

# Fast quantum algorithms for approximating the irreducible representations of groups

Stephen P. Jordan\*

*Institute for Quantum Information, California Institute of Technology. sjordan@caltech.edu*

## Abstract

All representations of finite groups and compact linear groups can be expressed as unitary matrices given an appropriate choice of basis. This makes them natural candidates for implementation using quantum circuits. As shown here, the irreducible representations of the symmetric group  $S_n$ , the alternating group  $A_n$ , the unitary groups  $U(n)$  and  $SU(n)$ , and the special orthogonal group  $SO(n)$  can each be efficiently implemented by quantum circuits. Using the Hadamard test one can thus approximate individual matrix elements of the irreducible representations of these groups to within  $\pm\epsilon$  in time polynomial in  $n$  and  $1/\epsilon$  on a quantum computer. I am aware of no polynomial-time classical algorithm that achieves this.

## 1 Introduction

Explicit representations of groups have many uses in physics, chemistry, and mathematics. All representations of finite groups and compact linear groups can be expressed as unitary matrices given an appropriate choice of basis[4]. Here we show how to implement unitary representations of  $S_n$ ,  $A_n$ ,  $U(n)$ ,  $SU(n)$ , and  $SO(n)$  using quantum circuits of  $\text{poly}(n)$  gates. Using these quantum circuits one can approximate any matrix element of these representations to polynomial precision by repeating a simple measurement called the Hadamard test, as described in section 2.3. Because the representations considered are of exponentially large dimension, one cannot efficiently find these matrix elements by classically multiplying the matrices representing a set of generators.

For exponentially large unitary matrices, the typical matrix element is exponentially small. Thus for average instances, a polynomially precise approximation provides almost no information. However, it is common that the worst case instances of a problem are hard whereas the average case instances are trivial. In section 2.4 I conjecture a class of hard instances for the problem of estimating the matrix elements of the irreducible representations of the symmetric group to polynomial precision. As described in section 2.1, the quantum algorithm for the symmetric group has potential applications to quantum chemistry. As described in section 3.1, the quantum algorithms for Lie groups have potential application to simulation of quantum systems and approximation of special functions.

The main content of this paper is divided into two sections. Section 2 deals with the quantum computation of irreducible representations of finite groups, specifically the symmetric and alternating groups of permutations. Section 3 deals with the quantum computation of irreducible representations of Lie groups, specifically the unitary and special orthogonal groups. The quantum computational techniques used in these two sections are somewhat different. The quantum algorithm for the symmetric and alternating groups uses direct quantum circuit implementations of the representations of transpositions. These circuits are related both to the quantum algorithms for approximating Jones polynomials such as [2] and to quantum Fourier transforms over groups such as [31, 7]. The quantum algorithm for the unitary and special orthogonal groups takes techniques from [3] for simulating sparse Hamiltonians and applies them to the Lie algebras associated

---

\*Parts of this work were completed at MIT's Center for Theoretical Physics and RIKEN's Digital Materials Laboratory.

with the groups. Efficient quantum circuits to implement the irreducible representations of the group  $SU(2)$  were previously constructed by Zalka using a different approach[45].

Many of the known exponential quantum speedups are essentially representation-theoretic. The quantum algorithms for hidden subgroup problems such as factoring are based on Fourier transforms over groups. The quantum algorithms for estimating Jones and HOMFLY polynomials are based on efficient quantum circuit implementations of unitary representations of the braid group. It was pointed out by Moore *et al.* in [31] that quantum Fourier transforms, and hence hidden subgroup algorithms, owe their efficiency to subgroup adapted bases for group representations. This also holds for the Jones and HOMFLY algorithms and all of the algorithms presented in this paper. Thus, as discussed in section 4, subgroup adapted bases provide a unifying theme for almost all known exponential quantum speedups other than quantum simulation.

## 2 Symmetric and Alternating Groups

### 2.1 Introduction

The study of the irreducible representations of the symmetric group began work of Alfred Young around the turn of the twentieth century. In addition to their intrinsic mathematical interest, the irreducible representations of the symmetric group and their characters have applications in a wide variety of settings. The representations of the symmetric group arise naturally in the description of many-body quantum mechanical systems[21]. In particular, some computational methods in quantum chemistry are based on the calculation of explicit matrix representations of the symmetric group[28, 33]. In addition, knowledge of the characters of the symmetric group allows the calculation of the mixing time of certain random walks, such as card shuffling[12].

These applications have motivated research into the computation of explicit matrix representations of the symmetric group. One can use the general algorithm of [5] which obtains matrix representations of any finite group in time polynomial in the size of the group. For the symmetric group  $S_n$  this algorithm thus requires time exponential in  $n$ . Many techniques have been developed specifically to speed up the exact classical calculation of matrices from representations of the symmetric group[21, 9, 43, 44, 13, 11, 35, 33]. For representations of dimension  $d_\lambda$ , all of these techniques involve matrix manipulations on  $d_\lambda \times d_\lambda$  matrices that require exponential time in the cases that  $d_\lambda$  is exponentially large. The present paper gives a quantum algorithm to approximate any individual matrix element of any irreducible representation of a permutation, which runs in polynomial time even when the representation has exponentially large dimension. As discussed in section 2.4, the precision  $\epsilon$  achieved by the quantum algorithm is coarse compared to most matrix elements in most representations. However, we characterize a large class of instances in which the  $\epsilon$  achievable on a quantum computer in polynomial time is small compared to the matrix elements.

A representation of the symmetric group is a map from permutations to matrices. By taking the trace of these matrices, we obtain a corresponding map from permutations to scalars. This is known as the character of the representation, and it is a very useful and important mathematical object. Unlike the matrix elements it is independent of any choice of basis. Thus, it is natural to investigate quantum algorithms for estimating characters. By randomly sampling from the diagonal matrix elements and averaging the results, the quantum algorithm for estimating individual matrix elements can be used to estimate the normalized trace. However, as shown in section 2.5, the level of approximation of characters achievable this way is also achievable by a polynomial time randomized classical algorithm.

The irreducible representations of  $S_n$  are indexed by the Young diagrams of  $n$  boxes. These are all the possible partitions of the  $n$  boxes into rows, where the rows are arranged in descending order of length. The example  $n = 4$  is shown in figure 1. The matrix elements of these representations depend on a choice of basis. For present purposes it is essential that the basis be chosen so that the representation is unitary. Perhaps the most widely used such basis is the Young-Yamanouchi basis, in which irreducible representations are orthogonal<sup>1</sup> matrices[21]. For the irreducible representation corresponding to a Young diagram  $\lambda$ , the Young-

---

<sup>1</sup>Sometimes the representations in the Young-Yamanouchi basis are referred to as Young's orthogonal representations or Young's orthogonal form.




Figure 1: The Young diagrams with four boxes. They correspond to the irreducible representations of  $S_4$ .




Figure 2: Above is an example of a standard Young tableau, and beneath it the corresponding sequence of Young diagrams. The Yamanouchi symbol for this tableau is 1121322, because the sequence of Young diagrams is made by adding a box to row 1, then row 1 again, then row 2, and so on.

Yamanouchi basis vectors correspond to the set of standard Young tableaux compatible with  $\lambda$ . These are all the numberings of boxes so that if we started with no boxes, and added boxes in this order, the configuration would be a valid Young diagram after every step. Equivalently, these are all the numberings such that the numbers in each row are increasing to the right, and the numbers in each column are increasing downward. A Young tableau can also be conveniently represented by its Yamanouchi symbol, which is a list of integers indicating to which row we add each box in the sequence of steps that build the final Young diagram. This is illustrated in figure 2.

The following problem can be solved by a polynomial-time quantum algorithm.

**Problem 1:** Approximate a matrix element in the Young-Yamanouchi basis of an irreducible representation for the symmetric group  $S_n$ .

**Input:** A Young diagram specifying the irreducible representation, a permutation from  $S_n$ , a pair of standard Young tableaux indicating the desired matrix element, and a polynomially small parameter  $\epsilon$ .

**Output:** The specified matrix element to within  $\pm\epsilon$ .

Note this is an additive approximation. That is, if  $m_{\text{true}}$  is the true value of the desired matrix element and  $m_{\text{out}}$  is the output of our algorithm, we have  $|m_{\text{out}} - m_{\text{true}}| \leq \epsilon$  with probability at least  $1 - \delta$ . The runtime of the algorithm is polynomial in  $n$ ,  $\epsilon$ , and  $\log(1/\delta)$ .

It is not hard to see that for some  $\lambda$ , the number of standard tableaux, and hence the dimension of the representation, is exponential in  $n$ . As shown in [39],

**Theorem 1 (From [39])** *Let  $d_n^{\text{max}}$  denote the dimension of the highest-dimensional irreducible representation of  $S_n$ . There exist positive constants  $c_0$  and  $c_1$  such that*

$$e^{-\frac{c_1}{2}\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{n!} \leq d_n^{\text{max}} \leq e^{-\frac{c_0}{2}\sqrt{n}}\sqrt{n!}.$$

Thus, the matrix elements obtained by the quantum algorithm cannot be obtained in polynomial time by classically multiplying together representations of individual group elements. Sections 2.4 and 2.5 contain further comments on the complexity of problem 1 and the related problem of estimating irreducible characters.

$$\rho_{\square\square}(\sigma_1) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & & \end{array} \end{array} \quad \rho_{\square\square}(\sigma_2) = \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & -\frac{1}{2} & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} \\ 0 & \frac{\sqrt{3}}{2} & \frac{1}{2} \end{bmatrix} \begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & & \end{array} \end{array}$$

$$\rho_{\square\square}(\sigma_3) = \begin{bmatrix} -\frac{1}{3} & \frac{\sqrt{8}}{3} & 0 \\ \frac{\sqrt{8}}{3} & \frac{1}{3} & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{array}{l} \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 3 \\ \hline 4 & & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 & 4 \\ \hline 3 & & \end{array} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & & \end{array} \end{array}$$

Figure 3: The above matrices are irreducible representations in the Young-Yamanouchi basis with Young diagram  $\square\square$ . Here  $\sigma_i$  is the permutation in  $S_4$  that swaps  $i$  with  $i + 1$ .

## 2.2 Young-Yamanouchi Representation

For a given Young diagram  $\lambda$ , let  $\mathcal{V}_\lambda$  be the vector space formally spanned by all standard Young tableaux compatible with  $\lambda$ . For example, if

$$\lambda = \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline & \\ \hline & \\ \hline & \\ \hline \end{array}$$

then  $\mathcal{V}_\lambda$  is the 3-dimensional space consisting of all formal linear combinations of

$$\begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 4 \\ \hline 2 & \\ \hline 3 & \end{array}, \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 3 \\ \hline 2 & \\ \hline 4 & \end{array}, \text{ and } \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline 1 & 2 \\ \hline 3 & \\ \hline 4 & \end{array}.$$

For any given Young diagram  $\lambda$ , the corresponding irreducible representation in the Young-Yamanouchi basis is a homomorphism  $\rho_\lambda$  from  $S_n$  to the group of orthogonal linear transformations on  $\mathcal{V}_\lambda$ . It is not easy to directly compute  $\rho_\lambda(\pi)$  for an arbitrary permutation  $\pi$ . However, it is much easier to compute the representation of a transposition of neighbors. That is, we imagine the elements of  $S_n$  as permuting a set of objects  $1, 2, \dots, n$ , arranged on a line. A neighbor transposition  $\sigma_i$  swaps objects  $i$  and  $i + 1$ . It is well known that the set  $\{\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots, \sigma_{n-1}\}$  generates  $S_n$ .

The matrix elements for the Young-Yamanouchi representation of transpositions of neighbors can be obtained using a single simple rule: Let  $\Lambda$  be any standard Young tableau compatible with young diagram  $\lambda$  then

$$\rho_\lambda(\sigma_i)\Lambda = \frac{1}{\tau_i^\Lambda}\Lambda + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(\tau_i^\Lambda)^2}}\Lambda', \quad (1)$$

where  $\Lambda'$  is the Young tableau obtained from  $\Lambda$  by swapping boxes  $i$  and  $i + 1$ , and  $\tau_i^\Lambda$  is the axial distance from box  $i + 1$  to box  $i$ . That is, we are allowed to hop vertically or horizontally to nearest neighbors, and  $\tau$  is the number of hops needed to get from box  $i + 1$  to box  $i$ , where going down or left counts as  $+1$  hop and going up or right counts as  $-1$  hop. To illustrate the use of equation 1, some examples are given in figure 3.

In certain cases, starting with a standard Young tableau and swapping boxes  $i$  and  $i + 1$  does not yield a standard Young tableau, as illustrated below.

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \text{standard} & & \text{nonstandard} \\ \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i & i+1 \\ \hline \end{array} & \longrightarrow & \begin{array}{|c|c|} \hline i+1 & i \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array} \quad \begin{array}{ccc} \text{standard} & & \text{nonstandard} \\ \begin{array}{|c|} \hline i \\ \hline i+1 \\ \hline \end{array} & \longrightarrow & \begin{array}{|c|} \hline i+1 \\ \hline i \\ \hline \end{array} \end{array}$$

Some thought shows that all such cases are of one of the two types shown above. In both of these types, the axial distance is  $\pm 1$ . By equation 1, the coefficient on the invalid Young tableau is  $\sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(\pm 1)^2}} = 0$ . Thus the representation lies strictly within the space of standard Young tableaux.

### 2.3 Quantum Algorithm for $S_n$

In outline, the quantum algorithm for estimating matrix elements of the irreducible representations of the symmetric group works as follows. We first decompose the given permutation into a product of transpositions of neighbors. The classical bubblesort algorithm achieves this efficiently. For any permutation in  $S_n$ , it yields a decomposition consisting of at most  $O(n^2)$  transpositions. As described below, the Young-Yamanouchi representation of any transposition of neighbors can be implemented using a poly( $n$ )-sized quantum circuit. By concatenating at most  $O(n^2)$  such quantum circuits we obtain the representation of any permutation in  $S_n$ . A standard technique from quantum computation called the Hadamard test allows a measurement to polynomial precision of the matrix elements of this representation.

Having described the algorithm in outline, let's now look at it in detail. We encode the standard Young tableaux by their Yamanouchi symbols, as described in figure 2. There are at most  $n$  rows in any Young tableaux of  $n$  boxes, thus each integer in the Yamanouchi symbol can be represented using  $\log(n)$  bits. We therefore represent each Young tableau using  $n$  registers of  $\log n$  bits each. We use the notation  $\Lambda$  to denote both a standard Young tableau and the Yamanouchi symbol that encodes it.

Given a set of qubits encoding a particular standard Young tableau  $\Lambda$  compatible with Young diagram  $\lambda$ , we wish to perform the unitary transformation

$$\rho_\lambda(\sigma_i) |\Lambda\rangle = \frac{1}{\tau_i^\Lambda} |\Lambda\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(\tau_i^\Lambda)^2}} |\Lambda'\rangle, \quad (2)$$

in accordance with equation 1.  $\Lambda'$  is obtained by swapping boxes  $i$  and  $i + 1$  in the Young diagram  $\Lambda$ . This corresponds to swapping the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $(i + 1)^{\text{th}}$  components of the corresponding Yamanouchi symbol. Thus, in equation 2, the transition between states  $|\Lambda\rangle$  and  $|\Lambda'\rangle$  is made by swapping the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $(i + 1)^{\text{th}}$  registers of  $\log n$  qubits.

We can rewrite equation 2 as a  $2 \times 2$  matrix  $M_i^{(\Lambda)}$  describing the action of  $\rho_\lambda(\sigma_i)$  on the span of  $|\Lambda\rangle$  and  $|\Lambda'\rangle$ :

$$M_i^{(\Lambda)} = \begin{bmatrix} \frac{1}{\tau_i} & \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(\tau_i)^2}} \\ \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(\tau_i)^2}} & -\frac{1}{\tau_i} \end{bmatrix}.$$

This element of  $O(2)$  is recognizable as the reflection about the  $\theta_i^\Lambda = \frac{1}{2} \cos^{-1}(1/\tau_i)$  axis. Thus, we can construct it by conjugating the Pauli  $Z$  operator by rotations of angle  $\theta_i^\Lambda$

$$M_i^{(\Lambda)} = \begin{bmatrix} \cos(-\theta_i^\Lambda) & \sin(-\theta_i^\Lambda) \\ -\sin(-\theta_i^\Lambda) & \cos(-\theta_i^\Lambda) \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & -1 \end{bmatrix} \begin{bmatrix} \cos(\theta_i^\Lambda) & \sin(\theta_i^\Lambda) \\ -\sin(\theta_i^\Lambda) & \cos(\theta_i^\Lambda) \end{bmatrix} = R(-\theta_i^\Lambda) Z R(\theta_i^\Lambda) \quad (3)$$

The amplitudes in equation 2 for swapping these registers and leaving them alone define a unitary transformation on  $2 \log n$  qubits. In order to perform this unitary transformation, we use one ancilla qubit, and one register of  $m$  ancilla qubits. For now let  $m$  be arbitrary, although as shown below, it suffices to choose  $m = O(\log n)$ . We use the single-qubit register to store

$$s_i^\Lambda = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \tau_i^\Lambda > 0 \\ 1 & \text{if } \tau_i^\Lambda < 0 \end{cases} \quad (4)$$

Note that the axial distance from box  $i + 1$  to box  $i$  can never be zero in any standard Young tableau. We use the  $m$ -qubit register to store  $\theta_i^\Lambda$  to  $m$  bits of precision. Both of these quantities can be computed in

polynomial time classically, thus, they can be extracted into the ancilla registers using reversible circuits of polynomially many gates. This extraction step is the first step in our implementation of  $\rho_\lambda(\sigma_i)$ :

$$|\Lambda\rangle |0\rangle |000\dots\rangle \rightarrow |\Lambda\rangle |s_i^\Lambda\rangle |\theta_i^\Lambda\rangle.$$

Next, we remove the information  $s_i^\Lambda$  from the  $\Lambda$  register. That is, we do a controlled swap on the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$  components the Yamanouchi symbol. The swap is controlled by the  $s_i^\Lambda$  register. The resulting state is

$$\rightarrow |\tilde{\Lambda}\rangle |s_i^\Lambda\rangle |\theta_i^\Lambda\rangle,$$

where

$$\tilde{\Lambda} = \begin{cases} \Lambda & \text{if } \tau_i^\Lambda > 0 \\ \Lambda' & \text{if } \tau_i^\Lambda < 0 \end{cases}$$

and, as in equation 1,  $\Lambda'$  denotes the result of swapping boxes  $i$  and  $i+1$  in  $\Lambda$ . In  $\tilde{\Lambda}$ , the axial distance from box  $i+1$  to box  $i$  is always positive.


We next perform the rotations and reflections described in decomposition 3 on the  $s_i^\Lambda$  qubit. Thus we obtain

$$\rightarrow |\tilde{\Lambda}\rangle (\cos(2\theta_i^\Lambda) |s_i^\Lambda\rangle + \sin(2\theta_i^\Lambda) |-\neg s_i^\Lambda\rangle) |\theta_i^\Lambda\rangle.$$

By the definition of  $\theta_i^\Lambda$ , this is

$$= |\tilde{\Lambda}\rangle \left( \frac{1}{\tau_i^\Lambda} |s_i^\Lambda\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(\tau_i^\Lambda)^2}} |-\neg s_i^\Lambda\rangle \right) |\theta_i^\Lambda\rangle.$$

Recalling that  $\theta_i^\Lambda$  is encoded with  $m$  bits of precision, we see that the controlled reflection of qubit  $|\tau_i^\Lambda\rangle$  described in equation 3 can be performed using  $2m+1$  gates, as illustrated below for the example  $m=3$ .



Next, we do another controlled swap on the registers containing the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $(i+1)^{\text{th}}$  components of the Yamanouchi symbol. Again this swap is controlled by bit  $s_i^\Lambda$ . The resulting state is


$$\rightarrow \left( \frac{1}{\tau_i^\Lambda} |\Lambda\rangle |s_i^\Lambda\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(\tau_i^\Lambda)^2}} |\Lambda'\rangle |-\neg s_i^\Lambda\rangle \right) |\theta_i^\Lambda\rangle.$$

Next we just need to uncompute the ancilla registers. This is easy because  $s_i^{\Lambda'} = \neg s_i^\Lambda$ . Thus, we can once again use reversible circuits to compute the value of  $s_i^\Lambda$  and  $\theta_i^\Lambda$  for the tableau in the first register and add the results modulo two into the ancilla registers. The final resulting state is

$$\rightarrow \left( \frac{1}{\tau_i^\Lambda} |\Lambda\rangle + \sqrt{1 - \frac{1}{(\tau_i^\Lambda)^2}} |\Lambda'\rangle \right) |0\rangle |000\dots\rangle.$$

We can then throw away the ancilla qubits. The final result is the state that prescribed by equation 2.

Using the above methods, we can obtain an efficient quantum circuit to implement  $\rho_\lambda(\sigma_i)$  for any  $\lambda$  and  $i$ . Multiplying at most  $O(n^2)$  of these together, we can obtain the representation for an arbitrary permutation  $\pi \in S_n$ . Suppose we wish to obtain the diagonal matrix element  $\langle \Lambda | \rho_\lambda(\pi) | \Lambda \rangle$  for some arbitrary Young tableau  $\Lambda$  compatible with  $\lambda$ . We can do this using the following quantum circuit.



The probability of measuring  $|0\rangle$  is

$$p_0 = \frac{1 + \operatorname{Re}(\langle \Lambda | \rho_\lambda(\pi) | \Lambda \rangle)}{2}.$$

Thus, one can obtain the real part of  $\langle \Lambda | \rho_\lambda(\pi) | \Lambda \rangle$  to precision  $\epsilon$  by making  $O(1/\epsilon^2)$  measurements and counting what fraction of the measurement outcomes are  $|0\rangle$ . Similarly, if the control bit is instead initialized to  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(|0\rangle - i|1\rangle)$ , one can estimate the imaginary part of  $\langle \psi | \rho_\lambda(\pi) | \psi \rangle$ .

This procedure is standard in quantum computation, and is known as the Hadamard test. By modifying it slightly, we can similarly estimate off-diagonal matrix elements. It is clear that for any  $\nu \in S_n$ , one can construct an efficient reversible circuit implementing the unitary transformation  $U_\nu$  defined by

$$U_\nu |\Lambda\rangle = |\nu\Lambda\rangle \quad \forall \Lambda,$$

where  $\nu\Lambda$  is the Young tableau obtained by permuting the boxes of  $\Lambda$  according to  $\nu$ . For any pair  $(\Gamma, \Lambda)$  of standard Young tableaux compatible with Young diagram  $\lambda$ , there is some permutation of boxes  $\nu$  such that  $\Gamma = \nu\Lambda$ . The diagonal matrix element  $\langle \Lambda | \rho_\lambda(\pi) U_\nu | \Lambda \rangle$  is equal to the off-diagonal matrix element  $\langle \Lambda | \rho_\lambda(\pi) | \Gamma \rangle$ . We can use the Hadamard test to efficiently estimate  $\langle \Lambda | \rho_\lambda(\pi) U_\nu | \Lambda \rangle$ , and hence  $\langle \Lambda | \rho_\lambda(\pi) | \Gamma \rangle$ .

The runtime of the above quantum algorithm is clearly polynomial. More precisely, as the quantum circuit is the concatenation of the representations of at most  $O(n^2)$  transpositions of neighbors. The dominant cost of implementing the representation of an individual transposition of neighbors is the cost of computing the axial distance, which requires  $O(n \log n)$  steps classically. Thus it can be achieved in  $O(n \log n)$  time using a reversible circuit. All the remaining arithmetic, such as computing  $\cos^{-1}$  is done on registers of logarithmically many bits and is therefore negligible. Thus the full quantum circuit consists of  $O(n^3 \log n)$  gates. By usual sampling statistics, the Hadamard test must be run  $O(\epsilon^{-2})$  times to obtain  $\epsilon$  precision. Thus the total runtime of the quantum algorithm is  $O(n^3 \log n / \epsilon^2)$ . The initial bubblesort to decompose the given permutation into transpositions of neighbors takes  $O(n^2 \log n)$  time and is therefore negligible in comparison to the cubic runtime of the quantum circuit.

## 2.4 Complexity

Section 2.3 gives a polynomial time quantum algorithm for problem 1. It appears that no polynomial time classical algorithm for this problem is known. As discussed in section 2.1, many exponential time classical algorithms for the exact computation of entire matrices from representations of the symmetric group have been developed[21, 9, 43, 44, 13, 11, 35, 33]. There appears to be no literature on the computation or approximation of individual matrix elements of representations of  $S_n$ . The quantum algorithm of the preceding section works by implementing a series of orthogonal transformations on an exponentially large Hilbert space. These transformations have matrix elements of both signs, suggesting that interference effects are important, and therefore that the quantum process cannot be directly simulated by a classical probabilistic one.

On the other hand, the precision of approximation achieved by the quantum algorithm is trivial for average instances. We can see this as follows. Let  $\lambda$  be a Young tableau of  $n$  boxes, let  $\rho_\lambda$  be the corresponding irreducible representation of  $S_n$ , and let  $d_\lambda$  be the dimension of  $\rho_\lambda$ . For any  $\pi \in S_n$ , the root mean square of the matrix elements of  $\rho_\lambda(\pi)$  is

$$\operatorname{RMS}(\rho_\lambda(\pi)) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{d_\lambda^2} \sum_{a,b \in B} |\langle a | \rho_\lambda(\pi) | b \rangle|^2},$$

where  $B$  is any complete orthonormal basis for the vector space on which  $\rho_\lambda$  acts. We see that

$$\sum_{a \in B} |\langle a | \rho_\lambda(\pi) | b \rangle|^2 = 1$$

since, by the unitarity of  $\rho_\lambda(\pi)$ , this is just the norm of  $|b\rangle$ . Thus,

$$\operatorname{RMS}(\rho_\lambda(\pi)) = \sqrt{\frac{1}{d_\lambda^2} \sum_{b \in B} 1} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_\lambda}}. \tag{5}$$




Figure 4: Here is a sequence of Young diagrams, such that as the number of boxes increases, the Young diagram converges asymptotically to some fixed shape, in this case a triangle.

The interesting instances of problem 1 are those in which  $d_\lambda$  is exponentially large. In these instances, the typical matrix element is exponentially small, by equation 5. Running the quantum algorithm yields polynomial precision, thus one could instead simply guess zero every time, with similar results.

That the average case instances are trivial does not mean that the algorithm is trivial. Hard problems that are trivial on average are a common occurrence. The most relevant example of this is the problem of estimating a knot invariant called the Jones polynomial. A certain problem of estimating the Jones polynomial of knots is BQP-complete[15, 2, 1]. The Jones polynomial algorithm is based on estimating matrix elements of certain representations of the braid group to polynomial precision. On average these matrix elements are exponentially small. Nevertheless, the BQP-hardness of the Jones polynomial problem shows that the worst-case instances are as hard as any problem in BQP.

By analogy to the results on Jones polynomials, one might ask whether problem 1 is BQP-hard. The existing proofs of BQP-hardness of Jones polynomial estimation rely on the fact that the relevant representations of the braid group are dense in corresponding unitary group. Thus, one can construct a braid whose representation implements approximately the same unitary as any given quantum circuit. Furthermore, it turns out that the number of crossings needed to achieve a good approximation scales only polynomially with the number of quantum gates in the circuit. Unlike the braid group, the symmetric group is finite. Thus, no representation of it can be dense in a continuous group. Hence, if the problem of estimating matrix elements of the symmetric group is BQP-hard, the proof will have to proceed along very different lines than the BQP-hardness proof for Jones polynomials.

Lacking a hardness proof, the next best thing is to identify a class of instances in which the matrix elements are large enough to make the approximation nontrivial. As shown below, we can do this using known results on the asymptotic character theory of the symmetric group. Note that we need not worry about the matrix elements being too large, because even if we know *a priori* that a given matrix element has magnitude 1, it could still be nontrivial to compute its sign.

Let  $\pi$  be a permutation in  $S_n$ , and let  $\lambda$  be a Young diagram of  $n$  boxes. The character

$$\chi_\lambda(\pi) = \text{Tr}(\rho_\lambda(\pi))$$

is clearly independent of the basis in which  $\rho_\lambda$  is expressed. Furthermore, the character of a group element depends only on the conjugacy class of the group element, because for any representation  $\rho$ ,

$$\text{Tr}(\rho(hgh^{-1})) = \text{Tr}(\rho(h)\rho(g)\rho(h)^{-1}) = \text{Tr}(\rho(g)).$$

To understand the behavior of the characters of  $S_n$  as  $n$  becomes large, consider a sequence of Young diagrams that, when scaled down by a factor of  $1/\sqrt{n}$ , converge to a fixed shape as illustrated in figure 4. Let  $\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \lambda_3, \dots$  be such a sequence converging to shape  $\omega$ . Let  $d_{\lambda_n}$  be the dimension of the irreducible representation corresponding to Young diagram  $\lambda_n$ . Let  $\pi$  be a permutation in  $S_k$ . We can also consider  $\pi$  to be an element of  $S_n$  for any  $n > k$  which leaves the remaining  $n - k$  objects fixed. As shown by Biane[8],

$$\frac{\chi_{\lambda_n}(\pi)}{d_{\lambda_n}} = C_\pi(\omega)n^{-|\pi|/2} + O(n^{-|\pi|/2-1}). \quad (6)$$

Here  $|\pi|$  denotes the minimum number of transpositions needed to obtain  $\pi$ . Note that these are general transpositions, not transpositions of neighbors.  $C_\pi(\omega)$  is a constant that only depends on  $\pi \in S_k$  and the



shape  $\omega$ . A precise definition of what it means for the sequence to converge to a fixed shape is given in [8], but for present purposes, the intuitive picture of figure 4 should be sufficient.

$\chi_{\lambda_n}(\pi)/d_{\lambda_n}$  is the average of the matrix elements on the diagonal of  $\rho_{\lambda_n}(\pi)$ . In the present setting, where  $\pi$  is fixed,  $\chi_{\lambda_n}(\pi)/d_{\lambda_n}$  shrinks only polynomially with  $n$ . Thus polynomial precision is sufficient to provide nontrivial estimates of these matrix elements. Nevertheless, finding diagonal matrix elements of  $\rho_{\lambda_n}(\pi)$  for fixed  $\pi$  and large  $n$  is not computationally hard. This is because, recalling that  $\pi \in S_k$  and reviewing equation 1, one sees that  $\rho_{\lambda_n}(\pi)$  is a direct sum of irreducible representations of  $\pi$  in  $S_k$ . Because  $k$  is fixed, any irreducible representations of  $S_k$  has dimension  $O(1)$  and can therefore be computed in  $O(1)$  time by multiplying the matrices representing transpositions.

To produce a candidate class of hard instances of problem 1, we recall that the character  $\chi_{\lambda_n}(\pi)$  depends only on the conjugacy class of  $\pi$ . Thus, we consider  $\pi'$  conjugate to  $\pi$ . Like  $\pi \in S_n$ ,  $\pi' \in S_n$  leaves at least  $n - k$  objects fixed, and the representations  $\chi_{\lambda_n}(\pi')$  have diagonal matrix elements with polynomially small average value. However, the objects left fixed by  $\pi'$  need not be  $k + 1, k + 2, \dots, n$ . Indeed,  $\pi'$  can be chosen so that the object  $n$  is not left fixed, in which case  $\rho_{\lambda_n}(\pi')$  cannot be written as the direct sum of irreducible representations of  $S_m$  for any  $m < n$ .

There is an additional simple way in which an instance of problem 1 can fail to be hard. Let  $r(\pi)$  be the minimal number of transpositions of neighbors needed to construct the permutation  $\pi$ . If  $r(\pi)$  is constant or logarithmic, then the matrix elements of the irreducible representations of  $\pi$  can be computed classically in polynomial time by direct recursive application of equation 1. For a class of hard instances of problem 1 I propose the following.

**Conjecture 1** *Let  $\pi$  be a permutation in  $S_n$ . We consider it to permute a series of objects numbered  $1, 2, 3, \dots, n$ . Let  $s(\pi)$  be the number of objects that  $\pi$  does not leave fixed. Let  $l(\pi)$  be the largest numbered object that  $\pi$  does not leave fixed. Let  $r(\pi)$  be the minimum number of transpositions of neighbors needed to construct  $\pi$ . Let  $\lambda$  be a Young tableau of  $n$  boxes, and let  $\rho_\lambda$  be the corresponding  $d_\lambda$ -dimensional irreducible representation of  $S_n$ . I propose the problems of estimating the diagonal matrix elements of  $\rho_\lambda(\pi)$  such that  $s(\pi) = O(1)$ ,  $l(\pi) = \Omega(n)$ , and  $r(\pi) = \Omega(n)$  as a possible class of instances of problem 1 not solvable classically in polynomial time.*

Although this conjecture contains many restrictions on  $\pi$ , it is clear that permutations satisfying all of these conditions exist. One simple example is the permutation that transposes 1 with  $n$ .

## 2.5 Estimating Characters

Because characters do not depend on a choice of basis, the computational complexity of estimating characters is especially interesting. Hepler[23] showed that computing the characters of the symmetric group exactly is #P-hard. The following problem of estimating the normalized characters reduces to problem 1.

**Problem 2:** Approximate a character for the symmetric group  $S_n$ .

**Input:** A Young diagram  $\lambda$  specifying the irreducible representation, a permutation  $\pi$  from  $S_n$ , and a polynomially small parameter  $\epsilon$ .

**Output:** Let  $\chi^\lambda(\pi)$  be the character, and let  $d_\lambda$  be the dimension of the irreducible representation. The output  $\chi_{\text{out}}$  must satisfy  $|\chi_{\text{out}} - \chi^\lambda(\pi)/d_\lambda| \leq \epsilon$  with high probability.

We can perform the reduction by sampling uniformly at random from the Young tableaux compatible with Young diagram  $\lambda$ . For each Young tableau sampled we estimate the corresponding diagonal matrix element of  $\rho_\lambda(\pi)$ , as described in problem 1. By averaging the diagonal matrix elements for polynomially many samples, we obtain the normalized character to polynomial precision. The problem of sampling uniformly at random from the Young tableaux of a given shape is nontrivial but it has been solved. Greene, Nijenhuis, and Wilf proved in 1979 that their “hook-walk” algorithm produces the Young tableaux of any given shape with uniform probability[20]. Examination of [20] shows that the time needed by the hook-walk algorithm to produce a random Young tableaux compatible with a Young diagram of  $n$  boxes is upper bounded by

$O(n^2)$ .

As we have seen, the hook-walk algorithm allows a reduction from problem 2 to problem 1. However, I know of no reduction in the reverse direction. By averaging over diagonal matrix elements we lose some information contained in the individual matrix elements. This observation gives the intuition that it should often be harder to estimate individual matrix elements of a representation than to estimate its trace. Jones polynomials provide an example in which this intuition is confirmed. As discussed in [37], computing the Jones polynomial of the trace closure of a braid reduces to computing the character of a certain representation of the braid group. The problem of estimating this character is only DQC1-complete. In contrast, the individual matrix elements of this representation yield the Jones polynomial of the plat closure of the braid and are BQP-complete to approximate.

The above reduction implies that the quantum algorithm for problem 1 also yields a polynomial-time quantum algorithm for problem 2. However, as shown below, problem 2 is solvable by a randomized polynomial-time classical algorithm. As discussed above, problem 1 is likely to be harder than problem 2, so this does not prove or even particularly suggest that problem 1 is also efficiently solvable on a classical computer.

To construct a classical algorithm for problem 2, first recall that the character of a given group element depends only on the element's conjugacy class. We can think of any  $\pi \in S_n$  as acting on the set  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . The sizes of the orbits of the elements of  $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$  under repeated application of  $\pi$  form a partition of the integer  $n$ . For example, consider the permutation  $\pi \in S_5$  defined by

$$\pi(1) = 2 \quad \pi(2) = 3 \quad \pi(3) = 1 \quad \pi(4) = 5 \quad \pi(5) = 4.$$

This divides the set  $\{1, 2, 3, 4, 5\}$  into the orbits  $\{1, 2, 3\}$  and  $\{4, 5\}$ . Thus it corresponds to the partition  $(3, 2)$  of the integer 5. Two permutations in  $S_n$  are conjugate if and only if they correspond to the same partition. Thus, we can introduce the following notation. For any two partitions  $\mu$  and  $\lambda$  of  $n$  define  $\chi_\mu^\lambda$  to be the irreducible character of  $S_n$  corresponding to the Young diagram of  $\lambda$  evaluated at the conjugacy class corresponding to  $\mu$ .

To obtain an efficient classical solution to problem 2 we use the following theorem due to Roichman[36].

**Theorem 2 (From [36])** *For any partitions  $\mu = (\mu_1, \dots, \mu_l)$  and  $\lambda = (\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_k)$  of  $n$ , the corresponding irreducible character of  $S_n$  is given by*

$$\chi_\mu^\lambda = \sum_{\Lambda} W_\mu(\Lambda)$$

where the sum is over all standard Young tableaux  $\Lambda$  of shape  $\lambda$  and

$$W_\mu(\Lambda) = \prod_{\substack{1 \leq i \leq k \\ i \notin B(\mu)}} f_\mu(i, \Lambda)$$

where  $B(\mu) = \{\mu_1 + \dots + \mu_r \mid 1 \leq r \leq l\}$  and

$$f_\mu(i, \Lambda) = \begin{cases} -1 & \text{box } i+1 \text{ of } \Lambda \text{ is in the southwest of box } i \\ 0 & \text{ } i+1 \text{ is in the northeast of } i, i+2 \text{ is in the southwest of } i+1, \text{ and } i+1 \notin B(\mu) \\ 1 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}$$

(Note that northeast/southwest is exactly the distinction captured by  $s_i^\Lambda$  of equation 4). By using the hook walk algorithm we can sample uniformly at random from the standard Young tableaux  $\Lambda$  of shape  $\lambda$ . By inspection of theorem 2 we see that for each  $\Lambda$  sampled we can compute  $W_\mu(\Lambda)$  classically in  $\text{poly}(n)$  time. By averaging the values of  $W_\mu(\Lambda)$  obtained during the course of the sampling we can thus obtain a polynomially accurate additive approximation to the normalized character, thereby solving problem 2.

Some readers may notice that theorem 2 is similar in form to the much older and better-known Murnaghan-Nakayama rule. However, the Murnaghan-Nakayama rule is based on a sum over all "rim-hook tableaux" of shape  $\lambda$  (see [36]). It is not obvious how to sample uniformly at random from the rim-hook tableaux of a given shape. Thus, it is not obvious how to use the Murnaghan-Nakayama rule to obtain a probabilistic classical algorithm for problem 2.




Figure 5: To obtain the conjugate  $\hat{\lambda}$  of Young diagram  $\lambda$ , reflect  $\lambda$  about its diagonal. In other words the number of boxes in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  column of  $\hat{\lambda}$  is equal to the number of boxes in the  $i^{\text{th}}$  row of  $\lambda$ .

1	2	3	4
5	6		
7			

Figure 6: For a given Young diagram, there is a unique Young tableau in “typewriter” order, in which the boxes are numbered from left to right across the top row then from left to right across the next row, and so on, as illustrated in the example above.

## 2.6 Alternating Group

Any permutation  $\pi$  corresponds to a permutation matrix with matrix element  $i, j$  given by  $\delta_{\pi(i),j}$ . The determinant of any permutation matrix is  $\pm 1$ , and is known as the sign of the permutation. The permutations of sign  $+1$  are called even, and the permutations of sign  $-1$  are called odd. This is because a transposition has determinant  $-1$ , and therefore any product of an odd number of transpositions is odd and any product of an even number of transpositions is even.

The even permutations in  $S_n$  form a subgroup called the alternating group  $A_n$ , which has size  $n!/2$ .  $A_n$  is a simple group (*i.e.* it contains no normal subgroup) and it is the only normal subgroup of  $S_n$  other than  $\{1\}$  and  $S_n$ . As one might guess, the irreducible representations of the alternating group are closely related to the irreducible representations of the symmetric group. Consequently, as shown in this section, the quantum algorithm of section 2.3 can be easily adapted to approximate any matrix element of any irreducible representation of  $A_n$  to within  $\pm\epsilon$  in  $\text{poly}(n, 1/\epsilon)$  time.

Explicit orthogonal matrix representations of the alternating group are worked out in [38] and recounted nicely in [22]. Any representation  $\rho$  of  $S_n$  is automatically also a representation of  $A_n$ . However an irreducible representation  $\rho$  of  $S_n$  may no longer be irreducible when restricted to  $A_n$ . Each irreducible representation of  $S_n$  either remains irreducible when restricted to  $A_n$  or decomposes into a direct sum of two irreducible representations of  $A_n$ . All of the irreducible representations of  $A_n$  are obtained in this way.

The conjugate of Young diagram  $\lambda$  is obtained by reflecting  $\lambda$  about the main diagonal, as shown in figure 5. If  $\lambda$  is not self-conjugate then the representation  $\rho_\lambda$  of  $S_n$  remains irreducible when restricted to  $A_n$ . In this case we can simply use the algorithm of section 2.3. If  $\lambda$  is self-conjugate then the representation  $\rho_\lambda$  of  $S_n$  becomes reducible when restricted to  $A_n$ . It is a direct sum of two irreducible representations of  $A_n$ , called  $\rho_{\lambda+}$  and  $\rho_{\lambda-}$ . The two corresponding invariant subspaces of the reducible representation are the  $+1$  and  $-1$  eigenspaces, respectively, of the “associator” operator  $S$  defined as follows.

Let  $\lambda$  be a self-conjugate Young diagram of  $n$  boxes. Let  $\Lambda_0$  be the “typewriter-order” Young tableau obtained by numbering the boxes from left to right across the first row, then left to right across the second row, and so on, as illustrated in figure 6. For any standard Young tableau  $\Lambda$  of shape  $\lambda$ , let  $w_\Lambda \in S_n$  be the permutation that brings the boxes into typewriter order. That is,  $w_\Lambda \Lambda = \Lambda_0$ . Let  $\hat{\Lambda}$  be the conjugate of  $\Lambda$ , obtained by reflecting  $\Lambda$  about the main diagonal. If  $\Lambda$  is standard then so is  $\hat{\Lambda}$ . Let  $d(\lambda)$  be the length of the main diagonal of  $\lambda$ .  $S$  is the linear operator on  $\mathcal{V}_\lambda$  defined by

$$S\Lambda = i^{(n-d(\lambda))/2} \text{sign}(w_\Lambda) \hat{\Lambda}. \quad (7)$$

An orthonormal basis for each of the eigenspaces of  $S$  can be easily constructed from the Young-Yamanouchi basis. When  $(n - d(\lambda))/2$  is odd, every standard Young tableau  $\Lambda$  of shape  $\lambda$  has the property

$\text{sign}(w_\Lambda) = -\text{sign}(w_{\hat{\Lambda}})$ , and  $S$  is a direct sum of  $2 \times 2$  blocks of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -i \\ i & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

interchanging  $\Lambda$  and  $\hat{\Lambda}$ . In this case, the linear combinations  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\Lambda + i\hat{\Lambda})$  for each conjugate pair of standard Young tableaux form an orthonormal basis for the  $+1$  eigenspace of  $S$ , and the linear combinations  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\Lambda - i\hat{\Lambda})$  form an orthonormal basis for the  $-1$  eigenspace of  $S$ . Similarly, when  $(n - d(\lambda))/2$  is even,  $w_\Lambda = w_{\hat{\Lambda}}$  for all standard Young tableaux  $\Lambda$  of shape  $\lambda$ . Thus  $S$  is a direct sum of  $2 \times 2$  blocks of the form

$$\begin{bmatrix} 0 & -1 \\ -1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}$$

interchanging  $\Lambda$  and  $\hat{\Lambda}$ . In this case the linear combinations  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\Lambda - \hat{\Lambda})$  form an orthonormal basis for the  $+1$  eigenspace of  $S$  and the linear combinations  $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}(\Lambda + \hat{\Lambda})$  form an orthonormal basis for the  $-1$  eigenspace of  $S$ .

Suppose  $\lambda$  is self-conjugate and  $(n - d(\lambda))/2$  is even. Any matrix element of the irreducible representation  $\rho_{\lambda+}$  of  $A_n$  is given by

$$\frac{1}{2}(\Lambda + \hat{\Lambda})\rho_\lambda(\pi)(\Gamma + \hat{\Gamma}),$$

where  $\Lambda, \Gamma$  is some pair of standard Young tableaux and  $\pi$  is some element of  $A_n$ . This is a linear combination of only four Young-Yamanouchi matrix elements of  $\rho_\lambda(\pi)$ . One can use the algorithm of section 2.3 to calculate each of these and then simply add them up with the appropriate coefficients. The cases where  $(n - d(\lambda))/2$  is odd and/or we want a matrix element of  $\rho_{\lambda-}$  are analogous.

## 3 Unitary and Special Orthogonal Groups

### 3.1 Introduction

The set of all  $n \times n$  unitary matrices forms a group under matrix multiplication, called  $U(n)$ .  $U(n)$  is quite different from  $S_n$  and  $A_n$  in that it has an infinite set of group elements.  $SU(n)$  is the subgroup of  $U(n)$  with determinant one. Similarly,  $SO(n)$  is the group of all  $n \times n$  real orthogonal matrices with determinant equal to one. Because  $U(n)$ ,  $SU(n)$  and  $SO(n)$  are compact linear groups, all of their representations are unitary given the right choice of basis[4].

$U(n)$ ,  $SU(n)$ , and  $SO(n)$  are subgroups of  $GL(n)$ , the group of all invertible  $n \times n$  matrices. All of the irreducible representations of  $U(n)$  and  $SU(n)$  can be obtained by restricting the irreducible representations of  $GL(n)$  to these subgroups. The best classical algorithms for computing irreducible representations of  $GL(n)$  and  $U(n)$  appear to be those of [10] and [19]. To compute the representations general elements of  $U(n)$  these classical algorithms involve manipulating matrices whose dimension equals the dimension of the representation. Thus, they do not provide a polynomial time algorithm for computing matrix elements from representations whose dimension is exponentially large.

$U(n)$ ,  $SU(n)$ , and  $SO(n)$  are Lie groups. This means that they are also differentiable manifolds such that the group operations are compatible with the smooth structure. Representations of Lie groups find numerous uses throughout physics and mathematics. In particular, almost all of the special functions arising in physics can be obtained as matrix elements of representations of Lie groups[40]. The quantum algorithms of this section, which compute individual matrix elements of these representations, may therefore be useful for computing approximations to special functions. Furthermore, angular momentum eigenstates transform under rotation according to (projective) unitary irreducible representations of  $SO(3)$  thus, as pointed out by Zalka[45], quantum circuits implementing representations of  $SO(3)$  and  $SU(2)$  are potentially useful for quantum simulation.

### 3.2 Gel'fand-Tsetlin representation of $U(n)$

The irreducible representations of the Lie group  $U(n)$  are most easily described in terms of the corresponding Lie algebra  $u(n)$ . It is not necessary here delve into the theory of Lie groups and Lie algebras, but those who are interested can see [18]. For now it suffices to say that  $u(n)$  is the set of all antihermitian  $n \times n$  matrices, and for any  $u \in U(n)$  there exists  $h \in u(n)$  such that  $u = e^h$ . Given any representation  $a : u(n) \rightarrow u(m)$  one can construct a representation  $A : U(n) \rightarrow U(m)$  as follows. For any  $u \in U(n)$  find a corresponding  $h(u) \in u(n)$  such that  $e^h = u$ , and set  $A(u) = e^{a(h(u))}$ . If  $a$  is an antihermitian representation of  $u(n)$  then  $A$  is a unitary representation of  $U(n)$ . Furthermore, it is clear that  $A$  is irreducible if and only if  $a$  is irreducible.

It turns out that the irreducible representations of the algebra  $gl(n)$  of all  $n \times n$  complex matrices remain irreducible when restricted to the subalgebra  $u(n)$ . Furthermore, all of the irreducible representations of  $u(n)$  are obtained this way. Let  $E_{ij}$  be the  $n \times n$  matrix with all matrix elements equal to zero except for the matrix element in row  $i$ , column  $j$ , which is equal to one. The set of all  $n^2$  such matrices forms a basis over  $\mathbb{C}$  for  $gl(n)$ . Thus to describe a representation of  $gl(n)$  it suffices to describe its action on each of the  $E_{ij}$  matrices.

As described in chapter 18, volume 3 of [40], explicit matrix representations of  $gl(n)$  were constructed by Gel'fand and Tsetlin. (See also [17].) In their construction, one thinks of the representation as acting on the formal span of a set of combinatorial objects called Gel'fand patterns. The Gel'fand-Tsetlin representations of  $E_{p,p-1}$  and  $E_{p-1,p}$  are sparse and simple to compute for all  $p \in \{2, 3, \dots, n\}$ . This property makes the Gel'fand-Tsetlin representations particularly useful for quantum computation.

A Gel'fand pattern of width  $n$  consists of  $n-1$  rows of integers. The  $j^{\text{th}}$  row has  $n$  entries  $m_{j,1}, m_{j,2}, \dots, m_{j,n}$ . (Note that, in contrast to matrix elements, the subscripts on the entries of Gel'fand patterns conventionally indicate column first, then row.) These entries must satisfy

$$m_{j,n+1} \geq m_{j,n} \geq m_{j+1,n+1}.$$

Gel'fand patterns are often written out diagrammatically. For example the Gel'fand pattern of width 3 with rows

$$\begin{array}{lll} m_{1,3} = 4 & m_{2,3} = 1 & m_{3,3} = 0 \\ m_{1,2} = 3 & m_{2,2} = 0 & \\ m_{1,1} = 2 & & \end{array}$$

is represented by the diagram

$$\begin{pmatrix} 4 & 1 & 0 \\ & 3 & 0 \\ & & 2 \end{pmatrix}.$$

This notation has the advantage that the entries that appear directly to the upper left and upper right of a given entry form the upper and lower bounds on the values that entry is allowed to take.

We call the top row of a Gel'fand pattern its weight<sup>2</sup>. To each weight of width  $n$  corresponds one irreducible representation of  $gl(n)$ . This irreducible representation acts on the formal span of all Gel'fand patterns with that weight (of which there are always finitely many). To describe the action of the representation of  $gl(n)$  on these patterns let

$$l_{p,q} = m_{p,q} - p \tag{8}$$

$$a_{p-1}^j = \left| \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p (l_{i,p} - l_{j,p-1}) \prod_{i=1}^{p-2} (l_{i,p-2} - l_{j,p-1} - 1)}{\prod_{i \neq j} (l_{i,p-1} - l_{j,p-1}) (l_{i,p-1} - l_{j,p-1} - 1)} \right|^{1/2} \tag{9}$$

$$b_{p-1}^j = \left| \frac{\prod_{i=1}^p (l_{i,p} - l_{j,p-1} + 1) \prod_{i=1}^{p-2} (l_{i,p-2} - l_{j,p-1})}{\prod_{i \neq j} (l_{i,p-1} - l_{j,p-1}) (l_{i,p-1} - l_{j,p-1} + 1)} \right|^{1/2}. \tag{10}$$

---

<sup>2</sup>It is actually the *highest* weight of the representation[40], but for brevity I just call it the weight throughout this paper.

Let  $M$  be a Gel'fand pattern and let  $M_p^{+j}$  be the Gel'fand pattern obtained from  $M$  by replacing  $m_{j,p}$  with  $m_{j,p} + 1$ . Similarly, let  $M_p^{-j}$  be the Gel'fand pattern in which  $m_{j,p}$  has been replaced with  $m_{j,p} - 1$ . The representation  $a_{\vec{m}}$  of  $gl(n)$  corresponding to weight  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  is defined by the following rules, known as the Gel'fand-Tsetlin formulas.

$$a_{\vec{m}}(E_{p-1,p})M = \sum_{j=1}^p a_{p-1}^j M_{p-1}^{+j} \quad (11)$$

$$a_{\vec{m}}(E_{p,p-1})M = \sum_{j=1}^p b_{p-1}^j M_{p-1}^{-j} \quad (12)$$

$$a_{\vec{m}}(E_{p,p})M = \left( \sum_{i=1}^p m_{i,p} - \sum_{j=1}^{p-1} m_{j,p-1} \right) M \quad (13)$$

These formulas give implicitly a representation for all of  $gl(n)$ , because any  $E_{ij}$  can be obtained from operators of the form  $E_{p-1,p}$  and  $E_{p,p-1}$  by using the commutation relation  $[E_{ik}, E_{kl}] = E_{il}$ . By restricting the representation  $a_{\vec{m}}$  to antihermitian subalgebra of  $gl(n)$  and taking the exponential, one obtains an irreducible group representation  $A_{\vec{m}} : U(n) \rightarrow U(d_{\vec{m}})$ , where  $d_{\vec{m}}$  is the number of Gel'fand patterns with weight  $\vec{m}$ .

It should be noted that some references claim that the set of allowed weights for representations of  $GL(n)$  is  $\mathbb{N}^n$ , whereas others identify, as we do,  $\mathbb{Z}^n$  as the allowed set of weights. The reason for this is that irreducible representations of  $GL(n)$  in which the entries  $m_{n,1}, m_{n,2}, \dots, m_{n,n}$  of the weight are all nonnegative are polynomial invariants[30]. That is, for any  $g \in GL(n)$  and any  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ , each matrix element of the representation  $\rho_{\vec{m}}(u)$  is a polynomial function of the  $n^2$  matrix elements of  $u$ . The representations involving negative weights are called holomorphic representations, and many sources choose to neglect them. In the case that  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{N}^n$ , the Gel'fand diagrams of width  $n$  bijectively correspond to the semistandard Young tableaux of  $n$  rows (*cf.* [14], pg. 517).

### 3.3 Quantum Algorithm for $U(n)$

We start by finding a quantum circuit implementing the Gel'fand-Tsetlin representation of an  $n \times n$  unitary matrix of the form

$$u_0 = \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} & & & \\ u_{21} & u_{22} & & & \\ & & 1 & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & 1 \end{bmatrix},$$

where all off-diagonal matrix elements not shown are zero. After that we describe how to easily extend the construction to arbitrary  $n \times n$  unitaries.

For a given weight  $\vec{m} \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  we wish to implement the corresponding representation  $A_{\vec{m}}(u_0)$  with a quantum circuit. To do this, we first find an  $n \times n$  Hermitian matrix  $H_0$  such that  $e^{iH_0} = u_0$ . It is not hard to see that  $H_0$  can be computed in polynomial time and takes the form

$$H_0 = \begin{bmatrix} h_{11} & h_{12} & & & \\ h_{12}^* & h_{22} & & & \\ & & 0 & & \\ & & & \ddots & \\ & & & & 0 \end{bmatrix}.$$

Thus,

$$H_0 = h_{11}E_{11} + h_{12}E_{12} + h_{12}^*h_{21} + h_{22}E_{22}. \quad (14)$$

Hence,

$$a_{\bar{m}}(H_0) = h_{11}a_{\bar{m}}(E_{11}) + h_{12}a_{\bar{m}}(E_{12}) + h_{12}^*a_{\bar{m}}(E_{21}) + h_{22}a_{\bar{m}}(E_{22}). \quad (15)$$

To implement  $A_{\bar{m}}(u_0)$  with a quantum circuit, we think of  $a_{\bar{m}}(H_0)$  as a Hamiltonian and simulate the corresponding unitary time evolution  $e^{-ia_{\bar{m}}(H_0)t}$  for  $t = -1$ . The Hamiltonian  $a_{\bar{m}}(H_0)$  has exponentially large dimension in the cases of computational interest. However, examination of equation 14 shows that  $H_0$  is a linear combination of operators of the form  $E_{p,p-1}$  and  $E_{p-1,p}$ . Thus, by the Gel'fand-Tsetlin rules of section 3.2,  $a_{\bar{m}}(H_0)$  is sparse and that its individual matrix elements are easy to compute. Under this circumstance, one can use the general method for simulating sparse Hamiltonians proposed in [3].

Define row-sparse Hamiltonians to be those in which each row has at most polynomially many nonzero entries. Further, define row-computable Hamiltonians to be those such that there exists a polynomial time algorithm which, given an index  $i$ , outputs a list of the nonzero matrix elements in row  $i$  and their locations. Clearly, all row computable Hamiltonians are row-sparse. As shown in [3], the unitary  $e^{-iHt}$  induced by any row-computable Hamiltonian can be simulated in polynomial time provided that the spectral norm  $\|H\|$  and the time  $t$  are at most polynomially large. We have already noted that  $a_{\bar{m}}(H_0)$  is row-computable. Because  $a_{\bar{m}}(H_0)$  is row sparse with individual matrix elements of order unity, Gershgorin's circle theorem immediately shows that  $\|a_{\bar{m}}(H_0)\|$  is at most  $\text{poly}(n)$ .

Having shown that a quantum circuit of  $\text{poly}(n)$  gates can implement the Gel'fand-Tsetlin representation of an  $n \times n$  unitary of the form  $u_0$ , the remaining task is to extend this to arbitrary  $n \times n$  unitaries. Examination of the preceding construction shows that it works just the same for any unitary of the form

$$u_p = \mathbb{1}_p \oplus u \oplus \mathbb{1}_{n-p-2},$$

where  $\mathbb{1}_p$  denotes the  $p \times p$  identity matrix and  $u$  is a  $2 \times 2$  unitary. Corresponding to  $u_p$  is again an antihermitian matrix of the form

$$H_p = 0_p \oplus h \oplus 0_{n-p-2}$$

where  $0_p$  is the  $p \times p$  matrix of all zeros and  $h$  is a  $2 \times 2$  antihermitian matrix such that  $e^h = u$ . The only issue to worry about is whether  $\|a_{\bar{m}}(H_p)\|$  is at most  $\text{poly}(n)$ . By symmetry, one expects that  $\|a_{\bar{m}}(H_p)\|$  should be independent of  $p$ . However, this is not obvious from examination of equations 8 through 13. Nevertheless, it is true, as shown in appendix A. Thus,  $\|a_{\bar{m}}(H_p)\| = \|a_{\bar{m}}(H_0)\| = \text{poly}(n)$  for all  $p$ .

By concatenating the quantum circuits implementing  $A_{\bar{m}}(u_1), A_{\bar{m}}(u_2), \dots, A_{\bar{m}}(u_L)$ , one can implement  $A_{\bar{m}}(u_1 u_2 \dots u_L)$ . We next show that any  $n \times n$  unitary can be obtained as a product of  $\text{poly}(n)$  matrices, each of the form  $u_p$ , thus showing that the quantum algorithm is completely general and always runs in polynomial time.

For any  $2 \times 2$  matrix  $M$ , let  $\mathcal{E}(M, i, j)$  be the  $n \times n$  matrix in which  $M$  acts on the  $i^{\text{th}}$  and  $j^{\text{th}}$  basis vectors. In other words, the  $k, l$  matrix element of  $\mathcal{E}(M, i, j)$  is

$$\mathcal{E}(M, i, j)_{kl} = \begin{cases} M_{11} & \text{if } k = i \text{ and } l = i \\ M_{12} & \text{if } k = i \text{ and } l = j \\ M_{21} & \text{if } k = j \text{ and } l = i \\ M_{22} & \text{if } k = j \text{ and } l = j \\ \delta_{kl} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases}.$$

Thus

$$u_p = \mathcal{E} \left( \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} \\ u_{21} & u_{22} \end{bmatrix}, m+1, m+2 \right).$$

Next note that,

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathcal{E} \left( \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} \\ u_{21} & u_{22} \end{bmatrix}, m+1, m+3 \right) = \\ & \mathcal{E} \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, m+2, m+3 \right) \mathcal{E} \left( \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} \\ u_{21} & u_{22} \end{bmatrix}, m+1, m+2 \right) \mathcal{E} \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, m+2, m+3 \right). \end{aligned}$$

Thus the matrix

$$\mathcal{E} \left( \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} \\ u_{21} & u_{22} \end{bmatrix}, m+1, m+3 \right)$$

is obtained as a product of three matrices of the form  $u_p$ . By repeating this conjugation process, one can obtain

$$\mathcal{E} \left( \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} \\ u_{21} & u_{22} \end{bmatrix}, i, j \right) \quad (16)$$

for arbitrary  $i, j$  as a product of one matrix of the form

$$\mathcal{E} \left( \begin{bmatrix} u_{11} & u_{12} \\ u_{21} & u_{22} \end{bmatrix}, p+1, p+2 \right)$$

for some  $p$  and at most  $O(n)$  matrices of the form

$$\mathcal{E} \left( \begin{bmatrix} 0 & 1 \\ 1 & 0 \end{bmatrix}, q+1, q+2 \right)$$

with various  $q$ . A matrix of the form shown in equation 16 is called a two-level unitary. As shown in section 4.5.1 of [32], any  $n \times n$  unitary is obtainable as a product of  $\text{poly}(n)$  two-level unitaries. Thus we obtain  $A_{\vec{m}}(U)$  for any  $n \times n$  unitary  $U$  using  $\text{poly}(n)$  quantum gates. One can then obtain any matrix element of  $A_{\vec{m}}(U)$  to precision  $\pm\epsilon$  by repeating the Hadamard test  $O(1/\epsilon^2)$  times.

### 3.4 Special Orthogonal Group

The special orthogonal group  $SO(n)$  consists of all  $n \times n$  real orthogonal matrices with determinant equal to one. The irreducible representations of  $SO(n)$  are closely related to those of  $U(n)$  and can also be expressed unitarily using a Gel'fand-Tsetlin basis. As discussed in chapter 18, volume 3 of [40], the nature of the representations of  $SO(n)$  depends on whether  $n$  is even or odd. Following [40] and [17], we therefore introduce an integer  $k$  and consider  $SO(2k+1)$  and  $SO(2k)$  separately.

The irreducible representations of  $SO(2k+1)$  are in bijective correspondence with the set of allowed weight vectors  $\vec{m}$  consisting of  $k$  entries, each of which is an integer or half-integer. Furthermore, the entries must satisfy

$$m_{1,n} \geq m_{2,n} \geq \dots \geq m_{k,n} \geq 0.$$

The irreducible representations of  $SO(2k)$  correspond to the weight vectors  $\vec{m}$  with  $k-1$  entries, each of which must be an integer or half integer, and which must satisfy

$$m_{1,n} \geq m_{2,n} \geq \dots \geq m_{k-1,n} \geq |m_{k,n}|.$$

As in the case of  $U(n)$ , the set of allowed Gel'fand patterns is determined by rules for how a row can compare to the one above it. For  $SO(n)$  these rules are slightly more complicated, and the rule for the  $j^{\text{th}}$  row depends on whether  $j$  is odd or even. Specifically the even rule for  $j = 2k$  is

$$m_{1,2k+1} \geq m_{1,2k} \geq m_{2,2k+1} \geq m_{2,2k} \geq \dots \geq m_{k,2k+1} \geq m_{k,2k} \geq -m_{k,2k-1},$$

and the odd rule for  $j = 2k-1$  is

$$m_{1,2k} \geq m_{1,2k-1} \geq m_{2,2k} \geq m_{2,2k-1} \geq \dots \geq m_{k-1,2k} \geq m_{k-1,2k-1} \geq |m_{k,2k}|.$$

The Lie algebra  $so(n)$  corresponding to the Lie group  $SO(n)$  is the algebra of all antisymmetric  $n \times n$  matrices. For any  $G \in SO(n)$  there exists a  $g \in so(n)$  such that  $e^g = G$ . The Lie algebra  $so(n)$  is the space of all  $n \times n$  real traceless antisymmetric matrices. Thus it is spanned by operators of the form

$$I_{k,i} = E_{i,k} - E_{k,i} \quad 1 \leq i < k \leq n.$$



We can fully specify a representation of  $so(n)$  by specifying the representations of the operators of the form  $I_{q+1,q}$  because these generate  $so(n)$ . That is, any element of  $so(n)$  can be obtained as a linear combination of commutators of such operators. The Gel'fand-Tsetlin representation  $b_{\vec{m}}$  of these operators depends on whether  $q$  is even or odd, and is given by the following formulas.

$$\begin{aligned}
A_{2p}^j(M) &= \frac{1}{2} \left| \frac{\prod_{r=1}^{p-1} [(l_{r,2p-1} - \frac{1}{2})^2 - (l_{j,2p} + \frac{1}{2})^2] \prod_{r=1}^p [(l_{r,2p+1} - \frac{1}{2})^2 - (l_{j,2p} + \frac{1}{2})^2]}{\prod_{r \neq j} (l_{r,2p}^2 - l_{j,2p}^2)(l_{r,2p}^2 - (l_{j,2p} + 1)^2)} \right|^{1/2} \\
B_{2p+1}^j(M) &= \left| \frac{\prod_{r=1}^p (l_{r,2p}^2 - l_{j,2p+1}^2) \prod_{r=1}^{p+1} (l_{r,2p+2}^2 - l_{j,2p+1}^2)}{l_{j,2p+1}^2 (4l_{j,2p+1}^2 - 1) \prod_{r \neq j} (l_{r,2p+1}^2 - l_{j,2p+1}^2)(l_{j,2p+1}^2 - (l_{r,2p+1} - 1)^2)} \right|^{1/2} \\
C_{2p}(M) &= \frac{\prod_{r=1}^p l_{r,2p} \prod_{r=1}^{p+1} l_{r,2p+2}}{\prod_{r=1}^p l_{r,2p+1} (l_{r,2p+1} - 1)} \\
b_{\vec{m}}(I_{2p+1,2p})M &= \sum_{j=1}^p A_{2p}^j(M) M_{2p}^{+j} - \sum_{j=1}^p A_{2p}^j(M_{2p}^{-j}) M_{2p}^{-j} \\
b_{\vec{m}}(I_{2p+2,2p+1})M &= \sum_{j=1}^p B_{2p+1}^j(M) M_{2p+1}^{+j} - \sum_{j=1}^p B_{2p+1}^j(M_{2p+1}^{-j}) M_{2p+1}^{-j} + iC_{2p}(M)M
\end{aligned}$$

By applying these rules to the set of allowed Gel'fand patterns described above one obtains the irreducible representations of the algebra  $so(n)$ . By exponentiating these, one then obtains the irreducible representations of the group  $SO(n)$ . Thus the quantum algorithm for approximating the matrix elements of the irreducible representations of  $SO(n)$  is analogous to that for  $U(n)$ .

### 3.5 Special Unitary Group

Irreducible representations of  $SU(n)$  can be easily constructed from the irreducible representations of  $U(n)$ , using the following facts taken from chapter 10 of [6]. The representations of  $U(n)$  can be partitioned into a set of equivalence classes of projectively equivalent representations. Two representations of  $U(n)$  with weights  $\vec{l} = (l_1, l_2, \dots, l_n)$  and  $\vec{m} = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n)$  are projectively equivalent if and only if there exists some integer  $s$  such that  $m_i = l_i + s$  for all  $1 \leq i \leq n$ . Any irreducible representation of  $U(n)$  remains irreducible when restricted to  $SU(n)$ . Furthermore, by choosing one representative from each class of projectively equivalent representations of  $U(n)$  and restricting to  $SU(n)$  one obtains a set of inequivalent irreducible representations of  $SU(n)$ . The Lie algebra  $su(n)$  corresponding to the Lie group  $SU(n)$  is easily characterized; it is the space of all traceless  $n \times n$  antihermitian matrices. Thus matrix elements of irreducible representations of  $SU(n)$  are obtained by essentially the same quantum algorithm given for  $U(n)$  in section 3.3.

### 3.6 Characters

As always, an algorithm for approximating matrix elements immediately gives us an algorithm for approximating the normalized characters. However, the characters of  $U(n)$ ,  $SU(n)$ , and  $SO(n)$  are classically computable in  $\text{poly}(n)$  time. As discussed in [16], the characters of any compact Lie group are given by the Weyl character formula. In general this formula may involve sums of exponentially many terms. However, in the special cases of  $U(n)$ ,  $SU(n)$ , and  $SO(n)$  the formula reduces to simpler forms[16], given below.

Because characters depend only on conjugacy class, the character  $\chi_{\vec{m}}(u)$  depends only on the eigenvalues of  $u$ . For  $u \in U(n)$  let  $\lambda_1, \dots, \lambda_n$  denote the eigenvalues. Let  $\vec{m} = (m_1, m_2, \dots, m_n) \in \mathbb{Z}^n$  be the weight of a representation of  $U(n)$ . Let

$$l_i = m_i + n - i \tag{17}$$

for each  $i \in \{1, 2, \dots, n\}$ . The character of the representation of weight  $\vec{m}$  is

$$\chi_{\vec{m}}^{U(n)}(u) = \frac{\det A}{\det B}$$

where  $A$  and  $B$  are the following  $n \times n$  matrices

$$\begin{aligned} A_{ij} &= \lambda_i^{l_j} \\ B_{ij} &= \lambda_i^{n-j}. \end{aligned}$$

This formula breaks down if  $u$  has a degenerate spectrum. However, the value of the character for degenerate  $u$  can be obtained by taking the limit as some eigenvalues converge to the same value. As shown in [41], one can obtain the dimension  $d_{\vec{m}}$  of the representation corresponding to a given weight  $\vec{m}$  by calculating  $\lim_{\epsilon \rightarrow 1} \chi_{\vec{m}}(u)$ . Specifically, by choosing  $\lambda_j = e^{ij\epsilon}$  for each  $1 \leq j \leq n$  and taking the limit as  $\epsilon \rightarrow 0$  one obtains

$$d_{\vec{m}} = \frac{\prod_{i < j} (l_j - l_i)}{\prod_{i < j} (j - i)},$$

where  $l_i$  is as defined in equation 17.

As discussed in section 3.5, the irreducible representations of  $SU(n)$  are restrictions of irreducible representations of  $U(n)$ , therefore the characters of  $SU(n)$  are given by the same formula as the characters of  $U(n)$ .

$SO(n)$  consists of real matrices. The characteristic polynomials of these matrices have real coefficients, and thus their roots come in complex conjugate pairs. Thus, the eigenvalues of an element  $g \in SO(2k+1)$  take the form

$$\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k, 1, \lambda_1^*, \lambda_2^*, \dots, \lambda_k^*,$$

and for  $g \in SO(2k)$ , the eigenvalues take the form

$$\lambda_1, \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_k, \lambda_1^*, \lambda_2^*, \dots, \lambda_k^*.$$

As discussed in [16], the characters of the special orthogonal group are given by

$$\chi_{\vec{m}}^{SO(2k+1)}(g) = \frac{\det C}{\det D}$$

and

$$\chi_{\vec{m}}^{SO(2k)}(g) = \frac{\det E + \det F}{\det G}$$

where  $C$  and  $D$  are the following  $k \times k$  matrices

$$\begin{aligned} C_{ij} &= \lambda_j^{m_i+n-i+1/2} - \lambda_j^{-(m_i+n-i+1/2)} \\ D_{ij} &= \lambda_j^{n-i+1/2} - \lambda_j^{-(n-i+1/2)} \end{aligned}$$

and  $E, F, G$  are the following  $(k-1) \times (k-1)$  matrices

$$\begin{aligned} E_{ij} &= \lambda_j^{l_i} + \lambda_j^{-l_i} \\ F_{ij} &= \lambda_j^{l_i} - \lambda_j^{-l_i} \\ G_{ij} &= \lambda_j^{n-i} + \lambda_j^{-(n-i)}, \end{aligned}$$

where  $l_i$  is as defined in equation 17.

As with  $U(n)$ , the character of any element with a degenerate spectrum can be obtained by taking an appropriate limit.

## 4 Concluding Remarks

Upon surveying known quantum algorithms[26], one observes that the quantum algorithms offering super-polynomial speedup over the best known classical algorithms for non-oracular problems fall mainly into three classes. The first class is based on the hidden subgroup problem. This class includes quantum algorithms for factoring as well as other number theoretic problems such as discrete logarithms and solving Pell's equation. The second class of algorithms find additive approximations to topological invariants such as the Jones and HOMFLY polynomials. The third is simulation of quantum systems. There are also a small number of known exponential quantum speedups outside of these three classes, such as the BQP-complete linear-algebraic and combinatoric problems described in[25, 24, 29]. The first two classes of algorithms are, at their core, representation theoretic. The hidden subgroup algorithms are based on Fourier transforms over groups. The quantum algorithms for additively approximating Jones and HOMFLY polynomials work by finding matrix elements or traces of quantum circuits implementing representations of the braid group[2, 42, 37, 27].

By continuing to consider the problem of estimating matrix elements of group representations, but removing the requirement that the matrix elements have a topological interpretation, we arrive at a greatly expanded class of problems to attack by quantum computation. As shown here, some of these problems appear to admit exponential speedup over classical computation. In the future it would be interesting to extend the methods of this paper to other groups. The promising candidates are the groups with unitary irreducible representations of exponentially large dimension. All of the finite-dimensional representations of compact groups and finite groups are unitary given an appropriate choice of basis[4]. Conversely, connected noncompact simple Lie groups have no nontrivial unitary finite-dimensional representations (see [6], theorem 8.1.2). This applies to the symplectic group, for example. As usual, the quantum algorithms must compete with some non-obvious classical algorithms. For example, the matrix elements of the irreducible representations of the Heisenberg group over  $\mathbb{F}_p$  can be computed classically in polynomial time even when  $p$  is exponentially large (see section 2.2. of [34]).

It also seems worth considering whether efficient quantum circuits implementing unitary representations of groups might have algorithmic uses other than the estimation of matrix elements via the Hadamard test. For example, efficient quantum circuit implementations of unitary representations of groups are useful in constructing quantum Fourier transforms over those groups (see the discussion of "twiddle factors" in [31]).

The Young-Yamanouchi representations of  $S_n$  and  $A_n$  and the Gel'fand-Tsetlin representations of  $U(n)$ ,  $SU(n)$ , and  $SO(n)$  all use subgroup adapted bases.  $S_n$  has a subgroup isomorphic to  $S_{n-1}$  of all permutations leaving the last object fixed. An irreducible representation of  $S_n$  when restricted to this subgroup is equivalent to a direct sum of irreducible representations of  $S_{n-1}$ . In the Young-Yamanouchi basis, the matrices representing the elements of this subgroup are already in the block diagonal form corresponding to this direct sum. This phenomenon occurs similarly for the entire chain of subgroups  $S_n \supset S_{n-1} \supset \dots \supset S_1$ . The Gel'fand-Tsetlin basis for the irreducible representations of  $U(n)$  is subgroup adapted to the chain  $U(n) \supset U(n-1) \supset \dots \supset U(1)$ , and similarly for  $SU(n)$  and  $SO(n)$ . For a more thorough discussion of subgroup adapted bases see [31]. Like the quantum circuits in this paper, the efficient quantum circuits for implementing representations of the braid group[2, 42, 37, 27] and the efficient quantum circuits for quantum Fourier transforms[31] all depend on subgroup adapted bases. Thus subgroup adapted bases give rise to almost all known exponential quantum speedups other than quantum simulation.

## 5 Acknowledgements

I thank Daniel Rockmore, Cris Moore, Andrew Childs, and Jeffrey Goldstone for useful discussions. I thank Isaac Chuang and Vincent Crespi for comments that helped to inspire this work. Parts of this work were completed at the Center for Theoretical physics at MIT, the Digital Materials Laboratory at RIKEN, and the Institute for Quantum Information at Caltech. I thank these institutions as well as the Army Research Office (ARO), the Disruptive Technology Office (DTO), the Department of Energy (DOE), Franco Nori and Sahel Ashab at RIKEN, and John Preskill at Caltech.

## A $\|a_{\vec{m}}(H_p)\|$ is independent of $p$

As shown in section 2.3, the irreducible representation of an arbitrary  $u \in U(n)$  with weight  $\vec{m}$  can be computed by simulating the time evolution according to a series of Hamiltonians of the form  $A_{\vec{m}}(H_p)$ , where  $A_{\vec{m}}$  is the Gel'fand-Tsetlin representation of the Lie algebra  $su(n)$  and

$$H_p = 0_p \oplus h \oplus 0_{n-p-2},$$

where  $h$  is a  $2 \times 2$  antihermitian matrix. The quantum algorithm for simulating these Hamiltonians require that  $\|A_{\vec{m}}(H_p)\|$  be at most poly( $n$ ). In section 2.3 we showed this to be the case for  $p = 0$ . Here we prove it for all  $p$  by showing:

**Proposition 1** *Let  $h$  be a fixed  $2 \times 2$  antihermitian matrix and let  $H_p = 0_p \oplus h \oplus 0_{n-p-2}$ . Let  $a_{\vec{m}}$  be the Gel'fand-Tsetlin representation of  $su(n)$  with weight  $\vec{m}$ . Then  $\|a_{\vec{m}}(H_p)\|$  is independent of  $p$ .*

**Proof:**

Let  $U_p^k = e^{kH_p}$ . Then

$$U_p^k = \mathbf{1}_p \oplus e^{kh} \oplus \mathbf{1}_{n-p-2}.$$

Thus for any  $0 \leq q \leq n$ , there exists  $V \in U(n)$  such that

$$U_q^k = VU_p^kV^{-1}. \quad (18)$$

Specifically,  $V$  is just a permutation matrix. Let  $A_{\vec{m}}$  be the Gel'fand-Tsetlin representation of  $SU(n)$ . That is,

$$A_{\vec{m}}(U_q^k) = e^{a_{\vec{m}}(kH_q)}.$$

Thus

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{d}{dk} A_{\vec{m}}(U_p^k) \right\| &= \|a_{\vec{m}}(H_p) e^{ka_{\vec{m}}(H_p)}\| \\ &= \|a_{\vec{m}}(H_p)\|. \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

Here we have used the fact that  $A_{\vec{m}}$  is a unitary representation. Similarly,

$$\|a_{\vec{m}}(H_q)\| = \left\| \frac{d}{dk} A_{\vec{m}}(U_q^k) \right\|.$$

Using equation 18, this is equal to

$$\left\| \frac{d}{dk} A_{\vec{m}}(VU_p^kV^{-1}) \right\|.$$

Because  $A_{\vec{m}}$  is a group homomorphism and  $V$  is independent of  $k$  this is equal to

$$\left\| A_{\vec{m}}(V) \left( \frac{d}{dk} U_p^k \right) A_{\vec{m}}(V)^{-1} \right\|.$$

Because  $A_{\vec{m}}$  is a unitary representation this is equal to

$$\left\| \frac{d}{dk} U_p^k \right\|.$$

By equation 19 this is equal to  $\|a_{\vec{m}}(H_p)\|$ .  $\square$

## References

- [1] Dorit Aharonov and Itai Arad. The BQP-hardness of approximating the Jones polynomial. *arXiv:quant-ph/0605181*, 2006.
- [2] Dorit Aharonov, Vaughan Jones, and Zeph Landau. A polynomial quantum algorithm for approximating the Jones polynomial. In *Proceedings of the 38th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2006. arXiv:quant-ph/0511096.
- [3] Dorit Aharonov and Amnon Ta-Shma. Adiabatic quantum state generation and statistical zero knowledge. In *Proceedings of the 35th ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, 2003. arXiv:quant-ph/0301023.
- [4] Michael Artin. *Algebra*, chapter 9. Prentice Hall, 1991.
- [5] László Babai and Lajos Rónyai. Computing irreducible representations of finite groups. *Mathematics of Computation*, 55(192):705–722, 1990.
- [6] A. O. Barut and R. Rączka. *Theory of Group Representations and Applications*. World Scientific, 2nd edition, 1986.
- [7] Robert Beals. Quantum computation of fourier transforms over symmetric groups. In *Proceedings of the twenty-ninth annual ACM symposium on the theory of computing*, pages 48–53, 1997.
- [8] Phillippe Biane. Representations of symmetric groups and free probability. *Advances in Mathematics*, 138:126–181, 1998.
- [9] H. Boerner. *Representations of Groups*. North-Holland, 1963.
- [10] Peter Bürgisser. The computational complexity to evaluate representations of general linear groups. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 30(3):1010–1022, 2000. Preliminary version appears in Proc. 10th International Conference on Formal Power Series and Algebraic Combinatorics.
- [11] Joseph M. Clifton. A simplification of the computation of the natural representation of the symmetric group  $S_n$ . *Proceedings of the American Mathematical Society*, 83(2):248–250, 1981.
- [12] Persi Diaconis. The cutoff phenomenon in finite Markov chains. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, pages 1659–1664, 1996.
- [13] Ömer Eğecioğlu. Algorithms for the character theory of the symmetric group. In *EUROCAL '85*, volume 204/1985 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 206–224, 1985.
- [14] Philippe Di Francesco, Pierre Mathieu, and David Sénéchal. *Conformal Field Theory*. Springer, 1997.
- [15] Michael Freedman, Michael Larsen, and Zhenghan Wang. A modular functor which is universal for quantum computation. *arXiv:quant-ph/0001108*, 2000.
- [16] William Fulton and Joe Harris. *Representation Theory: A first course*. Springer, 2004.
- [17] Izrail M. Gelfand. *Collected Papers*, volume 2. Springer-Verlag, 1988.
- [18] Robert Gilmore. *Lie groups, Lie algebras, and some of their applications*. Dover, 2006.
- [19] Johannes Grabmeier and Adalbert Kerber. The evaluation of irreducible polynomial representations of the general linear groups and the unitary groups over fields of characteristic 0. *Acta Applicandae Mathematicae*, 8:271–291, 1987.
- [20] Curtis Greene, Albert Nijenhuis, and Herbert S. Wilf. A probabilistic proof of a formula for the number of Young tableaux of a given shape. *Advances in Mathematics*, 31(1):104–109, 1979.

- [21] Morton Hamermesh. *Group Theory and its Application to Physical Problems*. Addison-Wesley, 1962.
- [22] Patrick Headley. On Young’s orthogonal form and the characters of the alternating group. *Journal of Algebraic Combinatorics*, 5:127–134, 1996.
- [23] Charles Thomas Hepler. On the complexity of computing characters of finite groups. Master’s thesis, University of Calgary, 1994.
- [24] Dominik Janzing and Pawel Wocjan. A promiseBQP-complete string rewriting problem. *arXiv:0705.1180*, 2007.
- [25] Dominik Janzing and Pawel Wocjan. A simple promiseBQP-complete matrix problem. *Theory of Computing*, 3:61–79, 2007. arXiv:quant-ph/0606229.
- [26] Stephen P. Jordan. *Quantum Computation Beyond the Circuit Model*. PhD thesis, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, 2008. arXiv:0809.2307.
- [27] Stephen P. Jordan and Pawel Wocjan. Estimating Jones and HOMFLY polynomials with one clean qubit. *arXiv:0807.4688*, 2008.
- [28] Jacek Karwowski. Symmetric-group-based methods in quantum chemistry. *Journal of Mathematical Chemistry*, (23):127–149, 1998.
- [29] E. Knill and R. Laflamme. Quantum computation and quadratically signed weight enumerators. *Information Processing Letters*, 79(4):173–179, 2001. arXiv:quant-ph/9909094.
- [30] Robert König. *de Finetti theorems for quantum states*. PhD thesis, University of Cambridge, 2007. see pg. 37.
- [31] Cristopher Moore, Daniel Rockmore, and Alexander Russell. Generic quantum Fourier transforms. In *SODA ’04: Proceedings of the fifteenth annual ACM-SIAM Symposium On Discrete Algorithms*, pages 778–787. Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 2004. arXiv:quant-ph/0304064.
- [32] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information*. Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, UK, 2000.
- [33] Ruben Pauncz. *The Symmetric Group in Quantum Chemistry*. CRC Press, 1995.
- [34] Jaikumar Radhakrishnan, Martin Rötteler, and Pranab Sen. On the power of random bases in Fourier sampling: hidden subgroup problem in the Heisenberg group. In *Automata, Languages, and Programming*, volume 3580/2005 of *Lecture Notes in Computer Science*, pages 1399–1411. Springer, 2005. arXiv:quant-ph/0503114.
- [35] Sten Rettrup. A recursive formula for Young’s orthogonal representation. *Chemical Physics Letters*, 47(1):59–60, 1977.
- [36] Yuval Roichman. Characters of the symmetric groups: formulas, estimates and applications. In D. A. Hejhal, J. Friedman, M. C. Gutzwiller, and A. M. Odlyzko, editors, *Emerging Applications of Number Theory*, volume 109 of *The IMA Volumes in Mathematics and its Applications*, pages 525–546. Springer, 1999.
- [37] Peter W. Shor and Stephen P. Jordan. Estimating Jones polynomials is a complete problem for one clean qubit. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 8(8-9):681–714, 2008. arXiv:0707.2831.
- [38] R. M. Thrall. Young’s semi-normal representation of the symmetric group. *Duke Mathematical Journal*, 8:611–624, 1941.

- [39] A. M. Vershik and S. V. Kerov. Asymptotics of the largest and typical dimensions of irreducible representations of a symmetric group. *Functional Analysis and its Applications*, 19(1):21–31, 1985.
- [40] N. Ja. Vilenkin and A. U. Klimyk. *Representations of Lie groups and special functions*. Kluwer, 1992.
- [41] Hermann Weyl. *The Classical Groups*, chapter 7. Princeton University Press, 1946.
- [42] Pawel Wocjan and Jon Yard. The Jones polynomial: quantum algorithms and applications in quantum complexity theory. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 8(1-2):147–180, 2008. arXiv:quant-ph/0603069.
- [43] Wei Wu and Qianer Zhang. An efficient algorithm for evaluating the standard Young-Yamanouchi orthogonal representation with two-column Young tableaux for symmetric groups. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General*, 25:3737–3747, 1992.
- [44] Wei Wu and Qianer Zhang. The orthogonal and the natural representation for symmetric groups. *International Journal of Quantum Chemistry*, 50:55–67, 1994.
- [45] Christof Zalka. Implementing high dimensional unitary representations of  $SU(2)$  on a quantum computer. *arXiv:quant-ph/0407140*, 2004.