

Barren Plateaus of Alternated Disentangled UCC Ansatzs

Rui Mao,* Guojing Tian,† and Xiaoming Sun‡

State Key Lab of Processors, Institute of Computing Technology,
Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100190, China and

School of Computer Science and Technology, University of Chinese Academy of Sciences, Beijing 100049, China

(Dated: December 14, 2023)

We conduct a theoretical investigation on the existence of Barren Plateaus for alternated disentangled UCC (dUCC) ansatz, a relaxed version of Trotterized UCC ansatz. In the infinite depth limit, we prove that if only single excitations are involved, the energy landscape of any electronic structure Hamiltonian concentrates polynomially. In contrast, if there are additionally double excitations, the energy landscape concentrates exponentially, which indicates the presence of BP. Furthermore, we perform numerical simulations to study the finite depth scenario. Based on the numerical results, we conjecture that the widely used first-order Trotterized UCCSD and k -UpCCGSD when k is a constant suffer from BP. Contrary to previous perspectives, our results suggest that chemically inspired ansatz can also be susceptible to BP. Furthermore, our findings indicate that while the inclusion of double excitations in the ansatz is essential for improving accuracy, it may concurrently exacerbate the training difficulty.

Variational quantum eigensolvers (VQEs) are a class of variational quantum algorithms (VQAs) aiming to find the ground energy of a Hamiltonian. In VQEs, a trial wave function (or an ansatz) is prepared using a parameterized quantum circuit (PQC), and the expectation value (or the cost function) of a Hamiltonian is measured on a quantum computer. The cost function is then minimized by training the parameters using variational principle on a classical computer. While VQEs have been successfully demonstrated for various small molecules [1–5], the theoretical understanding of their trainability, efficiency and accuracy is still lacking. Here, we study the trainability of a specific class of VQE algorithms, by investigating the landscape of the cost function.

The ansatz plays a crucial role in VQEs. Roughly speaking, the ansatzs employed in VQEs fall into three categories [6, 7]: chemically inspired ansatz [1], hardware-efficient ansatz (HEA, [2]), and Hamiltonian variational ansatz (HVA, [8]). Among chemically inspired ansatzs, a class of ansatzs derived from unitary coupled cluster (UCC) theory is considered a promising candidate for VQE applications [1, 9, 10]. In UCC theory, the trial wave function is parameterized as the unitary exponentiation of excitation operators acting upon a reference state:

$$|\psi_{\text{UCC}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle = e^{\hat{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \hat{T}^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\theta})} |\psi_0\rangle, \quad (1)$$

where $\hat{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{ia} \theta_i^a \hat{a}_i^a + \sum_{ijab} \theta_{ij}^{ab} \hat{a}_{ij}^{ab} + \dots$ and $|\psi_0\rangle$ is the Hartree–Fock state [11]. Here we use the shorthand $\hat{a}_{ij}^{ab} := \hat{a}_a^\dagger \hat{a}_b^\dagger \dots \hat{a}_j \hat{a}_i$, where \hat{a} (\hat{a}^\dagger) represents the annihilation (creation) operator, and i, j, \dots (a, b, \dots) label the occupied (virtual) orbitals. In practice, \hat{T} is truncated at a finite order. For example, the widely used UCCSD [1, 7]

corresponds to the truncation up to double excitations. As for the implementation, the canonical approach is to approximate the large exponentiation in Eq. (1) by Trotterization [12]: $e^{A_1 + \dots + A_m} = \left(e^{\frac{A_1}{k}} \dots e^{\frac{A_m}{k}} \right)^k + O(k^{-1})$.

In this work, we study a *relaxed* version of the k^{th} -order Trotterized UCC ansatz, which we refer to as the *alternated disentangled UCC (dUCC) ansatz*:

$$|\psi_{k\text{-UCC}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^m e^{\theta_j^{(i)} \hat{\tau}_j - (\theta_j^{(i)} \hat{\tau}_j)^\dagger} |\psi_0\rangle, \quad (2)$$

where $\hat{\tau}_l \in \{\hat{a}_i^a, \hat{a}_{ij}^{ab}, \dots\}$. By “relaxed” we mean that the parameters across the k alternations in the k^{th} -order Trotterized UCC ansatzs become independent. dUCC offer the advantage over UCC of being provably able to express the exact FCI state using only single and double excitations as $k \rightarrow \infty$ [13]. Also, several commonly discussed ansatzs can be considered as examples of alternated dUCC ansatzs, including k -UpCCGSD [10], basis rotation ansatz (BRA, [14], since the Givens rotations are equivalent to single excitation rotations when acting on neighboring qubits), and the first-order Trotterized UCCSD mentioned above.

In the research field of trainability of VQAs, the Barren Plateaus (BP) phenomenon aroused a lot of concern, since the presence of BP could rule out quantum advantage. BP refers to the gradients of the cost function being exponentially vanishing with respect to system size at most points [15], rendering gradient-based [16] and even gradient-free [17] optimization intractable under random initialization. Even with reasonable heuristics for initialization, BP remains an obstacle to performance — if the initial guess does not position itself within the *narrow gorge* of the optimal solution, the algorithm cannot escape a local minima without exponential training cost. Due to the severity, there have been a series of works in recent years trying to understand the causes of BP [15, 18–21], identify which VQAs are affected by

* maorui21b@ict.ac.cn

† tianguojing@ict.ac.cn

‡ sunxiaoming@ict.ac.cn

it [22–25], and propose solutions [26, 27]. Despite the extensive work, currently the existence of BP is well-understood only for a few *problem-agnostic* ansatzs such as HEA [18, 23, 28] and tensor network-inspired ansatzs [23–25]. In contrast, BP of *problem-specific* ansatzs (such as chemically inspired ansatzs in VQE) are not as well-understood, despite their potential to offer improved performance.

In this Letter, we make a step towards this direction by studying the *concentration of cost function* for various alternated dUCC ansatzs in the *infinite* depth limit. We first showed that for alternated dUCC ansatzs, the exponential concentration of cost implies BP at any depth, while the converse is true only at poly(n) depth. Through tensor network contraction and convergence of alternated projections, we proved that when $k \rightarrow \infty$:

- (1) if the ansatz contains only single excitation rotations, and these rotations form a connected graph (e.g., ∞ -UCC(G)S and ∞ -BRA), then the cost function concentrate around its mean polynomially with respect to qubit number n ;
- (2) if the ansatz contains at least one additional double excitation rotation (e.g., ∞ -UCC(G)SD and ∞ -UpCCGSD), then the cost function will concentrate exponentially, which implies BP.

Furthermore, we conducted numerical simulation to study the finite depth behavior. Based on the numerical results, we conjecture that the variance of the cost function converges to its asymptotic value within relative error ε when k is approximately $O(n^2 \ln 1/\varepsilon)$ for k -BRA, $O(n \ln 1/\varepsilon)$ for k -UCC(G)S, and $O(\ln 1/\varepsilon)$ for k -UCC(G)SD and k -UpCCGSD. If the conjecture holds true, it would imply the presence of BP for first-order Trotterized UCCSD and k -UpCCGSD when k is constant.

As a side note, we also consider the “qubit” version of alternated dUCC ansatzs in Appendix, where all Pauli Z terms are trimmed after Jordan-Wigner transformation of excitation operators [29]. Remark that the Givens rotations can be viewed as qubit single excitation rotations [14]. The most important finding is that the qubit version of k -UCCS is exactly the same as k -UCCSD in terms of cost variance, which may indicates the connection between qubit UCCS and standard UCCSD.

Definitions.— In VQE, the cost function to be minimized is naturally chosen to be the energy (expectation value) of an electronic structure Hamiltonian $H_{\text{el}} = \sum_{pq} h_{pq} \hat{a}_p^{\dagger} + \sum_{pqrs} g_{pqrs} \hat{a}_{pq}^{rs}$, with respect to an ansatz $U(\boldsymbol{\theta}) |\psi_0\rangle$:

$$C(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \langle \psi_0 | U^{\dagger}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) H_{\text{el}} U(\boldsymbol{\theta}) | \psi_0 \rangle. \quad (3)$$

The design of the ansatz hence plays a prominent role in VQE algorithms. We focus on a variant of the widely employed UCC ansatzs, dubbed *alternated dUCC ansatz*. In such ansatz, $|\psi_0\rangle$ is chosen to be the Hartree-Fock

state [11] specified by number of orbitals n and number of particles n_e :

$$|\psi_0\rangle = | \underbrace{1 \dots 1}_{n_e} \underbrace{0 \dots 0}_{n-n_e} \rangle. \quad (4)$$

And $U(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = U_k^{\mathbf{R}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is determined by a positive integer k and a sequence of excitation rotations $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, \dots, R_m)$, where each excitation rotation R_j accepts a parameter θ and can be written as $R_j(\theta) = \exp(\theta \hat{\tau} - (\theta \hat{\tau})^{\dagger})$ with $\hat{\tau} \in \{\hat{a}_p^q, \hat{a}_{pq}^{rs}, \dots\}$:

$$U_k^{\mathbf{R}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^m R_j(\theta_j^{(i)}). \quad (5)$$

For the ease of analysis, we make two assumptions. (1) The one- and two-electron integrals h_{pq} and g_{pqrs} are both real and symmetric, i.e., $h_{pq} = h_{qp} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $g_{pqrs} = g_{srqp} \in \mathbb{R}$. Moreover, $g_{pqrs} \neq 0$ only if $p > q > r > s$ or $p < q < r < s$. (2) The parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ are all real. The first assumption can be removed, while the second is left for future work.

BP is defined to be the exponential concentration of cost gradients around 0, assuming uniformly random initialization of parameters. We discriminate it with the concentration of cost function itself. Formally, consider a family of unbiased cost functions $(C_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$, i.e., $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [\partial_{\theta_j} C_n] = 0$ for all $\theta_j \in \boldsymbol{\theta}$ and $n \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Let $G(n) = \max_{\theta_j \in \boldsymbol{\theta}} \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (\partial_{\theta_j} C_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$, $F(n) = \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (C_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$. We say the gradients of $(C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ (or $(C_n)_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$) *concentrate polynomially* if $G(n)$ (or $F(n)$) is $\Omega(1/\text{poly}(n))$, and *concentrate exponentially* if $G(n)$ (or $F(n)$) is $1/\exp(\Omega(n))$.

Cost concentration and BP.— We will focus on cost concentration instead of gradient concentration for the ease of analysis. Fortunately, these two concepts are closely related. In [30], the equivalence between exponential cost concentration and exponential gradient concentration (i.e., BP) was established for ansatzs comprising a polynomial number of independent Pauli rotations. Since this result is not directly applicable in our setting, we establish a quantitative relationship between the two concepts, using the same arguments in [28].

Lemma 1 (Relationship between variances of cost and gradients). *For the cost function C of an alternated dUCC ansatz $U_k^{\mathbf{R}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$,*

$$(km)^{-1} \cdot \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (C) \leq \max_{\theta_j \in \boldsymbol{\theta}} \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (\partial_{\theta_j} C) \leq \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (C). \quad (6)$$

In fact, in Appendix we present a more general version of Lemma 1 for all periodic cost functions without rapid oscillations. Lemma 1 implies that for alternated dUCC ansatzs, the exponential cost concentration implies exponential gradient concentration by second inequality of Eq. (6), while the reverse holds only when km is sub-exponential by the first inequality. Given our primary focus on infinite depth behavior (i.e., $k \rightarrow \infty$), the lower bound in Eq. (6) becomes trivial, and we will exclusively rely on the second inequality.

Moments of cost function.— We analyze cost concentration for the alternated dUCC in the infinite depth limit by providing an explicit formula of cost variance. In a unified manner, we will analyze the t^{th} moment of cost function, $\mathbb{E}[C^t]$, with a focus on $t = 1, 2$. The calculation of $\mathbb{E}[C^t]$ involves two key steps:

1. Through tensor network contraction [22–25], $\mathbb{E}[C^t]$ can be represented as product of enlarged tensors corresponding to the reference state, gates and the observable:

$$\mathbb{E}[C^t] = \langle H_{\text{el}} |^{\otimes t} \left(\prod_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}] \right)^k | \psi_0 \rangle^{\otimes 2t}. \quad (7)$$

Here, $M^{\otimes t, t} := M^{\otimes t} \otimes (M^*)^{\otimes t}$. This representation allows for the separation of different parameters, resolving non-linearity by incorporating an enlarged Hilbert space with dimension 2^{2tn} .

2. The periodicity of excitation rotations implies that each $\mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$ is an orthogonal projection, denoted as P_{M_j} . Let $M := \bigcap_j M_j$ represent the intersection space. Through the convergence of alternating projections [31], we obtain:

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[C^t] = \langle H_{\text{el}} |^{\otimes t} P_M | \psi_0 \rangle^{\otimes 2t}. \quad (8)$$

This approach circumvents the challenge of tracking the evolution of $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}$ or $|H_{\text{el}}\rangle^{\otimes t}$ at finite k . Instead, it suffices to determine the intersection space M , which turns out to be tractable.

Let us elaborate a bit more on the two key steps. Firstly, to facilitate a more straightforward description of the enlarged tensors, the $2tn$ qubits are rearranged so that the enlarged Hilbert space can be conceptualized as a tensor product of n subsystems. Each subsystem, which we refer to as a *site*, comprises $2t$ qubits. As an illustrative example, $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}$ is identified with

$$|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t} = \underbrace{|1 \dots 1\rangle}_{2t}^{\otimes n_e} \underbrace{|0 \dots 0\rangle}_{2t}^{\otimes (n - n_e)}. \quad (9)$$

Secondly, in BP studies, it is common that the t^{th} moment superoperators of parameterized gates, such as $\mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$ in our case, are orthogonal projections. For instance, in [15, 18, 24] the circuit or block of gates is assumed to be Haar random up to the 2nd moment. Under such assumption one can verify that the 2nd moment superoperator of the circuit or block of gates is an orthogonal projection of rank 2. However, the projections encountered in our analysis are notably more intricate. Specifically, the t^{th} moment of qubit single excitation rotations forms a projection of rank 70 within the subsystem it acts on, let alone normal excitation rotations that are highly non-local. Consequently, while the authors in [18] successfully track the evolution of reference state

under the Haar random assumption, achieving a similar goal may not be possible in the present setting. Instead, we turn to study the infinite case. It is worth noting that the phenomenon where the infinite case is easier than the finite one also arises in the theoretical analysis of classical neural networks [32].

Thirdly, we ascertain the intersection space M by leveraging the following identity:

$$M^\perp = M_1^\perp + M_2^\perp + \dots + M_m^\perp. \quad (10)$$

In other words, it suffices to determine the spanning set of M_j^\perp , and then take the union to obtain the spanning set of M^\perp . To further simplify the analysis, we utilize the symmetries of $P_{M_j} = \mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$ and identify the spanning set of M_j^\perp within the invariant spaces induced by these symmetries. To be specific, the symmetries and their corresponding invariant spaces that contain $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}$ are listed below.

- The $Z_p^{\otimes 2t}$ -symmetry induces an invariant space $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}} = \text{span } \mathcal{S}_t^{\text{even}}$, where

$$\mathcal{S}_t^{\text{even}} := \left\{ |b_1 b_2 \dots b_{2t}\rangle \left| \sum_i b_i \equiv 0 \right. \right\}^{\otimes n}. \quad (11)$$

- The particle number symmetry further induces an invariant space $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} = \text{span } \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$ at $t = 2$. Here, we define $\mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{even}}$ to be the set of paired states, and a vector $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{even}}$ is called a paired state, if

$$\#|0000\rangle = \#|1111\rangle + n - 2n_e, \quad (12)$$

$$\#|0011\rangle = \#|1100\rangle, \quad (13)$$

$$\#|0101\rangle = \#|1010\rangle, \quad (14)$$

$$\#|0110\rangle = \#|1001\rangle, \quad (15)$$

where $\#|b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4\rangle$ counts the number of sites in $|\Phi\rangle$ that are in state $|b_1 b_2 b_3 b_4\rangle$.

- The $(S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n}$ -symmetry induces an invariant space \mathcal{H}_t^τ . Here, the operator S_τ^b defines a permutation of qubits in one site by $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{2t}$, and \mathcal{H}_t^τ is the +1 eigenspace of $(S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n}$.

In Appendix, the spanning set of $M_j^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ and $M_j^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \cap \bigcap_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_4} \mathcal{H}_2^\tau$ is characterized at $t = 2$. With these spanning sets in hand, we can then characterize the intersection space M inside these invariant spaces, according to Eq. (10). Surprisingly, as shown in Appendix, while the dimension of each M_j is exponentially large, the dimension of the intersection $M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ is at most $\text{poly}(n)$ at $t = 2$, under a mild assumption.

Cost function is unbiased.— We first show that $\mathbb{E}[C] = 0$ for any alternated dUCC ansatz and any k (finite or infinite).

Theorem 1 (Unbiased cost function). *For the cost function C of an alternated dUCC ansatz, we have $\mathbb{E}[C] = 0$ for all k .*

Proof. Recall Eq. (7). One checks that $\left(\prod_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[R_j^{\otimes 1,1} \right] \right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2} \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\text{even}}$, while $|H_{\text{el}}\rangle \in (\mathcal{H}_1^{\text{even}})^\perp$. \square

As a corollary, $\text{Var}(C) = \mathbb{E}[C^2]$ for cost function of alternated dUCC ansatz.

Polynomial concentration when there are only single excitation rotations.— We start by considering the scenario where only single excitation rotations are involved. These class of ansatz includes k -UCC(G)S, the alternated disentangled variant of UCC truncated at single excitations, and k -BRA. One might expect the trainability to be similar for k -UCC(G)S and k -BRA since they have the same expressibility when k is large enough [33]. Indeed, we prove that the cost variance is the same as long as the graph formed by the index pairs of single excitations is connected. Given a sequence of excitation rotations \mathbf{R} , the graph formed by single excitation rotations in \mathbf{R} is defined to be $G = (V, E)$, where $V = [n]$ and $E = \{(u, v) | \exists R_j \in \mathbf{R}, \text{ s.t. } R_j(\theta_j) = e^{\theta_j(\hat{a}_u^v - \hat{a}_v^u)}\}$.

Theorem 2 (Polynomial concentration). *Suppose \mathbf{R} consists of single excitation rotations that form a connected graph, and C be the cost function of $U_k^{\mathbf{R}}$. There exists a function V_1 such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C) = V_1(n, n_e, \|\mathbf{h}\|, \|\mathbf{g}\|) \sim \text{poly}(n^{-1}, n_e, \|\mathbf{h}\|, \|\mathbf{g}\|)$. Here $\|\cdot\|$ is the ℓ^2 norm.*

Proof sketch. The proof is constructive. An explicit vector $|\Psi^*\rangle$ is given, and is shown to equal $P_M |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ by verifying that $|\Psi^*\rangle \in M$ and $|\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in M^\perp$, using the spanning set of $M_j^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. We then obtain $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[C^2]$ by Eq. (8), $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[C]$ by Theorem 1, and the theorem follows. \square

We present the closed form of the function V_1 in appendix. Remark that Theorem 2 applies to k -UCC(G)S, and k -BRA, since for these ansatz the graph formed by single excitation rotations is a complete graph, a complete bipartite graph and a path, respectively.

Exponential concentration when there are additionally double excitation rotations.— Next, we explore the case where double excitation rotations are included in the ansatz, in addition to single excitation rotations. This class of ansatz includes k -UCC(G)SD, which is an alternated disentangled variant of the UCCSD method, and k -UpCCGSD. The 1-UCC(G)SD (equivalent to the first-order Trotterized UCC(G)SD) and k -UpCCGSD are both popular choice in VQE, with k -UpCCGSD improves on 1-UCCSD in terms of both accuracy and efficiency [6]. We prove that the inclusion of any double excitation rotations in the ansatz leads to the exponential vanishing of the variance.

Theorem 3 (Exponential concentration). *Suppose \mathbf{R} consists of single excitation rotations forming a connected graph as well as at least one double excitation rotation, and C be the cost function of $U_k^{\mathbf{R}}$. There exists a function V_2 such that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C) = V_2(n, n_e, \|\mathbf{h}\|, \|\mathbf{g}\|) \sim \text{poly}(\|\mathbf{h}\|, \|\mathbf{g}\|) / \binom{n}{n_e}$.*

Proof sketch. It can be shown that $\dim(M_j^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \cap \bigcap_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_4} \mathcal{H}_2^\tau) = 1$. Hence, $P_M |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ is the unique vector in $M_j^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \cap \bigcap_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_4} \mathcal{H}_2^\tau$ that satisfies $\langle \mathbb{1}^2 | \psi_0 \rangle^{\otimes 4} = 1$. We then obtain $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[C^2]$ by Eq. (8), $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[C]$ by Theorem 1, and the theorem follows. \square

We present the closed form of the function V_2 in Appendix. V_2 is exponentially vanishing if $n_e = \Theta(n)$. Remark that Theorem 3 applies to k -UCC(G)SD, and k -UpCCGSD, since in these ansatz the single excitation rotations form a connected graph, and they include double excitation rotations.

Numerical results.— In order to study the cost concentration for finite k , we carry out numerical simulations for 4 alternated dUCC ansatz: k -BRA, k -UCCS, k -UCCSD and k -UpCCGSD. In Figure 1 we plot the following quantities against different values of k , n , and n_e : (1) the $\ell^1, \ell^2, \ell^\infty$ distance between $\left(\prod_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[R_j^{\otimes 2,2} \right] \right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ and $P_M |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2}$; (2) the distance (relative error) between cost variance at k and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C)$, with respect to monomial observables $\hat{a}_p^q + \hat{a}_q^p$ and $\hat{a}_{pq}^{rs} + \hat{a}_{rs}^{pq}$. All these distances converges to 0 as k increases until exhausting machine precision, validating our predictions. Moreover, it appears that all these distances decays at least as $\exp(-k/c(n))$ for some $c(n) \in \text{poly}(n)$. Based on this discovery, we made the following conjecture.

Conjecture. *For any electronic structure Hamiltonian H_{el} with $h_{pq}, g_{pqrs} \in O(1)$, there exists some $c(n) \in O(\text{poly}(n))$, such that*

$$\left| \text{Var}(C) / \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C) - 1 \right| \leq \exp(-k/c(n)). \quad (16)$$

Here C is the cost function that implicitly depends on k . Moreover, $c(n) \in O(n^2)$ for k -BRA, $c(n) \in O(n)$ for k -UCC(G)S, $c(n) \in O(1)$ for k -UCC(G)SD and k -UpCCGSD.

Summary and discussion.— In this work, we conducted a rigorous analysis of cost concentration for the alternated dUCC ansatz in the infinite depth limit. Contrary to previous belief [34], we showed that the chemically inspired ansatz can also suffer from BP.

It is worth noting that our work does not rule out the practicality of chemically inspired ansatzs. Firstly, our study focused on alternated dUCC ansatzs, while the trainability of Trotterized UCCSD and adaptive variants [35] remains open. Secondly, the BP phenomenon is considered under random parameter initialization, whereas




FIG. 1: Convergence of the projected state and cost variance with respect to k . For different ansatzs k -BRA, k -UCCS, k -UCCSD and k -UpCCGSD, and different $n = 4, 6, 8, 10, n_e = \frac{n}{2}$, we compare the $\ell^1, \ell^2, \ell^\infty$ distance between $\left(\prod_{j=1}^m \mathbb{E} \left[R_j^{\otimes 2,2} \right] \right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ and $P_M |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2}$, and the relative difference between cost variance at k and the predicted asymptotic variance for all one- or two-electron terms. Notice that the cost variance is bounded by the ℓ^1 distance multiplied by the ℓ^∞ norm of the observable. The logarithm of distance in all cases decreases almost perfectly in a linear manner as k increases, until reaching the machine precision.

VQE typically benefits from reasonable heuristics for choosing an initial guess. BP imply that the optimizer cannot escape local minimas, but there is still a possibility that the initial guess is already inside the same narrow gorge as the optimal solution. Lastly, we exclusively considered the Jordan-Wigner transformation, as employed in the canonical implementation of UCCSD. However, results in [18] suggest that the Bravyi-Kitaev transformation might be a better choice due to its local-

ity.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

We thank Kecheng Liu for helpful discussions. This work was supported in part by the National Natural Science Foundation of China Grants No.62325210, 62272441, 12204489, 62301531, and the Strategic Priority Research Program of Chinese Academy of Sciences Grant No.XDB28000000.

APPENDIX

Throughout the text, we will use X, Y, Z for Pauli matrices, I for 2×2 identity matrix, and $\mathbb{1}_N$ for $N \times N$ identity matrix. Two additional 2×2 matrices are used: qubit annihilation operator $Q = |0\rangle\langle 1|$, and occupation number operator $N = |1\rangle\langle 1|$. The symbol n is reserved for the number of orbitals (qubits), and n_e for the number of occupied orbitals. For any 2×2 matrix M (for example X, Y, Z, I), we define $M_i := I^{\otimes i-1} \otimes M \otimes I^{\otimes n-i}$, where $i \in [n]$ and $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$.

We use z^* to denote the complex conjugate of z , and M^\dagger to denote the conjugate transpose of matrix M . i represents the imaginary unit. Denote \mathfrak{S}_m the symmetric group on a set of size m . The set of bit string of length m is denoted by \mathbb{F}_2^m . For a bit string $\mathbf{b} \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$, $\bar{\mathbf{b}}$ denotes the flip of \mathbf{b} , i.e., $\bar{\mathbf{b}} = b_1 b_2 \dots b_m \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$ and $\bar{b}_i = 1 - b_i, \forall i$. For two bit strings $\mathbf{b}, \mathbf{b}' \in \mathbb{F}_2^m$, $\mathbf{b} \odot \mathbf{b}'$ denotes the bitwise dot, defined by $\sum_{i=1}^m \mathbf{b}_i \cdot \mathbf{b}'_i$.

Appendix A: Definitions and main results

In this work we study the scalability of various *alternated disentangled UCC (dUCC)* ansatzs, which can be viewed as a relaxed version of Trotterized UCC. Recall that in UCC theory, the trial wave function is parameterized as the unitary exponentiation of excitation operators $\hat{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{ia} \theta_{ia} \hat{a}_a^\dagger \hat{a}_i + \sum_{ijab} \theta_{ijab} \hat{a}_a^\dagger \hat{a}_b^\dagger \hat{a}_i \hat{a}_j + \dots$ acting upon a reference state $|\psi_0\rangle$:

$$|\psi_{\text{UCC}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rangle = e^{\hat{T}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) - \hat{T}^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\theta})} |\psi_0\rangle. \quad (\text{A1})$$

Here we use the convention that i, j, \dots (a, b, \dots) label the occupied (virtual) orbitals, but *generalized* excitations without the occupation constraint are also allowed (and we will use p, q, r, s, \dots for all orbitals to emphasize the difference). The widely used UCCSD variant corresponds to truncated \hat{T} up to second excitations. For circuit implementation, it is unclear how to exactly implement the large exponentiation in Eq. (A1) efficiently (i.e., to polynomial number of one and two qubits gates), except for the case when there are only single excitations. The canonical approach is to take a k^{th} order Trotter approximation, with systematic error up to $O(k^{-1})$. In contrast, for the ease of our analysis, we will incorporate an additional relaxation step after Trotterization, as described below:

$$e^{\sum_{j=1}^m \theta_j (\hat{\tau}_j - \hat{\tau}_j^\dagger)} \xrightarrow{\text{Trotter}} \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^m e^{\frac{\theta_j}{k} (\hat{\tau}_j - \hat{\tau}_j^\dagger)} \xrightarrow{\text{Relax}} \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^m e^{\theta_j^{(i)} (\hat{\tau}_j - \hat{\tau}_j^\dagger)}, \quad (\text{A2})$$

where $\hat{\tau}_j \in \{\hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q, \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s, \dots\}$. Remark that θ_j and $\theta_j^{(i)}$ are different set of parameters, and we implicitly make the assumption that all parameters are real (this is valid if we only care about real wave functions). Obviously, such relaxation can offer higher variational accuracy, at the cost of higher training overhead. We refer to the last unitary in Eq. (A2) as *alternated dUCC ansatz*[36], which is formally defined below. To avoid bothering with the fermionic ladder operators \hat{a}, \hat{a}^\dagger , we will identify $\hat{a}_p, \hat{a}_p^\dagger$ with $Q_p \prod_{a < p} Z_a, Q_p^\dagger \prod_{a < p} Z_a$ respectively, by Jordan-Wigner transformation[37]. A ‘‘qubit’’ version of UCC theory, where the Z -string is eliminated after Jordan-Wigner transformation, is also considered in this work.

Definition A.1 (Alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz). *Call the unitary $U_k^{\mathbf{R}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ ($k \in \mathbb{N}_+$) an alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz, if it can be written as*

$$U_k^{\mathbf{R}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{j=1}^m R_j(\theta_j^{(i)}), \quad (\text{A3})$$

where $\mathbf{R} = (R_1, \dots, R_m)$ is a sequence of (qubit) excitation rotations, $R_j(\theta) = \exp(\theta(\hat{\tau}_j - \hat{\tau}_j^\dagger))$ and $\hat{\tau}_j \in \{\hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q, \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s, \dots\}$ (or $\hat{\tau}_j \in \{Q_p^\dagger Q_q, Q_p^\dagger Q_q^\dagger Q_r Q_s, \dots\}$ in qubit version).

While Definition A.1 encompasses any (qubit) excitations, our primary focus lies on single and double (qubit) excitations. This is particularly relevant in scenarios like UCCSD. To this end, we will introduce dedicated notation for single and double (qubit) excitation rotations, as follows.

$$A_{pq}(\theta) = \exp\left(\theta(Q_p^\dagger Q_q - h.c.) \prod_{a=q+1}^{p-1} Z_a\right), \quad B_{pqrs}(\theta) = \exp\left(\theta(Q_p^\dagger Q_q^\dagger Q_r Q_s - h.c.) \prod_{b=s+1}^{r-1} Z_b \prod_{a=q+1}^{p-1} Z_a\right), \quad (\text{A4})$$

$$A_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \exp(\theta(Q_p^\dagger Q_q - h.c.)), \quad B_{pqrs}^{\text{qubit}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \exp(\theta(Q_p^\dagger Q_q^\dagger Q_r Q_s - h.c.)), \quad (\text{A5})$$

where ‘‘h.c.’’ stands for Hermitian conjugation, and $p > q > r > s$. Examples of alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz (including at most double (qubit) excitations) are

$$k\text{-UCCS}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{p > n_e \geq q} A_{pq}(\theta_{pq}^{(i)}), \quad (\text{A6})$$

$$k\text{-UCCGS}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{p > q} A_{pq}(\theta_{pq}^{(i)}), \quad (\text{A7})$$

$$k\text{-UCCSD}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{p > n_e \geq q} A_{pq}(\theta_{pq}^{(i)}) \prod_{p > q > n_e \geq r > s} B_{pqrs}(\theta_{pqrs}^{(i)}), \quad (\text{A8})$$

$$k\text{-UCCGSD}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{p > q} A_{pq}(\theta_{pq}^{(i)}) \prod_{p > q > r > s} B_{pqrs}(\theta_{pqrs}^{(i)}), \quad (\text{A9})$$

$$k\text{-qubit-UCCS}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{p > n_e \geq q} A_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}(\theta_{pq}^{(i)}), \quad (\text{A10})$$

$$k\text{-qubit-UCCGS}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{p > q} A_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}(\theta_{pq}^{(i)}), \quad (\text{A11})$$

$$k\text{-qubit-UCCSD}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{p > n_e \geq q} A_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}(\theta_{pq}^{(i)}) \prod_{p > q > n_e \geq r > s} B_{pqrs}^{\text{qubit}}(\theta_{pqrs}^{(i)}), \quad (\text{A12})$$

$$k\text{-qubit-UCCGSD}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{p > q} A_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}(\theta_{pq}^{(i)}) \prod_{p > q > r > s} B_{pqrs}^{\text{qubit}}(\theta_{pqrs}^{(i)}), \quad (\text{A13})$$

$$k\text{-BRA}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{l=1}^k \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} A_{i,i+1}(\theta_{i,i+1}^{(l)}), \quad (\text{A14})$$

$$k\text{-UpCCGSD}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{i=1}^k \prod_{p > q} A_{pq}(\theta_{pq}^{(i)}) \prod_{a > b} B_{2a,2a-1,2b,2b-1}(\theta_{ab}^{(i)}). \quad (\text{A15})$$

In VQE, the *cost function* to be optimized is naturally chosen to be energy of the molecule system:

$$C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \rho, U, O) = \text{tr}(OU(\boldsymbol{\theta})\rho U(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\dagger). \quad (\text{A16})$$

Here

- ρ is an easy-to-prepare *reference state*. In this work, ρ is fixed to be $|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|$, where $|\psi_0\rangle$ is a *Hartree-Fock state*,

$$|\psi_0\rangle := |\underbrace{1 \dots 1}_{n_e} \underbrace{0 \dots 0}_{n-n_e}\rangle. \quad (\text{A17})$$

- $U(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is the *ansatz*, such that $U(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\psi_0\rangle$ produces a *trial state*.
- O is the *observable*, usually the electronic structure Hamiltonian $H_{\text{el}} = \sum_{pq} h_{pq} \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + \sum_{pqrs} g_{pqrs} \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s$. In our study, we focus on the real case, where the one- and two-electron integrals h_{pq} and g_{pqrs} are assumed to be both real and symmetric ($h_{pq} = h_{qp} \in \mathbb{R}$ and $g_{pqrs} = g_{srqp} \in \mathbb{R}$). Moreover, we assume that $g_{pqrs} \neq 0$ only if $p > q > r > s$ or $p < q < r < s$. In other words, terms such as $\hat{a}_1^\dagger \hat{a}_3^\dagger \hat{a}_2 \hat{a}_4$ are forbidden. It is important to note that this assumption is made for ease of analysis, rather than due to the drawback of our proof techniques. In fact, our results can be generalized to *any* observables, although the progress of extending the analysis could be tedious. Remark that under the aforementioned assumptions, H_{el} can be written as:

$$H_{\text{el}} = \sum_{p > q} h_{pq} (\hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c.) + \sum_{p > q > r > s} g_{pqrs} (\hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c.). \quad (\text{A18})$$

The cost function we study may take various forms, with $\rho = |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|$ fixed, and $U(\boldsymbol{\theta}), O$ potentially varying in different instances. For simplicity, we will slightly abuse the notation and use $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U, O), C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U), C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; O)$ or even $C(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ instead of $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; \rho, U, O)$, whenever the context is clear.

While VQA and VQE are promising in NISQ era, there are several unresolved obstacles, among which the Barren Plateaus (BP) phenomenon poses a major concern [34]. Analogous to the gradient vanishing problem in training classical neural network, BP refers to the exponential concentration of gradients (of cost function in VQA) around 0 over random parameters, thus ruling out any gradient based optimization method with random starting point. Another related concept is the concentration of cost function, which also characterizes the flatness of cost landscape. For example, the exponential concentration of cost function around its mean would rule out any gradient-free optimization method with random starting point. The two types of concentration are strictly defined as follows. Let $\{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ be a family of cost functions indexed by qubit number n and $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [\partial_{\theta_j} C(\boldsymbol{\theta})] = 0$ for all $\theta_j \in \boldsymbol{\theta}$.

Definition A.2 (Gradient concentration and BP). *Let $G(n) = \max_{\theta_j \in \boldsymbol{\theta}} \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (\partial_{\theta_j} C_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$. We say the gradients of $\{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ concentrate polynomially if $G(n) = 1/\text{poly}(n)$, and concentrate exponentially if $G(n) = 1/\exp(\Omega(n))$. Specifically, $\{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ exhibits BP if the gradients concentrate exponentially.*

Definition A.3 (Cost concentration). *Let $F(n) = \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (C_n(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$. We say $\{C_n\}_{n \in \mathbb{N}_+}$ concentrate polynomially if $F(n) = 1/\text{poly}(n)$, and concentrate exponentially if $F(n) = 1/\exp(\Omega(n))$.*

Intuitively, both gradient concentration and cost concentration describe the flatness of landscape. In [30], the equivalence between exponential cost concentration and exponential gradient concentration (i.e., BP) was established for ansatzs comprising a polynomial number of independent Pauli rotations, using integral arguments and the parameter shift rule. Since their result is not directly applicable in our setting, in the following lemma we derive a quantitative relationship between cost variance and gradient variances, using the fact that the cost function of alternated dUCC ansatz is periodic and has no rapid oscillations. The proof of this lemma is postponed to Appendix B, and is largely inspired by [28].

Lemma A.4 (Relationship between variances of cost and gradients). *Let $U_k^{\mathbf{R}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be an alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz defined in Eq. (A3), and $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}})$ defined in Eq. (A18), then*

$$(k|\mathbf{R}|)^{-1} \cdot \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (C) \leq \max_{\theta_j \in \boldsymbol{\theta}} \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (\partial_{\theta_j} C) \leq \text{Var}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} (C). \quad (\text{A19})$$

Consequently, for alternated dUCC ansatzs, the exponential decay of cost variance implies exponential decay of gradient variance by second inequality of Eq. (A19), while the reverse holds only when $k|\mathbf{R}|$ is sub-exponential by the first inequality. Our main focus will be determining the scaling of variance of cost, and bound the variance of gradients by Lemma A.4. We prove in our main result (Theorem A.5) that while variants of alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz (k -UCCSD, k -BRA, etc.) differs both in structure and performance, their asymptotic behavior of cost variance in the large depth limit can be categorized by a few representatives.

Theorem A.5 (Main result). *Let $U_k^{\mathbf{R}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be an alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz defined in Eq. (A3), and $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})$ defined in Eq. (A16), where the qubit number is n , and H_{el} defined in Eq. (A18), with $|h_{pq}|, |g_{pqrs}| \in O(\text{poly}(n))$. Denote the simple undirected graph formed by index pairs of (qubit) single excitations in \mathbf{R} by G , i.e.,*

$$G := (V = [n], E = \{(u, v) | A_{uv} \text{ or } A_{uv}^{\text{qubit}} \in \mathbf{R}\}). \quad (\text{A20})$$

Suppose G is connected. The limit $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var} (C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})) =: V(n)$ exists, and

1. *If \mathbf{R} contains only single excitation rotations, then $V(n) = 1/\text{poly}(n)$.*
2. *If \mathbf{R} contains only single qubit excitation rotations, then $V(n) = 1/\text{poly}(n)$ if the maximum degree of G is 2, and $V(n) = 1/\exp(\Theta(n))$ otherwise.*
3. *If \mathbf{R} contains both single and double excitation rotations, then $V(n) = 1/\exp(\Theta(n))$.*
4. *If \mathbf{R} contains both single and double qubit excitation rotations (and satisfy the condition in Theorem H.2), then $V(n) = 1/\exp(\Theta(n))$.*

Appendixes C to H are devoted to the proof of Theorem A.5, which is in fact the calculation of cost variance $\text{Var}(C)$. The proof is divided into the following parts (illustrated in Figure 2):

- In Appendix C, we give a high level description about how we calculate the t^{th} moment of cost function.

- We represent the t^{th} moment of cost function as a circuit-like tensor network (Lemma C.1), by contracting initial state, gates and observable into larger tensors: $\mathbb{E}[C^t] = \langle H_{\text{el}} \rangle^{\otimes t} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{R}|} \mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}] \right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}$. Since the t^{th} moment of cost is essentially captured by the vector $|\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle := \left(\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{R}|} \mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}] \right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}$, we refer to such vector as (\mathbf{R}, t, k) -moment vector (Definition C.2).
- We introduce site decomposition (Definition C.3), so that the enlarged space $\mathbb{C}^{2^{2tn}}$ involved in calculating $\mathbb{E}[C^t]$ can be still viewed as tensor product of n subsystems. These subsystems are referred to as *sites*, each containing $2t$ qubits. Under site decomposition, tensor like $\mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$ can be viewed as an operator acting on sites.
- We show that each $\mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$ is an orthogonal projection (Lemma C.6), denoted by P_{M_j} .
- The convergence of alternating projections hence assures that $|\Psi_{t,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = P_M |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}$, where $M = \bigcap_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{R}|} M_j$ (Corollary C.8). While it is not obvious how to find the intersection space M , it is easy to find its orthogonal complement M^\perp , since $M^\perp = \sum_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{R}|} M_j^\perp$ (Lemma C.9).
- In Appendix D, we characterize the spanning set of M_j^\perp (Lemma D.9). Symmetries of $\mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$ is used to reduce the space.
 - The $Z_p^{\otimes 2t}$ -symmetry helps to reduce to the invariant space $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{even}}$ (Corollary D.3).
 - The particle number symmetry helps to further reduce to the invariant space $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ (Lemma D.8) when $t = 2$.
 - The $(S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n}$ -symmetry helps to reduce to the invariant space \mathcal{H}_t^τ (Corollary D.13).
- In Appendix E, we prove that the cost function is unbiased, i.e., the first moment is zero. We also illustrate how to calculate the second moment by an example.
- In Appendixes F to H, we prove our main result Theorem A.5, by calculating $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$, and taking the inner product between $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ and $|H_{\text{el}}\rangle^{\otimes 2}$ which evaluates to $\mathbb{E}[C^2]$.
 - The proof of case 1 and part of case 2 is constructive: we give an explicit vector $|\Psi^*\rangle$, and prove $|\Psi_{t,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = |\Psi^*\rangle$ by showing that $|\Psi^*\rangle \in M$ and $|\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in M^\perp$. In this proof, we use the spanning set of the orthogonal complement M inside $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} - (M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$.
 - We prove the rest of the theorem by showing that $\dim(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \cap \bigcap_\tau \mathcal{H}_2^\tau) = 1$. In such case, $|\Psi_{t,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ is obvious.

Appendix B: Proof of Lemma A.4

In this section, we prove the equivalence between variances of cost and gradients for alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz (Lemma A.4). In fact, we prove a more generalized version in Lemma B.2 for any *bounded frequency periodic function* (defined below). Intuitively, such function does not have rapid oscillation.

Definition B.1 (Bounded frequency periodic function). *A function $f : \mathbb{R}^L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is called bounded frequency periodic, if it is periodic with the following Fourier expansion*

$$f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^L} c_{\mathbf{n}} \exp(i\mathbf{n} \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}), \quad \text{where } c_{\mathbf{n}} \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (\text{B1})$$

Moreover, there exists a constant $B > 0$ independent of L , s.t.

$$c_{\mathbf{n}} = 0 \quad \text{if } \|\mathbf{n}\|_\infty > B. \quad (\text{B2})$$

Notice that we implicitly assumed bounded frequency periodic function to have period 2π , but it can be generalized to any periodic function by rescaling. The following proof is similar to Lemma 1 of [28]. We include the proof for completeness.




FIG. 2: Illustration of how we calculate the t^{th} moment of cost function. (a) Tensor network representation of the t^{th} moment. Here the square bracket represents taking the t^{th} moment. (b) Use the independence of parameters to contract the tensor network into a circuit-like one. (c) The t^{th} moment of each excitation rotation is orthogonal projection. In the infinite depth limit, these projections contract into an orthogonal projection onto the intersection space M_t . (d) The t^{th} moment in the infinite depth limit can be recovered as the inner product between vector O_t and moment vector $|\Psi_{t,\infty}\rangle$ (projected ρ_t).

Lemma B.2 (Relationship between variances of cost and gradients, generalized). *For bounded frequency periodic function $f : \mathbb{R}^L \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ where the frequencies are bounded by B as in Eq. (B2),*

$$L^{-1} \cdot \text{Var}_{\theta} (f(\theta)) \leq \max_{1 \leq j \leq L} \text{Var}_{\theta} (\partial_{\theta_j} f(\theta)) \leq B^2 \cdot \text{Var}_{\theta} (f(\theta)). \quad (\text{B3})$$

Proof. Expand f in Fourier basis as in Eq. (B1). Since f is real-valued, $c_{\mathbf{n}} = c_{-\mathbf{n}}^*$ for any $\mathbf{n} \in \mathbb{Z}^L$. Since $\mathbb{E}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} [e^{im\theta}] = \delta(m)$ for any integer m , we have

$$\text{Var}(f) = \mathbb{E}[f^2] - \mathbb{E}[f]^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} |c_{\mathbf{n}}|^2 - |c_0|^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{n} \neq 0} |c_{\mathbf{n}}|^2, \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$\text{Var}(\partial_{\theta_j} f) = E[(\partial_{\theta_j} f)^2] - \mathbb{E}[\partial_{\theta_j} f]^2 = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} |c_{\mathbf{n}}|^2 n_j^2 - 0 = \sum_{\mathbf{n}} |c_{\mathbf{n}}|^2 n_j^2. \quad (\text{B5})$$

By the fact that $|n_j| \leq B$,

$$\text{Var}(f) \leq \sum_{\mathbf{n}} |c_{\mathbf{n}}|^2 \|\mathbf{n}\|_2^2 = \sum_j \text{Var}(\partial_{\theta_j} f) \leq L \max_j (\partial_{\theta_j} f) \leq LB^2 \cdot \text{Var}(f). \quad (\text{B6})$$

□

The following two lemmas show that the cost function of alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz is bounded frequency periodic, completing the proof of Lemma A.4.

Lemma B.3 (Periodicity of (qubit) excitation rotations). *Let $R(\theta)$ be a (qubit) excitation rotation (Definition A.1). $R(\theta)$ is periodic with period 2π . Moreover, there exists constant matrices M_R^+, M_R^-, M_R^0 , such that*

$$R(\theta) = e^{i\theta} M_R^+ + e^{-i\theta} M_R^- + M_R^0. \quad (\text{B7})$$

Proof. Recall $R(\theta) = \exp(\theta(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger))$, where $\hat{\tau} \in \{\hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q, \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s, \dots\} \cup \{Q_p^\dagger Q_q, Q_p^\dagger Q_q^\dagger Q_r Q_s, \dots\}$. Notice that $\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger$ is anti-Hermitian. It suffices to show that the eigenvalues of $\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger$ are $0, \pm i$. In fact,

$$(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger)^2 = (Q_p^\dagger Q_q^\dagger \dots Q_r Q_s \dots - Q_r^\dagger Q_s^\dagger \dots Q_p Q_q \dots)^2 = -(N_p N_q \dots + N_r N_s \dots - N_p N_q \dots N_r N_s \dots). \quad (\text{B8})$$

Hence, $(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger)^2$ is a diagonal matrix, and each element on the diagonal is either 0 or -1. □

Lemma B.4. *Let $U_k^R(\theta)$ be an alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz defined in Eq. (A3). The cost function $C(\theta; U_k^R)$ defined in Eq. (A16) is bounded frequency periodic.*

Proof. By Lemma B.3,

$$C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}) = \text{tr}(OU_k^{\mathbf{R}}(\boldsymbol{\theta}) |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| U_k^{\mathbf{R}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\dagger) \quad (\text{B9})$$

$$= \text{tr}\left(O\left(\prod_{ij} R_j(\theta_i^{(j)})\right) |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| \left(\prod_{ij} R_j(\theta_i^{(j)})\right)^\dagger\right) \quad (\text{B10})$$

$$= \sum_{\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{c}' \in \{0, \pm 1\}^m} e^{i(\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{c}') \cdot \boldsymbol{\theta}} \text{tr}\left(O\left(\prod_{ij} M_{R_j}^{c_{ij}}\right) |\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0| \left(\prod_{ij} M_{R_j}^{c'_{ij}}\right)^\dagger\right). \quad (\text{B11})$$

Since $\|\mathbf{c} - \mathbf{c}'\|_\infty \leq 2$, $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}})$ is bounded frequency periodic. \square

To conclude this section, we make two remarks. First, the lower bound in Lemma B.2 can be saturated, for example by the function $f(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \sum_j \cos^2 \frac{\theta_j}{2}$. Notice that $f(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ emerges as the *global* cost function $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \text{tr}(OU(\boldsymbol{\theta}) |\mathbf{0}\rangle\langle\mathbf{0}| U^\dagger(\boldsymbol{\theta}))$, where $U(\boldsymbol{\theta}) = \prod_{j=1}^n \exp(i\theta_j X_j)$ and $O = \sum_{j=1}^n |\mathbf{0}\rangle\langle\mathbf{0}|_j$. Second, we only utilize the periodicity of alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz (Lemma B.3) when proving the equivalence between cost variance and gradient variance. Such argument could possibly be strengthened using other properties such as non-locality.

Appendix C: Moments of cost function

In the last section, we showed that for alternated dUCC ansatz, the variance of gradient can be bounded by the variance of cost itself in both directions (Lemmas B.2 and B.4). For now on, we turn to calculate to the variance of cost function. To start with, we employ the common trick in the study of BP [22–25] to express the t^{th} moment of cost function as a circuit-like tensor network. The motivation is to separate initial state, gates and observables apart, and to resolve the non-linearity in high order moment.

1. Circuit-like tensor network representation of $\mathbb{E}[C^t]$ and moment vector

In this section, we express the t^{th} moment of cost function as a circuit-like tensor network. All quantum gates related to the same parameter are contracted to one “elevated” tensor which has a larger dimension, namely, the t^{th} moment superoperator. The (matrix form of) t^{th} *moment superoperator* of an operator $T(\theta)$ with a real parameter θ is defined to be

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} [T(\theta)^{\otimes t, t}] = \int_{\mathbb{R}} T(\theta)^{\otimes t} \otimes T^*(\theta)^{\otimes t} d\theta. \quad (\text{C1})$$

To simplify the notations, we will use the shorthand $\mathbb{E}[T^{\otimes t, t}] := \mathbb{E}_{\theta \in \mathbb{R}} [T(\theta)^{\otimes t, t}]$ whenever the context is clear. Moreover, we introduce dedicated notation \bar{T}, \tilde{T} for the 1st and 2nd moment of $T(\theta)$, since they will be used frequently:

$$\bar{T} := \mathbb{E}[T^{\otimes 1, 1}], \quad \tilde{T} := \mathbb{E}[T^{\otimes 2, 2}]. \quad (\text{C2})$$

The *vectorization* of an operator $U \in \mathbb{C}^{2^m \times 2^m}$ is defined to be $|U\rangle := (U \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^m}) \sum_{i \in \mathbb{F}_2^m} |i, i\rangle$.

Using the fact that $\mathbb{E}[XY] = \mathbb{E}[X]\mathbb{E}[Y]$ for independent random variables X, Y , we can express the t^{th} moment of cost function of alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz by the product of t^{th} moment of excitation operators.

Lemma C.1 (t^{th} moment of cost function). *Let $U_k^{\mathbf{R}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ be an alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz defined in Eq. (A3), $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, O)$ be the cost function defined in Eq. (A16) where O is any observable. For any $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$ and observables $O_1, \dots, O_t \in \mathbb{C}^{2^m \times 2^m}$,*

$$\mathbb{E}\left[\prod_{l=1}^t C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, O_l)\right] = \left(\bigotimes_{l=1}^t \langle O_l | \right) \left(\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{R}|} \mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]\right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}. \quad (\text{C3})$$

In particular, the t^{th} moment of cost function $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, O)$ for some observable O is

$$\mathbb{E}[C^t(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, O)] = \langle O |^{\otimes t} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{R}|} \mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]\right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}. \quad (\text{C4})$$

Proof. Observe that $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U, O) = \text{tr}(OU(\boldsymbol{\theta})|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|U(\boldsymbol{\theta})^\dagger) = \langle O|U(\boldsymbol{\theta})^{\otimes 1,1}|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2}$, and use the independence of parameters. \square

We make two remarks regarding Lemma C.1.

1. Eq. (C3) is useful in calculating covariance, or other quantities alike.
2. The expectations in Lemma C.1 are taken over random parameters $\boldsymbol{\theta}$ sampled from $\mathbb{R}^{k|\mathbf{R}|}$, or equivalently from $[0, 2\pi)^{k|\mathbf{R}|}$ by the periodicity of (qubit) excitation rotations (Lemma B.3).

Lemma C.1 indicates that the t^{th} moment of cost function for different observables are essentially captured by a vector, which is the product of t^{th} moment superoperators of excitation rotations and initial state. In other words, one can in principle calculate $\mathbb{E}[C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; O)^t]$ for any observable O if such vector is known — just take an inner product of the vectorization of O and the vector. Hence, we refer to such vector as a *moment vector*, as defined below.

Definition C.2 ((\mathbf{R}, t, k) -moment vector). *Let \mathbf{R} be a sequence of excitation rotations defined in Definition A.1, and $|\psi_0\rangle$ be the Hartree-Fock state defined in Eq. (A17). For $t, k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the (\mathbf{R}, t, k) -moment vector is defined to be*

$$|\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = \left(\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{R}|} \mathbb{E}[T_j^{\otimes t, t}] \right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}. \quad (\text{C5})$$

In particular, the moment vector of k -UCCSD, k -BRA etc. is denoted by $|\Psi_{t,k}^{\text{UCCSD}}\rangle, |\Psi_{t,k}^{\text{BRA}}\rangle$ etc. And the moment vector of k -qubit-UCCSD etc. is denoted by $|\Psi_{t,k}^{\text{qUCCSD}}\rangle$ etc.

Eq. (C4) can be rewritten as $\mathbb{E}[C^t] = \langle O|^{\otimes t} |\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$. As an example, $\langle \mathbb{1}^{\otimes t} |\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = \langle \mathbb{1}^{\otimes t} |\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = \mathbb{E}[C^t(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, \mathbb{1})] = 1$.

2. Site decomposition: a straightforward way to describe the elevated tensors

So far, we have addressed the non-linearity in calculating the t^{th} moment of cost by considering $2t$ replicas of the original system. Moreover, $\mathbb{E}[C^t]$ turns out to be the inner product of the vectorization of O and the (\mathbf{R}, t, k) -moment vector $|\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$. Before delving into the calculation of $|\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$, it is worthwhile to reorder the qubits in the enlarged Hilbert space so that the elevated tensor can be described naturally. Such reordering, which we refer to as *site decomposition*, is formally defined below.

Definition C.3 (Site decomposition). *The isomorphism between Hilbert spaces $\mathcal{H}^{\otimes 2t} \cong \bigotimes_{i=1}^n \mathcal{H}_i$ with $\mathcal{H} = \mathbb{C}^{2^n}$, $\mathcal{H}_i = \mathbb{C}^{2^{2t}}$, defined by*

$$\bigotimes_{j=1}^{2t} |b_1^{(j)} \dots b_n^{(j)}\rangle \rightarrow \bigotimes_{i=1}^n |b_i^{(1)} \dots b_i^{(2t)}\rangle, \quad (\text{C6})$$

is called a site decomposition. Each $\mathcal{H}_i = \mathbb{C}^{2^{2t}}$ is called a site of length $2t$. Moreover, we will use $|\Psi\rangle$ to denote any state in the enlarged space $\mathbb{C}^{2^{2tn}}$, while $|\Phi\rangle$ is reserved for computational basis states. Φ is interpreted as a bit string in $\mathbb{F}_2^{2^{2tn}}$. For $i \in [n], j \in [2t]$, Φ_i denotes the bit string of the i^{th} site, and Φ_{ij} denotes the j^{th} bit of i^{th} site.

This procedure described in Definition C.3 can be understood as reordering and splitting the $2tn$ qubits into n equally-sized subsystems, with each subsystem forming a site. As an example, the t^{th} moment of a qubit single excitation rotation acting on qubit 1 and 2 can be viewed as a tensor acting on site 1 and 2, as illustrated in Figure 3. Without site decomposition, it is less straightforward to describe such tensor. The reader should be aware that we will implicitly assume site decomposition in the subsequent text.

The following proposition reexpress the initial state and vectorization of observable $\hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c.$ and $\hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c.$ under site decomposition.




FIG. 3: Illustration of the t^{th} moment of a double qubit gate acting on qubit 1 and 2, which can be viewed as a larger tensor acting on site 1 and 2. Here $t = 2$ and $n = 3$. Each ball represents a qubit, the gray boxes together represent the t^{th} moment of the double qubit gate, and the balls in the red dashed cycle form the 3rd site of length $2t$.

Proposition C.4 (Initial state and observable under site decomposition). *Let $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, and $|\psi_0\rangle$ as defined in Eq. (A17). Under site decomposition,*

$$|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t} = |\underbrace{1 \dots 1}_{2t}\rangle^{\otimes n_e} |\underbrace{0 \dots 0}_{2t}\rangle^{\otimes (n-n_e)}. \quad (\text{C7})$$

After Jordan-Wigner transformation, when $O = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c.$ ($p > q$),

$$|O\rangle^{\otimes t} = \left(|01\rangle_q |10\rangle_p + |10\rangle_q |01\rangle_p \right)^{\otimes t} \otimes_{a \in [1, q \cup (p, n)]} \bigotimes_{a \in [1, q \cup (p, n)]} (|00\rangle_a + |11\rangle_a)^{\otimes t} \otimes_{b \in (p, q)} \bigotimes_{b \in (p, q)} (|00\rangle_b - |11\rangle_b)^{\otimes t}. \quad (\text{C8})$$

And when $O = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c.$ ($p > q > r > s$),

$$|O\rangle^{\otimes t} = \left(|01\rangle_s |01\rangle_r |10\rangle_q |10\rangle_p + |10\rangle_s |10\rangle_r |01\rangle_q |01\rangle_p \right)^{\otimes t} \otimes_{a \in [1, s] \cup (r, q) \cup (p, n)} \bigotimes_{a \in [1, s] \cup (r, q) \cup (p, n)} (|00\rangle_a + |11\rangle_a)^{\otimes t} \otimes_{b \in (s, r) \cup (q, p)} \bigotimes_{b \in (s, r) \cup (q, p)} (|00\rangle_b - |11\rangle_b)^{\otimes t}. \quad (\text{C9})$$

Proof. Notice that after Jordan-Wigner transformation $\hat{a}_p = Q_p \prod_{a < p} Z_a$, and the vectorization of Q, I, Z is $|Q\rangle = |01\rangle$, $|I\rangle = |00\rangle + |11\rangle$, $|Z\rangle = |00\rangle - |11\rangle$, respectively. \square

The following operators related to sites will be useful.

Definition C.5 ($S_\pi, S_{pq}, S_\tau^b, F_V^W$). *Let $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n, \tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{2t}, V \subseteq [n], W \subseteq [2t]$.*

1. Define $S_\pi \in \mathbb{C}^{2tn \times 2tn}$ to be the permutation of sites by π :

$$S_\pi |\Phi_1 \Phi_2 \dots \Phi_n\rangle = |\Phi_{\pi^{-1}(1)} \Phi_{\pi^{-1}(2)} \dots \Phi_{\pi^{-1}(n)}\rangle, \quad \forall \Phi_i \in \mathbb{F}_2^{2t}. \quad (\text{C10})$$

In particular, denote $S_{pq} := S_{(pq)}$ the swap of site p and q .

2. Define $S_\tau^b \in \mathbb{C}^{2t \times 2t}$ to be the permutation of qubits in one site by τ :

$$S_\tau^b |b_1 b_2 \dots b_{2t}\rangle = |b_{\tau^{-1}(1)} b_{\tau^{-1}(2)} \dots b_{\tau^{-1}(2t)}\rangle, \quad \forall b_i \in \mathbb{F}_2. \quad (\text{C11})$$

3. Define $F_V^W \in \mathbb{C}^{2tn \times 2tn}$ to be the flip of the j^{th} bit in the i^{th} site for all $i \in V, j \in W$:

$$F_V^W = \prod_{i=1}^n \bigotimes_{j=1}^{2t} X_i^{[i \in V \wedge j \in W]}. \quad (\text{C12})$$

In particular, denote $F_{pq\dots}^{ab\dots} = F_{\{p, q, \dots\}}^{\{a, b, \dots\}}$.

3. Moments of excitation rotations

After introducing site decomposition, we now return to the calculation of moment vector $|\Psi_{t,k}^R\rangle$. Recall the definition of $|\Psi_{t,k}^R\rangle$ in Definition C.2. Since the initial state is fixed to be $|\psi_0\rangle$, it remains to determine each $\mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t,t}]$, where R_j is some (qubit) excitation rotation. The following lemma give some basic properties of $\mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t,t}]$. More properties will be covered in later sections.

Lemma C.6 (Basic properties of $\mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t,t}]$). *Let $R(\theta)$ be a (qubit) excitation rotation (Definition A.1), and $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$.*

1. $\mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t,t}] = \mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes 2t}]$.
2. $\mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t,t}]$ is an orthogonal projection.
3. Suppose $R(\theta)$ is a qubit excitation rotation, i.e., $R(\theta) = \exp(\theta(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger))$ for some $\hat{\tau} = Q_{p_1}^\dagger \cdots Q_{p_r}^\dagger Q_{p_{r+1}} \cdots Q_{p_{2r}}$. Define $\Phi_{p_1:p_{2r},j} := \Phi_{p_1,j} \cdots \Phi_{p_{2r},j}$, $\mathbf{b}_0 := 0^r 1^r$, $\mathbf{b}_1 := 1^r 0^r$, and

$$n_{ab} := \#\{j \in [2t] | \Phi_{p_1:p_{2r},j} = \mathbf{b}_a, \Phi'_{p_1:p_{2r},j} = \mathbf{b}_b\}, \quad \forall a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2. \quad (\text{C13})$$

Then

$$\langle \Phi | \mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t,t}] | \Phi' \rangle = \begin{cases} 0, & (*) \\ (-1)^{n_{01}} \frac{(n_{00}+n_{11}-1)!!(n_{01}+n_{10}-1)!!}{(n_{00}+n_{11}+n_{01}+n_{10})!!}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{C14})$$

Here we use the convention that $(-1)!! := 1$, and $(*)$ is the union of the following cases:

- $\Phi_i \neq \Phi'_i$ for some $i \in [n] \setminus \{p_s | s \in [2r]\}$.
 - $\Phi_{p_1:p_{2r},j} \neq \Phi'_{p_1:p_{2r},j}$ and $\{\Phi_{p_1:p_{2r},j}, \Phi'_{p_1:p_{2r},j}\} \not\subseteq \{\mathbf{b}_0, \mathbf{b}_1\}$ for some $j \in [2t]$.
 - One of $n_{00} + n_{11}$ and $n_{01} + n_{10}$ is odd.
4. Suppose $R(\theta)$ is an excitation rotation, i.e., $R(\theta) = \exp(\theta(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger))$ for some $\hat{\tau} = \hat{a}_{p_1}^\dagger \cdots \hat{a}_{p_r}^\dagger \hat{a}_{p_{r+1}} \cdots \hat{a}_{p_{2r}}$. Assume $\hat{\tau} = \pm Q_{p_1}^\dagger \cdots Q_{p_r}^\dagger Q_{p_{r+1}} \cdots Q_{p_{2r}} \prod_{i \in V} Z_i$ for index set $V \subset [n] \setminus \{p_s | s \in [2r]\}$. Define $\hat{\tau}' := Q_{p_1}^\dagger \cdots Q_{p_r}^\dagger Q_{p_{r+1}} \cdots Q_{p_{2r}}$, $R'(\theta) := \exp(\theta(\hat{\tau}' - (\hat{\tau}')^\dagger))$, $\mathbf{z} := \bigotimes_{a \in V} \Phi_a$ and $X_i^{\mathbf{z}} := \bigotimes_{j=1}^{2t} X_i^{z_j}$. The following conversion rule holds:

$$\mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t,t}] |\Phi\rangle = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{\mathbf{z}} \right) \mathbb{E}[(R')^{\otimes t,t}] \left(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^{\mathbf{z}} \right) |\Phi\rangle. \quad (\text{C15})$$

Proof. 1. Notice that $R(\theta)$ is real.

2. Since $R(\theta) = \exp(\theta(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger))$ for some constant operator $\hat{\tau}$,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta_1}[R(\theta_1)^{\otimes t,t}] \mathbb{E}_{\theta_2}[R(\theta_2)^{\otimes t,t}] = \mathbb{E}_{\theta_1}[\mathbb{E}_{\theta_2}[R(\theta_1 + \theta_2)^{\otimes t,t}]]. \quad (\text{C16})$$

By Lemma B.3, $R(\theta)$ is periodic. Thus,

$$\mathbb{E}_{\theta_1}[\mathbb{E}_{\theta_2}[R(\theta_1 + \theta_2)^{\otimes t,t}]] = \mathbb{E}_{\theta_1}[\mathbb{E}_{\theta_2}[R(\theta_2)^{\otimes t,t}]] = \mathbb{E}_{\theta_2}[R(\theta_2)^{\otimes t,t}]. \quad (\text{C17})$$

Combining Eq. (C16) and Eq. (C17), we have $\mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t,t}]^2 = \mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t,t}]$.

Moreover,

$$\mathbb{E}[R(\theta)^{\otimes t,t}]^\dagger = \mathbb{E}[R(-\theta)^{\otimes t,t}] = \mathbb{E}[R(\theta)^{\otimes t,t}]. \quad (\text{C18})$$

Hence, $\mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t,t}]$ is an orthogonal projection.

3. By taking the Taylor expansion of matrix exponential $e^M = \sum_{m \geq 0} \frac{M^m}{m!}$, it is easy to verify that

$$R(\theta) = \exp\left(\theta(|\mathbf{b}_1\rangle\langle\mathbf{b}_1| - |\mathbf{b}_0\rangle\langle\mathbf{b}_0|)_{p_1, \dots, p_{2r}}\right) \quad (\text{C19})$$

$$= \mathbf{1}_{2^n} + (\sin \theta (|\mathbf{b}_1\rangle\langle\mathbf{b}_0| - |\mathbf{b}_0\rangle\langle\mathbf{b}_1|) + (\cos \theta - 1)(|\mathbf{b}_0\rangle\langle\mathbf{b}_0| + |\mathbf{b}_1\rangle\langle\mathbf{b}_1|))_{p_1, \dots, p_{2r}}. \quad (\text{C20})$$

Consequently, $\langle \Phi | \mathbb{E} [R^{\otimes t, t}] | \Phi' \rangle$ can only be non-zero if none of the first 2 cases of (*) happens. If so,

$$\begin{aligned} \langle \Phi | \mathbb{E} [R(\theta)^{\otimes t, t}] | \Phi' \rangle &= \mathbb{E} \left[(-1)^{n_{01}} \cos(\theta)^{n_{00}+n_{11}} \sin(\theta)^{n_{01}+n_{10}} \right] \\ &= \begin{cases} 0, & \text{if } n_{00} + n_{11} \text{ or } n_{01} + n_{10} \text{ is odd,} \\ (-1)^{n_{01}} \frac{(n_{00}+n_{11}-1)!!(n_{01}+n_{10}-1)!!}{(n_{00}+n_{11}+n_{01}+n_{10})!!}, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{C21})$$

4. Since $\hat{\tau}' - (\hat{\tau}')^\dagger$ anti-commutes with $\prod_{i=1}^n X_i$,

$$\mathbb{E} [R(\theta)^{\otimes 2t}] | \Phi \rangle = \mathbb{E} \left[\bigotimes_{j=1}^{2t} R'((-1)^{z_j} \theta) \right] | \Phi \rangle = \left(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^z \right) \mathbb{E} [R'(\theta)^{\otimes 2t}] \left(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^z \right) | \Phi \rangle. \quad (\text{C22})$$

□

4. Convergence of alternating projections

One of the most important finding in Lemma C.6 is that the t^{th} moment superoperator of (qubit) excitation rotations $\mathbb{E} [R^{\otimes t, t}]$ are orthogonal projections. This is not unusual in BP studies. For example, in [15, 18, 24] the circuit (or block of gates) is assumed to be Haar random up to 2^{nd} moment. Under such assumption one verifies that the 2^{nd} moment superoperator of the circuit (or block of gates) is an orthogonal projector of rank 2. However, the projectors we encountered is significantly more complex compared to the Haar random case. In fact, the 2^{nd} moment of qubit single excitation rotations is a projector of rank 70 in the subsystem it acts on, let alone normal excitation rotations which are highly non-local. Hence, we do not expect it to be easy to figure out or even bound $|\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ for any finite k . Rather, we turn to study the infinite- k case, which turns out to be tractable. The phenomenon that infinite case is easier than finite one is ubiquitous, for example in the theoretical analysis of classical neural networks [32]. The following lemma will play a central role.

Lemma C.7 (Convergence of alternating projections [31]). *Let \mathcal{H} be a Hilbert space, and denote P_M to be the orthogonal projection onto a subspace $M \subseteq \mathcal{H}$. Given N subspace M_1, \dots, M_N with intersection $M = M_1 \cap \dots \cap M_N$,*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left\| (P_{M_N} \cdots P_{M_1})^k(x) - P_M(x) \right\| = 0, \quad \forall x \in \mathcal{H}. \quad (\text{C23})$$

Remark that we are working in a finite Hilbert space, and in such case uniform convergence $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} (P_{M_N} \cdots P_{M_1})^k = P_M$ can be shown.

Corollary C.8. *Let \mathbf{R} be a sequence of excitation rotations defined in Definition A.1, and $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$. Denote the projection $\mathbb{E} [R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$ by P_{M_j} , where M_j is the subspace that P_{M_j} projects onto. Define $M := \bigcap_j M_j$. We have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \left(\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{R}|} \mathbb{E} [R_j^{\otimes t, t}] \right)^k = P_M \quad \text{and} \quad |\Psi_{t,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = P_M |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}. \quad (\text{C24})$$

We make two remarks regarding Corollary C.8.

1. The reason why the infinite case is easier is that by Corollary C.8 it suffices to figure out the intersection $M = \bigcap_j M_j$, rather than tracking how $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}$ evolves.
2. In the subsequent text, regardless of the form of \mathbf{R} and order of moment t , we will denote the subspace that $\mathbb{E} [R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$ projects onto by M_j , and the intersection space $\bigcap_j M_j$ by M , as in Corollary C.8. The reader should be cautious with which \mathbf{R} and t is used in context to define M and M_j .

While we may be able to characterize (albeit a bit complex) each M_j , since the matrix form of $\mathbb{E} [R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$ has been explicitly written out in Lemma C.6, it is not obvious how to calculate their intersection at first sight. On the other hand, it is straightforward to determine the spanning set of the orthogonal complement M^\perp if one has determined the spanning set of each M_j^\perp — just take the union of these spanning sets. The reason is explained in Lemma C.9 (2). Lemma C.9 also includes other properties of orthogonal complement which will be used in later sections. The proof of Lemma C.9 is elementary and is omitted.

Lemma C.9. Let V_1, V_2, \dots, V_m and V' be subspaces of finite dimensional vector space V .

1. $(V_1^\perp)^\perp = V_1$.
2. $(V_1 \cap V_2 \cap \dots \cap V_m)^\perp = V_1^\perp + V_2^\perp + \dots + V_m^\perp$.
3. $((V_1 \cap V')^\perp \cap V')^\perp \cap V' = V_1 \cap V'$.
4. $((V_1 \cap V_2 \cap \dots \cap V_m) \cap V')^\perp \cap V' = (V_1 \cap V')^\perp \cap V' + (V_2 \cap V')^\perp \cap V' + \dots + (V_m \cap V')^\perp \cap V'$.

If in addition $[P_{V'}, P_{V_i}] = 0$ for all $i = 1, 2, \dots, m$, then

5. $(V_1 \cap V')^\perp \cap V' = V_1^\perp \cap V'$.
6. $((V_1 \cap V_2 \cap \dots \cap V_m) \cap V')^\perp \cap V' = (V_1 \cap V_2 \cap \dots \cap V_m)^\perp \cap V'$

Appendix D: Reduce the space by symmetries

In the last section, we have hinted how we will calculate the t^{th} moment of cost function at $k = \infty$ for alternated dUCC ansatzs:

1. we find out the spanning set of each M_j^\perp (recall that $P_{M_j} := \mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$),
2. take the union to get the spanning set of M^\perp (recall that $M := \bigcap_j M_j$),
3. somehow calculate $P_M |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}$, using the spanning set of M^\perp ,
4. finally take the inner product between $|H_{e1}\rangle^{\otimes t}$ and $|\Psi_{t, \infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = P_M |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t}$, which evaluates to $\mathbb{E}[C^t]$.

Step 2 and 4 has been explained in the last section. This section will be devoted to step 1, and will sketch the idea behind 3. We do so by restricting ourselves into invariant subspaces using symmetries of $\mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$. The reduction of space is in sequence. It is worth noting that while these symmetries should apply for any (qubit) excitation rotations and any $t \in \mathbb{N}_+$, we primarily focus on the cases of (qubit) single/double excitation rotations and $t = 1, 2$, since these are enough for proving Theorem A.5.

1. $Z_p^{\otimes 2t}$ -symmetry

The $Z_p^{\otimes 2t}$ -symmetry of $\mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$ helps to reduce from the whole space $\mathbb{C}^{2^{2tn}}$ to $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$, the space spanned by states where each site has an even Hamming weight.

Definition D.1 ($\mathcal{S}_t^{\text{even}}, \mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$). Define $\mathcal{S}_t^{\text{even}}, \mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}} \subset \mathbb{C}^{2^{2tn}}$ as follows:

$$\mathcal{S}_t^{\text{even}} := \left\{ |b_1 b_2 \dots b_{2t}\rangle \left| \sum_{i=1}^{2t} b_i \equiv 0 \pmod{2}, b_i \in \mathbb{F}_2 \right. \right\}^{\otimes n}, \quad \mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}} := \text{span } \mathcal{S}_t^{\text{even}}. \quad (\text{D1})$$

Let $R(\theta)$ be a (qubit) excitation rotation, and \mathbf{R} be a sequence of (qubit) excitation rotations (Definition A.1).

Lemma D.2 ($Z_p^{\otimes 2t}$ -symmetry). For any $p \in [n]$, $[\mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t, t}], Z_p^{\otimes 2t}] = 0$.

Proof. Notice that $R(\theta) = \exp(\theta(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger))$ for some (qubit) excitation $\hat{\tau}$, and Z_p either commutes or anti-commutes with $\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger$ (since Z commutes with I, Z and anti-commutes with Q, Q^\dagger).

- If Z_p commutes with $\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger$, then Z_p commutes with $R(\theta)$, and thus $Z_p^{\otimes 2t}$ commutes with $\mathbb{E}[R(\theta)^{\otimes 2t}]$.
- If Z_p anti-commutes with $\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger$, then $Z_p^{\otimes 2t} \mathbb{E}[R(\theta)^{\otimes 2t}] Z_p^{\otimes 2t} = \mathbb{E}[R(-\theta)^{\otimes 2t}] = \mathbb{E}[R(\theta)^{\otimes 2t}]$.

□

Corollary D.3 (Invariance of $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$). $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$ is an invariant subspace of $\mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t, t}]$. Moreover, $|\Psi_{t, k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle, |\Psi_{t, \infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$.

Proof. Notice that $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$ is the common +1 eigenspace of $Z_1^{\otimes 2t}, Z_2^{\otimes 2t}, \dots, Z_n^{\otimes 2t}$. Since $Z_1^{\otimes 2t}, Z_2^{\otimes 2t}, \dots, Z_n^{\otimes 2t}$ and $\mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t, t}]$ commute mutually, $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$ is an invariant subspace of $\mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t, t}]$. By Proposition C.4, $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t} \in \mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$. Hence, $|\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = \left(\prod_j \mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t, t}]\right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t} \in \mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$. Since $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$ is closed, $|\Psi_{t,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$. \square

The invariance of $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$ is enough to calculate the first moment of cost function. The reader can jump to Appendix E for more details. In order to calculate the second moments, however, we still need to find the spanning set of M_j^\perp , or equivalently diagonalizing $\tilde{R}_j = \mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes 2, 2}]$. Since $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$ is an invariant subspace that contains $|\Psi_{t,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$, we can diagonalize inside $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$ to save some work. But before that, we first introduce special notations for sites with an even Hamming weight at $t = 2$, so that the notation for states in $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{even}}$ can be simpler. Recall that when $t = 2$, each site has a length of 4, indicating that the dimension of the Hilbert space for each site is 2^4 . Out of the 16 computational basis states of each site, there are 8 with an even Hamming weight, as follows.

Definition D.4 (8 special basis states of site at $t = 2$). *Define 8 product state in \mathbb{C}^{2^4} as follows:*

$$|I_{ab}\rangle = |a, I(a), b, I(b)\rangle, \quad |X_{ab}\rangle = |a, X(a), b, X(b)\rangle, \quad a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2. \quad (\text{D2})$$

Namely, they are

$$|I_{00}\rangle = |0000\rangle, \quad |I_{11}\rangle = |1111\rangle, \quad |I_{01}\rangle = |0011\rangle, \quad |I_{10}\rangle = |1100\rangle, \quad (\text{D3})$$

$$|X_{00}\rangle = |0101\rangle, \quad |X_{11}\rangle = |1010\rangle, \quad |X_{01}\rangle = |0110\rangle, \quad |X_{10}\rangle = |1001\rangle. \quad (\text{D4})$$

Remark that $\mathcal{S}_2^{\text{even}} = \{|I_{ab}\rangle, |X_{ab}\rangle | a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2\}^{\otimes n}$. For example, the following state is a paired state at $n = 8$. Different ‘‘pair’’s are marked in different colors.

$$|I_{00}\rangle |X_{11}\rangle |I_{01}\rangle |X_{10}\rangle |X_{00}\rangle |I_{10}\rangle |I_{11}\rangle |X_{01}\rangle. \quad (\text{D5})$$

We can give the square of the vectorization of $\hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c.$ and $\hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c.$ a more succinct expression compared to that in Proposition C.4, using the notations $|I_{ab}\rangle, |X_{ab}\rangle$ as follows.

Proposition D.5 (Succinct expression of $|O\rangle^{\otimes 2}$). *After Jordan-Wigner transformation, when $O = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c.$ ($p > q$),*

$$|O\rangle^{\otimes 2} = \left(\sum_{c,d \in \mathbb{F}_2} |X_{cd}\rangle_q |X_{\bar{c}\bar{d}}\rangle_p \right) \otimes_{a \in [1,q] \cup (p,n)} \left(\sum_{c,d \in \mathbb{F}_2} |I_{cd}\rangle_a \right) \otimes_{b \in (p,q)} \left(\sum_{c,d \in \mathbb{F}_2} (-1)^{c+d} |I_{cd}\rangle_b \right). \quad (\text{D6})$$

And when $O = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c.$ ($p > q > r > s$),

$$|O\rangle^{\otimes 2} = \left(\sum_{c,d \in \mathbb{F}_2} |X_{cd}\rangle_s |X_{cd}\rangle_r |X_{\bar{c}\bar{d}}\rangle_q |X_{\bar{c}\bar{d}}\rangle_p \right) \otimes_{a \in [1,s] \cup (r,q) \cup (p,n)} \left(\sum_{c,d \in \mathbb{F}_2} |I_{cd}\rangle_a \right) \otimes_{b \in (s,r) \cup (q,p)} \left(\sum_{c,d \in \mathbb{F}_2} (-1)^{c+d} |I_{cd}\rangle_b \right). \quad (\text{D7})$$

Now that we have defined the notation $|I_{ab}\rangle, |X_{ab}\rangle$, we return to the diagonalization of \tilde{R}_j inside $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$. The following lemma gives diagonalization of \tilde{A}^{qubit} and partial diagonalization of \tilde{B}^{qubit} inside $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$. These will be used in the next section to derive the spanning set of M_j^\perp for $R_j \in \{A, A^{\text{qubit}}, B, B^{\text{qubit}}\}$.

Lemma D.6 (Diagonalization of $\tilde{A}^{\text{qubit}}, \tilde{B}^{\text{qubit}}$ inside $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$).

1. *The subspace that $\tilde{A}_{pq}^{\text{qubit}} |_{\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{even}}}$ projects onto is spanned by $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$, where*

$$S_1 := \{|\Phi\rangle | |\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{even}}, \Phi_p = \Phi_q\}, \quad (\text{D8})$$

$$S_2 := \{|\Phi\rangle + (-1)^{\Phi_p \oplus \Phi_q} S_{pq} |\Phi\rangle | |\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{even}}, \Phi_p \neq \Phi_q, \Phi_p \neq \bar{\Phi}_q\}, \quad (\text{D9})$$

$$S_3 := \{|\Phi\rangle + S_{pq} |\Phi\rangle + F_{pq}^{st} |\Phi\rangle + S_{pq} F_{pq}^{st} |\Phi\rangle | |\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{even}}, |\Phi_p\rangle = |I_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_q\rangle = |I_{11}\rangle, 1 \leq s < t \leq 4\}. \quad (\text{D10})$$

2. The space spanned by $S := \{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{even}} \mid \Phi_p \neq \Phi_q, \Phi_p \neq \bar{\Phi}_q, \Phi_p = \bar{\Phi}_r, \Phi_q = \bar{\Phi}_s\}$ is invariant under $\tilde{B}_{pqrs}^{\text{qubit}}$, and when restricted in such subspace, $\tilde{B}_{pqrs}^{\text{qubit}}$ is an orthogonal projection onto the space spanned by $S' := \{|\Phi\rangle + (-1)^{\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q} S_{ps} S_{qr} |\Phi\rangle \mid |\Phi\rangle \in S\}$.

Proof. 1. — By Lemma C.6 (3), $\hat{A}_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}$ stabilizes every vector in $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$, and

$$\text{tr}\left(\hat{A}_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}|_{\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{even}}}\right) = \sum_{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{even}}} \langle \Phi | \hat{A}_{pq}^{\text{qubit}} | \Phi \rangle = \left(8 \times 1 + 48 \times \frac{1}{2} + 8 \times \frac{3}{8}\right) \times 8^{n-2} = \sum_{i=1}^3 \dim(\text{span } S_i). \quad (\text{D11})$$

Finally, since S_1, S_2, S_3 are mutually orthogonal, $\hat{A}_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}|_{\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{even}}}$ is a projection onto $\text{span}(S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3)$.

2. — By Lemma C.6 (3), for any $|\Phi\rangle \in S$,

$$\tilde{B}_{pqrs}^{\text{qubit}} |\Phi\rangle = \frac{1}{2} |\Phi\rangle + \frac{(-1)^{\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q}}{2} S_{ps} S_{qr} |\Phi\rangle. \quad (\text{D12})$$

Thus, S is invariant under $\tilde{B}_{pqrs}^{\text{qubit}}$, and $\tilde{B}_{pqrs}^{\text{qubit}}|_{\text{span } S}$ is indeed an orthogonal projection onto the space spanned by $S' := \{|\Phi\rangle + (-1)^{\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q} S_{ps} S_{qr} |\Phi\rangle \mid |\Phi\rangle \in S\}$. \square

2. Particle number symmetry

The particle number symmetry of $\tilde{R}_j = \mathbb{E} \left[R_j^{\otimes 2, 2} \right]$ helps to reduce the space from $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{even}}$ to $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, where certain constraints regarding the number of $|I_{ab}\rangle, |X_{ab}\rangle$ must be satisfied. Notice that we exclusively focus on the $t = 2$ case for particle number symmetry, but such symmetry should hold for general t .

Definition D.7 (Paired state and related notions). *Let $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{even}}$ and $V \subseteq [n]$.*

1. For any $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2$, define

$$n_{ab}^I(|\Phi\rangle; V) := \#\{i \in V \mid |\Phi_i\rangle = |I_{ab}\rangle\}, \quad n_{ab}^X(|\Phi\rangle; V) = \#\{i \in V \mid |\Phi_i\rangle = |X_{ab}\rangle\}. \quad (\text{D13})$$

If V is omitted, it is assumed that $V = [n]$, i.e., $n_{ab}^I(|\Phi\rangle) := n_{ab}^I(|\Phi\rangle; [n]), n_{ab}^X(|\Phi\rangle) := n_{ab}^X(|\Phi\rangle; [n])$.

2. Call $|\Phi\rangle$ a paired state, if

$$n_{01}^I(|\Phi\rangle) - n_{10}^I(|\Phi\rangle) = n_{00}^X(|\Phi\rangle) - n_{11}^X(|\Phi\rangle) = n_{01}^X(|\Phi\rangle) - n_{10}^X(|\Phi\rangle) = 0, \quad (\text{D14})$$

$$n_{00}^I(|\Phi\rangle) - n_{11}^I(|\Phi\rangle) = n - 2n_e. \quad (\text{D15})$$

3. Denote the set of all paired states by $\mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$, and the Hilbert space spanned by these states by $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$.

4. Define the configuration of a paired state $|\Phi\rangle$ by

$$\text{conf}(|\Phi\rangle) = (n_{01}^I(|\Phi\rangle), n_{00}^X(|\Phi\rangle), n_{01}^X(|\Phi\rangle)). \quad (\text{D16})$$

5. Denote the set of all paired states with configuration (a, b, c) by $\mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$, and the Hilbert space spanned by these states by $\mathcal{H}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$.

Remark that the 8 numbers $n_{ab}^I(|\Phi\rangle), n_{ab}^X(|\Phi\rangle)$ is uniquely determined by the configuration of a paired state $|\Phi\rangle$, and $n_{01}^I(|\Phi\rangle) + n_{00}^X(|\Phi\rangle) + n_{01}^X(|\Phi\rangle) \leq \min\{n_e, n - n_e\}$.

Lemma D.8 (Invariance of $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$). *Let \mathbf{R} be a sequence of (qubit) excitation rotations, with $R_j \in \{A, A^{\text{qubit}}, B, B^{\text{qubit}}\}$. $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ is an invariant subspace of each \tilde{R}_j . Moreover, $|\Psi_{2,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle, |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$.*

Proof. In order to prove invariance of $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, it suffices to show that $|\Psi\rangle := \tilde{R}|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, for all $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$ and $R \in \{A, A^{\text{qubit}}, B, B^{\text{qubit}}\}$.

- We first prove the case when $R \in \{A^{\text{qubit}}, B^{\text{qubit}}\}$. Since $\tilde{A}_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}$ (and $\tilde{B}_{pqrs}^{\text{qubit}}$) acts non-trivially only on 2 (and 4) sites, one can enumerate 8^2 (and 8^4) states of these sites to verify that if $|\Phi'\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{even}}$ has non-zero overlap with $|\Psi\rangle$, then for all $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2$ and $S \in \{I, X\}$,

$$n_{ab}^S(|\Phi'\rangle) - n_{ab}^S(|\Phi\rangle) = n_{\bar{a}\bar{b}}^S(|\Phi'\rangle) - n_{\bar{a}\bar{b}}^S(|\Phi\rangle). \quad (\text{D17})$$

Thus, $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. In fact, Eq. (D17) is obvious when $R = \tilde{A}^{\text{qubit}}$ by the diagonalization given in Lemma D.6 (1).

- In order to prove the case when $R \in \{A, B\}$, we utilize the conversion rule in Lemma C.6 (4). Notice that for any $a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2$ and $S \in \{I, X\}$, there exists $a', b' \in \mathbb{F}_2$ and $S' \in \{I, X\}$, such that for any $|\Phi'\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{even}}$,

$$n_{ab}^S(|\Phi'\rangle) = n_{a'b'}^{S'}\left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^z\right)|\Phi'\rangle\right), \quad n_{\bar{a}\bar{b}}^S(|\Phi'\rangle) = n_{\bar{a}'\bar{b}'}^{S'}\left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^z\right)|\Phi'\rangle\right). \quad (\text{D18})$$

Here $\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^z$ is defined as in Lemma C.6 (4) with respect to $|\Phi\rangle$. Thus, if $|\Phi'\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$ has a non-zero overlap with $|\Psi\rangle$, then

$$n_{ab}^S(|\Phi'\rangle) - n_{ab}^S(|\Phi\rangle) = n_{a'b'}^{S'}\left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^z\right)|\Phi'\rangle\right) - n_{a'b'}^{S'}\left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^z\right)|\Phi\rangle\right) \quad (\text{D19})$$

$$= n_{\bar{a}'\bar{b}'}^{S'}\left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^z\right)|\Phi'\rangle\right) - n_{\bar{a}'\bar{b}'}^{S'}\left(\left(\prod_{i=1}^n X_i^z\right)|\Phi\rangle\right) \quad (\text{D20})$$

$$= n_{\bar{a}\bar{b}}^S(|\Phi'\rangle) - n_{\bar{a}\bar{b}}^S(|\Phi\rangle). \quad (\text{D21})$$

Eq. (D20) follows from Lemma C.6 (4) and Eq. (D17).

Finally, by Proposition C.4, $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. Hence, $|\Psi_{2,k}^R\rangle = \left(\prod_j \tilde{R}_j\right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. Since $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ is closed, $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^R\rangle = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\Psi_{2,k}^R\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. \square

Lemma D.8 indicates that we can restrict ourselves in $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ — instead of the spanning set of each M_j^\perp , it suffices to find the spanning set of the orthogonal complement of each M_j inside $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$: $(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. As one may expect, the union of these spanning set spans $(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, according to Lemma C.9 (4). The following lemma characterizes the spanning set of $(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ for $R_j \in \{A, A^{\text{qubit}}, B, B^{\text{qubit}}\}$.

Lemma D.9 (Spanning set of $(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ for $A, A^{\text{qubit}}, B, B^{\text{qubit}}$). *Denote by M_1, M_2, M_3, M_4 the space that $\tilde{A}_{pq}, \tilde{A}_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}, \tilde{B}_{pqrs}, \tilde{B}_{pqrs}^{\text{qubit}}$ projects onto. Suppose $p > q$ for (qubit) single excitations and $p > q > r > s$ for (qubit) double excitations.*

1. $(M_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ is spanned by all the following vectors: for any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$, let $\mathbf{z} := \bigoplus_{a \in (q,p)} \Phi_a$,
 - $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{(\Phi_p \oplus \mathbf{z}) \odot (\Phi_q \oplus \mathbf{z})} S_{pq} |\Phi\rangle$.
 - $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{z_1 + z_2} F_{pq}^{12} |\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{z_1 + z_3} F_{pq}^{13} |\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{z_2 + z_3} F_{pq}^{23} |\Phi\rangle$ if $|\Phi_p\rangle = |I_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_q\rangle = |I_{11}\rangle$.
2. $(M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ is spanned by all the following vectors: for any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$,
 - $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q} S_{pq} |\Phi\rangle$.
 - $|\Phi\rangle - F_{pq}^{12} |\Phi\rangle - F_{pq}^{13} |\Phi\rangle - F_{pq}^{23} |\Phi\rangle$ if $|\Phi_p\rangle = |I_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_q\rangle = |I_{11}\rangle$.
3. $(M_3 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ contains $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{(\Phi_p \oplus \mathbf{z}) \odot (\Phi_q \oplus \mathbf{z})} S_{ps} S_{qr} |\Phi\rangle$, where $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$, $\Phi_p \neq \Phi_q, \Phi_p \neq \bar{\Phi}_q, \Phi_p = \bar{\Phi}_r, \Phi_q = \bar{\Phi}_s$, and $\mathbf{z} := \bigoplus_{a \in (s,r) \cup (q,p)} \Phi_a$.

4. $\left(M_4 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ contains $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q} S_{ps} S_{qr} |\Phi\rangle$, where $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$, and $\Phi_p \neq \Phi_q, \Phi_p \neq \bar{\Phi}_q, \Phi_p = \bar{\Phi}_r, \Phi_q = \bar{\Phi}_s$.

Proof. We first prove 2 and 4 using diagonalization of $\tilde{A}_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}, \tilde{B}_{pqrs}^{\text{qubit}}$ in $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{even}}$ (Lemma D.6), then prove 1 and 3 using the qubit to non-qubit conversion rule in Lemma C.6 (4).

2. — Denote the set of specified vectors by S . Obviously, $S \subseteq \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. We need to prove (1) $S \subseteq \left(M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp$, (2) $S^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ (since that would imply $\text{span } S \supseteq \left(M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$).

(1) $S \subseteq \left(M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp$: We show that every vector in S is orthogonal to $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$ defined in Lemma D.6 (1), hence $S \subseteq \left(M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{even}}\right)^\perp \subseteq \left(M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp$. First, consider the vector $v_1 := |\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q} S_{pq} |\Phi\rangle \in S$.

- If $\Phi_p = \Phi_q$, then $v_1 = 0$ and v_1 is orthogonal to $S_1 \cup S_2 \cup S_3$.
- If $\Phi_p = \bar{\Phi}_q$, then v_1 is orthogonal to $S_1 \cup S_2$. v_1 is also orthogonal to S_3 since $v_1 = |\Phi\rangle - S_{pq} |\Phi\rangle$ while for vectors in S_3 the overlaps with $|\Phi\rangle$ and $S_{pq} |\Phi\rangle$ are the same.
- Otherwise, v_1 is orthogonal to $S_1 \cup S_3$. v_1 is also orthogonal to S_2 since for vectors in S_2 the overlaps with $|\Phi\rangle$ and $S_{pq} |\Phi\rangle$ differ by $(-1)^{\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q}$.

Next, consider the vector $v_2 := |\Phi\rangle - F_{pq}^{12} |\Phi\rangle - F_{pq}^{13} |\Phi\rangle - F_{pq}^{23} |\Phi\rangle$ with $|\Phi_p\rangle = |I_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_q\rangle = |I_{11}\rangle$. v_2 is orthogonal to $S_1 \cup S_2$. v_2 is also orthogonal to S_3 since for vectors in S_3 the overlap with $|\Phi\rangle$ equals one of the overlaps with $F_{pq}^{12} |\Phi\rangle, F_{pq}^{13} |\Phi\rangle, F_{pq}^{23} |\Phi\rangle$, while the rest two are both zero.

(2) $S^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$: Suppose $v \in S^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, we prove $v \in M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. Write $v = \sum_{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}} c_\Phi |\Phi\rangle$, with $c_\Phi \in \mathbb{C}$. Since v is orthogonal to S , we have

- $c_\Phi = (-1)^{\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q} c_{\Phi'}$ if $|\Phi'\rangle = S_{pq} |\Phi\rangle$.
- $c_\Phi = c_{\Phi^{12}} + c_{\Phi^{13}} + c_{\Phi^{23}}$ if $|\Phi_p\rangle = |I_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_q\rangle = |I_{11}\rangle$ and $|\Phi^{ab}\rangle = F_{pq}^{ab} |\Phi\rangle$.

Hence,

$$v = \sum_{\Phi_p = \Phi_q} c_\Phi |\Phi\rangle + \sum_{\Phi_p \neq \Phi_q, \bar{\Phi}_q} c_\Phi (|\Phi\rangle + (-1)^{\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q} |\Phi\rangle) + \sum_{\substack{|\Phi_p\rangle = F_{pq}^{ab} |I_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_q\rangle = F_{pq}^{ab} |I_{11}\rangle, \\ 1 \leq a < b \leq 4}} c_{\Phi^{ab}} (F_{pq}^{ab} |\Phi\rangle + F_{pq}^{ab} S_{pq} |\Phi\rangle + |\Phi\rangle + S_{pq} |\Phi\rangle). \quad (\text{D22})$$

It is straightforward to verify that $v \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ and by Lemma D.6 (1) $v \in M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{even}}$. Thus, $v \in M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$.

4. — Obviously, $v := |\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q} S_{ps} S_{qr} |\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. Use the notation S, S' from Lemma D.6 (2). Since $\text{span } S$ is an invariant space of P_{M_4} and $\text{span } S \cap M_4 = \text{span } S'$, we have $M_4 = \text{span } S' \oplus \left((\text{span } S)^\perp \cap M_4\right)$. v is orthogonal to $(\text{span } S)^\perp \cap M_4$ since $v \in \text{span } S$. v is also orthogonal to $\text{span } S'$, since for vectors in S' the overlaps with $|\Phi\rangle$ and $S_{ps} S_{qr} |\Phi\rangle$ differ by $(-1)^{\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q}$. Hence, $v \in M_4^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} = \left(M_4 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ by Lemma C.9 (5).

1 and 3. — Same as 2 and 4 but use the conversion rule. \square

Lemma D.9 has a simple yet interesting corollary — if \mathbf{R} contains enough (qubit) single excitations, the dimension of $M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ is at most $\text{poly}(n)$. Moreover, vectors in $M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ has a nice decomposition which we refer to as decomposition in *configuration basis*.

Corollary D.10 (Configuration basis decomposition). *Let \mathbf{R} be a sequence of (qubit) excitation rotations defined in Definition A.1, M be the intersection space defined in Lemma C.7. Denote the simple undirected graph formed by index pairs of (qubit) single excitations in \mathbf{R} by G as in Theorem A.5. If G is connected, then there exists a function*

$\text{sign}(a, b, c) \in \pm 1$ which defines a set of configuration basis $\left\{ |\Psi_{(a,b,c)}\rangle = \sum_{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}} \text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle) |\Phi\rangle \right\}_{a,b,c}$, such that for any $|\Psi\rangle \in M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$,

$$|\Psi\rangle = \sum_{a+b+c=0}^{\min\{n_e, n-n_e\}} c(a, b, c) |\Psi_{(a,b,c)}\rangle, \quad c(a, b, c) \in \mathbb{C}. \quad (\text{D23})$$

Proof. By Lemma D.9, $|\Phi\rangle \pm S_{uv} |\Phi\rangle \in \left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, for any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ and $(u, v) \in E$. By Lemma C.9, $\left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$. Hence, for any $|\Psi\rangle \in M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, we have $\langle \Phi | \Psi \rangle = \pm \langle \Phi | S_{uv}^\dagger | \Psi \rangle$. In other words, if two paired states differ only by a site swap on an edge, their overlaps with $|\Psi\rangle$ differs by either $+1$ or -1 , and such relative sign is independent of $|\Psi\rangle$. Since G is connected, one can argue that if two paired states $|\Phi\rangle, |\Phi'\rangle$ has the same configuration (a, b, c) , their overlaps with $|\Psi\rangle$ differs by at most ± 1 — two paired states with the same configuration differ by some site permutation, which can be decomposed into product of swaps, and each swap can in turn be decomposed into product of swaps on edges. The decomposition of a site permutation into swaps on edges may not be unique, and if the signs induced by two different decomposition conflict, it must be $c(a, b, c) = 0$ for all $|\Psi\rangle \in M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ (one can argue that $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$, and thus $\mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$). Otherwise, the relative signs for paired states in $\mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$ must be unique, and are independent of $|\Psi\rangle$. Hence, one can pick a sign function that satisfies the requirements — on $\mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$, define sign arbitrarily, and otherwise define sign arbitrarily on some $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$, and extend to other $|\Phi'\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$ according the unique relative sign. \square

Now that we have characterized the spanning set of $\left(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, we are prepared to prove case 1 and part of case 2 of Theorem A.5. Our proof for these parts is constructive — we will give an explicit vector $|\Psi^*\rangle$, and prove that $|\Psi^*\rangle = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = P_M |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4}$. To be precise, we show that the following two conditions holds:

- $|\Psi^*\rangle$ is orthogonal to $\left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, and $|\Psi^*\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, hence $|\Psi^*\rangle \in M$ (Lemma C.9 (3)).
- $|\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in \left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, hence $|\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in M^\perp$ (Lemma C.9 (6)).

The reader can jump to Appendixes F and G for more details. Remark that such proof relies on the complete spanning set of $\left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. We have only given an incomplete spanning set for $\left(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ of $R_j \in \left\{ \tilde{B}, \tilde{B}^{\text{qubit}} \right\}$, thus simply taking the union of these spanning set is not enough. In fact, to prove the rest of Theorem A.5 we utilize another symmetry discussed in next section to reduce the space down to one dimension. In such case $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ is obvious.

3. $(S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n}$ -symmetry

The $(S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n}$ -symmetry of $\mathbb{E} [R_j^{\otimes t, t}]$ helps to further reduce the space $\mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. We use this symmetry to find a one-dimensional subspace of $M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, which contains $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$.

Definition D.11 (\mathcal{H}_t^τ). For any $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{2t}$, \mathcal{H}_t^τ is defined to be the $+1$ eigenspace of $(S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n}$.

Let $R(\theta)$ be a (qubit) excitation rotation, and \mathbf{R} be a sequence of (qubit) excitation rotations (Definition A.1).

Lemma D.12 ($(S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n}$ -symmetry). For any $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{2t}$, $[\mathbb{E} [R^{\otimes t, t}], (S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n}] = 0$.

Proof. $(S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n} \mathbb{E} [R(\theta)^{\otimes 2t}] \left((S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n} \right)^{-1} = \mathbb{E} [R(\theta)^{\otimes 2t}]$, since the action of $(S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n}$ induces a permutation of $2t$ replicas of $R(\theta)$ by τ , which does not change the result. \square

Corollary D.13 (Invariance of \mathcal{H}_t^τ). For any $\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{2t}$, \mathcal{H}_t^τ is an invariant subspace of $\mathbb{E} [R^{\otimes t, t}]$. Moreover, $|\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle, |\Psi_{t,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_t^\tau$.

Proof. By Definition D.11 and Lemma D.12, \mathcal{H}_t^τ is an invariant subspace of $\mathbb{E}[R^{\otimes t,t}]$. By Proposition C.4, $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t} \in \mathcal{H}_t^\tau$. Hence, $|\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = \left(\prod_j \mathbb{E}[R_j^{\otimes t,t}]\right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2t} \in \mathcal{H}_t^\tau$. Since \mathcal{H}_t^τ is closed, $|\Psi_{t,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} |\Psi_{t,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_t^\tau$. \square

We use the following lemma to reduce the space to dimension one in later proofs.

Lemma D.14. *Let \mathbf{R} be a sequence of (qubit) excitation rotations. Denote the simple undirected graph formed by index pairs of (qubit) single excitations in \mathbf{R} by G as in Theorem A.5. Suppose*

1. G is connected.

2. For all $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$ where at least two of a, b, c is non-zero, $|\Phi\rangle \in \left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \cap \bigcap_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_4} \mathcal{H}_2^\tau\right)^\perp$.

Then,

$$|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = \frac{1}{\binom{n}{n_e}^2 + 2\binom{n}{n_e}} \sum_{l=0}^m (|\Psi_{(l,0,0)}\rangle + |\Psi_{(0,l,0)}\rangle + |\Psi_{(0,0,l)}\rangle), \quad (\text{D24})$$

where $|\Psi_{(a,b,c)}\rangle := \sum_{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}} |\Phi\rangle$, $m := \min\{n_e, n - n_e\}$.

Proof. Since G is connected (1st condition), vectors in $M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ admits decomposition in configuration basis (Corollary D.10), say, $\sum_{a,b,c} c(a,b,c) |\Phi'_{(a,b,c)}\rangle$ with $|\Phi'_{(a,b,c)}\rangle = \sum_{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}} \pm |\Phi\rangle$. Moreover, by the 2nd condition, $c(a,b,c) = 0$ if two of a, b, c is non-zero. We prove (1) $|\Phi'_{(l,0,0)}\rangle = |\Phi_{(l,0,0)}\rangle = \sum_{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(l,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}} |\Phi\rangle$, and likewise for configuration $(0, l, 0)$ and $(0, 0, l)$, (2) $\dim\left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \cap \bigcap_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{2t}} \mathcal{H}_2^\tau\right) \leq 1$, (3) the coefficients of $\{|\Phi_{(l,0,0)}\rangle, |\Phi_{(0,l,0)}\rangle, |\Phi_{(0,0,l)}\rangle\}_l$ in $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ are exactly those provided in Eq. (D24).

(1) We prove that $|\Phi\rangle - S_{uv}|\Phi\rangle \in \left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, for any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(l,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}$ (and similarly $\mathcal{S}_{2,(0,l,0)}^{\text{paired}}$ or $\mathcal{S}_{2,(0,0,l)}^{\text{paired}}$) and $(u, v) \in E$. After that, one can argue in the same way as in Corollary D.10 to complete the proof. Suppose $u < v$. By definition of G , either A_{uv} or A_{uv}^{qubit} is contained in \mathbf{R} .

- If $R_j = A_{uv}^{\text{qubit}}$, by Lemma D.9 (2) $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\Phi_u \oplus \Phi_v} S_{uv} |\Phi\rangle \in \left(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. Since $\text{conf}(|\Phi\rangle) = (l, 0, 0)$, we have $\Phi_u, \Phi_v \in \{|I_{ab}| a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2\}$. Hence, $(-1)^{\Phi_u \oplus \Phi_v} = 1$, and $|\Phi\rangle - S_{uv} |\Phi\rangle = |\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\Phi_u \oplus \Phi_v} S_{uv} |\Phi\rangle \in \left(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq \left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$.
- If $R_j = A_{uv}$, by Lemma D.9 (1) $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{(\Phi_u \oplus z) \oplus (\Phi_v \oplus z)} S_{uv} |\Phi\rangle \in \left(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, where $z = \bigoplus_{a \in (u,v)} \Phi_a$. Since $\text{conf}(|\Phi\rangle) = (l, 0, 0)$, we have $\Phi_u, \Phi_v, z \in \{|I_{ab}| a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2\}$. Hence, $(-1)^{(\Phi_u \oplus z) \oplus (\Phi_v \oplus z)} = 1$. The remainder is similar as the previous case.

(2) Fix a vector $|\Psi\rangle \in M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \cap \bigcap_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{2t}} \mathcal{H}_2^\tau$. We have proved that $|\Psi\rangle \in \text{span}\{|\Phi_{(l,0,0)}\rangle, |\Phi_{(0,l,0)}\rangle, |\Phi_{(0,0,l)}\rangle\}_l$. Denote by $c(a, b, c)$ the coefficient of $|\Phi_{(a,b,c)}\rangle$ in $|\Psi\rangle$, where at most one of a, b, c is non-zero. Define $c(a, b, c) = 0$ if at least two of a, b, c is non-zero. We prove that (2.1) $c(a, b, c) = c(a+1, b, c) + c(a, b+1, c) + c(a, b, c+1)$, (2.2) $c(1, 0, 0) = c(0, 1, 0) = c(0, 0, 1)$. If so, it must be $|\Psi\rangle \propto \sum_{l=0}^m (|\Phi_{(l,0,0)}\rangle + |\Phi_{(0,l,0)}\rangle + |\Phi_{(0,0,l)}\rangle)$. Hence, $\dim\left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \cap \bigcap_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{2t}} \mathcal{H}_2^\tau\right) \leq 1$.

(2.1) Fix $(u, v) \in E$. Suppose $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$, $|\Phi_u\rangle = |I_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_v\rangle = |I_{11}\rangle$. We need to prove that $|\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{12} |\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{13} |\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{23} |\Phi\rangle$ is orthogonal to $|\Psi\rangle$, since the configuration of $F_{uv}^{12} |\Phi\rangle, F_{uv}^{13} |\Phi\rangle, F_{uv}^{23} |\Phi\rangle$ is $(a+1, b, c), (a, b+1, c), (a, b, c+1)$ respectively, and hence $(|\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{12} |\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{13} |\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{23} |\Phi\rangle)^\dagger |\Psi\rangle = c(a, b, c) - c(a+1, b, c) - c(a, b+1, c) - c(a, b, c+1)$. If two of a, b, c are non-zero, then $c(a, b, c) = c(a+1, b, c) = c(a, b+1, c) = c(a, b, c+1) = 0$ and the equality holds trivially. Assume without loss of generality that $a \geq 0, b = c = 0$. Once more by definition of G , either A_{uv} or A_{uv}^{qubit} is contained in \mathbf{R} .

- If $R_j = A_{uv}^{\text{qubit}}$, by Lemma D.9 (2) $|\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{12} |\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{13} |\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{23} |\Phi\rangle \in \left(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$.

- If $R_j = A_{uv}$, by Lemma D.9 (1) $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{z_1+z_2} F_{uv}^{12} |\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{z_1+z_3} F_{uv}^{13} |\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{z_2+z_3} F_{uv}^{23} |\Phi\rangle \in (M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$, where $z = \bigoplus_{a \in (u,v)} \Phi_a$. Since $\text{conf}(|\Phi\rangle) = (l, 0, 0)$, we have $z \in \{|I_{ab}\rangle | a, b \in \mathbb{F}_2\}$. Thus, $(-1)^{z_1+z_2} = 1$, while $(-1)^{z_1+z_3}, (-1)^{z_2+z_3} = \pm 1$. By the 2nd condition, $F_{uv}^{13} |\Phi\rangle, F_{uv}^{23} |\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$, since the configuration of $F_{uv}^{13} |\Phi\rangle$ is $(a, b+1, c)$ and $a, b+1 > 0$, and likewise for $F_{uv}^{23} |\Phi\rangle$. Hence, $|\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{12} |\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{13} |\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{23} |\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$.

(2.2) Fix a vector $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(1,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}$ and two swaps $\tau_1 = (1\ 3), \tau_2 = (1\ 4)$. Let $|\Phi^1\rangle := (S_{\tau_1}^b)^{\otimes n} |\Phi\rangle, |\Phi^2\rangle := (S_{\tau_2}^b)^{\otimes n} |\Phi\rangle$. It is easy to check that the configuration of $|\Phi^1\rangle, |\Phi^2\rangle$ is $(0, 1, 0), (0, 0, 1)$ respectively. By Definition D.11, $|\Phi\rangle - |\Phi^1\rangle \in (\mathcal{H}_2^{\tau_1})^\perp$ and $|\Phi\rangle - |\Phi^2\rangle \in (\mathcal{H}_2^{\tau_2})^\perp$. Finally, since $|\Psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\tau_1} \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\tau_2}$, we have $0 = (|\Phi\rangle - |\Phi^1\rangle)^\dagger |\Psi\rangle = c(1, 0, 0) - c(0, 1, 0)$ and $0 = (|\Phi\rangle - |\Phi^2\rangle)^\dagger |\Psi\rangle = c(1, 0, 0) - c(0, 0, 1)$.

(3) Since $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle \in M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \cap \bigcap_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_{2t}} \mathcal{H}_2^\tau$, there exists constant c such that $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = c \sum_{l=0}^m (|\Phi_{(l,0,0)}\rangle + |\Phi_{(0,l,0)}\rangle + |\Phi_{(0,0,l)}\rangle)$. Recall that $\langle \mathbb{1}^{\otimes 2t} | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle = 1$, thus

$$1 = \langle \mathbb{1}^{\otimes 2t} | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle = \left(\sum_{l=0}^m |\Phi_{(l,0,0)}\rangle \right)^\dagger |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = c \sum_{l=0}^m \binom{n}{l, l, n_e - l, n - n_e - l} + 2c \binom{n}{n_e} = \left(\binom{n}{n_e}^2 + 2 \binom{n}{n_e} \right) c. \quad (\text{D25})$$

Solving the equation one obtains the desired coefficients. □

Appendix E: Average of cost is zero

In this section, we will prove that cost function of alternated dUCC ansatz is unbiased, i.e., $\mathbb{E}[C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})] = 0$, where H_{el} is an electronic structure Hamiltonian. We also sketch a failed attack towards the variance of cost function, which serves as an illustration of techniques used in the proof of main results.

Theorem E.1 (Unbiased cost function). *Let $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})$ be a cost function defined in Eq. (A16), where $U_k^{\mathbf{R}}(\boldsymbol{\theta})$ is an alternated (qubit) dUCC ansatz defined in Eq. (A3), and H_{el} is an electronic structure Hamiltonian defined in Eq. (A18). We have $\mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} [C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})] = 0$.*

Proof. By Proposition C.4, $|\hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c.\rangle$ and $|\hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c.\rangle$ lie in $(\mathcal{H}_1^{\text{even}})^\perp$, and by Corollary D.3, $|\Psi_{1,k}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\text{even}}$. Hence,

$$\mathbb{E}[C] = \langle H_{\text{el}} | \Psi_{1,k}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle = \sum_{pq} h_{pq} \langle \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c. | \Psi_{1,k}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle + \sum_{pqrs} g_{pqrs} \langle \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c. | \Psi_{1,k}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle = 0. \quad (\text{E1})$$

□

As a corollary, to calculate the variance of cost, it suffices to calculate the 2nd moment, since

$$\text{Var}(C) = \mathbb{E}[C^2] - \mathbb{E}[C]^2 = \mathbb{E}[C^2]. \quad (\text{E2})$$

Now we sketch a failed attack towards the variance of cost. The reader can safely skip this part. It would be great if we can give a nontrivial bound of the 2nd moment of cost function using only 1st moments, for example utilizing the following inequality:

$$\mathbb{E}[C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, O)^2] \leq \mathbb{E}[C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, O^2)], \quad k \in \mathbb{N}_+ \cup \{\infty\}. \quad (\text{E3})$$

Unfortunately, it is not the case, at least not for Eq. (E3). The derivation is sketched below, and may serve as an example of the techniques used in the proof of main results.

Suppose we wish to bound $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, O)^2]$ by calculating $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E}[C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, O^2)]$. For simplicity, we consider the case $O = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c.$, since it is straightforward to generalize to other cases. We further assume that the index pairs of (qubit) single excitations in \mathbf{R} form a connected graph, i.e., there exists a connected simple graph

$G = (V, E)$, such that $V = [n]$ and \mathbf{R} contains A_{uv} (or A_{uv}^{qubit}) for all $(u, v) \in E$. The importance of this assumption would be made clear below.

Recall that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \mathbb{E} [C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, O^2)] = \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \langle O^2 | \left(\prod_{j=1}^{|\mathbf{R}|} \mathbb{E} [R_j^{\otimes 1,1}] \right)^k |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2} = \langle O^2 | \Psi_{1,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle$ (Lemma C.1 and Definition C.2). Since $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 2} \in \mathcal{H}_1^{\text{even}}$ (Proposition C.4) and $\mathcal{H}_1^{\text{even}}$ is invariant under $\mathbb{E} [R_j^{\otimes 1,1}]$ for all j (Corollary D.3), we can restrict ourselves in the subspace $\mathcal{H}_1^{\text{even}}$. Fix an $R_j \in \mathbf{R}$, and suppose $R_j(\theta) = \exp(\theta(\hat{\tau} - \hat{\tau}^\dagger))$, where $\hat{\tau} = \hat{a}_{p_1}^\dagger \dots \hat{a}_{p_r}^\dagger \hat{a}_{p_{r+1}} \dots \hat{a}_{p_{2r}}$ (or the corresponding qubit version). By Lemma C.6 (3 and 4), for any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_1^{\text{even}}$,

$$\mathbb{E} [R_j^{\otimes 1,1}] |\Phi\rangle = \begin{cases} \frac{1}{2} |\Phi\rangle + \frac{1}{2} S_{(p_1 \ p_{r+1}) \dots (p_r \ p_{2r})} |\Phi\rangle, & \text{if } \Phi_{p_1} = \dots = \Phi_{p_r} = \bar{\Phi}_{p_{r+1}} = \dots = \bar{\Phi}_{p_{2r}}, \\ |\Phi\rangle, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{E4})$$

Notice that $\mathbb{E} [R_j^{\otimes 1,1}]$ preserves the number of $|00\rangle$ and $|11\rangle$ in $|\Phi\rangle$, due to particle number symmetry. In particular, if $R_j = A_{uv}$ (or A_{uv}^{qubit}) for any $(u, v) \in E$, and $|\Phi\rangle, |\Phi'\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_1^{\text{even}}$ differ by S_{uv} , the equality $\mathbb{E} [R_j^{\otimes 1,1}] |\Psi_{1,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = |\Psi_{1,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ implies that $\langle \Phi | \Psi_{1,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle = \langle \Phi' | \Psi_{1,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle$. The connectivity of G and the particle number symmetry thus indicates

$$|\Psi_{1,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle \propto \sum_{\substack{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_1^{\text{even}}, \\ \#|11\rangle \text{ in } |\Phi\rangle \text{ is } n_e}} |\Phi\rangle. \quad (\text{E5})$$

The coefficient in (Eq. (E5)) must be $\binom{n}{n_e}^{-1}$ by the equality $\langle \mathbb{1}_{2^n} | \Psi_{1,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle = 1$. Lastly, since $O = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c.$,

$$|O^2\rangle = |N_p + N_q - N_p N_q\rangle = (|00\rangle_p |11\rangle_q + |11\rangle_p |00\rangle_q) \otimes \bigotimes_{a \neq p, q} (|00\rangle + |11\rangle)_a. \quad (\text{E6})$$

And therefore,

$$\mathbb{E} [C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_\infty^{\mathbf{R}}, O^2)] = \langle O^2 | \Psi_{1,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle = 2 \binom{n-2}{n_e-1} \binom{n}{n_e}^{-1} = \frac{2n_e(n-n_e)}{n(n-1)}. \quad (\text{E7})$$

Such upper bound is at least $1/\text{poly}(n)$, and is roughly $1/2$ when $n_e = n/2$, definitely not enough to argue an exponential decay which is a sufficient condition of BP.

Appendix F: Proof of main result: Case 1

In this section we prove the polynomial concentration of cost function for alternated dUCC ansatz containing only single excitation rotations, with mild connectivity assumption (Theorem A.5 (1)). Examples of such ansatz include k -BRA, k -UCCS and k -UCCGS.

Definition F.1 (Crossing number of paired state). *Let $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$. Draw a graph of n vertices according to $|\Phi\rangle$ as follows:*

1. *Place the n sites of $|\Phi\rangle$ in order on a circle. Color $|I_{01}\rangle, |I_{10}\rangle$ by red, $|X_{00}\rangle, |X_{11}\rangle$ by green, and $|X_{01}\rangle, |X_{10}\rangle$ by blue. Do not color $|I_{00}\rangle, |I_{11}\rangle$.*
2. *Draw an edge inside the circle between any two sites of the same color, and color it with this same color. Make sure no three edges cross at the same point.*

The crossing number of $|\Phi\rangle$, denoted by $\text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle)$, is defined to be the minimal number of crossing points of edges in color red and green, or green and blue, or red and blue. Alternatively, suppose site i is colored by $c(i) \in \{\perp, R, G, B\}$ as above,

$$\text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle) := \# \left\{ (i_1, i_2, i_3, i_4) \left| \begin{array}{l} 0 \leq i_1 < i_2 < i_3 < i_4 \leq n, c(i_1) \neq c(i_2), \\ c(i_1) = c(i_3) \neq \perp, c(i_2) = c(i_4) \neq \perp \end{array} \right. \right\}. \quad (\text{F1})$$

For example, the crossing number of the paired state in Eq. (D5) is 2 (Figure 4). We need the following properties of crossing numbers in the proof.




FIG. 4: Illustration of Definition F.1. The crossing number of this paired state is 2, with the corresponding crossing points marked by gray balls. Notice that there are 3 crossing points not counted into the crossing number, since the horizontal edge is not colored.

Lemma F.2 (Properties of crossing numbers). *Let $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$, $1 \leq u < v \leq n$, $\mathbf{z} := \bigoplus_{a \in (u,v)} \Phi_a$. The following properties of crossing numbers holds.*

1. $\text{cr}(S_{uv}|\Phi\rangle) - \text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle) \equiv (\Phi_u \oplus \mathbf{z}) \odot (\Phi_v \oplus \mathbf{z}) \pmod{2}$.
2. If $|\Phi_u\rangle = |I_{00}\rangle$, $|\Phi_v\rangle = |I_{11}\rangle$, then

$$\text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle) \equiv z_1 + z_2 + \text{cr}(F_{uv}^{12}|\Phi\rangle) \equiv z_1 + z_3 + \text{cr}(F_{uv}^{13}|\Phi\rangle) \equiv z_2 + z_3 + \text{cr}(F_{uv}^{23}|\Phi\rangle) \pmod{2}. \quad (\text{F2})$$

Proof. 1. — The key observation here is that by swapping two neighboring sites $j, j+1$ of $|\Phi\rangle$, the parity of crossing number will change by $\Phi_j \odot \Phi_{j+1}$. Indeed, if one of Φ_j or Φ_{j+1} is not colored or are both in the same color, then $\Phi_j \odot \Phi_{j+1} \equiv 0$, and swapping Φ_j with Φ_{j+1} will not change the crossing number. And if Φ_j and Φ_{j+1} are in different colors, then $\Phi_j \odot \Phi_{j+1} \equiv 1$, and swapping Φ_j with Φ_{j+1} will change the parity of crossing number, since there are even-number of red, green or blue sites and thus the degrees of Φ_j and Φ_{j+1} are both odd. Consider the paired state sequence $(|\Phi^{(t)}\rangle)_{1 \leq t \leq T}$ where $T = 2v - 2u - 1$ and

$$|\Phi^{(t)}\rangle = \begin{cases} |\Phi\rangle, & t = 0, \\ S_{u+t-1, u+t} |\Phi^{(t-1)}\rangle, & 1 \leq t \leq v - u, \\ S_{2v-u-t-1, 2v-u-t} |\Phi^{(t-1)}\rangle, & v - u < t \leq T. \end{cases} \quad (\text{F3})$$

Notice that $|\Phi^{(T)}\rangle = S_{uv}|\Phi\rangle$. By the observation above,

$$\text{cr}(|\Phi^{(t)}\rangle) - \text{cr}(|\Phi^{(t-1)}\rangle) \equiv \begin{cases} \Phi_u \odot \Phi_{u+t}, & 0 < t \leq v - u, \\ \Phi_v \odot \Phi_{2v-u-t}, & v - u < t \leq T. \end{cases} \quad (\text{F4})$$

Thus,

$$\text{cr}(S_{uv}|\Phi\rangle) - \text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle) = \sum_{t=1}^T \left(\text{cr}(|\Phi^{(t)}\rangle) - \text{cr}(|\Phi^{(t-1)}\rangle) \right) \equiv (\Phi_u \oplus \mathbf{z}) \odot (\Phi_v \oplus \mathbf{z}). \quad (\text{F5})$$

The last equation uses the fact that $\mathbf{z} \odot \mathbf{z} \equiv 0$.

2. — Let $|\Phi^z\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$, $|\Phi^a\rangle = F_{uv}^{12}|\Phi\rangle$, $|\Phi^b\rangle = F_{uv}^{13}|\Phi\rangle$, $|\Phi^c\rangle = F_{uv}^{23}|\Phi\rangle$. Notice that Eq. (F2) is equivalent to

$$\Phi_u^z \odot \mathbf{z} + \text{cr}(|\Phi^z\rangle) \equiv \Phi_u^a \odot \mathbf{z} + \text{cr}(|\Phi^a\rangle) \equiv \Phi_u^b \odot \mathbf{z} + \text{cr}(|\Phi^b\rangle) \equiv \Phi_u^c \odot \mathbf{z} + \text{cr}(|\Phi^c\rangle) \pmod{2}. \quad (\text{F6})$$

- If $u+1 = v$, then $\mathbf{z} = 0$. By changing $|\Phi^z\rangle$ to $|\Phi^a\rangle$ (or $|\Phi^b\rangle, |\Phi^c\rangle$), site u and v will both be colored by red (or green, blue), and the number of crossing points increased will be even. Hence,

$$\text{cr}(|\Phi^z\rangle) \equiv \text{cr}(|\Phi^a\rangle) \equiv \text{cr}(|\Phi^b\rangle) \equiv \text{cr}(|\Phi^c\rangle) \pmod{2}, \quad (\text{F7})$$

and Eq. (F6) follows.

- If $u + 1 < v$, then by Eq. (F5),

$$\text{cr}(S_{u,v-1}|\Phi^x\rangle) \equiv \text{cr}(|\Phi^x\rangle) + \Phi_u^x \odot \mathbf{z} + \mathbf{z} \odot \Phi_{v-1}^x, \quad \forall x \in \{z, a, b, c\}. \quad (\text{F8})$$

Similar to Eq. (F7),

$$\text{cr}(S_{u,v-1}|\Phi^z\rangle) \equiv \text{cr}(S_{u,v-1}|\Phi^a\rangle) \equiv \text{cr}(S_{u,v-1}|\Phi^b\rangle) \equiv \text{cr}(S_{u,v-1}|\Phi^c\rangle) \pmod{2}. \quad (\text{F9})$$

Finally, notice that $\Phi_{v-1}^z = \Phi_{v-1}^a = \Phi_{v-1}^b = \Phi_{v-1}^c$. Combined with Eqs. (F8) and (F9) we have proved Eq. (F6). \square

Lemma F.3. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph with $|V| = n$ vertices. Suppose \mathbf{R} contains a subsequence of single excitation rotations $(A_{uv})_{(u,v) \in E}$. Let M be the intersection space of \mathbf{R} defined in Corollary C.8 at $t = 2$. For any $|\Phi\rangle, |\Phi'\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$, $(-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle)}|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi'\rangle)}|\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp$.*

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Corollary D.10, but more specific.

- Suppose $|\Phi'\rangle = S_{uv}|\Phi\rangle$ for some $(u, v) \in E$ and $u < v$. By assumption, there exist some $R_j \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $R_j = A_{uv}$. Thus, by Lemma D.9 (1), $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{(\Phi_u \oplus \mathbf{z}) \odot (\Phi_v \oplus \mathbf{z})}|\Phi'\rangle \in (M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, where $\mathbf{z} := \bigoplus_{a \in (u,v)} \Phi_a$. By Lemma C.9, $(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$. And by Lemma F.2, $(\Phi_u \oplus \mathbf{z}) \odot (\Phi_v \oplus \mathbf{z}) \equiv \text{cr}(|\Phi'\rangle) - \text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle) \pmod{2}$. Hence, $(-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle)}|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi'\rangle)}|\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp$.
- Otherwise, $|\Phi'\rangle = S_\pi|\Phi\rangle$ for some $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$. The permutation π can be decomposed into product of swaps, and by the fact that G is connected, each swap can in turn be decomposed into product of swaps on edges (pick an arbitrary path connecting (u, v) in G , the swap (u, v) can be decomposed into product of swaps along the path). Hence, there exists $T \in \mathbb{N}$ and a sequence of edges $(u_t, v_t)_{1 \leq t \leq T} \subseteq E$, such that $\pi = \prod_{t=1}^T (u_t, v_t)$. Let $|\Phi^{(t)}\rangle = \prod_{i=1}^t S_{u_i, v_i}|\Phi\rangle$, we have $|\Phi^{(0)}\rangle = |\Phi\rangle, |\Phi^{(T)}\rangle = |\Phi'\rangle$ and $|\Phi^{(t)}\rangle = S_{u_t, v_t}|\Phi^{(t-1)}\rangle$ for $1 < t \leq T$. By the previous case, $(-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi^{(t-1)}\rangle)}|\Phi^{(t-1)}\rangle - (-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi^{(t)}\rangle)}|\Phi^{(t)}\rangle \in M^\perp$ for $1 < t \leq T$. The sum of these $T - 1$ vectors yields $(-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle)}|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi'\rangle)}|\Phi'\rangle$, which is also a member of M^\perp . \square

Theorem F.4. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph with $|V| = n$ vertices, \mathbf{R} be a sequence of single excitation rotations $(A_{uv})_{(u,v) \in E}$. Define $m := \min\{n_e, n - n_e\}$. The $(\mathbf{R}, 2, \infty)$ -moment vector is*

$$|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = \frac{\binom{n+4}{2}}{\binom{n}{n_e} \binom{n+4}{n_e+2}} \sum_{\substack{a,b,c \geq 0, \\ a+b+c \leq m}} \frac{|\Psi_{(a,b,c)}\rangle}{\binom{a+b+c+2}{2} \binom{a+b+c}{a,b,c}}, \quad (\text{F10})$$

where $|\Psi_{(a,b,c)}\rangle := \sum_{|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}} (-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle)}|\Phi\rangle$.

Proof. Denote the right-hand side of Eq. (F10) by $|\Psi^*\rangle$. Use the notations M, M_j from Corollary C.8. Since $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = P_M|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4}$, in order to prove $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = |\Psi^*\rangle$, it suffices to prove that (1) $|\Psi^*\rangle \in M$ and (2) $|\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in M^\perp$.

- (1) Obviously, $|\Psi^*\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. We prove that $|\Psi^*\rangle$ is orthogonal to $(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, for each $R_j \in \mathbf{R}$. If so, we have $|\Psi^*\rangle \in M$ by Lemma C.9. Recall the spanning set of $(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ characterized in Lemma D.9 (1). Suppose $R_j = A_{uv}$. For any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$, let $\mathbf{z} = \bigoplus_{a \in (u,v)} \Phi_a$. We check the following two cases.

- $|\Psi^*\rangle$ is orthogonal to $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{(\Phi_u \oplus \mathbf{z}) \odot (\Phi_v \oplus \mathbf{z})} S_{uv}|\Phi\rangle$. In fact, the overlap between these two vectors is proportional to $(-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle)} - (-1)^{(\Phi_u \oplus \mathbf{z}) \odot (\Phi_v \oplus \mathbf{z}) + \text{cr}(S_{uv}|\Phi\rangle)}$, which is 0 by Lemma F.2 (1).

- $|\Psi^*\rangle$ is orthogonal to $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{z_1+z_2} F_{uv}^{12} |\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{z_1+z_3} F_{uv}^{13} |\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{z_2+z_3} F_{uv}^{23} |\Phi\rangle$. In fact, the overlap between these two vectors is proportional to

$$\frac{(-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi\rangle)}}{\binom{k+2}{2} \binom{k}{a,b,c}} - \frac{(-1)^{z_1+z_2+\text{cr}(|F_{uv}^{12}\Phi\rangle)}}{\binom{k+3}{2} \binom{k+1}{a+1,b,c}} - \frac{(-1)^{z_1+z_3+\text{cr}(|F_{uv}^{13}\Phi\rangle)}}{\binom{k+3}{2} \binom{k+1}{a,b+1,c}} - \frac{(-1)^{z_2+z_3+\text{cr}(|F_{uv}^{23}\Phi\rangle)}}{\binom{k+3}{2} \binom{k+1}{a,b,c+1}}. \quad (\text{F11})$$

Here we define $k := a + b + c$. By Lemma F.2 (2), the numerators in the four fractions in Eq. (F11) are the same. Factoring out the four identical numerators, it can be proved that Eq. (F11) equals 0 for any integer a, b, c using combinatorial arguments.

- (2) Next, we prove $|\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in M^\perp$, by expressing $|\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ as a linear combination of vectors in $(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$. Recalls that the union of the spanning sets of each $(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ (characterized in Lemma D.9 (1)) spans $(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$.

- For any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(0,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}$, by Lemma F.3, we have

$$|\Phi\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in M^\perp. \quad (\text{F12})$$

- For $|\Phi^z\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}, |\Phi^a\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a+1,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}, |\Phi^b\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b+1,c)}^{\text{paired}}, |\Phi^c\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c+1)}^{\text{paired}}$, by Lemma D.9, Lemma F.2 (2), and Lemma F.3, we have

$$(-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi^z\rangle)} |\Phi^z\rangle - (-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi^a\rangle)} |\Phi^a\rangle - (-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi^b\rangle)} |\Phi^b\rangle - (-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi^c\rangle)} |\Phi^c\rangle \in M^\perp. \quad (\text{F13})$$

We show that there exists functions $w, s : \mathbb{N}^3 \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} &= \frac{1}{s(0,0,0)} \sum_{(\text{F12})} (|\Phi\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4}) \\ &- \sum_{a,b,c} w(a,b,c) \sum_{(\text{F13})} \left((-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi^z\rangle)} |\Phi^z\rangle - (-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi^a\rangle)} |\Phi^a\rangle - (-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi^b\rangle)} |\Phi^b\rangle - (-1)^{\text{cr}(|\Phi^c\rangle)} |\Phi^c\rangle \right). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{F14})$$

Here the under script indicates that the summation is taken over vectors in Eqs. (F12) and (F13). Let $D := \frac{\binom{n+4}{2}}{\binom{n}{n_e} \binom{n+4}{n_e+2}}$. Let $s(a,b,c)$ be the number of different paired states with configuration (a,b,c) :

$$s(a,b,c) := \frac{n!}{(n - n_e - a - b - c)(n_e - a - b - c)! (a!b!c!)^2}, \quad (\text{F15})$$

and define

$$w(a,b,c) := \frac{a!b!c!}{s(a+1,b,c)s(a,b+1,c)s(a,b,c+1)} f(a+b+c), \quad (\text{F16})$$

where

$$f(k) := \begin{cases} \frac{1}{\binom{n}{n_e}} - D, & k = 0, \\ \frac{k}{(n - n_e - k + 1)(n_e - k + 1)} f(k-1) - \frac{D}{\binom{k+2}{2} k!}, & k \geq 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{F17})$$

Comparing the coefficients of vectors in both sides of Eq. (F14), we have to prove the following linear equations.

$$D = \frac{1 - s(0,0,0)}{s(0,0,0)} - w(0,0,0)s(1,0,0)s(0,1,0)s(0,0,1), \quad (\text{F18})$$

$$\begin{aligned} \frac{D}{\binom{k+2}{2} \binom{k}{a,b,c}} &= -w(a,b,c)s(a+1,b,c)s(a,b+1,c)s(a,b,c+1) \\ &+ w(a-1,b,c)s(a-1,b,c)s(a-1,b+1,c)s(a-1,b,c+1) \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
& + w(a, b-1, c) s(a, b-1, c) s(a+1, b-1, c) s(a, b-1, c+1) \\
& + w(a, b, c-1) s(a, b, c-1) s(a+1, b, c-1) s(a, b+1, c-1).
\end{aligned} \tag{F19}$$

Here we define $k := a + b + c$, and $w(a, b, c) = s(a, b, c) = 0$ if at least one of $a, b, c < 0$. Eq. (F18) follows from definition. It can be verified that the right-hand side of Eq. (F19) equals

$$a!b!c! \left(-f(k) + \frac{k}{(n-n_e-k+1)(n_e-k+1)} f(k-1) \right), \tag{F20}$$

which equals the left-hand side by definition. \square

Notice that the moment vector $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ in Theorem F.4 does not depend on the structure of G except the connectivity. As an immediate corollary, the $(\mathbf{R}, 2, \infty)$ -moment vectors of k -BRA, k -UCCS and k -UCCGS are the same, since the underlying graphs G , which are a path, a complete bipartite graph and a complete graph respectively, are all connected.

Corollary F.5. *Let \mathbf{R} be defined in Theorem F.4.*

$$|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{BRA}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{UCCS}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{UCCGS}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle. \tag{F21}$$

With $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ characterized, we can calculate the 2nd moment of cost function for any observables in the $k \rightarrow \infty$ limit. The case 1 of main result is stated formally as following corollary.

Corollary F.6 (Main result, Case 1). *Let \mathbf{R} be defined in Theorem F.4, $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})$ be the cost function defined in Eq. (A16). Here the observable H_{el} is an electronic structure Hamiltonian defined in Eq. (A18), with coefficients $\mathbf{h} = (h_{pq})_{p>q}, \mathbf{g} = (g_{pqrs})_{p>q>r>s}$. We have*

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})) = \|\mathbf{h}\|_2^2 \frac{4n_e(n-n_e)}{n(n-1)(n+2)} + \|\mathbf{g}\|_2^2 \frac{2^2 \binom{n_e}{2} \binom{n-n_e}{2}}{45 \binom{n+2}{6}}. \tag{F22}$$

Proof. Recall that

$$\begin{aligned}
\text{Var}(C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})) &= \mathbb{E}[C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})^2] = (\langle H_{\text{el}} | | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle) \\
&= \sum_{p>q} h_{pq}^2 (\langle \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c. | | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle) + \sum_{p>q>r>s} g_{pqrs}^2 (\langle \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c. | | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle) + \text{cross terms}.
\end{aligned} \tag{F23}$$

The contribution of cross terms is zero. To see that, take $(\langle O_1 | \otimes \langle O_2 | | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle$ with $O_1 = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c., O_2 = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_r + h.c.$ ($q \neq r$) as an example. Notice that $P := \prod_{i=1}^n (\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_{2^n}^{\otimes 2i} + \frac{1}{2} Z_i^{\otimes 2i})$ is the orthogonal projection onto $\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$. However,

$$\begin{aligned}
P(|O_1\rangle \otimes |O_2\rangle) &= P(O_1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^n} \otimes O_2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^n}) \sum_{j,j' \in [2^n]} |j, j', j', j'\rangle \\
&= \left(\prod_{i \in [n] \setminus \{q\}} \left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_{2^n}^{\otimes 4} + \frac{1}{2} Z_i^{\otimes 4} \right) \right) (O_1 \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^n} \otimes O_2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_{2^n}) \underbrace{\left(\frac{1}{2} \mathbb{1}_{2^n}^{\otimes 4} - \frac{1}{2} Z_q^{\otimes 4} \right)}_{=0} \sum_{j,j' \in [2^n]} |j, j', j', j'\rangle = 0.
\end{aligned} \tag{F24}$$

Hence, $|O_1\rangle \otimes |O_2\rangle \in (\mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}})^\perp$. Consequently, $(\langle O_1 | \otimes \langle O_2 | | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle = 0$ since $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_t^{\text{even}}$. The same argument can be extended to when one of or both O_1, O_2 are double excitation Hermitians, except for the tricky case where O_1, O_2 are both double excitation Hermitians and the sets of indices are the same. For example, when $O_1 = \hat{a}_1^\dagger \hat{a}_2^\dagger \hat{a}_3 \hat{a}_4 + h.c., O_2 = \hat{a}_1^\dagger \hat{a}_3^\dagger \hat{a}_2 \hat{a}_4 + h.c.$, $(\langle O_1 | \otimes \langle O_2 | | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle$ may not be 0. However, we have assumed that terms like $\hat{a}_1^\dagger \hat{a}_3^\dagger \hat{a}_2 \hat{a}_4 + h.c.$ do not appear in H_{el} to rule out the non-zero cases, since they are not essential.

Finally, by Theorem F.4 and Proposition D.5,

$$\langle \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c. | | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle = \frac{4 \binom{n+4}{2}}{\binom{n}{n_e} \binom{n+4}{n_e+2}} \sum_{a=0}^{m-1} \frac{\binom{n-2}{2a} \binom{2a}{a} \binom{n-2-2a}{n_e-1-a}}{\binom{a+3}{2} \binom{a+1}{1}} = \frac{4n_e(n-n_e)}{n(n-1)(n+2)}, \tag{F25}$$

$$\langle \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c. | | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle = \frac{4 \binom{n+4}{2}}{\binom{n}{n_e} \binom{n+4}{n_e+2}} \sum_{a=0}^{m-2} \frac{\binom{n-4}{2a} \binom{2a}{a} \binom{n-4-2a}{n_e-2-a}}{\binom{a+4}{2} \binom{a+2}{2}} = \frac{2 \binom{n_e}{2} \binom{n-n_e}{2}}{45 \binom{n+2}{6}}. \tag{F26}$$

Here $m := \min(n_e, n - n_e)$. \square

Notice that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C) = 1/\text{poly}(n)$ if $h_{pq}, g_{pqrs} \in O(1)$.

Appendix G: Proof of main result: Case 2

In this section we prove the polynomial/exponential concentration of cost function for alternated dUCC ansatz containing only qubit single excitation rotations, with mild connectivity assumption (Theorem A.5 (2)). Examples of such ansatz include k -qubit-UCCS and k -qubit-UCCGS.

Theorem G.1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph with $|V| = n$ vertices, \mathbf{R} be a sequence of qubit single excitation rotations $(A_{uv}^{\text{qubit}})_{(u,v) \in E}$. Define $m := \min\{n_e, n - n_e\}$. Depending on structure of G , the moment vector $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ admits the one of following forms.*

1. *If G is a path or a ring, then $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = S_\pi |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{BRA}}\rangle$ with $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ and $(\pi(i), \pi(i+1)) \in E$ for all $i \in [n-1]$.*
2. *If $n = 2n_e$, G is bipartite, and both parts of G have an even size (i.e., let $V_1 \cup V_2$ be the unique partition of vertices such that both V_1 and V_2 are independent sets, $|V_1|$ and $|V_2|$ are both even), then $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ can be written in the form of Eq. (D23), with*

$$c(a, b, c) = \begin{cases} D, & \text{if } a = b = c = 0, \\ \frac{D}{3}, & \text{if exactly one of } a, b, c \text{ is nonzero, and } a + b + c < n_e, \\ \frac{\binom{n}{n_e} - 2}{\binom{n}{n_e} + 2} \cdot \frac{D}{3}, & \text{if exactly one of } a, b, c \text{ is nonzero, and } a + b + c = n_e, \\ \frac{2}{\binom{n}{n_e} + 2} \cdot \frac{D}{3}, & \text{if exactly two of } a, b, c \text{ is nonzero, and } a + b + c = n_e, \\ 0, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{G1})$$

And for $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$,

$$\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle) = \begin{cases} -(-1)^{\sum_{p < q \in V_1} \Phi_p \odot \Phi_q}, & \text{if exactly two of } a, b, c \text{ is nonzero, and } a + b + c = n_e, \\ 1, & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases} \quad (\text{G2})$$

Here we define $D := \frac{3\binom{n}{n_e} + 6}{\binom{n}{n_e}^3 + 4\binom{n}{n_e}^2}$.

3. *Otherwise, $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ is given in Eq. (D24).*

As an immediate corollary, we can determine the $(\mathbf{R}, 2, \infty)$ -moment vector of k -qubit-UCCS and k -qubit-UCCGS, where the underlying graph G is a complete bipartite graph and a complete graph, respectively.

Corollary G.2. $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{UCCS}}\rangle$ is determined by Theorem G.1 (2), and $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{UCCGS}}\rangle$ is determined by Theorem G.1 (3).

With $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ characterized, we can calculate the 2nd moment of cost function for any observables in the $k \rightarrow \infty$ limit. Case 2 of main result is stated formally as following corollary.

Corollary G.3 (Main result, Case 2). *Let \mathbf{R}, G be defined in Theorem G.1, and $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})$ be the cost function defined in Eq. (A16). Here the observable H_{el} is an electronic structure Hamiltonian defined in Eq. (A18), with coefficients $\mathbf{h} = (h_{pq})_{p>q}, \mathbf{g} = (g_{pqrs})_{p>q>r>s}$.*

1. *If G is a path or a ring, then $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C)$ is the same as in Corollary F.6.*
2. *If $n = 2n_e$, G is bipartite, and both parts of G have an even size, then,*

$$\begin{aligned} \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})) &= \sum_{p>q} h_{pq}^2 \frac{4\binom{n-2}{n_e-1} \left[\binom{n}{n_e} + 2(1 - (-1)^{[q \leq n_e < p] + p - q}) \right]}{\binom{n}{n_e}^3 + 4\binom{n}{n_e}^2} \\ &\quad + \sum_{p>q>r>s} g_{pqrs}^2 \frac{4\binom{n-4}{n_e-2} \left[\binom{n}{n_e} + 2(1 - (-1)^{[q \leq n_e < p \vee s \leq n_e < r] + p - q + r - s}) \right]}{\binom{n}{n_e}^3 + 4\binom{n}{n_e}^2}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G3})$$

Here we define $[P] = 1$ if a proposition P is true and $[P] = 0$ otherwise.

3. Otherwise,

$$\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})) = \|\mathbf{h}\|_2^2 \frac{4 \binom{n-2}{n_e-1}}{\binom{n}{n_e}^2 + 2 \binom{n}{n_e}} + \|\mathbf{g}\|_2^2 \frac{4 \binom{n-4}{n_e-2}}{\binom{n}{n_e}^2 + 2 \binom{n}{n_e}}. \quad (\text{G4})$$

Proof. Similar to the proof of Corollary F.6, it suffices to evaluate $(\langle O | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle)$ for $O = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c.$ and $O = \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c.$

1. Case 1 is already proved in Corollary F.6.

2. Let $D = \frac{3 \binom{n}{n_e} + 6}{\binom{n}{n_e}^3 + 4 \binom{n}{n_e}^2}$. By Theorem G.1 and Proposition D.5,

$$(\langle \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c. | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle)^{\otimes 2} = \binom{n-2}{n_e-1} \cdot \frac{D}{3} - (-1)^{[q \leq n_e < p] + p - q} \binom{n-2}{n_e-1} \cdot \frac{2}{\binom{n}{n_e} + 2} \frac{D}{3} \quad (\text{G5})$$

$$= \frac{4 \binom{n-2}{n_e-1} \left[\binom{n}{n_e} + 2(1 - (-1)^{[q \leq n_e < p] + p - q}) \right]}{\binom{n}{n_e}^3 + 4 \binom{n}{n_e}^2}, \quad (\text{G6})$$

$$(\langle \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c. | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle)^{\otimes 2} = \binom{n-4}{n_e-2} \cdot \frac{D}{3} - (-1)^{[q \leq n_e < p \vee s \leq n_e < r] + p - q + r - s} \binom{n-4}{n_e-2} \cdot \frac{2}{\binom{n}{n_e} + 2} \frac{D}{3} \quad (\text{G7})$$

$$= \frac{4 \binom{n-4}{n_e-2} \left[\binom{n}{n_e} + 2(1 - (-1)^{[q \leq n_e < p \vee s \leq n_e < r] + p - q + r - s}) \right]}{\binom{n}{n_e}^3 + 4 \binom{n}{n_e}^2}. \quad (\text{G8})$$

3. By Theorem G.1 and Proposition D.5,

$$(\langle \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q + h.c. | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle)^{\otimes 2} = \frac{4 \binom{n-2}{n_e-1}}{\binom{n}{n_e}^2 + 2 \binom{n}{n_e}}, \quad (\langle \hat{a}_p^\dagger \hat{a}_q^\dagger \hat{a}_r \hat{a}_s + h.c. | \Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}} \rangle)^{\otimes 2} = \frac{4 \binom{n-4}{n_e-2}}{\binom{n}{n_e}^2 + 2 \binom{n}{n_e}}. \quad (\text{G9})$$

□

Notice that if $n_e = \Theta(n)$, $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C) = 1/\text{poly}(n)$ in case 1, and $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C) = \exp(-\Theta(n))$ in case 2 and 3.

1. Proof of Theorem G.1 (1)

Proof of Theorem G.1 (1). The basis rotation ansatz consists of single excitation rotations acting on edges of a path which connects all neighboring qubits, i.e., $E = \{(i, i+1) | i \in [n-1]\}$. When acting on two neighboring qubits, single excitations are equivalent to qubit single excitations ($\hat{a}_{i+1}^\dagger \hat{a}_i = Q_{i+1} Q_i$). Thus, when G is a path connecting all neighboring qubits, $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle$ is exactly $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{BRA}}\rangle$. Suppose G is an arbitrary path. Fix one of the two corresponding permutations $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$, such that $(\pi(i), \pi(i+1)) \in E, \forall i \in [n-1]$. By examining the proof of Theorem F.4, it can be checked that the moment vector remains unchanged if one replace the initial state $|\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ by any paired state in $\mathcal{S}_{2,(0,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}$. Thus,

$$\begin{aligned} S_\pi |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{BRA}}\rangle &= S_\pi \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{l=1}^k \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \tilde{A}_{i,i+1} |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} = S_\pi \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{l=1}^k \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \tilde{A}_{i,i+1}^{\text{qubit}} \left(S_\pi^{-1} |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \right) \\ &= \lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \prod_{l=1}^k \prod_{i=1}^{n-1} \tilde{A}_{\pi(i), \pi(i+1)}^{\text{qubit}} |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G10})$$

To extend the conclusion to rings, it suffices to show the equality for the “standard” ring, i.e., $E = \{(i, i+1) | i \in [n-1]\} \cup \{(1, n)\}$, and argue for arbitrary rings similar to Eq. (G10). Let $P_{M_1} = \tilde{A}_{1n}, P_{M_2} = \tilde{A}_{1n}^{\text{qubit}}$. It suffices to prove that $M_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} = M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. If so, one can replace A_{1n}^{qubit} by A_{1n} without changing $\mathbb{E}[C^2]$. Since $A_{i,i+1}^{\text{qubit}}$ can also be replaced by $A_{i,i+1}$ for $i \in [n-1]$, one concludes that $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{BRA}}\rangle$ according to Theorem F.4. Equivalently, we

prove that the spanning sets are the same for $(M_1 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ and $(M_2 \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. By comparing 1 and 2 in Lemma D.9, we need to prove for any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$ with $\mathbf{z} := \bigoplus_{1 < i < n} \Phi_i$, that (1) $(\Phi_1 \oplus \mathbf{z}) \odot (\Phi_n \oplus \mathbf{z}) \equiv \Phi_1 \odot \Phi_n \pmod{2}$, (2) if $|\Phi_1\rangle = |I_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_n\rangle = |I_{11}\rangle$, then $z_1 + z_2 \equiv z_1 + z_3 \equiv z_2 + z_3 \pmod{2}$.

(1) Since $|\Phi\rangle$ is a paired state, we have $|\mathbf{z} \oplus \Phi_1 \oplus \Phi_n\rangle \in \{|I_{00}\rangle, |I_{11}\rangle\}$. Hence,

$$\Phi_1 \odot \Phi_n \equiv (\Phi_1 \oplus (\mathbf{z} \oplus \Phi_1 \oplus \Phi_n)) \odot (\Phi_n \oplus (\mathbf{z} \oplus \Phi_1 \oplus \Phi_n)) \equiv (\Phi_1 \oplus \mathbf{z}) \odot (\Phi_n \oplus \mathbf{z}) \pmod{2}. \quad (\text{G11})$$

(2) Since $|\Phi\rangle$ is a paired state, and $|\Phi_1\rangle = |I_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_n\rangle = |I_{11}\rangle$, we have $|\mathbf{z}\rangle \in \{|I_{00}\rangle, |I_{11}\rangle\}$. Hence, $z_1 + z_2 \equiv z_1 + z_3 \equiv z_2 + z_3 \pmod{2}$.

□

2. Proof of Theorem G.1 (2)

Lemma G.4. *Let G, sign, c be defined in Theorem G.1 (2). Suppose (u, v) is an edge of G . For any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$, if $c(a, b, c) \neq 0$, then $\text{sign}(S_{uv}|\Phi\rangle) = (-1)^{\Phi_u \odot \Phi_v} \text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)$.*

Proof. Let $|\Phi'\rangle = S_{uv}|\Phi\rangle$. Recall that G is a bipartite graph, and the two parts V_1, V_2 of G are both even. Assume without loss of generality that $u \in V_1, v \in V_2$. By definition, $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)/\text{sign}(|\Phi'\rangle) = (-1)^{(\Phi_u \oplus \Phi_v) \odot \bigoplus_{w \in V_1 \setminus \{v\}} \Phi_w}$. We prove by comparing $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)/\text{sign}(|\Phi'\rangle)$ and $(-1)^{\Phi_u \odot \Phi_v}$.

- If $\bar{\Phi}_u = \bar{\Phi}_v$ or $\Phi_u = \Phi_v$, then $\Phi_u \oplus \Phi_v \in \{|I_{00}\rangle, |I_{11}\rangle\}$. Hence, $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)/\text{sign}(|\Phi'\rangle) = 1$. Meanwhile, $(-1)^{\Phi_u \odot \Phi_v} = 1$.
- If one of Φ_u, Φ_v is $|I_{00}\rangle$ or $|I_{11}\rangle$, then by the definition of $c(a, b, c)$, at most one of a, b, c is non-zero. In such case, we have $\Phi_p \odot \Phi_q \equiv 0 \pmod{2}$ for any $p, q \in V$. Hence, $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)/\text{sign}(|\Phi'\rangle) = 1$. Meanwhile, $(-1)^{\Phi_u \odot \Phi_v} = 1$.
- Otherwise, it must be the case that exactly two of a, b, c is non-zero, and $\Phi_u \notin \{\Phi_v, \bar{\Phi}_v\}$. We have $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)/\text{sign}(|\Phi'\rangle) = -1$, since $\bigoplus_{w \in V_1 \setminus u} \Phi_w$ must be one of $\Phi_u, \bar{\Phi}_u, \Phi_v, \bar{\Phi}_v$, by the fact $|V_1|$ is even. Meanwhile, $(-1)^{\Phi_u \odot \Phi_v} = -1$.

□

Lemma G.5. *Let G, sign, c be defined in Theorem G.1 (2). Suppose (u, v) is an edge of G . For any $|\Phi^z\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$, with $|\Phi_u^z\rangle = |I_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_v^z\rangle = |I_{11}\rangle$, let $|\Phi^a\rangle = F_{uv}^{12}|\Phi^z\rangle, |\Phi^b\rangle = F_{uv}^{13}|\Phi^z\rangle, |\Phi^c\rangle = F_{uv}^{23}|\Phi^z\rangle$. We have*

$$\text{sign}(|\Phi^z\rangle)c(a, b, c) = \text{sign}(|\Phi^a\rangle)c(a+1, b, c) + \text{sign}(|\Phi^b\rangle)c(a, b+1, c) + \text{sign}(|\Phi^c\rangle)c(a, b, c+1). \quad (\text{G12})$$

Proof. We prove by evaluating the values of sign and c in Eq. (G12).

- If $a = b = c = 0$, the signs of $|\Phi^z\rangle, |\Phi^a\rangle, |\Phi^b\rangle, |\Phi^c\rangle$ are all 1 and Eq. (G12) follows from the equality $D = \frac{D}{3} + \frac{D}{3} + \frac{D}{3}$.
- If exactly one of a, b, c is non-zero, and $a + b + c < n_e - 1$, the signs of $|\Phi^z\rangle, |\Phi^a\rangle, |\Phi^b\rangle, |\Phi^c\rangle$ are all 1 and Eq. (G12) follows from the equality $\frac{D}{3} = \frac{D}{3} + 0 + 0$.
- If exactly one of a, b, c is non-zero, and $a + b + c = n_e - 1$, the signs of $|\Phi^z\rangle, |\Phi^a\rangle, |\Phi^b\rangle, |\Phi^c\rangle$ are all 1. To see that, we may assume without loss of generality that $u \in V_1$ and $v \in V_2$, and $a = n_e - 1$. By definition, $\text{sign}(|\Phi^z\rangle) = \text{sign}(|\Phi^a\rangle) = 1$, and

$$\text{sign}(|\Phi^b\rangle) = -(-1)^{\sum_{p < q \in V_1} \Phi_p^b \odot \Phi_q^b} = -(-1)^{\Phi_u^b \odot \bigoplus_{w \in V_1 \setminus u} \Phi_w^b} = 1, \quad (\text{G13})$$

since $|\Phi_v^b\rangle \in \{|X_{00}\rangle, |X_{11}\rangle\}$ and $|\Phi_w^b\rangle \in \{|I_{01}\rangle, |I_{10}\rangle\}$ for $w \in V_1 \setminus \{v\}$, and $|V_1|$ is even. Similarly, $\text{sign}(|\Phi^c\rangle) = 1$. Eq. (G12) follows from the equality

$$\frac{D}{3} = \frac{2}{\binom{n}{n_e} + 2} \cdot \frac{D}{3} + \frac{2}{\binom{n}{n_e} + 2} \cdot \frac{D}{3} + \frac{\binom{n}{n_e} - 2}{\binom{n}{n_e} + 2} \cdot \frac{D}{3}. \quad (\text{G14})$$

- Otherwise, we may assume that exactly two of a, b, c is non-zero, and $a + b + c = n_e - 1$, since in other cases the coefficients of $|\Phi^z\rangle, |\Phi^a\rangle, |\Phi^b\rangle, |\Phi^c\rangle$ are all zero. Assume without loss of generality that $c = 0$, $v \in V_1$ and $u \in V_2$. By definition,

$$\text{sign}(|\Phi^a\rangle)/\text{sign}(|\Phi^b\rangle) = (-1)^{(\Phi_v^a \oplus \Phi_v^b) \odot \bigoplus_{w \in V_1 \setminus \{v\}} \Phi_w^a} = -1, \quad (\text{G15})$$

since $|\Phi_v^a\rangle \in \{|I_{01}\rangle, |I_{10}\rangle\}$, $|\Phi_v^b\rangle \in \{|X_{00}\rangle, |X_{11}\rangle\}$, $|\Phi_w^a\rangle \in \{|I_{01}\rangle, |I_{10}\rangle, |X_{00}\rangle, |X_{11}\rangle\}$ for $w \in V_1 \setminus \{v\}$, and $|V_1|$ is even. Eq. (G12) follows from the equality

$$0 = \frac{2}{\binom{n}{n_e} + 2} \cdot \frac{D}{3} - \frac{2}{\binom{n}{n_e} + 2} \cdot \frac{D}{3} + 0. \quad (\text{G16})$$

□

Lemma G.6. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a simple, connected graph with $|V| = n$ vertices and $\max_{v \in V} \deg(v) \geq 3$. Suppose \mathbf{R} contains a subsequence of qubit single excitation rotations $(A_{uv}^{\text{qubit}})_{(u,v) \in E}$. Let M be the intersection space of \mathbf{R} defined in Corollary C.8 at $t = 2$. For any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$, if one of the following two cases happens, then $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$.*

1. Two of a, b, c are non-zero and $2(a + b + c) < n$.
2. All of a, b, c are non-zero.

Proof. Fix a vertex $v \in V$ such that $\deg(v) \geq 3$, and pick u_1, u_2, u_3 from the neighborhood of v . Then v, u_1, u_2, u_3 form a star motif centered at v .

(1) Assume without loss of generality that $a, b > 0$. Since $2(a + b + c) < n$, there is at least one $|I_{00}\rangle$ or $|I_{11}\rangle$ in $|\Phi\rangle$. We may assume that

$$|\Phi_v\rangle = |I_{01}\rangle, |\Phi_{u_1}\rangle \in \{|I_{00}\rangle, |I_{11}\rangle\}, |\Phi_{u_2}\rangle = |X_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_{u_3}\rangle = |X_{11}\rangle. \quad (\text{G17})$$

This is because by Corollary D.10, once we prove $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$, we can argue that $|\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp$ for any $|\Phi'\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$. Consider the vector sequence $|\Phi^{(0)}\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$, and

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^{(1)}\rangle &= S_{vu_1} |\Phi\rangle, & |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle &= S_{vu_2} |\Phi^{(1)}\rangle, & |\Phi^{(3)}\rangle &= S_{vu_1} |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle, & |\Phi^{(4)}\rangle &= S_{vu_3} |\Phi^{(3)}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G18})$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^{(5)}\rangle &= S_{vu_2} |\Phi^{(4)}\rangle, & |\Phi^{(6)}\rangle &= S_{vu_1} |\Phi^{(5)}\rangle, & |\Phi^{(7)}\rangle &= S_{vu_2} |\Phi^{(6)}\rangle, & |\Phi^{(8)}\rangle &= S_{vu_3} |\Phi^{(7)}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G19})$$

It can be verified that $|\Phi^{(8)}\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$. By Lemma D.9 (2), the following vectors lie in $(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$.

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^{(0)}\rangle - |\Phi^{(1)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(1)}\rangle - |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(3)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(3)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(4)}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G20})$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^{(4)}\rangle - |\Phi^{(5)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(5)}\rangle - |\Phi^{(6)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(6)}\rangle - |\Phi^{(7)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(7)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(8)}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G21})$$

Combining these vectors to eliminate $|\Phi^{(1)}\rangle, |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle, \dots, |\Phi^{(7)}\rangle$, we get $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$, since $|\Phi^{(0)}\rangle = |\Phi^{(8)}\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$.

(2) Similarly assume that

$$|\Phi_v\rangle = |I_{01}\rangle, |\Phi_{u_1}\rangle = |X_{01}\rangle, |\Phi_{u_2}\rangle = |X_{00}\rangle, |\Phi_{u_3}\rangle = |X_{11}\rangle. \quad (\text{G22})$$

Consider the vector sequence in Eqs. (G18) and (G19). By Lemma D.9 (2), the following vectors lie in $(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}})^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$.

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^{(0)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(1)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(1)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(3)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(3)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(4)}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G23})$$

$$\begin{aligned} |\Phi^{(4)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(5)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(5)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(6)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(6)}\rangle - |\Phi^{(7)}\rangle, & \quad |\Phi^{(7)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(8)}\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G24})$$

Combining these vectors to eliminate $|\Phi^{(1)}\rangle, |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle, \dots, |\Phi^{(7)}\rangle$, we get $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$, since $|\Phi^{(0)}\rangle = |\Phi^{(8)}\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$. □

Lemma G.7. *Same condition as Theorem G.1 (2). For $|\Phi\rangle, |\Phi'\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_2^{\text{paired}}$, if $\text{conf}(|\Phi\rangle) = \text{conf}(|\Phi'\rangle)$, then $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)|\Phi\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi'\rangle)|\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp$.*

Proof. Suppose $\text{conf}(|\Phi\rangle) = (a, b, c)$. If (a, b, c) satisfies the conditions in Lemma G.6, then $|\Phi\rangle, |\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp$, hence $(-1)^{\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)}|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\text{sign}(|\Phi'\rangle)}|\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp$. Otherwise, $c(a, b, c) \neq 0$ by definition in Eq. (G1). The rest of the proof is similar to that of Lemma F.3, using Lemma D.9 (2), Lemma G.4 and connectivity of G . \square

Lemma G.8. *Same condition as Theorem G.1 (2). For any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}, |\Phi'\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a',b',c')}^{\text{paired}}$, if one of the following 3 cases happens, we have $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)|\Phi\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi'\rangle)|\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp$.*

1. $a + b = a' + b' = n_e$ and $a, b, a', b' > 0$.
2. $a + c = a' + c' = n_e$ and $a, c, a', c' > 0$.
3. $b + c = b' + c' = n_e$ and $b, c, b', c' > 0$.

Proof. We prove the first case, since the rest 2 cases are similar. It suffices to prove that for any $0 < l < n_e - 1$, if $a = l + 1, b = n_e - a, a' = l, b' = n_e - a'$, then $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)|\Phi\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi'\rangle)|\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp$. Furthermore, we may assume that there exists $(u, v) \in E$ and $|\Phi^z\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(l,n_e-l-1,0)}^{\text{paired}}$ such that $|\Phi\rangle = F_{uv}^{12}|\Phi^z\rangle, |\Phi'\rangle = F_{uv}^{13}|\Phi^z\rangle$, since one can then use Lemma G.7 to argue for general cases. By definition of G , there exists $R_j \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $R_j = A_{uv}^{\text{qubit}}$. By Lemma D.9 (2) and Lemma C.9, $|\Phi^z\rangle - |\Phi\rangle - |\Phi'\rangle - F_{uv}^{23}|\Phi^z\rangle \in \left(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$. Since $\text{conf}(|\Phi^z\rangle) = (l, n_e - l - 1, 0)$, $\text{conf}(F_{uv}^{23}|\Phi^z\rangle) = (l, n_e - l - 1, 1)$, we have $|\Phi^z\rangle, F_{uv}^{23}|\Phi^z\rangle \in M^\perp$ according to Lemma G.6. Hence, $|\Phi\rangle + |\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp$. It remains to show that $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle) / \text{sign}(|\Phi'\rangle) = -1$, which has been proved in Eq. (G15). \square

Proof of Theorem G.1 (2). Denote the state specified in Eqs. (G1) to (G2) by $|\Psi^*\rangle$. Use the notations M, M_j from Corollary C.8. We proceed similarly as in the proof of Theorem F.4 by showing that (1) $|\Psi^*\rangle \in M$ and (2) $|\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in M^\perp$.

- (1) Obviously, $|\Psi^*\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$. We prove that $|\Psi^*\rangle$ is orthogonal to $\left(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$, for each $R_j \in \mathbf{R}$. If so, we have $|\Psi^*\rangle \in M$ by Lemma C.9. Recall the spanning set of $\left(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ characterized in Lemma D.9 (2). Suppose $R_j = A_{uv}^{\text{qubit}}$. For any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$, we check the following two cases.

- $|\Psi^*\rangle$ is orthogonal to $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\Phi_u \odot \Phi_v} S_{uv} |\Phi\rangle$. In fact, the overlap between these two vectors is proportional to $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle) - (-1)^{\Phi_u \odot \Phi_v} \text{sign}(S_{uv} |\Phi\rangle)$, which is 0 by Lemma G.4.
- $|\Psi^*\rangle$ is orthogonal to $|\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{12}|\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{13}|\Phi\rangle - F_{uv}^{23}|\Phi\rangle$. In fact, the overlap between these two vectors is proportional to $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)c(a, b, c) - \text{sign}(F_{uv}^{12}|\Phi\rangle)c(a + 1, b, c) - \text{sign}(F_{uv}^{13}|\Phi\rangle)c(a, b + 1, c) - \text{sign}(F_{uv}^{23}|\Phi\rangle)c(a, b, c + 1)$, which is 0 by Lemma G.5.

- (2) Next, we prove $|\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in M^\perp$, by expressing $|\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4}$ as a linear combination of vectors in $\left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$. Recalls that the union of the spanning sets of each $\left(M_j \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$ (characterized in Lemma D.9 (2)) spans $\left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}$.

- For any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(0,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}$, by Lemma G.7,

$$|\Phi\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} \in M^\perp. \quad (\text{G25})$$

- For any $|\Phi^z\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(0,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}, |\Phi^a\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(1,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}, |\Phi^b\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(0,1,0)}^{\text{paired}}, |\Phi^c\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(0,0,1)}^{\text{paired}}$, by Lemma D.9 (2) and Lemma G.7,

$$|\Phi^z\rangle - |\Phi^a\rangle - |\Phi^b\rangle - |\Phi^c\rangle \in M^\perp. \quad (\text{G26})$$

- For any $|\Phi^{a'}\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(l,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}, |\Phi^{a''}\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(l+1,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}$ with $1 \leq l \leq n_e - 2$, by Lemma D.9 (2), Lemma G.6 and Lemma G.7,

$$|\Phi^{a'}\rangle - |\Phi^{a''}\rangle \in M^\perp. \quad (\text{G27})$$

And similarly by replace a by b, c (and the corresponding configurations), we have

$$|\Phi^{b'}\rangle - |\Phi^{b''}\rangle \in M^\perp, \quad (\text{G28})$$

$$|\Phi^{c'}\rangle - |\Phi^{c''}\rangle \in M^\perp. \quad (\text{G29})$$

- For any $|\Phi^{az}\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(n_e-1,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}, |\Phi^{aa}\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(n_e,0,0)}^{\text{paired}}, |\Phi^{ab}\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(l,n_e-l,0)}^{\text{paired}}, |\Phi^{ac}\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(l,0,n_e-l)}^{\text{paired}}$ with $0 < l < n_e$, by Lemma D.9 (2), Lemma G.7 and Lemma G.8,

$$|\Phi^{az}\rangle - |\Phi^{aa}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{ab}\rangle) |\Phi^{ab}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{ac}\rangle) |\Phi^{ac}\rangle. \quad (\text{G30})$$

And similarly by replacing a, b, c (and the corresponding configurations), we have

$$|\Phi^{bz}\rangle - |\Phi^{bb}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{ab}\rangle) |\Phi^{ab}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{bc}\rangle) |\Phi^{bc}\rangle, \quad (\text{G31})$$

$$|\Phi^{cz}\rangle - |\Phi^{cc}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{ac}\rangle) |\Phi^{ac}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{bc}\rangle) |\Phi^{bc}\rangle. \quad (\text{G32})$$

We prove that there exists functions $s, w : \mathbb{N} \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, such that

$$\begin{aligned} |\Psi^*\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4} &= \frac{1}{s(0)} \sum_{(\text{G25})} (|\Phi\rangle - |\psi_0\rangle^{\otimes 4}) \\ &- w(0) \sum_{(\text{G26})} (|\Phi^z\rangle - |\Phi^a\rangle - |\Phi^b\rangle - |\Phi^c\rangle) \\ &- \sum_{l=1}^{n_e-2} w(l) \left(\sum_{(\text{G27})} (|\Phi^{a'}\rangle - |\Phi^{a''}\rangle) + \sum_{(\text{G28})} (|\Phi^{b'}\rangle - |\Phi^{b''}\rangle) + \sum_{(\text{G29})} (|\Phi^{c'}\rangle - |\Phi^{c''}\rangle) \right) \\ &- w(n_e-1) \sum_{(\text{G30})} (|\Phi^{az}\rangle - |\Phi^{aa}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{ab}\rangle) |\Phi^{ab}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{ac}\rangle) |\Phi^{ac}\rangle) \\ &- w(n_e-1) \sum_{(\text{G31})} (|\Phi^{bz}\rangle - |\Phi^{bb}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{ab}\rangle) |\Phi^{ab}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{bc}\rangle) |\Phi^{bc}\rangle) \\ &- w(n_e-1) \sum_{(\text{G32})} (|\Phi^{cz}\rangle - |\Phi^{cc}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{ac}\rangle) |\Phi^{ac}\rangle - \text{sign}(|\Phi^{bc}\rangle) |\Phi^{bc}\rangle). \end{aligned} \quad (\text{G33})$$

Here the subscripts indicate that the summation is taken over vectors in Eqs. (G25) to (G32).

Abusing the notation $s(\cdot, \cdot, \cdot)$ in the proof of Theorem F.4, we define $s(l) := s(l, 0, 0)$. $w(\cdot)$ is defined recursively as follows:

$$w(l) = \begin{cases} s(1)^{-3}(s(0)^{-1} - D), & l = 0, \\ s(2)^{-1}(s(0)s(1)^2w(0) - \frac{D}{3}), & l = 1, \\ s(l+1)^{-1}(s(l-1)w(l-1) - \frac{D}{3}), & 2 \leq l \leq n_e - 2, \\ \frac{1}{6s(n_e-1)s(n_e)} \cdot \frac{2}{\binom{n}{n_e}+2} \cdot \frac{3}{\binom{n}{n_e}^2-2\binom{n}{n_e}} \cdot \frac{D}{3}, & l = n_e - 1. \end{cases} \quad (\text{G34})$$

By comparing coefficients of vectors in both sides of Eq. (G33), we have to prove the following linear equations:

$$D = \frac{1}{s(0)} - s(1)^3w(0), \quad (\text{G35})$$

$$\frac{D}{3} = s(0)s(1)^2w(0) - s(2)w(1), \quad (\text{G36})$$

$$\frac{D}{3} = s(l-1)w(l-1) - s(l+1)w(l), \quad (2 \leq l \leq n_e - 2), \quad (\text{G37})$$

$$\frac{D}{3} = s(n_e-2)w(n_e-2) - \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_e-1} s(i, n_e-i, 0) \right)^2 s(n_e)w(n_e-1), \quad (\text{G38})$$

$$\frac{2}{\binom{n}{n_e}+2} \cdot \frac{D}{3} = 6s(n_e-1)s(n_e)w(n_e-1), \quad (\text{G39})$$

$$\frac{\binom{n}{n_e} - 2}{\binom{n}{n_e} + 2} \cdot \frac{D}{3} = \left(\sum_{i=1}^{n_e-1} s(i, n_e - i, 0) \right)^2 s(n_e - 1)w(n_e - 1). \quad (\text{G40})$$

Notice that Eqs. (G35) to (G37) and (G39) holds by definition, and one can check that Eq. (G40) also holds. To prove Eq. (G38), we multiply $s(l)$ on both sides of Eq. (G37) to get

$$s(l-1)s(l)w(l-1) - s(l)s(l+1)w(l) = \frac{D}{3}s(l), \quad 2 \leq l \leq n_e - 2. \quad (\text{G41})$$

Thus,

$$s(1)s(2)w(1) - s(n_e - 2)s(n_e - 1)w(n_e - 2) = \frac{D}{3} \sum_{l=2}^{n_e-2} s(l). \quad (\text{G42})$$

And Eq. (G38) follows. □

3. Proof of Theorem G.1 (3)

Proof of Theorem G.1 (3). It suffices to prove that if $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$ and at least two of a, b, c is non-zero, then $|\Phi\rangle \in \left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \cap \bigcap_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_4} \mathcal{H}_2^\tau \right)^\perp$. The rest follows immediately from Lemma D.14. Since we did not fall into case 1 or 2, it must be $\max_{v \in V} \deg v \geq 3$, and

- (1) $n \neq 2n_e$,
- (2) or G contains an odd ring as subgraph, and the size of the ring is smaller than n ,
- (3) or G is bipartite, but one part of G has an odd size.

We prove that $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$ in the first 2 cases, and $|\Phi\rangle \in \left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \cap \bigcap_{\tau \in \mathfrak{S}_4} \mathcal{H}_2^\tau \right)^\perp$ in the 3rd case. It suffices to prove the case where exactly two of a, b, c are non-zero and $2(a + b + c) = n$, since otherwise $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$ according to Lemma G.6. Assume without loss of generality that $a, b > 0$ and $2(a + b) = n$.

- (1) If $n \neq 2n_e$, then $a + b + c \leq \min(n_e, n - n_e) < \frac{n}{2}$. Hence, $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$ by Lemma G.6.
- (2) Suppose G contains a ring $G' = (V', E')$ as subgraph, where $V' = \{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$, $E' = \{(v_i, v_{i+1}) | i \in [r-1]\} \cup \{(v_1, v_r)\}$, and $3 \leq r \leq n$ is an odd number. Assume without loss of generality that $|\Phi_{v_1}\rangle = |I_{01}\rangle$, $|\Phi_{v_r}\rangle = |X_{00}\rangle$. Consider the vector sequence $(|\Phi^{(t)}\rangle)_{0 \leq t \leq T}$ where $T = 2r - 2$ such that

$$|\Phi^{(t)}\rangle = \begin{cases} |\Phi\rangle, & t = 0, \\ S_{t,t+1} |\Phi^{(t-1)}\rangle, & 1 \leq t < r, \\ S_{2r-t-2, 2r-t-1} |\Phi^{(t-1)}\rangle, & r \leq t < T, \\ S_{1r} |\Phi^{(t-1)}\rangle, & t = T. \end{cases} \quad (\text{G43})$$

It is easy to see that $|\Phi^{(T)}\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$. Construct a vector $|\Phi^{(t)}\rangle \pm |\Phi^{(t+1)}\rangle \in M^\perp$ for each $0 \leq t < T - 1$ according to Lemma D.9 (2), one can argue that $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$.

- (3) Suppose the two parts of G are V_1, V_2 , and $|V_1|$ is odd. We first show that for any $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$, $|\Phi'\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a',b',c')}^{\text{paired}}$, if $2(a + b) = 2(a' + b') = n$ and $a, b, a', b' > 0$, then

$$(-1)^{n_a(|\Phi\rangle; V_1)} |\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{n_a(|\Phi'\rangle; V_1)} |\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp. \quad (\text{G44})$$

Here we define $n_a(|\Phi\rangle; V_1) := n_{01}^I(|\Phi\rangle; V_1) + n_{10}^I(|\Phi\rangle; V_1)$. The proof is similar to Lemma G.7 and Lemma G.8, hence we only provide a proof sketch.

- Eq. (G44) holds if $a = a'$. — For any edge (u, v) , there exists $R_j \in \mathbf{R}$ such that $R_j = A_{pq}^{\text{qubit}}$. By Lemma D.9 (2) and Lemma C.9, we have $|\Phi\rangle - (-1)^{\Phi_u \odot \Phi_v} S_{uv} |\Phi\rangle \in \left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$. On the other hand, one checks that $n_a(|\Phi\rangle; V_1) - n_a(S_{uv} |\Phi\rangle; V_1) \equiv \Phi_u \odot \Phi_v \pmod{2}$. Hence, Eq. (G44) holds if $|\Phi'\rangle = S_{uv} |\Phi\rangle$. The connectivity of G then implies that Eq. (G44) holds if $\text{conf}(|\Phi\rangle) = \text{conf}(|\Phi'\rangle) = (a, b, 0)$.
- Eq. (G44) holds if $a = a' + 1$. — We may assume that there exists $(u, v) \in E$ and $|\Phi^z\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2, (a', b, 0)}^{\text{paired}}$ such that $|\Phi\rangle = F_{uv}^{12} |\Phi^z\rangle, |\Phi'\rangle = F_{uv}^{13} |\Phi^z\rangle$. By Lemma D.9 (2) and Lemma C.9, we have $|\Phi^z\rangle - |\Phi\rangle - |\Phi'\rangle - F_{uv}^{23} |\Phi^z\rangle \in \left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp$. By Lemma G.6, $|\Phi^z\rangle, F_{uv}^{23} |\Phi^z\rangle \in M^\perp$. Hence, $|\Phi\rangle + |\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp$. On the other hand, $n_a(|\Phi\rangle; V_1) - n_a(|\Phi'\rangle; V_1) = 1$. Hence, Eq. (G44) holds.

Remark that when $|V_1|$ is even, $-(-1)^{n_a(|\Phi\rangle; V_1)}$ coincides with $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)$ defined in Eq. (G2), while when $|V_1|$ is odd $\text{sign}(|\Phi\rangle)$ is always -1.

Next, we show that $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp + (\mathcal{H}_2^\tau)^\perp$ with $\tau = (1\ 4)$, which completes the proof. Let $|\Phi'\rangle = (S_\tau^b)^{\otimes n} |\Phi\rangle$. It is straightforward to check that $\text{conf}(|\Phi'\rangle) = (b, a, 0)$ and $n_a(|\Phi\rangle; V_1) + n_a(|\Phi'\rangle; V_1) = |V_1| \equiv 1 \pmod{2}$. Hence, by Eq. (G44) we have $|\Phi\rangle + |\Phi'\rangle \in M^\perp$. On the other hand, by definition of \mathcal{H}_2^τ we have $|\Phi\rangle - |\Phi'\rangle \in (\mathcal{H}_2^\tau)^\perp$. Thus, $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp + (\mathcal{H}_2^\tau)^\perp$. □

Appendix H: Proof of main result: Case 3 and 4

In this section we prove the exponential concentration of cost function for alternated dUCC ansatz containing both single and double (qubit) excitation rotations, with mild connectivity assumption (Theorem A.5 (3 and 4)). Examples of such ansatz include k -UCCSD and k -UCCGSD, k -UpCCGSD, k -qubit-UCCSD, k -qubit-UCCGSD.

Theorem H.1. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph with $|V| = n$ vertices, \mathbf{R} be a sequence of single excitation rotations $(A_{uv})_{(u,v) \in E}$ concatenated with at least one double excitation rotation B_{pqrs} . We have $|\Psi_{2, \infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2, \infty}^{\text{qUCCGS}}\rangle$.*

Proof. It suffices to prove that if $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2, (a, b, c)}^{\text{paired}}$ and at least two of a, b, c is non-zero, then $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$. The theorem then follows immediately from Lemma D.14. Assume without loss of generality that $a, b > 0, p > q > r > s$, and

$$|\Phi_p\rangle = |I_{01}\rangle, \quad |\Phi_q\rangle = |X_{00}\rangle, \quad |\Phi_r\rangle = |I_{10}\rangle, \quad |\Phi_s\rangle = |X_{11}\rangle. \quad (\text{H1})$$

Denote $\mathbf{z}_1 = \bigoplus_{a \in (s, r)} \Phi_a, \mathbf{z}_2 = \bigoplus_{a \in (r, q)} \Phi_a, \mathbf{z}_3 = \bigoplus_{a \in (q, p)} \Phi_a$. Consider the following state sequence:

$$\left| \Phi^{(0)} \right\rangle = |\Phi\rangle, \quad \left| \Phi^{(1)} \right\rangle = S_{sp} S_{rq} |\Phi\rangle, \quad \left| \Phi^{(2)} \right\rangle = S_{rq} \left| \Phi^{(1)} \right\rangle, \quad \left| \Phi^{(3)} \right\rangle = S_{sp} \left| \Phi^{(2)} \right\rangle. \quad (\text{H2})$$

Obviously $|\Phi^{(3)}\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$. By Lemma D.9 (3),

$$\left| \Phi^{(0)} \right\rangle - (-1)^{(\Phi_p \oplus \mathbf{z}_1 \oplus \mathbf{z}_3) \odot (\Phi_q \oplus \mathbf{z}_1 \oplus \mathbf{z}_3)} \left| \Phi^{(1)} \right\rangle \in \left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp. \quad (\text{H3})$$

By Lemma F.3,

$$\left| \Phi^{(1)} \right\rangle - (-1)^{(\Phi_q \oplus \mathbf{z}_2) \odot (\Phi_r \oplus \mathbf{z}_2)} \left| \Phi^{(2)} \right\rangle \in M^\perp, \quad (\text{H4})$$

$$\left| \Phi^{(2)} \right\rangle - (-1)^{(\Phi_p \oplus \mathbf{z}_1 \oplus \mathbf{z}_2 \oplus \mathbf{z}_3 \oplus \Phi_q \oplus \Phi_r) \odot (\Phi_s \oplus \mathbf{z}_1 \oplus \mathbf{z}_2 \oplus \mathbf{z}_3 \oplus \Phi_q \oplus \Phi_r)} \left| \Phi^{(3)} \right\rangle \in M^\perp. \quad (\text{H5})$$

Combining Eqs. (H3) to (H5) to eliminate $|\Phi^{(1)}\rangle, |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle$ we get $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$, since $|\Phi^{(0)}\rangle = |\Phi^{(3)}\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$. □

For alternated qubit dUCC ansatz, we make mild assumption about the topology G as well as the position of qubit double excitation rotations.

Theorem H.2. *Let $G = (V, E)$ be a connected graph with $|V| = n$ vertices and $\max_{v \in V} \deg(v) \geq 3$, \mathbf{R} be a sequence of qubit single excitation rotations $(A_{uv}^{\text{qubit}})_{(u,v) \in E}$ concatenated with at least one qubit double excitation rotation B_{pqrs}^{qubit} . Assume, only when $n = 2n_e$ and G is a bipartite graph with two non-empty even parts $V = V_1 \cup V_2$, that $|V_1 \cap \{p, q, r, s\}| = 2$. We have $|\Psi_{2, \infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2, \infty}^{\text{qUCCGS}}\rangle$.*

Proof. If $n \neq 2n_e$ or G is not a bipartite graph with two non-empty even parts, then $\dim M = 1$ (Theorem G.1 (3)), and it must be $|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\mathbf{R}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{qUCCGS}}\rangle$. Otherwise, we show that if $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathcal{S}_{2,(a,b,c)}^{\text{paired}}$ and at least two of a, b, c is non-zero, then $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$. The theorem then follows immediately from Lemma D.14. Similar to the proof of Theorem H.1, we assume Eq. (H1), and consider the paired state sequence Eq. (H2). By Lemma D.9 (4),

$$|\Phi^{(0)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(1)}\rangle \in \left(M \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}}\right)^\perp \cap \mathcal{H}_2^{\text{paired}} \subseteq M^\perp. \quad (\text{H6})$$

By Lemma G.7,

$$|\Phi^{(1)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle, |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle + |\Phi^{(3)}\rangle \in M^\perp. \quad (\text{H7})$$

Combining Eqs. (H6) and (H7) to eliminate $|\Phi^{(1)}\rangle, |\Phi^{(2)}\rangle$ we get $|\Phi\rangle \in M^\perp$, since $|\Phi^{(0)}\rangle = |\Phi^{(3)}\rangle = |\Phi\rangle$. \square

As an immediate corollary, the moment vector of the 2nd moment at infinity step of k -UCCSD and k -UCCGSD, k -UpCCGSD, k -qubit-UCCSD, k -qubit-UCCGSD are the same.

Corollary H.3. *We have*

$$|\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{UCCSD}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{UCCGSD}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{UpCCGSD}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{qUCCSD}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{qUCCGSD}}\rangle = |\Psi_{2,\infty}^{\text{qUCCGS}}\rangle. \quad (\text{H8})$$

With moment vector of the 2nd moment characterized, we can calculate the 2nd moment of cost function for any observables. Case 3 and 4 of main result is stated formally as following corollary.

Corollary H.4 (Main result, Case 3 and 4). *Let \mathbf{R} be defined in Theorems H.1 and H.2, and $C(\boldsymbol{\theta}; U_k^{\mathbf{R}}, H_{\text{el}})$ be the cost function defined in Eq. (A16) where H_{el} is an electronic structure Hamiltonian defined in Eq. (A18). $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C)$ is the same as Corollary G.3 (3).*

Notice that $\lim_{k \rightarrow \infty} \text{Var}(C) = \exp(-\Theta(n))$.

-
- [1] A. 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, *Nature communications* **5**, 4213 (2014).
 - [2] A. Kandala, A. Mezzacapo, K. Temme, M. Takita, M. Brink, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, Hardware-efficient variational quantum eigensolver for small molecules and quantum magnets, *nature* **549**, 242 (2017).
 - [3] P. J. O'Malley, R. Babbush, I. D. Kivlichan, J. Romero, J. R. McClean, R. Barends, J. Kelly, P. Roushan, A. Tranter, N. Ding, *et al.*, Scalable quantum simulation of molecular energies, *Physical Review X* **6**, 031007 (2016).
 - [4] Y. Nam, J.-S. Chen, N. C. Pientz, K. Wright, C. Delaney, D. Maslov, K. R. Brown, S. Allen, J. M. Amini, J. Apisdorf, *et al.*, Ground-state energy estimation of the water molecule on a trapped-ion quantum computer, *npj Quantum Information* **6**, 33 (2020).
 - [5] J. I. Colless, V. V. Ramasesh, D. Dahlen, M. S. Blok, M. E. Kimchi-Schwartz, J. R. McClean, J. Carter, W. A. de Jong, and I. Siddiqi, Computation of molecular spectra on a quantum processor with an error-resilient algorithm, *Physical Review X* **8**, 011021 (2018).
 - [6] D. A. Fedorov, B. Peng, N. Govind, and Y. Alexeev, VQE method: a short survey and recent developments, *Materials Theory* **6**, 1 (2022).
 - [7] P. K. Barkoutsos, J. F. Gonthier, I. Sokolov, N. Moll, G. Salis, A. Fuhrer, M. Ganzhorn, D. J. Egger, M. Troyer, A. Mezzacapo, *et al.*, Quantum algorithms for electronic structure calculations: Particle-hole hamiltonian and optimized wavefunction expansions, *Physical Review A* **98**, 022322 (2018).
 - [8] D. Wecker, M. B. Hastings, and M. Troyer, Progress towards practical quantum variational algorithms, *Physical Review A* **92**, 042303 (2015).
 - [9] A. G. Taube and R. J. Bartlett, New perspectives on unitary coupled-cluster theory, *International journal of quantum chemistry* **106**, 3393 (2006).
 - [10] J. Lee, W. J. Huggins, M. Head-Gordon, and K. B. Whaley, Generalized unitary coupled cluster wave functions for quantum computation, *Journal of chemical theory and computation* **15**, 311 (2018).
 - [11] P.-L. Dallaire-Demers, J. Romero, L. Veis, S. Sim, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, Low-depth circuit ansatz for preparing correlated fermionic states on a quantum computer, *Quantum Science and Technology* **4**, 045005 (2019).
 - [12] N. Hatano and M. Suzuki, Finding exponential product formulas of higher orders, in *Quantum annealing and other optimization methods* (Springer, 2005) pp. 37–68.
 - [13] F. A. Evangelista, G. K. Chan, and G. E. Scuseria, Exact parameterization of fermionic wave functions via unitary coupled cluster theory, *The Journal of chemical physics* **151** (2019).

- [14] G. A. Quantum, Collaborators*†, F. Arute, K. Arya, R. Babbush, D. Bacon, J. C. Bardin, R. Barends, S. Boixo, M. Broughton, B. B. Buckley, *et al.*, Hartree-fock on a superconducting qubit quantum computer, *Science* **369**, 1084 (2020).
- [15] J. R. McClean, S. Boixo, V. N. Smelyanskiy, R. Babbush, and H. Neven, Barren plateaus in quantum neural network training landscapes, *Nature communications* **9**, 4812 (2018).
- [16] M. Cerezo and P. J. Coles, Higher order derivatives of quantum neural networks with barren plateaus, *Quantum Science and Technology* **6**, 035006 (2021).
- [17] A. Arrasmith, M. Cerezo, P. Czarnik, L. Cincio, and P. J. Coles, Effect of barren plateaus on gradient-free optimization, *Quantum* **5**, 558 (2021).
- [18] M. Cerezo, A. Sone, T. Volkoff, L. Cincio, and P. J. Coles, Cost function dependent barren plateaus in shallow parametrized quantum circuits, *Nature communications* **12**, 1791 (2021).
- [19] C. O. Marrero, M. Kieferová, and N. Wiebe, Entanglement-induced barren plateaus, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040316 (2021).
- [20] S. Wang, E. Fontana, M. Cerezo, K. Sharma, A. Sone, L. Cincio, and P. J. Coles, Noise-induced barren plateaus in variational quantum algorithms, *Nature communications* **12**, 6961 (2021).
- [21] Z. Holmes, K. Sharma, M. Cerezo, and P. J. Coles, Connecting ansatz expressibility to gradient magnitudes and barren plateaus, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 010313 (2022).
- [22] A. Pesah, M. Cerezo, S. Wang, T. Volkoff, A. T. Sornborger, and P. J. Coles, Absence of barren plateaus in quantum convolutional neural networks, *Physical Review X* **11**, 041011 (2021).
- [23] C. Zhao and X.-S. Gao, Analyzing the barren plateau phenomenon in training quantum neural networks with the ZX-calculus, *Quantum* **5**, 466 (2021).
- [24] Z. Liu, L.-W. Yu, L.-M. Duan, and D.-L. Deng, Presence and absence of barren plateaus in tensor-network based machine learning, *Physical Review Letters* **129**, 270501 (2022).
- [25] E. C. Martín, K. Plekhanov, and M. Lubasch, Barren plateaus in quantum tensor network optimization, *Quantum* **7**, 974 (2023).
- [26] H. R. Grimsley, G. S. Barron, E. Barnes, S. E. Economou, and N. J. Mayhall, Adaptive, problem-tailored variational quantum eigensolver mitigates rough parameter landscapes and barren plateaus, *npj Quantum Information* **9**, 19 (2023).
- [27] E. Grant, L. Wossnig, M. Ostaszewski, and M. Benedetti, An initialization strategy for addressing barren plateaus in parametrized quantum circuits, *Quantum* **3**, 214 (2019).
- [28] J. Napp, Quantifying the barren plateau phenomenon for a model of unstructured variational ansätze, arXiv preprint arXiv:2203.06174 (2022).
- [29] H. L. Tang, V. Shkolnikov, G. S. Barron, H. R. Grimsley, N. J. Mayhall, E. Barnes, and S. E. Economou, qubit-adaptive: An adaptive algorithm for constructing hardware-efficient ansätze on a quantum processor, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 020310 (2021).
- [30] A. Arrasmith, Z. Holmes, M. Cerezo, and P. J. Coles, Equivalence of quantum barren plateaus to cost concentration and narrow gorges, *Quantum Science and Technology* **7**, 045015 (2022).
- [31] I. Halperin, The product of projection operators, *Acta Sci. Math.(Szeged)* **23**, 96 (1962).
- [32] A. Jacot, F. Gabriel, and C. Hongler, Neural tangent kernel: Convergence and generalization in neural networks, *Advances in neural information processing systems* **31** (2018).
- [33] I. 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, *Physical review letters* **120**, 110501 (2018).
- [34] M. Cerezo, A. Arrasmith, R. Babbush, S. C. Benjamin, S. Endo, K. Fujii, J. R. McClean, K. Mitarai, X. Yuan, L. Cincio, *et al.*, Variational quantum algorithms, *Nature Reviews Physics* **3**, 625 (2021).
- [35] H. R. Grimsley, S. E. Economou, E. Barnes, and N. J. Mayhall, An adaptive variational algorithm for exact molecular simulations on a quantum computer, *Nature communications* **10**, 3007 (2019).
- [36] The term “dUCC” was coined in [13], where it was used to refer to any sequence of excitation rotations (similar to an 1-step Trotterization but conceptually different), and was proved to be able to express the exact FCI state in the limit $k \rightarrow \infty$ even when only single and double excitations are involved. We add the “alternated” prefix to emphasize the alternative structure.
- [37] Jordan-Wigner transformation is also employed in the canonical implementation. Other transformation such as Bravyi-Kitaev’s may be investigated in future work.