

Super Quantum Search Algorithm with Weak Value Amplification and Postselection

Arun Kumar Pati^{1,*}

¹Quantum Information and Computation Group,
Harish-Chandra Research Institute, HBNI, Chhatnag Road, Jhansi, Allahabad 211 019, India
(Dated: February 17, 2022)

We propose a new model of quantum computation which aims to speed up quantum algorithms assisted by the weak value amplification and ancillary quantum register with the pre- and postselection. Within this model, we show that a quantum computer can solve a data base search of N entries in one step with probability close to one for large N , provided the post-selection on the ancillary quantum register is successful. In this model, to search a database of N entries, the number of qubits grows from n to $2n$, but there is a huge reduction in time complexity. Physically, this can be understood as the effect of weak value amplification that arises due to the pre- and postselection of the ancillary register which interacts with the n qubit register where quantum search is performed. This effectively accelerates the computation and takes the state of quantum computer much ahead in time, compared to what one would obtain without weak value amplification and post-selection.

Introduction.— Quantum computers have the potential to solve problems that are beyond the reach of even the most powerful classical supercomputers. Feynman [1] has envisioned that the laws of quantum mechanics make it hard for classical computers to simulate the behavior of complex many-body quantum systems. This flared the interest that may be one should explore quantum computers to simulate quantum systems efficiently. After the pioneering idea by Deutsch [2], we know that the superposition provides the massive parallelism and entanglement provides the fuel for quantum computers. Even though the race to build quantum computers is already on the horizon and facing its own challenges, the ability to discover new quantum algorithms is quite demanding. In the standard model of quantum computation, we prepare the quantum computer in an n -qubit state which is an equal superposition of all possible logical states, apply the sequence of unitary transformations (quantum gates) depending on the algorithm to be implemented, and finally measurement is performed in the computational basis to retrieve the correct answer. This can also be phrased as ‘prepare-compute-read’ model of quantum computer. Over the last three decades, several quantum algorithms have been discovered [3–9] that show the quantum advantage over classical computers. Two notable algorithms are worth mentioning here, one is Shor’s algorithm [4] that could efficiently factorize large numbers and the other is Grover’s algorithm [5] which aims to search in a fastest possible way a particular item from an unstructured database. Grover’s algorithm can search a marked item in $O(\sqrt{N})$ steps for a database of N entries and this quadratic speed-up has been proven to be optimal [10–12]. Though the importance of entanglement in Shor’s algorithm [13], Grover’s algorithm [14] and general quantum algorithms have been [15] entrenched, it remains an open question as to how much entanglement is required, if at all, to achieve exponential speed-up for quantum algorithm over classical algorithm.

Weak value, pre- and postselection.— If a quantum system is pre-selected in a state and post-selected in a non-orthogonal state, then if that system is allowed to interact weakly with another quantum system, the state of the later system is affected by a strange value-called the ‘weak value’ [16, 17]. Unlike

the eigenvalues of a physical observable, the weak value can be complex in nature and arbitrarily large. The notion of two-time symmetric formalism [16] plays a major role in interpreting the weak value and the former has been exploited to propose quantum time-translation machine [18] which can take a quantum system to future under suitable postselection. The notion of modular value has been introduced which goes beyond the notion of weak value [19] and can arise even without weak interaction. Very recently, the concept of potent value has been defined which unifies the idea of weak value and modular value [20]. This describes how a quantum system affects the state of the another system during the time between two strong measurements corresponding to the pre- and post-selection. The weak value amplification is a concept that has been extensively used in a myriad of applications in recent years. It has been shown that weak measurements can be used for interrogating quantum systems in a coherent manner [21, 22]. Among others, it plays important role in understanding the uncertainty principle in the double-slit experiment [23, 24], resolving Hardy’s paradox [25], analyzing tunneling time [26, 27], and modifying the quantum mechanical decay law [28]. The optimal probe wavefunction and the upper bound for the amplification factor for the weak value has been explored in Ref.[29, 30]. By expressing the wavefunction as a weak value of a projector, one can measure the wavefunction of single photon [31–33]. Similarly, the advantage of weak value amplification in quantum metrology has been investigated in details [34–37]. Quite intriguingly, the notion of weak value also allows one to measure the average of any non-Hermitian operator in quantum mechanics [38] and this has been tested in interferometry without weak interaction and postselection [39].

Quantum computing with weak value amplification and postselection.— In the circuitry model of quantum computation one considers only pre-selected quantum computer. Since quantum theory allows pre- and postselected ensembles as fundamental quantum ensembles and they contain more information than ensembles that are only preselected, then a natural question is whether we can speed-up quantum algorithm assisted by quantum register which has been pre- and

post-selected. The effect of postselection in quantum computing has been discussed earlier, where the postselection was supposed to be performed on the quantum computer itself and the role of ancillary quantum system with the pre- and postselection as a resource has not been exploited. Using the idea of postselection it has been argued that quantum computation can be carried out in constant depth that cannot be simulated classically with high accuracy [40]. It has been argued that any problem that can be solved in BQP with polynomial quantum advice can also be solved in Probabilistic Polynomial-Time (PP) with polynomials-size classical advice [41]. Most importantly, it has been proved that postselection can be used to define a new complexity class, namely, Postselected Bounded-Error Quantum Polynomial-Time (PostBQP) with $\text{PostBQP} = \text{PP}$ [42]. Using the relational time-symmetric framework a new perspective to some of the existing quantum algorithms have been presented [43]. However, the effect of weak value amplification along with postselection have never been considered before in quantum computing. Specifically, we ask whether one can discover new quantum algorithms using the weak value amplification along with ancillary register in pre- and postselected states?

This motivates us to propose a new model of quantum computation which aims to speed up quantum search algorithm assisted by weak value amplification and ancillary quantum register with pre- and post-selected states. This model, for brevity, we name it as Quantum Computation assisted with weak value amplification and postselection (WVAP) or WVAP Quantum Computation. This requires two quantum registers each having n -qubits, where the first register is our quantum computer where the actual algorithm will be implemented and the second register is allowed to interact with the quantum computer with specific pre- and postselected states at intermediate times. In a sense, the pre- and postselected quantum register acts as a resource for quantum computation. We show that if we have access to the ancillary quantum register with the specific pre and post-selection, then a quantum computer can solve a database search of N entries in one step with probability close to one for large N . In this model, we do not allow postselection on the quantum computer itself where algorithm is being implemented. Even though to search a database of N entries the number of qubits double, there is a huge reduction in time complexity. This exponential quantum advantage is the effect of weak value amplification that arises due to pre- and post-selection of n qubit ancillary register which interacts with the quantum computer where quantum search is performed. Therefore, this may provide a new mechanism for accelerating the computation which takes the state of quantum computer much ahead in time, compared to what one would obtain without weak value amplification and post-selection. Thinking differently, we can say that effect of weak value amplification and postselection creates the potent operator which takes the quantum computer to future (similar to time-translation machine), thus deciphering the item to be searched in one oracle query. It may be stressed that without the weak value amplification, exponential speed up may not

be possible just by using postselection. Of course, the exponential speed-up does not come for free. There is a price we have to pay for the super search algorithm and that is fetched by the ancillary quantum register.

Potent Value and potent operator.— For the sake of completeness, we briefly introduce the notion of potent value and potent operator here. When two systems interact weakly, we know that if one system is subject to the pre- and postselection, then the dynamics of the other system is affected by the weak value. If the coupling is not small, then how does the pre- and postselected system affect the other system? To answer this question, we need to introduce the concept of potent value [20] which is again kind of ‘strange value’ corresponding to observable A that affects the state of another system for arbitrary coupling strength. Consider two quantum states $|\Psi\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1 \otimes \mathcal{H}_2$. Let these two quantum systems evolve under the action of an interaction Hamiltonian as given by

$$|\Psi\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle \rightarrow e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} g O \otimes A} |\Psi\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $|\Psi\rangle$ is the initial state of the first system, $|\psi_i\rangle$ is the pre-selected state of second system, O and A are the observables of the first and second system, respectively. This evolution can be expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle &\rightarrow \sum_k \langle k | e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} g O \otimes A} |\Psi\rangle |k\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle \\ &= \sum_k |k\rangle \otimes A_k |\psi_i\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $A_k = \langle k | e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} g O \otimes A} |\Psi\rangle$ and $|k\rangle$ is an orthonormal basis for the first system. The set of operators A_k are in general are not unitary and act on the state of the second system in \mathcal{H}_2 . The state of the first system, after the general interaction and upon post-selection of the system in the state $|\psi_f\rangle$, is given by

$$|\Psi_f\rangle = \mathcal{N} \sum_k \frac{\langle \psi_f | A_k | \psi_i \rangle}{\langle \psi_f | \psi_i \rangle} |k\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where \mathcal{N} is a normalization factor. The set of complex numbers defined below are called potent values that depend on the observable of the second system. These are given by

$$\langle A^{(k)} \rangle_P = A_P^{(k)}(\psi_f | \psi_i) = \frac{\langle \psi_f | A_k | \psi_i \rangle}{\langle \psi_f | \psi_i \rangle}. \quad (4)$$

Therefore, the final state of the first system is given by

$$|\Psi_f\rangle = \mathcal{N} \sum_k \langle A^{(k)} \rangle_P |k\rangle, \quad (5)$$

where $\mathcal{N}^2 = \frac{1}{\sum_k |\langle A^{(k)} \rangle_P|^2}$. Here, the effect of pre- and post-selected system on the first system is completely described by a set of potent values $\langle A^{(k)} \rangle_P$. Since the final state of the system can also be expressed as $|\Phi_f\rangle = \sum_k C_k |k\rangle$ with where $C_k = \mathcal{N} \langle A^{(k)} \rangle_P$, the potent values of the second system actually describe the final state of the quantum system in \mathcal{H}_1

completely. Notice here that like the weak value, these set of potent values can be complex and arbitrarily large. Also, by measuring the potent values via the measurement of non-Hermitian operators [38], we can determine the state of the quantum system.

The potent values generalize and unify the notion of weak values [17] and modular values [19]. If $g \ll 1$, i.e., for the weak interaction, the potent values are related to weak values and for arbitrary interaction the potent values are related to modular values. In the weak coupling limit $g \ll 1$, these potent values result in the weak value effectively, thus leading to the final state of the first system as given by

$$|\Psi_f\rangle = \mathcal{N} e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} g A_W(\psi_f|\psi_i) O} |\Psi\rangle, \quad (6)$$

where $A_W(\psi_f|\psi_i) = \frac{\langle\psi_f|A|\psi_i\rangle}{\langle\psi_f|\psi_i\rangle}$ is the weak value of the observable A .

When a quantum system interacts with a pre- and postselected quantum system, one can define another concept which we call as the potent operator. Consider a composite system consisting of two quantum systems that evolves under unitary evolution as given by

$$|\Psi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle \rightarrow U|\Psi\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle = e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} g O \otimes A} |\Psi\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle,$$

where g is an arbitrary coupling strength. If we postselect the second system in the state $|\psi_f\rangle$, the final state of the first system, up to normalization, is described by

$$|\Psi_f\rangle = \frac{\langle\psi_f|e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} g O \otimes A}|\psi_i\rangle}{\langle\psi_f|\psi_i\rangle} |\Psi\rangle = U_P(\psi_f|\psi_i)|\Psi\rangle, \quad (7)$$

where

$$U_P(\psi_f|\psi_i) = \frac{\langle\psi_f|e^{-\frac{i}{\hbar} g O \otimes A}|\psi_i\rangle}{\langle\psi_f|\psi_i\rangle} \quad (8)$$

is the potent operator that acts on the first Hilbert space \mathcal{H}_1 .

The potent operator [20] has interesting connection to weak values [17] and modular values [19]. Suppose that the joint unitary operator is a conditional unitary operator $U = \sum_k \Pi_k \otimes V_k$ where Π_k 's are the projection operators acting on \mathcal{H}_1 with $\Pi_k \Pi_l = \Pi_k \delta_{kl}$ and V_k 's are the set of unitaries that act on \mathcal{H}_2 . In this case the potent operator is given by

$$U_P(\psi_f|\psi_i) = \sum_k \frac{\langle\psi_f|V_k|\psi_i\rangle}{\langle\psi_f|\psi_i\rangle} \Pi_k = \sum_k \langle V_k \rangle_M \Pi_k, \quad (9)$$

where the potent operator depends on the set of modular values $\langle V_k \rangle_M$ in the second system as well as on the local projection operators in \mathcal{H}_1 . The final state of the first system, up to normalization, is given by

$$|\Psi_f\rangle = \sum_k \langle V_k \rangle_M \Pi_k |\Psi\rangle. \quad (10)$$

If the unitary V_k 's are also Hermitian operators, then $\langle V_k \rangle_M = \langle V_k \rangle_W$ and they can represent weak values. Thus, the notion

of weak values and modular values can arise in a more general context without weak interaction and specific nature of systems.

Super quantum search algorithm.— In quantum searching, we are given an unknown binary function $f_y(x)$, which returns 1 for a unique target value $x = y$ and 0 otherwise, where $x = 0, 1, 2, \dots, N-1$, with $N = 2^n$. Our goal is to find y such that $f_y(x) = 1$ for $x = y$. Here, N items of the database are mapped onto the states of n qubits. The quantum search problem is to reach the target item in a shortest possible time, thus amounts to maximizing the overlap between the target state and the final state of the quantum computer after algorithm has been implemented.

- New algorithm begins with two quantum registers each consisting of n qubits, where n is the number of qubits necessary to represent the search space of size $2^n = N$. The first n -qubit register is the quantum computer where the item to be searched is stored and the second register is the ancillary system which is used for the pre- and postselection.

- Let the n -qubits of the quantum computer be initialized to $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$ and the initial state of the ancillary system is pre-selected in the state $|\psi_i\rangle$ (we will specify this later). Apply the Hadamard gate to each qubit in the first register. The state of the first register is $|\Psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{x=0}^{N-1} |x\rangle = \cos\theta|\bar{y}\rangle + \sin\theta|y\rangle$, where $|\bar{y}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N-1}} \sum_{x \neq y} |x\rangle$, $|y\rangle$ is the target state we wish to find and $\sin\theta = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$.

The joint state of the quantum computer and the ancillary quantum register is given by

$$|\Psi\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle = (\cos\theta|\bar{y}\rangle + \sin\theta|y\rangle) \otimes |\psi_i\rangle. \quad (11)$$

- We allow the quantum computer and the ancillary quantum register to interact by a quantum gate which is a conditional unitary operator U given by

$$U = \bar{\Pi}_y \otimes I + \Pi_y \otimes V, \quad (12)$$

where $\bar{\Pi}_y = (I - \Pi_y)$, $\Pi_y = |y\rangle\langle y|$ and V is a unitary operator that acts on n qubit ancillary register. In particular, $V = H^{\otimes n} \sigma_x^{\otimes n} H^{\otimes n} I_w$, where H is the Hadamard gate, σ_x is the X -gate and $I_w = (I - 2|w\rangle\langle w|)$ is the reflection operator which is Hermitian and self-inverse with $|w\rangle$ being any one of the orthonormal state of the second register in the computational basis. The unitary V can also be expressed as $V = \sigma_z^{\otimes n} I_w$ as $H\sigma_x H = \sigma_z$. If the quantum computer (first n -qubit register) is in the state $|y\rangle$, then the unitary operator V is applied on the ancillary register and does nothing if the quantum computer is in any other state different than $|y\rangle$. Note that to implement U we need only one oracle query on n qubit quantum computer that contains the search item (see Eq(20)).

The unitary operator allows two registers to evolve as

$$|\Psi\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle \rightarrow \bar{\Pi}_y |\Psi\rangle \otimes |\psi_i\rangle + \Pi_y |\Psi\rangle \otimes V|\psi_i\rangle. \quad (13)$$

- After this unitary operator, we post-select the ancillary register in the state $|\psi_f\rangle$. If post-selection is successful, then

the final state of the quantum computer that contains the item to be searched is given by

$$|\Psi_f\rangle = \mathcal{N}[\cos\theta|\bar{y}\rangle + \sin\theta\langle A\rangle_W|y\rangle], \quad (14)$$

where $\langle V\rangle_W = \frac{\langle\psi_f|V|\psi_i\rangle}{\langle\psi_f|\psi_i\rangle}$ is called as the weak value of V in the pre-selected state $|\psi_i\rangle$ and postselected state $|\psi_f\rangle$ and \mathcal{N} is the normalization factor with $\mathcal{N}^2 = \frac{1}{\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta|\langle A\rangle_W|^2}$. It may be mentioned that $\langle V\rangle_W$ can also be called as the modular value $\langle V\rangle_M$ as V is a unitary operator. As we will see later, V is not only unitary but also Hermitian, therefore, we can call it as the weak value of V . We can also view the final state of the quantum computer (14) as a result of the action of the potent operator $U_P(\psi_f|\psi_i) = \bar{\Pi}_y + \Pi_y\langle V\rangle_W$, i.e., $|\Psi_f\rangle = \mathcal{N}U_P(\psi_f|\psi_i)|\Psi\rangle$.

• Now, we ask what is the probability of finding the target state $|y\rangle$ when quantum computer is in the state $|\Psi_f\rangle$? This is given by

$$p = |\langle y|\Psi_f\rangle|^2 = \frac{\sin^2\theta|\langle A\rangle_W|^2}{\cos^2\theta + \sin^2\theta|\langle A\rangle_W|^2}. \quad (15)$$

Can the weak value amplification help the search algorithm beyond what is allowed by the Grover algorithm? The answer is yes. By suitable choice of pre- and postselected states for the ancillary quantum register and the unitary operator V acting on the ancillary register, one can show that the probability of finding the target state can actually be close to one, for large N .

Note that we define the pre-selected state for the second register as the one which is the state of the ancillary system just before we apply the unitary interaction between these two quantum registers. We could, in principle, pre-process the n qubit ancillary register state as we wish. Consider the ancillary state of quantum register pre-selected in $|\psi_i\rangle = I_w H^{\otimes n}|0\rangle^{\otimes n} = I_w|\psi\rangle$, where $|\psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}\sum_{x=0}^{N-1}|x\rangle = \cos\theta|\bar{w}\rangle + \sin\theta|w\rangle$, with $|\bar{w}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{N-1}}\sum_{x\neq w}|x\rangle$ and $|w\rangle$ is any one of the orthonormal basis of n qubit ancillary register, and $I_w = (I - 2|w\rangle\langle w|)$. Therefore, the pre-selected state of the ancillary register is given by

$$|\psi_i\rangle = |\psi\rangle - \frac{2}{\sqrt{N}}|w\rangle. \quad (16)$$

Next, we perform measurement on the second quantum register with the post-selected state $|\psi_f\rangle = |-\rangle^{\otimes n}$, where $|-\rangle = H|1\rangle$. Using $\langle\psi_f|\psi\rangle = 0$ and $\langle\psi_f|w\rangle = \pm\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}}$, we have

$$|\langle\psi_f|\psi_i\rangle|^2 = \frac{4}{N^2}. \quad (17)$$

Now, with the choice of $V = H^{\otimes n}\sigma_x^{\otimes n}H^{\otimes n}I_w$, we can check that $|\langle\psi_f|V|\psi_i\rangle|^2 = 1$. With this choice of the pre- and post-selection, we have the modulus square of the weak value modulus as $|\langle A\rangle_W|^2 = \frac{N^2}{4}$. Therefore, the probability

of finding the target state, upon post-selection on the ancillary register, is given by

$$p = \frac{N^2}{N^2 + 4(N-1)}. \quad (18)$$

Hence, for the large database search, we have $p = 1 - O(\frac{1}{N})$, i.e., the probability of finding the correct item approaches one. This completes the proof of the main result.

Now, we discuss how many oracle queries are required to implement U . Below, we will show that to implement U we need only one oracle query. An oracle is a black-box function that evaluates a function to check the desired solution. The quantum oracle is a quantum black-box which can recognize if the system is in the correct state. If the system is indeed in the correct state, then the oracle will give $f_y(x) = 0$ for $x \neq y$ and $f_y(x) = 1$ for $x = y$. In the Grover search algorithm, the quantum oracle implements the unitary transformation as given by

$$|x\rangle|j\rangle \rightarrow |x\rangle|j \oplus f_y(x)\rangle, \quad (19)$$

where $|x\rangle$ is an n -qubit state of the quantum computer and $|j\rangle$ is a single qubit state. Quantum oracle can also be expressed as $|x\rangle \rightarrow (-1)^{f_y(x)}|x\rangle$, where $f_y(x) = 1$ if x is the correct state, and $f_y(x) = 0$ otherwise. This can be represented as a unitary operator $I_y = (I - 2|y\rangle\langle y|)$ so that $I_y|y\rangle = -|y\rangle$ and $I_y|x\rangle = |x\rangle$ if $x \neq y$. Note that in the case of Grover search, we need to apply the Grover operator $G = -I_0I_y$ repeatedly $O(\sqrt{N})$ times to find the target state, where $I_0 = (I - 2|\Psi\rangle\langle\Psi|)$. In the case of super quantum search, the unitary operator U given in (2) can be expressed as

$$U = I \otimes P_1 + I_y \otimes P_2, \quad (20)$$

where $P_1 = \frac{1}{2}(I + V)$ and $P_2 = \frac{1}{2}(I - V)$. Notice that $V = \sigma_z^{\otimes n}I_w$ and we can always choose $|w\rangle$ as an eigenstate of $\sigma_z^{\otimes n}$ with eigenvalue $+1$, i.e., $\sigma_z^{\otimes n}|w\rangle = |w\rangle$. In this case, we can check that $\sigma_z^{\otimes n}$ and I_w commute and V is not only unitary but also a Hermitian operator. Furthermore, $P_1 = \frac{1}{2}(I + V)$ and $P_2 = \frac{1}{2}(I - V)$ becomes two orthogonal projectors on the n -qubit ancillary register, i.e., $P_i^2 = P_i$ ($i = 1, 2$) and $P_1P_2 = 0$. This follows from the fact that V is unitary and Hermitian. Thus, the unitary operator given in (2) for super quantum search algorithm is a controlled Grover oracle query that uses the function evaluation only once. Also, notice that there is an interesting symmetry in the unitary operator as given in (2) and (20).

Conclusions.— In this paper, we have shown the power of weak value amplification and postselection (WVAP) assisted quantum computation. However large the database may be, with the assistance of ancillary quantum register upon which we can perform pre- and post-selection, it is possible to find the desired item in one query. It may happen that probability of postselection becomes very small for large database,

but if it is non-zero, then in that case the marked item can be searched in one step. We stress that in our model we do not allow postselection on the state of the quantum computer where the algorithm is implemented. The exponential search algorithm comes at a cost, but that is bestowed by the ancillary quantum register. If we believe in the many world interpretation, then there is one branch of the ancillary register which will certainly find the searched item in one query. Since exponentially fast search algorithm can be conjured to solve NP problems, our result suggests that it may be possible for quantum computers to solve NP problems with non-zero probability of success with WVA quantum computer. It will be interesting to implement the super quantum search algorithm with the existing quantum computing platforms.

Quantum computer assisted with a pre- and postselected quantum register can provide a new paradigm to discover quantum algorithms. At the interpretation level, one can imagine that this algorithm is supplemented by ancillary quantum register that is described by two state vectors and that act as a resource. The pre-selected state propagates forward in time and the postselected state propagates backward in time. Since two-time states are the basic objects in this formalism they provide a boost to quantum search algorithm. Instead of a sequence of unitary which involves $O(\sqrt{N})$ steps, a single unitary interactions between the quantum computer and the ancillary register transforms the state of the quantum computer to the target state because of the existing correlations between forward and backward states. The potent operator transforms the state of the quantum computer to the desired state in one query. The exponential speed-up that is possible here possibly arises from the fact that the ancillary quantum register conveys the answer about the target state from the future.

Acknowledgement: The possibility that weak value amplification with pre- and post-selections could speed-up quantum search algorithm was conjectured many years ago and the proof was completed in June 2018. I thank Samuel L. Braunstein, Aditi Sen De and Ujjwal Sen for several discussions. Also, I thank Sandu Popescu for useful remarks during a Workshop on Quantum Information and Quantum Foundations held in Crete, Greece during July 10-12, 2018.

* akpati@hri.res.in

- [1] R. P. Feynman, Int. J. Theor. Phys. **21**, 467 (1982).
- [2] D. Deutsch, Proc. R. Soc. London **400**, 97 (1985).
- [3] D. Deutsch and R. Jozsa, Proc. R. Soc. London **439**, 553 (1992).
- [4] P. W. Shor, Proceedings, 35th Annual Symposium on Fundamentals of Computer Science (FOCS) 56 (1994).
- [5] L. K. Grover, Proceedings of 28th ACM STOC, pages 212- 219, (1996).
- [6] L. K. Grover, Phys. Rev. Lett. **79**, 325 (1997).
- [7] E. Bernstein and U. Vazirani, SIAM Journal on Computing, **26**, 1411 (1997).
- [8] D. Simon, SIAM Journal on Computing, **26**, 1474 (1997).
- [9] A. W Harrow, A. Hassidim, and S. Lloyd, Phys. Rev. Lett. **103**, 150502 (2009).
- [10] C. H. Bennett, E. Bernstein, G. Brassard and U. Vazirani, SIAM J. Comput. **26**(5), 1510 (1997).
- [11] M. Boyer, G. Brassard, P. Hyer and A. Tapp, Frottsch. Phys. **46**, 493 (1998).
- [12] C. Zalka, Phys. Rev. A **60**, 2746 (1999).
- [13] N. Linden and S. Popescu, Phys. Rev. Lett. **87**, 047901 (2001).
- [14] S. L. Braunstein and A. K. Pati, Quantum Information and Computation, **2**, 399 (2002).
- [15] R. Jozsa and N. Linden, Proc. R. Soc. Lond. A **459**, 2011 (2003).
- [16] Y. Aharonov, P. G. Bergmann, J. L. Lebowitz, Phys. Rev. **134**, B1410 (1964).
- [17] Y. Aharonov, D. Albert, L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **60**, 1351 (1988).
- [18] Y. Aharonov, J. Anandan, S. Popescu and L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **64**, 2965 (1990).
- [19] Y. Kedom and L. Vaidman, Phys. Rev. Lett. **105**, 230401 (2010).
- [20] A. K. Pati, arXiv:1805.10202 (2018).
- [21] Y. Aharonov, S. Popescu, and J. Tollaksen, Phys. Today **63**, 27 (2010).
- [22] A. Cho, Science **333**, 690 (2011).
- [23] H. M. Wiseman, Phys. Lett. A **311**, 285 (2003).
- [24] R. Mir *et al*, New J. Phys. **9**, 287 (2007).
- [25] J. S. Lundeen and A. M. Steinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **102**, 020404 (2009).
- [26] A. M. Steinberg, Phys. Rev. Lett. **74**, 2405 (1995).
- [27] A. M. Steinberg, Phys. Rev. A **52**, 32 (1995).
- [28] P. C. W. Davies, Phys. Rev. A **79**, 032103 (2009).
- [29] H. Kobayashi, G. Puentes, Y. Shikano, Phys. Rev. A **86**, 053805 (2012).
- [30] Y. Susa, Y. Shikano, A. Hosoya, Phys. Rev. A **85**, 052110 (2012).
- [31] J. S. Lundeen *et al*, Nature **474**, 188 (2011).
- [32] C. Bamber and J. S. Lundeen, Phys. Rev. Lett. **112**, 070405 (2014).
- [33] J. S. Lundeen and C. Bamber, Phys. Rev. Lett. **108**, 070402 (2012).
- [34] H. H. Hofmann, Phys. Rev. A **83**, 022106 (2011).
- [35] S. Pang, J. Dressel, and T. A. Brun, Phys. Rev. Lett. **113**, 030401 (2014).
- [36] A. N. Jordan, J. M. Rincon, and J. C. Howell, Phys. Rev. X **4**, 011031 (2014).
- [37] K. Lyons, J. Dressel, A. N. Jordan, J. C. Howell, P. G. Kwiat, Phys. Rev. Lett. **114**, 170801 (2015).
- [38] A. K. Pati, U. Singh, U. Sinha, Phys. Rev. A **92**, 052120 (2015).
- [39] G. Nirala, S. N. Sahoo, A. K. Pati, U. Sinha, Phys. Rev. A **99**, 022111 (2019).
- [40] B. M. Terhal and D. P. DiVincenzo, Quantum Information and Computation, **4**, 134 (2004).
- [41] S. Aaronson, Proc. IEEE Complexity, 320-332 (2004).
- [42] S. Aaronson, arXiv:quant-ph/0412187 (2004).
- [43] G. Castagnoli, E. Cohen, A. Ekert, A. Elitzur, arXiv:1910.04432 (2019).