

Quantum and Probabilistic Computers Rigorously Powerful than Traditional Computers, and Derandomization

TIANRONG LIN

Abstract

In this paper, we extend the techniques used in our previous work to show that there exists a probabilistic Turing machine running within time $O(n^k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$ accepting a language L_d which is different from any language in \mathcal{P} , and then further to prove that $L_d \in \mathcal{BPP}$, thus separating the complexity class \mathcal{BPP} from the class \mathcal{P} (i.e., $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{BPP}$).

Since the complexity class \mathcal{BQP} of *bounded error quantum polynomial-time* contains the complexity class \mathcal{BPP} (i.e., $\mathcal{BPP} \subseteq \mathcal{BQP}$), we thus confirm the widespread-belief conjecture that quantum computers are *rigorously powerful* than traditional computers (i.e., $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{BQP}$).

We further show that (1). $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{RP}$; (2). $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$; (3). $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{ZPP}$. Previously, whether the above relations hold or not are long-standing open questions in complexity theory.

Meanwhile, the result of $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{BPP}$ shows that *randomness* plays an essential role in probabilistic algorithm design. In particular, we go further to show that:

- (1). The number of random bits used by any probabilistic algorithm which accepts the language L_d can not be reduced to $O(\log n)$;
- (2). There exists no efficient (complexity-theoretic) *pseudorandom generator* (PRG) $G : \{0, 1\}^{O(\log n)} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n$;
- (3). There exists no quick HSG $H : k(n) \rightarrow n$ such that $k(n) = O(\log n)$.

Contents

1. Introduction	2
1.1. Main Results	4
1.2. Overview	7
2. Definitions and Notation	8

Keywords: \mathcal{BQP} , \mathcal{BPP} versus \mathcal{P} , Diagonalization, Derandomization, Randomness
AMS Classification: Primary: 68Q01, 68Q10, 68Q15, 68Q17; Secondary: 03D15.

2.1. Polynomial-time Deterministic Turing Machines	8
2.2. Quantum Turing machines	9
2.3. Probabilistic Turing machines	10
2.4. Complexity classes \mathcal{P} , \mathcal{BPP} and \mathcal{BQP}	12
2.5. Complement of a Complexity Class	13
2.6. Complexity Classes \mathcal{RP} , $\text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$ and \mathcal{ZPP}	13
2.7. Useful Lemma and Corollary	13
2.8. Efficient Simulation	14
3. Enumeration of Polynomial-Time Deterministic Turing Machines	14
4. Diagonalization against Polynomial-Time Deterministic Turing Machines by A Probabilistic Turing Machine	17
5. L_d is in \mathcal{BPP}	23
6. Proof of $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{RP}$	25
7. Proof of $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$	26
8. Randomness Does Help	28
8.1. Eliminating Randomness by Enumeration Method	28
8.2. Derandomize Probabilistic Algorithms by PRGs	29
8.3. Derandomize Probabilistic Algorithms by HSGs	30
9. Conclusions	31
References	32

1. Introduction

Recently, a great deal of attention has been focused on quantum computation. For example, see [BV97, BBBV97, FG99, For03, Gro96, Sho97], etc. A natural question raised: How powerful can *quantum computers* be? It is a widespread belief that quantum computers are at least powerful than traditional computers, since the exciting discovers of polynomial-time quantum algorithm for *prime factorization* by Shor [Sho97] (see the popular introduction [A3]) and $O(\sqrt{N})$ quantum algorithm for *database search* by Grover [Gro96]. But, strictly speaking, there is still no formal proof today that quantum computers are rigorously powerful than our traditional computers now in use, since we are unable to prove that there is no polynomial-time algorithms for *prime factorization* which means it is still possible that there are polynomial-time algorithms for *prime factorization* but we did not find them till now. The polynomial-time quantum algorithm for *prime factorization* only shows that the problem of *prime factorization* is in the complexity class \mathcal{BQP} (see the popular introduction [A4]), a complexity class defined in [BV97] that comprises the problems which can be solved in polynomial-time by quantum computers with an error probability of at most $1/3$ for all instances. While the $O(\sqrt{N})$

quantum algorithm is based on oracle query [Gro96, BBBV97] and it is of course not in \mathcal{BQP} . In brief, existing evidence is poor to claim that *quantum computers* are rigorously powerful than traditional computers. In other words, whether the problem of *prime factorization* is in \mathcal{P} or not is still unknown.

In similarity to the complexity class \mathcal{BQP} , another important complexity class is the class of \mathcal{BPP} (see the popular introduction [A2]) — defined in [Gil77] — that comprises the decision problems solvable by probabilistic Turing machines in polynomial-time with an error probability bounded by $1/3$ for all instances. \mathcal{BPP} is one of the largest practical classes of problems, meaning most problems of interest in \mathcal{BPP} have efficient probabilistic algorithms that can be run quickly on probabilistic machines. \mathcal{BPP} also contains \mathcal{P} , the class of problems solvable in polynomial time with a deterministic machine, since a deterministic machine is a special case of a probabilistic machine (see [A1]). However, many problems have been known to be in \mathcal{BPP} but not known to be in \mathcal{P} .

Moreover, what about the true relationship between the complexity classes \mathcal{BPP} and \mathcal{BQP} ? It is proved in [BV97] that $\mathcal{BPP} \subseteq \mathcal{BQP}$ meaning that every language decidable in polynomial-time by a probabilistic Turing machine (with an error probability bounded by $1/3$ for all instances) is decidable in polynomial-time by a quantum Turing machine (with an error probability bounded by $1/3$ for all instances), but this only tells that \mathcal{BPP} is a subset of \mathcal{BQP} and it tells nothing about whether $\mathcal{BPP} \neq \mathcal{BQP}$ or not. It is conjectured in [BBBV97] that it will not be possible to conclusively prove that $\mathcal{BQP} \neq \mathcal{BPP}$ without resolving the major open problem $\mathcal{P} \stackrel{?}{=} \mathcal{PSPACE}$. In fact, if it were shown to be that $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{PSPACE}$ then it immediate follows that $\mathcal{BPP} = \mathcal{BQP}$. However, we have shown in [Lin21a, Lin21b] that $\mathcal{P} \neq \mathcal{PSPACE}$, which is still not possible to conclusively prove that $\mathcal{BQP} \neq \mathcal{BPP}$, since there is no similar technique to deal with probabilistic Turing machines by universal quantum Turing machine.

Although the aforementioned story, we indeed can show that $\mathcal{BQP} \neq \mathcal{P}$, or move precisely, $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{BQP}$ via showing that $\mathcal{P} \subset \mathcal{BPP}$ by further extending the techniques applied and developed in [Lin21a, Lin21b], thus forcefully showing that *quantum computers are rigorously powerful than traditional computers*. Previously, the true relationship between \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{BQP} is unknown. Following Shor's result that *prime factoring* is solvable in quantum polynomial-time, it is natural to ask that to what extension can quantum computers be powerful? Whether all problems of \mathcal{NP} can be efficiently solved in quantum polynomial-time? Although, it was showed in [BBBV97] that relative to an oracle chosen uniformly at random with probability 1 the class \mathcal{NP} can not be solved on a quantum Turing machine in time $o(2^{\frac{n}{2}})$, this does not necessarily imply $\mathcal{NP} \not\subset \mathcal{BQP}$ because the oracle result is not a necessary and sufficient condition

for $\mathcal{NP} \not\subseteq \mathcal{BQP}$, which means that the exact relationship between \mathcal{BQP} and \mathcal{NP} is unknown.

As we mentioned earlier, many problems have been known to be in \mathcal{BPP} but not known to be in \mathcal{P} . But, it seems that the past several decades have seen several interesting result since the area of *derandomization*, which have also fascinated a great deal of attention (see, for example [NW94, IW97, IW01, IKW02, MV99, STV01, ACR98]), giving strong evidence that we can often eliminate randomness from probabilistic computation, and it is conjectured that $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$ (see [CRT98] for more recent advances towards proving $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$). Loosely speaking, the field of *derandomization* is trying to remove the randomness from the probabilistic algorithms (i.e., deterministic simulation of probabilistic algorithms) and the main goal in this field is that the theorists try to attack the larger question of whether *all* efficient probabilistic algorithms can be derandomized, e.g. does $\mathcal{BPP} = \mathcal{P}$? One of the highlights of this line of work is the construction of [IW97], which implies that $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$ (see [Imp02] for a survey).

One natural tool or main basic method used to derandomize algorithms is to use a (complexity-theoretic) *pseudorandom generators* (PRGs) [NW94] that expands a small, truly random input into a larger, random-looking output. The (complexity-theoretic) pseudorandom generator is a twist on the definition of a *cryptographically secure pseudorandom generator*, with the main difference allowing the generator to run in *exponential time* [AB09]. The *pseudorandom sequences* produced by PRGs are also important for cryptographic applications such as stream ciphers [CDR04]. In additional, it showed in [ACR98] that the *quick hitting set generators* (HSGs) can replace PRGs to derandomize any probabilistic *two-sided error* algorithms.

Prior to this work, the main open question in the field of *derandomization* is the old one: prove an unconditional derandomization result for \mathcal{BPP} or for the complexity class \mathcal{ZPP} (defined later). In view of the recent results (see survey [Kab02]), derandomizing \mathcal{BPP} is quite hard. Maybe, it is easier to derandomize \mathcal{ZPP} , as there are no known circuit lower bounds implied by the assumption that $\mathcal{ZPP} = \mathcal{P}$. For more details about these, see survey article [Kab02], which focuses on recent developments in the area of derandomization.

1.1. *Main Results.* In this paper, the main results can be stated in the following way. Although recent research gives strong indications that adding randomness does not in fact change what is solvable in polynomial-time, i.e., the conjecture that $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$, we are in doubt that this maybe not be the true case, because a proof of $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$ does not exist. Moreover, in the light of [Imp02], possibilities concerning the power of randomized algorithms include:

1. Randomization always helps for intractable problems, i.e., $\mathcal{EXPTIME} = \mathcal{BPP}$.
2. The extent to which randomization helps is problem-specific. It can reduce complexity by any amount from not at all to exponentially.
3. True randomness is never needed, and random choices can always be simulated deterministically, i.e., $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$.

We state our first main result to disprove the aforementioned 3th possibility:

THEOREM 1.1. *There is a language L_d accepted by no polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines, but accepted by a probabilistic Turing machine M_0 running within time $O(n^k)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$ with probability at least $\frac{2}{3}$. Further, it can be shown that $L_d \in \mathcal{BPP}$. Namely, $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{BPP}$,*

from which and together with the relationship $\mathcal{BPP} \subseteq \mathcal{BQP}$ shown in [BV97], it immediately follows that

COROLLARY 1.2. $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{BQP}$. □

The above Theorem 1.1 and Corollary 1.2 shows that quantum computers and classical probabilistic computers are rigorously powerful than traditional computers now in use.

Now let us turn to next question. Recall that the complexity class of \mathcal{RP} is defined to be that: A language L is in complexity class \mathcal{RP} if there is probabilistic polynomial-time Turing machine A running in polynomial-time such that

$$x \in L \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r[A(x) \text{ accepts}] \geq \frac{1}{2}$$

and

$$x \notin L \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r[A(x) \text{ accepts}] = 0.$$

Our next main result by applying the similar techniques to show Theorem 1.1 is the following:

THEOREM 1.3. *There is a language \widetilde{L}_d accepted by no polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines, but by a probabilistic Turing machine M_0 running within time $O(n^k)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$ with probability at least $\frac{1}{2} + \epsilon$ where $\epsilon > 0$. Further, it can be shown that $\widetilde{L}_d \in \mathcal{RP}$,*

from which it immediately follows that

COROLLARY 1.4. $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{RP}$. □

Recall that the definition of the complement of the complexity class \mathcal{RP} (the definition of complement of a complexity class is given in subsection 2.5), i.e., the complexity class $\text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$ is defined to be: A language L is in $\text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$ if there exists a probabilistic polynomial-time Turing machine A running in

polynomial-time such that

$$x \in L \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r[A(x) \text{ accepts}] = 1$$

and

$$x \notin L \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r[A(x) \text{ accepts}] \leq \frac{1}{2}.$$

Interestingly, we find that a slightly modified arguments of the technique applied to show Theorem 1.1 and Theorem 1.3 are also applicable to show $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$, i.e., the following:

THEOREM 1.5. *There is a language \widehat{L}_d accepted by no polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines, but by a probabilistic Turing machine M_0 running within time $O(n^k)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$ with probability at least $1 - \epsilon$ where $\epsilon > 0$. Further, it can be shown that $\widehat{L}_d \in \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$,*

from which it follows that

COROLLARY 1.6. $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$. □

Remark 1.1. As a matter of fact, the language \widehat{L}_d is also in \mathcal{RP} by definition, because

$$x \in \widehat{L}_d \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r[M_0(x) \text{ accepts}] = 1 - \epsilon \geq \frac{1}{2}, \text{ as } \epsilon \rightarrow 0,$$

and

$$x \notin \widehat{L}_d \Rightarrow \mathcal{P}_r[M_0(x) \text{ accepts}] = \epsilon \text{ truly tends to } 0,$$

as ϵ tends to 0, from which it follows that

$$\widehat{L}_d \in \mathcal{RP} \cap \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}.$$

Let us denote the complexity class $\mathcal{RP} \cap \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$ by \mathcal{ZPP} , then, in fact, this gives a separation of the class \mathcal{ZPP} from the class \mathcal{P} .

COROLLARY 1.7. $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{ZPP}$. □

Generally, *enumeration*¹ (see p. 51 in [Vad12]) is a derandomization technique that enables us to deterministically simulate any randomized algorithm with an exponential slowdown (i.e., $\mathcal{BPP} \subseteq \mathcal{EXPTIME} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \bigcup_{c \in \mathbb{N}_1} \text{DTIME}[2^{n^c}]$) and it is general in that it applies to all \mathcal{BPP} algorithms. However, if the algorithm for a language $L \in \mathcal{BPP}$ uses only a small number of random bits, say $O(\log n)$,

¹Not to be confused with *enumeration* discussed in Section 3 that enumeration of polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines which means to establish (1, 1) correspondence between \mathbb{N}_1 and the set $\{(M, k)\}$ of polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines. The “*enumeration*” here means something like the action of mentioning a number of things one by one.

then $L \in \mathcal{P}$ (see Proposition 3.3, p. 52 in [Vad12]). Take the language L_d in Theorem 1.1 as an example, we prove the following result:

THEOREM 1.8. *The number of random bits used by any probabilistic algorithm A which accepts the language L_d can not be reduced to $O(\log n)$.*

In [IW97], it showed that if $E \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{DTIME}[2^{O(n)}]$ has a function of circuit complexity $2^{\Omega(n)}$, then $\mathcal{BPP} = \mathcal{P}$. The Theorem 1.1 immediately implies the following

COROLLARY 1.9. *Any function in E does not have circuit complexity $2^{\Omega(n)}$. \square*

As we mentioned earlier, a main basic method used to derandomize algorithms is to use a (complexity-theoretic) *pseudorandom generators* (PRGs) and if there exists some specific PRGs, then $\mathcal{BPP} = \mathcal{P}$. We show the following:

THEOREM 1.10. *There exists no (complexity-theoretic) pseudorandom generator $G : \{0, 1\}^{l(t)} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^t$ with $l(t) = O(\log t)$.*

In [ACR98], it showed that *quick hitting set generators* (HSGs) can replace *quick pseudorandom generators* to derandomize any probabilistic *two-sided error* algorithms. An important result in [ACR98] is that if a logarithmic price quick hitting set generator exists then $\mathcal{BPP} = \mathcal{P}$. By these, we can show such a HSG does not exist.

THEOREM 1.11. *Let $k(n) = O(\log n)$. Then there exists no quick HSG $H : k(n) \rightarrow n$.*

1.2. Overview. The rest of the paper is organized as follows: For the convenience of the reader, in the next Section we will review some definitions closely associated with our discussions and fix some notation we will use in the following context. Also, some useful technical lemmas are presented in Section 2. In Section 3, we show a (1, 1) correspondence between \mathbb{N}_1 and the set of all polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine by encoding a polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine to an integer, thus showing that the set of all polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines is enumerable. Section 4 contains the construction of our probabilistic Turing machine which accepts a language L_d not in \mathcal{P} . In Section 5 we show that L_d is in \mathcal{BPP} . We show Theorem 1.3 and Theorem 1.5 in Section 6 and in Section 7, respectively. The proofs of Theorem 1.8, Theorem 1.10 and Theorem 1.11 are given in Section 8. Finally, we draw some conclusions in the last Section.

2. Definitions and Notation

In this Section, we describe the notation and notions needed in the following context.

Let \mathbb{N} denote the natural numbers

$$\{0, 1, 2, 3, \dots\}$$

where $+\infty \notin \mathbb{N}$. Furthermore, \mathbb{N}_1 denotes the set of

$$\mathbb{N} - \{0\}.$$

It is clear that there is a bijection between \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{N}_1 . To see this just let the bijection to be

$$n \mapsto n + 1$$

where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ and $n + 1 \in \mathbb{N}_1$.

The computation models we use here are the *Turing machine* as it defined in standard textbooks such as [AHU74], the *quantum Turing machines* as it defined in [BV97] and the *probabilistic Turing machines* as it defined in [San69, San71, Gil77].

2.1. Polynomial-time Deterministic Turing Machines. To give a definition of polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine, let us first quote the definition of deterministic Turing machine as follows:

Definition 2.1 (*k*-tape deterministic Turing machine, [AHU74]). A *k*-tape deterministic Turing machine (shortly, DTM) *M* is a seven-tuple $(Q, T, I, \delta, \mathfrak{b}, q_0, q_f)$ where :

- (1) *Q* is the set of states.
- (2) *T* is the set of tape symbols.
- (3) *I* is the set of input symbols; $I \subseteq T$.
- (4) $\mathfrak{b} \in T - I$, is the blank.
- (5) q_0 is the initial state.
- (6) q_f is the final (or accepting) state.
- (7) δ is the next-move function, maps a subset of $Q \times T^k$ to

$$Q \times (T \times \{L, R, S\})^k.$$

That is, for some $(k+1)$ -tuples consisting of a state and *k* tape symbols, it gives a new state and *k* pairs, each pair consisting of a new tape symbol and a direction for the tape head. Suppose

$$\delta(q, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) = (q', (a'_1, d_1), (a'_2, d_2), \dots, (a'_k, d_k)),$$

and the deterministic Turing machine is in state *q* with the *i*th tape head scanning tape symbol a_i for $1 \leq i \leq k$. Then in one move the

deterministic Turing machine enters state q' , changes symbol a_i to a'_i , and moves the i th tape head in the direction d_i for $1 \leq i \leq k$.

The notion of a nondeterministic Turing machine is similar to that of a deterministic Turing machine, except that the next-move function δ is a mapping from $Q \times T^k$ to subsets of $Q \times (T \times \{L, R, S\})^k$, stated as follows:

Definition 2.2 (k -tape nondeterministic Turing machine, [AHU74]). A k -tape nondeterministic Turing machine (shortly, NTM) M is a seven-tuple $(Q, T, I, \delta, \mathbb{b}, q_0, q_f)$ where all components have the same meaning as for the ordinary deterministic Turing machine, except that here the next-move function δ is a mapping from $Q \times T^k$ to subsets of $Q \times (T \times \{L, R, S\})^k$.

In the following, we will refer to the Turing machine as the deterministic Turing machine. And we will sometimes use DTM to denote a deterministic Turing machine.

Now, we give the definition of polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines in the following:

Definition 2.3 (Cf. [Coo00]). Formally, a polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine is a deterministic Turing machine M such that there exists $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$, for all input x of length n where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is arbitrary, $M(x)$ will halt within $n^k + k$ steps.

We represent a polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine by a tuple of (M, k) where M is the polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine itself, and k is the unique minimal degree of some polynomial $n^k + k$ such that for any input x of length n where $n \in \mathbb{N}$ is arbitrary, $M(x)$ will halt within $n^k + k$ steps. We call k the order of polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine (M, k) .

The family of languages of deterministic time complexity $T(n)$ is denoted by $\text{DTIME}[T(n)]$.

2.2. Quantum Turing machines. Now, let us turn to the notion of a *quantum Turing machine*. We present its definition as follows:

Definition 2.4 (Cf. Definition 3.2 in [BV97]). Let $\tilde{\mathbb{C}}$ be the set consisting of $\alpha \in \mathbb{C}$ such that there is a deterministic algorithm that computes the real and imaginary parts of α to within 2^{-n} in time polynomial in n . A QTM M is defined by a triplet (I, Γ, Q, δ) , where $I \subset \Gamma$ is the finite input alphabet and $\mathbb{b} \notin I$, Γ is the finite tape alphabet and $\mathbb{b} \in \Gamma$ is the blank symbol, Q is a finite set of states with an identified initial state q_0 and final state $q_f \neq q_0$, and δ ,

the quantum transition function, is a function

$$\delta : Q \times \Gamma \rightarrow \widetilde{\mathbb{C}}^{\Gamma \times Q \times \{L,R,S\}}.$$

The QTM has a two-way infinite tape of cells indexed by \mathbb{Z} and a single read/write tape head that moves along the tape.

Let S be the inner-product space of finite complex linear combinations of configurations of M with the Euclidean norm. We call each element $\psi \in S$ a superposition of M . Then QTM M defines a linear operator $U_M : S \rightarrow S$, called the time evolution operator of M , as follows: if M starts in configuration c with current state p and scanned symbol σ , then after one step M will be in superposition of configurations $\phi = \sum_i \alpha_i c_i$, where each nonzero α_i corresponds to a transition $\delta(p, \sigma, \tau, q, d)$, and c_i is the new configuration that results from applying this transition to c . Extending this map to the entire space S through linearity gives the linear time evolution operator U_M such that U_M is unitary.

The family of languages of bounded-error accepting probability for quantum Turing machines (BQTIME) is defined as follows:

Definition 2.5. A language L is in BQTIME[$T(n)$] if and only if there exists a quantum Turing machine M , such that

1. M runs for $T(n)$ time on all inputs.
2. For all $x \in L$, M accepts x with probability $\geq \frac{2}{3}$.
3. For all $x \notin L$, M accepts x with probability $\leq \frac{1}{3}$.

2.3. Probabilistic Turing machines. Generally, a *probabilistic Turing machine* is a non-deterministic Turing machine that chooses between the available transitions at each point according to some probability distribution (see [A1] for a popular introduction). There are many equivalent definitions of probabilistic Turing machine. For example, the one presented in [San69, San71] and the one given in [Gil77]. Note that the definition given in [San71] for a *probabilistic Turing machine* is more general than that given in [Gil77]. For our convenience, we follow the definition from [San71]. We should first present the definition of Santos [San71]:

Definition 2.6 ([San71], Definition 3.1). A probabilistic Turing machine (PTM) may be defined through the specification of three mutually disjoint finite nonempty set A , B , and S ; a function p from $S \times U \times V \times S$ into $[0, 1]$ where $U = A \cup B$, $V = U \cup S \cup \{+, -, \cdot\}$, $+, -, \cdot \notin U \cup S$; and a function h from S into $[0, 1]$. The functions p and h satisfy the following conditions:

1. $\sum_{v \in V} \sum_{s' \in S} p(s, u, v, s') = 1$ for every $s \in S$, $u \in U$, and
2. $\sum_{s \in S} h(s) = 1$.

The sets A and B are, respectively, the printing and auxiliary alphabets. The set S is the set of internal states. $h(s)$ is the probability that the initial state is s and $p(s, u, v, s')$ gives the probability of the “next act” of the PTM given that its present state is s and input u is applied. The “next act” of a PTM is determined by v and may be any one of the conventional Turing machine operations.

1. $v \in U$: replace u by v on the scanned square and go to state s' .
2. $v = +$: move one square to the right and go to state s' .
3. $v = -$: move one square to the left and go to state s' .
4. $v = \cdot$: stop.
5. $v \in S$: go to either v or s' depending on a given random set.

The function p and h will be referred to as the transition function and initial distribution, respectively. If h is concentrated at a single state $s_0 \in S$, i.e., $h(s_0) = 1$ and $h(s) = 0$ for $s \neq s_0$, then we say that s_0 is the initial state.

Definition 2.7 ([San71], Definition 3.2). Let $Z = (A, B, S, p, h)$ be a PTM. Then

1. Z is deterministic iff the range of both p and h consists of only two numbers, 0 and 1.
2. Z is simple iff $p(s, u, v, s') = 0$ for every $s, s' \in S, u \in A \cup B$, and $v \in S$.

Remark 2.1. Observe that the conventional Turing machines are deterministic PTM. In the case of a deterministic PTM, the transition function p is uniquely determined by the set $\{(s, u, v, s') : p(s, u, v, s') = 1 \text{ and } v \neq \cdot\}$.

By Definition 2.6 and Definition 2.7, we can adapt the definition of *probabilistic Turing machine* based on Definition 2.2, i.e., the definition of a non-deterministic Turing machine:

Definition 2.8 (Probabilistic Turing machine, adaptation from Definition 2.6). A k -tape probabilistic Turing machine (shortly, PTM) M is a 8-tuple $(Q, T, I, \delta, \mathbb{b}, q_0, q_f, \mathcal{P}_r)$ where:

- (1) Q is the set of states.
- (2) T is the set of tape symbols.
- (3) I is the set of input symbols; $I \subseteq T$.
- (4) $\mathbb{b} \in T - I$, is the blank.
- (5) q_0 is the initial state.
- (6) q_f is the final (or accepting) state.
- (7) δ is the next-move function, maps a subset of $Q \times T^k$ to subsets of

$$Q \times (T \times \{L, R, S\})^k.$$

That is, for some $(k+1)$ -tuples consisting of a state and k tape symbols, it gives a new state and k pairs, each pair consisting of a set of pairs of new tape symbol and a direction for the tape head. Suppose

$$\delta(q, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) = \{(q'_i, (a'_{1,i}, d_{1,i}), (a'_{2,i}, d_{2,i}), \dots, (a'_{k,i}, d_{k,i}))\}_{1 \leq i \leq n}$$

for some $n \geq 1$.

(8) \mathcal{P}_r is a function (probability distribution) fulfills the condition: if the transition

$$\delta(q, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) = (q'_i, (a'_{1,i}, d_{1,i}), (a'_{2,i}, d_{2,i}), \dots, (a'_{k,i}, d_{k,i}))$$

with probability p_i for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, i.e.,

$$\mathcal{P}_r(\delta(q, a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k) = (q'_i, (a'_{1,i}, d_{1,i}), (a'_{2,i}, d_{2,i}), \dots, (a'_{k,i}, d_{k,i}))) = p_i$$

for all $1 \leq i \leq n$, then

$$\sum_{1 \leq i \leq n} p_i = 1,$$

and $p_i \geq 0$ for every i .

The family of languages of bounded-error accepting probability for probabilistic Turing machines (BPTIME) is defined as follows:

Definition 2.9. A language L is in $\text{BPTIME}[T(n)]$ if and only if there exists a probabilistic Turing machine M , such that

1. M runs for $T(n)$ time on all inputs.
2. For all $x \in L$, M accepts x with probability $\geq \frac{2}{3}$.
3. For all $x \notin L$, M accepts x with probability $\leq \frac{1}{3}$.

2.4. Complexity classes \mathcal{P} , \mathcal{BPP} and \mathcal{BQP} . Let w be an input, we use $|w|$ to denote the length of w . If for every input w of length n all computations of a deterministic (or, probabilistic/quantum) Turing machine M end in less than or equal to $T(n)$ steps, then M is said to be a deterministic (or, probabilistic/quantum) $T(n)$ *time-bounded Turing machine*, or is said to be of *time complexity $T(n)$* .

The complexity classes \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{BPP} (see [A2] for a popular introduction) are respectively defined to be the class of languages:

$$\mathcal{P} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_1} \text{DTIME}[n^k],$$

and

$$\mathcal{BPP} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_1} \text{BPTIME}[n^k].$$

The complexity class \mathcal{BQP} is defined to be the class of languages:

$$\mathcal{BQP} = \bigcup_{k \in \mathbb{N}_1} \text{BQTIME}[n^k].$$

2.5. *Complement of a Complexity Class.* For a complexity class \mathcal{C} , its complement is denoted by $\text{co}\mathcal{C}$ (see [Pap94]), i.e.,

$$\text{co}\mathcal{C} = \{\bar{L} : L \in \mathcal{C}\},$$

where L is a decision problem, and \bar{L} is the complement of L . For example, $\text{co}\mathcal{P}$ is the complement of \mathcal{P} , and $\text{co}\mathcal{NP}$ is the complement of \mathcal{NP} . Note that, the complement of a decision problem L is defined as the decision problem whose answer is “yes” whenever the input is a “no” input of L , and vice versa.

2.6. *Complexity Classes \mathcal{RP} , $\text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$ and \mathcal{ZPP} .* With the above definitions at hands, the complexity classes of \mathcal{RP} , $\text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$ and \mathcal{ZPP} can be respectively defined as follows:

Definition 2.10 (Cf. Definition 2.9 in [Vad12]). \mathcal{RP} is the class of languages L for which there exists a polynomial-time probabilistic Turing machine M such that

1. M runs in polynomial time in the input size on all inputs.
2. $x \in L$ if M accepts x with probability $\geq \frac{1}{2}$.
3. $x \notin L$ if M accepts x with probability 0.

Then class $\text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$ is the complement of \mathcal{RP} . A more intuitive definition is the following:

Definition 2.11 (Cf. Definition 2.11 in [Vad12]). $\text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$ is the class of languages L for which there exists a polynomial-time probabilistic Turing machine M such that

1. M runs in polynomial time in the input size on all inputs.
2. $x \in L$ if M accepts x with probability 1.
3. $x \notin L$ if M accepts x with probability $\leq \frac{1}{2}$.

For simplicity, the class \mathcal{ZPP} can equivalently be defined as $\mathcal{RP} \cap \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$:

Definition 2.12. $\mathcal{ZPP} \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \mathcal{RP} \cap \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$.

2.7. *Useful Lemma and Corollary.* In regard to the time complexity of k -tape deterministic (or, nondeterministic) Turing machine and that of single-tape deterministic (or, nondeterministic) Turing machine, we quote the following useful Lemma, extracted from [AHU74] (see Lemma 10.1 and Corollary

1 to Lemma 10.1 in [AHU74]), which play important roles in the following context:

LEMMA 2.1 (Lemma 10.1 in [AHU74]). *If L is accepted by a k -tape nondeterministic $T(n)$ time-bounded Turing machine, then L is accepted by a single-tape nondeterministic $O(T^2(n))$ time-bounded Turing machine.* \square

The deterministic version of the above lemma is as follows:

COROLLARY 2.2 (Corollary 1 in [AHU74] to Lemma 10.1; See also Theorem 6 in [HS65] and Theorem 2.1 in [Pap94]). *If L is accepted by a k -tape deterministic $T(n)$ time-bounded Turing machine, then L is accepted by a single-tape deterministic $O(T^2(n))$ time-bounded Turing machine.* \square

2.8. *Efficient Simulation.* The following theorem about efficient simulation is needed a few times, and its proof is present in [HS66], see also [AB09].

LEMMA 2.3 ([AB09], see also [HS66]). *There exists a Turing machine U such that for every $x, \alpha \in \{0, 1\}^*$, $U(x, \alpha) = M_\alpha(x)$, where M_α denotes the Turing machine represented by α . Moreover, if M_α halts on input x within $T(|x|)$ steps, then $U(x, \alpha)$ halts within $cT(|x|) \log T(|x|)$ steps, where $\log n$ means $\log_2 n$ and c is a constant independent of $|x|$ and depending only on M_α 's alphabet size, number of tapes, and number of states.* \square

Finally, more information and premise lemmas will be given along the way to prove our main result.

3. Enumeration of Polynomial-Time Deterministic Turing Machines

In the following context, if a polynomial-time Turing machine (see Definition 2.3) runs at most $|x|^k$ steps for any input x , then we often say that it runs within time $O(n^{k-1})$ rather than $O(n^k)$.

We have represented a polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine by a tuple of (M, k) in subsection 2.1, where M is the polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine itself, and k is the unique minimal degree of some polynomial $n^k + k$.

Remark 3.1. One of the conveniences of tuple-representation (M, k) of a polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine in this way is, of course, to conveniently control the running time of the probabilistic Turing machine M_0 constructed in Theorem 4.1 in Section 4 below, so that it facilitates our analysis of the time complexity of M_0 , i.e., to easily show the fact of Theorem 4.2.

By Corollary 2.2, we can restrict ourselves to single-tape deterministic Turing machines. So, in the following context, by polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines we mean single-tape polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines.

To obtain our main result, we need to *enumerate* all of the polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines, so that for each nonnegative integer i there is a unique tuple of (M, k) associated with i (i.e., to define a function from \mathbb{N}_1 to the set of all polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines $\{(M, k)\}$), such that we can refer to the j -th polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine. For convenience of the reader, let us quote the notion of an enumeration of a set as follows:

Definition 3.1 ([Rud76], p. 27, Definition 2.7). By an enumeration of set T , we mean a function e defined on the set \mathbb{N}_1 of all positive integers. If $e(n) = x_n \in T$, for $n \in \mathbb{N}_1$, it is customary to denote the enumeration e by the symbol $\{x_n\}$, or sometimes by x_1, x_2, x_3, \dots . The values of e , that is, the elements $x_n \in T$, are called the *terms* of the enumeration.

To achieve our goals, we first use the method presented in [AHU74], p. 407, to encode a single-tape deterministic Turing machine into an integer.

Without loss of generality, we can make the following assumptions about the representation of a single-tape deterministic Turing machine with input alphabet $\{0, 1\}$ because that will be all we need:

- (1) The states are named

$$q_1, q_2, \dots, q_s$$

for some s , with q_1 the initial state and q_s the accepting state.

- (2) The input alphabet is $\{0, 1\}$.
- (3) The tape alphabet is

$$\{X_1, X_2, \dots, X_t\}$$

for some t , where $X_1 = \mathbb{b}$, $X_2 = 0$, and $X_3 = 1$.

- (4) The next-move function δ is a list of quintuples of the form

$$(q_i, X_j, q_k, X_l, D_m),$$

meaning that

$$\delta(q_i, X_j) = (q_k, X_l, D_m),$$

and D_m is the direction, L , R , or S , if $m = 1, 2$, or 3 , respectively. We assume this quintuple is encoded by the string

$$10^i 10^j 10^k 10^l 10^m 1.$$

- (5) The deterministic Turing machine itself is encoded by concatenating in any order the codes for each of the quintuples in its next-move function. Additional 1's may be prefixed to the string if desired. The result will be some string of 0's and 1's, beginning with 1, which we can interpret as an integer.

Next, we encode the order of (M, k) to be $10^k 1$ so that the tuple (M, k) can be encoded by concatenating the binary strings representing M itself and $10^k 1$ together. Now the tuple (M, k) is encoded as a binary string, which can be explained as an integer.

Any integer that cannot be decoded is deemed to represent the trivial polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine with an empty next-move function by this encoding. Every polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine will appear infinitely often in the enumeration since, given a polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine, we can prefix 1's at will to find larger and larger integers representing the same set of the polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine of (M, k) . We denote such a set of the polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine by \widehat{M}_j , where j is the integer representing (M, k) . The reader will easily get that we have defined a surjective function e from \mathbb{N}_1 to the set $\{(M, k)\}$ of all polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines, which is consistent with the Definition 3.1.

Furthermore, we in fact have defined a $(1, 1)$ correspondence between the set $\{(M, k)\}$ of all polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines and \mathbb{N}_1 if any integer that cannot be decoded is deemed to represent the trivial polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine, from which we have reached the similar case to p. 241 of [Tur37], i.e., the set $\{(M, k)\}$ of all polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines are therefore enumerable.

Remark 3.2. There is another way to *enumerate* all of the polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines without encoding the order of polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines into their representation. To do so, we need the *Cantor pairing function* :

$$\pi : \mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{N}$$

defined by

$$\pi(k_1, k_2) := \frac{1}{2}(k_1 + k_2)(k_1 + k_2 + 1) + k_2$$

where $k_1, k_2 \in \mathbb{N}$. Since the Cantor pairing function (see Figure 1 below which is from [A5]) is invertible (see [A5]), it is a bijection between $\mathbb{N} \times \mathbb{N}$ and \mathbb{N} . As we have shown that any polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine itself is an integer, we can place any polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine M and its order k to the tuple (M, k) and use the Cantor pairing function to map the tuple (M, k) to an integer in \mathbb{N}_1 . Recall that there is a bijection

between \mathbb{N} and \mathbb{N}_1 . Obviously, the inverse of such Cantor pairing function is an enumeration of the set $\{(M, k)\}$. For more complete details, see [Lin21a].




Figure 1. Cantor pairing function

4. Diagonalization against Polynomial-Time Deterministic Turing Machines by A Probabilistic Turing Machine

The *diagonalization* technique is a powerful technique to give space and time hierarchies for classical Turing machines, e.g., see [Coo73, HS65, SHL65]. For more details about this technique, we refer the reader to the Turing's original article [Tur37] or the survey article [For00].

Now, our task is to design a four-tape probabilistic Turing machine M_0 which treats its input string x both as an encoding of a tuple (M, k) of deterministic $n^k + k$ time-bounded Turing machine M and also as the input to M . One of the capabilities possessed by M_0 is the ability to simulate any a

deterministic Turing machine, given its specification. Before to the beginning, suppose that M_0 has two specially designated states: the pretended accept state q_{pa} and the pretended reject state q_{pr} , which play important role in what follows. We shall have M_0 determine whether the deterministic $T(n) = n^k + k$ time-bounded Turing machine (M, k) accepts the input x without using more than $O(T(n) \log T(n))$ steps (by Lemma 2.3). If M accepts x within in time $T(n)$, then M_0 transfers its next-state to the state q_{pa} . Otherwise, M_0 transfers its next-state to the state q_{pr} . Note that the states q_{acc} and q_{rej} are respectively the actual accept state and the actual reject state of M_0 , which will be added to M_0 lastly.

Let $\lambda \in (0, 1)$ be a rational and $\epsilon > 0$ be any a rational. The final step of M_0 is that, if M_0 is in the state of q_{pr} , then M_0 transfers its next-state from the state q_{pr} to the state q_{acc} with probability $\lambda + \epsilon$ and to the state q_{rej} with probability $1 - (\lambda + \epsilon)$ then halts. Otherwise, M_0 transfers its next-state from the state q_{pa} to the state q_{acc} with probability $1 - (\lambda + \epsilon)$ and to the state q_{rej} with probability $\lambda + \epsilon$ then halts, which is illustrated by Figure 2 below.




Figure 2. The probabilistic transitions of M_0 and the corresponding probabilities.

Concretely, we are going to show the following:

THEOREM 4.1. *There exists a language L_d accepted by a probabilistic Turing machine M_0 but by no polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines.*

Proof. Let M_0 be a four-tape probabilistic Turing machine which operates as follows on an input string x of length of n .

- (1) M_0 decodes the tuple encoded by x . If x is not the encoding of some single-tape polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine \widehat{M}_j for some j then reject the input, else determines t , the number of tape symbols used by \widehat{M}_j ; s , its number of states; and k , its order of polynomial. The third tape of M_0 can be used as “scratch” memory to calculate t .
- (2) Then M_0 lays off on its second tape n blocks of

$$\lceil \log t \rceil$$

cells each, the blocks being separated by single cell holding a marker #, i.e., there are

$$(1 + \lceil \log t \rceil)n$$

cells in all. Each tape symbol occurring in a cell of \widehat{M}_j 's tape will be encoded as a binary number in the corresponding block of the second tape of M_0 . Initially, M_0 places \widehat{M}_j 's input, in binary coded form, in the blocks of tape 2, filling the unused blocks with the code for the blank.

- (3) On tape 3, M_0 sets up a block of

$$\lceil \log(n^{k+1} - 2) \rceil$$

cells, initialized to all 0's. Tape 3 is used as a counter to count up to

$$n^{k+1} - 2.^2$$

- (4) M_0 simulates \widehat{M}_j , using tape 1, its input tape, to determine the moves of \widehat{M}_j and using tape 2 to simulate the tape of \widehat{M}_j . The moves of \widehat{M}_j are counted in binary in the block of tape 3, and tape 4 is used to hold the state of \widehat{M}_j . If \widehat{M}_j accepts, then M_0 transfers its next-state to the state q_{pa} , or if the counter on tape 3 overflows (because we should finally reject the inputs which lead to overflows of the counter on tape 3). M_0 transfers its next-state to the state q_{pr} if \widehat{M}_j halts without accepting.

Remark 4.1. So far, the above design of M_0 , in fact, is a universal deterministic Turing machine, but it is also a probabilistic Turing machine. It just

²Suppose that \widehat{M}_j is a deterministic $T(n)$ time-bounded Turing machine where

$$T(n) = n^k + k,$$

then by Lemma 2.3, the simulation can be done within time $T(n) \log T(n)$ which is less than $n^{k+1} - 2$. Further, there are 2 additional steps (described by the transition rules (1) and (2) below) to run after completion of the simulation, so we set the counter to count up to $n^{k+1} - 2$ such that the total steps of M_0 running are at most n^{k+1} .

simulates any a polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine, but does no diagonalization operations at all.

To finish our design, we add some additional probabilistic transition rules into M_0 : For any 4-tuple $X = (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) \in \{0, 1\}^4$, where a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4 are tape-symbol of M_0 but the blank \mathbb{b} and the delimiter $\#$ (appearing on tape 2):

$$(1) \quad \begin{aligned} \delta(q_{pa}, X) &= (q_{pa}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) && \text{with probability 1} \\ \delta(q_{pr}, X) &= (q_{pr}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) && \text{with probability 1.} \end{aligned}$$

Note that M_0 's tape-alphabet is $\{0, 1, \mathbb{b}, \#\}$ where $\#$ appears on tape 2. Thus, the probabilistic transition rules (1) means that for any

$$X = (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4) \in \{0, 1\}^4,$$

when M_0 in state q_{pa} or q_{pr} , it will keep its state in q_{pa} or q_{pr} unchanged, and the tuple of tape-symbol $X = (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ will be rewritten, i.e., the tuple of tape-symbols $X = (a_1, a_2, a_3, a_4)$ will be replaced by $(a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4)$ with probability 1 and it will keep its read/write heads stationary. Of course, we should suppose that when entering into the state q_{pa} or q_{pr} , M_0 's tape-heads scan the tape symbols 0 or 1 but the symbol \mathbb{b} or $\#$, which is not hard to implement.

Remark 4.2. In the above, M_0 does not rewrite the contents of tape 1 and tape 4, because tape 1 is the input to M_0 , which are constants during the simulation for a fixed input to M_0 ; and tape 4 denotes the states of \widehat{M}_j , so the contents of tape 4 are also constants during the simulation of a fixed input to M_0 . Thus, we decide not to rewrite them, i.e., not to replace them by \mathbb{b} s to make M_0 look more *well-behaved*.

Let $\lambda = \frac{2}{3}$ and ϵ be an arbitrary small rational. Then, we add two actual halting states (when M_0 enters into these states, it will halt with no more transitions), i.e., q_{acc} and q_{rej} , into M_0 which denote the actual accept state and the actual reject state of M_0 , respectively. Now, since the simulation of a fixed input has already completed, we are at the point to let M_0 do the diagonalization operations by adding the following probabilistic transition rules

into M_0 . For any $X = (a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4)$ where $a_1, a_4 \in \{0, 1\}$:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \delta(q_{pa}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{rej}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\
 & \quad \text{with probability } \frac{2}{3} + \epsilon \\
 & \delta(q_{pa}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{acc}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\
 & \quad \text{with probability } \frac{1}{3} - \epsilon \\
 (2) \quad & \delta(q_{pr}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{acc}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\
 & \quad \text{with probability } \frac{2}{3} + \epsilon \\
 & \delta(q_{pr}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{rej}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\
 & \quad \text{with probability } \frac{1}{3} - \epsilon.
 \end{aligned}$$

Remark 4.3. After doing so, M_0 is not a universal deterministic Turing machine again, it becomes a probabilistic Turing machine which can simulate any polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines and can flip the answers probabilistically (i.e., do the diagonalization operations). Most importantly, M_0 does not appear in the enumeration e , since the probabilistic transitions with probability less than 1 and greater than 0 are not encoded in a similar way presented in Section 3 like the polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines.

The probabilistic Turing machine M_0 described above is of time complexity, say S , which is currently unknown. According to Lemma 2.1 (regarding a probabilistic Turing machine as a nondeterministic Turing machine with probability distribution on the set of possible next-moves), M_0 is equivalent to a single-tape probabilistic $O(S^2)$ time-bounded Turing machine, and it of course accepts some language L_d .

Then for any $x \in L_d$, M_0 accepts x with probability $\frac{2}{3} + \epsilon \geq \frac{2}{3}$ and for any $x \notin L_d$, M_0 accepts x with probability $\frac{1}{3} - \epsilon \leq \frac{1}{3}$. See Figure 3 below for more clear about the accepting conditions.

Suppose now L_d were accepted by some, say, the i -th deterministic Turing machine in the enumeration e which is a deterministic $T(n) = n^k + k$ time-bounded Turing machine \widehat{M}_i . Then by Lemma 2.1 we may assume that \widehat{M}_i is a single-tape deterministic Turing machine. Let \widehat{M}_i have s states and t tape




Figure 3. The transitions of states of M_0 and corresponding probabilities by setting $\lambda = \frac{2}{3}$.

symbols. Since \widehat{M}_i ³ appears infinitely often in the enumeration, and

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{T(n) \log T(n)}{n^{k+1} - 2} \\
 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \frac{(n^k + k) \log(n^k + k)}{n^{k+1} - 2} \\
 &= \lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} \left(\frac{n^k \log(n^k + k)}{n^{k+1} - 2} + \frac{k \log(n^k + k)}{n^{k+1} - 2} \right) \\
 &= 0 \\
 &< 1.
 \end{aligned}$$

So, there exists a $N_0 > 0$ such that for any $N \geq N_0$,

$$T(N) \log T(N) < N^{k+1} - 2$$

which implies that for a sufficiently long w , say $|w| \geq N_0$, and M_w denoted by such w is \widehat{M}_i , we have that

$$T(|w|) \log T(|w|) < |w|^{k+1} - 2.$$

Thus, on input w , M_0 has sufficient time to simulate M_w and reaches the state q_{pr} or q_{pa} . After running the additional 2 steps (i.e., the probabilistic transition rules (1) and (2)) to finish the diagonalization operation, M_0 accepts with probability $\geq \frac{2}{3}$ if and only if M_w rejects and accepts with probability $\leq \frac{1}{3}$ if and only if M_w accepts, which further means that $w \in L_d$ if and only if

³We know that we may prefix 1's at will to find larger and larger integers representing the same set of quintuples of the same deterministic Turing machine M_i , thus there are infinitely binary strings of sufficiently long which represents deterministic Turing machine M_i .

M_w rejects w and $w \notin L_d$ if and only if M_w accepts w . But we assumed that \widehat{M}_i accepted L_d , i.e., \widehat{M}_i agreed with M_0 on all inputs. We thus conclude that \widehat{M}_i does not exist, we obtain

$$L_d \notin \mathcal{P}.$$

□

Next, we are going to show that the probabilistic Turing machine M_0 works in time $O(n^k)$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$:

THEOREM 4.2. *The probabilistic Turing machine M_0 constructed in proof of Theorem 4.1 runs in time $O(n^k)$ for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$.*

Proof. The quickest way to show this theorem is to prove that for any input w to M_0 , there is a corresponding positive integer $i_w \in \mathbb{N}_1$ such that M_0 runs at most $|w|^{i_w+1}$ steps.

On the one hand, if the input x encodes a deterministic $T(n)$ time-bounded Turing machine, say $T(n) = O(n^k)$, then M_0 runs at most

$$|x|^{k+1}$$

steps by the construction (the simulation can be completed in $|x|^{k+1} - 2$ and to halts itself, there are 2 additional steps to run). This means that k is the required positive integer (i.e., $i_w = k$) in this case. This holds true for all polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines as input to M_0 with k the order of the corresponding polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine.

But on the other hand, if the input x does not encode some polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine, then it rejects and the running time of M_0 is within $O(|x|)$ (i.e., M_0 runs at most $|x|^2$ steps) which means 1 is the required positive integer. So M_0 is a probabilistic

$$S(n) = \max\{n^{k+1}, n^2\}$$

time-bounded Turing machine for any $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$. That is, M_0 is a probabilistic

$$O(n^k)$$

time-bounded Turing machine for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$. □

5. L_d is in \mathcal{BPP}

Next, we are going to show the language L_d is in the class \mathcal{BPP} . Of course, the proof of $L_d \in \mathcal{BPP}$ is basically the same as to prove that the diagonalization language in [Lin21a] is in \mathcal{NP} (see Section 5 in [Lin21a]). For completeness of the paper and for simplicity, we only present the simpler proof as follows:

THEOREM 5.1. *The language L_d accepted by the probabilistic Turing machine M_0 is in \mathcal{BPP} .*

Proof. We first define the family of languages

$$\{L_d^i\}_{i \in \mathbb{N}_1}$$

by adding a new tape to M_0 as a counter to count up to

$$n^{i+1},$$

which means that M_0 turns off when M_0 continues to run 2 steps after the counter of tape 3 exceeding $n^{i+1} - 2$ or when the counter of the newly added tape exceeds n^{i+1} :

$L_d^i \stackrel{\text{def}}{=} \text{language accepted by } M_0 \text{ running within time } O(n^i) \text{ for fixed } i \in \mathbb{N}_1.$

That is, M_0 turns off mandatorily when its moves made by M_0 during the computation exceeds n^{i+1} steps.

Then by construction, M_0 runs at most $|w|^{i_w+1}$ steps for any input w where $i_w \in \mathbb{N}_1$ (i.e., M_0 runs within time $O(n^i)$ for any $i \in \mathbb{N}_1$, see Theorem 4.2), we thus have

$$(3) \quad L_d = \bigcup_{i \in \mathbb{N}_1} L_d^i.$$

Furthermore,

$$L_d^i \subseteq L_d^{i+1}, \quad \text{for each fixed } i \in \mathbb{N}_1$$

since for any word $w \in L_d^i$ accepted by M_0 within $O(n^i)$ steps, it surely can be accepted by M_0 within $O(n^{i+1})$ steps, i.e.,

$$w \in L_d^{i+1}.$$

This gives that for any fixed $i \in \mathbb{N}_1$,

$$(4) \quad L_d^1 \subseteq L_d^2 \subseteq \dots \subseteq L_d^i \subseteq L_d^{i+1} \subseteq \dots$$

Now, we assume that

$$L_d \notin \mathcal{BPP},$$

then there must exists at least a fixed $i \in \mathbb{N}_1$ such that

$$L_d^i \notin \mathcal{BPP}.$$

But by definition, L_d^i is the language accepted by the probabilistic Turing machine M_0 running within time $n^{i+1} + (i + 1)$, i.e.,

$$L_d^i \in \text{BPTIME}[n^i],$$

which is clear a contradiction. We thus can claim that such an i can not be found. Equivalently,

$$(5) \quad L_d^i \in \mathcal{BPP} \quad \text{for all } i \in \mathbb{N}_1,$$

which further implies

$$L_d \in \mathcal{BPP},$$

as required. □

Now we are naturally at the point to present the proof of Theorem 1.1:

Proof of Theorem 1.1. It is obvious that Theorem 1.1 is an immediate consequence of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 5.1. □

6. Proof of $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{RP}$

The proof of Theorem 1.3 is basically the same as that of Theorem 1.1, except that we should replace L_d with \widetilde{L}_d in the proof of Theorem 4.1 and replace the probabilistic transition rules given by (2) with the following:

$$(6) \quad \begin{aligned} & \delta(q_{pa}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{rej}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\ & \quad \text{with probability } 1 - \epsilon \\ & \delta(q_{pa}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{acc}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\ & \quad \text{with probability } \epsilon \\ & \delta(q_{pr}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{acc}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\ & \quad \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} + \epsilon \\ & \delta(q_{pr}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{rej}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\ & \quad \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon \end{aligned}$$

for any $X = (a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4)$ where $a_1, a_4 \in \{0, 1\}$.

For clarity, the modified probabilistic transition rules (6) are shown in Figure 4 below, and the reminder is the same as proof of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2. Next, the required language \widetilde{L}_d can be obtained as ϵ tends to 0.

Now, we are able to see that for $x \in \widetilde{L}_d$,

$$\mathcal{P}_r[M_0(x) \text{ accepts}] \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

and for $x \notin \widetilde{L}_d$,

$$\mathcal{P}_r[M_0(x) \text{ accepts}] = 0.$$




Figure 4. The transitions of states and corresponding probabilities for $\widetilde{L}_d \in \mathcal{RP}$.

Moreover, by the similar arguments appearing in the proof of Theorem 4.1, it is clear that $\widetilde{L}_d \notin \mathcal{P}$. The rest to show $\widetilde{L}_d \in \mathcal{RP}$ is similar to the proof of Theorem 5.1. \square

7. Proof of $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathbf{co}\text{-}\mathcal{RP}$

The proof of Theorem 1.5 is also basically the same as that of Theorem 1.1, except that we should add an additional state q_{uk} of “unknown” into M_0 (when M_0 is in state q_{unk} , it should print a symbol representing the meaning of “unknown” for a fixed input and then halts) and replace L_d with \widehat{L}_d in the proof of Theorem 4.1, and further replace the probabilistic transition rules given by (2) with the following:

$$\begin{aligned}
 & \delta(q_{pa}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{rej}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\
 & \quad \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} - \epsilon \\
 & \delta(q_{pa}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{uk}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\
 & \quad \text{with probability } \frac{1}{2} \\
 (7) \quad & \delta(q_{pa}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{acc}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\
 & \quad \text{with probability } \epsilon \\
 & \delta(q_{pr}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{acc}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\
 & \quad \text{with probability } 1 - \epsilon \\
 & \delta(q_{pr}, a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4) = (q_{rej}, (a_1, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (\mathbb{b}, S), (a_4, S)) \\
 & \quad \text{with probability } \epsilon
 \end{aligned}$$

for any $X = (a_1, \mathbb{b}, \mathbb{b}, a_4)$ where $a_1, a_4 \in \{0, 1\}$.

For clarity, the modified probabilistic transition rules (7) are shown in Figure 5 below, and the reminder is the same as proofs of Theorem 4.1 and Theorem 4.2. Next, the required language \widehat{L}_d can be obtained as ϵ tends to 0.

At this point, it is clear that for $x \in \widehat{L}_d$,

$$\mathcal{P}_r[M_0(x) \text{ accepts}] = 1,$$

and for $x \notin \widehat{L}_d$,

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{P}_r[M_0(x) \text{ accepts}] &= 0 \\
 &< \frac{1}{2}.
 \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, by the similar arguments appearing in the proof of Theorem 4.1, it is clear that $\widehat{L}_d \notin \mathcal{P}$. The rest to show $\widehat{L}_d \in \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$ is similar to the proof of Theorem 5.1. \square

Remark 7.1. As a matter of fact, \widehat{L}_d is also in \mathcal{RP} since for $x \in \widehat{L}_d$,

$$\mathcal{P}_r[M_0 \text{ accepts } x] = 1 \geq \frac{1}{2},$$

as ϵ tends to 0. For $x \notin \widehat{L}_d$,

$$\mathcal{P}_r[M_0 \text{ accepts } x] = 0,$$

as ϵ tends to 0. Thus, we can conclude that

$$\widehat{L}_d \in \mathcal{RP} \cap \text{co-}\mathcal{RP},$$

which finishes the proof of Corollary 1.7.




Figure 5. The transitions of states of M_0 and corresponding probabilities for $\widehat{L}_d \in \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$.

8. Randomness Does Help

Since the 1970s, scientists in *theoretical computer science* community have been wondering how necessary is the use of randomness in algorithm applications. Currently, as we all know, the use of randomness has become a very important tool in the design of efficient algorithm for several important problems. Furthermore, probabilistic algorithms are often the simpler ones to solve a given problem, or the most efficient [ACR98].

In this Section, we prove our main results that randomness can not be eliminated, i.e., it plays an important and indispensable role in probabilistic algorithm design.

8.1. *Eliminating Randomness by Enumeration Method.* A direction studied for to prove $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$ relies on the theory of derandomization, i.e., the design of general methods that allow an efficient deterministic simulation of probabilistic algorithms. One can always remove randomization with at most an exponential slowdown (see [Vad12]), which means that $\mathcal{BPP} \subseteq \mathcal{EXPTIME}$. As we mentioned earlier, the proof of $\mathcal{BPP} \subseteq \mathcal{EXPTIME}$ is via enumeration method, but the enumeration method is infeasible, since it takes exponential time. However, if the algorithm uses only a small number of random bits, it is feasible, as shown by the following:

PROPOSITION 8.1 (Proposition 3.3 in [Vad12]). *If L has a probabilistic polynomial-time algorithm that runs in time $t(n)$ and uses $m(n)$ random bits, then $L \in \text{DTIME}[t(n) \times 2^{m(n)}]$. In particular, if $t(n)$ is a polynomial and $m(n) = O(\log n)$, then $L \in \mathcal{P}$.*

Proof. See p. 51–52 in [Vad12]. □

As can be seen from Proposition 8.1, one way to resolve the conjecture of $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$ is the following: First show that the number of random bits for any \mathcal{BPP} algorithm can be reduced from $\text{poly}(n)$ to $O(\log n)$, and then eliminate the randomness entirely by enumeration.

We are at a point to give a proof of Theorem 1.8 naturally.

Proof of Theorem 1.8. We show Theorem 1.8 by contradiction. Suppose now that a probabilistic algorithm for the language L_d uses only $O(\log n)$ random bits, then by Proposition 8.1, we can deduce that

$$L_d \in \mathcal{P},$$

which contradicts Theorem 1.1, and thus the proof is completed. □

8.2. *Derandomize Probabilistic Algorithms by PRGs.* One among the two basic methods in the theory of derandomization is *pseudorandom generators*, as shown by the following Theorem 8.2, which exhibits how a *complexity-theoretic PRGs* can be used to derandomize probabilistic algorithms.

Let us first give the definition of pseudorandom generator:

Definition 8.1 ([NW94]). $G = \{G_n : \{0, 1\}^{l(n)} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n\}$, denoted by $G : l \rightarrow n$, is called a *pseudorandom generator* if for any circuit C of size n :

$$|\mathcal{P}_r[C(y) = 1] - \mathcal{P}_r[C(G(x)) = 1]| < 1/n,$$

where y is chosen uniformly in $\{0, 1\}^n$, and x in $\{0, 1\}^l$.

THEOREM 8.2 ([NW94]). *If there is a (complexity-theoretic) pseudorandom generator*

$$G : \{0, 1\}^{l(t)} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^t,$$

then

$$\text{BPTIME}[t(n)] \subseteq \text{DTIME}[2^{O(l(t^2(n)))}].$$

Proof. See [NW94]. □

A corollary of the above theorem is the following:

COROLLARY 8.3. *If there is a (complexity-theoretic) pseudorandom generator*

$$G : \{0, 1\}^{l(t)} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^t$$

with $l(t) = O(\log t)$, then $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$.

Proof. Let $L \in \mathcal{BPP}$. Then $L \in \text{BPTIME}[n^k]$ for some fixed $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$. By Theorem 8.2, we have

$$\begin{aligned} L &\in \text{DTIME}[2^{O(l(n^{2k}))}] \\ &= \text{DTIME}[n^{O(1)}], \quad (\text{by } l(n^{2k}) = O(2k \log n)) \\ &\subset \mathcal{P}. \end{aligned}$$

□

Now, we are at the point to give the proof of Theorem 1.10:

Proof of Theorem 1.10. Suppose to the contrary that there exists a (complexity-theoretic) pseudorandom generator $G : \{0, 1\}^{l(t)} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^t$ with $l(t) = O(\log t)$. Then by Corollary 8.3, we can deduce that

$$L_d \in \mathcal{P},$$

which is impossible by Theorem 1.1, and thus completes the proof of Theorem 1.10. □

8.3. *Derandomize Probabilistic Algorithms by HSGs.* Besides the method of pseudorandom generators, hitting set generators (HSGs) is another method studied in the theory of derandomization [ACR98].

We first give the definition of *hitting set generators*:

Definition 8.2 ([ACR98]). A *hitting set generator* (HSG) is a function $H = \{H_n : \{0, 1\}^{k(n)} \rightarrow \{0, 1\}^n, n > 0\}$ (denoted by $H : k(n) \rightarrow n$) that, for any sufficiently large n and for any n -input boolean circuit C with size at most n such that

$$\mathcal{P}_r(C(\vec{y}) = 1) \geq \frac{1}{n},$$

is required to provide *just one* “example” \vec{y} for which $C(\vec{y}) = 1$, that is, there exists $\vec{x} \in \{0, 1\}^{k(n)}$ such that $C(H_n(\vec{x})) = 1$.

An important result was shown in [ACR98], saying that:

COROLLARY 8.4 (Corollary 3.2 in [ACR98]). *Let $k(n) = O(\log n)$. If there exists a quick HSG $H : k(n) \rightarrow n$, then $\mathcal{BPP} = \mathcal{P}$.*

With the above at hands, we are naturally at a point to finish the proof of Theorem 1.11:

Proof of Theorem 1.11. Let $k(n) = O(\log n)$. Suppose to the contrary that there exists a quick HSG $H : k(n) \rightarrow n$, then by Corollary 8.4, we have $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$, which contradicts Theorem 1.1 and hence completes the proof of Theorem 1.11. \square

9. Conclusions

In conclusion, we have shown that there exists a language L_d accepted by some probabilistic Turing machine with bounded error probability $1/3$ but not by any polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines. To achieve this, we first encode any single-tape polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine into an integer by using the method presented in [AHU74], and then also encode the order of the polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine into a binary string. By concatenating the binary strings representing the polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine itself and its order together, we thus establish a $(1, 1)$ correspondence e between \mathbb{N}_1 and the set $\{(M, k)\}$ of all polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines if any integer that cannot be decoded is deemed to represent the trivial polynomial-time deterministic Turing machine. These steps are the same as [Lin21a].

Next, we design a four-tape probabilistic Turing machine M_0 which can diagonalize against all polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines. The Theorem 4.1 illustrates in detail the operation of the probabilistic Turing machine M_0 , showing that there exists a language L_d accepted by M_0 but by no polynomial-time deterministic Turing machines. We carefully analysis the running time of M_0 in Theorem 4.2, proving that M_0 runs within time

$$O(n^k)$$

for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_1$. We further show in Theorem 5.1 that

$$L_d \in \mathcal{BPP}.$$

It thus follows the Theorem 1.1.

By slightly modifying the proof of Theorem 1.1, we present the proofs of Theorem 1.3 in Section 6 and Theorem 1.5 in Section 7, showing that $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{RP}$ and $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \text{co-}\mathcal{RP}$. The similar arguments also show the result $\mathcal{P} \subsetneq \mathcal{ZPP}$.

Our result of Theorem 1.1 disproves the conjecture that $\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$. Furthermore, we prove in Section 8 that randomness is essential and useful in probabilistic algorithm design, which can be summarized by the Theorem 1.8. Specifically, we show in Section 8 that the number of random bits used by any probabilistic algorithm which accepts the language L_d can not be reduced to $O(\log n)$.

We also show negative answers about the existence of some efficient *pseudorandom generator* (PRGs) and the existence of some efficient *quick hitting*

set generators (HSGs). The detailed results are summarized by Theorem 1.10 and Theorem 1.11 in Section 8.

Lastly, the question of whether *quantum computers* are rigorously powerful than *probabilistic computers* is unknown, and showing such result that

$$\mathcal{BPP} \subsetneq \mathcal{BQP}$$

would represent a major breakthrough in complexity theory (see [NC00]), because in particular we do not know how to simulate any probabilistic Turing machine by a specific quantum Turing machine and finally flip answer. Furthermore, we know that the complexity class \mathcal{NP} having complete problems (see [Coo71]) and although we have shown that $L_d \notin \mathcal{P}$ but $L_d \in \mathcal{BPP}$, we in fact do not know whether the complexity class \mathcal{BPP} has a rich structure resembling the complexity class \mathcal{NP} shown in [Lad75], which says there exists \mathcal{NP} -intermediate languages if \mathcal{P} and \mathcal{NP} differ. Specifically and in brief, we do not know whether the language L_d is a \mathcal{BPP} -intermediate language or not.

Meanwhile, of importance is to build the physical *probabilistic computers* (being undertaken, see [FKI⁺22]) based on the result presented in this paper (i.e., traditional computers are unable to run some probabilistic algorithms) if it is more harder to build the physical *quantum computers* than to build the physical *probabilistic computers*.

References

- [A1] ANONYMOUS AUTHORS. *Probabilistic Turing machine*. Available at [this https URL.](#)
- [A2] ANONYMOUS AUTHORS. *BPP (complexity)*. Available at [this https URL.](#)
- [A3] ANONYMOUS AUTHORS. *Shor's algorithm*. Available at [this https URL.](#)
- [A4] ANONYMOUS AUTHORS. *BQP (complexity)*. Available at [this https URL.](#)
- [A5] ANONYMOUS AUTHORS. *Pairing function*. Available at [this https URL.](#)
- [AB09] SANJEEV ARORA AND BOAZ BARAK. *Computational Complexity: A Modern Approach*. Cambridge University Press, 2009.
- [ACR98] A. E. ANDREEV, ANDREA E. F. CLEMENTI AND JOSÉ D. P. ROLIM. *A New General Derandomization Method*. Journal of the ACM, Vol. 45, No. 1, January 1998, pp. 179–213.
- [AHU74] ALFRED V. AHO, JOHN E. HOPCROFT AND JEFFREY D. ULLMAN. *The Design and Analysis of Computer Algorithms*. Addison–Wesley Publishing Company, Reading, California, 1974.
- [BV97] ETHAN BERNSTEIN AND UMESH VAZIRANI. *Quantum Complexity Theory*. SIAM Journal on Computing, Vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 1411–1473, October 1997.
- [BBBV97] CHARLES H. BENNETT, ETHAN BERNSTEIN, GILLES BRASSARD AND UMESH VAZIRANI. *Strengths and Weaknesses of quantum computing*.

- SIAM Journal on Computing, Vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 1510–1523, October 1997.
- [Coo71] STEPHEN A. COOK. *The complexity of theorem-proving procedures*. In: Proceedings of the Third Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing, pages 151–158, ACM, New York, 1971.
- [Coo73] STEPHEN A. COOK. *A Hierarchy for Nondeterministic Time Complexity*. Journal of Computer and System Sciences 7, 343–353 (1973).
- [Coo00] STEPHEN A. COOK. *The P versus NP problem*. April, 2000. Available at [PvsNP.ps](#).
- [CDR04] THOMAS W. CUSICK, C. DING AND ARI RENVALL. *Stream Ciphers and Number Theory*. Revised edition. North-Holland Mathematical Library, 66. Elsevier Science B.V., Amsterdam, 2004.
- [CRT98] ANDREA E. F. CLEMENTI, JOSÉ D. P. ROLIM AND LUCA TREVISAN. *Recent Advances Towards Proving $P=BPP$* . Bulletin of the EATCS 64: 96–103 (1998).
- [FG99] LANCE FORTNOW AND JOHN ROGERS. *Complexity Limitations on Quantum Computation*. Journal of Computer and System Sciences 59, 240–252 (1999).
- [For00] LANCE FORTNOW. *Diagonalization*. Bulletin of the EATCS 71: 102–113 (2000).
- [For03] LANCE FORTNOW. *One complexity theorist’s view of quantum computing*. Theoretical Computer Science 292 (2003) 597–610.
- [FKI⁺22] TAKUYA FUNATSU, SHUN KANAI, JUN’ICHI IEDA, SHUNSUKE FUKAMI AND HIDEO OHNO. *Local bifurcation with spin-transfer torque in superparamagnetic tunnel junctions*. Nature Communications 13, 4079 (2022).
- [Gil77] JOHN GILL. *Computational Complexity of Probabilistic Turing Machines*. SIAM Journal on Computing, Vol. 6, No. 4, December 1997, pp. 675–695.
- [Gro96] LOV K. GROVER. *A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search*. In: Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM Symposium on the Theory of Computing, July 1996, pp. 212–219.
- [HS65] J. HARTMANIS, AND R. STEARNS. *On the computational complexity of algorithms*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, 117 : 285–306, 1965.
- [HS66] F. C. HENNIE AND R. E. STEARNS. *Two-Tape Simulation of Multitape Turing Machines*. Journal of the ACM, Vol. 13, No. 4 (October, 1966), pp. 533–546.
- [IW97] RUSSELL IMPAGLIAZZO AND AVI WIGDERSON. *$\mathcal{P} = \mathcal{BPP}$ if E requires exponential circuits: derandomizing the XOR lemma*. In: Proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing, May 1997, pp. 220–229.
- [IW01] RUSSELL IMPAGLIAZZO AND AVI WIGDERSON. *Randomness vs Time: Derandomization under a Uniform Assumption*. Journal of Computer and System Sciences, 63, 672–688 (2001).

- [IKW02] RUSSELL IMPAGLIAZZO, VALENTINE KABANETS AND AVI WIGDERSON. *In search of an easy witness: exponential time vs. probabilistic polynomial time*. Journal of Computer and System Sciences 65 (2002) 672–694.
- [Imp02] RUSSELL IMPAGLIAZZO. *Hardness as randomness: A survey of universal derandomization*. In: Proceedings of the International Congress of Mathematicians, Vol. 3 (Beijing, 2002), pp. 659–672.
- [Kab02] VALENTINE KABANETS. *Derandomization: a brief overview*. Bulletin of the EATCS 76: 88–103 (2002).
- [Lad75] RICHARD E. LADNER. *On the Structure of Polynomial Time Reducibility*. Journal of the ACM, Vol. 22, No. 1, January 1975, pp. 155–171.
- [Lin21a] T. LIN. *Diagonalization of Polynomial-Time Deterministic Turing Machines via Nondeterministic Turing Machine*. CoRR abs/2110.06211 (2021). Available at [/abs/2110.06211](#)
- [Lin21b] T. LIN. *The Separation of NP and PSPACE*. CoRR abs/2106.11886 (2021). Available at [/abs/2106.11886](#)
- [MV99] P. MILTERSEN AND V. VINODCHANDRAN. *Derandomizing Arthur-Merlin games using hitting sets*. In: Proceedings of the 40th IEEE Symposium on Foundations of Computer Sciences. IEEE, New York, 1999. pp. 71–80.
- [NW94] NOAM NISAN AND AVI WIGDERSON. *Hardness vs Randomness*. Journal of Computer and System Sciences 49, 149–167 (1994).
- [NC00] M. A. NIELSEN AND I. L. CHUANG. *Quantum computation and quantum information*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000.
- [Pap94] CHRISTOS H. PAPADIMITRIOU. *Computational Complexity*. Addison-Wesley, 1994.
- [Rud76] WALTER RUDIN. *Principles of Mathematical Analysis*. (3rd edition). McGraw-Hill, New York. 1976.
- [SHL65] R. E. STEARNS, JURIS HARTMANIS AND P. M. LEWIS. *Hierarchies of memory limited computations*. IEEE 6th Annual Symposium on Switching Circuit Theory and Logical Design, 1965, pp. 179–190.
- [San69] E. S. SANTOS. *Probabilistic Turing Machines and Computability*. Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society, 22 (1969), pp. 704–710.
- [San71] E. S. SANTOS. *Probabilistic Turing Machines and Computability*. Transactions of the American Mathematical Society, Volume 159, September 1971, pp. 165–184.
- [Sho97] PETER W. SHOR. *Polynomial-Time Algorithms for Prime Factorization and Discrete Logarithms on a Quantum Computer*. SIAM Journal on Computing, Vol. 26, No. 5, pp. 1484–1509, October 1997.
- [STV01] MADHU SUDAN, LUCA TREVISAN AND SALIL VADHAN. *Pseudorandom Generators without the XOR Lemma*. Journal of Computer and System Sciences 62, 236–266 (2001).
- [Tur37] ALAN M. TURING. *On computable numbers with an application to the entscheidungsproblem*. Proceedings of the London Mathematical Society, Volume s2-42, Issue 1, 1937, pp. 230–265.

- [Vad12] SALIL P. VADHAN. *Pseudorandomness*. Foundations and Trends in Theoretical Computer Science: Vol. 7: Nos. 1–3, pp. 1–336. Now Publishers, 2012.

NATIONAL HAKKA UNIVERSITY (STILL IN THE IMAGINATION OF ESTABLISHMENT), CHINA