

Guaranteed efficient energy estimation of quantum many-body Hamiltonians using ShadowGrouping

Alexander Gresch^{1,*} and Martin Kliesch^{2,†}

¹*Institute for Theoretical Physics, Heinrich Heine University Düsseldorf, Germany*

²*Institute for Quantum Inspired and Quantum Optimization, Hamburg University of Technology, Germany*

Estimation of the energy of quantum many-body systems is a paradigmatic task in various research fields. In particular, efficient energy estimation may be crucial in achieving a quantum advantage for a practically relevant problem. For instance, the measurement effort poses a critical bottleneck for variational quantum algorithms.

We aim to find the optimal strategy with single-qubit measurements that yields the highest provable accuracy given a total measurement budget. As a central tool, we establish new tail bounds for empirical estimators of the energy. They are helpful for identifying measurement settings that improve the energy estimate the most. This task constitutes an NP-hard problem. However, we are able to circumvent this bottleneck and use the tail bounds to develop a practical, efficient estimation strategy, which we call *ShadowGrouping*. As the name suggests, it combines shadow estimation methods with grouping strategies for Pauli strings. In numerical experiments, we demonstrate that ShadowGrouping outperforms state-of-the-art methods in estimating the electronic ground-state energies of various small molecules, both in provable and practical accuracy benchmarks. Hence, this work provides a promising way, e.g., to tackle the measurement bottleneck associated with quantum many-body Hamiltonians.

I. INTRODUCTION

As their name suggests, observables are said to be the physically observable quantities in quantum mechanics. Their expectation values play a paradigmatic role in quantum physics. However, quantum measurements are probabilistic and, in practice, expectation values have to be estimated from many samples, i.e., many repetitions of experiments. The arguably most important observables, such as quantum many-body Hamiltonians, cannot be measured directly but have some natural decomposition into local terms. Typically, they are estimated individually, in commuting groups [1–6], or using randomized measurements [7–12] to keep the number samples sufficiently low. So far, the focus has been on estimating the local terms first with individual error control and then combining them into the final estimate. Sample complexity bounds fully tailored to the estimation of many-body Hamiltonians are still missing. Energy estimation from not too many samples is becoming an increasingly important task in applications. After advances on “quantum supremacy” [13, 14] achieving a practical quantum advantage has now arguably become the main goal in our field. The perhaps most promising practical application is the simulation of physical systems [15], as already suggested by Feynman [16]. The estimation of ground states of quantum many-body Hamiltonians plays a paradigmatic role in this endeavour. The two main ways to solve this task are (i) a digital readout of the energy as achieved by the phase estimation algorithm and (ii) a direct readout. Since (i) seems to require fault-tolerant quantum computation, which is out of reach at the moment, we focus

on (ii) with particularly simple direct readout strategies that seem most amenable to noisy and intermediate scale quantum (NISQ) [17] hardware.

As one concrete possible application of our energy estimation strategy, we discuss variational quantum algorithms (VQAs). In VQAs, one aims to only use short parametrized quantum circuits (PQCs) in order to finish the computation before the inevitable noise has accumulated too much. The most promising, yet challenging computational problems come from quantum chemistry or combinatorial optimization for which the variational quantum eigensolver (VQE) [18–20] and the quantum approximate optimization algorithm (QAOA) [21, 22] have been proposed, respectively. In either case, we aim to find the ground-state of a given Hamiltonian H by preparing a suitable trial state ρ via the PQC. Its parameters need a classical optimization routine, often done via gradient-based methods. In this case, the estimation of the gradient itself can be restated as an energy estimation problem by using a parameter-shift rule [23–31]. Therefore, the elementary energy estimation task remains even if the actual ground-state lies in the ansatz class of the VQA and if problems such as barren plateaus [32] or getting stuck in local minima [33, 34] are avoided. We refer to the review articles [35, 36] for more details.

Analogue quantum simulators are another very promising approach to achieve a useful quantum advantage [37]. In these approaches, a target state ρ associated to a quantum many-body Hamiltonian is prepared, which could be a time-evolved state, a thermal state, or a ground state. Given this preparation, one or more observables of interest have to be measured to infer insights about ρ . For instance, they could be some spin or particle densities, correlation functions, or an energy. All these observables are, however, captured by k -local observables. There are various possibilities of how such quantum simulations

* alexander.gresch@hhu.de

† martin.kliesch@tuhh.de




Figure 1. Overview of our estimation protocol. **Top:** As input, we are given a description of the Hamiltonian H in terms of Pauli observables $O^{(i)}$ and a measurement budget N . ShadowGrouping generates a list of unitaries $(Q_i)_{i=1}^N$ as measurement settings in a preprocessing step. **Center:** Then, N copies of an unknown quantum state ρ are prepared sequentially and measured in the computational basis upon applying the i -th unitary to the i -th copy. The measurements result in N bit strings as measurement outcomes. **Bottom:** In the postprocessing, the description of H and the measurement outcomes are combined into the estimator \hat{E} of the state’s energy E together with an accuracy upper bound ϵ . The protocol works independently of the strategy that is used to find the unitaries, which automatically results in different estimators and bounds ϵ . Conversely, one can also minimize ϵ to obtain suitable measurement settings $(Q_i)_{i=1}^N$.

could provide a useful quantum advantage on imperfect hardware [38]. Typically, analogue quantum simulators are limited in their readout capabilities. At the same time, the single-qubit control is rapidly improving, rendering them a more and more contesting alternative.

As each measurement requires its own copy of ρ , i.e., preparing the state again for each measurement, this constitutes a huge *bottleneck*. This is especially true in quantum chemistry applications where we require a high precision for the final energy estimate of the (optimized) state. This bottleneck is persistent no matter how we may design the actual PQC preparing the trial state or which quantum simulator is considered. This makes tackling the measurement bottleneck crucial for any feasible application of NISQ-friendly hardware to any practicable task.

Hence, in order to keep the energy estimation feasible, reliable and controlled, we ask for the following list of desiderata to be fulfilled. The energy estimation protocol should be

- (i) based only on basis measurements and single-qubit rotations,
- (ii) it comes along with rigorous guarantees and sample complexity bounds for the energy estimation,
- (iii) the required classical computation must be practically feasible, and
- (iv) it should yield competitive results to state-of-the-art approaches.

Previous works addressed these points mostly separately. For such settings, two main paradigms for the energy estimation problem have emerged: grouping strategies [1–6] and (biased) classical shadows [7–12, 39] as well as a first framework to partially unify the two [40]. We provide some more details in the Supplementary information. A few ideas outside these paradigms also exist [41–43]. Most of these works are compatible with (i) & (iii) and fulfill (iv). However, the metrics introduced to track the amount of measurement reduction achieved leave (ii) unfulfilled. This lack of guarantees is pernicious for two reasons. On one hand, we want to be able to efficiently estimate Hamiltonian expectation values (or any other Hermitian operator for that matter) in relevant quantum experiments where the actual solution is not known and the qubits’ number exceeds those used in the addressable benchmarks. In quantum chemistry applications, for example, high precision is priority and a guarantee for the estimation error is key. On the other hand, obtaining sample complexities for these quantum algorithms is vital in accessing their feasibility in reliably addressing problems with increasing number of qubits. The current benchmarks already hint at a daunting measurement effort despite not even exceeding 20 qubits. Understanding how the sample complexity of an energy estimation task and a particular choice for the measurement strategy scales with the number of qubits enables the user to forecast their chance of successfully completing the task beforehand.

In this work, we outperform state-of-the-art estimation protocols and provide rigorous guarantees completing desideratum (ii). We summarize the estimation task and our contributions in Figure 1. In particular, they include the first rigorous guarantees for commonly used grouping techniques, see Section II. We do so by providing tail bounds on empirical estimators of the state’s energy that are compatible with grouping strategies. This way, our bound allows us to assess the accuracy and feasibility of typical state-of-the-art measurement schemes. We show that minimizing this upper bound is NP-hard in the number of qubits in the worst case. As a heuristic solution, we propose our own measurement scheme which we call *ShadowGrouping* that efficiently makes use of the observables’ dominating contributions to the upper bound as well as their respective commutation relations. We conclude with an outlook in Section III.

II. RESULTS

We structure our results as follows. The provable guarantees for measurement strategies can be found in Section II A. This section also includes the hardness of finding optimal measurement settings in the number of qubits, which shows that heuristic measurement optimization approaches are required. In particular, the hardness result motivates the conception of ShadowGrouping, presented in Section II B. Numerically, we demonstrate in Section II C that ShadowGrouping outperforms other state-of-the-art approaches in the benchmark of estimating the electronic ground-state energy of various small molecules.

A. Equipping measurement strategies with provable guarantees

In order to set the stage, we properly define the energy estimation task and give a notion of a measurement scheme.

1. The energy estimation task

Assume we are handed an n -qubit quantum state ρ of which we want to determine its energy E w.r.t. a given Hamiltonian H . The energy estimation is not a straightforward task: due to the probabilistic nature of quantum mechanics, we have to estimate E by many measurements round in which we prepare ρ and measure it in some chosen basis. Moreover, we typically cannot measure the state's energy directly. Instead, we decompose the Hamiltonian in terms of the Pauli basis as

$$H = \sum_{i=1}^M h_i O^{(i)}, \quad O^{(i)} = \bigotimes_{j=1}^n O_j^{(i)} \quad (1)$$

with $h_i \in \mathbb{R}$ and single-qubit Pauli operators $O_j^{(i)} \in \{\mathbb{1}, X, Y, Z\}$. Often we identify H with its decomposition

$$H \equiv \left(h_i, O^{(i)} \right)_{i \in [M]}. \quad (2)$$

Without loss of generality, we assume that $O^{(i)} \neq \mathbb{1}^{\otimes n} \forall i$. To ensure the feasibility of this decomposition, we require that $M = O(\text{poly}(n))$. This is the case, for example, in quantum chemistry applications where M scales as n^4 .

Given a quantum state ρ , the energy estimate is determined by evaluating each expectation value $o^{(i)} := \text{Tr}[\rho O^{(i)}]$. By $\hat{o}^{(i)}$ we denote the empirical estimator of $o^{(i)}$ from N_i samples. In more detail, $\hat{o}^{(i)} := \frac{1}{N_i} \sum_{\alpha=1}^{N_i} y_{\alpha}$, where $y_{\alpha} \in \{-1, 1\}$ are iid. random variables determined by Born's rule $\mathbb{P}[y_{\alpha} = 1] = \text{Tr}[\rho (2Q_i - \mathbb{1})]$. We assume that each $\hat{o}^{(i)}$ is estimated from iid. preparations of ρ . This assumption solely stems from the proof techniques of

the classical shadows used in order to arrive at Eq. (3) [10]. We expect this assumption to be loosened in the future such that we only need to assume unbiased estimators $\hat{o}^{(i)}$. In either case, we do not assume different $\hat{o}^{(i)}$ to be independent. In particular, we can reuse the same sample to yield estimates for multiple, pair-wise commuting observables at once.

Leveraging standard commutation relations requires many two-qubit gates for the read-out, increasing the noise in the experiment or quantum circuit enormously. Therefore, we impose the stronger condition of qubit-wise commutativity (QWC): any two Pauli strings $P = \bigotimes_i P_i$, $Q = \bigotimes_i Q_i$ *commute qubit-wise* if P_i and Q_i commute for all $i \in [n]$. In either case, the empirical estimators $\hat{o}^{(i)}$ do not have to be independent as a consequence of using the same samples for the estimation of several (qubit-wise) commuting observables. Using these estimators, the energy can be determined. By linearity of Eq. (2) we have that

$$E = \sum_{i=1}^M h_i o^{(i)}, \quad \hat{E} = \sum_{i=1}^M h_i \hat{o}^{(i)}. \quad (3)$$

to which we refer as the *grouped empirical mean estimator*.

2. Measurement schemes & compatible settings

For conciseness, we introduce our notions of measurement settings, schemes and compatible Pauli strings in Definitions 1 and 2 in the following. Throughout this work, we set $\mathcal{P} = \{X, Y, Z\}$ as short-hand notation for labels of the Pauli matrices and \mathcal{P}^n for Pauli strings, i.e., labels for tensor products of Pauli matrices. Moreover, let $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{1}} = \{\mathbb{1}, X, Y, Z\}$ and $\mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{1}}^n$ analogously.

Definition 1 (Measurement scheme and settings). *Let H a Hamiltonian as in Eq. (2) and $N \in \mathbb{N}$ a number of measurement shots. An algorithm \mathcal{A} is called a measurement scheme if it takes (N, H) as input and returns a list of measurement settings $\mathbf{Q} \in (\mathcal{P}^n)^N$ specifying a setting for each measurement shot.*

Having formalized what a measurement schemes does, we have to take a look at the Pauli strings in the Hamiltonian decomposition (2) and their commutation relations as they effectively require various measurement settings to yield an estimate of the energy. To this end, we define how we can relate the target Pauli strings with a proposed measurement setting.

Definition 2 (Compatible measurement). *Consider a Pauli string $Q \in \mathcal{P}^n$ as a measurement setting. A Pauli string $O \in \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{1}}^n$ is said to be compatible with Q if O and Q commute. Furthermore, they are QWC-compatible if O and Q commute qubit-wise. We define the compatibility indicator $\mathcal{C} : \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{1}}^n \times \mathcal{P}_{\mathbb{1}}^n \rightarrow \{\text{True} \equiv 1, \text{False} \equiv 0\}$ such that $\mathcal{C}[O, Q] = \text{True}$ if and only if O and Q are compatible. Analogously, we define \mathcal{C}_{QWC} that indicates QWC-compatibility.*

3. Measurement guarantees

With these two definitions, we are able to formalize what we mean by equipping a measurement scheme with guarantees. As sketched in Figure 1, we are given access to a device or experiment that prepares an unknown quantum state ρ and some Hamiltonian Eq. (2). Not only do we want to estimate its energy from repeated measurements, but we would like to accommodate the energy estimator with rigorous tail bounds. That is, we wish to determine how close the estimate \hat{E} is to the actual but unknown energy E and how confident we can be about this closeness. Mathematically, we capture the two questions by the *failure probability*, i.e., the probability that $|\hat{E} - E| \geq \epsilon$ for a given estimation error $\epsilon > 0$. In general, this quantity cannot be efficiently evaluated (as it depends on the unknown quantum state produced in the experiment). Nevertheless, we can often provide upper bounds to it that hold regardless of the quantum state under consideration. One crucial requirement is that we simultaneously want to minimize the total number of measurement rounds. For instance, in grouping strategies we extract multiple samples from a single measurement outcome. This introduces correlation between samples for commuting Pauli terms in Eq. (2) and, therefore, standard arguments based on basic tail bounds cannot be applied. We resolve this issue by formulating a modified version of the vector Bernstein inequality [44, 45] in a first step to bound the joint estimation error of each of the contributing Pauli observables. In particular, this takes into account any correlated samples that stem from the same measurement round. In the same step, we extend the inequality to arbitrary random variables in a separable Banach space which might be of independent interest. In a second step, we show that this actually serves as an upper bound of the absolute error of the energy estimation. Throughout this work, we denote the set $[n] := \{1, \dots, n\}$ as $[n]$. Additionally, the p -norm of a vector \mathbf{x} is denoted as $\|\mathbf{x}\|_p$ and the absolute value of any $x \in \mathbb{C}$ as $|x|$. With this notation, the guarantee reads as

Theorem 3 (Energy estimation inconfidence bound). *Consider \mathbf{Q} obtained from a measurement scheme (Definition 1) for some input (N, H) . Let $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$. Fix a compatibility indicator $f = \mathcal{C}$ or $f = \mathcal{C}_{\text{QWC}}$. Denote the number of compatible measurements for observable $O^{(i)}$ by $N_i(\mathbf{Q}) := \sum_{j=1}^N f(Q_j, O^{(i)})$ and assume $N_i \geq 1$ for all $i \in [M]$ (we usually drop the \mathbf{Q} -dependence). Denote $h'_i := |h_i|/\sqrt{N_i}$ and $h''_i := |h_i|/N_i$. Moreover, let $0 \leq \epsilon \leq 2\|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1}(1 + 2\|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1}/\|\mathbf{h}''\|_{\ell_1})$. Then any grouped empirical mean estimator (3) satisfies*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[|\hat{E} - E| \geq \epsilon\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\left[\frac{\epsilon}{2\|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1}} - 1\right]^2\right). \quad (4)$$

We sketch a proof of this theorem in Section IV B and provide a detailed proof in the Supplementary information. This result shows that we can equip any measurement scheme with guarantees, which hold uniformly for

all quantum states. In particular, it is compatible with correlated samples, rendering it applicable to popular grouping strategies. Additionally, Theorem 3 also serves as a benchmarking tool: given a Hamiltonian decomposition (2) and a confidence $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$, we can compare any two measurement strategies each of them preparing a certain number of measurement settings: We set the right-hand side of Eq. (4) equal to δ and solve for ϵ . This calculation yields the error bound

$$\epsilon \leq 6 \log \frac{1}{\delta} \|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1}. \quad (5)$$

The minimization of ϵ over \mathbf{Q} we refer to as the optimization of a measurement scheme.

4. Optimization of a measurement scheme

In order to optimize a measurement scheme, we wish to choose it such that the guarantee parameter ϵ (5) is minimized. One option is to introduce a small systematic error in favor of a larger statistical error, i.e., and introduce a biased estimator of the energy. A straight-forward idea is to remove certain observables from the Hamiltonian, i.e., a truncation of the Pauli decomposition [20]. Due to the form of Eq. (5), the statistical errors on the individual terms add up independently of each other. As a result, this allows us to judge on the effectiveness of truncating the Hamiltonian. Given a list of measurement settings \mathbf{Q} , update the empirical estimate $\hat{o}^{(i)}$ for each observable in the decomposition as

$$\hat{o}^{(i)} \leftarrow \begin{cases} 0 & \text{if } N_i < \alpha_\delta^2, \\ \hat{o}^{(i)} & \text{if } N_i \geq \alpha_\delta^2, \end{cases} \quad (6)$$

with

$$\alpha_\delta := 4\sqrt{\log(1/\delta)} + 2. \quad (7)$$

This *truncation criterion* ensures that we find the optimal trade-off between the statistical error in Eq. (4) and the systematic one just introduced. This is formalized in the following.

Corollary 4. *Consider the setting of Theorem 3 and let $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$. Then, with probability at least $1 - \delta$, the application of the truncation criterion (6) leads to a provably higher precision.*

Importantly, the criterion does not depend on the magnitude of the coefficients $|h_i|$. We visualize it in Figure 2 to illustrate that a feasible number of compatible settings is required even for $\delta \ll 1$.

Another idea to optimize the guaranteed precision is to optimize over the measurement setting \mathbf{Q} . However, this optimization is NP-hard in the number of qubits n :

Proposition 5 (Hardness of optimal allocation (informal version)). *Consider a Hamiltonian (2), state ρ , the*




Figure 2. Illustration of the truncation criterion (6). We plot α_δ^2 as a function of the selected inconfidence level δ (orange line). The criterion tells us that it is better to go with a truncation if $N_i \leq \alpha_\delta^2$ (shaded area). For illustrative purposes, we have added several σ -regions to the confidence levels. They suggest that reaching confidence levels that make significant deviations virtually impossible does not require an infeasible number of measurements per observable.

grouped empirical mean estimator \hat{E} (3) and $N \geq 1$ a number of measurement settings. Then, finding the measurements settings $\mathbf{Q} \in (\mathcal{P}^n)^N$ that minimize a reasonable upper bound to $\mathbb{P}[|\hat{E} - E| \geq \epsilon]$, such as Eq. (4), is NP-hard in the number of qubits n . In particular, it is even NP-hard to find a single measurement setting that lowers this bound the most.

The formal statement of Proposition 5 and its proof are contained in the Supplementary information. In summary, we show the hardness by reducing the optimization of the measurement scheme from a commonly used grouping technique. Since finding the optimal grouping strategy is known to be NP-hard [40], this also transfers over to the optimization of the measurement scheme. Therefore, we have to rely on heuristic approaches to practically find suitable measurement settings. In the following, we devise our own efficient measurement scheme that is aware of both the upper bound and the commutation relation among the Pauli observables to find such settings.

B. ShadowGrouping

We aim to determine the energy E by measuring the individual Pauli observables in Eq. (2). In order to increase the accuracy of the prediction with the smallest number of measurement shots possible, Theorem 3 suggests to minimize Eq. (5). The minimization is done by choosing the most informative measurement settings by exploiting the commutativity relations of the terms in the Hamiltonian decomposition. However, Proposition 5 states that finding the next measurement setting that reduces the current inconfidence bound the most is NP-hard, even when trying to find a single measurement setting. As a suitable

heuristic, we propose an approach that makes use of the structure of the terms in the tail bound and which we call *ShadowGrouping*. It makes use of the fact that there exists a natural hierarchy for each of the terms in the decomposition: we order the Pauli observables decreasingly by their respective importance to the current inconfidence bound. This gives rise to a non-negative weight function **weight** that takes the Hamiltonian decomposition (2) and a list of previous measurement settings \mathbf{Q} as inputs and outputs a non-negative weight w_i for each Pauli observable in the decomposition. Here, the weight is defined as

$$\text{weight}(\mathbf{Q}, H)_i := |h_i| \frac{\sqrt{N_i + 1} - \sqrt{N_i}}{\sqrt{N_i(N_i + 1)}} > 0 \quad (8)$$

with $N_i = N_i(\mathbf{Q})$.

Details on the motivation for this choice can be found in Section IV C in the Methods section. The function **weight** takes into account two key properties: the importance $|h_i|$ of each observable in the Hamiltonian (2) and how many compatible measurement settings we collected previously. A larger weight increases the corresponding observable's contribution to the bound as statistical uncertainties get magnified. On the other hand, this uncertainty is decreased upon by collecting more compatible settings. As the weights are derived from tail bounds to the estimation error, the individual contributions decrease rapidly with the number of compatible measurement settings. Iterative application of ShadowGrouping thus ensures that each observable eventually has at least one compatible measurement setting.

We now explain how ShadowGrouping utilizes these




Figure 3. Sketch of the generation of a measurement setting $\mathbf{Q} \in \mathcal{P}^n$. Each box corresponds to a single-qubit operator in the tensor product. Empty boxes correspond to $\mathbb{1}$ and the three colours to each of the Pauli operators, respectively. We order the observables descendingly by their respective weights, i.e., $w_1 \geq w_2 \geq w_3 \geq \dots \geq w_M$, each of which is computed with the function **weight**. The arrow in the middle indicates the order in which \mathbf{Q} is adjusted to the observables indicated on the left. Only the observable in the second row cannot be measured with the measurement setting proposed by the algorithm. After single-qubit measurements are assigned they cannot be altered any more to ensure compatibility with previously considered observables.

weights to find new measurement settings tailored to the Hamiltonian. A sketched of the algorithm is presented in Figure 3 but we also provide the pseudo-code for ShadowGrouping in Algorithm 1. For the sake of simplicity, we explain the QWC-version – an extension to general commutativity is, however, straight-forward to do. Moreover, we call the *idle part* of a measurement setting Q the set of those qubits where Q acts as the identity. The idea of the algorithm is as follows. We start with an idle measurement setting $Q = \mathbb{1}^{\otimes n}$. For each of the next elements O from the ordered list provided by `weight`, we check whether $C_{\text{QWC}}[O, Q]$, see Definition 2. If so, we allow to change the idle parts of Q to match O . For example, $C_{\text{QWC}}[X\mathbb{1}, \mathbb{1}Y]$, thus we would alter $\mathbb{1}Y$ into XY in Line 6 of Algorithm 1. Because we are only allowed to alter the idle parts in Q in each successive step, we do not change the compatibility with the previously checked observables. Eventually, there are no more identities in Q left in which case we have found the next measurement setting: each element in Q tells us in which Pauli basis the corresponding qubits has to be measured. We update the weights, i.e., calculate the new tail bound, and are ready to start anew.

Algorithm 1 ShadowGrouping.

Require: Hamiltonian decomposition $H = (h_i, O^{(i)})_{i \in [M]}$
Require: previous measurement settings $\mathbf{Q} \in (\mathcal{P}^n)^{N-1}$
Require: function `weight()` to attribute a weight to each observable, e.g. Eq. (8)
Require: compability indicator $f = \mathcal{C}$ or C_{QWC}

```

1:  $Q \leftarrow \mathbb{1}^{\otimes n}$ 
2:  $w_i \leftarrow \text{weight}(Q, H)_i \forall i$ 
3: while  $|\text{supp}(Q)| < n$  do
4:    $j \leftarrow \arg \max_i w_i$  ▷ or use ARGSORT() instead
5:   if  $f[O^{(j)}, Q]$  then ▷ update idle parts
6:     update  $Q$  s.t.  $\mathbb{1} \neq O_i^{(j)} = Q_i \forall i$ 
7:   end if
8:    $w_j \leftarrow 0$ 
9: end while
10: return  $Q$ 
```

Our algorithm has two major advantages over state-of-the-art strategies. First, our algorithm is highly adaptable: it only requires a weight function `weight` that provides a hierarchy for the Pauli observables. Moreover, in case `weight` is derived from an actual upper bound like Eq. (4), we can adapt the hierarchy after each round while improving the guarantees from Theorem 3. This does not require carrying out the read-out, we merely keep track of previous settings. This way, we can apply ShadowGrouping in an on-line setting as we do not require a costly preprocessing step as in typical grouping schemes [6, 40]. As another consequence, our scheme is capable of adapting to previous measurement settings, similar as the derandomization approach of Ref. [10]. Secondly, the algorithm is also efficient: each pass through the algorithm has a computational complexity of $O(M \log(M))$ due to the

sorting of the M weighted observables. Standard grouping techniques, on the other hand, compute the whole commutativity graph which requires $O(M^2)$. Our procedure thus corresponds to a continuously adapting overlapped grouping strategy [40] but also incorporates the performance guarantees obtained from the classical shadow paradigm, hence our naming scheme.

C. Numerical benchmark

One common benchmark to compare the performance of the various measurement schemes is the estimation of the electronic ground-state energy E of various small molecules [10]. The fermionic Hamiltonian given a molecular basis set has been obtained using Qiskit [46] which also provides three standard fermion-to-qubits mappings: JW [47], BK [48] and the parity transformation [48, 49]. Then, the Hamiltonian is exact diagonalized to obtain the state vector of the GS and its energy E for the benchmark. Together, we obtain the Hamiltonian decomposition (2) and are able to run the various measurement schemes to obtain an estimate \hat{E} of E by repeatedly drawing samples from the state. The code generating the results can be found in a separate repository [50]. We compare ShadowGrouping with other state-of-the-art methods such as overlapped grouping [40], adaptive Pauli estimation [11], derandomization [10] and AeQuO [6]. To keep the comparison fair, we only compared methods that utilize Pauli basis measurements without any additionally two-qubit gates. This excludes grouping methods that focus solely on general commutation relations [1–5].

As the figure of merit for the benchmark, we allow for a total measurement budget of $N = 1000$ per energy estimate and report the final RMSE

$$\text{RMSE} := \sqrt{\frac{1}{N_{\text{runs}}} \sum_{i=1}^{N_{\text{runs}}} (\hat{E}_i - E)^2} \quad (9)$$

over $N_{\text{runs}} = 100$ independent runs. We summarize the results in Table I. The smallest RMSE in each row is highlighted in bold font. For the benchmark, we have tried several allocation strategies: ShadowGrouping only requires weights for each of the Pauli observables in the decomposition. As we show in Section IV D, this can come from our Theorem 3, but a different bound such as from Ref. [10] also suffices. Running ShadowGrouping with either tail bound yields the first two columns. However, using Theorem 3 has its merits: due to Corollary 4, we know under what conditions a truncation is beneficial. This can be used to systematically truncate the Hamiltonian decomposition and rerun ShadowGrouping on the truncated set of Pauli observables (third column). In certain instances, this yields a significant improvement, in other cases not. We comment on this observation below. Furthermore, we numerically validate that minimizing the tail bound yields an accuracy improvement. To this end, we run a sequential brute-force search over all 3^n possible

Molecule E [mHa]	Enc.	ShadowGrouping			Brute-force unbiased	Derando- mization [10]	Random Paulis [8]	Adapt. Paulis [11]	AeQuO [6]	Overlapped Grouping [40]
H_2 -1.86×10^3	JW	40.8 \pm 2.1	9.5\pm1.2	11.0 \pm 1.3	12.1 \pm 1.5	11.9 \pm 1.4	27 \pm 3	60 \pm 7	12.0 \pm 1.4	11.8 \pm 1.4
	BK	40.3 \pm 2.1	15.0 \pm 1.6	16.1 \pm 1.8	13.1 \pm 1.7	15.8 \pm 1.9	26 \pm 3	29 \pm 3	11.2\pm1.2	15.8 \pm 1.7
	Parity	40.5 \pm 2.2	11.9 \pm 1.4	14.0 \pm 1.6	12.6 \pm 1.6	14.4 \pm 1.8	28 \pm 3	30 \pm 4	11.0\pm1.3	18.1 \pm 2.4
H_2 (6-31g) -1.86×10^3	JW	51.2 \pm 2.5	52 \pm 6	54 \pm 7	47\pm5	55 \pm 7	123 \pm 15	71 \pm 8	52 \pm 6	
	BK	50.3 \pm 2.7	42 \pm 5	39\pm5	41 \pm 5	51 \pm 6	114 \pm 13	118 \pm 15	45 \pm 5	
	Parity	50.1 \pm 2.6	41 \pm 6	48 \pm 5	37\pm4	51 \pm 6	134 \pm 16	84 \pm 10	53 \pm 6	
LiH -8.91×10^3	JW	40.9 \pm 2.4	33\pm4	37 \pm 4		38 \pm 5	84 \pm 10	49 \pm 5	58 \pm 7	37 \pm 4
	BK	39.5 \pm 1.8	36 \pm 4	36 \pm 5		38 \pm 4	92 \pm 10	67 \pm 7	63 \pm 7	36\pm4
	Parity	40.0 \pm 1.9	29\pm3	35 \pm 4		34 \pm 4	97 \pm 12	51 \pm 6	62 \pm 7	40 \pm 5
BeH_2 -19.05×10^3	JW	70 \pm 3	64\pm7	76 \pm 9		172 \pm 19	170 \pm 18	123 \pm 14	117 \pm 13	79 \pm 9
	BK	70\pm3	79 \pm 9	101 \pm 11		158 \pm 18	158 \pm 22	94 \pm 10	123 \pm 14	78 \pm 9
	Parity	69 \pm 4	73 \pm 9	62\pm7		172 \pm 21	130 \pm 16	97 \pm 11	134 \pm 15	64 \pm 9
H_2O -83.60×10^3	JW	93\pm10	123 \pm 13	132 \pm 15		420 \pm 50	320 \pm 40	133 \pm 16	360 \pm 40	141 \pm 15
	BK	256 \pm 29	256 \pm 29	257 \pm 28		530 \pm 60	430 \pm 50	280 \pm 30	430 \pm 50	205\pm22
	Parity	154 \pm 18	140\pm16	168 \pm 20		450 \pm 50	670 \pm 70	223 \pm 24	410 \pm 50	146 \pm 18
NH_3 -66.88×10^3	JW	98\pm7	182 \pm 19	169 \pm 19		7730 \pm 230	430 \pm 50	186 \pm 22	500 \pm 50	171 \pm 22
	BK	109\pm8	180 \pm 22	187 \pm 23		450 \pm 50	340 \pm 40	164 \pm 18	570 \pm 70	124 \pm 15
	Parity	117\pm12	249 \pm 29	194 \pm 24		840 \pm 90	470 \pm 50	260 \pm 29	630 \pm 80	139 \pm 16

The values above are the RMSE (9) of each method in mHa

Table I. Empirical benchmark: Energy estimation benchmark of the electronic GS problem for various small molecules. All calculations have been carried out using the minimal STO-3G basis set except for H_2 for which we have also chosen the 6-31G basis set. The fermionic Hamiltonians have been mapped to qubit Hamiltonians using either the JW, BK or Parity encoding. Deviations are reported as the RMSE over a hundred independent runs in units of mHa. Chemical accuracy is reached below a value of 1.6 mHa. The best average value per row is highlighted in bold font. Number in parentheses indicate the error on the mean in terms of the last two relevant digits. The various methods of the benchmark are discussed in the main text.

measurement settings to iteratively find the next best measurement setting that minimizes the tail bound the most. Within statistical errors, this always yields a competitive measurement scheme for the attainable molecule sizes and, thus, indicates that minimizing Eq. (4) actually increases the precision. Lastly, we benchmark the results against state-of-the-art method from the literature whose results we provide in the five rightmost columns. We see that minimizing the tail bounds does improve the estimation quality with the caveat that there can be certain problem instances where it might not be the case.

From the previous benchmark, we have seen that pairing ShadowGrouping with a tail bound achieves state-of-the-art results. However, the quality of the estimation is depending on the problem instance and the tail bound under consideration. This is of concern if we were to apply a measurement schemes to instances where we do not know the ground-state energy, i.e., to practical cases. Therefore, we propose a second, more robust benchmark that does make any assumptions on the state from which samples are collected. By virtue of Theorem 3 and Eq. (6) from Section II B, we have access to guarantees for the estimation accuracy given the proposed measurement settings. Using only these settings of each measurement scheme, i.e., without preparing the quantum state ρ , we calculate the corresponding guaranteed accuracy. Because we do not require any state dependence (as no samples are drawn from ρ at all), this comparison yields a more practically oriented benchmark for the schemes.

In this benchmark, we iteratively find measurements

settings and track the guaranteed accuracy ϵ over the number of measurements settings N . Setting $\delta = 2\%$, Corollary 4 tells us to include any Pauli observable in the decomposition only if it has at least $\alpha_\delta^2 = 99$ compatible measurements. We compare ShadowGrouping applied to Eq. (4) with the two most competitive methods from the literature in Figure 4, exemplary shown for NH_3 . We have tuned ShadowGrouping to scan through each Pauli observable at least once (see IV C in the Methods section for the details) to gauge their relevance for the tail bound. This additional check introduces some overhead in the guaranteed accuracy (blue dotted line). However, after a truncation of the irrelevant observables by virtue of Eq. (6), and a subsequent rerun of ShadowGrouping, we reliably produce the best measurement scheme when comparing to the literature (blue solid line). Comparing the values with the benchmark of Table I, on the other hand, indicates that the upper bound is not tight as the guaranteed accuracy is over a hundred times larger than the observed RMSE.

Finally, we illustrate worst-case upper bounds to the total number of measurement rounds for the various molecules from the benchmark. In quantum chemistry problems, energy estimates are usually required to be within chemical accuracy $\epsilon_{\text{chem}} = 1.6$ mHa of the actual expectation value [51]. Therefore, we calculate the range for the required total number of measurement rounds (possibly including grouping schemes) from the Hamiltonian decomposition (2) to reach a precision of ϵ_{chem} . As confidence, we choose a value of $1 - \delta = 98\%$. We




Figure 4. Comparison of the guarantees of the methods from the benchmark of Table II: Guaranteed accuracy ϵ_A for the ground-state energy of NH_3 of selected competitive schemes \mathcal{A} as a function of the number of allocated measurements N with confidence $1 - \delta = 98\%$. The x -axis is logarithmic. The molecule has been encoded by several common fermion-to-qubit mappings. For each method and allocated measurements, we applied the Corollary 4 to yield the highest provable precision. It tells us that it is always beneficial to go with the systematic error ϵ_{sys} for $N \leq \alpha_\delta^2 = 99$, hence the plateaus for small values of N (gray highlighted region). We see that ShadowGrouping scans through all Pauli observables first, thus, the plateaus extend further out (blue dotted line). However, re-running the algorithm on the truncated observable set (see main text), yields the smallest provable prediction error compared to other state-of-the-art methods (blue solid line). As both the adaptive and the OverlappedGrouping scheme sample the allocations, we have averaged their respective accuracies over 100 independent runs.

employ the minimal basis set STO-3G from the benchmarks before as well as the 6-31G set that also includes valence orbitals and thus uses more qubits to describe the electronic structure problem more accurately. Since larger basis sets are expected to minimize the systematical error introduced by cutting away less significant orbitals, we compare the effect of selecting chemically more relevant




Figure 5. Worst-case upper bound ranges to the sample complexity for the molecules from the previous benchmarks. They represent the number of measurement rounds upon provably reaching chemical accuracy with confidence $1 - \delta = 98\%$. We plot these ranges as a function of the number of qubits n needed to encode the problem. Furthermore, we considered two different basis sets: the minimal STO-3G (green) and 6-31G that also include some valence orbitals (blue). For the former, we also indicate tighter upper-bounds by asterisks, see main text. For better visibility, we have spread the ranges for BeH_2 and H_2O apart from each other – both are located at $n = 14$ and $n = 26$, respectively.

basis sets on the sample complexity.

In our tail bound, Theorem 3, the commutation relations among the Pauli observables impede the direct extraction of a sample complexity upper bound. Instead, we resort to the two extremal cases where either all M observables commute with each other or none at all. Thus, the actual upper bound scales as $O(M)$ but can also be significantly smaller, which depends on the Hamiltonian. We present these ranges in Figure 5. To give tighter upper-bounds, we can inspect the (overlapping) groups generated by the algorithm of Ref. [40]. This allows us to decrease the upper limit of the ranges significantly since we need to measure each group at worst equally often rather than each observable. We indicate this modification for the STO-3G basis by asterisks in Figure 5. In this worst-case estimation, the required number of measurement rounds is daunting. However, these bounds only make statements about measuring the energy of the worst-case state that exhibits the largest possible variance – this situation is unlikely to be encountered in any practical case.

III. DISCUSSION

Our work achieves two things: first and foremost, we provide rigorous sampling complexity upper bounds for the read-out of quantum experiments as needed for the direct energy estimation of quantum-many body Hamiltonians. Secondly, we propose an efficient and straightforward measurement protocol. It is immediately applicable to VQAs, where the measurement effort is a critical bottleneck. Moreover, our efficient readout strategy is also promising for analog quantum simulators. More generally, it applies to any experiment where a

direct measurement of a quantum many-body observable is needed. Technically, our protocols rely on assigning each of the contributions of the Hamiltonian (2) a corresponding weight, which we obtain from probability-theoretic considerations. To this end, we have derived an upper bound to the probability in Theorem 3 that a given empirical estimator fails to yield an ϵ -accurate value for the compound target observable such as the quantum state's energy. This readily provides a worst-case ranges for the sample complexity which is useful, for example, in order to appraise the feasibility of employing quantum devices to quantum chemistry problems where accuracy is most crucial [51].

Finally, there are several promising further research directions:

- Investigating the interplay of how the compounds of a observable contribute to the complexity, likely based on power-mean inequalities [52], is useful for tighter bounds for the sample complexity.
- We do not impose further information of the prepared quantum state ρ – this, however, can be used to improve the sample complexity, e.g., when considering pure states [53] or to incorporate available prior variance estimates [54].
- Our tail bound (4) does not rely on independent sampling procedures but is compatible with popular grouping schemes. However, in the proof we completely discard any information of the actual empirical variances of the estimates. Refining the upper bound such that it takes into account the empirical variances between samples is an exciting question for further investigation as the numerical benchmarks suggest that the grouped mean estimator yields more accurate estimates compared to other estimators. Since ShadowGrouping finds the measurement settings sequentially, the algorithm could easily benefit from such an empirical tail bound as the measurement outcomes can easily be fed back to it. Moreover, this carries over to estimating the covariances of grouped observables to further assess which observables are suited to be measured jointly.
- As ShadowGrouping appears to efficiently provide state-of-the-art groupings based on QWC (see Table I), an extension to general commutativity relations (or relations tailored to the hardware constraints [55]) is straight-forward and enticing for deeper measurement circuits, appearing to outperform QWC even in the presence of increased noise [56]. This decreases the measurement overhead efficiently, especially important for larger system sizes as the number of terms in the decomposition increases rapidly.
- Currently, we are developing a fermionic version of ShadowGrouping in order to make it more amenable to applications from quantum chemistry.

During the completion of this manuscript, another state-of-the-art scheme has been presented in Ref. [57]. The numerical benchmark shows that ShadowGrouping is similarly accurate while being computationally more efficient.

IV. METHODS

This section provides further background information on classical shadows that yield the energy estimator (3) as well as details for replicating the numerical benchmark. We also provide proof sketches for Theorem 3, Corollary 4, and Proposition 5 but refer to the Supplementary information for detailed proofs. Lastly, we end up with further details on our algorithm ShadowGrouping such as the motivation for our choice of the weight function. The also includes an examination of our results in light of prior ideas presented in Ref. [10] and a comparison to a conceptionally easier single-shot estimator.

A. Classical shadows

The framework of classical shadows allows use to rewrite the expectation value $o = \text{Tr}[O\rho]$ which we want to estimate in terms of those random variables accessible in the experiment [7, 8]. To this end, consider any measurement settings $Q \in \mathcal{P}^n$ that is QWC-compatible with O , see Definition 2. Given a state ρ , this produces a bitstring $b \in \{\pm 1\}^n$ with some probability $\mathbb{P}[b|Q, \rho]$. These bitstrings contain information about the target observables O as it is compatible with Q . Concisely, we have that

$$o = \mathbb{E}_b \prod_{i: O_i \neq \mathbb{1}} b_i = \sum_{b \in \{\pm 1\}^n} \mathbb{P}[b | Q, \rho] \prod_{i: O_i \neq \mathbb{1}} b_i. \quad (10)$$

Using Monte-Carlo sampling, this expectation value is estimated by the empirical estimator

$$\hat{o} = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{j=1}^N \prod_{i: O_i \neq \mathbb{1}} \hat{b}_i^{(j)} \quad (11)$$

with $\hat{b}^{(j)}$ being the j -th bitstring outcome of measuring with setting Q . This assumes that we have at least $N \geq 1$ compatible measurement settings with the target observable. If not, we can set the estimator equal to 0 and introduce a constant systematic error of at most

$$\epsilon_{\text{syst}}^{(i)} = |h_i|. \quad (12)$$

Since Eq. (11) only includes the qubits that fall into the support of O , we are not restricted with a single choice of the measurement settings Q as long as it is not fully supported on all qubits. In fact, any measurement setting that is compatible with O is suited for the estimation which can be exploited by randomized measurement settings. An advantage of classical shadows is that these random settings come equipped with rigorous sample complexity bounds. For instance, using single-qubit Clifford circuits for the read-out we require a measurement budget of

$$N = \mathcal{O} \left(\frac{\log(M/\delta)}{\epsilon^2} \max_i 3^{k_i} \right) \quad (13)$$

to ensure

$$|\hat{o}^{(i)} - o^{(i)}| \leq \epsilon \quad \forall i \in [M] \quad (14)$$

with confidence at least $1 - \delta$, where k_i is the weight of the target observable O_i , i.e., its number of non-identity single-qubit Pauli operators [10]. We provide further information on extensions of this method in the Supplementary information.

B. Proof sketch of Theorem 3

In order to derive the energy estimation inconfidence bound, we first prove a useful intermediate result which may be of independent interest: a Bernstein inequality for random variables in a Banach space. For this purpose, we extend inequalities from Refs. [44, 45]. In particular, we explicitly extend the vector Bernstein inequality of Ref. [44, Theorem 12] to random variables taking values in separable Banach spaces following Ref. [45]. We call them B -valued random variables henceforth. Then, we apply it to random vectors equipped with the 1-norm. A suitable construction of these random vectors finishes the proof of the theorem.

We start by defining B -valued random variables following Ref. [45, Chapter 2.1]:

Definition 6 (B -valued random variables). *Let B be a separable Banach space (such as \mathbb{R}^n) and $\|\cdot\|_B$ its associated norm. The open sets of B generate its Borel σ -algebra. We call a Borel measurable map X from some probability space $(\Omega, \mathcal{A}, \mathbb{P})$ to B a B -valued random variable, i.e., taking values on B .*

In the Supplementary information, we show that the norm of the sum of B -valued random variables concentrates exponentially around its expectation if we have some information about the variances of the random variables. We summarize this finding in the following.

Theorem 7 (B -valued Bernstein inequality). *Let X_1, \dots, X_N be independent B -valued random variables in a Banach space $(B, \|\cdot\|_B)$ and $S := \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$. Furthermore, define the variance quantities $\sigma_i^2 := \mathbb{E}[\|X_i\|_B^2]$, $V := \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^2$, and $V_B := \left(\sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i\right)^2$. Then, for all $t \leq V/(\max_{i \in [N]} \|X_i\|_B)$,*

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|S\|_B \geq \sqrt{V_B} + t\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{4V}\right). \quad (15)$$

As an important corollary, we find that for the Banach space $B = \mathbb{R}^d$ equipped with the p -norm ($\|\cdot\|_B \equiv \|\cdot\|_{\ell_p}$) with $p \in [1, 2]$ we can tighten the value of $\sqrt{V_B}$ in Eq. (15):

Corollary 8 (Vector Bernstein inequality). *Let X_1, \dots, X_N be independent, zero-mean random vectors*

in $(\mathbb{R}^d, \|\cdot\|_{\ell_p})$, $S = \sum_{i=1}^N X_i$, and $p \in [1, 2]$. Furthermore, define the variance quantities $\sigma_i^2 := \mathbb{E}[\|X_i\|_{\ell_p}^2]$ and $V := \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^2$. Then, for all $t \leq V/(\max_{i \in [N]} \|X_i\|_{\ell_p})$,

$$\mathbb{P}\left[\|S\|_{\ell_p} \geq \sqrt{V} + t\right] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{4V}\right). \quad (16)$$

This corollary includes the edge case of $p = 2$ proven in Ref. [44, Theorem 12].

Remark 1 The tail bound (4) keeps a balance between the magnitude of the coefficients h_i of each observable and how often they have been measured, respectively.

Remark 2 Due to the inherent commutation relations in Eq. (2), the dependence of the tail bound (4) on the N_i necessarily becomes slightly convoluted. In fact, we can identify $\|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1}^{-2}$ to be proportional to a weighted power mean of power $r = -1/2$ where the mean runs over $(N_i)_i$ with weights $(|h_i|)_i$. Similarly, $\|\mathbf{h}''\|_{\ell_1}$ is inversely proportional to the mean with $r = -1$. Some of this mean's properties and relations to other means can be found, e.g., in Ref. [52].

To make this more precise, the *weighted power mean* of $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with weights $\mathbf{w} \in \mathbb{R}_{\geq 0}^d$ and power r is defined as

$$M_r(\mathbf{x}|\mathbf{w}) := \left(\frac{\sum_{i=1}^d w_i x_i^r}{\sum_{i=1}^d w_i}\right)^{1/r}. \quad (17)$$

For non-negative \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{w} , M_r is monotonously increasing with r .

Now we set $w_i = |h_i|$ and $x_i = N_i$. Thus, we have that

$$M_{-1/2}(\mathbf{N}|\mathbf{h}) = \frac{\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1}^2} \quad (18)$$

$$\begin{aligned} M_{1/2}(\mathbf{N}|\mathbf{h}) &= \left(\frac{\sum_i |h_i| \sqrt{N_i}}{\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1}}\right)^2 \\ &\leq \frac{\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_2}^2}{\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1}^2} \sqrt{\sum_i N_i} \end{aligned} \quad (19)$$

due to Cauchy's inequality. It follows

$$\|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1} \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_2} \sqrt{\sum_i N_i}} \geq \frac{\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1}}{\sqrt{\sum_i N_i}}. \quad (20)$$

as a lower-bound. In the limiting case of non-commuting observables, this bound reduces to $\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1}/\sqrt{N}$ where N is the total shot number. The converse, i.e., extracting upper bounds is not as straightforward to do.

C. Finding an equivalent weight function for the energy estimation inconfidence bound

In this section, we find an equivalent weight function **weight** for our tail bound (4) that can be used to assess each observable's individual contribution to the total bound. As of now, the current bound depends on all

contributions jointly. However, the 1-norm in Eq. (4) makes a subdivision into the individual contributions possible. To this end, we inspect the bound further. We start with a further upper bound [58, Theorem 2.4] to Eq. (4) to get rid of the mixed terms in the square and conclude that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{P}[|\hat{E} - E| \geq \epsilon] &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\left[\frac{\epsilon}{2\|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1}} - 1\right]^2\right) \\ &\leq \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{32\|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1}^2} + \frac{1}{4}\right) \\ &< 1.3 \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{32\|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1}^2}\right) \end{aligned} \quad (21)$$

is to be minimized the most when trying to minimize Eq. (5). Since the argument is monotonously increasing with $\|\mathbf{h}'\|$, this is equivalent to minimizing $\|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1} = \sum_i |h_i|/\sqrt{N_i}$. In order to decrease the sum the most we like to find a measurement setting such that the summands change the most. If we define

$$\begin{aligned} w_i &:= |h_i| \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N_i}} - \frac{1}{\sqrt{N_i+1}} \right) \\ &= |h_i| \frac{\sqrt{N_i+1} - \sqrt{N_i}}{\sqrt{N_i(N_i+1)}} > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (22)$$

since $N_i \geq 1$ as per Theorem 3, the optimization boils down to maximizing $\sum_i w_i > 0$. Therefore, we come back to a form of the objective function where the arguments of the sum serve as the individual weights for each of the observables in the Hamiltonian. As a consequence, we can readily provide the weights to ShadowGrouping as sketched in Figure 3. There is one caveat left: 3 does not hold if any of the Pauli observables has no compatible measurements, i.e., in case of $N_i = 0$ for some i . In this case, Eq. (22) is ill-defined. Using the fact that $w_i \leq |h_i| \forall i$, we can numerically rectify the issue by setting

$$w_i = \alpha |h_i| \quad \text{if } N_i = 0 \quad (23)$$

with some hyperparameter $\alpha \geq 1$ that balances the immediate relevance of terms that have no compatible measurement setting yet with those that do but are of larger magnitude $|h_i|$ in the Hamiltonian decomposition. Repeated rounds eventually leads to all Pauli observables having at least one compatible measurement setting such that we can evaluate Eq. (4). In our numerics, we choose α such that observables with no compatible measurement setting yet are always preferred over the ones that do. Setting

$$\begin{aligned} h_{\min} &:= \min_i |h_i| > 0, \\ h_{\max} &:= \max_i |h_i| > 0, \end{aligned} \quad (24)$$

we find α to be at least

$$\alpha > \frac{h_{\max}}{h_{\min}} \geq 1. \quad (25)$$

We use $\alpha = h_{\max}^2/h_{\min}^2$ throughout all numerical experiments. This way, we scan through all observables at least once to rank them according to Eq. (22) and find potentially good settings afterwards. As described in Section II, this overhead introduced can be mitigated by applying the truncation criterion, Corollary 4, and running ShadowGrouping on the smaller observable set again. This combination is computationally efficient (it roughly doubles the computational overhead) and ensures that only the observables of statistical relevance to the tail bound are considered in the first place.

D. Comparison with derandomization

While our tail bound, Theorem 3, is the first derived upper bound for the energy estimation of quantum many-body Hamiltonians, there is pioneering work in this direction in Ref. [10]. Here, a tail bound is found by means of Hoeffding's inequality that at least one unweighted, *single* Pauli observable in a given collection deviates substantially from its mean. This situation is somewhat related to the task of estimating the energy by summation of many Pauli observables but discards the different weights in the Pauli decomposition as well as their respective interplay as each of the observables are treated independently of the other. The authors of Ref. [10] reintroduce the weights in an ad-hoc manner. Hence, we refer to it as the derandomization bound which originally reads as

$$\text{DERAND}_i^{(\text{orig})} := 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2} N_i \frac{\max_j |h_j|}{|h_i|}\right). \quad (26)$$

Here, ϵ is again the accuracy, N_i counts the number of previous compatible measurement settings and the h_i come from Eq. (2). Taking into account the weights h_i in an ad-hoc fashion, however, renders this expression unsuitable for an actual upper bound. We can shift the parameter $O \mapsto hO =: \tilde{O}$ by some value $h \neq 0$. Hoeffding's inequality implies that

$$\mathbb{P}[|\hat{\tilde{O}} - \tilde{O}| \geq \epsilon] \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2h^2} N\right). \quad (27)$$

This ensures that all weighted observables in Eq. (2) are treated equally with respect to the value of ϵ . Thus, the actual derandomization bound reads as

$$\text{DERAND}_i := 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2h_i^2} N_i\right). \quad (28)$$

Taking a union bound over all observables $O^{(i)}$, we again obtain an upper bound for $\mathbb{P}[|E - \hat{E}| \geq \epsilon]$. We see that this derivation leads to a more conservative ϵ -closeness (captured in terms of the ∞ -distance) compared to the 1-distance of Theorem 3. Since we treat each observable independently of all the others, the total accuracy of the

	Theorem 3	Derandomization
norm	ℓ_1	ℓ_∞
ϵ_{eff}	ϵ	$M\epsilon$
equation	$\exp\left(-\frac{1}{4}\left[\frac{\epsilon}{2\ \mathbf{h}'\ _{\ell_1}} - 1\right]^2\right)$	$2\sum_{i=1}^M \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2h_i^2} N_i\right)$
WEIGHT	see above	$c^{N_i} - c^{N_i+1}$ $c = \exp(-\epsilon^2/(2h_i^2))$

Table II. Comparison of our tail bound (4) with the derandomization bound (28) adapted from Ref. [10]. Norm refers to how the error is captured with respect to the single Pauli terms in Eq. (2) whereas ϵ_{eff} refers to the error in terms of the energy estimation. For Theorem 3, this is identical to the guarantee parameter ϵ while the derandomization guarantee scales with the number of qubits n . The difference arises from the fact that we effectively exchange the sum and the exponential function in the corresponding bounds. The latter are used to derive a weight function **weight** for ShadowGrouping, see e.g. the previous section.

energy estimation can grow as

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\text{eff}} &:= \left| \sum_{i=1}^M \left(h_i \hat{o}^{(i)} - h_i o^{(i)} \right) \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{i=1}^M \underbrace{|h_i \hat{o}^{(i)} - h_i o^{(i)}|}_{\leq \epsilon} = M\epsilon \end{aligned} \quad (29)$$

via the generalized triangle inequality. Since in typical scenarios $M = \text{poly}(n)$, this implies that the guarantee parameter ϵ scales with the number of qubits in order to guarantee $|\hat{E} - E| \leq \epsilon_{\text{eff}}$, requiring even more measurement settings to compensate this effect. We summarize and compare both tail bounds for $|\hat{E} - E| \geq \epsilon$ in Table II.

We also compare ShadowGrouping to the derandomization measurement scheme. First, ShadowGrouping does not require a qubit-ordering as it directly works with the inherent commutation relations in Eq. (2). The derandomization algorithm, on the other hand, finds the measurement setting qubit by qubit and thus imposes an ordering of the observables. As a consequence of this difference, the computational complexity of our scheme scales with $O(nM \log(M))$ for assigning a single measurement setting as we have to order the M weights first in descending order, then go through every target observable comprised of n qubits. In contrast to that, the derandomization procedure from Section IV D scales as $O(nM)$ as it has to modify all M terms in its corresponding bound after appending a single-qubit Pauli observable to the next measurement setting. We see that our approach only worsens the scaling by a logarithmic factor but enables the algorithm to find the next measurement setting in an arbitrary qubit order (the derandomization procedure always uses the same ordering). This might help to decrease the inconfidence bound quicker. Moreover, the derandomization scheme requires a continuation of the tail bound to the case of having partially assigned

the next measurement setting. This is possible for the derandomization bound [10] but unclear in case of our tail bound. ShadowGrouping, on the other hand, can be applied to either bound which we do in the numerical benchmark, Section II C.

E. Comparison with single-shot estimator

We introduce a single-shot estimator to assess the scaling of our measurement guarantee (5). This estimator simply picks a single observable in the Hamiltonian decomposition with probability $p_i = |h_i|/\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1}$ and obtains a single-shot estimate. This way, a single estimate of the state's energy can be obtained. Assuming, we have picked the k -th observable to be measured, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \hat{E} &= s_k \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1} \\ s_k &:= \text{sign}(h_k) \delta^{(k)} \in \{\pm 1\}. \end{aligned} \quad (30)$$

This estimator is unbiased:

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\hat{E}] &= \sum_{i=1}^M p_i \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1} \mathbb{E}[s_i] = \sum_{i=1}^M |h_i| \text{sign}(h_i) \mathbb{E}[\delta^{(i)}] \\ &= \sum_{i=1}^M h_i o^{(i)} = E. \end{aligned}$$

Clearly, $|\hat{E}| \leq \|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1}$. Invoking Hoeffding's inequality, for N many independent samples, we have that

$$\mathbb{P}[|\hat{E} - E| \geq \epsilon] \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{N\epsilon^2}{2\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1}^2}\right) \quad (31)$$

given some $\epsilon > 0$. We arrive at a sample complexity (with $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$) of

$$N \geq \frac{2\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1}^2}{\epsilon^2} \log \frac{2}{\delta} \quad (32)$$

with probability $1 - \delta$ in order for $|\hat{E} - E| \leq \epsilon$. Solving for ϵ , we compare this guarantee to Eq. (5). With $\log(2/x) \leq 2 \log(1/x)$ for $x \leq 1/2$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \epsilon_{\text{single}} &= \sqrt{2} \sqrt{\log \frac{2}{\delta}} \frac{\|\mathbf{h}\|_{\ell_1}}{\sqrt{N}} \leq 2 \sqrt{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{|h_i|}{\sqrt{N}} \\ &\leq 2 \sqrt{2 \log \frac{1}{\delta}} \sum_{i=1}^M \frac{|h_i|}{\sqrt{N_i}} \leq \alpha_\delta \|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1} \equiv \epsilon_{\text{multi}} \\ &\Rightarrow \tilde{O}(\epsilon_{\text{single}}) = \tilde{O}(\epsilon_{\text{multi}}), \end{aligned}$$

with α_δ from Eq. (6), see also the proof of Corollary 4 in the Supplementary information. We find that the two guarantees agree up to logarithmic factors in N . Moreover, in case all observables commute with each other, both tail bounds are equivalent up to a constant factor. However, in the numerical benchmark from Section II C, we see

Molecule E [mHa]	Enc.	Random Paulis [8]	Single shot Eq. (30)
H_2 -1.86×10^3	JW	27\pm3	50 \pm 6
	BK	26\pm3	43 \pm 5
	Parity	28\pm3	49 \pm 6
H_2 (6-31g) -1.86×10^3	JW	123\pm15	360 \pm 40
	BK	114\pm13	300 \pm 40
	Parity	134\pm16	370 \pm 50
LiH -8.91×10^3	JW	84\pm10	380 \pm 40
	BK	92\pm10	340 \pm 40
	Parity	97\pm12	350 \pm 40
BeH_2 -19.05×10^3	JW	170\pm18	640 \pm 70
	BK	158\pm22	610 \pm 70
	Parity	130\pm16	620 \pm 80
H_2O -83.60×10^3	JW	320\pm40	1980 \pm 220
	BK	430\pm50	2030 \pm 280
	Parity	670\pm70	1980 \pm 240
NH_3 -66.88×10^3	JW	430\pm50	2000 \pm 230
	BK	340\pm40	2170 \pm 250
	Parity	470\pm50	2060 \pm 210
Values above in mHa			

Table III. The same benchmark as Table I. The single shot estimator defined in Eq. (30) does not produce competitive estimates when benchmarked with the RMSE-metric (9).

that the estimator (30) does not fare better than the random Pauli settings, see Table III. We attribute this discrepancy to the fact that the grouped mean estimator bears a lower variance in practice than the single-shot estimator introduced here. Both implies that recycling the measurement outcomes is the more favourable approach and hints towards a possible refinement of our tail bound.

Data availability

The Hamiltonian decompositions used for the benchmarks in Tables I and III and Figure 4 have been sourced from an online repository [59]. Any intermediate data generated for the benchmarks is stored alongside the computer code in Ref. [50].

Code availability

All computer code required to reproduce Figures 2, 4 and 5 and Tables I and III have been deposited in Ref. [50].

-
- [1] P. Gokhale, O. Angiuli, Y. Ding, K. Gui, T. Tomesh, M. Suchara, M. Martonosi, and F. T. Chong, *Minimizing state preparations in variational quantum eigensolver by partitioning into commuting families*, [arXiv:1907.13623 \[quant-ph\]](#) (2019).
- [2] A. Jena, S. Genin, and M. Mosca, *Pauli partitioning with respect to gate sets*, [arXiv:1907.07859 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [3] O. Crawford, B. van Straaten, D. Wang, T. Parks, E. Campbell, and S. Brierley, *Efficient quantum measurement of Pauli operators in the presence of finite sampling error*, *Quantum* **5**, 385 (2021), [arXiv:1908.06942 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [4] V. Verteletskyi, T.-C. Yen, and A. F. Izmaylov, *Measurement optimization in the variational quantum eigensolver using a minimum clique cover*, *J. Chem. Phys.* **152**, 124114 (2020), [arXiv:1907.03358 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [5] A. Zhao, A. Tranter, W. M. Kirby, S. F. Ung, A. Miyake, and P. J. Love, *Measurement reduction in variational quantum algorithms*, *Phys. Rev. A* **101**, 062322 (2020), [arXiv:1908.08067 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [6] A. Shlosberg, A. J. Jena, P. Mukhopadhyay, J. F. Haase, F. Leditzky, and L. Dellantonio, *Adaptive estimation of quantum observables*, *Quantum* **7**, 906 (2023), [arXiv:2110.15339](#).
- [7] H.-Y. Huang and R. Kueng, *Predicting features of quantum systems from very few measurements*, [arXiv:1908.08909 \[quant-ph\]](#) (2019).
- [8] H.-Y. Huang, R. Kueng, and J. Preskill, *Predicting many properties of a quantum system from very few measurements*, *Nature Physics* **16**, 1050–1057 (2020), [arXiv:2002.08953 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [9] C. Hadfield, S. Bravyi, R. Raymond, and A. Mezzacapo, *Measurements of quantum Hamiltonians with locally-biased classical shadows*, [arXiv:2006.15788 \[quant-ph\]](#) (2020).
- [10] H.-Y. Huang, R. Kueng, and J. Preskill, *Efficient estimation of Pauli observables by derandomization*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 030503 (2021), [arXiv:2103.07510 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [11] C. Hadfield, *Adaptive Pauli shadows for energy estimation*, [arXiv:2105.12207 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [12] A. Elben, S. T. Flammia, H.-Y. Huang, R. Kueng, J. Preskill, B. Vermersch, and P. Zoller, *The randomized measurement toolbox*, *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **5**, 9 (2022), [arXiv:2203.11374](#).
- [13] F. Arute et al., *Quantum supremacy using a programmable superconducting processor*, *Nature* **574**, 505 (2019), [arXiv:1910.11333 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [14] J. M. Arrazola, V. Bergholm, K. Brádler, T. R. Bromley, M. J. Collins, I. Dhand, A. Fumagalli, T. Gerrits, A. Goussev, L. G. Helt, J. Hundal, T. Isacsson, R. B. Israel, J. Izaac, S. Jahangiri, R. Janik, N. Killoran, S. P. Kumar, J. Lavoie, A. E. Lita, D. H. Mahler, M. Menotti, B. Morrison, S. W. Nam, L. Neuhaus, H. Y. Qi, N. Quesada, A. Repington, K. K. Sabapathy, M. Schuld, D. Su, J. Swinerton, A. Száva, K. Tan, P. Tan, V. D. Vaidya, Z. Vernon, Z. Zabaneh, and Y. Zhang, *Quantum circuits with many photons on a programmable nanophotonic chip*, *Nature (London)* **591**, 54 (2021), [arXiv:2103.02109 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [15] T. Hoeffler, T. Häner, and M. Troyer, *Disentangling hype from practicality: On realistically achieving quantum advantage*, *Commun. ACM* **66**, 82–87 (2023), [arXiv:2307.00523 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [16] R. P. Feynman, *Simulating physics with computers*, *Int. J. Theor. Phys.* **21**, 467 (1982).
- [17] J. Preskill, *Quantum computing in the NISQ era and beyond*, *Quantum* **2**, 79 (2018), [arXiv:1801.00862 \[quant-ph\]](#).

- [18] A. Peruzzo, J. McClean, P. Shadbolt, M.-H. Yung, X.-Q. Zhou, P. J. Love, A. Aspuru-Guzik, and J. L. O'Brien, *A variational eigenvalue solver on a photonic quantum processor*, *Nat. Commun.* **5**, 4213 (2014), [arXiv:1304.3061 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [19] D. Wecker, M. B. Hastings, and M. Troyer, *Progress towards practical quantum variational algorithms*, *Phys. Rev. A* **92**, 042303 (2015), [arXiv:1507.08969 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [20] J. R. McClean, J. Romero, R. Babbush, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, *The theory of variational hybrid quantum-classical algorithms*, *New J. Phys.* **18**, 023023 (2016), [arXiv:1509.04279 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [21] E. Farhi, J. Goldstone, and S. Gutmann, *A quantum approximate optimization algorithm*, [arXiv:1411.4028 \[quant-ph\]](#) (2014).
- [22] L. Zhou, S.-T. Wang, S. Choi, H. Pichler, and M. D. Lukin, *Quantum approximate optimization algorithm: Performance, mechanism, and implementation on near-term devices*, *Phys. Rev. X* **10**, 021067 (2020), [arXiv:1812.01041 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [23] M. Schuld, V. Bergholm, C. Gogolin, J. Izaac, and N. Killoran, *Evaluating analytic gradients on quantum hardware*, *Phys. Rev. A* **99**, 032331 (2019), [arXiv:1811.11184 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [24] J. Li, X. Yang, X. Peng, and C.-P. Sun, *Hybrid quantum-classical approach to quantum optimal control*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **118**, 150503 (2017), [arXiv:1608.00677 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [25] K. Mitarai, M. Negoro, M. Kitagawa, and K. Fujii, *Quantum circuit learning*, *Phys. Rev. A* **98**, 032309 (2018), [arXiv:1803.00745 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [26] D. Wierichs, J. Izaac, C. Wang, and C. Y.-Y. Lin, *General parameter-shift rules for quantum gradients*, *Quantum* **6**, 677 (2022), [arXiv:2107.12390 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [27] O. Kyriienko and V. E. Elfving, *Generalized quantum circuit differentiation rules*, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 052417 (2021), [arXiv:2108.01218 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [28] J. Gil Vidal and D. O. Theis, *Calculus on parameterized quantum circuits*, [arXiv:1812.06323 \[quant-ph\]](#) (2018).
- [29] D. O. Theis, *Optimality of finite-support parameter shift rules for derivatives of variational quantum circuits*, [arXiv:2112.14669 \[quant-ph\]](#) (2021).
- [30] A. F. Izmaylov, R. A. Lang, and T.-C. Yen, *Analytic gradients in variational quantum algorithms: Algebraic extensions of the parameter-shift rule to general unitary transformations*, *Phys. Rev. A* **104**, 062443 (2021), [arXiv:2107.08131 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [31] L. Bittel, J. Watty, and M. Kliesch, *Fast gradient estimation for variational quantum algorithms* (2022), [arXiv:2210.06484 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [32] J. R. McClean, S. Boixo, V. N. Smelyanskiy, R. Babbush, and H. Neven, *Barren plateaus in quantum neural network training landscapes*, *Nat. Commun.* **9**, 4812 (2018), [arXiv:1803.11173 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [33] L. Bittel and M. Kliesch, *Training variational quantum algorithms is NP-hard*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **127**, 120502 (2021), [arXiv:2101.07267 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [34] L. Bittel, S. Gharibian, and M. Kliesch, *The optimal depth of variational quantum algorithms is QCMA-hard to approximate*, in *38th Comput. Complexity Conf. (CCC 2023)*, Vol. 264 (2023) pp. 34:1–34:24, [arXiv:2211.12519 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [35] M. Cerezo, A. Arrasmith, R. Babbush, S. C. Benjamin, S. Endo, K. Fujii, J. R. McClean, K. Mitarai, X. Yuan, L. Cincio, and P. J. Coles, *Variational quantum algorithms*, *Nat. Rev. Phys.* **3**, 625 (2021), [arXiv:2012.09265 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [36] K. Bharti, A. Cervera-Lierta, T. H. Kyaw, T. Haug, S. Alperin-Lea, A. Anand, M. Degroote, H. Heimonen, J. S. Kottmann, T. Menke, W.-K. Mok, S. Sim, L.-C. Kwek, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, *Noisy intermediate-scale quantum (NISQ) algorithms*, *Rev. Mod. Phys.* **94**, 015004 (2022), [arXiv:2101.08448 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [37] A. J. Daley, I. Bloch, C. Kokail, S. Flannigan, N. Pearson, M. Troyer, and P. Zoller, *Practical quantum advantage in quantum simulation*, *Nature* **607**, 667 (2022).
- [38] R. Trivedi, A. F. Rubio, and J. I. Cirac, *Quantum advantage and stability to errors in analogue quantum simulators*, [arXiv:2212.04924 \[quant-ph\]](#) (2022).
- [39] M. Arienzo, M. Heinrich, I. Roth, and M. Kliesch, *Closed-form analytic expressions for shadow estimation with brickwork circuits*, [arXiv:2211.09835 \[quant-ph\]](#) (2022).
- [40] B. Wu, J. Sun, Q. Huang, and X. Yuan, *Overlapped grouping measurement: A unified framework for measuring quantum states*, *Quantum* **7**, 896 (2023), [arXiv:2105.13091](#).
- [41] S. Hillmich, C. Hadfield, R. Raymond, A. Mezzacapo, and R. Wille, *Decision diagrams for quantum measurements with shallow circuits*, in *2021 IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering (QCE)* (2021) pp. 24–34, [arXiv:2105.06932 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [42] M. Kohda, R. Imai, K. Kanno, K. Mitarai, W. Mizukami, and Y. O. Nakagawa, *Quantum expectation-value estimation by computational basis sampling*, *Phys. Rev. Research* **4**, 033173 (2022), [arXiv:2112.07416 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [43] D. McNulty, F. B. Maciejewski, and M. Oszmaniec, *Estimating quantum hamiltonians via joint measurements of noisy noncommuting observables*, *Phys. Rev. Lett.* **130**, 100801 (2023), [arXiv:2206.08912](#).
- [44] D. Gross, *Recovering low-rank matrices from few coefficients in any basis*, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Th.* **57**, 1548 (2011), [arXiv:0910.1879 \[cs.IT\]](#).
- [45] M. Ledoux and M. Talagrand, *Probability in Banach Spaces: isoperimetry and processes*, Vol. 23 (Springer, 1991).
- [46] A. tA v, M. S. ANIS, and A.-M. et al., *Qiskit: An open-source framework for quantum computing* (2021).
- [47] P. Jordan and W. Eugene, *Über das paulische äquivalenzverbot*, *Z. Physik* **47**, 631 (1928).
- [48] S. B. Bravyi and A. Y. Kitaev, *Fermionic quantum computation*, *Ann. Phys.* **298**, 210 (2002).
- [49] J. T. Seeley, M. J. Richard, and P. J. Love, *The Bravyi-Kitaev transformation for quantum computation of electronic structure*, *J. Chem. Phys.* **137**, 224109 (2012), [arXiv:1208.5986 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [50] A. Gresch and M. Kliesch, *ShadowGrouping*, GitHub repository <https://gitlab.com/GreschAI/shadowgrouping> (2022).
- [51] H. Liu, G. H. Low, D. S. Steiger, T. Häner, M. Reiher, and M. Troyer, *Prospects of quantum computing for molecular sciences*, *Mater. Theor.* **6**, 11 (2022), [arXiv:2102.10081 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [52] P. S. Bullen, *Handbook of Means and Their Inequalities* (Springer Netherlands, 2003).
- [53] D. Grier, H. Pashayan, and L. Schaeffer, *Sample-optimal classical shadows for pure states*, [arXiv:2211.11810 \[quant-ph\]](#) (2022).
- [54] T.-C. Yen, A. Ganeshram, and A. F. Izmaylov, *Deterministic improvements of quantum measurements with group-*

ing of compatible operators, non-local transformations, and covariance estimates, [arXiv:2201.01471 \[quant-ph\]](#) (2022).

- [55] D. Miller, L. E. Fischer, I. O. Sokolov, P. K. Barkoutsos, and I. Tavernelli, *Hardware-tailored diagonalization circuits*, [arXiv:2203.03646](#) (2022).
- [56] Z. P. Bansingh, T.-C. Yen, P. D. Johnson, and A. F. Izmaylov, *Fidelity overhead for nonlocal measurements in variational quantum algorithms*, *J. Phys. Chem. A* **126**, 7007 (2022), [arXiv:2205.07113 \[quant-ph\]](#).
- [57] Z.-J. Zhang, K. Nakaji, M. Choi, and A. Aspuru-Guzik, *A composite measurement scheme for efficient quantum observable estimation*, [arXiv:2305.02439 \[quant-ph\]](#) (2023).
- [58] E. J. Candès and Y. Plan, *A probabilistic and RIPless theory of compressed sensing*, *IEEE Trans. Inf. Theory* **57**, 7235 (2011), [arXiv:1011.3854 \[cs.IT\]](#).
- [59] C. Hadfield, *adaptiveshadows*, GitHub repository <https://github.com/charleshadfield/adaptiveshadows/tree/main/Hamiltonians> (2021).
- [60] V. V. Jurinskii, *Exponential bounds for large deviations*, *Theo. Prob. & Appl.* **19**, 154 (1974).
- [61] K. Siegrist, *Random - probability, mathematical statistics, stochastic processes* (1997).
- [62] R. M. Karp, *Reducibility among combinatorial problems*, in *Complexity of computer computations* (Springer, 1972) pp. 85–103.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work has been funded by the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft (DFG, German Research Foundation) via the Emmy Noether program (Grant No. 441423094); the German Federal Ministry of Education and Research (BMBF) within the funding program “Quantum technologies – From basic research to market” in the joint project MANIQU (Grant No. 13N15578); and by the Fujitsu Services GmbH and Dataport as part of the endowed professorship “Quantum Inspired and Quantum Optimization”.

Author contributions

A.G. carried out all calculations and numerical studies, M.K. supervised the process and conceived the idea of applying the vector Bernstein inequality. Both authors wrote the manuscript together. The authors declare no competing financial interest.

SUPPLEMENTARY INFORMATION

Here, we provide further information on the two main paradigms for the measurement reduction, namely grouping schemes and shadow methods in Appendices A and B, respectively. Afterwards, we give proofs to our main results: our energy estimation tail bound in Appendix C and the hardness result in Appendix D.

A. Grouping methods

Grouping makes use of the fact that in Eq. (2), many of the Pauli operators commute with each other which allows them to be measured simultaneously with the same measurement setting. To this end, we want to decompose the operator collection $\{O^{(i)}\}$ into N_g non-overlapping sets of commuting operators where N_g should be made as small as possible. This is called grouping of Pauli observables. This way, we only require $N_g \ll M$ independent measurement settings which reduces the total run-time of the sampling procedure. In principle, for a system of n qubits, the decomposition in Eq. (2) can have up to $M_{\max} = 4^n - 1$ relevant terms which each require a separate measurement routine. In comparison, this collection can be partitioned into $N_g^{\min} = 2^n + 1$ equal groups of $2^n - 1$ members each, which roughly corresponds to a quadratic reduction of the number of circuit preparations. However, optimally grouping a given collection referred to as MIN-GROUPING, that is finding the partition with N_g^{\min} , is NP-hard in the system size [40]. As a trade-off between the estimation routine’s run-time and this costly grouping step, approximative grouping algorithms have been devised, see the Introduction for details. Lastly, partitioning into commuting groups generally requires measurement circuits consisting of multiple two-qubit gates. As they increase the noise level of the quantum circuit significantly, we restrict ourselves to single-qubit gates only and, thus, switch to the constraint commutation relation of qubit-wise commutativity (QWC). Due to the tensor structure of the Pauli observables it is easy to see that QWC implies general commutativity. The contrary is not true: $\mathcal{C}[XX, YY] = \text{true}$ but $\mathcal{C}_{\text{QWC}}[XX, YY] = \text{false}$. For grouping operators that fulfill QWC, polynomial heuristic algorithms of low degrees are applicable to efficiently find a solution which, however, may not be optimal [1].

B. Shadow methods

The method of classical shadows is to find a classical approximation $\hat{\rho}$ to a quantum state ρ that reproduces the same expectation values for an ensemble of M observables $\{O^{(i)}\} \forall i \in [M]$ up to some error threshold ϵ [7, 8]. A classical shadow is constructed by rotating the target state ρ via a randomly drawn unitary $U \in \mathcal{U}$ from a fixed ensemble \mathcal{U} , e.g., local Pauli operators and

tensors thereof or Clifford gates. In consequence, the state transforms as $\rho \mapsto U\rho U^\dagger$. Afterwards, the resulting state is measured in the computational basis which yields a string $|b\rangle \in \{0, 1\}^n$ of n bits with probability $\langle b|U\rho U^\dagger|b\rangle$. Storing this measurement outcome is efficiently done on a classical computer and only scales linearly with the number of qubits n . The rotation is undone by applying the adjoint of the chosen unitary U onto $|b\rangle$. This yields the state $U^\dagger|b\rangle\langle b|U$. This procedure can be repeated multiple times, e.g., as often as the measurement budget allows it. The expectation over all unitaries $U \in \mathcal{U}$ and the corresponding measurement outcomes $|b\rangle$ is an Hermitian operator \mathcal{M} of the underlying quantum state ρ :

$$\mathcal{M}(\rho) = \mathbb{E}_{U,b} [U^\dagger|b\rangle\langle b|U] = \mathcal{M}^\dagger(\rho). \quad (\text{S1})$$

Although this state is not a valid quantum state (it is not necessarily positive-semidefinite), the mapping \mathcal{M} can still be regarded as a quantum channel and inverted. Since \mathcal{M} is a linear function, we can recover the state ρ in expectation via

$$\rho = \mathbb{E}_{U,b} [\mathcal{M}^{-1}(U^\dagger|b\rangle\langle b|U)] \quad (\text{S2})$$

as long as \mathcal{M} is *tomographically complete*. The completeness ensures invertibility and is defined as $\forall \rho, \sigma$ with $\rho \neq \sigma \exists U \in \mathcal{U}, |b\rangle : \langle b|U\sigma U^\dagger|b\rangle \neq \langle b|U\rho U^\dagger|b\rangle$. The right choice of the transformation ensemble \mathcal{U} ensures that the channel inversion can be applied efficiently by a classical computer. Surely, averaging over all possible ensemble unitaries and their respective outcomes is not efficiently possible. However, we are not interested in a full description of ρ , but only in its expectation values. The latter is achievable by taking single snap-shots called the *classical shadows* $\hat{\rho} = \mathcal{M}^{-1}(U^\dagger|b\rangle\langle b|U)$ and computing their empirical mean (11). The mean concentrates exponentially quickly around ρ (with $\mathbb{E}\hat{\rho} = \rho$) and the expectation values are recovered in expectation:

$$o_i = \text{Tr}[O_i\rho] = \text{Tr}[O_i\mathbb{E}\hat{\rho}] = \mathbb{E}\text{Tr}[O_i\hat{\rho}] = \mathbb{E}\hat{o}_i. \quad (\text{S3})$$

a. Locally-biased classical shadow

As stated above, classical shadows rely on sampling new measurement settings uniformly at random. The aim of locally-biased classical shadows (LBCSs) is to alter the underlying distribution β from which these settings are sampled in order to take the target observables' structures, such as each other's QWC, into account [9, 11]. With locality, we refer to the fact that the sampling distribution β factorizes over the n qubits as

$$\beta(Q) = \prod_{i=1}^n \beta_i(Q_i). \quad (\text{S4})$$

In the unbiased case above, we simply set $\beta_i = 1/3 \forall i$, i.e., we assign the measurement basis uniformly at random

and construct an unbiased estimator for the target observable O . By examining the variance of the estimator, we can bias the $\{\beta_i\}$ in such a way that the variances are decreased the most while retaining an unbiased estimator. Optimizing the sampling distribution is done in a preprocessing step. Additionally, it can readily be adapted to a weighted collection of target observables such as the ones in the Hamiltonian decomposition (2).

b. Derandomization

The idea of derandomization is to greedily select the most advantageous measurement settings as indicated by the current inconfidence bound [10]. As we want to fulfill the ϵ -closeness of Eq. (14) in the ∞ -norm, we focus on each observable independently. We can regard each summand $\prod_{i, O_i \neq \mathbb{1}} \hat{b}_i \in \{-1, +1\}$ in Eq. (11) as a random variable s with two possible outcomes. Thus, Eq. (11) is only the empirical mean \hat{s} for s . We can invoke Hoeffding's inequality in this case to end up with

$$\mathbb{P}[|\hat{o}_i - o_i| \geq \epsilon] \leq 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2} N_i\right), \quad (\text{S5})$$

which is - by construction - valid $\forall i, \forall \epsilon > 0$ and $\forall N_i \geq 0$. Using a union bound over $i \in [M]$, we conclude

$$\mathbb{P}[\|\hat{\mathbf{o}} - \mathbf{o}\|_{\ell_\infty} \geq \epsilon] \leq \sum_{i=1}^M 2 \exp\left(-\frac{\epsilon^2}{2} N_i\right) \equiv \delta \quad (\text{S6})$$

from which a sample complexity (13) can be derived in the unweighted case. Moreover, Eq. (S6) can be extended to cases where we have already partially assigned the next measurement setting [10]. This allows to update the inconfidence bound qubit by qubit. In this bound, the locality can still implicitly influence the values for N_i : Consider for example $O = X^{\otimes n}$. The probability of a random measurement setting Q to be compatible with O is exponentially small in the system size n : $\mathbb{P}[[O, Q] = 0] = 3^{-n}$. Thus, we require an exponential number of randomly drawn measurement settings compared to rightly choosing $Q = O$, instead. Randomly drawn classical shadows perform poorly as they completely disregard any structure in the target observables. The method of derandomization aims to rectify this in a greedy approach: for each next allocation, the expected inconfidence bound is calculated and the Pauli operator is picked that bears the lowest bound. It has the advantage that it provably achieves a lower inconfidence bound than selecting the measurement basis uniformly at random. However, it enforces a fixed qubit ordering and it is unclear how much different permutations affect the performance. In general, the disadvantage for any greedy algorithm is that optimal performance is not guaranteed and furthermore not probable.

C. Proof of Theorem 3 and Corollary 4

In order to proof the theorem, we have to first take a step back and proof Theorem 7 and Corollary 8, subsequently. Afterwards, we make the connection to Theorem 3 and Corollary 4. However, we first need two helpful observations. The first theorem is proven in Ref. [44, Theorem 11] and Ref. [45, Chapter 6]. We use a slightly weaker instantiation:

Theorem 9 (Variance bound for real-valued martingales). *Let X_0, \dots, X_N be arbitrary B -valued random variables, s.t. $X_i \in L^2(B)$. Set $\mathbf{X}_i = \{X_1, \dots, X_i\}$, $\mathbf{X}_0 = \emptyset$. Let $Z_0 = 0$ and let Z_1, \dots, Z_N be a sequence of real-valued random variables. Assume the martingale condition*

$$\mathbb{E}[Z_i \mid \mathbf{X}_{i-1}] = Z_{i-1} \quad (\text{S7})$$

holds for $i = 1, \dots, N$. Assume further that the martingale difference sequence $D_i = Z_i - Z_{i-1}$ respects

$$|D_i| \leq c_i, \quad |\mathbb{E}[D_i^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_{i-1}]| \leq \sigma_i^2. \quad (\text{S8})$$

Then, with $V = \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^2$,

$$\mathbb{P}[Z_N > t] \leq \exp\left(-\frac{t^2}{4V}\right) \quad (\text{S9})$$

for any $t \leq 2V/(\max_i c_i)$.

In addition, we also make use of the following lemma, proven in Ref. [45, Lemma 6.16], see also Ref. [60]:

Lemma 10. *Let X_1, \dots, X_N be independent B -valued random variables. Let D_i as defined in Eq. (S13). Then, almost surely for every $i \leq N$,*

$$|D_i| \leq \|X_i\|_B + \mathbb{E}[\|X_i\|_B]. \quad (\text{S10})$$

Furthermore, if the X_i are in $L^2(B)$ we also have

$$\mathbb{E}[D_i^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_{i-1}] \leq \mathbb{E}[\|X_i\|_B^2]. \quad (\text{S11})$$

With this, we are ready for the proof.

Proof of Theorem 7. We inherit its concentration inequality from the variance bound of martingales, Theorem 9. As our proof follows the one given in Ref. [44], we leave out analogous calculations and only present our contribution to the proof. In summary, we approximate the zero-mean random variable $\|S\|_B - \mathbb{E}[\|S\|_B]$ (recall that $S := \sum_i X_i$.) by the martingale

$$Z_i = \mathbb{E}[\|S\|_B \mid \mathbf{X}_i] - \mathbb{E}[\|S\|_B], \quad (\text{S12})$$

where $\mathbf{X}_i := \{X_1, \dots, X_i\}$. As suggested by Theorem 9, we define

$$D_i = Z_i - Z_{i-1} = \mathbb{E}[\|S\|_B \mid \mathbf{X}_i] - \mathbb{E}[\|S\|_B \mid \mathbf{X}_{i-1}]. \quad (\text{S13})$$

Then, Lemma 10 asserts that

$$\begin{aligned} |D_i| &\leq 2 \max \|X_i\|_B =: c_i \\ \mathbb{E}[D_i^2 \mid \mathbf{X}_{i-1}] &\leq \mathbb{E}[\|X_i\|_B^2] =: \sigma_i^2. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S14})$$

Our contribution now consists of finding an upper bound to the expectation value $\mathbb{E}[\|S\|_B]$. Using first the triangle inequality and then Jensen's inequality for $\mathbb{E}[Z] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[Z^2]}$, we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|S\|_B] &\leq \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\|X_i\|_B] \leq \sum_{i=1}^N \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|X_i\|_B^2]} \\ &\equiv \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i =: \sqrt{V_B}. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S15})$$

Finally, inserting Eq. (S12) into Theorem 9 and shifting $\mathbb{E}[\|S\|_B]$ over yields Theorem 7. \square

Up to now, we have not restricted ourselves on any particular choice of Banach space B . However, for certain choices of Banach spaces, we can tighten the upper bound on $\mathbb{E}[\|S\|_B]$ further. This is encapsulated by Corollary 8, which we prove in the following.

Proof of Corollary 8. Let $1 \leq p < \infty$ for now. We define the space $L^p(B)$ the space of all B -valued random variables X such that

$$\mathbb{E}\|X\|^p = \int \|X\|_B^p d\mathbb{P} < \infty. \quad (\text{S16})$$

The spaces $L^p(B)$ are indeed Banach spaces again with the norm $\|\cdot\|_{L^p}$ defined as

$$\|X\|_{L^p} = (\mathbb{E}[\|X\|_B^p])^{1/p}. \quad (\text{S17})$$

For $B = L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)$, the vector space of d -dimensional real vectors equipped with the standard 2-norm, we can invoke Pythagoras' theorem due to the independence. Together with the zero-mean property of the X_i (as assumed) we arrive at

$$\mathbb{E}[\|S\|_{\ell_2}^2] = \sum_{i=1}^N \mathbb{E}[\|X_i\|_{\ell_2}^2] = \sum_{i=1}^N \sigma_i^2 \equiv V \quad (\text{S18})$$

$$\Rightarrow \mathbb{E}[\|S\|_{\ell_2}] \leq \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|S\|_{\ell_2}^2]} = \sqrt{V} \leq \sqrt{V_B}, \quad (\text{S19})$$

using Jensen's inequality again and the sub-additivity of the square root in the last step. This improvement also holds for $B = L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)$ with $p \in [1, 2]$ as

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|S\|_{\ell_p}] &= \|S\|_{L^p(\mathbb{R}^d)} \leq \|S\|_{L^2(\mathbb{R}^d)} \\ &= \sqrt{\mathbb{E}[\|S\|_{\ell_2}^2]} = \sqrt{V} \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S20})$$

where the norm relation stems from Lyupanov's inequality [61, Theorem 3.11.6]. \square

Finally, we have all the tools required to prove our main result:

Proof of Theorem 3. We will apply Corollary 8 to random vectors $X_k := \mathbf{v}_k$ in \mathbb{R}^M whose construction we explain below. Setting $V = \sigma^2 \geq \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_{\ell_p}^2$ and $B \geq \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_{\ell_p}$, Eq. (16) asserts to

$$\mathbb{P} \left(\left\| \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbf{v}_k \right\|_{\ell_p} \geq \epsilon \right) \leq \exp \left(-\frac{1}{4} \left[\frac{\epsilon}{\sigma} - 1 \right]^2 \right), \quad (\text{S21})$$

where $0 \leq \epsilon \leq \sigma^2/B + \sigma^2$. We now construct the random vectors as follows. Assume a list of N measurement settings $\mathbf{Q} \in (\mathcal{P}^n)^N$ such that it contains $N_i(\mathbf{Q}) > 0$ compatible settings for each target observable $O^{(i)}$. In principle, this allows us to construct the k -th random vector \mathbf{v}_k such that it contains a non-trivial entry for the i -th observable if it is compatible with the k -th measurement setting and zero otherwise. However, as we want to make statements about the summation of all the random vectors, the positions of the zero-entries do not matter and we can shift them around as we like. In particular, we move all zero entries to the last random vectors in the sequence. This way, we typically obtain a sequence of random vectors with non-zero entries early on and with mostly zero-entries at the end of the sequence. We shall see that the appending of zero-entries does not alter the statement of Theorem 3. With this construction, we can still make use of correlated samples since entries of random vectors do not need to be independent of each other. The independence between random vectors, however, is kept as each of the N measurement rounds is independent of the others. Having this construction idea in mind, each entry of the random vectors consists of the difference of the sampled value from the actual (but unknown) expectation value of the target observable, weighted by the corresponding factor h_i from the decomposition (2). Furthermore, we down-weight its importance by N_i to turn the summation over the vectors into an empirical mean. Since we do not typically measure each observable equally often, we let k run up to N and append $N - N_i$ many zero values for the components of the \mathbf{v}_k such that we obtain N vectors \mathbf{v}_k with M entries each. Let $\hat{o}_k^{(j)}$ denote the k -th sample for the j -th target observable $O^{(j)}$ and $o^{(j)}$ again its mean value. The definition, thus, reads as

$$\mathbf{v}_k := \left(\frac{h_j}{N_j} \left(\hat{o}_k^{(j)} - o^{(j)} \right) [k \leq N_j] \right)_{j=1}^M. \quad (\text{S22})$$

Here, $[\cdot]$ denotes the Iverson bracket that asserts to 1 for a true argument and 0 else. The \mathbf{v}_k has zero mean by construction. We upper bound its norm by the fact that $\text{spec}(O^{(j)}) \subseteq [-1, 1] \forall j$ as we deal with tensor products of Pauli observables. We can also drop the Iverson bracket because it can only decrease the actual value of the norm.

We arrive at

$$\begin{aligned} \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_{\ell_1} &= \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{|h_j|}{N_j} \left| \hat{o}_k^{(j)} - o^{(j)} \right| [k \leq N_j] \\ &\leq 2 \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{|h_j|}{N_j} = 2 \|\mathbf{h}''\|_{\ell_1} =: B \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S23})$$

with $h_j'' = h_j/N_j$. A similar trick is done for the expectation value of its square, i.e.,

$$\begin{aligned} \mathbb{E}[\|\mathbf{v}_k\|_{\ell_1}^2] &\leq \mathbb{E} \left[\left(2 \sum_{j=1}^M \frac{|h_j|}{N_j} [k \leq N_j] \right)^2 \right] \\ &= 4 \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \frac{|h_j|}{N_j} [k \leq N_j] \right)^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S24})$$

in order to drop the expectation altogether. With this, we proceed by calculating a bound σ^2 on the expected sample variance as

$$\begin{aligned} &\sum_{k=1}^N \mathbb{E} \|\mathbf{v}_k\|_{\ell_1}^2 \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^M \frac{|h_i h_j|}{N_i N_j} \sum_{k=1}^N [k \leq N_i] [k \leq N_j] \\ &= 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^M \frac{|h_i h_j|}{N_i N_j} \min(N_i, N_j) \\ &\leq 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^M \frac{|h_i h_j|}{N_i N_j} \sqrt{N_i N_j} = 4 \sum_{i,j=1}^M \frac{|h_i h_j|}{\sqrt{N_i N_j}} \\ &= 4 \|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1}^2 =: \sigma^2, \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S25})$$

where we have first used Eq. (S24), then summed over k . The second inequality arises from the fact that $\min(a, b) \leq \sqrt{ab}$ for any non-negative real numbers a, b . Lastly, we have defined $(h')_j = h_j/\sqrt{N_j}$. The notation has been chosen such that each apostrophe to \mathbf{h} indicates element-wise division by $(\sqrt{N_i})_i$.

For the sake of readability and clarity, we introduce

$$\text{MEAN}(O)_{\mathcal{S}} := \frac{1}{|\mathcal{S}|} \sum_{i=1}^{|\mathcal{S}|} \hat{o}_i, \quad (\text{S26})$$

where the sum runs over the outcomes of the measurement settings \mathcal{S} (with $S_i \in \mathbf{Q}$) that are compatible with O . This way, we reformulate the mean sample vector as

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=1}^N \mathbf{v}_k &= \left(\sum_{j=1}^M \frac{h_j}{N_j} \left(\hat{o}_k^{(j)} - o^{(j)} \right) \right)_j \\ &= \left(h_j \left[\text{MEAN}_{\mathcal{S}_j}(O^{(j)}) - o^{(j)} \right] \right)_j. \end{aligned} \quad (\text{S27})$$

This relates to the absolute energy estimation error as

$$\begin{aligned}
|\hat{E} - E| &= \left| \sum_{j=1}^M h_j \left[\text{MEAN}_{\mathcal{S}_j}(O^{(j)}) - o^{(j)} \right] \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{j=1}^M \left| h_j \left[\text{MEAN}_{\mathcal{S}_j}(O^{(j)}) - o^{(j)} \right] \right| \quad (\text{S28}) \\
&= \left\| \sum_k \mathbf{v}_k \right\|_{\ell_1}.
\end{aligned}$$

The first inequality step is the general triangle inequality for real numbers and the last step follows by evaluating the 1-norm of Eq. (S27). Putting Eqs. (S22), (S23) and (S25) into Corollary 8 and, furthermore, using Eq. (S28), we have proven Eq. (4). \square

As the last step, we use Theorem 3 and the definition in Eq. (6) to conclude with Corollary 4.

Proof of Corollary 4. Let $\delta \in (0, 1/2)$. First, we deduce Eq. (5) from Eq. (4). We set the right-hand side of the latter equal to the given δ . Solving for ϵ yields

$$\epsilon = \alpha_\delta \|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1} \quad (\text{S29})$$

with α_δ from Eq. (6). Using the observation (the claim can be, e.g., derived by taking the derivative on both sides) that

$$\frac{3}{2}x^2 \geq x + \frac{1}{2} \quad \forall x \geq 1. \quad (\text{S30})$$

yields $\alpha_\delta \leq 6 \log(1/\delta)$, hence Eq. (5). Now, we compare this statistical error with the systematic error that is introduced by Eq. (6). Assume we leave out the i -th term in the grouped empirical mean estimator (3) by setting $\hat{o}^{(i)} = 0$. This introduces a symmetric *systematical* error of at most $\epsilon_{\text{sys}}^{(i)} = |h_i|$, see Eq. (12). Let I_{sys} be the index set of omitted terms and I_{stat} the index set of measured observables. Both sets are disjoint and their union yields the index set $[M]$. We write, using first the triangle inequality and then Eq. (S29),

$$\begin{aligned}
|E - \hat{E}| &\leq \sum_{i=1}^M \left| h_i \left(\hat{o}^{(i)} - o^{(i)} \right) \right| \\
&\leq \sum_{i \in I_{\text{stat}}} \frac{\alpha_\delta}{\sqrt{N_i}} |h_i| + \sum_{i \in I_{\text{sys}}} |h_i| \quad (\text{S31}) \\
&:= \epsilon_{\text{stat}} + \epsilon_{\text{sys}}
\end{aligned}$$

with probability $1 - \delta$. This readily provides us with a criterion whether the error for the i -th term should be estimated by statistical or statistical means, i.e., whether it should be measured or simply set to zero: for each term in the decomposition, we simply compare whether the total sum is large when sorting the corresponding index either into I_{stat} or I_{sys} . Comparing the corresponding entries in the two summations above, we arrive at Corollary 4. \square

D. Proof of Proposition 5

We prove the proposition by first stating a more general problem that translates the optimization over a finite set (here, the measurement settings) to the minimization of a target function. Subsequently, we show that this problem is NP-complete in the number of qubits n which even holds true for a single measurement setting. This is done by relating the problem to the problem of MIN-GROUPING, i.e., grouping a given collection of Pauli observables into the smallest number of partitions with overlap which is NP-hard in the number of qubits [40] and to CLIQUE, i.e., finding the largest clique in a graph [62]. Proposition 5 then follows as a corollary.

To define the problem setting, we recall what makes a Pauli string compatible with a measurement setting. The concept of compatibility, Definition 2, is crucial for minimizing the right-hand side of Eq. (4). We define the minimization problem as follows.

Problem 11 (BEST-ALLOCATION-SET). *Fix a compatibility indicator, either $g = \mathcal{C}$ or $g = \mathcal{C}_{\text{QWC}}$ and a family of convex and strictly monotonously decreasing functions $f_\alpha : \mathbb{R}_+ \rightarrow \mathbb{R}_+$ with $\lim_{x \rightarrow \infty} f_\alpha(x) = 0$, parametrized by $\alpha > 0$ such that $f_\alpha(0) > 0$ for all $\alpha > 0$ and $f_\alpha(x) < f_\beta(x)$ for all $x > 0$ and $\alpha < \beta$ which can be evaluated in polynomial time. Assume that α controls the curvature of f_α , i.e., $f_\alpha(1) = L_\alpha f_\alpha(0)$ with constant $L_\alpha < 1$ that can be made arbitrarily small by increasing either α or $1/\alpha$.*

Input:

1. A set of weighted Pauli strings $\mathcal{O} = \{(O^{(i)}, h_i)\}_{i \in [M]}$ (comprising a Hamiltonian (2))
2. Measurement budget N

Output:

$$\mathcal{Q}_{\text{opt}} := \arg \min_{\mathcal{Q} \in (\mathcal{P}^n)^N} \sum_{i=1}^M f_{|h_i|}(N_i(\mathcal{Q})), \quad (\text{S32})$$

where $N_i(\mathcal{Q}) = \sum_{j=1}^N g(O^{(i)}, \mathcal{Q}_j)$. The corresponding decision version of the problem is to decide for a threshold value $t \in \mathbb{R}$ as an additional input whether or not the optimal value is $\sum_{i=1}^M f_{|h_i|}(N_i(\mathcal{Q}_{\text{opt}})) \leq t$.

The minimization of the right-hand side of Eq. (4) is one of the instantiations of Problem 11. The function family f_α is derived in more detail in Section IV C – in essence, we ensure that the right-hand side of Eq. (S32) is nothing but $\|\mathbf{h}'\|_{\ell_1}$ from Eq. (4). However, this problem class potentially includes other tail bounds as long as they decrease strictly monotonously with each of the N_i and are convex (see also Section IV D for another tight tail bound which is less tight). Now, we prove that BEST-ALLOCATION-SET is NP-hard in the number of qubits n . To this end, we find a polynomial time many-one reduction from the NP-hard MIN-GROUPING [40] to BEST-ALLOCATION-SET in the following.

Proposition 12. *Problem 11 is*

- a) NP-complete.
b) NP-complete, even when restricted to $N = 1$.

Proof. The decision version of BEST-ALLOCATION-SET is in NP: given any $\mathcal{Q} \in (\mathcal{P}^n)^N$, we can efficiently calculate the argument of the right-hand side of Eq. (S32) (because the $f_{|h_i|}$ can be evaluated in polynomial time) and compare it to the threshold value $t \in \mathbb{R}$.

BEST-ALLOCATION-SET is also NP-hard (Proposition 12a) since we can find a polynomial time many-one reduction from MIN-GROUPING: We are given a collection of Pauli observables $\{O^{(i)}\}_{i \in [M]}$ and a threshold value $\eta \in \mathbb{N}$ for the number of groups. We now construct the corresponding weights by inspecting the functions f_α . The key idea is to choose the weights in such a way that the minimization of the target function (S32) requires each observable to have at least one compatible measurement. Let $\Delta_\alpha(x) = f_\alpha(x+1) - f_\alpha(x)$ be the slope of the secant between x and $x+1$. Because of convexity and monotony, we have that $\Delta_\alpha(0)/\Delta_\alpha(1) > 0$. Moreover, we have that $\Delta_\alpha(1) \leq f_\alpha(1) = L_\alpha$ as f_α is non-negative. Thus,

$$\frac{\Delta_\alpha(0)}{\Delta_\alpha(1)} \geq \frac{\Delta_\alpha(0)}{L_\alpha f_\alpha(1)} = \frac{1 - L_\alpha}{L_\alpha} = \frac{1}{L_\alpha} - 1, \quad (\text{S33})$$

and there exists a constant γ such that $\Delta_\gamma(0) > M\Delta_\gamma(1)$. We use this constant to provide the set of weighted Pauli strings $\mathcal{O} = \{(O^{(i)}, \gamma)\}_{i \in [M]}$. Finally, set $N = \eta$. Let $\mathcal{Q}^* = \{Q_i \in \mathcal{P}^n\}_{i=1}^N$ be an optimal solution of BEST-ALLOCATION-SET. Dropping duplicates (with a worst-case time complexity of $O(N^2)$) provides measurement settings $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{filt.}} \subset (\mathcal{P}^n)^k$ with $k \leq \eta$. Now we explain that this ‘filtered version’ of \mathcal{Q} exactly contains the optimal solution of MIN-GROUPING. To see this, we go through each $Q \in \mathcal{Q}_{\text{filt.}}$ and through each $(O, w) \in \mathcal{O}$ and append O to the group belonging to Q if $g(Q, O) = \text{true}$. Due to the choice of γ , we can obtain YES-instances of MIN-GROUPING of threshold η from YES-instances of BEST-ALLOCATION-SET with threshold $Mf_\gamma(1)$.

Now, we fix $N = 1$ beforehand and show NP-hardness (Proposition 12b) by a reduction from CLIQUE with

threshold $\nu \in \mathbb{N}$, the size of the clique [62]. Given a graph $G(V, E)$, we employ the polynomial time reduction of Ref. [40, Algorithm 2] in order to obtain $M = |V|$ n -qubit observables where $n = M(M-1)/2 - |E|$. We turn these observables into a Hamiltonian with the same γ as above. Then, BEST-ALLOCATION-SET given a threshold of $(M - \nu)f_\gamma(0) + \nu f_\gamma(1)$ delivers the solution to CLIQUE. \square

Finally, we show that Proposition 5 is just an instantiation of Problem 11. We formalize and prove this in the following.

Corollary 13. *Consider a Hamiltonian (2), state ρ and an estimator \hat{E} (3) of $E = \text{Tr}[\rho H]$ and a measurement budget $N \geq 1$. Fix a compatibility indicator, either $g = \mathcal{C}$ or $g = \mathcal{C}_{\text{QWC}}$. Choose an $\epsilon > 0$ and pick one of the tail bounds from Table II for $|\hat{E} - E| \geq \epsilon$. Then, finding the measurement settings $\mathcal{Q}_{\text{opt}} \in (\mathcal{P}^n)^N$ that yields the smallest upper bound to $\mathbb{P}[|\hat{E} - E| \geq \epsilon]$ is*
a) NP-complete in the number of qubits n ,
b) NP-complete, even when $N = 1$.

Proof. We now check that we fulfill the requirements for Problem 11. To this end, we check that the minimization of either of the two tail bounds of Table II can be cast as Eq. (S32). The energy estimation inconfidence bound (4) is minimized if and only if $\sum_i |h_i|/\sqrt{N_i(\mathcal{Q})}$ is minimized, see Section IV C. This implies to choose $f_\alpha(x) = \alpha/\sqrt{x}$ for $x \geq 1$, fulfilling the requirements. As noted in Section IV C, the case for $x = 0$ is ill-defined. Since $N_i(\mathcal{Q}) \in \{0, 1, \dots, N\}$, we can set $f_\alpha(0) := \alpha^2(1 - 1/\sqrt{2}) + \alpha$ and interpolate between 0 and 1 with a second-degree polynomial (with coefficients being polynomials of α such that f_α is differentiable at $x = 1$). One can check that $\Delta_\alpha(0) \geq \alpha\Delta_\alpha(1)$, i.e., it is easy to select $\gamma > M$ to finish the claim for this tail bound.

For the other tail bound, see e.g. Eq. (28), we can readily select $f_\alpha(x) = \exp(-x/\alpha)$ which already fulfills all requirements from Problem 11. In this case, we have $\Delta_\alpha(0) \geq \exp(1/\alpha)\Delta_\alpha(1)$, i.e., selecting $\gamma < 1/\log(M)$ finishes the claim for the other tail bound. \square