

Improved Quantum Algorithms for Eigenvalues Finding and Gradient Descent

Nhat A. Nghiem^{1,*} and Tzu-Chieh Wei^{1,2}

¹*Department of Physics and Astronomy, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3800, USA*

²*C. N. Yang Institute for Theoretical Physics, State University of New York at Stony Brook, Stony Brook, NY 11794-3840, USA*

Block encoding is a key ingredient in the recently developed quantum signal processing that forms a unifying framework for quantum algorithms. Initially showcased for simplifying and optimizing resource utilization in several problems, such as searching, amplitude estimation, and Hamiltonian simulation, the capabilities of the quantum signal processing go beyond these and likely offer untapped potential for devising new quantum algorithms. In this article, we utilize block encoding to substantially enhance two previously proposed quantum algorithms: largest eigenvalue estimation and quantum gradient descent. Unlike previous works that involve sophisticated procedures, our findings, using the unitary block encoding, demonstrate that even with elementary operations, these newly revamped algorithms can shed major scaling factors present in their original counterparts. This yields much more efficient quantum algorithms capable of tackling complex computational problems with remarkable efficiency. Furthermore, we show how to extend our proposed method to different contexts, including matrix inversion and multiple eigenvalues estimation.

I. INTRODUCTION

Quantum computing is currently experiencing rapid and exciting advancements due to its immense potential to tackle complex computational problems that often elude classical computing capability, as well as tremendous progress in quantum devices. There has been development of many quantum algorithms, a few of them exhibiting substantial speedup against known classical ones. For example, Grover's search algorithm [1] demonstrated a quadratic speedup compared to the most efficient classical counterpart. On the other hand, Shor's algorithm [2] and a recently improvement by Regev [3] showcase superpolynomial speedup in the integer factorization. Notably, a series of pivotal contributions [4–8] yielded quantum algorithms for simulating the dynamics of quantum systems, which is also a critical and highly impactful application of quantum computing in the physics domain. Moreover, some recent works have demonstrated the unprecedented potential of quantum computing in machine learning and artificial intelligence [9–15], which is arguably one of the major focuses in industry.

Among many quantum algorithmic breakthroughs, the Harrow-Hassidim-Lloyd (HHL) algorithm [16] provides an exponential speedup for solving linear systems. This landmark achievement has opened up new horizons in quantum computing, given the foundational role that linear systems play across a wide array of engineering, theoretical, and applied scientific domains. In fact, various subsequent quantum algorithms have been built upon the framework of the HHL algorithm to tackle diverse computational challenges. Notable examples include quantum data fitting [17], accurate estimation of electromagnetic cross sections [18], creation of support vector machines for classification tasks [19], and solving linear and non-linear partial differential equations [20–22].

As the potential of quantum computers continues to unfold, exploring domains where quantum advantage can make a transformative impact is both natural and increasingly imperative. This quest to enhance the frontiers of computing is driven by the growing demand to harness the power of quantum advancements and unlock novel possibilities.

In the above, we have described various quantum algorithms, each tailored to address specific computational challenges. These algorithms exhibit unique execution patterns, aligning with their distinct problem-solving objectives. However, a recent groundbreaking advancement has shed new light on the field. Referred to as “quantum singular-value transformation” [23, 24] (QSVT), this innovative framework has revealed a *unifying* approach that transcends the individual differences among various quantum algorithms. It is worth noting that this concept can also be likened to “quantum signal processing” [25], as a nearly simultaneous development occurred when the authors of [25] proposed a simple yet remarkably powerful technique. Essentially, the underlying power of such a framework features two things. First, one encodes some matrix of interest into a unitary, i.e., the so-called unitary block encoding (see definition 1 below). Second, one utilizes single and multi-qubit gates (e.g., the Toffoli gate) to transform such a block-encoded matrix to our desire. This approach, for instance, has constructed provably optimal quantum simulation algorithms [25, 26]. Over time, the QSVT framework has undergone multifaceted extensions, including the works of [27–31], and it underscores the dynamic nature of quantum algorithmic research and its capacity for far-reaching impact.

* nhatanh.nghiemvu@stonybrook.edu

Our work here aims to exploit the unitary block encoding technique to significantly improve two quantum algorithms. The first algorithm addresses the estimation of the largest eigenvalue of a given matrix A through an oracle access [32]. The second algorithm, as outlined in [19], tackles the challenge of the gradient descent for a multi-valued input function f , aiming to identify the vector at which f is minimized. Both these original quantum algorithms boast logarithmic time complexity concerning the input dimension n . However, they suffer from expensive resource scaling in relation to different factors. The primary bottleneck for both algorithms results from the necessity to obtain a series of desired states via complicated quantum operations plus measurements, inevitably resulting in major time growth as the function of error tolerance and iteration count accumulate.

Interestingly, as an example, while the work in [31] necessitates a complex algorithmic procedure plus delicate analysis for an enhanced quantum algorithm, our findings demonstrate that even elementary operations utilizing the unitary block encoding technique can suffice. These operations enable the removal of the exponential factor present in the original versions of the algorithms [19, 32], as we will illustrate in subsequent sections.

The remaining structure of our work is as follows. In section III, we begin with a brief review of the problem of interest, i.e., estimating the largest eigenvalue of a given matrix A . We summarized the previous solution [32] as well as its running time. We then proceed to describe our improved quantum algorithm. A comparison is then made to see the superiority of the improved version, which is a consequence of the unitary block encoding framework. In the next section IV, we tackle the (quantum) gradient descent problem [19]. The same structure holds, where we first begin with a revision of the main problem and its solution of the original quantum algorithm [19]. We then proceed to outline our improved version, which consists of two perspectives, followed up with a comparison to the original work. In Sec. V, we conclude our work with further comments and discuss how our methods can be extended to solve different kinds of problems.

As a summary, we point out the key improvements of our work in the following bullet points. Technical details are provided in subsequent discussions.

- **Improved quantum power method:** The running time of the quantum power method outlined in [32] has a scaling factor of $\mathcal{O}(\kappa^k)$, where κ is the conditional number of given matrix and k is the number of iteration steps. The bottleneck of this approach, e.g., the exponential growth on k , results from the requirement to obtain some desired state by measurements, which incur some finite probability of failure at each round. Our proposed method here removes such an exponential scaling and, in turn, provides an efficient algorithm with $\mathcal{O}(k)$ dependence. Therefore, with respect to k , our new version achieves exponential speedup relative to the previous one [32]. In particular, by using a new quantum matrix multiplication tool based on unitary block encoding, our algorithm removes the running time dependence on κ and improves the scaling dependence over error tolerance ϵ .

- **Alternative quantum gradient descent:** In this part, we introduce two versions. The first version is more or less an indirect improvement to the original work in [19], and we make an adjustment to the input and output of the quantum Newton method. Roughly speaking, instead of working with vectors \vec{x} (pure states in the context of [19]), we work with density operators $\vec{x}\vec{x}^T$. By recasting this way, our algorithm, once begins with an initial guessed operator $x_0x_0^T$, allows a simple iterative procedure that leads to the final operator $x_Tx_T^T$ that corresponds to the final solution vector of the Newton method for a total of T iterations (note T in the subscript of x). While the representation of such a solution in terms of a density matrix is not typical (as opposed to most quantum algorithms, the output is a pure state), any information of x_T could be extracted from $x_Tx_T^T$ using the QSVP technique. This approach admits highly efficient scaling resource on error tolerance ϵ , which is polylogarithmic. On the contrary, the original work [19] has time scaling dependence being polynomial in $1/\epsilon$. Subsequently, we point out how the same idea (of this version) can be applied to the problem of finding the inverse of a matrix.

- **Improved quantum gradient descent:** In this second version, we make a direct improvement on the original algorithm proposed in Ref. [19]. The key step in the quantum gradient descent method [19] is, by taking multiple copies of a quantum state, denoted as $|x_t\rangle$ (where t refers to t -th iteration step), to produce an updated state $|x_{t+1}\rangle$. For such a single step in the gradient descent method, our algorithm requires a power-of-three fewer number of copies of the given state at step t . Furthermore, the time complexity of our approach has a power-of-four advantage compared to that of Ref. [19] with respect to the error tolerance ϵ .

II. PRELIMINARIES

Here, we summarize the key recipes used in our subsequently described quantum algorithms. We keep the statements here concise and precise, with their proofs/constructions referred to the original works or the appendices of this paper.

Readers familiar with these results can skip this section. Throughout the work, we use $\|\cdot\|$ to denote the matrix/vector norm, $|\cdot|$ to denote the absolute value of numbers.

Definition 1 (Block Encoding Unitary) [23, 25, 26] Let A be some Hermitian matrix of size $N \times N$ whose matrix norm $|A| < 1$. Let a unitary U have the following form:

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} A & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix}.$$

Then U is said to be an exact block encoding of matrix A . Equivalently, we can write:

$$U = |\mathbf{0}\rangle \langle \mathbf{0}| \otimes A + \dots$$

where $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ simply denotes the extra ancilla system. In the case where the U has the form

$$U = |\mathbf{0}\rangle \langle \mathbf{0}| \otimes \tilde{A} + \dots,$$

where $\|\tilde{A} - A\| \leq \epsilon$, then U is said to be an ϵ -approximated block encoding of A .

Lemma 1 ([23]) Let $\rho = \text{Tr}_A |\Phi\rangle \langle \Phi|$, where $|\Phi\rangle \in \mathbb{H}_A \otimes \mathbb{H}_B$, and thus ρ is a density matrix that acts on states in \mathbb{H}_B . Given a unitary U that generates $|\Phi\rangle$ from $|\mathbf{0}\rangle_A \otimes |\mathbf{0}\rangle_B$, then there exists a procedure that constructs an exact unitary block encoding of ρ in complexity $\mathcal{O}(T_U + \log(n))$, where n is the dimension of \mathbb{H}_B .

The proof of the above lemma is given in [23] (see their Lemma 45).

Lemma 2 (Block Encoding of Product of Two Matrices) Given the unitary block encoding of two matrices A_1 and A_2 , an efficient procedure exists that constructs a unitary block encoding of $A_1 A_2$.

The proof of the above lemma is given in appendix A.

Lemma 3 ([33]) Given the unitary block encoding $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^m$ of multiple operators $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^m$ (assumed to be exact encoding), then there is a procedure that produces the unitary block encoding operator of $\bigotimes_{i=1}^m M_i$, which requires a single use of each $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ SWAP gates.

The above lemma is a result from [33].

Lemma 4 Given oracle access to an s -sparse matrix A of dimension $n \times n$, then an ϵ -approximated unitary block encoding of A/s could be prepared with gate/time complexity $\mathcal{O}(\log n + \log^{2.5}(\frac{1}{\epsilon}))$.

This is a standard result from previous works [23, 25, 26]. In fact, the optimal Hamiltonian simulation algorithm outlined in [25, 26] essentially makes use of the oracle access to entries of a given Hamiltonian H to construct the unitary block encoding of H , followed by a series of transformations on such blocks to approximate the desired operator, i.e., $\exp(-iHt)$.

III. IMPROVING EIGENVALUES ESTIMATION

In this section, we consider the following

Problem: Given an oracle access to entries of a Hermitian, s -sparse matrix A of dimension $n \times n$, whose eigenvalues' norm has known bounds, we estimate its largest eigenvalue (in magnitude) λ_{max} up to an additive error δ .

In [32], the authors propose a quantum algorithm for the above problem based upon the classical power method, which relies on an iterative multiplication of matrix A to some initial random vector. A further assumption on matrix A is that its eigenvalues' norms are within a fixed range, e.g., $(1/\kappa, 1)$, which is always achievable by a trivial scaling. While the method in [32] is simple, its running time grows exponentially with respect to the number of iterations k in the power method. Here, we aim to reduce such an exponential scaling based on the unitary block encoding

technique recently proposed [23, 25].

We first remind readers of some key ideas from the classical power method and its quantum counterpart [32]. The method begins with some random unit vector x_0 , or equivalently a quantum state $|x_0\rangle$ (subsequently, we will use these two notations interchangeably). Upon being acted by matrix A for k times, we obtain a vector $x_k = A^k |x_0\rangle$. Let $|x_k\rangle$ denote the (normalized) quantum state corresponding to x_k , whose difference is essentially a normalization. The quantity that we wish to compute is:

$$\lambda = \langle x_k | A | x_k \rangle, \quad (1)$$

which is an approximation to the true maximum eigenvalue λ_{max} . The accuracy apparently depends on the number of iteration k . Ideally, λ should approach λ_{max} as $k \rightarrow \infty$. In what follows, we treat k as a parameter and aim to outline a quantum algorithm that has highly efficient running time with respect to k . In order to obtain $|x_k\rangle$, the algorithm in [32] used results from [17] to perform the so-called quantum matrix multiplication. We quote Lemma 3 from [32]:

Lemma 5 *Given access to entries of A , assumed to have the norm of eigenvalues in the range $(1/\kappa, 1)$, the following unitary action can be (approximately) achieved:*

$$U_{A^k} |0\rangle |x_0\rangle = |0\rangle A^k |x_0\rangle + |1\rangle |Garbage\rangle, \quad (2)$$

with a running time:

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log(n)s\kappa}{\epsilon} + \log(k)\right),$$

where n, κ , and s are, respectively, the dimension, conditional number and sparsity of A ; ϵ is the error tolerance, i.e., with the actual unitary denoted as \tilde{U}_{A^k} , it holds that $\|\tilde{U}_{A^k} - U_{A^k}\| \leq \epsilon$, where $\|\cdot\|$ denotes the operator norm.

For convenience, we rewrite the state in Eqn 2 as:

$$U_{A^k} |0\rangle |x_0\rangle = \sqrt{p_k} |0\rangle |x_k\rangle + \sqrt{p_G} |1\rangle |Garbage\rangle, \quad (3)$$

where $p_k = \|A^k x_0\|^2$ (where $\|\cdot\|$ here refers to the l_2 -norm of a vector) and $p_G = 1 - p_k$ are, respectively, the probabilities of measuring $|0\rangle$ and $|1\rangle$.

One can easily see that the state $|x_k\rangle$ can be obtained if we perform measurement on the first qubit and post-select the outcome $|0\rangle$. This step is the main bottleneck that leads to the exponential scaling w.r.t. k , as the success probability $p_k = \|A^k x_0\|^2$ grows exponentially small with k (which we will explicitly show later). Once $|x_k\rangle$ is obtained, another round of matrix multiplication based on [17] is enacted to obtain $A|x_k\rangle$ that is entangled in a larger state with an extra ancilla qubit. An additional simple step is the Hadamard test to estimate the overlap $\langle x_k, Ax_k \rangle$, giving rise to our quantity of interest.

What we have described above is the essence of the algorithm in [32] and we recapitulate the running time in [32] for the purpose of subsequent comparison:

Lemma 6 ([32]) *Given oracle access to entries of a Hermitian matrix A and some initial state $|x_0\rangle$, and denoting $x_k = A^k |x_0\rangle$ and $|x_k\rangle$ be its normalized version, then the $\lambda = \langle x_k | A | x_k \rangle$ can be estimated up to an additive error δ in time*

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{\log(n)s\kappa}{\delta} + \log(k)\right) \cdot \frac{\kappa^k}{\delta}\right).$$

We remark that the above quoted Lemma is slightly different from (but is equivalent to) the main result stated in [32], as the parameter k now appears explicitly in the time complexity. In [32], the parameter k was absorbed into the scaling \mathcal{O} , as we will see later that it depends logarithmically on dimension n and the error tolerance δ , and, therefore, it was safe to absorb such dependence to obtain an overall running time. Here, we explicitly write out the k dependence and treat it as a parameter of the algorithm.

The challenge now is evident: *how can we estimate λ by performing as fewer measurements as possible?*

Before working out our main algorithm, we remark that the above matrix multiplication (used in 5) method has been improved in [34] by using ideas from [35] that improved matrix inversion. Here, we point out that unitary block encoding can also provide a highly efficient quantum matrix multiplication. We first show the following lemma:

Lemma 7 *Given oracle access to some s -sparse matrix A , then the following unitary:*

$$U_{A^k} |\mathbf{0}\rangle |x_0\rangle = |\mathbf{0}\rangle \frac{A^k}{s^k} |x_0\rangle + \sum_{j \neq \mathbf{0}} |j\rangle |\text{Garbage}\rangle_j \quad (4)$$

can be realized up to additive accuracy ϵ in time

$$\mathcal{O}\left(k\left(\log(n) + \log^{2.5}\left(\frac{s^k}{\epsilon}\right)\right)\right),$$

where $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ refers to an ancillary system. We note that all $\{| \text{Garbage}\rangle_j\}$ are not properly normalized.

The proof of the above lemma is simple. We use Lemma 4 to obtain an ϵ -approximated block encoding of A/s . Note that due to the error accumulation, we require each block encoding of A/s to have error tolerance ϵ/k . We then use Lemma 2 k times to obtain an ϵ -approximated block encoding of $(A/s)^k$. By using the definition of the block encoding (see Def 1), we have arrived at equation (4).

For convenience, we write the equation (4) as:

$$\begin{aligned} U_{A^k} |\mathbf{0}\rangle |x_0\rangle &= |\mathbf{0}\rangle \frac{A^k}{s^k} |x_0\rangle + \sqrt{p_G} |\text{Garbage}\rangle \\ &= \sqrt{p_k} |\mathbf{0}\rangle |x_k\rangle + \sqrt{p_G} |\text{Garbage}\rangle, \end{aligned} \quad (5)$$

where $x_k = A^k |x_0\rangle$ and $|x_k\rangle$ is the corresponding normalized quantum state, $p_k = |x_k|^2/s^k$ and $p_G = 1 - p_k$. We first mention that if instead of measurement, we trace out the first register (that contains $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$) from Eqn 5, we will obtain the following density matrix:

$$\rho_k = p_k |x_k\rangle \langle x_k| + p_G \sigma_{\text{garbage}},$$

where σ_{garbage} denotes the redundant density state after tracing out the first register. Therefore, we have

$$\text{Tr}(A\rho_k) = p_k \text{Tr}(A|x_k\rangle \langle x_k|) + p_G \text{Tr}(A\sigma_{\text{garbage}}). \quad (6)$$

For simplicity, we denote $\text{Tr}(A\sigma_{\text{garbage}}) = \beta$ and we rewrite the above equation as:

$$\text{Tr}(A\rho_k) = p_k \lambda + p_G \beta. \quad (7)$$

So the central question is how to estimate λ from here. There are four variables in the above equation, including both sides, as $p_k + p_G = 1$. However, $\sqrt{p_k}$ and $\sqrt{p_G}$ are two related amplitudes of the resultant states obtained from some initial state undergoing a unitary transformation U_{A^k} (see Lemma 5). Therefore, they can be estimated using the amplitude estimation method [36, 37], given the unitary U_{A^k} and the initial state. As a result, the number of independent variables reduces to three, i.e., λ , β , and $\text{Tr}(A\rho_k)$.

Below, we describe a procedure that allows us to estimate $\text{Tr}(A\rho_k)$, or more precisely, $\text{Tr}(A\rho_k/s)$, where s is the sparsity of A . This subsequently enables us to estimate λ from solving a linear equation derived from further observables, i.e., $\text{Tr}\left(\frac{M \otimes A \rho_k}{s}\right)$, where M is some 2×2 matrix of our choice; see further detailed discussions below.

A. Estimation of $\text{Tr}(A\rho_k)$

We note that the density matrix ρ_k is obtained by tracing out a subsystem of a state for which we know how to generate, i.e., we have the unitary U_{A^k} in Lemma 5. The following result from [30] allows us to estimate the desired quantity:

Lemma 8 ([30]) *Given the block encoding U of some matrix A (whose norm less than 1) and a unitary U_ρ that satisfies*

$$\rho = \text{Tr}_A(U_\rho |\mathbf{0}\rangle \langle \mathbf{0}|_A U_\rho^\dagger),$$

then the quantity $\text{Tr}(A\rho)$ can be estimated up to an additive error ϵ using a circuit of size

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{T_U + T_\rho}{\epsilon}\right),$$

where T_ρ is the time required to construct U_ρ and T_U is the time required to construct U .

In our context, we have that the oracle access to entries of A can be used to obtain the unitary block encoding of A/s (where s is the sparsity of A), which requires $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ time. Therefore, by virtue of Lemma 8 (plus Eqn. 4), the quantity $\text{Tr}(A\rho_k/s)$ is easily estimated up to accuracy δ in time

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{k(\log(n) + \log^{2.5}(sk/\delta))}{\delta}\right).$$

We remark that we already include the error from the approximated block encoding with the error coming from estimation, which is set to δ for convenience.

B. Estimating λ

From Lemma 7, we have:

$$U_{A^k} |0\rangle |x_0\rangle = \sqrt{p_k} |\mathbf{0}\rangle |x_k\rangle + \sqrt{p_G} |\textit{Garbage}\rangle. \quad (8)$$

We modify the above process by adding an ancilla initialized in $|1\rangle_a$:

$$\mathbb{I} \otimes U_{A^k} |1\rangle_a (|\mathbf{0}\rangle |x_0\rangle) = \sqrt{p_k} |1\rangle_a |\mathbf{0}\rangle |x_k\rangle + \sqrt{p_G} |1\rangle_a |\textit{Garbage}\rangle. \quad (9)$$

Now we use the controlled- X gate, with the second register as the control (conditioned on being $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$), and this transforms the above state to:

$$\sqrt{p_k} |0\rangle_a |\mathbf{0}\rangle |x_k\rangle + \sqrt{p_G} |1\rangle_a |\textit{Garbage}\rangle. \quad (10)$$

If we trace out the second register from the above state, we obtain the following density matrix (note that we have abused the notation, as we already use ρ_k previously; however, it does not create any issue here):

$$\rho_k = p_k |0\rangle_a \langle 0| \otimes |x_k\rangle \langle x_k| + p_G |1\rangle_a \langle 1| \otimes \sigma_{\textit{garbage}}, \quad (11)$$

where again $\sigma_{\textit{garbage}}$ denotes the remaining part of $|\textit{Garbage}\rangle$ after tracing over the second register.

We now observe the following: if instead of A , we have access to $M \otimes A$, where M is some 2×2 matrix acting on the ancilla a , and we compute:

$$\text{Tr}(M \otimes A \cdot \rho_k) = p_k \text{Tr}(M |0\rangle \langle 0|) \text{Tr}(A |x_k\rangle \langle x_k|) + p_G \text{Tr}(M |1\rangle \langle 1|) \text{Tr}(A \sigma_{\textit{garbage}}) \quad (12)$$

$$= p_k \text{Tr}(M |0\rangle \langle 0|) \lambda + p_G \text{Tr}(M |1\rangle \langle 1|) \beta, \quad (13)$$

where we have suppressed the subscript a . From here, we can see that if M has known entries, which means that both $\text{Tr}(M |0\rangle \langle 0|)$ and $\text{Tr}(M |1\rangle \langle 1|)$ are known, and additionally, if we can estimate $\text{Tr}(M \otimes A \cdot \rho_k)$, then, in principle, we can find λ (we will elaborate on this later). In the previous subsection, we have provided a way to estimate $\text{Tr}(A\rho_k/s)$. The story does not change much in this setting, where the quantity of interest is $\text{Tr}(M \otimes A \cdot \rho_k/s)$. The key takeaway is that if one chooses M to be a known matrix, then $M \otimes A$ is simply an embedding of matrix A into a larger matrix. This trick has been used in many scenarios, such as the celebrated quantum linear system solver [16], singular-value decomposition [38], data-fitting [17], etc. The only issue that we may need to deal with is producing the unitary block encoding of $M \otimes A/s$, but this is actually straightforward from Lemma 3, as the unitary block encoding of the chosen M is easy to obtain. As we have mentioned, M could be an arbitrary single-qubit rotational gate with a known angle. Therefore, with the obtained block encoding of $M \otimes A/s$, we can use Lemma 8 to estimate

$$\text{Tr}\left(\frac{M \otimes A\rho_k}{s}\right).$$

Procedure for finding λ :

Let $b_1 \equiv \text{Tr}(A\rho_k)$ in equation 7) and $b_2 \equiv \text{Tr}(M \otimes A \cdot \rho_k)$ in equation (13) (noting the notation ρ_k). We have a linear system:

$$\begin{cases} b_1 = p_k \lambda + p_G \beta, \\ b_2 = p_k \text{Tr}(M |0\rangle \langle 0|) \lambda + p_G \text{Tr}(M |1\rangle \langle 1|) \beta. \end{cases} \quad (14)$$

The solution will not change if we divide both sides by the same factor s ,

$$\begin{cases} b_1/s = (p_k/s)\lambda + (p_G/s)\beta, \\ b_2/s = (p_k/s) \text{Tr}(M|0\rangle\langle 0|)\lambda + (p_G/s) \text{Tr}(M|1\rangle\langle 1|)\beta. \end{cases} \quad (15)$$

Therefore, the above equations form a simple 2×2 linear equation: $A \cdot x = b$, where

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} p_k/s & p_G/s \\ (p_k/s) \text{Tr}(M|0\rangle\langle 0|) & (p_G/s) \text{Tr}(M|1\rangle\langle 1|) \end{pmatrix}, \quad (16)$$

$$x = \begin{pmatrix} \lambda \\ \beta \end{pmatrix}, \quad (17)$$

$$b = \begin{pmatrix} b_1/s \\ b_2/s \end{pmatrix}, \quad (18)$$

which can be easily solved. However, we do not have the ideal case here, as we only know approximately the entries of A and b . By now, we have obtained $p_k, p_G, b_1/(s)$, and $b_2/(s)$ estimated to some accuracy, for example, δ . Therefore, the solution we will obtain after solving the approximated linear equation is clearly only an approximation to the real solution. Fortunately, there is the following elementary result on the numerical linear algebra [39]:

Theorem 1 Consider two linear equations $A_1x_1 = b_1$ and $A_2x_2 = b_2$. If A_1 is non-singular and $\|A_1 - A_2\| \leq 1/\|A_1^{-1}\|$, then the following holds:

$$\frac{\|x_2 - x_1\|}{\|x_1\|} \leq \frac{\kappa}{1 - \kappa\|A_2 - A_1\|/\|A_1\|} \cdot \left(\frac{\|b_2 - b_1\|}{\|b_1\|} + \frac{\|A_2 - A_1\|}{\|A_1\|} \right),$$

where $\|\cdot\|$ refers to any norm measure and κ is the conditional number of A_1 .

Since the above inequality holds for any arbitrary norm measure, we use the l_1 -norm for subsequent discussions. It means that for an arbitrary vector $x = (x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n)$, $\|x\|_1 = \sum_{i=1}^n |x_i|$; and for an arbitrary matrix A of dimension n , $\|A\|_1 = \max_{j=1, \dots, n} \sum_{i=1, \dots, n} |a_{ij}|$. In the following, we drop the subscript 1 and simply use $\|\cdot\|$ for simplicity.

The application of the above result to our case is now straightforward. More specifically, we have to solve the linear system $A'x' = b'$, where the entries of A' and b' are entry-wise δ -approximation to those of A and b in the original ones, respectively. We now calculate the deviation of b :

$$\|b' - b\| = \sum_{i=1}^2 \|b'_i - b_i\| \leq 2\delta. \quad (19)$$

The deviation $\|A' - A\|$ is a bit more tricky to compute since $\|A' - A\|$ depends on the columns. However, it will be easy to see after we write them out explicitly,

$$A' - A = \begin{pmatrix} (p'_k - p_k)/(s) & (p'_G - p_G)/(s) \\ (p'_k - p_k)/(s) \text{Tr}(M|0\rangle\langle 0|) & (p'_G - p_G)/(s) \text{Tr}(M|1\rangle\langle 1|) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (20)$$

Since $|p'_k - p_k| \leq \delta$ (and same thing holds for $|p'_G - p_G|$), $(p'_k - p_k)/(s)$ is clearly upper bounded by δ , as s is greater than 1 and $\delta/s < \delta$. Therefore, the difference in the two matrices is upper bounded by the following,

$$\|A' - A\| \leq \max\{\delta(1 + \text{Tr}(M|0\rangle\langle 0|)), \delta(1 + \text{Tr}(M|1\rangle\langle 1|))\}, \quad (21)$$

which is of order $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$. Let $m = \max\{(1 + \text{Tr}(M|0\rangle\langle 0|)), (1 + \text{Tr}(M|1\rangle\langle 1|))\}$. Therefore, from Thm. 1, we have:

$$\frac{\|x' - x\|}{\|x\|} \leq \frac{\kappa}{1 - \kappa m \delta / \|A\|} \cdot \left(\frac{2\delta}{\|b\|} + \frac{m\delta}{\|A\|} \right). \quad (22)$$

For small δ , we make the first approximation to the denominator:

$$\frac{1}{1 - \kappa m \delta / \|A\|} \approx 1 + \frac{\kappa m \delta}{\|A\|} + \mathcal{O}(\delta^2). \quad (23)$$

which leads to:

$$\frac{\|x' - x\|}{\|x\|} \leq \kappa \left(1 + \frac{\kappa m \delta}{\|A\|}\right) \left(\frac{2}{\|b\|} + \frac{m}{\|A\|}\right) \delta \quad (24)$$

$$= \kappa \left(\frac{2}{\|b\|} + \frac{m}{\|A\|}\right) \delta + \kappa \left(\frac{2}{\|b\|} + \frac{m}{\|A\|}\right) \frac{\kappa m \delta}{\|A\|} \delta \quad (25)$$

$$= \mathcal{O}(\delta), \quad (26)$$

where in the last line, we have retained the result to the first order. Therefore, the above bound suggests that as $\delta \rightarrow 0$, x' will approach x , which is desirable. Since the matrix A depends on the iteration numbers k , one may ask, what if $\|A\|$ grew exponentially small with respect to k ? If so, we would have to require δ to be exponentially small w.r.t. k , necessitating no fewer than exponential scaling resources. However, we now argue that this is not the case by analyzing p_k and p_G .

Recall that $p_k = |A^k x_0|_2^2$, where $|\cdot|_2$ refers to the l_2 norm of a vector. Let $\{\lambda_i, |E_i\rangle\}_{i=1}^n$ denote the spectrum of A , and $x_0 = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i |E_i\rangle$ be the expansion of x_0 in the eigen-basis of A . Then it is clear that $p_k = \sum_{i=1}^n c_i^2 \lambda_i^{2k}$, which means that p_k decreases exponentially with k . At the same time, $p_G = 1 - p_k$; therefore, the exponential decreasing of p_k implies that p_G approaches one exponentially. It means that beginning with some arbitrary value, p_G will become greater than p_k at an exponential pace. Thus, it is very reasonable to conclude that for a sufficiently large value of k , $p_G > p_k$, and, hence,

$$\|A\| = \frac{p_G}{s} + \frac{p_G \text{Tr}(M|1\rangle\langle 1|)}{s}, \quad (27)$$

which is clearly upper bounded (since $p_G \leq 1$) and lower bounded (as p_G approaches 1 quickly). Therefore, $\|A\|$ would not suffer from the exponential decay. However, we remark that there is a factor $1/s$, which means that we need to choose $\delta \rightarrow \delta/s$ to cancel out the sparsity term s , so as to guarantee the error δ .

At this point, we have successfully constructed a new quantum algorithm for estimating λ , which is also an approximation of λ_{max} . We summarize the result in the following theorem:

Theorem 2 (Improved Quantum Power Method) *Given oracle access to entries of a Hermitian matrix A and some initial state $|x_0\rangle$. Let $x_k = A^k |x_0\rangle$ and $|x_k\rangle$ be its normalized quantum state. Then, $\lambda = \langle x_k | A | x_k \rangle$ can be estimated up to accuracy δ in time*

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{ks(\log(n) + \log^{2.5}(sk/\delta))}{\delta}\right).$$

The above running time's dependence on k has a huge implication. As a direct comparison with Lemma 6, the improvement on k is exponential, and we can even see that by incorporating the new quantum matrix application tool, there is also an improvement in error.

To elaborate further on how it really affects the estimation of the largest eigenvalue λ_{max} , we first recall that in the original classical (and quantum) power method, k is the number of iterations for which we apply the given matrix A to some initial seed vector. The value λ is an approximation of the true largest eigenvalue of A , λ_{max} , and the quality of such approximation depends on k . Ref. [40] thoroughly analyzes the classical power method and shows that, in order for λ to be a Δ -multiplicative approximation to λ_{max} , k needs to be as large as

$$\Omega((\log(1/\Delta) + \log \sqrt{n})).$$

The logarithmic dependence on Δ means that the classical power method can estimate λ_{max} with a very modest cost regarding the scaling error in Δ . However, as analyzed in Ref. [32], the quantum power method does not seem to be as effective due to the measurement and post-selection issues.

As we can see that the running time in Thm 2 is highly efficient w.r.t. k , which means that we can make the power method extremely precise at a modest cost. Therefore, if we choose k in Thm 2 that is sufficiently high enough to guarantee the error from the power method itself to be $\mathcal{O}(\delta)$, then the largest eigenvalue λ_{max} can be estimated up to an additive accuracy δ in time

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{\log(n)}{\delta} \left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right) + \frac{\log(n)}{2}\right)\right).$$

IV. IMPROVING THE GRADIENT DESCENT METHOD

In the second problem, we explore how the unitary block encoding method can be used to improve the quantum gradient descent method proposed in [19]. We refer the readers to the original work [19] for full details. In the following, we simply provide a brief overview of the problem and the proposed quantum algorithm developed in [19].

Problem: Find x that minimizes a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$, where f is some homogeneous polynomial of even degree.

A very popular method to solve the above problem is the gradient descent method. According to [19], we begin with some random guess x_0 , and then iteratively perform the following subtraction:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \eta \nabla f(x_t), \quad (28)$$

where t refers to the iteration step and η is the known time step. In [19], the authors imposed the spherical constraint, i.e., $x^T x = 1$, where $x \in \mathbb{R}^n$ refers to the input of f . The spherical constraint simply implies that the temporal solution x_{t+1} is normalized after each iteration before performing the next step. It means that the above step should be rewritten as:

$$x_{t+1} = |x_t\rangle - \eta \nabla f(|x_t\rangle), \quad (29)$$

and subsequently, one uses the normalized state $|x_{t+1}\rangle$ as a starting point and repeat the process.

The challenge in this method is the evaluation of the gradient of the function f . Let us briefly mention some definitions from the original work [19] that we will need. Recall that in [19], the authors considered a real-valued function f that is a polynomial of degree $2p$:

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \sum_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_p=1}^n A_{m_1, m_2, \dots, m_p} x_{m_1} \dots x_{m_p}. \quad (30)$$

Particularly, it can be written in an algebraic form:

$$f(x) = \frac{1}{2} \langle x| \otimes \dots \otimes \langle x| A |x\rangle \otimes \dots \otimes |x\rangle, \quad (31)$$

where A is a real matrix of dimension $n^p \times n^p$ with a bounded norm. Furthermore, A can be formally decomposed as:

$$A = \sum_{\alpha=1}^K A_1^\alpha \otimes A_2^\alpha \dots \otimes A_p^\alpha, \quad (32)$$

where K is some number counting the terms in the decomposition and each A_i^α is a matrix of dimension $n \times n$ (which can be a distinct matrix for each i). Given the above tensor formulation, the gradient of f can be rewritten as:

$$\nabla f(x) = D(|x\rangle) |x\rangle, \quad (33)$$

where

$$D(|x\rangle) = \sum_{\alpha=1}^K \sum_{m=1}^p \left(\prod_{n=1, n \neq m}^p \langle x| A_n^\alpha |x\rangle \right) A_m^\alpha. \quad (34)$$

The above gradient operator D is equivalent to:

$$D = \text{tr}_{1,2,\dots,p-1}(|x\rangle \langle x|^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes \mathbb{I}) M_D, \quad (35)$$

where

$$M_D = \sum_{\alpha=1}^K \sum_{m=1}^p \left(\bigotimes_{n=1, n \neq m}^p A_n^\alpha \right) \otimes A_m^\alpha. \quad (36)$$

As further shown in [19], the above M_D can be simplified as

$$M_D = \sum_{j=1}^p M_j, \quad (37)$$

where entries of M_j can be obtained from elements of A . Therefore, the oracle access to A can be used to access M_j for all j .

We refer the readers to the original work [19] for full details of the execution of the quantum gradient descent, as well as the cost of the algorithm. Here, we simply point out that the gradient operator D (see Eqn. 35) literally consumes multiple copies of $|x_t\rangle$ at each of the t -th iteration step. As M_D is not unitary, it is not straightforward to execute D . What the authors in [19] did was that they employed the Hamiltonian simulation method to simulate $\exp(-iM_D\delta t)$ for varying time steps δt , adapting the quantum state exponentiation procedure outlined in [10], e.g., as in the following approximation

$$\text{Tr}_{1,2,\dots,p-1} \left(\exp(-iM_D\delta t) |x\rangle \langle x|^{\otimes p} \exp(iM_D\delta t) \right) \approx \exp(-iD\delta t) |x\rangle \langle x| \exp(iD\delta t). \quad (38)$$

From the simulation of $\exp(-iD\delta t)$, a similar method as in [17] is employed to finally obtain the multiplication D to some state $|x\rangle$. While we have left out a lot of technical details in the above description, we would like to mention that the simulation step $\exp(-iM_D\delta t)$, plus the above partial trace step and the final subroutine for applying D , introduces many sources of error, which thus requires substantial resources to suppress below a desired threshold.

Now, we proceed to describe the first version of our quantum gradient descent. We shall see that the framework of the unitary block encoding can remove major complicated steps, providing a relatively simpler yet more accurate method. By being accurate, we mean that the errors induced during the process are negligible. For simplicity, we set a convention that $\|A\| < 1$, where $\|\cdot\|$ refers to the matrix norm, as it is always achievable by trivial scaling, e.g., by considering the matrix $A' = A/|A_{max}|$ instead. As a result, as also pointed out in [19], the norm of the gradient operator D , denoted as $\|D\|$, is upper bounded by p for arbitrary input during the iteration. Such an assumption does not incur any systematic issue but is merely made for simplification. Furthermore, we assume that the oracle access to each term in the summation of M_D (Eqn. 37) is available, similar to that of [19].

A. First Version

In the first version, our problem statement is somewhat an alternate to that of [19]. First, we relax the spherical constraint condition and treat the minimization problem in its full generality. Next, for each iteration step t , instead of producing the exact quantum state $|x_t\rangle$, we aim to produce the block encoding of a matrix that is proportional to $x_t(x_t)^T$. (Note that we will deal with real vectors x_t 's, so the Hermitian conjugate produces the same effect as the transpose, and we use transpose for convenience.) The reason for such a representation is more or less inspired by our main tool, i.e., the unitary block encoding [23, 25, 26]. The framework allows a highly flexible and universal way to manipulate an arbitrary matrix by encoding it into a unitary matrix. Therefore, if we can produce the desired state, or more generally, the density matrix in such a unitary block encoding representation, then, in principle, we can extract useful information from such a representation. A marked difference between this alternative problem compared to that of [19] is because we do not require the spherical constraint, e.g., at each iteration step t , and the output is a quantum state (normalized vector) $|x_t\rangle$. Therefore, we do not employ the intermediate measurement and, hence, relax a major step that could contribute substantially to the running time due to the finite probability of success in measurement.

In the above formulation of A and D , we see that there are tensor product structures in their formulation. As such, the first recipe we will need is the production of the unitary block encoding of the tensor product of some operators, given the unitary block encoding of each operator, respectively. For convenience, we recall the following tool from [33].

Lemma 9 ([33]) *Given unitary block encoding $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^m$ of multiple operators $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^m$ (assumed to be exact encoding). Then there is a procedure that produces a unitary block encoding operator of $\bigotimes_{i=1}^m M_i$, which requires a single use of each $\{U_i\}_{i=1}^m$ and $\mathcal{O}(1)$ SWAP gates.*

Since each term in the summation of M_D (Eqn. 37), e.g., M_j , has entries given via the oracle access, the same assumption as given in [19], and the preparation of ϵ -approximation unitary encoding of M_j/s is achievable due to Lemma 4, where s is the sparsity of A (see e.g., chapter 27 of [41]). Furthermore, in [23], the authors showed the following:

Lemma 10 *Given unitary block encoding of multiple operators $\{M_i\}_{i=1}^m$. Then there is a procedure that produces a unitary block encoding operator of $\sum_{i=1}^m \pm M_i/m$ with a time complexity $\mathcal{O}(m)$,*

where the \pm sign in the above lemma indicates that it can be either addition or subtraction. Therefore, the ϵ -approximation block encoding of $M_D/(sp)$ is easily obtained in time $\mathcal{O}(p(\log(n) + \log^{2.5}(1/\epsilon)))$.

It is also straightforward to see that Lemma 3 allows us to obtain the unitary block encoding of $(xx^T)^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes \mathbb{I}$ given the unitary block encoding of xx^T , since the block encoding of \mathbb{I} is simple. For example, the matrix corresponding to the controlled-Z gate

$$c - Z = \begin{pmatrix} 1 & 0 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 1 & 0 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 1 & 0 \\ 0 & 0 & 0 & -1 \end{pmatrix}$$

is a block encoding of the 2×2 identity using two qubits (if we focus on the top left corner of the 2×2 block structure). Therefore, the tensor product $c - Z \otimes \mathbb{I}_d$ (for an arbitrary dimension d) will produce a trivial block encoding of the identity matrix of an arbitrary dimension.

In order to produce the block encoding of the gradient operator D , we can use the following procedure. With the block encodings of $M_D/(ps)$ and $(xx^T)^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes \mathbb{I}$, it is straightforward to use Lemma 2 to prepare the block encoding of the operator

$$(xx^T)^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes \mathbb{I} \cdot \frac{M_D}{ps} \cdot (xx^T)^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes \mathbb{I}.$$

Using Eq. (36), we can straightforwardly show that

$$(xx^T)^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes \mathbb{I} \cdot \frac{M_D}{ps} \cdot (xx^T)^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes \mathbb{I} = (xx^T)^{\otimes p-1} \otimes \frac{D(x)}{ps}. \quad (39)$$

In the appendix, we show the following lemma:

Lemma 11 *Given the block encoding of $(xx^T)^{\otimes p-1} \otimes \frac{D(x)}{ps}$, then it is possible to obtain the block encoding of $D(x)/ps$ in time $\mathcal{O}(\gamma^{2(p-1)}ps)$, where γ is some constant.*

The factor γ in the above lemma will be derived in appendix C, and it will be shown there that γ is upper bounded by either heuristic method or by choosing the learning rate η in the gradient descent sufficiently small. Now, we are ready to outline our improved quantum gradient descent in detail.

Improved Quantum Gradient Descent

- The first step in the gradient descent method is the creation of a random real vector x_0 . Without loss of generality, we can take x_0 to be generated by some known circuit (therefore, it has a unit norm). We need to prepare a unitary encoding of $x_0 x_0^T$. To do so, we first note the decomposition of x_0 , or $|x_0\rangle$ in the standard computational basis as:

$$|x_0\rangle = \sum_{i=1}^n x_0^i |i\rangle. \quad (40)$$

If we then add a second register initialized in $|0\rangle$ and trace it out, then we trivially obtain:

$$\rho = \sum_{i,j=1}^n x_0^i x_0^j |i\rangle \langle j|, \quad (41)$$

which is exactly $|x_0\rangle \langle x_0|$. It is thus straightforward to apply Lemma 1 to prepare the unitary encoding of $x_0 x_0^T$. The generation of $|x_0\rangle$ can be done with an arbitrary low-depth circuit, e.g., one with a few rotation gates. Therefore, it is safe to assume that the time required is $\mathcal{O}(1)$, as we will choose some random vector x_0 that can be generated with a short-depth circuit. Therefore, the complexity for preparing the block encoding of ρ as above is $\mathcal{O}(\log(n))$.

- Given the randomly chosen state x_0 , the previous step yields the unitary encoding of $x_0 x_0^T$. Then we need to perform the following iteratively:

$$x_{t+1} = x_t - \eta \nabla f(x_t). \quad (42)$$

In the density matrix representation, the above formulation can be rewritten as:

$$x_{t+1}(x_{t+1})^T = (x_t - \eta \nabla f(x_t))(x_t - \eta \nabla f(x_t))^\dagger \quad (43)$$

$$= (I - \eta D(x_t)) x_t x_t^T (I - \eta D(x_t)^\dagger) \quad (44)$$

$$= (I - \eta D(x_t)) x_t x_t^T (I - \eta D(x_t)), \quad (45)$$

where in the last line, we have used the hermitian property of the gradient operator D . Previously, we have shown that we can prepare the unitary encoding of $D(x_t)/(ps)$ given the unitary block encoding of $x_t x_t^T$. Note that the factor ps is non-trivial, and we only need to make a corresponding adjustment. In this case, we need to obtain the unitary block encoding of $(I - D(x_t))/(ps)$, which requires the unitary block encoding of $I/(ps)$, which has dimension $n \times n$. We consider the following procedure to achieve the unitary block encoding of $I/(ps)$. Recall that the RY rotational gate has the matrix representation:

$$R_Y(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta/2) & -\sin(\theta/2) \\ \sin(\theta/2) & \cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (46)$$

If one choose θ such that $\cos(\theta/2) = 1/ps$, then $R_Y(\theta)$ has $\frac{1}{ps}$ on the diagonals. The tensor product of $R_Y(\theta)$ with \mathbb{I}_2 (where \mathbb{I}_2 is the identity matrix of size 2×2), i.e., $R_Y(\theta/2) \otimes \mathbb{I}_2$, contains the following matrix

$$\begin{pmatrix} \frac{1}{sp} & 0 \\ 0 & \frac{1}{sp} \end{pmatrix}$$

on the top-left corner. Therefore, $R_Y(\theta) \otimes \mathbb{I}_2$ is exactly the unitary block encoding of the above matrix. Keep repeating the process, i.e., the tensor product with \mathbb{I}_2 , we will obtain the unitary block encoding of an $n \times n$ matrix that contains $\frac{1}{sp}$ on the diagonals, which is nothing but $I/(sp)$ (where we have omitted the dimension n in the subscript). The same procedure as above also allows us to build the unitary block encoding of $\text{diag}(\eta)$, whose nonzero entries are all η on the diagonals. Then, we can use Lemma 2 to construct the unitary block encoding of $\eta D(x_t)/(ps)$.

Given the block encoding of $I/(sp)$ as outlined above (note that we are only concerned with the top left corner block) plus the unitary block encoding of $x_0 x_0^T$, Lemma 2 allows us to construct the unitary block encoding of $U_1 \equiv x_0 x_0^T/(sp)$. Similarly, the block encoding of, say, $\eta D(x_0)/(sp)$ and of $x_0 x_0^T$ allows us to construct the block encoding of their product, $U_2 \equiv \eta D(x_0) x_0 x_0^T/(sp)$ and the reverse of their product, i.e., $U_3 \equiv x_0 x_0^T \eta D(x_0)/(sp)$. Furthermore, Lemma 2 combines the block encoding of $\eta D(x_0) x_0 x_0^T/(sp)$ and $\eta D(x_0)/(sp)$ to yield the block encoding of

$$U_4 \equiv \frac{\eta D(x_0)}{(sp)} x_0 x_0^T \frac{\eta D(x_0)}{(sp)}. \quad (47)$$

Note that there is an unwanted factor (sp) , which might accumulate to a larger factor as we continue to iterate the process. Fortunately, this issue has been handled in [23], where the authors show that by using a technique called preamplification, it is possible to get rid of such a factor using $\mathcal{O}(sp)$ corresponding block-encoding operators, e.g., U_2 . Given U_1, U_2, U_3, U_4 (we already assume that the unwanted factor is removed), Lemma 10 allows us to construct the block encoding of

$$\frac{U_1 - U_2 - U_3 + U_4}{4}.$$

It is then straightforward to verify the following property:

$$x_0 x_0^T - \eta D(x_0) x_0 x_0^T - x_0 x_0^T \eta D(x_0) + \eta D(x_0) x_0 x_0^T \eta D(x_0) = (I - \eta D(x_0) x_0 x_0^T (I - \eta D(x_0))) \quad (48)$$

$$= x_1 x_1^T, \quad (49)$$

where the last line comes from Eqn. (45). Therefore, the matrix defined in Eqn. (47) is exactly $x_1 x_1^T/4$. We can iteratively proceed with the above procedure to obtain the desired operator for a fixed time T . We note that the factor 4 from the above could be removed using preamplification method [23]. In the appendix, we would show that if one carefully chooses the initial operator $x_0 x_0^T$ with bounded norm, then the norm of operator $x_t x_t^T$ is less than unity at any t -th iteration step.

As a summary, our algorithm begins with preparing unitary encoding of M_j (see 37). Each unitary encoding of M_j takes $p \log(n)$ time to prepare since a SWAP operation between two $p \log(n)$ -qubit systems is required to do this (see further [23, 25]). The preparation of M_D in Eqn. (37), by Lemma 10, will incur $\mathcal{O}(p)$ operations of M_j 's. The preparation of the unitary block encoding for the gradient operator D/ps with

$$D = \text{tr}_{1,2,\dots,p-1}((xx^T)^{\otimes(p-1)} \otimes \mathbb{I}) M_D \quad (50)$$

takes $\mathcal{O}(\alpha^{2p-2})$ operations due to the step in taking the trace. As we can see, such a time is negligible compared to the time required by M_D , as the summation requires $\mathcal{O}(p \log(n))$ operations. Lastly, we use the preamplification method to remove the undesired subnormalization factor, which takes further $\mathcal{O}(sp)$ time. Now, we summarize the main result of this section before comparing it with the original version in [19].

Theorem 3 *Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^n \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ with algebraic form as defined in Eqn. (31). For a fixed iteration number T , there exists a quantum algorithm that produces a unitary U_T that encodes an ϵ -approximation of the operator $x_T x_T^T$. Define $\beta \equiv \alpha^{2p-2} ps$, where α is some bounded constant. The running time of the quantum algorithm is*

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\log(n) + \log^{2.5} \frac{1}{\epsilon}\right) \beta \frac{\beta^{T+1} - 1}{\beta - 1}\right).$$

Given the output in Thm 3, one can perform arbitrary subsequent processing on the block-encoded matrix, which contains $x_T x_T^T$ without using measurement. As to what kind of useful operation depends on the kind of application. To compare the complexity with the original algorithm, we recall that from [19], the time complexity for producing the final state $|x_T\rangle$ up to accuracy ϵ is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\left(\frac{p}{\epsilon}\right)^{3T} \left(\frac{ps_A}{\epsilon}\right)^T \log(n)\right).$$

The seeming advantage of the above algorithm relative to that of [19] is that the running time is much more efficient with respect to error tolerance ϵ , and polynomial improvement over T . However, as we have commented previously, the goal of our method is a bit different from that of [19], but what we will do next is to introduce another algorithm closer to that of [19], where we expect that the unitary block encoding framework can also provide some enhancement.

B. Second Version

In this setting, we directly improve upon the method in [19], which means that we impose the spherical constraint. Our goal now is to produce the quantum state $|x_t\rangle$ that corresponds to the temporal solution after t -th iteration step. Similar to [19], suppose at step t , we are presented with multiple copies of $|x_t\rangle$, which can be the output of the previous step. The new solution is then updated per the following formula:

$$x_{t+1} = |x_t\rangle - \eta D(|x_t\rangle \langle x_t|) |x_t\rangle. \quad (51)$$

Then, of course, we need to obtain the quantum state $|x_{t+1}\rangle$ that corresponds to the (un-normalized) vector x_{t+1} . We note that in this condition, the formula for the gradient operator (Eqn. 35) needs to take into account such a normalization issue as well because we will be working with a quantum state instead of a general vector.

What we do now is to construct the unitary block encoding of $\rho_t \equiv |x_t\rangle \langle x_t|$. Since we are only presented with copies of ρ_t , we cannot apply Lemma 1, as we do not have the means to prepare the purification of ρ_t . We first need the so-called density matrix exponentiation technique that was proposed in [10].

Lemma 12 ([10]) *Given multiple copies of ρ , the unitary $\exp(-i\rho t)$ can be simulated up to error ϵ in time $\mathcal{O}(t^2 \epsilon^{-1})$.*

We note that the technique in [10] also allows us to construct a controlled version of $\exp(-i\rho t)$. Given the unitary $\exp(-i\rho t)$ plus its controlled version, if we set $t = 1$, then it is possible to construct an approximation of the unitary block encoding of ρ . This has been done in [23], for which we quote the following result.

Lemma 13 (Corollary 71 in [23]) *Given the unitary $\exp(-i\rho)$, it is possible to construct a δ -close unitary block encoding of $\pi\rho/4$ using $\mathcal{O}\left(\log\left(\frac{1}{\delta}\right)\right)$ controlled versions of $\exp(-i\rho)$ and its inverse plus a single ancilla qubit.*

Now, we have enough preparation to solve our problem. By Lemma 10, the unitary encoding of $(I - \eta M_D)/ps$ can be constructed, as each of the terms in the subtraction can be block encoded. Lemma 13 yields the δ -close block encoding of $\pi\rho_t/4$, which can be used to construct the $p\delta$ -close block encoding of $(\pi\rho_t/4)^{\otimes p}$. Then Lemma 2 allows us to construct the (approximated) unitary block encoding of their product, i.e.,

$$\frac{I - \eta M_D}{sp} \cdot \left(\frac{\pi\rho_t}{4}\right)^{\otimes p}. \quad (52)$$

We use the approximated block encoding of $(\pi\rho_t/4)^{\otimes p-1} \otimes \mathbb{I}$ (note that the last term is the identity matrix) plus Lemma 2 to construct the block encoding U_t of

$$P_t \equiv (\pi\rho_t/4)^{\otimes p-1} \otimes \mathbb{I} \cdot \frac{(I - \eta M_D)}{sp} \cdot \left(\frac{\pi\rho_t}{4}\right)^{\otimes p}.$$

Now, we pay attention to the numerator. As ρ_t is a projector, $\rho_t \cdot \rho_t = \rho_t$, we have:

$$\rho_t^{\otimes p-1} \otimes \mathbb{I} \cdot (I - \eta M_D) \cdot \rho_t^{\otimes p} = \rho_t^{\otimes p} - \eta \rho_t^{\otimes p-1} \otimes \mathbb{I} \cdot M_D \cdot \rho_t^{\otimes p}. \quad (53)$$

We recall that the original formulation of M_D :

$$M_D = \sum_{\alpha=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\bigotimes_{i=1, i \neq j}^p A_i^\alpha \right) \otimes A_j^\alpha.$$

Therefore, we have

$$\rho_t^{\otimes p-1} \otimes \mathbb{I} \cdot M_D \cdot \rho_t^{\otimes p} = \sum_{\alpha=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\bigotimes_{i=1, i \neq j}^p |x_t\rangle \langle x_t| A_i^\alpha |x_t\rangle \langle x_t| \right) \otimes A_j^\alpha |x_t\rangle \langle x_t| \quad (54)$$

$$= \sum_{\alpha=1}^K \sum_{j=1}^p \left(\bigotimes_{i=1, i \neq j}^p \langle x_t| A_i^\alpha |x_t\rangle |x_t\rangle \langle x_t| \right) \otimes A_j^\alpha |x_t\rangle \langle x_t| \quad (55)$$

$$= |x_t\rangle \langle x_t|^{\otimes p-1} \otimes D(|x_t\rangle) |x_t\rangle \langle x_t|. \quad (56)$$

We thus arrive at the following action,

$$P_t |x_t\rangle^{\otimes p} = \left(\frac{\pi}{4} \right)^{2p-1} \frac{1}{sp} |x_t\rangle^{\otimes p-1} \otimes \left(I_n - \eta D(|x_t\rangle) \right) |x_t\rangle, \quad (57)$$

where I_n denotes specifically the identity matrix of dimension $n \times n$, which is the same dimension as that of $|x_t\rangle$. As we know that U_t can be explicitly written out as:

$$U_t = |\mathbf{0}\rangle \langle \mathbf{0}| \otimes P_t + \dots, \quad (58)$$

its action on an arbitrary state $|\mathbf{0}\rangle |\phi\rangle$ (the dimension of $|\phi\rangle$ is n^p) is:

$$U_t |\mathbf{0}\rangle |\phi\rangle = |\mathbf{0}\rangle P_t |\phi\rangle + \sum_{j \neq \mathbf{0}} |j\rangle |\text{Garbage}_j\rangle. \quad (59)$$

If we choose $|\phi\rangle = |x_t\rangle^{\otimes p}$, and perform measurement on the first register, post-selecting the outcome on seeing $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$, then we obtain:

$$\frac{1}{C} |x_t\rangle^{\otimes p-1} \otimes (I_n - \eta D(|x_t\rangle)) |x_t\rangle,$$

which contains our desired state in the last register. In the above, C is a normalization factor, which is:

$$C^2 = \|(I_n - \eta D(|x_t\rangle)) |x_t\rangle\|^2 \quad (60)$$

$$= (1 - 2\eta \langle x_t| D(|x_t\rangle) |x_t\rangle + \eta^2 \langle x_t| D^2(|x_t\rangle) |x_t\rangle), \quad (61)$$

and it is proportional to the probability of successfully obtaining the outcome $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ on the first register. As also proved in [19], the factor C is lower bounded by:

$$C^2 \geq (1 - \eta \sqrt{\langle x_t| D^2(|x_t\rangle) |x_t\rangle})^2. \quad (62)$$

Previously, we have made the assumption that the norm of D satisfies that $|D| \leq p$, which means that

$$\sqrt{\langle x_t| D^2(|x_t\rangle) |x_t\rangle} \leq \max_y \|D|y\rangle\| \leq p.$$

If we choose η to satisfy $0 < \eta < 1/(2p)$, then we have: $C^2 \geq 1/4$. As in the previous version, we can use the quantum amplitude amplification to improve the success probability [36]. Therefore, altogether, it yields the following lower bound:

$$p_{\text{success}} \geq \left(\frac{\pi}{4} \right)^{2p-1} \frac{1}{4sp},$$

and the total number of repetitions required is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(sp \left(\frac{4}{\pi}\right)^{2p-1}\right),$$

where we have absorbed a factor $\pi/2$ into the \mathcal{O} scaling. The tolerance in all steps is set to be ϵ for convenience. We summarize the single gradient step in the following theorem.

Theorem 4 *Given $\mathcal{O}(p/\epsilon)$ copies of $|x_t\rangle$, there exists a quantum algorithm that produces an ϵ -tolerance of the updated state that corresponds to*

$$x_{t+1} = |x_t\rangle - \eta D(|x_t\rangle) |x_t\rangle.$$

The running time for obtaining the state $|x_{t+1}\rangle$ from copies of $|x_t\rangle$ is

$$\mathcal{O}\left(\left(p^2 \log(n) + \frac{1}{\epsilon} \log\left(\frac{1}{\epsilon}\right)\right) s \left(\frac{4}{\pi}\right)^{2p-1}\right).$$

In [19], a single gradient step, requires $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p^3}{\epsilon^3}\right)$ copies of $|x_t\rangle$, with a further running time $\mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p^3}{\epsilon^3} \cdot \frac{ps}{\epsilon} \log(n)\right) = \mathcal{O}\left(\frac{p^4}{\epsilon^4} s \log(n)\right)$ in order to obtain the updated state $|x_{t+1}\rangle$. One can see that in our approach there is a polynomial improvement (i.e., saving) in the number of copies required. For the total running time, our method achieves significant improvement over the dependence on the error tolerance ϵ , but with the same $\mathcal{O}(\log n)$ dependence. Regarding the factor p , we observe that our method has a factor $(\pi/2)^{2p-1}$ grows exponentially w.r.t. p . To assess the whether this is a disadvantage, we must compare the growth of the two functions: p^4 and $p^2(4/\pi)^{2p-1}$ and the regime of p . For example, from numerical evaluations, we observe that for $1 < p < 10$ (we remind that $2p$ is the degree of the given polynomial function f), the value of $p^2(4/\pi)^{2p-1}$ is smaller than p^4 . Therefore, this is the regime where our method is overall better than that of [19].

In the above, we discuss a single-step gradient descent. Multiple-step gradient descent is a purely straightforward execution from the single-step gradient descent. Therefore, the total cost of our improved method is still exponential in the number of iteration steps T , similar to [19]. However, the enhancement of our method for the whole multi-step procedure is substantial, as it is already more efficient in each iteration step, as discussed above.

V. DISCUSSION AND CONCLUSION

Here, we discuss some possible extensions that are directly applicable from our methodology.

A. From Largest Eigenvalue to Multiple Eigenvalues

Interestingly, the method introduced in this work via the block encoding is relatively simple compared to previous constructions, but yields a substantial speedup. The first problem we have discussed is finding the largest eigenvalue based on the quantum power method, as has been previously discussed by us in [32], and its inverse version (by replacing the original matrix A by its inverse A^{-1}) can be used to find the minimum eigenvalue (in magnitude). It is well-known that the minimum eigenvalue problem is a very important problem, for instance, the ground-state energy of a given system. Therefore, improving this work suggests a more efficient way to achieve the other task better by reducing the cost induced by the iteration steps. While in [32], a hybrid Krylov subspace method was introduced to find multiple eigenvalues, here, we point out another simpler and potentially more efficient way to find multiple eigenvalues when the given matrix A is positive-definite, i.e., having positive eigenvalues.

Denote the eigenvalues of A (in increasing magnitude) $0 < \lambda_1 < \lambda_2, \dots, \lambda_n < 1$ (note n is the dimension of A and of course we consider A to be Hermitian). Suppose we already find the largest eigenvalue λ_n of A , e.g., via the improved quantum power method. If we compute the difference $\lambda_n - \lambda_i$ for $i = 1, 2, \dots, n-1$, then $\lambda_n - \lambda_1$ has the largest magnitude. It means that if we consider the matrix:

$$\lambda_n I_{n \times n} - A.$$

Then this matrix has $\lambda_n - \lambda_1$ to be its largest eigenvalue. However, this matrix has a 0 eigenvalue (since $\lambda_n - \lambda_n = 0$), which might cause some issues. For instance, if one randomizes an initial vector, say x_0 , that happens to be the eigenvector with the zero eigenvalue, then we cannot execute the method, as $Ax_0 = 0$. A simple way to avoid this issue is to slightly shift the spectrum by a constant Δ , i.e., we consider instead the matrix

$$(\lambda_n + \Delta) I_{n \times n} - A.$$

We note that we still need to choose Δ such that $\lambda_n + \Delta \leq 1$. Then again, this matrix has $\lambda_n + \Delta - \lambda_1$ to be its largest eigenvalue. Since we know λ_n (and apparently Δ), we can estimate λ_1 , which is the minimum eigenvalue. Therefore, we can employ the improved quantum power method here to find $\lambda_n + \Delta - \lambda_1$. As we mentioned previously, the block

encoding of A/s is easily constructed, and hence the block encoding of $(\lambda_n + \Delta)I_{n \times n}/s$ is also easy to construct. For example, one considers the matrix R_Y

$$R_Y(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta/2) & -\sin(\theta/2) \\ \sin(\theta/2) & \cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix}. \quad (63)$$

If we choose $\cos(\theta/2) = (\Delta + \lambda_n)/s$ and construct its tensor product with, for instance, $I_{n \times n}$, then we obtain a unitary block encoding of a $n \times n$ matrix that contains only λ_n/s on the diagonal. The construction of the unitary block encoding of

$$\frac{\lambda_n + \Delta}{s}I_{n \times n} - \frac{A}{s} = \frac{1}{s}((\lambda_n + \Delta)I_{n \times n} - A)$$

is doable due to Lemma 10.

Note that as $\lambda_n - \lambda_1$ is the largest eigenvalue of the matrix $\lambda_n I_{n \times n} - A$, it is straightforward to see that $\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1}$ is its minimum (non-zero) eigenvalue. Therefore, one can repeat the same process with the new matrix above to find $\lambda_n - \lambda_{n-1}$, which gives us the value of λ_{n-1} – the second largest eigenvalue of A . Hence, doing this multiple times allows us to find multiple eigenvalues of A .

B. Newton Iteration Method for Matrix Inversion

We have provided two perspectives on the quantum gradient descent method. While the second version is clearly a direct improvement on what has been done previously in [19], the first one is more or less an indirect procedure inspired purely by block encodings. Here, we wish to point out that the idea presented in the first version actually has a very relevant application: finding the inverse of some matrix A . We recall that the main spirit of this approach is to encode our matrices into larger ones, and by using simple operations of the block-encoded matrices (see Lemmas 2 & 10), a simple iterative procedure is carried out. It turns out that there is a similar method, i.e., the Newton iteration method for finding the inverse of a given matrix, to which we can also apply our idea straightforwardly. This is a well-known classical approach, and its proof of performance guarantee can be found in any standard literature [42]. We simply summarize the procedure first.

Suppose we are given matrix A and hope to find its inverse A^{-1} . We begin with a random guess $X_0 = \alpha A^T$ where α is some small parameter. At the t -th iteration step, the matrix is updated as follows:

$$X_{t+1} = 2X_t - X_t A X_t. \quad (64)$$

In order to construct a quantum approach, we apply the idea from the first version, described in Sec. IV A. First, we note that the black box access to entries of A allows us to construct the unitary block encoding of A/s , where s is the sparsity, which directly yields the block encoding of A^T/s . To insert the factor α , we choose $\cos(\theta/2) = \alpha$ in the RY rotational gate

$$R_Y(\theta) = \begin{pmatrix} \cos(\theta/2) & -\sin(\theta/2) \\ \sin(\theta/2) & \cos(\theta/2) \end{pmatrix} \quad (65)$$

and construct the tensor product $R_Y(\theta) \otimes A^T$, which contains the matrix αA^T in the top left corner, then we obtain exactly the unitary block encoding of $\alpha A^T \equiv X_0$. The remaining task is straightforward as we simply use Lemmas 10 & 2 to iteratively update the matrix according to Eqn. (64). Hence, we obtain the desired approximation of the inverse of A encoded in a bigger unitary, for which subsequent operations can be executed depending on the application context.

C. Conclusion

We have successfully introduced more efficient methods for two different problems: estimating the largest eigenvalue and performing the quantum gradient descent. The underlying framework of our algorithm is the powerful unitary block encoding [23, 25, 26], which has recently transformed quantum algorithms in a very fundamental way, as it provides a unified viewpoint for all previously proposed algorithms. Our work thus contributes as another instance of demonstrating the efficacy of the unitary block encoding method, following the success in [25], [30], [31], and [43]. It is remarkable that our method utilizes only the block-encoded matrices and elementary operations between them to

construct an efficient procedure that removes some exponential scaling from the original versions. This highlights the subtle but extremely useful ideas from quantum signal processing, or quantum singular value transformation, that allow the handling of arbitrary matrices, which is not necessarily unitary. It is thus of interest to explore further the power of such block encoding or quantum singular value transformation framework, and we hope our work to motivate further such exploration into various contexts.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

This work was supported in part by the US Department of Energy, Office of Science, National Quantum Information Science Research Centers, Co-design Center for Quantum Advantage (C2QA) under contract number DE-SC0012704. We also acknowledge the support by a Seed Grant from Stony Brook University’s Office of the Vice President for Research and by the Center for Distributed Quantum Processing.

-
- [1] Lov K Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proceedings of the twenty-eighth annual ACM symposium on Theory of computing*, pages 212–219, 1996.
 - [2] Peter W Shor. Polynomial-time algorithms for prime factorization and discrete logarithms on a quantum computer. *SIAM review*, 41(2):303–332, 1999.
 - [3] Oded Regev. An efficient quantum factoring algorithm. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2308.06572*, 2023.
 - [4] Richard P Feynman. Simulating physics with computers. In *Feynman and computation*, pages 133–153. CRC Press, 2018.
 - [5] Seth Lloyd. Universal quantum simulators. *Science*, 273(5278):1073–1078, 1996.
 - [6] Dominic W Berry, Graeme Ahokas, Richard Cleve, and Barry C Sanders. Efficient quantum algorithms for simulating sparse hamiltonians. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 270(2):359–371, 2007.
 - [7] Dominic W Berry and Andrew M Childs. Black-box hamiltonian simulation and unitary implementation. *Quantum Information and Computation*, 12:29–62, 2009.
 - [8] Dominic W Berry, Andrew M Childs, and Robin Kothari. Hamiltonian simulation with nearly optimal dependence on all parameters. In *2015 IEEE 56th annual symposium on foundations of computer science*, pages 792–809. IEEE, 2015.
 - [9] Seth Lloyd, Masoud Mohseni, and Patrick Rebentrost. Quantum algorithms for supervised and unsupervised machine learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1307.0411*, 2013.
 - [10] Seth Lloyd, Masoud Mohseni, and Patrick Rebentrost. Quantum principal component analysis. *Nature Physics*, 10(9):631–633, 2014.
 - [11] Maria Schuld, Ilya Sinayskiy, and Francesco Petruccione. The quest for a quantum neural network. *Quantum Information Processing*, 13(11):2567–2586, 2014.
 - [12] Maria Schuld and Francesco Petruccione. *Supervised learning with quantum computers*, volume 17. Springer, 2018.
 - [13] Maria Schuld, Alex Bocharov, Krysta M Svore, and Nathan Wiebe. Circuit-centric quantum classifiers. *Physical Review A*, 101(3):032308, 2020.
 - [14] Maria Schuld. Machine learning in quantum spaces, 2019.
 - [15] Vojtěch Havlíček, Antonio D Córcoles, Kristan Temme, Aram W Harrow, Abhinav Kandala, Jerry M Chow, and Jay M Gambetta. Supervised learning with quantum-enhanced feature spaces. *Nature*, 567(7747):209–212, 2019.
 - [16] Aram W Harrow, Avinandan Hassidim, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations. *Physical review letters*, 103(15):150502, 2009.
 - [17] Nathan Wiebe, Ashish Kapoor, and Krysta Svore. Quantum algorithms for nearest-neighbor methods for supervised and unsupervised learning. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1401.2142*, 2014.
 - [18] B David Clader, Bryan C Jacobs, and Chad R Sprouse. Preconditioned quantum linear system algorithm. *Physical review letters*, 110(25):250504, 2013.
 - [19] Patrick Rebentrost, Maria Schuld, Leonard Wossnig, Francesco Petruccione, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum gradient descent and newton’s method for constrained polynomial optimization. *New Journal of Physics*, 21(7):073023, 2019.
 - [20] Juan Miguel Arrazola, Timjan Kalajdzievski, Christian Weedbrook, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum algorithm for nonhomogeneous linear partial differential equations. *Physical Review A*, 100(3):032306, 2019.
 - [21] Dominic W Berry. High-order quantum algorithm for solving linear differential equations. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 47(10):105301, 2014.
 - [22] Andrew M Childs, Jin-Peng Liu, and Aaron Ostrander. High-precision quantum algorithms for partial differential equations. *Quantum*, 5:574, 2021.
 - [23] András Gilyén, Yuan Su, Guang Hao Low, and Nathan Wiebe. Quantum singular value transformation and beyond: exponential improvements for quantum matrix arithmetics. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 193–204, 2019.
 - [24] John M Martyn, Zane M Rossi, Andrew K Tan, and Isaac L Chuang. Grand unification of quantum algorithms. *PRX Quantum*, 2(4):040203, 2021.

- [25] Guang Hao Low and Isaac L Chuang. Optimal hamiltonian simulation by quantum signal processing. *Physical review letters*, 118(1):010501, 2017.
- [26] Guang Hao Low and Isaac L Chuang. Hamiltonian simulation by qubitization. *Quantum*, 3:163, 2019.
- [27] Andrew K Tan, Yuan Liu, Minh C Tran, and Isaac L Chuang. Error correction of quantum algorithms: Arbitrarily accurate recovery of noisy quantum signal processing. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2301.08542*, 2023.
- [28] Kosuke Mitarai, Kiichiro Toyozumi, and Wataru Mizukami. Perturbation theory with quantum signal processing. *Quantum*, 7:1000, 2023.
- [29] Zane M Rossi and Isaac L Chuang. Multivariable quantum signal processing (m-qsp): prophecies of the two-headed oracle. *Quantum*, 6:811, 2022.
- [30] Patrick Rall. Quantum algorithms for estimating physical quantities using block encodings. *Physical Review A*, 102(2):022408, 2020.
- [31] Shantanav Chakraborty, András Gilyén, and Stacey Jeffery. The power of block-encoded matrix powers: improved regression techniques via faster hamiltonian simulation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:1804.01973*, 2018.
- [32] Nhat A Nghiem and Tzu-Chieh Wei. Quantum algorithm for estimating eigenvalue. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2211.06179*, 2022.
- [33] Daan Camps and Roel Van Beeumen. Approximate quantum circuit synthesis using block encodings. *Physical Review A*, 102(5):052411, 2020.
- [34] Nhat A Nghiem and Tzu-Chieh Wei. An improved method for quantum matrix multiplication. *Quantum Information Processing*, 22(8):299, 2023.
- [35] Andrew M Childs, Robin Kothari, and Rolando D Somma. Quantum algorithm for systems of linear equations with exponentially improved dependence on precision. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 46(6):1920–1950, 2017.
- [36] Gilles Brassard, Peter Hoyer, Michele Mosca, and Alain Tapp. Quantum amplitude amplification and estimation. *Contemporary Mathematics*, 305:53–74, 2002.
- [37] A Yu Kitaev. Quantum measurements and the abelian stabilizer problem. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/9511026*, 1995.
- [38] Patrick Rebentrost, Thomas R Bromley, Christian Weedbrook, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum hopfield neural network. *Physical Review A*, 98(4):042308, 2018.
- [39] Lloyd N Trefethen and David Bau. *Numerical linear algebra*, volume 181. Siam, 2022.
- [40] Joel Friedman. Error bounds on the power method for determining the largest eigenvalue of a symmetric, positive definite matrix. *Linear algebra and its applications*, 280(2-3):199–216, 1998.
- [41] Andrew M Childs. Lecture notes on quantum algorithms. *Lecture notes at University of Maryland*, 2017.
- [42] Carl T Kelley. *Iterative methods for linear and nonlinear equations*. SIAM, 1995.
- [43] András Gilyén, Seth Lloyd, Iman Marvian, Yihui Quek, and Mark M Wilde. Quantum algorithm for petz recovery channels and pretty good measurements. *Physical Review Letters*, 128(22):220502, 2022.
- [44] Anupam Prakash. *Quantum algorithms for linear algebra and machine learning*. University of California, Berkeley, 2014.

Appendix A: Product of Block Encoding

Here we explicitly show that, given unitary block encoding of matrices A_1 and A_2 respectively, one can construct the unitary block encoding of A_1A_2 , or A_2A_1 with a few modest steps. While it has been established in the original work [23], we present a proof here for completeness.

Let U_1, U_2 be block encoding of A_1, A_2 , i.e, we have:

$$U_{1,2} = \begin{pmatrix} A_{1,2} & \cdot \\ \cdot & \cdot \end{pmatrix}.$$

Equivalently, we can write U (we drop the subscript for now, as it is not too important):

$$U = |\mathbf{0}\rangle \langle \mathbf{0}| \otimes A + \dots$$

We observe the following property

$$U |\mathbf{0}\rangle |\phi\rangle = |\mathbf{0}\rangle A |\phi\rangle + \sum_{j \neq \mathbf{0}} |j\rangle |\phi_j\rangle, \quad (\text{A1})$$

where $|\phi\rangle$ and all $|\phi_j\rangle$'s (essentially garbage states) share the same dimension as matrix A . For a reason that will be clear later on, we borrow an extra qubit initialized in $|0\rangle$ and rewrite the above equation as:

$$\mathbb{I} \otimes U |1\rangle |\mathbf{0}\rangle |\phi\rangle = |0\rangle |\mathbf{0}\rangle A |\phi\rangle + |0\rangle \sum_{j \neq \mathbf{0}} |j\rangle |\phi_j\rangle. \quad (\text{A2})$$

We use X gate to flip the ancilla qubit (to $|1\rangle$) to obtain the state:

$$|1\rangle |\mathbf{0}\rangle A |\phi\rangle + |1\rangle \sum_{j \neq \mathbf{0}} |j\rangle |\phi_j\rangle.$$

Denote the whole above unitary process, which maps $|0\rangle |\mathbf{0}\rangle |\phi\rangle$ to $|1\rangle |\mathbf{0}\rangle A |\phi\rangle + |1\rangle \sum_{j \neq \mathbf{0}} |j\rangle |\phi_j\rangle$ as \mathcal{U} . For matrix A_1 , given a computational basis state $|i\rangle$, we have the corresponding action \mathcal{U}_1 :

$$\mathcal{U}_1 |\mathbf{0}\rangle |i\rangle = |1\rangle |\mathbf{0}\rangle A_1 |i\rangle + |1\rangle \sum_{j \neq \mathbf{0}} |j\rangle |\phi_j\rangle. \quad (\text{A3})$$

For matrix A_2 , we will use the conjugate transpose of the original U_2 (without the extra CNOT step that flips the ancilla) to obtain:

$$U_2^\dagger |\mathbf{0}\rangle |k\rangle = |0\rangle |\mathbf{0}\rangle A_2^\dagger |k\rangle + |0\rangle \sum_{j \neq \mathbf{0}} |j\rangle |\phi_j\rangle. \quad (\text{A4})$$

Now, for the above state, we use the register $|\mathbf{0}\rangle$ as controlling qubits, aiming to flip the first qubit $|0\rangle$ to $|1\rangle$. In other words, from the above state, we obtain:

$$|1\rangle |\mathbf{0}\rangle A_2^\dagger |k\rangle + |0\rangle \sum_{j \neq \mathbf{0}} |j\rangle |\phi_j\rangle. \quad (\text{A5})$$

We denote the process containing U_2 and the controlled-X step above as \mathcal{U}_2 . To summarize, we have

$$\mathcal{U}_2 |0\rangle |\mathbf{0}\rangle |k\rangle = |1\rangle |\mathbf{0}\rangle A_2^\dagger |k\rangle + |0\rangle \sum_{j \neq \mathbf{0}} |j\rangle |\phi_j\rangle. \quad (\text{A6})$$

It is straightforward to observe that, thanks to the orthogonality of computational basis states, the inner product:

$$\langle 0 | \langle \mathbf{0}, k | \mathcal{U}_2^\dagger \mathcal{U}_1 | 0 \rangle | \mathbf{0}, i \rangle = \langle k | A_2 A_1 | i \rangle \equiv (A_2 A_1)_{ki}, \quad (\text{A7})$$

which is exactly the definition of unitary block encoding. Therefore, we have successfully constructed the block encoding of A_2A_1 . The procedure is the same for the reverse order A_1A_2 , except that we need to reverse the role of $\mathcal{U}_{1,2}$ from the above procedure.

Appendix B: Norms of Solution

In this section, we show that if the initial solution x_0 has a bounded norm, then the norm of the solution at any time step t is guaranteed to be less than unity. Our proof is borrowed from the analysis of success probability in [19]. Once we begin with x_0 , we have that:

$$x_1 = x_0 - \eta D(x_0)x_0. \quad (\text{B1})$$

So the norm is:

$$\|x_1\|^2 = \|x_0\|^2 - 2\eta x_0^T \cdot D(x_0)x_0 + \eta^2 \|D(x_0)x_0\|^2 \quad (\text{B2})$$

$$\leq \|x_0\|^2 + 2\eta \|x_0\| \|D(x_0)x_0\| + \eta^2 \|D(x_0)x_0\|^2 \quad (\text{B3})$$

$$\leq \|x_0\|^2 (1 + \eta \|D\|)^2 \quad (\text{B4})$$

$$\leq 4\|x_0\|^2, \quad (\text{B5})$$

where the last line comes from the fact that one can choose η to be smaller than $1/\|D\| < 1/p$. Iteratively continuing the procedure, we have that at the t -th iteration:

$$\|x_t\|^2 \leq 4^t \|x_0\|^2. \quad (\text{B6})$$

If we choose x_0 such that: $\|x_0\|^2 \leq 1/4^t$, then, the norm of x_t is guaranteed to be less than unity, as we desired. The question now is how to generate x_0 satisfying such a condition. A simple solution is that we choose to generate a vector X of dimension $M > n$, and pick the first n amplitudes so that their squared sum is less than $1/4^t$. Such a state could be prepared with a method outlined in [44]. Another simple way to prepare such a state apparently exists. If we use $2t$ qubits initialized in $|0\rangle$ and apply Hadamard gates, we obtain the state:

$$|\phi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^{2t}}} \sum_i^{4^t} |i\rangle.$$

If we choose t such that $2t > \log(n)$, then the above summation has $4^t > n$ terms. If we consider only the first n amplitudes, then their squared sum is $n/4^t$. We simply need to choose $t' = t + \log(n)/2$, then the norm is $1/4^{t'}$, which is exactly the desired norm. Given that we can prepare such M -dimensional state, Lemma 1 allows us to construct the block encoding of XX^T of dimension $M \times M$. If we limit ourselves to the top left block of dimension $n \times n$, then this is the operator $x_0 x_0^T$ that we desired.

Appendix C: Proof of Lemma 11

We remind the lemma we wish to prove:

Lemma 14 *Given block encoding of $(xx^T)^{\otimes p-1} \otimes \frac{D(x)}{ps}$, then it is possible to obtain the block encoding of $D(x)/ps$ in $\mathcal{O}(\gamma^{2(p-1)}ps)$ where γ is some constant.*

We first define several symbols. Let P denote the block encoding of $X \equiv (xx^T)^{\otimes p-1} \otimes \frac{D(x)}{ps}$. Let A , B , and C denote the registers corresponding to the auxiliary system of block encoding (see the definition 1), $(xx^T)^{\otimes p-1}$, and $D(x)/ps$, respectively. Let U denote some unitary of dimension $n \times n$. Then, we have the following:

$$P(I_A \otimes U^{\otimes p-1} \otimes I) |\mathbf{0}\rangle_A |\mathbf{0}\rangle_B |k\rangle_C = |\mathbf{0}\rangle_A X(U^{\otimes p-1}) |\mathbf{0}\rangle_B |k\rangle_C + |\Phi_\perp\rangle, \quad (\text{C1})$$

where $|\Phi_\perp\rangle$ satisfies that $|\mathbf{0}\rangle_A \langle \mathbf{0}|_A \otimes I \cdot |\Phi_\perp\rangle = 0$. Let us note the following:

$$U^{\otimes p-1} |\mathbf{0}\rangle_B = U^{\otimes p-1} |0\rangle^{\otimes p-1} = |\alpha\rangle^{\otimes p-1},$$

and define the symbol $\beta = \langle \alpha | xx^T | \alpha \rangle$. It is then straightforward to see that:

$$\langle \mathbf{0}|_B \langle i|_C U^{\dagger \otimes p-1} X U^{\otimes p-1} |\mathbf{0}\rangle_B |k\rangle_C = \beta^{p-1} \langle i|_C \frac{D(x)}{ps} |k\rangle_C = \beta^{p-1} (D(x)/ps)_{ik}, \quad (\text{C2})$$

where the last term comes from the definition of a matrix. Therefore, the unitary $(I_A \otimes U^{\dagger \otimes p-1} \otimes I)P(I_A \otimes U^{\otimes p-1} \otimes I)$ is the unitary block encoding of $\beta^{p-1}D(x)/ps$. Thanks to the preamplification technique introduced in [23], one can use the block encoding above roughly $\mathcal{O}((1/\beta)^{p-1})$ times to remove such a factor. Therefore, the factor γ in the stated lemma is $1/\sqrt{\beta}$. We remark that the factor $\beta = \langle \alpha | xx^T | \alpha \rangle$ can be estimated using the Hadamard test method and the procedure is as follows.

We use the block encoding of xx^T to apply to the state $|\mathbf{0}\rangle_A |\alpha\rangle$ (where A refers to the ancilla system for the block encoding), resulting in the following:

$$|\psi\rangle = |\mathbf{0}\rangle_A xx^T |\alpha\rangle + |\phi_\perp\rangle, \quad (\text{C3})$$

where again $|\mathbf{0}\rangle_A \langle \mathbf{0}|_A \otimes I \cdot |\phi_\perp\rangle = 0$.

Then we generate $|\mathbf{0}\rangle_A |\alpha\rangle$ in another register. We use $|\psi\rangle$ and $|\mathbf{0}\rangle_A$ in the Hadamard test and observe that their overlap is β . One may wonder what if the value of β is small, e.g., of the order $1/n$. If that is the case, then $1/\beta$ is very large, resulting in a substantial running time. Since the state $|\alpha\rangle$ can be arbitrary, one can heuristically choose an arbitrary unitary U and execute the algorithm. As the value β can be evaluated via the Hadamard test, we can first test to see if β is large enough. Then the value of γ in Lemma 11 is bounded, as claimed. Note that since at each iteration step t , we might use a different U and hence the value of β at each step is different, the actual value of γ in Lemma 11 is the maximum among all values of γ , hence justifying the running time to be $\mathcal{O}(T\gamma^{2p-2})$.

The above procedure is quite heuristic as we choose U that provides a non-small value of β . This is quite practical as it only requires changing the circuit U and using the Hadamard test. Now we provide a more careful analysis to show that, for a given U , e.g., one might choose U to be the circuit that generates the initial state $|x_0\rangle$, if one chooses the step size η to be sufficiently small, then the value of β is guaranteed to be lower bounded.

We observe that, once we begin with $|x_0\rangle \langle x_0|$ (or $x_0 x_0^T$ for simplicity), at step t , we obtain the new operator $X_t = x_t x_t^T$ and the new operator in the next iteration is:

$$X_{t+1} = x_{t+1} x_{t+1}^T = \frac{1}{4} \left((I - D(X_t)) X_t (I - D(X_t))^T \right). \quad (\text{C4})$$

As the norm of $D \leq p$ for any input, we have that:

$$|x_0^T x_{t+1}| = \left| \frac{1}{2} x_0^T (I - \eta D(X_t)) x_t \right| \quad (\text{C5})$$

$$= \left| \frac{1}{2} x_0^T x_t - \frac{1}{2} \eta x_0^T D(X_t) x_t \right| \quad (\text{C6})$$

$$\geq \left| \frac{1}{2} x_0^T x_t - \frac{1}{2} \eta p x_0^T x_t \right| \quad (\text{C7})$$

$$= \left| \left(\frac{1 - \eta p}{2} \right) \cdot x_0^T x_t \right|. \quad (\text{C8})$$

By a simple inductive procedure for a total of $(t + 1)$ iterations, and using the fact that $|x_0|^2 = 1/4^t$ as shown previously, we can infer that:

$$|x_0^T x_{t+1}| \geq \left(\frac{1 - \eta p}{2} \right)^{t+1} \frac{1}{4^t} = 4 \left(\frac{1 - \eta p}{8} \right)^{t+1}. \quad (\text{C9})$$

If we choose the unitary U to be the one that generates x_0 , we have that at the t -th step:

$$\beta = x_0^T x_t x_t^T x_0 = 16 \left(\frac{1 - \eta p}{8} \right)^{2t}. \quad (\text{C10})$$

If we want β to be lower bounded, for example, greater than $1/4$, then we require:

$$\left(\frac{1 - \eta p}{8} \right)^{2t} \geq \frac{1}{64}. \quad (\text{C11})$$

The above condition is equivalent to:

$$\eta \leq \frac{1}{p} \left(1 - 8 \left(\frac{1}{8} \right)^{1/t} \right), \quad (\text{C12})$$

which shows that if η is sufficiently small then β is guaranteed to be lower bounded at time step t , which in turn means that γ (in Lemma 11) is upper bounded at the same time step. For a total T steps in the gradient descent algorithm, one simply chooses η correspondingly by fixing $t = T$ in the above equation.