

Quantum Speedup for Spectral Approximation of Kronecker Products

Yeqi Gao*

Zhao Song[†]Ruizhe Zhang[‡]

Abstract

Given its widespread application in machine learning and optimization, the Kronecker product emerges as a pivotal linear algebra operator. However, its computational demands render it an expensive operation, leading to heightened costs in spectral approximation of it through traditional computation algorithms. Existing classical methods for spectral approximation exhibit a linear dependency on the matrix dimension denoted by n , considering matrices of size $A_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. Our work introduces an innovative approach to efficiently address the spectral approximation of the Kronecker product $A_1 \otimes A_2$ using quantum methods. By treating matrices as quantum states, our proposed method significantly reduces the time complexity of spectral approximation to $O_{d,\epsilon}(\sqrt{n})$.

*a916755226@gmail.com. The University of Washington.

[†]zsong@adobe.com. Adobe Research.

[‡]ruizhe@utexas.edu. Simons Institute for the Theory of Computing.

1 Introduction

Kronecker product is an important linear algebra operator. For two matrices $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n' \times d'}$, the Kronecker product $A \otimes B$ is an nn' -by- dd' matrix such that for any $(i_1, j_1) \in [n] \times [n']$ and $(i_2, j_2) \in [d] \times [d']$,

$$(A \otimes B)_{(i_1, j_1), (i_2, j_2)} := A_{i_1, i_2} \cdot B_{j_1, j_2}.$$

Due to its strong connection to tensors, it has been widely used in optimization and machine learning [KB09, SDLF⁺17, SWZ19]. However, the computational cost for the Kronecker product is very expensive. Naively, it takes $O(n^2 d^2)$ time to compute the Kronecker product between two n -by- d matrices. Thus, it has become an essential problem in sketching and sublinear-time algorithms to design efficient algorithms for the Kronecker product and related applications such as tensor regression, tensor low-rank approximation [DSSW18, SWZ19, DJS⁺19], etc.

In this work, we study a fundamental problem of computing the spectral approximation for the Kronecker product. More specifically, given two matrices $A_1, A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, let $A := A_1 \otimes A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$. The goal is to compute a matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times d^2}$ with $m \ll n^2$ such that $B^\top B \approx_\epsilon A^\top A$. This can be regarded as a dimension reduction in that we reduce the number of rows in A from n^2 to m . A direct application of this problem is to solve the tensor regression faster since it suffices to solve the “sketched” regression for the smaller-sized matrix B , and the spectral approximation guarantees that the solution will be close to the optimal solution of the original regression problem. Initiated by the seminal work of Pagh [Pag13] the TensorSketch, several variations of tensor generalization of classical sketches have been proposed such as TensorSRHT [AKK⁺20, SWYZ21] (tensor generalization of SRHT [LDFU13]), TensorSparse [SXZ22] (tensor generalization of [NN13]). Unfortunately, the computational costs of these methods have at least a linear dependence on n , the number of rows. It is undesirable when the matrix is tall (also called over-constrained setting), i.e., $n \gg d$, which is indeed the case in a large number of practical applications, including linear regression [CW17, NN13], linear programming [BLSS20] neural network training [SZZ24]. Therefore, it is natural to ask the following question:

Can we compute the spectral approximation of $A_1 \otimes A_2$ in $O_{d, \epsilon}(\sqrt{n})$ -time¹?

Contributions. In this work, we provide an affirmative answer to this question by proposing an efficient quantum algorithm to compute the spectral approximation of Kronecker products. Over the past few years, quantum computing has made remarkable progress: real devices with increasing capabilities have been built in the labs, and “supremacy experiments” have demonstrated quantum advantages over classical computations in some problems [AAB⁺19, ZWD⁺20]. In particular, there has been a long line of work on quantum algorithms for optimization and machine-learning problems [VAGGdW17, Wan17, KLLP19, AM20, CLL⁺22, LZ22, CMP23, DLT23]. One popular approach is quantum linear algebra (QLA), which treats matrices as quantum unitaries and vectors as quantum states [Pra14, CGJ18, GSLW19, MRT21, TT24]. It can achieve exponential quantum speedups in some linear algebra tasks, such as solving linear systems, matrix-vector multiplication, etc. However, this approach may not be applied to sketching and spectral approximation due to the following limitations:

- We expect classical outputs (vectors/matrices) for sketching in practical applications, while the QLA approach only encodes the outputs in quantum states. We need to apply quantum

¹We use $O_g(f(n))$ to denote $f(n) \cdot g^{O(1)}$.

state tomography techniques [CPF⁺10, vACGN23] to extract classical information from the quantum outputs, which corrupts the exponential quantum advantage.

- The costs of most QLA-based algorithms depend on several data-dependent parameters, including the condition number and Frobenius norm of the input matrices. However, the corresponding classical state-of-the-art algorithms do not depend on them. Thus, it is difficult to have a fair comparison between quantum and classical costs.

This work is inspired by the recent result by (author?) [AG23], who developed a quantum matrix sketching method and used it to speed up linear programming (LP) solving. We generalize this method to sketch Kronecker products, which broadens its applications. Moreover, the output of our algorithm is purely classical, and the costs do not depend on any data-dependent parameter. Thus, in the tall matrix regime ($n \gg d$), our algorithm achieves a polynomial quantum speedup over the currently best classical algorithm.

1.1 Our Result

We state our main result as follows

Theorem 1.1 (Main Result). *Consider query access to matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$ (where $A = A_1 \otimes A_2$, $A_1, A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ with row sparsity r). For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there is a quantum algorithm that returns a diagonal matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times n^2}$ such that*

- $\|D\|_0 = O(\epsilon^{-2} d^2 \log d)$
- $(1 - \epsilon)A^\top A \preceq A^\top D^\top D A \preceq (1 + \epsilon)A^\top A$
- Each row in DA is a scaling of one of rows in A .
- $D \sim \text{LS}(A)$.
- It makes $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon)$ row queries to A
- It takes $\tilde{O}(r\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon + d^\omega)$ time
- The success probability 0.999

Roadmap. In Section 2, we present relevant literature pertaining to our contribution, encompassing leverage score and quantum sketching algorithms. We then delve into technical tools related to both classical mathematical and quantum properties in sampling, which will be instrumental in the analysis of spectral approximation. The Section 4 introduces the generalized leverage score, a key element facilitating the computation in our algorithm. The conclusive quantum algorithmic results are detailed in Section 5, and the entirety of our work is summarized in Section 7.

2 Related Work

Leverage Score We use $\sigma_i(A)$ to denote the leverage score of the i -th row as $\sigma_i(A)$, defined as $\sigma_i(A) = a_i^\top (A^\top A)^\dagger a_i$ given $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$. The concept of leverage scores finds extensive applications in graph theory and linear algebra.

In graph theory, leverage scores play a crucial role in various applications such as maximum matching [BLN⁺20, LSZ20], max-flow problems [DS08, Mad13, Mad16, LS20], graph sparsification [SS08a], and the generation of random spanning trees [Sch18].

Within the field of optimization, leverage scores are heavily explored in linear programming [LS14, BLSS20], the approximation of the John Ellipsoid [CCLY19], cutting-plane methods [Vai89, LSW15], and semi-definite programming [JKL⁺20]. In matrix analysis, [SWZ19] investigates tensor CURT decomposition, while [BW14, SWZ17, SWZ19] focus on matrix CUR decomposition. Other works, such as [SS08b, DMIMW12], concentrate on approximating leverage scores. Simultaneously, the generalized concept of Lewis weight is explored by [BLM89, CP15].

Quantum Sketching Algorithms In quantum computing, sketching seems unnecessary because the block-encoding framework can exponentially reduce the dimensions. For example, linear regression can be solved in poly-logarithmic time in quantum without using sketching [Wan17, CGJ18, CdW21, Sha23]. However, as discussed in Section 1, the quantum linear algebra and block-encoding-based approaches have several intrinsic limitations. This motivates us to investigate other quantum algorithmic paradigms for solving classical optimization and machine learning problems. Before our work, there are only a few works on quantum sketching algorithms. [ADW22] proposed efficient quantum algorithms for graph sparsification and solving Laplacian systems with some polynomial speedups. [Pra14, LZ17, Sha23] designed quantum algorithms for leverage score approximation and sampling. However, these algorithms use quantum linear algebra, and the complexities depend on some data-dependent parameters (e.g., the condition number of the matrix). Very recently, [AG23] proposed a quantum algorithm for solving linear programming using the interior-point method. A key sub-routine is a quantum algorithm for matrix spectral approximation, which quantizes the classical algorithm [CLM⁺15]. Our work generalizes this result to Kronecker spectral approximation.

3 Preliminary

3.1 Notations

We use $\Pr[\cdot]$ to denote probability. We use $\mathbb{E}[\cdot]$ to denote expectation.

For vectors $u, v \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we let $\langle u, v \rangle = \sum_{i \in [d]} u_i v_i$ denote the standard inner product. A positive definite matrix H defines an inner product $\langle u, v \rangle_H := \langle u, H v \rangle$.

For $\epsilon > 0$, the matrix $Q \in S^d$ is an ϵ -spectral approximation of a d -by- d PSD matrix $H \succeq 0$ if

$$(1 - \epsilon)Q \preceq H \preceq (1 + \epsilon)Q,$$

where $A \preceq B$ is equivalent to $B - A \succeq 0$. We denote such a spectral approximation by $Q \approx_\epsilon H$. We will also use this notation for scalars, where $a \approx_\epsilon b$ denotes $(1 - \epsilon)b \leq a \leq (1 + \epsilon)b$, and for vectors (where the inequalities hold entrywise).

Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times n_1}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2 \times n_2}$. We define the Kronecker product between matrices A and B , denoted $A \otimes B \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 m_2 \times n_1 n_2}$, as $(A \otimes B)_{(i_1-1)m_2+i_2, (j_1-1)n_2+j_2}$ is equal to $A_{i_1, j_1} B_{i_2, j_2}$, where $i_1 \in [m_1], j_1 \in [n_1], i_2 \in [m_2], j_2 \in [n_2]$. Given $m_1 = m_2 = m$ and $n_1 = n_2 = n$, we also use \oplus to denote $A \oplus B \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, where $(A \oplus B)_{i, j} = A_{i, j} + B_{i, j}$.

In the context of a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{m \times n}$, we use the notation $\|\cdot\|$ to denote spectral norms. Specifically, $\|\cdot\|_1$ corresponds to the entrywise ℓ_1 -norm defined as $\|A\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n |A_{i, j}|$. We use $\|A\|_2$ denotes the Frobenius-norm, i.e., $\|A\|_F := (\sum_{i=1}^m \sum_{j=1}^n |A_{i, j}|^2)^{1/2}$. We include $\|\cdot\|_0$ to denote the ℓ_0 -norm, which counts the number of non-zero elements in the matrix.

For a square and full-rank matrix A , we use A^{-1} to denote its true inverse. For any matrix B , we use B^\dagger to denote the pseudo-inverse.

Given matrix A and B , we use $B \subseteq_p A$ to denote subsampling B from A by keeping any individual row with a probability p .

We use $|i\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^{2^m}$ to represent the i -th computational basis quantum state in the m -qubit Hilbert space.

“with high probability” means with probability at least $1 - 1/n^c$ for an arbitrarily high but fixed constant $c > 0$, where n typically denotes the size of the problem instance.

3.2 Basic linear algebra facts

Due to the standard property of tensor \otimes , it is easy to observe the following fact,

Fact 3.1. *Given matrix A, B, C, D , we have*

$$(A \otimes B)(C \otimes D) = (AC) \otimes (BD).$$

Fact 3.2. *If the following conditions hold*

- *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denote a psd matrix*
- *Let $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ denote a psd matrix*
- *$(1 - \epsilon)B \preceq A \preceq (1 + \epsilon)B$*
- *Let $\epsilon \in (0, 0.1)$*

Then, we have

- *Part 1. $(1 + \epsilon)^{-1}A \preceq B \preceq (1 - \epsilon)^{-1}A$*
- *Part 2. $(1 - 2\epsilon)A \preceq B \preceq (1 + 2\epsilon)A$*

Fact 3.3. *Let matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, and let $\lambda(\cdot)$ represent eigenvalues. The spectrum of $A \otimes B$ equals $\{\lambda(A)_i \lambda(B)_j \mid i, j \in [D]\}$.*

The Chernoff bound lemma is introduced as follows.

Lemma 3.4 (Chernoff bound). *Let $Y = \sum_{i=1}^n X_i$, with X_i the random variable indicating whether the i -th row of A is in A_L . Then $\mu := \mathbb{E}[Y] \in \Theta(d)$. The multiplicative Chernoff bound for random variables in $\{0, 1\}$ states that $\Pr[|Y - \mu| \geq \delta\mu] \leq 2e^{-\delta^2\mu/3}$ for $0 \leq \delta \leq 1$, and so $Y \in \Theta(d)$ except with probability $e^{-\Omega(d)}$.*

We state the well-known JL Lemma as follows:

Lemma 3.5 (JL Lemma [JLS86]). *For all integers $n, D \geq 0$ and precision $\epsilon > 0$, there exists a distribution $\mathcal{D}_{n,D,\epsilon}$ over matrices in $\mathbb{R}^{O(\log(n)/\epsilon^2) \times D}$ such that the following holds: for any set of vectors $x_i \in \mathbb{R}^D$, $i \in [n]$, it holds that if $\Pi \sim \mathcal{D}_{n,D,\epsilon}$ then with high probability*

$$\|\Pi x_i\|_2^2 = (1 \pm \epsilon)\|x_i\|_2^2, \quad \forall i \in [n].$$

Moreover, the matrix $\Pi \sim \mathcal{D}_{n,D,\epsilon}$ can be sampled in time $\tilde{O}(D/\epsilon^2)$.

3.3 Fast Quantum Sampling Tool

We first review the previous tool for one-dimensional fast quantum sampling (Lemma 3.6). Then, we prove a generalized version for multi-dimensional sampling (Lemma 3.7), which we believe is of independent interest.

Lemma 3.6 (Quantum sampling in 1D, Claim 3 in [ADW22], Lemma 3.10 in [AG23]). *Let $p \in [0, 1]^n$. There is a quantum algorithm such that*

- **Part 1.** *Outputs the sampled elements where each element is sampled independently with probability $p_i \in [0, 1]$.*
- **Part 2.** *Runs in $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n\|p\|_1})$ time.*

Lemma 3.7 (Quantum sampling in k -dimension). *If the following conditions hold*

- *Let $n, k \in \mathbb{N}$.*
- *Let matrix $p \in [0, 1]^{n \times k}$ and vectors $p^{(1)}, \dots, p^{(k)} \in [0, 1]^n$.*

Then, there exists a quantum algorithm such that

- **Part 1.** *Outputs the indices of the sampled elements where each element indexed by $(i_1, \dots, i_k) \in [n]^k$ is sampled independently with probability $\prod_{j=1}^k p_{i_j}^{(j)}$.*
- **Part 2.** *It runs in time*

$$\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^k \sqrt{\|p^{(j)}\|_1} \cdot \prod_{l=1}^{j-1} \|p^{(l)}\|_1).$$

Proof. We simulate the sampling tasks in a tree structure. Intuitively, we sample the first coordinate i_1 at the first level according to $p^{(1)}$. In expectation, about $\|p^{(1)}\|_1$ elements will be selected. Then, we sample the second coordinate i_2 for each selected element according to $p^{(2)}$. In total, the tree has k levels, and each node at level- i has $\|p^{(i)}\|_1$ children.

We can apply the quantum algorithm in Lemma 3.6 to decide the children's indices. Then, the cost of a node at level- j is $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{n\|p^{(j)}\|_1})$ for $j \in [k]$. And there are $\prod_{l=1}^{j-1} \|p^{(l)}\|_1$ nodes at level- j . Thus, the total cost is

$$\begin{aligned} & \sum_{j=1}^k \prod_{l=1}^{j-1} \|p^{(l)}\|_1 \cdot \tilde{O}(\sqrt{n\|p^{(j)}\|_1}) \\ &= \tilde{O}\left(\sqrt{n} \cdot \sum_{j=1}^k \sqrt{\|p^{(j)}\|_1} \cdot \prod_{l=1}^{j-1} \|p^{(l)}\|_1\right). \end{aligned}$$

The lemma is then proved. □

3.4 Quantum input model

The input model of our quantum algorithm is the row-query model for the matrix:

$$\mathcal{O}_A|i\rangle|0\rangle = |i\rangle|a_i\rangle \quad \forall i \in [n],$$

where a_i is the i -th row of A . The time complexity of each query is $O(d)$ or $O(r)$ if A is r -sparse.

Our subsequent quantum repeated halving algorithm (refer to Algorithm 2) needs to query a long classical random string efficiently. Similar to [AG23], we use the following lemma to remedy this issue at the price of using a QRAM, which is a strong assumption. We leave it as an open question to remove the QRAM.

Lemma 3.8 (Quantum random oracles Claim 1 in [ADW22]). *Consider any quantum algorithm with runtime q that makes queries to a uniformly random string. We can simulate this algorithm with a quantum algorithm with runtime $\tilde{O}(q)$ without random string, using an additional QRAM of $\tilde{O}(q)$ qubits.*

3.5 Leverage Score Distribution

We define the leverage score, which is a well-known concept in numerical linear algebra.

Definition 3.9 (Leverage Score, see Definition B.28 in [SWZ19] as an example). Given a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, let $U \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ denote the orthonormal basis of A . We define $\sigma_i := \|U_{i,*}\|_2^2$ for each $i \in [n]$. We say σ is the leverage score of A .

It is well known that, leverage score alternatively can be defined as follows

$$\sigma_i(A) := a_i^\top (A^\top A)^\dagger a_i.$$

where a_i^\top is the i -th row of A for all $i \in [n]$

Fact 3.10. *It is well known that $\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i = d$.*

Definition 3.11 ($D \sim \text{LS}(A)$, see Definition B.29 in [SWZ19] as an example). Let $c > 1$ denote some universal constant.

For each $i \in [n]$, we define $p_i := c \cdot \sigma_i/d$.

Let $q \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be the vector that $q_i \geq p_i$.

Let m denote the sparsity of diagonal matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$.

We say a diagonal matrix D is a sampling and rescaling matrix according to leverage score of A if for each $i \in [n]$, $D_{i,i} = \frac{1}{\sqrt{mq_i}}$ with probability q_i and 0 otherwise. (Note that each i is picked independently and with replacement) We use notion $D \sim \text{LS}(A)$ to denote that.

3.6 Matrix Subsampling

Definition 3.12 (Matrix Subsampling). The simplest way of subsampling is just keeping any individual row with a probability p . We use

$$B \subseteq_p A$$

to denote the matrix obtained by keeping every individual row of A independently with probability p .

Definition 3.13 (Weighted Subsampling (Refined version of Definition 3.12)). We will also use a more refined notion of subsampling. For a matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and an entrywise positive weight vector $w \in \mathbb{R}^n = (w_i)_{i \in [n]}$, we denote by

$$B \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\subseteq} A$$

The following lemma states that a weighted subsampling of a matrix according to the leverage-score distribution implies spectral approximation.

Lemma 3.14 (Consequence of the matrix Chernoff bound [Tro12]). *If the following conditions hold*

- Consider matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$
- Weight vector $w = (w_i)_{i \in [n]}$ satisfying $w_i \geq \sigma_i(A)$
- $B \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\prec} A$ be defined in Definition 3.13
- Let $p_i = \min\{1, cw_i \log(d)/\epsilon^2\}$, for $i \in [n]$.

Then we have

- $B^\top B \approx_\epsilon A^\top A$
- B has at most $O(\sum_{i \in [n]} p_i)$ rows
- It holds with high probability.

Now note that we always have

$$\sum_{i \in [n]} p_i \leq c \log(d) \|w\|_1 / \epsilon^2$$

and $\sum_{i=1}^n \sigma_i(A) = d$ by Fact 3.10. Hence, if we have good estimates $w_i \in \Theta(\sigma_i(A))$ of the leverage scores of A , then $\|w\|_1 \in O(d)$ and the resulting matrix B has only $O(d \log(d)/\epsilon^2)$ rows.

3.7 Quantum Spectral Approximation for Matrices

The following theorem proved in [AG23] gives a quantum algorithm for matrix spectral approximation. Our work is mainly inspired by this result. Thus, we present a thorough review of it in Appendix A.

Theorem 3.15 (Quantum repeated halving algorithm, Theorem 3.1 in [AG23]). *Consider query access to matrix $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ with row sparsity r . For any $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$, there is a quantum algorithm that, returns a diagonal matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times n}$ such that*

- Part 1. $\|D\|_0 = O(\epsilon^{-2} d \log d)$
- Part 2. $(1 - \epsilon)A^\top A \preceq A^\top D^\top D A \preceq (1 + \epsilon)A^\top A$
- Part 3. $D \sim \text{LS}(A)$ (see Definition 3.11)
- Part 4. It makes $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon)$ row queries to A
- Part 5. It takes $\tilde{O}(r\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon + d^\omega)$ time
- The success probability 0.999

4 Generalization of Leverage Scores

In our algorithm (See Algorithm 2), the computation of leverage plays a crucial role. However, executing this computation incurs a significant computational cost. To address this challenge, we consider a generalization of leverage scores and efficiency leverage score computation based on Johnson-Lindenstrauss (JL) (See Section A.2). This approach provides a robust estimate of leverage scores, which proves sufficient for our algorithm’s requirements.

Definition 4.1 (Generalization of leverage scores in [CW17]). Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}, B \in \mathbb{R}^{n_B \times d}$. For $i \in [n]$, we define the *generalized* leverage score of the i -th row of a matrix A with respect to a matrix B as follows

$$\sigma_i^B(A) := \begin{cases} a_i^\top (B^\top B)^\dagger a_i & \text{if } a_i \perp \ker(B) \\ \infty & \text{otherwise.} \end{cases}$$

In the subsequent section, we will illustrate how the upper bound of the leverage score for matrix A can be established through the generalized definition. Building upon this observation and in conjunction with Lemma 4.3, we can derive a spectral approximation of the matrix using leverage score-based sampling.

Claim 4.2. *If the following conditions hold:*

- Let $\sigma_i(\cdot)$ be defined in Definition 4.1
- Let $p \in [0, 1]$ and $B \subseteq_p A$ for $p \in [0, 1]$.
- Let \subseteq_p be defined in Definition 3.12.
- Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$

We have that

- **Part 1.** $\sigma_i(A) = \sigma_i^A(A)$
- **Part 2.** $\sigma_i^B(A) \geq \sigma_i(A)$.

Our primary focus lies in the Kronecker product, a mathematical operation involving two matrices. Additionally, we will elucidate the establishment of spectral approximation for a single matrix through the utilization of a sampling method based on leverage scores. This explanation aims to enhance readers’ comprehension of our methodology.

It is important to note that, despite the conceptual similarity, this method cannot be directly applied to our algorithm. Instead, we introduce a novel sampling approach specifically tailored for the quantum method proposed in Lemma 3.7. This method is presented in Section 5.2 as one of our contributions, acknowledging Kronecker as a key element.

Lemma 4.3 (Theorem 4 in [CLM⁺15]). *If the following conditions hold*

- $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $B \subseteq_{1/2} A$.
- $w \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by $w_i \geq \sigma_i^B(A)$
- $p_i = \min\{1, cw_i \log(d)/\epsilon^2\}$
- $\tilde{B} \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\prec} A$

We have

- **Part 1.** $(1 - \epsilon)A^\top A \leq \tilde{B}^\top \tilde{B} \leq (1 + \epsilon)A^\top A$
- **Part 2.** \tilde{B} has $O(d \log(d)/\epsilon^2)$ rows
- **Part 3.** It holds with probability $\sum_{i \in [n]} p_i \in O(d \log(d)/\epsilon^2)$

5 Repeated halving Algorithm For 2-D version

5.1 Weighted Sampling Algorithm

For the purpose of simplifying the description in the following section, we provide an overview of 2D weighted subsampling here. Let $p^1 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ and $p^2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ be given. From a quantum perspective, we efficiently sample from two matrices, ensuring that the time complexity remains no higher than sampling from a single matrix.

Simultaneously, we illustrate that sampling from A_1 and A_2 to obtain B^1 and B^2 , respectively, where $B = B^1 \otimes B^2$, is equivalent to directly sampling from $A = A^1 \otimes A^2$ (resulting in a time complexity of n^2). In other words, $B^\top B \approx_\epsilon A^\top A$.

Definition 5.1 (Weighted Sampling Algorithm). Let algorithm be defined in Algorithm 1, we will use the following method to describe the algorithm, i.e

$$B_1, B_2 \stackrel{w^1, w^2}{\leftarrow} \text{Sample}(A_1, A_2)$$

Algorithm 1 Weighted Subsampling

- 1: **procedure** SAMPLING($A_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $w^1 \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \infty)^n$, $w^2 \in (\mathbb{R}_{>0} \cup \infty)^n$, $\epsilon > 0$)
 - 2: **for** $i \in [n]$ **do**
 - 3: with probability $p_i^1 := \min\{1, cw_i^1 \log(d)/\epsilon^2\}$, add row $\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_i^1}} a_i^\top$ to B^1
 - 4: with probability $p_i^2 := \min\{1, cw_i^2 \log(d)/\epsilon^2\}$, add row $\frac{1}{\sqrt{p_i^2}} a_i^\top$ to B^2
 - 5: **end for**
 - 6: **return** B^1, B^2
 - 7: **end procedure**
-

5.2 Uniform Sampling

Theorem 5.2 (A 2-D version of Lemma 4.3, Tensor version of Theorem 4 in [CLM⁺15]). *If the following conditions hold*

- $A^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $A^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$
- $A = A^1 \otimes A^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$
- $B_1 \subseteq_{1/2} A^1$ and $B_2 \subseteq_{1/2} A^2$.
- $w^1, w^2 \in \mathbb{R}^n$ by $w_i^1 = \sigma_i^{B^1}(A^1)$ and $w_i^2 = \sigma_i^{B^2}(A^2)$
- $p_i^1 = \min\{1, cw_i^1 \log(d)/\epsilon^2\}$
- $p_i^2 = \min\{1, cw_i^2 \log(d)/\epsilon^2\}$

- $\tilde{B}^1 \stackrel{w,\epsilon}{\leftarrow} A^1$, $\tilde{B}^2 \stackrel{w,\epsilon}{\leftarrow} A^2$ (which sample from A^1 and A^2 independently)
- $\tilde{B} = \tilde{B}^1 \otimes \tilde{B}^2$.

We have

- **Part 1.** $(1 - \epsilon)A^\top A \preceq \tilde{B}^\top \tilde{B} \preceq (1 + \epsilon)A^\top A$
- **Part 2.** \tilde{B} has $O(\epsilon^{-4}d^2 \log^2(d))$ rows
- **Part 3.** It holds with probability 1 that $\sum_{i \in [n]} p_i \in O(d \log(d)/\epsilon^2)$

Proof. By Lemma 4.3, we have $(\tilde{B}^1)^\top \tilde{B}^1 \approx_\epsilon (A^1)^\top A^1$ and $(\tilde{B}^2)^\top \tilde{B}^2 \approx_\epsilon (A^2)^\top A^2$.

Note that

$$\begin{aligned} A^\top A &= (A^1 \otimes A^2)^\top (A^1 \otimes A^2) \\ &= ((A^1)^\top \otimes (A^2)^\top)(A^1 \otimes A^2) \\ &= ((A^1)^\top A^1) \otimes ((A^2)^\top A^2), \end{aligned}$$

where the first step follows from the definition of A , and the second and third steps follow from the properties of the Kronecker product (see Fact 3.1).

$$\tilde{B}^\top \tilde{B} = ((\tilde{B}^1)^\top \tilde{B}^1) \otimes ((\tilde{B}^2)^\top \tilde{B}^2).$$

We also note that the spectrum of $A \otimes B$ is $\{\lambda(A)_i \cdot \lambda(B)_j \mid i, j \in [D]\}$, where $\lambda(A)$ and $\lambda(B)$ are eigenvalues of A and B , respectively (See Fact 3.3). The spectral approximation of \tilde{B}^1 guarantees that

$$\lambda((\tilde{B}^1)^\top \tilde{B}^1)_i \in (1 \pm \epsilon) \cdot \lambda((A^1)^\top A^1)_i \quad \forall i \in [D].$$

And for \tilde{B}^2 , it holds that

$$\lambda((\tilde{B}^2)^\top \tilde{B}^2)_j \in (1 \pm \epsilon) \cdot \lambda((A^2)^\top A^2)_j \quad \forall j \in [D].$$

Thus, for any $(i, j) \in [D] \times [D]$,

$$\begin{aligned} &\lambda((\tilde{B}^1)^\top \tilde{B}^1)_i \cdot \lambda((\tilde{B}^2)^\top \tilde{B}^2)_j \\ &\in (1 \pm \epsilon)^2 \cdot \lambda((A^1)^\top A^1)_i \cdot \lambda((A^2)^\top A^2)_j \\ &\in (1 \pm O(\epsilon)) \cdot \lambda((A^1)^\top A^1)_i \cdot \lambda((A^2)^\top A^2)_j. \end{aligned}$$

It implies that

$$((\tilde{B}^1)^\top \tilde{B}^1) \otimes ((\tilde{B}^2)^\top \tilde{B}^2) \approx_{O(\epsilon)} ((A^1)^\top A^1) \otimes ((A^2)^\top A^2).$$

That is, $\tilde{B}^\top \tilde{B} \approx_{O(\epsilon)} A^\top A$.

□

5.3 Correctness of Repeated halving algorithm

Lemma 5.3 (Repeated halving Algorithm for 2-D version). *If the following conditions hold*

- Let repeated halving algorithm be defined in Algorithm 3
- Let $A = A^1 \otimes A^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$ where $A^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $A^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$.
- Let $\tilde{B} = \tilde{B}^1 \otimes \tilde{B}^2$

With high probability, we have that

- **Part 1.** B_ℓ has $O(d \log(d))$ rows
- **Part 2.** $\tilde{B}^\top \tilde{B} \approx_\epsilon A^\top A$
- **Part 3.** the output \tilde{B} has $O(d \log(d)/\epsilon^2)$ rows

Proof. Proof of Part 1 and Part 2. Now, we will consider A^1 first. First we prove that for every $1 \leq \ell < L$, with high probability, B_ℓ has $O(d \log(d))$ rows and $B_\ell^\top B_\ell \approx_{1/2} A_\ell^\top A_\ell$.

We prove this by induction.

The base case $\ell = L$ and $B_L^1 = A_L^1$ directly implies that

$$(B_L^1)^\top B_L^1 \approx_{1/2} (A_L^1)^\top A_L^1$$

and by a multiplicative Chernoff bound (See Lemma 3.4), A_L has $\Theta(d)$ rows with high probability.

For the inductive step $l-1, l-2, \dots, 1$, given that $B_{l+1}^\top B_{l+1} \approx_{1/2} A_{l+1}^\top A_{l+1}$ and Definition 4.1, we have that

$$(1 - 1/2)\sigma_i^{A_{l+1}}(A_\ell) \leq \sigma_i^{B_{l+1}}(A_\ell) \leq (1 + 1/2)\sigma_i^{A_{l+1}}(A_\ell)$$

Let w_i be defined in Line 5 in Algorithm 3. and it follows that $\sigma_i^{A_{l+1}}(A_\ell) \leq w_i \leq 6\sigma_i^{A_{l+1}}(A_\ell)$. Hence we can apply Lemma 4.3 with $\epsilon = 1/2$, which implies that with high probability $B_\ell^\top B_\ell \approx_{1/2} A_\ell^\top A_\ell$ and B_ℓ has $O(d \log d)$ rows. The proof of **Part1** is finished.

Now we have that $B_1 \approx_{1/2} A_1$ and $\sigma_i^{A_1}(A) \leq w_i \leq 6\sigma_i^{A_1}(A)$.

Similarly, we also have that $\sigma_i^{A_2}(A) \leq w_i \leq 6\sigma_i^{A_2}(A)$.

Notice that $\tilde{B}^1 \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\approx} A^1$ and $\tilde{B}^2 \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\approx} A^2$ and then by Theorem 5.2, we have that $(1 - \epsilon)(A^1 \otimes A^2)^\top (A^1 \otimes A^2) \leq (\tilde{B}^1 \otimes \tilde{B}^2)^\top (\tilde{B}^1 \otimes \tilde{B}^2)$.

and $(\tilde{B}^1 \otimes \tilde{B}^2)^\top (\tilde{B}^1 \otimes \tilde{B}^2) \leq (1 + \epsilon)(A^1 \otimes A^2)^\top (A^1 \otimes A^2)$

In addition, we know \tilde{B} has $O(d^2 \log(d)/\epsilon^2)$ rows.

Now the proof of **Part 2** and **Part 3** are finished. \square

6 Quantum Halving Algorithm

6.1 Time Complexity: Single Step For Quantum halving algorithm

Lemma 6.1 (Single Step For Quantum halving algorithm). *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $A^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ and $A^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ with row sparsity r .
- Let $A = A^1 \otimes A^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$.

- Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$
- Let the Sampling process be described in Algorithm 1.
- Consider a random submatrix $A' \subseteq_{1/2} A$ and assume that we are given $B' \in \mathbb{R}^{O(d \log d) \times d}$, with row sparsity r , such that $B'^\top B' \approx_{1/2} A'^\top A'$.

there is a quantum algorithm such that

- **Part 1.** returns a matrix $B^1 \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\leftarrow} A^1$ for $w_i = \min\{1, \tilde{w}_i\}$ with $2\sigma_i^{B'}(A^1) \leq \tilde{w}_i \leq 4\sigma_i^{B'}(A^1)$.
- **Part 2.** returns a matrix $B^2 \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\leftarrow} A^2$ for $w_i = \min\{1, \tilde{w}_i\}$ with $2\sigma_i^{B'}(A^2) \leq \tilde{w}_i \leq 4\sigma_i^{B'}(A^2)$.
- **Part 3. Time Complexity.** The algorithm takes $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon)$ row queries to A^1 and A^2 and $\tilde{O}(r\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon + d^\omega)$ time.
- **Part 4.** It holds with high probability.

Proof. Proof of Part 1 and Part 2. For **Part 1** and **Part 2**, we will consider A^1 first. And A^2 will share the similar proof.

First we apply Lemma A.2 to A^1 and B' , with $D = O(d \log(d))$. It states that, after a precomputation time of $\tilde{O}(d^\omega)$, we can query approximate leverage scores $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ satisfying $\tilde{\sigma}_i \approx_{1/2} \sigma_i^{B'}(A^1)$ for $i \in [n]$, by querying one row of A and using time $O(r_{A^1} \log(n))$ per leverage score. Now set $w_i = \min\{1, \tilde{w}_i\}$ with $\tilde{w}_i = 2\tilde{\sigma}_i$, which satisfies $2\sigma_i^{B'}(A^1) \leq \tilde{w}_i \leq 4\sigma_i^{B'}(A^1)$.

Proof of Part 3 and Part 4. We define the list $p = (p_i)_{i \in [n]}$ by setting

$$p_i = \min\{1, cw_i \log(d)/\epsilon^2\}$$

(See Section A.1), and so we can query p_i at the same cost of querying $\tilde{\sigma}_i$.

To sample $B^1 \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\leftarrow} A^1$, we apply the algorithm from Lemma 3.6 to the list p . Lemma 4.3 implies that $\sum_i p_i \in O(d \log(d)/\epsilon^2)$, and so the complexity amounts to $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon)$ queries to p . A^2 follows the same proof above.

Combined with the precomputation time of $\tilde{O}(d^\omega)$ and Lemma 3.6, this gives a total complexity of $\tilde{O}((r_{A^1} + r_{A^2})\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon + d^\omega)$ time and $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon)$ row queries to A^1 and A^2 . \square

6.2 Main Result: Quantum Repeated halving algorithm

Theorem 6.2 (Main Result, a formal version of Lemma 1.1). *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $A_1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $A_2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$.
- $A(A = A_1 \otimes A_2) \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times d^2}$.
- A with row sparsity r and $\epsilon \in (0, 1)$

there is a quantum algorithm (See Algorithm 2) that such that

- **Part 1.** returns the sparse representation of a diagonal matrix $D \in \mathbb{R}^{n^2 \times n^2}$ (Each row in DA is a scaling of one of rows in A . $D \sim \text{LS}(A)$.)
- **Part 2.** $\|D\|_0 = O(\epsilon^{-2} d^2 \log d)$
- **Part 3.** $(1 - \epsilon)A^\top A \preceq A^\top D^\top DA \preceq (1 + \epsilon)A^\top A$

Algorithm 2 Quantum Kronecker repeated halving algorithm:

```

1: procedure QUANTUMOTIMES( $A^1 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $A^2 \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ )
2:   implicitly construct the chain  $A_L^1 \subseteq_{1/2} \cdots \subseteq_{1/2} A_1^1 \subseteq_{1/2} A^1$  for  $L = O(\log(n/d))$ 
3:   implicitly construct the chain  $A_L^2 \subseteq_{1/2} \cdots \subseteq_{1/2} A_1^2 \subseteq_{1/2} A^2$  for  $L = O(\log(n/d))$ 
4:   use Grover search2 to explicitly learn  $A_L^1, A_L^2$ 
5:    $B_L \leftarrow A_L$ 
6:   for  $\ell = L - 1, L - 2, \dots, 1$  do
7:     Construct  $B_\ell^1 \xleftarrow{w_i^{1/2}} A_\ell^1$  with  $w_i^1 = \min\{1, \tilde{w}_i^1\}$  and  $2\sigma_i^{B_\ell^1}(A_\ell^1) \leq \tilde{w}_i^1 \leq 4\sigma_i^{B_\ell^1}(A_\ell^1)$ 
8:     Construct  $B_\ell^2 \xleftarrow{w_i^{1/2}} A_\ell^2$  with  $w_i^2 = \min\{1, \tilde{w}_i^2\}$  and  $2\sigma_i^{B_\ell^2}(A_\ell^2) \leq \tilde{w}_i^2 \leq 4\sigma_i^{B_\ell^2}(A_\ell^2)$  ▷
     Use Lemma 3.6 to run the following sampling steps in the same time
9:   end for
10:  Construct  $B^1 \xleftarrow{w_i^\epsilon} A^1$  with  $w_i^1 = \min\{1, \tilde{w}_i^1\}$  and  $2\sigma_i^{B^1}(A^1) \leq \tilde{w}_i^1 \leq 4\sigma_i^{B^1}(A^1)$ 
11:  Construct  $B^2 \xleftarrow{w_i^\epsilon} A^2$  with  $w_i^2 = \min\{1, \tilde{w}_i^2\}$  and  $2\sigma_i^{B^2}(A^2) \leq \tilde{w}_i^2 \leq 4\sigma_i^{B^2}(A^2)$  ▷ Use
     Lemma 3.6 to run the following sampling steps in the same time
12:  return  $B^1 \otimes B^2$ 
13: end procedure

```

- **Part 4.** It makes $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon)$ row queries to A and takes $\tilde{O}(r\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon + d^\omega)$ time
- **Part 5.** The success probability 0.999

Proof. **Proof of Part 1.** It directly follows from Lemma 5.3.

Proof of Part 2 and Part 3. It directly follows from Lemma 6.1 □

7 Conclusion

As a widely utilized operator in linear algebra, the Kronecker product plays a pivotal role. Owing to its computationally intensive nature, researchers have delved into employing spectral approximation as an efficient calculation method. However, the conventional approach to performing such operations entails a time complexity squared compared to that of a single matrix without considering the Kronecker product. In response to this challenge, we propose a novel method that reduces the time complexity to $O_{d,\epsilon}(\sqrt{n})$ employing a quantum methodology. Our aspiration is that our work will attract more researchers to engage in the application of quantum ideas within the realm of classical algorithm theory.

Appendix

Roadmap. In Section A, we present the classical algorithm for spectral approximation of a single matrix, employing the repeated halving algorithm. Additionally, we discuss its quantum counterpart. We also introduce the efficient computation of leverage scores, a key component repeatedly utilized in our algorithm.

A Quantum Algorithm for Matrix Spectral Approximation

For self-containedness, we review the quantum algorithm proposed by [AG23] that achieves a quantum speedup for matrix spectral approximation. It mainly consists of the following three components:

1. Classical repeated halving framework proposed in [CLM⁺15].
2. Classical efficient approximation of leverage scores via JL lemma.
3. Quantum implementation of the repeated halving procedure.

We introduce these components in the following three subsections.

A.1 Repeated Halving Algorithm

The matrix size is reduced by $A' \subseteq_{1/2} A$ by a factor roughly two by uniform subsampling. In the subsequent algorithm (See Algorithm 2 in [CLM⁺15]), we obtain a sequence of $L \in O(\log(n/d))$ uniformly downsampled matrices, denoted as A_1, \dots, A_L . This sequence reaches a matrix A_L with a mere $\tilde{O}(d)$ rows. By Lemma 4.3, we can extract leverage scores A_ℓ (See Section 4) to construct an approximate matrix $B_{\ell-1}$ corresponding to $A_{\ell-1}$. Replicating this procedure for L iterations eventually produces an approximation B_0 for the original matrix $A_0 = A$.

Algorithm 3 Repeated halving algorithm

```
1: procedure REPEATEDHALVING( $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $\epsilon > 0$ )
2:   let  $A_L \subseteq_{1/2} \dots \subseteq_{1/2} A_1 \subseteq_{1/2} A$  for  $L = \lceil \log_2(n/d) \rceil$ 
3:    $B_L \leftarrow A_L$ 
4:   for  $\ell = L - 1, L - 2, \dots, 1$  do
5:     let  $B_\ell \xleftarrow{w, 1/2} A_\ell$  with  $2\sigma_i^{B_{\ell+1}}(A_\ell) \leq w_i \leq 4\sigma_i^{B_{\ell+1}}(A_\ell)$ 
6:   end for
7:   let  $\tilde{B} \xleftarrow{w, \epsilon} A$  with  $2\sigma_i^{B_1}(A) \leq w_i \leq 4\sigma_i^{B_1}(A)$ 
8:   return  $\tilde{B}$ 
9: end procedure
```

By employing the concepts presented in [CLM⁺15], we can derive the subsequent result.

Lemma A.1 (Repeated halving Algorithm). *If the following conditions hold*

- *Let repeated halving algorithm be defined in Algorithm 3*
- *Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ be the input.*

With high probability, we have that

- **Part 1.** B_ℓ has $O(d \log(d))$ rows
- **Part 2.** $\tilde{B}^\top \tilde{B} \approx_\epsilon A^\top A$
- **Part 3.** the output \tilde{B} has $O(d \log(d)/\epsilon^2)$ rows

Proof. First we prove that for every $1 \leq \ell < L$, with high probability, B_ℓ has $O(d \log(d))$ rows and $B_\ell^\top B_\ell \approx_{1/2} A_\ell^\top A_\ell$.

We prove this by induction.

The base case $\ell = L$ and $B_L = A_L$ directly implies that

$$B_L^\top B_L \approx_{1/2} A_L^\top A_L$$

and by a multiplicative Chernoff bound (See Lemma 3.4), A_L has $\Theta(d)$ rows with high probability.

For the inductive step $l-1, l-2, \dots, 1$, given that $B_{\ell+1}^\top B_{\ell+1} \approx_{1/2} A_{\ell+1}^\top A_{\ell+1}$ and Definition 4.1, we have that

$$(1 - 1/2)\sigma_i^{A_{\ell+1}}(A_\ell) \leq \sigma_i^{B_{\ell+1}}(A_\ell) \leq (1 + 1/2)\sigma_i^{A_{\ell+1}}(A_\ell)$$

Let w_i be defined in Line 5 in Algorithm 3. and it follows that $\sigma_i^{A_{\ell+1}}(A_\ell) \leq w_i \leq 6\sigma_i^{A_{\ell+1}}(A_\ell)$. Hence we can apply Lemma 4.3 with $\epsilon = 1/2$, which implies that with high probability $B_\ell^\top B_\ell \approx_{1/2} A_\ell^\top A_\ell$ and B_ℓ has $O(d \log d)$ rows. The proof of **Part1** is finished.

Now we have that $B_1 \approx_{1/2} A_1$ and

$$\sigma_i^{A_1}(A) \leq w_i \leq 6\sigma_i^{A_1}(A)$$

Given that $A_1 \subseteq_{1/2} A$ and by Lemma 4.3 and $\tilde{B} \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\leftarrow} A$, it follows that

$$(1 - \epsilon)A^\top A \preceq \tilde{B}^\top \tilde{B} \preceq (1 + \epsilon)A^\top A$$

and \tilde{B} has $O(d \log(d)/\epsilon^2)$ rows. Now, the proof of **Part 2 and 3** are finished. \square

A.2 Efficiency Leverage Score Computation

For any $\epsilon > 0$, the computation of a multiplicative $(1 \pm \epsilon)$ -approximation of the generalized leverage scores $\sigma_i^B(A)$ is one of the main bottlenecks in the iterative halving algorithm is

For the sake of completeness in our paper, we introduce an efficient algorithm for computing generalized leverage scores, which has been employed in various other works. Here, $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ has r_A -sparse rows a_i^\top , and $B \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times d}$ has r_B -sparse rows, with $D \geq d$. Precisely calculating the generalized leverage scores, albeit naively, requires $O(r_A^2)$ time per score after some preprocessing. The Johnson-Lindenstrauss (JL) lemma allows us to obtain ϵ -approximate leverage scores with a computational expense of $O(r_A \log(n)/\epsilon^2)$ per leverage score.

We start by rewriting the leverage scores as vector norms:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma_i^B(A) &= a_i^\top (B^\top B)^\dagger a_i \\ &= a_i^\top (B^\top B)^\dagger B^\top B (B^\top B)^\dagger a_i \\ &= \|B(B^\top B)^\dagger a_i\|_2^2. \end{aligned}$$

Now, by Lemma 3.5, we can sample a random matrix $\Pi \in \mathbb{R}^{O(\epsilon^{-2} \log(n)) \times D}$ (independent of A, B) such that with high probability (in n),

$$\|\Pi B(B^\top B)^\dagger a_i\|_2^2 = (1 \pm \epsilon) \|B(B^\top B)^\dagger a_i\|_2^2, \quad \forall i \in [n].$$

Now, we can compute the matrix $C = \Pi B(B^\top B)^\dagger \in \mathbb{R}^{O(\epsilon^{-2} \log(n)) \times d}$ in additional time $O(\epsilon^{-2} d \log(n) \cdot (D + d))$ with the following steps:

- Compute the $O(d \log(n)/\epsilon^2)$ entries of ΠB , each of which is an inner product in dimension D
- Compute $\Pi B(B^\top B)^\dagger$, this time with inner products in dimension d .
- Computate $\tilde{\sigma}_i = \|Ca_i\|_2^2$ for the leverage scores, satisfying $\tilde{\sigma}_i = (1 \pm \epsilon)\sigma_i^B(A)$, at a cost per estimate of 1 row-query to A and time $O(r_A \log(n)/\epsilon^2)$.

Now, we have an efficiency generalized leverage score computation algorithm as follows.

Algorithm 4 Generalized leverage scores via Johnson-Lindenstrauss:

```

1: matrices  $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ ,  $B \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times d}$ , approximation factor  $\epsilon > 0$ 
2: – Preprocessing:
3: sample random matrix  $\Pi \sim \mathcal{D}_{n,D,\epsilon}$  and compute  $C = \Pi B(B^\top B)^\dagger$ 
4: sample random matrix  $\Pi' \sim \mathcal{D}_{n,d,\epsilon}$  and compute  $C' = \Pi'(I - (B^\top B)(B^\top B)^\dagger)$ 
5: procedure LEVERAGESCORECOMPUTATION( $i \in [n]$ )
6:   Compute  $C'a_i$ ;
7:   if  $C'a_i \neq 0$  then
8:      $\tilde{\sigma}_i \leftarrow \infty$ 
9:   else
10:     $\tilde{\sigma}_i \leftarrow \|Ca_i\|_2^2$ 
11:   end if
12:   return  $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ 
13: end procedure

```

Based on this algorithm we can prove the following lemma.

Lemma A.2 (Johnson-Lindenstrauss leverage scores). *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$.
- Let $i \in [n]$
- For each $i \in [n]$, let $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ be output of LEVERAGESCORECOMPUTATION($i \in [n]$).
- Let r_B -sparse matrix $B \in \mathbb{R}^{D \times d}$ with $n, D \gg d$.
- Let preprocessing process be described in Algorithm 4.
- Let LEVERAGESCORECOMPUTATION be described in Algorithm 4.

We have that

- **Part 1. Correctness** With high probability, $(1 - \epsilon)\sigma_i^B(A) \leq \tilde{\sigma}_i \leq (1 + \epsilon)\sigma_i^B(A)$
- **Part 2. Time Complexity of Preprocessing** The time complexity of preprocessing

$$O(\min\{Dd^{\omega-1}, Dr_B^2 + d^\omega\} + \epsilon^{-2} dD \log(n))$$

- **Part 3. Time Complexity** For $i \in [n]$, at a cost per estimate of one row query to A and time $O(r_A \log(n)/\epsilon^2)$.

Proof. Proof of Part 1. First we show correctness of the algorithm.

By Lemma 3.5 and for all $i \in [n]$, it follows that

$$(1 - \epsilon)\|B(B^\top B)^\dagger a_i\|_2 \leq \|Ca_i\|_2 \leq (1 + \epsilon)\|B(B^\top B)^\dagger a_i\|_2$$

and

$$\begin{aligned} \|C'a_i\|_2 &\geq (1 - \epsilon)\|(I - (B^\top B)(B^\top B)^\dagger)a_i\|_2 \\ \|C'a_i\|_2 &\leq (1 + \epsilon)\|(I - (B^\top B)(B^\top B)^\dagger)a_i\|_2 \end{aligned}$$

with high probability.

From $\|C'a_i\|_2$ we can now check whether $a_i \perp \ker(B)$ or not: indeed $I - (B^\top B)(B^\top B)^\dagger$ corresponds to the projector onto $\ker(B)$, and so $a_i \perp \ker(B)$ iff $\|C'a_i\|_2 = 0$.

Hence, if $\|C'a_i\|_2 = 0$ we can set $\tilde{\sigma}_i = \infty$ and otherwise we can set $\tilde{\sigma}_i = \|Ca_i\|_2^2$, which will be correct with high probability.

Proof of Part 2 Now we prove the complexity bounds. First consider the precomputation phase. As discussed earlier, given B we can compute $(B^\top B)^\dagger$ and $(B^\top B)(B^\top B)^\dagger$ in time $O(\min\{Dd^{\omega-1}, Dr_B^2 + d^\omega\})$, and $C = \Pi B(B^\top B)^\dagger$ and $C' = \Pi'(I - (B^\top B)(B^\top B)^\dagger)$ in time $O(dD \log(n)/\epsilon^2)$.

Proof of Part 3. For the approximation of a single leverage score $\sigma_i^B(A)$, we query the entire row a_i of A , and compute $C'a_i$ and Ca_i in time $O(r_A \log(n)/\epsilon^2)$. \square

A.3 Quantum Implementation of Repeated Halving

In this section, we introduce the quantum algorithm for obtaining a spectral approximation of a matrix via quantum repeated halving.

The following lemma shows the quantum speedup for a single iteration of the halving procedure.

Lemma A.3 (Quantum halving (one iteration)). *If the following conditions hold*

- Let $A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$ with row sparsity r .
- Let $\epsilon \in (0, 1]$
- Consider a random submatrix $A' \subseteq_{1/2} A$ and assume that we are given $B' \in \mathbb{R}^{O(d \log d) \times d}$, with row sparsity r , such that $B'^\top B' \approx_{1/2} A'^\top A'$.

there is a quantum algorithm such that

- **Part 1.** returns a matrix $B \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\leftarrow} A$ for $w_i = \min\{1, \tilde{w}_i\}$ with $2\sigma_i^{B'}(A) \leq \tilde{w}_i \leq 4\sigma_i^{B'}(A)$.
- **Part 2. Time Complexity.** The algorithm takes $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon)$ row queries to A and $\tilde{O}(r\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon + d^\omega)$ time.
- **Part 3.** It holds with high probability.

Proof. Proof of Part 1. First we apply Lemma A.2 to A and B' , with $D = O(d \log(d))$. It states that, after a precomputation time of $\tilde{O}(d^\omega)$, we can query approximate leverage scores $\tilde{\sigma}_i$ satisfying $\tilde{\sigma}_i \approx_{1/2} \sigma_i^{B'}(A)$ for $i \in [n]$, by querying one row of A and using time $O(r_A \log(n))$ per leverage score. Now set $w_i = \min\{1, \tilde{w}_i\}$ with $\tilde{w}_i = 2\tilde{\sigma}_i$, which satisfies $2\sigma_i^{B'}(A) \leq \tilde{w}_i \leq 4\sigma_i^{B'}(A)$.

Proof of Part 2 and Part 3. We define the list $p = (p_i)_{i \in [n]}$ by setting

$$p_i = \min\{1, cw_i \log(d)/\epsilon^2\}$$

(See Section A.1), and so we can query p_i at the same cost of querying $\tilde{\sigma}_i$.

To sample $B \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\leftarrow} A$, we apply the algorithm from Lemma 3.6 to the list p . Lemma 4.3 implies that $\sum_i p_i \in O(d \log(d)/\epsilon^2)$, and so the complexity amounts to $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon)$ queries to p .

Combined with the precomputation time of $\tilde{O}(d^\omega)$, this gives a total complexity of $\tilde{O}(r_A \sqrt{nd}/\epsilon + d^\omega)$ time and $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{nd}/\epsilon)$ row queries to A . \square

By the classical repeated halving lemma (Lemma A.1), we can apply Lemma A.3 for $O(\log(n))$ times. Then, with high probability, the returned matrix B will have $O(d \log(d)/\epsilon^2)$ rows and satisfy $B \approx_\epsilon A$.

Algorithm 5 Quantum repeated halving algorithm

- 1: **procedure** QUANTUMREPEATEDHALVING($A \in \mathbb{R}^{n \times d}$, $\epsilon > 0$)
 - 2: implicitly construct the chain $A_L \subseteq_{1/2} \cdots \subseteq_{1/2} A_1 \subseteq_{1/2} A$ for $L = O(\log(n/d))$
 - 3: use Grover search³ to explicitly learn A_L
 - 4: $B_L \leftarrow A_L$
 - 5: **for** $\ell = L - 1, L - 2, \dots, 1$ **do**
 - 6: use Lemma A.3 on $A_{\ell+1} \subseteq_{1/2} A_\ell$ and $B_{\ell+1}$ to explicitly construct $B_\ell \stackrel{w, 1/2}{\leftarrow} A_\ell$ with $w_i = \min\{1, \tilde{w}_i\}$ and $2\sigma_i^{B_{\ell+1}}(A_\ell) \leq \tilde{w}_i \leq 4\sigma_i^{B_{\ell+1}}(A_\ell)$
 - 7: **end for**
 - 8: use Lemma A.3 on $A_1 \subseteq_{1/2} A$ and B_1 to explicitly construct $B \stackrel{w, \epsilon}{\leftarrow} A$ with $w_i = \min\{1, \tilde{w}_i\}$ and $2\sigma_i^{B_1}(A) \leq \tilde{w}_i \leq 4\sigma_i^{B_1}(A)$
 - 9: **return** B
 - 10: **end procedure**
-

References

- [AAB⁺19] Frank Arute, Kunal Arya, Ryan Babbush, Dave Bacon, Joseph C Bardin, Rami Barends, Rupak Biswas, Sergio Boixo, Fernando GSL Brandao, David A Buell, et al. Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor. *Nature*, 574(7779):505–510, 2019.
- [ADW22] Simon Apers and Ronald De Wolf. Quantum speedup for graph sparsification, cut approximation, and laplacian solving. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 51(6):1703–1742, 2022.
- [AG23] Simon Apers and Sander Gribling. Quantum speedups for linear programming via interior point methods. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2311.03215*, 2023.

³More specifically, apply Lemma 3.6 with $p_i = \Pi_{\ell \leq L} X_i^{(\ell)}$, where the $X_i^{(\ell)}$'s were defined in Section 3.4.

- [AKK⁺20] Thomas D Ahle, Michael Kapralov, Jakob BT Knudsen, Rasmus Pagh, Ameya Velingker, David P Woodruff, and Amir Zandieh. Oblivious sketching of high-degree polynomial kernels. In *Proceedings of the Fourteenth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 141–160. SIAM, 2020.
- [AM20] Srinivasan Arunachalam and Reevu Maity. Quantum boosting. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 377–387. PMLR, 2020.
- [BLM89] Jean Bourgain, Joram Lindenstrauss, and Vitali Milman. Approximation of zonoids by zonotopes. 1989.
- [BLN⁺20] Jan van den Brand, Yin-Tat Lee, Danupon Nanongkai, Richard Peng, Thatchaphol Saranurak, Aaron Sidford, Zhao Song, and Di Wang. Bipartite matching in nearly-linear time on moderately dense graphs. In *2020 IEEE 61st Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 919–930. IEEE, 2020.
- [BLSS20] Jan van den Brand, Yin Tat Lee, Aaron Sidford, and Zhao Song. Solving tall dense linear programs in nearly linear time. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 775–788, 2020.
- [BW14] Christos Boutsidis and David P Woodruff. Optimal cur matrix decompositions. In *Proceedings of the forty-sixth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 353–362, 2014.
- [CCLY19] Michael B Cohen, Ben Cousins, Yin Tat Lee, and Xin Yang. A near-optimal algorithm for approximating the john ellipsoid. In *Conference on Learning Theory*, pages 849–873. PMLR, 2019.
- [CdW21] Yanlin Chen and Ronald de Wolf. Quantum algorithms and lower bounds for linear regression with norm constraints. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2110.13086*, 2021.
- [CGJ18] Shantanav Chakraborty, András Gilyén, and Stacey Jeffery. The power of block-encoded matrix powers: improved regression techniques via faster hamiltonian simulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.01973*, 2018.
- [CLL⁺22] Andrew M Childs, Tongyang Li, Jin-Peng Liu, Chunhao Wang, and Ruizhe Zhang. Quantum algorithms for sampling log-concave distributions and estimating normalizing constants. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:23205–23217, 2022.
- [CLM⁺15] Michael B Cohen, Yin Tat Lee, Cameron Musco, Christopher Musco, Richard Peng, and Aaron Sidford. Uniform sampling for matrix approximation. In *Proceedings of the 2015 Conference on Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science*, pages 181–190, 2015.
- [CMP23] Shantanav Chakraborty, Aditya Morolia, and Anurudh Peduri. Quantum regularized least squares. *Quantum*, 7:988, 2023.
- [CP15] Michael B Cohen and Richard Peng. Lp row sampling by lewis weights. In *Proceedings of the forty-seventh annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 183–192, 2015.

- [CPF⁺10] Marcus Cramer, Martin B Plenio, Steven T Flammia, Rolando Somma, David Gross, Stephen D Bartlett, Olivier Landon-Cardinal, David Poulin, and Yi-Kai Liu. Efficient quantum state tomography. *Nature communications*, 1(1):149, 2010.
- [CW17] Kenneth L Clarkson and David P Woodruff. Low-rank approximation and regression in input sparsity time. *Journal of the ACM (JACM)*, 63(6):1–45, 2017.
- [DJS⁺19] Huaian Diao, Rajesh Jayaram, Zhao Song, Wen Sun, and David Woodruff. Optimal sketching for kronecker product regression and low rank approximation. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [DLT23] João F Doriguello, Alessandro Luongo, and Ewin Tang. Do you know what q-means? *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.09701*, 2023.
- [DMIMW12] Petros Drineas, Malik Magdon-Ismail, Michael W Mahoney, and David P Woodruff. Fast approximation of matrix coherence and statistical leverage. *The Journal of Machine Learning Research*, 13(1):3475–3506, 2012.
- [DS08] Samuel I Daitch and Daniel A Spielman. Faster approximate lossy generalized flow via interior point algorithms. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 451–460, 2008.
- [DSSW18] Huaian Diao, Zhao Song, Wen Sun, and David Woodruff. Sketching for kronecker product regression and p-splines. In *International Conference on Artificial Intelligence and Statistics*, pages 1299–1308. PMLR, 2018.
- [GSLW19] András Gilyén, Yuan Su, Guang Hao Low, and Nathan 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*, pages 193–204, 2019.
- [JKL⁺20] Haotian Jiang, Tarun Kathuria, Yin Tat Lee, Swati Padmanabhan, and Zhao Song. A faster interior point method for semidefinite programming. In *2020 IEEE 61st annual symposium on foundations of computer science (FOCS)*, pages 910–918. IEEE, 2020.
- [JLS86] William B Johnson, Joram Lindenstrauss, and Gideon Schechtman. Extensions of lipschitz maps into banach spaces. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 26:189–206, 1986.
- [KB09] Tamara G Kolda and Brett W Bader. Tensor decompositions and applications. *SIAM review*, 51(3):455–500, 2009.
- [KLLP19] Iordanis Kerenidis, Jonas Landman, Alessandro Luongo, and Anupam Prakash. q-means: A quantum algorithm for unsupervised machine learning. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 32, 2019.
- [LDFU13] Yichao Lu, Paramveer Dhillon, Dean P Foster, and Lyle Ungar. Faster ridge regression via the subsampled randomized hadamard transform. *Advances in neural information processing systems*, 26, 2013.
- [LS14] Yin Tat Lee and Aaron Sidford. Path finding methods for linear programming: Solving linear programs in $o(\text{vrnk})$ iterations and faster algorithms for maximum

- flow. In *2014 IEEE 55th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 424–433. IEEE, 2014.
- [LS20] Yang P Liu and Aaron Sidford. Faster energy maximization for faster maximum flow. In *Proceedings of the 52nd Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 803–814, 2020.
- [LSW15] Yin Tat Lee, Aaron Sidford, and Sam Chiu-wai Wong. A faster cutting plane method and its implications for combinatorial and convex optimization. In *2015 IEEE 56th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 1049–1065. IEEE, 2015.
- [LSZ20] S Cliff Liu, Zhao Song, and Hengjie Zhang. Breaking the n-pass barrier: A streaming algorithm for maximum weight bipartite matching. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2009.06106*, 2020.
- [LZ17] Yang Liu and Shengyu Zhang. Fast quantum algorithms for least squares regression and statistic leverage scores. *Theoretical Computer Science*, 657:38–47, 2017.
- [LZ22] Tongyang Li and Ruizhe Zhang. Quantum speedups of optimizing approximately convex functions with applications to logarithmic regret stochastic convex bandits. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 35:3152–3164, 2022.
- [Mad13] Aleksander Madry. Navigating central path with electrical flows: From flows to matchings, and back. In *2013 IEEE 54th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 253–262. IEEE, 2013.
- [Mad16] Aleksander Madry. Computing maximum flow with augmenting electrical flows. In *2016 IEEE 57th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 593–602. IEEE, 2016.
- [MRTC21] John M Martyn, Zane M Rossi, Andrew K Tan, and Isaac L Chuang. Grand unification of quantum algorithms. *PRX Quantum*, 2(4):040203, 2021.
- [NN13] Jelani Nelson and Huy L Nguyễn. Osnap: Faster numerical linear algebra algorithms via sparser subspace embeddings. In *2013 IEEE 54th annual symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 117–126. IEEE, 2013.
- [Pag13] Rasmus Pagh. Compressed matrix multiplication. *ACM Transactions on Computation Theory (TOCT)*, 5(3):1–17, 2013.
- [Pra14] Anupam Prakash. *Quantum algorithms for linear algebra and machine learning*. University of California, Berkeley, 2014.
- [Sch18] Aaron Schild. An almost-linear time algorithm for uniform random spanning tree generation. In *Proceedings of the 50th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 214–227, 2018.
- [SDLF⁺17] Nicholas D Sidiropoulos, Lieven De Lathauwer, Xiao Fu, Kejun Huang, Evangelos E Papalexakis, and Christos Faloutsos. Tensor decomposition for signal processing and machine learning. *IEEE Transactions on signal processing*, 65(13):3551–3582, 2017.

- [Sha23] Changpeng Shao. Quantum speedup of leverage score sampling and its application, 2023.
- [SS08a] Daniel A Spielman and Nikhil Srivastava. Graph sparsification by effective resistances. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 563–568, 2008.
- [SS08b] Daniel A Spielman and Nikhil Srivastava. Graph sparsification by effective resistances. In *Proceedings of the fortieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 563–568, 2008.
- [SWYZ21] Zhao Song, David Woodruff, Zheng Yu, and Lichen Zhang. Fast sketching of polynomial kernels of polynomial degree. In *International Conference on Machine Learning*, pages 9812–9823. PMLR, 2021.
- [SWZ17] Zhao Song, David P Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Low rank approximation with entrywise l_1 -norm error. In *Proceedings of the 49th Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 688–701, 2017.
- [SWZ19] Zhao Song, David P Woodruff, and Peilin Zhong. Relative error tensor low rank approximation. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 2772–2789. SIAM, 2019.
- [SXZ22] Zhao Song, Zhaozhuo Xu, and Lichen Zhang. Speeding up sparsification using inner product search data structures. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2204.03209*, 2022.
- [SZZ24] Zhao Song, Lichen Zhang, and Ruizhe Zhang. Training Multi-Layer Over-Parametrized Neural Network in Subquadratic Time. In Venkatesan Guruswami, editor, *15th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference (ITCS 2024)*, volume 287 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 93:1–93:15, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2024. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [Tro12] Joel A Tropp. User-friendly tail bounds for sums of random matrices. *Foundations of computational mathematics*, 12:389–434, 2012.
- [TT24] Ewin Tang and Kevin Tian. A cs guide to the quantum singular value transformation. In *2024 Symposium on Simplicity in Algorithms (SOSA)*, pages 121–143. SIAM, 2024.
- [vACGN23] Joran van Apeldoorn, Arjan Cornelissen, András Gilyén, and Giacomo Nannicini. Quantum tomography using state-preparation unitaries. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1265–1318. SIAM, 2023.
- [VAGGdW17] Joran Van Apeldoorn, András Gilyén, Sander Gribling, and Ronald de Wolf. Quantum sdp-solvers: Better upper and lower bounds. In *2017 IEEE 58th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science (FOCS)*, pages 403–414. IEEE, 2017.
- [Vai89] Pravin M Vaidya. A new algorithm for minimizing convex functions over convex sets. In *30th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 338–343. IEEE Computer Society, 1989.

- [Wan17] Guoming Wang. Quantum algorithm for linear regression. *Physical review A*, 96(1):012335, 2017.
- [ZWD⁺20] Han-Sen Zhong, Hui Wang, Yu-Hao Deng, Ming-Cheng Chen, Li-Chao Peng, Yi-Han Luo, Jian Qin, Dian Wu, Xing Ding, Yi Hu, et al. Quantum computational advantage using photons. *Science*, 370(6523):1460–1463, 2020.