Lecture 4: Linear combination of unitaries

Lecturer: Simon Apers

In the previous lecture we encoded a general Hermitian matrix H into a unitary quantum walk operator. We combined this operator with phase estimation to apply a function f(H) of H onto a quantum state (e.g.,  $e^{iHt}$  for Hamiltonian simulation and  $H^{-1}$  for linear system solving). The cost scaled with some problem parameter, and was inversely proportional to the precision  $\varepsilon$  (cost  $\sim t/\varepsilon$  for Hamiltonian simulation,  $\sim \kappa^2/\varepsilon$  for linear system solving). This linear scaling in the error is intrinsic to the use of phase estimation. In this lecture we see that an alternative technique called linear combination of unitaries (LCU) [CW12] allows us to implement a function f(H) more directly and more precisely.

## 1 Linear combination of unitaries

Consider a Hermitian matrix H with  $||H||_1 < 1$ , and let W be the QW operator based on H. Let  $\Pi_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ . We saw in the last lecture that

$$(I \otimes \Pi_0) U_{\psi}^{\dagger} W^t U_{\psi} |\chi\rangle |0\rangle = (T_t(H) |\chi\rangle) |0\rangle.$$
(1)

I.e., if we project into the right subspace, then a quantum walk effectively applies the t-th Chebyshev polynomial  $T_t(H)$  on  $|\chi\rangle$ . We will use that these form a basis for the polynomials.

Exercise 1. • Verify that the Chebyshev polynomials form an orthogonal set w.r.t. the inner product

$$\langle f, g \rangle = \int_{-1}^{+1} f(x)g(x) \frac{\mathrm{d}x}{\sqrt{1 - x^2}}.$$

Hint: use that  $T_t(\cos(\theta)) = \cos(t\theta)$ .

• Moreover, they form a basis: any degree-d polynomial can be described as a linear combination of the first d+1 Chebyshev polynomials. Prove this by finding the coefficients of the expansion

$$x^{\tau} = \sum_{t=0}^{\tau} \alpha_t T_t(x). \tag{2}$$

Hint: use the fact that  $\cos(\theta) = (e^{i\theta} + e^{-i\theta})/2$ .

As a consequence, we can try to implement a general polynomial  $f(H) = \sum_t \alpha_t T_t(H)$  to the quantum state  $|\chi\rangle$  by implementing a linear combination  $\sum_t \alpha_t W^t$  of the quantum walk evolution (1) for different times. However, this no longer corresponds to a unitary operator. The LCU technique allows to bypass this restriction (again, by mapping the nonunitary dynamics to a subspace of certain unitary dynamics).

The technique uses the "controlled" version of the QW operator (which also shows up in phase estimation). For some integer  $\tau \geq 0$ , this operator is defined by

$$cW = \sum_{t=0}^{\tau} W^t \otimes |t\rangle \langle t|.$$

You can think of the cost of the controlled operator as essentially  $\tau$  steps of the QW operator W. Applying this operator to a state  $|\phi\rangle|t'\rangle$  gives

$$cW |\phi\rangle |t'\rangle = W^{t'} |\phi\rangle |t'\rangle$$
,

so it applies a number of QW steps given by the second register. Now assume that  $\sum_t |\alpha_t| = 1$ , and define the "clock" state

$$U_{\rm cl} |0\rangle = \sum_t \sqrt{\alpha_t} |t\rangle$$
.

The LCU technique puts this state into the clock register, applies a conditioned QW operator, and then inverts the clock operation. This yields the state  $(I \otimes U_{\rm cl}^{\dagger}) \, cW \, (I \otimes U_{\rm cl}) \, |\phi\rangle \, |0\rangle$ . Looking at this state in the right subspace reveals what we are interested in.

**Exercise 2.** • Let  $\Pi_0 = |0\rangle\langle 0|$ . Analyze what the (projected) output of the LCU algorithm corresponds to, given by

$$(I \otimes \Pi_0)(I \otimes U_{\mathrm{cl}}^{\dagger}) \, cW \, (I \otimes U_{\mathrm{cl}}) \, |\phi\rangle \, |0\rangle \, .$$

• Analyze what the following state corresponds to:

$$(I \otimes \Pi_0 \otimes \Pi_0)(U_{ib}^{\dagger} \otimes I)(I \otimes U_{cl}^{\dagger}) cW (I \otimes U_{cl})(U_{\psi} \otimes I) |\chi\rangle |0\rangle |0\rangle$$
.

## 2 Matrix powering and quantum fast-forwarding

As an illustration of the LCU technique we consider the problem of matrix powering, where we wish to return a state of the form  $H^{\tau} | \psi \rangle$  (up to normalization) for some integer  $t \geq 0$ . This corresponds to implementing the polynomial  $f(x) = x^{\tau}$ .

- **Exercise 3.** Let W be the QW operator associated to H. Explicitly describe the LCU algorithm based on W for constructing the state  $H^{\tau} |\psi\rangle/\|H^{\tau} |\psi\rangle\|_2$ . What is the cost of this algorithm?
  - Quantum fast-forwarding. We can implement an approximation of  $H^{\tau}$  more efficiently by truncating the sum in (2).
    - Consider independent and uniformly distributed random variables  $X_1, \ldots, X_{\tau} \in \{+1, -1\}$ , and let  $Y_{\tau} = \sum_{k=1}^{\tau} X_k$ . Prove that the coefficients in Eq. (2) satisfy  $\alpha_t = \Pr(|Y_{\tau}| = t)$ .
    - By Hoeffding's theorem we know that  $\Pr(|Y_{\tau}| \ge r) \le 2 \exp(-r^2/(2\tau))$  for any  $r \ge 0$ . Use this to prove that there exists  $d \in O(\sqrt{\tau \log(1/\varepsilon)})$  such that the degree-d polynomial

$$h(x) = \sum_{t=0}^{d} \alpha_t T_t(x)$$

satisfies  $|h(x) - x^{\tau}| \le \varepsilon$  for all  $x \in [-1, 1]$ .

- Describe the LCU algorithm based on the polynomial h. What is its cost?

This technique was first described in [AS19]. It was used in the recent resolution [AGJK20] of a long-standing problem related to quantum walk search: can we find an element from a marked set M in time  $\widetilde{O}(\sqrt{HT(M)})$ ? In previous lectures we proved the weaker bound  $\widetilde{O}(1/\sqrt{\delta\pi(M)})$ .

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>1</sup>In fact, a similar argument applies as long as  $\sum_{t} |\alpha_{t}| \in \Theta(1)$ .

## 3 Hamiltonian simulation

In the case of Hamiltonian simulation, we are given some initial state  $|\chi\rangle$ , a Hermitian matrix H and a time  $t \geq 0$ , and we wish to output the state  $e^{iH\tau}|\chi\rangle$ . This corresponds to implementing the function  $f(x) = e^{ix\tau}$ . For the case where  $||H||_1 < 1$ , we described an algorithm based on quantum walks and phase estimation with complexity  $\tilde{O}(\tau/\varepsilon)$ . We will use LCU to improve the error dependency to  $\log(1/\varepsilon)$ .

We focus on the case where  $||H||_1 < 1$  and  $\tau \le 1$ . To use LCU, we must find a polynomial  $h(x) = \sum_t \alpha_t T_t(x)$  such that  $\sum_t |\alpha_t| \in \Theta(1)$  and  $|h(x) - e^{ix\tau}| \le \varepsilon$  for |x| < 1.

**Exercise 4.** • Find an expansion  $e^{ix\tau} = \sum_{t>0} \alpha_t T_t(x)$  using the Jacobi-Anger expansion

$$e^{i\cos(\theta)\tau} = J_0(\tau) + 2\sum_{k=1}^{+\infty} i^k J_k(\tau)\cos(k\theta).$$

Here the function  $J_k(y)$  corresponds to the k-th Bessel function of the first kind.

- Use that  $|J_k(\tau)| \leq \frac{1}{k!2^k}$  for  $\tau \leq 1$  to show that  $\sum_t |\alpha_t| \in \Theta(1)$ .
- Show that there exists  $d \in O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$  such that  $h(x) = \sum_{t=0}^{d} \alpha_t T_t(x)$  satisfies  $|h(x) e^{ix}| \le \varepsilon$  for |x| < 1.
- Describe the LCU algorithm based on h for Hamiltonian simulation with  $||H||_1 < 1$ ,  $\tau \le 1$  and error  $\varepsilon > 0$ . What is its cost?

Using standard tools, this algorithm can be extended to  $\varepsilon$ -approximate general Hamiltonians for arbitrary times  $\tau \geq 0$  with cost  $O(\tau ||H||_1 \log(1/\varepsilon))$ .

## References

- [AGJK20] Andris Ambainis, András Gilyén, Stacey Jeffery, and Martins Kokainis. Quadratic speedup for finding marked vertices by quantum walks. In *Proceedings of the 52nd ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing (STOC)*, pages 412–424. ACM, 2020. arxiv:1903.07493.
- [AS19] Simon Apers and Alain Sarlette. Quantum fast-forwarding Markov chains and property testing. Quantum Information & Computation, 19(3&4):181–213, 2019. arXiv:1804.02321.
- [CKS17] Andrew M. Childs, Robin Kothari, and Rolando D. Somma. Quantum algorithm for systems of linear equations with exponentially improved dependence on precision. SIAM Journal on Computing, 46(6):1920–1950, 2017.
- [CW12] Andrew M. Childs and Nathan Wiebe. Hamiltonian simulation using linear combinations of unitary operations. Quantum Information & Computation, 12(11–12):901–924, 2012.

<sup>&</sup>lt;sup>2</sup>While harder to prove, you could even choose  $d \in O(\log(1/\varepsilon)/\log\log(1/\varepsilon))$ .