

Transferable Belief Model on Quantum Circuits

Qianli Zhou, Hao Luo, Lipeng Pan, Yong Deng*, Éloi Bossé, *Senior Member, IEEE*

Abstract—The transferable belief model, as a semantic interpretation of Dempster-Shafer theory, enables agents to perform reasoning and decision making in imprecise and incomplete environments. The model offers distinct semantics for handling unreliable testimonies, allowing for a more reasonable and general process of belief transfer compared to the Bayesian approach. However, because both the belief masses and the structure of focal sets must be considered when updating belief functions—leading to extra computational complexity during reasoning—the transferable belief model has gradually lost favor among researchers in recent developments. In this paper, we implement the transferable belief model on quantum circuits and demonstrate that belief functions offer a more concise and effective alternative to Bayesian approaches within the quantum computing framework. Furthermore, leveraging the unique characteristics of quantum computing, we propose several novel belief transfer approaches. More broadly, this paper introduces a new perspective on basic information representation for quantum AI models, suggesting that belief functions are more suitable than Bayesian approach for handling uncertainty on quantum circuits.

Impact Statement—This paper offers a novel perspective on the quantum AI reasoning model. For reasoning on quantum circuits under the belief function framework, it provides specific meanings for qubits and features more convenient arithmetic compared to quantized Kolmogorov probability theory. More general, this paper shows that the information update of belief function is more consistent with the semantics of von Neumann probability theory.

Index Terms—quantum computing, Dempster-Shafer theory, information fusion, transferable belief model, quantum AI

I. INTRODUCTION

IMPLEMENTING **trustworthy**, **interpretable** and **generalizable** reasoning approaches in uncertain environment is the key issue for the contemporary AI developments. Dempster-Shafer (DS) theory of evidence, also known as belief function theory, is an effective tool for modeling restrictions of variable in uncertain environments [1], [2]. Initially introduced through multi-valued mappings in probability spaces, it has since been interpreted and extended to various semantic frameworks. The transferable belief model (TBM) [3] is the most well-known of these, independent of probability theory,

and provides a complete, rigorous, and elegant theoretical system for subjective belief representation. In the realm of the **trustworthy**, the TBM offers a distinct interface for unreliable testimonies, allowing a single information granule to represent both the randomness of the variables and the state of knowledge about that randomness. In the realm of the **interpretable**, the TBM consists of two levels: the credal level and the pignistic level. The credal level facilitates the transfer of the agent’s belief state using available information, while the pignistic level makes decisions based on the current belief state. In the realm of the **generalizable**, the TBM serves as a bridge between probabilistic and possibilistic information [4], enabling belief functions to model both statistical data and linguistic knowledge. Therefore, the belief function theory, developed from the TBM semantics is widely used in multi-source information fusion [5]–[7], expert decision making [8], [9], fault diagnosis [10], [11], classifier fusion [12], [13] and computer vision [14], [15]. However, these approaches typically represent data and knowledge as belief functions using general machine learning methods that perform evidential operations on high-level information representations or small-scale data sets. This is because belief functions, as information granules modeled on the power set, introduce extra computational complexity. In other words, the advantages of using belief functions are outweighed by the burden of increased computational complexity. Thus, in the recent wave of Artificial Generative Intelligence development, the advantages of belief functions have been overshadowed by scaling law driven by the high computational power.

Quantum computing, as an emerging research hotspot in recent years, aims to utilize the principles of quantum mechanics to realize a different way of operation from classical information. Its outstanding performance on specific complex problems has inspired its adoption in the field of machine learning [16], with the aim of addressing current challenges such as dimensionality explosion and optimization difficulties. However, in recent years, as more machine learning algorithms have been quantized [17], scholars have found that quantum machine learning offers no significant advantage in algorithmic acceleration. In the context of NISQ, the development of generalizable quantum AI methods appears to have encountered yet another bottleneck [18]. In quantum computing, information is stored in the wave function and can only be extracted through measurements. Unlike Kolmogorov’s probability axioms, quantum probability is based on von Neumann’s measurement theory, where the probability of a quantum state is determined by the square of its amplitude [19]. Thus, when classical probabilistic information is directly transferred to quantum computing for processing, a significant difference arises in how information is updated: **From directly updating**

This work is partially supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 62373078).

Qianli Zhou, Hao Luo and Yong Deng were with the Institute of Fundamental and Frontier Science, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China, Chengdu 610054, China.

Lipeng Pan was with the College of Information Engineering, Northwest A&F University, Yangling, 712100, China.

Yong Deng was also with the School of Medicine, Vanderbilt University, Nashville 37240, USA.

Éloi Bossé was with the Department of Image and Information Processing, IMT-Atlantique, Brest, 29238, France, also with the Expertises Parafuse, Quebec City, G1W 4N1, Canada.

Manuscript received ; revised .

the probabilities of basic events in classical to updating the probabilities of quantum states by manipulating qubits. However, in previous research on quantum machine learning, scholars appear to have overlooked these implications. The basic probability assignment (BPA) ¹, an identical information content representation of belief function, can be viewed as a 2^n -dimensional normalized weight vector. When a BPA is encoded in a quantum superposition state, each element can be associated with a qubit, this consistency does not exist in probabilistic semantics [20].

The intersection of quantum mechanics and Dempster-Shafer theory has been explored by various scholars from different perspectives, such as lattice of subspace [21], [22], quantum-like [23], quantum modeling [24], [25], mixed-pure state [26], and interference prediction [27]. However, these methods do not take advantage of the consistency relationship between qubits and elements under the belief function framework. Zhou *et al.* encoded the BPA into a quantum state using element-qubit consistency and extended conventional belief operations via the HHL algorithm [20] and the variational quantum linear solver [28]. This demonstrates that belief function operations on quantum circuits can inherit the general advantages of quantum machine learning. More generally, evidence combination rules based on Boolean algebra have been extended to quantum circuits, and attribute fusion-based evidential classifiers have been implemented, demonstrating exponential complexity advantages over classical approaches [29]. Thus, an open issue arises: **Does the belief function-based approaches on quantum circuits have unique advantages over general quantum AI methods?** In this paper, we will try to address this issue by developing the TBM on quantum circuits. First, we will implement the TBM on quantum circuits and modify certain operations to better adapt them to quantum computing. Next, we will leverage the unique characteristics of quantum computing to enhance the TBM, specifically by exploring belief operations that have been overlooked in classical settings. Finally, we will discuss why belief functions offer distinct advantages in quantum computing.

The structure of the paper is organized as follows: Section II introduces the necessary concepts of the TBM and quantum computing. Section III represents and implements the belief function on quantum circuits. Section IV discusses the operations of credal level on quantum circuits and proposes some belief revision methods inspired by the quantum computing. Section V extends the operations on product space on quantum space. Section VI summarizes the contributions and discusses potential directions for future research.

II. PRELIMINARIES

A. Transferable belief model

The transferable belief model (TBM) is an interpretation of Dempster-Shafer theory that quantifies an agent's belief at a certain time. During the development of TBM [3], although the authors acknowledged that its semantics are similar to Shafer's

original work on evidence theory [30], they emphasized a clear distinction between belief functions and probabilities to avoid confusion. In later developments, since the two models (TBM and evidence theory) share many operations with similar semantics, no specific distinction is typically made between them in cases where their relationship to probability theory is not emphasized. In this paper, we will use widely accepted notations, even if they differ from those originally proposed in the TBM.

1) *Information representation*: Consider an uncertain variable X , whose true value is contained within the frame of discernment (FoD) $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$. The belief (Bel) function $Bel : 2^\Omega \rightarrow [0, 1]$, which satisfies $\forall F_1, F_2, \dots, F_k \subseteq \Omega, Bel(F_1 \cup F_2 \cup \dots \cup F_k) \geq \sum_i Bel(F_i) - \sum_{i>j} Bel(F_i \cap F_j) - \dots - (-1)^n Bel(F_1 \cap F_2 \cap \dots \cap F_k)$, represents a restriction of X , i.e., it conveys information about the value of X . $Bel(F_i)$ represents the agent's support belief that $X \in F_i$. Its dual measure, plausibility function, is denoted as $Pl(F_i) = 1 - Bel(\overline{F_i})$, which represents the agent's non-negative belief that $X \in F_i$. Bel and Pl functions represents the lower and upper beliefs of the proposition. A mass function m , called basic probability assignment (BPA), is an identical information representation of them, which satisfies $m(F_i) \in [0, 1]$ and $\sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} m(F_i) = 1$. If $m(F_i) > 0$, F_i is a focal set, and i is the decimal representation of binary codes of F_i . They have the following reversible transformations: [30]–[32]

$$\begin{aligned} Bel(F_i) &= \sum_{\emptyset \neq F_j \subseteq F_i} m(F_j), Bel(\emptyset) = 0; \\ m(F_i) &= \sum_{F_j \subseteq F_i} (-1)^{|F_i| - |F_j|} Bel(F_j), m(\emptyset) = 1 - Bel(\Omega). \\ Pl(F_i) &= \sum_{F_i \cap F_j \neq \emptyset} m(F_j), Pl(\emptyset) = 0; \\ m(F_i) &= \sum_{F_j \subseteq F_i} (-1)^{|F_i| - |F_j| + 1} Pl(\overline{F_j}), m(\emptyset) = 1 - Pl(\Omega). \end{aligned}$$

In addition, derived via the set operations, there are another two dual identical information representations, implicability b function and commonality q function, which are defined as

$$\begin{aligned} b(F_i) &= \sum_{F_j \subseteq F_i} m(F_j); m(F_i) = \sum_{F_j \subseteq F_i} (-1)^{|F_i| - |F_j|} b(F_j). \\ q(F_i) &= \sum_{F_i \subseteq F_j} m(F_j); m(F_i) = \sum_{F_i \subseteq F_j} (-1)^{|F_j| - |F_i|} q(F_j). \end{aligned}$$

For the programming convenience, the BPA can be represented as the vector form $\mathbf{m} = [m(F_0), \dots, m(F_{2^n-1})]^T$, and the above functions can be implemented through the matrix calculus [31]:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbf{b} &= \mathbf{m} \mathbf{2b} \cdot \mathbf{m}, m_{2b}(F_i, F_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & F_j \subseteq F_i; \\ 0 & \text{others} \end{cases}; \\ \mathbf{q} &= \mathbf{m} \mathbf{2q} \cdot \mathbf{m}, m_{2q}(F_i, F_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & F_i \subseteq F_j; \\ 0 & \text{others} \end{cases}. \end{aligned} \quad (1)$$

2) *Credal level*: When the agent possesses multiple bodies of evidence from different sources, at the credal level, the agent's belief is transferred to integrate the available

¹Also called basic belief assignment in TBM.

information. When the sources are independent and reliable, the conjunctive combination rule (CCR), also known as the unnormalized Dempster's rule of combination, provides a reasonable manner to integrate them. CCR can be implemented through BPA or q function [32]:

$$m_{1 \odot_2}(F_i) = \sum_{F_j \cap F_k = F_i} m_1(F_j)m_2(F_k), \quad q_{1 \odot_2}(F_i) = q_1(F_i)q_2(F_i). \quad (2)$$

According to the Eq. (1), the CCR also can be implemented through matrix calculus: $m_{1 \odot_2} = \mathbf{S}_{m_2} \cdot m_1$, where $\mathbf{S}_{m_2} = m_2 \mathbf{q}^{-1} \mathbf{diag}(q_2) m_2 \mathbf{q}$. When the sources are independent and at least one of them is reliable, the disjunctive combination rule (DCR) provides a reasonable choice, whose implementations are [31]:

$$m_{1 \oplus_2}(F_i) = \sum_{F_j \cup F_k = F_i} m_1(F_j)m_2(F_k), \quad b_{1 \oplus_2}(F_i) = b_1(F_i)b_2(F_i). \quad (3)$$

Building on the above, and driven by specific requirements in information fusion, a parametric matrix calculus-based combination rule, called the α -junction, is proposed [31], [33], which is denoted as

$$m_{1 \odot_2^\alpha} = \mathbf{K}_{m_2}^{\cap, \alpha} \cdot m_1, \quad m_{1 \oplus_2^\alpha} = \mathbf{K}_{m_2}^{\cup, \alpha} \cdot m_1. \quad (4)$$

The conjunctive case \odot^α means the neutral element is m_Ω , i.e., $m \odot^\alpha m_\Omega = m$, and the $\mathbf{K}_m^{\cap, \alpha}$ is denoted as

$$\mathbf{K}_m^{\cap, \alpha} = \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} m(F_i) \cdot \mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cap, \alpha}, \quad \mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cap, \alpha} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{I} & F_i = \Omega, \\ \prod_{\omega \notin F_i} \mathbf{K}_\omega^{\cap, \alpha} & F_i \subset \Omega, \end{cases}$$

$$K_{\omega}^{\cap, \alpha}(F_i, F_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \omega \notin F_i, F_j = F_i \cup \{\omega\}, \\ \alpha & \omega \notin F_j, F_i = F_j, \\ 1 - \alpha & \omega \notin F_j, F_i = F_j \cup \{\omega\}, \\ 0 & \text{others,} \end{cases} \quad (5)$$

where $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, the boundary cases are as follows: when $\alpha = 1$ degrades to the CCR, and $\alpha = 0$ degrades to the conjunctive exclusive combination rule (CECR):

$$m_{1 \odot_2} m_2(F_i) = \sum_{F_i = (F_j \cap F_k) \cup (\overline{F_j} \cap \overline{F_k})} m_1(F_j)m_2(F_k). \quad (6)$$

Similarly, the disjunctive case \oplus^α means the neutral element is m_\emptyset , i.e., $m \oplus^\alpha m_\emptyset = m$, and the $\mathbf{K}_m^{\cup, \alpha}$ is denoted as

$$\mathbf{K}_m^{\cup, \alpha} = \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} m(F_i) \cdot \mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cup, \alpha}, \quad \mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cup, \alpha} = \begin{cases} \mathbf{I} & F_i = \emptyset, \\ \prod_{\omega \in F_i} \mathbf{K}_\omega^{\cup, \alpha} & F_i \in 2^\Omega \setminus \emptyset, \end{cases}$$

$$K_{\omega}^{\cup, \alpha}(F_i, F_j) = \begin{cases} 1 & \omega \notin F_j, F_i = F_j \cup \{\omega\}, \\ \alpha & \omega \in F_j, F_i = F_j, \\ 1 - \alpha & \omega \notin F_i, F_j = F_i \cup \{\omega\}, \\ 0 & \text{others,} \end{cases} \quad (7)$$

where $\alpha \in [0, 1]$, the boundary cases are as follows: when $\alpha = 1$ degrades to the DCR, and $\alpha = 0$ degrades to the disjunctive exclusive combination rule (DECR):

$$m_1 \odot m_2(F_i) = \sum_{F_i = (F_j \cap F_k) \cup (\overline{F_j} \cap \overline{F_k})} m_1(F_j)m_2(F_k). \quad (8)$$

As the outcomes are derived from the required properties, the interpretation of the α -junction remains an open question. Pichon and Dencoux [33] offered an explanation based on the trustworthiness of sources, though it has yet to be applied in specific scenarios.

3) *Pignistic level*: When no additional bodies of evidence are available to update the mass function, belief masses should be assigned to singletons to support decision making, a process known as probability transformation. Driven by the linearity principle, the pignistic probability transformation is defined as [34]

$$BetP_m(\omega) = \sum_{\omega \in F_i} \frac{m(F_i)}{(1 - m(\emptyset))|F_i|}. \quad (9)$$

In addition, several probability transformation methods have been proposed from various perspectives [35]. Among them, the plausibility transformation method, guided by Dempster's semantic consistency, is defined as [36]

$$Pl_P_m(\omega_i) = \frac{pl(\omega_i)}{\sum_{\omega_j \in \Omega} pl(\omega_j)}, \quad (10)$$

where $pl(\omega) = Pl(\{\omega\})$, and it is denoted as the contour function.

4) *Operation on product space*: Operating belief function on product space [37] is the key issue for both the Generalized Bayesian Theorem (GBT) [38] and the Valuation-Based System (VBS) [39]. Consider a mass function m on the space $\Omega \times \Theta$, denoted as $m^{\Omega \times \Theta}$, its marginalization on the FoD Ω is

$$m^{\Omega \times \Theta \downarrow \Omega}(F_i) = \sum_{\{G_i \subseteq \Omega \times \Theta | \text{Proj}(G_i \downarrow \Omega) = F_i\}} m^{\Omega \times \Theta}(G_i), \quad (11)$$

$$\text{Proj}(G_i \downarrow \Omega) = \{F_i \subseteq \Omega | \exists H_i \subseteq \Theta, F_i \times H_i = G_i\}.$$

The inverse operation of marginalization, representing the mass function m^Ω on the FoD $\Omega \times \Theta$, is known as the vacuous extension, which is defined as

$$m^{\Omega \uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}(G_i) = \begin{cases} m^\Omega(F_i) & F_i \subseteq \Omega, G_i = F_i \times \Theta, \\ 0 & \text{others.} \end{cases} \quad (12)$$

Hence, for the mass functions from different FoDs, such as m_1^Ω and m_2^Θ , their combination and projection can be implemented as $m_{1 \odot_2}^\Omega = (m_1^{\Omega \times \Theta} \odot m_2^{\Omega \times \Theta}) \downarrow \Omega$; $m_{1 \odot_2}^\Theta = (m_1^{\Omega \times \Theta} \odot m_2^{\Omega \times \Theta}) \downarrow \Theta$. When one of the mass functions is categorical, meaning it has only one focal set, the CCR in this case is referred to as the conditioning of the mass function. When given the target element of Θ locating in H_i , the conditioning of m^Ω is $m^\Omega[H_i] = (m^{\Omega \times \Theta} \odot m_{H_i}^{\Omega \times \Theta}) \downarrow \Omega$, $m_{H_i} \equiv \{m(H_i) = 1\}$. The inverse operation of conditioning is known as the ballooning extension, which entails providing $m^\Omega[H_i]$ and extending it onto the FoD $\Omega \times \Theta$. It is defined as

$$m^\Omega[H_i]^{\uparrow\Omega \times \Theta}(G_i) = \begin{cases} m^\Omega[H_i](F_i) & G_i = (F_i \times H_i) \cup (\Omega \times (\Theta \setminus H_i)), F_i \subseteq \Omega, \\ 0 & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (13)$$

The core contribution of this paper is the implementation of these methods on quantum circuits to quantize the TBM.

B. Quantum computing

Quantum computing is governed by the four fundamental principles of quantum mechanics and seeks to perform information updates through the evolution of quantum states [40]. To assist readers unfamiliar with quantum computing in understanding the contributions of this paper, we will introduce key concepts of quantum computing based on these four principles.






1) *Quantum state*: Any isolated quantum system can be fully described by a state vector $|\psi\rangle$ in a complex Hilbert space, which encapsulates all the information about the system. This state vector is expressed as a superposition of basis states, and the computational basis states of qubits are $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$. Consider an information system represented by n bits. In classical computing, information is modeled as an n -dimensional binary string, whereas in quantum computing, the state of information is represented as a vector composed of all possible n -dimensional binary strings. It can be written as

$$|\psi\rangle \equiv a_0|0\rangle^n + a_1|0\rangle^{n-1}|1\rangle + \dots + a_{2^n-1}|1\rangle^n = \begin{bmatrix} a_0 \\ \vdots \\ a_{2^n-1} \end{bmatrix},$$

and it has $\|a_0\|^2 + \|a_1\|^2 + \dots + \|a_{2^n-1}\|^2 = 1$. For existing multiple quantum states, they can be composited using the tensor product, which is written as $|\psi_0\rangle \otimes |\psi_1\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |\psi_k\rangle = |\psi_0\psi_1 \dots \psi_k\rangle$.

2) *Quantum evolution*: The time evolution of a closed quantum system is governed by a unitary operator U . If a quantum state $|\psi\rangle$ evolves to a state $|\psi'\rangle$ at time $t \rightarrow t'$, then $|\psi'\rangle = U_{t \rightarrow t'} |\psi\rangle$. $U_{t \rightarrow t'}$ is a unitary matrix, which leads the evolution being deterministic and reversible. Quantum gates, also known as the operators, act on quantum states to represent the quantum evolution. Table I shows the necessary quantum gates in this paper.

TABLE I
NECESSARY QUANTUM GATES IN THIS PAPER, WHERE I_n IS AN n -DIMENSIONAL ELEMENTARY MATRIX.

X gate	RY gate	C-NOT gate	Toffoli gate	Control-RY gate
				
$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} \cos(\frac{\theta}{2}) & \sin(\frac{\theta}{2}) \\ -\sin(\frac{\theta}{2}) & \cos(\frac{\theta}{2}) \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} I_2 & 0 \\ 0 & X \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} I_6 & 0 \\ 0 & X \end{bmatrix}$	$\begin{bmatrix} I_2 & 0 \\ 0 & R_Y(\theta) \end{bmatrix}$

3) *Quantum measurement*: In a quantum system, physical quantities are measured through their associated operators (Hermitian matrices). The result of the measurement will be one of the operator's eigenvalues, and after the measurement, the system will collapse into the corresponding eigenstate

(the eigenvector associated with the measured eigenvalue). In quantum computing, measurements are typically performed in the computational basis. The measurement operators are used to extract the probability information of the quantum state in the $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$ states (for single-qubit systems) or the standard basis states (such as $|00\rangle$, $|01\rangle$, etc., for multi-qubit systems). After the measurement, the quantum state collapses to the corresponding computational basis state. For a quantum superposition state, the probability of obtaining a particular outcome is given by the square of the amplitude of that state. For example, for the state $|\psi\rangle = a|0\rangle + b|1\rangle$, the outcome of measurement is $Prob(|1\rangle) = |b|^2$.

4) *Quantum entanglement*: Quantum entanglement is one of the key advantages of quantum computing, enabling connections between qubits that surpass classical limitations. In a multi-qubit system with entanglement, measuring the amplitude of each qubit individually and then composing them via tensor products yields a different outcome compared to measuring all qubits together. For example, the Bell state $|\Phi^+\rangle = a|00\rangle + b|11\rangle$ is an entangled state. In quantum computing, gates involving control and target qubits are responsible for generating entanglement during quantum evolution.

In the introduction above, Section II-B1 presents the basic representation of information, where a quantum state composed by n -qubit can represent 2^n states simultaneously, but n -bit classical information only can represent one of them. Section II-B2 outlines the basic method of updating information, the amplitude and phase of quantum state can be evolved through performing unitary operators. Section II-B3 interprets how to measure a physical quantity in a quantum system and emphasizes the irreversibility of this process in quantum computing. Section II-B4 describes the phenomenon and generation of entanglement in quantum computing. Thus, quantum computing is a computational paradigm developed to leverage the unique strengths of quantum mechanics while adhering to the four fundamental principles discussed above.

III. REPRESENTING AND IMPLEMENTING BELIEF FUNCTION ON QUANTUM CIRCUITS

A. Motivation

The encoding method is proposed in [20], and in this paper, we reorganize the logic of motivation with the aim of emphasizing that **this quantization is not simply an extension but a necessary research**. A mass function can be viewed as a random set, that is, a collection of sets with inherent randomness, where the randomness is modeled by a probability distribution. Similarly, a quantum superposition state can be interpreted as an uncertain state, which is revealed through measurement and characterized by the probabilistic uncertainty. Additionally, for an n -element FoD, belief masses are assigned to its power set, and for an n -qubit system, the quantum superposition state is composed of 2^n states. Fig. 1 shows the extension process of classical bit to the superposition state and random sets. Despite their distinct mathematical consistency, this interesting relation has not been discussed in prior research.




Fig. 1. Motivation of encoding mass function on quantum circuits.

B. Encoding mass function as superposition state

We map the elements in the FoD to qubits, focal sets to states, mass function to superposition state, and belief masses to the probabilities obtained after measurement.

Definition 1. Consider a mass function m under an n -element FoD $\Omega = \{\omega_1, \dots, \omega_n\}$, an n -qubit system q_0, \dots, q_{n-1} can model its uncertainty as a quantum superposition state, called mass function quantum state (MFQS) $|m\rangle$, which is denoted as

$$|m\rangle = \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} \sqrt{m(F_i)} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle, \quad (14)$$

where $\text{bin}(i)$ indicates the binary codes of i . The focal set F_i corresponds to the state $|\text{bin}(i)\rangle$, whether the ω_j contained is represented by the state of the qubit q_{j-1} .

Remark 1. Von Neumann's measurement theory of quantum probability focuses on the likelihood of a state resulting from the measurement of a quantum system, which corresponds to mutually exclusive events in Kolmogorov's probability axioms. However, in the belief function framework, the focal sets may be non-exclusive with each other. They represent ignorance on the target element by allowing mutually exclusive elements to form a proposition (focal set). Thus, encoding focal sets as orthogonal states in Eq. (14) does not fully align with the original physical interpretation. However, this inconsistency does not affect the development of computational advantages on quantum circuits through their mathematical correspondences.

Remark 2. The encoding ensures that the belief masses correspond to the probabilities after measurement, and is therefore only related to the amplitude. Consequently, although quantum states are represented in Hilbert space, the MFQS is not connected to existing research in complex-valued evidence theory [41], [42], which emphasizes the use of phase information to model additional types of uncertainty.

C. Implementation of mass function quantum state

In [20], Zhou *et al.* provide a method for quantizing the general mass functions. Consider a mass function m under an n -element FoD, its MFQS $|m\rangle$ can be implemented in an n -qubit system:

- Invert the initial state of q_0, \dots, q_{n-1} : $X|0\rangle^n \rightarrow |1\rangle^n$.
- Apply the RY gate on q_0 : $R_Y(\theta_0)|1\rangle \rightarrow -\sin(\frac{\theta_0}{2})|0\rangle + \cos(\frac{\theta_0}{2})|1\rangle$, where $\theta_0 = \arctan \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{\omega_1 \notin F_i} m(F_i)}{\sum_{\omega_1 \in F_j} m(F_j)}}$.

- For each qubit k , where k from 1 to $n-1$, execute the following steps.

- Prepare 2^k Control^k-RY gates, with the control qubits q_0, \dots, q_{k-1} and the target qubit q_k , where the control qubits are represented as $(k-1)$ -bit binary codes Bin , with 1 indicating a positive control qubit and 0 vice versa.
- Apply them to the corresponding quantum states in binary coding order: $CR(\{q_0 \dots q_{k-1}\}_{Bin}, q_k, \theta_{k,t}) |q_0 \dots q_{k-1}\rangle |1\rangle \rightarrow |q_0 \dots q_{k-1}\rangle \left(-\sin(\frac{\theta_{k,t}}{2}) |0\rangle + \cos(\frac{\theta_{k,t}}{2}) |1\rangle \right)$, where $\{q_0 \dots q_{k-1}\}_{Bin}$ means the control bits are $q_0 \dots q_{k-1}$ and Bin indicates the positive or negative control bit and $t = \text{dec}(Bin)$ is the decimal representation of Bin and $\theta_{k,t} = \arctan \sqrt{\frac{\sum_{F_i = F_t} m(F_i)}{\sum_{F_j = F_t \cup \{\omega_{k+1}\}} m(F_j)}}$.
- Output the implemented state as $|m\rangle$.

Fig. 2 shows the implementation circuits for a mass function under a 3-element FoD. While this method can encode an arbitrary mass function as a quantum state, it suffers from high computational complexity and is not suitable for quantizing evidential reasoning methods.

In this paper, we present an efficient method for preparing a specific type of mass function, known as the poss-transferable mass function, which corresponds classically to an invertible transformation from the possibility distribution to the belief function [43].

Definition 2. Consider a possibility distribution π under an n -element FoD, the poss-transferable mass function is defined as

$$m_{Poss}(F_i) = \prod_{\omega \in F_i} \pi(\omega) \prod_{\omega \notin F_i} (1 - \pi(\omega)) = \bigcirc_{\omega \in \Omega} \{\Omega \setminus \{\omega\}\}^{\pi(\omega)}, \quad (15)$$

where $F_i^\sigma \equiv \{m(F_i) = 1 - \sigma, m(\Omega) = \sigma\}$ is called the simple mass function. This transformation is developed from the inverse process of canonical decomposition. Hence, when the outcome of the canonical decomposition of m is a possibility distribution, m will be a poss-transferable mass function.

Theorem 1. To implement the poss-transferable mass function within an n -element FoD, only n RY gates are required to implement its quantum state, with the parameter θ determined by its contour function.

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

Remark 3. Quantum states of the poss-transferable mass function are equivalent to separable quantum states in quantum initial state preparation, i.e., quantum states without entanglement.

Remark 4. Although both the poss-transferable mass function and the consonant mass function can be uniquely transformed into a possibility distribution, they originate from different




Fig. 2. Implementation of MFQS with a 3-qubit system.

perspectives. The specific differences in their properties are analyzed in detail in [43].

Based on the above, implementing a general MFQS requires $2^n - 2$ Control-RY gates and a RY gate, while only n RY gates are required for the poss-transferable mass function. Therefore, the uncertainty modeling and handling methods related to the poss-transferable mass function are more convenient for extending into quantum computing, such as the attribute fusion-based evidential classifier [29].

D. Implementation of belief functions on quantum circuits

As shown in Section II-A1, there are some identical information content representations with mass functions, which can model uncertainty more intuitively and combine bodies of evidence more conveniently. Matrix calculus is an effective approach for implementing them in programming. In quantum computing, they can be efficiently extracted from MFQS using control gates².

Definition 3. Consider a MFQS $|m\rangle$ in an n -qubit system, q_0, \dots, q_{n-1} , its $b(\overline{F_i})$ and $q(F_i)$ can be implemented through a C^k -NOT gate, where $k = |F_i|$. Introduce an ancilla bit, q_n , the specific evolution process is:

$$CX(\{q_i | \omega_{i+1} \in F_i\}_{1_{|F_i|}}, q_n | m\rangle | 0\rangle \rightarrow |m\rangle \left(\sqrt{\sum_{F_i \subseteq F_j} m(F_j)} |1\rangle + \sqrt{\sum_{F_i \cap \overline{F_j} \neq \emptyset} m(F_j)} |0\rangle \right)$$

$$CX(\{q_i | \omega_{i+1} \in \overline{F_i}\}_{0_{|\overline{F_i}|}}, q_n | m\rangle | 0\rangle \rightarrow |m\rangle \left(\sqrt{\sum_{F_j \subseteq F_i} m(F_j)} |1\rangle + \sqrt{\sum_{F_j \cap \overline{F_i} \neq \emptyset} m(F_j)} |0\rangle \right)$$

and the quantum circuit is shown in Fig. 3.




Fig. 3. Implementation of belief functions from MFQS.

Therefore, the transformation method defined based on the inclusion relation of focal sets can be efficiently implemented

²Corresponding expression is incorrect in [44] and has been corrected here.

on quantum circuits. **Operations in quantum computing are performed on qubits, rather than on states, corresponding in the belief function framework to the focal sets that contain (or do not contain) the corresponding elements. This corresponding relationship is the reason why we should develop TBM on quantum circuits.**

E. Pignistic level on quantum circuits

In the TBM, the pignistic probability transformation (Eq. (9)) is the most widely recognized method for assigning the belief of multi-element focal sets to their corresponding singletons [34]. Smets has provided an efficient implementation of pignistic transformation through matrices calculus [31], which has been extended on quantum circuits through HHL-inspired method [20]. However, this method does not achieve acceleration and exists the theoretical errors. A quantized approach for pignistic transformation that matches the elegance and efficiency of the credal level remains undiscovered. Therefore, in this paper, we recommend using the plausibility transformation method (Eq. (10)) as the pignistic level of TBM on quantum circuits.

Definition 4. Consider a MFQS $|m\rangle$ in an n -qubit system q_0, \dots, q_{n-1} has been updated on the credal level, its plausibility transformation method on quantum circuits can be implemented using the following steps:

- Prepare n ancilla bits $q_{0_a}, \dots, q_{n-1_a}$, $|m\rangle |0\rangle^n$.
- Perform n C-NOT gates on the state, where the control bit is q_i and the target bit is q_{i_a} , $|m\rangle |m\rangle$.
- Prepare n classical bits c_0, \dots, c_{n-1} , and measure the q_{i_a} on the c_i .
- Generate the contour function based on the measured probability, $pl(\omega_i) = Prob_{q_{i-1_a}}(|1\rangle)$.
- Normalize the contour function, $\frac{pl(\omega_i)}{\sum_{\omega_j \in \Omega} pl(\omega_j)}$.

Compared to the pignistic probability transformation, the plausibility transformation method can be efficiently implemented by leveraging the extraction of contour functions on quantum circuits.

F. Discussion

This part primarily introduces how to encode and implement mass functions and their associated representations on quantum circuits. Through a one-to-one correspondence between elements in FoD and qubits in system, operating on each qubit is equivalent to operating on a proposition containing the corresponding element, which is not possible with quantum probability-based information processing methods. These contributions have been presented in our previous works [20]

and [29]. To maintain the integrity of this paper, we reorganize the motivation along with the specific evolution and derivation processes. In the following sections, we will further explore this feature and implement additional operations of belief functions on quantum circuits.

IV. CREDAL LEVEL ON QUANTUM CIRCUITS

A. Combination rules for independent sources on quantum circuits

As discussed in Section II, the combination rules for independent sources, such as CCR, DCR, CECR, and DECR, involve handling belief masses and focal sets separately. The fused belief mass is obtained through multiplication, while the fused focal set is defined using Boolean algebra operations. In quantum computing, state composition is achieved via multiplication, and control-bit gates are used to perform Boolean algebra operations. This naturally raises the question: can we propose a unified rule that encompasses all Boolean algebra operations for independent sources and implement it on quantum circuits?

1) Boolean algebra-based combination rule:

Definition 5. Consider k mass functions m_1, \dots, m_k from the independent sources, the Boolean algebra-based combination rule (BACR) of them is defined as

$$m_{k+1}(F_{i_{k+1}}) = \sum_{\mathfrak{B}(F_{i_1}, \dots, F_{i_k}) = F_{i_{k+1}}} \prod_{j=1}^k m_j(F_{i_j}), \quad (16)$$

where m_{k+1} is the result of combination, F_{i_j} is the focal set in the j th body of evidence³ and $\mathfrak{B}(F_{i_1}, \dots, F_{i_k})$ is the logical operation of Boolean algebra.

Continue to Definition 5, when $\mathfrak{B}(F_{i_1}, \dots, F_{i_k}) = F_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap F_{i_k}$, BACR will degrade to CCR; when $\mathfrak{B}(F_{i_1}, \dots, F_{i_k}) = F_{i_1} \cup \dots \cup F_{i_k}$, BACR will degrade to DCR; when $\mathfrak{B}(F_{i_1}, \dots, F_{i_k}) = (F_{i_1} \cap F_{i_2}) \cup \dots \cup (F_{i_{k-1}} \cap F_{i_k})$, BACR will degrade to $(K - 1)$ -out of- K rule [45]. Hence, the BACR is a unified combination rule for independent sources. When the input mass functions are categorical, i.e., there is only one focal set in a mass function, the BACR will degrade to the classical Boolean algebra operation. To facilitate the discussion of the specific steps of BACR, we introduce two new concepts for the operations of Boolean circuits.

- **t -layer Boolean algebra operation:** A Boolean algebra operation \mathfrak{B} can be divided into t layers, which corresponds to a t -depth Boolean circuit. Assume that multiple Boolean algebra operations can be performed simultaneously, and t indicates the minimum number of operations required to construct \mathfrak{B} . For example, if $\mathfrak{B} = (\{\omega_1\omega_2\} \cap \{\omega_2\omega_3\}) \cup (\{\omega_2\omega_4\} \cap \{\omega_4\omega_5\})$, $\{\omega_1\omega_2\} \cap \{\omega_2\omega_3\}$ and $\{\omega_2\omega_4\} \cap \{\omega_4\omega_5\}$ can be performed simultaneously, which are denoted as the first layer, and $\{\omega_2\} \cup \{\omega_4\}$ is the second layer. Hence, \mathfrak{B} is a 2-layer

Boolean algebra operation, and its corresponding BACR also is denoted as 2-layer BACR.

- **Operation component:** When the output has only one result, the operation corresponding to the maximum number of inputs is called an operation component. Continue to the above example, where $\{\omega_1\omega_2\} \cap \{\omega_2\omega_3\}$ and $\{\omega_2\omega_4\} \cap \{\omega_4\omega_5\}$ are two operation components.

2) *BACR on quantum circuits:* In [20] and [28], the CCR and DCR are implemented on quantum circuits through the HHL algorithm and VQLS, respectively, which realize the specialization and generalization of belief functions. These methods do not utilize the correspondence between elements and qubits; they merely represent a simple migration from the perspective of matrix operations. The fidelity of the implementation outcomes is limited due to the theoretical errors inherent in HHL and VQLS. BACR can be viewed as an extension of Boolean algebra operations from classical sets to random sets. The Boolean algebra operations of classical sets can be implemented through Boolean circuits, and when randomness is introduced, the idea of extending these Boolean circuits to quantum circuits becomes easily appeared. Hence, in this paper, the combination rules in credal levels are implemented from the perspective of Boolean algebra operation.

Definition 6. Consider k MFQSS $|m_1\rangle, \dots, |m_k\rangle$, each of them is composed in an n -qubit system, q_0, \dots, q_{n-1} , ($t = \{1, \dots, k\}$), where q_{i_j} represents the state of element ω_{i+1} in the m_j . The goal state, representing the outcome of BACR, is $|m_{k+1}\rangle$, whose qubits are $q_{0_{k+1}}, \dots, q_{n-1_{k+1}}$. If there is only one operation component in the \mathfrak{B} , the specific evolutionary process is:

- For the negation operation on m_j , it can be implemented through performing X gates on $q_0 \dots q_{n-1}$: $X|m_j\rangle = X \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} \sqrt{m(F_i)} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle \rightarrow \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} \sqrt{m(\overline{F_i})} |\text{bin}(i)\rangle = |\overline{m_j}\rangle$.
- For the intersection of m_1, \dots, m_k , i.e., multi-source CCR, it can be implemented through n C^k -NOT gates, where the positive control bits are q_{i_1}, \dots, q_{i_k} , and the target bit is $q_{i_{k+1}}$, ($i = \{0, \dots, n-1\}$).
- For the union of m_1, \dots, m_k , i.e., multi-source DCR, it can be implemented through n C^k -NOT gates and X gates. First, perform n C^k -NOT gates on the state, where the negative control bits are q_{i_1}, \dots, q_{i_k} , and the target bit is $q_{i_{k+1}}$, ($i = \{0, \dots, n-1\}$). And then, perform n X gates on $q_0 \dots q_{n-1}$.

In the BACR with multiple operation components and layers, each operation component can output to n ancilla bits, which then serve as the input for the operation components in the subsequent layer.

Example 1. Consider two mass functions $m_1 = \{0.2, 0.1, 0.4, 0.3\}$ and $m_2 = \{0.05, 0.13, 0.02, 0.8\}$ and the Boolean operation $\mathfrak{B} = (F_{i_1} \cap F_{i_2}) \cup (\overline{F_{i_1}} \cap \overline{F_{i_2}})$. Based on the Definition 5, the output of BACR with \mathfrak{B} is $m_3 = \{0.229, 0.143, 0.357, 0.271\}$. Based on the Definition 6, the quantum circuit of implementing $|m_3\rangle$ from $|m_1\rangle$ and $|m_2\rangle$ is shown in Fig. 4. The measured probability vector of q_0, q_1, q_3 is $[0.230, 0.143, 0.356, 0.271]^T$.

³Special reminder: i_j is a decimal number that can indicate a focal set, and i can no longer be interpreted in isolation.




Fig. 4. Implementation of BACR on quantum circuits in Example 1, where q_{i_j} means the qubit which corresponds to ω_{i+1} in m_j , and a_j means the j th ancilla qubit.

Theorem 2. For the same Boolean algebra operation \mathfrak{B} , the square of amplitude of $|m_{k+1}\rangle$ in Definition 6 equals the outcome m_{k+1} in Definition 5.

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

Theorem 3. The CECR and DECR from two sources can be implemented on quantum circuit without ancilla bits, which is more efficiently than the evolution proposed in Definition 6.

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

Recalling our motivation, implementing BACR on quantum circuits is equivalent to quantize the Boolean algebra. The Boolean algebra is the theoretical basis of classical logical reasoning. Hence, from the above perspective, **the BACR can be viewed as the theoretical basis of quantum logical reasoning.**

B. α -junction on quantum circuits

Unlike general combination rules designed for specific tasks, the α -junction is a matrix calculus-based parametric combination rule derived from the specific requirements [31], [33]. Therefore, due to its extremely high computational complexity and the lack of interpretability for sources, it is often neglected in the context of information fusion under the belief function framework.

According to the Eqs. (4)(5) and (7), the α -junction can be written as $m_1 \overset{\alpha}{\circ} m_2 = \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} m_1(F_i) \cdot \mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cdot, \alpha} \cdot \mathbf{m}_2 = \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} m_1(F_i) \cdot \mathbf{m}_{2, F_i}^{\cdot, \alpha}$, where $\cdot = \{\cap, \cup\}$. Hence, the major sources of computational complexity are the generation of $\mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cdot, \alpha}$ and $\mathbf{m}_{F_i}^{\cdot, \alpha}$.

Theorem 4. The $\mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cdot, \alpha}$ can be implemented through the Kronecker multiplication of 2-dimensional matrices. In the realm of the conjunctive case, the characteristic matrix is $\mathbf{C}^{\cap, \alpha} = \begin{bmatrix} \alpha & 1 \\ 1 - \alpha & 0 \end{bmatrix}$, and for the focal set F_i , the corre-

sponding matrix $\mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cap, \alpha} = \bigotimes_{j=1:|\Omega|} \begin{cases} \mathbf{C}^{\cap, \alpha} & \omega_{|\Omega|-j+1} \notin F_i, \\ \mathbf{I}_2 & \omega_{|\Omega|-j+1} \in F_i. \end{cases}$

In the realm of the disjunctive case, the characteristic matrix is $\mathbf{C}^{\cup, \alpha} = \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 - \alpha \\ 1 & \alpha \end{bmatrix}$, and for the focal set F_i , the corre-

sponding matrix $\mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cup, \alpha} = \bigotimes_{j=1:|\Omega|} \begin{cases} \mathbf{C}^{\cup, \alpha} & \omega_{|\Omega|-j+1} \in F_i, \\ \mathbf{I}_2 & \omega_{|\Omega|-j+1} \notin F_i. \end{cases}$

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

According to Theorem 4, since $\mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cdot, \alpha}$ can be constructed via the Kronecker multiplication, this is the same way as the implementation of composite quantum systems. Therefore, it is a natural idea to implement the target matrix $\mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cdot, \alpha}$ on quantum circuits.

Definition 7. Consider two mass functions m_1 and m_2 , their conjunctive α -junction rule can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} m_1(F_i) \cdot \mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cap, \alpha} \cdot \mathbf{m}_2 &= \\ \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} m_1(F_i) \cdot \prod_{\omega \notin F_i} \mathbf{K}_{\omega}^{\cap, \alpha} \cdot \mathbf{m}_2 &= \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} m_1(F_i) \cdot \mathbf{m}_{2, F_i}^{\cap, \alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Suppose the MFQS of m_2 , $|m_2\rangle$, has been implemented through a black box in a n -qubit system $q_0 \cdots q_{n-1}$, introduce n ancilla qubits $q_{0a} \cdots q_{n-1a}$ and execute the following evolution:

- Perform n X gates on the $q_0 \cdots q_{n-1}$.
- Perform n Control-RY gates with parameters $\theta = 2 \arccos(\sqrt{\alpha})$ on the state, whose the control bit is q_i and the target bit is q_{ia} .
- Perform n X gates on the $q_0 \cdots q_{n-1}$.
- The output state is denoted as $|m_2^{\cap, \alpha}\rangle$.

For the focal set F_i , additional n ancilla qubits $q_{na} \cdots q_{2n-1a}$ are needed to extract the values of $\mathbf{m}_{2, F_i}^{\cap, \alpha}$.

- Perform n C-NOT gates on the state $|m_2^{\cap, \alpha}\rangle |0\rangle^n$, if $\omega_j \notin F_i$, whose control bit is q_{j-1a} and target bit is q_{2j-1a} ; if $\omega_j \in F_i$, whose control bit is q_{j-1} and target bit is q_{2j-1a} .
- The probability measures of $q_{na} \cdots q_{2n-1a}$ of the output state equal the values of $\mathbf{m}_{2, F_i}^{\cap, \alpha}$.

Similarly, the disjunctive α -junction rule can be written as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} m_1(F_i) \cdot \mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cup, \alpha} \cdot \mathbf{m}_2 &= \\ \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} m_1(F_i) \cdot \prod_{\omega \in F_i} \mathbf{K}_{\omega}^{\cup, \alpha} \cdot \mathbf{m}_2 &= \sum_{F_i \subseteq \Omega} m_1(F_i) \cdot \mathbf{m}_{2, F_i}^{\cup, \alpha}. \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

The specific evolutionary steps are:

- Perform n Control-RY gates with parameters $\theta = 2 \arccos(\sqrt{\alpha})$ on the state, where the control bit is q_i and the target bit is q_{ia} .
- Perform n X gates on the $q_{0a} \cdots q_{n-1a}$.
- The output state is denoted as $|m_2^{\cup, \alpha}\rangle$.

For the focal set F_i , additional n ancilla qubits $q_{na} \cdots q_{2n-1a}$ are needed to extract the values of $\mathbf{m}_{2, F_i}^{\cup, \alpha}$.

- Perform n C-NOT gates on the state $|m_2^{\cup, \alpha}\rangle |0\rangle^n$, if $\omega_j \in F_i$, where the control bit is q_{j-1a} and target bit is q_{2j-1a} ; if $\omega_j \notin F_i$, whose control bit is q_{j-1} and target bit is q_{2j-1a} .
- The probability measures of $q_{na} \cdots q_{2n-1a}$ of the output state equal the values of $\mathbf{m}_{2, F_i}^{\cup, \alpha}$.

Example 2. Consider a mass function

$$m = \{0.02, 0.1, 0.1, 0.25, 0.06, 0.27, 0.02, 0.18\},$$

the state $|m_2^{\cap, \alpha}\rangle$ can be implemented based on the Definition 7, and the specific quantum circuit is shown in the Fig. 5. The




Fig. 5. Implementation of $|m^{\cap,0.3}\rangle$ in Example 2, where $q_{0_a}, q_{1_a}, q_{2_a}$ compose the quantum state of $m_0^{\cap,0.3}$ and $q_{3_a}, q_{4_a}, q_{5_a}$ compose the quantum state of $m_{\{\omega_1\}}^{\cap,0.3}$.

measured probability vector with 8096 shots on $q_{0_a}, q_{1_a}, q_{2_a}$ and $q_{3_a}, q_{4_a}, q_{5_a}$ are

$$[0.3657, 0.0461, 0.2205, 0.0345, 0.2297, 0.0493, 0.0473, 0.0069]^T, \\ [0.0678, 0.3367, 0.0462, 0.21, 0.0726, 0.2054, 0.0121, 0.0492]^T,$$

respectively. Based on the Eq. (17), when $\alpha = 0.3$, it has

$$m_0^{\cap,0.3} = \{0.3659, 0.0489, 0.2239, 0.0323, 0.2183, 0.0519, 0.0519, 0.0069\}, \\ m_{\{\omega_1\}}^{\cap,0.3} = \{0.0698, 0.345, 0.0462, 0.21, 0.0742, 0.196, 0.0098, 0.049\}.$$

Theorem 5. For the same parameter α , the $m_{2,F_i}^{\cap,\alpha}$ of m in α -junction equals the square of amplitude of $|m_{2,F_i}^{\cap,\alpha}\rangle$ in Definition 7.

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

We realize the efficient implementation of $|m_{2,F_i}^{\cap,\alpha}\rangle$ on the quantum circuit, which is the step in α -junction with highest computational complexity. Different from the classical operations, the $|m_2^{\cap,\alpha}\rangle$ can be viewed as a state containing the information of all focal sets, which can be repeatedly extracted by controlling the corresponding qubits, rather than through re-implementation. In addition, the subsequent step of α -junction, the vector-weighted summation, can be completed in classical computation.

In addition, an alternative implementation of the α -junction is proposed, which costs less quantum gates and can implement the entire α -junction on quantum circuits. To give the reader a better understanding of the circuit, let us review the definition of α -junction first (Eqs. (4)-(8)). In the conjunctive case, the α -junction can be considered an intermediate state between CECR and CCR, with the parameter α representing the specific degree. In the Definition 6 and Theorem 3, the implementations of CECR and CCR have been proposed, hence, the using Control-RY gates to adjust these state also can implement the intermediate state.

Definition 8. Consider two mass functions m_1 and m_2 , their MFQSs are $|m_1\rangle$ and $|m_2\rangle$ in quantum circuits q_{j_1}, q_{j_2} , where $j = \{0, \dots, n-1\}$. The conjunctive α -junction rule of $|m_1\rangle$ and $|m_2\rangle$ can be implemented through the following steps:

- Introduce $2n$ ancilla bits $q_{j_{a1}}, q_{j_{a2}}$.
- Perform $2n$ X gates on the q_{j_1}, q_{j_2} .

- Perform n Toffoli gates on the state, where the control bits are q_{j_1} and q_{j_2} , and the target bit is $q_{j_{a1}}$.
- Perform $2n$ C-NOT gates on the state, where half of them have the control bit q_{j_1} and the target bit $q_{j_{a2}}$, and the other have the control bit q_{j_2} and the target bit $q_{j_{a2}}$.
- Perform n X gates on the $q_{j_{a2}}$.
- The output state of $q_{j_{a2}}$ is the target state $|m_1 \ominus^\alpha m_2\rangle$.

Similarly, the disjunctive case can be implemented through the following steps:

- Introduce $2n$ ancilla bits $q_{j_{a1}}, q_{j_{a2}}$.
- Perform n Toffoli gates on the state, where the control bits are q_{j_1} and q_{j_2} , and the target bit is $q_{j_{a1}}$.
- Perform $2n$ C-NOT gates on the state, where half of them have the control bit q_{j_1} and the target bit $q_{j_{a2}}$, and the other have the control bit q_{j_2} and the target bit $q_{j_{a2}}$.
- The output state of $q_{j_{a2}}$ is the target state $|m_1 \cup^\alpha m_2\rangle$.

The specific circuit of the above evolution is shown in the Fig. 6.




Fig. 6. Implementation of the entire α -junctions on quantum circuit.

This paper provides two forms of implementation of the α -junction, the first is partial implementation on quantum circuits, which is inspired from the definition of the α -junction as multiple belief revisions to one of the input mass function, which are then obtained by weighted averaging with another input mass function. The second is implemented entirely on quantum circuits, which is inspired from the boundary conditions of the α -junction, viewing it as an intermediate state of two non-parameter rules. The first implementation allows for a clearer description of the physical meaning of the α junction and inspires new belief revision methods in Section IV-D. The second implementation costs the fewer gates, as shown in Table II.

C. Comparative analysis

In this paper, we achieve a quantized credal level without theoretical errors, owing to the mathematical consistency between the belief structure and the superposition state. Furthermore, we will demonstrate that BACR and α -junction require fewer computational resources on quantum circuits from the perspective of operation times.

Remark 5. In quantum computing, computational complexity has various ways to be measured, such as circuit depth, number of elementary gates, etc. In this paper, the computational complexity of the fusion operation for multiple bodies of evidence is measured by the number of Toffoli gates. For belief

revision of a body of evidence, the complexity is determined by the number of single-bit control gates.

Theorem 6. Consider k mass functions m_1, \dots, m_k under an n -element FoD, their MFQs are denoted as $|m_1\rangle, \dots, |m_k\rangle$. If the BACR with Boolean operation $\mathfrak{B} = F_{i_1} \cap \dots \cap F_{i_k}$, i.e., multi-source CCR, is implemented on quantum circuits, it will cost $(k-1) \times n$ Toffoli gates.

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

Theorem 7. In classical works, the computational complexity of combining k mass functions under an n -element FoD using CCR depends on the types of mass functions involved. For a poss-transferable mass function, the combination requires $(k-1) \times n$ multiplications, while for a general mass function, it requires $(k-1) \times 2^n$ multiplications.

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

According to the Theorems 6 and 7, we conclude that while implementing CCR on quantum circuits does not provide acceleration benefits for the poss-transferable mass function, it offers exponential acceleration for general mass functions. Remark 3 allows us to analyze the above phenomenon from the perspective of quantum entanglement. In quantum circuits, logic operations are implemented using control gates. When applied to qubits, these operations carry not only the information of the qubits themselves but also their entanglement information. In contrast, classical frameworks cannot inherently carry entanglement information through operations on corresponding elements, requiring additional steps to transfer such information. For the poss-transferable mass function, where the corresponding MFQS is a separable quantum state, i.e., no entanglement exists among qubits, applying logic operations on quantum circuits offers no advantage over classical frameworks. In contrast, general mass functions typically have MFQs containing entanglement information, resulting in an acceleration benefit when applying logical operations on quantum circuits.

Theorem 8. Consider a mass function m under an n -element FoD, with its MFQS represented as $|m\rangle$ in an n -qubit system. Implementing $|m^{\cdot\alpha}\rangle$ requires n Control-RY gates, while extracting $|m_{F_0}^{\cdot\alpha}\rangle \dots |m_{F_{2^n-1}}^{\cdot\alpha}\rangle$ requires $n \times 2^n$ C-NOT gates.

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

Theorem 9. Consider two mass functions, m_1 and m_2 , under an n -element frame of discernment, with their MFQs represented as $|m_1\rangle$ and $|m_2\rangle$. Implementing the α -junction rule in Definition 8 requires $4n$ operations.

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

Theorem 10. In classical frameworks, the computational complexity of implementing $\mathbf{m}_{F_i}^{\cdot\alpha}$ depends on the type of mass function. For the poss-transferable mass function, the implementations of $\mathbf{m}_{F_0}^{\cdot\alpha}, \dots, \mathbf{m}_{F_{2^n-1}}^{\cdot\alpha}$ require $n \times 2^n$ multiplications. For the general mass functions, the implementations of above require 2^{2n} multiplications.

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

TABLE II
OPERATION TIMES IN CREDAL LEVEL OF CLASSICAL AND QUANTUM COMPUTATIONAL FRAMEWORKS.

	Classical	Quantum
Poss-transferable mass function (CCR)	$(k-1) \times n$	$(k-1) \times n$
General mass function (CCR)	$(k-1) \times 2^n$	$(k-1) \times n$
Poss-transferable mass function (partial α -junction)	$n \times 2^n$	$n \times 2^n$
General mass function (partial α -junction)	2^{2n}	$n \times 2^n$
Poss-transferable mass function (entire α -junction)	$n \times 2^n$	$4 \times n$
General mass function (entire α -junction)	2^{2n}	$4 \times n$

Table II presents a comparison of the computational complexity between classical and quantum frameworks from the perspective of CCR and α -junctions. When handling MFQs with entangled information, i.e., MFQS of the general mass function, performing logic operations on quantum circuits can achieve exponential speedup without theoretical errors. Compared to other inference methods on quantum circuits [46], or belief transfer methods developed through general quantum algorithms [20], [28], **the proposed methods in this paper are more efficient, convenient, and logical, demonstrating that only belief functions can achieve these advantages on quantum circuits, as opposed to uncertainty theories under other structures.**

D. Modified credal level inspired by quantum computing

According to Definition 7, implementations on quantum circuits provide a more distinct interpretation for the meaning of the matrix $\mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{\cdot\alpha}$ in α -junction. For the conjunctive case, when the matrix $\mathbf{K}_{\Omega \setminus \{\omega\}}^{\cap, \alpha}$ acts on the vector \mathbf{m} , it is equivalent to first performing the negation operation on ω (apply X gate in quantum computing) and then adjusting the total belief masses of the element ω in the direction of the empty set, i.e., decreasing the belief masses of the focal sets with containing ω . Hence, when $\alpha = 0$, i.e., adjusting no belief masses, the output $m_{\Omega \setminus \{\omega\}}^{\cap, 0}(F_i) = \begin{cases} m(F_i \cup \{\omega\}) & \omega \notin F_i, \\ m(F_i \setminus \{\omega\}) & \omega \in F_i. \end{cases}$ And with

the α increasing, total belief masses of ω in $m_{\Omega \setminus \{\omega\}}^{\cap, 0}$ will be transferred to the empty set. Hence, it is not possible to realize $m_{\Omega \setminus \{\omega\}}^{\cap, \alpha} = m$ regardless of the value of alpha, which creates a significant obstacle to interpret this operation in practical applications. The similar phenomenon also appears in the disjunctive case. In this paper, we slightly modified this operation and propose a more reasonable and interpretable belief revision method.

Definition 9. Consider an agent's knowledge state can be modeled through a mass function m under the FoD Ω . When new testimony indicates that the total belief masses of elements in F_i are too low (or too high), the contour enhancement (or reduction) revisions can adjust the agent's knowledge state in a reasonable manner. When the testimony indicates that the total belief masses of elements in F_i should be enhanced with β degree, the contour enhancement revision (CER) is defined as

$$\mathbf{m}_{F_i}^{+, \beta} = \mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{+, \beta} \cdot \mathbf{m}, \quad (19)$$

where the revision matrix

$$\mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{+, \beta} = \bigotimes_{k=i:|\Omega|} \begin{cases} \mathbf{E}^\beta & \omega_{\Omega-k+1} \in F_i, \\ \mathbf{I}_2 & \omega_{\Omega-k+1} \notin F_i, \end{cases}, \mathbf{E}^\beta = \begin{bmatrix} 1-\beta & 0 \\ \beta & 1 \end{bmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

When the testimony indicates that the total belief masses of elements in F_i should be reduced with β degree, the contour reduction revision (CRR) is defined as

$$\mathbf{m}_{F_i}^{-, \beta} = \mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{-, \beta} \cdot \mathbf{m}, \quad (21)$$

where the revision matrix

$$\mathbf{K}_{F_i}^{-, \beta} = \bigotimes_{k=i:|\Omega|} \begin{cases} \mathbf{R}^\beta & \omega_{\Omega-k+1} \in F_i, \\ \mathbf{I}_2 & \omega_{\Omega-k+1} \notin F_i, \end{cases}, \mathbf{R}^\beta = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & \beta \\ 0 & 1-\beta \end{bmatrix}. \quad (22)$$

Similar with the α -junction, the CER and CRR also can be implemented on quantum circuits efficiently.

Definition 10. For the CRR, suppose the MFQS of m , $|m\rangle$, has been implemented through a black box in a n -qubit system $q_0 \cdots q_{n-1}$, introduce n ancilla qubits $q_{0_a} \cdots q_{n-1_a}$ and execute the following evolution:

- Perform n Control-RY gates with parameters $\theta = 2 \arccos(\sqrt{\beta})$ on the state, where the control bit is q_i and the target bit is q_{i_a} .
- The output state is denoted as $|m^{-, \beta}\rangle$.

For the focal set F_i , additional n ancilla qubits $q_{n_a} \cdots q_{2n-1_a}$ are needed to extract the values of $\mathbf{m}_{F_i}^{-, \beta}$.

- Perform n C-NOT gates on the state $|m^{-, \beta}\rangle |0\rangle^n$, if $\omega_j \in F_i$, whose control bit is q_{j-1_a} and target bit is q_{2j-1_a} ; if $\omega_j \notin F_i$, whose control bit is q_{j-1} and target bit is q_{2j-1_a} .
- The probability measures of $q_{n_a} \cdots q_{2n-1_a}$ of the output state equal the values of $\mathbf{m}_{F_i}^{-, \beta}$.

Similarly, the CER can be implemented through the following specific evolution:

- Perform n Control-RY gates with parameters $\theta = 2 \arccos(\sqrt{\beta})$ on the state, where the negative control bit is q_i and the target bit is q_{i_a} .
- Perform n X gates on the $q_{0_a} \cdots q_{n-1_a}$.
- The output state is denoted as $|m^{+, \beta}\rangle$.

For the focal set F_i , additional n ancilla qubits $q_{n_a} \cdots q_{2n-1_a}$ are needed to extract the values of $\mathbf{m}_{F_i}^{+, \beta}$.

- Perform n C-NOT gates on the state $|m^{+, \beta}\rangle |0\rangle^n$, if $\omega_j \in F_i$, whose control bit is q_{j-1_a} and target bit is q_{2j-1_a} ; if $\omega_j \notin F_i$, whose control bit is q_{j-1} and target bit is q_{2j-1_a} .
- The probability measures of $q_{n_a} \cdots q_{2n-1_a}$ of the output state equal the values of $\mathbf{m}_{F_i}^{+, \beta}$.

Compared to the matrix calculus in α -junction, the proposed revision method offers a clearer physical interpretation. CER and CRR enable the enhancement or reduction of the belief masses of selected elements without impacting others. In this paper, our goal is to demonstrate that quantum computing can inspire novel approaches to belief revision. The specific

properties and performance of CER and CRR will be explored in future works.

V. OPERATIONS ON PRODUCT SPACE ON QUANTUM CIRCUITS

In the preceding discussion, the advantages of belief functions on quantum circuits have been demonstrated from the perspective of operations within a FoD. For the operations on product space, they also can be efficiently implemented on quantum circuits.

A. Marginalization on quantum circuits

Definition 11. Consider a mass function under a composed FoD $\Omega \times \Theta$, denoted as $m^{\Omega \times \Theta}$, and its MFQS $|m^{\Omega \times \Theta}\rangle$ has been implemented in a $|\Omega| \times |\Theta|$ -qubit system, $q_{(0,0)}, q_{(0,1)}, \cdots, q_{(|\Omega|-1, |\Theta|-1)}$, where $q_{(i,j)}$ represents the state of element $(\omega_{i+1}, \theta_{j+1})$. The quantum state of the marginalization of $m^{\Omega \times \Theta}$ on Ω can be implemented as follows:

- Prepare $|\Omega|$ ancilla bits, $q_{0_a}, \cdots, q_{|\Omega|-1_a}$.
- Perform $|\Omega|$ C ^{$|\Theta|$} -NOT gates on the state, where the negative control bits are $q_{(i,0)}, \cdots, q_{(i, |\Theta|-1)}$ and the target bit is q_{i_a} .
- Perform $|\Omega|$ X gates on the qubits, $q_{0_a}, \cdots, q_{|\Omega|-1_a}$.
- Output the state of qubits $q_{0_a}, \cdots, q_{|\Omega|-1_a}$ as $|m^{\Omega \times \Theta \downarrow \Omega}\rangle$.

Example 3. Consider a mass function

$$m^{\Omega \times \Theta} \equiv \{m^{\Omega \times \Theta}((\omega_1, \theta_1)) = 0.1, m^{\Omega \times \Theta}((\omega_1, \theta_2), (\omega_2, \theta_2)) = 0.4, m^{\Omega \times \Theta}((\omega_1, \theta_1), (\omega_2, \theta_1), (\omega_2, \theta_2)) = 0.2, m^{\Omega \times \Theta}(\Omega \times \Theta) = 0.3\},$$

according to the Eq. (11), the marginalization of $m^{\Omega \times \Theta}$ on Ω and Θ are

$$m^{\Omega \times \Theta \downarrow \Omega}(\{\omega_1\}) = 0.3, m^{\Omega \times \Theta \downarrow \Omega}(\Omega) = 0.7; \\ m^{\Omega \times \Theta \downarrow \Theta}(\{\theta_1\}) = 0.1, m^{\Omega \times \Theta \downarrow \Theta}(\{\theta_2\}) = 0.4, m^{\Omega \times \Theta \downarrow \Theta}(\Theta) = 0.5.$$

Based on the Definition 11, its quantum circuits are shown in Figure 7, and the probability measures of $q_{0_a} q_{1_a}$ and $q_{2_a} q_{3_a}$ are

$$Prob_{q_{0_a} q_{1_a}}(|01\rangle) = 0.3, Prob_{q_{0_a} q_{1_a}}(|11\rangle) = 0.7; \\ Prob_{q_{2_a} q_{3_a}}(|01\rangle) = 0.1, Prob_{q_{2_a} q_{3_a}}(|10\rangle) = 0.4, Prob_{q_{2_a} q_{3_a}}(|11\rangle) = 0.5.$$




Fig. 7. Implementation of $|m^{\Omega \times \Theta \downarrow \Omega}\rangle$ and $|m^{\Omega \times \Theta \downarrow \Theta}\rangle$ in Example 3.

Theorem 11. *The square of amplitude output state $|m^{\Omega \times \Theta \downarrow \Omega}\rangle$ in Definition 11 equals the outcome of marginalization in Eq. (11).*

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

B. Vacuous extension on quantum circuits

Definition 12. *Consider a mass function under the FoD Ω , denoted as m^Ω , and its MFQS $|m^\Omega\rangle$ has been implemented in a $|\Omega|$ -qubit system, q_0, \dots, q_{n-1} , where q_i represents the state of element ω_{i+1} . The quantum state of vacuous extension of m^Ω on $\Omega \times \Theta$ can be implemented as follows:*

- Prepare $|\Omega \times \Theta|$ ancilla bits, $q_{(0,0)_a}, \dots, q_{(|\Omega|-1,|\Theta|-1)_a}$.
- Perform $|\Omega \times \Theta|$ C-NOT gates on the state, for the control bit q_i , there are $|\Theta|$ C-NOT gates with target bits $q_{(i,0)_a}, \dots, q_{(i,|\Theta|-1)_a}$.
- Output the state of qubits $q_{(0,0)_a}, \dots, q_{(|\Omega|-1,|\Theta|-1)_a}$ as $|m^{\Omega \uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}\rangle$, where $q_{(i,j)_a}$ represents the state of element $(\omega_{i+1}, \theta_{j+1})$ in $\Omega \times \Theta$.

Example 4. *Consider a mass function under the FoD Ω ,*

$$m^\Omega(\{\omega_1\}) = 0.1, \quad m^\Omega(\{\omega_2\}) = 0.4, \quad m^\Omega(\Omega) = 0.5.$$

According to Definition 12, its vacuous extension on FoD $\Omega \times \Theta$ is

$$m^{\Omega \uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}((\omega_1, \theta_1), \dots, (\omega_1, \theta_{|\Theta|})) = 0.1, \quad m^{\Omega \uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}((\omega_2, \theta_1), \dots, (\omega_2, \theta_{|\Theta|})) = 0.4, \quad m^{\Omega \uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}(\Omega \times \Theta) = 0.5.$$

Based on the Definition 12, the circuit of implementing MFQS of $m^{\Omega \uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}$ is shown in Figure 8, and the probability measures of $q_{(0,0)_a} \dots q_{(1,|\Theta|-1)_a}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}_{q_{(0,0)_a} \dots q_{(1,|\Theta|-1)_a}}(|\mathbf{0}_\Theta \mathbf{1}_\Theta\rangle) &= 0.1, \\ \text{Prob}_{q_{(0,0)_a} \dots q_{(1,|\Theta|-1)_a}}(|\mathbf{1}_\Theta \mathbf{0}_\Theta\rangle) &= 0.4, \\ \text{Prob}_{q_{(0,0)_a} \dots q_{(1,|\Theta|-1)_a}}(|\mathbf{1}_2 \times \mathbf{1}_\Theta\rangle) &= 0.5. \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 8. Implementation of $|m^{\Omega \uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}\rangle$ in Example 4.

Theorem 12. *The square of amplitude output state $|m^{\Omega \uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}\rangle$ in Definition 8 equals the outcome of vacuous extension in Eq. (12).*

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

C. Ballooning extension on quantum circuits

Definition 13. *Consider a mass function with given $F_i \subseteq \Theta$ under an FoD Ω , denoted as $m^\Omega[F_i]$, and its MFQS has been implemented in a $|\Omega|$ -qubit system, q_0, \dots, q_{n-1} , where q_i represents the state of element ω_{i+1} . The quantum state of ballooning extension of $m^\Omega[F_i]$ on $\Omega \times \Theta$ can be implemented as follows:*

- Prepare $|\Omega \times \Theta|$ ancilla bits, $q_{(0,0)_a}, \dots, q_{(|\Omega|-1,|\Theta|-1)_a}$.
- When $\theta_j \in F_i$, perform $|\Omega|$ C-NOT gates on the state, where the control bit is q_k , ($k = \{0, \dots, |\Omega| - 1\}$), and the target bit is $q_{(k,j-1)_a}$.
- When $\theta_j \notin F_i$, perform X gates on the qubits $q_{(0,(j-1)_a)}, \dots, q_{(|\Omega|-1,(j-1)_a)}$.
- Output the state of qubits $q_{(0,0)_a}, \dots, q_{(|\Omega|-1,|\Theta|-1)_a}$ as $|m^{\Omega[F_i] \uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}\rangle$, where $q_{(i,j)_a}$ represents the state of element $(\omega_{i+1}, \theta_{j+1})$ in $\Omega \times \Theta$.

Example 5. *Consider a mass function with given θ_2 under the FoD Ω ,*

$$m^\Omega[\{\theta_2\}](\{\omega_1\}) = 0.1, \quad m^\Omega[\{\theta_2\}](\{\omega_2\}) = 0.4, \quad m^\Omega[\{\theta_2\}](\Omega) = 0.5.$$

According to Definition 13, its ballooning extension on the FoD $\Omega \times \Theta$ is

$$\begin{aligned} m^\Omega[\{\theta_2\}]^{\uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}((\omega_1, \theta_2), (\omega_2, \theta_1), (\omega_2, \theta_2)) &= 0.1, \\ m^\Omega[\{\theta_2\}]^{\uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}((\omega_1, \theta_1), (\omega_1, \theta_2), (\omega_2, \theta_2)) &= 0.4, \\ m^\Omega[\{\theta_2\}]^{\uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}(\Omega \times \Theta) &= 0.5. \end{aligned}$$

Based on the Definition 13, the circuit of implementing MFQS of $m^\Omega[\{\theta_2\}]^{\uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}$ is shown in Figure 9, and the probability measures of $q_{(0,0)_a} \dots q_{(1,1)_a}$ are

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Prob}_{q_{(0,0)_a} \dots q_{(1,1)_a}}(|1110\rangle) &= 0.1, \\ \text{Prob}_{q_{(0,0)_a} \dots q_{(1,1)_a}}(|1011\rangle) &= 0.4, \\ \text{Prob}_{q_{(0,0)_a} \dots q_{(1,1)_a}}(|1111\rangle) &= 0.5. \end{aligned}$$




Fig. 9. Implementation of $|m^{\Omega[\{\theta_2\}] \uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}\rangle$ in Example 5.

Theorem 13. *The square of amplitude output state $|m^{\Omega[\{\theta_2\}] \uparrow \Omega \times \Theta}\rangle$ in Definition 9 equals the outcome of vacuous extension in Eq. (13).*

Proof. Please refer to the supplementary material. \square

D. Discussion

Unlike the credal and pignistic levels in the TBM, operations on the product space involve re-encoding the information granule. In the classical framework, this re-encoding is performed through projection, multiplication, and set operations,

which complicates arithmetic and programming in large-scale computing. In this paper, these re-encoding operations are efficiently implemented on quantum circuits and are generalizable to accommodate more complex computations. The VBS [39] and the GBT [38] are the most well-known tools for reasoning and decision making with multiple variables under the belief function frameworks. In the VBS, combining the bodies of evidence under the different FoDs and the marginalization are the key steps. In the GBT, the conditional embedding in the product space (ballooning extension) and the Dempster's conditioning are the key steps. Since the aforementioned techniques have been implemented in this paper, both VBS and GBT can also be extended to quantum circuits, making the operations more convenient.

VI. CONCLUSION

This pioneering paper establishes a correspondence encoding between qubits in quantum computing and elements of the Dempster-Shafer structure, demonstrating that quantum circuit operations can significantly enhance the efficiency of belief function computations. Compared to the direct extension of classical probability to quantum probability, belief function operations are more logically suited to quantum computing and provide a clearer interpretation of qubits in reasoning and decision-making. Furthermore, inspired by the application of belief functions on quantum circuits, we introduce a novel belief revision method, called contour enhancement/reduction revision, which offers a previously unexplored reasoning semantics.

This paper also validates the issue raised in the introduction: **developing quantum AI methods within the belief function framework offers greater interpretability and generalizability compared to other uncertainty theories.** Moving forward, future research will proceed in two directions. First, we will explore broader advantages of belief functions on quantum circuits, including applications such as evidential machine learning and evidential deep learning. Second, we propose utilizing belief functions as the foundational representation for quantum AI information, aiming to optimize existing quantum AI models.

REFERENCES

- [1] R. R. Yager and L. Liu, *Classic works of the Dempster-Shafer theory of belief functions*. Springer, 2008, vol. 219.
- [2] T. Denœux, D. Dubois, and H. Prade, "Representations of uncertainty in ai: Beyond probability and possibility," in *A Guided Tour of Artificial Intelligence Research (vol. I)*. Springer International Publishing, May 2020, pp. 119–150. [Online]. Available: <https://hal.science/hal-02921351>
- [3] P. Smets and R. Kennes, "The transferable belief model," *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 66, no. 2, pp. 191–234, 1994.
- [4] Q. Zhou, T. Zhan, and Y. Deng, "Isopignistic canonical decomposition via belief evolution network," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2405.02653*, 2024.
- [5] J.-B. Yang and D.-L. Xu, "Evidential reasoning rule for evidence combination," *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 205, pp. 1–29, 2013.
- [6] Y. Zhang, S. Destercke, Z. Zhang, T. Bouadi, and A. Martin, "On computing evidential centroid through conjunctive combination: An impossibility theorem," *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 4, no. 3, pp. 487–496, 2023.
- [7] M. Zhou, Y.-J. Zhou, J.-B. Yang, and J. Wu, "A generalized belief dissimilarity measure based on weighted conflict belief and distance metric and its application in multi-source data fusion," *Fuzzy Sets and Systems*, vol. 475, p. 108719, 2024.
- [8] J. Zhao and K. H. Cheong, "Mase: Multi-attribute source estimator for epidemic transmission in complex networks," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, 2024.
- [9] J. Deng, Y. Deng, and J.-B. Yang, "Random permutation set reasoning," *IEEE Transactions on Pattern Analysis and Machine Intelligence*, 2024.
- [10] X. Chen and Y. Deng, "Evidential software risk assessment model on ordered frame of discernment," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 250, p. 123786, 2024.
- [11] Z. Liu, C. Li, and X. He, "Evidential ensemble preference-guided learning approach for real-time multimode fault diagnosis," *IEEE Transactions on Industrial Informatics*, vol. 20, no. 4, pp. 5495–5504, 2024.
- [12] Z. Zhang, Z. Liu, H. Tian, and A. Martin, "Mixed-type imputation for missing data credal classification via quality matrices," *IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems*, vol. 54, no. 8, pp. 4772–4785, 2024.
- [13] L. Huang, "Combination of information in labeled and unlabeled data via evidence theory," *IEEE Transactions on Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 2179–2192, 2024.
- [14] L. Huang, J. Fan, and A. W.-C. Liew, "Integration of multikinds imputation with covariance adaptation based on evidence theory," *IEEE Transactions on Neural Networks and Learning Systems*, pp. 1–15, 2024.
- [15] L. Huang, S. Ruan, P. Decazes, and T. Denœux, "Deep evidential fusion with uncertainty quantification and reliability learning for multimodal medical image segmentation," *Information Fusion*, vol. 113, p. 102648, 2025.
- [16] J. Biamonte, P. Wittek, N. Pancotti, P. Rebentrost, N. Wiebe, and S. Lloyd, "Quantum machine learning," *Nature*, vol. 549, p. 195–202, 2017.
- [17] M. Ying, "Quantum computation, quantum theory and ai," *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 174, no. 2, pp. 162–176, 2010, special Review Issue.
- [18] S. Chen, J. Cotler, H.-Y. Huang, and J. Li, "The complexity of nismq," *Nature Communications*, vol. 14, no. 1, p. 6001, 2023.
- [19] J. Von Neumann, *Mathematical foundations of quantum mechanics: New edition*. Princeton university press, 2018, vol. 53.
- [20] Q. Zhou, G. Tian, and Y. Deng, "Bf-qc: Belief functions on quantum circuits," *Expert Systems with Applications*, vol. 223, p. 119885, 2023.
- [21] C. Zhou, "Belief functions on distributive lattices," *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 201, pp. 1–31, 2013.
- [22] A. Vourdas, "Quantum probabilities as Dempster-Shafer probabilities in the lattice of subspaces," *Journal of Mathematical Physics*, vol. 55, no. 8, p. 082107, 08 2014.
- [23] F. Xiao, "Generalized quantum evidence theory," *Applied Intelligence*, vol. 53, no. 11, pp. 14 329–14 344, 2023.
- [24] L. Pan, X. Gao, and Y. Deng, "Quantum algorithm of dempster rule of combination," *Applied Intelligence*, vol. 53, no. 8, pp. 8799–8808, 2023.
- [25] X. Deng, S. Xue, and W. Jiang, "A novel quantum model of mass function for uncertain information fusion," *Information Fusion*, vol. 89, pp. 619–631, 2023.
- [26] X. Deng and W. Jiang, "Quantum representation of basic probability assignments based on mixed quantum states," in *2021 IEEE 24th International Conference on Information Fusion (FUSION)*. IEEE, 2021, pp. 1–6.
- [27] L. Pan and X. Gao, "Evidential markov decision-making model based on belief entropy to predict interference effects," *Information Sciences*, vol. 633, pp. 10–26, 2023.
- [28] H. Luo, Q. Zhou, Z. Li, and Y. Deng, "Variational quantum linear solver-based combination rules in dempster-shafer theory," *Information Fusion*, vol. 102, p. 102070, 2024.
- [29] H. Luo, Q. Zhou, L. Pan, Z. Li, and Y. Deng, "Attribute fusion-based evidential classifier on quantum circuits," *arXiv preprint arXiv:2401.01392*, 2024.
- [30] G. Shafer, *A Mathematical Theory of Evidence*. Princeton University Press, 1976.
- [31] P. Smets, "The application of the matrix calculus to belief functions," *International Journal of Approximate Reasoning*, vol. 31, no. 1, pp. 1–30, 2002.
- [32] T. Denœux, "Conjunctive and disjunctive combination of belief functions induced by nondistinct bodies of evidence," *Artificial Intelligence*, vol. 172, no. 2–3, pp. 234–264, 2008.
- [33] F. Pichon and T. Denœux, "Interpretation and Computation of alpha-Junctions for Combining Belief Functions," in *6th International Symposium on Imprecise Probability: Theories and Applications (ISIPTA '09)*, Durham, United Kingdom, 2009. [Online]. Available: <https://hal.science/hal-00450984>

- [34] P. Smets, "Decision making in the tbm: the necessity of the pignistic transformation," International Journal of Approximate Reasoning, vol. 38, no. 2, pp. 133–147, 2005.
- [35] D. Han, J. Dezert, and Z. Duan, "Evaluation of probability transformations of belief functions for decision making," IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics: Systems, vol. 46, no. 1, pp. 93–108, 2016.
- [36] B. R. Cobb and P. P. Shenoy, "On the plausibility transformation method for translating belief function models to probability models," International Journal of Approximate Reasoning, vol. 41, no. 3, pp. 314–330, 2006.
- [37] T. Denœux and P. Smets, "Classification using belief functions: Relationship between case-based and model-based approaches," IEEE Transactions on Systems, Man, and Cybernetics, Part B (Cybernetics), vol. 36, no. 6, pp. 1395–1406, 2006.
- [38] P. Smets, "Belief functions: The disjunctive rule of combination and the generalized bayesian theorem," International Journal of Approximate Reasoning, vol. 9, no. 1, pp. 1–35, 1993.
- [39] P. P. Shenoy and G. Shafer, "Axioms for probability and belief-function propagation," in Uncertainty in Artificial Intelligence, ser. Machine Intelligence and Pattern Recognition, R. D. SHACHTER, T. S. LEVITT, L. N. KANAL, and J. F. LEMMER, Eds. North-Holland, 1990, vol. 9, pp. 169–198.
- [40] M. A. Nielsen and I. Chuang, "Quantum computation and quantum information," 2002.
- [41] L. Pan and Y. Deng, "A new complex evidence theory," Information Sciences, vol. 608, pp. 251–261, 2022. [Online]. Available: <https://www.sciencedirect.com/science/article/pii/S002002522006570>
- [42] F. Xiao, Z. Cao, and C.-T. Lin, "A complex weighted discounting multi-source information fusion with its application in pattern classification," IEEE Transactions on Knowledge and Data Engineering, vol. 35, no. 8, pp. 7609–7623, 2023.
- [43] Q. Zhou, Y. Deng, and R. R. Yager, "Cd-bft: Canonical decomposition-based belief functions transformation in possibility theory," IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics, vol. 54, no. 1, pp. 611–623, 2024.
- [44] Q. Zhou, H. Luo, É. Bossé, and Y. Deng, "Why combining belief functions on quantum circuits?" in Belief Functions: Theory and Applications, Y. Bi, A.-L. Jusselme, and T. Denœux, Eds. Cham: Springer Nature Switzerland, 2024, pp. 161–170.
- [45] F. Pichon, S. Destercke, and T. Burger, "A consistency-specificity trade-off to select source behavior in information fusion," IEEE Transactions on Cybernetics, vol. 45, no. 4, pp. 598–609, 2015.
- [46] G. H. Low, T. J. Yoder, and I. L. Chuang, "Quantum inference on bayesian networks," Physical Review A, vol. 89, no. 6, p. 062315, 2014.