

# Quantum circuit design for mixture and preparation of arbitrary pure and mixed quantum states

Bo-Hung Chen,<sup>1,2,\*</sup> Dah-Wei Chiou,<sup>3,†</sup> and Jie-Hong Roland Jiang<sup>3,‡</sup>

<sup>1</sup>*Department of Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617, Taiwan*

<sup>2</sup>*Center for Theoretical Physics, National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617, Taiwan*

<sup>3</sup>*Graduate Institute of Electronics Engineering,  
National Taiwan University, Taipei 10617, Taiwan*

This paper addresses the challenge of preparing arbitrary mixed quantum states, an area that has not been extensively studied compared to pure states. Two circuit design methods are presented: one via a mixture of pure states and the other via purification. A novel strategy utilizing the Cholesky decomposition is proposed to improve both computational efficiency during preprocessing and circuit efficiency in the resulting circuits, offering significant advantages, especially when the targeted density matrix is low-ranked or sparse. By leveraging the incomplete Cholesky decomposition with threshold dropping, we also propose an appealing strategy for generating a high-fidelity approximation of the targeted density matrix, enabling substantial efficiency enhancement at the cost of mild fidelity loss. Additionally, as a closely related issue, we prove the “no-superposing theorem”: given a certain number of arbitrary unknown pure states as input, it is impossible to devise an operation that produces an output state as the superposition of the input states with predefined coefficients unless all but one of the coefficients vanish.

## I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum state preparation plays a pivotal role in the field of quantum computation and quantum information, serving as a fundamental building block for various quantum algorithms and protocols [1]. The capability to systematically prepare arbitrary quantum states, whether pure or mixed, enables the initialization of qubits into any desired state to harness the power of superposition and entanglement.

Quantum algorithms, such as quantum search algorithms [2, 3] or quantum simulations [4], often require the ability to prepare specific pure quantum states efficiently. The ability to prepare arbitrary state is particularly crucial in quantum machine learning [5, 6], where quantum computers

---

\* kenny81778189@gmail.com;

† dwchiou@gmail.com;

‡ jhjiang@ntu.edu.tw;

can efficiently represent and process complex data structures. In the realm of quantum information and quantum communication [7, 8], where the goal is to manipulate and transmit quantum information reliably, arbitrary quantum state preparation becomes indispensable. Quantum key distribution, for instance, relies on the secure preparation and transmission of quantum states for the establishment of secure communication channels. Moreover, preparing pure states with high fidelity is crucial in applications where accuracy is important, such as in quantum cryptography [9] and in the quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations [10].

On the other hand, the preparation of arbitrary mixed quantum states, which are characterized by density matrices, holds a distinctive significance [11]. While pure states represent the pristine form of quantum information, mixed states play a crucial role in representing the inherent uncertainties and imperfections encountered in real-world quantum systems, offering a more realistic model of quantum systems by accounting for environmental noise and decoherence [12, 13]. The ability to prepare arbitrary mixed states is crucial for the robustness and stability of quantum algorithms, ensuring their resilience in the presence of imperfections [14]. Particularly, in quantum error correction, the preparation of mixed states facilitates the development and investigation of strategies to detect and correct errors caused by noise [15]. Additionally, the study of entanglement and quantum correlations relies on the preparation and manipulation of mixed states, contributing to a deeper understanding of quantum phenomena in realistic, noisy environments [16, 17]. In essence, the preparation of arbitrary mixed states addresses the challenges posed by real-world quantum systems and enhances the practicality and reliability of quantum information processing [18–20]. Furthermore, since thermal states inherently manifest as mixed states, within the context of running experiments and simulations in quantum circuits, the preparation of mixed states can play a crucial role in investigating quantum thermalization processes [21, 22], particularly the eigenstate thermalization hypothesis [23], and exploring thermodynamic properties in the realm of quantum chemistry [24–26].

Recent progress in the preparation of pure quantum states has led to various efficient gate decomposition methods by exploiting symmetries and (non)commutativity of subcircuits to optimize circuit design [27, 28]. Techniques such as the quantum multiplexor [29], universal gate decomposition [30], and isometry decomposition [31] have demonstrated substantial improvement in reducing the circuit depth and the number of CNOT gates. By incorporating the concept of *uniformly controlled one-qubit gates* [32], the studies conducted by [33, 34] have developed a systematic and efficient circuit design strategy for preparing arbitrary  $n$ -qubit pure states. This strategy requires  $2^{n+1} - 2n - 2$  CNOT gates and  $2^{n+1} - 2$  one-qubit rotation gates, establishing it as the most

efficient circuit implementation to date for arbitrary pure state preparation. (For the performance of various pure state preparation algorithms, see the benchmark data conducted in [35].)

Quantum state preparation gains remarkable advantages when focusing on special forms of states characterized by specific symmetries or features. Instead of dealing with arbitrary states, algorithms tailored for special forms exhibit superior circuit efficiency. Notable examples are the algorithms specifically designed for preparing uniform [36], sparse [37–40], and probability distribution [41] states. Furthermore, when slight deviations from exact states are tolerable, various algorithms, including those introduced in [42–44], become valuable tools for achieving good approximations with a substantial reduction in circuit complexity. The approximation approach offers a practical compromise between state accuracy and circuit efficiency, expanding the applicability of practical quantum computing, where strict adherence to exact state preparation may not always be necessary, especially in the noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) [45, 46] era.

Contrary to pure states, the preparation of arbitrary mixed states has not been extensively studied, aside from some fundamental concepts [11]. This paper aims to delve into this issue. When the density matrix is specified in terms of an ensemble of pure states, we propose two circuit design methods: one via a mixture of pure states and the other via purification. The first method requires fewer qubits if some of them can be recycled. The second method demands more qubits but offers the extra benefit of producing a purified state of the targeted mixed state. Additionally, the second method can be further optimized in terms of uniformly controlled one-qubit gates, following the same idea suggested by [33, 34].

On the other hand, when the density matrix is specified in terms of matrix elements, one can perform preprocessing by solving the eigenvalue problem to convert the targeted density matrix into the form of an ensemble of pure states. Instead of solving the eigenvalue problem, we propose a novel strategy utilizing the *Cholesky decomposition* [47–50]. Solving the Cholesky decomposition is more computationally efficient than solving the eigenvalue problem, especially when the targeted density matrix is low-ranked or sparse. More importantly, since the resulting Cholesky factorization matrix always exhibits a certain degree of sparsity, regardless of whether the density matrix itself is sparse or not, the strategies tailored for preparing sparse pure states, as proposed in [37–40], can be leveraged to significantly reduce circuit complexity. If the targeted density matrix itself is sufficiently sparse, the new strategy offers even greater advantages in both computational efficiency during preprocessing and circuit efficiency in the resulting circuits.

Furthermore, utilizing the *incomplete Cholesky decomposition* [49, 51] with the *threshold dropping* option provides a solid framework for generating a high-fidelity approximation of the targeted

density matrix. As the drop tolerance increases, the Cholesky factorization becomes increasingly sparser, leading to substantial improvements in both preprocessing and circuit efficiency. The fidelity between the targeted density matrix and the approximate one degrades with increasing drop tolerance, but it remains satisfactorily high within the specified tolerance, offering an ideal compromise between accuracy and efficiency.

Additionally, as an issue closely related to the task of *preparing* arbitrary quantum states, we also investigate the task of *mixing* arbitrary quantum states: given a set of arbitrary *unknown* pure or mixed quantum states as input, can we devise an mechanism to generate an output state as a superposition or mixture of the provided states with predefined coefficients or weights? For mixed states, we can design a circuit to mix arbitrary unknown mixed states, which can also be utilized to prepare a mixed state specified as an ensemble of pure states. For pure states, on the other hand, we prove that it is impossible (by any means, not just in quantum circuits) to devise an operation that produces the superposition of arbitrary unknown pure states, unless all but one of the predefined coefficients vanish. We term this result the “*no-superposing theorem*”, which is a consequence of the well-known fact that any two nonorthogonal states cannot be reliably distinguished.

This paper is organized as follows. In Sec. II, we investigate the task of mixing arbitrary unknown quantum states into a novel state and prove the no-superposing theorem. In Sec. III, aiming to enhance our understanding of fundamental concepts, we revisit and re-derive previously established results for the preparation of arbitrary pure quantum states. We approach this task from a slightly different starting point, eventually arriving at the same circuit as proposed in [33, 34]. In Sec. IV, we delve into the preparation of arbitrary mixed states, presenting systematic schemes tailored to different scenarios. Furthermore, we also propose a strategy for preparing a high-fidelity approximation of the desired mixed state. In Sec. V, we recap and summarize our results. Additionally, the concepts of uniformly controlled one-qubit gates, as initially introduced in [32–34], are briefly outlined in Appendix A.

## II. SUPERPOSITION AND MIXTURE OF UNKNOWN QUANTUM STATES

Before undertaking the task of implementing quantum circuits capable of preparing arbitrary pure or mixed quantum states, let us first consider a different yet closely related challenge: provided with a certain number of arbitrary *unknown* pure or mixed quantum states as input, can we transform them into a novel output state as a superposition or mixture of the input states with

predefined coefficients or weights? If this can be achieved, it can be utilized for the task of preparing arbitrary quantum states.

### A. Superposition of pure states

The task of superposing arbitrary unknown pure states with predefined coefficients turns out to be unattainable (by *any* means, not just in quantum circuits) except for the exceptional case. We term this fact the “*no-superposing theorem*”, which bears a close connection to the well known fact that any two nonorthogonal states cannot be unambiguously distinguished. The theorem is formally stated and proven as follows.

**Theorem 1** (No-superposing theorem). *Given  $\ell$  predefined coefficients  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$ , it is impossible to devise an operation that generates a new state  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$  such that*

$$|\psi\rangle \propto \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i |\psi_i\rangle, \quad (2.1)$$

when provided with  $\ell$  arbitrary unknown pure quantum states  $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}_i$ , where the Hilbert spaces  $\mathcal{H}_i$  are isomorphic to one another (i.e.  $\mathcal{H}_i \cong \mathcal{H}_j \cong \mathcal{H}$  for all  $i, j = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$ ), unless  $\alpha_i$  are given in the exceptional case where all but one of  $\alpha_i$  vanish.<sup>1</sup>

*Proof.* If  $\alpha_i$  are not given in the exceptional case, at least two of them are nonzero. Without loss of generality, we assume that  $\alpha_0$  and  $\alpha_1$  have the largest and second-largest absolute values among the nonzero  $\alpha_i$ , i.e.,  $\alpha_0, \alpha_1 \neq 0$  and  $|\alpha_0| \geq |\alpha_1| \geq |\alpha_2|, \dots, |\alpha_{\ell-1}|$ . By choosing the phases  $\delta_i$  for  $i = 2, \dots, \ell - 1$  properly, we can always have  $0 < |\alpha_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{\ell-1} e^{i\delta_i} \alpha_i| \leq |\alpha_0|$ .<sup>2</sup> We can then pick up two states  $|\phi_a\rangle, |\phi_b\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$  such that  $\langle \phi_b | \phi_a \rangle = -(\alpha_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{\ell-1} e^{i\delta_i} \alpha_i) / \alpha_0$  with  $0 < |\langle \phi_b | \phi_a \rangle| \leq 1$ .

Now consider the scenario that Alice sends either of the two predefined states  $|\phi_a\rangle$  and  $|\phi_b\rangle$  to Bob and challenges Bob to determine which state has been sent. If the operation described in the theorem is possible for the given  $\alpha_i$ , Bob can devise such an operation that transforms any  $\ell$  arbitrary input states  $|\psi_i\rangle$  into a single output state  $|\psi\rangle \propto \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i |\psi_i\rangle$ . Bob then particularly

<sup>1</sup> Note that, for some special configurations of  $\alpha_i$ , providing some particular states of  $|\psi_i\rangle$  can result in a null state  $|\psi\rangle = 0$ . (For example, let  $\alpha_0 = -\alpha_1 = 1$  and  $|\psi_0\rangle = |\psi_1\rangle$  in the case of  $\ell = 2$ .) If the operation is possible at all, the null state  $|\psi\rangle = 0$  should be viewed as a special outcome (i.e., something peculiar happens), which is completely distinguishable from any other ordinary outcomes of  $|\psi\rangle \neq 0$ .

<sup>2</sup> For  $\ell = 2$ , this is obvious. For  $\ell = 3$ , we can choose  $\delta_2$  such that  $\alpha_1$  and  $e^{i\delta_2} \alpha_2$  are in opposite directions in the complex plane. Therefore,  $|\alpha_1 + e^{i\delta_2} \alpha_2| \leq |\alpha_1| \leq |\alpha_0|$ . In the case where  $\alpha_1 + e^{i\delta_2} \alpha_2 = 0$ , we can slightly adjust  $\delta_2$  to ensure  $0 < |\alpha_1 + e^{i\delta_2} \alpha_2| \leq |\alpha_0|$ . For  $\ell \geq 4$ , it can be proven by induction.

provides  $|\psi_1\rangle, |\psi_2\rangle, \dots, |\psi_{\ell-1}\rangle$  with  $|\phi_b\rangle, e^{i\delta_2}|\phi_b\rangle, \dots, e^{i\delta_{\ell-1}}|\phi_b\rangle$ , respectively, and treats  $|\psi_0\rangle$  as the input slot receiving the state sent from Alice. Obviously, when Alice sends  $|\phi_a\rangle$  and  $|\phi_b\rangle$  to Bob, Bob's operation produces  $|\psi_a\rangle \propto \alpha_0|\phi_a\rangle + \alpha_1|\phi_b\rangle + \left(\sum_{i=2}^{\ell-1} e^{i\delta_i}\alpha_i\right)|\phi_b\rangle$  and  $|\psi_b\rangle \propto |\phi_b\rangle$ , respectively.<sup>3</sup> This yields  $\langle\psi_b|\psi_a\rangle \propto \alpha_0\langle\phi_b|\phi_a\rangle + \alpha_1 + \sum_{i=2}^{\ell-1} e^{i\delta_i}\alpha_i = 0$ .

Since  $|\psi_a\rangle$  and  $|\psi_b\rangle$  are orthogonal to each other (or  $|\psi_a\rangle = 0$ , while  $|\psi_b\rangle \neq 0$ ), Bob can unambiguously infer whether the state sent by Alice is  $|\phi_a\rangle$  or  $|\phi_b\rangle$  by measuring whether the operation's outcome is projected into  $|\psi_b\rangle$  or not. This however contradicts the well known fact that any two nonorthogonal states cannot be reliably discriminated (see Box 2.3 of [1] for the proof in view of measurement and Section 9.4 of [52] for the proof in view of thermodynamics). Therefore, the operation described in the theorem is impossible except the exceptional case.

In the exceptional case where all  $\alpha_i$  vanish except one of them (say,  $\alpha_0$ ), the operation can be trivially implemented by keeping  $|\psi_0\rangle$  while discarding  $|\psi_1\rangle, \dots, |\psi_{\ell-1}\rangle$ .  $\square$

## B. Mixture of mixed states

On the other hand, the task of mixing arbitrary unknown mixed states is possible. We first consider the challenge of mixing two unknown mixed state as formally stated as follows. Given a predefined real number  $0 \leq p \leq 1$ , devise an operation that generates the new mixed state

$$\rho = p\rho_0 + (1-p)\rho_1 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}), \quad (2.2)$$

when provided with any two arbitrary *unknown* mixed quantum states  $\rho_0 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_0)$  and  $\rho_1 \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_1)$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_0 \cong \mathcal{H}_1 \cong \mathcal{H}$ .

In the case that both  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$  are  $n$ -qubit mixed states carried by quantum wires, this operation can be achieved by implementing the circuit as depicted in Fig. 1. First, we prepare the state  $\sqrt{p}|0\rangle + \sqrt{1-p}|1\rangle$  for the ancilla qubit (the feasibility of this preparation will be discussed in Sec. III). Then, we apply a sequence of  $n$  controlled-SWAP (CSWAP, also known as Fredkin) gates that interchange  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$  when the ancilla qubit is in  $|1\rangle$  and do nothing when the ancilla qubit is  $|0\rangle$ . By tracing out the second  $n$ -qubit wire and the ancilla wire, the circuit in the end yields the state  $\rho$  given by (2.2).

The scheme of mixing two unknown mixed states can be straightforwardly extended to the case of many unknown mixed states. That is, given a set of  $\ell$  predefined real numbers  $0 < p_i \leq 1$  for

<sup>3</sup> Note that  $|\psi_a\rangle$  is the null state, i.e.  $|\psi_a\rangle = 0$ , in the case where  $|\langle\phi_b|\phi_a\rangle| = 1$ .




FIG. 1. The quantum circuit transforming  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$  into  $\rho$  in (2.2). Here, the vertical line adorned with one dot and two crosses represents a sequence of  $n$  CSWAP gates applied to each pair of the corresponding qubits carrying  $\rho_0$  and  $\rho_1$ .

$i = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$  satisfying  $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i = 1$ , produce the new mixed state

$$\rho = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i \rho_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}), \quad (2.3)$$

when provided with any  $\ell$  arbitrary *unknown* mixed quantum states  $\rho_i \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H}_i)$ , where  $\mathcal{H}_i \cong \mathcal{H}_j \cong \mathcal{H}$  for all  $i, j = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$ . The quantum circuit for mixing  $\rho_i$  into  $\rho$  is depicted in Fig. 2. At each step in the circuit,  $\rho_i$  is fed into the circuit and the ancilla is prepared in the state

$$|\alpha_i\rangle := \cos \alpha_i |0\rangle + \sin \alpha_i |1\rangle, \quad (2.4)$$

for  $i = 1, \dots, \ell - 1$ , where

$$\alpha_i = \arctan \left( \sqrt{\frac{p_i}{\sum_{j=0}^{i-1} p_j}} \right). \quad (2.5)$$

This circuit requires  $2n + 1$  qubit registers, if the qubits trashed out can be recycled, which is possible in the dynamic circuit framework [53] such as the transmon-based quantum computer in the IBM Quantum [54]. On the other hand, if only the static circuit is feasible such as in the case of a trapped-ion quantum computer, it requires  $\ell(n + 1) - 1$  qubit registers. In both cases, the circuit requires  $n(\ell - 1)$  CSWAP gates and  $\ell - 1$  one-qubit rotations used to produce (2.4) in the worst-case scenario.<sup>4</sup>

As a pure state  $|\psi\rangle$  can be considered a special case of a mixed state, i.e.  $\rho = |\psi\rangle\langle\psi|$ , it should be noted that, when provided with  $\ell$  arbitrary unknown states  $|\psi_i\rangle$  for  $i = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$ , we can

<sup>4</sup> A CSWAP gate can be decomposed into a Toffoli gate and two CNOT gates. More precisely,  $\text{CSWAP}_{0,12} = \text{CNOT}_{2,1} \text{Toffoli}_{01,2} \text{CNOT}_{2,1}$ , where the indices before the comma in the subscript represent the control qubit(s), and those after the comma represent the target qubit(s). A Toffoli gate can be further decomposed into 2  $H$  gates, 3  $T$  gates, 4  $T^\dagger$  gates, 1  $S$  gate, and 6 CNOT gates (see Figure 4.9 in [1]). Therefore, in terms of primitive gates, a CSWAP gate requires 8 CNOT gates and 10 one-qubit rotation gates in total.




FIG. 2. The quantum circuit transforming a set of mixed states  $\rho_i$  into  $\rho$  in (4.1).




FIG. 3. The quantum circuit producing the state in (3.1).

devise a quantum operation to generate the mixed state  $\rho = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|$ , given any predefined real numbers  $p_i$  satisfying  $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$  and  $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i = 1$ , but it is impossible to devise a mechanism to generate the pure state proportional to  $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i |\psi_i\rangle$ , given the predefined coefficients  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$ , unless all but one of  $\alpha_i$  vanish.

### III. PREPARATION OF ARBITRARY PURE STATES

Any arbitrary  $n$ -qubit quantum state can be described as  $|\psi\rangle^{(n)} = \sum_{a=0}^{2^n-1} \alpha_a |a\rangle$ , where  $|a\rangle$  are the computational basis states. Given the coefficients  $\alpha_a \in \mathbb{C}$  all specified, can we construct a quantum circuit that produces the state  $|\psi\rangle^{(n)}$ ? Here, we present a systematic scheme to implement such a quantum circuit.

In the case of  $n = 1$ , any arbitrary state

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle^{(n=1)} &= \alpha |0\rangle + \beta |1\rangle \\ &\equiv e^{-i\phi/2} \cos \frac{\theta}{2} |0\rangle - e^{i\phi/2} \sin \frac{\theta}{2} |1\rangle \end{aligned} \quad (3.1)$$

can be produced by the circuit in Fig. 3.

For  $n = k$ , suppose that we can always construct a circuit that maps the state  $|0\rangle^{\otimes k}$  to a desired arbitrary  $k$ -qubit state  $|\psi\rangle^{(k)}$ . Denote this circuit as the unitary gate  $U[|\psi\rangle^{(k)}]$ .

For  $n = k + 1$ , then, any arbitrary  $(k + 1)$ -qubit state can be expressed as

$$|\psi\rangle^{(n=k+1)} = \alpha |0\rangle |\psi_1\rangle^{(k)} + \beta |1\rangle |\psi_2\rangle^{(k)}. \quad (3.2)$$

By induction, the state (3.2) can be produced by the circuit in Fig. 4. If (3.2) takes the special






FIG. 4. The quantum circuit producing the state in (3.2).

form

$$|\psi\rangle^{(n=k+1)} = (\alpha|0\rangle + \beta|1\rangle)|\psi\rangle^{(k)}, \quad (3.3)$$

the first qubit is not entangled with the remaining  $k$  qubits. In this case, the circuit in Fig. 4 can be much simplified by disconnecting the controls from the first qubit and replacing  $U[|\psi_1\rangle^{(k)}]$  and  $U[|\psi_2\rangle^{(k)}]$  with a single gate  $U[|\psi\rangle^{(k)}]$ .

By expanding the nested structure in Fig. 4, it is easy to see that the circuit consists of numerous controlled- $R_y$  and controlled- $R_z$  gates, conditioned on all different control node configurations. By exploiting the fact that controlled-gates conditioned on distinct control node configurations commute with one another, the sequence of the controlled- $R_y$  and controlled- $R_z$  gates can be rearranged into the equivalent circuit as illustrated in Fig. 5 in terms of  $k$ -fold *uniformly controlled rotations*,  $F^k[R_{\mathbf{a}}]$ , for  $k = 0, \dots, n-1$ . Uniformly controlled rotations belong to a special case of *uniformly controlled one-qubit gates*, which were first introduced in [32] and investigated in [32–34].<sup>5</sup> A  $k$ -fold uniformly controlled one-qubit gate  $F^k[U]$  is a  $(k+1)$ -bit gate with one target qubit and  $k$  control qubits in the form of (A1). The circuit in Fig. 5 is exactly the same as the state preparation circuit proposed in [33, 34], albeit derived from a slightly different perspective.

According to the strategy proposed in [33, 34], a  $k$ -fold uniformly controlled rotation  $F^k[R_{\mathbf{a}}]$  can be efficiently decomposed into  $2^k$  CNOT gates and  $2^k$  one-qubit rotation gates, as illustrated in Fig. 8. Furthermore, before concatenating  $F^k[R_y]$  and  $F^k[R_z]$ , we can equivalently implement  $F^k[R_z]$  by applying each gate as shown in Fig. 8 but in the opposite sequential order, while replacing each rotation angle  $\phi_a$  with  $-\phi_a$ . Then, for each pair of  $F^k[R_y]$  and  $F^k[R_z]$ , the rightmost CNOT gate of  $F^k[R_y]$  and the leftmost CNOT gate of  $F^k[R_z]$  can be cancelled out, further reducing two CNOT gates. As a result, the quantum circuit in Fig. 5 requires  $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} (2 \times 2^k - 2) = 2^{n+1} - 2n - 2$  CNOT gates and  $\sum_{k=0}^{n-1} 2 \times 2^k = 2^{n+1} - 2$  one-qubit rotation gates in total. The requirement of  $2^{n+1} - 2$  one-qubit rotation gates corresponds to  $2^n - 1$  real degrees of freedom for arbitrary  $n$ -qubit states.

<sup>5</sup> For the convenience of readers, a brief outline of uniformly controlled one-qubit gates is provided in Appendix A.




FIG. 5. The quantum circuit equivalent to Fig. 4. The upper plot is a concise representation of the lower one. A rectangle of  $R_{\mathbf{a}}$  along with the vertical line adorned with  $k$  split dots represents a  $k$ -fold *uniformly controlled rotation*  $F^k[R_{\mathbf{a}}]$  (see Appendix A for more detail).

#### IV. PREPARATION OF ARBITRARY MIXED STATES

We now study quantum circuits that prepare arbitrary mixed states (i.e., density matrices). Typically, there are two different ways of characterizing a density matrix: either through an ensemble of pure states or by directly specifying its matrix elements. We will consider each of them separately.

##### A. Density matrix in terms of an ensemble of pure states

A density matrix  $\rho \in \mathcal{L}(\mathcal{H})$  can be specified as

$$\rho = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|, \quad (4.1)$$

given a set of  $\ell$  real numbers  $0 < p_i \leq 1$  satisfying  $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i = 1$  and a set of  $\ell$  pure states  $|\psi_i\rangle \in \mathcal{H}$  for  $i = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$ . We may call  $\{p_i, |\psi_i\rangle\}$  an *ensemble of pure states*. Accordingly, the mixed state  $\rho$  can be understood as being in the state  $|\psi_i\rangle$  with the respective probability  $p_i$ . However, the same  $\rho$  admits different ensembles of pure states, which is called the *unitary freedom* (see Theorem 2.6 in [1] for more details). Particularly, one can diagonalize  $\rho$  into

$$\rho = \sum_{i=0}^{\text{rank}(\rho)-1} \lambda_i |\lambda_i\rangle \langle \lambda_i|, \quad (4.2)$$

where the nonzero eigenvalues  $0 < \lambda_i \leq 1$  satisfy  $\sum_i \lambda_i = 1$  and the eigenstates  $|\lambda_i\rangle$  are orthogonal to one another. The mixed state  $\rho$  can then be understood in terms of the ensemble of pure states

$\{\lambda_i, |\lambda_i\rangle\}$ .

Given a density matrix  $\rho$  as specified in (4.1), we can perform preprocessing to recast it into (4.2) before considering the implementation of the quantum circuit that produces  $\rho$ . However, whether doing so is advantageous or not depends on whether the preprocessing is time-consuming, whether the rank of  $\rho$  is smaller than  $\ell$ , and whether the states  $|\lambda_i\rangle$  are easier to prepare than the states  $|\psi_i\rangle$ . As (4.2) can be viewed as a special case of (4.1), in the following, we adhere to (4.1) and provides two methods for preparing  $\rho$ . Which of the two methods is more efficient depends on the hardware considerations.

### 1. Method via a mixture of pure states

Obviously, (4.1) can be understood as (2.3) with  $\rho_i = |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$  for  $i = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$ . Therefore, the circuit in Fig. 2 can be used to prepare  $\rho$ , if each  $\rho_i$  is provided with the pure state  $|\psi_i\rangle$ . The states  $|\psi_i\rangle$  for  $i = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$  can be prepared using the circuit discussed in Sec. III. This circuit requires  $2n + 1$  qubit registers in the dynamic circuit framework and  $\ell(n + 1) - 1$  qubit registers in the static circuit framework. In the worst-case scenario, the circuit requires  $\ell(2^{n+1} - 2n - 2)$  CNOT gates,  $\ell(2^{n+1} - 2) + (\ell - 1) = \ell(2^{n+1} - 1) - 1$  one-qubit rotation gates, and  $n(\ell - 1)$  CSWAP gates in total, including the components for preparing the states  $\rho_i = |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$  and  $|\alpha_i\rangle$ .

### 2. Method via purification

According to the *purification theorem* [1], any arbitrary state  $\rho_A$  in a finite-dimensional Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_A$  can always be *purified* into a pure state  $|\Psi_{AB}\rangle$  in an enlarged Hilbert space  $\mathcal{H}_{AR} \cong \mathcal{H}_A \otimes \mathcal{H}_R$  such that  $\rho_A$  is a partial trace of  $|\Psi_{AR}\rangle$ , i.e.,  $\rho_A = \text{Tr}_R |\Psi_{AR}\rangle\langle\Psi_{AR}|$ . Particularly, with the inclusion of  $m = \lceil \log_2 \ell \rceil$  ancilla qubits, the state given by (4.1) can be purified into

$$|\Psi\rangle^{(n+m)} = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \sqrt{p_i} |\psi_i\rangle^{(n)} \otimes |i\rangle^{(m)}, \quad (4.3)$$

where  $|i\rangle^{(m)}$  are the computational basis states of the ancilla qubits. The state  $\rho$  then can be obtained simply by ignoring the ancilla qubits.

Instead of applying the  $U[|\Psi\rangle^{(n+m)}]$  gate directly, we propose a slightly more efficient scheme to obtain  $|\Psi\rangle^{(n+m)}$  as follows. First, we prepared the state

$$|p\rangle^{(m)} := \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \sqrt{p_i} |i\rangle^{(m)} \quad (4.4)$$




FIG. 6. The quantum circuit producing the mixed state  $\rho$  in (4.1) and the corresponding purified state  $|\Psi\rangle^{(n+m)}$  in (4.3).

for the ancilla qubits by applying  $U[|p\rangle^{(m)}]$  on  $|0\rangle^{(m)}$ . Next, with the ancilla qubits serving as the control nodes, we sequentially apply controlled- $U[|\psi_i\rangle]$  gates conditioned on the corresponding control node configurations as illustrated in Fig. 6. Finally, simply ignoring the ancilla qubits, we obtain the state given in (4.1). In comparison to the method via a mixture of pure states, the method via purification offers an additional bonus of providing a purified state, which could be useful in various occasions.

As discussed previously, each  $U[|\psi_i\rangle]$  gate can be implemented in the layout of Fig. 5. Consequently, each  $m$ -fold controlled- $U[|\psi_i\rangle]$  gate appearing in Fig. 6 can be implemented in the same way, except that the uniformly controlled configurations in Fig. 5 are all enlarged to include the corresponding control node configuration of the  $m$  ancilla qubits. Since controlled-gates conditioned on distinct control node configurations commute with one another, by rearranging the sequence of the controlled- $R_y$  and controlled- $R_z$  gates, the circuit in Fig. 6 collectively can be rendered into a layout similar to Fig. 5 but with the uniformly controlled rotations  $F^k[R_y]$  and  $F^k[R_z]$  for  $k = m, \dots, m+n-1$  instead of  $k = 0, \dots, n-1$ .

In the worst-case scenario, the circuit of Fig. 6 requires  $\sum_{k=m}^{n+m-1} (2 \times 2^k - 2) = 2^m(2^{n+1} - 2) - 2n$  CNOT gates and  $\sum_{k=m}^{n+m-1} (2 \times 2^k) = 2^m(2^{n+1} - 2)$  one-qubit rotations. Additionally, to prepare the state  $|p\rangle^{(m)}$  in (4.4), it requires  $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (2^k) = 2^m - 1$  CNOT gates and  $\sum_{k=0}^{m-1} (2^k) = 2^m - 1$  one-qubit  $R_y$  gates in the worst case.<sup>6</sup> To sum up, in the worst case, the circuit for preparing an arbitrary  $n$ -qubit state  $\rho$  requires  $2^m(2^{n+1} - 1) - 2n - 1 \sim \ell(2^{n+1} - 1) - 2n - 1$  CNOT gates and  $2^m(2^{n+1} - 1) - 1 \sim \ell(2^{n+1} - 1) - 1$  one-qubit rotation gates in total.<sup>7</sup>

<sup>6</sup> As the coefficients in (4.4) are all chosen to be real, no  $R_z$  gates are needed.

<sup>7</sup> This is slightly more efficient than directly implementing the  $U[|\Psi\rangle^{(n+m)}]$  gate, which requires  $2^{n+m+1} - 2(m+n) - 2$  CNOT gates and  $2^{n+m+1} - 2$  one-qubit rotation gates using the method in Sec. III.

## B. Density matrix in terms of matrix elements

In many occasions, the density matrix  $\rho$  is not given in the form of (4.1), but in terms of the matrix elements, i.e.,

$$\rho = \sum_{a,b=0}^{2^n-1} \rho_{ab} |a\rangle \langle b|, \quad (4.5)$$

where  $|a\rangle$  are the  $n$ -qubit computational basis states, and

$$\rho_{ab} = \rho_{ba}^* = \langle a | \rho | b \rangle. \quad (4.6)$$

Given  $\rho_{ab}$ , can we design a circuit that efficiently prepares the state  $\rho$ ?

An obvious strategy is to perform preprocessing to recast (4.5) into the diagonal form of (4.2) by solving the eigenvalue problem, followed by the application of the methods presented in Sec. IV A. However, this approach comes with two potential drawbacks. Firstly, solving the eigenvalue problem can be time-consuming. Secondly, the eigenstates  $|\lambda_i\rangle$  may be difficult to deal with when they are incorporated into the circuit. In the following, we present an alternative approach that circumvents the need to solve the eigenvalue problem and is more advantageous in both preprocessing and circuit implementation.

Suppose that  $\rho$  can be efficiently recast into the form of (4.1). By expanding each  $|\psi_i\rangle$  as

$$|\psi_i\rangle = \sum_{a=0}^{2^n-1} \alpha_{ai} |a\rangle, \quad (4.7)$$

where  $\alpha_{ai} \in \mathbb{C}$  and  $\sum_{a=0}^{2^n-1} |\alpha_{ai}|^2 = 1$ , it leads to

$$\begin{aligned} \rho &= \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \sum_{a,b=0}^{2^n-1} p_i \alpha_{ai} \alpha_{bi}^* |a\rangle \langle b| \\ &=: \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \sum_{a,b=0}^{2^n-1} \tilde{\alpha}_{ai} \tilde{\alpha}_{bi}^* |a\rangle \langle b|, \end{aligned} \quad (4.8)$$

where we have defined  $\tilde{\alpha}_{ai} := \sqrt{p_i} \alpha_{ai}$ , and the values of  $\ell$ ,  $p_i$ , and  $\alpha_{ia}$  are to be determined from the given  $\rho_{ab}$ . Equivalently, we have

$$\rho = AA^\dagger, \quad (4.9)$$

where  $\rho$  is viewed as a  $2^n \times 2^n$  matrix and  $A$  is a  $2^n \times \ell$  matrix with the matrix elements

$$A_{ai} = \tilde{\alpha}_{ai} \equiv \sqrt{p_i} \alpha_{ai}. \quad (4.10)$$

Since it is obvious that  $A^\dagger A$  is positive semi-definite and  $\text{Tr } A^\dagger A = \text{Tr } A A^\dagger = \text{Tr } \rho = 1$ , we have

$$0 \leq (A^\dagger A)_{ii} = \sum_{a=0}^{2^n-1} \tilde{\alpha}_{ai} \tilde{\alpha}_{ai}^* \leq 1 \quad (4.11)$$

and  $\sum_i (A^\dagger A)_{ii} = 1$ . Consequently, letting

$$p_i = (A^\dagger A)_{ii} \quad (4.12)$$

leads to  $0 \leq p_i \leq 1$  with  $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i = 1$  and  $\sum_{a=0}^{2^n-1} |\alpha_{ai}|^2 = 1$  if  $p_i > 0$ . The real numbers  $p_i$  can be viewed as disjoint probabilities, and the complex numbers  $\alpha_{ai}$  for  $p_i > 0$  can be viewed as normalized coefficients of an  $n$ -qubit state  $|\psi_i\rangle$ .

Therefore, if we can find a  $2^n \times \ell$  matrix  $A$  satisfying (4.9), then the state  $\rho$  can be produced by the methods discussed in Sec. IV A. The method via a mixture of pure states implements the circuit of Fig. 2 with the following prescription: the real numbers  $p_i > 0$  given by (4.12) are used to specify the states  $|\alpha_i\rangle$  via (2.4) and (2.5), and  $\rho_i = |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|$  are prepared as the states  $|\psi_i\rangle$  given by (4.7) with the coefficients  $\alpha_{ai} = A_{ai}/\sqrt{p_i}$ .<sup>8</sup> On the other hand, the method via purification either implements the circuit of Fig. 6 or employs other pure state preparation methods to produce the purified state  $|\Psi\rangle^{(n+m)}$  given in (4.3) with the number of ancilla qubits chosen to be  $m = \lceil \log_2 \ell \rceil$ . The only remaining challenge is to find the matrix  $A$ , which can be efficiently solved by the *Cholesky decomposition* [47–50].

### 1. Cholesky decomposition

In the Cholesky decomposition, if  $M$  is a  $d \times d$  Hermitian positive semi-definite matrix, then it admits a factorization

$$M = LL^\dagger, \quad (4.13)$$

where  $L$  is a  $d \times d$  lower triangular matrix. Performing the Cholesky decomposition upon  $\rho$  to obtain  $L$  and then removing the columns that contain all zeros from  $L$ , we obtain a  $2^n \times \ell$  matrix, which obviously is a solution of  $A$  in (4.9). The factorization is unique if  $M$  is positive definite, but needs not be so if  $M$  is only positive semi-definite. However, if the rank of  $M$  is  $r$ , there is a unique factorization where  $L$  is a  $d \times d$  lower triangular matrix with  $r$  positive diagonal elements

---

<sup>8</sup> If  $p_i = 0$ , we have  $\sum_{a=0}^{2^n-1} |\tilde{\alpha}_{ai}|^2 = 0$ , implying  $\tilde{\alpha}_{ai} = 0$  for all  $a = 0, \dots, 2^n - 1$ . The whole column of  $\tilde{\alpha}_{ai}$  can be removed from  $A$  to still satisfy (4.9). Thus, the case of  $p_i = 0$  can be disregarded.

and  $d - r$  columns containing all zeros [48]. This unique factorization leads to a solution of  $A$  as a  $2^n \times r$  matrix.<sup>9</sup>

Several algorithms exist for solving the Cholesky decomposition, each with its own strengths. Commonly used algorithms are the Cholesky algorithm, the Cholesky–Banachiewicz algorithm, and the Cholesky–Crout algorithm, all of which have a time complexity of  $O(d^3)$ , requiring  $\sim d^3/3$  floating-point operations [47]. The computational efficiency can depend on various factors, including the size and condition of the matrix, as well as other specific implementation details. If the rank of the matrix is sufficiently low, it can lead to significant computational efficiency. The pivoted Cholesky decomposition [49, 55] and the rank-revealing Cholesky decomposition [56] can be used to take advantage of the rank deficiency. Both rank-aware algorithms still have the time complexity of  $O(d^3)$ , but they can be significantly more efficient in practice for low-rank matrices. Generally, the Cholesky decomposition is considered to be efficient, especially when compared to other matrix factorization methods.

Alternatively, we can perform the preprocessing to render (4.5) into the diagonal form of (4.2) by solving the eigenvalue problem. A commonly used algorithm for finding eigenvalues and eigenvectors is the QR algorithm [47, 48], which utilizes the QR decomposition and is efficient for dense matrices with a time complexity of  $O(d^3)$ , requiring  $\sim 6d^3$  floating-point operations [47]. In comparison, the preprocessing of solving the Cholesky decomposition in general is more efficient than that of solving the eigenvalue problem by a factor of  $\sim 18$ . In the case where the qubit number  $n$  is large enough, the matrix size  $d = 2^n$  can be huge, and the difference between the time consumption of  $\sim d^3/3$  and  $\sim 6d^3$  floating-point operations can be significant.

For solving the eigenvalue problems of sparse matrices, specialized iterative methods such as the Lanczos algorithm [49, 57] may be more efficient in practice than the QR algorithm. On the other hand, for solving the Cholesky decomposition of sparse matrices, one can significantly boost computational efficiency by applying the techniques of reordering strategies to obtain a sparse Cholesky factorization [50, 58, 59]. Therefore, regardless of whether  $\rho$  is sparse or not, the preprocessing via solving the Cholesky decomposition is more preferable to that via solving the eigenvalue problem.

It is important to note that, in general, the matrix  $A$  is fairly sparse, as it is obtained from a lower triangular matrix, even if the original matrix  $M$  is not sparse itself.<sup>10</sup> When the original

---

<sup>9</sup> The unique factorization gives the minimum possible matrix size of  $A$  (i.e.,  $\ell = r$ ). However, the solutions with  $\ell > r$  are still considered as they may exhibit higher sparsity, the merit of which will be discussed shortly.

<sup>10</sup> In the worst case, there are still at least  $1 + 2 + \dots + (\ell - 1) = \ell(\ell - 1)/2$  zeros in  $A$ .

matrix is sparse, reordering strategies can be employed to minimize the creation of “fill-ins” (i.e., the non-zero elements in the factorized matrices that are zero in the original matrix) and maintain sparsity in the factorized form as much as possible [58, 59]. These strategies aim to reorder the rows and columns of the matrix in a way that preserves its sparsity structure, reducing the number of non-zero entries introduced during the factorization. By contrast, the coefficients  $\beta_{ai}$  for the eigenstates  $|\lambda_i\rangle = \sum_{a=0}^{2^n-1} \beta_{ai} |a\rangle$  do not always exhibit sparsity, even if the original matrix is sparse. The sparsity of a matrix does not necessarily imply sparsity in its eigenvectors, and vice versa.

The sparsity of the matrix  $A$  offers a significant advantage in circuit implementation. With many of the coefficients  $\alpha_{ai}$  vanishing, the corresponding states  $|\psi_i\rangle$  are mostly sparse in the computational basis  $\{|a\rangle\}$ . Employing the algorithms specifically designed for preparing sparse states, such as those proposed in [37–40], to prepare the pure states  $\rho_i = |\psi_i\rangle\langle\psi_i|$  in Fig. 2 will markedly enhance circuit efficiency. Alternatively, as the purified state  $|\Psi\rangle^{(n+m)}$  in (4.3) as a whole is also sparse in the computational basis  $\{|a\rangle^{(n)} \otimes |i\rangle^{(m)}\}$ , these algorithms can also be applied to implement a highly efficient circuit for directly producing the state  $|\Psi\rangle^{(n+m)}$ .<sup>11</sup>

## 2. Incomplete Cholesky decomposition

In many applications, it is good enough to prepare only an approximate state  $\rho'$  that is close enough to  $\rho$ , instead of  $\rho$  itself as originally specified. The *incomplete Cholesky decomposition* [49, 51] can be performed upon  $\rho$  to give rise to such approximation.

For a  $d \times d$  Hermitian positive semi-definite matrix  $M$ , the incomplete Cholesky decomposition gives the factorization

$$M' := L'L'^{\dagger}, \quad (4.14)$$

where  $L'$  is a  $d \times d$  lower triangular matrix subject to a certain predefined option, and  $M'$  is “close” to  $M$  in a predefined sense. Particularly, if the *threshold dropping* option [51] is employed with a specified nonnegative drop tolerance  $\epsilon$ , any nondiagonal elements smaller in magnitude than  $\epsilon$  are dropped from  $L'$ , and the resulting  $M'$  is close to  $M$  in the sense that

$$\frac{\|M - M'\|_F}{\|M\|_F} \sim O(\epsilon), \quad (4.15)$$

---

<sup>11</sup> If the rank  $r$  of the given density matrix  $\rho$  is sufficiently low, it can be more preferable to apply the unique factorization to yield  $A$  with the minimum possible matrix size  $2^n \times r$ . On the other hand, if the matrix  $\rho$  is sufficiently sparse, it becomes more preferable to apply the reordering strategies [58, 59] to yield  $A$  with a larger matrix size but higher sparsity. (Recall Footnote 9.)



where  $\|\cdot\|_F$  is the Frobenius norm. As the drop tolerance  $\epsilon$  increases, the accuracy of the approximation decreases, but the sparsity of  $L'$  increases.

The incomplete Cholesky decomposition, prescribed with a considerably large drop tolerance, is extremely cheap in computational cost and yields a highly sparse factor matrix  $L'$ . When dealing with a density matrix  $M = \rho$ , a highly sparse  $2^n \times \ell$  matrix  $A'$  can be obtained from  $L'$  in the same manner that  $A$  is obtained from  $L$ . Consequently, we obtain a good approximation  $\rho'$  to  $\rho$  as

$$\rho' = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i |\psi'_i\rangle \langle \psi'_i|, \quad (4.16)$$

where<sup>12</sup>

$$p'_i = (A'^{\dagger} A')_{ii}, \quad p_i = \frac{p'_i}{\sum_{i=0}^{\ell} p'_i}, \quad (4.17)$$

$$|\psi'_i\rangle = \sum_{a=0}^{2^n-1} \alpha'_{ai} |a\rangle, \quad (4.18)$$

and

$$A'_{ai} = \sqrt{p'_i} \alpha'_{ai}. \quad (4.19)$$

Because the coefficients  $\alpha'_{ai}$  are significantly sparser than those  $\alpha_{ai}$  obtained through the standard Cholesky decomposition, the circuit required for preparing the approximate state  $\rho'$  is considerably less expensive than that needed for preparing  $\rho$ . This offers an appealing approach to generating a high-quality approximate state, invoking highly economical preprocessing and resulting in highly efficient circuits.

The fact that  $\rho'$  is close to  $\rho$  can be quantified in terms of the trace distance between them as

$$\begin{aligned} D(\rho, \rho') &:= \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \rho'\|_* \\ &\sim \frac{1}{2} \|\rho - \rho'\|_F \\ &\sim \|\rho\|_F \times O(\epsilon) \sim O(\epsilon), \end{aligned} \quad (4.20)$$

where, for any matrix  $A$  with  $\sigma_i(A)$  being its singular values,  $\|A\|_* := \text{Tr} \sqrt{A^{\dagger} A} = \sum_i \sigma_i(A)$  is the trace norm (also known as the nuclear norm) of  $A$ , and  $\|A\|_F := \sqrt{\text{Tr}(A^{\dagger} A)} = \sqrt{\sum_i \sigma_i^2(A)}$  is the Frobenius norm (also known as the Hilbert–Schmidt norm). The relation (4.15) with  $M = \rho$ ,  $M' \approx$

---

<sup>12</sup> Note that  $\text{Tr} A'^{\dagger} A' = \text{Tr} A' A'^{\dagger} = \text{Tr} M'$  is close to but slightly different from  $\text{Tr} M \equiv \text{Tr} \rho = 1$ . Thus, we have to normalize  $p'_i$  to  $p_i$  to satisfy  $\sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i = 1$ . Because of this, also note that  $\rho' \neq M'$  but  $\rho' = M' / \text{Tr} M' \approx M'$ .

$\rho'$  and the fact  $\|\rho\|_F \leq \|\rho\|_* = 1$  have been used. Consequently, given a small drop tolerance  $\epsilon$ , the Fuchs–van de Graaf inequality [60],  $1 - \sqrt{F(\rho_1, \rho_2)} \leq D(\rho_1, \rho_2) \leq \sqrt{1 - F(\rho_1, \rho_2)}$ , implies that the fidelity between  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  remains as high as

$$1 - O(\epsilon) \lesssim F(\rho, \rho') \lesssim 1 - O(\epsilon^2). \quad (4.21)$$

## V. SUMMARY

As an issue closely related to arbitrary quantum state preparation, we investigate the task of state mixture: given a certain number of arbitrary unknown pure or mixed quantum states as input, devise an operation to produce a new output state as a superposition or mixture of the provided states with predefined coefficients or weights. Provided with arbitrary unknown pure states  $|\psi_i\rangle$  for  $i = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$ , it turns out the operation to produce the new superposed state  $|\psi\rangle \propto \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} \alpha_i |\psi_i\rangle$  with predefined coefficients  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}$  is unattainable by any means, unless all but one of  $\alpha_i$  vanish. This observation is coined as the no-superposing theorem as stated in Theorem 1, which is closely related to the fact that any two nonorthogonal quantum states cannot be unambiguously discriminated. On the other hand, provided with arbitrary unknown mixed states  $\rho_i$  for  $i = 0, \dots, \ell - 1$ , the task to produce the new mixed state  $\rho = \sum_{i=0}^{\ell-1} p_i \rho_i$  with predefined weights  $0 < p_i \leq 1$  can be achieved by the quantum circuit in Fig. 2, which requires  $n(\ell - 1)$  CSWAP gates and  $\ell - 1$  one-qubit rotation gates.

To elucidate fundamental concepts, we revisit and re-derive the previously established results for preparation of arbitrary pure states. Given an  $n$ -qubit quantum state  $|\psi\rangle^{(n)} = \sum_{a=0}^{2^n-1} \alpha_a |a\rangle$  with the coefficients  $\alpha_a \in \mathbb{C}$  all specified, we provide a systematic scheme via the recursive relation (3.2) to implement the quantum circuit, as shown in Fig. 4, to produce  $|\psi\rangle^{(n)}$ . This circuit can be rearranged into the equivalent circuit in terms of uniformly controlled rotations,  $F^k[R_{\mathbf{a}}]$ , for  $k = 0, \dots, n - 1$ , as depicted in Fig. 5, which is precisely the same as the circuit proposed in [33, 34], although derived from a different starting perspective. By following the methodology introduced in [33, 34], the uniformly controlled rotations  $F^k[R_y]$  and  $F^k[R_z]$  appearing in Fig. 5 can be efficiently decomposed into CNOT gates and one-qubit rotation gates as illustrated in Fig. 8. In the worse case, the state preparation circuit in Fig. 5 requires  $2^{n+1} - 2n - 2$  CNOT gates and  $2^{n+1} - 2$  one-qubit rotation gates in total, presenting the most efficient circuit implementation to date for arbitrary state preparation [33, 34].

As a novel contribution to the literature, we explore the issue of arbitrary mixed state preparation. When the density matrix  $\rho$  is specified in terms of an ensemble of pure states, as given in

(4.1), the circuit depicted in Fig. 2 can be employed to generate  $\rho$ . This circuit necessitates the use of  $2n + 1$  qubit registers in the dynamic circuit framework and  $\ell(n + 1) - 1$  qubit registers in the static circuit framework. In the worst-case scenario, the circuit requires  $\ell(2^{n+1} - 2n - 2)$  CNOT gates,  $\ell(2^{n+1} - 1) - 1$  one-qubit rotation gates, and  $n(\ell - 1)$  CSWAP gates in total. Alternatively, the circuit presented in Fig. 6 can also generate  $\rho$ , bringing an additional benefit of providing a purified state of  $\rho$ , which could be useful in various situations. In the worst-case scenario, this circuit requires  $2^m(2^{n+1} - 1) - 2n - 1 \sim \ell(2^{n+1} - 1) - 2n - 1$  CNOT gates and  $2^m(2^{n+1} - 1) - 1 \sim \ell(2^{n+1} - 1) - 1$  one-qubit rotation gates, where  $m = \lceil \log_2 \ell \rceil$ .

On the other hand, when the density matrix  $\rho$  is specified in terms of matrix elements, as shown in (4.5), one can perform the preprocessing of solving the eigenvalue problem to render (4.5) into the diagonal form of (4.2) before applying the aforementioned methods. However, solving the eigenvalue problem can be time-consuming, and the resulting eigenstates may be difficult to deal with. Instead of solving the eigenvalue problem, we propose a better strategy that utilizes the Cholesky decomposition to factorize the  $2^n \times 2^n$  density matrix  $\rho$  into  $\rho = AA^\dagger$ , where  $A$  is a  $2^n \times \ell$  matrix with  $r \equiv \text{rank}(\rho) \leq \ell \leq 2^n$ . Once  $A$  is obtained, we can compute  $p_i$  by (4.12) and  $\alpha_{ai}$  by (4.10). Consequently, by providing the states  $|\alpha_i\rangle$  given by (2.4) and (2.5), and  $\rho_i = |\psi_i\rangle \langle \psi_i|$  as the states  $|\psi_i\rangle$  given by (4.7), we can implement the circuit of Fig. 2 to produce  $\rho$ . Alternatively, we can implement the circuit of Fig. 6 or adopt other pure state preparation methods to produce the purified state  $|\Psi\rangle^{(n+m)}$  given in (4.3), with the number of ancilla qubits selected as  $m = \lceil \log_2 \ell \rceil$ .

For a  $d \times d$  matrix  $M$ , the commonly used algorithms for solving the Cholesky decomposition have a time complexity of  $O(d^3)$  and require  $\sim d^3/3$  floating-point operations, in general more efficient than the commonly used QR algorithm for solving the eigenvalue problem, which also has a time complexity of  $O(d^3)$  but requires  $\sim 6d^3$  floating-point operations. In cases where the rank of  $M$  is sufficiently low, the application of rank-aware algorithms for the Cholesky decomposition can significantly enhance computational efficiency. Additionally, if  $M$  is sparse enough, computational efficiency can be further improved and a sparse Cholesky factorization can be obtained by employing reordering strategies.

The resulting matrix  $A$  typically exhibits a considerable degree of sparsity, even when the density matrix  $\rho$  itself is not sparse at all. Particularly, in the case where  $\rho$  is sparse enough, reordering strategies can be employed to minimize fill-ins and thus yield high sparsity in the resulting  $A$ . This sparsity in the matrix  $A$  offers a remarkable advantage in circuit implementation. Given that many of the coefficients  $\alpha_{ai}$  vanish, the corresponding states  $|\psi_i\rangle$  and the purified state  $|\Psi\rangle^{(n+m)}$  in (4.3) too are sparse in their computational basis. Consequently, by adopting the methods specially

designed for the preparation of sparse pure states, such as those proposed in [37–40], the complexity of the circuit for preparing  $\rho$  can be significantly reduced.

Furthermore, the incomplete Cholesky decomposition with the threshold dropping option provides an appealing scheme for preparing a high-fidelity approximate state  $\rho'$  close to  $\rho$ . Striking an excellent balance between accuracy and efficiency, this approach incurs an extremely low computational cost in preprocessing and yields highly efficient circuits in the end. When the drop tolerance  $\epsilon$  increases, the sparsity of the Cholesky factorization rises, while the accuracy of the approximation declines. Consequently, with increasing drop tolerance, both the efficiency of the preprocessing and the efficiency of the resulting quantum circuit improve significantly, while the fidelity between  $\rho$  and  $\rho'$  degrades but remains satisfactorily high, as indicated in (4.21).

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the National Science and Technology Council, Taiwan, under grants 112-2119-M-002-017 and 113-2119-M-002-024, the NTU Center of Data Intelligence: Technologies, Applications, and Systems under grant NTU-113L900903, and the Intelligent Computing for Sustainable Development Research Center at National Taiwan Normal University under the Higher Education Sprout Project, sponsored by the Ministry of Education, Taiwan.

### Appendix A: Uniformly controlled one-qubit gates

In this appendix, we provide a brief outline of *uniformly controlled one-qubit gates* and *uniformly controlled rotations* as a special category. Readers are referred to [32–34] for more details and explanations.

A  $k$ -fold uniformly controlled one-qubit gate  $F^k[U]$  is a  $(k+1)$ -qubit gate with one target qubit and  $k$  control qubits in the form

$$F^k[U] := \begin{cases} \sum_{a=0}^{2^k-1} |a\rangle \langle a| \otimes U_a & \text{for } k > 0, \\ U_0 & \text{for } k = 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A1})$$

where  $U_a$  are one-qubit unitary operators acting on the target qubit. A uniformly controlled one-qubit gate  $F^k[U]$  can be understood as a sequence of  $k$ -fold controlled gates conditioned on all different control node configurations as illustrated in Fig. 7.

In the special case where all the one-qubit operators  $U_a$  belong to the one-parameter group of rotations about a common axis  $\mathbf{a}$  that is perpendicular to the  $x$ -axis, i.e.  $U_a = R_{\mathbf{a}}(\theta_a)$  with  $\mathbf{a} \cdot \hat{x} = 0$




FIG. 7. The quantum circuit of a uniformly controlled one-qubit gate  $F^2[U]$ .




FIG. 8. An efficient quantum circuit implementation for a uniformly controlled rotation  $F^3[R_{\mathbf{a}}]$ .

and some angle  $\theta_a$ , the uniformly controlled gate  $F^k[U]$  is called a *uniformly controlled rotation* and denoted as  $F^k[R_{\mathbf{a}}]$ .

Efficient implementation of uniformly controlled one-qubit gates can be achieved in terms of CNOT gates and one-qubit gates. Specially, a  $k$ -fold uniformly controlled rotation can be implemented even more efficiently with  $2^k$  CNOT gates and  $2^k$  one-qubit rotation gates [32–34] as illustrated in Fig. 8.

Given

$$F^k[R_{\mathbf{a}}] := \begin{cases} \sum_{a=0}^{2^k-1} |a\rangle \langle a| \otimes R_{\mathbf{a}}(\theta_a) & \text{for } k > 0, \\ R_{\mathbf{a}}(\theta_0) & \text{for } k = 0, \end{cases} \quad (\text{A2})$$

the corresponding rotation angles  $\phi_a$  of  $R_{\mathbf{a}}(\phi_a)$  in Fig. 8 are given via the transformation

$$\phi_a = \sum_{b=0}^{2^k-1} M_{ab} \theta_b, \quad M_{ab} = 2^{-k} (-1)^{\mathcal{b}(b) \cdot \mathcal{g}(a)}, \quad (\text{A3})$$

where  $\mathcal{b}(a)$  and  $\mathcal{g}(a)$  represent the binary code and the binary reflected Gray code, respectively, of the integer  $a$ , and  $\mathcal{b}(b) \cdot \mathcal{g}(a)$  is the bit-wise multiplication of  $\mathcal{b}(b)$  and  $\mathcal{g}(a)$  [32, 33].

- 
- [1] M. A. Nielsen and I. L. Chuang, *Quantum Computation and Quantum Information* (Cambridge University Press, 2010).
  - [2] A. Ambainis, Quantum search algorithms, *ACM SIGACT News* **35**, 22 (2004).
  - [3] P. R. Giri and V. E. Korepin, A review on quantum search algorithms, *Quantum Information Processing* **16**, 1 (2017).
  - [4] I. M. Georgescu, S. Ashhab, and F. Nori, Quantum simulation, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **86**, 153 (2014).

- [5] P. Wittek, *Quantum Machine Learning: What Quantum Computing Means to Data Mining* (Academic Press, 2014).
- [6] J. Biamonte, P. Wittek, N. Pancotti, P. Rebentrost, N. Wiebe, and S. Lloyd, Quantum machine learning, *Nature* **549**, 195 (2017).
- [7] G. Jaeger, *Quantum Information* (Springer, 2007).
- [8] M. M. Wilde, *Quantum Information Theory* (Cambridge University Press, 2013).
- [9] N. Gisin, G. Ribordy, W. Tittel, and H. Zbinden, Quantum cryptography, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **74**, 145 (2002).
- [10] A. W. Harrow, A. Hassidim, and S. Lloyd, Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **103**, 150502 (2009).
- [11] D. Aharonov, A. Kitaev, and N. Nisan, Quantum circuits with mixed states, in *Proceedings of the thirtieth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing* (1998) pp. 20–30.
- [12] G. Alber, T. Beth, M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, R. Horodecki, M. Rötteler, H. Weinfurter, R. Werner, and A. Zeilinger, *Quantum Information: An Introduction to Basic Theoretical Concepts and Experiments*, Vol. 173 (Springer, 2003).
- [13] Y.-C. Liang, Y.-H. Yeh, P. E. Mendonça, R. Y. Teh, M. D. Reid, and P. D. Drummond, Quantum fidelity measures for mixed states, *Reports on Progress in Physics* **82**, 076001 (2019).
- [14] N. A. Peters, T.-C. Wei, and P. G. Kwiat, Mixed-state sensitivity of several quantum-information benchmarks, *Phys. Rev. A* **70**, 052309 (2004).
- [15] C. H. Bennett, D. P. DiVincenzo, J. A. Smolin, and W. K. Wootters, Mixed-state entanglement and quantum error correction, *Phys. Rev. A* **54**, 3824 (1996).
- [16] T.-C. Wei, K. Nemoto, P. M. Goldbart, P. G. Kwiat, W. J. Munro, and F. Verstraete, Maximal entanglement versus entropy for mixed quantum states, *Phys. Rev. A* **67**, 022110 (2003).
- [17] A. Datta and G. Vidal, Role of entanglement and correlations in mixed-state quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. A* **75**, 042310 (2007).
- [18] M. Horodecki, P. Horodecki, and R. Horodecki, Mixed-state entanglement and quantum communication, in *Quantum Information: An Introduction to Basic Theoretical Concepts and Experiments* (Springer Berlin Heidelberg, Berlin, Heidelberg, 2001) pp. 151–195.
- [19] A. Datta and S. Gharibian, Signatures of nonclassicality in mixed-state quantum computation, *Phys. Rev. A* **79**, 042325 (2009).
- [20] C. Macchiavello and M. F. Sacchi, Mixed-state certification of quantum capacities for noisy communication channels, *Phys. Rev. A* **97**, 012303 (2018).
- [21] A. Riera, C. Gogolin, and J. Eisert, Thermalization in nature and on a quantum computer, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **108**, 080402 (2012).
- [22] C.-F. Chen, M. J. Kastoryano, F. G. S. L. Brandão, and A. Gilyén, Quantum thermal state preparation (2023), arXiv:2303.18224 [quant-ph].
- [23] F. Fritzsche and T. c. v. Prosen, Eigenstate thermalization in dual-unitary quantum circuits: Asymp-

- otics of spectral functions, *Phys. Rev. E* **103**, 062133 (2021).
- [24] S. McArdle, S. Endo, A. Aspuru-Guzik, S. C. Benjamin, and X. Yuan, Quantum computational chemistry, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **92**, 015003 (2020).
- [25] B. P. Lanyon, J. D. Whitfield, G. G. Gillett, M. E. Goggin, M. P. Almeida, I. Kassal, J. D. Biamonte, M. Mohseni, B. J. Powell, M. Barbieri, *et al.*, Towards quantum chemistry on a quantum computer, *Nature chemistry* **2**, 106 (2010).
- [26] Y. Cao, J. Romero, J. P. Olson, M. Degroote, P. D. Johnson, M. Kieferová, I. D. Kivlichan, T. Menke, B. Peropadre, N. P. Sawaya, *et al.*, Quantum chemistry in the age of quantum computing, *Chemical reviews* **119**, 10856 (2019).
- [27] I. F. Araujo, D. K. Park, T. B. Ludermir, W. R. Oliveira, F. Petruccione, and A. J. da Silva, Configurable sublinear circuits for quantum state preparation, *Quantum Information Processing* **22**, 123 (2023).
- [28] P. Niemann, R. Datta, and R. Wille, Logic synthesis for quantum state generation, in *2016 IEEE 46th International Symposium on Multiple-Valued Logic (ISMVL)* (2016) pp. 247–252.
- [29] V. Shende, S. Bullock, and I. Markov, Synthesis of quantum-logic circuits, *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* **25**, 1000 (2006).
- [30] M. Plesch and i. c. v. Brukner, Quantum-state preparation with universal gate decompositions, *Phys. Rev. A* **83**, 032302 (2011).
- [31] R. Iten, R. Colbeck, I. Kukuljan, J. Home, and M. Christandl, Quantum circuits for isometries, *Phys. Rev. A* **93**, 032318 (2016).
- [32] M. Möttönen, J. J. Vartiainen, V. Bergholm, and M. M. Salomaa, Quantum circuits for general multi-qubit gates, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **93**, 130502 (2004).
- [33] V. Bergholm, J. J. Vartiainen, M. Möttönen, and M. M. Salomaa, Quantum circuits with uniformly controlled one-qubit gates, *Phys. Rev. A* **71**, 052330 (2005).
- [34] M. Möttönen, J. J. Vartiainen, V. Bergholm, and M. M. Salomaa, Transformation of quantum states using uniformly controlled rotations, *Quantum Info. Comput.* **5**, 467–473 (2005).
- [35] S. Druskat, Quantum computing library (qclib), <https://github.com/qclib/qclib> (2021), released: 2021-08-11.
- [36] F. Mozafari, H. Riener, M. Soeken, and G. De Micheli, Efficient boolean methods for preparing uniform quantum states, *IEEE Transactions on Quantum Engineering* **2**, 1 (2021).
- [37] E. Malvetti, R. Iten, and R. Colbeck, Quantum circuits for sparse isometries, *Quantum* **5**, 412 (2021).
- [38] N. Gleinig and T. Hoefler, An efficient algorithm for sparse quantum state preparation, in *2021 58th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference (DAC)* (2021) pp. 433–438.
- [39] T. M. de Veras, L. D. da Silva, and A. J. da Silva, Double sparse quantum state preparation, *Quantum Information Processing* **21**, 204 (2022).
- [40] F. Mozafari, G. De Micheli, and Y. Yang, Efficient deterministic preparation of quantum states using decision diagrams, *Phys. Rev. A* **106**, 022617 (2022).

- [41] C. Zoufal, A. Lucchi, and S. Woerner, Quantum generative adversarial networks for learning and loading random distributions, *npj Quantum Information* **5**, 103 (2019).
- [42] K. Nakaji, S. Uno, Y. Suzuki, R. Raymond, T. Onodera, T. Tanaka, H. Tezuka, N. Mitsuda, and N. Yamamoto, Approximate amplitude encoding in shallow parameterized quantum circuits and its application to financial market indicators, *Phys. Rev. Res.* **4**, 023136 (2022).
- [43] F. M. Creevey, C. D. Hill, and L. C. L. Hollenberg, GASP: a genetic algorithm for state preparation on quantum computers, *Scientific Reports* **13**, 11956 (2023).
- [44] I. F. Araujo, C. Blank, I. C. S. Araújo, and A. J. da Silva, Low-rank quantum state preparation, *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems* **43**, 161 (2024).
- [45] J. Preskill, Quantum computing in the NISQ era and beyond, *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018).
- [46] M. Brooks, Beyond quantum supremacy: the hunt for useful quantum computers, *Nature* **574**, 19 (2019).
- [47] L. N. Trefethen and D. Bau, *Numerical Linear Algebra* (Society for Industrial and Applied Mathematics, 1997).
- [48] J. E. Gentle, *Numerical Linear Algebra for Applications in Statistics* (Springer, 1998).
- [49] G. H. Golub and C. F. Van Loan, *Matrix Computations*, 4th ed. (Johns Hopkins University Press, Baltimore, 2013).
- [50] MATLAB function: chol — Cholesky factorization (2023), <https://www.mathworks.com/help/matlab/ref/chol.html>.
- [51] MATLAB function: ichol — Incomplete Cholesky factorization (2023), <https://www.mathworks.com/help/matlab/ref/ichol.html>.
- [52] A. Peres, *Quantum Theory: Concepts and Methods* (Kluwer Academic Publishers, New York, 2002).
- [53] A. D. Córcoles, M. Takita, K. Inoue, S. Lekuch, Z. K. Mineev, J. M. Chow, and J. M. Gambetta, Exploiting dynamic quantum circuits in a quantum algorithm with superconducting qubits, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 100501 (2021).
- [54] J. Blake, Bringing the full power of dynamic circuits to qiskit runtime (2022), <https://www.ibm.com/quantum/blog/quantum-dynamic-circuits>.
- [55] N. J. Higham, Analysis of the Cholesky decomposition of a semi-definite matrix, in *Reliable Numerical Computation* (Oxford University Press, 1990) pp. 161–185.
- [56] M. Gu and L. Miranian, Strong rank revealing Cholesky factorization, *Electronic Transactions on Numerical Analysis* **17**, 76 (2004).
- [57] I. Ojalvo, Origins and advantages of Lanczos vectors for large dynamic systems, in *International Modal Analysis Conference, 6th, Kissimmee, FL* (1988) pp. 489–494.
- [58] T. A. Davis, Cholesky Factorization, in *Direct Methods for Sparse Linear Systems* (2006) Chap. 4, pp. 37–68.
- [59] S. Toledo, Computing the Cholesky Factorization of Sparse Matrices, lecture note in <https://www.tau.ac.il/~stoledo/Support/>.
- [60] C. Fuchs and J. van de Graaf, Cryptographic distinguishability measures for quantum-mechanical



states, *IEEE Transactions on Information Theory* **45**, 1216 (1999).