

# Circuit Complexity of Sparse Quantum State Preparation

Jingquan Luo and Lvzhou Li\*

*Institute of Quantum Computing and Software, School of Computer Science and Engineering,  
Sun Yat-sen University, Guangzhou 510006, China*

June 25, 2024

## Abstract

Quantum state preparation is a fundamental and significant subroutine in quantum computing. In this paper, we conduct a systematic investigation on the circuit size for sparse quantum state preparation. A quantum state is said to be  $d$ -sparse if it has only  $d$  non-zero amplitudes. For the task of preparing an  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state, we obtain the following results:

- **Without ancillary qubits:** We propose the first approach that uses  $o(dn)$  elementary gates without using ancillary qubits. Specifically, it is proven that any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state can be prepared by a quantum circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$  without using ancillary qubits. This is asymptotically optimal when  $d = \text{poly}(n)$ , and this optimality extends to a broader scope under some reasonable assumptions.
- **With limited ancillary qubits:** (i) We show that any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state can be prepared by a quantum circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  and depth  $\Theta(\log dn)$  using at most  $O(\frac{nd}{\log d})$  ancillary qubits, which not only reduces the circuit size compared to the one without ancillary qubits when  $d = \omega(\text{poly}(n))$ , but also achieves the same asymptotically optimal depth while utilizing fewer ancillary qubits and applying fewer quantum gates compared to the result given in [Physical Review Letters, 129, 230504(2022)]. (ii) We establish the lower bound  $\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log(n+m)+\log d} + n)$  on the circuit size with  $m$  ancillary qubits available. Additionally, we demonstrate a slightly stronger lower bound  $\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log(n+m)} + n)$  under reasonable assumptions.
- **With unlimited ancillary qubits:** We prove that with arbitrary amount of ancillary qubits available, the circuit size for preparing  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum states is  $\Theta(\frac{dn}{\log dn} + n)$ .

---

\*Email: lilvzh@mail.sysu.edu.cn

# 1 Introduction

Since the inception of quantum computing [1], an increasing number of quantum algorithms have emerged, exhibiting acceleration advantages over classical algorithms. Notable examples include Shor’s algorithm [2], Grover’s algorithm [3], HHL algorithm [4], and Hamiltonian simulation algorithms [5, 6, 7, 8], as well as quantum machine learning algorithms [9, 10, 11, 12, 13]. Within these algorithms, the preparation of quantum states plays a pivotal role. Usually, the first and inevitable step to process classical data by quantum algorithms is to encode the data into quantum states. If this step consumes substantial resources, it may offset the acceleration advantages of quantum algorithms. Several works have indicated that the substantial accelerations achieved by quantum machine learning stem from the underlying input assumptions [14, 15, 16, 17, 18]. Therefore, how to efficiently prepare quantum states is a fundamental and significant issue in the field of quantum computing.

Before delving into the discussion of quantum state preparation, it is essential to specify the elementary gate set and complexity metrics. In this paper, we adopt the most common gate set, which consists of single-qubit gates and CNOT gates, enabling the accurate implementation of any unitary transformation [19]. Additionally, for convenience, the Toffoli gate is permitted, which can be constructed using 10 single-qubit gates and 6 CNOT gates [20]. Various standards can be employed to gauge the efficiency of a quantum circuit, including size, depth, number of ancillary qubits, and more. Given the considerably higher implementation cost of CNOT gates compared to single-qubit gates, the count of CNOT gates is also utilized as a measure of algorithmic efficiency.

When the quantum state to be prepared does not possess any structural features, we refer to it as the general quantum state preparation problem. This problem has already been extensively researched, and current preparation algorithms have achieved the optimal circuit size  $\Theta(2^n)$  [21, 22, 23, 24, 24, 25]. Given the high cost of preparing general quantum states and the fact that, in practical applications, data often exhibits special structures, there has been considerable literature focusing on the preparation of special quantum states. These include states whose amplitudes are given by a continuous function [26, 27, 28, 29, 30, 31], states whose amplitudes are accessed through a black-box oracle [32, 33, 34], and states under the low-rank assumption [35]. Another class of special quantum states that holds both practical and theoretical significance is sparse quantum states. In this paper, we focus on characterizing the circuit size for sparse quantum state preparation, exploring the two scenarios: without and with ancillary qubits.

An  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state refers to an  $n$ -qubit quantum state with  $d$  non-zero amplitudes. Given two positive integers  $n$  and  $0 < d \leq 2^n$ , along with a set

$$\mathcal{P} = \{(\alpha_i, q_i) \mid \alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}, q_i \in \{0, 1\}^n, 0 \leq i \leq d - 1\}, \quad (1)$$

such that  $\sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 = 1$ , the aim of sparse quantum state preparation is to generate a quantum circuit which acts on  $n + m$  qubits and implements a unitary operator  $U$  satisfying

$$U |0\rangle^{\otimes n} |0\rangle^{\otimes m} = \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \alpha_i |q_i\rangle |0\rangle^{\otimes m}, \quad (2)$$

where  $m \geq 0$  is an integer and the last  $m$  qubits serve as ancillary qubits.

The problem of sparse quantum state preparation has garnered significant attention [36, 37, 38, 39, 40, 41, 42, 43, 44]. Gleinig and Hoefler [36] were the first to address this problem and presented an algorithm generating a quantum circuit of size  $O(dn)$  without using ancillary qubits for any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state. Subsequently, Malvetti et al. [37] and Ramacciotti et al. [38] presented permutation-based preparation algorithms, achieving the same circuit size using 0 and 1 ancillary qubits, respectively. de Veras et al. [40] improved upon the ideas in [45, 46] and introduced a preparation algorithm based on quantum state splitting, achieving the same circuit size by employing 2 ancillary qubits. They further optimized this algorithm [41], presenting a circuit size depending on the Hamming weights of the basis states with non-zero amplitudes:  $O(\sum_i |q_i|)$ . In the worst case, the circuit size remains  $O(dn)$ . Mozafari et al. [39] employed decision diagrams to represent quantum states and introduced an algorithm with circuit size  $O(kn)$ , using 1 ancillary qubit, where  $k$  denotes the number of paths in the decision diagram. For a  $d$ -sparse quantum state, as the number of paths in its associated decision diagram satisfies  $k \leq d$ , the circuit size of this method in the worst-case remains  $O(dn)$ . In summary, the circuit sizes of all the aforementioned algorithms are  $O(dn)$ .

It is worth noting that recently Mao et al. [44] propose a sparse state preparation algorithm which generates circuits of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$  with two ancillary qubits, improving the circuit size upper bound of  $O(dn)$ . They also show a matching lower bound under some reasonable assumptions, which implies the circuit size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$  is asymptotically optimal when  $d = O(2^{\delta n})$  for some constant  $0 < \delta < 1$  and at most  $poly(n)$  ancillary qubits are used.

In addition to optimizing the circuit size, Zhang et al. [42] and Sun et al. [43] focused on optimizing circuit depth with ancillary qubits. Zhang et al. [42] showed that, with  $O(dn \log d)$  ancillary qubits, any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state can be prepared by a circuit of depth  $O(\log dn)$ . They also proved a matching depth lower bound  $\Omega(\log dn)$ . On the other hand, for any  $m \geq 0$ , Sun et al. [43] proposed an algorithm with depth complexity  $O(n \log dn + \frac{dn^2 \log d}{n+m})$  using  $m$  ancillary qubits.

Despite significant research on sparse quantum state preparation, the circuit size for this task is not as clearly characterized as it is for general quantum state preparation. The understanding on the following issue is still limited: what is the optimal circuit size for sparse quantum state preparation with and without ancillary qubits, respectively.

## 1.1 Contributions

In this paper, we conduct a systematic investigation on the circuit size of sparse quantum state preparation, exploring the two scenarios: without and with ancillary qubits. The comparison of exiting works and our results is illustrated in Table 1. The complexity notations  $O$ ,  $\Omega$ ,  $o$  and  $\omega$  will be explained in detail in Section 2.

First, we consider the scenario of not using ancillary qubits.

**Theorem 1.** *Any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state can be prepared by a quantum circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$  without using ancillary qubits.*

Compared to a quite recent result [44], we demonstrate for the first time that any

Table 1: Summary of Results on Sparse Quantum State Preparation

Reference	Circuit Size	Depth	# Ancilla
[36, 37]	$O(dn)$	/ *	0
[38, 39, 41]	$O(dn)$	/	1
[40]	$O(dn)$	/	2
[44]	$O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$	/	2
[42]	$O(dn \log d)$ **	$\Theta(\log dn)$	$O(dn \log d)$
[43]	/	$O(n \log dn + \frac{dn^2 \log d}{n+m})$	$m$
Theorem 1	$O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$	/	0
Theorem 2	$O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$	/	$O(\frac{n\sqrt{d}}{\log d} + d)$
Theorem 3	$O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$	$O(\log dn)$	$O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$
Theorem 4	$\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log(m+n)+\log d} + n)$	/	$m$
Theorem 6	$\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log(m+n)} + n)$ ***	/	$m$
Corollary 5	$\Theta(\frac{dn}{\log dn} + n)$	/	unlimited number
	$\Theta(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$ ( $d = \text{poly}(n)$ )	/	0

\* The notation ‘/’ indicates that the corresponding cost was not considered in the original paper.

\*\* The circuit size was not given in [42], but it can be obtained by inspecting the algorithm presented there.

\*\*\* The lower bound is obtained under reasonable assumptions.

$n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state can be prepared by a circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$  without using ancillary qubits. Later, in Corollary 5 we will see that the upper bound  $O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$  is asymptotically optimal when  $d = \text{poly}(n)$  in the case of no ancillary qubits available. Moreover, this asymptotic optimality extends to a broader scope under reasonable assumptions as shown in Theorem 6.

Next, we consider the scenario of using ancillary qubits. In the following, we assume that  $d \geq 2$ .

**Theorem 2.** *Any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state can be prepared by a quantum circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  using at most  $O(\frac{n\sqrt{d}}{\log d} + d)$  ancillary qubits.*

Theorem 2 indicates that the circuit size of preparing sparse quantum states can be further reduced with employing ancillary qubits. Specifically, when  $d = \omega(\text{poly}(n))$ , Theorem 2 exhibits a superior circuit size compared to Theorem 1. Note that the circuit size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  is asymptotically optimal when  $d = \Omega(n)$  (see Corollary 5 later). Furthermore, if more ancillary qubits are allowed, then the circuit depth can be optimized to  $O(\log dn)$  while preserving the asymptotic circuit size.

**Theorem 3.** *Any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state can be prepared by a quantum circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  and depth  $O(\log dn)$  using at most  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  ancillary qubits.*

Zhang et al. [42] proposed an algorithm for sparse quantum state preparation achieving the circuit depth of  $O(\log dn)$  and using  $O(dn \log n)$  ancillary qubits. They also demonstrated that a matching lower bound of  $\Omega(\log dn)$ . In comparison, we achieve the same asymptotically optimal depth while utilizing fewer ancillary qubits and applying fewer quantum gates.

We also establish a lower bound on the circuit size for sparse quantum state preparation.

**Theorem 4.** *Given  $m$  ancillary qubits available, there exist  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum states such that any algorithm to prepare them requires  $\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log(m+n)+\log d} + n)$  elementary quantum gates.*

Putting the above results together, we can obtain a full characterization on the circuit size of sparse quantum state preparation for the case of unlimited number of ancillary qubits available.

**Corollary 5.** *With arbitrary amount of ancillary qubits available, the circuit size for preparing  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum states is  $\Theta(\frac{dn}{\log dn} + n)$ . Furthermore, if  $d = \text{poly}(n)$ , then the circuit size is  $\Theta(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$ , which can be achieved without using ancillary qubits.*

*Proof.* First note that the circuit size has been shown to be  $O(dn)$  even without any ancillary qubit [36, 37], as shown in Table 1. Thus, employing more than  $O(dn)$  ancillary qubits (or in other words,  $\omega(dn)$  ancillary qubits) is meaningless for circuit size optimization. Then, when the number of ancillary qubits available is unlimited, it is sufficient to assume  $\Theta(dn)$  ancillary qubits available. Therefore, by setting  $m = \Theta(dn)$  in Theorem 4, we get the lower bound  $\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log dn} + n)$ . This lower bound can be achieved by combining Theorem 1 and Theorem 2: employing the algorithm in Theorem 1 when  $d \leq n$ , and resorting to the algorithm in Theorem 2 when  $d > n$ .

Furthermore, if  $d = \text{poly}(n)$ , then  $\Theta(\frac{dn}{\log dn} + n)$  becomes  $\Theta(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$ , which can be achieved without using ancillary qubits as shown in Theorem 1.  $\square$

We notice that all sparse quantum state preparation methods proposed so far use at most  $O(d)$  arbitrary-angle single-qubit rotation gates (i.e.,  $R_x(\theta)$ ,  $R_y(\theta)$ ,  $R_z(\theta)$ ). For example, in permutation-based algorithms [37, 38], arbitrary-angle single-qubit rotation gates are only used in the first step to prepare a  $\lceil \log d \rceil$ -qubit quantum state, while in the second step, implementing a permutation only involves CNOT gates and  $O(n)$  specific types of single-qubit gates. We believe that using more arbitrary-angle single-qubit rotation gates is pointless. Here we prove that under reasonable assumptions, the circuit size lower bound can be further improved.

**Theorem 6.** *Suppose  $d \leq 2^{\delta n}$  for a sufficiently small constant  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , and given  $m$  ancillary qubits available, if an algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  for preparing  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum states satisfies the following conditions:*

1.  $\mathcal{A}$  uses at most  $O(d)$  single-qubit rotation gates with arbitrary angles,
2. all other single-qubit gates amount to a total of  $O(n)$  types,

*then  $\mathcal{A}$  requires  $\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log(m+n)} + n)$  elementary quantum gates in the worst case.*

The lower bound presented in Theorem 6 is  $\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$  when  $m = 0$ , matching the circuit size given in Theorem 1, which indicates that when  $d \leq 2^{\delta n}$  for a sufficiently small constant  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , the upper bound given in Theorem 1 is asymptotically optimal under reasonable assumptions.

## 1.2 Proof Techniques

**Upper Bounds for Circuit Size** The idea of sparse quantum state preparation without ancillary qubits proposed in this paper aligns with prior research [37, 38]. Given the state description  $\mathcal{P} = \{(\alpha_i, q_i) \mid \alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}, q_i \in \{0, 1\}^n, 0 \leq i \leq d - 1\}$ , initially a dense  $\lceil \log d \rceil$ -qubit quantum state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |\sigma^{-1}(q_i)\rangle$  is prepared, where  $\sigma$  is some permutation such that  $0 \leq \sigma^{-1}(q_i) \leq d - 1$ . Subsequently, this state is transformed into the target quantum state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |q_i\rangle$  by applying  $\sigma$ . The dense quantum state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |\sigma^{-1}(q_i)\rangle$  can be prepared with a circuit of size  $O(d)$ . Therefore, the primary contribution to circuit size arises from the second step—the implementation of the permutation  $\sigma$ . Prior works [37, 38] have constructed circuits of size  $O(dn)$  for implementing  $\sigma$ , which results in an overall circuit size of  $O(dn)$ . In comparison, we adopt a method for implementing  $\sigma$  with circuit size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log n})$ , as detailed in Lemma 9.

To further reduce the circuit size with ancillary qubits, we adopt a new framework. First, a specific  $d$ -qubit quantum state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |e_i\rangle$  using unary encoding is prepared, where  $|e_i\rangle$  denotes the quantum state where the  $i$ th qubit is 1, and all other qubits are 0. Johri et al. [47] showed that the unary encoding can be efficiently implemented (see Lemma 11). Subsequently, we transform the encoding from  $|e_i\rangle$  to  $|q_i\rangle$  to obtain the target quantum state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |q_i\rangle$ . We devise a procedure to perform the encoding transformation, with circuit size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  and using  $O(\frac{n\sqrt{d}}{\log d})$  ancillary qubits.

**Lower Bound for Circuit Size** Prior proofs of lower bounds for quantum circuit size relied on dimensionality arguments [24, 48], resulting in a trivial lower bound of  $\Omega(d)$  when applied to the sparse quantum state preparation problem. Here we employ the counting argument. The challenge in applying this method to establish lower bounds for quantum circuit size lies in the existence of an infinite number of single-qubit quantum gates, i.e., the parameters of  $\{R_x(\theta), R_y(\theta), R_z(\theta)\}$  are continuous. The fundamental idea in the proof is to discretize the parameters of the single-qubit quantum gates.

## 2 Preliminaries

In this paper, all logarithms are base 2. A permutation  $\sigma$  on a finite set  $A$  is a bijective function  $\sigma: A \rightarrow A$ . Given a positive integer  $n$ , we denote by  $\mathfrak{S}_{2^n}$  the set of all permutations on  $\{0, 1\}^n$ , and the permutations considered in this paper all belong to  $\mathfrak{S}_{2^n}$ . A cycle  $(a_1, a_2, \dots, a_k)$  is a permutation  $\sigma$  such that  $\sigma(a_1) = a_2$ ,  $\sigma(a_2) = a_3$ ,  $\dots$ , and  $\sigma(a_k) = a_1$ . The length of a cycle is the number of elements it contains. A cycle of length two is called a transposition. A cycle of length  $k$  is called a  $k$ -cycle. The composition of two permutations  $\sigma_1$  and  $\sigma_2$  is denoted by  $\sigma_2 \circ \sigma_1$  where the right one is applied first. The composition operation is typically not commutative, but when two permutations are disjoint, we can interchange them. Any permutation can be decomposed as a composition

of a finite number of transpositions. A permutation is even (odd) if it can be written as a composition of an even (odd) number of transpositions.

**Lemma 7** ([49]). *Any permutation can be written as the composition of a finite number of pairwise disjoint cycles.*

A fixed point of a permutation  $\sigma$  is an element  $x \in \{0, 1\}^n$  satisfying  $\sigma(x) = x$ . For any permutation  $\sigma$ , let  $\mathbf{size}(\sigma)$  denote the number of non-fixed points of  $\sigma$ :

$$\mathbf{size}(\sigma) := |\{x \in \{0, 1\}^n \mid \sigma(x) \neq x\}|. \quad (3)$$

Here we give a simple example to show the notions given above. Consider the permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_8$  given as follows:

$$\begin{aligned} \sigma(0) &= 1, & \sigma(1) &= 5, \sigma(2) = 4, \sigma(3) = 3, \\ \sigma(4) &= 2, & \sigma(5) &= 7, \sigma(6) = 6, \sigma(7) = 0. \end{aligned}$$

$\sigma$  could be written as

$$\sigma = (0, 1, 5, 7) \circ (2, 4) \circ (3) \circ (6) \quad (4)$$

$$= (0, 1, 5, 7) \circ (2, 4) \quad (5)$$

$$= (0, 5) \circ (0, 1) \circ (5, 7) \circ (2, 4). \quad (6)$$

In Equation (4),  $\sigma$  is written as the composition of pairwise disjoint cycles, where  $(0, 1, 5, 7)$  is a 4-circle and  $(2, 4)$  is a transposition. In Equation (5), we omit 1-circles. In Equation (6),  $\sigma$  is decomposed as the composition of 5 transpositions, thus  $\sigma$  is an odd permutation. The number of non-fixed points of  $\sigma$  is  $\mathbf{size}(\sigma) = 6$ .

An  $n$ -qubit Toffoli gate is a quantum gate acting on  $n$  qubits and applying an X gate on the last qubit when the preceding  $n - 1$  qubits are all in the state  $|1\rangle$ . Gidney [50] demonstrated the following lemma in his well-known blog:

**Lemma 8** ([50]). *Any  $n$ -qubit Toffoli gate can be implemented by a quantum circuit of size  $O(n)$  without ancillary qubits.*

We briefly introduce several complexity notations. Given two functions  $f(n)$  and  $g(n)$  defined on  $\mathbb{N}$ :

- $f(n) = O(g(n))$  if there exist positive constants  $c$  and  $n_0$  such that  $f(n) \leq c \cdot g(n)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ .
- $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$  if there exist positive constants  $c$  and  $n_0$  such that  $f(n) \geq c \cdot g(n)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ .
- $f(n) = \Theta(g(n))$  if both  $f(n) = O(g(n))$  and  $f(n) = \Omega(g(n))$ .
- $f(n) = o(g(n))$  if, for any positive constant  $c > 0$ , there exists a constant  $n_0$  such that  $f(n) \leq c \cdot g(n)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ .
- $f(n) = \omega(g(n))$  if, for any positive constant  $c > 0$ , there exists a constant  $n_0$  such that  $f(n) \geq c \cdot g(n)$  for all  $n \geq n_0$ .

## 3 Sparse Quantum State Preparation Algorithm

### 3.1 Without Ancillary Qubits

In this section, we present a sparse quantum state preparation algorithm without using ancillary qubits. The algorithm presented here relies on the efficient implementation of a permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$ . Zakablukov [51] demonstrated that any even permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$  can be implemented by an NCT circuit of size  $O(\frac{n2^n}{\log n})$  without ancillary qubits, where an NCT circuit consists of X gates, CNOT gates and Toffoli gates. Wu and Li [52] proved that any permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_n$  can be implemented by a quantum circuit with no more than  $O(\frac{n2^n}{\log n})$  elementary gates and with much fewer Non-Clifford gates. Inspired by [51, 52], it is shown in the following lemma that the circuit size for implementing a permutation  $\sigma$  is actually related to the number of non-fixed point of  $\sigma$ .

**Lemma 9.** *For any permutation  $\sigma \in \mathfrak{S}_{2^n}$ , there exists a quantum circuit implementing  $\sigma$  of size  $O(\frac{\text{size}(\sigma)n}{\log n} + n \log \min\{\text{size}(\sigma), \log n\})$  without using ancillary qubits. In particular, when  $\sigma$  is a composition of  $\frac{\text{size}(\sigma)}{2}$  disjoint transpositions, there exists a circuit implementing  $\sigma$  of size  $O(\frac{\text{size}(\sigma)n}{\log n} + n)$  without using ancillary qubits.*

*Proof.* The basic steps are as follows:

- **Step 1:** Decompose  $\sigma$  into a composition of a series of permutations  $\sigma_i$ , where each permutation  $\sigma_i$  consists of at most  $m$  pairwise disjoint transpositions.  $m$  is a parameter to be determined.
- **Step 2:** Assume  $\sigma_i = (x_0, x_1) \circ (x_2, x_3) \circ \dots \circ (x_{2m-2}, x_{2m-1})$  and implement each  $\sigma_i$  successively by the following steps:
  - **Step 2a:** Execute the permutation  $\sigma_{i,1}$  satisfying the condition: for any  $0 \leq j \leq 2m - 1$ ,  $\sigma_{i,1}(x_j) = j$ ;
  - **Step 2b:** Execute the permutation  $\sigma_{i,2} = (0, 1) \circ (2, 3) \circ \dots \circ (2m - 2, 2m - 1)$ ;
  - **Step 2c:** Execute the inverse of permutation  $\sigma_{i,1}$ .

Below, we illustrate how to implement this process, set the parameter  $m$ , and analyze the circuit size.

In Step 1, we aim to decompose  $\sigma$  into the composition of  $M = \lfloor \frac{\text{size}(\sigma)}{m} \rfloor + \lceil \log(\min\{3m, \text{size}(\sigma)\}) \rceil$  permutations  $\{\sigma_i \mid 0 \leq i \leq M - 1\}$ , i.e.,  $\sigma = \sigma_{M-1} \circ \dots \circ \sigma_0$ , where each  $\sigma_i$  consists of at most  $m$  pairwise disjoint transpositions, where  $m$  will be determined later. Firstly, by Lemma 7, we decompose  $\sigma$  into a composition of  $K$  pairwise disjoint cycles for some integer  $K \geq 0$ , i.e.  $\sigma = \rho_{K-1} \circ \dots \circ \rho_0$ , where each  $\rho_k$  is an  $r_k$ -cycle for some integer  $r_k \geq 0$ . It is obvious that  $\sum_k r_k = \text{size}(\sigma)$ . Assuming  $\rho_k = (x_0, x_1, \dots, x_{r_k-1})$ , it can be decomposed as  $\rho_k = (x_0, x_2, \dots, x_{r_k-4}, x_{r_k-2}) \circ (x_0, x_1) \circ (x_2, x_3) \circ \dots \circ (x_{r_k-2}, x_{r_k-1})$  when  $r_k$  is even, or  $\rho_k = (x_0, x_2, \dots, x_{r_k-4}, x_{r_k-2}, x_{r_k-1}) \circ (x_0, x_1) \circ (x_2, x_3) \circ \dots \circ (x_{r_k-3}, x_{r_k-2})$  when  $r_k$  is odd. By applying this method repeatedly, we can decompose  $\rho_0, \dots, \rho_{K-1}$  until obtaining  $m$  pairwise disjoint transpositions, which makes up  $\sigma_0$ . At this point,  $\sigma = \sigma' \circ \sigma_0$  and  $\text{size}(\sigma') = \text{size}(\sigma) - m$ . Repeating this process until it is no longer possible to find out new  $m$  pairwise disjoint transpositions, we obtain at most  $\lfloor \frac{\text{size}(\sigma)}{m} \rfloor$

permutations composed of  $m$  pairwise disjoint transpositions. Now, we can represent  $\sigma$  as  $\sigma = \sigma'' \circ \sigma_{L-1} \cdots \circ \sigma_1 \circ \sigma_0$  for some integer  $L \leq \lfloor \frac{\text{size}(\sigma)}{m} \rfloor$ . In the worst case,  $\sigma''$  is the composition of at most  $(m-1)$  3-cycles, and  $\text{size}(\sigma'') \leq \text{size}(\sigma)$ . Thus, we have  $\text{size}(\sigma'') \leq \min\{3m, \text{size}(\sigma)\}$ . We continue to decompose  $\sigma''$  into the composition of permutations composed of fewer than  $m$  pairwise disjoint transpositions as above. In the worst case,  $\sigma''$  is a cycle itself, which can be further decomposed into at most  $\lceil \log(\text{size}(\sigma'')) \rceil$  permutations, each composed of fewer than  $m$  pairwise disjoint transpositions.

Step 2 is divided into three substeps. Suppose that  $\sigma_i = (x_0, x_1) \circ (x_2, x_3) \circ \cdots \circ (x_{2m-2}, x_{2m-1})$  is composed of  $m$  pairwise disjoint transpositions. First, we illustrate how to implement a permutation  $\sigma_{i,1}$  that satisfies  $\sigma_{i,1}(x_j) = j$  for any  $0 \leq j \leq 2m-1$ . Note that  $x_j$  is an integer represented by  $n$  bits. We treat  $x_j$  as an  $n$ -dimensional row vector  $x_j = (x_{j,0}, x_{j,1}, \dots, x_{j,n-1})$  satisfying  $x_j = \sum_{k=0}^{n-1} x_{j,k} 2^k$ , where  $x_{j,k}$  represents the  $k$ -th bit and the bits are arranged from the least significant bit to the most significant bit, contrary to the usual convention. We construct a matrix composed of  $x_j$  to track the changes in  $x_j$ :

$$A = \begin{pmatrix} x_0 \\ x_1 \\ \dots \\ x_{2m-2} \\ x_{2m-1} \end{pmatrix} = \begin{pmatrix} x_{0,0} & x_{0,1} & \dots & x_{0,n-2} & x_{0,n-1} \\ x_{1,0} & x_{1,1} & \dots & x_{1,n-2} & x_{1,n-1} \\ \vdots & \vdots & & \vdots & \vdots \\ x_{2m-2,0} & x_{2m-2,1} & \dots & x_{2m-2,n-2} & x_{2m-2,n-1} \\ x_{2m-1,0} & x_{2m-1,1} & \dots & x_{2m-1,n-2} & x_{2m-1,n-1} \end{pmatrix} \quad (7)$$

Now we introduce additional conditions to  $m$ : suppose  $m$  is a power of 2 and satisfies  $2m \leq \log n$ . With these conditions, realizing the permutation  $\sigma_{i,1}$  is equivalent to transforming the matrix  $A$  into another matrix  $\tilde{A}$  using elementary gates:

$$\tilde{A} = \begin{pmatrix} \overbrace{0 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0}^{\log 2m} & \overbrace{0 \ \dots \ 0}^{n-\log 2m} \\ 1 \ 0 \ \dots \ 0 & 0 \ \dots \ 0 \\ \vdots & \vdots \\ 0 \ 1 \ \dots \ 1 & 0 \ \dots \ 0 \\ 1 \ 1 \ \dots \ 1 & 0 \ \dots \ 0 \end{pmatrix} \quad (8)$$

Suppose that the matrix  $A$  has  $\ell$  distinct non-zero columns. Since the matrix  $A$  has  $2m$  distinct rows, we have  $\log 2m \leq \ell \leq 2^{2m} - 1$ . When the  $j$ -th column is identical to the  $k$ -th column, i.e.,  $x_{i,j} = x_{i,k}$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq 2m-1$ , and they are not all-zero columns, we apply, without loss of generality, a CNOT gate with the  $j$ -th qubit as the control qubit and the  $k$ -th qubit as the target qubit, transforming the  $k$ -th column into an all-zero column. This process is repeated until the matrix no longer contains identical non-zero columns. This step requires at most  $n - \ell$  CNOT gates. Next, by using at most  $\ell$  swap gates (each of which can be implemented with 3 CNOT gates), we swap the  $\ell$  non-zero

columns to the first  $\ell$  columns, obtaining matrix  $A_1$ :

$$A_1 = \begin{pmatrix} \overbrace{a_{0,0} & a_{0,1} & \dots & a_{0,\ell}}^{\ell} & \overbrace{0 & \dots & 0}^{n-\ell} \\ \overbrace{a_{1,0} & a_{1,1} & \dots & a_{1,\ell}}^{\ell} & \overbrace{0 & \dots & 0}^{n-\ell} \\ \vdots & & & \vdots & \vdots \\ \overbrace{a_{2m-2,0} & a_{2m-2,1} & \dots & a_{2m-2,\ell}}^{\ell} & \overbrace{0 & \dots & 0}^{n-\ell} \\ \overbrace{a_{2m-1,0} & a_{2m-1,1} & \dots & a_{2m-1,\ell}}^{\ell} & \overbrace{0 & \dots & 0}^{n-\ell} \end{pmatrix} \quad (9)$$

Next, we proceed to transform each row of matrix  $A_1$  step by step, gradually converting it to matrix  $\tilde{A}$ . We start with the first row (indexed as row 0). If  $a_{0,k} = 1$  for any  $0 \leq k \leq n-1$ , we apply a X gate to the  $k$ -th qubit. This step requires at most  $\ell$  X gates. Upon completing this step, matrix  $A_1$  becomes matrix  $A_2$ :

$$A_2 = \begin{pmatrix} \overbrace{0 & 0 & \dots & 0}^{\ell} & \overbrace{0 & \dots & 0}^{n-\ell} \\ \overbrace{b_{1,0} & b_{1,1} & \dots & b_{1,\ell}}^{\ell} & \overbrace{0 & \dots & 0}^{n-\ell} \\ \vdots & & & \vdots & \vdots \\ \overbrace{b_{2m-2,0} & b_{2m-2,1} & \dots & b_{2m-2,\ell}}^{\ell} & \overbrace{0 & \dots & 0}^{n-\ell} \\ \overbrace{b_{2m-1,0} & b_{2m-1,1} & \dots & b_{2m-1,\ell}}^{\ell} & \overbrace{0 & \dots & 0}^{n-\ell} \end{pmatrix} \quad (10)$$

Suppose the rows indexed by 0 to  $j-1$  have been successfully transformed, we turn our attention to row indexed as  $j$ , which can be divided into two scenarios:

- In the case where there exists an element  $b_{j,k} \neq 0$  in row  $j$  with  $k > \log 2m$ , for each  $0 \leq k' < \ell$  satisfying  $k' \neq k$  and  $b_{j,k'} \neq \tilde{A}_{j,k}$ , we apply a CNOT gate with the  $k$ -th qubit as the control qubit and the  $k'$ -th qubit as the target qubit. This step requires at most  $\ell$  CNOT gates. Subsequently, to eliminate the value  $b_{j,k}$ , we employ a multi-control Toffoli gate. The control qubits for this gate correspond to the non-zero elements in row  $j$  of matrix  $\tilde{A}$ , while the target qubit is the  $k$ -th qubit. This Toffoli gate can be implemented by a circuit of size  $O(\log 2m)$  according to Lemma 8.
- In the case where there is no element  $b_{j,k} \neq 0$  in row  $j$  satisfying  $k > \log 2m$ , we first apply a multi-control Toffoli gate, where the control qubits are those corresponding to the non-zero elements in the current row, while the target qubit is the  $(\log 2m + 1)$ -th qubit. It is asserted that this Toffoli gate will not alter the elements in the rows indexed by 0 to  $j-1$  of the current matrix, as otherwise, there would exist some  $0 \leq j' \leq j-1$  such that the  $j'$ -th row is identical to the  $j$ -th row, contradicting the assumption that each row is distinct. This Toffoli gate contains at most  $\log 2m$  control qubits. Hence, it can be implemented by a circuit of size  $O(\log 2m)$  according to Lemma 8. Upon completion of this Toffoli gate, we revert to the first case.

Combining the above two cases, the transformation of row  $j$  can be implemented using a

circuit of size  $O(\ell + \log 2m)$ . Therefore, the permutation  $\sigma_{i,1}$  can be implemented using a circuit of size  $O(n + m\ell + m \log m)$ .

The final component for implementing  $\sigma$  is  $\sigma_{i,2} = (0, 1) \circ (2, 3) \circ \dots \circ (2m - 2, 2m - 1)$ . Given that  $m$  is a power of 2, the permutation  $\sigma_{i,2}$  essentially flips the first qubit when the last  $n - \log 2m$  qubits are all in the state  $|0\rangle$ . Thus, this permutation can be realized using  $2(n - \log 2m)$  X gates and a multi-controlled Toffoli gate with the last  $n - \log 2m$  qubits as the control qubits and the first qubit as the target qubit. According to Lemma 8, the circuit size for this Toffoli gate is  $O(n - \log 2m)$ .

In summary, the circuit size for implementing any permutation  $\sigma_i$  composed of  $m$  pairwise disjoint transpositions is  $O(n + m\ell + m \log m)$ . Setting  $m = 2^{\lfloor \log(\frac{\log n}{4}) \rfloor}$  and noting that  $\log 2m \leq \ell \leq 2^{2m} - 1$ , the circuit size for implementing  $\sigma_i$  simplifies to  $O(n)$ . In Step 1, we decompose  $\sigma$  as  $\sigma = \sigma_{M-1} \circ \dots \circ \sigma_0$ , where each  $\sigma_i$  consists of at most  $m$  pairwise disjoint transpositions and  $M = \lfloor \frac{\text{size}(\sigma)}{m} \rfloor + \lceil \log(\min\{3m, \text{size}(\sigma)\}) \rceil$ . Thus, the circuit size for implementing  $\sigma$  is  $O(\frac{\text{size}(\sigma)n}{\log n} + n \log \min\{\text{size}(\sigma), \log n\})$ .

In particular, when  $\sigma$  is a composition of  $\frac{\text{size}(\sigma)}{2}$  disjoint transpositions, we have  $M = O(\max\{1, \frac{\text{size}(\sigma)}{\log n}\})$ , resulting in a circuit size of  $O(\max\{\frac{\text{size}(\sigma)n}{\log n}, n\}) = O(\frac{\text{size}(\sigma)n}{\log n} + n)$ .  $\square$

Now, we are ready to derive the main theorem in this section.

**Theorem 10** (Restatement of Theorem 1). *Any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state can be prepared by a quantum circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$  without using ancillary qubits.*

*Proof.* The basic idea is to first prepare a  $\lceil \log d \rceil$ -qubit dense quantum state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |\sigma^{-1}(q_i)\rangle$  where  $\sigma$  is a specific permutation satisfying that  $0 \leq \sigma^{-1}(q_i) \leq d - 1$ , and then transform it to the target state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |q_i\rangle$  by applying  $\sigma$ . The algorithm for the theorem is illustrated in Algorithm 1. In Algorithm 1, after the first two for loops, we construct a permutation  $\sigma$  composed of at most  $d$  disjoint transpositions. According to Lemma 9, the permutation  $\sigma$  can be implemented by a circuit  $C_2$  of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$ . The circuit  $C_1$  is to prepare a  $\lceil \log d \rceil$ -qubit quantum state, thus the circuit size is  $O(d)$ . Therefore, for any  $d$ -sparse quantum state, Algorithm 1 constructs a preparation circuit without ancillary qubits, of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$ .  $\square$

## 3.2 With Ancillary Qubits

In this section, we assume  $d \geq 2$  and present algorithms for preparing any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state with ancillary qubits. The first step is to construct a  $d$ -qubit quantum state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |e_i\rangle$  using unary encoding. Remember that  $|e_i\rangle$  denotes a quantum state where the  $i$ th qubit is 1, and all other qubits are 0. It's crucial to note that what we construct is not a  $2^n$ -qubit quantum state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |e_{q_i}\rangle$ , which contains  $2^n - d$  qubits in the  $|0\rangle$  state, unentangled with any other qubits, given that there exists only  $d$  non-zero amplitudes. Therefore, we can save these qubits, resulting in a significant reduction in the required number of ancillary qubits. It is shown in the following lemma that the unary encoding can be efficiently implemented.

---

**Algorithm 1:**  $d$ -Sparse Quantum State Synthesis Algorithm without Ancillary Qubits

---

**Input:**  $\mathcal{P} = \{(\alpha_i, q_i) \mid 0 \leq i \leq d-1\}$  with  $\alpha_i \in \mathbb{C}, q_i \in \{0, 1\}^n$  for all  $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ , and  $\sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 = 1$ .

**Output:** A quantum circuit for preparing state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |q_i\rangle$ .

**Procedure:**

- 1 Let  $\text{Flag}[d]$  be a Boolean vector with all elements initialized to 0 ;
  - 2 Let  $\sigma$  be an identity permutation ;
  - 3 **for**  $(\alpha_i, q_i)$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  **do**
  - 4     **if**  $q_i < d$  **then**
  - 5          $\text{Flag}[q_i] \leftarrow 1$  ;
  - 6 **for**  $(\alpha_i, q_i)$  in  $\mathcal{P}$  **do**
  - 7     **if**  $q_i \geq d$  **then**
  - 8         find a index  $k$  such that  $\text{Flag}[k] = 0$  ;
  - 9          $\text{Flag}[k] \leftarrow 1$  ;
  - 10          $\sigma \leftarrow \sigma \circ (k, q_i)$  ;
  - 11 Construct a quantum circuit  $C_1$  for preparing the  $\lceil \log d \rceil$ -qubit state  $\sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \alpha_i |\sigma^{-1}(q_i)\rangle$  on the  $\lceil \log d \rceil$  least significant qubits ;
  - 12 Construct a quantum circuit  $C_2$  for implementing the permutation  $\sigma$  ;
  - 13 Output the circuit  $C_2 C_1$  ;
- 

**Lemma 11** ([47]). *Given an integer  $d > 0$  and a vector  $(\alpha_0, \alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_{d-1})^T \in \mathbb{C}^d$  satisfying  $\sum_i |\alpha_i|^2 = 1$ , there exists a quantum circuit operating on  $d$  qubits that implements the transformation*

$$|0\rangle^{\otimes d} \rightarrow \sum_{i=0}^{d-1} \alpha_i |e_i\rangle. \quad (11)$$

*The circuit is of size  $O(d)$  and depth  $O(\log d)$ , and it does not use any ancillary qubits.*

Our current objective is to transform the encoding method. Specifically, we aim to implement the transformation  $\{|e_i\rangle \rightarrow |q_i\rangle \mid 0 \leq i \leq d-1\}$ . One straightforward approach is to prepare a new register with  $n$  qubits for storing  $|q_i\rangle$ , and then sequentially use the  $i$ -th qubit of  $|e_i\rangle$  as the control qubit to write the binary encoding of  $q_i$  into the new register. Finally, apply  $d$   $(n+1)$ -qubit general Toffoli gates with the  $n$  qubits of the new register as the control qubits to reset the  $i$ -th qubit of  $|e_i\rangle$  to  $|0\rangle$  for  $0 \leq i \leq d-1$ . However, this method incurs a circuit size of  $O(dn)$ . To optimize, we propose dividing the binary encoding of  $q_i$  into several segments. We first obtain the unary encoding of each segment and then convert them into binary encoding separately.

**Lemma 12.** *Given a set of  $d$  integers, denoted as  $\{q_i \mid 0 \leq q_i \leq 2^n - 1, 0 \leq i \leq d-1\}$ , there exists a quantum circuit implementing the transformation*

$$|e_i\rangle |0\rangle^{\otimes n} \rightarrow |0\rangle^{\otimes d} |q_i\rangle, \quad 0 \leq i \leq d-1. \quad (12)$$

*The circuit is of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$ , utilizing  $O(\frac{n\sqrt{d}}{\log d})$  ancillary qubits.*

*Proof.* Let  $0 < r \leq n$  be an integer parameter to be determined. For simplicity, let's assume  $r$  divides  $n$ . For each  $q_i$ , we divide its binary representation into  $\frac{n}{r}$  segments. Denote the decimal integer corresponding to the  $j$ -th segment as  $q_{i,j}$ , such that

$$q_i = \sum_{j=0}^{r-1} q_{i,j} 2^{rj}, \quad (13)$$

and

$$|q_i\rangle = |q_{i,n/r-1}\rangle \dots |q_{i,0}\rangle. \quad (14)$$

We implement the transformation defined in Equation (12) through the following steps:

$$\begin{aligned} & \underbrace{|e_i\rangle}_A \underbrace{|0\rangle^{\otimes 2^r}}_{B_{n/r-1}} \dots \underbrace{|0\rangle^{\otimes 2^r}}_{B_0} \underbrace{|0\rangle^{\otimes r}}_{C_{n/r-1}} \dots \underbrace{|0\rangle^{\otimes r}}_{C_0} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{step1}} & |e_i\rangle |e_{q_{i,n/r-1}}\rangle \dots |e_{q_{i,0}}\rangle |0\rangle^{\otimes n} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{step2}} & |0\rangle^{\otimes d} |e_{q_{i,n/r-1}}\rangle \dots |e_{q_{i,0}}\rangle |0\rangle^{\otimes n} \\ \xrightarrow{\text{step3}} & |0\rangle^{\otimes d} |e_{q_{i,n/r-1}}\rangle \dots |e_{q_{i,0}}\rangle |q_{i,n/r-1}\rangle \dots |q_{i,0}\rangle \\ \xrightarrow{\text{step4}} & |0\rangle^{\otimes d} |0\rangle^{\otimes \frac{n2^r}{r}} |q_{i,n/r-1}\rangle \dots |q_{i,0}\rangle \\ & = |0\rangle^{\otimes d} |0\rangle^{\otimes \frac{n2^r}{r}} |q_i\rangle. \end{aligned} \quad (15)$$

The first  $d$  qubits form register  $A$ . The middle  $\frac{n2^r}{r}$  qubits are designated as register  $B$ , which is further divided into  $\frac{n}{r}$  sub-registers  $B_i$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{r} - 1$ , each containing  $2^r$  qubits. The last  $n$  qubits constitute register  $C$ , which is also divided into  $\frac{n}{r}$  sub-registers  $C_i$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{r} - 1$ , each containing  $r$  qubits.

**Step 1:** This step aims to write the unary encoding of each segment of  $q_i$  into each sub-register  $B_j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq \frac{n}{r} - 1$ . Define  $CNOT_{j,k}^i$  as a CNOT gate with the  $i$ -th qubit of register  $A$  as the control qubit and the  $k$ -th qubit of register  $B_j$  as the target qubit. It can be verified that Step 1 can be implemented using the following CNOT circuit:

$$\prod_{i=0}^{d-1} \prod_{j=0}^{\frac{n}{r}-1} CNOT_{j,q_{i,j}}^i. \quad (16)$$

Thus, this step can be achieved with  $\frac{dn}{r}$  CNOT gates.

**Step 2:** This step aims to eliminate the unary encoding  $e_i$  in register  $A$ . Define  $T_i$  as a  $\frac{n}{r} + 1$ -qubit Toffoli gate, with the  $\frac{n}{r}$  control qubits being the  $q_{i,j}$ -th qubit of register  $B_j$  for  $0 \leq j \leq \frac{n}{r} - 1$ , and the target qubit being the  $i$ -th qubit of register  $A$ . Step 2 is implemented using the Toffoli circuit  $\prod_{i=0}^{d-1} T_i$ . According to Lemma 8, each Toffoli gate can be realized with a circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{r})$ . Thus, Step 2 has a circuit size of  $O(\frac{dn}{r})$ .

**Step 3:** This step aims to write the corresponding binary encoding of register  $B_i$  into register  $C_i$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{r}$ . For any  $r$ -bit positive integer  $0 \leq k \leq 2^r - 1$ , let  $S(k) := \{i \mid k_i = 1, 0 \leq i \leq r - 1\}$ . Define  $CNOT_k^{i,j}$  as a CNOT gate, with the control

qubit being the  $j$ -th qubit of register  $B_i$ , and the target qubit being the  $k$ -th qubit of register  $C_i$ . Step 3 is implemented using the following CNOT circuit:

$$\prod_{i=0}^{\frac{n}{r}-1} \prod_{j=0}^{2^r-1} \prod_{k \in S(j)} \text{CNOT}_k^{i,j}. \quad (17)$$

Thus, the circuit size of Step 3 is  $O(n2^r)$ .

**Step 4:** This step aims to eliminate the unary encoding in register  $C_i$  for  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{r}$ . Let  $T_j^i$  denote an  $r+1$ -qubit general Toffoli gate with the  $r$  control qubits being the  $m$  qubits of register  $C_i$ , and the target qubit being the  $j$ -th qubit of register  $B_i$ , which flips the target qubit when register  $C_i$  is in state  $|j\rangle$ . Step 4 is implemented using the following Toffoli circuit:

$$\prod_{i=0}^{\frac{n}{r}-1} \prod_{j=0}^{2^r-1} T_j^i. \quad (18)$$

According to Lemma 8, each  $T_j^i$  can be realized with a circuit of size  $O(r)$ . Therefore, the circuit size of Step 4 is  $O(n2^r)$ .

In conclusion, the circuit size of the entire process is  $O(\frac{dn}{r} + n2^r)$ , and the number of ancillary qubits is  $O(\frac{n2^r}{r})$ . By setting  $r = \lceil \frac{\log d}{2} \rceil$ , the circuit size of the entire process is  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$ , and the number of ancillary qubits is  $O(\frac{n\sqrt{d}}{\log d})$ .  $\square$

If more ancillary qubits are allowed, the transformation described in Lemma 12 can be implemented by a circuit of depth  $O(\log dn)$  in the following, following a procedure similar to Lemma 28 in [43].

**Lemma 13.** *Given a set of  $d$  integers, denoted as  $\{q_i \mid 0 \leq q_i \leq 2^n - 1, 0 \leq i \leq d - 1\}$ , there exists a quantum circuit that implements the transformation*

$$|e_i\rangle |0\rangle^{\otimes n} \rightarrow |0\rangle^{\otimes d} |q_i\rangle, \quad 0 \leq i \leq d - 1. \quad (19)$$

*The circuit is of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  and depth  $O(\log dn)$ , utilizing  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  ancillary qubits.*

*Proof.* For the sake of completeness, we include the proof in Appendix A.  $\square$

Now we present the main theorem of this section.

**Theorem 14** (Restatement of Theorem 2). *Any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state can be prepared by a quantum circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  using at most  $O(\frac{n\sqrt{d}}{\log d} + d)$  ancillary qubits.*

*Proof.* The process can be described by the following formula:

$$|0\rangle^{\otimes n} |0\rangle^{\otimes d} |0\rangle^{\otimes m'} \xrightarrow{\text{Lemma 11}} |0\rangle^{\otimes n} \left( \sum_i \alpha_i |e_i\rangle \right) |0\rangle^{\otimes m'} \quad (20)$$

$$\xrightarrow{\text{Lemma 12}} \left( \sum_i \alpha_i |q_i\rangle \right) |0\rangle^{\otimes d} |0\rangle^{\otimes m'}, \quad (21)$$

where  $m' = O(\frac{n\sqrt{d}}{\log d})$ . First, we prepare a  $d$ -qubit quantum state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |e_i\rangle$  by a circuit of size  $O(d)$  according to Lemma 11 on  $d$  ancillary qubits. Then, utilizing additional  $m' = O(\frac{n\sqrt{d}}{\log d})$  ancillary qubits according to Lemma 12, we transform the state into an  $n$ -qubit quantum state  $\sum_i \alpha_i |q_i\rangle$  by a circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$ .  $\square$

**Theorem 15** (Restatement of Theorem 3). *Any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state can be prepared by a quantum circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  and depth  $O(\log dn)$  using at most  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  ancillary qubits.*

*Proof.* The proof is similar to that of Theorem 14, by combining Lemma 11 and Lemma 13.  $\square$

## 4 Lower Bound on the Circuit Size

In this section, we prove lower bounds on the circuit size for preparing sparse quantum states. The following proof is based on the counting argument. To overcome the challenge posed by the existence of an infinite number of single-qubit quantum gates, we discretize the parameters of these gates.

**Theorem 16** (Restatement of Theorem 4). *Given  $m$  ancillary qubits available, there exist  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum states such that any algorithm to prepare them requires  $\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log(m+n)+\log d} + n)$  elementary quantum gates.*

*Proof.* Consider the universal quantum gate set  $G := \{R_x(\theta), R_y(\theta), R_z(\theta), CNOT\}$ , where  $\theta \in [0, 2\pi)$  is a parameter, and the set of quantum states

$$\mathcal{D}_d := \left\{ |\psi_{\mathcal{S}}\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{d}} \sum_{i \in \mathcal{S}} |i\rangle \mid \mathcal{S} \subset \{0, \dots, 2^n - 1\}, |\mathcal{S}| = d \right\}. \quad (22)$$

For any  $|\psi\rangle, |\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_d$  such that  $|\psi\rangle \neq |\phi\rangle$ , we have  $\| |\psi\rangle - |\phi\rangle \| \geq \sqrt{\frac{2}{d}}$ . Suppose the number of elementary quantum gates required to prepare a quantum state  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_d$  in the worst case is  $T$ . Note that  $T \leq c dn$  for some constant  $c > 0$  [36, 37], as shown in Table 1.

Now we consider a new set of quantum gates  $\tilde{G}$  and a new quantum state preparation task. The new set  $\tilde{G}$  is constructed from  $G$  by restricting the precision of the rotation angles of the single-qubit gates to  $\delta := \sqrt{\frac{1}{4c^2 d^3 n^2}}$ . For instance, given a single-qubit gate  $R_x(\theta)$  from  $G$  with a parameter  $\theta$ , we set  $\tilde{\theta} = \delta \lfloor \frac{\theta}{\delta} \rfloor$ , acquire  $R_x(\tilde{\theta})$  in  $\tilde{G}$ , and approximate  $R_x(\theta)$  with  $R_x(\tilde{\theta})$ . The new quantum state preparation task is to construct a circuit with  $\tilde{G}$  to prepare a quantum state  $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$  for any given  $|\psi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_d$  such that  $\| |\psi\rangle - |\tilde{\psi}\rangle \| \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{4d}}$ . Note that  $\| |\phi\rangle - |\tilde{\psi}\rangle \| > \sqrt{\frac{1}{4d}}$  for any  $|\phi\rangle \in \mathcal{D}_d$  such that  $|\psi\rangle \neq |\phi\rangle$ .

The circuit to prepare  $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$  with  $\tilde{G}$  can be constructed as follows: first, we construct a circuit  $U = U_{T-1} \dots U_0$  with  $G$  to prepare the quantum state  $|\psi\rangle$  exactly, where  $U_i \in G$  or  $U_i = I$ ; then, we replace each single-qubit gate  $R_l(\theta)$  ( $l \in \{x, y, z\}$ ) in  $U$  with  $R_l(\tilde{\theta})$

from  $\tilde{G}$ . It can be verified that this new circuit  $\tilde{U}$  prepare an approximate quantum state  $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$  for  $|\psi\rangle$ , satisfying  $\| |\psi\rangle - |\tilde{\psi}\rangle \| \leq \sqrt{\frac{1}{4d}}$ . This demonstrates the feasibility of achieving the new quantum state preparation task with  $\tilde{G}$ . Note that the discussion also reduces the task of preparing  $|\tilde{\psi}\rangle$  with  $\tilde{G}$  to preparing  $|\psi\rangle$  with  $G$ . Therefore, the lower bound on the circuit size of the former immediately implies the lower bound on the circuit size of the latter.

Note that  $|\tilde{G}| = \frac{6\pi}{\delta} + 1$ . For each  $U_i$ , there are a total of  $(\frac{6\pi}{\delta} + 2)$  choices of quantum gates (including the identity gate  $I$ ) to select from. The position where the quantum gates act has at most  $(m+n)^2$  choices. Therefore, by the counting argument, we have

$$\left( (m+n)^2 \cdot \left( \frac{6\pi}{\delta} + 2 \right) \right)^T \geq |\mathcal{D}_d| \geq \left( \frac{2^n}{d} \right)^d \quad (23)$$

Thus, we have  $T = \Omega\left(\frac{dn - d \log d}{\log(m+n) + \log d}\right)$ .

In addition, we have  $T = \Omega(d)$  from the dimensionality argument. Also, we consider the preparation of the state  $|1\rangle^{\otimes n}$  from the initial state  $|0\rangle^{\otimes n}$  with arbitrary single-qubit gates and CNOT. Undoubtedly we have to access all the qubits to prepare  $|1\rangle^{\otimes n}$ . Therefore we get a lower bound  $\Omega(n)$  on the circuit size.

Combining the argument above, we conclude that

$$T = \Omega\left(\frac{dn - d \log d}{\log(m+n) + \log d} + d + n\right) \quad (24)$$

$$= \Omega\left(\frac{dn}{\log(m+n) + \log d} + n\right). \quad (25)$$

□

**Theorem 17** (Restatement of Theorem 6). *Suppose  $d \leq 2^{\delta n}$  for a sufficiently small constant  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , and given  $m$  ancillary qubits, if an algorithm  $\mathcal{A}$  for preparing  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum states satisfies the following conditions:*

1.  $\mathcal{A}$  uses at most  $O(d)$  single-qubit rotation gates with arbitrary angles,
2. all other single-qubit gates amount to a total of  $O(n)$  types,

then  $\mathcal{A}$  requires  $\Omega\left(\frac{dn}{\log(m+n)} + n\right)$  elementary quantum gates in the worst case.

*Proof.* Following the same discussion as in the proof of Theorem 16, it remains to estimate the number of quantum circuits with  $T$  gates and containing only  $O(d)$  single-qubit rotation gates with arbitrary angles. We distinguish  $\{R_x(\theta), R_y(\theta), R_z(\theta)\}$  from other single-qubit gates in the circuit, so there are  $O(n)$  types of single-qubit gates in total. First, we estimate the number of circuit templates without specifying the parameters of  $\{R_x(\theta), R_y(\theta), R_z(\theta)\}$  in the circuit, and then we specify the angles of single-qubit rotation gates. Therefore, we have

$$\left( (m+n)^2 \cdot c_1 n \right)^T \cdot \left( \frac{6\pi}{\delta} \right)^{c_2 d} \geq |\mathcal{D}_d| \geq \left( \frac{2^n}{d} \right)^d, \quad (26)$$

where  $c_1$  and  $c_2$  are some constants. Hence, we have  $T = \Omega(\frac{dn}{\log(m+n)})$ . Similarly, combining  $T = \Omega(d + n)$ , we obtain the lower bound on the circuit size as  $\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log(m+n)} + n)$ .  $\square$

## 5 Conclusion

In this paper, we focus on optimizing the circuit size of preparing sparse quantum states in two scenarios: without and with ancillary qubits. First, we have demonstrated that, without ancillary qubits, any  $n$ -qubit  $d$ -sparse quantum state can be prepared by a circuit of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log n} + n)$ . Second, we have proved that with some ancillary qubits available, the circuit size can be further reduced to  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  for  $d \geq 2$ , and if a little more ancillary qubits are available, we can further achieve the optimal circuit depth of  $\Theta(\log dn)$  while preserve the same circuit size, which, compared to the previous work [42], employs fewer ancillary qubits and quantum gates. Finally, we establish a lower bound  $\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log(m+n)+\log d} + n)$  on the circuit size for the case of  $m$  ancillary qubits available, which implies the optimality of the circuit size in the case of no ancillary qubits available when  $d = \text{poly}(n)$ . Putting the above results together, we have obtained the optimal bound  $\Theta(\frac{dn}{\log dn} + n)$  on the circuit size in the case of unlimited number of ancillary qubits available. Also, When  $d \leq 2^{\delta n}$  for a sufficiently small constant  $\delta \in (0, 1)$ , we prove a stronger circuit size lower bound under a reasonable assumption. It remains an intriguing question to explore whether the lower bound  $\Omega(\frac{dn}{\log(m+n)+\log d} + n)$  is tight in the general case.

## References

- [1] Richard P Feynman. Simulating physics with computers. *International Journal of Theoretical Physics*, 21(6/7), 1982.
- [2] Peter W Shor. Algorithms for quantum computation: discrete logarithms and factoring. In *Proceedings of the 35th Annual Symposium on Foundations of Computer Science*, pages 124–134. IEEE, 1994.
- [3] Lov K Grover. A fast quantum mechanical algorithm for database search. In *Proceedings of the 28th Annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 212–219, 1996.
- [4] Aram W Harrow, Avinatan Hassidim, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum algorithm for linear systems of equations. *Physical Review Letters*, 103(15):150502, 2009.
- [5] Andrew M Childs, Dmitri Maslov, Yunseong Nam, Neil J Ross, and Yuan Su. Toward the first quantum simulation with quantum speedup. *Proceedings of the National Academy of Sciences*, 115(38):9456–9461, 2018.
- [6] Guang Hao Low and Isaac L Chuang. Optimal hamiltonian simulation by quantum signal processing. *Physical Review Letters*, 118(1):010501, 2017.
- [7] Guang Hao Low and Isaac L Chuang. Hamiltonian simulation by qubitization. *Quantum*, 3:163, 2019.

- [8] Dominic W Berry, Andrew M Childs, Richard Cleve, Robin Kothari, and Rolando D Somma. Simulating hamiltonian dynamics with a truncated taylor series. *Physical Review Letters*, 114(9):090502, 2015.
- [9] Seth Lloyd, Masoud Mohseni, and Patrick Rebentrost. Quantum principal component analysis. *Nature Physics*, 10(9):631–633, 2014.
- [10] Iordanis Kerenidis and Anupam Prakash. Quantum recommendation systems. In *Proceedings of the 8th Innovations in Theoretical Computer Science Conference*, volume 67 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 49:1–49:21, 2017.
- [11] Iordanis Kerenidis, Jonas Landman, Alessandro Luongo, and Anupam Prakash. q-means: A quantum algorithm for unsupervised machine learning. *Advances in Neural Information Processing Systems*, 32, 2019.
- [12] Iordanis Kerenidis and Jonas Landman. Quantum spectral clustering. *Physical Review A*, 103(4):042415, 2021.
- [13] Patrick Rebentrost, Masoud Mohseni, and Seth Lloyd. Quantum support vector machine for big data classification. *Physical Review Letters*, 113(13):130503, 2014.
- [14] Ewin Tang. A quantum-inspired classical algorithm for recommendation systems. In *Proceedings of the 51st Annual ACM SIGACT Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 217–228, 2019.
- [15] Nai-Hui Chia, Tongyang Li, Han-Hsuan Lin, and Chunhao Wang. Quantum-inspired sublinear algorithm for solving low-rank semidefinite programming. In *Proceedings of the 45th International Symposium on Mathematical Foundations of Computer Science*, volume 170 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 23:1–23:15, 2020.
- [16] Ewin Tang. Quantum principal component analysis only achieves an exponential speedup because of its state preparation assumptions. *Physical Review Letters*, 127(6):060503, 2021.
- [17] Nai-Hui Chia, András Pal Gilyén, Tongyang Li, Han-Hsuan Lin, Ewin Tang, and Chunhao Wang. Sampling-based sublinear low-rank matrix arithmetic framework for dequantizing quantum machine learning. *Journal of the ACM*, 69(5):1–72, 2022.
- [18] András Gilyén, Zhao Song, and Ewin Tang. An improved quantum-inspired algorithm for linear regression. *Quantum*, 6:754, 2022.
- [19] Adriano Barenco, Charles H Bennett, Richard Cleve, David P DiVincenzo, Norman Margolus, Peter Shor, Tycho Sleator, John A Smolin, and Harald Weinfurter. Elementary gates for quantum computation. *Physical Review A*, 52(5):3457, 1995.
- [20] Michael A Nielsen and Isaac L Chuang. *Quantum computation and quantum information*, volume 2. Cambridge university press Cambridge, 2001.
- [21] Lov Grover and Terry Rudolph. Creating superpositions that correspond to efficiently integrable probability distributions. *arXiv preprint quant-ph/0208112*, 2002.

- [22] Vivek V Shende, Stephen S Bullock, and Igor L Markov. Synthesis of quantum logic circuits. In *Proceedings of the 2005 Asia and South Pacific Design Automation Conference*, pages 272–275, 2005.
- [23] Ville Bergholm, Juha J Vartiainen, Mikko Möttönen, and Martti M Salomaa. Quantum circuits with uniformly controlled one-qubit gates. *Physical Review A*, 71(5):052330, 2005.
- [24] Martin Plesch and Časlav Brukner. Quantum-state preparation with universal gate decompositions. *Physical Review A*, 83(3):032302, 2011.
- [25] Raban Iten, Roger Colbeck, Ivan Kukuljan, Jonathan Home, and Matthias Christandl. Quantum circuits for isometries. *Physical Review A*, 93(3):032318, 2016.
- [26] Adam Holmes and Anne Y Matsuura. Efficient quantum circuits for accurate state preparation of smooth, differentiable functions. In *Proceedings of IEEE International Conference on Quantum Computing and Engineering*, pages 169–179. IEEE, 2020.
- [27] Javier Gonzalez-Conde, Thomas W Watts, Pablo Rodriguez-Grasa, and Mikel Sanz. Efficient quantum amplitude encoding of polynomial functions. *Quantum*, 8:1297, 2024.
- [28] Arthur G Rattew and Bálint Koczor. Preparing arbitrary continuous functions in quantum registers with logarithmic complexity. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2205.00519*, 2022.
- [29] Gabriel Marin-Sanchez, Javier Gonzalez-Conde, and Mikel Sanz. Quantum algorithms for approximate function loading. *Physical Review Research*, 5(3):033114, 2023.
- [30] Sam McArdle, András Gilyén, and Mario Berta. Quantum state preparation without coherent arithmetic. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2210.14892*, 2022.
- [31] Mudassir Moosa, Thomas W Watts, Yiyu Chen, Abhijat Sarma, and Peter L McMahon. Linear-depth quantum circuits for loading fourier approximations of arbitrary functions. *Quantum Science and Technology*, 9(1):015002, 2023.
- [32] Yuval R Sanders, Guang Hao Low, Artur Scherer, and Dominic W Berry. Black-box quantum state preparation without arithmetic. *Physical Review Letters*, 122(2):020502, 2019.
- [33] Johannes Bausch. Fast black-box quantum state preparation. *Quantum*, 6:773, 2022.
- [34] Shengbin Wang, Zhimin Wang, Guolong Cui, Shangshang Shi, Ruimin Shang, Lixin Fan, Wendong Li, Zhiqiang Wei, and Yongjian Gu. Fast black-box quantum state preparation based on linear combination of unitaries. *Quantum Information Processing*, 20(8):270, 2021.
- [35] Israel F Araujo, Carsten Blank, Ismael CS Araújo, and Adenilton J da Silva. Low-rank quantum state preparation. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 2023.

- [36] Niels Gleinig and Torsten Hoefler. An efficient algorithm for sparse quantum state preparation. In *Proceedings of the 58th ACM/IEEE Design Automation Conference*, pages 433–438. IEEE, 2021.
- [37] Emanuel Malvetti, Raban Iten, and Roger Colbeck. Quantum circuits for sparse isometries. *Quantum*, 5:412, 2021.
- [38] Debora Ramacciotti, Andreea-Iulia Lefterovici, and Antonio F Rotundo. A simple quantum algorithm to efficiently prepare sparse states. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2310.19309*, 2023.
- [39] Fereshte Mozafari, Giovanni De Micheli, and Yuxiang Yang. Efficient deterministic preparation of quantum states using decision diagrams. *Physical Review A*, 106(2):022617, 2022.
- [40] Tiago ML de Veras, Ismael CS De Araujo, Daniel K Park, and Adenilton J da Silva. Circuit-based quantum random access memory for classical data with continuous amplitudes. *IEEE Transactions on Computers*, 70(12):2125–2135, 2020.
- [41] Tiago ML de Veras, Leon D da Silva, and Adenilton J da Silva. Double sparse quantum state preparation. *Quantum Information Processing*, 21(6):204, 2022.
- [42] Xiao-Ming Zhang, Tongyang Li, and Xiao Yuan. Quantum state preparation with optimal circuit depth: Implementations and applications. *Physical Review Letters*, 129(23):230504, 2022.
- [43] Xiaoming Sun, Guojing Tian, Shuai Yang, Pei Yuan, and Shengyu Zhang. Asymptotically optimal circuit depth for quantum state preparation and general unitary synthesis. *IEEE Transactions on Computer-Aided Design of Integrated Circuits and Systems*, 42(10):3301–3314, 2023.
- [44] Rui Mao, Guojing Tian, and Xiaoming Sun. Towards optimal circuit size for quantum sparse state preparation. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2404.05147*, 2024.
- [45] Daniel K Park, Francesco Petruccione, and June-Koo Kevin Rhee. Circuit-based quantum random access memory for classical data. *Scientific Reports*, 9(1):3949, 2019.
- [46] Carlo A Trugenberger. Probabilistic quantum memories. *Physical Review Letters*, 87(6):067901, 2001.
- [47] Sonika Johri, Shantanu Debnath, Avinash Mocherla, Alexandros Singk, Anupam Prakash, Jungsang Kim, and Iordanis Kerenidis. Nearest centroid classification on a trapped ion quantum computer. *npj Quantum Information*, 7(1):122, 2021.
- [48] Vivek V Shende, Igor L Markov, and Stephen S Bullock. Smaller two-qubit circuits for quantum communication and computation. In *Proceedings Design, Automation and Test in Europe Conference and Exhibition*, volume 2, pages 980–985. IEEE, 2004.
- [49] Marshall Hall. *The theory of groups*. Courier Dover Publications, 2018.

- [50] Craig Gidney. Constructing large controlled nots. <https://algassert.com/circuits/2015/06/05/Constructing-Large-Controlled-Nots.html> 2015.
- [51] Dmitry V Zakablukov. On asymptotic gate complexity and depth of reversible circuits without additional memory. *Journal of Computer and System Sciences*, 84: 132–143, 2017.
- [52] Xian Wu and Lvzhou Li. Asymptotically optimal synthesis of reversible circuits. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2302.06074*, 2023.
- [53] Junhong Nie, Wei Zi, and Xiaoming Sun. Quantum circuit for multi-qubit toffoli gate with optimal resource. *arXiv preprint arXiv:2402.05053*, 2024.
- [54] Cristopher Moore and Martin Nilsson. Parallel quantum computation and quantum codes. *SIAM Journal on Computing*, 31(3):799–815, 2001.

## A Proof of Lemma 13

Recently, Nie et al. [53] proved that an  $n$ -qubit Toffoli gate can be realized by a circuit of logarithmic depth.

**Lemma 18** ([53, Theorem 1, Theorem 6]). *An  $n$ -qubit Toffoli gate can be implemented by a circuit of depth  $O(\log n)$  and size  $O(n)$  with one ancillary qubit. If no ancillary qubits are available, the depth is  $O(\log^2 n)$  and circuit size is  $O(n)$ .*

We also require the following lemma to reduce the depth of CNOT circuits.

**Lemma 19** ([54]). *Let  $C$  be a quantum circuit consisting of  $n$  CNOT gates with identical target qubits but different control qubits. There exists an equivalent circuit of depth  $O(\log n)$  and size  $O(n)$ , without ancillary qubits.*

To facilitate parallel execution of quantum gates, efficiently replicating the contents of a register is often required. The following lemma demonstrates that this operation can be achieved with high efficiency.

**Lemma 20** ([43]). *Given a qubit  $|x\rangle$  in the state  $|0\rangle$  or  $|1\rangle$ , we can construct a circuit of depth  $O(\log n)$  and employing a total of  $n$  CNOT gates, which implements the following transformation:*

$$|x\rangle |0\rangle^{\otimes n} \rightarrow |x\rangle |x\rangle^{\otimes n}. \quad (27)$$

Now we begin to prove Lemma 13.

**Lemma 21.** *[Restatement of Lemma 13] Given a set of  $d$  integers, denoted as  $\{q_i \mid 0 \leq q_i \leq 2^n - 1, 0 \leq i \leq d - 1\}$ , there exists a quantum circuit that implements the transformation*

$$|e_i\rangle |0\rangle^{\otimes n} \rightarrow |0\rangle^{\otimes d} |q_i\rangle, \quad 0 \leq i \leq d - 1. \quad (28)$$

*The circuit is of size  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  and depth  $O(\log dn)$ , utilizing  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  ancillary qubits.*

*Proof.* Following the discussion in the proof of Lemma 12, we analyze how to reduce the depth of the circuits for implementing Steps 1-4 in Equation (15) below.

**Step 1:** This step involves  $\frac{dn}{r}$  CNOT gates:

$$\prod_{i=0}^{d-1} \prod_{j=0}^{n/r-1} CNOT_{j,q_{i,j}}^i, \quad (29)$$

where  $CNOT_{j,k}^i$  denotes a CNOT gate with the  $i$ -th qubit of register  $A$  as the control qubit and the  $k$ -th qubit of register  $B_j$  as the target qubit. To reduce the circuit depth, we first duplicate the contents of register  $A$   $\frac{n}{r} - 1$  times, utilizing  $d(\frac{n}{r} - 1)$  additional ancillary qubits:

$$\underbrace{|e_i\rangle |e_i\rangle \dots |e_i\rangle}_{n/r \text{ copies of } |e_i\rangle} \underbrace{|0\rangle^{\otimes 2^r}}_{B_{n/r-1}} \dots \underbrace{|0\rangle^{\otimes 2^r}}_{B_0}. \quad (30)$$

According to Lemma 20, this duplication operation can be implemented using a circuit of depth  $O(\log n)$  and size  $O(\frac{dn}{r})$  with  $O(\frac{dn}{r})$  ancillary qubits. Now we have  $\frac{n}{r}$  copies of  $|e_i\rangle$ , where the  $j$ -th copy of  $|e_i\rangle$  is responsible for all the CNOT gates acting on register  $B_j$ , i.e.,  $\prod_{i=0}^{d-1} CNOT_{j,q_{i,j}}^i$ . These  $d$  CNOT gates have different control qubits, and for any qubit in register  $B_j$ , at most  $d$  CNOT gates target it. Thus, according to Lemma 19, these CNOT gates can be implemented using a circuit of depth  $O(\log d)$  and size  $O(d)$ . Finally, we reverse the order of gates in the circuit that implements the duplication operation and execute the circuit again to restore the content of the ancillary register. Thus, Step 1 can be implemented using a circuit of depth  $O(\log d + \log n)$  and size  $O(\frac{dn}{r})$  with  $O(\frac{dn}{r})$  ancillary qubits.

**Step 2:** The circuit implementation of this step is  $\prod_{i=0}^{d-1} T_i$ , where  $T_i$  represents a  $\frac{n}{r} + 1$ -qubit Toffoli gate. Its control qubits are the  $q_{i,j}$ -th qubits of register  $B_j$  where  $0 \leq j \leq \frac{n}{r} - 1$ , and the target qubit is the  $i$ -th qubit of register  $A$ . Note that the qubits in register  $B_j$  collectively participate in  $d$  Toffoli gates. Suppose the  $k$ -th qubit in register  $B_j$  participates in  $t_{j,k}$  Toffoli gates. We have  $t_{j,k} = \sum_i \delta_{q_{i,j}=k}$  and  $\sum_k t_{j,k} = d$ . To execute  $T_i$  in parallel, for all  $0 \leq j \leq \frac{n}{r} - 1$  and all  $0 \leq k \leq 2^r - 1$ , we duplicate the content of the  $k$ -th qubit in register  $B_j$   $t_{j,k} - 1$  times. According to Lemma 20, this step can be implemented by a circuit of depth  $O(\log d)$  and size  $O(\frac{dn}{r})$  with  $O(\frac{dn}{r})$  ancillary qubits. Next, we execute all Toffoli gates in parallel, where each Toffoli gate can be implemented by a circuit of depth  $O(\log n)$  and size  $O(\frac{n}{r})$  according to Lemma 18. Finally, we restore the content of the ancillary register. In conclusion, Step 2 can be implemented by a circuit of depth  $O(\log d + \log n)$  and size  $O(\frac{dn}{r})$  with  $O(\frac{dn}{r})$  ancillary qubits.

**Step 3:** This step involves constructing the circuit:

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n/r-1} \prod_{j=0}^{2^r} \prod_{k \in S(j)} CNOT_k^{i,j}, \quad (31)$$

where  $CNOT_k^{i,j}$  denotes a CNOT gate with the  $j$ -th qubit of register  $B_i$  as the control qubit and the  $k$ -th qubit of register  $C_i$  as the target qubit, and  $S(k) := \{i \mid k_i = 1, 0 \leq i \leq r - 1\}$ . Step 3 aims to decode the unary encoding  $|e_j\rangle$  in register  $B_i$  into register  $C_i$

using the CNOT circuit  $\prod_{j=0}^{2^r} \prod_{k \in S(j)} CNOT_k^{i,j} = \prod_{k=0}^{r-1} \prod_{j \in \{0, \dots, 2^r-1\}: j_k=1} CNOT_k^{i,j}$ . As a result, each qubit in register  $C_i$  is targeted by  $2^{r-1}$  CNOT gates with distinct control qubits.

For all  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{r} - 1$ , we duplicate the content of  $B_i$   $r - 1$  times. This step can be achieved by a circuit of depth  $O(\log r)$  and size  $O(n2^r)$  with  $O(n2^r)$  ancillary qubits. The  $k$ -th copy of  $B_i$  is responsible for all the CNOT gates acting on the  $k$ -th qubit of register  $C_i$ , i.e.,  $\prod_{j \in \{0, \dots, 2^r-1\}: j_k=1} CNOT_k^{i,j}$ . Thus, according to Lemma 19, all CNOT gates can be executed by a circuit of depth  $O(r)$  and size  $O(n2^r)$ . Finally, we restore the content of the ancillary register. Therefore, Step 3 can be implemented by a circuit of depth  $O(r)$  and size  $O(n2^r)$ , with  $O(n2^r)$  ancillary qubits.

**Step 4:** This step involves constructing the circuit:

$$\prod_{i=0}^{n/r-1} \prod_{j=0}^{2^r-1} T_j^i. \quad (32)$$

where  $T_j^i$  denotes an  $m + 1$ -qubit Toffoli gate with the  $m$  qubits of register  $C_i$  as control qubits and the  $j$ -th qubit of register  $B_i$  as the target qubit. Its function is to flip the target qubit when the state of register  $C_i$  is  $|j\rangle$ . Each  $T_j^i$  can be implemented by a circuit of depth  $O(\log r)$  and size of  $O(r)$  according to Lemma 18. To execute all  $T_j^i$  in parallel, we duplicate the content of  $C_i$   $2^r - 1$  times for all  $0 \leq i \leq \frac{n}{r} - 1$ . This step can be implemented by a circuit of depth of  $O(r)$  and size  $O(n2^r)$  with  $O(n2^r)$  ancillary qubits. Subsequently, we execute all  $T_j^i$  in parallel. Finally, we restore the content of the ancillary register. Thus, Step 4 can be implemented by a circuit of depth  $O(r)$  and size  $O(n2^r)$  with  $O(r)$  ancillary qubits.

In summary, the circuit size of the above process is  $O(\frac{dn}{r} + n2^r)$  and the depth is  $O(\log r + \log n + \log d)$ , with  $O(\frac{dn}{r} + n2^r)$  ancillary bits required. By setting  $r = \lceil \frac{\log d}{2} \rceil$ , the circuit size is  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  and the depth is  $O(\log dn)$ , with  $O(\frac{dn}{\log d})$  ancillary bits. Thus, the proof is complete. □