

# The Power of Lorentz Quantum Computer

Qi Zhang(张起)<sup>1,2</sup> and Biao Wu(吴飙)<sup>3,4</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Science, Liaoning Petrochemical University, Fushun 113001, China

<sup>2</sup>Liaoning Provincial Key Laboratory of Novel Micro-Nano Functional Materials, Fushun 113001, China

<sup>3</sup>International Center for Quantum Materials, Peking University, 100871, Beijing, China

<sup>4</sup>Wilczek Quantum Center, School of Physics and Astronomy, Shanghai Jiao Tong University, Shanghai 200240, China

(Dated: March 8, 2024)

We demonstrate the superior capabilities of the recently proposed Lorentz quantum computer (LQC) compared to conventional quantum computers. We introduce an associated computational complexity class, bounded-error Lorentz quantum polynomial-time (BLQP), and prove that the complexity class  $P^{\sharp P}$  is contained within BLQP. We present LQC algorithms that solve in polynomial time the problem of maximum independent set and the problems in the classes of NP, co-NP, PH (polynomial hierarchy), PP (probabilistic polynomial-time), and  $P^{\sharp P}$ . We show that the quantum computing with postselection proposed by Aaronson can be simulated efficiently by LQC, but not vice versa.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Theoretical models of computing are of fundamental importance in computer sciences because they shape our understanding of the basic principles of computing, its limits, and its potentials [1, 2]. Some models, such as Turing machine and quantum Turing machine, are physically sound and can be regarded as abstraction of actual computers. Other models are not physically sound, meaning that they can not be realized physically in any equivalent form; however, these models are very useful in analyzing and delineating the complexity of computing problems. One of such examples are non-deterministic Turing machine (NDTM), which can not be realized physically as it requires exponentially large memory size; however, it is widely used in analyzing complexity classes. In fact, NP problems are defined alternatively as a set of problems that can be solved by a NDTM in polynomial time.

Quantum computer with postselection is another theoretical model that is not physically sound because “the ability to postselect on a measurement yielding a specific outcome” is beyond the basic principle of quantum mechanics [3, 4]. However, this model is interesting and useful theoretically. It not only sheds new light on the complexity class PP (probabilistic polynomial-time) but also reveals the relation between the basic principles of quantum mechanics and the limitations of quantum computing [4].

The theoretical model of Lorentz quantum computer (LQC) was proposed recently [5]. An inherent feature of this model is that it has a different type of bit, which is called hyperbolic bit (hybit) and evolves according to complex Lorentz transformations. Although this model was inspired by physics [6–8], it is not physically sound at current stage. It may become physically sound when the future physical theory of unifying quantum mechanics and gravity falls in the framework of Lorentz quantum mechanics [7, 8]. However, this model is interesting and potentially very useful theoretically. It was already pointed out in Ref.[5] that LQC is more powerful than the conventional quantum computer as it can exponentially speed up the Grover search [9].

In this work we explore systematically the power of LQC.




FIG. 1: The hierarchy diagram for major complexity classes.

For two connecting classes, the class below is included within the class above. BLQP is a complexity class defined for Lorentz quantum computer in parallel to BQP for conventional quantum computer. The diagram without BLQP can be found at [www.complexityzoo.com](http://www.complexityzoo.com).

In parallel to the complexity class BQP (bounded-error quantum polynomial-time) defined for quantum computer [10], we introduce a complexity class BLQP (bounded-error Lorentz quantum polynomial-time) for LQC. It consists of all the problems that can be solved by LQC in polynomial time with bounded error. As the conventional quantum computer is a special case of LQC, BQP is clearly a subset of BLQP. We present LQC circuits for algorithms that solve in polynomial time the problem of maximum independent set, which is NP-

hard, and all the problems in the complexity classes NP and co-NP. This means that both NP and co-NP are subsets of BLQP. We further find LQC algorithms that can solve in polynomial time problems in the classes of PH (polynomial hierarchy), PP (probabilistic polynomial-time), and  $P^{\#P}$ . Along with these algorithms, we explain the source of computing power of LQC.

We make a detailed comparison between LQC and quantum computing with postselection [4]. LQC is shown to be able to simulate the postselection efficiently. In contrast, a capability of LQC, which we call super-postselection, can not be simulated by quantum computer with postselection. So, the class PostBQP, defined for quantum computing with postselection, is included in BLQP. However, we cannot prove that PostBQP is a true subset of BLQP.

In the following, we will first briefly review the basics of LQC and introduce two important logic gates, CV gate and CCV gate. These two gates play central roles in our efficient algorithms for solving various problems, such as MIS, NP, PP, and  $P^{\#P}$ , and underscore why LQC is much more powerful than the conventional quantum computer. At the end we compare and discuss the relation between LQC and quantum computing with postselection.

## II. THEORETICAL MODEL OF LORENTZ QUANTUM COMPUTER

The theoretical model of Lorentz quantum computer (LQC) was proposed and discussed extensively in Ref. [5]. In this section, we briefly review this model. It is based on the Lorentz quantum mechanics [7], a theory generalized from the Bogoliubov-de Genne equation, which describes the dynamics of bosonic Bogoliubov quasiparticles. One key feature of these systems is that they have two branches of excitations: although both are involved in the dynamics, only one of them, i.e., bosonic Bogoliubov quasiparticle, is regarded as physical while the other with negative energy is regarded unphysical and unobservable [6]. LQC takes advantage of this feature by introducing hyperbolic bits (or hybits for brevity) for which only one of its basis is observable while the other is unobservable. Similar systems with indefinite inner products have been studied before by many [11], including Pauli [8].

In a LQC, information is stored in two different types of bits: qubits and hybits. While the qubit is just the working bit in conventional quantum computing, subject to unitary transformation, the hybit is unique to LQC and undergoes complex Lorentz evolution under gate operations. For a hybit, its general state is represented as

$$|\psi\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle = \begin{pmatrix} a \\ b \end{pmatrix} \quad (1)$$

where  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$  are the computational basis satisfying

$$(0|\sigma_z|0) = 1, \quad (1|\sigma_z|1) = -1, \quad (1|\sigma_z|0) = 0. \quad (2)$$

Here  $\sigma_z = \text{diag}\{1, -1\}$  is the familiar Pauli  $z$  matrix. In the notation that follows,  $|\cdot\rangle$  denotes the state of a hybit, while  $|\cdot\rangle$

denotes the state of conventional qubit. The hybit  $|\psi\rangle$  evolves according to Lorentz quantum mechanics [5, 7]. During the Lorentz evolution, the indefinite inner product of the hybit state does not change with time

$$\frac{d}{dt}(\psi|\sigma_z|\psi) = 0. \quad (3)$$

All the logic gates acting on a hybit induce Lorentz transformations, which preserve the indefinite inner product. For example, if a hybit is in the state of  $|\psi\rangle = (a, b)^T$  it becomes  $G|\psi\rangle = (a', b')^T$  after a gate operation  $G$ , then we must have  $|a'|^2 - |b'|^2 = |a|^2 - |b|^2$ . An important consequence is that there is no  $\sigma_x$  operation that flips between the hybit state  $|0\rangle$  to  $|1\rangle$  because  $(0|\sigma_z|0) = 1$  and  $(1|\sigma_z|1) = -1$ .

Inherited from Lorentz quantum mechanics, for the two basis of a hybit, only  $|0\rangle$  is observable and  $|1\rangle$  is unobservable. This is a fundamental and crucial feature of the hybit; as we shall see later the power of LQC is mostly derived from this feature. The extension to a multi-bit scenario follows straightforwardly (for an extensive elaboration, refer to Ref. [5]).

Consider a LQC comprised of  $N_q$  qubits and  $N_h$  hybits. Its state  $|\Phi\rangle$  can be expressed in the computational basis as

$$|\Phi\rangle = \sum_{j=1}^{2^{N_q+N_h}} a_j |\psi_j\rangle, \quad (4)$$

where

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_j\rangle &= |q_1\rangle \otimes |q_2\rangle \cdots \otimes |q_i\rangle \cdots \otimes |q_{N_q}\rangle \\ &\quad \otimes |h_1\rangle \otimes |h_2\rangle \cdots \otimes |h_i\rangle \cdots \otimes |h_{N_h}\rangle \\ &= |q_1, q_2 \cdots q_i \cdots q_{N_q}; h_1, h_2 \cdots h_i \cdots h_{N_h}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

with  $q_i$ 's and  $h_i$ 's taking values of either 0 or 1. As long as  $N_h \neq 0$ , the LQC evolves according to the Lorentz transformation. It is important to note that, if a term  $|\psi_j\rangle$  contains at least one  $|1\rangle$ , it is not observable. For example,  $|1, 0 \cdots, 0; 1, 0, \cdots, 0\rangle$  is not observable. Also note that when  $N_h = 0$  a LQC is reduced to a conventional quantum computer. In other words, a quantum computer is a special case of a Lorentz computer.

It has been established [5] that the universal gates of a LQC consist of both single-bit gates and two-bit gates in three distinct sets:  $\{H, T\}$ ,  $\{\tau, T\}$ , and  $\{\Lambda_1^{qq}(\sigma_z), \Lambda_1^{qh}(\sigma_z), \Lambda_1^{hq}(\sigma_z), \Lambda_1^{hh}(\sigma_z)\}$ , where the subscript 1 refers to that there is one control bit. The first set  $\{H, T\}$  is the Hadamard gate  $H$  and the  $\pi/8$  gate  $T$ ,

$$H = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\sigma_x + \sigma_z), \quad (6)$$

$$T = e^{-i\frac{\pi}{8}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{i\pi/8} & 0 \\ 0 & e^{-i\pi/8} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (7)$$

They are applicable to single qubits, and their combined application can approximate any single qubit transformation with arbitrary precision. They are represented in circuits by symbols in Fig. 2(a).

The second set operates on single hybits and consists of the  $\pi/8$  gate  $T$  and the gate  $\tau$ . The  $T$  gate has the same matrix



FIG. 2: (a) Single qubit gates  $H$  and  $T$ ; (b) single hybit gates  $\tau$  and  $T$ .

form as the  $T$  gate for qubits, and the matrix form of the  $\tau$  gate is given by

$$\tau = \sqrt{2}\sigma_z + i\sigma_x = \begin{pmatrix} \sqrt{2} & i \\ i & -\sqrt{2} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (8)$$

These two gates are applicable to single hybits. Their symbols in circuits are depicted in Fig. 2(b). It is noteworthy that the operator  $H$  is unitary and  $\tau$  is Lorentzian whereas  $T$  is both unitary and Lorentzian.




FIG. 3: Four different controlled- $\sigma_z$  gates

The logical gates in the final set, denoted as  $\Lambda_1^{qq}(\sigma_z)$ ,  $\Lambda_1^{qh}(\sigma_z)$ ,  $\Lambda_1^{hq}(\sigma_z)$  and  $\Lambda_1^{hh}(\sigma_z)$ , represent four variations of controlled- $\sigma_z$  operators. These variations distinguish themselves by the types of the control and target bits as indicated by the superscripts:  $q$  for qubit and  $h$  for hybit. The corresponding circuits are illustrated in Fig. 3. Notably, we have opted for the controlled- $\sigma_z$  gate over the controlled-NOT (CNOT) gate, a more common choice in quantum computing. This decision is motivated by the fact that the CNOT gate is a unitary transformation, which does not apply for a hybit. In contrast, the controlled- $\sigma_z$  gate is both unitary and Lorentzian.

Note that the gates  $\Lambda_1^{qq}(\sigma_z)$ ,  $\Lambda_1^{qh}(\sigma_z)$ ,  $\Lambda_1^{hq}(\sigma_z)$  and  $\Lambda_1^{hh}(\sigma_z)$  are denoted in Ref. [5] as  $\Lambda_1^{qq}(\sigma_z)$ ,  $\Lambda_1^{ql}(\sigma_z)$ ,  $\Lambda_1^{lq}(\sigma_z)$  and  $\Lambda_1^{ll}(\sigma_z)$ , respectively. The superscript  $l$  is replaced by  $h$  in this work to avoid confusion.

It has been established [5] that any Lorentz transformation of the state  $|\Phi\rangle$  in Eq. (4) can be realized through a combination of the gate sets  $\{H, T\}$ ,  $\{\tau, T\}$ , and  $\{\Lambda_1^{qq}(\sigma_z), \Lambda_1^{qh}(\sigma_z), \Lambda_1^{hq}(\sigma_z), \Lambda_1^{hh}(\sigma_z)\}$ .

In the following sections, we will present powerful LQC algorithms to solve difficult problems. In these algorithms, one two-bit control gate is repeatedly used. It is the controlled- $V$  gate  $\Lambda_1^{qh}(V)$ , and we denote it as CV. Its circuit is depicted in Fig. 4(a), where the control bit is a qubit and the target bit is a




FIG. 4: (a) Two-bit logical CV gate; (b) a simple way to realize CV using the controlled- $\sigma_z$  gate and the  $\tau$  gate for  $\chi = 2\ln(\sqrt{2} + 1)$ .

hybit. When the qubit is in the state of  $|0\rangle$ , nothing happens; when it is in the state of  $|1\rangle$ , the hybit undergoes a complex Lorentz transformation

$$V = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh \chi & -i \sinh \chi \\ i \sinh \chi & \cosh \chi \end{pmatrix}, \quad (9)$$

where  $\chi$  is a positive constant. The transformation  $V$  is in fact a hyperbolic rotation: for a positive integer  $r$ , we have

$$V^r = \begin{pmatrix} \cosh r\chi & -i \sinh r\chi \\ i \sinh r\chi & \cosh r\chi \end{pmatrix}. \quad (10)$$

For  $\chi = 2\ln(\sqrt{2} + 1)$ , as shown in Fig. 4(b), the CV gate can be realized using two  $\tau$  gates and two controlled- $\sigma_z$  gates.




FIG. 5: (a) Three-bit logical CCV gate; (b) the circuit that implements the CCV gate with four  $\tau$  gates and four controlled- $\sigma_z$  gates for  $\chi = 4\ln(\sqrt{2} + 1)$ .

We also often use a three-bit logical gates as shown in Fig. 5(a), where the two qubits are control bits and the hybit is the target bit. Only when both the qubits are in the state  $|1\rangle$ , does the target hybit undergo the Lorentz transformation  $V$ ; otherwise, nothing happens. We call it CCV gate, which can be realized with a circuit in Fig. 5(b). This circuit consists of four  $\tau$  gates and four controlled- $\sigma_z$  gates for  $\chi = 4\ln(\sqrt{2} + 1)$ .

The gates CV and CCV lie in the heart of LQC's computing power as the Lorentz transformation in Eq. (10) has the ability to amplify the components of a hybit state without bound. Consider a system of a qubit and a hybit, which is in the state of

$$|\phi_0\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} [ |0\rangle + |1\rangle ] \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (11)$$

After the application of a CV gate, the state becomes

$$\frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle + \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} |1\rangle \otimes [ \cosh \chi |0\rangle - i \sinh \chi |1\rangle ] \quad (12)$$

As mentioned before, the state  $|1\rangle$  for a hybit is unobservable so that we only need to consider the two terms involving  $|0\rangle$ , which are

$$|\phi_1\rangle = \frac{\sqrt{2}}{2} [ |0\rangle + \cosh\chi |1\rangle ] \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (13)$$

Compared to the state  $|\phi_0\rangle$ , it is clear that the weight of the term  $|1\rangle$  has increased absolutely and relatively. As we shall see in the following sections, this capability of the gate CV gives LQC a significant computing advantage over the conventional quantum computer. The gate CCV has a similar capability to selectively amplify.

With this capacity of amplification in mind, we introduce the formal definition of BLQP, a computational complexity class of languages associated with LQC. For a language  $L$  within BLQP, there exists a uniform family of quantum circuits of polynomial size, denoted as  $\{\mathbb{C}_n\}_{n \geq 1}$ , which comprises qubits and hybits, as well as unitary and Lorentzian gates. These circuits allow mid-circuit measurements. Given an input  $\omega \in L$  with length  $n$ , and specific initial states for the work qubits and hybits, the circuit  $\mathbb{C}_n$  operates for a time polynomial in the length of  $\omega$ , that is,  $n$ , and then halts. The resulting output of  $\mathbb{C}_n$  is expressed as:

$$|\psi\rangle = c_{\text{yes}}|\text{yes}\rangle + c_{\text{no}}|\text{no}\rangle, \quad (14)$$

where  $|c_{\text{yes}}|^2 > 2/3$ . Similarly, for an input  $\omega \notin L$  with length  $n$  and the same initial states for the work qubits and hybits, when the circuit  $\mathbb{C}_n$  operates for a time polynomial in  $n$  and halts, its output is:

$$|\psi\rangle = c_{\text{yes}}|\text{yes}\rangle + c_{\text{no}}|\text{no}\rangle, \quad (15)$$

where  $|c_{\text{yes}}|^2 < 1/3$ . For convenience, it is common practice to equivalently express this probability of error as an exponentially small quantity rather than using  $1/3$ . The mid-circuit measurements are sometimes needed to avoid amplification of small amplitudes by the Lorentz gates after queries to quantum oracles.

### III. LQC ALGORITHMS FOR PH-RELATED CLASSES

It is a well-established result that if  $P=NP$  then the complexity class PH collapses to P [1], meaning that all problems within the PH class, such as NP, co-NP, and  $P^{\text{NP}}$ , can be solved in polynomial time. In this section, we will first present a LQC algorithm that solve the problem of maximum independent set (MIS) in polynomial time. As MIS is a NP-hard problem [12], this implies immediately that one can solve all the problems in the classes of NP, co-NP, and  $P^{\text{NP}}$  in polynomial time by LQC. To illustrate, we present a LQC algorithm for solving NP and co-NP problems and a LQC algorithm for the problem of  $P^{\text{SAT}}$ .

#### A. algorithm for maximum independent set

For a graph  $G(n, m)$  with  $n$  vertices and  $m$  edges, an independent set (IS) is a subset of the vertices which are not

connected to each other directly by edges. The maximum independent sets (MIS) are the ones with the largest number of vertices among all ISs. For a given graph, finding its MIS is difficult on a classical computer and it is a NP-hard problem [12]. Moreover, for a given graph  $G(n, m)$ , no classical algorithm can find an appropriately approximate MIS in polynomial time in the worst case [13, 14]. For many graphs, the largest IS found by polynomial-time classical algorithms is only about half the size of the MIS [15, 16]. A quantum algorithm proposed recently shows promising signs of exponential speeding up [17, 18]; however, there is no rigorous proof or very convincing numerical evidence. Here we present a LQC algorithm which can solve MIS problems in polynomial time.

To design the algorithm for a given graph  $G(n, m)$ , we assign a Boolean variable to each vertex,  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ . As a result, a subset of vertices is represented by an integer  $x$  in its  $n$  digits binary form: if its  $i$ th digit  $x_i = 1$  then the  $i$ th vertex is included in the subset;  $x_i = 0$  then it is not. If  $x$  is an IS, then its  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  cannot both be 1 simultaneously when the two vertices  $x_i$  and  $x_j$  are connected by an edge.

For a LQC algorithm, we use  $n$  work qubits to represent the  $n$  vertices. Its  $N = 2^n$  possible states  $|00\dots 0\rangle, |00\dots 1\rangle, \dots, |11\dots 1\rangle$  naturally represent all the subsets of vertices. That is, a basis vector  $|x\rangle$  corresponds to the subset  $x$  where the integer  $x$  is in its binary form. The goal is to find the target state  $|M\rangle$  corresponding to MIS out of the  $N = 2^n$  possible states.




FIG. 6: LQC circuit for the operation  $Q$  that is capable of counting the number of ones that are in the basis state  $|x\rangle$ . It consists of  $n$  CCV gates. The right circuit is a short-hand representation of the left circuit.

In our algorithm for MIS problems, we add one oracle qubit and one hybit on top of the  $n$  work qubit in the computing circuit. The key part of our algorithm is shown in Fig. 6, which consists of  $n$  CCV gates. To see its functionality, let us consider two basis states  $|x\rangle$  and  $|y\rangle$ :  $x$  is not an IS and  $y$  is an IS. To distinguish them, we entangle them with the oracle qubit and prepare the following initial state

$$|\phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|x\rangle \otimes |0_o\rangle + |y\rangle \otimes |1_o\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (16)$$

The operation  $Q$  shown in Fig. 6 is composed of  $n$  CCV gates.




FIG. 7: Circuit of a LQC algorithm for solving MIS problems in polynomial time. As explained in the text,  $r$  is proportional to  $n$ .

After its application, the state at the output is

$$|\phi_1\rangle = Q|\phi_0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} \left[ |x\rangle \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle + \cosh(m_y \chi) |y\rangle \otimes |1_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle + i \sinh(m_y \chi) |y\rangle \otimes |1_o\rangle \otimes |1\rangle \right], \quad (17)$$

where  $m_y$  is the number of ones in the binary form of  $y$ . As emphasized in the last section, the hybit state  $|1\rangle$  is unobservable. So, the above state effectively has only the first two terms. As a result, the weight of the state  $|y\rangle$  is enhanced by a factor of  $\cosh(m_y \chi)$  that is determined by  $m_y$ , the number of ones in  $y$ . This means that the circuit in Fig. 6 effectively has the ability to count the number of ones in  $y$ , which for the graph is the number of vertices in the subset  $y$ .

To achieve an entangled state similar to  $|\phi_0\rangle$  in Eq.(16), we use the following oracle

$$O_{\text{IS}} = (I - P_{\text{IS}}) \otimes I_o + P_{\text{IS}} \otimes (|0_o\rangle\langle 1_o| + |1_o\rangle\langle 0_o|), \quad (18)$$

where

$$P_{\text{IS}} = \sum_{x \in \text{IS}} |x\rangle\langle x|. \quad (19)$$

The quantum oracle  $O_{\text{IS}}$  is similar to the one that people use in the Grover algorithm [10], and it evaluates whether a subset  $x$  is an IS in polynomial time.

The circuit of our algorithm is shown in Fig. 7. The initial state of the whole system, including the  $n$  work qubits, one oracle qubit and one hybit, is set to be  $|00\dots 0\rangle \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$ . The algorithm then proceeds as follows:

- (i) Apply Hadamard gates on all work qubits;
- (ii) Apply the oracle  $O_{\text{IS}}$ ;
- (iii) Apply the operation  $Q$  for  $r$  times;
- (iv) Measure the oracle qubit and the hybit.

After the step (i), the state becomes

$$|\Psi_0\rangle = |\Phi_0\rangle \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \sum_{x=0}^{2^n-1} |x\rangle \right) \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (20)$$

With the oracle operation in the step (ii), we have

$$|\Psi_1\rangle = O_{\text{IS}} |\Phi_0\rangle \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle = \left( \sum_{j \notin \text{IS}} |j\rangle \otimes |0_o\rangle + \sum_{x \in \text{IS}} |x\rangle \otimes |1_o\rangle \right) \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (21)$$

After the step (iii), we obtain

$$|\Psi_2\rangle = Q^r |\Psi_1\rangle = \left( \sum_{j \notin \text{IS}} |j\rangle \otimes |0_o\rangle + \sum_{x \in \text{IS}} \cosh(m_x r \chi) |x\rangle \otimes |1_o\rangle \right) \otimes |0\rangle + \left( \sum_{x \in \text{IS}} i \sinh(m_x r \chi) |x\rangle \otimes |1_o\rangle \right) \otimes |1\rangle, \quad (22)$$

where  $m_x$  is the number of ones in the binary form of  $x$ , or equivalently, the number of vertices in the IS  $x$ . As already mentioned in the last section, the hybit state  $|1\rangle$  is not observable. So, the probability  $P$  of obtaining the MIS after the measurement is given by

$$P = \frac{N_{\text{MIS}} \cosh^2(Mr\chi)}{N - N_{\text{IS}} + \sum_{x \in \text{IS}} \cosh^2(m_x r \chi)}, \quad (23)$$

where  $M$  is the number of vertices in the MIS,  $N_{\text{IS}}$  is the number of ISs, and  $N_{\text{MIS}}$  is the number of MIS. It is apparent that we have

$$P > \frac{N_{\text{MIS}} \cosh^2(Mr\chi)}{(N - N_{\text{MIS}}) \cosh^2((M-1)r\chi) + N_{\text{MIS}} \cosh^2(Mr\chi)} \approx \frac{N_{\text{MIS}} e^{2r\chi}}{N - N_{\text{MIS}} + N_{\text{MIS}} e^{2r\chi}}. \quad (24)$$

It is clear that  $P \approx 1$  when  $r \approx \frac{1}{\chi} \ln N \propto n$ . As each execution of  $Q$  involves  $n$  CCV gates, the time complexity of our algorithm is  $O(n \ln N) \sim O(n^2)$ .

Like in quantum computing, the output in LQC as seen in Eq. (23) is always probabilistic rather than absolutely accurate although the probability  $P$  can be made very close to one by repeating the CV operations sufficiently many times. This is analogous to the complexity class BQP (bounded-error quantum polynomial-time), and it is why we call the associated complexity class for Lorentz quantum computing BLQP (bounded-error Lorentz quantum polynomial-time).

As MIS is an NP-hard problem, the ability to solve it in polynomial time implies the ability to solve any NP problem in polynomial time. In other words, N=NP. There is a well-known result that if N=NP then all the problems in PH classes can be solved in polynomial time [1]. That LQC can solve MIS, a non-NP problem, in polynomial time also implies that both NP and co-NP are true subsets of BLQP. In the following, to illustrate these capacities of LQC, we will present a few detailed algorithms that solve NP, co-NP, and  $\text{P}^{\text{SAT}}$  problems in polynomial time.

## B. LQC algorithm for NP and co-NP

In classical computing, the relationship between NP and co-NP remains an open question. We present here a LQC algo-

rithm that can solve both NP and co-NP problems in polynomial time. In this sense NP and co-NP are equivalent for LQC.

The NP class is defined as a set of problems that can be solved by a non-deterministic Turing machine (NDTM) in polynomial time. Alternatively, NP problems are defined as decision problems where candidate solutions can be verified in polynomial time. One example is the Boolean satisfiability problem (SAT), where the task is to determine if there exists an assignment of values to the Boolean variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  such that a given Boolean formula  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  evaluates to true. The formula  $f$  is usually in conjunctive normal form consisting of clauses of  $k$  Boolean variables. SAT problems with  $k \geq 3$  variables in each clause are NP-complete, meaning if any  $k$ -SAT problem for  $k \geq 3$  could be solved in polynomial time, then every NP problem could be solved in polynomial time. This highlights the significance of NP-completeness - solving any NP-complete problem efficiently would allow efficient solutions for the entire complexity class NP.

The complexity class co-NP consists of the set of decision problems that are complementary to the problems in NP. For example, for a SAT problem with the Boolean formula  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ , when the task is changed to determine if there exists no assignment of values to the Boolean variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  such that a given Boolean formula  $f$  evaluates to true, it is a NONSAT problem belonging to the co-NP class. Similarly, NONSAT problems with  $k \geq 3$  are co-NP-complete, implying that if any  $k$ -NONSAT problem for  $k \geq 3$  could be solved in polynomial time, then every co-NP problem could be solved in polynomial time.

As  $k$ -SAT problems are NP-complete and  $k$ -NONSAT problems are co-NP-complete, we only need to design an algorithm to solve  $k$ -SAT problems and  $k$ -NONSAT problems. If it can solve them in polynomial time, our algorithm can solve any NP and co-NP problems in polynomial time. The logic circuit of our LQC algorithm is illustrated in Fig. 8. The circuit has one oracle qubit, one hybit, and  $n$  work qubits, which represent the  $n$  Boolean variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$ . For brevity, a quantum state  $|x_1 x_2 \dots x_n\rangle$  is denoted as  $|x\rangle$  with  $x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$  being the binary form of integer  $x$ . The task is to separate all the  $N = 2^n$  possible states  $|0\rangle = |00\dots 00\rangle$ ,  $|1\rangle = |00\dots 01\rangle$ ,  $\dots$ ,  $|N-1\rangle = |11\dots 11\rangle$  into two groups: one group evaluates a given Boolean formula  $f$  to true and the other group evaluates  $f$  to false. Once one manages to do this, one is able to answer both questions: (1) if there exists an assignment of values to the Boolean variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  such that  $f = 1$ ; (2) if there exists no assignment of values to the Boolean variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  such that  $f = 1$ .

The key components in Fig. 8 are the oracle for  $f$  and logical gates CV that operate on the lone hybit. The oracle  $O$  is an operator defined as [10]:

$$O = (I - P_s) \otimes I_o + P_s \otimes (|0_o\rangle\langle 1_o| + |1_o\rangle\langle 0_o|), \quad (25)$$

where  $I_o$  is the identity matrix for the oracle qubit and  $P_s$  is a projection onto the sub-Hilbert space spanned by all possible solutions  $|j\rangle$  of  $f = 1$

$$P_s = \sum_{j \in \{f=1\}} |j\rangle\langle j|. \quad (26)$$

The quantum oracle  $O$  is the same as the one in Eq. (18). As pointed out in Ref. [18] (see also Appendix A), the problem of independent sets is equivalent to a special 2-SAT problem.




FIG. 8: Circuit of a LQC algorithm for solving SAT and NON-SAT problems, which are NP-complete and co-NP-complete, respectively. The big box represents the oracle that implement the operator (25) for a given Boolean formula  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ . The circuit enclosed within the dashed box is referred to as “Lorentz oracle”, and will be used both as an NP-oracle and a co-NP-oracle in LQC algorithms to solve more difficult problems such as the ones in the  $P^{NP}$  class.

The two-bit control gate CV utilizes the oracle qubit as its control bit and the hybit as its target bit. When the oracle qubit is in the state  $|1_o\rangle$ , CV executes the Lorentz transformation  $V$  as defined in Eq. (10) on the hybit. The number of the gate CV in the circuit is proportional to  $n$ , the number of work qubit as we will explain below.

With the  $n$  work qubits, the oracle qubit and the lone hybit initially in the state of  $|00\dots 0\rangle \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle$ , the LQC algorithm as depicted in Fig. 8 proceeds as follows:

(i) Apply the Hadamard gates to all work qubits, and the system state becomes

$$|\Phi_0\rangle \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{2^n-1} |j\rangle \right) \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (27)$$

(ii) Apply the oracle operator  $O$ , and repeat applying the gate CV  $r$  times with  $r \approx \frac{1}{\chi} \ln N$ .

(iii) Measure the oracle qubit and the hybit.

Let us look at the state  $|\Phi\rangle$  obtained in the step (ii). Let  $\mathcal{L}_{CV}$  be the matrix representing the gate operation CV, and we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi\rangle &= \mathcal{L}_{CV}^r O |\Phi_0\rangle \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ &= \left( \sum_{j \notin \{f=1\}} |j\rangle \right) \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ &\quad + \left( \sum_{j \in \{f=1\}} \cosh(r\chi) |j\rangle \right) \otimes |1_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ &\quad + \left( \sum_{j \in \{f=1\}} i \sinh(r\chi) |j\rangle \right) \otimes |1_o\rangle \otimes |1\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

According to the theory of Lorentz mechanics [5], the hybit state  $|1\rangle$  is not observable. Therefore, all the terms in the above equation on the right hand side have been separated into two groups, one group with  $|0_o\rangle$  and the other group with  $|1_o\rangle$ . So, the probability  $P$  of measuring the oracle qubit  $|1_o\rangle$  such that  $f = 1$  is

$$\begin{aligned} P &= \frac{N_{f=1} \cosh^2(r\chi)}{N - N_{f=1} + N_{f=1} \cosh^2(r\chi)} \\ &\approx \frac{N_{f=1} e^{2r\chi}}{N - N_{f=1} + N_{f=1} e^{2r\chi}}, \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

where  $N_{f=1}$  is the number of states out of the  $N$  states such that  $f = 1$ . When  $N_{f=1} = 0$ ,  $P = 0$ . When  $N_{f=1} \neq 0$ , since  $r \approx \frac{1}{\chi} \ln N$ , we obviously have  $P \approx 1$ . This means that when one measures the oracle qubit, one either gets  $|0_o\rangle$  or  $|1_o\rangle$ . This answers at once both the questions: (1) whether there is an assignment of values to the Boolean variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  such that  $f = 1$ ; (2) whether there exists no assignment of values such that  $f = 1$ . Since  $r \sim O(n)$ , this LQC algorithm solves either a SAT problem or a NONSAT problem in polynomial time.

### C. LQC algorithm for $P^{\text{SAT}}$

The PH class is a complexity class that naturally generalizes P, NP, and co-NP. It contains hierarchical subclasses defined using oracles with unrestricted resources. One example is the subclass  $P^{\text{NP}}$ , which is located on the second level of PH. The ‘‘NP’’ in the superscript refers to an imaginary, resource-unconstrained NP-oracle, which is designed to ascertain efficiently whether a given problem belongs to NP or not. This NP-oracle can be loosely regarded as a NDTM, who has the ability to solve a NP problem in polynomial time. The crucial difference is that each query to the NP-oracle is considered to be ‘‘1’’ in terms of time or operation steps, not a polynomial of  $n$ . Any problem can be solved in polynomial time deterministically with an NP oracle belongs to the class of  $P^{\text{NP}}$ . This captures the meaning behind having ‘‘P’’ as the main character in the notation  $P^{\text{NP}}$  - the problems can be solved in polynomial time given access to the NP-oracle. Because all  $k$ -SAT problems for  $k \geq 3$  are NP-complete, it follows that  $P^{\text{NP}} = P^{\text{SAT}}$ .

One example of  $P^{\text{SAT}}$  is the problem of UNIQUE-SAT: for a given SAT problem, specified by a Boolean formula  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ , whether there exists exactly one solution for  $f = 1$ . This is a  $P^{\text{SAT}}$  problem due to the self-reducibility property of SAT. Specifically, for a given Boolean formula  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ , we can conduct  $O(n)$  adaptive queries to the SAT-oracle: we initially fix  $x_1$  and query the SAT oracle to determine if  $f(x_1 = 0, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  is satisfiable. If it is, we keep  $x_1 = 0$ ; if not, we switch to  $x_1 = 1$ . Once a satisfying assignment for  $x_1$  is obtained, we proceed to set values for  $x_2, x_3, \dots, x_n$  iteratively by fixing variables and querying the oracle. This ‘‘self-reduction’’ process solves SAT by recursively querying a SAT oracle, requiring at most  $n$  steps to find a satisfying assignment. After discovering a satisfying assignment  $A$ , we query  $f \wedge (x \neq A)$ . If this is unsatisfiable,  $f$  belongs to

UNIQUE-SAT. Otherwise,  $f$  is not in UNIQUE-SAT. Given an assignment  $A$ , it is easy to construct the Boolean expression for  $x \neq A$ . For example, for  $n = 4$  and  $A = 1001$ , the expression for  $x \neq A$  is  $\overline{x_1} \wedge \overline{x_2} \wedge \overline{x_3} \wedge x_4$ .

It is clear that if one can find an algorithm that is capable of determining whether a SAT problem is satisfiable in polynomial time, then one can replace the SAT-oracle with this algorithm and solve  $P^{\text{SAT}}$  in polynomial time. The LQC circuit enclosed within the dashed box in Fig. 8 is just such an algorithm as we have already demonstrated. As a result, we have a LQC algorithm that solves UNIQUE-SAT and its time complexity is  $O(n^2)$ . This can certainly be generalized to solve any  $P^{\text{NP}}$  problem. Specifically, for a problem belonging to  $P^{\text{NP}}$  with a time complexity of  $O(n^c)$ , its time complexity, when utilizing the oracle within the dashed box in Fig. 8, becomes  $O(n^{c+1})$ .

In this algorithm for solving UNIQUE-SAT, which is a  $P^{\text{NP}}$  problem, polynomial adaptive queries are made to the BLQP oracle, the rationale behind these adaptive queries will be discussed in Sec. VI(C).

In fact, the MIS problem is also within the complexity class  $P^{\text{NP}}$ . The  $k$ -IS, which involves finding an independent set of  $k$  vertices, falls within NP. We can perform  $n$  non-adaptive queries to the NP-oracle (or SAT-oracle since the SAT problem is NP-complete) for 0-IS, 1-IS, all the way up to  $n$ -IS solutions. By determining the maximum value of  $k_{\text{MAX}}$  that yields a positive result from the oracle, we derive the solution for MIS. Thus, MIS resides within the class  $P^{\|\text{NP}}$  [19, 20].

## IV. LQC ALGORITHMS FOR PP AND OTHER RELATED CLASSES

In this section, we will first present a LQC algorithm that solves problems of the complexity class PP in polynomial time. We then show that this algorithm can be used to solve problems in the class of  $P^{\#P}$  in polynomial time. This means that both PP and  $P^{\#P}$  are subsets of BLQP.

### A. LQC algorithm for PP

Instead of considering the class of PP (probabilistic polynomial-time) in general, we focus on a PP-complete problem, MAJSAT, and discuss the approach to solving it with LQC. For a given Boolean expression  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  of  $n$  Boolean variables, the problem of MAJSAT is to determine whether major assignments of Boolean variables satisfy  $f = 1$ . To understand why MAJSAT is PP-complete, please consult some textbooks on computational complexity theory, for example, Ref. [1]. For a given SAT problem, we let  $s$  be the number of assignments of  $n$  Boolean variables satisfying  $f = 1$ . The problem of MAJSAT is to determine whether  $s > 2^{n-1}$ .

The LQC circuit for solving MAJSAT is depicted in Fig. 9, where an auxiliary qubit is used along with  $n$  work qubit, an oracle qubit and a hybit. The quantum oracle used here is similar to the one in Fig. 8 and has the ability to evaluate  $f$  in parallel in polynomial time. We continue to use binary notation, that is, in a state  $|x\rangle$  of  $n$  work qubit, the integer  $x$  is




FIG. 9: Circuit of a LQC algorithm for solving MAJSAT, which belongs to the PP class. The auxiliary qubit is initialized in  $\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$  with  $\beta/\alpha = 2^i$ , where  $i$  is an integer ranging from  $-n$  to  $n$ .

understood in its binary form. The algorithmic steps as shown in Fig. 9 are as follows:

(i) Initialize all the bits to either  $|0\rangle$  or  $|1\rangle$  except the auxiliary qubit, which is set in the state of  $|\varphi_{\beta/\alpha}\rangle = \alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle$  with  $\alpha$  and  $\beta$  being real and positive.

(ii) Apply Hadamard gates to each of the work qubits,

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_{ii}\rangle &= |\Phi_0\rangle \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |\varphi_{\beta/\alpha}\rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \left( \sum_{j=0}^{2^n-1} |j\rangle \right) \otimes |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |\varphi_{\beta/\alpha}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

(iii) Apply the oracle operator  $O$  in Eq. (25) to the state vector, followed by applying Hadamard gates and  $\sigma_x$ -gates to each of the work qubits.

(iv) Apply the operation  $Q$  (see Fig. 6)  $r$  times without using the oracle qubit as the control bit.

(v) Apply the Hadamard gate to the oracle qubit with the auxiliary qubit as the control bit.

(vi) With the oracle qubit as the control bit and the hybit as the target bit, apply the CV gates  $r'$  times.

(vii) Measure the auxiliary qubit in the  $x$ -direction a large number of times, and count the number of either of the two outcomes: 1 and  $-1$ . Note that one needs to re-do steps (i)-(vi) for each measure. The number of measurement will be discussed in later analysis.

(viii) Repeat the above procedures  $2n+1$  times, each with a distinct value of  $\beta/\alpha = 2^i$  for the auxiliary qubit, where  $i$  is an integer ranging from  $-n$  to  $n$  inclusively.

Let us analyze the algorithm to understand why it is capable of solving MAJSAT. After step (iii), the entire system becomes:

$$|\Psi_{iii}\rangle = \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} |x\rangle \otimes (a_x|0_o\rangle + b_x|1_o\rangle) \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |\varphi_{\beta/\alpha}\rangle, \quad (31)$$

where  $a_x = 1$  and  $b_x = 0$  when  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = 0$ , and  $a_x = 0$  and  $b_x = 1$  when  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n) = 1$ . With  $r \approx \ln N/\chi$ , the subsequent  $Q$  operations in step (iv) are aimed at effectively isolating the term with  $|11\dots 1\rangle$  among all the possible  $N = 2^n$

terms. Omitting terms with exponentially smaller coefficients and terms with  $|1\rangle$  which are unobservable, we have

$$|\Psi_{iv}\rangle \approx |11\dots 1\rangle \otimes |\phi_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |\varphi_{\beta/\alpha}\rangle, \quad (32)$$

where

$$|\phi_o\rangle = \frac{(N-s)|0_o\rangle + s|1_o\rangle}{\sqrt{(N-s)^2 + s^2}}. \quad (33)$$

In this step, the number of satisfying assignments  $s$  has been coded in the coefficients of the oracle qubit state  $|\phi_o\rangle$ . As the difference between the two coefficients can be exponentially small, one in general needs to measure it exponentially large number of times to tell the difference. The steps (v) and (vi) are to use the special property of hybit to reduce it to polynomial number of times.

At the step (v), the controlled Hadamard gate mixes up the coefficients of the oracle qubit state and the auxiliary qubit state. At the step (vi), the CV gate is applied  $r'$  times with the oracle qubit as the control bit and the hybit as the target bit. By setting  $r' \approx \ln N/\chi$ , when we measure the oracle qubit, we are almost certain to find it in the state of  $|1_o\rangle$  and the auxiliary qubit in the state of

$$|\varphi_\eta\rangle = \frac{s|0\rangle + \eta\sqrt{1/2}(2^n - 2s)|1\rangle}{\sqrt{s^2 + (\eta^2/2)(2^n - 2s)^2}}, \quad (34)$$

where  $\eta = \beta/\alpha$ . For the detailed calculation leading to the above equation, please refer to Appendix B. As indicated in the step (viii),  $\eta$  has  $2n+1$  possible values,  $\eta_i = 2^i$  ( $i \in [-n, n]$ ).

With  $|\varphi_\eta\rangle$ , it is now possible to determine whether  $s > 2^{n-1}$  in polynomial time. We regard the auxiliary qubit as a spin, and measure it along the  $x$ -direction for which the two basis vectors are  $|\pm\rangle = (|0\rangle \pm |1\rangle)/\sqrt{2}$ . When  $s \leq 2^{n-1}$ , it is easy to show that

$$P_- = |\langle -|\varphi_{2^i}\rangle| \leq 1/2. \quad (35)$$

This means that if we measure it large number of times, the number of outcome  $-1$  does not exceed the number of outcome 1.



When the instance  $f$  is in MAJSAT, that is,  $s > 2^{n-1}$ , the probability of outcome  $-1$  is

$$P_- = \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\sqrt{2}\eta s(2s - 2^n)}{2s^2 + \eta^2(2s - 2^n)^2}, \quad (36)$$

which is always bigger than  $1/2$ . Although  $\delta_p = P_- - 1/2$  can be exponentially small for some values of  $\eta$ , we find that for a given value of  $\delta_p \leq \sqrt{2}/4$ , there exists some values of  $\eta$  so that for all the possible values of  $s > 2^{n-1}$  we always have

$$P_- \geq \frac{1}{2} + \delta_p. \quad (37)$$

For convenience, we denote one of such  $\eta$  as  $\eta_a = 2^{m_a}$  with  $m_a$  is an integer between  $-n$  and  $n$ . For detailed analysis, please see Appendix C. Note that  $\delta_p$  can be set to a small value but the value is finite and independent of  $n$ . For a smaller  $\delta_p$ , there are more possible values of  $\eta$ , similar to  $\eta_a$ . Suppose for the special  $\eta_a$ , the auxiliary qubit is measured  $N_{PP}$  times. We find that when

$$N_{PP} \geq \frac{2 \log(\varepsilon)}{\log(1 - 4\delta_p^2)}, \quad (38)$$

the probability of the number of measurement results  $-1$  exceeding the number of results  $1$  for  $\eta_a$  is  $P = 1 - \varepsilon$ .

Based on the above analysis, we lay out the procedure for determining if  $f$  is in MAJSAT. We first set  $\varepsilon = c^{-n}$  with  $c > 1$ . As a result, the value of  $N_{PP}$  becomes a linear function of  $n$ . Then, for each  $\eta_i = 2^i$  ( $i \in [-n, n]$ ), we measure the auxiliary qubit in the  $x$ -direction  $nN_{PP}$  times. With each set of  $N_{PP}$  measures, designate a result as ‘‘success’’ if the count of results  $-1$  exceeds the count of results  $1$ . For the  $n$  sets of  $N_{PP}$  measures, tally the occurrences of ‘‘success’’ results.

If  $f$  is in MAJSAT, then the probability of all the results being ‘‘success’’ at  $\eta_a$  is given by

$$P_n = (1 - c^{-n})^n. \quad (39)$$

It is evident that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n = 1$ . This means that, for a sufficiently large  $n$ , there must exist a value of  $\eta = \beta/\alpha = 2^i$  such that the results of all  $n$  sets of measures are ‘‘success’’.

However, if  $f$  is not in MAJSAT, then the probability of having at least one value of  $\eta$ , such that for  $n$  sets of measures, all the results are ‘‘success’’, is given by

$$P_n \leq 1 - (1 - 2^{-n})^{2n+1}. \quad (40)$$

It is clear that  $\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} P_n = 0$ . This implies, for a sufficiently large  $n$ , it is impossible that all  $n$  sets of measures result in ‘‘success’’ for all ratios of  $\eta_i = 2^i$ .

With this strategy, we can determine whether an instance  $f$  belongs to MAJSAT. The time complexity of the entire algorithm is  $O(n^4)$ , meaning that it runs in polynomial time.

## B. LQC algorithm for $P^{\#P}$

According to computational complexity theory, we have  $P^{PP} = P^{\#P}$  [21]. Consequently, the LQC algorithm for PP

problems can be adapted to efficiently solve problems in  $\#P$  and  $P^{\#P}$ . In this section, we briefly discuss the algorithm through a specific example, namely, the MAX- $k$ -IS problem.

The problems in the class of  $\#P$  is to determine the number of solutions of an NP problem. A  $\#P$ -complete problem is  $\#SAT$ , which involves determining, for a Boolean expression  $f(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ , the count of assignments of Boolean variables  $x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n$  such that  $f = 1$ . The class  $P^{\#P}$  is defined as the set of problems that can be deterministically solved in polynomial time with access to a  $\#P$ -oracle.

We focus on a  $P^{\#P}$  problem called MAX- $k$ -IS. For a given graph  $G(n, m)$ , there are many ISs. Let us denote the set of ISs that have  $k$  vertices as  $k$ -IS and its size as  $\#k$ -IS. For example,  $\#0$ -IS is one and  $\#1$ -IS is  $n$ . The problem of MAX- $k$ -IS is to determine which  $\#k$ -IS is the largest. MAX- $k$ -IS is evidently a  $P^{\#P}$  problem. As the  $k$ -IS is an NP-complete problem, we can query the  $\#P$ -oracle for  $\#0$ -IS,  $\#1$ -IS, up to  $\#n$ -IS, respectively, and compare them to determine which one is the largest. We will now demonstrate that this problem can be solved by LQC, using the algorithm for solving PP as depicted in Fig. 9.

Regarding the graph  $G(n, m)$ , similarly to the previous section, we employ binary notation:  $x = x_1x_2 \dots x_n$ , where  $x_j = 1$  signifies the selection of the  $j$ th vertex. Given that the  $k$ -IS is an NP problem, a Boolean expression  $f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  exists such that  $f_k = 1$  if and only if  $x_1x_2 \dots x_n$  forms an independent set comprising  $k$  vertices. To address this problem using the PP algorithm, we formulate an additional Boolean expression  $g_z(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ , where  $1 \leq z \leq 2^n$ . This expression evaluates to  $1$  ( $g_z = 1$ ) if the string  $x = x_1x_2 \dots x_n$ , interpreted as a binary number, is less than  $z$ .

We next introduce an additional Boolean variable  $x_0$ , and construct a Boolean expression involving  $n + 1$  variables,

$$F(x_0, x_1, \dots, x_n) = (x_0 \wedge f_k(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)) \vee (\bar{x}_0 \wedge g_z(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)). \quad (41)$$

This expression  $F$  is true only when either  $f_k$  or  $g_z$  is true, and  $x_0$  here serves as a switch.

With the Boolean expression (41), we construct a MAJSAT problem: whether the majority of assignments for  $x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{n+1}$  satisfy  $F = 1$ . In other words, we determine if the following inequality holds:

$$z + \#k\text{-IS} \geq 2^{n+1}/2 = 2^n, \quad (42)$$

The LQC circuit illustrated in Fig. 9, incorporating  $n + 1$  work qubits, can be used to solve this problem. As has been mentioned, the time complexity of this algorithm is  $O(n^4)$ .

The detailed procedure is as follows. For a given  $k$ , we initiate the process by setting  $z = 2^{n-1}$ , denoted as  $z = 100 \dots 0$  with  $n - 1$  zeros, and formulate the Boolean expression  $g_{2^{n-1}}$  to determine whether  $\#k\text{-IS} + 2^{n-1} \geq 2^n$  holds. If the result is negative, we retain the first 1 and change the first zero to one, i.e., set  $z = 1100 \dots 0$ ; if positive, we change the one to 0 and set  $z = 0100 \dots 0$ . This process is then iterated to determine the subsequent numbers in the binary representation of  $z$ . The iteration continues until the minimum number  $z$  satisfying Eq. (42) is obtained, denoted as  $z_{\text{MIN}}$ . The value of  $\#k$ -IS is subsequently calculated as  $2^n - z_{\text{MIN}}$ . The time complexity of this search is  $O(n) \cdot O(n^4) = O(n^5)$ .

After applying this iterative process for 0-IS, 1-IS,  $\dots$ , up to  $n$ -IS, we have the solution for MAX- $k$ -IS. The overall time complexity amounts to  $O(n^6)$ , which is polynomial. It is important to note once again that the length of the input for the graph  $G(n, m)$  is not  $n$  but  $n^2$ .

The above result implies that the class  $P^{\#P}$  is a subset of BLQP. The entire class PH is defined as:  $\Delta_0 = \Sigma_0 = \Pi_0 = P$ ;  $\Delta_i = P^{\Sigma_{i-1}}$ ,  $\Sigma_i = NP^{\Sigma_{i-1}}$ ,  $\Pi_i = \text{co-NP}^{\Sigma_{i-1}}$ . According to Toda's theorem [22],  $\text{PH} \subset P^{\#P}$ . So, we again have shown in principle that the class PH is a subset of BLQP.

In this algorithm for solving MAX- $k$ -IS, which is a  $P^{\#P}$  problem, polynomial adaptive queries are made to the BLQP oracle, the rationale behind these adaptive queries will be discussed in Sec. VI(C).

## V. COMPARISON BETWEEN LQC AND QUANTUM COMPUTING WITH POSTSELECTION

As far as we know, the term ‘‘postselection’’ has various meanings. It quite often refers to a method of selectively choose specific outcomes after many rounds of quantum measurements [23, 24]. The postselection that we discuss here was introduced by Aaronson as ‘‘the power of discarding all runs of a computation in which a given event does not occur’’ [4]. In other words, it is a capability to force specific outcomes in a single run of quantum measurement, which is beyond quantum mechanics. A quantum computer with this ability of postselection was found to be very powerful, and the corresponding computational complexity class PostBQP was shown to be equivalent to PP [4]. Below we briefly review this concept and then discuss the relation between PostBQP and BLQP.

### A. Simulation of postselection by LQC

The postselection introduced in Ref. [4] is the ability to efficiently collapse a quantum state given by

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_i c_i |\psi_i\rangle = \sum_{j \in \text{yes}} c_j |\psi_j\rangle + \sum_{k \in \text{no}} c_k |\psi_k\rangle, \quad (43)$$

to the following target state,

$$|\Psi_{\text{yes}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sum_{j \in \text{yes}} |c_j|^2} \sum_{j \in \text{yes}} c_j |\psi_j\rangle. \quad (44)$$

Here  $|\Psi\rangle$  represents a general quantum state, and  $|\psi_i\rangle$ s are basis states which are categorized into ‘yes’ and ‘no’ according to a given problem.

In essence, the postselection consists of two operations. The first one behaves like an oracle, which marks each state with yes or no; the second is quantum measurement with the ability of collapsing into only yes states. Both of the operations can be simulated by LQC: the first one with an oracle qubit and the second one with Lorentz transformations on a hybit. And the states  $|\Psi\rangle$  and  $|\Psi_{\text{yes}}\rangle$  is stored in  $n$  work qubits.

The specific process unfolds as follows. The initial state is prepared as

$$|\Psi_i\rangle = |0_o\rangle \otimes |\Psi\rangle \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (45)$$

Here  $|0_o\rangle$  is the state of the oracle qubit, and  $|0\rangle$  is for the hybit, which can only undergo Lorentz transformation in the space spanned by  $|0\rangle$  and  $|1\rangle$ . The state  $|1\rangle$  is unobservable. After the oracle operation as described in Eq. (25) and illustrated with the small box marked ‘‘oracle’’ in Fig. 8, the state of the system becomes

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_o\rangle = & |1_o\rangle \otimes \sum_{j \in \text{yes}} c_j |\psi_j\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ & + |0_o\rangle \otimes \sum_{k \in \text{no}} c_k |\psi_k\rangle \otimes |0\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (46)$$

where the yes states and no states are marked out with the oracle qubit. Within the oracle, whether a given state  $|\psi_i\rangle$  belongs to ‘yes’ or ‘no’ can be verified within polynomial time. This oracle operation can be implemented using conventional quantum computer and the states in superposition are checked in parallel.

We then use a manipulation that is unique in LQC. It is the CV gate shown in Fig. 4, with the oracle qubit as the control and the hybit as the target. When the oracle qubit is in the state of  $|1\rangle$ , a Lorentz transformation  $V$  in Eq. (10) is applied on the hybit. After applying the CV gate  $r$  times, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_V\rangle = & |1_o\rangle \otimes \sum_{j \in \text{yes}} c_j \cosh(r\chi) |\psi_j\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ & + |0_o\rangle \otimes \sum_{k \in \text{no}} c_k |\psi_k\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ & + |1_o\rangle \otimes \sum_{j \in \text{yes}} c_j i \sinh(r\chi) |\psi_j\rangle \otimes |1\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (47)$$

Because the state  $|1\rangle$  for the hybit is unobservable, the resulting state is equivalent to

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi_V\rangle = & |1_o\rangle \otimes \cosh(r\chi) \sum_{j \in \text{yes}} c_j |\psi_j\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ & + |0_o\rangle \otimes \sum_{k \in \text{no}} c_k |\psi_k\rangle \otimes |0\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (48)$$

where the normalization constant is dropped. When the repeated time  $r \approx \frac{1}{\chi} \ln 2^n \sim O(n)$ , the amplitude for the yes states is exponentially larger. If the oracle bit is measured, it is almost certain to find it in the state of  $|1\rangle$ . So, after the measurement, we are almost certain to find the system in the following state

$$|\Psi_f\rangle = |1_o\rangle \otimes \sum_{j \in \text{yes}} c_j |\psi_j\rangle \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (49)$$

The ‘‘postselection’’ is accomplished.

It is apparent that even when the absolute values of  $|c_j|$ s are very different, for instance, some  $|c_j|$ s are exponentially smaller than the others, we can still obtain the states (49) in polynomial time of  $n$ .

## B. Super-postselection by LQC

In Sec. III, we have discussed an operation called  $Q$ , whose LQC circuit is shown in Fig. 6. The operation  $Q$  is capable of counting the number of qubits in the state  $|1\rangle$  within  $|\psi_i\rangle$ , and then uses this count to appropriately amplify the amplitude. By repeating  $Q$  sufficient number of times, one can select the basis states that have the largest number of qubits in  $|1\rangle$ .

Consider, for example, a superposition state given by

$$|\Phi_0\rangle = [ |1000\rangle + |0110\rangle ] \otimes |1_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle, \quad (50)$$

which is not normalized as the normalization is not important. We apply  $Q$  with four work qubits to this state  $r$  times, and the state becomes

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi_r\rangle &= [ \cosh(r\chi) |1000\rangle + \cosh(2r\chi) |0110\rangle ] \otimes |1_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \\ &+ i [ \sinh(r\chi) |1000\rangle + \sinh(2r\chi) |0110\rangle ] \otimes |1_o\rangle \otimes |1\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

For  $\chi = 4 \ln(\sqrt{2} + 1)$ , when  $r = 4$ , the ratio between the coefficient before  $|1000\rangle$  and the coefficient before  $|0110\rangle$  is over  $10^6$ . Due to  $|1\rangle$  is unobservable, the above state can be regarded approximately as

$$|\Phi_r\rangle \approx |0110\rangle \otimes |1_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (52)$$

The state  $|0110\rangle$  is selected. However, let us start with a different superposition state

$$|\Phi_0\rangle = [ |1110\rangle + |0110\rangle ] \otimes |1_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle. \quad (53)$$

This time we again apply the same  $Q$  operation four times. What is selected at the end is  $|1110\rangle$  instead of  $|0110\rangle$  as  $|1110\rangle$  has more ones than  $|0110\rangle$ .

It is clear from the above example that the selection achieved with repeated  $Q$  operations is relative. This is in stark contrast to postselection, which is done according to a preset criterion, for example, a Boolean expression. It is precisely due to this special selection capability of LQC that we are able to solve the problem of MIS in polynomial time with the circuit shown in Fig. 7. We call the selection via  $Q$  super-postselection just to distinguish it from Aaronson's postselection introduced in Ref. [4].

The above comparison shows that LQC can solve efficiently any problem that is efficiently solved by quantum computer with postselection, not vice versa due to the super-postselection capability of LQC. This implies that PostBQP is a subset of BLQP, but not necessarily a true subset of BLQP. The reason is that the problem solved by LQC with super-postselection may be solved efficiently by postselection with a different strategy.

## VI. BLQP AND OTHER COMPLEXITY CLASSES

### A. $\text{BLQP} \subseteq \text{PSPACE}$

As the proof for  $\text{BQP} \subseteq \text{PSPACE}$  does not require unitarity for the gate transformation [1, 10], we naturally have  $\text{BLQP} \subseteq$

$\text{PSPACE}$ . We have not found an efficient LQC algorithm to the problem of quantified Boolean formulas (QBF), recognized as  $\text{PSPACE}$ -complete [2, 21]. It is likely that  $\text{BLQP} \subseteq \text{PSPACE}$ .

### B. “ $\text{BLQP} \subseteq \text{PP}$ ” cannot be proven

According to the conventional definition of BQP and PostBQP [4], when the gates in the quantum circuit consist only of the Hadamard gate, Toffoli gate, and projective gate, i.e., the absolute values of the real nonzero matrix elements of each gate in the computational representation are the same, then we can prove  $\text{BQP}(\text{PostBQP}) \subseteq \text{PP}$ . However, in LQC, the introduction of Lorentz operators, such as  $\tau$  as depicted in Eq. (8), is essential to augment computational capability. Notably, these operators contain different irrational matrix elements. In this context, the nonzero elements within each operator cannot share the same absolute values, implying that  $\text{BLQP} \not\subseteq \text{PP}$ .

### C. Measurements and adaptive querying to BLQP oracles

As  $\text{BQP} = \text{BQP}^{\text{BQP}}$  [25], we would expect  $\text{BLQP} = \text{BLQP}^{\text{BLQP}}$ . However, upon closer examination, one realizes that this expectation may be incorrect because, in LQC, any nonzero error probability could be arbitrarily magnified by Lorentz gates. Instead, as discussed in Ref. [4], we generally have  $\text{BLQP} = \text{BQP}_{\|\text{classical}\|}^{\text{BLQP}}$ , which represents the class of problems solvable by a machine capable of making a polynomial number of non-adaptive classical queries to a BLQP oracle, followed by a polynomial-time quantum computation. The requirement for the queries to be non-adaptive is further explained as follows.

Consider querying a BLQP oracle, yielding a result denoted as follows, without loss of generality:

$$c_O |O\rangle + c_{\text{error}} |\text{error}\rangle, \quad (54)$$

Here,  $|O\rangle$  represents the expected correct result produced by the oracle, while  $|\text{error}\rangle$  denotes an irrelevant outcome, an inherent feature in any bounded-error algorithm, characterized by a very small amplitude  $c_{\text{error}}$ . The subsequent gates are designed to obtain the expected result assuming the error is zero. Therefore, without loss of generality, the output can be expressed as follows:

$$c_O U |O\rangle + c_{\text{error}} U |\text{error}\rangle = c_O |\text{expected}\rangle + c_{\text{error}} U |\text{error}\rangle, \quad (55)$$

where  $|\text{expected}\rangle$  represents the final state we anticipate when designing the algorithm.

In conventional quantum algorithms, the unitarity of the operator  $U$  ensures no enlargement of small  $|c_{\text{error}}|^2$ . Consequently, adaptive queries to a BQP oracle are viable in conventional quantum computers, resulting in  $\text{BQP} = \text{BQP}^{\text{BQP}}$ . However, in the context of LQC, the operator  $U$  can be Lorentzian, potentially leading to the amplification of the second term in Eq. (55), even when  $|c_{\text{error}}|^2$  is exponentially

small. As a consequence, queries to BLQP oracles in LQC must be non-adaptive, implying independence or parallelism. The primary circuit managing each oracle's results can only incorporate unitary gates, resulting in  $\text{BLQP} = \text{BQP}_{\parallel, \text{classical}}^{\text{BLQP}}$ . This is the same rationale behind  $\text{PostBQP} = \text{BQP}_{\parallel, \text{classical}}^{\text{PostBQP}}$  [4].

However, if a measurement follows immediately after each query to the BLQP oracle, such that

$$c_{\text{O}}|0\rangle + c_{\text{error}}|\text{error}\rangle \xrightarrow{\text{measurement}} |0\rangle, \quad (56)$$

then the exponentially small error vanishes and will not be amplified by the subsequent gate. Consider the scenario where we make polynomial number  $p$  of queries to BLQP oracles, each with an exponentially small error probability of  $c^{-p}$  ( $c > 1$ ). In this scenario, regardless of whether the queries are adaptive or non-adaptive, the probability of obtaining the correct result for the entire circuit is given by

$$P = (1 - c^{-p})^p \rightarrow 1. \quad (57)$$

As the time for each measurement is usually regarded as “1”, polynomial measurements are permitted for a polynomial algorithm. With the inclusion of after-query measurements (as defined in Sec. II), we have  $\text{BLQP} = \text{BLQP}^{\text{BLQP}}$ .

By incorporating after-query measurements, the adaptive queries to BLQP oracles in the algorithms for  $\text{P}^{\text{SAT}}$  as discussed in Sec. III(C) and for  $\text{P}^{\#P}$  as discussed in Sec. IV(B), are justifiable. Specifically, the algorithm for PP discussed in Sec. IV(A) already entails a polynomial number of measurements following polynomial parallel independent LQC circuits.

It is noteworthy that the concept of mid-circuit measurement has been previously addressed in Ref. [26–28]. Following the deferred measurement principle [29], measurements during a quantum computation can be emulated by employing extra quantum gates and auxiliary qubits.

With the LQC algorithms presented in the previous sections, the relations between BLQP and other major complexity classes are clear:  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{BLQP}$ ,  $\text{co-NP} \subseteq \text{BLQP}$ ,  $\text{PH} \subseteq \text{BLQP}$ ,  $\text{PP} \subseteq \text{BLQP}$ , and  $\text{P}^{\#P} \subseteq \text{BLQP}$ . These relation along with  $\text{BLQP} \subseteq \text{PSPACE}$  are depicted in the complexity hierarchy diagram shown in Fig.1.

Some of these relations can also be derived abstractly without algorithms. For example, with  $\text{BLQP} = \text{BLQP}^{\text{BLQP}}$  and  $\text{NP} \subseteq \text{BLQP}$ , we have  $\text{BLQP} = \text{BLQP}^{\text{BLQP}} \supseteq \text{NP}^{\text{NP}} = \text{NP}^{\text{co-NP}}$ , and consequently  $\text{PH} \subseteq \text{BLQP}$ . This is also implied by the polynomial LQC algorithm for solving the problem of MIS. Similarly, with  $\text{PP} \subseteq \text{BLQP}$ , we can derive  $\text{BLQP} = \text{BLQP}^{\text{BLQP}} \supseteq \text{PP}^{\text{PP}} \supseteq \text{P}^{\text{PP}} = \text{P}^{\#P}$ . This is consistent with that we have a polynomial LQC algorithm for  $\text{P}^{\#P}$ .

## VII. SUMMARY

In summary, we have demonstrated the superior power of Lorentz quantum computer (LQC) through concrete examples. These results show that its computational complexity class BLQP (bounded-error Lorentz quantum polynomial-time) contains  $\text{P}^{\#P}$  and is a subset of PSPACE. In comparison,

it is not even clear whether the complexity class BQP associated with the conventional quantum computer contains NP or not. Our work will likely motivate further study into LQC to better understand its capabilities and whether additional complexity classes may be contained in BLQP.

This work also reveals an intriguing relation between computing power and physics. In Ref. [4], it is argued that quantum mechanics is an island in the “theoryspace”. LQC appears to put an intriguing spin on this claim. On the one hand, Lorentz quantum mechanics appears drastically different from quantum mechanics by having unobservable states while living in an indefinite inner product space with complex Lorentz transformations [5, 7]. On the other hand, the Bogoliubov excitations, quasi-particles of bosonic many-body systems, do behave approximately like a Lorentz quantum mechanical system [6].

## ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

BW is supported by National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 11921005 & 92365202), and Shanghai Municipal Science and Technology Major Project (Grant No.2019SHZDZX01).

## Appendix A: Independent sets and 2-SAT

For a given graph  $G(n, m)$ , an independent set (IS) is a subset of its vertices that are not directly connected by edges. This problem is equivalent to a special 2-SAT problem. We assign each vertex a Boolean variable  $x_i$ , then an IS is represented by the string of Boolean variables  $x_1 x_2 \cdots x_n$  with  $x_i = 1$  if the corresponding  $i$ th vertex is included and  $x_i = 0$  if the corresponding  $i$ th vertex is excluded. In this way, the graph  $G(n, m)$  can be expressed as a Boolean formula

$$\bigwedge_{\langle ij \rangle} (\bar{x}_i \vee \bar{x}_j), \quad (A1)$$

where  $\langle ij \rangle$  is for a pair of vertices that are connected by an edge. This is a special 2-SAT problem.

## Appendix B: State of the oracle qubit, the auxiliary qubit, and the hybrid

After the step (iv) of the algorithm solving MAJSAT, we have (dropping the state for work qubits  $|11 \dots 1\rangle$ )

$$|\psi_{\text{iv}}\rangle = |\phi_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |\phi_{\beta/\alpha}\rangle \quad (B1)$$

where  $|\phi_o\rangle = a_s |0_o\rangle + b_s |1_o\rangle$  with

$$a_s = \frac{N-s}{\sqrt{(N-s)^2 + s^2}}, \quad b_s = \frac{s}{\sqrt{(N-s)^2 + s^2}}. \quad (B2)$$

After applying the controlled-Hadamard gate at the step (v), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
|\psi_v\rangle &= \alpha |\phi_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |0\rangle + \\
&\frac{\beta}{\sqrt{2}} [(a_s + b_s)|0_o\rangle + (a_s - b_s)|1_o\rangle] \otimes |0\rangle \otimes |1\rangle \\
&= |0_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes \left[ \alpha a_s |0\rangle + \frac{\beta(a_s + b_s)}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle \right] + \\
&|1_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes \left[ \alpha b_s |0\rangle + \frac{\beta(a_s - b_s)}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle \right] \quad (B3)
\end{aligned}$$

After the application of CV gate  $r'$  time at the step (vi) and the omission of terms that are either unobservable or exponentially small, this state becomes

$$|\psi_{vi}\rangle \approx |1_o\rangle \otimes |0\rangle \otimes \left[ \alpha b_s |0\rangle + \frac{\beta(a_s - b_s)}{\sqrt{2}} |1\rangle \right]. \quad (B4)$$

The exact probability of having this state is

$$P_{\beta/\alpha} = \frac{\cosh^2(2r\chi)}{2^n - 1 + \cosh^2(2r\chi)} \cdot \frac{\cosh^2(r'\chi)(\alpha^2 s^2 + \beta^2(2^n - 2s)^2/2)}{\cosh^2(r'\chi)(\alpha^2 s^2 + \beta^2(2^n - 2s)^2/2) + \alpha^2(2^n - s)^2 + \beta^2 2^{2n-1}}, \quad (B5)$$

where  $\chi = 2 \ln(\sqrt{2} + 1)$ . We have  $P_{\beta/\alpha} \approx 1$  when  $r \approx r'$  and  $\ln N / \chi \approx n$ .

### Appendix C: Possible values of $\eta = \beta/\alpha$

The probability of obtaining  $-1$  when the auxiliary qubit state  $\varphi_\eta$  is measured along the  $x$ -direction is

$$\begin{aligned}
P_- &= |\langle - | \varphi_\eta \rangle|^2 \\
&= \frac{|s - \eta \sqrt{1/2}(2^n - 2s)|^2}{2[s^2 + \eta^2(2^n - 2s)^2/2]} \\
&= \frac{s^2 + \eta^2(2^n - s)^2/2 - \sqrt{2}\eta s(2^n - 2s)}{2[s^2 + \eta^2(2^n - 2s)^2/2]} \\
&= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\sqrt{2}\eta s(2^n - 2s)}{2s^2 + \eta^2(2^n - 2s)^2} \quad (C1)
\end{aligned}$$

When  $s > 2^{n-1}$ , the second term on the right hand side is positive and we re-write it as

$$P_- - \frac{1}{2} = \frac{\sqrt{2}\eta s(2s - 2^n)}{2s^2 + \eta^2(2s - 2^n)^2}. \quad (C2)$$

It can be shown, for a given probability  $0 < \delta_p < 1/2$ , when

$$\frac{(1 - \sqrt{1 - 4\delta_p^2})s}{\sqrt{2}\delta_p(2s - 2^n)} \leq \eta \leq \frac{(1 + \sqrt{1 - 4\delta_p^2})s}{\sqrt{2}\delta_p(2s - 2^n)}, \quad (C3)$$

we have

$$P_- - \frac{1}{2} \geq \delta_p. \quad (C4)$$

Let  $s = 2^{n-1} + \delta s$  and we have

$$\frac{(1 - \sqrt{1 - 4\delta_p^2})s}{2\sqrt{2}\delta_p \delta s} \leq \eta \leq \frac{(1 + \sqrt{1 - 4\delta_p^2})s}{2\sqrt{2}\delta_p \delta s}, \quad (C5)$$

When  $\delta s = 2^{n-1}$  we have the ratio  $s/\delta s = 2$ , which is the smallest. This shows that to satisfy the inequality (C4) for a given  $\delta_p$  for all possible values of  $s$ , we must have

$$\eta_m - \eta_s = \frac{2\sqrt{1 - 4\delta_p^2}}{\sqrt{2}\delta_p}, \quad (C6)$$

where  $\eta_m$  and  $\eta_s$  are the largest and smallest values of  $\eta$ . Since  $\eta$  takes only discrete values in the form of  $2^j$  with  $j \in [-n, n]$ , the number of  $\eta$  satisfying the inequality (C4) increases with smaller  $\delta_p$ .

### Appendix D: Boolean expression for the function $g_z$

The Boolean formula  $g_z(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$  used in the main text is defined as  $g_z = 1$  if the string  $x = x_1 x_2 \dots x_n$ , interpreted as a binary number, is less than  $z$ . When  $x \geq z$ , we have  $g_z = 0$ .

We use an example to show how to construct  $g_z(x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$ . Assume that  $n = 8$  and  $z = 10101001$ , we then have

$$g_z = \bar{x}_1 \vee (\bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_3) \vee (\bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_4 \wedge \bar{x}_5) \vee (\bar{x}_2 \wedge \bar{x}_4 \wedge \bar{x}_6 \wedge \bar{x}_7 \wedge \bar{x}_8). \quad (D1)$$

The length of the Boolean expression thus constructed is always less than  $n^2$ . This construction method is applicable to different values of  $N$ .

[1] S. Arora and B. Barak, *Computational Complexity: A Modern Approach* (Cambridge University Press, 2009).

[2] C. H. Papadimitriou, *Computational Complexity* (Addison-

- Wesley, 1994).
- [3] E. Knill, Fault-Tolerant Postselected Quantum Computation: Schemes, arXiv: quant-ph/0402171 (2004).
- [4] S. Aaronson, Quantum computing, postselection, and probabilistic polynomial time, *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **461**, 3473 (2004).
- [5] W. He, Z. Wang, and B. Wu, Lorentz quantum computer, *Chinese Physics B* **32**, 040304 (2023).
- [6] B. Wu and Q. Niu, Superfluidity of bose-einstein condensate in an optical lattice: Landau-zener tunnelling and dynamical instability, *New Journal of Physics* **5**, 104 (2003).
- [7] Q. Zhang and B. Wu, Lorentz quantum mechanics, *New Journal of Physics* **20**, 013024 (2018).
- [8] W. Pauli, On dirac's new method of field quantization, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **15**, 175 (1943).
- [9] L. K. Grover, Quantum mechanics helps in searching for a needle in a haystack, *Physical Review Letters* **79**, 325 (1997).
- [10] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum computing and quantum information* (Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 2000).
- [11] J. Bogнар, *Indefinite inner product space* (Springer-Verlag, New York, 1974).
- [12] M. Xiao and H. Nagamochi, Exact algorithms for maximum independent sets, *Information and Computation* **255**, 126 (2017).
- [13] J. Hastad, Clique is hard to approximate within  $n^{1-\epsilon}$ , *Acta Mathematica* **182**, 105 (1999).
- [14] D. Zuckerman, Linear degree extractors and the inapproximability of max clique and chromatic number, in *Proceedings of the Thirty-Eighth Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, STOC '06 (Association for Computing Machinery, New York, NY, USA, 2006) pp. 681–690.
- [15] A. Coja-Oghlan and C. Efthymiou, On independent sets in random graphs, *Random Structures & Algorithms* **47**, 436 (2015).
- [16] A. Frieze, On the independence number of random graphs, *Discrete Mathematics* **81**, 171 (1990).
- [17] H. Yu, F. Wilczek, and B. Wu, Quantum algorithm for approximating maximum independent sets, *Chinese Physics Letters* **38**, 030304 (2021).
- [18] B. Wu, H. Yu, and F. Wilczek, Quantum independent-set problem and non-abelian adiabatic mixing, *Physical Review A* **101**, 012318 (2020).
- [19] S. R. Buss and L. Hay, On truth-table reducibility to sat, *Information and Computation* **91**, 86 (1991).
- [20] L. Hemachandra, The strong exponential hierarchy collapses, *Journal of Computer and System Sciences* **39**, 299 (1989).
- [21] <http://www.complexityzoo.com>.
- [22] S. Toda, Pp is as hard as the polynomial-time hierarchy, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **20**, 865 (1991).
- [23] A. Peres, Bell Inequalities with Postselection, arXiv: quant-ph/9512003 (1995).
- [24] Y. Aharonov, F. Colombo, S. Popescu, I. Sabadini, D. C. Struppa, and J. Tollaksen, Quantum violation of the pigeonhole principle and the nature of quantum correlations, *PNAS* **113**, 532 (2016).
- [25] E. Bernstein and U. Vazirani, Quantum complexity theory, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **26**, 1411 (1997).
- [26] D. Zhu, G. D. Kahanamoku-Meyer, L. Lewis, and C. Noel, Interactive cryptographic proofs of quantumness using mid-circuit measurements, *Nature Physics* **19**, 1 (2023).
- [27] K. Rudinger *et al.*, Characterizing mid-circuit measurements on a superconducting qubit using gate set tomography, arXiv/2103.03008.
- [28] M. A. Norcia *et al.*, Midcircuit qubit measurement and rearrangement in a 171yb atomic array, *Physical Review X* **13**, 041034 (2023).
- [29] O. A. Cross, *Topics in Quantum Computing* (O. A. Cross., 2012).