

Splitting techniques for approximating the exponential of commutators

F. Casas¹, A. Escorihuela-Tomàs²

¹ *Departament de Matemàtiques and IMAC, Universitat Jaume I, 12071-Castellón, Spain*
Email: Fernando.Casas@mat.uji.es

² *Departament de Matemàtiques and IMAC, Universitat Jaume I, 12071-Castellón, Spain*
Email: alescori@uji.es

We construct product formulas of orders 3 to 6 approximating the exponential of a commutator of two arbitrary operators in terms of the exponentials of the operators involved. The new schemes require a reduced number of exponentials and thus provide more efficient approximations than other previously published alternatives, whereas they can be still used as a starting methods of recursive procedures to increase the order of approximation.

I. INTRODUCTION

The problem of approximating the exponential of the sum of two non-commuting operators A and B in terms of the exponential of each operator has a long history, with applications in many areas of physics, chemistry and applied mathematics [3]. The simplest approximation corresponds of course to the so-called *Lie–Trotter* formula $\chi_t^{[1]} = e^{tA} e^{tB}$, verifying

$$e^{t(A+B)} - \chi_t^{[1]} = \mathcal{O}(t^2) \quad \text{as } t \rightarrow 0. \quad (1)$$

A higher-order approximation can be achieved by considering a symmetrized version of (1), also called the *Strang* (splitting) *scheme*,

$$S_t^{[2]} = e^{\frac{1}{2}tA} e^{tB} e^{\frac{1}{2}tA}. \quad (2)$$

Specifically, $e^{t(A+B)} - S_t^{[2]} = \mathcal{O}(t^3)$. In fact, $S_t^{[2]}$ can be used as the starting point of the recursion ($k \geq 2$) [8, 16]

$$S_t^{[2k]} = S_{\gamma_k t}^{[2k-2]} S_{(1-2\gamma_k)t}^{[2k-2]} S_{\gamma_k t}^{[2k-2]}, \quad (3)$$

$$\gamma_k = \frac{1}{2 - 2^{1/(2k-1)}},$$

leading to approximations of arbitrarily high order $2k$, although the number of exponentials increases rapidly with the order, and large positive and negative coefficients are present in (3). The alternative corresponding to the five maps composition [15]

$$S_t^{[2k]} = S_{\alpha_k t}^{[2k-2]} S_{\alpha_k t}^{[2k-2]} S_{(1-4\alpha_k)t}^{[2k-2]} S_{\alpha_k t}^{[2k-2]} S_{\alpha_k t}^{[2k-2]}, \quad (4)$$

$$\alpha_k = \frac{1}{4 - 4^{1/(2k-1)}},$$

although leading to smaller error terms, involves an even larger number of exponentials. Approximation schemes of high order involving a reduced number of exponentials have been designed for the numerical integration of differential equations, in which case A and B correspond to Lie derivatives associated to different parts of the defining vector field [2]. These *splitting methods* are of the form

$$S_t = e^{a_1 t A} e^{b_1 t B} \dots e^{a_s t A} e^{b_s t B} \quad (5)$$

and the coefficients a_j, b_j are chosen so that S_t provides an approximation to $e^{t(A+B)}$ of a given order r . This is achieved by first obtaining and then solving the so-called order conditions, polynomial equations in a_j, b_j whose number and complexity grow rapidly with r . Thus, for $r = 1, \dots, 10$, the number of order conditions is, respectively, 2, 1, 2, 3, 6, 9, 18, 30, 56 and 99 [12]. In any case, the number of exponentials involved in (5) is much smaller than in compositions (3) and (4). Splitting methods are widely used in the context of *Geometric Numerical Integration*, where one is interested in obtaining numerical solutions still possessing the same qualitative features as the continuous system they approximate [2, 10, 14]. A more detailed treatment can be found in [12] and the recent review [3].

Important as it is, not only the object $\exp(t(A+B))$ can be approximated in this way. In fact, as shown in particular in [6, 7, 11], similar compositions can be designed to approximate exponentials of commutators and more general Lie polynomials. The simplest compositions correspond to

$$\Psi_{2,1}(t) = e^{tA} e^{tB} e^{-tA} e^{-tB} \quad \text{and} \quad (6)$$

$$\Psi_{2,2}(t) = e^{-tB} e^{tA} e^{tB} e^{-tA},$$

both verifying that $\Psi_{2,j}(t) = e^{t^2[A,B]} + \mathcal{O}(t^3)$. The problem of constructing product formulas of a given order $r \geq 3$, namely, determining coefficients c_0, c_1, \dots so that

$$\Psi_r(t) = e^{c_0 t A} e^{c_1 t B} e^{c_2 t A} e^{c_3 t B} \dots = e^{t^2[A,B]} + \mathcal{O}(t^{r+1}) \quad (7)$$

has been analyzed in [6, 7], where general recursions are presented. They allow one, starting from a given approximation of order m , to construct a composition of order $m+1$ or $m+2$, for any $m \geq 2$. In particular, starting with a basic formula of order 3, different formulas of order 5 are designed and illustrated in practice. This approach, however, involves an exceedingly large number of exponentials: the most efficient procedure (called $\sqrt{10}$ -copy recursive formula in [6]) requires $(10N_m - 4)$ exponentials to generate a formula of order $m+2$ starting from a formula of (odd) order m with N_m exponentials, and $(10N_m - 2)$ if the basic scheme is of even order. Thus, from a composition of order 3 with 6 exponentials, the most efficient product formula of order 5 involves 56 exponentials.

In this work we address the general problem (7) by applying the same strategy usually pursued to construct splitting methods to approximate $e^{t(A+B)}$: first, we obtain the relevant order conditions required by such composition and then determine the coefficients by solving these order conditions. Although different procedures can be used to get the order conditions (see for instance [3]), here we successively apply the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula to the product (7) to express $\Psi_r(t)$ as the exponential of only one operator (a linear combination of A , B and their nested commutators). Comparison with $e^{t^2[A,B]}$ then gives the relevant equations to be satisfied by the coefficients c_j . The relative efficiency of different solutions (i.e., different sets of coefficients) is then determined by defining a function related with the effective error, so that the most efficient scheme is taken as the one minimizing this function. By following this procedure, we construct schemes of orders 4, 5 and 6 involving 10, 16 and 26 exponentials, respectively. This reduction in the number of exponentials contributes a good deal to the improvement in efficiency of the new methods. Furthermore, by considering additional exponentials (and therefore additional free parameters) it is possible to get even more efficient approximations. Of course, the methods we obtain here can be safely used as basic formulas for the recursive procedures presented in [6] if one is interested in achieving even higher orders.

As shown in [7] and especially in [6], having efficient product formulas approximating $e^{t^2[A,B]}$ is essential for some quantum simulations, in which case the exponentials e^{As} and $e^{Bs'}$ are native gates in a quantum circuit. We thus expect the present results (possibly in combination with the recursions of [6]) can be applied in practical quantum computations where commutators appear in a natural way, such as those enumerated there.

The rest of this work is organized as follows. In section II we consider in detail the case of order 3, thus illustrating the technique we use and the different types of composition that arise, whereas in section III we analyze the existing invariances and present new schemes of orders 4, 5 and 6. These methods are illustrated in section IV on some simple examples. Product formulas designed to approximate the exponential of other elements in the Lie algebra generated by A and B are presented in section V. Finally, section VI contains some concluding remarks.

II. THIRD-ORDER SCHEMES

Just as it is the case for order 2, equation (6), two types of compositions may in principle lead to higher order approximations, namely

$$AB : e^{c_0 t A} e^{c_1 t B} \dots e^{c_{2n} t A} e^{c_{2n+1} t B}, \quad (8)$$

and

$$BA : \Psi(t) = \prod_{j=0}^n e^{c_{2j} t B} e^{c_{2j+1} t A} \quad (9) \\ = e^{c_0 t B} e^{c_1 t A} \dots e^{c_{2n} t B} e^{c_{2n+1} t A}.$$

TABLE I: Particular basis of \mathcal{L}_j , $1 \leq j \leq 6$, taken in this work.

\mathcal{L}_j	Basis of \mathcal{L}_j		
\mathcal{L}_1	$E_{1,1} = A$	$E_{1,2} = B$	
\mathcal{L}_2	$E_{2,1} = [A, B]$		
\mathcal{L}_3	$E_{3,1} = [A, E_{2,1}]$	$E_{3,2} = [B, E_{2,1}]$	
\mathcal{L}_4	$E_{4,1} = [A, E_{3,1}]$	$E_{4,2} = [B, E_{3,1}]$	$E_{4,3} = -[B, E_{3,2}]$
\mathcal{L}_5	$E_{5,1} = [A, E_{4,1}]$	$E_{5,2} = [B, E_{4,1}]$	$E_{5,3} = [A, E_{4,2}]$
	$E_{5,4} = [B, E_{4,2}]$	$E_{5,5} = [A, E_{4,3}]$	$E_{5,6} = [B, E_{4,3}]$
\mathcal{L}_6	$E_{6,1} = [A, E_{5,1}]$	$E_{6,2} = [B, E_{5,1}]$	$E_{6,3} = [A, E_{5,2}]$
	$E_{6,4} = [A, E_{5,4}]$	$E_{6,5} = [B, E_{5,2}]$	$E_{6,6} = [A, E_{5,5}]$
	$E_{6,7} = [B, E_{5,5}]$	$E_{6,8} = [A, E_{5,6}]$	$E_{6,9} = [B, E_{5,6}]$

For our analysis next we consider compositions of type BA, although, as we will see, the results are also valid for (8).

If we apply sequentially the Baker–Campbell–Hausdorff formula to (9), we end up with $\Psi(t)$ expressed as one exponential of a series of operators in powers of t , namely

$$\Psi(t) = \exp(Y(t)), \quad \text{with} \quad Y(t) = \sum_{j \geq 1} t^j Y_j, \quad (10)$$

and $Y_j \in \mathcal{L}(A, B)$ is an element of the homogeneous subspace $\mathcal{L}_j(A, B)$ of degree j of the graded free Lie algebra $\mathcal{L}(A, B) = \bigoplus_{j \geq 1} \mathcal{L}_j(A, B)$ [13]. One can think of \mathcal{L}_j as the vector subspace formed by linear combinations of nested commutators involving j operators A and B , verifying $[\mathcal{L}_n, \mathcal{L}_m] \subset \mathcal{L}_{n+m}$. For the particular basis of \mathcal{L}_j , $1 \leq j \leq 6$, collected in Table I, the operator $Y(t)$ reads

$$Y(t) = t(w_{1,1}A + w_{1,2}B) + t^2 w_{2,1}[A, B] \\ + t^3(w_{3,1}E_{3,1} + w_{3,2}E_{3,2}) \\ + t^4 \sum_{\ell=1}^3 w_{4,\ell} E_{4,\ell} + t^5 \sum_{\ell=1}^6 w_{5,\ell} E_{5,\ell} \quad (11) \\ + t^6 \sum_{\ell=1}^9 w_{6,\ell} E_{6,\ell} + \mathcal{O}(t^7),$$

where $w_{n,k}$ are polynomials of homogeneous degree n in the parameters c_j . In particular,

$$w_{1,1} = \sum_{i=0}^{2n-1} c_{2i+1}, \quad w_{1,2} = \sum_{i=0}^{2n-1} c_{2i}, \\ w_{12} = \frac{1}{2} w_{1,1} w_{1,2} - \sum_{i=0}^{n-1} c_{2i} \sum_{j=i}^{n-1} c_{2j+1}.$$

From (11), it is clear that an approximation to $e^{t^2[A,B]}$ of order 3 (i.e., with an error $\mathcal{O}(t^4)$) is obtained by requiring that

$$w_{1,1} = w_{1,2} = 0, \quad w_{2,1} = 1, \quad w_{3,1} = w_{3,2} = 0. \quad (12)$$

In consequence, at least 5 exponentials in the composition (9) are required. It turns out, however, that equations (12) do not

have solutions in that case. It is therefore necessary to include an additional exponential, i.e., to consider the scheme

$$\Psi_3(t) = e^{c_0 t B} e^{c_1 t A} e^{c_2 t B} e^{c_3 t A} e^{c_4 t B} e^{c_5 t A}, \quad (13)$$

in which case one has a free parameter, say c_5 . The general solution is then given by ($c_5 \neq 0$)

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= \frac{1 \mp \sqrt{5}}{2c_5}, \quad c_1 = \frac{c_5(-1 \pm \sqrt{5})}{2}, \quad c_2 = \frac{1}{c_5}, \\ c_3 &= \frac{c_5(-1 \mp \sqrt{5})}{2}, \quad c_4 = \frac{-3 \pm \sqrt{5}}{2c_5}. \end{aligned} \quad (14)$$

It is a common practice when designing splitting methods to choose the free parameter so as to minimize some objective function typically related with the leading error term in the asymptotic expansion of $Y(t)$ in (11), in this case $\sum_{\ell=1}^3 w_{4,\ell} E_{4,\ell}$. In general, given a composition (9) involving s exponentials that approximates $e^{t^2[A,B]}$ up to order r , we define its effective error as

$$\mathcal{E}^{(r+1)} = s \left(\sqrt{\sum_{\ell=1}^{\dim \mathcal{L}_{r+1}} w_{r+1,\ell} E_{r+1,\ell}} \right)^{1/r}, \quad (15)$$

to take also into account the computational effort required by the scheme [3]. A method of order r is typically more efficient in practice than another one when it leads to a smaller $\mathcal{E}^{(r+1)}$, so it makes sense to take the effective error as the objective function to minimize. One should be aware, however, that the value of $\mathcal{E}^{(r+1)}$ may differ depending on the basis of \mathcal{L} one is using.

In the particular case of the 3rd-order scheme (13)-(14), the minimum value of $\mathcal{E}^{(4)}$ is obtained with the solution

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= \pm \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{5}+1}}, \quad c_1 = \mp \sqrt{\sqrt{5}-2}, \quad c_2 = \mp \sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{5}-1}}, \\ c_3 &= -c_2, \quad c_4 = -c_1, \quad c_5 = -c_0. \end{aligned} \quad (16)$$

Notice the peculiar arrangement in the distribution of the coefficients in this case:

$$(c_0, c_1, c_2, -c_2, -c_1, -c_0). \quad (17)$$

In fact, the same minimum is also obtained by the sequence ($i = \sqrt{-1}$)

$$\begin{aligned} (\tilde{c}_0, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_2, \tilde{c}_1, \tilde{c}_0), \\ \tilde{c}_0 = ic_0, \quad \tilde{c}_1 = -ic_1, \quad \tilde{c}_2 = ic_2, \end{aligned} \quad (18)$$

with c_j given in (17), although in this case all the coefficients are pure imaginary. Sequences such as (17) and (18) turn out to be very convenient when designing higher order methods.

III. HIGHER-ORDER COMPOSITIONS

Before proceeding to the actual construction of higher-order schemes, it is worth to briefly review some of the invariances

that a composition of type (9) has when approximating $e^{t^2[A,B]}$. This, on the one hand, provides more insight into the solutions obtained at order 3 and, on the other hand, may help in our exploration.

A. Invariances

The first and most obvious invariance takes place when one reverses the sign of t in (9). If $\Psi_r(t)$ is a method of order r , i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_r(t) &= \prod_{j=0}^n e^{c_{2j} t B} e^{c_{2j+1} t A} \\ &= \exp(t^2[A, B] + D_{r+1} t^{r+1} + \mathcal{O}(t^{r+2})), \end{aligned}$$

then

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_r(-t) &= \prod_{j=0}^n e^{-c_{2j} t B} e^{-c_{2j+1} t A} \\ &= \exp(t^2[A, B] + (-1)^{r+1} D_{r+1} t^{r+1} + \mathcal{O}(t^{r+2})). \end{aligned}$$

In consequence, and according with the definition of $\mathcal{E}^{(r+1)}$, both $\Psi_r(t)$ and $\Psi_r(-t)$ lead to the same effective error. This is in agreement with the two families of solutions (17) differing by a sign. In other words, when we propose a method with some specific coefficients c_j , the scheme obtained by considering the same composition with coefficients $-c_j$ has the same effective error.

Consider now the effect of the transformation

$$t \mapsto i\tilde{t}, \quad A \mapsto -\tilde{A}$$

on composition (9). Then

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_r(t) \mapsto \tilde{\Psi}_r(\tilde{t}) &= e^{ic_0 \tilde{t} B} e^{-ic_1 \tilde{t} \tilde{A}} \dots e^{ic_{2n} \tilde{t} B} e^{-ic_{2n+1} \tilde{t} \tilde{A}} \\ &= \exp(\tilde{t}^2[\tilde{A}, B] + (i)^{r+1} \tilde{D}_{r+1} \tilde{t}^{r+1} + \mathcal{O}(\tilde{t}^{r+2})), \end{aligned}$$

where \tilde{D}_{r+1} is the same linear combination of commutators as D_{r+1} , possibly with some coefficients with the reverse sign, thus leading again to a scheme with the same effective error. This fact accounts for the second family of solutions (18) found when $r = 3$.

Finally, consider the transformation

$$A \mapsto \hat{B}, \quad B \mapsto -\hat{A}. \quad (19)$$

Then, clearly

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi_r(t) \mapsto \hat{\Psi}_r(t) &= e^{-c_0 t \hat{A}} e^{c_1 t \hat{B}} \dots e^{-c_{2n} t \hat{A}} e^{c_{2n+1} t \hat{B}} \\ &= \exp(t^2[\hat{A}, \hat{B}] + \hat{D}_{r+1} t^{r+1} + \mathcal{O}(t^{r+2})). \end{aligned}$$

In other words, a BA method is transformed into an AB scheme, although possibly with a different value of $\mathcal{E}^{(r+1)}$, since the map (19) may modify the basis. In the particular case of the basis collected in Table I, one has $\hat{E}_{6,4} = E_{6,4} + \frac{1}{3}(E_{6,5} + E_{6,6})$. All other terms $\hat{E}_{j,\ell}$ up to $j = 6$ only differ from $E_{j,\ell}$ in a sign. We can therefore safely consider schemes of type BA, at least up to this order of approximation. Notice how $\Psi_{2,1}(t)$ can be obtained from $\Psi_{2,2}(t)$ in (6) in this way.

B. ‘Counter-palindromic’ patterns

We have seen how the sequences (17) and (18) lead, when $r = 3$, to methods with the minimum value of the effective error, such as is defined in (15). Scheme $\Psi_{2,2}(t)$ in (6) actually follows the same pattern: (c_0, c_1, c_1, c_0) . It seems then reasonable to consider similar sequences of coefficients when the order of approximation $r > 3$, i.e., either

$$(c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{m-1}, c_m, c_m, c_{m-1}, \dots, c_2, c_1, c_0) \quad (20)$$

or

$$(c_0, c_1, c_2, \dots, c_{m-1}, c_m, -c_m, -c_{m-1}, \dots, -c_2, -c_1, -c_0). \quad (21)$$

Schemes of this class will be called (positive or negative) *counter-palindromic* compositions, to emphasize the fact that the coefficients multiply a different operator (A or B) the second time they appear in the sequence (with the same or opposite sign, respectively). Sequences of this type have been previously considered in [9] when designing symplectic integrators for the (space discretized) Schrödinger equation.

Moreover, it turns out that sequences (20) and (21) actually lead to a significant reduction in the number of order conditions, since they already satisfy by construction many of them. Specifically, the coefficients in the expansion (11) of the operator $Y(t)$ associated to the scheme verify the identities (up to order 6):

$$\begin{aligned} w_{1,1} &= \pm w_{1,2} & w_{3,1} &= \mp w_{3,2} & w_{4,1} &= -w_{4,3} \\ w_{5,1} &= \pm w_{5,6} & w_{5,2} &= \pm w_{5,5} & w_{5,3} &= \pm w_{5,4} \\ w_{6,1} &= -w_{6,9} & w_{6,2} &= -w_{6,8} & w_{6,3} &= -w_{6,7} \\ w_{6,4} &= 3(w_{6,5} + w_{6,6}). \end{aligned}$$

Here the top sign corresponds to the pattern (20) and the bottom sign to (21).

This can be seen as follows. Suppose we have a composition of type (20),

$$\Psi(t) = e^{c_0 t B} e^{c_1 t A} \dots e^{c_{m-1} t B} e^{c_m t A} e^{c_m t B} e^{c_{m-1} t A} \dots e^{c_1 t B} e^{c_0 t A}, \quad (22)$$

which can be formally expressed as $\Psi(t) = \exp(Y(t))$, with $Y(t)$ given by (11), and interchange A and B in (22). This results in the new method

$$\tilde{\Psi}(t) = e^{c_0 t A} e^{c_1 t B} \dots e^{c_{m-1} t A} e^{c_m t B} e^{c_m t A} e^{c_{m-1} t B} \dots e^{c_1 t A} e^{c_0 t B},$$

whose associated operator was $\tilde{Y}(t)$ in $\tilde{\Psi}(t) = \exp(\tilde{Y}(t))$ reads

$$\begin{aligned} \tilde{Y}(t) &= t(w_{1,1} B + w_{1,2} A) - t^2 w_{2,1} [A, B] \\ &+ t^3 (-w_{3,1} E_{3,2} + w_{3,2} E_{3,1}) \\ &+ t^4 (w_{4,1} E_{4,3} - w_{4,2} E_{4,2} + w_{4,3} E_{4,1}) + \mathcal{O}(t^5) \end{aligned}$$

Now, the adjoint of $\tilde{\Psi}(t)$, defined as $(\tilde{\Psi}(t))^* = (\tilde{\Psi}(-t))^{-1}$ [10], is precisely $\Psi(t)$, so that

$$-\tilde{Y}(-t) = Y(t),$$

TABLE II: Number of independent order conditions to achieve order r for a general composition (9) (first row) and for counter-palindromic compositions (second row). The number s refers to the number of exponentials involved in the composition.

Order r	3	4	5	6
General	5 (6)	8 (≥ 8)	14 (≥ 14)	23 (≥ 23)
CP (s)	3 (6)	5 (10)	8 (16)	13 (26)

whence, by comparing the corresponding expansions, one arrives at $w_{1,1} = w_{1,2}$, $w_{3,1} = -w_{3,2}$, $w_{4,1} = -w_{4,3}$, etc. A similar argument is also valid for compositions (21) by considering the interchange $A \leftrightarrow -B$.

As a result, designing counter-palindromic methods of order $r \geq 4$ requires solving a smaller number of polynomial equations than with more general compositions. This is clearly visible in Table II, where we collect the number of order conditions required to achieve order $3 \leq r \leq 6$ for a general composition (9) (first row) and the corresponding number for a counter-palindromic composition (second row). For clarity, we have also included the minimum number s of exponentials required in each case (in **bold**).

Although the number of exponentials increases with respect to the general case (e.g., 16 vs. 14 for $r = 5$), the number of equations to solve (and therefore the complexity of the problem) reduces considerably (14 vs. 8 equations for $r = 5$). Moreover, although the number of order conditions sets up the minimum number of exponentials involved in a general composition, this by itself does not guarantee the existence of real solutions. This fact has been illustrated for $r = 3$ in section II. On the other hand, we recall that the most efficient 5th-order composition built in [6] involves 56 exponentials.

C. New schemes

We have explored both types of sequences (20) and (21) and solved the required order conditions to achieve up to order 6 with the minimum number of exponentials in each case. This task is simplified by considering schemes with patterns (20) and (21). The coefficients of the most efficient methods (i.e., with the smallest value of $\mathcal{E}^{(r+1)}$) are collected in Table III. The resulting method is denoted as $\mathcal{PCP}_s^{[r]}$ (respectively, $\mathcal{NCP}_s^{[r]}$) if it corresponds to a composition of class (20) (respect., (21)) of order r involving s exponentials. For clarity, the methods read, respectively

$$\begin{aligned} \Psi(t) &= e^{c_0 t B} e^{c_1 t A} \dots e^{c_{m-1} t B} e^{c_m t A} \\ &\quad \times e^{c_m t B} e^{c_{m-1} t A} \dots e^{c_1 t B} e^{c_0 t A} \quad (m \text{ odd}) \\ \mathcal{PCP} : \Psi(t) &= e^{c_0 t B} e^{c_1 t A} \dots e^{c_{m-1} t A} e^{c_m t B} \\ &\quad \times e^{c_m t A} e^{c_{m-1} t B} \dots e^{c_1 t B} e^{c_0 t A} \quad (m \text{ even}) \end{aligned} \quad (23)$$

TABLE III: Coefficients of the most efficient counter-palindromic schemes of order $3 \leq r \leq 6$ with the minimum number of exponentials.

$\mathcal{NCP}_6^{[3]}$,	$\mathcal{E}^{(4)}/s \approx 0.473$
$c_0 = c_1 - c_2$ $c_2 = -\sqrt{\frac{2}{\sqrt{5}-1}}$	$c_1 = -\sqrt{\sqrt{5}-2}$
$\mathcal{NCP}_{10}^{[4]}$,	$\mathcal{E}^{(5)}/s \approx 0.606$
$c_0 = \sum_{j=1}^4 (-1)^{j+1} c_j$ $c_2 = -1.569846260451462851779$ $c_4 = 3.007307207357765662262$	$c_1 = 0.4920434066428167763156$ $c_3 = -0.0340560371300231615989$
$\mathcal{PCP}_{16}^{[5]}$,	$\mathcal{E}^{(6)}/s \approx 0.505$
$c_0 = -\sum_{j=1}^7 c_j$ $c_2 = 1.418243492034305431995$ $c_4 = -0.127142127469064995044$ $c_6 = 0.8493401946712687892513$	$c_1 = 0.2969175443796203417835$ $c_3 = 0.4347212029859471608694$ $c_5 = -0.014276365712093993010$ $c_7 = -0.305642216160471071886$
$\mathcal{PCP}_{26}^{[6]}$,	$\mathcal{E}^{(7)}/s \approx 0.447$
$c_0 = -\sum_{j=1}^{12} c_j$ $c_2 = 0.437855533639627516106$ $c_4 = -1.160402744300525331934$ $c_6 = -0.2264322765760404736976$ $c_8 = 0.4687839445292851414849$ $c_{10} = -0.9894918460835968618662$ $c_{12} = -0.2387711966553848135336$	$c_1 = 0.2464427486685065253599$ $c_3 = -0.6290554972825559401392$ $c_5 = -0.5248160600039844378749$ $c_7 = 0.1165418804073705040233$ $c_9 = 1.983312306755703005101$ $c_{11} = 0.6722571007458945095097$

and

$$\begin{aligned}
 \mathcal{NCP} : \quad \Psi(t) &= e^{c_0 t B} e^{c_1 t A} \dots e^{c_{m-1} t B} e^{c_m t A} \\
 &\quad \times e^{-c_m t B} e^{-c_{m-1} t A} \dots e^{-c_1 t B} e^{-c_0 t A} \quad (m \text{ odd}) \\
 \Psi(t) &= e^{c_0 t B} e^{c_1 t A} \dots e^{c_{m-1} t A} e^{c_m t B} \\
 &\quad \times e^{-c_m t A} e^{-c_{m-1} t B} \dots e^{-c_1 t B} e^{-c_0 t A} \quad (m \text{ even})
 \end{aligned} \tag{24}$$

We should remark that, due to the symmetries and invariances explored in subsection III A, there are more compositions than those collected in Table III leading to the same efficiency.

A useful strategy to improve the efficiency of splitting methods when approximating $e^{t(A+B)}$ consists in including additional exponentials in the composition, and therefore additional parameters, which are then fixed in the optimization process of the objective function [3]. In fact, very often the most efficient method does not necessarily correspond to the scheme requiring the minimum number of exponentials: the extra cost can be compensated by the additional accuracy obtained, although solving the polynomial equations with additional exponentials and free parameters is not a trivial task. By pursuing the same strategy in this context we have obtained the schemes of order 4 and 5 collected in Table IV. Notice how the effective error is reduced: the extra cost resulting from an increased number of exponentials is compensated by the higher accuracy achieved.

TABLE IV: Coefficients of optimized counter-palindromic schemes of order 4 and 5 involving 12 and 18 exponentials, respectively.

$\mathcal{PCP}_{12}^{[4]}$,	$\mathcal{E}^{(5)}/s \approx 0.455$
$c_0 = -\sum_{j=1}^5 c_j$ $c_2 = -1.564170317916158642032$ $c_4 = 2.920816850699232751348$	$c_1 = 0.3263285743794757829237$ $c_3 = -0.0234725141740210902965$ $c_5 = -0.8045459762846959202889$
$\mathcal{NCP}_{18}^{[5]}$,	$\mathcal{E}^{(6)}/s \approx 0.395$
$c_0 = \sum_{j=1}^8 (-1)^{j+1} c_j$ $c_2 = 0.3165189600901244909982$ $c_4 = -1.042459743800714071012$ $c_6 = 1.290831433928573680468$ $c_8 = 0.253358191085494126186$	$c_1 = -0.6410115692148225407946$ $c_3 = 0.2075766074841999769730$ $c_5 = 1.027769699504593533740$ $c_7 = 0.7061407649397449413288$

IV. NUMERICAL EXAMPLES

In this section we illustrate the previous methods for some simple examples. The first one has also been used as a test bench in [6] and consists in approximating the exponential of the commutator of Pauli matrices, namely $e^{[-i\sigma_x, -i\sigma_z]}$, by products of elementary exponentials of $A = -i\sigma_x$ and $B = -i\sigma_z$. Specifically, we compute

$$\left\| \Psi(1/\sqrt{n})^n - e^{[A,B]} \right\|_2 \tag{25}$$

for several values of n and plot its error as a function of the total number of exponentials ns required by each method $\Psi(t)$ to take into account its overall computational cost. In this way we get the diagram of Figure 1 (left).

Here \mathcal{S}_2 , \mathcal{S}_3 and \mathcal{G}_5 correspond to schemes of order 2, 3 and 5 proposed in [6], involving 4, 6 and 56 exponentials, respectively. Actually, \mathcal{S}_2 is the approximation $\Psi_{2,1}$ of (6), whereas \mathcal{G}_5 is obtained by applying the most efficient ($\sqrt{10}$ -copy) recursive formula presented in [6] to the basic scheme \mathcal{S}_3 . We also show in the diagram the results achieved by the methods of Table III. Notice that, whereas the improvement achieved by the new 3-order approximation $\mathcal{NCP}_6^{[3]}$ is only marginal, this is not the case for the new schemes of order 4 and 5, essentially due to the much reduced number of exponentials involved. The improvement is still more remarkable in the case of the 6th-order method $\mathcal{PCP}_{26}^{[6]}$, which in fact provides the most efficient approximation. This method should be compared with the 6th-order scheme labelled \mathcal{G}_6 , which is obtained by applying the recursion of [6] to the basic scheme $\mathcal{NCP}_{10}^{[4]}$ (involving a total of 98 exponentials). In all cases, the leftmost point along the line corresponds to $n = 1$.

To discard the possible effect of the low dimensionality (2×2) and the particular structure (skew-Hermitian) of the matrices involved, we repeat the same experiment, but this time by constructing two 16×16 real matrices \tilde{A} , \tilde{B} with elements randomly generated from a normal distribution and then taking $A = \tilde{A}/\|\tilde{A}\|$, $B = \tilde{B}/\|\tilde{B}\|$. As before, we plot in Figure 1 (right) the efficiency diagram obtained by the methods of Table III in comparison with the most efficient approximation designed in [6]. We observe the same behavior as for Pauli




FIG. 1: Error committed in the approximation of $e^{[A,B]}$ by different product formulas vs. the number of elementary exponentials when $A = -i\sigma_x$, $B = -i\sigma_z$ (left) and when A and B are 16×16 real matrices with random elements (right). Methods of Table III are compared with schemes designed in [6].

matrices, with the new 6th-order method $\mathcal{PCP}_{26}^{[6]}$ showing the best performance.

Figure 2 illustrates, on the same examples, the behavior of the optimized methods of order 4 and 5 whose coefficients are collected in Table IV. Notice that, even if the computational cost per step increases, they still show a better overall efficiency in both cases.

We can also consider values $t > 1$ to check how the different schemes perform in the long run. To this end, we take $t = 10$ and compute accordingly

$$\left\| \Psi(10/\sqrt{n})^n - e^{10[A,B]} \right\|_2.$$

The corresponding efficiency diagrams for Pauli (left) and random 16×16 matrices (right) are shown in Figure 3.

In our next experiment, we determine the number of elementary exponentials (gates) ns required for each scheme $\Psi(t)$ so that the error for different values of x in $e^{x^2[A,B]}$, namely

$$\left\| \Psi(x/\sqrt{n})^n - e^{x^2[A,B]} \right\|_2 \quad (26)$$




FIG. 2: Error in the approximation of $e^{[A,B]}$ obtained by product formulas of Table IV when $A = -i\sigma_x$, $B = -i\sigma_z$ (left) and when A and B are 16×16 real matrices with random elements (right).

is smaller than a prescribed tolerance. We choose again $A = -i\sigma_x$, $B = -i\sigma_z$, and $x \in [0.1, 0.9]$. The corresponding results are depicted in Figure 4 for a tolerance 10^{-4} (left) and 10^{-7} (right). The improvement with respect to the most efficient scheme presented in [6] is quite remarkable, even for small values of x .

V. EXTENSIONS

Not only the exponential of a commutator can be approximated by products of exponentials of the elementary operators involved, but in fact the same technique can be applied to any element of the free Lie algebra generated by A and B . In this section we illustrate the procedure in two particular cases, already considered previously in the literature.

A. Approximating the exponential of $F = t(A + B) + t^2R[A, B]$

Suppose one is interested in computing an approximation to the exponential of both the sum and commutator of A , B ,




FIG. 3: Same as Figure 1, but now when approximating $e^{t[A,B]}$ with $t = 10$.

namely, $F = t(A + B) + t^2 R[A, B]$, for an arbitrary $R \in \mathbb{R}$. A particular application arises in the simulation of counter-adiabatic time evolution of two-qubit Hamiltonians [6].

Clearly, the coefficients of an approximation of the form (9) of order r , namely,

$$e^{c_0 t RB} e^{c_1 t RA} \dots e^{c_{2n} t RB} e^{c_{2n+1} t RA} = e^F + \mathcal{O}(r+1)$$

have to verify

$$\begin{aligned} w_{1,1} = w_{1,2} = 1, \quad w_{2,1} = R^2, \\ w_{j,\ell} = 0, \quad 3 \leq j \leq r, \quad \ell = 1, \dots, \dim(\mathcal{L}_j). \end{aligned}$$

Thus, we get an approximation of order 2 with only 3 exponentials:

$$\begin{aligned} \Phi_3^{[2]}(t) = e^{c_0 t RB} e^{c_1 t RA} e^{c_2 t RB}, \\ c_0 = -\frac{2R^2 - 1}{2R}, \quad c_1 = \frac{1}{R}, \quad c_2 = \frac{2R^2 + 1}{2R}, \end{aligned}$$

whereas the inclusion of a free parameter c_3 allows us to reduce the effective error:

$$\Phi_4^{[2]}(t) = e^{c_0 t RB} e^{c_1 t RA} e^{c_2 t RB} e^{c_3 t RA},$$




FIG. 4: Number of elementary exponentials (gates) required by each product formula to approximate $e^{x^2[-i\sigma_x, -i\sigma_z]}$ with error smaller than 10^{-4} (left) and 10^{-7} (right).

with

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 = \frac{2R^2 + 2Rc_3 - 1}{2R(Rc_3 - 1)}, \quad c_1 = -\frac{Rc_3 - 1}{R}, \\ c_2 = -\frac{2R^2 + 1}{2R(Rc_3 - 1)}. \end{aligned}$$

Moreover, in this case we recover the scheme $\Psi_{2,2}(t)$ of (6) in the limit $R \rightarrow \infty$ with $c_3 = -1$.

By following the same strategy, the following 3rd-order scheme can be obtained:

$$\Phi_5^{[3]}(t) = e^{c_0 t RB} e^{c_1 t RA} e^{c_2 t RB} e^{c_3 t RA} e^{c_4 t RB},$$

with coefficients

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= \frac{1}{R} \left(3R^4 - R^2 \mp \Delta + \frac{1}{4} \right), & c_1 &= \frac{6R^4 \pm 2\Delta - \frac{1}{2}}{R(12R^4 - 1)}, \\ c_2 &= \frac{1}{2R} - 6R^3, & c_3 &= \frac{6R^4 \mp 2\Delta - \frac{1}{2}}{R(12R^4 - 1)}, \\ c_4 &= \frac{1}{R} \left(3R^4 - R^2 \pm \Delta + \frac{1}{4} \right), \\ \Delta &= \frac{\sqrt{3(12R^4 - 1)(36R^4 + 1)}}{12}. \end{aligned} \quad (28)$$

It is worth noticing that, whereas 6 exponentials are necessary to approximate $e^{t^2[A,B]}$ up to order 3 (cf. Section III), with only 5 we are able to reproduce e^F in general, in contrast with the treatment in [6].

B. Approximating $e^{t^3[A,[A,B]]}$

In some problems arising in quantum computing it is desirable to suppress the effect of undesirable interactions in coupled spin systems by using composite pulse sequences to generate an effective Hamiltonian for which the nested commutator $[A, [A, B]]$ is the dominant term [4]. This can itself be approximated by a product of exponentials of A and B . Thus, a straightforward calculation shows that

$$e^{tA} e^{tB} e^{-tA} e^{-tB} e^{-tA} e^{tB} e^{tA} e^{-tB} = e^{t^3[A,[A,B]]} + \mathcal{O}(t^4), \quad (27)$$

whereas, if the identity $[A, [B, [B, A]]] = 0$ holds, then error of this approximation is of order $\mathcal{O}(t^5)$ [7]. By applying the same strategy as in section III it is possible to construct a left-right palindromic composition of order 4 involving only 9 exponentials,

$$\Psi(t) = e^{c_0 t B} e^{c_1 t A} e^{c_2 t B} e^{c_3 t A} e^{c_4 t B} e^{c_3 t A} e^{c_2 t B} e^{c_1 t A} e^{c_0 t B}. \quad (28)$$

In fact, this composition has essentially the same computational cost as (27) when it is used iteratively (since the last exponential can be concatenated with the first one at the next step). The analysis shows that there is a free parameter in (28), so that the sequence of coefficients reads

$$(c_0, c_1, c_2, c_3, c_4) = \left(-\frac{c_2}{2}, \pm \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_2}}, c_2, \mp \frac{1}{\sqrt{c_2}}, -c_2 \right)$$

and the minimum effective error is achieved with $c_2 = ((\sqrt{1346} - 36)/25)^{1/3}$. By following the same approach, an approximation of order 6 can be obtained with 21 exponentials. On the other hand, the composition

$$\Psi(t) = e^{c_0 t B} e^{c_1 t A} e^{c_2 t B} e^{c_3 t A} e^{c_4 t B},$$

involving only 5 exponentials verifies

$$\Psi(t) = \exp(t(A+B) + t^2[A,B] + t^3[A,[A,B]]) + \mathcal{O}(t^4)$$

when the coefficients are given by

$$\begin{aligned} c_0 &= -\frac{3}{4} + \frac{\alpha}{4}, & c_1 &= \frac{1}{2} + \frac{\alpha}{2}, & c_2 &= \frac{1}{2}, \\ c_3 &= \frac{1}{2} - \frac{\alpha}{2}, & c_4 &= \frac{5}{4} - \frac{\alpha}{4} \end{aligned}$$

and $\alpha = \sqrt{47/3}$.

VI. CONCLUDING REMARKS

In this work we have obtained efficient approximations for the exponential of the commutator $e^{t^2[A,B]}$ of two arbitrary operators A and B as compositions of exponentials of the operators involved. Previous analyses of this same problem show that it is in fact possible to get arbitrarily high-order approximations by considering recursive formulas starting from a basic low-order scheme, in a similar way as the well known triple (3) and quintuple jump (4) formulas do for approximating $e^{t(A+B)}$. Although these recursive formulas allow one to get explicit upper bounds for the error committed and on the number of exponentials required, this number is exceedingly large, even for moderate orders of approximation, and so their application to solve problems in practice is questionable at least. This is the case in particular in quantum computing, where the action of e^{tA} and e^{tB} is simulated by a quantum circuit. In that setting it is clearly relevant to reduce to a minimum the number of exponentials required to achieve a certain accuracy in the approximation.

Here, by applying the same techniques as in the construction of splitting methods for the time integration of differential equations, and considering particular patterns in the distribution of the exponentials, we have obtained product formulas of orders 4, 5 and 6 with a much reduced computational cost (only two more exponentials than the theoretical minimum). The numerical examples we gather clearly show how this reduction greatly contributes to the improvement in the efficiency. The new methods could then be applied in quantum simulations where it is essential to have a number of gates as small as possible whereas still having good accuracy. Other possible applications include the computation of the successive terms in the Zassenhaus formula [5] and its continuous symmetric analogue [1].

Although we have limited our analysis up to order 6, it is clear that similar calculations can be carried out for higher orders if necessary. In any case, the new methods can be used as basic schemes for the general recursive procedures developed in [6, 7].

Acknowledgements

This work has been funded by Ministerio de Ciencia e Innovación (Spain) through project PID2022-136585NB-C21, MCIN/AEI/10.13039/501100011033/FEDER, UE, and also by Generalitat Valenciana (Spain) through project CIAICO/2021/180. The authors wish to thank S. Blanes for his very useful comments.

-
- [1] P. BADER, A. ISERLES, K. KROPIELNICKA, AND P. SINGH, *Effective approximation for the semiclassical Schrödinger equation*, Found. Comput. Math., 14 (2014), pp. 689–720.
- [2] S. BLANES AND F. CASAS, *A Concise Introduction to Geometric Numerical Integration*, CRC Press, 2016.
- [3] S. BLANES, F. CASAS, AND A. MURUA, *Splitting methods for differential equations*, tech. rep., arXiv:2401.01722, 2024.
- [4] T. W. BORNEMAN, C. E. GRANADE, AND D. G. CORY, *Parallel information transfer in a multinode quantum information processor*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 108 (2012), p. 140502.
- [5] F. CASAS, A. MURUA, AND M. NADINIC, *Efficient computation of the Zassenhaus formula*, Comput. Phys. Comm., 183 (2012), pp. 2386–2391.
- [6] Y.-A. CHEN, A. M. CHILDS, M. HAFEZI, Z. JIANG, H. KIM, AND Y. XU, *Efficient product formulas for commutators and applications to quantum simulations*, Phys. Rev. Res., 4 (2022), p. 013191.
- [7] A. M. CHILDS AND N. WIEBE, *Product formulas for exponentials of commutators*, J. Math. Phys., 54 (2013), p. 062202.
- [8] M. CREUTZ AND A. GOCKSCH, *Higher-order hybrid Monte Carlo algorithms*, Phys. Rev. Lett., 63 (1989), pp. 9–12.
- [9] S. GRAY AND D. E. MANOLOPOULOS, *Symplectic integrators tailored to the time-dependent Schrödinger equation*, J. Chem. Phys., 104 (1996), pp. 7099–7112.
- [10] E. HAIRER, C. LUBICH, AND G. WANNER, *Geometric Numerical Integration. Structure-Preserving Algorithms for Ordinary Differential Equations*, Springer-Verlag, Second ed., 2006.
- [11] F. JEAN AND P.-V. KOSELEFF, *Elementary approximation of exponentials of Lie polynomials*, in Applied Algebra, Algebraic Algorithms and Error-Correcting Codes, T. Mora and H. Mattson, eds., Springer, 1997, pp. 174–188.
- [12] R. I. MCLACHLAN AND R. QUISPÉL, *Splitting methods*, Acta Numerica, 11 (2002), pp. 341–434.
- [13] H. MUNTHER-KAAS AND B. OWREN, *Computations in a free Lie algebra*, Phil. Trans. Royal Soc. A, 357 (1999), pp. 957–981.
- [14] J. SANZ-SERNA, *Geometric integration*, in The State of the Art in Numerical Analysis (York, 1996), vol. 63 of Inst. Math. Appl. Conf. Ser. New Ser., New York, 1997, Oxford Univ. Press, pp. 121–143.
- [15] M. SUZUKI, *Fractal decomposition of exponential operators with applications to many-body theories and Monte Carlo simulations*, Phys. Lett. A, 146 (1990), pp. 319–323.
- [16] H. YOSHIDA, *Construction of higher order symplectic integrators*, Phys. Lett. A, 150 (1990), pp. 262–268.