

# Optimal quantum circuit cuts with application to clustered Hamiltonian simulation

Aram W. Harrow <sup>\*†</sup>      Angus Lowe <sup>\*‡</sup>

March 5, 2024

## Abstract

We study methods to replace entangling operations with random local operations in a quantum computation, at the cost of increasing the number of required executions. First, we consider “space-like cuts” where an entangling unitary is replaced with random local unitaries. We propose an entanglement measure for quantum dynamics, the *product extent*, which bounds the cost in a procedure for this replacement based on two copies of the Hadamard test. In the terminology of prior work, this procedure yields a quasiprobability decomposition with minimal 1-norm in a number of cases, which addresses an open question of Piveteau and Sutter. As an application, we give dramatically improved bounds on clustered Hamiltonian simulation. Specifically we show that interactions can be removed at a cost exponential in the sum of their strengths times the evolution time.

We also give an improved upper bound on the cost of replacing wires with measure-and-prepare channels using “time-like cuts”. We prove a matching information-theoretic lower bound when estimating output probabilities.

## 1 Introduction

The precise control of a large number of entangled qubits presents a significant challenge for realizing large-scale quantum computation. While considerable progress has been made toward the design and construction of devices which overcome this challenge, near-term quantum computers are likely to be restricted both in terms of the number of logical qubits available as well as in their ability to generate and maintain long-range entanglement. In this work, we study methods which aim to alleviate these issues by replacing entangling operations with an ensemble of local operations in a given quantum circuit. Such methods have been referred to collectively as *circuit cutting* (e.g., [Low+23]) or *circuit knitting* [PS23] since, when applied to circuits with an appropriate structure, they may be employed to simulate large quantum circuits using circuits defined on strictly fewer qubits and resembling sub-regions of the original circuit.

Besides the obvious practical motivation for studying these methods, it is also a long-standing theoretical problem to understand smooth trade-offs between the classical and quantum resources required to accomplish different information processing tasks. In quantum Shannon theory, for instance, one often studies the landscape of achievable rates when trading between generating entanglement, transmitting classical information, and transmitting quantum information. Prior work

---

<sup>\*</sup>Center for Theoretical Physics, MIT, Cambridge, MA, 02139, USA

<sup>†</sup>[aram@mit.edu](mailto:aram@mit.edu)

<sup>‡</sup>[alowe7@mit.edu](mailto:alowe7@mit.edu)




Figure 1: We consider two different methods of circuit cutting referred to as space-like and time-like. (a) A quantum circuit with two unitary operations acting on three registers, each comprising some number of qubits. (b) Space-like cut applied to the first unitary operation. (c) Time-like cut applied to the second register, after the first unitary operation.

on circuit cutting has suggested that trade-offs between entanglement and classical randomness also exist in the computational setting. For example, Ref. [BSS16] gives a method for adding “virtual qubits” in sparse quantum circuits, while Ref. [Pen+20] develops a framework for decomposing clustered quantum circuits using mid-circuit Pauli measurements.

The cost of these and other proposals for circuit cutting is two-fold. First, the known approaches succeed when the task is to estimate an expectation value, but it is unclear whether they can be used to sample from the output distribution of a quantum circuit. This restriction still allows for many proposed uses of quantum computing, including estimating correlation functions [Ort+01], solving decision problems in BQP, and optimizing objective functions, e.g., in variational algorithms. The second and more substantial limitation is an increase in the number of repetitions of the computation which tends to grow exponentially in the number of operations replaced. This exponential cost is to be expected, however, since otherwise one might envision applying the procedure recursively to derive an efficient, fully classical algorithm to simulate the circuit. (See [MTD23] for a more detailed heuristic argument along these lines.)

In this paper, we give new methods for two special cases of circuit cutting which, following Ref. [MF21a] we refer to as “space-like” and time-like”, as depicted in Figure 1. In our procedure for space-like cutting, an entangling unitary is replaced by an ensemble of unitaries acting locally on the original systems and a pair of ancilla qubits. In a time-like cut, a subset of the wires in a circuit are replaced by an ensemble of measure-and-prepare operations, i.e., the qubits are measured and replaced by freshly prepared qubits whose state depends on the measurement outcome. In both instances we make use of the framework of quasiprobability decompositions (QPDs), as described in further detail in Section 2.2.

## 1.1 Space-like cuts

The cost of cutting a unitary gate can be thought of as a measure of its entangling power. In Section 3 we introduce i) a new measure of the entangling power of unitary operations called the *product extent* and ii) a simple procedure for space-like cutting whose cost equals the product extent. In many cases (including all 2-qubit gates, SWAP operators or transversal operations), we prove that this procedure is optimal. In order to describe these results quantitatively, it will be helpful to introduce some preliminary definitions.

**Definition 1.1** (Space-like cut). A *space-like cut* of a bipartite quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}_{AB \rightarrow AB}$  is a decomposition of the form

$$\mathcal{N} = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i (\text{id}_{AB} \otimes \mathcal{T}_i) \circ \mathcal{E}_i \quad (1)$$

where

- $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ;
- $\mathcal{E}_i: \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{AR_A BR_B})$  are quantum channels implementable using local operations and classical communication (LOCC) between  $A$  and  $B$ ; and
- $\mathcal{T}_i: \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{R_A R_B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  are *post-processing operations* of the form  $\mathcal{T}_i: X \mapsto \text{Tr}(OX)$  for some  $O$  such that  $O = O_i^{(A)} \otimes O_i^{(B)}$  with  $O_i^{(A)} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{R_A})$  and  $O_i^{(B)} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{R_B})$  and  $\|O\| \leq 1$ . These  $\mathcal{T}_i$  are not necessarily quantum operations because they will generally output a density matrix times a scalar.

We refer to the quantity  $\|a\|_1$  as the *1-norm of the (space-like) cut* and the infimum of  $\|a\|_1$  over all space-like cuts as the *gamma factor*  $\gamma(\mathcal{N})$ . If, in addition,  $\mathcal{E}_i = \mathcal{V}_i \otimes \mathcal{W}_i$  for some isometric channels  $\mathcal{V}_i, \mathcal{W}_i$  we say that the space-like cut is *local*.

The gamma factor was previously introduced in Ref. [PS23]. The form of the decomposition in a space-like cut is motivated by the fact that the 1-norm  $\|a\|_1$  quantifies the overhead in a simulation of the action of  $\mathcal{N}$  using the channels appearing in the decomposition, which can be implemented without entangling the subsystems  $A$  and  $B$ . (cf. Section 2.2.) With these definitions in hand, we can now state our first result.

**Theorem 1.2.** *Let  $U = \sum_j c_j V_j \otimes W_j$  be a decomposition of  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$  into local unitary operations. The double Hadamard test of Section 3.3 is a local space-like cut of  $\mathcal{U}: \rho \mapsto U\rho U^\dagger$  with two ancilla qubits (i.e.,  $d_{R_A} = d_{R_B} = 2$ ) and 1-norm  $\phi := 2\|c\|_1^2 - \|c\|_2^2$ . Moreover, if this decomposition is an operator Schmidt decomposition<sup>1</sup> then*

$$\phi = \gamma(\mathcal{U}) = 2\|c\|_1^2 - 1. \quad (2)$$

This result motivates our definition of the product extent (Definition 3.3) as the minimum value of

$$2\|c\|_1^2 - \|c\|_2^2 \quad \text{over all decompositions} \quad U = \sum_j c_j V_j \otimes W_j. \quad (3)$$

Our circuit cutting approach is analogous to the stabilizer-rank based classical simulation methods of Ref. [Bra+19], where the cost can be related to similar minimizations over decompositions of unitaries.

A potential cause for concern in the motivation for this definition is the complexity of finding good decompositions, as well as the gate complexity of implementing the space-like cut using our procedure. Fortunately, the quantity  $\phi$ , and hence the product extent, is submultiplicative under composition of unitaries (again, in a way analogous to [Bra+19]). This allows one to derive a good decomposition compatible with the double Hadamard test of Section 3.3 using decompositions of

<sup>1</sup>By an operator Schmidt decomposition, we mean a decomposition of a bipartite operator  $X$  acting on  $\mathcal{H}_{AB}$  of the form  $X = \sum_j \lambda_j A_j \otimes B_j$  such that  $\text{Tr}(A_j^\dagger A_k) = d_A \delta_{jk}$ ,  $\text{Tr}(B_j^\dagger B_k) = d_B \delta_{jk}$ , and  $\lambda_j > 0$ ,  $\sum_j \lambda_j^2 = 1$ . Such a decomposition always exists, though the  $A_j, B_j$  need not be unitary.




Figure 2: The left-hand side depicts the interaction graph of a Hamiltonian  $H$  describing a system of qubits with nearest-neighbour interactions on a 2D grid. There are 3 weak interactions in the boundary  $\partial A$ , indicated by the dashed red lines, and some 3-site (non-local) observable of interest  $P \otimes Q$  acts on the qubits highlighted in green. The right-hand side shows the interaction graph of the pair of randomly-chosen circuits  $\mathbf{U}_A$  and  $\mathbf{U}_B$  acting locally on  $AR_A$  and  $BR_B$ , respectively, which arises from the procedure described in Section 3.3. By measuring the observable  $P \otimes Q$  and a product of Pauli-Z operators on the ancillas, we can multiply by a random variable  $\gamma$  to recover the original mean value, in expectation.

the individual gates which comprise a given circuit. We exploit this property in Section 3.4 to derive a significantly improved, efficient algorithm for clustered Hamiltonian simulation. This problem was previously proposed and analyzed in Ref. [Pen+20], and subsequently in Ref. [Chi+21]. Here, one considers a Hamiltonian  $H$  defined on a system of  $n$  qubits which is a sum of  $\text{poly}(n)$  terms  $H_j$  each of which acts non-trivially on at most  $O(1)$  qubits and satisfies  $\|H_j\| \leq 1$ . We further assume that a given term is proportional to a Pauli operator. Suppose we partition the qubits into two disjoint subsets  $A$  and  $B$  of  $n_A$  and  $n_B$  qubits, respectively, and denote the set of interactions crossing the partition as  $\partial A$ . We show the following theorem.

**Theorem 3.12 (Informal).** *Let  $\eta := \sum_{j \in \partial A} \|H_j\|$  be the interaction strength in a bipartite Hamiltonian for the system  $AB$ , and let  $R_A$  and  $R_B$  be two ancilla qubits. To compute the expectation value of a time-evolved observable  $e^{-iHt}(X_A \otimes X_B)e^{iHt}$ , using an ensemble of polynomial-size local quantum circuits on  $AR_A$  and  $BR_B$  increases the number of required executions by a multiplicative factor of at most  $O(e^{8\eta t})$ .*

We arrive at this result by applying our procedure for space-like cutting to the first-order Lie-Trotter formula for the time-evolution operator under the Hamiltonian  $H$ . The procedure in the theorem is depicted schematically in Figure 2. For clustered Hamiltonians whose interaction strength between the partitions is sufficiently small, and for short enough times, we envision that the sample overhead may be manageable in practical settings. It is also clear that we may execute these local circuits one-at-a-time so long as the initial state is a product state  $\rho = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ . This results in an algorithm which requires executing quantum circuits defined on just  $\max\{n_A, n_B\}$  qubits and a single ancilla qubit.

Our result offers a significant improvement to the sample complexity of this problem compared with previous bounds, such as an upper bound of  $2^{O(\eta^2 t^2 |\partial A| / \epsilon)}$  due to Ref. [Pen+20], where  $\epsilon$  is the precision attained by the Trotter formula, and the  $O(\cdot)$  in the exponent hides a very large constant (much greater than 8) as well as a dependence on the degree of the interaction graph, which is taken to be some constant. By invoking higher-order Trotter formulae, Ref. [Chi+21] improves this to  $2^{O(\eta^{1/p} t^{1+1/p} |\partial A| / \epsilon^{1/p})}$ , with the same constant in the exponent and where  $p$  indicates the order of the product formula. Furthermore, in prior work it was assumed that the terms in the Hamiltonian

act geometrically locally, which is an assumption we are able to drop in our scheme. Noting that  $\eta \leq |\partial A|$ , both bounds are strictly worse than the bound in [Theorem 3.12](#). However, in our work we focus solely on the case of bipartitioning the system of interest, as opposed to arbitrarily many partitions as considered in [\[Pen+20\]](#). We leave the question of whether our scheme can be modified to allow for partitioning into more than two disjoint subsystems to future work.

## 1.2 Time-like cuts

In [Section 4](#) we give an improved bound on the cost of replacing wires in a circuit with measure-and-prepare operations, and we show that this bound is tight in some cases. The upper bound makes use of a certain time-like cut.

**Definition 1.3** (Time-like cut). A *time-like cut* of a quantum channel  $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow B}$  is a decomposition of the form

$$\mathcal{N} = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i (\text{id}_B \otimes \mathcal{T}_i) \circ \mathcal{M}_i \quad (4)$$

where

- $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ;
- $\mathcal{M}_i : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{BR_B})$  are measure-and-prepare channels; and
- $\mathcal{T}_i : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{R_B}) \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$  are post-processing operations of the form  $\mathcal{T}_i : X \mapsto \text{Tr}(OX)$  such that  $\|O\| \leq 1$ .

We refer to the quantity  $\|a\|_1$  as the *1-norm of the (time-like) cut* and the infimum of  $\|a\|_1$  over all time-like cuts as the *time-like gamma factor*  $\gamma_{\uparrow}(\mathcal{N})$ .

We remark that there is a way to unify the terminology in the time- and space-like cases using the formalism presented in, for example, Ref. [\[GS21\]](#). However, in this work we find it more convenient to treat the two cases separately.

In [Proposition 4.1](#) we show that, to estimate an observable  $X$  with respect to the output state of a generic circuit, one can use a decomposition of the form in [Definition 1.3](#) to replace  $k$  wires in the circuit with an ensemble of measure-and-prepare channels while increasing i) the size of the circuit by at most  $O(k^2)$  additional gates and ii) the number of executions by a multiplicative factor of at most  $O(2^k r)$  if  $X$  has rank at most  $r \leq 2^k$ , and by at most  $O(4^k)$  in general. In particular, a cost of  $O(2^k)$  executions suffices for additive-error estimates of the output probabilities of the original circuit. Interestingly, the proposal involves only random *diagonal* unitary 2-designs as well as state preparation and measurement in the computational basis.

We then give an information-theoretic argument that any similar procedure necessarily increases the number of required samples by a factor of at least  $\Omega(2^k)$ , leading to [Theorem 4.3](#). This argument is somewhat reminiscent of quantum data hiding [\[DLT02\]](#), wherein a bit can be perfectly encoded in a random choice of mixed state shared between Alice and Bob, but remains inaccessible so long as they use measurements implementable with local operations and classical communication (LOCC). Crucially, the “data hiding states” can be chosen to be pure states in our case since we consider a heavily restricted class of LOCC measurements, whereas it is known that the states must be mixed in order to hide the bit against LOCC more generally [\[MWW09\]](#). We leverage this difference to prove the lower bound when estimating output probabilities.

### 1.3 Related work

Ref. [PS23] gives a procedure which achieves the minimal 1-norm in a QPD for the special case of bipartite Clifford unitaries. The procedure we give in Section 3 differs in a few key respects: i) the upper bound on the 1-norm of our procedure is applicable to arbitrary unitaries, ii) our procedure makes use of a single pair of ancilla qubits, rather than a number of ancilla qubits growing with the dimension of the unitary, iii) our procedure does not use classical communication between parties, and iv) the overhead in gate complexity of our procedure is explicitly shown to be small in relevant cases. The procedure in Section 3 is also closely related to ideas in Refs. [BSS16] and [Edd+22]. In Ref. [BSS16], a circuit resembling a Hadamard test is used to simulate  $k$  physical qubits in sparse quantum circuits defined on  $n + k$  qubits. Roughly speaking, this would correspond to classically simulating a  $k$ -qubit subsystem of the “double Hadamard test” circuit depicted in Figure 3, and would therefore not be applicable in the settings we consider, where  $k$  may be equal to  $n$  in the worst case. In Ref. [Edd+22], a QPD-based method is suggested for “doubling” the size of a quantum simulation, though their analysis is performed at the level of quantum states rather than unitaries. Another key technical difference is that our procedure does not require preparing states corresponding to those in a Schmidt decomposition of the initial state in the circuit, which underlies the application of our result to clustered Hamiltonian simulation.

The decomposition of the identity channel into measure-and-prepare channels which we employ in Section 4.1 has previously been used to obtain similar results. To the best of our knowledge, the decomposition was first explicitly given in [Yua+21] to describe an application of the dynamic entanglement measure which they introduce. The authors show that the resulting QPD can be used to estimate expectation values of observables, though they do not provide explicit implementations of the channels. A similar procedure which makes use of ancilla qubits was then suggested in [BPS23]. Follow-up works [HWY23; Ped23] removed the need for ancilla qubits and provided explicit gate complexities for implementing the relevant channels. The procedure we give in Section 4.1 makes use of the same decomposition as in the works above, though we give a simpler implementation of the channels based on diagonal 2-designs (cf. [HWY23, Algorithm 1] versus Protocol 1). All in all, our improved upper bound comes from an improved *analysis* of the procedure, rather than a different choice of measure-and-prepare channels. Our lower bound in this setting is not implied by lower bounds on the 1-norm appearing in prior work [BPS23], as discussed in Section 2.2.

During the preparation of this paper we became aware of two other works whose results overlap with some aspects of our procedure for space-like cutting. In [SPS23, Theorem 5.1] the authors show using a different analysis that for bipartite unitaries (referred to as “KAK-like” unitaries in their work), the minimal 1-norm in a QPD is at most the product extent<sup>2</sup> defined in Section 3, which overlaps with the content of Theorem 1.2. Theorem 1.2 goes beyond this work by giving explicit circuits and bounds on the number of ancilla qubits required. Ref. [Ufr+23] gives a similar set of results for the special case of 2-qubit rotation gates.

## 2 Preliminaries

### 2.1 Notation

**Sets.** Throughout, we let  $\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B$ , etc. denote finite-dimensional Hilbert spaces representing quantum systems  $A, B$ , etc., and we denote their dimensions by  $d_A, d_B$ , etc. respectively. We denote

---

<sup>2</sup>Our description of their result is rewritten in the language of this paper and corrects a minor error at the time of writing.



by  $L(\mathcal{H}_A, \mathcal{H}_B)$  the set of all linear operators from  $\mathcal{H}_A$  to  $\mathcal{H}_B$ , and  $L(\mathcal{H}_A)$  the set of all square linear operators acting on  $\mathcal{H}_A$ . We let  $D(\mathcal{H}_A) \subset L(\mathcal{H}_A)$  be the set of all quantum states of system  $A$ , and  $U(\mathcal{H}_A) \subset L(\mathcal{H}_A)$  be the set of unitary operators acting on  $\mathcal{H}_A$ . The set of separable states (i.e., convex combinations of tensor product states) on the bipartite Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$  will be denoted by  $\text{SEP}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}|A, B)$ .

**Vectorization, Choi and Bell states.** The notation  $\text{vec}(\cdot)$  denotes vectorization, i.e., the natural linear bijection from linear operators on  $\mathcal{H}_A$  to elements of  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_A$ . For a given quantum channel  $\mathcal{N} : L(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{H}_{A'})$ , we let  $J_{\mathcal{N}} \in L(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A'})$  be the Choi-Jamiolkowski state (referred to as the *Choi state* from now on) corresponding to the channel, i.e.,  $J_{\mathcal{N}} = (\text{id}_A \otimes \mathcal{N})(\Phi_A)$  where  $\Phi_A = \frac{1}{d_A} \text{vec}(\mathbb{1}_A) \text{vec}(\mathbb{1}_A)^\dagger$ . For two quantum systems of equal dimension  $A$  and  $A'$  we let  $|\Phi\rangle_{AA'} := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_A}} \sum_{j \in [d_A]} |j\rangle_A \otimes |j\rangle_{A'}$  be the maximally entangled state (or Bell state) between  $A$  and  $A'$ .

**Some special operations.** The SWAP operator acting on the bipartite Hilbert space  $(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})^{\otimes 2}$  is denoted by  $F$  and has the action  $F|\psi\rangle \otimes |\phi\rangle = |\phi\rangle \otimes |\psi\rangle$  for any  $|\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d$ . For  $n$ -partite Hilbert spaces we denote by  $F_\pi$  the permutation operator corresponding to the permutation  $\pi \in \mathfrak{S}_n$  where  $\mathfrak{S}_n$  is the symmetric group of order  $n$ . The partial transpose map applied to an operator  $X \in L(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$  is denoted  $X^\Gamma$  and has the action  $|i\rangle\langle j|_A \otimes |k\rangle\langle \ell|_B \mapsto |i\rangle\langle j|_A \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle k|_B$  in the standard basis. For an operator  $M \in L(\mathcal{H}_A)$  let  $\bar{M}$  denote the complex conjugate of  $M$ .

**Random variables, distributions.** We denote random variables, including matrix-valued random variables, using bold font e.g.,  $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{U}$ , etc. If  $x$  is a real-valued random variable we write  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ , and similarly for other sets. The total variation distance between two distributions  $p, q$  is denoted by  $d_{\text{TV}}(p, q)$ .

**Operator conventions.** The  $p$ -norm  $\|X\|_p$  of an operator  $X$  is the Schatten  $p$ -norm, and we let  $\|X\|$  denote the Schatten  $\infty$ -norm of  $X$ , i.e., the operator norm. We write  $X \preceq Y$  if and only if  $Y - X$  is positive semidefinite.

## 2.2 Quasiprobability decompositions of quantum channels

In this work, a QPD of a quantum channel  $\mathcal{N} : L(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{H})$  is<sup>3</sup> a decomposition of the form

$$\mathcal{N} = \sum_{i=1}^m a_i \mathcal{T}_i \circ \mathcal{E}_i = \|a\|_1 \sum_{i=1}^m \frac{|a_i|}{\|a\|_1} \text{sign}(a_i) \mathcal{T}_i \circ \mathcal{E}_i. \quad (5)$$

[Definition 1.1](#) and [Definition 1.3](#) are special cases of this definition. The ingredients of the decomposition in [Equation \(5\)](#) are

- a vector  $a \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ;
- channels  $\mathcal{E}_i : L(\mathcal{H}) \rightarrow L(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_R)$  satisfying the desired constraint (i.e., an LOCC channel for space-like cuts, or a measure-and-prepare channel for time-like cuts); and

<sup>3</sup>The current definition differs from some prior work in that the coefficients  $a_i$  need not sum to one, because the  $\mathcal{T}_i$ 's can introduce weights. This renders the moniker ‘‘quasiprobability’’ slightly misleading, though we keep the terminology to be consistent with other, more closely related, prior work, e.g., [\[PS23\]](#).

- *post-processing operations*  $\mathcal{T}_i : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H} \otimes \mathcal{H}_R) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  of the form  $\mathcal{T}_i : \rho \mapsto \text{Tr}_R((\mathbb{1} \otimes O_i)\rho)$ , where  $O_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_R)$  is some observable on the ancilla system  $R$  satisfying  $\|O_i\| \leq 1$ .

The key feature of decompositions of this form is that measuring the observable  $\|a\|_1 \text{sign}(a_i)(O_i \otimes X)$  on the ensemble of states  $\{(|a_i| / \|a\|_1, \mathcal{E}_i(\rho))\}_i$  gives an unbiased estimator of  $\text{Tr}(X\mathcal{N}(\rho))$ , for any  $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H})$  and Hermitian observable  $X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$ . (Here, the index  $i$  in the observable corresponds to the value of  $i$  that is drawn when randomly selecting the state in the ensemble to prepare.)

For example, the local space-like cut we present in [Section 3.3](#), uses decompositions where  $R = R_A R_B$  is a pair of ancilla qubits,  $O_i = \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z$ , and  $\mathcal{E}_i = \mathcal{V}_i \otimes \mathcal{W}_i$  are local isometries in the ensemble. We then take the empirical mean of the outcomes from measuring  $\|a\|_1 \text{sign}(a_i) [X \otimes (\sigma_z)_{R_A} \otimes (\sigma_z)_{R_B}]$  on the ensemble of states. For the time-like cut presented in [Section 4](#), we have  $d_R = 1$  (the ancilla register is trivial),  $O_i = 1$ , and the channels  $\mathcal{E}_i = \mathcal{M}_i$  are measure-and-prepare channels in the ensemble. In either case, taking the empirical mean of  $N$  trials  $\hat{\mu}_1, \hat{\mu}_2, \dots, \hat{\mu}_N$  results in an unbiased estimator  $\hat{\mu}$  with variance  $\text{Var}[\hat{\mu}] = \text{Var}[\hat{\mu}_1]/N$ .

The definition of what constitutes a QPD given above contains as special cases the definition given in Ref. [\[PS23\]](#) and the “twisted channel” construction in Ref. [\[Zha+23\]](#).

**1-norm versus sample complexity.** At first glance, an appropriate quantity to characterize the minimum value of  $N$  required for an accurate estimate would appear to be the 1-norm  $\|a\|_1$ . Indeed, since  $\mu_1$  clearly has magnitude at most  $\|a\|_1$  with probability 1 (recall that  $X$  is assumed to be bounded in operator norm), taking  $N$  be of the order of  $\|a\|_1^2$  suffices by a straightforward application of Hoeffding’s Inequality. This is the argument provided in many if not all prior works on circuit cutting and related applications of QPDs. For a space-like cut of a given channel  $\mathcal{N}$ , the minimum value of the 1-norm,  $\gamma(\mathcal{N})$ , can in turn be lower bounded by examining the Choi state  $J_{\mathcal{N}}$  of  $\mathcal{N}$  and computing its *robustness of entanglement*  $R(J_{\mathcal{N}})$  (defined in [Section 2.3](#)) using the results of Ref. [\[PS23\]](#).

**Claim 2.1** (Essentially [\[PS23, Lemma 3.1\]](#)). *Let  $\mathcal{N}_{AB \rightarrow AB}$  be a bipartite quantum channel and consider space-like cuts of  $\mathcal{N}$  of the form in [Definition 1.1](#). It holds that*

$$\gamma(\mathcal{N}) \geq 1 + 2R(J_{\mathcal{N}}). \quad (6)$$

We provide a self-contained proof in [Appendix A](#) for completeness. A similar argument can be used to lower-bound the optimal 1-norm  $\gamma_{\uparrow}(\mathcal{N})$  for time-like cuts as well, as in [\[BPS23, Prop. 4.2\]](#). Intuitively, the less entangling an operation, the easier it should be to replace using a QPD.

There is a danger, however, in assuming a number of samples of the order  $\gamma(\mathcal{N})^2$ , or  $\gamma_{\uparrow}(\mathcal{N})^2$ , is also *necessary*. Firstly, as shown in [Proposition 4.1](#), this conclusion is demonstrably false in some cases of practical interest: the variance in the procedure associated with the optimal time-like cut scales at most like  $\gamma_{\uparrow}(\mathcal{N})$  for a class of non-trivial observables which nevertheless satisfy  $\|X\| = 1$ . Moreover, bounding the 1-norm of the cut in itself does not constitute an information-theoretic lower bound on the number of samples required for a procedure of a similar spirit, but perhaps not utilizing QPDs, to succeed. This raises the natural question: can we rigorously prove that a QPD-based approach is sample-optimal in a non-trivial setting? We answer this in the affirmative by showing in [Theorem 4.3](#) that, for estimating output probabilities, any choice of measure-and-prepare channels and classical post-processing in [Algorithm 1](#) requires the same number of samples, up to a constant factor, as the QPD-based procedure we give in [Section 4.1](#).



### 2.3 Diagonal 2-designs and the robustness of entanglement

A *diagonal t-design* on  $n$  qubits is a unitary-operator-valued random variable  $\mathbf{U} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^{2^n})$  satisfying

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U}} \mathbf{U}^{\otimes t} \mathbf{X} (\mathbf{U}^\dagger)^{\otimes t} = \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} V_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^{\otimes t} \mathbf{X} (V_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}^\dagger)^{\otimes t} \quad \forall \mathbf{X} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathbb{C}^{2^n}) \quad (7)$$

where  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \theta_{00\dots 0} \theta_{00\dots 1} \dots \theta_{11\dots 1} \in [0, 2\pi)^{\{0,1\}^n}$  is uniformly random and  $V_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \in \mathcal{U}(\mathbb{C}^{2^n})$  maps  $|x\rangle$  to  $e^{i\theta_x} |x\rangle$  for any  $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ . The implementation we make use of is stated in the following proposition. Here, a *k-qubit phase-random circuit* is a circuit in which random diagonal  $k$ -qubit unitaries are applied to every possible combination of  $\binom{n}{k}$  wires.

**Proposition 2.2** (Prop. 2 in [NKM14]). *For a system comprising  $n$  qubits, a  $k$ -qubit phase-random circuit is an exact diagonal  $t$ -design if and only if  $\min\{n, \lfloor \log t \rfloor + 1\} \leq k$ .*

In particular, in Section 4 we employ the case  $t = 2$  in our procedure for implementing time-like cuts, for which random 2-qubit diagonal gates suffice.

We will often have occasion to examine the robustness of entanglement of the Choi state of the channels we consider. The robustness of entanglement<sup>4</sup>  $R(\rho_{AB})$  of a quantum state  $\rho_{AB} \in \mathcal{H}_{AB} = \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$  is an entanglement measure which quantifies the amount of ‘‘mixing’’ with a separable state that is required in order to bring  $\rho_{AB}$  into the set of separable states. It is defined through

$$R(\rho_{AB}) = \min \left\{ s \geq 0 : \frac{1}{1+s} (\rho_{AB} + s\sigma_-) \in \text{Sep}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}|A, B), \sigma_- \in \text{Sep}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}|A, B) \right\}. \quad (8)$$

In the case where  $\rho_{AB}$  is pure a closed-form characterization of the robustness in terms of its Schmidt coefficients may be given [VT99]:

$$R(|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|) = \left( \sum_j \lambda_j \right)^2 - 1 \quad (9)$$

where  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$  has a Schmidt decomposition

$$|\psi\rangle_{AB} = \sum_j \lambda_j |a_j\rangle_A \otimes |b_j\rangle_B \quad (10)$$

with Schmidt coefficients  $\lambda_j$  satisfying  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq 0$ . The following theorem is a slight modification of the construction that appears in [VT99] which will enable us to give an efficient construction of good measure-and-prepare channels for the first setting we consider in this work.

**Theorem 2.3** (Similar to [VT99]). *Suppose  $\psi = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$  is a pure state of the form in Equation (10). Let  $R := R(\psi) = (\sum_j \lambda_j)^2 - 1$  and  $\boldsymbol{\theta} = \theta_1 \theta_2 \dots$  be a collection of independent and uniformly random angles  $\theta_j \in [0, 2\pi)$ . Define the random unit vectors*

$$|u_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\rangle := \frac{1}{(1+R)^{1/4}} \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j} e^{i\theta_j} |a_j\rangle, \quad |v_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\rangle := \frac{1}{(1+R)^{1/4}} \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j} e^{i\theta_j} |b_j\rangle \quad (11)$$

along with the separable states

$$\sigma_- := \frac{1}{R} \sum_{k \neq \ell} \lambda_k \lambda_\ell |a_k\rangle\langle a_k| \otimes |b_\ell\rangle\langle b_\ell|, \quad \sigma_+ := \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} |\overline{u_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}\rangle\langle \overline{u_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}}| \otimes |v_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\rangle\langle v_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}|. \quad (12)$$

It holds that

$$\sigma_+ = \frac{1}{1+R} (\psi + R\sigma_-). \quad (13)$$

<sup>4</sup>Closely related to the exponential of the max-relative entropy of entanglement [Dat09].

We say that two states  $\sigma_+, \sigma_-$  which satisfy Equation (13) for a particular  $\psi$  are *optimal* for  $\psi$ . Though at first glance it may appear that  $\sigma_+$  is defined as a convex combination of an infinite family of difficult-to-implement pure states, we may straightforwardly take this to be a more tractable, finite set in the following manner. Let  $d = 2^n$  and suppose  $\mathbf{U}$  is a diagonal 2-design. Also, let  $A_1, B_1, A_2, B_2$  be any unitaries which have the following actions:

$$\begin{aligned} A_1 : |1\rangle_A &\mapsto \frac{1}{(1+R)^{1/4}} \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j} |j\rangle_A, & B_1 : |1\rangle_B &\mapsto \frac{1}{(1+R)^{1/4}} \sum_j \sqrt{\lambda_j} |j\rangle_B \\ A_2 : |j\rangle_A &\mapsto |a_j\rangle_A, & B_2 : |j\rangle_B &\mapsto |b_j\rangle_B. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

Then defining the random unit vectors

$$|s(\mathbf{U})\rangle := A_2 \mathbf{U}^\dagger A_1 |1\rangle_A, \quad |t(\mathbf{U})\rangle := B_2 \mathbf{U} B_1 |1\rangle_B, \quad (15)$$

one may verify that

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U}} |s(\mathbf{U})\rangle \langle s(\mathbf{U})| \otimes |t(\mathbf{U})\rangle \langle t(\mathbf{U})| = \mathbb{E}_{\theta} |\bar{u}_\theta\rangle \langle \bar{u}_\theta| \otimes |v_\theta\rangle \langle v_\theta|. \quad (16)$$

Furthermore, as shown in [NKM14], a phase-random circuit  $U$  can be implemented by drawing 2-qubit gates from a finite set of 6 gates, independently and uniformly at random, at  $O(n^2)$  fixed locations in the circuit. In summary, one obtains an explicit description of  $\sigma_+$  as a random mixture of at most  $6^{O(n^2)}$  pure states. Moreover, if  $A_1, B_1, A_2,$  and  $B_2$  can be efficiently implemented, then the entire procedure to prepare  $\sigma_+$  is efficient in  $n$ .

### 3 Space-like cuts

In this section we introduce and analyze a procedure for local space-like cuts. We first give some preliminary definitions in Section 3.1 and Section 3.2 which will help us bound the cost of the procedure. We then describe the procedure and bound its cost in Section 3.3 before applying it to the problem of clustered Hamiltonian simulation in Section 3.4.

#### 3.1 Local decompositions of entangling unitaries

Fix a bipartite system  $AB$  with a corresponding Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B$ . A set  $\Gamma$  is called a *local decomposition* if it is of the form  $\Gamma = \{(c_i, V_i \otimes W_i) : i \in [m]\}$  for some positive integer  $m > 0$ , where for each  $i \in [m]$  it holds that  $c_i \in \mathbb{R}$ ,  $V_i \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_A)$ , and  $W_i \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_B)$ . (We omit the term “local” whenever it is unambiguous and safe to do so.) We say that a decomposition  $\Gamma$  of the above form is *valid* for a unitary operator  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$  if  $U = \sum_{i \in [m]} c_i V_i \otimes W_i$ . We also define the *magnitude* of such a decomposition  $\Gamma$  as

$$\phi(\Gamma) := 2 \|c\|_1^2 - \|c\|_2^2 \quad (17)$$

viewing  $(c_i : i \in [m])$  as a column vector in  $\mathbb{R}^m$ . Finally, we define the *product* of two decompositions  $\Gamma_1 = \{(a_i, V_i^{(1)} \otimes W_i^{(1)}) : i \in [m_1]\}$  and  $\Gamma_2 = \{(b_i, V_i^{(2)} \otimes W_i^{(2)}) : i \in [m_2]\}$  as

$$\Gamma_1 \cdot \Gamma_2 := \{(a_i b_j, V_i^{(1)} V_j^{(2)} \otimes W_i^{(1)} W_j^{(2)}) : (i, j) \in [m_1] \times [m_2]\}. \quad (18)$$

We then have the following straightforward but important observations.

**Lemma 3.1.** Let  $U, V \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ . If  $\Gamma_1$  and  $\Gamma_2$  are valid local decompositions for  $U$  and  $V$ , respectively, then  $\Gamma_1 \cdot \Gamma_2$  is a valid local decomposition for  $UV$ .

**Lemma 3.2.** The magnitude  $\phi$  is submultiplicative. In other words, for any two decompositions  $\Gamma_1, \Gamma_2$ , it holds that  $\phi(\Gamma_1 \cdot \Gamma_2) \leq \phi(\Gamma_1)\phi(\Gamma_2)$ .

*Proof.* Let  $m_1, m_2 \in \mathbb{Z}$  be positive integers,  $a \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1}$  and  $b \in \mathbb{R}^{m_2}$  be two column vectors, and define the column vector  $c \in \mathbb{R}^{m_1 \times m_2}$  through  $c_{ij} := a_i b_j$ . It suffices to show the inequality  $2\|c\|_1^2 - \|c\|_2^2 \leq (2\|a\|_1^2 - \|a\|_2^2)(2\|b\|_1^2 - \|b\|_2^2)$ . First, note that  $\|c\|_1^2 = \|a\|_1^2 \|b\|_1^2$  and  $\|c\|_2^2 = \|a\|_2^2 \|b\|_2^2$ . Therefore, subtracting the left-hand side of the inequality from the right-hand side yields

$$2(\|a\|_1^2 - \|a\|_2^2)(\|b\|_1^2 - \|b\|_2^2) \quad (19)$$

which is nonnegative due to the inequality between norms  $\|\cdot\|_1 \geq \|\cdot\|_2$ .  $\square$

The proof reveals that a stronger bound is possible. For any nontrivial decomposition, Equation (19) will be strictly positive. This is related to the fact that cutting multiple gates together reduces the cost, which has been previously observed in Refs. [SPS23; PS23]; here we see additionally that the strict inequality holds by simply taking products of the unitaries in the original decompositions.

### 3.2 The product extent: an operational measure of entanglement

Making use of the terminology established in the previous section we have the following definition.

**Definition 3.3** (Product extent of a unitary). The *product extent*  $\zeta(U)$  of a unitary operator  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$  is defined as the minimum of  $\phi(\Gamma)$  over all local decompositions  $\Gamma$  which are valid for  $U$ .

This definition relies on the fact that the minimum is always achieved, which in turn relies on the fact that optimal decompositions exist with a bounded number of terms. We prove these facts in Appendix B. In addition to satisfying the desired criteria for a “dynamic” entanglement measure [Nie+03], the product extent is submultiplicative under composition. (See Lemma 3.8.) This enables one to bound, for example, the product extent of a circuit from knowing the product extent of its individual gates. The definition of the product extent is motivated by Theorem 1.2, which implies that it is an achievable cost in a simple space-like cutting procedure. We repeat the theorem below for convenience, with a minor addition since we have now defined  $\zeta(U)$ .

**Theorem 1.2** (Rephrased). Let  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$  be a unitary operation. For any local decomposition  $\Gamma$  which is valid for  $U$ , the double Hadamard test of Section 3.3 is a local space-like cut of  $\mathcal{U}: \rho \mapsto U\rho U^\dagger$  with two ancilla qubits (i.e.,  $d_{R_A} = d_{R_B} = 2$ ) and 1-norm  $\phi(\Gamma)$ . Moreover, if this decomposition is an operator Schmidt decomposition then

$$\phi(\Gamma) = \zeta(U) = \gamma(\mathcal{U}) = 2\|c\|_1^2 - 1. \quad (20)$$

The first part of the theorem follows by combining Lemma 3.9 and Lemma 3.11. The second part follows from Claim 2.1 and Proposition 3.7. We now compare the product extent to a previously introduced [HN03] entanglement measure for unitaries called the Choi-Jamiolkowski robustness. This quantity is reminiscent of an entanglement measure for quantum states  $\rho$ , the *log-negativity* [Ple05]  $\log\|\rho^\Gamma\|_1$ , and may be interpreted as an analogous measure for quantum dynamics.

**Definition 3.4** (Choi-Jamiolkowski robustness). The *Choi-Jamiolkowski robustness*  $R_c(U)$  of a bipartite unitary operator  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$  is defined as  $1 + 2R(J_U)$ .

Up to a constant shift and rescaling factor, this is just the robustness of entanglement of the Choi state of the channel  $\mathcal{U} : \rho \mapsto U\rho U^\dagger$ . The Choi-Jamiolkowski robustness may be equivalently expressed as

$$\begin{aligned} R_c(U) = \min \quad & \|a\|_1 \\ \text{s.t.} \quad & J_U = \sum_j a_j \rho_j \otimes \sigma_j \\ & \rho_j \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A) \\ & \sigma_j \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_B) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

by collecting terms appropriately. The following proposition gives an easily computable expression for the solution to this optimization problem.

**Proposition 3.5.** *For any bipartite unitary operator  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$  it holds that*

$$R_c(U) = 2(d_A d_B)^{-1} \|(UF)^\Gamma\|_1^2 - 1. \quad (22)$$

*Proof.* Any operator  $X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$  has an operator Schmidt decomposition of the form

$$X = \sum_j \lambda_j A_j \otimes B_j \quad (23)$$

where  $\text{Tr}(A_j^\dagger A_k) = d_A \delta_{jk}$ ,  $\text{Tr}(B_j^\dagger B_k) = d_B \delta_{jk}$ , and  $\sum_j \lambda_j^2 = 1$ . Taking  $U = X$ , a simple algebra shows

$$(UF)^\Gamma = \sum_j \lambda_j \text{vec}(A_j) \text{vec}(\overline{B_j})^\dagger. \quad (24)$$

Using the orthogonality of the operators  $A_j$  and  $B_j$ , we find that the singular vectors of  $(UF)^\Gamma$  are proportional to  $\text{vec}(A_j)$  and  $\text{vec}(\overline{B_j})$ , and hence the singular values of  $(UF)^\Gamma$  are  $\sqrt{d_A d_B} \lambda_j$ . Therefore, the right-hand side of Equation (22) is equal to  $2(\sum_j \lambda_j)^2 - 1$ . Moreover, it may be straightforwardly verified that  $\lambda_j$  are the Schmidt coefficients of the pure state corresponding to the unit vector  $(\mathbb{1}_{A'B'} \otimes U_{AB})|\Phi\rangle_{A'B'AB}$ . The claim then follows from Equation (9) and the fact that we are defining the Choi-Jamiolkowski robustness such that  $R_c(U) = 1 + 2R(J_U) = 1 + 2((\sum_j \lambda_j)^2 - 1) = 2(\sum_j \lambda_j)^2 - 1$ .  $\square$

Clearly,  $R_c(U) \leq 2d_A d_B - 1$ , with equality if  $U$  is a dual unitary operator such as a SWAP operation. We can relate the product extent to the Choi-Jamiolkowski robustness as follows.

**Lemma 3.6.** *For any bipartite unitary operator  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$  it holds that*

$$1 \leq R_c(U) \leq \xi(U) \leq 2d_A^2 d_B^2 - 1. \quad (25)$$

*Proof.* The first inequality is clear from the definition of the Choi-Jamiolkowski robustness. The final inequality can be seen by writing  $U$  in the discrete Weyl (generalized Pauli) basis: if the vector  $\alpha$  satisfies  $U = \sum_{j=1}^{d_A^2 d_B^2} \alpha_j P_j \otimes Q_j$  for  $P_j, Q_j$  discrete Weyl operators then

$$1 = \frac{\text{Tr}(U^\dagger U)}{d_A d_B} = \|\alpha\|_2^2. \quad (26)$$

The maximum value of  $\|\alpha\|_1^2$  given this constraint is attained when  $\alpha_j = 1/d_A d_B$  for every  $j$ , so  $\|\alpha\|_1^2 \leq (d_A d_B)^2$ . It remains to prove that  $R_c(U) \leq \xi(U)$ . To this end, we show in the following paragraph that if  $U = \sum_j c_j V_j \otimes W_j$  then a decomposition of the Choi state  $J_U$  of the form  $J_U = \sum_j a_j \rho_j \otimes \sigma_j$  exists with  $\|a\|_1 = 2\|c\|_1^2 - \|c\|_2^2$ , which proves the claim.

Let

$$|a_j\rangle := V_j|\Phi\rangle_{AA'}, \quad |b_j\rangle := W_j|\Phi\rangle_{BB'}, \quad (27)$$

so that we may write

$$J_U = \sum_{ij} c_i c_j |a_i\rangle\langle a_j| \otimes |b_i\rangle\langle b_j| \quad (28)$$

$$= \sum_i c_i^2 |a_i\rangle\langle a_i| \otimes |b_i\rangle\langle b_i| + \sum_{i \neq j} c_i c_j |a_i\rangle\langle a_j| \otimes |b_i\rangle\langle b_j|. \quad (29)$$

We can decompose the ‘‘off-diagonal’’ terms in the second sum using the following identity, which also appears in [Edd+22] (and implicitly in [MF21b]):

$$\sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^4} (-1)^p |\alpha_{ij}^p\rangle\langle \alpha_{ij}^p| \otimes |\beta_{ij}^p\rangle\langle \beta_{ij}^p| = |a_i\rangle\langle a_j| \otimes |b_i\rangle\langle b_j| + |a_j\rangle\langle a_i| \otimes |b_j\rangle\langle b_i| \quad (30)$$

where we have set

$$|\alpha_{ij}^p\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|a_i\rangle + i^p |a_j\rangle), \quad |\beta_{ij}^p\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}} (|b_i\rangle + i^p |b_j\rangle). \quad (31)$$

Hence, we have

$$J_U = \sum_i c_i^2 |a_i\rangle\langle a_i| \otimes |b_i\rangle\langle b_i| + \frac{1}{2} \sum_{p \in \mathbb{Z}^4} (-1)^p \sum_{i \neq j} c_i c_j |\alpha_{ij}^p\rangle\langle \alpha_{ij}^p| \otimes |\beta_{ij}^p\rangle\langle \beta_{ij}^p|. \quad (32)$$

The sum of the absolute values of the coefficients in the above is equal to

$$\|c\|_2^2 + 2 \sum_{i \neq j} |c_i c_j| = 2\|c\|_1^2 - \|c\|_2^2 \quad (33)$$

as desired.  $\square$

**Sufficient conditions for optimality.** By Claim 2.1 we have that  $R_c(U)$  bounds from below the 1-norm in any space-like cut of  $U$ :  $\rho \rightarrow U\rho U^\dagger$ . Hence, we say that a space-like cut of  $U$  into LOCC channels whose 1-norm saturates this bound is optimal. Remarkably, in many cases our procedure — which only makes use of local unitary operations and does not use classical communication — achieves this notion of optimality, which addresses an open question from Ref. [PS23].

**Proposition 3.7.** *Suppose  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$  admits an operator Schmidt decomposition whose Schmidt operators are each proportional to some unitary operator. Then  $\xi(U) = R_c(U)$ .*

*Proof.* By Lemma 3.6, we have  $\xi(U) \geq R_c(U)$ . Let  $U = \sum_j \lambda_j V_j \otimes W_j$  be the operator Schmidt decomposition of  $U$ , such that  $\text{Tr}(V_j^\dagger V_k) = d_A \delta_{jk}$  and  $\text{Tr}(W_j^\dagger W_k) = d_B \delta_{jk}$ , and  $\sum_j \lambda_j^2 = 1$ , and  $V_j, W_j$

are unitary. Then

$$\zeta(U) \leq 2\left(\sum_j \lambda_j\right)^2 - \sum_j \lambda_j^2 \quad (34)$$

$$= 2\left(\sum_j \lambda_j\right)^2 - 1 \quad (35)$$

$$= 1 + 2R(J_U) \quad (36)$$

$$= R_c(U). \quad \square$$

We remark that 2-qubit gates, generalized SWAP operations, transversal gates, and certain controlled-Pauli operations all fall into the required category of unitary. We conclude this discussion by showing that the product extent satisfies the desirable properties mentioned at the beginning of this section.

**Lemma 3.8.** *The product extent satisfies:*

- i) Faithfulness:  $\zeta(U) = 1$  iff  $U$  is a product of local unitaries.
- ii) Local unitary invariance:  $\zeta((V_A \otimes V_B)U(W_A \otimes W_B)) = \zeta(U)$ .
- iii) Submultiplicativity:  $\zeta(UV) \leq \zeta(U)\zeta(V)$ .

*Proof.* To show faithfulness of  $\zeta$ , we make use of [Lemma 3.6](#) along with the fact that  $R_c(U)$  is faithful, from which it follows that if  $\zeta(U) = 1$  then  $U$  must be a product of local unitaries. The other direction is straightforward. Local unitary invariance follows from the local unitary invariance of the feasible set in the optimization problem which defines  $\zeta$ . Submultiplicativity follows from the definition of  $\zeta$  since the magnitude  $\phi$  is submultiplicative.  $\square$

### 3.3 The double Hadamard test

In this section we describe the procedure which leads to [Theorem 1.2](#). In addition to yielding the bound in the statement of the theorem, this procedure allows us to give explicit descriptions of the required products of local unitaries in the relevant QPD.

Fix a positive integer  $m \in \mathbb{Z}$  as well as a valid local decomposition  $\Gamma$  for the unitary  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$  of the form  $\Gamma = \{(c_i, V_i \otimes W_i) : i \in [m]\}$ , such that  $U = \sum_{i=1}^m c_i V_i \otimes W_i$  and  $c_i > 0$  for each  $i \in [m]$ . Note that this positivity requirement is without loss of generality compared to the decompositions appearing previously since the sign of each  $c_i$  can be absorbed into the unitary operators. We define the *setting random variables*  $\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j} \in [m]$  and  $\mathbf{g} \in \{0, 1\}$  with joint probability mass function (PMF) given by

$$p(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{g}) = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } \mathbf{i} = \mathbf{j} \text{ and } \mathbf{g} = 1 \\ c_{\mathbf{i}} c_{\mathbf{j}} \phi(\Gamma)^{-1} & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (37)$$

Note that this is a valid PMF since

$$\sum_{\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{g}} p(\mathbf{i}, \mathbf{j}, \mathbf{g}) = \phi(\Gamma)^{-1} \left( \sum_{\mathbf{i}} c_{\mathbf{i}}^2 + 2 \sum_{\mathbf{i} \neq \mathbf{j}} c_{\mathbf{i}} c_{\mathbf{j}} \right) = \phi(\Gamma)^{-1} (2 \|c\|_1^2 - \|c\|_2^2) = 1. \quad (38)$$

Using the setting random variables, we define a corresponding *random* local unitary circuit acting on  $AB$  and a pair of local ancilla qubits  $R_A R_B$  according to [Figure 3](#). These circuits have a nearly






Figure 3: **Left:** a bipartite unitary operation  $U$  acting on a subsystem  $AB$  of the system  $ABE$  followed by measurement of an observable  $X$ , yielding an outcome  $y_0 \in \text{spec}(X)$ . **Right:** an ensemble of “double Hadamard test” circuits for space-like cutting of the unitary making use of the decomposition  $U = \sum_i c_i V_i \otimes W_i$ . The ensemble is generated by the random variables  $i, j$ , and  $G$ , as described in Section 3.3. The estimator described in Lemma 3.9 is constructed from the measurement outcomes from these random circuits, and bounding the variance of this estimator leads to Theorem 1.2.

identical form to that for two simultaneous Hadamard tests except all qubits are measured. Here,  $G = \mathbb{1}$  if  $g = 0$  and  $G = S$  (a single-qubit phase gate) otherwise, and

$$\begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{V_i/V_j} \\ | \\ \text{---} \end{array} = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes V_i + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes V_j, \quad \begin{array}{c} \text{---} \\ | \\ \text{---} \\ \boxed{W_i/W_j} \\ | \\ \text{---} \end{array} = |0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes W_i + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes W_j. \quad (39)$$

The following lemma implies that this ensemble of operations allows one to estimate expectation values with respect to the output of the original circuit using a number of samples at most on the order of  $\phi(\Gamma)^2 \|X\|^2$ .

**Lemma 3.9.** *Let  $X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{ABE})$  be a Hermitian observable and  $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{ABE})$  be a quantum state. Define  $\mathbf{y} \in \text{spec}(X)$  and  $\mathbf{b} = \mathbf{b}_1 \mathbf{b}_2 \in \{0, 1\}^2$  to be the random variables obtained from measuring  $X$  on the register  $ABE$  and measuring  $R_A R_B$  in the computational basis, respectively, on the output of the random circuit in Figure 3. It holds that  $\hat{\mu} := \phi(\Gamma) (-1)^{\mathbf{g} + \mathbf{b}_1 + \mathbf{b}_2} \mathbf{y}$  is an unbiased estimator of  $\mu := \text{Tr}(X U_{AB} \rho_{ABE} U_{AB}^\dagger)$ .*

If  $\|X\| \leq 1$  and we pick an optimal  $\Gamma$  so that  $\phi(\Gamma) = \zeta(U)$  then the estimator has variance at most  $\zeta(U)^2$ .

### Proof of Lemma 3.9

By linearity, it suffices to show that the lemma holds for any pure input state  $\rho_{ABE} = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|_{ABE}$ . Let  $\mathcal{B}(i, j, g)$  denote the event where  $i = i, j = j$ , and  $g = g$  for any value of the setting random variables  $(i, j, g) \in [m]^2 \times \{0, 1\}$ . We may write

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \hat{\mu} &= \sum_i c_i^2 \mathbb{E} \left[ (-1)^{b_1 + b_2} \mathbf{y} | \mathcal{B}(i, i, 0) \right] \\ &\quad + \sum_{i \neq j} c_i c_j \left( \mathbb{E} \left[ (-1)^{b_1 + b_2} \mathbf{y} | \mathcal{B}(i, j, 0) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ (-1)^{b_1 + b_2} \mathbf{y} | \mathcal{B}(i, j, 1) \right] \right). \end{aligned} \quad (40)$$

Conditioned on  $\mathcal{B}(i,i,0)$ , the state (see [Figure 3](#)) prior to measurement is  $|0\rangle_{R_A}(V_i \otimes W_i)_{AB}|\psi\rangle_{ABE}|0\rangle_{R_B}$ . (Here and for the remainder of this section we use implicit identities acting on the register  $E$ .) Hence,  $(b_1, b_2) = (0,0)$  with probability 1 and the first sum in [Equation \(40\)](#) is equal to

$$\sum_i c_i^2 \text{Tr}(X(V_i \otimes W_i)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|(V_i^\dagger \otimes W_i^\dagger)). \quad (41)$$

A preview of the conclusion of the next part of the argument is as follows: for any  $i \neq j$ , the  $(i,j)$ <sup>th</sup> term in the second sum is equal to

$$\frac{c_i c_j}{2} \left[ \text{Tr}\left(X(V_i \otimes W_i)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|(V_j^\dagger \otimes W_j^\dagger)\right) + \text{Tr}\left(X(V_j \otimes W_j)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|(V_i^\dagger \otimes W_i^\dagger)\right) \right] \quad (42)$$

which implies that the right-hand side of [Equation \(40\)](#) is equal to

$$\sum_{i,j \in [m]} c_i c_j \text{Tr}(X(V_i \otimes W_i)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|(V_j^\dagger \otimes W_j^\dagger)) = \text{Tr}(XU|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|U^\dagger) \quad (43)$$

as required. Let us now show this.

**Claim 3.10.** *For any  $i, j \in [m]$  it holds that*

$$\begin{aligned} & \mathbb{E} \left[ (-1)^{b_1+b_2} \mathbf{y} | \mathcal{B}(i, j, 0) \right] - \mathbb{E} \left[ (-1)^{b_1+b_2} \mathbf{y} | \mathcal{B}(i, j, 1) \right] \\ &= \frac{1}{2} \left[ \text{Tr}(X(V_i \otimes W_i)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|(V_j^\dagger \otimes W_j^\dagger)) + \text{Tr}(X(V_j \otimes W_j)|\psi\rangle\langle\psi|(V_i^\dagger \otimes W_i^\dagger)) \right]. \end{aligned} \quad (44)$$

*Proof.* Let us consider the case where  $i = 1$  and  $j = 2$  for notational clarity: the other cases are identical. Define the states

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi_{00}\rangle &:= (V_1 \otimes W_1)|\psi\rangle & |\psi_{01}\rangle &:= (V_1 \otimes W_2)|\psi\rangle \\ |\psi_{10}\rangle &:= (V_2 \otimes W_1)|\psi\rangle & |\psi_{11}\rangle &:= (V_2 \otimes W_2)|\psi\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (45)$$

Conditioned on the event  $\mathcal{B}(1,2,0)$ , the circuit in [Figure 3](#) acts as

$$|00\rangle_{R_A R_B} |\psi\rangle_{AB} \longrightarrow \frac{1}{2} \sum_{a \in \{0,1\}^2} |a\rangle_{R_A R_B} \otimes |\psi_{a_1 a_2}\rangle_{AB} \quad (46)$$

$$\longrightarrow \frac{1}{4} \sum_{a, a' \in \{0,1\}^2} (-1)^{a \cdot a'} |a'\rangle \otimes |\psi_{a_1 a_2}\rangle \quad (47)$$

where  $a \cdot b := a_1 b_1 + a_2 b_2$ . Therefore, the probability of observing the outcome  $y$  from measuring  $AB$  according to  $X$  and  $b = b_1 b_2$  from measuring  $R_A R_B$  in the computational basis is equal to

$$\frac{1}{16} \sum_{a, a' \in \{0,1\}^2} (-1)^{(a-a') \cdot b} \langle \psi_{a'_1 a'_2} | \Pi_y | \psi_{a_1 a_2} \rangle \quad (48)$$

in this case. Similarly, if  $\mathcal{B}(1,2,1)$  occurs, the circuit produces the state

$$\frac{1}{4} \sum_{a, a' \in \{0,1\}^2} i^{a \cdot (1,1)} (-1)^{a \cdot a'} |a'\rangle \otimes |\psi_{a_1 a_2}\rangle. \quad (49)$$

such that the probability of observing the outcomes  $b = b_1 b_2$  and  $y$  from measuring  $R_A R_B$  and  $AB$ , respectively, is

$$\frac{1}{16} \sum_{a,a' \in \{0,1\}^2} i^{(a-a') \cdot (1,1)} (-1)^{(a-a') \cdot b} \langle \psi_{a'_1 a'_2} | \Pi_y | \psi_{a_1 a_2} \rangle. \quad (50)$$

Using Equation (48) and Equation (50) we find that the left-hand side of Equation (44) (with  $i = 1$  and  $j = 2$ ) is equal to

$$\begin{aligned} & \frac{1}{16} \sum_{\substack{y \in \text{spec}(X) \\ b \in \{0,1\}^2 \\ a,a' \in \{0,1\}^2}} (-1)^{b \cdot (1,1)} y \left( (-1)^{(a-a') \cdot b} - i^{(a-a') \cdot (1,1)} (-1)^{(a-a') \cdot b} \right) \langle \psi_{a'_1 a'_2} | \Pi_y | \psi_{a_1 a_2} \rangle \\ &= \frac{1}{16} \sum_{\substack{a,a' \in \{0,1\}^2 \\ b \in \{0,1\}^2}} (-1)^{(a-a'+(1,1)) \cdot b} \left( 1 - i^{(a-a') \cdot (1,1)} \right) \langle \psi_{a'_1 a'_2} | X | \psi_{a_1 a_2} \rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (51)$$

A straightforward case analysis shows

$$\sum_{b \in \{0,1\}^2} (-1)^{(a-a'+(1,1)) \cdot b} \left( 1 - i^{(a-a') \cdot (1,1)} \right) = \begin{cases} 8 & \text{if } a = 00 \text{ and } a' = 11 \\ 8 & \text{if } a = 11 \text{ and } a' = 00 \\ 0 & \text{otherwise} \end{cases} \quad (52)$$

from which we may conclude that the right-hand side of Equation (51) is equal to

$$\frac{1}{2} (\langle \psi_{00} | X | \psi_{11} \rangle + \langle \psi_{11} | X | \psi_{00} \rangle). \quad (53)$$

The claim follows from the definitions of  $|\psi_{00}\rangle$  and  $|\psi_{11}\rangle$ .  $\square$

The next lemma completes the proof of the first part of Theorem 1.2, concerning the existence of a space-like cut of the desired form.

**Lemma 3.11.** *Lemma 3.9 implies that the channel  $\mathcal{U}: \rho \mapsto U\rho U^\dagger$  has a space-like cut of the form described in Theorem 1.2.*

*Proof.* Let  $E$  be a copy of the system  $AB$ . By Lemma 3.9 we have

$$\mathbb{E} \hat{\mu} = \text{Tr}(X(\text{id}_E \otimes \mathcal{U})(\rho)) \quad (54)$$

for any Hermitian observable  $X \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{ABE})$  and state  $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{ABE})$ , where  $\hat{\mu}$  is defined as in the lemma. Using Equation (40), the definitions of  $y$  and  $b_1 b_2$ , and making use of Figure 3, the expected value of  $\hat{\mu}$  can be written

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E} \hat{\mu} &= \sum_{i,j} c_i c_j \text{Tr} \left( (X \otimes (\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z)_{R_A R_B}) (\text{id}_E \otimes \mathcal{V}_{AR_A}^{(i,j,0)} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{BR_B}^{(i,j,0)}) (\rho \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00|_{R_A R_B}) \right) \\ &\quad - \sum_{i \neq j} c_i c_j \text{Tr} \left( (X \otimes (\sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z)_{R_A R_B}) (\text{id}_E \otimes \mathcal{V}_{AR_A}^{(i,j,1)} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{BR_B}^{(i,j,1)}) (\rho \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00|_{R_A R_B}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (55)$$

$$=: \text{Tr} \left( X(\text{id}_E \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{U}})(\rho) \right) \quad (56)$$

where  $\mathcal{V}^{(i,j,g)}$  and  $\mathcal{W}^{(i,j,g)}$  denote the actions of the local circuits on the subsystems  $AR_A$  and  $BR_B$ , respectively, in [Figure 3](#), conditioned on the event where  $i = i$ ,  $j = j$ , and  $g = g$ , and in the second line we have defined the map  $\tilde{\mathcal{U}} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$  by

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{\mathcal{U}}(Y_{AB}) = & \sum_{i,j} c_i c_j \text{Tr}_{R_A R_B} \left( (\mathbb{1}_{AB} \otimes \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z) (\mathcal{V}_{AR_A}^{(i,j,0)} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{BR_B}^{(i,j,0)}) (Y_{AB} \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00|_{R_A R_B}) \right) \\ & - \sum_{i \neq j} c_i c_j \text{Tr}_{R_A R_B} \left( (\mathbb{1}_{AB} \otimes \sigma_z \otimes \sigma_z) (\mathcal{V}_{AR_A}^{(i,j,1)} \otimes \mathcal{W}_{BR_B}^{(i,j,1)}) (Y_{AB} \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00|_{R_A R_B}) \right) \end{aligned} \quad (57)$$

for all  $Y_{AB} \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$ . By inspection, if  $\mathcal{U} = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$  then the right-hand side of the above is a QPD of the desired form. It remains to show that  $\mathcal{U} = \tilde{\mathcal{U}}$ . But this is clear from the fact we may pick a basis of Hermitian observables for the vector space  $\mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{ABE})$  and use [Equation \(54\)](#) and [Equation \(56\)](#) for each element of this basis to conclude that

$$(\text{id}_E \otimes \tilde{\mathcal{U}})(\rho) = (\text{id}_E \otimes \mathcal{U})(\rho) \quad (58)$$

for any  $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{ABE})$ . Picking  $\rho = \Phi_{AB}$  to be the maximally entangled state and noting that the function taking linear maps to their Choi states is a bijection proves the claim.  $\square$

### 3.4 Application to clustered Hamiltonian simulation

Our procedure for space-like cutting is applicable to the simulation of clustered quantum systems, as previously considered in [\[Pen+20; Chi+21\]](#). Unlike the setting introduced in these works, we focus on partitioning the system into just two disjoint subsets, and we also assume the local terms in the Hamiltonian of the system are proportional to Pauli strings. However, our setting is more general in other ways: we do not require *geometric* locality, nor a restriction to 2-local interactions between qubits in a bounded-degree interaction graph. Instead, we consider systems of  $n$  qubits whose Hamiltonian we take to be of the general form

$$H = \sum_{i \in E_A} H_i + \sum_{j \in B} H_j + \sum_{k \in \partial A} H_k \quad (59)$$

where  $A, B \subset [n]$  is a partition of the  $n$  qubits into disjoint subsystems comprising  $n_A$  and  $n_B$  qubits, respectively, each term is  $O(1)$ -local (acts non-trivially on at most  $O(1)$  subsystems), and terms  $H_i$  with  $i \in E_A$  ( $i \in E_B$ ) act non-trivially only on qubits in  $A$  ( $B$ ), while terms  $H_k$  with  $k \in \partial A$  act non-trivially on qubits in both subsystems. We also assume that each term satisfies  $\|H_i\| \leq 1$  and the total number of terms is at most  $\text{poly}(n)$ . Suppose further that there is an observable of interest  $X$  which can be efficiently measured and whose eigenvectors are product states with respect to  $AB$ , e.g., computational basis measurements and efficient post-processing, or Pauli observables of the form  $X = X_A \otimes X_B$ . The following is then a formal description of the task considered in prior work in the case of bipartitioning.

**Problem 1** (Clustered Hamiltonian Simulation).

**Input:**  $N$  copies of some initial state  $\rho_{AB}$ , an accuracy parameter  $\varepsilon > 0$ , a simulation time  $t \in \mathbb{R}$ , and classical descriptions of i) a Hamiltonian  $H$  of the form in [Equation \(59\)](#) and ii) an observable  $X$  of the form described above.

**Output:** An estimate  $\hat{\mu}$  of  $\mu := \text{Tr}(X e^{-iHt} \rho_{AB} e^{iHt})$  s.t.  $|\hat{\mu} - \mu| \leq \varepsilon$  with high probability.

In the statement of the following theorem, “polynomial-size” indicates circuits which are of size polynomial in  $n$ ,  $t$ , and  $\varepsilon$ , while “locally” refers to product unitaries with respect to subsystems  $AR_A$  and  $BR_B$ .

**Theorem 3.12.** *Let  $R_A$  and  $R_B$  be a pair of ancilla qubits. [Problem 1](#) can be solved using a quantum algorithm which computes  $\hat{\mu}$  using efficient classical post-processing of the measurement outcomes obtained from  $N = O(e^{8\eta t} / \varepsilon^2)$  independent executions of random, polynomial-size quantum circuits each acting locally on a copy of  $\rho_{AB} \otimes |00\rangle\langle 00|_{R_A R_B}$ , where  $\eta := \sum_{k \in \partial A} \|H_k\|$ . Moreover, there is a classical algorithm to sample these circuits in time  $\text{poly}(n, t, 1/\varepsilon)$ .*

It is straightforward to see that we may execute the circuits in this theorem one-at-a-time on a single system of  $\max\{n_A, n_B\} + 1$  qubits so long as the initial state is a product state  $\rho = \rho_A \otimes \rho_B$ , making use of the assumption that the observable  $X$  is implementable without applying entangling unitaries prior to measuring. This allows one to recover the originally suggested use-case of solving this problem from Ref. [[Pen+20](#)]; that is, reducing the number of qubits required to perform a quantum simulation task.

*Proof of [Theorem 3.12](#).* We describe an algorithm which satisfies all the required properties. The algorithm is based on a straightforward local decomposition of the first-order Trotter formula for the time-evolution  $\mathcal{T} : \mathbb{R} \rightarrow \text{U}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$  defined for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$  as

$$\mathcal{T}(x) = \prod_{j \in E_A \cup E_B} e^{-iH_j x} \prod_{k \in \partial A} e^{-iH_k x}. \quad (60)$$

By [[Chi+21](#), Corollary 12], for instance, taking a sufficiently large positive integer  $r = O(\text{poly}(n) t^2 \varepsilon^{-1})$  and defining  $U := \mathcal{T}(t/r)^r$  we have

$$\|U - e^{-iHt}\| \leq \varepsilon/4. \quad (61)$$

By this choice, making use of the assumption that  $\|X\| \leq 1$  it holds that

$$|\text{Tr}(Xe^{-iHt}\rho e^{iHt}) - \text{Tr}(XU\rho U^\dagger)| \leq \varepsilon/2. \quad (62)$$

Hence, to solve [Problem 1](#) it suffices to produce an estimate for  $\text{Tr}(XU\rho U^\dagger)$  which is accurate to within  $\varepsilon/2$ . We may accomplish this using the procedure in [Theorem 1.2](#) in the following manner. We consider local decompositions of the unitary operation  $e^{-iH_j t/r}$ . If  $j \in E_A \cup E_B$  then this operator itself is a local decomposition via the singleton set  $\Gamma_j = \{(1, e^{-iH_j t/r})\}$  since  $e^{-iH_j t/r}$  is of the form  $U_A \otimes U_B$ . If instead  $j \in \partial A$  we use the local decomposition

$$\Gamma_j = \{(\cos(\|H_j\|t/r), \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1}), (\sin(\|H_j\|t/r), -i H_j / \|H_j\|)\} \quad (63)$$

whose magnitude is

$$\phi(\Gamma_j) = 2(|\cos(t\|H_j\|/r)| + |\sin(t\|H_j\|/r)|)^2 - 1 \quad (64)$$

$$= 1 + 4|\cos(t\|H_j\|/r)\sin(t\|H_j\|/r)| \quad (65)$$

$$\leq 1 + 4t\|H_j\|/r \quad (66)$$

where the inequality follows from the fact that  $|\sin(x)| \leq |x|$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . By [Lemma 3.1](#) the decomposition

$$\Gamma := \left( \prod_{j \in E_A \cup E_B} \Gamma_j \prod_{k \in \partial A} \Gamma_k \right)^r \quad (67)$$

is valid for  $U$ . Moreover, by [Lemma 3.2](#) it holds that this decomposition has magnitude

$$\phi(\Gamma) \leq \left( \prod_{j \in E_A \cup E_B} \underbrace{\phi(\Gamma_j)}_{=1} \prod_{k \in \partial A} \phi(\Gamma_k) \right)^r \quad (68)$$

$$\leq \left( \prod_{k \in \partial A} (1 + 4t \|H_k\| / r) \right)^r. \quad (69)$$

$$\leq \exp(4\eta t) \quad (70)$$

using the definition of  $\eta$  and the inequality  $1 + x \leq e^x$  for all  $x \in \mathbb{R}$ . [Theorem 1.2](#) then implies that we can use the procedure in [Section 3.3](#) with the decomposition  $\Gamma$  to estimate  $\text{Tr}(XU\rho U^\dagger)$  to within accuracy  $\varepsilon/2$  using  $O(e^{8\eta t}/\varepsilon^2)$  independent executions of the random circuits described therein, which act locally on  $AR_A$  and  $BR_B$  as required. It remains to show that this procedure, including the classical post-processing step, can be implemented efficiently. Since  $X$  is efficiently measurable by assumption, and the procedure in [Section 3.3](#) involves computing the empirical mean of the observable  $\phi(\Gamma) [(\sigma_z)_{R_A} \otimes (\sigma_z)_{R_B} \otimes X_{AB}]$  on the output of some random circuits, it suffices to show that we can efficiently i) implement a given circuit from the ensemble ii) sample from the appropriate distribution for  $\Gamma$ , as described in [Equation \(37\)](#) and iii) compute  $\phi(\Gamma)$ .

The first claim holds since, by inspecting [Equation \(67\)](#) and making use of the definitions of the  $\Gamma_j$  terms, the decomposition  $\Gamma$  comprises unitary operators which are implementable by local Pauli rotations interspersed with Pauli operators  $-i H_k / \|H_k\|$  for some term  $k$ . The double Hadamard test procedure from [Section 3.3](#) is then implemented using controlled versions of these local circuits, as depicted in [Figure 3](#), and the size of any such circuit is of the order  $r \cdot \text{poly}(n)$ .

For each  $k \in \partial A$  set  $c_{k,0} := |\cos(\|H_k\|t/r)|$  and  $c_{k,1} := |\sin(\|H_k\|t/r)|$ . To show the second claim, we give an explicit procedure for performing the sampling task. First, set  $\ell = 1$  and for each  $k \in \partial A$  independently sample the Bernoulli random variable  $x_{\ell,k} \in \{0,1\}$  according to the distribution such that

$$x_{\ell,k} = \begin{cases} 0 & \text{w/ prob. } \frac{c_{k,0}}{c_{k,0} + c_{k,1}} \\ 1 & \text{w/ prob. } \frac{c_{k,1}}{c_{k,0} + c_{k,1}} \end{cases} \quad (71)$$

Then repeat this procedure for each  $\ell \in \{2, \dots, r\}$ . The end result is a random vector  $\vec{x}$  indexed by elements in  $\{0,1\}^{[r] \times \partial A}$ . Repeat this entire procedure once more, resulting in a random vector  $\vec{y} \in \{0,1\}^{[r] \times \partial A}$ . We may interpret each fixed value  $\vec{x} \in \{0,1\}^{[r] \times \partial A}$  as an index set for the vectors  $c$  in the decomposition  $\Gamma$  with elements

$$c_{\vec{x}} := \prod_{\ell \in [r]} \prod_{k \in \partial A} c_{k, x_{\ell,k}}. \quad (72)$$

The 1- and 2-norms of these vectors can then be written explicitly as

$$\|c\|_1 = \sum_{\vec{x}} c_{\vec{x}} = \left( \prod_{k \in \partial A} (c_{k,0} + c_{k,1}) \right)^r, \quad \|c\|_2 = \sqrt{\sum_{\vec{x}} c_{\vec{x}}^2} = \left( \prod_{k \in \partial A} (c_{k,0}^2 + c_{k,1}^2) \right)^{r/2}. \quad (73)$$

Let  $g \in \{0,1\}$  be an independent Bernoulli random variable such that  $g = 0$  with probability  $1/2$ , and let  $\mathcal{B}$  denote the event where  $\vec{x} = \vec{y}$  and  $g = 1$ . To sample from the desired distribution, we post-select on  $\mathcal{B}$  not occurring, i.e., the complement of  $\mathcal{B}$  which we denote by  $\mathcal{B}^c$ . We can accomplish this post-selection by allowing one to repeat the procedure if  $\mathcal{B}$  occurs, up to  $K$  times, and declaring



failure if none of the trials yields the event  $\mathcal{B}^c$ . Since  $\Pr[\mathcal{B}] \leq 1/2$  we can amplify the success probability to an arbitrarily small value by taking  $K$  sufficiently large. We have in particular that

$$\Pr[\mathcal{B}^c] = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \sum_{\vec{x}} \prod_{\ell \in [r]} \prod_{k \in \partial A} \frac{c_{k,x_{\ell,k}}^2}{(c_{k,0} + c_{k,1})^2} = 1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|c\|_2^2}{\|c\|_1^2}. \quad (74)$$

Next, observe that the random variables  $\vec{x}$ ,  $\vec{y}$ , and  $\mathbf{g}$  are distributed such that for each value of  $g \in \{0,1\}$  and  $\vec{x}, \vec{y} \in \{0,1\}^{[r] \times \partial A}$  which are in the event  $\mathcal{B}^c$  we have

$$\Pr[\vec{x} = \vec{x}, \vec{y} = \vec{y}, \mathbf{g} = g \mid \mathcal{B}^c] = \frac{1}{2} \prod_{\ell \in [r]} \prod_{k \in \partial A} \frac{c_{k,x_{\ell,k}}}{c_{k,0} + c_{k,1}} \cdot \frac{c_{k,y_{\ell,k}}}{c_{k,0} + c_{k,1}} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|c\|_2^2}{\|c\|_1^2}\right)^{-1} \quad (75)$$

$$= \frac{c_{\vec{x}} c_{\vec{y}}}{2 \|c\|_1^2} \left(1 - \frac{1}{2} \frac{\|c\|_2^2}{\|c\|_1^2}\right)^{-1} \quad (76)$$

$$= \frac{c_{\vec{x}} c_{\vec{y}}}{2 \|c\|_1^2 - \|c\|_2^2} \quad (77)$$

$$= c_{\vec{x}} c_{\vec{y}} \phi(\Gamma)^{-1}. \quad (78)$$

Thus, the setting random variables  $\vec{x}$ ,  $\vec{y}$ , and  $\mathbf{g}$  produced by this post-selected random process are distributed as in [Equation \(37\)](#), as desired.

The final claim regarding the efficiency of computing  $\phi(\Gamma)$  is evident upon writing the magnitude as

$$\phi(\Gamma) = 2 \left( \prod_{k \in \partial A} (c_{k,0} + c_{k,1}) \right)^{2r} - \left( \prod_{k \in \partial A} (c_{k,0}^2 + c_{k,1}^2) \right)^r. \quad \square$$

We conclude with some additional observations about the circuits appearing in the procedure above which may be of interest. We state these without proof.

1. For each possible circuit, the subgraph of the circuit interaction graph restricted to qubits in  $A$  is identical to that for the Hamiltonian interaction graph, and similarly for  $B$ .
2. For each possible circuit, the vertex corresponding to  $R_A$  in the circuit interaction graph is adjacent only to those qubits in  $A$  with which  $\partial A$  is incident, and similarly for  $R_B$ .

These observations are also depicted in [Figure 2](#).

## 4 Time-like cuts

In this section, we analyze the performance of a specific time-like cut of the identity channel (i.e., [Definition 1.3](#) with  $\mathcal{N}_{A \rightarrow A} = \text{id}_A$ ) for a natural operational task. We pick a decomposition of the form in [Equation \(4\)](#) which is optimal, i.e., the 1-norm of the time-like cut is equal to the time-like gamma factor  $\gamma_{\uparrow}(\text{id}_A) = 2d_A - 1$ . Additionally, the required measure-and-prepare operations  $\mathcal{M}_i$  can be implemented efficiently using diagonal 2-designs, and there is no post-processing of ancilla qubits required, so  $d_{R_B} = 1$  and [Equation \(4\)](#) becomes  $\text{id}_A = \sum_i a_i \mathcal{M}_i$ . Note that the fact that the time-like gamma factor is at most  $2d_A - 1$  is immediate from the decomposition we give, while the argument for the lower bound is nearly identical to the proof of [Claim 2.1](#), so we omit it here. See [[Yua+21](#); [BPS23](#)] for more detailed discussions. To analyze the performance of the time-like

cut in an operational task, we introduce the following template for an algorithm with desirable properties.

---

**Algorithm 1** Mean estimation using time-like cut without ancillas

---

**Input:**  $\rho_{AE}^{\otimes N}$ , observable  $X$  on  $AE$ ,  $\varepsilon$ ,  $d_A$   
**Output:** Estimate  $\hat{\mu}$  of  $\text{Tr}(X\rho_{AE})$

- 1: **for**  $k = 1, \dots, N$  **do**
- 2:   Sample  $z_k \sim p$
- 3:   Prepare  $\rho'_k = (\mathcal{M}_{z_k} \otimes \text{id}_E)(\rho)$  using  $k^{\text{th}}$  copy of  $\rho$
- 4:    $x_k \leftarrow$  measure  $X$  on  $\rho'_k$
- 5: **end for**
- 6:  $\hat{\mu} \leftarrow$  ClassicalPostProcessing( $(z_1, x_1), \dots, (z_N, x_N)$ )
- 7: **return**  $\hat{\mu}$

---

To instantiate the algorithm, one specifies the classical post-processing step and a choice of an ensemble of measure-and-prepare channels  $\{(p_z, \mathcal{M}_z)\}$ . We say that the algorithm is successful if its output satisfies  $|\hat{\mu} - \text{Tr}(X\rho_{AE})| \leq \varepsilon$ , and we would like to bound the number of iterations, or *copies*,  $N$  required for the algorithm to succeed with high probability using our time-like cut. Using the reasoning based on Hoeffding's Inequality presented in [Section 2.2](#) and in prior work,  $N = O(\|a\|_1^2 / \varepsilon^2)$  copies should suffice. In [Section 4.1](#) we show that going beyond this analysis by bounding the variance directly leads to an improved upper bound for some cases. In [Section 4.2](#) we verify that this analysis is tight when  $X$  is rank-1, using an information-theoretic argument.

## 4.1 The performance of optimal measure-and-prepare channels

We show the following proposition.

**Proposition 4.1.** *Let  $A$  be a subset of the qubits in an  $n$ -qubit quantum system. There exists a pair of measure-and-prepare channels  $\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1 : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$  and a choice of ensemble distribution  $p : \{0, 1\} \rightarrow [0, 1]$  such that [Algorithm 1](#) succeeds with high probability using*

$$N = O(d_A \varepsilon^{-2} (1 + \|\text{Tr}_A(X^2)\|)) \quad (79)$$

*copies of the unknown state. Furthermore,  $\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1$  can be implemented using  $O(\log^2(d_A))$  diagonal 2-qubit gates along with measurement and state preparation in the computational basis.*

Let us first remark on some consequences of the bound in [Equation \(79\)](#). The operator norm in the right-hand side of [Equation \(79\)](#) can in turn be bounded by  $d_A^{(q-1)/q} \|X^2\|_q$  for any  $q \geq 1$  using the results of [[Ras12](#), Prop. 1]. The following two consequences are of particular interest. When  $q = \infty$ , we get  $N = O(d_A^2 / \varepsilon^2)$ , which reproduces the results obtained in prior work. (More precisely, the dependence on the dimension scales at most like  $(2d_A - 1)^2$  in this case.) For constant error  $\varepsilon = O(1)$ , taking  $q = 1$  and using the fact that all the eigenvalues of  $X$  have magnitude at most 1, we find  $N = O(d_A r)$  where  $r$  is the rank of the observable  $X$ . This implies, for instance, that additive error estimates of the output probabilities of a unitary quantum circuit can be computed using  $O(d_A)$  rounds of the above procedure, which is a quadratic improvement over the bounds in prior work and enables us to conclude that the information-theoretic lower bound we derive in [Section 4.2](#) is tight in some cases.

### Proof of Proposition 4.1

The Choi state of the identity channel  $\text{id}_{A \rightarrow A}$  is just the maximally entangled state  $\Phi_A$ . We will describe a pair of efficiently implementable measure-and-prepare channels  $\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1 : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$  satisfying

$$\Phi_A = d_A J_{\mathcal{M}_0} - (d_A - 1) J_{\mathcal{M}_1}. \quad (80)$$

This is equivalent to showing  $\text{id}_A = d_A \mathcal{M}_0 - (d_A - 1) \mathcal{M}_1$ , which is a space-like cut of  $\text{id}_A$  with 1-norm  $2d_A - 1$ . Let  $\{|1\rangle, |2\rangle, \dots, |d_A\rangle\}$  denote the standard basis for  $\mathcal{H}$  and consider a uniformly random ‘‘equatorial’’ state

$$|v_\theta\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d_A}} \sum_{j=1}^{d_A} e^{i\theta_j} |j\rangle \quad (81)$$

where  $\theta = \theta_1 \theta_2 \dots \theta_{d_A}$  for  $\theta_j$  drawn independently and uniformly at random from  $[0, 2\pi)$ . Define

$$\mathcal{M}_0 : \rho \mapsto d_A \mathbb{E}_\theta \text{Tr}(|v_\theta\rangle\langle v_\theta| \rho) |v_\theta\rangle\langle v_\theta|, \quad (82)$$

$$\mathcal{M}_1 : \rho \mapsto \frac{1}{d_A - 1} \sum_{k \neq \ell} \text{Tr}(|k\rangle\langle k| \rho) |k\rangle\langle \ell| \quad (83)$$

where  $k, \ell \in [d_A]$ . Let us first check that this choice satisfies Equation (80). We have

$$J_{\mathcal{M}_0} = (\text{id} \otimes \mathcal{M}_0)(\Phi) \quad (84)$$

$$= \sum_{j,k=1}^{d_A} |j\rangle\langle k| \mathbb{E}_\theta \langle v_\theta | j \rangle \langle k | v_\theta \rangle |v_\theta\rangle\langle v_\theta| \quad (85)$$

$$= \mathbb{E} [|\bar{v}_\theta\rangle\langle \bar{v}_\theta| \otimes |v_\theta\rangle\langle v_\theta|]. \quad (86)$$

On the other hand, it is fairly straightforward to verify that

$$\mathbb{E} [(|v_\theta\rangle\langle v_\theta|)^{\otimes 2}] = \frac{1}{d_A^2} \left( F + \sum_{k \neq \ell} |k\ell\rangle\langle k\ell| \right) \quad (87)$$

where  $F$  is the swap operation on  $(\mathbb{C}^{d_A})^{\otimes 2}$ . By taking partial transposes of both sides, Equation (87) holds if and only if

$$\mathbb{E} [|\bar{v}_\theta\rangle\langle \bar{v}_\theta| \otimes |v_\theta\rangle\langle v_\theta|] = \frac{1}{d_A} \left( \Phi + \frac{1}{d_A} \sum_{k \neq \ell} |k\ell\rangle\langle k\ell| \right) \quad (88)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d} \left( \Phi + \frac{d_A - 1}{d_A(d_A - 1)} \sum_{k \neq \ell} |k\ell\rangle\langle k\ell| \right) \quad (89)$$

Hence,  $\mathcal{M}_0$  and  $\mathcal{M}_1$  satisfy Equation (80).

We now explain how they can be implemented efficiently on a quantum circuit on  $n$  qubits, assuming  $d_A = 2^n$ . The channel  $\mathcal{M}_1$  is straightforward to implement using measurements and state preparations in the computational basis, so we focus on  $\mathcal{M}_0$ . We claim that the following procedure implements the channel  $\mathcal{M}_0$ .

**Protocol 1** (Optimal measure-and-prepare channel  $\mathcal{M}_0$ ).

**Input:**  $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$  for  $A$  an  $n$ -qubit system.

**Output:**  $(\mathcal{M}_0 \otimes \text{id}_E)(\rho)$ , where  $\mathcal{M}_0$  is as in Equation (82).

1. Apply a phase-random circuit  $U^\dagger$  to the system  $A$ .
2. Apply single-qubit Hadamard gates on each qubit in  $A$ .
3. Measure the system  $A$  in the computational basis, obtaining  $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ .
4. Prepare the state  $UH^{\otimes n}|x\rangle_A$  on system  $A$ .

This implements a channel acting on subsystem  $A$  with the action

$$\rho \mapsto \mathbb{E}_U \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} \text{Tr}(U|h_x\rangle\langle h_x|U^\dagger \rho) U|h_x\rangle\langle h_x|U^\dagger \quad (90)$$

for any  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A)$  where we let  $|h_x\rangle$  denote the state  $H^{\otimes n}|x\rangle$ . The right-hand side of the above is equal to

$$\sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} \mathbb{E}_U \text{Tr}_1 \left( (\rho \otimes \mathbb{1})(U|h_x\rangle\langle h_x|U^\dagger)^{\otimes 2} \right) = \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} \text{Tr}_1 \left( (\rho \otimes \mathbb{1}) \mathbb{E}_U (U|h_x\rangle\langle h_x|U^\dagger)^{\otimes 2} \right) \quad (91)$$

$$= \sum_{x \in \{0,1\}^n} \text{Tr}_1 \left( (\rho \otimes \mathbb{1}) \mathbb{E}_\theta V_\theta^{\otimes 2} |h_x\rangle\langle h_x|^{\otimes 2} (V_\theta^\dagger)^{\otimes 2} \right) \quad (92)$$

$$= d_A \text{Tr}_1 \left( (\rho \otimes \mathbb{1}) \mathbb{E}_\theta (|v_\theta\rangle\langle v_\theta|)^{\otimes 2} \right) \quad (93)$$

$$= d_A \mathbb{E}_\theta \text{Tr}(|v_\theta\rangle\langle v_\theta| \rho) |v_\theta\rangle\langle v_\theta| \quad (94)$$

where the second line follows since  $U$  forms a diagonal unitary 2-design and the third line follows from the fact that  $V_\theta|h_x\rangle$  is identically distributed to  $|v_\theta\rangle$  for any  $x \in \{0,1\}^n$ . The total gate complexity of this procedure is  $O(n^2)$  and it is dominated by the phase-random circuit.

It remains to bound the number of additional samples required to achieve the simulation task using these measure-and-prepare channels. To this end, consider randomly applying one of the two possible modified circuits in the above scheme according to a Bernoulli random variable  $z$  such that  $z = 0$  with probability  $d_A/(2d_A - 1)$  and  $z = 1$  with probability  $(d_A - 1)/(2d_A - 1)$ . For each possible outcome  $z = 0, 1$ , this yields the final state

$$\sigma_z := (\mathcal{M}_z \otimes \text{id}_E)(\rho_{AE}). \quad (95)$$

Next, fix an eigendecomposition of  $X$  of the form  $X = \sum_{j=1}^{d_{AE}} \lambda_j |v_j\rangle\langle v_j|$ , such that  $\lambda_1 \geq \lambda_2 \geq \dots \geq \lambda_{d_{AE}}$ . If we measure  $X$  we obtain a random variable  $\mathbf{y} \in \text{spec}(X)$  such that, conditioned on  $z = z$ , we have  $\mathbf{y} = y$  with probability  $\sum_{j \in [d_{AE}]: \lambda_j = y} \langle v_j | \sigma_z | v_j \rangle$ . As described in Section 2.2, we take our unbiased estimator of the true expectation  $\mu := \text{Tr}(X\rho_{AE})$  to be

$$\hat{\mu} := (2d_A - 1)(-1)^z \mathbf{y}. \quad (96)$$

**Claim 4.2.** *It holds that  $\mathbb{E} \hat{\mu} = \mu$  and*

$$\text{Var}[\hat{\mu}] \leq (2d_A - 1) \cdot \min\{2 \|\text{Tr}_A(X^2)\| + 1, 2d_A - 1\}. \quad (97)$$

*Proof.* First, we have

$$\mathbb{E} \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}} = d_A \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{z} = 0] - (d_A - 1) \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}|\mathbf{z} = 1] \quad (98)$$

$$= d_A \text{Tr}(X\sigma_0) - (d_A - 1) \text{Tr}(X\sigma_1) \quad (99)$$

$$= \boldsymbol{\mu} \quad (100)$$

where the last line follows by making use of Equation (95), the linearity of trace, and the fact that  $d_A \mathcal{M}_0 - (d_A - 1) \mathcal{M}_1 = \text{id}_A$ . The bound  $\text{Var}[\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}] \leq (2d_A - 1)^2$  follows from the definition of  $\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}$ , since  $\|X\| \leq 1$  and therefore  $|\hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}| \leq 2d_A - 1$  with probability 1. Finally, we bound the variance by the second moment, which is equal to

$$\mathbb{E} \hat{\boldsymbol{\mu}}^2 = (2d_A - 1)^2 \left( \frac{d_A}{2d_A - 1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}^2|\mathbf{z} = 0] + \frac{d_A - 1}{2d_A - 1} \mathbb{E}[\mathbf{y}^2|\mathbf{z} = 1] \right) \quad (101)$$

$$= (2d_A - 1) (d_A \text{Tr}(X^2\sigma_0) + (d_A - 1) \text{Tr}(X^2\sigma_1)). \quad (102)$$

Using the fact that  $\mathcal{M}_0$  and  $\mathcal{M}_1$  are self-adjoint maps, we have

$$\text{Tr}(X^2\sigma_z) = \text{Tr}((\mathcal{M}_z \otimes \text{id}_E)(X^2)\rho_{AE}) \quad (103)$$

for each  $z \in \{0, 1\}$ . We may then compute

$$(\mathcal{M}_0 \otimes \text{id}_E)(X^2) = d_A \mathbb{E}_{\boldsymbol{\theta}} \text{Tr}_2((|v_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}\rangle\langle v_{\boldsymbol{\theta}}|_{12}^{\otimes 2} \otimes \mathbb{1}_3)(\mathbb{1}_1 \otimes X_{23}^2)) \quad (104)$$

$$\preceq \frac{1}{d_A} [\text{Tr}_2((F_{12} \otimes \mathbb{1}_3)(\mathbb{1}_1 \otimes X_{23}^2)) + \text{Tr}_2(\mathbb{1}_1 \otimes X_{23}^2)] \quad (105)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d_A} [X^2 + \mathbb{1}_A \otimes \text{Tr}_A(X^2)] \quad (106)$$

where the second line follows from Equation (87) as well as the fact that

$$\sum_{k \neq \ell} |k\ell\rangle\langle k\ell| = \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} - \sum_k |kk\rangle\langle kk| \quad (107)$$

and the operator

$$\text{Tr}_2((|kk\rangle\langle kk|_{12} \otimes \mathbb{1}_3)(\mathbb{1}_1 \otimes X_{23}^2)) \quad (108)$$

is positive semidefinite for all  $k$ . Therefore,

$$\text{Tr}(X^2\sigma_0) \leq \frac{1}{d_A} [\text{Tr}(X^2\rho_{AE}) + \text{Tr}(\text{Tr}_A(X^2)\rho_E)] \quad (109)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{d_A} (1 + \|\text{Tr}_A(X^2)\|). \quad (110)$$

where  $\rho_E = \text{Tr}_A(\rho_{AE})$  is the reduced state of the qubits which are not acted upon by the measure-and-prepare channels, and the second line follows since  $\|O\| \leq 1$ . Similarly, we can bound the second term in Equation (102) by observing that

$$(\mathcal{M}_1 \otimes \text{id}_E)(X^2) = \frac{1}{d_A - 1} \sum_{k \neq \ell} \text{Tr}_2((|k\rangle\langle k|_1 \otimes |\ell\rangle\langle \ell|_2 \otimes \mathbb{1}_3)(\mathbb{1}_1 \otimes X_{23}^2)) \quad (111)$$

$$\preceq \frac{\text{Tr}_2(\mathbb{1}_1 \otimes X_{23}^2)}{d_A - 1} \quad (112)$$

$$= \frac{\mathbb{1}_A \otimes \text{Tr}_A(X^2)}{d_A - 1} \quad (113)$$

and therefore

$$\mathrm{Tr}(X^2\sigma_1) \leq \frac{\|\mathrm{Tr}_A(X^2)\|}{d_A - 1}. \quad (114)$$

Substituting Equation (110) and Equation (114) into Equation (102) yields the bound on the variance as claimed.  $\square$

Using the bound on the variance in the above claim as well as Chebyshev's Inequality concludes the proof of Proposition 4.1. We remark that the proposition would follow from a similar analysis based on unitary 2-designs (e.g., random Clifford circuits) rather than diagonal 2-designs, though we chose the latter since the resulting pair of channels  $\mathcal{M}_0, \mathcal{M}_1$  achieve the optimal space-like cut.

## 4.2 An information-theoretic lower bound

In this section, we show an information-theoretic lower bound of  $\Omega(d_A)$  on the number of copies required in any instantiation of Algorithm 1 whenever  $X$  is rank-1. In particular, this allows us to conclude that the bound in Proposition 4.1 is tight for the special case where one is interested in output probabilities of quantum circuits. Furthermore, the lower bound suggests that, unlike in classical shadows [HKP20], for example, a dependence on  $d_A$  in the number of samples required for circuit cutting is unavoidable even if one restricts the task to estimating expectation values of low-rank observables.

**Theorem 4.3.** *Consider the setting in Algorithm 1. Suppose  $X$  is known to be a rank-1 projection operator. Then the choice of measure-and-prepare channels in the proof of Proposition 4.1 is sample-optimal with respect to the dimension of subsystem  $A$ ; that is,  $N = \Theta(d_A)$  copies of the unknown state are both necessary and sufficient for a procedure of the form in Algorithm 1 to succeed with high probability.*

*Proof.* The upper bound follows directly from Proposition 4.1 using the fact that  $\|\mathrm{Tr}_A(X^2)\| \leq 1$  in this case. For the lower bound, consider the state discrimination task in which the goal is to distinguish between the two alternatives  $\rho_U^{(1)} = U|1\rangle\langle 1|U^\dagger$  and  $\rho_U^{(2)} = U|2\rangle\langle 2|U^\dagger$ , where  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$  is some unitary operator. Clearly, this task reduces to estimating  $\mathrm{Tr}(X\rho)$  for the unknown state  $\rho \in \{\rho_U^{(1)}, \rho_U^{(2)}\}$  and with the observable taken to be  $X = U|1\rangle\langle 1|U^\dagger$ . Namely, if the estimate  $\hat{\mu}$  is sufficiently accurate, then outputting 1 if  $\hat{\mu} \geq 1/2$  and 2 otherwise results in a successful discrimination. Hence, it suffices to show the existence of a unitary  $U$  such that the information available from the procedure described in Algorithm 1 is insufficient to identify  $\rho$  unless it is repeated  $N = \Omega(d_A)$  times. To this end, let  $x \in \{1, 2\}$  be a random variable, let  $\mathbf{U}$  be a Haar-random unitary, let  $z$  denote the choice of measure-and-prepare channel, and let  $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}$  be the random variable corresponding to measuring  $(\mathcal{M}_z \otimes \mathrm{id}_E)(\rho_U^{(x)})$  according to the POVM  $\{M, \mathbb{1} - M\}$  where  $M = \mathbf{U}|1\rangle\langle 1|\mathbf{U}^\dagger$  and  $M$  is the POVM element corresponding to the outcome  $\mathbf{y} = 0$ . Let us now define the following shorthand for the joint distribution of the random variables  $(\mathbf{y}, z)$  (which are the ones available for use in the state discrimination task) conditioned on the others. For each  $x \in \{1, 2\}$ ,  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_B)$ , and  $z$  a possible value of  $z$  let

$$p_U^{(x)}(0, z) := \Pr[\mathbf{y} = 0, z = z | x = x, \mathbf{U} = U] \quad (115)$$

and  $p_U^{(x)}(1, z) := 1 - p_U^{(x)}(0, z)$ . We claim that

$$\mathbb{E}_{U \sim \mathrm{Haar}} d_{\mathrm{TV}}(p_U^{(1)}, p_U^{(2)}) \leq O\left(\frac{1}{d_A}\right). \quad (116)$$



Therefore there exists a fixed unitary  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$  for which the TV distance between the distributions  $p_U^{(1)}$  and  $p_U^{(2)}$  is at most  $O(1/d_A)$ . By the telescoping property of the TV distance,

$$d_{\text{TV}}((p_U^{(1)})^{\otimes N}, (p_U^{(2)})^{\otimes N}) \leq O\left(\frac{N}{d_A}\right) \quad (117)$$

and therefore the left-hand side is small unless  $N = \Omega(d_A)$ . It remains to show Equation (116). Let  $q$  denote the marginal distribution of  $z$  and define  $p_{U,z}^{(x)}(y) = p_U^{(x)}(y, z)/q(z)$ . Then the left-hand side of Equation (116) is equal to  $\mathbb{E}_{z \sim q} \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U} \sim \text{Haar}} d_{\text{TV}}(p_{\mathbf{U},z}^{(1)}, p_{\mathbf{U},z}^{(2)})$  since  $\mathbf{U}$  and  $z$  are independent. Also, for any  $z$  we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U} \sim \text{Haar}} d_{\text{TV}}(p_{\mathbf{U},z}^{(1)}, p_{\mathbf{U},z}^{(2)}) = \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U} \sim \text{Haar}} \left| p_{\mathbf{U},z}^{(1)}(0) - p_{\mathbf{U},z}^{(2)}(0) \right| \quad (118)$$

$$\leq \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U} \sim \text{Haar}} \left( p_{\mathbf{U},z}^{(1)}(0) + p_{\mathbf{U},z}^{(2)}(0) \right). \quad (119)$$

Hence, it suffices to show that both terms in Equation (119) are  $O(1/d_A)$  for any value of  $z$ . Let  $\{E_j\} \subset \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_E)$  be the Kraus operators corresponding to the channel  $\mathcal{M}_z \otimes \text{id}_E$ . For the first term, we compute

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U} \sim \text{Haar}} p_{\mathbf{U},z}^{(1)}(0) = \sum_j \mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U}} \text{Tr} \left\{ \mathbf{U} |1\rangle\langle 1| \mathbf{U}^\dagger E_j \mathbf{U} |1\rangle\langle 1| \mathbf{U}^\dagger E_j^\dagger \right\} \quad (120)$$

$$= \sum_j \text{Tr} \left\{ F_{(1324)} \left( \mathbb{E} (\mathbf{U} |1\rangle\langle 1| \mathbf{U}^\dagger)^{\otimes 2} \otimes E_j \otimes E_j^\dagger \right) \right\} \quad (121)$$

Using the well-known identity

$$\mathbb{E}_{\varphi \sim \text{Haar}} |\varphi\rangle\langle \varphi| = \frac{1}{d(d+1)} \left( \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} + F_{(12)} \right) \quad (122)$$

in dimension  $d$ , we can rewrite the  $j^{\text{th}}$  term in the right-hand side of Equation (121) as

$$\frac{1}{d(d+1)} \left[ \underbrace{\text{Tr} \left\{ F_{(1324)} (\mathbb{1}^{\otimes 2} \otimes E_j \otimes E_j^\dagger) \right\}}_{=\text{Tr}(E_j^\dagger E_j)} + \underbrace{\text{Tr} \left\{ F_{(13)(24)} (\mathbb{1}^{\otimes 2} \otimes E_j \otimes E_j^\dagger) \right\}}_{=|\text{Tr}(E_j)|^2} \right] \quad (123)$$

where in the above and until the end of this proof we are setting  $d := d_A d_E$ . Therefore, we have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U} \sim \text{Haar}} p_{\mathbf{U},z}^{(1)}(0) = \frac{1}{d(d+1)} \left( \sum_j \text{Tr}(E_j^\dagger E_j) + \sum_j |\text{Tr}(E_j)|^2 \right) \quad (124)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d+1} + \frac{\sum_j |\text{Tr}(E_j)|^2}{d(d+1)} \quad (125)$$

$$\leq \frac{1}{d+1} + \frac{d_E^2 d_A}{d(d+1)} \quad (126)$$

$$= O\left(\frac{1}{d_A}\right). \quad (127)$$

Here, the second line uses the fact that the Kraus operators satisfy  $\sum_j E_j^\dagger E_j = \mathbb{1}_{AE}$ . The third line is based on the following reasoning. Since the measure-and-prepare channels act trivially

on the  $E$  subsystem we may write  $E_j = |\psi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j| \otimes \mathbb{1}_E$  for some normalized  $|\psi_j\rangle$  and potentially unnormalized  $|\phi_j\rangle$  satisfying  $\| |\phi_j\rangle \| \leq 1$  and  $\sum_j |\phi_j\rangle\langle\phi_j| = \mathbb{1}_A$ . (Using rank-1 Kraus operators for measure-and-prepare channels are without loss of generality by [HSR03, Thm. 4].) Thus,

$$\sum_j |\mathrm{Tr}(E_j)|^2 = d_E^2 \sum_j |\langle\phi_j|\psi_j\rangle|^2 \leq d_E^2 \sum_j \langle\phi_j|\phi_j\rangle = d_E^2 d_A. \quad (128)$$

Finally, we apply a similar argument to bound the second term in Equation (119). We have

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U} \sim \text{Haar}} p_{\mathbf{U},z}^{(2)} = \sum_j \mathrm{Tr} \left\{ F_{(1324)} \left( \mathbb{E} \mathbf{U}^{\otimes 2} (|1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes |2\rangle\langle 2|) (\mathbf{U}^\dagger)^{\otimes 2} \otimes E_j \otimes E_j^\dagger \right) \right\} \quad (129)$$

$$= \frac{1}{d^2 - 1} \sum_j \left[ \mathrm{Tr}(E_j^\dagger E_j) - \frac{|\mathrm{Tr}(E_j)|^2}{d} \right] \quad (130)$$

$$\leq \frac{d}{d^2 - 1} \quad (131)$$

$$= O\left(\frac{1}{d_A}\right) \quad (132)$$

where the second line follows from the identity

$$\mathbb{E}_{\mathbf{U} \sim \text{Haar}} \mathbf{U}^{\otimes 2} (|u\rangle\langle u| \otimes |v\rangle\langle v|) (\mathbf{U}^\dagger)^{\otimes 2} = \frac{1}{d^2 - 1} \left( \mathbb{1} \otimes \mathbb{1} - \frac{F_{(12)}}{d} \right) \quad (133)$$

for any two orthogonal unit vectors  $|u\rangle, |v\rangle \in \mathbb{C}^d$  and the third line follows from neglecting the second term and once again noting that  $\sum_j E_j^\dagger E_j = \mathbb{1}_{AE}$ .  $\square$

## 5 Further directions

Our work raises several open questions. Firstly, does there exist a bipartite unitary  $U$  for which  $\zeta(U) \neq R_c(U)$ ? The procedure for space-like cutting described here (and also in simultaneous work [SPS23]) shows that classical communication does not lead to a lower 1-norm in a space-like cut for a large class of unitaries. Is there an entangling operation for which classical communication provably lowers the minimal 1-norm in a space-like cut, as originally suggested in Ref. [PS23]?

It is also natural to ask how far techniques for circuit cutting can be pushed from an information-theoretic standpoint. Can one show that any choice of measure-and-prepare channel (and post-processing function) in Algorithm 1 necessarily incurs a sample overhead of  $\Omega(4^k)$  for general observables, matching the upper bound? Note that this is false if we relax Algorithm 1 to allow access to the intermediate measurement outcomes obtained during application of the measure-and-prepare channels. In this setting, when the register  $E$  is trivial (one “cuts” all the wires), the observable outcomes may be disregarded completely, and one may perform classical shadows [HKP20] on the wires to predict the expectation value using at most  $O(2^k)$  samples of the unknown state, though perhaps computationally inefficiently. Could the answer depend on assumptions regarding computational efficiency? What should one expect of an information-theoretic lower bound for space-like cutting?

It would be interesting and potentially useful to extend the “double Hadamard test” construction to general multipartite systems, and apply this to clustered Hamiltonian simulation as well. Another direction would be to investigate the possibility of modifying the proposal in this work to compute spatial correlation functions in thermal states or ground states. It would also be interesting

to see how circuit cutting techniques may be applied to compute temporal correlation functions. For example, consider a correlation function of the form  $C_{PQ}(t) := \langle \psi_0 | e^{-iHt} P e^{iHt} Q | \psi_0 \rangle$  where  $|\psi_0\rangle$  is some initial tensor product state,  $P$  and  $Q$  are two multi-qubit Pauli operators, and  $H$  has interaction strength  $\eta$  across some partition. We may then estimate the magnitude  $|C_{PQ}(t)|$  using local circuits of the form used in [Theorem 3.12](#) through a Trotter decomposition of  $e^{-iHt} P e^{iHt} Q$  and taking the observable to be  $|\psi_0\rangle\langle\psi_0|$ . The cost would then be on the order of  $e^{O(\eta t)}/\varepsilon^4$ . Is there a way to estimate this quantity using similar techniques, including the sign? What are some specific examples of quantum systems which are amenable to techniques for clustered Hamiltonian simulation?

Finally, we conclude by reiterating an open question raised in Ref. [\[BGL23\]](#) regarding the power of limited quantum memory. Can one provably simulate a restricted, yet classically-hard family of  $n$ -qubit quantum circuits (e.g., shallow circuits) in time  $\text{poly}(n)$  using *far* fewer qubits than expected, for example,  $O(\text{poly}(\log n))$ ? As remarked by the authors of [\[BGL23\]](#), such a simulation might be enabled by the techniques considered in their work. Note that naively applying the circuit cutting methods discussed in this work, one could only hope to reduce the number of qubits required for such a simulation by a constant factor, generically. We view this as an exciting direction of both theoretical and practical importance.

## Acknowledgements

AL thanks Richard Allen for helpful comments and Christophe Piveteau for discussions. AL was funded by NSF grant PHY-1818914. AWH was funded by NSF grant CCF-1729369 and the DOE center ‘‘Quantum Systems Accelerator.’’

## A Robustness of the Choi state lower-bounds 1-norm

In this section we prove [Claim 2.1](#). The proof uses the same idea as that in [\[PS23, Lemma 3.1\]](#), though we need to generalize it slightly to the definition of a space-like cut presented here, [Definition 1.1](#).

**Lemma A.1.** *Let  $\rho \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$  be a bipartite quantum state. Suppose there exist separable states  $\sigma_1, \sigma_2, \dots \in \text{SEP}(\mathcal{H}_{AB}|A, B)$  and coefficients  $a_1, a_2, \dots \in \mathbb{R}$  such that*

$$\rho = \sum_j a_j \sigma_j. \quad (134)$$

*It holds that  $\sum_j |a_j| \geq 1 + 2R(\rho)$ .*

*Proof.* We may rewrite [Equation \(134\)](#) as

$$\rho = \sum_{j:a_j \geq 0} |a_j| \sigma_j - \sum_{j:a_j < 0} |a_j| \sigma_j \quad (135)$$

$$= \kappa_+ \sum_{j:a_j \geq 0} \frac{|a_j|}{\kappa_+} \sigma_j - \kappa_- \sum_{j:a_j < 0} \frac{|a_j|}{\kappa_-} \sigma_j \quad (136)$$

$$= (1 + \kappa_-) \sigma_+ - \kappa_- \sigma_- \quad (137)$$

where in the second line we defined  $\kappa_+ = \sum_{j:a_j \geq 0} |a_j|$  and  $\kappa_- = \sum_{j:a_j < 0} |a_j|$ , and  $\sigma_+, \sigma_-$  are separable states, and the third line follows from the observation that  $1 = \text{Tr}(\rho) = \sum_j a_j = \kappa_+ - \kappa_-$ . Comparing

Equation (137) to the definition of robustness in Equation (8), we necessarily have that

$$R(\rho) \leq \kappa_- = \frac{\kappa_+ + \kappa_- - \kappa_+ + \kappa_-}{2} = \frac{\sum_j |a_j| - 1}{2}. \quad \square$$

In the remainder of the proof we give distinct labels to the input and output systems of the channel we consider. Let  $\mathcal{N} : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{A_1 B_1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{A_2 B_2})$  be a bipartite quantum channel which has a QPD of the form in Equation (5) into *separable* channels, i.e.,  $\mathcal{N} = \sum_j c_j \mathcal{T}_j \circ \mathcal{E}_j$  for some  $c_j \in \mathbb{R}$  satisfying  $\sum_j |c_j| = \kappa$ , separable channels  $\mathcal{E}_j : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{A_1 B_1}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{A_2 R_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_2 R_B})$ , and post-processing functions  $\mathcal{T}_j : \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{A_2 R_A} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{B_2 R_B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_{A_2 B_2})$  with the actions

$$\mathcal{T}_j : \rho_{A_2 R_A B_2 R_B} \mapsto \text{Tr}_{R_A R_B} ((O_j \otimes \mathbb{1}_{A_2 B_2}) \rho_{A_2 R_A B_2 R_B}) \quad (138)$$

for some  $O_j$  of the form  $O_j = O_j^{(A)} \otimes O_j^{(B)}$  such that  $\|O_j\| \leq 1$ . For each  $j$ , we have that  $J_{\mathcal{E}_j} \in \text{SEP}(\mathcal{H}_{A_1 A_2 R_A B_1 B_2 R_B} | A_1 A_2 R_A, B_1 B_2 R_B)$  by definition, so we may write

$$J_{\mathcal{E}_j} = \sum_k p^{(j)}(k) \rho_k^{(j)} \otimes \sigma_k^{(j)} \quad (139)$$

where  $p^{(j)}(k) > 0$ ,  $\sum_k p^{(j)}(k) = 1$ ,  $\rho_k^{(j)} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{A_1 A_2 R_A})$ , and  $\sigma_k^{(j)} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{B_1 B_2 R_B})$ . Then the Choi state  $J_{\mathcal{N}} \in \mathcal{D}(\mathcal{H}_{A_1 B_1} \otimes \mathcal{H}_{A_2 B_2})$  is equal to

$$J_{\mathcal{N}} = \sum_{jk} c_j p^{(j)}(k) (\text{id}_{A_1 B_1} \otimes \mathcal{T}_j) (\rho_k^{(j)} \otimes \sigma_k^{(j)}) \quad (140)$$

$$= \sum_{jk} c_j p^{(j)}(k) \text{Tr}_{R_A} \left( (\mathbb{1}_{A_1 A_2} \otimes O_j^{(A)}) \rho_k^{(j)} \right) \otimes \text{Tr}_{R_B} \left( (\mathbb{1}_{B_1 B_2} \otimes O_j^{(B)}) \sigma_k^{(j)} \right) \quad (141)$$

$$= \sum_{jk} c_j p^{(j)}(k) \sum_{x \in [d_A]} \sum_{y \in [d_B]} g_j(x, y) p_{A,k}^{(j)}(x) p_{B,k}^{(j)}(y) \omega_{A_1 A_2, k}^{(j,x)} \otimes \tau_{B_1 B_2, k}^{(j,y)} \quad (142)$$

where in the third line we let  $\{|j, x\rangle\}_x$  and  $\{|j, y\rangle\}_y$  be eigenbases for  $O_j^{(A)}$  and  $O_j^{(B)}$ , respectively, we let  $g_j(x, y)$  be the  $(x, y)^{\text{th}}$  eigenvalue of  $O_j$ , and we define

$$p_{A,k}^{(j)}(x) := \text{Tr} \left( (\mathbb{1}_{A_1 A_2} \otimes |j, x\rangle\langle j, x|) \rho_k^{(j)} \right), \quad p_{B,k}^{(j)}(x) := \text{Tr} \left( (\mathbb{1}_{B_1 B_2} \otimes |j, y\rangle\langle j, y|) \sigma_k^{(j)} \right) \quad (143)$$

and

$$\omega_{A_1 A_2, k}^{(j,x)} := \text{Tr}_{R_A} \left( (\mathbb{1}_{A_1 A_2} \otimes |j, x\rangle\langle j, x|) \rho_k^{(j)} \right) / p_{A,k}^{(j)}(x), \quad \tau_{B_1 B_2, k}^{(j,y)} = \text{Tr}_{R_B} \left( (\mathbb{1}_{B_1 B_2} \otimes |j, y\rangle\langle j, y|) \sigma_k^{(j)} \right) / p_{B,k}^{(j)}(y). \quad (144)$$

By Lemma A.1 we have

$$1 + 2R(J_{\mathcal{U}}) \leq \sum_j \sum_k \sum_{x \in [d_A]} \sum_{y \in [d_B]} |c_j g_j(x, y) p^{(j)}(k) p_{A,k}^{(j)}(x) p_{B,k}^{(j)}(y)| \quad (145)$$

$$\leq \sum_j |c_j| \sum_k \sum_{x \in [d_A]} \sum_{y \in [d_B]} p^{(j)}(k) p_{A,k}^{(j)}(x) p_{B,k}^{(j)}(y) = \sum_j |c_j| \quad (146)$$

using the fact that  $|g_j(x, y)| \leq 1$  and  $\sum_{x \in [d_A]} p_{A,k}^{(j)}(x) = \sum_{y \in [d_B]} p_{B,k}^{(j)}(y) = 1$  for any  $j$  and  $k$ . This establishes the lower bound on the QPD 1-norm of  $\mathcal{N}$  in terms of the robustness of its Choi state.

## B The product extent is well-defined

In this section we prove that the product extent (Definition 3.3) is well-defined, using elementary facts from linear programming. (See Ref. [MG07, Chapter 4] for an introduction to the relevant concepts.) Let  $U \in \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_{AB})$  be a bipartite unitary operator. For any positive integer  $m \geq d_A^2 d_B^2$  define  $\xi_m(U)$  by a restriction of the optimization problem in Definition 3.3 to column vectors with  $m$  entries through

$$\begin{aligned} \xi_m(U) &:= \min && 2\|c\|_1^2 - \|c\|_2^2 \\ &\text{s.t.} && \sum_{j=1}^m c_j V_j \otimes W_j = U \\ &&& c \in \mathbb{R}^m \\ &&& (V_j)_{j=1}^m \subset \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_A) \\ &&& (W_j)_{j=1}^m \subset \mathcal{U}(\mathcal{H}_B). \end{aligned} \tag{147}$$

That this quantity is well-defined follows from the fact that the objective function is continuous and the feasible set defined by the constraints is nonempty (decompose  $U$  in the Pauli basis) and compact. Clearly, we have  $\xi_n(U) \leq \xi_m(U)$  for all  $m, n \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that  $d_A^2 d_B^2 \leq m \leq n$ . Also, from the definition of the product extent and the fact that  $\xi(U) \geq 1$  (Lemma 3.6) we have  $\xi(U) = \lim_{m \rightarrow \infty} \xi_m(U)$ . It therefore suffices to show there exists some positive  $m^* \in \mathbb{Z}$  such that for all  $m \geq m^*$  we have  $\xi_m(U) \geq \xi_{m^*}(U)$  since this implies that  $\xi(U) = \xi_{m^*}(U)$  and the minimum in Definition 3.3 is attained. To this end, let  $m^* = 2d_A^2 d_B^2$  and consider  $\xi_m(U)$  for some  $m \geq m^* + 1$ . Let  $c \in \mathbb{R}^m$ ,  $c \geq 0$  and  $(V_j)_{j=1}^m, (W_j)_{j=1}^m$  be an optimal solution to the optimization problem in Equation (147). (We may take  $c \geq 0$  without loss of generality since the sign can be absorbed into the unitary operators in the first constraint without changing the value of the objective function.) For each  $\gamma \in \mathbb{R}$  define

$$S(\gamma) := \{d \in \mathbb{R}^m : d \geq 0, U = \sum_{j=1}^m d_j V_j \otimes W_j, \|d\|_1 = \gamma\}. \tag{148}$$

Then  $S(\|c\|_1)$  is a nonempty, convex, compact set. Hence, the convex optimization  $\max\{\|d\|_2 : d \in S(\|c\|_1)\}$  attains its maximum at an extreme point of  $S(\|c\|_1)$ . But  $S(\|c\|_1)$  is a polytope specified by the  $2d_A^2 d_B^2$  linear constraints given by the real and imaginary parts of the equation  $U = \sum_{j=1}^m d_j V_j \otimes W_j$ . This implies that the extreme points have support of size at most  $2d_A^2 d_B^2$  by the equivalence between extreme points and basic feasible solutions for convex polytopes. Letting  $d^*$  denote such an optimal extreme point, we therefore have

$$\xi_{m^*}(U) \leq 2\|d^*\|_1^2 - \|d^*\|_2^2 = 2\|c\|_1^2 - \|d^*\|_2^2 \leq 2\|c\|_1^2 - \|c\|_2^2 = \xi_m(U). \tag{149}$$

## References

- [Bra+19] S. Bravyi, D. Browne, P. Calpin, E. Campbell, D. Gosset, and M. Howard. ‘‘Simulation of quantum circuits by low-rank stabilizer decompositions’’. In: *Quantum* 3 (2019), p. 181. ISSN: 2521-327X. DOI: [10.22331/q-2019-09-02-181](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2019-09-02-181). arXiv: [1808.00128](https://arxiv.org/abs/1808.00128).
- [BGL23] S. Bravyi, D. Gosset, and Y. Liu. *Classical simulation of peaked shallow quantum circuits*. 2023. arXiv: [2309.08405](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.08405).

- [BSS16] S. Bravyi, G. Smith, and J. A. Smolin. “Trading Classical and Quantum Computational Resources”. In: *Phys. Rev. X* 6.2 (2016), p. 021043. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevX.6.021043](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevX.6.021043). arXiv: [1506.01396](https://arxiv.org/abs/1506.01396).
- [BPS23] L. Brenner, C. Piveteau, and D. Sutter. *Optimal wire cutting with classical communication*. 2023. arXiv: [2302.03366](https://arxiv.org/abs/2302.03366).
- [Chi+21] A. M. Childs, Y. Su, M. C. Tran, N. Wiebe, and S. Zhu. “Theory of Trotter Error with Commutator Scaling”. In: *Physical Review X* 11.1 (2021). DOI: [10.1103/physrevx.11.011020](https://doi.org/10.1103/physrevx.11.011020). arXiv: [1912.08854](https://arxiv.org/abs/1912.08854).
- [Dat09] N. Datta. “Max-relative Entropy of Entanglement, Alias Log-robustness”. In: *International Journal of Quantum Information* 07.02 (2009), pp. 475–491. DOI: [10.1142/S0219749909005298](https://doi.org/10.1142/S0219749909005298). arXiv: [0807.2536](https://arxiv.org/abs/0807.2536).
- [DLT02] D. DiVincenzo, D. Leung, and B. Terhal. “Quantum data hiding”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* 48.3 (2002), pp. 580–598. DOI: [10.1109/18.985948](https://doi.org/10.1109/18.985948). arXiv: [quant-ph/0103098](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0103098).
- [Edd+22] A. Eddins, M. Motta, T. P. Gujarati, S. Bravyi, A. Mezzacapo, C. Hadfield, and S. Sheldon. “Doubling the Size of Quantum Simulators by Entanglement Forging”. In: *PRX Quantum* 3.1 (2022), p. 010309. DOI: [10.1103/PRXQuantum.3.010309](https://doi.org/10.1103/PRXQuantum.3.010309). arXiv: [2104.10220](https://arxiv.org/abs/2104.10220).
- [GS21] G. Gour and C. M. Scandolo. “Entanglement of a bipartite channel”. In: *Physical Review A* 103.6 (2021). DOI: [10.1103/physreva.103.062422](https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.103.062422). arXiv: [1907.02552](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.02552).
- [HWY23] H. Harada, K. Wada, and N. Yamamoto. *Optimal parallel wire cutting without ancilla qubits*. 2023. arXiv: [2303.07340](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.07340).
- [HN03] A. W. Harrow and M. A. Nielsen. “Robustness of quantum gates in the presence of noise”. In: *Phys. Rev. A* 68.1 (2003), p. 012308. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.68.012308](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.68.012308). arXiv: [quant-ph/0301108](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0301108).
- [HSR03] M. Horodecki, P. W. Shor, and M. B. Ruskai. “Entanglement Breaking Channels”. In: *Reviews in Mathematical Physics* 15.06 (Aug. 2003), pp. 629–641. DOI: [10.1142/s0129055x03001709](https://doi.org/10.1142/s0129055x03001709). arXiv: [quant-ph/0302031](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0302031).
- [HKP20] H.-Y. Huang, R. Kueng, and J. Preskill. “Predicting many properties of a quantum system from very few measurements”. In: *Nature Physics* 16.10 (2020), 1050–1057. ISSN: 1745-2481. DOI: [10.1038/s41567-020-0932-7](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41567-020-0932-7). arXiv: [2002.08953](https://arxiv.org/abs/2002.08953).
- [Low+23] A. Lowe, M. Medvidović, A. Hayes, L. J. O’Riordan, T. R. Bromley, J. M. Arrazola, and N. Killoran. “Fast quantum circuit cutting with randomized measurements”. In: *Quantum* 7 (2023), p. 934. DOI: [10.22331/q-2023-03-02-934](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2023-03-02-934). arXiv: [2207.14734](https://arxiv.org/abs/2207.14734).
- [MTD23] S. C. Marshall, J. Tura, and V. Dunjko. *All this for one qubit? Bounds on local circuit cutting schemes*. 2023. arXiv: [2303.13422](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.13422).
- [MG07] J. Matoušek and B. Gärtner. *Understanding and Using Linear Programming*. Springer Berlin Heidelberg, 2007. ISBN: 9783540306979. DOI: [10.1007/978-3-540-30717-4](https://doi.org/10.1007/978-3-540-30717-4).
- [MWW09] W. Matthews, S. Wehner, and A. Winter. “Distinguishability of Quantum States Under Restricted Families of Measurements with an Application to Quantum Data Hiding”. In: *Communications in Mathematical Physics* 291.3 (2009), 813–843. ISSN: 1432-0916. DOI: [10.1007/s00220-009-0890-5](https://doi.org/10.1007/s00220-009-0890-5). arXiv: [0810.2327](https://arxiv.org/abs/0810.2327).



- [MF21a] K. Mitarai and K. Fujii. “Constructing a virtual two-qubit gate by sampling single-qubit operations”. In: *New Journal of Physics* 23.2 (2021), p. 023021. DOI: [10.1088/1367-2630/abd7bc](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/abd7bc). arXiv: [1909.07534](https://arxiv.org/abs/1909.07534).
- [MF21b] K. Mitarai and K. Fujii. “Overhead for simulating a non-local channel with local channels by quasiprobability sampling”. In: *Quantum* 5 (2021), p. 388. DOI: [10.22331/q-2021-01-28-388](https://doi.org/10.22331/q-2021-01-28-388). arXiv: [2006.11174](https://arxiv.org/abs/2006.11174).
- [NKM14] Y. Nakata, M. Koashi, and M. Mura0. “Generating a state  $t$ -design by diagonal quantum circuits”. In: *New Journal of Physics* 16.5 (2014), p. 053043. DOI: [10.1088/1367-2630/16/5/053043](https://doi.org/10.1088/1367-2630/16/5/053043). arXiv: [1311.1128](https://arxiv.org/abs/1311.1128).
- [Nie+03] M. A. Nielsen, C. M. Dawson, J. L. Dodd, A. Gilchrist, D. Mortimer, T. J. Osborne, M. J. Bremner, A. W. Harrow, and A. Hines. “Quantum dynamics as a physical resource”. In: *Phys. Rev. A* 67.5 (2003), p. 052301. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.67.052301](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.67.052301). arXiv: [quant-ph/0208077](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0208077).
- [Ort+01] G. Ortiz, J. E. Gubernatis, E. Knill, and R. Laflamme. “Quantum algorithms for fermionic simulations”. In: *Physical Review A* 64.2 (2001). ISSN: 1094-1622. DOI: [10.1103/physreva.64.022319](https://doi.org/10.1103/physreva.64.022319). arXiv: [cond-mat/0012334](https://arxiv.org/abs/cond-mat/0012334).
- [Ped23] E. Pednault. *An alternative approach to optimal wire cutting without ancilla qubits*. 2023. arXiv: [2303.08287](https://arxiv.org/abs/2303.08287).
- [Pen+20] T. Peng, A. W. Harrow, M. Ozols, and X. Wu. “Simulating Large Quantum Circuits on a Small Quantum Computer”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 125 (15 2020), p. 150504. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.150504](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.125.150504). arXiv: [1904.00102](https://arxiv.org/abs/1904.00102).
- [PS23] C. Piveteau and D. Sutter. “Circuit knitting with classical communication”. In: *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* (2023). DOI: [10.1109/TIT.2023.3310797](https://doi.org/10.1109/TIT.2023.3310797). arXiv: [2205.00016](https://arxiv.org/abs/2205.00016).
- [Ple05] M. B. Plenio. “Logarithmic Negativity: A Full Entanglement Monotone That is not Convex”. In: *Phys. Rev. Lett.* 95.9 (2005), p. 090503. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.090503](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevLett.95.090503). arXiv: [quant-ph/0505071](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/0505071).
- [Ras12] A. E. Rastegin. “Relations for Certain Symmetric Norms and Anti-norms Before and After Partial Trace”. In: *Journal of Statistical Physics* 148.6 (2012), 1040–1053. ISSN: 1572-9613. DOI: [10.1007/s10955-012-0569-8](https://doi.org/10.1007/s10955-012-0569-8). arXiv: [1202.3853](https://arxiv.org/abs/1202.3853).
- [SPS23] L. Schmitt, C. Piveteau, and D. Sutter. *Cutting circuits with multiple two-qubit unitaries*. 2023. arXiv: [2312.11638](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.11638).
- [Ufr+23] C. Ufrecht, L. S. Herzog, D. D. Scherer, M. Periyasamy, S. Rietsch, A. Plinge, and C. Mutschler. *Optimal joint cutting of two-qubit rotation gates*. 2023. arXiv: [2312.09679](https://arxiv.org/abs/2312.09679).
- [VT99] G. Vidal and R. Tarrach. “Robustness of entanglement”. In: *Phys. Rev. A* 59.1 (1999), pp. 141–155. DOI: [10.1103/PhysRevA.59.141](https://doi.org/10.1103/PhysRevA.59.141). arXiv: [quant-ph/9806094](https://arxiv.org/abs/quant-ph/9806094).
- [Yua+21] X. Yuan, Y. Liu, Q. Zhao, B. Regula, J. Thompson, and M. Gu. “Universal and operational benchmarking of quantum memories”. In: *npj Quantum Information* 7.1 (2021). DOI: [10.1038/s41534-021-00444-9](https://doi.org/10.1038/s41534-021-00444-9). arXiv: [1907.02521](https://arxiv.org/abs/1907.02521).
- [Zha+23] X. Zhao, L. Zhang, B. Zhao, and X. Wang. *Power of quantum measurement in simulating unphysical operations*. 2023. arXiv: [2309.09963](https://arxiv.org/abs/2309.09963).