

Quantum spectral method for gradient and Hessian estimation

Yuxin Zhang* and Changpeng Shao†

Academy of Mathematics and Systems Science, Chinese Academy of Sciences,
Beijing, 100190 China

July 8, 2024

Abstract

Gradient descent is one of the most basic algorithms for solving continuous optimization problems. In [Jordan, PRL, 95(5):050501, 2005], Jordan proposed the first quantum algorithm for estimating gradients of functions close to linear, with exponential speedup in the black-box model. This quantum algorithm was greatly enhanced and developed by [Gilyén, Arunachalam, and Wiebe, SODA, pp. 1425-1444, 2019], providing a quantum algorithm with optimal query complexity $\tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{d}/\varepsilon)$ for a class of smooth functions of d variables, where ε is the accuracy. This is quadratically faster than classical algorithms for the same problem.

In this work, we continue this research by proposing a new quantum algorithm for another class of functions, namely, analytic functions $f(\mathbf{x})$ which are well-defined over the complex field. Given phase oracles to query the real and imaginary parts of $f(\mathbf{x})$ respectively, we propose a quantum algorithm that returns an ε -approximation of its gradient with query complexity $\tilde{O}(1/\varepsilon)$. This achieves exponential speedup over classical algorithms in terms of the dimension d . As an extension, we also propose two quantum algorithms for Hessian estimation, aiming to improve quantum analogs of Newton's method. The two algorithms have query complexity $\tilde{O}(d/\varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{O}(d^{1.5}/\varepsilon)$, respectively, under different assumptions. Moreover, if the Hessian is promised to be s -sparse, we then have two new quantum algorithms with query complexity $\tilde{O}(s/\varepsilon)$ and $\tilde{O}(sd/\varepsilon)$, respectively. The former achieves exponential speedup over classical algorithms. We also prove a lower bound of $\tilde{\Omega}(d)$ for Hessian estimation in the general case.

*zhangyuxin@amss.ac.cn

†changpeng.shao@amss.ac.cn

Contents

1	Introduction	3
1.1	Main results	4
1.2	Summary of the key ideas	6
1.3	Comparison with Gilyén-Arunachalam-Wiebe’s algorithm	8
1.3.1	Similarity	8
1.3.2	Difference 1: Approximation methods	9
1.3.3	Difference 2: Oracle settings	10
1.4	Relevant previous results	11
1.5	Outline of the paper	11
2	Preliminaries	11
2.1	Description of oracles	12
2.2	Multivariable calculus	15
2.2.1	Holomorphic functions in several complex variables	16
2.2.2	Analytic functions	17
2.3	Spectral method	17
2.4	Grid of sampling points	19
3	Quantum spectral method for gradient estimation	20
4	Quantum algorithms for Hessian estimation using spectral method	24
4.1	Estimating Hessians in the general case	25
4.2	Estimating sparse Hessians	26
5	Quantum algorithms for Hessian estimation using finite difference formula	30
5.1	Estimating Hessians in the general case	30
5.2	Estimating sparse Hessians	32
5.3	Some final comments	34
6	Lower bounds analysis	35
7	Conclusions	37
A	Error analysis of finite difference formula	38

1 Introduction

Efficient estimation of the gradient and Hessian of functions plays a vital role across a wide range of fields, including mathematical optimization [BV04], machine learning [SNW12], and others. For instance, in optimization problems, the gradient provides essential information about the direction of the steepest ascent or descent of the given function, guiding the search for optimal solutions. The Hessian matrix captures the second-order curvature and local behavior of the function, which is crucial for assessing the nature of these solutions—whether they are minima, maxima, or saddle points. They are widely used in many fundamental optimization algorithms, such as gradient descent and Newton’s method.

Given a real-valued function $f(\mathbf{x}) : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ of d variables, its gradient at point \mathbf{a} is defined as $\nabla f(\mathbf{a}) = (\frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_1}, \dots, \frac{\partial f(\mathbf{x})}{\partial x_d})|_{\mathbf{x}=\mathbf{a}}$. As the gradient contains d entries, gradient estimation can be computationally expensive, especially in high-dimensional cases. This challenge has stimulated significant efforts toward developing efficient quantum algorithms for gradient computation. Jordan [Jor05] proposed a fast quantum algorithm for numerical gradient estimation, which is a landmark contribution in this area. Particularly, if the function is close to linear, then the query complexity is $O(1)$, which is exponentially faster than classical algorithms. Later, Gilyén, Arunachalam, and Wiebe [GAW19] significantly developed Jordan’s algorithm and improved the efficiency using a higher-order finite difference formula [Li05]. Their algorithm requires $\tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{d}/\varepsilon)$ optimal quantum queries for a class of smooth functions, where ε is the accuracy of approximating the gradient under the ℓ_∞ -norm. This is quadratically more efficient than classical algorithms. As a result, these fast quantum algorithms for computing the gradient become an important subroutine of many quantum algorithms, such as quantum algorithms for convex optimizations [CCLW20, vAGGdW20], quantum tomography [vACGN23], quantum algorithms for multiple expectation-value estimation [HWM⁺22], and quantum reinforcement learning [JCOD23], among others.

In the exploration of quantum advantages, quantum algorithms with exponential speed-up are very attractive, and other quantum algorithms based on them can lead to large quantum speedups over classical algorithms for practically relevant applications, such as [CCLW20, vAGGdW20, vACGN23]. These algorithms are indeed still based on Jordan’s algorithm. Therefore, it is interesting to know more about the existence of exponential quantum speedups for gradient estimation.

With this motivation in mind, in this work, we propose a new quantum algorithm for gradient estimation for another class of functions. More importantly, this algorithm achieves exponential speedup over classical algorithms. We will consider analytic functions that are allowed to take values from the complex field, and we assume we are given quantum oracles that can query the real and imaginary parts. Our main result roughly states that for any analytic function with phase oracles to query the real and imaginary parts respectively, there is a quantum algorithm that approximates its gradient, which only costs $\tilde{O}(1/\varepsilon)$ quantum queries. Unlike previous quantum algorithms [Jor05, GAW19], which are based on higher-order finite difference method [Li05], our algorithm is based on the spectral method [For81, Tre00]. Apart from this, another difference is the oracle, as we are dealing with complex-valued functions. We will explain this in detail in Subsection 1.3. It is interesting to note that previous quantum algorithms for solving differential equations [Ber14, CL20] already showed that the spectral method is more efficient than the higher-order finite difference method.

As a generalization of Gilyén-Arunachalam-Wiebe’s algorithm and our algorithm for gradient estimation, we propose two quantum algorithms for estimating the Hessian of

analytic functions under the matrix max-norm. Both are polynomially faster than classical algorithms. We will show that polynomial speedup for Hessian estimation is the best we can expect by proving a lower bound of $\tilde{\Omega}(d)$. However, for sparse Hessians, which are very common in practice, we show that larger quantum speedups than polynomial exist. Notice that the Hessian is widely used in many fundamental optimization algorithms, perhaps the most famous one is Newton's method. Thus, we hope our quantum algorithms can be used to accelerate Newton's method for some practical applications.

In the following subsections, we explain our results in more detail.

1.1 Main results

Let $f : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function that maps \mathbb{R}^d into \mathbb{R} . Since f is analytic, the latter property implies that the gradient satisfies $\nabla f(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathbb{R}^d$. For a complex vector $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_1 + i\mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and a complex function $f(\mathbf{x}) = f_1(\mathbf{x}) + if_2(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{C}$, where i denotes the imaginary unit, we naturally store them in quantum registers as follows:

$$|\mathbf{x}\rangle := |\mathbf{x}_1\rangle |\mathbf{x}_2\rangle, \quad |f(\mathbf{x})\rangle := |f_1(\mathbf{x})\rangle |f_2(\mathbf{x})\rangle. \quad (1.1)$$

For real numbers $r \in \mathbb{R}$, we use the standard and most common storage method, representing r as its finite-precision binary encoding. As before, we also assume phase oracle access to query f . Specifically, we assume that we are given phase oracles O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} for the real and imaginary parts of $f = f_1 + if_2$ separately:

$$O_{f_1} : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{if_1(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle, \quad O_{f_2} : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{if_2(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle, \quad (1.2)$$

These are our basic settings. Although the target function involves complex numbers, the representation remains the typical and natural ways in quantum computing.

Problem 1.1. *Let $\varepsilon \in (0, 1)$ denote the accuracy. Assume that $f : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is an analytic function satisfying $f(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathbb{R}$. Given access to oracles O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} , compute an approximate gradient $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|\mathbf{g} - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ for any $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.¹*

When the function f is only well-defined on \mathbb{R}^d , [GAW19] obtained the following result for a class of functions satisfying certain smoothness conditions.

Proposition 1.2 (Finite difference method). *Assume that $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is analytic and satisfies $|\partial^\alpha f(\mathbf{x})| \leq c^k k^{k/2}$ for every $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ such that $|\alpha| = k$. Given the phase oracle O_f , there exists a quantum algorithm that outputs $\mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|\mathbf{g} - \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ for any $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$, with query complexity $\tilde{\Theta}(\sqrt{d}/\varepsilon)$.*

The above functions are known as a special kind of Gevrey class functions [Cor19].² In [Cor19], Cornelissen summarized and generalized the above result to a larger class of Gevrey class functions. Note that when $\sigma > 1$, these functions lie between smooth functions and real analytic functions; for $\sigma = 1$, they are equivalent to real analytic functions. Therefore, it is evident that the assumptions made in Proposition 1.2 correspond to Gevrey functions with $\sigma = 1/2$, which is a proper subset of real analytic functions.

For Problem 1.1, our main result is as follows.

¹Here $\|\cdot\|_\infty$ is the ℓ_∞ -norm of vectors. For a vector $\mathbf{v} = (v_1, \dots, v_d)$, we define $\|\mathbf{v}\|_\infty := \max_j |v_j|$.

²Let $\sigma \in \mathbb{R}$, $c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. We call f a **Gevrey class function** if: (i) f is smooth. (ii) The power series of f around any point $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ converges. (iii) For all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}^d$ with $|\alpha| = k$, we have $|\partial^\alpha f(\mathbf{x})| \leq c^k (k!)^\sigma$.

Theorem 1.3 (Informal form of Theorem 3.6, spectral method). *There exists a quantum algorithm that solves Problem 1.1 with $\tilde{O}(1/\varepsilon)$ queries to O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} .*

From Theorem 1.3, we conclude that for the gradient estimation problem, there is an exponential speedup in dimension d for complex-valued analytic functions. Here we make a remark on our main result.

Remark 1.4. Regarding the assumption that f maps \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R} , we indeed only use the property that $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}^d$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. In this work, we find it more natural to state $f(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathbb{R}$ as it is an assumption on f rather than on its gradient.

Additionally, to approximate $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0)$, instead of assuming f is analytic over \mathbb{C}^d , our algorithm works when f is real analytic and can be evaluated at points in the complex plane near \mathbf{x}_0 .

The functions considered in Problem 1.1, when restricted to \mathbb{R}^d , are real analytic. Hence, they are also a proper subset of real analytic functions. The class of these functions and those considered in [GAW19] intersect but do not contain each other, illustrating that our main result—a quantum algorithm with better query complexity performance—does not contradict the optimality stated in Proposition 1.2. We will provide a more detailed explanation of this in Subsection 1.3.

As mentioned in [GAW19, below Theorem 5.2], for multivariate polynomials $P(\mathbf{x})$ of degree $O(\text{polylog}(d))$, the query complexity of the quantum algorithm provided in [GAW19] is polylogarithmic in dimension d and achieves exponential speedup compared to Jordan’s [Jor05]. In comparison, Theorem 1.3 implies that if we have oracles that can query the real and imaginary parts of $P(\mathbf{x})$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, then the quantum query complexity of computing the gradient of P is always polylogarithmic in dimension d , regardless of the degree.

Furthermore, one might wonder why we do not consider the analytic continuation of f when it is only real analytic, allowing our algorithm to still apply in the situation mentioned in Proposition 1.2. There are indeed two issues with this idea: (i) computing the analytic continuation of $f(\mathbf{x})$ typically involves computing its gradient; (ii) even if the analytic continuation $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})$ of $f(\mathbf{x})$ is already known, constructing an oracle to query $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})$ based on an oracle that queries $f(\mathbf{x})$ is non-trivial. This difficulty is clearly illustrated by the simple function $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x}) = x_t^k$ for some t, k unknown, here x_t is the t -th entry of \mathbf{x} . Given an oracle that can only evaluate $f(\mathbf{x}) = x_t^k$ for $x_t \in \mathbb{R}$, it is challenging to use this oracle to evaluate $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) = (x_{t1} + ix_{t2})^k$ for $x_{t1}, x_{t2} \in \mathbb{R}$ without knowing t, k .

As a continuation of gradient estimation, we also present two quantum algorithms for estimating the Hessian of f , which is fundamental to second-order iterative methods for optimizations, such as Newton’s method. Below, for a matrix $A = (a_{ij})$, the max norm is defined as $\|A\|_{\max} = \max_{i,j} |a_{ij}|$.

Theorem 1.5 (Informal form of Theorem 4.2, spectral method). *Let $f : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function that maps \mathbb{R}^d to \mathbb{R} . Then there is a quantum algorithm that uses $\tilde{O}(d/\varepsilon)$ queries to O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} , and computes $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ such that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{H}} - \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_{\max} \leq \varepsilon$, where $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{x}_0)$ is the Hessian of f at $\mathbf{x}_0 \in \mathbb{R}^d$.*

Theorem 1.6 (Informal form of Theorem 5.2, finite difference method). *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}, B \in \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfy $m \geq \log(dB/\varepsilon)$. Assume $f : [-R, R]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $(2m+1)$ -times differentiable and $|\partial_{\mathbf{r}}^{2m+1} f(\mathbf{x})| \leq B$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in [-R, R]^d$ and $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{x}/\|\mathbf{x}\|$. Then there is a quantum algorithm that uses $\tilde{O}(d^{1.5}/\varepsilon)$ queries to O_f and computes $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ such that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{H}} - \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{x}_0)\|_{\max} \leq \varepsilon$.*

Classically, for comparison with the quantum cases, suppose we also provide access to the function via a binary oracle, which returns the value of $f(\mathbf{x})$ when the input is \mathbf{x} . Using empirical estimation, we need $O(1/\varepsilon^2)$ samples to evaluate the function to precision ε . Hence, we can compute the Hessian to ε -precision under the max norm using $O(d^2/\varepsilon^2)$ samples. From this point, our two quantum algorithms achieve polynomial speedups over classical algorithms. The following result shows that this is the best we can achieve generally.

Theorem 1.7 (Informal forms of Propositions 6.2 and 6.6). *Any quantum algorithm that approximates $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ up to a constant accuracy $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2]$ must make $\tilde{\Omega}(d)$ quantum phase queries.*

The above lower bound shows that the quantum spectral method for Hessian estimation is optimal in terms of d . However, it does not rule out the possibility of the existence of exponential quantum speedups for some special cases, e.g., the graph learning problem considered in [MS22, LSZ21]. Indeed, for sparse Hessians, we can have better quantum algorithms. The following results further show the advantage of the spectral method over the finite difference method.

Theorem 1.8 (Informal form of Theorem 4.9, spectral method). *Making the same assumption as Theorem 1.5, then there is a quantum algorithm that estimates $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ using*

- $\tilde{O}(s/\varepsilon)$ queries to O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} if $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ is s -sparse.
- $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{m}/\varepsilon)$ queries to O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} if $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ contains at most m nonzero entries.

Theorem 1.9 (Informal form of Theorem 5.8, finite difference method). *Making the same assumption as Theorem 1.6, then there is a quantum algorithm that estimates $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ using*

- $\tilde{O}(sd/\varepsilon)$ queries to O_f if $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ is s -sparse.
- $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{md}/\varepsilon)$ queries to O_f if $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ contains at most m nonzero entries.

In the above, there is no need to know the positions of nonzero entries if the Hessian is s -sparse or contains at most m terms. Classically, without knowing this information, it may still cost $O(d^2/\varepsilon^2)$ queries to estimate $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$. The above results show that when s and m are small, the cost is linear or even polylogarithmic in the dimension. Theorem 1.8 shows that the quantum spectral method is exponentially faster than classical algorithms for Hessian estimation. Although the quantum speedup using the finite difference method is limited, our lower bound analysis in Proposition 6.6 shows that the quantum algorithms given in Theorem 1.9 are optimal in terms of d . Sparse Hessian matrices are quite common in optimizations [FGL97, PT79, CM84, Col84, GMP05], so the above results might be helpful in accelerating some classical optimization problems.

1.2 Summary of the key ideas

Below, we summarize our key idea for gradient and Hessian estimation. To facilitate understanding, it is helpful to recall the fundamental procedure of previous quantum algorithms for approximating gradients [Jor05, GAW19]. For illustrative purposes, we consider the special case where $f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{x}$ is a real-valued linear function for some unknown vector $\mathbf{g} = (g_1, \dots, g_d) \in \mathbb{Z}_N^d$. Now \mathbf{g} is the gradient of $f(\mathbf{x})$. Given a phase oracle $O_f : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{2\pi i f(\mathbf{x})/N} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$, we can generate the quantum state:

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{N^d}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_N^d} e^{\frac{2\pi i f(\mathbf{x})}{N}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle = \bigotimes_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{x_j \in \mathbb{Z}_N} e^{\frac{2\pi i g_j x_j}{N}} |x_j\rangle.$$

We will obtain $|g_1, \dots, g_d\rangle$ by applying the inverse of the quantum Fourier transform to the above state. This approach is also effective when $f(\mathbf{x})$ is close to a linear function $\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{x}$, as demonstrated in [GAW19, Theorem 5.1]. Therefore, a core idea of [Jor05, GAW19] is to refine the representations of $\nabla f(\mathbf{0})$ using higher-order finite difference methods to obtain a function that is close to $\nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}$.

Our approach follows the same principle but utilizes the spectral method [LM67, Tre00] to approximate the gradient $\nabla f(\mathbf{0})$. To elaborate on this, consider a univariate function $f(x)$ that is analytic at point $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ such that the Taylor series of f at x_0 converges in an open neighbourhood of $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ containing $\overline{B}(x_0, r) \subset \mathbb{C}$, the closed disk centered at x_0 with radius $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$. In $\overline{B}(x_0, r)$, $f(x)$ can be computed by the Taylor series:

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n (x - x_0)^n, \quad a_n = \frac{f^{(n)}(x_0)}{n!}.$$

Then there exists a constant κ such that $|a_n| \leq \kappa r^{-n}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, as detailed in Lemma 2.25. Choose some $\delta \in (0, r)$, say $\delta = r/2$, and let $\omega = e^{-2\pi i/N}$. Then,

$$f_k := f(x_0 + \delta \omega^k) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n (\delta \omega^k)^n = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \omega^{kn} c_n,$$

where $c_n = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{n+mN} \delta^{n+mN}$. Applying the inverse of the discrete Fourier transform gives us

$$c_n = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega^{-kn} f_k.$$

From this, we know that:

$$\left| a_n - \frac{c_n}{\delta^n} \right| \leq \kappa r^{-n} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\delta/r)^{mN} = \kappa r^{-n} \frac{(\delta/r)^N}{1 - (\delta/r)^N}.$$

Particularly, when $n = 1$,

$$\left| f'(x_0) - \frac{c_1}{\delta} \right| \leq \kappa r^{-1} \frac{(\delta/r)^N}{1 - (\delta/r)^N}.$$

When $N = O(\log(\kappa/\varepsilon))$, we can approximate $f'(x_0)$ up to an additive error ε .

For a multivariable function $f(\mathbf{x})$, to approximate $\nabla f(\mathbf{0})$, we consider $h(\tau) := f(\tau \mathbf{x})$ and view it as a univariate analytic function of τ . It follows that $h'(0) = \nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}$. Using the above analysis, which will be detailed further in Theorem 3.1, the spectral method enables us to derive a real-valued function $F(\mathbf{x})$ having a similar form to c_1 , which can be used to approximate $\nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}$. Additionally, we can construct the phase oracle $\mathbf{O} : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{2\pi i 2^{n\varepsilon} F(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$ using $\tilde{O}(1/\varepsilon\delta + N)$ queries to O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} , as described in Lemma 3.5. Combining this with the previous idea described at the beginning of this subsection, we obtain a quantum algorithm that estimates $\nabla f(\mathbf{0})$.

Regarding Hessian estimation (i.e., the quantum algorithms mentioned in Theorems 1.5 and 1.6), our basic idea is reducing the task to gradient estimation. For illustrative simplicity, assume $f(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{x} | H | \mathbf{x} \rangle$ for some unknown symmetric Boolean Hermitian matrix H , which is the Hessian of f . Given a phase oracle to query f on a quantum computer, a basic idea of learning H is using Bernstein-Vazirani's algorithm [BV93], by considering $g(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{2}(f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x})) = \langle \mathbf{x} | H | \mathbf{y} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{y} | H | \mathbf{y} \rangle$ for a fixed \mathbf{y} . It defines a linear function

of \mathbf{x} . Via Bernstein-Vazirani's algorithm, we can learn $H|\mathbf{y}\rangle$ with 1 query to g , equating to 2 queries to f . By selecting $|\mathbf{y}\rangle = |i\rangle$ for $i \in [d]$, we can then learn all the columns of H . This algorithm of learning H is indeed optimal [Mon12]. With the quantum algorithms for gradient estimation, we can use a similar idea to estimate the Hessians.

The main difficulty is the error analysis caused by the numerical methods. In practice, we only have a function $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})$ that is close to $\mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x}$. To use the above idea, we hope that $\frac{1}{2}(\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}))$ is close to $\langle \mathbf{x} | H | \mathbf{y} \rangle + \frac{1}{2} \langle \mathbf{y} | H | \mathbf{y} \rangle$ for any fixed \mathbf{y} , say $\mathbf{y} = |i\rangle$. For the spectral method, this is easy to satisfy. However, the finite difference method is based on Taylor expansion, which gives a good approximation when the norms of \mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} are small. Choosing a \mathbf{y} with a small norm, such as $\mathbf{y} = |i\rangle/\sqrt{d}$, will increase the query complexity because we will obtain an approximation of $H\mathbf{y}$ (which is $H|i\rangle/\sqrt{d}$ in this example, whereas what we really want is an approximation of $H|i\rangle$). It is hard to avoid this due to the nature of the finite difference method. This is the main reason why the query complexity of the quantum algorithm based on the finite difference method is higher than the one based on the spectral method, as seen in Theorems 1.5 and 1.6.

When the Hessian is promised to be s -sparse, then randomly generating $k := \tilde{O}(s)$ samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k$ is enough for us to determine H . Now we can determine H by solving a linear system $HY = B$, with $Y = [\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k]$ and B the output matrix of gradient estimation with input Y . With this idea, we can propose two new quantum algorithms presented in Theorems 1.8 and 1.9. Due to the reason mentioned above, even in the sparse case, there is only a saving of \sqrt{d} for the finite difference method. However, the quantum spectral method can be exponentially faster than classical algorithms.

1.3 Comparison with Gilyén-Arunachalam-Wiebe's algorithm

In this subsection, we discuss and highlight the similarities and differences between the Gilyén-Arunachalam-Wiebe (hereafter abbreviated as GAW) algorithm and our algorithm for gradient estimation. Below, G_n^d represents the grid defined in Definition 2.26.

1.3.1 Similarity

Both GAW's algorithm and our algorithm are based on the following Lemma 1.10, which arises from Jordan's quantum algorithm for gradient estimation [Jor05]. For more details, refer to [GAW19, Theorem 5.1].

Lemma 1.10. *Let $c \in \mathbb{R}, a, \rho, \varepsilon < M \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and $\mathbf{x}_0, \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|\mathbf{g}\|_\infty \leq M$. Let $n_\varepsilon = \lceil \log_2(4/a\varepsilon) \rceil$, $n_M = \lceil \log_2(3aM) \rceil$, and $n = n_\varepsilon + n_M$. Suppose $\tilde{f} : (\mathbf{x}_0 + aG_n^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfies:*

$$\left| \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_0 + a\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g} \cdot a\mathbf{x} - c \right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon a}{8 \cdot 42\pi} \quad (1.3)$$

for all but a 1/1000 fraction of the points $\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d$. Given access to a phase oracle $\mathbf{O} : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{2\pi i 2^{n_\varepsilon} \tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}_0 + a\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$ acting on $\mathcal{H} = \text{Span}\{|\mathbf{x}\rangle : \mathbf{x} \in G_n^d\}$, there is a quantum algorithm that can calculate a vector $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\Pr \left[\|\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbf{g}\|_\infty > \varepsilon \right] \leq \rho,$$

with $O(\log(d/\rho))$ queries to \mathbf{O} .

With this result, it becomes clear that for any function f , as long as we can construct a function \tilde{f} based on f such that condition (1.3) holds for $\mathbf{g} = \nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0)$, then we can apply this lemma to approximate the gradient $\nabla f(\mathbf{x}_0)$.

1.3.2 Difference 1: Approximation methods

The first and most significant difference is the choice of functions used to approximate $\nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}$ such that condition (1.3) is satisfied. Without loss of generality, we set $\mathbf{x}_0 = \mathbf{0}$ for convenience. The GAW algorithm deals with real-valued functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that satisfy some specific smoothness conditions. They used the following degree- $2m$ central difference approximation:

$$f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{\substack{\ell=-m \\ \ell \neq 0}}^m \frac{(-1)^{\ell-1}}{\ell} \frac{\binom{m}{|\ell|}}{\binom{m+|\ell|}{|\ell|}} f(\ell \mathbf{x}) \approx \nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}. \quad (1.4)$$

It was shown that

$$|f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}| \leq e^{-m/2} B \|\mathbf{x}\|^{2m+1},$$

where $|\partial_{\mathbf{r}}^{2m+1} f(\tau \mathbf{x})| \leq B$ for $\mathbf{r} = \mathbf{x}/\|\mathbf{x}\|$ and all $\tau \in [-m, m]$. The directional derivative $\partial_{\mathbf{r}}$ is defined in Definition 2.15. Particularly, if $|\partial^\alpha f| \leq c^k k^{k/2}$ for all $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ with $|\alpha| = k$, then the error above is bounded by

$$\sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} (8acm\sqrt{d})^k$$

for all but a $1/1000$ fraction of points $\mathbf{x} \in aG_n^d$. To satisfy condition (1.3), it suffices to choose a such that $a^{-1} = O(cm\sqrt{d}(cm\sqrt{d}/\varepsilon)^{1/2m})$. This makes the query complexity of their algorithm $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{d}/\varepsilon)$.

In comparison, our algorithm differs in that it requires sampling function values within the complex domain, i.e., evaluating some $f(\mathbf{z})$ for $\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{C}^d$. To be more specific, our method deals with analytic functions that can evaluate points in the complex plane near $\mathbf{0}$. Moreover, these functions map reals to reals. Indeed, all we need is $\nabla f(\mathbb{R}^d) \subset \mathbb{R}$, which ensures the implementation of the quantum Fourier transform as an indispensable part of the algorithm. The key finding is the following formula for approximating gradients, derived using the spectral method:

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{N\delta} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega^{-k} f(\delta \omega^k \mathbf{x}), \quad \text{where } \omega = e^{-2\pi i/N}. \quad (1.5)$$

For further details, see Theorem 3.1, where we prove that the error bound is given by

$$|F(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}| \leq \frac{\kappa}{2r} \frac{(\delta/2r)^N}{1 - (\delta/2r)^N}$$

for some constant $\kappa \in \mathbb{R}_+$. As analyzed in Theorem 3.6, by selecting $\delta < 2r$ and $N = O(\log(\kappa/\varepsilon))$, we can ensure that the above error is bounded by the right-hand side of condition (1.3). We also analyze the number of queries to O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} required to implement the phase oracle $\mathbf{O} : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{2\pi i 2^{n\varepsilon} F(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$ in Lemma 3.5. Finally, the overall query complexity of our algorithm is $\tilde{O}(1/\varepsilon)$.

In contrast to the commonly used finite difference methods, the spectral method offers better error performance in approximating derivatives. In our opinion, one of the key reasons for this improvement is the way of selecting sampling points. As illustrated in Figure 1, for 1-dimensional functions, the finite difference method samples points along a straight line, while the spectral method utilizes points on a circle around the target point 0 ,




Figure 1: Comparison between GAW’s formula and ours. The figure illustrates the points that are used to approximate the derivative for functions of dimension $d = 1$. The blue points on the x axis are used in the higher-order finite difference method and the red points on the circle are used in the spectral method.

intuitively demonstrating the advantage, as the derivative is a local property. Besides, as we can see from formula (1.4), the coefficients associated with sampling points further from the target point are smaller in the finite difference method. This implies that these points contribute less to the approximation of the derivative at the target point. In contrast, the spectral method exhibits coefficients with the same magnitude for all sampling points, indicating a more efficient utilization of information from all points. This also demonstrates the superiority of the spectral method.

Remark 1.11. We believe that the exponential speedup achieved here can be significantly attributed to the spectral method. This method drastically reduces the error in approximating the derivative of a function at some points using the function values at sampled points, compared to the finite difference formulae. To our knowledge, the application of the spectral method in quantum algorithms for gradient estimation is novel. The advantage of the spectral method has also been observed in other applications, such as solving differential equations on a quantum computer, where the spectral method [CL20] has demonstrably improved complexity results compared to the finite difference method [Ber14].

1.3.3 Difference 2: Oracle settings

The second difference is the setting of oracles. In the GAW algorithm, which considers real-valued functions, it is natural to assume quantum access to the phase oracle $O_f : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{if(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle$. Our approach, however, deals with complex-valued functions, requiring evaluations at points in the complex domain. Thus, we cannot directly assume the existence of the phase oracle O_f since it is not a unitary operator now. Instead, we consider having phase oracles for the real and imaginary parts of $f(\mathbf{x}) = f_1(\mathbf{x}) + if_2(\mathbf{x})$, denoted as O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} , respectively, as outlined in (1.2). Similar to classical computing, the real and imaginary parts of a complex value are stored separately as their finite-precision binary encoding. Fortunately, our formula $F(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}$, and we can construct the corresponding phase oracle using the given oracles. This allows us to perform the quantum Fourier transform effectively. Consequently, Lemma 1.10 still works. It is worth noting that while

our oracle assumptions differ from those in the GAW algorithm, they remain standard and natural, akin to how data is stored in classical computing.

1.4 Relevant previous results

Apart from the two references [Jor05, GAW19] we mentioned previously, there are also many related works focusing on optimizing the quantum computation of gradients and Hessians in specific application contexts. For instance, reference [Teo23] provided optimized methods for estimating gradients and Hessians in variational quantum algorithms. Reference [GLW⁺21] presented a quantum gradient algorithm for general polynomials, showcasing the potential of quantum approaches in more specialized mathematical landscapes. A recent work [AG23] provided a quantum algorithm for linear programming, which is based on interior point methods and requires efficient approximation of the Hessian and gradient of the barrier function. They provided efficient methods for computing these specific forms of the Hessian and gradient. Reference [RSW⁺19] developed quantum versions of gradient descent and Newton’s method, and applied them to polynomial optimization tasks. Reference [KP20] provided a quantum method for performing gradient descent and used it to speed up the solving of weighted least-squares problems. Besides, there are related works that investigate the problem from a hardware perspective [SBG⁺19, MBK21].

1.5 Outline of the paper

The rest of the paper is organized as follows: In Section 2, we present some preliminary results that will be used throughout the paper. In Section 3, we describe our main quantum algorithm for gradient estimation. In Section 4, we present two quantum algorithms for Hessian estimation using spectral method. In Section 5, we present two quantum algorithms for Hessian estimation using finite difference method. In Section 6, we prove some lower bounds of Hessian estimation. Appendix A contains some detailed calculations required in the Hessian estimation.

2 Preliminaries

Notation. For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, $[n]$ denotes the set $\{1, 2, \dots, n\}$. $\mathbb{N}_0 = \mathbb{N} \cup \{0\}$. By \mathbb{R}_+ , we mean the set of all positive real numbers. Let \mathbb{K} denote the field \mathbb{R} or \mathbb{C} ,³ and let $d \in \mathbb{N}$ denote the dimension of the space on which function $f : \mathbb{K}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ is defined. We use bold letters for vectors, in particular, $\mathbf{0}$ denotes the all-0 vector. The set \mathbb{K}^d is equipped with the usual vector space structure. For vectors $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{K}^d$, we write $\|\mathbf{x}\| = \sqrt{|x_1|^2 + \dots + |x_d|^2}$, and $\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty = \max_{i \in [d]} |x_i|$, where $|x|$ represents the absolute value for $x \in \mathbb{K}$. The max norm of matrix $A = (a_{ij})$ is $\|A\|_{\max} = \max_{i,j} |a_{ij}|$. With A^\dagger , we mean the complex conjugate transpose of A .

For $n \in \mathbb{N}$, an n -dimensional multi-index is written as $\nu = (\nu_1, \nu_2, \dots, \nu_n) \in \mathbb{N}_0^n$. The factorial of ν is $\nu! = \nu_1! \nu_2! \dots \nu_n!$, and the absolute value is $|\nu| = \nu_1 + \nu_2 + \dots + \nu_n$. Given a multi-index $\alpha = (\alpha_1, \dots, \alpha_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ and $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in \mathbb{K}^d$, we write \mathbf{x}^α for $x_1^{\alpha_1} x_2^{\alpha_2} \dots x_d^{\alpha_d}$. For variables $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{K}^d$, the higher-order partial derivative is denoted as $\partial^\alpha = \frac{\partial^{|\alpha|}}{\partial z_1^{\alpha_1} \dots \partial z_d^{\alpha_d}}$. In other words, $\partial^\alpha = \partial_1^{\alpha_1} \partial_2^{\alpha_2} \dots \partial_d^{\alpha_d}$, where $\partial_i^{\alpha_i} := \partial^{\alpha_i} / \partial z_i^{\alpha_i}$.

³When we use \mathbb{K} , it implies that the statements apply to both fields of real and complex numbers.

2.1 Description of oracles

Definition 2.1 (Binary oracle for complex-valued functions). For $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+$, let $f : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function with an η -accurate binary oracle access acting as

$$U_f^\eta : |\mathbf{x}_1\rangle|\mathbf{x}_2\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle \rightarrow |\mathbf{x}_1\rangle|\mathbf{x}_2\rangle|\tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{x})\rangle|\tilde{f}_2(\mathbf{x})\rangle,$$

where input $\mathbf{x} = \mathbf{x}_1 + i\mathbf{x}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^d$ and function value $f(\mathbf{x}) = f_1(\mathbf{x}) + if_2(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{C}$, the real numbers $f_1(\mathbf{x}), f_2(\mathbf{x})$ are stored as their finite-precision binary encodings with precision η , which means

$$|f_1(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{x})| \leq \eta, \quad |f_2(\mathbf{x}) - \tilde{f}_2(\mathbf{x})| \leq \eta.$$

Sometimes we omit the η and write U_f . We denote the cost of one query to U_f^η as $C(\eta)$.⁴

Remark 2.2. In this paper, we store the real and imaginary parts of all complex numbers $z \in \mathbb{C}$ separately. However, for clarity and conciseness, we denote them as $|z\rangle$, representing actually $|z_1\rangle|z_2\rangle$ for $z = z_1 + iz_2$. The same representation applies to complex vectors $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{z}_1 + i\mathbf{z}_2 \in \mathbb{C}^d$.

Lemma 2.3 (Some arithmetic operations of complex values). For $a, b, c \in \mathbb{C}$, we can implement unitaries satisfying

$$|a\rangle|b\rangle \rightarrow |a\rangle|b + ac\rangle. \quad (2.1)$$

Proof. By [RPGE17], we can do the common arithmetic operations for binary encoding of real numbers. Using these operations as a foundation, we can make some adjustments to handle the case of complex numbers. Assume $a = a_1 + ia_2, b = b_1 + ib_2$ and $c = c_1 + ic_2$, then the following is a process of implementing (2.1) because $b + ac = (b_1 + a_1c_1 - a_2c_2) + i(b_2 + a_1c_2 + a_2c_1)$:

$$\begin{aligned} |a_1\rangle|a_2\rangle|b_1\rangle|b_2\rangle &\rightarrow |a_1\rangle|a_2\rangle|b_1 + a_1c_1\rangle|b_2\rangle \\ &\rightarrow |a_1\rangle|a_2\rangle|b_1 + a_1c_1 - a_2c_2\rangle|b_2\rangle \\ &\rightarrow |a_1\rangle|a_2\rangle|b_1 + a_1c_1 - a_2c_2\rangle|b_2 + a_1c_2\rangle \\ &\rightarrow |a_1\rangle|a_2\rangle|b_1 + a_1c_1 - a_2c_2\rangle|b_2 + a_1c_2 + a_2c_1\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

□

Definition 2.4 (Phase oracle). Let $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $f : X \rightarrow [-\pi, \pi]$ be a real-valued function defined on a set X . The phase oracle for f acts as

$$O_f^\eta : |x\rangle \rightarrow e^{i\tilde{f}(x)}|x\rangle,$$

where $|\tilde{f}(x) - f(x)| \leq \eta$ for all $x \in X$. Sometimes, we will ignore η and just write O_f . If f is complex-valued with real and imaginary parts f_1, f_2 , we can similarly define O_{f_1} and O_{f_2} to query f .

The query model is commonly used in the field of quantum query complexity. It is widely known that the binary oracle and phase oracle for real-valued functions can be converted to each other, using the phase-kickback technique and quantum phase estimation. In the case of complex-valued functions, we have a similar result.

⁴The cost function $C(\eta)$ depends on the specific method to obtain U_f^η . For instance, if f can be calculated using classical circuits, $C(\eta)$ is $\text{polylog}(1/\eta)$, however, the cost is typically $1/\eta$ if U_f^η is obtained using quantum amplitude estimation.

Proposition 2.5 (Binary oracle and phase oracle). *Let $f : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function.*

- *Given U_f^η , we can obtain the phase oracles $O_{f_1}^\eta, O_{f_2}^\eta$ for its real and imaginary parts with 2 applications of U_f^η .*
- *Conversely, suppose $f_1(\mathbf{x}), f_2(\mathbf{x}) \in [-\pi, \pi]$ for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, then given $O_{f_1}^\eta, O_{f_2}^\eta$, we can obtain $U_f^{\eta+\varepsilon}$ with $O(1/\varepsilon)$ applications of $O_{f_1}^\eta, O_{f_2}^\eta$.*

Proof. Note that for any $y \in \mathbb{R}$ represented as binary expansion, it is easy to implement $|y\rangle \rightarrow e^{iy}|y\rangle$ using controlled phase gates. Therefore, given $U_f^\eta : |\mathbf{x}\rangle|0\rangle \rightarrow |\mathbf{x}\rangle|\tilde{f}_1(\mathbf{x})\rangle|\tilde{f}_2(\mathbf{x})\rangle$ for $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{C}^d$, we can obtain $O_{\tilde{f}_1}, O_{\tilde{f}_2}$ in this way with the same accuracy. Each is obtained with 2 applications of U_f^η .

Conversely, suppose that we are given phase oracles. Following the process of quantum phase estimation, the phase oracle conjugated with the quantum Fourier transform (QFT) acting on the output register can give us a binary query. Note that the QFT can be performed properly since $f_1(\mathbf{x}), f_2(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}$. The complexity is the same as that of quantum phase estimation. \square

Definition 2.6 (Fractional query oracle). Let $r \in [-1, 1], \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $f : X \rightarrow [-\pi, \pi]$ be a real-valued function defined on a set X . The fractional query oracle $O_{r,f}$ is defined as

$$O_{r,f}^\eta : |x\rangle \rightarrow e^{ir\tilde{f}(x)}|x\rangle,$$

where $|\tilde{f}(x) - f(x)| \leq \eta$ for all $x \in X$. As usual, we sometimes ignore η when it makes no difference.

The following result follows from Circuit 4.2.18 in [Cor19] (also see [GSLW19, Corollary 34]).

Proposition 2.7 (Phase oracle to fractional oracle). *Assume that $\|f\|_\infty \leq 1/2$, $r \in [0, 1/48]$ and $\eta > 0$, then there is a quantum circuit that implements $O_{r,f}$ up to error η using $O(\log(1/\eta))$ applications of O_f and its controlled form.*

If $1/48 < r < 1$ and r is an integer multiple of $r' \in [0, 1/48]$, then we can apply the above result to construct $O_{r,f}$ by considering it as r/r' -th power of $U_{r',f}$. So the query complexity will be $O((r/r') \log(1/\eta))$.

Remark 2.8. Although U_f, O_f are commonly used oracles in the design of quantum algorithms, another more practical oracle is the probability oracle. Assume $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow [0, 1]$, the probability oracle acts as

$$P_f : |x\rangle|0\rangle \rightarrow |x\rangle \left(\sqrt{f(x)}|0\rangle|\psi_0\rangle + \sqrt{1-f(x)}|1\rangle|\psi_1\rangle \right), \quad (2.2)$$

where $|\psi_0\rangle, |\psi_1\rangle$ are arbitrary (normalized) quantum states. The right-hand side of the above state appears widely in many quantum algorithms. As shown in [GAW19, Corollary 4.1], there is an effective procedure to convert a probability oracle to a phase oracle. This result will be used below, so state it here.

Lemma 2.9 (Probability oracle to phase oracle). *Suppose that we are given a probability oracle P_g for $g(x) : X \rightarrow [0, 1]$. Let $t \in \mathbb{R}$ and $f(x) = tg(x)$ for all $x \in X$. We can implement an ε -approximate phase oracle O_f with query complexity $O(|t| + \log(1/\varepsilon))$, i.e., this many uses of P_g and its inverse.*

Conversely, as shown in [GAW19, Lemma 16 (the arXiv version)], we have the following conversion from phase to probability oracle.

Lemma 2.10 (Phase oracle to probability oracle). *Let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1/2)$ and $f : X \rightarrow [\delta, 1-\delta]$. Given access to the phase oracle O_f , then we can implement a probability oracle P_f up to accuracy ε using $O(\delta^{-1} \log(1/\varepsilon))$ invocations of (controlled) O_f and O_f^\dagger .*

For a complex-valued function $f(\mathbf{x}) = f_1(\mathbf{x}) + if_2(\mathbf{x})$, an alternative representation is using polar coordinates, i.e., $f(\mathbf{x}) = r(\mathbf{x})e^{i\theta(\mathbf{x})}$. So it is natural to consider two other phase oracles:

$$O_r : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{ir(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle, \quad O_\theta : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{i\theta(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle. \quad (2.3)$$

We below show that given O_r, O_θ , we can efficiently construct O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} . This implies that the oracle assumption on O_r, O_θ is weaker.

Proposition 2.11. *Let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1/2)$. Assume $r(\mathbf{x}), \cos(\theta(\mathbf{x})), \sin(\theta(\mathbf{x})) \in [-1+2\delta, 1-2\delta]$ for all \mathbf{x} . Then given O_r, O_θ , we can construct O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} up to error ε with $O(\delta^{-1} \log^4(1/\varepsilon))$ applications of O_r, O_θ , including $O_r^\dagger, O_\theta^\dagger$ and their controlled forms.*

To prove this claim, we need to invoke some results on block-encoding [GSLW19].

Definition 2.12 (Block-encoding). Let A be an operator and $\alpha \geq \|A\|$, then a unitary U is called a α -block-encoding of A if it has the form

$$U = \begin{pmatrix} A/\alpha & * \\ * & * \end{pmatrix}.$$

Intuitively, U is a block-encoding of A if for any state $|\psi\rangle$, we have $U|0\rangle|\psi\rangle = |0\rangle \otimes (A/\alpha)|\psi\rangle + |0\rangle^\perp$ for some orthogonal part $|0\rangle^\perp$. Sometimes, more than 1 ancillary qubits are required.

Given block-encodings of operators, the linear combination of unitaries (LCU) is a useful technique to construct block-encoding of their linear combinations. For example, for $i \in \{0, 1\}$, let U_i be a block-encoding of A_i with parameter $\alpha_i = 1$, then by LCU, it is easy to check that the following process constructs a block-encoding of $A_0 + A_1$ with $\alpha = 2$:

1. Prepare $|+\rangle|0, \psi\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle|0, \psi\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle|0, \psi\rangle$.
2. Apply $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes U_0 + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes U_1$ to obtain $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|0\rangle U_0|0, \psi\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|1\rangle U_1|0, \psi\rangle$.
3. Apply Hadamard gate to the first register to obtain $\frac{1}{2}|0\rangle(U_0 + U_1)|0, \psi\rangle + \frac{1}{2}|1\rangle(U_0 - U_1)|0, \psi\rangle$.

Given a block-encoding of a Hermitian matrix, Low and Chuang showed how to implement an optimal Hamiltonian simulation.

Lemma 2.13 (Hamiltonian simulation, see [LC19]). *Suppose that U is a block-encoding of the Hamiltonian H with parameter α . Then one can implement an ε -precise approximation of the Hamiltonian simulation unitary e^{itH} with $O(\alpha|t| + \log(1/\varepsilon))$ uses of controlled- U or its inverse.*

Lemma 2.14. *Let $\varepsilon, \delta \in (0, 1/2)$ and $f, g : X \rightarrow [-1 + 2\delta, 1 - 2\delta]$. Given phase oracles O_f, O_g , we can construct O_{fg} up to accuracy ε with $O(\delta^{-1} \log^3(1/\varepsilon))$ calls to O_f, O_g .*

Proof. Let $f' = (1 - f)/2, g' = (1 - g)/2$. From O_f, O_g , it costs $O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$ to construct $O_{f'}, O_{g'}$ up to accuracy ε by Lemma 2.7. Moreover, $f', g' : X \rightarrow [\delta, 1 - \delta]$. By Lemma 2.10, we can construct $P_{f'}$ and $P_{g'}$

$$P_{f'} : |\mathbf{x}\rangle|0\rangle \rightarrow |\mathbf{x}\rangle \left(\sqrt{f'(\mathbf{x})}|0\rangle + \sqrt{1 - f'(\mathbf{x})}|1\rangle \right),$$

$$P_{g'} : |\mathbf{x}\rangle|0\rangle \rightarrow |\mathbf{x}\rangle \left(\sqrt{g'(\mathbf{x})}|0\rangle + \sqrt{1 - g'(\mathbf{x})}|1\rangle \right),$$

up to accuracy ε using $O(\delta^{-1} \log(1/\varepsilon))$ queries to $O_{f'}, O_{g'}$. Now, it is easy to check that $P_{f'}^\dagger(I \otimes Z)P_{f'}$ is a 1-block-encoding of the $\text{diag}\{1 - 2f'(\mathbf{x})\} = \text{diag}\{f(\mathbf{x})\}$. Similarly, $P_{g'}^\dagger(I \otimes Z)P_{g'}$ is a 1-block-encoding of $\text{diag}\{g(\mathbf{x})\}$. Given these two block-encodings, we can construct a 1-block-encoding of the product $H := \text{diag}\{f(\mathbf{x})g(\mathbf{x})\}$. Finally, we use Lemma 2.13 to implement e^{iH} up to accuracy ε with $O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$ applications of the block-encoding. This gives the phase oracle O_{fg} . \square

We are now ready to prove Proposition 2.11.

Proof of Proposition 2.11. Note that $f_1(\mathbf{x}) = r(\mathbf{x}) \cos(\theta(\mathbf{x})), f_2(\mathbf{x}) = r(\mathbf{x}) \sin(\theta(\mathbf{x}))$. We consider the following process:

1. Prepare $|\mathbf{x}\rangle|+\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\mathbf{x}\rangle|0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}|\mathbf{x}\rangle|1\rangle$.
2. Apply control- O_θ , i.e., $|0\rangle\langle 0| \otimes O_\theta + |1\rangle\langle 1| \otimes O_\theta^{-1}$, we then obtain $\frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{i\theta(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle|0\rangle + \frac{1}{\sqrt{2}}e^{-i\theta(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle|1\rangle$.
3. Apply Hadamard gate to the second register to obtain $|\mathbf{x}\rangle(\cos(\theta(\mathbf{x}))|0\rangle + \sin(\theta(\mathbf{x}))|1\rangle)$.

The above defines a process to implement a probability oracle for the function $\cos(\theta(\mathbf{x}))$. As it acts like a rotation, we denote it as R . By considering $R + R^T$ using LCU, we will obtain a 1-block-encoding of $\text{diag}(\cos(\theta(\mathbf{x})))$. Similarly, by considering $X(R - R^T)$ we will have a 1-block-encoding of $\text{diag}(\sin(\theta(\mathbf{x})))$. Here $X = |0\rangle\langle 1| + |1\rangle\langle 0|$ is the Pauli- X . From these block-encodings, by Lemma 2.13, we can construct phase oracles

$$O_1 : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{i \cos(\theta(\mathbf{x}))} |\mathbf{x}\rangle, \quad O_2 : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{i \sin(\theta(\mathbf{x}))} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$$

up to accuracy ε using $O(\log(1/\varepsilon))$ applications of O_θ . Finally by Lemma 2.14, we can construct the phase oracles of $r(\mathbf{x}) \cos(\theta(\mathbf{x}))$ and $r(\mathbf{x}) \sin(\theta(\mathbf{x}))$ from O_r, O_1, O_2 . \square

2.2 Multivariable calculus

This paper extensively utilizes concepts from multivariable analysis. Here, we provide a brief overview of notation, definitions, and properties, to facilitate understanding. For further information, we recommend referring to the following classic textbooks: [KP02] delves into real analytic functions, and [GR22, Ran98, Kra01, LT10] encompass holomorphic functions in several complex variables.

Definition 2.15 (Directional derivative). Given a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ that is n -times differentiable at $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, then the n -th order directional derivative along the direction $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ is

$$\partial_{\mathbf{r}}^n f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{d^n}{d\tau^n} f(\mathbf{x} + \tau \mathbf{r}) = \sum_{\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d, |\alpha|=n} \frac{n!}{\alpha!} \mathbf{r}^\alpha \cdot \partial^\alpha f(\mathbf{x}).$$

Finite difference formulae, derived from the Taylor expansion, can be used to approximate derivatives of functions. In [Li05], Li provided general finite difference formulae and error analysis for higher-order derivatives of functions. Therefore, we can use them to obtain an approximate formula for the Hessian of multivariable functions, as defined below.

Definition 2.16 (Finite difference formula for Hessian). Let $m \in \mathbb{N}$. The degree- $2m$ central difference approximation of the second derivative of a function $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is

$$f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{t=-m}^m a_t^{(2m)} f(t\mathbf{x}) \approx \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{x},$$

where \mathbf{H}_f is the Hessian matrix of f . The coefficients for $t \in \{-m, \dots, m\} \setminus \{0\}$ are

$$a_t^{(2m)} := \frac{(-1)^{t-1} \cdot 2}{t^2} \frac{m!m!}{(m+t)!(m-t)!}$$

and $a_0^{(2m)} = - \sum_{t=-m, t \neq 0}^m a_t^{(2m)}$.

2.2.1 Holomorphic functions in several complex variables

In this part, we outline the definitions and related concepts of multivariable complex functions, including their derivatives, analyticity, and other pertinent properties. These topics are foundational in analysis and are provided here for reference, in case some readers are less familiar with the differential properties of multivariable complex functions.

For $d \in \mathbb{N}$, we define an isomorphism of \mathbb{R} -vector spaces between \mathbb{C}^d and \mathbb{R}^{2d} by setting $z_j = x_j + iy_j$ for all $j \in [d]$. The holomorphic and anti-holomorphic differential operations are given by

$$\begin{cases} \frac{\partial}{\partial z_j} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} - i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \right), \\ \frac{\partial}{\partial \bar{z}_j} = \frac{1}{2} \left(\frac{\partial}{\partial x_j} + i \frac{\partial}{\partial y_j} \right), \end{cases}$$

for $j \in [d]$.

Definition 2.17 (Page 5 of [Ran98], Definition 1.1 of [LT10]). Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$ be an open set and function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$. The function f is said to be holomorphic on Ω if f is differentiable and satisfies the system of partial differential equations

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial \bar{z}_j}(\mathbf{c}) = 0 \quad \text{for every } \mathbf{c} \in \Omega \text{ and } j \in [d],$$

which is called the homogeneous Cauchy-Riemann system. As for real-valued functions, we denote $\nabla f(\mathbf{c}) = \left(\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_1}(\mathbf{c}), \dots, \frac{\partial f}{\partial z_d}(\mathbf{c}) \right)$.

Lemma 2.18 (Hartogs's Theorem, Theorem 2.9 of [LT10]). *Let $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be a function defined on $\Omega \subset \mathbb{C}^d$. If f is holomorphic, then f is holomorphic in each variable separately. More precisely, the functions f_j defined by $z \mapsto f(z_1, \dots, z_{j-1}, z, z_{j+1}, \dots, z_d)$ are holomorphic as functions of one complex variable, which means the following limit exists⁵*

$$\frac{\partial f}{\partial z_j}(\mathbf{c}) := \lim_{z_j \rightarrow c_j} \frac{f(c_1, \dots, c_{j-1}, z_j, c_{j+1}, \dots, c_d) - f(\mathbf{c})}{z_j - c_j}$$

⁵Note that $z_j \in \mathbb{C}$ tends to c_j in all directions in the complex plane, and the limit exists meaning that the values obtained in different directions are all the same.

for each $j \in [d]$ and any $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_d) \in \Omega$. Conversely, if f is holomorphic in each variable separately, then Hartogs's theorem⁶ ensures that the function f itself is holomorphic.

2.2.2 Analytic functions

Definition 2.19 (Power series). Let $a_\nu \in \mathbb{K} = \mathbb{R}$ or \mathbb{C} for $\nu = (\nu_1, \dots, \nu_d) \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$. A power series in d variables $\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{K}^d$ centered at the point $\mathbf{c} = (c_1, \dots, c_d) \in \mathbb{K}^d$ is a series of the form

$$\sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} a_\nu (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{c})^\nu, \quad (2.4)$$

where $(\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{c})^\nu$ is a multi-index notation representing $(z_1 - c_1)^{\nu_1} \cdots (z_d - c_d)^{\nu_d}$.

The domain of convergence of multivariable power series is not as straightforward as in the single-variable case. Below, we will give some basic results about the convergence.

Definition 2.20 (Polydisc). The (open) polydisc $D(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{r})$ of multi-radius $\mathbf{r} = (r_1, \dots, r_d) \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ and center $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{K}^d$ is

$$D(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{r}) = \{\mathbf{z} = (z_1, \dots, z_d) \in \mathbb{K}^d : |z_j - c_j| < r_j \text{ for all } j = 1, \dots, d\}.$$

The closed polydisc is $\bar{D}(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{r}) = \{\mathbf{z} \in \mathbb{K}^d : |z_j - c_j| \leq r_j \text{ for all } j \in [d]\}$.

Lemma 2.21 (Abel's Lemma, Lemma 1.15 of [Ran98]). Given $a_\nu \in \mathbb{K}$ for all $\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$, $\mathbf{c} \in \mathbb{K}^d$, and the power series (2.4) above, there exists $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$ such that

$$\sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} |a_\nu| \mathbf{r}^\nu < \infty.$$

Hence, the power series $\sum a_\nu (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{c})^\nu$ converges on the polydisc $D(\mathbf{c}, \mathbf{r})$.

Definition 2.22 (Analytic functions). Let $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$ be a function defined on an open set $\Omega \subset \mathbb{K}^d$. We say that f is analytic on Ω if for any point $\mathbf{p} \in \Omega$, it can be written as a power series

$$f(\mathbf{z}) = \sum_{\nu \in \mathbb{N}_0^d} a_\nu (\mathbf{z} - \mathbf{p})^\nu$$

in which the coefficients $a_\nu \in \mathbb{K}$, and the series converges to $f(\mathbf{z})$ for $\mathbf{z} \in D(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r})$ for some $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. Indeed, the coefficients $a_\nu = \frac{\partial^\nu f(\mathbf{p})}{\nu!}$. In other words, f is said to be analytic at point \mathbf{p} if its Taylor series at \mathbf{p} converges to f in some polydisc $D(\mathbf{p}, \mathbf{r})$.

Lemma 2.23 (Osgood's Lemma, Theorem 2 of Chapter 1 of [GR22]). Let $\Omega \subset \mathbb{K}^d$ be an open set, and function $f : \Omega \rightarrow \mathbb{K}$. If f is continuous and analytic in each variable separately, then f itself is analytic.

2.3 Spectral method

The spectral method is powerful in computing the first, second, and higher-order derivatives of analytic functions, whether real or complex-valued [For81, Tre00, LS71, Lyn68, LM67]. It offers better error performance compared to the finite difference method.

⁶Under the additional hypothesis that f is continuous, the statement is easier to prove, known as Osgood's lemma.

Lemma 2.24 (Corollary 1.1.10 of [KP02]). *The power series $\sum_n a_n(x - \alpha)^n$ has radius of convergence ρ if and only if for each $0 < r < \rho$, there exists a constant $0 < \kappa = \kappa(r)$ such that $|a_n| \leq \kappa r^{-n}$ for all n .*

Proof. Suppose that $0 < \overline{\lim}_{n \rightarrow \infty} |a_n|^{1/n} = A < \infty$, then $\rho = A^{-1}$. By definition,

$$\lim_{n \rightarrow \infty} (\sup_{m \geq n} |a_m|^{1/m}) = \rho^{-1}.$$

For any $0 < r < \rho$, let $\varepsilon = r^{-1} - \rho^{-1} > 0$, there exists $N = N(r)$ such that whenever $n > N$,

$$\sup_{m \geq n} |a_m|^{1/m} \leq \rho^{-1} + \varepsilon = r^{-1},$$

which means $|a_m|^{1/m} \leq r^{-1}$ for all $m > N$. Let $\kappa = \max\{1, |a_1|r, \dots, |a_N|r^N\}$, then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $|a_n| \leq \kappa r^{-n}$. \square

We can make the constant κ more precisely for analytic functions by the Cauchy inequality.

Lemma 2.25 (Cauchy's inequality, Chapter 2.5 of [Tit39]). *Assume that f is analytic at x_0 with the radius of convergence r . Let $\delta < r$ and M_δ be the upper bound of $|f(x)|$ on the circle $C_\delta = \{x \in \mathbb{C} : |x - x_0| = \delta\}$, then*

$$|f^{(n)}(x_0)| \leq \frac{n!M_\delta}{\delta^n}$$

for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$.

Proof. By Cauchy's differentiation formula, we have

$$f^{(n)}(x_0) = \frac{n!}{2\pi i} \oint_{C_\delta} \frac{f(x)}{(x - x_0)^{n+1}} dx. \quad (2.5)$$

Hence,

$$|f^{(n)}(x_0)| \leq \frac{n!}{2\pi} \cdot \frac{M_\delta}{\delta^{n+1}} \cdot 2\pi\delta = \frac{n!M_\delta}{\delta^n}.$$

\square

In the above proof, if we approximate the integral (2.5) by an N -point trapezoidal rule, we can then approximate $\delta^n f^{(n)}(x_0)/n!$ with $N^{-1} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} e^{2\pi i k n/N} f(x_0 + \delta e^{-2\pi i k/N})$. Another way to see this is from the Taylor series of $f(x)$ at x_0 , where the error analysis is relatively more clear.

Now let f be a function that is analytic at point $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}$, and the Taylor series of f at x_0 converges in an open neighbourhood of $x_0 \in \mathbb{C}$ that contains $\overline{B}(x_0, r) \subset \mathbb{C}$, which is the closed disk with center x_0 and radius $r \in \mathbb{R}_+$. In $\overline{B}(x_0, r)$, f can be computed by the Taylor series:

$$f(x) = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n(x - x_0)^n, \quad a_n = \frac{f^{(n)}(x_0)}{n!}.$$

According to Lemma 2.25, there is a constant $\kappa = M_r > 0$ such that

$$|a_n| \leq \kappa r^{-n}, \quad \forall n \in \mathbb{N}.$$

Here M_r denotes the maximum value of $|f(x)|$ on the circle centered at x_0 with radius r .

Choose some $\delta \in (0, r)$, $N \in \mathbb{N}$, consider the following N values of f

$$f_k := f(x_0 + \delta\omega^k), \quad k = 0, \dots, N-1,$$

where $\omega = e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{N}}$. Then we have

$$f_k = \sum_{n=0}^{\infty} a_n (\delta\omega^k)^n = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \omega^{kn} \left(\sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{n+mN} \delta^{n+mN} \right).$$

Denote $c_n = \sum_{m=0}^{\infty} a_{n+mN} \delta^{n+mN}$, then

$$f_k = \sum_{n=0}^{N-1} \omega^{kn} c_n,$$

which is an application of the discrete Fourier transform (DFT). The inverse DFT gives

$$c_n = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega^{-kn} f_k = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega^{-kn} f(x_0 + \delta e^{-2\pi i k/N}).$$

This formula coincides with the formula obtained by the trapezoidal rule mentioned above. Thus, c_n can be obtained through N function evaluations of f . Consequently, an approximation of $a_n = \frac{f^{(n)}(x_0)}{n!}$ can be provided by c_n/δ^n , and the error is

$$\left| a_n - \frac{c_n}{\delta^n} \right| \leq \kappa r^{-n} \sum_{m=1}^{\infty} (\delta/r)^{mN} = \kappa r^{-n} \frac{(\delta/r)^N}{1 - (\delta/r)^N}. \quad (2.6)$$

Particularly, when $n = 1$,

$$\left| f'(x_0) - \frac{c_1}{\delta} \right| \leq \kappa r^{-1} \frac{(\delta/r)^N}{1 - (\delta/r)^N}. \quad (2.7)$$

There are two ways to look at the approximation (2.6). If we fix N and consider the behavior of the error when the radius δ approaches 0, then we derive $a_n = c_n/\delta^n + O(\kappa\delta^N)$. This is an approximation of a_n of order N with respect to δ . We can also fix δ and let $N \rightarrow \infty$, we now obtain $a_n = c_n/\delta^n + O(\kappa e^{-\alpha N})$, where $\alpha = \log(r/\delta) > 0$. This approximation is exponential with respect to N . In this work, we will use the second way to determine N to achieve the desired accuracy ε by setting α as a constant. As a result, $N = O(\log(\kappa/\varepsilon))$.

2.4 Grid of sampling points

Every algorithm that estimates some information based on function evaluations must describe a set of sampling points. For clarity and ease of comparison between previous methods and ours, we describe a common grid of points here.

Definition 2.26 (Grid of sampling points). Let $d, n \in \mathbb{N}$, we define

$$G_n^d := \times_{i=1}^d \left\{ \frac{1}{2^n} \cdot k_i + \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} : k_i \in \{-2^{n-1}, \dots, 2^{n-1} - 1\} \right\} \subset \mathbb{R}^d. \quad (2.8)$$

Note that G_n^d is the grid around the original point with side length 1, and for $a \in \mathbb{R}_+$, we refer to aG_n^d as the grid with side length a . It is clear that the elements $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in G_n^d$ are just vectors whose components x_i are uniformly distributed in $(-1/2, 1/2)$ with intervals of $1/2^n$.

From the analysis presented in Lemma 3.2, d denotes the dimension (or the number of variables) of f , and n relates to the accuracy of estimating the gradient of f .

Note that every binary string $b = (b_0, \dots, b_{n-1}) \in \{0, 1\}^n$ can be viewed as an integer in $[0, 2^n) \cap \mathbb{Z}$, i.e., $b_0 + 2b_1 + \dots + 2^{n-1}b_{n-1}$. There is a natural bijection between $[0, 2^n) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ and $[-2^{n-1}, 2^{n-1}) \cap \mathbb{Z}$, which leads to a natural bijection between $[0, 2^n) \cap \mathbb{Z}$ and the set G_n defined above for $d = 1$. Hence, an n -qubit basis state $|b_0\rangle \cdots |b_{n-1}\rangle$ can represent a corresponding element in G_n . In this work, we will label n -qubit basis states by elements in G_n for convenience.

We define the quantum Fourier transform acting on state $|x\rangle$ for $x \in G_n$ as

$$\text{QFT}_{G_n} : |x\rangle \rightarrow \frac{1}{\sqrt{2^n}} \sum_{k \in G_n} e^{2\pi i 2^n x k} |k\rangle. \quad (2.9)$$

This unitary is equivalent to the usual quantum Fourier transform QFT_{2^n} up to conjugation with a tensor product of n single-qubit phase gates, so we can interchangeably use these two equivalent transforms, see [GAW19, Claim 5.1].

3 Quantum spectral method for gradient estimation

Most previous work, e.g., [Jor05, GAW19], about computing gradients through quantum algorithms focused on real-valued functions. A key technique is the quantum Fourier transform. However, complex numbers play a crucial role in quantum mechanics [Kar20], where observables are Hermitian operators, the quantum Fourier transform is frequently applied, and the time evolution of states is described by unitaries, among others. Complex-valued functions also have plenty of applications in mathematics and engineering.

For a complex-valued function $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$, to utilize the spectral method, we explore functions satisfying $f'(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathbb{R}$. Note that if $f : \mathbb{C} \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ is analytic and maps \mathbb{R} into \mathbb{R} , then for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$, we have $f^{(n)}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathbb{R}$. This can be easily deduced from the uniqueness property of the limit, and multivariable functions exhibit similar behavior by definition. This constraint on functions may seem somewhat contrived at first glance, but it has numerous applications and examples, such as polynomials, exponentials, and other basic functions. In fact, any analytic real-valued function can be locally extended to the complex plane, which is quite natural through Taylor expansion. Moreover, the derivatives we consider are also local properties that align well with this perspective.

Given oracle access to a function that can evaluate its values, if we aim to approximate its derivatives at a point, it is necessary to provide a formula expressing the derivatives in terms of function values. In [GAW19], they used a finite difference formula for approximating the first-order derivative, derived from Taylor expansion, for this purpose. In this work, we employ the spectral method for analytic functions, as introduced above, which arises from the Cauchy differentiation formula.

Theorem 3.1. *Let $N \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\omega = e^{-\frac{2\pi i}{N}}$. Let $f : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function that maps \mathbb{R}^d into \mathbb{R} . Assume the Taylor series of f converges to itself in a closed polydisc $\bar{D}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{r})$ with $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. Denote $r = \min_{j \in [d]} r_j$, then for all $\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d$ and $\delta \in (0, 2r)$,*

$$F(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{N\delta} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega^{-k} f(\delta \omega^k \mathbf{x})$$

gives an approximation for $\nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}$ with error

$$|F(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}| \leq \frac{\kappa}{2r} \frac{(\delta/2r)^N}{1 - (\delta/2r)^N}$$

for some constant $\kappa = \max_{\tau} |f(\tau \mathbf{x})| > 0$ with τ ranging over the circle centered at 0 with radius $2r$. Moreover, $F(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}$.

Proof. Given $\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, define $h(\tau) := f(\tau \mathbf{x})$ as a function over the field \mathbb{C} which is also analytic and maps \mathbb{R} to \mathbb{R} , then

$$h^{(k)}(\tau) = \frac{d^k f(\tau \mathbf{x})}{d\tau^k} = \partial_{\mathbf{x}}^k f(\tau \mathbf{x}).$$

In particular, $h'(0) = \nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}$. Since the Taylor series of f converges to itself in $\overline{D}(\mathbf{0}, r)$, the Taylor series of h converges as well for all τ satisfying $|\tau x_j| \leq r_j, j \in [d]$. More precisely, take $\tilde{r} := 2r$, then for all $\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d$, the Taylor series of h converges to itself in an open set containing the closed ball $\overline{B}(0, \tilde{r}) \subset \mathbb{C}$. By (2.7),

$$\left| h'(0) - \frac{c_1}{\delta} \right| \leq \kappa \tilde{r}^{-1} \frac{(\delta/\tilde{r})^N}{1 - (\delta/\tilde{r})^N},$$

where

$$c_1 = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega^{-k} h(\delta \omega^k) = \frac{1}{N} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega^{-k} f(\delta \omega^k \mathbf{x})$$

and κ is the maximum value of $|h(\tau)|$ on the circle centered at 0 with radius \tilde{r} . Finally, we obtain the claimed error bound in this theorem by noting that $F(\mathbf{x}) = c_1/\delta$. Moreover, $h^{(n)}(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathbb{R}$ for all $n \in \mathbb{N}$ since $h(\mathbb{R}) \subset \mathbb{R}$. Consequently, $F(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}$ since $c_1 \in \mathbb{R}$ by its definition. \square

Lemma 3.2 (Theorem 5.1 of [GAW19]). *Let $c \in \mathbb{R}, a, \rho, \varepsilon < M \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and $\mathbf{y}, \mathbf{g} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that $\|\mathbf{g}\|_{\infty} \leq M$. Let $n_{\varepsilon} = \lceil \log_2(4/a\varepsilon) \rceil$, $n_M = \lceil \log_2(3aM) \rceil$ and $n = n_{\varepsilon} + n_M$. Suppose $f : (\mathbf{y} + aG_n^d) \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is such that*

$$|f(\mathbf{y} + a\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{g} \cdot a\mathbf{x} - c| \leq \frac{\varepsilon a}{8 \cdot 42\pi}$$

for all but a $1/1000$ fraction of the points $\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d$. If we have access to a phase oracle

$$O : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{2\pi i 2^{n_{\varepsilon}} f(\mathbf{y} + a\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$$

acting on $\mathcal{H} = \text{Span}\{|\mathbf{x}\rangle : \mathbf{x} \in G_n^d\}$, then we can calculate a vector $\tilde{\mathbf{g}} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ such that

$$\Pr[\|\tilde{\mathbf{g}} - \mathbf{g}\|_{\infty} > \varepsilon] \leq \rho,$$

with $O\left(\log\left(\frac{d}{\rho}\right)\right)$ queries to O .

In the above lemma, the gate complexity is $O\left(d \log\left(\frac{d}{\rho}\right) \log\left(\frac{M}{\varepsilon}\right) \log\log\left(\frac{d}{\rho}\right) \log\log\left(\frac{M}{\varepsilon}\right)\right)$. Here we briefly summarize this quantum algorithm, which is also a key subroutine of our quantum algorithm below, for computing $\tilde{\mathbf{g}}$. We set $a = 1, \mathbf{y} = \mathbf{0}$ for convenience. Denote $N = 2^n$. With O , we can generate the following state

$$|\phi\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^d}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d} e^{2\pi i f(\mathbf{x})N} |\mathbf{x}\rangle.$$

By the condition that $f(\mathbf{x})$ is close to $\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{x} + c$, the above state is close to

$$|\psi\rangle := \frac{1}{\sqrt{N^d}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d} e^{2\pi i (\mathbf{g} \cdot \mathbf{x} + c)N} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$$

$$= e^{2\pi icN} \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{x_1 \in G_n} e^{2\pi ig_1 \cdot x_1 N} |x_1\rangle \right) \otimes \cdots \otimes \left(\frac{1}{\sqrt{N}} \sum_{x_d \in G_n} e^{2\pi ig_d \cdot x_d N} |x_d\rangle \right).$$

Finally, we apply the inverse of the quantum Fourier transform on G_n^d to $|\phi\rangle$, which will be a state close to $|\tilde{\mathbf{g}}\rangle$ with high probability. In the above, because of the representation of grid points in G_n , it is $e^{2\pi ig_1 \cdot x_1 N}$ rather than $e^{2\pi ig_1 \cdot x_1 / N}$ in the standard quantum Fourier transform.

In Theorem 3.1, we already proved that $F(\mathbf{x})$ is close to $\nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}$. To use the above result to estimate $\nabla f(\mathbf{0})$, we need to construct the phase oracle O to query $F(\mathbf{x})$. We below consider this construction in two cases: using the binary oracle U_f and using phase oracles O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} .

Below we will set $a = 1$. Different from the finite difference method used in [GAW19], a is not important for us in the spectral method. This will make a big difference in gradient and Hessian estimation.

Lemma 3.3 (Oracle construction using binary oracle). *Given an analytic function $f : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ that maps \mathbb{R}^d into \mathbb{R} , and the access to the oracle U_f^η defined in Definition 2.1, then for $F(\mathbf{x})$ defined in Theorem 3.1 and $n_\varepsilon = \lceil \log_2(4/\varepsilon) \rceil$, we can get an η' -precision oracle*

$$O : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{2\pi i 2^{n_\varepsilon} F(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$$

required in Lemma 3.2, with $O(N)$ queries to U_f^η and $\eta/\eta' \in O(\varepsilon\delta)$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, we have $F(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{N\delta} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega^{-k} f(\delta\omega^k \mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, particularly for $\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d$. Using Lemma 2.3, we can implement unitaries for any $k \in [N]$ satisfying

$$V_k : |\mathbf{x}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle \rightarrow |\mathbf{x}\rangle|\delta\omega^k \mathbf{x}\rangle,$$

and

$$W_k : |f(\delta\omega^k \mathbf{x})\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle \rightarrow |f(\delta\omega^k \mathbf{x})\rangle|\omega^{-k} f(\delta\omega^k \mathbf{x})\rangle.$$

Using the above unitaries and oracle U_f (and its inverse U_f^{-1}), we can construct an oracle for any $k_1, k_2 \in [N]$ (we omit the tensor product with the identity mapping for brevity):

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{x}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle &\xrightarrow{V_{k_1}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle|\delta\omega^{k_1} \mathbf{x}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle \\ &\xrightarrow{U_f} |\mathbf{x}\rangle|\delta\omega^{k_1} \mathbf{x}\rangle|f(\delta\omega^{k_1} \mathbf{x})\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle \\ &\xrightarrow{W_{k_1}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle|\delta\omega^{k_1} \mathbf{x}\rangle|f(\delta\omega^{k_1} \mathbf{x})\rangle|\omega^{-k_1} f(\delta\omega^{k_1} \mathbf{x})\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

Note that the two intermediate registers serve as auxiliary components, with the first one representing the input \mathbf{x} and the last one storing the desired outcome.

As before, we denote $f_k := f(\delta\omega^k \mathbf{x})$. Then the inverse $V_{k_1}^{-1} \cdot U_f^{-1}$ allows us to reset the auxiliary registers to the original states, enabling the proceeding operations:⁷

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{x}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\omega^{-k_1} f_{k_1}\rangle &\longrightarrow |\mathbf{x}\rangle|\delta\omega^{k_2} \mathbf{x}\rangle|f_{k_2}\rangle|\omega^{-k_1} f_{k_1}\rangle \\ &\longrightarrow |\mathbf{x}\rangle|\delta\omega^{k_2} \mathbf{x}\rangle|f_{k_2}\rangle|\omega^{-k_1} f_{k_1} + \omega^{-k_2} f_{k_2}\rangle \\ &\longrightarrow |\mathbf{x}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle|\omega^{-k_1} f_{k_1} + \omega^{-k_2} f_{k_2}\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

⁷The first arrow is similar to the above using V_{k_2} and U_f , and the second one follows the complex-value operations describing in Lemma 2.3.

Running the oracle described above from $k = 0$ to $N - 1$, we obtain

$$\begin{aligned}
|\mathbf{x}\rangle|\mathbf{0}\rangle &\longrightarrow |\mathbf{x}\rangle\left|\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\omega^{-k}f(\delta\omega^k\mathbf{x})\right\rangle \\
&\longrightarrow |\mathbf{x}\rangle\left|\frac{1}{N\delta}\sum_{k=0}^{N-1}\omega^{-k}f(\delta\omega^k\mathbf{x})\right\rangle \\
&\longrightarrow |\mathbf{x}\rangle|F(\mathbf{x})\rangle \\
&\longrightarrow |\mathbf{x}\rangle|2\pi\cdot 2^{n_\varepsilon}F(\mathbf{x})\rangle.
\end{aligned}$$

Since $2\pi\cdot 2^{n_\varepsilon}F(\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}$, standard oracle conversion gives us the oracle

$$O : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{2\pi i 2^{n_\varepsilon} F(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle.$$

The overall process shows that the oracle U_f and its inverse are called a total number of $4N$ times. \square

Remark 3.4. Note that the binary oracle U_f^η gives us an η -precision approximation $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})$ instead of the exact $f(\mathbf{x})$. Therefore, the oracle O , which we constructed using U_f^η in the above lemma, also exhibits a precision η' . It is easy to see that $\eta' \approx \eta/\varepsilon\delta$, implying that the cost of each application of O is $C(\varepsilon\delta\eta')$.

Lemma 3.5 (Oracle construction using phase oracle). *Let $f : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function that maps \mathbb{R}^d into \mathbb{R} , with real and imaginary parts f_1, f_2 . Suppose we have access to phase oracles $O_{f_1}^\eta, O_{f_2}^\eta$. Then for $F(\mathbf{x})$ defined in Theorem 3.1 and $n_\varepsilon = \lceil \log_2(4/\varepsilon) \rceil$, we can get the oracle up to accuracy η*

$$O : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{2\pi i 2^{n_\varepsilon} F(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$$

required in Lemma 3.2, with $O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} + N \log\left(\frac{N}{\eta}\right)\right)$ queries to each $O_{f_1}^\eta, O_{f_2}^\eta$.

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, we have $F(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{N\delta} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega^{-k} f(\delta\omega^k\mathbf{x}) \in \mathbb{R}$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. We write $c_k := \cos(-2\pi k/N)$ and $s_k := \sin(-2\pi k/N)$ for all $k \in [N]$, then $\omega^{-k} = c_k + is_k$. As $F(\mathbf{x})$ is real, we obtain that

$$F(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{N\delta} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (c_k f_1(\mathbf{x}_k) - s_k f_2(\mathbf{x}_k))$$

where $\mathbf{x}_k = \delta\omega^k\mathbf{x}$. Observe that

$$e^{2\pi i 2^{n_\varepsilon} F(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle = e^{i \frac{2\pi 2^{n_\varepsilon}}{N\delta} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} (c_k f_1(\mathbf{x}_k) - s_k f_2(\mathbf{x}_k))} |\mathbf{x}\rangle.$$

Denote the scaling factor $S := \frac{2\pi 2^{n_\varepsilon}}{N\delta}$, then implementing O requires

$$\sum_{k=0}^{N-1} [|c_k|S] \leq NS = \frac{\pi}{2\varepsilon\delta},$$

queries to O_{f_1} and at most N queries to fractional oracle O_{tf_1} defined in Definition 2.6.

Given O_{f_1} , by Lemma 2.7 we can implement O_{tf_1} up to error η' using $O(\log(1/\eta'))$ applications of O_{f_1} . Thus, the overall error in the above procedure is $O(N\eta')$ as there are N terms in the summation. Setting $\eta' = \eta/N$ leads to the claimed result. The same argument holds for O_{f_2} as well. \square

With the above preliminaries, we are now prepared to present our main theorem for gradient estimation.

Theorem 3.6 (Quantum spectral method for gradient estimation). *Let $\rho, \varepsilon \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and let $f : \mathbb{C}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{C}$ be an analytic function that maps \mathbb{R}^d into \mathbb{R} . Assume that the Taylor series of f converges to itself in a closed polydisc $\overline{D}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{r})$ for some $\mathbf{r} \in \mathbb{R}_+^d$. Denote $r = \min_{j \in [d]} r_j$ and $\kappa = \max_{\mathbf{x} \in \overline{D}(\mathbf{0}, \mathbf{r})} |f(\mathbf{x})|$. Given access to the oracle U_f^η as in Definition 2.1, or phase oracles $O_{f_1}^\eta, O_{f_2}^\eta$ as in Definition 2.4, there exists a quantum algorithm that computes an approximate gradient \mathbf{g} such that $\|\mathbf{g} - \nabla f(\mathbf{0})\|_\infty \leq \varepsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \rho$. The algorithm requires:*

- $O\left(\log\left(\frac{d}{\rho}\right) \log\left(\frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon r}\right)\right)$ queries to U_f with precision $\eta \in O(\varepsilon r)$, or
- $O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon r} \log\left(\frac{d}{\rho}\right) + \log\left(\frac{d}{\rho}\right) \log\left(\frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon r}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \log\left(\frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon r}\right)\right)\right)$ queries to O_{f_1} and O_{f_2} .

Proof. By Theorem 3.1, we have

$$|F(\mathbf{x}) - \nabla f(\mathbf{0}) \cdot \mathbf{x}| \leq \frac{\kappa}{2r} \frac{(\delta/2r)^N}{1 - (\delta/2r)^N} = E$$

for all $\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d$. We now set $\delta = r$. By choosing

$$N \geq \frac{\log(1 + 4 \cdot 42\pi\kappa/\varepsilon r)}{\log(2r/\delta)} = O(\log(\kappa/\varepsilon r)),$$

we can ensure that

$$E \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8 \cdot 42\pi},$$

which is required in Lemma 3.2 with $a = 1$. By Lemma 3.3, it costs $O(N)$ to construct the oracle O to query $F(\mathbf{x})$ from U_f^η , and by Lemma 3.5, the cost is $O\left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon\delta} + N \log\left(\frac{N}{\eta}\right)\right)$ from $O_{f_1}^\eta, O_{f_2}^\eta$. The oracle O obtained using U_f^η has precision $\eta' = 8\pi\eta/\varepsilon\delta$. To ensure the algorithm operates correctly, η' should be approximately $1/42$, which implies $\eta = O(\varepsilon\delta)$. The claims in this theorem are now from Lemma 3.2. \square

In the above theorem, the first claim seems better than the second one. Indeed, in Jordan's algorithm [Jor05] and GAW's algorithm [GAW19], if we also use the binary oracle, then these algorithms also achieve exponential speedups in terms of d . However, as already analyzed in [GAW19] and can also be seen from the first claim, it requires a high level of accuracy to implement U_f^η with $\eta = O(\varepsilon r)$. The cost of each application of U_f^η is $C(\eta) = C(\varepsilon r)$. If this oracle is obtained from phase estimation, then the cost $C(\varepsilon r) = 1/\varepsilon r$, which coincides with our second claim. In some other cases, as explained in [GAW19], the dependence on the precision can be as bad as $1/d$. From the viewpoint of applications, the phase oracle is more commonly used and easier to obtain, especially from the probability oracle.

4 Quantum algorithms for Hessian estimation using spectral method

In this section, we extend our idea to estimate Hessians of functions. Our basic idea is to estimate each column of the Hessian by reducing the task to a gradient estimation problem. This technique is commonly used in quantum algorithms [MS22, LSZ21]. In the simplest

case, given an oracle to query $f(\mathbf{x}) = \langle \mathbf{x} | H | \mathbf{x} \rangle$ for some unknown matrix H . For any fixed \mathbf{y} , by considering $f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x})$, we will obtain an oracle to compute $g(\mathbf{x}) := \langle \mathbf{x} | H | \mathbf{y} \rangle$. This function is linear, hence the vector $H|\mathbf{y}\rangle$ can be learned using the quantum algorithm for gradient estimation. Below, we use this idea to general functions.

4.1 Estimating Hessians in the general case

The following result generalizes Lemma 3.2 for gradient estimation to Hessian estimation.

Proposition 4.1 (From gradient to Hessian). *Let $c \in \mathbb{R}, \rho, \varepsilon < M \in \mathbb{R}_+$ as in Lemma 3.2. Given a matrix $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $\|H\|_{\max} \leq M$, if we have $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$|h(\mathbf{z}) - \langle \mathbf{z} | H | \mathbf{z} \rangle - c| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8 \cdot 42\pi}$$

for almost all inputs $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}$, where $\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^d$, and access to its phase oracle $O_h : |\mathbf{z}\rangle \rightarrow e^{ih(\mathbf{z})}|\mathbf{z}\rangle$. Then we can calculate a matrix \tilde{H} with probability at least $1 - \rho$ such that

$$\|\tilde{H} - H\|_{\max} \leq \varepsilon$$

using $O\left(\frac{d}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{d}{\rho}\right)\right)$ queries to the phase oracle O_h .

Proof. For any fixed $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^d$, let $F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) := \frac{1}{2}(h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - h(\mathbf{x}))$, then using two queries to oracle O_h , we can obtain the following oracle

$$O_{F_{\mathbf{y}}} : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{iF_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle.$$

It is easy to check that

$$\left|F_{\mathbf{y}}(\mathbf{x}) - \langle \mathbf{x} | H | \mathbf{y} \rangle - \frac{1}{2}\langle \mathbf{y} | H | \mathbf{y} \rangle\right| \leq \frac{\varepsilon}{8 \cdot 42\pi}.$$

This satisfies the condition described in Lemma 3.2 with $a = 1$. From $O_{F_{\mathbf{y}}}$, we can implement the oracle described in Lemma 3.2 with $O(1/\varepsilon)$ applications of $O_{F_{\mathbf{y}}}$. Now, by Lemma 3.2, there is a quantum algorithm that approximates $H|\mathbf{y}\rangle$. In particular, if we choose $\mathbf{y} = |i\rangle$, i.e., the i -th column of the identity matrix, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \mathbf{g}_i satisfying

$$\Pr \left[\|\mathbf{g}_i - H|i\rangle\|_{\infty} \leq \varepsilon \right] \geq 1 - \frac{\rho'}{d},$$

with query complexity $O(\log(d^2/\rho'))$. Here $H|i\rangle$ is exactly the i -th column of H . Let \tilde{H} be the matrix generated by all \mathbf{g}_i , then⁸

$$\Pr \left[\|\tilde{H} - H\|_{\max} \leq \varepsilon \right] \geq \left(1 - \frac{\rho'}{d}\right)^d \geq 1 - \frac{d\rho'}{d - \rho'}.$$

Setting $\rho' = d\rho/(d + \rho)$, then the success probability becomes $1 - \rho$. Putting it all together, we obtain the claimed query complexity. \square

Similar to Lemma 3.2, M affects the gate complexity. The algorithm described above may seem natural; however, as we will demonstrate in Proposition 6.2 below, it is indeed close to optimal for constant ε . Prior to that, we use the above result to estimate the Hessian of a general function using the spectral method.

⁸Here we used the facts that $\ln(x) \geq 1 - x^{-1}$ and $e^{-x} \geq 1 - x$.

Theorem 4.2 (Hessian estimation using spectral method). *Assuming the same conditions as in Theorem 3.6, then there is a quantum algorithm that computes an approximate matrix $\tilde{\mathbf{H}}$ such that $\|\tilde{\mathbf{H}} - \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})\|_{\max} \leq \varepsilon$ with probability at least $1 - \rho$, where $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ is the Hessian of f at $\mathbf{0}$. The algorithm requires:*

- $O\left(d \log\left(\frac{d}{\rho}\right) \log\left(\frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon r^2}\right)\right)$ queries to U_f with precision $\eta \in O(\varepsilon r)$, or
- $O\left(d \log\left(\frac{d}{\rho}\right) \left(\frac{1}{\varepsilon r} + \log\left(\frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon r^2}\right) \log\left(\frac{1}{\eta} \log\left(\frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon r^2}\right)\right)\right)\right)$ queries to O_{f_1} and O_{f_2} .

Proof. Following the procedure in the proof of Theorem 3.1 by considering $h''(0)$, we derive the following approximate formula by (2.6)

$$\langle \mathbf{z} | \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) | \mathbf{z} \rangle = h''(0) \approx \frac{2}{N\delta^2} \sum_{k=0}^{N-1} \omega^{-2k} f(\delta\omega^k \mathbf{z}) \quad (4.1)$$

for $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}$, where $\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^d$. To satisfy the corresponding convergence condition, we choose $\tilde{r} = 2r/3$ here, and $\delta = \tilde{r}/2$ as before. The error is bounded by $2\kappa\tilde{r}^{-2} \frac{(\delta/\tilde{r})^N}{1-(\delta/\tilde{r})^N}$. The oracle for the right-hand side of (4.1) can be constructed similarly to Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5. We can choose an appropriate $N = O\left(\log\left(\frac{\kappa}{\varepsilon r^2}\right)\right)$ to satisfy the condition described in Proposition 4.1. Now following the procedure in Proposition 4.1, invoking the gradient estimation algorithm d times can approximate the Hessian matrix $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$.

Finally, we can obtain the claimed overall query complexity of approximating $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ by combining the results of Proposition 4.1, along with Lemmas 3.3 and 3.5. \square

4.2 Estimating sparse Hessians

Estimating sparse Hessian is useful in optimizations [FGL97, PT79, CM84, Col84, GMP05]. In this section, we show that sparse Hessians can be estimated more efficiently on a quantum computer. Below, when we say H is s -sparse, we mean it contains at most s nonzero entries in each row and column.

Lemma 4.3 (Schwartz-Zippel Lemma). *Let $P \in R[x_1, x_2, \dots, x_n]$ be a non-zero polynomial of total degree $d \geq 0$ over an integral domain R . Let S be a finite subset of R and let r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n be selected at random independently and uniformly from S . Then*

$$\Pr[P(r_1, r_2, \dots, r_n) = 0] \leq \frac{d}{|S|}.$$

To apply the above result, we modify the grid of sampling points as follows: Let $q > 2$ be a prime number, define

$$S_q := \left\{ \frac{k}{q} : k = -\frac{q-1}{2}, \dots, \frac{q-1}{2} \right\} \subset \left(-\frac{1}{2}, \frac{1}{2}\right). \quad (4.2)$$

To clarify and avoid any confusion with G_n , we change the notation to S_q . Below, with \mathbb{Z}_q , we mean $\left\{-\frac{q-1}{2}, \dots, \frac{q-1}{2}\right\}$, which is an integral domain.

The following result is a generalization of [MS22, Theorems 15 and 17] for \mathbb{Z}_q .

Lemma 4.4. *Assume that $d \in \mathbb{N}$, q is a prime number. Let $H = (h_{ij})_{d \times d} \in S_q^{d \times d}$ be a symmetric matrix. Let $f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x}$ and the oracle be $O_f : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{iqf(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$.*

- If H is s -sparse, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns H with probability at least 0.99 using $O(s \log(qd))$ queries.
- If H contains at most m nonzero entries, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns H with probability at least 0.99 using $O(\sqrt{m \log(qd)})$ queries.

Proof. For any fixed $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^d$, let $g(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}(f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x})) = \mathbf{x} \cdot (H\mathbf{y}) + \frac{1}{2}f(\mathbf{y})$. With $O(1)$ applications of O_f , we have the following state

$$\frac{1}{\sqrt{q^d}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d} e^{2\pi i q g(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle = \frac{e^{\pi i q f(\mathbf{y})}}{\sqrt{q^d}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d} e^{2\pi i q \mathbf{x} \cdot H\mathbf{y}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle. \quad (4.3)$$

To apply the quantum Fourier transform, we consider the first register of the above state: here we assume that $x_1 = k_1/q$ and $h_{1j} = \ell_{1j}/q$ for some $k_1, \ell_{1j} \in \mathbb{Z}_q$,

$$\sum_{x_1 \in S_q} e^{2\pi i q x_1 \sum_{j=1}^d h_{1j} y_j} |x_1\rangle = \sum_{k_1 \in \mathbb{Z}_q} e^{2\pi i q \frac{k_1}{q} \frac{\sum_{j=1}^d \ell_{1j} y_j}{q}} |k_1\rangle.$$

Applying the inverse of the quantum Fourier transform, we obtain $\sum_{j=1}^d \ell_{1j} y_j \pmod{\mathbb{Z}_q}$. Here, to apply the quantum Fourier transform, it is important to make sure that $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^d$ rather than S_q^d .

For convenience, denote $H = L/q$, where $L \in \mathbb{Z}_q^{d \times d}$. As a result of the above analysis, we obtain $L\mathbf{y} \pmod{\mathbb{Z}_q}$ for any given $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^d \subset \mathbb{Z}_q^d$. We now randomly choose k samples $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k \in \{0, 1\}^d$, then we obtain $L\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, L\mathbf{y}_k \pmod{\mathbb{Z}_q}$ using $O(k)$ quantum queries.

Note that for any $\mathbf{x} \neq \mathbf{x}'$, by the Schwartz-Zippel lemma, the probability that $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{x}' \cdot \mathbf{y}_i$ for all i is at most 2^{-k} . By the union bound, for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{Z}_q^d$, the probability that there exists an $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{Z}_q^d$ such that $\mathbf{x}' \neq \mathbf{x}$, $|\mathbf{x}'|_0 \leq s$ and $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{x}' \cdot \mathbf{y}_i$ for all i is bounded by⁹

$$\sum_{l=0}^s \binom{d}{l} (q-1)^l 2^{-k} = O\left(s \binom{d}{s} q^s 2^{-k}\right) = O\left(2^{\log(s) + s \log(de/s) + s \log q - k}\right).$$

We apply this bound to all rows of L via a union bound, then the probability that for any row \mathbf{x} of L , there is an $\mathbf{x}' \in \mathbb{Z}_q^d$ such that $\mathbf{x}' \neq \mathbf{x}$, $|\mathbf{x}'|_0 \leq s$ and $\mathbf{x} \cdot \mathbf{y}_i = \mathbf{x}' \cdot \mathbf{y}_i$ for all i is bounded by $O(d \cdot 2^{\log(s) + s \log(de/s) + s \log q - k})$. It suffices to choose $k = O(s \log(qd/s))$ to make this probability arbitrary small. From $\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, \mathbf{y}_k$ and $L\mathbf{y}_1, \dots, L\mathbf{y}_k$, we then can determine L with high probability. This proves the first claim.

For the second claim, we first apply the above algorithm by setting $s = \sqrt{m/\log(qd)}$. This learns all rows of L with at most $\sqrt{m/\log(qd)}$ nonzero entries and identifies all dense rows with more than $\sqrt{m/\log(qd)}$ nonzero entries. And there are at most $\sqrt{m \log(qd)}$ dense rows. For those rows, we use (4.3) to learn them by setting \mathbf{y} as the corresponding standard basis vector. The overall cost is $O(\sqrt{m \log(qd)})$. \square

Proposition 4.5. *Assume that $d \in \mathbb{N}$, $\eta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and q is a prime number. Let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\|H\|_{\max} \leq 1/2$. Assume $H = \tilde{H} + E$, where $\tilde{H} \in S_q^{d \times d}$ and $\|E\|_{\max} \leq \eta$. Let $f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x}$ and the oracle be $O_f : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{iqf(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$.*

- If H is s -sparse, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O(s \log^2(qd))$ queries if $\eta = o(1/sq)$.

⁹Here $|\mathbf{x}'|_0$ refers to the Hamming weight of \mathbf{x}' , i.e., the number of nonzero entries of \mathbf{x}' .

- If H contains at most m nonzero entries, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O(\sqrt{m} \log^{1.5}(qd))$ queries if $\eta = o(1/\sqrt{mq})$.

In the above, the assumption $\|H\|_{\max} \leq 1/2$ ensures the existence of the decomposition $H = \tilde{H} + E$.

Proof. Our goal is to choose an appropriate η such that \tilde{H} can be recovered with high probability. We use the same idea as the algorithm presented in Lemma 4.4, which is mainly based on (4.3). From the proof of Lemma 4.4, it is sufficient to prove the first claim. So without loss of generality, we assume that H is s -sparse. For the state (4.3), up to a global phase, it equals

$$\begin{aligned} |\psi\rangle &= \frac{1}{\sqrt{q^d}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d} e^{2\pi i \mathbf{q} \mathbf{x} \cdot H \mathbf{y}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle = \frac{1}{\sqrt{q^d}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d} e^{2\pi i \mathbf{q} \mathbf{x} \cdot (\tilde{H} \mathbf{y} + E \mathbf{y})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \\ &= \bigotimes_{j=1}^d \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{x_j \in S_q} e^{2\pi i q x_j (\tilde{H} \mathbf{y})_j} e^{2\pi i q x_j (E \mathbf{y})_j} |x_j\rangle. \end{aligned}$$

For each j , we have that

$$\begin{aligned} \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{x_j \in S_q} (e^{2\pi i q x_j (E \mathbf{y})_j} - 1) |x_j\rangle \right\|^2 &= \frac{4}{q} \sum_{x_j \in S_q} \sin^2(\pi q x_j (E \mathbf{y})_j) \\ &\leq \frac{4}{q} \sum_{x_j \in S_q} \pi^2 q^2 x_j^2 (E \mathbf{y})_j^2 \\ &< \frac{\pi^2 q^2 s^2 \eta^2}{4}. \end{aligned}$$

In the last step, we use the facts that $|x_j| < 1/2$, $|y_j| \leq 1$ and E is s -sparse with $\|E\|_{\max} \leq \eta$. So we choose η such that $sq\eta = o(1)$ is a small constant. With this choice, for each j ,

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{x_j \in S_q} e^{2\pi i q x_j (\tilde{H} \mathbf{y})_j} e^{2\pi i q x_j (E \mathbf{y})_j} |x_j\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{x_j \in S_q} e^{2\pi i q x_j (\tilde{H} \mathbf{y})_j} |x_j\rangle \right\| = o(1).$$

From the state $\frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{x_j \in S_q} e^{2\pi i q x_j (\tilde{H} \mathbf{y})_j} |x_j\rangle$, we can recover $(\tilde{H} \mathbf{y})_j$ with probability 1 using the quantum Fourier transform. Since $|\psi\rangle$ is a product state and $j \in [d]$ are independent of each other, we can recover all $(\tilde{H} \mathbf{y})_j$ with high probability using $O(\log d)$ measurements. Namely, for each \mathbf{y} , we can obtain $\tilde{H} \mathbf{y}$. With this result and the analysis for Lemma 4.4, we obtain the claimed results. \square

Remark 4.6. In the above proposition, the condition $\|E\|_{\max} \leq o(1/sq)$ indicates that entries of H have the form $k/q + o(1/sq)$ for $k \in \mathbb{Z}_q$. This condition might be strong, as the error is usually bounded by $1/2q$ rather than $o(1/sq)$. However, from the choice of η in the above proof, we can relax this to $\|E\|_{\max} \leq 1/2q$ by considering $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^d / (\alpha s)$ for some large constant α . In this case, the oracle we need becomes $|\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{isqf(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$. Consequently, the query complexity in our final theorem below (i.e., Theorem 4.9) will be multiplied by a factor of $O(s)$. If s is not excessively large, then this should not be an issue.

As shown below, the above result also holds when $f(\mathbf{x})$ is close to a quadratic form $\mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x}$. We consider this under two cases: $\|H\|_{\max} \leq 1/2$ and $\|H\|_{\max} \leq M/2$ for some general $M > 1$.

Proposition 4.7. *Assume that $d, \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \varepsilon, \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+, q = O(1/\varepsilon)$ is prime. Let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\|H\|_{\max} \leq 1/2$. Assume that $H = \tilde{H} + E$, where $\tilde{H} \in S_q^{d \times d}$ and $\|E\|_{\max} \leq \eta$. Assume that $|f(\mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{z}^T H \mathbf{z}| \leq O(\varepsilon)$, where $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}$, holds for all but a $1/1000$ fraction of points $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$ and all $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^d$. Let the oracle be $O_f : |\mathbf{z}\rangle \rightarrow e^{iqf(\mathbf{z})}|\mathbf{z}\rangle$ for any $\mathbf{z} \in S_q^d + \{0, 1\}^d$.*

- If H is s -sparse, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O(s \log^2(qd))$ queries if $\eta = o(1/sq)$.
- If H contains m nonzero entries, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O(\sqrt{m} \log^{1.5}(qd))$ queries if $\eta = o(1/\sqrt{mq})$.

Proof. The key idea of the proof of Proposition 4.5 is based on the state (4.3) generated by using the oracle to query $h(\mathbf{x}) := \mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x}$. By assumption, for any $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^d$, when the condition $|f(\mathbf{z}) - h(\mathbf{z})| \leq O(\varepsilon)$ is satisfied for all $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}$ with $\mathbf{x} \in W \subset S_q^d$, and the size $\#(W) \geq 999q^d/1000$, it is straightforward to verify that

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{q^d}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in W} e^{2\pi i q \frac{1}{2}(h(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y})-h(\mathbf{x}))} |\mathbf{x}\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{q^d}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in W} e^{2\pi i q \frac{1}{2}(f(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y})-f(\mathbf{x}))} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \right\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{q^d} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \in W} q^2 \pi^2 \left| (h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - h(\mathbf{x})) - (f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x})) \right|^2 \\ & = O(q^2 \varepsilon^2). \end{aligned}$$

For $\mathbf{x} \notin W$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} & \left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{q^d}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \notin W} e^{2\pi i q \frac{1}{2}(h(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y})-h(\mathbf{x}))} |\mathbf{x}\rangle - \frac{1}{\sqrt{q^d}} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \notin W} e^{2\pi i q \frac{1}{2}(f(\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y})-f(\mathbf{x}))} |\mathbf{x}\rangle \right\|^2 \\ & \leq \frac{1}{q^d} \sum_{\mathbf{x} \notin W} 4q^2 \leq \frac{4}{1000}. \end{aligned}$$

To ensure these estimates are bounded by a small constant, it suffices to choose $q = O(1/\varepsilon)$, which is exactly what we claim in the statement of this proposition. Thus, using O_f , we also obtain a state close to $|\psi\rangle$ required in the proof of Proposition 4.5. \square

Corollary 4.8. *Assume that $d \in \mathbb{N}, \varepsilon, \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+, M > 1$, and $q = O(M/\varepsilon)$ is prime. Let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\|H\|_{\max} \leq M/2$. If $H = M \cdot \tilde{H} + M \cdot E$, where $\tilde{H} \in S_q^{d \times d}$ and $\|E\|_{\max} \leq \eta$, and assume that $|f(\mathbf{z}) - \mathbf{z}^T H \mathbf{z}| \leq O(\varepsilon)$, where $\mathbf{z} = \mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}$, holds for all but a $1/1000$ fraction of points $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$ and all $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^d$. Let the oracle be $O_f : |\mathbf{z}\rangle \rightarrow e^{if(\mathbf{z})}|\mathbf{z}\rangle$ for any $\mathbf{z} \in S_q^d + \{0, 1\}^d$.*

- If H is s -sparse, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O(\frac{s}{\varepsilon} \log^2(qd))$ queries if $\eta = o(1/sq)$.
- If H contains m nonzero entries, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O(\frac{\sqrt{m}}{\varepsilon} \log^2(qd))$ queries if $\eta = o(1/\sqrt{mq})$.

Proof. It suffices to consider $\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) = f(\mathbf{x})/M$ and $h(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x}/M$. Then for any $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^d$, we have $|\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})| \leq O(\varepsilon/M)$. To use Proposition 4.7, the oracle we need is

$$O_{\tilde{f}} : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{iq\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle = e^{if(\mathbf{x})/\varepsilon}|\mathbf{x}\rangle = O_f^{1/\varepsilon}|\mathbf{x}\rangle$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$. The results now follow from Proposition 4.7. \square

Finally, combining Proposition 4.8 and the idea of the proof of Theorem 4.2, we obtain the following result. It coincides with Theorem 4.2 in the worst cases.

Theorem 4.9 (Sparse Hessian estimation using spectral method). *Making the same assumption as Theorem 4.2. Assume that the Hessian $H = \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ satisfies $\|H\|_{\max} \leq M/2$ and $H = M \cdot \tilde{H} + M \cdot E$, where $\tilde{H} \in S_q^{d \times d}$ and $\|E\|_{\max} \leq \eta$, where $q = O(M/\varepsilon)$ is prime. Then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} exactly using*

- $\tilde{O}(s/\varepsilon)$ queries to O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} if H is s -sparse and $\eta = o(1/sq)$.
- $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{m}/\varepsilon)$ queries to O_{f_1}, O_{f_2} if H contains at most m nonzero entries and $\eta = o(1/\sqrt{mq})$.

Different from Theorem 4.2, which is about absolute error estimation, Theorem 4.9 estimates H under the relative error.

5 Quantum algorithms for Hessian estimation using finite difference formula

In this section, we will use the finite difference formula to estimate the Hessian. From our results below, we will see that the spectral method can demonstrate significant advantages over the finite difference method for Hessian estimation. The key ideas are similar, however, the error analysis for the finite difference method is more involved, as we will see shortly.

5.1 Estimating Hessians in the general case

The following result is similar to but slightly weaker than Proposition 4.1.

Proposition 5.1. *Let $c \in \mathbb{R}, a, \rho, \varepsilon < M \in \mathbb{R}_+$ as in Lemma 3.2. Given a matrix $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ such that $\|H\|_{\max} \leq M$, if we have $h : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} \left(h(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - h(\mathbf{x}) \right) - \mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{y} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^T H \mathbf{y} \right| \leq O(a\varepsilon). \quad (5.1)$$

for all but a $1/1000$ fraction of points $\mathbf{x} \in aG_n^d$ and any fixed $\mathbf{y} \in \{|i\rangle : i \in [d]\}$, and access to its phase oracle $O_h : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{ih(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle$, then there is a quantum algorithm that calculates a matrix \tilde{H} with probability at least $1 - \rho$ such that

$$\|\tilde{H} - H\|_{\max} \leq \varepsilon$$

using $O\left(\frac{d}{a\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{d}{\rho}\right)\right)$ queries to the phase oracle O_h .

Proof. The condition in Proposition 4.1 implies (5.1), and the latter is indeed the condition used in the proof of Proposition 4.1. Therefore, the claim here follows directly from Proposition 4.1. \square

As given in Definition 2.16, in the finite difference method, which is based on Taylor expansion, we have $f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x}) \approx \mathbf{x}^T H_f(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{x}$, see Lemma A.4 in the appendix. The error between them is highly affected by the norm of \mathbf{x} . This is reasonable as the Hessian is a local property, so we need to choose \mathbf{x} having a small norm. In Proposition 5.1, to satisfy (5.1), one natural option is letting $f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) \approx (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})^T H_f(\mathbf{0})(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})$ when $\mathbf{y} = |i\rangle$. Generally, this is not possible as $\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}$ can have a large norm. The following result states a case in which this is possible.

Theorem 5.2. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}, R, B \in \mathbb{R}_+$ satisfy $m \geq \log(dB/\varepsilon)$. Assume that $f : [-R, R]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $(2m + 1)$ -times differentiable and*

$$|\partial_{\mathbf{r}}^{2m+1} f(\mathbf{x})| \leq B \quad \text{for all } \mathbf{x} \in [-R, R], \text{ where } \mathbf{r} = \mathbf{x}/\|\mathbf{x}\|. \quad (5.2)$$

Given access to its phase oracle $O_f : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{if(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle$, then there is a quantum algorithm that can estimate its Hessian at point $\mathbf{0}$ with accurate ε and probability at least $1 - \rho$, using $\tilde{O}(d^{1.5}m/\varepsilon + md/R\varepsilon)$ queries to O_f .

Proof. By Lemma A.4 in the appendix, the condition in Proposition 5.1 is satisfied for $f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x})$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \{|i\rangle : i \in [d]\}$. Moreover, from Lemma A.4, $a \approx 1/\sqrt{dm}$. Another natural restriction on a is $ma/2 \leq R$, i.e., $a \leq 2R/m$. By Lemma A.2, we have $\sum_{t=1}^m |a_t^{(2m)}| < \pi^2/6$. So we can implement a phase oracle to query $f_{(2m)}$ with $O(m)$ applications of O_f . The result now follows from Proposition 5.1. \square

The condition (5.2) is quite strong because B usually increases with respect to m , such as for $f(x) = e^{\alpha x}$ with $B = O(\alpha^m)$. In this case, the condition $m \geq \log(dB/\varepsilon)$ is hard to satisfy. Thus, the above theorem is useful when B is small.

One may realize that all these conditions in the above theorem are mainly caused by the choice of $\mathbf{y} = |i\rangle$, which has a norm of 1. Indeed, we can also choose $\mathbf{y} = a|i\rangle$ such that it has a norm of the same order as \mathbf{x} in Proposition 5.1. With this choice, we will obtain an approximation of $aH|i\rangle$, see the proof of Proposition 4.1. This means that the complexity in Proposition 5.1 will be multiplied by an extra factor of $O(1/a)$. In summary, if we choose $\mathbf{y} = a|i\rangle$, then the query complexity will be $\tilde{O}(d/a^2\varepsilon)$. In the finite difference method, $a \approx 1/\sqrt{d}$. So the overall query complexity is $\tilde{O}(d^2/\varepsilon)$. This indeed shows no quantum speedup in terms of d over classical algorithms. However, the restriction on B can be relaxed, and the dependence on ε is better than classical algorithms. We summarize this in the following theorem.

Theorem 5.3. *Let $\rho, \varepsilon, c \in \mathbb{R}_+$, and suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is analytic such that for every $k \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d$ with $|\alpha| = k$,*

$$|\partial^\alpha f(\mathbf{0})| \leq c^k k^{\frac{k}{2}}.$$

Given access to its phase oracle $O_f : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{if(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle$, then there is a quantum algorithm that can estimate its Hessian at point $\mathbf{0}$ with accurate ε and probability at least $1 - \rho$, using $O\left(\frac{cd^2}{\varepsilon} \log\left(\frac{c\sqrt{d}}{\varepsilon}\right) \log\left(\frac{d}{\rho}\right)\right)$ queries to O_f .

Proof. For $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$, using the finite difference method, we have an approximation of $\langle \mathbf{x} | \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) | \mathbf{x} \rangle$ by Definition 2.16, where $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ denotes the Hessian of function f at point $\mathbf{0}$:

$$f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x}) := \sum_{t=-m}^m a_t^{(2m)} f(t\mathbf{x}).$$

By Lemma A.5 in the appendix, for at least 999/1000 fraction of inputs $\mathbf{x}, \mathbf{y} \in aG_n^d$, we have $|f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})^T \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})| \leq \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} (13acm\sqrt{d})^k$. As a result, we have

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} \left(f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x}) \right) - \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{y} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{y} \right| \leq \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} (13acm\sqrt{d})^k.$$

This is similar to the condition (5.1) stated in Proposition 5.1. We now choose a such that $a^{-1} := 14cm\sqrt{d}(196 \cdot 8 \cdot 42\pi cm\sqrt{d}/\varepsilon)^{\frac{1}{2m}} = \tilde{O}(\sqrt{d})$, then we have $13acm\sqrt{d} = \frac{13}{14}(196 \cdot 8 \cdot 42\pi cm\sqrt{d}/\varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2m}}$. Moreover,

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} (13acm\sqrt{d})^k &= (13acm\sqrt{d})^{2m+1} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} (13acm\sqrt{d})^k \\ &\leq \frac{\varepsilon}{196 \cdot 8 \cdot 42\pi cm\sqrt{d}} (196 \cdot 8 \cdot 42\pi cm\sqrt{d}/\varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2m}} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \left(\frac{13}{14}\right)^k \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon}{14cm\sqrt{d} \cdot 8 \cdot 42\pi} (196 \cdot 8 \cdot 42\pi cm\sqrt{d}/\varepsilon)^{-\frac{1}{2m}} \\ &= \frac{\varepsilon a}{8 \cdot 42\pi}. \end{aligned}$$

Therefore, the function $f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x})$ satisfies condition (5.1). Now following the procedure described in the proof of Proposition 5.1, invoking the gradient estimation algorithm d times can approximate the Hessian matrix $\mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$. Note that now $\mathbf{y} \in aG_n^d$, in the procedure, we have to choose $\mathbf{y} = \frac{a}{2}|i\rangle$. Using the notation in that proof, the error between \mathbf{g}_i and $H|i\rangle$ is bounded by $O(\sqrt{d}\varepsilon)$, so we have to choose a much smaller ε to ensure this error is small. This leads to an extra factor of \sqrt{d} in the overall complexity. \square

5.2 Estimating sparse Hessians

As shown in Lemma 4.4, in the sparse case, we need to choose $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^d \subset \mathbb{Z}_q^d$ randomly. This requirement is too strong for Proposition 5.1 as $\mathbf{y} = |i\rangle$. Fortunately, Lemma A.4 used in the proof of Theorem 5.2 holds for any $\mathbf{y} \neq 0$ with $\|\mathbf{y}\| = 1$. As a result, we will replace $\mathbf{y} \in \{0, 1\}^d$ with $\mathbf{y} \in \{\pm 1/\sqrt{d}\}^d$ below. All the arguments remain the same.

Lemma 5.4. *Assume that $d \in \mathbb{N}, q$ is a prime number. Let $H = (h_{ij})_{d \times d} \in S_q^{d \times d}$ be a symmetric matrix. Let $f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x}$ and the oracle be $O_f : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{iq\sqrt{d}f(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$.*

- If H is s -sparse, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns H with probability at least 0.99 using $O(s \log(qd))$ queries.
- If H contains at most m nonzero entries, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns H with probability at least 0.99 using $O(\sqrt{m \log(qd)})$ queries.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Lemma 4.4. As \mathbf{y} is normalized, we choose $\mathbf{y} = (\pm 1/\sqrt{d}, \dots, \pm 1/\sqrt{d})$. The oracle is changed accordingly. \square

Proposition 5.5. *Assume that $d \in \mathbb{N}, \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and q is a prime number. Let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\|H\|_{\max} \leq 1/2$. Assume that $H = \tilde{H} + E$, where $\tilde{H} \in S_q^{d \times d}$ and $\|E\|_{\max} \leq \eta$. Let $f(\mathbf{x}) = \mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x}$ and the oracle be $O_f : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{iq\sqrt{d}f(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$.*

- If H is s -sparse, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O(s \log^2(qd))$ queries if $\eta = \min\{1/2q, o(\sqrt{d}/sq)\}$.
- If H contains at most m nonzero entries, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O(\sqrt{m} \log^{1.5}(qd))$ queries if $\eta = \min\{1/2q, o(\sqrt{d}/\sqrt{mq})\}$.

Proof. The proof here is similar to that of Proposition 4.5. We will use the notation in the proof of Proposition 4.5 below. As \mathbf{y} is normalized, we have

$$\left\| \frac{1}{\sqrt{q}} \sum_{x_j \in S_q} \left(e^{2\pi i q x_j (E\mathbf{y})_j} - 1 \right) |x_j\rangle \right\|^2 < \frac{\pi^2 q^2 s^2 \eta^2}{4d}.$$

So it suffices to choose η such that the above estimate is $o(1)$, i.e., $\eta = o(\sqrt{d}/sq)$. Because of the decomposition $H = \tilde{H} + E$, we also have $\eta \leq 1/2q$. \square

Proposition 5.6. Assume that $d, \ell \in \mathbb{N}, \varepsilon, \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+, q = O(1/\varepsilon)$ is prime. Let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\|H\|_{\max} \leq 1/2$. Assume that $H = \tilde{H} + E$, where $\tilde{H} \in S_q^{d \times d}$ and $\|E\|_{\max} \leq \eta$. Let

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} \left(f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x}) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left((\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})^T H (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x} \right) \right| \leq O(\varepsilon)$$

for all but a $1/1000$ fraction of points $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$ and all $\mathbf{y} \in \{\pm 1/\sqrt{d}\}^d$. Let the oracle be $O_f : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{iq\sqrt{d}f(\mathbf{x})} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$.

- If H is s -sparse, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O(s \log^2(qd))$ queries if $\eta = \min\{1/2q, o(\sqrt{d}/sq)\}$.
- If H contains m nonzero entries, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O(\sqrt{m} \log^{1.5}(qd))$ queries if $\eta = \min\{1/2q, o(\sqrt{d}/\sqrt{mq})\}$.

Proof. The proof is similar to that of Proposition 4.7. Here, we should use Proposition 5.5 instead. \square

Proposition 5.7. Assume that $d \in \mathbb{N}, a, \varepsilon, \eta \in \mathbb{R}_+, M \geq 1, q = O(M/\varepsilon)$ is prime. Let $H \in \mathbb{R}^{d \times d}$ and $\|H\|_{\max} \leq M/2$. Assume that $H = M \cdot \tilde{H} + M \cdot E$, where $\tilde{H} \in S_q^{d \times d}$ and $\|E\|_{\max} \leq \eta$. Let

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} \left(f(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - f(\mathbf{x}) \right) - \frac{1}{2} \left((\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})^T H (\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - \mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x} \right) \right| \leq O(a\varepsilon)$$

for all but a $1/1000$ fraction of points $\mathbf{x} \in aS_q^d$ and all $\mathbf{y} \in \{\pm 1/\sqrt{d}\}^d$. Let the oracle be $O_f : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{i\frac{f(a\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y})-f(a\mathbf{x})}{2}} |\mathbf{x}\rangle$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$.

- If H is s -sparse, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O\left(\frac{s\sqrt{d}}{a\varepsilon} \log^2(qd)\right)$ queries if $\eta = \min\{1/2q, o(\sqrt{d}/sq)\}$.
- If H contains m nonzero entries, then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} with probability at least 0.99 using $O\left(\frac{\sqrt{md}}{a\varepsilon} \log^{1.5}(qd)\right)$ queries if $\eta = \min\{o(\sqrt{d}/\sqrt{mq}), 1/2q\}$.

Proof. For any $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$, define

$$\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{f(a\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - f(a\mathbf{x})}{2aM}, \quad h(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{(a\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y})^T H(a\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - a^2 \mathbf{x}^T H \mathbf{x}}{2aM}.$$

Then by assumption, for any $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$, we have $|\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x}) - h(\mathbf{x})| \leq O(\varepsilon/M)$. So we choose $q = O(M/\varepsilon)$. To use Proposition 5.6, the oracle we need is

$$O_{\tilde{f}} : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{iq\sqrt{d}\tilde{f}(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle = e^{i\sqrt{d}\frac{f(a\mathbf{x}+\mathbf{y})-f(a\mathbf{x})}{2a\varepsilon}}|\mathbf{x}\rangle = O_f^{\sqrt{d}/a\varepsilon}|\mathbf{x}\rangle$$

for any $\mathbf{x} \in S_q^d$. The results now follow from Proposition 5.6. \square

Finally, combining Proposition 5.7 and Theorem 5.2, we obtain the following result.

Theorem 5.8 (Sparse Hessian estimation using finite difference formula). *Making the same assumption as Theorem 5.2. Assume that the Hessian $H = \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0})$ satisfies $\|H\|_{\max} \leq M/2$ and $H = M \cdot \tilde{H} + M \cdot E$, where $\tilde{H} \in S_q^{d \times d}$ and $\|E\|_{\max} \leq \eta$, where $q = O(M/\varepsilon)$ is prime. Then there is a quantum algorithm that returns \tilde{H} exactly using*

- $\tilde{O}(sd/\varepsilon)$ queries to O_f if H is s -sparse and $\eta = \min\{1/2q, o(\sqrt{d}/sq)\}$.
- $\tilde{O}(\sqrt{md}/\varepsilon)$ queries to O_f if H contains at most m nonzero entries and $\eta = \min\{1/2q, o(\sqrt{d}/\sqrt{mq})\}$.

The above theorem does not coincide with Theorem 5.2 in the worst case. This is mainly caused by the choice of \mathbf{y} . In Theorem 5.2, $\mathbf{y} = |i\rangle$, while in Theorem 5.8, $\mathbf{y} \in \{\pm 1/\sqrt{d}\}^d$. However, it still saves a factor of \sqrt{d} when the Hessian is sparse.

In the above theorem, there is no need to know the positions of nonzero entries. Classically, if this information is not known, it may still cost $O(d^2)$ queries to compute H . So the above quantum algorithm can achieve quadratic quantum speedups over the classical counterparts. In addition, as shown in Proposition 6.6 below, the above quantum algorithm is optimal in terms of d . So quadratic speedup is the best we can expect for the finite difference method.

5.3 Some final comments

As we can see from the algorithms presented in this section and the previous section, error analysis is much easier for the spectral method than for the finite difference method. The condition in Proposition 4.1 is easily satisfied by the spectral method. This is the main reason why quantum algorithms based on the spectral method outperform those based on the finite difference method. As analyzed in Subsection 1.3, this difference essentially arises from the fundamental techniques of these two methods: the spectral method is based on the Cauchy integral formula, while the finite difference method is based on Taylor expansion.

Since the finite difference formula is based on Taylor expansion, achieving sufficiently small errors requires relatively small magnitudes of variables. In contrast, the spectral method has superior error performance. Additionally, as we can see in Subsection 1.3, in the finite difference formula, the function values at points further from the target point have smaller linear combination coefficients, thus contributing less information. However, their larger magnitudes contribute more to the error, which is an undesirable situation.

6 Lower bounds analysis

For Hessian estimation, a lower bound of $\Omega(d/\log d)$ follows from [Mon12, Proposition 1].

Lemma 6.1. *Let $f : \mathbb{F}_q^d \rightarrow \mathbb{F}_q$ be a multilinear degree k polynomial over finite field \mathbb{F}_q . Then any quantum query algorithm that learns f with bounded error must make $\Omega(d^{k-1})$ queries to U_f .*

If we are only given O_f , then to apply U_f once, by quantum phase estimation (also see Proposition 2.5), we have to use $O(\log q)$ applications of O_f as $\log q$ bits are enough to specify $f(\mathbf{x})$ for any $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{F}_q^n$. So by Lemma 6.1, a lower bound with respect to phase oracle O_f is $\Omega(d^{k-1}/\log q)$.

Proposition 6.2. *Let f be a real- or complex-valued function of d variables with a phase access oracle O_f (or O_{f_1}, O_{f_2}), then any quantum algorithm that outputs the Hessian of f up to a constant error $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ must make $\Omega(d/\log d)$ queries to O_f (or O_{f_1}, O_{f_2}) to vectors in G_n^d .*

Proof. We first consider the lower bound for real-valued functions with oracle O_f . Let H be an unknown $d \times d$ Boolean Hermitian matrix such that the diagonal entries are 0. Consider the function $f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\langle \mathbf{x} | H | \mathbf{x} \rangle = \sum_{i < j} H_{ij} x_i x_j$, which is a typical form of multilinear degree 2 polynomials. For Hessian estimation, we will query points from G_n^d . Each point $\mathbf{x} = (x_1, \dots, x_d) \in G_n^d$ satisfies $x_j = \frac{k_j}{2^n} + \frac{1}{2^{n+1}} \in (-1/2, 1/2)$ for some $k_n \in \{-2^{n-1}, \dots, 2^{n-1} - 1\}$. To view them as vectors from \mathbb{F}_q^d for some q that will be determined shortly, we multiply them by 2^{n+1} , i.e., we introduce $y_j = 2^{n+1}x_j = 2k_j + 1 \in (-2^n, 2^n)$.

Now let $g(\mathbf{y}) = f(2^{n+1}\mathbf{x})$. For any \mathbf{x} , we have $|g(\mathbf{y})| < (d^2 - d)2^n$. We now choose $q = 2(d^2 - d)2^n$ so that $g(\mathbf{y})$ does not change even after modulo q in the field \mathbb{F}_q . Now by Lemma 6.1, the query complexity of computing H exactly is lower bounded by $\Omega(d/\log q) = \Omega(d/(n + \log d))$. If $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$, then an ε -approximation of H also allows us to determine H as we know it is a Boolean matrix. From Lemma 3.2 and the proof of Theorem 4.1, $n = O(\log(d/\varepsilon))$. So we obtain a lower bound of $\Omega(d/\log d)$ when $\varepsilon \in (0, 1/2)$ is a constant.

Next, we consider lower bounds analysis for complex-valued functions. The argument is very similar to the above. By Theorem 3.1, in the spectral method, the complex vectors we queried have the form $\delta\omega^k\mathbf{x}$, which is just a complex scaling of \mathbf{x} for $\mathbf{x} \in G_n^d$. As a result, for the function we constructed above, we have $f(\delta\omega^k\mathbf{x}) = \delta^2\omega^{2k}f(\mathbf{x})$. The real and imaginary parts are $f_1(\delta\omega^k\mathbf{x}) = \delta^2\cos(2\pi k/N)f(\mathbf{x})$ and $f_2(\delta\omega^k\mathbf{x}) = \delta^2\sin(2\pi k/N)f(\mathbf{x})$ respectively. They all contain the information of $f(\mathbf{x})$. On a quantum computer, we represent them using finite-precision binary encodings, so similar to the above argument by scaling f approximately, we can also obtain a lower bound of $\Omega(d/\log d)$. The scaling here depends on the precision of representing f_1, f_2 , which further depends on $\delta^2\cos(2\pi k/N)$ and $\delta^2\sin(2\pi k/N)$. Note that $N = O(\log(\kappa/\varepsilon))$ for $\kappa = \max |f(\mathbf{x})| = O(d^2)$, and from the proof of Theorem 3.6, δ depends on the radius of the convergence rate, which can be set as a constant for the function $f(\mathbf{x}) = \frac{1}{2}\langle \mathbf{x} | H | \mathbf{x} \rangle$. So q should be set as large as $O(d^2 2^n \times \kappa/\varepsilon) = O(d^4 2^n)$ as ε is constant in our setting. All these do not change the lower bounds too much. \square

For real-valued functions with oracle O_f , we can prove a slightly better lower bound of $\Omega(d/\varepsilon)$. We here use a similar idea of the lower bound proof of gradient estimation given in [GAW19].

Lemma 6.3 (Theorem 1.2 in [GAW19]). Let \mathcal{F} be a finite set of functions $X \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$. Suppose we have access to $f \in \mathcal{F}$ via a phase oracle such that

$$\mathbf{O}_f : |x\rangle \rightarrow e^{if(x)}|x\rangle \quad \text{for every } x \in X.$$

Let $f_* \in \mathcal{F}$ be fixed. Given \mathbf{O}_f for some unknown $f \in \mathcal{F}$, determining whether $f = f_*$ has query complexity

$$\Omega \left(\sqrt{|\mathcal{F}| - 1} / \sqrt{\max_{x \in X} \sum_{f \in \mathcal{F}} |f(x) - f_*(x)|^2} \right).$$

To prove a lower bound in the situation of Theorem 5.3, we construct a family of functions \mathcal{F} for which the functions can be well distinguished by calculating their Hessians with accuracy ε in the matrix max norm. Then, with the help of Lemma 6.3 we show that this requires $\Omega(d/\varepsilon)$ queries.

Lemma 6.4. Let $d \in \mathbb{N}, \varepsilon, c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and define the following functions that map \mathbb{R}^d into \mathbb{R} : $f_*(\mathbf{x}) := 0$ and $f_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}) := \varepsilon x_j x_k e^{-c\|\mathbf{x}\|^2/2}$ for all $j, k \in [d]$. Consider the family of functions $\mathcal{F} := \{f_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}) : j, k \in [d]\}$, then $|\mathcal{F}| = d^2$ and for all $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ we have

$$\sum_{j,k \in [d]} |f_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}) - f_*(\mathbf{x})|^2 \leq \frac{4\varepsilon^2}{e^2 c^2}.$$

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{j,k \in [d]} |f_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}) - f_*(\mathbf{x})|^2 &= \sum_{j,k \in [d]} \left| \varepsilon x_j x_k e^{-c\|\mathbf{x}\|^2/2} \right|^2 \\ &= \varepsilon^2 \|\mathbf{x}\|^4 e^{-c\|\mathbf{x}\|^2} \\ &\leq \frac{4\varepsilon^2}{e^2 c^2}. \end{aligned}$$

The last inequality uses $ze^{-\sqrt{z}} \leq 4/e^2$ with $z := c^2\|\mathbf{x}\|^4$. \square

Lemma 6.5. Let $d, t \in \mathbb{N}, 1 \leq c \in \mathbb{R}_+$ and $\mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Then the functions $f_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}) := cx_j x_k e^{-c\|\mathbf{x}\|^2/2}$ satisfy the following: for any $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d, |\alpha| = t$,

$$|\partial^\alpha f_{j,k}(\mathbf{0})| \leq c^t t^{\frac{t}{2}},$$

and $\mathbf{H}_{f_{j,k}}(\mathbf{0}) = c(E_{jk} + E_{kj})$, where E_{jk} is the $(0,1)$ -matrix of dimension d such that only the (j,k) -th entry equals 1.

Proof. Observe that

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sqrt{cx_j} e^{-\frac{cx_j^2}{2}} \cdot \sqrt{cx_k} e^{-\frac{cx_k^2}{2}} \cdot \prod_{i \neq j,k}^d e^{-\frac{cx_i^2}{2}}.$$

From the Taylor series $e^{-\frac{cx^2}{2}} = \sum_{\ell=0}^{\infty} \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^\ell \frac{(\sqrt{cx})^{2\ell}}{\ell!}$, we have that for $t \in \mathbb{N}$,

$$\partial_i^t e^{-\frac{cx_i^2}{2}} \Big|_{x_i=0} = \begin{cases} \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^\ell (\sqrt{c})^{2\ell} \frac{(2\ell)!}{\ell!} & t = 2\ell \\ 0 & t = 2\ell + 1 \end{cases},$$

and

$$\partial_j^t \sqrt{cx_j} e^{-\frac{cx_j^2}{2}} \Big|_{x_j=0} = \begin{cases} 0 & t = 2\ell \\ \left(-\frac{1}{2}\right)^\ell (\sqrt{c})^{2\ell+1} \frac{(2\ell+1)!}{\ell!} & t = 2\ell + 1 \end{cases}.$$

Also observe that, for $\ell \geq 0$, we have $(\sqrt{c})^\ell \leq c^\ell$, and

$$\frac{(2\ell)!}{\ell!} \leq (2\ell)^\ell \quad \text{and} \quad \left(\frac{1}{2}\right)^\ell \frac{(2\ell+1)!}{\ell!} \leq (2\ell+1)^{\ell+1/2}.$$

The statements of the lemma follow by combining the above results. \square

Proposition 6.6 (Lower bound for sparse Hessian estimation of real-valued functions).
Let $\varepsilon, c, d \in \mathbb{R}_+$ such that $\varepsilon \leq c$, and for an arbitrary finite set $G \subset \mathbb{R}^d$, let

$$\mathcal{H} = \text{Span}\{|\mathbf{x}\rangle : \mathbf{x} \in G\}.$$

Suppose \mathcal{A} is a T -query quantum algorithm, given query access to phase oracle $O_f : |\mathbf{x}\rangle \rightarrow e^{if(\mathbf{x})}|\mathbf{x}\rangle$, acting on \mathcal{H} , for analytic functions $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ satisfying

$$|\partial^\alpha f(\mathbf{0})| \leq c^t t^{\frac{t}{2}} \quad \text{for all } t \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d, |\alpha| = t$$

such that \mathcal{A} computes an ε -approximation of the Hessian of f at $\mathbf{0}$, succeeding with probability at least $2/3$, then $T > cd/\varepsilon \in \Omega(d/\varepsilon)$.

Proof. We defined a set of functions $\mathcal{F} = \{f_{j,k}(\mathbf{x}) : j, k \in [d]\}$ and $f_* = 0$ as shown in Lemma 6.4. By Lemma 6.5, every $f \in \mathcal{F}$ satisfies $|\partial^\alpha f(\mathbf{0})| \leq c^t t^{\frac{t}{2}}$ for all $t \in \mathbb{N}$ and $\alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d, |\alpha| = t$. Suppose we are given the phase oracle $O_f = O_{f_{j,k}}$ for some unknown $j, k \in [d]$ or $O_f = O_{f_*}$. Since $\mathbf{H}_{f_*}(\mathbf{0}) = \mathbf{0}$ and $\mathbf{H}_{f_{j,k}}(\mathbf{0}) = 2\varepsilon(E_{jk} + E_{kj})$, using T -query algorithm \mathcal{A} , one can determine which function the given oracle corresponds to with success probability at least $2/3$. In particular, we can distinguish the case $f = f_*$ from $f \in \mathcal{F}$, and thus by Lemmas 6.3 and 6.4 we get that

$$T \geq \frac{\sqrt{d^2}}{2\varepsilon/ec} > \frac{cd}{\varepsilon}.$$

This completes the proof. \square

7 Conclusions

In this work, we proposed a new quantum algorithm for gradient estimation for analytic functions that can take values from the complex field. The algorithm achieves exponential speedup over classical algorithms. We also generalized our algorithm and Gilyén-Arunachalam-Wiebe's algorithm for gradient estimation to Hessian estimation, both achieving polynomial speedups over classical algorithms. A lower bound shows that polynomial speedup is the best we can expect. For the estimation of sparse Hessians, we proposed two new quantum algorithms with better performance. Exponential quantum speedup is achieved for the quantum algorithm based on the spectral method. After this research, we feel there are some interesting questions that deserve further study:

- Can we find some applications of our algorithms for gradient estimation and Hessian estimation? Jordan's algorithm and Gilyén-Arunachalam-Wiebe's algorithm for gradient estimation have already been used to speed up some practical problems [CCLW20, vAGGdW20, vACGN23, HWM⁺22, JCOD23]. Similar to Jordan's algorithm, our algorithm also achieves exponential speedup, so it is interesting to find some useful applications for it. The Hessian matrix widely appears in second-order optimization algorithms, such as Newton's method, so it is also interesting to

know if our quantum algorithms for Hessian estimation can be used to speed up some problems using Newton's method. Sparse Hessian is very common in optimizations [FGL97, PT79, CM84, Col84, GMP05]. It is interesting to see if our quantum algorithms for sparse Hessian estimation can be used to accelerate some classical optimization problems.

- What is the right bound for Hessian estimation? In Section 6, we obtained a lower bound of $\tilde{\Omega}(d)$ in two settings. For complex-valued functions, our algorithm is optimal up to a logarithmic factor. However, for real-valued functions, there is still a gap. We are not able to close this gap in the current research.
- Can the finite difference method perform better for Hessian estimation? The algorithms based on the spectral method have better performance; however, the oracle assumption is stronger than that in the finite difference method. If better quantum algorithms can be found using the finite difference method, then this should be very helpful for practical applications.

Acknowledgement

The research was supported by the National Key Research Project of China under Grant No. 2023YFA1009403. We would like to thank Shantanav Chakraborty and Tongyang Li for their helpful comments on an earlier version of this paper.

Appendix A Error analysis of finite difference formula

Lemma A.1. *For all $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and $k \geq 2m$, we have*

$$\sum_{t=-m}^m \left| a_t^{(2m)} t^{k+1} \right| \leq 24e^{-\frac{7m}{6}} m^{k+\frac{3}{2}},$$

where $a_t^{(2m)}$ is defined in Definition 2.16.

Proof.

$$\begin{aligned} \sum_{t=-m}^m \left| a_t^{(2m)} t^{k+1} \right| &\leq 4 \sum_{t=1}^m \frac{2}{t^2} \frac{m!m!}{(m+t)!(m-t)!} t^{k+1} \\ &\leq 8m \cdot \max_{t \in [m]} \frac{m!m!}{(m+t)!(m-t)!} t^{k-1}. \end{aligned}$$

Using a similar argument to the proof of [GAW19, Lemma 34 (the arXiv version)], we obtain

$$\frac{m!m!}{(m+t)!(m-t)!} t^{k-1} \leq 3\sqrt{m} e^{-\frac{7}{6}m} m^k.$$

This completes the proof. \square

Lemma A.2. *Let $x \in \mathbb{R}_+$, $m \in \mathbb{N}$ and suppose that $f : [-mx, mx] \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $(2m+1)$ -times differentiable. Then there exists some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that*

$$\begin{aligned} \left| f''(0)x^2 - f_{(2m)}(x) - c \right| &= \left| f''(0)x^2 - \sum_{t=-m}^m a_t^{(2m)} f(tx) \right| \\ &\leq 4e^{-\frac{m}{2}} \left\| f^{(2m+1)} \right\|_{\infty} |x|^{2m+1} \end{aligned}$$

where $\|f^{(2m+1)}\|_\infty := \sup_{\xi \in [-mx, mx]} |f^{(2m+1)}(\xi)|$ and $a_t^{(2m)}$ is defined in Definition 2.16. Moreover

$$\sum_{t=1}^m |a_t^{(2m)}| < \sum_{t=1}^m \frac{1}{t^2} < \frac{\pi^2}{6}.$$

Proof. For any $y \in \mathbb{R}$, Taylor's theorem gives us

$$f(y) = \sum_{j=0}^{2m} \frac{f^{(j)}(0)}{j!} y^j + \frac{f^{(2m+1)}(\xi)}{(2m+1)!} y^{2m+1}$$

for some ξ between 0 and y . Denote the first term on the right-hand side of the above equation as $p(y/x)$, and let $z := y/x$. Then we have

$$p(z) = \sum_{j=0}^{2m} \frac{f^{(j)}(0)}{j!} (zx)^j = f(zx) - \frac{f^{(2m+1)}(\xi)}{(2m+1)!} (zx)^{2m+1}. \quad (\text{A.1})$$

Note that $p''(0) = f''(0)x^2$. Since $\deg(p) \leq 2m$, the Lagrange interpolation formula leads to

$$p(z) = \sum_{t=-m}^m p(t) \prod_{\substack{i=-m \\ i \neq t}}^m \frac{z-i}{t-i}.$$

Now we aim to compute the 2nd-order derivative of the above function. Note that

$$\prod_{\substack{i=-m \\ i \neq t}}^m \frac{1}{t-i} = \frac{(-1)^{m-t}}{(m+t)!(m-t)!}.$$

We below handle the cases for $t \neq 0$ and $t = 0$ respectively:

- For $t \neq 0$, we have

$$\prod_{\substack{i=-m \\ i \neq t}}^m (z-i) = \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq |t|}}^m (z^2 - i^2) \cdot z(z+t).$$

Let $h(z) := \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq |t|}}^m (z^2 - i^2)$ and $g(z) := z(z+t)$. Note that $h(z)$ is a polynomial with

only even powers, which can be written as $h(z) = z^{2m-2} + \dots + c_1 z^2 + c_0$. It is easy to see that $g(0) = 0$, $f'(0) = 0$, $g''(0) = 2$, and

$$f(0) = c_0 = \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq |t|}}^m (-i^2) = (-1)^{m-1} \cdot \frac{(m!)^2}{t^2}.$$

Then $[h(z)g(z)]'' = h''(z)g(z) + 2h'(z)g'(z) + h(z)g''(z)$ leads to

$$\left(\prod_{\substack{i=-m \\ i \neq t}}^m (z-i) \right)'' \Big|_{z=0} = \frac{2 \cdot (-1)^{m-1} (m!)^2}{t^2}.$$

- For $t = 0$, we have

$$\prod_{\substack{i=-m \\ i \neq t}}^m (z - i) = \prod_{i=1}^m (z^2 - i^2) = z^{2m} + \dots + d_1 z^2 + d_0.$$

Its 2nd-derivative at $z = 0$ is just

$$2d_1 = 2 \sum_{j=1}^m \prod_{\substack{i=1 \\ i \neq j}}^m (-i^2) = 2 \cdot (-1)^{m-1} (m!)^2 \cdot \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{j^2}.$$

Combining the above results, we obtain that

$$\begin{aligned} p''(0) &= 2 \cdot (-1)^{t-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{j^2} \cdot p(0) + \sum_{\substack{t=-m \\ t \neq 0}}^m \frac{2 \cdot (-1)^{t-1}}{t^2} \frac{(m!)^2}{(m+t)!(m-t)^2} \cdot p(t) \\ &= 2 \cdot (-1)^{t-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{j^2} \cdot p(0) + \sum_{\substack{t=-m \\ t \neq 0}}^m a_t^{(2m)} p(t), \end{aligned} \tag{A.2}$$

where $a_t^{(2m)}$ is the coefficients given in Definition 2.16. Therefore,

$$\begin{aligned} f''(0)x^2 &= p''(0) \\ &\stackrel{\text{(A.2)}}{=} 2 \cdot (-1)^{t-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{j^2} \cdot p(0) + \sum_{\substack{t=-m \\ t \neq 0}}^m a_t^{(2m)} p(t) \\ &\stackrel{\text{(A.1)}}{=} 2 \cdot (-1)^{t-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{j^2} \cdot f(0) + \sum_{\substack{t=-m \\ t \neq 0}}^m a_t^{(2m)} \left(f(tx) - \frac{f^{(2m+1)}(\xi_t)}{(2m+1)!} (tx)^{2m+1} \right). \end{aligned}$$

Let $c := (a_0^{(2m)} - 2 \cdot (-1)^{t-1} \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{j^2}) f(0)$, which is a constant since $|c| \leq (|a_0^{(2m)}| + 2 \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{j^2}) f(0) \leq 4 \sum_{j=1}^m \frac{1}{j^2} f(0) \leq \frac{2\pi^2}{3} f(0)$. Hence,

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{(2m)}(x) - f''(0)x^2 - c| &= \left| \sum_{\substack{t=-m \\ t \neq 0}}^m a_t^{(2m)} \frac{f^{(2m+1)}(\xi_t)}{(2m+1)!} (tx)^{2m+1} \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{\substack{t=-m \\ t \neq 0}}^m |a_t^{(2m)} t^{2m+1}| \cdot \frac{\|f^{(2m+1)}\|_\infty}{(2m+1)!} \cdot |x|^{2m+1} \\ &\leq 24e^{-\frac{7m}{6}} m^{2m+3/2} \frac{\|f^{(2m+1)}\|_\infty}{(2m+1)!} |x|^{2m+1} \\ &\leq 12e^{-\frac{7m}{6}} m^{2m+1/2} \frac{\|f^{(2m+1)}\|_\infty}{\sqrt{4\pi m} (2m/e)^{2m}} |x|^{2m+1} \\ &\leq 4e^{-\frac{7m}{6}} \left(\frac{e}{2}\right)^{2m} \|f^{(2m+1)}\|_\infty |x|^{2m+1} \\ &\leq 4e^{-\frac{m}{2}} \|f^{(2m+1)}\|_\infty |x|^{2m+1}, \end{aligned}$$

which is as claimed. \square

Based on Lemma A.2, we now prove a version for higher dimensional functions.

Lemma A.3. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}, B > 0, \mathbf{x} \in \mathbb{R}^d$. Assume that $f : [-m\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty, m\|\mathbf{x}\|_\infty]^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is $(2m+1)$ -times differentiable and*

$$|\partial_{\mathbf{r}}^{2m+1} f(\tau \mathbf{x})| \leq B \quad \text{for all } \tau \in [-m, m], \text{ where } \mathbf{r} := \frac{\mathbf{x}}{\|\mathbf{x}\|},$$

then there exists some constant $c \in \mathbb{R}$ such that

$$|f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{x} - c| \leq 4Be^{-\frac{m}{2}} \|\mathbf{x}\|^{2m+1}.$$

Proof. Consider the function $h(\tau) := f(\tau \mathbf{x})$, then

$$\begin{aligned} |f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{x} - c| &= |h_{(2m)}(1) - h''(0)| \\ &\leq 4e^{-\frac{m}{2}} \sup_{\tau \in [-m, m]} |h^{(2m+1)}(\tau)| \\ &= 4e^{-\frac{m}{2}} \sup_{\tau \in [-m, m]} |\partial_{\mathbf{x}}^{2m+1} f(\tau \mathbf{x})| \\ &= 4e^{-\frac{m}{2}} \sup_{\tau \in [-m, m]} |\partial_{\mathbf{r}}^{2m+1} f(\tau \mathbf{x})| \|\mathbf{x}\|^{2m+1} \\ &\leq 4Be^{-\frac{m}{2}} \|\mathbf{x}\|^{2m+1}, \end{aligned}$$

as claimed. \square

Lemma A.4. *Making the same assumption as Lemma A.3, let $\mathbf{x} \in aG_n^d, \mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|\mathbf{y}\| = 1$. If $m \geq \log(dB/\varepsilon)$ and $a \approx O(1/\sqrt{dm})$, we then have*

$$\left| \frac{1}{2} (f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}) - f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x})) - \mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{y} - \frac{1}{2} \mathbf{y}^T \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{y} \right| \leq O(a\varepsilon). \quad (\text{A.3})$$

Proof. By Lemma A.3, for any \mathbf{y} , we have

$$\text{LHS of (A.3)} \leq 4Be^{-\frac{m}{2}} (\|\mathbf{x}\|^{2m+1} + \|\mathbf{x} + \mathbf{y}\|^{2m+1}).$$

When $\mathbf{x} \in aG_n^d$ and $\mathbf{y} \in \mathbb{R}^d$ with $\|\mathbf{y}\| = 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} \text{LHS of (A.3)} &\leq 4Be^{-\frac{m}{2}} \left(\left(\frac{a\sqrt{d}}{2} \right)^{2m+1} + \left(\frac{a}{2} \sqrt{d} + 1 \right)^{2m+1} \right) \\ &\leq 8Be^{-\frac{m}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{2} \sqrt{d} + 1 \right)^{2m+1} \end{aligned}$$

It is hoped that the above is smaller than $\eta a\varepsilon$ with $\eta = 1/8 \cdot 42 \cdot \pi$. We assume that $a\sqrt{d}/2 < 1$ and $(2m+1)\frac{a\sqrt{d}}{2} < 1$, then by $\ln(1+x) \leq x$ and $e^x \leq 1+2x$ when $0 < x < 1$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} 8Be^{-\frac{m}{2}} \left(\frac{a}{2} \sqrt{d} + 1 \right)^{2m+1} &= 8Be^{-\frac{m}{2}} e^{(2m+1) \ln(1 + \frac{a\sqrt{d}}{2})} \\ &\leq 8Be^{-\frac{m}{2}} e^{(2m+1) \frac{a\sqrt{d}}{2}} \\ &\leq 8Be^{-\frac{m}{2}} (1 + (2m+1)a\sqrt{d}). \end{aligned}$$

Let

$$8Be^{-\frac{m}{2}} (1 + (2m+1)a\sqrt{d}) \leq \eta a\varepsilon,$$

i.e.,

$$a(\eta\varepsilon - 8Be^{-\frac{m}{2}}(2m+1)\sqrt{d}) \geq 8Be^{-\frac{m}{2}}.$$

So we obtain

$$8Be^{-\frac{m}{2}} \leq (\eta\varepsilon - 8Be^{-\frac{m}{2}}(2m+1)\sqrt{d}) \frac{2}{\sqrt{d}(2m+1)}.$$

This means

$$12Be^{-\frac{m}{2}}\sqrt{d}(2m+1) \leq \eta\varepsilon.$$

Thus when m is large enough, say $m \approx \log(dB/\varepsilon)$, the above holds. As a result, we can choose $a < 2/\sqrt{d}(2m+1) \approx 1/\sqrt{d}\log(d/\varepsilon)$. \square

Lemma A.5. *Let $m \in \mathbb{N}, a, c \in \mathbb{R}_+$. Suppose $f : \mathbb{R}^d \rightarrow \mathbb{R}$ is analytic and for all $k \in \mathbb{N}, \alpha \in \mathbb{N}_0^d, |\alpha| = k$*

$$|\partial^\alpha f(\mathbf{0})| \leq c^k k^{\frac{k}{2}},$$

then we have

$$|f_{2m}(\mathbf{x}) - \mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{x}| \leq \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} (13acm\sqrt{d})^k$$

for all but 1/1000 fraction of points $\mathbf{x} \in aG_n^d$.

Proof. Since f is analytic, we can write it as its Taylor series:

$$f(\mathbf{x}) = \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \sum_{\alpha \in [d]^k} \frac{\mathbf{x}^\alpha \cdot \partial_\alpha f(\mathbf{0})}{k!}.$$

In this proof, we use the notation $\partial_\alpha f := \partial_{\alpha_1} \partial_{\alpha_2} \cdots \partial_{\alpha_k} f$ for $\alpha \in [d]^k$ to make the expression clearer and more concise. Using the finite difference formula defined in Definition 2.16, we have

$$\begin{aligned} f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x}) &= \sum_{t=-m}^m a_t^{(2m)} f(t\mathbf{x}) \\ &= \sum_{t=-m}^m a_t^{(2m)} \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\alpha \in [d]^k} (t\mathbf{x})^\alpha \cdot \partial_\alpha f(\mathbf{0}) \\ &= \sum_{k=0}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\alpha \in [d]^k} \mathbf{x}^\alpha \cdot \partial_\alpha f(\mathbf{0}) \underbrace{\sum_{t=-m}^m a_t^{(2m)} t^k}_{*}. \end{aligned}$$

Applying Lemma A.2 to the function t^k with the choice $x = 1$ tells us that the term $*$ is 0 if $k \leq 2m$ except for $k = 2$, in which case it is 2. Therefore, using Lemma A.1

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{x}^\top \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{x} - f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x})| &= \left| \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} \frac{1}{k!} \sum_{\alpha \in [d]^k} \mathbf{x}^\alpha \cdot \partial_\alpha f(\mathbf{0}) \sum_{t=-m}^m a_t^{(2m)} t^k \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} \left(\frac{e}{k} \right)^k \frac{1}{\sqrt{4\pi m}} \left| \sum_{\alpha \in [d]^k} \mathbf{x}^\alpha \cdot \partial_\alpha f(\mathbf{0}) \right| \left| \sum_{t=-m}^m a_t^{(2m)} t^k \right| \\ &\leq \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} \left| \sum_{\alpha \in [d]^k} \mathbf{x}^\alpha \cdot \partial_\alpha f(\mathbf{0}) \right| \left(\frac{e}{k} \right)^k \frac{12e^{-\frac{7m}{6}} m^{k+\frac{1}{2}}}{\sqrt{\pi m}} \\ &\leq \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} 2\sqrt{2} \left| \sum_{\alpha \in [d]^k} \mathbf{x}^\alpha \cdot \partial_\alpha f(\mathbf{0}) \right| \left(\frac{em}{k} \right)^k. \end{aligned}$$

Some probabilistic results [GAW19, Lemma 36 in the arXiv version] allow us to obtain that, if we choose uniformly random $\mathbf{x} \in aG_n^d$, then for all $k \in \mathbb{N}_+$, the ratio of \mathbf{x} for which

$$\left| \sum_{\alpha \in [d]^k} \frac{\mathbf{x}^\alpha}{a^k} \cdot \frac{\partial_\alpha f(\mathbf{0})}{c^k k^{\frac{k}{2}}} \right| \geq \sqrt{2} \left(4\sqrt{\frac{dk}{2}} \right)^k$$

is at most 4^{-2k} . Since $\sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} 4^{-2k} \leq \sum_{k=3}^{\infty} 4^{-2k} < 1/1000$, it follows that for all but a $1/1000$ fraction of $\mathbf{x} \in aG_n^d$, we have

$$\begin{aligned} |\mathbf{x}^T \mathbf{H}_f(\mathbf{0}) \mathbf{x} - f_{(2m)}(\mathbf{x})| &\leq \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} 2\sqrt{2} \left| \sum_{\alpha \in [d]^k} \mathbf{x}^\alpha \cdot \partial_\alpha f(\mathbf{0}) \right| \left(\frac{em}{k} \right)^k \\ &\leq \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} 4 \left(4\sqrt{\frac{dk}{2}} \right)^k a^k c^k k^{\frac{k}{2}} \left(\frac{em}{k} \right)^k \\ &= \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} 4 \left(\frac{4\sqrt{d}acem}{\sqrt{2}} \right)^k \\ &< \sum_{k=2m+1}^{\infty} (13acm\sqrt{d})^k. \end{aligned}$$

This completes the proof. □

References

- [AG23] Simon Apers and Sander Gribling. Quantum speedups for linear programming via interior point methods. *arXiv:2311.03215*, 2023.
- [Ber14] Dominic W Berry. High-order quantum algorithm for solving linear differential equations. *Journal of Physics A: Mathematical and Theoretical*, 47(10):105301, 2014.
- [BV93] Ethan Bernstein and Umesh Vazirani. Quantum complexity theory. In *Proceedings of the twenty-fifth annual ACM Symposium on Theory of Computing*, pages 11–20, 1993.
- [BV04] Stephen P Boyd and Lieven Vandenberghe. *Convex Optimization*. Cambridge University Press, 2004.
- [CCLW20] Shouvanik Chakrabarti, Andrew M Childs, Tongyang Li, and Xiaodi Wu. Quantum algorithms and lower bounds for convex optimization. *Quantum*, 4:221, 2020.
- [CL20] Andrew M Childs and Jin-Peng Liu. Quantum spectral methods for differential equations. *Communications in Mathematical Physics*, 375(2):1427–1457, 2020.
- [CM84] Thomas F Coleman and Jorge J Moré. Estimation of sparse Hessian matrices and graph coloring problems. *Mathematical Programming*, 28:243–270, 1984.
- [Col84] Thomas F Coleman. *Large Sparse Numerical Optimization*. Springer-Verlag, New York, 1984.

- [Cor19] Arjan Cornelissen. Quantum gradient estimation of Gevrey functions. *arXiv:1909.13528*, 2019.
- [FGL97] Roger Fletcher, Andreas Grothey, and Sven Leyffer. Computing sparse Hessian and Jacobian approximations with optimal hereditary properties. *Large-Scale Optimization with Applications: Part II: Optimal Design and Control*, pages 37–52, 1997.
- [For81] Bengt Fornberg. Numerical differentiation of analytic functions. *ACM Transactions on Mathematical Software (TOMS)*, 7(4):512–526, 1981.
- [GAW19] András Gilyén, Srinivasan Arunachalam, and Nathan Wiebe. Optimizing quantum optimization algorithms via faster quantum gradient computation. In *Proceedings of the Thirtieth Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms*, pages 1425–1444. SIAM, 2019.
- [GLW⁺21] Pan Gao, Keren Li, Shijie Wei, Jiancun Gao, and Guilu Long. Quantum gradient algorithm for general polynomials. *Physical Review A*, 103(4):042403, 2021.
- [GMP05] Assefaw Hadish Gebremedhin, Fredrik Manne, and Alex Pothén. What color is your Jacobian? Graph coloring for computing derivatives. *SIAM Review*, 47(4):629–705, 2005.
- [GR22] Robert C Gunning and Hugo Rossi. *Analytic Functions of Several Complex Variables*, volume 368. American Mathematical Society, 2022.
- [GSLW19] 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.
- [HWM⁺22] William J Huggins, Kianna Wan, Jarrod McClean, Thomas E O’Brien, Nathan Wiebe, and Ryan Babbush. Nearly optimal quantum algorithm for estimating multiple expectation values. *Physical Review Letters*, 129(24):240501, 2022.
- [JCOD23] Sofiene Jerbi, Arjan Cornelissen, Maris Ozols, and Vedran Dunjko. Quantum policy gradient algorithms. In Omar Fawzi and Michael Walter, editors, *18th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2023)*, volume 266 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 13:1–13:24, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2023. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [Jor05] Stephen P Jordan. Fast quantum algorithm for numerical gradient estimation. *Physical Review Letters*, 95(5):050501, 2005.
- [Kar20] Ricardo Karam. Why are complex numbers needed in quantum mechanics? some answers for the introductory level. *American Journal of Physics*, 88(1):39–45, 2020.
- [KP02] Steven G. Krantz and Harold R. Parks. *A Primer of Real Analytic Functions*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2002.

- [KP20] Jordanis Kerenidis and Anupam Prakash. Quantum gradient descent for linear systems and least squares. *Physical Review A*, 101(2):022316, 2020.
- [Kra01] Steven George Krantz. *Function Theory of Several Complex Variables*, volume 340. American Mathematical Society, 2001.
- [LC19] Guang Hao Low and Isaac L Chuang. Hamiltonian simulation by qubitization. *Quantum*, 3:163, 2019.
- [Li05] Jianping Li. General explicit difference formulas for numerical differentiation. *Journal of Computational and Applied Mathematics*, 183(1):29–52, 2005.
- [LM67] James N Lyness and Cleve B Moler. Numerical differentiation of analytic functions. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 4(2):202–210, 1967.
- [LS71] James N Lyness and G Sande. Algorithm 413: ENTCAF and ENTCRE: evaluation of normalized Taylor coefficients of an analytic function. *Communications of the ACM*, 14(10):669–675, 1971.
- [LSZ21] Troy Lee, Miklos Santha, and Shengyu Zhang. Quantum algorithms for graph problems with cut queries. In *Proceedings of the 2021 ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 939–958. SIAM, 2021.
- [LT10] Christine Laurent-Thiébaud. *Holomorphic function theory in several variables: An introduction*. Springer Science & Business Media, 2010.
- [Lyn68] J.N. Lyness. Differentiation formulas for analytic functions. *Mathematics of Computation*, 22(102):352–362, 1968.
- [MBK21] Andrea Mari, Thomas R Bromley, and Nathan Killoran. Estimating the gradient and higher-order derivatives on quantum hardware. *Physical Review A*, 103(1):012405, 2021.
- [Mon12] Ashley Montanaro. The quantum query complexity of learning multilinear polynomials. *Information Processing Letters*, 112(11):438–442, 2012.
- [MS22] Ashley Montanaro and Changpeng Shao. Quantum Algorithms for Learning a Hidden Graph. In François Le Gall and Tomoyuki Morimae, editors, *17th Conference on the Theory of Quantum Computation, Communication and Cryptography (TQC 2022)*, volume 232 of *Leibniz International Proceedings in Informatics (LIPIcs)*, pages 1:1–1:22, Dagstuhl, Germany, 2022. Schloss Dagstuhl – Leibniz-Zentrum für Informatik.
- [PT79] M. J. D. Powell and Ph. L. Toint. On the Estimation of Sparse Hessian Matrices. *SIAM Journal on Numerical Analysis*, 16(6):1060–1074, 1979.
- [Ran98] R Michael Range. *Holomorphic Functions and Integral Representations in Several Complex Variables*, volume 108. Springer Science & Business Media, 1998.
- [RPGE17] Lidia Ruiz-Perez and Juan Carlos Garcia-Escartin. Quantum arithmetic with the quantum Fourier transform. *Quantum Information Processing*, 16:1–14, 2017.

- [RSW⁺19] Patrick Reberntrost, 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.
- [SBG⁺19] Maria Schuld, Ville Bergholm, Christian Gogolin, Josh Izaac, and Nathan Killoran. Evaluating analytic gradients on quantum hardware. *Physical Review A*, 99(3):032331, 2019.
- [SNW12] Suvrit Sra, Sebastian Nowozin, and Stephen J Wright. *Optimization for Machine Learning*. MIT Press, 2012.
- [Teo23] Y.S. Teo. Optimized numerical gradient and Hessian estimation for variational quantum algorithms. *Physical Review A*, 107(4):042421, 2023.
- [Tit39] Edward C Titchmarsh. *The Theory of Functions*. Oxford University Press, 1939.
- [Tre00] Lloyd N. Trefethen. *Spectral Methods in MATLAB*. SIAM, 2000.
- [vACGN23] Joran van Apeldoorn, Arjan Cornelissen, András Gilyén, and Giacomo Nannicini. Quantum tomography using state-preparation unitaries. In *Proceedings of the 2023 Annual ACM-SIAM Symposium on Discrete Algorithms (SODA)*, pages 1265–1318. SIAM, 2023.
- [vAGGdW20] Joran van Apeldoorn, András Gilyén, Sander Gribling, and Ronald de Wolf. Convex optimization using quantum oracles. *Quantum*, 4:220, 2020.