculus reduced stabiliser decompositions*. *Quantum Science and Technology* 7(4), p. 044001, doi:10.1088/2058-9565/ac5d20.
- [44] Aleks Kissinger, John van de Wetering & Renaud Vilmart (2022): *Classical Simulation of Quantum Circuits with Partial and Graphical Stabiliser Decompositions*. In François Le Gall & Tomoyuki Morimae, editors: *17th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2022)*, *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)* 232, Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik, Dagstuhl, Germany, pp. 5:1–5:13, doi:10.4230/LIPIcs.TQC.2022.5.
- [45] Stefanos Kourtis, Claudio Chamon, Eduardo Mucciolo & Andrei Ruckenstein (2019): *Fast Counting with Tensor Networks*. *SciPost Physics* 7(5), p. 060, doi:10.21468/SciPostPhys.7.5.060.
- [46] Stach Kuijpers, John van de Wetering & Aleks Kissinger (2019): *Graphical Fourier Theory and the Cost of Quantum Addition*, doi:10.48550/arXiv.1904.07551. arXiv:1904.07551.

- [47] Tuomas Laakkonen (2022): *Graphical Stabilizer Decompositions For Counting Problems*. Master's thesis, University of Oxford. Available at <https://www.cs.ox.ac.uk/people/aleks.kissinger/theses/laakkonen-thesis.pdf>.
- [48] Tuomas Laakkonen, Konstantinos Meichanetzidis & John van de Wetering (2022): *A Graphical #SAT Algorithm for Formulae with Small Clause Density*, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2212.08048. arXiv:2212.08048.
- [49] Adrian Lehmann, Ben Caldwell & Robert Rand (2022): *VyZX : A Vision for Verifying the ZX Calculus*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2205.05781. arXiv:2205.05781.
- [50] David Lichtenstein (1982): *Planar Formulae and Their Uses*. *SIAM Journal on Computing* 11(2), pp. 329–343, doi:10.1137/0211025.
- [51] Daniel Litinski & Naomi Nickerson (2022): *Active volume: An architecture for efficient fault-tolerant quantum computers with limited non-local connections*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2211.15465. arXiv:2211.15465.
- [52] Cristopher Moore & Stephan Mertens (2011): *The Nature of Computation*. Oxford University Press, Inc., USA, doi:10.1093/acprof:oso/9780199233212.001.0001.
- [53] Michael A. Nielsen & Isaac L. Chuang (2010): *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, doi:10.1017/CB09780511976667.
- [54] Román Orús (2014): *A practical introduction to tensor networks: Matrix product states and projected entangled pair states*. *Annals of Physics* 349, pp. 117–158, doi:10.1016/j.aop.2014.06.013.
- [55] C.H. Papadimitriou (1994): *Computational Complexity*. Theoretical computer science, Addison-Wesley, doi:10.5555/1074100.1074233.
- [56] Dan Roth (1996): *On the hardness of approximate reasoning*. *Artificial Intelligence* 82(1), pp. 273–302, doi:10.1016/0004-3702(94)00092-1.
- [57] Razin A. Shaikh, Quanlong Wang & Richie Yeung (2022): *How to sum and exponentiate Hamiltonians in ZXW calculus*, doi:10.48550/arXiv.2212.04462. arXiv:2212.04462.
- [58] Alexis Shaw, Michael Bremner, Alexandru Paler, Daniel Herr & Simon J. Devitt (2022): *Quantum computation on a 19-qubit wide 2d nearest neighbour qubit array*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2212.01550. arXiv:2212.01550.
- [59] Alex Townsend-Teague & Konstantinos Meichanetzidis (2021): *Classifying Complexity with the ZX-Calculus: Jones Polynomials and Potts Partition Functions*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2103.06914. arXiv:2103.06914.
- [60] G. S. Tseitin (1983): *On the Complexity of Derivation in Propositional Calculus*. In Jörg H. Siekmann & Graham Wrightson, editors: *Automation of Reasoning: 2: Classical Papers on Computational Logic 1967–1970*, Symbolic Computation, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 466–483, doi:10.1007/978-3-642-81955-1_28.
- [61] Christian Ufrecht, Maniraman Periyasamy, Sebastian Rietsch, Daniel D. Scherer, Axel Plinge & Christopher Mutschler (2023): *Cutting multi-control quantum gates with ZX calculus*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2302.00387. arXiv:2302.00387.
- [62] L. G. Valiant (1979): *The Complexity of Computing the Permanent*. *Theoretical Computer Science* 8(2), pp. 189–201, doi:10.1016/0304-3975(79)90044-6.
- [63] L. G. Valiant & V. V. Vazirani (1986): *NP Is as Easy as Detecting Unique Solutions*. *Theoretical Computer Science* 47, pp. 85–93, doi:10.1016/0304-3975(86)90135-0.
- [64] Leslie G. Valiant (1979): *The Complexity of Enumeration and Reliability Problems*. *SIAM Journal on Computing* 8(3), pp. 410–421, doi:10.1137/0208032.
- [65] Leslie G. Valiant (2006): *Accidental Algorithms*. In: *2006 47th Annual IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS'06)*, pp. 509–517, doi:10.1109/FOCS.2006.7.
- [66] Jamie Vicary (2013): *Topological Structure of Quantum Algorithms*. *2013 28th Annual ACM/IEEE Symposium on Logic in Computer Science*, doi:10.1109/lics.2013.14.

- [67] Magnus Wahlström (2008): *A Tighter Bound for Counting Max-Weight Solutions to 2SAT Instances*. In Martin Grohe & Rolf Niedermeier, editors: *Parameterized and Exact Computation*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 202–213, doi:10.1007/978-3-540-79723-4_19.
- [68] Dominic Welsh & Amy Gale (2011): *The Complexity of Counting Problems*. In: *Aspects of Complexity: Minicourses in Algorithmics, Complexity and Computational Algebra. Mathematics Workshop, Kaikoura, January 7-15, 2000*, De Gruyter, doi:10.1515/9783110889178.
- [69] John van de Wetering (2020): *ZX-calculus for the working quantum computer scientist*. doi:10.48550/arXiv.2012.13966. arXiv:2012.13966.
- [70] Mingji Xia & Wenbo Zhao (2006): *#3-Regular Bipartite Planar Vertex Cover Is #P-Complete*. In Jin-Yi Cai, S. Barry Cooper & Angsheng Li, editors: *Theory and Applications of Models of Computation*, Lecture Notes in Computer Science, Springer, Berlin, Heidelberg, pp. 356–364, doi:10.1007/11750321_34.

A Rewriting Rules

The ZH-calculus is equipped with the following set of sound and complete rewriting rules [2]:



We will also use the following derived rewriting rules [3, Lemmas 2.10-2.24],

$$(\pi_1) \quad \begin{array}{c} \dots \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \circ \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \dots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \dots \\ \pi \quad \pi \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \circ \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \pi \quad \pi \\ \dots \end{array} \quad (\pi_2) \quad \begin{array}{c} \dots \\ \pi \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \circ \\ \dots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \dots \\ \pi \cdots \pi \\ \dots \end{array} \quad (29)$$

$$(SF_X) \quad \begin{array}{c} \dots \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \circ \quad \circ \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \dots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \dots \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \circ \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \dots \end{array}$$

as well as the generalized (M) rule [2, Lemma 2.3]:

$$(M) \quad \begin{array}{c} \dots \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \circ \quad \circ \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ a \quad b \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \dots \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \circ \\ \dots \end{array} \quad (30)$$

B #SAT \rightarrow #MON-BI-PL-3DEG-SAT

The smallest subset of #2SAT that has been considered in the literature is #PL-MON-BI-CUBIC-2SAT, where CUBIC- indicates that the primal graph of the instance is 3-regular [70]. In this section, we show that #3DEG-SAT is #P-complete graphically, by relating the zero-labeled H-box with the Fibonacci numbers. Here, 3DEG- indicates that every variable appears in at most three clauses. Then in Theorem 7 we combine all of our reductions to show #P-completeness for #PL-MON-BI-3DEG-2SAT. This is slightly less restrictive than #PL-MON-BI-CUBIC-2SAT, but retains the interesting property that the maximum degree is the lowest possible (if the maximum degree was two, then the problem can be solved in polynomial time [22]), while avoiding the complicated global construction of the original proof.

We will make use of the following identities concerning the Fibonacci numbers, defined by:

$$F_n = F_{n-1} + F_{n-2} \quad F_1 = 1 \quad F_0 = 0 \quad (31)$$

Lemma 9. $\gcd(F_n, F_{n-1}) = 1$ for all $n > 1$.

Proof. $\gcd(F_n, F_{n-1}) = \gcd(F_{n-1} + F_{n-2}, F_{n-1}) = \gcd(F_{n-2}, F_{n-1})$ thus by induction $\gcd(F_n, F_{n-1}) = \gcd(F_2, F_1) = 1$. \square

Lemma 10 [36]. For every $M \geq 1$ there exists some $0 < n \leq M^2$ such that $F_n \equiv 0 \pmod{M}$.

Lemma 11 [36]. $F_n = \left\lfloor \frac{\phi^n}{\sqrt{5}} + \frac{1}{2} \right\rfloor$ where $\phi = \frac{1+\sqrt{5}}{2}$ is the golden ratio.

Lemma 12. Suppose that $F_n \equiv 0 \pmod{M}$, then the following rewrite holds:

$$\text{---} \equiv \boxed{F_{n-1}^{-1}} \underbrace{\text{---} \boxed{0} \text{---} \boxed{0} \text{---} \dots \text{---} \boxed{0} \text{---}}_{n \text{ copies}} \text{---} \pmod{M} \quad (32)$$

Proof. Note that the Fibonacci numbers are defined by

$$\begin{pmatrix} F_{n+1} \\ F_n \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} F_n \\ F_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \implies \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^n = \begin{pmatrix} F_{n+1} & F_n \\ F_n & F_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (33)$$

and so, supposing that $F_n \equiv 0 \pmod{M}$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \underbrace{\text{---} \boxed{0} \text{---} \boxed{0} \text{---} \dots \text{---} \boxed{0} \text{---}}_{n \text{ copies}} &= \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}^n = \begin{pmatrix} F_n + F_{n-1} & F_n \\ F_n & F_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} \\ &\equiv \begin{pmatrix} F_{n-1} & 0 \\ 0 & F_{n-1} \end{pmatrix} = \boxed{F_{n-1}^{-1}} \text{---} \pmod{M} \end{aligned} \quad (34)$$

but by Lemma 9, F_{n-1} is coprime to F_n , so it must be coprime to M and thus invertible. \square

Lemma 13. Given M and k such that $F_k \equiv 0 \pmod{M}$, for any $\phi \in \#_{\mathbf{M}}\text{SAT}$ with n variables, m clauses, and maximum clause size at least two, there is a $\phi' \in \#_{\mathbf{M}}\text{SAT}$ with $O(nmk)$ variables and $O(nmk)$ clauses such that every variable has degree at most three, and $\#_{\mathbf{M}}(\phi) = c \cdot \#_{\mathbf{M}}(\phi') \pmod{M}$ where c is computable in $O(\text{poly}(n, m, k))$ time. Additionally, ϕ' can be computed in $O(\text{poly}(n, m, k))$ time and preserves the maximum clause size of ϕ .

where the last line follows from the proof of Lemma 3. After this is applied to every clause of size two, every path between two vertices in the incidence graph will have even length (since every edge is replaced by four edges), and hence the incidence graph is bipartite. \square

Theorem 7. We have the following:

1. **#MON-BI-PL-3DEG-2SAT** is **#P**-complete
2. \oplus **MON-BI-PL-3DEG-2SAT** is \oplus **P**-complete

Proof. We can reduce from arbitrary **#SAT** instances to **#MON-BI-PL-3DEG-2SAT** by applying the previously given reductions in the following order:

$$\begin{aligned} \#SAT &\xrightarrow{1} \#PL\text{-SAT} \xrightarrow{2} \#PL\text{-2SAT} \xrightarrow{5} \#MON\text{-PL-2SAT} \\ &\xrightarrow{14} \#MON\text{-BI-PL-2SAT} \xrightarrow{13} \#MON\text{-BI-PL-3DEG-2SAT} \end{aligned}$$

In both cases, we first reduce to **#PL-SAT** using Lemma 1. Then, we continue differently:

1. Apply Theorem 2 and Theorem 3 to reduce to **#MON-PL-2SAT**, as these preserve planarity. Then, given ϕ with n variables, we apply Lemma 14 with $r = n + 1$ to obtain $\phi' \in \#MON\text{-BI-PL-2SAT}$ such that $\#(\phi) = \#_{2^r}(\phi') = \#(\phi') \pmod{2^r}$. Then reduce ϕ' to **#MON-BI-PL-3DEG-2SAT** using Theorem 6, since it preserves planarity, monotonicity and bipartite structure.
2. Similarly, given $\phi \in \#SAT$, apply Lemma 3 with $r = 0$, Lemma 5 with $r = 1$, Lemma 14 with $r = 0$, and Lemma 13 with $M = 2$ and $k = 3$, to obtain $\phi' \in \#MON\text{-BI-PL-3DEG-2SAT}$ such that $\#_2(\phi) = \#_2(\phi')$. \square

C #PERFECT-MATCHINGS and the ZW-Calculus

While so far we have worked exclusively with the ZH-calculus, which naturally represents **#SAT**, we can use other calculi to attack other problems. In this section, we will use the ZW-calculus to examine the connection between the problems **#XSAT** and **#PERFECT-MATCHINGS**, and sketch an argument that they are both **#P**-complete. Like the connection between **#SAT** and **#2SAT** given using the ZH-calculus, with this technique we can circumvent the usual reduction via the permanent.

Definition 5. Let $f : \mathbb{B}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{B}$ be a boolean function defined by

$$f(x) = \bigwedge_{i=0}^m \phi(c_{i1}, \dots, c_{ik_i}) \quad (38)$$

where $c_{ij} = x_k$ or $\neg x_k$ for some k , and $\phi(\vec{x}) = 1$ if and only if $w(\vec{x}) = 1$, where $w(\vec{x})$ is the Hamming weight of \vec{x} . Each ϕ term defines a clause, and so $f(x) = 1$ iff every clause has exactly one true literal. The problem **#XSAT** is to compute $\#(f)$. When $k_i = 3$ for all i , this is also known as **#1-in-3SAT**.

Definition 6. The problem **#PERFECT-MATCHINGS** is as follows: given an undirected simple graph G , compute the number of perfect matchings of G . That is, the number of independent edge sets of G that cover each vertex exactly once. We denote this quantity $\text{PerfMatch}(G)$.

The ZW-calculus is a graphical calculus built from two generators, W-spiders and Z-spiders, which are flexsymmetric [35]. The Z-spider is a close analogue of the Z-spider in ZH-calculus (except with a π phase), whereas the W-spider represents the W-state:

$$\begin{array}{c} \cdots \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \circ \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \cdots \end{array} = |\vec{0}\rangle\langle\vec{0}| - |\vec{1}\rangle\langle\vec{1}| \qquad \begin{array}{c} \cdots \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \cdots \end{array} = \sum_{\substack{u,v \\ w(uv)=1}} |u\rangle\langle v| \qquad (39)$$

These, along with wires, caps, and cups, are combined with tensor product and tensor contraction in the same way as in the ZH-calculus. Like the ZH-calculus, we will treat diagrams purely as tensor networks rather than formal objects - hence equality of diagrams is just equality of tensors. This calculus is also equipped with a set of sound and complete rewrite rules, including the following spider fusion rules,

$$\begin{array}{c} \cdots \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \circ \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \cdots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \cdots \quad \cdots \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \circ \quad \circ \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \cdots \quad \cdots \end{array} \qquad \begin{array}{c} \cdots \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \bullet \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \cdots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \bullet \\ \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \diagup \\ \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \end{array} \qquad (40)$$

as well as others which we omit for brevity as we don't use them explicitly here. In the same way that ZH-calculus diagrams naturally represent #SAT instances with Z-spiders and clauses, the ZW-calculus naturally represents #XSAT instances with the following mapping:

$$\text{Variable} \iff \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \cdots \end{array} \qquad \text{Clause} \iff \begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \cdots \end{array} \qquad \text{Negation} \iff \text{---}\bullet\text{---} \qquad (41)$$

Lemma 15. #XSAT is #P-complete

Proof. We can translate from #2SAT to #XSAT with the following correspondence:

$$\begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \cdots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \cdots \end{array} \qquad \text{---}\boxed{0}\text{---} = \begin{array}{c} \circ \\ \bullet \\ \text{---}\bullet\text{---} \end{array} \qquad \text{---}\pi\text{---} = \text{---}\bullet\text{---} \qquad (42)$$

In the other direction, we can translate #XSAT to #SAT by first expanding every clause of size more than three as follows:

$$\begin{array}{c} \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \cdots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \quad \bullet \quad \cdots \quad \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \cdots \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \end{array} = \begin{array}{c} \bullet \quad \circ \quad \cdots \quad \circ \quad \bullet \\ \diagup \quad \diagdown \quad \cdots \quad \diagup \quad \diagdown \\ \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \quad \cdots \end{array} \qquad (43)$$

Then, each clause

$$\begin{aligned} \phi(x,y,z) &= (x \wedge \neg y \wedge \neg z) \vee (\neg x \wedge y \wedge \neg z) \vee (\neg x \wedge \neg y \wedge z) \\ \phi(x,y) &= (x \wedge \neg y) \vee (\neg x \wedge y) \\ \phi(x) &= x \end{aligned} \qquad (44)$$

can be rewritten as a bounded number of CNF clauses. □

However, as Carette *et al.* [12] note, diagrams of the ZW-calculus can also naturally represent instances of #PERFECT-MATCHINGS by taking each vertex of the graph to be a W-spider and edges of the graph as wires. Therefore, any ZW-diagram containing only W-spiders represents an instance of #PERFECT-MATCHINGS.

Theorem 8. #PERFECT-MATCHINGS is #P-complete.

D #P-Completeness for the Permanent

The proof by Valiant [62] that the permanent of an integer-valued matrix, \mathbb{Z} -Permanent, is #P-complete, and the simplified proof by Ben-Dor and Halevi [7], both rely on a reduction from #3SAT. This reduction could be simplified by using #2SAT instead, but this was unfortunately not possible, as the proof that #2SAT is #P-complete relies itself on a reduction from the permanent. However, since we proved in Theorem 2 that #2SAT is #P-complete independent of the permanent, we can make use of this to simplify the reduction for \mathbb{Z} -Permanent further. In this section, we detail this reduction, which shows that \mathbb{Z} -Permanent is #P-hard. Our construction and proof is essentially identical to that of Ben-Dor and Halevi [7], with the exception that we start with an instance of #MON-2SAT, and can hence use simpler gadgets.


Definition 7. Given a directed edge-weighted graph G with edges E , a *cycle-cover* of G is a set $E' \subseteq E$ of simple cycles that partition the vertices of G . Note that self-loops are permitted in G . The weight of a cycle cover is the product of all the weights of the edges in E' .

Lemma 16. Let G be a directed graph with self-loops and edge weights w_{ij} , and let A be its adjacency matrix, i.e. $A_{ij} = w_{ij}$ if i and j are connected or $A_{ij} = 0$ otherwise. Then the permanent of A is the sum of weights of all cycle-covers of G . We denote this number by $\#(G)$.

Given this, it is sufficient to reduce #MON-2SAT to the problem of determining the sum of weights of cycle-covers of a graph. We aim to construct a graph G_ϕ from a #MON-2SAT instance ϕ with n variables and m clauses, in polynomial time, such that $\#(G_\phi) = f(\phi) \cdot \#(\phi)$ for some easily computable and suitably bounded $f(\phi)$. We construct G_ϕ as follows:

1. For each variable x_i in ϕ , introduce a vertex v_i to G_ϕ .
2. For each clause in ϕ , introduce a *clause gadget* of four vertices to G_ϕ , the structure of which we will describe momentarily. Two of the vertices of this gadget are designated as the first and second input respectively.
3. For every variable vertex, add a self-loop s_i of weight one to G_ϕ .
4. For every variable vertex v_i , add an edge of weight one from v_i to an unused input c_1 of the first clause in which v appears. Then add an edge of weight one from c_1 to c_2 , an unused input of the second clause in which v appears. Continue similarly until all d_i clauses in which v appears have been processed, then add an edge of weight one from c_{d_i} to v_i . Let these edges be labeled as c_{ij} .

An example of this construction is given below, the loop of edges proceeding from each variable highlighted in a different color:



Hence, the weight of E'_r must also be zero. Note that each E'_r that is induced by a satisfying assignment must be induced by a unique assignment, since you can recover the assignment from E'_r . \square

Clearly, the sum of weights of all partial covers of G_ϕ is the same as the sum of weights of all cycle-covers of G_ϕ . But by Lemma 17, this is $4^m \#(\phi)$, so $\#(\phi) = 4^{-m} \#(G_\phi)$, and thus \mathbb{Z} -**Permanent** is $\#\mathbf{P}$ -hard, as G_ϕ can be computed in polynomial time from ϕ .

It is interesting to note that the constructions of Ben-Dor and Halevi, and Valiant, both make use of negative-weight edges and have $f(\phi) = k^m$ for some even integer k (12 for Ben-Dor and Halevi, and 4^5 for Valiant). In order to further simplify the next steps of the reduction to \mathbb{B} -**Permanent**, it would be desirable to have no negative weights, or $k = 1$. However, as Valiant points out [62], neither of these is likely to be possible:

- If k is odd, then $\#(\phi) \equiv \#(G_\phi) \pmod{2}$, but $\#(G_\phi) \pmod{2}$ is easy to compute [7] (as the parity of the permanent is equal to the parity of the determinant), so then $\mathbf{P} = \bigoplus \mathbf{P}$ and $\mathbf{NP} = \mathbf{RP}$ by the Valiant-Vazirani theorem [63].
- Suppose G_ϕ is constructed by reduction from **3SAT**. If there are no negative-weighted edges, then the existence of any cycle-cover of G_ϕ indicates the existence of a satisfying assignment to ϕ . But determining if a cycle-cover exists is easy for general directed graphs, so then $\mathbf{P} = \mathbf{NP}$.

This last argument does not hold up for our construction, since we start from **#MON-2SAT**, for which it is trivial to determine if a satisfying assignment exists (indeed, one always exists by setting every variable true). However, we can still rule out the possibility of a reduction without negative-weighted edges: it is known that \mathbb{Z} -**Permanent** with non-negative weights has an FPRAS [40], whereas **#MON-2SAT** does not, unless $\mathbf{NP} = \mathbf{RP}$ [68, Theorem 57].