

PDQMA = DQMA = NEXP:  
QMA With Hidden Variables and Non-collapsing Measurements

Scott Aaronson\*    Sabee Grewal†    Vishnu Iyer‡    Simon C. Marshall§  
Ronak Ramachandran¶

**Abstract**

We define and study a variant of QMA (Quantum Merlin Arthur) in which Arthur can make multiple non-collapsing measurements to Merlin’s witness state, in addition to ordinary collapsing measurements. By analogy to the class PDQP defined by Aaronson, Bouland, Fitzsimons, and Lee (2014), we call this class PDQMA. Our main result is that  $\text{PDQMA} = \text{NEXP}$ ; this result builds on the  $\text{MIP} = \text{NEXP}$  Theorem and complements the result of Aaronson (2018) that  $\text{PDQP}/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$ . While the result has little to do with quantum mechanics, we also show a more “quantum” result: namely, that QMA with the ability to inspect the entire history of a hidden variable is equal to NEXP, under mild assumptions on the hidden-variable theory. We also observe that a quantum computer, augmented with quantum advice and the ability to inspect the history of a hidden variable, can solve any decision problem in polynomial time.

---

\*University of Texas at Austin. [aaronson@cs.utexas.edu](mailto:aaronson@cs.utexas.edu).

†University of Texas at Austin. [sabee@cs.utexas.edu](mailto:sabee@cs.utexas.edu).

‡University of Texas at Austin. [vishnu.iyer@utexas.edu](mailto:vishnu.iyer@utexas.edu).

§Leiden University.

¶University of Texas at Austin. [ronakr@utexas.edu](mailto:ronakr@utexas.edu).

# 1 Introduction

To understand the power of quantum computation is, in large part, to understand how that power depends on the central features of quantum mechanics itself, such as linearity, unitarity, tensor products, complex numbers, the Born Rule, or the destructive nature of measurement. But since quantum mechanics is usually presented as a “package deal,” how can we pick apart these dependencies? One natural approach has been to define complexity classes based on “fantasy” versions of quantum mechanics, which change one or more of its features, and see how they relate to the standard BQP (Bounded-Error Quantum Polynomial-Time). Some representative findings of that research program over the past few decades include:

- (1) Quantum mechanics over the reals or quaternions leads to the same computational power as quantum mechanics over the complex numbers, despite the theories differing in other respects [RG02].
- (2) Quantum mechanics with a nonlinear Schrödinger equation would generically allow NP- and even #P-complete problems to be solved in polynomial time, in contrast to what is conjectured for standard (linear) quantum mechanics [AL98].
- (3) A quantum computer with closed timelike curves could solve exactly the problems in PSPACE, same as a classical computer with closed timelike curves [AW09].
- (4) Quantum computers with nonunitary linear evolution, or modifications of the Born rule (say,  $|\psi|^3$ ), with normalization of probabilities imposed, yield at least the power of quantum computers with *postselected measurement outcomes*—a model that Aaronson called PostBQP and proved to coincide with the classical complexity class PP [Aar04, Aar05c].
- (5) Generalized probabilistic theories (GPTs), a class of theories that includes quantum mechanics and classical probability theory as special cases, are as a whole characterized by the complexity class AWPP [LB15, BdBHL19].
- (6) If we allow multiple, non-collapsing measurements of the same state—or, closely related, to see the entire history of a hidden variable as in Bohmian mechanics—we get a model of computation that seems more powerful than standard quantum computation, but only “slightly” so [Aar05b]. As examples, we can quickly find collisions in many-to-one functions (and thus, for example, solve Graph Isomorphism), and we can solve the Grover search problem in  $N^{1/3}$  steps rather than  $\sqrt{N}$ . But we still seem unable to solve NP-complete problems in polynomial time.

Example (6) is the one of most interest to us here. To our knowledge, it is the only natural example known where changing the rules of quantum mechanics leads to complexity classes that appear only modestly larger than BQP. Much of the power comes from the combination of non-collapsing measurements with ordinary collapsing ones. As an example, given a two-to-one function  $f : [N] \rightarrow [M]$ , the way to find collisions is simply to prepare

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{x \in [N]} |x\rangle |f(x)\rangle,$$

then measure the  $|f(x)\rangle$  register in the ordinary way to get

$$\frac{|x\rangle + |y\rangle}{\sqrt{2}}$$

where  $f(x) = f(y)$  in the first register, and finally perform multiple non-collapsing measurements on the first register in the standard basis, until both  $x$  and  $y$  are observed with high probability.<sup>1</sup>

In a hidden-variable theory, where the hidden variable is either at  $|x\rangle$  or  $|y\rangle$  with equal probabilities, the solution at this point is to “juggle”—for example, by repeatedly applying Fourier transforms followed by their inverses. The goal here is to cause the hidden variable to “forget” whether it was at  $|x\rangle$  or  $|y\rangle$ , so that it must eventually visit both of them with high probability. In such a case, if (as we’re imagining) we could see the whole history of the hidden variable at once, from some godlike vantage point, we would learn both  $|x\rangle$  and  $|y\rangle$  and thereby solve our computational problem.

The history of these ideas is a bit tangled. In 2005, Aaronson defined the class DQP (Dynamical Quantum Polynomial-Time), to capture the problems that quantum computers could efficiently solve, if only one could examine the entire history of a hidden variable (in any hidden-variable theory that satisfies reasonable axioms, called robustness and indifference). He showed that  $\text{SZK} \subseteq \text{DQP}$ , where SZK is Statistical Zero Knowledge, basically because DQP could simulate non-collapsing measurements (although he didn’t formalize this). Combined with Aaronson’s quantum lower bound for finding collisions [Aar02], which implies the existence of an oracle relative to which  $\text{SZK} \not\subseteq \text{BQP}$ , this gives us an oracle separation between BQP and DQP. Aaronson also showed that  $\text{DQP} \subset \text{EXP}$ , which has not been improved since then. He claimed to give an oracle relative to which  $\text{NP} \not\subseteq \text{DQP}$ , although his proof had a bug [ABFL16] and the existence of such an oracle remains open. Then, in 2014, Aaronson, Bouland, Fitzsimons, and Lee [ABFL16] defined the class PDQP (Product Dynamical Quantum Polynomial-Time), to capture non-collapsing measurements specifically. They showed that PDQP also contains SZK, showed the upper bound  $\text{PDQP} \subseteq \text{BPP}^{\text{PP}}$ , and gave a correct proof that there exists an oracle relative to which  $\text{NP} \not\subseteq \text{PDQP}$ .

Overall, as we said, these results painted a picture of DQP and PDQP as only modestly more powerful than BQP. However, a surprising new wrinkle came in 2018, when Aaronson [Aar18] observed that  $\text{PDQP}/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$ , where  $/\text{qpoly}$  means “with polynomial-sized quantum advice,” and ALL is the class of all languages. This stands in contrast to 2004 results of Aaronson [Aar05a] that limit the power of BQP/qpoly: namely, that  $\text{BQP}/\text{qpoly} \subseteq \text{PP}/\text{poly}$  (later improved by Aaronson and Drucker [AD14] to  $\text{BQP}/\text{qpoly} \subseteq \text{QMA}/\text{poly}$ ), and that there exists an oracle relative to which  $\text{NP} \not\subseteq \text{BQP}/\text{qpoly}$ . In other words, quantum advice and non-collapsing measurements have a “Mentos and Coke” character, where each one is only modestly powerful in isolation, but together they trigger a complexity-theoretic explosion.

To prove the  $\text{PDQP}/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$  result, Aaronson adapted a 2005 theorem of Raz [Raz09] that  $\text{QIP}/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$ , where QIP is the class of languages that admit quantum interactive proofs. In both Raz’s protocol and Aaronson’s, given an arbitrary Boolean function  $f : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \{0, 1\}$  that one wants to compute, one first chooses a prime  $q \gg n$ . The whole truth table of  $f$  is then encoded

---

<sup>1</sup>The reason why non-collapsing measurement allows Grover search in  $N^{1/3}$  steps is simpler and does not require us to combine collapsing with non-collapsing measurements. Instead, given a unique marked item out of  $N$ , one simply runs Grover’s algorithm for  $T = N^{1/3}$  iterations, thereby boosting the probability of the marked item to  $\sim \frac{T^2}{N} = N^{-1/3}$ , and then performs  $N^{1/3}$  non-collapsing measurements so that the marked item is found with constant probability.

by the quantum advice state

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q^n}} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} |z\rangle |p(z)\rangle,$$

where  $p : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$  is the unique multilinear polynomial over  $\mathbb{F}_q$  such that  $p(x) = f(x)$  for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ . Next, given a point of interest  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , on which one wants to evaluate  $f(x)$ , one measures  $|\psi\rangle$  so as to collapse it to an equal superposition

$$|\psi_L\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q-1}} \sum_{z \in L \setminus \{x\}} |z\rangle |p(z)\rangle$$

over a random line  $L \subset \mathbb{F}_q^n$  that passes through  $x$ , minus the point  $x$  itself. Finally, one uses polynomial interpolation on this line to recover  $p(x) = f(x)$ . In the non-collapsing measurements model, this is done by simply measuring the state  $|\psi_L\rangle$  over and over in the standard basis, until enough  $(z, p(z))$  pairs have been observed for the interpolation to work.<sup>2</sup>

## 1.1 This Paper

Here we show a new example where non-collapsing measurements combined with one other resource yield extraordinary computational power—vastly more power than either resource in isolation.

The class QMA (Quantum Merlin Arthur) is a well-known quantum generalization of NP; it consists of all languages for which a “yes” answer can be verified in quantum polynomial time with the help of a polynomial-size quantum witness state. We define and study PDQMA (Product Dynamical QMA), or QMA augmented with non-collapsing measurements. Our main result is that PDQMA = NEXP, even if PDQMA is defined with a completeness/soundness gap of (say)  $1 - 2^{-n}$  vs.  $2^{-n}$  (Theorem 5).

Since the inclusion PDQMA  $\subseteq$  NEXP is straightforward, the interesting part is NEXP  $\subseteq$  PDQMA. By the seminal work of Babai, Fortnow, and Lund [BFL91], it suffices to show that MIP  $\subseteq$  PDQMA, where MIP is the class of languages that admit an interactive protocol with two non-communicating provers. Our proof that MIP  $\subseteq$  PDQMA builds on Aaronson’s proof [Aar18] that PDQP/qpoly = ALL, but with two key differences. First, to simulate MIP, we need a witness state that can support at least *two* queries to an exponentially long truth table, rather than just one query. Second, we now need an analysis of *soundness*: why, for example, can the prover not cheat by sending a witness that causes the response to each query to depend on the other query? This problem seems particularly acute once we realize that, when non-collapsing measurements are allowed, we can no longer rely on the no-signaling principle of quantum mechanics. Fortunately, there turns out to be a simple solution: basically, the “error-correcting code” structure of an honest witness state prevents a cheating prover from gaining anything by correlating the query responses.

We point out some implications of our result. First, combining with the Nondeterministic Time Hierarchy Theorem (NP  $\neq$  NEXP), we find that PDQMA is *unconditionally* more powerful than NP. Second, “scaling down by an exponential,” we find that when non-collapsing measurements are allowed, the problem of optimizing an acceptance probability over all  $N$ -dimensional quantum states jumps from easy (a principal eigenvector problem) to NP-hard even to approximate.

Let us place our result in the context of previous work on generalizations of QMA. Aharonov and Regev [AR03] defined QMA+, a variant of QMA where the verifier can directly obtain the

---

<sup>2</sup>Since  $p$  is a multilinear extension of a Boolean function on  $n$  variables, its degree is at most  $n$ . Hence,  $n + 1$  pairs are needed to do polynomial interpolation.

probability a given two-outcome measurement will accept, and showed  $\text{QMA}^+ = \text{QMA}$ . More recently, Jeronimo and Wu [JW23] showed that  $\text{QMA}^+(2) = \text{NEXP}$ , where  $\text{QMA}^+(2)$  is  $\text{QMA}$  with two unentangled proofs that have nonnegative real amplitudes. Bassirian, Fefferman, and Marwaha [BFM23] improved this to show that  $\text{QMA}^+ = \text{NEXP}$ —i.e., nonnegative amplitudes alone suffice for the jump to  $\text{NEXP}$ . As of this writing, it remains a matter of avid speculation whether unentangled witnesses *also* suffice for the jump to  $\text{NEXP}$ : that is, whether  $\text{QMA}(2) = \text{NEXP}$ . Of course, our result implies that it would suffice to simulate non-collapsing measurements using unentangled proofs—i.e., to show  $\text{PDQMA} \subseteq \text{QMA}(2)$ .

One important observation about our  $\text{PDQMA}$  protocol is that it only ever measures the witness state in the computational basis—and hence, one could say, never exploits quantum interference. So in particular, if we defined a complexity class  $\text{PDMA}$  (Product Dynamical Merlin-Arthur) in mathematical parallel to  $\text{PDQMA}$ , where the witness was a classical probability distribution  $\mathcal{D}$ , and one was allowed to sample from  $\mathcal{D}$  with or without doing Bayesian updating to it, we would equally have  $\text{PDMA} = \text{NEXP}$ . The main difference here is simply that it seems hard to invent a story that motivates  $\text{PDMA}$ .

In Section 4, we sharpen this point, by defining and studying a class that we call  $\text{DQMA}$  (Dynamical  $\text{QMA}$ ), or  $\text{QMA}$  augmented by the ability to see the entire history of a hidden variable. We show that  $\text{DQMA} = \text{NEXP}$  (Theorem 16). Here the reasons really do depend on quantum mechanics. Specifically, they depend on the ability to “hide” crucial information in the phases of amplitudes, to prevent a hidden variable trajectory from remembering that information. If we tried to define the analogous class  $\text{DMA}$  (Dynamical  $\text{MA}$ ), it would trivially coincide with  $\text{MA}$ . Assuming  $\text{MA} = \text{NP}$ , as follows from a standard derandomization assumption, this has the amusing consequence that  $\text{DMA} \neq \text{DQMA}$ —that is, in the presence of both witness states and trajectory sampling, quantum can already be known to be stronger than classical. In the same section, we also observe that our techniques imply  $\text{DQP}/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$  (Theorem 17), complementing Aaronson’s result that  $\text{PDQP}/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$  [Aar18]. This result relies on quantum mechanics in the same way that our  $\text{DQMA}$  result does.

One might also wonder about other “fantasy” variants of  $\text{QMA}$ . In principle, any variant of  $\text{BQP}$  can be combined with  $\text{QMA}$  to yield a new complexity class. For example, consider a variant of  $\text{BQP}$  that can clone states (i.e., perform the transformation  $|\psi\rangle|0^n\rangle \mapsto |\psi\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ ). It is easy to see that one can simulate  $k$  non-collapsing measurements of a state by cloning the state  $k$  times and then measuring each copy in the usual collapsing way. Hence, combining this  $\text{BQP}$  variant with  $\text{QMA}$  yields a complexity class equal to  $\text{NEXP}$  by our Theorem 5. Indeed, if one wants to alter Arthur’s powers *without* triggering a “Mentos and Coke” effect, they would need to find a  $\text{BQP}$  variant that is only modestly more powerful, the way  $\text{PDQP}$  is.

**Concurrent Work** In concurrent and independent work, Bassirian and Marwaha [BM24] show that  $\text{QMA}$  with non-collapsing measurements equals  $\text{NEXP}$ . They observe that the proof of  $\text{QMA}^+ = \text{NEXP}$  [BFM23] goes through even if one replaces the promise of a non-negative witness state with the ability for the verifier to perform non-collapsing measurements. [BFM23] can prove a containment (for a constant completeness/soundness gap) using a constant number of non-collapsing measurements, whereas our verification procedure always uses  $O(n \log n)$  non-collapsing measurements. Our approach readily extends to prove  $\text{DQMA} = \text{NEXP}$  and  $\text{DQP}/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$ .

## 2 Preliminaries

We assume the reader has familiarity with the basic concepts of complexity theory and quantum computing.

We give a formal definition of PDQMA.

**Definition 1.**  $\text{PDQMA}(c, s)$  is the class of languages  $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$  for which there exists a PDQP verifier  $V$  (to be defined shortly) such that, for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ :

- **Completeness:** If  $x \in L$  then there exists a witness state  $|\phi\rangle$ , on  $\text{poly}(n)$  qubits, such that  $V(x, |\phi\rangle)$  accepts with probability at least  $c$ .
- **Soundness:** If  $x \notin L$  then  $V(x, |\phi\rangle)$  accepts with probability at most  $s$  for all witness states  $|\phi\rangle$ .

A PDQP verifier consists of two phases. In the first phase, a  $P$ -uniform quantum circuit  $C_x$ , depending on the input  $x$ , is applied to the initial state  $|\phi\rangle|0^{p(n)}\rangle$ , where  $|\phi\rangle$  is the witness and  $p$  is a polynomial. This  $C_x$  can consist of three types of gates: CNOT gates, 1-qubit  $\pi/8$  rotations, and measurements in the  $\{|0\rangle, |1\rangle\}$  basis. The CNOT and  $\pi/8$  gates provide universality for BQP, while the measurement gates introduce a probabilistic component. In the second phase, we consider the final state  $|\psi\rangle$  of  $C_x$ , which depends in part on the probabilistic results of the measurement gates. Let  $\mathcal{D}$  be the probability distribution induced by measuring all qubits of  $|\psi\rangle$  in the computational basis. Then a classical polynomial-time algorithm,  $A$ , receives as input  $x$  as well as  $q(n)$  independent samples from  $\mathcal{D}$ , and then either accepts or rejects.

Our proof that  $\text{PDQMA} = \text{NEXP}$  will rely on the famous  $\text{MIP} = \text{NEXP}$  theorem of Babai, Fortnow, and Lund [BFL91], where MIP is the class of languages that have multi-prover interactive proofs. Babai, Fortnow, and Lund showed that NEXP is captured by a two-prover protocol with multiple rounds of interaction. To simplify our proof, we use an improved version of their theorem. In particular, we will use the fact that  $\text{NEXP} = \text{MIP}$  even if only a single query is made to each of the two provers. This can be shown via a connection to probabilistically checkable proofs (PCPs). Although this is basic for classical complexity theorists, we explain this formally below for completeness. We begin by defining the complexity classes MIP and PCP.

**Definition 2.**  $\text{MIP}_{c,s}[r, q]_\Sigma$  is the class of languages  $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$  for which there exists a probabilistic polynomial-time machine  $V_{\text{MIP}}$  that uses  $r$  random bits and makes a single query to each of  $q$  provers  $\pi_1, \dots, \pi_q$  (who cannot communicate among themselves), each time receiving a response in some alphabet  $\Sigma$  such that

1. **Completeness:** If  $x \in L$ , then  $\exists \pi_1, \dots, \pi_q$  such that  $\Pr[V_{\text{MIP}}^{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_q}(x) = 1] \geq c$ .
2. **Soundness:** If  $x \notin L$ , then  $\forall \pi_1, \dots, \pi_q$ ,  $\Pr[V_{\text{MIP}}^{\pi_1, \dots, \pi_q}(x) = 1] \leq s$ .

Note that this definition only allows the verifier to make one query to each prover. We explain below that this definition, even with two provers, is equal to NEXP, and therefore it is equivalent to the standard definition of MIP as well.

**Definition 3.**  $\text{PCP}_{c,s}[r, q]_\Sigma$  is the class of languages  $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$  for which there exists a probabilistic polynomial-time verifier  $V_{\text{PCP}}$  which uses  $r$  random bits and makes  $q$  queries to an oracle  $\pi$ , each time receiving a response in some alphabet  $\Sigma$  such that

1. **Completeness:** If  $x \in L$ , then  $\exists \pi$  such that  $\Pr[V_{\text{PCP}}^\pi(x) = 1] \geq c$ .

2. **Soundness:** If  $x \notin L$ , then  $\forall \pi$ ,  $\Pr[V_{\text{PCP}}^\pi(x) = 1] \leq s$ .

The celebrated PCP theorem [AS98, ALM<sup>+</sup>98] tells us that  $\text{NP} = \text{PCP}_{1,s}[O(\log(n)), 3]_{\{0,1\}}$  for any constant  $s$ . A simple consequence is that  $\text{NEXP} = \text{PCP}_{1,s}[\text{poly}(n), 3]_{\{0,1\}}$ . We are now ready to prove the stronger MIP characterization of NEXP.

**Theorem 4.** For a size-8 alphabet  $\Sigma$  and any constant  $s \in (0, 1)$ ,  $\text{MIP}_{1,s}[\text{poly}(n), 2]_\Sigma = \text{NEXP}$ .

*Proof.* It is folklore that  $\text{PCP}_{c,s}[r, q]_\Sigma \subseteq \text{PCP}_{c,s/q}[r + \log(q), 2]_{\Sigma^q}$ , i.e., that the number of queries can be reduced to two at the cost of a larger alphabet and worse soundness error. Applying this to the PCP theorem for NEXP yields  $\text{NEXP} = \text{PCP}_{1,s}[\text{poly}(n), 2]_\Sigma$  for a size-8 alphabet  $\Sigma$  and any constant  $s \in (0, 1)$ . To complete the proof, we use the fact that  $\text{PCP}_{1,s}[r, q]_\Sigma \subseteq \text{MIP}_{1,s,q^q}[r, q]_\Sigma$ , a result due to Ta-Shma [TS96].  $\square$

One can improve the soundness error to sub-constant by further increasing the alphabet size and our proofs that  $\text{PDQMA} = \text{NEXP}$  (Theorem 5) and  $\text{DQMA} = \text{NEXP}$  (Theorem 16) still go through with only slight (if any) modification.

### 3 QMA and Non-collapsing Measurements

We prove our main result: in QMA, if Arthur can perform non-collapsing measurements in addition to standard quantum computation, then the resulting class is equal to NEXP.

**Theorem 5.**  $\text{PDQMA} = \text{NEXP}$ .

*Proof.*  $\text{PDQMA} \subseteq \text{NEXP}$  is clear, since in NEXP we can guess an exponentially-long classical description of the PDQMA witness and then verify it.

Thus, we show  $\text{NEXP} \subseteq \text{PDQMA}$ . By Theorem 4, it suffices to show  $\text{MIP} \subseteq \text{PDQMA}$ . In particular, we can assume the MIP verifier makes a single query to each of two provers and receives a response in a constant-size alphabet. Let  $f, f' : \{0, 1\}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$  be Boolean functions that encode the responses of the two provers to all possible queries  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , where  $q$  is some prime number between  $n + 2$  and  $2n + 1$ , which is guaranteed to exist by Bertrand's postulate. Let  $p, p' : \mathbb{F}_q^n \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$  be the unique multilinear extensions of  $f$  and  $f'$ , respectively. Then the honest PDQMA witness is

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{q^n}} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} |z\rangle |p(z)\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{q^n}} \sum_{z' \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} |z'\rangle |p'(z')\rangle.$$

Given this witness, the PDQP verification procedure is as follows:

- (1) Simulating the MIP verifier, choose two queries  $x, x' \in \{0, 1\}^n$ .
- (2) Map the witness to

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{q^n}} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} |z\rangle |p(z)\rangle |R(z - x)\rangle \otimes \frac{1}{\sqrt{q^n}} \sum_{z' \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} |z'\rangle |p'(z')\rangle |R(z' - x')\rangle,$$

where  $R(0^n) = 0^n$  and for  $y \neq 0^n$ ,  $R(y)$  is some canonical representative of the ray in  $\mathbb{F}_q^n$  passing through  $y$ . For concreteness, when  $y \neq 0$ , we will take  $R(y)$  to be the unique scalar multiple of  $y$  whose leftmost nonzero entry is 1.

- (3) Measure the  $|R(z - x)\rangle$  and  $|R(z' - x')\rangle$  registers in the usual collapsing way.
- (4) Make  $T = O(n \log n)$  non-collapsing measurements of the  $|z\rangle$ ,  $|p(z)\rangle$ ,  $|z'\rangle$ , and  $|p'(z')\rangle$  registers.
- (5) If fewer than  $n + 1$  distinct  $z$  values or fewer than  $n + 1$  distinct  $z'$  values were obtained, then reject.
- (6) If more than one  $p(z)$  value was obtained for the same  $z$ , or  $p'(z')$  for the same  $z'$ , then reject.
- (7) Perform polynomial interpolation to obtain univariate polynomials  $u, u' : \mathbb{F}_q \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$  of degree at most  $n$  that are consistent with  $p$  and  $p'$  respectively on the measured points.
- (8) Calculate  $f(x) = p(x) = u(0)$  and  $f'(x') = p'(x') = u'(0)$ . Plug these responses into the MIP verifier, and accept if and only if it does.

Perfect completeness is clear for this protocol. The analysis is essentially the same as the one given in [Aar18, Theorem 2], and we refer the reader there for details. The interesting part (and a contribution of this work) is proving that this protocol is sound.

The first key insight is this: suppose that, for simplicity, we restrict attention to a *single* witness state

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{q^n}} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} |z\rangle |p(z)\rangle,$$

and try to simulate a single query to the Boolean function  $f$ . Then in the soundness case, we argue that the uniformity of the superposition is irrelevant. All that matters is that Merlin commits to *some*  $f$ —or even a distribution over  $f$ 's—and that we can query  $f$  on any desired point  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$ , by doing polynomial interpolation (or, of course, reject if the interpolation fails). We don't even need to show that  $p(z)$  is globally a low-degree polynomial. Arthur will simply reject if he fails to decode the  $f(x)$  of his choice. In summary, by deviating from the honest witness state above, Merlin only increases the probability that the polynomial interpolation will fail.

Hence, when there are two witness states, the only thing that could go wrong in the soundness case is that the  $f(x)$  and  $f'(x')$  values are somehow correlated with each other—i.e., that  $f(x)$  depends on  $x'$  or  $f'(x')$  depends on  $x$ . For that to happen, the witness states would need to be entangled, and, while Merlin can entangle the two proof registers, we will argue that Merlin cannot use entanglement to correlate the two queries in any meaningful way.

To see this, observe that the only way Arthur encodes his choice of  $x$  into the first witness is by choosing how to measure it. And the only thing the measurement does is collapse in the standard basis (to a single affine line). Furthermore, the only way Arthur's choice of  $x$  could affect  $f'(x')$  is by changing the values of the polynomial  $p'$ . Changes to the second witness that don't affect  $p'$  might cause Arthur to fail to decode and reject, but they can never cause him to decode a different  $f'(x')$  value. Therefore, we can write the polynomial in the second witness state as  $p'_z(z')$ —it could in general be different for every basis state  $z$  of the first witness:

$$\sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} |z\rangle |p(z)\rangle \sum_{z' \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} |z'\rangle |p'_z(z')\rangle.$$

Nonetheless, we remark that the value of  $z$  encodes zero information about  $x$ , Arthur's choice of first input. This is because, for *every* possible  $x$ , there's a unique line that passes through  $x$  and



$z$ , so the probability of measuring  $z$  is always the same regardless of the  $x$  chosen by Arthur. So it's as if, in the  $\text{MIP} = \text{NEXP}$  protocol, the first prover is allowed to send a message to the second prover, but that message has to be uniformly random and uncorrelated with Arthur's message to the first prover. By convexity, the second prover might as well ignore the message, and we still have  $\text{MIP} = \text{NEXP}$ . (Merlin could try to make the first witness depend on the second witness too, but, by symmetry, our arguments go through in the same way.)

As such, in our setting, Merlin might as well commit to a fixed polynomial  $p'$ , and then Arthur either decodes the  $f'(x')$  value or fails to. In any case, the polynomial doesn't depend on  $x$ , so our protocol is sound. In particular, our protocol inherits the same soundness as the  $\text{MIP}$  protocol.  $\square$

## 4 QMA and Hidden Variables

We introduce and characterize the complexity class  $\text{DQMA}$ , a variant of  $\text{QMA}$  where the verifier can perform  $\text{DQP}$  computations. Informally,  $\text{DQP}$  is like  $\text{BQP}$  with the ability to inspect the entire history of a hidden variable. For completeness, we begin this section by giving a formal definition of  $\text{DQMA}$ . Then, as with  $\text{PDQMA}$ , we prove that  $\text{DQMA} = \text{NEXP}$ . This result is more “quantum” than  $\text{PDQMA} = \text{NEXP}$  ([Theorem 5](#)) because the  $\text{DQP}$  verifier will use quantum circuits (as opposed to merely computational basis measurements).

### 4.1 The Complexity Class $\text{DQMA}$

We give a formal definition of  $\text{DQMA}$ . To do so, we must recall a few definitions related to the class  $\text{DQP}$  (see [[Aar05b](#)] for more detail about this class).

We begin by defining hidden-variable theories. To aid intuition, one can think of hidden-variable theories like standard quantum mechanics where there is a state vector that evolves unitarily. However, there is also a deeper “hidden variable” in some definite state (i.e., not in superposition) that evolves stochastically in a manner determined by the state vector and the state vector's unitary evolution. In the series of definitions that follow, we are building up to defining a model of computation where one evolves a state vector unitarily, and then (at the end of the computation) can inspect which states the hidden variable was in at each step of the computation.

**Definition 6** (Hidden-variable theory). *A hidden-variable theory is a family of functions  $\{S_d\}_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$ , where each  $S_d$  maps a  $d$ -dimensional mixed state  $\rho$  and a  $d \times d$  unitary matrix  $U$  onto a singly stochastic matrix  $S_d(\rho, U)$ .*

That is, we take a hidden-variable theory to be a function that maps the unitary evolution of a state to a stochastic matrix that evolves one probability distribution to another. Conditioned on a hidden variable being in a state  $|j\rangle$ ,  $(S)_{ij}$  is the probability that a hidden variable transitions to the  $|j\rangle$ .

Aaronson [[Aar05b](#)] defined a number of axioms a hidden-variable theory could satisfy. We require three of these axioms to define  $\text{DQP}$ : the marginalization axiom, the indifference axiom, and the robustness axiom. In the following definitions,  $S$  denotes the hidden-variable theory,  $\rho$  a  $d$ -dimensional quantum state, and  $U$  a  $d \times d$  unitary matrix. Each axiom must hold for all  $d \in \mathbb{N}$ .

**Definition 7** (Marginalization axiom). *The marginalization axiom says that for all  $j \in \{1, \dots, d\}$ ,*

$$\sum_i (S)_{ij}(\rho)_{ii} = (U\rho U^\dagger)_{jj}.$$

In words, the marginalization axiom says that the hidden-variable theory should make predictions that are consistent with quantum mechanics.

**Definition 8** (Indifference axiom). *For a matrix  $M \in \mathbb{C}^{d \times d}$ , let a block be a subset  $B \subseteq \{1, \dots, d\}$  such that  $(M)_{ij} = 0$  for all  $(i, j)$  such that  $i \in B, j \notin B$  and  $i \notin B, j \in B$ . The indifference axiom says that, the stochastic matrix  $S(\rho, U)$  must have the same blocks as  $U$ .*

Physically, the indifference axiom is saying the following. Given any quantum state  $\rho$  in a tensor product space  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$  and any unitary  $U$  acting nontrivially only on  $\mathcal{H}_A$ , the stochastic matrix  $S(\rho, U)$  acts nontrivially only on  $\mathcal{H}_A$  as well.

Finally, we state the robustness axiom, for which we need the following notation. Let  $P(\rho, U)$  be the matrix of joint probabilities whose  $(i, j)$  entry is  $(P)_{ij} := (S)_{ij}(\rho)_{ii}$ .

**Definition 9** (Robustness axiom). *Let  $\tilde{\rho}$  and  $\tilde{U}$  be perturbations of  $\rho$  and  $U$ , respectively, and, for a matrix  $M$ , let  $\|M\|_\infty := \max_{i,j} |(M)_{ij}|$ . The robustness axiom says that, for all polynomials  $p$ , there should exist a polynomial  $q$  such that,*

$$\|P(\tilde{\rho}, \tilde{U}), P(\rho, U)\|_\infty \leq \frac{1}{p(d)},$$

whenever  $\|\tilde{\rho} - \rho\|_\infty \leq 1/q(d)$  and  $\|\tilde{U} - U\| \leq 1/q(d)$ .

The robustness axiom is necessary to prove that the class DQP is not sensitive to the choice of gate set defining the class.

Next, we define the history of a hidden variable.

**Definition 10** (Hidden variable history). *Let  $|\psi_{\text{init}}\rangle$  be an  $n$ -qubit quantum state, and let  $U := U_T \cdots U_1$  be an  $n$ -qubit, depth- $T$  quantum circuit, where  $U_1, \dots, U_T$  denote each layer of the quantum circuit  $U$ . The history of a hidden variable is a sequence  $H = (v_0, \dots, v_T)$  of basis states, where  $v_t$  is the state of the hidden variable immediately after the layer  $U_t$  of the circuit is applied. Given a hidden-variable theory  $\mathcal{T} := \{S_d\}_{d \in \mathbb{N}}$ , we obtain a probability distribution over hidden variable histories  $\Omega(\mathcal{T}, U, |\psi_{\text{init}}\rangle)$  via the stochastic matrices*

$$S(|\psi_{\text{init}}\rangle, U_1), S(U_1|\psi_{\text{init}}\rangle, U_2), \dots, S(U_{T-1} \cdots U_1|\psi_{\text{init}}\rangle, U_T).$$

We can now define the complexity class DQMA.

**Definition 11.**  $\text{DQMA}(c, s)$  is the class of languages  $L \subseteq \{0, 1\}^*$  for which there exists a DQP verifier  $V$  (to be defined shortly) such that, for all  $x \in \{0, 1\}^*$ :

- **Completeness:** If  $x \in L$  then there exists a witness state  $|\phi\rangle$ , on  $\text{poly}(n)$  qubits, such that  $V(x, |\phi\rangle)$  accepts with probability at least  $c$ .
- **Soundness:** If  $x \notin L$  then  $V(x, |\phi\rangle)$  accepts with probability at most  $s$  for all witness states  $|\phi\rangle$ .

A DQP verifier is defined as follows. Let  $\mathcal{T}$  be a hidden-variable theory satisfying the marginalization, indifference, and robustness axioms (Definitions 7 to 9), and let  $C_x$  (depending on the input  $x$ ) be a  $P$ -uniform quantum circuit comprised of gates from any finite gate set that is universal for BQP. A DQP verifier is a deterministic classical Turing machine that is allowed to draw one sample from the distribution  $\Omega(\mathcal{T}, C_x, |\phi\rangle|0^{p(n)}\rangle)$  (Definition 10), where  $|\phi\rangle$  is the witness and  $p$  is a polynomial.

## 4.2 DQMA = NEXP and DQP/qpoly = ALL

We conclude this section by proving  $\text{DQMA} = \text{NEXP}$  and  $\text{DQP}/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$ . Recall that in the proof of  $\text{PDQMA} = \text{NEXP}$  ([Theorem 5](#)), the verifier uses non-collapsing measurements to sample  $O(n \log n)$  values of a multivariate polynomial along an affine line of one's choice and then does interpolation. To prove  $\text{DQMA} = \text{NEXP}$ , we use the same verification procedure, except we use the history of a hidden variable to collect the samples in place of non-collapsing measurements. Hence, to prove  $\text{DQMA} = \text{NEXP}$  it suffices to explain how we collect these samples with the history of a hidden variable. We achieve this by generalizing the “juggle subroutine” due to Aaronson [[Aar05b](#), Section VII].

**Lemma 12** (Juggle subroutine [[Aar05b](#), Section VII]). *Suppose we have an  $\ell$ -qubit state*

$$\frac{|a\rangle \pm |b\rangle}{\sqrt{2}},$$

where  $|a\rangle$  and  $|b\rangle$  are unknown basis states. Given a single copy of the state, the juggle subroutine (a DQP algorithm) can efficiently learn both  $a$  and  $b$  with success probability at least  $1 - e^{-\ell}$ .

We generalize this algorithm to work on states that are an equal superposition over polynomially many strings by reducing to the case of an equal superposition over two strings. Before explaining the generalization, we first must define (and give a simple fact about) pairwise independent families of hash functions, which are used in our reduction.

**Definition 13** (Pairwise independent family of hash functions). *A family of hash functions  $\mathcal{H} = \{h : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow R\}$  is called pairwise independent if  $\forall x \neq y \in \{0, 1\}^\ell$  and  $\forall a_1, a_2 \in R$ , we have*

$$\Pr[h(x) = a_1 \wedge h(y) = a_2] = \frac{1}{|R|^2}.$$

**Fact 14.** *Let  $S \subseteq \{0, 1\}^\ell$  be a subset, and let  $\mathcal{H} := \{h : \{0, 1\}^\ell \rightarrow R\}$  be a family of pairwise independent hash functions such that  $2|S| - 4 \leq |R| \leq 3|S| - 3$ . Then, for any fixed  $x \in S$ , the probability that  $x$  collides with exactly one other  $y \in S$  is at least  $\frac{1}{6}$ .*

*Proof.* Let  $h \in \mathcal{H}$  be chosen uniformly at random, and let  $x \in S$  be some fixed element. The probability that exactly one other element collides with  $x$  is

$$\frac{|S| - 1}{|R|} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{|R|}\right)^{|S| - 2}.$$

We lower bound this quantity.

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{|S| - 1}{|R|} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{1}{|R|}\right)^{|S| - 2} &\geq \frac{|S| - 1}{|R|} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{|S| - 2}{|R|}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{3} \cdot \left(1 - \frac{|S| - 2}{|R|}\right) \\ &\geq \frac{1}{6}. \end{aligned}$$

The first inequality follows from Bernoulli's inequality. The second and third inequalities use the fact that  $2|S| - 4 \leq |R| \leq 3|S| - 3$ .  $\square$

We now give the generalized juggle subroutine.

**Lemma 15** (Generalized juggle subroutine). *Suppose we have an  $\ell$ -qubit state*

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{|S|}} \sum_{x \in S} |x\rangle,$$

where  $S \subseteq \{0,1\}^\ell$  is an unknown subset of  $|S| \leq \text{poly}(\ell)$  basis states. Given a single copy of the state, the generalized juggle subroutine (a DQP algorithm) can efficiently learn  $S$  with success probability at least  $1 - e^{-\ell}$ .

*Proof.* We begin with the state of the form

$$|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{|S|}} \sum_{x \in S} |x\rangle.$$

We perform a procedure that involves applying transformations to  $|\psi\rangle$  and then inverting them to get back to  $|\psi\rangle$ , in an attempt to “dislodge” the hidden variable from whichever basis state it’s currently sitting in, and get it into a different, uniformly random one. Each time we do this, we have a  $1/\text{poly}(\ell)$  probability of success. Importantly, since there’s no penalty for failure, we can repeat this procedure  $\text{poly}(\ell)$  times, and then with overwhelming probability, the hidden variable will have visited every basis state  $|x\rangle$  for  $x \in S$ . Therefore, one will learn  $S$  upon observing the hidden-variable history.

The procedure works as follows. First, choose a random hash function  $h$  (with a range satisfying the conditions in [Fact 14](#)) from some pairwise-independent family, and then map each  $|x\rangle$  to  $|x\rangle|h(x)\rangle$ . Let  $y$  be the current state of the hidden variable. By [Fact 14](#), with probability at least  $\frac{1}{6}$ , there’s *exactly* one other basis state  $z \neq y$  such that  $h(z) = h(y)$ , and this  $z$  is uniformly random. If that happens, then because of the indifference axiom (which says that, if we don’t touch the  $h$ -register, then the hidden variable will never move between  $h$ -values), we’ve reduced to the problem handled by the original juggle subroutine. In particular, we can now run the original juggle subroutine on the the first register (where the hidden variable is). [Lemma 12](#) tells us that, with probability at least  $1 - e^{-\ell}$ , the hidden variable moves from  $y$  to  $z$ . Finally, we uncompute  $h$ , leaving us with our original state  $|\psi\rangle$ . Overall, the inner loop moves the hidden variable from  $y$  to a uniformly random  $z$  with probability at least  $\frac{1}{6} - \frac{e^{-\ell}}{6} \geq 1/\text{poly}(\ell)$ .<sup>3</sup> Since there is no penalty for failure, we can repeat this procedure  $2\ell^2$  times to ensure that with probability at least  $1 - e^{-\ell}$ , the hidden variable was successfully moved to a uniformly random basis state. Finally, since we visit a uniformly random state with high probability, we can visit every state with high probability by repeating this entire procedure a polynomial number of times.  $\square$

We are now ready to prove the main theorem of this section. Namely, that giving Arthur access to hidden-variable histories blows up the power of QMA to NEXP.

**Theorem 16.**  $\text{DQMA} = \text{NEXP}$ .

---

<sup>3</sup>We note that there is some chance that the hidden variable stays put or moves to somewhere other than  $z$ , but that’s OK too, since our ultimate goal is for the hidden variable to visit every possible state in  $S$ . In any case, we keep repeating.

*Proof.* It is clear that  $\text{DQMA} \subseteq \text{NEXP}$ . By [Theorem 4](#), we can complete the proof by showing  $\text{MIP} \subseteq \text{DQMA}$ .

The verification procedure and the honest witness sent by Merlin are the same as in the proof of [Theorem 5](#). Suppose we have a yes-instance, and Merlin sends the honest witness with the form:

$$\frac{1}{q^n} \sum_{z \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} |z\rangle |p(z)\rangle \otimes \sum_{z' \in \mathbb{F}_q^n} |z'\rangle |p'(z')\rangle.$$

We must explain how to use the history of a hidden variable in lieu of non-collapsing measurements. After the verifier makes *collapsing* measurements, they must learn the support of the post-measurement state. To do this, the verifier runs the generalized juggle subroutine ([Lemma 15](#)). After that, the verifier can do polynomial interpolation with just classical computation (or reject if there is insufficient data to do the interpolation).

The completeness and soundness of this procedure follow in the same way as for [Theorem 5](#). In particular, if Merlin deviates from the honest witness state, then he can only hurt his success probability by causing the polynomial interpolation step to fail. Additionally, while Merlin *can* entangle the two proof registers, he cannot entangle them in any meaningful way as explained in the proof of [Theorem 5](#).  $\square$

Finally, we remark that our generalized juggle subroutine can be used to prove  $\text{DQP}/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$ , complementing Aaronson’s result that  $\text{PDQP}/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$  [[Aar18](#)] and Raz’s result that  $\text{QIP}(2)/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$  [[Raz09](#)]. Similar to [Theorem 16](#), this result is more “quantum” than Aaronson’s or Raz’s, because the generalized juggle subroutine requires quantum computation.

**Theorem 17.**  $\text{DQP}/\text{qpoly} = \text{ALL}$ .

*Proof.* The advice state and verification procedure are the same as in [[Aar18](#), Theorem 2], except we replace the non-collapsing measurements with the generalized juggle subroutine in the same manner described in the proof of [Theorem 16](#).  $\square$

## 5 Open Problems

Is  $\text{PDQP} \subseteq \text{DQP}$ ? Aaronson et al. [[ABFL16](#)] give intuition for why this containment ought to be true, but it remains an open problem. Proving  $\text{PDQP} \subseteq \text{DQP}$  (combined with [Theorem 5](#)) immediately implies  $\text{DQMA} = \text{NEXP}$ . We also remark that improving the upper bound  $\text{DQP} \subseteq \text{EXP}$  remains an interesting open problem.

We now know that modifying QMA by giving the verifier access to non-collapsing measurements, hidden-variable histories, or non-negative witnesses will cause QMA to “explode” in power to NEXP. Is it possible to replace the verifier with some variant that does *not* lead to NEXP? Having access to such variants may find applications in proving better bounds on  $\text{QMA}(2)$ .

## 6 Acknowledgments

SCM thanks David Dechant for useful discussions. SG, VI, and RR thank Joshua Cook, Siddhartha Jain, and Kunal Marwaha for helpful conversations.

SA is supported by a Vannevar Bush Fellowship by the US Department of Defense, the Berkeley NSF-QLCI CIQC Center, a Simons Investigator Award, and the Simons “It from Qubit” collaboration. SG and RR are supported via SA from the same funding sources. VI is supported by an NSF Graduate Research Fellowship. SCM is supported by the European Union’s Horizon 2020 program (NEQASQC) and a gift from Google Quantum AI.

## References

- [Aar02] S. Aaronson. Quantum Lower Bound for the Collision Problem. In *Proc. ACM STOC*, pages 635–642, 2002. [quant-ph/0111102](#). [p. 3]
- [Aar04] S. Aaronson. Is Quantum Mechanics An Island In Theoryspace? In A. Khrennikov, editor, *Proceedings of the Växjö Conference “Quantum Theory: Reconsideration of Foundations”*, 2004. [quant-ph/0401062](#). [p. 2]
- [Aar05a] S. Aaronson. Limitations of Quantum Advice and One-Way Communication. *Theory of Computing*, 1:1–28, 2005. Earlier version in CCC’2004. [quant-ph/0402095](#). [p. 3]
- [Aar05b] S. Aaronson. Quantum Computing and Hidden Variables. *Phys. Rev. A*, 71(032325), 2005. [quant-ph/0408035](#) and [quant-ph/0408119](#). [pp. 2, 9, 11]
- [Aar05c] S. Aaronson. Quantum Computing, Postselection, and Probabilistic Polynomial-Time. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London*, A461(2063):3473–3482, 2005. [quant-ph/0412187](#). [p. 2]
- [Aar18] S. Aaronson. PDQP/qpoly = ALL. [arXiv:1805.08577](#), 2018. [pp. 3, 4, 5, 8, 13]
- [ABFL16] S. Aaronson, A. Bouland, J. Fitzsimons, and M. Lee. The space “just above” BQP. In *Proc. Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science (ITCS)*, pages 271–280, 2016. [arXiv:1412.6507](#). [pp. 3, 13]
- [AD14] S. Aaronson and A. Drucker. A Full Characterization of Quantum Advice. *SIAM J. Comput.*, 43(3):1131–1183, 2014. Earlier version in STOC’2010. [arXiv:1004.0377](#). [p. 3]
- [AL98] D. S. Abrams and S. Lloyd. Nonlinear quantum mechanics implies polynomial-time solution for NP-complete and #P problems. *Phys. Rev. Lett.*, 81:3992–3995, 1998. [quant-ph/9801041](#). [p. 2]
- [ALM<sup>+</sup>98] S. Arora, C. Lund, R. Motwani, M. Sudan, and M. Szegedy. Proof Verification and the Hardness of Approximation Problems. *J. of the ACM*, 45(3):501–555, 1998. [doi:10.1145/278298.278306](#). [p. 7]
- [AR03] D. Aharonov and O. Regev. A Lattice Problem in Quantum NP. In *Proc. IEEE FOCS*, pages 210–219, 2003. [quant-ph/0307220](#). [p. 4]
- [AS98] S. Arora and S. Safra. Probabilistic Checking of Proofs: A New Characterization of NP. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 45(1):70–122, 1998. [doi:10.1145/273865.273901](#). [p. 7]

- [AW09] S. Aaronson and J. Watrous. Closed Timelike Curves Make Quantum and Classical Computing Equivalent. *Proc. Roy. Soc. London*, A465:631–647, 2009. [arXiv:0808.2669](#). [p. 2]
- [BdBHL19] J. Barrett, N. de Beaudrap, M. J. Hoban, and C. M. Lee. The computational landscape of general physical theories. *npj Quantum Information*, 5(1):41, 2019. [doi:10.1038/s41534-019-0156-9](#). [p. 2]
- [BFL91] L. Babai, L. Fortnow, and C. Lund. Nondeterministic exponential time has two-prover interactive protocols. *Computational Complexity*, 1(1):3–40, 1991. [doi:10.1007/BF01200056](#). [pp. 4, 6]
- [BFM23] R. Bassirian, B. Fefferman, and K. Marwaha. Quantum merlin-arthur and proofs without relative phase, 2023. [arXiv:2306.13247](#). [p. 5]
- [BM24] R. Bassirian and K. Marwaha. Superposition detection and QMA with non-collapsing measurements, 2024. [p. 5]
- [JW23] F. G. Jeronimo and P. Wu. The Power of Unentangled Quantum Proofs with Non-Negative Amplitudes. In *Proc. ACM STOC*, page 1629–1642, 2023. [doi:10.1145/3564246.3585248](#). [p. 5]
- [LB15] C. M. Lee and J. Barrett. Computation in generalised probabilistic theories. *New Journal of Physics*, 17(8):083001, 2015. [doi:10.1088/1367-2630/17/8/083001](#). [p. 2]
- [Raz09] R. Raz. Quantum Information and the PCP Theorem. *Algorithmica*, 55(3):462–489, 2009. Earlier version in FOCS’2005. [quant-ph/0504075](#). [pp. 3, 13]
- [RG02] T. Rudolph and L. Grover. A 2 rebit gate universal for quantum computing, 2002. [arXiv:quant-ph/0210187](#). [p. 2]
- [TS96] A. Ta-Shma. A note on PCP vs. MIP. *Information Processing Letters*, 58(3):135–140, 1996. [doi:10.1016/0020-0190\(96\)00043-9](#). [p. 7]