

Fluid fermionic fragments for optimizing quantum measurements of electronic Hamiltonians in the variational quantum eigensolver

Seonghoon Choi,^{1,2} Ignacio Loaiza,^{1,2} and Artur F. Izmaylov^{1,2, a)}

¹⁾*Department of Physical and Environmental Sciences, University of Toronto Scarborough, Toronto, Ontario M1C 1A4, Canada*

²⁾*Chemical Physics Theory Group, Department of Chemistry, University of Toronto, Toronto, Ontario M5S 3H6, Canada*

(Dated: 1 September 2022)

Measuring the expectation value of the molecular electronic Hamiltonian is one of the challenging parts of the variational quantum eigensolver. A widely used strategy is to express the Hamiltonian as a sum of measurable fragments using fermionic operator algebra. Such fragments have an advantage of conserving molecular symmetries that can be used for error mitigation. The number of measurements required to obtain the Hamiltonian expectation value is proportional to a sum of fragment variances. Here, we introduce a new method for lowering the fragments' variances by exploiting flexibility in the fragments' form. Due to idempotency of the occupation number operators, some parts of two-electron fragments can be turned into one-electron fragments, which then can be partially collected in a purely one-electron fragment. This repartitioning does not affect the expectation value of the Hamiltonian but has non-vanishing contributions to the variance of each fragment. The proposed method finds the optimal repartitioning by employing variances estimated using a classically efficient proxy for the quantum wavefunction. Numerical tests on several molecules show that repartitioning of one-electron terms lowers the number of measurements by more than an order of magnitude.

I. INTRODUCTION

The variational quantum eigensolver (VQE)^{1–5} is a promising hybrid quantum-classical algorithm for finding the ground-state of the molecular electronic Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{pq} h_{pq} \hat{E}_p^q + \sum_{pqrs} g_{pqrs} \hat{E}_p^q \hat{E}_r^s, \quad (1)$$

presented here in so-called chemists' notation, i.e., in terms of one-electron excitation operators, $\hat{E}_p^q = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q$, while h_{pq} and g_{pqrs} are related to one- and two-electronic integrals, N is the number of spin-orbitals.

VQE circumvents the hardware limitations of today's noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) devices⁶ by exploiting both quantum and classical computers: A quantum computer prepares a parameterized trial state $|\psi_\theta\rangle$ and measures its energy $E_\theta = \langle \psi_\theta | \hat{H} | \psi_\theta \rangle$, while a classical computer suggests new θ parameters to minimize E_θ (for brevity, we omit θ from now). However, measuring the expectation value E is not trivial because digital quantum computers can only measure polynomial functions of Pauli- \hat{z} operators.

A common technique for measuring E is to express the

molecular electron Hamiltonian in Eq. (1) as

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H} &= \hat{H}_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_f} \hat{H}_\alpha = \sum_{pq} h_{pq} \hat{E}_p^q + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_f} \sum_{pqrs} g_{pqrs}^{(\alpha)} \hat{E}_p^q \hat{E}_r^s \\ &= \hat{U}_0^\dagger \left(\sum_p \lambda_p \hat{n}_p \right) \hat{U}_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_f} \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger \left(\sum_{pq} \lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)} \hat{n}_p \hat{n}_q \right) \hat{U}_\alpha, \end{aligned} \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{n}_p = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_p$ are occupation number operators, and $\hat{U}_\alpha = \exp[\sum_{p>q} \theta_{pq}^{(\alpha)} (\hat{E}_p^q - \hat{E}_q^p)]$ are orbital rotations. Since \hat{n}_p is mapped to polynomial functions of Pauli- \hat{z} under all standard qubit-fermion transformations,⁷ each $\hat{U}_\alpha \hat{H}_\alpha \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger$ is measurable on a quantum computer. Therefore, E can be obtained by measuring each \hat{H}_α term separately using

$$E = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{N_f} \langle \psi | \hat{H}_\alpha | \psi \rangle = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{N_f} \langle \hat{U}_\alpha \psi | \hat{U}_\alpha \hat{H}_\alpha \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger | \hat{U}_\alpha \psi \rangle. \quad (3)$$

Equation (3) shows that to measure each \hat{H}_α , one first has to apply \hat{U}_α on $|\psi\rangle$. Fortunately, implementing \hat{U}_α on a quantum computer is efficient as it only requires $\binom{N}{2}$ two-qubit rotations and a gate depth of N .⁸

To find the fragments, \hat{H}_α , starting from the Hamiltonian in the second-quantized form, one can employ either the low-rank (LR) decomposition^{9–11} or the full-rank (FR) optimization.¹² Both methods are only concerned with the two-electron fragments because \hat{U}_0 for the one-electron fragment (\hat{H}_0) can be found easily as it simply corresponds to a unitary matrix that diagonalizes the one-electron tensor, h_{pq} .⁸ The difference between

^{a)}Electronic mail: artur.izmaylov@utoronto.ca

LR and FR fragments is the rank of the resulting $\lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)}$ [in Eq. (2)]. In the LR decomposition, $\lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)}$ is an outer product of some vector $\eta_p^{(\alpha)}$ (i.e., $\lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)} = \eta_p^{(\alpha)} \eta_q^{(\alpha)}$) and, therefore, has rank 1. In contrast, in FR optimization, $\lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)}$ can be a full-rank hermitian matrix. Increased flexibility of FR fragments was exploited in Ref. 12 to lower the number of measurements required to obtain E up to error ϵ when each \hat{H}_α is measured independently:¹³

$$M(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{N_f} \frac{\text{Var}_\psi(\hat{H}_\alpha)}{m_\alpha}, \quad (4)$$

where $\text{Var}_\psi(\hat{H}_\alpha) = \langle \psi | \hat{H}_\alpha^2 | \psi \rangle - \langle \psi | \hat{H}_\alpha | \psi \rangle^2$ is the variance of \hat{H}_α , and m_α is the fraction of the total measurements allocated to \hat{H}_α . Developing techniques for measuring E with a low $M(\epsilon)$ is especially important for VQE because a recent analysis¹⁴ showed that the advantage of VQE over state-of-the-art classical algorithms is limited due to the large $M(\epsilon)$.

Yet, even the best implementation of the FR optimization was shown to have higher $M(\epsilon)$'s than those in the measurement approaches developed in the qubit space.^{13,15-22} The qubit-space techniques start by applying one of the fermion-qubit mappings^{7,23} to the fermionic Hamiltonian to produce the qubit Hamiltonian

$$\hat{H}_q = \sum_{j=1}^{N_f} c_j \hat{P}_j, \quad (5)$$

where each \hat{P}_j is an N -qubit Pauli product (i.e., a tensor product of Pauli operators for individual qubits). Thus obtained \hat{H}_q is subsequently partitioned into a linear combination of N_f independently measured fragments \hat{H}_α (i.e., $\hat{H}_q = \sum_{\beta=1}^{N_f} \hat{H}_\beta$), where

$$\hat{H}_\beta = \hat{V}_\beta^\dagger \left(\sum_i a_i^{(\beta)} \hat{z}_i + \sum_{ij} a_{ij}^{(\beta)} \hat{z}_i \hat{z}_j + \dots \right) \hat{V}_\beta. \quad (6)$$

Every \hat{H}_β contains only mutually commutative Pauli products and thus allows one to efficiently implement the corresponding \hat{V}_β using only one- and two-qubit Clifford gates.^{13,20,24,25} The qubit-space methods with the lowest $M(\epsilon)$ take advantage of the flexibility in the fragments offered by the realization that some \hat{P}_j can belong to multiple \hat{H}_β . The coefficients of \hat{P}_j in different \hat{H}_β , $c_j^{(\beta)}$, can be varied without changing the total expectation value of \hat{H}_q as long as $c_j^{(\beta)}$ sum to c_j in the qubit Hamiltonian.²¹ In addition, even \hat{P}_j not present in \hat{H}_q can be introduced into multiple \hat{H}_β provided that corresponding $c_j^{(\beta)}$ sum to zero.²² A significant reduction in $M(\epsilon)$ was achieved by optimizing $c_j^{(\beta)}$ using approximate variances obtained by employing a classically efficient wavefunction, $|\phi\rangle$, to estimate $\text{Var}_\phi(\hat{H}_\beta)$.

In this work, we present an extension to fermionic fragment techniques that further increases their flexibility in reducing the number of measurements. The new approach generalizes the technique of repartitioning of some fragments used in the qubit space. It extends the repartitioning idea from commuting to non-commuting operators. Another motivation for developing fermionic measurement schemes is their advantage compared to the qubit-space counterparts in conserving molecular symmetries (e.g., electronic number and spin operators). These symmetries can be used for error mitigation techniques, which are essential for advancing quantum computing schemes on near-term devices.^{26,27}

II. THEORY

A. Fluid Fermionic Fragments

Here, we present a new approach that exploits two properties of fermionic operators to minimize the number of measurements in Eq. (4). First, any linear combination of one-electron hermitian operators can be brought to the factorized form

$$\sum_\alpha c_\alpha \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger \left(\sum_p \epsilon_p^{(\alpha)} \hat{n}_p \right) \hat{U}_\alpha = \hat{U}^\dagger \left(\sum_p \epsilon_p \hat{n}_p \right) \hat{U}, \quad (7)$$

where $c_\alpha, \epsilon_p^{(\alpha)}$, and ϵ_p are some real coefficients, and \hat{U}_α, \hat{U} are orbital rotations. Second, the occupation number operators are idempotent, $\hat{n}_p^2 = \hat{n}_p$.

Using the \hat{n}_p idempotency, each \hat{H}_α in Eq. (2) with $\alpha > 0$ can be re-written as a sum of one- and two-electron parts:

$$\hat{H}_\alpha = \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger \left(\sum_p \lambda_{pp}^{(\alpha)} \hat{n}_p + \sum_{p \neq q} \lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)} \hat{n}_p \hat{n}_q \right) \hat{U}_\alpha. \quad (8)$$

This expression reveals the freedom that one can extract any amount of the one-electron part from every \hat{H}_α and add it to \hat{H}_0 , thereby re-partitioning the one- and two-electron Hamiltonians. Thus, the re-partitioned fragments, which we will refer to as fluid fermionic fragments (F^3), are

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{H}'_0 &= \hat{H}_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_f} \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger \left(\sum_p c_p^{(\alpha)} \hat{n}_p \right) \hat{U}_\alpha, \\ \hat{H}'_\alpha &= \hat{H}_\alpha - \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger \left(\sum_p c_p^{(\alpha)} \hat{n}_p \right) \hat{U}_\alpha \\ &= \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger \left[\sum_p (\lambda_{pp}^{(\alpha)} - c_p^{(\alpha)}) \hat{n}_p + \sum_{p \neq q} \lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)} \hat{n}_p \hat{n}_q \right] \hat{U}_\alpha. \end{aligned} \quad (9)$$

Even after the modification, each \hat{H}_α for $\alpha > 0$ remains measurable because $\hat{U}_\alpha \hat{H}_\alpha \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger$ still maps onto a polyno-

mial function of Pauli- \hat{z} after qubit-fermion transformations. For \hat{H}'_0 , new \hat{U}'_0 and λ'_p can easily be found by simply diagonalizing $h'_{pq} = h_{pq} + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_f} \sum_r^N (U_{rp}^{(\alpha)})^* c_r^{(\alpha)} U_{rq}^{(\alpha)}$, where $U_{pq}^{(\alpha)}$ is an $N \times N$ matrix representation of \hat{U}_α .^{8,12} Measuring \hat{H}'_α instead of \hat{H}_α gives the same E because re-partitioning does not change the operator sum: $\sum_{\alpha=0}^{N_f} \hat{H}'_\alpha = \sum_{\alpha=0}^{N_f} \hat{H}_\alpha = \hat{H}$. In contrast, $M(\epsilon)$ changes with the choice of $c_p^{(\alpha)}$ because $\text{Var}_\psi(\hat{H}'_\alpha)$ has a non-linear dependence on $c_p^{(\alpha)}$. As a consequence, one can reduce $M(\epsilon)$ by optimizing $c_p^{(\alpha)}$. Linearity of fermionic fragments with respect to $c_p^{(\alpha)}$ makes variance optimization particularly efficient.

B. Optimization of the number of measurements

In the following, we will present the approach for optimally repartitioning the one- and two-electron fragments to lower $M(\epsilon)$ (initial fragments are obtained as described in Appendix A). Since $M(\epsilon)$ depends on the fragment variances evaluated with the quantum wavefunction $|\psi\rangle$, which is classically difficult, we minimize the approximation to $M(\epsilon)$ computed with $\text{Var}_\phi(\hat{H}'_\alpha)$:

$$M_\phi(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \sum_{\alpha=0}^{N_f} \frac{\text{Var}_\phi(\hat{H}'_\alpha)}{m_\alpha}. \quad (11)$$

The variances of the fragments after the repartition [\hat{H}'_α in Eqs (9) and (10)] are obtained as

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_\phi(\hat{H}'_0) = & \text{Var}_\phi(\hat{H}_0) + \sum_{\alpha,\beta}^{N_f} \sum_{p,q}^N c_p^{(\alpha)} c_q^{(\beta)} \text{Cov}_\phi(\hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}, \hat{O}_q^{(\beta)}) \\ & + \sum_{\alpha}^{N_f} \sum_p^N c_p^{(\alpha)} \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{H}_0, \hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}), \end{aligned} \quad (12)$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{Var}_\phi(\hat{H}'_\alpha) = & \text{Var}_\phi(\hat{H}_\alpha) + \sum_{p,q}^N c_p^{(\alpha)} c_q^{(\alpha)} \text{Cov}_\phi(\hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}, \hat{O}_q^{(\alpha)}) \\ & - \sum_p^N c_p^{(\alpha)} \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{H}_\alpha, \hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}), \end{aligned} \quad (13)$$

where we introduced $\overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{A}, \hat{B}) = \text{Cov}_\phi(\hat{A}, \hat{B}) + \text{Cov}_\phi(\hat{B}, \hat{A})$ and $\hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)} = \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{n}_p \hat{U}_\alpha$ for notational simplicity. To minimize Eq. (11) with respect to $c_p^{(\alpha)}$ and m_α , we perform two-step iterative optimization following Refs. 21 and 22: 1) $c_p^{(\alpha)}$ are optimized with fixed m_α and 2) m_α are updated to the optimal allocation according to Eq. (22) with fixed $c_p^{(\alpha)}$. To optimize the $c_p^{(\alpha)}$ variables with fixed m_α , one can solve the system of linear

equations:

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial M_\phi(\epsilon)}{\partial c_p^{(\alpha)}} = & \frac{1}{m_0} \left[\sum_{\beta}^{N_f} \sum_q^N c_q^{(\beta)} \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}, \hat{O}_q^{(\beta)}) + \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{H}_0, \hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}) \right] + \\ & \frac{1}{m_\alpha} \left[\sum_q^N c_q^{(\alpha)} \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}, \hat{O}_q^{(\alpha)}) - \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{H}_\alpha, \hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}) \right] = 0. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

The final m_α obtained at the end of the iterative procedure suggests the optimal allocation of the total budget for each \hat{H}_α . The suggested Mm_α measurements for each fragment \hat{H}_α is not an integer, but rounding Mm_α to the nearest integer should only have a negligible effect on the measurement error because $M \gtrsim 10^6$ in practice. We will refer to the algorithm proposed in this work as the fluid fermionic fragment (F³) method.

C. Reducing the number of optimization variables

The computational cost for optimizing $c_q^{(\alpha)}$ in the F³ method increases with the number of $c_q^{(\alpha)}$ (N_c). The two main contributors to the computational time are the evaluation of covariances, $\overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}, \hat{O}_q^{(\beta)})$, and solving the system of linear Eqs. (14). Because the evaluation of $\overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}, \hat{O}_q^{(\beta)})$ scales quadratically with N_c and the computational time required for solving Eq. (14) has an approximately cubic scaling with N_c , the cost of F³ can be lowered significantly by reducing N_c . Therefore, we propose several restrictions on $c_q^{(\alpha)}$ to lower their number.

Using spin symmetry of the electronic Hamiltonian written in a spin-restricted spin-orbital basis, we achieve a twofold reduction in the number of $c_q^{(\alpha)}$. Note that $\lambda_{2i-1,2i-1}^{(\alpha)} = \lambda_{2i,2i}^{(\alpha)}$ for $i = 1, \dots, N/2$ in the initial \hat{H}_α fragments obtained by considering the smaller \tilde{g}_{ijkl} tensor over spatial orbitals (see Appendix A for definitions). Because $\lambda_{2i-1,2i-1}^{(\alpha)} = \lambda_{2i,2i}^{(\alpha)}$, we impose that the same amount of $\lambda_{2i-1,2i-1}^{(\alpha)}$ and $\lambda_{2i,2i}^{(\alpha)}$ is extracted from \hat{H}_α , i.e., we impose that $c_{2i-1}^{(\alpha)} = c_{2i}^{(\alpha)} = \tilde{c}_i^{(\alpha)}$, thereby reducing the number of optimization variables by half. In the resulting F³-Full method, $N_c = N_f N/2$, and the system

of equations is simplified to

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial M_\phi(\epsilon)}{\partial \tilde{c}_i^{(\alpha)}} = & \\ \frac{1}{m_0} \left[\sum_{\beta}^{N_f} \sum_j^{N/2} \tilde{c}_j^{(\beta)} \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{P}_i^{(\alpha)}, \hat{P}_j^{(\beta)}) + \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{H}_0, \hat{P}_i^{(\alpha)}) \right] + & \\ \frac{1}{m_\alpha} \left[\sum_j^{N/2} \tilde{c}_j^{(\alpha)} \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{P}_i^{(\alpha)}, \hat{P}_j^{(\alpha)}) - \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{H}_\alpha, \hat{P}_i^{(\alpha)}) \right] = 0, & \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

where $\hat{P}_i^{(\alpha)} = \hat{O}_{2i-1}^{(\alpha)} + \hat{O}_{2i}^{(\alpha)} = \sum_\sigma \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger \hat{n}_{i\sigma} \hat{U}_\alpha$.

Even more drastic reduction in N_c can be achieved if we restrict $c_p^{(\alpha)}$ to be p -independent. This restricts us to re-partitioning of only a fraction of the entire one-electron part of a two-electron \hat{H}_α fragment [i.e., a fraction of $\hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger (\sum_p \lambda_{pp}^{(\alpha)} \hat{n}_p) \hat{U}_\alpha$]. To this end, we restrict $c_p^{(\alpha)}$ as a scalar multiple of $\lambda_{pp}^{(\alpha)}$: $c_p^{(\alpha)} = c^{(\alpha)} \lambda_{pp}^{(\alpha)}$. As a result, $N_c = N_f$, and the system (14) simplifies down to

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon^2 \frac{\partial M_\phi(\epsilon)}{\partial c^{(\alpha)}} = & \\ \frac{1}{m_0} \left[\sum_{\beta}^{N_f} c^{(\beta)} \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{O}^{(\alpha)}, \hat{O}^{(\beta)}) + \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{H}_0, \hat{O}^{(\alpha)}) \right] + & \\ \frac{1}{m_\alpha} \left[2c^{(\alpha)} \text{Var}_\phi(\hat{O}^{(\alpha)}) - \overline{\text{Cov}}_\phi(\hat{H}_\alpha, \hat{O}^{(\alpha)}) \right] = 0, & \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

where $\hat{O}^{(\alpha)} = \sum_p^N \lambda_{pp}^{(\alpha)} \hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}$. We will refer to this reduced version of F³ as F³-R1.

Yet another reduction of variables can be done and is motivated by the relationship between $[\text{Var}_\psi(\hat{H}_\alpha)]^{1/2}$ appearing in the expression for the total measurement number with optimal m_α [$M_{\text{opt}}(\epsilon)$ in Appendix A] and the L_1 norm of a coefficient vector for a linear combination of unitaries (LCU) decomposition: $\hat{H}_\alpha = \sum_j a_j^{(\alpha)} \hat{V}_j + d_\alpha \hat{1}$, where \hat{V}_j are some unitaries.²⁸ Maximum $[\text{Var}_\psi(\hat{H}_\alpha)]^{1/2}$ for any $|\psi\rangle$ occurs when $|\psi\rangle = (|\max\rangle_\alpha + |\min\rangle_\alpha)/\sqrt{2}$, where $|\max\rangle_\alpha$ ($|\min\rangle_\alpha$) is the eigenstate of \hat{H}_α with the highest (lowest) eigenvalue, $E_{\max}^{(\alpha)}$ ($E_{\min}^{(\alpha)}$); the corresponding maximum is

$$\max_{\psi} \sqrt{\text{Var}_\psi(\hat{H}_\alpha)} = \Delta E_\alpha / 2 \equiv (E_{\max}^{(\alpha)} - E_{\min}^{(\alpha)}) / 2. \quad (17)$$

Using Theorem 1 of Ref. 28, which shows that the LCU L_1 norm, $\sum_j |a_j^{(\alpha)}|$, is in turn an upper bound for $\Delta E_\alpha / 2$, we find that

$$\sqrt{\text{Var}_\psi(\hat{H}_\alpha)} \leq \sum_j |a_j^{(\alpha)}|. \quad (18)$$

Thus, one can use \hat{H}_α with a low LCU L_1 norm as a heuristic approach to lowering $M(\epsilon)$.

One way to reduce the L_1 norm for a collection of \hat{H}_α while maintaining their measurability is substituting every \hat{n}_p operator in the two-electron \hat{H}_α fragments with reflections: $\hat{r}_p = 1 - 2\hat{n}_p$ (satisfying $\hat{r}_p^2 = 1$ and $\hat{r}_p^\dagger = \hat{r}_p$).^{9,28–30} Because \hat{r}_p maps onto an all- \hat{z} Pauli product under all standard transformations (e.g., it maps to \hat{z}_p under the Jordan–Wigner transformation),⁷ the fragment remains measurable even after the substitution:

$$\hat{H}'_\alpha = \hat{U}_\alpha^\dagger \left(\sum_{pq}^N \frac{\lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)}}{4} \hat{r}_p \hat{r}_q \right) \hat{U}_\alpha. \quad (19)$$

To ensure that $\sum_{\alpha=0}^{N_f} \hat{H}'_\alpha = \hat{H}$, the one-electron \hat{H}_0 term must also be modified as

$$\hat{H}'_0 = \hat{H}_0 + \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_f} \sum_{pq}^N \left(\lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)} \hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)} - \frac{\lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)}}{4} \right). \quad (20)$$

Concerning measurements, the constant term in Eq. (20) affects neither $M(\epsilon)$ nor the measurability of the fragments. Moving the constant terms, $-\sum_{pq} \lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)}/4$, from \hat{H}'_0 back to each \hat{H}'_α reveals the connection to F³: the substitution of \hat{n}_p with \hat{r}_p simply corresponds to the F³ approach with $c_p^{(\alpha)}$ fixed as $c_p^{(\alpha)} = \sum_q \lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)}$.

Inspired by this connection to F³ and the reduction in the upper bound for the fragment variances achieved by the substitution of \hat{r}_p , we heuristically propose F³-R2 that restricts the optimization variables as $c_p^{(\alpha)} = c^{(\alpha)} \sum_q \lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)}$. Note that this choice is equivalent to substituting \hat{r}_p only for a fraction of the two-electron fragment ($c^{(\alpha)} \hat{H}_\alpha$) while leaving the rest $[(1 - c^{(\alpha)}) \hat{H}_\alpha]$ as functions of \hat{n}_p . The $c^{(\alpha)}$ variables in F³-R2 are optimized by solving the system of equations identical to Eq. (16) except that $\hat{O}^{(\alpha)} = \sum_{pq}^N \lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)} \hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}$ (instead of $\hat{O}^{(\alpha)} = \sum_p^N \lambda_{pp}^{(\alpha)} \hat{O}_p^{(\alpha)}$ in F³-R1).

III. RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

We compare $M(\epsilon)$ in the different versions of F³ applied to either LR or FR fragments with $M(\epsilon)$ in the initial LR and GFRO fragments (see Appendix A for definitions). In addition, the performance of F³ is compared with the best qubit-space techniques that have the lowest $M(\epsilon)$: the iterative coefficient splitting (ICS)²¹ and shared Pauli products (SPP)²² methods. The algorithms were used to compute $\epsilon^2 M(\epsilon)$ for electronic Hamiltonians of several molecules (LiH, BeH₂, H₂O, and NH₃) in the STO-3G basis and the following nuclear geometries: $R(\text{Li} - \text{H}) = 1 \text{ \AA}$ (for LiH), $R(\text{Be} - \text{H}) = 1 \text{ \AA}$ with $\angle \text{HBeH} = 180^\circ$ (for BeH₂), $R(\text{O} - \text{H}) = 1 \text{ \AA}$ with $\angle \text{HOH} = 107.6^\circ$ (for H₂O), and $R(\text{N} - \text{H}) = 1 \text{ \AA}$ with $\angle \text{HNN} = 107^\circ$ (for NH₃). Note that the presented $\epsilon^2 M(\epsilon)$ value is equivalent to the number of measurements in millions required to obtain E with 10^{-3} a.u. accuracy.

TABLE I. The required measurement numbers [$\epsilon^2 M(\epsilon)$] in the different versions of F^3 applied to either LR or FR fragments are compared with $\epsilon^2 M(\epsilon)$ in LR, GFRO, ICS,²¹ and SPP²² for Hamiltonians of LiH, BeH₂, H₂O, and NH₃ (N is the number of spin-orbitals and is equal to the number of qubits).

Sys	N	LR	GFRO	ICS	SPP	Full	F ³ -LR			F ³ -FR	
							R1	R2	Full	R1	R2
LiH	12	3.16	2.73	0.295	0.148	0.127	0.338	0.196	0.122	0.197	0.165
BeH ₂	14	1.86	1.61	0.543	0.341	0.543	0.848	0.680	0.430	0.948	0.583
H ₂ O	14	58.5	49.4	2.05	1.16	0.892	9.83	1.10	0.709	25.7	0.911
NH ₃	16	58.1	46.1	4.83	2.62	1.49	9.22	1.70	0.990	31.3	1.18

TABLE II. The number of optimization variables (N_c) in the different versions of F^3 applied to either LR or FR fragments is compared with N_c in ICS²¹ and SPP²² for systems presented in Table I.

Sys	N	ICS	SPP	F ³ -LR		F ³ -FR	
				Full	R1/R2	Full	R1/R2
LiH	12	1346	2718	126	21	354	59
BeH ₂	14	1265	3048	196	28	602	86
H ₂ O	14	1863	7987	196	28	938	134
NH ₃	16	7203	35875	288	36	904	113

Table I shows that between the different versions of F^3 , the most flexible full version yields the lowest $M(\epsilon)$ in all examples: on average, $M(\epsilon)$ in F³-Full is a factor of 12 lower than that in F³-R1 and a factor of 1.3 lower than that in F³-R2. However, as shown in Table II, the increased flexibility also results in F³-Full having $N/2$ -fold more optimization variables than the other versions. While F³-R1 and F³-R2 have the same N_c , F³-R2 has a much lower $M(\epsilon)$ for every molecule. The success of F³-R2 can be heuristically justified since it is designed to lower the LCU L_1 norm, which is an upper bound for fragment variances, as discussed in Sec. II C. Because F³-R2 can achieve a lower $M(\epsilon)$ with the identical computational cost as F³-R1, there is no reason to employ F³-R1 instead of F³-R2. Therefore, we omit F³-R1 in the following discussion.

The comparison of $M(\epsilon)$ in F^3 with that in the initial set of LR or FR fragments demonstrates the success of the proposed method. On average, $M(\epsilon)$ in F³-Full is a factor of 34 lower than that in the initial fragments, and $M(\epsilon)$ in F³-R2 is a factor of 27 lower than that in the initial fragments. Since $M(\epsilon)$ in GFRO is always lower than that in LR, $M(\epsilon)$ in F^3 is also lower when FR fragments are used as the initial fragments. However, the FR optimization involves an iterative non-linear optimization procedure which is computationally more expensive than the LR decomposition. Moreover, while N_f in LR is upper bounded by $(N^2/8 + N/4)$, N_f in GFRO is typically higher (for the presented molecules, GFRO has, on average, three times more fragments). Since the number of optimization variables is directly proportional to N_f ($N_c = N_f N/2$ in F³-v1 and $N_c = N_f$ in F³-R2), employing F^3 on the FR fragments requires more computational

effort than employing it on the LR fragments.

Comparison of F^3 with state-of-the-art qubit-space techniques (ICS and SPP) shows that for all molecules except BeH₂, F^3 has lower $M(\epsilon)$. In particular, even the computationally most efficient combination of applying F³-R2 to the LR fragments yields a lower $M(\epsilon)$ than that in ICS, whereas this most efficient combination yields a similar $M(\epsilon)$ to that in SPP. Furthermore, $M(\epsilon)$ in the best fermionic-space technique (F³-FR-Full) is, on average, a factor of 1.6 smaller than $M(\epsilon)$ in the best qubit-space technique (SPP). The bottleneck in the optimization procedures in all three methods (F³, ICS, and SPP) is solving a system of linear equations. Therefore, one can assess the required computational cost by examining the number of optimization variables. Table II shows that even the most computationally costly combination, F³-FR-Full has a much lower N_c than that in either ICS or SPP.

IV. CONCLUSION

This work proposes a new method that achieves a significant reduction in the number of measurements by taking advantage of the possibility of extracting fractions of one-electron parts from the two-electron fermionic fragments and combining them with the purely one-electron fragment. This repartitioning keeps the fragments measurable and conserves the Hamiltonian expectation value. On the other hand, the number of measurements due to its dependence on variances of fragments can be lowered by this repartitioning. The proposed algorithm finds the repartitioning that minimizes the number of measurements and achieves a severalfold reduction in the number of measurements compared to those for initially generated fragments.

Even though the number of measurements in the previously proposed methods suggested that the qubit-space techniques are superior to their fermionic counterparts, by employing the fluid fermionic fragments method, we were able to achieve the number of measurements lower even than those in the best qubit-space techniques (ICS²¹ and SPP²²). Furthermore, compared to these techniques, the method presented here was shown to have much fewer optimization variables. In particular, the number of optimization variables in the computationally most

efficient version of the proposed algorithm scales sub-quadratically with the number of spatial orbitals, thereby making the algorithm applicable for larger systems. In addition, fermionic fragments conserve molecular symmetries and their measurements can be corrected by error mitigation methods employing these symmetries.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

A.F.I. is grateful to Tom O'Brien for insightful discussions and acknowledges financial support from the Google Quantum Research Program, Zapata Computing Inc., and the National Science Foundation under Grant No. NSF PHY-1748958. S.C. thanks Tzu-Ching Yen for helpful discussions and acknowledges financial support from the Swiss National Science Foundation through the Postdoc Mobility Fellowship (Grant No. P500PN-206649). This research was enabled in part by support provided by Compute Ontario and Compute Canada.

APPENDIX A: INITIAL HAMILTONIAN FRAGMENTS

The LR decomposition is less ambiguous compared to its FR counterpart, and we use an LR decomposition procedure described in Ref. 11. Among different implementations of the FR decomposition, we employ the ‘‘greedy’’ FR optimization (GFRO), since it has the lowest $M(\epsilon)$.¹² Greedy algorithms typically have low $M(\epsilon)$, and their success can be attributed to the sum of square roots appearing in

$$M_{\text{opt}}(\epsilon) = \frac{1}{\epsilon^2} \left[\sum_{\alpha=0}^{N_f} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{\psi}(\hat{H}_{\alpha})} \right]^2 \quad (21)$$

obtained by choosing the optimal measurement allocation,

$$m_{\alpha} = \frac{\sqrt{\text{Var}_{\psi}(\hat{H}_{\alpha})}}{\sum_{\beta=0}^{N_f} \sqrt{\text{Var}_{\psi}(\hat{H}_{\beta})}}, \quad (22)$$

that minimizes $M(\epsilon)$. For a fixed sum of $\text{Var}_{\psi}(\hat{H}_{\alpha})$, the sum of square roots in Eq. (21) is lower if the variances are distributed unevenly, and greedy approaches tend to yield an uneven distribution of $\text{Var}_{\psi}(\hat{H}_{\alpha})$.

The computational effort of both LR and FR decompositions is reduced significantly by working with a smaller two-electron tensor over spatial orbitals, \tilde{g}_{ijkl} , instead of the tensor over spin-orbitals, g_{pqrs} . One can rewrite the electronic Hamiltonian as

$$\hat{H} = \sum_{\sigma} \sum_{ij} \tilde{h}_{ij} \hat{E}_{i\sigma}^{j\sigma} + \sum_{\sigma\sigma'} \sum_{ijkl} \tilde{g}_{ijkl} \hat{E}_{i\sigma}^{j\sigma} \hat{E}_{k\sigma'}^{l\sigma'} \quad (23)$$

where σ and σ' specify the spin- z projection, while \tilde{h}_{ij} and \tilde{g}_{ijkl} are one- and two-electronic integrals:

$$\tilde{h}_{ij} = \int d\vec{r} \phi_i^*(\vec{r}) \left(-\frac{\nabla^2}{2} - \sum_I \frac{Z_I}{|\vec{r} - \vec{r}_I|} \right) \phi_j(\vec{r}) - \sum_k^{N/2} \tilde{g}_{ikkj} \quad (24)$$

and

$$\tilde{g}_{ijkl} = \frac{1}{2} \iint d\vec{r}_1 d\vec{r}_2 \frac{\phi_i^*(\vec{r}_1) \phi_j(\vec{r}_1) \phi_k(\vec{r}_2) \phi_l^*(\vec{r}_2)}{|\vec{r}_1 - \vec{r}_2|}, \quad (25)$$

where $\phi_i(\vec{r})$ is the i th one-particle electronic basis function in the position representation, and the charge and position of the I th nucleus are denoted by Z_I and \vec{r}_I .

To optimize the computational cost for LR and FR decompositions, we work with \tilde{g}_{ijkl} and then subsequently convert the resulting $\tilde{\lambda}_{ij}^{(\alpha)}$ and $\tilde{U}_{ij}^{(\alpha)}$ into $\lambda_{pq}^{(\alpha)}$ and $U_{pq}^{(\alpha)}$ according to

$$\begin{aligned} \lambda_{2i-1,2j-1}^{(\alpha)} &= \lambda_{2i-1,2j}^{(\alpha)} = \lambda_{2i,2j-1}^{(\alpha)} = \lambda_{2i,2j}^{(\alpha)} = \tilde{\lambda}_{ij}^{(\alpha)}, \quad (26) \\ U_{2i-1,2j-1}^{(\alpha)} &= U_{2i,2j}^{(\alpha)} = \tilde{U}_{ij}^{(\alpha)}, \quad U_{2i,2j-1}^{(\alpha)} = U_{2i-1,2j}^{(\alpha)} = 0 \end{aligned} \quad (27)$$

for $i, j = 1, \dots, N/2$.

The LR decomposition is particularly efficient because it finds the rank-1 matrices $\tilde{\lambda}_{ij}^{(\alpha)} = \tilde{\eta}_i^{(\alpha)} \tilde{\eta}_j^{(\alpha)}$ by diagonalizing the two-electron tensor $\tilde{g}_{ij,kl}$ considered as a matrix with each dimension spanned by a pair of basis indices. This diagonalization gives a theoretical limit on $N_f \leq N_o(N_o + 1)/2$, where $N_o = N/2$, and the less-than sign originates from a truncation of the expansion by removing terms for low magnitude eigenvalues (see Ref. 10 for further details on LR decomposition). Having a low N_f is beneficial for the fluid fermionic fragments method because the number of optimization variables ($c_p^{(\alpha)}$) is directly proportional to N_f .

Though the LR decomposition requires less computational effort than GFRO, $M(\epsilon)$ in GFRO is lower owing to more flexible $\tilde{\lambda}_{ij}^{(\alpha)}$. The α th GFRO fragment, \hat{H}_{α} , is found by minimizing the L_1 norm of the $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}^{(\alpha+1)}$ tensor in

$$\sum_{ijkl\sigma\sigma'} \tilde{G}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha)} \hat{E}_{i\sigma}^{j\sigma} \hat{E}_{k\sigma'}^{l\sigma'} - \hat{H}_{\alpha} = \sum_{ijkl\sigma\sigma'} \tilde{G}_{ijkl}^{(\alpha+1)} \hat{E}_{i\sigma}^{j\sigma} \hat{E}_{k\sigma'}^{l\sigma'}, \quad (28)$$

where $\tilde{G}_{ijkl}^{(1)} = \tilde{g}_{ijkl}$. In each iteration, the L_1 norm of $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}^{(\alpha+1)}$ is minimized over the space of $\{\tilde{\lambda}_{ij}^{(\alpha)}, \tilde{\theta}^{(\alpha)}\}$ variables parameterizing the α th fragment,

$$\hat{H}_{\alpha} = \hat{U}(\tilde{\theta}^{(\alpha)})^{\dagger} \left(\sum_{ij\sigma\sigma'} \tilde{\lambda}_{ij}^{(\alpha)} \hat{n}_{i\sigma} \hat{n}_{j\sigma'} \right) \hat{U}(\tilde{\theta}^{(\alpha)}), \quad (29)$$

where $\hat{U}(\tilde{\theta}^{(\alpha)}) = \exp[\sum_{i>j}^{N_o} \tilde{\theta}_{ij}^{(\alpha)} \sum_{\sigma} (\hat{E}_{i\sigma}^{j\sigma} - \hat{E}_{j\sigma}^{i\sigma})]$. The iteration terminates when the L_1 norm of $\tilde{\mathbf{G}}^{\alpha+1}$ is below a given threshold ($1 \cdot 10^{-5}$ is used in this work).

- ¹A. Peruzzo, J. McClean, P. Shadbolt, M.-H. Yung, X.-Q. Zhou, P. J. Love, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and J. L. O’Brien, “A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor,” *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 1–7 (2014).
- ²J. R. McClean, J. Romero, R. Babbush, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, “The theory of variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms,” *New J. Phys.* **18**, 023023 (2016).
- ³I. G. Ryabinkin, R. A. Lang, S. N. Genin, and A. F. Izmaylov, “Iterative qubit coupled cluster approach with efficient screening of generators,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **16**, 1055–1063 (2020).
- ⁴M. Cerezo, A. Arrasmith, R. Babbush, S. C. Benjamin, S. Endo, K. Fujii, J. R. McClean, K. Mitarai, X. Yuan, L. Cincio, and C. P. J., “Variational quantum algorithms,” *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **3**, 625–644 (2021).
- ⁵A. Anand, P. Schleich, S. Alperin-Lea, P. W. K. Jensen, S. Sim, M. Díaz-Tinoco, J. S. Kottmann, M. Degroote, A. F. Izmaylov, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, “A quantum computing view on unitary coupled cluster theory,” *Chem. Soc. Rev.* **51**, 1659–1684 (2022).
- ⁶J. Preskill, “Quantum computing in the NISQ era and beyond,” *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018).
- ⁷J. T. Seeley, M. J. Richard, and P. J. Love, “The Bravyi-Kitaev transformation for quantum computation of electronic structure,” *J. Chem. Phys.* **137**, 224109 (2012).
- ⁸I. D. Kivlichan, J. McClean, N. Wiebe, C. Gidney, A. Aspuru-Guzik, G. K.-L. Chan, and R. Babbush, “Quantum simulation of electronic structure with linear depth and connectivity,” *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **120**, 110501 (2018).
- ⁹D. W. Berry, C. Gidney, M. Motta, J. R. McClean, and R. Babbush, “Qubitization of arbitrary basis quantum chemistry leveraging sparsity and low rank factorization,” *Quantum* **3**, 208 (2019).
- ¹⁰M. Motta, E. Ye, J. R. McClean, Z. Li, A. J. Minnich, R. Babbush, and G. K. Chan, “Low rank representations for quantum simulation of electronic structure,” *npj Quantum Inf.* **7**, 1–7 (2021).
- ¹¹W. J. Huggins, J. R. McClean, N. C. Rubin, Z. Jiang, N. Wiebe, K. B. Whaley, and R. Babbush, “Efficient and noise resilient measurements for quantum chemistry on near-term quantum computers,” *npj Quantum Inf.* **7**, 1–9 (2021).
- ¹²T.-C. Yen and A. F. Izmaylov, “Cartan subalgebra approach to efficient measurements of quantum observables,” *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040320 (2021).
- ¹³O. Crawford, B. v. Straaten, D. Wang, T. Parks, E. Campbell, and S. Brierley, “Efficient quantum measurement of Pauli operators in the presence of finite sampling error,” *Quantum* **5**, 385 (2021).
- ¹⁴J. F. Gonthier, M. D. Radin, C. Buda, E. J. Daskocil, C. M. Abuan, and J. Romero, “Identifying challenges towards practical quantum advantage through resource estimation: the measurement roadblock in the variational quantum eigensolver,” arXiv:2012.04001 (2020).
- ¹⁵A. Jena, S. Genin, and M. Mosca, “Pauli partitioning with respect to gate sets,” arXiv:1907.07859 (2019).
- ¹⁶C. Hadfield, S. Bravyi, R. Raymond, and A. Mezzacapo, “Measurements of quantum hamiltonians with locally-biased classical shadows,” *Commun. Math. Phys.* **391**, 951–967 (2022).
- ¹⁷H.-Y. Huang, R. Kueng, and J. Preskill, “Predicting many properties of a quantum system from very few measurements,” *Nat. Phys.* **16**, 1050–1057 (2020).
- ¹⁸S. Hillmich, C. Hadfield, R. Raymond, A. Mezzacapo, and R. Wille, “Decision diagrams for quantum measurements with shallow circuits,” in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering* (2021) pp. 24–34.
- ¹⁹B. Wu, J. Sun, Q. Huang, and X. Yuan, “Overlapped grouping measurement: A unified framework for measuring quantum states,” arXiv:2105.13091 (2021).
- ²⁰T.-C. Yen, V. Verteletskyi, and A. F. Izmaylov, “Measuring all compatible operators in one series of single-qubit measurements using unitary transformations,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **16**, 2400–2409 (2020).
- ²¹T.-C. Yen, A. Ganeshram, and A. F. Izmaylov, “Deterministic improvements of quantum measurements with grouping of compatible operators, non-local transformations, and covariance estimates,” arXiv:2201.01471 (2022).
- ²²S. Choi, T.-C. Yen, and A. F. Izmaylov, “Improving quantum measurements by introducing “ghost” Pauli products,” arXiv:2208.06563 (2022).
- ²³S. B. Bravyi and A. Y. Kitaev, “Fermionic quantum computation,” *Ann. Phys.* **298**, 210–226 (2002).
- ²⁴S. Aaronson and D. Gottesman, “Improved simulation of stabilizer circuits,” *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 052328 (2004).
- ²⁵Z. P. Banskhi, T.-C. Yen, P. D. Johnson, and A. F. Izmaylov, “Fidelity overhead for non-local measurements in variational quantum algorithms,” arXiv:2205.07113 (2022).
- ²⁶I. G. Ryabinkin, S. N. Genin, and A. F. Izmaylov, “Constrained variational quantum eigensolver: Quantum computer search engine in the fock space,” *J. Chem. Theory Comput.* **15**, 249–255 (2019).
- ²⁷F. Arute, K. Arya, R. Babbush, D. Bacon, J. C. Bardin, R. Barends, S. Boixo, M. Broughton, B. B. Buckley, D. A. Buell, B. Burkett, N. Bushnell, Y. Chen, Z. Chen, B. Chiaro, R. Collins, W. Courtney, S. Demura, A. Dunsworth, E. Farhi, A. Fowler, B. Foxen, C. Gidney, M. Giustina, R. Graff, S. Habegger, M. P. Harrigan, A. Ho, S. Hong, T. Huang, W. J. Huggins, L. Ioffe, S. V. Isakov, E. Jeffrey, Z. Jiang, C. Jones, D. Kafri, K. Kechedzhi, J. Kelly, S. Kim, P. V. Klimov, A. Korotkov, F. Kostritsa, D. Landhuis, P. Laptev, M. Lindmark, E. Lucero, O. Martin, J. M. Martinis, J. R. McClean, M. McEwen, A. Megrant, X. Mi, M. Mohseni, W. Mruczkiewicz, J. Mutus, O. Naaman, M. Neeley, C. Neill, H. Neven, M. Y. Niu, T. E. O’Brien, E. Ostby, A. Petukhov, H. Putterman, C. Quintana, P. Roushan, N. C. Rubin, D. Sank, K. J. Satzinger, V. Smelyanskiy, D. Strain, K. J. Sung, M. Szalay, T. Y. Takeshita, A. Vainsencher, T. White, N. Wiebe, Z. J. Yao, P. Yeh, and A. Zalcman, “Hartree-fock on a superconducting qubit quantum computer,” *Science* **369**, 1084–1089 (2020).
- ²⁸I. Loaiza, A. M. Khah, N. Wiebe, and A. F. Izmaylov, “Reducing molecular electronic hamiltonian simulation cost for linear combination of unitaries approaches,” arXiv:2208.08272 (2022).
- ²⁹V. von Burg, G. H. Low, T. Häner, D. S. Steiger, M. Reiher, M. Roetteler, and M. Troyer, “Quantum computing enhanced computational catalysis,” *Phys. Rev. Res.* **3**, 033055 (2021).
- ³⁰J. Lee, D. W. Berry, C. Gidney, W. J. Huggins, J. R. McClean, N. Wiebe, and R. Babbush, “Even more efficient quantum computations of chemistry through tensor hypercontraction,” *PRX Quantum* **2**, 030305 (2021).