

CONSTRUCTIONS OF BLOCK-ENCLOSING AND THEIR EFFECTS ON QUANTUM SPEEDUPS[†]

HYEONMIN ROH*, TAEWON KIM**

ABSTRACT. Abstract is here, not exceeding 160 words. It must contain *Main Facts*.

AMS Mathematics Subject Classification : 65H05, 65F10.

Key words and phrases : Nonlinear equation, three-step iterative method, multi-step iterative method.

1. Introcutiion

On claimed exponential speedups of quantum machine learning algorithms subsequent to HHL algorithm for solving linear system of equations, Tang presented classical counterparts for fair amount of QML algorithms by exploiting basic linear algebraic properties underlying data structures used during accessing matrices in a quantum-advantage way, and corresponding them to classical randomized numerical linear algebra methods. Such process is termed ‘dequantization’.

All known linear algebraic QML techniques are captured by Quantum singular value transformation (QSVT), a unifying framework of quantum algorithms. QSVT can be classified by their input model assumptions, whether if inputs for QML are sparse or low-rank. Since sparse-access input models are known to give exponential speedup, dequantization attacks low-rank input models, where classical data without strong restrictions are applicable.

For classical data, QML algorithms must efficiently prepare them as quantum states. So we assume the existence of quantum random access memory (QRAM), a quantum device corresponding to classical RAM. QRAM stores n bits of data

Received , . Revised , . Accepted , . *Corresponding author.

[†]Please add: “This research received no external funding” or “This research was funded by NAME OF FUNDER grant number XXX.” and “The APC was funded by XXX”. Check carefully that the details given are accurate and use the standard spelling of funding agency names, any errors may affect your future funding. Example: This work was supported by the research grant of the University

© 2023 KSCAM.

and query those data in superposition by a $\text{polylog}(n)$ time. Dequantization is essentially the process of providing psuedo-QRAM to classical computers, by assumming a input model of sampeling and query access to a vector, which would lead to a fair comparison between quantum and classical machine learning.

Results of dequantization draw a border line for our understanding of QML algorithms and their limitations. Hence, one of the open problems of QML is whether there exist other ways to construct data structures that prevent dequantization. We focus on this matter by its basic unit, termed ‘Block-encoding’. Our goal is to formally define two alternative data structure implicitly stated by Kerenidis and Prakash, and CHakraborty, Gilyén, and Jeffery, generelizing sparse-input model to QRAM-input model.

2. Nomenclature

3. Block-encoding

What lets an algorithm to be dequantized? Below is a QRAM data structure used for the recommendation algorithm, which is the first algorithm to be dequantized.

Theorem 3.1 (Kerenidis 2017, Theorem 15). *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a matrix with $A_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ being the entry of the i -th row and the j -th column. If w is the number of entries that have already arrived in the system, given the entries (i, j, A_{ij}) in an arbitrary order, there exists a data structure to store the matrix A with the following properties:*

- (1) *The size of the data structure is $\mathcal{O}(w \log^2(mn))$.*
- (2) *Given the entries (i, j, A_{ij}) in an arbitrary order, the time to store them is $\mathcal{O}(\log^2(mn))$.*
- (3) *There exists a quantum algorithm that can perform the following maps in $\text{polylog}(mn)$ time for $i \in [m]$ and $j \in [n]$:*

$$\tilde{U} : |i\rangle |0\rangle \mapsto |i\rangle |A_i\rangle,$$

$$\tilde{V} : |0\rangle |j\rangle \mapsto |\tilde{A}\rangle |j\rangle,$$

where $\tilde{A} \in \mathbb{R}^m$ has entries $\tilde{A}_i = \|A_i\|$.

Proof. The data structure consists of an array of m binary trees $B_i, i \in [m]$. When a new entry (i, j, A_{ij}) arrives the leaf node j , in tree B_i is created if not present and updated otherwise. The depth of each tree B_i is at most $\lceil \log n \rceil$. An internal node v of B_i stores the sum of the values of all leaves in the subtree rooted at v , i.e. the sum of the square amplitudes of the entries of A_i in the subtree. Hence, the value stored at the root is $\|A_i\|^2$.

- (1) The memory required for the data structure is $\mathcal{O}(w \log^2 mn)$ as for each entry (i, j, A_{ij}) at most $\lceil \log n \rceil$ new nodes are added, each node requiring $\mathcal{O}(\log mn)$ bits.

- (2) The time required to store entry (i, j, A_{ij}) is $\mathcal{O}(\log^2 mn)$ as the insertion algorithm makes at most $\lceil \log n \rceil$ updates to the data structure and each update requires time $\mathcal{O}(\log mn)$ to retrieve the address of the updated node.
- (3) The amplitudes stored in the internal nodes of B_i are used to apply a sequence of conditional rotations to the initial state $|0\rangle^{\lceil \log n \rceil}$ to obtain $|A_i\rangle$. Also, note that the amplitudes of the vector \tilde{A} are equanto $\|A_i\|$, and the values stored on the roots of the trees B_i are equal to $\|A_i\|^2$. Hence by a similar construction for the m roots, we can perform the unitary \tilde{V} efficiently.

□

Theorem 3.2 ([2]). *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$ be a matrix with $A_{ij} \in \mathbb{R}$ being the entry of the i -th row and the j -th column. If w is the number of non-zero entries of A , then there exists a data structure of size $\mathcal{O}(w \log^2(mn))$ that, given the entries (i, j, A_{ij}) in an arbitrary order, stores them such that time taken to store each entry of A is $\mathcal{O}(\log(mn))$. Once this data structure has been initiated with all non-zero entries of A , there exists a quantum algorithm that can perform the following maps with ϵ -precision in $\mathcal{O}(\text{polylog}(mn/\epsilon))$ time:*

$$\begin{aligned}\tilde{U} : |i\rangle |0\rangle &\mapsto \frac{1}{\|A_{i,\cdot}\|} \sum_{j=1}^n A_{i,j} |j\rangle = |i, A_i\rangle, \\ \tilde{V} : |0\rangle |j\rangle &\mapsto \frac{1}{\|A\|_F} \sum_{i=1}^m \|A_{i,\cdot}\| |i\rangle |j\rangle = |\tilde{A}, j\rangle,\end{aligned}$$

where $|A_{i,\cdot}\rangle$ is the normalized quantum state corresponding to the i -th row of A and $|\tilde{A}\rangle$ is a normalized quantum state such that $\langle i|\tilde{A}\rangle = \|A_{i,\cdot}\|$, i.e. the norm of the i -th row of A .

In particular, given a vector $\mathbf{v} \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times 1}$ stored in this data structure, we can generate an ϵ -approximation of the superposition $\sum_{i=1}^m v_i |i\rangle / \|\mathbf{v}\|$ in complexity $\text{polylog}(m/\epsilon)$.

The notion of block-encoding was devised as a solution to the problem of Hamiltonian simulation. Hamiltonian simulation, one of the original motivations for designing practical quantum computers, may stated as follows: For time evolution of the wave function $|\psi(t)\rangle$ governed by the Schrödinger equation, that is,

$$i\hbar \frac{d}{dt} |\psi(t)\rangle = H(t) |\psi(t)\rangle$$

the Hamiltonian, an operator with units of energy, is $H(t)$. Hamiltonian simulation is a problem of designing quantum circuit or unitary matrix U consisting of $\text{poly}(n, t, 1/\epsilon)$ gates such that $\|U - e^{iHt}\| \leq \epsilon$. The cost of Hamiltonian simulation depends on the number of qubits n , evolution time t , target error ϵ , and access models of Hamiltonian H . While acheiving optimal Hamiltonian

simulation by the process called ‘Qubitization’, Low and Chuang (2017) defined a *standard-form encoding*, a primitive statement of *block-encoding*. Basically, qubitization is a technique of representing Hermitian or subnormalized matrix as the top-left block of a unitary matrix, that is;

$$U = \begin{bmatrix} A/\alpha & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{bmatrix}$$

where \cdot denotes arbitrary elements of U .

Definition 3.3 (Block-encoding). For $A \in \mathbb{C}^{n \times m}$, $\alpha, \epsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $a \in \mathbb{N}$, $(s+a)$ -qubit unitary U is an (α, a, ϵ) -block-encoding of A if

$$\|A - \alpha(\langle 0|^{\otimes a} \otimes I)U(|0\rangle^{\otimes a} \otimes I)\| \leq \epsilon.$$

For $n, m \leq 2^s$ we may define an embedding matrix $A_e \in \mathbb{C}^{2^s \times 2^s}$ such that the top-left block of A_e is A and all other entries are 0.

Theorem 3.4 ([2]). Let $A \in \mathbb{C}^{m \times n}$.

- (1) Fix $p \in [0, 1]$. If $A^{(p)}$ and $(A^{(1-p)})^\dagger$ are both stored in quantum-accessible data structures, then there exist unitaries U_R and U_L that can be implemented in time $\mathcal{O}(\text{polylog}(mn/\epsilon))$ such that $U_R^\dagger U_L$ is a $(\mu_p(A), \lceil \log(n+m+1) \rceil, \epsilon)$ -block-encoding of \bar{A} .
- (2) On the other hand, if A is stored in a quantum-accessible data structure, then there exist unitaries U_R and U_L that can be implemented in time $\mathcal{O}(\text{polylog}(mn/\epsilon))$ such that $U_R^\dagger U_L$ is a $(\|A\|_F, \lceil \log(m+n) \rceil, \epsilon)$ -block-encoding of \bar{A} .

Proof. For $j \in [m]$, we define $|\psi_j\rangle$ and $|\phi_j\rangle$ as follows.

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_j\rangle &= \frac{\sum_{k \in [n]} A_{j,k}^p |j, m+k\rangle}{\sqrt{s_{2p}(A)}} + \sqrt{1 - \frac{\sum_{k \in [n]} A_{j,k}^{2p}}{s_{2p}(A)}} |j, n+m+1\rangle \\ |\phi_j\rangle &= \end{aligned}$$

□

Introduction is here

4. Main results

Main results are here

Theorem 4.1 (Pan and Zhang [1, p. 682 (1.5)]). *Theorem is here*

Proof. Proof is here [5, Proposition 1.4]

□

Lemma 4.2 (Yun [7]). *Lemma is here*

Proof. Proof is here

□

Corollary 4.3 ([7]). *Corollary is here*

Definition 4.4. Definition is here

Remark 4.1. Remark is here

Conflicts of interest : Declare conflicts of interest or state “The authors declare no conflict of interest.” Authors must identify and declare any personal circumstances or interest that may be perceived as inappropriately influencing the representation or interpretation of reported research results.

Data availability : In this section, please provide details regarding where data supporting reported results can be found, including links to publicly archived datasets analyzed or generated during the study. If the study did not report any data, you might add “Not applicable” here.

Acknowledgments : In this section you can acknowledge any support given which is not covered by the author contribution or funding sections.

REFERENCES

REFERENCES

1. C. Baiocchi and A. Capelo, *Variational and Quasi Variational Inequalities*, J. Wiley and Sons, New York, 1984.
2. Chakraborty, Gilyén and Jeffery. *The Power of Block-Encoded Matrix Powers*, ICALP **132** (2019), 33:1-33:14.
3. Kerenidis, Iordanis and Prakash, Anupam. *Quantum gradient descent for linear systems and least squares*, Phys.Rev.A **2** (2020), 022316.
4. Tang, Ewin, and James Lee. *Quantum Machine Learning Without Any Quantum*, ProQuest Dissertations and Theses, University of Washington (2023), 21-22.
5. D. Chan and J.S. Pang, *The generalized quasi variational inequality problems*, Math. Oper. Research **7** (1982), 211-222.
6. C. Belly, *Variational and Quasi Variational Inequalities*, J. Appl. Math. and Computing **6** (1999), 234-266.
7. D. Pang, *The generalized quasi variational inequality problems*, J. Appl. Math. and Computing **8** (2002), 123-245.

1st Author name received M.Sc. from Seoul National University and Ph.D. at University of Minnesota. Since 1992 he has been at Chungnam National University. His research interests include numerical optimization and biological computation.

Department of Mathematics, Chungnam National University, Daejeon 305-764, Korea.
e-mail: soh@cnu.ac.kr

2nd Author name received M.Sc. from Kyungpook National University, and Ph.D. from Iowa State University. He is currently a professor at Chungbuk National University since 1991. His research interests are computational mathematics, iterative method and parallel computation.

Department of Mathematics, College of Natural Sciences, Chungbuk National University, Cheongju 361-763, Korea.
e-mail: gmjae@chungbuk.ac.kr