

Quantum Eigensolver for General Matrices

Xiao-Ming Zhang,^{1,2} Yukun Zhang,² Wenhao He,^{3,4} and Xiao Yuan^{2,*}

¹*School of Physics, South China Normal University, Guangzhou 510006, China*

²*Center on Frontiers of Computing Studies, School of Computer Science, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

³*School of Physics, Peking University, Beijing 100871, China*

⁴*Center for Computational Science and Engineering, Massachusetts Institute of Technology, Cambridge, MA 02139, USA*

The eigenvalue problem, a cornerstone in linear algebra, provides profound insights into studying matrix properties. Quantum algorithms addressing this problem have hitherto been constrained to special normal matrices assuming spectral decomposition, leaving the extension to general matrices an open challenge. In this work, we present a novel family of quantum algorithms tailored for solving the eigenvalue problem for general matrices, encompassing scenarios with complex eigenvalues or even defective matrices. Our approach begins by tackling the task of searching for an eigenvalue without additional constraints. For diagonalizable matrices, our algorithm has $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ complexity with an error ε , achieving the nearly Heisenberg scaling. Subsequently, we study the identification of eigenvalues closest to a specified point or line, extending the results for ground energy and energy gap problems in Hermitian matrices. We achieve an accuracy scaling of $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$ for general diagonalizable matrices, further refining to $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-1})$ under the condition of real eigenvalues or constant distance from the reference point. The algorithm's foundation lies in the synergy of three techniques: the relationship between eigenvalues of matrix A and the minimum singular value of $A - \mu I$, quantum singular value threshold subroutine extended from quantum singular-value estimation, and problem-specific searching algorithms. Our algorithms find applications in diverse domains, including estimating the relaxation time of Markov chains, solving Liouvillian gaps in open quantum systems, and verifying PT-symmetry broken/unbroken phases. These applications underscore the significance of our quantum eigensolvers for problems across various disciplines.

Eigenvalue, a fundamental concept in linear algebra, represents scalar factors by which a matrix transformation stretches or compresses space. Formally, complex value λ_j and normalized vector $|v_j\rangle$ are considered as the eigenvalue and the corresponding eigenvector of matrix A if

$$A|v_j\rangle = \lambda_j|v_j\rangle. \quad (1)$$

The applications of quantum computing in solving Eq. (1) have mostly been restricted to the Hermitian cases $A = A^\dagger$ [1–3], where λ_j are real, and $|v_j\rangle$ forms an orthonormal basis. For a general matrix, however, we encounter complex and even defective eigenvalues, and eigenvectors are not necessarily orthogonal. While quantum computing naturally favours Hermiticity, its applicability in solving Eq. (1) for non-Hermitian matrices remains an outstanding question.

Relating to the eigenvalues, one can perform Jordan decomposition of A as

$$A = P\Lambda P^{-1}, \quad (2)$$

where Λ is a matrix in the Jordan canonical form (JCF), whose diagonal elements correspond to the eigenvalues, and P is an invertible matrix. A is called *diagonalizable* if Λ is diagonal. Note that a diagonalizable matrix is not necessarily Hermitian since P is generally non-unitary. Most generally, Λ is a block-diagonal matrix *as close to a diagonal matrix as possible* $\Lambda = \Lambda_1 \oplus \Lambda_2 \oplus \dots \oplus \Lambda_M$ with $M \leq N$. Each Jordan block Λ_j is in the form of

$$\Lambda_j = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_j & 1 & & \\ & \lambda_j & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & 1 \\ & & & \lambda_j \end{pmatrix}. \quad (3)$$

If there exists a nontrivial Jordan block with a dimension larger than one, we call A a *defective* matrix. In this case, we have strictly $M < N$ and there are less than N linearly independent eigenvectors.

It is worth noting that eigenvalues are fundamentally different from singular values. There is no direct correspondence between eigenvalues and singular values in general unless the matrix is normal with spectral decomposition. Therefore, the eigenvalue problem does not trivially fit into the framework of quantum singular value transformation [4, 5].

Here, we propose quantum eigensolver algorithms for general matrices. The complexity of the algorithms for solving Eq. (1) depends on two properties of the matrix A . The first one is how defective A is, which can be formally defined as the largest dimension of the Jordan block $m'_{\max} \equiv \max_j \dim(\Lambda_j)$. The second one is the condition number of the matrix P , denoted as κ_P . Regarding the nonuniqueness of the Jordan decomposition, we define κ_P as the minimum value for all possible P in the following text. In our discussion, we assume that we have knowledge of the upper bound of both quantities, i.e. m_{\max} and K satisfying $m_{\max} \geq m'_{\max}$ and $K \geq \kappa_P$.

Eigenvalue Problems. We first summarize the detailed definitions of the eigenvalue problems. The first problem we consider is to output an estimation of an eigenvalue defined as follows.




FIG. 1: Sketch of (a) the energy gap for Hermitian matrices with reference point $P = 0$, (b) the point gap for non-Hermitian matrices with reference point $P = 0$, and (c) the line gap for non-Hermitian matrices with reference line $L = \{ib, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$.

Problem 1 (Eigenvalue searching). *Given a square matrix A with $\|A\| \leq 1$, output an estimation of an eigenvalue $\hat{\lambda}$, such that $\min |\hat{\lambda} - \lambda| \leq \varepsilon$ for some error ε , where λ is one of the eigenvalue solutions to Eq. (1).*

Here, $\|\cdot\|$ refers to the spectral norm of a matrix. Problem 1 has no restrictions on the eigenvalue. We may require that the eigenvalue to be estimated have certain properties. Take the Hermitian matrix as an example, there are two important questions related to eigenvalues. The first one is the lowest eigenvalue problem. For a quantum many-body system described by a Hermitian Hamiltonian, this corresponds to the ground-state energy of the system [1–3]. The second one is the eigenvalue gap problem, which plays a critical role in many-body physics phenomena, such as conductivity and superconductivity. Extending from Hermitian to non-Hermitian matrices with complex eigenvalues, the generalization of both questions is not unique [6, 7], which correspond to the eigenvalue searching problems under different restrictions. In particular, we consider the following two problems.

Problem 2. *Given a square matrix $\|A\| \leq 1$, a reference point $P \in \mathcal{D}(0, 1)$ and accuracy $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Let $g \equiv \min_{\lambda_j \neq P} |\lambda_j - P|$, $\mathcal{S} \equiv \{\lambda_j | |P - \lambda_j| \in [g, g + \varepsilon]\}$. The goal is to output the gap estimation g' and eigenvalue estimation λ' , such that $|g' - g| \leq \varepsilon$ and $|\lambda' - \lambda_j| \leq \varepsilon$ for some $\lambda_j \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Problem 3. *Given a square matrix $\|A\| \leq 1$, a reference line L in the complex plain such that $L \cup \mathcal{D}(0, 1) \neq \emptyset$, and accuracy $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Let $g = \min_{\lambda_j \notin L, p \in L} |\lambda_j - p|$, $\mathcal{S} \equiv \{\lambda_j | \min_{p \in L} |\lambda_j - p| \in [g, g + \varepsilon]\}$. The goal is to output the gap estimation g' and eigenvalue estimation λ' , such that $|g' - g| \leq \varepsilon$ and $|\lambda' - \lambda_j| \leq \varepsilon$ for some $\lambda_j \in \mathcal{S}$.*

Here, we have defined the disk as $\mathcal{D}(\mu, r) \equiv \{x | |x - \mu| \leq r\}$. In case P or L have no overlap with eigenvalues, Problem 2 or 3 corresponds to finding an eigenvalue that is closest to the reference point P , or line L (up to an accuracy ε). Therefore, they can be considered as two different ways of the generalization of the ground energy problem for Hermitian matrices. On the other hand, when P or L overlaps with at least one of the

eigenvalues, Problems 2 and 3 become *Point gap*, or *Line gap* problems [6–8]. As illustrated in Fig. 1, they can be considered as two different ways of the generalizations from the energy gap problem of the Hermitian case. We note that the point gap and line gap are different. In some cases, both point gaps and line gaps are non-vanishing. But there exists matrices with non-vanishing point gap, but zero line gap. Physics systems with Hamiltonian corresponding these two cases may emerge from different symmetries and topologies [6–8]. In particular, the second case does not have a Hermitian counterpart, the corresponding physics system is also named to be *genuinely non-Hermitian* [7].

Furthermore, eigenvalue and eigenvector are related in general. We discuss in [9] that an accurate eigenvalue estimation implies a good approximation to the corresponding eigenvectors. In the remaining of the main text, however, we focus on the eigenvalue problems.

Results. Here, we introduce our results for the three eigenvalue problems. We only summarize the results in the main text and refer to [9] for details.

We first discuss the assumptions of the algorithms. Given a general square matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ with $N = 2^n$, we consider its block encoding that provides unitary access to the matrix. For a unitary \mathcal{O}_A , we say it is a block encoding of A if it encodes the desirable matrix A such that $A = (|0^a\rangle \langle 0^a| \otimes I) \mathcal{O}_A (|0^a\rangle \langle 0^a| \otimes I)$, with I the N -dimensional identity. Note that we have neglected a scaling factor compared to the conventional definition as it can be absorbed in matrix A . Block-encoding is a standard way of encoding the classical description of a matrix to quantum operations [4, 5, 10–12]. In practice, \mathcal{O}_A may be constructed by sparse-access input model or linear combination of unitaries (LCU) [10], depending on the form of A being presented.

For Hermitian matrices, the eigenvalue problem is typically solved by assuming the existence of an initial state that can be prepared to have a reasonable lower-bounded overlap with the targeted eigenstate [1, 2]. Otherwise, the problems are in general QMA-competent [13]. Here, a similar assumption is also made for general matrices. We introduce an oracle \mathcal{P}_A , which given an input μ satisfying $|\mu| \leq 1$, outputs a quantum

state $|\psi_\mu^{\text{ini}}\rangle$ satisfying $|\langle\psi_\mu^{\text{ini}}|u_0(\mu)\rangle| \geq \gamma$. Here, $|u_0(\mu)\rangle$ is the right singular vector of the matrix $A - \mu I$ corresponding to its smallest singular value. \mathcal{P}_A may be constructed quantumly, with methods like variational quantum algorithms [14–16] or adiabatic state preparation [1]. Alternatively, one may find an approximated model of A whose eigenvalue can be calculated efficiently on a classical computer.

Here and after, we assume that \mathcal{O}_A , \mathcal{P}_A , and their inverses can be queried efficiently. For simplicity, we also count the query to controlled \mathcal{O}_A or \mathcal{P}_A as a single query to them.

For Problem 1, we have the following result.

Theorem 1. *With success probability at least $1 - \delta$, Problem 1 can be solved with*

$$\tilde{O}\left(K^3 \varepsilon^{-3m_{\max}+2} \gamma^{-1}\right) \quad (4)$$

uses of the query to \mathcal{O}_A , \mathcal{P}_A and their inverses, and extra single- and two-qubit gates.

Here $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$ omits the polylogarithmic dependence on $1/\delta$, $1/\varepsilon$, K , and N . We also clarify that for qubit systems, the extra single- and two-qubit gate number contains a dependency of qubit number $O(n)$, which is however neglected by \tilde{O} .

When $m_{\max} = 1$, i.e. A is diagonalizable, Eq. (4) reduces to $\tilde{O}(K^3 \varepsilon^{-1} \gamma^{-1})$, achieving a nearly-optimal dependency on ε , which is also called the Heisenberg scaling. Besides, the dependency on K can be reduced if we have further restrictions on A . For example, if the eigenvalue is promised to be real, the complexity can be further reduced to $\tilde{O}(K^2 \varepsilon^{-1} \gamma^{-1})$.

We achieve the following result for Problems 2 and 3.

Theorem 2. *Promised that $g \geq \varepsilon$. With success probability at least $1 - \delta$, Problem 2 and 3 can be solved with*

$$\tilde{O}(K^3 \varepsilon^{-3m_{\max}-1} \gamma^{-1}) \quad (5)$$

queries to \mathcal{O}_A , \mathcal{P}_A and their inverses, and extra single- and two-qubit gates.

For diagonalizable matrix, the accuracy dependency is $\tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{-2})$. It is open whether the above theorem is optimal or not. The complication is that different from Problem 1, we should exclude the possibility for eigenvalues with a gap smaller than g . Besides, if more restrictions exist on the eigenvalue distribution, the query complexity may be further reduced. For example, if we are promised that the eigenvalues are *real*, or in a circle, the complexity can be reduced to $\tilde{O}(K^2 \varepsilon^{-1} \gamma^{-1})$, achieving the Heisenberg scaling. The former is consistent with results for Hermitian case [2], while the latter is consistent with the result of quantum phase estimation [17].

Below, we briefly introduce the main idea of our algorithms achieving Theorem 1 and 2 and refer to [9] for details. To

begin with, we consider an equivalent form of Eq. (1) as

$$(A - \lambda_j I)|v_j\rangle = 0. \quad (6)$$

Our algorithm is based on the following key observation.

$$\sigma_0(A - \mu I) = 0 \text{ if and only if } \mu \text{ is the solution to Eq. (6),}$$

where $\sigma_0(\cdot)$ is the minimum singular value of a matrix. Specifically, eigenvalue problems can be transferred to the problem of searching for μ , such that $A - \mu I$ has zero singular values. In practice, however, we can only estimate the singular value up to a certain accuracy. To this end, we define a cost function

$$C(\mu) \equiv \sigma_0(A - \mu I). \quad (7)$$

The distance from μ to an eigenvalue can be bounded by $C(\mu)$ in the following lemma.

Lemma 1. *When A is diagonalizable, we have*

$$C(\mu) \leq \min_j |\mu - \lambda_j| \leq \kappa_P C(\mu). \quad (8)$$

When A is defective, we have

$$C(\mu) \leq \min_j |\mu - \lambda_j| \leq 3(\kappa_P C(\mu))^{1/m_{\max}}. \quad (9)$$

As we have assumed that $\kappa_P \leq K$, Lemma 1 indicates that for diagonalizable matrix, it suffice to find μ satisfying $C(\mu) \leq \varepsilon K^{-1}$ to achieve accuracy $\min |\mu - \lambda_j| \leq \varepsilon$, and similar for defective matrices.

To solve Problem 1, the remaining task is to search for a μ with small $C(\mu)$. Our searching method is based on a subroutine, called the singular value threshold subroutine (SVTS). The SVTS gives us the following result.

Lemma 2 (SVTS). *Let $\mu \in \mathcal{D}(0, 1)$, $\tilde{\varepsilon}, \delta \in (0, 1)$ be the centre, threshold and success probability of the SVTS. We define $O_C(\mu, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \delta)$ as the output of SVTS, which satisfies the following*

$$\Pr[O_C(\mu, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \delta) = \text{True} | C(\mu) \leq \tilde{\varepsilon}/2] \geq 1 - \delta \quad (10a)$$

$$\Pr[O_C(\mu, \tilde{\varepsilon}, \delta) = \text{False} | C(\mu) \geq \tilde{\varepsilon}] \geq 1 - \delta \quad (10b)$$

Then, SVTS can be constructed with $\tilde{O}(\tilde{\varepsilon}^{-1} \gamma^{-1})$ uses of the query to \mathcal{O}_A , \mathcal{P}_A and their inverses, and extra single- and two-qubit gates.

In [9], we prove Lemma 2 by constructing SVTS with quantum singular value transformation [4]. Note that there is a “blur” region $C(\mu) \in (\tilde{\varepsilon}/2, \tilde{\varepsilon})$, in which the output of the oracle is arbitrary. The runtime of SVTS depends on the range of the blur region.

Based on Lemma 2, one can find the eigenvalue with brute force search using SVTS, but it requires total $O(1/\varepsilon^2)$ queries to SVTS. We develop a divide-and-conquer method for eigenvalue searching, which uses only $O(\text{polylog}(\varepsilon^{-1}))$ queries to SVTS, and achieve scaling claimed in Theorem 1.

Problem 2 and 3 are more challenging. Take Problem 2 as an example, the complication is that to claim g' is a good estimation of g with accuracy ε , we should ensure that there is no eigenvalue in the region $\mathcal{D}(P, g' - \varepsilon)/\mathcal{D}(P, \varepsilon)$. Our iterative strategy is as follows. Suppose at the j th step, we are confidence that $g \in [R_j^{\min}, R_j^{\max}]$. Let $\Delta_j = R_j^{\max} - R_j^{\min}$, we reduce Δ_j by querying a set of SVTSs. The process is terminated until $\Delta_j \leq \varepsilon$. After that, we search for an eigenvalue near the circle with radius g' .

Now we discuss the applications of our results in different problems.

Applications 1: Relaxation time of Markov chain. Markov chains model systems transitioning between states with probabilities determined solely by their current state, with broad applications in both natural and social science [18–22]. A finite Markov chain can be described by the stochastic matrix. In this case, we have $\sum_i A_{i,j} = 1$ for each column j . For every finite Markov chain, the largest eigenvalue is 1. So we can define the absolute spectral gap of A as $g_{\text{mar}} \equiv 1 - \max_{\lambda_j \neq 1} |\lambda_j|$. The relaxation time, defined as $t_{\text{rel}} \equiv 1/g_{\text{mar}}$, is a crucial parameter in understanding the properties of the Markov chain. In particular, for irreducible, time-reversible Markov chain, t_{rel} can be used to upper bound the mixing time, i.e. the time converging to the stationary distribution [22].

With a similar strategy to solving Problem 2 and 3, we can estimate the relaxation time with complexity consistent with Theorem 2 as follows.

Theorem 3. *Suppose A is a stochastic matrix describing a Markov chain. Promised that the relaxation time t_{rel} is larger than $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$. Then, t_{rel} can be estimated to accuracy ε with $\tilde{O}(K^3 \varepsilon^{-3m_{\text{max}}+1} \gamma^{-1})$ queries to $\mathcal{O}_A, \mathcal{P}_A$ and their inverses, and extra single- and two-qubit gates.*

Applications 2: Liouvillian gap for open quantum systems. The Liouvillian gap (LG) is an important quantity characterizing the decaying behaviour and phase transitions of open quantum systems [23–28]. The dynamics of an open quantum system can be described by the Lindblad master equation $\dot{\rho} = -i[H, \rho] + \sum_{\mu} \left(2L_{\mu}\rho L_{\mu}^{\dagger} - \left\{ L_{\mu}^{\dagger}L_{\mu}, \rho \right\} \right) \equiv \mathcal{L}(\rho)$ for the Hamiltonian H and dissipators L_{μ} . Because the Liouvillian operator \mathcal{L} is a linear superoperator, we can perform vectorization of $\dot{\rho} = \mathcal{L}(\rho)$ as $\dot{\tilde{\rho}} = \tilde{\mathcal{L}} \cdot \tilde{\rho}$, where $\tilde{\rho} = \sum_{m,n} \rho_{mn} |m\rangle \otimes |n\rangle$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = -iH \otimes I + iI \otimes H^T + \sum_{\mu} \left(2L_{\mu} \otimes L_{\mu}^* - L_{\mu}^{\dagger}L_{\mu} \otimes I - I \otimes L_{\mu}^T L_{\mu}^* \right)$. Let $\lambda_j(\tilde{\mathcal{L}})$ be the eigenvalues of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ ordered according to the magnitude of the real part, i.e. $\text{Re}\lambda_0(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}) \geq \text{Re}\lambda_1(\tilde{\mathcal{L}}) \geq \dots$. For a general Lindbladian, there exists at least one steady state ρ_{ness} satisfying $\tilde{\rho}_{\text{ness}} = \tilde{\mathcal{L}}\tilde{\rho}_{\text{ness}} = 0$, resulting in $\lambda_0 = 0$. The LG is formally defined as

$$g_L \equiv |\text{Re}\lambda_1(\tilde{\mathcal{L}})|. \quad (11)$$

g_L has a close relation to the relaxation behaviour of the open quantum system. In most cases, the relaxation time τ of an open quantum system satisfies $\tau \lesssim 1/g_L$ [26].

For many-body systems, analytic solutions to LG only exist for some special cases, while numerical calculation with classical computers suffers from the exponential increase of the Hilbert space. On the other hand, LG can potentially be solved with a quantum computer efficiently based on our quantum eigensolver. One may assume that the vectorized Liouvillian has a Jordan decomposition $\tilde{\mathcal{L}} = P\Lambda P^{-1}$, where the condition number of satisfies $\kappa_P \leq K$. We may also assume that $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ is diagonalizable. Compared to Problem 3, LG is a line gap problem with $L = \{ib, b \in \mathbb{R}\}$. According to Theorem 2, we have the following result.

Theorem 4. *Promised that $g_L \geq \varepsilon$ and $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ is diagonalizable and $\|\tilde{\mathcal{L}}\| \leq 1$. With success probability at least $1 - \delta$, g_L can be estimated to accuracy ε with*

$$\tilde{O}(K^3 \varepsilon^{-2} \gamma^{-1}) \quad (12)$$

queries to $\mathcal{O}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}, \mathcal{P}_{\tilde{\mathcal{L}}}$ and their inverses, and extra single- and two-qubit gates.

In most open quantum system models, $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$ can be decomposed into the linear combination of Pauli strings. Accordingly, the block encoding of $\tilde{\mathcal{L}}$, up to a rescaling factor, can be constructed by the linear combination of unitaries technique [29].

Applications 3: PT-broken/unbroken phase classification. In quantum systems described by non-Hermitian operators, the eigenvalue does not necessarily to be complex. A typical example is the parity-time (PT) symmetry operators [30–34]. An operator is called PT symmetry if it is invariant under simultaneous application of parity-reversal operator \mathcal{P} and time-reversal operator \mathcal{T} respectively. The eigenvalues of the PT-symmetry operator can either be real only or appear as complex conjugate pairs. The former possesses PT-symmetry and is therefore categorized as PT-unbroken phase when the matrix is diagonalizable [34, 35]. In the second case, PT-symmetry is simultaneously broken and therefore categorized as the PT-broken phase. The transition between these two phases is of broad interest with applications in quantum sensing [36, 37].

To verify whether the quantum system is in the PT-broken or PT-unbroken phase, it suffices to determine if it contains complex eigenvalues. In practice, we may allow a certain error ε . When all eigenvalues are at most ε distance away from the real axis, the matrix is categorized as PT-unbroken. With a mild modification of the algorithms for solving Problem 3, one can solve this problem with a similar complexity claimed in Theorem 2. More specifically, we have the following result.

Theorem 5. *Given a square, diagonalizable matrix $\|A\| \leq 1$. With success probability $1 - \delta$, one can verify whether A has eigenvalues satisfying $|\text{Im}[\lambda_j]| \geq \varepsilon$, or all eigenvalues are in the real axis, with $\tilde{O}(K^3 \varepsilon^{-2} \gamma^{-1})$ queries to $\mathcal{O}_A, \mathcal{P}_A$ and their inverses, and extra single- and two-qubit gates.*

Based on Theorem 5, we can characterize the PT-broken/unbroken phase readily under the diagonalizable assumption.

Discussions. We have developed quantum algorithms for solving eigenvalue problems. The idea can also be generalized to the study of the properties related to eigenvectors. Future works include finding more applications in physics, data science, and other related fields.

Acknowledgement. We thank Seth Lloyd, Xiaogang Li and Dong Yuan for their helpful discussions. This work is supported by the National Natural Science Foundation of China (Grant No. 12175003, No. 12361161602, and No. 12247124), NSAF (Grant No. U2330201), and Project funded by China Postdoctoral Science Foundation (Grant No. 2023T160004)

Note-added. Another related work has appeared during the preparation of this work [38]. In Theorem 3 and Theorem 12 of Ref [38], eigenvalue estimation is discussed based on stronger assumptions that initial state with $O(\varepsilon)$ distance to the corresponding eigenvector can be prepared.

* Electronic address: xiaoyuan@pku.edu.cn

- [1] T. Albash and D. A. Lidar, Adiabatic quantum computation, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **90**, 015002 (2018).
- [2] L. Lin and Y. Tong, Near-optimal ground state preparation, *Quantum* **4**, 372 (2020).
- [3] 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).
- [4] A. Gilyén, Y. Su, G. H. Low, and N. Wiebe, Quantum singular value transformation and beyond: exponential improvements for quantum matrix arithmetics, in *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing* (2019) pp. 193–204.
- [5] J. M. Martyn, Z. M. Rossi, A. K. Tan, and I. L. Chuang, Grand unification of quantum algorithms, *PRX Quantum* **2**, 040203 (2021).
- [6] K. Kawabata, K. Shiozaki, M. Ueda, and M. Sato, Symmetry and topology in non-hermitian physics, *Physical Review X* **9**, 041015 (2019).
- [7] E. J. Bergholtz, J. C. Budich, and F. K. Kunst, Exceptional topology of non-hermitian systems, *Reviews of Modern Physics* **93**, 015005 (2021).
- [8] D. S. Borgnia, A. J. Kruchkov, and R.-J. Slager, Non-hermitian boundary modes and topology, *Physical review letters* **124**, 056802 (2020).
- [9] See Supplemental Material, partially provided in this arXiv version.
- [10] G. H. Low and I. L. Chuang, Hamiltonian simulation by qubitization, *Quantum* **3**, 163 (2019).
- [11] S. Chakraborty, A. Gilyén, and S. Jeffery, The power of block-encoded matrix powers: Improved regression techniques via faster hamiltonian simulation, *Leibniz international proceedings in informatics* **132** (2019).
- [12] X.-M. Zhang and X. Yuan, On circuit complexity of quantum access models for encoding classical data, arXiv:2311.11365 (2023).
- [13] A. Y. Kitaev, A. Shen, and M. N. Vyalyi, *Classical and quantum computation*, 47 (American Mathematical Soc., 2002).
- [14] S. Endo, J. Sun, Y. Li, S. C. Benjamin, and X. Yuan, Variational quantum simulation of general processes, *Physical Review Letters* **125**, 010501 (2020).
- [15] N. Yoshioka, Y. O. Nakagawa, K. Mitarai, and K. Fujii, Variational quantum algorithm for nonequilibrium steady states, *Physical Review Research* **2**, 043289 (2020).
- [16] X.-D. Xie, Z.-Y. Xue, and D.-B. Zhang, Variational quantum eigensolvers for the non-hermitian systems by variance minimization, arXiv:2305.19807 (2023).
- [17] A. Y. Kitaev, Quantum measurements and the abelian stabilizer problem, *quant-ph/9511026* (1995).
- [18] J. R. Norris, *Markov chains*, 2 (Cambridge university press, 1998).
- [19] J. Odencrantz, Markov chains: Gibbs fields, monte carlo simulation, and queues, *Technometrics* **42**, 438 (2000).
- [20] O. Ibe, *Markov processes for stochastic modeling* (Newnes, 2013).
- [21] S. P. Meyn and R. L. Tweedie, *Markov chains and stochastic stability* (Springer Science & Business Media, 2012).
- [22] D. A. Levin and Y. Peres, *Markov chains and mixing times*, Vol. 107 (American Mathematical Soc., 2017).
- [23] M. V. Medvedyeva, F. H. Essler, and T. Prosen, Exact bethe ansatz spectrum of a tight-binding chain with dephasing noise, *Physical review letters* **117**, 137202 (2016).
- [24] L. Banchi, D. Burgarth, and M. J. Kastoryano, Driven quantum dynamics: Will it blend? *Physical Review X* **7**, 041015 (2017).
- [25] D. A. Rowlands and A. Lamacraft, Noisy spins and the richardson-gaudin model, *Physical review letters* **120**, 090401 (2018).
- [26] T. Mori and T. Shirai, Resolving a discrepancy between liouvilian gap and relaxation time in boundary-dissipated quantum many-body systems, *Physical Review Letters* **125**, 230604 (2020).
- [27] D. Yuan, H.-R. Wang, Z. Wang, and D.-L. Deng, Solving the liouvilian gap with artificial neural networks, *Physical Review Letters* **126**, 160401 (2021).
- [28] B. Zhou, X. Wang, and S. Chen, Exponential size scaling of the liouvilian gap in boundary-dissipated systems with anderson localization, *Physical Review B* **106**, 064203 (2022).
- [29] A. M. Childs and N. Wiebe, Hamiltonian simulation using linear combinations of unitary operations, arXiv:1202.5822 (2012).
- [30] C. M. Bender and S. Boettcher, Real spectra in non-hermitian hamiltonians having p t symmetry, *Physical review letters* **80**, 5243 (1998).
- [31] C. M. Bender, S. Boettcher, and P. N. Meisinger, Pt-symmetric quantum mechanics, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **40**, 2201 (1999).
- [32] A. Khare and B. P. Mandal, A pt-invariant potential with complex qes eigenvalues, *Physics Letters A* **272**, 53 (2000).
- [33] E. Delabaere and D. T. Trinh, Spectral analysis of the complex cubic oscillator, *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and General* **33**, 8771 (2000).
- [34] A. Mostafazadeh, Pseudo-hermiticity versus pt symmetry: the necessary condition for the reality of the spectrum of a non-hermitian hamiltonian, *Journal of Mathematical Physics* **43**, 205 (2002).
- [35] X. Li, C. Zheng, J. Gao, and G. Long, Dynamics simulation and numerical analysis of arbitrary time-dependent \mathcal{PT} -symmetric system based on density operators, (2022).
- [36] S. Yu, Y. Meng, J.-S. Tang, X.-Y. Xu, Y.-T. Wang, P. Yin, Z.-J. Ke, W. Liu, Z.-P. Li, Y.-Z. Yang, *et al.*, Experimental investigation of quantum p t-enhanced sensor, *Physical Review Letters* **125**, 240506 (2020).
- [37] J.-H. Park, A. Ndao, W. Cai, L. Hsu, A. Kodigala, T. Lepetit, Y.-H. Lo, and B. Kanté, Symmetry-breaking-induced plasmonic

- exceptional points and nanoscale sensing, *Nature Physics* **16**, 462 (2020).
- [38] G. H. Low and Y. Su, Quantum eigenvalue processing, arXiv:2401.06240 (2024).
- [39] W. Kahan, B. Parlett, and E. Jiang, Residual bounds on approximate eigensystems of nonnormal matrices, *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis* **19**, 470 (1982).
- [40] J. Erxiong, Bounds for the smallest singular value of a jordan block with an application to eigenvalue perturbation, *Linear Algebra and its Applications* **197**, 691 (1994).
- [41] Y. Dong, L. Lin, and Y. Tong, Ground-state preparation and energy estimation on early fault-tolerant quantum computers via quantum eigenvalue transformation of unitary matrices, *PRX Quantum* **3**, 040305 (2022).
- [42] G. H. Low and I. L. Chuang, Optimal hamiltonian simulation by quantum signal processing, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 010501 (2017).

Supplemental material (Partial)

I. BOUND THE ACCURACY OF EIGENVALUE WITH $C(\mu)$: PROOF OF LEMMA. 1

$C(\mu) \leq \min |\mu - \lambda_j|$ follows straightforwardly from Weyl's Theorem Below, we focus on the upper bound of $\min |\mu - \lambda_j|$. We begin with the diagonalizable matrix. We should proof that $\min |\mu - \lambda_j| \leq \kappa_P C(\mu)$. Let $\|\cdot\| = \sigma_{\max}(\cdot)$ be the operator norm. According to definition, the cost function satisfies

$$C(\mu) = 0 \quad \mu = \lambda_j, \quad (\text{S-1})$$

$$C(\mu) = \|(M - \mu I)^{-1}\|^{-1} \quad \mu \neq \lambda_j. \quad (\text{S-2})$$

When $\mu = \lambda_j$, Lemma. 1 holds obviously. We now consider the case when $\mu \neq \lambda_j$. Because $PP^{-1} = P^{-1}P = I$, we have

$$M - \mu I = P(\Lambda - \mu I)P^{-1}, \quad (\text{S-3})$$

and

$$(M - \mu I)^{-1} = P(\Lambda - \mu I)^{-1}P^{-1}. \quad (\text{S-4})$$

Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} \|(M - \mu I)^{-1}\| &= \|P(\Lambda - \mu I)^{-1}P^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \|P\| \|(\Lambda - \mu I)^{-1}\| \|P^{-1}\| \\ &\leq \|P\| \|P^{-1}\| \|(\Lambda - \mu I)^{-1}\| \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S-5})$$

By definition, we have $\kappa_P \equiv \sigma_{\max}(P)/\sigma_{\min}(P)$, where $\sigma_{\min}(P)$ is the minimum singular value of P . Because $1/\sigma_{\min}(P) = \sigma_{\max}(P^{-1})$, we have

$$\kappa_P = \sigma_{\max}(P)\sigma_{\max}(P^{-1}) = \|P\| \|P^{-1}\|. \quad (\text{S-6})$$

Moreover, we have

$$\|(\Lambda - \mu I)^{-1}\| = \frac{1}{\min |\mu - \lambda_j|}. \quad (\text{S-7})$$

Combining Eq. (S-5), (S-6) and (S-7), we have

$$C(\mu)^{-1} = \frac{\kappa_P}{\min |\mu - \lambda_j|}, \quad (\text{S-8})$$

which is equivalent to Eq. (8).

We then consider the defective matrix case. We first consider the Jordan normal form of the matrix $M - \mu I$. It can be expressed as $M - \mu I = P\tilde{\Lambda}P^{-1}$, where $\tilde{\Lambda} \equiv \Lambda - \mu I \equiv \tilde{\Lambda}_1 \oplus \tilde{\Lambda}_2 \oplus \cdots \oplus \tilde{\Lambda}_M$ is a block-diagonal matrix, where each Jordan block is

$$\tilde{\Lambda}_j = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda_j - \mu & 1 & & \\ & \lambda_j - \mu & \ddots & \\ & & \ddots & 1 \\ & & & \lambda_j - \mu \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{S-9})$$

According to Eq. (S-2), we have

$$\begin{aligned}
C(\mu) &= \|(M - \mu I)^{-1}\|^{-1} \\
&= \|P \text{diag}(\tilde{\Lambda}_1^{-1}, \tilde{\Lambda}_2^{-1}, \dots, \tilde{\Lambda}_N^{-1}) P^{-1}\|^{-1} \\
&\geq \kappa_P^{-1} \|\text{diag}(\tilde{\Lambda}_1^{-1}, \tilde{\Lambda}_2^{-1}, \dots, \tilde{\Lambda}_N^{-1})\|^{-1} \\
&\geq \kappa_P^{-1} \|\tilde{\Lambda}_j^{-1}\|^{-1} \\
&= \frac{\sigma_{\min}(\tilde{\Lambda}_j)}{\kappa_P}.
\end{aligned} \tag{S-10}$$

Note that Eq. (S-10) is applied for arbitrary j . According to Ref.[39] (see also Ref. [40]), let $\delta_j = |\lambda_j - \mu|$, we have

$$\sigma_{\min}(\tilde{\Lambda}_j) \geq \frac{\delta_j^{m_j}}{(1 + \delta_j)^{m_j - 1}}. \tag{S-11}$$

Because the operator norm of A is bounded by $\|A\| \leq 1$, we also have $|\lambda_j| \leq 1$ for all eigenvalues. Our searching region is also restricted by $|\mu| \leq 1$, so we have $\delta_j \leq 2$. We can simplify Eq. (S-11) as

$$\sigma_{\min}(\tilde{\Lambda}_j) \geq \left(\frac{\delta_j}{1 + \delta_j}\right)^{m_j} (1 + \delta_j) \geq (\delta_j/3)^{m_j}. \tag{S-12}$$

Combining Eq. (S-10) with Eq. (S-12), we have

$$\kappa_P C(\mu) \geq (\delta_j/3)^{m_j}, \tag{S-13}$$

which gives

$$\delta_j \leq 3(\kappa_P C(\mu))^{1/m_j}. \tag{S-14}$$

Because $\min_j |\mu - \lambda_j| \leq \delta_j$, we have

$$\min_j |\mu - \lambda_j| \leq 3(\kappa_P C(\mu))^{1/m_j}. \tag{S-15}$$

When $C(\mu) \leq 1/\kappa_P$, we have $\kappa_P C(\mu) \leq 1$, and the right hand side of Eq. (S-15) increases monotonically with m_j . So $\min_j |\mu - \lambda_j| \leq 3(\kappa_P C(\mu))^{1/m_{\max}}$. When $C(\mu) > 1/\kappa_P$, we have $\kappa_P C(\mu) > 1$, so the right hand side of Eq. (S-15) is larger than 3. Because we always have $\min_j |\mu - \lambda_j| \leq 2$, so we also have $\min_j |\mu - \lambda_j| \leq 3(\kappa_P C(\mu))^{1/m_{\max}}$, and the proof is of Lemma 1 completed.

II. SOLUTIONS TO PROBLEM 1

In this section, we discuss the solution to Problem 1, which is summarized as the pseudo-code in Algorithm. 1. Our protocol is based on the following lemma that can be straightforwardly verified from Lemma. 1 and the definition of O_C in Lemma. 2.


Lemma 3. *For diagonalizable matrix, if $\min_j |\mu - \lambda_j| \leq r/(2K)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the output of $O_C(\mu, r/K, \delta)$ is True. If $\min_j |\mu - \lambda_j| \geq r$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the output of $O_C(\mu, r/K, \delta)$ is False.*

For defective matrix, we define

$$\nu(r) = (r/3)^{m_{\max}} (2K)^{-1}. \tag{S-16}$$

if $\min_j |\mu - \lambda_j| \leq \nu(r)$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the output of $O_C(\mu, 2\nu(r), \delta)$ is True. If $\min_j |\mu - \lambda_j| \geq r$, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the output of $O_C(\mu, 2\nu(r), \delta)$ is False.

Lemma. 3 is also illustrated in Fig. S1a. For each SVTS (i.e. $O_C(\mu, r/K, \delta)$ for defective matrix or $O_C(\mu, 2\nu(\mu), \delta)$), we mark the region of μ in which the output of SVTS is ‘‘True’’ (with probability at least $1 - \delta$) using yellow color. We also mark



Supplementary Figure S1: (a) Sketch of SVTS. (b) Sketch of Algorithm. 2 for shrinking the range of eigenvalue searching (Problem 1). The initial and updated guess region is enclosed by grey circles. (c) Sketch of Algorithm. 4 for shrinking the range of point gap. The initial guess region is a ring enclosed by two grey circles (Problem 2). The updated guess region is a ring enclosed by a grey circle and red (one of the SVTS has output “True”) or blue (all of the SVTS has output “False”) circles.

a larger region with a green color. If all eigenvalues are outside the green region, the output of SVTS is unlikely to be “True” (with probability at least $1 - \delta$). Note that the radius of yellow regions is $r/2K$ or $\nu(r)$ for diagonalizable and defective matrices, the radius of green regions is r .

Because $\|A\| \leq 1$, all eigenvalues are in $\mathcal{D}(0, 1)$. Our strategy is to iteratively shrink the region in which there is at least one eigenvalue in it (with high probability). Our method contains $J = \lceil \log_2(1/\varepsilon) \rceil$ steps, and the process of each step is illustrated in Fig. S1b (see also Algorithm. 2). Suppose that before the j th step, we are confident that there is at least one eigenvalue in the region $\mathcal{D}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D)$. At this step, we shrink the radius of such confidence region from D to $D/2$. This is achieved by introducing a set of SVTSs, whose yellow region covers $\mathcal{D}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D)$. This ensures that at least one of the SVTSs has output “True”. Another restriction is that the green region of each SVTS has a radius $D/2$. In this way, once we obtain an output “True”, we are confident that at least one eigenvalue is in the region $\mathcal{D}(\lambda'_{\text{gss}}, D/2)$, where λ'_{gss} is the center of such SVTS with output “True”.

Note that in Algorithm. 2, we have introduced a set of points $\mathcal{N}_{\text{net}}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D, m_{\text{max}})$. It represents the centers of all SVTSs satisfying the criteria above. Equivalently, we have

$$\mathcal{D}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D) \subset \bigcup_{\mu \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{net}}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D, 1)} \mathcal{D}(\mu, D/4K), \quad (\text{S-17})$$

when $m_{\text{max}} = 1$, or

$$\mathcal{D}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D) \subset \bigcup_{\mu \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{net}}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D, m_{\text{max}})} \mathcal{D}(\mu, \nu(D/2)). \quad (\text{S-18})$$

when $m_{\text{max}} > 1$.

We first estimate the complexity of diagonalizable matrices. According to Lemma. 3, the query to each SVTS has complexity $\tilde{O}(KD^{-1}\gamma^{-1})$. Moreover, the area of $\mathcal{D}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D)$ and the yellow regions of SVTSs are πD^2 and $\pi D^2/(4K)^2$ respectively. So it suffices to use $O(K^2)$ number of SVTSs to cover $\mathcal{D}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D)$. Therefore, the complexity at each step is $\tilde{O}(KD^{-1}\gamma^{-1}) \times O(K^2) = \tilde{O}(K^3 D^{-1}\gamma^{-1})$. In Algorithm. 1, the total algorithm contains $J = \lceil \log_2(1/\varepsilon) \rceil$ steps, and we have $D \geq \varepsilon$. So the total complexity is $\tilde{O}(K^3 \varepsilon^{-1}\gamma^{-1})$.

For defective matrix, the threshold of each SVTS is $2\nu(D/2) = O(D^{m_{\text{max}}}/K)$. The complexity of each query to SVTS is therefore $\tilde{O}(KD^{-m_{\text{max}}}\gamma^{-1})$. The yellow region of each SVTS has area $O(D^{2m_{\text{max}}}/K^2)$, so totally $O(K^2 D^{-2m_{\text{max}}+2})$ number of SVTSs is required to cover $\mathcal{D}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D)$. Therefore, the complexity for each step is $\tilde{O}(K^3 D^{-3m_{\text{max}}+2}\gamma^{-1})$, while the total complexity of Algorithm. 1 is $\tilde{O}(K^3 \varepsilon^{-3m_{\text{max}}+2}\gamma^{-1})$.

Algorithm 1 Quantum eigenvalue searching for Problem 1.

```

 $D \leftarrow 1, \delta' \leftarrow \delta / \lceil \log_2(D/\varepsilon) \rceil$ 
while  $D > \varepsilon$ :
     $\lambda_{\text{gss}} \leftarrow \mathcal{R}_{\text{diag}}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D, \delta')$ 
     $D \leftarrow D/2$ 
end while
return  $\lambda_{\text{gss}}$ 

```

Algorithm 2 $\mathcal{R}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D, \delta)$

```

 $\delta' \leftarrow \delta / |\mathcal{N}_{\text{net}}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D, m_{\text{max}})|$ 
for all  $\mu \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{net}}(\lambda_{\text{gss}}, D, m_{\text{max}})$ :
    if  $m_{\text{max}} = 1$ :
         $B \leftarrow O_C(\mu, D/4K, \delta')$ 
    else if:  $m_{\text{max}} > 1$ :
         $B \leftarrow O_C(\mu, 2\nu(D/2), \delta')$ 
    end if
    if  $B = \text{True}$ :
        break for
    end if
end for
return  $\mu$ 

```

III. SOLUTION TO PROBLEM 2

In below, we briefly introduce the main idea of our protocols for solving Problem 2. For Problem 3 and other related problems, the processes are similar. We specify the reference point as the original point, i.e. $P = 0$. The goal is then to find an eigenvalue that is closest to, but not equal to 0. In case $P \neq 0$, we can always define a new matrix $\tilde{A} = (A - PI)/(1 + |P|)$, and the problem then reduces to the point gap problem for \tilde{A} with the original point as the reference point.

Our algorithm contains two stages, in the first stage, we output an estimation of the gap $g \equiv \min_{\lambda_j} |P - \lambda_j|$ to accuracy ε . In the second stage, we search the estimation of a target eigenvalue to accuracy ε .

A. Stage 1

According to definition in Problem 2, we initially have $g \in [R_0^{\min}, R_0^{\max}]$ with $R_0^{\min} = \varepsilon$ and $R_0^{\max} = 1$. Our strategy is to shrink the range of g iteratively. The full process is summarized in Algorithm. 3. Suppose at the j th step, we are confidence that

$$g \in [R_{j-1}^{\min}, R_{j-1}^{\max}]. \quad (\text{S-19})$$

In this step, R_{j-1}^{\min} or R_{j-1}^{\max} is updated by querying the eigenvalue range shrinking subroutine (ERSS)

$$\mathcal{S}(R^{\min}, R^{\max}, r, \delta) \rightarrow (\tilde{R}^{\min}, \tilde{R}^{\max}) \quad (\text{S-20})$$

defined in Algorithm. 4 (4.1, and 4.2 corresponds to diagonalizable and defective matrix respectively). The ERSS contains four input parameters. R^{\min} and R^{\max} are the recent confidence region in which the gap g is in. The third parameter $r > 0$ controls the step size of updating. It is required that $r \leq R^{\min}$ and $r \leq R^{\max} - R^{\min}$. The first requirement ensures that the output of ERSS will not be affected by eigenvalue at the original point, if any. The second requirement ensures that the current gap $\Delta_j \equiv R_j^{\max} - R_j^{\min}$ is non-increasing. The last parameter δ is the failure probability. The ERSS has the following property.

Lemma 4. *Let A be a square matrix satisfying $\|A\| \leq 1$. Let $(\tilde{R}^{\min}, \tilde{R}^{\max})$ be the output of $\mathcal{S}(R^{\min}, R^{\max}, r, \delta)$ for some $0 < R^{\min} < R^{\max} \leq 1$, and $0 < r \leq \min(R^{\min}, (R^{\max} - R^{\min})/2)$, and $\delta \in (0, 1)$. Then, suppose the point gap satisfies $g \in [R^{\min}, R^{\max}]$, with probability $1 - \delta$, we have $g \in [\tilde{R}^{\min}, \tilde{R}^{\max}]$. Here, \tilde{R}^{\min} and \tilde{R}^{\max} are defined in Algorithm. 4.*

Moreover, the complexity of ERSS is given by the following.

Lemma 5. $\mathcal{S}(R^{\min}, R^{\max}, r, \delta)$ defined in Algorithm. 4 can be realized with $\tilde{O}(K^2 R^{\min} r^{-2m_{\max}} \gamma^{-1})$ queries to \mathcal{O}_A , \mathcal{P}_A and their inverses, and single- and two-qubit gates.

Base on Lemma 4, we are able to update the region of g by $\mathcal{S}(R_{j-1}^{\min}, R_{j-1}^{\max}, r, \delta') \rightarrow (R_j^{\min}, R_j^{\max})$, where δ' is set as a sufficiently small value. From Algorithm. 4, it can also be verified that

$$|\Delta_{j-1} - \Delta_j| \geq \Omega(r^{m_{\max}}/K). \quad (\text{S-21})$$

Stage 1 is separated into two substages. In substage 1, we set $r = R_{j-1}^{\min}$ at each step, and this substage terminates when $R_j^{\min} \geq R_j^{\max}/2$. The complexity of each step is $\tilde{O}(K^2(R_j^{\min})^{-2m_{\max}+1}\gamma^{-1})$. From Eq. (S-21), it can be verified that this substage terminates with at most $O(K\varepsilon^{-m_{\max}+1})$ steps. Because $R_j^{\min} \geq \varepsilon$, The total complexity for this substage is

$$\tilde{O}(K^2\varepsilon^{-2m_{\max}+1}\gamma^{-1}) \times O(K\varepsilon^{-m_{\max}+1}) = \tilde{O}(K^3\varepsilon^{-3m_{\max}+2}\gamma^{-1}). \quad (\text{S-22})$$

In substage 2, we set $r = (R_{j-1}^{\max} - R_{j-1}^{\min})/2$, and this substage terminates when $\Delta_j \leq \varepsilon$. In this substage, the complexity of each step is $\tilde{O}(K^2\varepsilon^{-2m_{\max}}\gamma^{-1})$. This substage contains $\tilde{O}(K\varepsilon^{-m_{\max}+1})$ steps as can be verified from Eq. (S-21). So the total complexity of substage 2 is

$$\tilde{O}(K^2\varepsilon^{-2m_{\max}}\gamma^{-1}) \times O(K\varepsilon^{-m_{\max}+1}) = \tilde{O}(K^3\varepsilon^{-3m_{\max}+1}\gamma^{-1}). \quad (\text{S-23})$$

Combining Eq. (S-22) and Eq. (S-23), the total complexity of stage 1 is $\tilde{O}(K^3\varepsilon^{-3m_{\max}+1}\gamma^{-1})$.

Algorithm 3 Stage 1 for solving Problem 2

```

 $R_0^{\min} \leftarrow \varepsilon; R_0^{\max} \leftarrow 1; j \leftarrow 1$ 
while  $R_{j-1}^{\min} < R_{j-1}^{\max}/2$ :                               # Substage 1
     $(R_j^{\min}, R_j^{\max}) \leftarrow \mathcal{S}(R_{j-1}^{\min}, R_{j-1}^{\max}, R_{j-1}^{\min}, \delta')$ 
     $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
end while
while  $R_{j-1}^{\max} - R_{j-1}^{\min} > \varepsilon$ :                               # Substage 2
     $(R_j^{\min}, R_j^{\max}) \leftarrow \mathcal{S}(R_{j-1}^{\min}, R_{j-1}^{\max}, (R_{j-1}^{\max} - R_{j-1}^{\min})/2, \delta')$ 
     $j \leftarrow j + 1$ 
end while
return  $(R_{j-1}^{\min}, R_{j-1}^{\max})$ 

```

B. Stage 2

After stage 1, we are confidence that $g \in [R_j^{\min}, R_j^{\max}]$ for some $R_j^{\max} - R_j^{\min} \leq \varepsilon$. In other words, we are confident that there exists at least one eigenvalue in the region $\tilde{\mathcal{D}} = \mathcal{D}(0, R_j^{\max})/\mathcal{D}(0, R_j^{\min})$, while there is no eigenvalue in the region $\mathcal{D}(0, R_j^{\min})/\mathcal{D}(0, \varepsilon)$.

The remaining task is then to find an eigenvalue estimation in $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. This is achievable with a similar strategy for Problem 1. We introduce a set of SVTSs, whose green region has radius ε , and the yellow region covers $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. Accordingly, the complexity of implementing each SVTS is $\tilde{O}(\nu(\varepsilon)) = \tilde{O}(K\varepsilon^{-m_{\max}})$. The area of $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$ is upper bounded by $2\pi\varepsilon$, while the yellow region of each SVTS is $\nu(\varepsilon) = \tilde{O}(\varepsilon^{m_{\max}}/K)$. So it suffices to use totally $\tilde{O}(K\varepsilon^{-m_{\max}+1})$ number of SVTSs to cover $\tilde{\mathcal{D}}$. Therefore, the total complexity of this stage is $\tilde{O}(K\varepsilon^{-m_{\max}}) \times \tilde{O}(K\varepsilon^{-m_{\max}+1}) = \tilde{O}(K^2\varepsilon^{-2m_{\max}+1})$.

Combining the complexity for stage 1 and stage 2, the total complexity for solving Problem 2 is $\tilde{O}(K^3\varepsilon^{-3m_{\max}+1}\gamma^{-1})$.

IV. EIGENVALUE RANGE SHRINKING SUBROUTINE

In this section, we give detailed construction of the ERSS. We described the ERSS for diagonalizable matrix and defective matrix separately in Algorithm. 4.1 and Algorithm. 4.2. They are denoted as $\mathcal{S}_{\text{diag}}$ and \mathcal{S}_{def} respectively.

Algorithm 4 $\mathcal{S}(R^{\min}, R^{\max}, r, \delta)$

```

if  $m_{\max} = 1$ 
   $(\tilde{R}^{\min}, \tilde{R}^{\max}) \leftarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{diag}}(R^{\min}, R^{\max}, r, \delta)$ 
elseif  $m_{\max} > 1$ 
   $(\tilde{R}^{\min}, \tilde{R}^{\max}) \leftarrow \mathcal{S}_{\text{def}}(R^{\min}, R^{\max}, r, \delta)$ 
end if
return  $(\tilde{R}^{\min}, \tilde{R}^{\max})$ 

```

Algorithm 4.1 $\mathcal{S}_{\text{diag}}(R^{\min}, R^{\max}, r, \delta)$ (i.e. eigenvalue range shrinking subroutine for diagonalizable matrix)

```

 $\delta' \leftarrow \delta / |\mathcal{N}_{\text{ring}}(R^{\min}, r/K)|$ 
for all  $t \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{ring}}(R^{\min}, r/K)$ :
   $B \leftarrow O_C(t, r/K, \delta')$ 
  if  $B = \text{True}$ :
    break for
  end if
end for
if  $B = \text{True}$ :
   $\tilde{R}^{\min} \leftarrow R^{\min}$ 
   $\tilde{R}^{\max} \leftarrow R^{\min} + r$ 
else if  $B = \text{False}$ :
   $\tilde{R}^{\min} \leftarrow R^{\min} + r/(4K)$ 
   $\tilde{R}^{\max} \leftarrow R^{\max}$ 
end if
return  $(\tilde{R}^{\min}, \tilde{R}^{\max})$ 

```

Algorithm 4.2 $\mathcal{S}_{\text{def}}(R^{\min}, R^{\max}, r, \delta)$ (Eigenvalue range shrinking subroutine for defective matrix)

```

 $\delta' \leftarrow \delta / |\mathcal{N}_{\text{ring}}(R^{\min}, \nu(r))|$ 
for all  $t \in \mathcal{N}_{\text{ring}}(R^{\min}, \nu(r))$ :
   $B \leftarrow O_C(t, \nu(r), \delta')$ 
  if  $B = \text{True}$ :
    break for
  end if
end for
if  $B = \text{True}$ :
   $\tilde{R}^{\min} \leftarrow R^{\min}$ 
   $\tilde{R}^{\max} \leftarrow R^{\min} + r$ 
else if  $B = \text{False}$ :
   $\tilde{R}^{\min} \leftarrow R^{\min} + \nu(r)/4$ 
   $\tilde{R}^{\max} \leftarrow R^{\max}$ 
end if
return  $(\tilde{R}^{\min}, \tilde{R}^{\max})$ 

```

Here, we have also defined

$$\mathcal{N}_{\text{ring}}(R, s) = \left\{ R e^{i2\pi m/M(R,s)} \mid m \in \{1, 2, \dots, M(R, s)\} \right\}, \quad (\text{S-24})$$

where

$$M(R, s) = \frac{2\pi}{\arctan(s/(2R))}. \quad (\text{S-25})$$

$\mathcal{N}_{\text{ring}}(R, s)$ defines a set of points at the circle with radius R and center 0. The main idea of ERSS is illustrated in Fig. S1c. The

yellow region of all SVTSs covers the edge of the circle with radius R^{\min} . If either of the SVTS has output true, we have $B = \text{True}$. In this case, with confidence at least $1 - \delta$, there exists at least one eigenvalue in the region covered by the green circle. So R^{\max} is updated. Otherwise, we have $B = \text{False}$. In this case, with confidence at least $1 - \delta$, all of the eigenvalues are outside in the region covered by the yellow circle. So R^{\min} is updated.

V. SINGULAR VALUE THRESHOLD SUBROUTINE: PROOF OF LEMMA. 2

Given a general matrix $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ satisfying $\|A\| \leq 1$, we can always rewrite it in the form of singular value transformation form

$$A = \sum_{j=0}^{N-1} \sigma_j |w_j\rangle\langle u_j| \quad (\text{S-26})$$

for some singular value $0 \leq \sigma_0 \leq \sigma_1 \cdots$, orthonormal left singular vectors $\{|w_j\rangle\}$ and right singular vectors $\{|u_j\rangle\}$. The SVTS aims to determine if there are singular values smaller than a threshold. Below, we show how this can be realized with the block-encoding of matrix A .

Let $N = 2^n$, we choose the simplest definition of block encoding, i.e. an $(n + a)$ qubit unitary \mathcal{O}_A is called the block encoding of A if $(\langle 0^a | \otimes I) \mathcal{O}_A (|0^a\rangle \otimes I) = A$. It is typically required that $a = O(\text{poly}(n))$. Let $P(\cdot)$ be a real polynomial function, we define the singular value transformation of a matrix as

$$P^{(\text{svt})}(A) = \begin{cases} P(\sigma_j) |w_j\rangle\langle u_j| & \text{if the degree of } P(\cdot) \text{ is odd} \\ P(\sigma_j) |u_j\rangle\langle u_j| & \text{if the degree of } P(\cdot) \text{ is even} \end{cases} \quad (\text{S-27})$$

According to [4], QSVT can be effectively constructed with \mathcal{O}_A and few extra elementary quantum gates, if $P(\cdot)$ satisfies some reasonable criteria. More specifically, we have the following.

Lemma 6 (QSVT for real polynomials with definite parity, adapted from Theorem 4 in [4]). *Let $P \in \mathbb{R}$ be a polynomial function satisfying (1) The degree of P is at most d ; (2) P is either of even or odd parity; (3) For $\forall x \in [-1, 1]$, $|P(x)| \leq 1$.*

Then there exists a block encoding of $P(A)$ using d queries of \mathcal{O}_A , \mathcal{O}_A^\dagger , one extra ancillary qubit, and $O(a + 1)d$ extra single- and two-qubit gates.

As mentioned earlier, the aim of Lemma. 2 is approximately determine where the targeted eigenvalue lies, a task similar to the fuzzy bisection scheme proposed in Ref. [41]. To this end, we also utilize the Heaviside function for the bisection. Yet, the main difference between our construction and Dong *et al.* [41]'s construction is that to deal with complex eigenvalues, we take advantage of the relationship between eigendecomposition and singular value decomposition as given by Lemma. 1. That is given the construction of the shifted matrix $A - \mu I$, if the shifted value μ is close enough to the targeted eigenvalue λ_j , $C(\mu)$ is then close to zero. Therefore, we can decide whether there is an eigenvalue λ_j that is close to the attempted shift μ by determining the existence of singular value signals close to zero by QSVT techniques [4]. As such, an approximated Heaviside function of the matrix is constructed. The assumption on the initial state $|\psi_I\rangle$ then dictates the threshold (lower-bound value) of the signal that we are seeking. The main difference between our and Dong *et al.* [41]'s scenario is that the polynomial function we applied is for the singular values but not eigenvalues.

The next step is thus to approximate a shifted Heaviside function $H(x - \theta)$ with a polynomial function $P_H^{(\text{svt})}(\cdot)$ using QSVT methods. The shifted Heaviside function is given by

$$H(x - \theta) = \begin{cases} 1, & x \leq \theta \\ 0, & x > \theta \end{cases} \quad (\text{S-28})$$

Regarding the approximated block encoding, we say that a unitary U_A is the (α, a, η) -block encoding of A if $\|\alpha(\langle 0^a | \otimes I) U_A (|0^a\rangle \otimes I) - A\| \leq \eta$. From [42], we have the following lemma.

Lemma 7. *Let $\Delta, \eta \in (0, 0.5)$. Given a matrix A with its $(1, a, 0)$ block-encoding \mathcal{O}_A , we can construct a $(1, a + 1, \eta)$ -block-encoding of $P_H^{(\text{svt})}(A)$ satisfying $|P_H(x) - 1| \leq \eta, \forall x \in [-1, \Delta/2]$ and $|P_H(x)| \leq \eta, \forall x \in [\Delta, 1]$ using $O\left(\frac{1}{\Delta} \log\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\right)\right)$ applications of \mathcal{O}_A and \mathcal{O}_A^\dagger , and $O\left(\frac{a}{\Delta} \log\left(\frac{1}{\eta}\right)\right)$ extra one- and two-qubit gates.*

Here, we have approximated the Heaviside function with a shift $\theta = 3\Delta/4$. It is worth noting that the function between interval $x \in [\Delta/2, \Delta]$ often takes values that smoothly interpolate the function value of the two endpoints of the interval. See Sec. V of Ref. [41] for an example. For simplicity, we will denote the $(1, a+1, \eta)$ -block encoding unitary of $P_H^{\text{svt}}(A)$ as U_H .

As discussed in the main text, we further assume that we have a unitary oracle \mathcal{P}_A which prepares an initial state with nontrivial overlap to $|u_0\rangle$. More specifically, we have $\mathcal{P}_A|0^n\rangle = |\psi\rangle$, for some $|\langle u_0|\psi\rangle| \geq \gamma$. Applying U_H to the joint state of ancillary qubits at state $|+\rangle|0^{a+1}\rangle$ and data qubit at state $|\psi\rangle$, we obtain

$$U_H|+\rangle|0^{a+1}\rangle|\psi\rangle = |+\rangle|0^{a+1}\rangle \sum_j c_j P_H(\sigma_j)|u_j\rangle + |\text{garb}\rangle \quad (\text{S-29})$$

for some $|c_0| \geq \gamma$, and

$$\langle\langle +|\langle 0^{a+1}| \otimes I|\text{garb}\rangle = 0. \quad (\text{S-30})$$

If we project the ancillary qubits to $|+\rangle|0^{a+1}\rangle$, the success probability of the projection is given by

$$p_{\text{suss}} \equiv \left\| \langle\langle +|\langle 0^{a+1}| \otimes I U_H|+\rangle|0^{a+1}\rangle|\psi\rangle \right\| \quad (\text{S-31})$$

$$= \sum_j |c_j|^2 |P_H(\sigma_j)|^2. \quad (\text{S-32})$$

If the smallest singular value of A satisfies $\sigma_0 \leq \Delta/2$, we have

$$p_{\text{suss}} \geq |c_0|^2 |P_H(\sigma_0)|^2 \geq |c_0|^2 (1-\eta)^2 \geq \gamma/4. \quad (\text{S-33})$$

If $\sigma_0(A) \geq \Delta$, we have

$$p_{\text{suss}} \leq \eta^2. \quad (\text{S-34})$$

We note that η decays rapidly with order d for the polynomial function. For example, we may require that the probability in the second case is at most half of the probability in the first case, i.e.

$$\eta^2 \leq (\gamma/4)/2 = \gamma/8. \quad (\text{S-35})$$

This can be achieved with $d = O\left(\frac{\log(1/\gamma)}{\Delta}\right)$. To distinguish whether Eq. (S-33) or Eq. (S-34) are satisfied, we can use the Monte Carlo method by performing the projection process many times. To achieve a constant correct probability, this method requires sampling size $O(\gamma^{-2})$, and each run of the quantum circuit requires a single query to U_H (Lemma 9 of Ref [41], see also Ref [2]). Alternatively, we can improve the dependency on γ to $O(\gamma^{-1})$ with the amplitude amplification method.

Lemma 8 (Lemma.12 in Ref [41]). *Given a unitary W applied at $n_w + 1$ qubits, and let*

$$\omega = \left\| \langle\langle 0| \otimes I_{2^{n_w}}) W|0\rangle|0^{n_w}\rangle \right\|, \quad (\text{S-36})$$

where $I_{2^{n_w}}$ is 2^{n_w} -dimensional identity. It is further promised that either $\omega \leq \gamma_1$ or $\omega \geq \gamma_2$ for some $0 \leq \gamma_1 < \gamma_2$. These two cases can be distinguished with success probability at least $1-\delta$ with $O\left((\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)^{-1} \log(\delta^{-1})\right)$ queries to W and one additional ancilla qubit.

We define $\mathcal{P}'_A = (I_2 \otimes \text{Hard} \otimes I_{2^{a+1}} \otimes \mathcal{P}_A)$, where Hard is Hardamard gate. Following the definition in Eq. (S-29), it can be verified that

$$(I_2 \otimes U_H) \mathcal{P}'_A|0\rangle|0^{n+a+2}\rangle \quad (\text{S-37})$$

$$= |0\rangle|+\rangle|\psi\rangle \quad (\text{S-38})$$

$$= |0\rangle \left(|+\rangle|0^{a+1}\rangle \sum_j c_j P_H(\sigma_j)|u_j\rangle + |\text{garb}\rangle \right). \quad (\text{S-39})$$

We define $|\psi'\rangle = |+\rangle|0^{a+1}\rangle \sum_j c_j P_H(\sigma_j)|u_j\rangle$, and a controlled rotation $R_{|\psi'\rangle} \equiv I_2 \otimes |\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'| + X \otimes (I - |\psi'\rangle\langle\psi'|)$. According to Eq. (S-30), we have

$$p_{\text{succ}} = \|(\langle 0| \otimes I_{2^{a+2}})R_{|\psi'\rangle}|0\rangle|0^{a+2}\rangle\|. \quad (\text{S-40})$$

Here, p_{succ} is the success probability of projection defined in Eq. (S-31). According to Eq. (S-33) and Eq. (S-34), we can set two thresholds of projection success probabilities to be $\gamma_1 = \eta^2 \leq \gamma/8$ and $\gamma_2 = \gamma/4$ respectively. According to Lemma. 8, we can distinguish whether $p_{\text{succ}} \leq \gamma_1$ or $p_{\text{succ}} \geq \gamma_2$ with $O((\gamma_2 - \gamma_1)^{-1} \log(\delta^{-1})) = \tilde{O}(\gamma^{-1})$ queries to $R_{|\psi'\rangle}$.

$R_{|\psi'\rangle}$ requires single query to U_H , \mathcal{P}'_A and $O(n)$ extra single- and two-qubit quantum gates. Summing up the complexity for U_H and \mathcal{P}'_A , we have

Lemma 9. *Let $\Delta, \eta \in (0, 0.5)$, Given $A \in \mathbb{C}^{N \times N}$ satisfying $\|A\| \leq 1$, and promised that either $\sigma_0(A) \leq \Delta/2$ or $\sigma_0(A) \geq \Delta$. We can distinguish these two cases with probability at least $1 - \delta$ using $\tilde{O}(\Delta^{-1}\gamma^{-1})$ queries to \mathcal{O}_A , \mathcal{P}_A and their inverses, and extra single- and two-qubit gates.*

Note that $\tilde{O}(\cdot)$, has neglected the dependency on n . The difference of Lemma. 2 from Lemma. 9 is that we should deal with the shifted matrix $(A - \mu I)$. This can be achieved by performing rescaling $\tilde{A} = (A - \mu I)/(1 + |\mu|)$, which ensures that $\|\tilde{A}\| \leq 1$. As shown in Sec. VI, we can encode \tilde{A} with $O(1)$ extra single- and two-qubit gates and one extra ancillary qubit. Moreover, because $|\mu| < 1$, the accuracy scaling is identical for dealing with A and $(A - \mu I)/(1 + |\mu|)$. Then, Lemma. 2 can be verified readily.

VI. BLOCK ENCODING OF $A - \mu I$

In the block encoding implementation, we typically require that the spectral norm of the matrix being encoded is bounded by 1. However, we have $\|A - \mu I\| > 1$ in some cases. This problem can be solved by encoding a rescaled matrix $(A - \mu I)/(1 + |\mu|)$ instead, because $\|(A - \mu I)/(1 + |\mu|)\| \leq 1$. For brevity, we simply denote $\mathcal{O}_{A,\mu}$ as the block encoding of matrix $(A - \mu I)/(1 + |\mu|)$. We have the following result about its construction.

Lemma 10. *$\mathcal{O}_{A,\mu}$ can be constructed with one query of single-qubit controlled \mathcal{O}_A , single ancillary qubit, and a constant number of extra single- and two-qubit gates.*


Proof. Let $\theta = \arccos\left(\sqrt{\frac{1}{1+|\mu|}}\right)$ and

$$R(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos \theta & -\sin \theta \\ \sin \theta & \cos \theta \end{pmatrix}, \quad \text{Ph}(\phi) = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 \\ 0 & e^{i\phi} \end{pmatrix}. \quad (\text{S-41})$$

The block encoding unitary is constructed as

$$\mathcal{O}_{A,\mu} = (R(-\theta) \otimes I) \left(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathcal{O}_A - |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes e^{i\arg(\mu)} I \right) (R(\theta) \otimes I), \quad (\text{S-42})$$

which is equivalent to the following quantum circuit



It can be verified that.

$$\begin{aligned} \langle 0^{a+1}| \mathcal{O}_{A,\mu} |0^{a+1}\rangle &= (\cos \theta \langle 0| + \sin \theta \langle 1|) \otimes I \left(|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes \mathcal{O}_A - |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes e^{i\arg(\mu)} I \right) (\cos \theta |0\rangle + \sin \theta |1\rangle) I \\ &= \cos^2 \theta \mathcal{O}_A - \sin^2 \theta e^{i\arg(\mu)} I \\ &= \frac{\mathcal{O}_A - \mu I}{1 + |\mu|}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S-43})$$

□

We note that for algorithms related to QSVT, the runtime is affected by the rescale factor $1 + |\mu|$. However, because we always have $|\mu| \leq 1$ in our application, the rescale factor is bounded by a constant and will affect the runtime significantly.