

Quadratic fermionic interactions yield effective Hamiltonians for adiabatic quantum computing

Michael J. O'Hara*

Applied Mathematics Program, University of Maryland, College Park MD 20742

Dianne P. O'Leary†

*Department of Computer Science and Institute for Advanced Computer Studies,
University of Maryland, College Park MD 20742; and National Institute of Standards and Technology,
Mathematical and Computational Sciences Division, Gaithersburg MD 20899*

(Dated: November 16, 2018)

Polynomially-large ground-state energy gaps are rare in many-body quantum systems, but useful for adiabatic quantum computing. We show analytically that the gap is generically polynomially-large for quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians. We then prove that adiabatic quantum computing can realize the ground states of Hamiltonians with certain random interactions, as well as the ground states of one, two, and three-dimensional fermionic interaction lattices, in polynomial time. Finally, we use the Jordan-Wigner transformation and a related transformation for spin-3/2 particles to show that our results can be restated using spin operators in a surprisingly simple manner. A direct consequence is that the one-dimensional cluster state can be found in polynomial time using adiabatic quantum computing.

I. INTRODUCTION

Adiabatic quantum computing (AQC) [1] is an approach to quantum computation where a problem is encoded as the ground state of some Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_P . It is assumed that it is feasible to prepare a physical system in the ground state of some simple Hamiltonian \mathcal{H}_0 , and then evolve the Hamiltonian slowly from \mathcal{H}_0 to \mathcal{H}_P . Under the right conditions and if the evolution is done sufficiently slowly [2], then at the end of the evolution the state of the system is the ground state of \mathcal{H}_P . Measurement of this final state reveals the solution to the original problem. As an approach to quantum computing, AQC is known to be equivalent to standard gated quantum computing, in that each can be efficiently simulated by the other [3, 4]. Also, a simple Hamiltonian evolution corresponds to the Grover search algorithm [5].

AQC succeeds in polynomial time if the inverse of the ground-state energy gap is bounded by a polynomial in the problem size. A typical Hamiltonian must fit exponentially-many energy levels into a polynomial-sized energy range, so most energy gaps must be exponentially small. It is not clear *a priori* why the ground-state energy gap should ever be larger than the rest. Let us be more precise. Mathematically, we can construct a Hamiltonian with any given set of 2^n energy levels. Theorem I.1 (below) establishes that large ground-state energy gaps are rare among choices of energy levels.

Theorem I.1 (Large ground-state energy gaps are rare). *Consider uniform random choices of energy levels for a Hermitian operator on n qubits, under the restriction that the ground-state energy is zero and the energies are contained in the unit interval. The fraction of these choices with a ground-state energy gap greater than $2^{-n/2}$ tends to $e^{-2^{n/2}}$ for large n .*

Proof. The ground-state energy gap is larger than some $\epsilon > 0$ provided the $2^n - 1$ non-zero energy levels are selected from the interval $(\epsilon, 1]$. Thus the fraction of choices of energy levels with a ground-state energy gap of at least ϵ is $(1 - \epsilon)^{2^n - 1}$. Let us choose $\epsilon = 2^{-n/2}$, then we have

$$\left(1 - 2^{-n/2}\right)^{2^n - 1} = \left(1 - 2^{-n/2}\right)^{\sqrt{2^n - 1}\sqrt{2^n - 1}} \quad (1)$$

$$\approx \left(e^{-1}\right)^{\sqrt{2^n - 1}} \quad (2)$$

$$\approx e^{-2^{n/2}}. \quad (3)$$

*Email: mjohara@gmail.com

†Email: oleary@cs.umd.edu

In fact, since the dimension of the problem is exponentially large in the number of qubits, it is difficult to even *determine* the minimum ground-state energy gap for large problems. Therefore, it would be useful to identify a class of Hamiltonians meeting the following requirements:

1. The class should have large ground-state energy gaps.
2. The class should have many degrees of freedom and allow many interactions between qubits, so that it represents diverse problem-instances for AQC.
3. The class should include a simple \mathcal{H}_0 for AQC, and be convex, so that $\mathcal{H}(s)$, where

$$\mathcal{H}(s) = (1 - s)\mathcal{H}_0 + s\mathcal{H}_P, \quad (4)$$

stays within the class for $s \in [0, 1]$.

We show that quadratic fermionic interactions can be used to define a class of Hamiltonians meeting all three requirements. In Section II, we develop background on the fermionic commutation relations, necessary for Section III, where we identify a class meeting all three requirements. We show that, provided the interaction coefficients are bounded, the fraction of Hamiltonians with a ground-state energy gap greater than $2x/n$ for any $x > 0$ tends to e^{-x} for large n . For random Hamiltonians whose interaction coefficients are constructed from standard normal Gaussian distributions, we show the ground-state energy gap is $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$. In Section IV, we analytically bound the ground-state energy gap for two and three dimensional lattices of interacting fermions. We then show that AQC can find the ground states of certain random Hamiltonians and these two and three dimensional fermionic lattices in polynomial time. Finally, in Section V we derive alternate representations of these Hamiltonians using the Jordan-Wigner transform and a related transform for spin-3/2 particles, and show that the one-dimensional cluster state may be obtained in polynomial time using adiabatic quantum computation.

II. BACKGROUND ON THE FERMIONIC COMMUTATION RELATIONS

For a detailed exposition on properties of the fermionic commutation relations (FCRs), see, e.g., [6, 7, 8]. Here we only highlight some essential points, mostly without proof, that is needed to develop the results in following sections.

The FCRs on a set of linear operators $\{c_j : j = 1 \dots n\}$ are

$$\{c_j, c_k^\dagger\} = \delta_{j,k}, \quad \{c_j, c_k\} = 0, \quad (5)$$

where the bracket notation indicates the anti-commutator $\{x, y\} = xy + yx$, and δ_{jk} equals the identity operator if $j = k$ and zero otherwise. The superscript dagger denotes the Hermitian adjoint. A consequence of the FCRs is that $\{c_j, c_j^\dagger : j = 1 \dots n\}$ are creation and annihilation operators that anticommute.

Suppose we have a Hamiltonian of the form

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{j=1}^n C_j c_j^\dagger c_j, \quad (6)$$

where the coefficients C_j are positive and real. All the terms in \mathcal{H} commute, and the j^{th} term has eigenvalues 0 and C_j . Now, take the sum of elements in each possible subset (including the empty set) of $\{C_j : j = 1 \dots n\}$. The 2^n resulting values are the eigenvalues of \mathcal{H} . In particular, the ground-state energy of \mathcal{H} is zero, and the ground-state energy gap is the least non-zero coefficient C_j . To decide whether an arbitrary value is an eigenvalue of \mathcal{H} for arbitrary coefficients is NP-complete however, as it is equivalent to the subset-sum problem (also known as the knapsack problem) [6].

We can write many Hamiltonians in the form of (6) using Theorem II.1 (below), originally due to Lieb *et al.* [9]. Suppose we have a *quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian* \mathcal{H} , defined as

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{j,k=1}^n A_{j,k} (c_j^\dagger c_k - c_j c_k^\dagger) + B_{j,k} (c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger - c_j c_k), \quad (7)$$

for some set of real coefficients $A_{j,k}$ and $B_{j,k}$. For convenience, we gather the coefficients $A_{j,k}$ and $B_{j,k}$ into real $n \times n$ matrices that we label A and B . If $B = 0$, then \mathcal{H} represents a Hubbard model with no on-site interactions, for instance electrons in metals [10] or graphene [11]. If A and B are tridiagonal, then \mathcal{H} represents a one-dimensional

chain of interacting spin-1/2 particles. If A and B have three non-zero super- and sub-diagonals, then \mathcal{H} represents a chain of interacting spin-3/2 particles [12]. Also, we can see using the FCRs that different choices of A and B may represent the same Hamiltonian. In particular, for any given Hamiltonian, A can be chosen to be symmetric and B anti-symmetric.

Theorem II.1 establishes that we can write (7) in the form of (6), added to a multiple of the identity. Thus we can easily find the first few eigenvalues of \mathcal{H} , and in particular its ground-state energy gap.

Theorem II.1 (Lieb *et al.*, 1961). *Consider a quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian as in (7), where A is an $n \times n$ real symmetric matrix, B is an $n \times n$ real anti-symmetric matrix, and the operators $\{c_k : k = 1, \dots, n\}$ satisfy the FCRs. Then we can find Λ^2 diagonal and X unitary so that $X(A - B)(A + B) = \Lambda^2 X$, and Y unitary so that $Y(A + B)(A - B) = \Lambda^2 Y$. Define the operators $\{\eta_j : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ by*

$$\left. \begin{aligned} \eta_j &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n (X_{jk} + Y_{jk}) c_k + (X_{jk} - Y_{jk}) c_k^\dagger \\ \eta_j^\dagger &= \frac{1}{2} \sum_{k=1}^n (X_{jk} - Y_{jk}) c_k + (X_{jk} + Y_{jk}) c_k^\dagger \end{aligned} \right\} j = 1 \dots n. \quad (8)$$

Then $\{\eta_j : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ satisfy the FCRs, and

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{j=1}^n 2\Lambda_j \eta_j^\dagger \eta_j - \left(\sum_{j=1}^n \Lambda_j \right) I_{2^n}, \quad (9)$$

where Λ_j denotes the j^{th} entry on the diagonal of the matrix Λ and I_{2^n} is the identity operator.

Proof. See the appendix. □

Theorem II.1 was used initially by Lieb *et al.* to find the spectrum of the one-dimensional XY model, and subsequently has been used, for instance, in the analysis of the one-dimensional model of free electron transport [7]. Quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians as in (7) have also sparked recent interest because of their application to quantum complexity theory. If one takes a set of gates defined by $U = \exp(i\mathcal{H}t)$ for some t and a constant quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} in the form of (7), then one obtains a set of gates that resembles a universal set, but in fact may be classically simulated [13]. Broader sets of gates that can be classically simulated have been identified [14, 15]. To classically simulate an evolving Hamiltonian, it has been shown [4] that Hamiltonian evolutions may be efficiently approximated by discretizing the evolution into a sequence of short, constant Hamiltonians. Theorem II.1 has also been used to find efficient sets of quantum gates for computing properties of quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians in the form (7) [16]. Further, the relationship between a vanishing energy gap and discontinuity in the ground state has been studied for these Hamiltonians [17].

The Jordan-Wigner transformation applied to the Hamiltonian evolution

$$\mathcal{H}(s) = (1 - s) \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j^z + s \sum_{j=1}^{n-1} \sigma_j^x \sigma_{j+1}^x \quad (10)$$

transforms $\mathcal{H}(s)$ into a quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian in the form of (7), thus providing a means for determining the spectrum for any $s \in [0, 1]$. In fact, this evolution exhibits a second-order quantum phase transition, and a ground-state energy gap that decreases as $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$ [18, 19], which is surprisingly large. Yet much broader classes of quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians in the form of (7) also have remarkably large ground-state energy gaps.

Since $(A + B)^\dagger = A - B$, and since the singular values of a matrix M are the square roots of the eigenvalues of $M^\dagger M$, we see that Λ_j from (9) is a singular value of $A + B$. Further, C_j in (6) can be defined to be $2\Lambda_j$. Thus, if $A + B$ is non-singular, then twice the least singular value is the ground-state energy gap of \mathcal{H} . If $A + B$ is singular, then \mathcal{H} has a degenerate ground state, and the least non-zero singular value is the energy gap between the ground-state subspace and the higher energy levels of the Hamiltonian. In any case, since $A + B$ has only n eigenvalues, in contrast to \mathcal{H} which has 2^n , we might expect that often the least singular value of $A + B$ is not exponentially small in n . Then the ground-state energy gap of \mathcal{H} would not be exponentially small. In the next section we state and prove more precise formulations of this claim.

III. A CLASS OF HAMILTONIANS MEETING THE REQUIREMENTS OF AQC

The class of quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians represented by (7) in fact meets all three requirements to be useful for adiabatic quantum computing. To establish that the ground-state energy gaps are large (Requirement 1), we provide

two theorems. In Theorem III.1 (below), we take a particular distribution of coefficient matrices A and B under the restriction $\|A + B\|_2 \leq 1$, and establish that the ground-state energy gap is $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$. Here all matrix norms are assumed to be the two-norm, which is equal to the square root of the largest singular value. Then, in Theorem III.3, we show that the ground-state energy gap is $\mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$ for Gaussian-distributed interaction coefficients.

Theorem III.1 (Ground-state energy gaps of quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians with bounded coefficients). *Choose a real diagonal $n \times n$ matrix Σ uniformly at random with entries in the unit interval, and choose U and V according to any probability distribution over orthogonal $n \times n$ matrices. Then $C = U\Sigma V^\dagger$ represents a distribution over all real matrices with $\|C\|_2 \leq 1$. Take A to be the symmetric part of C and B to be the anti-symmetric part of C , e.g. $A = (C + C^\dagger)/2$ and $B = (C - C^\dagger)/2$, and let \mathcal{H} be defined as in (7). The probability that the ground-state energy gap of \mathcal{H} is greater than $2x/n$, for any $x > 0$, tends to e^{-x} for large n .*

Proof. If the ground-state energy gap \mathcal{H} is greater than $2x/n$, then the singular values of C are contained in the interval $(x/n, 1)$. The fraction of choices for Σ where this is true is

$$\left(1 - \frac{x}{n}\right)^n = \left[\left(1 - \frac{x}{n}\right)^{n/x}\right]^x, \quad (11)$$

which tends to e^{-x} for large n . □

To determine the ground-state energy gap for Gaussian-distributed interaction coefficients, we first need the following theorem about random matrices, due to Edelman [20, Corollary 3.1].

Theorem III.2 (Edelman, 1988). *Let C be an $n \times n$ matrix, whose elements have independent Gaussian distributions with mean zero and unit variance. We denote such distributions as $N(0,1)$. Let ς be the least singular value of C . Then for large n , $n\varsigma^2$ converges in distribution to*

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1 + \sqrt{x}}{2\sqrt{x}} e^{-(x/2 + \sqrt{x})}. \quad (12)$$

Since $n\varsigma^2$ has a probability distribution that is asymptotically independent of n , it follows that $\varsigma = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$. Also, (12) implies that $\varsigma \neq 0$ with probability one. Similar results for other ensembles of random matrices are known [21].

Let us now apply Theorem III.2 to quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians in the form of (7).

Theorem III.3 (Ground-state energy gaps of quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians with Gaussian coefficients). *Let C be an $n \times n$ matrix with independent $N(0,1)$ coefficients, let A be the symmetric part of C , and let B be the anti-symmetric part of C , so*

$$A = \frac{C + C^\dagger}{2}, \quad B = \frac{C - C^\dagger}{2}, \quad (13)$$

and $C = A + B$. Define

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{j,k=1}^n A_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k - c_j c_k^\dagger \right) + B_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger - c_j c_k \right), \quad (14)$$

and let γ be the ground-state energy gap of \mathcal{H} . Then, for large n , $n\gamma^2/4$ converges in distribution to $\rho(x)$ defined in (12).

Proof. By Theorem III.2, if $\gamma/2$ is the least singular value of C , then $n\gamma^2/4$ converges in distribution to $\rho(x)$ for large n . Theorem III.2 also implies that C is non-singular with probability one, so γ is the ground-state energy gap. □

Since $n\gamma^2/4$ has a probability distribution that is asymptotically independent of n , $\gamma = \mathcal{O}(1/\sqrt{n})$. Recalling Theorem I.1, we see this is a remarkable property. Since there must be 2^n distinct energy levels in an energy range of $\mathcal{O}(n^2)$, most of the energy gaps must be exponentially small. In fact it can be shown that the Hamiltonians in Theorem III.3 are with probability one non-degenerate, so these exponentially small gaps are also non-zero. Figure 1 illustrates the difference between the distribution of the ground-state energy gaps and the rest of the gaps for 1000 randomly-generated 10-qubit Hamiltonians, and indeed the ground-state energy gaps are typically much larger than the other gaps.

To establish that quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians as in (7) have many interaction degrees of freedom (Requirement 2), we observe that for n qubits there are $n(n+1)/2$ continuous degrees of freedom in choosing a real symmetric




FIG. 1: The ground-state energy gap distribution is compared to the distribution for the other energy gaps. All the energy levels are computed for 1000 random $n = 10$ (10-qubit) Hamiltonians. Each Hamiltonian is chosen randomly as described in Theorem III.3. As predicted by Theorem III.3, the ground-state energy gaps are much larger than the other gaps.

$n \times n$ matrix A , and $n(n-1)/2$ continuous degrees of freedom in choosing a real anti-symmetric matrix B . The total degrees of freedom are thus n^2 .

Finally, it is obvious that if two quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians are in the form of (7), then their sum is a quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian in that form (Requirement 3). We choose, as our initial Hamiltonian for AQC,

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(2c_j^\dagger c_j - I_{2^n} \right) = \sum_{j=1}^n \left(c_j^\dagger c_j - c_j c_j^\dagger \right). \quad (15)$$

The ground state of this Hamiltonian is easy to construct. For example, for electrons in a metal, c_j is the annihilation operator for electron occupation at site j , and then the ground state of \mathcal{H}_0 is the state with each site unoccupied. Then the whole Hamiltonian evolution $\mathcal{H}(s)$ is a quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian in the form of (7), where

$$\mathcal{H}(s) = (1-s)\mathcal{H}_0 + s \sum_{j,k=1}^n \left[A_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k - c_j c_k^\dagger \right) + B_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger - c_j c_k \right) \right]. \quad (16)$$

To find the ground-state energy gap of $\mathcal{H}(s)$, we define

$$\begin{aligned} \check{A}(s) &= (1-s)I_{2^n} + sA, \\ \check{B}(s) &= sB. \end{aligned} \quad (17)$$

Then we can rewrite Equation (16) as

$$\mathcal{H}(s) = \sum_{j,k=1}^n \check{A}_{j,k}(s) \left(c_j^\dagger c_k - c_j c_k^\dagger \right) + \check{B}_{j,k}(s) \left(c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger - c_j c_k \right), \quad (18)$$

and twice the least non-zero singular value of $\check{A}(s) + \check{B}(s)$ is the ground-state energy gap of $\mathcal{H}(s)$.

We cannot directly use Theorem III.3 to establish that the ground-state energy gap is large for *all* of $\mathcal{H}(s)$ in (16), since Theorem III.3 is a probabilistic result for a single random Hamiltonian. However, for several special classes of Hamiltonians in (16), we *can* establish that the gap is large throughout an evolution.

IV. HAMILTONIAN EVOLUTIONS WITH LARGE GROUND-STATE ENERGY GAPS

There are several classes of A and B for which we can easily find the least singular value of $\check{A}(s) + \check{B}(s)$ as defined in (17), and thus find the minimum ground-state energy gap of the evolution in (16). We do this for certain random choices of A and B , and also two and three-dimensional interaction lattices.




FIG. 2: Eigenvalues of $\mathcal{H}(s)$ as a function of s , where $\mathcal{H}(s)$ was defined as in Theorem IV.1 with $A = CC^\dagger/n$ for $n = 8$. The division by n is so that $\|\mathcal{H}(0)\| \approx \|\mathcal{H}(1)\|$, resulting in a better visualization although making the ground-state energy gap $\mathcal{O}(1/n^2)$ instead of $\mathcal{O}(1/n)$. We can see that the ground-state energy gap is linearly decreasing with s as predicted by Theorem IV.1, and is much larger than most of the other energy gaps.

If $A + B$ is symmetric positive semi-definite, we can determine the least singular value of $\check{A}(s) + \check{B}(s)$ from the least singular value of $A + B$. In that case $B = 0$ and thus $\mathcal{H}(1)$ represents a Hubbard model with no on-site interactions. In order to choose random samples of symmetric positive semi-definite matrices, we first choose C to be an $n \times n$ matrix with independent random $N(0,1)$ elements, as before, and then set $A = CC^\dagger$ and $B = 0$.

Theorem IV.1 (Ground-state energy gaps for random Hamiltonian evolutions). *Let C be an $n \times n$ matrix with independent $N(0,1)$ coefficients, and let $A = CC^\dagger$. Define*

$$\mathcal{H}(s) = (1-s)\mathcal{H}_0 + s \sum_{j,k=1}^n A_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k - c_j c_k^\dagger \right). \quad (19)$$

Then the ground-state energy gap for $\mathcal{H}(s)$ is

$$\check{\gamma}(s) = 2(1-s) + s\gamma, \quad (20)$$

where $n\gamma/2$ converges in distribution for large n to $\rho(x)$ defined in (12).

Proof. Let us label the least singular value of C as $\sqrt{\gamma/2}$. Then by Theorem III.2, for large n , $n\gamma/2$ converges in distribution to the density function $\rho(x)$, and is non-zero with probability one. Since $A = CC^\dagger$ is symmetric positive semi-definite, $\gamma/2$ is its least singular value. Thus γ is the ground-state energy gap of $\mathcal{H}(1)$.

Define

$$\check{A}(s) = (1-s)I_n + sA, \quad (21)$$

then the ground-state energy gap $\check{\gamma}(s)$ of $\mathcal{H}(s)$ is twice the least non-zero singular value of $\check{A}(s)$. Notice A and I are symmetric positive semi-definite, and diagonal in the same basis. Since $\gamma/2$ is the least eigenvalue of A , we have

$$\frac{\check{\gamma}(s)}{2} = (1-s) + s \left(\frac{\gamma}{2} \right). \quad (22)$$

□

Figure 2 illustrates the energy levels for an 8-qubit instance of a random evolution as in (19). Evidently the ground-state energy gap is larger than the other gaps throughout the evolution.

If $A + B$ is not symmetric, then the eigenvalues of $G(s) = (\check{A}(s) + \check{B}(s))(\check{A}(s) - \check{B}(s))$ are of interest. We explore three classes of matrices where finding these eigenvalues is easy, namely, generalizations of the one-dimensional XY model, and generalizations of two and three-dimensional lattices of interacting fermions.

The one-dimensional XY model is expressed with A and B matrices such as [9, p. 413]:

$$A = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & 1 \\ 1 & 0 & 1 & \\ & 1 & 0 & \cdot \\ 1 & & \cdot & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} 0 & 1 & & -1 \\ -1 & 0 & 1 & \\ & -1 & 0 & \cdot \\ 1 & & \cdot & 1 & 0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (23)$$

where omitted entries are zero. The ground state of the one-dimensional XY model can be found in polynomial time with AQC [18, 19]. In fact, this holds for more general choices of A and B . An essential property of the definitions in (23) is that each row is a cyclic shift of the previous row. Such matrices are called *circulant*. For n qubits, it is easy to check that there are n degrees of freedom in choosing a symmetric circulant matrix A and anti-symmetric circulant matrix B . We show that AQC can find the ground state of any Hamiltonian with circulant A and B matrices in polynomial time.

Theorem IV.2 (Ground-state energy gaps for circulant A and B matrices). *Let*

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{j,k=1}^n \left(A_{j,k} (c_j^\dagger c_k - c_j c_k^\dagger) + B_{j,k} (c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger - c_j c_k) \right), \quad (24)$$

where A is a real circulant $n \times n$ symmetric matrix, and B is a real circulant anti-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix. Then the ground-state energy gap of \mathcal{H} is bounded from below by a polynomial in $1/n$.

Proof. Circulant matrices form a commutative ring [22, p. 201], so if A and B are circulant, then so is $G = (A + B)(A - B)$. Also, G is symmetric positive semi-definite, and the ground-state energy gap of \mathcal{H} is twice the square root of the least non-zero eigenvalue of G .

Circulant matrices also have the nice property that their eigenvalues are given by the discrete Fourier transform of their first column [23, p. 124]. The $n \times n$ Fourier transform matrix is

$$F_n = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \begin{pmatrix} e^{(0 \cdot 0)2\pi i/n} & e^{(0 \cdot 1)2\pi i/n} & e^{(0 \cdot 2)2\pi i/n} & \dots \\ e^{(1 \cdot 0)2\pi i/n} & e^{(1 \cdot 1)2\pi i/n} & e^{(1 \cdot 2)2\pi i/n} & \dots \\ e^{(2 \cdot 0)2\pi i/n} & e^{(2 \cdot 1)2\pi i/n} & e^{(2 \cdot 2)2\pi i/n} & \dots \\ \dots & \dots & \dots & \dots \\ e^{((n-1) \cdot 0)2\pi i/n} & e^{((n-1) \cdot 1)2\pi i/n} & e^{((n-1) \cdot 2)2\pi i/n} & \dots \end{pmatrix}. \quad (25)$$

Recall we label the eigenvalues of G as Λ_k^2 . Labeling the entries in the first column of G as g_k , we can write:

$$\begin{pmatrix} \Lambda_1^2 \\ \Lambda_2^2 \\ \Lambda_3^2 \\ \dots \\ \Lambda_n^2 \end{pmatrix} = F_n \begin{pmatrix} g_1 \\ g_2 \\ g_3 \\ \dots \\ g_n \end{pmatrix}. \quad (26)$$

Also, G is symmetric so $g_k = g_{n+2-k}$ for $k \geq 2$. Then we have, for n odd:

$$\Lambda_k^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left[g_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{(n+1)/2} g_j \left(e^{((j-1) \cdot (k-1))2\pi i/n} + e^{((n-j+1) \cdot (k-1))2\pi i/n} \right) \right] \quad (27)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left[g_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{(n+1)/2} g_j \left(e^{((j-1) \cdot (k-1))2\pi i/n} + e^{-((j-1) \cdot (k-1))2\pi i/n} \right) \right] \quad (28)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left[g_1 + \sum_{j=2}^{(n+1)/2} g_j \cos \left(\frac{2\pi(j-1)(k-1)}{n} \right) \right]. \quad (29)$$

For n even we have a leftover term, but it simplifies:

$$\Lambda_k^2 = \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left[g_1 + g_{n/2+1} e^{((n/2) \cdot (k-1)) 2\pi i/n} + \sum_{j=2}^{n/2} g_j \cos \left(\frac{2\pi(j-1)(k-1)}{n} \right) \right] \quad (30)$$

$$= \frac{1}{\sqrt{n}} \left[g_1 + (-1)^{(k-1)} g_{n/2+1} + \sum_{j=2}^{n/2} g_j \cos \left(\frac{2\pi(j-1)(k-1)}{n} \right) \right]. \quad (31)$$

For $n \geq 1$, we have $1/n \leq 1/\sqrt{n}$. So whether n is even or odd, Taylor expansion of the cosine makes it clear that if $\Lambda_k \neq 0$ then Λ_k is bounded from below by a polynomial in $1/n$. So the ground-state energy gap of \mathcal{H} is bounded from below by a polynomial in $1/n$. \square

We can extend this result to a whole Hamiltonian evolution.

Corollary IV.3 (Hamiltonian evolutions with circulant A and B matrices). *Let*

$$\mathcal{H}(s) = (1-s)\mathcal{H}_0 + s \sum_{j,k=1}^n \left(A_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k - c_j c_k^\dagger \right) + B_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger - c_j c_k \right) \right), \quad (32)$$

where A is a real circulant $n \times n$ symmetric matrix, and B is a real circulant anti-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix. Then the ground-state energy gap of $\mathcal{H}(s)$ is bounded from below by a polynomial in $1/n$ and s .

Proof. First rewrite $\mathcal{H}(s)$ as in (18). The elements of the matrix

$$\check{G}(s) = \left(\check{A}(s) + \check{B}(s) \right) \left(\check{A}(s) - \check{B}(s) \right) \quad (33)$$

are quadratic functions of s , and $\check{A}(s)$ and $\check{B}(s)$ are circulant. Then we can follow the proof of Theorem IV.2 to see that the eigenvalues of $\check{G}(s)$ are bounded by a polynomial in s and $1/n$, and so the ground-state energy gap of $\mathcal{H}(s)$ is bounded from below by a polynomial in $1/n$ and s . \square

Circulant coefficient matrices other than the XY model include scenarios such as non-nearest neighbor interactions on a one-dimensional chain of interacting fermions. The restriction that A and B are circulant imposes the requirement that the interaction strengths are independent of position, and it imposes periodic boundary conditions. It should be noted that while circulant matrices yield to elegant analysis, these results could be extended to interaction matrices derived from other boundary conditions. For instance, if G is symmetric Toeplitz tridiagonal (Toeplitz matrices are those with constant diagonals), then its eigenvalues may be found analytically [24, p. 158]. Analysis of the two and three-dimensional interaction grids then builds on the one-dimensional analysis in exact analogy to the circulant case.

Now let us consider the case of a two-dimensional lattice of interacting fermions with periodic boundary conditions. The A and B matrices then have a block structure such as

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} A_0 & I & & I \\ I & A_0 & I & \\ & & \cdot & \cdot \\ & & I & A_0 & I \\ I & & & I & A_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad B = \begin{pmatrix} B_0 & I & & -I \\ -I & B_0 & I & \\ & & \cdot & \cdot \\ & & -I & B_0 & I \\ I & & & -I & B_0 \end{pmatrix}, \quad (34)$$

where B_0 and A_0 are as in (23). Evidently each block is circulant, and A and B are circulant in the blocks. Such matrices are called ‘‘block circulant with circulant blocks’’ (BCCB). Let us assume that the blocks are $p \times p$, and there are q blocks per row, so $n = pq$.

Theorem IV.4 (Ground-state energy gaps for BCCB A and B matrices). *Let A and B be $n \times n$ BCCB matrices with $p \times p$ blocks and q blocks per row, so $pq = n$. Assume A is real symmetric and B is real anti-symmetric. Define the quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} with A and B as in (7). Then the ground-state energy gap of \mathcal{H} is bounded from below by a polynomial in $1/n$.*

Proof. It is easy to check $G = (A+B)(A-B)$ is BCCB, and since G is symmetric, it is block symmetric and its blocks are symmetric. Then $T^\dagger G T$ is diagonal [25], where

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} F_p & & \\ & F_p & \\ & & \ddots \end{pmatrix} P_y \begin{pmatrix} F_q & & \\ & F_q & \\ & & \ddots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (35)$$

and P_y is a permutation matrix that re-orders the columns as $(1, p+1, 2p+1, \dots, (q-1)p+1, 2, p+2, 2p+2, \dots)$. The matrix T diagonalizes G by first diagonalizing the blocks of G , then reordering the rows and columns so that the matrix is block diagonal with circulant blocks, and finally diagonalizing those blocks. Geometrically, this procedure can be thought of as a Fourier transform first along the horizontal axis of the lattice and then along the vertical axis.

The eigenvalues of G are then the eigenvalues of symmetric circulant matrices, whose entries are the eigenvalues of symmetric circulant matrices. Following the proof of Theorem IV.2, we can see that the non-zero eigenvalues of G are bounded from below by a polynomial in $1/n$. \square

We can extend this result to a whole Hamiltonian evolution:

Corollary IV.5 (Hamiltonian evolutions with BCCB A and B matrices). *Let*

$$\mathcal{H}(s) = (1-s)\mathcal{H}_0 + s \sum_{j,k=1}^n \left[A_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k - c_j c_k^\dagger \right) + B_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger - c_j c_k \right) \right], \quad (36)$$

where A is a real BCCB $n \times n$ symmetric matrix, and B is a real BCCB anti-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix. Then the ground-state energy gap of $\mathcal{H}(s)$ is bounded from below by a polynomial in $1/n$ and s .

Proof. The proof is analogous to the proof of Corollary IV.3. \square

We can even do the three-dimensional lattice of interacting fermions. Then the A and B matrices are as in (34), but A_0 and B_0 are BCCB instead of circulant. Let us call these matrices “block circulant with BCCB blocks”, or $(BC)^2CB$.

Theorem IV.6 (Ground-state energy gaps for $(BC)^2CB$ A and B matrices). *Let A and B be $n \times n$ $(BC)^2CB$ matrices. Let the number of blocks be r , and the BCCB blocks contain q circulant subblocks each $p \times p$, so $n = pqr$. Define the quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian \mathcal{H} with A and B as in (7). Then the ground-state energy gap of \mathcal{H} is bounded from below by a polynomial in $1/n$.*

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Theorem IV.4, but we set

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} F_p & & \\ & F_p & \\ & & \ddots \end{pmatrix} P_y \begin{pmatrix} F_q & & \\ & F_q & \\ & & \ddots \end{pmatrix} P_z \begin{pmatrix} F_r & & \\ & F_r & \\ & & \ddots \end{pmatrix}, \quad (37)$$

where P_z is a permutation matrix that re-orders the columns as $(1, pq+1, 2pq+1, \dots, (r-1)pq+1, 2, pq+2, 2pq+2, \dots)$. This transformation first diagonalizes the BCCB blocks, then permutes rows and columns to obtain a block-diagonal matrix with circulant blocks, and diagonalizes the remaining blocks. \square

We can extend this result to a whole Hamiltonian evolution:

Corollary IV.7 (Hamiltonian evolutions with $(BC)^2CB$ A and B matrices). *Let*

$$\mathcal{H}(s) = (1-s)\mathcal{H}_0 + s \sum_{j,k=1}^n \left[A_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k - c_j c_k^\dagger \right) + B_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger - c_j c_k \right) \right], \quad (38)$$

where A is a real $(BC)^2CB$ $n \times n$ symmetric matrix, and B is a real $(BC)^2CB$ anti-symmetric $n \times n$ matrix. Then the ground-state energy gap of $\mathcal{H}(s)$ is bounded from below by a polynomial in $1/n$ and s .

Proof. The proof is analogous to that of Corollary IV.3. \square

V. REPRESENTATIONS OF THE HAMILTONIANS

Using the Jordan-Wigner transformation, we can define Hamiltonians using other kinds of particle operators that also have large ground-state energy gaps. In the Hubbard model of free electrons, interaction terms such as $c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger - c_j c_k$ do not occur because they do not conserve the number of electrons. However, they may occur in spin systems

transformed into fermionic representations. The best-known example is the Hamiltonian resulting from the Jordan-Wigner transformation applied to the XY-model [9]. Let us first identify *all* the Hamiltonians that, under the Jordan-Wigner transformation [26]

$$\begin{aligned} c_j &= (-1)^{j-1} \sigma_1^z \sigma_2^z \dots \sigma_{j-1}^z \left(\frac{\sigma_j^x - i\sigma_j^y}{2} \right), \\ c_j^\dagger &= (-1)^{j-1} \sigma_1^z \sigma_2^z \dots \sigma_{j-1}^z \left(\frac{\sigma_j^x + i\sigma_j^y}{2} \right), \end{aligned} \quad (39)$$

yield a quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian in the form of (7). Theorem V.1 is equivalent to the result in [27, p. 4], but using a different basis representation.

Theorem V.1 (Quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians represented with Pauli operators). *There is a bijection between Hamiltonians on n qubits of the form*

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{j=1}^n W_{j,j} \sigma_j^z + \sum_{k>j} W_{j,k} \sigma_j^x \sigma_{j+1}^z \dots \sigma_{k-1}^z \sigma_k^x + \sum_{k>j} W_{k,j} \sigma_j^y \sigma_{j+1}^z \dots \sigma_{k-1}^z \sigma_k^y, \quad (40)$$

where the coefficients $W_{j,k}$ are real, and Hamiltonians of the form

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{j,k=1}^n A_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k - c_j c_k^\dagger \right) + B_{j,k} \left(c_j^\dagger c_k^\dagger - c_j c_k \right), \quad (41)$$

where $\{c_j : j = 1, \dots, n\}$, defined by (39), satisfy the FCRs, A is a real symmetric $n \times n$ matrix, and B is a real anti-symmetric matrix. The bijection is given by the invertible transformation

$$\begin{aligned} A_{j,j} &= W_{j,j}, \\ A_{j,j+m} &= A_{j,j+m} = \frac{(-1)^{m+1}}{2} (W_{j,j+m} + W_{j+m,j}), \\ B_{j,j+m} &= -B_{j,j+m} = \frac{(-1)^{m+1}}{2} (W_{j,j+m} - W_{j+m,j}). \end{aligned} \quad (42)$$

Proof. Apply (39) to (41), and use the commutation relations for Pauli operators to simplify the result. \square

Using Theorem V.1, we can restate earlier results in a surprisingly simple manner. First, observe that application of Theorem V.1 to \mathcal{H}_0 defined in (15) yields

$$\mathcal{H}_0 = \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j^z. \quad (43)$$

The ground state of \mathcal{H}_0 is the configuration with each particle in a spin-down eigenstate of σ^z . If \mathcal{H}_P is in the form of (40), then so is the Hamiltonian evolution

$$\mathcal{H}(s) = (1-s) \sum_{j=1}^n \sigma_j^z + s \mathcal{H}_P, \quad (44)$$

for $0 \leq s \leq 1$.

Next, observe that, up to sign, the elements of the matrix W are the same those of $A + B$. So to find the ground-state energy gap for a Hamiltonian that can be written in the form of (40), we only need to apply the necessary sign changes to the elements of W , find the least non-zero singular value of the resulting matrix, and multiply by two. Thus Theorem III.3 can be applied to the Hamiltonians in (40) yielding a simple result:

Theorem V.2 (Ground-state energy gaps of Hamiltonians defined using Pauli operators with Gaussian coefficients). *Let \mathcal{H} be defined by (40), where the elements of W are $N(0,1)$ and independent. Let γ be the ground-state energy gap of \mathcal{H} . Then, for large n , $n\gamma^2/4$ converges in distribution to the probability density function*

$$\rho(x) = \frac{1 + \sqrt{x}}{2\sqrt{x}} e^{-(x/2 + \sqrt{x})}. \quad (45)$$

Proof. Observe that the entries of W are, up to sign, those of $A + B$ as defined by Theorem V.1. Thus $A + B$ has independent $N(0,1)$ entries, so we have the same proof as Theorem III.3. \square

The universal two-dimensional cluster state may be found in polynomial time using AQC [28]. The one-dimensional cluster state, while not universal for quantum computing, is useful for gaining intuition about cluster states [29]. The third-order interaction terms in (40) are exactly the stabilizers of the one-dimensional cluster state [30]. In fact

$$\mathcal{H} = - \sum_{j=2}^{n-1} \sigma_j^x \sigma_{j+1}^z \sigma_{j+2}^x + (-1)^{n-1} \sigma_1^y \sigma_2^z \sigma_3^z \dots \sigma_{n-2}^z \sigma_{n-1}^y + (-1)^{n-1} \sigma_2^y \sigma_3^z \sigma_4^z \dots \sigma_{n-1}^z \sigma_n^y \quad (46)$$

is a Hamiltonian whose ground state is the one-dimensional cluster state. By Theorem V.1 A and B matrices corresponding to \mathcal{H} are circulant, and so by Theorem IV.2 the one-dimensional cluster state can be realized in polynomial time.

In general, we can define Fermi operators using spin- S operators provided $2S + 1 = 2^n$ for some n [12]. Let us consider $S = 3/2$. Using n spin-3/2 particles, we can define $2n$ Fermi operators by

$$c_{1,j} = \frac{-1}{\sqrt{3}} S_j^- S_j^z S_j^- \prod_{k < j} \left[\frac{5}{4} - (S_k^z)^2 \right], \quad (47)$$

$$c_{2,j} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{3}} \left(\frac{1}{2} + S_j^z \right)^2 S_j^- \prod_{k < j} \left[\frac{5}{4} - (S_k^z)^2 \right], \quad (48)$$

where S^x , S^y , and S^z are spin-3/2 operators and $S^\pm = S^x \pm iS^y$. While the standard Jordan-Wigner transform applied to a one-dimensional chain of spin-1/2 particles results in a tridiagonal B matrix, the spin-3/2 transform applied to a one-dimensional chain of spin-3/2 particles yields a pentadiagonal B matrix.

VI. CONCLUSION

We showed that polynomially-large ground-state energy gaps are rare in many-body quantum Hermitian operators, but the gap is generically polynomially-large for quadratic fermionic Hamiltonians. We then proved that adiabatic quantum computing can realize the ground states of Hamiltonians with certain random interactions, as well as the ground states of one, two, and three-dimensional fermionic interaction lattices, in polynomial time. Finally, we used the Jordan-Wigner transformation to show that our results can be restated with Pauli operators in a surprisingly simple manner, and also consider a related spin-3/2 transformation.

Since quadratic fermionic Hamiltonian evolutions are classically simulatable, the adiabatic quantum computations in Section IV are simulatable. Thus we have provided a polynomial-time classical algorithm for finding properties of the ground states of certain random-interaction Hamiltonians and fermionic interaction lattices in one, two, and three dimensions.

It should be noted that the Jordan-Wigner transformation can be generalized to higher dimensions, e.g. [31]. Interesting results may follow from application of these alternate transformations to our theorems.

Some fermionic systems may only approximately decouple into “non-interacting quasiparticles”, unlike the exact decouplings studied here. These systems may be “approximately” classically simulatable have “approximately” polynomially-large ground state energy gaps. This may be interesting to explore.

Also, in principle, the decoupling-transformation may be classically difficult to find, whereas in the Hamiltonians studied here it is known how to find them. It is interesting whether similar results could be obtained for systems where the transformation is difficult to find explicitly.

APPENDIX A: PROOF OF THE LIEB *ET AL.* THEOREM

For completeness we include a proof of Theorem II.1. We first need the property that the fermionic commutation relations are preserved under certain unitary transformations.

Theorem A.1 (Unitary transformations). *Suppose the operators $\{c_j : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ obey the FCRs. Let*

$$T = \begin{pmatrix} U & V \\ V & U \end{pmatrix}, \quad (A1)$$

where U and V are real $n \times n$ matrices, and suppose T is unitary. Define the set of operators $\{\eta_j : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ by

$$\begin{pmatrix} \eta_1 \\ \eta_2 \\ \vdots \\ \eta_n \\ \eta_1^\dagger \\ \eta_2^\dagger \\ \vdots \\ \eta_n^\dagger \end{pmatrix} = T \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \\ \vdots \\ c_n \\ c_1^\dagger \\ c_2^\dagger \\ \vdots \\ c_n^\dagger \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where (A2) denotes the transformation

$$\eta_j = \sum_{i=1}^n T_{j,i} c_i + T_{j,i+n} c_{i+n}^\dagger. \quad (\text{A3})$$

Then $\{\eta_j : j = 1, \dots, n\}$ also obey the FCRs.

Proof. The proof follows from substituting the definitions of $\{\eta_j : j = 1 \dots n\}$ into the FCRs, and using the known commutation relations on $\{c_j, c_j^\dagger : j = 1 \dots n\}$. \square

Now we are ready to prove Theorem II.1:

Proof of Theorem II.1. We write Equation (7) as

$$\mathcal{H} = \begin{pmatrix} c_1^\dagger & c_2^\dagger & \dots & c_n^\dagger & c_1 & c_2 & \dots & c_n \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B & -A \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} c_1 \\ c_2 \\ \vdots \\ c_n \\ c_1^\dagger \\ c_2^\dagger \\ \vdots \\ c_n^\dagger \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A4})$$

The theorem is equivalent to showing there are solutions to

$$\begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B & -A \end{pmatrix} = \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} (X+Y) & (X-Y) \\ (X-Y) & (X+Y) \end{pmatrix}^\dagger \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & -\Lambda \end{pmatrix} \frac{1}{2} \begin{pmatrix} (X+Y) & (X-Y) \\ (X-Y) & (X+Y) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (\text{A5})$$

for some non-negative real $n \times n$ diagonal matrix Λ , where X and Y are unitary. If so, then substituting Equation (A5) into Equation (A4) and using the definition of η_k , we get

$$\mathcal{H} = \sum_{k=1}^n \left(\Lambda_k \eta_k^\dagger \eta_k - \Lambda_k \eta_k \eta_k^\dagger \right). \quad (\text{A6})$$

Further, by Theorem A.1, $\{\eta_k : k = 1 \dots n\}$ satisfy the FCRs. So we can apply the FCRs to the second term in each summand to get Equation (9).

Now we set about finding solutions to Equation (A5). We rewrite it for convenience as:

$$\begin{pmatrix} X+Y & X-Y \\ X-Y & X+Y \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} A & B \\ -B & -A \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} \Lambda & 0 \\ 0 & -\Lambda \end{pmatrix} \begin{pmatrix} X+Y & X-Y \\ X-Y & X+Y \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{A7})$$

Equation (A7) is equivalent to the following four equations:

$$(X + Y)A - (X - Y)B = \Lambda(X + Y) , \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$(X + Y)B - (X - Y)A = \Lambda(X - Y) , \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$(X - Y)A - (X + Y)B = -\Lambda(X - Y) , \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$(X - Y)B - (X + Y)A = -\Lambda(X + Y) . \quad (\text{A11})$$

Evidently only two of the equations are independent. Adding and subtracting Equations (A8) and (A10) yields

$$X(A - B) = \Lambda Y , \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$Y(A + B) = \Lambda X . \quad (\text{A13})$$

We can left-multiply by Λ to get

$$\Lambda X(A - B) = \Lambda^2 Y , \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$\Lambda Y(A + B) = \Lambda^2 X , \quad (\text{A15})$$

and then substitute Equation (A13) into Equation (A14) and Equation (A12) into Equation (A15) to get the pair of eigen-decomposition equations

$$Y(A + B)(A - B) = \Lambda^2 Y , \quad (\text{A16})$$

$$X(A - B)(A + B) = \Lambda^2 X . \quad (\text{A17})$$

Since A is real symmetric and B is real anti-symmetric, $(A + B)^\dagger = A - B$ and so $(A - B)(A + B)$ and $(A + B)(A - B)$ are symmetric positive semi-definite. So there is always a unitary X and Y with non-negative diagonal Λ^2 satisfying Equations (A16) and (A17). \square

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This research is supported in part by National Science Foundation Grant CCF 0514213. The authors would like to thank Stephen Bullock, Gavin Brennen, William Kaminsky, Charles Clark, Ana Maria Rey, E. ‘‘Manny’’ Knill, and Eite Tiesinga for helpful comments and feedback.

-
- [1] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, S. Gutmann, J. Lapan, A. Lundgren, and D. Preda, *Science* **292**, 472 (2001).
 - [2] M. J. O’Hara and D. P. O’Leary, *Physical Review A* **77**, 042319 (2008).
 - [3] D. Aharonov, W. van Dam, J. Kempe, Z. Landau, S. Lloyd, and O. Regev, *SIAM Journal on Computing* **37**, 166 (2007).
 - [4] W. van Dam, M. Mosca, and U. Vazirani, *How powerful is adiabatic quantum computation?*, <http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0206003> (2002).
 - [5] J. Roland and N. J. Cerf, *Physical Review A* **65**, 042308 (2002).
 - [6] M. A. Nielsen, *The Fermionic canonical commutation relations and the Jordan-Wigner transform*, <http://michaelnielsen.org/blog/?p=233> (2005).
 - [7] J.-P. Blaizot and G. Ripka, *Quantum theory of finite systems* (MIT Press, Cambridge, MA, 1986).
 - [8] M. J. O’Hara, Ph.D. thesis, University of Maryland at College Park, College Park, MD (2008).
 - [9] E. Lieb, T. Schultz, and D. Mattis, *Annals of Physics* **16**, 407 (1961).
 - [10] J. T. Devreese, R. P. Evrard, and V. E. van Doren, *Highly conducting one-dimensional solids* (Plenum Press, New York, NY, 1979).
 - [11] J. K. Pachos and M. Stone, *International Journal of Modern Physics B* **21**, 5113 (2007).
 - [12] S. V. Dobrov, *Journal of Physics A* **36**, 503 (2003).
 - [13] B. M. Terhal and D. P. DiVincenzo, *Physical Review A* **65**, 032325 (2002).
 - [14] R. Somma, H. Barnum, G. Ortiz, and E. Knill, *Physical Review Letters* **97**, 190501 (2006).
 - [15] R. Jozsa and A. Miyake, [quant-ph/0804.4050](http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0804.4050).
 - [16] F. Verstraete, J. I. Cirac, and J. I. Latorre, [quant-ph/0804.1888](http://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0804.1888).
 - [17] P. Zanardi, M. Cozzini, and P. Giorda, *Journal of Statistical Mechanics: Theory and Experiment* p. L02002 (2007).
 - [18] W. H. Zurek, U. Dorner, and P. Zoller, *Physical Review Letters* **95**, 105701 (2005).
 - [19] R. Schützhold and G. Schaller, *Physical Review A* **74**, 060304(R) (2006).
 - [20] A. Edelman, *SIAM Journal on Matrix Analysis and Applications* **9**, 543 (1988).

- [21] M. L. Mehta, *Random matrices* (Elsevier Inc., San Diego, CA, 2004).
- [22] G. H. Golub and C. F. Loan, *Matrix computations (3rd ed.)* (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, MD, 1996).
- [23] E. Chu and A. George, *Inside the FFT black box* (CRC Press, Boca Raton, FL, 2000).
- [24] S. N. Elaydi, *An introduction to difference equations* (Springer-Verlag, New York, NY, 1996).
- [25] P. N. Swarztrauber, *SIAM Review* **19**, 490 (1977).
- [26] R. Somma, G. Ortiz, J. E. Gubernatis, E. Knill, and R. Laflamme, *Physical Review A* **65**, 042323 (2002).
- [27] B. Wehefritz-Kaufmann, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **47**, 123509 (2006).
- [28] M. S. Siu, *Physical Review A* **75**, 062337 (2007).
- [29] A. C. Doherty and S. D. Bartlett, [quant-ph/0802.4314](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0802.4314).
- [30] J. K. Pachos and M. B. Plenio, *Physical Review Letters* **93**, 056402 (2004).
- [31] Y. R. Wang, *Physical Review B* **43**, 3786 (1991).