

Low-Overhead Parallelisation of LCU via Commuting Operators

Gregory Boyd 

Department of Materials, University of Oxford, Parks Road, Oxford OX1 3PH, United Kingdom

The Linear Combination of Unitaries (LCU) method is a powerful scheme for the block encoding of operators but suffers from high overheads. In this work, we discuss the parallelisation of LCU and in particular the SELECT subroutine of LCU based on partitioning of observables into groups of commuting operators, as well as the use of adaptive circuits and teleportation that allow us to perform required Clifford circuits in constant depth. We additionally discuss the parallelisation of QROM circuits which are a special case of our main results, and provide methods to parallelise the action of multi-controlled gates on the control register. We only require an $O(\log n)$ factor increase in the number of qubits in order to produce a significant depth reduction, with prior work suggesting that for molecular Hamiltonians, the depth saving is $O(n)$, and numerics indicating depth savings of a factor approximately $n/2$. The implications of our method in the fault-tolerant setting are also considered, noting that parallelisation reduces the T -depth by the same factor as the logical algorithm, without changing the T -count, and that our method can significantly reduce the overall space-time volume of the computation, even when including the increased number of T factories required by parallelisation.

1 Introduction

The Linear Combination of Unitaries (LCU) method [1] is a powerful quantum subroutine used for the efficient block encoding of operators, that when combined with Quantum Singular Value Transformation (QSVT) [2, 3] leads to asymptotically optimal algorithms for Hamiltonian simulation [4] as well as dissipative ground state finding algorithms [5], and quantum linear algebra [6]. Despite the power of LCU, there are high overheads associated with its implementation, leading to recent work promoting the use of product formula methods for Hamiltonian simulation as a practical alternative [7, 8]. In this work, we make a contribution to reducing the time overhead of LCU by presenting a general method for parallelising the algorithm for operators provided in the Pauli rep-

resentation that we conjecture is typically able to reduce the depth (T -depth in the fault-tolerant setting) of LCU by a factor of $O(n)$ (see Section 2.4) while only requiring an $O(\log n)$ factor increase in qubit count, resulting in a net reduction in the space-time volume cost of the logical algorithm by a factor of $O(n/\log n)$. A special case of the circuits we propose parallelisation methods for in this work is QROM circuits [9], used for loading classical data into quantum computers.

We also provide methods for parallelisation of the application of gates with complicated patterns of positive and negative controls from an ancilla register of size a at the cost of depth $O(\log a)$, which may be preferable when the size of the ancilla register is large (as opposed to the case assumed for LCU above where the register has size $O(\log n)$) which allows us to parallelise the above circuits with a constant factor qubit overhead, reducing the depth by a factor of $O(n/\log a)$.

Special cases of reducing the complexity of LCU exist, e.g. for the specific case of local fermionic Hamiltonians where tensor hypercontraction methods [10] and others [11, 12, 13] can be used to reduce the daunting $O(n^4)$ cost of block encoding molecular Hamiltonians. Parallelisation methods also exist for performing Hamiltonian simulation for certain kinds of Hamiltonian [14].

Prior work also includes methods using one-hot or k -hot encodings of the coefficients or fan-out have been examined to reduce the depth and improve the errors in LCU by taking advantage of the parallelisability of geometrically local observables [15, 16]. In Section 2 we discuss the LCU method, as well as the basis for the parallelisation techniques we will use. Section 3 will discuss our method in more detail, including discussion of the implementation of these methods on fault-tolerant hardware.

2 Background

2.1 LCU

The LCU method constructs a linear combination of unitaries using the combination of PREPARE and SELECT subroutines. It involves constructing an operator A as a linear combination of a set of unitary

arXiv:2312.00696v3 [quant-ph] 21 Aug 2024

operators U_j with corresponding coefficients c_j :

$$A = \sum_j^L c_j U_j \quad (1)$$

This is done by loading the coefficients into an ancilla register in the PREPARE step:

$$|0^a\rangle \rightarrow |\alpha\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{\|c\|_1}} \sum_j \sqrt{c_j} |j\rangle \quad (2)$$

where the size of the ancilla register is $\log L$. We will restrict our analysis when discussing LCU to $L \sim \text{poly}(n)$ so that the number of ancilla in the coefficient register is $O(\log n)$.

Then the unitaries are applied controlled on the ancilla in the SELECT step:

$$|j\rangle |\psi\rangle \rightarrow |j\rangle U_j |\psi\rangle \quad (3)$$




Figure 1: Example of the usual procedure for the SELECT step of LCU with two ancillas.

LCU is of particular use for implementing block encodings of non-unitary operators, such as Hamiltonians, and therefore provides access to performing QSVT on these block encodings to apply functions of the operator.

2.2 QROM

Quantum Read-Only Memory [9] is a technique for loading classical data into quantum memory, by allowing data to be accessed by an index in superposition:

$$\text{QROM}_d \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \alpha |l\rangle |0\rangle = \sum_{l=0}^{L-1} \alpha |l\rangle |d_l\rangle \quad (4)$$

This can be achieved using a circuit in the form of Fig. 1 where the unitaries applied are tensor products of Pauli X 's encoding the binary strings of the data entries d_l to be loaded. QROM circuits are also used as a component of advanced schemes for block encoding quantum chemistry Hamiltonians [10], where it is noted that QROM is the dominant cost of the procedure, and therefore a prime target for runtime optimisation.

2.3 Parallelisation Techniques

Techniques for parallelising quantum algorithms have been known for some time [17]. Our algorithm makes use of the primitives of fanout and gate teleportation

using states prepared by measurement and feedforward.

The fanout operation [18] (Fig. 2) can be thought of as a basis-dependent ‘‘copy’’ operation that takes information in the computational basis from one register and spreads it across additional registers.

$$|j\rangle |0\rangle \dots |0\rangle \rightarrow |j\rangle |j\rangle \dots |j\rangle \quad (5)$$

Crucially, this allows us to perform commuting operations on a qubit register in parallel, by first performing a fanout to spread the information across multiple registers, and then performing the operations on each register individually. We then uncompute the fanout operation.




Figure 2: Fanout operation performing operations on the same input in parallel.

A log-depth fanout circuit can be constructed straightforwardly from a tree of CNOT gates, and a constant depth circuit can be constructed using teleportation with $O(k)$ ancillas, where the fanout acts on k qubits [19].

An additional tool we use is the use of measurement and feedforward (or adaptive circuits), where circuits contain measurements and operations that are controlled on the measurement results, resulting in deterministic measurement based circuits to prepare certain resource states [19, 20] and the use of gate teleportation with these states [21] to reduce circuit depth.

2.4 Partitioning into commuting groups

A third technique used in our work is the partitioning of operators into commuting groups of Pauli terms, these methods were initially developed for the optimisation of measurements in variational algorithms [22, 23, 24, 25]. In this context, it is desirable to partition observables into commuting groups to determine which components can be measured simultaneously. This is done by calculating an approximate Minimum Clique Cover (MCC) of the graph $G = (V, E)$ where the vertices are the Pauli terms in the operator and edges are placed between commuting terms.

The amount of commuting terms found using this method will of course depend on the operator in question, but evidence from numerics on molecular electronic Hamiltonians with up to 50 thousand terms

indicate that the ratio of total terms over number of commuting groups scales “at least linearly with the number of qubits” [25]. Jena *et al.* [26] also conjecture that this ratio is linear with respect to the lengths of the operators and provide numerical evidence for molecular Hamiltonians.

3 Parallelisation

In this section we will discuss our parallelisation of the SELECT stage of LCU, as the parallelisation of the PREPARE stage will significantly depend on the particular state preparation method chosen, but we note that a reduction in depth by a factor of $O(n)$ with $O(n \log n)$ qubits using fanout is achievable [27, 28]. In the usual application of SELECT (Fig. 1) the unitaries are applied in sequence, as is required by the complex controls on the ancilla register storing the coefficients. By fanning out the ancilla register, we can very straightforwardly remove this obstacle, and are then free to apply unitaries that act on disjoint sets of qubits in parallel.

To extend this to unitaries that are not already acting on disjoint sets of qubits, we can perform a unitary U to transform the action of the unitaries on the system register into action on disjoint qubits. The set of unitaries must satisfy two conditions in order for this to be possible:

- They must all commute
- They must form a linearly independent set

We do this by first partitioning the terms of the Hamiltonian into commuting groups as described in Section 2.4, and then use a greedy search algorithm to find linearly independent sets within each of those commuting groups.

For a Hamiltonian H , we define the filling factor \mathcal{F} as the average size of the sets of terms that satisfy these conditions, after placing all the terms into such sets, normalised by the maximum applicable size (which is the number of qubits in the main register).

For the case where the unitaries in SELECT are Pauli operators P_i , we can partition the operators into linearly independent commuting sets, and then perform Clifford transformations to transform the terms in each set into single qubit Pauli operators as described in Section 2.4. We can then apply these controlled Pauli operators in parallel from the ancilla registers, applying up to n terms simultaneously,¹ and then perform the inverse Clifford transformation, as depicted in Fig. 4.

¹If the size of the commuting group is $m > n$, it can still be applied in one step by enlarging the system register to m qubits by appending qubits in $|0\rangle$ and performing a Clifford circuit on all m qubits (this also requires increasing the size of the fanout).

The issue with this is that the linear depth saving from applying n terms in parallel is offset by the depth of the Clifford transformations, which is $O(n)$ in the worst case when using reversible compilation [29]. We therefore present an alternative compilation of Clifford circuits using adaptive circuits and teleportation with $3n$ ancilla that is constant depth in Section 3.1.

The depth reduction achieved is determined by the filling factor \mathcal{F} . We conjecture that this is $O(n)$ in the case of practical molecular Hamiltonians and provide evidence from the literature based on the size of commuting groups in Hamiltonians for this in Section 2.4. In Fig. 3 we demonstrate the factor of improvement in T depth for a series of molecular Hamiltonians by performing the partitioning into parallelisable sets, with the slope of the graph indicating an approximately constant $\mathcal{F} \approx 0.5$ for molecular Hamiltonians in this regime. We also performed the partitioning for ‘Hamiltonians’ containing only Pauli X terms (as would be found in QROM circuits) up to 14 qubits, and find $\mathcal{F} \approx 1$ for this case (see Appendix A).




Figure 3: T depth reduction as determined by the average size of the parallelisable sets found in molecular Hamiltonians up to 36 qubits. The slope indicates an approximately constant $\mathcal{F} \approx 0.5$ for molecular Hamiltonians in this regime. Colour indicates the molecule and marker indicates the choice of basis.

Given this partitioning into parallelisable sets, the space-time saving is a factor of $O\left(\frac{n\mathcal{F}}{\log n}\right)$. Although the saving will be very significant in the high- n regime, we find that even in the low-qubit regime, we can still achieve large speed-ups and a reduction in the overall space-time volume. For example, the 26-qubit Hamiltonian of H₂O in the 6-31G basis contains 13884 terms, which can be applied in 1070 parallelised steps by using 468 qubits, resulting in 13 times fewer layers of multi-controlled Pauli gates for a qubit increase of 11.7 times, which slightly reduces the space-time volume by a factor of ~ 1.1 . See Section 3.3 for further

discussion on how the space-time volume of the parallelised subroutine compares to the serial version when taking into account the space required by T factories.




Figure 4: Applying Pauli operators in the SELECT step of LCU in parallel, by using fanout and a Clifford transformation U . The square controls indicate multiple controls on the ancilla register given the index of the Pauli operator.

3.1 Performing Clifford Circuits in Constant Depth

In order to reduce the depth of the required Clifford circuits, we can use techniques from [30] that apply them in constant depth using a constant number of resource stabiliser states on $O(n)$ ancilla. This method is based on the observation that any Clifford circuit is equivalent to circuits that contain a sequence of stages containing the same kind of gates, for example, Aaronson and Gottesman provided an 11 stage compilation H-C-P-C-P-C-H-P-C-P-C where -H-, -P-, and -C- stand for stages composed of only Hadamard, Phase, and CNOT gates, respectively [31]. More recently, techniques for implementing Clifford circuits using only 3 layers of two-qubit gates (the sequence CX-CZ-P-H-CZ-P-H) have been developed [32].

Considering only the non-trivial layers which contain 2-qubit gates, we can perform these layers by preparing states that are stabiliser states of Calderbeck-Shor-Steane (CSS) codes (up to single qubit rotations) [33] on $3n$ ancilla and performing Steane syndrome extraction circuits using these resource states as an input [30], followed by a correction consisting of single qubit Pauli gates (Fig. 5).




Figure 5: Circuit based on Steane syndrome extraction for performing a Clifford C -stage from [30], using the CSS states $|\Omega_{1,2}\rangle$, with a Pauli correction P depending on the measurement outcomes. This circuit uses $5n$ ancilla, but the same operation can be performed with $3n$ ancilla by performing the measurement on $|\Omega_1\rangle$ and then generating $|\Omega_2\rangle$ on the same ancilla.

These resource states can themselves be prepared in constant depth using adaptive circuits with the standard method to prepare stabiliser states of measuring the stabilisers and correcting incorrect outcomes [34], the required measurements of parities can be performed in constant depth using either circuits that are log-depth in the weight of the stabilisers, or in constant depth by noting that parity circuits are equivalent to fanout under a unitary transformation [35] and using results described in Section 2.3.

Therefore, the required Clifford transformations can be performed in constant depth, potentially allowing for a linear depth saving from parallelisation.

3.2 Replacing the Ancilla Fanout

It may be the case that we are not willing to pay the cost of fanning out the ancilla register n times, either because we are restricted in the number of available qubits, or, for QROM, it may be the case that the input register is of comparable (or larger) size than the output register. We therefore present a scheme for parallelising the action of the input register using a constant factor increase in ancilla qubits and additional constant-depth Clifford transformations.




Figure 6: Example of a QROM circuit with a complex pattern of positive (filled) and negative (empty) controls, with the action on the output register already diagonalised.

We can use a Clifford transformation on the ancilla register to transform the pattern of controls into the form in Fig. 7 (provided the bit strings describing

the controls form a linearly independent set, see Appendix A for a discussion on partitioning bit strings into linearly independent sets). This can be seen by the fact that conjugating the circuit in Fig. 6 by a CNOT gate acting between qubits i and j results in a row operation adding row i of the controls (thought of as a binary matrix) onto row j , we can therefore use Gauss-Jordan elimination to diagonalise the pattern of controls provided the set of bit strings are linearly independent. The Clifford circuit we need to apply is also only a single C -stage (Fig. 5) so has a depth of $\sim 3\times$ less than a full Clifford unitary.




Figure 7: Use of a Clifford transformation to ‘diagonalise’ the action of the controls on the input register.

These controls cannot yet be trivially parallelised. However, each of the gates is now only activated from a state with Hamming weight 1, so by computing a flag containing `hamming_weight == 1`, we can then perform the gates on the output register by performing a Toffoli on a register that contains a fanout of the original ancilla register, and a register containing copies of the `hamming_weight==1` flag, as shown in Fig. 8.




Figure 8: Circuit to compute and use the Hamming weight of the inputs to parallelise Fig. 7.

This Hamming weight circuit can be done in depth $\log a$, and a constant factor increase in ancilla qubits is required to perform this parallelisation.

3.3 In fault-tolerant architectures

Until this point, we have only been discussing the parallelisation implemented in terms of logical operations. However, there are some further considerations that must be made when examining the implications of parallelisation in fault-tolerant architectures. We will discuss these in the context of the surface code, but similar considerations apply to other fault-tolerant settings.

In surface code architectures, the available operations are of the form Clifford+ T where the T gates are

non-transversal and require the use of additional techniques such as magic state distillation [36] to be implemented, and therefore have a higher cost than the Clifford gates, taking up the majority of the computational budget. Our LCU parallelisation succeeds in reducing the T -depth of the algorithm without changing the T -count. However, whereas only a factor $O(\log n)$ qubit increase is required in the logical setting, in the fault-tolerant setting, the number of qubits used for magic state distillation must be increased to keep up with the increased rate of magic state usage required for a speed-up for the parallelised algorithm. However, this additional cost in T factories is modest and also introduces a $\log n$ factor (albeit with a higher constant) in the naïve case where every multi-controlled gate is done separately with $\log n$ T cost. We also note that when the controls of the LCU/QROM circuits are constructed with unary iteration [9], which only results in a constant rate of T state usage regardless of register size, the increase in space for the T factories is further decreased. In Fig. 9, we use the Azure Quantum Resource Estimator [37] to compare the space-time volume of the parallel vs serial computation (assuming $\mathcal{F} = 1$) which initially has n qubits in the main register, $\log n$ ancilla qubits, and use of unary iteration for the application of controls. We find orders of magnitude savings in space-time volume for large n .




Figure 9: Scaling of the improvement in space-time volume of the parallelised algorithm over the serial version for $\mathcal{F} = 1$, when including the space required for additional T factories due to the increased rate that the parallel circuit is able to use them.

The increase in qubits required for T factories may also be mitigated by the following factors:

- In cases where more magic state factories are required for other parts of the computation than are required to keep up with the rate of the serial SELECT procedure, the parallelised procedure is more efficiently able to use magic states at the rate they are produced.

- Magic states can be prepared offline and stored in a quantum memory.
- Magic state preparation has been significantly optimised in recent years [38, 39], and optimisation is likely to continue, further bringing down the cost.

4 Discussion and Conclusion

In this work we have produced an effective and low-overhead scheme for reducing the depth of the SELECT subroutine of LCU or data loading via QROM by a factor $O(n\mathcal{F})$, where $\mathcal{F} \leq 1$ is the filling factor denoting the average size of the parallelisable sets of terms to be applied, whilst only increasing the required number of qubits by a factor $O(\log n)$. A key part of this scheme is a method for performing Clifford transformations in constant depth based on adaptive circuits and teleportation. Methods are also presented for the parallelisation of complex patterns of multi-controlled operations with only a constant factor qubit overhead. We provide a numerical study on the parallelisability of SELECT on molecular Hamiltonians up to 36 qubits, and find they all can be reduced in depth by a factor of approximately $n/2$. We also note the procedure is inherently scalable with the number of ancillas available, meaning that if only $O(m \log n)$ ancillas are available for the fanout (as opposed to $O(n \log n)$), then the algorithm will simply perform m operations in parallel. Alternatively, $m > n$ can be chosen, by adding $m - n$ qubits to the system register initialised in $|0\rangle$, and performing the Clifford transformation on all m qubits. Indeed, depending on the distributions of the sizes of the commuting groups, it may not be worth using all $O(n \log n)$ ancillas if there are not a significant number of groups of size greater than m .

We believe that the use of parallelisation techniques in quantum algorithms is a fruitful direction for reducing the overheads of quantum computation, particularly when asymptotically optimal algorithms exist for problems such as Hamiltonian simulation, but the current runtime estimates for useful applications can be daunting. Works of this kind could also be of interest from the perspective of certain hardware platforms, as it means that scaling up hardware can reduce runtimes, allowing for offsetting of long gate times.

Further work includes accurate resource estimations of qubit counts and required wall-clock times in the fault-tolerant setting, the extension of the scheme to other families of unitaries, e.g. using matchgate circuits [40] and the generalisation of this scheme to alternative groupings of operators.

Note

During the late stages of production of this manuscript, another pre-print making use of measurement-based circuits, teleportation and commuting groups of operators was produced [41]. However, this work differs from ours in that it produces constant depth Clifford transformations in an alternative way inspired by measurement-based quantum computing, and specifically applies them to exponentials of Pauli operators found in VQE and QAOA.

Code Availability

Code relevant to this paper, including python code for preprocessing Hamiltonians and Q# code for the circuits described can be found [here](#). The code makes use of the packages OpenFermion [42], Stim [43], and graph-tool [44].

Acknowledgements

I thank Simon Benjamin and Bálint Koczor for their advice and give thanks to them and Matthew Goh for comments on this manuscript. I would also like to thank Arthur Rattew, Tim Chan and Adam Connolly for helpful discussions.

A Filling factor for QROM circuits

For the case of parallelising QROM circuits, the operators being applied are all tensor products of Pauli X operators, so already commute with each other. The linear independence condition becomes equivalent to the linear independence of binary vectors, which is easy to satisfy as demonstrated in Fig. 10 where we plot \mathcal{F} found by a greedy search over all 2^n bit strings for varying n .




Figure 10: Filling factor for parallelisation of QROM circuits, using Hamiltonians containing all tensor products of Pauli X 's.

References

- [1] Andrew M. Childs and Nathan Wiebe. “Hamiltonian simulation using linear combinations of unitary operations” (2012).
- [2] András Gilyén, Yuan Su, Guang Hao Low, and Nathan Wiebe. “Quantum singular value transformation and beyond: Exponential improvements for quantum matrix arithmetics”. *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing* Pages 193–204 (2019). [arxiv:1806.01838](#).
- [3] John M. Martyn, Zane M. Rossi, Andrew K. Tan, and Isaac L. Chuang. “Grand Unification of Quantum Algorithms”. *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040203 (2021).
- [4] Guang Hao Low and Isaac L. Chuang. “Hamiltonian Simulation by Qubitization”. *Quantum* **3**, 163 (2019). [arxiv:1610.06546](#).
- [5] Chi-Fang Chen, Michael J. Kastoryano, and András Gilyén. “An efficient and exact non-commutative quantum Gibbs sampler” (2023). [arxiv:2311.09207](#).
- [6] Andrew M. Childs, Robin Kothari, and Rolando D. Somma. “Quantum algorithm for systems of linear equations with exponentially improved dependence on precision”. *SIAM Journal on Computing* **46**, 1920–1950 (2017). [arxiv:1511.02306](#).
- [7] Gumaro Rendon, Jacob Watkins, and Nathan Wiebe. “Improved Error Scaling for Trotter Simulations through Extrapolation” (2022). [arxiv:2212.14144](#).
- [8] Pei Zeng, Jinzhao Sun, Liang Jiang, and Qi Zhao. “Simple and high-precision Hamiltonian simulation by compensating Trotter error with linear combination of unitary operations” (2022). [arxiv:2212.04566](#).
- [9] Ryan Babbush, Craig Gidney, Dominic W. Berry, Nathan Wiebe, Jarrod McClean, Alexandru Paler, Austin Fowler, and Hartmut Neven. “Encoding Electronic Spectra in Quantum Circuits with Linear T Complexity”. *Physical Review X* **8**, 041015 (2018). [arxiv:1805.03662](#).
- [10] Joonho Lee, Dominic W. Berry, Craig Gidney, William J. Huggins, Jarrod R. McClean, Nathan Wiebe, and Ryan Babbush. “Even more efficient quantum computations of chemistry through tensor hypercontraction”. *PRX Quantum* **2**, 030305 (2021). [arxiv:2011.03494](#).
- [11] Kianna Wan. “Exponentially faster implementations of Select(H) for fermionic Hamiltonians”. *Quantum* **5**, 380 (2021). [arxiv:2004.04170](#).
- [12] Vera von Burg, Guang Hao Low, Thomas Häner, Damian S. Steiger, Markus Reiher, Martin Roetteler, and Matthias Troyer. “Quantum computing enhanced computational catalysis”. *Physical Review Research* **3**, 033055 (2021). [arxiv:2007.14460](#).
- [13] Dominic W. Berry, Craig Gidney, Mario Motta, Jarrod R. McClean, and Ryan Babbush. “Qubitization of Arbitrary Basis Quantum Chemistry Leveraging Sparsity and Low Rank Factorization”. *Quantum* **3**, 208 (2019).
- [14] Zhicheng Zhang, Qisheng Wang, and Mingsheng Ying. “Parallel Quantum Algorithm for Hamiltonian Simulation” (2023). [arxiv:2105.11889](#).
- [15] Sina Zeytinoglu and Sho Sugiura. “Error-Robust Quantum Signal Processing using Rydberg Atoms” (2022). [arxiv:2201.04665](#).
- [16] Nobuyuki Yoshioka, Tsuyoshi Okubo, Yasunari Suzuki, Yuki Koizumi, and Wataru Mizukami. “Hunting for quantum-classical crossover in condensed matter problems” (2023). [arxiv:2210.14109](#).
- [17] Christopher Moore and Martin Nilsson. “Parallel Quantum Computation and Quantum Codes” (1998). [arxiv:quant-ph/9808027](#).
- [18] Peter Hoyer and Robert Spalek. “Quantum Circuits with Unbounded Fan-out”. *Theory of Computing* **1**, 81–103 (2005). [arxiv:quant-ph/0208043](#).
- [19] Harry Buhrman, Marten Folkertsma, Bruno Loff, and Niels M. P. Neumann. “State preparation by shallow circuits using feed forward” (2023). [arxiv:2307.14840](#).
- [20] Michael Foss-Feig, Arkin Tikku, Tsung-Cheng Lu, Karl Mayer, Mohsin Iqbal, Thomas M. Gatterman, Justin A. Gerber, Kevin Gilmore, Dan Gresh, Aaron Hankin, Nathan Hewitt, Chandler V. Horst, Mitchell Matheny, Tanner Mengle, Brian Neyenhuis, Henrik Dreyer, David Hayes, Timothy H. Hsieh, and Isaac H. Kim. “Experimental demonstration of the advantage of adaptive quantum circuits” (2023). [arxiv:2302.03029](#).
- [21] Daniel Gottesman and Isaac L. Chuang. “Quantum Teleportation is a Universal Computational Primitive”. *Nature* **402**, 390–393 (1999). [arxiv:quant-ph/9908010](#).
- [22] Ophelia Crawford, Barnaby van Straaten, Daochen Wang, Thomas Parks, Earl Campbell, and Stephen Brierley. “Efficient quantum measurement of Pauli operators in the presence of finite sampling error”. *Quantum* **5**, 385 (2021). [arxiv:1908.06942](#).
- [23] Pranav Gokhale, Olivia Angiuli, Yongshan Ding, Kaiwen Gui, Teague Tomesh, Martin Suchara, Margaret Martonosi, and Frederic T. Chong. “Minimizing State Preparations in Variational Quantum Eigensolver by Partitioning into Commuting Families” (2019). [arxiv:1907.13623](#).
- [24] Vladyslav Verteletskyi, Tzu-Ching Yen, and Artur F. Izmaylov. “Measurement Optimization in the Variational Quantum Eigensolver Using a Minimum Clique Cover”. *The Jour-*

- nal of Chemical Physics **152**, 124114 (2020). [arxiv:1907.03358](#).
- [25] Tzu-Ching Yen, Vladyslav Verteletskyi, and Artur F. Izmaylov. “Measuring All Compatible Operators in One Series of Single-Qubit Measurements Using Unitary Transformations”. *Journal of Chemical Theory and Computation* **16**, 2400–2409 (2020).
- [26] Andrew Jena, Scott Genin, and Michele Mosca. “Pauli Partitioning with Respect to Gate Sets” (2019). [arxiv:1907.07859](#).
- [27] Pei Yuan and Shengyu Zhang. “Optimal (controlled) quantum state preparation and improved unitary synthesis by quantum circuits with any number of ancillary qubits”. *Quantum* **7**, 956 (2023). [arxiv:2202.11302](#).
- [28] Xiao-Ming Zhang, Tongyang Li, and Xiao Yuan. “Quantum State Preparation with Optimal Circuit Depth: Implementations and Applications”. *Physical Review Letters* **129**, 230504 (2022). [arxiv:2201.11495](#).
- [29] Dmitri Maslov and Ben Zindorf. “Depth Optimization of CZ, CNOT, and Clifford Circuits”. *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering* **3**, 1–8 (2022).
- [30] Yi-Cong Zheng, Ching-Yi Lai, Todd A. Brun, and Leong-Chuan Kwek. “Depth reduction for quantum Clifford circuits through Pauli measurements” (2018). [arxiv:1805.12082](#).
- [31] Scott Aaronson and Daniel Gottesman. “Improved simulation of stabilizer circuits”. *Physical Review A* **70**, 052328 (2004).
- [32] Timothy Proctor and Kevin Young. “A simple asymptotically optimal Clifford circuit compilation algorithm” (2023). [arxiv:2310.10882](#).
- [33] Kai Chen and Hoi-Kwong Lo. “Multi-partite quantum cryptographic protocols with noisy GHZ states” (2008). [arxiv:quant-ph/0404133](#).
- [34] Michael A. Nielsen and Isaac L. Chuang. “Quantum computation and quantum information” (2010).
- [35] Yasuhiro Takahashi and Seiichiro Tani. “Collapse of the Hierarchy of Constant-Depth Exact Quantum Circuits” (2012). [arxiv:1112.6063](#).
- [36] Sergey Bravyi and Alexei Kitaev. “Universal quantum computation with ideal Clifford gates and noisy ancillas”. *Physical Review A* **71**, 022316 (2005).
- [37] Michael E. Beverland, Prakash Murali, Matthias Troyer, Krysta M. Svore, Torsten Hoefler, Vadym Kliuchnikov, Guang Hao Low, Mathias Soeken, Aarthi Sundaram, and Alexander Vaschillo. “Assessing requirements to scale to practical quantum advantage” (2022). [arxiv:2211.07629](#).
- [38] Daniel Litinski. “Magic State Distillation: Not as Costly as You Think”. *Quantum* **3**, 205 (2019).
- [39] Wai-Keong Mok, Hui Zhang, Tobias Haug, Xi-anshu Luo, Guo-Qiang Lo, Hong Cai, M. S. Kim, Ai Qun Liu, and Leong-Chuan Kwek. “Rigorous noise reduction with quantum autoencoders” (2023). [arxiv:2308.16153](#).
- [40] Richard Jozsa and Akimasa Miyake. “Matchgates and classical simulation of quantum circuits”. *Proceedings of the Royal Society A: Mathematical, Physical and Engineering Sciences* **464**, 3089–3106 (2008). [arxiv:0804.4050](#).
- [41] Thierry Nicolas Kaldenbach and Matthias Heller. “Mapping quantum circuits to shallow-depth measurement patterns based on graph states” (2023). [arxiv:2311.16223](#).
- [42] Jarrod R. McClean, Nicholas C. Rubin, Kevin J. Sung, Ian D. Kivlichan, Xavier Bonet-Monroig, Yudong Cao, Chengyu Dai, E. Schuyler Fried, Craig Gidney, Brendan Gimby, Pranav Gokhale, Thomas Häner, Tarini Hardikar, Vojtěch Havlíček, Oscar Higgott, Cupjin Huang, Josh Izaac, Zhang Jiang, Xinle Liu, Sam McArdle, Matthew Neeley, Thomas O’Brien, Bryan O’Gorman, Isil Ozfidan, Maxwell D. Radin, Jhonathan Romero, Nicolas P. D. Sawaya, Bruno Senjean, Kanav Setia, Sukin Sim, Damian S. Steiger, Mark Steudtner, Qiming Sun, Wei Sun, Daochen Wang, Fang Zhang, and Ryan Babbush. “OpenFermion: The electronic structure package for quantum computers”. *Quantum Science and Technology* **5**, 034014 (2020).
- [43] Craig Gidney. “Stim: a fast stabilizer circuit simulator”. *Quantum* **5**, 497 (2021).
- [44] Tiago P. Peixoto. “The graph-tool python library”. [figshare](#) (2014).